

ASKO & SIMO PARPOLA

On the relationship of the Sumerian toponym
Meluhha and Sanskrit mleccha

Contents

1. Introduction: Meluhha is used of the Indus civilization in the early cuneiform sources
2. The meaning and geographical connotations of Sanskrit mleccha and the corresponding Prakrit words
3. The etymology of mleccha
4. Phonological analysis of the Sanskrit and Prakrit forms
5. Phonological analysis of Sumerian me-luh-ha
6. Summary and implications

1.0. In his studies of the material culture of ancient Mesopotamia, Armas Salonen has many times had to deal with objects and materials imported from the distant country of Meluhha, which (as far as the early cuneiform sources are concerned) is with increasing confidence being identified as Baluchistan and the area of the Indus civilization. Since we have been studying the script and related aspects of the Indus civilization for many years, it seems appropriate to congratulate our maternal uncle with a contribution on this subject of common interest.

1.1. It is not our intention to deal here in detail and the archaeological and textual evidence for the location of the three countries that were the leading foreign parti-

cipants in the sea trade of Mesopotamia in the late third and early second millennium BC. For our purposes it will be sufficient to state that we agree with the following general identifications which are now fairly unanimously approved, though, of course, there is still much uncertainty and dispute in regard to the detailed locations:

- 1) Dilmun = the culture centred on the islands of Bahrain and Failaka in the Persian Gulf
- 2) Magan = the Makran coast, probably with the Oman peninsula
- 3) Meluhha = the Indus civilization, probably including

NW India with Gujarat as well as eastern Baluchistan. The paper of Hansman (1973) cited below has convincingly established the identity of the toponyms Magan and Makran. The etymology suggested as a possibility by Hansman (p. 568 n. 91), Dravidian makan,¹ seems to us very plausible, since this is basic vocable meaning 'son' (and the corresponding feminine form 'daughter'), and is in plural used not only in the meaning of 'children' but also of 'men, people, human beings'. Words meaning 'man, human being' are very often used by various peoples of themselves, cf. e.g. ba-ntu 'men'.² The Kulli people inhabiting the Makran coast in the third millennium have also been traced in Oman³, and seem to be genetically related with the Indus civilization⁴, the language of which was also Dravidian (cf. below 2.4.). The presence of the Harappan settlements of Sutkāgen-dor and other sites almost as far to the west on the Makran coast as the Iran-Pakistan border, and of Dābar-kōt in North Baluchistan⁵, is sufficient to account for the cuneiform references to Meluhha which seem to imply a location in Baluchistan. Otherwise we refer the reader to the subjoined list of select literature for the data on which the identifications are based.

A.L. Oppenheim, "The Seafaring Merchants of Ur", Journal of the American Oriental Society 54, 1954, 6-17.

W.F. Leemans, Foreign Trade in the Old Babylonian Period, as revealed by the texts from Southern Mesopotamia, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960 (Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui pertinentia, 6)

---, "Old Babylonian Letters and Economic History", Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 11, 1968, 171-226 (215-226: "Additional evidence for the Persian Gulf trade and MeluhĦa")

M.E.L. Mallowan, "The Mechanics of Ancient Trade in Western Asia. Reflections on the location of Magan and MeluhĦa", Iran 3, 1965, 1-7

Hartmut Schmökel, "Zwischen Ur und Lothal. Die Seehandelsroute von Altmesopotamien zur Induskultur", Forschungen und Fortschritte 40, 1966, 143-147

I.J. Gelb, "Makkan and MeluhĦa in early Mesopotamian Sources", Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale 64, 1970, 1-8

Geoffrey Bibby, Looking for Dilmun, Penguin Books 1970

E.C.L. During Caspers, "Harappan trade in the Arabian Gulf in the third millennium BC", Mesopotamia 7, 1972, 167-191

Giovanni Pettinato, "Il commercio con l'estero della Mesopotamia meridionale nel 3. millennio av.Cr. alla luce delle fonti letterarie e lessicali sumeriche", Mesopotamia 7, 1972, 43-166.

John Hansman, "A Periplus of Magan and MeluhĦa", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 36, 1973, 554-584

1.2. In this paper, we shall concentrate on the clarification of a single issue, namely the possible etymological connection of Sumerian MeluhĦa with Sanskrit mleccha first suggested by C.J. Gadd⁶. The matter will be approached

from three different points of view. First, we present a fairly comprehensive survey of all relevant contexts in which the word mleccha and its dialectal variants occur in order to establish whether its meaning and geographical and ethnographical implications permit its association with the area/carriers of the Indus civilization. Second, we investigate in detail the etymology of the Sanskrit word on the basis of the clues obtained from the study of the contexts, and examine the phonetic shape of the Sanskrit and Prakrit words in regard to the proposed etymology. Third, we study the cuneiform evidence in order to establish how it would fit to the results obtained from the analysis of the Indian material. We hope to be able to present the evidence in such a manner that both Sumerologists and Indologists will be in a position to distinguish fact from speculation, and to form, unaffected by our views, an independent judgement of the matter.

2.0. The identification of Meluhha as NW India makes it fully legitimate to seek a possible survival in the Indian material⁷. Sanskrit mleccha is a priori a fitting candidate because it occurs comparatively early (around 700 BC) in our sources, and is used of the Indian enemies of the Vedic Aryans, who during the late second and early first millennium BC subdued most of the western and central North India, and composed the documents which (apart from the short and still largely unread Indus inscriptions and the cuneiform references to Meluhha) constitute the earliest available textual sources of the Indian history. In addition, it has not been possible to propose any convincing Indo-European etymology for mleccha, which, tellingly, has no counterpart in the closely related Iranian languages⁸. On the other hand, there is a number of Middle-Indo-Aryan (Prakrit)⁹ words with identical meaning, which are gene-

rally recognized as etymologically related variants of Sanskrit mleccha (see 3.1.). Their great and partly irregular phonetic variation has been considered as pointing to a non-Aryan ethnic name as the most likely source.⁸ In the absence of a comprehensive survey of the occurrences of the word mleccha and its MIA counterparts, we shall first examine the textual evidence in order to establish the earliest meaning as precisely as possible.¹⁰

2.1. In the epic texts, dating from the early centuries A.D. or earlier, mleccha denotes "foreigner" in general, as opposed to ārya.¹¹ The Purāṇas¹² and the canonical texts of the Jains¹³, the dramas Mudrārāksasa and Prabodhacandrodaya, the commentators of Manu, etc., enumerate by name mleccha peoples, including both non-Indians, such as Greeks, Romans, Śakas, Huns, etc., and Indian peoples, among them many Dravidians, but also more remote Aryans. Such lists are in cosmographic descriptions¹³ contrasted with similar lists of Aryan peoples.

Especially in the astronomical and astrological texts composed under heavy Hellenistic influence the word mleccha refers specifically to the Greeks and Romans.¹⁴ It is interesting to note that in the classical Tamil literature of the early centuries A.D., milēccar occurs as a loanword from Sanskrit, used of the Greek mercenaries employed as body guards by the Tamil kings.¹⁵ Later, mleccha means particularly the Muslims.¹⁶

More interesting are the cases where mleccha is used as an ethnic name of a particular Indian people. Thus, in the Padmapurāṇa list of the "foreign" or "barbarian" peoples, it stays in the place of Paundra in the corresponding list of the Mahābhārata (both lists mention at the end also "the northern and western mlecchas").¹⁷ In the Rāmāyaṇa, mleccha stays for the Matsya people of Rajputana.¹⁸ In the post-Vedic Atharvaveda-Parīśiṣṭas (50,2,4-6), the Mlecchas are mentioned between the Matsyas and the Pulin-

das.¹⁹ In Varāhamihira's *Yogayātrā* (3,19-20), where the nine "planets" of the Indian astronomy are said to have been "born" in different countries (the sun rising in the east in the eastern country of the *Āṅgas*, and so forth), Ketu is said to have been born in the country of the *Mlecchas*.²⁰ Rather interesting are the isolated references to the tribe of *Taṅkanas* in the north-western *Madhya Pradesh* (the upper *Sarayū* river valley) as *mlecchas* in the *Āvaś-yaka* stories of the Jains²¹, and the application of the word *mech* (< *mleccha*) to a specific Tibeto-Burmese tribe in the Bengali language, but it is certainly very risky to draw conclusions from these late references about the identity of the original *mlecchas*.²²

2.2. The early post-Vedic *Dharmaśāstras* perpetuate Vedic traditions. The *mlecchas* are referred to as ritually impure people comparable to *Candālas*, whose country one should not visit, or at least not perform the funeral ceremonies there.²³ Very interesting (cf. below 2.3) is the statement of Manu (2.23), according to which "that land where the black antelope naturally roams, one must know to be fit for the performance of sacrifices; (the tract) different from that (is) the country of the *Mlecchas* (barbarians)." ²⁴ Immediately before this we have two other definitions of the *Āryāvarta*²⁵:

(2,21) "That (country) which (lies) between the *Himavat* and the *Vindhya* (mountains) to the east of *Prayāga* [= *Al-lahābād*] and to the west of *Vinaśana* (the place [in the *Hissār* district] where the river *Sarasvatī* disappears) is called *Madhyadeśa* (the central region). (2,22) But (the tract) between those two mountains (just mentioned), which (extends) as far as the eastern and western oceans, the wise call *Āryāvarta* (the country of the *Āryans*)."²⁴ A noteworthy reference is also *Kautilya's Arthaśāstra* 3,13

where it is said that the mlecchas are not punishable if they sell or pledge their children, but an ārya is not allowed to become a slave.

Several Dharmasāstras contain prohibitions against learning the language of the Mlecchas.²⁶ The Mahābhārata, too, often speaks of the language of the Mlecchas.²⁷

The Jaina text *Suṃyagadaṅgasutta* (1,1,2,15-16) contains the following passage:

milakkhu amilakkhussa jahā vuttānubhāsae /
 na heum se viyānāi bhāsiyam vānubhāsae //
 evam annāniyā nānam vayamta bhāsiyam sayam /
 nicchayattham na jānamti milakkhu vva abohie //

"As a Mleccha repeats what an Arya has said but does not understand the meaning, merely repeating his words, so the ignorant, though pretending to possess knowledge, do not know the truth, just as an uninstructed Mleccha."²⁸

The word milakkha recurs several times in the oldest Pāli texts, but always in the same stereotype phrase, namely, paccimantesu janapadesu paccājāto hoti (or: paccājāyanti) aviññātaresu milakkhesu (or: milakkhusu) "(a soul is, or: many beings are) reborn in the bordering (i.e., peripheral: the opposite is majjhimesu in the middlemost) countries, among the milakkhas who do not understand (Aryan speech)".²⁹ Cf. also the glosses in *Aggavaṃsa's Saddanīti*, a Pāli grammar: milecha aviyattāyaṃ vācāyaṃ, milacchati milakkhu (342,3-4), and milaccheti avyattavācam bhāsatīti milakkhu (530,3-5), emphasizing the indistinct speech of the milakkhu expressed by the corresponding verb. A well known but late (8th century AD) passage in *Kumārila's Tantaravārttika* on *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* 1,3,8 ff. elucidates the mleccha usages and words (including such words of Dravidian etymology as tamarasa 'lotus', etc.) occurring in the Veda.³⁰

2.3. By far the most important is the oldest available reference in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa which seems to be the starting point for much of the later usage, and the only one that can really elucidate the nature of the original mlecchas. The relevant passage in the Mādhyandina version is 3,2,1,18-19, and in the still unpublished Kāṇva recension in 4,2,1. It deals with the myth explaining the meaning of the black antelope's horn which the sacrificer ties to the end of his garment in the ritual.³¹ It may be noted that the black antelope in this myth is identified with the personified Sacrifice, who plays a central role in the myth: this is clearly related to Manu's above recorded statement (see 2.2) distinguishing the country of the mlecchas from that where the black antelope naturally roams and which is fit for sacrifice. The myth itself occurs also in other texts, but in these older versions no reference is made to Speech (vāc) (and consequently also not to the mlecchas): her place is there taken by the personified Sacrificial Gift (dakṣiṇā).³² According to the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa the gods and demons (asura) -- the divine counterparts of the vedic Aryans and their rivals/enemies (cf. 2.4) -- inherited from their common father, the creator god Prajāpati, Mind and Speech respectively. The gods by means of the masculine Sacrifice succeeded in tempting the female Speech to come to them, robbed her and made her their own by offering her up. Then follows the passage 23 (latter part)-24: te 'surā āttavacaso he 'lavo he 'lava iti vadantah parābabhūvuh // tatra itām api vācam ūduh / upajijñāsyām sa mlecchas tasman na brāhmaṇo mlecched asuryā haisā vāg evam evaiṣa dviṣatām sapatnānām ādatte vācam te 'syāttavacasah parābhavanti ya evam etad veda. "And the Asuras, being deprived of speech, were undone, crying, 'He 'lavah! he 'lavah!' Such was the unin-

telligible speech which they then uttered, -- and he (who speaks thus) is a Mleccha (barbarian). Hence let no Brahman speak barbarous language, since such is the speech of the Asuras. Thus alone he deprives his spiteful enemies of speech; and whosoever knows this, his enemies, being deprived of speech, are undone".³³ The Kāṇva recension differs in having te hāttavāco 'surā hailo haila ity etām ha vācam vadantah parābabbhūvuh³⁴, and in accentuating mleccha (4,2, 1,18) for mlecchā in the Mādhyandina recension.³⁵ A third version has been preserved in the introduction of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya (2nd century BC): te 'surā he 'layo he 'laya iti kurvantah parābabbhūvuh (ed. Kielhorn I, p. 2,7). Since the Mahābhāṣya nearly agrees with the Kāṇva version³⁶ in continuing with the words brāhmaṇena na mlecchitavai (ib. 8) instead of na brāhmaṇo mlecchet in the Mādhyandina version, it may have preserved the correct Kāṇva reading for hailo haila ity, which is corrupt.³⁷ In any case it seems certain that Sāyaṇa, the mediaeval commentator, is right in glossing the exclamation of the mlecchas with the Sanskrit words he 'rayo. This is borne out by the researches of P. Thieme, who has shown that the vocative of the word ari (which he interprets as "stranger": simultaneously "guest" and "enemy") is in Pāli and Prakrit attested as a term of address, often with an impolite addition, cf. e.g. are kūṭajajila "you there, a false ascetic" (Jātaka III, 86,9) or ale caṇḍālā, "you there, outcasts" (Mṛcchakaṭikā V, 31/2). Thieme also quotes Pāli āvudha < āūdha < Skt. āyudha as a parallel for the genuine Prakrit form preserved in the ŚB: he 'lavo < he 'laö < he 'layo = Skt. he 'rayo.³⁸ The conclusion drawn by many scholars³⁹ that we have here a Prakrit, and more specifically a Māgadhī-like expression (with the characteristic l for r) seems quite warranted.

The importance of the linguistic aspect is emphasized by the use of a verbal derivative from the word mleccha in the sense of "speaking indistinctly or corruptly" (cf. also 2.2). That a Prakritic speech is concerned, is confirmed also by the only other occurrence of the word mleccha in the old Vedic texts.⁴⁰ Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra 2,5 comprises a long formula in which the sacrificer drives out of himself his own defects by banning them into beings or objects somehow associated with these defects: mleccha, which one of the two commentators undoubtedly correctly explains as apabhraṃśabhāṣanam "speaking a corrupted form of the Aryan language"⁴¹, is here banned to enter the people living (in uncivilized state) in the forests (vanyesu me mlecchah).⁴² The Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra may be as old as the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, with which it is closely related, or even older⁴³, but the uniqueness of this long formula and the accompanying ritual, as well as the fact that the context is somewhat abrupt, make one to suspect with Kashikar that a later interpolation may be concerned.⁴⁴

2.4. It is possible to make two conclusions with regard to the people called (in all likelihood after their own ethnic name) mlecchas around 700 BC. Firstly, they spoke a language which was of Aryan affinity but sounded very corrupt in the ears of the Vedic Aryans. Second, this Prakrit had Magadhī-like features and was apparently encountered in the lower Ganges valley.⁴⁵ The latter conclusion is corroborated by the probable place of composition of the Yājñavalkya books of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, to which our reference belongs.⁴⁶ A third clue leading to the same result is provided by the analysis of the word mleccha (see 4.3).

The fact that the earliest known mlecchas spoke an Aryan language does not preclude the possibility that the

word originally denoted the pre-Aryan Indus people. On the contrary, this is suggested by the following considerations.

A number of phonological and syntactic features as well as loanwords clearly show that Sanskrit has been influenced in North India by a Dravidian substratum.⁴⁷ This holds good already for the most ancient document, the Ṛgveda, but the main influence was exerted between the late Vedic and the early classical period, in the Madhyadeśa and the central Gangetic plain.⁴⁸ The fact that the Dravidian languages of Brahui in Baluchistan and Kurukh and Malto in Central and Eastern India have in common a number of innovations which are not shared by the other Dravidian languages also proves that Dravidian has once been spoken over almost entire North India, though it later has been replaced by Indo-Aryan.⁴⁹

The only archaeological culture matching the age and area of this proto-North-Dravidian dialect is the Harappan civilization.⁵⁰ The decipherment of the Indus script is only beginning, but enough is already known to us to be certain about the Dravidian affinity of the underlying language.⁵¹ A reason for the relatively small number of Dravidisms in the Ṛgveda seems to be an Aryanization of the upper Indus valley that had taken place long before the arrival of the Ṛgvedic Aryans. The people with whom the Ṛgvedic Aryans were fighting in these regions called themselves dāsa, which in later usage means "slave" (originally, "captured enemy"), but which etymologically is an Aryan word meaning "man", and which is attested as an ethnic appellation also for an Iranian tribe.⁵² That a different branch of Indo-Iranian speakers is involved, is shown also by religious and linguistic differences from the Vedic Aryans. Thus the word asura which originally means "lord, god" was used by

the enemies of the Vedic Aryans in this sense, but in the Brāhmaṇa texts means "demon" and is associated with the enemy, especially the "easterners", a name used by Megasthenes for the Magadhans.⁵³ There is already in the R̥gveda evidence for the existence at that time of non-Sanskritic Aryan dialects showing Prakrit features⁵⁴, and it has been suggested that such Dravidisms as the retroflexion of the cerebrals in the R̥gveda are derived from these Middle-Indo-Aryan-like languages.⁵⁵ Dravidian has originally no initial consonant clusters and in the middle of the word only double consonants and clusters of homorganic nasal + voiceless stop.⁵⁶ The simplification of the consonant clusters through assimilation, anaptyxis, etc., which is the most characteristic feature of the Prakrit languages when compared with Sanskrit, seems to be mainly due to the adaptation of Indo-Aryan to the Dravidian pattern of their mother tongue by the first bilingual generations initiating the Aryanization of North India. The phenomenon is paralleled by the changes of Sanskrit loanwords in Tamil, cf. e.g. tottiram < stotram.

The descendents of the Indus civilization had thus largely abandoned their original Dravidian speech and adopted the language of the pre-R̥gvedic Aryans. While the words dāsa and vrātya used of this Prakrit-speaking hybrid population in our earliest texts are of Aryan origin, the non-Aryan word mleccha in all probability perpetuates the appellation used of itself by the Dravidian component of this mixed population. This is suggested also by the fact that it was encountered by the Vedic Aryans in Eastern India, where Dravidian was (and still is, though to a much lesser extent) a sizeable portion of the population.

3.0. Having thus established the probable earliest meaning of the word mleccha, we shall now examine its etymology.

3.1. The MIA and NIA counterparts of Sanskrit mleccha may be divided into the following groups:⁵⁷

- 1) Pāli milakkha, milakkhu⁵⁸
Ardha-Māgadhī milakkhu, milukku⁵⁹
Sinhalese malak 'savage', malaki-dū 'a Vāddā woman'
- 2) AMg, Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī, Śaurasenī, Apabhraṃśa mēccha
AMg miccha
Prakrit maleccha⁶⁰
AMg miliccha
Kashmiri mīch, dat. mīcas m. 'non-Hindu',⁶¹
Panjabi milech, malech m. (f. milechnī, malechnī) 'Moslem, unclean outcaste, wretch'
West Pahari (Bhadrawāhī dialect) mālēōh 'dirty'
Bengali mech 'a Tibeto-Burman tribe'
Sinhalese milis (< MIA miliccha)
- 3) Pāli milāca 'wild man of the woods, non-Aryan',⁶²
- 4) Sinhalese maladu, milidu, miliṇḍu 'wild savage'

The first group seems to be independent of Sanskrit mleccha,⁶³ and the second dependent on it. The third is in all likelihood a contamination of mleccha and piśācā 'demon',⁶⁴ and the fourth a similar contamination of mleccha and pulindā 'name of a barbarous tribe' (Sinhalese puliṇḍa, stem puliṇḍu-, 'a barbarian, a Vāddā').⁶⁵ In the following we shall take into consideration only the first group, which is also represented by oldest sources.

3.2. The considerations in 2.0 and 2.4 suggest that Skt. mleccha and Pkt. milakkha etc. is a Dravidian loanword. The form milakkha makes it very likely that the latter part of the original Dravidian etymon is the Dravidian word akam, which primarily means 'inside, house, abode',⁶⁶ but which is also used in the sense of 'country', 'place', cf. especially early Old Tamil tamil-akam 'Tamil country',⁶⁷ besides tamil-nāṭu 'Tamil country',⁶⁸ and tamil-nāṭṭ-akam.⁶⁹

Akam is in classical Tamil literature also used with special reference to agricultural land (marutam).⁷⁰ It occurs in a number of Tamil compounds in the general sense of 'place' or 'country'.⁷¹ The intervocalic -k- is in Tamil spirantized, as it probably was already in Proto-Dravidian;⁷² in all the three languages of the North Dravidian group, Brahui, Kuṛukh and Malto, it has been realized as [x] or [ç],⁷² described as follows: Brahui kh is "pronounced like Persian-Arabic khe, i.e., like ch in German and in the Scotch word loch"⁷³; in Kuṛukh "the bottom of the throat and the upper portion of the windpipe being kept well open, pronounce the sound h; the resulting broad sound will be a satisfactory approximation to the pronunciation of kh"⁷⁴.

3.3. The first part of the Dravidian etymon to be reconstructed poses a more difficult problem. We would like to suggest for consideration two tentative solutions. 3.3.1. It may have been preserved in the latter part of the name Tamil (cf. Tamilakam in 3.2) on the hypothesis that this is separable into two elements. The etymology of this ethnic name is an old problem. It is attested in the South Dravidian languages, and in Indo-Aryan since Mahābhārata and Manu's lawbook (i.e., since the latter part of the first millennium BC when contacts with South India developed).⁷⁵ Here is the evidence:

Dravidian

Tamil tamil 'Tamil language, the Tamils, the Tamil country'
tamilan 'a Tamilian'

Malayalam tamil 'Tamil language'

Toda tobil 'Tamil language'

Kannada tamila, tambala 'Tamil language'

Tulu tamulu, tamulu, tambulu 'Tamil'

Indo-Aryan

Sanskrit draviḍa, (adj.) drāviḍa 'name of a people, the Dravidians'

dramiḍa, dramila

Pāli damiḷa

Prakrit damila, daviḷa, daviḍa

Old Sinhalese demel, Sinhalese demalā 'Tamil'

Sanskrit dra- with r has generally been explained as a hy-persanskritism, but it seems more likely that it is due to borrowing from Telugu or some Central Dravidian language with the characteristic initial metathesis.⁷⁷ The m/v alternation, both initial and medial, is common and wide-spread in Dravidian.⁷⁸

Since the Proto-South-Dravidian probably was introduced by traders and settlers coming from the third millennium Indus valley and giving the impetus to the formation of the Southern neolithic culture,⁷⁹ the name Tamilakam might stand for Proto-Dravidian *Tam-Mil(u)/Vil(u)-akam, from which the first two elements have been abstracted as an ethnic appellation, though originally the last two would have formed a more coherent compound. Phonologically and semantically this explanation seems plausible; -m/v- may be the result of original m-v⁸⁰ perhaps reflected by -mb- in Kannada and Tulu. Tam- is the oblique form of the third person and reflexive pronoun tām 'they, themselves',⁸¹ which is commonly prefixed especially to kinship terms in the possessive sense: 'one's own, their own',⁸² and is in this sense attested in Old Tamil also before the word nātu 'country'.⁸³ The etymon of the middle part could be Dravidian vilu 'to fall (down), descend (hill or mountain)',⁸⁴ which would suit the "low" lands of the Indus valley (to which the Brahuīs still use to descend yearly)⁸⁵ and of the

Tamīlnāṭu. Cf. also the toponym Milalai, mentioned as a part of the Cōla country in Old Tamil texts.⁸⁶

3.3.2. Another possibility might be that the first part of the word mlēccha/milakkha goes back to original Dravidian *mēl(u) 'what is above, that is high, superior, lofty, good; the top, sky'.⁸⁷ The form mēl is the result of a syncope from *mik-al, but it is not yet clear whether it may be posited for the Proto-Dravidian, or for South Dravidian only.⁸⁸ The Sanskrit name of the cosmic mountain, Mēru, the abode of the gods, attested since the Mahābhārata, and occurring as mēr in the Dardic language Khowār in the Hindukūś (Āitrāl) in the appellative meaning 'mountain', seems to be derived from this Dravidian etymon.⁸⁹ The name Mēl(u)-akam, which phonologically is not so plausible as the former alternative (cf. 4.2.4), might have been either the mountain country of Baluchistan, which was the home land of the pre-Harappan neolithic settlers of the Indus valley who later evolved the Indus civilization, or it may have referred to a central cosmological concept in the Harappan world view.⁹⁰ Mēl-akam is attested in Tamil, but only in the meaning 'upper storey' (TL).

3.4. The word akam means 'country' (3.2), but mleccha, milakkha, and milakkhu are ethnic appellations. In Dravidian we have besides the country name such as kuṭakam 'Coorg country' also ethnic derivatives with the masculine suffix -an corresponding to Indo-Aryan -a(h), as kuṭakan 'Coorg man', and in addition forms ending in -u denoting primarily the country, but also its language and people, such as kuṭaku.⁹¹ These Dravidian -u forms⁹² offer a satisfactory explanation to the milakkha/milakkhu alternation.⁹³

4.0. We shall now examine how the phonetic shape of the Sanskrit and Prakrit forms conform to the proposed Dravi-

dian etymology.

4.1.1. Prakrit kkh instead of kh (= aspirated k, which was phonematic in Indo-Aryan) may be taken as a fairly accurate transcription of the (North) Dravidian spirantic [x] or [ɣ] which does not exist in Indo-Aryan.

4.1.2. In the Veda there is variation between (c)ch and ks⁹⁴, and on the other hand between ks, kś and khy,⁹⁵ and in later times between kh, s, and ks.⁹⁶ Bailey⁹⁷ is undoubtedly right in positing *mlekṣa as the older form of mleccha, and in saying that "this -ks- could be accepted as a substitute for a foreign velar fricative ʁ (the sound expressed in Arabic script by ځ kh [also transcribed h])", such as the (North) Dravidian [x]. Pāli and Ardhamāgadhī -kkh- seems to be independent of Sanskrit, though Sanskrit ks is replaced in different Prakrit dialects chiefly by kkh or palatalized (c)ch.⁹⁸

4.2.1. Dravidian mil(u) corresponds well with Pāli and AMg. mil-: for the replacement of Dravidian l [r]⁹⁹ by l in Old Indo-Aryan, cf. e.g. kāla 'black' < Drav. kāl 'black'.¹⁰⁰

4.2.2. Sanskrit mlē- is also easily explained from Dravidian *milakam when one takes into regard that it was almost certainly borrowed in Central or Eastern India (cf. 2.4): Telugu (occupying a middle position between the South and the Central Dravidian languages) and the Central Dravidian, situated in Central and Eastern India, are characterized by metathesis, with or without vowel-contraction, resulting in initial consonant clusters not otherwise occurring in Dravidian. This metathesis shifts alveolar and retroflex consonants from medial to initial position, cf. Tamil viluṅku, Malayalam miluṅṅuka 'to swallow': Telugu mriṅgu < *mli-ṅg- < *mil-ṅg-.¹⁰¹ ē is the regular result of the contraction of i-a.¹⁰² In this connexion it may also be pointed out that the designation of the Telugu speakers, Sanskrit āndhra, makes its

appearance in our sources very much at the same time as mleccha: it occurs for the first time in Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa 7,18, together with Puṇḍras, Śabarasa, Pulindas and Mūtibas, which often figure in the lists of mleccha peoples or are mentioned in the immediate vicinity of the mlecchas when these are included as a people in such lists. Also the expression that these peoples "live in large numbers beyond the borders" (udantyā bahavo) in the AB passage reminds us of the standard phrase used of the milakkhas in the Pāli canon (see 2.2).

4.2.3. While the above explanation smoothly fits both the Sanskrit and Prakrit forms, the derivation of the Prakrit form from Sanskrit or vice versa is difficult because of the irregular correspondence Pkt. a : Skt. ē.¹⁰³ Pkt. mil- could otherwise be a regular anaptyxis of Skt. ml-, and this a hypersanskritism for Prakrit mil-, if the latter be regarded as primary. But as in the case of kkh/cch it seems better to take the two as independent reflexes of a Dravidian etymon.

4.2.4. While Pkt. miccha < meccha < Skt. mlēccha is regular before a long consonant, milakkha < Drav. *mēlakam would be difficult to explain. Sanskrit mlē- < Central Drav. *mlē- < *mēl suffers also from the difficulty that no forms with metathesis are cited from these languages, and the antiquity of the proto-form *mēl is also doubtful.¹⁰⁴ By contrast, there are no difficulties in 4.2.1-2.

5.0. In this section we shall study whether it is possible to associate the Sumerian geographical term Meluhha with the reconstructed Proto-North-Dravidian etymon *mil(u)-akam/*mēl(u)-akam on phonetic grounds.

5.1. Writings. In the 3rd millennium and early 2nd millennium texts, Meluhha is regularly spelled Me-luh-ha^(ki), the determinative being optional and therefore frequently

omitted¹⁰⁵; sometimes the word is preceded by the apposition kur "(foreign) land".¹⁰⁶ This standard spelling predominates also in late 2nd millennium and 1st millennium texts.¹⁰⁷ In the Middle-Assyrian period and afterwards, corrupt and hypercorrect inflected forms (^{KUR}Me-luh, ^{KUR}Me-luh-hi) as well as gentilic back-formations (^{LÜ}Me-luh-he-e, ^{KUR}Me-luh-he-e^{KI}) occur besides the standard spelling;¹⁰⁸ we have several syllabic spellings with -lu- replacing -luh- in the middle syllable (^{KUR}Me-lu-hi/a)¹⁰⁹, and some spellings with an initial Mi-¹¹⁰; a hellenistic copy of HAR-ra-hubullu renders the toponym in Greek letters as MHAΩ.¹¹¹

5.2. Reading. Though all the signs in the standard spelling have polyphonic values, their traditional reading Me-luh-ha is most natural and can hardly be seriously questioned. It is supported by the late writings and by the following consideration: since a foreign toponym is in question, a "syllabic" spelling is expected, and the reading Me-luh-ha encompasses the only "syllabic" values attested for the signs concerned in the 3rd millennium.¹¹² One reservation, occasioned by the Indian evidence, must however be made. Though the syllabic value läh for LUH does not seem to be attested in the 3rd millennium, it can virtually certainly be posited for the period,¹¹³ and consequently the toponym could, were it not for the late spellings, be equally well read Me-läh-ha, which would better tally with the Prakrit forms and the Dravidian etymology suggested above.¹¹⁴ This possibility must remain just a possibility for the time being, because we do not know how seriously the late explicit spellings with u and omega have to be taken;¹¹⁵ in particular, we do not know whether the correct pronunciation of the toponym was preserved in literary circles even after the word itself had become obsolete (in living usage) after the break-up of trade connections with India in the

turn of the 3rd millennium B.C. Per se, it seems entirely thinkable that the reading Me-luh-ha could have been based on an ancient misunderstanding, for the sign LUH was in the later periods truly ambiguous in contexts where no morphological considerations were of help in deciding whether the value lah, lih or luh was to be chosen.¹¹⁶

5.3. Phonological interpretation. The reading Me-luh-ha (or perhaps Me-lah-ha) must of course not be taken at face value. It is just a sign-by-sign transliteration of a sequence of cuneiform signs and does not - as such - tell much about the phonetic shape of the word these signs seek to render. Two cautions in particular are necessary: First, though the transliteration of Sumerian is intended to be phonemic, it is that only up to a certain limit, and the exact definitions of quite a few phonemes are still open to debate.¹¹⁷ Second, consonantal and vocalic quantity was as a rule not expressed in Sumerian script, and double consonants occurring in writing usually find their explanation in orthographic conventions.¹¹⁸ In the present case, accordingly, the double <hh> may be taken to indicate a long consonant, but far more likely it indicates that the Sumerian scribes had etymologized Me-luh-ha as a compound ending in the participle morpheme -a.¹¹⁹ Such an interpretation would imply that the syllable preceding -ha was stressed, since the place of stress in Sumerian words with suffixes was certainly on the last syllable of the lexical morpheme.¹²⁰ Passing now on to a consideration of the segmental phonemes discernible in Me-luh-ha, the following approximate definitions may be taken as generally accepted:

m = bilabial nasal consonant, IPA [m]

e = half-close front vowel, IPA [e]

l = dental or alveolar lateral, IPA [l]

u = close or half-close back vowel, IPA [u] or [o]

h = voiceless velar fricative, IPA [x]

a = open central vowel, IPA [a]

Depending on whether the middle sign is read as luh or lah, we can, on the above premises, approximate the phonetic shape of Me-luh-ha as [mel'uxa], [mel'oxa] or [mel'axa], to be compared with the Dravidian etymon reconstructed as ['mil(u)-'axam] or ['m:el(u)-'axam]. It should be noted that the phonetic correspondence may have been even closer originally, since final -m was frequently left unexpressed in Sumerian script.¹²¹

6. We may conclude that Sumerian Meluhha "country of the Indus civilization" can with good reasons be linked with Sanskrit mlēccha "stranger of ill-pronounced speech", and over Prakrit milakkha, further to an original Dravidian etymon that seems to have been preserved in the Old Tamil designation of South India, Ta-mil-akam. It is true that the exact interpretation of the name Tamil, including its suggested segmentation, remains hypothetical, but the results of our examination seem to be sufficiently feasible in fitting well the historico-geographical contexts and the linguistic forms. In our opinion these names, linking Mesopotamia and India and, in India, the third and first millennium BC, are of great importance for the study of Indian protohistory and Sumerian phonology in particular. They provide one more proof for the Dravidian affinity of the Indus civilization and, so far, the only foreign language in addition to the Akkadian to check the Sumerian pronunciation.

Footnotes

1) See DED (= T. Burrow and M.B. Emeneau, A Dravidian Ety-

mological Dictionary, Oxford 1961, and the same, Supplement, Oxford 1968) no. 3768. The probable ancient pronunciation [maxan] or [mayan], with the spirantization of intervocalic -k- (cf. K. Zvelebil, Comparative Dravidian Phonology, The Hague 1970, [Janua linguarum, Series practica 80], p. 120), in plural [ma(:)kka_l], fits well the Sumerian spelling.

2) For further examples see e.g. H.W. Bailey, "Iranian arya- and daha-", Transactions of the Philological Society 1959 (Oxford 1960), 71-115, p. 110.

3) Cf. Karen Frifelt, "Excavations in Abu Dhabi (Oman)" Artibus Asiae 33, 1971, 296-9.

4) Cf. Mortimer Wheeler, The Indus Civilization, 3 ed., Cambridge 1968, p. 15-18.

5) Cf. Wheeler 1968, p. 59-62.

6) C.J. Gadd apud Leemans 1960, p. 164 and 1968, p. 223. The relationship of Meluhha and Mleccha has already been discussed fairly extensively, though not exhaustively, by P. Aalto, "Marginal notes on the Meluhha problem": Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri Felicitation Volume ... (Madras 1971), pp. 234-238.

7) For the etymological relation of Meluhha and Baluchistan, suggested by Hansman 1973 (see 1.1), see Bailey's comments in his annexe to Hansman's paper.

8) Cf. M. Mayrhofer, Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen II, Heidelberg 1963, p. 699.

9) The term 'Middle-Indo-Aryan' is not quite appropriate, for Prakrits have existed in India from pre-Rgvedic times. Cf. below, 2.4.

10) For previous discussions of the word mleccha, see in addition to the literature mentioned by Mayrhofer (see note 8) and L. Renou, Introduction générale to J. Wackernagel's Altindische Grammatik, Göttingen 1957, p. 73 n. 236, espe-

cially H.W. Bailey, "Mleccha-, Balōč, and Gadrōsia", BSOAS 36, 1973, 584-7. Cf. also the references cited below, in 3.1. Bailey gives a very short list of the contextual meanings. See also O. Böhtlingk & R. Roth, Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, 5. Bd., St. Petersburg 1868, p. 934 ff. (and 1678), with many references not discussed here.

11) For Mahābhārata see S. Sörensen, An index to the names in the Mahābhārata, London 1904-1925, p. 480 f. For Rāmāyana, see Ramashraya Sharma, A socio-political study of the Vālmiki Rāmāyana, Delhi 1971, p. 24 and 296.

12) References in V.R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, The Purana Index, II, Madras 1952, p. 745 f., and Kirfel (note 13).

13) See especially W. Kirfel, Die Kosmographie der Inder nach den Quellen dargestellt, Bonn und Leipzig 1920, p. 226 f., where the Jaina lists falling into two classes have been worked out.

14) Cf. e.g. Jñānabhāskara quoted in A. Weber, Verzeichnis der Sanskrit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, I, Berlin 1853, no. 939: mlecchajanmabhuvā bhūmau prātīcyām romake pure, and Varāhamihira, Brhatsamhitā 2, 15 quoted ibid. no. 849, p. 239: mlecchā hi yavanās, teṣu ... For Varāhamihira, cf. also Bailey 1973, p. 585.

15) Mullaippattu 65-66.

16) Cf. P.V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, II:1, Poona 1941, p. 389 ff.

17) Cf. Kirfel 1920, p. 78 f.

18) S. Lévi, Journal Asiatique XI sér. 11:I, 1918, p. 123 cited by Bailey 1973, p. 584.

19) The text here gives a list of the peoples affected by the moon when it has human form:

bālhikān yavana-kāmbojāñ chālvān madrān uśīnarān /
godhāmś ca bhadrakāmś caiva madhyam ca kurubhiḥ saha//4
saurāṣṭrān sindhu-sauvīrān vāneyāmś cāpi siṃsakān /

kṣudrakān mālavān matsyān mlecchān saha pulindakaiḥ//5
 śastropajīvi-kudṛyāṃś ca brāhmāṇa yodhinaś ca ye /
 etāñ janapadān hanti somah puruṣa-lakṣaṇaḥ // 6.

20) See H. Kern's edition, translation and notes in Indische Studien 10, 1868, 161-212. Ketu is associated with the descending node but is to be taken here, as Kern suggests, probably as the causer of the solar eclipses (as distinct from Rāhu who is responsible for the lunar eclipses). We would like to suggest that the mlecchas here stand for all surrounding foreigners: From the Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa 52 (11,4c-12,2b) it appears that while the eight other planets are associated with specific directions of space, being also called diggrahāḥ, the feared Ketu seems to sway everywhere (cf. J. von Negelein, "Zum System der frühen indischen Astrologie", Festgabe H. Jacobi, Bonn 1926, p. 448). Ketu is obviously identical with Mr̥tyu Dhūmaketu in Atharvaveda 19,9,10, and therefore to be identified with the Sinhalese Mārea or Mārāya, who together with the planets influences the human life: the Ceylonese tradition has preserved to us the interesting piece of information that Mārea changes his place in the sky each day of the week (see P. Wirz, Exorcism and the art of healing in Ceylon, Leiden 1954, p. 20 f.).

21) Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen, hrsg. von E. Leumann, I, Leipzig 1897, (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 10:2), p. 39: uttarāvahe taṅkaṇā nāma mecchā. Taṅgaṇas and Parataṅgaṇas are mentioned immediately before uttarās cāpare mlecchāḥ in the lists of Brahmapurāṇa and Mahābhārata (cf. Kirfel 1920, p. 79).

22) B. Liebich was inclined to see in the Bengali usage an important clue: BSOS 8, 1936, p. 625, and ZDMG 72, 1918, p. 286 f.

23) See Kane II:1, 1941, p. 382 ff.

- 24) Transl. G. Bühler, The Laws of Manu, Oxford 1886 (Sacred Books of the East, 25), p. 33. Parallel passages are found in other texts.
- 25) See also Kane II:1, 1941, p. 13 ff.
- 26) References in Kane, p. 382 f.
- 27) See Sörensen, p. 480 f. Cf. notably 2,2040 nāryā mlecchanti bhāṣābhiḥ.
- 28) Transl. H. Jacobi, Jaina Sūtras II, Oxford 1895 (Sacred Books of the East, 45), p. 241.
- 29) Āṅguttara-Nikāya IV,226,9 (XXIX = Gahapativagga); I, 35,17 (XIX = Appamattakavagga); Dīgha-Nikāya III, 264, 12-13; Saṃyutta-Nikāya V,466,29. -- We are grateful to the Critical Pāli Dictionary in Copenhagen for access to its unpublished collection of references to the occurrences of milakkha etc.
- 30) See Renou, 1957, n. 273, and Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Paris 1956, p. 80 f.
- 31) For the ritual see W. Caland and V. Henry, L'agniṣṭoma, I, Paris 1906, § 17 f., and, for the differences in the two branches of the Vājasaneyi school, J. Eggeling, The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa ... translated, II, Oxford 1885 (Sacred Books of the East 26), p. 30 n. 1
- 32) Kaṭha-Saṃhitā 23,4: 78,17 ff.; Kapīṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā 36,1; Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā 3,6,8: 70,3-10; Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 6,1,3,6-7.
- 33) Transl Eggeling, p. 31 f.
- 34) Cf. Eggeling, p. 31 n. 3.
- 35) Cf. W. Caland, The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in the Kāṇvīya recension edited, I [all published], Lahore 1926 (The Punjab Sanskrit Series 10), p. 31.
- 36) Cf. mlecchitāvyaṃ in ŚBK 4,2,1,18 (Vishva Bandhu, A Vedic Word Concordance, Vol. II:2, 2 ed., Hoshiarpur 1973, s.v.).

- 37) Eggeling, p. 31 n. 3, suggests (with query) he ilā "ho, speech!"
- 38) P. Thieme, Der Fremdling im Rigveda, Leipzig 1938 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 23:2), p. 3 f.
- 39) Cf. also e.g. A.A. Macdonell and A.B. Keith, A Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, London 1912, II, p. 181 (with further references); J. Bloch, Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to modern times, transl. A. Master, Paris 1965, p. 75 f.
- 40) The bulky material of the Veda is effectively controlled with the aid of the Vedic Word Concordance in 16 volumes, edited by Vishva Bandhu, Lahore and Hoshiarpur 1935-1973.
- 41) In a narrower sense apabhramśa is the intermediary stage between MIA and NIA. The other gloss has ajñatvam "ignorance".
- 42) Caland's edition is to be emended here, cf. Kashikar cited in n. 44.
- 43) Cf. Caland 1926.I, p. 94-101.
- 44) Cf. C.G. Kashikar, "Pāpmano vinidhayaḥ", Indian Antiquary, Third Series 3: 1-4, 1969, p. 30-40.
- 45) A.L. Basham (apud Leemans 1968, p. 223) has suggested that the absence of the word mleccha from the older texts may be explained by the survival of the Indus civilization many centuries longer in Gujarat than in the Indus valley, the area with which the Aryans first came into contact.
- The location of the Pāli language poses a difficult problem, cf. the summary in É. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien, Louvain 1958, p. 622-8. It seems to be a Māgadhī-based koine in which the characteristic eastern elements have been replaced by Western features. It seems to have come into being with the westward expansion of the Magadhan empire, and its area probably coincided with that of the Northern Black Polished Ware (cf. Parpola 1974 in n.

50). For the determination of the place where the word milakkha/milakkhu was borrowed, this wide extension is hardly helpful. The same applies mutatis mutandis to Ardha-Māgadhi.

46) Cf. L. Renou, Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda, Paris 1947 (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 9), p. 199; Klaus Mylius, "Geographische Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgegend des Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa", Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, 14, 1965, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe 4, p. 759-761.

47) Cf. M.B. Emeneau, "India as a linguistic area", Language 32:1, 1956, 3-16.

48) Cf. T. Burrow, The Sanskrit language, 3 ed., London 1973, p. 385 f.

49) Cf. M.B. Emeneau, Brahui and Dravidian Comparative Grammar, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962 (University of California Publications in Linguistics, 27), p. 62 ff. M. Pfeiffer, Elements of Kurux Historical Phonology, Leiden 1972 (Indologia Berolinensis, 3), p. 1. f.

50) Cf. A. Parpola, "On the protohistory of the Indian languages in the light of archeological, linguistic and religious evidence: an attempt at integration", South Asian Archaeology -- 1973, ed. by J.E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, Leiden (in press).

51) Cf. A. Parpola, "Interpreting the Indus Script", Fifty Years of Harappan Studies, ed. B.B. Lal and S.P. Gupta, New Delhi (in press).

52) Cf. Bailey 1959 (see n. 2).

53) Cf. A. Parpola, Arguments for an Aryan origin of the South Indian Megaliths, Madras 1973, p. 30 f. and 34 ff.

54) Cf. Burrow 1973³, p. 45 ff.

55) Cf. D.H. Killingley, "Retroflexion in Sanskrit", Pro-

ceedings of the First International Conference Seminar of Tamil Studies, Kuala Lumpur-Malaysia, April 1966 (Kuala Lumpur 1969), Vol. II, p. 596-606.

56) Cf. Zvelebil 1970, p. 76 f.

57) Unless otherwise specified, the source is R. Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen, Strassburg 1900 (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I:8), §§ 84 and 105 (with references to textual occurrences), cf. also §§ 136 and 233; or R.L. Turner, A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages, London 1966, no. 10389.

58) See the references cited above, 2.2: both forms as variant readings in AN IV, 226,9.

59) Pañhāvāgaraṇāim, first chapter as edited by A. Weber, Verzeichniss der Sanskrit- und Prakrit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, II:2, Berlin 1888, no. 1815 p. 510: ime ya bahave milukkhajātī (milekkha^o B, milekkhu^o C, milukkhū^o P); cf. Pischel 1900, § 105, citing milukkhaya as occurring in Sūyagadāṅgasutta, ed. Bombay samvat 1940, 816, besides milakkhu elsewhere in the text.

60) Prakrit index in Caitanyacandrodayam, ed. Calcutta 1854, according to H.D.T. Sheth, Pāia-Sadda-Mahannavo, 2 ed., Varanasi 1963 (Prākṛit Text Society Series 7), s.v.

61) "Loss of aspiration unexplained", Turner.

62) Jātaka IV, 288-297.

63) Cf. W. Geiger, Pāli, Strassburg 1916 (Grundriss..I:7), § 34. (cf. also I. Scheftelowitz, ZDMG 73, 1919, p. 243 f.)

64) Thus Turner.

65) Thus Helmer Smith in Journal Asiatique 1950, p. 186, cited by Turner, who considers a derivation from MIA *mlēcha also possible. This concerns the two last mentioned forms only.

66) DED no. 8.

67) Patirru. Pati. 2.5; Puram 168,18; Cilapp. 3, 38; Maṇi.

17,62.

68) Cilapp. 23,15 (kaṭṭurai); 25,165; 29,1,8. Cf. also Tamilnannātu ibid. 10,58; 25,171.

69) Pari. Tirattu. 9,1.

70) Cīvaka. 1613; Aintinai (70) 47,1; cf. TL, s.v., 5, and N. Subrahmanian, Pre-Pallavan Tamil Index, Madras 1966, s.v.

71) Cf. Tamil Lexicon (TL) s.v. kal-l-akam 'mountain' (kal 'stone'), kān-akam 'forest, wood' (kān 'forest'), tī-y-akam 'hell', as a place of fire (tī), pakai-y-akam 'enemy's country', man-n-akam vai-y-akam 'earth, world' (= man, vai), and nīr-akam 'the earth, as sea-girt' (nīr 'water').

72) Cf. Zvelebil 1970, p. 120.

73) Bray cited by Zvelebil, l.c.

74) Grignard cited by Zvelebil, l.c.

75) For the development of the North-South Indian contacts see C. Maloney, "The Beginnings of Civilization in South India", The Journal of Asian Studies 29:3, May 1970, 603-616.

76) Cf. DED no. 2508; Turner, CDIAL no. 6632; Mayrhofer, EWA II, p. 73.

77) Cf. Master, BSOAS 12, 364, cited in Mayrhofer l.c. Cf. also below, 4.2.2.

78) Cf. Zvelebil 1970, p. 125 ff.

79) Cf. A. Parpola, as cited above, notes 50 and 53.

80) Cf. maram + vēr > mara-vēr 'tree root' in Tamil (Beythan, Praktische Grammatik der Tamilsprache, Leipzig 1943, p. 41). In Tamil m + m in sandhi normally results in single m, but one-syllable first components form an exception, the result being mm (ibid. p. 40 f.).

81) DED 2582.

82) Cf. M.B. Emeneau, "Dravidian kinship terms", Language 29, 1953, p. 339-353.

- 83) Narriṇai 183,1, where tannātu 'own country' in the first verse is contrasted with piranātu 'foreign country' in the second.
- 84) DED 4457. Note also the variation m/v in the near homophone miluṇku, viluṇku 'swallow', DED 3985.
- 85) Cf. Emeneau 1962 (see n. 49), p. 1: The Brahuis "are nomadic in their habits, most strikingly in the matter of their winter migrations from the ferocious climate of their highlands to the softer winter of Sind and of the Kacchī".
- 86) Puram 24,19.
- 87) DED+S nos. 3966, 4173; JAOS 92, 1972, p. 418; Pfeiffer 1972, p. 18 f. no. 80. Cf. also Aalto 1971, p. 236 (see above, fn. 6), suggesting a different meaning.
- 88) Cf. Zvelebil 1970, p. 75, 120 ff. The word tōl < tukal occurs in a number of Central Dravidian languages, too, but so far it is a rather isolated example. Cf., however, Gondi mēlta, etc.
- 89) Skt. mēru has so far been connected with DED 4180 (Kannada mēruve 'pile, pyramid, high top', Telugu mēruvu 'pyramid, cone'); for other suggestions see Mayrhofer. Cf. also Buddhist Sanskrit meluḥ 'a high number'.
- 90) The word mēru 'cosmic mountain' figures as the latter part of several cities in Western India founded around 1000 AD, e.g. Ajmēr < Ajayamēru, cf. G. Bühler, "The Origin of the town Ajmer and of its name", WZKM 11, 1897, 51-6.
- 91) DED 1374. Cf. also DED 1692 (koṇkam, koṇku, koṇkan), 2820 (telu(n)kam, telu(n)ku, telu(n)kan).
- 92) Cf. kunru besides kunram (DED 1548), kunṭu/kunṭam (DED 1389), etc.
- 93) Pischel 1900 § 105 p. 89 suggested that the change a > u hangs together with the accent, which in Sanskrit is on the final syllable in this and other similar cases. The Kāṇva ŚB has, however, mléccha (see 2.3.).

- 94) Cf. J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik I, Göttingen 1896, p. 158 § 135b; M. Bloomfield and F. Edgerton, Vedic Variants II, Philadelphia 1932, p. 96 f.
- 95) Bloomfield and Edgerton 1932, p. 99 f.
- 96) Wackernagel 1896 I, p. 136 f. § 118.
- 97) Bailey 1973 (see n. 10), p. 585.
- 98) kkh has been considered an Eastern and cch a Western development on the basis of inscriptional evidence. H. Berger, Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre, München 1955 (Münchener Indologische Studien 1), p. 65 ff. has, however, suggested that kkh is the regular development and cch due to special conditions only; for different reactions cf. the reviews by M. Mayrhofer in Indo-Iranian Journal 1, 1957, p. 101 f., and by P. Tedesco in Language 32, 1956, p. 501 ff. - Cf. above, note 45.
- 99) On this problematic phoneme see Zvelebil 1970, p. 147-155 with further references.
- 100) DED 1253.
- 101) Cf. Zvelebil 1970, p. 164 ff. with further literature.
- 102) Cf. Zvelebil 1970, p. 75 and 122.
- 103) Pischel 1900, p. 102 § 129, records only two cases of Pkt. a : Skt. e: nāliara (besides nālierī and nāriela) = nālikera, and pavaṭṭha = praveṣṭa.
- 104) Cf. above, notes 87 and 88.
- 105) Me-lu^{ki}-ha: Barton, HLC III, no. 368 i 6; CT 3, 14594,6.12; Chiera STA no. 19 ii 15; Gelb, Studi ... Levi della Vida I (1956), 381; Gudea, Cyl. A IX 19; XV 5; XVI 22; Cyl. B XIV 13; ITT I 1426; II 705; IV 7157; 8015; Lau, OBTR no. 242 ii 11; Lutz, STR no. 65:6; PBS V 34 - XV 41 vi 9'; Pettinato, UNL I 2 iii 53; SLT 213 viii 8; UET III 368 i 2; 430,2; 660,3; 703 ii 8; 752 r ii; 757:5; 761:4; 764:4; 768; 770; 828; 1421; 1498; etc.
- Me-lu^{ki}-ha: CT 5, 17751 ii 1; Gudea, Stat D iv 2; PBS V

34 - XV v 9'; UNL I 2 iii 18, etc.

106) na₄-gug na₄-za-gin kur Me-luh-ha-ta, SLTNI 61, 138.

107) Me-luh-ha: Hh III 155; 205; 287; IV 99; 195; 283; XI 343; XVI 97; 5 R 33 ii 39.

^{KUR}Me-luh-ha: Reiner, JNES 15 129 ff. no. I i 33; KUB III no. 51; 20; 52,6.

For additional examples, see S. Parpola, AOAT 5 p. 245f; note the artificial spelling ^{KUR}EME(= me_x)-luh-ha in Luckenbill, Sn. 156, 19.

108) References in AOAT 5, s.v. Meluhha. Note also Me-luh-he-e Hh III 155; Me-luh-hi *ibid.* 205; CT 14 21 v 22; Me-luh-hi-tum Hh IV 283; Me-luh-hu-ú *ibid.* 99; 195; XI 343; ^{KUR}Me-luh-hi, KAH II 161; ^{LÜ}Me-luh-ha^{MEŠ}, KBo I 15 r 9.

109) Borger, Ash Klch D 5; Knudtzon, VAB 2 (1910), p. 1578.

110) Borger, op. cit. Frt M 4; Knudtzon, loc. cit.

111) Sollberger, Iraq 24 (1962) 66.

112) ME had also the phonetic value išib (> Akk. [2nd mill.] šib), but this was used in Sumerian contexts only in the logographic function. LUH had a logographic value šukkal, never used syllabically; for LUH = lih, lah see below, fn. 112. The only syllabic value attested for HA is ha. Sollberger, ZA 54 49, sub no. 317, considers a value ku₆ in en_x(= ZAG)-ku₆(d), but it is preferable to read in this case ZAG.KU₆, assigning the latter sign a semantic rather than phonetic function.

113) The phonetic value LUH = lah is assured from at least OB times on; cf. ap-lah Gilg. IX i 5 (OB); pi-lah, CT 2 39,25; Lutz, PBS 1/2 1, 20, and the examples cited in vSoden-Röllig, AnOr 42, p. 33. Since a phonemic merger of /a/ and /u/ is unthinkable in Akkadian (as well in other Sem. languages) in the environment l_h, it is legitimate to assume that the value lah was inherited from Sumerian, even though this value cannot be unequivocally proven for

the 3rd millennium. Note that vowel alternation of the type lu_h-la_h is a well attested feature of Sumerian (cf. Civil, JCS 20 119ff., and note la-a_h = mi-su-u (var. lu-u_h) S^b II 74; lu-u_h LU_h = mi-su-u Ea IV 76 (Hallock, AS 7 p. 18); also [lu-ú]_h LU_h = me-e-su-um, Ur-Ea A f 1 (MSL 2 p. 138). In one case (Gudea, Cyl. A XII 13: i-ha-LU_h), la_h rather than lu_h is actually required in view of the "vowel harmony" operating in Sum. polysyllabic lexemes. It may be noted, furthermore, that in Old Akkadian, LU_h certainly had at least the phonetic value li_h in addition to lu_h (cf. Gelb, MAD 2² p. 88); that la_h is not attested may be simply due to the scarcity of our sources. Note lastly the absence of the phonetic value la_h (= UD) in 3rd millennium texts.

114) Notice that the Pkt. variant miluk_hku and the reconstructed Pr.NDr. etymon (milu-akam, mēlu-akam) also permit the reading Me-lu_h-ha, and it is hence unnecessary to argue categorically for either of the possible readings.

115) In Greek texts quoted, Μηλῶ is preceded by two likewise corrupt forms, Διλιον (for Tilmun) and Μακκα (for Makkan). If the late tradition could substitute voiced stops for originally voiceless ones in the toponyms Tilmun and Makkan (cf. the explicit writings ^{KUR}Til-mu-un in KAH II no. 61; Ma-ak-ka-nu-u in H_h III 286, IV 194 and passim), nothing guarantees that it based its reading of Melu_hha on anything else than written texts.

116) Cf. vSoden-Röllig, loc. cit.

117) See the contribution of S. Parpola elsewhere in this volume.

118) In accordance with its historical development, Sumerian orthography required that lexical morphemes be represented by given graphemes (or combinations of graphemes) regardless of their allomorphs or grammatical forms. In-

flectional morphemes could be represented in script, but their representation did not affect the writing of lexical morphemes. Since the scribes mostly carried out the segmentation into lexical and inflectional morphemes on the basis of syllable division, the following graphemic representation often resulted:

morphemic	segmented as	graphemic
hursag̃ + še	hur sag̃ še	hur-sag̃-šè
hursag̃ + ta	hur sag̃ ta	hur-sag̃-ta
hursag̃ + a	hur sag̃ ga	hur-sag̃-gá

That the last spelling is only due to orthographic conventions is borne out by spellings like hur-sag̃-a (occurring far less often than hur-sag̃-gá), in which the scribe has segmented the word on the basis of its morphemic constitution.

119) Given a Sumerian "etymology", Me-luh̃-ha would mean "washed cult" or similar. Of course such an "etymology" does not make any sense to use, but who knows what the Sumerians might have thought about the matter? For the sake of curiosity, it may be recalled that Landsberger (ZA 35 [1924] 217²) considered Meluh̃ha a "Sumerian-sounding" name!

120) See Falkenstein, ZA 53 (1959) 97ff; Krecher, AOAT 1 (1969) 177 ff.

121) See e.g. Falkenstein, GSGL I p. 47 f.