Anatolian lexical isolates and their external Nostratic cognates

The author proposes external (Nostratic) etymologies for several dozen Hittite-Luwian roots and auxiliary morphemes lacking Indo-European cognates. The main part of discussed lexemes belongs to the basic vocabulary.

Bifurcation of the Proto-Indo-European language (Indo-Hittite, using E. Sturtevant’s term) into Anatolian and Narrow Indo-European branches is nowadays accepted by the majority of scholars (see the overview in Blažek 2007).

One of the corollaries of this schema is the fact that roots and stems known only from the Anatolian languages have practically the same chances as Proto-Narrow IE forms to represent Nostratic retentions in Indo-Hittite.¹

Below I list ca. 40 Anatolian stems from the basic vocabulary (i.e. Swadesh list, kinship terms, anatomical terms, and so on) which cannot be

¹ Cf. a similar approach in Kloekhorst 2008, where an interesting common Anatolian-Uralic morphosyntactic phenomenon is analyzed.
identified as loans, lack Narrow IE cognates, but have reliable external (Nostratic) parallels.

**Notes on the terminology.**

1) The Tower of Babel Project groups Indo-European, Altaic, Uralic, Kartvelian and Dravidian proto-languages into a *Eurasiat*ic macrofamily, provisionally reserving the term *Nostratic* for the next level, where *Eurasiat*ic is linked to the Afroasiatic (Semito-Hamitic) macrofamily as its closest relative. Since *Eurasiat*ic has not become a common term thus far, in my paper I use the more usual designation of *Nostratic* as the name of the protolanguage that yielded IE, Altaic, Uralic, Kartvelian and Dravidian protolanguages. The genealogical tree of Nostratic (http://starling.rinet.ru/images/globet.png), based on 35-word lists and certain morphological data, shows that the family diverged ca. 10–9 millenium B.C., i.e. in the Mesolithic or Early Neolithic period.

2) The traditional abbreviation *IE* refers to the Indo-Hittite protolanguage, whereas for the Narrow Indo-European protolanguage I use the term *Narrow IE*.

The fundamental list of phonetic correspondences between the proto-languages that constitute Nostratic is adduced in Иллич-Свityч ОСНЯ 1: 147 ff. and Dolgopolsky ND: 9 ff. Compared to Иллич-Свityч, Dolgopolsky establishes a number of new correspondences, out of which the most important for us is the loss of Nostratic *z/-phonemes in Indo-Hittite, i.e. Nostr. *z/ż/ž > IE *∅ (or IE *H, using Dolgopolsky’s notation).

Nostratic data are given in accordance with the Tower of Babel Project databases (unless otherwise mentioned). The following etymological databases were used:

Nostratic — *Nostret.dbf* by S. Starostin (a compilation of Иллич-Свityч’s publications and Dolgopolsky ND, plus a number of new comparisons; unfinished work); Indo-European — *Piet.dbf* by S. Nikolaev; Altaic — *Altet.dbf* (= EDAL with minor corrections); Uralic — *Uralet.dbf* (= Rédei UEW, plus a number of additions and corrections by various scholars; unfinished work); Kartvelian — *Kartet.dbf* by S. Starostin (a compilation of Климов ЭСКЯ and Klimov EDKL plus a number of additions); Dravidian — *Dravet.dbf* by G. Starostin.
Anatolian data are given according to the main lexicographic sources — CHD, HEG, HED, EDHIL, Melchert CLL. These dictionaries are usually not mentioned in the entries. Datings of the cuneiform texts are given apud Konkordanz.

Narrow IE forms are quoted from the standard dictionaries (LSJ for Ancient Greek; BR and Mayrhoffer EWA for Old Indian; OLD for Latin; and so on) without references.

The list of proposed etymologies is divided into two sections: Reliable (regular phonetic correspondences and self-evident meaning shifts; No. 1–41) and Dubious (phonetically irregular or semantically distant comparisons; No. 42–55).

The entries have the following structure:

**Title of the entry:** Anatolian data (Hittite forms are not specified).

◊ Virtual (Narrow) IE reconstruction, as can be established on the basis of Anatolian data.
≠ Disputable or improbable Narrow IE cognates of the Anatolian form.
√ Proposed Nostratic cognates.
→ Comments & references.

### A. Reliable

1. *ayimpa-, aimpa-, impa- c. ‘weight, burden (literal and figurative)’, *impai- ‘to be depressed’. From MS on. Vocalic alternation resembles Ablaut in the noun *ayis* (nom.-acc) ~ *iss-* (obl.) ‘mouth’ (to OInd. *ās-,* Lat. *ōs* ‘mouth’, etc.).

◊ IE **VmPo-**.
Hsch. ἰμφθείς · βλαφθείς, λωβηθείς · νυχθείς ‘oppressed, maltreated’ (if here) is an Asia Minor word.


? Ural. * ámbpe ‘whole, complete’: Est. umb, umbes ‘ganz, durchaus, über und über’, Saam. obbâ, obâ, oabâ (N) ‘whole, in its entirety, all; only, rather, pretty’. Perhaps to be separated from the homonymous Uralic stem ‘closed; closed state’.

→ Consonant correspondences are regular; vocalic correspondences are unclear due to the ambiguity of the Hittite vocalism. See Nostret.dbf #1950 (Alt. + Ural.).

2. * álwaṇz(a)- ‘witchcraft, sorcery’ in derivates álwaṇz-adar ‘witchcraft, sorcery’, álwaṇz-essar ‘witchcraft, sorcery’, álwaṇz-ahh- ‘to bewitch’, etc. (from OS on). The suffix -anza- is not etymologically clear, but attested in a number of Hitt. stems, see Kronasser EHS: 198 ff.

◊ IE **ol/uvaultbelowo-. (~ a-).

≠ E. Rieken and I. Yakubovich (see Yakubovich // Kadmos 47 (2008): 17) connect it to Luwian * álwaṇnai- ‘inimical’ from Indo-Hittite * állo- ‘other’ (Lat. alius ‘other’, probably Lydian aλa ‘other’) with the Luw. suffix -wanai-. Problematic both phonetically (immotivated loss of -i- in Hittite) and semantically (shift ‘enemy’ > ‘witchcraft’ is unprovable).

√ Alt. * zjałVbi ‘sorcery, witchcraft; to investigate (by magic power)’: Tung. * sílbi- ‘to promise, warn, report’; Mong. * sílbe- * sílmo ‘1 to behave indecently, glance around; 2 devil’; Turk. * jelbi- ‘sorcery, witchcraft’; Jpn. * sîrîtmip- ‘1 to tune, adjust to rhythm, play rhythmical music; 2 to investigate’; Kor. * sîjôh- ‘to be annoyed, vexed, sad’.

→ Correspondences are regular (Nostr. * z > IE ð; Nostr. *-w > Alt. *b-).

Differently and unlikely Dolgopol'sky ND #2661 ‘sorcery, witchcraft’: Alt. + IE * Hel- ‘to destroy’ + Afras.

3. anku adv. ‘fully, quite, really, absolutely, unconditionally’. From MS on.

◊ IE ** onKu-, ** onK- (~ an- - ñ-).

√ Alt. * ánô ‘right’: Tung. * án(g)i- ‘right’; Mong. * enge- ‘1 South; 2 front (of cloth)’; Turk. * onj ‘1 right; 2 good, lucky; 3 West’.
4. ekt-, ikt- c. ‘(catch-)net’, CLuw. akkat(i)- ‘hunting net’ (with the secondary anaptyxis, cf., e.g., Melchert AHP: 277). From MS on.
◊ IE **eKT-.
≠ Traditionally analyzed as a t-formation from IE *jêk- ‘to throw’ (Lat. iacēō ‘to throw’), but according to known Hitt. passages, ekt- / akkat(i)- was not a missile, but a hunting net.
The connection to West Germ. *jagōn ‘to drive, chase, hunt’ (with highly hypothetical Narrow IE cognates: Proto-Toch. *yokai- ‘thirst, desire’, OInd. yāhtu-, yahvā- ‘restless, swift, active’, see Pok.: 502, Adams DTB: 510) is not too apt either. First, a deverbal nomen instrumenti with the suffix -t is not a normal morphological pattern; second, the loss of initial *j- in Luwian is inexplicable.
Cf. also the unclear OInd. form ákṣu ‘net’ (AV+) that can directly correspond to the Hitt. form if we suppose a consonant metathesis in Proto-Indo-Aryan or Proto-Anatolian (the so-called «Brugmann’s fricative»: Hitt. tk ~ OInd. ks).
√ Ural. *šäktV ‘to plait (e.g., net);
? Kartv. *skw- ‘to tie (lace, etc.)’: Georg. škv(-), Megr. šk(u)-, šk−, šk−, Laz šk−, Svan le-skw-er ‘rope’.
→ Correspondences between IE—Ural.—Alt. are exact. Nostr. *z > IE Ø is regular. See Nostret.dbf #1542 (Ural. + Alt. + Kartv.).

5. ektu-, iktu- c. ‘leg’. MH/NS.
◊ IE **eKTu- or *VjKTu-.
→ Correspondences are exact. Nostr. *z > IE Ø is regular. Hittite stem was correctly etymologized in Dolgopol’sky ND #2661 (Hitt. + Alt. + Afras.).
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‘thigh, ham’ if < *sedgu- < *setk-< *sekt- (see Nikolaev, Piet.dbf #3022 with incorrect IE reconstruction, without Hittite, but with a dubious Toch. B cognate). Apparently IE *soK< contains the t- suffix (the same as, e.g., in *neK< ‘night’) and the starting Indo-Hittite root was *soK<.3

6. istam-ass-mi ‘to hear’, istam-ana/-istam-ina- ‘ear’ (from OS on), CLuw. tumm-ant- ‘ear’.
   ◊ IE **stom- (~ -a-). Hitt. st- ~ CLuw. t- may points to IE “s-mobile”.
   CLuw. u < a probably under the influence of labial m.
   ♦ Traditionally united with Grk. στόμα(τ­) ‘mouth’ (further to Avest. staman- ‘maw’) as ‘an organ of perception’ that is semantically unsatisfactory (the same concerns ‘a hole in the head’ as an invariant meaning).
   √ Kartv. *śtVm- ‘ear’, based on Svan ṣdim, šṭim ‘ear’ and probably on *(s)a-(s)tum-al- or *(s)a-(s)tu-n-al- ‘head of the bed’5: Georg. sastumal- ‘head of the bed’, Megr. ortumel- ‘head of the bed’, Laz omtunal- [< ontumal-] ‘bearing log of the fire’ (Klimov EDKL: 175). Svan -i- in ṣdim can be explained as paradigmatic levelling after the nominative form with i-assimilation *šdim-i > *šdum- > šdim-.
   The retention of ST-onset in Georg. -stumal- is unclear. Cf. also forms with -n-, not -m-, quoted in Климов ЭСКЯ: 170. Alternatively *(s)a-(s)tu-n-al- can go back to Kartv. *(s)taw- ‘head’.
   → Anatolian root was correctly etymologized in Dolgopolsky ND #2133 *sVTimV ‘to hear’: Hitt. + Kartv. + Egypt. (ṣdm ‘to hear’, if ḏ < *Ty??) and some other Afras.

7. yaya-hi ‘to expectorate (phlegm)’. Scarce attestation in medical NS texts. For the meaning of the term see Kassian forthcoming.
   ◊ IE **foj- (~ -a-).
   √ Alt. *njåji ‘pus; snot’: PTung. *nā- ‘1 to rot; 2 pus’; PMong. *nij- ‘1 snot; 2 to blow nose’.

4 For Hittite orthographic iš-ta-, covering phonetic /st-/ see Kassian & Yakubovich 2002.
5 If < ‘pillow’; cf. Russian под-ушка ‘pillow’, lit. ‘under-ear’.
Drav. *nej- ‘oil, ghee’: South *nej- ‘butter, ghee, oil, grease, fat, honey’; 
Telugu *nej- ‘ghee, oil’; Kolami-Gadba *nej ‘oil, ghee’; Gondi-Kui *nij ‘oil, ghee’. The primary anatomic meaning is preserved in the 
compound with *tör- ‘to flow’ — Drav. *nej-tor ‘blood’: South 
*nej-tör; Telugu *nettura; Kolami-Gadba *netru; Gondi-Kui *nej-tor;
Brahui ditar.
→ Nostr. *ni- > IE *i- ~ Alt. *ni- ~ Drav. n- is regular.

8. haruwa- ‘road’, rare word (MH/NS), can be a Luwism. HLuw. harwa- ‘road’, harwa-ni- ‘to send, dispatch’.
◊ IE **Horu- (~ -a-) or **Hru-. If the Hitt. stem is a Luwian loan, then 
theoretically it can correspond to IE **HorK- (with *k̂/ĝ/gĥ > y).
√ Drav. *ār- (~ -a-) (South only: *ār/linebelow._­) ‘way, road, path’.
Kartv. *xer- ‘to lead, to make way’: Georg. m-xer-v-al- ‘leading’,
sa-xer-v-el- ‘rudder, steering oar’, Megr. xar- ‘to make way in the 
snow’, Laz xar- ‘step’.
→ Anatolian *h- ~ Kartv. *x- ~ Drav. θ is regular. Drav. *r, however, 
points to the Nostratic front vowel in the second syllable.
Cf. also a similar root in u-: Ural. *ura ‘way, path’, Drav. *var- ‘road’,
*or-ünk- ‘lane, path’ (Nostret.dbf #1205, plus Alt.).

9. kam(m)ars-ma ‘to defecate (said of human and animal)’, kammaras-niya-
‘to befoul(?), kamars-uwant- c. ‘defecation’. From MS on.
◊ IE **Kom… (~ -a-).
≠ Traditionally the Hitt. stem is analyzed as *kad-mar-s-, i.e. IE *ghod-
(Grk. χέζω, OInd. hādati ‘to defecate’, etc.) + heteroclitic suffix 
-mar, well-attested in Hitt. + additional s-suffix. This supposition is 
based on three facts:
1) double *mm- pointing to an old cluster (*-Tm- or *-mn-);
2) direct morphological parallel in Toch. B kenner ‘excrement’
(< *ghod-mor) and
3) unique Luwoid form with the retained cluster: prs. 3 pl. katmarsitti.
As a matter of fact, the doubled *mm- is attested only twice (iter. 3 pl.
imp. kammaraseskīddu in LNS KUB 17.27 and suffixed stem kḷamma-
rasṇiyattat in broken MS’ KBo 38.188), the standard orthography is
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-m- (from MS on). Furthermore, Toch. B kenner does not exist (pit=kenner is to be read pitke-enner ‘spittle’ + ‘(a medical ingredi-
ent)’, see Adams DTB: 193). As for Luwoid katmarsitti, the translation ‘they defecate’ is quite improbable for the ritual context KUB 30.31 1–8; we must accept that the meaning of this word remains un-
known, see CHD, Š: 47 (supported by Rieken // HS 116 (2003): 308).

Postulation of the Anatolian root *kam- ‘dung’ is therefore plausible;
the second element of the Hitt. stem (-ars-) is not clear, it can be a
double-suffixal formation (e.g., heteroclitic -ar and denomina-
-tive -s- as in istam-a(-)ss- ‘to hear’). In any case, Puhvel’s suppositions
about compound [kad-mar] + verbs sai-/siya- ‘to press’ or suwai- ‘to
fill’ seem improbable.

√ Alt. *k’amo ‘dung, faeces’: Tung. *[x]amū- ‘1 faeces, dung; 2 to defe-
cate; 3 snuff, thief (in a pipe)’; Mong. *komu- ‘horse dung’; Turk.
*Kom- ‘1 horse dung; 2 sheep dung balls; 3 round, spheroid’.

10. kappuwai- ‘to count, tally, calculate; to take into account’ (from OS
on). The Hitt. verb is a transparent denominative formation from an
unattested u-stem *kappu-. The meaning ‘to tally’ is primary, since the
semantic shift ‘to tally’ > ‘to take into account, etc.’ is well attested in
the world languages, but probably not vice versa.

◊ IE **Kopu- (~ a-).

≠ Similarity with Lat. com-putāre ‘to calculate’ (cf. putāre ‘to make clean or
tidy, prune’, probably from paviō ‘to thump, pound’) provokes
some Indo-Europeanists to invest in risky etymological theories:
Hitt. kappuwai- is analyzed as the Hitt. verb puwai- ‘to pound, grind
(a medical ingredient)’ (can be a Luwian loan; a cognate of Lat.
paviō) with non-existent Anatolian adverbs/preverbs *kam- or *kat-.
However, it is clear that Lat. com-putāre is derived not from the ter-
minus technicus putāre ‘to prune, cut back (trees, bushes); to scour
(wool), etc.’, but from the homonymous putāre ‘to think, suppose; to
consider, regard’ (with the cross-linguistically well attested mean-
ing shift ‘to think’ > ‘to calculate’); therefore, the Hitt. verb puwai- ‘to
grind’ as a hypothetical base of kappuwai- is out of play.6

* Inner Hittite formal difficulties are hardly easier to overcome. The assumed compound
*kam-puwai- should be ruled out with certainty, since there are no adverbial counterparts of

---

6 Inner Hittite formal difficulties are hardly easier to overcome. The assumed compound
Alternatively Nikolaev (Piet.dbf #1629) connects \textit{kappuωai-} to Slav. *\textit{zob-/žeb-} [Rus. \textit{saô-oma} ‘concern (for); care (for)’, etc.], Balt. *\textit{geb-} [Lith. \textit{gebêti} ‘pflegen, gewohnt sein, vermögen’, \textit{gebûs} ‘fleissig, begabt’], Germ. *\textit{kôpjan-} ‘to stare, to gape; to observe’ [Orel HGE: 219], *\textit{kapên-} [OHG \textit{kappên} ‘schauen, spählen’; Köbler GWb s.v. *\textit{kapp-}]. This comparison is phonetically unsatisfactory, since Hitt. points to IE *\textit{-p-}, BSlav. — to IE *\textit{-bh-}, Germ. — to IE *\textit{-b-}.

\checkmark Alt. *\textit{k'êpû} ‘price; to transform(?): Mong. *\textit{kubîl-} ‘to transform, take another form’ [if here!]; Turk. *\textit{Kebi-/Ic-} ‘1 a gift of food to someone who comes to stack the crop after the fields are clear; 2 harvest tax in favour of the poor or the clergy; 3 debt’; Jpn. *\textit{kupua-} ‘profit’; Kor. *\textit{kâps} ‘price’.

Drav. *\textit{kap-} ‘tribute’: South *\textit{kap-am} ‘tribute’, Telugu *\textit{kapp-} ‘tribute, tax, subsidy’.

→ Correspondences are regular. Apparently we deal with the Nostratic nominal stem *\textit{kVpu} ‘number’ or ‘count’ with natural meaning shifts to ‘price’ (Alt.) and ‘tribute’ (Drav.).

Altaic verbal stem *\textit{kápa} ‘to buy, pay back’ [Tung. *\textit{xab-} ‘1 to buy; 2 to complain, start a lawsuit’; Jpn. *\textit{káp-} ‘to buy, (ex)change’; Kor. *\textit{kâphi-} ‘to compensate, pay back’] cannot be separated from this cluster (semantic shift ‘count’ > ‘recount’ > ‘pay’ is the same as, e.g., in OHG \textit{zalôn} ‘to count’ > NHG \textit{zahlen}).

Cf. also extremely dubious IE *\textit{ka(µ)p-} ‘merchant’: Grk. κάπητας [ίς] (Hdt., Plato, etc.) ‘retail-dealer, huckster, tavern-keeper’, Lat. caupō / cōpō, -ōnis (Plautus, Horatius, etc.) ‘shop-keeper, tavern-keeper’, cōpī f. ‘woman who provides entertainment in taverns’. Seems to be a Wanderwort of unclear nature with irregular phonetic correspondences.

See Nostret.dbf #1032 (Alt. + Drav. + dubious IE ‘merchant’).

\hline
IE *\textit{kom-} ‘with’ in Anatolian languages, not to mention that the cluster *\textit{-mP-} is retained in Hittite. As for the proposed *\textit{kat-puwai-}, the adverbs \textit{katta} and \textit{katti} ‘down, above’ (Grk. \textit{kāta}, \textit{kattî}) are already known from the most ancient Hittite texts, but the variant \textit{kat-} is unattested elsewhere, leaving the compound *\textit{kat-puwai-} without any reliable parallels within the Hittite morphological system (the simplification *\textit{-TP-} > *\textit{-PP-} in Proto-Hittite is also a mere guess without proof; synchronically TP-clusters were possible at least in borrowed words, cf. such divine names as \textit{katpuzzizi}, \textit{putpar} and toponyms \textit{kutpina}, \textit{hutpa}, \textit{kutpa}).
11. karuss-iga-mu ‘to be/fall silent; to keep quiet (about)’. From MS on.
◊ IE **Kor… (-ar- - s-).
≠ Traditionally united with Hitt. kariya- ‘to stop, pause (intr.)’: semantically possible, but the morphological pattern of derivation is quite unclear. Eichner’s comparison with Balto-Slav.-Germ. onomatopoetic root *(s)kreyst- (Germ. *kreustanan ‘to gnash teeth’, Latv. skraustēti ‘to crackle’, Slav. *xrustěti ‘to crackle’) is improbable.
√ Kartv. *qurs- ‘to be silent, become silent’: Georg. qurs-, Megr. urs-.
→ Correctly etymologized in Dolgopolsky ND #1942 (Hitt. + Kartv. + Afras.).

12. kasa ‘look here, lo, behold’ (see Hoffner & Melchert: 323 f. for the nuances of the English translation). From OS on. Hitt. kasa can be a fossilized imv. 3 sg. from an unattested verbal hi-stem.
◊ IE **Kos- (-a-).
≠ Traditionally kasa is derived from the pronominal stem *ka- ‘this’ (< IE *kei/o/i-) after an unclear morphological pattern.
√ Ural. *kače ‘to see, look, notice’.
→ Correspondences are regular. Further cf. probably Alt. *káče ‘wish, intend’ (so Nostret.dbf #1706: Ural. + Alt.).

13. kist-, kest- ‘to be extinguished, die out’, causative kis(t)anu-. Palaic kist- ‘id.’. From OS on.
◊ IE **KV/st- or **Kest- ( -zd-).
≠ Traditionally to IE *gves-: OInd. jásate ‘to be exhausted’, Rus. zacnymu, etc. Hittite, however, must show ku- for IE *gves-, whereas t-suffixation is unlikely for this primary verbal stem.
→ Note Alt. *š- ~ Anatolian *st-.

14. kudur n. r-st. ‘leg/shank (of animal: beef, lamb etc.)’, only in “culinary contexts. From OH/NS on.
Morphological analysis *kud-ur* is plausible.

M. Poetto (supported by HED) adduces a parallel with ONorse *kvett* ‘meat’, Icel. *kvetti* ‘Fleischstück vom Wal’ (de Vries ANEW: 337), possibly a *t*-formation from the highly unclear Germ. root *kut-* ‘to cut’, violating IE phonotactics (i.e. ‘meat’ as ‘cut off’): Faroese *kvetta* ‘hastig abschneiden’, Swed. and Icel. *kuta* ‘to cut with a knife’, Swed. *kuta*, Icel. *kuti* ‘knife’, MEng. *cutten* ‘to cut’ (North Germ. loan?). On the other hand, ON *kvett* is very similar to ON *kjot* ‘meat’; the former originates from some virtual IE stem like *ged̑yo* (violating IE phonotactics), and *kvett* may go back to the same Germ. stem with y-metathesis. Cf. also inherited OFrench *couteau* ‘knife’ (source of borrowing?). Thus the (North) Germanic root ‘to cut’ remains problematic; it can hardly reflect Proto-IE in view of the Germ. sequence *k-t*, and the semantic shift ‘to cut’ > ‘meat’ > ‘animal leg’ requires typological evidence as well.


Correspondences are regular.

Further cf. the well-known Nostr. root *kudV*- ‘tail’ (Nostret.dbf #595):

IE (Lat.) *kaud-,* Alt. *k’údor(gV),* Kartv. *qwad-,* maybe Ural. *kuttV* ‘back’.

15. *kuwattar / kuttar* n. r/n-st. (obl.: *kuttan-*) ‘nape of the neck, scruff, top of shoulders; mainstay, support’ (from OS on), *kuttan-iga*- ‘herrisch behandeln’ (MS), *kuttan-alli* ‘necklace’ (NS). Puhvel (HED) translates *kuttar* in the entry title as ‘strength, force, power’, but in the quoted passages gives the correct translation ‘mainstay’. Derived verb *kuttan-iga-* means something like ‘herrisch behandeln’ (rather than ‘to exert power’ as per Puhvel).° Anatomical semantics is apparently primary.

IE **Kvot-t** or **Kwot-t** (~ *-a-*).

° Lat. *carn-* ‘meat’, quoted in HED, goes back to IE *karaw-* ‘meat’ (Germ. *xarun-d-a-n* ‘skin, body, flesh’); its connection with IE *(s)ker-* ‘to cut’ is hypothetical (derivation from IE *(s)ker-* ‘bark, skin’ is more probable in any case).

° Semantic shift resembles ἱσσαφός (Exodus 33:3) ‘σκληρο-τράχηλος, stiff-necked’, etc.
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≠ Puhvel, departing from the meaning ‘power’, connects this to IE *keyô/- *kyô- ‘schwellen’ (Pok.: 592 ff.), cf. especially Ond. (RV) švô-trib- ‘strong; strength’. Morphological issues, however, are not any less problematic than semantic ones, since the well-attested Hittite abstract heteroclitic suffix -adar has voiced -t-, not voiceless -tt- and oblique form in -nn- (< *-dn-), not -ttan-. Thus kuwattar / kuttar must be treated as a primary heteroclitic stem: kuwatt-ar.

An interesting parallel is Lat. guttur ‘throat’ (certainly not inherited < Italic).

√ Drav. *kut- ‘1 throat; 2 neck’ (South *kut- ‘neck, throat’; Telugu *kut-ik- ‘throat’; Gondi-Kui *kut- ‘neck, throat’).

→ Correspondences are regular. Semantic shift ‘neck’ > ‘nape of the neck’ is possible, but probably not vice versa.


16. le ‘don’t (prohibitive, strong negative, usually expressing wish or command)’. Hitt. le is translated as Akkad. la; opposed to Hitt. natta ‘not (negative of assertion)’ = Akkad. il.

◊ IE **le or *IV/. 

≠ Connection with IE *ne or *mē is phonetically impossible. For want of better ideas, some scholars assume that le originated from Indo-Hittite *ne via “nasal dissimilation” in the construction ne=man > le=man (‘don’t’ + optative particle -man), after which le spread into other syntactical positions — highly unlikely, since, according to known Hittite texts, le=man is not at all a predominating construction with le (see CHD L–N); also, “nasal dissimilation” is only a very occasional phonetic phenomenon in Hittite.9

9 Katz 2005, in an attempt to confirm his original etymological solution for Hitt. lahhanza, claims that the dissimilative process *n—N > l—N was regular in Proto-Hittite. Besides le ‘don’t’, he adduces three further examples that show Hitt. l instead of expected n: 1) lah(h)anza ‘a k. of duck’ = suffixal formation from IE *snâ- [*sneH-] ‘to swim, to wash oneself’, with unexpected “s-mobile”, i.e. ‘duck’ as ‘swimming’; 2) lamari ‘name’ = IE *wômô ‘name’; 3) lammar, gen. lammas ‘a small unit of time, moment; instantly, immediately’ = Lat.
Ural. *ālā / *ala ‘don’t (prohibitive)’.
Drav. *al- ‘negative morpheme (negative of assertion)’.

→ See Dolgopolsky ND #22, #1342 and Nostret.dbf #1193. Well-known comparison, accepted even by some Indo-Europeans.
Further to Sem. *tal ‘don’t; not’ and Sem. *lā/lā? ‘don’t; not’ (see Dolgopolsky with Cushitic data). The primary shape was probably *la (Sem., Hitt.), extended by *a- (Drav., Ural.), and then by *y- (Sem., Ural., Alt.).

17. mai-/miya-hi ‘to grow, ripen (act.); to be born (med.)’ (well-attested from OS on), may-ant- ‘adult; young male; mighty male’, and other derivates.
Palaic may-ant- ‘adult male’. HLuw. *may- ‘to grow’ in derivates.

◊ IE **mō/i- or **mā/i-.
≠ Hardly to IE *mē/i- ‘to measure’ because of semantic difficulties.
Lat. mātūrus ‘ripe (of fruit); fully grown, adult (of person); having gone full term, fully developed (of foetus)’ should be considered a hidden cognate, since its meaning exactly matches Hitt. verb.

18. miyu-/meyu- ‘4, four’, Cluw. mawa- ‘4, four’. From MS on.

◊ IE **meu-.

númerus ‘number’. Puhvel (HED L: 50) adds a fourth case: 4) lam- ‘to be mixed together’ (if the reading is correct?) – IE *nem- ‘zuteilen; nehmen’ (Pok.: 763 f.). Two of these etymologies (lah(h)anza and lam-) are rather weak and, therefore, cannot prove any unconventional phonetic laws. The comparison laman ~ *nōm/nringbelow is indisputable, but related forms in other Nostratic branches show the same l/n-alternation (Alt. ġlōmó(ŋa) ‘name; spell, divination’ and Ural. *lime ‘name’ alongside the variant *nime), therefore, an equivalent solution would be to assume Indo-Hittite *lōm, assimilating to *nōm in Narrow IE (as well as some Uralic branches). As for lammar, this stem is derived from an Anatolian root like *lən- or *laT- (cf. doubled -mm- with the heteroclitic suffix -mar; root (!) connection to Lat. númerus is indeed plausible, therefore, occasional nasal dissimilation n-m > l-m can be accepted for this Hitt. stem. Of course, Hittite has a great number of stems and morphemes where the sequence n–N is retained, both inherited and borrowed. E.g., namma ‘then’, nekna- ‘brother’, causative infix -nir-, prt. 1 sg. ending -num, and so forth. For each of these “exceptions” Katz equilibristically proposes individual rules that prevent the words from following his dissimilative law. I suppose that there is no additional need to discuss the faultiness of this methodological approach.
Anatolian lexical isolates and their external Nostratic cognates

Alt. *móju ‘all (totus), whole’: Tung. *muja- ‘whole, all (totus)’, Jap. *müina ‘all (totus), all (omnis)’, Kor. *māin ‘most, extremely, very’.

→ Nostratic counting systems consisted of three members: “1, 2, >2/several/many”. Indo-Hittite expanded it to “1, 2, 3, >3/several/many”.
For the newly formed numeral, *meju- ‘4’, Anatolian used the Nostratic stem that yielded Proto-Altaic *móju ‘all (totus)’. For details and typological discussion see Kassian 2009.
Correspondences are regular (except for the secondary Indo-Hittite *o/e apophonies).

19. nega-, niga- c. ‘sister’ (from OH/MS on), nek-na- c. ‘brother’ (OS hapax?). Also in compounds, e.g., pappa-nega- ‘fraternal sister’, etc. The element -niga is also encountered in a number of Cappadocian female names. Cf. also Lallworts with the shape NANA: CLuw. nani(ya)- (adj.) ‘of a brother’, HLuw. nana-sri- ‘sister’ (+ sri ‘woman’), Lyc. A nēnēlī- ‘brother’, which theoretically can originate from the same Anat. *neG-na- ‘brother’.

◊ IE *neGo- or **nVGo-.
≠ G. Neumann (supported by HED) compares nekna- ‘brother’ with Ogham ini-gena, OIrish in-gen ‘daughter; girl’, Grk. ἐγ-γονός ‘grandson; descendant’, ἐγ-γόνη ‘grand-daughter’, literally ‘in-born’ (IE *en(i) + *gvanten)/shwa-). This folk etymology does not explain the morphology of Hitt. nekna- ‘brother’, not to mention the fact that the internal Hittite analysis points to nega- ‘sister’ as a basic stem, while nekna- is a secondary suffixal formation.10


→ Drav. *-g- points to IE *-gh-.
Correctly etymologized in Dolgopol’sky ND #1538a (Hitt. + Drav. + Afras.).

10 Cf., e.g., pes(e)na- ‘man’ : IE pes- ‘penis’; isna- ‘dough’ (MS, later issana-lessana-): IE *jes- (OHG jes–an ‘to ferment’), etc. For the infrequent derivation ‘sister’ > ‘brother’ cf., e.g., Proto-Turkic *sinjil ‘younger sister’ (in a number of languages: OTurk. sinjil, Karakh. sinil, Turkm. siñli, etc.), but in two languages with the *m-suffix: Chulym Shor sign-im ‘younger brother’, Chuvash šiǐl-šim ‘younger brother’ (EDAL: 1224 f.).
Cf. also Alt. *nīoǵē ‘son-in-law, nephew’.

20. nink-‘to soak up, be saturated; to get drunk’ (from OS’ and MS on), causative ninka-nu- ‘to soak, drench; to make drunk’.
◊ IE **nenK- (~ i- ~ v1-).
≠ Apparently not to Hitt. ninink- (*nik- with nin-infix) ‘to set in motion’, Lith. su-nikt, su-ninkū ‘to go at, assail, apply oneself to’, Slav. *-niknuti, as per Puhvel, who assumes the “alcoholic” meaning to be primary(!).
√ Drav. *nīnd- ‘to be full’: South *nIṟ-ai-, *nīr- ‘to be full’, Telugu *ner- /nīnd- ‘to become full, be fulfilled or accomplished’, Kolami-Gadba *nīnd- (*-nd-) ‘to be full’, Gondi-Kui *nīnd- ‘to be filled’, North *nīnd- ‘to fill’.
→ Drav. cluster *-nd- seems to be one of the possible reflexes of Nostr. *-nk- (*-ŋ-), cf. the well-known comparison: Alt. *nēnu ‘female relative (sister or brother’s wife)’ ~ Ural. *nīnv ‘female’ ~ IE *jenH-ter- ‘die Frau des Bruders des Gatten’ ~ Drav. *nānd- ‘female relative’.

21. pak-nu-‘to defame, slander, denounce’. Rare verb, OH/NS. Clear causative in -nu- with a-grade.
◊ IE **PeK- (~ o- ~ a-).

11 Further Alt. *néŋnī ‘East or South (wind), warm season’ ~ Drav. *nēınd- ‘day’ (Nostret.dbf #1054).
Alt. *pek’a ‘to be confused, embarrassed’; Tung. *pekut ‘to be confused, annoyed, to feel shy’; Mong. *bakter-da- ‘to be anxious, confused’.

→ Correspondences are regular.

22. palwa- c. ‘vesicle, water blister’ or rather ‘watery fluid of blister’. Known from NH lexical list, matching Akkad. bubu?tu ‘vesicle, water blister’¹². Since the vocabulary allotcs palwas together with eshar ‘blood’ and manis ‘pus’ in a separate lexical section (bodily fluids?), it seems that palwa- means ‘watery or serous fluid of blister’ rather than ‘water blister’ itself.

◊ IE **Pol/uvaultbelowo (~ ­a­).
≠ Possibly, but not obligatory to Lat. palud- ‘bog, pool’, Olnd. palvala- ‘pool’. Cf. also Puhvel’s construction (HED M: 196), based on the incorrect reading mu-wa- (instead of pal-wa-) and the incorrect meaning ‘sperm’.


→ Correspondences are regular. The diphthong is simplified in Indo-Hittite according to general phonotactical rules (*oulu > *oly).

23. pankur n. r/n-st. ‘udder, teat’. Hitt. pank-ur designates an external body part of a mammal; according to known contexts, translation ‘udder, teat’ seems to be the only sensible variant. Secondary meaning ‘milk’ or ‘foremilk’ is also very plausible for some ritual passages.

◊ IE **PonK- (~ -an- ~ -ŋ-).
≠ Certainly to be separated from the homographic pankur ‘group of related animals or persons; clan’.

√ Ural. *poŋe(-sV) ‘breast, bosom’.


24. puss-mi ‘to be (partly) eclipsed’. The verb describes an unfavorable astronomic omen, related to the position of the sun and the moon (“the king will die”, “the land will become small”, etc.). The only reasonable

¹² For the meaning of Akkad. bubu?tu ‘vesicle with clear fluid, water blister’ (as opposed to blister with opaque pus) see now Scurlock & Andersen: 222 ff., 719 fn. 58.
translation is ‘to be (partially) eclipsed’, despite the fact that more commonly the idea of eclipse is expressed by the verb ‘to die’.

◊ IE **Pus-**, **PVys-** or **PyVs-**.

≠ Traditionally to IE *pay- ‘small’ with s-extension.

√ Alt. *bijusī (~ p-)* ‘to hide (intr.)’; Turk. *bus- ‘to hide (intr.), lay an ambush’; Jpn. *pisó-ka ‘hidden, secret’; Kor. *pski- ‘to extinguish, go out (of fire)’.

→ Correspondences are regular.

Cf. semantically very doubtful Ural. *pise ‘to remain, be stuck’ (proposed in Nostret.dbf #1502).

25. *sarhuwant- c. ‘internal organs, intestines, womb; foetus’. From OS on.

Morphologically can be analyzed as *sarhu-ant- or *sarh-want-.

◊ IE **so*Hu- (~ -ar- -r-).

≠ Cf. Arm. argand ‘venter, uterus’ (< IE *srHavn-?? or rather a loan) and Toch. AB *sáry ‘Samen’.

Cf. also Grk. ὀρύα (name of a play of Epicharmus), ὀρύα (Hsch.) ‘sausage’, hardly inherited.


→ A good 4-consonant stem with regular phonetic correspondences (for Kart. alternatively and not likely cf. Dolgopolsky ND #2802 with doubtful Ural. and Afras. cognates).

The meaning shift ‘gut’ ↔ ‘intestines’ is trivial. The semantic development ‘sinew’ ↔ ‘gut’ is more interesting; it can be illustrated, e.g., by Semitic data: Harari *wattār ‘nerve, vein, gut, sinew’ from Semitic *wat(a)r- ‘tendon’ (SED 1: #290); in the contrary direction: Ugar. *ksl ‘lomo, espalda; tendón, nervio; lado, sector’ from Semitic *kVsmallV ‘(area between) loins and genitals’ (SED 1: #111).

26. *sasa- c. ‘(a wild member of the goat family), ‘antelope (vel sim.)’. From OH/MS on.

◊ IE **soso- (~ -a-o-).

≠ Certainly not to OInd. śásā ‘hase’ < IE *kasō- ‘grey’.


Ural. *ćačV ‘herd’

→ Correspondences are regular. Nostret.dbf #1682 (Alt. + Ural.)
27. sēr adv./preverb/postpos. ‘above, over’, adv./prev./postpos. sarā ‘up, upwards; above, on top’. From OS on. CLuw. sarra ‘(up)on; thereon’, sarri ‘above; up’. Internal reconstruction points to Anatolian nominal consonantal stem *ser ‘top’ with e/∅ Ablaut (ser is nominative or “suffix-less locative”, sara is fossilized allative, sarri is locative).

◊ IE **ser, **sr-/sr­.
≠ Comparison with Grk. ῥίον [ῑ] ‘any jutting part of a mountain, whether upwards or forwards: peak, headland’ (both meanings from Hom. on) is possible, if ‘peak’ is the primary meaning. Attempts to separate Grk. ῥίον into two lexemes — ‘peak’ and ‘headland’ — with different etymologies are not plausible.

? Ural. *śarma ‘hole in tent roof’, very dubious. More promising is the comparison with Mordvinian forms: E șér(e), M šér ‘Höhe; Wuchs, Statur’, E sér­j, sér­j, sér­j, šárij, M šéri ‘hoch, tief’ (Rédei UEW: 761).
→ Correspondences are regular.

28. sissur n. r-st. ‘irrigation’ (from OH/NS on), denominative sissur-iya- ‘to supply with water, irrigate’ (from MS on; a secondary root variant is found in the iterative form with -sk-: sissiur-i-ske­). Morphological analysis siss-ur is plausible (+ deverbal suffix -ur).

◊ IE **sVịs- or **ses-.
≠ Traditionally analyzed as a reduplication (sile-sur-) of the root sur-, further to IE *sur-/sour- ‘sour’ — perhaps possible morphologically, but not very convincing semantically. Other proposed connections (IE *seɿ- ‘tröpfeln’ [Pok.: 889] or IE *seso-/*sas­- ‘Feldfrucht’ [Pok.: 880]) are also vague, either phonetically or semantically.
→ Correspondences are regular.
Cf. Dolgopolsky ND #2016 *Saču/*šaču ‘to scatter, spread about, pour’: Afras. + Alt. *šěčo ‘to scatter, pour out’ + Ural. (Ob.-Ug.) *čačV- ‘to pour out, sweep’ or *šača ‘flood’ + IE (incorrect Hitt. ‘to filter; sieve’). In all likelihood, these are several different roots. In any case it is clear that Hitt. sies(s)ar-iya- ‘to filter, strain’, sesar-ul ‘sieve’, quoted by Dolgopolsky, are derived from the unattested noun *sie-ssar ‘sifting’, with the latter going back to IE *šeř- ‘to sift’ with the well-known Hittite abstract suffix -ssar.

29. siwi- ‘sour’ (said of bread). A hapax legomenon in OS, matching Akkad. emṣu ‘sour’ in the corresponding source.
◊ IE **se/uvaultbelowi-, **si/uvaultbelowi- or **sV/ivaultbelow/uvaultbelowi-.
Ural. *šOwV ‘to sour’ or *čawV ‘sour; to become sour’
Kartv.: Georg. m-žav-e ‘sour’ (Климов—Халилов: 318).
→ Correspondences are regular (except for, perhaps, the vocalism of Ural. and Kartv. forms).
Correctly etymologized in Dolgopolsky ND #2788 (Kartv. + Hitt. + Alt. + dubious Afras.).

30. -t, ending of the instrumental case.13 Most likely, initially athematic, in the later texts with i-anaptyxis: -it. In the New Hittite epoch super-

13 Based on the intervocalic spelling with a single, not doubled consonant (e.g., OS KBo 17.17+ IV 12’ g)(i)-nu-ta-at-kán, i.e. ginut=at=kan ‘(let him take) it by the knee(s)’, and passim in this text; OS HT 95 5’ ku-an-ni-ta, i.e. kuunt=a ‘but by right (…)’; etc.), one could assert that this ending goes back to Indo-Hittite *d or *dh rather than *t. As a matter of fact, there is some evidence that in Hittite the final position was that of neutralization, in which all obstruent consonants became voiced. Cf. pa-i-ta-uş (OH/NS KUB 28.4 obv. 11b, 22b), pa-a-i-ta-uş
ceded by the ablative ending -(a)z; completely lost in Luwian and other branches of Anatolian.

◊ IE **-T.

≠ It is rather unclear whether we should merge this instrumental morpheme with the Indo-Hittite ablative ending *-d.\(^{14}\)

√ Drav. *(a)ṭ, marker of the instrumental case in the Kolami-Gadba branch (Kolami -aḍ, Parji -oḍ < *(a)ṭ, Salur Gadba -aṭ) and Brahui -(aṭ); see Андронов: 144, 148–149, Zvelebil Sketch: 19, 32. The instrumental ending *(a)ṭ must be kept apart from the sociative (comitative) markers of the shape -oṭV or -oḍV (Zvelebil Sketch: 33), which originate from the root *oḍ- (South *oḍ:- ‘together with’, Telugu *oḍ: ‘to consent, agree’); the t~d variation in the sociative morphemes seems be the result of a late contamination with the instrumental *(a)ṭ.

Kartv. *(o)ṭ, ending of the instrumental case (Georg., Megr., Laz).

→ A Nostratic origin for the Hitt. ending was proposed already by Королев (Королев ХЛЯ: 20). See further Dolgopolsky ND #2651, bringing together grammatical suffixes and prepositional/postpositional auxiliary words (very dubious Alt.: Tung, instrumental ending should be reconstructed as *-ʒi, further see EDAL: 221).

31. tagi- ‘another, foreign; alien(?).’ From OS on.

◊ IE **ToGi- (~ -a-).

≠ Traditionally as ta- (Hitt. ta- ‘2, two’ or IE *to- ‘that’) with the suffix -g, but such a suffix is unknown to the Hittite morphological system.

(pre-NH/LNS KUB 24.8 i 29) vs. more rare pa-[it(?)-a-] (OH/NS KUB 28.5 obv. 15b) = prt. 3 sg. pa[it-as ‘he went’, where the ending -t corresponds to IE 3 sg. *-t of the so-called “secondary series”. The situation closely resembles Hurrian, where voicing of final obstruents is established based on Ugaritic alphabetical texts. Kimball (HHP: 302) claims that the final stops became devoiced in Hittite, but her sparse examples are not very convincing, since in all these cases we may be dealing with the gemination-causing enclitic -ya ‘and’. Unfortunately, Hittite forms in Ugaritic and Egyptian texts (see Patri 2009) do not provide any help in solving this phonetic question.

\(^{14}\) Hitt. morpheme -(a)ṭ-in the ablative forms of personal pronouns: annu-ed(a)-z ‘from me’, tu-ed(a)-z ‘from thee’, annz-ed(a)-z ‘from us’, sum(m)-ed(a)-z ‘from you’. In Narrow IE: Olnd. -aṭ, Avest. -aṭ, -aṭa, Lat. -aḍ, -oḍ, Osc. -aḍ (Oscan data show that the consonant was *d, not *dh, and certainly not ‘t).
→ Correspondences are regular. Alt. *-g- points to IE *-gh-.

◊ IE **Top- (~ -e- -a-).
√ Alt. *tépá ‘tuft (of hair)’: Tung. *teb- ‘1 rags; 2 tail on shaman’s belt’;
Mong. *tab, *tebeg ‘1 tuft of hair attached to a metal ring (for play);
shuttlecock; 2 long hair on back of head’; Turk. *tepö (-iı) ‘hill, top;
top of head’ [if here]; Jpn. *tampua ‘knot of hair on back of head’;
Kor. *tapar ‘bundle, bunch’.
→ Correspondences are regular.

33. tabus n. s-st. ‘rib; body side; side’; case forms are used as locative adverbs. From OS on. A s-formation from an unattested u-stem (see Rieken StBoT 44: 197 ff.).
◊ IE **ToBu- (~ -a-).
Ural. *tuppV ‘back, spine’.
→ Correspondences are regular. Hitt. shows the same semantic shift as is observed in some Tungusic languages.
See Nostret.dbf #1578 (Alt. + Ural.).
Cf. also the two roots in Dolgopolosky ND #499 *dubʔV ‘back, hinder part, tail’ (Afras. + Ural. + Alt.), #2286 *tup/glottalstoprevinvV ‘tail, back’ (Afras. + the same Ural. + dubious Alt. + dubious IE).

34. Anatolian *ti- (nom.), *tu- (oblique) ‘thou’, 2 sg. personal pronoun:
Hitt. zi-g (nom.), tu- (oblique), Palaic ti- (nom.), tu- (oblique), HLuw. ti- (nom.), tu- (oblique).
◊ IE **ti- and **Tu-.
≠ No traces of the nominative stem *ti can be found within Narrow IE languages, see Бабаев 2008: 186 ff.15

15 Песь Бабаев 2008, Alb. nom. ti ‘thou’ is a regular reflexion of IE *tū, cf. Alb. mi ‘mouse’ < IE *mī-s, etc. (Orel CHGAL: 11).
Anatolian lexical isolates and their external Nostratic cognates

√ Alt. personal pronoun *t/i ‘thou’ (sg.) vs. *t/a ‘you’ (pl.): Mong. only. Drav. ending of the nominal predicate 2 sg. *-ti. 
→ See most recently Бабаев 2008: 191 ff. for the general discussion. The stem *ti as a Nostratic retention in Anatolian was correctly recognized already by A. Korolev (Королев ХЛЯ: 20). The stem *tu is unparalleled within other Nostratic branches and seems an Indo-Hittite innovation.

35. tukk- (med.-pass.) ‘to be visible; to be appointed, defined; to be important, respected’. From MS and OH/NS on.
◊ IE **T/uvaultbelowk­, **Tu­ or theoretically **T/uvaultbelowVk­.
≠ No satisfactory cognates can be found within IE languages, except for Hsch. δεύκω · βλέπω ‘to see’, δεύκει · φροντίζει ‘to consider, reflect’ of unknown origin.
Alb. duk-et ‘to appear’ seems to have been borrowed from MGrk./NGrk. δοκεῖ ‘to seem’ (Orel AED: 78).
The well attested Hitt. stem tuekka- ‘body (sg.); limbs (pl.)’ can be a non-obvious cognate of Hitt. tukk- ‘to be visible’, since the semantic shift ‘to be visible’ > ‘body’ has numerous typological parallels (but not vice versa: ‘body’ > ‘to be visible’ seems improbable). Alternately, despite irregularities in vocalism, tuekka- ‘body’ can be compared with IE *t/uvaultbelowak- ‘skin’ (OInd. tvác- ‘skin’, Grk. σάκος ‘Schild (aus Leder)’), whose primary meaning was ‘skin’ (cf. supportive Nostratic cognates: Alt. *ṭ/qdotaw ~ *ṭ/qdoteb- ‘to skin, flay; hide’ with metathesis; see Nostr-et.dbf #208).
IE *dhe­ ‘berühren, drücken, melken’ (Pok.: 271) certainly does not belong here.
√ Alt. *tük­ ‘to make a sign’: Tung. *duKū- ‘to write’; Mong. *doki- ‘to make a sign’; Turk. *Tükrag ‘symbol of kingship’ [if here]; Jpn. *tünkà- ‘to let know, inform’; Kor. *tjak- ‘to note down, to write’ (diphthong *ū instead of simple ū is reconstructed on the basis of the diphthong *io in Kor.).
? Kartv. *tkw- ‘to speak, say’ or *ṭqw- ‘to recognize, notice’; w-
metathesis and assimilation within a consonant cluster.

→ Hitt. Auslaut -kk- instead of expected **-kku- (IE **-ků, agreeing with
Alt. *-ků) should not confuse us, since it seems that the sequence
*VųKs dissimilated > *VųK in Indo-Hittite: there are no reliable
Narrow IE or Indo-Hittite roots in *VųK, except for *auk*
(- -kh”) ‘oven, cooking pot’ (Piet.dbf #17; Pok.: 88).

Cf. Nostrev.dbf #760 *tVjḳV ‘show, point at’ (IE *deik- ‘to show’,
Alt. *tůjk’ū ‘to make a sign’, Ural. *tākkV ‘to look, observe’, ?
Kartv. *ṭqw- ‘to recognize, notice’). And Dolgopolsky ND #2257
*tīk[ü] ‘to show’ (IE *deik- + Kartv. *tkw- ‘to speak, say’ + very
dubious Alt. + Afras.). Most likely, more than two Nostratic
roots are represented here. Cf., e.g., the variety in IE: *deik-
‘to acquire, gain; respect, thank’ [Piet.dbf #1879, some forms
should be excluded; WP I: 782]; *dok- ‘to teach, to show’ [Piet.dbf
#1881; WP I: 782]; *deike- (- -g?) ‘to show’ [Piet.dbf #1869; WP I:
776].

U-tinged vocalism obliges us to treat Hitt. tukk- and Alt. *tůjk’ū as a
separate Nostratic root — *tu(i)kkV- ‘to make visible; to be visible
(med.-pass’).

36. HLUw. uni- ‘to know; to recognize’, causative uni/a-nu- ‘to cause to
know’. Cf. CLUw. unai- ‘to know(?).’

◊ IE *y[n] or *un-.

√ Drav. *un- ‘to think, consider’: South *un- ‘to think, consider’, Telugu
*up-k- ‘to consider’, Brahui hunn-ing (hur-, hutt-) ‘to look, look at,
look for, wait for, consider’.

→ Correspondences are regular.

37. wakk-, wakk-ar- ‘to be absent, lack; to defect’. From MH/NS on. Cf.
waks-iya-mi ‘to be scanty, scarce’ (if here) with unclear suffixation of -s-.

◊ IE **ok- or **uk- (- *-k-).

≠ Oettinger’s comparison with Lat. vaco, vacare ‘to be empty’ cannot be
rejected (despite laryngealistic objections in EDHIL: 941).

√ Alt. *uk’i (- -e) ‘to die, be hungry’: Tung. *(x)uk- ti- ‘to be hungry’;
Mong. *ūkii- ‘to die’.

→ Correspondences are regular.

◊ IE *żyonTo- (~ -a-) or perhaps *żyTo-.

√ Ural. *onta (‘Onta’) ‘warmth, heat’.


◊ I E *uvaultbeloworHu- (~ -u-), or perhaps *uvaultbelow/rringbelowK-.  


→ Correspondences are regular. The Mong. form in *-rg- (-g- is treated as a suffix in EDAL) is extremely interesting in the light of Hitt. -rh-. Dolgopolsky (ND: 11) proposes Mong. *-g- and *-g-(?) as possible correspondences for Indo-Hittite *-H-, but I have so far failed to find any reliable examples in Dolgoposky’s data.

39. warhui- (i-st.) ‘overgrown (of road, mountain), hairy (of skin), with thick leaves (of tree)’. From MS and OS/NH on.

◊ IE *yorHu- (~ -a-).


→ Correspondences are regular. The Mong. form in *-rg- (-g- is treated as a suffix in EDAL) is extremely interesting in the light of Hitt. -rh-. Dolgopolsky (ND: 11) proposes Mong. *-g- and *-g-(?) as possible correspondences for Indo-Hittite *-H-, but I have so far failed to find any reliable examples in Dolgoposky’s data.


◊ IE *yorK- (~ -a-) or perhaps *γγK-.
Sometimes the Hitt. root is connected to IE *wer(ə)gə- ‘strength, force’:
OInd. ārj-, ārjā, ārjā m. ‘power, strength, vigor, sap’, ārjā- ‘strong, powerful, eminent’, Grk. ἀργή ‘seelischer Trieb, Sinnesart, Charakter, (heftige) gemütsbewegung, Leidenschaft, Zorn’, Ofr. ferc, ferg ‘Zorn’ (Pok. 1169, WP I 289, Piet.dbf #1226, Nostret.dbf #1162). However, Hitt. (i.e. Luwian) glossenkel’ed: warku(i)- ‘wrath, anger (vel sim.)’ is a much more plausible cognate for IE *wer(ə)gə-.


→ Correspondences are regular. Tung. shows the semantic development ‘fat’ > ‘bone marrow’ > ‘brain’.

41. warrai/- c. ‘aid, help; auxiliary’, denominative warrai,mas / urrai,mas ‘to help’, warr-essa- ‘to provide aid’ (from MS on). CLuw. warrahit- ‘aid, help’.

◊ IE **/ʔorH... (~ -a-) or perhaps **ʔrH...

Anatolian -rr- points to an old cluster with *h, i.e. *rh > rr in the inter-vocalic position a_a(?)}, cf. Melchert AHP #4.1.6.1.3.

≠ Probably cognate is IE *t̥eɾu- (‘teɾHu-) ‘to defend, to guard; to cover, to close’ (OInd. t̥aru-tar ‘defender’, etc.; WP I: 280; Pok.: 1161). Apparently Hitt. warra/i- should not be connected to IE *ter- ‘to observe, watch’ (WP I: 284; Pok.: 1164). For the latter, cf. rather Hitt. werida- ‘fear’ (at least = Lat. vereor ‘to show reverence or respect for; to fear’).

16 The polysemy ‘bone marrow’ ~ ‘brain’ is not unfrequent in languages around the world. For ‘fat’ ~ ‘bone marrow’ cf., e.g., Akkad. li-pu ‘1. adipose tissue, fat, tallow; 2. bone marrow; 3 pitch’ < Sem. *li-aʔ- ‘fatty, fleshy tissue’ (SED 1 #180), or, in the contrary direction, Sem. *məld- ‘brain’ (SED 1 #187) > Hebrew māld ‘bone-marrow’, Phoenician ml, mū ‘fat, rich’ (adj.), Hebrew mēld ‘eating’.

17 If so, the phonetic development of Hittite warra- < *t̥erHu- resembles the variants of the Hitt. athematic verb tarhu-, to conquer, to be able, etc.’:
1) tardu- in archaic texts (OS),
2) secondary tardu- in later texts due to the unification of the athematic declination pattern (-rh- is retained, since there is no intervocalic position in the main paradigmatic forms),
3) thematic med.-pass. dardu- (MH/NS on) ‘to be able’, showing -rr-.

The verbal stem tardhu-/tarda- goes back to IE *terHu-, cf. esp. OInd. relict prs. tardo-te ‘to pass’ and other forms in -a-.
Drav. *ūṛ-i- ‘service; to serve’; South *ūṛ-i- ‘service’, Telugu *ūḍ-i- ‘service, drudgery, slavery’.
Ural. *warV ‘to guard; to wait’: Ugric only (Mansi ōr-, ūr-, ur- ‘warten, sich hüten; hüten’, etc., Hungarian: vár- ‘warten, erwarten, harten’).
→ Correspondences are regular. The Hitt. meaning almost exactly matches Drav., whereas Ural. and Narrow IE show the development ‘to help’ > ‘to protect’.
Nostret.dbf #1621 (Drav. + Ural. + unreasonably IE *čer- ‘to observe’).

B. Dubia

42. *hassu- c. ‘king’ in various derivates. From OH on.
◊ IE **Hosu- (-a-).
≠ Traditionally derived from the Hitt. verb hass- ‘to born’ and hassa- ‘progeny’. Typologically cf. Germ. *kuninjaz ‘king’ and *kunjan ‘clan, tribe, race, generation, etc.’ from IE *ǵnjo-.
√ Drav. *aǯǯ- ‘father, ancestor’.
Alt. *ăčV ‘elder relative, ancestor’.
Ural. *ăčā ‘father’.
→ Etymologized in Dolgopolsky ND #797 (Drav. + Alt. + Ural. + Hitt.);
Nostret.dbf #984. Nostratic stem is clearly a Lallwort, therefore dubious in any case.

43. *he(y)u- c. ‘rain’ (from OS on), also in derivates. Probably the same morphophonological pattern as meyu- ‘4’ < Anat. *meju- (see above #18).
◊ IE **Heju-, **Hejy-.
≠ Traditionally to Toch. AB su, swā-s- ‘to rain’, Grk. ὑει ‘to rain’, i.e. IE *sH- with unexpected “s-mobile”. Alternatively to IE *ǵhey- ‘pour’ with the irregular fricativization *ǵh > h in Anatolian.
√ Kartv. *yiw- ‘to cry, weep’: Georg. ɣi-, Megr. ɣi-.
→ The Hitt. stem has interesting cognates within Afrasian: Egypt. ḫw.t ‘rain’ and Chadic forms (Siri ḫwii, Somray ʔwā, etc.) with the same semantics (Takács EDE I: 46). This fact proves that the meaning of the Nostratic stem was ‘rain’. As for Kartv. ‘to weep’, the phonetic
comparison with Hitt. *heyu- is exact, but the meaning shift, however, is not self-evident. There are a lot of cases among the world’s languages when ‘rain’ and ‘to cry’ originate from the same root ‘to pour’, but the semantic derivation ‘rain’ > ‘to cry’ requires reliable typological parallels. Cf. a rare example of similar derivation in the Yenisseian family, where the Common Yenisseian stems *xura ‘wet’ and *xur(a)-gV ‘to wash’ go back to Yen. *xur ‘rain’ (Yenet.dbf #772–774).

Cf. Dolgopolsky ND #2611 (Hitt. + Afras.).

44. kaga- c. ‘tooth’. From MS on.

◊ IE **KoGo- (~ -a-).

≠ Probably cognate is IE *köy-, known from Germ. *xak-ōn ‘hook; bolt’, *xōka-z ‘hook; angle’ (Orel HGE: 154).18 Both directions of the assumed meaning shift are possible: ‘hook’ > ‘fang’ > ‘tooth’ / ‘hook’ > ‘bolt’ > ‘tooth’ or, vice versa, ‘tooth’ > ‘hook’. For general reasons the Hitt. anatomic meaning should be accepted as primary.


→ Semantically tempting, but the phonetic correspondences between Hitt. and Alt. are quite irregular (poor vocalism in the case of Alt. *k’juğe and consonantism in the case of Alt. *kek’V).

Cf. also the great number of the roots with the shape KVKV and a general meaning ‘hook’ or ‘peg’ within in daughter languages of Nostratic.19

---

18 Cf. also the enigmatic Slav. form *kogъtь / *kokъtь (~ -ъ) ‘claw (East Slav.); thorn (West Slav.)’. It seems that the variant in *-gъ could have been formed by secondary analogy with *nogъtь ‘nail’, or represent the same phenomenon as Russ. мёкъкъ < Slav. měkku ‘mild’. Even if *kogъtь reflects the primary shape, it cannot be directly compared with Germ. forms due to violation of Winter’s law.

19 E.g., Alt. *gěk’á ‘hook, bend’, *gůk’á (~ -o-) ‘curve, hook; to cling to’, *k’ŏki ‘hinge, hook’; Drav. *kok ‘beak, bill’; etc.
45. **kamm-ara** c. ‘mist, fog; shade; swarm (of bees)’. From OS on.

◊ IE **Ko/a...**. The stable spelling with -mm- points to an old cluster *Tm* or *mn*.

≠ Traditionally to IE *kem-‘to cover, to hide’ or to IE *kem-‘to compress’ (HED K: 36). Semantically vague; geminated *mm* remains without an explanation.

√ Ural. *kümTV-‘fog, smoke’ (Иллиц-Свитым ОСНЯ 1 #187; Dolgopol-sky ND #1067; as *küntTV- in Ural.dbf #312)

→ Etymologized in Dolgopol-sky ND #1067, where Hitt. mm < Tm < mT via metathesis. Further cf. forms without the nasal (Nostret.dbf #581): Alt. *k’édò‘wind, fog’, dubious IE *k(ʷ)ed-‘smoke’. Dolgopol-sky adds Kartv. *kwam-/-kwm-‘to smoke (intr.)’ and Afras.


◊ IE **KVult-** or **kVeVt-**.

≠ A t-formation from IE *ghey-‘to pour’? Hardly to IE *kot-‘shed, hut; room’ in view of *-u- in Anatolian.


→ Tempting, but the consonant correspondence Drav. *d ~ IE *t is ir-regu-lar.


47. **mask-an** n. ‘bribe (given to officials); propitiatory gift (given to gods)’, iterative verb maski-ske-‘to give presents to gods(?)’ (a hapax legome-non). From MH/MS on.

◊ IE **mosK- (~ -a-)**.

≠ Puhvvel (HED) analyzes mask- as a verbal stem containing the fossil-ized iterative suffix -ske-, i.e. *mag-ske-, further to IE *mVgh-, known from OInd. magh- ‘gift’, Avest. maga- ‘(sacificial) offering(?)’. However, Proto-Hittite normally retains the cluster -sk-, albeit broken up through anaptyxis, as seen in, e.g., hueg-/hug- ‘to
say an invocation’²⁰ + -ske- > *hukske- (with devoicing of the root-final stop) > Hitt. hukkiske-, for details see Kassian & Yakubovich 2002: 37 ff. Thus, Proto-Hittite *mag-ske- should yield something like **makkiske- rather than maske-.

√ Ural. *maksà ‘to give; to offer (a price)’ (Finno-Volgaic only): Fin. maksà- ‘zahlen, bezahlen; kosten’, Est. maks ‘tax; toll’, Saam. mak’sè-, maksè- etc. ‘to pay; payment’ (if not < Finn.), Mord. *maksù- ‘geben; bieten (einen Preis)’.

→ The comparison seems reliable both semantically and phonetically, if we accept a metathesis in Hitt. or Ural.

48. parstu- c. ‘leaf, foliage’ (certainly not ‘bud’, in all likelihood not ‘sprout/shoot’, see the contexts in CHD). From OS on. Probably the basic word for ‘leaf’ (cf. also scarcely attested hurpasta-/hurpusta- ‘leaf, (onion) peel’).

◊ IE **PorsTu- (~ -a-) or **P/rringbelowsTu-.

≠ Of possible interest are such forms as Slav. *brǔst’u’n ‘young sprout, bud’, O Sax. brust-ian ‘aufbrechen, Knospen treiben’ (Heliand). NHD Brust ‘breast; rupture; bud’, if not to Germ. *brust- ‘to break’ (Köbler GWb, s.v. *brusti-2; perhaps to be kept apart from Germ. *brust-z ‘breast’). Slav. and Germ. forms point to IE *bhrust-.

As an emergency, one could compare the Hitt. stem with Germ. *berst- ‘to burst, break’, but the latter seems to be a Germanic-only metathetical variant of Germ. *brest- (Köbler GWb, s.v. *brestan).


→ Not very reliable in view of the ambiguity of Kartv. data. Note Kartv. *-ć- ~ Hitt. -st-.

A riskier etymology is present in Dolgopol’skij ND: Hitt. root par- to Nostr. #1767 *porV ‘leaf’ (IE + Alt. *půre ‘leaf, bud’ + scarce Drav. + Afras.) or #232 ‘bud, leaf’ (Hitt. + Ural. *pārV ‘bud’ + Afras.).

²⁰ IE *Huęgh(*)-, HED H: 327.
49. pul n. ‘lot, lottery, жребий’.
◊ IE **PVL- or **PyVL-.
≠ May be a cultural word. Cf. Akkad. pūru ‘lot, portion, plot; lot, lottery’.
√ Alt. *p’ule (~ -i) ‘to be left, surplus’: Tung. *pule- ‘to be left, surplus’;
Mong. *hule- ‘1 surplus, to leave; 2 more than; 3 remain, get left’;
Turk. *ile- ‘1 to divide, distribute, endow; 2 lot, endowment’.
→ Dubious.

50. purutt n. ‘1 mud, silt, sludge in its natural form; 2 finished mud ready
to use for walls, roofs, etc., mudbrick; 3 dry earth, soil in its natural
form’. From MS and OH/NS on. Seems obscure morphologically and
looks like an old loan (Luwian or Hurrian), especially if the word was
primarily used as a terminus technicus. Cf. Rieken StBoT 44: 160 ff.,
where it is regarded as a native formation.
◊ IE **Purut- or the same with **V/uvaultbelow / **/uvaultbelowV.
≠ The most acceptable inner IE etymology is Grk. φύρω ‘to mix smth.
dry w. smth. wet’ (as per Puhvel).
√ Drav. *buṟad- ‘mud’: South *burud- (*-r-) ‘mud’, Telugu *burad- ‘mud,
→ Dubious in view of the ambiguity of the Hittite stem.
In any case, the etymology is to be separated from Nostret.dbf #39
‘dust, ashes’: Drav. *buṟud- ‘dust, ashes’ ~ Alt. *bóru (~ -a, -o)
‘dust; smoke, whirlwind’ ~ Ural. *pora ‘dust’ (SKES 605) ~ Kartv.
*burt(yw)- ‘dust’ ~ Slav. *búrjá ‘storm, tempest’, Lat. furó ‘to be out
of one’s mind; to rage with anger’.

51. sanh-‘m ‘to clean, sweep’. From OS on.
◊ IE **sonH (~ -a-) or **s-menu.
≠ As a «Schwebe-ablaut» variant of IE *snaH- (OInd. snāli ‘baden’, Lat.
näre etc.).
*čay ‘1 whitish, blond, grey (of hair); 2 white colour’; Turk. *čAY
‘1 morning dawn; 2 mist’; Jpn. *sim ‘to become clear, limpid’.
→ Dubious because of way too general semantics. Note M. Zhivlov’s
correspondence Alt. *η ~ Indo-Hittite *nH (Живлов 2007). One
could expect Hitt. -hu- in compliance with Alt. *-u. Cf. also Dol-
gopolsky ND #323 (very unlikely).
52. *sara- ‘woman’ (in compounds; from Cappadocian epoch on), CLuw.
  *asra/-i- ‘woman’ (in derivates).
  ♦ IE **sor/**osr- (~ a).
  *sar-bacin ‘monkey’; Jpn. *saru ‘monkey’.
  → Meaning shifts are possible, but unprovable: ‘woman’ < ‘girl’ > ‘monkey’
  or ‘female’ > ‘female monkey’ > ‘monkey’; very dubious as a result.
  *z- ought to correspond to Indo-Hittite θ-.

53. takkani- ‘breast (human male, animal)’ (from OS on). Hitt. takkaliya- ‘to
  embrace’ (from OS on) probably contains the same Anatolian root
  (*takk- ‘breast’) with a different suffix.
  ♦ IE **Tok (~ a- ~ k-).
  √ Drav. *dok- (i.e. *V[dok]-?) ‘breastbone; chest; belly’: Telugu *dok-
  ‘skeleton, belly’, Kolami-Gadba *dok- ‘bone’, Gondi-Kui *dok-
  ‘breastbone, chest’.
  → The vocalic correspondence Drav. *-o- ~ Indo-Hittite *-o- may be regular,
  but initial *d- in Drav. should point to a non-inherited root or
  to loss of an onset vowel (*V[dok]-).

Николаев [1985: 64] (reiterated by Ivanov // ŠULMU: Papers on the
Ancient Near East, 1988: 140) treats Hitt. takkani- ‘breast’ as a
North Caucasian loan: Proto-Nakh *doḳ ‘heart’ (< Proto-North
Caucasian *jërkwĭ ‘heart’). This solution is attractive phonetically,
but not very probable for general reasons. There is, indeed, a small
number of Proto-Nakh loans in the Hittite lexicon, but it seems
that all of them belong to the cultural vocabulary. We are not
aware of any Hittite–Nakh contacts that would be intense enough
to cause borrowing of items on the Swadesh wordlist.

54. ()tissai-, tessai- ‘to give right shape, to ready; to form up and march
forth (e.g., troops’). NH only; sometimes glossenkeil’ed, therefore
seems to be a Luwian stem. Cf. CLuw. tis(s)ai- ‘id.?’
  ♦ IE **TVjs-.
  √ Alt. *dasa ‘to regulate, govern’: Tung. *dasa- ‘to govern, regulate’;
  Mong. *das- ‘to get accustomed’; Turk. */Asa- ‘1 to determine, gov-
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ern; 2 to create'; Kor. *ién- '1 to govern, regulate; 2 to improve, order, correct'.
→ The vocalic correspondence IE *Vj ~ Alt. *a is irregular.

55. wattai- c. ‘bird (in general?)’.
◊ IE **jot- (−◦a◦).
√ Drav. *ūd:- ‘bird (in general); quail’: North Drav. *ōṛ-ā only.
→ IE *t- ~ Drav. *-q- is irregular.
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