

A DRAVIDIAN-SANSKRIT ETYMOLOGY

M. B. EMENEAU

University of California, Berkeley

Sanskrit kuḍmalá- adj. 'filled with buds, budded', noun masc. or neut.¹ 'bud'. is not provided with an etymology by Mayrhofer (nor by Uhlenbeck).² A Dravidian connection will be suggested later in this paper, but before that it will be useful to state accurately the history of the Sanskrit words involved and to add the data from later Indo-Aryan stages.

The adjective and noun appear in the manuscripts of, e.g., the Raghuvamśa (as reported in Nandargikar's edition) as both kuḍmala- and kuṭmala-, and our dictionaries mention both forms. Even kudmala- is reported as occurring in the manuscripts.

Following our dictionaries, Turner notes the Mahābhārata as the earliest source for the word, and presumably Mayrhofer too would have recorded epic attestation, if he had been including such information in this early part of his etymological dictionary. However, examination of the passages recorded in PW and elsewhere makes it doubtful whether the word is really epic. The only Mahābhārata passage referred to is 4.393 (Calcutta ed.), which turns out in the Poona critical edition to be an interpolation (App. 12, line 19, occurring after 4.13.10) in a much interpolated erotic passage on the encounter of Kīcaka and Draupadī. One Rāmāyaṇa passage has the adjective, given in the Gorresio edition, 4.38.40, as kuṭmala-, but read in the Baroda edition, 4.37.17, as kuḍmala- with no indication of any variant reading. This passage is, according to the Baroda editor's critical principles, sufficiently well attested, but it should be noted that one group of seven manuscripts omits verses 15-23 (substituting one verse and a half, which do not contain our word) and is followed in the omission (but not the substitution) by the Lahore edition. I am unable to evaluate this manuscript situation further, but judge that it makes the attestation of this word in the Rāmāyaṇa less than certain. Both the epic passages use the word in comparisons. The Mahābhārata occurrence must be, and the Rāmāyaṇa oc-

currence may be, judged to be medieval additions in the mildly-developed epic *belles-lettres* style, and chronologically they are equatable with the *kāvya* (i.e. the highly-developed *belles-lettres*) style; I shall call them pseudoepic.

Otherwise our word is well-attested in Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa, the Ṛt-usaṃhāra, śūdraka's Mṛcchakaṭikā, the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, the Hitopadeśa, and various lexica, including the Amarakośa. A reference to Pāṇini 5.4.145 (Sch.) is to the Kāśīkā commentary, where this word is used in a compound with another word, which latter is the point of the Pāṇinian rule. Our word also occurs in the Uṇādisūtra, but no date can be inferred from this. The word, then, is post-epic, essentially *kāvya*—with a possible epic occurrence in the Rāmāyaṇa passage.

A derivative kuḍmalita- adj. 'filled with buds' is also attested in the *kāvya*, in Amaruśataka and the Bālarāmāyaṇa (the latter in the 10th century). The earliest datable occurrence that I know of is in Bāṇa's Harṣacarita (Nirṇayasāgara edition 1897, p. 126, l. 16), which is, of course, later than Kālidāsa's use of kuḍmala-. The form is taught in the wordlist (gaṇapāṭha) tārakādi to Pāṇini 5.2.36 (Boehtlingk, gaṇapāṭha 101.14), but it is impossible to use this as establishing any antiquity for the word.

Another derivative, the denominative verb kuḍmalāyate, is attested in the Bālarāmāyaṇa.

In Pali kuḍmalaka- 'an opening bud' is recorded by the Pali Text Society's Dictionary only for the Aṅguttaranikāya (iv. 117, 119), with the bad guess that it is 'for kusuma'. Geiger (§35) correctly thinks of derivation from kuḍmala-, with ḍ preserved (instead of becoming ḷ) presumably because of insertion of the 'Teilvokal' in the cluster ḍm only shortly before the composition of the text (which is not verse). This attestation of the word might belong to the late pre-Christian period.

Edgerton recorded in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit kuḍmalaka- 'bud' in the Mahāvvyutpatti dictionary, and kuḍmalī-bhūta- 'budded' in the Lalitavistara. For neither of these occurrences can any great age be safely assumed.

In Prakrit there are two forms recorded as deriving from Sanskrit kuḍmala: kumpala- and kuppala-. The former is given by grammarians, including Hemacandra (12th century), who uses it in his literary work Kumārapālacarita, which has as its other purpose to teach grammar. The latter, kuppala-, is also a grammarian's form; curiously, Sheth's dictionary refers only to Pischel's recording

of it.

Turner (*CDIAL*, entry 3250) records the modern vernacular forms in two sub-entries. Under kuḍmala- he gives forms with -mb- and -m- (the latter from -mb- before -l-): Pahari kumbāle 'tuft of grass', Lahnda kūmlī 'bud, young shoot'. Under kuṭmala- there are forms derived through Prakrit -mp-: Hindi kōpaḷ 'opening bud, new leaf just sprouting, sprout, shoot', Gujarati kōpaḷ, kūpaḷ 'tender sprout, new twig'. Nepali kopilo 'bud' would seem to represent the Prakrit form with -pp-. In addition, Turner (entry 3249) sets up an Old Indic reconstruction *kuḍma-, whence Marathi kōb 'young shoot' is certainly derived; Sinhalese kumu 'unopened flower' is also listed here but the details of the derivation are unclear to me.

The various forms must be grouped (in agreement with Turner) into these lines of development:

(1) Skt. -ḍm- > Prakrit *-mb- > NIA -mb- (-m- before -l-);

(2) Skt. -ṭm- > (a) Prakrit -mp- > NIA -mp-,

and > (b) Prakrit -pp- > NIA -p-.

The Sanskrit datable attestations are late, opening up the possibility that the words in Sanskrit may in fact be Middle Indo-Aryan in origin and thence borrowed into Sanskrit. In Middle Indo-Aryan indeed, the earliest form, viz. that in Pali (the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit forms are very dubious as to date), also shows the consonant cluster -ḍm-. The other MIA forms, those with *-mb-, -mp-, -pp-, must be developments from -ḍm- and -ṭm-; development in the other direction, with resolution of labial clusters into retroflex + labial, would be both unmotivated and unparalleled. Whether we are to posit that the appearance of kuḍ/ṭmala- forms in Indo-Aryan took place first in Sanskrit of a (probably) post-epic period or in early MIA, is of little import and probably an insoluble problem. These two periods, if not strictly contemporary (the Pali may even be earlier than the Sanskrit attestations), are in principle at any rate indistinguishable.

It should be noted that, according to Pischel's presentation (§277) of the Prakrit forms kumpala- and kuppala-, these are the only representatives of Sanskrit words which have a cluster made up of retroflex stop + labial nasal. He attests, however, very few examples of clusters made up of any stop + labial nasal. From Skt. rukma- and its derivatives, the various Prakrits have ruppa-; from ātman-, some Prakrits have appa- and others atta-. These would seem to provide warrant for kuṭmala- > kuppala-. But, considering atta- and the general rarity

of relevant forms, we may hardly be sure that voiceless stop + labial nasal > pp is a valid rule; the few examples with tn > tt and pn > pp do not help. Combinations of voiced stop + labial nasal are just as rare and not even as unified in their development: gm and gn > gg (e.g. yugma- > jugga-, agni- > aggi-), and dm > mm, but only very doubtfully (chadma- > chamma-, according to the grammarian Hemacandra; otherwise chaūma-). There are no examples of ḍm > mb to put beside the postulated *kumbala-, anymore than there are examples of ṭm > mp to put beside the attested kuṭmala- > kumpala-. In other words, the Prakrit developments in the words under investigation are unique, though kuppala- would seem to be systematically justified, and kuṭ/ḍmala- > kump/bala- are a parallel pair. Even so, there can hardly be much doubt that the equations of these Sanskrit and Prakrit words are correct.

Kittel (p. XXIII) had attempted to interpret kuḍmala- as a Dravidian compound, for the members of which he gave Kannaḍa kūṭa 'a joining, union' or kūḍu *id.* plus *mala (cf. Kannaḍa malar 'flower'), i.e. (as he says) 'a shut or undeveloped flower'. Mayrhofer rejects this as 'nicht befriedigend' (not satisfactory). His grounds are presumably phonological (the first syllable seems wrong, since Sanskrit would be expected to show kū²u- or the like), as well as (possibly) semantic, since whenever there is, as rarely, anything more than 'bud' (i.e. unopened flower) in our dictionaries, there seems to be a reference to 'opening' rather than to 'shut'. It is uncertain also (to me, at least) whether the verb *kūṭu- would be used of a flower to denote either its shutting or its shut state. The semantic arguments seem to be somewhat weaker than the phonological. All told, Mayrhofer was probably right in rejecting Kittel's suggestion.

I would now suggest derivation of the Sanskrit forms from the Dravidian group of etyma collected in *DED* and *DEDS* 1787. Practically all the languages in the family are represented, including even Brahui. The meanings in the group are based on 'young, tender, new/fresh' and develop into (1) 'young or new person in the family, e.g. child, younger person just become an affinal relative (younger brother's wife, husband's younger brother, daughter-in-law)', and (2) 'new leaf-shoot, sprout, bud' (with a number of verb forms 'to sprout'). The basic form is *koṛ(u)-, which occurs as such or with various derivational suffixes. It has already been suggested in *DED* that Sanskrit kora-, koraka- 'bud' is a borrowing from this Dravidian group.³ *DEDS* adds epic Sanskrit kuḍaka- 'child'.⁴

With the forms kuḍmala-, kuṭmala-, and the postulated *kuḍma- of Turner's entry 3249, we should compare those few forms in *DED* 1787 that have a suffix beginning with -m-. Tamil has koṟumai 'freshness (as of shoots), beauty'. In Telugu this form yields komma 'maiden, female' by loss (probably regular) of the vowel between ṛ and m and assimilation of *ṛm > mm; this form with or without a feminine suffix -ḷ appears in the Central Dravidian languages (closely related to Telugu) Kolami kommal, Naikṛi kommal, Naiki of Chanda komma 'daughter'. It is from such a form as that postulated for pre-Telugu, *koṟma-, with possibly assimilatory change of first-syllable o to u before loss of second-syllable u (i.e. *kuṟuma- > *kuṟma-), that we would derive Sanskrit kuḍmala-, kuṭmala-. The voiced ḍ, rather than the voiceless ṭ, may be expected in Sanskrit from ṛ (cf. especially kuḍaka-); ṭ cannot really be explained.⁵

One more point remains to be discussed in the Sanskrit words, viz. -la-. If the adjective usage were older or more frequent than the noun use, it might be thought that -la- is the adjective suffix copiously exemplified in Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik* II.2.§693b, and this interpretation would even be strengthened by the occurrence of *kuḍma- 'bud', from which kuḍmala- might be derived. Attractive as this is, the adjective usage is rare, and is older than the noun only if the Rāmāyaṇa occurrence is not an interpolation. Examples are found of a secondary suffix -la- which has no additional meaning (*ibid.* §693a). It is even possible that such names of flowers as kamala- and utpala- have contributed something to the shape of kuḍmala-/kuṭmala-⁶

Footnotes

1. Whether the gender is determinable from the lexica or texts is unknown to me. PW says masc.; pw gives masc. or neut., both asterisked, which should mean that grammarians or lexicographers give both, but that neither is attested in texts; MW follows pw with 'm. n.', as does Mayrhofer. No text quoted by PW is decisive, since all forms given are of the kind in which there is neutralization of the two genders (e.g. instrumental or locative plural, or uninflected stem in a compound); but I may have missed some text, the author of which made a decision.

2. The references to dictionaries and grammars are:

PW = Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg, 1855-75).

pw = Otto Böhtlingk, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* (St. Petersburg, 1879-89).

MW = Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1899).

Mayrhofer = Manfred Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (Heidelberg, 1956--).

Uhlenbeck = C. C. Uhlenbeck, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des altindischen Sprache* (Amsterdam, 1898-99).

A Dravidian-Sanskrit Etymology

- Edgerton = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary* (New Haven, 1953).
- Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* (London, 1949).
- Geiger = Wilhelm Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache* (Strassburg, 1916).
- Sheth = Hargovind Das T. Sheth, *Pāia-sadda-mahaṅṅavo, a comprehensive Prakrit-Hindi dictionary* (2nd ed.; Varanasi, 1963).
- Pischel = R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen* (Strassburg, 1900).
- Turner, *CDIAL* = (Sir) R. L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages* (London, 1966).
- Kittel = F. Kittel, *A Kannaḍa-English Dictionary* (Mangalore, 1894).
- DED* = T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau, *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* (Oxford, 1961).
- DEDS* = *id.*, *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary: Supplement* (Oxford; 1968).
3. Accepted by Mayrhofer, though he misprints Tamil kuṛai 'shoot' as kuṛai. The development of ṛ to Sanskrit r is paralleled in several other borrowings, especially kūra- 'boiled rice' in *DED* 1592.
 4. Which Burrow discusses and validates, along with the items listed in Turner, *CDIAL*, entry 3245, in *Dr. S. K. Belvalkar Felicitation Volume*, pp. 6 f.
 5. For *ṛ in borrowings of Dravidian words, the most common equivalent in Sanskrit is l, but r (see n. 3) and ḍ are also sufficiently well attested. It has been suggested that Skt. kuṛaka- 'a newly-born animal' is a borrowing from this same Dravidian group. The Dravidian alternation of ṛ : ṛ is seen in this group in Kannaḍa koṛasu 'young one of wild beasts'.
 6. Another kuṛmala-, given in pw as m. n. 'part of an arrow', but in E. W. Hopkins, *JAOS* 13.277, as 'notch of an arrow', should be listed in Mayrhofer's entry kulmala-. The occurrence of this kulmala- is in Mahābhārata 8.34.19, which in the Poona edition is interpolation 257* following 8.24.67.