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COMUNICAZIONE:

G. Forni, Might Hurro-Urartian and North-Caucasian Languages Be Derived from (or Related to) Indo-European?

Several basic-lexicon etymologies, with regular sound correspondences, suggest Hurro-Urartian (HU) might be derived from (or related to) Proto-Indo-European (PIE). Preliminary evidence suggests North-Caucasian (NC) languages might also be related to PIE – in particular, to Iranian languages and Armenian.

Introduction

This short article summarizes the current status of a research project on the relationships between Hurro-Urartian (HU), North-Caucasian (NC) languages and Proto-Indo-European (PIE).

Previous research on HU and NC reached various conclusions, incl.:
• Hurrian (H) and Urartian (U) are related, but HU is an isolated family [Wilhelm 2008a and 2008b]
• HU and NC are related [Starostin, Nikolayev 1994]
• HU and NC belong to a wider phylum, Sino-Dené-Caucasian, which would also include Sino-Tibetan, Na-Dené, Yeniseyan, Basque and Burushaski, but not PIE (Starostin et al.)
• North-West Caucasian languages and PIE derive from a common ancestor, Proto-Pontic [Colarusso 1997]

This article suggests a simpler picture: both HU and NC might derive from PIE.

Sources

For H and U, [Wilhelm 2008a and 2008b] is the primary source; [Starostin, Nikolayev 1994] was also occasionally used as a secondary source.

(P)NC forms are from [Starostin, Nikolayev 1994].
PIE forms are from [Mallory, Adams 2006]; Iranian forms are from [Mallory, Adams 2006], [Cheung 2002] and [Bailey 1979]; Armenian forms are from [Martirosyan 2010].
Proto-Turkic forms are from [Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak 2003].
(Proto-)Kartvelian forms are from [Fähnrich, Sardshweladse 1995] and [Klimov 1998].
**Hurro-Urartian (HU)**

This section contains a selection of key findings from a wider, on-going research which started from a selection of 161 HU basic terms and morphemes and found likely or tentative PIE etymologies for 109 (=68%) of them, and no PIE etymology for 52 (=32%) of them.

A brief discussion of Hurrian sound system and PIE-to-Hurrian sound laws is followed by a selection of key likely etymologies for Hurrian basic vocabulary, with Urartian, IE and sometimes NC comparanda. A PIE-to-Urartian set of sound laws is not included in this article.

**Hurrian sound system**

According to [Wilhelm 2008a: 84-85], “the distribution of voiced and voiceless consonants […] is allophonic” i.e. “voicing is not phonemic” in Hurrian. Therefore, Hurrian spelling conventions can be turned into a phonemic representation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spelling (&lt;…&gt;)</th>
<th>phonemic representation (/…/)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;b, p&gt;</td>
<td>/P/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;g, k&gt;</td>
<td>/K/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;d, t&gt;</td>
<td>/T/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;v, f&gt;</td>
<td>/F/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;z, s&gt;</td>
<td>/S/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ž, š&gt;</td>
<td>/Š/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ġ, h&gt;</td>
<td>/H/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, /F/ and /w/ are probably allophones as well [Wilhelm 2008a: 84, 85], and an alternation between /P/, /F, w/ and /m/ is also frequent [Wilhelm 2008a: 85, 87, 89, 90, 93, 97].

**PIE-to-Hurrian sound laws**

Key sound laws identified so far include:
* *t, *d, *dʰ > /T/
* *k, *g > /K/
* *p, *bʰ(?) > /P/
* *t(i), dw(/i), ģ, ģʰ > /Š/
* *l > /l, r/ (compare Sanskrit)
* V’CV > ‘CV (loss of word-initial, pre-tonic vowels)
Evidence is still insufficient for sound laws concerning vowels and laryngeals. Other sound laws are mainly identities.

HU – Key etymologies

1. H iš-te ‘I’ (absolute), iž-až ‘I’ (ergative), šo-, šu- ‘me’ (obl.) (/iŠ-, Šo-, Šu-/); U iš-tidə ‘I’ (absolute subject), iešə ‘I’ (ergative), šu-ka ‘me’ (absolute object), šu-sə ‘my’ (prob. /i(e)s-, su-/ < PIE *h₁eɡ̑(o), i.e. /iš-/ < *h₁eɡ̑. /Šo-, Šu-/ < *h₁eɡ̑ó; compare Armenian es, Old Avestan azə̅m, Ossetic æz, Kurdish ez, Ormuri az, Yidgha zo, Sogdian ‘zw, OCS (j)azů, and NC etymology #1 in next section

2. H -iffə, -iffē-, -iffu- ‘my’ (/iw-/?); U -ma ‘to me’ < PIE *h₁me with m/F/w oscillation; compare Hittite ammm- ‘me’ (obl.), Avestan mẽ, Khotanese ma, mi ‘me’, Armenian im ‘my’

3. H fe(-) ‘thou, you’, -ffa ‘you’ (abs.), -m(ma) ‘thou’ (abs.), -v / -b / -p ‘thy’, (/we-, -wa, -w/?), -ū, -ō ‘2nd person singular verb ending’; U -w ‘thou’ < PIE *wo- ‘you’ with m/F/P/w oscillation; compare Sanskrit va-, Avestan vō, Khotanese –ū, OCS vy, and NC etymology #3 in next section

4. H anV- ‘that’, U inV- ‘demonstrative pronoun’ < PIE *h₂eno-; compare Armenian n(a/o)-, OCS on-, Sanskrit aná- etc.

5. H andi, andu- ‘this’ < H anV- + PIE *to-; compare Armenian d(a/o)- ‘that (near you)’, Avestan ta- ‘this’ etc., and NC etymology #4 in next section.

6. H oli, U ulo ‘another’ < PIE *h₂el-/ *h₂ol-; compare Latin ollus, Armenian ayl etc.

7. H -ma- / -va- ‘negative suffix for ergative verbs’; va-, -ov- ‘prohibitive’, U mi ‘prohibitive’, ui ‘not’ < PIE *meh₁ / *mē (with m/F/w oscillation); compare Armenian mi, Avestan mā, and NC etymology #5 in next section

8. H oia ‘no!’ < PIE *h₁oiu; compare Greek ou

9. H -kkV ‘negation of non-ergative verbs’, -kk- ‘negation of adjectives’ < PIE *(h₁oiu-)kʷi(d); compare Armenian očʿ, Greek ouk, oukhí

10. H tā/e- ‘relative pronoun’ < PIE *yo-

11. H ave- ‘who’ < PIE *yo-; compare Armenian ov ‘who’

12. H -až ‘plural morpheme’ (prob. /-as/) < PIE *-es

13. H ai ‘if’; compare Greek (Dor., Eol.) ai, Phrygian ai

14. H -ma ‘connective’; compare Hittite -ma ‘and, but’

15. U para ‘to, towards, on’ < PIE *pr-

16. U pei ‘under’ (postposition) < PIE *h₄u pó

17. H tān-, tan-. U tan- ‘to do’ < PIE *dʰeh₁- ‘to put; to do’ with *-ne- extension; compare Armenian dn-em ‘to put, build’, OCS dĕ-ti ‘to do, say’


19. H taže ‘present’ (prob. /tase/) < PIE *deh₃- with *-ti- extension; compare Armenian ta- ‘to give’, Greek dōsis, Latin dōs, dōtis ‘present’
20. H mann- ‘to be’, U man- ‘to be, exist’ < PIE *men- ‘to remain, stay’; compare Armenian mn-em, Avestan mān- etc.
21. H kad- /kat-/ ‘to say, speak’ < PIE *gʷet- ‘to say’; compare Armenian koč-em ‘to call’, Gothic qib-an ‘to say, speak’
22. H fur- /wur-/ ‘to see’ < PIE *wer-; compare Greek oráō
23. H, U ar- ‘to give’ < PIE *(H)reh₁- ‘to give’; compare Proto-Indo-Iranian *rā-s- ‘to bestow, give’
24. H šar- ‘to desire, ask’ < PIE *g̑hor- ‘to desire’; compare Old Avestan zara ‘goal’, Sanskrit hárya- ti ‘desires’
25. H ūr-, ur- ‘to want, desire’ < PIE *wel-; compare Avestan var- ‘desire’, Latin uol-, uel- ‘to want’
26. H tari ‘fire’ < PIE *h₂eh₂tṛ; compare Avestan ātar- and NC etymology #6 in next section
27. H turi ‘low, lower’ < PIE *ndʰero-; compare Avestan aδara-
28. H zur-gi /sur-ki/ ‘blood’ < PIE *h₁ésh₂r; compare Sanskrit áśr, áṣṭṛ-
29. H atta-i, U ate ‘father’ < PIE *at- / *h₂et-; compare Hittite, Greek attas, Latin, Gothic atta
30. H šál-a, U solā ‘daughter’ < PIE *seu(h₁)- + participial *-l- (as in Armenian); compare English son, various NC parallels from PNC *-ĭšwĔ(-rV-) ‘son, daughter’ and Proto-Kartvelian *šw-il- ‘born, son’
31. H pura-, U pura ‘slave’ < PIE *ph₁u-ero-; compare Latin puer
32. H ešši, iššija- ‘horse’ < PIE *h₁ék̑wo-; compare Sanskrit áśvā-, Khotanese aśśa- ‘horse’, Armenian ēš ‘donkey’, and NC etymology #8 in next section
33. H avar- ‘field’ < PHU *arwar < PIE *h₃er₁,wr; compare Armenian harawunk’, Greek ároura, etc.

Conclusions

Etymologies listed above suggest that HU might be daughter (or possibly sister?) languages of PIE: this research thread seems to be worth continuing, in order to:
• identify additional cognates (ideally involving longer phoneme sequences and more numerous non-root etymologies);
• refine sound laws (including phonemic status of Hurrian voicing, and sound correspondences for vowels and laryngeals);
• collect evidence to understand whether HU are daughter or sister languages of PIE.

North Caucasian (NC)
NC languages

North Caucasian (NC) languages consist of the following families and sub-families:
North-East Caucasian (NEC) = Nakh-Dagestanian
   NAKH: Chechen, Ingush, Batsbi
AVAR-ANDI: Avar, Andi, Chadakolob, Akhvakh, Chamalal, Tindi, Karata, Botlikh, Bagvalal, Godoberi
TSEZIAN: Tsezi, Ginukh, Khvarshi, Inkhokvari, Bezhta, Gunzib
LAK-DARGWA: Lak, Akushi, Urakhi, Muiri, Kaitag, Tsudakhar, Kubachi, Chirag
LEZGHIAN: Lezghi, Tabasaran, Agul, Rutul, Tsakhur, Kryz, Budukh, Archi, Udi
Khinalug

North-West Caucasian (NWC):
Abkhaz, Abaza
Adyghe, Kabardian
Ubykh

NEC and NWC are non-controversial families; their sub-families are even evident by inspection (possibly with the exception of Archi within Lezghian). Starostin and Nikolayev (among others) consider NEC and NWC related.

The following sub-section lists some striking parallels between (P)NC and (P)IE, which provide preliminary hints for a possible genetic relationship between NC and PIE. The source of (P)NC forms is [Starostin, Nikolayev 1994], with the following changes in transcription (to use IPA symbols instead of non-IPA ones):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUNDS</th>
<th>DIACRITICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starostin’s</td>
<td>Mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>ı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>tɬ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ɬ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>ɬ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĉ</td>
<td>ɭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>dʒ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIACRITICS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starostin’s</td>
<td>Mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>ʰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>′</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample NC – PIE comparisons

1. PNC *zō(-n), *ʔez(V) ‘I (first person singular pronoun)’: PIE *h₁eg̑(ó(m))
   NAKH: Chechen so, as (erg.); Ingush so, az (erg.); Batsbi so
   AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob dun; Andi din; Akhvakh dene; Chamalal dī; Tindi de; Karata den; Botlikh den(i); Bagvalal dē; Godoberi den; Avar dun
   TSEZIAN: Tsezi di; Ginukh de; Khvarshi da; Inkhokvari do; Bezhta do; Gunzib de
   LAK-DARGWA: Lak t:u- (obl.); Chirag du
   LEZGHIAN: Lezghi zun; Tabasaran uzu; Agul zum; Rutul zī; Tsakhir zu; Kryz zin; Budukh zīn; Archi zon; Udi zu
   Khinalug zi; jā (<*jaz) (erg.)
   ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz sa-rá; Abaza sa-ra
   ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe sa; Kabardian sa
   Ubykh sa-kwá
   IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *azam; Old Avestan azēm; Young Avestan azēm; Sogdian ‘zw; Khwaresmian ‘z; Ossetic az; Khotanese aysz, aysā; Pashto za, zo, za, zā; Wanetsi za; Yidgha zo; Munji za; Wakhī wuz; Parthian ‘z; Kurdish az; Ormuri az, az; Old Persian adam
   Armenian es
   Also compare HU etymology #1
   Comment: AVAR-ANDI, TSEZIAN and LAK-DARGWA share *g ̂> d with Persian. NC reflexes and PIE parallels might lead to a revised PNC reconstruction *ez, *(e)zó(n)

2. PNEC *dū ‘thou (oblique base)’: PIE *tuhx, *te(we)
   AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob, Andi, Akhvakh, Chamalal, Tindi, Karata, Botlikh, Bagvalal, Godoberi, Avar du-
   TSEZIAN: Tsezi, Ginukh, Khvarshi de-b-; Inkhokvari du-b-; Bezhta di-b- / du-; Gunzib di-b- / du-
   IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *taya; Avestan tu, tvēm, tum, ṭvām, tōi, tē; Sogdian tw‘; Ossetic dēw (gen.); Khotanese thu, thā, thā, tē, te; Pashto ta, to, tʰa, tə; Wanetsi ta, ta; Ormuri tu; Old Persian tūvam, tāiy; Middle Persian tō
   Armenian du
   Comment: compare Ossetic and Armenian for *t- > d-; this pronoun is in almost complementary distribution with the following one in NC sub-families.

3. PNC *yō(-) ‘thou’: PIE *wo- ‘you’ (plural and dual)
   LAK-DARGWA: Lak wi
   LEZGHIAN: Lezghi, Agul wun; Tabasaran uwu; Rutul wi; Tsakhir wu; Kryz, Budukh win; Archi, Udi un
   Khinalug wi
   ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz wa-rá; Abaza wa-ra
   ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe, Kabardian wa
Ubykh wa-ʁʷá

IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *vah; Avestan vō; Khotanese ahā, abu, -ū, uhu
Comment: for the semantic shift ‘you (plur.)’ > ‘thou’ compare, e.g., English; this pronoun is in almost complementary distribution with the previous one in NC sub-families.

4 PNC *dV ‘that’: PIE *to-
NAKH: Chechen dʕā (< *da-ha); Ingush dʕa (< *da-ha); Batsbi da-h
AVAR-ANDI: Botlikh, Avar do-b
LEZGHIAN: Tabasaran du-mu; Udi t:e
Khinaulug du ‘this’
ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz, Abaza -da
ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe, Kabardian -da
IRANIAN: Avestan ta-; Khotanese tta- ‘this’; Pashto da, dʌγʌ ‘this’; Wanetsi da, dʌγʌ ‘this’
Armenian da-, do- ‘that (near you)’
Also compare HU etymology #5
Comment: *t- > d- as in comparison #2 (PNC *dū : PIE *tuhখ)

5. PNC *ma / *mə ‘prohibitive particle’: PIE *meh₁, *mē
NAKH: Chechen, Ingush, Batsbi ma
LAK-DARGWA: Lak ma
LEZGHIAN: Lezghi –mir; Tabasaran, Agul, Rutul, Tsakhir, Kryz, Budukh m-;
Udi ma
ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz, Abaza m- ‘neg., prohib.’
ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe, Kabardian mə-
Ubykh -m(a)- ‘neg., prohib.’
Sanskrit mā
IRANIAN: Avestan, Old Persian mā; Khotanese ma
Armenian mi; some Armenian dialects mir (compare Lezghi)
Also compare HU etymology #7
Comment: also extended to general negative particle in some NWC languages; further comparisons with Proto-Kartvelian *ma- and Proto-Turkic *-ma- ‘not’ are also possible.

6. PNC *tsʔaŋ ‘fire’: PIE *h₂eh₂tṛ
NAKH: Chechen tsʰe, tsʰera-; Ingush tsʰi, tsero; Batsbi tsʰe, tsʰari-
AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob ʧʰa; Andi tsʰa; Akhvakh ʧʰari; Chamalal, Tindi tsʰa;
Karata, Botlikh tsʰa; Bagvalal tsaj; Godoberi tsaj; Avar tsʰa
TSEZIAN: Tsezi tsi; Ginukh ʧʰe; Khvarshi tsʰa; Inkhokvari, Bezhta tsʰo; Gunzib tsʰə
LAK-DARGWA: Lak tsʰu, tsʰara-; Akushi, Urakhi, Tsudakhar, Kubachi tsʰa;
Chirag tsa
LEZGHIAN: Lezghi tsʰa; Tabasaran tsə; Agul tsʰa; Rutul tsaj; Tsakhir tsʰa; Kryz tsʰə; Budukh tsʰo; Archi osʰ; Udi ar-uχ (< plur.)
Khinalug ʧˀä
IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *āθra-; Avestan ātar-, āθr-; Sogdian ‘‘tr, ‘rð; Khwaresmian ‘rw; Ossetic art; Yaghnobi āl; Pashto or, o’r, wor, yer; Wanetsi owar; Shughni yóc; Yazgulami yec; Sariqoli yuc; Kurdish ār; Baluchi ās, āč; Ormuri rawā; Middle Persian ţdūr
Also compare HU etymology #26
Comments: remarkable parallels include: Udi ar- vs. Kurdish ār and Pashto or; Archi ots˚ vs. Baluchi ās, āč. Shughni yóc, Sariqoli yuc (and maybe Proto-Turkic *oť ‘fire’). Several NC oblique stems may lead to a revised PNC reconstruction *ts’ær.

7. PNC *dz̲whärī / *dz̲wăhrī ‘star’: PIE *h₂stér
NAKH: Batsbi ʧeʧรก
AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob tswa; Andi ts’a; Akhvakh ts’wari; Chamalal s’a; Tindi ts:aru; Karata ts:wa; Botli kh ts:aj; Bagvalal ts:war; Godoberi ts:aj; Avar ts’wa
TSEZIAN: Tsezi ts̄a; Ginukh tswa; Khwarshi ts̄a; Inkhokvari ts̄a; Bezhta ts̄a; Gunzib ts̄a
LAK-DARGWA: Lak t’u-ku, t’u’r-; Akushri urʔi; Urakhri urʔi; Tsudakhar zuri; Kubachi di(ʔi) ; Chirag zure
ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz á-jeʧˀ˅a; Abaza jaʧˀʷa
Ubykh tswa(n)-ki
Sanskrit tāras
IRANIAN: Avestan star-; Sogdian ‘st’rk, ‘stry; Khwaresmian st’ryk; Ossetic st’aly / (æ)st’alu; Khotanese stāraa-; Pashto stōrai (>*stāraka-), starga, store/ɔ/ʌ; Wanetsi stori; Yidgha stārē; Wakhi stār; Sangl. uṣtaruk; Shughni x̌itǟrj; Yazg x̌itǟrj, x̌tarag; Sariqoli x̌ituʃ̄; Kurdish istirk; Baluchi istār, astār; Parachī estēč; Ormuri starrak, storak, stora; Middle Persian *st’r̥g, stārag
Armenian astł; Armenian dialects astl-, usdl, asł’, aʃstł-, æsl, æx, æxən, ask
Comment: NC forms may derive from a “pre-PNC” **Vhtér; a further comparison with Proto-Turkic *julduf is also possible (if from ** JVštVr)

8. PNC *fi[n]ʃwi/ĕ ‘horse’: PIE *h₁ék̑wos ‘horse’, *h₁ék̑weh₂ ‘mare’
LAK-DARGWA: Lak ifw; Akushri urfi; Urakhri urfi; Kubachi ưfe; Chirag urfe
Khinalug pši
ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz a-ʃa; Abaza ʃa
ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe, Kabardian ʃa
Ubykh ʃa
Sanskrit áśvā-
Armenian ēš ‘donkey’
Also compare HU etymology #32
Comment: NC reflexes and PIE parallels might lead to a revised PNC reconstruction *efw-; one might also compare Proto-Turkic *āt ‘horse’

9. PNC *jërkw ‘heart’: PIE *Kerd-
NAKH: Chechen dog; Ingush dog; Batsbi dok
AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob rak; Andi rokwo; Akhvakh rakwa; Chamalal jakwa; Tindi rakwa; Karata rakwa; Botlikh rakwa; Bagvalal rakwa; Godoberi rakwa; Avar rak
TSEZIAN: Tsezi rok; Ginukh rok(?)e; Khvarshi lokwa; Inkhokvari loko; Bezhta rakо; Gunzib rokо
LAK-DARGWA: Lak dak; Akushi urk;i; Urakih urk;i; Tsudakhar urf;i; Kubachi uk’e; Chirag urf’e
LEZGHIAN: Lezghi rig; Tabasaran juk; Agul jurk; Tsakhur jik; Kryz jik; Budukh jik; Archi ik; Udi uk;
Khinalug ung
ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz a-gwó; Abaza gwо
ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe gwо; Kabardian gwо
Ubykh го
IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *zrd-; Avestan zərəd; Sogdian ʃər < *zərō; Ossetic zərđa; Khotanese ysâra-, ysarak, ysr-, ysr(ak)-; Pashtо ʃər, zera, zla; Wanetsi ʃər; Yidghа ʃil, zël, z’la; Munji zilgy; Shughni zərə, zərə; Yazg zawd; Sariqoli zãrd, zor shutdown, zord; Parthian zyr; Parachi zư; Ormuri zli, z’li; Middle Persian dyl
Armenian sîr
SLAVIC: OCS srьдьce, Russian сердце, etc.
Comment: NC reflexes offer a very complex picture, which can be better understood in the light of PNC reconstruction *jërkw, possibly from “pre-PNC” *zVrdV-k- (similar to Khotanese and OCS) > *jVrVkw(?)- / *(jV)dVk-.
These revised proto-forms, together with Agul jurk, also suggest a comparison with Proto-Turkic *jürek ‘heart’. On the other hand, NWC forms (such as Abaza, Adyghe and Kabardian gwо) can be compared with Kartvelian (=South-Caucasian) terms such as Svan gwi-; gu(h)- and Laz gu(r)- ‘heart’ < Proto-Kartvelian *gul-

10. PNC *tsHо ‘one’: PIE *h,oi-wo-
NAKH: Chechen tsha; Ingush tsa; Batsbi tsha
AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob so; Andi se-w; Akhvakh tse-be; Chamalal se-b; Tindi se-b; Karata tse-b; Botlikh se-b / tse-b; Bagvalal se-b / tse-b; Godoberi se-b; Avar tso
TSEZIAN: Tsezi sis; Ginukh hes; Khvarshi has; Inkhokvari hos; Bezhta hоs; Gunzib hоs
LAK-DARGWA: Lak tsа; Akushi tsа; Urakih tsа; Kubachi sa; Chirag tsа
LEZGHIAN: Lezghi sa; Tabasaran sa; Agul sad; Rutul sa; Tsakhur sa; Kryz sad;
Budukh sad; Archi os; Udi sa
Khinalug sa
ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz z-na ‘once’; Abaza za-kə
ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe za; Kabardian zə
Ubykh za
IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *aiwa-; Avestan aēva-, aēuua-; Sogdian ‘yw;
Khwaresmian ‘yw; Ossetic iw / (j)ew; Khotanese śśau, śśā, śye, śi, śe, śo etc.
< *yūva < *aiwa-, śśūka- ‘only, alone’, śśūka- ‘alone’; Pashto yau, yaw, yō;
Yidgha yū; Munji yū; Wakhi tə; Sanglechi wok, yak; Shughni yī(w);
Yazgulami yū, wū(ɡ); Sariqoli t(w); Baluchi ēyōk ‘single’, evakā ‘alone’;
Parachi žū < *yau < *aiwa-; Ormuri śē, se, sa; Old Persian aiva; Middle
Persian ś(v)
Comment: Khotanese, Parachi and Ormuri forms are particularly close to NC
forms; Abaza za-kə and Khotanese śśūka- also suggest a comparison with
Hurrian šukki ‘one’.

11. PNC *(t)qHwā ‘two’: PIE *dwoh3(u)
AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob ki-gu; Andi sə-gu; Akhvakh ke-da; Chamalal eʃi-da;
Tindi ke-ja; Karata ke-da; Botlikh ke-da; Bagvalal ke-ra; Godoberi ke-da;
Avar ki-go
TSEZIAN: Tseezi qˁano; Ginukh qˁono; Khvarshi qˁwene; Inkhokvari qˁune;
Bezhta qona; Gunzib qˁanu
LAK-DARGWA: Lak kˀi=a; Akushi kel; Urakhi kwi; Kubachi kwe; Chirag qˁwal
LEZGHIAN: Lezghi qʷe-d; Tabasaran qʷu; Agul qʷu-d; Rutul qʷad; Tsakhur
qʷo-lla; Kryz qʷad; Budukh qa-b; Archi qʷe; Udi pːe
Khinalug kˀu
ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz ʕʷ-bà; Abaza ʕʷ-ba
ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe tə; Kabardian tə
Ubykh təqwa
IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *duwayne-; Avestan dwa (masc.), baē (fem., neuter), bi-;
Sogdian (’)dəw; Ossetic dywwə, duwə / duw(w)ə; Yaghnobī du; Khotanese
d(u)va; šata-, še ‘second’ < *dwi-ta-; Pashto dwa; Wanetsi dwē; Yidgha lōh;
Munji lu; Wakhi bū(i); Sanglechi dōu; Shughni dū; Yazgulami du; Kurdish
do; Baluchi do; Ormuri dīo; Middle Persian dō
Armenian erku < Proto-Armenian *tkʷu
Comment: PNC *(t)qHwā and Ubykh təqwa are very close to Proto-Armenian
*tkʷu ‘two’ and Proto-Kartvelian *tˀqub- ‘twins’. Proto-Turkic *e̟k(k)i might
also be compared, if < *etkʷ- (with prothetical *e- as in Armenian erku).
Adyghe and Kabardian tə are very close to Pashto dwa etc. Udi pːe can be
compared with Avestan baē and Wakhi bū(i).

12. PNC *HHE ‘three’: PIE *tréyes, *trih
AVAR-ANDI: Chadakolob tāb-gu; Andi śob-gu; Akhvakh tiwa-dabe / tio-dabe;
Chamalal tə-ła-da; Tindi təb-da; Karata təb-da; Botlikh habu-da; Bagvalal
təb-da; Godoberi təbu-da; Avar təb-go
TSEZIAN: Tsezi ɬōno; Ginukh ɬono; Khvarshi ɬona; Inkhokvari ɬono; Bezhta ɬana; Gunzib ɬono

LAK-DARGWA: Akushi ħaˁba-al; Urakhi ħaˁb; Kubachi ħaˁb; Chirag ħaˁb-al

LEZGHIAN: Lezghi p:u-d < *xp:u-d; Tabasaran šubu-b; Agul xibu-d; Rutul xibi-d; Tsakhar xebi-lā; Kryz şibi-d; Budukh šubu-d; Archi ſeb; Udi ſib

ABKHAZ-TAPANT: Abkhaz ɣ-pa; Abaza ɣ-pa

ADYGHE-KABARDIAN: Adyghe šə; Kabardian šə

Ubykh ša, šə

IRANIAN: Proto-Iranian *θrayah; Avestan ərayō, əri, tišrō; Sogdian əry; Khwaremsian šy; Ossetic æte; Yaghnob šurri; Khotanese drai; Pashto drē; Yidgha xuri; Munji xirōi; Wakhi trūi; Sanglechi rōi; Shughni arāi; Yazgulami xurōi; Sariqoli aroy; Baluchi saı; Parachi ši; Ormuri ši, ɕi; Middle Persian še Armenian ērek, ɕri, ɕri-, Armenian dialects že-, še-

Comment: PNC *tɬHĕ and PIE *treye- are remarkably close per se. NWC forms such as Adyghe šə, Ubykh ša, šə are close to e.g. Khwaremsian šy, Parachi ši, Middle Persian še, Armenian dialects že-, še-. If frequent –b or –nV extensions in NC can legitimately be compared with Proto-Kartvelian *-m, then Proto-Kartvelian *sam ‘three’ could also be added to these comparisons.

Preliminary conclusions

These comparisons between NC and IE languages (in particular, Iranian and Armenian) are intriguing enough to encourage further analysis. The accumulation of further comparisons is necessary to identify regular sound correspondences and to rule out the possibility that this initial set of comparanda is due to chance resemblances and/or loans (instead of genetic relatedness). Some parallels also suggest that Turkic languages (and possibly Kartvelian ones) should be included in the research and might even be ultimately derivable directly from PIE (rather than from a higher-level proto-language such as putative “Proto-Nostratic”).
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Intervengono: Milani, Vai, Soldani, Fortuna, Borghi.
La seduta è tolta alle ore 18.50

SEDUTA DEL 16/1/2012

Presenti: Borghi, De Marchi, Fortuna, Lozza, Milani, Scala, Sgarbi, Soldani, Vai.
Presiede Milani.
La seduta ha inizio alle ore 17.

COMUNICAZIONE:

R. Sgarbi, *Contributo all’ermeneutica neotestamentaria di Mt 5, 17-19.*

Per una paradigmatica autocertificazione circa la posizione del pensiero e del comportamento di Gesù di Nazaret nei confronti del *corpus* della Legge ebraica, quella detta ‘mosaica’ o *Tōrāh* e quella onnicomprensiva o *Miṣvah*, possiamo riferirci alla seguente apodittica pericope neotestamentaria del testo greco dell’evangelo matteano (Mt 5, 17-19) nell’edizione critica stoccardiana pubblicata da Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.¹