

IJDL

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DRAVIDIAN LINGUISTICS

VOLUME I, NUMBER 1

JANUARY 1972

S. K. Chatterji: Address to the Dravidian Linguists.....	1
T. Burrow: The Primitive Dravidian Word for the Horse.....	18
William Bright: The Enunciative Vowel.....	26
Kenneth L. Pike and Kent H. Gordon: Preliminary Technology to show Emic Relations... in Dhangar (Kudux Nepal).....	56
J. D. Singh: Panini's Theory of Language.....	80
Kamil Zvelebil: A new Model of Language.....	97
Ray S. Jackendoff: Speculations on Presentences and Determiners	112
V. I. Subramoniam: Rules of Nasal Assimilation in Malayalam.....	137
Leigh Lisker: On Stops and Geminata in Tamil.....	144
V. R. Prabodhachandran Nayar: Phonological Formulae for verbal suffixes in Malayalam.....	151
Notes:	
Al Quadri: All about Brahui.....	160
D. N. S. Bhat: Historical Subgrouping.....	174
Review:	
S. Velayudhan: Vowel Duration in Malayalam (K. M. Tiwari)...	178
Publications received	180
News:	
Call attention notice for the D. L. A.....	181
First Conference of the Dravidian Linguists.....	183

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

UNIVERSITY OF KERALA, KARIAVATTOM, TRIVANDRUM
INDIA

THE PRIMITIVE DRAVIDIAN WORD FOR THE HORSE

T. Burrow

In the Dravidian Etymological Dictionary there are three entries containing words meaning 'horse'. Of these DED 1423, Ta. kutirai, etc. has the widest spread, but leaving out borrowings, it is nevertheless essentially confined to the South Dravidian languages. In DED 3268 Ta. Ma. pari is simply a nominal use of the verbal base pari 'to run, gallop', and Tu. payyoli, which along with payyeru 'horse' is put there with query, means both 'horse' and 'riding, galloping'. In DED 3917 Ta. maa, Te. maavu 'horse' have specialised the more general meaning of this word which is 'animal, beast'. DEDS noted Nahali maav 'horse' presumed to be borrowed from Dravidian. In Tamil, puravi 'horse' is common in the classical poetry, but has no cognates in the other languages; another word, killai appears to be only lexical. The other SDrav. languages have no native words in this sense, other than those which appear in DED 1423.

In looking for the primitive Dravidian word for 'horse', DED 1423, Ta. kutirai, etc., is the only one out of the above mentioned items which would deserve consideration, but this word itself has only a very uncertain claim to be regarded as such, because it is found only in the Southern Dravidian languages. This means that there is a possibility only that these languages have preserved the primitive Dravidian word, which has been lost elsewhere, but it is equally possible the word does not go back so far, and that it is a later creation of this particular group. As noted in DED (following Gundert and Kittel) the word appears to be derived from the verbal base Ta. kuti 'to jump, leap', Ma. kuti 'leap, gallop' Ka. kuduku 'to trot', etc., and in view of this derivation the word need not be very ancient.

The question of the original word for horse in Dravidian is rendered more difficult to decide because all the Central Dravidian

languages, as well as Kurukh and Malto, have as words for horse only loanwords with the exception of Gad. *aynam* whose derivation is wholly uncertain. These loanwords are either from Indo-Aryan, from the derivatives of Sanskrit *ghoṭaka* – or, in the case of languages subject to Telugu influence, from Te. *gurramu* (e.g. Pa. *gurrol*, Kol. *gurram*. etc.) The Indo-Aryan loanwords are mostly straightforward (e.g. Pe. *Kui gooṛa*, Kur. *ghoṛoo*, Malt. *goṛo*), but Gondi *kooḍaa* (Tr.) has replaced the initial by unvoiced *k*–, and (in most dialects) has intervocalic *-d*– which would seem to indicate that the word has been taken from Marathi. (cf. Mar. *ghooḍaa*, as opposed to Hi., etc. *ghooṛaa*, CDIAL, no. 4516). The loans from Telugu are mostly equally straightforward, though Pa. *gurrol* is an original plural form used as a singular (the Pa. plur. is *gurrocil*). Only the Naiki of Chanda develops a rather aberrant form, *kurmam/kurmmam*, with initial unvoicing and extra suffixation. Thus the central Dravidian languages and Kurukh–Malto have nothing to contribute to the problem of the original word for the horse in Primitive Dravidian, and it is not possible to say what word they may have had for ‘horse’ before it was replaced by these loanwords. It is possible that they may have had something corresponding to Ta. *kutirai*, etc. but it is equally possible that this word never extended beyond South Dravidian.

The southern Kolarian languages possess words meaning ‘horse’ that bear some resemblance to Ta. *kutirai*, etc, namely Sav. *kurtaa*, Gad. *krutaa*, a fact that has long been noted, and discussed without any definite conclusion being reached. The similarity may be purely accidental; if not it can only be explained as a loan-relationship. Since the Dravidian words seem to be definitely connected with the Drav. verbal base *kuti*, a borrowing from Kolarian into Dravidian may be ruled out. A borrowing from Dravidian into Kolarian would be possible on the assumption that there has been transposition of the consonants – *t* and – *r*. In that case it would indicate a wider extension of the item Ta. *kutirai*, etc., since these languages would be expected to have borrowed it from some earlier form of one of the Dravidian dialects spoken in south Orissa, but as the connection can only be regarded as speculative, this must remain purely hypothetical. There is incidentally a Sanskrit late lexical word *kuraṭha*–which has been quoted in this connection, and it could conceivably have been borrowed from this Kolarian source. On the other hand a *kuruṭin*– ‘horse’, also found in a late lexicon, is probably better explained as being based on the obscure hapax legomenon *kuruṭinī* which appears in AV 10, 1, 15 and kept quite apart from *kuraṭha*– and its possible Kolarian origin.

The Kolarian material cannot therefore be regarded as a sound basis for assuming a wider extension of SDrav. kutirai, etc., even though there remains a remote possibility that it may do so. But there is another argument which has been employed towards the same end, and that is an equation proposed between Ta. kutirai, etc. on the one hand and Sanskrit, ghoṭaka- 'horse' and its descendants on the other, on the assumption that the latter are loanwords from Dravidian. Between these two words, kutirai and ghoṭaka-, there is a slight resemblance in respect of the first syllable, which prompted Gundert in his Malayalam dictionary to propose this connection, and he was followed by Kittel in the introduction to his Kannaḍa dictionary and by others. An attempt to account for the comparison in detail was made by J. Bloch in BSOS, V, p. 736 by assuming an original base ghutr- from which Sanskrit ghoṭa(ka)- on the one hand and Ta. kutirai and Te. gurramu on the other might be derived. This theory runs counter to the fact that Primitive Dravidian possessed no initial voiced consonants, either unaspirated or aspirated, and that although in due course most Dravidian languages have developed initial unaspirated voiced stops to some extent, they have not done this with aspirated voiced stops. Consequently a hypothetical ghutr- can be altogether ruled out of the question. In addition there is the general point that the resemblance between Skt. ghoṭaka- and Ta. kutirai is so slight that it does not form a proper basis for any etymological comparison.

The Sanskrit word ghoṭaka- (and later occasionally ghoṭa- without the suffix-ka) is not very common, being quoted in PW only from the Pancatantra (apart from lexica). It is unknown to the early Pali literature, and the only instance of it quoted in the PTS dictionary is a passage in Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Jaataka (VI, 452) where it is used to paraphrase the term khaḷunka- in the original verse. In Prakrit it is recorded in Jain canonical texts, but none of those need antedate the Christian era. In modern Indo-Aryan, and including the Kafiri languages as well as Dardic, it becomes the universal word for horse, with the sole exception of Sinhalese. On the basis of this evidence one would conclude that it is a word of Prakrit origin that had not become current until after the Christian era, and which in due course almost totally replaced the original word for horse, asva-.

In view of these considerations it comes as a surprise that in PW. ghoṭa- 'horse' is quoted from the Aapastamba śrauta Suutra (XV, 3, 12; cf. also the corresponding passage in Bhaaradvāja śrauta Suutra, XI, 3, 7). It is rather surprising because if ghoṭa-

horse is found in so early a text then there must be an intervening period of some years before it next turns up during which no trace of the word is to be found. This is not an absolute impossibility, but the circumstance does warrant a critical look at the passage in the Suutra from which this ghoṭa- is quoted. The passage reads, aajyasthaaliṃ rauhiṇakapaale ca parimaṇḍale ghoṭaprakaare "From this earth he prepares a butter-vessel and two dishes for the rauhiṇa-cakes (which are) circular and ghoṭa-shaped". The question arises as to whether ghoṭa- in this passage really means 'horse', since such a meaning does not necessarily arise from the context, and furthermore is not very likely in it. The commentaries take it as being ghoṭa- 'horse' and Caland in his translation renders it so. as also does C. G. Kashikar in his translation of the Bhaaradvaja Srauta Suutra. But Caland remarks, in the note to his translation "die Deutung ist unsicher", since in this context such a meaning is wholly implausible as well as contradicting the preceding epithet, parimaṇḍala-. We cannot in fact believe in these circular dishes shaped like a horse. Furthermore this word for horse, ghoṭaka- in Sanskrit, ghoḍaga-, ghoḍaya-, ghoḍaa- in Prakrit contains a suffix -ka which is an essential part of the word, and not a secondary addition as is the -ka in asvaka- beside asva-. We know this because leaving aside the Apastamba passage, which is so exceedingly dubious, the word appears with the suffix -ka in all its earlier occurrences, and the forms ghoṭa- and ghoṭii appear only in exceedingly late sources, and are therefore obviously secondary.

The question arises as to what this ghoṭa- in the Suutra is, if it is not, as we must almost certainly conclude, a word meaning 'horse'. Naturally on such a point certainty can hardly be expected, but the following suggestion may possibly provide the explanation. There is a series of words in Dravidian (DED 1723 with DEDS) meaning a kind of jujube, Ta. koṭṭai-ilantai, koṭṭai, Ka. koṭṭa, Te. goṭṭi, Go. ghoṭia, etc. from which Skt ghoṭaa 'a kind of jujube' may reasonably be considered to be derived. In addition to this Sanskrit word given in DESS there is also another word goṭaa=badarii quoted in R. Schmidt's Nachtrage. Possibly this ghoṭa- in Apastamba is another adaptation of the same Dravidian original. At any rate it would make a tolerable sense, 'shaped like a jujube fruit', which is more than can be said of the meaning 'horse'. Even if this meaning can only be regarded as conjectural, the alternative meaning, 'horse' can with fair certainty be ruled out for the reasons given above.

There is another conclusion to be drawn from the fact that this word for horse is primarily ghoṭaka-, and not ghoṭa-, and that

if the suffix-ka is an essential part of the word, as the evidence suggests, then it should be the Indo-Aryan primary suffix-ka commonly used in the formation of agent nouns (like *codaka-*, *krośaka-*, etc.), and this would exclude its being borrowed from any other non-Aryan source, as well as from Dravidian. So the question to be decided is whether there is in Indo-Aryan a root from which the word *ghoṭaka-* can be derived by means of this primary suffix-ka. As *ghoṭaka-* is according to the evidence a Prakrit word in the first place, later accepted into Sanskrit, we would be advised to look in Prakrit for a verbal base from which it might be derived. A verb *ghoḍai* is in fact recorded for Prakrit in the sense of 'turn, revolve', and with it we may place (taking into account the usual alternation *ḍ/1*) Pkt. *gholai* in the same sense. A corresponding root, *ghuṭa* parivartane is listed in the *Dhaatupaatha* in the first class, and is quoted once from the *Pañcatantra vyaaghuṭya* 'having returned'). It seems at first sight that the meaning of this root hardly provides a suitable basis for the derivation of *ghoṭaka-* 'horse' (though *Kṣīrasvamin* in his commentary on the *Dhaatupaatha* finds no difficulty in proposing just this etymology for *ghoṭaka-*) but there is evidence that the meaning of the Prakrit verb was a good deal wider, and could include the sort of meanings that would justify the derivation from it of a word meaning 'horse'. In the first place in the form *gholai* it counts as a *Dhaatvaadeśa* corresponding to Sanskrit *ghuṛṇ-* (*Hemacandra*, IV, 117, along with *ghulai*, etc.) and Sanskrit *ghuṛṇ-* has a much wider meaning than 'turn, revolve', which was presumably its original meaning, e. g. 'move to and fro, shake, be agitated, roll about'. That the same kind of development of meaning had occurred in the case of *ghoḍai* is evident from the way it is used in *Setubandha*, 5, 10 :

jaha jaha nisaa samappai	taha taha vevira-taraṅga-
	paddimaa-vadham
kimkaayavva-vimuḍham	ghoḍai hiaṃ va uahino
	sasi-bimbam.

"As the night goes by the disc of the moon, reflected in the tremulous wave, moves unsteady as if it were the heart of the ocean uncertain as to what to do".

Although it is not possible to state precisely the point of reference, it seems that the sphere of meaning of this verb, including swaying motion, unsteady and tremulous motion or oscillating motion is sufficiently wide for it to have been used in connection with the motion of a horse. The word *ghoṭaka-* is of Prakrit origin,

the earliest form in the Jaina texts being *ghoḍaga-*, and it is a descriptive epithet based on this Prakrit root. Even though it has found its way into the *Dhaatupaāṭha*, this root is originally a Prakrit root, and the word for 'horse' derived from it is likewise Prakrit in origin.

Thus the word *ghoṭaka-* cannot have any connection with the above mentioned Dravidian words, but some further consideration must be given to the Te. word *guṛamu*. This word has always been quoted in connection with the proposed Dravidian origin of Skt *ghoṭaka-*, and it is a fact that there is a somewhat greater resemblance between the Indo-Aryan word and this Te. word than there is between it and Ta. *kutirai*, etc. As regards the status of this Te. word, it is registered in DED along with Ta. *kutirai*, etc. as if etymologically connected with them in the usual way. Nevertheless there are serious phonetic difficulties in the way of this derivation, since no other instance of Te. *-rr-* representing *-tir-*, it must be assumed if this etymology is accepted that originally *-tr-* existed. Furthermore Te. has a perfectly regular corresponding form to Ta. *kutirai*, namely *kudira*, and since there is this perfectly regular correspondence, it is difficult to see how the wholly anomalous *guṛamu* can be accounted for as an alternative. If it cannot be so explained then the possibility has to be considered that Te. *guṛamu* is a loanword from Indo-Aryan.¹ This possibility is based on the fact that in certain central Dravidian languages there is a phonetic change by which intervocalic *-ḍ-* became *-r-* so the Telugu form can be accounted for on the assumption that it has been borrowed through some such intermediary. The facts are briefly as follows. In *Koṇḍa* and *Goṇḍi* (in those dialects which distinguish *-r-* and *-ṛ-*) Dravidian intervocalic *-ḍ-* becomes *-ṛ-*, as in *Koṇḍa naar*, *Go. naar* 'village', cf. Ta. *naaṭu*, Ka. *naaḍu*, etc. It thus falls together with Dravidian *-ṛ-* which appears in such words as *Go.*, *Koṇḍa eer* 'water', cf. Ta. *yaaru*, etc. In addition to this, in the other members of this sub-group, namely in *Pengo*, *Maṇḍa*, *Kuui* and *Kuui*, Dravidian *-ḍ-* and *-ṛ-* also fall together: cf. on the one hand *Pe. naaz*. *Maṇḍa naay*, *Kuui naaju*, *Kuui naayu*, and on the other hand *Pe. eez*, *Maṇḍa ey*. *Kui (K) eju*, *Kuui eyu*. These facts can be explained if we assume that in these languages Dravidian *-ḍ-* became *-ṛ-*, as in *Koṇḍa* and *Goṇḍi*, and then in common with *-ṛ-* representing original Dravidian *-ṛ-* underwent the above treatments. This means that there was originally a very wide spread of this change of *-ḍ-* to *-ṛ-* in central Dravidian, and in addition there is also the fact that *Gaḍaba*, though not belonging to this subfamily, turns *Drav. -ḍ-* into *-r-* in such cases as *ir-* 'to put'

(<id-) and karp- 'to cross' (<kadp-). Assuming that the Prakrit word ghodaga- / ghodaa- had become current in these regions, a similar change might be expected if it were borrowed into Dravidian, and this would account for the -rr- of Telugu gurramu if it had been borrowed through some such intermediary. It is certainly easier to account for the word this way, than as an inherited form corresponding to Ta. kutirai, etc.

From what has been said above it is clear that any attempt to derive Skt. ghoṭaka- etc. form Dravidian should be abandoned, and that Te. gurramu is more likely to be a loanword from Indo-Aryan than an inherited Dravidian word. Tamil kutirai, etc. cannot be shown to go back to primitive Dravidian since no corresponding forms can be found outside the southern Dravidian languages. The central Dravidian languages and Kurukh and Malto have no native words for horse and so cannot contribute to the question. There remains Brahui, which has not so far been taken into consideration. The Brahui language has been heavily infiltrated by Iranian on the one hand, and by Indo-Aryan on the other, so that its native Dravidian vocabulary has been very considerably reduced. Nevertheless it possesses a word for 'horse' which is neither Iranian nor Indo-Aryan, namely hulli, and which should therefore be regarded as belonging to the native Dravidian element of the language. As regards its etymology Bray tentatively compared Ta. kutirai, etc. This is quite out of question since Brah. initial h- is secondary, and as can be seen from the Brahui words quoted in DED and its supplement. Brahui words beginning with h- correspond to words beginning with vowels in other Dravidian languages (e. g. Brah. hal 'rat', Ta. eli, etc., Brah. hiining 'to lamb', Ta. iin-, etc.). This Brahui word could find no place in DED since we had found no word corresponding to it. Nevertheless there is such a word, and that is the Tamil word, not so far noted above (and also not appearing in DED), ivuḷi 'horse'. The comparison Ta. ivuḷi = Brah. hulli, though so far not noted, is an obvious equation, and it presents no difficulties of a phonetic nature, since the only difference of importance is a contraction of the first part of the word which has taken place in Brahui, a not unexpected development in view of the long period that separates modern Brahui from primitive Dravidian. On the other hand Ta. ivuḷi may be regarded as preserving unaltered the primitive Dravidian form of the word.

The Tamil lexicon is very sparing with information about ivuḷi, simply noting one passage where it occurs in *Puraṇaannuṇu*.

The word is however quite common in the Sangam literature, and it remains in use later as a poetic word. It has obviously long ceased to be used in the spoken language, *kutirai* having become the usual word, and it has died out in all the other S. Dravidian languages. In contradistinction to *kutirai* it cannot be connected with any verbal root, and it has all the characteristics of an archaic word, preserved, as far as living speech is concerned, only in the early period of the language. The comparison with Brahui takes the word back to the primitive Dravidian stage, since, although it is preserved only in two languages, these two languages are at the opposite ends of the Dravidian area. Furthermore, Tamil having the most ancient literature of the Dravidian languages takes the word back a considerable distance towards the primitive Dravidian stage. We may therefore conclude without any reasonable doubt that in this Tamil-Brahui equation we have the original Dravidian word for 'horse'.

This conclusion has obviously considerable importance for the question as to where the Dravidian languages originated. It has often been suggested that Dravidian came into India from the North-West, and that, Brahui has remained in Baluchistan representing a stage in this process. The opposite theory, that Dravidian originated in South India, assumes that Brahui has reached its present position by migration to the North. The fact that primitive Dravidian had a word for the 'horse', demonstrated by this agreement between Tamil and Brahui, speaks quite definitely in favour of the North-Western origin. The horse is not native to South India, and if the primitive Dravidian language had originated there, we would not expect it to have a word for 'horse'. Another point to be considered is that since Tamil, in South India, has preserved the original Dravidian word for 'horse', it cannot have been spoken there during a long period during which the horse was unknown in that region. This would speak against assuming too early a date for the spread of Dravidian to South India. This is a question to which archaeology, in conjunction with the linguistic evidence, should help to provide a solution. The object of the present article is simply to draw attention to the linguistic facts.

-
- 1 It also has form (lexical) *kudaramu*, which might be explained as due to contamination between *kudira* and *gurramu* but which could also be due to an attempted Sanskrit etymology, i e. *ku-dara*-tearing the earth (with its hooves)'.