

РАЗДЕЛ III. ЛИНГВИСТИКА ТЕКСТА

УДК 81'02

ББК 81.1

Dmitry M. Bystrov¹

the founder of Orthowiki (<http://орфография.орг/>)

and Planned Russian language project

ORCID 0000-0002-9678-5804

independent researcher

Riazan', Russia

dmitry.alonecoder@gmail.com

Mikhail S. Yastrebov-Pestritskiy²

ORCID 0000-0002-6455-0816

Scientific Library of the State Archive

of the Russian Federation (SARF SL)

myp-63@mail.ru

THE LEXICAL CORE OF THE PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGE: THE COMPLETE SWADESH LIST

Abstract

In this work, the lexical core of Proto-Indo-European is reconstructed using only the words that simultaneously fell into 4 main branches of Indo-European languages (Indo-Iranian, Italo-Celtic, Balto-Slavic, Greek), without violation of satemization and without any additional phonemes (4th laryngeal, Brugmann's "thorn"-clusters, *q). These restrictions minimize the likelihood of peripheral vocabulary and random coincidences getting into the reconstruction. The methodology of such a search for obtaining implied list of concepts is described in details. The resulting Swadesh list of 207 concepts is presented with a link to the work materials. Since, under such strict restrictions, it was still possible to deduce the entire list (complex cases are considered in details), there is a reason to think that it is possible to reconstruct "core PIE"

¹ Дмитрий Михайлович Быстров – основатель информационного сайта «Орфовики» (<http://орфография.орг/>) и проекта «Планный русский язык». Рязань. Россия.

² Михаил Сергеевич Ястребов-Пестрицкий, Научная библиотека Госархива РФ (НБ ГАРФ), 119435, г. Москва, ул. Пироговская Большая; ведущий специалист, кандидат филологических наук; Москва. Россия.

(the direct common ancestor of the listed branches) as a full-fledged language and make its dictionary. Suggestions on the structure and procedure for compiling such a dictionary are given. It was also found that only 59% of the words of the resulting Swadesh list for “core PIE” are reflected in at least one Germanic language – this confirms the assumption that the Germanic branch does not originate from the core PIE, being in fact peripheral. In the process of searching for Balto-Slavic material, we have found a law according to which *s* and *š* are distributed in Lithuanian language (RUKI law operates completely in Proto-Balto-Slavic, including the endings): the suffix *-s* (if it is synchronously detected) is restored as *-s* regardless of the position; the final *-š* > *-s*, entailing the median *-š-* > *-s-* (including the satemic consonant *š* < *č* < *k*). Also noted was **sm-* > Latin *sp-*, Greek *σμ-* (later > *μ-*).

Keywords: etymology, method, proto-Indo-European, Swadesh, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Slavic, Lithuanian, RUKI rule.

The purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to determine the lexical core of the Proto-Indo-European language (hereinafter referred to as PIE), taking into account the following conditions:

- the main condition for the presence of a word (or root) in the lexical core of PIE is its presence in all 4 main branches of Indo-European languages (hereinafter referred to as «quadruple cognates»): Indo-Iranian, Italo-Celtic, Balto-Slavic, Greek. The branches are determined by the number of involved etymologies of [60] (counting by index in the dictionary) and other considerations indicated in [36, 183–200];

- non-standard phonemes are not allowed: laryngeals except three standard ones (to explain, for example, the Greek *ι*), Brugmann’s «thorn»-clusters, **q* [4, 132];

- violations of satemization are not allowed (**g/*ǵ*, etc. must be clearly separated).

These restrictions minimize the probability of including any random coincidences and words of peripheral vocabularies into the reconstruction of PIE.

At the same time, it is necessary to take into account the quality criteria for the reconstruction of the proto-language as a whole:

- coverage of basic concepts (Swadesh list, etc.);
- coverage of the dictionaries for separate languages (we work with »complete« dictionaries);
- accuracy of deduction (a small percentage of special cases: metatheses, contaminations, etc.).

In this paper, with the listed conditions, the Proto-Indo-European Swadesh list of 207 concepts is reconstructed. It should be noted that even the 100 concepts list has not yet been published with limitations so strict. Since Swadesh list for PIE is needed in any case, we will expand the search area a little – initially we will take all the branches in an expansive sense (and in the end we will evaluate the need for such expansions):

- the Greek branch is taken with Macedonian and Phrygian languages (in the absence of a generally accepted name for such a branch, we propose «Hellenic»). For example, for the concept ‘brother's wife’ in accordance with Skr. giri- (hapax, which might be an incorrect translation instead of ‘mountain’ [44, 115–121]) only the Phrygian gélaros, gállaros is known (not to be mixed with the concept of ‘husband's sister, sister-in-law’, for which there is Greek γᾶλόωζ, and from Indo-Iranian, respecting the satemization, only the Kashmiri zām ‘husband's sister’ is suitable);

- we treat Italic and Celtic as one, and allow to use data from Italo-Celtic languages whose group is not certain (Lepontic, Venetic);

- we allow data from Indo-Iranian languages that are not reliably included in either Indo-Aryan or Iranian group (Nuristani, Dardic);

- we allow dialectal words of Balto-Slavic languages, regardless of their coinage in closely related languages.

Research methodology

To begin with, neither dictionaries nor other sources are complete (therefore we will use the word «complete» in quotation marks) and free from errors. More distant from the primary material means less reliable. The gradation of sources is as follows:

1. The primary material is the oral language. Dialect dictionaries are available for dialects, however, «отсутствие в большинстве диалектных словарей и атласов литературной лексики не позволяет выявить ареалы литературных слов и тем самым определить направление диалектных потоков в истории формирования литературного словаря» [3, 105].

2. Secondary material – texts. Due to the peculiarities of written speech, the syntax and frequency of words are significantly distorted.

3. Explanatory dictionaries. Already at this stage, words of different origins can be combined into one nest (for example, in Dahl's dictionary [7] «плефель» in the nest of «плева» [7, III, 124]). Incorrect interpretations of individual words may appear: for example, «быком пить (to drink as a bull)» – 'to drink from a large vessel' instead of ‘пить не отставляя сосуд (drinking without setting aside the vessel)’ in the Deulino Dictionary [25] (which is confirmed by the first example there, and by Dahl's dictionary, and by the personal experience of one of the authors of this article, a Ryazan citizen) or «стрёма» 'дворник (janitor)' instead of

'стража, сигнал об опасности (guards, a signal of danger)' in the project of »Dictionary of the Russian language of the XIX century« [10, 183–210]. There may also be insidious misspellings, as in the aforementioned Deulino dictionary – the loss of dots over *ě* in the article «седня» and erroneous phonetic entries with *'e* instead of *'o* in the articles «сегодня», «спонасёрдки», «серёд», «серёдка» (which is easy to see if you compare them with the headings of the articles – that is, these «phonetic records» were compiled post factum according to the spelling records and, apparently, gave rise to the legend of non-jo-speaking dialects in the Ryazan region). A number of other misprints in dictionaries are listed in [2, 18–21]

4. Bilingual dictionaries. At this stage, the words under study may have additional ambiguity, since words in different languages do not accurately correspond to each other. Moreover, dictionaries are incomplete for various reasons: for example, in a two-volume Latvian–Russian dictionary of 53,000 words [47] there is no such basic word as pauts 'egg' (a message from a native speaker: «now only old Latvians call bird eggs that way, the second meaning of «man's testicles (male genital area)» has become more popular» [34]). It should also be taken into account that in the bilingual dictionaries of ancient languages, vowels can have accents, lengths and tones not supported by written sources, without marking the conjecture. Further, this information can be distributed in etymological studies. A separate problem exists in Sanskrit dictionaries, where either a whole word or its stem can be represented, without the indication which is which. In addition, verbs are often given in a personal form, but are translated by an infinitive.

5. Etymological research (for example, on individual words of Slavic languages). At this stage, «lexical phantoms» – reconstructed words can get into scientific circulation (for example, «Old Church Slavonic» *крава* [29, 21], *краль* [31, XI, 86–87]), or correspondences based on a «description of the situation» (such as сидеть 'to sit' ~ ходить 'to walk', because they were supposed to mean «to move while sitting in a cart» [28, IV, 253]), or comparisons of concepts that are close only from the author's point of view (as in [4]: 'shirt' ~ 'to strike' ~ 'a pole to fix the fabric on a loom' [4, I, 112], 'sparse' ~ 'silver' ~ 'rare' ~ 'hole' ~ 'pierced' [4, I, 112], 'food' ~ 'pleasure' ~ 'oak with nutritious acorns' [4, I, 114], 'urine' ~ 'sour' ~ 'raw' [4, I, 172], 'pasture, dwelling' ~ 'curse' [4, I, 180], 'row, line' ~ 'entrance, passage' ~ 'suddenly' [4, I, 180]).

6. Etymological dictionaries (for example: [28]). At this stage, one dictionary can show etymologies that contradict each other (see, for example, the article «дождь (rain)» in Vasmer's dictionary [28, I, 521–522]). In addition, a reader of such dictionaries may perceive an illusion

about the proximity of certain languages to each other (in the case of Vasmer's dictionary, Slavic to Germanic) due to the peculiarities of the researcher's language background.

7. Macrocomparativistic studies. At this stage, random roots from different reconstructions of the previous level can be brought together, and such correspondences can again be based on the «description of the situation» according to the researcher's cultural intuition (for example: [1, 77] root П-39 «*Повивать, родильный, с земли, обрядно* (To nurse, maternity, from the motherland, ceremoniously)»: «the semantic focus here was the primordial ritual of raising a newborn child from the ground (= from the birthbed), which served as an act of recognizing him as similar to his parents and, accordingly, belonging to the genus and tribe»).

8. Macrocomparativistic dictionaries (for example, Altaic). Here, the results of the previous stage are supplemented by correspondences in a wide range of languages, possibly found by end-to-end computer search ignoring the morphology [69, 81].

9. Cultural studies. Additional bold conclusions are drawn here: if the concept did not get into the dictionary, then it did not exist, if it did, then it certainly was (even if it is an obvious derivative), and a general situation (which does not necessarily correspond to reality) is made up of fantastic «descriptions of situations».

10. Teaching. Among other things, there exist the issues of teachers' personal preferences and the peculiarities of their memory.

11. Finally, the most unreliable level is machine translation. In particular, at the time of writing this article, Google Translate website [43] translates non-existent (but etymologically plausible) «Lithuanian» words as follows: *vėninis* as 'marital', *veninis* as 'brother-in-law', and *šėivà* as 'daughter'.

In order to give this study more quality, it is necessary to fulfill the following conditions:

– Whenever possible, involve a «complete» dictionary of the language in question.

– Deliberately avoid materials beyond the 6th level (etymological dictionaries). Etymological dictionaries (and researches) should be used after monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. When using bilingual dictionaries (for example, Greek–Russian [8]), check them with other bilingual dictionaries (for example, Greek–English [49]).

– If possible, do not base reconstructions on reconstructions. At the level of written languages, it is already useful to break and rethink the nests (for example, Lat. *via* 'road' and 'strip on clothes', Rus. *до* 'before' and 'to'), and to even greater extent, this applies to deeper levels.

Therefore, when drawing up intermediate reconstructions (which will certainly be needed – at least Proto-Balto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-Iranian), they should be used only as a hint, and, if necessary, corrected. We need consistency between the reconstructions of PIE and all intermediate levels, but this does not mean subordination of the reconstruction of PIE to the reconstructions of intermediate levels.

– Try to write down the applied phonetic correspondences with lists of reliable examples.

– Instead of quadruple cognates (that are needed), write down a “septet of cognates” (Baltic, Slavic, Italic, Celtic, «Hellenic», Indo-Aryan, other Indo-Iranian). The septets provide additional statistics and a valuable resource: on their basis, in some cases, it is possible to postulate the equality of proto-forms, and through this – postulate rare sound laws, for which there are not enough reliable examples. For example, it cannot be excluded that PIE *ǵo > Lat. ge: Greek γομφίος ‘molar’ (< *ǵomb^h-i-os) ~ Lat. gemma (< *ǵomb^h-n-ā?) ‘gem, pearl’ (Skr. jámbha- ‘tooth’, Pashto žāma ‘jaw’, OCS зѣбѣ ‘tooth’, Lith. žaĩbas ‘blade’, Irish gop ‘beak’ (Gaul. *gobbo- > Old Fr. gobel, gobet ‘bit’) – full septet); Greek γόνυ ‘knee’ ~ Lat. genu (< *ǵonu) ‘knee’ (Skr. jānu ‘knee’, Persian zānu ‘knee’, Pol. zonaczyć ‘to incline’, there are no exact correspondences in Baltic and Celtic, only Lith. žniūgti ‘break’ < *žniugas ‘break, knee?’, Old Irish glin ‘knee’ < Proto-Celtic *gninos); Greek γονεύς ‘ancestor’ ~ Lat. genius (< *ǵoneus?) ‘the spirit of the genus’ (it is important that in Lat. there are no formations with gon- for this root at all; perhaps, here also Skr. jānukā ‘woman giving birth’, with less probability Skr. janu- ‘the soul’ (Brugmann’s law is not reflected: *o>ā in an open syllable), Rus. зоня ‘some byname’); possibly Greek γοάω ‘I groan’ ~ Lat. gemō (< *ǵomom?) ‘I groan’ (Rus. зыда ‘whining’, Slovene zum ‘buzzing’?). Apparently, this does not apply to *ko: Lat. callēre ‘to be or grow hard’ ~ Lit. šáltas ‘cold’.

– When deriving the meanings, the «description of the situation» is never used, but only the «closest common semantic ancestor», from which the meanings in the descendant languages are deduced.

– Try to write down morphological information (even among professional linguists, not many are able to remember about 200 Russian suffixes – see [18]). Knowing the morphology of a language well (and colloquial speech has a relatively free morphology [14, 27, 189]), we can find in it a word with the desired meaning indirectly. If in the reconstruction, instead of suffixes with a known function, some «root expanders» are used, this indicates problems in the reconstruction.

The process for reconstructing a given list of concepts (Swadesh list in our case):

1. Enter a column with the desired list of concepts. Further, while doing some other work, we can add other concepts, but we mark the concepts of Swadesh list separately.

2. Enter the quadruple cognates already found in our previous work [36, 183–200] in separate columns. (Since that publication, we added to words for *g-, *ǵ-, *g^w-, *g^h-, *ǵ^h-, *sg^h-, *sk the words for *u-, *b^h-, *d^h-, collected by the same method – a comparison of “complete” dictionaries.) There should be columns for PIE, Proto-Balto-Slavic, Italic, Celtic, Greek (with other «Hellenic»), Indo-Aryan and Iranian (with other Indo-Iranian languages).

3. In a separate table, compile the Proto-Balto-Slavic Swadesh list, using [50], [51], [47] and [25] (taking into account the personal knowledge and interviews with native speakers of Baltic languages, see above the information about the primary material). The table should contain the following columns: meaning, Baltic words, Slavic words, Proto-Balto-Slavic words, and also separate columns for cognates in other Indo-European branches. This list is corrected when it is necessary.

4. For each word found for Proto-Balto-Slavic Swadesh list, we include Indo-European etymologies (NB: not all Proto-Balto-Slavic words will give quadruple cognates).

5. In separate columns of the main table, enter the quadruple cognates found while compiling the Proto-Balto-Slavic Swadesh list (NB: not all such quadruple cognates have meanings from the Swadesh list, there are common Balto-Slavic innovations that just indicate the reality of Proto-Balto-Slavic [22]).

6. In a separate column, compile the Proto-Indo-Iranian Swadesh list using the electronic Sanskrit dictionaries [61; 62], Large Russian-Ossetian dictionary [5], Avestan Dictionary [56], Persian Dictionary [66] and Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages [30].

7. Try to fill in the gaps in Swadesh list for PIE, searching for Latin [55], Greek [8; 49], Celtic [15] and Balto-Slavic words corresponding to Proto-Indo-Iranian, starting with cases where the Proto-Balto-Slavic word already corresponds to the Proto-Indo-Iranian one.

8. Try to fill in more gaps on the basis of Latin and Greek, searching for cognates in other languages for them.

9. In the presence of any gaps at this point, use the etymological dictionaries: J. Pokorny [57]; R. Matasovic [40]; R. Beekes [38]; M. de Vaan [39]; J. Cheung [41]. In these works, the search for quadruple cognates was rarely made, but for the present study, such searches are mandatory for each case. It should be emphasized that up to this point, the study was mostly independent, but now it's time to verify the Proto-

Balto-Slavic Swadesh list using Sayenko's data [23, 139–148] and Rick Derksen's dictionary [37].

10. If some concepts could not be deduced, an attempt to find cognates for suitable words of any languages and, if unsuccessful, marks that the word could not be deduced. In the process of marking, we keep statistics on how many concepts have been reconstructed for 7, 6, 5 or 4 groups from 7 involved (Baltic, Slavic, Italic, Celtic, «Hellenic», Indo-Aryan, other Indo-Iranian).

Research results

The Swadesh list of 207 concepts for PIE has been completed under the given limitations.

Analyzing the Latin data, we have found the outcome of PIE *sm-as Latin sp-:

- *sparus* ‘a small kind of sea-bream’ ~ Gr. *σπαρίς* ‘*Sparus smaris*’.
- *spīrō* ‘I am inspirated’ ~ Gr. *φιλο-μμειδής* ‘smiling with pleasure’, OCS *смѣхъ* ‘laugh’, Ir. *sméitid* ‘nods, beckons, winks’.
- *spīcō* ‘I furnish with a sharp point’, *spīna* ‘thorn’ ~ Gr. *σμίλη* (ἰ) ‘knife; chisel’, *σμίλνός* ‘prong-hoe’.
- *spurcō* ‘I soil’ ~ Slovene *smrk* ‘snot’.
- *spargō* ‘I sprinkle’ ~ Rus. dial. *сморзати* ‘to blow one's nose with sound’.
- Old Fr. (14 c.) *spruce* ‘spruce’ ~ Ukr. *смерека* ‘spruce’, CS *смѣрчие* ‘conifer’.
- *spēs* ‘hope’ ~ OCS *смѣти* ‘to dare’ (NB not used with other prefixes, reconstructed as *smělъ(jь) ‘daring’ in EDSL [31, XXV, 18]).

Also with the assumption of s-mobile:

- *spectō* ‘I examine’ ~ Rus. dial. *смѣк* ‘wit’, *κυμέκατῆ* ‘to think’.
 - *spissus* ‘slow’ ~ OCS *мьдлостъ* ‘slowness’.
- The alternation *sm-/*m- in Greek seems to be an internal Greek development *sm > *mm > *m (abbreviations after [48, XXVII–XXIX]):
- *σμάραγδος* (Her., Plat.)/*μάραγδος* (μᾶ) (Men.) ‘emerald’.
 - *σμάριλη* (ἰ) (Arst.)/*μᾶριλη* (ἰ) (Arph., Arst.) ‘cinders, embers’.
 - *φιλο-μμειδής* ‘smiling with pleasure’ (Hom.)/*μμείδημα* ‘smile’ (Hes., Anth.).
 - *σμήρινθος*/μῆρινθος ‘thread’.
 - *σμίκρο-* (Ionic, Old Attic)/μῑκρο- ‘small’.
 - *σμίλαξ* (Poll., Theognost.)/Attic *μίλαξ* ‘yew’.
 - *σμοτός* (Theognost.)/μμοτός (H.) ‘difficult, fearful, hated, sad- or angry-looking’.
 - *ἔμμορα* pf. for *μμείρομαι* ‘to meet one's fate’.
 - *σμούδρος* (H.)/μῑδρος ‘red-hot iron’.

Dmitry M. Bystrov, Mikhail S. Yastrebov-Pestritskiy

- $\sigma\mu\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\nu$ (Arst.)/ $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\nu$ ‘mullet or eel’.
- $\sigma\mu\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$ (Arst.)/ $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$ ‘moray’.
- $\sigma\mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ (Archil.)/ $\mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ‘I salve, perfume’.
- $\sigma\mu\upsilon\rho\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ (Anth.) ‘of myrtle’/ $\mu\upsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$, Eur., Plut. $\mu\upsilon\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$, Doric $\mu\upsilon\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ (i) ‘myrtle’

– $\sigma\mu\tilde{\omega}\delta\acute{\iota}\xi$ (Hom.) ‘bruise’/ $\mu\tilde{\omega}\delta\acute{\iota}\xi$ (H.) ‘blood vessel, boil’

Because of the same authors on the both sides, this alternation depends of copyists, and any word written with μ - in Greek literature might reflect PIE *sm-.

Analyzing the Balto-Slavic data, we have found a law for s and š in Lithuanian (RUKI law operates completely in Proto-Balto-Slavic, including the endings, and contrary to [4, 130], in all 4 contexts (for example, Lith. $aušrà$ ‘dawn’, $maišas$ ‘bag’, $viršum̃$ ‘over’, $barkšóti$ ‘to stick up’)):

1) suffix -s (if it reveals synchronistically) is restored as -s regardless of the context;

2) final -š > -s, entailing the median -š- > -s- (including the satemic consonant š < č < k̑):

- *alkšniš > *alksnis: Lith. $alksnis$ ‘alder’;
- *āušiš > *āušis: Lith. $ausis$ ‘ear’ (but $aušúoti$ ‘to converse’);
- *auštiš (~ Rus. $ycmbe$ ‘estuary’) > *austis: Lith. $úostas$ ‘estuary’ (but $áušena$ ‘gawk’ ~ Rus. $ycma$ ‘lips, mouth’);
- *blušiš (~ Skr. $plúši$ - ‘flea’) > *blusis: Lith. $blusà$ ‘flea’;
- *bōbāušiš > *bōbāušis: Lith. $bobaūšis$ ‘ $\sigma\rho\rho\acute{o}\kappa$ (mushroom)’;
- *dāušuš (~ Old Rus. духъ ‘spirit’ with u-declension) > *dāušus: Lith. $daūsos$ ‘heaven’;
- *dušgiš > *dusgis: Lith. $duzgėti$ ‘to rumble (possibly, about rain)’;
- *gāušuš > *gāušus: Lith. $gausūs$ ‘numerous’;
- *gāušiš > *gāušis: Lith. $gaūšis$ ‘abundance’;
- *mušiš > *musis: Lith. $musis$ ‘fly’;
- *pušniš > *pusnis: Lith. $pusnis$ ‘snow-bank’;
- *teišuš > *teisus: Lith. $tiesūs$ ‘straight’;
- *wāišiuš > *wāišius: Lith. $vaišius/vaišius$ ‘fruit’;
- *wāiškuš > *wāiskus: Lith. $váiskus$ ‘transparent’;
- *weiwersiš > *weiwersis: Lith. $vieversỹs$ (OPr. $werwirsis$) ‘lark’;
- *wičiš (~ OCS вѣць ‘whole’) > *wišiš > *wisis: Lith. $vìsas$ ‘whole’.

Exception: $ašis$ ‘axis’ (however, formally it can be analyzed as regular $ašsis$ < * $aššiš$ < * $ačšiš$ < * $aksis$, cf. Lat. $axis$).

Hyperactivity: $sašsas$ ‘dry’ (between two “s”).

Might affect a median ž as well, but all the cases found are followed by a consonant: Lith. Añsk-upis (< *anžuš ‘narrow’), blizgùs ‘bright’ (but blyškùs ‘pale’ from blỹkšti ‘to pale’), burzdùs ‘spry’ and burzgùlis ‘ardent person’ (~ Rus. бóрзый/бóрзóй ‘mettlesome’), vañzdis ‘tube’, vizgùs ‘twistful’.

Notes on used PIE notation:

– cases and numbers are written as Nsg., Asg., Gsg., Dsg., Isg., Lsg., Ablsg., Vsg., also -du., -pl. Gender is written as m., f., n.

– Asg. ending is written as *-n (preserved in Gr.), unlike *-m in 1 sg. pres. of verbs (lost in Gr.).

– after | we show known stems of oblique cases and derivatives.

– *a is equal to *h₂e of Leiden notation. *ā is equal to *eh₂ of Leiden notation.

– unknown laryngeal is written as H. If a laryngeal is underlined, this means we put it in a place that differs from the one in the preceding research. We assume Skr. *HC > Ch syllable-initially: *plHtus > Skr. pṛthú- ‘wide’ ~ Gr. πλατύς; *Hsta- > Skr. asthāt aor. ‘stood’ ~ Gr. ἵστημι ‘stay’; *urh₂d- > Skr. vrhati (dh > h cf. rodhati = rohati ‘grows’) ‘root up’ ~ Gr. ῥίζα/Aeol. βρίζα ‘root’; *dhruHg- > Skr. druha- ‘son’ ~ Lat. fructus ‘gain’, Gr. τρῶφή ‘luxury (surfeit)’. This might depend of the type of laryngeal.

– we don’t reconstruct a synthetic laryngeal at the word onset if there is a vowel or a sonant.

– coarticulations are written with diacritical marks and superscript. However, a notation like *k^w does not imply that we reconstruct this as a phoneme, not as a sequence of two. This is not yet decided.

– a construction, written as *g^{wh}/*ǵ^{wh} by convention (as well as deducible combinations *g^hu/*ǵ^hu), gives different reflexes in Greek, most commonly θ. Specimen: θείνω ‘I hit, kill’ ~ Skr. hánti ‘hits, kills’ ~ YAv. jaiñti ‘kills’ ~ Lat. -fendō ‘I hit’ in offendō, defendō. θάνατος (ǵ) ‘death’ is also linked there. The presumed alternation pho/the (analogy to *k^w) does not hold in any root, neither in declension, nor in conjugation. The best covering of data is achieved with the assumption of dialectal difference: Attic θ, Doric χ, Aeolic φ, with later borrowings. Specimen: ὄρνις ‘bird’ (Gsg. ὄρνιθος/Dor. ὄρνιχος, Asg. ὄρνιθα/Dor. ὄρνιχα; Npl. ὄρνιθες/Dor. ὄρνιχες, Gpl. ὄρνεων/Dor. ὄρνιχων, Dpl. ὄρνισι/Dor. ὄρνισιν and ὄρνιχεςσι, Apl. ὄρνιθας). Other cases of φ and χ instead of θ: αὐχὴν/Aeol. Asg. ἄμφενα ‘neck’, ἐλάχυς/ἐλαφρός ‘small’, χωριαμός/φοριαμός ‘chest’, θερμός ‘warm’/Dor. χάρμα ‘martial heat’, θήρ/Aeol. φήρ ‘animal’, θλίβω/φλίβω (ῑ) ‘I press’, θλάω/φλάω/κλάω ‘I hit’, θνήσκω ‘I die’/ἔπεφον ‘I killed’. Possibly θυλλα (Hesych.,

Cretan?)/φύλλον ‘leaves’ (but [38] reconstructs *b^h). The case of νίφας ‘snow’/νίβα ‘winter’ (Hesych.) is likely a contamination with νέφος ‘cloud’.

– sonants are marked as syllabic only for explanation of specific forms.

– verbs are reconstructed in the form of 1 sg. pres. with -om or -mi (for athematic verbs). If only the suffixed forms are known, like -st- (Baltic), -d- (Slavic.), -i-, -n- (in any language), the form is not reconstructed, this is a subject for separate research.

– stress is not reconstructed here.

– reconstructions already known are not commented. New cognates are added to them with NB.

Swadesh list:

1. ‘I’ = *eǵ [45: Vol. 4, p. 5–13], Asg. *(h₁)mēm, Gsg. *(h₁)mene?

2. ‘you (sg.)’ = *tuH, Asg. *tēm, Gsg. teue.

3. ‘he’ = *eis|i-|*es- (see more in № 7. ‘this’).

4. ‘we’ = Npl. *mes, Apl. *nōs, Gpl. *nos?, Ndu. *uē (oblique cases use stem *nō-: OCS Adu. на, Gr. νόϊ ‘us (Adu.)’, OCS GLdu. наю, Av. Gdu. nā, Gr. νόϊν ‘us (GDdu.)’). Npl. *mes: OCS мы ‘we’ (mixture of Npl. + Apl. *mes is kept in Slovene mé (f. n., but mí m.) and in the ending of Old Cz. buděme (also buděmy), Rusyn бyдeмe, Ukr. бyдeмo, Serb.-Cr. бyдeмo), Lith. mēs ‘we’, Lat. Memmius (Roman gens), Gr. Aeol. ἄμμες (< *ḡs-mes) ‘we’, Skr. asmān, Av. ahma (< *ḡs-me-) ‘us (Apl.)’, Oss. мах ‘we’. Also used in 1 pl. pres. of verbs: OCS -мь, Lith. -me, Old Lat. -mos, OIr. -mi/mai, Gr. Dor. -μες, Skr. -mas, Av. -ma. Apl. *nōs: OCS ны, Lat. nōs (also used in Npl.), Gr. epic νό (Adu. or Apl.? see above the form of Adu.), Skr. nās, Av. nā ‘us (Apl.)’. Gpl. *nos?: Lat. nostrum ‘us (Gpl.)’, OIr. -nn (< *(s)nos? [39, 413]) ‘us’, Skr. nas, Av. nō ‘us (Gpl.)’. Ndu. *uē: OCS вѣ (< *uē), Lith. vėdu (< *uē) ‘we two’, Lat. «nec, quod fuimusve sumusve, eras erimus» ‘that we were before and became, we shall not be tomorrow’ (Lat. -ve ‘or’ is used after the second word of a copula, so the first ve (< *uē) is more likely ‘we’, not ‘or’), Gr. ἡμεῖς (< *uē-me-), Skr. vām, Av. vā.

5. ‘you (Npl.)’ = *iū (Apl. *uōs): Polab. jai ‘you (Npl.)’ (regular i > ai, also indirectly confirmed by «и иже како люди мыслѣте» of the OCS alphabet) (OCS, Old Rus. NApI. вы), Lith. jūs ‘you (Npl.)’ (Apl. jùs, but OPr. Apl. wans by noun declension), Lat. iō ‘look!’, Welsh ych ‘your’, Gr. ὑμῶν (Apl. ὑμᾶς/ὑμεῖων/ὑμέων/ὑμῶν/ὑμμέων/οὐμίων/ὑμμε), Skr. yūyám (AGDpl. vas), Av. yūžəm ‘you (Npl.)’ (Apl. vā).

6. ‘they’ = *eii m., iai? f., iō? n.: OCS Npl. of full adjectives -и m. (< *cii?), -ѧ f. (< *iai? cf. Gsg. земля and Gsg. жены), -ia n. (< *iō?), Lith.

jiē m. (< *eii?), dial. jaĩ f. (< two-syllabled *iai?), Old Lat. eĩ m. (< *eii?), eae f. (< *iai?), Osc. ioc (Umbr. eu/eo) n. (< *iō?), OIr. é ‘they’ (< *eii?), Gr. εἶεν ‘let it be!’, εἶᾶ ‘let’s!’ (cf. meaning with Rus. *он/она/оно/они-мо(с)ь* ‘let it be!’ from ‘he/she/it/they’+‘just’(+‘self’), about *εν* see № 7. ‘this’), Zazaki ē ‘they’ (< *eii? but Skr. imé m., imás f., imá(ni) n. = Av. ime m., imā f., imā n., stem from Asg. *in > *im).

7. ‘this’ = *eis (*iā f., *iod n.) ‘this one, he’ and *kís (*kiā f., *kíod² n.) ‘this here’:

*eis m. (Asg. *in, Gsg. *es?, Dsg. *iōi?, Lsg. *esiei?):

Nsg. *eis: OCS и ‘that (m.)’ (also used in Asg.), Sudovian es ‘he’ (Lith. jis < *i-), Old Lat. eis ‘this, that, he’ (Osc. izik, Umbr. erek < *eis-ke, with Osc.-Umbr. pronominal *ke), OIr. (h)é ‘he’, Skr. ayám (Av. aiiām)³ ‘this (m.)’. – Asg. *in: Lith. jĩ, Old Lat. im ‘him’, Gr. ἴν⁴ ‘him’, Skr. imám, Av. iməm ‘this (Asg. m.)’. – Gsg. *es?: OCS ѣго (Proto-Slav. *e-go, cf. the particle in Lith. dial. tũgu ‘you’ and Venet. meço Asg. ‘me’; OCS чесо ‘what (Gsg.)’ (but Old Polish czso [64: V. 1, p. 317, 395; V. 6, p. 119]) < *keses < *kwi- ‘what’ + *es + *es?), Lith. esã: «Jis, esã, nežinaš» ‘he, by his words, doesn’t know’, Osc. eiseis (< *es + *es?), Umbr. ererek (< *es + *es + Osc.-Umbr. pronominal *ke?) ‘this, that, him (Gsg.)’, Gr. εός ‘his (own), one’s (m.f.)’ (< *es + *es? aspiration after ὄς ‘this’), Skr. asyá (Av. ahiia, axiiaça, ahe, aṅhe) ‘this (Gsg.)’ (with -yám and noun declension?) or ~ Gr. epic oío ‘this (Gsg.)’ < *es + *io ≠ лит. jō ‘him’). – Dsg. *iōi: OCS ѣмоу ‘to him’ (with DLlsg. extension -m-, -ōi > -oy cf. Gsg. of -o-declension: OCS -oy, Lith. -ui, Lat. -ō, Gr. -ōya), Lat. eĩ ‘to him/her/it (m.f.n.)’, Gr. ἰῶ ‘to one (m. or n.)’, but Gr. praep. cum dat. ὀμῆ ‘to’, Skr. asmái (Av. ahmāi) ‘to this’ from the stem of Gsg. (with DLabls. extension -m-). – Lsg. *esiei?: OCS ece ‘here is’, Osc. eisei/eizeic ‘in him’, Gr. εἰ (epic-Dor. αἰ) ‘if < in this’ [42, 7], Av. ahmī (Skr. asmín) ‘in this (m.)’ (with DLabls. extension -m-).

*iā f. (Asg. *ian, Gsg. *iās?, Dsg. *iai?):

Nsg. *iā: OCS, Old Rus. ја ‘that (f.), she’, Lat. ea ‘this, that, she’ (Osc. iiuk/ioc < *iā-ke?), Gaul. eia ‘she’, Gr. ἡ/μία ‘one (f.)’, Skr. yā ‘which (f.)’ (Av. yā [31, VIII, 204]): yā yā ‘whatever woman’, iyám (Av. im) ‘this (f.)’. – Asg. *ian: OCS ѣх ‘that (Asg. f.)’ (Rus. dial. ю ‘her

¹ Also eeis/eīs (by III noun declension), Osc. e)isai (from the stem of Gsg.), Osc. iusc (?).

² For n. -od cf. also n. *k*od ‘who’, *dod ‘when’.

³ < *ei-, extension *-Hem cf. in Skr. tvám ‘you’, ahám ‘I’ (Av. azəm), also here ai-šamas ‘this year’ and esá-, etá- (Av. aēša, aētat) ‘that’ [42, 21–28].

⁴ Cyp. ἰν, Ion. μῖν (ἴ), Dor.-Att. víν (ἴ) (< *in, reduplication as in Lat. Asg. emem [42, 10]). Possibly, also here éν ‘at that time’ (< *in with augment *e-, as in ἐκείνογ/κεῖνογ ‘that?’) – this contraction is known for εἰν in other meanings.

(Asg.)), Lith. *jā*, Latg. *jū* ‘her (Asg.)’, Lat. *eam* (< *ian, but Osc. *iak* < *ian-ke?) ‘this, that, her’, Gr. *ἑαυ* ‘one (Asg. f.)’, Skr. *imām* (stem from Asg. m. *in > *im). – Gsg. *iās?: Cz. *jí* ‘of which (possessive)’ (< *ji (*jy) < Proto-Balto-Slav. *iōs, but Slovene *njé* ‘her (Gsg.)’ < *iai by noun declension from *iā, OCS *-ѣа* ‘that (Gsg. f.)’ < Gsg m. *es + idem), Lith. *jōs*, Gr. *ἑἷς* ‘one (Gsg. f.)’, Skr. *asyās* ‘this (Gsg. f.)’ (*es or Gsg. m.), Gsg. f. ending *-ā-yās*, but Lat. *eius* ‘him, her, it (Gsg. m.f.n.)’? Umbr. *erar* ‘her’ from Gsg. m. – Dsg. *iai?: OCS *ѣи* ‘to that (f.)’ (Rus. *eŭ* ‘to her’), Lith. *jái*, Lat. *eae* ‘to this, that, her’, Gr. *ἑἷ* ‘to one (f.)’, Skr. *asyái* ‘to this (f.)’ (*es from Gsg. m.).

*iod n. (in oblique cases *id⁻¹):

OCS *я* ‘that (n.)’ (also used in Asg.), Lith. *jì* ‘she’ (< Asg. *id, Lith. generally does not use n.), Lat. *id* ‘this (n.)’ (< *id, Asg. m. eum, Umbr. eu < *iod-n?, Osc. *ionc* < *iod-ke?), OIr. (h)ed ‘it’ (Manx *í* ‘she’ [45, Vol 4, p. 10]), Gr. *ióv* ‘one (Asg. m. or n.)’ (< *iod-n?), Skr. *yád* ‘which, that’ (Av. *yaṭ* [31, issue 8, c. 204]), *idám* n. ‘this’ (< *id-, Asg. *idám*; but Av. Nsg. *imat*² from *iod? for -d > -ṭ cf. ablative *ahmāt*).

*kís m., *kiā f. (in oblique cases *kia-?), *kiod? n. (in oblique cases *kid-):

OCS *съ* m. (< *kís), *си* f. (< *kiā), *се* n. (< *kiod?), Lith. *šis* ‘this’, Lat. *cis* ‘from this side’, OIr. (ogham) *ci* (Lsg. *coi*) ‘this’, Gr. Cypr. *κιδνόν* (< *kid (n.) + -n- [38]) ‘here’, Skr. *śiṣṭa-* ‘remaining’ (~ *stha-* ‘staying’, cf. № 125. ‘to stand’).

8. ‘that’ = *au- (Nsg. *so, Asg. *tom ‘that’ is only reflexed in Indo-Iranian and Greek, the roots are used separately in Celt. and Lat., *so in Balto-Slavic only appears in OCS *самъ* ‘self?’): OCS *овъ* ‘that’, Lith. *avà* ‘there’, Lat. *autem* ‘on other side’, OIr. *úa* ‘from’, Gr. *αὐτός* ‘that same’, Skr. *avōṣ* ‘those two’, Av. *ava* ‘that’.

9. ‘here’ = *id^he: OCS *идеже* ‘where (relative)’, Umbr. *ife* (Lat. *ibī*) ‘there’, Gr. *iθός* ‘immediately’ (cf. meaning of Rus. *мѹм* ‘here; immediately’), Pali *idha* (Skr. *ihá*), Av. *iḏā* ‘here’.

10. ‘there’ = *an: OCS *оноуде* ‘there’, Lat. *an*, Gr. *ἄν* (*ā*) ‘maybe’ (cf. meaning of Rus. *там* ‘there; (enclitic) maybe’), Gaul. *antom*, Skr. *ánta-* ‘border’, Skr. *aná*, Av. *anā* ‘through this’, Pers. *ânjā* ‘there’.

11. ‘who’ = *k^wos m., *k^wā f., *k^wod n. (cf. forms with № 7. ‘this’), also ‘which’: OCS *къто* ‘who’ (*кѹижьдо* m., *каѹажьдо* f., *коѹежьдо* n. ‘every’), Lith. *kas* ‘who, what’, Umbr. *poi* (Lat. *quī*) ‘who (m.)’, Osc. *pai*

¹ For n. the use of Asg. instead of Nsg. is likely, and also Nsg. n. instead of Asg. m., as equally showing the inactivity.

² For the propagation of im- stem from Asg. *in m. cf. Asg. *imām* f. (Av. *imam*), Npl. *imé* m., *imás* f., *imá(ni)* n. (Av. *ime* m., *imā* f., *imā* n.).

(Lat. quae) ‘who (f.)’, pod (Lat. quod) ‘who (n.)’, OIr. nech (< *nek^{wos}) ‘someone’, Gr. ποῖος (Ion. κοῖος) ‘which, who, what’, Skr. kás, Av. kē ‘who’.

12. ‘what’ = *k^{wi}-.

13. ‘where’ = *k^{wu}-.

14. ‘when’ = *dos, *dā, *dod? (cf. forms with № 7. ‘this’), often with *k^wo- ‘which’: Rus. dial. *мо(з)д́а/мо(з)д́ы/мо(з)д́е/мозду́* ‘then’, OCS *къгда/когда*; Slovene *kedaj* (Rus. dial. *кодáú*); Slovak *kedy* (Rus. dial. *козды́*), Lith. *kada* ‘when’, Lat. dum ‘whiles’ (quan-dō ‘when’ < *dod?), Gr. epic *δηθά* ‘for a long time (=when + from)’, Dor. οὐ δᾶν! ‘no, I swear! (=no + when)’, Skr. *kadá* ‘when’ (*ekadā* ‘once’, *sadā* ‘always’), Oss. *кад* ‘when’.

15. ‘how’ = *k^{wid} и *k^{wod} (ablatives (-d) from *k^{wi}- ‘what’ and *k^{wos} ‘who’), various constructions of ‘from + what/who’ are also used:

– *k^{wid}: OCS *что* ‘why’, Latv. *cik* ‘how’, Lat. *quid* ‘why’ (NB in Lat. this ablative of *k^{wi}- ‘what’ has been substituted by *quō* (ablative of *k^{wos} ‘who’), there is also a mixture of *k^{wid} + *k^{wos}: *quis* ‘who’), Welsh *py* ‘how’, Gr. *τί* (ἵ) ‘why’, Oss. *куыд* ‘how’ (~ Skr. *kim* ‘how; why; interrogative particle?’).

– *k^{wod}: Rus. dial. *ик* ‘how’ (*и* ‘and’), Latv. *ka* ‘how’, Lat. *quod* ‘how’, Gr. *ποῦ* (Ion. *κοῦ*) ‘how’, Skr. *kam/kad* ‘interrogative particle’.

– using *ā ‘from’ (Skr. *ā*- ‘from’) *in preposition*: OCS *какъ* (Pol. *jak*)/*акы/како* (Pol. *jako*) ‘how’ (такъ ‘so’, *инакъ* ‘otherwise’), Lith. *kóks n.*, *kokià f.* ‘which’ (*tóks* ‘like that’, *šióks* ‘like this’); *in postposition*: Slovene *kà* ‘as; when; perhaps’, Latv. *kā* ‘how’, Lat. *quā* ‘how’, Welsh *pa* ‘how’, Gr. *πῆ/πῆ* (Dor. *πᾶ/πᾶ*, Ion. *κῆ/κῆ*) ‘how’, Skr. *kā* ‘interrogative particle’.

– using *d^{hen} ‘from’ (Gr. -θε(v) – partitive and genitive suffix): Lith. *kàd* ‘if’, Lat. *quīdum* ‘how’, Gr. *πόθεν*/Ion. *κόθεν* ‘how’, Skr. *kathám* ‘how’.

16. ‘not’ = *ne|*n-.

17. ‘all’ = *uikis: OCS *всь* ‘every’, Lith. *visi* ‘all’ (Npl. of *visas* ‘whole’, see above about š > s), Lat. *vīcēnī* ‘20’ (not derivable from *duidekm-, derivable from ‘all (fingers)’), Gr. *ἵκτᾶρ* ‘together’, Skr. *vísva-*, Av. *vīspa* ‘all’.

18. ‘many’ = *plHus|*polH-: OCS *плькъ*, Lith. *pułkas* ‘crowd’, Rus. *пльнь/половодье* ‘flood’, Lat. *plūs* ‘more’, OIr. *il* ‘much’, Gr. *πολύς* ‘much, many’, *πλοῦτος* ‘wealth’, Skr. *puru-* ‘many’, Av. *pouru* ‘much, many, full’. Also used is *uel-|*ul- ‘much’: OCS *велии* ‘big’, *вельми* ‘very’, Latv. *un kā vēl* ‘and how!’, OPr. *walnennien* ‘the better’, Lat. *ultimus* ‘largest, highest’, *vēlōx* ‘fast’ (*uellōks, *lok- ‘fast’: Spanish *loco*

‘impetuous’, Bologna (Modena) loc ‘fast’, Lith. lakùs ‘fast’, see № 120. ‘to fly’), MWelsh gwell ‘better’, Gr. ἄλις (*-l̥-) ‘enough’, Skr. vardhati ‘grows’.

19. ‘some’ = *li: OCS љѣико ‘how many’ (Old Polish ile/jele), Lith. keli ‘some; how many?’ Lat. aliquī ‘some’ (quī ‘how’), πηλίκος (ῖ) ‘what size’ (πῆ ‘how’), Skr. li- m. ‘sameness’.

20. ‘few’ = *men-|mn-: Rus. dial. μένε/мнеῦ ‘less’, Lith. menkavėrtis ‘of little value’, Lat. minor ‘less’, Osc. mennum ‘to lessen’, MĪr. menb (< *menwos) ‘small’, Gr. μᾶνός ‘rare’, μειώνως ‘too few’ (dissimilation of n-n, as in ἀνχὴν ‘neck’, ἦτρον ‘belly’, ἔν-διον ‘noon’), Skr. manāk ‘a little’, Oss. mængæj ‘few, small’.

21. ‘other’ = *alios: Cz. ale, Rus. dial. алé ‘but’ (formed as an adverb from ‘other’), Lith. aliáí ‘every’, Lat. alius, OIr. aile/oile/eile (Gaul. allos), Gr. ἄλλος/ἄλλος ‘other’, Skr. aryamán m. ‘a bosom friend’ (cf. meaning with OCS другъ ‘other; friend’), Oss. æsægælon ‘alien’ (æsaæg ‘true’ + *arjana- ‘alien’) [30, I, 223]. (Skr. anyá-, Av. ania- ‘other’ – contamination with *antr- ‘other’ < *an- ‘there, on the other side’: Skr. ántara- ‘different from’, Av. antara, Oss. æндæp, Lith. aňtras, Latv. otrs, OPr. antars, antrā, anters ‘other’; contamination to the other side: Lat. alter ‘other’.)

22. ‘one’ = *oinos m., *oinā f.: Slovene èn, êna, Rus. dial. ённый, Pol. jany, OPr. ains, Sudovian ans, Old Lat. oinos (Osc. uinus), OIr. oén (Welsh un) ‘one’, Gr. οἶνη ‘the ace on a die’, Skr. ena-, MPers. ên ‘this’. Other formations from *oi- ‘only?’: οἶος ‘only, single’, Skr. éka- ‘one’, éva- ‘alone, only’, Av. aēuaa ‘one’. (Old Rus. инии ‘he; one’, Lith. jinaĩ ‘she’ are from № 7. ‘this’ = *ei-.)

23. ‘two’ = *duoH|*duH-.

24. ‘three’ = *treies|*tri-.

25. ‘four’ = *k^wetuore|*k^wetur-: OCS четыре, Rus. четы́ре, Lith. keturi, Lat. quattuor, OIr. cethair, Gr. τέσσαρες/τέτταρες/Ion. τέσσερες/Dor. τέτορες/Lesb. πέσ(σ)ορες/Aeol. πίσυρες (but PIE *-es > Gr. -ος!), Skr. catur (m. pl. catvárah), Av. caθβar, caθβārō.

26. ‘five’ = *penk^we.

27. ‘big’ = *megH-/*mgH-: Rus. dial. μέστο ‘wealth’, музлάν ‘peasant’ (< *mgH-n-, OCS мжжъ ‘man’ with the affiliation suffix -i-), Old Lith. mėzliava ‘pooling’, Lat. ingēns/magnus, OIr. maige, Gr. μέγας, Skr. mahā-, Av. maza ‘big’. See also *uel-|*ul- ‘much’ in № 18.

28. ‘long’ = *dlHgh^hos.

29. ‘wide’ = *plHtus.

30. ‘thick’ = *b^heng^h-|*b^hng^h-: Rus. dial. бузлάν ‘big healthy man’, Lith. būožė ‘knob’, Lat. fungus ‘mushroom’ (pinguis ‘fat’ contains

an irregular p), Welsh bwr ‘fat, strong, big’, Gr. παχύς ‘thick’, Skr. bahú- ‘large’, Av. bāzah- ‘thickness’ (Oss. бæзджын ‘thick (of a book)’). Also used is *taūk-: Old Pol. tuczicz ‘to make thick’, Lith. taukùs ‘thick’, Lat. tūc(c)ētum ‘some made-up savoury dish’, Ir. tón ‘buttock’ (*tūknā-), Gr. τυκτά ‘royal feast’, Skr. tokma ‘cloud’.

31. ‘heavy’ = *g^{wr}H- (cf. № 156. ‘stone’).

32. ‘small’ = *men-|*mn- (cf. № 20. ‘few’). Also used is *moǵ-: Bulg. мѡзак ‘a delicate creature, for ex., a child, a lamb etc.’, Lith. māžas ‘small’, OIr. mug, Corn. maw ‘servant’, Gr. μογοσ-τόκος ‘speeding the birth’, Skr. maj- ‘under’.

33. ‘short’ = *mrǵ^hus: Rus. мерзѡвчик ‘the smallest measure for vodka’, мерзѡч (<*мерзѡч?) ‘small perch, small fish’, мервѡ (<*мерзѡ?) ‘small tailings of flax scutching’, Lith. išbrizga ‘clout, rag’ (contaminated with brīgzi (brīzga, brīzgo) ‘to frazzle’), Lat. brevis, Gr. βρᾶχύς ‘short’, Skr. mūhu/mūhur (<*mūrhu-?) ‘suddenly, in a moment’ (cf. meaning of English *shortly*), Av. mərəzu- (Oss. морз) ‘short’.

34. ‘narrow’ = *ang^hus (~ № 130. ‘to squeeze’).

35. ‘thin’ = *tenHus|*tnHu-.

36. ‘woman’ = *g^{wen}Hs|*g^{wne}H-: NB Lat. Venus.

37. ‘man (adult male)’ = *uirHos: NB Rus. dial. «мой миленок, вирьвирьѡнок», верверьѡнок ‘beloved man’.

38. ‘human’ = *h₁leuH^his: OCS людьскъ ‘human (adj.)’, OPr. ludis ‘master of the house’ (Latv. ļaudis ‘people’), Old Lat. loeber ‘free man’ (irregular oe), Old Welsh luidt ‘tribe, lineage, family’ (Old Corn. leid ‘descendants’), Gr. ἐλεύθερος ‘free (man)’, YAv. huraoða- ‘beautiful (of men and gods)’ (hu- ‘good’).

Also used is *ǵ^hen-|*ǵ^hn-: Latv. zēns ‘boy’, Skr. jana- m. ‘man, person’, Gr. ἀγηνία (ἄ): ὀμμάτων ἐν ἀγηνίαις (Aesch.) ‘(of a statue) in unseeing eyes (=unhuman)’, Old Lat. hemo, Gsg. hemōnis ‘human’, Rus. dial. зѡма «countryman», an invocation, Old Lith. žmuo ‘human’, Lith. žmōnēs ‘people’, OPr. smunents ‘human’, smoy ‘man’, Gpl. smūni, Rus. dial. (Vologda) змѡвыны, Pol. zmōwiny ‘match-making (not an engagement!)’, Slovene zmikati ‘to draw in’, Pol. zmykany ‘kind of dance’, Rus. dial. (Smolensk) «сама змычет – не попова дочка (she keeps company with men(?), she is not from a priest’s family)» [24, XXI, 34] (*zmykъ cf. камыкъ ‘stone’).

39. ‘child’ = *uoīkos: OCS чловѣкъ ‘man’ (Rus. dial. вѡкша ‘single woman, never married’), Lith. vaikas ‘child’ (Latv. vaiks ‘boy’, Npl. vaiki ‘children’, OPr. wayklis ‘son’), Lat. uxor/uxor ‘wife’ (regular ū <*oi, regular orthography uo (wu) [17, 58], -sor cf. in soror <*suesor- ‘sister’), Gr. οικεύς ‘servant’, Skr. vekāṭa- ‘youth’.

40. 'wife' = *koiuā? (from 'beloved woman'): Rus. *посевное полотёнце* 'in a wedding rite: a towel, bride's mother moves it around the heads of the newly weds, saying «Сей ленок, будет платок»' [24, XXX, 145], «*Ну будь моя супруга севёчная и праведная*» [24, XXXVII, 104] ('be my wife of (*севка*)s and pious'), *сиволан* 'clumsy, rude man' [7, IV, art. 145] ('(*сева*)'s toucher' from *лأنать* 'to touch'), Bulg. *севдá* 'love' [6, 156] (Slav. -ьд < *-id '-ing'), Pol. *Matka Boska Siewna* '8th of September' [63, 127–128] ('Our Lady of (*siewa*)s'), Latv. *sieva* 'wife', лат. *coitus* 'sexual intercourse' (-oi- not from verb *kci- (regular outcome of *oi is ū), might be from *koiuā + itus), MWelsh *cu* 'beloved' (Corn. *cuf*), Gr. *κῆδευμα* 'relation (by wife)' (-id '-ing' cf. *севдá*), *śéva* 'the male organ' (cf. Rus. *женілка* 'the male organ' from *женіть* 'to marry (him to her)'). Other formations from the same verb: Rus. «*друг мой сѣтный*» 'my dear friend', Old Lat. *ceivis* 'friendly inhabitant', Skr. *śéva-* 'dear'. Also the word for 'woman' (№ 36) is used for 'wife'.

41. 'husband' = *potis (also 'lord'): NB Welsh *udd* 'lord'.

42. 'mother' = *mātēr|*mātr-.

43. 'father' = *pHtēr|*pHtr-: Lat. *pater* (Gsg. *patris*) 'father' (Osc. *patir*), Ir. *aite* 'tutor', Gr. *πάτήρ* (Gsg. *πάτρός / πατέρος*) 'father', Skr. *pitā* (Dsg. *pitṛé*), Av. *ptā* (Oss. *фьд*, Old Pers. *pitā*), 'father'. Proto-Balto-Slavic *ptē gives *tē in most languages, suffixed and reduplicated forms are used: Rus. dial. *méku* 'uncle, mother's brother', Rus. dial. *тетя́й* 'father in wedding rite', Lith. *tėtė*, Latv. *tētis* 'father', OPr. *thetis* 'grandfather'. Some of these forms (except for OPr., where *ptē-ptē corresponds to the meaning 'father's father') might be connected to Skr. *tātā* 'father', but it corresponds to Rus. *máma* 'father', Cf. Rus. dial. *стёвушка* 'father-in-law', *стёвы́й* 'father-in-law's'. A common origin is possible for Old Rus. *тъсть* 'wife's father' (from a dialect with *pt > st, cf. Old Rus., Serb. *нестера* 'niece' ~ Cz. *neteř* 'niece') and Rus. dial. *тётка* 'husband's father'. Also reflected is *pHtrui- 'father's brother': Rus. *стры́й/строй* 'father's brother', Skr. *pitṛvā* 'father's brother' (Baltic words without -r-: Lith. *tėvas*, Latv. *tēvs*, Sudovian *tews* 'father', OPr. *thewis* 'father's brother', *tāws* 'father' are also traced from *(p)tē + *aγos 'ancestor' [35, 29]).

44. 'animal' = *ǵʰuēr|*ǵʰuer-: OCS *звѣрь*, Lith. *žvėris*, Lat. *fera* 'wild animal', Mlr. *geir* (d) < *gwered- (MWelsh *gwer*) 'animal fat, tallow', Gr. *θήρ/Aeol. φήρ* 'beast', Skr. *hūrava* 'jackal'.

45. 'fish' = *perkā: Rus. *пéречень* 'small bream', Pol. dial. *perk* 'Baltic herring', Lith. *peřpelė* 'пузанок, fish *Alosa fallax*', Lat. *perca* 'perch', Ir. *earc* 'salmon', Gr. *πέρκη* 'perch', Skr. *parkaṭa* 'heron' (*perkā + *atti* 'eater', cf. Rus. dial. *рыбоѣд* 'heron' (literally 'fish-eater'), cf. tt shortening in *páttram* > *pátram* 'wing, feather'), Yazghulami *púrgi zənéç*

‘bot. bladder fern (< fish’s swimming-bladder)’ ([30. VI, 173] shows ‘mouse’s swimming-bladder’, that does not make sense), Pers. pul ‘fish scales’?

46. ‘bird’ = *auis (*h₂euis for Old Arm. haw ‘bird; hen’).

47. ‘dog’ = *kuōn|*kuon- (Gsg. *kunes). NB Rus. dial. *сби* ‘word for calling dogs’, Rus. *свора* ‘pack of dogs’, *сйка* ‘bitch’.

48. ‘louse’ = *utis: Old Rus. *въшь* (diminutive of **вѣтъ*), Lith. *utis*, Lat. *tinea* ‘louse’ (*ut- with the singleness suffix *-īn), Gr. *ύσσωπος* ‘hyssop’ (used against vermins), Skr. *utkuṇa-* ‘louse’.

49. ‘snake’ = *neHg-|*nHg-: Skr. *nāgá-/áhi-* (Av. *aži-*) ‘snake’, OIr. *nathir* ‘snake’/esc-ong ‘eel’, Old Rus. *ужь* ‘snake’ (пол. *wąż*), Lith. *angis* ‘vipér’, Lat. *anguis* ‘snake’, Gr. *ἔχις* ‘vipér’ and *ὄφις* ‘snake’ (the latter with suffix -ῦ-, thus another colouring of *n and φ < *g^hϣ, see above on *g^{wh}/*g^{wh}).

50. ‘worm’ = *kerm-|*krm-: Slovene *čm*, Lith. *kirmis/kiřmis* ‘worm’, Lat. *cirrus* ‘tentacle (of polyps)’, OIr. *cruim* ‘worm, maggot’, Gr. *κεραία* ‘tentacle’, Skr. *křmi-*, Pers. *kerm* (Oss. *калм*) ‘worm’.

51. ‘tree’ = *uer-: Rus. *верѣга* ‘long thick pole’, *верейка* ‘pole of distaff’, Latv. *vēris* ‘big forest’, Lat. *verū* ‘javelin’, MWelsh *gwern* ‘alder, mast of a ship’, Gr. *ἔρμα* ‘pole’, Skr. *varaṇa-*, Av. *varaša, urvarā*, Oss. *бæлас* ‘tree’. Also *doru|*dreu- ‘wood’: Rus. *дор* ‘roofing lath’, Latv. *dārna* ‘resin’, Welsh *derwen* ‘oak’, Gr. *δῶρυ/δρῦς* ‘tree’, Skr. *dāru* ‘wood’, drú ‘tree, branch’, Av. *dāuru* ‘wood’. Hence the name of squirrel (Rus. *вѣверица*, OPr. *weware*, Welsh *wywer*, Pers. *varvarah*).

52. ‘forest’ = *uen-: Rus. *венок/венец* ‘one row of logs in a framework’, Slovene *venéti* ‘to be green’, Lith. *pavénis* ‘refuge from sun’, Lat. *vēnor* ‘to hunt’ (cf. the meaning of Latv. *mežs* ‘forest’, *medīt* ‘to hunt’), MIr. *fian* ‘band of warriors’ (Proto-Celtic **wēnā*), Gr. *εινοσί-φυλλος* ‘wooded’, Skr. *vána-* ‘forest’, Av. *vanā* ‘tree’.

53. ‘stick’ = *uerHb^h-|*urHb^h-: Rus. *верба* ‘pussey-willow’, Lith. *viřbas* ‘twig’, Lat. *verbēna* ‘a leafy branch of an aromatic tree’, Gr. *ῥάβδος* (< **urHb^h-i-os*) ‘stick’, Skr. *vāribhava-* ‘kind of plant’.

54. ‘fruit’ = *māl- (*maHl- for Hitt. *maḥla* ‘grape-vine’): Rus. *малина* ‘raspberry’, dial. *strawberry* (альтернативная праформа и второе значение русского слова). Lith. *moliūgas* ‘pumpkin’, Lat. *mālum* ‘apple, pear’, Gr. *μαλον/μηλον* ‘apple, lemon’, Skr. *nirāmālu-* ‘wood apple’ (*nīra-juice*), Yazghulami *mawn* ‘apple’ (< **m ālnā*).

55. ‘seed’ = *seHmn: OCS *сѣмя*, OPr. *semen*, Lat. *sēmen*, MIr. *seimed* ‘seed’, Gr. *ἥμερα* ‘crops’, Skr. *sāmagrya* ‘reserves’ (*agrya-* ‘roof’), *sāman* ‘wealth’ > *sāmanta-* ‘leader’, Pers. *hāmat* ‘the chief of a people, family, or tribe’.

56. 'leaf' = *b^hol-: Rus. dial. *болобо́лки* 'a kind of water-lily', Lith. *balānas* 'sod', Lat. *folium*, MlR. *bileóc* (< *bheljo-) 'leaf', Gr. *φολίς* 'scales', *φύλλον* 'leaf', Skr. *bharita-* 'green' (*bhariṇī* 'green colour'), Pers. *bar* 'leaf'.

57. 'root' = *kor-|*ker-: OCS *корень*, Lith. *kėras* 'root', Lat. *cornū*, MWelsh *carn* 'hoof', Gr. *κόρσεον* 'root of lotus', Skr. *caraṇa* 'root', Yazghulami *čərmúk* 'part of a spinning loom – pegs on the end of the frame, where the rope is attached' [30: V. 2, p. 232]. Also used is *ureh₂ds|*urh₂d-.

58. 'bark' = *korion (from *ker- 'separate (of bark)', Lith. *kėrti*): Serb.-Cr. *kōtje*, Old Rus. *корье*, Rus. dial. *корьё* 'bark', лтш. *krija* 'bast', лит. *karigė*, OPr. *karige* 'rowan' (< Proto-Baltic *karijan, from the speckled bark used in folk medicine; the rowan-berry does not seem to be used before 18 c.), Lat. *corium* 'crust', Gr. *κόριον* 'maiden', Pers. *kara* 'мозоль'. Other formations with the same meaning from the same verb: Old Rus. *кора* 'bark', Latv. *kārklis* 'withe', Lith. *karnà* 'lime bast', Lat. *cortex* 'bark', Gr. *κόρφα* 'maiden', Skr. *karaka-* 'a cocoa-nut shell', Skr. *cārman*, Av. *carəman* 'pelt', Oss. *цъар* 'bark'.

59. 'flower' = *b^hulH-: OCS *былине* 'grass', Lith. *burbūlis* 'globe-flower', Lat. *furfur* 'husk', Gr. *φύλλον* 'petal', Skr. *phulla-*, Baluchi *phul* 'flower'.

60. 'grass' = *g^{wh}erH-: Ukr. *зрєний/зрєний* 'green', Latv. *grīslis* 'sedge', *grīnis* 'sedge-heather pinery', Lat. *grāmen* 'grass', Gr. *θρίον* 'fig leaf', *θρίδαξ* 'lettuce' (diminutive -id), Skr. *hrasva-* 'names of various plants', *hrasvakuśa-* 'Kuśa grass or a kind of short Kuśa grass'.

61. 'rope' = *uer-: Rus. dial. *вєрька* 'rope', Lith. *vėrė* 'loop', *vėrinys* 'thread', Lat. *vermis* 'worm', Gaul. *viria* 'kind of bracelet', Skr. *varatrā* 'belt, rope', Pers. *bārrang* 'ropes, girths, bandages'.

62. 'skin' = *keHutos|*kHut-: NB Rus. *кѹтатъ* 'to wrap up', Skr. *kutū* 'a leathern oil-bottle'.

63. 'meat' = *mēmson.

64. 'blood' = *h₁esh₂r|*h₁sh₂en-|*h₁osh₂- (detransitive/protomiddle voice by Pooth [59]): NB Rus. dial. *вocyá/вocyá* 'herpes; eye decease in birds; sore; skin decease with itch (herpes, eczema, scab)'. Also used is *kreuHs (or it means 'raw meat').

65. 'bone' = *osts (*h₃est- for Hitt. *ḫa-aš-ta-i n. /ḫaštāi/* 'bone') and *keh₂ulis.

66. 'fat' = *touHk-|*tuHk-: OCS *тоуць* 'fat', Lith. *táukas* 'piece of lard', Lat. *tūc(c)ētum* 'sausage roll', Ir. *tón* 'buttocks' (*tūknā-), Gr. *τοκτά* 'royal feast', Skr. *tokma-* 'ear-wax'.

67. 'egg' = *ōuion. Also used is *kokkos.

68. 'horn' = *k^herHns|*k^hrHn-.

69. ‘tail’ = *rouHǵ-|*puHǵ-: Rus. dial. *пύζο* ‘purse of a sweep-net’, *пѣлѣж* ‘anchor cable’, Upper Sorbian *wopuš* ‘tail’ (< *puHǵ-s-), Latv. *pušķis* ‘bunch, pompon’ (Lith. dial. *paustis* ‘animal hair’), Lat. *pūga*, Gr. *πῦγῆ* ‘buttocks’, Skr. *púccha-*, Av. *pusa-* ‘tail’ (< *puHǵ-s-).

70. ‘feather’ = *spHeros|*spHr-: Rus. dial. *спореня́* ‘a form of snow (unlike «крупинки»/grains and «ляпушки»/flakes)’, *спóрина* ‘husk’, Lith. *spraņas* (Latv. *spārns*) ‘wing’, Latv. *spalva* ‘feather’, Lat. *sparus* ‘dart’, Welsh *pâr* ‘spear’, Gr. *σπάρτων* ‘balance indicator’, Pers. *par* ‘feather’. Possibly here: Rus. *перó* ‘feather’, *пернáтый* ‘winged’ (*perŋ-), Lat. *pernix* ‘quick’, Gr. *Περσεύς* ‘Perseus (he wore winged sandals)’, Skr. *parṇá*, Av. *parəna* ‘wing’.

71. ‘hair’ = *motos: Rus. dial. *мом* ‘lock of hair’, Latv. *mats* ‘hair’, Lat. *mollestra* ‘sheepskin’, OIr. *molt* ‘wether’, Celtiber. *maTu-* ‘bear’, Gr. *μοτός* ‘rag thread or downy cloth for bandage’, Skr. *namata-* ‘felt, woollen stuff’.

72. ‘head’ = *k̑erH-|*k̑rH-: Rus. dial. *серя́к* ‘headscarf; hooded cloak’, Old Rus. *серьга* ‘ear-ring’, Lith. *šėrnas* ‘boar’, Lat. *cerebrum* ‘brain’, MWelsh *crib* ‘comb’, Gr. *κάρα* ‘head’ (*κράνιον* ‘skull’), Skr. *śiras*, Av. *sarəm* *Asg.* ‘head’ (*Oss.* *cəp*, *Pers.* *sar*).

73. ‘ear’ = *h₂ōus.

74. ‘eye’ = *okʷ-.

75. ‘nose’ = *neh₂s|*nh₂s-: NB Gr. *ἀάζω* ‘I breathe out’.

76. ‘mouth’ = *eHs-|*oHs-: Slovene *jāška* ‘cavity in earth’, Slovak *jašk* ‘tunnel’, Lower Sorbian *jašk* ‘a hole of a fish-trap’, Ukr. *яскі́ня* ‘cave’, Lith. *uostà* ‘mouth of a river’ (also reflects *aust- ‘lip’), Lat. *ōs* (*Gsg.* *ōris*) ‘mouth’, OIr. *á* ‘mouth’, Gr. *ῥῆμα* ‘food’, Skr. *ās-*, Av. *āh-* ‘mouth’.

77. ‘tooth’ = *ǵombʰos and *h₃dents|*h₃dont- (*h₃* for Gr. (Ion.) *ὀδοός*, Arm. *atamn* ‘tooth’, *h₁* for Gr. (Aeol.) *ἔδοντες* ‘teeth’, Gr. *ἔδω*, Arm. *owtem* ‘eat’ [39, 166, 186]).

78. ‘tongue’ = *ǵʰnHǵʰuā: (with dissimilation *ǵʰ-ǵʰ*) OCS *ѠЗЫКЪ* ‘tongue’, Rus. dial. *язы́ня* ‘babblers’, OPr. *insuwis* ‘tongue’, Lith. *ižūláuti* ‘to cheek up’, *liežūvis* (lie- from *liēžti* ‘to lick’) ‘tongue’, Latv. *iezt* ‘to grin’, Osc. *fangvam* *Asg.*, *fancua* *Npl.* ‘tongue’ (< *ǵʰnHǵʰu-), Lat. *lingua* ‘tongue’ from **hinguā*¹ (< *ǵʰnHǵʰu-) affected by *lingō* ‘I lick’, Gr. *κανθάριον* ‘bowl’ (< *ǵʰnHǵʰu-), *καύχα* ‘boast’ (metathesis of -ǵʰu-), *χναύω* ‘I chew’, *χναυμάτιον* ‘dainty’ (< *ǵʰnHǵʰu- without the second -ǵʰ-),

¹ Old Lat. **dingua* does not match Osc. *fangvam* and is not reliable, only mentioned by Gaius Marius Victorinus: «nos nunc... linguam potius per l quam per d», which might be corrupted by a copyist (single h perceived as D).

Skr. jihvá/juhū, Av. hizvā ‘tongue’ (< *ǵ^hnHǵ^hu- with re-colouring of -a- < -n- because of the surrounding palatals and -i- < -H-).

79. ‘fingernail’ = *h₃nog^hus|*h₃ng^heu-.

80. ‘foot’ = *pēds (Asg. podn, Gsg. pedes, Lsg. pedei?, Npl. pōdēs?, Apl. podns, Gpl. pedōn?). Nsg. *pēds: OCS рѣшь ‘unmounted, foot (adj.)’, Rus. *нёндаль* ‘kick’ (*pēđь + *dati ‘to give?’), Lith. pėdà ‘footprint’, OPr. pedan ‘foot’, Lat. pēs ‘foot’, OIr. ís ‘under’ (*pēd-su?), Gr. πηδόν ‘oar blade’, Skr. pāt, Old Pers. pāda-, Oss. fad (Oss. a < ā, æ < a) ‘foot’. – Asg. *podn: Rus. dial. *нод* ‘hearth-stone, sole (of furnace)’, Lith. pādas ‘sole’, Celtiber. Asg. ozas, Gr. Asg. ποῦν (hence Nsg.. πούς, ποδ- in other cases), Phryg. Asg. ποδας, Skr. Asg. pādām ‘foot’. – Gsg. pedes: Lat. Gsg. pedis ‘foot’, Gr. πέδον ‘soil’ (< Gsg. *πέδος? hence πέζα ‘foot’ ~ Rus. dial. *нёжа* ‘of something little’, πεζή ‘afoot’), Skr. Gsg. padás ‘foot’. – Lsg. pedei?: Rus. dial. *педянка* ‘abscess between toes (or fingers?)’ (< Lsg.?), Umbr. Ablsg. persi ‘foot’ (< Lsg.?), Gr. πέδη ‘fettors’ (< Lsg.?), Skr. Lsg. pádi ‘foot’, pade ‘at every step’ (< Lsg.?). – Npl. pōdēs?: Rus. dial. *подожица* ‘onucha (winding on footwear)’ (*жица* ‘thread’), *подолаз* ‘shoe on ski where the foot is mounted’ (*лаз* ‘hole’), Lat. pōdex ‘anus’, Umbr. atripursatu ‘to dance the tripodium’ (< *pōd-), Galat. Npl. ades ‘feet’ (< *pōd-), Skr. pādas, also from this is Germanic *fōt-, Npl. *fōtiz. Ending *-ēs is reconstructed after Lat. pedēs, Gr. πόδες (*-ēs > Lat. -is, Gr. -ος, cf. the ending of Gsg. and words like νέφος, εος ‘cloud’). – Apl. podns?: OCS подь ‘under’ (< Apl.?), Gr. Apl. πόδᾶς (thus Npl. πόδες), Skr. Apl. pādas ‘feet’. – Gpl. pedōn?: Lat. Gpl. pedum, Gr. Gpl. ποδῶν (πο Gdu. ποδοῖν/ποδοῖν?) ‘feet’, Skr. dvi-pād- ‘bipeds’ (< Gdu.?).

81. ‘leg’ = *korkos|*kerk-|*krk-: Bulg. крак ‘leg’, Lith. kárka ‘shin’, Lat. cancer ‘cancer, crab’ (< *krkr, dissimilation as in menetrix ‘escort girl’ < meretrīx), MWelsh carn ‘hoof’, Gr. καρκίνος ‘cancer or crab’, κερκίς -ίδος (ῖ) ‘shinbone’, Skr. karkara- ‘bone’, karkaṭa- ‘lobster’, MPers. karčang ‘crab’.

82. ‘knee’ = *ǵonu|*ǵneu- (see above about cognate septets).

83. ‘hand’ = *man-: Rus. *манить* ‘wave with hand’, Latv. maņģs ‘crafty’, Lat. manus -ūs ‘hand’, OIr. muin ‘patronage’ (cf. the meaning of Rus. *ла́на*), Gr. μᾶνω ‘I point (at)’, Skr. maṇiṣṭakā ‘the little finger’.

84. ‘wing’ = *pet-|*pt-: OCS пѣтица ‘bird’, Lith. pūtė ‘little bird’, peteliškė ‘butterfly’, pētys ‘shoulder’, Lat. penna/pinna ‘feather, wing’, OIr. én ‘bird’ (MWelsh adein ‘wing’), Gr. πτηνά ‘birds’, πτερόν ‘feather, wing’, Skr. pātram, pāttram ‘wing, feather’, Av. pat- ‘to fly’ (Oss. bədūl ‘nestling’). Cf. № 70. ‘feather’.

85. ‘belly’ = *uentr-|*untr-.

86. ‘guts’ = *ǵʰh₃er-|*ǵʰh₃r-: Rus. dial. *зóренька* ‘child’s game with «жгуты»/laces’, Lith. *žarnà* ‘intestine’, Lat. *hīra* ‘jejunum, entrails’, Gr. *χόριον* ‘bowels’, *χορδή* ‘intestine’, Skr. *hīra-* ‘strip, band’, *hirá* ‘vein’. Also used is *enteron|*entr- (from ‘inside’): Rus. *я́тρώ* ‘kidney? pl. entrails’, Lat. *exenterō* (*exinterō*) ‘I disembowel’, *interiōra* ‘entrails’, Gr. *ἔντερον* ‘intestine, belly’, Skr. *antrám* ‘entrails’.

87. ‘neck’ = *monHis|*mnH-: Rus. dial. *монéя* ‘beads’, *монáк* ‘nod’, *монúсто* ‘necklace’, Lith. *maniškà* ‘collar’, Lat. *monīle* ‘necklace’, Mlr. *muin* ‘the upper part of the back below the neck’, Gr. *μανιάκης* ‘necklace’, Skr. *mānyā*, Av. *manaοθrī-* ‘neck’.

88. ‘back (body part)’ = *noHt-|*nHt-: Rus. dial. *нотор* ‘a peg where a pot is hanged’, Slovene *nât* ‘tops of vegetables’, Lith. *añt-* ‘on’ (bare stem in tatpuruṣa compositions?), Lat. *natis* ‘the buttock’, Gr. *νότος/νότον* ‘back (body part)’, Skr. *nāthá-* ‘protection, help, refuge’, Saka *ānata-* ‘protected’ (cf. the meaning of English *back*).

89. ‘breast’ = *psten-: Rus. dial. *стéнчику* ‘little children’, *стенá* ‘side of cow: «Так стенами ниче корова»’, Lith. *spenỹs* ‘nipple, teat’, Lat. *stercēja* ‘nurse’ (contaminated with *stercus* ‘feces’), Manx *sheeiney* ‘breast, teat, nipple’, Gr. *στήνιον*, Skr. *stána-*, Av. *fštána* ‘breast’.

90. ‘heart’ = *kord (Gsg *krdes): OCS *срьдьце*, Lith. *širdis*, Lat. *cor/cōr*, Gsg. *cordis* ‘heart’, OIr. *críde* (*kerdjo-), *κῆρ/κέαρ/κραδίη/καρδίη*, Dsg. *κῆρτ* ‘heart’, Skr. *śardha* ‘bold’, *śardhañjaha* ‘pulse’. Skr. *hṛd-* ‘heart’ (Av. *zərəd*) – contaminated with *háršati* ‘is excited’?

91. ‘liver’ = *Hiok^wr|*Hiek^wr-.

92. ‘to drink’ = *pī-, aorist stem *po-.

93. ‘to eat’ = *edmi.

94. ‘to bite’ = *knHdom: пол. *kądek* ‘bit’, Lith. *kašti*, *kándu*, Lat. *mandō*, Welsh *cnoad* ‘to bite’, Gr. *κνώδων* ‘jag’, Skr. *khādati* ‘chews, bites’, *knathti* ‘hurts’, Pers. *xâyidan* ‘to chew’.

95. ‘to suck’ = *d^heH-.

96. ‘to spit’ = *pstHuom|*psteHu- (NB Alb. *pshtyj* ‘to spit’): OPol. *pywala* ‘spat’, Pol. *pluć* ‘to spit’, Rus. dial. *тѣфу/стѣфу* ‘spitting sound’, Lith. *spíauti*, Lat. *spuere*, ppp. *spūtum*, Welsh *-poeraf* (*amboeri*) ‘to spit’, Gr. *πτύω*, *πτύζω*, *ἐκ-πῦ-τίζω*, Dor. *ἐπι-φθύσδω* ‘I spit’, Cyp. (Hes.) *ψύττει* ‘spits’, Skr. *ṣṭhívati* ‘spits’, *sphoṭa* ‘boil [furuncle]’, Oss. *ты* ‘spitting’, Northern Kurdish *tifand* ‘to spit’.

97. ‘to vomit’ = *reüg-|*rüg-, also *uemh₁-.

98. ‘to blow’ = *d^hmom.

99. ‘to breathe’ = *h₂enh₁-.

100. ‘to laugh’ = *smeiom (see above on *sm- > Lat. *sp-*).

101. ‘to see’ = *ueidmi, also *derk¹-.

102. ‘to hear’ = *k̑leu-: Baltic *kluštei (Lith. paklūsti ‘listen to’ with restored suffix -s, see above the rule for š) is due to dissimilation of č-š («Meillet’s law»), cf. Lith. šlovė ‘glory’ without the suffix.

103. ‘to know’ = *ǵneh₃om.

104. ‘to think’ = *menom|*mn-. Also used is *(s)keit-|*(s)kit-: OCS число/чисмя ‘number’, чътениѣ ‘appeal (speech)’, Lat. scītus ‘clever’, Gr. κισάω/κιστάω ‘I crave’, Skr. cetas ‘thinking soul’, Av. cisti ‘consciousness’.

105. ‘to smell (perceive)’ = *od- (*h₃ed- for Arm. hot ‘smell’): NB Skr. svāda ‘flavour’ (su- ‘good’).

106. ‘to fear’ = *b^{hei-}|*b^{hi-}: NB Gr. φοιτάω ‘I rush about’.

107. ‘to sleep’ = *suep-|*sup-.

108. ‘to live’ = *g^wiuom.

109. ‘to die’ = *mrom^l|*mer-.

110. ‘to kill’ = *g^{wh}en-|*g^{wh}n-: NB Rus. кровавая жáтва ‘mass murder’, Latv. dzenāt ‘to flap (flies)’.

111. ‘to fight’ = *ieud^hom and *b^{er-}: OCS брати ‘to fight’, Lith. bárti ‘to scold’, Lat. feriō ‘I hit’, OIr. berg [ā] ‘robbery’, Gr. φέριστος ‘bravest’, Skr. bhara ‘battle’, Osset. (Iron) byrsyn/byrst, (Dig.) bursun/burst ‘to break; to intrude; to push, press on; to overcome in a fight, fight’.

112. ‘to hunt’ = *ueiHmi (1 sg. ending deduced from 2 sg. Skr. véṣi). Also *lau-.

113. ‘to hit’ = *b^{heiom}.

114. ‘to cut’ = *ker-|*kr-.

115. ‘to split’ = *skeid-|*skid-: NB Rus. *расседáться* ‘to crack, split (intr.)’, Lith. skiedrà ‘chip’. Also *krih₁- ‘separate’: Upper Sorbian křida ‘sieve’, Lat. cernō ‘to sift, to separate, to distinguish’ (< *kri-n-h₁-), OIr. criathar ‘sieve’, Gr. κρίνω ‘to separate, to decide’, Skr. kṛitá- ‘a sort of despised caste’.

116. ‘to stab’ = *b^{hed^h-}|*b^{hd^h-}: Rus. dial. бeдь ‘a hole in the bench of a boat, where the mast is mounted’, Lith. bėsti, bėda ‘to poke’, Lat. fībula (<*b^{hed^h-d^hlā}) ‘pin’, MWelsh beð ‘grave’, Old Breton bodou ‘crow’, Gr. φαλλός ‘phallus’, Skr. bādha- ‘injury’, bhadrā ‘cow’, Oss. бел ‘shovel’.

117. ‘to scratch’ = *skab^hom: Rus. *скоблѣть* ‘to scratch’, Lith. skabýti ‘to tear off’, Lat. scabō ‘I scratch’, MĪr. (s)cīp ‘hand’, Gr. σκάριον ‘hoe or spade’, MPers. /škpt/ ‘violent, terrible’, Choresmian (+ *para-ā-) /pr^wškm-/ ‘to rob’ (cf. meaning with Rus. *оободра́ть*, English *to strip*), Skr. missing or requires the loss of *a: skunāti ‘tears, rends’ (Cb^hn > Cun? Cbhn

¹ [60, 439] incorrectly cites OCS у-мыръеть, in reality it has у-мырьеть, у-мыръо.

does not exist in Skr.). Also used is *kes- (missing in Lat. and Iranian). *ksu- is missing in Celto-It. *skrīb^h- is missing in Indo-Iranian.

118. 'to dig' = *kep-: OCS копати 'to dig', Latv. kaps 'grave', Lat. excipula (e>i is regular in the middle syllable) 'pool, pond', MĪr. cechor 'bog?', Gr. κοπίς 'butchering knife', Skr. kapaṇā 'a worm, caterpillar', Pers. kāftan/kāv- 'to dig'.

119. 'to swim' = *pleuom.

120. 'to fly' = *petom and *lek-: Slovene lèt 'flight', Rus. dial. леклѣк 'stork, egret', лóкма 'ball', Lith. lėkti, lekiù 'to fly', Lat. lōcusta 'locust', Gr. λόκαλος 'stork?', Skr. racayati 'puts in motion (a horse)', Rushani racost, Khufi racūst 'to flee', hence Lith. lakùs 'fast', Lat. vēlōx 'fast' (see № 18. 'many').

121. 'to walk' = *eimi|*i- и *g^we-|*g^w-.

122. 'to come' = *eimi|*i- и *g^we-|*g^w-.

123. 'to lie (as in bed)' = *leg^h-: NB Skr. rahas 'sexual intercourse', Oss. лæууын 'to lie (as in bed)'.

124. 'to sit' = *sed-, 1 sg. *si(s)dom: OPr. sīdons 'sitting (pret.)', Lat. sīdō 'I sit down', OĪr. -said 'sit', Gr. ἵζω 'I sit down', Skr. sīdati 'sits', MPers. nāstn' 'sit on'.

125. 'to stand' = *Hsta-: NB Skr. asthāt aor. 'stood' ~ Gr. ἵστημι 'stay'.

126. 'to turn (intransitive)' = *uertom|*urt-.

127. 'to fall' = *pedmi: OCS пасти, падж 'to fall', Lith. peslŷs 'kite', Lat. pessum 'downwards (to prostrate)', Gr. τροχοὶ ἐπήδων 'wheels (of broken chariots) flew away'; τρίτῳ Ἐτεόκλω τρίτος πάλος πῆδησεν 'the third lot fell upon Eteoclus', Skr. pádyate 'falls', Av. pa'diia'te 'falls into', MPers. ōbastan 'to fall' [30, VI, 238].

128. 'to give' = *dōmi.

129. 'to hold' = *seg^hom: OCS саци 'to touch', Lith. sėgti 'to fasten, to pin', Lat. sevērus 'severe', OĪr. suanem 'rope', Gr. ἔχω 'I have', Skr. sahate 'bears, withstands', Old Pers. frahanjati 'to hang'.

130. 'to squeeze' = *ang^hom (~ № 34. 'narrow').

131. 'to rub' = *terom|*tr-: OCS трѣти/терж (Rus. *тру* from the imperative *mpu*?), Latv. trīt 'to rub', Lat. terō, Gr. τρίρω (*teriō) 'I rub', Welsh tarnaf 'to dry, rub', Skr. tārás 'shrill' (= Gr. τορός), Shughni, Roshani tār-/tārt 'to cleanse, remove dirt'.

132. 'to wash' = *louom: NB Rus. dial. лáва 'gangway for washing the clothes', Lith. lovŷs 'trough', Skr. ravaṇaka- 'filter'.

133. 'to wipe' = *terom|*tr- (see № 131. 'to rub').

134. 'to pull' = *h₂uelk^wom|*h₂ulk^w-: OCS влѣщи, Lith. vilkti 'to pull', Lat. ulcus 'quarry', Welsh gwalch 'hawk, rascal' (Lat. vultur

‘kite’), Gr. $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\zeta$ /epic Asg. $\omega\lambda\kappa\alpha$ ‘furrow’, Skr. varkate ‘takes’, Av. varək- ‘to pull’.

135. ‘to push’ = *pisom (also ‘to pound’): Rus. *пхатъ* ‘to push’, Latv. pist, pīsu ‘to copulate’, piesta ‘pestle’, Lat. pīnsō ‘I pound’, pistor ‘baker’, Gr. $\pi\tilde{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ‘felt’, Skr. piṣṭás ‘milled’, Av. pišant- ‘pounding’. Also *(s)per|*(s)pr-. See also № 130. ‘to squeeze’.

136. ‘to throw’ = *sei-|*si-: Rus. *прое́ивать* ‘to sift’, *сúмо* ‘sieve’, Lat. sinō, situm ‘I put’ (cf. meaning with Italian mettere ‘to put, throw’ < Lat. mittere ‘to throw’), MWelsh hidl, Gr. $\eta\theta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ‘sieve’, Skr. sénā ‘dart’.

137. ‘to tie’ = *b^hend^h-: Rus. dial. *беда́л/беда́рка* ‘two-wheeled cart’, Lith. beñdras ‘partner’, Lat. offendīx ‘knot, band’, Welsh benn ‘cart’, Gr. $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ‘father-in-law; brother-in-law, son-in-law’, Skr. badhnāti/bandhati ‘ties’, Pers. bastan ‘to bind, tie’, Oss. бæттын ‘to tie (sheafs)’.

138. ‘to sew’ = *siuHom.

139. ‘to count’ = *h₂ri-: Rus. dial. *pecá* ‘multitude’, Lith. rikis ‘formation’, Fr. rime ‘rhyme’, Lat. rītus ‘order’, OIr. rím ‘number’, Gr. ἀριθμός (ᾱ) ‘number’ (νήριτος ‘innumerable’), Skr. rīti- ‘custom, method, line’. Also *k^weit-|*k^wit- (or it means ‘to think’).

140. ‘to say’ = *h₁re-: OCS рещи, Lith. réikšti (réiškia) ‘to say’, Lat. reus ‘a party in a court’, OIr. réimm ‘shout’, Gr. εἶρω ‘I say’, Skr. ráva- ‘talk’, YAv. gāθrō.rayant- ‘shouting the holy hymns (of heretics)’.

141. ‘to sing’ = *kanom: Rus. dial. *káня* ‘beggar’, Lith. kañklės ‘gusli’, Lat. canō ‘I sing’, Gr. $\eta\tilde{\iota}\text{-}\kappa\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ‘rooster’, Skr. kanda- ‘in mus. a kind of time’, Oss. kadæg/kadæmgæ ‘epic recital’. Also *gāi-.

142. ‘to play’ = *leid-|*lid-: Rus. dial. *ляда́иццй* ‘mad’, Lith. láidyti ‘to fly (a kite), to toboggan’, Lat. lūdō (< *loid-) ‘I play’, Gr. $\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$ ‘plays’, Skr. līlā (< *līdā) ‘play, amusement’.

143. ‘to float’ = *neh₂om.

144. ‘to flow’ = *sreuom, also used is tek^w- (Gr. only has a questionable τόπος ‘place’ [38, 1494]).

145. ‘to freeze’ = *gelom|*gl-: Cz. holet ‘hoar-frost’, Lith. gelumā ‘great cold’, Lat. gelō ‘I freeze’, Gr. $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\nu$ ‘frost’, Kurd (Sina) girsīān ‘to coagulate, stiffen’ [41, 105–106]. Also used is *sg^hal-: OCS хладъ ‘cold (noun)’, Latv. gāle ‘ice’, Lat. hālō ‘I blow’, Gr. $\chi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\zeta\alpha$ ‘hail’, Skr. hari ‘the wind’.

146. ‘to swell’ = *b^hruH-: Rus. dial. *бруне́тъ* ‘to swell’, Lith. braūna ‘flake’, Latv. bruka ‘hernia’, Lat. frux ‘fruit’, OIr. brū ‘belly’, Gr. φρούγμα ‘arrogance’, Skr. bhrūnās ‘embryo’.

147. ‘sun’ = *seh₂ul|*sh₂uen-.

148. ‘moon’ = *mēns|*mēns-. NB CS ма́сопоусть ‘40-day fast’.

149. ‘star’ = *h₂stēr|*h₂str-.

150. ‘water’ = *uodr|*udn-, coll. udōr [38, 1526–1527].
151. ‘rain’ = *h₁uer-|*h₁ur-: Macedonian (Slavic) vrne ‘rain’, Lith. versmẽ ‘spring (source)’, Lat. vēr ‘spring (time)’, OIr. feraid ‘to pour, to shower’, frass ‘rain-shower’, Gr. ἔρση/ἔερσα ‘dew’, Skr. varṣá, Av. vāra (Oss. уарын) ‘rain’.
152. ‘river’ = *ap- (*h₂ep- for Hitt. ḫa-pa-aš ‘river’, Old Arm. hawari ‘riverbed’): NB Gr. Ἀπίς ‘Peloponnesus’, Ἀπιδᾶνός/Ἠπιδανός ‘Apidanus (river in Thessaly)’.
153. ‘lake’ = *sel-: Rus. dial. *сельга* ‘shallow in a lake’, *сельгá* ‘brook’, Lith. sėliai ‘Selons’ (their home Augšzeme contains a lot of lakes), Oscan? Σιδικῖνοι ‘Italic tribe on river Liri’, Gr. ἔλος ‘swamp’, Skr. sáras ‘lake, pool’, Nuristani (Kamviri) sur ‘mountain lake or pond’.
154. ‘sea’ = *mari-: NB Gr. μαῖνος ‘seafish’, Μαρέη/Μάρεια ‘lake and town near the mouth of Nile’, Skr. maryādā ‘shore’.
155. ‘salt’ = *sals.
156. ‘stone’ = *g^{wr}H- (suffixes -au and -n give ‘millstone’): Rus. *жёрнов*, Lith. girna ‘millstone’, Lat. ūrium ‘waste rock’, OIr. brao ‘millstone’, Skr. grāvan ‘a stone for pressing out the soma’, Oss. кырой ‘mill’ (windmill: уадгырой; watermill: донгырой)?
157. ‘sand’ = *roik-: OCS рѣськъ ‘sand’, Rus. *сыпесь* ‘clay sand’, *песовый* ‘of sandy colour’, *песоватый* ‘sandy’, Lith. paišai ‘soot’, Lat. praegniarius ‘gladiator’ (cf. the meaning of arena ‘sand’), Gr. ποικίλος (ῖ) ‘motley’, Skr. puru-pēśa-, Av. paēsa- ‘leprous’.
158. ‘dust’ = *prs-: OCS прахъ, Rus. *пёрхоть*, *персть* ‘dust’, Lith. piškšnys ‘tiny cinders’, Lat. porřigo ‘scab’, Gr. πασία ‘sap’ (cf. καρδία/κραδία, κάρτος/κράτος, θάρσος/θράσος), Skr. pṛṣan ‘spotty’, Av. paṣnu ‘dust’.
159. ‘earth’ = *ǵ^{hem}-|*ǵ^{hm}-|*ǵ^{hom}-: Rus. *наземь* ‘to the ground’, *чернозём* ‘black earth’, Lith. žemė, Lat. humus ‘earth’, Gr. Lsg. χᾶμαι ‘on earth’, Skr. jamba- ‘mud’ (kṣám ‘earth’ is not in this series), Av. zam- ‘earth’.
160. ‘cloud’ = *neb^{hes}|*neb^{hes}-.
161. ‘fog’ = *h₃mig^h-: NB Lat. migdilix ‘a term of abuse (fog-lover? ~ diligō ‘I love’): «aduenisti nos captatum, migdilix, bisulci lingua quasi proserpens bestia» (Pl. Poen.1033).
162. ‘sky’ = *dieus.
163. ‘wind’ = *h₂ueh₁nt-: NB Rus. dial. *вѣя* ‘snowstorm’, Lith. vėjėtas ‘windy’, Latv. vējenes ‘windmill’.
164. ‘snow’ = *snoig^{wh}-|*snig^{wh}-.
165. ‘ice’ = *h₁eiH-: Rus. *инеѣ* (without suffix NB Rus. dial. (Yakut.) *ue* ‘deep cavities filled with water from ice’), Lith. ýnis, Lat.

pruīna ‘hoar-frost’ (< *pruīna < *prus-īna, see № 194. ‘wet’), MBret. yen ‘cold’, Gr. ἤν-οψ ‘sparkling’, Oss. их ‘ice’, Skr. eṣati ‘glides’.

166. ‘smoke’ = *d^huHmos.

167. ‘fire’ = *ngnis: NB Welsh engyl ‘fire’, North Kurd agir ‘fire’, Yazghulami aynág ‘white stone (flint?)’, wūyn (*aṃa-) ‘blavk’, YAv. name Dāštāyuni-, name *Ag-nu-par-nu (from Akkadian source).

168. ‘ash’ = *aHs (*h₂eHs- for Hitt. ḫāš ‘ash’, but Old Arm. ačiwn ‘ashes’!).

169. ‘to burn (transitive)’ = *d^heg^h-.

170. ‘road’ = *ponts|*pnt-: OCS пѣтъ, OPr. pintys ‘road’, Lat. pōns, Gsg. pontis ‘bridge, path’, Ir. ar fhód mhearairgthe ‘on the path of error’, Gr. λόντος ‘sea, sea way’, πάτος ‘path’, Skr. patha, Osset. фæндаг ‘road’.

171. ‘mountain’ = *g^worH-|*g^wrH-: OCS гора ‘mountain’, Lith. garaĩnė ‘barren mountain’, Lat. grūmus ‘hillock’, Gr. Βορέῃς ‘north’, Skr. giri, Av. gairi ‘mountain’.

172. ‘red’ = *h₁reud^hos.

173. ‘green’ = *ǵ^heIH-|*ǵ^hIH-.

174. ‘yellow’ = *ǵ^hel-|*ǵ^hl-.

175. ‘white’ = *b^halōs: NB Rus. dial. болóнь ‘hard white film on meat’, болóнка ‘window’, болóнка ‘turnip’, бóлоко ‘cloud’, Lith. bālas ‘white’, Latv. bāls ‘pale’, OFr. baille, OBret. baill ‘paleness’, Gr. φολός ‘white’, Skr. bhāla ‘splendour (great light, luster or brilliance)’, Yazghulami vəráng ‘salt standing out on ground’, Rushani, Khufi ravār (*fra-) ‘salt effusion on ground’, Yidgha wārwan ‘Milky Way’.

176. ‘black’ = *krs-: NB Lat. cerrus ‘Turkey oak (gives ink)’, Gr. κράνον ‘Cornelian cherry’.

177. ‘night’ = *nok^wts|*nk^wt-.

178. ‘day’ = *dein-|*dīn-: OCS дьнь, Lith. dienà, Sudovian dins ‘day’, Lat. nūndinae ‘market-days (once per 9 days)’, Ir. denus ‘spatium temporis’, Gr. ἔνδιον ‘noon’ (dissimilation of n-n, as in αὐχίην, ἦτρον, μειδῶος), Skr. dīna- ‘day’, MPers. ādīna ‘friday’, Ishkashimi dīn ‘day’.

179. ‘year’ = *uetos.

180. ‘warm’ = *g^wher-.

181. ‘cold’ = *gel-|gl- (see № 145. ‘to freeze’).

182. ‘full’ = *plHnos.

183. ‘new’ = *neuos (secondary ew > ow in Balt., Slav., It., Celt.).

184. ‘old (of things)’ = *uetus: NB Skr. vātula ‘affected by wind-disease, gouty, rheumatic’.

185. ‘good’ = *h₁ues-.

186. ‘bad’ = *ǵ^hul-: OCS зьль ‘bad, evil’, Lith. atžūlas, atžūlūs ‘heartless, unfeeling’, ižūlūs ‘boring, insolent, rude’, Lat. ulcus ‘ulcer; weak

or sore spot’, ultor ‘avenger’, OIr. olc (Lepontic Ulkos) ‘bad, evil’, *χολός* ‘lame’, Skr. *hvalati* ‘goes crookedly or wrongly or deviously’, Av. *zūrah-* ‘injustice’ (Oss. *æwzæp* ‘bad’).

187. ‘rotten’ = *puH-.

188. ‘dirty’ = *melH-|*mlH-: Rus. *малевать* ‘to daub’, лит. *mólis* ‘clay’, Lat. *malus* ‘weed’, OIr. *malcad* ‘rottenness’, Gr. *μέλας* ‘dark’, Skr. *malina-*, *samala-* ‘dirty’, Oss. *mīl/mel* ‘soot; back spot’, Tajik *murdor* ‘dirty’.

189. ‘straight’ = *h₃regtos: Rus. dial. *рѣмка* ‘mandrel for stropping the scythe’, *ремуо́у* ‘healthy, trig, reliable’, Lith. *réžtas* ‘order’, Lat. *rēctus* ‘straight’, OIr. *recht* ‘law’ (cf. meaning of Old Rus. *правда* ‘law’ ~ *правьи* ‘straight’), Gr. *ῥεκτός* ‘stretched out’.

190. ‘round’ = *uol-|*uel-|*ul-: Rus. dial. *обвалить* ‘to encircle’, Pol. *obły* ‘round’, Lith. *apvalūs* ‘round’, *vėlenas* ‘axle’, Lat. *volūmen* ‘ring’, Welsh *olwyn* ‘wheel’, Gr. *ῥόμος* ‘round stone, roller’, Skr. *valaya* ‘ring’, Old Pers. *vart-* ‘round’.

191. ‘sharp (as a knife)’ = *h₂okr|*h₂ekon-.

192. ‘dull (as a knife)’ = *ne h₂okr? All the words for ‘dull’ are derived: OCS *тѣпъ* ‘dull’ (< *top-n- ‘beaten’), Lith. *šipti* ‘to become dull’ (~ *šipulys* ‘chip’), *brizgėti* ‘to become dull’ (~ *brizgti* ‘to frazzle’), *būkas* ‘dull’ (~ Latv. *buknīt* ‘to poke’), Latv. *truls* ‘dull’ (~ *trunēt* ‘to rot, decay’), Lat. *hebes* (< ‘weak’), Gr. *κωφός* (< ‘weak’), *ἀμβλύς* (< ‘weak’), Bengal *bhota* (< *b^hug-t- ‘bent’?), Skr. *cipitha* (< ‘flattened’), *muṅkha-* (< ‘bald’), *hṛṣita-* (< ‘bent’), *tūparā-* (< tup- ‘to hurt’), *kuṅṭha-* (< *kunṭ-* ‘to hurt, injure’, *kun-* ‘bad-’) ~ Pers. *kond* ‘dull’. So there was no separate root for this concept in PIE. Moreover, all the metaphors are dialectal: from ‘beaten’ (‘broken’, ‘crushed’) only in Balto-Slavic, from ‘decayed’ – only in Latv., from ‘bent’ and ‘flattened’ – only in Indo-Aryan, from ‘injured’ – only in Indo-Iranian, from ‘weak’ – only in Gr. and Lat. This forces the reconstruction of ‘dull’ as ‘not + sharp’ (the only morphological reconstruction in the list).

193. ‘smooth’ = *g^hleHd^h-|*g^hlHd^h-: OCS *гладъкъ*, Latv. *gluds*, Lat. *glaber* ‘smooth’, Bret. *glann* ‘shore’, Gr. *χλᾶνίς* ‘blanket’, Skr. *hradá-* ‘big water space’, Pers. *lašan* ‘smooth’.

194. ‘wet’ = *prus-: Rus. *прыскаць*, Serb.-Croat. *prskati* ‘to splash’, Lith. *praūsti* ‘to wash’, Lat. *pruīna* ‘hoar-frost’ (< *pruīna < *prus-īna, см. п. 165 ‘ice’), Welsh *rhew* ‘frost’, Gr. *πρώξ* ‘dewdrop’, Skr. *pruṣita-* ‘wet’, Khotanese *pruha-* ‘hoar-frost, dew’.

195. ‘dry’ = *ssk- (< *sek-|*sk- ‘to become dry’: Lith. *sėkti* (*seīka*, *sėko*), Rus. *сыкнутъ* ‘to dry out’): Rus. dial. *сех* ‘oven’ in a riddle «Старик во сеху, Переселся со смеху» (answer: a pot with boiling water

in an oven), *сѣхнуть* ‘to dry out’ (contaminated with *сѣхнуть*), Lith. *sùskis* ‘having tetter’, Lat. *siccus* ‘dry’, Mlr. *sesc* ‘dry’, MWelsh *hysp* ‘dry’, Gr. *ισχνός* ‘dry’, *ἔσκετο φωνή* ‘the voice broke down’, Skr. *a-sásucuṣi-* ‘not drying up’, Av. *hišku-* ‘dry’.

Also used is **sh₂eus-/*sh₂us-*: OCS *соухъ* ‘dry’, OPr. *sausai* ‘сухо, насыхо’, Lat. *sūdus* (-sd- > -d-, except for compounds), греч. *αῦος* ‘dry’ (h-h > Ø-h by Grassmann’s law), Illyr. (Hesych.) *σαυκόν* ‘dry’, Skr. *śoṣas* ‘dryness’ (< **siaušas* < **sHeusos*), *śúṣkas*, Av. *huška-* ‘dry’.

196. ‘correct (true)’ = **h₁sonts*.

197. ‘near’ = **h₁opi|*h₁epi*.

198. ‘far’ = **duh₂-|*duh₂-*: Pol. dial. *dy* ‘dalej!’, Rus. dial. *дѣле* ‘further’, Lith. *dūliuoti* ‘to appear vaguely’, Lat. *dūdum* ‘long ago’, Bret. doun ‘deep’, Gr. *δῆν* ‘long ago’, Skr. *dūrā*, Pers. *dur* ‘far’.

199. ‘right’ = **deks-*.

200. ‘left’ = **laiuos*: NB Skr. *revaṭa-* ‘a muscle or a conch-shell which coils from right to left’ (Oss. *галиу* ‘left’ requires the explanation for the ra-: is this the intensitive particle *ghā*, as in Skr.? it generally looks as *γ*- in Oss.).

201. ‘at’ = **prei*.

202. ‘in’ = **en|*n*.

203. ‘with’ = **so*: OCS *съ* ‘with’ (see about the variations of prepositions/prefixes *без, въ, до, за, из, къ, на, о, от, по, подъ, при, прѣдъ, съ* with added -н- before j- and *ЛТИ/НАТИ* ~ Lith. *im̃ti/Latv. ņemt* in [19] with the literature), OPr. *sa-* (*sallūban* ‘spouse’, *sauinsle* ‘belt’), Lat. *sospes*, -itis ‘safe’ (~ *spēs* ‘hope’), OIr. *sommae* ‘rich’ < **so-ofsmiyo-* (cp. OIr. *doimm* ‘poor’ < **dus-ops-mi-*, Lat. *ops*, Skr. *ápna-* ‘wealth’), Gr. *ὄς* ‘my own/your own’ (≠ *σός* ‘your own’), Skr. *sākām* ‘with’.

204. ‘and’ = **k^we*.

205. ‘if’ = **kā*: Rus. *как* ‘if’, Lith. *kad* ‘if’, Portuguese *caso* ‘if’, Gr. *κέ(ν)/κά* (*ᾱ*) ‘if’, Pashto *ka* ‘if’.

206. ‘because’ = **g^hi*.

207. ‘name’ = **h₃neh₃mn|*h₃nh₃men-* [39, 412].

Out of 207 concepts:

– in 161 the root is reflected in all 7 groups (Baltic, Slavic, Italic, Celtic, Greek, Indo-Aryan and Iranian);

– in 36 the root is missing in one group: 16 in Celtic (‘all’, ‘at’, ‘back’, ‘blood’, ‘child’, ‘dust’, ‘fall’, ‘fruit’, ‘lake’, ‘left’, ‘push’, ‘sand’, ‘short’, ‘tongue’, ‘tail’, ‘when’), 16 in Iranian (‘animal’, ‘count’, ‘fat’, ‘flow’, ‘hair’, ‘hand’, ‘heart’, ‘laugh’, ‘play’, ‘skin’, ‘stone’, ‘swell’, ‘this’, ‘throw’, ‘wash’, ‘with’), 4 in Indo-Aryan (‘egg’, ‘human’, ‘straight’, ‘scratch’), 0 in Italic, 0 in Baltic, 0 in Slavic.

– in 10 the root is missing in two groups from different branches ('bark', 'freeze', 'if' in Celtic and Indo-Aryan, 'grass', 'guts', 'louse', 'smooth', 'some', 'smell', 'stick' in Celtic and Iranian), this was the worst case.

The cases when the Greek reflex is missing are not considered according to the limitations. This research might poorly reflect the groups where a considerable proportion of data was taken from etymological dictionaries (Iranian, Celtic).

The stats for the roots were also counted in Germanic languages, because they are the most studied of all peripheral Indo-European languages. Out of 207 concepts there are cognates for 123 (i. e. 59%, unlike 100% in other branches), including the words known only in West Germanic or only in East Germanic. Not found: 'all', 'animal', 'at', 'back', 'bad', 'bark', 'bird', 'blood', 'blow', 'bone', 'burn', 'child', 'count', 'day', 'dig', 'dirty', 'drink', 'dry', 'dull', 'dust', 'earth', 'fall', 'far', 'fear', 'fight', 'fire', 'float', 'flower', 'fog', 'forest', 'fruit', 'give', 'good', 'green', 'guts', 'hair', 'here', 'hold', 'how', 'if', 'kill', 'lake', 'leaf', 'left', 'leg', 'live', 'liver', 'louse', 'mountain', 'narrow', 'old', 'play', 'pull', 'push', 'rain', 'river', 'road', 'root', 'rope', 'round', 'rub', 'sand', 'say', 'scratch', 'sharp', 'sky', 'smell', 'some', 'split', 'squeeze', 'stick', 'that', 'there', 'tongue', 'tree', 'true', 'turn', 'walk', 'we', 'what', 'when', 'where', 'white', 'wife', 'wipe', 'with', 'worm', 'year'. (This list contains 21 of 26 words not found in Celtic, except freeze, grass, short, smooth, tail.)

This confirms the assumption that Germanic branch does not descend from the core PIE, but is in fact peripheral (preceding research has shown that 45,3% of Germanic strong verbs don't have Indo-European etymology [52, 168]).

NB: we can only state that we have not found the reflexes, but we cannot exclude them, because for most languages we don't have access to "complete" dictionaries (if they exist at all), and our method doesn't allow us to find prefixed words effectively.

Conclusions

It was possible to deduce a list of 207 concepts for PIE with strict limitations (reflection in all 4 main branches, no non-standard phonemes, no violations of satemization).

For 161 concepts, the root is reflected in all 7 groups (Baltic, Slavic, Italic, Celtic, Greek, Indo-Aryan and Iranian). Initially, it was supposed to use language branches in an expanded sense. But in practice, neither Macedonian nor Phrygian language data, nor ungrouped Italo-Celtic languages were needed, and there was only one case ('lake') where Nuristani data substitutes Iranian, which is compensated by the presence

of the corresponding word in Sanskrit. As for Balto-Slavic, there are no cases where the comparison is based on a single dialect example.

Additionally, Baltic, Slavic, Italic, Greek reflect all the roots. So the result doesn't depend on Italo-Celtic hypothesis and even on Balto-Slavic theory.

Out of 207 cases, the full form of the word is restored in 128.

Morphological reconstruction was needed only in 1 case: 'dull'.

And s-mobile was not needed in any case.

The result suggests that the 4 main branches of PIE are not just closer to each other than it was previously thought, but they have a direct common ancestor, which can be called the «core PIE». We can talk about the possibility of compiling a dictionary of this core PIE. The proposed composition of the dictionary (not counting the introductions, indexes, etc.):

1. Applied phonetic correspondences with the lists of reliable examples.

2. Prefixes and prepositions with meanings and examples.

3. Suffixes with meanings and examples.

4. Inflections (case and gender), inflection of names and verbs.

5. Remarks on accentology. For example: according to the existing theory of Proto-Slavic stress, simultaneous orthogonal marking by length, ictus and tone is required [11, 12], and it is tied not to vowels or syllables, but to morphemes [12, 12], in contrast, for example, to the CVRV^hC, CVR^hV^hCa system in Russian [20]; the high speed of stress mutation is clearly visible in Russian [13, 371–387], for example, the groups of words on *-аж*, *-аму* have changed stress in just one hundred years; the main mechanisms of stress formation are contraction (different dropped consonants can give different tones), vowel length and analogy.

6. Remarks about ablaut. It is necessary to bring together different theories [52; 46; 68; 58], using the data of core PIE as relatively more reliable material.

7. Root morphemes or reconstructed words in their entirety (usually only this part is published).

8. Reverse dictionary (some of the concepts have to be reconstructed using the above affixes, and such cases should be specially marked).

The presence of a reverse dictionary ensures that it is a language that is being reconstructed, not a random set of words. The compilation of the reverse dictionary can begin with this Swadesh list, then moving on to 400-word dictionary (for example, [65]), further adding concepts from Basic English [53] (850 words), [32] (about 1500 words), [54] (about 3000 words). At the latest stages, we need perfect knowledge of PIE morphology, because some words have to be reconstructed

morphologically. It is unlikely that we can get all the concepts directly from known languages, even if we use their «complete» dictionaries.

It makes sense (at least to obtain statistics on word substitutions in less noisy material than literary languages and various dictionaries of PIE) to reconstruct in parallel some of the intermediate proto-languages, namely Proto-Balto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-Iranian.

At the moment, we are working on 400-word dictionaries for core PIE, Proto-Indo-Iranian, Proto-Balto-Slavic, separately Proto-Baltic and Proto-Slavic. The material we are working with is posted at [33].

Список источников

1. Андреев Н. Д. Ранне-индоевропейский праязык. Ленинград: Наука, 1986. 328 с.
2. Аникин А. Е. Русский этимологический словарь (проект). М., 2007. 71 с.
3. Вендина Т. И. Лексический атлас русских народных говоров и принцип системности в лингвогеографической проекции лексики // Лексический атлас русских народных говоров (материалы и исследования). Санкт-Петербург: Нестор-История, 2013. С. 102–118.
4. Гамкрелидзе Т. В., Иванов Вяч. Вс. Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Тбилиси, Изд-во Тбилисского Университета, 1984. 1328 сс. (в 2 т. со сплошной нумерацией страниц).
5. Гацалова Л. Б., Парсиева Л. К. Большой русско-осетинский словарь: около 60000 слов и выражений. Владикавказ: ИПО СОИГСИ, 2011. 687 с.
6. Геровъ Найдень. Рѣчникъ на българский языкъ: в 5 т. с дополнением. Пловдив: Съгласие, 1895–1908. Т. 5. 476 с.
7. Даль В. Толковый словарь живаго великорускаго языка. 3-е изд.: в 4 т. Санкт-Петербург, Москва: Изд. Т-ва М.О. Вольф, 1903–1909.
8. Дворецкий И. Х. Древнегреческо-русский словарь: около 70000 слов / в 2 т. Москва: ГИС, 1958.
9. Дворецкий И. Х. Латинско-русский словарь: около 50000 слов. 2-е изд., переработ. и доп. Москва: Русский язык», 1976. 1096 стр.
10. Добродомов И. Г., Шаповал В. В. Стрѣма! (Из историко-лексикологических маргиналий к одному лексикографическому проекту) // Единым письмен употреблением памяти подкрепляется вечность. Санкт-Петербург: Наука, 2007. С. 183–210.

11. Дыбо В. А., Замятина Г. И., Николаев С. Л. Основы славянской акцентологии / отв. ред. Р. В. Булатова. Москва: Наука, 1990. 284 с.
12. Дыбо В. А. Морфонологизованные парадигматические акцентные системы: Типология и генезис. Т. I. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 2000. 736 с.
13. Зализняк А. А. От праславянской акцентуации к русской. Москва: Наука, 1985. 428 с.
14. Земская Е. А., Китайгородская М. В., Ширяев Е. Н. Русская разговорная речь. Общие вопросы. Словообразование. Синтаксис. Москва: Наука, 1981. 276 с.
15. Ирландский словарь The electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language (eDIL). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.dil.ie/38500> (дата обращения: 05.06.2023).
16. Кимрский словарь (словарь уэльского языка). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://www.geiriadur.ac.uk/gpc/gpc.html> (дата обращения: 05.06.2023).
17. Нидерман М. Историческая фонетика латинского языка. Москва: Изд-во иностранной литературы, 1949. 191 с.
18. Орфовики: Суффиксы. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://орфография.орг/вики/Суффиксы> (дата обращения: 05.06.2023).
19. Орфовики: Сън. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://орфография.орг/вики/Сън> (дата обращения: 05.06.2023).
20. Орфовики: Ударение в полногласии. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: Ударение в полногласии – Орфовики (xn--80afqvalc3ae5i.xn--c1avg) (дата обращения: 05.06.2023).
21. Орфовики: Цв. [Электронный ресурс]. URL:Цв – Орфовики (xn--80afqvalc3ae5i.xn--c1avg) (дата обращения: 05.06.2023).
22. Саенко М. Н. Общие инновации в базовой лексике как аргумент в дискуссии о балто-славянском единстве. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.20. Москва, 2015. 27 с.
23. Саенко М. Н. Реконструкция праславянского списка Сводеша // Вестник РГГУ. Серия: Филологические науки. Языкознание. 2013. № 10. С. 139–148.
24. Словарь русских народных говоров / Академия наук СССР, Институт русского языка, Словарный сектор. Вып. 1–48. Москва, Ленинград: Наука, Ленинградское отделение. 1965–2015.
25. Словарь современного русского народного говора (д. Деулино Рязанского района Рязанской области) / Под ред. И. А. Оссовецкого. Москва: Наука, 1969. 612 с.

26. Срезневский И. И. Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка: в 3 т. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Императорской Академии наук, 1893–1912.

27. Трубачёв О. Н. Примечание на ст. *ход* // Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка / Пер. с нем. и дополнения О. Н. Трубачева. Под ред. с предисл. проф. Б. А. Ларина. 2-е изд., стереотипн.: в 4 т. Москва: Прогресс, 1986–1987. Т. IV, 1987. С. 253.

28. Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка / Пер. с нем. и дополнения О. Н. Трубачева. Под ред. с предисл. проф. Б. А. Ларина. 2-е изд., стереотипн.: в 4 т. Москва: Прогресс, 1986–1987.

29. Цейтлин Р. М. Лексика старославянского языка. Опыт анализа мотивированных слов по данным древнеболгарских рукописей X–XI вв. Москва: Наука, 1977. 336 с.

30. Этимологический словарь иранских языков / В. С. Расторгуева, Д. И. Эдельман; Ин-т языкознания РАН. Москва: Восточная литература РАН. Т. 1–6. 2000–2020.

31. Этимологический словарь славянских языков (ЭССЯ): Праславянский лексический фонд. Москва: Наука, 1974–2021. Вып. 1–41.

32. AECMA Simplified English [Электронный ресурс]. URL: AECMA Simplified English (techscribe.co.uk) (дата обращения: 22.02.2023).

33. Alonocoder [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://alonocoder.nedopc.com/ling/PIE/index.html> (дата обращения: 22.02.2023).

34. Balto-Slavica [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.balto-slavica.org/forum/index.php?showtopic=23334&page=2#entry385951> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023).

35. Blažek Václav. Indo-European kinship terms in *-ǵ2TER // Grammaticvs: studia linguistica Adolfo Erharto quinque et septuagenario oblata. Brně: Masarykova univerzita, 2001. Pp. 24–33.

36. Bystrov Dm., Yastrebov-Pestritskiy M. Searching for the lexical core of Proto-Indo-European language // Вестник славянских культур. 2020. № 57. С. 183–200.

37. Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon / by R. Derksen (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series). Vol. 13. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2015. 684 p.

38. Etymological dictionary of Greek / by R. Beekes; with the assistance of L. van Beek (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 10/1. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2009. 1839 p.

39. Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages / by M. de Vaan (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 7. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008. 825 p.
40. Etymological dictionary of proto-Celtic / by R. Matasovic. p. em. (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 9. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008. 458 p.
41. Etymological dictionary of the Iranian verb / by Johnny Cheung. (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 2. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007. 600 p.
42. Fontana, Alessandro. The Proto-Indo-European anaphoric and relative pronouns: analysis and considerations. Leiden University. 99 p. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: The Proto-Indo-European anaphoric and relative pronouns: analysis and considerations (universiteitleiden.nl) (дата обращения: 22.03.2023).
43. Google Translate. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://translate.google.com/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023).
44. Griffiths A., Lubotsky A. Two Words for 'sister-in-law'? Notes on Vedic *yātar-* and *giri-*. // *Beiträge zur Iranistik*. Band 30. Wiesbaden, 2009. Pp. 115–121.
45. Hamp E. P. Indo-European 'ego', Slavic *ja* = Runic *ek*, and Celtic *Ø* // *Slavia Centralis*. 2011. Vol 4/1. Pp. 5–13.
46. Kloekhorst Alwin. The Proto-Indo-European acrostatic inflection reconsidered / *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2014. Pp. 140–163.
47. *Latviešu – krievu vārdnīca*. Rīga: Liesma, 1979-1981: 1-2 vol.
48. Liddell H. G.; Scott R. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1883. 1776 p.
49. Liddell H. G.; Scott, R.; Jones, H. S. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
50. *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://lkz.lt/> (дата обращения: 14.03.2023).
51. Lyberis Antanas. *Lietuvių-rusų kalbų žodynas*. Ketvirtoji laida. / Spec. redaktorius prof. habil. dr. Valerijus Čekmonas. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2005. 951 p.
52. Mailhammer, Robert. *The Germanic strong verbs: foundations and development of a new system* (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007. 272 p.
53. Ogden C. K. *The Basic Books*. / Supplement to *The Basic News*, January, 1938. Cambridge: The Orthological Institute, 1938. p. 4. [Электронный ресурс]. URL:

http://zenglish.net/sites/basic/basic_books.html (дата обращения: 22.02.2023).

54. Oxford 3000. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/external/pdf/wordlists/oxford-3000-5000/The_Oxford_3000.pdf (дата обращения: 22.02.2023).

55. Oxford Latin Dictionary. – Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968. 2126 с.

56. Peterson Joseph H. Dictionary of most common AVESTA words. 1995. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.avesta.org/avdict/avdict.htm> (дата обращения: 22.02.2023).

57. Pokorny J. Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. / Band 1–3. Bern, München, 1959.

58. Pooth R. A. The Proto-Indo-European aspect system. Published at www.academia.edu on 2014-12-26. [Электронный ресурс]. URL:

https://www.academia.edu/9910503/The_Prototo_Indo_European_aspect_system (дата обращения: 22.02.2023).

59. Pooth R. A. There will be ‘blood’. The etymology of Greek *ὀπώρα* and Proto-Germanic **asani-* and the function of the o-grade in Proto-Indo-European // FIU Research Comment – Vouvant, Vendée, France; Cologne, Rhineland, Germany; Ghent, Flandres, Belgium, 3–7 August 2018, revised 13–15 November 2018. [Электронный ресурс]. URL:

https://www.academia.edu/37804863/There_will_be_blood_The_etymology_of_Greek_%E1%BD%80%CF%80%CF%8E%CF%81%CE%B1_and_Prototo_Germanic_asani_and_the_function_of_the_o_grade_in_Prototo_Indo_European (дата обращения: 15.03.2023).

60. Rix H. Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben. Wiesbaden: DR. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2001. 824 p.

61. Sanskrit – Dictionary. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://www.learnssanskrit.cc/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023).

62. Sanskrit Dictionary. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://www.sanskritdictionary.com/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023).

63. Słownik gwar polskich. / Ułożył Jan Karłowicz. В 6 т. Kraków, 1900-1911. Vol. 5. 476 p.

64. Słownik Staropolski. / kierownik Stanisław Urbańczyk. 1-11 vol. Polska Akademia Nauk, 1953–2002. Т. 1, Warszawa, 1953–1955. Т. 6, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków, 1970–1973.

65. Starostin, George; Kassian, Alexei; Trofimov, Artem; Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2017. 400-item basic wordlist for potentially «Nosstratic» languages. Moscow: Laboratory for Oriental and Comparative Studies

of the School of Advanced Studies in the Humanities, Russian Presidential Academy. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://starling.rinet.ru/new400> (дата обращения: 23.03.2023).

66. Steingass F. J. A Comprehensive Persian-English dictionary, including the Arabic words and phrases to be met with in Persian literature. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1892. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/steingass/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023).

67. Swadesh M. Lexico-statistic Dating of Prehistoric Ethnic Contacts // Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. 1952. Vol. 96. № 4. Pp. 452-463.

68. Vidal M. C. Proto-Indo-European nominal Ablaut patterns. 2014. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://www.academia.edu/8450869/Proto_Indo_European_nominal_Ablaut_patterns (дата обращения: 15.03.2023).

69. Vovin A. The End of Altaic Controversy // Central Asiatic Journal. 2008. № 57 (1). Pp. 71–132.

REFERENCES

1. Andreev N. D. Early Indo-European Proto-language. Leningrad.: Nauka, 1986. 328 p. P. 77 (In Russ.).

2. Anikin A. E. Russian Etymological Dictionary (project). Moscow, 2007. 71 p. Pp. 18–21 (In Russ.).

3. Vendina T. I. Lexical atlas of Russian vernacular dialects and the principle of consistency in the lingua-geographic projection of vocabulary / Lexical atlas of Russian vernacular dialects (Materials and research) / In-t of linguistic researches. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2013. P. 102–118. (In Russ.).

4. Gamkrelidze T. V., Ivanov V. V. Indo-European language and Indo-Europeans. Tbilisi, «Tbilisi University Publishing House», 1984. 1328 ss. (in two volumes with continuous page numbering). (In Russ.).

5. Gatsalova L. B., Parsieva L. K. Large Russian-Ossetian dictionary: about 60,000 words and expressions. Vladikavkaz: IPO SOIGSI, 2011. 687 p. (In Russ.).

6. Geroev Naiden. The Bulgarian language dictionary. Plovdiv, 1895–1908. Vol. 5. 476 p. 156. (In Bulg.).

7. Dahl' V. Explanatory dictionary of the Great-Russian language. 3rd ed. St. Petersburg, Moscow: Publishing house of M. O. Wolf, 1903-1909. Vol. 1-4. (In Russ.).

8. Dvoretzky I. H. Ancient Greek-Russian Dictionary. 2 v. Moscow: State Publishing House of Foreign and National Dictionaries, 1958. (In Russ.).

9. Dvoretzky I. H. Latin-Russian dictionary. 2nd edition, reworked and additional. Moscow: Russian language, 1976. 1096 p. (In Russ.).
10. Dobrodomov I. G., Shapoval V. V. Strioma! (From historical and lexicological marginalia to complex lexicographic project) // Eternity is supported by a single written use of memory. St. Petersburg, 2007. Pp. 183–210. (In Russ.).
11. Dybo V. A., Zamyatina G. I., Nikolaev S. L. Fundamentals of Slavic accentology / ed. by R. V. Bulatov. Moscow: Nauka (Science), 1990. 284 p. (In Russ.).
12. Dybo V. A. Morphonologized paradigmatic accent systems: Typology and genesis. Russian Culture Languages, 2000. 736 з. (In Russ.).
13. Zaliznyak A. A. From the Proto-Slavic accentuation to Russian one. Moscow: Nauka, 1985. 428 p. (In Russ.).
14. Zemsкая E. A., Kitaygorodskaya M. V., Shiryayev E. N. Russian colloquial speech. General questions. Word formation. Syntax. Moscow: Nauka, 1981. 276 p. (In Russ.).
15. The electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language (eDIL). URL: <https://dil.ie/38838> (accessed 05.06.2023).
16. Welsh dictionary. URL: <https://www.geiriadur.ac.uk/gpc/gpc.html> (accessed 05.06.2023).
17. Niedermann M. Historical phonetics of the Latin language. Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1949. 190 p. (In Russ.).
18. Orthowiki: Suffixes. URL: <http://орфография.орг/вики/Суффиксы> (accessed 05.06.2023).
19. Orthowiki: S'n. URL: <http://орфография.орг/вики/Сън> (accessed 05.06.2023).
20. Orthowiki: Stress in full-voicing. URL: http://орфография.орг/вики/Ударение_в_полногласии (accessed 05.06.2023).
21. Orthowiki: Ts'v. URL: <http://орфография.орг/вики/Цв> (accessed 05.06.2023).
22. Sayenko M. N. General innovations in the basic vocabulary as an argument in the discussion about the Baltic-Slavic unity. Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences. Moscow, 2015. 27 p. (In Russ.).
23. Sayenko M. N. Reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic list of Svodesh // Journal of Language Relationship. 2013. Questions of linguistic kinship. Russian Dictionary. 10. Pp. 139–148. (In Russ.).

Dmitry M. Bystrov, Mikhail S. Yastrebov-Pestritskiy

24. Dictionary of Russian Vernacular / Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Institute of the Russian Language, Dictionary Sector. Issues 1–48. Moscow, Leningrad: Nauka, Leningrad Branch, 1965–2015. (In Russ.).

25. Dictionary of modern Russian folk dialect (count. Deulino, Ryazan district, Ryazan region) / Edited by I. A. Ossovetsky. Moscow: Nauka, 1969. 612 p. (In Russ.).

26. Sreznevsky I. I. Materials for the dictionary of the Old Russian language. SPb.: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1893–1912. Vol. 1–3. (In Russ.).

27. Trubachev O. N. Note on art. khod in: Vasmer M. Etymological dictionary of the Russian language / Trans. from it. and additions by O. N. Trubachev. Edited with a preface by prof. B. A. Larin. 2nd ed., stereotype. In 4 vv. Moscow: Progress, 1986–1987. Vol. IV, 864 p., P. 253 («khod»). (In Russ.).

28. Vasmer M. Etymological dictionary of the Russian language / Trans. from German and additions by O. N. Trubachev. Edited with a preface by prof. B. A. Larin. 2nd ed., stereotype. In 4 volumes. Moscow: Progress, 1986–1987. (In Russ.).

29. Tseitlin R.M. Vocabulary of the Old Slavic language. The experience of analyzing motivated words according to the data of Ancient Bulgarian manuscripts of the X–XI centuries. Moscow: Nauka, 1977. 336 p. (In Russ.).

30. Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages. V. S. Rastorgueva, D. I. Edelman; Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow: Publishing Company «Oriental Literature» of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Nauka – East. Lit., 2000–2020. Vv. 1–6. (In Russ.).

31. Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages: Proto-Slavic Lexical Fund. Moscow: Nauka, 1974–2021. Issues 1–41. (In Russ.).

32. AECMA Simplified English. URL: <https://stefannystrom.com/arkivet/AECMA%20Simplified%20English.pdf> (accessed 22.02.2023). (In Eng.).

33. Alonecoder [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://alonecoder.nedopc.com/ling/PIE/index.html> (дата обращения: 22.02.2023). (In Eng.).

34. Balto-Slavica [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.balto-slavica.org/forum/index.php?showtopic=23334&page=2#entry385951> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023). (In Eng.).

35. Blažek Václav. Indo-European kinship terms in *-ǵ2TER // *Grammaticvs: studia linguistica Adolfo Erharto quinque et septuagenario oblata*. Brně: Masarykova univerzita, 2001. Pp. 24–33. (In Eng.).
36. Bystrov Dm., Yastrebov-Pestritskiy M. Searching for the lexical core of Proto-Indo-European language // *Вестник славянских культур*. 2020. № 57. С. 183–200. (In Eng.).
37. Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon / by R. Derksen (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series). Vol. 13. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2015. 684 p. (In Eng.).
38. Etymological dictionary of Greek / by R. Beekes; with the assistance of L. van Beek (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 10/1. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2009. 1839 p. (In Eng.).
39. Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages / by M. de Vaan (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 7. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008. 825 p. (In Eng.).
40. Etymological dictionary of proto-Celtic / by R. Matasovic. p. em. (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 9. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008. 458 p. (In Eng.).
41. Etymological dictionary of the Iranian verb / by Johnny Cheung. (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series). Vol. 2. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007. 600 p. (In Eng.).
42. Fontana, Alessandro. The Proto-Indo-European anaphoric and relative pronouns: analysis and considerations. Leiden University. 99 p. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: The Proto-Indo-European anaphoric and relative pronouns: analysis and considerations (universiteitleiden.nl) (дата обращения: 22.03.2023). (In Eng.).
43. Google Translate. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://translate.google.com/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023). (In Eng.).
44. Griffiths A., Lubotsky A. Two Words for 'sister-in-law'? Notes on Vedic *yātar-* and *giri-*. // *Beiträge zur Iranistik*. Band 30. Wiesbaden, 2009. Pp. 115–121.
45. Hamp E. P. Indo-European 'ego', Slavic *ja* = Runic *ek*, and Celtic *Ø* // *Slavia Centralis*. 2011. Vol 4/1. Pp. 5–13. (In Eng.).
46. Kloekhorst Alwin. The Proto-Indo-European acrostatic inflection reconsidered / *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2014. Pp. 140–163. (In Eng.).
47. Latviešu – krievu vārdnīca. Rīga: Liesma, 1979-1981: 1-2 vol. (In Latv.).
48. Liddell H. G.; Scott R. A Greek-English Lexicon. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1883. 1776 p. (In Eng.).

49. Liddell H. G.; Scott, R.; Jones, H. S. A Greek-English Lexicon. New ed. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. (In Eng.).

50. Lietuvių kalbos žodynas. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://lkz.lt/> (дата обращения: 14.03.2023). (In Lith.).

51. Lyberis Antanas. Lietuvių-rusų kalbų žodynas. Ketvirtoji laida. / Spec. redaktorius prof. habil. dr. Valerijus Čekmonas. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2005. 951 p. (In Lith.).

52. Mailhammer, Robert. The Germanic strong verbs: foundations and development of a new system (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007. 272 p. (In Eng.).

53. Ogden C. K. The Basic Books. / Supplement to The Basic News, January, 1938. Cambridge: The Orthological Institute, 1938. p. 4. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: http://zbenglish.net/sites/basic/basic_books.html (дата обращения: 22.02.2023). (In Eng.).

54. Oxford 3000. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/external/pdf/wordlists/oxford-3000-5000/The_Oxford_3000.pdf (дата обращения: 22.02.2023). (In Eng.).

55. Oxford Latin Dictionary. – Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968. 2126 с. (In Eng.).

56. Peterson Joseph H. Dictionary of most common AVESTA words. 1995. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://www.avesta.org/avdict/avdict.htm> (дата обращения: 22.02.2023). (In Eng.).

57. Pokorny J. Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. / Band 1–3. Bern, München, 1959. (In Germ.).

58. Pooth R. A. The Proto-Indo-European aspect system. Published at www.academia.edu on 2014-12-26. [Электронный ресурс]. URL:

https://www.academia.edu/9910503/The_Prot_Indo_European_aspect_system (дата обращения: 22.02.2023). (In Eng.).

59. Pooth R. A. There will be ‘blood’. The etymology of Greek ἄσπρᾱ and Proto-Germanic *asani- and the function of the o-grade in Proto-Indo-European // FIU Research Comment – Vouvant, Vendée, France; Cologne, Rhineland, Germany; Ghent, Flandres, Belgium, 3–7 August 2018, revised 13–15 November 2018. [Электронный ресурс]. URL:

https://www.academia.edu/37804863/There_will_be_blood_The_etymology_of_Greek_%E1%BD%80%CF%80%CF%8E%CF%81%CE%B1_and_Pr

oto_Germanic_asani_and_the_function_of_the_o_grade_in_Proto_Indo_Eu
ropean (дата обращения: 15.03.2023). (In Eng.).

60. Rix H. Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben. Wiesbaden: DR. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2001. 824 p. (In Germ.).

61. Sanskrit – Dictionary. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://www.learnsanskrit.cc/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023). (In Eng.).

62. Sanskrit Dictionary. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://www.sanskritdictionary.com/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023). (In Eng.).

63. Słownik gwar polskich. / Ułożył Jan Karłowicz. В 6 т. Kraków, 1900-1911. Vol. 5. 476 p. (In Polish).

64. Słownik Staropolski. / kierownik Stanisław Urbańczyk. 1-11 vol. Polska Akademia Nauk, 1953–2002. Т. 1, Warszawa, 1953–1955. Т. 6, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków, 1970–1973 (In Polish).

65. Starostin, George; Kassian, Alexei; Trofimov, Artem; Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2017. 400-item basic wordlist for potentially «Nostratic» languages. Moscow: Laboratory for Oriental and Comparative Studies of the School of Advanced Studies in the Humanities, Russian Presidential Academy. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://starling.rinet.ru/new400> (дата обращения: 23.03.2023). (In Eng.).

66. Steingass F. J. A Comprehensive Persian-English dictionary, including the Arabic words and phrases to be met with in Persian literature. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1892. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/steingass/> (дата обращения: 15.03.2023). (In Eng.).

67. Swadesh M. Lexico-statistic Dating of Prehistoric Ethnic Contacts // Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. 1952. Vol. 96. № 4. Pp. 452-463. (In Eng.).

68. Vidal M. C. Proto-Indo-European nominal Ablaut patterns. 2014. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://www.academia.edu/8450869/Proto_Indo_European_nominal_Ablaut_patterns (дата обращения: 15.03.2023). (In Eng.).

69. Vovin A. The End of Altaic Controversy // Central Asiatic Journal. 2008. № 57 (1). Pp. 71–132. (In Eng.).

ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОЕ ЯДРО ПРАИНДООЕВРОПЕЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА: ПОЛНЫЙ СПИСОК СВОДЕША-207

Д. М. Быстров

независимый исследователь, г. Рязань, Россия

М. С. Ястребов-Пестрицкий

Научная библиотека Госархива РФ (НБ ГАРФ)

В данной работе лексическое ядро ПИЕ реконструируется только по словам, попавшим одновременно в 4 главных ветви индоевропейских языков (индоиранскую, италийско-кельтскую, балтославянскую, греческую), причём без нарушения сатемизации и без введения дополнительных фонем (4-го ларингала, «спирантов Бругмана», *q). Эти ограничения минимизируют вероятность попадания периферийной лексики и случайных совпадений в реконструкцию. Подробно описана методика такого поиска для получения заданного списка понятий. Результирующий список Сводеша на 207 слов приведён вместе со ссылкой на рабочие материалы. Поскольку при таких жёстких ограничениях всё же удалось вывести весь список (сложные случаи рассмотрены подробно), то есть основания полагать, что можно реконструировать центральный ПИЕ (прямой общий предок перечисленных ветвей) как полноценный язык и составить его словарь. Даны предложения о структуре и порядке составления такого словаря. Также обнаружено, что только 59% слов полученного списка Сводеша для центрального ПИЕ отражены хотя бы в одном германском языке – это подтверждает предположение, что германская ветвь не происходит из центрального ПИЕ, а действительно является периферийной. В процессе поиска балтославянского материала обнаружен закон, по которому распределяются s и š в литовском языке (правило RUKI действует в прабалтославянском полностью, в том числе в окончании): суффикс -s (если он синхронно обнаруживается) восстанавливается в виде -š независимо от позиции; конечное -š > -s и влечёт срединное -š- > -s- (в том числе это касается сатемного согласного š < ě < k̄). Также обнаружено соответствие *sm- > Lat. sp-, Gr. σμ- (позже > μ-).

Ключевые слова: etymology, method, proto-Indo-European, Swadesh, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Slavic, Lithuanian, правило RUKI

Для цитирования: Bystrov D. M., Yastrebov-Pestritskiy M. S. The lexical core of proto-indo-european language: the complete Swadesh list // Libri Magistri. 2023. № 4 (26). С. 36–78.

Поступила в редакцию 26.06.2023