

Российский государственный гуманитарный университет  
Russian State University for the Humanities



# RSUH/RGGU BULLETIN

№ 4 (13)

Academic Journal

Series:

Philology. Journal of Language Relationship

Moscow 2015

ВЕСТНИК РГГУ

№ 4 (13)

Научный журнал

Серия

«Филология. Вопросы языкового родства»

Москва 2015

Редакционный совет серий «Вестника РГГУ»

Е.И. Пивовар, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (председатель)

Н.И. Архипова, д-р экон. н., проф. (РГГУ), А.Б. Безбородов, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ), Х. Варгас (Ун-т Кали, Колумбия), А.Д. Воскресенский, д-р полит. н., проф. (МГИМО (У) МИД России), Е. Вятр (Варшавский ун-т, Польша), Дж. Дебарделебен (Карлтонский ун-т, Канада), В.А. Дыбо, акад. РАН, д-р филол. н. (РГГУ), В.И. Заботкина, д-р филол. н., проф. (РГГУ), В.В. Иванов, акад. РАН, д-р филол. н., проф. (РГГУ; Калифорнийский ун-т Лос-Анджелеса, США), Э. Камия (Ун-т Тачибана г. Киото, Япония), Ш. Карнер (Ин-т по изучению последствий войн им. Л. Больцмана, Австрия), С.М. Каштанов, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ИВИ РАН), В. Кейдан (Ун-т Карло Бо, Италия), Ш. Кечкемети (Национальная Школа Хартий, Сорбонна, Франция), И. Клюканов (Восточно-Вашингтонский ун-т, США), В.П. Козлов, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ВНИИДАД), М. Коул (Калифорнийский ун-т Сан-Диего, США), Е.Е. Кравцова, д-р психол. н., проф. (РГГУ), М. Крэмер (Гарвардский ун-т, США), А.П. Логунов, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ), Д. Ломар (Ун-т Кельна, Германия), Б. Луайер (Ин-т геополитики, Париж-VIII, Франция), С. Масамичи (Ун-т Чуо, Япония), В.И. Молчанов, д-р филос. н., проф. (РГГУ), В.Н. Незамайкин, д-р экон. н., проф. (Финансовый ун-т при Правительстве РФ), П. Новак (Ун-т Белостока, Польша), Ю.С. Пивоваров, акад. РАН, д-р полит. н., проф. (ИНИОН РАН), Е. ван Поведская (Ун-т Сантьяго-де-Компостела, Испания), С. Рапич (Ун-т Вупперталь, Германия), М. Сасаки (Ун-т Чуо, Япония), И.С. Смирнов, канд. филол. н. (РГГУ), В.А. Тишков, акад. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ИЭА РАН), Ж.Т. Тощенко, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р филос. н., проф. (РГГУ), Д. Фоглесонг (Ун-т Ратгерс, США), И. Фолтыс (Политехнический ин-т г. Ополе, Польша), Т.И. Хорхордина, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ), А.О. Чубарьян, акад. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ИВИ РАН), Т.А. Шаклеина, д-р полит. н., проф. (МГИМО (У) МИД России), П.П. Шкаренков, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ)

Серия «Филология. Вопросы языкового родства»

Редакционная коллегия серии

В.А. Дыбо, гл. ред., акад. РАН, д-р филол. н. (РГГУ), Г.С. Старостин, зам. гл. ред., канд. филол. н., доц. (РГГУ), Т.А. Михайлова, отв. сек., д-р филол. н., проф. (МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова), К.В. Бабаев, д-р филол. н., доц. (РГГУ, ИВ РАН), А.В. Дыбо, д-р филол. н. (ИЯз РАН), А.С. Касьян, д-р филол. н. (ИЯз РАН), С.В. Кулланда, канд. ист. н. (ИВ РАН), М.А. Молина (ИЯз РАН), И.С. Якубович, канд. филол. н. (РГГУ)

Ответственные за выпуск: Г.С. Старостин, А.С. Касьян, М.А. Молина



УДК 800(05)  
ББК 80/84я5

Вопросы языкового родства: Международный научный журнал / Рос. гос. гуманитар. ун-т; Рос. акад. наук. Ин-т языкознания; под ред. В. А. Дыбо. — М., 2015. — № 4(13). — x + 106 с. — (Вестник РГГУ. Серия «Филология. Вопросы языкового родства»: Научный журнал).

Journal of Language Relationship: International Scientific Periodical / Russian State University for the Humanities; Russian Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics; Ed. by V. A. Dybo. — Moscow, 2015. — No. 4(13). — x + 106 p. — (RSUH/RGGU Bulletin. Series: Philology. Journal of Language Relationship: Academic Journal).

ISSN 2073-6320

<http://www.jolr.ru/>  
[journal@jolr.ru](mailto:journal@jolr.ru)

Дополнительные знаки: С. Г. Болотов  
Add-on symbols by S. G. Bolotov

Подписано в печать 15.12.2015. Формат 60×90/8.  
Бум. офсетная.  
Печать офсетная. Тираж 1050 экз.  
Заказ №

Отпечатано в полном соответствии с качеством  
предоставленного оригинал-макета  
в «Наша Полиграфия», г. Калуга, ул. Грабцевское шоссе, 126  
Лиц. ПЛД № 42-29 от 23.12.99

# Table of Contents / Содержание

Table of Contents / Содержание . . . . .	vii
Contributors / Сведения об авторах . . . . .	viii
Note for Contributors / Будущим авторам . . . . .	ix

## Articles / Статьи

<i>Sergei L. Nikolaev</i> . Toward the reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan. Part 2: Algonquian-Wakashan sound correspondences . . . . .	289
[ <i>С. Л. Николаев</i> . К реконструкции алгонкино-вакашского праязыка. Ч. 2: Алгонкино-вакашские звуковые соответствия]	
<i>Miguel Valério</i> . Linear A <i>du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re</i> , Hittite <i>tabarna</i> and their alleged relatives revisited . . . . .	329
[ <i>Мигель Валерио</i> . Линейное A <i>du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re</i> , хеттское <i>tabarna</i> и их гипотетические когнаты]	
<i>А. И. Коган</i> . Дардские языки и пятидесятисловная лексикостатистика . . . . .	355
[ <i>Anton Kogan</i> . Dardic languages and lexicostatistics (the 50-item wordlist approach)]	
<i>М. Н. Саенко</i> . История далматинского и балкано-романских языков с точки зрения лексикостатистики . . . . .	371
[ <i>Mikhail Saenko</i> . History of the Dalmatian and Balkan Romance languages from the lexicostatistical point of view]	

## Book Reviews / Рецензии

William H. BAXTER, Laurent SAGART. Old Chinese. A New Reconstruction, 2014 ( <i>George Starostin / Г. С. Старостин</i> ) . . . . .	383
Ranko MATASOVIĆ. Slavic Nominal Word-Formation. Proto-Indo-European Origins and Historical Development, 2014 ( <i>Ж. Ж. Варбот / Zh. Zh. Varbot</i> ) . . . . .	390

## Contributors

*Anton Kogan* — candidate of sciences (Philology), researcher, Department of Asian and African languages, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), kogan\_anton@yahoo.com

*Sergei Nikolaev* — doctor of sciences (Philology), lead researcher, Department of Slavic linguistics, Institute of Slavic studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow/Novosibirsk), sergenicko@mail.ru

*Mikhail Saenko* — candidate of sciences (Philology), junior researcher, Institute of Slavic studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, veraetatis@yandex.ru

*George Starostin* — candidate of sciences (Philology), head of Department of the history and philology of the Far East, Institute of Eastern Cultures and Antiquity, RSUH (Moscow); head of the Laboratory of Oriental and Historical-Linguistic Studies, Russian Presidential Academy, gstarst@rinet.ru

*Miguel Valério* — graduate student, University of Barcelona, mfg\_valerio@yahoo.com

*Zhanna Varbot* — doctor of sciences (Philology), head of Department of etymology and onomastics, Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, zhannavarbot@yandex.ru

## Сведения об авторах

*Валерио, Мигель* — докторант университета Барселоны, Испания, mfg\_valerio@yahoo.com

*Варбот, Жанна Жановна* — доктор филол. наук, зав. отделом этимологии и ономастики Института русского языка РАН (Москва), zhannavarbot@yandex.ru

*Коган, Антон Ильич* — канд. филол. наук, науч. сотрудник Отдела языков Азии и Африки Института востоковедения РАН (Москва), kogan\_anton@yahoo.com

*Николаев, Сергей Львович* — доктор филол. наук, вед. науч. сотрудник Отдела славянского языкознания Института славяноведения РАН (Москва), sergenicko@mail.ru

*Саенко, Михаил Николаевич* — канд. филол. наук, мл. науч. сотрудник Института славяноведения РАН (Москва), veraetatis@yandex.ru

*Старостин, Георгий Сергеевич* — канд. филол. наук, зав. кафедрой истории и филологии дальнего востока ИВКА РГГУ, зав. Центром востоковедения и сравнительно-исторического языкознания ШПИ РАНХиГС (Москва), gstarst@rinet.ru



## Note for Contributors

*Journal of Language Relationship* welcomes submissions from everyone specializing in comparative-historical linguistics and related disciplines, in the form of original articles as well as reviews of recent publications. All such submissions should be sent to the managing editor:

G. Starostin  
Institute for Oriental and Classical Studies  
Russian State University for the Humanities  
125267 Moscow, Russia  
Miuskaya Square, 6  
E-mail: [journal@jolr.ru](mailto:journal@jolr.ru)

Articles are published preferably in English or Russian, although publication of texts in other major European languages (French, German, etc.) is possible. Each article should be accompanied with an abstract (not exceeding 300 words) and keywords.

For more detailed guidelines on article submission and editorial policies, please see our website at: <http://www.jolr.ru> or address the editorial staff directly at [journal@nostratic.ru](mailto:journal@nostratic.ru).

## Будущим авторам

Журнал *Вопросы языкового родства* принимает заявки на публикацию оригинальных научных статей, а также рецензий от всех, кто специализируется в области сравнительно-исторического языкознания и смежных дисциплин. Рукописи можно высылать непосредственно заместителю главного редактора по адресу:

125267 Москва  
Миусская площадь, д. 6  
Российский государственный гуманитарный университет  
Институт восточных культур и античности  
Г. Старостину  
E-mail: [journal@jolr.ru](mailto:journal@jolr.ru)

Предпочтительные языки публикации — английский или русский, хотя возможна также публикация статей на других европейских языках (французский, немецкий и т. п.). К каждой статье обязательно прикладывается резюме (не более 300 слов) и список ключевых слов.

Подробнее о требованиях к оформлению рукописи, редакционной политике журнала и т. п. вы можете узнать на нашем сайте по адресу: <http://www.jolr.ru> или же непосредственно, обратившись к редакции по электронной почте ([journal@nostratic.ru](mailto:journal@nostratic.ru)).



## **Toward the reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan. Part 2: Algonquian-Wakashan sound correspondences**

The second part of the present study, continuing an earlier publication by the author in a previous number of JLR, includes: an inventory of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonemes with a list of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonemes with references to Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan roots (§2); a comparative Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan dictionary that includes more than 400 root reconstructions, with relevant examples from Proto-Wakashan, Proto-Nivkh and Proto-Algic data, also including Proto-Nivkh-Algic roots (§3); an index of lexical meanings for the Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan and Proto-Nivkh-Algic roots (§4). The main innovative aspect of the present article is the formal demonstration of genetic relationship between Nivkh, Algic, and Wakashan languages, conducted by means of the standard comparative method, i. e. establishing a system of regular sound correspondences between the vocabularies of the compared languages.

*Keywords:* Algonquian-Wakashan languages, Nivkh-Algonquian languages, Algic languages, Wakashan languages, Chimakuan-Wakashan languages, Nivkh language, historical phonology, comparative dictionary.

### **1. Introduction**

In the first part of the present paper (Nikolaev 2015) it was stated that a genetic relationship between Proto-Wakashan, Proto-Nivkh, and Proto-Algic may be demonstrated by means of the standard comparative method, i. e. the establishment of a system of regular sound correspondences between the compared vocabularies. Table 4 in Nikolaev 2015: 30 displays the reconstructed system of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonemes and their reflexes in separate families (PW, PNi, PAlg), but lexical illustration of regular sound correspondences has been limited in that part, for volume reasons, to specific subsets of the “basic” and “cultural” lexicons. Conversely, the second part of the paper will be dedicated to presenting the bulk of the evidence in the form of a comprehensive Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan comparative vocabulary (§3).

### **2. Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonological inventory**

The Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonological inventory is shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Definite reconstructions that contain specific PAW phonemes and ambiguous reconstructions where one of 2 alternate protophonemes may have been present (optional variants are divided with the tilde sign) are listed after the Tables 1 & 2. Numbers refer to the Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan vocabulary (§3). Plain and glottalized sonorants *m/m'*, *n/n'*, *r/r'*, etc. (that differ only in PW and perhaps in PChi) and short/long variants of vowels are given jointly.

Table 1. Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan obstruents and sonorants.

Labial	Dental	Alveolar	Palatal	Lateral	Velar	Labio- velar	Uvular	Labio- uvular	Laryn- geal
p	t	c	č	ʎ	k	k <sup>w</sup>	q	q <sup>w</sup>	
b	d	ʒ	ž	ʎ	g	g <sup>w</sup>	ɢ	ɢ <sup>w</sup>	
p'	t'	c'	č'	ʎ'	k'	k' <sup>w</sup>	q'	q' <sup>w</sup>	ʔ
		s	š	ʎ	x	x <sup>w</sup>	χ	χ <sup>w</sup>	h
	r			l	ɣ	ɣ <sup>w</sup>	ʁ	ʁ <sup>w</sup>	
	r'			l'					
m	n		ń		ŋ				
m'	n'		ń'		ŋ'				
w			y						
w'			y'						

Table 2. Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan vowels.

Front	Mid	Back
i i: ü:	ɨ ɨ:	u u:
e e:	ə ə:	o o:
ä ä:		a a:

*p	13, 16, 25, 31, 85, 145, 183, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 292, 293, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 384, 417
*b	60, 62, 63, 64, 320
*b ~ *p	58, 68, 69, 70, 291, 294
*b ~ *p'	59, 61, 65, 65, 67, 71, 153, 154, 167, 242, 255, 394
*p'	97, 98, 111, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 307a
*t	38, 53, 99, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346
*t ~ *t'	142, 350, 353
*d	11, 35, 40, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 387
*d ~ *t'	61, 105, 106, 126, 167, 278, 282, 329, 360, 372
*t'	40, 86, 347, 348, 349, 351, 352, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 361
*c	73, 116, 228, 322, 403
*c ~ č	76
*c ~ *c'	74, 261, 376
*c ~ *s	75, 125, 327, 388, 401
*ʒ	78, 136, 186, 197, 330, 378, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417
*ʒ ~ *ž	27
*c'	77, 78, 81, 95, 297, 321, 323
*c' ~ *č'	79, 80
*s	4, 141, 187, 326, 382
*č	36, 36, 84, 86, 87, 88, 90, 158
*č ~ *č'	52, 83, 91
*č ~ *š	85, 285

*ʒ	161, 364, 418, 419, 420
*č'	39, 84, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97
*š	170, 235, 266, 281, 283, 385
*λ	48, 150, 204, 206
*λ	198, 199, 200, 201, 202
*λ ~ *λ'	203
*λ'	207, 208, 209, 260
*ɬ	3, 31, 121, 148, 188, 209a, 210, 211, 212, 213, 217, 393
*k	17, 42, 94, 157, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 175, 181, 302, 324, 344, 374, 414, 415
*k ~ *k'	24, 46, 294
*k ~ *x	341
*g	7, 30, 40, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 123
*g ~ *k'	137, 169, 172, 174, 191, 206, 245, 264, 270, 395, 407
*g ~ *k	152
*k'	24, 40, 93, 110, 149, 162, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 398, 409
*k' ~ *q'	193, 355
*x	81, 88, 149, 155, 162, 204, 195a, 286, 351, 388, 405
*k <sup>w</sup>	53, 62, 73, 84, 92, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179
*k <sup>w</sup> ~ *k' <sup>w</sup>	96, 298, 418
*k <sup>w</sup> ~ *q <sup>w</sup>	180
*g <sup>w</sup>	62, 108, 116, 117, 118, 200, 201, 209, 237, 251, 263, 284, 391, 397, 399, 402
*g <sup>w</sup> ~ *k' <sup>w</sup>	27, 358, 390, 410
*g <sup>w</sup> ~ *G <sup>w</sup>	400
*k' <sup>w</sup>	19, 84, 144, 181, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 209a, 286, 287, 300, 354, 416
*k' <sup>w</sup> ~ *q' <sup>w</sup>	45, 158, 285, 293
*x <sup>w</sup>	75, 75, 104, 172, 176, 212, 223, 260, 331, 359, 363, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 393a
*x <sup>w</sup> ~ *χ <sup>w</sup>	312, 402
*q	90, 137, 208, 304, 308, 310, 311, 312, 349
*G	121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 140, 143, 311
*G ~ *q	207
*G ~ *q'	133, 258, 296, 315
*q'	43, 52, 150, 208, 229, 299, 316, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 385
*χ	11, 35, 102, 226, 339, 394, 395, 397, 398, 399, 400, 400a, 401a, 407a
*χ ~ *q'	203
*q <sup>w</sup>	110, 306, 324, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 348, 353
q <sup>w</sup> ~ *q' <sup>w</sup>	12, 184, 334, 373
*G <sup>w</sup>	5, 101, 128, 129, 130, 337, 419
*G <sup>w</sup> ~ *q' <sup>w</sup>	103
*G <sup>w</sup> ~ *q <sup>w</sup>	325, 336
*q' <sup>w</sup>	12, 38, 77, 78, 128, 131, 213, 273, 323, 332, 333, 335, 336, 338, 340, 348
*χ <sup>w</sup>	196, 402, 403
*ʔ	1–36, 38–56, 73, 81, 88, 93, 94, 95, 100, 144, 146, 154, 171, 173, 178, 187, 188, 191, 196, 202, 204, 210, 213, 218, 221, 225, 226, 238, 240, 241, 246, 262, 290, 292, 308, 343, 339, 345, 349, 378, 384
*h	49, 92, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 154a, 155, 156, 210, 234, 240, 259, 279, 389, 422, 423
*ɣ	41, 252, 292, 341, 347, 421
*ɣ ~ *ɸ	65

*j <sup>w</sup>	87, 95, 99, 119, 120, 134, 411
*B	126a, 127
*B <sup>w</sup>	80, 101, 127, 131, 132, 295
*w, *w'	5, 11, 21, 26, 27, 43, 54, 74, 79, 165, 174, 192, 230, 236, 237, 245, 246, 256, 280, 291, 345, 362, 363, 364, 365, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 378, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 404, 406, 408
*y, *y'	7, 25, 45, 97, 126a, 130, 182, 192, 211, 227, 262, 266, 274, 283, 333, 345, 361, 364, 380, 383, 392, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 407a, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412
*r, *r'	2, 14, 41, 64, 128, 149, 158, 175, 208, 222, 227, 263, 288, 310, 313, 335, 337, 338, 357, 379, 391, 394, 395, 397, 400, 401, 422
*l, *l'	11, 17, 20, 22, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 63, 86, 97, 112, 113, 114, 120, 130, 132, 140, 145, 160, 162, 165, 185, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 195a, 196, 197, 216, 249, 266, 277, 287, 290, 293, 299, 300, 305, 307a, 308, 311, 317, 359, 362, 363, 390, 400a
*l ~ *č	124, 289, 325, 328
*m, *m'	1, 15, 18, 34, 49, 50, 103, 122, 147, 152, 154a, 157, 169, 177, 179, 194, 207, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 272, 317, 319, 320, 342, 348, 352, 355, 361, 401, 423
*n, *n'	105, 106, 150, 172, 180, 187, 193, 235, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 249, 316, 318, 321, 322, 356, 374, 379
*n ~ *ń	10, 127, 247, 248, 250
*n ~ *ŋ	52, 54, 89
*ń, *ń'	25, 30, 33, 194, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 330
*ŋ, *ŋ'	16, 19, 94, 109, 143, 165, 174, 185, 195, 197, 200, 209a, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 299, 300, 332, 334, 380, 393a, 418
*i	16, 23, 24, 46, 49, 64, 75, 79, 85, 86, 87, 100, 102, 117, 119, 123, 129, 131, 149, 161, 167, 173, 174, 225, 243, 248, 263, 286, 304, 317, 318, 332, 333, 336, 350, 351, 377, 378, 392, 393, 410, 416, 417
*i ~ *ä	101, 112
*i ~ *e	22, 84, 148, 150, 172, 207, 210, 239, 247, 280, 284, 305, 341, 342, 375, 376
*e	13, 14, 15, 62, 63, 122, 169, 177, 183, 184, 204, 219, 238, 252, 256, 311, 312, 326, 328, 340, 371, 372, 373, 384, 385, 397, 407a, 419
*ä	10, 11, 12, 61, 77, 110, 176, 209a, 218, 251, 261, 279, 316, 325, 370, 391, 402
*ĭ	27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 50, 67, 94, 97, 103, 166, 186, 201, 208, 211, 226, 253, 264, 271, 272, 273, 306, 353, 354, 405, 417
*ĭ ~ *ə	17, 25, 26, 65, 66, 91, 99, 113, 185, 193, 206, 282, 287, 288, 352, 379, 404
*ĭ ~ *o	104, 132
*ə	18, 19, 20, 21, 74, 78, 93, 97, 111, 144, 145, 146, 147, 171, 178, 221, 222, 223, 257, 262, 270, 283, 300, 349, 374, 409
*ə ~ *e	348
*a	11, 40, 58, 109, 116, 121, 136, 169, 175, 190, 191, 192, 198, 199, 200, 215, 233, 234, 241, 259, 260, 269, 308, 310, 315, 323, 337, 339, 365, 376, 383, 389, 390, 395
*a ~ *ä	1, 2, 59, 133, 134, 135, 165, 214, 216, 217, 242, 275, 302, 347, 362, 364, 369, 394, 413, 414
*a ~ *ə	128, 139, 338, 363
*o	33, 76, 88, 105, 114, 130, 150, 152, 179, 180, 188, 202, 209, 227, 244, 245, 246, 249, 289, 290, 291, 319, 321, 329, 330, 331, 334, 335, 336, 398
*u	69, 70, 115, 120, 124, 195, 197, 229, 296, 400, 401, 420
*ü:	7, 38, 71, 80, 81, 90, 125, 126, 154a, 155, 203, 231, 267, 274, 295, 313, 358, 380, 399

### 3. Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan lexicon

Phonetically, the Proto-Nivkh-Algic (PNA) reconstructions would not differ from the hypothetical Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan (PAW) forms that chronologically precede them; therefore, PNA forms in the list below are interspersed with PAW ones. PNA forms that have their Proto-Salishan counterparts may be considered as PAW forms that were lost in Proto-Wakashan.

The Chimakuan languages (Quileute and the scarcely documented Chemakum) belong to the same phylum as Wakashan. However, the Quileute material still requires further processing in its historical aspect; therefore, only the most important Quileute and Chemakum data are given in the present paper.

There are numerous lexical similarities between Proto-Salishan and PAW, including those within the “basic lexicon” (Nikolaev 2015, §4). However, data for establishing regular sound correspondences between PAW and PS remain scarce, and so the Salish-Algonquian-Wakashan relationship stays in the realm of speculation. In the list below I quote Salishan forms as external comparative data.

Whereas modern forms of the Wakashan and Nivkh languages differ insignificantly from the PW and PN<sub>i</sub> forms, sound changes in the Algic family have been so substantial that cognates are frequently unrecognizable to “the naked eye”. For this reason the Proto-Algic and Proto-Algonquian reconstructions are provided below with examples of their reflexes in certain attested languages.

In protoforms the tilde symbol (~) denotes alternative variants of reconstruction, rather than actual variance in the proto-language. If reconstruction of two (rarely three) proto-phonemes in the same position is possible, the alternative variants are given in parentheses. For example, PAW \**gilV* (~ *ä, l*) ‘three’: Quil. *q<sup>w</sup>ú:ʔl*, PN<sub>i</sub> \**ce-*, PAlg \**ni-khl-* means that attested reflexes permit us to reconstruct either PAW \**i* or \**ä*, either \**l* or \**l’*.

Reconstruction of PAW glottal features of stops/affricates (voiceless / voiced / glottalized) in roots containing two stops or affricates is somewhat difficult, due to assimilation/dissimilation of glottal features in the history of many of the concerned languages; therefore, several roots have optional protoforms. This also applies to labialization of velars and uvulars. In such cases alternate protoforms are divided with the tilde symbol. Thus, cf. PAW \**k’i:wŋV* ~ \**gi:wŋV* ‘to freeze, cold’: here PW \**k’in-* ‘to feel cold’ reflects PAW \**k’-*, PN<sub>i</sub> \**k’iŋ-* ‘to freeze, cool down’ reflects PAW \**g-* and PA \**ko:n-* ‘snow’ may reflect either of the two proto-phonemes; or PAW \**bu-* ~ \**pu-* ‘to go out, leave’, where PW \**bu:-* ‘to leave, flee, abandon’ reflects PAW \**b-*, but PN<sub>i</sub> \**phu-* ‘to go out/away’ reflects PAW \**p-* and PA \**papa:-m-* ‘to go about, pass by’ [reduplication] may reflect PAW \**p-*, \**b-*, \**p’-*.

Potential metatheses are represented in the same way; thus, PAW \**hoʔVq’A* ~ \**hoq’VʔA* ‘hole’ > PWS \**ʔaq’iʔ*, \**q’aq’iʔ* ‘cave’ vs. PN<sub>i</sub> \**holq-e-* ‘deepening, hole’, PA \**-a:ʔak-* ‘hole’.

Reflexes of the clusters “sonorant + obstruent” (\**nC*, \**lC*, \**rC*, etc.) are rather unstable, and sometimes I reconstruct them on the basis of their presence in just one of the families.

Within the reconstructed forms, capital letters should be decoded as follows: *A* = indefinite mid/back vowel, *C* = any sibilant (alveolar) or hushing (palato-alveolar) affricate, *E* = indefinite front vowel, *K* = any velar stop, *L* = any lateral, *N* = \**n* ~ \**n’* ~ \**ŋ*, *O* = \**u* ~ \**o* (~ \**i*), *P* = any labial stop, *Q* = any uvular stop, *S* = \**s* ~ \**š*, *V* = any vowel, *X* = any velar or uvular fricative. This notation is used when sound correspondences are generally regular, but available comparative material is insufficient to definitively choose one particular PAW phoneme over another. Example:

\**n’OLK*(<sup>w</sup>)*V* (~ *n’*) ‘hand, arm’ • PW \**-n’uk<sup>w</sup>* (suff.) ‘in hand’ • PA \**-neʔk-* ‘hand, arm’

Here either *n'* or *n̄'* can be reconstructed (since the Nivkh data are absent); the symbol *O* denotes a choice between *\*i* and *\*u*; the symbol *\*L* denotes the possibility of reconstructing either *\*λ*, *\*λ'*, *λ'*, or *\*l*; the symbol *\*K<sup>(w)</sup>* denotes a choice between *\*k<sup>(w)</sup>*, *\*g<sup>(w)</sup>*, and *\*k'<sup>(w)</sup>*.

Many PAW roots seem to have “inversed” allomorphs *\*CVCV* and *\*?VCCV* (rarely *\*hVCCV*). The latter structures may represent “incorporated” root forms that were originally used as suffixal variants. Reflexes of the *?VCCV*-type allomorphs prevail in PNA. The reconstructed allomorphs of both types are divided with the double tilde (*≈*): *\*č'Ak<sup>w</sup>V ≈ \*?Ač'k<sup>w</sup>V* ‘earth, dirt’, *\*č'ək'E ≈ \*?ač'k'E* ‘tail (of fish)’, etc.

Another type of alternation, namely *\*CVCV- ~ \*CCV-*, is not infrequent in Nivkh (e. g., PNi *\*chɔŋq-ř*, *\*chqɪŋ-ř* ‘polecat, weasel’ < PNA *\*čo:nVKA*; PNi *\*ciy-r*, *\*cxə-r* ‘tree’ < PAW *\*zík<sup>w</sup>E*, etc.); most probably, this is just an internal Nivkh phenomenon, not projectible onto deeper historical levels.

The voiced lateral stop is provisionally denoted here as *λ*, as against Nikolaev 2015, where it was marked as *L*. This replacement has been made in order to avoid graphical confusion of *l* (“voiced lateral stop”) and *L* (“any lateral”).

Many of the items below are provided with short comments, although this does not extend to the examples that have already been commented upon in Nikolaev 2015. Some of the PAW and PNA protoforms have been improved upon during the preparation of this part of the article, and are slightly different from those quoted in Nikolaev 2015.

1. PNA *\*?aLVmV* (~ *ä*, *m'*) ‘dog’ • PNi *\*ajm* ‘dog (taboo)’ [instead of regular *\*\*(a)lam*; irregularity of the PNi form may be explained by a “tabooistic” mutation of the original phonetics]; NiY *\*laamə*- *O* ‘dog’ • PA *\*atəm-w-*, *-(a)?təm-w-* ‘dog’ [Cree *atim*, Men. *anɛ:m*, Ab. *alem-ós* ‘dog’; Cree *wa:p-astim* ‘white dog’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
2. PAW *\*?arV* (~ *ä*) ‘blood’ • PWN *\*?əl-k<sup>w</sup>-* ‘blood’; *\*?əl-x<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to bleed’ • Quil. *ti-č-* ‘blood’, *ti:-* ‘to bleed’ • PNi *\*ŋ-ar* ‘blood’ ◊ Cf. PSI *\*m-il'-k* ‘blood’, PS *\*m-il'* ‘to bleed’ [see PNA *\*ŋV* #268] || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
3. PAW *\*?AɬV* ‘eye’ • PW *\*G-aɬ-* ‘eye’ [with prefix of inalienable possession]; PWS (suff.) *\*(k)s-uɬ*, *-(k)s-iɬ* ‘eye’ • PAlg *\*-?eɬ* in *\*čep-?eɬ-*, *\*-čp-?eɬ-* ‘eyelash’ ◊ Cf. PS *\*-ɬ* in *\*čap-ɬ* ‘eyebrow, eyelash’ || Nikolaev 2015: 38, 48.
4. PAW *\*?A:sV* ‘face’ • PW *\*G-as-* ‘eye’ [with prefix of inalienable possession]; *\*-as*, *\*-?aw-as* (suff.) ‘cheek’ • PAlg *\*-a:s-*, *\*-e-ey-s-* (suff.) ‘head’ [PA *\*-i:t-eɬɬ-* ‘head hair’, Wi. *-as ~ -iš ~ -uš* (suff.) ‘head’] ◊ Cf. PS *\*m-?us* ‘face’, suff. *\*-us* ‘face, eye’.
5. PAW *\*?AwVNg<sup>w</sup>E* ‘duck’ • PWN *\*?əŋq-* ‘duck (generic)’ • Quil. *díq'diq'* ‘duck, mallard’ • PNi *\*awŋk* (~ *ə*) ‘duck sp.’ ◊ Cf. PSC *\*mu?q<sup>w</sup>* ‘duck (generic)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 53.
7. PAW *\*?a:gV ~ \*ya:gV* (~ *a:*) ‘all’ • PWN *\*?a:g-* ‘all, in full, every, any, each’ • PA *\*wi:-yak-* ‘some sort, all sorts’ [Men. *we:yak*, Oj. *wi:yak*, etc.] ◊ Cf. PIS *\*yəɬ* ‘many, all’.
8. PNA *\*?a:ndVXKE* (~ *ä:*, *t'*) ‘raven, crow’ • PNi *\*atk*, *\*atk-ak* ‘raven, crow’ • PA *\*a:nte:hkw-* ‘crow’ [Oj. *a:nte:kkw*, Shawnee *a:te:kw-a*, etc.].
9. PNA *\*?a:XpV* (~ *ä:*) ‘mouth (of animal)’ • PNi *\*av-ŋ* ‘mouth (of animal), palate’ • P *\*-a:hp-itk-an-* ‘jaw, chin’ [Cree *-a:p-isk-an*, Men. *-a:hp-ɛhk-an*, Ab. *od-špp-ihk-án*, etc.].
10. PAW *\*?änV* ‘year, season’ • PW *\*-?in-χ* (suff.) ‘year, season’; PWN *\*hi:-?ən-χ* ‘summer’ • PNi *\*ań* ‘year’; *\*h-on-f* ‘spring (season)’ • PAlg *\*-en-* ‘season’ in PA *\*ni:p-en-* ‘summer’, Yu. *kiš-en-* ‘be summer; summer’ [lit. ‘warm season’] ◊ Cf. PS *\*-án-ax<sup>w</sup>* (suff.) ‘season, year’ || Nikolaev 2015: 46, 54.
11. PAW *\*?ä:IVw'adVχE* ‘cloud’ • PWS *\*ti:w'aχ-* ‘get cloudy’ • PNi *\*lax* ‘cloud’ • PAlg *\*?a:lwadek-w-*, *\*?a:lewdek-w-* (~ *kh*) ‘cloud’ [PA *\*aletkw-* and *\*watkw-* ‘cloud’, Yu. *lewkw-*, *rewkw-* ‘cloudy, misty’; Wi. *?alúk-š* ‘shadow’] || Nikolaev 2015: 37.



12. PAW \*ʔä:qʷA ‘to believe’ • PW \*ʔu:qʷ-, \*ʔu:qʷ- ‘to believe’ • PNi \*aχ(-t-) ‘to believe, hope’.
13. PAW \*ʔepV ‘heart’ • PWN -ʔp(-a:) (suff.) ‘chest’, PWS \*t-’ap-at- ‘to think’ • PNi \*η-if ‘heart’ || PW \*t- is a prefix, cf. PWN \*qəl-χ- ‘egg’ ~ \*t-’əlq- ‘roe, spawn’ (#308).
14. PAW \*ʔerV ‘to vomit’ • PWS \*ʔat- ‘to vomit’ • PNi \*er-u- ‘to vomit’.
15. PNA \*ʔe:mV (~ m) ‘to flee’ • PNi \*ph-im- ‘to flee’ • PA \*-a:m-o:- ‘to flee, fly’ [WOj. *en-am-o* ‘the road goes thither’, Fox *ki:w-a:mo:-wā* ‘he flees hither and thither’, etc.].
16. PNA \*ʔEηi:pV (~ η) ‘leaf, flower’ • PNi \*eηv- ‘to flower’, \*eηv-k ‘flower’ • PA \*ani:py- ‘leaf’ [WOj. *eni:pi:-šš* ‘leaf’, Ab. *wanib-ák-w* ‘leaf of a tree’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
17. PAW \*ʔalkE (~ i) ‘to open’ • PWN \*ʔalk- ‘to open clams’ • PNi \*aly- ‘open’ • PA \*pe-a(:)tk- ‘to open’ [Cree *p-a:sk-in-am* ‘she opens it’, WOj. *p-a:kk-in-ank*, Ab. *b-óskw-en-á* ‘to open by hand’, etc.]
18. PAW \*ʔamV ‘mother, aunt’ • PWS \*ʔam(a)- ‘mother’ • PNi \*im(i)-k ‘mother; mother’s sister; father’s brother’s wife and her sister; step-father’s sister’; \*mam ‘old woman; wife’ • PA \*-i:m-at- ‘mother’ [\*n-i:m-at-a ‘my mother’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \*t-um-a? ‘mother, aunt’; PSI \*mʔam ‘woman, wife’.
19. PAW \*ʔəŋV(-kʷE) ‘fire’ • PW \*ʔan-, \*ʔanakʷ- ‘fire’ • PNi \*phl-iŋ-g ‘ashes’ • PAlg \*p(el)-en-ekw- ‘ashes, dust’ || Nikolaev 2015: 39. PAW \*ʔəŋV-kʷE ‘fire’ and the compound \*pVl-əŋV-kʷE ‘ashes’ (#300) contain the same diminutive (?) suffix as \*ʔə:wV-kʷE ‘fish egg’ #21, \*təŋV-kʷV ‘woman’ #209a.
20. PNA \*ʔə:lV (~ l) ‘to think’ • PNi \*əl-m- (~ i) ‘to think of’, NiY \*önmə- ‘mind, reason’ • PAlg \*-a:l-, \*-e:l- ‘to think, feel’ [Wi. *l-at-bit* ‘she feels so’, *l-at-a?w* ‘how she looks’, PA \*-e:l-em- ‘to think, by mind’ (cf. PAlg \*-Vm- ‘by feeling, thought’)].
21. PNA \*ʔə:wV (~ w) ‘egg, brood’, \*ʔə:wV-kʷE ‘fish egg’ • PNi \*η-əv-i ‘nest’; \*η-əw-k ‘fish egg’ • PAlg \*w-a:w- ‘egg’ [Wi. *w-á-?l* ‘roe’, Yu. *w-o:-lew* ‘spawn’, PA \*w-a:w-i, Pl. *w-a:w-al-i* ‘egg’]; PA \*w-a:hkw- ‘roe, spawn, fish egg’ [Cree *w-a:hkw-a* ‘lump of roe’, WOj. *w-a:kk* ‘roe’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \*ʔa-kʷ, \*ʔa-qʷ ‘fish roe’ || Nikolaev 2015: 50.
22. PNA \*ʔilV (~ e) ‘thus’ • PNi \*lil-η ‘indeed that, just that’ • PAlg \*ʔel-, \*ʔal-, dim. \*ʔer-, \*ʔar- ‘thither, thus, that way, like that, that sort’ [Wi. *t-əla-* ‘there, then, thus’, Yu. *s-on* ‘to be like’, PA \*eł- ‘thus, thither’, \*t-at- ‘there’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
23. PAW \*ʔi:kV (~ k) ‘hand’ • PW \*-i:k-s (suff.) ‘in/by hand’ • ? PAlg \*-e(:)k- (~ kh) ‘hand’ in Yu. *pən-ek* ‘hand measure’, *pən-ek-əh* ‘hand length’ ◇ Cf. PS \*-ak, \*-ak-a?, \*-ak-is(t) (suff.) ‘hand, lower arm’ || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
24. PAW \*ʔi:kʷV ~ \*kʷi:ʔV ‘above’ • PW \*ʔi:kʷ- ‘above’ • PNi \*khi- ‘above’.
25. PNA \*ʔipwinyV (~ ə) ‘paddle’ • PNi \*iv(i)ń ‘paddle’ • PA \*apwiy- ‘paddle’ [Cree *apw-iy*, Men. *p-i:h*, etc.].
26. PNA \*ʔiwV (~ ə, w) ‘to use’ • PNi \*iw-ri- ‘to use’ • PA \*aw- ‘to use’ [\*aw-e:w-a ‘he uses him’, \*aw-ih-e:w-a ‘he lends to him’, etc.].
27. PAW \*ʔiwʷVgʷE (~ ʒ, kʷ) ‘beforehand’ • PWN \*-ʔʷkʷ ‘beforehand’ • PNi \*iwʷik (~ d) ‘beforehand’.
28. PNA \*ʔi:LV ‘kidney’ • PNi \*η-əl-ř ‘kidney’; NiY \*al-ajə- ‘liver, kidney’ • PA \*-o:ł- (~ l) ‘kidney’ [> Ab. *-ól-ló*, Mic. *bug-əl-uön* ‘kidney’].
29. PAW \*ʔi:LV ‘mouth’ • Quil. *ʔól-it* ‘mouth’ • PNi \*əl ‘mouth’ • PAlg \*-o:ł- ‘mouth’ [Wi. *-əl-ul*, Yu. *-el-uł* ‘mouth’, *mewol-uł-ek* ‘I wipe my mouth’] || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
30. PNA \*ʔi:ńgE ‘face’ • PNi \*η-ińk ‘face’ • PAlg \*-i:ngw-, \*-engw- ‘face’ [Yu. *-ełw-ey/ -o?w-ey* ‘face’, PA \*-i:nkw-e:, \*-?kw-e: ‘face, look’].
31. PNA \*ʔi:płV ‘lip, tip of tongue’ • PNi \*əvl-(i)x ‘lip’ • PAlg \*-i:pł- ‘tongue’ [Wi. *-it*, Yu. *-ipł*, PA \*-i:ł-an-] || Nikolaev 2015: 50.

33. PNA \*ʔo:ńk<sup>w</sup>E (~ q<sup>w</sup>, X<sup>w</sup>) ‘star’ • PNi \*uńy(i)-r ‘star’ • PA \*aʔ-a:nkw- ‘star’ [Cree *ata:hk*, Men. *ana:h*, WOj. *ena:nk*, Ab. *alákw-s*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47, 50.
34. PAW \*ʔOmV ‘angry’ • PWN \*ʔəm-s- ‘bad luck’ • PNi \*um- ‘angry, be angry’.
35. PAW \*ʔOχVdAg<sup>(w)</sup>V (~ t’, k’) ‘to know how’ • PWS \*huχtak<sup>w</sup>- ‘to know how, learn, expert’ • PA \*ketk- ‘to know, recognize’ [Cree *kisk-e:y-im-e:w* ‘to know, find out’, WOj. *kekk-e:n-em-at* ‘to know, find out’, Ab. *o-gáhk-im-š* ‘he teaches him’, etc.].
36. PNA \*ʔO:čk’E ‘head, face’ • PNi \*osk ‘face’ • PAlg \*-o:čk-w-, \*-ečk-w-, \*-etk-w- ‘head’ [PA \*-etkw- ‘head’ (suff.), \*-a:n-etkw- ‘head hair’, suff. -šk-y- ‘hair; leaf, foliage’; Wi. *m-ák<sup>w</sup>-uks* ‘brains’; Yu *m-oʔ*, *m-oʔk<sup>w</sup>-oh* ‘head’], PA \*-ešk(y)-i:n-š-ekw- ‘eye’ [in this compound \*-i:n- maybe corresponds to Wi. *-alid*, Yu. *-elin* ‘eye’ < PAlg \*-li:n-].
38. PAW \*ʔü:tOq<sup>w</sup>E ‘man’ • PW \*-ʔi:t(a)χ<sup>w</sup>, \*-ʔat(a)χ<sup>w</sup> ‘man of tribe or residing at; male inhabitant of; people of, where one lives’ • PNi \*utk- ‘man, husband’ || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
39. PNA \*ʔVč’kE (~ q, X) ‘foot, leg’ • PNi \*η-əcx ‘foot, leg’ • PAlg \*-Včk-, \*-Vtk- ‘foot, leg’ [Wi. *-əčk-ač*, *-itk-əd-*, *-ətk-* ‘leg’, Yu. *-eck-ah* ‘leg’, *m-eck-es* ‘track’, *-a:ʔk-* ‘by foot’; PA \*-etk-a:t- ‘leg’, \*-ešk-, \*-ehk- ‘by foot’].
40. PAW \*ʔVda:k’A ~ \*ʔVt’a:gA ‘belly, abdomen’ • PW \*da:k’- ‘belly’ [> PWN \*tk’- (< \*dák’-), suff. \*-(s-)da:k’ɜ(-a:), PWS \*tač’ ‘belly’] • PNi \*taq-(a)l ‘fish abdomen’ • PAlg \*ʔata:γ-w-, \*ʔetay-w- ‘belly, stomach’ [Wi. *tag-əd-aʔl* ‘one’s belly’, Shawnee *hopeʔkw-ata:w-ilok-e* ‘she has a stomach ache’] || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
41. PNA \*ʔVγrV ‘skin (of animals), scale’ • PNi \*η-ayr, \*η-əyr ‘skin (of animals)’ • PAlg \*-ayl-, \*-ayr- ‘skin, scale’. [PA \*w-aʔl-ak-ay- ‘skin, scale’, \*w-aʔš-ak-ay- ‘skin’, \*-ʔam-eš-k-ay- ‘inner skin, membrane’; Wi. *w-ət-k-ay* ‘skin’; Yu. *sr-ahk<sup>w</sup>-oh* ‘loincloth’, *sl-ekw* ‘clothes (a single set)’] ◇ PS \*k’w’al’ ‘skin, feather, porcupine quill’ || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
42. PAW \*ʔVklV ‘to name’ • PW \*-kʔ- (suff.) ‘named’ [PWN \*-(x)ʔ(-a:) ‘named, called’; PWS \*-qʔ(-a:) ‘named, called; having as name’], PWN \*-kl(-a:) ‘to refer to’ • Quil. *k<sup>w</sup>ol-áʔ* ‘name’ • PAlg \*-ekl- (~ kh, g) > PA \*-eʔl- ‘narrate (sacred story) [i. e. ‘to refer to ancestors’ names’: \*a:t-eʔl-o:hk-aw-e:w-a ‘he tells a sacred story’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
43. PAW \*(ʔV:IV-)q’AwV (~ l’) ‘nose’ • PWS \*q’aw-a:n- ‘fish nose, fish nose cartilage’ [cf. the same suffix in PWS \*q’im-a:n- ‘navel’] • PA \*-e:likw-em- ‘nostrils’ [Cheyenne *-átsʔtseʔ-e:m-*, Cree *-e:yig-um*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
45. PNA \*ʔVlyak<sup>w</sup>A (~ q<sup>w</sup>) ‘squirrel’ • PNi \*laq-r ‘squirrel’, PNi \*olv-ilak ‘flying squirrel’ • PAlg \*ʔalyekw- (~ kh) ‘squirrel’ [Yu. *hey-oyek<sup>w</sup>* ‘pine/flying squirrel’, *k<sup>w</sup>ec-oyek<sup>w</sup>* ‘ground squirrel’, PA \*anyikw-a ‘squirrel’], PA \*pel-e:nyikw- ‘flying squirrel’ [Men. *penε:nik*, Ab. *planikw*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 54.
46. PAW \*ʔO:l’i:kE (~ k’) ‘wolf’ • PWN \*ʔu:l’i:k- > Kw. *ʔul’ig-ŋ* ‘wolf’ • PNi \*liy-ř ‘wolf’ || Nikolaev 2015: 54.
48. PAW \*ʔVλV:nQ<sup>w</sup>V ‘k. of berries’ • PWN \*ʔəŋq<sup>w</sup>- ‘an unidentified plant with edible red berries’ • PA \*alo:ʔk-an- (~ tk) ‘raspberry’ [Cree *ayo:sk-an*, Men. *ano:hk-an*, etc.] || PA -ʔk- in spite of \*-nk- due to assimilation with the preceding \*-ʔ-.
49. PAW \*ʔVmi:hV ‘to pray’ • PWN \*ʔəmi:ʔ-, \*ʔəmi:- ‘to pray, praise, honour, pay tribute’ • PA \*al-amih- [Cree *ay-amih-a:w*, Men. *an-a:meh-a:w*, Oj. *an-amih-a*: ‘he goes to church, prays’, etc.]; \*mamy-a:ntw- ‘to pray’ [reduplication: Fox *mam-a:t-ome:wa* ‘he prays to him’, Men. *mami-aht-omεw* ‘he prays to him, etc.].
50. PNA \*ʔVmiyX<sup>w</sup>E (~ m’, K<sup>w</sup>) ‘spoon’ • PNi \*mijx ‘spoon (wooden)’ • PA \*e:mehkw-a:n-, \*e:meškw-a:n- ‘spoon’ [Blackfoot *hámešk-o*, Cree *e:mihkw-a:n*, Men. *e:miskw-ən*, etc.].
52. PAW \*ʔE:q’VnVčV (~ η, č’) ‘k. of shellfish’ • PWN \*q’ənc-, \*q’əns- ‘chitons (sea prunes, Chinese slippers)’ • PAlg \*ʔe:h nec- (~ ch) ‘bivalve shell’ [Yu. *ʔənc-əh* ‘abalone shell’, PA \*e:hs- ‘clam, oyster’, \*e:ns- ‘any bivalve mollusk, clam’].

53. PAW \*ʔVtOk<sup>w</sup>A ‘deer’ • PWN \*tək<sup>w</sup>- ‘deer’ • PNi \*thoχ ‘elk’<sup>1</sup> • PA \*atehk<sup>w</sup>- ‘caribou’ [Cree *atihk*, Men. *ate:h*, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \*tiqiw ‘deer, elk’.
54. PAW \*ʔVwO:nV (~ η) ‘cloud, fog’ • PWN \*ʔən-u:- ‘cloud’, \*ʔu:n-q<sup>w</sup>- ‘fog’ • NiY \*niwə- ‘cloud’ [metathesis either in “Northern Nivkh” or in Proto-Yukaghir] • PA \*awa(:)n-w- ‘fog’ [Cree *awan*, Men. *awa:n*, etc.], cf. Yu. -uʔwəy ‘cloud’ || Nikolaev 2015: 37, 54.
58. PAW \*ba ~ \*pa ‘to wither’ • PWN \*pə-χ<sup>w</sup>- ‘to wither (plant, etc.)’ • PNi \*pa- ‘to wither’.
59. PNA \*baTKE (~ p’, ä, q, X) ‘partridge’ • PNi \*paxi ‘partridge’ • PA \*patk-iw-, \*patpatk-iw- ‘partridge’ [Cree *paspask-iw*, Fox *pahk-i:wa*, Ab. *bákk-ess-ó*, Miami *pahk-i-a*, etc.].
60. PAW \*bA:LQ<sup>w</sup>V ‘to sever’ • PWN \*ba:q<sup>w</sup>- ‘to separate things that are joined together (e.g. a pen and its cap)’ • PA \*paʔk- ‘to sever, break’ [Fox *pahk-wíwin-éw-a* ‘he is shedding his horn’, WOj. *pekk-on:t* ‘he skins him’, Mic. *pěšk-wít* ‘to shed the feathers’, etc.].
61. PNA \*bä:dV (~ p’, t’) ‘slow’ • PNi \*pat- ‘quiet, slow’ • PA \*pe:t-, \*pe:s- ‘slowly’ [WOj. *pe:s-ikk-a*: ‘to move slowly’, *pe:č-i:w-i*: ‘he is walking slowly’, etc.].
62. PAW \*be:k<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*pe:g<sup>w</sup>E ‘person’ • PW \*buk<sup>w</sup>-, \*bux<sup>w</sup>- ‘human being’ • Quil. *poʔó:q<sup>w</sup>*, *pó:ʔoq<sup>w</sup>* ‘person, Indian’ • PNi \*ni-vy-η ‘person; Nivkh’ • PAlg \*na(:)-pe:γw- (~ ph) ‘man, male’ [Yu. *peγ-ək* ‘man’, *peγ-it* ‘male’, PA \*na:-pe:w- ‘male’] || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
63. PNA \*be:lV ‘to walk’ • PNi \*ple-w- ‘to go for a walk’ • PAlg \*ba:l-, dimin. \*ba:r- ‘to walk, go’ [Yu. *ʔor-oy-* ‘to walk’, PA \*-pal- ‘to go, move’] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
64. PAW \*bi:rV ~ \*pi:rV ‘to scatter’ • PWN \*bi:t- ‘to pull apart (moss, etc.), to scatter’; \*bəl-χ- scatter (feathers, moss, down), to spread (roots)’ • PNi \*pir- (~ ə) ‘scattered’, \*phir-i- (~ ə) ‘spread’ ◇ Cf. PS \*pil, \*pal ‘scatter, smudge’.
65. PNA \*biγE (~ p’, ə, ɛ) ‘k. of seal’ • PNi \*piγi (~ ə) ‘seal sp.’ • PAlg \*pay- (~ ph) > Yu. *pəγ-əʔm* ‘seal’.
66. PNA \*biKE (~ p’, ə, Q, X) ‘to throw’ • PNi \*pəγ-z- ‘to throw’ • PA \*pak- ‘to throw’ [Men. *pak-e:n-ε:w* ‘she puts her down’, Shawnee *nooč-pak-il-a* ‘I throw her’, etc.].
67. PNA \*birKE (~ p’, Q) ‘to rot’ • PNi \*pirk- ‘to rot’ • PA \*pek-eškaʔ- ‘putrid, rotten’ [\*-eškaʔ ‘rot’; Cree *pik-iskat-at-iw* ‘he is putrid, rotten’, Oj. *pak-aškan-an-i* ‘be rotten’, etc.].
68. PAW \*bO ~ \*pO ‘to bleed’ • PWN \*pə-x- ‘to bleed sb.’ • PNi \*pu- ‘to bleed’.
69. PAW \*bu: ~ \*pu: ‘to go out, leave’ • PW \*bu:- ‘to leave, flee, abandon’ • PNi \*phu- ‘to go out/away’ • PA \*papa:-m- ‘to go about, pass by’ [reduplication; Cree *papa:-m-isk-a:w* ‘he goes about’, Men. *papa:-m-esk-aw* ‘he goes about’, etc.].
70. PAW \*bu: ~ \*pu: ‘to blow (with mouth); swell’ • PW \*bu-x<sup>w</sup>- ‘illegitimately pregnant’; \*bu-s- ‘to swell (esp. when pregnant)’; \*bu-t-, \*bu-ʃ- ‘to swell, swelling, to boil (tide), to bud or flower’; \*pu:- ‘to swell or blow up’ • PNi \*phu-v- ‘to blow (with mouth)’; \*pho-ηa-, \*phoη-phoηa- ‘to swell out’ • PAlg \*po:-, \*pa- (~ ph) ‘to blow with the mouth’ [Yu. *pəʔ-əh*, PA \*po:-taw-]; PA \*pa:-kih[š]- ‘to swell’ [Cree *pa:-kis-iw* ‘he is swelling’, Oj. *pa:-kišš-i* ‘be swollen’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \*paw, \*puh, \*pux<sup>w</sup>, \*pax<sup>w</sup> ‘to blow, breathe, swell’.
71. PNA \*bü:PTV (~ p’) ‘foam’ • PNi \*poft-r ‘foam’ • PAlg \*pi:pt- (~ ph, b) > PA \*pi:ʔt-e:w- ‘foam’ [Cree *pi:st-e:w*, Ab. *piht-á* ‘foam, froth’, etc.].
72. PAW \*bVN’V ‘down’ • PWN \*bən- ‘down, under, below, lower’ • PAlg \*pen- (~ ph) ‘down to the ground’ [Yu. *pen-*, PA \*pen-].
73. PAW \*cA:ʔk<sup>w</sup>V ≈ \*ʔA:ck<sup>w</sup>V ‘seal’ • PWN \*sa:ʔk<sup>w</sup>- ‘seal, seal meat’ • PAlg \*ʔa:ckw-, \*ʔe(:)ckw- (~ ch, kh) ‘seal’ [Yu. *ʔec*, *ʔeck<sup>w</sup>-oh* ‘sea-lion’, PA \*a:sk-ikw-a ‘seal’] ◇ Cf. PS \*ʔasx<sup>w</sup> ‘seal’ || Nikolaev 2015: 53.

<sup>1</sup> Borrowed into Proto-Manchu-Tungusic as \*tōKī ‘elk’. According to Anna Dybo (p.c.), Proto-Mongolic \*togij ‘grown-up elk’ is a Manchu-Tungusic borrowing.

74. PNA \**cə:wV* (~ *c*, *w*) ‘to open’ • PNi \**chiw-* ‘to open’ • PA \**ta:w-atw-* ‘to open one’s mouth, gape’ [with \**atw-* ‘to turn, round’; Cree *ta:w-at-iw* ‘he opens mouth, gapes’, Men. *ta:w-an-ew* ‘he holds his mouth open’, etc.].
75. PAW \**ci:x<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *s*) ‘rash’ • PWS \**six<sup>w</sup>* ‘rash, sores’ • PNi \**chix* ‘rash’.
76. PAW \**co:x<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**čo:x<sup>w</sup>E* ‘to leak, soak’ • PW \**ca:x<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to leak’ • PNi \**zoy-vor-* ‘to leak’ [“incorporated” form of \**chox-*] • PA \**so:k-* ‘to pour, soak’ ◊ Cf. PS \**six<sup>w</sup>* ‘to pour, spill’.
77. PAW \**c’ü:q<sup>w</sup>A*, \**c’V:cq<sup>w</sup>A* ‘small bird’ • PW \**c’i:k<sup>w</sup>-* ‘bird (generic)’; PWN \**c’asq<sup>w</sup>-*, \**casq<sup>w</sup>-* ‘any small songbird’ • PNi \**zaq* ‘chickadee’ • PAlg \**co:ck-* ‘small bird’ [Wi. *cuck-iš*, Yu. *c’uc’-iš* ‘(small) bird’] ◊ Cf. PS \**c’yaq<sup>w</sup>*, \**c’q<sup>w</sup>ay*, \**c’k<sup>w</sup>ay* ‘small bird’ || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
78. PNA \**c’aq<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**ʒaq<sup>w</sup>E* ‘to fear’ • PNi \**zig-u-* (~ *ə*) ‘to frighten, punish’ • PAlg \**ʒe:k(w)-* (~ *kh*) ‘be afraid’ [Yu. *ʒek<sup>w</sup>-eł* ‘to be afraid’, PA \**se:k-* ‘fright’].
79. PAW \**c’i:wV* (~ *č*) ‘new’ • PW \**c’u:-x-* ‘new’ • Quil. *c’á:ta* ‘new’ • PNi \**chu-ř-*, \**chi-ř-* ‘new’, NiY \**c’irov-* ‘new’ • PAlg \**ci:-*, \**ci-* (~ *ch*, *č*, *čh*) > Yu. *ca-ʒan*, *ci-n-* ‘new’ || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
80. PAW \**c’u:ɸ<sup>w</sup>A* (~ *č*) ‘to wash, clean’ • PW \**c’u:-* ‘wash’ • PNi \**cu-* ‘clean, wash’, \**chχo-j-* ‘wash, launder’ ◊ Cf. PS \**c’ab<sup>w</sup>*, \**c’aw* ‘wash, clean’.
81. PAW \**c’ü:xA* ≈ \**ʔü:c’xA* ‘sap, blood’ • PWN \**c’i:x-* > Kw. *c’ix-a* ‘boiled blood’; ? PWN \**c’i:x-* ‘lean (meat)’ • PNi \**choχ* ‘pitch, sap; blood’ • PAlg \**-ck-oʔw-*, \**-tk-oʔw* ‘blood; red’ [Wi. *-atk-aʔw-ik*, PA \**m-esk-w-i* ‘blood’, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**ciɸ<sup>w</sup>* ‘to bleed’; \**ciq<sup>w</sup>*, \**caq<sup>w</sup>* ‘to bleed; red’ || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
82. PNA \**Ci(:)* (~ *e[:]*) ‘to dry’ • PNi \**che-* ‘to dry’ • PAlg \**ce(:)-* (~ *ch*, *č*, *čh*) > Yu. *ce-ʔl-* ‘dry (adj.)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
83. PNA \**ček<sup>w</sup>E* (~ \**č*, *g*, *q*)<sup>2</sup> ‘all’ • PNi \**sek* ‘all’ [“incorporated” form of \**chek*] • PAlg \**č-ey-ak-* (~ *čh*, *ž*, *kh*, *g*) > PA \**ča:k-* ‘completely’ [Fox *čá:gǐ* ‘all’, WOj. *ča:ke-* ‘completely’, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**cuk<sup>w</sup>* ‘to be all there, be complete’ || Nikolaev 2015: 35.
84. PAW \**čik<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**č’ik<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *e*) ‘big stone, rock’ • PWN \**cək<sup>w</sup>-*, \**cəx<sup>w</sup>-* ‘rock fence, fish trap made of stones’ • PNi \**cey-ra-* ‘rock, cliff’ • PAlg \**čekw-*, \**č-ey-ekw-* (~ *čh*, *kh*) ‘big stone, rock’ [PA \**ši:kw-an-* ‘cliff, grindstone’; Yu. *cek<sup>w</sup>-eł* ‘prayer stone “seat” (semicircular wall of mortared stones)’] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
85. PNA \**či:pV* ~ \**pi:čV* (~ *š*) ‘to stretch’ • PNi \**phez-* ‘to stretch oneself’ • PA \**ši:p-* (pref.) ‘to stretch’ [Fox *ši:p-* ‘to stretch’, Men. *se:p-e:w* ‘he acts long’, etc.].
86. PAW \**či:t’V(-IV)* ‘foot, leg’ • PWS (suff.) \**-cit’-a* ‘leg, thigh’, \**-c’i:-ł* ‘foot’ • PNi \**ηə-z(i)-l* ‘foot, sole’ • PAlg \**-cit-ł-* ‘foot’ [PA \**-sit-* and secondary \**-łił-* in Wi. *-elił* ‘foot’] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
87. PAW \**či:γ<sup>w</sup>V* ‘adze’ • PWN \**cu:x<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to chip out with an adze’; \**cəx<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to adze off fine chips’; • PNi \**chiw-ř* (~ *s*) ‘adze’ ◊ Cf. PS \**cək* ‘to adze, whittle, carve’.
88. PAW \**čo:ʔxE* ‘to slip’ • PWN \**ca:ʔx-* ‘to slip, slippery’ • PNi \**chuy-* ‘slip out’.
89. PNA \**čo:nVKA* (~ *č*, *š*, *η*) ‘weasel, mink’ • PNi \**choŋq-ř*, \**chqŋŋ-ř* ‘polecat, weasel’ • PA \**ša:nkw-e:hs-* ‘mink’; \**šenkw-e:hs-* ‘weasel’ [Cree *sa:hkw-e:s-iw* ‘mink’ and *sihk-os* ‘weasel’, WOj. *ša:nkw-e:šš-i* ‘mink’, *šenkw-ass* ‘weasel’, etc.].
90. PAW \**čü:qA* ‘to melt’ • PWN \**ci:q-*, \**ci:χ-* ‘to melt (tallow), to fry’ • PNi \**choɸ-* ‘to melt, thaw’.
91. PNA \**čVXəpV* (~ *č*, *i*) ‘eyebrow, eyelash’ • PNi \**chyiv-r* ‘eyebrow’ • PAlg \**čep-ʔeł-*, \**-čp-ʔeł-* (~ *ph*) ‘eyelash’ [Wi. *čapł*, Yu. *-ełp’eł*] ◊ Cf. PS \**cəp-ł* ‘eyebrow, eyelash’ || In PAlg (and PS) compounds with PAW \**ʔAłV* ‘eye’ #3.

<sup>2</sup> Pace Nikolaev 2015: 31, reflexes of PAW hushing sounds in Proto-Wakashan should be amended to the following: \**č* > *c*; \**ž* > *ʒ-*; \**č* > *c’-*; \**š* > *s*.

92. PAW \*č'Ak<sup>w</sup>V ≈ \*hAč'k<sup>w</sup>V 'earth, dirt' • PW \*c'ak<sup>w</sup>- 'dirt' • Quil. c'iq'-á:ti 'ground, land, earth, world, territory' • PAlg \*hačk-y-, \*hečk-y- (~ čh, kh) 'earth, land' [Yu. hečk- 'on land', PA \*atky-i 'land', etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \*c'iq' 'mud' || Nikolaev 2015: 38, 54.
93. PAW \*č'ək'E ≈ \*ʔəč'k'E 'tail (of fish)' • PW \*c'ax- 'tail of a fish' • PNi \*ηə-sk 'tail fin (of a seal)' • PAlg \*-ček-w-an-, \*-č-ey-ek-an- 'tail (of fish, bird), rump' [PA \*-šekw-an- 'tail of fish'; \*-šyi:k-an- 'rump'; Wi. we-tútk 'ventral fin'; Yu. cək<sup>w</sup> 'bird's tail'; cecek<sup>w</sup> 'fin of fish'] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
94. PAW \*č'i:η'k'E ≈ \*ʔi:η'č'k'E 'head' • Quil. dók<sup>w</sup>č'-it 'head (usually fish or animals)' • PNi \*coŋy-r 'head' [the Sakh. variant coŋqr has -q-, probably under the influence of PNi \*-qəp 'neck'] • PAlg \*-ačk-w-, \*-ečk-, \*-etk- (~ čh, kh) 'head' [PA \*-etkw-, -ešky- (suff.) 'head', Yu. m-očk<sup>w</sup>- 'head'] || Nikolaev 2015: 39, 50.
95. PAW \*c'Oγ<sup>w</sup>V ≈ \*ʔOγ<sup>w</sup>ʔV (~ B<sup>w</sup>) 'to give' • PW \*c'u:- 'to give' • PA \*ʔahʒ-, \*ʔahd-, \*ʔehʒ- 'to give' [Wi. ʔəc-əb- 'give food to', Yu. ʔoʔ 'give', PA \*ahš-am- 'to give food' (\*-am- 'by mouth, to eat')] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
96. PAW \*č'Vk<sup>w</sup>V (~ k<sup>w</sup>) 'short' • PWN \*c'ək<sup>w</sup>- 'short' • PAlg \*tetkw-, \*tatkw-, \*tačkw- (~ th, čh, kh) 'be short' [Yu. tk<sup>w</sup>- 'short, low', PA \*tatkw-, \*tahkw- 'short'] ◇ Cf. PSI \*x<sup>w</sup>ic 'short' || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
97. PAW \*č'VIVyip<sup>w</sup>V, \*č'VIVyip<sup>w</sup>ə:tKE 'root' • PW \*ʔ'u:p'ak 'root' • Quil. c'á:boq<sup>w</sup>-t 'root' • PNi \*vizlix (~ -řl-) 'root'; NiY \*wađiulu: 'root' [with metathesis] • PAlg \*(wʔe-)dlayep-, \*(wʔe-)dlayepi:t(a)k- (~ th, kh) 'root' [PA \*we-tye:pitki, \*we-tye:piski, \*we-tye:piški, suff. \*-tye:petk- 'root'; Wi. ʔu-wə-lápitk-əřl, ʔu-lápitk-əřl 'roots'; Yu. ʔwə-ʔ 'root(s)', ʔwo-ʔtəp- 'eʔy' 'angelica root', ʔwə-ʔtəp-itək 'root, willow root', also ʔwo-hp-ey 'spruce root']. ◇ Cf. PS \*c'apaʔχ 'cedar root' || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
98. PAW \*dA:p'V 'dark (as the night)' • PWN \*da:p- 'dark (as the night)', ? PW \*p'ad- 'dark' [metathesis ?] • PA \*tep-etk- 'night' [lit. 'dark night': Cree tip-isk 'night', Men. tep-ε:h 'last night', Ab. deb-ókw 'night', etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \*t'əp 'dark'.
99. PNA \*dəy<sup>w</sup>V (~ i) 'opening, door' • PNi \*thi 'door; ice-hole' • PAlg \*thayw-, \*theyw- 'through an opening, passage, space, or door; out' [Wi. thig- 'out', Yur. tew-oʔn 'it breaks (of rope or string)', PA \*taw- (pref.) 'to open', etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \*təχ 'open up, branch out' || Nikolaev 2015: 55. PNi \*th- < \*t(V)X-.
100. PNA \*di ≈ \*ʔidV 'to say, tell' • PNi \*it- 'to say, tell' • PAlg \*the-l-, \*tha-l- 'to talk' [Wi. thə-l- 'to talk', Yu. t-ey-er-ew 'to talk', t-əy-əw 'to speak', PA \*ta-t- 'to tell'] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
101. PAW \*di:β<sup>w</sup>V ~ \*di:g<sup>w</sup>V (~ ä:) 'meat, flesh' • PWN \*di:q<sup>w</sup>- 'meat, flesh' in Oo. diq<sup>w</sup>my'a 'cheek meat of fish', Ha. diq<sup>w</sup>a 'diseased fish with white spots in flesh' • PNi \*tju-ř 'meat' [Am. cur, Sakh. tuř]; NiY \*cu:l 'meat' • PAlg \*thew- (~ t) > Yu. tew-on, -tew 'flesh' || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
102. PAW \*di:χV 'to defecate, urinate' • PWN \*di:χ- 'to defecate (said of an animal)' • PAlg \*dik-, (dim.)\*žik- 'to urinate, defecate' [Wi. tik-əl- 'to urinate', Yu. ʔahk-ek' 'I urinate, I piss (of men)', PA \*šek- 'to defecate, urinate'] ◇ Cf. PSI \*tk-ay' 'urine'.
103. PAW \*di:mG<sup>w</sup>E (~ q<sup>w</sup>) 'arm' • PW \*du:mq<sup>w</sup>- > PWN \*du:q<sup>w</sup>-, \*dəmq<sup>w</sup>- 'armpit' • PNi \*tamk 'hand, arm', NiY \*đirqa- 'hand, finger, paw, sole' || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
104. PAW \*dix<sup>w</sup>A (~ o) 'to jump' • PW \*dux<sup>w</sup>- 'to jump' • PNi \*tχa-rβa- 'to run, gallop'.
105. PNA \*do:nKA (~ t') 'to touch' • PNi \*toβ- 'to touch' • PA \*ta:nk- 'to touch' [Fox tá:g-eθk-əmw-ă 'he touches it with the foot', Oj. ta:nk-in-ik-e: 'he touches, catches', Mic. tək-əm-əs-i 'to strike', etc.] .
106. PNA \*dO:nXE (~ t', K) 'strong' • PNi \*tonx- 'strong' • PA \*so:nk- 'strong' [Cree so:hk-is-iw 'he is strong, resolute', WOj. so:nk-a:kk-uʔan-k 'he makes it fast', etc.] .

107. PAW \**dV* ‘demonstrative stem’ • PW \**da* ‘this, that’ • PNi \**tu-* ‘this’, \**to-ń-* ‘this (visible)’ • PAlg \**ta*, \**ti* ‘the one (known but not previously mentioned)’ [Wi. *ta* ‘the, some’, *či* ‘that’s where, what, why’, Yu. *tu?* ‘and then’, Cree *-te:* ‘(t)hither’, *-ta* ‘(t)here’, Ab. *io-dá* ‘this one (inanimate)’, etc.] Nikolaev 2015: 43.
108. PAW \**gV* ~ \**g<sup>w</sup>V* ‘demonstrative stem’ • PW \**ga:* ‘this; here’ • PNi \**ku-* ‘that (invisible)’ • PAlg \**kw-Vl-* ‘he, she, it’ [Wi. *k<sup>w</sup>-il-ǰł*, Yu. *k<sup>w</sup>-el-as*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
109. PNA \**ga:ŋV* ‘salmon, trout’ • PNi \**qaŋ* ‘trout’ • PA \**ki:ko:n-* ‘fish (generic)’ [WOj. *kiko:n*, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**kan-ax<sup>w</sup>* ‘salmon (generic term)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
110. PAW \**gälq<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**k’älq<sup>w</sup>E* ‘to urinate’ • PW \**k’alq<sup>w-</sup>* ‘to urinate (man)’ • PNi \**kiy-* ‘to urinate’.
111. PNA \**gə:p<sup>v</sup>V* ‘to stand’ • PNi \**kəp-r-* ‘to stand, stand up’ • PAlg \**ga:p-* (~ *ph*) ‘to stand’ [Yu. *-oʔop*, PA \**ka:p-*, \**kap-*] ◊ Cf. PSI \**γap* ‘to stand upright’ || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
112. PAW \**gilV* (~ *ä*, *l*) ‘three’ • Quil. *q<sup>w</sup>á:ʔl* ‘three’ • PNi \**ce-* ‘three’ [< \**kje-* < \**kle-*] • PAlg \**ni-khl-*, \**ni-khr-* ‘three’ [Wi. *dik*, *dikh-*, Yu. *nahks-*, PA \**neʔt-w-*] ◊ Cf. PS \**kaʔt-as* ‘three’ || Nikolaev 2015: 57.
113. PAW \**gilV* (~ *ə*) ‘long’ • PWN \**gəl-* ‘long, tall’ • PNi \**kil-* ‘long’ • ? PAlg \**ken-ew-* ‘long’ [Yu. *kn-ew-*, PA \**ken-w-*], where *-n-* may go back to \**-l-n-* || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
114. PAW \**go:l<sup>v</sup>V* ‘to suspect’ • PWN \**ga:l<sup>v-</sup>* ‘to suspect sb.’ • PNi \**qol-o-*, \**qol-ʋolv-* ‘to suspect’; NiY \**qolluj-* (~ *ɔ*) ‘to envy’.
115. PAW \**guLA* ‘to open’ • PWS \**kuλ-* ‘to open’ • PNi \**kul-u-*, \**kul-kul-* ‘to open eyes, stare’.
116. PAW \**gA:cV* ~ \**g<sup>w</sup>A:cV* ‘to rub’ • PWN \**g<sup>w</sup>əs-* ‘to rub, scrub, wring out (washing)’ • PA \**ka:s-*, \**kes-* ‘to rub, wipe, wash’ [Cree *ka:s-i:h-am* ‘to wipe, wash’, Men. *kes-i:hkw-an* ‘towel’, WOj. *kis-i:nkw-e:* ‘he washes his face’, etc.].
117. PAW \**g<sup>w</sup>i:g<sup>w</sup>V* ‘leg, foot’ • PW \**g<sup>w</sup>i:g<sup>w</sup>i:* ‘leg, foot, flipper’ • PAlg \**-ki:k-* (~ *kh*) > Yu. *-ekik* ‘hip(s)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 48.
118. PAW \**g<sup>w</sup>V* ‘interrogative stem’ • PW \**ʔan-ga*, \**ʔan-g<sup>w</sup>a* ‘who’ • PNi \**an-q* ‘who’ • PA \**ke:-kw-* ‘something; which?’ [Men. *kε:k-o:h* ‘something’, WOj. *ke:k-o:* ‘something’, etc.]; PAlg \**we:-kw-* ‘what’ [Wi. *k<sup>w</sup>-áʔw-a* ‘what?’, PA \**we:-kw-* ‘what is it?'] ◊ PS \**ka(n)* ‘interrogative stem (do what? do something); (be) where, how?’ || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
119. PAW \**γ<sup>w</sup>i:KV* ‘to dwell’ • PWN \**g<sup>w</sup>u:k<sup>w-</sup>* ‘to live in a place, reside, dwell, settle’, \**g<sup>w</sup>u:x<sup>w-</sup>* ‘to dwell’ • PA \**wi:k-* ‘dwell’ [Cree *wi:k-iw* ‘to dwell’, WOj. *wi:k-uw-a:m* ‘house’, etc.].
120. PAW \**γ<sup>w</sup>ulV* ‘to crawl, go on all fours’ • PW \**gul-* ‘to crawl, go on all fours’ • PNi \**ful-* ‘to crawl, go on all fours’.
121. PAW \**ga:ʔV* ‘to speak’ • PWN \**ga:ʔ-* ‘to call sb. names’ • PNi \**qla-j-* ‘speak’ • PAlg \**ga:l-*, \**ga:ʔ-* ‘to speak’ [Yu. *ʔol-oy-eʔw* ‘it calls (e.g. of a bird)’, *ʔol-oy-ok-eʔl* ‘larynx, vocal chords, throat’, PA \**kaʔ-aw-*, \**keʔ-aw-* ‘to speak’] ◊ Cf. PS \**q<sup>w</sup>al* ‘to speak, think’.
122. PAW \**GemV* ‘head’ • PW \**-gam(-ʔ)*, \**-s-Gam* ‘round thing; mask’ [originally perhaps ‘head’]; PWN \**G<sup>w</sup>u:-G<sup>w</sup>m-i:* ‘face’ [‘head-face’, compound consisting of PW \**G<sup>w</sup>u:-* ‘face’ and \**gam-* ‘head’] • PNi \**hem-i* ‘temple’ ◊ Cf. PS \**q<sup>w</sup>um* ‘head, skull, hair on head’ || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
123. PAW \**gi:gE* ‘tooth’ • PW \**gi:g-* ‘tooth’ • PNi \**khik* ‘fang’ || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
124. PAW \**Gu:lV* (~ *ʔ*) ‘k. of fish’ • PWN \**G<sup>w</sup>u:ʔ-* ‘trout’ • PNi \**qhol* ‘common rud’ ◊ Cf. PS \**qal* ‘salmon (generic)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 53.
125. PAW \**gü:cV* (~ *s*) ‘to shake’ • PW \**gi:s-* ‘to shake head’ • PNi \**qhoz-*, \**qhos-qhoz-* ‘to shake, shake head’.
126. PAW \**gü:dV* (~ *t*) ‘body’ • PW \**-gi:t* (suff.) ‘on body’ • PNi \**hut* ‘body, carcass’.
- 126a. PAW \**BAyV* ‘far’ • PWS \**χay-a:-* (~ *s-*) ‘far’ • PA \**ay-a:-k(a)w-* ‘far off’ [Men. *aya:ki:htaw* ‘far back in ancestry’, Natick *aongkóúe* ‘utmost, farthest off’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 45.

127. PAW \**B*VnV ~ \**B*<sup>w</sup>VnV (~ *n*) ‘to carry’ • PWN \**G*ən- ‘to carry in the arms’ • PA \**wen-ik-* ‘to carry on shoulders’ [Cree *on-ik-a:t-e:w*, Men. *an-e:k-an-ε:w* ‘he carries him on his shoulder’, WOj. *on-ik-e:* ‘he carries sth. over a portage’, etc.].
128. PAW \**G*<sup>w</sup>*a:(r)q*<sup>w</sup>V (~ *a:*) ‘raven’ • PW \**G*<sup>w</sup>*a:χ*<sup>w</sup>- ‘raven’ • PAlg \**ka:(h)k-*, \**kwa:(h)kw-* (~ *kh*) ‘raven’ [Yu. *k<sup>w</sup>-ey-okw*, PA \**ka:hka:k-iw-a*, \**ka:ka:k-* ‘raven’].
129. PAW \**G*<sup>w</sup>*i:* ‘whale’ • PWN \**G*<sup>w</sup>*i:-* ‘whale’ • PNi \**qe-η* ‘whale’ ◊ Cf. PS \**q<sup>w</sup>a-nis* ‘whale’ || Nikolaev 2015: 53.
130. PAW \**G*<sup>w</sup>*olyV* ‘seagull’ • PWS \**q<sup>w</sup>al-i:*, \**q<sup>w</sup>alala-i* ‘seagull’ • PNi \**qojla* ‘seagull’.
131. PAW \**B*<sup>w</sup>*i:Xq*<sup>w</sup>V (~ *rq*<sup>w</sup>) ‘to pull’ • PWN \**G*<sup>w</sup>*(u):q<sup>w</sup>-*, \**q<sup>w</sup>u:q<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to pull, tug, hoist sth. up’ • PA \**wi:hkw-* ‘to pull’ [WOj. *wi:kk-up-in-a:t* ‘he pulls him in’, Ab. *o-wihkw-en-em-én* ‘to pull in’, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**x<sup>w</sup>uk<sup>w</sup>*, \**x<sup>w</sup>uk<sup>w</sup>* ‘pull (out)’.
132. PAW \**B*<sup>w</sup>*o:lV* (~ *i:*) ‘fat (n.)’ • PWN \**G*<sup>w</sup>*u:ɬ-* ‘animal fat, tallow, marrow’ • PAlg \**wel-*, \**w-ey-el-* ‘fat (n.)’ [Wi. *-wil-ákh<sup>w</sup>-i?l-iw* ‘(animal’s) fat’, Yu. *wel* ‘fat’, PA \**wi:l-enw-i* ‘fat’] || Nikolaev 2015: 38, 53.
133. PNA \**haGA* (~ *ä*, *q*) ‘headdress, cap’ • PNi \**haq* ‘headdress, cap’ • PAlg \**?ek-* ‘hat’ [Wi. *k-ihy* ‘basketry cap’, Yu. *?ek-ah*, *?ek-ahp-* ‘hat, cap’].
134. PAW \**hay<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *ä*) ‘to yawn, open the mouth wide’ • PW \**hax-* ‘to yawn, open the mouth wide, open sth. jawlike’ • PNi \**hava-* ‘to open the mouth wide’ ◊ Cf. PS \**haw* ‘to yawn’.
135. PNA \**hapV* (~ *ä*) ‘lungs’ • PNi \**hav-[h]af* ‘lungs’ • PA *-hp-an-* ‘lung(s)’ [Cree *-hp-an*, Men. *-hp-a:n*, Ab. *o-hp-án* ‘lung’, etc.].
136. PAW \**ha3V* ‘to sneeze’ • PWN \**has-*, \**?as-* ‘to sneeze’ [also PW \**ha?ic(x)*] • PNi \**hac-hac-* ‘to sneeze’ • PAlg \**?a:č-* (~ *o*, *c*, *čh*, *ch*) > Yu. *?oc-* ‘to sneeze’.
137. PAW \**hAqAgV* (~ *k*) ‘k. of berries’ • PWN \**qək-* ‘bunchberries (*Cornus canadensis*)’ • PNi \**haqaq* ‘red bilberry’ || Nikolaev 2015: 51.
139. PAW \**ha:* (~ *a:*) ‘to go’ • PWN \**ha:-* ‘to go, move’ • PAlg \**ha:-* ‘to go’ [Wi. *kitka wi-l-á-th-um* ‘I’m going with her’, *l-a-g(i)* ‘to go’; Yu *ho:* ‘to go, travel’, PA \**-a:-* ‘to go’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
140. PAW \**hA:lGv* ‘crotch, armpit’ • PWN \**-ha:q(i):*, *-ha:g-i:* (suff.) ‘crotch’ • PAlg \**-irk-a:w-* (~ *kh*) > Yu. *-ark-ow* ‘armpit’ ◊ Cf. PS \**-aq*, \**-aq* (suff.) ‘crotch, sexual organs’.
141. PAW \**hA:sV* ‘to breathe’ • PW \**ha:s-* ‘to breathe’ • PAlg \**has-*, \**hes-* (~ *?-*) ‘to breathe’ [PA \**-aɬ-amw-* ‘breath’, Yu. *s-ew* ‘to breathe, sigh’].
142. PAW \**hA:tV* (~ *t*) ‘ear’ • PWN \**-ha:t-u:* (suff.) ‘ear’ • PAlg \**-ht-?l-*, \**-hč-?r-* ‘ear; to listen’ [PA \**-ht-aw-ak-* ‘ear’, suff. \**-ht-*, \**-hš-* ‘ear; to listen’; Wi. *-ətb-əl-úk* ‘ear’, *šáp-ər-uk-* ‘to listen’; Yu. *cp-ey-a2r* ‘ear’, *cp-e2r-oy-* ‘to listen’, *r-e2r-oy-* ‘to hear sth. as news’, *cp-ey-u2r* ‘to tell a story’] || Nikolaev 2015: 38.
143. PAW \**heGEnV* ~ \**heηEGV* ‘goose’ • PW \**hang-a:q* ‘goose’ • PNi \**iη-a* ‘merganser’ || Nikolaev 2015: 53.
144. PAW \**hək<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**k<sup>w</sup>əhE* ≈ \**?əhk<sup>w</sup>E* ‘to drink; water’ • PW \**k’a-*, \**?ak[’]w-* > PWS \**č’a-* ‘to drink’; PWS \**č’a-?ak<sup>w</sup>* ‘water’ [this PWS compound seems to have meant ‘drinking water’] • PChi \**k<sup>w</sup>a:y-*, \**k<sup>w</sup>a:w-* > Quil *k<sup>w</sup>á:ya*, Chem. *c’ó:wa*, *-c’o:* ‘water’ • PNi \**əγ-* ‘give to drink, irrigate, pour on’, \**iγ-r* ‘creek’ • PAlg \**-a:hkw-*, *-ehkw-* (~ *kh*) ‘to drink’ [PA \**men-ehkw-*, Yu *r-ek<sup>w</sup>-ohp-* ‘to drink’]; \**-a:k-awy-*, \**-ek-awy-* ‘to flow’; PA \**akw-* (adverbial stem) ‘out of/in the water’; \**-a:k-amy-*, \**-e:k-amy-* (suff.) ‘natural body of water’, \**kwa:-p-* ‘out of the water’ ◊ Cf. PS \**?uq<sup>w</sup>* ‘to drink; water’; \**q<sup>w</sup>u?*, \**qu-l*, \**qa-l* ‘water; to drink’; suff. \**-q<sup>w</sup>a*, \**-k<sup>w</sup>a* ‘water’ || Nikolaev 2015: 44, 51.
145. PAW \**həpV(IV)* ‘hair (body, facial)’ • PW \**hap-* ‘hair (body, facial)’ • PNi \**əf* ‘moustache, beard, tentacles’; \**η-əv-r-k-i* ‘body hair’ • PAlg \**-ep-l*, \**-ep-r* (facial, head) [Wi. *-əp-ɬ-* ‘hair-

- like object', Yu. *ʔlep* 'hair', PA *\*-i:ʔ-eʔ-ʔ-* 'head hair' ("head+hair"]) ◇ Cf. PSI *\*wəp* 'hair, fur, cover of grass, weed' || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
146. PAW *\*hə:ʔV* ~ *\*ʔə:hV* 'yes' • PW *\*ha:(ʔa)* 'yes' • PNi *\*hi* (~ ə) 'yes' • PA *\*e:he* 'yes', Yu. *ʔey, ʔe:, ʔe:y; ʔi:, ʔi:y* 'yes'.
147. PAW *\*hə:ymʔV* 'old' • PWN *\*-ha:mʔ-a-* (suff.) 'old, worn-out, useless' • PNi *\*həjm-ŋ-* 'old'.
148. PAW *\*hi:ʔV* (~ *e:*) 'tongue; to lick' • Quil. *ʔiʔi:-t-ot* 'tongue' • PNi *\*hil-k, \*hil-x* 'tongue', *\*hel-[h]el-* 'lick' • PA *\*-e:ʔ-any-* 'tongue' [Cree *-e:y-an-iy*, WOj. *-e:n-en-iw*, etc.] ◇ Cf. PSI *\*t-qʔ-aʔ* 'tongue' || Nikolaev 2015: 44, 48.
149. PAW *\*hi:rɣkʔE* 'louse (head)' • PW *\*G-i:xk-* 'louse' [with prefix of inalienable possession] • Quil. *wi:kʔ-is* 'louse' • PNi *\*hiʔk-r* 'nit, body louse' • PAlg *\*hihk-w-* 'louse' [Wi. *ikʔ* 'louse', Yu. *m-ohk-oh* 'head louse', PA *\*ehkw-* 'louse'] ◇ Cf. PS *\*m-əxk-n* ~ *\*m-əxkʔ-n* 'head louse' || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
150. PAW *\*hinV* (~ *e*) 'to carry' • PWN *\*hən-q-, \*hən-kʔ-* 'to carry in one's apron or blanket' • PNi *\*hin-* 'to carry on back'.
151. PAW *\*hoʔVqʔA* ~ *\*hoqʔVʔA* 'hole' • PWS *\*ʔaqʔiʔ* (also *\*qʔaqʔiʔ* 'cave' with reduplication) • PNi *\*holq-e-* 'deepening, hole' • PA *\*-a:ʔak-* (suff.) 'hole' [Fox *mak-a:nak-et-on-wa*, Oj. *mank-a:nak-it-on* 'he has a large mouth', etc.].
152. PAW *\*homV* 'to carry on back' • PW *\*ham-, \*ʔam-* 'carry on one's back, shoulders' • PAlg *\*-o:m-* 'carry on one's back' [Yu. *n-a:m-ew* 'grab in one's mouth', *n-o:ʔm* 'carry (a load)', PA *\*-o:m-* 'carry on back', etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 55.
153. PAW *\*hObV* (~ *p*) 'to dip' • PWN *\*həp-* 'to dip, immerse, dye' • PNi *\*hup-u-* 'to dip'.
154. PNA *\*hO:bV* ≈ *\*ʔO:hbV* (~ *p*) 'to tie' • PNi *\*hup-* 'to tie tightly' • PAlg *\*ʔaph-, \*ʔeph-* 'to tie' [Wi. *ʔəph-* 'to tie', Yu. *-(i)p-et-* 'bundle; to tie', PA *\*-ahp-iʔ, -it* 'to be tied', etc.], PA *\*a:p-* 'cord' [Cree *ahč-a:p-iy* 'bow', Men. *kenu-ap-i:k-at* 'it's a long string', Mic. *ab-i* 'cord', etc.].
- 154a. PNA *\*hü:mV* (~ *m*) 'to hurry' • PNi *\*mom-jo-* 'to hurry' [reduplication] • PAlg *\*him-* 'hurriedly' [Wi. *im-əratw-* 'hurriedly'; Yu. *him-ec-ok* 'I hurry', *him-en* 'quickly', etc.].
155. PAW *\*hü:xE* 'head, nape' • PWN *\*hi:x-* 'head' • PNi *\*oy-r-i* 'nape (of the neck)' || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
156. PAW *\*hV* 'demonstrative stem' • PW *\*hi:-* 'that ("empty root")' • PNi *\*hu-ŋ-* 'this ("a little farther")'; *\*ho-* 'this (remote)' || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
157. PAW *\*kA:mV* 'chief' • PWS *\*ča:m-atʔa* 'chief' [*\*č-* < PW *\*k-*] • PA *\*-kem-a:-* 'chief' [Cree *u-kim-a:w* 'chief', Fox *ʔa:kim-a:hkw-e:w-a* 'chieftain-woman', WOj. *sa:kim-a:* 'an Indian not belonging to the Grand Medicine, yet knowing medicine well', etc.].
158. PNA *\*kerčkʔA* (~ *qʔ*) 'to fish with line and hook' • PNi *\*kherqo-* 'to fish with line and hook' • PAlg *\*kačkw-, \*kečkw-, \*ketkw-* (~ *kh, th, čh*) 'to fish with hook' [Yu. *kat* 'trout fishing pole', *katk-ek* 'I go trout fishing', PA *\*kwetkw-* 'to fish with a hook', *\*me-kesk-an-* 'fish hook', etc.].
159. PAW *\*kE* (~ *g*) 'along with' • PW *\*ki* (~ *g*) > PWS *\*-či* (suff.) 'along with' • PA *\*kek-* 'along, with' [Cree, WOj. *kik-i* 'having such and such a thing', Fox *kek-ap-iw-a* 'he sits having sth.', etc.].
160. PAW *\*kElV* 'to fear' • PWN *\*kəʔ-* 'to be amazed, afraid' • PNi *\*khl-u-* 'to fear' • PA *\*kwa:l-, \*kakwa:l-* 'frightful' [Men. *kakuan-εʔnak-ε:n-eh-t-am*, WOj. *kakwa:n-issak-e:n-tam* 'he thinks it terrible', Ab. *gwáhl-ial-ew-á* 'he startles someone', etc.].
161. PNA *\*kirjʔV* (~ *q, X*) 'sun, moon' • PNi *\*kheŋ-* 'sun', NiY *\*kin(i)ʔə-* 'moon, month' • PAlg *\*k-ey-ěch-* 'sun, moon', *\*kečh-* 'sunshine, daylight' [Wi. *kačh-áʔy* 'day', Yu. *kec-iʔ* 'it is daylight', PA *\*ki:š-eʔʔwa* 'sun/ moon/ month', etc.] ◇ Cf. PS *\*kʔusən* 'star' || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
162. PAW *\*kOlxV* ~ *\*kʔOlkʔV* ~ *\*kʔwi:lkʔV* 'round' • PWN *\*kəlx-* 'round, round thing, to turn (wheel), to make sth. round' • PNi *\*kulku-ʔ* 'wheel' • PA *\*kwe:ʔk-* 'to turn, return' [Cree



- kwe:sk-in-am* ‘he turns it about’, Men. *ko:hk-aw-εw* ‘to tip over, upset’, Penobscot *kósk-ɔw-e* ‘to tip over, upset’ etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
164. PAW \**kV* ‘you (sg.), thou’ • PChi \**ki-* > Quil. *či*, Chem. *ce:ya* ‘thou’ • PNi \**chi* ‘thou’ • PAlg \**ke?*- (prefix) ‘thou, thee, thy’, \**ke?ila* ‘thou’ ◊ Cf. PS \**n-k<sup>w</sup>ə*, \**n-ɣ<sup>w</sup>ə* ‘thou (independent pronoun)’, \**?ən[ɣ<sup>w</sup>]*- ‘2nd singular possessive prefix’ \**-ax<sup>w</sup>* ‘2nd singular transitive subject suffix’, \**-k-ax<sup>w</sup>* ‘2nd singular intransitive subject affix’, etc || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
165. PNA \**kVlanVwV* ~ \**kVŋalVwV* (~ *ä*) ‘bird of prey’ • PNi \**cham-ŋ* ‘eagle’ [< \**khjam-* < \**khlanŋw-*], NiY \**comə-* (~ *ɔ*) ‘raven’ • PAlg \**ken-ey-lew-* (~ *kh*) ‘a sp. of brownish hawk’ [Yu. *knu:-u* ‘hawk’, PA \**kenliw-a* ‘eagle’] || Nikolaev 2015: 54.
166. PNA \**KičV(-KE)* (~ *Q, X*) ‘wild cat’ • PNi \**khis-k* ‘cat’ • PAlg \**ka:č-*, \**ket-* (~ *kh, th, čh*) ‘wild cat’ [Yu. *k-ey-et* ‘puma’, PA \**kaš-ak-e:ns-* ‘cat’].
167. PNA \**KVdibV* (~ *t, p*) ‘thick (cloth), tight (fabric)’ • PNi \**tip-i* (~ \**c-*) ‘tight (fabric)’ • PA \**ketp-*, \**kečp-* ‘thick (e.g., cloth)’ [Yu. *ketp-e?n* ‘it is thick (cloth, etc.)’, PA \**ketp-* ‘thick’].
168. PAW \**k’ä:* ‘negative stem’ • PWN \**k’i:-*, \**k’ə-* ‘negative stem’, PWN \**-k(a:)* (suff.) ‘un-’ • PNi \**qha-u-* ‘no, there isn’t’ • PAlg \**ka-* ‘negative stem’ [Wi. *kə-* (pref.) ‘negative’, Yu. *k-en-im-i* ‘emphatic negative’; *k-im-i* ‘negative with reference to time’; PA \**ka-* ‘negative stem’] || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
169. PAW \**k’e:ma:k<sup>w</sup>A* ~ \**ge:ma:k<sup>(w)</sup>A* ‘ring’ • PWS \**k’a:ma:k<sup>w</sup>* ‘ring’ • PNi \**kemqa* ‘iron ring on the rim of shaman’s tambourine’.
170. PAW \**k’E:šV* ‘loose’ • PWN \**k’əs-* ‘loose, to loosen’ • PA \**ke:hš-aw-* ‘loose’ [Men. *ke:hs-aw-e:hn-en*, WOj. *ke:šš-aw-iss-in* ‘to be loose on the handle’, etc.].
171. PAW \**k’ə:* ≈ \**?ə:k’E* ‘to reach’ • PWN \**-ka:* (suff.) ‘to reach, manage to do, get to or exceed limit’ • PNi \**ək-* ‘to reach’.
172. PAW \**k’inx<sup>w</sup>V* ~ \**ginx<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *e*) ‘curly’ • PWN \**k’anx<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to be curly (hair), to be curled up (in chair)’ • PNi \**kev-kev-* ‘curly’.
173. PAW \**k’i:* ≈ \**?i:k’V* • PW \**?i:k’-* ‘above’ • PNi \**khi-* ‘above’.
174. PAW \**k’i:wŋV* ~ \**gi:wŋV* ‘to freeze; cold’ • PW \**k’in-* ‘to feel cold’ • PNi \**kiŋ-* ‘to freeze, cool down’ • PA \**ko:n-* ‘snow’ [Cree *ko:n-a*, Men. *ko:n*, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**k’im* ‘cold, to freeze’ || Nikolaev 2015: 37, 54.
175. PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>a:rkA* ‘dry’ • PW \**k<sup>w</sup>a:k-* (~ *g<sup>w</sup>*) > PWS (suff.) \**-k<sup>w</sup>a:k-t*, \**-k<sup>w</sup>a:š-t* ‘dried’ • Quil. *q’i:x-* ‘dry’ • PNi \**qharχa-harba-* ‘hard, dry’ • PA \**ka:hk-* ‘dry’ [Cree *ka:hk-e:w-ak* ‘dried meat’, Men. *ka:hk-ek-εs-ow* ‘to dry’, WOj. *ka:sk-iw-ak* ‘dried meat’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 37, 50 (compared with PWN \**q’ək-* ‘to dry and pound salmon eggs’).
176. PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>ä:x<sup>w</sup>V* ‘warm, hot’ • PWN \**k<sup>w</sup>u:x<sup>w</sup>-* ‘warm’ • PNi \**qhav-* ‘hot’ || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
177. PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>e:mV* ‘to know, understand’ • PW \**k<sup>w</sup>am-* (~ *g<sup>w</sup>*) > PWS \**kam-ał* ‘known’ • PNi \**him-*, \**khim-* ‘to know, understand, realize’ • PAlg. \**k(w)a:m-* (~ *kh, o:*) > Yu. *kom-* ‘to understand, feel’ || Nikolaev 2015: 40 (PW \**χam-* > PWS \**χam-* ‘to know, know how, recognize’ and Quil. *χab-* ‘to know how’ are compared instead of PWS \**kam-ał* ‘known’).
178. PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>ə?V* ≈ \**?ək<sup>w</sup>V* ‘to jump’ • PWS \**ka?-axkat-* ‘jump’; PWN \**?ək-* ‘to jump on the surface of the water (said of whales, dolphins, fish)’ • PNi \**khi-* (~ *ə*) ‘to jump, jump on the surface of the water’ • PA \**kwa:š-kwa:š-* ‘to jump’ [Cree *kwa:s-kwa:s-kwanip-i:hk-e:w* ‘the big vein from the heart, “jumper”’, Oj. *kwa:k-kwa:š-konip-i:kk-a:n?* ‘kangaroo, grasshopper’, etc.].
179. PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>omV* ‘to stoop’ • PWN \**k<sup>w</sup>əm-* ‘to stoop, to bend the body down’ • PNi \**khun-tku-* ‘round-shouldered’.
180. PNA \**k<sup>w</sup>onV* (~ *q<sup>w</sup>, n*) ‘light; day’ • PNi \**khun-u* ‘dawn’; \**khun-u-* ‘light, transparent’ • PA \**-wi-kwen-* ‘day’ [\**neł-wi-kwen-ak-es-iw-a* ‘he is three days old’; \**nye:w-wi-kwen-i* ‘four days’; \**meta:hł-wi-kwen-i* ‘ten days’, \**-tahtł-wi-kwen-ak-atw-i* ‘it is so many days old’, etc.].

181. PAW \*k<sup>(w)</sup>EkA ‘to squeak, creak’ • PWN \*k’ək-, \*k’wək- ‘to squeak, creak’ • PNi \*keɤ- ‘to squeal’.
182. PNA \*k’wEyV (~ q’<sup>w</sup>, g<sup>w</sup>) ‘owl’ • PNi \*kiku ‘owl’ • PAlg \*kway- (~ kh) > Yu. k’wəyk’wəy-əc ‘screech owl’.
183. PAW \*k’we:pV ‘to separate’ • PWN \*k’wə:p- ‘to separate, split up, divorce’ • PNi \*vev- ‘particular’, \*vev-u- ‘to separate’.
184. PAW \*k’we:Tq<sup>w</sup>V (~ q’<sup>w</sup>) ‘lichen’ • PWN \*k’wə:ʔq<sup>w</sup>- ‘lichen’ • PAlg \*ki:kw-t- (~ kh) > Yu. kik’w-t-en- ‘moss; rotten wood’ || Nikolaev 2015: 47, 55.
185. PAW \*k’wɪVηV (~ ə) ‘worm’ • PWN \*k’wəl-p- > Ha. k’wɪbŋə ‘worm’ • PNi \*kilaŋ-a ‘snake’ and \*chŋ-a ‘viper’; NiY \*kölŋi-ʒə- ‘worm, caterpillar’ • PAlg \*ʔ(e)ye(:)-kwʔ- (~ kh) > Yu. ʔye-k’wʔ ‘maggot, worm’ ◊ Cf. PS \*q’yaλ’an ‘snail, slug’ || Nikolaev 2015: 46.
186. PAW \*k’wɪ:ʒV ‘to bend, fold’ • PW \*k’wɪ:s- ‘fold, bend’ • PNi \*khiç- (~ t) ‘bend, bow’ ◊ Cf. PS \*k’wəç- ‘to bend, twist’.
187. PAW \*k’wɪonsV ≈ \*ʔonsk’wA ‘neck’ • PWN \*k’wɪns- (~ c) ‘gill(s)’ • Quil. -q’wos ‘neck’ • PNi \*qhos-ŋ ‘neck, Adam’s apple’ • PAlg \*-sk-w- ‘neck’ [PA \*-tkw-e:-k-an-, suff. \*-Vtkw-/\*-Vkw- ‘neck’; Wi. -əsw- ‘neck’ in hi-ták’w-əsw-al-iʔ ‘she fell and broke her neck’, (hu)w-əsw-itk-əd-əʔl ‘her neck’] ◊ Cf. PS \*k’əs-pan ‘neck’ || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
188. PAW \*k’wɪoʔV ≈ \*ʔoʔk’wA ‘to sleep’ • PW \*k’wɪ- ‘to sleep, to dream’ • PNi \*qho- ‘to sleep’ • PAlg \*-i:tkw-, \*-eʔkw- (~ kh) ‘to sleep, dream’ [Yu. ka:m-iʔk’w-ok’ ‘I dream a bad dream about sth.’, etc., PA \*-enk’w ‘sleep’ < \*-en-eʔkw-] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
189. PAW \*k’wɪOcV (~ s, š) ‘wolf, wolverine’ • PWN \*k’wɪəs- ‘wolf’ • PNi \*khuz-r ‘wolverine’, NiY \*khöře(y)el ‘wolf’.
190. PAW \*la ‘to be in a position, be such as’ • PW \*la- ‘to be in a position’ • PNi \*-la (suff.) ‘to be such as’.
191. PNA \*la:gA ≈ \*ʔa:lgA (~ l’, k’, g, q’) ‘snowshoe, ski’ • PNi \*laq ‘ski’ • PA \*a:k-em- ‘snowshoe’ [Cree -a:k-im, Men. a:k-em, WOj. a:k-im, etc.]
192. PAW \*la:yVwV ‘wind; to blow (wind)’ • PW \*yu:- ‘wind; to blow (wind)’ [< \*l(V)yew-] • PNi \*la ‘wind’; NiY \*ilijə- ‘wind’ • PAlg \*lo:yew- ‘wind, to blow’ [Yu. ro:-k’w’s ‘wind’, PA \*lo:w- < \*lo:yew- ‘wind, to blow’] ◊ Cf. PS \*-al-aq (suff.) ‘wind, weather’ || Nikolaev 2015: 45, 54.
193. PNA \*link’E (~ l’, ə, q’) ‘to shake’ • PNi \*lik-lik- (~ ə) ‘to shake, tremble’ • PA \*nenenk- ‘to shake’ [Fox nenenk-əšk-a:w-i ‘it moves up and down’, Oj. ninink-ač-i ‘shiver, tremble with cold’, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \*lax<sup>w</sup>, \*x<sup>w</sup>al ‘to shake, hurry’.
194. PNA \*loŋmV (~ l’, n’, m’) ‘salmon, trout’ • PNi \*lojm(-r) ‘trout’ • PA \*nam-e:- ‘trout, sturgeon; fish’ [Cree nam-e:-w ‘sturgeon’, Fox nam-e:-ə-a ‘fish’, WOj. nem-e: ‘sturgeon’, Ab. nam-á-(o)kw ‘trout’, etc.]
195. PAW \*lu:, \*lu:-ŋ- ‘to sing’ • PWN \*nu:-, \*nəʔ-, \*nəl- ‘to sing’ • PNi \*lu ‘song’, \*luŋ-ju- ‘sing’; NiY \*loŋ-də-, \*loju-də- ‘to dance’ ◊ Cf. PS \*lul ‘to sing’.
- 195a. PAW \*lVxE ‘to slip, slide’ • PWN \*lax- ‘to slip, slide’ [probably from PW \*t-lVx-] • PNi \*ley-, \*th-ley- ‘to slide’ ◊ Cf. PS \*lix ‘slime, slimy’ || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
196. PAW \*l’Eχ<sup>w</sup>A ≈ \*ʔEχ<sup>w</sup>l’A ‘to cough’ • PWN \*l’əχ<sup>w</sup>- ‘to cough’ • PNi \*qhj-ew- ‘to cough’ ◊ Cf. PS \*ʔəχ<sup>w</sup>u? ‘to cough’.
197. PAW \*l’u:ŋ’ʒV ‘moon’ • PWN \*n’u:ʔs-i: ‘moon, month’ • PNi \*loŋ- ‘moon’, NiY \*jä-lo<sup>n</sup>:ʒə ‘sun’ || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
198. PAW \*la ‘near’ • PW \*la- ‘near’ • PNi \*la-ɤ- ‘near’, -le- (postpos.) ‘near’ || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
199. PAW \*la: ‘to stand’ • PW \*la:- ‘to stand’ • PNi \*la-r- ‘to get up on the back paws’ • PA \*la-m-at- ‘to stand up, erase’ [\*we-ʔam-ač-i- ‘he stands erect’, \*ne-ʔam-at-en-e:n-i ‘I erect it, erase it’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.

200. PAW \**la:ŋg<sup>w</sup>V* ‘to borrow’ • PWN \**la:k<sup>w</sup>-* (/ *li:k<sup>w</sup>-*) ‘to borrow’ • PNi \**laŋ-r-* ‘to borrow’.
201. PAW \**li:g<sup>w</sup>E* ‘spiritual power’ • PW \**lu:g<sup>w</sup>-* ‘supernatural power’ • PNi \**liy-i-* ‘omnipotent (shaman)’.
202. PAW \**lo?V* ‘together’ • PW \**la?u(:)* ‘(with) another’ • PNi \**rolo* ‘mutually, together’ [reduplication ?].
203. PAW \**li:χV ~ \*λ’ü:χV (~ q)* ‘skin, fur’ • PWS \**λ’iχ-aq* ‘skin, fur’ • PAlg \**lo:k-* (~ *kh*) ‘skin, feather’ [Yu. *r-ey-o?* ‘feather’, PA \**to:k-* ‘hide, skin’] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
204. PAW \**λe:xE ≈ \*?e:λxE* ‘to look for, watch’ • PWN \**λa:x-* ‘to look for lice’ • PNi \**khi-* ‘to wait’ • PAlg \**?ekt-, \*?etk-* ‘to watch’ [Wi. *kʔ-* ‘to watch’, Yu. *ʔk-y-* ‘to look at, watch’, PA \**aʔk-* ‘to wait, lie in ambush’] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
206. PAW \**λik<sup>w</sup>E (~ ə, g)* ‘to notch’ • PWN \**λək-* ‘to notch’ • PNi \**tək-* ‘to notch’ [cf. borrowed Pit \**lök-əl* ‘notch, mark’].
207. PAW \**λ’imqA (~ e, ɔ)* ‘to hop on one foot’ • PWN \**λ’amq-* ‘to hop on one foot’ • PNi \**teɕ-* (~ *c*) ‘hop on one foot’.
208. PAW \**λ’i:rqE* ‘cold, to freeze’ • PWN \**λ’u:χ<sup>w</sup>-* ‘ice; to ice up, to freeze, to congeal’ • PNi \**lakri-* ‘to chill’; NiY \**lérkə-* (~ *j-*) ‘to shiver with cold’ • PA \**tahk-* ‘cool, cold’ [Cree *tahk-a:k* ‘when it is cool’, Fox *tahky-a:w-i* ‘cold’, Men. *tahk-i:k* ‘when it is cool’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \**λ’ax<sup>w</sup>* ‘cold (object)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
209. PAW \**λ’og<sup>w</sup>E* ‘to kneel’ • PW \**λ’ak<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to kneel, to lean in the elbow, to push with the knee or elbow’ • PNi \**luk-* ‘to kneel, bow’.
- 209a. PAW \**ʔänV-k<sup>(w)</sup>V ≈ \*?äʔŋV-k<sup>(w)</sup>V* ‘woman’ • PW \**ʔuk-* ‘woman’ • PNi \**ʔanq* ‘woman’ [“incorporated” form of \**thanq*] • PAlg \**?aʔkw-, \*?etkw-* (~ *kh*) ‘woman, female’ [Yu. *?əʔk-əh* ‘bitch’, PA \**eʔkw-e:w-* ‘woman’] ◇ Cf. PS \**ʔan-ay* ‘woman’ || Nikolaev 2015: 45. PAW \**ʔänV-k<sup>(w)</sup>V* contains the same diminutive (?) suffix as ##19, 21, 19, 300.
210. PAW \**ʔi:hV ≈ \*?i:hʔV (~ e:)* ‘to lie’ • PWN \**ʔi:-* ‘to lie (said of many people)’ • PAlg \**-Vhʔ* ‘to lie, fall’ [Wi. *-ʔ-*, PA \**-hʔ-* ‘to fall, lie’] || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
211. PAW \**ʔi:yV* ‘thunder’ • PWS \**ʔu:-t-* ‘thunder’ • PNi \**liʔ* ‘thunder’.
212. PAW \**ʔOx<sup>w</sup>V* ‘almost, all the time’ • PWN \**ʔu:x<sup>w</sup>-* ‘almost (happening)’ • PA \**ʔaxk-, \*ʔehk-* ‘all the time, long time’ [Cree *tahk-i* ‘all the time’, Fox *nehk-i* ‘so long a time as’, etc.].
213. PAW \**ʔVq<sup>(w)</sup>E ≈ \*?Vʔq<sup>(w)</sup>E* ‘bone’ • PWN \**ʔəq<sup>w</sup>-*, \**λ’əq<sup>w</sup>-* ‘pit (in fruit); inside of sea eggs (urchins); brain’ • PNi \**ŋ-ək* ‘gristle’ • PAlg \**-Vʔk-* ‘bone’ [Wi. *w-əʔk-əd-át*, Yu. *?w-əʔk-ə?*, PA \**w-eʔk-an-, \*-k-an-*] || Nikolaev 2015: 36, 48.
214. PNA \**manqA (~ m’, ä, k’, q’)* ‘big, main’ • PNi \**manq-* ‘strong, main’ • PA \**mank-* ‘big’ [Cree *mama:hk-* ‘big’, WOj. *menkw-akk-em-ik-ess-in* ‘it has mounds’, *mema:nk-e-* ‘big’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
215. PAW \**ma:* ‘near’ • PWN \**ma:-k-* ‘near, next to, close’ • PNi \**ma-* ‘near, close’; NiY \**mi(ä)-kə* ‘near’ • PA \**ma:-ʔ-* ‘side by side, in a row’ || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
216. PNA \**ma:lV (~ m’, ä:)* ‘many’ • PNi \**mal-ɕ-*, \**mel-ɕ-* ‘numerous’ • PA \**ma:l-* ‘many, much’ [Fox *má:n-εw-ä* ‘many’, WOj. *men-ikk* ‘many, much’, Ab. *mel-óhs-és* ‘very old man’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
217. PAW \**ma:lV (~ ä:)* ‘berry, fruit’ • PWN \**ma:ʔ-* ‘fruit’, \**mäl-k-* ‘berry’ • PAlg \**mal-o:-*, \**mel-o:-* ‘k. of berry; wild rice (*Zizania* sp.)’ [Yu. *men-o-men* ‘Juneberry’, Fox *man-o:-min-i* ‘rice’, Men. *man-o:-mən-an* ‘wild rice; oats’, Ab. *mal-o-mön* ‘wheat’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 51.
218. PAW \**mä:ʔV ≈ \*?ä:ʔmV* ‘to smell’ • PW \**mi:-s-* ‘to smell’ • PAlg \**-a:ʔm-* (~ *o:*) ‘to smell, by smell’ > Yu. *-oʔm-* ‘to smell’; PAlg \**mey-a-* > PA \**mya:-* ‘to smell’ [Men. *wi:ki-mya:kwat* ‘it smells good’; Cree *wi:hki-ma:me:w* ‘he likes the smell of him’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \**hum* ‘to smell, sniff’.
219. PAW \**me:* ‘two’ • PW \**ma:ʔta* ‘two’, PWN \**mə-t-* ‘twins’ • PNi \**mi-*, \**me-* ‘two’-, NiY \**mä:l-* ‘two’ || Nikolaev 2015: 44.

220. PAW \**mE*: ‘to flame, fire’ • PWN \**mi*:- ‘to flame’ • PAlg \**me*-*hs*- ‘fire’ [with diminutive suffix: Wi. *bə*-*s*, Yu. *me*-*c*, PA \**me*-*hʦ*-] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
221. PAW \**məʔV* ≈ \**ʔəmʔV* ‘to hear’, \**ʔəmE-IV* ‘ear’ • PWS \**-ʔamiʦ* (suff.) ‘ear’ • PNi \**m-la* ‘ear’, \**mi*- ‘hear, listen’ • PAlg \**-Vʔm-* ‘by hearing (also ‘by thought’) in Yu. *k-o(ʔ)m-* ‘hear’ (also ‘understand, feel’), Wi. *k-ən-iʔm-iʦ* ‘hear’, PA \**pe:m-t-*, \**no:m-t-* ‘hear’ (< \**pe-em-*, \**no(:)-Vm-*) || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
222. PAW \**mə:rV* ‘to swim’ • PWN \**ma:ʦ-* ‘to swim’ • PNi \**mrə-* ‘to swim (human, animal), bathe’; NiY \**mör(i)-* ‘to swim’ • PAlg \**-o:l-* ‘to swim’ [Wi. *-úl-*, Yu. *-ur-*] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
223. PAW \**mə:x<sup>w</sup>E* ‘sea lion’ • PWN \**ma:x<sup>w</sup>-* ‘sea lion’ • PNi \**miγ-r-3* (~ *ə*) ‘sea lion’ || Nikolaev 2015: 53.
224. PAW \**mi*: (~ *ä*:, *ü*:) ‘leaf, berry’ • PWN *mi*:- ‘leaf’ • PAlg \**me-n-*, \**m-ey-en-* ‘berry, berries’ [Yu. *men-o-men* ‘Juneberry’, PA \**mi:n-*, *-min-* ‘berry’].
225. PNA \**mi*: ≈ \**ʔi:mV* (~ *m*) ‘to give’ • PNi \**kh-im-*, \**im-* ‘to give, hand over’ • PAlg \**mi:l-* ‘to give’ [Wi. *bi-l-* ‘to divide and distribute’, PA \**mi:l-* ‘to give to sb.’] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
226. PAW \**miχE* ≈ \**ʔimχE* ‘hair, feather’ • PWN \**məχ-* ‘long feather of eagle’ • PNi \**η-əmx* ‘head hair; animal hair’ • PAlg \**mekw-*, \**m-ey-ekw-* (~ *kh*, *g*) > PA \**mi:k-w-an-*, \**-[m]ik-w-an-* ‘feather’ [Woj. *mi:(n)kw-an*, Ab. *migw-én*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
227. PNA \**mo:ryV* (~ *m*) ‘to die’ • PNi \**mu-*, \**muj-v-* ‘to die’ • PAlg \**ma:hy-* ‘to die’, \**meh[y]-t-* ‘to kill’ [Yu. *moy-k-ek* ‘I die’, PA \**meʔ-t-ekw-a:py-* ‘bow, bowstring’, \**mi:-ʦkw-ahw-e:w-a* ‘he hits him with missile’, Fox *méh-t-ahw-èw-ǎ* ‘to shoot’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
228. PNA \**mOmcka* (~ *m*, *Q*, *X*) ‘shoe’ • PNi \**momsq* (~ *ʔq*) ‘women’s footwear’ • PA \**matk-es-en-* ‘shoe’ [Cree *mask-is-in*, Woj. *mekk-is-in*, Arapaho *woʔ-óh* ‘moccasin, shoe’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 55.
229. PAW \**mulq*<sup>(w)</sup>*E* ‘bear’ • PWS \**mucmuχ-aq* ‘bear’ [reduplication] • PNi \**molk* ‘Asian black bear’<sup>3</sup> • PA \**matk-w-* ‘bear’ [Cree *maskwa*, Fox *máhkwa*, Mic. *-skw*, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**miχat* ‘black bear’.
230. PAW \**mu:wV* (~ *o*:) ‘deer, elk’ • PWS \**muw-ač* ‘deer’ [-č < PW \**-k*] • PAlg \**mo:w-*, \**mew-* ‘elk’ [PA \**mo:-szw-* ‘elk, moos’, Yu. *mew-iʦ* ‘elk’].
231. PAW \**mü*: ‘dirt(y)’ • PWN \**mi:-q<sup>w</sup>-* ‘dirty, muddy (said of water)’ • PA \**my-e:y-i* ‘piece of dung, dropping’; PA \**mo:w-* ‘dirt, dung’ [Fox *mo:w-a:w-i* ‘soiled’, Woj. *-mo:w-an* ‘droppings’, Shawnee *mo:w-i* ‘manure’, etc.].
232. PNA \**mVNVCV* (~ *m*, *N*) ‘spiritual power’ • NiY \**mönca* ‘spiritual power’ • PA \**maneto:-* ‘spirit’ [Cree *manito:w*, Woj. *menito*: ‘manitou’, Fox *máneto:w-i-* ‘sacred’, etc.] ◊ PS \**naʔm* ‘shaman (power)’.
233. PAW \**m’a* ‘to touch with the hands’ • PW \**m’a-* ‘to touch with the hands’ • PNi \**ma*, \**ma-n-* ‘big span (distance between toe and little finger)’.
234. PAW \**m’a:hV* ≈ \**ham’V* ‘to eat’ • PW \**ham-* ‘to eat’, \**m’a-* ‘to bite, hold in teeth’, PWS \**m’a-* ‘to bite’; \**ma:-c-*, \**ma(:)-s-* ‘to eat as side dish’ • PNi \**am-* ‘(fish)bait’; \**əm-x*, \**əm-k* ‘mouth’ • PAlg \**ʔam-w-* ‘to eat’, \**-Vm-* (suff.) ‘by mouth, eating, biting’; PA \**mo:[h]w-*, \**mi:t-* ‘to eat’ ◊ Cf. PS \**ʔum-*, \**ʔam-*, \**m-* ‘to feed, food’; \**ma-l* ‘(fish)bait’; PSC \**ma-k<sup>w</sup>* ‘to eat, put into mouth, chew’ || Nikolaev 2015: 38.
235. PAW \*(*ʔV*)*m’A:nšV* ‘flower, berry’ • PW \**ma:s-* > PWN \**ma:s-* ‘blossom, flowers’; Noo. *m’aš-*, *m’a:yi* ‘young green shoots of salmonberry bush’ • PA \**eminšy-* ‘fruit, berry, or nut-bearing tree’ [Fox *-emiš-i*, *-(e)mišy-*, Men. *-emeh*, *-emehsy-*, etc.].

<sup>3</sup> Cf. such Manchu-Tungusic forms as Evenki *mōdikā*, Manchu *možixan*, Negidal, Ulchi *monoko(n)* ‘Asian black bear’, which have no Altaic etymologies.

236. PAW \*m'A:w'V 'to load' • PW \*m'aw'-u 'to load, transport, deliver' • PAIg \*-*[m]i:w-er*, \*-*[m]i:w-ar* (suff.) 'load, burden' [Wi. -*ul-aw-*, Yu. -*u:l-*, PA \*-*i:w-ał-*, \*-*i:wetł-*].
237. PAW \*m'äw<sup>w</sup>E 'blue' • PWS \*m'uk<sup>w</sup>- 'blue' • PNi \*mawka- 'dark blue'.
238. PAW \*m'e: ≈ \*ʔe:m'V 'earth, land' • PWS \*nis-m'a-k 'land, country', PWN \*-*g-m'a:-* 'tribe' • PNi \*mi-f 'land, place'; \*mami 'clay', \*or-mi 'clay' • PA \*-*a:m-ehkw-* 'earth, soil' [Fox -*a:m-ehk(w)-*, Shawnee -*a:m-ełk*, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \*-*mi-x<sup>w</sup>* 'earth, land, ground' || Nikolaev 2015: 38.
239. PAW \*m'i (~ e) 'we' • Quil. *lo-bá:ʔa*, Chem. *má:ʔa-ł* 'we' • PNi \*me- 'we' ◊ Cf. PS \*n-*ʔim-* 'we' || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
240. PAW \*m'O:ʔV ≈ \*hO:ʔm'V 'below' • PWN \*-*(a:)m'u:* 'underlying or implicated in' • PAIg \*hiʔm-*eli* 'below' [Wi. *iʔm-əl-*, Yu. *him-ar*].
241. PAW \*na ≈ \*ʔanV 'interrogative stem' • PW \*ʔa-g<sup>w</sup>a-, \*ʔən-g<sup>w</sup>a- 'who?' • Quil. *ta-qá:* 'who' • PNi \*an-q 'who', \*an- 'who; where', \*na-r 'who' ◊ Cf. PS \*ʔin-*wa-t*, \*ʔin-*wa-n-* 'to say what? (interrogative verb)'.
242. PNA \*nabV (~ n', ä, p) 'early' • PNi \*nap- 'early' • PAIg \*neP-t- > PA \*neʔ-t-*am-* 'earliest, first in time' [Cree *nis-t-am*, WOj. *net-t-am* 'first', etc.].
243. PAW \*ni:K<sup>w</sup>V 'k. of fur game' • PWN \*nu:k<sup>w</sup>- 'fur seal' • PAIg \*ni:kw- (~ kh) > Yu. *nik<sup>w</sup>-ec* 'grizzly bear'
244. PAW \*no: 'to hear' • PW \*na:- 'to hear' > PWN \*na:- in Kw. *nanaGiga* 'to obey'; PWS \*naʔa:- 'to hear; sense'; \*nayı- 'echo' • Quil. *ʔò:lá:-x-at*, suff. -*la-x* 'ear' • PNi \*no-s 'ear' • PAIg \*no(:)-*Vm-t-* > PA \*no:-*nt-* 'to hear' [Men. *n-o:ht-am*, WOj. *n-o:nt-am*, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \*t-*ʔan-iʔ*, \*t-*ʔan-aʔ* 'ear', suff. \*-*an-iʔ*, \*-*an-aʔ* 'ear(side)'; ? \*q(-)*an* 'to hear'.
245. PAW \*nowgE (~ k') 'to wait' • PW \*nawk- 'to be anxiously expecting sb. who is late, to be worried when sb. is late' • PNi \*nuk-nuk- 'wait for'.
246. PAW \*nowV ≈ \*ʔonwV 'to suck; breast' • PWS \*ʔanma 'breast; to suckle' • PNi \*mo-mo- 'to suck' [reduplication]; \*mo-c- 'to suck, kiss', \*mo-c 'breast (female)' • PAIg \*new- 'to suck' [Wi. *du-n-ač-* 'to suckle', Yu. *new* 'breast milk', PA \*no:-*n-* 'to suck, suckle'] || Nikolaev 2015: 47. PNi \*mo- < \*\**nwo-*.
247. PAW \*n'i: (~ n', e) 'down' • PW \*-*n'i-(?)i:s*, \*-*ni-c-'i(:)s* (suff.) 'down to beach' [cf. PW \*-*hi:s* 'on beach'] • PA \*ni:-*ht-* 'down' [Cree *ni:-ht-in-am* 'to lower', WOj. *ni:-ss-ey-aʔ-i:* 'below the place', Ab. *le-ss-ín* 'he lies down', etc.].
248. PAW \*n'i:n'V (~ n') 'k. of bird' • PWS \*n'i:n'-*i(:)č-*, \*n'ayn'-*ays-* 'small bird' • Quil. *dí:d-oʔos* 'bird (generic)' • PA \*nen-*emeXk-* 'small bird' [Fox *nen-emehk-i:w-a* 'thunderbird', WOj. *ne:n-o:kk-a:ss-i* 'hummingbird', etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \*ninaʔ 'great horned owl' || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
249. PAW \*n'o:lV 'to fly' • PWN \*n'al- 'to fly' > Kw. *n'ł-xʔid*, *nł-xʔid* 'to fly' • PNi \*nul-*jo-* 'to hurry' • PAIg -*[n]a:l-*, \**[n]el-* 'to fly' [Wi. -*al-*, Yu. -*ol-*, -*el-*; PA \*-*iʔ-l* 'to fly' with incorporated PAIg \*-*ip-* 'speed'] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
250. PAW \*n'OLK<sup>(w)</sup>V (~ n') 'hand, arm' • PW \*-*n'uk<sup>w</sup>* (suff.) 'in hand' • PA \*-*nełk-* 'hand, arm' [Cree *kihči-nisk* 'right arm', Fox -*nehk-i*, WOj. *nik* 'arm, hand', Mic. -(*i*)*nsk-ə-* 'arm', etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
251. PAW \*ná:g<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*ná:g<sup>w</sup>TV 'night' • PWN \*ni:k<sup>w</sup>-, \*nək<sup>w</sup>- 'night, at night' • PNi \*ńak-r (~ ə) 'night' • PAIg \*neyt-, \*neyč- 'last night' [Wi. *dəc-əw-* 'night', Yu. *nahsc-* 'night, evening'] ◊ Cf. PS \*nat 'night; 24 hour period' || Nikolaev 2015: 41, 48.
252. PNA \*neyV (~ n') 'to carry' • PNi \*ńe- 'to put on head or shoulders' • PAIg \*nay-, \*ney- 'to carry' [\**nay-o:m-* > Yu. *na:-m-* 'to carry'; *nonow-* 'to fetch, invite'; PA \**nay-* 'to carry', \**na:-t-*, \**nená:-t-* 'to fetch', etc.].
253. PNA \*ńi: (~ n') 'to eat' • PNi \*ńi- 'to eat' • PAIg \*no:-*n-* > Yu. *nu-n-* 'to feed, food' || Nikolaev 2015: 47.

254. PAW \**nV* 'I' • PW \**nu:-* 'I; we' • Quil. *lá:-b*, Chem. *lá:-ʔaʔ* • PNi \**ni* 'I'; \**ni-ŋ* 'we (excl.)' • PAlg \**neʔ-* (pref.) 'I, me, my', \**neʔ-il-a* 'I (independent pronoun)' ◊ Cf. PS \**n-ca*, \**ca-naʔ* [with deictic particle \**ca*] 'I (independent pronoun)'. || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
255. PAW \**n'AbV* (~ *p*) 'to die' • PWS \**n'ap-xt-a:-* 'to die instantly from blow' • PNi \**pnu-* 'to die (about twins)' [metathesis of \**np-u-*] • PA \**nep-* 'to die' [Cree *nipiw*, Men. *nepuah*, WOj. *nempo*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
256. PAW \**n'e:(wV)* 'to see, look' • PW \**n'a:-* in \**n'a:-k-* 'to look', PWS suff. \**-in'aw-χ* 'seeking', PWN \**n'u:-* 'to aim' • Quil. *da-q<sup>w</sup>ó:* 'eye' • PNi \**nu-* 'to look, watch', \**n-ři-* 'to see; find', \**na-χ* 'eye', \**ni-saχ* 'tears', \**n-xir* 'eyelashes', \**ni-t-* 'to aim'; NiY \**nu(y)ə-* 'to see, find', \**nojdi-* 'watch, guard' • PAlg \**ne:-w-*, \**na-w-* 'to see' [Yu. *new*, PA \**ne:w-*, \**naw*]; \**nenʔ-* 'to look for' [Yu. *ni:ʔn*]; \**na-*, \**ne-* 'by sight' [PA \**-n-* 'by sight', \**na-t(a)w-* 'seek, hunt'], etc. || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
257. PAW \**n'ə* 'one' • PW \**n'a-m* 'one' • PNi \**ni-*, \**ni-ŋ* 'one'; \**nuyi* 'first, fore' • PAlg \**ne-kweht-* ~ \**ne-kwehc-* 'one' [compound "one+half"], PA \**ne-hš-ihk-e:w-* 'alone', \**na-y-* 'only; all in one place', \**na-w-at-* 'first' ◊ Cf. PS \**na-k*, \**n-k'u* 'one, another', \**na-qas* 'one' || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
258. PAW \**ŋAGA* (~ *q*) 'snow' • Quil. *laq-* 'to snow' • PNi \**ŋaq-r* 'snow'.
259. PAW \**ŋa:hV* 'beast of prey' • PW \**na:n(a)* 'grizzly bear' • PNi \**ŋa* 'animal, beast' • PA \**mah-* 'wolf' [Cree *mah-i:hk-an*, Men. *mah-w-ε:w*, etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**my-aw* 'large feline or canine (fox, coyote, lynx, cougar)' || Nikolaev 2015: 53.
260. PAW \**ŋa:ʔx<sup>w</sup>A* 'vulva' • PWN \**na:ʔx<sup>w</sup>-* 'vulva' • PNi \**malχ* 'female privy parts'; \**mulk* 'privy parts of a girl' [PNi \**m-* instead of \**ŋ-* perhaps due to "tabooistic" mutation of the original phonetics].
261. PNA \**ŋä:cV* (~ *c*) 'track, trail' • PNi \**ŋaz-i-f* (~ *ə*) 'track' • PA \**ma:t-* 'track, trail' [Cree *ma:č-i:w* 'he hunts', WOj. *ma:t-eʔ-att-o:t* 'he starts to follow its trail', etc.].
262. PAW \**ŋə:ʔyV* 'valley, shoal' • PWN \**na:ʔ-x-* 'swampy, soggy underfoot, quicksand' • PNi \**ŋij* 'valley; shoal, sandbank'.
263. PAW \**ŋi:rg<sup>w</sup>V* 'k. of berries' • PWN \**nək<sup>w</sup>-* 'salal berry' • PAlg \**mihkhw-* 'salal berry' [Wi. *bikh<sup>w</sup>-əl*, Yu. *mahkew* 'salal', *mahk-uʔ* 'salal berry'].
264. PAW \**ŋigE* (~ *k*) 'rock, clod' • PW \**nuk-* 'mountain' • PNi \**ŋik-r* (~ *ə*) 'clod' || Nikolaev 2015: 43, 54.
265. PNA \**ŋOk<sup>w</sup>A* (~ *ŋ*, *q<sup>w</sup>*, *X*) 'fat, grease' • PNi \**ŋoχ* 'fat (n.)', \**ŋiy-l-* 'fat (adj.)' • PA \**makw-* 'grease' in \**makw-ehš-e:w-en-i* 'feast, banquet' || Nikolaev 2015: 38.
266. PNA \**ŋOlyV* (~ *ŋ*) 'path, road' • PNi \**ŋol* 'path' • PAlg \**mey-e:-* > PA \**mye:-* 'road, trail' [Cree *me:-sk-an-a:w* 'trail, road', WOj. *mi:-kk-an* 'road', etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
267. PAW \**ŋü:šV* 'full' • PWS \**nis-* 'be full, satiated' • PA \**mo:š-k-* 'full, to fill' [Cree *mo:s-k-i-*, Fox *mo:(h)š-k-i-*, WOj. *mo:š-k-i-* 'to fill', *mo:š-k-eʔ-an* 'it is flooded', etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
268. PNA \**ŋV-* (~ *ŋ*) 'prefix: inalienable possession' • PNi \**ŋ(a)-/ŋ(ə)-* prefixal morph in many body part terms<sup>4</sup> • PAlg \**m(V)-* 'indefinite possessor of inalienable nouns (body parts, tree, close relatives, louse and dog)' [Wi. *b-*, Yu. *m-*, PA \**m-*] ◊ Cf. PS \**m(ə)-* 'prefixal morph in many body part terms and "inalienable" nouns' (\**mə-qsn* 'nose', \**m-əxk'n* 'louse', etc.).

<sup>4</sup> PNi \**ŋəcx* 'foot, leg', \**ŋaf* 'side, rib, hip', \**ŋaŋn* 'cheek', \**ŋaŋr*, \**ŋəŋr* 'skin (animal)', \**ŋəvri*, \**ŋəvri* 'shoulder; rib', \**ŋəys*, \**ŋəyər* (~ *ř*) 'tooth', \**ŋəzř* 'skin (of paw)', \**ŋəlŋər* 'palate', \**ŋəłř* 'kidney', \**ŋəltir* 'side, rib', \**ŋəmaʔ* 'skin (of seal)', \**ŋəmx* 'hair', \**ŋəny(ə)f* 'bone', \**ŋər* 'blood', \**ŋəyər* 'breast; wing', \**ŋərm* 'side, rib', \**ŋəraqi* 'milt', \**ŋəsk* 'tail (of seal)', \**ŋəski* 'back, backbone', \**ŋəvřki* 'hair (body), fur', \**ŋəw* 'intestines', \**ŋəwk* 'spawn', \**ŋəwr(-k)* 'brain', \**ŋəz(ə)l* 'foot, sole', \**ŋəzf* 'gut (of animal)', \**ŋəz-r*, \**ŋəz-aq* 'blood vessel', \**ŋəχ* 'milt', \**ŋəjv* 'back side of hand', \**ŋək* 'gristle', \**ŋəm* 'belly', \**ŋənik* 'face', \**ŋəziy* 'hind paws (of seal)', \**ŋif* 'heart', etc.

269. PAW \**ŋ'a*: 'to go with, go and do' • PW \**n'a*:- 'go (with)' • PNi \**ŋa*- 'go (for some purpose)' • PAlg \**ma*, \**me* 'to go and do' [Wi. *b*- 'to go to do', Yu. *me*- 'went and did', PA \**ma-w*- 'to go and do sth.'].  
 270. PAW \**ŋ'a:gE* (~ *k*') 'tail' • PW \**na:k*- (~ *n*') 'tail of fish or bird' • Quil. *-doq<sup>w</sup>* 'fishtail' • PNi \**ŋaki* 'tail'; NiY \**laqi-l*, \**l*- 'tail of animals' ◊ Cf. PS \**-anak* (suff.) 'tail, anus, buttocks' || Nikolaev 2015: 43.  
 271. PAW \**ŋ'i*: 'k. of fur game' • PWN \**n'a:-λ'*- 'wolverine' • PNi \**ŋi-ŋ* 'otter' || Nikolaev 2015: 54.  
 272. PAW \**ŋ'i:mV* ~ \**m'i:ŋV* 'all' • PWS \**n'u:m'(a)*- 'all' • PNi \**miŋ*- (~ *ə*) 'wholly' || Nikolaev 2015: 35, 50.  
 273. PAW \**ŋ'i:q<sup>w</sup>V* 'to swallow' • PW \**n'uq<sup>w</sup>*- 'to swallow' (cf. \**n'a:q*- 'drink') • PAlg \**mi:k(w)*- (~ *kh*) > Yu. *mik-olum*- 'to swallow' ◊ Cf. PS \**maq'*, \**maq<sup>w</sup>* 'to swallow, eat one's fill'.  
 274. PAW \**ŋ'ü:yV* (~ \**?Vŋ'ü:yV*) 'egg' • PW \**n'i*: [PWN \**Gi:n'i*: 'salmon roe'; PWS \**n'i-x<sup>w</sup>* 'salmon roe, kidneys'] • PNi \**ŋoj-eq* 'egg', \**ŋoj* 'penis', \**ŋoj-choχ* 'sperm' • PA \**a:-mi:w*- 'to spawn' [Cree *a:-mi:w* 'she spawns', Oj. *a:-mi*: '(fish) is spawning', etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 38.  
 275. PNA \**pa* (~ *ä*) 'to miss' • PNi \**pha-r-u*- 'to miss' • PA \**pa-t-*, \**pa-t̄*- 'to miss, pass by' [Fox *pə-n-ə*- 'to miss, to fail to', Ab. *o-ba-lh-ám* 'he errs', etc.].  
 277. PAW \**pAlV* 'thin and flat' • PW \**pat̄*- 'flat'; PWN \**pəl'*-, \**pəl*- 'thin and flat (as a layer or sheet of sth.)'; \**pəl-q*- 'to flatten with a hammer, to be somewhere (said of a flat obj.)' • PAlg \**pel*- 'flat (and wide)' [Wi. *pal*- 'flat', *par*- 'little and flat', Yu. *pl*- 'wide and flat'] ◊ Cf. PS \**pal* 'flat, thin', \**p'il*, \**p'al* 'flat'.  
 278. PNA \**pedV* (~ *t'*) 'to cover' • PNi \**phit-i*- (~ *c*) 'to be covered with sth.' • PA \**pet*- 'to cover' (Haas 1958: 244).  
 279. PNA \**pehV* 'to run' • PNi \**phe-γ-o*- 'to hurry', \**ve*- 'to run (animal)' • PAlg \**pah-*, \**poh*- (~ *ph*) 'to run' [Yu. *pah-c*- 'to move one's body', PA \**-pah-*, \**pah-t*- 'to run'].  
 280. PAW \**pewV* (~ *i*) 'deep' • PW \**pu*- 'deep' • PNi \**vev*- 'deep' [“incorporated” form of \**phew*-].  
 281. PAW \**pE:šV* ≈ \**?E:pšV* 'one' • PWN \**?əps*- 'one (side), the other, the opposite' • PA \**pe:š-ekw*- 'one' [WOj. *pe:š-ik*, Ab. *baz-ék*, etc.].  
 282. PAW \**pədV* (~ *i*, *t'*) 'to split' • PWN \**pət*- 'to split dry oolachens in two' • PNi \**phit*- 'to split'.  
 283. PAW \**pəyšV* 'to peel' • PW \**pays*- 'to peel off inner bark' • PA \**pe:hš*- 'to peel, husk' [Fox *pí:š-a:g-ən-ĩ* 'to skin, peel', WOj. *pešš-ak-en-ak-e:kkw-e*: 'he peels bark', Ab. *ps-i-al-á* 'he is skinning', etc.].  
 284. PNA \**ping<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *e*) 'fly, gnat' • PNi \**phenγ-r* 'fly (n.)'; NiY \**pugucee* 'midge' • PA \**penkw*- 'gnat' [Cree *pihk-os* 'gnat', Oj. *pink-ošš* 'sandfly', etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 54.  
 285. PNA \**pišk<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *č*, *q<sup>w</sup>*) 'k. of bird' • PNi \**phisk* 'kite' • PA \**p-ey-eškw-*, \**peškw-* 'nighthawk' [Cree *pi:skw-a* 'nighthawk', Men. *pε:sk-i?* 'mosquito hawk', Shawnee *peškw-a* 'nighthawk', etc.] ◊ Cf. PS \**p'əsk'a* 'hummingbird'.  
 286. PAW \**pi:xk<sup>w</sup>E* 'tree, willow' • PW \**pu:xk<sup>w</sup>*- > Kw. *pux<sup>w</sup>-as* 'willow tree' • PNi \**phx-i* 'mixed wood (taiga)' • PAlg \**pihkw-* (~ *ph*, *kh*) > Yu. *pahk<sup>w</sup>-o?* 'willow, red willow'.  
 287. PNA \**piLVIVk<sup>(w)</sup>E* (~ *ə*) 'stone suitable for making tools' • PNi \**vālk-i* 'chain' [“incorporated” form of \**phalk*-] • PAlg \**peletk*- 'stone suitable for making tools' [PA \**-a:-pełkw-*, \**-pełkw*- 'stone/metal'; Yu. *pełk*- 'gravel, pebbles'; Wi. *płátk* 'rock, stone'] || Nikolaev 2015: 55.  
 288. PAW \**pirV* (~ *ə*) 'to spread' • PWN \**pəl-k*- 'to be somewhere (said of flat obj.), to spread out' • PNi \**phiri*- (~ *ə*) 'to spread'.  
 289. PAW \**po:lV* (~ *t̄*) 'to flood' • PWN \**pa:t̄*- 'to rise, flood, overflow (river)' • PNi \**phol-x* 'whirlpool, deep place'; NiY \**palayə*- (~ *-ɔ-*) 'to flood' ◊ Cf. PS \**p'il* 'overflow'.

290. PAW \**po:lV* ≈ \**ʔo:lpV* ‘large bird’ • PWN \**pa:t-* (also \**ma:t-*) ‘swallow (bird)’ • PNi \**olvilak* ‘flying squirrel’ • PAlg \**pel(-e:ɣw)-* (~ *ph*) ‘large bird’ [Yu. *pl-iʔw-or-es* ‘k. of owl’, *pr-ey-on-iš*, *pr-ey-o:s* ‘condor’, *pl-ey-eʔl* ‘k. of owl’, PA \**pel-e:hš-* ‘bird’, \**pel-e:w-* ‘partridge’, \**-ʔl-e:w-* ‘bird’ (-ʔl- < \**-pl-*); \**pel-e:nyikw-* ‘flying squirrel’] ◇ Cf. PSC \**paʔl* ‘large bird’ || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
291. PAW \**po:wV* (~ *b*) ‘to dream’ • PWS \**pu(:)w-’is-* ‘dreaming’ • PA \**pa:w-*, \**a:h-paw-* ‘to dream’ [Cree *pa:w-a:m-iw* ‘to dream’, EOj. *pa:w-ε:* ‘he gains insight through vision or dream’, Fox *a:h-paw-e:w-a* ‘he dreams’, WOj. *puw-a:n-a:t* ‘he dreams of him’, etc.].
292. PAW \**pOɣ<sup>(w)</sup>V* ≈ \**ʔOpɣ<sup>(w)</sup>V* ‘to heat, burn’ • PWN \**pəx-* ‘to heat, hot (like metal)’ • PNi \**phu-*, \**phuj-* ‘to set fire; shine (sun)’ • PAlg \**po:w-*, \**pew-*, \**pu-* ‘to heat, put on the fire’ [Wi. *pu* ‘to cook’, *hi-piy-əgəd-ət-il* ‘I scorched my face’; Yu. *pew* ‘to cook’, PA \**po:n-* ‘to put on the fire’]; PA \**apw-* ‘to heat, roast, bake’ [Cree *apw-a:n*, Men. *apu-an* ‘a roast’, Ab. *ab-ṣn-ak* ‘cake’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PSI \**p’əx* ‘to burn (esp. of forest fire)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
293. PNA \**pOlk<sup>w</sup>A* (~ *q<sup>w</sup>*) ‘to pierce’ • PNi \**pholq-o-* ‘to pierce’ • PAlg \**pek<sup>w</sup>-*, \**pak<sup>w</sup>-* (~ *ph*, *kh*) ‘to pierce through an obstacle’ [Yu. *p<sup>k</sup>w-* ‘out of a hole’; to bring/come out, PA \**pak<sup>w</sup>-*, \**pek<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to pierce; hole’] ◇ Cf. PS \**pəl<sup>k</sup>w*, \**pat<sup>k</sup>w* ‘to pierce’, \**pəlx<sup>w</sup>* ‘to pierce, pop out’.
294. PAW \**pO:kV* (~ *b*, *k*) ‘thin (flexible obj.)’ • PWS \**pu:k-* ‘thin (flexible obj.)’ • PA \**pepak-* ‘thin, lean’ [reduplication: Fox *papəg-eh-ènw-ī*, WOj. *pepak-a:*, etc.] ◇ Cf. PSI \**p’ax* ‘thin (layer)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
295. PNA \**pü:ɓ<sup>w</sup>V* ‘k. of seal’ • PNi \**pho*, \**phov-k* ‘seal (small species)’ • PAlg \**pe(:)ɣw-* (~ *ph*) > Yu. *peʔw-iš* ‘lake porpoise’.
296. PAW \**puq<sup>w</sup>A* (~ *ɔ*) ‘fish bladder’ • PWS \**q<sup>w</sup>uq<sup>w</sup>-ac* ‘bladder’ • PNi \**phoqi* ‘fish bladder’ || PWS \**q<sup>w</sup>-* instead of \**p’-* due to assimilation.
297. PAW \**pVc<sup>w</sup>V* ‘to be hot, to warm’ • PWN \**pac<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to warm oneself by the fire’ • PA \**pas-et-* ‘be hot’ [Cree *pas-it-e:w* ‘it is on fire’, Fox *pas-et-e:w-i* ‘it is hot, burnt’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
298. PAW \**pV<sup>k</sup>w<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *k<sup>w</sup>*) ‘edible root’ • PWN \**pək<sup>w</sup>-* ‘cedar roots (edible)’ • PAlg \**pek<sup>w</sup>-an-e* (~ *ph*, *kh*) ‘Indian rhubarb (a plant with edible roots)’ [Yu. *pək<sup>w</sup>-ən-əʔ* ‘Indian rhubarb’, PA \**pek<sup>w</sup>-an-* ‘wild rhubarb, burdock’, etc.].
299. PAW \**pVlanq<sup>w</sup>A* ‘leaf, flower’ • PWN \**pəlq-* (~ *χ*) > Ha. *p<sub>l</sub>χa* ‘flower, blossom’ • PNi \**phlanq* ‘leaf, branch of broad-leaved tree’ • PAlg \**p(el)ak<sup>w</sup>-* (~ *ph*, *b*, *kh*, *g*) > PA \**-pak<sup>w</sup>-* ‘leaf’ [Fox *ta:htu-pəg-o:n-ī* ‘leaves’, Men. *ka:keke-pak* ‘evergreen’, EOj. *-bəg* ‘leaf, flower’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \**packl* [< \**palk-c*] ‘leaf’ || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
300. PNA \**pVl-əŋV-k<sup>w</sup>E* ‘ashes’ • PNi \**phl-iŋg* ‘ashes’ • PAlg \**p(el)-enek<sup>w</sup>-* (~ *ph*, *kh*) ‘ashes, dust’ [Yu. *penk<sup>w</sup>* ‘acorn flour’, PA \**penkw-* ‘ashes, powder’] || Nikolaev 2015: 36, 48. A compound: \**pVlV* ‘dust’ + \**əŋV(-k<sup>w</sup>E)* fire’.
301. PAW \**pVɓV* ‘to split’ • PWN \**pəx-* ‘to split’ • PAlg \**peɣ-* (~ *ph*) ‘to split’ > Yu. *peɣ-* ‘to split’.
302. PAW \**p’akV* (~ *ä*) ‘red; blood’ • Quil. *p’ič-* ‘red’ [č’ < PChi \**k*] • PNi \**paɓ-* ‘red, red-haired’ • PAlg \**pek-*, \**pak-* (~ *ph*, *kh*) ‘red; blood’ [Yur. *pek-*, *pək-* ‘red’, PA \**pek-*, \**ni:-/ne-pek-* ‘blood; red’] || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
303. PAW \**p’E* ‘along’ • PW \**-p’i-* ‘along with’ • PA \**pe-m-* ‘along (in space or time)’ [Cree *pi-m-ih-a:w* ‘to fly along’, WOj. *pe-m-i-* ‘movement on, along, past’, etc.].
304. PAW \**p’iqE* ‘knee’ • PWS \**-p’iq-a* (suff.) ‘knee’ • PNi \**pix*, \**pix-t-* ‘knee’, NiY \**poɣoði-* (~ *ɔ*) ‘knee’ || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
305. PNA \**p’i:lV* (~ *e:*) ‘big’ • PNi \**pil-* ‘big’ • PAlg \**pe:l-*, \**pel-* (~ *ph*) > Yu. *pel-*, *pl-* ‘big’ || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
306. PAW \**p’i:Tq<sup>w</sup>E* ‘to break’ • PWN \**p’u:q<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to break off with the hands (dried fish, leaves, etc.)’ • PNi \**pəɣ-* ‘to break’ • PA \**po:tkw-* ‘to break’ [Cree *po:skw-a:w* ‘he breaks it by tool’,



- Men. *pu:hkw-ah-am* ‘to break’, Ab. *boskw-en-á* ‘to break’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PSI *\*p’əc’q’w*, *\*pəc’q’w* ‘break/tear off’.
307. PAW *\*p’OLV* ‘to blink, close eyes’ • PW *\*p’əʔ-* ‘to blink, close eyes’ • PNi *\*pol-m-* ‘blind’; NiY *\*pīlom-* ‘foolish’.
- 307a. PAW *\*p’OLV* ≈ *\*?Op’IV* ‘moss’ • PW *\*p’ul-* ‘moss’ • PAlg *\*ʔapʔ-* (~ *b*, *ph*) > PA *\*aʔʔ-a:xk-am-ik-* ‘(ground) moss’ [Men. *aʔn-a:hk-am-ek*, WOj. *ass-akk-am-ik*, etc.].
308. PAW *\*qalV* ≈ *\*ʔaqlV* ‘egg’ • PWN *\*qəl-χ-* ‘egg; to lay eggs (said of a bird); to have children’; PWN *\*t’əʔq-* ‘roe, spawn in fish’ • PNi *\*t-qhla-* ‘to spawn’ || Nikolaev 2015: 38.
309. PAW *\*qaχʔA* (~ *ä*) ‘spear’ • PWN *\*qəlχ-* ‘to spear salmon’ • PNi *\*qhaχ* ‘spear, to spear’ || Nikolaev 2015: 55.
310. PAW *\*qa:rV* ‘to walk’ • PW *\*qaʔ-* ‘to walk, to leave (walking)’ • PNi *\*khri-* ‘to follow’.
311. PNA *\*qe:ɣʔA* ~ *\*ge:ɣʔA* ‘seagull’ • PNi *\*keχ* ‘seagull’ • PAlg *\*k-ey-a:rga* (~ *kh-*) ‘seagull’ [Yu. *k-ey-oʔs-ney* ‘seagull’, PA *\*k-ey-a:škw-*, *\*k-ay-a:škw-*, *\*k-ay-a:hkw-* ‘gull’].
312. PAW *\*qe:xʔA* (~ *χʔ*) ‘to hear’ • PWN *\*qa:χʔ-* (~ *-xʔ-*) ‘to hear, listen’ • Quil. *qʔoqʔ-al-* ‘to hear’ • PNi *\*heχ-* ‘to hear about, feel’ || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
313. PNA *\*qü:rV* (~ *x*, *χ*) ‘throat’ • PNi *\*qhor-qr* ‘throat’ • PAlg *\*ke:l-* (~ *kh-*) > Yu. *kelokeʔl* ‘throat’.
314. PAW *\*q’amV* ~ *\*gamV* (~ *a*, *o*) ‘to sing’ • PW *\*q’am-at-* ‘to sing (for dancers)’ • PAlg *\*ne-gam-*, *\*na-gam-* ‘to sing’ [Yu. *nə:m-əy* ‘to sing songs’, PA *\*ne-kam-* ‘to sing’].
315. PAW *\*q’anʔV* ~ *\*ganʔV* (~ *c*, *s*) ‘to eat, bite’ • PW *\*q’Vns-* > PWN *\*q’əns-* ‘to eat meat’; *\*q’əs-* ‘to eat meat or fat’; *\*-q’əs* (suff.) ‘eat, put in mouth’; PWS *-i:ks* ‘to eat, consume’ • PNi *\*haz-* ‘to bite’ || Nikolaev 2015: 38.
316. PAW *\*q’änV* ‘dog’ • PWS *\*q’in-iʔ-* ‘dog’ • PNi *\*qan-ŋ* ‘dog’ ◇ Cf. PSC *\*qʔm-ay* ‘dog’ || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
317. PAW *\*q’ilmV* ~ *\*qilmV* (~ *ɣ*) ‘navel’ • PWS *\*q’im-a:n(a)* ‘navel’ [the same derivation as in *\*q’aw-a:n-* ‘nose’] • PNi *\*khilm-ř* ‘navel’ || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
318. PAW *\*q’i:(nV)* ≈ *\*(n’i):q’V* ‘to sew’ • PW *\*q’i:-n-*, *\*n’i:q-* ‘to sew’ • PNi *\*kne-* ‘to sew (dress, footgear)’ • PAlg *\*ka-*, *\*ki-* (~ *kh-*) ‘to sew’ [Yu. *ka-hc-*, PA *\*ka-šk-*; *\*k-w-a:-*, etc.].
319. PAW *\*q’omV* (~ *q’w*) ‘green’ • PW *\*q’am-* (~ *q’w*) ‘green, unripe’ • PNi *\*qoŋ-ɣ-r* ‘green’, NiY *\*qomo-* ‘green’ || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
320. PAW *\*q’OmbV* ‘sand’ • PWN *\*q’əp-* ‘sand’ • PNi *\*qom-r* (~ *-ř*) ‘sand’ ◇ Cf. PSI *\*q’ap-aʔ* ‘sand’ || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
321. PNA *\*q’o:nc’V* ‘to push’ • PNi *\*qoc-* ‘to push’ • PA *\*ka:nt-* ‘to push’ [Fox *ka:č-iʔ-ah-e:w-a* ‘he gives him a push’, Men. *ka:hč-w-ε:p-ah-am* ‘to push, shove by instrument’, WOj. *ka:nt-uw-a:t* ‘he pushes him’, etc.].
322. PAW *\*q’V:ncV* ‘to fold’ • PWN *\*q’əns-* ‘to fold, to wrap up’ • PA *\*ke:s-ip-* ‘to fold’ [Men. *ke:s-ep-εn-ε:w* ‘he folds him up uselessly’, WOj. *ke:s-ep-i:k-en-ank* ‘to make, fold up’, etc.].
323. PAW *\*q’wəKc’V* ‘half, one of a pair’ • PW *\*qakc’a* ‘other, following’ > PWS *\*qakc’a* ‘three’ (“another number [after two]”) • PNi *\*-vasq* ‘half, one of a pair’<sup>5</sup> • PAlg *\*ne-kwehc-*, *\*ne-kweht-* ‘one’ [Wi. *kuc-* ‘one’, Yu. *kəht-*, *\*kəhc-* ‘one’, PA *\*ne-kwet-* ‘one’] || Nikolaev 2015: 47, 57.
324. PAW *\*q’wATkA* ‘hard, tough’ • PW *\*qutk-* ‘to be hard or tough’ • PNi *\*qhab-* ‘hard, tough’.
325. PAW *\*q’wä:IV* ~ *\*G’wä:IV* (~ *ʔ*) ‘blue, green’ • PWN *\*q’w:i:ʔ-* ‘blue, turquoise’ • PNi *\*qal-a-* ‘green, unripe’, NiY *\*qola-* (~ *k*) ‘green, yellow’ ◇ Cf. PS *\*k’wəl* ‘green, yellow’ and *\*q’wəy* ‘blue, green; bruise’ || Nikolaev 2015: 39.

<sup>5</sup> The isolated forms *pasq*, *pazk-r* with irregular *\*p-* have been derived (with hypercorrection) from the incorporated forms *\*-vasq*, *\*-fasq* after numerals: *n-vasq*, *me-vasq*, *c-fasq*, etc.

326. PAW  $*q^{w}esV \approx *heq^{w}sV$  ‘mouth, nose, throat’ • PW  $*(h)ags-$  (suff.) ‘mouth’ • PNi  $*hes$  ‘larynx’,  $*hes-qr$  ‘throat, gullet’ • PA  $-t-kwet-$ ,  $*kwet-$  ‘nose’ [Cree *timi-kut-e:w* ‘he has a short nose’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
327. PAW  $*q^{w}E:cV (\sim s)$  ‘to worry’ • PWN  $*q^{w}u:s-$  ‘to worry’ • PNi  $*qhez-$ ,  $*qhoz-$  ‘to worry, suffer’.
328. PAW  $*q^{w}e:lV (\sim t)$  ‘to burn to cinders’ • PWN  $q^{w}a:t-$  ‘to burn to cinders’ • PNi  $*hil-m-$ ,  $*helm-[h]elm-$  ‘to blaze’,  $*hi[l]m-ř$  ‘cinders’ ◊ Cf. PS  $*q^{w}al$ ,  $*q^{w}ay$  ‘to scorch, (burn to) ashes, black; roast, ripe(n)’. PWN  $*q^{w}a:t-$  perhaps borrowed from Salish || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
329. PAW  $*q^{w}odV (\sim t)$  ‘to cut in two; middle, other’ • PW  $*qa:t-$  ‘to cut in two’ • PNi  $*hut-i$  ‘middle’, NiY  $*kōdi-(\delta\alpha)$  ‘inner, amidst’ • PA  $*kwet-ak-$  ‘other’ [Cree *kot-ak*, Fox *kút-əg-ă* ‘other, another’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 50.
330. PAW  $*q^{w}ońzV$  ‘to sink’ • PWN  $*q^{w}alc-$  ‘to sink a weighted object; heavy’,  $*q^{w}als-$  ‘to drop anchor’ • PNi  $*qhońz-$  ‘to sink’ • PA  $*kwes-$  ‘to sink’ [Cree *kos-a:p-e:w* ‘it sinks’, Oj. *kos-a:p-i-* ‘to sink’, etc.].
331. PAW  $*q^{w}o:x^{w}A$  ‘to freeze’ • PWS  $*qu:x^{w}-$  ‘to freeze’ • PNi  $*hox-a-$  ‘to freeze’.
332. PAW  $*q^{w}iηV$  ‘snake, snail’ • PW  $*q^{w}in-$  ‘snail, slug’ • PNi  $*ven-$  in Sakh. *ven-umlan* ‘ratsnake (?)’ • PA  $*kenw-e:p-ikw-$  ‘snake’,  $*keny-e?p-ikw-$  [Cree *kin-e:p-ik*, Men. *ken-u:p-ik*] — PA  $*kenw-$  instead of  $**kwen-$  under the influence of  $*kenw-$  ‘long’; PA  $*keny-e?p-ikw-$  ‘spider’ [Shawnee *kiny-e?p-ikw-a*, Ab. *mams-eláb-ihk-á*] ◊ Cf. PS  $*k^{w}ink^{w}u$  ‘snake’ || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
333. PAW  $*q^{w}i:yV$  ‘neck’ • PWN  $*q^{w}u:-$  ‘neck’ • PA  $*kwe:y-aw-$ ,  $*kway-aw-$  ‘neck’ [Cree *kino-kway-aw-e:w* ‘he has a long neck’, Oj. *kino-kway-aw-e-* ‘to have a long neck’, Men. *pi:me-kiy-aw-en-ε:w* ‘she wrings her neck’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
334. PAW  $*q^{w}oηwV \sim *q^{w}oηwV$  ‘liver, bowels’ • PWN  $*q^{w}am-$  ‘liver’ • PNi  $*khuη-ř$  ‘bowels’.
335. PAW  $*q^{w}orV$  ‘to boil’ • PWN  $*q^{w}a:t-$  ‘to boil’ • PNi  $*qor-qor-$  ‘to boil’ ◊ Cf. PS  $*q^{w}al$  ‘boil (food), cook’.
336. PAW  $*q^{w}o:q^{w}E (\sim -G^{w}-)$  ‘dark’ • PWN  $*q^{w}a:q^{w}-$  ‘to darken (by smoke, heat)’ • PNi  $*vuk-vuk-$  ‘dark’ ◊ Cf. PS  $*q^{w}iχ$  ‘dark color’.
337. PAW  $*r^{w}a:G^{w}E$  ‘time’ • PWN  $*la:q^{w}$  ‘time’ • PNi  $*ř^{w}ak$  ‘time’.
338. PAW  $*r^{w}a:q^{w}A \approx *?a:r^{w}q^{w}A (\sim a:)$  ‘liver’ • PW  $*l^{w}a:q-$  ‘liver’ • PNi  $*η-arq-aj (\sim \alpha)$  ‘milt’ • PAlg  $*-Vtkw-$  ‘liver’ [Wi. *w-átw-əd*, Yu. *?w-ətk-un*, PA  $*w-e?kw-a/en-$ ,  $-tkw-an-$ ] ◊ Cf. PS  $*?iq^{w}$  ‘flesh, meat’ || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
339. PAW  $*taχA \approx *?atχA$  ‘night’ • PWS  $*?atχ-iy(i)$  ‘night’ • PNi  $*thaχ$  ‘afterglow’ • PA  $*-etk-$  ‘night’ [in  $*tep-etk-$  ‘(dark) night’;  $*l-etk-an-$  ‘it is evening; by night’] || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
340. PAW  $*te:Xq^{w}E$  ‘to hold’ • PW  $*ta:q^{w}-$  ‘hold or squeeze’ • PNi  $*thik-$  ‘to carry in armful’ • PAlg  $*tahkw-$ ,  $*tehk-w-$  ( $\sim th, kh$ ) ‘to hold, grasp’ [Yu. *tek-on-ek* ‘I wear (clothes)’, PA  $*tahkw-$  ‘to hold’] ◊ Cf. PSI  $*t^{w}uq^{w}$  ( $\sim k^{w}$ ) ‘hold/carry in the arms, hug, get an armful of’.
341. PAW  $*tiyV (\sim e)$  ‘liver, gall’ • PWN  $*tax-$  ( $\sim k$ ) ‘bile, gall’ • PNi  $*thiu-ř$  ‘liver, kidney’ || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
342. PAW  $*timQV (\sim e)$  ‘to kick’ • PW  $*timq-$  ( $\sim q^{w}$ ) ‘to wade or kick in water’ • PA  $*tank-$  ‘to kick’ [Cree *tahk-isk-am*, Men. *tahk-ε:sk-am*, Ab. *o-dák-sk-am-én* ‘to stamp, kick’, etc.].
343. PNA  $*tO \approx *?OtV$  ‘to carry’ • PNi  $*tho-$  ‘to carry’ • PA  $*-at-$  ‘to carry’ [Cree *aw-at-a:w* ‘he carries it off’, Men. *aw-a:t-a:w* ‘he takes it away with him’, Oj. *aw-at-o:n* ‘to carry’, etc.].
344. PAW  $*tOkA$  ‘to press’ • PWN  $*tak-$  ‘to press; tight (shoe, etc.)’ • PNi  $*thox-$  ‘to press’ • ? PA  $*tamakw-$  ‘to press, squeeze’.
345. PNA  $*tOyV?wV$  ‘to burn (trans.)’ • PNi  $*thuv-$  ‘to burn’ • PAlg  $*teye?w-$  ‘to burn’ [Wi. *tuw-án-i?l* ‘it is burned out’, Yu. *tye?w-ol-ok* ‘I burn (trans.)’] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
346. PNA  $*tV$  ‘interrogative stem’ • PNi  $*thju-$  > Am. *si-*, Sakh. *ř^{w}u-* ‘what?’ [“incorporated” allomorphs of Am.  $*chi$ , Sakh.  $*thu$ ],  $*tha-$  ‘who?’ • PA  $*tV-$  ‘interrogative stem’ [Blackfoot *t-*,

- Cree *t-a:n-*, Miami *t-an-*, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS *\*ta-m?* ‘what?’ (and perhaps *\*wa-t* ‘who?’) || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
347. PNA *\*t'ayV* (~ *ä*) ‘spotted’ • PNi *\*taj-* ‘spotted’ • PAlg *\*tey-*, *\*tay-* (~ *th*) > Yu *tey-ek-en-i* ‘spotted’, *tayəlyk'əly* ‘it is spotted’.
348. PAW *\*t'amq<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *e*) ‘dance’ • PWN *\*t'anq<sup>w</sup>-* > Kw *t'ŋq<sup>w</sup>a* ‘a dance of some kind’ • PNi *\*tiy-* ‘female dance, to dance’.
349. PAW *\*t'a:qE* ≈ *\*ʔa:t'qV* ‘chest, breast’ • PWN *\*t'aq-* ‘chest, breast’ • PNi *\*ŋ-əryi-r* ‘breast; wing’ • PAlg *\*te(:)k-w-l-*, dimin. *\*če:k-w-r-* ‘heart’ [Wi. *-atw-*, Yu. *cek<sup>w</sup>-s* ‘heart’, *tek<sup>w</sup>* ‘chest’, dim. *tek<sup>w</sup>-s-aʔr* ‘heart of salmon, uvula’; PA *-te:h-* ‘heart’] || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
350. PAW *\*t'i:q<sup>w</sup>V* ~ *\*ti:q<sup>w</sup>V* ‘to sit’ • PWS *\*t'i:q<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to sit, to lie back’ • PNi *\*thiv-* ‘to sit, sit down (tr.)’, NiY *\*šava-* (~ *ɔ*, *ɣ*) ‘to sit’ || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
351. PAW *\*t'i:xE* ‘to carry’ • PWN *\*t'ix-* ‘to carry a bulky thing on the shoulder’ • PNi *\*thik-* ‘to carry in armful’.
352. PAW *\*t'imV* (~ *ə*) ‘k. of berries’ • PWN *\*t'am-s-* ‘bunchberry (*Unifolium dilatatum*)’ • PNi *\*tam* ‘cranberry’ ◇ Cf. PS *\*t'am-x<sup>w</sup>* ‘gooseberry’ || Nikolaev 2015: 51.
353. PAW *\*t'iq<sup>w</sup>E* ~ *\*tiq<sup>w</sup>E* ‘head’ • PW *\*t'uq<sup>w</sup>-* ‘head’ • Quil. *-t'i-*, Chem. *-t'e:q-l* ‘head’ • PNi *\*thax* ‘forehead’ • PAlg *\*tekw-*, *-č-tekw-*, *-T-tekw-* (~ *th*, *kh*) ‘head’ [Yu. *tə:k-un* ‘fish head’, PA *\*-ʔ-tekw-a:n-*, *\*-š-tekw-a:n-* ‘head’] || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
354. PAW *\*t'ik<sup>w</sup>E* ~ *\*k<sup>w</sup>i:t'V* ‘nail, claw; peg’ • PWN *\*k<sup>w</sup>u:t-* ‘to nail’ • PNi *\*tak<sup>n</sup>* ‘claw, fingernail’, NiY *\*tuk-nə-* ‘nail (peg)’ • PAlg *\*-tk-an-*, *\*-čk-an-*, *\*-čk-en-* ‘claw, hoof, finger-, toenail’ [PA *\*we-šk-a(n)-š-y-*, *\*we-tk-a(n)-š-y-* ‘fingernail, claw, hoof’; Wi. *-tk-an(-əy)* ‘finger-, toenail’; Yu. *?we-šk-e-tey* ‘fingernail, toenail, claw’] || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
355. PNA *\*t'Omk'A* (~ *q*) ‘elbow’ • PNi *\*tomq* ‘elbow’ • PAlg *-čekw-* ‘elbow’ [Wi. *cacukəd-*, *wətuk*, PA. *\*-škw-an-*].
356. PAW *\*t'OnCV* (~ *S*) ‘cold’ • PWN *\*t'əns-* ‘cold’ • PNi *\*tuz-* ‘cool’ || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
357. PAW *\*t'OrV* ‘to jump’ • PWN *\*t'əʔ-* ‘to jump (said of fish)’ • PNi *\*thur-i-* ‘jump over’.
358. PAW *\*t'ü:g<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *k<sup>w</sup>*) ‘to dig’ • PWS *\*t'ik<sup>w</sup>-* ‘dig with digging stick’ • PNi *\*tok-l-* ‘dig up’.
359. PAW *\*t'Vlx<sup>w</sup>V* ‘to pound’ • PW *\*t'ulx<sup>w</sup>-* ‘shred cedar bark by pounding’ • PAlg *\*tekw-*, *\*takw-* ‘to break, pound’ [Wi. *tək<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to break’, Yu. *tek<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to chop, break’, PA *\*takw-* ‘to pound fine’].
360. PNA *\*t'VPOT'V* (~ *d*) ‘arm’ • PNi *\*tot* ‘forearm, arm’ • PA *\*-tpetw-* ‘arm’ [Cree *-spit-un*, Ab. *-hped-ín*, etc.].
361. PAW *\*t'VyOmV* ‘raft’ • PWN *\*t'am-*, *\*t'am-s-* ‘old, worn-out canoe’ • PNi *\*com* ‘raft’; *\*combi-zombi-* ‘to paddle in turns’<sup>6</sup>; NiY *\*cam-ʒə* ‘paddle’ • PAlg *\*teyim-* (~ *th*, *d*) > PA *\*či:m-* ‘to paddle’ [Cree *či:m-a:n* ‘canoe; to paddle, swim’, Men. *ise:-čim-ew* ‘he paddles thither’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 55.
362. PNA *\*wa:lwV* (~ *w*, *ä*) ‘back, behind’ • PNi *\*al(-ɸ)-*, *-al* ‘behind’ • PA *\*wa:lw-* ‘back, around’ [Cree. *way-o:n-i-* ‘back’, Oj. *wa:n-in-* ‘around, circle’, etc.].
363. PAW *\*walx<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *ə*) ‘to find out’ • PWN *\*wəlx<sup>w</sup>-* ‘to do sth. at short notice’ • PNi *\*aly-* ‘find out, learn’ || Nikolaev 2015: 50.
364. PNA *\*walyVʒV* (~ *w*, *ä*) ‘to cheat’ • PNi *\*valc-* ‘to cheat’; NiY *\*ju(u)lizə-* O ‘sly’ • PA *\*waye:š-* ‘to deceive’ [Cree *waye:s-im-e:w* ‘he deceives him with talk’, Oj. *waye:š-im* ‘to cheat so.’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS *\*məc* ‘cheat, trick, lie’.
365. PNA *\*waNXKA* (~ *w*) ‘box’ • PNi *\*vaq-aj* ‘box’ • PA *\*mahk-ahkw-* ‘box, barrel, tub’ [Cree *mahk-ahk* ‘box, barrel, tub’, Fox *máhk-ahkw-ĩ* ‘box’, Men. *mahk-a:h* ‘box, chest, trunk’, WOj. *mekk-akk* ‘box’, etc.].

<sup>6</sup> Admittedly from *\*t(V)jom-*, cf. PChK loan *\*tijmi-* ‘to paddle’.

366. PNA *\*waTVrk'añV* (~ *w*) 'fork' • PNi *\*marqañ* 'fork' • PAlg *\*watehkan-*, *\*wacehkan-* (~ *th*, *kh*) [PA *\*watehkwan-* 'fork (of tree)'; Yu *cki:kə?* 'fork, table fork'; *ckəkə?* 'to pierce, spear, pitchfork, fork (utensil)'].
367. PAW *\*wa:kV* (~ *a*, *k*) 'to bend' • PWN *\*wa:k-* 'to bend sth., to be bent, to be ring-shaped, to be around sth.' • PA *\*wa:k-* 'to bend, crook' [Blackfoot *é-vóhk-o* 'it's bent', Cree *wa:g-a:w*, Miami *wak-* 'to bend', etc.].
368. PNA *\*wa:ncVKA* (~ *w*, *n*, *Q*, *X*) 'heron, crane' • PNi *\*vaz(a)χ* 'heron, crane' • PAlg *\*mo:ck-*, *\*mack-* 'heron, crane' (~ *ch*, *kh*) [PA *\*mo:sk-aho:siw-* 'bittern, heron'; Yu. *mək* 'crane, heron'].
369. PNA *\*wa:XX<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *w*, *ä*, *Q<sup>w</sup>*) 'moss, lichen' • PNi *\*vaβ[η]* 'moss' • PA *\*wa:hkw-en-ak-* 'lichen' [Cree *asini:-wa:hk-on-ak* 'lichen', Men. *wa:hk-on-ak* 'tree lichen', etc.].
370. PAW *\*wä:* 'river, flowing water' • PWN *\*wa:-* 'river, stream, flowing water' • PNi *\*i* 'river'.
371. PAW *\*we:* ~ *\*ʔe:wV* 'voice; to call' • PW *\*ʔa:-da:-* 'call, ask for' • PNi *\*əw* 'voice' • PAlg (suff.) *\*-a:we(ʔe)* 'sound', PA *\*-we:*, *\*-we:w-* 'to speak; voice' [Yu. *r-o:-ʔe-c* 'there is an echo', *tolow-o:-c-ek* 'I speak Tolowa', Cree *it-we:-w* 'he speaks so', etc.] ◊ Cf. PS *\*ʔaβ<sup>w</sup>*, *\*ʔaw* 'to call, howl'.
372. PNA *\*we:dV* (~ *w*, *t*) 'to dress' • PNi *\*veta-* 'to dress' • PA *\*wa:we:š-* 'to dress up, ornament' [Cree *wawe:s-i:h-e:w* 'he dresses him up', Oj. *u:we:š-eʔ-a:t* 'he dresses him up', etc.].
373. PAW *\*we:q<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *q<sup>w</sup>*) 'nose, cape' • PWN *\*wa:q<sup>w</sup>-* 'cape' • PNi *\*vix* 'nose' || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
374. PAW *\*wə:nkE* 'to bark (dog)' • PWN *\*wa:k-* 'to bark (dog), to woof' • PNi *\*əγ-* 'to bark (dog)' • PAlg *\*ma:k-*, *\*mek-* (~ *kh*) 'to bark' [Yu. *mok<sup>w</sup>-*, PA *\*mek-*].
375. PAW *\*wi* (~ *e*) 'to walk, go' • PWN *\*wə-n-* 'to go, go ahead' • PNi *\*vi-* 'to walk, go' • PAlg *\*we-hʔ-* 'to walk' [Wi. *šəmit-ó-r-it yo* 'did you come on foot?', Yu. *n-o-ʔr-* 'to run', *ʔo:-ʔr* 'run behind or in front of someone else', PA *\*we-hʔ-* 'to walk'] || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
376. PNA *\*wiXca:rV* (~ *w*, *e*, *q*, *c*) 'to slip' • PNi *\*ezbar-* 'to slip' • PA *\*wekca:ʔr-* 'slippery' in PA *\*weʔsa:ʔš-ikwepy-* 'slippery elm bark' [Men. *osa:ʔs-ekop* 'slippery elm bark', Oj. *ussa:šš-ekop* 'slippery elm', etc.].
377. PAW *\*wi:LV* 'horn' • PWN *\*wəλ-* 'horn, antler' • PA *\*-wi:ʔ-*, *\*-wiwi:ʔ-* 'horn' [Cheyenne *vevêse*, *-évesé-*, Arapaho *hini:n-is*, Delaware *wi:l-a:w-an*, Kickapoo *-wi:n-*, Miami *wi:wi:l-a* 'horn', Fox *pahk-wíwin-éw-a* 'he is shedding his horn', etc.] ◊ Cf. PS *\*wiλ* ~ *\*wil* 'horn': Bella Coola *wiλ'-aχ*, Shuswap *wl-aps* 'horn' || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
378. PAW *\*wi:ʔV* ≈ *\*ʔi:wʔV* 'body, belly' • PWN *\*-ʔi:s* (suff.) 'body, belly' • PNi *\*vic* 'body (of human)'; NiY *\*wizie* 'body' • PA *\*wi:s-* 'belly fat' [Cree *wi:s-ih* 'belly fat', EOj. *wi:nz-i* 'fat', Mic. *us-ək* 'fat on the kidneys', etc.] ◊ Cf. PS *\*-iws* (suff.) 'body' || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
379. PNA *\*wirKE* ~ *\*winKE* (~ *w*, *a*) 'scab' • PNi *\*vəry-i*, *\*vərx* 'scab' • PA *\*mek-y-* 'scab' [Men. *o-mε:k-e:w* 'he has a scab/scar', Oj. *o-mik-i:* 'have scabs; have leprosy', etc.].
380. PNA *\*wi:ηVyV* (~ *w*, *η*, *γ*) 'musk gland; musk deer' • PNi *\*vonji* 'musk-deer'; NiY *\*onəj* 'wild reindeer' • PA *\*wi:niy-* 'musk-gland' [Cree, Men. *wi:n-iy*, etc.].
381. PAW *\*wV* (~ *w*) 'interrogative stem' • PW *\*way(a)* (~ *w*) 'interrogative stem' • PA *\*we:-kw-* 'what', *\*a-we:-na* 'who' ◊ Cf. PS *\*wa-t* 'who?' || Nikolaev 2015: 45.
382. PAW *\*w'APsV* (~ *Ks*) 'to cough' • PWS *\*w'as-aq-* 'to cough' • PAlg *\*wepʔ-* (~ *kʔ*) > PA *\*weʔʔ-* 'to cough' [Cree *ost-ost-ot-am* 'he coughs', WOj. *uss-ass-et-am* 'to cough', etc.].
383. PAW *\*w'a:yV* 'to bark (dog)' • PWN *\*w'a:-* 'to bark'; *\*w'a:(-s)-* 'hunt with dogs', *\*w'a:-s-* 'dog' • PNi *\*vaj-* 'to bark (dog)' • PAlg *\*way-e(h)c-* 'dog' [Wi. *wáy-ic* 'dog', Yu. *wəy-c-ək* 'puppy'] ◊ Cf. PS *\*wuh*, *\*wah* 'to bark (at)' || Nikolaev 2015: 37.
384. PAW *\*w'e:pV* ~ *\*pe:wV* 'water, liquid' • PWN *\*w'a:p-* 'water' • PNi *\*fi* 'dew' [“incorporated” allomorph of *\*phi*] • PAlg *\*-[w]a:p-* (~ *ph*) 'liquid' [Yu. *-op-* 'water, liquid'; PA *\*-a:p-* 'liquid, water']; PAlg *\*pi-ʔihk-* > Yu. *pa-ʔah* 'water, juice; be/get wet' || Nikolaev 2015: 44.

385. PAW *\*w'e:šq*<sup>V</sup> 'to produce or use smoke' • PWN *\*w'a:χ*- 'to produce or use smoke' • PNi *\*th-usk-* 'to smoke fish' [compound with *\*thu-* 'smoke'] • PA *\*wi:škw-* 'to smoke (leather or meat)' [Cree *wi:skw-as-am* 'he smokes it (leather)', Men. *wi:skw-a?t-εw* 'it gets smocked', Oj. *wi:šk-oss-a:n* 'to smoke (meat)'] || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
386. PAW *\*w*<sup>V</sup> 'demonstrative stem' • PWN *\*w'ə*- 'this ("empty root")' • PNi *\*iw-η* 'he', *\*əv-η* 'he (honor.)' • PAlg *\*we?*- '3rd person'; *\*we* 'this (nonpersonal, extended)'; *\*wa* 'this (personal, extended)' || Nikolaev 2015: 43.
387. PAW *\*w*<sup>V</sup>*dV* 'cold' • PWN *\*w'ad-* 'cold, to be cold' • PA *\*-at-* 'cold' [Fox *kep-at-enw-i*, Men. *kep-a:t-en*, WOj. *kep-at-in* 'to freeze', etc.].
388. PAW *\*xEcV* ≈ *\*?ExcV* (~ *s*) 'tooth' • PWN *\*-xs-i:(?a:)* (suff.) 'tooth' • PNi *\*ηə-γs*, *\*ηə-γz-ir* (~ *-ř*) 'tooth' || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
389. PNA *\*x<sup>w</sup>a* ≈ *\*hax<sup>w</sup>V* 'name' • PNi *\*qha* 'name' • PAlg *\*w(-ey)-en-* 'name; to mention by name' [Wi. *wən-* 'to mention by name', Yu. *w-ey-en-* 'to name', PA *\*wi:n-* 'name']; *\*he(:)w-* > Yu. *hew* 'name' ◇ Cf. PS *\*k<sup>w</sup>a-* ~ *\*k<sup>w</sup>i-* 'name, to name' || Nikolaev 2015: 41.
390. PAW *\*x<sup>w</sup>a:lg<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *-k<sup>w</sup>*) 'boat' • PWN *\*x<sup>w</sup>a:k<sup>w</sup>*- 'canoe' • PNi *\*halk* 'boat, barge'.
391. PAW *\*x<sup>w</sup>ä:rg<sup>w</sup>A* ~ *\*g<sup>w</sup>ä:rg<sup>w</sup>A* 'k. of edible root' • PWN *\*x<sup>w</sup>u:k<sup>w</sup>*- 'Indian rice, rice root (*Fritillaria*, chocolate lily)' • PNi *\*qarq* 'wild lily with blue flowers'.
392. PAW *\*x<sup>w</sup>i:yV* 'to whistle' • PW *\*k<sup>w</sup>i:-*, *\*x<sup>w</sup>i:-* 'to whistle' • PNi *\*phev-* 'to whistle' • PAlg *\*kwey-*, *\*kwa:hk-*, *\*kwa:y-* (~ *kh*) 'to whistle' [Yu. *k<sup>w</sup>eyk<sup>w</sup>eyur-* 'to whistle', *k<sup>w</sup>əhk<sup>w</sup>əyrcek'*, *k<sup>w</sup>əyək<sup>w</sup>* 'I whistle', PA *\*kwi:škwihə-* 'to whistle'] ◇ Cf. PS *\*x<sup>w</sup>iw* 'whistle'.
393. PAW *\*x<sup>w</sup>i:tV* 'to turn' • PWN *\*x<sup>w</sup>i:t-* 'to turn back' • PNi *\*khel-γel-* 'to turn round' • PA *\*kwe:t-* 'to turn, return' [in *\*kwe:t-k-*, *\*kwe:t-ap-* 'over, round', cf. also PAlg *\*kel-om-* 'turn'] ◇ Cf. PS *\*x<sup>w</sup>ul* 'to turn, spin, drill, wrap around; round' and *\*χ<sup>w</sup>ələq<sup>w</sup>* 'round, to roll'.
- 393a. PAW *\*x<sup>w</sup>O:ηV* ~ *\*ηO:x<sup>w</sup>V* 'bee' • PWN *\*x<sup>w</sup>əm-* 'bee' • PNi *\*vuη* 'bee' • PA *\*a:-mo:w-*, *\*a:-maw-* 'bee' [Cree *a:mo:w*, Oj. *a:mo:*, Miami *ama-w-ia*, etc.] || PA *-m-* is an irregular medial reflex of *\*η* (PA *\*-n-* is expected). Perhaps PA *a:-* is a secondary prefix, cf. PA *\*a:-mi:w-* 'to spawn' from PAW *\*η'ü:yV* 'egg' (#274).
394. PAW *\*χarbV* (~ *ä*, *p*) 'to scratch, scrape' • PWN *\*χəlp-* 'to rake, scrape with the fingers, shovel, scrape' • PNi *\*qharp-* 'to scratch, scrape'.
395. PAW *\*χa:rgA* (~ *k*) 'backbone' • PWN *\*χa:k-* 'backbone of fish' • PNi *\*harq*, *\*har(ε)r* (~ *-ř*) 'dried fish backbone' • PA *\*-tapta-ka:k-w-* 'backbone' [Fox *-tahta-ka:k-w-an-*, Oj. *-tattə-ka:wək-an*, WOj. *tatta-ka:k*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
397. PAW *\*χe:rg<sup>w</sup>A* ~ *\*ge:rx<sup>w</sup>A* 'bark (of tree)' • PWN *\*χa:k<sup>w</sup>*, *\*χa:x<sup>w</sup>* 'bark; scab' • PNi *\*kerba-ř* 'birch bark (with fine scales), "black birch"' || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
398. PAW *\*χo:ck'E* (~ *č*, *s*, *š*) 'bone' • PW *\*χa:x-* 'bone' • Quil. *qa:χ* 'bone' • PNi *\*xuski* 'fish bones' || Nikolaev 2015: 37, 48.
399. PAW *\*χü:g<sup>w</sup>E* ~ *\*g<sup>w</sup>ü:χE* 'to scratch, scrape' • PW *\*ki:χ<sup>w</sup>* 'to scratch, rip' • PNi *\*huk-u-* 'to brush off, peel' ◇ Cf. PS *\*χik<sup>w</sup>* 'to scratch, crunch'.
400. PAW *\*χurg<sup>w</sup>E* ~ *\*χurg<sup>w</sup>E* 'hollow' • PW *\*χulq<sup>w</sup>* 'hollow inverted object', PWN *\*χəlk-* 'hollow-shaped surface, warped, concave; ridgepole, central point of the sides of a vault or of one's ribs' • PNi *\*hurk-i-* 'hollow'.
- 400a. PAW *\*χVIV* ≈ *\*?VIχV* • PWN *\*?əlx-* 'to kill, murder, beat up' • PNi *\*kh-u-* 'to kill' [also passive *\*kh-u-* 'to perish (in the battle)'] ◇ Cf. PS *\*χ<sup>w</sup>ay* 'to perish (pl.), disappear' || Nikolaev 2015: 40.
401. PAW *\*χVru:mcV* (~ *s*) 'to rot' • PWN *\*χu:ms-* 'rotten' • PNi *\*kruŋz-* 'rot'.
- 401a. PAW *\*χVtV* • PWN *\*-χt-a:m'u:* 'knee' [with the specificatory suffix *\*(a:)m'u:* 'underlying or implicated in'] • PAlg *\*ket-* (~ *kh*, *th*) 'knee' [PA *\*ket-ekw-*, Yu. *?ə:kəł*, (suff.) *-ekeł-* 'knee'] || Nikolaev 2015: 40.

402. PNA \* $\chi^{w\ddot{a}}:g^wA$  (~  $x^w$ -) ‘fox’ • PNi \**kheq* ‘fox’ • PAlg \**wa:kw-*, \**way(w)-* ‘fox’ [Yu. *wəy-əs*, PA \**wa:kw-*] ◇ Cf. PSI \* $\chi^{w\ddot{a}k^w}$  ‘fox’.
403. PAW \* $\chi^{w\ddot{a}}:yVcV$  (~  $\ddot{a}$ :,  $o$ :) ‘ready’ • PWN \* $\chi^{w\ddot{a}}:s-$  ‘to get ready, to prepare (for anything)’ • PA \**kwayat-*, \**kwayat-k-* ‘ready/good, fixedly’ [Cree *kwayask* ‘properly, good straight’, Fox *kwaya:s-i* ‘good, definitely, fixedly’, Men. *kwaya:k* ‘properly, good straight; in the right place’, etc.] ◇ Cf. PS \* $\chi\ddot{a}c$  ‘ready, completed’.
404. PNA \* $y^{iw}V$  (~  $y$ ’,  $\ddot{a}$ ,  $w$ ’) ‘body, intestines’ • PNi \* $\eta\text{-}\ddot{a}w$  ‘intestines’ • PA \* $-i\text{-}y\ddot{a}w-$  ‘body; flesh, meat’ [Cree  $-i\text{:}y\ddot{a}:w$  ‘body’,  $wi\text{:}y\ddot{a}:s$  ‘meat, flesh’, etc.]<sup>7</sup>.
405. PAW \* $y^{ix}A$  ‘quick, fast’ • PW \**yux* ‘fast’ • PNi \**ek-* ‘quick, hurry’.
406. PAW \* $y^{OL}wV$  ‘to roll, wrap’ • PWN \* $y\ddot{a}\lambda-$  ‘to wrap or tie around (rope, bandage, strap), to bandage’ • PA \**ał-w-* ‘round’ [cf. Yu. *ho:l-* ‘around’] ◇ Cf. PS \**yāl*, \**yul*, \**həyl* ‘to roll, turn over; round’.
407. PAW \* $y^{Og}E$  (~  $k$ ’) ‘to limp, lame’ • PWN \* $y\ddot{a}k-$  ‘to limp’ • PNi \**hok-l-* ‘lame, to limp’.
- 407a. PAW \* $y^{e:\chi}E \approx *?e:y^{e:\chi}E$  ‘to suffer’ • PWS \* $-y^{i:\chi}\text{-}a$  (suff.) ‘to suffer from excess or die from’ • PNi \**ijy-* ‘to suffer, grieve’.
408. PAW \* $y^{E:w}V$  ‘?’ in \* $n^{i-y}E:wV$ , \* $mV-y^{e:w}V$  ‘four’ • PW \**mu*: ‘four’ • Quil. *báɣyas* ‘four’, Chem. *ma:ʔis*, *miʔis* (< PChi \**ma-ʔy-as*) ‘four’ • PNi \**nī-*, \**nu-* ‘four’ • PAlg \**ni-ye:ʔw-* ‘four’ [Wi. *di-yałw-*, PA \**n-ye:w-*] ◇ Cf. PS *mu-s* ‘four’ (from Wakashan?) || Nikolaev 2015: 57.
409. PAW \* $y^{a:k}E \sim *k^{a:y}E$  ‘bad’ • PW \**y’ak-* ‘bad, spoiled, evil, vicious, sick, not as it should be’; \**yax<sup>w</sup>*- ‘bad’ • PNi \**ik-i-* ‘bad’ • PAlg \**ki:-* (~ *kh*) ‘bad’ [Yu. *ka:-m-*, PA \**ki:-*] ◇ Cf. PS \**k’i-s* ‘bad’.
410. PAW \* $y^{ilg}E$  (~  $k^{w}$ ) ‘to carry’ • PWN \* $y^{alk}w-$  ‘to carry a long, stiff object on the shoulder’ • PNi \**ilk-* ‘carry behind the belt’ ◇ Cf. PSI \* $\nu k^w$  ‘carry, haul, take/bring somewhere’.
411. PAW \* $y^{O:\gamma}E$  ‘rain’ • PWN \* $y^{u:g}w-$  ‘to rain’; \* $y^{u:g}w-a$  ‘rain’ • PNi \**ju* ‘dew’ || Nikolaev 2015: 42.
412. PAW \* $y^{V}$  ‘demonstrative stem’ • PW \* $y^{i}(:)-$  ‘that yonder’; \* $y^{a}$ : ‘that’; \* $y^{u}(:)-$  ‘that (near you)’ • PNi \**a-* ‘that, there’ [\**a-* ‘there, downriver’, \**a-γi-* ‘there (distant)’, \**a-*, \**a-hu-* ‘that (visible distant)’] • PAlg \**ya* ‘that (personal, extended); then’; \**yo* ‘that (restricted)’ [Wi *yo* ‘then’, Yu. *yo?* ‘he, she, it’; *yu?* ‘there’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
413. PNA \* $\zeta aKE$  (~  $\ddot{a}$ ,  $X$ ) ‘to stick in’ • PNi \**caγ-a-* ‘to stick in’ • PA \**sa:k-* ‘to protrude, emerge’ [Men. *sa:k-a:p-et-εw* ‘to teethe’, WOj. *sa:k-ekk-i* ‘it grows forth’, etc.].
414. PNA \* $\zeta aXkA$  (~  $\ddot{a}$ ) ‘cradleboard’ • PNi \**caq* ‘cradleboard’ • PA \**tehk-* ‘to tie on the cradleboard’, \**tehk-in-a:-kan-* ‘cradle board’ [Cree *tihk-in-a:-kan*, WOj. *tekk-in-a:-kan* ‘cradle’, Men. *tehk-e:w* ‘he is tied to the cradleboard’, etc.].
415. PAW \* $\zeta A:kE$  ‘bear’ • PWN \**sa:k-* ‘grizzly bear’ • PNi \**cxī-f* ‘brown bear’.
416. PAW \* $\zeta ik^{wE}$  ‘tree’ • PW \**suk-* ‘tree’ • PNi \**ciγ-r*, \**cxə-r* ‘tree’ ◇ Cf. PSI \**caq* ‘tree’ || Nikolaev 2015: 44.
417. PAW \* $\zeta i:pV \sim *zi:pV$  ‘k. of bird’ • PWN \**su:p-*, \**cu:p-* ‘robin (*Turdus migratorius*)’ • PNi \**cevr-q* ‘bird (singing, generic)’ • PAlg \**c-ey-ep-* (~ *ch*, *ph*) > PA \**si:p-e:hs-* ‘bird (generic)’ [Ab. *sib-es*, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
418. PAW \* $\zeta A:\eta k^{wV}$  (~  $k^{w}$ ) ‘straight, extended’ • PWN \* $\zeta a:k^w-$  ‘to straighten out, extend (leg, knife), to spread apart with the hands’ • PA \**šenk-* ‘straight, extended (lying)’ [Cree *sihk-is-em-e:w* ‘to lay down’, Fox *še:k-iš-ik-a* ‘one who lies down’, WOj. *šenk-išš-in* ‘to lay down’, etc.].

<sup>7</sup> P. Proulx (1994, #370) traces PA \* $-i\text{:}y\ddot{a}w-$  ‘flesh; body’ and Yu. *tew-on*, *-tew* ‘flesh’ to PAlg \**we-Tewi*, \**w-ey-eTawi* ‘(her) flesh, body’. Here, however, sound correspondences are “reverse”, because PAlg \**T* = \**d* regularly changes to *ʔ/∅* in Yurok and Wiyot and not in Proto-Algonquian.

419. PAW \*ʒ[e:]G<sup>w</sup>A ‘spear, point, knife’ • PWN \*ʒi:q<sup>w</sup>- ‘spear, point, prong’ • PNi \*caq-o ‘knife’.
420. PAW \*ʒu: ‘fish, salmon’ • PW \*ʒu:-x<sup>w</sup>- ‘coho salmon’ • PNi \*cho ‘fish’ ◊ Cf. PS \*caw’i-n ‘coho salmon’ || Nikolaev 2015: 39.
421. PAW \*-Vɣ- ‘infix: plural’ • PWS \*-ay- or \*-ay- ‘plural infix’ • PAlG \*-eɣ- ‘plural infix’.
422. PNA \*-VhrV ‘diminutive suffix’ • PNi morphs \*-r and \*-ř in animal names : \*qhot-r ‘bear’, \*laq-r ‘squirrel’, \*luvn-r ‘sable’, \*tot-r ‘marten’, \*khuz-r ‘wolverine’, etc.; chonq-ř ‘polecat, weasel’, \*liy-ř ‘wolf’, etc. • PA \*-e:hš- ‘diminutive suffix, esp. in animal and bird names’: \*wa:kw-e:hš-a ‘fox’, \*penkw-e:hš-a ‘gnat’, \*ša:nkw-e:hša ‘mink’, \*ko:hko:-hš-a ‘pig’, also \*makw-e:hš-e:w-en-i ‘feast, banquet’ (from \*makw- ‘grease’).
423. PAW \*-VhmV ‘diminutive suffix’ • PWN \*-hm ‘diminutive suffix’ • PAlG \*-Vm-c- (suff.) ‘diminutive suffix’ [Wi. -ác-, -íc-, Yu. -os-, -es-, PA \*-ens-].

#### 4. Index of lexical meanings

- ABDOMEN — PAW \*ʔVda:k’A ~ \*ʔVt’a:gA ‘belly, abdomen’ 40
- ABOVE — PAW \*ʔi:k’V ~ \*k’i:ʔV 24 • PAW \*k’i: ≈ \*ʔi:k’V 173
- ADZE — PAW \*či:ɣ<sup>w</sup>V 87
- ALL — PAW \*ʔa:gV ~ \*ya:gV (~ a:) 7 • PNA \*ček’E (~ č’, g, q’) 83 • PAW \*ʔi:m’V ~ \*m’i:ʔV 272
- ALL THE TIME, ALMOST — PAW \*ʔOx<sup>w</sup>V ‘almost, all the time’ 212
- ALONG — PAW \*p’E 303
- ALONG WITH — PAW \*kE (~ g) 159
- ANGRY — PAW \*ʔOmV 34
- ARM — PAW \*dī:mg<sup>w</sup>E (~ q<sup>w</sup>) 103 • PAW \*n’OLK<sup>(w)</sup>V (~ í’) ‘hand, arm’ 250 • PNA \*t’VPot’V (~ d) 360
- ASHES — PNA \*pVl-əŋV-k<sup>w</sup>E 300
- AUNT — PAW \*ʔəmV ‘mother, aunt’ 18
- BACK (ADV.) — PNA \*wa:lwV (~ w’, ä:) ‘back, behind’ 362
- BACKBONE — PAW \*χa:rgA (~ k’) 395
- BAD — PAW \*y’a:k’E ~ \*k’a:y’E 409
- BARK (DOG) — PAW \*wə:nkE 374 • PAW \*w’a:yV 383
- BARK (TREE) — PAW \*χe:rg<sup>w</sup>A ~ \*ge:rrχ<sup>w</sup>A 397
- BE IN A POSITION, BE SUCH AS — PAW \*la ‘to be in a position, be such as’ 190
- BEAR (N.) — PAW \*mulq<sup>(w)</sup>E 229 • PAW \*ʒA:kE 415
- BEAST OF PREY — PAW \*ŋa:hV 259
- BEE — PAW \*x<sup>w</sup>O:ŋV ~ \*ŋO:x<sup>w</sup>V 393a
- BEFOREHAND — PAW \*ʔi:wɜVg<sup>w</sup>E (~ ʒ, k<sup>w</sup>) 27
- BEHIND — PNA \*wa:lwV (~ w’, ä:) ‘back, behind’ 362
- BELIEVE — PAW \*ʔä:q<sup>w</sup>A 12
- BELLY — PAW \*ʔVda:k’A ~ \*ʔVt’a:gA ‘belly, abdomen’ 40 • PAW \*wi:ɜV ≈ \*ʔi:wɜV ‘body, belly’ 378
- BELOW — PAW \*m’O:ʔV ≈ \*hO:ʔm’V 240
- BEND — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>i:ɜV ‘to bend, fold’ 186
- BERRIES (KIND OF) — PAW \*ʔVλV:nQ<sup>w</sup>V 48 • PAW \*hAqAgV (~ k’) 137 • PAW \*ŋi:rg<sup>w</sup>V 263 • PAW \*t’imV (~ ə) 352
- BERRY — PAW \*ma:lV (~ ä:) ‘berry, fruit’ 217 • PAW \*mi: (~ ä:, ü:) ‘leaf, berry’ 224 • PAW \*(ʔV)m’A:nšV ‘flower, berry’ 235 •
- BIG — PNA \*manŋA (~ m’, ä, k’, q’) ‘big, main’ 214 • PNA \*p’i:lV (~ e:) 305

- BIRD (KIND OF) — PAW \*n'i:n'V (~ n') 248 • PNA \*pišk'wE (~ č, q'w) 285  
 BIRD (LARGE) — PAW \*po:lV ≈ \*ʔo:l'pV 290  
 BIRD (SMALL) — PAW \*c'ü:q'wA, \*c'V:cq'wA 77 • PAW \*zi:pV ~ \*zi:pV 417  
 BIRD OF PREY — PNA \*kVlanVwV ~ \*kVnalVwV (~ ä) 165  
 BITE — PAW \*q'an3V ~ \*gan3V (~ c, s) 'to eat, bite' 315  
 BLADDER (FISH) — PAW \*puq'A (~ ɣ) 'fish bladder' 296  
 BLEED — PAW \*bO ~ \*pO 68  
 BLINK — PAW \*p'OLV 'to blink, close eyes' 307  
 BLOOD — PAW \*ʔarV (~ ä) 2 • PAW \*c'ü:xA ≈ \*ʔü:c'xA 'sap, blood' 81 • PAW \*p'akV (~ ä) 'red; blood' 302  
 BLOW (WIND) — PAW \*la:yVwV 'wind; to blow (wind)' 192  
 BLOW (WITH MOUTH) — PAW \*bu: ~ \*pu: 'to blow (with mouth); swell' 70  
 BLUE — PAW \*m'äwɣ'wE 237 • PAW \*q'wä:lV ~ \*ɣ'wä:lV (~ t) 'blue, green' 325  
 BOAT — PAW \*x'w'a:lɣ'wV (~ -k'w-) 390  
 BODY — PAW \*gü:dV (~ t') 126 • PAW \*wi:3V ≈ \*ʔi:w3V 'body, belly' 378 • PNA \*y'iwV (~ y', ə, w') 'body, intestines' 404  
 BOIL (VB.) — PAW \*q'worV 335  
 BONE — PAW \*tVq'(<sup>w</sup>)E ≈ \*ʔVtq'(<sup>w</sup>)E 213 • PAW \*x'o:ck'E (~ č, s, š) 398  
 BORROW — PAW \*la:ɲɣ'wV 200  
 BOWELS — PAW \*q'wɔɲwV ~ \*q'wɔɲwV 'liver, bowels' 334  
 BOX — PNA \*waNXKA (~ w') 365  
 BREAK — PAW \*p'i:Tq'wE 306  
 BREAST — PAW \*t'a:qE ≈ \*ʔa:t'qV 'chest, breast' 349  
 BREAST (FEMALE) — PAW \*nowV ≈ \*ʔonwV 'to suck; breast' 246  
 BREATHE — PAW \*hA:sV 141  
 BROOD — PNA \*ʔa:wV (~ w') 'egg, brood' 21  
 BURN (TRANS.) — PAW \*pOɣ'(<sup>w</sup>)V ≈ \*ʔOɣ'(<sup>w</sup>)V 'to heat, burn' 292 • PNA \*tOyVʔwV 345  
 BURN TO CINDERS — PAW \*q'we:lV (~ t) 328  
 CALL — PAW \*we: ~ \*ʔe:wV 371  
 CAP — PNA \*hagA (~ ä, q) 'cap, headdress' 133  
 CAPE — PAW \*we:q'wE (~ q'w) 'nose, cape' 373  
 CARRY — PAW \*bVnV ~ \*b'wVnV (~ n') 127 • PAW \*hinV (~ e) 150 • PNA \*ńeyV (~ n') 252 • PNA \*tO ≈ \*ʔOtV 343 • PAW \*t'i:xE 351 • PAW \*y'ilɣ'wE (~ k'w) 410  
 CARRY ON ONE'S BACK — PAW \*homV 152  
 CAT (WILD) — PNA \*KičV(-KE) (~ Q, X) 166  
 CHEAT — PNA \*walyV3V (~ w', ä) 364  
 CHEST — PAW \*t'a:qE ≈ \*ʔa:t'qV 'chest, breast' 349  
 CHIEF — PAW \*kA:mV 157  
 CLAW — PAW \*t'i:k'wE ~ \*k'w'i:t'V 'nail, claw; peg' 354  
 CLEAN (VB.) — PAW \*c'u:b'wA (~ č') 'to wash, clean' 80  
 CLOD — PAW \*ɲiɣE (~ k') 'rock, clod' 264  
 CLOSE EYES — PAW \*p'OLV 'to blink, close eyes' 307  
 CLOUD — PAW \*ʔä:lVw'adVχE 11 • PAW \*ʔVwO:nV (~ ɲ) 'cloud, fog' 54  
 COLD — PAW \*k'i:wɲV ~ \*ɣi:wɲV 'to freeze; cold' 174 • PAW \*λ'i:rɣE 208 • PAW \*t'OnCV 356 • PAW \*w'VdV 387  
 COUGH — PAW \*l'Eχ'wA ≈ \*ʔEχ'w'l'A 196 • PAW \*w'APsV (~ Ks) 382  
 COVER (VB.) — PNA \*pedV (~ t') 278  
 CRADLEBOARD — PNA \*3aXkA (~ ä) 414



- CRANE — PNA *\*wa:ncVKA* (~ *w*, *n*, *Q*, *X*) ‘heron, crane’ 368
- CRAWL — PAW *\*ɣ<sup>w</sup>ulV* ‘to crawl, go on all fours’ 120
- CREAK — PAW *\*k<sup>(w)</sup>EkA* ‘to squeak, creak’ 181
- CROW — PNA *\*ʔa:ndVXKE* (~ *ä*, *t*) ‘raven, crow’ 8
- CURLY — PAW *\*k<sup>w</sup>inx<sup>w</sup>V* ~ *\*ginx<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *e*) 172
- CUT IN TWO — PAW *\*q<sup>w</sup>odV* (~ *t*) ‘to cut in two; middle, other’ 329
- DANCE — PAW *\*t<sup>w</sup>amq<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *e*) 348
- DARK — PAW *\*q<sup>w</sup>o:q<sup>w</sup>E* (~ -*G<sup>w</sup>*-) 336
- DARK (AS THE NIGHT) — PAW *\*dA:p<sup>w</sup>V* 98
- DAY — PNA *\*k<sup>w</sup>onV* (~ *q<sup>w</sup>*, *n*) ‘light; day’ 180
- DEEP — PAW *\*pewV* (~ *i*) 280
- DEER — PAW *\*ʔVtOk<sup>w</sup>A* 53 • PAW *\*mu:wV* (~ *o*:) ‘deer, elk’ 230
- DEFECATE — PAW *\*di:χV* ‘to defecate, urinate’ 102
- DEMONSTRATIVE STEM — PAW *\*dV* 107 • PAW *\*gV* ~ *\*g<sup>w</sup>V* 108 • PAW *\*hV* 156 • PAW *\*w<sup>w</sup>V* 386  
• PAW *\*y<sup>w</sup>V* 412
- DIE — PAW *\*n<sup>w</sup>AbV* (~ *p*) 255 • PNA *\*mo:ryV* (~ *m*) 227
- DIG — PAW *\*t<sup>w</sup>ü:g<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *k<sup>w</sup>*) 358
- DIMINUTIVE SUFFIX — PAW *\*-VhmV* 423 • PNA *\*-VhrV* 422
- DIP — PAW *\*hObV* (~ *p*) 153
- DIRT — PAW *\*č<sup>w</sup>Ak<sup>w</sup>V* ~ *\*hAč<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>V* 92
- DIRT(Y) — PAW *\*mü:* 231
- DOG — PAW *\*q<sup>w</sup>änV* 316 • PNA *\*ʔaLVmV* (~ *ä*, *m*) 1
- DOOR — PNA *\*daj<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *i*) ‘opening, door’ 99
- DOWN — PAW *\*bVN<sup>w</sup>V* 72 • PAW *\*n<sup>w</sup>i:* (~ *n<sup>w</sup>*, *e*:) 247
- DREAM (VB.) — PAW *\*po:wV* (~ *b*) 291
- DRESS (VB.) — PNA *\*we:dV* (~ *w*, *t*) 372
- DRINK — PAW *\*hək<sup>w</sup>E* ~ *\*k<sup>w</sup>əhE* ~ *\*ʔəhk<sup>w</sup>E* ‘to drink; water’ 144
- DRY (ADJ.) — PAW *\*k<sup>w</sup>a:rkA* ‘dry’ 175
- DRY (VB.) — PNA *\*Ci(:)* (~ *e[:]*) ‘to dry’ 82
- DUCK — PAW *\*ʔAwVNg<sup>w</sup>E* ‘duck’ 5
- DWELL — PAW *\*ɣ<sup>w</sup>i:KV* 119
- EAR — PAW *\*hA:tV* (~ *t*) 142 • PAW *\*ʔamE-IV* 221
- EARLY — PNA *\*nabV* (~ *n<sup>w</sup>*, *ä*, *p*) ‘early’ 242
- EARTH — PAW *\*č<sup>w</sup>Ak<sup>w</sup>V* ~ *\*hAč<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>V* 92 • PAW *\*m<sup>w</sup>e:* ~ *\*ʔe:m<sup>w</sup>V* ‘earth, land’ 238
- EAT — PAW *\*m<sup>w</sup>a:hV* ~ *\*ham<sup>w</sup>V* 234 • PNA *\*n<sup>w</sup>i:* (~ *n<sup>w</sup>*) 253 • PAW *\*q<sup>w</sup>anɔV* ~ *\*ganɔV* (~ *c*, *s*) ‘to eat, bite’ 315
- EGG — PNA *\*ʔa:wV-k<sup>w</sup>E* ‘fish egg’ 21 • PAW *\*n<sup>w</sup>ü:yV* 274 • PAW *\*qalV* ~ *\*aq<sup>w</sup>lV* ‘egg, fish egg’ 308 • PNA *\*ʔa:wV* (~ *w*) ‘egg, brood’ 21
- ELBOW — PNA *\*t<sup>w</sup>Omk<sup>w</sup>A* (~ *q*) 355
- ELK — PAW *\*mu:wV* (~ *o*:) ‘deer, elk’ 230
- EXTENDED — PAW *\*ʕA:ŋk<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *k<sup>w</sup>*) ‘straight, extended’ 418
- EYE — PAW *\*ʔAɬV* 3
- EYEBROW, EYELASH — PNA *\*čVXəpV* (~ *č*, *i*) ‘eyebrow, eyelash’ 91
- FACE — PAW *\*ʔA:sV* 4 • PNA *\*ʔi:ŋgE* 30 • PNA *\*ʔO:čk<sup>w</sup>E* ‘head, face’ 36
- FAR — PAW *\*ɛAyV* 126a
- FAST — PAW *\*yixA* ‘quick, fast’ 405
- FAT (N.) — PAW *\*ɛ<sup>w</sup>o:lV* (~ *i*:) 132 • PNA *\*ŋOk<sup>w</sup>A* (~ *ŋ*, *q<sup>w</sup>*, *X*) ‘fat, grease’ 265
- FEAR — PAW *\*kElV* 160 • PNA *\*c<sup>w</sup>əq<sup>w</sup>E* ~ *\*ʕəq<sup>w</sup>E* 78

- FEATHER — PAW \**m*χE ≈ \**ʔim*χE ‘hair, feather’ 226  
 FIND OUT — PAW \**walx*<sup>w</sup>E (~ ə) 363  
 FIRE — PAW \**ʔəŋV*(-k<sup>w</sup>E) 19 • PAW \**m*E: ‘to flame, fire’ 220  
 FISH — PAW \**ʒu*: ‘fish, salmon’ 420  
 FISH (KIND OF) — PAW \**Gu:lV* (~ ʔ) 124  
 FISH WITH LINE AND HOOK — PNA \**kerčk*<sup>w</sup>A (~ q<sup>w</sup>) 158  
 FLAME (VB.) — PAW \**m*E: ‘to flame, fire’ 220  
 FLAT — PAW \**pAl*<sup>v</sup> ‘thin and flat’ 277  
 FLEE — PNA \**ʔe:mV* (~ m<sup>ʔ</sup>) 15  
 FLESH — PAW \**di:k*<sup>w</sup>V ~ \**di:g*<sup>w</sup>V (~ ä:) ‘meat, flesh’ 101  
 FLOOD (VB.) — PAW \**po:lV* (~ ʔ) 289  
 FLOWER — PNA \**ʔEni:pV* (~ η<sup>ʔ</sup>) ‘leaf, flower’ 16 • PAW \*(*ʔV*)*m*<sup>ʔ</sup>A:*nšV* ‘flower, berry’ 235 • PAW \**pVlanq*<sup>ʔ</sup>A ‘leaf, flower’ 299  
 FLY (N.) — PNA \**ping*<sup>w</sup>E (~ e) ‘fly, gnat’ 284  
 FLY (VB.) — PAW \**n*<sup>o</sup>:*lV* 249  
 FOAM — PNA \**bü:PTV* (~ p<sup>ʔ</sup>) 71  
 FOG — PAW \**ʔVwO:nV* (~ η<sup>ʔ</sup>) ‘cloud, fog’ 54  
 FOLD (VB.) — PAW \**k*<sup>w</sup>:*i:ʒV* ‘to bend, fold’ 186 • PAW \**q*<sup>v</sup>:*ncV* 322  
 FOOT — PNA \**ʔVč*<sup>ʔ</sup>kE (~ q, X) ‘foot, leg’ 39 • PAW \**či:t*<sup>v</sup>(-lV) ‘foot, leg’ 86 • PAW \**g*<sup>wi</sup>:*g*<sup>w</sup>V 117  
 FORK — PNA \**waTVrk*<sup>ʔ</sup>*ańV* (~ w<sup>ʔ</sup>) 366  
 FOUR — PAW \**n*<sup>ʔ</sup>:*y*<sup>ʔ</sup>E:*wV*, \**mV-y*<sup>ʔ</sup>E:*wV* 408  
 FOX — PNA \**χ*<sup>w</sup>:*ä:g*<sup>w</sup>A (~ x<sup>w</sup>) 402  
 FREEZE — PAW \**k*<sup>i</sup>:*wŋV* ~ \**gi:wŋV* ‘to freeze; cold’ 174 • PAW \**q*<sup>w</sup>:*x*<sup>w</sup>A 331 • PAW \**λ*<sup>i</sup>:*rqE* 208  
 FRUIT — PAW \**ma:lV* (~ ä:) ‘berry, fruit’ 217  
 FULL — PAW \**ŋü:šV* 267  
 FUR GAME (KIND OF) — PAW \**ni:K*<sup>w</sup>V 243 • PAW \**ŋ*<sup>i</sup>: 271  
 FUR — PAW \**lä:χV* ~ \**λ*<sup>ü</sup>:*χV* (~ q<sup>ʔ</sup>) ‘skin, fur’ 203  
 GALL — PAW \**tiŋV* (~ e) ‘liver, gall’ 341  
 GIVE — PAW \**c*<sup>ʔ</sup>*Oŋ*<sup>w</sup>V ≈ \**ʔOŋ*<sup>w</sup>*ʒV* (~ k<sup>w</sup>) 95 • PNA \**mi*: ≈ \**ʔi:mV* (~ m<sup>ʔ</sup>) 225  
 GNAT — PNA \**ping*<sup>w</sup>E (~ e) ‘fly, gnat’ 284  
 GO — PAW \**ha*: (~ ə:) 139 • PAW \**wi* (~ e) ‘to walk, go’ 375  
 GO AND DO — PAW \**ŋ*<sup>a</sup>: ‘to go with, go and do’ 269  
 GO ON ALL FOURS — PAW \**ŋ*<sup>w</sup>:*ulV* ‘to crawl, go on all fours’ 120  
 GO OUT — PAW \**bu*: ~ \**pu*: ‘to go out, leave’ 69  
 GO WITH — PAW \**ŋ*<sup>a</sup>: ‘to go with, go and do’ 269  
 GOOSE — PAW \**heGEnV* ~ \**heŋEgV* ‘goose, merganser’ 143  
 GREASE — PNA \**ŋOk*<sup>w</sup>A (~ η<sup>ʔ</sup>, q<sup>w</sup>, X) ‘fat, grease’ 265  
 GREEN — PAW \**q*<sup>ʔ</sup>:*omV* (~ q<sup>w</sup>) 319 • PAW \**q*<sup>w</sup>:*ä:lV* ~ \**G*<sup>w</sup>:*ä:lV* (~ ʔ) ‘blue, green’ 325  
 HAIR — PAW \**həpV*(lV) ‘hair (body, facial)’ 145 • PAW \**m*χE ≈ \**ʔim*χE ‘hair, feather’ 226  
 HALF — PAW \**q*<sup>w</sup>:*aKc*<sup>v</sup> ‘half, one of a pair’ 323  
 HAND — PAW \**ʔi:kV* (~ k<sup>ʔ</sup>) 23 • PAW \**n*<sup>ʔ</sup>:*OLK*<sup>(w)</sup>V (~ ń<sup>ʔ</sup>) ‘hand, arm’ 250  
 HARD — PAW \**q*<sup>w</sup>:*ATkA* ‘hard, tough’ 324  
 HEAD — PNA \**ʔO:čk*<sup>ʔ</sup>E ‘head, face’ 36 • PAW \**č*<sup>ʔ</sup>:*i:ŋ*<sup>ʔ</sup>*k*<sup>ʔ</sup>E ≈ \**ʔi:ŋ*<sup>ʔ</sup>*č*<sup>ʔ</sup>*k*<sup>ʔ</sup>E 94 • PAW \**GemV* 122 • PAW \**hü:xE* ‘head, nape’ 155 • PAW \**t*<sup>ʔ</sup>:*iq*<sup>w</sup>E ~ \**tiq*<sup>w</sup>E 353  
 HEADDRESS — PNA \**hagA* (~ ä, q<sup>ʔ</sup>) ‘cap, headdress’ 133  
 HEAR — PAW \**məʔV* ≈ \**ʔəmʔV* 221 • PAW \**no*: 244 • PAW \**qe:x*<sup>w</sup>A (~ χ<sup>w</sup>) 312  
 HEART — PAW \**ʔepV* 13

- HEAT — PAW \*pOγ<sup>(w)</sup>V ≈ \*?Opy<sup>(w)</sup>V ‘to heat, burn’ 292  
 HERON — PNA \*wa:ncVKA (~ w’, n’, Q, X) ‘heron, crane’ 368  
 HOLD — PAW \*te:Xq<sup>w</sup>E 340  
 HOLE — PAW \*hoλVq’A ~ \*hoq’VλA 151  
 HOLLOW — PAW \*χurg<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*χurg<sup>w</sup>E 400  
 HOP ON ONE FOOT — PAW \*λ’imqA (~ e, G) 207  
 HORN — PAW \*wi:LV 377  
 HOT — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>ä:x<sup>w</sup>V ‘warm, hot’ 176  
 HURRY — PNA \*hü:mV (~ m’) 154a  
 I — PAW \*ñV 254  
 INALIENABLE POSSESSION (PREFIX) — PNA \*ηV- (~ η’) 268  
 INTERROGATIVE STEM — PAW \*g<sup>w</sup>V 118 • PAW \*na ≈ \*?anV 241 • PNA \*tV 346 • PAW \*wV (~ w’) 381 •  
 INTESTINES — PNA \*yiwV (~ y’, ə, w’) ‘body, intestines’ 404  
 JUMP — PAW \*dix<sup>w</sup>A (~ o) 104 • PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>ə?V ≈ \*?ək<sup>w</sup>V 178 • PAW \*t’OrV 357  
 KICK — PAW \*timQV (~ e) 342  
 KIDNEY — PNA \*?i:LV 28  
 KILL — PAW \*χVIV ≈ \*?VlχV 400a  
 KNEE — PAW \*p’iqE 304 • PAW \*χVtV 401a  
 KNEEL — PAW \*λ’og<sup>w</sup>E 209  
 KNIFE — PAW \*ʒ[e:]G<sup>w</sup>A ‘spear, point, knife’ 419  
 KNOW — PAW \*?OχVdAg<sup>(w)</sup>V (~ t’, k’) ‘to know how’ 35 • PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>e:mV ‘to know, understand’ 177  
 LAME — PAW \*yOgE (~ k’) ‘to limp, lame’ 407  
 LAND — PAW \*m’e: ≈ \*?e:m’V ‘earth, land’ 238  
 LEAF — PNA \*?Eηi:pV (~ η’) ‘leaf, flower’ 16 • PAW \*mi: (~ ä:, ü:) ‘leaf, berry’ 224 • PAW \*pVlanq’A ‘leaf, flower’ 299  
 LEAK — PAW \*co:x<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*čo:x<sup>w</sup>E ‘to leak, soak’ 76  
 LEAVE — PAW \*bu: ~ \*pu: ‘to go out, leave’ 69  
 LEG — PNA \*?Vč’kE (~ q, X) ‘foot, leg’ 39 • PAW \*či:t’V(-IV) ‘foot, leg’ 86 • PAW \*g<sup>w</sup>i:g<sup>w</sup>V 117  
 LICHEN — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>e:Tq<sup>w</sup>V (~ q<sup>w</sup>) 184 • PNA \*wa:XX<sup>w</sup>V (~ w’, ä:, Q<sup>w</sup>) ‘moss, lichen’ 369  
 LICK — PAW \*hi:tV (~ e:) ‘tongue; to lick’ 148  
 LIE (DOWN) — PAW \*ti:hV ≈ \*?i:h<sup>t</sup>V (~ e:) 210  
 LIGHT — PNA \*k<sup>w</sup>onV (~ q<sup>w</sup>, n’) ‘light; day’ 180  
 LIMP — PAW \*yOgE (~ k’) ‘to limp, lame’ 407  
 LIP — PNA \*?i:p<sup>t</sup>V ‘lip, tip of tongue’ 31  
 LIQUID — PAW \*w’e:pV ~ \*pe:w’V ‘water, liquid’ 384  
 LIVER — PAW \*q<sup>w</sup>oηwV ~ \*q<sup>w</sup>oηwV ‘liver, bowels’ 334 • PAW \*r’a:q<sup>w</sup>A ≈ \*?a:r’q<sup>w</sup>A (~ ə:) 338 • PAW \*tiyV ‘liver, gall’ 341  
 LOAD (VB.) — PAW \*m’A:w’V 236  
 LONG — PAW \*g’ilV (~ ə) 113  
 LOOK — PAW \*ñ’e:(wV) ‘to see, look’ 256  
 LOOK FOR — PAW \*λe:xE ≈ \*?e:λxE ‘to look for, watch’ 204  
 LOOSE — PAW \*k’E:šV 170  
 LOUSE — PAW \*hi:rxk’E 149  
 LUNGS — PNA \*hapV (~ ä) 133  
 MAIN — PNA \*manqA (~ m’, ä, k’, q’) ‘big, main’ 214  
 MAN — PAW \*?ü:tOq<sup>w</sup>E 38

- MANY — PNA \**ma:IV* (~ *m'*, *ä:*) 216  
 MEAT — PAW \**di:k<sup>w</sup>V* ~ \**di:g<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *ä:*) ‘meat, flesh’ 101  
 MELT — PAW \**čü:qA* 90  
 MIDDLE — PAW \**q<sup>w</sup>odV* (~ *t'*) ‘to cut in two; middle, other’ 329  
 MINK — PNA \**čo:nVKA* (~ *č'*, *š*, *η*) ‘weasel, mink’ 89  
 MISS (VB.) — PNA \**pa* (~ *ä*) 275  
 MOON — PAW \**l'u:η'žV* 197 • PNA \**kiηžV* (~ *q*, *X*) ‘sun, moon’ 161  
 MOSS — PAW \**ʔVp'Olv* 307a • PNA \**wa:XX<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *w'*, *ä:*, *Q<sup>w</sup>*) ‘moss, lichen’ 369  
 MOTHER — PAW \**ʔəmV* ‘mother, aunt’ 18  
 MOUTH — PNA \**ʔa:XpV* (~ *ä:*) ‘mouth (of animal)’ 9 • PAW \**ʔi:LV* 29 • PAW \**q<sup>w</sup>esV* ≈ \**heq<sup>w</sup>sV*  
 ‘mouth, nose, throat’ 326  
 MUSK DEER, MUSK GLAND — PNA \**wü:ηVyV* (~ *w'*, *η'*, *y'*) ‘musk gland; musk deer’ 380  
 NAIL — PAW \**t'i:k<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**k<sup>w</sup>i:t<sup>w</sup>V* ‘nail, claw; peg’ 354  
 NAME (N.) — PNA \**x<sup>w</sup>a* ≈ \**hax<sup>w</sup>V* 389  
 NAME (VB.) — PAW \**ʔVklV* 42  
 NAPE — PAW \**hü:xE* ‘head, nape’ 155  
 NAVEL — PAW \**q'ilmV* ~ \**qilmV* (~ *ɕ*) 317  
 NEAR — PAW \**la* 198 • PAW \**ma*: 215  
 NECK — PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>onsV* ≈ \**ʔonsk<sup>w</sup>A* 187 • PAW \**q<sup>w</sup>i:yV* 333  
 NEGATIVE STEM — PAW \**k'ä:* 168  
 NEW — PAW \**c'i:wV* (~ *č'*) 79  
 NIGHT — PAW \**nä:g<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**nä:g<sup>w</sup>TV* 251 • PAW \**taχA* ≈ \**ʔatχA* 339  
 NOSE — PAW \**(ʔV:lv-)q'AwV* (~ *l'*) 43 • PAW \**q<sup>w</sup>esV* ≈ \**heq<sup>w</sup>sV* ‘mouth, nose, throat’ 326 • PAW  
 \**we:q<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *q<sup>w</sup>*) ‘nose, cape’ 373  
 NOT — see NEGATIVE STEM  
 NOTCH (VB.) — PAW \**lik'E* (~ *ə*, *g*) 206  
 OLD — PAW \**hə:ym'V* 147  
 ONE — PAW \**n'ə* 257 • PAW \**pE:šV* ≈ \**ʔE:pšV* 281  
 ONE OF A PAIR — PAW \**q<sup>w</sup>aKc'V* ‘half, one of a pair’ 323  
 OPEN (VB.) — PAW \**ʔəlkE* (~ *i*) 17 • PNA \**ca:wV* (~ *c'*, *w'*) 74 • PAW \**guLA* 115  
 OPEN THE MOUTH WIDE — PAW \**hay<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *ä*) 134  
 OPENING — PNA \**dəy<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *i*) ‘opening, door’ 99  
 OTHER — PAW \**q<sup>w</sup>odV* (~ *t'*) ‘to cut in two; middle, other’ 329  
 OWL — PNA \**k<sup>w</sup>EyV* (~ *q<sup>w</sup>*, *g<sup>w</sup>*) 182  
 PADDLE — PNA \**ʔipwińyV* (~ *ə*) 25  
 PARTRIDGE — PNA \**baTkE* (~ *p'*, *ä*, *q*, *X*) 59  
 PATH — PNA \**ηOlyV* (~ *η'*) ‘path, road’ 266  
 PEEL (VB.) — PAW \**pəyšV* 283  
 PEG — PAW \**t'i:k<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**k<sup>w</sup>i:t<sup>w</sup>V* ‘nail, claw; peg’ 354  
 PERSON — PAW \**be:k<sup>w</sup>E* ~ \**pe:g<sup>w</sup>E* 62  
 PIERCE — PNA \**pOlk<sup>w</sup>A* (~ *q<sup>w</sup>*) 293  
 PLURAL INFIX — PAW \*-*Vγ*- 421  
 POINT — PAW \**ʒ[e:]G<sup>w</sup>A* ‘spear, point, knife’ 419  
 POUND (VB.) — PAW \**t'Vlx<sup>w</sup>V* 359  
 PRAY — PAW \**ʔVmi:hV* 49  
 PRESS — PAW \**tOkA* 344  
 PULL — PAW \**b<sup>w</sup>i:Xq<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *rq<sup>w</sup>*) 131  
 PUSH — PNA \**q'o:nc'V* 321

- QUICK — PAW \**yixA* ‘quick, fast’ 405  
 RAFT — PAW \**t’VyOmV* 361  
 RAIN — PAW \**y’O:γ<sup>w</sup>E* 411  
 RASH — PAW \**ci:x<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *s*) 75  
 RAVEN — PNA \**ʔa:ndVXKE* (~ *ä*; *t*) ‘raven, crow’ 8 • PAW \**G<sup>w</sup>a:(r)q<sup>w</sup>V* (~ *a*) 128  
 REACH — PAW \**k’ə: ≈ ʔə:k’E* 171  
 READY — PAW \**χ<sup>w</sup>a:yVcV* (~ *a*; *o*) 403  
 RED — PAW \**p’akV* (~ *ä*) ‘red; blood’ 302  
 RING — PAW \**k’e:ma:k<sup>w</sup>A ~ \*ge:ma:k<sup>(w)</sup>A* 169  
 RIVER — PAW \**wä*: ‘river, flowing water’ 370  
 ROAD — PNA \**ηOlyV* (~ *η*) ‘path, road’ 266  
 ROCK — PAW \**čik<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*č’ik<sup>w</sup>E* (~ *e*) ‘big stone, rock’ 84 • PAW \**ηigE* (~ *k*) ‘rock, clod’ 264  
 ROLL — PAW \**yOLwV* ‘to roll, wrap’ 406  
 ROOT — PAW \**č’VIVyip’V, \*č’VIVyip’a:tKE* 97  
 ROOT (EDIBLE) — PAW \**pVkwV* (~ *k<sup>w</sup>*) 298 • PAW \**x<sup>w</sup>ü:rg<sup>w</sup>A ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>ü:rg<sup>w</sup>A* 391  
 ROT — PNA \**birKE* (~ *p*, *Q*) 67 • PAW \**χVru:mcV* (~ *s*) 401  
 ROUND — PAW \**kOlxV ~ \*k’Olk’V ~ \*k<sup>w</sup>i:lk’V* 162  
 RUB — PAW \**gA:cV ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>A:cV* 116  
 RUN — PNA \**pehV* 279  
 SALMON — PNA \**ga:ηV* ‘salmon, trout’ 109 • PNA \**lOñmV* (~ *l*, *n*, *m*) ‘salmon, trout’ 194 •  
 PAW \**ʒu*: ‘fish, salmon’ 420  
 SAND — PAW \**q’OmbV* 320  
 SAP — PAW \**c’ü:xA ≈ ʔü:c’xA* ‘sap, blood’ 81  
 SAY — PNA \**di ≈ ʔidV* 100  
 SCAB — PNA \**wirKE ~ \*winKE* (~ *w*, *a*) 379  
 SCALE — PNA \**ʔVγrV* ‘skin (of animals), scale’ 41  
 SCATTER — PAW \**bi:rV ~ \*pi:rV* 64  
 SCRAPE, SCRATCH — PAW \**χarbV* (~ *ä*, *p*) 394 • PAW \**χü:g<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>ü:χE* 399  
 SEA LION — PAW \**mə:x<sup>w</sup>E* 223  
 SEAGULL — PAW \**G<sup>w</sup>olyV* 130 • PNA \**qe:glA ~ \*ge:qlA* 311  
 SEAL — PAW \**cA:ʔk<sup>w</sup>V ≈ ʔA:ck<sup>w</sup>V* 73  
 SEAL (KIND OF) — PNA \**biγE* (~ *p*, *a*, *ʁ*) 65 • PNA \**pü:ʁ<sup>w</sup>V* 295  
 SEASON — PAW \**äñV* ‘year, season’ 10  
 SEE — PAW \**n’e:(wV)* ‘to see, look’ 256  
 SEPARATE (VB.) — PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>e:pV* 183  
 SEVER — PAW \**bA:LQ<sup>w</sup>V* 60  
 SEW — PAW \**q’i:(nV) ≈ \*(n’i:)q’V* 318  
 SHAKE — PAW \**gi:cV* (~ *s*) 125 • PNA \**link’E* (~ *l*, *a*, *q*) 193  
 SHELLFISH — PAW \**ʔE:q’VnVčV* (~ *η*, *č*) ‘k. of shellfish’ 52  
 SHOAL — PAW \**ηə:ʔyV* ‘valley, shoal’ 262  
 SHOE — PNA \**mOmckA* (~ *m*, *Q*, *X*) 228  
 SHORT — PAW \**č’VkwV* (~ *k<sup>w</sup>*) 96  
 SING — PAW \**lu:*, \**lu:-η-* 195 • PAW \**q’amV ~ \*gamV* (~ *a*, *o*) 314  
 SINK — PAW \**q<sup>w</sup>oñzV* 330  
 SIT — PAW \**t’i:q<sup>w</sup>V ~ \*ti:q<sup>w</sup>V* 350  
 SKI — PNA \**la:gA ≈ ʔa:lgA* (~ *l*, *k*, *G*, *q*) ‘snowshoe, ski’ 191  
 SKIN — PNA \**ʔVγrV* ‘skin (of animal), scale’ 41 • PAW \**λü:χV ~ \*ʔ’ü:χV* (~ *q*) ‘skin, fur’ 203  
 SLEEP (VB.) — PAW \**k<sup>w</sup>oʔV ≈ ʔoʔk<sup>w</sup>A* 188

- SLIDE (VB.) — PAW \*IVxE ‘to slip, slide’ 195a  
 SLIP — PAW \*čo:žxE 88 • PAW \*IVxE ‘to slip, slide’ 195a • PNA \*wiXca:rV (~ w', e, q', c') 376  
 SLOW — PNA \*bä:dV (~ p', t') 61  
 SMELL (VB.) — PAW \*mä:žV ≈ \*žä:žmV 218  
 SMOKE (PRODUCE OR USE) — PAW \*w'e:šq'V ‘to produce or use smoke’ 385  
 SNAIL — PAW \*q'wiŋV ‘snake, snail’ 332  
 SNAKE — PAW \*q'wiŋV ‘snake, snail’ 332  
 SNOW — PAW \*ŋAgA (~ q') 258  
 SNOWSHOE — PNA \*la:gA ≈ \*ža:lga (~ l', k', G, q') ‘snowshoe, ski’ 191  
 SOAK — PAW \*co:x<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*čco:x<sup>w</sup>E ‘to leak, soak’ 76  
 SPEAK — PAW \*Ga:žV 121  
 SPEAR — PAW \*qaχlA (~ ä) 309 • PAW \*ž[e:]G<sup>w</sup>A ‘spear, point, knife’ 419  
 SPIRITUAL POWER — PAW \*li:g<sup>w</sup>E 201 • PNA \*mVNVCV (~ m', N') 232  
 SPLIT — PAW \*pədV (~ i, t') 282 • PAW \*pVpV 301  
 SPOON — PNA \*žVmiyX<sup>w</sup>E (~ m', K<sup>w</sup>) 50  
 SPOTTED — PNA \*t'ayV (~ ä) 347  
 SPREAD — PAW \*pitrV (~ ə) 288  
 SQUEAK — PAW \*k'(w)EkA ‘to squeak, creak’ 181  
 SQUIRREL — PNA \*žVlyak'<sup>w</sup>A (~ q'<sup>w</sup>) 45  
 STAND — PAW \*la: 199 • PNA \*gə:p'V 111  
 STAR — PNA \*žo:ŋk<sup>w</sup>E (~ q<sup>w</sup>, X<sup>w</sup>) 33  
 STICK IN — PNA \*žakE (~ ä, X) 413  
 STONE — PAW \*čik'<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*č'ik<sup>w</sup>E (~ e) ‘big stone, rock’ 84  
 STONE SUITABLE FOR MAKING TOOLS — PNA \*pžLV-lVk'(w)E (~ ə) 287  
 STOOP — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>omV 179  
 STRAIGHT — PAW \*žA:ŋk<sup>w</sup>V (~ k'<sup>w</sup>) ‘straight, extended’ 418  
 STRETCH — PNA \*či:pV ~ \*pi:čV (~ š) 85  
 STRONG — PNA \*dO:nXE (~ t', K) 106  
 SUCK — PAW \*nowV ≈ \*žonwV ‘to suck; breast’ 246  
 SUFFER — PAW \*y'e:χE ≈ \*že:y'χE 407a  
 SUN — PNA \*kiŋžV (~ q, X) ‘sun, moon’ 161  
 SUSPECT — PAW \*go:l'V 114  
 SWALLOW (VB.) — PAW \*ŋ'i:q'<sup>w</sup>V 273  
 SWELL — PAW \*bu: ~ \*pu: ‘to blow (with mouth); swell’ 70  
 SWIM — PAW \*mə:rV 222  
 TAIL — PAW \*ŋ'a:gE (~ k') 270  
 TAIL (OF FISH) — PAW \*č'ak'E ≈ \*žäč'k'E 93  
 TELL — PNA \*di ≈ \*židV 100  
 THAT — see DEMONSTRATIVE STEM  
 THICK (CLOTH) — PNA \*KVdibV (~ t', p') 167  
 THIN (FLEXIBLE OBJ.) — PAW \*pO:kV (~ b, k') 294  
 THIS — see DEMONSTRATIVE STEM  
 THINK — PNA \*žə:lV (~ l') 20  
 THOU — PAW \*kV ‘you (sg.), thou’ 164  
 THREE — PAW \*gilV (~ ä, l') 112  
 THROAT — PNA \*qü:rV (~ x, χ) 313 • PAW \*q<sup>w</sup>esV ≈ \*heq<sup>w</sup>sV ‘mouth, nose, throat’ 326  
 THROW — PNA \*biKE (~ p', ə, Q, X) 66  
 THUNDER — PAW \*ti:yV 211

- THUS — PNA \*ʔilV (~ e) 22  
 TIE — PNA \*hO:bV ≈ \*ʔO:hbV (~ p') 154  
 TIGHT (FABRIC) — PNA \*KVdibV (~ t', p') 167  
 TIME — PAW \*r'a:G<sup>w</sup>E 337  
 TOGETHER — PAW \*λoʔV 202  
 TONGUE — PAW \*hi:tV (~ e:) 'tongue; to lick' 148 • PNA \*ʔi:pʔV 'lip, tip of tongue' 31  
 TOOTH — PAW \*gi:gE 123 • PAW \*xEcV ≈ \*ʔExcV (~ s) 388  
 TOUCH — PNA \*do:nKA (~ t') 105  
 TOUCH WITH THE HANDS — PAW \*m'a 233  
 TOUGH — PAW \*q<sup>w</sup>ATkA 'hard, tough' 324  
 TRACK, TRAIL — PNA \*ηä:cV (~ c') 'track, trail' 261  
 TREE — PAW \*pi:xk<sup>w</sup>E 'tree, willow' 286 • PAW \*ʒik<sup>w</sup>E 416  
 TROUT — PNA \*ga:ηV 'salmon, trout' 109 • PNA \*lOñmV (~ l', n', m') 'salmon, trout' 194  
 TURN — PAW \*x<sup>w</sup>i:tV 393  
 TWO — PAW \*me: 219  
 UNDERSTAND — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>e:mV 'to know, understand' 177  
 URINATE — PAW \*di:χV 'to defecate, urinate' 102 • PAW \*gälq<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*k'älq<sup>w</sup>E 110  
 USE — PNA \*ʔiwV (~ a, w') 26  
 VALLEY — PAW \*ηa:ʔyV 'valley, shoal' 262  
 VOICE — PAW \*we: ~ \*ʔe:wV 371  
 VOMIT — PAW \*ʔerV 14  
 VULVA — PAW \*ηa:λ'x<sup>w</sup>A 260  
 WAIT — PAW \*nowgE (~ k') 245  
 WALK — PNA \*be:IV 63 • PAW \*qa:rV 310 • PAW \*wi (~ e) 'to walk, go' 375  
 WARM — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>ä:x<sup>w</sup>V 'warm, hot' 176  
 WASH — PAW \*c'u:k<sup>w</sup>A (~ č') 'to wash, clean' 80  
 WATCH — PAW \*λe:xE ≈ \*ʔe:λxE 'to look for, watch' 204  
 WATER — PAW \*hak<sup>w</sup>E ~ \*k<sup>w</sup>əhE ≈ \*ʔəhk<sup>w</sup>E 'to drink; water' 144 • PAW \*wä: 'river, flowing water' 370 • PAW \*w'e:pV ~ \*pe:w<sup>w</sup>V 'water, liquid' 384  
 WE — PAW \*m'i (~ e) 239  
 WEASEL — PNA \*čo:nVKA (~ č', š, η) 'weasel, mink' 89  
 WHALE — PAW \*G<sup>w</sup>i: 129  
 WHAT — see INTERROGATIVE STEM  
 WHISTLE (VB.) — PAW \*x<sup>w</sup>i:yV 392  
 WHO — see INTERROGATIVE STEM  
 WILLOW — PAW \*pi:xk<sup>w</sup>E 'tree, willow' 286  
 WIND — PAW \*la:yVwV 'wind; to blow (wind)' 192  
 WITHER — PAW \*ba ~ \*pa 58  
 WOLF — PAW \*ʔO:l'i:kE (~ k') 46 • PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>OcV (~ s, š) 'wolf, wolverine' 189  
 WOLVERINE — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>OcV (~ s, š) 'wolf, wolverine' 189  
 WOMAN — PAW \*ʔäñV-k<sup>(w)</sup>V ≈ \*ʔäñV-k<sup>(w)</sup>V 209a  
 WORM — PAW \*k<sup>w</sup>iIVηV (~ a) 185  
 WORRY — PAW \*q<sup>w</sup>E:cV (~ s) 327  
 WRAP — PAW \*yOLwV 'to roll, wrap' 406  
 YAWN — PAW \*hay<sup>w</sup>V (~ ä) 134  
 YEAR — PAW \*ʔänV 'year, season' 10  
 YES — PAW \*hə:ʔV ~ \*ʔə:hV 146  
 YOU (SG.) — PAW \*kV 'you (sg.), thou' 164

## Language abbreviations and sources

- Ab. — Abenaki, acc. to O. Mudrak's comparative Proto-Algonquian database.
- Am. — Amur Nivkh.
- Arapaho — acc. to Salzman 1983.
- Blackfoot — acc. to Proulx 1989 and Hewson 1993.
- Chem. — Chemakum, acc. to Powell 1993 and Boas 1892.
- Cheyenne — acc. to Fisher, Leman, Pine, Sanches 2004 and Hewson 1993.
- Cree — acc. to Hewson 1993.
- Delaware — acc. to O'Meara 1996.
- EOj. — Eastern Ojibwa, acc. to O. Mudrak's comparative Proto-Algonquian database.
- Fox — acc. to Hewson 1993 and O. Mudrak's comparative Proto-Algonquian database.
- Ha. — Haisla, acc. to Linkoln, Rath 1980.
- He. — Heiltsuk, acc. to Linkoln, Rath 1980.
- Kickapoo — acc. to Voorhis, 1988.
- Kw. — Kwak'wala (Kwakiutl), acc. to Linkoln, Rath 1980.
- Men. — Menominee, acc. to Hewson 1993 and O. Mudrak's comparative Proto-Algonquian database.
- Miami — acc. to Baldwin, Costa 2005.
- Mic. — Micmac (Mi'kmaq), acc. to O. Mudrak's comparative Proto-Algonquian database.
- Natick — acc. to Aubin 1975.
- NiY — "Nivkh of Yukaghir borrowings", the hypothetical Northern Sakhalin language. Forms are given acc. to O. Mudrak's comparative Yukaghir database *jukaet.dbf*.
- Oj. — Ojibwa, acc. to Hewson 1993.
- Oo. — Oowekyala, acc. to Linkoln, Rath 1980.
- PA — Proto-Algonquian, acc. to Aubin 1975; Goddard 1974, 1979, 1982; Hewson 1993; Proulx 1984a, b, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1994 [with transliteration \*ʁ ⇒ \*ʔ; \*xk, \*xp ⇒ \*tk, \*tp; \*çk, \*çp > sk, \*sp].
- PAlg — Proto-Algic, acc. to Proulx 1984a, b, 1991, 1992, 1994. I have also added several PAlg roots, according to the rules of Proulx's reconstruction. I interpret the PAlg phonemes denoted by Paul Proulx as \*T, \*K, \*L, \*C, \*Č as voiced \*d, \*g, \*L, \*ʒ, \*ʒ. Proulx's \*s which only occurs in clusters is denoted as \*ʃ; its reflexes are PA \*ʔ, Wi. Ø and Yu. s (< \*r < \*ʃ). This PAlg phoneme corresponds to velars in other Algonquian-Wakashan languages. The "normal" PAlg velar glide \*ɣ does not occur in consonantal clusters.
- PAIt — Proto-Altaic, acc. to Starostin et al. 2003.
- PAW — Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan, author's reconstruction.
- PChi — Proto-Chumakuan, author's reconstruction.
- PChiW — Proto-Chimakum-Wakashan, author's reconstruction.
- PChK — Proto-Chukchi-Kamchatkan acc. to Mudrak 2000 and O. Mudrak's comparative database "Chukchi-Kamchatkan etymology" *kamet.dbf* (<http://starling.rinet.ru>).
- PIt — Proto-Itelmen acc. to Mudrak 2000 and O. Mudrak's comparative database "Itelmen etymology" *itelet.dbf* (<http://starling.rinet.ru>).
- PNA — Proto-Nivkh-Algic, author's reconstruction.
- PNi — Proto-Nivkh, author's reconstruction according to materials in O. Mudrak's comparative Nivkh database *nivget.dbf*.
- PS — Proto-Salish, acc. to Kuipers 2002.
- PSC — Proto-Central Salish, acc. to Kuipers 2002.
- PSI — Proto-Interior Salish, acc. to Kuipers 2002.
- PW — Proto-Wakashan, acc. to Fortescue 2007.
- PWN — Proto-Southern Wakashan, acc. to Fortescue 2007.
- PWS — Proto-Northern Wakashan, acc. to Fortescue 2007 and Linkoln, Rath 1980.
- Sakh. — Sakhalin Nivkh.
- Shawnee — acc. to Hewson 1993.
- Quil. — Quileute, acc. to Powell, Woodruff 1976.
- Wi. — Wiyot, acc. to Teeter, Nichols 1993 and Proulx 1984a, b, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1994.
- WOj. — Western Ojibwa, acc. to O. Mudrak's comparative Proto-Algonquian database.
- Yu. — Yurok, acc. to Robins 1958 and Proulx 1985.

## References

- Aubin 1975 — George F. Aubin. *A Proto-Algonquian dictionary*. Ottawa, 1975.
- Baldwin, Costa 2005 — Daryl Baldwin, David J. Costa. *Miami-Peoria dictionary*. Miami University, 2005.
- Beck 1997 — David Beck. Mosan III: a problem of remote common proximity. *32<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages*. 1997.
- Fisher, Leman, Pine, Sanches 2004 — Louise Fisher, Wayne Leman, Leroy Pine Sr., Marie Sanchez. *Cheyenne dictionary*. Morrisville, 2004.
- Fortescue 2007 — Michael Fortescue. *Comparative Wakashan dictionary*. München, 2007.



- Goddard 1974 — Ives Goddard. An outline of the historical phonology of Arapaho and Atsina. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. Vol. 40 (2). 1974, pp. 102–116.
- Goddard 1979 — Ives Goddard. Comparative Algonquian. In: *The languages of Native America: Historical and comparative assessment*, eds. Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun. Austin, 1979, pp. 70–132.
- Goddard 1982 — Ives Goddard. The historical phonology of Munsee. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. Vol. 48 (1). 1982, pp. 16–28.
- Haas 1958 — Mary R. Haas. A new linguistic relationship in North America: Algonkian and the Gulf languages. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. Vol. 14, pp. 231–264.
- Hewson 1993 — John Hewson. *A computer-generated dictionary of Proto-Algonquian*. Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1993.
- Kuipers 2002 — Aert Hendrik Kuipers. *Salish Etymological Dictionary*. Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana, 2002.
- Lincoln, Rath 1980 — Neville J. Lincoln, John C. Rath. *North Wakashan Comparative Root List*. Canadian Museum of Civilization Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper no. 68. Ottawa, 1980.
- Mudrak 2000 — O. A. Mudrak. *Etimologicheskij slovar' chukotsko-kamchatskikh jazykov*. Moscow, 2000.
- Nikolaev 2015 — Sergei L. Nikolaev. Toward the reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan. Part 1: Proof of the Algonquian-Wakashan relationship. *Journal of Language Relationship*. 13/1. Moscow, 2015. Pp. 23–61.
- O'Meara 1996 — John O'Meara. *Delaware–English / English–Delaware dictionary*. Toronto, 1996.
- Powell, Woodruff 1976 — J.V. Powell, Fred Woodruff, Sr. *Quileute dictionary*. Northwest anthropological research notes. Memoir No. 3. Part 2. Moscow (Idaho), 1976.
- Proulx 1984a — Paul Proulx. Proto-Algic II: Verbs. *International journal of American linguistics*. Vol. 50 (1). 1984, pp. 59–94.
- Proulx 1984b — Paul Proulx. Proto-Algic I: Phonological sketch. *International journal of American linguistics*. Vol. 50 (2). 1984, pp. 165–207.
- Proulx 1989 — Paul Proulx. A sketch of Blackfoot historical phonology. *International journal of American linguistics*. Vol. 55 (1). 1989, pp. 43–82.
- Proulx 1991 — Paul Proulx. Proto-Algic III: Pronouns. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 16. University of Kansas, 1991, pp. 129–170.
- Proulx 1992 — Paul Proulx. Proto-Algic IV: Nouns. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 17, No. 2. University of Kansas, 1992, pp. 11–58.
- Proulx 1994 — Paul Proulx. Proto-Algic V: Doublets and their implications. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 19, No. 2. University of Kansas, 1994. Pp. 113–183.
- Robins 1958 — Robert H. Robins. *The Yurok Language: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. University of California Publications in Linguistics. Vol 15. 1958.
- Salzmann 1983 — Zdenek Salzmann. *Dictionary of contemporary Arapaho usage*. Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, 1983.
- Starostin et al. 2003 — S.A. Starostin, A.V. Dybo, O.A. Mudrak. *The etymological dictionary of Altaic languages*. Leiden, 2003.
- Teeter, Nichols 1993 — Karl V. Teeter, John D. Nichols. *Wiyot Handbook I. Glossary and concordance*. Winnipeg, 1993.
- Voorhis, 1988 — Paul H. Voorhis. *Kickapoo vocabulary*. Winnipeg, 1988.

С. Л. Николаев. К реконструкции алгонкино-вакашского праязыка. Ч. 2: Алгонкино-вакашские звуковые соответствия.

Вторая часть настоящей статьи, продолжающая исследование, опубликованное в одном из предыдущих номеров ВЯР, содержит: состав праалгонкино-вакашских фонем со ссылками на праалгонкино-вакашский сравнительный словарь (§2); сравнительный праалгонкино-вакашский словарь, который включает более четырехсот корневых реконструкций, снабженных релевантным правакашским, пранивхским и праалгийским материалом, причем словарь включает также пранивхско-алгонкинские корни (§3); индекс лексических значений праалгонкино-вакашских и пранивхско-алгонкинских корней (§4). Научная новизна статьи заключается в формальном доказательстве гене-

тического родства между нивхским, алгийскими (алгонкино-ритванскими) и вакашскими языками стандартным компаративистическим методом, т. е. путем установления системы регулярных фонетических соответствий между словарями сравниваемых языков.

*Ключевые слова:* алгонкино-вакашские языки, алгийские языки, вакашские языки, чимакум-вакашские языки, вакашские языки, нивхский язык, историческая фонология, сравнительный словарь.

## Linear A *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, Hittite *tabarna* and their alleged relatives revisited \*

This article intends to be a comprehensive reassessment of a previous hypothesis connecting the Linear A sequence *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and the Hittite royal title *t/labarna-*, as well as a series of Anatolian words, toponyms and personal names allegedly related to the latter and belonging to the semantic sphere of power. In the course of this survey, several Anatolian onomastic elements, mostly dated to the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, are disconnected from the Minoan sequence and the Hittite title, and receive new explanations (with various levels of security) in the framework of the Luwic (IE) languages. Likewise, I separate *Labranios* (a Cypriot epithet of Zeus) from Hittite *labarna-* and argue instead for the old theory that it is an adaptation of the Phoenician name of Mount Lebanon. The conclusion of this reassessment is that, while there may have been a Luwian noun *\*tapara-* ‘rule’, there are no independent grounds for linking any Anatolian material to Minoan *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and no basis for assuming the latter meant ‘master’ (or similar).

*Keywords:* Linear A, Tabarna, Labarna, Luwic languages, Anatolian onomastics, Cilician names.

### 1. Introduction

Although the language of Linear A (LA), the logo-syllabic script of Minoan Crete, still eludes interpretation, the writing system itself cannot be considered wholly undeciphered. Decades of scholarship have shown that a significant number of syllabograms have phonetic values analogous to their Linear B (LB) counterparts. Particularly, through a set of independent contextual tests Duhoux (1989) has proved this to be the case with at least 30 syllabograms.<sup>1</sup> Inevitably, since LB is the product of an adaptation of LA to another language (Mycenaean Greek), which surely possessed a different phonemic inventory, we can hardly expect all phonetic values to be exact matches. They can, nevertheless, act as guiding phonetic approximations.

In a previous work (Valério 2007), I have dealt with a LA sequence which in this way reads *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*. It is found self-standing once (KO Za 1) and elsewhere in compounds, namely *(j)a-di-ki-te-te-du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* (PK Za 8 and 15) and *pa-ta-da-du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* (HT Zb 160) (*ibid.*: 8–9, citing

---

\* The content of this article derives mainly from a presentation made at the 1<sup>st</sup> session of the workshop ‘Luwic’ *Dialects: Inheritance and Diffusion* (University of Barcelona, October 23, 2013). The final text benefits from various comments, references and suggestions by I.-X. Adiego (U. Barcelona), A. Kassian (Russian Academy of Sciences), C. Melchert (UCLA), I. Yakubovich (U. Marburg) and J. G. Younger (U. Kansas). Thanks are also owed to R. Oreshko (U. Hamburg) for sending me a copy of his recent work. As usual, the responsibility for the views here contained, as well as any mistakes and shortcomings, is mine alone.

<sup>1</sup> These included a survey of the positional frequency of the suspected vowel (V) syllabograms, and listing sign alternations in LA-B pairs of sequences and within LA itself. Duhoux was cautious about the results: he considered different levels of security for each of the phonetic values depending on how many contextual tests confirmed them.

GORILA). I hypothesized that the compound (*j*)*a-di-ki-te-te-du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* was to be segmented (*j*)*a=di-ki-te-te=du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and signified a periphrastic divine name: ‘(to?) the Diktaian Master’, or similar. Thus, *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* would be the Minoan word for ‘master, lord’. The basis for this interpretation included three morphophonological and contextual facts: (1) the existence of a Minoan stem *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-* (> *da-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-*), which I linked with LB *da-pu(2)-ri-to-* = alphabetical λαβύρινθος (with a well-known non-Greek suffix *-vθoς*), i.e. ‘labyrinth’;<sup>2</sup> the similarity between (*j*)*a=di-ki-te-te=* and the name of Mount Dikte, aided by the fact the compounds with this string are limited to stone libation tables found at or near the Minoan peak sanctuary of Petsofas (near Palaikastro, East Crete), which later in the Archaic period was devoted precisely to to Diktaian Zeus (i.e. Zeus born on Mount Dikte); beyond phonetic resemblance, this supported the interpretation of (*j*)*a=di-ki-te-te<sup>o</sup>* as ‘Diktaian’; (3) the attestation of LB *di-ka-ta-jo di-we* ‘Diktaian Zeus’ at Knossos, showing a Late Bronze Age Cretan background for this deity. However, on the side of semantics, the grounds to propose ‘master’ as the meaning of *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* were admittedly more fragile. I drew upon Evans’ old idea that λαβύρινθος was the ‘royal palace’ of Knossos (see §2) and the presumable similarity of *da-pu(2)-r-/λαβύρ-* to one of the titles of the Hittite kings, *tabarna-/labarna-*, as well as a series of words and onomastic elements from Anatolia and Cyprus presumably related to the latter and belonging to the sphere of (human and divine) power.

In this I followed mainly the work of Yakubovich (2002) on Hitt. *t/labarna-* and its connections. The title has been among the most hotly debated items of the Hittite vocabulary, with contending interpretations of its etymology, Indo-European (IE) and non-IE, including proposals of a traveling contact word (*Wanderwort*) (see §10). Although at present the author thinks it is impossible to quantify the plausibility of the competing IE and non-IE hypotheses (pers. comm.), Yakubovich (2002) contains the most extensive argument favorable to the migrating word hypothesis, which provided the basis for the interpretation in Valério (2007). Starting with the Luwo-Hittite form (:)*tapar-* ‘to rule’, long thought to be related to Hitt. *t/labarna-*, Yakubovich compiled a dossier of possible regional connections:

- 1.1) Luwo-Hitt. *tapar(r)iya-* ‘to rule’ and derivatives;
- 1.2) Hieroglyphic Luwian LEPUS+*ra/i-i(a)-* ‘authority’ and derivatives;
- 1.3) The Hellenistic Cilician personal names Τβερασητας and Τβερημωσις (presumably reflecting \**Tapara-zitali* and \**Tapara-muwa+zi*, respectively)
- 1.4) The Lycian personal name *Dapara-* = ΛΑΠΑΡΑΣ;
- 1.5) *Labranios* (ΛΑΒΡΑΝΙΟΣ), an epithet of Zeus in Cyprus;

<sup>2</sup> An identical suggestion (unknown to me until very recently) was made by Billigmeier (1989), but unfortunately it was limited to an abstract, with no follow-up paper ever being published (thanks are owed to B. Davis and J. Younger for helping me locate this reference). My own argument (Valério 2007: 7–8) was based on the following: LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* is reminiscent of LB *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-ra-zo* (KN V[3] 419.1) and *da-pu<sub>2</sub>-ra-zo* (EL 1 1.2), two non-Greek personal names or, rather, two variants of the same name. The Cu-CV-/Ca-CV- alternation is seen in two well-known LA-B pairs: LA *ku-pa<sub>3</sub>-nu* (HT 1, 3, 42, 49, 88, 117, 122) / *ku-pa<sub>3</sub>-na-tu* (HT 119.3), attested in likely Minoan lists of persons, and the non-Greek personal names *ka-pa<sub>3</sub>-no* (KN As[2] 1516.16) / *ka-pa<sub>3</sub>-na-to* (KN Df 1219) in LB tablets from Knossos. Since *-zo* is a common ending of non-Greek names in the LB records from Knossos, it seems that the names above and LB *da-pu(2)-ri-to-* contain a Minoan element *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-r<sup>o</sup>*. The most plausible explanation for the vocalism is that of Davis (2014: 242–243): *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-* reflects Min. /DŭPúr-/ with an unaccented short /u/ that tended to be centralized to a schwa, whence /DəPúr-/ , transcribed in LB as *da-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-*, with *a* (I use “D” and “P” to represent what in my opinion are undetermined dental and labial obstruents). The LA texts are cited according to GORILA and those of LB follow *DocMyc*<sup>2</sup>.

- 1.6) The epithet of Zeus Labraundos (Λάβραυνδος), at the city of Labraunda, in Caria (with several variant spellings: ΛΑΒΡΑΥΥΝΔΟΣ ΛΑΒΡΑΙΥΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΑΥΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΙΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΕΝΔΟΣ; Λάβραυνδος; ΛΑΒΡΕΝΔΟΣ; and later Λαβρα[ν]δέυς)
- 1.7) LB *da-pu/pu<sub>2</sub>-ri-to-* = alphabetical Greek λαβύρινθος

At the time, the author suggested that these forms were all derivatives of migrating South Anatolian \*/*daBar-*/ ‘to rule’ and \*/*daBara-*/ ‘power?’, /*ð*/ presumably corresponding to a voiced coronal fricative /*ð*/. Thus, Lyc. *Dapara* would be a direct product of \*/*daBara-*/, while the Luwian forms would have undergone the development \*/*daBar-*/ > \*/*taBar-*/. The lambdacist transcription of *Dapara* as Grk. Λαπαρας would reflect this alien /*ð*/, as would the *d* ~ *λ* alternation in *da-pu(2)-ri-to-/λαβύρινθος* and the varying *t/labarna-*.

In Valério (2007), I proposed this virtual \*/*daBar-*/ to be related also to LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, but to help explaining its vocalism, I augmented the dossier of *possible* Anatolian relatives to include:

- 1.8) A set of Carian personal names with the alleged element -*DUbr-* (where D apparently corresponded to either Car. *ð* or *t* → Grk. *ð*, and U seemed to match Car. *w*, now transliterated *ý* = Grk. *υ*), including the alleged equivalences of the names *ksatýbr* → *Ξανδυβερις* and *smdýbrs* → *Ζεσμεδυβερις*.
- 1.9) The Lycian place name *Tuburehi* = Grk. *Τυβερισος* and the personal name *Tebursseli*.

A reassessment of my interpretation is now necessary, partly because of intrinsic problems (it admittedly depends on a number of undemonstrated connections) and partly because of its ramifications for the study of the language of LA. Given their phonological shape, the Carian names were one of the cornerstones of the hypothesis, but at the time I put it on paper, I had not yet had the opportunity to study comprehensively the entire dossier (which is gathered and discussed in Adiego 2007). In the meantime, the interpretation of LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* in Valério (2007) has gained some acceptance,<sup>3</sup> and its alleged ties to Hitt. *t/labarna-* and Lyc. *dapara/Λαπαρας* are now part of an argument by Davis (2014: 193–215) that the LA *d* series transcribed a “phoneme /*θ*/ that was realized in Minoan speech as allophones [*ð*] and [*θ*]”. In what follows, I will revisit the whole dossier.

## 2. (Non-)Greek λαβύρινθος and Carian Λαβραύνδα

The theories connecting λαβύρινθος and the Carian city Labraunda (Λαβραύνδα) can be traced back to Plutarch’s (*Greek Questions* 45, 2.302a) explanation of the local epithet of Zeus, Labrandeus (sic), as a derivative of λάβρος, an alleged Lydian word for ‘axe’. The Lydian word may have existed, but there is a chance the account of the ancient author owes to a folk etymology formulated at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, since Zeus Labraundos was characteristically depicted holding a double-axe in Achaemenid coins from Caria (Yakubovich 2002: 106–107, fn. 36.). At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Mayer and Kretschmer (apud Kretschmer 1896: 404) came up with the idea that Labraundos corresponded to “Cretan” λαβύρινθος. This notion emerged in connection with another theory by Kretschmer, namely that the toponymic suffixes -*νθος* (Aegean) and -*νδα* (Anatolia) are cognate and ensue from a Pre-Greek “substrate” language spoken on both sides of the Aegean Sea in prehistoric times. This idea is far

<sup>3</sup> See Younger (2011: 170, fn. 66) and Davis (2013: 42, 44; 2014).

from demonstrated,<sup>4</sup> but the crucial issue is not even the suffix, but the base morphemes, which require us to equate λαβύρ(ι)- and Λάβρα(ν)- (with all its variants; see §1). Already Kretschmer (1896: 404) had to do great phonological gymnastics and conjecture for both place-names a common preform \*Λαβραυυθός.

We know now that this is far from the reality: the Late Bronze Age form of λαβύρινθος was *da-pu(2)-ri-to-*, reflecting most likely /dap<sup>h</sup>úrint<sup>h</sup>os/.<sup>5</sup> In fact, it is often neglected that the pair is *not synchronic*: λαβύρινθος is first attested in Herodotus (2.148), so more than seven centuries separate it from its Mycenaean predecessor. In LB itself there are no examples whatsoever of words interchanging LB *d* = /d/ and *r* = /l/, which means there is no support for assuming Myc. \*/dap<sup>h</sup>úrint<sup>h</sup>os/ ~ \*/lap<sup>h</sup>úrint<sup>h</sup>os/ and, more significantly, no basis for Lejeune's old idea that the *d* ~ λ spellings reflect Greek attempts to render a foreign sound. More likely, /dap<sup>h</sup>úrint<sup>h</sup>os/ is the original form and λαβύρινθος owes to later, if only obscure, phenomena.<sup>6</sup>

Finally, in his renowned work on the Knossos palace, Evans (1921: 6) picked up on the (unprovable) suggestions of Mayer and Kretschmer and further claimed the double axe of Bronze Age Crete was identical with the Lydo-Carian λάβρος. For him, this equation was the “key” to understand both Labraundos and the “Labyrinth”, which to his mind were to be “identified with the palace sanctuary of Knossos”. Such etymological speculations constitute the historiographical roots of the interpretation of Grk. λαβύρινθος as ‘royal palace’ (see §1). The fact remains that in its first attestation λαβύρινθος was used by Herodotus (2.148) to refer to a vast, partially-underground Egyptian mortuary complex, so not only we have no basis to infer ‘palace’ was its original sense, but it is actually the case that other meanings, such as ‘hypogeum’, would explain better the earliest uses of the word (see Sarullo 2008).

### 3. Cypriot Greek ΛΑΒΡΑΝΙΟΣ

In Cyprus, a cult to Zeus *Labranios* (ΛΑΒΡΑΝΙΟΣ) is known through a dozen of ex-votos from the Roman period (late 2<sup>nd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century), found at Fasoúla, 10 km to the north of Amathus, and at Chandría, to the north of Fasoúla in the Troodos Mountains (Mitford 1961: 111, nos. 12–13).

Yakubovich (2002: 104–105; see also 2009a: 268) advanced tentatively a connection with *labarna-*. In a way, this echoed a theory first expounded by Hall (1885 [1883]: clxviii–clxix), who compared Zeus *Labranios* to Zeus Labraundos (see §2). According to Hall, the cult of Zeus

<sup>4</sup> For recent discussions see de Hoz (2004) and Yakubovich (2009b: 9–11).

<sup>5</sup> Chadwick has pointed out that “*pu* = *bu* is ... remarkable” (Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 538), and indeed the pronunciation of the interchanging *pu* = /pu, p<sup>h</sup>u/ and *pu*<sub>2</sub> /p<sup>h</sup>u/ ought to be /p<sup>h</sup>u/. Although descriptions of the phonological system of Myc. Greek routinely include a phoneme /b/, they overlook the fact that there are no uncontroversial examples of /b/ in native Mycenaean words; the phoneme was absent or near absent from the language, a situation which was inherited from PIE (see Thompson 2005).

<sup>6</sup> LB *d* > alphabetical λ shift(?) is reminiscent of two Pamphylian glosses in Hesychius, who notes that standard Grk. δίσκος ‘discus, quoit’ and δάφνη ‘sweet bay’ were pronounced respectively as λίσκος and λάφνη at the city of Perge. As we will see in §8 and §10, 1<sup>st</sup> millennium Anatolian languages like Lydian and Lycian lacked initial /d-/, which was replaced with /l-/ in loanwords (at least in Lydian). This suggests that Pergaeian λίσκος and λάφνη may have been the pronunciations of local Anatolians who spoke Greek as a second language. Since λαβύρινθος first appears in the work of Herodotus, a native of Halicarnassus (Caria), perhaps its *lambdacism* owes to similar reasons. As regards LB *p*(2) = /p<sup>h</sup>/ vs. alph. β (see fn. 5), it is tempting to speculate that /dap<sup>h</sup>úrint<sup>h</sup>os/ co-existed with \*/dawúrint<sup>h</sup>os/ owing to different Greek strategies to render a foreign voiceless labial fricative (cf. Mongolian, which adapts Russian [f] as [p<sup>h</sup>], [p<sup>h</sup>] or [w] in loanwords; Svantesson 2005: 31). For LB *w* > alph. β, cf. the case of LB *mo-ri-wo-do* /mólivdos/(?) vs. μόλυβδος/μόλιβος ‘lead’, certainly a borrowing in Greek.

*Labraundos* was taken by Carian settlers to Cyprus, where the toponymic epithet developed into *Labranios* through *multiple and irregular* sound changes.

A more economical explanation arose not much later from the pen of Ohnefalsch-Richter (1893: 220, 229), who equated Zeus *Labranios* with Phoenician *bʿl lbnn* ‘Ba’al of Lebanon’,<sup>7</sup> a deity worshiped in Cyprus in Pre-Roman times. Syncretisms between Greek Zeus and Semitic Ba’al are far from unseen and this one was later accepted by Mitford (1961: 111, 143), who worked extensively on Cypriot epigraphy, as well as Lipiński (1995: 306–307), a Semiticist.

At first sight, the inexact phonological match between *lbnn* and *Labranios* might seem to deter the identification. Credit is due to Lipiński (ibid.) for his comparison of H. Luw. (MONS) *La-pa+ra/i-na-*, most probably ‘Mt. Lebanon’ (see Hawkins 2000: 414). *\*/Labrana/* and *\*/Labarna/* are both possible readings, but the former is more likely in the light of Hitt. *Lablana*, Hurr. *Lablahhi* ‘from/of Lebanon’ (< *\*Lablan=hi*), Ugarit Akkadian [H]UR.S[AG *la*]-*ab-la-na* and Neo-Assyrian Akkadian *Labnāna* (see Del Olmo and Sanmartín 2003: 491). However, based on the Luwian form, Lipiński maintained that *Labranios* ‘of Mt. Lebanon’ was ultimately of Anatolian origin. This explanation is as implausible in historical terms as it is unnecessary. Greek and Phoenician-speaking communities coexisted in Iron Age Cyprus,<sup>8</sup> so Phoenician can be taken as the direct source of *Labranios*. As for H. Luw. *La-pa+ra/i-na-* /*Labrana-*/, it may be just the outcome of the characteristic Luwian *l > r* “flapping” in a previous form *\*Lablana-*, cognate with the abovementioned Hittite name of Mt. Lebanon.<sup>9</sup>

We only need to account for the phonological details of the Greek adaptation. In the Semitic languages the oronym contains /bn/, but since synchronically this cluster never occurs in native Greek words, *\*Λαβνāv-* would be impossible as the Hellenic adaptation of Phoen. *Lbnn*. Thus, *Λαβραν-* with /br/ must have been the alternative. Finally, the ending *-ιος* may correspond to a well-attested ancient Cypriot Greek genitive suffix that occurs in ethnics (cf. e.g. *se-la-mi-ni-o-se* /*Selaminios*/ ‘from Salamis’) as well as in divine epiclesis (Egetmeyer 2010: 253–254, 260–261).

#### 4. Alleged Carian names with *\*-DUbr*

Now that LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and LB *da-pu<sub>(2)</sub>-ri-to-* have been disconnected from the Carian place-name *Labraunda*, we need to reassess the dossier of Carian names that was crucial to the interpretation of the Minoan form. As stated above, I will now discuss all names listed in Adiego (2007) that could in theory contain a *-DUbr* element:

- 5.1) *ardybyrs* (E.Me 52)
- 5.2) *ardybyrs* (E.Me 52)
- 5.3) *dtýbr* (E.Th 2)
- 5.4) *dýbr* (E.Th 5)
- 5.5) *kśatýbr* (E.Th 2)
- 5.6) *kudtubr* (E.Th 9)
- 5.7) *smđýbrs* (C.Ha 1)

<sup>7</sup> This form is attested in an inscribed bronze bowl (KAI 31; cf. Masson and Sznycer 1972: 77–78).

<sup>8</sup> For a recent survey of the evidence for linguistic contact between Phoenician and Greek in Cyprus, see, e.g. Egetmeyer (2010).

<sup>9</sup> The consonantal divergence between Hurrian/Hittite/Ugarit Akkadian *lbn-* and Assyrian/Phoenician *lbnn* is best explained by a dissimilatory or assimilatory process involving this chain of sonants. I thank A. Kassian for suggesting this solution.

Two facts are relevant. First, the names remain opaque, and there is not the slightest hint of a connection to the semantics of power. Second, our present knowledge of Carian historical phonology does not suggest that Carian *y*, *y̅* or *u* can have the same source of Luwian *a*, the implication being that any connection to Luw. *tapar-* ‘to rule’ cannot go back to a Proto-Luwic stage;<sup>10</sup> we would rather be forced to assume that *\*-DUbr* was a late borrowing in Carian, and that, like Minoan, it had differences in vocalism. Before considering borrowings, however, I believe the more recommendable method is to try to understand the Carian forms internally first and afterwards seek possible etymological explanations within a Luwic framework.

*ardybyrs̅*, the genitive of *ardubur-*, is the most transparent name of the group as it corresponds to the Αρδυβερος (KPN §86–6) of Greek sources. It is significant that neither form has a letter of nasal value. Adiego (2007: 333, 353) maintains the possibility of segmenting *ard-ybyr-* / Αρδ-υβερος based on the existence of a Carian name *ybrs-* at Hyllarima (C.Hy 1); at the same time, he compares tentatively the string αρδ-/ορδ- of other Carian names in Greek transmission, but the analysis cannot be taken much farther.<sup>11</sup>

Three personal names from Thebes (Egypt), *dt̅ybr*, *d̅ybr* and *k̅sat̅ybr*, contain a string *-y̅br*; it is unclear whether *kudtubr* is also related. This small set is very difficult to analyze. *k̅sat̅ybr* has been compared to the Lycian name Ξανδυβερος (KPN §1061), but Car. *-t-* is not usually rendered by Grk. *-vδ-*. The problem is not insurmountable,<sup>12</sup> but in §5 we will see evidence that *k̅sat̅ybr* and Ξανδυβερος are to be separated. Thus, the easiest assumption is that the segmentable element in *dt̅ybr*, *d̅ybr* and *k̅sat̅ybr* is the one they all share: *-y̅br*. This view is consistent with (1) the proposed segmentation of *ard-ybyr-*; (2) the existence of a self-standing Carian name *ybrs-*; (3) the fact that *d̅ybr* leaves little margin for different segmentations.<sup>13</sup> In connection, I propose tentatively the segmentation of the latter name as *d̅-y̅br*, with a Luwic element *d-* = Iδα- that I will discuss in §8).

The anthroponym *sm̅d̅y̅brs* (C.Ha 1) was at first compared to Ζεομεδυβερος (from Mylasa) by Blümel (1990: 38–39), when the decipherment of Carian was not yet fully settled. Melchert (1993c: 81) added the idea that Ζεομε-/sm- had the same source as Luw. *zal/rma-* ‘protection’, because the “omission of the pre-consonantal /r/ in the Carian version” is supposedly unsurprising. This would point to *\*sm-δ̅y̅brs*. However, given the lack of secure cases of other similar omissions, I think it is actually unexpected (see Adiego 2007: 413). A second obstacle to segmenting *\*sm-δ̅y̅brs* is the use of the Carian letter *δ*, usually matching Grk. *vδ*, absent from the remaining names in the dossier. Conversely, if we opt for a different analysis of the name as *\*smδ̅-y̅brs* it becomes possible to adduce acceptable comparanda for both elements. It is unclear whether the *-s* of *sm̅d̅y̅brs* is part of the stem (Adiego 2007: 283), but, if it was, then the

<sup>10</sup> Following Melchert (2003: 175–177, fn. 7), “Luwic” is used here to refer to a group of closely related dialects, including not just Luwian and Lycian, but also Carian, Pisidian, Sidetic (besides unattested dialects which left traces only in Greek-written onomastics). As Melchert notes, it remains an open question whether their affinity is due to a common origin in a unitary prehistoric language, to areal diffusion of innovations, or both. In any case, I use “Proto-Luwic” for reconstructions of (naturally hypothetical) proto-forms that *could* explain material shared by different Luwic dialects.

<sup>11</sup> Schürr (2002) further compares αρδ-/ορδ- to the *\*(a)radu* of two Late Bronze Age names from Arzawa, *Tarhundaradu* and *Piyammaradu*, but the connection is hard to demonstrate as the meaning of the latter is uncertain.

<sup>12</sup> There is so far no unchallengeable instance of the letter *δ* (the one systematically rendered by Grk. *-vδ-*) in the Theban variety of the Carian alphabet (Adiego 2007: 222), so here *t* could be taking its place. In any event, the subcorpus of Carian inscriptions from Thebes is still not well understood and *δ* might in the future be discovered to be a part of it as well.

<sup>13</sup> In the latter case, we might entertain the possibility that *d̅y̅br* is a self-standing name itself, but this would leave the question of why would *dt̅y̅br* and *k̅sat̅y̅br* spell the same element with *t*, if *d* was available at Thebes.



second component is similar to the abovementioned self-standing name *ybrs-*. Concerning *\*smδ-*, the possible term of comparison is the anthroponym Ισεμενδα[...]ος (Caria; *KPN* §486), but I would further venture a connection with C. Luw. *zamm(n)ant(i)-* ‘having *zamna-*.’ This *zamna-* is a word of uncertain meaning but negative connotations that appears in Luwian onomastics of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE (see Melchert 1993a: 276 and Yakubovich 2013a: 101). The idea is not wholly new: Neumann (2007: 399) already compared *smδybrs* to Σεμενδησις, a name from Cilicia (*KPN* §1396) that Houwink ten Cate (1961: 165–166) interpreted in the light of *\*zamna-*. Still, Luwic *\*zammant(i)-* /*tsammand(i)*/ seems like a more straightforward source for *\*smδ-*.<sup>14</sup>

Not all loose ends can be tied. Taken together, Ζερωμεδυβερος (Caria) and Ζερωμουνδς (Lycia; *KPN* §383) still point to the existence of *\*Ζερω(ε)-* and *\*(ε)δυβερος*. This is difficult to reconcile with the above scenarios, unless Ζερωμεδ- is some extended form of Ζερω-. Hence, at present an impeccable analysis of this set of Carian names is unfeasible, but I think it has been demonstrated how difficult, if not impossible, it is to associate them all with a virtual, variable element *\*-DUbr* as I attempted previously. The above set of hypotheses, hinting at the isolation of *-ybyr*, *-ybr* and *-ybrs* (comparable to self-standing *ybrs*), is in my view the most economical.

Neumann (2007: 399) compared the Hellenized component *\*-υβερο(υ)-* in names from Lycia (see next section) and Caria with Luwo-Hitt. *warri-* ‘helpful’, *warri-* ‘help’ and *warrai-* ‘to come in aid’. Are these Luwisms cognate with Car. *ybr-*? One problem is the possibility (noted by Adiego 2007: 257) that Car. *y* denoted a semivowel /y/ (counterpart to *y = /y/*), potentially the result of the fronting of /u:/ and /w/ in propitious environments. It is true that there is also evidence for *Umlaut* in Carian (cf. *en* ‘mother’ and *ted* ‘father’ < *\*anni-* and *\*tádi-*), which could have produced a front vowel and, as a consequence, motivated the fronting of *w*. However, the biggest difficulty is that we would expect the development *ybr* < *\*yβeri* < Pre-Carian *\*uweri*, from P.-Luwic *\*\*uwar(r)i-*, not from *\*warri-*. The following section pursues these matters by dealing with Lycian and Cilician onomastics that contain an element potentially related to Car. *-ybyr* and *-ybr(s)*.

## 5. *-δυβερο(υ)-* (Lycia) and *-υδο(υ)βα/ε/ηρα-* (Cilicia)

Above Car. *ksatybr* was compared to Ξανδυβερος. This name needs to be treated as well, but its assessment cannot be separated from a set of other personal names from Lycian and Cilicia containing a similar component:

### Lycia:

- 5.8) [E]ρωμανδυβερο[ις] (*KPN* §355–17a)
- 5.9) Ξανδυβερος (*KPN* §1061)
- 5.10) \*Περωπενδυβερος (gen. Περωπενδυβεροιος) (*KPN* §1242–1)

### Cilicia:

- 5.11) Ινδοβηρας / *\*Iνδοβαρας* (gen. Ινδοβαρου) (Bean and Mitford 1970: no. 176, 193 apud *PHI*)
- 5.12) Μινδυβηρας (Bean and Mitford 1970: no. 180, 201 apud *PHI*)

<sup>14</sup> Houwink ten Cate’s interpretation of Σεμενδησις is also extended to Σεμνουτασις/Σεμνωτασις (*TAM* III,1: 74, 753–754, apud *PHI*) and Οσαμνωτασις (*KPN* §1118–2) from Pisidia.

- 5.13) \*Μοτονδοβερας (gen. Μοτονδοβερου) (SEG 37:1294.A39 apud PHI)<sup>15</sup>  
 5.14) \*Ουαξανδοβηρας (gen. Ουαξανδοβηρου) (Bean and Mitford 1970 apud PHI)  
 5.15) Ρωνδβερορας (KPN §1339–2) / \*Ρωνδοβερορας (gen. Ρωνδοβερορου) (DAW 44,6 [1896] 71,155 apud PHI)  
 5.16) Ταρκυνδβερορας (acc. Ταρκυνδβεροραν) (KPN §1512–14)<sup>16</sup>

Ερμανδυβερις is easily segmented as \*Ερμα-νδυβερις ‘(The god) Arma is *nd.*’ or ‘*nd.* of Arma’. The structure of Περπενδυβερις is inferred by comparing it with Περπεννυνις (SEG 44.1156 apud PHI) and Περπενηνις (KPN §1242–2), both also from Lycia. Περπε-νηνις surely contains a reflex of Luwic \**nani-*, which traditionally is taken to be cognate with Luw. *nāni-* ‘brother’, but recently Oreshko (2014) argues for the existence of a homophonous Luwian word *nani-* ‘lord, leader’. The name is structurally analogous to Lyc. *Errñme-nēne/i-* = Ερμε-νηνις ‘Arma is [my] lord(?)’.<sup>17</sup> A priori this indicates that the first element is Περπε-, for which we can compare Carian *prp-* in the personal name *prp-wrik* (see Adiego 2007: 402).<sup>18</sup> The only obstacle to segmenting Περπε- is that Περπεννυνις might also reflect \*Περπεν-δυνις with assimilation of intervocalic \*-*nd-* (> \*-*nn-*); in favor of \*δυνις, cf. Ερμαδονις (KPN §355–7).<sup>19</sup> In this case, the other two names could represent \*Περπεν-δυβερις and \*Περπε(ν)-νηνις. Nevertheless, this is not a serious hindrance because \*Περπε(ν)-νδυβερις is also possible.

Moving on to Cilicia, \*Μοτονδοβερας is not too difficult to analyze. The first component is in all likelihood a reflex of P.-Luwic \**muwatta-* ‘might, potency’, thus Μοτο-νδοβερας can be regarded as ‘*nd.* of might’ (or sim.). For the contraction of \**muwatta-* in Luwic onomastics of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, cf. Lycian *Mutlēi* vs. the Hittite royal name <sup>m</sup>*Muwatalli-* = H. Luw. *Mu-wa/i-ta-li* ‘the mighty one’, perhaps connected as well to Μότυλος (Caria) and Μοταλις (Phrygia) (see Melchert 2013: 34, citing KPN §334 and Houwink ten Cate 1961: 103).

\*Ουαξανδοβηρας can be segmented as \*Ουαξα-νδοβηρας with relative security, since its first element is recognized in other Luwic names, particularly Car. *u/úksmu* = Ουαξα-μοας/μως (Isauria and Cilicia; KPN §1141, 2–3 and Adiego 2007: 427) ‘(having the might) of *waksa*’ or ‘(having) *waksa* might’.<sup>20</sup> I would like to suggest that Ξανδυβερις is a reduced variant of \*Ουαξανδυβερις, the probable Lycian version of \*Ουαξανδοβηρας.<sup>21</sup> This is further supported by the attestation of a Ξανδοβερος in Cilicia (Zgusta 1970: 35, apud Blümel 1992: 8). If

<sup>15</sup> Dagron and Feissel (1987: no. 11a). Based on the photograph provided the reading of M in this name seems plausible.

<sup>16</sup> It is uncertain to me whether Μανδουβιος (KPN § 856–3) belongs in this group.

<sup>17</sup> For the latter, see Houwink ten Cate (1961: 144). Cf. the Hieroglyphic personal name LUNA.FRATER<sub>2</sub> > *Arma-nani?* (Oreshko 2014: 618, citing Laroche 1966).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also Παρπολινις (Lycia; KPN §1208), which Schürr (2010: 191) directly compares to Car. *prpwrik*.

<sup>19</sup> Analyzed as \**Arma-tuna+mi* by Houwink ten Cate (1961: 134).

<sup>20</sup> The opaque \*ουαξα- is attested in several other Anatolian anthroponyms from Greek sources. It is comparable to Milyan *wax(s)a-*, which was translated as ‘hero’ by Gusmani. Melchert (2004: 134) disagrees, stating (without providing a justification) that *waxssa-* conveys an inanimate object. Shevoroshkin (apud Melchert 2004: 134) initially suggested ‘heroic valor’, but now tentatively reads ‘fight(ers)’ and compares Hitt. *wah-nu-* ‘whirl’ / *wahessar* ‘swinging’ (Shevoroshkin 2010: 165). A cognate of Milyan *waxssa-* is also found in the Lycian personal name *Waxssepddimi*.

<sup>21</sup> Notice, however, that the personal name Ξανδαροιζας (Pamphylia) could in theory point to a different segmentation of Ξανδυβερις, unless here we have an extended form \**waksanda-* > Ξανδα-. The Pamphylian name appears to be formed with \*-ροιζα, analogous to Ρω(ι)ζις (Pisidia), which is a denasalized allomorph of Ρωνζα- (< \*[K]runtiya-) ‘Stag-god’ (as seen by Melchert 2013: 36).

this assessment is accepted, then we have to exclude any link to Car. *kšatýbr*, since the latter shows *š* where *u/úksmu* has *s*.

It is not instantly clear how is *Ρωνδβερρας*/\**Ρωνδοβερρας* to be split. Without doubt, the first component is the name of the Stag-god \*(*K*)*runtiya*, but the latter surfaces variedly as *Ρω-*, *Ρων-*, and *Ρωνδ-* in onomastics of Greco-Roman Cilicia.<sup>22</sup> It is only through *Ινδοβηρας*/\**Ινδοβαρας* that we can shed some light on its structure. One needs only to draw a parallel with *Ια-ζαρμας* ‘(Having the) protection of Iya’ and *Ρω-ζαρμας* ‘(Having the) protection of the Stag-god’ (see Melchert 2013: 36, with refs.). In both cases we have pairs of theophoric names that interchange *Runtiya* and *Iya*, the Anatolian version of the Mesopotamian deity *Ea*. Combinatory analysis therefore hints at \**Ρω(ν)-νδ(ο)βερρας* ‘(Having the) *nd.* of the Stag-god’ alongside a contracted \**Ι(α)-νδοβα/ηρας* ‘(Having the) *nd.* of Iya’. Like *Ρωνδβερρας*, *Ταρκυνδβερρας* is slightly ambiguous: should we segment \**Ταρκυνδ-βερρας*, \**Ταρκυνδβερρας* or \**Ταρκν(ν)-νδβερρας*? In light of all of the above, \**Ταρκν(ν)-νδβερρας* seems the most plausible composition, whence the likely meaning ‘(Having the) *nd.* of the Storm-god (Tarhunt)’.<sup>23</sup>

By now, it has become clear that *-νδυβερι-* ~ *-νδο/υβα/ε/ηρα-* denotes an attribute of the same kind as ‘might’ and ‘protection’, one that defined individuals and was considered a gift of the gods. It is also evident that its various spellings in Cilicia diverge from the Lycian version as regards the ending. This divergence suggests that the Cilician forms reflect a Luwic *a*-stem, while the Lycian variant conceals an *i*-stem whose ending moreover prompted the typical Lycian *Umlaut*. Thus: Cil. \*/<sup>n</sup>duβæra-/ vs. Lyc. \*/<sup>n</sup>duβari-/ > /<sup>n</sup>duβæri-/.

At least formally, \**-νδυβερι-* /<sup>n</sup>duβæri-/ is a direct match for Lyc. *ñtuweri-*, the noun that underlies the substantivized plural adjective *ñtuweriha* (*ñtuweri-ha*), attested in one of the Lycian inscriptions on the Pillar of Xanthos (T44b: 57): ...*se dewē: zxxaza: se ñtuweriha: ade: ‘and made a dedication<sup>(?)</sup> to the warriors and to the ñt.’s*.<sup>24</sup> In this inscription, context demands a descriptive of people, possibly an occupational term or collective title, and since we are dealing with a substantivized adjective (*-ha* is an adjective suffix), it seems self-evident that the *ñtuwerihe* are those who possess, belong, or are related to *ñtuweri-*, which might therefore be an attribute, as is *-νδυβερι-*. The lack of further examples makes it very difficult to unveil the exact meaning of the word, but we have seen in the previous section that Neumann compared Lycian \**-υβερι* to Hitt. *warri-* ‘help; helpful’ and H. Luw. *wariya-* ‘to help’. If we follow his idea, a possible etymology involves analyzing *ñtuweri-* as \**ñt(e)-(u)weri*, with Lyc. *ñte-* ‘in(side)’ and a reflex of Luwic \*(*u*)*wari-* ‘help’, which in turn leads to the possibility of its meaning being ‘assistance’ or similar.<sup>25</sup> This hypothesis admittedly rests on no independent evidence, but

<sup>22</sup> Cf. e.g. *Ρω-ζαρμας* < \**Runt(iya)-zarma-*, *Ρων-δεοβρεμς* < \**Runt(iya)-tarpami-*, and *Ρωνδ-βης* < \**Runt(iya)-piya-* (see *KPN*, Melchert 2013: 43 and the interpretations in this section).

<sup>23</sup> Alternatively, it is possible that *Ταρκυνδβερρας* reflect \**Tarhunt-warri* ‘help to Tarhunt?’ (Or ‘from Tarhunt?’) Cf. H. Luw. *TONITRUS-hu-wal/i+ra/i-i* /*Tarhu-warra/i-* (Hawkins 2000: 192, 534, 537, apud Melchert 2013: 38). If so, a similar explanation is also conceivable for *Ρωνδ-βερρας*, but not for the other forms.

<sup>24</sup> Against this equation one could raise a priori the objection that intervocalic Greek *-β-* normally renders Lyc. *-VbV-* rather than *-VwV-* (cf. *Pubieleje* > *Πυβιαληι* and *xñtabura* = *Κενδαβορα* vs. *xuwata-je* = *Κοατα*). Yet there is evidence for some oscillation between /β/ and /w/ in Lycian and related dialects. Thus Lycian has *xñtawa* ‘to rule’ and *xñtawata* ‘rule, kingship’ but Milyan features both *xñtaba-* ‘regulate’ > *xñtabaimeli-* ‘ruling’ and *xñtawaza-* ‘rule’ (Melchert 2004: 84, 136). Likewise, a cognate of Lyc. *xñtawat(i)* surfaces as the personal name *Γδεβετις* in Pisidia, while Mil. *xñtaba* ‘ruler’ corresponds to *Κενδηβα/ης* (Lycia) and *Κενδεβης* ~ *Κενδηβα/ης* (Cilicia) (*KPN* §576–5).

<sup>25</sup> Melchert (pers. comm.) brings my attention to the Hittite verbal phrase *anda warrissa-* ‘to come to the aid’ found in *KBo* 5.8 i 18–20: *ša LÚ.MEŠ URU Taggašta=ma kuiēš ÉRIN.MEŠ NARĀRĒ anda warriššanteš ešer n=at arḫa parāšēšer*

it would explain most facts in a satisfactory way. First, in the text in the Pillar of Xanthos it would lead to a plausible interpretation of the word in its context: *dewē: zxxaza: se ṅtuweriha* “dedication(?) to the warriors/soldiers and the auxiliaries/auxiliary troops(?)”.<sup>26</sup> Second, the basic sense of ‘assistance’ would square well with the semantic structure of the personal names above. Specifically, we could have theophorics with varying divine attributes, such as *Πω-ζαρχμας* ‘(Having the) protection of the Stag-god’ vs. *Πωνδ(ο)βερχμας* ‘(Having the) assistance of the Stag-god’, while *Μοτο-νδοβερχμας* would make perfect sense as ‘(Having the) assistance of might’.

The etymology of *-νδυβερχι-* ~ *-νδο/νβα/ε/ηρχα-* must remain hypothetical, but my main contention is that combinatorial analysis favors their segmentation as such. Therefore, they are not likely to be directly related to the Carian names with *ybr-* (although they may share a common element), nor do they contain a virtual *\*-tapara* ‘ruler’, as Houwink ten Cate proposed for *Πωνδ(ο)βερχμας* (sic) and *Ταρχκυνδβερχμας*. In conclusion, the Anatolian names discussed in the last two sections must be separated from LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*.

## 6. Lycian *Tubure-*, *-τοβορχι-*, etc.

It is unclear whether Lyc. *Tubure-* in TL 69,2 (from Kyaneai) is another personal name or a sort of title (see Melchert 2004: 105).<sup>27</sup> Milyan features a noun *tuburi-*, attested in plural, which tips scales in favor of the latter option.

Likely, the same noun is the base of the place-name *Tuburehi* = Grk. *Τυβερχισσος*. The Greek form must have been adopted from a third language (Carian?) or from a pre-Lycian form that had not undergone the well-known Lycian shift *\*s > h*. Thus, from a Lycian viewpoint, *Tuburehi* would mean ‘of/belonging to *Tubur(e)*’. Yakubovich (apud Valério 2007: 5) made the suggestion that the Lycian personal name *Tebursseli* might be toponymic, built on pre-Lycian *\*Tebur(e)si* = *Τυβερχισσος* + a Luwic adjectival suffix *-li*,<sup>28</sup> but this cannot be confirmed.

Schürr (2012: 125) collects a possibly related form, the mythological name *Τουβερχις*, from Stephen of Byzantium (s. v. *Υλαμοι*), and at the same time directs our attention to the personal name *Ερματοβορχις* (KPN §355–30). Interestingly, the latter is attested as a patronymic in an inscription from Plos: *Ερμοκρατης Ερματοβορχιος* ‘Hermokrates, son of Ermatoboris’. Colvin (2004: 62) has already suggested that this and other examples where father and son interchange Greek Hermes and the Anatolian Moon-god Arma as elements of their names point to an acknowledged (semantic) connection between the two, but this case opens the special possibility that *Ερμο-κράτης* ‘Might of Hermes’ is a translation of *\*Ερμα-τοβορχις*. Similar cases are known: cf. *Ορνειπειμις* (= virtual Lyc. *\*Urne-pijēmi* ‘Given by the great one’ < Luwic *\*uranna/i-* ‘great’ + *\*piyamma/i-* ‘given’), a Lycian who is the son of *Μεγιστόδοτος* and whose

---

‘But the auxiliary troops of Taggašta who had come to help (my opponents) dispersed’ (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 311). In my opinion, this Anatolian parallel gives some support to the hypothesis that Lyc. *ṅtuweri-* is etymologically ‘assistance, aid’.

<sup>26</sup> We might compare typologically the Roman *auxilarii* (< Lat. *auxilium* ‘help, assistance’) and *legiones adiutrices* (< *adjuvo* ‘to help’). The latter were “legions raised by the proconsul in the provinces for the purpose of strengthening the veteran army” (Lewis and Short 1891). Cf. also the Anatolian parallel in fn. 25.

<sup>27</sup> The word is attested in the supposed genitive form *Tubureδ* and accompanies the name of “*Ipresidaδ* son of *Arṁpaδ*”.

<sup>28</sup> For another Lycian name formed with *-li*, cf. perhaps Lyc. *Erttimeli* = *Αρτεμηλιν* (acc.), based on the divine name Artemis (Melchert 2004: 94; 2013: 37).

name seems to be the Lycian translation of his father's Greek name (see Colvin 2004: 69 for the names and Melchert 2013: 48 for the interpretation). However, the prospect that Lyc. *tubure-*/\**τοβορι-* means 'might'<sup>29</sup> presents a puzzling paradox: it cannot be related to a virtual Carian \*-DUbr, but it seems clear from its vocalism that it also has no connection to a virtual Luw. \**tapara-* 'ruler', nor to the Lycian anthroponym (*D*)*dapara* (see the following sections). At best, *tubure-*/\**τοβορι-* could have a Carian equivalent in *kudtubr* (for which see §4).<sup>30</sup>

### 7. Alleged Luwian \**tapara* 'ruler'

Part of Yakubovich's (2002) dossier was drawn from Houwink ten Cate (1961: 158–159 following the work of Bossert), who compiled a small set of onomastic material he thought contained a Luwian noun \**tapara* 'ruler' ("or the like"), by comparison with Luw. *tapar-* 'to rule':<sup>31</sup>

- 7.1) <sup>d</sup>*Alitapara* (<sup>d</sup>*A-li-ta-pa-ra*) (*KBo* 5.1 i 10)
- 7.2) <sup>m</sup>*Pittalipara* (<sup>m</sup>*Pi-it-ta/ti-pa-ra*) (Laroche 1966: no. 1030)
- 7.3) <sup>m</sup>*Tiwatapara* (<sup>m</sup>*Ti-wa-ta-pa-ra*) (Laroche 1966: no. 1348)
- 7.4) <sup>m</sup>*Taprammi* (<sup>m</sup>*Tap-ra-am-mi*) = Hieroglyphic LEPUS+*ra/i-mi*<sup>32</sup>

Houwink ten Cate's view also requires revision. His inclusion of <sup>m</sup>*Pittapara* and <sup>m</sup>*Tiwatapara* relies on his idea that they present cases of haplogy: thus \**Pitta-tapara* > *Pittapara* and \**Tiwata-tapara* > *Tiwatapara*. This claim is hindered by a number of obstacles. <sup>m</sup>*Pittalipara* is the name of a Kaskaean rebel leader and therefore it is unlikely to have been Luwian. The name of another Kaskaean rebellious chief, <sup>m</sup>*Pittagatalli*, justifies a different segmentation, namely the isolation of *Pitta-* (cf. possibly Hittite *pitta-* 'allotment, gift'). This would yield as second component *-para*, which would also be feasible in the case of <sup>m</sup>*Tiwatapara* < \**Tiwata-pa-ra*, the name of a Hittite landholder.<sup>33</sup> Luw. *Tiwata* 'Sun-god' as a self-standing onomastic element is grounded on H. Luw. SOLIS-*wa-tà-muwa* /*Tiwatamuwa*/ 'Tiwad is (my) might' (Laroche 1966: no. 1246). In any case, it should be noted that a segmentation as \**Tiwa-tapara* is in theory possible, given the existence of an anthroponym *Tiwa-šarpa* beside <sup>md</sup>UTU-*šar-pí* (\**Tiwata-šarpi*?) (Laroche 1966: nos. 1344 and 1349).<sup>34</sup>

The divine name <sup>d</sup>*Alitapara* is a hapax in the Middle-Hittite Kizzuwatnaean ritual of Papanikri (*KBo* 5.1). It is more promising in the sense that *Ali-* might correspond to Luw. *āl(i)-*

<sup>29</sup> Perhaps *Καδοβορις* (*KPN* §500–16) contains the same element as *Ερματοβορις*, but it is not to be excluded that this common component consisted only in the string \*-οβορις.

<sup>30</sup> Other names may belong in this dossier as well, but I suspect that only additional epigraphical data would help clarify the issue: cf. *Τοβορορος* (Caria; *KPN* § 1577) and *Περατουβαρις* (Pisidia; *SEG* 57: 1620–1621 apud *PHI*) (see e.g. Blümel 1992: 23 and Schürr 2014).

<sup>31</sup> Houwink ten Cate also cites a divine-name \**160-tapara*, which is nowadays read as DEUS.VITIS-*ti-PRAE-ia* = \**Tipariya-*, presumably a wine-god (see Hawkins 2000: 97) and hence to be excluded.

<sup>32</sup> See McMahon (1991: 53–54). This name appears in a bicipital seal from Ugarit (RS 17.231), but also in the seal impression (Sob II 92) of a tablet from Boğazköy (KUB 25.32) and on Boğazköy socle 2.

<sup>33</sup> See also Schuler (1965: 106–107). Melchert (forthcoming) has now argued that C. Luw. *par(a)-* means 'carry' (< PIE \**b<sup>h</sup>er-*). This would permit us to interpret tentatively <sup>m</sup>*Tiwata-pa-ra* as 'Brought forth by Tiwat' on the same model as \**Tarhu-piya* 'Given by Tarhu(nt)' (for which see Melchert 2013: 47–48), while <sup>m</sup>*Pittalipara* can perhaps, *mutatis mutandis*, be compared to Grk. *Δωρο-φόρος* 'Gift-carrying'. The exact morphological details escape me.

<sup>34</sup> See Laroche (1966: nos. 1344 and 1349).

‘high’?<sup>35</sup> but, since it would now be our only genuine example of *\*-tapara* in names, we should be cautious.

The personal name *Taprammi* was used by a high-ranking contemporary of king Tudhaliya IV. I suspect the least problematic way to analyze it is along the same lines as H. Luw. *Pi-ha-mi* (Melchert 2013: 34). The latter is cognate with C. Luw. *piha(i)mma/i-* ‘imbued with splendor, resplendent’,<sup>36</sup> a denominative adjective constructed from the noun *\*piha-* ‘splendor’ (see Melchert 1993a: 176).<sup>37</sup> In our case, *\*Taprammi* would mean ‘imbued with *tapra-*’, which ironically can only be conciliated with *\*tapara* if we assume some irregular syncope.

## 8. Lycian *Dapara*

Houwink ten Cate (1965: 118, 159) and Yakubovich (2002: 95–96; 2009b: 231) connect the alleged Luwian onomastic element *\*tapara-* ‘ruler’? to the Lycian personal name *Dapara*, which is rendered as  $\Lambda\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$  in Greek in a Lycian bilingual inscription from Karmylessos (TL 6).<sup>38</sup> As we will see (§10), Yakubovich (2009b: 231) now proposes the source of both to be pre-Luw. *\*dabara-* ‘power’ (vel. sim).

The first obstacle to this etymology, as noted by Yakubovich (2002: 96, n. 10) himself, is that the medial Grk.  $\pi$  corresponds to Lyc. *-p-*, not *-b-*, thus indicating a voiceless bilabial stop that is inconsistent with the voiced sound of his Pre-Luw. *\*dabara-* > Luw. *\*tapara-* /*tabara-*).

The second obstacle lies in the interpretation of the initial dental. In synchronic terms, the equation *Dapara* =  $\Lambda\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$  has been cited as proof of the widely accepted notion that Lyc. *d* denotes a phoneme [ð]. This phonological interpretation is likely, but, based on other evidence (namely borrowings and the distribution of Lyc. *d* and *t*<sup>39</sup>), not on this pair. Paradoxically, it seems typologically strange that Lyc. [ð], a voiced non-sibilant coronal fricative, would cause a lambdacist spelling in Greek. In theory, Grk.  $\delta$ , which represented a voiced coronal stop /d/, would be the optimal choice for rendering [ð]; resorting to  $\lambda$  = /l/ for a coronal fricative would seem to me justified only in the event that it had a lateral articulation, i.e. if it was pronounced at least some of the time as a lateral coronal fricative [ɬ].<sup>40</sup> Moreover, regardless of the precise pronunciation of *d*, it is obviously a Lycian sound. The very old theory that *d* ~  $\lambda$  indicate different strategies of rendering a special “substratum” sound (see e.g. Heubeck 1957) would only make sense if Lyc. *Dapara* and Grk.  $\Lambda\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$  were independent transcriptions of a foreign

<sup>35</sup> Strauss (2006: 304) credits Hutter (with ref. to Zinko 1994: 76) with the interpretation of <sup>d</sup>*Alitapara* as a “Mischkompositum” from Hurr. *allai-* ‘Herrin’ and Luw. *tapara* ‘Fluch’, but the actual form of the latter is *taparu-* ‘something evil’ (Melchert 1993a: 207–208).

<sup>36</sup> Melchert (2013).

<sup>37</sup> The noun *\*piha-* is unattested but its existence is well-grounded on onomastics (ibid.).

<sup>38</sup> Neumann (2007: 36) cites three other examples of  $\Lambda\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$  in Greek inscriptions (in Rhodes, Palaia Isauria and Letoon/Xanthos), but cf. also  $\Delta\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\varsigma$  (Myra, 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. BCE; Petersen and von Luschan 1889 apud PHI) and  $\Delta\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota$  (dat. sg.) (Telmessos, 183/4 BCE; *Clara Rhodos* 2 (1932) 172,3 apud PHI).

<sup>39</sup> See Van den Hout (1995) and Melchert (2008: 49). On one hand, Iranian /d/ is transcribed with the digraph *ñt-*, not *d*, in the Lycian rendering of the name of Darius, *Ñtarijeus-* (cf. Mod. Greek  $\text{Ντάνιελ}$  instead of <sup>\*\*</sup> $\Delta\acute{\alpha}\nuιελ$  for *Daniel*, because  $\delta$  = [ð]). On the other hand, Iranian  $\theta$  could be adapted as *d*, as seen in Lyc. *xssadrapa-/xssaθrapa-* ‘satrap’ < Ir. *\*xšaθra-pā-van* ‘protector of the kingdom/power’.

<sup>40</sup> This is the case of Amis, an Austronesian language of Taiwan, in which [ɬ], [ð], [ɳ], and [d] constitute different dialectal pronunciations of /ð/ (Maddieson and Wright 1995: 47). In fact, the articulation of [ɬ] and [ð] is so close that these two sounds are not found to contrast in any language in the UPSID sample of 451 world languages (Maddieson 1984).

name (with a foreign sound), from a third source. Since to my knowledge there is no evidence for a third, non-IE language in Lycia as late as the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, this theory is unfounded. Most likely, *Dapara* is simply a Lycian name that was Hellenized in the bilingual and λ the Greek rendering of Lyc. *d*. It is true that Lyc. *d* is normally rendered with Grk. δ (cf. *Edrijeuse-hñ* > Ἰδριεύς/Ἐδριεύς; *Esedeplēmeli* / *Sedeplñmi* > Ἀσεδεπλημῆς; *Idazzala* > Εἰδασσαλα), but there is also the case of *Xesñtedi* > Κεσινδηλις,<sup>41</sup> suggesting that in certain cases (allophonically?) Lyc. *d* might have been pronounced as something other than a non-sibilant coronal fricative.

Two points that usually go unmentioned in discussions of *Dapara* are: 1) Lycian avoids word-initial *d*-; 2) when words beginning with geminate *dd*- follow a copulative *se*, the two fuse and de-gemination takes place: cf. *ddewē* > *se=dewē* (see Melchert 2004: 9). *Dapara* too follows a copulative, *se=dapara* (ibid.: 92), so its actual self-standing form must be *\*Ddapara*. This has implications for the etymology and pronunciation of the name. There is the possibility that Lyc. *ddV*- reflects earlier *\*VdV*-, and therefore I would like to suggest as a working hypothesis that *\*Ddapara* contains *Ida*-, a fairly common Luwic formant of names that appears in Hellenized transcriptions as Ἰδ(α)-/Εἰδ(α)-. This suggestion finds a degree of support in Myl. *Ddxug[a]*, which, despite being damaged, invites a comparison with Car. *dquq* and Greek-written Ἰδαγυγος (as proposed tentatively by Adiego 1995: 27, n. 9). Notice that the segmentation of the Carian name as *d-quq* is independently supported by the existence of *quq* as a self-standing name. The term of comparison is the abovementioned Lyc. *Ida-zzala* > Εἰδα-σσαλα, alongside *Zzala* > Σαλας (see Adiego 2007: 334). If this proposition is correct, what we have is *\*Idapara* > *Ddapara*, with the same kind of (accent-driven?) aphaeresis seen in Mylian and Carian. Given the Lycian avoidance of initial *d*-, we would expect this consonant to undergo gemination after aphaeresis in order to keep up with the phonotactic demands of the language (Van den Hout 1995: 135).

Irrespective of the etymology of (*se*=)*dapara*, it seems that the λ of Λαπαράς renders the “simple” intervocalic *d*, possibly owing to circumstances like those of *Xesñtedi* > Κεσινδηλις (if the latter is not the result of dissimilation).<sup>42</sup> Just why intervocalic *d* would be perceived as a close to a Greek lateral must remain a matter of speculation,<sup>43</sup> but based on the present analysis I would keep *Ddapara* separated from *\*tapara*-.

## 9. Cilician Τβερα/η-

Houwink ten Cate (1961: 159) analyzed as compounds with Luw. *\*tapara*- four personal names from Hellenistic Cilicia: Τβερασητας (*\*Tapara-zitali*), Τβερημωσις (*\*Tapara-muwa+zi*), Ρωνδβεροας (*\*Ru(n)-tapara*), and Ταρκυνδβεροας (*\*Tarhu(nt)-tapara*). The last two names were already treated in §5, so this section deals with the other two. The starting point is the combinatorial comparison with other Greek-written Anatolian anthroponyms:

<sup>41</sup> For all these onomastic forms see Melchert (2004).

<sup>42</sup> However, I would not entirely exclude that *Xesñtedi* > Κεσινδηλις involves some kind of dissimilation of the voiced coronal fricative because of the preceding voiced coronal stop.

<sup>43</sup> I would at least annotate the possibility that, in this position and in fast-speech, the sound may have been flapped. A similar explanation could account for the match between the Carian place-name Μύλασα (Mylasa) and the *Mutamutassa* from cuneiform sources (via *\*Mudasa*?) (see Carruba 1996: 23, apud Adiego 2007: 342), if the equation is valid.

Τβερη-μω-σις <sup>44</sup> (* <i>T.-muwa-zi-</i> ) 'Man of <i>t.</i> might'	Τβερρα-σητας <sup>45</sup> (* <i>T.-zita-</i> ) ' <i>T.</i> man'
Οπρα-μω-σις / Οπρα-μουα-σις <sup>46</sup> (* <i>Uppara-muwa-zi-</i> ) 'Man of superior might'	Ουπρα-σητας <sup>47</sup> (* <i>Uppara-zita-</i> ) 'Superior man'
Πορδα-μοα-σις <sup>48</sup> (* <i>P.-muwa-zi-</i> ) 'Man of <i>p.</i> might'	Πορδα-σητας (* <i>P.-zita-</i> ) ' <i>P.</i> man'

The patterning of these names implies that Τβερρα/η- is an adjective qualifying the named individual or his might. Possibly, it contains the PIE adjectival suffix *-ro-*, also seen in Luwic *\*uppara-* 'superior' (< PIE *\*uperó-*) (Melchert 2013: 44), but this is less than certain. A priori, *\*'Man with a ruler's might'* or *\*'Ruler man'* are acceptable meanings for Τβερημωσις and Τβερρασητας, respectively. Besides clarifying the morphological and semantic structure, the above comparisons also supply us with phonological clues. By Hellenistic times Luwic *\*uppara* (VCVRV) has been ubiquitously reduced to O(υ)πρα- (VCRV) in the onomastics of Lycia, Pamphylia, Isauria and Cilicia, probably through accent-driven syncope.<sup>49</sup> If we transport these observations to our case, it seems expectable that *\*tapara-* would resurface not as Τβερρα/η-, but rather as *\*\*TVβρα-*, in Hellenistic Cilician onomastics. Even if we started with *\*tapra-*, Lycian Πιγραμος (*\*Pihra-muwa*) suggests that, at least in Lycia, the outcome would have been *\*\*TVβρα-*. It stands to reason that Τβερρα/η- must reflect something else.

The key is the cluster Τβ-. A survey of late Greek-written Anatolian onomastics in *PHI* reveals that it is very rare:

Region	Anthroponym	Reference
Caria	Κυτβελημυς / Κοτβελημυς	<i>KPN</i> §771 / <i>Myl</i> 12.14 apud Blümel (1992)
Caria	[Κ]υατβης (acc. Κυατβην)	<i>KPN</i> §765
Caria	Σαγγοτβηηρις	<i>Myl</i> 12.3 apud Blümel (1992)
Pisidia	Τβημυς / *Τβημυς (in patr. Τβημεους)	<i>KPN</i> §1522
Cilicia	*Τβωτ-ς (in patr. Τβωτος)	Bean-Mitford (1970: 185,205, apud <i>PHI</i> )
Cilicia	*Τβιος (in patr. Τβιου)	<i>KPN</i> §1523
Cilicia	*Τβερρασητας (in patr. Τβερρασητα)	<i>KPN</i> §1521–2
Cilicia	Τβερημωσις (in gen. Τβερημωσιος)	<i>KPN</i> §1521–1

<sup>44</sup> *KPN* §1521–2.

<sup>45</sup> *KPN* §1521–1.

<sup>46</sup> *KPN* §1099–4, 7.

<sup>47</sup> *KPN* §1099–11.

<sup>48</sup> Dagron and Feissel (1987: no. 11a). The reading given is Πορδαμοαξις (patronymic), but in my opinion, the photograph provided permits us to correct it to Πορδαμοασις.

<sup>49</sup> Differently Pisidian Ουπερ-, now persuasively explained by Adiego (2012: 20) as a secondary development *\*Uppara* > *Upra* (Ουπρα) > *\*Upr-* > Ουπερ-, only in compounds. Melchert (2013: 44) reaches a similar conclusion independently. It remains to be seen whether Οβρα/- (seen e.g. in Οβρασητας) belongs here. If it were so, we would probably have to assume a voicing of *\*VprV* > *-VbrV-* motivated by a prohibition of voiceless stops between a vowel and a sonorant in the underlying Luwic dialect(s).



Let us put the evidence from Caria aside for a moment. Some of the names from Pisidia and Cilicia elicit comparisons with other anthroponyms that might help unveil the historical source of the cluster:

Κβ-	Τβ-	Του-
LYC. Κβαμιος <sup>50</sup>	PIS. Τβημης / *Τβημης	PIS. *Τουημης <sup>51</sup>
ISAUR. *Κβιας <sup>52</sup>	CIL. *Τβιος	
LYC. Κβαδης <sup>53</sup>	CIL. *Τβωτ-ς	

These potential correspondences suggest that τβV from Pisidia and Cilicia can also appear in roughly the same area as τουV, but matches κβV from Lycia and Isauria.<sup>54</sup> In this way, they evoke the different outcomes of P.-Anat. *dwV* (or unstressed *duwV*) in Lycian and Milyan. As is well-known, Milyan features *tbV*, probably /tɸV/, where Lycian has *kbV*, likely /cɸV/ with a palatal stop:<sup>55</sup> cf. Mil. *tbišu* vs. Lyc. *kbihu* ‘twice’ (< \**dwisu*-).<sup>56</sup> In fact, among the personal names in the table, \*Κβιας/\*Τβιος can be compared to Lyc. *kbije* ‘another, second’ (< \**dwiyō*-) and probably means ‘second-born child’.<sup>57</sup> Further potential matches are possible if we take all this into consideration.

Κβ-	Τβ-	Του-
LYC. Κβαμιος <sup>58</sup>	PIS. Τβημης / *Τβημης	PIS. *Τουημης
ISAUR. *Κβιας (cf. Lyc. <i>kbije</i> ‘another; second’)	CIL. *Τβιος	
LYC. Κβαδης	CIL. *Τβωτ-ς (cf. H. Luw. PN <i>Tu-wa/i-ti</i> <sup>59</sup> and Mil. <i>Tuwada</i> <sup>60</sup> )	
LYC. Κβα-μοας <sup>61</sup>		PIS. Τουα-μου-σις <sup>62</sup>
Lyc. <i>kbatra</i> ‘daughter’ < * <i>twatra</i> < * <i>tuwatra</i>		LYCAON. Τουατρις <sup>63</sup> < * <i>tuwatri(ya)</i> - ‘daughterly’? (or ‘little daughter’?)

<sup>50</sup> KPN §562.

<sup>51</sup> MAMA VIII 358 apud PHI.

<sup>52</sup> KPN §563.

<sup>53</sup> KPN §560. Cf. also Melchert (2004: 106).

<sup>54</sup> I follow Melchert (2013: 31) in his cautious note that assignment of Greek-transmitted names to specific Anatolian languages can be done only in variable degrees of assurance, hence my use of e.g. ‘in/from Lycia’ instead of ‘Lycian’.

<sup>55</sup> Kloekhorst (2008a: 125). Melchert (2008: 49) speaks of a “front velar”.

<sup>56</sup> It is important to stress that if Lycian *k* really represents a palatal stop /c/, then in theory it could also have been transcribed with *t* in Greek. In this case, τβ would have been used for /cɸ/ as well. I thank Adiego (pers. comm.) for pointing this out.

<sup>57</sup> As suggested by Shevoroshkin (1978: 247). For a typological parallel cf. Latin numerical names *Primus*, *Secundus*, and so forth.

<sup>58</sup> In this case, it must be noticed that, alongside Pisidian Γβαμιος (KPN §205), Κβαμιος might reflect Lyc. *xba-* instead of *kba-*.

<sup>59</sup> Hawkins (2000: 308)

<sup>60</sup> Melchert (2004: 106).

<sup>61</sup> KPN §563.

<sup>62</sup> Brixhe et al. (1987: no. 26).

<sup>63</sup> KPN §1585–3.

If this is correct, then names written with τβV in Caria ought to find a similar explanation. It seems to be the case. Κυτβελημιος and Κοτβελημιος are known to match the Carian personal name *q̄tblem-* (Adiego 1993: 235; 2007: 408), but these seem moreover analogous to Mil. *q̄etbeleimi-* (as first seen by Shevoroshkin 1978: 252). Melchert (2004: 126) considers the latter to be an adjective (attested twice in plural), but attempts no translation. I would like to propose that both the Carian and the Mylian items go back to a Proto-Luwic participial adjective *\*Hwitwalāim(a/i)-* ‘vivified, animated’ (or sim.). I base this on a hypothetical denominative verb *\*Hwitwalāi-* ‘to make be alive, vivify’, ultimately from a P.-Luwic adjective *\*Hwitwal(i)-*, which survived in C. Luw. *huitwal(i)-* ‘alive, living’ (for the latter see Melchert 1993a: 84).<sup>64</sup> I believe this etymology is not difficult to harmonize with current views on Mylian and Carian phonology<sup>65</sup> and implicates a regular development P.-Anat. *\*dwV* > Car. / Mil. *tbV*.

Σαγγοτβηηρις, also from Caria, is opaque, but it can be segmented as Σαγγο-τβηηρι- in the light of Σαγγως (*KPN* §1369), another Greek-written Carian name.<sup>66</sup> I will only note that this *\*τβηηρι-* might be cognate with Cilician Τβερα/η- and that nothing a priori prevents it from having Proto-Luwic status.<sup>67</sup>

This digression reinforces the notion that τβV conceals etymological P.-Anat. *\*dwV*, including instances from unstressed *\*duwV*. Thus Cilician Τβερα/η- is not likely to derive from a virtual Luw. *\*tapara*, but rather from a Proto-Anatolian adjective whose form is close to *\*d(u)wara-*. Based on this reconstruction, I would like to suggest an Anatolian reflex of PIE *\*d̥wēh<sub>2</sub>-ró-* ‘long (of time and space)’, cognate with Grk. δηρός (Doric δῆρόν) ‘long’, Skt. *dūrā* ‘far (of time and space)’, and Arm. *erkar* (*\*< dwār?*) ‘long’.<sup>68</sup> Τβερημωσις and Τβερασητας would make perfect sense as ‘Man of long-lasting might’ and ‘Long-lasting man’. The immediate obstacle is that no direct descendant of P.-Anat. *\*dwāra-* is attested among the Anatolian languages, but this absence is mitigated by the existence of the Hittite adverb *tuwa* ‘far’ (with Kloekhorst 2008b: 904–905, compare Attic δῆν and Doric δοάν/δάν ‘long, for a long while; far’) and the adjective *tuwala-* ‘far’ (see Tischler 1994: 486–489). We may add C. Luw. *dūwazza-*, traditionally translated as ‘wide’, but now argued by Yakubovich (2013b: 163–164) to be an absolute superlative ‘the most wide, broad’. The PIE etymon is thus well represented in Anatolia. In theory, if Luwian possessed an adjective *\*tuwala-* ‘far, long, wide’ like Hittite, then it

<sup>64</sup> For C. Luw. *huitwal(i)-* ‘alive, living’, see Melchert 1993a: 84. For the etymology see Puhvel (1991: 354–355) and Kloekhorst (2008b: 355–356). More tentatively, P.-Luwic *\*Hwitwal(i)-*, if it ever was an *a*-stem, could also be the source of the personal name Κοτοβαλως (Caria; I. Amyzon 2.4), probably a match for Car. *q̄tblo* (see Adiego 2007: 408, with refs.); likewise, Κοτοβηους (Lydia; *KPN* §707–1) might be a variant of Carian Κυατβης = *q̄utbe* (ibid.). However, in these two cases the cluster *-tβV-* would appear broken with a labial vowel in the Greek transcription (*-τοβV-*).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. the fate of the Storm-god’s name: Lyc. *trq̄ñt*, Car. *trq̄δ*, Luw. *Tarhunt-* < P.-Anat. *\*trH<sup>w</sup>ant-* (Kloekhorst 2008a: 138; see also Adiego 2007: 331–332). Mylian is written with the Lycian alphabet, so that Myl. *q* should represent a sound close to that of Lyc. *q*, which according to Kloekhorst (2008a: 124–125) was a labialized velar /k<sup>w</sup>/ < P.-Anat. /H<sup>w</sup>/. Car. *q* is interpreted a possible uvular stop by Adiego (2007: 244) and as a labialized velar by Kloekhorst (2008a: 138).

<sup>66</sup> Attested in patronymic form: Σαγγωδος (see Blümel 1992: 21).

<sup>67</sup> *\*-τβηηρι-* is also reminiscent of Car. *t̄bridbδś* (at Memphis), possibly a papponym or appellative (Adiego 2007: 273, 421). A priori, if *t̄br(i)º* is somehow related to *\*-τβηηρι-*, then we would expect *\*\*t̄beridbδś*, since Grk. η systematically reflects Car. *e* (Adiego 2007: 236). However, it cannot be excluded that in *t̄bridbδś* some sort of vowel reduction took place because of stress (I thank Adiego for pointing this out to me in a pers. comm.).

<sup>68</sup> For the PIE root and derivatives, see Mallory and Adams (1997: 356–357; 2006: 298–299); for the Armenian etymology see Martirosyan (2010: 266–267).

might have undergone the characteristic “flapping”  $l > r$ , as well as syncope, thereby yielding a form *\*tuwara-* that would explain our Cilician Τβερα/η-.

Regardless of the future of this hypothesis,<sup>69</sup> the point to be retained is that Τβερημωσις and Τβερασητας are unlikely to contain a reflex of *\*tapara* ‘ruler’.

### 10. Hittite *l/tabarna-* and Luwian (:)*tapar-* ‘to rule’

It is well known that *l/tabarna-* was used as a title by Hittite monarchs since the Old Hittite period and was apparently the personal name of at least one early king. Almost all rulers of Hatti down to the fall of Hattusa bore it, the exceptions being Suppiluliuma I and his immediate successors (Soysal 2005: 189–190). This has elicited the comparison with the case of Roman *Caesar* (> German *Kaiser* ‘Emperor’; Russian царь ‘Czar’), which began as a *cognomen* and evolved to an imperial title (Tischler 1988: 348–349). According to the *CHD* (L–N: 43), the distribution of the lexeme in Hittite “seems to confirm the theory that *labarna* or *tabarna*” was initially a personal name borne by an early ruler, but afterwards became the traditional title of the king of Hatti as a means of establishing a dynastic link with the ancestral Labarna. Besides Hittite, *l/tabarna-* appears in Hattic, Akkadian, Palaic, Luwian, and possibly Hurrian (see Soysal 2005 for a useful list of the attestations of the word). Hittite uses both spellings, but the remaining languages all spell the word exclusively with *ta-*, with the exception of Luwian, in which only the variant with *la-* is attested.<sup>70</sup> A detailed account of the myriad of attempts to etymologize *l/tabarna-* in the Hittitological literature would make this survey too long, so I will focus only on those with ramifications for the present discussion.<sup>71</sup>

Non-IE etymologies of *l/tabarna-* include the hypothesis of a Hattic loanword in the IE Anatolian languages (among others, see recently Soysal 2005 and Kassian 2009–2010: 357–362), but no proposal has ever brought forth a full explanation of its meaning and morphology in acceptable Hattic terms.<sup>72</sup> Of course, on its own this does not prove that the word is not Hattic.

Credit is due to Carruba (1986: 203f, apud Melchert 2003a: 18) for demonstrating that the *t-/l-* orthographic alternation, peculiar to the Hittite spellings of the title, has no parallel in the various Hattic borrowings in Hittite. Starting from the consensus that Proto-Anatolian *\*d* was devoiced to *t* word-initially in Hittite and Luwian, Melchert (2003a: 18–19) has suggested an alternative account. He argues that if devoicing occurred first in “pre-Hittite”, then a hypothetical “pre-Luwian” form *\*dabarna-* would have been borrowed into pre-Hittite as *labarna-*, with */l/* as a substitute for “foreign” word-initial */d/*. To account for all facts, he further postulates (following an idea by Tischler) that Hitt. *labarna-* “was later (but still prehistorically) altered to *tabarna-* by association with the Luwo-Hitt. verb *tapar(r)iya-* ‘to rule,’” when the devoicing of initial *\*d* had already taken place in the latter language. Contrary to certain claims, Melchert’s hypothesis is typologically sound. It finds support in Lydian, which borrowed the

<sup>69</sup> Melchert (pers. comm.) suggests as alternative comparandum Lyc. *tuwere/i*. I think that this is formally tempting and worth mentioning as a possibility, but the sense is unclear and, in my opinion, the suggested meaning ‘celebrant’ (or sim.), or person “responsible for prescribed offerings” (see Melchert 2004: 74, with refs.) would not square well with the semantics we expect for Τβερημωσις / Τβερασητας.

<sup>70</sup> The primacy of *labarna-* in Luwian seems to have lasted beyond the Empire period, as early 1<sup>st</sup> millennium Assyrian texts (see *RIMA* 3) mention *Lubarna*, the name (or title?) of a king of Pattin/Unqu.

<sup>71</sup> A relatively recent summary from the beginnings of the discipline onward is given in Soysal (2005: fn. 7), but cf. also Tischler (1991: 34, 116–119) and *CHD* L–N: 43.

<sup>72</sup> Thus Soysal (2005), for example, interprets the title as a half-obscure *ta=par=na* ‘the thousand *na*’ without being able to explain the alleged morpheme *-na*.

Aeolic Greek divine names Δαμάταρ (gen. Δάματρος) ‘Demeter’ and Δεύς ‘Zeus’ respectively as *lamētru* and *lefs/lewś*. Apparently, Lydian prohibited the voiced coronal stop in initial position (Melchert 2003b: 181, fn. 13; Yakubovich 2005: 87, n. 50). Accordingly, Lyd. *d*, which can occur at the beginning of words, is thought to represent a coronal fricative /ð/, while actual [d] would have existed only as an allophone of /t/ in certain environments (thus being spelled with *t*), but not word-initially (Melchert 2008: 58–59). The use of Lyd. /l-/ as the optimal replacement for Grk. /d-/ is not without parallels in contemporary languages.<sup>73</sup> The main issue with Melchert’s hypothesis is that it requires demonstration that the devoicing of initial stops is a post-Proto-Anatolian development that took place separately in Hittite and Luwian.

Whatever the phonological explanation, if *labarna-* was the original form, then it is tempting to think it was later changed to *tabarna-* by folk etymology, under the influence of *tapar(r)iya-* ‘rule, authority’. If this is the case, it seems more likely that it was contaminated in its usage as a royal title. There are facts that mitigate both in favor and against this notion, but it would be beyond the scope of this paper to review them in detail.<sup>74</sup> What is significant for our current purposes is the distinct possibility that the *t-/l-* alternation is *not* the reflex of different Hittite strategies to spell a special sound of a non-IE word from some *ad hoc* linguistic adstrate, such as a voiceless lateral affricate /tʃ/<sup>75</sup> or a voiced coronal fricative /ð/. Together with the above analyses of λαβύρινθος and *Dapara/Λαπαρας*, this makes it even more difficult to maintain LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and Hittite *l/tabarna-* as manifestations of the same contact word.

As hinted above, Hittite and Luwian possess an array of lexemes routinely involved in attempts to etymologize *l/tabarna-*. Their revision is not of secondary importance, as we are trying to determine whether they can all be connected to a traveling contact word associated with kingship. The most original forms appear to be Luw. (:) *tapar-* ‘to rule’ and Luwo-Hitt. *tapar(r)iya-* ‘order, ruling; authority’, which yields denominative verb *tapar(r)iya(i)-* ‘to order, rule’ (geminated *-rr-* is secondary; see Kloekhorst 2008b: 830). The last two have cognates in H. Luwian: LEPUS+*ra/i-ia-*<sup>76</sup> or *\*tapariya-* ‘authority’ and (“LIGNUM”).LEPUS+*ra/i-(ia-)* or *\*tapari(ya)-* ‘to decree, govern, with its reduplicated form *\*tatapari(ya)-*. I would also include here the C. Luwian noun *taparamman-* ‘ruling, governing’ which on the model of *āhra-* ‘pain,

<sup>73</sup> For instance, Yaqui (a Uto-Aztecan language of NW Mexico) replaced foreign [d] with either [r] or [l] in Spanish loanwords: cf. Yaqui *lios* < Sp. *dios* ‘god’ (Estrada Fernández 2009: 834, 844–846). The deployment of [l] as substitute for a dental stop is unsurprising, since lateral approximants are routinely articulated with an occlusion — the defining feature of stops — in the dental/alveolar region (Ladefoged and Maddieson 1996: 182–183). The preference for [l] over [t] (the voiceless dental/alveolar stop) as a substitute is also acceptable if we assume that in [d] the feature of voicing was perceptually favored by native speakers of Lydian.

<sup>74</sup> Yakubovich (2009b: 230) objects that altering the king’s title would have constituted an unacceptable case of *laesio majestatis*. This is not an issue if we assume the contamination operated in Luwian after it borrowed Hitt. *labarna*: foreignisms are often opaque and thus more liable to folk etymology. English has a ready parallel in *sovereign* (< Mid. Eng. *souerain* < Old Fr. *soverain* ‘princely, chief’ < Late Lat. *\*super-ānus* ‘chief, highest’), an opaque Gallicism altered under influence of the unrelated *reign* (< Lat. *regnare* ‘to have royal power, rule’) (Skeat 1993 [1884]: 479 and Fowler *et al.* 2011 [1911]: 834). I know of no record of an English monarch feeling offended after being referred to as *sovereign*. The problem is that we would have to assume that *tabarna-* emerged in Luwian (where it left no traces) and then was re-borrowed into Hittite when Luwian had already become a prestige language.

<sup>75</sup> The idea of a “/tʃ/” sound is as early as Forrer (1922: 183, n. 1) and has often been repeated in the literature (e.g. Tischler 1988: 350). For the explicit proposal of /tʃ/ see e.g. Kloekhorst (2008b: 521).

<sup>76</sup> The reading of the logogram LEPUS as *\*tapa-* is well-established, but its motivation remains obscure. Different attempts to connect a hypothetical Luw. *\*tap(p)a-* ‘hare’ to Latin *lepus* or Armenian *napastak* (dialectal *lapustrak*, *labəstag*) have, all of them, problems (see e.g. Arbeitman 1988: 77 and Katz 2001: 216 apud Yakubovich 2002: 98). In fact, by comparison with Massiliot Grk. λεβήρις, Lat. *lepus*, *-oris* might be a borrowing from a non-IE western European language (see de Vaan 2008: 335).

woe' > *āhramman-* 'state of pain' (see Melchert 1993a: 4–5) points to a noun *\*tapara-* 'rule'. These words have a number of secondary derivatives in both Hittite and Luwian.<sup>77</sup>

Although all members of this group seem interrelated, it is not easy to explain them as derivatives from a single common source. The main issue is the difficulty to associate C. Luw. *tapar-* 'to rule' with Luwo-Hitt. *tapar(r)iya-* 'rule, authority' morphologically, despite obvious semantic ties. For Oettinger (1979: 384, apud Starke 1990: 259–260), the athematic stem of *tapar-* is structurally atypical of PIE-inherited verbal forms in Luwian, whence he concludes it most likely is of secondary origin. This idea was followed by Starke (ibid.), who argued that *tapar-* was back-formed from Luw. *tapar(r)iya(i)-* 'to rule' (which in turn is a denominative verb from the noun *tapar(r)iya-*) on the model of verbs like *lawarr(iya)-* 'destroy(?)', but his proposal faces serious morphological obstacles.<sup>78</sup> Still, the notion that *tapar-* is a secondary form based on *tapar(r)iya(i)-* remains the most economical.<sup>79</sup> According to Melchert (1997: 87–88), *tapar-* is a *non-present* stem back-formed from a *present* stem *tapari(ya)-*<sup>80</sup> by analogy with Luwian pairs of unextended non-present vs. extended present, such as Luw. *kup-* / *\*kupiya-* 'to plot, scheme' (cf. also Hitt. *karuš-ten* / *karuššīye-* 'to be silent'). If Melchert is correct, then both verbal stems ultimately go back to the noun *tapariya-*.

In the meantime, for *l/tabarna-* itself Melchert (1993b: 107; 1997: 87–88; 2003a: 19) suggests an IE etymology partially linked to attempts by several scholars (starting with Hrozný 1917, apud Tischler 1991: 118) of connecting Luw. *tapar-* to Latin *faber* 'artificer',<sup>81</sup> Old Church Slavonic *dobr-ъ* 'good' and Middle High German *tapfer* 'massive, firm; brave'. He reconstructs a PIE adjective *\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>(h)</sup>-ro-*<sup>82</sup> 'capable' as the source of a virtual substantivized adjective *\*tapar-* 'powerful', which in turn would have yielded *tapar-iya-* '(sphere of) command' through the adjectival suffix *-iya-* (cf. C. Luw. *tummantiya-* 'obedience' < *tummant-* 'ear, hearing'; Melchert 1990: 91). The semantic and morphological aspects of this scenario need a brief comment. Se-

<sup>77</sup> For the cuneiform material see Tischler (1991: 116), Melchert (1993a: 203) and Kloekhorst (2008: 829–830); for the forms in H. Luwian, see Hawkins (2000: 629–630). As regards the remaining Anatolian relatives, Hittite has the agent noun <sup>LÚ</sup>*tapariyalli-* 'commander' (< *\*tapariya-*) and the gloss-wedge form (:) *taparammahit-* 'position of commanding', probably a Luwian borrowing derived from *taparamman* on the model of *handawat(i)-* 'king' > *\*handawatahit-* 'kingdom'. H. Luwian also has the agent noun LEPUS+*ra/i-ia-li-* = *\*tapariyal(i)-* 'governor' (= Luwo-Hitt. <sup>LÚ</sup>*tapariyalli-*), which produces the factitive verb LEPUS+*ra/i-ia-la-* = *\*tapariyala-* 'to be/make governor', as well as LEPUS+*pa+ra/i-hi-* = *\*taparahit-* '(position of) authority' (nom.-acc. sg.), which is independent from Luwo-Hitt. (:) *taparamma-hit-*, and the hapax LEPUS-RA/I-*ta-na* = *\*taparitan* 'authority (acc. sg.)'. The latter is at first sight baffling, but I think Yakubovich's (pers. comm.) suggestion that it is a syncopated version of the noun *\*tapari(ya)ta-* 'command' is compelling; the process would be analogous to that of Hitt. *\*piyatta-* > *pitta-* 'allotment, gift' (see Puhvel 1979: 213).

<sup>78</sup> Starke's argument is that this verb's infinitive, *lawarruna*, is identical with that of *tapar-*, *taparuna* (he also cites (:) *palhā* and its inf. *palhuna*, but according to Melchert 1993a: 164 there is no stem *\*palhiya-* attested for this verb). This is complicated by the fact that the two verbs are conjugated with different stems in the Pret. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg: (:) *ta-pa-ar-ta* ~ *ta-pār-ta* vs. *la-wa-ar-ri-it-ta* (Melchert 1993a: 126, 207).

<sup>79</sup> For Kloekhorst (2008b: 831), *tapar-* could be from an IE source only if its stem was */tbar-/*, from a root of the structure *\*Tb<sup>(h)</sup>er-* (where *T* = dental stop). However, he admits that if *tapar-* is IE he cannot offer plausible cognates and, more importantly, his treatment does not exclude back-formation as a way to account for its atypical structure.

<sup>80</sup> According to Melchert (1997: 87), seventeen out of eighteen attestations of (:) *tapar-* are non-presents.

<sup>81</sup> Armenian *darbin* 'smith' has since long been cited as a cognate of Lat. *faber* (Meillet 1894: 165, apud Schrijver 1991: 102), but Melchert (2003a: 19, fn. 18) rejects this on phonological grounds. Yakubovich (2002: 103, fn. 26, owing to a suggestion by Kassian; 2009: 267–268) proposes the Armenian word to be a borrowing from an Urartian cognate of Hurr. *tabrinni-* 'blacksmith'.

<sup>82</sup> For those skeptical about both *\*a* and *\*b* as PIE phonemes, this would naturally be *\*d<sup>h</sup>eb<sup>h</sup>-ro-*.

mantics are less problematic if with Melchert (pers. comm.) one assumes *\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>(h)</sup>ro-* had a semantic range similar to that of German *tüchtig* ‘capable; big; good’, which can explain the diversification to Lat. *faber* ‘artificer (skillful working with various materials)’, OCS *dobro-* ‘good’ and virtual Luw. *\*tapar-* ‘powerful’, although MHG *tapfer* ‘valiant’ < ‘heavy’ (< P.-Germanic *\*dapra-* ‘heavy’; see Kroonen 2013: 89) remains difficult. But the real conundrum lies in morphology. In order to maintain the development PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>(h)</sup>ro-* > P. Anat. *\*dabro-* > Luw. *\*tapar-*, Melchert (1993b) needs to resort to his Anatolian “law of finals”, according to which *\*Cro-* would have regularly shifted to *Car-*. Yet this rule is not consensual and a possible counterexample is found in Hitt. *gim(ma)ra-* ‘countryside, field’ and C. Luw. *im(ma)ra-* ‘open country’ < PIE *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>im-ro-*.<sup>83</sup> In addition, we have seen that C. Luw. *taparamman-* points to a noun *\*tapara-* ‘rule’ which is also able to account for *tapariya-* (< *\*tapar(a)-iya-*), but can hardly be the outcome of PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>(h)</sup>ro-*, or, for that matter, reconciled with *\*tapra-*, the presumable component of the name *Taprammi*.

Interestingly, Yakubovich (2009b: 216, n. 11; 231) now traces *l/tabarna-* back to pre-Luw. *\*dabra-* ‘rule’ and considers his earlier *\*dabara-* as a secondary formation by analogy with the vocalism of *\*dabar-na*. His revision, which is only secondarily concerned with the etymology of the word,<sup>84</sup> is based on four Anatolian anthroponyms attested in the Old Assyrian sources of the early 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE: *Šupilapra*, *Walapra*, *Wašatapra*, and *Watapra* (spelled with sign DA/TÁ).<sup>85</sup> In Yakubovich’s opinion, *Walapra* and *Watapra* are variants of the same name and contain an independent element *l/tapra*, corresponding to Luw. *\*dabra-* ‘rule’. The alternating spellings, much like *l/tabarna-*, would indicate hesitations in transcribing an early Luwian voiced *\*d* by speakers of Hittite. Some reservations must be expressed, however. First: while *Šupilapra* is probably Hittite,<sup>86</sup> it is not clear if the remaining names are Hittite, Luwian, or something else (e.g. Hurrian). Second: it is not certain that *lapra* and *tapra* are correctly segmented and (should they be Hittite) represent a Luwian borrowing. In the case of *\*Wa-lapra/\*Wa-tapra* it is not obvious what would *Wa-* be, and Kassian (2009–2010: 358–359) duly notes that *\*Wala-pra/\*Wata-pra* are also possible segmentations. Third: we are dealing with early 2<sup>nd</sup>-millennium BCE texts written in the Old Assyrian language and script, which possesses unambiguous means of transcribing a voiced stop /d/; therefore, one would need to assume the scribes involved were not Assyrians, but Nesites working for the Assyrians and struggling to write Luwian onomastics with a foreign sound. Tempting as it is to posit pre-Luw. *dabra-* > *tapra-*, the evidence is not uncontroversial and, even if *\*dabra* existed as a self-standing element, there are no grounds to assume its meaning was ‘rule’.

It is worthwhile pointing out that, regardless of which source one prefers, Melchert’s or Yakubovich’s, there is an explanation — if only theoretical — of how *l/tabarna-* might have

<sup>83</sup> I find compelling the proposed connection with PIE *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>eim-* ‘winter’ (cf. Hitt. *gimmant-* ‘winter’), whence *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>im-ro-* ‘wintery (steppe)’ > ‘open country’ (Benveniste apud Puhvel 1997: 179).

<sup>84</sup> It is only in a footnote that Yakubovich retrieves his 2002 suggestion that this and other (allegedly) related forms “may have a non-Indo-European, “Minoan” origin”.

<sup>85</sup> Spellings of these names and texts where they appear (apud Yakubovich 2009b: Table 25): *Šu-pi-lá-áp-ra* (KUG 8.7, in Hecker 1966: 13); *Wa-lá-áp-ra-a* (TC 3 191.22, in Ulshöfer 1995: 316); *Wa-ša-tap-ra* (Kt 89/k 383 2, in Donbaz 1993: 134); *Wa-tá-áp-ra* (CCT 1 6c.13, in Eisser and Lewy 1930: 20).

<sup>86</sup> *Šupi-lapra* seems to contain *šuppi-* ‘pure’, which in the texts of the imperial period occurs exclusively in Hittite. Zehnder (2010: 7) claims that *šuppi-* has no valid IE etymology. Nevertheless, in the *Karum*-period it occurs in personal names with transparent Anatolian etymologies. Hence, *ṁŠuppi-uman* (‘of the pure one’) is formed through the addition of the well-known Hittite ethnic suffix; likewise, *ṁŠuppi-nika* (‘sister of the pure one’) contains the exclusively Nesite *-nika*. *ṁŠuppi-hšu* (‘male offspring of the pure one’) and *ṁŠuppi-hšušar* (‘female offspring of the pure one’) contain forms of *\*h(a)šu-*, a noun comparable to H. Luw. (NEPOS) *hasu-* ‘progeny, descendant’ (for these cases see Melchert 2003a: 16–17, Yakubovich 2009b: 216–217 and Zehnder 2010: 278–279).

been derived in Anatolian terms. It was formulated by Starke (1980–1983: 406) based on the parallel of C. Luw. *im(ma)ra-* ‘open country’ > \**immar-na* > <sup>d</sup>*Immarn-iya* ‘(deity) of the open country’. It works with Yakubovich’s \**dabra-* if the vocalism of \**dabarna-* was the outcome of anaptyxis after the syllabification of interconsonantal /r/: pre-Luw. \**dabr-na-* > \**dabr̥na-* > \**dabarna-* → Hitt. *labarna-*.<sup>87</sup> The same process can be hypothesized for Melchert’s \**dabar-*, only more straightforwardly, as it would be unnecessary to posit anaptyxis after the addition of *-na-*.

In the end, the question whether *l/tabarna-* is related to Luw. *tapariya-*, etc. remains open. I would insist that the original semantics of the title *need not* be linked to kingship if truly it is just the crystallized personal name of a memorable early Hittite monarch — again, we can compare the case of Roman *Caesar*, whose imperial connotations are secondary.<sup>88</sup>

## 11. Concluding remarks

As Kassian (2009–2010: 359) duly notes, the overarching problem with positing a Minoan-Anatolian contact word is that we need to assume an adstrate lexeme that not only travelled through different regions (Aegean, south-central Anatolia, Cyprus) during a long time-span (from the early 2<sup>nd</sup> to second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE), but did so while maintaining at all times a stable coronal fricative [ð] that prompted similar spelling alternations in several languages and scripts of the ancient Eastern Mediterranean.

The foregoing has showed that while there are grounds to link LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and Grk. *da-pu(2)-ri-to-/λαβύρινοθος*, there is no compelling way of connecting these Aegean forms to the Anatolian material, see the table on the next page.

Even if the interpretations put forward here are not always indisputable, the onomastics of 1<sup>st</sup>-millennium BCE southern Anatolia that we have scrutinized are more cogently explained as containing diverse elements of Luwic tradition, and none can be shown to contain a virtual form \**tapara* ‘ruler’ or a relative of Minoan *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*. At the same time, a Phoenician rather than an Anatolian etymology can be advanced (or rather reestablished) for *Labranios*, the Cypriot epithet of Zeus. The one item that remains suspicious is *Ἐρματοβορίς* (vis-à-vis *Ἐρμοκράτης* ‘Might of Hermes’) from Lycia, but neither the isolation of \*-τοβορι- nor its equivalence to Grk. *κράτης* (semantically) or Lyc. *tubure-* (etymologically) can be confirmed independently. Finally, not even the onomastics of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE have shown conclusive traces of \**tapara* ‘ruler’, but, somewhat paradoxically, a Luwian noun reconstructed with the same phonetic shape and a meaning close to ‘rule’ looks like the best way to account for Luw. *tapariya-* ‘rule, authority’ (> *tapar(r)iya(i)-* ‘to rule’ > *tapar-* ‘to rule’) and *taparamman-* ‘ruling’. It remains unclear whether this noun would be related to the Hittite royal title *l/tabarna-* and, if it were, whether the relation is etymological (direct) or owes to folk etymology (indirect). This is the reason that virtual Luw. \**tapara-* ‘rule’ would now be the most promising item. Nevertheless, I see no compelling reason to associate it with LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, so I conclude there is no Anatolian link leading to the interpretation of the Minoan sequence as ‘master’. It is to be seen whether the alternative ‘cave that housed the cult of a local divinity’, suggested by Sarullo (2008), can throw light on all instances of LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and its Aegean relatives. This, however, must be left for another occasion.

<sup>87</sup> I thank Yakubovich for suggesting this development (pers. comm.).

<sup>88</sup> This holds true even if the explanation of *Caesar* as ‘one delivered through a caesarian section’ (< Lat. *caeso* ‘to cut’) by Pliny the Elder (Plin. *Nat.* 7.7. s. 9) is the product of folk etymology.

Region	Word(s)	Proposed etymology
Aegean	LA <i>du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re</i>	Uncertain; ‘cult cave’(?) (see Sarullo 2008)
	LB <i>da-pu<sub>(2)</sub>-ri-to-</i> / Grk. λαβύριθος	Min. <i>du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re</i> /DəPúr(i)-/ ‘?’ + -vθ- (see fn. 2) ‘underground complex’(?)
Anatolia	Hitt. <i>l/tabarna-</i>	Uncertain (originally a personal name?). Cf. <i>La[b]arnaš</i> in the Old Assyrian sources
	Luw. <i>tapar(r)iya-</i> ‘rule, authority’ (> <i>tapar(r)iya(i)-</i> ‘to rule’ > <i>tapar-</i> ‘to rule’) and <i>taparamman-</i> ‘ruling’	Luw. noun <i>*tapara-</i> ‘rule’(?), of uncertain origin
	ᵈAlitapara (Kizzuwatna)	Uncertain
	<i>*Taprammi</i>	<i>*tapra-</i> + adj. suffix <i>-a(i)mmi-</i> ‘imbued with <i>tapra-</i> ’(?)
	-νδυβεϛι- (LYC.) -νδ/ο(υ)βα/ε/ηϛα- (CIL.)	Comparable to Lyc. <i>ñtuweri-</i> ‘?’. Perhaps Luwic <i>anda</i> + <i>warri-</i> > ‘aid, assistance’(?)
	Car. <i>ybyr</i> and <i>ybr(s)</i>	Uncertain (related to Luwo-Hitt. <i>warri-</i> ‘help’?)
	Τβεϛα/η- (CIL.) <i>*τβηηϛι-</i> (CAR.)	P.-Anat. <i>*dwāra-</i> ‘far, long’(?)
	Lyc. <i>*Ddapara</i> ( <i>se=dapara</i> )	Luwic <i>*Id(a)</i> + ( <i>a</i> ) <i>ppara</i> (?)
	Lyc. <i>Tubure-</i>	Uncertain
	<i>*-τοβοϛι-</i> (LYC.)	A Lycian word for ‘might’(??)
	Labraunda (CAR.)	Uncertain
Cyprus	Cypr. Grk. <i>Labranios</i>	Phoen. <i>lbnn</i> /Labnān/ ‘Lebanon’ + Grk. adjective suffix <i>-ios</i>

## References

- Adiego Lajara, Ignacio-Javier. 1993. *Studia Carica. Investigaciones sobre la escritura y lengua carias*, Barcelona.
- . 1995. Contribuciones al desciframiento del cario. *Kadmos* 34, 18–34.
- . 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Arbeitman, Yoel L. 1988. Iranian “Scribe”, Anatolian “Ruler”, or Neither: A City’s Rare Chances for “Leadership”. In Y. L. Arbeitman (ed.). *Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1–101.
- Bean, George E. and Mitford, Terence B. 1970. *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964–1968, Etc.* (Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften. Phil-Hist. Klasse. Denkschriften Band 102). Graz/Vienna/Colonia: Kommissionsverlag.
- Billigmeier, Jon-Christian. 1989. The Linear A Libation Formula Revisited. *American Philological Association: 121<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting: Boston, Massachusetts, December 27–30, 1989: Abstracts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 109.
- Blümel, Wolfgang. 1990. Zwei neue Inschriften aus Mylasa aus der Zeit des Maussollos. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 16, 29–43.
- . 1992. Einheimische Personennamen in griechischen Inschriften aus Karien. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 20, 7–34.
- Brixhe, Claude, Drew-Bear, Thomas, and Kaya, Durmuş. 1987. Nouveaux monuments de Pisidie. *Kadmos* 26/2, 124–192.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1986. Tabarna: Chattisch oder Indogermanisch? IX. *Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 21–25 Eylül 1981. Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, 201–206.
- . 1996. Neues zur Frühgeschichte Lykiens. In F. Blakolmer et al. (eds.), *Fremde Zeiten. Festschrift für Jürgen Borchardt*. Wien: Phoibos Verlag, 26–33.



- CHD = Güterbock, H. G., Hoffner, H. A., and van den Hout Th. P. J. (eds.). 1983. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago.
- Clara Rhodos 2 = Maiuri, Amedeo. 1932. *Monumenti di scultura del Museo archeologico di Rodi I (Clara Rhodos. Studi e materiali pubblicati a cura dell' Istituto storico-archeologico di Rodi 2)*, Rhodes: Istituto storico-archeologico.
- Colvin, Stephen. 2004. Names in Hellenistic and Roman Lycia. In S. Colvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society* (Yale Classical Studies 31), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 44–84.
- Dagron, Gilbert, and Feissel, Denis. 1987. *Inscriptions de Cilicie*. With the collaboration of Antoine Hermay, Jean Richard and Jean-Pierre Sodini. (Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance. Collège de France. Monographies 4). Paris: De Boccard.
- Davis, Brent 2013. "Syntax in Linear A: The Word-Order of the 'Libation Formula'". *Kadmos* 52, 35–52.
- 2014. *Minoan Stone Vessels with Linear A Inscriptions* (Aegaeum 36). Leuven: Peeters.
- De Hoz, Javier. 2004. De cómo los protogriegos crearon el griego y los pregriegos lo aprendieron. In P. Bádenas de la Peña et al. (eds.), *Lenguas en contacto: El testimonio escrito*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 35–56.
- De Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin (and the other Italic Languages)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, and Sanmartín, Joaquín. 2003. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Part 1 and 2. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- DocMyc<sup>2</sup> = Ventris, Michael, and Chadwick, John. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donbaz, Veysel. 1993. Some Remarkable Contractors of 1-B Period Kültepe Tablets II. In M. Mellink et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özğüç*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. Pp. 131–54.
- Duhoux, Yves. 1989. Le linéaire A: problèmes de déchiffrement. In Y. Duhoux, T.G. Palaima and J. Bennet (eds), *Problems in Decipherment*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 59–119.
- Egetmeyer, Markus. 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre. Tome I: Grammaire; Tome II: Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chypro-grec*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1975. Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems. In H. Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 71–103.
- Eisser, Georg and Lewy, Julius. 1930. *Die altassyrischen Rechtsurkunden von Kültepe*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft 33. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Estrada Fernández, Zarina. 2009. Loanwords in Yaqui, a Uto-Aztecan language of Northwestern Mexico. In M. Haspelmath and U. Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: a Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 823–845.
- Evans, Arthur. 1921. *The Palace of Minos at Knossos. Vol. I: The Neolithic and Early and Middle Minoan Ages*. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd.
- Forrer, Emil. 1922. Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 76, 174–269.
- Fowler, Henry W., Fowler, Francis G. and Crystal, David. 2011 [1911]. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary: The Classic First Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GORILA = Godart, Louis and Olivier, Jean-Pierre. 1976–1985. *Recueil des inscriptions en linéaire A*, 5 volumes, Paris: É. De Boccard.
- Hall, Isaac H. 1885 [1883]. A Temple of Zeus Labranios in Cyprus. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11, clxvi–clxx.
- Hawkins, John D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Volume I. Part I, II: Texts; Part III: Plates. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Hecker, Karl. 1966. *Die Keilschrifttexte der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen*. Giessen: Universitätsbibliothek.
- Heubeck, Alfred. 1957. Linear B und das 'aegaeische Substrat'. *Minos* 5, 149–153.
- Hoffner, Harry A., and Melchert, Craig H. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Vol. 1: *A Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. 1961. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kassian, Alexei. 2009–2010. Hattic as a Sino-Caucasic language. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 41, 309–447.

- Katz, Joshua T. 2001. Hittite *ta-pa-ka-li-ya-aš*. In O. Carruba and W. Meid (ed.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch — Anatolico e indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanische Gesellschaft ‘Anatolio e indoeuropea’* (Pavia 22.–25. September 1998). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 205–237.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008a. Studies in Lycian and Carian Phonology and Morphology. *Kadmos* 47, 117–146.
- . 2008b. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- KPN = Zgusta, Ladislav. 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prague: Tschechoslowakische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1896. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen: Vandenhoe & Ruprecht.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ladefoged, Peter and Maddieson, Ian. 1996. *The Sounds of the World's Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1966. *Les noms des Hittites* (Études linguistiques 4). Paris.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. (2<sup>nd</sup> impression 1987). Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Short, Charles. 1891. *A Latin Dictionary. Founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary. revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by. Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and. Charles Short, LL.D.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lipiński, Edward. 1995. *Dieux et déesses de l'univers phénicien et punique* (Studia Phoenicia 14). Leuven: Peeters.
- Maddieson, Ian. 1984. *UCLA Phonological Segment Inventory Database* [Retrieved online: <http://web.phonetik.uni-frankfurt.de/upsid.html>].
- Maddieson, Ian, and Wright, Richard. 1995. The vowels and consonants of Amis—a preliminary phonetic report. *Fieldwork Studies of Targeted Languages III* (UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics) 91, 45–65.
- Mallory, James P. and Douglas Q. Adams (eds.). 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London/Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Mallory, James P. and Douglas Q. Adams. 2006. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MAMA VIII = Calder, William M. and Cormack, James M. R. 1962. *Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian Borderland, Aphrodisias* (Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua 8). Manchester: University Press.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Masson, Olivier and Sznycer, Maurice. 1972. *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre*. Geneva and Paris: Droz.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1894. Notes arméniennes III. Etymologies, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 8, 164–165.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1990. Adjective Stems in \*-iyo- in Anatolian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 103, 198–207.
- . 1993a. *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill: self-published.
- . 1993b. A New Anatolian ‘Law of Finals’. *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8, 105–113.
- . 1993c. Remarks on Some New Readings in Carian. *Kadmos* 32, 77–86.
- . 1997. Traces of a PIE Aspectual Contrast in Anatolian? *Incontri Linguistici* 20, 83–92.
- . 2003a. Prehistory. In H. C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*. Leiden: Brill, 8–26.
- . 2003a. Language. In H. C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*. Leiden: Brill, 170–210.
- . 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- . 2008. Lycian. In R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 46–55.
- . 2013. Naming Practices in Second and First Millennium Western Anatolia. In R. Parker (ed.) *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia* (Proceedings of the British Academy 191). Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 31–49.
- . Forthcoming. New Luwian Verb Etymologies. To appear in a Festschrift.
- Mitford, Terence B. 1961. Further contributions to the epigraphy of Cyprus. *American Journal of Archaeology* 65, 93–151.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- Ohnefalsch-Richter, Max H. 1893. *Kypros, die Bibel und Homer*. Berlin.
- Oreshko, Rostislav. 2014. The Strange Case of Dr. FRATER and Mr. DOMINUS: a Re-Consideration of the Evidence Concerning Luwian *nani-*. In P. Taracha and M. Kapelus (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*. Warsaw, 614–631.
- Petersen, Eugen A. H., and von Luschan, Felix. 1889. *Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien*. Vol. II, *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyrat*. Vienna.

- PHI = Packard Humanities Institute, The. 2012. *Searchable Greek Inscriptions — A Scholarly Tool in Progress* [<http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main>].
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1979. Hittite words with initial *pít/pát* sign. In E. Neu and W. Meid, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*, Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 209–217.
- . 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 3: Words beginning with H.* (Trends in Linguistics Documentation 5). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 1997. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 4: Words beginning with K.* (Trends in Linguistics Documentation 14). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- RIMA 3 = Grayson, A. Kirk. 1996. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BCE)*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rüster, Christel and Wilhelm, Gernot. 2012. *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sarullo, Giulia. 2008. The Cretan Labyrinth: Palace or Cave? *Caerdroia* 37, 31–40.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Schuler, Einar. 1965. *Die Kaškäer: Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schürr, Diether. 2002. Karische Parallelen zu zwei Arzawa-Namen. *Kadmos* 41, 163–167.
- . 2010. Spätkarisch: Regionalisierung und Lautentwicklungen. In R. Van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia, Oxford, 29 June–2 July 2006*. Paris: Ausonius, 187–205.
- . 2012. Lykische Genitive. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115, 118–126.
- . 2014. Lykische Orte und ihre Namen: drei Namentypen. In P. Taracha (ed.), with the assistance of M. Keipelus, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, Warsaw: Agade Publishing, 743–774.
- SEG = Chaniotis, Angelos, Corsten, Thomas, Papazarkadas, Nikolaos, and Tybout, Rolf (eds.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Leiden: Brill.
- Shevoroshkin, Vitalij. 1978. Studies in Hittite-Luwian Names. *Names* 26, 231–257.
- . 2010. Four Notes on Milyan. In T. M. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Issledovanija po lingvistike i semiotike: sbornik statej k jubileju Vjach. Vs. Ivanova* (Studies in Linguistics and Semiotics: A Collection of Articles for the Anniversary for Vyacheslav V. Ivanov). Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, 156–167.
- Skeat, Walter W. 1993 [1884]. *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
- Soysal, Oğuz. 2005. On the Origin of the Royal Title *tabarna* / *labarna*. *Anatolica* 31, 189–210.
- Starke, Frank. 1980–1983. *Labarna. Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 6. Berlin.
- . 1989. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. *StBoT* 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Strauss, Rita. 2006. *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Svantesson, Jan-Olof; Tsendina, Anna; Karlsson, Anastasia; and Franzén, Vivan. 2005. *The Phonology of Mongolian*. Oxford: University Press.
- TAM III, 1 = Herbedey, Rudolf (ed.). 1941. *Tituli Asiae Minoris, III. Tituli Pisidiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti, 1. Tituli Termessi et agrī Termessensis*, Vienna: A. Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Tischler, Johann. 1988. *Labarna*. In E. Neu, C. Rüster (eds.), *Documentum Asia Minoris Antiqua. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 347–358.
- . 1991. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu. Teil III, L. 8, T, D/1. Innsbruck.
- . 1994. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu. Teil III, L. 10, T, D/3. Innsbruck.
- Thompson, Rupert J. E. 2005. Two notes on Mycenaean labial stops. *Živa Antika* 55, 107–115.
- Ulshöfer, Andrea M. 1995. *Die altassyrischen Privaturkunden*. ATU 4. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Valério, Miguel. 2007. ‘Diktaian Master’: A Minoan Predecessor of Diktaian Zeus in Linear A? *Kadmos* 46, 3–14.
- Ventris, Michael, and Chadwick, John. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2002. Labyrinth for Tyrants. *Studia Linguarum* 3 (*Memoriae A.A. Korolev dicata*). Ed. A. S. Kassian and A. V. Sidel'tsev. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, 93–116.

- . 2005. Lydian Etymological Notes. *Historische Sprachforschung* 118, 75–91.
- . 2009a. Two Armenian Etymologies. *Caucasian and Near Eastern Studies XIII*, Tbilisi, 266–272.
- . 2009b. *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013a. Anatolian Names in *wiya-* and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics. In A. Mouton et al. (eds.), *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden: Brill, 87–123.
- . 2013b. The Degree of Comparison in Luwian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118, 155–168.
- Younger, John G. 2011. A view from the sea. In: E. Hallager (gen. ed.), *The seascape in Aegean Prehistory*. Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 161–183.
- Zehnder, Thomas. 2010. *Die hethitischen Frauennamen: Katalog und Interpretation* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 29). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Zinko, Christian. 1994. Die Hethiter: Volk zwischen indogermanischer Tradition und kleinasiatisch-autochthonen Einflüssen. *Mitteilungen der Grazer Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 4, 54–82.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1970. *Neue Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen Anthroponymie* (Dissertationes orientales 24). Prague: Academia.

Мигель Валерио. Линейное A *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, хеттское *tabarna* и их гипотетические когнаты.

В статье подробно рассматривается и заново оценивается предположение о связи линейного A *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* и хеттского царского титула *t/labarna-*, а также целого ряда фонетически схожих апеллятивов с семантикой власти и могущества, топонимов и антропонимов, происходящих из Древней Анатолии. Автор отделяет от форм *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* и *t/labarna-* некоторые анатолийские ономастические единицы, относящиеся преимущественно к 1-му тыс. до н.э., предлагая для них независимую этимологию на основе языков лувической подгруппы. Также автор разделяет кипрский эпитет Зевса *Labranios* и хеттское *labarna-*, защищая старую гипотезу о *Labranios* как об адаптации финикийского названия Ливанского хребта. В результате тщательного пересмотра материала автор приходит к выводу, что, несмотря на возможное существование лувийского субстантива *\*tapara-* ‘власть’, у нас нет независимых доводов ни в пользу связи минойского *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* с какими-либо формами из анатолийских языков, ни в пользу того, что *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* вообще значит ‘господин’ (или нечто близкое).

*Ключевые слова:* линейное письмо A, табарна, лабарна, лувические языки, анатолийская ономастика, киликийские имена.

## Дардские языки и пятидесятисловная лексикостатистика

Дардские языки различных подгрупп обнаруживают друг с другом более 50% совпадений в стословном списке Сводеша. По этой причине предпочтительным методом изучения их родственных отношений, по-видимому, является стандартная лексикостатистика. В то же время процент совпадений между языками дардской группы, с одной стороны, и индоиранскими языками прочих ветвей, с другой, нередко опускается ниже 40%. Это говорит о целесообразности использования лексикостатистических подсчетов по пятидесятисловному списку для уточнения положения дардских языков внутри индоиранской языковой общности. Данный вопрос подробно рассматривается в настоящей статье. Уменьшение числа единиц в опытном списке со ста до пятидесяти позволяет привлечь для исследования большее количество идиомов. В частности, стал возможным анализ материала ряда дардских языков, не испытавших сильного индоарийского влияния. Результаты этого анализа показали, что средний процент дардско-индийских соответствий не отличается сколько-нибудь значительно от такового для дардских и иранских языков.

*Ключевые слова:* лексикостатистика, пятидесятисловный список, генетическая классификация языков, индоиранские языки, дардские языки, индоарийские языки.

Метод пятидесятисловной лексикостатистики<sup>1</sup> считается оптимальным для изучения родственных отношений языков, обнаруживающих не более 40—50% совпадений в стословном списке Сводеша [Старостин 2013: 141]. Языки дардской группы состоят в более тесном родстве: средний процент сходжений между ними составляет 56% [Васильев, Коган 2013], что по формуле С. А. Старостина предполагает около 3 тыс. лет дивергенции. По этой причине предпочтительным методом построения их внутренней классификации представляется стандартная лексикостатистика<sup>2</sup>. Ситуация, однако, становится иной, когда мы выходим за пределы собственно дардской языковой общности и ставим целью изучение ее внешних связей, т. е. генетических отношений дардских языков с прочими индоиранскими. В этом случае мы нередко будем иметь дело с долями совпадений ниже 40%<sup>3</sup>. Данный факт дает основания считать целесообразным использование лексикостатистических подсчетов по пятидесятисловному списку для уточнения положения дардских языков внутри индоиранской языковой общности.

Хотя вопрос о месте дардской группы в кругу индоиранских языков был поставлен давно и изучался весьма интенсивно<sup>4</sup>, представляется оправданным вернуться к нему вновь. На наш взгляд, пятидесятисловная лексикостатистика дает целый ряд преиму-

---

<sup>1</sup> Описание метода см. [Starostin 2010; Старостин 2013: 137—144].

<sup>2</sup> Попытка создания такой классификации на основании лексикостатистических подсчетов по стандартному стословному списку делается в работе [Васильев, Коган 2013].

<sup>3</sup> Результаты дардско-индийских и дардско-иранских лексикостатистических подсчетов приводятся в работе [Коган 2005].

<sup>4</sup> Результаты новейших исследований см. [Коган 2005]. Там же приводится список более ранней литературы.

ществ при его исследовании. Прежде всего, она позволяет отчасти решить проблему нехватки данных, острейшую для любого лингвиста, работающего с дардским материалом. При лексикостатистических подсчетах важным аспектом этой проблемы нередко является тот факт, что в исследование невозможно включать большое число идиомов, у которых в опытных списках слишком много лагун. Сокращение числа сопоставляемых единиц со ста до пятидесяти во многом позволяет преодолеть это препятствие: лишь в немногих известных нам дардских языках неполнота пятидесятисловников (в отличие от стословников) является настолько значительной, чтобы списки стали непригодными для сравнения.

Вопрос о числе идиомов в лексикостатистической базе и о возможном составе этой базы заслуживает особого обсуждения применительно к дардским языкам. Невозможность составления полных (или, по крайней мере, содержащих небольшое число лагун) стословных списков для многих из них обусловила то, что разные подгруппы дардской группы оказались неравномерно изученными с точки зрения лексикостатистики. Значительная, а иногда и бóльшая часть языков, привлекавшихся нами ранее для лексикостатистического анализа, относилась к восточnodардской подгруппе<sup>5</sup>.

Данное обстоятельство представляется весьма важным. Дело в том, что восточnodардские языки в гораздо большей степени, чем остальные дардские, подверглись влиянию со стороны индоарийских языков. Восточnodардско-индоарийские контакты, по всей видимости, существовали уже на праязыковом уровне (контакты языка-предка восточnodардских языков с неким синхронным ему раннесреднеиндийским языком) и продолжались в течение многих веков, итогом чего стало появление ряда ареальных совместных инноваций, в том числе на лексическом уровне [Васильев, Коган 2013]. Наличие таких инноваций даже давало в прошлом основания усомниться в возможности выделения восточnodардской подгруппы как генетической общности, а не как ареальной группы изначально далеко разошедшихся дардских идиомов, вторично сблизившихся благодаря контактам друг с другом и с индоарийскими языками [там же]<sup>6</sup>. Разумеется, данная ситуация не могла не сказаться на результатах лексикостатистических подсчетов. Восточnodардские языки обнаруживают повышенный в сравнении с остальной дардской группой процент совпадений с индоарийскими языками. При упоминавшейся выше непропорционально высокой доле восточnodардского материала в стословных базах это отражается на среднем проценте дардско-индоарийских соответствий.

Средний процент совпадений в стословном списке между языками дардской и индоарийской групп составляет 43,5%, что несколько превышает соответствующую цифру для дардских и иранских языков (в среднем 39,3% совпадений). Как было показано нами в работе [Коган 2005], причиной превышения, вероятнее всего, являются языковые контакты, а не особо тесное дардско-индоарийское родство<sup>7</sup>. В пользу этого говорят, в частности, результаты подсчетов по методу этимостатистики (корневой глоттохронологии),

<sup>5</sup> Лексикостатистическая база данных, использованная нами в работе [Коган 2005], содержит семь дардских языков, три из которых входят в восточnodардскую подгруппу. В работе [Васильев, Коган 2013] сравниваются стословные списки 16 языков и диалектов дардской группы, 12 из которых — восточnodардские.

<sup>6</sup> Впрочем, дальнейшее исследование показало, что восточnodардские языки обнаруживают пучок общих историко-фонетических инноваций, возникновение которого не может быть объяснено только языковыми контактами [там же]. Это заставляет признать генетический характер восточnodардской языковой общности.

<sup>7</sup> Как указывал в своей основополагающей статье по лексикостатистике С. А. Старостин, контакты между родственными языками могут вызывать подскок в доле совпадений на 5—6% [Старостин 2007]. Разрыв между средним дардско-индийским и дардско-иранским показателем, составляющий 4,2%, вполне укладывается в обозначенный Старостиным промежуток.

которые, по всей видимости, в принципе не могут подвергаться существенному влиянию конвергентных процессов. Они однозначно свидетельствуют против особо тесной дардско-индийской генетической близости и в пользу генетической равноудаленности трех ветвей индоиранских языков: иранской, дардской и индоарийской [там же]. Принимая во внимание данный факт, нельзя не задаться вопросом, возможно ли каким-либо способом минимизировать влияние ареального фактора на лексикостатистические данные, приблизив их таким образом к более реалистичным, на наш взгляд, результатам этимостатистического анализа.

Есть основания полагать, что это можно сделать, попросту удалив из лексикостатистической базы восточnodардский материал. Сразу необходимо сказать, что этот шаг едва ли позволит решить проблему полностью: дардско-индийские контакты, вероятнее всего, существовали уже в общедардскую эпоху<sup>8</sup> и, следовательно, должны были сказаться не только на восточnodардских языках. Вместе с тем, устранение списков, содержащих, кроме «общедардско-индоарийских», также сепаратные восточnodардско-индоарийские лексические изоглоссы контактного происхождения, несомненно, должно повлиять на конечные результаты подсчетов, существенно уточнив их. До недавнего времени подобный шаг представлялся нам крайне нежелательным. В двух составленных нами стословных базах имелось всего четыре дардских идиома, не относящихся к восточnodардской подгруппе: кховар, калаша, гавар-бати и лауровани<sup>9</sup>. Привлечь для анализа списки по другим восточnodардским языкам и диалектам казалось невозможным из-за недостатка данных. Если учесть, что дардский лексический материал всё еще недостаточно хорошо, а для некоторых языков весьма плохо изучен с точки зрения этимологии, то следует признать, что значительное сокращение числа сопоставляемых идиомов может крайне отрицательно сказаться на надежности конечных результатов. Переход от стословной лексикостатистики к пятидесятисловной способен существенным образом изменить ситуацию. В условиях, когда стало возможным значительно увеличить выборку, включив в нее целый ряд новых списков, удаление из лексикостатистической базы восточnodардского материала, вероятнее всего, уже не будет иметь далеко идущих последствий.

Прежде чем переходить к лексикостатистическим подсчетам по пятидесятисловным спискам, мы считаем необходимым остановиться на одной важной проблеме, возникшей в ходе предварительной подготовки материала. Для одного из привлекаемых нами для анализа дардских языков — языка кховар — есть основания предположить ситуацию скрытого субстрата, аналогичную той, что была описана Г. С. Старостиным для африканского языка квегу [Старостин 2013: 125—128]. Подобно последнему, кховар в ряде случаев обнаруживает существенные отклонения от среднего для своей группы процента совпадений в стословном списке. Это показывают, в частности, цифры из приводимой ниже матрицы: табл. 1.

Жирным шрифтом выделены проценты совпадений между кховар и восточnodардскими языками. Как можно видеть, они уступают (иногда, как в случае с языком кашмири, весьма существенно) «среднедардскому» значению — 56%. Примечательно также, что показывающий наибольшую близость к кховар язык калаша (доля совпадений между ним и кховар превышает среднюю на 5%) не обнаруживает пониженных процентов сходжений с языками восточnodардской подгруппы. Иными словами, налицо аномалия, подобная той, что наблюдается при сопоставлении квегу с другими южносурмийскими

<sup>8</sup> См. [Коган 2005].

<sup>9</sup> Последний представляет собой один из языков-диалектов подгруппы пашаи. Этот единственный представитель данной подгруппы в наших лексикостатистических базах выступал под названием «пашаи».

Таблица 1. Проценты совпадений в стословном списке между некоторыми дардскими языками (стословные списки приводятся в работе [Васильев, Коган 2013]).

Язык	кашм.	шина	майян	г.-б.	лаур.	кал.	кхов.
кашм.	—	63	68	57	52	54	<b>45</b>
шина		—	73	61	53	60	<b>48</b>
майян			—	64	55	63	<b>47</b>
г.-б.				—	66	67	52
лаур.					—	65	56
кал.						—	61

языками<sup>10</sup>. При этом, как и в случае с квегу, весьма значительная часть лексических расхождений между кховар и близкородственными языками приходится на слова неясного происхождения.

Наличие в языке кховар большого пласта неэтимологизированной лексики — факт, давно признанный учеными<sup>11</sup>. Если предположить, что основную часть данного пласта составляют заимствования из неизвестного субстратного языка, следует признать, что влияние последнего на кховар было весьма глубоким, поскольку слова неизвестной этимологии в немалом количестве встречаются и в базисной части словаря. В частности, в стословном списке можно выделить следующие предположительные субстратные заимствования: *pheru* ‘пепел’; *khoʷanu* ‘живот’; *kot* ‘облако’; *ʷer*, *huʃ* ‘жир’; *araq* ‘рот’; *k(h)ũʃun* ‘дым’. Показательно, что некоторые из этих слов характеризуются не только отсутствием этимологических связей, но и наличием фонем, не характерных для исконной лексики кховар. К таким фонемам относится, например, увулярный *q*, присутствующий в названии рта.

Из приведенных выше лексем три (*pheru* ‘пепел’, *araq* ‘рот’, *k(h)ũʃun* ‘дым’) входят в пятидесятисловный список и при лексикостатистическом анализе будут рассматриваться нами как предположительные субстратные заимствования. Поскольку их неисконное происхождение является лишь гипотезой, мы считаем целесообразным провести две серии подсчетов с разной интерпретацией указанных слов (в первом случае — как исконных, во втором — как заимствованных)<sup>12</sup>. В приводимых ниже матрицах — табл. 2 и 3 — результаты этих подсчетов отражены в двух строках с названиями кхов.1 и кхов.2 соответственно.

Подсчеты проводились в системе Starling для восьми дардских идиомов: гавар-бати, шумашти, калаша, кховар и четырех языков-диалектов подгруппы пашаи — лауровани, гульбахари, курангали и вегали<sup>13</sup>. Списки приводятся в специальном приложении в конце работы.

Из приведенных матриц видно, что разрыв между процентами дардско-индийских и дардско-иранских соответствий является минимальным. В среднем он составляет менее 2% (1,85% без учета и 1,8% с учетом гипотетических субстратных заимствований в языке кховар), т. е. лежит в пределах статистической погрешности. Интересно также отметить, что некоторые индийские языки обнаруживают заметно более низкие доли сов-

<sup>10</sup> О ней см. [Старостин 2013: 126].

<sup>11</sup> См., например, [Morgenstierne 1932: 48; 1947].

<sup>12</sup> Помимо трех гипотетических заимствований, пятидесятисловный список кховар содержит также одно несомненное — *doʷur* ‘ноготь’, усвоенное из восточноиранского языка, близкого к ваханскому (ср. вах. *dgər to* же).

<sup>13</sup> Лексический материал взят из работ [Morgenstierne 1945; 1950; 1956; 1973<sub>1,2</sub>; Sloan 1981].



Таблица 2. Проценты совпадений между 50-словными списками дардских и индоарийских языков. **Средние проценты совпадений:** 58% (без учета субстратных заимствований в кховар), 58,6% (с учетом субстратных заимствований в кховар).

Язык	хинди	пандж.	лхд.	синд.	гудж.	мар.	синг.	бенг.	асс.	неп.	кот.
г.-б.	65	67	69	67	65	62	67	59	55	56	61
шум.	61	63	66	64	61	59	67	55	53	54	57
лаур.	61	63	63	63	60	58	61	54	51	54	59
гульб.	59	60	59	61	58	54	58	53	46	50	56
кур.	57	59	59	59	57	53	56	50	48	51	54
вег.	61	63	65	65	63	60	63	57	53	54	59
кал.	61	63	67	65	65	62	67	57	55	54	59
кхов.1	51	50	55	51	52	51	52	46	45	48	51
кхов.2	56	55	60	56	57	55	57	49	49	52	56

Таблица 3. Проценты совпадений между 50-словными списками дардских и иранских языков. **Средние проценты совпадений:** 56,15% (без учета субстратных заимствований в кховар), 56,8% (с учетом субстратных заимствований в кховар).

Язык	дари	тат.	курд.	бел.	гал.	афг.	йидга	шугн.	вах.	санг.	ос.
г.-б.	57	55	60	53	51	56	57	55	67	56	52
шум.	60	60	63	55	56	56	56	55	70	57	52
лаур.	57	55	60	52	53	55	57	60	63	62	58
гульб.	56	51	53	50	50	54	53	61	65	61	53
кур.	52	52	56	46	51	52	52	54	63	60	53
вег.	59	57	63	55	56	55	59	60	65	62	60
кал.	53	53	63	55	53	57	57	56	64	58	54
кхов.1	49	51	56	52	49	47	52	50	56	56	54
кхов.2	53	56	60	58	54	51	57	56	61	61	59

падений с языками дардской группы, чем некоторые иранские (ср., например, средние проценты сходжений с дардскими языками, с одной стороны, для бенгали или ассамского, с другой — для ваханского или сангличского).

Таким образом, на поставленный в начале данной работы вопрос о возможности минимизации влияния ареального фактора на результаты лексикостатистических подсчетов можно с полным основанием дать положительный ответ. Следует сказать, что рассмотренное нами преимущество пятидесятисловной лексикостатистики перед столсловной в применении к арийским языкам, по всей видимости, не единственное. Если вдвое уменьшить число слов в опытном списке, то, например, можно привлечь для подсчетов материал нуристанских языков, стословники по которым изобилуют лакунами. Это, в свою очередь, впервые позволит исследовать генетические отношения нуристанской группы с прочими ветвями арийской языковой общности в рамках лексикостатистического метода.

## Сокращения

асс. — ассамский	кашм. — кашмири	лхд. — лахнда
афг. — афганский (пушту)	кот. — котгархи (индоарийский язык подгруппы пахари)	мар. — маратхи
бел. — белуджский	кур. — курангали (язык подгруппы пашаи)	неп. — непали
бенг. — бенгали	курд. — курдский	ос. — осетинский
вах. — ваханский	кхов.1 — кховар (без учета субстратных заимствований)	пандж. — панджаби
вег. — вегали (язык подгруппы пашаи)	кхов.2 — кховар (с учетом субстратных заимствований)	санг. — сангличский
г.-б. — гавар-баты	лаур. — лауровани (язык подгруппы пашаи)	синг. — сингальский
гудж. — гуджарати		синд. — синдхи
гульб. — гульбахари (язык подгруппы пашаи)		тал. — талышский
кал. — калаша		тат. — татский
		шугн. — шугнанский
		шум. — шумашти

## Литература

- Васильев М. Е., Коган А. И. К вопросу о восточнодардской языковой общности. *Вопросы языкового родства*, 2013, №10. С. 149—178. [Vasil'ev M. E., Kogan A. I. K voprosu o vostochnodardskojazykovoj obschnosti. *Voprosy jazykovogo rodstva*, 2013, №10. S. 149—178.]
- Коган А. И. *Дардские языки. Генетическая характеристика*. М.: Восточная литература, 2005. [Kogan A. I. *Dardskie jazyki. Geneticheskaja kharakteristika*. М.: Vostochnaja literatura, 2005.]
- Старостин Г. С. *Языки Африки. Опыт построения лексикостатистической классификации*. Том 1. *Методология. Койсанские языки*. М.: ЯСК, 2013. [Starostin G. S. *Jazyki Afriki. Opyt postroenija leksikostatisticheskoi klassifikatsii*. Том 1. *Metodologija. Kojsanskie jazyki*. М.: JaSK, 2013.]
- Старостин С. А. Сравнительно-историческое языкознание и лексикостатистика. В: С. А. Старостин. *Труды по языкознанию*. М.: Языки славянских культур, 2007. С. 407—447. [Starostin S. A. *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskoe jazykoznanie i leksikostatistika*. V: S. A. Starostin. *Trudy po jazykoznaniju*. М.: Jazyki slavjanskikh kul'tur, 2007. S. 407—447.]
- Morgenstierne, G. 1932. *Report on a Linguistic Mission to North-Western India*. Oslo: Instituttet for sammelnende kuturforskning. Ser. C. 3.1.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1945. Notes on Shumashti, a Dardic Dialect of the Gawar-Bati Type. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*. Bd. XIII. Oslo, 1945. Pp. 239—281.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1947. Some Features of Khowar Morphology. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*. Bd. XIV. Oslo, 1947. Pp. 5—28.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1950. *Notes on Gawar-Bati*. Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps Akademi i Oslo. II. Hist. Filos. Klasse, 1950, #1. Oslo.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1956. *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*. Vol. III: *The Pashai Language*, pt. 3, *Vocabulary*. Oslo: Aschenoug & Co.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1973<sub>1</sub>. *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*. Vol. IV: *The Kalasha Language*. Oslo: Universitetforlaget.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1973<sub>2</sub>. Sanscritic Words in Khowar. *Irano-Dardica*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. Pp. 256—272.
- Sloan, M. I. 1981. *Khowar-English Dictionary*. Peshawar.
- Starostin, G. 2010. Preliminary lexicostatistics as a basis for language classification: a new approach. *Journal of Language Relationship* 3, 2010, pp. 79—117.

## Приложение. Пятидесятисловные списки

Пятидесятисловные списки индоарийских и иранских языков были составлены на основе столовых списков, использованных в работе [Коган 2005]. Источники дардского лексического материала, включенного в пятидесятисловную базу, указаны нами выше.

При подготовке списков мы, разумеется, не могли не столкнуться с проблемой синонимии. Проблема эта в большинстве случаев осложнялась отсутствием информации о стилистической окраске слов. В подобной ситуации в качестве наиболее приемлемого на сегодняшний день решения мы приняли допущение двух (но не более!) синонимов, если оба слова обнаруживают этимологические связи за пределами данной ветви (ср., например, названия яйца в языке калаша — *onḍrak* и *ayukun* — первое из которых имеет несомненные параллели в индоарийских, а второе — в иранских языках). Общее число синонимических пар в нашем материале невелико — одна в дардской и по три в иранской и индоарийской лексикостатистической базе.

Номера, сопровождающие приводимые ниже формы, отсылают к номерам записей в этимологических базах данных по дардским, индоарийским и иранским языкам (в системе Старлинг), а также отражают когнацию (одинаковые номера = отражения одного и того же пракорня). Отрицательные номера присваиваются очевидным заимствованиям, а также лакунам в пределах 50-словного списка.

### Пятидесятисловные списки дардских языков.

Сокращения: Gaw. — гавар-бати, Gul. — гульбахари (язык подгруппы пашаи), Kal. — калаша, Kho. — кховар<sup>14</sup>, Krn. — курангали (язык подгруппы пашаи), Lau. — лауровани (язык подгруппы пашаи), Shu. — шумашти, Weg. — вегали (язык подгруппы пашаи).

1. ASHES: Gaw. *sāga* (2), Lau. *āsək* (2), Kho. *pheru* (349), Kal. *ṣuṭik* (394), Shu. *āsik* (2), Gul. *ōsk(a)* (2), Krn. *wōsik* (2), Weg. *āsek* (2).

2. BIRD: Gaw. *phēčīn* (123), Lau. *pašīn* (123), Kho. *boik* (352), Kal. *pačhīyak* (123), Shu. ? (-1), Gul. *raxīn* (123), Krn. *pāčīn* (123), Weg. *pičīn* (123).

3. BLACK: Gaw. *khāca* (265), Lau. *šāmāk* (320), Kho. *šā* (320), Kal. *križṇa* (9), Shu. *ḡaca* (265), Gul. *šāmek* (320), Krn. *šōmak* (320), Weg. *sāmek* (320).

4. BLOOD: Gaw. *lō* (198), Lau. *ār* (321), Kho. *ley* (198), Kal. *lui* (198), Shu. *luī* (198), Gul. *ūr* (321), Krn. *ōeλ* (321), Weg. *āš* (321).

5. BONE: Gaw. *haḍ* (-1), Lau. *aṭṭhī* (11), Kho. *astī* (11), Kal. *aṭhi* (11), Shu. *āṭhi* (11), Gul. *ustuxūn* (-1), Krn. *āṭhi* (11), Weg. *aṇḍī* (11).

6. CLAW(NAIL): Gaw. *nak* (14), Lau. *nawarī* (14), Kho. *doḡur* (-1), Kal. *naṅguš* (14), Shu. *naūcik* (14), Gul. *naxūn* (-2), Krn. *nakucik* (14), Weg. *nawar* (14).

7. DIE: Gaw. *mi-* (19), Lau. *le-* (19), Kho. *br-* (19), Kal. *naš-* (397), Shu. *lī-* (19), Gul. *muṛī par-* (19), Krn. *lī-* (19), Weg. *le-* (19).

<sup>14</sup> Стословный список кховар приводится без учета гипотетических субстратных заимствований, т.е. с трактовкой последних как лексических замен.

8. DOG: Gaw. *šunā* (20), Lau. *šūŋg* (20), Kho. *rēni* (357), Kal. *šū(r)a* (20), Shu. *šūrə* (20), Gul. *šūŋg* (20), Krn. *šūŋiŋ* (20), Weg. *šūrīŋ* (20).
9. DRINK: Gaw. *pi-* (128), Lau. *pi-* (128), Kho. *pi-* (128), Kal. *pi-* (128), Shu. *pi-* (128), Gul. ? (-1), Krn. *pi-* (128), Weg. *pē-* (128).
10. DRY: Gaw. *šukha* (22), Lau. *sus-* (22), Kho. *čūčhu* (22), Kal. *šuštə* (22), Shu. *sux-* (22), Gul. *xuš* (-3), Krn. *sus-* (22), Weg. *susuwā* (22).
11. EAR: Gaw. *khamṭa* (23), Lau. *k(h)āi* (23), Kho. *kar* (23), Kal. *krū* (23), Shu. *kōr* (23), Gul. *kai* (23), Krn. *xōr* (23), Weg. *xār* (23).
12. EAT: Gaw. *žu-* (268), Lau. *ay-* (324), Kho. *žib-* (268), Kal. *žu-* (268), Shu. *zō-* (268), Gul. *žū-* (268), Krn. *ay-* (324), Weg. *ā-* (324).
13. EGG: Gaw. *aṇḍa* (130), Lau. *āṇḍā* (-1), Kho. *ayukun* (358), Kal. *onḍrak* (130) / *ayukun* (358), Shu. *āṇa* (130), Gul. *padārī* (465), Krn. *āndō* (-1), Weg. *āṇa* (-1).
14. EYE: Gaw. *icīn* (28), Lau. *ačhī* (28), Kho. *yeč* (28), Kal. *eč* (28), Shu. *aīc* (28), Gul. *ačhūi* (28), Krn. *aince* (28), Weg. *anč* (28).
15. FIRE: Gaw. *aṅgār* (30), Lau. *aṅgār* (30), Kho. *angār* (30), Kal. *aṅgār* (30), Shu. *ār* (30), Gul. *lōkan* (466), Krn. *āṅgō* (30), Weg. *aṅgār* (30).
16. FOOT: Gaw. *khur* (33), Lau. *pā* (204), Kho. *poŋg* (204), Kal. *khūr* (33), Shu. *xur* (33), Gul. *pūī* (204), Krn. *xūr* (33), Weg. *pā* (204).
17. HAIR: Gaw. *khēs* (272), Lau. *žūtr* (327), Kho. *dro* (366), Kal. *čurī* (403), Shu. *kyēs* (272), Gul. *jālū* (467), Krn. *juš* (474), Weg. *žūl* (327).
18. HAND: Gaw. *hast* (39), Lau. *hāst* (39), Kho. *host* (39), Kal. *hast* (39), Shu. *ast* (39), Gul. *ōst* (39), Krn. *ōs* (39), Weg. *āst* (39).
19. HEAD: Gaw. *šauṭa* (40), Lau. *šīr* (40), Kho. *kapal* (328), Kal. *šīš* (40), Shu. *šārə* (40), Gul. *šīr* (40), Krn. *šīr* (40), Weg. *sīr* (40).
20. HEAR: Gaw. *šūŋi-* (188), Lau. *piēn-* (468), Kho. *kara do-* (233), Kal. *saŋg(h)a-* (405), Shu. *šune-* (188), Gul. *piān-* (468), Krn. *ar-* (329), Weg. *ar-* (329).
21. HEART: Gaw. *hiṛa* (138), Lau. *hār* (138), Kho. *hardi* (138), Kal. *h(r)iya* (138), Shu. *idə* (138), Gul. *ār* (138), Krn. *zir* (-2), Weg. *ār* (138).
22. HORN: Gaw. *šīŋ* (42), Lau. *šāŋg* (42), Kho. *surung* (42), Kal. *šīŋ* (42), Shu. *šīŋ* (42), Gul. *šūx* (-4), Krn. *šīŋ* (42), Weg. *šeŋ* (42).
23. I: Gaw. *ā* (189), Lau. *ā* (189), Kho. *atwa* (189), Kal. *ā* (189), Shu. *ā* (189), Gul. *ā* (189), Krn. *ā* (189), Weg. *mam* (189).
24. KILL: Gaw. *mār-* (44), Lau. *mār-* (44), Kho. *mar-* (44), Kal. *mar-* (44), Shu. *lay-* (469), Gul. *mār-* (44), Krn. *an-* (330), Weg. *an-* (330).
- 24a. KILL  
Lau. *(h)an-* (330), Kal. *hūr-* (330), Gul. *an-* (330), Krn. *mōr-* (44), Weg. *mār-* (44).
25. LEAF: Gaw. *phaṭa* (47), Lau. *paṭā* (47), Kho. *čhan* (368), Kal. *p(r)ū* (47), Shu. *paṭṭa* (47), Gul. *pūṭ* (47), Krn. *phāṭak* (47), Weg. *paṭik* (47).

26. LOUSE: Gaw. *zum* (51), Lau. *žū* (51), Kho. *žūγ* (51), Kal. *juk* (51), Shu. *yū* (51), Gul. *žū* (51), Krn. *iyū* (51), Weg. *žū* (51).
27. MEAT: Gaw. *anda* (278), Lau. *pāi* (335), Kho. *pušur* (369), Kal. *mos* (55), Shu. *āda* (278), Gul. *pē* (335), Krn. *pīu* (335), Weg. *pē* (335).
28. MOON: Gaw. *māsoi* (279), Lau. *māi* (279), Kho. *mas* (279), Kal. *mastruk* (279), Shu. *mās* (279), Gul. *mōi* (279), Krn. *mōk* (279), Weg. *mā* (279).
29. MOUTH: Gaw. *hāsi* (59), Lau. *dōr* (336), Kho. *apak* (372), Kal. *aši* (59), Shu. *dōr* (-1), Gul. *dūr* (336), Krn. *dūr* (336), Weg. *dōr* (336).
30. NAME: Gaw. *nam* (60), Lau. *nām* (60), Kho. *nam* (60), Kal. *nom* (60), Shu. *nām* (60), Gul. *nām* (60), Krn. ? (-1), Weg. *nām* (60).
31. NEW: Gaw. *nuṅga* (63), Lau. *nūṅga* (63), Kho. *noγ* (63), Kal. *nhok* (63), Shu. ? (-1), Gul. *nūṅg* (63), Krn. ? (-1), Weg. *nogā* (63).
32. NIGHT: Gaw. *yel* (281), Lau. *wyāl* (281), Kho. *čhuy* (374), Kal. *rāt* (-1), Shu. *wyel* (281), Gul. *šab* (-5), Krn. *wel* (281), Weg. *wēl* (281).
33. NOSE: Gaw. *nāsī* (64), Lau. *nās* (64), Kho. *niskar* (64), Kal. *načur* (64), Shu. *načū* (64), Gul. *nūst* (64), Krn. *nōs* (64), Weg. *nās* (64).
34. NOT: Gaw. *na* (65), Lau. *ne* (65), Kho. *no* (65), Kal. *ne* (65), Shu. *na* (65), Gul. *na* (65), Krn. *ne* (65), Weg. *ne* (65).
35. ONE: Gaw. *yak* (66), Lau. *ī* (66), Kho. *ī* (66), Kal. *ek* (66), Shu. *yāk* (66), Gul. *ī* (66), Krn. *yē* (66), Weg. *ī* (66).
36. RAIN: Gaw. *waš* (237), Lau. *dāmān* (337), Kho. *bošik* (237), Kal. *bāšik* (237), Shu. *wāš* (237), Gul. ? (-1), Krn. *domon* (337), Weg. *wāš* (237).
37. SMOKE: Gaw. *dum* (84), Lau. *dūm* (84), Kho. *kūšun* (380), Kal. *dhūm* (84), Shu. *dūm* (84), Gul. *dūm* (84), Krn. *dūm* (84), Weg. *dūm* (84).
38. STAR: Gaw. *tāra* (86), Lau. *astārīč* (86), Kho. *istāri* (86), Kal. *tāri* (86), Shu. *taizolik* (86), Gul. *sitāru* (-6), Krn. *lētorō* (86), Weg. *tajuṛik* (86).
39. STONE: Gaw. *wał* (155), Lau. *wār* (155), Kho. *boxt* (155), Kal. *bat* (155), Shu. *wār* (155), Gul. *zōmba* (470), Krn. *wō* (155), Weg. *wār* (155).
40. SUN: Gaw. *sūri* (88), Lau. *sur* (88), Kho. *yor* (382), Kal. *sūri* (88), Shu. *surī* (88), Gul. *sura* (88), Krn. *sur* (88), Weg. *sur* (88).
41. TAIL: Gaw. *limoṭa* (90), Lau. *līm* (90), Kho. *rum* (90), Kal. *dhamrei* (90), Shu. *līmā* (90), Gul. *dumb* (90), Krn. *lime* (90), Weg. *leme* (90).
42. THOU: Gaw. *tu* (95), Lau. *tū* (95), Kho. *tu* (95), Kal. *tu* (95), Shu. *tu* (95), Gul. *tū* (95), Krn. *tū* (95), Weg. *tō* (95).
43. TONGUE: Gaw. *zib* (96), Lau. *jib* (96), Kho. *ligini* (383), Kal. *jip* (96), Shu. *zīb* (96), Gul. *jiba* (96), Krn. *zip* (96), Weg. *jip* (96).
44. TOOTH: Gaw. *dant* (97), Lau. *dānd* (97), Kho. *don* (97), Kal. *dandoryak* (97), Shu. *dān* (97), Gul. *dandūn* (-7), Krn. *dōn* (97), Weg. *dand-* (97).

45. TREE: Gaw. *muṭha* (241), Lau. *kuṛā* (343), Kho. *kan* (384), Kal. *muṭ* (241), Shu. *gōlā* (463), Gul. *ustūm* (471), Krn. *zal* (472), Weg. *karek* (343).

46. TWO: Gaw. *du* (99), Lau. *dō* (99), Kho. *jū* (99), Kal. *dū* (99), Shu. *dū* (99), Gul. *dō* (99), Krn. *dō* (99), Weg. *dō* (99).

47. WATER: Gaw. *aū* (104), Lau. *warg* (344), Kho. *uṛ* (104), Kal. *uk* (104), Shu. *wō* (104), Gul. *wūr̥k* (344), Krn. *warek* (344), Weg. *warag* (344).

48. WE: Gaw. *amō* (105), Lau. *hamā* (105), Kho. *ispa* (105), Kal. *abi* (105), Shu. *abā* (193) / *ama-* (105), Gul. *hamā* (105), Krn. *amā* (105), Weg. *amā* (105).

49. WHAT: Gaw. *kī* (106), Lau. *kōr* (106), Kho. *kya* (106), Kal. *kīa* (106), Shu. *kyēlā* (106), Gul. *kar* (106), Krn. *kul* (106), Weg. *koī* (106).

50. WHO: Gaw. *kara* (109), Lau. *kī* (109), Kho. *ka* (109), Kal. *kura* (109), Shu. *karā* (109), Gul. *kē* (109), Krn. *kē* (109), Weg. *kē* (109).

### Слословные списки индоарийских языков.

Сокращения: Ass. — ассамский, Bng. — бенгали, Guj. — гуджарати, Hnd. — хинди-урду, Kot. — котгархи (индоарийский язык подгруппы пахари), Lhd. — лахнда, Mar. — маратхи, Nep. — непали, Pnj. — панджаби, Snd. — синдхи, Sng. — сингальский.

1. ASHES: Hnd. *rākh* (3), Pnj. *suāh* (111), Lhd. *chai* (152), Snd. *rakh* (3), Guj. *rākh* (3), Mar. *rākh* (3), Bng. *chai* (152), Ass. *sai* (152), Nep. *kharāni* (140), Sng. *aḷu* (382), Kot. *chār* (140).

2. BIRD: Hnd. *pākhī* (7), Pnj. *pakkherū* (7), Lhd. *pakkhī* (7), Snd. *pakhī* (7), Guj. *pākhī* (7), Mar. *pakṣī* (-1), Bng. *pakhi* (7), Ass. *sorai* (6), Nep. *carā* (6), Sng. *kurullā* (-1), Kot. *panchi* (7).

3. BLACK: Hnd. *kālā* (9), Pnj. *kālā* (9), Lhd. *kālā* (9), Snd. *kāro* (9), Guj. *kāḷo* (9), Mar. *kālā* (9), Bng. *kalo* (9), Ass. *kōla* (9), Nep. *kālo* (9), Sng. *kaḷu* (9), Kot. *kaḷo* (9).

4. BLOOD: Hnd. *lahū* (10), Pnj. *lahū* (10) / *ratt* (115), Lhd. *lahū* (10) / *ratt* (115), Snd. *ratu* (115), Guj. *lohī* (10), Mar. *rakt* (-2), Bng. *rōkto* (-1), Ass. *tez* (330), Nep. *ragat* (-1), Sng. *lē* (10), Kot. *lou* (10).

5. BONE: Hnd. *haḍḍī* (11), Pnj. *haḍḍī* (11), Lhd. *haḍḍī* (11), Snd. *haḍ'o* (11), Guj. *hāḍkū* (11), Mar. *hāḍ* (11), Bng. *har* (11), Ass. *har* (11), Nep. *hāḍ* (11), Sng. *āṭaya* (388), Kot. *haḍḍ* (11).

6. CLAW(NAIL): Hnd. *nāḥun* (-1), Pnj. *nahū* (14), Lhd. *naūh* (14), Snd. *nāhū* (14), Guj. *nakh* (14), Mar. *nakh* (14), Bng. *nōkh* (14), Ass. *nōkh* (14), Nep. *naṅ* (14), Sng. *niyapotta* (14), Kot. *nōš* (14).

7. DIE: Hnd. *mar-* (17), Pnj. *mar-* (17), Lhd. *mar-* (17), Snd. *mar-* (17), Guj. *mar-* (17), Mar. *mar-* (17), Bng. *mār-* (17), Ass. *mār-* (17), Nep. *mar-* (17), Sng. *māre-* (17) / *nasi-* (393), Kot. *mār-* (17).

8. DOG: Hnd. *kuttā* (18), Pnj. *kuttā* (18), Lhd. *kuttā* (18), Snd. *kutto* (18), Guj. *kutro* (18), Mar. *kuṭrā* (18), Bng. *kukur* (302), Ass. *kukur* (302), Nep. *kukur* (302), Sng. *sunbayā* (395), Kot. *kukkār* (302).

9. DRINK: Hnd. *pī-* (19), Pnj. *pī-* (19), Lhd. *pī-* (19), Snd. *pī-* (19), Guj. *pi-* (19), Mar. *pi-* (19), Bng. *kha-* (303), Ass. *pī-* (19), Nep. *pīu-* (19), Sng. *bo-* (19), Kot. *pī-* (19).

10. DRY: Hnd. *sukhā* (20), Pnj. *sukkā* (20), Lhd. *sukkā* (20), Snd. *sukalu* (20), Guj. *sukū* (20), Mar. *sukhā* (20), Bng. *śukno* (20), Ass. *hukan* (20), Nep. *sukkho* (20), Sng. *viyaḷi* (456), Kot. *śukkhō* (20).

11. EAR: Hnd. *kān* (21), Pnj. *kann* (21), Lhd. *kan* (21), Snd. *kanu* (21), Guj. *kān* (21), Mar. *kān* (21), Bng. *kaṇ* (21), Ass. *kaṇ* (21), Nep. *kān* (21), Sng. *kana* (21), Kot. *kān* (21).
12. EAT: Hnd. *khā-* (23), Pnj. *khā-* (23), Lhd. *khā-* (23), Snd. *khā-* (23), Guj. *khā-* (23), Mar. *khā-* (23), Bng. *kha-* (23), Ass. *kha-* (23), Nep. *khā-* (23), Sng. *ka-* (23), Kot. *khā-* (23).
13. EGG: Hnd. *aṇḍā* (24), Pnj. *āṇḍā* (24), Lhd. *ānā* (24), Snd. *āno* (24), Guj. *iṇḍū* (24), Mar. *aṇḍē* (24), Bng. *ḍim* (304), Ass. *ḍima* (304), Nep. *aṇḍā* (24), Sng. *aṇḍa* (24), Kot. *pinne* (442).
14. EYE: Hnd. *ākh* (25), Pnj. *akkh* (25), Lhd. *akkh* (25), Snd. *akhi* (25), Guj. *ākh* (25), Mar. *ḍoḷā* (274), Bng. *cokh* (305) / *ākhi* (25), Ass. *soku* (305), Nep. *ākhā* (25), Sng. *āsa* (25), Kot. *akkh* (25).
15. FIRE: Hnd. *āg* (27), Pnj. *agg* (27), Lhd. *agg* (27), Snd. *āgi* (27), Guj. *āg* (27), Mar. *āg* (27), Bng. *ag* (27), Ass. *zui* (334), Nep. *āgo* (27), Sng. *ginna* (-2), Kot. *āg* (27).
16. FOOT: Hnd. *pair* (30), Pnj. *pair* (30), Lhd. *pēr* (30), Snd. *per* (30), Guj. *pag* (30), Mar. *pāy* (30), Bng. *pa* (30), Ass. *bhəri* (335), Nep. *pāu* (30), Sng. *paya* (30), Kot. *pau* (30).
17. HAIR: Hnd. *bāl* (36), Pnj. *vāl* (36), Lhd. *vāl* (36), Snd. *vār* (36) / *kes* (185), Guj. *vāl* (36), Mar. *kēs* (185), Bng. *cul* (308) / *keś* (185), Ass. *suli* (308), Nep. *raū* (364), Sng. *kespata* (185), Kot. *bāl* (36).
18. HAND: Hnd. *hāth* (37), Pnj. *hatth* (37), Lhd. *hatth* (37), Snd. *hathu* (37), Guj. *hāth* (37), Mar. *hāt* (37), Bng. *hat* (37), Ass. *hat* (37), Nep. *hāt* (37), Sng. *ata* (37), Kot. *hatth* (37).
19. HEAD: Hnd. *sir* (38), Pnj. *sir* (38), Lhd. *sir* (38), Snd. *siru* (38), Guj. *māthū* (186), Mar. *ḍokē* (254), Bng. *śir* (38), Ass. *hir* (38), Nep. *munṭo* (338), Sng. *hisa* (38), Kot. *śir* (38).
20. HEAR: Hnd. *sun-* (39), Pnj. *suṇ-* (39), Lhd. *suṇ-* (39), Snd. *b'udh-* (187), Guj. *sāmbhaḷ-* (255), Mar. *aik-* (275), Bng. *śon-* (39), Ass. *hun-* (39), Nep. *sun-* (39), Sng. *asa-* (39), Kot. *śuṇ-* (39).
21. HEART: Hnd. *dil* (-2), Pnj. *dil* (-1), Lhd. *hā* (161), Snd. *hīo* (161), Guj. *dil* (-1), Mar. *hRday* (-3), Bng. *rhitpiṇḍo* (-2), Ass. *hiya* (161), Nep. *muṭu* (365), Sng. *ḷaya* (161), Kot. *hio* (161).
22. HORN: Hnd. *sīṅg* (40), Pnj. *siṅg* (40), Lhd. *siṅg* (40), Snd. *siṅg* (40), Guj. *siṅgḍū* (40), Mar. *śiṅg* (40), Bng. *śiṅg* (40), Ass. *hiṅg* (40), Nep. *sīṅg* (40), Sng. *(h)anga* (40), Kot. *śiṅg* (40).
23. I: Hnd. *māi* (41), Pnj. *māi* (41), Lhd. *māi* (41), Snd. *āū* (41), Guj. *hū* (41), Mar. *mī* (41), Bng. *ami* (309), Ass. *mci* (41), Nep. *ma* (41), Sng. *mama* (41), Kot. *mū* (41).
24. KILL: Hnd. *mār-* (42), Pnj. *mār-* (42), Lhd. *mār-* (42), Snd. *mār-* (42), Guj. *mār-* (42), Mar. *ṭhār mār-* (42), Bng. *mere phel-* (42), Ass. *mār-* (42), Nep. *mār-* (42), Sng. *mar-* (42), Kot. *mar-* (42).
- 24a. KILL: Pnj. *koh-* (121), Lhd. *kuh-* (121), Snd. *kuh-* (121), Kot. *dzhang-* (444).
25. LEAF: Hnd. *pattā* (45), Pnj. *pattar* (45), Lhd. *pātar* (45), Snd. *panu* (189), Guj. *pāḍrū* (189), Mar. *pān* (189), Bng. *pata* (45), Ass. *pat* (45), Nep. *pāt* (45), Sng. *pata* (45), Kot. *pāč* (45).
26. LOUSE: Hnd. *jū* (50), Pnj. *jū* (50), Lhd. *juā* (50), Snd. *jūa* (50), Guj. *jū* (50), Mar. *ū* (50), Bng. *ukuṇ* (311), Ass. *okṇi* (311), Nep. *jumrā* (50), Sng. *ukuṇā* (311), Kot. *jū* (50).
27. MEAT: Hnd. *gošt* (-3), Pnj. *mās* (124), Lhd. *mās* (124), Snd. *māsu* (124), Guj. *mās* (124), Mar. *mās* (124), Bng. *mākšō* (124), Ass. *mṅgoh* (124), Nep. *māsu* (124), Sng. *mas* (124), Kot. *mas* (124).
28. MOON: Hnd. *cād* (52), Pnj. *cann* (52), Lhd. *candar* (52), Snd. *caṇḍu* (52), Guj. *cāndo* (52), Mar. *cād* (52), Bng. *cand* (52), Ass. *zon* (340), Nep. *jūn* (340), Sng. *hañda* (52), Kot. *dzūṇ* (340).

29. MOUTH: Hnd. *mūh* (54), Pnj. *mūh* (54), Lhd. *mūh* (54), Snd. *mūhu* (54), Guj. *mhō* (54), Mar. *tōḍ* (281), Bng. *mukh* (54), Ass. *mukh* (54), Nep. *mukh* (54), Sng. *muva* (54), Kot. *mū* (54).
30. NAME: Hnd. *nām* (55), Pnj. *nā* (55), Lhd. *nā* (55), Snd. *nālo* (55), Guj. *nām* (55), Mar. *nāv* (55), Bng. *nam* (55), Ass. *nam* (55), Nep. *nāu* (55), Sng. *nama* (55), Kot. *naū* (55).
31. NEW: Hnd. *nayā* (57), Pnj. *navā* (57), Lhd. *navā* (57), Snd. *naō* (57), Guj. *navū* (57), Mar. *navā* (57), Bng. *নব্য* (57), Ass. *no* (57), Nep. *nayā* (57), Sng. *nava* (57), Kot. *noṽo* (57).
32. NIGHT: Hnd. *rāt* (58), Pnj. *rāt* (58), Lhd. *rāt* (58), Snd. *rāti* (58), Guj. *rāt* (58), Mar. *rāt* (58), Bng. *rat* (58), Ass. *rati* (58), Nep. *rāt* (58), Sng. *rāya* (58), Kot. *rāč* (58).
33. NOSE: Hnd. *nāk* (59), Pnj. *nakk* (59), Lhd. *nakk* (59), Snd. *naku* (59), Guj. *nāk* (59), Mar. *nāk* (59), Bng. *nak* (59), Ass. *nak* (59), Nep. *nāk* (59), Sng. *nahaya* (59), Kot. *nāk* (59).
34. NOT: Hnd. *na* (60), Pnj. *nā* (60), Lhd. *na* (60), Snd. *na* (60), Guj. *nā* (60), Mar. *na* (60), Bng. *na* (60), Ass. *no* (60), Nep. *na* (60), Sng. *nā* (60), Kot. *na* (60).
35. ONE: Hnd. *ek* (61), Pnj. *ik* (61), Lhd. *ek* (61), Snd. *hiku* (61), Guj. *ek* (61), Mar. *ek* (61), Bng. *ek* (61), Ass. *ek* (61), Nep. *ek* (61), Sng. *ek* (61), Kot. *ēk* (61).
36. RAIN: Hnd. *mēh* (62), Pnj. *mīh* (62), Lhd. *vasōyā* (127), Snd. *vas* (127), Guj. *varsād* (127), Mar. *pāūs* (127), Bng. *badol* (127), Ass. *borokhuṅ* (127), Nep. *jhārī* (369), Sng. *vāssa* (127), Kot. *pāṇī* (447).
37. SMOKE: Hnd. *dhuā* (78), Pnj. *dhūā* (78), Lhd. *dhū* (78), Snd. *dūhō* (78), Guj. *dhumāḍo* (78), Mar. *dhūr* (78), Bng. *dhōva* (78), Ass. *dhōva* (78), Nep. *dhuṽā* (78), Sng. *duma* (78), Kot. *dhū* (78).
38. STAR: Hnd. *tārā* (80), Pnj. *tārā* (80), Lhd. *tārā* (80), Snd. *tāro* (80), Guj. *tāro* (80), Mar. *tārā* (80), Bng. *tara* (80), Ass. *tra* (80), Nep. *tārā* (80), Sng. *taruva* (80), Kot. *taro* (80).
39. STONE: Hnd. *patthar* (81), Pnj. *patthar* (81), Lhd. *vaṭṭā* (167), Snd. *pattharu* (81), Guj. *patthar* (81), Mar. *dagaḍ* (286), Bng. *pathor* (81), Ass. *hil* (351), Nep. *ḍhungo* (371), Sng. *gala* (-3), Kot. *patthar* (81).
40. SUN: Hnd. *sūraj* (82), Pnj. *sūraj* (82), Lhd. *sijjh* (82), Snd. *siju* (82), Guj. *sūraj* (82), Mar. *sūrya* (-4), Bng. *šurjo* (-3), Ass. *beli* (352), Nep. *ghām* (236), Sng. *ira* (82), Kot. *dheṛo* (168).
41. TAIL: Hnd. *pūch* (84), Pnj. *pucch* (84), Lhd. *pucchar* (84), Snd. *puch* (84), Guj. *puchḍū* (84), Mar. *šēpūṭ* (288), Bng. *langul* (317), Ass. *negur* (317), Nep. *pucchar* (84), Sng. *naguṭa* (317), Kot. *pundzhar* (84).
42. THOU: Hnd. *tū* (87), Pnj. *tū* (87), Lhd. *tū* (87), Snd. *tū* (87), Guj. *tū* (87), Mar. *tū* (87), Bng. *tumi* (87), Ass. *toi* (87), Nep. *tā* (87), Sng. *tō* (87), Kot. *tū* (87).
43. TONGUE: Hnd. *jībh* (88), Pnj. *jībh* (88), Lhd. *jibbh* (88), Snd. *j'ibh* (88), Guj. *jībh* (88), Mar. *jībh* (88), Bng. *jib* (88), Ass. *zibha* (88), Nep. *jibro* (88), Sng. *diva* (88), Kot. *dzibbh* (88).
44. TOOTH: Hnd. *dāt* (89), Pnj. *dand* (89), Lhd. *ḍand* (89), Snd. *ḍ'andu* (89), Guj. *dāt* (89), Mar. *dāt* (89), Bng. *dāt* (89), Ass. *dāt* (89), Nep. *dāt* (89), Sng. *data* (89), Kot. *dānd* (89).
45. TREE: Hnd. *peṛ* (90), Pnj. *rukkh* (131), Lhd. *vaṇ* (169), Snd. *vaṇu* (169), Guj. *jhāḍ* (266), Mar. *jhāḍ* (266), Bng. *gach* (318), Ass. *gōs* (318), Nep. *ruk* (131), Sng. *gaha* (318), Kot. *pēṛ* (90).
- 45a. TREE: Nep. *boṭ* (373), Sng. *ruka* (131), Kot. *buṭṭi* (373).
46. TWO: Hnd. *do* (91), Pnj. *do* (91), Lhd. *ḍū* (91), Snd. *b'a* (91), Guj. *be* (91), Mar. *don* (91), Bng. *dui* (91), Ass. *dui* (91), Nep. *duī* (91), Sng. *deka* (91), Kot. *dui* (91).



47. WATER: Hnd. *pānī* (94), Pnj. *pāñī* (94), Lhd. *pāñī* (94), Snd. *pāñī* (94), Guj. *pāñī* (94), Mar. *pāñī* (94), Bng. *jal* (319), Ass. *pani* (94) / *zol* (319), Nep. *pānī* (94), Sng. *pān* (94) / *diya* (425), Kot. *pāñī* (94).

48. WE: Hnd. *ham* (95), Pnj. *asī* (95), Lhd. *assā* (95), Snd. *asī* (95), Guj. *ame* (95), Mar. *āmhī* (95), Bng. *amra* (95), Ass. *ami* (95), Nep. *hāmī* (95), Sng. *api* (95), Kot. *hamme* (95).

49. WHAT: Hnd. *kyā* (96), Pnj. *kī* (96), Lhd. *ke* (96), Snd. *kahiṛo* (96), Guj. *šū* (96), Mar. *kāy* (96), Bng. *ki* (96), Ass. *kih* (96), Nep. *ke* (96), Sng. *mokada* (426), Kot. *ke* (96).

50. WHO: Hnd. *kaun* (99), Pnj. *kaun* (99), Lhd. *koṇ* (99), Snd. *keru* (99), Guj. *koṇ* (99), Mar. *koṇ* (99), Bng. *ke* (99), Ass. *kon* (99), Nep. *ko* (99), Sng. *kavuda* (99), Kot. *kuṇ* (99).

### Столосвные списки иранских языков.

Сокращения: Afg. — афганский (пушту), Bal. — белуджский, Dar. — дари, Krd. — курдский, Oss. — осетинский, Sgl. — сангличский, Shg. — шугнанский, Tal. — талышский, Tat. — татский, Wkh. — ваханский, Ydg. — йидга.

1. ASHES: Dar. *χākestar* (2), Tat. *χokistər* (2), Krd. *kozi* (–1), Bal. *pur* (193), Tal. *randəmü* (210), Afg. *ira* (291), Ydg. *yaχia* (291), Shg. *šir* (291), Wkh. *parg* (378), Sgl. *wuter* (291), Oss. *ärtχūtäg* (291).

2. BIRD: Dar. *mory* (7), Tat. *mürq* (7), Krd. *čivik* (155), Bal. *murg* (7), Tal. *kižə* (214), Afg. *muryə* (7), Ydg. *parinda* (–1), Shg. *parindā* (–1), Wkh. *parənda* (–1), Sgl. *parənda* (–1), Oss. *mary* (7).

3. BLACK: Dar. *seyāh* (9), Tat. *siyə* (9), Krd. *raš* (156), Bal. *siyā(h)* (–1), Tal. *šivə* (9), Afg. *tor* (296), Ydg. *nərou* (324), Shg. *təer* (296), Wkh. *šiw* (9), Sgl. *šūi* (9), Oss. *caw* (9).

4. BLOOD: Dar. *χūn* (10), Tat. *χun* (10), Krd. *χ<sup>w</sup>ēn* (10), Bal. *(h)ōn* (10), Tal. *χūn* (–1), Afg. *wīna* (10), Ydg. *ino* (10), Shg. *wiχin* (10), Wkh. *wiχən* (10), Sgl. *wēn* (10), Oss. *tug* (461).

5. BONE: Dar. *ostoxān* (11), Tat. *əsdūqu* (11), Krd. *hastū* (11), Bal. *haḏḏ* (–2), Tal. *asa* (11), Afg. *haḏ* (–1), Ydg. *yāstiy* (11), Shg. *sitχōn* (–2), Wkh. *yayč* (11), Sgl. *ostok* (11), Oss. *istäg* (11).

6. CLAW(NAIL): Dar. *nāχon* (15), Tat. *nəχü* (15), Krd. *nainik* (15), Bal. *nāhun* (15), Tal. *nangir* (15), Afg. *nok* (15), Ydg. *anaxno* (15), Shg. *nəχūn* (–3), Wkh. *dgər* (15), Sgl. *narχok* (15), Oss. *nix* (15).

7. DIE: Dar. *mord-* (22), Tat. *mür-* (22), Krd. *mir-* (22), Bal. *mür-* (22), Tal. *mard-* (22), Afg. *mṛ-* (22), Ydg. *mər-* (22), Shg. *mar-* (22), Wkh. *mərəy-* (22), Sgl. *mur-* (22), Oss. *mül-* (22).

8. DOG: Dar. *sag* (23), Tat. *səg* (23), Krd. *sa* (23) / *kūčik* (158), Bal. *kučakk* (158), Tal. *šipə* (23), Afg. *spay* (23), Ydg. *yalw* (327), Shg. *kud* (354), Wkh. *šač* (23), Sgl. *ku*, (354), Oss. *k<sup>w</sup>iž* (354).

9. DRINK: Dar. *χord-* (24), Tat. *hənji-* (130), Krd. *vaχwar-* (24), Bal. *var-* (24), Tal. *(pe)šom-* (216), Afg. *cš-* (298), Ydg. *šam-* (216), Shg. *bireez-* (355), Wkh. *piv-* (383), Sgl. *pöv-* (383), Oss. *cim-* (216).

10. DRY: Dar. *χošk* (25), Tat. *χüšg* (25), Krd. *hišk* (25), Bal. *(h)ušk* (25), Tal. *hiškin* (25), Afg. *wuč* (25), Ydg. *ušk* (25), Shg. *qoq* (–4), Wkh. *wəsk* (25), Sgl. *χušk* (–2), Oss. *χūs* (25).

11. EAR: Dar. *gōš* (26), Tat. *guš* (26), Krd. *guh* (26), Bal. *gōš* (26), Tal. *güš* (26), Afg. *γwaž* (26), Ydg. *γū* (26), Shg. *γōγ'* (26), Wkh. *γiš* (26), Sgl. *γo!* (26), Oss. *qūs* (26).

12. EAT: Dar. *χord-* (29), Tat. *χurd-* (29), Krd. *χwar-* (29), Bal. *var-* (29), Tal. *hə-* (29), Afg. *χwar-* (29), Ydg. *χur-* (29), Shg. *χār-* (29), Wkh. *yaw-* (384), Sgl. *χ<sup>w</sup>ār-* (29), Oss. *χār-* (29).

13. EGG: Dar. *tox̄m* (30), Tat. *χoyə* (133), Krd. *hek* (133), Bal. *āyag* (133), Tal. *üvə* (133), Afg. *hagəy* (133), Ydg. *əryuy* (329), Shg. *tarmury* (-5), Wkh. *tx̄m̄irg* (-2), Sgl. *ākik* (133), Oss. *ayk* (133).
14. EYE: Dar. *čašm* (31), Tat. *čum* (31), Krd. *čav* (31), Bal. *čamm* (31), Tal. *čaš* (31), Afg. *stərga* (300), Ydg. *cam* (31), Shg. *cēm* (31), Wkh. *čəžm* (31), Sgl. *cām* (31), Oss. *cäst* (31).
15. FIRE: Dar. *āteš* (34), Tat. *ataš* (34), Krd. *āgir* (160), Bal. *ās* (34), Tal. *otaš* (-2), Afg. *or* (34), Ydg. *yūr* (34), Shg. *yōc* (34), Wkh. *rəχnig* (274), Sgl. *šənāi* (274), Oss. *art* (34) / *zing* (160).
16. FOOT: Dar. *pāy* (37), Tat. *poy* (37), Krd. *pe* (37), Bal. *pād* (37), Tal. *po* (37), Afg. *pša* (303), Ydg. *palo* (37), Shg. *p̄* (37), Wkh. *pid* (37), Sgl. *pū* (37), Oss. *fad* (37).
17. HAIR: Dar. *mōy* (44), Tat. *muy* (44), Krd. *mū* (44), Bal. *mūd* (44), Tal. *mü* (44), Afg. *wəšta* (305), Ydg. *γūnia* (246), Shg. *γūnj* (246), Wkh. *yanī* (246), Sgl. *soyond* (246), Oss. *q<sup>w</sup>in* (246).
18. HAND: Dar. *dast* (45), Tat. *dəs* (45), Krd. *dast* (45), Bal. *dast* (45), Tal. *das* (45), Afg. *las* (45), Ydg. *last* (45), Shg. *ust* (45), Wkh. *dast* (45), Sgl. *dōst* (45), Oss. *arm* (471).
19. HEAD: Dar. *sar* (46), Tat. *sər* (46), Krd. *sar* (46), Bal. *sarag* (46), Tal. *sə* (46), Afg. *sar* (46), Ydg. *pūsur* (46), Shg. *kāl* (-6), Wkh. *sar* (46), Sgl. *sōr* (46), Oss. *sār* (46).
20. HEAR: Dar. *šonūd-* (48), Tat. *šin-* (48), Krd. *bihist-* (168), Bal. *huškin-* (201), Tal. *məs-* (220), Afg. *awred-* (247), Ydg. *nəyuy-* (169), Shg. *niyōy'-* (169), Wkh. *kšiy-* (48), Sgl. *šud-* (48), Oss. *q<sup>w</sup>is-* (169).
21. HEART: Dar. *del* (49), Tat. *dül* (49), Krd. *zir* (49), Bal. *zird* (49), Tal. *dil* (-3), Afg. *zrə* (49), Ydg. *zil* (49), Shg. *z̄r* (49), Wkh. *pziṽ* (390), Sgl. *ōvzui* (420), Oss. *zärdä* (49).
22. HORN: Dar. *šāχ* (50), Tat. *sürg* (136), Krd. *stura* (136), Bal. *šāh* (-3), Tal. *šoχ* (-4), Afg. *škər* (136), Ydg. *šū* (136), Shg. *χ̄χ'* (-7), Wkh. *šəw* (136), Sgl. *šou* (136), Oss. *si* (136).
23. I: Dar. *man* (51), Tat. *mə* (51), Krd. *az* (51), Bal. *man* (51), Tal. *az* (51), Afg. *zə* (51), Ydg. *zo* (51), Shg. *wuz* (51), Wkh. *wuz* (51), Sgl. *az* (51), Oss. *üz* (51).
24. KILL: Dar. *košt-* (52), Tat. *küš-* (52), Krd. *kušt-* (52), Bal. *kuš-* (52), Tal. *kišt-* (52), Afg. *wažn-* (248), Ydg. *mōz-* (249), Shg. *z̄in-* (248), Wkh. *šay-* (391), Sgl. *žan-* (248), Oss. *mar-* (249).
- 24a. KILL: Afg. *məraw-* (249), Sgl. *kəl-* (52).
25. LEAF: Dar. *barg* (55), Tat. *vəlg* (55), Krd. *balg* (55), Bal. *pann* (-4), Tal. *vəraγ* (55), Afg. *pāṇa* (250), Ydg. *pəṇək* (250), Shg. *pār̄k* (250), Wkh. *palč* (250), Sgl. *barg* (-3), Oss. *sif* (472).
26. LOUSE: Dar. *šopoš* (60), Tat. *šubuj* (60), Krd. *sipī* (60), Bal. *bōD* (-5), Tal. *sibiž* (60), Afg. *spažg* (60), Ydg. *špū* (60), Shg. *šipay'* (60), Wkh. *šiš* (60), Sgl. *aspəl* (60), Oss. *sist* (60).
27. MEAT: Dar. *gōšt* (64), Tat. *gušd* (64), Krd. *gošt* (64), Bal. *gōšt* (64), Tal. *güžd* (64), Afg. *γuša* (64), Ydg. *γuš* (64), Shg. *gūχ't* (-8), Wkh. *gušt* (-3), Sgl. *pəf* (422), Oss. *fid* (422).
28. MOON: Dar. *mahtāb* (65), Tat. *məng* (65), Krd. *mah* (65), Bal. *mā(h)* (65), Tal. *ovšim* (222), Afg. *spožmay* (65), Ydg. *imoyō* (65), Shg. *mεest* (65), Wkh. *žəmak* (65), Sgl. *wulmēk* (65), Oss. *mäy* (65).
29. MOUTH: Dar. *dahān* (67), Tat. *ləʔə* (139), Krd. *daw* (67), Bal. *dap* (67), Tal. *gav* (224), Afg. *χula* (307), Ydg. *yurv* (333), Shg. *γəv* (224), Wkh. *γ'aš* (398), Sgl. *fōc* (281), Oss. *kom* (475).
30. NAME: Dar. *nām* (68), Tat. *num* (68), Krd. *nāv* (68), Bal. *nām* (68), Tal. *nom* (68), Afg. *num* (68), Ydg. *nam* (-2), Shg. *nōm* (68), Wkh. *nung* (68), Sgl. *nīm* (68), Oss. *nom* (68).

31. NEW: Dar. *naw* (70), Tat. *taza* (140), Krd. *nū* (70), Bal. *nōk* (70), Tal. *tožə* (140), Afg. *nəway* (70), Ydg. *nowoyo* (70), Shg. *naw* (70), Wkh. *šəy'd* (400), Sgl. *nuwōk* (70), Oss. *nāwäg* (70).
32. NIGHT: Dar. *šab* (71), Tat. *šəv* (71), Krd. *šaw* (71), Bal. *šap* (71), Tal. *šav* (71), Afg. *špa* (71), Ydg. *χšōvo* (71), Shg. *χ'āb* (71), Wkh. *nay'd* (401), Sgl. *fərsōu* (71), Oss. *äxsäv* (71).
33. NOSE: Dar. *bīnī* (72), Tat. *vini* (72), Krd. *poz* (177), Bal. *pōnz* (177), Tal. *vōni* (72), Afg. *pāza* (177), Ydg. *fəsko* (177), Shg. *nēz* (254), Wkh. *mīs* (254), Sgl. *nic* (254), Oss. *fīnɜ* (177).
34. NOT: Dar. *na* (73), Tat. *nə?* (73), Krd. *na* (73), Bal. *na* (73), Tal. *nə* (73), Afg. *na* (73), Ydg. *no* (73), Shg. *na* (73), Wkh. *nə* (73), Sgl. *na* (73), Oss. *nā* (73).
35. ONE: Dar. *yak* (74), Tat. *yə* (74), Krd. *yak* (74), Bal. *yak* (74), Tal. *i* (74), Afg. *yaw* (74), Ydg. *yū* (74), Shg. *yīw* (74), Wkh. *yīw* (74), Sgl. *wok* (74), Oss. *iw* (74).
36. RAIN: Dar. *bārān* (75), Tat. *voruš* (75), Krd. *bārān* (75), Bal. *gwārān* (75), Tal. *voš* (75), Afg. *bārān* (-2), Ydg. *wariyo* (75), Shg. *bārən* (-9), Wkh. *wir* (75), Sgl. *novok* (337), Oss. *warin* (75).
37. SMOKE: Dar. *dūd* (90), Tat. *durə* (90), Krd. *dū* (90), Bal. *dūt* (90), Tal. *dü* (90), Afg. *lūgay* (90), Ydg. *lūy* (90), Shg. *ud* (90), Wkh. *it* (90), Sgl. *dī* (90), Oss. *fäsdäg* (450).
38. STAR: Dar. *setāra* (92), Tat. *asdara* (92), Krd. *stairk* (92), Bal. *istar* (92), Tal. *astovə* (92), Afg. *storay* (92), Ydg. *stārēy* (92), Shg. *χ'iteerɜ* (92), Wkh. *sator* (92), Sgl. *ustərūk* (92), Oss. *istali* (92).
39. STONE: Dar. *sang* (93), Tat. *səng* (93), Krd. *bard* (183), Bal. *sing* (93), Tal. *səngona* (93), Afg. *kāṇay* (312), Ydg. *γar* (261), Shg. *žir* (261), Wkh. *γ'ar* (261), Sgl. *yer* (261), Oss. *dur* (-1).
40. SUN: Dar. *χoršəd* (94) / *āftāb* (95), Tat. *ofto* (95), Krd. *χawar* (94) / *taw* (95), Bal. *rōč* (185), Tal. *haši* (94), Afg. *lmar* (94), Ydg. *mīra* (285), Shg. *χir* (94), Wkh. *yir* (94), Sgl. *ormōzd* (430), Oss. *χur* (94).
41. TAIL: Dar. *dom* (97), Tat. *düm* (97), Krd. *dūv* (97), Bal. *dumm* (97), Tal. *düm* (97), Afg. *lim* (97), Ydg. *lim* (97), Shg. *um* (97), Wkh. *dumb* (97), Sgl. *dəmb* (97), Oss. *dīmäg* (97).
42. THOU: Dar. *tō* (100), Tat. *tü* (100), Krd. *tu* (100), Bal. *ta* (100), Tal. *tī* (100), Afg. *tə* (100), Ydg. *tu* (100), Shg. *tu* (100), Wkh. *tu* (100), Sgl. *tə* (100), Oss. *dī* (100).
43. TONGUE: Dar. *zabān* (101), Tat. *zuhun* (101), Krd. *zimān* (101), Bal. *zubān* (101), Tal. *zivon* (101), Afg. *žaba* (101), Ydg. *zəvīy* (101), Shg. *ziv* (101), Wkh. *zik* (101), Sgl. *zəvūk* (101), Oss. *ivzag* (101).
44. TOOTH: Dar. *dandān* (102), Tat. *dəndü* (102), Krd. *dirān* (102), Bal. *dantān* (102), Tal. *dandon* (102), Afg. *γāš* (286), Ydg. *lad* (102), Shg. *indōn* (102), Wkh. *dindik* (102), Sgl. *dānd* (102), Oss. *dāndag* (102).
45. TREE: Dar. *daraxt* (103), Tat. *dor* (147), Krd. *dār* (147), Bal. *dračk* (103), Tal. *do* (147), Afg. *wuna* (316), Ydg. *draxt* (-3), Shg. *diraxt* (-10), Wkh. *dəraxt* (-4), Sgl. *dəraxt* (-4), Oss. *bäläs* (481).
46. TWO: Dar. *dō* (104), Tat. *dü* (104), Krd. *du* (104), Bal. *du* (104), Tal. *dī* (104), Afg. *dwa* (104), Ydg. *lo* (104), Shg. *u* (104), Wkh. *buy* (104), Sgl. *dōu* (104), Oss. *dīwvä* (104).
47. WATER: Dar. *āb* (107), Tat. *ov* (107), Krd. *āv* (107), Bal. *āp* (107), Tal. *ov* (107), Afg. *obə* (107), Ydg. *youyo* (107), Shg. *χ'ac* (374), Wkh. *yupk* (107), Sgl. *vək* (107), Oss. *don* (482).
48. WE: Dar. *mā* (108), Tat. *imu* (108), Krd. *ma* (108), Bal. *mā* (108), Tal. *ama* (108), Afg. *mūž* (108), Ydg. *maχ* (108), Shg. *māš* (108), Wkh. *sak* (108), Sgl. *amaχ* (108), Oss. *maχ* (108).

49. WHAT: Dar. *čī* (109), Tat. *čü* (109), Krd. *či* (109), Bal. *čē* (109), Tal. *či* (109), Afg. *cə* (109), Ydg. *ces* (109), Shg. *čiz* (109), Wkh. *čiz* (109), Sgl. *čiz* (109), Oss. *ci* (109).

50. WHO: Dar. *kī* (111), Tat. *ki* (111), Krd. *ke* (111), Bal. *kai* (111), Tal. *ki* (111), Afg. *cok* (111), Ydg. *koy* (111), Shg. *čāy* (111), Wkh. *kuy* (111), Sgl. *kōy* (111), Oss. *kī* (111).

Anton Kogan. Dardic languages and lexicostatistics (the 50-item wordlist approach).

Dardic languages of different subgroups share more than 50% of cognates on the Swadesh 100-item wordlist. Because of this, traditional lexicostatistics seems to be the method of choice for the study of their internal classification. At the same time, the percentage of lexicostatistical matches between languages of the Dardic group, on the one hand, and languages that belong to other branches of Indo-Iranian, on the other, frequently drops below 40%. This fact makes it advisable to also conduct lexicostatistical calculations on the reduced 50-item “ultra-stable” wordlist in order to establish the exact genetic position of Dardic languages within the Indo-Iranian subfamily. In this paper, I present the results of such a study. It must be noted that the reduction of the number of items from 100 to 50 also makes it possible to subject more idioms to lexicostatistical analysis; for instance, one can now add the (limited) data of several Dardic languages which have escaped strong Indo-Aryan influence. Results of the analysis show that the average percentage of cognates between Dardic and Indo-Aryan does not differ much from the respective percentages between Dardic and Iranian.

*Keywords:* lexicostatistics, 50-item wordlist, language classification, Indo-Iranian languages, Dardic languages, Indo-Aryan languages.

## История далматинского и балкано-романских языков с точки зрения лексикостатистики

Цель описываемой в статье работы — при помощи лексикостатистики определить, являются ли молдавский и малые балкано-романские идиомы (истрорумынский, мегленорумынский и арумынский) отдельными языками или диалектами румынского (дакорумынского) языка. Кроме того, требовалось найти, был ли в истории всех этих идиомов период прарумынского языка, или они являются результатом независимого развития, а также можно ли лексикостатистическим методом вычислить время распада прарумынского языка. Отдельно рассматривается положение далматинского языка в классификации романских языков. Исследование проводилось на материале 110-словных списков Сводеша, собранных для проекта «Глобальная лексикостатистическая база данных». Подсчеты показали, что истрорумынский, мегленорумынский и арумынский следует признавать отдельными языками, в то время как молдавский является диалектом румынского; все балкано-романские языки восходят к прарумынскому языку, распад которого произошел приблизительно 1200—1300 лет назад; после распада праязыка некоторое время существовала арумыно-мегленорумынская общность и, возможно, истрорумыно-румынская общность; далматинский не относится к балкано-романским языкам и, по-видимому, составляет отдельную подгруппу в рамках романской группы.

*Ключевые слова:* лексикостатистика, балкано-романские языки, далматинский язык.

1. Для лексикостатистики как метода сравнительно-исторического языкознания романские языки всегда представляли особую ценность: их история сравнительно хорошо известна и изучена, и это один из немногих случаев, когда праязык таксона засвидетельствован в большом количестве письменных памятников. В связи с этим романские языки неоднократно становились своеобразным полигоном для отработки возможностей лексикостатистики. В рамках проекта «Глобальная лексикостатистическая база данных» (далее — GLD; доступен по адресу: <http://starling.rinet.ru/new100/main.htm>) [G. Starostin 2011—2016] мы проводим сбор аннотированных 110-словных списков для романских языков, с упором на диалекты и «малые» языки.

Данная статья посвящена лексикостатистическому разбору восточной части романоговорящего мира — балкано-романских и далматинского языков.

Это не первая попытка такого рода: в 1959 г. вышла статья В. Гуцу-Ромало «Stabilirea datei de separație a aromînei de dacoromîna cu ajutorul glotocronologiei» [Guțu-Romalo 1959], а в 2012 г. опубликована работа В. Блажека «Balkano-románské jazyky: lexikostatistický test» [Blažek 2012]. Однако статья Гуцу-Ромало охватывает только румынский и арумынский языки, а в работе Блажека применяется кардинально иной подход к сбору списков, чем тот, который принят в проекте GLD, поэтому мы полагаем, что наличие этих публикаций не уменьшает актуальности нашего исследования.

Балкано-романская подгруппа романской группы языков включает в себя пять идиомов: румынский, молдавский, истрорумынский, арумынский и мегленорумынский.

Дискуссионным остается вопрос, представляют ли последние четыре из них отдельные языки или диалекты румынского.

Целью работы является следующее: 1) установить, являются ли балкано-романские идиомы отдельными языками или диалектами одного языка; 2) осуществить лексико-статистическую классификацию балкано-романских идиомов; 3) выяснить, существовал ли прарумынский язык; 4) вычислить время распада прарумынского языка, если его существование подтверждается; 5) определить место далматинского языка в рамках романской группы.

**2.1. Материалом для решения поставленных задач послужили аннотированные 110-словные списки для всех балкано-романских идиомов, которые были собраны для проекта GLD (аннотированные версии списков доступны онлайн на странице проекта GLD).**

Все лексические вхождения оформлены согласно стандартам проекта GLD. Сперва дается транскрипция (основанная на МФА, но отличающаяся в некоторых деталях, см. <http://starling.rinet.ru/new100/UTS.htm>), затем в фигурных скобках — запись в орфографической системе, использующейся для данного языка. Приводится морфологическое членение слова: дефисы отделяют суффиксы и окончания, а знак равенства выделяет префиксы. Мегленорумынские и арумынские глаголы даны в форме 1 л. ед. ч. настоящего времени изъявительного наклонения.

Список для архаической латыни составлен преимущественно по произведениям Плавта (254—184 до н. э.), в отдельных случаях привлекался также материал из сочинения De agri cultura Катона Старшего (234—149 до н. э.). Предполагается, что диалектной разницы между их идиолектами не было (Плавт родился в Сарсине, Катон — в Тускулуме), поскольку пьесы Плавта, в молодости переехавшего в Рим, были рассчитаны на римскую публику и должны были отражать прежде всего язык Рима. Следует также отметить, что дошедшие до нас пьесы Плавта сохранились в рукописях ок. 100 г. н. э. и не вполне орфографически соответствуют оригиналу.

**Эталонный английский список:** 1. all; 2. ashes; 3. bark; 4. belly; 5. big; 6. bird; 7. to bite; 8. black; 9. blood; 10. bone; 11. breast; 12. to burn (transitive); 13. nail; 14. cloud; 15. cold; 16. to come; 17. to die; 18. dog; 19. to drink; 20. dry; 21. ear; 22. earth; 23. to eat; 24. egg; 25. eye; 26. fat (noun); 27. feather; 28. fire; 29. fish; 30. to fly; 31. foot; 32. full; 33. to give; 34. good; 35. green; 36. hair; 37. hand; 38. head; 39. to hear; 40. heart; 41. horn; 42. I; 43. to kill; 44. knee; 45. to know; 46. leaf; 47. to lie; 48. liver; 49. long; 50. louse; 51. man; 52. many; 53. meat; 54. moon; 55. mountain; 56. mouth; 57. name; 58. neck; 59. new; 60. night; 61. nose; 62. not; 63. one; 64. man (person); 65. rain; 66. red; 67. road; 68. root; 69. round; 70. sand; 71. to say; 72. to see; 73. seed; 74. to sit; 75. skin; 76. to sleep; 77. small; 78. smoke; 79. to stand; 80. star; 81. stone; 82. sun; 83. to swim; 84. tail; 85. that; 86. this; 87. you (thou); 88. tongue; 89. tooth; 90. tree; 91. two; 92. to walk (to go); 93. warm; 94. water; 95. we; 96. what; 97. white; 98. who; 99. woman; 100. yellow; 101. far (adverb); 102. heavy; 103. near (adverb); 104. salt; 105. short; 106. snake; 107. thin; 108. wind; 109. worm; 110. year.

**Архаичная латынь:** 1. 'omn-is {omnis}; 2. k'inis {cinis}; 3. l'iber {liber}; 4. w'enter {venter}; 5. m'aŋn-os {magnus}; 6. 'aw-is {avis}; 7. m'ord-'e:-re {mordere}; 8. 'a:ter {ater}; 9. s'aŋg<sup>w</sup>i-s {sanguis}; 10. os {os}; 11. p'ektos {pectus}; 12. 'u:r-ε-re {urere}; 13. 'uŋg<sup>w</sup>-is {unguis}; 14. n'u:b-is {nubis}; 15. fr'i:gid-os {frigidus}; 16. w'en-'i:-re {venire}; 17. m'or-i: {mori}; 18. k'an-e:s {canes} ~ k'an-is {canis}; 19. b'ib-ε-re {bibere}; 20. s'ik:-os {siccus}; 21. 'awr-is {auris}; 22. t'ε:-a {terra}; 23. 'e:d-ε-re {edere}; 24. 'o:w-ũ {ovum}; 25. 'okot-os {oculus}; 26. p'iŋg<sup>w</sup>-ε {pingue}; 27. p'en:-a {penna} ~ p'in:-a {pinna}; 28. 'iŋn-is {ignis}; 29. p'isk-is {piscis}; 30. wot-'a:-re {volare}; 31. pe:-s {pes}; 32.

pʰe:n-*os* {plenus}; 33. d'a-rē {dare}; 34. b'ɔn-*os* {bonus}; 35. w'irid-*is* {viridis}; 36. k'apit-*os* {capillus}; 37. m'an-*os* {manus}; 38. k'apot {caput}; 39. awd-i:-rē {audire}; 40. kər {cor}; 41. k'ɔrnu: {cornu}; 42. 'ego: ~ 'egɔ {ego}; me: {me}; 43. ɔ=k'i:d-ε-rē {occidere}; 44. g'enu {genu}; 45. sk'i:-rē {scire}; 46. fɔl-i-ũ {folium}; 47. yak-'e:-rē {iacere}; 48. y'ek-*or* {iecur}; 49. f'ɔŋg-*os* {longus}; 50. p'e:d-*is* {pedis}; 51. wir {vir}; 52. m'ult-*os* {multus}; 53. k'ar-*o*: {caro}; 54. f'u:n-*a* {luna}; 55. mɔ:n-*s* {mons}; 56. o:s {os}; 57. n'ɔ:-mɛn {nomen}; 58. k'ɔt-ũ {collum}; 59. n'ɔw-*os* {novus}; 60. nɔk-*s* {nox}; 61. n'a:s-ũ {nasum}; 62. nɔ:n {non}; 63. 'u:n-*os* {unus}; 64. h'ɔm-*o*: {homo}; 65. p'ʃow-*i-a* {pluvia}; 66. r'ub-*er* {ruber}; 67. w'i-*a* {via}; 68. r'a:d-i:k-*s* {radix}; 69. rot-'ond-*os* {rutundus}; 70. har'e:n-*a* {harena}; 71. d'ɛ:k-ε-rē {dicere}; 72. wid-'e:-rē {videre}; 73. s'e:-mɛn {semen}; 74. sɛd-'e:-rē {sedere}; 75. k'ɔr-i-ũ {corium}; 76. dɔrm-i:-rē {dormire}; 77. p'arw-*os* {parvus}; 78. fu:m-*os* {fumus}; 79. st'a:-rē {stare}; 80. st'e:t-*a* {stella}; 81. f'apɪ-*s* {lapis}; 82. so:t {sol}; 83. n'a:-rē {nare}; nat-'a:-rē {natate}; 84. k'awd-*a* {cauda}; 85. hɪ-k {hic}; 86. 'ist-ε {iste}; 'il:-ε {ille}; 87. tu: {tu}; 88. l'ɪŋg<sup>w</sup>-*a* {lingua}; 89. de:n-*s* {dens}; 90. 'arbɔr {arbor}; 91. d'ɔ-ɔ {duo}; 92. 'ɛ:-rē {ire}; 93. k'al-id-*os* {calidus}; 94. 'ak<sup>w</sup>-*a* {aqua}; 95. no:s {nos}; 96. k<sup>w</sup>-i-d {quid}; 97. 'aʃb-*os* {albus}; 98. k<sup>w</sup>-i-*s* {quis}; 99. m'ul-i-er {mulier}; 100. f'fa:w-*os* {flavus}; 101. f'ɔŋg-*e*: {longe}; 102. gr'aw-*is* {gravis}; 103. pr'ɔp-ε {prope}; 104. sa:t {sal}; 105. br'ɛw-*is* {brevis}; 106. 'aŋg<sup>w</sup>-*is* {anguis}; 107. t'ɛno-*is* {tenuis}; 108. w'ent-*os* {ventus}; 109. w'ɛrm-*is* {vermis}; 110. 'an:-*os* {annus}.

**Мегленорумынский:** 1. tot {tot}; 2. čən'uš-ə {tšānúšǎ}; skrum {scrum}; 3. — ; 4. fɔal-i {foáli}; 5. m'ar-i {mári}; 6. puʎ {puʎ}; 7. m'učk-u {mútšcu}; 8. n'egr-u {négru}; 9. s'ɔnz-i {sɔnzi}; 10. wos {ɥos}; 11. tɛpt {chiépt}; sin {sin}; 12. art {ard}; 13. 'uŋgʎ-ə {úŋglǎ}; 14. nor {nor}; 15. r'aci {rátsi}; 16. vin {vin}; 17. mor {mor}; 18. k'ɔyn-i {cɔjini}; 19. bɛa-w {beáɥ}; 20. usk-'at {uscát}; 21. ur'ɛakʎ-ə {ureáclǎ}; 22. c'ar-ə {tsárǎ}; 23. mən'ank {mānānc}; 24. wow {ɥóɥ}; 25. w'okʎ-u {ɥóclʎu}; 26. grəs-im-i {grāsími}; 27. p'ɛan-ə {peánǎ}; 28. fok {foc}; 29. p'ɛašt-i {peášt-i}; 30. pər-əy-'es {pārǎjés}; 31. pič'or {pitšór}; 32. ɛm=pl'in {amplín}; 33. da-w {dáɥ}; 34. bun {bun}; 35. v'ɛard-i {veárdi}; 36. per {per}; 37. m'ɔn-ə {mɔnǎ}; 38. kap {cap}; 39. ut {ud}; 40. bur'ik {buríc}; 41. korn {corn}; 42. yo {jɔ} ~ yew {jɛɥ} ~ iwə {iɥǎ}; mini {mini}; 43. nek {nec}; 44. zin'ukʎ-u {zinúclʎu}; 45. šti-w {štɪɥ}; 46. fr'unz-ə {frúnzǎ}; 47. zak {zac}; 48. drop {drob}; 49. lunk {lung}; 50. pid'ukʎ-u {pidúclʎu}; 51. bərb-'at {bārbát}; 52. mult {mult}; 53. k'arn-i {cárni}; 54. l'un-ə {lúnǎ}; 55. m'unt-i {munti}; 56. rost {rost}; 57. n'um-i {númi}; 58. g'uš-ə {gúšǎ}; 59. now {nóɥ}; 60. n'ɔapt-i {noápti}; 61. nas {nas}; 62. nu {nu}; 63. un {un}; 64. wom {ɥom}; 65. pl'ɔay-ə {ploájǎ}; 66. roš {roš}; 67. drum {drum}; 68. k'orin {córin}; 69. gurguʎ-'at {gurgulát}; 70. pis'ok {pisóc}; 71. zik {zic}; spun {spun}; 72. vet {ved}; 73. sim'inc-ə {simíntsǎ}; 74. šɔt {šɔd}; 75. k'ɔaž-ə {coájǎ}; 76. dorm {dorm}; 77. mik {mic}; 78. fum {fum}; 79. sta-w {staɥ}; 80. st'ew-ə {stéuǎ}; 81. rɔp-ə {rɔpǎ}; 82. s'ɔar-i {soári}; 83. pliv-əy-'es {plivǎjés}; 84. k'ɔad-ə {coádǎ}; 85. c'e-la {tséla}; 86. c'i-sta {tsísta}; 87. tu {tu}; 88. l'imb-ə {límbǎ}; 89. d'int-i {dínti}; 90. 'arbur {árbur}; 91. doy {doj}; 92. 'amn-u {ámnu}; 93. kalt {cald}; 94. 'ap-u {ápu}; 95. noy {noj}; 96. ce {tse}; 97. alp {alb}; 98. k'ar-i {cari}; 99. muʎ'ar-i {muʎári}; 100. g'alb-in {gálbin}; 101. di=p'art-i {dipárti}; 102. grew {gréɥ}; 103. pr'ɔap-i {proápi}; 104. s'ar-i {sári}; 105. kus {cus}; 106. šarp-i {šárpi}; 107. slap {slab}; 108. vint {vint}; 109. d'arm-i {ghǎrmi}; 110. an {an}.

**Истрорумынский:** 1. tot {tot}; 2. čer'uš-e {čerúše}; 3. k'or-a {córa}; 4. tərb'ux {târbúh}; 5. m'ɔr-e {mâre}; 6. puʎ {puʎ}; 7. mučk-'ɔ {mučcǎ}; 8. n'egr-u {négru}; 9. s'ɔnz-e {sânze}; 10. os {os}; 11. k'ɛpt {clépt}; 12. pal-i {palí}; 13. 'uŋgʎ-e {úŋglɛ}; 14. obl'ɔk {oblác}; 15. r'ɔč-e {rǎče}; 16. ver-i {verí}; 17. mur-i {murí}; 18. brek {brec}; 19. bǎ {be}; 20. usk'ɔ-t {uscát}; 21. ur'äkʎ-e {urécle}; 22. pem'int {pemínt}; 23. mǎŋk-'ɔ {māŋcǎ}; 24. ov {ov}; 25. 'okʎ-u {óclʎu}; 26. mɔst {mâst}; 27. p'ána {péna}; 28. fok {foc}; 29. r'ib-ǎ {ríbe}; 30. let-i {letí}; 31. pič'or {pičór}; 32. plir {plír}; 33. dɔ {dǎ}; 34. bur {bur}; 35. zel'en {zelén}; 36. per {per}; 37. mǎr {mâr}; 38. kɔp {cǎp}; 39. avz-i {avzǐ}; 40. y'irim-ǎ {jírime}; 41. korn {corn}; 42. yo {jɔ}; m'ire {míre}; 43. uč'id-e {učíde}; 44. žer'uŋkʎ-u {žerúnclʎu}; 45. šti {štɪ}; 46. foʎ-e {fólɛ}; 47. zač-'ɔ {zacǎ}; 48. fik'ɔc {ficát}; 49. luŋg {luŋg}; 50.

ped'ukΛ-u {pedúcl'u}; 51. m'uški {múški}; 52. č'uda {čúda}; may=m'unt {maj múnt}; 53. k'örn-e {cárne}; 54. l'ur-ä {lúre}; 55. k'odr-u {códru}; 56. g'ur-ä {gúre}; 57. l'ume {lúme}; 58. čerbič-e {čerbíče}; 59. nov {nóv}; 60. n'opt-e {nópte}; 61. n'os {nás}; 62. nu {nú}; 63. ur {ur}; 64. om {om}; 65. pl'oy-e {plóje}; 66. roys-u {róisu}; 67. k'vl-e {cále}; 68. k'ren {córen}; 69. tond {tond}; 70. salb'un {salbún}; 71. z'ič-e {zíce}; 72. ved-ä {vedé}; 73. sem'inc-ä {semínč}; 74. šed-ä {šedé}; 75. k'oz-e {cóze}; 76. durm-i {durmí}; 77. mik {mic}; 78. dim {dim}; 79. sto {stá}; 80. stä {ste}; 81. 'ərp-a {árpa}; 82. s'or-e {sóre}; 83. pliv-i {pliví}; 84. k'od-ä {códe}; 85. ač'e-la {áčéla}; 86. č'e-sta {čésta}; 87. tu {tú}; 88. l'imb-ä {límb}; 89. d'int-e {dín-te}; 90. l'emən {lémän}; 91. doy {doj}; 92. m'är-e {mére}; 93. k'od {cád}; 94. 'vp-ä {ápe}; 95. noy {noj}; 96. č'e {če}; 97. vb {áb}; 98. č'ire {číre}; 99. ž'ensk-ä {žénske}; 100. žut {žut}; 101. l'vrg-o {lárgo}; 102. grev {grev}; 103. pr'op-e {própe}; 104. s'vr-e {sáre}; 105. skurt {scurt}; 106. š'vrv-e {šárpe}; 107. sup=c'ir-e {suptíre}; 108. b'or-ä {bóre}; 109. γ'erm-u {γlérmu} ~ l'erm-u {lérmu}; 110. vn {än}.

**Арумынский:** 1. t'ut-ü {tut}; 2. čin'uš-e {činúše}; skr'um-ü {scrum}; 3. k'qaz-e {coáje}; 4. p'intik-ü {píntic}; 5. m'ar-e {máre}; 6. p'uΛ-ü {pul'ü}; 7. m'išk-u {míšču} ~ m'ušk-u {mušču}; 8. l'ay-ü {laü}; 9. s'inž-e {síndze}; 10. 'os-ü {os}; 11. t'ept-u {képtu}; 12. 'ard-u {árdu}; 13. 'ungΛ-e {úngle}; 14. ni'or-ü {niór}; 15. ar'ac-e {aráče}; 16. ž'in-ü {žin}; 17. m'or-ü {mor}; 18. k'in-e {cín}; 19. bæ-w {beá}; 20. usk-'at-ü {uscát}; 21. ur'ekΛ-e {ureáče}; 22. c'ar-ə {čárä}; 23. m'ik-ü {míc}; 24. ow {ou}; 25. 'okΛ-u {ócl'u}; 26. grəs-'im-e {grásime}; 27. p'ean-ə {peánä}; 28. f'ok-ü {foc}; 29. p'esk-u {péscu}; 30. asb'qair-ü {asboáir}; 31. čič'or-ü {čičór}; 32. pl'in-ü {plin} ~ m=pl'in-ü {mplin}; 33. da-w {daü}; 34. b'un-ü {bun}; 35. v'ead-e {veárde}; 36. p'er-ü {per}; 37. m'in-ə {mínä}; 38. k'ap-ü {cap}; 39. 'avd-u {ávdu}; 40. 'inim-ə {ínimä}; 41. k'orn-u {córnu}; 42. yo {io}; m'ine {mine}; 43. v'at-əm {vátäm}; 44. žin'ukΛ-u {dzinúcl'u}; 45. šti-w {štiü}; 46. fr'inž-ə {fríndzä}; 47. ž'ak-ü {dzac}; 48. šik'at-ü {hicát} ~ ixk'at-ü {ihcát}; 49. l'ung-u {lúngu}; 50. pid'ukΛ-u {pidúcl'u}; 51. bærb-'at-ü {bärbát}; 52. m'ult-u {múltu}; 53. k'arn-e {cárne}; 54. l'un-ə {lúnä}; 55. m'unt-e {múnte}; 56. g'ur-ə {gúrä}; 57. n'um-ə {númä}; 58. g'uš-e {gúše}; 59. now {noü}; 60. n'qapt-e {noápte}; 61. n'ar-e {náre}; 62. nu {nu}; 63. 'un-ü {un}; 64. 'om-ü {om}; 65. pl'qay-e {ploáče}; 66. ar'oš-ü {aróšü}; 67. k'al-e {cále}; 68. arədəc-'in-ə {arädäčínä}; 69. gurguΛ-əat-ü {gurguleát}; arukut-'os-ü {arucutós}; 70. ar'in-ə {arínä}; 71. ž'ik-ü {žíc}; asp'un-ü {aspún}; 72. v'ed-ü {ved}; 73. sim'inc-ə {simínčä}; 74. šed-ü {šed}; 75. t'çal-e {keále}; 76. d'orm-u {dórmu}; 77. n'ik-ü {n'ic}; 78. fum-ü {fum}; 79. šed-ü m=pr'ost-u {šed mpróstu}; 80. st'ea-o {steáo}; 81. t'eatr-ə {keáträ}; 82. s'qar-e {soáre}; 83. an'ot-ü {anót}; 84. k'qad-ə {coádä}; 85. ac'e-lü {ačél}; 86. a'e-stu {aéstu}; 87. t'ine {tine}; 88. l'imb-ə {límbä}; 89. d'int-e {dín-te}; 90. 'arbur-í {árbur}; 91. doy {doj}; 92. 'imn-u {ímnu}; n'erg-u {nérgu}; 93. k'ald-u {cáldu}; 94. 'ap-ə {ápä}; 95. noy {noj}; 96. ce {če}; 97. 'alb-u {álb}; 98. k'ar-e {cáre}; 99. mu'lear-e {mu'leáre}; 100. g'alb-in-ü {gálb}; 101. di=p'art-e {dipárte}; l'arg-u {lárgu}; 102. grew {greü}; 103. a=pr'qap-e {aproápe}; 104. s'ar-e {sare}; 105. sk'urt-u {scúrtu}; 106. š'arp-e {šárpe}; 107. sup=c'ir-e {suptíre}; 108. v'imt-u {vímtu}; 109. ž'erm-u {žermu}; 110. 'an-ü {an}.

**Румынский:** 1. tot {tot}; 2. čen'uš-ə {cenušä}; 3. sk'qarc-ə {scoartä}; 4. b'urt-ə {burtä}; 5. m'ar-e {mare}; 6. p'asər-e {pasäre}; 7. a=mušk-'a {a mušca}; 8. n'egr-u {negru}; 9. s'inž-e {sânge}; 10. os {os}; 11. pyept {piept}; 12. a='ard-e {a arde}; 13. 'unгы-e {unghie}; 14. nor {nor}; 15. r'eč-e {rece}; 16. a=ven-i {a veni}; 17. a=mur-i {a muri}; 18. k'iyn-e {câine}; 19. a=b'ea {a bea}; 20. usk-'at {uscát}; 21. ur'ek-e {ureche}; 22. pəm'int {pämânt}; 23. a=miŋk-'a {a mânca}; 24. ow {ou}; 25. ok'y {ochi}; 26. grəs-'im-e {grásime}; 27. p'an-ə {panä}; 28. fok {foc}; 29. p'ešt-e {pește}; 30. a=zbur-'a {a zbură}; 31. pič'or {picior}; 32. plin {plin}; 33. a=d'a {a da}; 34. bun {bun}; 35. v'erđ-e {verde}; 36. pər {pär}; 37. m'in-ə {mânä}; 38. kap {cap}; 39. a=awz-i {a auzi}; 40. 'inim-ə {inimä}; 41. korn {corn}; 42. yew {eu}; m'ine {mine}; 43. a=uč'id-e {a ucide}; a=omor-i {a omorî}; 44. ž'en'unč'y {genunchi}; 45. a=št'i {a šti}; 46. 'frunz-ə {frunzä}; 47. a=st'a kulk-'at {a sta culcat} ~ a=fi kulk-'at {a fi culcat}; 48. fik'at {ficat}; 49. luŋg {lung}; 50. pəd'uk-e {păduche}; 51. bærb-'at {bärbat}; 52.



mult {mult}; 53. k'arn-e {carne}; 54. l'un-ə {lună}; 55. m'unt-e {munte}; 56. g'ur-ə {gură}; 57. n'um-e {nume}; 58. git {gât}; 59. now {nou}; 60. n'qapt-e {noapte}; 61. nas {nas}; 62. nu {nu}; 63. un {un}; 64. om {om}; 65. pl'qay-e {ploaie}; 66. r'oš-u {roșu}; 67. drum {drum}; 68. rədəč'in-ə {rădăcină}; 69. rot'und {rotund}; 70. nis'ip {nisip}; 71. a=z'ič-e {a zice}; a=sp'un-e {a spune}; 72. a=ved-'əa {a vedea}; 73. sām'inc-ə {sămânță}; 74. a=šed-'əa {a șede}; 75. p'yel-e {piele}; 76. a=dorm-'i {a dormi}; 77. mik {mic}; 78. fum {fum}; 79. a=st'a-in-pič'qar-e {a sta în picioare}; 80. stęa {stea}; 81. p'yatr-ə {piatră}; 82. s'qar-e {soare}; 83. a=inot-'a {a înota}; 84. k'qad-ə {coadă}; 85. ač'e-l {acel}; 86. ač'e-st {acest}; 87. tu {tu}; 88. l'imb-ə {limbă}; 89. d'int-e {dinte}; 90. kop'ak {copac}; 91. doy {doi}; 92. a=umbl-'a {a umbla}; a=m'erž-e {a merge}; 93. kald {cald}; 94. 'ap-ə {apă}; 95. noy {noi}; 96. če {ce}; 97. alb {alb}; 98. čine {cine}; 99. fem'ey-e {femeie}; 100. g'alb-en {galben}; 101. de=p'art-e {departe}; 102. grew {greu}; 103. a=pr'qap-e {aproape}; 104. s'ar-e {sare}; 105. skurt {scurt}; 106. š'arp-e {șarpe}; 107. sub=c'ir-e {subțire}; 108. vint {vânt}; 109. v'yerm-e {vierme}; r'im-ə {râmă}; 110. an {an}.

**Далматинский:** 1. toč {toč}; 2. kan'ays-a {canáissa}; 3. — ; 4. vy'antr-o {viantro}; 5. mawr {maur}; 6. učul {učúl} ~ oč'el {očél}; 7. morsk-'wor {morskuōr}; 8. nyar {niár}; 9. swoŋg {suōng}; 10. vwas {vuass}; 11. pyat {pĭat}; syaŋ {sĭāŋ}; 12. — ; 13. 'oŋgl-a {oŋgla}; 14. n'uvol {núvol}; 15. gel'wat {gheluat}; 16. ven-'ar {venár}; 17. mor-'ar {morár}; 18. kwon {kuōn}; 19. b-ar {bar}; 20. swat {suat} ~ sot {sot}; 21. or'akl-a {orákla} ~ r'akl-a {rákla}; 22. t'ar-a {tára} ~ t'yar-a {tjára}; 23. manč-ur {mančúr}; 24. yuv {juv}; 25. v'akl-o {vaklo}; 26. gres {gres}; 27. p'ayn-a {paĭna}; 28. fuk {fuk}; 29. pyas {pĭas}; 30. — ; 31. pins {pins}; 32. playn {plajŋ}; 33. d-wor {duōr}; 34. buŋ {buŋ}; 35. vyard {vĭárd}; 36. kap'e-y {kapéj}; 37. mwon {muōn}; 38. kup {kúp} (исконн.); t'yast-a {tjasta} (заимств.); 39. sent-'ar {sentár}; 40. kwor {kuōr}; 41. kwarn {kvarŋ}; 42. yu {ju}; me {me} ~ mi {mi}; 43. dram-'wor {dramuōr}; 44. žin'wak {žinuák} ~ žin'awk {žináuk}; 45. sap-'ar {sapár}; 46. fwał-a {fuála} ~ fwał {fuál}; 47. — ; 48. fig'wot {figuōt}; 49. luŋg {lúŋg}; 50. ped'okl-o {pedóclo}; 51. om {om} ~ yom {jom}; 52. mwalt {muált}; 53. k'worn-o {kuōrno}; 54. loyn-a {lojna}; 55. mwant {muánt}; 56. bwak {buak}; 57. nawŋ {nauŋ} ~ nam {nam}; 58. kwal {kuál}; 59. nuf {nuf} ~ nwaf {nuaf}; 60. nwat {nuát}; 61. nwos {nuos}; 62. non {noŋ} ~ no {no}; 63. yoŋŋ {jóŋŋ}; 64. om {om} ~ yom {jom}; 65. plovay-a {plovaja} (исконн.) ~ pluv {pluv} (заимств.); 66. raws {raus} (исконн.) ~ rwas {ruas} (заимств.); 67. kal {kal}; 68. rad'ayk-a {radaĭka}; 69. — ; 70. salb'won {salbuōn}; 71. d'ek-ro {dékro}; 72. ved-'ar {vedár}; 73. sem'yanc {semĭanz}; 74. sed-'wor {seduōr} ~ sent-'wor {sentuōr}; 75. pyal {pĭal}; 76. dorm-'ar {dormár}; 77. p'el-o {pelo}; 78. — ; 79. stwor-in-p'ins {stuōr in pĭns}; 80. st'al-a {stalla}; 81. p'itr-a {píttra}; 82. sawl {sauł}; 83. not-'wor {notuōr}; 84. kud {kud} (заимств.) ~ kwod {kuōd} (исконн.) ~ kwad {kuad} (заимств.); 85. kol {kol}; 86. kost {kost}; 87. tu {tu} ~ te {te} ~ ti {ti}; 88. l'aŋg-a {laŋga}; 89. dyant {diant}; 90. y'arbur {járbur} ~ y'arber {járber} ~ y'arbul {jářbul}; 91. doy {doj}; 92. vis {vis} ~ viz {viš}; 93. kwolt {kuōlt}; 94. y'akw-a {jakua}; 95. noy {noj} ~ noy'iltri {nojiltri}; 96. kos {kos} ~ ko {ko}; 97. ywalb {juálb} (исконн.); byaŋk {bĭaŋk} ~ blaŋk {blaŋk} (заимств.); 98. ku {ku}; 99. mu'ér {mulér} ~ moł'ér {mołér}; 100. ž'woln-o {zuolno}; 101. lont'won {lontuōn}; 102. pez-'wont {pešuōnt}; 103. a=l'ič {a lich}; 104. swal {sual}; 105. kwart {kuart}; 106. serpyant {serpĭant}; 107. — ; 108. vyant {vĭant}; 109. vyarm {vĭarm}; 110. yaŋŋ {jájŋ}.

Следует отметить, что работа с далматинским списком требует особой осторожности. Кроме наличия целого ряда лакун, следует учитывать, что последний носитель далматинского, Антонио Удина, предоставивший в распоряжение исследователей основной массив данных, интервьюировался М. Бартоли в преклонном возрасте, спустя долгие годы после того, как Удина последний раз говорил на далматинском, таким образом, речь Удины содержала большое количество заимствований (преимущественно венетских), как явных, так и скрытых (венетских этимонов, перестроенных в соответствии с далматинской фонетикой).

Таблица 1. Заимствования в далматинском и балкано-романских идиомах (курсивом выделены случаи, когда заимствование употребляется наряду с исконным словом).

	рум.	истр.	арум.	мегл.	далм.
50-словник	stone; tree; <i>kill</i>	dog; smoke	<i>ashes</i> ; stone	<i>ashes</i>	black, <i>head</i> , rain, stone, <i>tail</i>
100-словник	belly; road; sand	bark; belly; burn; cloud; fat; fish; fly; green; man; <i>many</i> ; root; round; sand; skin; swim; woman; yellow	stand	fly; liver; road; root; sand; skin; swim	fish, green, <i>red</i> , road, <i>white</i> , yellow
110-словник		wind		short	
ВСЕГО	6	20	3	9	11

2.2. Согласно введенному С. А. Старостиным усовершенствованию, заимствования при лексикостатистических подсчетах не учитываются. Однако по стандартам GLD заимствованиями не считаются слова, которые на момент заимствования не входили в список базисной лексики, а попали в него лишь после смены значения уже в истории языка-реципиента. Поэтому как заимствования не учитываются такие случаи, как ар. k'qaže 'кора' (< 'кожица'), мегл. и ар. g'ušə 'шея' (< нар.-лат. geusiae 'десны' германского или кельтского происхождения), мегл. slap 'тонкий' (общий для балкано-романских языков славизм с первоначальным значением 'слабый'), а также общая для романских языков замена {iecur} на {ficatum}.

Следует особо отметить, что ситуацию в рамках балкано-романской подгруппы усложняет большое количество заимствований в меглено-румынском и особенно в истрорумынском идиомах: табл. 1.

3. Определение, являются ли балкано-романские идиомы отдельными языками или диалектами одного языка, с точки зрения лексикостатистики зависит от того, где провести условную границу между языком и диалектом. В учебнике С. А. Старостина и С. А. Бурлак указывается, что диалекты одного языка имеют 95 и более процентов совпадений в списке базисной лексики, в то время как близкородственные языки в среднем демонстрируют 75—85% совпадений [Бурлак, Старостин 2005: 19].

Чтобы иметь определенную параллель для сравнения, посмотрим, сколько несовпадений в стословном списке отделяет русский от некоторых других славянских языков (в скобках указано количество заимствований): 14 (3) от белорусского, 16 (3) от украинского, 22 (3) от болгарского, 23 (2) от польского и чешского, 24 (2) от сербохорватского. В данном случае заимствования не исключались из подсчетов, поскольку они так же затрудняют взаимопонимание между идиомами, как и инновации.

Теперь проведем подсчеты несовпадений между балкано-романскими идиомами (сопоставление молдавского и румынского списков Сводеша показало их стопроцентное совпадение, поэтому в дальнейшем молдавский отдельно от румынского не рассматривается): табл. 2.

Исходя из данных, приведенных в таблице, можно утверждать, что с лексикостатистической точки зрения все балкано-романские идиомы, кроме молдавского, являются отдельными языками. При этом разница в парах румынский-арумынский и мегленорумынский-арумынский соответствует разнице между русским и украинским, а истрору-

Таблица 2. Определение статуса балкано-романских идиомов: количество лексических расхождений между балкано-романскими идиомами в 100-словном и 110-словном списках (в скобках указано количество заимствований). Заимствования учитываются как расхождения.

	рум.		истрорум.		арум.		мегленорум.	
	100-сл.	110-сл.	100-сл.	110-сл.	100-сл.	110-сл.	100-сл.	110-сл.
рум.	—		26 (21)	28 (22)	16 (5)	16 (5)	21 (10)	23 (11)
истр.	—		—		29 (20)	30 (21)	29 (18)	33 (20)
арум.	—		—		—		16 (10)	18 (11)

Таблица 3. Определение времени расхождения балкано-романских идиомов: количество лексических совпадений между балкано-романскими идиомами в 100-словном и 110-словном списках (в процентном выражении). Заимствования исключены из подсчета.

	рум.		истрорум.		арум.		мегленорум.	
	100-сл.	110-сл.	100-сл.	110-сл.	100-сл.	110-сл.	100-сл.	110-сл.
рум.	—		93,20%	93,70%	89,40%	88,30%	88,80%	88,80%
истр.	—		—		89,90%	88,80%	86,40%	87,50%
арум.	—		—		—		92,90%	93,30%

мынский из-за большого числа заимствований оказывается в стороне от всех остальных балкано-романских языков.

4. Подсчет совпадений в сто- и столетисловных списках балкано-романских языков (использование пятидесятисловного списка для данной подгруппы представляется нерациональным в силу малой степени расхождения языков) дает следующий результат: табл. 3.

Глоттохронологические подсчеты, произведенные при помощи программы Starling, говорят о распаде прарумынского языка на две ветви (румынский + истрорумынский и мегленорумынский + арумынский) около 1200—1300 лет назад. Эти данные более-менее согласуются с традиционными оценками, которые относят распад прарумынского языка к X в., а отделение истрорумынского к XIII—XIV вв. ([Andreose, Renzi 2013: 311], [Лухт, Нарумов 2001: 582], [Десятова 2006: 54], [Sârbu, Frățilă 1998: 35]).

Полученные данные существенно отличаются от результатов В. Блажека. В частности, процент совпадений при наших подсчетах находится в интервале от 86,36% до 93,18% (от 87,50% до 93,67% при использовании 110-словного списка), в то время как у Блажека этот процент составляет от 93,62% до 96,91% [Blažek 2012: 74], что связано с нестрогим подходом Блажека к отбору синонимов и составлению списков в целом (так, в истрорумынском он насчитывает всего 6 заимствований). Это также влечет за собой разницу в датировке — распад прарумынского датируется Блажеком на несколько веков позже.

При этом дендрограмма, полученная при помощи программы Starling, и дендрограмма Блажека (впрочем, только если при построении древа он не использует метод наименьших значений) совпадают [Blažek 2012: 74—75].

5. Взгляды на место далматинского языка в рамках классификации романских языков разнятся: его относили к итало-романской подгруппе, балкано-романской подгруппе либо рассматривали как язык-мост между этими двумя группами [Репина, Нарумов 2001: 682].

Таблица 4. Определение места далматинского языка в рамках классификации романских языков: количество лексических совпадений между далматинским и рядом других романских идиомов (в скобках указаны диалекты) в абсолютном и процентном соотношении. Заимствования исключены из подсчета.

	100-словник		110-словник	
	слов	%	слов	%
румынский	68 из 85	80	74 из 94	78,7
истрорумынский	61 из 78	78,2	66 из 86	76,7
арумынский	68 из 87	78,2	74 из 96	77,1
мегленорумынский	65 из 83	78,3	70 из 91	76,9
фриульский	79 из 87	90,8	86 из 96	89,6
романшский (нижнеэнгадинский)	76 из 87	87,4	84 из 96	87,5
романшский (сурсельвский)	71 из 90	78,9	78 из 87	89,7
венетский	77 из 87	88,5	85 из 96	88,5
лигурийский (диалект Генуи)	72 из 86	83,7	80 из 96	83,3
неаполитанский	77 из 88	87,5	85 из 96	88,5
логудорский	65 из 90	72,2	70 из 95	73,7
кампиданский	66 из 88	75	70 из 94	74,5
испанский (кастильский)	72 из 86	83,7	77 из 95	81
каталанский (центральный)	71 из 86	82,6	78 из 93	83,4
окситанский (провансальский)	68 из 84	81	76 из 92	82,6

Сопоставление списков базисной лексики далматинского языка с другими романскими идиомами дает следующие результаты: табл. 4.

Как видно из таблицы, близости к балкано-романским языкам далматинский не показывает. Наибольший процент совпадений демонстрируют фриульский, венетский и неаполитанский. Тем не менее эта разница не так уж и велика. Кроме того, она может быть вызвана влиянием на речь Удины венетского языка. Поэтому решающее значение для отнесения далматинского языка к той или иной подгруппе должно иметь наличие или отсутствие общих инноваций с другими романскими идиомами.

**6.1.** Подсчет инноваций в балкано-романских и далматинском языках при сравнении с архаичной латынью (номера даны в соответствии с эталонным списком) дает следующие результаты:

- Мегленорумынский: tot {tot} (1); f<sub>o</sub>al-i {foáli} (4); m'ar-i {mári} (5); puł {pul} (6); m'učk-u {mútšcu} (7); n'egr-u {négru} (8); art {ard} (12); r'ac-i {rátsi} (15); usk-'at {uscát} (20); mən'ank {mănănc} (23); grəs-'im-i {grăsími} (26); fok {foc} (28); per {per} (36); bur'ik {buríc} (40); nek {nec} (43); fr'unz-ə {frúnză} (46); bərb-'at {bărbát} (51); rost {rost} (56); g'uš-ə {gúšă} (58); roš {roș} (66); gurguł-'at {gurgulát} (69); mik {mic} (77); rəp-ə {rəpă} (81); c'i-sta {tsísta} (86); 'amn-u {ámnu} (92); k'ar-i {cari} (98); g'alb-in {gálbin} (100); di=p'art-i {dipárti} (101); š'arp-i {šárpí} (106); slap {slab} (107);
- Истрорумынский: tot {tot} (1); m'br-e {măre} (5); puł {pul} (6); mučk-'b {mučcâ} (7); n'egr-u {négru} (8); r'pč-e {răče} (15); usk-'b-t {uscât} (20); pem'int {pemínt} (22); mən'k-'b {măncâ} (23); fok {foc} (28); per {per} (36); y'irim-ä {îirime} (40); fik'bc {ficâț} (48); k'odr-u

- {códru} (55); g'ur-ä {gúre} (56); čerb'ič-e {čerbíče} (58); r'oys-u {róisu} (66); k'bl-e {cále} (67); mik {mic} (77); 'ərp-a {árpa} (81); č'e-sta {čésta} (86); l'emən {lémân} (90); m'är-e {mère} (92); l'örg-o {lârgo} (101); skurt {scurt} (105); š'ərp-e {šârpe} (106); sup=c'ir-e {supťire} (107);
- Арумынский: t'ut-ŭ {tut} (1); k'qaz'e {coáje} (3); p'intik-ŭ {pî'ntic} (4); m'ar-e {máre} (5); p'uł-ŭ {pul'iu} (6); m'isk-u {mî'scu} ~ m'ušk-u {muşcu} (7); l'ay-ŭ {laiŭ} (8); 'ard-u {árdu} (12); ar'ac-e {aráte} (15); usk-'at-ŭ {uscát} (20); m'ik-ŭ {míc} (23); grəs-'im-e {grăsíme} (26); fok-ŭ {foc} (28); p'er-ŭ {per} (36); 'inim-ə {inimă} (40); v'at-əm {vátəm} (43); fr'inž-ə {frí'ndză} (46); f'ik'at-ŭ {hicát} ~ ixk'at-ŭ {ihcát} (48); bərb-'at-ŭ {bărbát} (51); g'ur-ə {gúră} (56); g'uš-e {gúşe} (58); n'ar-e {náre} (61); ar'oš-ŭ {aróşŭ} (66); k'al-e {cále} (67); gurguł-'əat-ŭ {gurgu'leát}; arukut-'os-ŭ {arucutós} (69); t'ęal-e {keále} (75); n'ik-ŭ {n'ic} (77); a'estu {aéstu} (86); 'imn-u {ímnu}; n'erg-u {nérgu} (92); k'ar-e {cáre} (98); g'alb-in-ŭ {gálbín} (100); di=p'art-e {dipárte}; l'arg-u {lârgu} (101); sk'urt-u {scúrtu} (105); š'arp-e {šârpe} (106); sup=c'ir-e {supťire} (107);
  - Румынский: tot {tot} (1); sk'qarc-ə {scoarță} (3); m'ar-e {mare} (5); p'asər-e {pasăre} (6); a=mušk-'a {a muşca} (7); n'egr-u {negru} (8); a='ard-e {a arde} (12); r'eč-e {rece} (15); usk-'at {uscat} (20); pəm'int {pământ} (22); a=min'k-'a {a mânca} (23); grəs-'im-e (26); fok {foc} (28); pər {păr} (36); 'inim-ə {inimă} (40); 'frunz-ə {frunză} (46); a=st'a kulk-'at {a sta culcat} ~ a=fi kulk-'at {a fi culcat} (47); fik'at {ficat} (48); bərb-'at {bărbat} (51); g'ur-ə {gură} (56); g'it {gât} (58); r'oš-u {roşu} (66); p'yel-e {piele} (75); mik {mic} (77); a=st'a-in-pič'qar-e {a sta în picioare} (79); ač'e-st {acest} (86); a=umbl-'a {a umbla}; a=m'erž-e {a merge} (92); fem'ey-e {femeie} (99); g'alb-en {galben} (100); de=p'art-e {departe} (101); skurt {scurt} (105); š'arp-e {şarpe} (106); sub=c'ir-e {subťire} (107);
  - Далматинский: toč {toč} (1); mawr {maur} (5); morsk-'wor {morskuŭor} (7); gel'wat {gheluat} (15); swat {suat} ~ sot {sot} (20); manč-'ur {mančúr} (23); gres {gres} (26); fuk {fuk} (28); sent-'ar {sentár} (39); dram-'wor {dramuŭor} (43); sap-'ar {sapár} (45); fig'wot {figuŭot} (48); om {om} ~ yom {jom} (51); bwak {buak} (56); raws {raus} (66); salb'woŋ {salbuŭoŋ} (70); pyal {pjal} (75); p'el-o {pelo} (77); stwor-iŋ-p'ins {stuŭor in píns} (79); kost {kost} (86); vis {vis} ~ viz {vis} (92); pez-'wont {pešuŭont} (102); a=l'ič {a lich} (103); kwart {kuart} (105); serp'yant {serpíant} (106).

При этом следует учитывать, что в некоторых пунктах инновации проходили повторно: архаич. лат. {ater} > классич. лат. {niger} > арум. l'ayŭ {laiŭ} 'черный'; лат. {cor} > прарум. {inimă} > мегл. bur'ik {buríc} 'сердце'; лат. {os} > прарум. {gură} > мегл. rost {rost} 'рот'; лат. {lapis} > прарум. {petra} (заимств.) > истр. 'əgra {ágra}, мегл. rəp-ə {ropă} 'камень'.

Часть этих инноваций восходит еще к народной латыни, являясь общей для всех романских языков: omnis > totus (1); liber > cortex (3); ater > niger (8); pingue > crassus (26); ignis > focus (28); iecur > ficatum (48); corium > pellis (75); hic > eccum istum (86); brevis > curtus (105); anguis > serpens (106). Замена edere > manducare (23) также охватывает значительную часть романских языков. См. табл. 5.

**6.2.** Если обратиться к общим инновациям в базисной лексике, то все балкано-романские идиомы объединяют как минимум 15 инноваций в 100-словном списке базисной лексики (17 в 110-словном), если не учитывать инновации, относящиеся к периоду народной латыни. Часть из них, впрочем, имеет гомопластичные аналоги в других подгруппах: burn, dry, hair, red, yellow и thin. Однако даже оставшиеся 10 (11 в 110-словном списке) уникальных инноваций говорят о наличии довольно продолжительного периода прарумынского языка. См. табл. 6.

Таблица 5. Количество инноваций в балкано-романских и далматинском языках по сравнению с архаичной латынью в абсолютном и процентном соотношении.

	50-словник		100-словник		110-словник	
	слов	%	слов	%	слов	%
рум.	9 из 48	18,7	29 из 95	30,5	33 из 105	31,4
истр.	10 из 48	20,8	23 из 82	28	27 из 91	29,7
арум.	12 из 49	24,5	31 из 98	31,6	35 из 108	32,4
мегл.	12 из 50	24	27 из 92	29,3	30 из 101	29,7
далм.	6 из 47	12,8	21 из 88	23,9	25 из 97	25,8

В мегленорумынском языке картину несколько затемняют повторные инновации: ‘сердце’ (старое *’iɾəmə* сохраняется в устойчивых выражениях), ‘рот’ (*’gura* сменило значение на ‘пасть’) и ‘тонкий’ (*surc’oḡi* засвидетельствовано в словаре Капидана, но в текстах встречается *slap*). У ‘идти’ (< *mergere*) имеется когнат в таком значении в мегленорумынском диалекте Цэрнареки.

Исходя из общих инноваций, нет смысла выделять период истрорумынско-румынского единства (всего 1 неэксклюзивная сепаратная инновация), но можно говорить о недолгом периоде арумынско-мегленорумынской общности (3 эксклюзивных сепаратных инновации).

**6.3.** Далматинский язык не обнаруживает инноваций, сближающих его с какой-либо подгруппой. Две инновации, общие с балкано-романскими языками (*dry* (20), *stand* (79)), объясняются гомоплазией. Все инновации, имеющие параллели в других подгруппах (*bite* (7), *hear* (39), *know* (45), *man* (51), *mouth* (56), *sand* (70), *small* (77), *go* (92), *heavy* (102)), относятся к пласту лексики, распространившейся в романских языках после отделения балкано-романской подгруппы и встречающейся повсеместно или чересполосно в большей части романского мира. Таким образом, имеющиеся данные не позволяют включать далматинский язык в какую-то определенную подгруппу. Особой близости к балкано-романской подгруппе он не обнаруживает, что не позволяет считать его «языком-мостом». Лексикостатистические данные, скорее, говорят в пользу гипотезы, выделяющей далматинский в отдельную подгруппу, причем от основного массива он оторвался уже после отделения балкано-романской подгруппы.

7. Исходя из полученных нами данных, можно сделать следующие выводы:

- 1) балкано-романская подгруппа романской группы состоит из четырех отдельных языков, впечатление о разнице между которыми, видимо, усиливается из-за большого количества сепаратных заимствований в сводешевской лексике;
- 2) все балкано-романские языки восходят к прарумынскому языку, существовавшему сравнительно долгое время;
- 3) после распада праязыка какое-то время существовала арумыно-мегленорумынская общность и, возможно, истрорумыно-румынская общность.
- 4) далматинский не относится к балкано-романским языкам и, по-видимому, составляет отдельную подгруппу в рамках романской группы.

Таблица 6. Общие инновации в балкано-романских языках. Курсивом выделены сохранившиеся исконные слова, нулями — случаи заимствований.

	рум.	истр.	арум.	мегл.
Универсальные				
5. big	m'are	m'bre	m'are	m'ari
7. bite	a muška	mučkʋ	m'išku ~ m'ušku	m'učku
12. burn	a 'arde	0	'ardu	art
15. cold	r'eče	r'ǒče	ar'ace	r'aci
20. dry	usk'at	usk'ǒt	usk'atǔ	usk'at
36. hair	pər	per	p'erǔ	per
40. heart	'inimə	y'irimä	'inimə	bur'ik
51. man	bərb'at	0	bərb'atǔ	bərb'at
56. mouth	g'urə	g'urä	g'urə	rost
66. red	r'ošu	r'oysu	ar'ošǔ	roš
67. road	0	k'ǒle	k'ale	0
71. say	a sp'une	sp'ure	asp'unǔ	spun
77. small	mik	mik	ɲ'ikǔ	mik
92. go	a m'erže	m'äre	ɲ'ergu	'amnu
100. yellow	g'alben	0	g'albinǔ	g'albin
101. far	dep'arte	l'brgo; dep'brte	l'argu; dip'arte	dip'arti
107. thin	subc'ire	supc'ire	supc'ire	slap
Сепаратные				
4. belly	0	fole (гов. Жеяне)	p'intikǔ	fǒali
6. bird	p'asəre	puł	p'ułǔ	puł
22. earth	pəm'int	pem'int	c'arə	c'arə
46. leaf	'frunzə	fǒle	fr'inzə	fr'unzə
58. neck	gīt	čerb'iče	g'uše	g'ušə
69. round	rot'und	0	gurguł'eatǔ	gurguł'at
81. stone	0	'ərpa	0	rǒpə
98. who	č'ine	č'ire	k'are	k'ari

### Литература

- Десятова М. Ю. Проблема определения статуса балкано-романских языков // Вестник ПСТГУ, Т. III, № 2, 2006. С. 49–66. [Desyatova M. Yu. Problema opredeleniya statusa balkano-romanskikh yazykov // Vestnik PSTGU, T. III, № 2, 2006. P. 49–66.]
- Лухт Л. И., Нарумов Б. П. Румынский язык // Языки мира. Романские языки. М.: Academia, 2001. С. 574–636. [Lukht L. I., Narumov B. P. Rumynskiy yazyk // Yazyki mira. Romanskiye yazyki. M.: Academia, 2001. P. 574–636.]

- Репина Т. А., Нарумов Б. П. Далматинский язык // Языки мира. Романские языки. М.: Academia, 2001. С. 681—694. [Repina T. A., Narumov B. P. Rumynskiy yazyk // Yazyki mira. Romanskiye yazyki. M.: Academia, 2001. P. 681—694.]
- Бурлак С. А., Старостин С. А. Сравнительно-историческое языкознание. М.: Academia, 2005. [Burlak S. A., Starostin S. A. Sravnitel'no-istoricheskoye yazykoznanie. M.: Academia, 2005.]
- Andreose, A., Renzi, L. 2013. Geography and distribution of the Romance languages in Europe // The Cambridge History of the Romance languages. New York: Cambridge University Press. T. II.
- Blažek, V. 2012. Balkano-románské jazyky: lexikostatistický test // Linguistica Brunensia, LX, 1—2, 2012. P. 61—83.
- Guțu-Romalo, V. 1959. Stabilirea datei de separație a aromînei de dacoromîna cu ajutorul glotocronologiei // Studii și cercetări lingvistice, 10/4. P. 576—584.
- Sârbu, R., Frățilă, V. 1998. Dialectul istroromân. Texte și glosar. Timișoara.
- Starostin G. (ed.). 2011—2016. The Global Lexicostatistical Database. Moscow/Santa Fe: Center for Comparative Studies at the Russian State University for the Humanities; Santa Fe Institute. Available on-line: <http://starling.rinet.ru/new100>.

Mikhail Saenko. History of the Dalmatian and Balkan Romance languages from the lexicostatistical point of view.

In this article, with the help of lexicostatistics, I will attempt to determine whether minor Balkan Romance idioms (Istro-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian and Aromanian) and Moldavian are separate languages or dialects of Romanian (the Daco-Romanian language). Additionally, I will attempt to determine if there was a Proto-Romanian period in the history of these idioms or if they are the result of independent development, and also, whether it is possible to calculate the time of disintegration of the Proto-Romanian language by applying the lexicostatistical method. Apart from this, the place of the Dalmatian language in the classification of the Romance languages will be analysed. The research is based on the material of 110 word Swadesh lists, made for the Global Lexicostatistical Database project. According to the conducted calculations, Istro-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian and Aromanian are separate languages, while Moldavian is a dialect of Romanian; all Balkan Romance languages originated from the Proto-Romanian language which disintegrated about 1200—1300 years ago; after the disintegration of the proto-language, the Aromano-Meglenian unity, and possibly the Istro-Romanian and Romanian unity, existed for some time; Dalmatian is not related to the Balkan Romance languages and most probably makes up a separate subgroup of the Romance group.

*Keywords:* lexicostatistics, Balkan Romance languages, Dalmatian language.



George Starostin

Russian State University for the Humanities / Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Moscow);  
gstarst1@gmail.com

William H. Baxter, Laurent Sagart.

*Old Chinese. A New Reconstruction.*

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. xiv + 432 pp.

The past decade has seen several publications on the history of the Chinese language that have already become, or are bound to become not merely “milestones” in research history, but something more important: scholarly “companions” — reference tools that are not just destined to be read, formally honoured, and put away, but will have serious scholars returning to them over and over again in the course of daily work activities. The first such publication was Axel Schuessler’s etymological dictionary of Old Chinese (Schuessler 2007), which was then rapidly succeeded by an updated and “modernized” edition of Bernhard Karlgren’s *Grammata Serica Recensa* (Schuessler 2009). The first of these was already discussed by the author of this review for a previous issue of this Journal (G. Starostin 2009), where the dictionary was judged to be an extremely valuable tool for etymologists and philologists alike, but it was also pointed out that its usefulness was somewhat limited inasmuch as “strong” etymologies (supported by reliable OC reconstructions and systematic external parallels) were not always differentiated from more “speculative” etymologies.

Now along comes *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction*, a monograph written jointly by William H. Baxter and Laurent Sagart, two of the most authoritative, innovative, and simply hard-working specialists on the history of Chinese phonology. Both of the authors had previously offered their own individual models of the phonology of Old Chinese (OC) — Baxter 1992 is a classic, comprehensive, and elaborate reconstruction that has, for more than 20 years, arguably served in the Western academic world as the most common reference point on the subject since the much earlier (and clearly obsolete in many respects) works of Karlgren; and Sagart 1999 presented a radical rethinking of the structure of the OC syllable and even the OC language in general, which specifically emphasized the importance of recognizing and reconstructing productive

derivational morphology, allegedly obscured by its inadequate reflection in the Chinese script.

Despite the obvious importance of both these works, neither of them claimed to be “closing the book” on the reconstruction of the sound system of OC, for two simple reasons. First, the employed methodology, based on the analysis of such highly specific data as rhyme classes of OC poetry and the phonetic principle of the OC script, had to be significantly different from the usual comparative-historical method, traditionally employed to reconstruct the sound systems of unattested protolanguages, and this implied that future changes and additions to the method would be inevitable. Second, as the authors explain themselves in the first two chapters of the book, in the two decades since the publication of Baxter’s model, a variety of new linguistic, philological, and archaeological data on OC has become available, much of which has a direct bearing on the reconstructed sound system and sometimes necessitates radical revisions of certain aspects.

It is, therefore, quite an auspicious development that neither of the authors of the book under review, having already produced comprehensive and consistent models of their own, chose to rigidly persist in all of their historical judgements, but agreed to develop and elaborate them further, rethinking and revising their previous reconstructions where new data have prompted such a necessity — moreover, agreed to do this in close collaboration with each other, arriving at a common consensus model, which is indeed a rare development in modern historical-linguistic studies. The very fact of something like this happening implies that *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction* is not to be taken lightly, and, for better or worse, has a serious chance of becoming the base reference model for OC phonology in the upcoming years. For the serious Sino-linguist, or, indeed, for anybody with a serious interest in the linguistic prehistory of Southeast Asia in

general, the book is a stimulating and challenging read, and much of the upcoming work on the history of the Chinese language will probably have to revolve around discussions of proposals made therein.

A lengthy critical discussion of a book so richly and densely packed with philological and linguistic arguments even within the scope of an extended review article would be out of the question. Instead, I will choose a different approach. Although the book does not state this explicitly, its structure seems to confirm that it tries to be simultaneously targeted at a general audience of professional and amateur Sinologists without any serious background in historical Chinese linguistics, as well as at a much smaller, specialized audience of scholars who are first and foremost interested in the “new” aspects of the reconstruction. Therefore, I will first briefly outline the challenges that the book poses for the general audience, and then try to outline some of the major advantages and flaws of the authors’ “new” approach to the reconstruction of OC, keeping the illustrative data examples to a minimum, with the hopes that this will by no means undermine the validity of many of Baxter and Sagart’s (henceforth — B&S) individual discoveries.

First of all, the jacket blurb correctly states that the book is “critical reading for anyone seeking an advanced understanding of Old Chinese”, with implied emphasis on *advanced*. Even though, technically, the first two chapters (“Introduction” and “The evidence for Old Chinese”) give a general overview of the main sources of data and the main challenges, this overview, densely stuffed into forty pages, is much too short for somebody with no prior knowledge of the basics of OC phonology to get a good grasp on the situation. It is clear that the authors’ primary goal is to concentrate on the revisions of their previous research rather than on writing an accessible tutorial — which is perfectly justified. However, one wishes that this were more precisely expressed in the introduction, with the general reader being more explicitly being warned about the book’s “advanced level” status in comparison to such predecessors as Sagart 1999 and *especially* Baxter 1992, which is still, in this reviewer’s opinion, the single best possible introduction to the complex science of reconstructing OC phonology for the uninitiated student of OC, still accustomed to strictly pronouncing ancient words in their 20<sup>th</sup> century Beijing pronunciation.

For instance, the detailed and informative overview of the important research of Qīng-era scholars on the rhyme categories of OC, which occupied about 30 pages worth of space in Baxter 1992, is here condensed to a single brief paragraph on p. 2 and a couple more

paragraphs on pp. 22–24; the important preliminary stage of explaining the phonology of Middle Chinese (MC) is reduced from 40 pages in Baxter 1992 to 10 in the new book, and so on.

Another confusing detail in the structure of the book is the inclusion of a special section (chapter 3, “An overview of the reconstruction”) that is clearly targeted only at those readers who are already well familiar with previous research, since it consists of a brief description of the innovations that differentiate this volume from Baxter 1992. Not only is it largely superfluous in the light of a more detailed explanation of all these hypotheses in subsequent chapters (perhaps it might have worked better as a special “appendix for specialists” rather than a chapter in its own rights?), but its placement right next to the briefer-than-brief introductory chapters for “neophytes” is downright puzzling. On the whole, structural comparison of this work to Baxter 1992, a work as close to perfection in terms of structuring and sequencing of its complicated material, is rather underwhelming, and makes one wonder whether the whole work was not rushed to the publishers too quickly, before the authors had a proper chance of making it more comfortable for either the specialists, or the novices, or both.

Nevertheless, these are merely subjective impressions; much more important is the issue of how much actual scientific progress has been achieved by the authors, and whether this “new and improved” version of OC reconstruction truly deserves to replace all previous ones as the new base reference model for linguists, philologists, historians, and other specialists whose research is in one way or another connected with the linguistic realities of Ancient China.

The authors’ own evaluation of their research states that they take a “broader approach” to reconstruction than most, if not all, previous studies, including their own (p. 3). Most importantly, this involves analysis of as many sources of data as possible — in addition to such major “pillars” of traditional OC reconstruction as rhymes in early poetry and the Chinese script itself, the authors systematically tackle such additional sources as (a) data from modern Chinese dialects, most notably the Mǐn subgroup, whose separation from the main bulk of Chinese dialects is commonly understood to predate the Middle Chinese period, making it of particular importance as a possible retainer of some archaic features of OC, lost elsewhere; (b) old loanwords from Chinese into Kra-Dai, Hmong-Mien, Mon-Khmer (Vietic), and Tibeto-Burman languages; (c) data from various epigraphic sources, such as bamboo strips and silk scrolls from relatively recent

excavations that bring to light numerous formerly unknown particularities of the Chinese script in the Warring States era — particularities that may force significant corrections both for individual reconstructions of specific words and to the phonological system of OC as a whole.

In theory, this broadening of the perspective is a wonderful thing: given the complexity of the task (reconstructing the phonology of a 2,500-year old language without the added benefits of the standard historical-comparative method), any additional source of data is a blessing, and a system that puts together and harmonizes the data of all available sources is, by default, more convincing than a system that is restricted to only a few of these sources. However, it also poses a problem: the “sources” in question vary significantly in terms of their reliability. When we employ the data of Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, or even Zhuang-Tai words of Chinese origin that penetrated these languages *en masse* starting from the Late Old Chinese and culminating in the Early Middle Chinese era, we have before us a highly systematized picture, well illustrated by numerous examples, where it is very easy to find the respective Japanese, Korean, etc. equivalents for almost any initial or coda of any Chinese syllable. In the case of something like a proposed set of significantly earlier borrowings from Chinese into Proto-Hmong-Mien, we find ourselves in a completely different position: such borrowings, though seemingly numerous *per se*, are relatively more scarce and do not translate into an easily comprehensible system as smoothly as they do with “younger” Sino-Xenic systems. In other words, any potential borrowing from Chinese into Hmong-Mien has to undergo a more rigorous procedure of justification, and using such potential borrowings as evidence for OC phonology may invoke circular logic — we modify our OC reconstructions because of their correlates in Hmong-Mien, without any additional means to make sure that these Hmong-Mien forms *are* correlates.

As an example, let us take the OC reconstruction *\*m̥.lət* ‘tongue’ for modern 舌 *shé* (MC *zyet*) on p. 180. The MC initial *zy-* is a regular development from OC *\*l-*; the only reason why the reconstruction here necessitates a “loose preinitial” *\*m̥-* is comparison with Proto-Hmong-Mien *\*mblet* ‘tongue’, which is assumed to be an early borrowing from Chinese, following the hypothesis in Ratliff 2010: 48. Precisely *why* this is assumed, however, remains unexplained. For sure, there is a significant amount of phonetic similarity between *\*mblet* (which seems to be a fairly reliable reconstruction) and *\*lat*, or even *\*C-lat* (if we agree that the MC reflexion *zy-* rather than *y-* necessarily reflects the

deletion of an earlier preinitial), but first, words for ‘tongue’ very frequently contain *-l-* in the world’s languages, and second, it is hardly a good idea to consider Proto-Hmong-Mien *\*mblet* outside of its lookalikes in Mon-Khmer languages, such as Sre, Biat *mpiat*, Chrau *lapiat*, Bahnar *rapiat*, etc. (← *\*lmpiat* ‘tongue’, further perhaps to *\*li(ə)t* ‘to lick’; cf. Shorto 2006: 305). No matter what these connections reflect (an old genetic connection between Hmong-Mien and Austro-Asiatic, or areal links between the two), they certainly suggest that the Hmong-Mien word is older than a presumed borrowing from OC circa the middle of the 1st millennium BC. In fact, why not vice versa — a borrowing *into* OC from some early ancestor of Hmong-Mien, with cluster simplification? Such a hypothesis would be at the very least equiprobable to the one expressed in the monograph.

Even worse is the amendment of the OC reconstruction *\*do-s* ‘tree’ (modern 樹 *shù*, MC *dzyuH*) to *\*m-toʔ-s* (p. 124) based on the comparison with Proto-Hmong-Mien *\*ntjuəŋH* (sic!) ‘tree’. The authors are perfectly correct when they derive the OC word from the verb 樹 *shù* (MC *dzyuX* < OC *\*m-toʔ*, which I would rather revert to original *\*doʔ*) ‘to plant, place upright’; but how exactly does one arrive from *\*m-toʔ-s* to *\*ntjuəŋH*? (Let alone the fact that during the early contacts between OC and Proto-Hmong-Mien the main equivalent for ‘tree’ in OC must have unequivocally been the old term 木 *\*muk*, and that the sociolinguistic basis for the borrowing of a very recent derived innovation ‘growing/planted tree’ in the general meaning ‘tree, wood’ is virtually non-existent).

It is for reasons like these (such examples could, of course, be readily multiplied) that I would exert extreme caution when using potential loans into Hmong-Mien as evidence for OC reconstructions — rather than the opposite situation, when already available OC reconstructions may be used to identify any such potential loans; otherwise, we risk landing into a circularity trap, particularly considering the relatively small corpus of evidence where it is hard to confirm recurrent patterns of correspondences.

“External” similarities, however, may be no more treacherous than “internal” similarities — namely, the strong belief in the power of the so-called “word families”, a concept that goes all the way back to Karlgren (or, if we want to get very pedantic about it, all the way back to the phonetic glosses of Hàn-era philologists) and has, in this author’s opinion, done far more harm to the field of Chinese etymology than good. Roughly speaking, a “word-family” in OC is defined as a set of words that share a noticeable amount of phonetic and semantic similarity (usually differing by

no more than one phoneme) and may, therefore, be suspected of sharing a common original root (like the textbook example of 黑 *hēi* ‘black’ < MC *xok* vs. 墨 *mò* ‘ink’ < MC *mok*, where the first word reflects an old contraction with prefixal \*s-). Now it would seem logical that within many of such “word-families” defined by a researcher, some of the noted similarities would be historically conditioned and some would be accidental — and that the more pattern-like the connections are and the more transparent the rules are that explain the grammatical formation of one word from another, the more confidence we can have in their common origin. For B&S, however, it seems that the very fact that two or more words *can* be arranged within a “word-family” is already proof, or at least strong evidence, that they *are* related — a decision that I find highly alarming.

To take but one example, is the phonetic and semantic similarity between MC 膝 *sit* ‘knee’ and MC 節 *tset* ‘joint of bamboo’ really sufficient to consider the two words related? B&S answer in the positive, and reconstruct both forms as OC \*s-*tsik* and \**ts’ik*, respectively. But if so, what were the actual derivational mechanisms, involving loss/acquisition of “pharyngealization” and prefixation of \*s-, that originally transformed ‘joint’ into ‘knee’ or vice versa (or derived both of them from a third party)? The question is not even *asked* as the new reconstruction of ‘knee’ is being proposed, let alone answered. And how systematic is this connection? Next to the above-mentioned link between ‘black’ and ‘ink’, where the *x-* / *m-* connection is strongly supported by additional evidence, this example is unique. Clearly, this reconstruction is not to be trusted, as are quite a few others, based on no stricter methodological basis than an intuitive feel for “word-family” connections.

Another area in which the authors occasionally seem to be overreaching is the complicated nature of the Chinese script and its multiple variants in attested texts as well as epigraphic, including recently excavated, monuments. It is perfectly true that both the phonoideographic principle *and* the presence of numerous graphic variants, where one phonetic component could sometimes be replaced by another (or could *not*, which also constitutes serious evidence), have been vital in our understanding of OC phonology, especially where syllable-initial consonants are concerned (since this is the only segment of the syllable on which the rhyming system of OC sheds no light whatsoever). However, it is *also* true that we have no 100% guarantee that the phonoideographic principle was always consistently enforced according to *precisely* the same standards whenever a new character

was created; and as we formulate a basic set of rules for the generation of new characters, we should also allow for a reasonable number of exceptions from these rules, without necessarily striving to explain them as minor regularities that override major regularities. After all, this is not regular historical-comparative linguistics that operates on “live” pronounced forms, but a study of the evolution of an artificially created graphical system, something much more prone to human error and various “transmission accidents”.

To use an artificial example, if a particular phonetic component is used to transcribe the syllable \**pa*, we would expect it to be able to *regularly* serve as a phonetic component for such phonetically similar syllables as \**pha*, \**ba*, \**pa-s*, \**pha-s*, \**pra*, \**pra-s*, and others that do not deviate from a general “similarity formula” like \**P(r)a(-s)*, where *P* = any labial stop and *-s* is a suffix. We would also expect it to *not* regularly serve as a phonetic component for a syllable like \**ma*, since the bulk of available evidence shows that *P-* and *m-* were perceived as phonetic entities belonging to different, non-intersecting sound classes, and minimal pairs with *P-* and *m-* are very rarely encountered in the graphical system. However, rare as they are, such intersections do exist (e. g. 武 \**ma?* vs. 賦 \**pa?*), and the question with them is: do we want “total accountability”, i. e. a system that allows for no exceptions and offers a (phonetically based) explanation for *everything*, or a system where statistically insignificant deviations are counted as “accidents”, and only *truly* systematic evidence is accepted as valid reason to modify our reconstruction of the phonological system? In this particular case, for instance — would we necessarily have to invent an *ad hoc* explanation, e. g. re-reconstruct 武 \**ma?* as \**p-ma?* or 賦 \**pa?* as \**m-pa?*, to account for this strange graphic “accident”, or could we just define this as an accident and move on?

It seems that the preferred model for the authors is “total accountability”: any encountered oddities in the Chinese script have to be explained, or are at least preferably explained as regular (if, in many cases, unique) reflexations of certain peculiarities of the phonetic system. Many of the rules described in the monograph are illustrated on no more than a couple of cases — sometimes less than a couple, as long as they seem to fit into some general pattern, the historical reality of which remains questionable.

As an example, let us take the reconstruction of OC 午 *wǔ* ‘seventh earthly branch’, which used to be \**nga?* (Baxter 1992: 795) and has now been amended to the far more intricate \**[m].q<sup>h</sup>a?*. The main reason for this amendment is that it is otherwise impossible to un-

derstand why 午 *\*nga?* (MC *nguX*) was used as a phonetic component in 杵 *chǔ* (MC *tsyhoX*) ‘pestle’. Consequently, ‘pestle’ is being reconstructed with a different “prefix”, but with the same initial as *\*t.qʰa?*, and the issue is considered resolved.

The principal problem with this solution is that this situation is *unique*. The usual way to reconstruct OC initial consonants or consonant clusters that differed from their MC reflexions was through identifying *recurrent patterns* in the Chinese script that grouped together syllables with radically different MC initials – and the more recurrent they were, the better they helped weed out historical accident as an alternate explanation. However, alternation between MC *ng-* (in 午) and *tsyh-* (in 杵) is anything *but* a recurrent pattern. It occurs only once, and, furthermore, there is a perfectly valid alternate explanation of this historical accident.

The authors propose (with good reason) that 午 was originally the graph for ‘pestle’; that it was later borrowed to denote the phonetically similar word for ‘seventh earthly branch’; and that still later, the original word for ‘pestle’ acquired the additional radical 木 so that it could be graphically re-separated from ‘earthly branch’. On the surface, this is a plausible scenario (analogous situations are quite plentiful), but there is a serious additional problem with it: namely, the so-called ‘12 earthly branches’, with the notable exception of the very first one (子 *zǐ* ‘child’), *do not represent words of Chinese origin*. Although the characters themselves clearly depict objects, some of which may be identified (‘arrow’, ‘tree’, ‘pestle’, ‘k. of animal’) and some of which remain obscure, the readings associated with these characters do not represent their regular OC names – which, naturally, leads to suggest that either the characters or at least the words associated with the characters were originally not of Chinese origin. Consequently, it is quite possible that the character 午 (‘pestle’) originally had two readings – a “non-Chinese” one (OC *\*nga?*) and a Chinese one (*\*tʰa?*); later on, a new expanded character was created for the second word. Such an explanation is no more fantastic than the one proposed by the authors – and is more in line with seeing the whole situation as a historical accident rather than a pattern, which would require additional evidence that has so far not been provided.

This very example also logically leads us to yet another problematic area of the new reconstruction: typological plausibility, especially from the diachronic point of view. As we have seen, OC *\*m.qʰ-* (in the word for ‘seventh earthly branch’) is supposed to yield MC *ng-*, a development explicitly indicated in

table 4.37 on p. 130. At the same time, its unaspirated correlate, OC *\*m.q-*, as seen from table 4.36 on p. 127, is expected to yield MC *y-* (through an intermediate voiced stage *\*g-*). The latter development is at least consistent with the general system, according to which all initial clusters of the type *\*m.C-* (where *-C-* is a voiceless stop) develop into voiced stops in MC; the former, however, is unique and completely unsupported by other similar developments (e. g. one should also expect that OC *\*m.pʰ-*, *\*m.tʰ-*, etc., should yield MC *\*m-*, *\*n-*, etc., which they do not). Considering the scarceness and occasional dubious character of the examples, one should definitely treat these reconstructions with a grain of salt.

These and many other rules are established to illustrate what is perhaps the single most significant innovation since Baxter 1992: a large, comprehensive set of OC “preinitials”, which come in two varieties (“tightly attached” and “loosely attached”, so that a syllable like OC *\*k.ton* is deemed phonologically different from *\*kə.ton*, and is expected to yield different reflexes in MC, as well as Mǐn dialects and, possibly, old loanwords in Hmong-Mien and Vietic). This theory has been carried over from Sagart 1999 (where the two varieties of syllables were respectively called “iambic” and “fused”), but it has been vastly expanded in the book under review, particularly because the authors claim to have discovered additional evidence: for instance, “loosely attached” preinitials are now associated with the so-called “softened” stops in Jerry Norman’s reconstruction of Proto-Mǐn, whereas the “tightly attached” preinitials are said to give rise to Proto-Mǐn “voiced aspirated” stops.

The amount of presented evidence seems so overwhelming, at least in terms of the sheer number of initial consonantal clusters reconstructed for OC, that at least *some* of these innovations in the reconstruction must be right, even if their phonetic interpretation may be reconsidered (for instance, in S. Starostin 1989 the voiced aspirated consonants of Proto-Mǐn were believed to reflect the original OC situation, rather than a combination with a “fused” presyllable). Unfortunately, at this point it is hard to state for sure which of the innumerable combinations of initial consonants reconstructed by the authors hold water and which ones do not – a proper evaluation would probably require almost as much time as it took to produce the work itself. Evidence from Mǐn dialects, Chinese script varieties, “word-families”, and Hmong-Mien / Vietic loans is juggled around so freely and so quickly that one never properly understands just how much evidence there is for any single correspondence, or (which is even more important) whether there is any

counter-evidence for that correspondence. Ultimately, utmost caution must be exercised when operating with such reconstructions as OC *\*m.lru[t]-s* ‘to fall down’ or *\*t.q<sup>h</sup>(r)A* ‘chariot’, and, most importantly, one should always try to distinguish between reconstructions based on recurrent, systematic, “robust” evidence from those based on a questionable parallel (e. g. do we really have to take for a *fact* that Proto-Hmong-Mien *\*mbruiH* ‘nose’ is borrowed from OC *\*m-bi[t]-s?*) or a subjective decision on which OC words are related to which others through poorly understood “word family” connections.

One very interesting idea that was previewed neither in Baxter 1992 nor in Sagart 1999 but is rather a relatively recent common proposal by the authors (actually, following up on an earlier proposal by Pān Wùyún) is the reconstruction of a distinct uvular series of consonants for OC (*\*q-*, *\*q<sup>h</sup>-*, etc.), based on the identification of two different types of phonetic series (those that allow for syllables with MC velar initials only and those that allow for syllables with either velar initials or an initial glottal stop in MC: the latter group is identified as having contained uvular initials in OC). This solution looks typologically plausible, but would require serious corroboration from at least one additional source of evidence, if we want to completely rule out chance as an alternate explanation. Incidentally, it could be noted that, in their Proto-Sino-Tibetan reconstruction, I. Peiros and S. Starostin (1996) did set up a separate category of uvular consonants for PST, even though they did not propose the preservation of uvulars in OC; it would be instructive to see how the alleged OC uvulars add up to the Tibeto-Burman evidence and whether there is any (at least partial) correlation between Baxter and Sagart’s OC reconstructions in *\*q-*, *\*G-*, etc., and Starostin and Peiros’s ST reconstructions beginning with the same consonants.

Another major innovation is the phonetic interpretation of the difference between the so-called “Type A” and “Type B” syllables as an opposition between *pharyngealized* and *unmarked initials* (so that, according to the authors, OC could phonologically distinguish between *\*ŋa* and *\*ŋ<sup>ʰ</sup>a*, etc.). The discussion over the nature of this opposition has involved numerous and diverse solutions (such as Karlgren’s old and by now completely discarded idea of an OC palatal glide in word-medial position, or attempts to reconstruct vowel length), but the one offered here by the authors seems fairly dubious, since it is grounded in purely typological evidence (and rather selective at that). Not only does it seem structurally wrong to regard this “pharyngealization” as a characteristics of the initial

consonant (which not only doubles the phonological inventory of OC, but also allows for such unique combinations as a pharyngealized glottal stop *\*ʔ<sup>ʰ</sup>* and its labialized counterpart *\*ʔ<sup>wʰ</sup>*), but it should also be remembered that pharyngealization is not at all a typical feature of the area in question: the authors themselves are only able to quote two isolated examples in typological support of the hypothesis (Northern Qiāng of Hóngyán and a couple of Austronesian languages on Taiwan), where pharyngealization is neither as all-pervasive as in the authors’ reconstruction of OC, nor is it in any way a relatively old and/or stable feature.

In light of this situation, I would argue that the older hypothesis of *vowel length* as the primary reason for the Type A / Type B opposition, independently put forward by Sergei Starostin and Zhengzhang Shangfang, remains far more plausible from both the typological point of view *and* the historical perspective (since it seems to correlate somewhat well with Tibeto-Burman evidence). Ironically, the authors themselves seem to have discovered a potential additional argument for this earlier interpretation, as they mention some of the early commentarial literature that refers to type-A and type-B syllables as 緩氣 *huǎnqì* ‘slow breath’ and 急氣 *jíqì* ‘fast breath’, respectively. Naturally, they try to fit these descriptions into their own argument (“‘spoken with slow breath’ would also be an appropriate description of a syllable beginning with a pharyngealized onset...”), but why should the issue be made so overcomplicated?

Summarizing all the observations and criticisms presented above (unfortunately, in a very compact form), my current conclusions about the monograph in general are as follows:

1. It presents an immense amount of both major amendments to the OC phonological system as reconstructed previously and minor amendments to specific reconstructions of particular words — all of which have to be taken into (critical) consideration in any subsequent research on OC.

2. It represents the first attempt to *systematically* bring into play comparative data from such previously untapped sources as early contact lexicon between OC and its non-Sino-Tibetan neighbours, and recently uncovered paleographic materials. A major accent should be placed on the word *systematically*, since many scholars had already paid occasional attention to all these matters; B&S are the first ones to place them square in the center of their study.

3. However, a most important methodological flaw on the authors’ part is their quest for what I would call “*total explainability*”, where just about any observ-

ed inconsistency or (possibly accidental) similarity may be granted the status of evidence, if it is needed to plug a hole in some part of the authors' highly convoluted system of OC. The result is a very shaky and vulnerable system of "correspondences" between phonetic series, MC readings, Proto-Min reconstructions, early Hmong-Mien and Vietic borrowings, "word-family" connections, etc., whose multiple constituents do not always agree with each other and sometimes even give the impression of a "house of cards" that can easily be demolished with a single counter-example or a single piece of newly discovered evidence.

Scholars of OC historical phonetics will, no doubt, agree with some parts of the reconstruction and make use of its shakier parts as a stimulus for further research, so that even some of the shortcomings of B&S may eventually lead to new insights and discoveries. However, utmost caution must be exercised if one wants to make systematic use of *A New Reconstruction* for general reference purposes; at the very least, I would recommend *always* comparing the revised reconstructions with older, more conservative sources, such as Baxter 1992 or S. Starostin 1989.

For the moment, I would rather advocate viewing the book essentially as the current state of a work-in-progress (which is in itself, more or less, acknowledged by the authors themselves) — although, in my opinion, if further progress is indeed to be made, certain methodological principles should probably be amended. Possible recommendations would include a far more rigorous approach to issues of comparative semantics and grammatical derivation in the case of "word-families"; a less permissive stance on what should or should not be admitted as a "borrowing" between Chinese and its non-Sinitic neighbours, particularly in the OC epoch; a tighter statistical control

over what should count as significant or accidental connection between or within different phonetic series; and, maybe most important of all, consistent corroboration of the results of the reconstruction by means of comparison with Tibeto-Burmese data. Of course, given the current generally unsatisfactory state of Tibeto-Burman reconstruction, the latter demand may sound too unrealistic; however, ultimately it is only the comparison of OC data on deeper levels of genetic relationship that can verify or disprove the bold claims made by the authors in their new monograph. Until then, most of these claims are bound to remain challenging, intriguing, and deeply controversial.

## References

- Baxter 1992 — William H. Baxter. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Peiros & Starostin 1996 — I. Peiros, S. Starostin. *A comparative vocabulary of five Sino-Tibetan languages (6 vols.)*. Melbourne.
- Ratliff 2010 — M. Ratliff. *Hmong-Mien language history*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sagart 1999 — L. Sagart. *The Roots of Old Chinese*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, vol. 184. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schuessler 2007 — A. Schuessler. *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Schuessler 2009 — A. Schuessler. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Old Chinese. A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Shorto 2006 — H. Shorto. *A Mon-Khmer Comparative Dictionary*. Ed. by Paul J. Sidwell, Doug Cooper, and Christian Bauer. Canberra: Australian National University.
- S. Starostin 1989 — С. А. Старостин. *Реконструкция древнекитайской фонологической системы* [A reconstruction of the Old Chinese phonological system]. Moscow: Nauka.
- G. Starostin 2009 — George Starostin. Review of Schuessler 2007. *Journal of Language Relationship* 1: 155–162.

Ranko Matasović.

*Slavic Nominal Word-Formation. Proto-Indo-European Origins and Historical Development.*

Empirie and Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft 3. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014. 221 pp.

Монография о славянском именном словообразовании задумана как «новый синтез» (см. 1. Introduction, с. 17) достижений предшествующих исследователей, труды которых очень кратко и весьма критически охарактеризованы автором как с позиций современной ларингальной теории и акцентологии, так и в плане затрудненного доступа (последнее — о польском языке очерка Ф. Славского [Sławski 1974—1979], 1. Introduction, с. 15, что представляется более чем странным, поскольку речь идет о трудах, предназначенных для компаративистов, прежде всего славистов). Источники потенциального обогащения представлений о славянском словообразовании, его истоках и развитии автор справедливо усматривает в использовании данных этимологических словарей праславянского языка, в том числе ЭССЯ и Дерксена [Derksen 2008], и исследований по словообразованию отдельных славянских языков (с. 16—17). Он не упоминает при этом польский *Słownik prasłowiański* [SP] (который, впрочем, включен в библиографию), а из этимологических словарей отдельных славянских языков в библиографию включены только [БЕР], [Skok 1973] и [Gluhak 1993], то есть словари южнославянских языков (отсутствие других объясняется, вероятно, теми же «языковыми трудностями»). Важным преимуществом своего исследования автор считает опору на реконструкцию праславянского лексического состава (с. 17). Следует, однако, отметить, что подобная реконструкция была исходной базой и для «Очерка славянского словообразования» Славского, упомянутого выше. Принципиальное значение имеет авторская методика выделения праславянских образований: таковыми признаются формы, рефлекс которых представлены хотя бы в трех славянских языках, желательно из трех ветвей; в своей работе автор предпочитает сочетание рефлексов праславянских образований в старославянском, русском, польском и хорватском языках (с. 17). По мнению автора, это обеспечивает решение сложной проблемы отделения рефлексов праславянских лексем от поздних параллельных производных отдельных славянских языков. Однако такой подход представляется чисто формальным и про-

тиворечащим результатам современных исследований по праславянской лексикологии и особенно по этимологии. Не говоря уже о произвольном выборе языков-репрезентантов праславянского, совершенно игнорируется общепризнанное диалектное членение праславянского языка и неизбежно связанное с ним существование праславянских диалектизмов.

Действительно новые и ценные аспекты рецензируемого исследования — пристальное внимание к индоевропейским источникам праславянских словообразовательных аффиксов и целых праславянских лексем, с углублением реконструкции до уровня ларингальных, а также введение акцентологических характеристик этих лексем. Автор придерживается теории о трех праиндоевропейских ларингальных. Обращаясь к необходимости в современном очерке славянского словообразования указывать акцентологические характеристики праславянских образований, автор отмечает связанную с этим вынужденную ориентацию на определенный этап в истории праславянской акцентологической системы (в относительной хронологии). Автор выбирает уровень существования трех акцентных парадигм, предшествующий появлению нового акута (с. 19). К сожалению, автор не определяет соотношение этого уровня с известной периодизацией праславянского языка по другим его характеристикам. Таковы цели и методика рецензируемого труда, как они изложены автором во Введении (1. Introduction, с. 15—20).

2, 3 и 4 разделы книги посвящены соответственно суффиксальному словообразованию (2. Derivation by suffixation), префиксам в именном словообразовании (3. Prefixes in nominal derivation) и именным сложениям (4. Nominal compounds). В разделе о суффиксальном словообразовании последовательно рассматриваются корневые имена, основы на сонанты и *s*, на *\*o < \*os*, бессуффиксные и суффиксальные основы на *\*i*, *\*ī*, *\*u*, *\*ū* (например, *\*-čv*, *\*-nv*, *\*-slv*, *\*-vrb*), редуцированные тематические имена, тематические суффиксальные основы (и *\*ā*-основы) с односложными суффиксами (например, *\*-čv < \*-kja*, *\*-nv*, *\*-no*, *\*-slo*), тематические основы с двусложными суффиксами (например, *\*-ačv*, *\*-anv*,



\*-епь, \*-ено, \*-ьть). Приведенные случаи распределения суффиксов по разделам обнаруживают принципиальный отход автора от традиционного методического принципа описания славянских суффиксальных моделей с опорой на консонантные элементы, предпочтение отдано вокалическим показателям основ (на консонантный состав ориентировано только описание тематических основ с двусложными суффиксами). В результате, с одной стороны, рядом рассматриваются бессуффиксные и суффиксальные основы (например, на \*-ь и \*-нь), а с другой стороны, оказываются оторванными друг от друга суффиксы, тождественные по консонантному составу (например, см. \*-нь, \*-нь и \*-епь или \*-slь и \*-slo), что противоречит генетическим связям суффиксальных моделей. В распределении праславянского лексического материала по перечисленным отделам усматривается еще один недостаток: при направленности работы на индоевропейские истоки и историю славянского словообразования важнейшая составляющая этой истории — преобразование в тематические основы индоевропейских корневых основ, гетероклитических основ, основ на согласные, на *i*, *ī* и *y* — представлена хаотично, поскольку лексемы, пережившие (предположительно) такие преобразования, размещены по их поздним, тематическим характеристикам (например, \*juxa, \*voda, \*žeravjь).

Книгу завершают перечень цитированных трудов и указатель праславянских и праиндоевропейских реконструкций.

Структура всех трех разделов о словообразовательных моделях тождественна. Образования с каждым словообразовательным аффиксом рассматриваются в отдельном пункте-параграфе, дается характеристика индоевропейского источника с анализом существующих версий (помещаемая при этом то в начало параграфа, то в его конец). Приводится перечень тех праславянских образований, праславянская принадлежность которых подтверждается продолжениями из отдельных славянских языков, избираемыми автором по описанному выше принципу (удачными исключениями являются случаи подтверждения праславянской древности меньшим набором славянских продолжений при наличии балтийских соответствий). Каждое образование характеризуется с хронологическо-генетической точки зрения: как индоевропейское наследие или наследие балто-славянской эпохи или как праславянское образование (при этом праславянские реконструкции располагаются по алфавиту), дается акцентуационная характеристика модели (с признанием во многих случаях за-

труднительности ее реконструкции). Вслед за праславянскими словами приводятся некоторые производные, образованные по той же модели в истории отдельных славянских языков, предпочтение явно отдается хорватским и русским материалам. В этой структуре вызывает недоумение алфавитное расположение материала: при сравнительно небольшом объеме приводимого лексического материала алфавитный порядок не является необходимым для поиска лексем, но зато очевидно препятствует выработке представления об истории словообразовательной модели от потенциального индоевропейского наследия до праславянского состояния, не говоря уже о разделении семантически близких образований даже при достаточно вероятной хронологической близости (см. порядок \*ālkъть, \*degъть, \*nōgъть, с. 53, здесь и далее праславянские образования приводятся в реконструкции автора). Для весьма лаконичного по стилю исследования странно видеть разноречивую терминологию, характеризующую генетические отношения праславянских слов с образованиями других языков: например, праслав. \*mirъ и др.-лит. mieras, праслав. \*ovъsa и санскр. avikā, праслав. \*žьlna и лит. gilnà названы параллельными образованиями, а праслав. \*šьvъсь и лит. siuvikas, праслав. \*jъdra и лит. údra — идентичными.

В определении происхождения праславянских лексем автор, как правило, опирается на авторитетные толкования этимологических словарей. Однако иногда встречаются неоправданные отклонения от надежных решений: см., например, толкование \*mētežь как производного от \*mesti 'бросать', \*ruxo — «от того же корня, что в \*runo». Вряд ли рационально включение в очерк праславянских лексем, не имеющих надежной этимологии (см. \*grěxъ, \*straxъ), тем более что, излагая проблематичность некоторых толкований, автор игнорирует их позднейшее подтверждение или новые разработки: ср. обоснование родства \*nozdrī с лит. nasraĩ и греч. ῥίς, ῥινός [Трубачев 1972: 14—17], новое членение и толкование \*gumьno < \*gum-ьno от \*gum- 'жать, давить' [Schuster-Šewc 5: 360—361; Варбот 1999: 614—618]. В работу включены некоторые авторские этимологические решения: см. достаточно убедительное возведение \*tēmę к \*teg- 'покрывать' (лат. tegō 'крыть' и tegmen 'покрытие'), \*esterъ 'осетр' к \*esetъ 'сушильня для зерна' (< 'борона, решетка с зубьями') и очень сомнительные предположения об образовании \*město от \*med- 'мера' и о родстве \*gyzda, \*gyzdъ 'грязь' с \*govędo.

Набор выделяемых аффиксов традиционен, хотя представленная для них лексическая реализа-

ция вследствие недочетов словообразовательного членения (см. ниже) требует критического подхода. В разделе о префиксации отсутствует *\*bez-*. Обращаясь к индоевропейским истокам славянских аффиксов, автор, как правило, излагает все существующие версии, логично предпочитая аргументацию целнолексемными соответствиями из славянских и других индоевропейских языков. Поскольку работа ориентирована на индоевропейское происхождение славянского словообразования, совершенно не оправдано включение заимствованного из тюркских языков (что признает и автор) суффикса *\*-bčbjь*.

Следует признать, что рецензента особенно интересовал словообразовательный анализ праславянских производных, который должен быть основой для реконструкции истории славянского словообразования, начиная с праславянского периода. Этот аспект работы вызывает целый ряд недоумений и возражений. Прежде всего, очень часто нарушается общепринятое требование к анализу — соотносительное выделение производящей основы и словообразовательного аффикса: см. выделение в *\*ukorizna* суффикса *\*-izna* при соотнесении с *\*ukoriti*, в *\*modlitva* — суффикса *\*-itva* при *\*modliti*, в *\*varivo* — суффикса *\*-ivo* при *\*variti*, в *\*kovačь* и *\*kopačь* — суф. *\*-ačь* при *\*kovati*, *\*kopati*; в *\*blěskъ* — суф. *\*-skъ* при *\*blъskati*, рус. *melоč* истолковано как производное от *melkij*, но слово включено в раздел о суффиксе *\*-čь*; *\*načedlo* определено как производное от *\*načeti*, но помещено в раздел о префиксе *\*na-*, *\*posъlъ* при производности от *\*posъlati* включено в число имен с префиксом *\*po-*. Соответственно, в раздел об определенном аффиксе попадают образования разной структуры и даже происхождения, например: к суф. *\*-ělъ* отнесены *\*gybělъ* (ср. *\*gyběti*) и *\*kapělъ* (от *\*kapati se*), к суф. *-eno* — *\*verteno* (ср. санскр. *vartaîna*) и *\*pъšeno* (субстантивация причастия). С другой стороны, оказываются разделенными образования с генетически тождественными суффиксами: например, *\*bičь* и *\*kopačь*.

Иногда неоправданно выглядит выбор производящей основы: см. *\*žbrъsvъ* — от *\*žerti* (хотя есть *\*žbra*), *\*čislo* — от *\*čitati* (но ср. *\*čisti*), *\*pokójь* «от того же корня, что в *\*čajati*» (но ср. *\*počiti*), выделение в *\*žilišče* суф. *\*-lišče* (но ср. *\*žilъjь*). В исследовании о словообразовании хотелось бы большей определенности вместо указания на образование имен «от корня...» с отсылкой к нескольким родственным основам: см. «*\*volja* от корня из *\*voliti* и *\*velti*», «*\*trava* от корня из *\*traviti*, *\*truti*», «*\*gъsli* ← *\*gъděti*, *\*gъsti*».

Для славянского отглагольного словообразования весьма существенен аспект огласовки корня в

производных именах. Автор отмечает преобладание той или иной ступени в некоторых суффиксальных моделях. Различие огласовок корня в называемой производящей основе и производном имени отмечается редко, а если эти различия и фиксируются, то часто никак не характеризуются с позиций праславянской морфонологии: см. без указания чередований *\*lqъno* от *\*lękti*, *\*děva* от и.-е. *\*dheh<sub>1</sub>-i-* (без упоминания *\*dojiti*), то же при формулировке «от того же корня, что в...»: так об отношениях *\*zorkъ* и *\*zbrěti*, *\*zvqъkъ* и *\*zvъněti*, опять-таки без указания на роль ступеней огласовки в определенных моделях.

Необходимой составляющей реконструкции истории праславянского словообразования представляется анализ различных типов вариантности. Прежде всего, это касается вариантности ступеней огласовки корня производных имен при тождественных аффиксах. Автор отмечает подобные случаи, но природа вариантности (параллелизм? преобразование?) и соотносительная хронология вариантов производных имен, как правило, не определяются: ср. *\*děra* («от корня *\*der-*»), в котором долгота толкуется как потенциальный показатель древнего корневого имени, и *\*dira*, для которого дается только отсылка (?) на *\*děra*; *\*blěskъ*, *\*bliskъ* и *\*blъskъ* снабжены только взаимными отсылками и определением вокализма в *\*blъskъ* как нулевой ступени корня.

Наряду с вариантностью корневого вокализма для истории словообразования важно появление вариантов аффиксов, установление генетических связей аффиксов и их функционального сближения. Относительно характеристики вариантов суффиксов в рецензируемой работе приходится отметить все ту же нестрогость подхода к словообразовательному членению: например, нельзя считать вариантами суффикса *\*-dlo* комплексы *\*-adlo* в *\*zbrcadlo* и *\*-idlo* в *\*kadidlo* при производящих основах *\*zbrcati* и *\*kaditi*, при том, что не упомянуто *\*gъrnidlo* — производное от *\*gъrnъ* с вариантом суффикса *\*-idlo*.

В работе не упоминаются структурные отношения основ I/II: см. «*\*kvâsъ* ← *\*kysnati*».

Отмечена генетическая связь суффиксов *\*-vka* и *\*-ica*, а также *\*-ljъ* и *\*-ulja*, а также некоторых других. Отмечая генетическую связь префиксов *\*pa-* и *\*po-*, как и *\*sq-* и *\*sv-*, *\*q-* и *\*vъ(n)-*, автор не упомянул о соотносительности и даже непосредственной производности имен с первыми приведенными префиксами от глаголов со вторыми: ср. *\*pamętъ* — *\*pomъněti*, *\*saprqъkъ* — *\*svъpregti*, *\*asadъ* — *\*vъsěsti* (модель производности, очевидно предшествовавшая

модели *\*rominъ — \*rominati*). В работе не упомянуты известные наблюдения Мейе относительно функциональной близости и своеобразного дополнительного распределения суффиксов *\*-slo* и *\*-lo* [Meillet 1905: 415].

Приведенный в каждом этюде материал из некоторых славянских языков, иллюстрирующий реализацию праславянской словообразовательной модели в истории отдельных славянских языков, отобран очень ограниченно и случайно, так что не дает сколько-нибудь удовлетворительного представления об этой истории (в отличие от собрания материалов славянских языков в [Vaillant 1974]). Только невниманием к истории собственно славянских языков можно объяснить курьезное толкование рус. диал. *завонь* ‘мелкий залив’ и ст.-чеш. *vodně* ‘вода, волна’ как переход индоевропейской гетероклитической основы *\*vodr-/\*vodn-* в *ni*-основу (в действительности это субстантивация прилагательных с суффиксом *-ьн-*: от *\*voda*: *\*zavodьbnь*, *\*vodьbnja*).

Из сказанного следует, что поставленная автором задача — показать историческое развитие славянского словообразования — не представляется решенной достаточно последовательно и полно.

## Литература

- БЕР — *Български етимологичен речник*. Кн. 1—7—. Състав. Вл. Георгиев, Ив. Гълъбов, Ст. Илчев, Й. Заимов, Тодор Ат. Тодоров, Х. Дейкова и др. София: БАН, 1971—2010—. [*Balgarski etimologičen rečnik*. Кн. 1—7—. Sastav. Vl. Georgiev, Iv. Galabov, St. Ilchev, J. Zaimov, Todor At. Todorov, Kh. Dejкова i dr. Sofija: BAN, 1971—2010—.]
- Варбот, Ж. Ж. Вокруг славянского гумна. // *Поэтика. История литературы. Лингвистика. Сборник к 70-летию Вячеслава Всеволодовича Иванова*. М.: ОГИ, 1999. [Varbot, Zh. Zh. Vokrug slavjanskogo gumna. // *Poetika. Istorija literatury. Lingvistika. Sbornik k 70-letiju Vjacheslava Vsevolodoviča Ivanova*. М.: OGI, 1999.]
- Трубачев, О. Н. Заметки по этимологии и сравнительной грамматике. // *Этимология 1970*. М.: Наука, 1972. с. 3—20. [Trubachev, O. N. Zametki po etimologii i sravnitel'noj grammatike. // *Etimologija 1970*. М.: Nauka, 1972. s. 3—20.]
- ЭССЯ — *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*. Вып. 1—39—. Отв. ред. О.Н. Трубачев (вып. 1—31), О.Н. Трубачев и А.Ф. Журавлев (вып. 32), А.Ф. Журавлев (вып. 33—39). М.: Наука, 1974—2014—. [*Etimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskikh jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*. Vyp. 1—39—. Отв. ред. О.Н. Trubachev (vyp. 1—31), O.N. Trubachev i A.F. Zhuravlev (vyp. 32), A.F. Zhuravlev (vyp. 33—39). М.: Nauka, 1974—2014—.]
- Derksen, R. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexikon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gluhak, A. 1993. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb: August Cesarec.
- Meillet, A. 1905. *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*. II. *Formation des noms*. Paris: Librairie Émile Bouillon.
- Skok, P. 1973. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Кн. I—IV.
- Sławski, F. 1974—1979. *Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego*. In: *Słownik prasłowiański*, t. 1—3, Wrocław etc.: Zakład im. Ossolińskich PAN.
- SP — *Słownik prasłowiański*. Т. 1—8. Pod red. F. Sławskiego. Wrocław etc.: Zakład im. Ossolińskich PAN, 1974—2001.
- Vaillant, A. 1974. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Т. IV. *La formation des noms*. Paris: Klincksieck.