

Is There a Genetic Relationship Between Indo-European and Dravidian?

Stephan Hillyer Levitt
Flushing, New York

This paper examines the possibility of a genetic relationship between Indo-European and Dravidian. A significant number of proposed etymological relationships have been presented by Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns in 1994 and Allan R. Bomhard in 1996. This paper can be seen to expand on this effort with suggestions of relationships which in the main require specialized knowledge of either Dravidian languages and linguistics or South Asian culture. Many of the forms considered, after a brief review of the literature connecting Dravidian with other language families, are in the main concepts considered to be central to the cultures concerned, such as cow, calf, king, god, fruit, milk, folk, people, speak. In a few instances, etymologies which may perhaps compete with established etymologies are proposed. In a few instances, seeming correspondences are attributed to "background noise". Reference is made throughout to Julius G. Pokorny 1959-69, Carl Darling Buck 1949, Mario Pei 1962, and Murray B. Emeneau and Thomas Burrow 1984. Also referred to are Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns 1994 and Allan R. Bomhard 1996.

There has been a lot of discussion lately about the relationship between different families of languages, such as that regarding the Nostratic families of languages. Witness, for example, *The New York Times* article by George Johnson 1995 and the recent First International Symposium on Language and Prehistory held in Ann Arbor, Michigan in 1988, papers from which were edited in Vitalii Victorovich Shevoroshkin, ed. 1992. From a different tack, Joseph Greenberg argues for a Eurasiatic language family that includes Japanese and Eskimo-Aleut, for instance. And Paul K. Benedict 1942 and 1975 argue for a relationship between the Thai family and the Austronesian family of languages. In reaction to Greenberg and Benedict, Isidore Dyen 1970 presents "evidence" for a connection between Austronesian and Indo-European which he argues could not exist on account of the disparate homelands of the two language families. He justifies his exercise on the grounds

Volume 26, Number 1 & 2, Spring/Summer 1998

that "if there was no Proto-Austronesian-Indo-European, the collection of evidence for it which I will present will bear on the amount and kind of 'background noise' that can be expected in hypotheses of common origins which involve great time-depth."¹

My intention here is to point out some arguments for a relationship between Dravidian and Indo-European a number of which require some knowledge of Dravidian to see, or some knowledge of developments which can be seen in the Indic setting. In some instances, for example, euphonic combination in Dravidian masks the connection. On the whole, the examples given are semantically transparent. I am not dealing here with words of possible general universal similarity, such as words for mother or father. The terms I am focusing on, though, are in large part central concepts in some of the cultures concerned, such as terms for cow, calf, king, god, fruit, milk, folk, people, speak.

On the whole, the comparisons pointed out here have not been included in Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns 1994 and Allan R. Bomhard 1996. In one or two instances, I give a different connection than the one offered by Bomhard; and in one or two instances the same connection is offered by Bomhard, but I find it worthwhile to underscore it here. This paper can thus be seen, perhaps, as amplifying in a small way Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns 1994 and Allan R. Bomhard 1996. Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns 1994 list Dravidian entries in 289 out of 601 sets of etyma. Of these 289 sets of etyma, 253 contain sets of etyma for both Dravidian and Indo-European. I am not focusing in this paper on quantity of sets of etyma, but the data presented by Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns 1994 certainly supports such an argument.

In some instances, an etymology proposed here competes with an existing etymology.

In some instances, a form can be seen to go back to an Indo-European form with a different more basic meaning. The etymology proposed here is not necessarily contraindicated, though, in all cases because the base meanings of Dravidian roots are generally not known. The Dravidian etymological material has been organized by Murray B. Emeneau and Thomas Burrow 1961 into etymological sets of cognate words of

¹Isidore Dyen 1970: 431.

roughly the same meaning, not by roots. Often one etymological set will display more than one root. Also, many different etymological sets of disparate meanings may share the same root. We must look at such instances on a case by case basis.

In a few instances, I also point out possible comparisons which are certainly accidental — instances of “background noise”, if we can use this locution. Unlike the instance of a comparison of Austronesian and Indo-European, though, in the instance of a comparison of Dravidian and Indo-European we do not have disparate homelands. The two language families have been seen to have entered into South Asia, for instance, from the northwest in subsequent waves.

I note I originally noticed morphological similarities between Old Tamil and German when studying these two languages at the same time in 1966-67. When it became apparent that I would not be able to do my doctoral dissertation on the Old Tamil epic *Manimekalai*, I suggested this as a possible topic to Dr. Ernest Bender of the University of Pennsylvania, where I was attending school. Dr. Bender exploded, saying I did not know German well enough. I mentioned the topic as a possible dissertation topic to Dr. Ludo Rocher, and he responded that he'd prefer I did something “solid”, and he proceeded to suggest an edition and translation of a Sanskrit text on polluted brahmans. It is unfortunate that I was so roundly discouraged in this direction at that time, because I did not make notes on the comparisons I had noticed. One of these which I remember, though, I have included reference to toward the end of this paper, together with just a few other morphological points which I have noticed, or possibly noticed again, more recently.

On account of this early reaction to my observations, my starting point here is usually English. But I consider German, the Romance languages, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit as well. When possible, I have included reference to Julius G. Pokorny 1959-69 (hence, Pokorny), Carl Darling Buck 1949 (hence, Buck) and Mario Pei 1962 (hence, Pei). For Dravidian I, of course, refer to Murray B. Emeneau and Thomas Burrow 1984 (hence, *DEDR*), 1961 (hence, *DED*), 1968 (hence, *DEDS*), and 1972 (hence, *DEN*). Also included is reference to Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns 1994 (hence, Bomhard and Kerns) and Allan R. Bomhard 1996 (hence, Bomhard) when

relevant. When a form is not noted by these latter two works, this is also noted. I add I am not an Indo-Europeanist. I am a Sanskritist and a Dravidianist.

In the main, Indo-European has not been focused on as the extra-Indian language family of connection with Dravidian. There is, though, S. Gnana Prakasar 1953, whose work suffered from having been done before the compilation of *DED*. Several of his comparisons prove to be with Indo-Aryan loanwords in Dravidian, such as Ta. *katai* < Skt. *gadā* and Ta. *paṇi* < Skt. *phanin* (*phaṇi* in compound and in genitive plural in *Suparnādhyāya*), for instance. The Tamil words in question are not listed in *DEDR*. And the Sanskrit forms are not listed in the index of *DEDR* as loanwords from Dravidian.² Others are perhaps sometimes farfetched. Ta. *eli*, listed in *DEDR* as meaning either 'rat' or 'bandicoot' across the board in Dravidian, is suggested to have referred in literary reference to a sheep or goat and from this all sorts of connections are made, for instance. Some of his comparisons may in fact be on the mark. See also Manfred Mayrhofer 1952 and Franklin C. Southworth 1982. Southworth's article is tongue-in-cheek ("... I doubt that genetic relationships can ever be proven by lexical evidence alone" — p. 20; "... when a person is searching for something, there is a much greater chance of finding it if the searcher is confident that something is there to be found" — p. 20, n. 9). Many, if not the overwhelming majority of his suggested relationships are exercises in *reductio ad absurdum*. For example, Ta. *makan* 'son', Eng. *my kin* (as in *mannikin*, *boykin*); Ta. *nii* 'you', Eng. *thee*, *ye* < **nthii*, **nyii*; Ta. *viral* 'finger, toe', Eng. *virile* (Southworth's note: "The semantic progression is clearly 'finger' → 'male organ' → 'man, manly'").

The connections generally focused on are those with Uralic and Altaic, which argument goes back to Bishop R. Caldwell in 1856 who referred to what he called the "Scythian" family of languages and to Max Müller in 1854 who independently reached similar conclusions and who used the term "Turanian" in the sense Caldwell used "Scythian". In 1925, F. O. Schrader returned to Caldwell's theory but simplified its terms of reference, leaving out of account reference to the Altaic languages. The references are given and critically

²The words are also not listed in Murray B. Emeneau and Thomas Burrow 1962, but many Indo-Aryan borrowings in Tamil do not find place in this lexicon. See, for instance, S. Vaidyanathan 1971.

discussed by Thomas Burrow 1943-46: 328-31. Regarding other efforts to connect Dravidian with Uralic, see Thomas Burrow 1943-46, Stephen A. Tyler 1968, Pentti Aalto 1971, M. Andronov 1971, and E. J. P. Marlow 1974 and 1980-81. See also Thomas A. Sebeok 1945. Regarding connections with Altaic, see Karl H. Menges 1969, 1975 and 1977 and Jaroslav Vacek 1978.

Of note is that in Bomhard and Kerns, 107 sets of etyma include Dravidian listings, either Uralic or Altaic or Finno-Ugrian or Finno-Permian listings, and Indo-European listings; while 146 sets of etyma include Dravidian and Indo-European etyma perhaps with Afroasiatic etyma or Sumerian etyma or Kartvelian etyma as well, but without reference to Uralic or Altaic etyma. Only 19 sets of etyma include Dravidian and either Uralic or Altaic or Finno-Ugrian, and perhaps Afroasiatic or Sumerian or Kartvelian listings alone. And 15 sets of etyma include Dravidian and Afroasiatic listings, perhaps with Sumerian or Kartvelian listings, but without reference to Indo-European, or Uralic or Altaic. The remaining 2 sets of etyma include Dravidian and Kartvelian listings alone. This skew is perhaps to be attributed to Allan R. Bomhard's familiarity with Indo-European, or perhaps to the generally larger amount of work done by the Western scholarly community on Indo-European.

A connection argued recently with a fair degree of success is that between Dravidian and Elamite. See David McAlpin 1974a, 1974b, 1975, 1979, and 1981. Bomhard and Kerns 26-27 and Bomhard 111-13 accept this relationship to be very close. When discussing Dravidian as a language family, these two sources refer to it under the rubric "Elamo-Dravidian".

Connections between Dravidian and other languages and families of languages have been argued with varying degrees of skill as well. J. Quintana Vives 1944 has argued for a relationship with Sumerian. N. Lahovary 1951 has argued for a relationship with Basque. See also Thomas Burrow 1964 regarding N. Lahovary's later book arguing for a relationship between Dravidian and Basque, Caucasian, Berber, Sumerian, Elamite, and other languages. T. Balakrishnan Nayar 1963 looks at Lahovary's argument from a different and more positive view. L. Homburger 1954 and 1957, K. O. Shamsuddin 1972 and Václav Blažek 1992a have argued for a relationship between Dravidian and Afroasiatic. L. Homburger 1948, 1949 and 1951b, to mention but three of Homburger's articles, argue for

a relationship between Dravidian and Negro-African. See also the section on "Indo-African" in L. Homburger 1951a: 240-46. Similarly, U. P. Upadhyaya 1976 argues for a relationship with Negro-African, specifically with the West Atlantic subgroup of the Niger-Congo family of languages. Václav Blažek 1992b has questioned whether there is a relationship between Dravidian and Australian. See also Václav Blažek 1992b for other arguments of connection. And see also Robert Austerlitz 1971 for a negative assessment of all such attempts at relationship and for further bibliography regarding such attempts.

The etymological proposals suggesting a genetic relationship between Indo-European and Dravidian which are argued for here follow.

1. Eng. *milk*, Lat. *mulgēre* (Pokorny 1.722-23, PIE **mēlg-* (or **melǵ-*?); Buck 5.86 (sb.), 5.87 (vb.)). Buck 5.87 notes, "Skt. *mṛj-* 'wipe, stroke', Av. *marəz-* 'touch', IE **melǵ-*, with Eur. specialization of 'wipe, stroke' or the like to 'milk'." Compare *DEDR* 4985 Ta. *mulai* 'woman's breast, teat'; Ma. *mula* id., 'udder' (PSDr. **mul-/mol-*). An alternation between front and back vowels, of course, exists in Germanic, for instance. For a similar alternation in Tamil between literary Tamil and colloquial Tamil, see A. Kamatchinathan 1972: 156-57, 160. Regarding such a possible alternation in Dravidian in general, see S. Gnana Prakasar 1953: 101, for instance, who would connect *DEDR* 833 Ta. *eli* 'rat, bandicoot' and *DEDR* 994 Pe. *orli* 'rat', Kui *odri* id. Such an alternation has not been established firmly for Dravidian in general to date, however, though such developments do exist in Kota, Toda and Kodagu, for instance, and in a comparison of literary Tamil and colloquial Tamil as noted above. To be mentioned is that the base meanings of roots in Dravidian are in the main not known. Note that *-k-* is a common Dravidian suffix. Bomhard and Kerns 552 connects the Indo-European forms instead to *DEDR* 5077 Ta. *mel* (*melv-*, *menr-*), *melku* (*melki-*) 'to chew, masticate; chide'. The connection here, though, seems more transparent. Note, their Finno-Ugrian examples include words for 'breast'.

2. Eng. *calf* (Pokorny 1.359-60, PIE **geleb(h)-*, **glēb(h)-* (: **glab(h)-*) and **gleb(h)-* (: **glb(h)-*); Buck 3.24; Pei 84-85). Pei connects the form with PIE **g^uelbh*. "The IE **g^uelbh* root means 'womb', and, by later extensions, 'cub'. In Germanic, this produces Anglo-Saxon *cealf* and *cealfian*, which become English *calf* and the verb *calve* (the irregularities in AS *cealf*, where we

would expect **cwealb*, seem due to a crossing with another related root, **gelbh*, meaning 'to bunch up'; the *f* and *v* of *cealf* and *cealve* are special Anglo-Saxon developments from an earlier *b* in certain positions; ...)." Buck notes, "... same word as ON *kālfr* 'calf of the leg', fr. **gel-bh-* an extension of **gel-* in Skt. *gula* 'ball', Lat. *galla* 'gallnut', parallel to **gel-t-* in Goth. *kilþei* 'womb', OE *cild* 'child', and with a similar semantic development, in this case 'swelling' to 'womb', 'fetus', 'young of an animal', 'calf'. But in part perh. blended with **g^welbh* in Grk. *δελφύς*, Skt. *garbha-* 'womb', etc. In any case 'calf' is a specialization of 'young of an animal'." Compare *DEDR* 1411 Ta. *kanru* 'calf, colt, young of various animals, sapling, young tree', *karr-ā* 'cow with a young calf', Ma. *kannu* (obl. *karru-*) 'young of cattle (esp. buffalo calf), young plantain trees around the mother plant' (PDr. **kanr-*/**karr-*/**kand-*/**kān-*/**kar-*/**kāc-*/**kat-*). Note the glossing of Te. *kanu* 'to bear or bring forth, beget', *kāncu* 'to bear, produce, bring forth', *kānupu* 'bringing forth a child', Konḍa *kās-* (-*t*) 'to bring forth young (of human beings), bear children', Br. *xaning* 'to give birth to'. Te. *kānupu* and Konḍa *kās-* (-*t*) were originally grouped in *DEDS* with *DED* 1220 Ta. *kāy* (-*pp-*, -*tt-*) 'to bear fruit', n. 'unripe fruit, unripe boil', not with *DED* 1187 Ta. *kanru*. They were shifted to *DED* 1187 in *DEN*, when Te. *kāncu* was added. Also note that by Old Tamil rules of euphonic combination, *nr* < *l + nt* and *rr* < *l + t*. Emeneau and Burrow in *DED*, etc. do not take into consideration euphonic combination in Dravidian. Both -*nt* and -*t* are common suffixes in Dravidian, as is also -*p*. This correspondence is perhaps strengthened by the next noted correspondence for Eng. *cow*, which sets up the paradigm Eng. *calf*, Tam. *kanru* (PDr. **kanr-*): Eng. *cow*, PDr. **kōnr-*. Using Tamil rules of euphonic combination, Tam. *kanru* = *kal-nt-u*, Tam. *karr-ā* = *kal-t-ā*. For the word 'calf', Bomhard and Kerns 50 focuses on different Indo-European forms which it connects with *DEDR* 4593 Ko. *po'ry* 'young bullock (one or two and a half years)'.

3. Eng. *cow* (Pokorny 1.482-83, PIE **g^wou-*; Buck 3.23, 3.20-24 (1); Pei 179). Buck 3.23 notes that "the majority of the words for 'cow' represent the IE word for 'ox, cow', Grk. *βούς*, etc., with specialization to 'cow' in Gmc. and Celtic." Buck 3.20-24 (1) notes "IE **g^wou-*, nom. sg. **g^wous*, the old generic word for the bovine species, 'ox' or 'cow'. Restricted to 'ox' in the Romance languages, to 'cow' in Celtic, Gmc., Lett., Arm."

Compare *DEDR* 2216 Ka. *gōnde* 'bull, ox', Te. *gōda* 'ox', Kol. (SR.) *kondā* 'bull', (Kin.) *kōnda* 'bullock', Ga. (Oll.) *kōnde* 'cow', (S.) *kōndē* 'bullock', Go. (Tr.) *kōndā*, (other dialects) *kōnda* 'bullock, ox' (PDr. **kōṅr-*). Also compare *DEDR* 2199 Te. *kōḍiya*, *kōḍe* 'young bull' ... Kol. (Haig) *kōḍē* 'bull', Nk. *khōre* 'male calf', Konda *kōḍi* 'cow', *kōre* 'young bullock', Pe. *kōḍi* 'cow'; Mand. *kūḍi* id., Kui *kōḍi* id., 'ox', Kuwi (F.) *kōḍi* 'cow', (S.) *kajja kōḍi* 'bull', (Su. P.) *kōḍi* 'cow' (PCDr. **kōt-/kōt-*). And compare as well *DEDR* 1886 Kol. *kuṭe* 'cow', Nk. *khūṭe* id., Nk. (Ch.) *kūṭe* id. (PCDr. **kūtt-*). If we can judge, on the basis of Old Tamil rules of euphonic combination, that PDr. **kōṅr-* is composed of **kōl-* + a common Dravidian suffix *-nt-*, we may also wish to suggest that the forms in *DEDR* 2199 and *DEDR* 1886 also contain an underlying *-l-* plus a common suffix (such as *-t-* or *-tt-*?) to which Dravidian rules of euphonic combination have been applied. Bomhard and Kerns 346 suggests a relationship between the Indo-European forms and *DEDR* 2199 only.

4. Eng. *speak*, *speech*, Germ. *sprechen* (Pokorny 1.997-98, PIE **(s)p(h)erag-*, **(s)p(h)erag-*, **(s)p(h)reg-* (nas. **spren-*); Buck 18.21(5)). Buck 18.21(5) notes, "the history of the *r*-less forms is obscure, but they are undoubtedly of secondary origin." The base meanings of the PIE forms would seem to indicate 'jerk, move convulsively, twitch' and 'strew, scatter, sprinkle, splash', according to Pokorny 1.996. Compare *DEDR* 4430 Ta. *pēcu* (*pēcī-*) 'to talk, speak, converse, make noise, roar; tell, say, recite, praise' ... Ka. *pēr* (*pērd-*) 'to utter, say, speak, narrate, tell, command' ... Te. *p(r)ēlu* 'to prattle, chatter, talk nonsense' ... Malt. *perqe* 'to talk, speak, simmer, hiss' (PDr. **pēc-/pēr-/pēr-/pār-/?er-*). Note that we have here forms with reflexes of **r* and **r̥* as well as without. See, for instance, Ko. *pe'c-* (*pe'c-*) 'to talk to oneself', *perc-* (*perc-*) 'to give irrelevant answers, talk nonsense, talk with impropriety in the presence of holy man' and Te. *p(r)ēlu* 'to prattle, chatter, talk nonsense', as well as the other forms just cited. Regarding the meanings of the Malto form, compare for instance Gk. *σφαραγέω* 'crackle, sputter, hiss' and Skt. *sphurj-* 'crackle, rustle'. This identification requires metathesis between the Tamil, Malayalam and Kota forms versus the Indo-European forms. Metathesis is common in, for instance, Central Dravidian. It is not standardly noted to be a feature of South Dravidian, however. Regarding an alternation of forms with and without *r*, see entry no. 11 below treating the German word *Deutsch*. There are as well a number

of other Dravidian forms for 'speak' which begin with *p-*, as for instance *DEDR* 3887 Ta. *paṇi* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) 'to speak, say, declare (used of a superior), order, command', n. 'saying, word, command', *DEDR* 4031 Ta. *paṇai* (*-v-*, *-nt-*; *-pp-*, *-tt-*) 'to speak, say', n. 'word, saying, statement' and *DEDR* 4233 Ta. *pukal* (*pukalv-*, *pukanr-*) 'to say, state, sound', n. 'word, mode of singing'. Bomhard and Kerns 21, 137, 343, 473, 492, 519, and 569 list seven different terms for 'speak'. None, though, contain Eng. *speak* or Ta. *pēcu* (*pēci-*).

5. Eng. *leg* (Pokorny 1.673, PIE **lek-* (: **l_hk-*), **lēk-* : **lək-* 'limb of the body'; Buck 4.35(4)). Buck 4.35(4) notes, "ON *legg* 'hollow bone of arms and legs' but also 'leg' (> ME, NE *leg*), esp. in latter sense *fötlegg* (as *handlegg* 'arm', 4.31), Dan. *læg*, Sw. *lägg* 'calf (of the leg)', no certain outside connection, but prob. fr. an IE **lek-* 'bend' (?) in Skt. *lakuta-* 'cudgel', Lat. *lacertus* 'muscle of the upper arm', and numerous other words with partial application to parts of the body, etc." Compare *DEDR* 1479 Ta. *kāl* 'leg, foot, base (of tree), quarter, family, relationship' ... Te. *kālu* 'leg, foot, quarter' (PDr. **kāl-*). This connection requires metathesis in either the Dravidian forms as a whole or the Indo-European forms. Bomhard and Kerns 583 does not list any Dravidian connection for these Indo-European forms.

6. Eng. *cold*, *cool*, *chill*, O.N. *kala* 'freeze', Lat. *gelidus* (with sb. *gelu* 'cold, frost', vb. *gelāre* 'freeze') (Pokorny 1.365-66, PIE **gel(ə)-*; Buck 15.86(2); Pei 130). Compare *DEDR* 1834 Ta. *kuḷir* (*-v-*, *-nt-*) 'to feel cool (as breeze), be cool, refreshing, get numbed (as in death)', n. 'coldness, chilliness, ague, shivering' ... Ka. *kuḷir* 'to be cool or cold', n. 'coldness, coolness, cold, snow, frost' (PSDr. **kuḷ-*). Bomhard and Kerns 287 also lists this connection.

7. Eng. *kill* (Pokorny 1.470-71, PIE **g^hel-*; Buck 4.76(4)). Buck 4.76(4) notes, "OE *cwellan*, ME *quelle* (NE *quell*), caus. of OE *cwelan* 'die' (4.75). ME *culle*, *kille*, also (earlier) 'strike, beat, knock', NE *kill*, orig. dub. The earlier meaning is against the supposition of OE **cyllan* (Gmc. **kuljan*) as an ablaut variant of *cwellan*, etc." Compare *DEDR* 2132 Ta. *kol* (*kolv-*, *konr-*) 'to kill, murder, destroy, ruin, fell, reap (as the heads of grain), afflict, tease', n. 'act of killing affliction' ... Ka. *kol*, *kolu*, *kollu* (*kond-*) 'to kill, murder' ... Br. *xalling* 'to strike, kill, fire (gun), throw (stone)' (PDr. **kol-/*koll-*). Regarding the alternation between front and back vowels in the Indo-European as against

Dravidian forms, see the comments above under entry no. 1, Eng. *milk*. Bomhard and Kerns 359 also lists this connection.

8. Eng. *king*, O.N. *konr* 'man of noble birth', Germ. *könig* 'king' (Pokorny 1.373-75, PIE **ǵen-*, **ǵenə-*, **ǵnē-*, **ǵnō-* 'to beget'; Buck 19.32(4); Pei 204-206). Compare *DEDR* 2177 Ta. *kō*, *kōṇ*, *kōmāṇ* 'emperor, king, great man, leadership' ... Pa. *kōc* 'king' (PDr. **kō-*/**kōṇ-*/**kōm-*/**kōc-*). Note that the base meaning of the Dravidian root is not clear, as is almost invariably the case. If there is a connection between *DEDR* 2177 and the next entry as well, though, the possibility of which is suggested, then the connection proposed here perhaps competes with the standing etymology, or either this suggestion or the next proposed connection may be an instance of "background noise". Regarding the standing Indo-European etymology, note the comments of Pei 204 that "the IE root **ǵen*, 'to beget', is one of the most fruitful in our language. On the Germanic side, it produces Anglo-Saxon *cynn*, *cennan*, which give us *kin* (with *kinship*, *kinsman*, *kinsfolk*, *akin*); Anglo-Saxon *gecynd*, leading to *kind*, *unkind*, *kindness*, *kindly*; Anglo-Saxon *cynning* (this is *cynn* with an *-ing* which is a patronymic suffix: 'kin-born'), which becomes *king*, with *kingly*, *kinship*, *kinglet*, *kingdom*, *kingfish*, etc. ...". Regarding the alternation of front and back vowels, see the comments above under entry no. 1, Eng. *milk* and entry no. 7, Eng. *kill*. Bomhard and Kerns do not include any words for 'king'.

9. Eng. *God*, Germ. *Gott* (Pokorny 1.413-14, PIE **ǵhau-*, **ǵhauə-* 'call, summon, invoke', **ǵhauo-s* 'summons', **ǵhū-to-* 'invoked'; Buck 22.12(4)). In *DEDR* 2177, referred to under entry no. 8 above, there are also such forms as Ta. *kōvil* 'temple', Te. *kōyila*, *kōvela* 'temple'. These forms are in fact compounds the second member of which, *il*, occurs in *DEDR* 494 and means 'house'. (The *-v-* and *-y-* of these forms are euphonic glides.) In such instances Ta. *kō*, etc. must carry the force 'god', the forms meaning 'the god's house'. The usage here would be comparable to Eng. *Lord* for 'God'. See also Ta. *kōpuram* (pron. *gōpuram*) 'temple tower', lit. 'the god's city', a clear understanding of which reference rests on a knowledge of the symbolism of the Hindu temple. Regarding the different realizations of the initial consonant in the English forms *king* and *God*, see for instance the different realizations of Old Indo-Aryan *-ḷ-* in Tamil from 100 A.D. to 1964/65 A.D. as in data collected by S. Vaidyanathan and referred to in Stephan Hillyer

Levitt 1989: 131 (1.3). If there was a lengthy period of separation, forms taken over at different times might perhaps be realized differently. There are many examples within Indo-European as well of words taken over at different times from other sub-divisions of Indo-European which result in different realizations of the same Indo-European root in individual languages. These Indo-European forms for 'God' in Germanic seem to be connected to the Sanskrit root *hu-* 'to call, invoke', though. The connection suggested here would seem to be a competing etymology or it may be an instance of "background noise", as mentioned under entry no. 8 for Eng. *king* above. To be emphasized is that the base meanings of most Dravidian roots are not known. Bomhard and Kerns do not include any words for 'God'.

10. Eng. *folk*, Germ. *volk* (Pokorny 1.798-800, PIE **pel-*, **pel-*, **plē-* 'to fill, to pour, flow, spill'; Buck 19.21(1) and (5), 19.22; Pei 229-31). The Sanskrit term *śūdra*, the name of the fourth social class, the 'folk', is probably from Skt. *śūla* 'spear' + the common Dravidian suffix *-t-* being added before the primary Sanskrit suffix *-a* (*śūl-* + *-t-* + *-a*).³ By Dravidian rules of euphonic combination *l* + *-t-* > *-r-*, pronounced in Tamil as *-tr-*. The voicing of the dental would probably be due to a Dravidian sound in an Indo-Aryan speaker's mouth. Compare *DEDR* 5536 Ta. *vēl* 'dart, spear, lance, javelin, trident, weapon' (PSDr. **vēl*). Note that in ethnographies of Tamil-speaking areas the *śūdra* castes are often referred to by the name, 'Infantry'. See, for instance, Dagfinn Sivertsen 1963. Also, in Kerala the *śūdras* function as the infantry. See also Stephan Hillyer Levitt 1991-92 where it is argued that chesspieces correspond to the king and the four classes of Indian society, the pawns or 'infantry' corresponding to the *śūdra* class. Arguing against this connection is that *DEDR* 5536 may perhaps be an innovation in Tamil and Malayalam. It is not clear from what forms these forms might be derived though, from which forms these forms grew out of, and what their base meanings might be. To be kept in mind as well in this regard is that the forms cited in *DEDR* 4786 Ta. *mā* 'great', for instance, which now include both South Dravidian and Central Dravidian entries and which are referred

³I have argued in Stephan Hillyer Levitt 1980 for a merger of Indo-Aryan and Dravidian roots in the form Skt. $\sqrt{\text{mand/mad}}$, and have pointed out in a paper pending publication on Skt. *brāhman* and Semitic *BRK* Dravidian roots which were borrowed into Sanskrit and onto which Sanskrit suffixes were added.

to under entry no. 15 below, were originally listed in *DED* 3923 with only Tamil and Malayalam entries alone cited as in *DEDR* 5536 here. Regarding the alternation of front and back vowels, see the comments above under entry no. 1, Eng. *milk*, entry no. 7, Eng. *kill*, and entry no. 8, Eng. *king*. The parallel between the two possibly related Sanskrit terms on the one hand and the Dravidian and Indo-European terms on the other hand is certainly striking. Bomhard and Kerns do not list forms for 'folk' or 'spear'.

11. Germ. *Deutsch* 'people, nation'. (See *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. 1989 (hence, *OED*): 4.1139c-1140a, under *Dutch*. See also Friedrich 1989: 138-39 and *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen* 1989: 1.276-77.) It was originally suggested by R. Caldwell in 1856 that the Skt. *draviḍa* 'Dravidian', with its Sanskrit variants *dramiḍa* and *dramila*, is related to the Ta. *tamiḥ* 'Tamil'. Suggesting this connection he cited Pali and Prakrit forms for the Tamils such as *damila*, *daviḷa*, *daviḍa*. See R. Caldwell 1913: 8-10. See also R. L. Turner 1966-69: 378b (6632). Various suggestions have been made regarding the meaning and etymology of these terms, perhaps the latest of which is Kamil Zvelebil 1986. See also K. M. George 1946, A. S. Narayanaswami Naidu 1968, M. Andronov 1977, and N. Nadaraja Pillai 1979 regarding these points. To be suggested here is that Ta. *tamiḥ*, Skt. *draviḍa*, *dramiḍa*, *dramila*, P. *damila*, Pkt. *daviḷa*, *daviḍa* are to be connected to Germ. *Deutsch* and the name *Druid* for the ancient inhabitants of Gaul and the British Islands. For the standing etymology of the name *Druid* see *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. 1910-11: 8.596. On an analogy with Irish, the form has been analyzed into *dru-vid* 'very knowing'. This etymology would seem to read into the term later attributions, and it seems forced. It is comparable to the type of etymology we get in the Sanskrit *Brāhmaṇas*. The appearance of *r* in some forms and not in others would be comparable to the suggested relationship between Eng. *fuck* and Germ. *pfrecken* 'to prick' (the latter word listed at Pokorny 1.167), and between Eng. *speak* and Germ. *sprechen* 'to speak'. As noted above under entry no. 4, Eng. *speak*, *speech*, Buck 18.21(5) notes that the history of the *r*-less forms for this set of etyma is obscure. We would seem to have in the word *Deutsch* metathesis of the two vowels. By Sanskrit rules of grammar, *au* is a 'vrddhi'-strengthened growth of the vowel *u*. Also by Sanskrit rules of euphonic combination *au + i > avi*. These points can be

seen to account for the differences between Skt. *draviḍa* and Germ. *Deutsch*. Supporting this connection is that standardly groups of people in India refer to themselves by a word in their language for 'people'. For instance, in the hills around the Assam valley in northeast India, the name *Dafla* of one of the tribal groups means 'people', and the name *Mizo* of another of the tribal groups also means 'people'. By this suggestion, Skt. *draviḍa* and Ta. *tamiṛ* would also mean 'people' and 'popular [speech]'. It would seem that this can be seen clearly in the Tamil locution *ādi-draviḍa* 'first Dravidians', used to refer to the untouchables. By this interpretation this locution would mean 'first people', 'first populace', *i.e.* 'first inhabitants of the land'. This is consonant with the position untouchables play in many village rituals in South Asia. Regarding the alternation of *m* and *v*, note that in Prakrit there is a development of *m* > *v* and *v* > *m*. See R. Pischel 1900: 251 and 261. Bomhard and Kerns do not include these terms.

12. Skt. *phala* 'fruit' (?Pokorny 1.985-87, PIE **(s)p(h)el-*; Buck 5.71(6)). See John Peile 1881: 106 who connects this form with Lat. *flōs*, *flōris*, Eng. *flower*, *bloom* (Pokorny 1.122, PIE **bhel-* and **bhlē-*, **bhlō-*, **bhl̥-*; Buck 8.57). It is not clear if Pokorny 1.985-87 connects Skt. *phala* 'fruit' with the forms he lists for Skt. *phālati* 'burst, break asunder'. M. Monier-Williams 1899 lists the two forms together, noting the verb Skt. *phalati* 'to bear or produce fruit, ripen' to be a denominative verbal form from Skt. *phala* 'fruit'. He clearly relates Skt. *phala* 'fruit' to Skt. *phālati* 'burst, break asunder'. Charles Rockwell Lanman 1884: 199 would list Skt. *phalati* 'to bear or produce fruit, ripen' as a separate verb. Pokorny does not seem to include Skt. *phala* 'fruit' in his dictionary. Buck lists it separately from all other words for 'fruit', but appears to clearly relate it to Skt. *phālati* 'burst, break asunder'. Pei 195-96 clearly does not include Skt. *phala* with Lat. *flōs*, *flōris*, Eng. *flower*, *bloom*. Compare *DEDR* 4004 Ta. *paṛu* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) 'to ripen (as fruits, grain), grow mature ...', *paṛam* 'ripe fruit', *paṇtam* 'fruit' ... Te. *paṇḍu* 'to ripen, mature, yield, produce, win (in a game)', n. 'fruit, berry', adj. 'ripe, mature' ... (PDr. **pāṛ-/ *paṇ-/ *pum-/ *pān-/ *pāl-/ *paṇt-/ *pat-/ *paṇt-/ *pañc-*). *DEDR* lists Skt. *phala* 'fruit', *phalati* 'to bear or produce fruit, ripen' as loanforms from Dravidian. We have, though, the Hebrew word for 'fruit', Heb. *peri*, which would seem to be related. Eng. *fruit* is seen to come from Lat. *frūctus* 'product, fruit' in the widest sense, from *frui* 'enjoy'. "Hence

with special though not exclusive application to 'tree fruit', It. *frutto*, coll. *frutta*, Fr. *fruit* (> ME *frut*, NE *fruit*), Sp. *fruto*, coll. *fruta*, Rum. *fruct*, ... Du. *vrucht* (OHG *fruht*, NHG *frucht* only in wider sense 'product, fruit'), Russ. *frukt*." See Buck 5.71(2). (Pokorny 1.173, PIE **bhrūg*-). Bomhard and Kerns do not list any word for 'fruit'.

13. Eng. *one*, Germ. *ein* (Pokorny 1.286, PIE **oi-nos*; Buck 13.32(1)). Compare *DEDR* 990 (a) Ta. *oru* (before consonant), *ōr* (before vowel) 'one' ... (b) Ta. *okka* 'together' ... (c) Ta. *oṅṭi* 'that which is single, solitary or single person, one who is alone', *oṭṭai* 'one, one of a pair, odd number, singleness, uniqueness (= *orrai*)' ... (d) Ta. *onru*, *oṅṇu* 'the number one, one (neut.)' ... Ma. *onnu* 'one (neut.)' Regarding the analysis of these forms, see Stephan Hillyer Levitt 1989: 132-39.

"In formal Tamil, the basic forms for the number 'one' are *ōr* and *oru* (listed in *DED* 834 (a)). These forms reflect the standard law, first formulated in modern Dravidian studies by Krishnamurti in 1955, that a radical vowel is long when not followed by a derivative suffix, and short when followed by a derivative suffix which is a vowel. In classical Tamil the only form used is *ōr*. These forms function as adjectives.

"Besides this there is a nominal form for 'one', *onru*, colloquial Ta. *oṅṇu* and Ma. *onnu*, and related forms such as *orri* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) 'to be united with, to be odd (as numbers)', *orrumai* 'union, oneness', and *orrai* 'one, one of a pair, odd number, singleness, uniqueness' (listed in *DED* 834 (d)).

"We as well have such forms as Ta. *okka* 'together' (listed in *DED* 834 (b)), and such forms of colloquial basis as Ta. *oṅṭi* 'that which is single, solitary or single person' and *oṭṭai* 'one, one of a pair, odd number, singleness, uniqueness (= *orrai*)' (listed in *DED* 834 (c)). Ta. *oṅṭi* is based on a verbal form *oṅṭu* (*oṅṭi-*) listed in *DED* under the verbal form to which it is related, *onru* (*oṅṭi-*) 'to unite, become one, be on intimate terms with' (*DED* 834 (d)), and Ta. *oṅṭi* is used in literary Tamil with the meaning 'camel, or dromidary'.

"By standard rules of euphonic combination in classical Tamil, *nr-* is the result of $l + n > \underline{n}$, $\underline{n} + t > \underline{nr}$. Thus *l*, with the addition of a common derivative suffix which appears to have Proto-Dravidian integrity since it can be found in languages in various sub-families of Dravidian, results in *nr*. ... Similarly, $l + t > \underline{nr}$. In general, $l +$ a stop (such as *k*, *c*, *t*, *p*) results in *rk*, *rc*, *rr*, *rp*, while $l +$ a nasal (such as *n* or *m*) results in *nr* or *nm*. $l + v$,

however, results in *rv*, and $\underline{n} + p$ results in *rp*. While $l + k > rk$, $\underline{n} + k > kk$. Thus, $l + n + k (= \underline{n} + k) > kk$. The trill *r* + any of the stops, for instance, would on the other hand itself not be subject to alteration.

"We can explain, in this way, our forms as a basic form containing *r*, as in Ta. *ōr*, *oru*, and a combining form to which suffixes *-nt-*, *-t-*, and *-nik-* are added which contains *l*. This would explain *onru*, *orri*, and *okka*, for instance, economically. The form *onru* < **ol-* + *nt* + *u*. The form *orri* < **ol-* + *t* + *i*. The form *orramai* < **ol-* + *t* + *u* + *mai*. The form *okka* < **ol-* + *nk* + *a*.

...
 "For an explanation of such forms as colloquial Tamil *onnu* and such forms as Ta. *oṅṅi* and Ta. *oṅṅai* (as in *DED* 834 (c)), we must rely in basics on historical developments which have not been outlined clearly to date.

"In modern formal Tamil, when a suffix *-nt-* is added to a verbal form which ends with *l* the resulting sound cluster is *nr*. This is pronounced in Tamil with which the writer is familiar as *nd*.

"This is in accord with the development of the corresponding hypothetical consonant cluster in Proto-Dravidian, **nt*, to the various forms which provide evidence for this cluster in modern Dravidian languages: Ma. *nn*, To. Ko. *d*, Koṇḍa *nr* (= *ndr*), Tu. Kui Kuwi *nj/j*, all other CDr and NDr *nd/nd/ṅd*. These correspondences have been summarized in several places, such as Krishnamurti 1961: 70 (1.165) and Zvelebil 1970: 171-73 (1.40.6-1.40.6.2).

"In other instances in Tamil, though, *nr* is not pronounced *nd*, but rather there is a variability not out of accord with the developments elsewhere in Dravidian. In some instances, this variability may reflect that the colloquial forms are derived in fact from forms other than the formal forms with which they are equated. Ta. *onru*, for instance, while it does not appear in classical Tamil, is pronounced generally in modern colloquial Tamil as *onnu*. In the Brahman dialect of South Arcot district as spoken to non-Brahmans, while Ta. *onrarai* is pronounced *oṅdre*, Ta. *en enrāl* is pronounced *ēnnā*, Ta. *inraikku* is pronounced *inniki*, and Ta. *ninren* is pronounced *ninnen*. (See Zvelebil 1970: 173 (1.40.6.2) for a different treatment of comparable data.) Ta. *oṅṅi* is clearly derived from a verbal form related to Ta. *onru* (*onri-*), just as Ta. *oṅṅai* clearly is the same form as Ta. *orrai*. What we would appear to have in some of

these instances is a split of $l > l$ and l^2 coupled with a merger of $!$ and l^2 within Proto-Dravidian or in pre-Dravidian, as suggested by Kui $l, d, C]l$, Br. l, lh , To. s, t corresponding to PDr $*l$, and by Kui $l, d, C]l$, Br. l, lh , To. l, l , Tu. l, l corresponding to PDr $*l$. This is not the appropriate place to discuss this in full. By such an explanation, though, such forms as Ta. *ontī* and *ottai* would be in accord with such rules of Tamil euphonic combination as $! + nt > nt$ and $! + t > tt$. Perhaps such a form as Ta. *onnu* can be explained by such rules of euphonic combination as $! + n > n$, and perhaps $n + u > nuu$. Or perhaps we simply have evidence of $*nt > Ta. nn, nt (nd)$, and nn alongside nr and nd each in different circumstances. nr corresponding to tt , of course, suggests similarly $*tt > Ta. tt$, just as in Telugu and Gadba $*tt > tt, t$.

“Aside from those rules given above, the relevant rules in Tolkappiyar’s grammar of Tamil would appear to be: 1.8.303, 1.8.307, 1.8.397, 1.8.398, 1.8.399, 1.8.400. For the sake of space, I do not give these rules here, but rather refer the reader to them in the various translations.

“The situation with regard to Ma. *onnu* is at first glance not clear, though it certainly would appear to correspond to Ta. *onnu* rather than be based on a form generated independently from within the old form of Tamil from which Malayalam was derived that would have composed the form, based on a stem $*ol-$, with a suffix $-n-$. We have some light on this form, indicating its antiquity, from a Kurukh form as will be seen below.”

Further analysis follows as well.

Of note is that Murray B. Emeneau 1957, in his discussion of the Dravidian words for the number ‘one’, provides evidence for doublets one member of which contains forms which provide evidence for an alveolar $*n$ and the other member of which contains forms which provide evidence for an alveolar $*r$.

In Stephan Hillyer Levitt 1989 it was argued that the Dravidian forms for the number ‘one’ were the origin of the Indo-European forms. In that location, this suggestion involved basically a substratum theory. This connection is suggested here in the present context, though, at this time. Note that the alternation between $*l$, or $*r / *l$ in this instance in the Dravidian forms, and $*n$ of the Indo-European forms is paralleled by other correspondences below under entries no. 16, Eng. *inn*, no. 17, Eng. *no, not*, no. 18, Eng. *in, Eng. on*, and

no. 23, Eng. *dog*, Eng. *hound*, Lat. *canis*. Also note that in Prakrit there is alternation such that $n > l$ on the one hand, and such that $l > n$ on the other. See R. Pischel 1900: 247 and 260 regarding this alternation in Indo-Aryan. Bomhard and Kerns do not list words for the number 'one'.

14. Eng. *all*, Germ. *alle* (Pokorny 1.24-25, PIE **al-*, **ol-*; Buck 13.13, 13.13(5), 13.14). Buck 13.13(5) notes, "general Gmc., outside connections dub., The general usage of this group is sg. 'all' = 'whole', pl. 'all'. The use of the sg. for 'every' is not properly Gothic ... nor OE (sometimes in ME, obs. in NE ...), and in general is uncommon or restricted to certain phrases." Compare *DEDR* 844 Ta. *ellām* 'whole, all (personal as well as impersonal)' ... Ko. *el, elm* 'all' ... Te. *ella* 'all, whole' ... Kuwi (F.) *ele'e* 'whole' (PDr. **ell-/el-*). Bomhard and Kerns do not list words for either 'all' or 'whole'.

15. Skt. *mahā* 'great' (Pokorny 1.708-709, PIE **mēg(h)-*; **mġ(h)-*; Buck 12.55(1); Pei 225-27). For the Celtic cognates, *mawr* (Welsh) or *mor* (Irish) 'large, great', O.H.Germ. *māri*, O.Eng. *mā* 'more', *māra*, *mæst* 'greater, greatest (in size, quantity, number)', Eng. *more*, *most* (not used of size), see Buck 12.55(2). These are seen to be derivatives of a PIE **mē-*, **mō-* (Pokorny 1.704). Pei 76 notes, "a combination of Celtic and Germanic is presented by the IE root **mē*, 'big'. There is a possible, perhaps probable, connection with the root of Latin *magis*, *magnus*, Indo-Iranian *maha-* of *maharajah*, Greek *meγas* ..., and numerous other words." Pei 225-27 lists these words as well. Compare *DEDR* 4786 Ta. *mā* 'great', Go. (Mu.) *māy(i)* 'very big' (*Voc.* 2794), (G.) *mayali* 'big' (*Voc.* 2709) (PDr. **mā-*). With Pokorny 1.708-709, Bomhard and Kerns 546 connects *DEDR* Ta. *miku* (*mikuv-*, *mikk-*). With *DEDR* 4786, Bomhard and Kerns 513 connects a number of other Dravidian forms such as *DEDR* 4803 Ta. *māṇ* (*māṇṇ-*, *māṇṭ-*) and *DEDR* 5086 Ta. *mē*, and Afroasiatic and Sumerian forms, but no Indo-European forms. Bomhard and Kerns 422 contains reference to Pokorny 1.704, with cognate forms listed for Afroasiatic and Sumerian only.

16. Eng. *inn* (*OED* 7.990a-91a). The form is not listed in either Pokorny, Buck, or Pei. Compare Ta. *il* 'house, home, place, wife', *illam* 'house, home' ... Te. *illu* (adj. *inti*) 'house, dwelling, habitation' (PDr. **il-/ill-/ell-*). Regarding the alternation of n and l , see entry no. 13, Eng. *one* above and the note toward the end of that entry, and the parallel alternations in entries no. 17, Eng. *no*, *not*, no. 18, Eng. *in*, Eng. *on*, and no.

23, Eng. *dog*, Eng. *hound*, Lat. *canis* suggested below. Bomhard and Kerns 61 lists different forms for 'house'.

17. Eng. *no*, *not*, Germ. *nein*, *nicht*, Skt. *na*, *an-* (Pokorny 1.756-58, PIE **nē*, **nē*, **nei*, (**ṇ-*, word-negation), see also Pokorny 1.17, PIE **aiu-*, **aiu-* and Pei 154). Regarding Lat. *neg-*, see Pokorny 1.417-18. Compare *DEDR* 2559 Ta. *il* 'non-existence, death', *illai* 'it is not (in Old Tamil with a complete neg. paradigm), no' ... Ma. *illa* 'does not exist, there is not, no, not' ... Te. *lē-* (complete neg. paradigm, 3 sg. non-m. *lēdu*) 'be not' ... Pa. *cila* 'does not exist (also inflected for gender and number ...)' ... Kuwi (F.) *hill-* 'to be not' (*hille'e* 'it is not') ... (PDr. **ci-*). Thomas Burrow 1947-48: 146-47 dates the loss of PDr. **c-* in SDr. and geographically southern Dravidian between the 3rd c. B.C. and the time of the beginning of palatalization in Tamil, c. 1st c. B.C. There is evidence of widespread dialectal variation in Proto-Dravidian, however, and this may be involved as well. Also compare *DEDR* 234 Ta. *at-* (1 sg. *allēn*, 1 pl. *allēm*, 2 sg. *allai*, 2 pl. *allir*, 3 sg. m. *allan*, 3 pl. m. *allar*, 3 sg. f. *allaḷ*, 3 sg. neut. *anru*, 3 pl. neut. *alla*; *alla* is used in mod. Ta. for all persons and numbers) 'to be not so-and-so' ... *allāta* 'which is not, different from' ... *anmai* 'negation of identity, reciprocal negation, evil', Ma. *alla* 'is not that, not thus' ... Kod. *alla* (for all persons and numbers) 'to be not so-and-so' ... Ga. (Tr.) *hal*, *hallē*, *haillē* 'not' (see 2559 Ta. *il*), Malt. *-l-* negative morpheme ... (PDr. **at-*/**all-*/**an-*/**anr-*/**-l-*). Regarding the alternation of *n* and *l* between the Indo-European and Dravidian forms, see entry no. 13, Eng. *one* above and the note toward the end of that entry, and the parallel alternations in entries no. 16, Eng. *inn* suggested above, no. 18, Eng. *in*, Eng. *on* suggested below, and no. 23, Eng. *dog*, Eng. *hound*, Lat. *canis* suggested below. Bomhard and Kerns 562 does not connect the Indo-European forms cited here with any Dravidian forms. Bomhard and Kerns 449, though, connects *DEDR* 234 with a Hittite form and with Uralic, Altaic, Afroasiatic, and Sumerian forms.

18. Eng. *in*, Lat. *in* (Pokorny 1.311-14, PIE **en*, **eni*; *OED* 7.759b-63b, see esp. 759b). Eng. *on*, Germ. *an* (Pokorny 1.39-40, PIE **an*, **anu*, **anō*, **nō*; *OED* 10.792c-96b, see esp. 792c-93a). Bomhard and Kerns 432 lists words for Indo-European and Afroasiatic only for Proto-Nostratic 'in, into, to, towards, besides, moreover', Pokorny 1.311-14. For Pokorny 1.39-40, Proto-Nostratic 'to, towards, over, for, against, upon, on', Bomhard and Kerns 425 lists forms for Indo-European,

Afroasiatic, and Sumerian only. They derive it, though, from Bomhard and Kerns 424 for which they list forms in *DEDR* 120 Ta. *anai* (-v-, -nt-) 'to approach, to come near, to touch, to come into contact with, to copulate with' ... *anmai*, *anumai*, *animai* 'nearness, proximity'. Bomhard and Kerns 367 also lists forms in Pokorny 1.24-26, PIE **al-*, **ol-* 'beyond', for Proto-Nostratic forms meaning 'to be high, exalted, to rise high, to ascend, on, upon, on top of, over, above, beyond'. This entry also does not contain Dravidian forms. Compare the Tamil locative suffix *-il* 'in, on' (especially in the context of the alternate forms in *l* and *n* pointed out in entries no. 13, 16, and 17 above and 23 below).

19. Lat. *ille*, *illa*, *illud* dem. pron., It. *il* def. article (Pokorny 1.24, 1.282; A. Ernout and A. Meillet 1985: 300a-b). See A. Ernout and A. Meillet 1985: 300a for force and usage of Lat. *ille*, *illa*, *illud* and for reflexes in French. Regarding the structure of Lat. *ille*, A. Ernout and A. Meillet 1985: 300b notes:

"La structure de *ille* doit être la même que celle de *hic* et de *iste*, c'est-à-dire qu'on y cherche une particule initiale suivie d'un ancien démonstratif. Mais les deux éléments sont obscurs.

"Le premier terme comprend *l*; et, en effet, il y a une particule de la forme *ol-* dans de vieux textes (v. l'art. *ollus*) qui rappelle le *ul-* de *uls*, *ultrā* et le *ol-* de *olim*. L'ombrien a *ulu*, *ulo* 'illūc', et l'osque *ullas* 'illius'.

"On a affaire au groupe de *l* indiquant l'objet éloigné; v. *uls*, *ultrō*, *olim* et *alius*. L'irlandais a ce même radical *l* dans irl. *t-all* 'là', etc. ... , et *l* se retrouve notamment dans v. sl. *lani* (**ol-n-*) 'l'année dernière'.

"Au second terme il peut y avoir *l* ou *n*; car **il-ne*, **ol-ne* donnent *ille*, *olle* aussi bien que **il-le*, **ol-le*.

"Or, il y a pour l'objet éloigné un radical *n*, notamment dans sl. *onū*, lit. *añs*, arm. *na*, *ayn*, v. h. a. *enēr*, ion.-att. *ἐχέϊνος*, dor. *τῆνος*.

"On ne peut donc sans arbitraire analyser *ille*."

To be noted is that in native Sanskrit lexicographical sources, as well as in Latin lexicographical sources, the subject is placed in the locative case. In this context, compare the Tamil locative suffix *-il*. Is it possible that there is a connection?

For the dem. pron. stem of Pokorny 1.24, see Bomhard and Kerns 431. No Dravidian forms are listed here.

20. Skt. *pūr*, *pura* 'fortified place, town' (Pokorny 1.798-800, PIE **pel-*, **peb-*, **plē-* 'to fill, to pour, flow, spill'; Buck 19.15(1); Pei 229-31). See also Lat. *urbs* 'town, city' (Buck 19.15(2)). Buck

19.15(2) notes, "etym. dub." He also notes suggestion that the Latin form was borrowed, noting though that this was without suggestion of any source. Compare *DEDR* 752 Ta. *ūr* 'village, town, city' (PDr. **ūr*-). Speaking against a connection of Skt. *pūr*, *pura* and Ta. *ūr* is that there is no explanation of what happened to the initial *p*- in Dravidian. If there is indeed no connection with Skt. *pūr*, *pura*, there may be one with Lat. *urbs* (> Eng. *urbane*) — though perhaps the Latin form *urbs* may explain a connection between Skt. *pūr*, *pura* and Ta. *ūr*. Bomhard and Kerns 55 connects Skt. *pūr*, *pura* with *DEDR* 4018 Ta. *paḷli* 'hamlet, herdsman's village, hermitage, temple (esp. of Buddhists and Jains), palace, workshop, sleeping place, school, room' ... Ka. *paḷli*, *haḷli* 'settlement, abode, hamlet, village'.

21. Eng. *nation* (Pokorny 1.373-75, PIE **ĝen*-, **ĝenə*-, **ĝnē*-, **ĝnō*- 'to beget'; Buck 19.22(3); Pei 204-206). Eng. *nature* (Pokorny 1.373-75; Pei 204-206). Eng. *nation* comes into English either directly or through French < Lat. *nātiō*, orig. 'birth': *nāsci* 'be born', *nātus* 'born'. Eng. *nature* comes into English either directly or through French < Lat. *nātūra*. Compare *DEDR* 3638 Ta. *nātu* (obl. and adj. *nāttu*) 'country, district, province, locality, situation, earth, land, world, kingdom, state, rural tracts (opposite to *nakaram*), open place, side, agricultural tract' ... *nāttār* 'people of a country' ... Ka. *nādu* '(cultivated, planted) country (in opposition to *kādu*), province, district, country (in opposition to the town)' (PDr. **nāt*-/**nātt*-/**nānt*-/**nār*-). I feel fairly certain that the resemblance here is accidental, and that this is an example of "background noise".

22. Gk. *δένδρον* 'tree'. This form has been classically proposed as cognate to Skt. *daṇḍa* 'stick, staff, cudgel, embodied power, army, punishment'. Thomas Burrow 1946: 19-20 hesitatingly proposes that the Sanskrit forms are borrowed from Dravidian. Emeneau and Burrow 1962: 37 (186) backs away from this, and takes the Sanskrit forms to have merged in Dravidian with native Dravidian forms of roughly the same shape and related meanings. Thus in *DEDR* we have, for instance, *DEDR* 3048 Ma. *taṇṭa* 'arm, generally the upper arm', *DEDR* 3053 Tu. *taṇḍelu* 'cudgel, club', *DEDR* 3054 Ta. *taṇṭu* (*tanti*-) 'to collect, levy, recover (as debts, rents, taxes, etc.)', *DEDR* 3055 Ta. (lex.) *taṇṭu* 'army, troops', and *DEDR* 3056 Ta. *taṇṭu* 'stalk, stem'. On the whole, though, Emeneau and Burrow have removed words from this grouping from Dravidian languages and have placed them instead as Indo-Aryan

loanwords in Dravidian. Also, H. W. Bailey 1952: 60-61 has argued for an Indo-European origin for the Sanskrit forms. R. L. Turner 1966-69: 1.350ab (6128) cross-references these forms with R. L. Turner 1966-69: 1.310a (5527) **dan̄tha* 'stem', and suggests a non-Indo-Aryan origin for both of them. He notes, "NIA has no form attesting **dandra-* to support comparison with Gk. *δένδρον*." I believe the Sanskrit forms are probably loanwords from Dravidian, agreeing with Burrow's 1946 argument. Of note is that they fit all the criteria given by Thomas Burrow 1946: 12-22 for judging a Sanskrit form to be a loanword. On a deeper level, though, we may have a connection between the Greek form (or between the Greek form and Sanskrit form, if one so judges) on the one side and Dravidian forms on the other side. Bomhard and Kerns do not consider these forms.

23. Eng. *dog* (Buck 3.61(5)). Buck 3.61(5) notes, "orig. unknown". Eng. *hound*, Lat. *canis* > It. *cane* (Pokorny 1.632-33, PIE **k̑uon-*, **k̑un-*; Buck 3.61(1); Pei 157). Buck 3.61(1) notes, "root connection much disputed and dub." Compare *DEDR* 1796 Ta. *kurai* (-*pp-*, -*tt-*) 'to bark, jubilate, shout', n. 'noise, roar, shout' ... *kukkal*, *kukkan̄* 'dog' (PDr. **kūr-*/**kūkk-*/**kūrkk-*/**kor-*/**kuc-*), which forms give rise to Skt. *kurkura*, *kukkura*, *kukura* 'dog' and a variant form, Skt. *kukkuṭa* in the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*. *DEDR* also cross-references *DEDR* 1901 Ta. *kūran̄* 'dog' and *DEDR* 2122 Ma. *kora* 'asthma'. To be kept in mind here is that there is an alternation in Dravidian between *r* and *l*, as shown in the discussion of the Dravidian words for the number 'one' above under entry no. 13 and as can be seen in the reduplicated Tamil form for 'dog' cited above, Ta. *kukkal*. An alternation between *l* and *n* in Dravidian forms as against Indo-European forms has been suggested above under entries no. 13, 16, 17, and 18. See also Ta. *kukkan̄* as an alternate form for Ta. *kukkal*. The variant Sanskrit form, Skt. *kukkuṭa* suggests a possible etymology for Eng. *dog*. The *r* of the form seems to be realized as *ʈ*, or else we have the addition of a standard Dravidian -*t-* suffix to a form ending with *l*. Metathesis in Dravidian versus Indo-European forms has been argued above with regard to Eng. *speak*, *speech* (entry no. 4) and with regard to Eng. *leg* (entry no. 5). In Eng. *dog* we appear to have a form with metathesis, and with voicing, of the same root which in Dravidian can be seen to be cognate as well with Eng. *hound* and Lat. *canis*. Notice also in this regard the Hindi forms, H.

kuttā 'dog', *kutti* 'female dog'. R. L. Turner 1966-69: 1.172a (3329) cross-references Skt. *kurkura* with R. L. Turner 1966-69: 1.168b (3275) **kutta*¹ 'dog'. Bomhard and Kerns 319 focuses on different Indo-European forms for 'dog'. Bomhard 652 focuses on the Indo-European forms for 'dog' referred to here, but lists only Afroasiatic cognates. For Sanskrit in this listing, he cites the form Skt. *śvan* but not the Sanskrit loanforms *kurkura*, *kukkura*, *kukura*, and *kukkuṭa*.

24. Germ. *-en*, used in the formation of adjectives, as in "meinen guten Freund", "den guten Stahl". Compare the usage of *-in* in Old Tamil, in which *-in* subordinates one word to the following word. Thus *Pattirruppattu* 14.19 *kaṭalaka varaippin i-p-poril* 'this ocean boundary grove', *Narriṇai* 201.5 *paḷaviṇ paḷayam* 'the jack tree fruit', *Pattirruppattu* 23.23 *pūviṇ tāmarai* 'the flowered lotus', *Narriṇai* 295.7 *kallin cāṭi* 'toddy jar', *Akanānuru* 13.1 *muttiṇ āram* 'pearl garland'.

25. Eng. *-er*, used in the sense of "one who ..." or "that which ..." as in "eater", "maker", "stopper". Also see Germ. "ein Kranker". Compare Ta. *nātu* (obl. and adj. *nāṭtu-*) 'country', *nāṭṭār* 'people of a country'. Also, "Tolkāppiyar" 'honorific reference to the author of the *Tolkāppiyam*', *Kalittokai* 103.69 *maruppu aṅcum neñciṇār* 'those with a heart afraid of (bull) horns'. The Tamil suffixes are 3rd person honorific / 3rd person plural. They are in set with the 3rd person masculine singular suffixes *-aṅ* and *-āṅ*, the 3rd person feminine singular suffixes *-aḷ* and *-āḷ*, and others. See also the 3rd person plural / 3rd person honorific suffix *-ōr*, as in *ivaṇōr* 'those who belong to this place' and *nallōr* 'those who are good'.

26. Eng. *-ed*, *-t*, *-en*. The past tense is commonly formed in English for many verbs by adding *-ed* or *-t*, or *-en*, as in "spelled, spelt" and "eaten". Eng. *-ing*. The present participle in English is formed by adding *-ing*, as in "spelling, eating". Compare two of the methods of forming the past tense in modern formal Tamil, the addition of *-t-* / *-tt-*, or *-in-*, before the personal declension. Compare the present tense in modern formal Tamil which is formed by adding the suffix *-kir-* / *-kkir-* before the personal declension. Thus, from the root *cēy-* 'do', *cēytēn* 'I did', *cēykirēn* 'I am doing'; from the root *aṟu-* 'weep', *aṟutēn* 'I wept', *aṟukirēn* 'I am weeping'; from the root *ati-* 'strike', *atittēn* 'I struck', *aṭikkirēn* 'I am striking'; *vānku-* 'get, buy', *vānkinēn* 'I got, I bought', *vānkukirēn* 'I am getting, I am buying'; *erutu-* 'write', *erutinēn* 'I wrote', *erutukirēn* 'I am writing'; *pō-* 'go', *pōnēn*

/ *pōyinēn* 'I went', *pōkirēn* 'I am going'. Regarding the historical integrity of Dravidian tense suffixes, see M. Andronov 1971. We have here in both an Indo-European language and a Dravidian language the past tense in a dental stop and in a nasal contrasted to a present tense form containing a velar stop.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

-
- 1910-11 *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., 29 vols. Cambridge: The University Press.
-
- 1989 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*, erarbeitet von einem Autorenkollektiv des Zentralinstitute für Sprachwissenschaft unter der Leitung von Wolfgang Pfeifer, 3 vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
-
- 1989 *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, 20 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (= *OED*).
- Aalto, Pentti
1971 "The Alleged Affinity of Davidian and Fenno-Ugrian", in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference Seminar of Tamil Studies, Madras, India, January 1968*, ed. R. E. Asher, 3 vols. Madras: International Association of Tamil Research. Vol. 1, pp. 262-66.
- Andronov, M.
1971 "Comparative Studies on the Nature of Dravido-Uralian Parallels (A Peep into the Pre-History of Language Families)", in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference Seminar of Tamil Studies, Madras, India, January 1968*, ed. R. E. Asher, 3 vols. Madras: International Association of Tamil Research. Vol. 1, pp. 267-77.
1977 "The Etymology of 'Tamil', 'Dravidian'", in *Indian Journal of Linguistics* 4: 89-92.
- Austerlitz, Robert
1971 "Long-Range Comparisons of Tamil and Dravidian with Other Language Families in Eurasia", in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference Seminar of Tamil Studies, Madras, India, January 1968*, ed. R. E. Asher, 3 vols. Madras: International Association of Tamil Research. Vol. 1, pp. 254-61.
- Bailey, H. W.
1952 "Six Indo-Iranian Notes", in *Transactions of the Philological Society* [n.v.]: 55-64.

Balakrishnan Nayar, T.

- 1963 "Where Did the Dravidians Come From?", in *Tamil Culture* 10.4: 121-33.

Benedict, Paul K.

- 1942 "Thai, Kadai, and Indonesian: A New Alignment in Southeastern Asia", in *American Anthropologist* 44: 576-601.
 1975 *Austro-Thai Language and Culture, with a Glossary of Roots*. New Haven: HRAF Press.

Blažek, Václav.

- 1992a "The New Dravidian-Afroasiatic Parallels: Preliminary Report", in *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind: Materials from the First International Interdisciplinary Symposium on Language and Prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988*, ed. Vitalii Viktorovich Shevoroshkin. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer. Pp. 150-65.
 1992b "Australian Elements in Dravidian Lexicon?", in *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind: Materials from the First International Interdisciplinary Symposium on Language and Prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988*, ed. Vitalii Viktorovich Shevoroshkin. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer. Pp. 421-31.

Bomhard, Allan R.

- 1996 *Indo-European and the Nostratic Hypothesis*. Studia Nostratica 1. Charleston, South Carolina: Signum Desktop Publishing. (=Bomhard).

Bomhard, Allan R. and John C. Kerns

- 1994 *The Nostratic Macrofamily: A Study in Distant Linguistic Relationship*. Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 74. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. (=Bomhard and Kerns).

Buck, Carl Darling

- 1949 *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (=Buck).

Burrow, Thomas

- 1943-46 "Dravidian Studies IV: The Body in Dravidian and Uralian", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11: 328-56. Rpt. in Thomas Burrow, *Collected Papers on Dravidian Linguistics*. Annamalai University Department of Linguistics Publication 13. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, 1968. Pp. 65-112.
 1946 "Loanwords in Sanskrit", in *Transactions of the Philological Society* [n.v.]: 1-30. Rpt. in Thomas Burrow, *Collected Papers on Dravidian Linguistics*. Annamalai University Department of Linguistics Publication 13. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, 1968. Pp. 285-318.
 1947-48 "Dravidian Studies VI: The Loss of Initial *c/s* in South Dravidian", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12: 132-47. Rpt. in Thomas Burrow, *Collected Papers on Dravidian Linguistics*.

The Journal of Indo-European Studies

- Annamalai University Department of Linguistics Publication 13.
Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, 1968. Pp. 150-77.
- 1964 Review of N. Lahovary, *Dravidian Origins and the West* (Madras: Orient Longmans, 1963), in *Journal of Indian History* 42.2: 587-88.
- Caldwell, R.
1913 *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*, 3rd ed., rev. and ed. by the Rev. J. L. Wyatt ... and T. Ramakrishna Pillai. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd. Orig. published in 1856.
- Dyen, Isidore
1970 "Background 'Noise' or 'Evidence' in Comparative Linguistics: The Case of the Austronesian-Indo-European Hypothesis", in *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans: Papers Presented at the Third Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania*, ed. George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald and Alfred Senn. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. 231-40.
- Emeneau, Murray B.
1957 "Numerals in Comparative Linguistics (with Special Reference to Dravidian)", in *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 29: 1-10. Rpt. in Murray B. Emeneau, *Dravidian Linguistics, Ethnology and Folktales: Collected Papers*. Annamalai University Department of Linguistics Publication 8. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, 1967. Pp. 139-47.
- Emeneau, Murray B. and Thomas Burrow
1961 *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. (=DED).
- 1962 *Dravidian Borrowings from Indo-Aryan*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 26. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1968 *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, Supplement*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. (=DEDS).
- 1972 "Dravidian Etymological Notes", in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92: 397-418, 475-91. (=DEN).
- 1984 *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (=DEDR).
- Ernout, A. and A. Meillet
1985 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, histoire des mots*, 4th ed., quatrième tirage augmenté d'additions et de corrections nouvelles par Jacques André. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- George, K. M.
1946 "The Terms Tamil and Dravida, A Study of Their Changes in Form and Meaning", in *The Madras Christian College Magazine* n.s. 16.1: 11-14.

Gnana Prakasar, Nallur Swami S.

- 1953 "Linguistic Evidence for the Common Origin of the Dravidians and Indo-Europeans", in *Tamil Culture* 2.1: 88-112.

Homburger, L.

- 1948 "Éléments dravidiens en peul", in *Journal de la Société des Africanists* 18: 135-43.
 1949 "Faits linguistiques communs aux langues négro-africaines et en dravidien [Résumé]", in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 45 (130): xix-xx.
 1951a *Le langage et les langues, introduction aux études linguistique*. Paris: Payot.
 1951b "Les Télougous et les dialectes Mandés", in *Journal de la Société des Africanists* 21: 113-26.
 1954 "Éléments dravidiens en Somali", in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 50: xxv.
 1957 "De quelques éléments communs à l'égyptien et aux langues dravidiennes", in *Kēmi* 14: 26-33.

Johnson, George

- 1995 "Linguists Debating Deepest Roots of Language", in *The New York Times*, June 27, 1995, C1 and C13.

Kamatchinathan, A.

- 1972 "More on Dravidian Umlaut", in *Third Seminar on Dravidian Linguistics*, ed. S. Agesthalingom and S. V. Shanmugam. Annamalai University Department of Linguistics Publication 27. Annamalainagar: Annamali University. Pp. 155-66.

Kluge, Friedrich

- 1989 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, unter Mithilfe von Max Bürgisser und Bernd Gregor völlig neu bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold, 22. Auflage. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Krishnamurti, Bh.

- 1961 *Telugu Verbal Bases: A Comparative and Descriptive Study*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 24. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lahovary, N.

- 1951 "Position linguistique du basque et du dravidien", in *Revue Internationale d'Onomastique* 3: 91-112, 185-98, 275-83.

Lanman, Charles Rockwell

- 1884 *A Sanskrit Reader, Text and Vocabulary and Notes*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Levitt, Stephan Hillyer

- 1980 "Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{mand/mad}}$, 'background noise' and Dravidian", in *The Journal of Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University* 2: 25-64.

The Journal of Indo-European Studies

- 1989 "The Alternation of *r* and *l* in Dravidian", in *Indian Linguistics* 50: 130-46. Errata in *Indian Linguistics* 52 (1991): 149-50.
- 1991-92 "Chess — Its South Asian Origin and Meaning", in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72-73: 533-47.
- [n.d.] "II. Sanskrit *brāhman* and Semitic *BRK*". To appear in *Indologica Taurinensia* 21-22.
- Marlow, E. J. P.
- 1974 *More on the Uralo-Dravidian Relationship: A Comparison of Uralic and Dravidian Etymological Vocabularies*. Doctoral Dissertation. See *Dissertation Abstracts International* 35.1: 433A.
- 1980-81 "Uralic-Dravidian Hypothesis: What Evidence?" in *Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Turku 20-27. VIII. 1980*, redegit Osmo Ikola, 8 vols. Turku: Suomen Kielen Seura. Vol. 7, pp. 245-50.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred
- 1952 "Indogermanisch-Dravidisches zum Thema 'Zufall'", in *Anthropos* 47: 664-65.
- McAlpin, David
- 1974a "Towards Proto-Elamo-Dravidian", in *Language* 50: 89 -101.
- 1974b "Elamite and Dravidian: The Morphological Evidence", in *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 3.2: 343-58.
- 1975 "Elamite and Dravidian: Further Evidence of Relationship", in *Current Anthropology* 16.1: 105-15.
- 1979 "Linguistic Prehistory: The Dravidian Situation". In *Aryan and Non-Aryan in India*, ed. Madhav M. Deshpande and Peter Edwin Hook. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan. Pp. 174-89.
- 1981 *Proto-Elamo-Dravidian: The Evidence and Its Implications*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 71.3. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Menges, Karl H.
- 1969 "The Dravido-Altaic Relationship", in *Journal of Tamil Studies* 1.1: 35-39.
- 1975 "Dravidian and Altaic", in *Central Asiatic Journal* 19.3: 202-20.
- 1977 "Dravidian and Altaic", in *Anthropos* 72: 129-79.
- Monier-Williams, M.
- 1899 *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged*, new ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Nadaraja Pillai, N.
- 1979 "The Etymology of 'Tamil' Revisited", in *Indian Journal of Linguistics* 6: 1-6.

- Narayanaswami Naidu, A. S.
 1968 "Tamil, an Explanation of the Term", in *A Glimpse of Tamilology*, ed. V. Sp. Manickam. Thiruchirappalli: The Academy of Tamil Scholars of Tamil Nadu. Pp. 191-96.
- Pei, Mario
 1962 *The Families of Words*. New York: St. Martin's Press. (=Pei).
- Peile, John
 1881 *Notes on the Nalopākhyānam or Tale of Nala, for the Use of Classical Students*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Pischel, R.
 1900 *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, begründet von G. Bühler, fortgesetzt von F. Kielhorn, I. Band, 8. Heft. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner. Trans. into English by Subhendra Jha as *Comparative Grammar of the Prakrit Languages*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, [c. 1957].
- Pokorny, Julius G.
 1959-69 *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. Bern: Francke Verlag. (=Pokorny).
- Sebeok, Thomas A.
 1945 "Finno-Ugric and the Languages of India", in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 65: 59-62.
- Shamsuddin, K. O.
 1972 "Origin of Dravidian and Semitic Languages", in *Proceedings of the First All India Conference of Dravidian Linguistics, 1971*, ed. V. I. Subramoniam. Trivandrum: St. Joseph's Press. Pp. 347-53.
- Shevoroshkin, Vitalii Viktorovich, ed.
 1992 *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind: Materials from the First International Interdisciplinary Symposium on Language and Prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988*. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer.
- Sivertsen, Dagfinn
 1963 *When Caste Barriers Fall, A Study of Social and Economic Change in a South Indian Village*. [Oslo]: Universitets Forlaget and George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Southworth, Franklin C.
 1982 "Dravidian and Indo-European — The Neglected Hypothesis", in *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 11.1: 1-21.
- Turner, R. L.
 1966 [i.e. 1962-66]-69. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press.

Tyler, Stephen A.

1968 "Dravidian and Uralian: The Lexical Evidence", in *Language* 44: 798-812.

Upadhyaya, U. P.

1976 "Dravidian and Negro-African", in *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 5.1: 32-64.

Vacek, Jaroslav

1978 "The Problem of the Genetic Relationship of the Mongolian and Dravidian Languages", in *Archiv Orientální* 46.2: 141-51.

Vaidyanathan, S.

1971 *Indo-Aryan Loanwords in Old Tamil*. Madras: Rajam Publishers.

Vives, J. Quintana

1944 "Posibilidad de una Conexión entre las Formas Verbales Adjetivas de las Lenguas Dravidias y las del Sumerio", in *Sefarad* 4.2: 245-54.

Zvelebil, Kamil.

1970 *Comparative Dravidian Phonology*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

1986 "The Term 'Tamil'", in *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 15.1: 1-10.