

## Dravidian Numerals

Although the most probable affiliation of the Dravidian language family on the macro-comparative level lies with the Nostratic superfamily, potential ties between Proto-Dravidian numerals and known Nostratic words for numerals remain scarce. The article summarizes most of the existing hypotheses on the origins of Dravidian numerals, both internal and external, and adds a few others based on the author's theory of a possible Australian substratum in Proto-Dravidian. It is concluded that the latter theory may shed some much needed light on this complicated issue

Numerals belong to the relatively stable part of lexicon of almost all language families, although they are certainly not immune against borrowing. This lack of immunity can be convincingly demonstrated on data from certain Dravidian languages: thus, Brahui has borrowed all the numerals above "3" from Persian, while other Dravidian languages have introduced them from Indo-Aryan languages: Malto (everything starting with "1", although inherited forms for "1" and "2" are also in parallel use), Kurukh (above "3"), Kuwi and Kui (above "2"; in Kui inherited forms for "3"–"7" are in parallel use), Pengo (above "2"), Kolami (above "4", besides parallel inherited forms), Gondi (above "7", besides parallel inherited forms). On the other hand, some non-Dravidian languages, e. g. Nihali, borrowed their numerals from their Dravidian neighbours: e. g. Nihali *irar* "2", *mōḥ(o)* "3", *nāḷku, nālo* "4" ([KUIPER 1966: 74–75]).

The main purposes of the present study are to describe the inherited Dravidian numerals, to try to understand their structure through internal etymologization, and, where possible, to discuss their external parallels. External comparison is understood here as drawing upon data from hypothetically related languages, hypothetical old substrata and neighbouring language families and language isolates. As far as external genetic relationship is concerned, the situation is approached here from the point of view of the Nostratic hypothesis, proposing a common origin for Afroasiatic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, Uralic, Altaic, and Dravidian languages. (It should be mentioned that Robert CALDWELL, the author of the first comparative grammar of Dravidian languages, was one of the first scholars who had already speculated about a distant relationship among these language families). Special attention will be paid to the data of the Elamite language, sometimes assumed to be closely related to Dravidian (McAlpin 1981).

We know next to nothing about pre-Dravidian substrata in India, with the potential exception of Nihali, although for this language the Austric affiliation seems most probable. In respect to this, the old hypothesis about a possible Dravidian-Australian relation ([MÜLLER 1882: 95–98]; [CALDWELL 1913: 75–77, 395]; recently again [DIXON 1980: 236, 488–489]) is reinterpreted here from this point of view — namely, that the pre-Dravidian substratum could be related to Australian languages ([BLAŽEK 1992: 421–431]). Finally, out of all the neighbouring languages it is most reasonable to take into particular account the Munda family, as one of the most common sources of borrowing into Dravidian.

Dravidian cardinal numerals have been reconstructed and etymologized as follows:

### "one"

**1.1.** *\*oru*-(C)/*\*ōr*-(V) ([DEDR: №990 (a)]; [Zvelebil 1977: 34]) = *\*or*- (G. STAROSTIN).

#### Etymology:

**1.1.1.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 169]) thinks that *-r* in *\*oru*-/ *\*ōr*- is secondary relative to the root *\*ol*-, discussed below. It is reasonable to think that the inlaut *-r*- of the following numeral *\*iru*-/ *\*īr*- could have influenced the transition *\*ol*- > *\*or*-. Since the sequence *\*wo*- is not attested in Dravidian, it is possible to speculate about a protoform *\*wol*-, which would be compatible with East Cushitic *\*wal*-/ *\*wil*- > Saho *wili* "one", Somali *wal* "all", Elmolo *wol* "together", Oromo *wol(-i)* "together, with", Sidamo *wole* "other" ([SASSE 1982: 188–189]).

**1.1.2.** There is a hypothetical possibility to identify here a substratum influence of the Australian type; cf. examples from various groups of Pama-Nyungan: Karanya *uru* ([CURR II: №104]), Pitta-Pitta *ururu* ([KLUGE 1938: 68 after ROTH]) (two languages of the Pitta-Pitta group); Karuwali (Karna subgroup of the Dieri group) *orru* (CURR) = *uru*, Wongkumara (Ngura subgroup of the Dieri group) *warra* "1" ([CURR II, №106, 52]; [SCHMIDT, *Anthropos* 7, 1912: 492]).

**1.2.** *\*onru* ([DEDR: №990 (d)]) = *\*on-tu* ([KRISHNAMURTI 2001: 255]) = *\*ond*- (G. STAROSTIN).

#### Etymology:

**1.2.1.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 168–169]) reconstructs an original *\*oŋ-tu* < *\*ol-tu* on the basis of Tamil *ol-*, Malayalam *ollu-* “to unite”, cf. also Tamil *ol* “end”. Regularity of the development *-l + t- > -nr-* may be demonstrated, for instance, on the example of the Tamil verb *al-* “to be not so-and-so” in the 3<sup>rd</sup> p. sg. ntr. *antū* ([DEDR: №234]).

**1.3.** *\*okk-* “one, single, alone” ([DEDR: №990 (b)]) = *\*ok(k)-* (G. STAROSTIN).

Etymology:

**1.3.1.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 169]) derives it from *\*ol- + -kk-*, via *\*ork-*, cf. Konḍa *urku urku* “one each”.

**1.3.2.** KRISHNAMURTI ([2001: 255]) prefers analyzing this and the other forms as a combination of the bare root *\*o* with suffixes *-r-*, *-n-*, *-k-*; the root *\*o* here is the same as in Old Tamil *o* “to unite”. This solution is perhaps compatible with the idea of ANDRONOV ([1978: 240]), who speculates about the same primitive root reflected in Malayalam *o-* “to be similar”.

**1.3.3.** ANDRONOV ([1978: 240]) also admits a possible connection with IE *\*oǵ-no/ko/yo-* “one”.

**1.4.** *\*oŋti* “alone, single” ([DEDR: №990 (c)]).

“two”

**2.1.** *\*iru-(C) / \*īr-(V)* ([DEDR: №474]; [ZVELEBIL 1977: 34]) = *\*ir-* (G. STAROSTIN).

Etymology:

**2.1.1.** CALDWELL ([1913: 331]) derived the numeral *\*īr-* “2” from the verb *\*īr-*, attested in Tamil *īr* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) “to drag along, pull, attract, carry, flay, draw, paint, write”, Malayalam *īr* “splitting, sawing”, *īruka* “to saw, split”, Kannada *īr* “to pull, draw”, Parji *īrp-* “to pull”, Gadba *īr-* “to pull, drag”, Gondi *ric-* “to cut with saw”. However, Pengo *nir-* “to pull”, if related, probably excludes this etymology ([DEDR: №542]).

**2.1.2.** CALDWELL himself also tried to find parallels outside the Dravidian family. His comparison with the potential Kartvelian counterparts is undoubtedly remarkable: Georgian *or-*, *vor-*, Megrelian *žir-*, *žar-*, Laz *žu(r)-*, *žu(r)-*, *jur-*, Svan *jōri*, *jori*, *jerbi* < *\*jerwi* < *\*jewri* < *\*jori*, derivable from proto-Kartvelian *\*jor-* “2” ([KLIMOV 1998: 144–145]). Yet the fact that it is the only common Kartvelian lexeme reconstructed with an initial *\*j-* is rather suspicious.

**2.1.3.** Again, there is a substratum alternative indicated by Australian forms: Tiwi (one of the non-Pama-Nyungan languages spoken at the Melville Island in north from the Arnhem Land) *yur-rara* “2” ([BLAKE 1981: 112]); Wailpi *yierlina* “2”, Kaurna *illa* “2”, *yerrábbola* “4” (both Yura subgroup of the South-Western group of the Pama-Nyungan family), Meyu (dialect of Kaurna) *yerra* “mutually, both”, *yerrabula* “4” = ‘dual of’ *yerra* ([KLUGE 1938, 59–61]).

Note: The North Munda numeral *\*iral-* “8”, attested in Santali, Birhor *irəl*, Mundari *iralia*, Ho *irilia*, Kurku *ilar(ia)* ([PINNOW 1959: 86]), stands isolated within both Munda and Austro-Asiatic. The numeral can be explained as having a Dravidian origin, provided it reflects a compound consisting of the Dravidian numeral *\*ir-* and the verb *\*al-* “to be not so-and-so” > Tamil *al-* id., Malayalam *alla* “is not that”, not thus”, Kota *ala-* “to be not so-and-so”, Toda *alogy* “except”, Kannada *alla* “to be not so-and-so”, Kodagu *alla* id., Gondi *hal* “not”, Malto *-l-* ‘negative morpheme’, Brahui *all-* ‘base of past negative tenses of *anning* “to be”’ ([DEDR: №234]); thus, *\*ir-al* = “two-is not”. It is possible to imagine a (North) Dravidian origin for this specific Northern Munda isogloss.

**2.2.** *\*utri* “pair” > Tulu *udri* “a match, pair”, Telugu *uddi* “a match, an equal, a rival; equal”, *uddincu* “to pair, match, couple” ([DEDR: №623]).

**2.2.1.** Within the framework of the hypothesis of an Australian-type substratum influence it is tempting to wonder if this word could not be related to Pama-Nyungan *\*kutyarra* “2” ([BLAKE 1988: 43]: formed from *\*kutyá* by the non-singular suffix *-rra*; cf. the reconstruction of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun: sg. *\*NHu-* : du. *\*NHunpala* : pl. *\*NHurra*, by [EVANS 1988: 103]). Loss of the expected initial *\*k-* is not unprecedented in Dravidian, especially before back vowels, cf., e.g., Tamil *konay/ōnāy*, Malayalam *konayi/ōnāyi* “wolf” ([ANDRONOV 1994: 85]).

“three”

**3.1.** *\*muv-(C) / \*mū-(V)* ([DEDR: №5052]; [ZVELEBIL 1977: 34–35]) = *\*mū-* (G. STAROSTIN) = *\*muH-* ([KRISHNAMURTI 2001: 330]: plus the neuter marker *\*-ntu*).

Etymology:

**3.1.1.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 169–170]) assumes segmentation into *\*mūn-* and the neuter marker *\*-tu*. In the first edition of his *Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages* ([1978: 242]) ANDRONOV speculates about a derivation from Dravidian *\*muŋ-* > Tamil *muŋ* “in front”, *muŋai* “front, face, eminence, point, edge”, Malayalam *mun* “priority in space and time”, Kota *mun-* “front, fore”, *mon* “point”, Toda *mun* “in front”, *min* “sharp point”, Kannada *mun* “that which is before, in front of”, *muntu* “the front

part or side, front”, Kodagu *miñña* “in front, further”, *mone* “sharp point”, *muṅ gay* “forearm”, Tulu *munè*, *monè* “point, end”, Telugu *muni* “first, former, previous, front”, Kolami *muni* “sting of scorpion”, *mut* “before” = Naiki *mund* id., Parji *muna vanda* “forefinger”, *mundi* “in front”, *mūni* “tip, point”, Gadba *mundel* “the front”, Gondi *munne* “in front of”, *mūne* “ahead”, Konḍa *mundala* “in front”, Kuwi *munu* “point of needle”, Kurukh *munddh*, *mund* “first, ahead of, previous to”, Malto *mundi* “formerly, in ancient times”, Brahui *mōn* ([DEDR: №5020]). He suggests the development “protruding finger” > “middle finger” > “third finger”. The root *\*muṅ-* is indeed used to designate one of the fingers, namely, “forefinger” in Parji *muna vanda*, probably in the sense of “first finger” (if the “thumb” is not included).

**3.1.2.** Alternatively, accepting a substratum origin, it is necessary to take into account some of the Australian forms for the numeral “3” (all from the South-Western group of the Pama-Nyungan family): Natingero dialect of Kalamai *mow* (Mirniny subgroup), Yungar dialect of Wadjuk *moa*, Wardand *mow*, Warrango *mowe*, Ngokgurring *mow*, Nyakinyaki *mow* (all from the Nyunga subgroup). There are also longer forms in various languages of the South-Western group: Natingero (see above) *monga*, Luritja or Kukatja *munngorra*, Bedengo *murrngul*, Jumu (‘Lake Amadeus’) *mun-kuripa*, and Malgana (‘Gascoyne River’) *manguraba* or (‘Sharkes Bay’) *mangaranu* “3” ([KLUGE 1938: 54–55]), where the second component can be identified with Nawu (Yura subgroup of the South-Western group) *karbu* “3” ([KLUGE 1938: 56]).

### “four”

**4.1.** *\*nāl* ([DEDR: №3655]; [ZVELEBIL 1977: 34]; (G. STAROSTIN).

#### Etymology:

**4.1.1.** Following KITTEL ([1908]), CALDWELL ([1913: 335]) speculated about a relation between the numeral *\*nāl* “4” and the adjective *\*nal* “good” > Tamil *nal* (*nar-*) “good”, *nalla* “good, fine, excellent, abundant”, Malayalam *nal* “good, fine”, *nalla* “good, right, fine, handsome, real, true”, Toda *nas* “beauty”, Kannada *nal* “goodness, fairness, fineness”, *nala(vu)*, *nalivu* “pleasure, delight”, Kodagu *nallē* “good”, Tulu *nala*, *nalū* “good, cheap”, Telugu *naluvu* “beauty, ability, beautiful”, Gondi *nelā* “good” ([DEDR: №3610]). But CALDWELL himself admitted that the semantic development remains unexplained.

**4.1.2.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 170]) mentions that Tamil *nālu* means both “4” and “several”, similarly Malayalam *nālu* and Telugu *nālugu*. But the primary meaning “several” would be understandable only if “four” were the highest numeral. It seems more probable to suppose a secondary development “four” → “several”, not vice versa.

**4.1.3.** On the other hand, there are some remarkable external parallels. CALDWELL ([1913: 335]) concluded: “The resemblance between the Finnish tongues and the Dravidian, with respect to the numeral “four”, amounts almost to identity, and can scarcely have been accidental.” The Fenno-Ugric data look as follows: *\*neljä* (> *\*neljä*) > Finnish *neljä*, Estonian *neli*, gen. *nelja* | Lappish North *njälljē*, Lule *nielja*, Kildin *nielj*, Akkala *niel’* | Mordvin Erzya *ni’le*, Moksha *ni’lä* | Mari *nəl* | Udmurt Kazan *ni’l’*, Sarapul *ni’l’*; Komi Permyak *ni’ol’*, East *nul’* | Khanty Vach *ni’lə*, Obdorsk *ni’l*; Mansi Tavda *ni’l’r*, Pelymka *ni’lə*, Sosva *ni’la*; Hungarian *négy* id., *negyven* “40” ([UEW: 315–316]) || ? Altaic: Middle Korean *nəyh* id. || Tungus *\*hö[l]gün* “6” ([BLAŽEK 1999: 130]).

**4.1.4.** Alternatively, Dravidian “4” could be of substratum origin if we accept its Australian connections: cf. the forms for “4” in some Australian languages, all from the vast Pama-Nyungan family: Nawu (Yura subgroup of South-Western group) *nulla* (№63: ‘Gawler Range’ by [CURR 1886]), unidentified language *nalira* (№155 from ‘Tambo, Barcoo River’), Koa (Maric subgroup of Pama-Maric group) *nadera* (№140: ‘Diamantina River, Middleton Creek’), Maraura (Narrinyeri group) *nailko* (№84: ‘Murray River’). These forms were collected by E. M. CURR in his monumental collection of aboriginal language vocabularies *The Australian Race*, I–III, published in Melbourne 1886; here quoted according to [TROMBETTI 1923: 83] who was the first to compare Dravidian & Australian forms).

**4.2.** *\*kirt-a* “one-fourth” > Kannada *gidda*, *girda*, *gira* “a fourth part”; *giddana*, *gidna* “the fourth part of a solige”, Telugu *gidda*, *gidde* “one-fourth of the *sōla* measure” ([DEDR: №1553]).

**4.2.1.** It is possible to speculate about a relation with Pama-Nyungan *\*kutyarra* “two” (see 2.2). In some Australian languages the numeral “4” is formed from the numeral “2” by means of the dual suffix *\*-pa/ula*, cf. Potaruwutj (Kulin group of the Pama-Nyungan family) *kirtpan* & *kurtpun* ([CURR III: 492, 494]: ‘Hopkins River’; quoted after [KLUGE 1938: 74]).

### “five”

**5.1.** *\*cayN\_(C) / \*cay\_(V)* ([DEDR: №2826]; [ZVELEBIL 1977: 34–35]) = *\*śai-* (G. STAROSTIN).

#### Etymology:

**5.1.1.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 171–172]) connects the numeral “5” with Dravidian *\*kay-/ \*key-* “hand” > Tamil *kai* “hand, arm; elephant’s trunk; handle”, Malayalam *kai, kayyi* id., *kayyu* “the hand”, Kota *kay* “hand, arm”, Toda *koy* id., Kannada *kay, kay(y)i, key* “hand, forearm; handle; trunk of elephant”, Kodagu *kay* “hand, arm”, Tulu *kai* “hand; handle”, Telugu *cēyi, cey(y)i* “hand, arm; elephant’s trunk”, *kai* “the hand”, Kolami *ki, kīy, kiyu, key* “hand, arm”, Naiki *kī* “hand”, Parji *key* id., Gadba *ki, kiy, kiyyu* id., Gondi *kay, kai* id., Konḍa *kiyu, kīvu* id., Pengo *key*, Manda *kiy* id., Kui *kaju, kagu* “hand, arm; elephant’s trunk”, pl. *kaska*, Kuwi *kēyū, keyyu, keyu*, pl. *keska*, Kurukh *xekkha* “hand, arm”, Malto *qege* “hand” ([DEDR: №2023]). ANDRONOV’s solution is undoubtedly acceptable from a semantic point of view, but it is difficult to understand why the initial consonant of the numeral became palatalized, in contrast with “hand” (this is the main objection of [KRISHNAMURTI 2001: 255]). It should be stressed that in the case of “hand”, only the Telugu form *cēyi, cey(y)i* undergoes (regular) palatalization (but not *kai* “the hand”, possibly a re-borrowing from Kannada). On the other hand, it is legitimate to suppose the influence of the following numeral *\*caṛu/ \*cār* “6”.

It is also possible to speculate about the relationship between “5” and Konḍa *sēna*, Pengo *hēni* “many” ([DEDR: №2824]).

**5.1.2.** Altaic: Middle Korean *tàsās* “5” = *tā* “all” + *son* “hand”; *suyn* “50” ([BLAŽEK 1999: 130]).

**5.1.3.** There are interesting parallels in Austro-Asiatic languages: geographically closest is Khasi *san* “5” (Nagaraja); further cf. proto-Mon *\*(m-)suun* id. ([DIFFLOTH 1976]), &c.

### “six”

**6.1.** *\*caṛu*-(C)/*\*cār*-(V) ([DEDR: №2485]; [ZVELEBIL 1977: 35]) = *\*śād-* (G. STAROSTIN).

**6.1.1.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 172]) rejects the proto-Dravidian status of the alternation *\*caṛu*-(C)/*\*cār*-(V), which is found only in South Dravidian. As the starting point, he reconstructs *\*cāl-* + *-tu* with the neuter marker *\*-tu*, an almost universal formative of numerals; in this case, the root can be identified with *\*cāl-* > Tamil *cāl* “to be abundant, full, sufficient, great”, Malayalam *cāla* “richly, fully”, Kannada *sāl(u)* “to be sufficient or enough, suffice”, Telugu *cālu* “to be able, capable, bear, endure, be enough, sufficient”, *cāla* “abundant(ly)”, Kolami *sāl* “to be able, can”, Gondi *hālna* “completely”, *āl-* “to be able”, Konḍa *sāl-* “to be capable of, be suitable”, Kuwi *hāl-* “to suffice, be enough to” ([DEDR: №2470]). The primary meaning of the numeral “six” = “the abundant [one]” is quite natural, cf. the most probable etymology of the Indo-European numeral *\*(k)seks-* ~ *\*(s)ueks-* “6” based on the root *\*ueks-* “to grow” > Lithuanian *vešétiz* “to grow vigorously; flourish” (see [BLAŽEK 1999: 239–241] with references). For the change *\*-l + t- > \*-r-* Andronov (l.c.) finds an analogy in certain Tamil non-case sandhi patterns, such as *āṛidu* “banyan [is] bad” < *āl tīdu* (Tamil *āl, ālam* “banyan”, &c.: [DEDR: №382], & Tamil *tītu* “evil, fault, defect”: [DEDR: №3267]).

**6.1.2.** It is possible to speculate about a compound of the type *\*cay* “5” + *\*orū-* “1”.

### “seven”

**7.1.** *\*eṛu*-(C)/*\*ēṛ-*-(V) ([DEDR: №910]; [ZVELEBIL 1977: 35]) = *\*eṛ-u-*/*\*ēṛ-* ([KRISHNAMURTI 2001: 63]) = *\*jōṛ-* (G. STAROSTIN: vocalization after Gondwan *\*jōṛ-* while *\*-ē-* in other branches could have been influenced by the following numeral *\*eṇ-* “8”; in his dissertation [STAROSTIN 2000: №350] reconstructs *\*ē*, i. e. *\*jēṛ-*, in his transcription *\*jēr-*).

**7.1.1.** CALDWELL ([1913: 342]) explained this numeral as a verbal noun, derived from *\*eṛ(u)* “to rise” > Tamil *eṛu* “to rise, ascend (as heavenly body), rise by one’s own power, originate, be excited, aroused, increase, grow, begin”, *eṛucci* “rising, ascent, elevation, starting, origin, beginning, birth”, *eṛumai*, Malayalam *eṛu* “height, prominence”, Kota *eṛ* “weight”, Kannada *eṛ, ēṛ(u)* “to stand up, rise, awake, spring up, be produced, be obtained”, Kodagu *ē-ḷ-* “to get up”, Tulu *erkuni* “to rise or collect”, *erka* “full; fullness”, Brahui *harfing* “to raise, support, carry (off)”, &c. ([DEDR: №851]). Although the semantic motivation is not transparent (< *\*“full”*?; cf. Written Mongolian *doluyan* “7” : Turkic *\*dōl-* “to fill” or Turkic *\*jätti* “7” : *\*jät-* “be enough”, Turkish dial. *yetiz* “all, whole, full”; see Blažek 1999, 116), this etymology remains most promising.

**7.1.2.** CALDWELL ([1913: 342]) also speculated about a relation with Turkic *\*jätti* “7” (on the etymology, see 7.1.1), but Dravidian *\*-ṛ-* and Turkic *\*-t(t)-* has not been recognized by anybody as a valid correspondence.

**7.1.3.** There are other possible cognates in Altaic: Turkic *\*jōṛ* “100” | Written Mongolian *yerü* “the most of”, *yerüdügen* “for the greatest part, generally”, *yerüñkei* “common” | Middle Korean *jār* “10”, *jārāh* “a big quantity, number” | Old Japanese *jōrò-du* “10.000” (see Blažek 1999, 117). The pri-

mary semantics is in good agreement with the Dravidian verb *\*eṛ(u)* “to rise” &c., discussed in §7.1.1. For both Altaic and Dravidian a common Nostratic denominator *\*jeřU* may be established.

**Note:** The North Munda numeral *\*eya* “7”, attested in Santali *eae*, Mundari *eja*, *ea(e)*, Ho *iya*, *aia*, Birhor *eae*, *aea*, Kurku (*y*)*eya* ([PINNOW 1959: 269]), stands isolated within Munda and Austro-Asiatic in general. It could be borrowed from a Dravidian donor language in which Proto-Dravidian *\*-ɻ-* changed into *-y-*. Such a change is described, e.g., for Irula & Kota (Irula *kuyi*, Kota *kōy* “pit, hole” : Tamil *kuṛi*: [DEDR: №1818]); Toda (*tōy* “to be lowered” : Tamil *tāṛ* id.: [DEDR: №3178]); Manda (*nuy-* “to wash” < *\*noṛ-* / *\*noṭ-*: [DEDR: №3783]); and Kurukh (*kiyya* “under”, also Brahui *kī* “below, down” < *\*kīṛ-*: [DEDR: №1619]), cf. [ZVELEBIL 1970: 150, § 1.34.3–4; 151, § 1.34.5; 153, §§ 1.34.11.3 & 1.34.14]; [KRISHNAMURTI 2001, 42–75]. The best candidate for a donor language for North Munda would be Proto-North Dravidian or, rather, its earlier ancestor that still preserved the higher numerals.

### “eight”

**8.1.** *\*eṭtu* / *\*eṇ* ([DEDR: №784]; [ZVELEBIL 1977: 35]) = *\*eṇṭtu* / *\*eṇ* ([ANDRONOV 1994: 173]) = *\*eṇ-* (*-nṭ-*) (G. STAROSTIN).

**8.1.1.** Already CALDWELL ([1913, 345–346]) identified this numeral with the stem *\*eṇ* “number”, *\*eṇ-* “to count, calculate”, joined by the neuter suffix *-(t)tu*; cf. the data: Tamil *eṇ* “thought”, calculation, number”, *ēṇi* “number”, *eṇṇu* “to think, consider, determine, esteem, conjecture, count, reckon”, Malayalam *eṇ* “number, thought”, Toda *ōṇ-* “to count”, *ōṇm* “counting, numbers”, Kannada *eṇike* “counting, number, thinking, observation”, *eṇṇu* “to count, think”, Kodagu *ēṇṇ-* “to say, tell”, Tulu *eṇṇuni* “to count, think”, *eṇṇige* “calculation, estimation”, Telugu *enṇu* “to count, reckon”, *encu* “to count, reckon, enumerate, think, consider, believe”, Parji *eja* “number”, *eja cāj-* “to count”, Pengo *eja ki-* id., Manda *eji ki-* id., Kuwi *eji kinai* id. ([DEDR: №793]).

**8.2.** *\*eṇ(u)-pa(k)ti* is reconstructible for Tulu, Telugu, Kolami and Gondi.

**8.2.1.** Although TYLER ([1986: 10]) accepts the identification of the word *\*eṇ* “number” with the numeral “8”, he alternatively offers to interpret the compound *\*eṇ(u)-pa(C)ti* as “a pair [subtracted from] ten” or “rest of ten”, where the first component can be identified with Tamil *ēṇai* “other; the rest” ([DEDR: №919]) or *\*iṇay* > Tamil *iṇai* “pair, couple, likeness, union”, Malayalam *iṇa* “pair, couple, union, companion”, Kannada *eṇe*, *eṇa* “a couple, pair, connexion, equality, similarity, a match”, Kodagu *ēṇe* “double”, *ēṇe makka* “twins”, Tulu *inè*, *iṇè* “a couple, pair, companion, mate”, Telugu *ena* “equal, equality, a match” ([DEDR: №457]). Although such constructions are not altogether improbable, the phonetic problems of *\*i* vs. *\*e* and *\*ṇ* vs. *\*ṇ* remain unresolved.

**8.2.2.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 173]) decides that the second component here is secondary, caused by analogy with the numeral “9”.

### “nine”

**9.1.** *\*oṇ-* / *\*oṛ-paktu* ([DEDR: №1025]).

**9.1.1.** Apparently “one [subtracted from] ten” (so [CALDWELL 1913: 347], and independently GUNDEBT).

**9.2.** *\*toḷ-* (*pak-tu*) ([DEDR: №3532]) = *\*toḷ-pad-* (G. STAROSTIN).

**9.2.1.** CALDWELL ([1913: 348]) suggested that *\*toḷ-* be identified with Dravidian *\*toḷ-* / *\*toḷ-* “before”, directly attested in Kuwi *toll(i)e*, *toli* “before, formerly”, cf. further Gondi *tollē* “previous”, Telugu *toli* “beginning; first, former, previous, old”, Tamil *tol* “old, ancient”, *tollai*, *toḷlai* “antiquity, ancientness” ([DEDR: №3516]). The semantic motivation “before [ten]” is quite acceptable.

**9.2.2.** The first component is almost universally identified with the root *\*toḷ-*, attested in Tamil *toḷ* “to perforate, bore with an instrument”, *toḷlai* “hole, perforation, pit, anything tubular, fault, defect”, Malayalam *toḷla* “hole, cavity”, Kota *toyḷ-* “to pierce”, *toḷ* “hole, vagina”, Kannada *toḷe* “hole, cavity”, Tulu *toluvè* “hole”, *toḷu* “hole; empty”, Telugu *toli* “hole”, Gondi *tullana* “to be pierced” ([DEDR: №3528]; cf. also [ANDRONOV 1994: 174]). However, the semantic motivation “defect [ten]” or “empty [ten]” seems rather vague.

### “ten”

**10.1.** *\*pak-tu* ([DEDR: №3918]) = *\*paH-* & neuter suffix *\*-tu* ([KRISHNAMURTI 2001: 328]) = *\*paT-* (G. STAROSTIN).

**10.1.1.** CALDWELL ([1913: 351]) accepted Gundert’s idea that Dravidian “10” may be borrowed from Sanskrit *pañkti-* “set of five”, cf. also the ordinal numeral *pakthá-* “fifth”. The divergence of South Dravidian, Telugu, and the branches represented by Kolami and Gondi is dated to the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC by ANDRONOV ([1994: 13]), or even later, to c. 1200–1000 BC by ([STAROSTIN

2000: 217–218]). In any case, contacts between Indo-Aryans and the ancestors of those Dravidians who preserved this numeral were possible.

**10.1.2.** ANDRONOV ([1994: 176]) proposes a long string of changes (*\*pax-* < *\*pav-* < *\*pam-* < *\*paŋ-* < *\*pal-*) so that the numeral can be identified with the root *\*pal-*, attested in such forms as Tamil *pala* “many, several, diverse”, *paŋmai* “plurality, multitude”, Malayalam *pala* “many, several, various”, Toda *pes* “a large number, many”, Kannada *pala*, *palavu* “much, many, several, various”, *palavar* “several persons”, Telugu *palu* “many, several, various, different”, *paluvuru*, *paluvuṇḍru* “many persons”, Malto *palware* “to be multiplied, be bred” ([DEDR: №3987]). From a semantic point of view this idea is acceptable, but the series of the proposed transformations is rather long and unconvincing.

**10.1.3.** CALDWELL ([1913: 353]) offered another possibility of internal etymologization, namely, based on the idea of “duplicity” (“10” = “2×5”?) or “share” (“<sup>1</sup>/<sub>10</sub>”?), cf. Tamil *pakku* “fracture, duplicity”, *pāttu* “dividing, sharing, share, half”, *pātti* “division, section, part, share”, *paṅkam* “portion, division”, Toda *paxy* “division”, Kannada & Tulu *pagadi* “tribute, tax”, &c., all from the verb *\*pak-* “to divide/be divided” ([DEDR: №3808]).

### “hundred”

**11.1.** *\*nūr(-tu)* ([DEDR: №3729]) = *\*nūd-* (G. STAROSTIN).

**11.1.1.** CALDWELL ([1913: 354]) argued for a starting-point in Tamil *nūru* “to crush, pulverize, reduce to powder; powder, dust, flour”, Malayalam *nūru* “powder”, &c. ([DEDR: №3728]).

**11.1.2.** MENGES ([1968: 97]) sought a cognate in Turkic *\*jūr* “100”, but, according to “classic” consonant correspondences among Nostratic languages, Dravidian *\*n-* is only compatible with Turkic *\*j-* when the latter reflects Altaic *\*ń-* (> Mongolian *\*n(i)-*, Tungusic *\*ń-*). For Turkic *\*-r-*, on the other hand, the regular counterpart in Dravidian has been identified as Proto-Dravidian *\*-r-* (ILLIC-SVITYČ 1971: 150; 170]). The cognates in other Altaic languages exclude the genetic relationship of these numerals, cf. Written Mongolian *yerü* “the most of”, *yerüdügen* “for the greatest part, generally”, *yerünkei* “common” | Middle Korean *jār* “10”, *jārāh* “a big quantity, number” | Old Japanese *jōrō-du* “10.000” (see [BLAŽEK 1999: 117]).

### “thousand”

**12.1.** Telugu *vēyi*, *veyi*, *veyyi*, pl. *vēlu* “1000”, *vēna-vēlu* “thousands by thousands”.

**12.1.1.** Derived from a Proto-Dravidian root, attested in such forms as Tamil *viyam* “extensiveness, height”, *viyal* “greatness, width, expansion”, *viyaṅ* “greatness, vastness, excellence”, Malayalam *viyam* “extension”, Gondi *weeya* “high” ([DEDR: №5404]).

### Conclusions.

1) For the higher numerals from “6” to “10”, as well as “100” and “1000”, internal Dravidian etymologies seem most probable. The same could be said about the numeral “5”, but only if its phonetic relation with the word “hand” can be made clearer.

2) Some of these higher numerals (“7”, “8”) may have been lost in North Dravidian languages, but their former presence in that subgroup can be reconstructed on the basis of their (allegedly) being borrowed into North Munda languages.

3) The most surprising results concern the numerals from “1” to “4”. In between the potential cognates in other branches of Nostratic and the potential Australian parallels, which should indicate a substratum origin for the Dravidian stems, it is the latter comparanda that seem more convincing. On the other hand, it is so far unclear how well distributed the quoted forms are among Australian languages; if they can be shown to represent recent innovations, which is not impossible, the value of these connections will be lessened.

The results of the present study are summarized in the following table:

Form	Internal etymology (§§)	External parallels (§§)
<i>*oru</i> / <i>*ōr</i> “1”		A: PN <i>*urr-</i> / <i>*warr-</i> 1 (1.1.2.) N: EC <i>*wal-</i> / <i>*wil-</i> together (1.1.1.)
<i>*iru</i> / <i>*īr</i> “2”		A: Kaurua <i>yerra</i> both, Tiwi <i>yurarra</i> 2 (2.1.3.) or N: K <i>*jor-</i> 2 (2.1.2.)
<i>*utr-i</i> “pair”		A: PN <i>*kutyarra</i> 2 (2.2.1.)
<i>*muv</i> / <i>*mū</i> or <i>*mūn-</i> “3”	<i>*muṅ</i> front, point (3.1.1.)	A: PN (SW) <i>*mow</i> 3 (3.1.2.) A: PN (SW) <i>*muṅ-kurV(ba)</i> 3 (3.1.2.)

Form	Internal etymology (§§)	External parallels (§§)
* <i>nāl</i> “4”		A: PN: Nuwa <i>nulla</i> ; Maraura <i>naikō</i> 4 (4.1.4.) N: FU * <i>neljä</i> 4     AL: MK <i>nəyh</i> 4 (4.1.3.)
* <i>kirt-i</i> “ <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub> ”		A: PN * <i>kutyarra-pula</i> 4 = dual of 2 (4.2.1.)
* <i>cayN</i> /* <i>cay</i> “5”	* <i>kay</i> /* <i>key</i> hand (5.1.1.) or CD * <i>cēn</i> - many (5.1.2.)	N: AL: MK <i>tasas</i> 5, <i>suyn</i> 50, <i>son</i> hand (5.1.2.) AU: Khasi <i>san</i> 5 (5.1.3.)
* <i>caru</i> /* <i>cār</i> “6”	< * <i>cāl-tu</i> : * <i>cāl</i> be abundant (6.1.1.)	
*( <i>j</i> ) <i>erū</i> /*( <i>j</i> ) <i>ēr</i> “7”	* <i>er(u)</i> rise (7.1.1.)	
* <i>eṇ</i> “8”	* <i>eṇ</i> number; calculate (8.1.1.)	
* <i>on-</i> /* <i>or-paktu</i> “9”	one [subtracted from] ten (9.1.1.)	
* <i>toḷ-(pak-)tu</i> “9”	[one] before ten (9.2.2.)	
* <i>pak-(tu)</i> “10”	Tamil <i>pakku</i> duplicity (10.1.3.)	
* <i>nūr-(tu)</i> “100”	* <i>nūru</i> powder (11.1.1.)	
Telugu <i>veyyi</i> “1000”	Tamil <i>viyan</i> greatness (12.1.1.)	

*Appendix 1: What is known about Elamite numerals?*

The hypothesis of a particularly close relationship between Elamite and Dravidian was first formulated by CALDWELL ([1856]; cf. [1913: 57; 65]); later, additional attempts at demonstrating this relationship were undertaken by A. TROMBETTI, F. BORK, I. DIAKONOFF and, particularly, J. MCALPIN. If this relationship were really close, one would expect some cognates among numerals. Below we list what is known about the Elamite numerals according to the interpretation of W. HINZ & H. KOCH, the authors of the monumental *Elamisches Wörterbuch* ([1987]):

*ki* “1” (also, with various extensions, *kik*, *kikki*, *kikqa*; with the personal marker, *kir*) — see [EW: 459, 465, 467, 468–469].

*mar* “2” (also syllabically written variants *ma-ir*, *mar-ra*) — see [EW: 876, 860].

*ziti* “3” — see [EW: 1305].

*tuku* “5”? — see [EW: 356].

*barba* “80”? — see [EW: 147].

It is apparent that among the known Elamite numerals there are no cognates in the system of Dravidian numerals (with the possible partial exception of *mar* “2”, cf. Dravidian \**maṛu* “other, next, again”: [DEDR: №4766]). It can also be mentioned that F. KÖNIG ([1965: 42, fn. 15]) offered to interpret the Middle Elamite word *nulkippi* as “4 pairs”, i. e. “8”. If his solution were correct, the hypothetical root \**nul-* could be a cognate of Dravidian \**nāl* “4”. However, HINZ & KOCH ([EW: 1016]) interpret this word quite differently, namely, as a plural form of the noun ‘fertility-maker’.

*Appendix 2: A survey of the inherited Dravidian cardinal numerals*

=(C)/=(V)	* <i>oru</i> /* <i>ōr</i> “1”	* <i>onru</i> “1”	* <i>oṅṭi</i> “alone”	* <i>okk-</i> “1”	* <i>iru</i> / * <i>īr</i> “2”	* <i>muv</i> / * <i>mū</i> “3”
DEDR	[№990 (a)]	[№990 (d)]	[№990 (c)]	[№990 (b)]	[№474]	[№5052]
Tamil	<i>oru</i> (C)/ <i>ōr</i> (V)	<i>onru</i> nr. one; n. <i>orrai</i> one of a pair, odd number	<i>oṅṭi</i> that which is single, one who is alone; <i>oṅṭai</i> one of a pair	<i>okka</i> to- gether	<i>iraṅṭu</i> ; adj. <i>iru</i> (C)/ <i>īr</i> (V) <i>iru-p/vatu</i> 20 <i>iruvar</i> 2 men <i>iraṅṭai</i> pair	<i>mūnru</i> & <i>mūn u</i> adj. <i>mu</i> (CC) / <i>mūv</i> (V) <i>mu-ppatu</i> 30 <i>muvar</i> 3 men
Mala- yalam	<i>oru</i> / <i>ōr</i>	<i>onnu</i> n., <i>orra</i> one, single, odd		<i>okka</i> to- gether	<i>raṅṭu</i> ; adj. <i>iru</i> (C)/ <i>īr</i> (V) <i>iru-patu</i> 20 <i>iruvar</i> 2 men <i>iraṅṭa</i> double	<i>mūnnu</i> <i>mu-/nu-ppatu</i> 30 <i>muvar</i> 3 men
Kasaba		<i>o(y)ndu</i> / <i>onnu</i>			<i>reṅṭu</i> ; <i>irppattu</i> 20	<i>mūyndu</i> <i>muvattu</i> 30

=(C)/=(V)	* <i>oru</i> / * <i>ōr</i> “1”	* <i>onru</i> “1”	* <i>oṅṭi</i> “alone”	* <i>okk-</i> “1”	* <i>iru</i> / * <i>īr</i> “2”	* <i>muv</i> / * <i>mū</i> “3”
DEDR	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (a)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (d)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (c)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (b)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 474]	[N <sup>o</sup> 5052]
Kurru		<i>oṅḍu</i> / <i>uṅḍu</i>			<i>reṅḍu</i> / <i>ronḍu</i> <i>iravay</i> / <i>iridi</i> 20	<i>mūru</i>
Irula					<i>raṅḍu</i> / <i>reṅḍu</i>	
Kota	<i>or, o-r, o</i>	<i>oḍ</i> 1 <i>pan oṅḍ</i> 11			<i>eyḍ</i> <i>ir va-d</i> 20	<i>mu-ṅḍ</i> <i>muat</i> 30
Toda	<i>wī-r, oṣ, o</i>	<i>wiḍ</i>	<i>waty</i> single, odd < Ta <i>oṭṭai</i>		<i>e-d;</i> <i>i-r o-r</i> 2 years <i>ī foḥ</i> 20 <i>īm</i> double	<i>mu-d</i> <i>mu poḥ</i> 30
Kan- naḍa	<i>or</i> (C) / <i>ōr</i> (V)	<i>ondu</i> 1 thing	<i>oṅṭi</i> 1, alone		<i>er(a)ḍu, erar</i> adj. <i>ir(u), ik, ic</i> <i>irpattu</i> 20 <i>irbar</i> 2 men	<i>mūru</i> adj. <i>mu(k), mū</i> <i>mū-vattu</i> <i>muvar</i> 3 men
Koḍagu	<i>ori</i>	<i>ondi</i> 1 thing <i>pannandi</i> 11		<i>okka</i> to- gether	<i>daṅḍi</i> n. <i>iru-vadi</i> 20 <i>ibba</i> 2 men	<i>mu-ndi</i> <i>mu-vē</i> 3 men <i>nuppadi</i> “30”
B. Ku- rumba		<i>-oṅḍe</i>			<i>-aḍḍu</i> , adj. <i>aḍ</i>	<i>-mu:ru</i>
Šolega		<i>oṅḍu</i> / <i>o</i>			<i>eruḍu</i> / <i>o</i> <i>ippattu</i> 20	<i>mu:r<sup>u</sup> / o</i> <i>mu:vattu</i> 30
Tulu	<i>or</i> adj., <i>oru</i> single	<i>oṅḍi</i> 1 thing <i>ondike</i> joining	<i>oṅṭi</i> alone, single		<i>raddu</i> n. adj. <i>iru, ir-</i> <i>irva</i> 20 <i>irveru</i> 2 men	<i>mūji</i> <i>muppa</i> 30 <i>mūv(v)eru</i> 3 men
Koragu		<i>oṅḍi</i> / <i>uṅḍi</i>			<i>eyḍi</i>	<i>mūji</i>
Telugu	<i>orumu</i> be united	<i>oṅḍu</i> 1 thing	<i>oṅṭi</i> singleness	<i>oka</i> 1, single	<i>reṅḍu</i> n. <i>iru-, ir-</i> comp. <i>iruva(d)i</i> 20 <i>ibbaru</i> 2 men	<i>mūḍu</i> , inscr. <i>mūṅru</i> adj. <i>mu, mū</i> <i>muppa(d)i</i> 30 <i>muvuru</i> 3 men
Kolami				<i>okkon</i> m. <i>okkod</i> f. <i>ok maṭ</i> once	<i>indiy</i> 2 things <i>iddar</i> 2 men <i>i-ral</i> 2 women <i>irve</i> 20	<i>mu-ndiy</i> 3 things <i>muggur</i> 3 men
Naiki				<i>okko(n)</i> m. <i>okko(d)</i> f. / n. <i>okoda</i> once	<i>inding</i> 2 things = Ch. <i>erndi</i> <i>iddar</i> 2 men = Ch. <i>iroṭer</i> <i>iral</i> 2 women = Ch. <i>ira</i>	<i>mūndiy</i> 3 things = Ch. <i>mūndi</i> <i>muggur</i> 3 men = Ch. <i>mug(g)ur</i> <i>muyal</i> 3 women = Ch. <i>muy(y)a</i>
Parji				<i>ok</i> adj., <i>okur</i> m., <i>okal</i> f.	<i>ir</i> adj. <i>irḍu</i> 2 things <i>irul</i> 2 men <i>iral</i> 2 women	<i>muy</i> adj. <i>mū:duk</i> 3 things <i>muvir</i> 3 men <i>muyal</i> 3 women
Gadba				<i>ukur</i> m., <i>okuṭ</i> f., <i>ukuṭ</i> n.	<i>iḍḍig</i> n., <i>ir</i> adj. <i>iṅḍi</i> 2 things <i>irul</i> 2 men <i>iral</i> 2 women	<i>mūnu</i> <i>mūṅḍ</i> n. <i>muvur</i> m. <i>muyal</i> f.
Gondi	<i>oror, ore</i> m.	<i>unḍi, unḍī,</i> <i>undi</i>	<i>unṭhal</i> n.	<i>ōkō</i> one each	<i>rand(u)</i> non-m. <i>irvu<sup>r</sup> / r</i> m. <i>ranṭe</i> pair	<i>mūṅḍ</i> non-m. <i>muvir</i> m. <i>muhk</i> 3 each
Konḍa	<i>or-</i>	<i>unṅri</i> f. / n.			<i>ri<sup>(p)</sup>-</i> <i>ri<sup>2</sup>er</i> 2 men <i>runḍi</i> f./n.	<i>mūṅri</i> n. <i>mu<sup>2</sup>er</i> 3 men <i>mūRku mūRku</i> 3 each
Pengo	<i>ro, ronje</i>				<i>ri; rindaṅ</i> n. <i>rikar</i> 2 men <i>rindek</i> 2 women	



=(C)/=(V)	* <i>oru</i> / * <i>ōr</i> “1”	* <i>onru</i> “1”	* <i>oṅṭi</i> “alone”	* <i>okk-</i> “1”	* <i>iru</i> / * <i>īr</i> “2”	* <i>muv</i> / * <i>mū</i> “3”
DEDR	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (a)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (d)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (c)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 990 (b)]	[N <sup>o</sup> 474]	[N <sup>o</sup> 5052]
Manda	<i>ru, runḍi</i>				<i>ri; rikar</i> 2 men <i>rikehiṅ</i> 2 wome	
Kui	<i>ro, ronḍi</i> n. <i>roanju</i> m.				<i>rī; rīṅḍi</i> f./ n. <i>ri’ari</i> 2 men <i>ri kōri</i> 40	<i>mū.;</i> <i>mūṅji</i> f./ n. <i>mu’ar</i> 3 men <i>mū kōri</i> 60
Kuwi	<i>rō; ro’esi</i> 1 man <i>ronḍi</i> 1 woman				<i>rī; ri’ari</i> 2 men <i>riṅḍi</i> f./ n.	
Kurukh	<i>or<sup>o</sup>t</i> m., <i>ol<sup>o</sup>x</i> f. <i>ormā</i> all	<i>ōn(d)</i> one whole	<i>oṅṭā</i> 1 thing	<i>oṅghon</i> once	<i>ē:r, ēṅḍ</i> 2 thing <i>irb</i> 2 men	<i>mūnd</i> 3 things <i>nubb</i> 3 men
Malto	<i>ort, -e</i> m., <i>-i</i> f. <i>orme</i> all	<i>-ond</i> 1 thing			<i>-is</i> 2 things <i>iwr</i> 2 men	
Brahui	<i>asiṭ</i> 1 (entity) <i>asi</i> adj. <i>asīke</i> once				<i>irat</i> 2 (entities) <i>irā</i> adj.	<i>musiṭ</i> 3 (entities) <i>musi</i> adj. <i>musika</i> thrice
=(C)/=(V)	* <i>nāl</i> “4”	* <i>cayN</i> / * <i>cay</i> “5”	* <i>caru</i> / * <i>cār</i> “6”	* <i>eṛu</i> / * <i>ēr</i> “7”		
DEDR	[N <sup>o</sup> 3655]	[N <sup>o</sup> 2826]	[N <sup>o</sup> 2485]	[N <sup>o</sup> 910]		
Tamil	<i>nāl(u), nālku, nāṅku</i> 4 <i>nāṛpatu, nappatu</i> 40 <i>nalvar</i> 4 men	<i>aintu, aṅcu; adj. ai</i> 5 <i>aim-patu</i> 50 <i>aivar</i> 5 men	<i>āru</i> 6 <i>aṛu-patu</i> 60 <i>aṛuvar</i> 6 men	<i>ēru</i> 7 <i>eṛu-patu</i> 70 <i>eṛuvar</i> 7 men		
Mala- yalam	<i>nāl(u), nāṅku, nān</i> 4 <i>nalpatu</i> 40 <i>nāl(uv)ar</i> 4 men	<i>aṅcu; adj. ai</i> 5 <i>am-patu</i> 50 <i>aivar</i> 5 men	<i>āru</i> 6 <i>aṛu-patu</i> 60 <i>aṛuvar</i> 6 men	<i>ēru</i> 7 <i>eṛu-patu</i> 70 <i>eṛuvar</i> 7 men		
Kasaba	<i>nālu; nālattu</i> 40	<i>aṅju; ayvattu</i> 50	<i>āru; aṛavattu</i> 60	<i>ēlu; eḷuvattu</i> 70		
Kurru	<i>nālu; nālabbay</i> 40	<i>aṅju; yābay</i> 50	<i>āru; aravay</i> 60	<i>ōgu; ḍabbay</i> 70		
Kota	<i>na·ng; na·n digl</i> 4 months; <i>na·lvat</i> 40 <i>na·r pa·d</i> 40 days	<i>aṅj</i> 5 <i>ay vat</i> 50	<i>a·r</i> <i>ar vat</i> 60	<i>e·y, dial. e·g</i> <i>eḷ vat</i> 70		
Toda	<i>no·ng; pa·ng</i> 14 <i>naḷ poḥ</i> 40	<i>üz, dial. üj; pu·j</i> 15 <i>e boḥ</i> 50	<i>o·r; pa·r</i> 16 <i>aṛoḥ</i> 60	<i>öw; pa·w</i> 17		
Kan- naḍa	<i>nāl(u), nāl(u)ku, nā(ku)</i> <i>nalvattu</i> 40 <i>nalvar</i> 4 men	<i>ay(i)du; adj. ai</i> <i>ay-vattu</i> 50 <i>aybaru</i> 5 persons	<i>āru</i> <i>aṛu/a-vattu</i> 60 <i>aṛuvar,</i> <i>arvaru</i> 6 men	<i>ēru</i> <i>ēr-pattu</i> 70 <i>ērvaru</i> 7 men		
Koḍagu	<i>na·li; na· padī</i> 40 <i>na·vē</i> 4 men	<i>aṅji; aim-badī</i> 50 <i>ayvē</i> 5 men	<i>a·ri; aru-vadī</i> 60	<i>ē·lii; eḷu-vadī</i> 70 <i>ēvvē</i> 7 men		
B. Ku- rumba	<i>na:kṛ</i>	<i>əyidu</i>	<i>a:rṛ</i>	<i>ō:lṛ</i>		
Šōlega	<i>na:kṛ/ō; na:lvattu</i> 40	<i>ayidu/ō; aivattu</i> 50	<i>a:rṛ/ō; aṛuvattu</i> 60	<i>ō:ḷu/ō; yappattu</i> 70		
Tulu	<i>nālu; nālpa</i> 40 <i>nālveru</i> 4 men	<i>ainu</i> 5 things; <i>aiva</i> 50 <i>aiveru, aiyeru</i> 5 men	<i>āji; āj(i)pa, ājip(p)a</i> 60	<i>ēlu; ēḷpa, erpa</i> 70 <i>eḷveru</i> 7 men		
Koragu	<i>nālu</i>	<i>ayṅu</i>				
Telugu	<i>nālugu, nāluvu</i> <i>naluvadi, nalubadi</i> 40 <i>naluguru, naluvuru</i> 4 men	<i>ayidu, ēnu</i> 5 (things) <i>ē:badī, yabhai</i> 50 <i>ayidu-guru, ēguru,</i> <i>ēvuru</i> 5 men	<i>āru</i> <i>aṛu-vadi, aruvai</i> 60 <i>āruguru, āruvuru</i> 6 men	<i>ēḍu, inscr. (7th c.) ēru</i> <i>ḍebbadi, ḍebbhai</i> 70 <i>ēḍuguru</i> 7 men		
Kolami	<i>na·liṅ</i> 4 things <i>nalgur</i> 4 men <i>nallav</i> 4 women	<i>aid &amp; ayd</i> <i>segur</i> 5 men	<i>ār</i> <i>argur</i>	<i>eḍ, ēṛ</i> <i>ergur, eḍgur</i> 7 men		
Naiki	<i>nālīṅ</i> 4 things Ch. <i>nāli</i> non-m. <i>nalgur</i> 4 men <i>nallaḷ</i> 4 women	Ch. <i>sēndi</i>	Ch. <i>sādi</i>			

_(C)/_(V)	*nāl “4”	*cayN/*cay “5”	*caru/*cār “6”	*erū/*ēr “7”	
DEDR	[N <sup>o</sup> 3655]	[N <sup>o</sup> 2826]	[N <sup>o</sup> 2485]	[N <sup>o</sup> 910]	
Parji	<i>nālu(k)</i> 4 things adj. <i>nel</i> ; <i>nelvir</i> 4 men <i>nelal</i> 4 women	<i>cē:du(k)</i> 5 things adj. <i>cem/n</i> ; <i>cevir</i> 5 men <i>ceyal</i> 5 women			
Gadba	<i>nalgur</i> , <i>nalvur</i> m. <i>nandal</i> , <i>naṇḍal</i> f. <i>nālig</i> , <i>nālug</i> n.				
Gondi	<i>nālung</i> ; <i>nālk</i> 4 each <i>nāl-vir/-vur/-gur</i> 4 men <i>nāluṅ</i> , <i>lālū</i> non-m.	<i>saiyung</i> , <i>sīyuy</i> , <i>hayuy</i> , <i>ayṅ</i> non-m., <i>sey(y)ur</i> , <i>sīvir</i> , ( <i>h</i> ) <i>ayvur</i> m., <i>saik saik</i> 5 each	<i>sārunḡ</i> , <i>harunḡ</i> (M.), <i>ārū sar<sup>vir</sup>/-vur</i> , ( <i>h</i> ) <i>arvur</i> m., <i>sarne</i> sixth day	( <i>y</i> ) <i>ērung</i> , <i>yedung</i> , <i>ērū</i> : non-m., <i>ēr<sup>vur</sup>/-vir</i> , <i>ēr(v)ur</i> m. <i>yērḡ</i> 7 each	
Koṇḍa	<i>nāl<sup>er</sup></i> m., <i>nālgī</i> non-m.			<i>ērū</i>	
Kui	<i>nal</i> ; <i>nālgī</i> non-m. <i>nālur</i> 4 men	<i>siṅgi</i> 5 things, <i>sēngī</i> f./n., <i>sēṅ gōri</i> 100	<i>saj</i> , <i>sajgi</i> 6 things dial. <i>hāja</i> 6	<i>oṛi</i> ; <i>oḍgi</i> 7 things <i>oṛi gōri</i> 140	
Kurukh	<i>nāx</i> 4 things <i>naib</i> m./ f.				
_(C)/_(V)	*eṭṭu/*eṅ “8”	*on-/*or-paktu “9”	*toḷ-(paC-)tu	*pak-tu “10”	*nūr-tu “100”
DEDR	[N <sup>o</sup> 784]	[N <sup>o</sup> 1025]	[N <sup>o</sup> 3532]	[N <sup>o</sup> 3918]	[N <sup>o</sup> 3729]
Tamil	<i>eṭṭu</i> ; <i>eṅ-patu</i> 80 <i>eṅmar</i> , <i>eṅvar</i> 8 men	<i>oṅpatu</i> , <i>ompotu</i>	<i>toṅṭu</i> 9 <i>toṅ-nūru</i> 90 <i>toḷḷ-ayiram</i> 900	<i>pattu</i> , <i>paktu</i> ; <i>paḡ-pattu</i> 100 = 10 x 10 <i>patin-</i> 10 in teens <i>-patu</i> 10 in tens <i>patinmar</i> 10 men	<i>nūru</i> , obl. <i>nūr<sup>ru</sup></i> - <i>nūr<sup>ru</sup>var</i> 100 men
Mala- yalam	<i>eṭṭu</i> ; <i>eṅ-patu</i> 80 <i>eṅmar</i> 8 men	<i>ompatu</i>	<i>toṅ-nūru</i> 90 <i>toḷḷ-ayiram</i> 900	<i>pattu</i> , obl. <i>patin-</i> <i>-patu</i> in tens <i>patinmar</i> 10 men	<i>nūru</i> , obl. <i>nūr<sup>ru</sup></i> - <i>nūr<sup>ru</sup>u/a<sup>var</sup></i> 100 men
Kasaba	<i>eṭṭu</i> ; <i>embattu</i> 80	<i>ombattu</i> 9	<i>tombattu</i> 90	<i>pattu</i>	
Kurru	<i>oṭṭu</i> ; <i>eṅ(a)bay</i> 80	<i>ombedu</i> 9		<i>pot(t)u</i>	
Kota	<i>eṭ</i> ; <i>em bat</i> 80	<i>orba-d</i> , dial. <i>onba</i> 9 <i>patrmba-d</i> 19	<i>tombat</i> 90	<i>pat</i> ; <i>paṅ</i> 11, <i>pad-</i> in 13, 14, <i>padn-</i> in 15–18 <i>-vat/-bat</i> in some tens	<i>nu·r</i>
Toda	<i>ōṭ</i> ; <i>pu-ṭ</i> 18	<i>winboṭ</i> ; <i>pu-nboṭ</i> 19 <i>e-ṅ boṭ</i> 90		<i>pot</i> ; <i>pon-</i> in 11–13; <i>-(f)oth/-poṭ/-boṭ</i> in tens	<i>nu·r</i>
Kana- ṇḍa	<i>eṅṭu</i> ; <i>eṅ-pattu</i> 80 <i>eṅbar</i> 8 men	<i>omb(h)attu</i>	<i>tom-b(h)attu</i> 90	<i>pattu</i> ; <i>padin-</i> teens in 15–18; <i>padi-</i> in 13, 14; <i>pann-</i> in 11, 12; <i>-vattu/</i> <i>-vattu/-battu</i> in tens <i>padimbar</i> 10 men	<i>nūru</i> <i>nūr(v)ar</i> 100 men
Koḍagu	<i>ēṭṭi</i> ; <i>ēm-badi</i> 80	<i>oymbadi</i>	<i>tom-badi</i> 90	<i>patti</i> ; <i>padin-</i> in 14–18, <i>padi-</i> in 13, <i>pann-</i> in <i>pannandi</i> 11, <i>pannerandi</i> 12 <i>-vadi/-padi/-badi</i> in tens	<i>nu·ri</i> , obl. <i>nu-iṭ-</i>
B. Ku- rumba	<i>-ōṭṭu</i>	<i>-embadu</i>		<i>-pattu</i>	
Šōlega	<i>eṅṭ<sup>u</sup>/o</i> 8; <i>yambattu</i> 80	<i>ombattu</i> 9; <i>tombattu</i> 90		<i>attu</i> 10	<i>nu:ru</i>
Tulu	<i>eṅ(u)ma</i> 8; <i>eṅpa</i> 80	<i>ormba</i>	<i>soṅpa</i> 90	<i>pattu</i> 10; <i>patt-</i> in 11, <i>padu-</i> in 12–14, <i>paduṅ-</i> in 15–19, <i>-va/-pa</i> , obl. <i>oṭṭu</i> in tens	<i>nūdu</i> , obl. <i>nūta-</i> 100

_(C)/_(V)	*eṭṭu/*eṇ “8”	*oṇ/*or-paktu “9”	*toḷ-(paC-)tu	*pak-tu “10”	*nūr-tu “100”
DEDR	[N <sup>o</sup> 784]	[N <sup>o</sup> 1025]	[N <sup>o</sup> 3532]	[N <sup>o</sup> 3918]	[N <sup>o</sup> 3729]
Telugu	<i>enimidi</i> 8; <i>enu-badi</i> , <i>enabhai</i> 80 = inscr. <i>eṇ(um)bodi</i> ; <i>enamandru</i> 8 persons		<i>tommidi</i> 9 <i>tombadi</i> , <i>tombhai</i> 90 <i>tomma(n)nūru</i> 900 <i>tommaṇḍuguru</i> , <i>tommandru</i> 9 persons	<i>padi</i> ; <i>padun-</i> in 11, 15–18 <i>padu-</i> in 13, 14, <i>pan-</i> in 19; <i>-vadi/-padi/-badi</i> in tens inscr. <i>padunru</i> 10 persons	<i>nūru</i> , obl. <i>nūṭa-</i> <i>nūruḡ/vuru</i> 100 men
Kolami	<i>enumadi</i> , <i>enumidi</i> 8 <i>enmāṭar</i> 8 persons		<i>tomdī</i> 9 <i>tomater</i> 9 men	<i>padī</i> , <i>padi</i>	
Gondi	<i>armu<sup>r</sup>/l</i> , <i>yermud</i> , <i>enmidi</i> , <i>tenmidi</i> 8 <i>armuhk</i> 8 each	<i>eḍmu</i> , <i>unmā</i> 9 <i>unmak</i> 9 each	<i>tomidi</i> , <i>tumidi</i> 9 <i>tombai</i> 90	<i>pad(i)</i> , pl. <i>patk</i>	<i>nūr</i> , pl. <i>nuhk</i>

### Abbreviations of languages and language periods

**A**ustralian; **AL**taic; **AU**stroasiatic; **CD** — Central Dravidian; **EC** — Eastern Cushitic; **FU** — Fenno-Ugric; **K**artvelian; **MK** — Middle Korean; **No**stratic; **PN** — Pama-Nyungan; **SW** — South-Western.

### References

- ANDRONOV 1978 — Михаил С. АНДРОНОВ [Mikhail S. ANDRONOV]. *Сравнительная грамматика дравидийских языков*. М.: «Наука», Главная редакция восточной литературы [A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages. Moscow: “Nauka”].
- ANDRONOV 1980 — Михаил С. АНДРОНОВ [Mikhail S. ANDRONOV]. *Язык брауи*. М.: «Наука», Главная редакция восточной литературы [The Brahui Language. Moscow: “Nauka”].
- ANDRONOV 1994 — Михаил С. АНДРОНОВ [Mikhail S. ANDRONOV]. *Сравнительная грамматика дравидийских языков*. 2-е изд. Москва: Российская Академия наук — Институт востоковедения [A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Moscow: Russian Academy of Sciences — Institute for Oriental Studies].
- BLAKE 1981 — Barry J. BLAKE. *Australian Aboriginal Languages*. London–Sydney–Melbourne–Singapore–Manila: ANGUS & ROBERTSON Publishers.
- BLAKE 1988 — Barry J. BLAKE. Redefining Pama-Nyungan: Towards the Prehistory of Australian Languages // *Aboriginal Linguistics*, 1; pp. 1–90.
- BLAŽEK 1992 — Václav BLAŽEK. Australian Elements in Dravidian Lexicon? // *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind* / Ed. Vitaly SHEVOROSHKIN. Bochum: BROCKMEYER; pp. 421–431.
- BLAŽEK 1999 — Václav BLAŽEK. *Numerals: Comparative-Etymological Analyses and Their Implications*. Brno: MASARYKOVA univerzita.
- BRAY 1934 — Sir Denys BRAY. *The Brahui Language*. Part III: *Etymological Vocabulary*. Delhi: Manager of Publications.
- CALDWELL 1913 — Robert CALDWELL. *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages*. New Delhi: Munshiram MANOHARLAL. 1913 [1974].
- CURR 1886 — Edward M. CURR. *The Australian Race: Its Origin, Languages, Customs, Place of Landing in Australia, and the Routes by Which It Spread in Itself over That Continent*. I – III. Melbourne: John FERRES, Government Printer.
- DEDR — *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Second Edition. By Thomas BURROW & Murray B. EMENEAU. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1984.
- DIFFLOTH 1976 — Gérard DIFFLOTH. Mon-Khmer numerals in Aslian languages // Gérard DIFFLOTH & Norman H. ZIDE. (eds.) / Special issue: *Austroasiatic Number Systems* (= *Linguistics* 174: Special publication). The Hague: MOUTON & C<sup>o</sup> B.V.; pp. 31–37.
- DIXON 1980 — Robert DIXON. *The Languages of Australia*. Cambridge: University Press.

- EVANS 1988 — Nicholas EVANS. Arguments for Pama-Nyungan as a Genetic Subgroup, with Particular Reference to Initial Laminalization // *Aboriginal Linguistics*, 1; pp. 91–110.
- EW — *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. by Walther HINZ & Heidemarie KOCH. Berlin: REIMER. 1987.
- ILLIČ-SVITYČ 1971 — В. М. Иллич-Свитыч [Vladislav M. ILLIČ-SVITYČ]. *Опыт сравнения ностратических языков (семитохамитский, картвельский, индоевропейский, уральский, дравидийский, алтайский): Введение. Сравнительный словарь*. М.: «Наука» [A Tentative Comparative Dictionary of the Nostratic Languages (Semitic-Hamitic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, Uralic, Dravidian, Altaic)]. Т. I (b–K)..
- KITTEL 1908 — Ferdinand KITTEL. *Grammar of the Kannada Language*. Mangalore.
- KLIMOV 1998 — Georgij A. KLIMOV. *Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages*. Berlin–New York: MOUTON–DE GRUYTER.
- KLUGE 1938 — Theodor KLUGE. *Die Zahlbegriffe der Australier, Papua und Bantuneger nebst einer Einleitung ueber die Zahl: Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte des Menschen*. Berlin–Steglitz: Selbstverlag.
- KÖNIG 1965 — Friedrich W. KÖNIG. *Die elamischen Königsinschriften*. Graz: *Archiv für Orientforschung*, Beiheft 16.
- KRISHNAMURTI 2001 — Bhadriraju KRISHNAMURTI. *Comparative Dravidian Linguistics*. Oxford: University Press.
- KUIPER 1966 — Franciscus B. J. KUIPER. The Sources of the Nahali Vocabulary // *Studies in Comparative Austroasiatic Linguistics* / Ed. by Norman H. ZIDE. London–The Hague–Paris: MOUTON; 57–81.
- MCALPIN 1981 — D. W. MCALPIN. Proto-Elamo-Dravidian: The Evidence and Its Implications // *Transactions of American Philosophical Society* 71/3. Philadelphia.
- MENGES 1968 — Karl H. MENGES. *The Turkic Languages and Peoples: An Introduction to Turkic Studies*. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ.
- MÜLLER 1886 — Friedrich MÜLLER. *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft*, II.1. Wien; 1–98.
- PINNOW 1959 — Heinz-Jürgen PINNOW. *Versuch einer Historischen Lautlehre der Kharia-Sprache*. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ.
- SASSE 1982 — Hans-Jürgen SASSE. *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*. Hamburg: BUSKE.
- SCHMIDT — Wilhelm SCHMIDT. Die Gliederung der Australischen Sprachen // *Anthropos*, Bd. 7 (1912), Bd. 8 (1913), Bd. 9 (1914), Bd. 12–13 (1917–1918).
- STAROSTIN 2000 — Георгий С. СТАРОСТИН [Georgij S. STAROSTIN]. *Сравнительная фонетика дравидийских языков*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. М. [A Comparative Phonology of the Dravidian Languages. PhD. Thesis. Moscow].
- TROMBETTI 1923 — Alfredo TROMBETTI. *Elementi di glottologia*. Bologna: ZANICHELLI.
- TYLER 1986 — Stephen TYLER. *Proto-Dravido-Uralian*. Austin (Rice University) [Ms].
- TYLER 1990 — Stephen TYLER. Summary of Noun and Verb Inflectional Correspondences in Proto-Dravidian and Proto-Uralian // *Proto-Languages and Proto-Cultures* / Ed. by Vitaly SHEVOROSHKIN. Bochum: BROCKMEYER, 68–76.
- UEW — *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* / Ed. by Károly RÉDEI. Akadémiai Kiadó. 1986–1988.
- ZIDE 1978 — Norman H. ZIDE. *Studies in the Munda Numerals*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
- ZVELEBIL 1970 — Kamil ZVELEBIL. *Comparative Dravidian Phonology*. The Hague–Paris: MOUTON.
- ZVELEBIL 1977 — Kamil ZVELEBIL. *A Sketch of Comparative Dravidian Morphology*. The Hague–Paris–New York: MOUTON.
- ZVELEBIL 2001 — Kamil ZVELEBIL. *Nilgiri Areal Studies* / Ed. by Jaroslav VACEK & Jan DVOŘÁK. Prague: The Karolinum Press.

## Р е з ю м е

Автор разделяет мнение, согласно которому дравидийская языковая семья является одной из ветвей ностратической макросемьи; вместе с тем отмечается, что в системе числительных, восстанавливаемой для прадравидийского, надежных ностратических параллелей практически не обнаружено. В статье перечислены все основные гипотезы о происхождении дравидийских числительных, включая как внешние, так и внутренние этимологии; к ним автор добавляет ряд собственных, предлагаемых им в рамках разрабатываемой им теории о наличии австралийского субстрата в прадравидийском. Согласно выводам автора, австралийская этимологизация ряда дравидийских числительных в целом оказывается предпочтительнее, чем известные сопоставления их с ностратическим материалом.