

14

Global Etymologies

John D. Bengtson and Merritt Ruhlen

*If the strength of Indo-European studies
is largely based on the existence,
in a few instances at least,
of very old sources, the strength
of Amerindian studies is simply
the vast number of languages.
Thus synchronic breadth becomes
the source of diachronic depth.*

—Joseph H. Greenberg (1987)

How does one know that two languages are related? Or that two language families are related? Every linguist purports to know the answers to these questions, but the answers vary surprisingly from one linguist to another. And the divergence of views concerning what *is* actually known is even greater than that exhibited on the question of how one *arrives at* this body of information. This is not a particularly satisfactory state of affairs. In what follows we will explore these questions in a global context. We conclude that, despite the generally antipathetic or agnostic stance of most linguists, the case for monogenesis of extant (and attested extinct) languages is quite strong. We will present evidence that we feel can only be explained genetically (i.e. as

the result of common origin), but we will also attempt to answer some of the criticism that has been leveled at work such as ours for over a century.

THE BASIS OF LINGUISTIC TAXONOMY

That ordinary words form the basis of linguistic taxonomy is a direct consequence of the fundamental property of human language, the *arbitrary* relationship between sound and meaning. Since all sequences of sounds are equally well suited to represent any meaning, there is no tendency or predisposition for certain sounds or sound sequences to be associated with certain meanings (leaving aside onomatopoeia, which in any event is irrelevant for classification). In classifying languages genetically we seek, among the available lexical and grammatical formatives, similarities that involve *both* sound and meaning. Typological similarities, involving sound alone or meaning alone, do not yield reliable results.

The fundamental principles of taxonomy are not specific to linguistics, but are, rather, as applicable in fields as disparate as molecular biology, botany, ethnology, and astronomy. When one identifies similarities among molecular structures, plants, human societies, or stars, the origin of such similarities can be explained only by one of three mechanisms: (1) common origin, (2) borrowing, or (3) convergence. To demonstrate that two languages (or language families) are related, it is thus sufficient to show that their shared similarities are not the result of either borrowing or convergence. As regards convergence—the manifestation of motivated or accidental resemblances—linguists are in a more favorable situation than are biologists. In biology, convergence may be accidental, but is more often motivated by the environment; it is not by accident that bats resemble birds, or that dolphins resemble fish. In linguistics, by contrast, where the sound/meaning association is arbitrary, convergence is *always* accidental.

It is seldom emphasized that similarities between language *families* are themselves susceptible to the same three explanations. That we so seldom see mention of this corollary principle is largely because twentieth-century historical linguistics has been laboring under the delusion that language families like Indo-European share *no* cognates with other families, thus offering nothing to compare. At this level, it is alleged, similarities simply do not exist.

What is striking is that this position—for which considerable evidence to the contrary existed already at the start of this century (Trombetti 1905) and which on a priori grounds seems most unlikely (Ruhlen 1988a)—came to be almost universally accepted by linguists, most of whom have never investigated the question themselves. Those few scholars who have actually investigated the question, such as Trombetti (1905), Swadesh (1960), and Greenberg

(1987), have tended to favor monogenesis of extant languages. Even Edward Sapir, often considered an exemplar of linguistic sobriety (despite his alleged excesses in the Americas), looked favorably upon the work of Trombetti, as seen in a letter to Kroeber in 1924: “There is much excellent material and good sense in Trombetti in spite of his being a frenzied monogenist. I am not so sure that his standpoint is less sound than the usual ‘conservative’ one” (quoted in Golla 1984: 420). We maintain that a comparison of the world’s language families *without preconception* reveals numerous widespread elements that can only be reasonably explained as the result of common origin.

BORROWING

Linguists employ a number of well-known techniques to distinguish borrowed words from inherited items. Most important, clearly, is the fact that basic vocabulary, as defined by Dolgopolsky (1964) and others, is highly resistant to borrowing. Though it is no doubt true that *any* word may on occasion be borrowed by one language from another, it is equally true that such basic items as pronouns and body parts are rarely borrowed. Furthermore, borrowing takes place between two languages, at a particular time and place, not between language families, across broad expanses of time and place. Thus to attribute the global similarities we document here to borrowing would be ludicrous. And as regards the alleged cases of *mass* borrowing in the Americas (the so-called “Pan-Americanisms”), Greenberg (1990: 11) quite rightly protests “that basic words and pronouns could be borrowed from Tierra del Fuego to British Columbia . . . is so utterly improbable that it hardly needs discussion.” It seems to us even less likely that basic vocabulary—the grist for most of the etymologies we offer herein—could have been borrowed from one language to another all the way from Africa across Eurasia to South America.

CONVERGENCE

A common criticism of work like ours is that, with around 5,000 languages to choose from, it cannot be too hard to find a word in some African language that is semantically and phonologically similar to, or even identical with, some word in an American Indian language.¹ There are so many possibilities, runs this argument, that one can hardly fail to find accidental “look-alikes” everywhere (Goddard 1979, Campbell 1988). But this sort of mindless search is exactly the reverse of how the comparative method proceeds. The units we are comparing are *language families*, not individual languages (a language isolate like Basque has traditionally been considered, taxonomically,

¹ For a more fundamental discussion of convergence, see Chapter 2.

a family consisting of a single language). Specifically, we will be comparing items in the following 32 taxa, each of which we believe is a genetically valid group at some level of the classification: Khoisan, Niger-Congo, Kordofanian, Nilo-Saharan, Afro-Asiatic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, Uralic, Dravidian, Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus, Korean, Japanese-Ryukyuan, Ainu, Gilyak, Chukchi-Kamchatkan, Eskimo-Aleut, Caucasian, Basque, Burushaski, Yeniseian, Sino-Tibetan, Na-Dene, Indo-Pacific, Australian, Nahali, Austroasiatic, Miao-Yao, Daic (= Kadai), Austronesian, and Amerind.

One may legitimately wonder why, for the most part, we are comparing relatively low-level families like Indo-European and Sino-Tibetan rather than higher-level taxa like Eurasiatic/Nostratic and Dene-Caucasian, especially since both of us support the validity of these higher-level families (Bengtson 1991a,b, Ruhlen 1990a). We do this to emphasize that higher-level groupings do not require the prior working out of all the intermediate nodes, contrary to the opinion of most Amerindian specialists (the field is all but bereft of generalists!). As is well known, both Indo-European and Austronesian were recognized as families from the early years of their investigation, long before specialists had reconstructed all their intermediate levels (a task that is, of course, still incomplete). In taxonomy it is a commonplace that higher-level groupings are often more obvious—and easier to demonstrate—than are lower-level nodes. We maintain that this is particularly so when one considers the entire world. Current contrary opinion notwithstanding, it is really fairly simple to show that all the world's language families are related, as we shall see in the etymologies that follow. Discovering the correct intermediate groupings of the tree—the subgrouping of the entire human family—is a much more difficult task, and one that has only begun. Exactly the same is true of Amerind, which itself is a well-defined taxon (Greenberg 1987, Ruhlen 1991a); the subgrouping *within* Amerind involves far more difficult analyses and taxonomic decisions (Ruhlen 1991c).

Each of our 32 genetic groups is defined by a set of etymologies that connects grammatical and lexical items presumed to be cognate within that group; the postulated membership and putative subgrouping within each of these groups is given in Ruhlen (1987a). The precise number of etymologies defining each of the 32 groups ranges from several thousand (for close-knit and/or well-documented groups like Dravidian or Indo-European) to several dozen (for ancient and/or poorly studied groups like Indo-Pacific or Australian). For the most part the many etymologies defining each group have been discovered independently, by different scholars. (In this regard Greenberg's work—in Africa, New Guinea, and the Americas—represents an exception to the rule.) So instead of drawing our etymologies from thousands of *languages*, each containing thousands of words, we are, rather, limited to less

than three-dozen *families*, some of which have no more than a few hundred identifiable cognates. The pool of possibilities is thus greatly reduced, and accidental look-alikes will be few.

We believe that the failure of our critics to appreciate the truly minuscule probability of accidental similarities is the chief impediment to their understanding why all the world's languages must derive from a common origin. Accordingly, let us consider this question in some detail. Each of the etymologies we cite involves at least a half-dozen of the 32 supposedly independent families, precisely because the probability of finding the same accidental resemblance in six different families is close to zero. The multiplication of the (im)probabilities of accidental resemblance, as more and more families are considered, quickly assures the attentive taxonomist that similarities shared by numerous families, often separated by vast distances, cannot be due to chance. This crucial point has been emphasized by Collinder (1949), Greenberg (1957, 1963, 1987), and Dolgopolsky (1964), among others, but even Trombetti (1905) was well aware of the statistical importance of attestation in multiple families, rather than in just two. The biologist Richard Dawkins (1987: 274) makes the same point: "Convergent evolution is really a special kind of coincidence. The thing about coincidences is that, even if they happen once, they are far less likely to happen twice. And even less likely to happen three times. By taking more and more separate protein molecules, we can all but eliminate coincidence."

To see just how unlikely accidental look-alikes really are, let us consider two languages that each have just seven consonants and three vowels:

p	t	k	i	u
	s		a	
m	n			
	l			

With a few notable exceptions the vast majority of the world's languages show at least these phonological distinctions. Yet even this minimal inventory is capable of producing 147 CVC roots, as shown in Table 5. The probability of accidental phonological *identity* is only 1/147, though the probability of accidental phonological *resemblance* might be 2/147, 3/147, etc., depending on how many other phonological shapes in Table 5 are deemed sufficiently similar. A perusal of Table 5 suggests, however, that most of these putative roots are quite distinct phonologically and are not readily connected by common phonological processes.

TABLE 5 Possible CVC Roots for a Language with Seven Consonants and Three Vowels

KAK	LAK	MAK	NAK	PAK	SAK	TAK
KAL	LAL	MAL	NAL	PAL	SAL	TAL
KAM	LAM	MAM	NAM	PAM	SAM	TAM
KAN	LAN	MAN	NAN	PAN	SAN	TAN
KAP	LAP	MAP	NAP	PAP	SAP	TAP
KAS	LAS	MAS	NAS	PAS	SAS	TAS
KAT	LAT	MAT	NAT	PAT	SAT	TAT
KIK	LIK	MIK	NIK	PIK	SIK	TIK
KIL	LIL	MIL	NIL	PIL	SIL	TIL
KIM	LIM	MIM	NIM	PIM	SIM	TIM
KIN	LIN	MIN	NIN	PIN	SIN	TIN
KIP	LIP	MIP	NIP	PIP	SIP	TIP
KIS	LIS	MIS	NIS	PIS	SIS	TIS
KIT	LIT	MIT	NIT	PIT	SIT	TIT
KUK	LUK	MUK	NUK	PUK	SUK	TUK
KUL	LUL	MUL	NUL	PUL	SUL	TUL
KUM	LUM	MUM	NUM	PUM	SUM	TUM
KUN	LUN	MUN	NUN	PUN	SUN	TUN
KUP	LUP	MUP	NUP	PUP	SUP	TUP
KUS	LUS	MUS	NUS	PUS	SUS	TUS
KUT	LUT	MUT	NUT	PUT	SUT	TUT

Now were we to compare two languages with a more typical phonemic inventory, say, fourteen consonants and five vowels,

p	t	k	j	w	i	u
b	d	g			e	o
	č				a	
	s					
m	n					
	l					
	r					

we would find that the number of possible CVC roots in each language jumps to 980. Again, of course, the probability of chance resemblance will depend on certain phonological assumptions, but precious few accidental identities *or* resemblances, vis-à-vis the stock of some other language or group of languages, could be expected.

One may appreciate just how unlikely an explanation of chance resemblance—independent development in each family—really is by considering the prob-

ability that the resemblances noted in etymology 21 (below) arose by convergence. We have chosen this etymology for our argument because the meaning involved is rarely borrowed and has no onomatopoeic connections. It thus offers a clear case, where the similarities must be due either to common origin or to accidental convergence. Let us try to calculate the probability that these similarities arose independently. To do this we must make certain assumptions, and at each such stage we shall adopt a minimalist approach that in fact underestimates the true probability. Let us assume, as we did above, that each language family uses only seven consonants and three vowels, yielding the 147 syllable types shown in Table 5. What, then, is the probability that two languages will accidentally match for a particular semantic/phonological domain, in the present case ‘female genitalia’? Clearly it is $1/147$ or .007. Whatever the form that appears in the first language family, the second family has only one chance in 147 of matching it. And the probability that a third family will offer a match will be $(1/147)^2$ or .000049; that of a fourth family, $(1/147)^3$ or .0000003; and so forth. In the etymology we give, 14 of the 32 taxa show apparent cognates, though the evidence is for the moment slim in Australian and the vowel in Austronesian (and many Amerind forms) is *e* rather than the expected *u*. But if we ignore these details, then the probability that the particular sound/meaning correlation “PUT/female genitals” arose independently *fourteen times* will be $(1/147)^{13}$, or about one chance in ten octillion, by our rough calculations. We feel that this qualifies as a long shot; certainly descent from a common source is the more likely explanation.

The foregoing constitutes what we consider to be the basis of genetic classification in linguistics. The application of these basic principles to the world’s language families leads inevitably, in our opinion, to the conclusion that they all derive from a single source, as suggested by the 27 etymologies presented below. We have not yet dealt, however, with a number of other topics that in the minds of many linguists are inextricably tied up with taxonomy, questions like reconstruction, sound correspondences, and the like. We believe that these topics are not in fact of crucial importance in linguistic taxonomy, and that mixing the basic taxonomic principles with these other factors has led to much of the current confusion that we see concerning the classification of the world’s languages. So that these ancillary topics not be invoked yet again, by those opposed to global comparisons, we will take them up one by one and explain why they are not relevant to our enterprise. Let us begin with a topic that is at the heart of many current disputes, the alleged incompatibility between Greenberg’s method of multilateral comparison and the traditional methods of comparative linguistics.

MULTILATERAL COMPARISON VS. THE TRADITIONAL METHOD

Many linguists feel that Greenberg's use of what he calls multilateral comparison to classify languages in various parts of the world is incompatible with—or even antagonistic to—the methods of traditional historical linguistics, which emphasize reconstruction and sound correspondences (about which, see below). Thus, Bynon (1977: 271) claims that “the use of basic vocabulary comparison not simply as a *preliminary* to reconstruction but as a *substitute* for it is more controversial. . . . Traditional historical linguists . . . have not been slow in pointing out the inaccuracies which are bound to result from a reliance on mere similarity of form assessed intuitively and unsubstantiated by reconstruction.” In a similar vein, Anna Morpurgo Davies (1989: 167) objects that “we do not yet know whether superfamilies outlined in this way have the same properties as families established with the standard comparative method. If they do not, there is a serious risk that the whole concept of superfamily is vacuous.” And Derbyshire and Pullum (1991: 13) find Greenberg's Amerind hypothesis “startling, to say the least, when judged in terms of the standard methodology”

The confusion displayed in the previous three quotes (and one could give many others) results from a failure to realize that the comparative method consists essentially of two stages. The first stage is *classification*, which is really no different from what Greenberg calls multilateral comparison. The second stage, which might be called *historical linguistics*, involves family-internal questions such as sound correspondences and reconstruction. In practice, there is no name for this second stage simply because the two stages are seldom distinguished in the basic handbooks on historical linguistics, in which, almost without exception, the initial stage, classification, is overlooked (Bynon 1977, Hock 1986, Anttila 1989). Also overlooked in these basic texts are language families other than Indo-European. The origin of this anomaly—which knows no parallel in the biological world—is a consequence of the primogeniture of Indo-European in the pantheon of identified families, and the subsequent elaboration of the family by Europeans in the nineteenth century.

That the initial stage of comparative linguistics, classification, is so systematically overlooked today lies in the origin of the Indo-European concept itself. When Sir William Jones announced in 1786 that Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin—and probably Gothic and Celtic as well—had all “sprung from some common source,” he essentially resolved the first stage of comparative linguistics at the outset: he identified five branches of Indo-European and hypothesized that all five were altered later forms of a single language that no longer existed. What was left unstated in Jones's historic formulation was the fact that languages such as Arabic, Hebrew, and Turkish—languages that Jones knew well—were

excluded from his Indo-European family.² For Indo-European, and for the Indo-Europeanists who came to dominate historical linguistics, the problem of classification was essentially resolved by Jones, and the later additions of a few more obvious branches, such as Tocharian and Anatolian, did not alter this state of affairs.

The problems that Greenberg confronted, however, when he set out to classify the languages of Africa, were quite different from those facing a historical linguist investigating an already-defined family. Greenberg was confronted by over 1,000 languages, only some of which fit into well-defined families (e.g. Semitic, Bantu), and among which there was little understanding of the relationships. Under these circumstances, where does one start? Obviously the only way to begin is by the comparison of basic lexical items and grammatical formatives in *all* the languages, which inevitably leads to a classification of the languages into a certain number of groups defined by recurring similarities. This is exactly what Jones had done when he identified Indo-European, stressing, as he did, “a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and in the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident.” He said nothing of sound correspondences or reconstruction, for in fact these concepts came to prominence (despite the earlier work of Rask, Grimm, and Bopp) only in the second half of the nineteenth century.

We believe, in short, that there is really no conflict between Greenberg’s method of classifying languages and what is often referred to rather inexplicitly as “the standard methodology.” The standard methodology is used to investigate family-internal problems; it does not—at least as it is explained in the basic textbooks referred to above—tell one how to identify language families. Accordingly, it does not tell one how to classify the world’s languages. This, rather, is what Greenberg’s work does, and it is, furthermore, how Greenberg views what he does. It has recently been alleged that he himself subscribes to the view that his methods differ from the standard methodology: “Greenberg (1987) makes clear that he believes such groupings [as Altaic, Hokan, and Amerind] cannot be reached by the standard comparative method; a wholly different method, MASS COMPARISON, is required” (Nichols 1990: 477). That this is, in fact, exactly the opposite of Greenberg’s views is shown in the following:

Statements from certain American Indianists that I have rejected comparative linguistics and have invented a new unorthodox method called mass or multilateral comparison are repeated again and again in the press. However, as I clearly stated in Greenberg (1987: 3), once we have a well-established stock I go about comparing and reconstructing just like anyone else, as can be seen in my various contributions to historical linguistics. However, as I pointed out long ago in regard to my generally accepted African classification, the first step has to be to look very broadly,

² The term Indo-European was not introduced until the nineteenth century.

on at least a continent-wide scale, to see what the obvious groupings are. How can one start to apply the comparative method until one knows what to compare? (Greenberg 1990: 8)

RECONSTRUCTION

It is remarkable how frequently reconstruction is confounded with taxonomy. For a moment's reflection should make it clear that one can only begin reconstructing a proto-language *after* one has decided which languages belong to the putative family. Until one has delineated a set of seemingly related languages, collectively distinct from all others, by the methods outlined at the outset of this chapter, there is simply nothing to reconstruct. (After the fact, of course, reconstruction and (re)classification may enjoy a fruitful feedback.) And as for the supposed validating effect of reconstruction, would anybody claim that a bad reconstruction invalidates a well-defined family such as Indo-European? Or that a brilliant reconstruction could show that Slavic, Ob-Ugric, and Basque form a valid family? As a process, reconstruction is entirely different from taxonomy, and the two should not be confused. It is for this reason that Bynon's claim that Greenberg uses multilateral comparison as a "substitute" for reconstruction really makes no sense, and it is certainly not anything that Greenberg has ever written or said or even suggested.

SOUND CORRESPONDENCES

Perhaps the greatest source of confusion in recent taxonomic debates has been the role that sound correspondences, for example Grimm's Law, play in classification. It is clear that many historical linguists see regular sound correspondences as playing some crucial role in identifying valid linguistic taxa. In reality, sound correspondences are discovered only *after* a linguistic family has been identified, for the simple reason that sound correspondences are properties of particular linguistic families. They are not—and could not be—a technique for discovering families. When the Indo-European sound correspondences were worked out in the nineteenth century, not for a minute did any of the Indo-Europeanists imagine that they were "proving" Indo-European, the validity of which had not been in doubt for decades.

There are several reasons why sound correspondences have become enmeshed with taxonomic questions. First, it is sometimes alleged that it is only by means of regular sound correspondences that borrowings can be discriminated from true cognates. It has long been recognized, however, that loanwords often obey regular sound correspondences as strictly as do true cognates, a point emphasized on several occasions by Greenberg (1957, 1987). Campbell (1986: 224) makes the same point: "It ought to be noted that such

agreements among sounds frequently recur in a number of borrowed forms, mimicking recurrent sound correspondences of true cognates.”

Another alleged use of sound correspondences is to discriminate superficial look-alikes from true cognates (see the quote by Bynon above), and cognates, it is claimed, do not look alike and can only be recognized by means of sound correspondences. Thus, the commonly accepted Indo-European sound correspondences show that Armenian *erku* ‘2’ and Latin *duo* ‘2’ are cognate, despite their different form, whereas English *bad* and Farsi *bad* are not cognate, despite their identity of form. Campbell has aptly criticized such views:

Identical or very similar sound matchings do not necessarily imply loans or weak evidence of genetic connection. . . . With a time depth approaching that of the Indo-European languages of Europe, the Mayan correspondences are on the whole identical or are the result of single natural and recurrent changes. Proto-Mayan **p*, **m*, **n*, and **y* are reflected unchanged, with identical correspondences, in all of the over thirty Mayan languages. All other correspondences are very similar. Even English, after its many changes, reflects Proto-Indo-European **r*, **l*, **m*, **n*, **s*, **w*, and **y* unchanged, on the whole.

A quick survey of once-disputed but now established remote genetic relationships reveals that identical (or very similar) sound correspondences are not that unusual

Therefore, identical correspondences should not be shunned nor too speedily attributed to borrowing. While longer separation may provide greater opportunity for unusual and exotic correspondences to develop in cases of distant genetic relationship, it is in no way necessary for such developments to have taken place nor for correspondences to be non-identical” (1986: 221–23).

Indeed, when one looks at the reconstructions that have been proposed for almost any family, one is able to find modern languages that preserve the proposed ancestral forms virtually unchanged. To cite just a few examples, Proto-Indo-European **nēpot*- ‘nephew, son-in-law’ is strikingly similar to modern Rumanian *nepot*, and Proto-Indo-European **mūs* ‘mouse’ was preserved without change in Latin, Old English, and Sanskrit. Proto-Austronesian **sepat* ‘2’ is almost identical with Rukai *sepate*, and Proto-Austronesian **mat^sa* ‘eye’ is identical with Rukai *mat^sa*. Proto-Uralic **tule* ‘fire’ is preserved in Finnish *tule*-, and Proto-Uralic **moška* ‘to wash’ differs little from Estonian *mōske*-. At an even greater time depth, we find that Proto-Nostratic **nato* ‘female relation by marriage’ has survived, in Uralic, as Finnish *nato* ‘husband’s or wife’s sister’ and, in Dravidian, as Malayalam *nāttūn* ‘husband’s sister, brother’s wife,’ while Proto-Nostratic **p^halV* ‘tooth’ survives in Dravidian as Telugu *palu* and in Altaic as Ulch *palu*. At a time depth perhaps even greater than that of Nostratic, we find Proto-Australian **bujku* ‘knee’ preserved in Dyirbal *bujku*.

In the etymologies we present below, connecting all of the world’s language families, the situation is not all that different from that within the families

just discussed. There are, in fact, many examples of sound correspondences of the transparent variety discussed by Campbell. This initial stage of the analysis is necessarily characterized by the identification of easily recognizable similarities, just as was the discovery of Indo-European or any other family. The refinement represented by exotic sound correspondences of the *erku-duo* variety inevitably awaits a later stage in the analysis—the second stage, which we have called “historical linguistics.” And it is important to recognize that the work of this stage leads almost invariably to a refinement of the *etymologies*, rather than a refinement of the *classification*.

Among the world’s language families, there are no doubt exotic sound correspondences as well that we have not detected. It should be noted, nevertheless, that as early as 1986 one of us (Bengtson) proposed some global sound correspondences, and the Russian scholar Sergei Starostin (1991) has recently published the most explicit statement of interphyletic sound correspondences to date. His brief table of Nostratic–Dene-Caucasian correspondences, though not quite global in scope, accounts for a vast expanse of the linguistic world. Nostratic, for Starostin, includes ten of our 32 taxa (Kartvelian, Indo-European, Uralic, Dravidian, Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus, Korean, Japanese-Ryukyuan, and Eskimo-Aleut), and Dene-Caucasian, for Starostin, includes Caucasian, Sino-Tibetan, Yeniseian, and Na-Dene—to which one may confidently add both Basque and Burushaski (Bengtson 1991a,b). Thus, Starostin’s equations account for roughly half of our 32 taxa, as well as the vast majority of the Eurasian land mass. We find nothing in Starostin’s correspondences that is inconsistent with the etymologies proposed below.

ON THE LIMITS OF THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

It has recently been widely asserted that the comparative method in linguistics produces reliable results only for the past 5,000–10,000 years. According to Kaufman (1990: 23), “A temporal ceiling of 7,000 to 8,000 years is inherent in the methods of comparative linguistic reconstruction. We can recover genetic relationships that are that old, but probably no earlier than that. The methods possibly will be expanded, but for the moment we have to operate within that limit in drawing inferences.” Similar statements from a host of other scholars are given in Chapter 11, where such beliefs are identified as the central myth of historical linguistics (Chapter 13 further analyzes such myths). The origin of this myth, we believe, is an attempt by Indo-Europeanists to “explain” why Indo-European has no known genetic connections—in our view yet another myth. The fact that Indo-European is intimately connected with numerous other families has been demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt by the Russian Nostraticists (Illich-Svitych 1971–84), a demonstration that is complemented and extended by Greenberg (to appear).

We have shown that in numerous cases sounds (particularly stable ones like nasal consonants and liquids)—and even entire words—have persisted over time spans greater than 8,000 years virtually unchanged. This raises the question why these evidently quite stable sounds must suddenly change beyond recognition, or disappear entirely, beyond the supposedly insuperable threshold of 10,000 years. If we can use modern languages to reconstruct proto-languages that existed at least 6,000–8,000 years ago (e.g. Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Uralic, Proto-Dravidian, Proto-Austronesian), why cannot such earlier languages themselves be compared (as in fact we will do) in order to discern still earlier groupings? Would it not be one of the more remarkable coincidences in the history of science if Indo-European, the family in terms of which comparative linguistics was discovered, turned out to define the temporal limit of comparative linguistics as well? That there is no such coincidence is amply demonstrated in the etymologies we give below. We feel it is time for linguists to stop selling the comparative method short and to apply it consistently to the world's linguistic taxa, *without preconception*. The present chapter represents a step in this direction, an initial step that shows that all of the world's populations are linguistically connected. The culmination of these efforts will be a comprehensive subgrouping of this single linguistic family.

BAD SEMANTICS

Another criticism of global etymologies in particular, and of long-range comparison in general, is that such liberties are taken with semantic change that literally anything can be connected with anything else, and it is certainly true that many global etymologies proposed over the years have been semantically unconvincing. But for just that reason we have constrained the semantic variation of each etymology very tightly, and few of the semantic connections we propose would raise an eyebrow if encountered in any of the standard etymological dictionaries. They are in fact semantically more conservative than many proposed connections in Pokorny (1959), the standard Indo-European etymological dictionary. Whatever damage this often alleged defect may have done to earlier programs of long-range comparison, we believe that it does not affect the etymologies presented below.

ERRORS IN THE DATA

Another often-cited criticism of long-range comparison is the presence of errors in the data, errors that invalidate the overall hypothesis. This is a specious argument, for it ignores both common sense and the standard measures of statistical significance. Genetic classification is not analogous to a mathematical proof, wherein one false step undermines the complete demon-

stration. Rather, the cumulative weight of all the evidence completely swamps the effects of whatever random errors may be scattered through the work. As Greenberg has often stressed—and has in fact shown in his work—multilateral comparison yields valid genetic classifications even from decidedly degenerate data. An example was Greenberg’s classification of Australian languages in 1953, using little more than the vocabularies published by E. M. Curr in 1886–87. The notion that data must be pristine and copious flies in the face of commonly accepted historical method. It is all well and good for Kaufman (1990: 18) to demand at least 500 items of basic vocabulary and 100 points of grammar before “serious comparative work” can be carried out, but the fact remains that Indo-Europeanists have classified Lydian as Indo-European, without dissent, on the basis of a handful of words, as noted by Greenberg (1990: 10). Similarly, David Payne (1991: 362) reports that “all that remains of the [Shebayo] language is a vocabulary list of fifteen words collected at the end of the 17th century. . . . Despite the paucity of data from this language, it is quite clear that it is Arawakan.” Historians and historical linguists—not to mention paleontologists working from handfuls of bashed fossils—use whatever material is available; they do not demand that the evidence be complete or immaculate.

DISTRIBUTIONAL DIFFERENCES

It is often alleged that one can find anything in linguistic data if one looks for it hard enough. Thus the global etymologies we present below are a tribute more to our industry and enterprise than to real genetic connections. Such a view is widespread among linguists who have never actually compared large numbers of languages (or language families), but those of us who *have* done this kind of work know the reverse to be true. “Wanting” to find something is of very little help if it is not there. Greenberg (1987) points out that the Amerind family has two general words for females, TUNA ‘girl’ and KUNA ‘woman.’ Both roots are abundantly attested throughout North and South America, and both are found in all eleven branches of the Amerind family. What is interesting about their distribution, however, is that whereas KUNA is widely attested in the Old World, as we show in etymology 11 below, we have found no trace of TUNA in the Old World. If it were really so easy to find anything one looks for, why did we fail to find TUNA in the roughly 4,500 Old World languages, when it is so readily observed in the approximately 500 New World languages? The evolutionary analysis provides a simple and natural explanation: when the Amerind forebears first entered the New World they brought with them the word KUNA ‘woman,’ and only later did they invent the word TUNA ‘girl.’ That there is no trace of TUNA ‘girl’ in the Old World is because it never existed there.

GLOBAL ETYMOLOGIES

For each etymology, in what follows, we present a phonetic and semantic gloss,³ followed by examples from different language families. Though we have not attempted to present a unified phonetic transcription for all sources, we *have* adjusted certain transcriptions from time to time to avoid potential ambiguity. In the first etymology (but not elsewhere) yod has been normalized to *j* in all citations. Ejectives have been normalized to *p'*, *t'*, *k'*, etc.; *V* represents a vowel of indeterminate timbre; *ǐ* is used for the Old Church Slavic soft sign and *ǔ* for the hard sign; and *~* separates alternative forms. In the two interrogative etymologies (10, 17), interrogative and relative uses are not distinguished ('who?' as in "Who is that man?" vs. 'who' in "The man who came to dinner."). The intimate connection between the two is well known and uncontroversial. Most of the cited forms are, however, true interrogatives.

The source of the information for each family represented in a given entry is indicated by an abbreviation in brackets at the end of the entry. The number following the abbreviation is either the etymology number in the original source (if there is one) or the page number there. Since the existence of these roots as characteristic features of the language families cited has already been established by other scholars, and is not for the most part in question, we do not give the complete documentation for each family, limiting ourselves in most instances to an indication of the range of semantic and phonological variation within the family. The reader who wishes to see every relevant form for a given family should consult the sources cited. For Amerind, however, we give extensive citations, in order to counterbalance the fallacious criticism that has been directed at Greenberg's work. Parts of etymologies that are problematic, by dint of either phonetic or semantic divergence, or by restricted distribution, are preceded by a question mark. The lack of a semantic gloss following a form means that that form has the same meaning as the preceding form.

We make no claim to being the first to discover any of the etymologies listed below. The pioneering work of Trombetti, Swadesh, Greenberg, Illich-Svitych, Dolgopolsky, and Starostin has identified numerous widespread roots. What we *have* tried to do is to make each etymology more complete and more soundly documented in this incarnation than it may have been in previous ones. With this goal in mind we have weeded out certain families from pre-

³ We do not deal here with reconstruction, and these glosses are intended merely to characterize the most general meaning and phonological shape of each root. Future work on reconstruction will no doubt discover cases where the most widespread meaning or shape was not original.

vious proposals, where the root was phonologically or semantically too divergent, or too weakly attested, to be convincing. But we believe we have also uncovered some additional etymological connections that had previously gone unnoticed. To a very great extent the recognition of these similarities has been made possible by the lower-level classificatory work of Greenberg in Africa, the New Guinea area, and the Americas, and by that of Russian scholars on Kartvelian, Caucasian, and other families of the former Soviet Union. Before all this work appeared, in recent decades, it was difficult, if not impossible, for a taxonomist to be sure that a root was truly diagnostic of some family, simply because there was no understanding of what the valid genetic families were, much less what cognates defined them. Trombetti, for example, dealt in terms of languages only where he was forced to by a lack of any general overall classification. Wherever possible, he worked with established language families (e.g. Indo-European, Uralic, Bantu), since he was well aware of the unavoidable methodological quandary presented by poorly documented families.

We harbor no illusions, of course, that every etymological connection we propose will be found, ultimately, to be correct, but we do believe that the removal of such errors as may exist in these etymologies will not seriously affect the basic hypothesis, which does not depend on any specific link for its validity. Furthermore, the number of widespread etymologies can be vastly increased over the fragment we present here. In the long run we expect the evidence for monogenesis of extant languages to become so compelling that the question will be not whether all the world's languages are related, but why it took the linguistic community so long to recognize this obvious fact.

1 AJA 'mother, older female relative'

KHOISAN: ≠Au.//eî *ai* 'female, mother,' !Kung *?ai* 'mother'; Naron *ai*, Hadza *aija* ~ *aijako* 'mother, grandmother, aunt'; /'Auni *aija* 'mother.' [BD 6]

NIGER-CONGO: Temne *-ja* 'mother,' Bulom *ja*, Yoruba *ija*; Bantu: Proto-Bantu **jǐjà* ~ **jǐjò*. [BA IV: 190]

NILO-SAHARAN: Saharan: Daza *aja* 'mother,' Kanembu *jia* ~ *ja*, Kanuri *ja*; Fur *ija*; Maban: Runga *ja*; Koman: Gumuz *ijo*; Central Sudanic: Mangbetu *aja*, Madi *ia*, Lombi *jaija*; East Sudanic: Gulfan *aja*, Midob *ija*, Suk *iju*, Nyangiya *joiiao* 'thy mother.' [NS 95, CN 67, ES 77, NSD 43]

AFRO-ASIATIC: Omotic: Wolamo *ajē* 'mother'; Cushitic: Oromo *ajo*, Somali *hoojo*; Chadic: Kotoko *īja* ~ *ija* ~ *ja*, Mubi *ījā*. [WM 64]

DRAVIDIAN: Tamil *āj* ~ *āji* ~ *jaḷ* 'mother,' *ājāl* 'mother, grandmother,' Kannada *āji* 'mother,' Kolami *aj*, Parji *ajal* 'woman, wife,' *ija* 'mother,' Gadba *aja* 'mother,' *ajal* 'woman, wife,' Gondi *ajal* 'mother,' Konda *aja*, Pengo

- aja* ~ *ija*, Manda *aja*, Kui *aia* ~ *aja* ~ *ija*, Kuwi *īja* ‘mother,’ *aja* ‘woman,’ Kurux *ajang* ~ *ajo* ‘mother,’ Malto *āja* ‘my mother.’ [D 364, NSD 43]
- BURUSHASKI *-ai* ‘daughter, girl.’ [B 455]
- ?INDO-PACIFIC: Isabi *aijo* ‘mother,’ Korafe *aja*. [FS 99]
- NAHALI *aji* ‘husband’s younger sister.’ [NA 59]
- AUSTROASIATIC: Munda: Sora *ajan-tsɔr* ‘bitch’ (= female-dog, cf. *kin-tsɔr* ‘male dog’); Mon-Khmer: Proto-Mon-Khmer **jaʔ* ‘grandmother.’ [PB 482, SB 34]
- MIAO-YAO: Proto-Yao **ja* ‘father’s sister.’ [PB 339]
- DAIC: Tai: Proto-Tai **ja* ‘father’s mother’; Sek *ja*; Kam-Sui: Proto-Kam-Sui **ja* ‘grandmother,’ Sui *ja* ‘grandmother, old woman’; Li: Proto-Li **ja* ‘mother, grandmother,’ Small Cloth Loi *ja* ‘mother’; Lakkia *jə* ‘grandmother.’ [PB 339]
- AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **ajah* ‘father,’ Atayal *jajaʔ* ‘mother,’ Pazeh *jah* ‘older sister,’ Malay *’ajah* ‘father,’ Javanese (*j*)*ajah* ‘father.’ [AN 13, WW 74, PB 339]
- AMERIND: Penutian: North Sahaptin *ájaD* ‘woman,’ Nez Perce *?ajat*, Tzotzil *jaja* ‘grandmother’; Hokan: Washo *-ja* ‘paternal aunt,’ Quinigua *?jaak*, Tonkawa *?ejan* ‘woman’s sister’; Central Amerind: Tewa *jia* ‘mother,’ Proto-Oto-Manguean **ja* ‘female,’ Proto-Uto-Aztecan **je* ‘mother,’ Tarahumara *ije*, Yaqui *?aije*, Nahuatl *-jeʔ*; Chibchan-Paezan: Xinca *aja* ‘woman,’ Matagalpa *joaja*, Cuna *jaa-kwa* ‘young woman,’ Colorado *aja* ‘mother’; Andean: Ona *joj* ‘grandmother,’ Auca *-jæjæ*; Macro-Tucanoan: Amaguaje *ajo* ‘old woman,’ Masaka *jaja* ‘older sister,’ Ticuna *jake* ‘old woman’; Equatorial: Mapiyana *aja* ‘aunt,’ Tora *ije* ‘paternal grandmother,’ Arikem *haja* ‘aunt’; Macro-Panoan: Mayoruna *jaja*, Shipibo *jaja* ‘paternal aunt,’ Moseten *eje* ‘grandmother,’ *jaja* ‘mother-in-law’; Macro-Carib: Accawai *aja* ‘mother’; Macro-Ge: Coropo *ajan*, Coroado *ajan*, Palmas *jã*. [CA 55, AMN]

2 BU(N)KA ‘knee, to bend’

- NIGER-CONGO: Baga *-buŋ* ‘knee,’ Pajade *-paŋ*, ?Lefana *-ŋko*; Bantu: Proto-Bantu **bóŋgó*, Swahili *bong’oa* ‘to stoop, bend down.’ [BA III: 57]
- KORDOFANIAN: Tegele *mbo* ‘knee’ (pl. *abɔan* ~ *abuauŋ*). [VB]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Omotic: Dime *boq* ‘knee,’ Bako *boɣa*, Basketo *buḳa*, Oyde *bunḳe*; Chadic: Fyer *fuj* ‘knee,’ Bura *ḅunji* ‘knee.’ [VB]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **bheug(h)* ‘to bend’; Indic: Sanskrit *bhugná* ‘bent’; Germanic: Gothic *biugan* ‘to bend,’ Old Icelandic *bogenn* ‘bent,’ English bow, elbow; Celtic: Proto-Celtic **buggo* ‘flexible, malleable,’ Irish *bog* ‘soft’; Albanian *butë* (< *bhug(h)-to*) ‘soft’; Baltic: Latvian *baūgurs* ‘hill, rising ground.’ [IE 152, N 25]

- TURKIC: Proto-Turkic **bük(ä) ~ *bökö(ä)* ‘to bend,’ Chuvash *pëk ~ pök* ‘to bend,’ Yakut *bük*, Khakas *bükri* ‘bent,’ Old Uighur *bük ~ bökö* ‘to twist,’ Uighur *bük ~ bökö* ‘to kneel.’ [N 25]
- MONGOLIAN: Proto-Mongolian **böke* ‘to bend,’ Written Mongolian *bökeji ~ bököji* ‘to cave in, sag’ *böken* ‘hump of a camel,’ *bökötür* ‘bent,’ Khalkha *böx(ón)* ‘hump of a camel,’ Kalmyk *bökñ* ‘hump, humped.’ [N 25]
- TUNGUS: Proto-Tungus **bökö(ä)* ‘to bend,’ Manchu *buk(-da)*, Nanai *bukun* ‘hump,’ Evenki *bukä* ‘to bow,’ *buku* ‘bent, crooked,’ *bäkä* ‘hump.’ [N 25]
- AINU *he-poki-ki* ‘bow down,’ *he-poki-poki* ‘to nod the head.’
- INDO-PACIFIC: Halmahera: Tobelo *buku* ‘knee,’ Modole *bubuqu*, Loda *wuwuku*; Bougainville: Koianu *poku*; South New Guinea: Teri Kawalsch *bugu*; Northeast New Guinea: Saker *bakbakan*. [IP 43]
- AUSTRALIAN: Proto-Australian **puŋku* ‘knee,’ Tyeraity *böŋgöl*, Maranunggu *biŋgar*, Guugu Yimidhir *buŋgu*, Kok-Nar *poŋk ~ püŋkuwál*, Gugu-Badhun *buŋguyal*, Kukatj *poŋkípal*, Dyirbal *buŋgu* ‘knee, bend in the river, wave,’ Yidiny *buŋgu* ‘knee, hump in a snake’s body.’ [NP 232, RD 110, 123, 223]
- AMERIND: Proto-Algonquian: **wāk-* ‘bend,’ Blackfoot *woxos* ‘shin’ (from an earlier meaning of ‘knee,’ as seen in Maidu *pok’ósi*), Bella Bella *wak* ‘bent,’ Crow *išbaxe* ‘elbow,’ Hidatsa *išpaŋi* ‘elbow,’ Caddo *buko* ‘knee’; Penutian: Tfalatik *pəsq* ‘bow’ (with metathesis, from earlier **pəqVs*), Kalapuya *oposqu* ‘bow’ (with metathesis), Maidu *pok’ósi* ‘knee,’ Nisenan *p’əkkasi* ‘elbow,’ Zuni *poʔku* ‘to fold,’ Texistepec *boka* ‘elbow,’ Pokonchi *bak* ‘crooked,’ Sierra Popoluca *pikši* ‘bow,’ Mixe *kupokš* ‘elbow’; Hokan: Shasta *ʔičipka* ‘knee,’ Achomawi *lupuʔisi* ‘bow,’ Chumash *sibuk ~ šipuk* ‘elbow,’ Walapai *mipuk* ‘knee,’ *phúʔ* ‘bow’; Central Amerind: Varohia *čopokori* ‘knee’; Chibchan-Paezan: Guamacá *buka* ‘knee, elbow,’ Rama *buk* ‘twist,’ Atanque *buküh-köna* ‘knee,’ Warrao *oboka* ‘elbow,’ Colorado *te-bunga* ‘elbow,’ Cayapa *ne-bumbuka* ‘knee,’ Chimu *č’epuk*; Andean: Jebero *pöktenja* ‘bow,’ Ona *epekten* ‘elbow,’ Alakaluf *kolpakar* ‘knee’; Macro-Tucanoan: Iranshe *poku* ‘bow (n.),’ Proto-Nambikwara **pako* ‘crooked,’ **pok* ‘bow (n.)’; Equatorial: Paumari *amabokoi* ‘elbow,’ Guarañoca *pokà* ‘bow,’ Cuiva *tabóko* ‘knee,’ Palicur *ubowγi*, Karif *bugunuge* ‘elbow’; Macro-Carib: Miranha *thüboqua* ‘bow,’ Apiaca *topkat*; Macro-Panoan: Mayoruna *mupukušau* ‘elbow,’ Panobo *waʔpuško* ‘elbow’ (with metathesis), Sapiboca *embako* ‘elbow,’ Tiatinagua *waku*; Macro-Ge: Mohačobm *pokai* ‘bow,’ Umotina *boika*, Bororo *boiga*, Opaie *či-pēge-ri* ‘elbow.’ [AM 157, MT 16, AMN]

3 BUR ‘ashes, dust’

- NILO-SAHARAN: Songhai: Gao *bonni* ‘ashes,’ Djerma *boron*; Berta *bub(u)?da*;
Central Sudanic: Bongo *buru-ku*, Keliko *ɔfɔrago*; East Sudanic: Kenzi,
Birgid *u-burti*, Murle *būr*, Mursi *burr*, Balé *bvr*, Shilluk, Bor *bur*, Lango
buru, Alur *burru*. [NS 9, CN 7, ES 5, NSD 6, NSB]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **b(w)rH* ‘loose soil, sand, dust’; Semitic:
Proto-Semitic **br* ‘dust,’ Arabic *baraj* ‘dust, soil,’ Mehri *berōr* ‘sandy
seashore,’ Classical Hebrew *bar* ‘field, open space,’ Proto-Semitic **bwr*
‘(fallow) ground,’ Arabic *bawr* ‘fallow ground,’ Syriac *būrō*, Akkadian
bāru ‘open space’; ?Berber: Shilha *tamurt* ‘soil’; Cushitic: Beja *būr* ‘soil,’
Bilin *birā* ‘soil,’ Saho *baṛo*, Afar *baḷō*, Somali *bərri*; Chadic: Proto-Chadic
**bwr* ‘sand,’ Angas *’bur* ‘sand, dust,’ Logone *būrá*, Gider *burduku* ‘soil.’
[CS 398, N 22]
- KARTVELIAN: Svan *burγw* ‘to raise dust,’ *birγw* (< **burγw-i*) ‘dust, ashes,’
?Middle Georgian *bre*. [N 22]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **porV* ‘dust, sand, dirt’; Samoyed: Ka-
massian *püre* ‘sand’; Ugric: Ostyak *per* ‘ashes’; Finnic: Finnish *poro* ‘hot
ashes, course dust,’ Estonian *pori* ‘mud,’ Mansi *pors* ‘sweepings.’ [U 68,
N 22]
- DRAVIDIAN: Proto-Dravidian **pūrV* ~ **porV* ‘loose soil, sand, dust,’ Malto
porsi ‘sweepings,’ Naikri *buṛdi* ‘ash,’ Telugu *būḍida* ‘ashes,’ Tulu *poyyē*
‘sand,’ Malayalam *purṭi* ‘dust, earth,’ *pūyi* ‘sand,’ Tamil *purṭi* ‘dust,
dry earth,’ *pūrṭ* ‘powder, dust.’ [D 4316, N 22, NSD 6]
- TURKIC: Proto-Turkic **bōr*, Chuvash *pur(ă)* ‘chalk,’ Tuva *por* ‘clay,’ Jakut
buor ‘soil, clay, dust,’ Altai *pur* ‘ashes,’ Uighur *bor*, Kazakh *bor* ‘chalk.’
[N 22]
- MONGOLIAN: Khalkha *bur* ‘dirty, muddy, dark,’ Buriat *bur* ‘silt, swamp,
clay.’ [N 22]
- TUNGUS: Manchu *buraki* ‘dust, sand,’ Nanai *buräxin* ‘dust,’ Oroch *buräxi*.
[N 22]
- ?ESKIMO-ALEUT: Proto-Eskimo-Aleut **pujV* ~ **apju* ‘dust, mud, soot.’ [EA]
BURUSHASKI *bur-di* ‘the ground.’
- ?INDO-PACIFIC: Tasmanian *būrana* ‘smoke.’
- AUSTRALIAN: Proto-Australian **burin* ~ **burinj* ‘smoke.’ [AC 75]
- AMERIND: Chibchan-Paezan: Cuna *piru* ‘ashes,’ Uncasica *bura*, Manare *oka-*
bora, Move *ñio-bru*, Guatuso *purun*, Catio *pora* ‘dust’; Andean: Lu-
paca *purka* ‘ashes’; Equatorial: Shuara *pupuur* ‘dust,’ Bare *baridi* ‘ashes,’
Wapishana *parati*, Goajiro *purpura* ‘dust’; Macro-Panoan: Taruma *gula-*
paru ‘powder’; Macro-Carib: Yagua *pupāndru* ‘ashes’; Macro-Ge: Proto-
Ge **prə* ‘ashes,’ Krenje *pro*, Cayapo *pra* ‘embers,’ Guato (*ma-*)*fora(-ta)*
‘ashes,’ Caraja *brībi*. [AM 11, AMN]

4 ČUN(G)A ‘nose; to smell’

- KHOISAN: ≠Au. //eî č'ũ ‘nose,’ !Kung $t^{s'ũ} \sim sũ$, !O-!Kung $t^n \sim čn$; G//abake čui, Naron *sõ* ‘to snuff,’ Nama *suni* ‘sniff, smell from’; /Xam *sũ* ‘snore,’ //Ng-!e *sũ?wa* ‘blow the nose,’ Kafia /*nuha čuni* ‘nostrils.’ [K 89, SAK 488, 489, HF 1:10]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Saharan: Zagawa *sina* ‘nose,’ Berti *sano*; East Sudanic: Meidob *i-siŋi* ‘nose,’ Ongamo (*a-ta*-)*siŋa* ‘to sneeze,’ Ik *sik'wa* ‘to sneeze’; Central Sudanic: Shabo *čona* ~ *šona* ‘nose.’ [NSB, KER, HF 12]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic $*t(w)n \sim *(j)n$ ‘smell; Ancient Egyptian *sn* ‘to smell,’ *śnśn* ‘to breathe’; Omotic: Proto-Omotic $*sin-t$ ‘nose,’ Basketo *sinča*, Chara *sinčā*, Gimira *sint*, Mao *šinto*; Cushitic: Burgi *suna*, Konso *sona*, Tambaro *sana*, Somali *san*, Kaffa *činnno* ‘odor,’ Saho *sīn* ‘to smell’; Chadic: Hausa *súnsúnā* ~ *sánsànā* ‘to smell,’ Bachama *šine*, Bata *činne*, Klesem *siŋ*, Bana *činan*, Dari *šin*. [AA 54, N 51, HF 1:10]
- KARTVELIAN: Georgian *sun* ‘odor, to smell.’ [N 51]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European $*snā$ ‘to flow, dampness, nose’; Germanic: Proto-Germanic $*snu$ ‘to smell, nose,’ Swedish *snus* ‘snuff,’ *snuva* ‘runny nose,’ German *snau* ‘snout, beak,’ Old Icelandic *snoppe* ‘to snuff,’ Norwegian *snūt* ‘nose,’ English ‘snout, sniff’; Baltic: Lithuanian *snukkis* ‘snout.’ [IE 971]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) $*čüŋV$ ‘to smell, odor, smoke,’ (Rédei) $*šąŋkʷ$ ‘smell, taste’; Samoyed: Nenets $t'üüñ \sim tiñ$ ‘to smell’; Ugric: Vogul *seeŋkw* ‘mist, vapor’; Finnic: Votyak *čyŋ* ~ *šyŋ* ‘smoke,’ Zyrian *čyn* ‘smoke,’ ?Finnish *henki* ‘breath, spirit.’ [U 97, N 51, KR 462]
- DRAVIDIAN: Tamil *cuŋtu* ‘bill, beak,’ Malayalam *cuŋtu* ‘beak, lips, snout,’ Kannada *cuŋdu* ‘a bird’s beak,’ Parji *conđ* ‘mouth, beak,’ Pengo *conđi* ‘beak of a bird,’ Kui *suđa* ‘mouth, beak,’ Kuwi *honđi* ‘mouth.’ [D 2664]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian $*sHwiInt'$ ‘to smell, snot,’ Proto-Avar-Andi $*s^{w}int'V$ ‘to smell, snuff,’ Avar *sunt* ‘snuff,’ *sunt'(-ize)* ‘to smell,’ Dargi *sunt* ‘scent, odor,’ Lak *sunt* ‘snuff,’ Proto-Lezghian $*s^{w}iInt'$ ‘snot,’ Tsaxur *suInt'* ‘snot,’ ?Hurrian *sunA* ‘breath, soul.’ [HF 1:10, C 190]
- BASQUE *su-dur* ‘nose,’ *sun-da* ‘smell.’
- BURUSHASKI *šūŋ (etas) ~ šũ (etas)* ‘to smell.’ [B 335]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Karen *suŋ* ‘odor’; Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman $*sVna$ ‘nose,’ $*suŋ$ ‘smell,’ Tibetan *sna*, *bsuŋ* ‘smell (sweet),’ Nung *səna*, Janggali *sina*, Digaro *həna(-gam)*, Burmese *hna*, *səŋ* ‘emit a pleasant odor.’ [ST 101, 405, HF 1:10]
- NA-DENE: Haida *sánjuu* ‘smell,’ *sīnaŋ* ‘sniffing’; Tlingit *čan* ‘stench’; Eyak *čāh* ~ *čā?* ‘stink’; Athabaskan: Proto-Athabaskan $*-čín-t$ ‘nose,’ Galice *šan* ~ *šāā* ‘smell,’ Kato *čən* ‘smell.’ [ND]

- INDO-PACIFIC: Baruya *sinna* ‘nose,’ Musak *sinami-* ‘to smell.’ [FS 105]
 NAHALI *čōn* ‘nose.’ [NA]
 MIAO-YAO: Miao *tsinyu* ‘nose,’ Yao (*pu-*)*tsoN*. [HF 1:10]
 DAIC: Ong Be *zoŋ* ‘nose,’ *suŋ* (*mu*) ‘to blow the nose’ (= to-blow [nose-mucus]). [PB 345]
 AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **iğʷŋ* ~ **uğʷŋ* ‘nose,’ Kavalan *uğʷŋ*, Proto-Philippine **suŋaD*, Proto-Oceanic **isu(ŋ)* ~ **untsu(ŋ)*, Fijian *utsu*, Proto-Polynesian **isu*; Proto-Austronesian **t'uŋaʎ* ~ **suNar* ‘to sneer, turn up the nose.’ [AN 67, 158; WW 139, 227; PB 345]
 AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Seneca *ʔosēnōʔ* ‘smell,’ Chiwere *sīŋe*, Tutelo *sūw* ‘stink’; Penutian: Wintu *sono* ‘nose,’ Chukchansi *sinik*, Gashowu *sīn-wiyi* ‘to blow the nose,’ Yokuts *šēniṭ* ‘smell,’ Yaudanchi *senk'a* ‘smell,’ Huave *šink* ‘nose,’ Santa Cruz *suunta* ‘snot,’ Lake Miwok *šin-* ‘blow the nose,’ Central Sierra Miwok *sēŋ-aH* ‘smelly thing’; Central Amerind: Tewa *sū* ‘smell,’ Kiowa *sē*, Proto-Central Otomi **šīñū* ‘nose,’ South Pame *šinyú*; Chibchan-Paezan: Atanque *sun-kōna* ‘beak,’ Binticua *misun-a* ‘nose,’ Move *inson*, Colorado *sin*, Timicua *čini*; Andean: Sek *čuna*, Leco (*bi-*)*činua*, Proto-Quechuan **sinqa*; Macro-Tucanoan: Ubde-Nehern *činuehei* ‘smell,’ Yuri *čunama*; Equatorial: Campa *asanki-ro*, Callahuaya *čini* ‘nose,’ Caranga *čonangā* ‘stink.’ [AK 175, CP 133, A 79, 106, AMN]

5 KAMA ‘hold (in the hand)’

- KHOISAN: Zhu *xóm(-xéi)* ‘rub back and forth’; Kxoe *xôm* ‘crush with the hands.’ [SAK 852]
 NIGER-CONGO: Dagomba *kam* ‘squeeze,’ Nupe *kā*, Proto-Bantu **kama*, Swahili *kama* ‘to squeeze, to milk,’ *kama-ta* ‘to take hold, seize, grasp.’ [KS 59, BA III: 263]
 ?NILO-SAHARAN: Songhai *kajkam* ‘squeeze’ (< **kamkam* ?). [KS 59]
 AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **km* ‘seize, take, squeeze’; Semitic: Akkadian *kamū* ‘to capture,’ Arabic *kamaša* ‘seize, grasp’; Cushitic: Dahalo *kam* ‘to hold,’ Kwadza *komos* ‘to grip,’ Iraqw *kom* ‘to have’; Berber: Tuareg *ekmem* ‘squeeze’; Chadic: Hausa *kāma* ‘to catch,’ Musgu *kaw* ‘seize,’ Gidar *gəma* ‘to take,’ Masa *čum*. [AA 63, N 157, AB 160]
 INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **gem* ~ **gemō* ‘to grasp with both hands, seize’; Armenian *čmlem* ‘I squeeze’; Greek *geuto* ‘he took’ (< **gem-to*); Celtic: Old Irish *gemel* ‘fettlers’; Germanic: Old Swedish *kumla* ‘to crumple’; Baltic: Latvian *gūmstu* ‘to seize, grasp’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *žīmoš* ‘I press, squeeze.’ [IE 368, N 157, AB 171]
 URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **kama-IV* ~ **koma-rV* ‘handful,’ (Rédei) **komꞤ(rꞤ)* ‘palm of the hand,’ (Rédei) **kāme(-ne)*; Samoyed: Yenisei Samoyed *hammara* ‘hand’; Finnic: Finnish *kamahlo* ~ *kahmalo*

- ‘double handful,’ Estonian *kamal* ‘handful,’ Mordvin *komoro*, Saami *goabmer* ‘double handful.’ [U 42, N 157, KR 137, 175]
- DRAVIDIAN: Proto-Dravidian **kamV* ‘to seize, take, hold,’ Koraga *kamđi* ‘to steal,’ Telugu *kamucu* ‘to hold, seize,’ Malto *kam* ‘to gather (by oneself).’ [D 1326, N 157]
- TURKIC: Proto-Turkic **kam-a* ~ **qam-a* ‘to take, seize,’ Old Uighur *qama* ‘to take prisoner, surround,’ Kirghiz *kama* ‘to surround, arrest,’ Tatar *kama* ‘to herd cattle into a pen,’ Nogai *kam-ty* ‘to seize.’ [N 157]
- MONGOLIAN: Written Mongolian *qamu* ‘to gather, pick up,’ Khalkha *xamă* ‘to gather, pick up.’ [N 157]
- TUNGUS: Proto-Tungus **kama* ~ **kamu* ‘to press, oppress, forbid,’ Nanai *kama-le* ‘to press, clasp,’ Olcha *kama-lu* ‘to forbid,’ *kama-lǝu* ‘to press,’ Orok *kamu-i* ‘to take in one’s arms, seize,’ Evenki *kama* ‘deny assistance to, oppress.’ [N 157]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **k’ēmV* ‘armful, handful,’ Proto-Lak **k’ama* ‘handful,’ Proto-Lezghian **k’em(a)* ‘armful.’ [C 124]
- ?INDO-PACIFIC: North New Guinea: Arapesh *kum* ‘to steal,’ Bosngun *kamba* ‘to steal,’ Siaute *kupi* ‘to take.’ [NNG 45]
- MIAO-YAO: Proto-Miao-Yao **ŋgam* ‘to crush, squeeze’ (< **kamgam*), Hainan Yao *gam* ‘to crush or squeeze with the hand.’ [PB 315]
- DAIC: Tai: Proto-Tai **hŋam* ‘to lay hold of, grasp’ (< **kamgam*), **kum* ‘hold with the hand’; Kam-Sui: Sui *ŋiam* ‘to hold,’ Mak *ńam* ‘to clench the fist, take hold of’ (< **ŋgam* < **kamgam*); Li: Proto-Li **kəm* ‘to press with the hand, squeeze,’ Southern Li *kom* (*luoi*) ‘to squeeze’ (= press [down]); Ong-Be *kom* ‘to press down.’ [PB 315]
- AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **kem* ‘enclose, cover, grasp,’ **gemgem* ‘hold, grasp in the fist, make a fist,’ Rukai (*wa-*)*gəmgəm* ‘to squeeze in the hand.’ [AN 54, 74, 78; WW 103; PB 315-16]

6 KANO ‘arm’

- KHOISAN: /Xam //kū ‘arm,’ /Nu-//en //kan ‘branch’; Naron //k’ōā ‘arm,’ Nama //ōa(-b); !Kung //kāū ‘branch,’ ?≠hā ~ ≠hā ‘arm.’ [SAK 130, 186]
- NIGER-CONGO: Yingulum *kəni* ‘arm,’ Fali *kɔn*; Bantu: Proto-Bantu **kónò* ‘(fore)arm,’ Nyali (*i-*)*kón(-do)* ‘hand,’ Swahili (*m-*)*kono* ‘arm, forearm, hand, front paw.’ [BA 297, AT 11]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Kunama *kò’ná* ‘hand,’ *u-kun-kula* ‘armpit, elbow’ (= arm-hole), Ilit *kon* ‘hand,’ Berta *k’oŋ-k’oloŋ* ~ *k’wɔn-k’wɔloŋ* ‘elbow,’ Teso (*á-*)*kāni* ‘hand,’ Masai (*eŋ-*)*káiná* ‘hand.’ [CN 5, AT 79, NSB]
- ?AFRO-ASIATIC: Chadic: Proto-West Chadic **hA-ganA* ‘arm, shoulder,’ An-gas *gwon* ‘shoulder,’ Bokkos *kôŋ* ‘arm,’ Sha *ḡaan*; Cushitic: Iraqw *kun(-day)* ‘foot.’ [AT 86, OS 683]

- ?INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **kon-t-* ~ **kn-t-* ‘10,’ Germanic: Proto-Germanic **handu(-z)* ‘hand,’ English hand.
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Rédei) **konʁ̥o* ~ **konʁ̥o-ala* ‘armpit’; Yukaghir *kun(-el)* ‘10,’ *xanba* ‘hand’; Ugric: Hungarian *hón* ~ *hón(-alj)* ‘armpit’ (*-alj* ‘that which is beneath’), Vogul *kan(-l)* ‘armpit’; Finnic: Finnish *kain* (*-alo*), Votyak *kun(-ul)*, Zyrian *kon(-uvt)*, (*-uvt* ‘that which is beneath’). [U 101, KR 178]
- DRAVIDIAN: Tulu *kaṅkuḷa* ‘armpit’ (= arm-hole), Kannada *kaṅkurε* ~ *gaṅkəlu* ‘armpit,’ Kota *ganjguly*. [D 1234, N 220]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **cHwɪnĀ* ‘arm, shoulder,’ Proto-Lezghian **qün* ‘shoulder,’ Krytz *qunā*, Archi *qlun*. [C 156]
- YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **ken* ‘shoulder.’ [Y 28]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Ancient Chinese **kēn* ‘shoulder’; Proto-Tibeto-Burman **kan* ‘arm.’ [Y 28, TB 438]
- NA-DENE: Proto-Eyak-Athabaskan **gān* ‘arm,’ Tanana *gan*, Tlatskanai *okane*, Ingalik *gān*, Galice *gaane?* ‘arm, branch,’ Navajo *gaan* ‘arm.’ [SN, ND]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Tasmanian: Southeastern *gouna* ~ *guna* ~ *gouana* ~ *wana* ‘arm, hand,’ Parawen *konεnε* ‘arm,’ Jilim *kanan* ‘left (arm),’ Dumpu *kiñεn* ‘shoulder,’ Gapun *akan* ‘arm.’ [T 83, FS 107, IP 820]
- ?NAHALI *khanḍa* ‘shoulder,’ *akhanḍi* ‘finger.’ [NA 59, 85; Kuiper believes *khanḍa* is probably a borrowing from Kurku.]
- ?AUSTROASIATIC: Vietnamese *cánh* ~ *cành* ‘arm, branch, wing.’
- DAIC: Tai: Proto-Tai **xeen* ‘arm,’ Dioi *kien* ‘arm, sleeve,’ Sek *keen*; Kam-Sui: Sui *chin*, Then *khyin* ‘sleeve’; Ong-Be *kan* (*mo*) ‘forearm,’ *gen* (*mo*) ‘upper arm.’ [PB 379]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Blackfoot *kin(-ists)* ‘hand,’ Kutenai *kin*, Kalispel *aḫən* ‘arm,’ Okanagan *-aqan*, Kwakwala *-xaina* ‘shoulder’; Penu-tian: Tunica *hkeni* ‘hand,’ Chitimacha *ʔokun* ‘shoulder,’ Sayula *konik* ‘carry on the shoulder’; Central Amerind: Chichimec *kan’a* ‘hand,’ Otomi *xí’nyí* ‘shoulder’; Chibchan-Paezan: Murire *kana* ‘arm,’ Bintucua *guna* ‘arm, hand,’ Guamaca *guna* ‘arm,’ Atanque *guna* ‘hand,’ Chimu *aken* ‘arm’; Andean: Ona *haken* ‘arm,’ Tehuelche *aken* ‘shoulder blade,’ Simacu *kanúxua* ‘shoulder,’ Selknam *k’ojjn*; Macro-Tucanoan: Särä *axkono* ‘shoulder,’ Uaiana *akono* ‘shoulder, armpit,’ Omoa *naxkono* ‘shoulder’; Equatorial: Piro *kano* ‘arm,’ Parecis *-kano-*, Canamari *kano* ‘shoulder,’ Timote *-kiñem* ‘hand,’ Mococho *kiñien*, Tinigua *kwana*, Trumai *kanap*; Macro-Carib: Miranya *gano-aga* ‘hand,’ *gano-múhtee* ‘armpit,’ Coeruna *kunia* ‘hand’; Macro-Panoan: Proto-Panoan **mī-kīni* ‘hand,’ Lengua *kanyama* ‘armpit’; Macro-Ge: Bororo *kana* ‘upper arm,’ Camican *guangāni* ‘arm,’ Botocudo *kinaon* ‘shoulder,’ Opaie (*či-*)*kā* ‘shoulder.’ [AK 6, CP 4, AM 16, AMN]

7 KATI ‘bone’

- ?KHOISAN: /Xam /*kuttən* ‘bone behind the ear,’ //Ng-!‘e *ketn* ‘bone.’ [BD 87, 326]
- NILO-SAHARAN: ?Berta *k’ara* ‘bone,’ East Sudanic: Nera *kətii(n)*, Kenuzi *kīd*, Kundugr *koidu*, Turkana *ako-*, Lotuko *-γōtyu*, Bari *kuyu*, Debri *kwedu*, Proto-Southeast Surmic **gigec*. [ES 21, NSB, SES]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **qš* ‘bone’; Ancient Egyptian *qš* ‘bone’; Semitic: Arabic *qaṣṣ* ~ *gaṣṣ* ‘sternum’; Cushitic: Proto-Cushitic **(m-)qS* ‘bone,’ Kambata *miqqa-ta* (*qq* < **qS*); Omotic: Jeba *ʔúús-u* (< **k’us*), Badditu *miqi-tē*, Wolamo *maqa-tta*; Berber: Proto-Berber **ǵs(j)* ‘bone,’ Shilha *ixs*, Kabyle *igēs*, Tuareg *egēs*; Chadic: Proto-Chadic *k’š(j)* ‘bone,’ Proto-West Chadic **ḥa-k’asi*, Hausa *k’āsī*, Musgu *keṣ’ke*, Gerka *γas*, Somrai *guseŋ*, Karbo *kāso* ~ *kāsi*. [CS 225, AA 11, N 219, OS 620, HF 12]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **kos-t* ‘bone’; Italic: Latin *costa* ‘rib’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *kostī* ‘rib,’ Serbo-Croatian *kôst*, Russian *kost’*. [IE 616, N 219]
- ?URALIC: Samoyed: Kamassian *kot* ‘rib’; Finnic: Mordvin *kaskă* ~ *kaske* ‘sacrum.’ [N 219, SUL 492]
- DRAVIDIAN: Kurux *xōc(-ol)* ‘bone,’ Malto *qoc(-lu)*. [D 1288]
- CHUKCHI-KAMCHATKAN: Proto-Chukchi-Kamchatkan **(χ)ətA-χəmV* ‘bone.’ [CK 1]
- ?ESKIMO-ALEUT: Proto-Eskimo-Aleut **qat’i* ‘breast, ribs.’ [EA]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **kōt’s’a* ‘kind of bone,’ Proto-Dido **k’ot’s’u* ‘back of head,’ Proto-Lezghian **k’at’s’a* ‘vertebra, shin,’ Proto-Xinalug **k’iz* ‘thigh, hip.’ [C 116]
- BASQUE *gar-khotx(e)* ‘nape’ (*gara* = ‘skull’).
- ?BURUSHASKI *kāŋja* ‘back of neck, neck joint.’
- SINO-TIBETAN: Proto-Sino-Tibetan **kut* ‘bone,’ Old Chinese **kwət*. [SC 57]
- NA-DENE: Haida (*s*)*kuts* ~ (*s*)*kuǵi* ‘bone,’ Eyak *q’ahš*. [ND]
- INDO-PACIFIC: South New Guinea: Dabu *kut* ‘bone,’ Dibolug *kute*, Ngamai *kuta*, Kawam *kutra*, Parb *kwod*, Tunjuamu *guat*, Tokwasa *kuart*, Bangu *kuar*, Keladdar *kadrowa*. [SNG 9]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Bella Bella *k’ōd’zo* ‘bone, rib’ (borrowing from Chinook?), Pawnee *kīsu* ‘bone,’ Wichita *kīs’pa*, Acoma *ya-gət’s’-əni* ‘rib’; Penutian: Chinook *qot’o* ‘bone,’ Northern Sierra Miwok *kyččyč*, Plains Miwok *kəčəč*, Yuki *k’i’pt*, Wappo *kúte* ‘rib,’ Chitimacha *kat’i* ‘bone,’ Uspantec *k’alk’aš* ‘rib’; Chibchan-Paezan: Binticua *katia* ~ *kiasi* ‘rib,’ Matanawi *kisi*, Atacameño *kada* ‘bone,’ Itonama *čidiki*, Chimu *čotti*, Colorado *čide*; Andean: Selknam *q’ejt* ‘breastbone,’ Mapudungu *kadi* ‘rib,’ Genneken *uguets* ‘bone,’ Alakaluf *akšiasē* ‘rib’; Macro-Tucanoan:

Kapishana *nya-kotsī*, Equatorial: Caranga *kaiču* ‘bone’; Macro-Panoan: Cavineña (*epere-*)*katse* ‘rib,’ Komlek *kadekotti* ‘bone,’ Caduveo *kodauek’o* ‘rib.’ [AM 141, P 102, CP 23, AIW, AMN]

8 K’OLO ‘hole’

- KHOISAN: ≠Au.//eî *lkuru* ‘quiver’ (n.), !Kung *!koro* ‘hole,’ *!kuru* ‘quiver’ (n.), *!koro* ‘hole, grave,’ !O-!Kung *kɔlɔ* ‘hollow’; G//abake *koro* ‘hole in tree,’ (čui) *kxolo* ‘nostrils’ (= nose hole); /Xam *!kɔrro* ‘to be hollow,’ /huru ‘hole,’ /ūru ‘anus,’ /’Auni *!kuru* ‘quiver’ (n.). [SAK 371]
- NIL0-SAHARAN: Songhai *nkoro* ‘buttocks’; Saharan: Kanuri *kuli* ‘anus,’ Teda *kulo*; Berta *k’oŋ-k’oloŋ* ~ *k’wɔn-k’wɔlɔŋ* ‘elbow’ (= arm-hole, cf. the Kunama form below); Koman: Buldiit *kul(ma)* ‘buttocks’; Kunama *kura* ‘anus,’ *ukunkula* ‘armpit, elbow’ (< **kan-kul* ‘arm-hole’); East Sudanic: Temein *kukuruk(it)* ‘buttocks,’ Nandi *kulkul* ‘armpit,’ So *ukɔlkɔl* ‘armpit,’ Gaam *kura-n* ‘hollow (in ground).’ [NS 4, CN 2, 5, ES 3, NSD 3, KER 432]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **(s)kūlo* ‘hiding place, back part’; Indic: Sanskrit *kūlam* ‘rear of army’; Italic: Latin *cūlus* ‘buttocks, anus,’ *clūnis* ‘buttock, hip’; Celtic: Old Irish *cūl* ‘back, rear,’ Welsh *cil* ‘back,’ *clūn* ‘buttock’; Germanic: Proto-Germanic **hulo* ‘hole,’ Gothic *hulundi* ‘cave,’ English *hole*, Swedish *näs-håla* ‘nostril.’ [IE 951]
- URALIC: Proto-Finno-Ugric **köl* ‘hole’; Ugric: Vogul *kal* ~ *hal* ‘crack,’ Ostyak *köl* ~ *hul*, Hungarian *halok* ‘incision’; Finnic: Finnish *kolo* ‘hole, crack,’ Saami *golo* ‘fissure,’ Zyrian *kolas* ‘crack,’ Cheremis *kongəla* ‘armpit,’ Southern Estonian *kaŋgel* ‘shoulder.’ [U 101, 106, N 220, EU]
- KOREAN *kul* ‘cave.’ [EU]
- JAPANESE-RYUKYUAN: Japanese *kur* ‘hollow, scoop out.’ [EU]
- DRAVIDIAN: Tulu *kulligè* ‘buttocks,’ *kaŋkuḷa* ‘armpit’ (= arm-hole), Kolami *kūla* ‘buttock,’ *ganjgūly* ‘armpit,’ Gondi *kula* ‘buttock,’ *kākri* ‘armpit,’ Kannada *kaŋkur* ~ *gaŋkəlu* ‘armpit,’ Telugu *kaŋgili* ‘breast,’ *tsaŋkili* ~ *tsakkili* ‘armpit’ (= arm-hole), Malayalam *akkulam* ‘armpit, tickling,’ Tamil *akkul* ‘armpit,’ *akkulu* ‘to tickle.’ [D 1234, 2274, Supplement 30; N 220, NSD 3]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **kHwə̄rV* ‘hole, pit, ravine,’ Proto-Nax **kōr* ‘window,’ Proto-Dido **kurV* ‘ravine,’ Proto-Lak **kulru* ‘nest,’ Proto-Dargi **kur* ‘pit,’ Proto-Lezghian **kur* ‘pit, river,’ Lezgi *k’ul-ux* ‘backwards,’ *k’ul-ux-k’il* ‘hip, posterior, buttocks,’ Kurin *qula* ‘loins, buttocks.’ [C 113, JR 58]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **kor* ~ **kwar* ‘hole,’ **kali* ‘armpit, tickle,’ Tibetan (West) *kor* ‘hollow in the ground, pit,’ Lushei *khuar* ~ *khur* ‘hole,’ *kor* ‘ravine,’ Dimasa *ha-khor* ‘cave’ (= earth-hole), *sisi-khor* ‘armpit’ (= tickle-hole), Bodo *ha-khor* ‘hole, valley,’ Bur-

- mese *kǎli* ‘tickle,’ *tshak-kǎli* ~ *lak-kǎli* ‘armpit’ (= arm-hole, cf. the Telugu form above), Lakher *kili* ‘tickle,’ *ba-kəli* ‘armpit.’ [ST 265, 349, 350]
 NA-DENE: Haida *kunts-qul* ~ *kwun-zool* ‘nostril’ (= nose-hole). [ND]
 DAIC: Khamti *kǎle* ‘tickle,’ *kap kǎle* ‘armpit’ *tsuŋ kǎri* ‘tickle,’ Shan *sop kǎlit* ‘armpit’; Tai: Proto-Tai **xru* ~ **ru* ‘hole,’ **xru ʔdaŋ* ‘nostril’ (= hole nose). [PB 316, 410]
 AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **kili* ‘shoulder,’ **kilikili* ‘armpit,’ Tagalog *kili(ti)* ‘tickling,’ *kilikili* ‘armpit,’ Cham *kələk* ‘tickle,’ Fijian *kili* ~ *kiri* ‘armpit,’ Nggela *kilikili* ‘tickle a tired pig to make it go.’ [AN 80, 121, WW 187, PB 230, 410]

9 KUAN ‘dog’

- KHOISAN: /Xam *!gwāi* ‘hyena,’ //Ng-!e /*xāi*, /’Auni /*kāin*, Kafia /*xāi*, /Nu-//en /*ūn*, !Kung /*gwí*, !O-!Kung /*gwī*. [SAK 380, DB 48]
 AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **k(j)n* ‘dog, wolf’; Omotic: Haruro *kānō*, Basketo *kanā*, Kullo *kana*, Gimira *kjan*, Kaffa *kunānō*, Mao *kano*; Chadic: Gamergu *kenē*, Jegu *káú*. [CS 189, N 238, UOL 175]
 INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **kwon* ~ **kun* ‘dog’; Phrygian *kan*; Greek *kuōn*; Italic: Latin *can(-is)*; Armenian *šun* ~ *šan*; Indic: Sanskrit *çvan*; Iranian: Avestan *span*; Tocharian *ku* ~ *kon*; Germanic: Old English *hund*, English hound. [IE 632, UOL 175, N 238, EU]
 URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **küjnä* ‘wolf’; Finno-Ugric: Northern Saami *gáidne* ‘wolf,’ Udmurt *kýjon* ‘wolf,’ Komi *kóin* ‘wolf’; Samoyed: Ostyak Samoyed *kana(-k)* ‘dog’ (probably a borrowing) [N 238, UOL 175, EU]
 TURKIC: Old Turkish *qančiq* ‘bitch.’ [EU]
 MONGOLIAN: Mongol *qani* ‘a wild masterless dog.’ [EU]
 TUNGUS: Proto-Tungus **xina* ‘dog,’ Manchu (*inda-*)*xun*, Udej *in’ai*, Oroch *inaxki*, Evenki *ina*, *inakin*, Lamut *ŋen*, Orok *ŋinda*. [N 238, EU]
 KOREAN *ka* ‘dog’ (< *kani*). [N 238, EU]
 GILYAK *qan* ~ *kan* ‘dog.’ [EU]
 ESKIMO-ALEUT: Sirenik *qanaŋa* ‘wolf.’ [EU]
 CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **χHwěje* ‘dog,’ Proto-Avar-Andi **χwoʔi* ‘dog,’ Proto-Lezghian **χwäja* ‘dog.’ [C 212]
 BASQUE *haz-koin* ‘badger’ (lit. ‘bear-dog’).
 YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **kūn* ~ **gūn* ‘wolverine.’ [Y]
 SINO-TIBETAN: Proto-Sino-Tibetan **qh^wij* ‘dog,’ Archaic Chinese **k^hiwəŋ* ‘dog’; Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **kwiŋ*, Tibetan *khyi*, Kanauri *kui*, Thebor *khui*, Vaya *uri*, Chepang *kwi*, Karen *gwi*. [ST 159, UOL 175]
 ?INDO-PACIFIC: Pila *kawun* ‘dog,’ Saki *kawuŋ*, Wodani *kawino*. [FS 14]

?AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Oceanic **nkaun* ‘dog.’ [WW 60]
 AMERIND: Hokan: Achomawi *kuān* ‘silver fox,’ Tonkawa *?ekuan* ‘dog,’ North Yana *kuwan-na* ‘lynx,’ Yurimangui *kwan* ‘dog’; Central Amerind: Jemez *kiano*, Isleta *kuyanide*, Taos *kwiane-*, Tewa *tux^wana* ‘fox, coyote,’ Zacapoaxtla *it^kwiin-ti* ‘dog,’ Chatina *čuni*, Popoloca *kuniya*, Ixcatec *?uniña*, Chocho *?uñā*; Chibchan-Paezan: Guamaca *kensi*; Equatorial: Esmeralda *kine*; Macro-Ge: Came *okong*, Serra do Chagu *hong-kon*. [A 86, CAN, UOL 176, AMN]

10 KU(N) ‘who?’

- KHOISAN: ≠Au.//eî *kama* ‘when, if,’ *xa* (interrogative particle), !Kung *ka* ‘when,’ !kū(-de) ‘who’; G//abake /*kam* ‘when,’ Naron *kama* ‘when, if,’ Nama *hamo* ‘when,’; /Xam *!ku(dexa)* ‘who,’ *xa* (interrogative particle). [SAK 384, 388, 757, 764, UOL 70]
- NIGER-CONGO: Pam *kāgē* ‘which,’ Dama *ká?i* ‘which,’ Jukun *ákē* ‘what,’ Proto-Bantu **kí~ká* ‘which,’ Swahili *ga-ni* ‘what, why, what kind.’ [BA]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Fur *kii* ‘who,’ *ka* ‘what,’ Daza *ka* ‘which,’ Masai *ka* ‘which,’ Didinga *ɲani* ‘who’ (< **kani* ?), Liguri *keneen* ‘who,’ Nyala *k-rem* ‘how many,’ Shatt *k-reñ* ‘how many,’ Shabo *kukne* ‘who.’ [NS 149, CN 126, HF 12]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **k(w) ~ *q(w)* ‘who’; Semitic: Proto-Semitic **kV* ‘how,’ Arabic *ka*, Geez *kama*, Aramaic *kə*, Akkadian *kima ~ ki* ‘how,’ South Arabian *ko* ‘how, why,’ Mehri *ūkō* ‘why’; ?Berber: Tuareg *akken* ‘how,’ Gdames (*mə-*)*k*; Cushitic: Proto-Cushitic **kw* ‘who,’ Somali *kú-ma* ‘who (masc.),’ Oromo *ka-mi* ‘who,’ *aka* ‘how’; Omotic: Kaffa *kō-nē* ‘who,’ Mao *konne*, Kullo *hone*, Wolamo *ōne*, Beja *kāk(u)* ‘how’; Chadic: Proto-Chadic **k'(w)* ‘who,’ Hausa *k'ā*, Bura *ga* ‘what,’ Logone *ɣwani*, Somrai *kāna* ‘who,’ Mubi *gin*. [N 232, UOL 70]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **k^wo ~ *k^wi* ‘who,’ **-k^we* (coordinating conjunction); Indic: Sanskrit *kas* ‘who’; Iranian: Avestan *kō*; Armenian *o* (< **k^wo*); Anatolian: Hittite *kuiš* ‘who,’ *kuit* ‘what,’ Luwian *kui* ‘who,’ Lydian *qis* ‘who,’ *qid* ‘what’; Albanian *kë* ‘whose’; Italic: Latin *quis* ‘who,’ *quis-que* ‘whoever,’ *quod* ‘what,’ *quam* ‘how, as,’ *quom* ‘when,’ (*arma virum*)-*que* ‘(arms) and (the man)’; Celtic: Old Irish *cia* ‘who,’ *cid* ‘what’; Germanic: Gothic *hwas* ‘who,’ English *who, what, when, where, why, how*; Baltic: Old Prussian *kas* ‘who,’ *ka* ‘what’; Slavic: Old Church Slavonic *kbto* ‘who’; Tocharian: Tocharian A *kus* ‘who, what.’ [IE 644, N 232, EU, UOL 70]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Rédei) **ke ~ *ki* ‘who,’ (Rédei) **ku ~ *ko* ‘who, which, ?what’; Yukaghir *kin* ‘who,’ *hon* ‘where,’ *hadi* ‘which,’ *hodier* ‘why’; Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **ke ~ *ko ~ *ku* ‘who’; Samoyed:

- Yurak *hu* ‘who,’ *huna* ‘where,’ Tavgy *kua* ‘which,’ *kuninu* ‘where,’ *kune* ‘when,’ Selkup *kutte* ‘who,’ *kun* ‘where,’ Kamassian *kaamōn* ‘when’; Ugric: Vogul *kon* ‘who,’ *qun* ‘when,’ Ostyak *höjə* ‘who,’ *hötə* ‘what,’ *hun* ‘when,’ Hungarian *ki* ‘who’; Finnic: Finnish *ken* ~ *kene* ~ *ke* ~ *ku* ~ *kuka* ‘who,’ *kussa* ‘where,’ *koska* ‘when,’ Saami *gi* ~ *gæ* ~ *gutti* ‘who,’ *goktë* ‘how,’ Mordvin *ki* ‘who,’ Cheremis *ke* ~ *kö* ~ *kü* ~ *kudō*, Votyak *kin* ‘who,’ *kin-ke* ‘someone,’ *ku* ‘when,’ Zyrian *kin* ‘who,’ *kod* ‘which,’ *ko* ‘when.’ [U 44, 46, N 223, 232, EU, KR 140, 191]
- TURKIC: Proto-Turkic **k’Em* ‘who,’ **ka* ~ **qa* (interrogative base), Chuvash *kam* ‘who,’ Old Turkish *kām* ‘who,’ *qa-ñu* ‘which,’ *qa-na* ‘where,’ Old Uighur *kim* ‘who,’ *qaju* ‘which,’ *qajda* ‘where,’ Tatar *kem* ‘who,’ Karagas *kum* ~ *kym*, Jakut *kim*, Old Oguz *qanda* ‘where.’ [N 223, 232, EU, UOL 70]
- MONGOLIAN: Proto-Mongolian **ké-n* ‘who,’ **ka* ‘where, whither,’ Written Mongolian *ken* ‘who,’ *qa-mi-ga* ‘where,’ Khalkha *xex* ‘who,’ *xāna* (< **ka-ga-na*) ‘where,’ Kalmyk *ken* ‘who,’ *xā* (< **ka-ga*) ‘where, whither,’ Moghol *ken* ‘who.’ [N 223, 232, EU]
- TUNGUS: Proto-Tungus **xa* ‘what, how, how much,’ Nanai *xaj* ‘what,’ *xadu* ‘how much,’ *xoni* ‘how,’ Manchu *aj* ‘what,’ *udu* ‘how much,’ Udihe *ī* ‘what,’ *adi* ‘how much,’ *ono* ‘how,’ Even *ī-rāk* ‘how,’ *adi* ‘how much,’ *ōn(i)* ‘how.’ [N 232, EU]
- KOREAN *ka* (interrogative particle). [N 232, EU]
- JAPANESE-RYUKYUAN: Japanese *ka* (interrogative particle, indefinitizer), *ka* . . . *ka* (alternating conjunction), Ryukyuan *ča* ‘what.’ [EU]
- AINU *ka* (interrogative particle, indefinitizer), *ka* . . . *ka* (coordinating conjunction). [EU]
- GILYAK *ka* (interrogative particle), *ko* . . . *ko* (coordinating conjunction). [EU]
- CHUKCHI-KAMCHATKAN: Kamchadal *k’e* ‘who’ (genitive *k’en*), Chukchi *mik* ~ *mek* ‘who,’ *req* ~ *raq* ‘what,’ Koryak *qej* . . . *qej* ‘either . . . or,’ *kur* ‘to be who?, to be what?,’ Kerek *jaq* ‘who, what.’ [EU]
- ESKIMO-ALEUT: Proto-Eskimo-Aleut **ken* ‘who,’ **qa-* (interrogative pronoun), Aleut *ki-n* ‘who,’ *qata* ‘where, whither, what,’ *qanangun* ‘where,’ *qanayam* ‘when,’ *qanagan* ‘whence,’ Eskimo *ki-na* ‘who,’ Greenlandic *qanqa* ‘when,’ *qanuq* ‘how,’ Siberian Yuit *qafsina* ‘how many,’ Alaskan Yuit *-ka* (question particle). [EU, EA 118, 121]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **kʷi* ‘who, which,’ Kurin *ku-* ‘what,’ Archi *kʷi-* ‘who,’ Avar *kʰi-n* ‘how.’ [UOL 70, SC 149]
- BURUSHASKI *kε* ‘if, when,’ *kε* ‘and,’ *kε* . . . *kε* ‘both . . . and,’ (*men* . . .) *kε* ‘(who)ever.’ [B 231, 265]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Old Chinese **kʰei* ‘how much,’ Hruso *kʰi-nia* ‘how many,’ *kʰi-mia* ‘how far.’ [SC 149]

- NA-DENE: Haida *gyis-to* ~ *kiš-to* ‘who,’ *gōsu* ~ *guu(s)* ‘what,’ *gyinu* ‘where,’ *giisant* ‘when’; Tlingit *kusu* ~ *gùsú* ~ *gū* ‘where,’ *kūnsa* ‘how much.’ [ND]
- ?AUSTRALIAN: Maung *gunuga* ~ *gigi* ‘what,’ Tiwi *kuwa* ‘who,’ *kamu* ‘what.’ [RD 373, 376]
- NAHALI (*nani*) *ka* ‘anyone’ (*nani* ‘who’), (*nan*) *ka* ‘anything’ (*nan* ‘what’). [NA 92]
- AUSTROASIATIC: Munda *o-ko-e* ‘who,’ *o-ka* ‘what,’ *če-le* ‘which’; Mon-Khmer: Vietnamese *gi* ‘what,’ Nicobarese *či* ‘who,’ *či-n* ‘who, what,’ *kahä* ‘what,’ *čan* ~ *ču* ‘where.’ [UOL 70]
- AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **ku‘a[ʔ]* ‘how.’ [AN]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Kutenai *ka* ‘where,’ Wiyot *gu-* ‘when, where,’ Yurok *kus* ‘when, where,’ Passamaquoddy *kek^w* ‘what,’ Chemakum *āč’is* ‘what,’ Quileute *ak’is* ‘what,’ *qo-* ‘where,’ Nootka *?aqi-* ‘what,’ Bella Bella *akoiqkan* ‘who,’ Pentlatch *kwənča* ‘where,’ *kwəs* ‘when,’ Upper Chehalis *ka-n* ‘do what?’, Keres *hēko* ‘whither,’ Quapaw *ka* ‘what,’ Ofo *kaka* ‘what,’ Wichita *?ēkiya?* ‘who,’ Caddo *kwit* ‘where,’ Cherokee *gago* ‘who,’ Onondaga *kanin* ‘where,’ Seneca *kwanu* ‘who,’ Mohawk *ka* ‘where’; Penutian: Tsimshian *gu* ‘who,’ Alsea *qau*, Kalapuya *ūk*, Coos *qanč* ‘where,’ Siuslaw *qani*, Klamath *kani* ‘who,’ *ka* ‘which,’ Bodega Miwok *?eke* ‘what,’ *?eketto* ‘where,’ Zuni *kāk’i-pi* ‘when,’ Tunica *kaku* ‘who,’ *kanahku* ‘what,’ *ka?aš* ‘when,’ Natchez *kanne* ‘someone,’ *gōš* ‘what,’ Huave *xaŋ* ‘who,’ *key* ‘what,’ Quiche *xan* ‘when’; Hokan: Achomawi *kī* ‘who,’ Washo *kudiŋa* ‘who,’ *kuŋate* ‘what,’ *kuŋa* ‘where,’ East Pomo *kia* ‘who,’ *k’owa* ‘what,’ Chumash *kune* ‘who,’ *kenu* ‘why,’ Esselen *kini* ‘who,’ *ke* ‘where,’ Walapai *ka* ‘who,’ Seri *ki?*, Coahuilteco *ka* ‘what,’ Chontal *kana?* ‘when,’ Tlapanec *gwana*, Jicaque *kat* ‘where,’ Yurimangui *kana* ‘what,’ *kuna* ‘where’; Central Amerind: Proto-Aztec **kaan* ‘where,’ **keem* ‘how,’ **kee-ski* ‘how much, how many,’ Nahuatl *a?kon* ‘who,’ Zacapoaxtla *akoni*, Yaqui *hakuni* ‘where,’ Isthmus Zapotec *guna?*, Mazatec *k?ia* ‘when’; Chibchan-Paezan: Cuna *kana* ‘when,’ Miskito *ajkia*, Paya *agini*, Terraba *kene* ‘where,’ Tirub *koñe*, Totoro *kin* ‘who,’ Paez *kim* ‘who,’ *kīh* ‘what,’ Catio *kai* ‘who,’ Mogue *kina* ‘who, what,’ Tucura *karea* ‘why’; Andean: Yahgan *kunna* ‘who,’ *kanin(a)* ‘to whom,’ *kana* ‘where,’ Tehuelche *keme* ‘who,’ *ken* ‘which,’ *kenaš* ‘when,’ *kienai* ‘where,’ Araucanian *kam* ‘how,’ Aymara *kuna* ‘what,’ *kamisa* ‘how,’ Iquito *kanlka* ‘who,’ Aymara *kuna* ‘what,’ *kauki* ‘where’; Macro-Tucanoan: Ticuna *karo* ‘where,’ *kejaito* ‘when’; Equatorial: Ayore *gōsi* ‘who,’ Tuyoneri *kate* ‘what,’ Yaruro *kanemo* ‘when,’ Uru *kanču*, Wapishana *kanum* ‘what,’ Puquina *kin*; Macro-Carib: Yabarana *ekkwarijawa* ‘when,’ *akətto* ‘where,’ Witoto *akö* ‘what,’ Miranya *kia* ‘where,’ Faai *kiati*, Andoke *koido* ‘who’; Macro-Panoan: Lule *kine-kinema*, Macca *kat^sik* ‘who,’ *kona* ‘when’ (rel.), Taruma *gaga* ‘what,’ Tacana *ket-sunu* ‘when,’ *kepia* ‘where.’ [AM: G102; UOL 70, AMN]

11 KUNA ‘woman’

AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic $*k(w)n \sim *knw$ ‘wife, woman’; Omotic: Chara *gänēts* ‘woman,’ Kaffa *geñe* ‘lady,’ Mocha *gäñe* ‘lady, woman,’ Shinasha *geña* ‘lady’; Cushitic: Proto-Cushitic $*H-kwn$ ‘wife,’ Bilin ‘ əx^wina (pl. $\text{’əkw}in$) ‘wife,’ Xamta *eq^wen* ‘wife,’ Dembia *kiünā* ‘wife,’ Avija *xuonā* ‘wife,’ Oromo *qena* ‘lady’; Semitic: Akkadian *kinītu* \sim *qinītu* ‘one of the wives in a harem’; Berber: Proto-Berber $*t-knw$ ‘wife,’ Tuareg *tēkne* ‘wife,’ Kabyle *takna* ‘one of the wives in polygamy’; Chadic: Margi *ḡkwà* ‘girl’ (< $*m-kwà$), Igala *ginum* ‘woman,’ Makari *gerim* ‘woman,’ Logone *gənəm* ‘woman.’ [N 178, UOL 179]

INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European $*g^wen \sim *g^wenā$ ‘wife, woman’; Anatolian: Lydian *kāna* ‘woman, wife,’ Luwian *wanā*; Indic: Sanskrit *gnā* ‘goddess’; Iranian: Avestan *gənā* ‘wife’; Armenian *kin* (pl. *kanai-k’*); Greek: Mycenaean *ku-na-ja*; Albanian *grue* \sim *grua*; Celtic: Old Irish *ben*; Germanic: Gothic *qino*, Old High German *quena*, English *queen*; Baltic: Old Prussian *genno* ‘wife’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *žena*; Tocharian: Tocharian B *šana*. [IE 473, N 178, EU, LC 922, UOL 179]

TURKIC: Proto-Turkic $*kūni$ ‘one of the wives in polygamy,’ Old Turkic *kūni* ‘wife,’ Kirghiz *künü*, Azerbaijani *günü*. [N 178]

ESKIMO-ALEUT: Proto-Eskimo-Aleut $*ʔaʔ(i)na-$ ‘woman,’ Eskimo: Alaskan *aganak*, Greenlandic *arnaq*, Yuit *arnaq* ‘female person, woman.’ [EU]

CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian $*q(w)änV$ ‘woman,’ Proto-Dagestan $*qonV(pV)$. [EC, NSC 59]

?INDO-PACIFIC: Andaman Islands: Bea *chána* ‘woman,’ *chana-da* ‘mother’; Tasmanian: Southeast *quani* ‘wife, woman’; Mugil *kanen* ‘mother.’ [T 471, UOL 180]

AUSTRALIAN: Warrgamay *gajin* ‘female of human or animal species,’ Gamilaraay *gunijarr* ‘mother,’ Ngaanyatjara *ngunytju*, Jalnguy *guyḡgun* ‘spirit of a dead woman.’ [RD 119, UOL 180]

?AUSTROASIATIC: Mon-Khmer: Nancowry *kān* \sim *kāne* ‘woman.’ [UOL 179]

AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Shawnee *kwan-iswa* ‘girl,’ Nootka *ganəmo*, Bella Bella *ganəm* ‘woman, wife,’ Lkungen *kaŋi* ‘girl,’ Spokane *en-okhono* ‘wife,’ Siletz *qenaʔs* ‘grandmother,’ Santa Ana *k’uwi* ‘woman, wife,’ Dakota *hun* ‘mother,’ Yuchi *wa-hane* ‘old woman’; Penutian: Tsimshian *hanāc* ‘woman,’ Cayuse *kwun-asa* ‘girl,’ Yawelmani *gāina* ‘woman,’ Konkwo *kónoj* ‘woman, wife,’ Nisenan *kono* ‘girl,’ San Juan Bautista *atsia-xnis*, Lake Miwok *ʔunu* ‘mother,’ Zuni *k’anakwayina* ‘woman,’ Yuki *aŋ-k’an* ‘mother’; Hokan: Chumash *kunup* ‘girl,’ Diegueño *kux-k’an^j* ‘mother,’ *xe-k’an^j* ‘daughter,’ Seri *kuāam* ‘female,’ *koŋkái* ‘wife,’ Tonkawa *k^wān* ‘woman,’ Karankawa *kanin* ‘mother,’ Tequistlatec (*ʔ-*)*agaʔno* ‘woman,

female'; Central Amerind: Proto-Tiwa **k^wiem* 'maiden,' Papago *hóoñigí* 'wife,' Isthmus Zapotec *gunáa* 'woman'; Chibchan-Paezan: Boncota *güina* 'female,' Ulua *guana*, Pedraza *konui-xa* 'daughter,' Choco *huena* 'woman,' Paez *kuenas* 'young woman'; Andean: Simacu *kaxkanu* 'daughter-in-law,' Yahgan *čou-kani-kipa* 'young woman,' Kulli *kañi* 'sister,' Cholon *akiñiu*, Alakaluf *ekin-eč* 'woman,' Tsoneka *na-kuna*; Macro-Tucanoan: Nadobo *kuñan*, Särä *kana* 'mother'; Equatorial: Yurucare *igün* 'girl,' *ti-gün* 'daughter,' Cuica *kuneu-ksoy* 'girl,' *kunakunam* 'woman,' Proto-Tupi **kuyã*, Guarani *kuña* 'female,' *kuña-taĩ* 'girl,' Guarayo *ekuna* 'woman,' Canoeiro *kuña-tain* 'small girl,' Kamayura *kunja* 'woman,' Guahibo *kvantua* 'first wife,' Amuesha *kuyan-iša* 'woman'; Macro-Carib: Palmella *ena-kone* 'mother,' Accawai *kana-muna* 'girl,' Muinane *kini-ño*, Miranya *guaniu* 'mother'; Macro-Panoan: Chama *eg^wan-asi* 'woman,' Lengua *iŋ-kyin* 'mother,' Sanapana *küli-guana-man* 'old woman,' ?Chacobo *huini* 'female,' ?Cavineña *ekwa?a* 'mother'; Macro-Ge: Suya *kuña* 'woman,' Cherente *pi-kon*, Capaxo *konjan*, Caraja *hanökö*. [AM 272, P 283, H 164, LC 922, AMN]

12 MAKO 'child'

- ?NIGER-CONGO: Bantu: Ngoala *maŋku* 'child,' Yaunde *mongo*, Pande *maŋga*, Mbudikum-Bamum *muŋke*. [HJ II: 271]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **maghos* 'young,' **maghu* 'child, boy'; Iranian: Avestan *maγava* 'unmarried'; Celtic: Old Irish *macc* 'son'; Germanic: Gothic *magus* 'boy,' Old English *magu* 'child, son, man,' Swedish *måg* 'son-in-law'; Baltic: Latvian *mač* (gen. *maģa*) 'small.' [IE 696, AB 371]
- DRAVIDIAN: Tamil *maka* 'child, young of an animal, son or daughter,' Malayalam *makan* 'son,' *makkaḷ* 'children (esp. sons),' Kota *mog* 'child,' Toda *mox* 'child, son, male, daughter,' Kannada *maga* 'son, male person,' *makan* 'son,' *magu* 'infant, child of either sex,' Kodagu *makka* 'children,' Tulu *mage* 'son,' *magaḷu* 'daughter,' Telugu *maga* 'male,' Konda *moga koṛo* 'boy child,' *gālu* 'daughter' (< **mgālu*), Pengo *gār* 'daughter,' Kuwi *maka* (vocative used to daughters and sisters in affection), Malto *maqe* 'boy,' *maqi* 'girl,' *maqo* 'small, little, young,' *maqu* 'young of an animal.' [D 4616, AB 371]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **mik*'wV 'small, young one,' Proto-Avar-Andi **mok*'i ~ **mik*'i 'small, child,' Proto-Dido **mik*'V 'small, little,' Proto-Lezghian **mik*'wV 'young.' [C 151]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **māk* 'son-in-law,' Miri *mak(-bo)*, Burmese (*sa-*)*mak*, Lushei *māk(-pa)*. [ST 324]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Southwest New Guinea: Jaqai *mak* 'child,' Aghu *amoko*, Madinava *imega(-kaivagu)*. [SWNG 12]

AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Natick *muketchouks* ‘boy,’ Beothuk *maga-raguis* ‘son,’ Santa Ana *-ma’kə* ‘my daughter,’ Acoma *magə* ‘girl,’ Hidatsa *makadištamia*; Penutian: Cayuse *m’oks* ‘baby,’ Modoc *mukak*, Gashowu *mokheta* ‘girl,’ Santa Cruz *mux-aš*, Zuni *maki* ‘young woman,’ Yuki *muh* ‘young,’ Mixe *mahntk* ‘son,’ ?*miš* ‘girl, boy’; Hokan: Achomawi *mik-tsan* ‘child’ (*-tsan* = dim.), Yana ?*imx* ‘young,’ Washo *mèhu* ‘boy,’ Chumash (Santa Barbara) *mičamo* ‘boy,’ *amičanek* ‘girl,’ Chumash (Santa Ynez) *makčai* ‘daughter,’ *mak-isi-huanok* ‘girl,’ Cocopa *xmik* ‘boy,’ Walapai *mik*, Maricopa *maxay*, Yuman *maša-xay* ‘girl,’ Tequistlatec (*ʔa-*)*mihkano* ‘boy’; Central Amerind: Tewa *mogè* ‘young,’ ?Otomi *metsi* ‘boy’; Chibchan-Paezan: Cuna *mači(-gua)*, Ulua *muix-bine* ‘child,’ Chimila *muka* ‘son-in-law,’ *muka-yunkvir* ‘daughter,’ Shiriana *moko* ‘girl,’ Nonama *mukua* ‘daughter,’ *mučaira* ‘son’; Andean: Yahgan *maku* ‘son,’ *makou-esa* ‘daughter-in-law,’ Yamana *māku-n* ‘son’; Macro-Tucanoan: Yeba *mākēē* ‘child,’ *yimaki* ‘son,’ Waikina *maxkē* ‘child,’ *mehino* ‘boy,’ Dyurumawa (*ma-*)*maki* ‘(small) child,’ Coto *ma-make* ‘boy,’ Tucano *muktuia* ‘boy, girl,’ *vimago* ‘girl,’ *dyemaxkī* ‘child,’ Curetu *si-magö* ‘daughter,’ *si-mugi* ‘son,’ Waiana *yemakə* ‘daughter,’ Ömöa *yemaxke* ‘son,’ Ticuna *mākan* ‘child,’ Desana *mague* ‘son,’ Auake *makuamē*, Waikina *make*; Equatorial: Mehinacu *yamakui* ‘boy,’ Paumari *makinaua* ‘boy, young,’ *-makhini* ‘grandson,’ Marawan *makibmani* ‘boy,’ Uru *mači* ‘daughter,’ Caranga *mač* ‘son,’ Oyampi *kunyā-muku-* ‘girl,’ Maue *makubdia*, Tambe *kusamuku* ‘young woman’; Macro-Carib: Yabarana *mūku* ‘boy,’ Galibi *magon* ‘young of animals,’ Cumanagote *miku* ‘child,’ Pavishana *mu’gi* ‘daughter,’ Taulipang *muku* ‘son,’ Accawai *mogo*; Macro-Panoan: Tiatinagua *mahi*; Macro-Ge: Apinage *māaukrīde* ‘girl,’ Ramkokamekran *mäggepru*, Coroado *meke-šambe* ‘son.’ [AM 62, AMN]

13 MALIQ’A ‘to suck(le), nurse; breast’

AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic: **mlg* ‘breast, udder, suck,’ Arabic *mlġ* ‘to suck the breast,’ Old Egyptian *mnd* (< **mlg*) ‘woman’s breast, udder’; Cushitic: Somali *maal-* ‘to milk,’ Rendille *maḥal-*. [N 291, LN 291]

INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **melǵ-* ‘to milk’; Greek *ἀμέλαγω*; Italic: Latin *mulg-ēre*; Celtic: Irish *bligim* ‘to milk,’ *mlicht* ‘milk’; Germanic: Gothic *miluks* ‘milk,’ Old Norse *mjolka* ‘to milk,’ English ‘to milk, milk’; Baltic: Lithuanian *milžti* ‘to milk’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *mlěsti*; Albanian *mjellë*; Tocharian: Tocharian A *mālk-lune* ‘milking,’ *malke* ‘milk,’ Tocharian B *mal-k-wer* ‘milk.’ [IE 722]

URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **māl̥ye* ‘breast,’ Proto-Finno-Ugric (Rédei) **mälke*; Saami *mielgâ* ‘breast, chest,’ Mordvin *mälhkä* ‘breast,’ Vogul *mägl* (with metathesis), Hungarian *mell*, Yukaghir *meḥu-t*. [N 291, R 267]

- DRAVIDIAN: Kurux *melkhā* ‘throat, neck’ and Malto *melqe* ‘throat,’ Tamil *melku* ‘to chew, masticate,’ Malayalam *melluka* ‘to chew, champ,’ Toda *melk* ‘mouthful,’ Kannada *mellu* ‘to chew, masticate, eat with a muttering sound,’ *melaku* ‘bringing up again for rumination,’ Telugu *mekku* ‘to eat, gobble,’ Gadba *mekkap-* ‘to eat like a glutton.’ [D 5077, 5080]
- ESKIMO-ALEUT: Aleut *umlix* ‘chest,’ Kuskokwim *milugā* ‘sucks it out,’ *mulik* ‘nipple,’ *milûgarâ* ‘licks (or sucks) it; kisses it (a child).’ [EU]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **mVq’VIV* ‘throat, larynx,’ Proto-Avar-Andi **maq’ala* ‘throat,’ Proto-Dido **muq’*, Proto-Dargi **muq’luq’* ‘chute, gutter.’ [C 142]
- AMERIND: Almosan: Lower Fraser *məlq^w* ‘throat,’ Nootka *îmuk^w* ‘swallow,’ Kwakwala *îm̓χ^w-ʔid* ‘chew food for the baby,’ *îm̓q^wa* ‘moisten the fingers with the tongue,’ Heiltsuk *îmelqva* ‘chew food for baby,’ *îmelχv-baúit* ‘lick the end of something,’ Yurok *mik’olum* ‘swallow,’ Kutenai *uʔmqoʔ*; Penutian: Chinook *-mókū-* ‘throat,’ *mlq^w-tan* ‘cheek,’ Wishram *ō-mēqλ* ‘lick’; Oregon: Takelma *mülk’* ‘swallow,’ Tfalatik *milq*, Kalapuya *malq-mat* ‘lick’; Yokuts *mōk’i* ‘swallow,’ *mik’-is* ‘throat,’ Mixe *amuʔul* ‘suck,’ Zoque *muʔk*; Hokan: Yuma *malʔaqé* ‘neck,’ Walapai *malqi* ‘throat, neck’ Havasupai *milqé* ‘throat,’ Yavapai *melqí* ‘neck,’ Mohave *malʔaqé* ‘throat,’ Akwa’ala *milqí* ‘neck,’ Paipai *milqí*; Chibchan: Cuna *murki-makka* ‘swallow,’ *murgi murgi sae* ‘swallow food’; Andean: Quechua (Cochabamba) *malq’a* ‘throat,’ Quechua (Huaraz) *mallaqa* ‘be hungry’; Aymara *malq’a* ‘swallow, throat’ (a borrowing from Quechua?) Equatorial: Guamo *mirko* ‘drink.’ [P 239, AMN; this etymology is explored in greater detail in Chapter 11.]

14 MANA ‘to stay (in a place)’

- ?NILO-SAHARAN: Tatoga *min* ‘to stand,’ Shabo *maq-ka* ‘to sit.’ [NSB, HF 12]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **mn* ‘to remain, be firm’; Ancient Egyptian *mn* ‘to remain,’ Coptic *mun*; Semitic: Proto-Semitic **mn* ‘to be firm, safe,’ Arabic *ʔmunu* ‘to be loyal to someone,’ *ʔmanu* ‘to be safe,’ Geez *ʔmn* ‘to be faithful,’ Syriac *ʔamīn* ‘firm,’ Classical Hebrew (*n-*)*mn* ‘to be permanent, safe’; Omotic: Gofa *min* ‘to be firm, strong’; Cushitic: Oromo *manā* ‘house, home,’ Somali *mīn*; Chadic: Musgu *mine* ‘to be.’ [CS 38, N 287, UOL 192]
- ?KARTVELIAN: Georgian *mena* ‘dwelling’ (possibly a borrowing from Iranian languages). [N 287]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **men* ‘to remain’; Indic: Sanskrit *man* ‘to linger, not budge from a place’; Iranian: Old Persian *man* ‘to remain, wait for’; Armenian *mnam* ‘I remain, wait for’; Italic: Latin *man(-ere)* ‘to remain’; Tocharian: Tocharian A *mñe* ‘waiting,’ *māsk* (< **men-sk*) ‘to be.’ [IE 729, N 287, UOL 192]

DRAVIDIAN: Proto-Dravidian **man* ‘to remain in a place,’ Brahui *manning* ‘to become, be,’ Malto *mene*, Kurux *mannā*, Kuwi *man* ‘to be, remain, stay,’ Konda *man* ‘to be, stay, dwell,’ Parji *men* ‘to be, stay,’ Telugu *manu* ‘to live, exist,’ *mannu* ‘to last, be durable,’ Malayalam *mannuka* ‘to stand fast,’ Tamil *mannu* ‘to be permanent, remain long, stay.’ [D 4778, N 287]

TUNGUS: Evenki *mānā* ‘to live settled, stay in camp for a long time in one place,’ Negidal *mānāgā* ‘to remain.’ [N 287]

CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **ʔi-ma(n)*- ‘to stay, be,’ Hurrian *mann-* ‘to be.’ [NSC 111]

BASQUE *min* ‘to place, set up, settle.’

BURUSHASKI *man(-as)* ‘to be, become.’ [B 257]

INDO-PACIFIC: South New Guinea: Makleu *man* ‘to sit,’ Jab *mōn*; Central New Guinea: Siane *min* ‘to stay, sit,’ Gende *mina* ‘stay,’ Mogeï *mana(-munt)* ‘to sit,’ Kuno *amen(-nyint)*; Northeast New Guinea: Langtub *min* ‘to stay’; Unclassified New Guinea: Waruna *mana* ‘to dwell,’ Gogodala *mana* ‘to sit, stay.’ [IP 65]

AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Nootka *ma-* ‘dwell’; Penutian: Tsimshian *mān* ‘remain,’ Kalapuya *māni-* ‘wait,’ Maidu *ma* ‘be,’ Zuni *ʔīma* ‘sit’; Hokan: Subtiaba *-ama*; Chibchan-Paezan: Cacaopera *ima* ‘wait,’ Puruha *ma* ‘be,’ Timicua *-ma* ‘inside’; Andean: Cholona *-man* ‘in,’ Aymara *mankxa* ‘inside,’ Araucanian *minu*, Quechua *ma-* ‘be,’ Yahgan *mani* ‘be,’ *jumanana* ‘live,’ *mōni* ‘remain,’ *kamani* ‘stand’; Equatorial: Dzubicua *mañe* ‘remain,’ Otomi *yamania* ‘live,’ Paumari *gamanani* ‘stand,’ Coche *xamnan* ‘be’; Macro-Carib: Yameo *mune* ‘sit down,’ Ocaina *mūnʔxo* ‘remain,’ Apiaca *umano* ‘wait’; Macro-Panoan: Cashinawa *mana*, Shipibo *manei* ‘remain,’ Chacobo *man-* ‘wait,’ Panobo *manai*, Lule *-ma* ‘in’; Macro-Ge: Botocudo *mēn* ‘remain,’ Crengéz *moinj* ‘to sit,’ Capoxo *moinjam*, Bororo *aīu* ~ *aīi* ‘to rest,’ Cayapo *kaimaniun* ‘stand,’ *kaman* ‘inside,’ Tibagi *ema* ‘dwell,’ [AM: G46, A 59, MG 99, AMN]

15 MANO ‘man’

?NIGER-CONGO: Bantu: Mbudikum-Bamum *-mani* ‘man,’ Rwanda *mana*, Nyanja *-muna*, Ci-ambo *-mna*.

NILO-SAHARAN: East Sudanic: Me’en *mɛʔɛn-* ‘person,’ Maban *mɛŋŋu*, Tama *ma*, Ik *am*, Didinga *mat^s* ‘male,’ Merarit *mo*, Dinka *mot^s*, Maban: Mabang *ma-šu* ‘person.’ [ES70, NSB]

AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **mn* ‘male, man, person’; Ancient Egyptian *mnw* ‘Min, a phallic deity,’ Old Egyptian *mnyw* ‘herdsman’; Omotic: Wolamo *minō* ‘warrior,’ Janjero *monō* ‘people’; Cushitic: Proto-Cushitic **mn* ‘man,’ Burji *méen-a* ‘people,’ Somali *mun* ‘male,’ Hadiyya *manna* ‘people,’ *man-čo* ‘person,’ Tembaro *mana*, Iraqw *ameni* ‘woman’; Berber:

- Zenaga *uman* ‘kin,’ Ghadames *iman* ‘person,’ Zwawa *iman*, Qabyle *iman*;
 Chadic: Proto-Chadic **mn(j)* ‘man,’ Proto-West Chadic **mani* ‘man, husband,’ Karekare *men* ‘people,’ Kanakuru *minja*, Bata *māno* ‘man,’ Musgu *muni* ‘woman,’ Logone *mēni* ‘man, person,’ Dari *mānji* ‘person.’ [AA 78, N 292, OS 801, LN 292]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **manu(-s) ~ *monu(-s)* ‘man’; Indic: Sanskrit *mānu* ~ *mānuṣ* ‘man, person’; Iranian: Avestan **manus* ‘man’; Germanic: Gothic *mann*, Old High German *man*, English *man* (pl. *men*), *woman* (< *wife* + *man*); Slavic: Old Church Slavic *moŕzi* (< **mon-g-jo-*), Russian *muž* ‘husband.’ [IE 700, N 292]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **mäńće* ‘man, person’; Ugric: Vogul *meńci* ~ *mańsi* (self-name), Ostyak *mańt’* ~ *mońt’* ~ *məs* ~ *mas* (self-name of one Ostyak clan), Hungarian *magyar* (self-name); Finnic: Finnish *mies*, Estonian *mees*. [U 114, N 292]
- DRAVIDIAN: Kolami *mās* ‘man,’ *māc* ‘husband,’ *māca* ‘wife,’ Naikri *mās* ‘man,’ *māsal* ‘woman,’ Naiki *mās* ‘husband,’ *māsa* ‘wife,’ Parji *mañja* ~ *mañña* ‘man,’ Gondi *manja* ‘man, person,’ Konda *māsi* ‘husband,’ Kurux *mēt* ~ *mēt* ‘adult man, husband,’ Tamil *māntar* ‘people, men.’ [D 4791; Illich-Svitych’s comparison (N 292) is with D 4774: Tamil *man* ‘king, chief, husband,’ etc. The two are probably related.]
- JAPANESE-RYUKYUAN: Old Japanese (wo-) *mina* ‘woman’ (mod. *onna*). [SY]
 AINU *meno(-ko) ~ mene(-ko)* ‘woman.’
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **mVnxV* ‘man, male.’ [NSC 116]
- YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **pix-* ‘man.’ [NSC 116]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Bilakura *munan* ‘man,’ Warenbori *mando*, Osum *aminika* ‘woman,’ Ikundun *mundu* ‘man.’ [FS 92, 93, 106]
- NAHALI *mancho* ~ *manco* ‘man,’ *man-ṭa* ‘men.’ [NA 89]
- MIAO-YAO: Proto-Miao-Yao **hmən* ‘person,’ Miao *hmoŋ* ~ *hmuŋ* (self-name of the Miao), Yao *man* ~ *myen* ~ *mun* (self-name of the Yao). [PB 336]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Bella Coola *man* ‘father,’ Pentlatch *mān*, Squamish *man*, Blackfoot *no-ma* ‘husband’; Penutian: Coos *ma* ‘person,’ Kalapuya *menami*, Nisenan *manai* ‘boy,’ Rumsien *ama* ‘person,’ Hokan: Chumash *s-mano* ~ *ʔ-mano* ‘man’; Chibchan-Paezan: Ayoman *ayoman* ‘husband,’ Warrau *moana* ‘people’; Andean: Iquito *komano* ‘father,’ Yahgan *imun-* ‘father,’ *yamana* ‘person’; Macro-Tucanoan: Yahuna *meni* ‘boy,’ *manehē* ‘husband,’ Yupua *manape*, Yuyuka *yemane*, Coto *ömuna* ‘man,’ Proto-Nambikwara **mīn* ‘father,’ Kaliana *mīnō* ‘man, person,’ *imone* ‘father-in-law,’ Wanana *meno* ‘man,’ *manino* ‘her husband,’ Waikina *emeno* ‘man’; Equatorial: Guahibo *amona* ‘husband,’ *itsa-mone* ‘person,’ Callahuaya *mana*, Achual *aišman* ‘man,’ Marawan *maki-b-mani* ‘boy,’ Chamicuro *ṭamoni* ‘my father,’ Manao *re-manao* ‘person,’ Proto-

Tupi **men* ‘husband,’ Guarani *mena*, Guajajara *man*; Macro-Carib: Apicaca *moni* ‘boy,’ Ocaina *moon* ‘father,’ Paravithana *mei-moen* ‘son,’ Miranya *itse-meni*; Macro-Panoan: Mosesten *moinči* ‘person,’ Charrua *itojman* ‘boy,’ Guana *emmanabie* ‘man’; Macro-Ge: Cayapo *män* ‘person,’ *miän* ‘husband,’ Chicriaba *aimaman* ‘boy,’ *mamaŋ* ‘father,’ Coroado *kuoyman* ‘man.’ [AM 154, AMN]

16 MENA ‘to think (about)’

?KHOISAN: Sandawe *mě:na* ‘to like.’

NIGER-CONGO: Fulup *-maman* ‘know,’ Mambila *mini* ‘think,’ Malinke *mɛn* ‘understand,’ Bambara *mɛ*, Proto-Bantu **màni* ~ **mèni* ~ **mèny* ~ **màn* ‘know,’ Namshi *meĩ*, Ibo *ma*, Mandyak *me*. [NC 28, KS 45, BA IV: 8, 12]

KORDOFANIAN: Tumale *aiman* ‘think.’ [NK 41]

NILO-SAHARAN: Songhai *ma* ‘understand,’ Daza *monər* ‘know,’ Dinik *mái*, Lotuko *mij*, Proto-Daju **minaje* ‘to dream,’ Shatt *miniŋ*, Ik *miin-es* ‘to love,’ Teso *a-min*. [KS 45, NSB, KER]

AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **man* ‘think, understand, wish, desire, count’; Semitic: Sokotri *mnj* ‘wish,’ Tigrinya *tāmānnājā*, Arabic *mnw* ‘understand,’ Hebrew *mānāh* ‘count,’ Akkadian *manū*, Aramaic *mənā*; Cushitic: Somali *mān* ‘mind’; Chadic: Angas *man* ‘know,’ Boleva *mon*, Masa *min* ‘wish.’ [N 281, AB 348]

INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **men* ‘to think’; Anatolian: Hittite *me-ma-a-i* (< **me-mn-eA-*) ‘to say’; Italic: Latin *men(s)* ‘mind,’ *meminī* ‘to remember,’ *mon(-ēre)* ‘to remind, warn’; Indic: Sanskrit *mānyatē* ‘to think,’ *mānas* ‘mind’; Greek *mimnēskein* ‘to remember’; Germanic: Gothic *munan* ‘to think,’ *muns* ‘thought’; Baltic: Lithuanian *menù*, *miñti* ‘to remember’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *mĭněti* ‘to count,’ *pa-meštĭ* ‘mind, memory’; Albanian *mund* ‘I can’; Armenian *i-manam* ‘I understand’; Tocharian: Tocharian A *mnu* ‘thought,’ Tocharian B *mañu* ‘wish (n.), desire (n.).’ [IE 726, N 281, AB 348]

URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **manV* ~ **monV* ‘guess, speak, conjure,’ (Rédei) **mon* ‘say’; Yukaghir *mon*; Samoyed: Yurak *maan*, Tavgy *muno* ‘say, command’; Ugric: Hungarian *mon(-d)* ‘say’; Finnic: Finnish *manaa* ‘to warn, admonish, curse, bewitch,’ Estonian *mana* ‘abuse, curse,’ Saami *moanâ* ‘to conjecture,’ Mordvin *muña* ‘bewitch,’ Cheremis *mana* ‘speak, order.’ [U 53, N 281, AB 348, KR 290]

DRAVIDIAN: Tamil *mañu* ‘prayer, request, word,’ Kannada *manuve* ‘request,’ Telugu *manavi* ‘prayer, humble request,’ Irula *mañi* ‘talk, speak,’ Kota *mayñ-* ‘talk, scold, abuse.’ [D 4671, 4775, N 281]

?TURKIC: Turkish *mani* ‘folk song,’ Crimean Turkish *manä* ‘folk song, melody.’ [LN 281]

BASQUE *mun* ‘medulla,’ *munak* (pl.) ‘brains.’ [LC 916]

?BURUSHASKI *minas* ‘story, tale.’ [B 506]

?SINO-TIBETAN: Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **r-miŋ* ‘name,’ Tibetan *miŋ*,‘ Magari *armin*, Limbu *miŋ*, Garo *miŋ* ‘to name,’ Burmese *mañ* ‘to be named,’ Mikir *mon* ‘mind,’ *mun-t’i* ‘to think, understand, guess, assume, appreciate,’ Midžu *moŋ* ‘to summon.’ [ST 83] Cf. also Proto-Tibeto-Burman **maŋ* ‘dream,’ often in composition with Proto-Tibeto-Burman **ip* ‘sleep,’ as in Nung *ip-maŋ* ‘to dream,’ Burmese *ip-mak* ‘dream,’ *hmaŋ(-tak-mi)* ‘to be possessed (applied to somnambulism).’ [ST 82]

AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Shawnee *menw* ‘prefer, like,’ Laguna *amū* ‘love,’ Catawba *muʔe* ‘wish,’ Thompson *iomin-* ‘have friendly feelings,’ Okanagan *iqamēn* ‘love,’ Kalispel *xamenč*, Spokane *-manən* ‘wish,’ Nootka *māna* ‘try, test’; Penutian: Lake Miwok *mēna* ‘think,’ *menaw* ‘try,’ Bodega Miwok *munu* ‘be hungry,’ Patwin *meina* ‘try’; Hokan: Chimariko *miʔinan* ‘like,’ Karok *ʔimnih* ‘love’; Central Amerind: Chichimec *men*, Mixtec *manī*; Chibchan-Paezan: Chimila *mojnaya* ‘wish,’ Binticua *meyuno* ‘seek,’ Timucua *mani* ‘wish,’ Andaqui *miña-za* ‘I sought,’ Colorado *munai* ‘love,’ *muna-ha* ‘wish’; Andean: Araucanian *mañumn* ‘love,’ Aymara *muna*, Sabelilla *mē-* ‘seek,’ Cholona *men* ‘wish,’ Quechua *muna*; Equatorial: Otomi *manenianda* ‘love,’ *momene* ‘think,’ Baure *emeniko* ‘love,’ Kamayura *emanhau*; Macro-Panoan: Lengua *min-* ‘wish,’ Mataco *hemen* ‘love,’ Vejoz *humín*, Mascoy *emeni*, Caduveo *addemane* ‘do you love me?’, Macro-Ge: Kamakan *mā* ‘seek,’ Krëye *mā-* ‘wish, love,’ Apinage *amnōnmōn* ‘think.’ [AM 270, AMN]

17 MI(N) ‘what?’

KHOISAN: ≠Au.//eî *kama* ‘if, when,’ G//abake /*kam* ‘when,’ Naron *kama* ‘if, when,’ Nama *hamo* ‘when,’ *maba* ‘where,’ Kxoe *ma* ‘who, which,’ /Nu-//en *maba* ‘where.’ [SAK 384, 757, 758, UOL 71]

AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **m(j)* ‘what, who’; Semitic: Akkadian *mīn* ‘what,’ *mann* ‘who,’ *man-ma* ‘whoever,’ Geez *mi* ‘what,’ Amharic *mīn* ‘what,’ Arabic *man* ~ *min* ‘who,’ *mah-mā* ‘whatever,’ Aramaic *man* ‘who,’ Classical Hebrew *mī*; Ancient Egyptian *m(j)* ‘who,’ *m* ‘what’; Berber: Tuareg *ma* ‘what,’ *mi* ‘who,’ Shilha *ma(t)* ‘who, what,’ *mīt* ‘who’; Cushitic: Proto-East Cushitic **maʔ* ‘what,’ Saho *mi* ‘who,’ *mā* ‘what,’ Somali *máḥā* ‘what,’ Oromo *māni* ‘what,’ *-mi* (interrogative particle), Sidamo *ma* ‘what,’ Darasa *ma* ‘what,’ *māta* ‘who’; Omotic: Kaffa *amone* ‘what,’ Mocha *ámo*, Alagwa *mi* ‘what,’ *miya* ‘who’; Chadic: Hausa *mè* ~ *mì* ‘what,’ Karekare *mija*, Margi *mì*, Bata *mən*, Ngala *mena*, Logone *mini* ‘who,’ Sokoro *-ma* (interrogative particle). [AA 77, N 300, UOL 71, LN 300]

- KARTVELIAN: Proto-Kartvelian **ma* ~ **maj* ‘what,’ **mi-n* ‘who,’ Georgian *ma* ‘what,’ *win* ‘who,’ *win-me* ‘whoever,’ Chan *mu* ‘what,’ *min* ‘who,’ Svan *maj* ‘what.’ [KA 124, 135, N 300, UOL 71]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **mo-* (base of interrogative adverbs); Anatolian: Hittite *ma-ši-š* ‘how much,’ *mahḫan* ‘when,’ Luwian *mān*, Hieroglyphic Hittite *mana* ‘if, when’; Celtic: Old Irish *má* ‘if,’ Middle Breton *ma* ‘what’; Tocharian: Tocharian A *mānt* ‘how.’ [N 300, EU]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **mi* ‘what,’ (Rédei) **mḡḡ* Yukaghir *meneme* ‘something’; Samoyed: Tavgy *ma* ‘what,’ Yenisei Samoyed *mii*, Kamassian *mo* ‘why’; Ugric: Vogul *män* ‘which, what,’ Hungarian *mi* ‘what, which’; Finnic: Finnish *mi* ~ *mi-kä*, Saami *mi* ~ *mâ*, Cheremis *ma* ~ *mo*, Votyak *ma* ‘what.’ [U 54, N 300, EU, R 296]
- ?DRAVIDIAN: Kajakadi *midā* ‘what,’ Burgendi *mī*, Tamil (*even-*)*um* ‘(who)ever.’ [N 300, UOL 71]
- TURKIC: Proto-Turkic **mi* ‘what,’ Chuvash *měn* ‘what,’ *miše* ‘how much,’ *měnlē* ‘what kind of,’ Old Uighur *mu* ~ *mü* (sentence question enclitic), Turkish *mi* (sentence question enclitic). [N 300, EU]
- MONGOLIAN: Mongolian *-ū* (< **wu* < **mu*) (sentence interrogative), Monguor *amu* ~ *ama* ‘what.’ [EU]
- TUNGUS: Tungus *-ma* (indefinitizer), (*ēku-*)*ma* ‘(what)ever.’ [EU]
- KOREAN *muōt* ‘what,’ *mjet* ‘how much,’ Old Korean *mai* ‘why.’ [EU]
- JAPANESE-RYUKYUAN: Ryukyuan *mī* ‘what,’ *-mi* (sentence interrogative enclitic). [EU]
- AINU *mak* ~ *makanak* ‘what,’ *makan* ‘what kind.’ [EU]
- CHUKCHI-KAMCHATKAN: Proto-Chukchi-Kamchatkan **m-ənqV* ‘what,’ **m-ke* ‘who,’ **maʔ* ‘when,’ **miŋ* ‘which,’ Chukchi *mikin* ‘who,’ *mi-k* ‘where,’ Kamchadal *min* ‘which, what sort.’ [EU, CK]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **ma* (interrogative particle), Chechen *mila* ‘who,’ Bats *me*. [KA 135]
- BURUSHASKI *mən* ‘who,’ *amin* ‘which,’ *mən* (. . . *kε*) ‘who(ever).’ [L 265]
- YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **wi-* ~ **we-* ‘what.’ [Y]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Andaman Islands: Biada *min* ‘thing,’ Bale *ming*; Central Melanesian: Laumbe *mina*, Reef (*kele*)*mengge* ‘this (thing)’; North New Guinea: Nyaura *məndə* ‘thing, what,’ Arapesh *mane* ‘what’; Southwest New Guinea: Kati *man* ‘something’; Central New Guinea: Matap *mina* ‘what.’ [IP 75]
- AUSTRALIAN: Proto-Australian **minha* ~ **minya* ‘what,’ Dyirbal *minya*, Pitta-Pitta *minha*, Gumbaynggir *minya*, Malyangapa *minhaga*, Yota-Yota *minhe*, Diyari *minha*. [RD 373, 376]
- NAHALI *miŋgay* ‘where,’ *miyan* ‘how much.’ [NA 91]

AUSTROASIATIC: Munda: Kurku *amae* ‘who,’ Mundari *ci-mae* ‘why’; Mon-Khmer: Mon *mu* ‘what,’ Sakai *ma*’, *āmai* ‘who,’ Central Sakai *mō*, *mā* ‘what.’ [NA 91, UOL 71]

AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Kwakwala *m’as* ‘what,’ Mandan *mana* ‘who,’ *matswε* ‘what,’ Tutelo *mā?tu* ‘when’; Penutian: Siuslaw *mīnč*, North Sahaptin *mēn* ‘where,’ *mūn* ‘when’ *miš* ‘how, why,’ Nez Perce *mana* ‘what,’ *mine* ‘where,’ *maua* ‘when,’ Patwin *mena* ‘where,’ Central Sierra Miwok *manaχ-* ‘who,’ *mičy* ‘do what,’ Northern Sierra Miwok *mini* ‘where,’ *mi-tan* ‘when,’ Bodega Miwok *manti* ‘who,’ San Jose Costanoan *mani* ‘where,’ San Francisco Costanoan *mato* ‘who,’ Chitimacha *?am* ‘what,’ Atakapa *ma* ‘where,’ Choctaw *mano* ‘when,’ *imato* ‘where,’ Yuki *im* ‘who,’ Coast Yuki *im* ‘where,’ Wappo *may* ‘who,’ Chontal *max*, Yucatec *ma-š*, Tzeltal *mač’a*, Jacaltec *mat^s(a)*; Hokan: Yana *?ambi*, East Pomo *am*, Chumash *muski*, Cocopa *makaya* ‘where,’ Diegueño *maap* ‘who,’ *ma?yum* ‘when,’ *maay* ‘where,’ Mohave *makač* ‘who,’ *maki* ‘where,’ Yuma *meki*, Maricopa *mekyenye* ‘who,’ *miki* ‘where,’ Akwa’ala *mukat* ‘who,’ Karankawa *muda* ‘where’; Central Amerind: Mazatec *hme* ‘what’; Chibchan-Paezan: Tarascan *ambe*, Guamaca *mai* ‘who, how,’ Kagaba *mai* ‘who,’ *mani* ‘where,’ *mitsa* ‘when,’ *mili* ‘which,’ Cacaopera *ma(-ram)* ‘where,’ Matagalpa *man*, Bribri *mīk* ‘when,’ Sumu *manpat*, Cabecar *mānē* ‘which,’ Move *ama* ‘where,’ Chimila *miki* ‘who,’ *murū* ‘when,’ *me-ma* ‘to where,’ *me-k* ‘from where,’ Guambiana *mu* ‘who,’ Totoro *man* ‘how many,’ Paez *manč* ‘when,’ *manka* ‘where,’ *manzos* ‘how often,’ *mants* ‘how many,’ *mau* ‘how,’ Cayapa *muŋ* ~ *maa* ‘who,’ Allentiac *men*, Catio *mai* ‘where,’ Colorado *moa* ‘who,’ *matuši* ‘when’; Andean: Sek *xam-anmi* ‘where,’ Jebero *ma?* ‘what,’ Cahuapana *ma-e* ‘what,’ *impi* ‘when,’ Quechua *ima* ‘what,’ *may* ‘where’; Equatorial: Guamo *miku* ‘what,’ Yurucare *ama* ‘who, which,’ Tinigua *mné’á* ‘who,’ Yuruna *mane*, Paumari *-mani-* (interrogative), Candoshi *maya* ‘what,’ Esmeralda *muka*, Timote *mape* ‘when,’ Turiwara *maape* ‘when, where,’ Saliba *imakena* ‘when,’ Tuyoneri *menoka* ‘when,’ *me-yo* ‘where,’ Guajajara *mɔn* ‘who,’ Guayaki *ma* ‘what, how,’ Guarani *mba’e* ‘what,’ *mamo* ‘where,’ Cofan *mā-ni*, Maripu *manu(b)* ‘in which direction,’ Kandoshi *maja* ‘what’; Macro-Carib: Witoto *mika*, Miranya *mukoka* ‘when,’ *mu* ‘whose,’ Witoto-Kaimō *muka* ‘which’; Macro-Panoan: Nocten *emetta* ‘what,’ *mequie* ‘when,’ Toba-Guazu *mi* ‘who’; Macro-Ge: Caraho *ampo* ‘what,’ *manēno* ‘when,’ *ampō-mē* ‘which,’ Puri *ya-moeni* ‘when,’ Aponegicran *muena* ‘what,’ Cayapo *mā* ‘where,’ Umutina *mašika* ‘where,’ *matuni* ‘why,’ Krēye *menō* ‘who,’ *ampō-ny* ‘why,’ Botocudo *mina* ‘who.’ [AM: G103, AMN]

18 PAL ‘2’

- NIGER-CONGO: Temne (*kə*)*bari* ‘twin,’ Mano *pere* ‘2,’ Nimbari *bala*, Daka *bara*, Proto-Bantu **bàdí* ~ **bídí* ‘2,’ **bádì* ‘side.’ [NC 48, KS 76, UOL 92, BA III: 21, 22, 43]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Nubian *bar(-si)* ‘twin,’ Merarit *wírre* ‘2,’ Kunama *báarè* ‘2,’ *ibā* ‘twin,’ Maba *mbar* ‘2,’ Mesalit *mbarrá*, Tama *warri*, Baka *brūe*, Ilit *ball-ame*. [ES 119, KS 76, UOL 92, NSB]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Omotic: Kafa *barā* ‘other,’ Mocha *baro*, Dime *bal*; Cushitic: Saho *baray* ‘2nd,’ Oromo *bíra*; Chadic: Proto-Central Chadic *(*kV-*)*bwVr* ‘2.’ [VB]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **pol* ‘half, side’; Indic: Sanskrit (*ka-*)*palam* ‘half’; Albanian *palë* ‘side, part, pair’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *polŭ* ‘side, half,’ Russian *pol* ‘half.’ [IE 802, 986, IS 356]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **pälä* ~ *pole* ‘half,’ (Rédei) **pälä* ‘half, side’; Samoyed: Yurak Samoyed *peelee* ‘half,’ Selkup *pēle*, Kamassian *pjeel* ‘half, side’; Ugric: Hungarian *fél* ~ *fele* ‘half, (one) side (of two),’ Vogul *pääl* ‘side, half’; Finnic: Saami *bælle* ~ *bæle* ‘side, half, one of a pair,’ Mordvin *peľ* ‘side,’ *pele* ‘half,’ Votyak *pal* ‘side, half.’ [U 67, IS 356, R 362]
- DRAVIDIAN: Proto-Dravidian **pāl* ‘part, portion,’ Tamil *pāl* ‘part, portion, share,’ Malayalam *pāl* ‘part,’ Kannada *pāl* ‘division, part,’ Tulu *pālu* ‘share, portion, part,’ Telugu *pālu* ‘share, portion,’ Parji *pēla* ‘portion.’ [D 4097, IS 356]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Andaman Islands: Biada (*ik-*)*pāūr(-da)* ‘2,’ Kede (*ír-*)*pōl*, Chariar (*né-*)*pól*, Juwoi (*ró-*)*pāūr*; New Guinea: Ndani *bere*, Sauweri *pere*; Tasmanian: Southeastern *boula* ~ *bura*, Southern *poalih*. [T 331, VB]
- AUSTRALIAN: Proto-Australian **bula* ‘2,’ Proto-Pama-Nyungan *(*nyuN*)*paIV* ‘(you) two,’ **pula* ‘they two,’ Ngiyambaa *bulā* ‘one of a pair.’ [RD 356, BB 7, 31]
- AUSTROASIATIC: Proto-Austroasiatic **ʔ(m)bar* ‘2’; Munda: Santali *bar*, Kharia (*u-*)*bar*, (*am-*)*bar* ‘you two,’ Juang *ambar*, Remo *ʔmbār* ‘2’; Mon-Khmer: Khmu’ *bār*, Bahnar *ʔbar*, Jeh *bal*, Old Mon *ʔbar*, Old Khmer *ber*, Sakai *hmbar*, Khasi *ār*, Riang (*k-*)*ār*, Palaung *ār* ~ *a*, *par* ‘you two,’ Temiar *bər(-nar)* ‘2,’ Central Nicobarese *ã*. [PB 135, UOL 94]
- MIAO-YAO: Proto-Miao-Yao *(*a*)*war* ~ *(*ə*)*wər* ‘2,’ Proto-Miao **way* (< **war*), Proto-Yao *(*w*)*i*. [PB 415]
- DAIC: Mak wa ‘twin,’ Ong Be von ‘2.’ [PB 415]
- AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **kə(m)bal* ~ *(*ŋ*)*kə(m)bar* ‘twin,’ Javanese *kēbar* ‘doubled,’ *kēmbar* ‘twin,’ Motu *hε-kapa* ‘twins,’ Roro *akabani* ‘8’ (= 4-pair). [AN 76, WW 227, PB 415]

AMERIND: Penutian: Wintun *palo(-l)* ‘2,’ Wappo *p’ala* ‘twins,’ Atakapa *hap-palst* ‘2,’ Huave *apool* ‘snap in two’; Chibchan-Paezan: Chiripo *bor* ‘2,’ Xinca *bial* ~ *piar*, Bribri *bul* ~ *bur*, Cacaopera *burru*, Sanuma *-palo* (repetitive), *polakapi* ‘2,’ Cayapo *pal’u*, Colorado *palu*, Atacameño *poya*; Andean: Quechua *pula* ‘both,’ Aymara *paja* ‘2,’ Yamana *sa-pai* ‘we-2’ (*sa* = ‘thou’), Yahgan *(i-)pai* ‘(we) two’; Macro-Tucanoan: Tuyuka *pealo* ‘2,’ Wanana *pilia*, Desana *peru*, Yupua *apara*, Proto-Nambikwara **p’āl(-in)*, Catuquina *upaua*, Hubde *mbeere*, Ticuna *peia*; Macro-Ge: Caraho *pa* ‘we-2-inc.’ [AM 262, AMN]

19 PAR ‘to fly’

NIGER-CONGO: Proto-West Sudanic **pil* ‘to fly,’ Serer *fol*, Same *pere*, Ewe *flò* ‘to jump,’ Yoruba *fò* ‘fly,’ Grebo *fri*, Igbo *fé*, Ijo *fin*. [KS 32]

NILO-SAHARAN: Dinka *par* ‘to fly,’ Nubian *fire* ‘to flutter,’ Teso *a-poror* ‘to fly,’ Teda *bur-ci* ‘to jump,’ Songhai *firi* ‘to fly,’ Ik *por-on*, Maasai *-biri*, Majang *pir*. [KS 32, NSD 27, UOL 193, KER, HF 12]

AFRO-ASIATIC: Omotic: Proto-Omotic **pyaRR* ‘to fly’; Ancient Egyptian *p?* ‘to fly, flee’; Semitic: Aramaic *parr* ‘flee,’ Arabic *farra*, South Arabian *ferfir* ‘wing,’ Amharic *barrara* ‘fly away, flee’; Cushitic: Beja *fār* ‘jump, hop,’ Boyo *firy* ‘flee’; Berber: Shilha *firri* ‘to fly,’ Ait Izdeg *afru*; Chadic: Ankwa *p’ār* ‘jump,’ Angas *piar* ‘jump, leap,’ Buduma *fər* ‘fly, jump.’ [CS 366, AA 32, IS 346]

KARTVELIAN: Proto-Kartvelian **p’er* ‘to fly,’ Georgian *p’er*, Svan *p’er*; Proto-Kartvelian **prin* ‘to fly,’ Georgian *prin* ~ *pren*, Mingrelian *purin*, Chan *purtin*. [KA 152, 190, IS 346]

INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **(s)per* ‘to fly’; Indic: Sanskrit *par-ṇá* ‘feather’; Iranian: Avestan *parəna* ‘feather, wing’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *peroš* ‘to fly,’ *pero* ‘feather.’ [WP II: 21, IE 850, IS 346, EU]

URALIC: Yukaghir *perie* ‘feathers,’ *perienze* ‘feathered,’ *perien’* ‘have wings’; Proto-Uralic **parV* ‘to fly’; Ugric: Ostyak *pər* ~ *pur* ‘to fly.’ [IS 346]

DRAVIDIAN: Proto-Dravidian **parV* ~ **parV* ‘to fly, run, jump,’ Tamil *para* ‘to fly, hover, flutter, move with celerity,’ Malayalam *parakka* ‘to fly, flee,’ *para* ‘bird,’ *paru* ‘flight,’ Kota *parn-* ‘to fly,’ Toda *pōr*, Kannada *pār* ‘to leap up, run, jump, fly,’ Kodagu *pār* ‘to fly, leap,’ Telugu *paracu* ‘to run away, flee,’ *parika* ‘a kind of bird,’ Kui *pāsk* ‘to fly,’ Kuwi *prād* ‘to run away.’ [D 4020, NSD 27, IS 346]

?TUNGUS: Evenki *hār* ‘to soar.’ [IS 346]

GILYAK *parpar* ‘to hover, fly about.’ [EU]

CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **pírV* ‘to fly,’ Proto-West Caucasian **pəɾə*, Ubyx *pəɾə*, Abkhaz *pír*; Proto-Lezghian **pVr-*, Udi *pur*, Archi *parx*, Proto-Avar-Andi **par-pV-*; Proto-Caucasian **pǎrVpǎIV* ‘butterfly, moth,’

- Proto-West Caucasian **parəpalə* ‘moth,’ Proto-Lezghian **pa(r)pal-* ‘butterfly.’ [C 162, 167; KA 152, 190]
- BASQUE *pimpirina* ‘butterfly’ (< **pir-pir-*).
- SINO-TIBETAN: Proto-Sino-Tibetan **phur* ~ **bhur* ‘to fly’; Archaic Chinese **pjwər* ‘to fly’; Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **pur* ~ **pir* ‘to fly,’ Tibetan *’phur-ba*, Central Tibetan *’phir-ba*, Nung *əphr* ‘to shake,’ *khon-phr* ‘moth,’ Garo *bil* ‘to fly,’ Dimasa *bir*, ?Bahing *byer*, ?Abor-Miri *ber*. [ST 181, 398, NSC 152]
- ?INDO-PACIFIC: Baham *paru-baru* ‘bird,’ Kondo *boro*, Kare *purupuru*, Bunabun *piropir* ‘butterfly.’ [FS 8, 135]
- NAHALI *aphir* ‘to fly.’ [NA 59; according to Kuiper this is a borrowing from Kurku]
- AUSTROASIATIC: Munda: Proto-Munda **apir* ‘to fly’; Mon-Khmer: Mon *pau*, Khmer *par*, Bahnar *par*, Jeh *pal*, Vietnamese *bay*. [PB 482]
- DAIC: Tai: Proto-Tai **?bin* ‘to fly,’ Diao *bin*; Sek *bil* ~ *?bil*; Kam-Sui: Proto-Kam-Sui **pwen* ~ **bwen*, Kam *pen*, Sui *win* ~ *vyen*, Mak *vin*; Lakkia *pon*; Ong-Be *vin*. [PB 394]
- AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Formosan *(*maq*)*baR* ‘to fly,’ *(*mi-*)*pəRpəR*. [PB 394]

20 POKO ‘arm’

- ?KHOISAN: Hadza *upukwa* ‘leg, hind leg, foot,’ *ufukwani* ‘thigh.’ [BD 247, 249]
- NIGER-CONGO: Dagomba *boɔo* ‘arm,’ Gbaya *baxa*, Ewe *abo*, Zande *bo*, Proto-Bantu **bókò*, Sotho *le-boko* ‘arm,’ ?Wolof, Gbaya *buko* ‘10,’ ?Mossi *piga*, ?Tiv *puwə*, ?Grebo *pu*, ?Vere *bo*. [KS 4, NC 44, UOL 194]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Bagirmi *boko* ‘arm,’ Baka *baka*, Berta *buá*, Didinga *iba*. [KS 4, CN 3, UOL 194]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **bhāghu(s)* ‘arm, forearm, elbow’; Indic: Sanskrit *bāhūḥ* ‘arm’; Iranian: Avestan *bāzus*; Armenian *bazuk* ‘forearm’ (a loan from Iranian languages, according to Pokorny); Tocharian: Tocharian A *poke* ‘arm,’ Tocharian B *pauke*; Greek *pakhus* ‘elbow, forearm’; Germanic: Old English *bōg* ‘arm, shoulder, bough,’ English *bough*. [IE 108, UOL 194]
- DRAVIDIAN: Kurux *pāknā* ‘to take up into one’s arms,’ Malto *páke* ‘to take in the lap.’ [D 4050]
- MONGOLIAN: Proto-Mongolian **baɣu-* ‘upper arm.’ [AD 20]
- BURUSHASKI: Hunza *baɣu* ‘double armful,’ Werchikwar *baɣ’o* ‘taking or embracing in two arms.’ [B 65, W 38]
- YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **boq* ‘hand, palm.’ [Y 28]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **pow* ~ **bow* ‘arm’ (cf. English *bough* for a similar phonetic development). [TB 442]
- ?INDO-PACIFIC: Andaman Islands: Bea *pag* ‘claw,’ Bale *poag*; Tasmanian

- pögaréna* ‘shoulder’; New Britain: Sulka *paaga* ‘fingernail’; West New Guinea: Baham *pag*; North New Guinea: Nafri *faxa*; East New Guinea: Amara *foka*; Unclassified New Guinea: Tate *faha* ‘claw.’ [IP 858]
- NAHALI *boko* ~ *bokko* ‘hand.’ [NA 74]
- ?AUSTROASIATIC: Semang *pāk* ‘hand,’ *ta-pak* ‘to slap.’ [NA 63]
- DAIC: Tai: Proto-Tai **ʔba* ‘shoulder’; Sek *va*; Kam-Sui: Mak *ha*; Ong-Be *bea*;
Li: Proto-Li **va*; Laqua *muə* ‘shoulder’ (< **mb(γ)a*). [PB 378]
- AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **(ʔa)-baɣa* ‘shoulder,’ Proto-Formosan **qa-baɣa-(a)n*, Proto-Oceanic **(qa-)paɣa*, Mukawa *kabara*, Paiwa *kavara*. [AN 19, WW 187, PB 378]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Mandan *sūpaxe* ‘arm,’ Dakota *xupahu*, Biloxi *sōpka* ‘fin’; Penutian: Natchez *ilbak* ‘hand,’ Choctaw *ibbok* ‘hand, arm,’ Chitimacha *pākta* ‘armpit,’ Totonac *paqniʔ* ‘arm,’ Huastec *pahāb* ‘hand,’ Quiche *sipax* ‘give’; Hokan: Yana *dac-buku* ‘arm,’ Salinan *puku*, Chumash *pu*, Cochimi *ginyakpak*, Mohave *hivipuk*, Havasupai *vuy-eboka*, Subtiaba *paxpu*; Chibchan-Paezan: Shiriana *poko* ~ *boko*, Cuitlatec *poxja*, Jutiapa *paxa*, Chiquimulilla *pux* ‘hand,’ Xinca *pahal* ‘arm,’ Paya *bakapu* ‘give,’ Cayapa *pexpex* ‘arm,’ Colorado *pexpe*, Mura *apixi*, Chimu *pīk* ‘give,’ Puruha *pux*; Andean: Culli *pui* ‘hand,’ Simacu *bixi*, Allentiac *pux* ‘give,’ Auca *po* ‘hand,’; Macro-Tucanoan: Canamari *pōghy* ‘hand,’ Papury *mbake*, Tiquie (*m*)*bake* ‘arm,’ Kaliana *kijapakuba*, Catauxim *ču-bakō* ‘hand,’ Proto-Nambikwara **pik*; Equatorial: Chamacoco *pukē* ‘arm,’ Turaha *pogo*, Camsa *buakua-ha*, Coche *buakwače* ‘hand, forearm,’ Ramarama *i-pāŋua* ‘arm,’ Karif *bugalaga* ‘armpit,’ Omagua *poa* ‘hand,’ Proto-Tupi **po*, Yuracare *popo*, Kamaru *bo* ‘arm,’ Aruashi *bu* ‘hand’; Macro-Carib: Muinane *ɔnɔ-bwɪkɪ* ‘arm,’ Mocoa *apo*, Ocaina *ooʔpo* ‘hand,’ Tamanaco (*j*-)*apa(-ri)* ‘arm,’ Coeruna (*ko*-)*ipai*; Macro-Panoan: Chulupi *pakat* ‘hand,’ Suhin *pakat-ai*, Sanapana *in-apheik*, Charrua (*is*-)*bax* ‘arm,’ Toba *apige*, Chacobo *baš* ‘elbow, forearm,’ Proto-Tacanan **bai* ‘arm’; Macro-Ge: Botocudo *po* ‘hand,’ Proto-Ge **pa* ‘arm,’ Kaingan *pe*, Chiquito (*i*-)*pa*, Guato (*ma*-)*po*. [AM 7, MT 46, AMN]

21 PUTI ‘vulva’

- NIGER-CONGO: Mande: Malinke *butu* ‘vulva,’ Guro *buri*, Bobo-Fing *bido*, Bisa *bid*; Bantu: Luganda *-butɔ* ‘womb,’ Kunda *-budu*, Swazi *-ŋgo-bɔti*, Ki-sikongo *-buti*. [HJ, M]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Songhai: Gao *buti* ‘vulva,’ Djerma *bute*; Koman: Ganza *pit*, Koma *bitt*. [NS 145, NSD 59]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **pwt* ‘hole, anus, vulva’; Omotic: Ganjule *pote* ‘vagina’; Semitic: Hebrew *pot* ‘vulva’ (“secret parts” in the King James Version, Isaiah 3:17); Cushitic: Somali *fúto* ‘anus,’ Darasa *fido*

- ‘genitals,’ Oromo *fuği* ‘vulva’; Chadic: Jegu *paate*, ‘vulva,’ *paato* ‘penis,’ Angas *fut* ‘hole.’ [CS 381, IS 340, WM 64]
- KARTVELIAN: Proto-Kartvelian **put* ‘hole,’ Svan *put’u*. [IS 340]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **puto* ‘cunnus’; Indic: Sanskrit *pū-tau* ‘buttocks’; Italic: Vulgar Latin **putta* ‘girl,’ Old French *pute* (mod. *putain*) ‘whore,’ Provençal *puta(-na)*, Spanish *puta*; Germanic: Old Icelandic *fuð* ‘cunnus,’ Middle High German *vut* ‘vulva,’ Swiss German *fotz* ~ *fotza*, Swedish *fitta*, *fod* ‘rear end’ (dialectal). [WP II: 21, IE 848, SM 1013]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Illich-Svitych) **putV* ‘rectum,’ (Rédei) **putʕo* ‘rectum, colon’; Ugric: Ostyak *pūti* ‘rectum’; Finnic: Saami *butteğě*. [U 91, IS 340, R 410]
- DRAVIDIAN: Brahui *punḍū* ‘anus, buttocks,’ *pōs* ‘vulva,’ Tamil *puṇṭai* ‘vulva,’ *pūru* ~ *pīru* ‘anus,’ *poccu* ‘vulva, anus,’ Malayalam *pūru* ‘buttocks, vulva,’ Kannada *pucci* ‘vulva,’ Telugu *pūḍa* ‘anus,’ Tulu *pūṭi* ‘vulva,’ Kodagu *puri*, Kota *pid*, Toda *piḍy* ‘penis,’ Kuwi *putki*. [D 4273, 4379, 4476, NSD 59]
- MONGOLIAN: Middle Mongolian *hütü-gün* ‘vulva.’
- JAPANESE-RYUKYUAN: Old Japanese *pʰoto* ‘vulva’ (mod. *hoto*). [SY]
- ESKIMO-ALEUT: Proto-Eskimo-Aleut **putu* ‘hole.’ [EA]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **pūt’i* ‘genitals (mostly female),’ Proto-Nax **but* ‘vulva,’ Proto-Avar-Andi **but’a*, Proto-Lak **put’i* ‘tube,’ Proto-Dargi **put’i* ‘anus,’ Proto-Lezghian **pōt* ‘penis.’ [C 168]
- BASQUE *poto-rro* ‘pubis, vulva.’
- ?AUSTRALIAN: Luridya *pudā* ‘vulva.’ [VB]
- ?AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **betik* ‘vagina,’ **puki* ‘vulva’ (< **puti* ?; cf. East Rukai *pai* ‘vulva’), Ami *puki*, Tsou *buki* ‘penis.’ [AN 121, WW 231, 233, PB 417]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Delaware *saputti* ‘anus,’ Mohegan *sebud*, Wiyot *beš* ‘vagina,’ Upper Chehalis *-pš* ‘anus’; Penutian: Chinook *puč*, Yaudanchi *poto* ‘penis,’ San Juan Bautista *lapus* ‘anus,’ Southern Sierra Miwok *pōtol*; Hokan: Washo (*d-*)*ībis* ‘vagina,’ Karok *vīθ*, Diegueño *hapīčatt*, Tequistlatec (*la-*)*bešu?*; Chibchan-Paezan: Move *butie*, Paya *peta-is-tapcca* ‘anus,’ Chimu *pot*, Ayoman *busi* ‘vagina,’ Allentiac *poru*; Andean: Quechua *upiti* ‘anus,’ Yamana *pūta* ‘hole,’ Aymara *pʰutʰu*; Macro-Tucanoan: Gamella *sebu* ‘vulva,’ Uaiana *mbitikope* ‘anus,’ Uasöna *hibitikope*; Equatorial: Guahibo *petu* ‘vagina,’ Guayabero *sil-fʰuta* ‘vulva,’ Kandoshi *apčir(-ič)*, Toyeri *apuit* ‘vagina,’ Wachipairi *ped*, Piapoko *aʰutani* ‘buttocks,’ Tariana *pāti-niawa* ‘vagina,’ Warakena *pēde* ‘clitoris,’ Caranga *piče* ‘vulva,’ Uro *piši*, (cf. also such Equatorial forms as Siusi *tʰu-pote* ‘vagina,’ Campa *sibiči* ‘vulva,’ *šibiči* ‘penis,’ Uro *šapsi* ‘genital organ’); Macro-Carib: Jaricuna *poita* ‘vagina,’ Pimenteira *pütze-maung*, Waiwai *boči* ‘pubic hair,’ Motilon *pirri* ‘penis’; Macro-Panoan: Cavineña

busu-kani ‘anus,’ Tagnani *opet*, Tiatinagua *besi* ‘penis,’ Panobo *buši*,
Lule *pesu*; Macro-Ge: Mekran *putote*. [AM 263, EQ 121, AMN]

22 TEKU ‘leg, foot’

- NIGER-CONGO: Konyagi *-tak* ‘heel,’ Gurmana *-duge*, Jarawa *-dudug-ul*, Kikuyu *-togigo*. [HJ II]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Proto-Kuliak **tak’a* ‘foot, shoe,’ *takw* ‘step on, tread on,’ So *teg* ‘foot’; Saharan: Daza *dige* ‘leg,’ Kanuri *dəŋgal* ‘wade,’ Kanembu *dō* ~ *duu* ‘leg,’ Berti *taki* ‘thigh,’ Karda *dìgì* ‘foot.’ [VB, NSB]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Omotic: Male *toki* ‘leg,’ Koyra *toke*, Kachama *tuke*, Bambeshi *tugε* ‘foot,’ Nao *tego* ‘to go,’ Dime *tingo*; Cushitic: Proto-East Cushitic **tāk-*, Somali *tag-* ‘to go,’ Dahalo *daka’a* ‘foot’; Chadic: Proto-West Chadic **tak-* ‘to walk with somebody, accompany,’ Muzgum *túgu* ‘foot,’ Gollango *taḥ* ‘to go.’ [VB, LN 255, OS 166]
- DRAVIDIAN: Proto-Central Dravidian **tāk* ‘to walk,’ Parji *tāk*, Pengo *tāŋ(g)*, Kui *tāka*. [D 3151, LN 255] Cf. also Telugu *ḍekka* ‘hoof,’ Naikri *ḍekka*, Konda *ḍeka*, Kuwi *dekka*. [D 2970]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **t’Hǎlq’wV* ‘part of the leg,’ Proto-East Caucasian **t’weh’wV* ‘foot,’ Proto-Dido **t’i’q’wV* ‘sole of the foot,’ Proto-Lezghian **t’elq’wI* ‘shin, ankle.’ [C 196]
- NA-DENE: Proto-Eyak-Athabaskan **t’ǎx* ~ **t’ǎh* ‘foot.’ [DC]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Tasmanian *tokǎna* ‘foot’; Timor-Alor: Abui *tuku* ‘leg, foot’; Halmahera: Ternate *tagi* ‘to walk’; Central Melanesian: Savo *tetegha* ‘foot, lower leg’; Tasmanian: Northeast *tage(-na)* ‘to walk,’ North *taka(-ri)*, Southeast *taga(-ra)*; North New Guinea: Arso *taka* ‘foot’; Southwest New Guinea: Marind *tagu* ‘to walk,’ Telefol *tek* ‘to go’; South New Guinea: Mombum *itōgh* ‘foot,’ Bara *togoi* ‘leg’; Central New Guinea: Ekari *togo* ‘to walk,’ Matap *tag* ‘hip’; East New Guinea: Jegasa Sarau *tegi* ‘foot.’ [IP 80, T 458]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Mandan *dok’a* ‘leg,’ Hidatsa *idiki*; Penu-tian: Siuslaw *tsīk’w* ‘foot,’ North Sahaptin *təχp* ‘with the foot,’ Nez Perce *texé?p* ‘foot,’ Wintu *t’ek-* ‘move,’ Mixe *tek* ‘foot,’ Huastec *t^{ss}ehet* ‘upper leg’; Hokan: Jicaque *tek* ‘leg’; Chibchan-Paezan: Borunca *tek* ~ *dek* ‘walk,’ Move *dikeko*, Atanque *dukakana* ‘leg,’ Baudo *tači-kini* ‘foot’; Andean: Simacu *tixea* ‘foot,’ Yahgan *kadek* ‘walk’; Macro-Tucanoan: Tiquie *do(γ)* ‘leg,’ Wanana *dexso* ‘thigh’; Equatorial: Tinigua *diki* ‘foot,’ Piaroa *tsihēpē*, Wapishana *čikep* ‘walk,’ Arawak *adikki-hi* ‘footprint,’ Miguri *guateke* ‘walk,’ Guayabero *tuk* ‘foot,’ Yurucare *tekte* ‘leg,’ Guahibo *taxu* ‘foot’; Macro-Carib: Bora *take* ‘leg,’ Andoke *(ka-)dekkhe* ‘foot’; Macro-Panoan: Cavineña *edači*, Panobo *taeg*, Mayoruna *taku*, Amahuaca *taku*; Macro-Ge: Oti *etage* ‘leg,’ Cotoxo *täxkatse*, Camican *tako-emaŋ* ‘walk,’ Proto-Ge **tε* ‘leg.’ [AM 165, AMN]

23 TIK ‘finger; one’

- NIGER-CONGO: West Atlantic: Fulup *sik* ~ *sex* ‘finger,’ Nalu *te*; North-Central Niger-Congo: Gur *dike* ‘1’; South-Central Niger-Congo: Gwa *dogbo*, Fon *dòkpá* Ewe *dèká*; Bantu: Tonga *tihó* ‘finger,’ Chopi *tʰihó*, Ki-Bira *zika*, Ba-Kiokwa *zigu*. [KS 55, UOL 91, HJ II: 295]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Fur *tək* ‘1,’ Maba *tək*, Dendje *doko* ‘ten,’ Nera *dɔkk-u* ‘1,’ Merarit *tok* ‘ten,’ Dinka *tok* ‘1,’ Berta *dúkóni*, ?Mangbetu *tʼɛ*, Kwama *seek-o*, Bari *to*, Jur *tok*, Twampa *dèʔ*, Komo *dé*. [NS 103, CN 72, ES 83, KS 55, UOL 91, NSB]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic **tak* ‘1’; Semitic: Peripheral West Gurage *təgu* (*əmmat*) ‘only 1’; Cushitic: Oromo *toko* ‘1,’ *takku* ‘palm (of hand),’ Yaaku *tegei* ‘hand,’ Saho *ti* ‘1,’ Bilin *tu*, Tsamai *dōkko*; Berber: Nefusa *tukoḍ* ‘finger’; Chadic: Hausa (*ḍaya*) *tak* ‘only 1,’ Gisiga *tēkoy* ‘1,’ Gidder *te-teka*, Logone *tku* ‘first.’ [AAD 3: 10]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **deik* ‘to show, point,’ **dekṃ* ‘10’; Italic: Latin *dig(-itus)* ‘finger,’ *dic(-āre)* ‘to say,’ *decem* ‘10’; Germanic: Proto-Germanic **tailhwō* ‘toe,’ Old English *tahe* ‘toe,’ English *toe*, Old High German *zēha* ‘toe, finger.’ [IE 188, 191, EU]
- URALIC: Votyak *odik* ‘1,’ Zyrian *ōtik*. [U 138, EU]
- TURKIC: Chuvash *tek* ‘only, just,’ Uighur *tek* ‘only, merely,’ Chagatai *tek* ‘only, single,’ Turkish *tek* ‘only,’ *teken* ‘one by one.’ [EU]
- KOREAN (*t*)*tayki* ‘1, thing,’ *teki* ‘1, guy, thing,’ Old Korean *tēk* ‘10.’ [EU]
- JAPANESE-RYUKYUAN: Japanese *te* ‘hand.’ [UOL 195]
- AINU *tek* ~ *teke* ‘hand,’ *atiki* ‘five.’ [UOL 195, EU]
- GILYAK *řak* ‘once.’ [EU]
- CHUKCHI-KAMCHATKAN: Kamchadal *itygin* ‘foot, paw.’ [EU]
- ESKIMO-ALEUT: Proto-Eskimo-Aleut **q(i)tik* ‘middle finger’; Eskimo: Kuskokwim *tik(-iq)* ‘index finger,’ Greenlandic *tik(-iq)* ‘index finger,’ *tikkuag-paa* ‘he points to it’; Aleut: Attu *tik(-laq)* ‘middle finger,’ *atgu* ‘finger,’ *taɣataq* ‘1,’ Atka *atakan*. [EU, EA 121]
- YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **tok* ‘finger.’ [VT]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Archaic Chinese **tʰjek* ‘single, 1’; Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **tyik* ‘1,’ Rai *tik(-pu)*, Tibetan (*g-*)*tšig*. [ST 94]
- NA-DENE: Haida (*s-*)*tʰa* ‘with the fingers’; Tlingit *tʰeeq* ‘finger,’ *tʰek* ‘1’; Eyak *tikhi*; Athabaskan: Sarsi *tlikʼ-(aza)*, Kutchin (*ĩ-*)*ʔag*, Hupa *ʔaʔ*, Navajo *ʔàʔ*. [ND]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Tasmanian: Southern *motook* ‘forefinger,’ Southeastern *togue* ‘hand’; West New Guinea: Proto-Karonan **dik* ‘1’; Southwest New Guinea: Boven Mbian *tek* ‘fingernail,’ Digul *tuk*. [IP 37, SWNG 39, SNG 42, UOL 195]

- AUSTROASIATIC: Proto-Austroasiatic **(k-)tig* ‘arm, hand’; Munda: Kharia *tiʔ*; Mon-Khmer: Riang *tiʔ*, Wa *taiʔ*, Khmer *ʔai*, Vietnamese *tay*, Proto-Aslian **tik* ~ **tiŋ*. [PB 467, UOL 195]
- MIAO-YAO: Proto-Miao-Yao **ntoʔ* ‘finger’; Proto-Yao **doʔ*; Proto-Miao **ntaiʔ* ‘point with the finger.’ [PB 356]
- DAIC: Proto-Li **dliŋ* ‘finger,’ Northern Li *tleaŋ* ~ *theŋ*, Loi *thexŋ* ~ *ciaŋ*. [PB 356]
- ?AUSTRONESIAN: Proto-Austronesian **(tu-)diŋ* ‘point with the finger.’ [AN 140, WW 156, PB 356, UOL 195]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Nootka *tak^wa* ‘only,’ Bella Coola *t^siʔx^w* ‘five,’ Kalispel *t^s’oq^w* ‘point with the finger,’ Kwakwaka *sok^w* ‘five,’ Nitinat *-tsoq-* ‘in hand,’ Cherokee *sakwe* ‘1,’ Acoma *ʔiskaw*, Pawnee *uska*, Mohawk *tsiʔer* ‘finger,’ Hidatsa *šaki*, Winnebago *sāk*, Quapaw *čak*, Biloxi *ičaki* ‘fingers,’ Yuchi *saki* ‘hand’; Penutian: Southern Sierra Miwok *t^sik’aʔ* ‘index finger,’ Wintun *tiq-eles* ‘10,’ Nisenan *tok-* ‘hand,’ Mixe *toʔk* ~ *tuk* ‘1,’ Sayula *tuʔk*, Tzeltal *tukal* ‘alone,’ Quiche *tik'ex* ‘carry in the hand,’ Hokan: Proto-Hokan **dik'i* ‘finger,’ Karok *tik* ‘finger, hand,’ Achumawi (*wa-*)*túči* ‘finger,’ Washo *tsek*, Yana *-t^s’gi-* ‘alone,’ East Pomo *bī’ya-tsūkai* ‘finger,’ Arraarra *teeh’k* ‘hand,’ Pehtsik *tiki-vash*, Akwa’ala *ašit-dek* ‘1’; Central Amerind: Nahua *t^siikiaʔa*, Pima Bajo *čič*, Tarahumara *sika* ‘hand,’ Mazatec *čikaʔā* ‘alone,’ Mangue *tike* ‘1,’ Cuicatec *diči* ‘10’; Chibchan-Paezan: Chibcha *ytiqun* ‘finger,’ *ačik* ‘by ones,’ Borunca *e’tsik* ‘1,’ Guatuso *dooki*, Shiriana *īthak* ‘hand,’ Ulua *tinka-mak* ‘finger,’ Paez *teēč* ‘1,’ Allentiac *tukum* ‘10,’ Warrau *hisaka* ‘finger, 1’; Andean: Cahuapana *itekla* ‘finger, hand,’ Jebero *itōkla*, Alakaluf *tākso* ‘1,’ Quechua *sōk*; Macro-Tucanoan: Siona *tekua*, Siona *teg-li* ‘5,’ Canichana *eu-tixle* ‘finger,’ Ticuna *suku* ‘hand,’ Yupua *di(x)ka* ‘arm,’ Uasōna *dikaga*; Equatorial: Upano *t^sikitik* ‘1,’ Aguaruna *tikiŋ*, Murato *t^siči* ‘hand,’ Uru *t^si* ‘1,’ Chipaya *zek*, Itene *taka*, Guamo *dixi* ‘finger,’ Katembri *tika* ‘toe,’ Yuracare *teče* ‘thumb’; Macro-Carib: Kukura *tikua* ‘finger,’ Accawai *tigina* ‘1,’ Yagua *teki*; Imihita *meux-tsekoa* ‘finger,’ Trio *tinki* ‘1,’ Ocaina *dikabu* ‘arm’; Macro-Panoan: Mataco *otejji* ‘1,’ Tagnani *etegueno* ‘finger,’ Sensi (*nawiš*)-*tikoe* ‘1 (finger)’ Cavineña *eme-toko* ‘hand,’ Moseten *tak* ‘10’; Macro-Ge: Botocudo (*po-*)*čik* ‘1 (finger),’ *gik* ‘alone,’ Proto-Ge **(pi-)t^si* ‘1 (finger).’ [AM 110, MT 1, DL 56, AMN]

24 TIKÀ ‘earth’

- ?NIGER-CONGO: Proto-Bantu **tākà* ‘earth, mud, ground, soil,’ Swahili *taka* ‘dirt, refuse.’ [BA IV: 87]
- ?NILO-SAHARAN: Berta *adok’o(ŋ)* ~ *atok’o(ŋ)* ‘mud.’ [Bender 1989]

- KARTVELIAN: Proto-Kartvelian **tiqa* ~ **diqa* ‘soil, clay,’ Georgian *tixa* ‘clay, dirt’ (< Old Georgian *tiqa*), Mingrelian *dixa* ~ *dexa* ‘soil, earth,’ Chan (*n*)*dixa* ‘soil.’ [KA 94, N 69]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European **dhghem* ‘earth’; Anatolian: Hittite *te-e-kan*; Indic: Sanskrit *kṣam*; Iranian: Avestan *zā* Albanian *dhe*; Italic: Latin *humus*; Celtic: Old Irish *dū* ‘place’; Baltic: Latvian *zeme* ‘earth’; Slavic: Old Church Slavic *zemlja*; Tocharian: Tocharian A *tkam*. [IE 414, N 69]
- DRAVIDIAN: Tamil *tukaḷ* ‘dust,’ Telugu *dūgara* ‘dust, dirt,’ Kolami *tūk* ‘dust, earth, clay,’ Naikri *tuk* ‘earth, clay,’ Parji *tūkud* ‘earth, clay, soil,’ Gadba *tūkuṛ* ‘earth, clay.’ [D 3283]
- JAPANESE-RYUKYUAN: Old Japanese *tukī* ‘mud,’ *tuki* ‘land’ (mod. *t^suki* ~ *t^suči*). [SY]
- BURUSHASKI *tīk* ~ *tik* ‘earth, ground.’ [B 351]
- YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **təq-* ‘clay, dirt,’ Ket *tag-ar* ‘clay,’ Kot *t^hag-ar* ‘dirt.’ [SC 76]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Lushei *diak* ‘mud,’ Sho *d^hek* ~ *dek* ‘earth.’ [IST 221]
- NA-DENE: Haida *t^lig* ~ *t^lga* ~ *klik* ‘earth, ground’ (cf. TIK ‘finger’ above for a similar shift of *t* > *t^l* before *i*); Tlingit (*t^lit-*)*tik* ~ *t^liak-ū* ~ *klatk* ‘earth’; Eyak (Yakutat) (*tza*)*t^lkh* ‘earth.’ [ND]
- NAHALI *t^sikal* ~ *sikal* ‘earth.’ [NA 67; probably a borrowing of Kurku *t^sikal* ‘mud,’ according to Kuiper.]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Bella Bella *təq^wum* ‘dirty,’ Nootka *t^sak^uum^s* ‘earth,’ Kwakwala *dzəqwa* ‘mud,’ Squamish *tíq^w* ‘muddy,’ Lower Fraser *s-t^liqəl*, Seneca *-tki-* ‘dirty,’ Yuchi *s^lak^ʔʔ* ‘mud,’ Hidatsa *ihatsaki* ‘dirty,’ Acoma *háʔat^si* ‘land’; Penutian: Tsimshian *maʔtks* ‘dirty,’ Pokonchi *t^sikot*, Mam *čokš* ‘earth,’ Mixe *məʔəts* ‘mud,’ Sayula *moʔts*, Ixil *šok^ʔol*, Quiche *šəq^ʔox* ‘muddy’; Hokan: Shasta *t^sik* ‘mud,’ Achomawi *teqade* ‘earth,’ Diegueño *taketak* ‘dirty’; Central Amerind: Cora *t^siʔit^sa*, Hopi *tīt^skīa* ‘earth,’ Chatina *t^suuh* ‘dirty,’ Proto-Central Otomi **t^so*, Chinantec *suh* ‘dirt’; Chibchan-Paezan: Xinca *tuxa* ‘mud,’ Benticua *tikan*, Bribri *ičuk* ‘earth,’ Rama *taki*, Cabecar *du-čeka* ‘mud,’ Guambiana *čig*, Allentiac *toko*, Cayapa *tu* ‘earth’; Andean: Quechua *č’iči* ‘dirty,’ Pehuelche *atek* ‘earth,’ Tehuelche *takhs* ‘dirty’; Macro-Tucanoan: Papury *tixsa*, Yupua *tixta* ‘earth,’ Tucano *dixta*, Särä *sixta*, Canichana *ni-čixiči*, Nadobo *togn* ‘mud’; Equatorial: Tinigua *tokwana* ‘earth,’ Caranga *t^suxt^si* ‘dirty,’ Chamicuro *t^sixta* ‘earth,’ Cocoma *tuguka*; Macro-Carib: Yabarana *ašikipe* ‘dirty,’ Witoto *sagope* ‘mud’; Macro-Panoan: Toba-Guazu *toko* ‘dirty,’ Lengua *atits*, Chulupi *tīš* ‘wet ground,’ Tacana *ači* ‘dirty’; Macro-Ge: Chiquito *tuki-s*, Bororo *txu*, Chavante *tika* ‘earth,’ Apinage *tugu* ‘dirty,’ Cayapo *tuk*. [AMN]

25 TSAKU ‘leg, foot’

- ?NIGER-CONGO: Bantu: Proto-Bantu **t^sàkù* ‘calf of the leg.’ [BA 79]
- NILO-SAHARAN: East Sudanic: Jur *čok* ‘foot,’ Zilmamu *šowa* ‘foot,’ Nera *šokna* ‘foot, claw,’ Proto-Dinka-Nuer **t^sok* ‘foot’; Gumuz: Proto-Gumuz **t^sogwa*, Proto-Koman **šok*, Komo *šawk^h*, Twampa *šòg*, Kwama *soŋk’*. [VB, NSB]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Cushitic: Beja *sikwina* ‘foot,’ Quara *sukanā*; Semitic: Hebrew *šoq* ‘leg,’ Arabic *sāq*; Berber: Shilha (*ta-*)*zux(-t)* ‘foot’; Chadic: Proto-West Chadic **sAkA* ‘leg,’ Bolewa *šeke* ‘foot,’ Fali *sika*. [CS 265, AA 34, OS 292]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Indic: Sanskrit *sak(-thi)* ‘thigh’; Iranian: Avestan *hax(-ti)*; Celtic: Welsh *heg(-ol)* ‘leg, shank.’ [IE 930]
- URALIC: Yukaghir *t^soγ(-ul)* ‘foot, leg’; Ugric: Ostyak *săg(-əńt’)* ~ *soh(-əť)* ~ *šog(-əś)* ‘back side of the leg from the heel to the bend of the knee (of a human being); back hoof (of a horse); Finnic: Saami *čæwǵa* ~ *čæwǵe* ‘hock of reindeer or other quadruped.’ [U 92]
- CHUKCHI-KAMCHATKAN: Kamchadal *t^sk(-ana)* ~ *t^ski* ‘foot, leg, paw.’ [Swadesh 1962]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **č^ʷV[l]k^wV* ‘foot, hoof,’ Proto-Avar-Andi **č^ʷik^wa* ‘foot.’ [C 75, DC]
- BURUSHASKI: Hunza *šak* ‘arm, forearm (of a human being); thigh, upper part of the leg (of an animal),’ Werchikwar *šak*. [B 320, W 215]
- ?SINO-TIBETAN: Ancient Chinese **tsⁱwok* ‘foot,’ Cantonese *tšuk*.
- INDO-PACIFIC: Andaman Islands: Onge *t^siġe* ‘leg,’ Biada *t^sag*, Puchikwar *t^sok*, Juwoi *čok*; Central New Guinea: Mikaru *saga* ‘foot,’ Grand Valley Dani (*ne-*)*sok* ‘(my) foot’; East New Guinea: Korona *sogo* ‘foot,’ Sikube *suku*, Mafulu *soge*, Kambisa *suga*. [IP 80, T 458]
- AUSTROASIATIC: Munda: Kharia *d^zuŋ* ‘foot’; Mon-Khmer: Mon *t^söŋ* ‘foot, leg,’ Khmer *d^zuŋ* ‘leg, foot,’ Temiar *d^zoŋ* ~ *d^zukⁿ*, Mah Meri *d^zogn*, Shompen *čuk* ‘foot.’ [VB]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Proto-Algic **-sōŋk-ani* ~ *-šōŋk-ani* ‘hip,’ Kutenai *saq* ‘leg,’ Quileute *t-t^s’oq^w* ‘foot,’ Squamish *-čq* ‘hip, side,’ Okanagan *s-t^s’ōqan* ‘leg,’ Yuchi *go-čuko* ‘thigh’; Penutian: Nass *asāx* ‘foot,’ Siuslaw *t^sik^w*, Klamath *č’ōg* ‘leg,’ *bo-sak-l’* ‘thigh,’ Lake Miwok *čúki* ‘hip,’ Wappo *čoke* ‘hip bone,’ Zuni *sak^wi* ‘leg,’ Atakapa *ʔaška* ‘foot,’ Huave *tsāk* ‘leg,’ Mam *čog*, Tzotzil *čakil* ‘hip’; Hokan: Achomawi *šakō* ‘leg,’ Northern Pomo *šaku*, Eastern Pomo *šako*, Kashaya *šahku*, Yana *d^zūk’uwalla* ‘hip,’ Mohave *t^sakas*; Central Amerind: Mazatec *n-t^saku* ‘his foot,’ Popoloca *t^sāgu* ‘leg,’ Mixtec *t^saha* ‘hip,’ Ixcatec *t^saku* ‘leg,’ Chocho *t^sagua*; Chibchan-Paezan: Tarascan *t^sika-hta-kua* ‘thigh,’ Murire *sokua-*

gete, Sabanero *suaguet* ‘leg,’ Binticua *ǰúkue*, Andaqui *sogua-para* ‘foot,’ Itonama *uj-sahua-no* ‘leg,’ Jirajira *a-sagan-ipipo*, Timucua *secah*; Andean: Proto-Quechuan **čaki* ‘foot,’ Yahgan *čikan* ‘leg,’ Alacaluf *čekur* ‘foot’; Macro-Tucanoan: Särä *tsagalo* ‘thigh,’ Buhugana *sakalo*, Yuri *sokehry* ‘hip’; Equatorial: Campa *no-tsaki*, Piaroa *tsiha* ‘thigh,’ Mococho *čuko* ‘leg,’ Otomi *čučuga* ‘thigh,’ Chapacura *čiki-či* ‘foot’; Macro-Carib: Trio *sako* ‘leg,’ Mocoa *saku*, Ocaina *ĩʔžóóga* ‘foot’; Macro-Panoan: Toba-Guazu *čagañi* ‘thigh,’ Cavineña *etsaka* ‘leg,’ Sapiboca *ečuxu* ‘thigh’; Macro-Ge: Botocudo *žāk-merum* ‘tibia,’ Masacara *šüöku* ‘leg,’ Kaingan *(in)-t^{so}* ‘(my) leg.’ [AM 165, AK 113, CP 114, AIW, PP 133, AMN]

26 Tsuma ‘hair’

- KHOISAN: !Kung *čum* ‘shell,’ š’um ‘skin,’ Eastern ≠Hua *č’ū ~ t^{s’}ū ~ dt^{s’}ū* ‘skin’; G//abake *čā ~ čo* ‘skin’; /Xam *tū* ‘shell.’ [SAK 597, 807]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Nyangiya *sim-at* ‘hair,’ Nandi *sum*. [KER 445]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Omotic: Proto-Omotic **somm-* ‘pubic hair’; Cushitic: Sidamo *šomb-*, Proto-Southern Cushitic **seʔem-* ‘hair’; Old Egyptian *zmꜥ*; Semitic: Proto-Semitic **šmġ* ‘fine hair shed by a camel’; Chadic: Hausa *suma* ‘growth of hair.’ [OL 47, CCE]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **t^s’fi wěme* ‘eyebrow,’ Proto-Lezghian **t^{s’w}em*, Proto-Nax **t^s’a-t^s’?Vm*. [C 70]
- BASQUE *zam-ar(r)* ‘lock of wool, shock of hair.’ [SC 12]
- YENISEIAN: Proto-Yeniseian **t^səŋe* ‘hair.’ [SC 12]
- SINO-TIBETAN: Proto-Sino-Tibetan **t^{sh}ām* ‘hair’; Archaic Chinese **sam ~ *šam* ‘hair, feather’; Tibeto-Burman: Proto-Tibeto-Burman **tsam* ‘hair,’ Lepcha *ātsom*, Tibetan (*ʔag-*)*tshom* ‘beard of the chin’ (= [mouth]-hair), Kanauri *tsam* ‘wool, fleece,’ (*mik-*)*tsam* ‘eyebrow’ (= [eye]-hair), Magari *tšham* ‘hair, wool,’ Burmese *tsham*, Lushei *sam* ‘hair (of the head),’ Dhimmal *tšam* ‘hide, bark,’ Garo *mik sam* ‘eyebrow,’ Nung *əŋsam* ‘hide.’ [ST 73, 191, UOL 194, SS 23]
- MIAO-YAO: Proto-Miao-Yao **šjām ~ *sjām* ‘beard, moustache.’ [PB 307]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Pawnee *ošu* ‘hair,’ Dakota *šū* ‘feather,’ Woccon *summe* ‘hair’; Penutian: North Sahaptin *šəmtai* ‘pubic hair,’ Nez Perce *simtey*, Kekchi *t^sut^sum* ‘feather,’ *ismal* ‘hair,’ Mam *tsamal*, Quiche *isumal*; Hokan: Proto-Hokan **č^hemi* ‘fur,’ North Pomo *t^sime* ‘hair,’ Kashaya *sime* ‘body hair, fur,’ Northeast Pomo *č^heme* ‘body hair,’ Mohave *sama* ‘root,’ Cocopa *išma* ‘hair,’ Tlappanec *t^sūŋ* ‘hair, root’; Central Amerind: Tubatulabal *t^somol* ‘hair, head’; Chibchan-Paezan: Matagalpa *susum* ‘beard,’ Xinka *susi* ‘beard’; Andean: Tsoneka *čomki* ‘pubic hair,’ Quechua *sunk* ‘a beard’; Equatorial: Caranga *čuma* ‘hair,’ Quitemo *čumi-či*, Aguaruna *susu* ‘beard,’ Candoshi *sosi*. [AM 136, EQ 54, UOL 194, DL 4, AMN]

27 ?AQ'WA 'water'

- KHOISAN: Northern: !o !kung *kāũ* 'to rain,' !kung *k"ā* 'drink'; Central: Naron *k"ā* 'drink'; Southern: /kam-ka !ke *k"wā* ~ *k"wē* 'drink,' *kāũ* 'to rain,' //ng !ke *k"ā* ~ *k"ēi* 'drink,' *kāũ* 'to rain,' Batwa *k"ā* ~ *k"ē* 'drink,' /auni *k"āa* 'drink,' Masarwa *k"ā* 'drink,' /nu //en *k"ā* 'drink.' [KE 261]
- NILO-SAHARAN: Fur *kōi* 'rain'; East Sudanic: Nyimang *kwe* 'water,' So *kwε?*, Ik *čue*; Central Sudanic: Mangbetu *éguo*; Berta *kōi* 'rain, cloud'; Koman: Kwama *uuku* 'water,' Anej *agu-d* 'cloud.' [NSB, KER]
- AFRO-ASIATIC: Proto-Afro-Asiatic (Illich-Svitych) **q(w)* 'water,' (Ehret) **ak^w*; Omotic: Proto-North Omotic **ak^l*, She *k'ai* 'wet,' Janjero *ak(k)a* 'water,' Kaffa *ačō*, Mocha *āč'o*, Gofa *haččā*, Shinasha *ač'č'o*, Badditu *wat^sē*; Cushitic: Proto-Cushitic (Ehret) **-k^w*- 'to be wet,' (Illich-Svitych) **qw* 'water,' Agaw *aq^w*, Bilin 'aq^w, Xamir *aq^{wā}* 'drops of water,' Damot *ag^wo* 'water,' Proto-East Cushitic (Ehret) **k'oy-* 'wet,' Hadiyya *wo'o* 'water,' Tambaro *waha*, Sidamo *waho*, Iraqw *āha* 'drink.' [N 139, EU, AM 87, CE 348]
- INDO-EUROPEAN: Proto-Indo-European (Pokorny) **ak^{wā}*- 'water,' (Puhvel) **eg^{w-}*, (Bomhard) **ek^{w-}*; Anatolian: Hittite *eku-*, Luwian *aku-*, Palaic *ah-* 'drink'; Italic: Latin *aqua* 'water'; Germanic: Gothic *ahwa* 'river'; Tocharian: Tocharian A *yok-* 'drink.' [IE 23]
- URALIC: Proto-Uralic (Rédei) **yoka* 'river.' [R 99–100]
- JAPANESE *aka* 'bilge water.' [JP 100]
- AINU *wakka* 'water,' *ku* 'drink.' [JP 100]
- CAUCASIAN: Proto-Caucasian **-VqV* 'suck,' Proto-Lezghian **?oχ^wa* 'drink,' Lezghian *χ^wa-l*, Agul *uχas*, Proto-Lezghian **?oq^wa-* 'rain,' Lezghian *q^wa-z*, Rutul *hub^was*, Tsakhur *joκ^wi*; Proto-Nax **-aq-* 'suck(le),' Chechen *-aq-* 'suck'; Proto-Dargi **-uq-* 'suck(le).' [C 3, 16]
- ?BURUSHASKI *hαγ-um* 'wet.'
- SINO-TIBETAN: Proto-Sino-Tibetan **Ku* 'fluid, spill,' Newari *k^hwo* 'river,' Khaling *ku* 'water,' Kachin *k^hu*. [NSC 43]
- INDO-PACIFIC: Awyu *okho* 'water, river,' Syiagha *okho* 'water,' Yareba *ogo*, Yonggom *oq*, Ninggirum *ok*. [FS 96, 134]
- AUSTRALIAN: Proto-Australian **gugu* 'water.' [AC]
- AMERIND: Almosan-Keresiouan: Proto-Central Algonquian **akwā* 'from water,' Kutenai *-q^w* 'in water,' Quileute *kwāya* 'water,' Snohomish *q^wa?*, Caddo *koko*; Penutian: Nass *ak^l-s*, Takelma *ug^w* 'drink,' Wintun *wak'ai* 'creek,' Zuni *k'a* 'water,' Atakapa *ak*, Yuki *uk'*, Tetontepec *uu?k* 'drink,' Yucatec *uk'* 'be thirsty'; Hokan: Chimariko *aqā* 'water,' Kashaya *pahqha* 'water,' *q'o* 'drink,' Seri *?ax* 'water,' Diegueno *?axā*, Quinigua *kwa*, Tonkawa *?āx*, Tequistlatec *l-axa?*; Central Amerind: Proto-Chinantec **g^wa*

'stream, river'; Chibchan-Paezan: Shiriana *koa* 'drink,' Chimila *uk-*, Binticua *agu*, Allentiac *aka* 'water'; Andean: Iquito *aqua*, Quechua *yaku*, Yamana *aka* 'lake'; Macro-Tucanoan: Auake *okōa* 'water, river,' Cubeo *oko* 'water,' Tucano *axko*; Equatorial: Amniape *ākū*, Quitemo *ako*, Uraicu *uaka* 'wash,' Terena *oko* 'rain,' Chipaya *ax^w* 'wash'; Macro-Carib: Yagua *xa* 'water,' Witoto *joko* 'wash,' Macushi *u-wuku* 'my drink,' Waiwai *woku* 'drink,' Taulipang *ai'ku* 'wet'; Macro-Panoan: Lule *uk* 'drink,' Mayoruna *uaka* 'water,' Culino *yaku* 'water,' *waka* 'river,' Huarayo *hakua* 'wash'; Macro-Ge: Koraveka *ako* 'drink,' Fulnio *waka* 'lake,' Kamakan *kwa* 'drink,' Chavante *kō* 'water,' Aponegicran *waike* 'drink.' [AM 87, AMN]

ABBREVIATIONS

A	Andean, Greenberg 1987
AA	Afro-Asiatic, Greenberg 1963
AAD	Afro-Asiatic Dictionary, Diakonov 1981–
AB	Allan Bomhard, 1987
AC	A. Capell, 1956
AD	Anna Dybo, 1988
AIW	Mary Key, 1987
AK	Almosan-Keresiouan, Greenberg 1987
AM	Amerind, Greenberg 1987
AMN	Amerindian Notebooks, 23 vols., Greenberg 1981
AN	Austronesian, Dempwolff 1934–38
AT	A. N. Tucker and M. A. Bryan, 1957
B	Burushaski, Lorimer 1938
BA	Bantu, Guthrie 1967
BB	Barry Blake, 1988
BD	Bushman Dictionary, Bleek 1956
C	Caucasian, Nikolaev and Starostin 1992
CA	Central Amerind, Greenberg 1987
CAN	Central Amerind Notebook, Greenberg 1981
CCE	Vladimir Orel and Olga Stolbova, 1988
CE	Christopher Ehret, 1989
CK	Chukchi-Kamchatkan, Mudrak 1990
CN	Chari-Nile, Greenberg 1963
CP	Chibchan-Paezan, Greenberg 1987
CS	Marcel Cohen, 1947
D	Dravidian, Burrow and Emeneau 1984
DB	Dorothea Bleek, 1929
DC	Dene-Caucasian, Nikolaev 1991

DL	D. R. Leshchiner, 1989
EA	Eskimo-Aleut, Mudrak 1989
EC	East Caucasian, Starostin and Nikolaev 1975
EQ	Equatorial, Greenberg 1987
ES	East Sudanic, Greenberg 1963
EU	Eurasiatic, Greenberg to appear
FS	F. Seto, 1988
H	Hokan, Greenberg 1987
HF	Harold Fleming, ed., <i>Mother Tongue</i> , 1986–
HJ	Harry Johnston, 1922
IE	Indo-European, Pokorny 1959
IP	Indo-Pacific, Greenberg 1971
IS	V. M. Illich-Svitych, 1967
IST	Robert Shafer, 1974
JB	John Bengtson, 1986
JP	James Patrie, 1982
JR	Johannes Rahder, 1963
K	Khoisan, Greenberg 1963
KA	Kartvelian, Klimov 1964
KE	Khoisan Etymologies, Ruhlen 1987b
KER	Harold Fleming, 1983a
KS	Kongo-Saharan, Gregersen 1972
LC	Morris Swadesh, 1960
LN	Václav Blažek, 1990
M	Mande, Mukarovsky 1966
MG	Macro-Ge, Greenberg 1987
MT	Macro-Tucanoan, Greenberg 1987
N	Nostratic, Illich-Svitych 1971–84
NA	Nahali, Kuiper 1962
NC	Niger-Congo, Greenberg 1963
ND	Na-Dene Notebook, Greenberg 1981
NK	Niger-Kordofanian, Greenberg 1963
NNG	North New Guinea, Greenberg 1971
NP	Norman-Paman, Black 1980
NS	Nilo-Saharan, Greenberg 1963
NSB	Nilo-Saharan, Bender 1980
NSC	Nostratic–Sino-Caucasian, Starostin 1991
NSD	Nilo-Saharan–Dravidian, Greenberg 1986
OL	Václav Blažek, 1989
OS	Olga V. Stolbova, 1987
P	Penutian, Greenberg 1987

PB	Paul Benedict, 1975
PP	Paul Proulx, 1984
R	Károly Rédei, 1986–88
RB	Robert Blust, 1980
RD	Robert Dixon, 1980
SAK	Southern African Khoisan, Ruhlen 1987b
SB	S. Bhattacharya, 1966
SC	Sino-Caucasian, Bengtson 1991a
SES	Southeast Surmic, Fleming 1983b
SM	Stuart Mann, 1984–88
SN	Sergei Nikolaev, 1991
SNG	South New Guinea, Greenberg 1971
SS	Sergei Starostin, 1984
ST	Sino-Tibetan, Benedict 1972
SUL	Björn Collinder, 1957
SWNG	Southwest New Guinea, Greenberg 1971
SY	S. Yoshitake, 1934
T	Tasmanian, Plomley 1976
TB	Tibeto-Burman, Matisoff 1985
U	Uralic, Collinder 1977
UOL	Alfredo Trombetti, 1905
VB	Václav Blažek, 1988
VT	V. N. Toporov, 1967
W	Werchikwar, Lorimer 1962
WM	Walter Müller, 1975
WP	Alois Walde and Julius Pokorny, 1930
WW	S. A. Wurm and B. Wilson, 1975
Y	Yeniseian, Starostin 1984

REFERENCES

- Anttila, Raimo. 1989. *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Amsterdam.
- Bender, M. Lionel. 1980. "Nilo-Saharan Comparative Wordlist," ms.
- . 1989. "Berta Lexicon," in M. Lionel Bender, ed., *Topics in Nilo-Saharan Linguistics*. Hamburg, 271–304.
- Benedict, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus*. Cambridge, Eng.
- . 1975. *Austro-Thai: Language and Culture*. New Haven, Conn.
- Bengtson, John D. 1986. "Toward Global Sound Correspondences," ms.
- . 1987. "Notes on Indo-European '10,' '100,' and '1,000,'" *Diachronica* 4: 257–62.

- . 1991a. “Notes on Sino-Caucasian,” in Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*. Bochum, Germany, 67–129.
- . 1991b. “Some Macro-Caucasian Etymologies,” in Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*. Bochum, Germany, 130–41.
- Bhattacharya, S. 1966. “Some Munda Etymologies,” in Norman H. Zide, ed., *Studies in Comparative Austroasiatic Linguistics*, The Hague, 28–40.
- Black, Paul. 1980. “Norman Paman Historical Phonology,” Bruce Rigsby and Peter Sutton, eds., *Papers in Australian Linguistics* 13, *Pacific Linguistics* A59. Canberra, 181–239.
- Blake, Barry. 1988. “Redefining Pama-Nyungan: Towards the Prehistory of Australian Languages,” *Yearbook of Australian Linguistics* 1.
- Blažek, Vaclav. 1988. “Additions to the Global Etymological Dictionary of Ruhlen-Bengtson 1988, part 2,” ms.
- . 1989. “Omotic Lexicon in Afroasiatic Perspective: Body Part Cognates,” paper given at the Second International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic.
- . 1990. “Lexica nostratica: Addenda et corrigenda II,” *Archív orientální* 58: 205–18.
- Bleek, Dorothea F. 1929. *Comparative Vocabularies of Bushman Languages*. Cambridge, Eng.
- . 1956. *A Bushman Dictionary*. New Haven, Conn.
- Blust, Robert. 1980. “Austronesian Etymologies,” *Oceanic Linguistics* 19: 1–189.
- . 1988. *Austronesian Root Theory*. Amsterdam.
- Bomhard, Allan R. 1987. “A Sample of the Comparative Vocabulary of the Nostratic Languages,” ms.
- Boyd, Raymond. 1978. “A propos des ressemblances lexicales entre langues niger-congo et nilo-sahariennes,” *Bulletin de SELAF (Paris)* 65: 43–94.
- Burrow, Thomas, and Murray B. Emeneau. 1984. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Oxford, Eng.
- Bynon, Theodora. 1977. *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge, Eng.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1986. “Cautions about Loan Words and Sound Correspondences,” in Dieter Kastovsky and Aleksander Szwedek, eds., *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries*. Berlin, 221–24.
- . 1988. Review of *Language in the Americas*, by Joseph H. Greenberg, *Language* 64: 591–615.
- Campbell, Lyle, and Ronald W. Langacker. 1978. “Proto-Aztec Vowels: Part III,” *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44: 262–79.
- Capell, A. 1956. *A New Approach to Australian Linguistics*. Sydney.
- Cohen, Marcel. 1947. *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris.

- Collinder, Björn. 1949. "La parenté linguistique et le calcul des probabilités," *Uppsala universitets årsskrift* 13: 1–24.
- . 1957. *A Survey of the Uralic Languages*. Uppsala.
- . 1977. *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary*. Hamburg.
- Curr, E. M. 1886–87. *The Australian Race*. Melbourne.
- Dawkins, Richard. 1987. *The Blind Watchmaker*. New York.
- Dempwolff, Otto. 1934–38. *Vergleichende Lautlehre des austronesischen Wortschatzes*, 3 vols. Berlin.
- Derbyshire, Desmond C., and Geoffrey K. Pullum, eds. 1991. *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, Vol. 3. Berlin.
- Diakonov, I. M., ed. 1981–. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskix jazykov*. Moscow.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1980. *The Languages of Australia*. Cambridge, Eng.
- Dolgopolsky, Aron. 1964. "Gipoteza drevnejšego rodstva jazykovyx semei severnoj Eurasii s verojatnostnoj točki zrenija," *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2: 53–63. [English translation in Vitalij V. Shevoroshkin and Thomas L. Markey, eds., *Typology, Relationship and Time*, 1986. Ann Arbor, Mich., 27–50.]
- Dybo, Anna. 1988. "Methods in Systemic Reconstruction of Altaic and Nostatic Lexics," paper given at the International Conference on Language and Prehistory, University of Michigan.
- Ehret, Christopher. 1989. "A Reconstruction of Proto-Afroasiatic," ms.
- Fleming, Harold. 1983a. "Kuliak External Relations: Step One," in Rainer Vossen and Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst, eds., *Nilotic Studies*. Berlin, 375–421.
- . 1983b. "Surma Etymologies," in Rainer Vossen and Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst, eds., *Nilotic Studies*. Berlin, 525–55.
- Fleming, Harold, ed. 1986–. *Mother Tongue*. Boston.
- . 1990. "Omotica, Afrasiana and More: Ethiopia as the Ever-Flowing Vase," *Mother Tongue* 12: 22–30.
- Goddard, Ives. 1979. "The Languages of South Texas and the Lower Rio Grande," in Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, eds., *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment*. Austin, 355–89.
- Golla, Victor, ed. 1984. *The Sapir-Kroeber Correspondence*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1953. "Historical Linguistics and Unwritten Languages," in A. L. Kroeber, ed., *Anthropology Today*. Chicago: 265–86.
- . 1957. "Genetic Relationship among Languages," in *Essays in Linguistics*, by Joseph H. Greenberg. Chicago, 35–45.
- . 1963. *The Languages of Africa*. Bloomington, Ind.
- . 1971. "The Indo-Pacific Hypothesis," in Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics*, Vol. 8. The Hague: 807–71.

- . 1981. "Amerindian Comparative Notebooks," 23 vols., Mss. on file, Green Library, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.
- . 1986. "Nilo-Saharan–Dravidian Etymologies," ms.
- . 1987. *Language in the Americas*. Stanford, Calif.
- . 1990. "The American Indian Language Controversy," *Review of Archaeology* 11: 5–14.
- . To appear. *Indo-European and Its Closest Relatives: The Eurasiatic Language Family*. Stanford, Calif.
- Gregersen, Edgar A. 1972. "Kongo-Saharan," *Journal of African Languages* 11: 69–89.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1967. *Comparative Bantu*, 4 vols. Farnborough, Eng.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1986. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin.
- Illich-Svitych, V. M. 1967. "Materialy k sravnitel'nomu slovarju nostratičeskix jazыkov," *Etimologija 1965* (Moscow): 321–96.
- . 1971–84. *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazыkov*, 3 vols. Moscow.
- Johnston, Harry H. 1922. *A Comparative Study of the Bantu and Semi-Bantu Languages*, 2 vols. Oxford, Eng.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1990. "Language History in South America: What We Know and How to Know More," in Doris L. Payne, ed., *Amazonian Linguistics: Studies in Lowland South American Languages*. Austin, Tex., 13–73.
- Key, Mary R. 1968. *Comparative Tacanan Phonology*. The Hague.
- . 1987. "American Indian Wordlist," ms.
- Klimov, G. A. 1964. *Etimologičeskij slovar' kartvel'skix jazыkov*. Moscow.
- Kuiper, F. B. J. 1962. *Nahali: A Comparative Study*. Amsterdam.
- Leshchiner, D. R. 1989. "Rekonstruktsija nazvanij častej tela v jazыkax sem'i xoka," *Lingvističeskaja rekonstruktsija i drevnejšaja istorija vostoka* (Moscow) 1: 159–66.
- Lorimer, D. L. R. 1938. *The Burushaski Language*, vol. 3. Oslo.
- . 1962. *Werchikwar English Vocabulary*. Oslo.
- Mann, Stuart E. 1984–88. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Hamburg.
- Matisoff, James A. 1985. "Out on a Limb: Arm, Hand and Wing in Sino-Tibetan," in Graham Thurgood, James A. Matisoff, and David Bradley, eds., *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan Area: The State of the Art*. Canberra, 421–49.
- Matteson, Esther, ed. 1972. *Comparative Studies in Amerindian Languages*. The Hague.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna. 1989. Comments on "Models of Change in Language and Archaeology," by Colin Renfrew, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 87(2): 156–71.

- Mudrak, Oleg A. 1984. "K voprosu o vnešnix svjazjax eskimosskix jazykov," *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja isorija vostoka* (Moscow) 1: 64–68.
- . 1989. "Eskaleutian Roots," in Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*. Bochum, Germany, 112–24.
- . 1990. "Kamchukchee Roots," in Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Explorations in Language Macrofamilies*. Bochum, Germany, 90–110.
- Mukarovskij, Hans G. 1966. "Zur Stellung der Mandsprachen," *Anthropos* 61: 679–88.
- Müller, Walter W. 1975. "Beiträge zur hamito-semitischen Wortvergleichung," in James Bynon and Theodora Bynon, eds., *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 63–73.
- Newman, Stanley. 1964. "Comparison of Zuni and California Penutian," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 30: 1–13.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1990. "Linguistic Diversity and the First Settlement of the New World," *Language* 66: 475–521.
- Nikolaev, Sergei. 1991. "Sino-Caucasian Languages in America," in Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*. Bochum, Germany, 42–66.
- Nikolaev, Sergei, and Sergei Starostin. 1992. "A (North) Caucasian Etymological Dictionary," ms.
- Orel, Vladimir E., and Olga V. Stolbova. 1988. "Cushitic, Chadic, and Egyptian: Lexical Relations," paper presented at the International Conference on Language and Prehistory, University of Michigan.
- Patrie, James. 1982. *The Genetic Relationship of the Ainu Language*. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Payne, David L. 1991. "A Classification of Maipuran (Arawakan) Languages Based on Shared Lexical Retentions," in Desmond C. Derbyshire and Geoffrey K. Pullum, eds., *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, Vol. 3. Berlin, 355–499.
- Plomley, N. J. B. 1976. *A Word-List of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Languages*. Launceston, Australia.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern.
- Proulx, Paul. 1984. "Proto-Algic I: Phonological Sketch," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 50: 165–207.
- Rahder, Johannes. 1963. "Etymological Vocabulary of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Ainu, Part 5," *Orbis* 12: 45–116.
- Rédei, Károly, ed. 1986–88. *Uralisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Budapest.
- Ruhlen, Merritt. 1987a. *A Guide to the World's Languages*, Vol. 1: Classification. Stanford, Calif.

- . 1987b. “Khoisan Etymologies,” Chapter 3 of this volume.
- . 1988a. “The Origin of Language: Retrospective and Prospective,” Chapter 13 of this volume. [Russian version in *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1 (1991): 5–19.]
- . 1988b. “Na-Dene Etymologies,” Chapter 5 of this volume.
- . 1991a. “Amerind T’ANA ‘Child, Sibling,’” Chapter 9 of this volume.
- . 1991b. “The Emerging Synthesis: A View from Language,” paper presented at the International Conference on Genetics, Linguistics, and Archaeology, Florence, Italy, May 1991.
- . 1991c. “The Amerind Phylum and the Prehistory of the New World,” in Sydney M. Lamb and E. Douglas Mitchell, eds., *Sprung from Some Common Source: Investigations into the Prehistory of Languages*. Stanford, Calif., 328–50.
- . 1992. “An Overview of Genetic Classification,” in John Hawkins and Murray Gell-Mann, eds., *The Evolution of Human Languages*. Redwood City, Calif. [Also Chapter 1 of this volume.]
- Schmidt, Wilhelm. 1952. *Die Tasmanischen Sprachen*. Utrecht.
- Seto, F. 1988. *Tropical Pacific Historical and Linguistic Selections*, vol. 5. Tokyo.
- Shafer, Robert. 1965. “The Eurasial Linguistic Superfamily,” *Anthropos* 60: 445–68.
- . 1974. *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*. Wiesbaden, Germany.
- Shevoroshkin, Vitaly, ed. 1991. *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*. Bochum, Germany.
- Starostin, Sergei A. 1982. “Prajensejskaja rekonstrukcija i vneshnie svjazi enisejskix jazykov,” *Ketskij sbornik*. Leningrad, 144–237.
- . 1984. “Gipoteza o genetičeskix svjazjax sinotibetskix jazykov s enisejskimi i severnokavkazskimi jazykami,” *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija vostoka* (Moscow) 4: 19–38. [English translation in Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*, 1991. Bochum, Germany, 12–41.]
- . 1991. “Nostratic and Sino-Caucasian,” in Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Explorations in Language Macrofamilies*. Bochum, Germany, 42–66.
- Starostin, Sergei, and Sergei Nikolaev. 1975. “List of Proto-Daghestanian and Proto-Nakh-Daghestanian (ND) Nominal Roots (with Extra-Caucasian Comparisons by Aron Dolgopolsky),” ms.
- Stolbova, Olga V. 1987. “Sravnitel’no-istoričeskaja fonetika i slovar’ zapadnočadskix jazykov,” in V. J. Porxomovskij, ed., *Afrikanskoje istoričeskoje jazykoznanije*. Moscow, 30–268.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1960. “On Interhemisphere Linguistic Connections,” in Stanley Diamond, ed., *Culture in History*. New York, 894–924.

- . 1962. "Linguistic Relations across Bering Strait, *American Anthropologist* 64: 1262–91.
- Thelwall, Robin. 1981. "Lexicostatistical Subgrouping and Lexical Reconstruction of the Daju Group," in T. C. Schadeberg and M. L. Bender, eds., *Nilo-Saharan*. Dordrecht, Netherlands, 167–84.
- Toporov, V. N. 1967. "Iz etimologii enisejskix jazykov," *Etimologija* 1965 (Moscow): 311–20.
- Trombetti, Alfredo. 1905. *L'unità d'origine del linguaggio*. Bologna.
- Tucker, A. N., and M. A. Bryan. 1957. *Linguistic Survey of the Northern Bantu Borderland*, vol. 4. London.
- Walde, Alois, and Julius Pokorny. 1930. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin.
- Wurm, S. A., and B. Wilson. 1975. *English Finderlist of Reconstructions in Austronesian Languages*. Canberra.
- Yoshitake, S. 1934. *The Phonetic System of Ancient Japanese*. London.