

UC Santa Barbara

Himalayan Linguistics

Title

Burushaski and unique Slavic isoglosses

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2kz640hv>

Journal

Himalayan Linguistics, 16(2)

Author

Čašule, Ilija

Publication Date

2017

DOI

10.5070/H916235459

Copyright Information

Copyright 2017 by the author(s). This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Himalayan Linguistics

A free refereed web journal and archive devoted to the study of the
languages of the Himalayas

Himalayan Linguistics

Burushaski and unique Slavic isoglosses

Ilija Čašule

Macquarie University

ABSTRACT

Comparative historical studies have established over five hundred lexical correspondences between autochthonous Burushaski words and Indo-European as well as significant grammatical correlations. A genetic relationship has been proposed. Within these correspondences, the correlations of Burushaski with Slavic together with other branches are numerous and regular. These are not the subject of this paper. We concentrate exclusively on Burushaski isoglosses with words or meanings uniquely found in Slavic which consequently often have unclear, difficult or competing etymologies. The stratification of these isoglosses is complex. It appears that we might be dealing with various layers. In some cases, the phonetic and formal make up suggest a correlation of remote antiquity, yet in many instances it is difficult to establish a chronology, although these too could be ancient. Most of the isoglosses may involve cultural borrowing, with the direction of borrowing unclear, but a significant number (the considerable correspondences in the names of body parts, grammatical particles) could point to a closer genetic relationship.

KEYWORDS

Burushaski, unique Slavic, lexical correspondences, Indo-European, etymology

This is a contribution from *Himalayan Linguistics*, Vol. 16(2): 1–25.

ISSN 1544-7502

© 2017. All rights reserved.

This Portable Document Format (PDF) file may not be altered in any way.

Tables of contents, abstracts, and submission guidelines are available at
escholarship.org/uc/himalayanlinguistics

Burushaski and unique Slavic isoglosses

Ilija Čašule
Macquarie University

1 Introduction¹

1.1 The theory of the Indo-European genetic affiliation of Burushaski

In Čašule (1998, 2003a, 2003b, 2004, 2009a, 2009b, 2010, 2012a, 2012b, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c) and especially in Čašule (2016) and in our etymological dictionary of the inherited Indo-European lexicon of the Burushaski language (2017) we have correlated autochthonous Burushaski vocabulary with Indo-European, and in our etymological analyses we have uncovered consistent and systematic lexical, phonological and most importantly, extensive and fundamental grammatical correspondences (the latter are outlined in Čašule (2003b: 69-79) and significantly expanded in Čašule (2017)). On the basis of the analysis of over 500 etymologies, presented in the etymological dictionary (with some 1000 derivatives) and the highly significant correspondences in the grammatical and derivational system (noun stems, nominal case endings, nominal plural endings, the verbal system and prefixes, suffixes and endings, the complete non-finite verbal system, all of the adjectival suffixes, the entire system of demonstratives, personal pronouns, postpositions, adverbs), we conclude that Burushaski displays characteristics of a language which could have had an early relationship or contact in its history with the Southern (Aegean) branch of Indo-European on the one hand and with the North-Western IE group on the other (see esp. Čašule (2004) (2014b) and Chapter 2 of Čašule (2016 and 2017) on the possible correlation with Phrygian²). The Phrygian expert Neroznak (1998: x) has stated that “the lexical parallels proposed by the author [Čašule] between Burushaski and Phrygian (the most documented of the Paleobalkan languages) are highly convincing.”

For an appraisal of this evidence, see Alonso de la Fuente (2006) and especially Friedrich (2011 letter to Elena Bashir p.c.) who has accepted our analysis of the Indo-European origin of Burushaski as conclusive.

The correspondences (~70) in the core vocabulary of names of body parts and functions can be found in Čašule (2003a) and (2016).

In an extensive analysis and comparison of the Burushaski shepherd vocabulary with Indo-European, Čašule (2009a) identifies some 30 pastoral terms that are of Indo-European (non-Indo-

¹ The introduction is based on Čašule (2017: 3-4, 2014b).

² More recently the eminent Russian archaeologist L. S. Klein (2007, 2010) has published two major studies on Indo-European ancient migrations. He devotes an entire chapter (Klein 2007: 108-120) specifically to the migrations of the Phrygians/Bryges from the Balkans. On the basis of archaeological evidence, historical sources, some linguistic aspects and mythical and religious comparisons he traces their movement from Macedonia via Asia Minor, Central Asia and most importantly all the way to Swat in North-West Pakistan, very close to the Burushaski speaking areas. He argues for an early contact between Phrygian and Sanskrit.

Iranian) origin in Burushaski, one third of which show direct and specific correspondences with the ancient Balkan substratal layer of shepherd terms in Albanian, Romanian and Aromanian.

Čašule (2010) focuses specifically on the original Burushaski Indo-European (non-Indo-Iranian) vocabulary that contains the reflexes of the Indo-European gutturals. It provides a full etymological analysis of some 150 autochthonous Burushaski stems (with many derivatives) and establishes correlations with various Indo-European branches.

The extensive and full correspondence of the Burushaski kinship terms (30 terms) with Indo-European is analysed in Čašule (2014a).

The correlations between Burushaski and possible substratal and archaic Modern Macedonian and Balkan Slavic vocabulary are discussed in Čašule (2012a). Eric P. Hamp (R), in the review of this article, based on the full body of evidence, and in support of our work, states: “Burushaski is *at bottom* Indo-European [italics EH] – more correctly in relation to IE or IH, maybe (needs more proof) IB[uru]” and further conjectures: “I have wondered if Burushaski is a creolized derivative; now I ask (Čašule 2009a) is it a shepherd creole? (as in ancient Britain)”. This statement goes hand in hand with the tentative conclusion that Burushaski might be “a language that has been transformed typologically at some stage of its development through language contact.” (Čašule 2010: 70).

Čašule (2014b) presents plant names in Burushaski of Balkan and Mediterranean origin, which appear to indicate that the language has affinities with these areas. Čašule (2016) gathers together the revised versions of the studies discussed previously. Čašule (2017) is a comprehensive etymological dictionary of the inherited Indo-European lexicon in Burushaski, which presents an analysis of over 500 corresponding etymologies, 200 of which are presented for the first time (and some 1000 derivatives), including a discussion of the very close correspondences (~75) within Swadesh’s 100-word list and confirms the hypothesis of the Indo-European origin of Burushaski.

The 2012 (spring/summer) issue of *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* was dedicated to the discussion of Čašule (2012b, significantly revised in Chapter 1 of Čašule (2017), with responses by Eric Hamp, Martin Huld and John Bengtson and Václav Blažek.³ The latter two (2012: 156-160) argue the position that Burushaski belongs to Dene-Caucasian. Importantly, there is little to no overlap of our material with their comparative data.

Huld (2012: 163) is skeptical in regard to the possibility of a genetic relationship, but he accepts nonetheless the notion that Burushaski has borrowed significantly from IE, with possibilities for a closer correlation in future studies.

Hamp is very supportive of the Indo-European hypothesis and correlation, although he argues for a relationship deeper in time. He concludes that [there is] ‘some form of genetic relationship between Indo-European and Burushaski’ of deep antiquity (Hamp 2012: 155). He also notes a number of outstanding examples. In Hamp (2013) in his genetic tree of Indo-European, he notes a correlation of Burushaski with Indo-Hittite in an assured sister relationship.

Most recently Smith (2017: 17) has stated that the “proposals [for the origin of Burushaski] involving Indo-European (IE) merit serious consideration”.

³ In Blažek and Bengtson (2011) the authors attempt to provide a critical assessment of our work. Their endeavour is seriously limited because it is based on only two of our older publications and this has led to a number of misconceptions and the wrong statement that our work does not include core vocabulary and that the correspondences are irregular. They do not take into account the phonological alternations in Burushaski and they gloss over the grammatical correspondences.

1.2. Other theories on the genetic affiliation of Burushaski

While Burushaski is still considered an isolate, there have been many attempts to relate it to languages as diverse as Basque, Nubian, Dravidian, various Caucasian as well as Yeniseian languages, Sino-Tibetan and Sumerian (for a brief review, see Bashir 2000: 1-3, and more recently Smith 2017: 117-119). These endeavours have failed mostly because of unsystematic or inconsistent correspondences, incorrect internal reconstruction, excessive semantic latitude and incoherent semantic fields, root etymologising and especially lack of grammatical and derivational evidence.

Recently we should note the Dene-Caucasian hypothesis by Bengtson and Blažek (2011) (1995) (Bengtson 2008). They consider Burushaski essentially a language isolate within a macrofamily “that also includes Na-Dene, Sino-Tibetan, North Caucasian, Basque and Yeniseian languages” (Bengtson, Blažek 2011: 25). Theirs is a rather ambitious and daunting task which requires evidence not only of the existence of this macrofamily but also of coherent correspondences between each and every one of its members at all levels, and especially at the grammatical. In order to be accepted it ultimately requires approval from scholars studying all of these language groups (Čašule 2012c: 164-165). The Dene-Caucasian macrofamily itself has been rejected resoundingly already in the 90s (e.g. Campbell 1997, Goddard 1996, Sagart 1993).

Their examples appear to point tentatively to the existence of several layers of Burushaski vocabulary, of which in the final analysis Dene-Caucasian could be one and Indo-European another. Bengtson and Blažek (2011) advances and attempts to substantiate the position of the authors about the Dene-Caucasian origin of Burushaski, but their presented material is not without problems: in many cases there is big semantic latitude, the correspondences in the vowel system are difficult to determine, the core vocabulary is very limited, there are unusual Burushaski phonological changes, limited grammatical correlations and lack of consistency among subgroupings.

Tuite (1998) considered a correlation between Burushaski and Northeastern Caucasian but his hypothesis has not met with acceptance.

Most recently Holst (September 2017) has proposed a genetic relationship between Burushaski and the Kartvelian (South Caucasian) languages, which has yet to be assessed. We provide some preliminary comments only on his etymologies (pp. 105-179).

His comparison is generally on weak grounds because it puts forward only 110 etymologies (only 18 of which are verbs and only 8 adjectives) with few coherent semantic fields and too few items belonging to basic vocabulary. The small number of postulated correspondences makes it very difficult to establish viable phonological correlations.

The book also has other methodological problems. Loanwords in Burushaski are noted as autochthonous and used in the comparisons, e.g. Bur *baqtá* ‘a type of big sheep; fat-tailed sheep’ (also found in Shina and Khowar) is a loanword from Persian *bakhta* ‘a ram, a fat tail’ (Steingass 159) (pp. 122-123); Bur *-čo* ‘a man’s brother, a woman’s sister’ is a loanword from Tibetan (Purik *a-co*, Kinnauri *acho*, Sherpa *ajo*, Tibetan *jo*, all ‘elder brother’), as noted by Parkin (1987a: 327) (pp. 131-133); various Indo-Aryan loanwords are analysed as original Burushaski words although they are marked as Indo-Aryan by Berger, e.g. Bur *gamún* ‘bottom, stump’ (B 145, T 4029) (pp. 138-139); Bur *phuš* ‘free’ (B 337: T 9098) (p. 154); Bur *pár ét-* ‘to fly’ (only in Yasin, Tiffou 234, who states it is from Urdu and also rare in Yasin) (pp. 165-166); Bur *tal* ‘ceiling, roof; eyelid’ (B 416: T 5803) (pp. 149-151) etc.

There is often too much semantic latitude: e.g. Kartv ‘a wind’ : Bur reflexive suffix/stem (pp. 117-120); Kartv ‘blood’ : Bur ‘people’ (p. 138); Kartv ‘white’ : Bur ‘new’ (p. 155); Kartv ‘elbow’ : Bur ‘knee’ (p. 146); Sw ‘hand’ : Bur ‘elbow’ (pp. 136-137); Kartv ‘spread out’ : Bur ‘swell’ (p. 169); Kartv ‘to cover’ : Bur ‘cloud’ (pp. 170-171); Kartv ‘to cover’ (verb) : Bur ‘cap’ (noun only) (p. 169); Kartv ‘drink’ : Bur ‘eat’ (pp. 174-175); Kartv ‘man’ : Bur suffix (pp. 126-127); Kartv ‘heart’ : Bur ‘belly’ (pp. 128-129); Kartv ‘soul’ : Bur ‘heart’ (pp. 153-154); (only) Mi ‘hard’ : Bur ‘soft’ (pp. 156-157); there is recourse to a Kartvelian word for ‘pillow’ to compare it with Bur ‘ear’ citing analogically a marginal and rejected Slavic etymology (see Orel 2011 III: 66) (p. 109). In some examples the semantics is strained as well as the Burushaski internal reconstruction: Grg *txem-i* ‘head, parting, peak’ is compared to Bur *tham* ‘prince, king’ (B 436-437), *thámkuş*, Ys *thánuş* ‘tham’ship, kingship, sovereignty’, *tháan* ‘residence of the king, palace’ (B 435) and importantly, with *-ee-* as the stem vowel, also *théenuş* ‘king’s residence’ (B 439), most probably here also *thaná* ‘success, good reputation’ (B 437). The etymology shows that the forms with *n* are older, i.e. the change is *n* > *m*.⁴ Comparing ‘head’ to ‘king’ across languages involves an excessive amount of semantic latitude.

The phonological correspondences are not always clearly elucidated and in several instances we find single consonant monophonemic or biphonemic correlations in the comparisons which increases significantly the possibility of chance. For example: Kartv **γ-* ‘take’ : Bur **ýun-* ‘give’ (a single consonant monophonemic correspondence with a semantic equation which could be disputed, even if it is found in Indo-European) (pp. 175-176). Without any real foundation, Holst states that the Bur *-ún-* is a causative suffix.

The vowel correspondences do not always appear to be consistent (and they are on a small scale in the case of some vowels). For example, Kartvelian *i* corresponds to Burushaski *i* (p. 167), to *a* (p. 177), to *e* (p. 178); Kartvelian *e* corresponds to Bur *-ú* as in Grg *ena* ‘tongue’ : Bur **ún-* ‘tongue’ (the Bur final vowel and ending are disregarded by Holst, see the full IE analysis in example [9] in this paper) but also variously to *a* (p. 112) and to *e* (p. 108), and to *i* (p. 131). Some consonantal correlations are difficult to substantiate fully and are based on too few examples. They involve radical changes (esp. frequent consonant loss on either side). For example, Holst (2017: 108) himself states that in Kartv **per-* ‘ashes’ and Bur **phet-* ‘ashes’ the correspondence *r:t* is irregular and does not occur elsewhere.

Holst’s earnest effort to trace the modern words to a proto-form, both in the case of Burushaski and of the Kartvelian languages is to be commended although the internal reconstruction of Burushaski is notoriously difficult. His earlier book (Holst 2014) is a significant contribution to the morphonology of Burushaski and is useful for the internal reconstruction, but at first sight, his hypothesis of the correlation of Burushaski with the Kartvelian languages is problematic and underdeveloped.

⁴ These words can be compared with OIcl *þengill*, OSax *ðengel* ‘prince, master’, MLG *dege* ‘thriving, flourishing; progress’, MCymr *brenhin teithiawc* ‘rex legitimus’, Av *taxma* ‘brave, competent, energetic, heroic’, with the derived Indo-European meaning of ‘thrive, flourish’, developments according to Pokorny (IEW 1068) from IE **tenk-*² ‘to thicken, to clot, become firm, curdle’: OIr *técht* ‘coagulated’, ON *þél* ‘buttermilk’, Lith *tànkus* ‘thick, copious’, Skt *tanákti* ‘pulls together’, TochB *tánki* ‘very, fully, full’. The semantic correspondence with Germanic and Celtic is direct, specific and remarkable, both in the meaning of ‘prince, king’ and ‘success’.

2 Overview of phonological correspondences between Burushaski and Indo-European

We reproduce the summary of phonological correspondences between Indo-European (IE)⁵ and Burushaski (Bur) (Čašule 2010: 11-12):

IE *a* > Bur *a*; IE *e* > Bur *e* : Hz, Ng *i*; IE *e* (unstr.) > Bur *a*; IE *ē* > Bur *ée*; IE *o* > Bur *ó*
 IE *o* (unstr.) > Bur *a, u*; IE *ō* > Bur *óó, óo*; IE *i* > Bur *í*; IE *u* > Bur *u*
 IE *ai, ei, oi*; *eu* > Bur *a*; IE *au, ou* > Bur *u*

PIE *h₁-* > Bur *h-*; PIE *h₁e-* > Bur *he-*; PIE *h₁uer-* > Bur *har-* : *-war-* : *her-*
 PIE *h₂-* > Bur *h-*; PIE *h₂e-* > Bur *ha-*; PIE *h₂ue-* > Bur *-we-* : *-wa-*
 PIE *h₃-* > Bur *h-*; PIE *h₃e-* > *h₃a-* > Bur *ha-*; PIE *h₄-* > Bur *h-*; PIE *h₄e-* > *h₄a-* > Bur *ha-*
 PIE *h₃-* > Bur *h-*; PIE *h₃e-* > *h₃o-* > Bur *ho-*; PIE *h_x-* > Bur *h-*; PIE *h_{1/2}i* > Bur *i-*

IE *l, m, n, r* > Bur *l, m, n, r*; IE *u* > Bur *-w/-u*; IE *u-* > Bur *b-*, also *m-*; IE *j* > Bur *y/i*
 IE *ṃ* > Bur *-um, -am*; IE *ṇ* > Bur *-un, -an*; IE *ṛ* > Bur *-ur, -ar*; IE *ḷ* > Bur *-ul, -al*

IE *p* > Bur *p, ph*, also *b-*; IE *b* > Bur *b*, also *m* (rare); IE *bh* > Bur *b*, also *m* (rare)
 IE *t* > Bur *t* : *th* (rare) : *ṭ*, and *d-*; IE *d* > Bur *d*; IE *dh-* > Bur *d-*; IE *vdhV* > Bur *-t-, -ṭ-*
 IE *k* > Bur *k* : *kh, k* : *q*; IE *k^w* > Bur *k*; IE *k̂* > Bur *k* : *kh, k* : *q*
 IE *g* > Bur *ḡ*; IE *gh* > Bur *g*; IE *g^w* > Bur *ḡ*; IE *g^wh* > Bur *ḡ*; IE *ḡ* > Bur *g, ḡ*; IE *ḡh-* > Bur *g, ḡ*
 IE *s* > Bur *s* or *s* : *ś, śh*; IE *ks* > Bur *ś*

3 Burushaski and unique Slavic isoglosses

Within the Indo-European-Burushaski correspondences, Burushaski continues in many cases old and widespread IE stems, but also displays a marked affinity with the so-called North-

⁵ Abbreviations of languages and dialects in this paper are as follows: *Alb* - Albanian, *Arm* - Armenian, *Av* - Avestan, *Balt* - Baltic, *Blg* - Bulgarian, *Blt-Sl* - Balto-Slavic, *Bur* - Burushaski, *Byruss* - Byelorussian, *Celt* - Celtic, *Croat* - Croatian, *Cymr* - Cymric, *Cz* - Czech, *Dan* - Danish, *Eng* - English, *Gaul* - Gaulic, *Gk* - Greek, *Goth* - Gothic, *Grg* - Georgian, *Grm* - German, *Grmc* - Germanic, *H* - Hindi, *Hitt* - Hittite, *Hz* - Hunza dialect of Burushaski, *IA* - Indo-Aryan, *IE* - Indo-European, *Ind* - Indian, *Ir* - Irish, *Irn* - Iranian, *Itl* - Italic, *Kartv* - Kartvelian, *Khw* - Khovar, *Ksh* - Kashmiri, *Lat* - Latin, *Lett* - Lettish, *Lith* - Lithuanian, *LSorb* - Lower Sorbian, *Mcd* - Macedonian, *MCymr* - Middle Cymric, *MEng* - Middle English, *MGk* - Modern Greek, *MHG* - Middle High German, *Mi* - Mingrelian, *MIr* - Middle Irish, *MLG* - Middle Low German, *MWels* - Middle Welsh, *Ng* - Nager dialect of Burushaski, *NH* - Nasiruddin Hunzai, Berger's Burushaski informant, *NPers* - New Persian, *NWIE* - North-Western Indo-European, *OCbSl* - Old Church Slavonic, *OEng* - Old English, *OHG* - Old High German, *OIcl* - Old Icelandic, *OInd* - Old Indian, *OIr* - Old Irish, *ON* - Old Norse, *OPers* - Old Persian, *OPl* - Old Polish, *OPruss* - Old Prussian, *OSax* - Old Saxon, *OSl* - Old Slavic, *Osset* - Ossetian, *OWels* - Old Welsh, *Panj* - Panjābī, *Pers* - Persian, *PGrmc* - Proto-Germanic, *Phrg* - Phrygian, *PIE* - Proto-Indo-European, *Pk* - Prakrit, *Pl* - Polish, *PSl* - Proto-Slavic, *Rom* - Romanian, *Russ* - Russian, *RussCbSl* - Russian Church Slavonic, *Sb* - Shina, *Si* - Sinhalese, *Skt* - Sanskrit, *Sl* - Slavic, *Slk* - Slovak, *Slv* - Slovenian, *Srb* - Serbian, *SrbCbSl* - Serbian Church Slavonic, *SSl* - South Slavic, *Sw* - Swan, *Thrac* - Thracian, *Tib* - Tibetan, *TochA* - Tocharian A, *TochB* - Tocharian B, *U* - Urdu, *Ukr* - Ukrainian, *USorb* - Upper Sorbian, *VLat* - Vulgar Latin, *Wels* - Welsh, *Ys* - Yasin dialect of Burushaski.

Western IE languages: Slavic, Baltic, Thracian, Albanian, Germanic, Tocharian, Phrygian, Italic and Celtic (grouping by Hamp 1990, q. in Mallory-Adams 2006: 74). Burushaski has the largest number of isoglosses with North-Western IE, e.g. this is evident in the close to 70 anatomical terms where there are many important correspondences with Slavic (in particular), Baltic, Germanic, Italic (Latin) and Celtic yet also with Greek (for a full discussion of the stratification of these terms see Čašule 2003a: 56-59). In the vocabulary (141 stems) involving reflexes of Indo-European gutturals, there are 30 stems where Burushaski aligns itself with NWIE (Čašule 2010). This pattern dominates throughout the correspondences. Burushaski has many isoglosses with the Phrygian language (Chapter 2 of Čašule 2017) in words denoting ritual and burial but also in common vocabulary (and in many (30) personal names). The scarce attestation of Phrygian makes these numerous correspondences all the more important.

The correspondences of Burushaski with Slavic are more than several hundred, in many cases also including Baltic, but also with attestations throughout Indo-European.

These general correlations are not the subject of this article. It needs to be stressed that we are only analysing the etymologies where the Slavic developments are unique within Indo-European and usually have difficult, multiple, unclear or no etymological interpretations and do not have cognates elsewhere.

3.1 *Names of anatomical parts*

There is a significantly large number of correspondences between Burushaski⁶ and unique Slavic developments in the semantic field of names of body parts, with no semantic latitude. This is intriguing as it implies a close contact between the two entities. The correlations are in the names for ‘foot’, ‘neck’, ‘vertex, centre line of head’, ‘arm’, ‘bone of ankle’, ‘tongue’ (formally) and ‘hand’ (shared with Baltic), and ‘thumb’ (shared with Latin).

[‘foot’]

⁶ For easier reference, we reproduce Berger’s table of the phonological system of Hz Ng Burushaski, which is essentially valid for the Ys dialect as well. Yasin Burushaski does not have the phoneme *çh* – for Ys Burushaski, see Tiffou-Pesot (1989: 7-9):

	<i>a</i>					<i>ʂ</i>	<i>ʂ́</i>	<i>s</i>	
<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>qh</i>	<i>kh</i>	<i>ʈh</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>çh</i>	<i>čh</i>	<i>ch</i>	<i>ph</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>q</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>ʈ</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>ç</i>	<i>č</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>p</i>
		<i>ḡ</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>ḏ</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>b</i>
			<i>ṅ</i>		<i>n</i>				<i>m</i>
<i>y</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>r</i>						

Table 1. Phonological system of Burushaski (Berger 1998 I: 13)

Notes: 1. All five vowels can be phonetically long, but for phonological and prosodical reasons Berger marks them as double (two component) vowels, in order to mark the position of the stress. This notation system was developed by Buddruss and Berger to indicate the pitch contours, which they consider as a result of first- or second-mora stress (Bashir p.c.). 2. Retroflex consonants are marked with an underdot. 3. *w* and *y* are allophones of *u* and *i*. 4. *č* = *ts* in Lorimer and *c* in Tiffou-Pesot (1989). 5. *ḡ* = *ɣ* in Lorimer and Tiffou-Pesot (1989). It is a voiced fricative velar /ɣ/. 6. *ṅ* = [ŋ] or [ŋk] [nk]. 7. The posterior *q* is similar to the Arabic *qāf*. (Berger I: 2.26). 8. The aspirated posterior *qh* is found only in Hz Ng. In Yasin to the latter corresponds a voiceless velar fricative *x*, similar to the German *ch*, as in *Bach*. 9. *y* is a retroflex, articulated somewhere between a “*r* grasséeyé and a *yj* or rather a fricative *r* with the tongue in a retroflex position” (Morgenstierne 1945: 68-9). 10. A hyphen before a word indicates that it is used only with the pronominal prefixes.

[1] Bur *-hútis* (Ys) (Tiffou 2014: 148), Hz Ng *-út* and *-útis* ‘foot, lower leg’ (B 459, 460) and with the common Bur *u : o* alternation also Bur *hóti* ‘artificial penis’ (B 203). Note the collective *-út-riin* ‘feet/legs and hands’ (~‘lower and upper limbs’). Most likely from IE **h₁óuh_xdh-* < **h₁eu_xdh-* ‘to swell (with fluid)’ (M-A 82) (in IEW 347: **ēudh-*, **ōudh-*, **ūdh-*) (**hou-* > *u*, **-dh-* > *-t-*), from which stem Jakobson (1959: 273, also in Vasmer IV: 148) derives PS1 **udь* ‘limb, member’, OChSl *udь*, and throughout Slavic e.g. Srb, Croat *úd* (Croat also *udo*), Mcd *ud*, Sln *ud*, Cz and Slk *úd*, Russ *ud* ‘same’, Blg *ud* ‘extremity; leg; membrum virile’, Pl *udo* ‘thigh’ (G 649, 671). Correlated here by Jakobson are also Russ *udit* ‘ripen (of grain); get filled with fluid; bloat, bulge, swell’ and PS1 **vyme* (< IE **ūdh-men-*) ‘udder’ (related to OInd *údhā* ‘udder’, OEng *ūder* ‘udder’, Lith *pa-údrė* ‘abdomen’, Lat *ūber* ‘1. udder, teat, (lactating) breast, 2. richness, fullness, fruitful, copious, rich’, Gk *oúthar* ‘udder’ (M-A 82). The Burushaski-Slavic correspondence is a direct one. The Bur suffix *-is* continues the IE nominative sg. ending **-is*.

Another etymological interpretation derives the Slavic words from IE **au-* > **u-* ‘further, from that side’ and the zero-grade of **dhə-* ‘put, make’ (Holub-Kopečný 400) (G 649). In both interpretations, the link between Burushaski and the unique Slavic word is direct. In Burushaski IE *-dh-* > *-t-*, *-t-*.

It is most probable that the Bur Ys verb *-hutén-*, Ng *-huṭin-*, Hz *-uṭin-* [note the alternation *-t-*: *-t-*] ‘to fill with (mass noun objects), to pour into’ (L 56) (B 459) (Will 119) is related (in the sense of ‘swell, fill with liquid’). Tiffou (2014: 148) gives also Ys *du-húten-* ‘to be accumulated; to be elevated; (of a plane) to take off’ (*-en-*, *-in-* is a verbal suffix, see Čašule 2017: 58). The correlation of these Burushaski verbs with the Russian verb *udit* is remarkable. This would be a correspondence from remote antiquity.

[‘neck’]

[2] Bur *-š* (in L 30: *-aš*) ‘1. neck, nape of neck, external throat; 2. collar (of coat, shirt, choga); 3. col, neck of hill; 4. pommel (of saddle)’ (L 30) (B 402). Lorimer and Berger also point to a special and unique form of this word: *-aši* ‘on the neck’, also *-ši* (B 402).⁷

We find a match with PS1 **šija* ‘neck’, found throughout Slavic: Srb, Croat *šija*, Mcd *šija*, Sln *šija*, Blg *šija*, Cz *šije*, USorb *šija*, LSorb *šyja*, Pl *szyja*, Ukr, Byruss *šyja*, Russ *šéja* ‘same’ and generally interpreted (but not with full certainty) as having meant initially ‘collar’ and thus connected with the verb **šiti* ‘to sew’ (Vasmer IV: 434-435) (Gluhak 606). Vasmer, however, also notes Srb *ošijati* ‘to turn over, turn back’ which has led some linguists to seek a link with Lat *sinus* ‘bend, fold, hollow’, Alb *gji, gjiri* ‘breast’, or with Alb *shj* ‘nape of neck’ (the latter rejected by Vasmer). Miklosich (apud Buck 233) connected the Slavic words with Skt *si-*, Lith *sieti*, Lett *siet* ‘bind’, OChSl *setь* ‘cord’, Lith *sija* ‘joist’, noting that in Slavic we would have a form with *š* for *s*, from a parallel form with *šj-*. Barić (1919: I, 96) derived the Albanian *shi* from an IE **ksī(n)j-*. The Burushaski word in its special locative form both semantically and phonetically parallels Slavic. Note also the first component *šeéi-* in Bur *šeéipaš* ‘band tied around the head’ (B 407) where the second component is *-paš* < *bašá* ‘turban’ < Skt *praśna* ‘same’ (via Sh), i.e. ‘turban folded around the head’, an example that supports Vasmer’s conjecture and clarifies the vowel correspondence with Slavic, as well as the semantic correlations.

⁷ The Nager dialect has an additional word for ‘neck’, also of IE origin: *-qhín* pl. ‘breastbone (of humans and animals)’, Ng also ‘neck (of humans)’ (B 358). It is a plural form, as in OInd and Arm below. Compare with IE **augh-*, **ugh-* ‘nape’, Gk *aukhén, -énos* m. ‘back of the neck, neck; strait’ (< **augh-en-*), OInd *uṣṇihā* ‘nape’ (only pl.), Arm *awj* ‘throat’, *awjik* pl. ‘collar’, Russ *vjazь* ‘nape’ (IEW 87). The IE reconstruction is different in M-A2 (176) from **h_aenǵh(w)ēn-* ‘neck’, and this from **h_aenǵh-* ‘narrow’.

Once again there is a direct match and the Slavic word does not have an agreed upon etymological interpretation (it is not included in Derksen 2008). (Amended entry from Časule 2016: 77-78.)

[‘vertex, centre line of head’]

[3] Bur *-thán* ‘top, tip, point; vertex, centre line of head; parting line of hair’ also *-thánas*, Ys: *-thánes* ‘centre line of top of head, top of mountain’ (L 344) (B 437). Could be compared to PS1 **tēmę* ‘vertex’ (OChSl *těme*, Srb *teme*, Croat *tjeme*, Mcd *teme*, Blg *teme*, Sln *teme*, Cz *témě*, Slk *temä*, LSorb *tyme*, Pl *ciemie*, Russ *temja*, Ukr *tim’ja*) a Proto-Slavic base without correspondences in the other Indo-European languages, also used in the sense of ‘top of mountain’ and derived from **tēn-men* (Bernštejn 1974: 189). Some authors point to a parallel with Ossetian *tenka* ‘vertex, top of head’, derived jointly with Slavic from IE **tem-* ‘to cut’ (also PS1 **teti*, **tbn̄* ‘hit’, OChSl *teti* ‘to cut’, Russ *tjat’*, *tnu-* ‘hit, pound’ (in ORuss also ‘cut, kill’) (G 629) (Derksen 2008: 492), e.g. Gk *témnō* ‘I cut, separate’ (IEW 1062-1063), a stem also found in Bur *tan-* ‘pound, crush s-thing’ (L 251, 344) (B 419). There are over 50 Burushaski examples with an alternation *t:th* (Čašule 2017: 6-7). The ending *-as/-es* continues the IE nominative singular in **-s*. This is a direct and full correspondence with a difficult Slavic etymology, albeit with different suffixes. (Amended entry from Čašule 2016: 78.)

[‘arm’]

[4] Bur *-śák* ‘arm, forearm; upper part of leg of animal, thigh of animal’ (Shina *śáako*) (B 389) (L 320), also (*gále*) *isákičii* ‘one of the ropes of a rope bridge’ (B 389). We should note tentatively further Ys *śak -t-* ‘to open’, *guren śak -t-* ‘open your hand’ (LYs 215), in Berger (BYs 179): *śaq -i-* ‘to spread, open (hand)’, which are close in meaning. There is also a construction *śāq ét-* ‘to stroke, rub down, rub with hand, wipe’ (L 319).

We find a remarkable direct correspondence with South Slavic: Srb, Croat and Mcd *šaka* ‘palm of hand, fist, hand’ (also dial. *šakati* ‘catch with hand’) (Skok II: 378), found with a more limited distribution also in Sln and Blg. The etymology of this word has not been established, which may mean it is of Balkan substratal origin. Gluhak (602) suggests a possible derivation from **kséka* < **skék-ā*.

Within IE we can perhaps relate the words in this Bur set and the Balkan South Slavic word to IE **k̑ā/k(h)ā*, **k̑ak(h)ā* ‘branch that forks at the end; plough’ (IEW 523) : Lith *šakà* ‘branch’, Lett *šākas* ‘pitchfork’, OInd *śākhā* ‘branch’, NPers *šax* ‘branch’, Arm *çax* ‘branch’, PS1 **soxa* ‘plough’ (G 570). M-A (80) give **k̑oh₁kōh₂* and explain the NPers and Arm forms from **k̑soh₁kōh₂*. They derive it from **k̑éh₁kom* ‘edible greens’, a PIE stem perhaps also represented in Burushaski *šiqá* ‘grass, foliage, small plant’ (B 408) (L 329-330) and *šiqám* Ys *išqám* ‘green, blue; gray (of horse)’ (L 330) (B 408), and indicate that the original stem refers to animal food in the west, but human food in the east. In this example, as is generally the case, the Burushaski word goes with the IE west as it denotes animal food. This complete derivational correspondence strengthens significantly this etymology. A correlation with Old Indian cannot be excluded entirely, but it would entail a semantic shift.

Note further in the same semantic context the Bur word *śaq* ‘wicker-work, wicker, wicker tray’, Ng ‘framework of a raft consisting of a lattice or trellis of poles and sticks’ (in Sh *śakéelo*, Balti *śaq*) (L 323) (B 391).

This IE stem has also a nasalised variant **k̑ank-* (Skok, Ibid.): OInd *śankuh* ‘sharp stick, wedge’, Cymr *cainc* ‘branch’ etc. which is correlated with the stem **k̑enk-* ‘to hang’. In this respect, we have in Bur *-śán* ‘limb, member (body part)’, also *-út -śán* ‘feet and limbs, all parts of the body’ – compare with the syntagm *-út -riin* ‘feet and hands’, which implies the meaning of ‘arm, hand’ for *-śán*, i.e. lower (*-út*) and upper (*-śán*) limbs.

It may be that not all the cited Bur words belong to this comparison, but the close semantic parallelism is remarkable: Bur ‘arm’ [for the relationship ‘arm’ – ‘branch’, e.g. Grm *Baumarm* ‘branch’ (liter. ‘arm of tree’)] vs SSl ‘hand’; Bur ‘wicker, poles, sticks’ vs IE ‘branch’; Bur ‘to spread, open’ vs IE ‘branch that forks at the end’. The semantics and the presence in Burushaski of both a nasalised and non-nasalised form of the IE stem argue for an IE origin, with a more specific development shared with Balkan Slavic (from the substratum?). The initial *ś-* is due to a development as in NPer and Arm (from *ks* or *ks* – see the examples in Čašule 2017, Chapter 1, under 1.5.8.) i.e. we could have had in Bur **ksah₁kōh*, whereby *ks-* > *ś-* which possibly might have been the case with the Paleobalkan substratum from where the word *šaka* may have entered the South Slavic languages.

This is an even more specific and localised correspondence, this time between Burushaski and South Slavic.⁸ Not found in Derksen (2008). (Entry from Čašule 2016: 81-82.)

[‘projecting bone of ankle’]

[5] Bur *geéltin*, Ng *gáiltin*, *gáitin* ‘the projecting bone of the ankle’ (L 165) (B 151). Lorimer gives a segmentation *geel-tin*, where *tin* ‘bone’, but Berger notes ? + *-lín* ‘bone’. We propose a third alternative, which may be able to account both for Lorimer’s and Berger’s solutions: **geel-Itin*. The first component can be related to IE **gel-* ‘compress, roundness’, e.g. Gk *gagglion* ‘swelling’, Lat *galla* ‘cone, gall-nut’, OInd *gulikā* ‘ball, pearl’ and semantically in particular with PSI **gleznъ / *glezna / *glezno* ‘ankle, joint’, found throughout Slavic : e.g. Srb and Croat *gležanj* ‘ankle’, Mcd *glezen*, Cz *hlezen*, Russ *glēzna*, Ukr *hlēzen*, USorb *glozonk* ‘same’ and derived from IE **gel-* > **gleĝ-* > **gle-ĝ-n*. From IE **gleĝ-* note also OIcl *klakr* ‘lump, blot’, Swed (dial.) *klakk* ‘lump, elevation in field; sole of shoe’, MHG *klac* ‘blot’, OEng *clyccan* ‘clutch’, MEng *clutch* (G 230-1). We cannot exclude the possibility that the original Bur word could have had the *-ĝ* extension, i.e. a development **gelg-tin*. In fact, the *-ee-* in Burushaski may be a compensatory lengthening after the consonant loss. The *-ee-* vocalism in Bur *geéltin* indicates an independent development from IE, also in relation to OInd *gulu* ‘wrist, ankle’ (< ‘swelling’), found in Sh Gilgit *gūlūcu* ‘ankle’, Sh Gurešī *gūlūcu* ‘wrist’, Ksh *gulu* ‘forearm above wrist’ (T 4214). If *gáiltin* is the primary form, then **gelg-* > **gēl-* > **gil-* > **gail-* (?). Phonetically and formally the two entities correspond well, with an Old Indian possibility. (Entry from Čašule 2016: 87-88.)

[‘stomach’ > ‘voracious’]

[6] Bur *tarabát*, Ng *tarabáq* ‘voracious’ (B 421). There is an interesting direct correspondence with the unique Russ *trebúx* ‘a voracious person’ from PSI **tr̥buxъ* ‘stomach, abdomen’ (with this latter meaning found throughout Slavic), where, as Gluhak (G 637) indicates, the root is **tr̥bb-* and it is with an unclear etymology (not found in Derksen 2008). Orel (IV: 97) also notes Srb and Croat *trbonja* ‘fat man’. In this sense, perhaps Ys *tarbát* ‘makúti [a sweet] prepared with fat’ (Tiffou 2014: 301) could be of relevance.

The following isogloss is uniquely Baltic and Slavic within Indo-European and is relevant for the other correspondences.

[‘hand’]

[7] Bur *-rén*, pl. *--réin*, *réinčin* Ys, Hz Ng *-ritin*, pl. *-ritinčin* ‘hand’ (L 304) (B 364), also *uríinčinćum uríinčinatar* ‘honour together, beat up together’ (‘gemeinsam ehren, gemeinsam

⁸ The unique correlations between Burushaski and South Slavic are analysed in detail in Čašule (2012a). Of these [22], [24] and [25] are reiterated in this paper.

verprügeln') (B 364). This idiomatic expression has the same semantic development as in Baltic below, of 'together' ('gather; assembly'). Burushaski has the underlying verb *du-úr-* 'to turn, (of mill) to work, to grind' (B 456), also *-wáre* 'around' (B 465).

Compare with IE **uer-k-* and nasalised IE **urenk-* 'to turn, wind, bend' > **uronkā-* < IE **uer-*₃ 'turn', esp. PSI **rōka* 'hand', OChSl *rōka*, Blg *rōka*, Srb, Croat *ruka*, Sln *roka*, Cz, Slk, Sorb *ruka*, Pl *ręka*, Russ *ruka*, Ukr, Byruss *ruka*, Mcd *raka*, (in all of Slavic) 'hand' and Lith *rankà*, Lett *riņoka*, OPruss *rancko*, all: 'hand', correlated with Lith *renkù*, *riņkti* 'gather', *surinkimas* 'assembly'. The Latin (late) *branca* 'paw' (> Rom *brincă* 'hand, paw', Itl *branca* 'claw, paw') is considered a loanword from Grmc **uranyō*. [Without the nasal: OIcl *vrā* 'angle, corner', OIr *ferc* 'hump, hunch', Cymr *cywarch* 'rope'.] (IEW 1155) (G 533-534).

Bernštejn (1961, Introduction) suggested that the Slavic word is a loanword from Baltic.

Consider especially Ys *érinkiš* 'round wicker braid (ring) allowing to place pots with convex bottom' (Tiffou 2014: 98) (BYs 143) which fits formally and also semantically ('round') with the IE stem above and confirms the proposed etymological interpretation. The *e-* could be the pronominal prefix.

The Hz Ng form *-riin* could derive from a lengthened grade **urēnk-* as in the Lithuanian example above.

The initial **u-* would have been lost to avoid confusion with the pronominal prefix for the 3. p. pl *u'-, ú-*. Consider in this regard Bur Hz Ng *-úlgis* 'nest': Ys *lkiš* (B 454). Lorimer (LYs 11-12) gives for Yasin also *-úlkis* and in fact states that the *-u* could be the Ys 3 p. sg. and 3 p. pl. pron. pref. forms (except 3 p. sg. hf). Note also Ys *óšum* 'waist-cloth, waist-belt' (without the pron. prefix), which has a pron. prefixed form *-štin* 'back of waist, loins, small of back' (LYs 11-12) (B 308)⁹. Also *ulán-* Ng : Ys *lán-* 'to be able, can' (B 454)¹⁰. (Entry from Čašule 2017: 217-218.)

In the following example the correspondence includes Latin.

['thumb']

[8] Bur *phulúte -miš* 'thumb' (*-miš* 'finger') (BYs 174) (LYs *phaloť miš*). From IE **polo-*, **polō-* 'swollen, thick, big' > 'thumb', e.g. Lat *pollex* 'thumb, big toe', OChSl *palъcbъ* 'thumb' (IEW 840-841) (Mcd, Sln and Blg *palec*, Srb and Croat *palac*, Cz and Slk *palec* all: 'thumb' and Pl *palec*, Russ *palec*, Sorb *palc*, Ukr *palec* 'finger'), with a different suffix (G 464-465) (*o:u* alternation in Bur).

In the Indo-European word for 'tongue' the Burushaski development parallels that of Slavic and Baltic, with the loss of initial *d-*, yet significantly Burushaski retains the Indo-European guttural which goes back to remote antiquity.

['tongue']

[9] Bur *-yúnus* Ys, in Hz Ng *-úmus* 'tongue', Hay "*unas*" (according to Berger for **u-úmus*) (L 54) (B 455-456). The Ys form *-yúngus* (Zarubin (1927: 341) and in L I, XXX, in BYs 187 and Tiffou 2014: 337: *-yúnus*, *-yúunus* also *-úmus*) would have to be considered older (the change goes in the

⁹ Of Indo-European origin: We relate it to IE **yōs-* 'to gird, to belt', e.g. PSI **pojasъ* 'belt, waist', Alb *ngjesh* 'to gird, to belt', Av *yāh* 'belt', or more precisely to IE derivations from **yōs-to-s*, e.g. Gk *zōstós* 'belted', Lith *júostas* 'belted' (G 492), also OInd *yāsa* 'girdle' (T 10478).

¹⁰ Also of IE origin: Bur *ulán-* Ng and *ilán-*, *-lai-*, Ys *lán-*, neg. *ául-* 'to be able, can' (B 454). Compare with IE **uel-*², **ulei-*, **ulē(i)-* 'to wish, to choose' (in M-A2 341: **uel(h₂)-*).

direction $n > m$). Holst (2014: 104) considers the $-y-$ in the Yasin form secondary, i.e. historically from the pronominal prefix $i-$.

It could be derived from IE $*(d)ṅghū-$ ‘tongue’ (Eric Hamp’s reconstruction) with initial $d-$ absent as in Slavic and Baltic e.g. OChSl *językъ* ‘language, people’ [found throughout Slavic: Mcd *jazik*, Srb, Sln and Croat *jezik*, Blg *ezik*, Russ, Byruss, Ukr *jazyk*, Pl *język*, Cz, Slk, USorb *jazyk*, all ‘tongue, language’], OPruss *insuwis*, OLat *dingua* (Lat *lingua*), Toch A *kāntu*, OInd *juhū*, *jihvā*, all: ‘tongue’ (IEW 223). The Bur ending $-us$ corresponds with the IE nominative sg. ending $*-us$. (Entry from Čašule 2016: 87-88.)

3.2 Objects

In counterdistinction to the correspondences in anatomical parts, the isoglosses referring to objects might be a result of borrowing, although the direction is unclear.

[10] Bur *gaŋú* ‘cloth, clothing, woman's shirt; pl. (ordinary word for) clothes’, in Ys ‘cotton trousers’ (LYs 404) (B 151) parallels directly PS1 **gatji* ‘clothes, trousers’, e.g. OS1 *gaštę* ‘trousers’, RussChSl *gaščī* ‘clothes’, *gači* ‘trousers’, Ukr *hači* ‘pants’, OPl *gace* orig. meaning ‘long cloth pants’, Slk *gate* ‘underpants’, Blg *gašti* ‘underpants, pants’, Mcd *gak'i* ‘underpants, long underpants, (rare) pants’. The Slavic words are derived from IE $*g^wa-$ ‘go’ with an enlargement $-t-$ (ESSJ VI: 106-108) (G 224).

Significantly, there is also Bur *gaŋál* ‘go on foot, walk’, also *kaŋál* (L 164) (B 150), and possibly here also Ng, Ys *go*, Hz Ng *gon* ‘go!, get along!, go ahead!, come on!’ (Will 57) (L 170, also *gun*) (B 157) which is correlatable with IE $*g^wa-$, $*g^wem-$ ‘to go, come, step’ (< $*g^wə-to-lo$), OInd *jī-ga-ti* ‘he goes’, Alb *ngā* ‘I run’ (< $*ga-njō$), Lith dial. *góti* ‘to go’, Arm *kam* ‘I stand’, OEng *cuman* ‘to come’, Gk *banein* ‘to go, walk, step’, *basis* ‘a stepping, tread; base’ (< $*g^wə-ti-$, suffixed zero-grade form of $*g^wā-$), *-batos* (< $*g^wə-to-$) ‘going’, *bádos* ‘way’ (IEW 463) (Wat 33).

Another possibility, esp. for Ys *go* and Hz Ng *gon* is PIE $*g^hē-$ / $*g^hō-$ ‘to go, to leave, to depart; to abandon, forsake’ (Bomhard II: 328), in M-A (349) $*g^heh_1-$ ‘to leave’ : Skt *já-hā-ti* ‘to leave, to abandon, to desert, to quit’, Av *za-zā-mi* ‘to release’, Dan *gaa* ‘to go’, Grm *gehen* ‘to go’ (also found in Gk, Lat and widely in Grmc).

The correspondence of Burushaski with Slavic is without any semantic latitude and the phonetics points to a very old correlation.

[11] Bur *phatasūndal* = *pfatasūndal* ‘plate, vessel (for food)’ (only in L 288). The first component of this compound is a loanword from Indo-Aryan (from *patra* ‘drinking vessel, dish’) (T 454). Lorimer comments that the second component $-sūndal$ or $-sūmdal$ could be an expletive. It is possible to relate the second part of the compound within IE to PSlavic $*s_1s_2od_1b$, $*s_2od_1b$, $*po-s_2o-da$ ‘plate, vessel’ (Russ *sosud* ‘plate’, Mcd *sad* ‘vessel, plate’, Pl *sąd* ‘same’, Srb, Croat *sud*, Sln *sód*, Blg *sъd*, Cz and Slk *sud*, Ukr *sudina* ‘same’, found throughout Slavic), usually derived from IE $*som-$ ‘one’ + $*dhe-$ ‘to put’ (G 199), e.g. OInd *samdhis*, *samdha* ‘agreement, connection, union’. The Slavic semantic development, shared with Burushaski, is unique in Indo-European. Derksen (2008: 463) does not register the meaning of ‘plate’. $-VI$ is a Bur suffix (see [15] and footnote 11). Related to [23]. (Amended entry from Čašule 2017: 208.)

[12] Bur *kabulék* ‘roof beams’ (B 239, q. K 120), with almost identical formal and semantic development as in PS1 $*kobyľka$ ‘pole for carrying loads’, ‘beam’ (and related meanings) (Mcd *kobilka*, Blg *kobilka*, Cz *kobyľka*, Pl *kobyľka*, ORuss, Russ *kobyľka*, Byruss dial. *kobyľka*, Ukr dial.

kobilka (derived from **kobyła* ‘mare’, with the suffix *-bka*) (ESSJ X: 100) or PSI **kobylica* ‘a pole for carrying loads on the shoulder’, ‘beam of scales’, ‘trestle’, ‘horse-tree’, ‘saw-horse’, ‘wisp’, and esp. ‘scaffolding, supporting beams’, widely represented in Slavic: OChSl *kobylica*, Blg *kobilica*, Mcd *kobilica*, Srb and Croat *kobilica*, Sln *kobilica*, Cz *kobilice*, Pl *kobylica*, Russ *kobylica*, Ukr *kobilicja*, Byruss *kabylica* (derived from **kobyła* ‘mare’ with the suffix *-ica* < **-ika*) (ESSJ X: 98). Burushaski also has *kabút* ‘white horse’ (Tiffou 2014: 167). This could be a very old correspondence, as Slavic *y* corresponds with Burushaski *u*, and Sl *o* with Bur *a*.

Both Slavic and Burushaski words are from IE **kab-*, **kabula-* ‘horse’, Thrac **kabūlā*, Phrg *kubela* ‘horse’ > Gk *kabállēs* ‘working horse’, according to Gluhak (326) from Thrac > OChSl *kobyła* ‘mare’, found throughout Slavic: Mcd *kobila*, Blg *kobila*, Slk and Cz *kobyła*, LSorb *kobyła*, Srb and Croat *kobila*, Byruss *kabýla*, Russ *kobýla*, all ‘mare’ and > Lat *caballus* ‘gelding, work horse, horse’ and late Lat *cabō* in glosses ‘caballus, caballus magnus, equus castratus’, Gk Hesychius *kábēlos* ‘castrated’ (ESSJ X: 93-98) (Buck 168 considers the Indo-European words to be certainly loanwords of “ethnic origin” (Anatolian or Balkan), probably with an original meaning of ‘gelding’).

[13] Bur Ys *balkás*, LYs: *bilkís* (Tiffou 2014: 31), Hz Ng *birkís*, pl. *bilkir-an* (Berger 2008: 32) (Sh *birkís*, *bilkís*) ‘treasure’ (B 55). Can be compared with PSI **bolgo*, OChSl *blago* ‘bonum, bona; benignus, lenis, suavis; beatus’ (Skok I: 166-8), found throughout Slavic: Russ dial. *bólogo* adv. ‘well, good’, ORuss *bologo* ‘(the) good’, Cz *blaho* ‘bliss, happiness’, Pl *blago* ‘good, happiness’. Consider especially the unique semantic development in South Slavic *blago* ‘treasure’ (Mcd *blago* ‘treasure’, Croatian and Serbian *blago* ‘wealth, money, cattle’, Sln *blago* ‘treasure, cattle, load’, Blg *blago* ‘good, property, wealth’), borrowed into Romanian as *blagă* ‘wealth, treasure’. The origin and the etymological links of this archaic Slavic word have not been established (Derksen 51, states that it is an unclear etymology), although some linguists consider it related to Av *bərəjayeiti* ‘salute, pay respect’, *bərəg* ‘ritual, custom’ and Skt *bhārgah* ‘light’ (ESSJ II: 173) from IE **bhelg-* ‘to shine’ (G 133). In Burushaski *e* > *a* in unstressed position, and *-g-* > *-k-* by assimilation with the adjective forming suffix *-kiš*: **bhelg-* + *-kiš* = **balkiš* and by vowel assimilation with the first syllable: *balkás* or with the second syllable: *bilkís* and an assimilative *l* > *r* change in Hz Ng. Berger (2008: 58) considers the forms with *-l-* as a result of dissimilation and segments the word: **birkir-š*. The second *-r-* could be a continuant of the IE adjectival suffix *-rós*.

[14] Bur *pelét* pl. *pelétišu* (Ys) ‘shoe’ (BYs 169) (Tiffou 2014: 236). We consider the plural suffix to be composite: *-iś-u* (Hz Ng *-iś-o*) where the first component would be a remnant of the nom. sg. suffix *-is* and the second the plural marker (for a discussion of the Bur plural endings, see Čašule 2016: 48-50). Comparison is possible with derivations from IE **pleth₂es*, an abstract noun from IE **pl₁th₂ú-* or **pl₁oth₂us* ‘broad, wide’ (< **pleth₂-* ‘spread’), PSI **plesno*, **plesna*, esp. OChSl *plesna* (< **plesnā*), *plesno* ‘sole of foot’, *plesnъce* ‘shoe, sandal’, with limited distribution in Slavic (not found in East Slavic): OCz *plesna* ‘sole’, Sln *plésna* ‘sole’, (BER 5: 340), (Derksen 403 who also notes OPruss *plasmeno* ‘front part of the sole’), and further OIr *leth* ‘side’ (i.e. ‘broad part of body’), Gk *platús* ‘breadth’, OInd *práthas* ‘breadth’ (M-A 83). From the same stem we should also note PSI **platъ* ‘cloth’, esp. **padъpalta*, e.g. Mcd, Blg *potplata* ‘sole, lining’ (BER 5: 462). Burushaski continues the bare stem.

Within Burushaski it can be correlated with *-wáldas* ‘back (of body)’ (PSI **pletje* ‘shoulder’) or *mal* ‘field’ (see Čašule 2017: 187, 253). Another Burushaski word which may be related is *phaltóóciñ* ‘Wickelgamaschen; puttees’ (B 322) (L 284). (Amended entry from Čašule 2017: 203.)

Words denoting objects can be borrowed more readily. It is important that there is no semantic latitude in the comparisons.

3.3 Plant names

[15] Bur *batúl* Ys sg. and pl. ‘a thorny plant’ (BYs 133). There is a suffix *-Vl-* in Burushaski¹¹ (see also [11] *phatasundal*). There is a direct semantic and formal correspondence with PSI **bodǔlb* : Blg *bodel* ‘thistle, thorn’, Srb *bodalj* ‘a type of thorny grass; thistle, *Cirsium arvense*, *Carduus*’, *bodelj* ‘the plant teasel (with thorny leaves), *Dipsacus silvester*’, Mcd *bodilo* ‘pricker, thorn’, Sln *bōdalj* ‘needle, thorn’ derived from the verb **bosti*, **bodo* ‘to prick, to sting’, from IE **bhedh-* ‘to prick, dig’ : Hitt *beda-* ‘dig’, Lat *fodiō* ‘I dig, I prick’, Cymr *bedd* ‘grave’, Goth *badi* ‘bed’, Eng *bed*, Lith *bèsti*, *bedù* ‘to prick, to dig’, TochA *pat-*, *pāt-* ‘to plough’ (G 142) (ESSJ II: 154-155) (Derksen 49). The word is almost exclusive to South Slavic – outside of it there is only RussChSl *bodlb* ‘thorn’ (which could be of SSl provenance), yet not in Russian. In Burushaski, *-dh-* > *-t-* : *-t-* (see also [1]), and unstressed *e* > *a*. (See Čašule 2017: 92, amended.)

[16] Bur *tukóro* ‘section of dry pumpkin, section of poppy capsule; slice of gourd’ (L 358) (B 448). It can be compared with PSlavic **tyky* ‘pumpkin’ which is represented throughout Slavic: Mcd, Sln, Croat, Srb *tikva*, Pl *tykwa*, Cz *tykev*, Russ *tykva*, all: ‘pumpkin’ and is considered a cultural word into Slavic from Southern Europe. Some linguists propose a Pelasgian source. Other etymologies point to an autochthonous Slavic word from the verb **tykati* ‘to push, press’ (Gluhak 1993: 626-627, 618). The existence of the suffix *-ur* in plant names (Berger 1956: 15) justifies a segmentation *tuk-óro*. (Entry from Čašule 1998: 19.)

3.4 Mythical creature

[17] Bur *bilás* ‘female demon, ogress’ (L 81), Ys *balhás* (Wakhi *bālhas* ‘man-eating, voracious demon’) (B 53). Steblin-Kamenskij (1999: 108) derives the Wakhi word from Arab *'abu-l-hawas* ‘father of desire’ (?) which is semantically distant and unfeasible and states it could be a borrowing from Burushaski. Note that the Wakhi word does not refer to a female demon. He also notes Sarikoli *būlas*, *būlas* ‘evil spirit, demon, monster’. The significant phonological divergence between the Hz Ng and Ys forms suggests perhaps a merger of two forms.

We propose a comparison of *bilás* (in Burushaski *v-* > *b-*, see Čašule 2010: 6-8), with PSI **vila* ‘fairy’ (G 670), found in South Slavic: Mcd *vila*, Srb and Croat *vila*, Blg *vila* ‘fairy’ (Gluhak 670, gives only South Slavic attestations, yet there is Old Russ *vila* ‘fairy’, but not in Russian) (not included in Derksen 2008) also with a negative meaning of ‘witch’, as in OCzech *vila* ‘spiteful, wicked, miserable, sickly’ also Sln *vila* ‘fairy; witch’. The Slavic word was compared by Pelikan with Lith *vỹlius* ‘deception, treachery’, from IE **uei-* + *-l-* ‘pursue, go after someone’ (Skok III: 593). The word in the meaning of ‘fairy’ is almost exclusively South Slavic.

Note further the most likely related Bur *bilchóni* ‘the name of a wandering beggar woman; a man who constantly moves about and doesn't settle down, a “rolling stone”; a quadruped’ (L 82), Berger (B 53), gives also the meaning ‘animal of prey who devours other animals’. The additional

¹¹ For example: Bur *dambálum* ‘slight ascent, easy ascent’ (B 113). Compare with IE **dʰǵʰbhos-* or **ǵʰbhos* ‘swelling, mound’ > Gk *túmbos* ‘barrow, tomb’ considered of “Pelasgian” origin (in Wat 92: perhaps a nasalised extended form **tu-m-b(h)-* or extended zero-grade form **tum-* < IE **teuh₂-* ‘to swell’), VLat *tumba* ‘gravestone’, Lat *tumulus* ‘a rounded hill, knoll; a burial mound, grave; a swelling, protuberance (on a surface)’ (Glare 1982: 1989) (the Latin word also < IE **teuh₂-* ‘to swell’, from a suffixed form **tum-ē-*), also Arm *damban* ‘grave’, Rom *dîmb* ‘hill, elevation’ (considered by some to be of Balkan substratal origin) (Neroznak 1978: 208) (Georgiev 1981: 100) (Katičić 1976: 71-72). Consider here also Bur *tum* NH ‘heap, pile, stack’ (B 448). (See Čašule 2017: 115.)

semantics here of ‘wandering beggar’ and ‘prey’ goes in support of Pelikan’s etymology above. The derivation would be *bilás* + *-on*, with the suffix < *-nko*.

3.5 Verbs and verbal expressions

These correspondences are more limited in number.¹²

[18] Bur *task-*, *task-íc-*, Ys *tásk-* / *-ltásk-* (Tiffou 2014: 198, also *tâsk-/ltâsk-*) (the Ys *-l-* is a prefix (Berger 2008: 81-82) ‘to draw, pull, drag; to draw a bow, to smoke (tobacco, opium)’ (L 347) (B 423). Consider the direct correlation with Russ *taskat*’, *taščit*’ ‘to draw, pull’, also Cz *tasiti*, Pl *taskać*, *taszczyć* ‘same’. Not found in South Slavic. The etymology of the Slavic verb is considered unclear, although Schmidt (apud Vasmer) related it to OInd *táskarás* ‘thief’ (Vasmer IV: 26). Not included in Derksen (2008). (See Čašule 1998: 47, amended.)

[19] Bur *luṭ ét-* Hz, *laṭ ét-* Ng ‘to frown’ (Varma 1941: 138 - adapted to Berger’s notation). This verbal construction is only registered by Varma. It can be correlated with PSI **ljútъ* ‘angry, displeased’, e.g. OChSl *ljutъ* ‘violent, frightful’, Blg *ljut*, Srb, Sln and Croat *ljut*, Mcd *lut*, Russ *ljutyj*, Cz *litý*, Pl *lutý*, all: ‘angry, harsh’ and generally very productive in Slavic, which does not have a clear etymology (Buck 1136), although it is sometimes compared with Cymr *llid* ‘anger, annoyance’ (G 392, < **lū-to-s*) (ESSJ XV: 231-6, which outlines the limited existing etymologies of the Slavic word). The semantic and phonological correspondence with Burushaski is direct. Not found in Derksen (2008).

[20] Bur *turí-* ‘to tumble down, to break up, to pull down’, also *-ltúr-* ‘(of a house) to tear the roof off, to tear down; (of seam, embroidery) to tear, to shred, to undo’ (L 45) (B 433) (the *-l-* is a verbal prefix (Berger 2008: 81-82). Consider also Bur *trúu man-* NH ‘go very quickly’ (B 431) and *tur -i-* ‘s-one to eat everything in a house’ and *turkín* ‘to drink greedily, with big gulps (impolite)’ (B433).

We can relate it directly to PSI **turati*, from which we have Mcd *turne* pf., *turka* impf. ‘push, push (to the ground), knock down (a house), overthrow, pull down’, *turka se* ‘to jostle’, and *turi* pf., *tura* impf. : *turi* / *tura se* ‘to do something excessively (esp. drink and eat); to have a plentiful harvest’ (e.g. *se turi od jadenje* ‘he ate till he burst’) and *turi*, *tura* ‘pour into; put’ and numerous prefixed forms (RMJ III: 413-4) and further in Slavic : Sln *turati* ‘push’, Blg *turjam* ‘I put’, Srb, Croat *turiti (se)* ‘push, urge, to crowd, crush’, Russ *turit*’ ‘to be in a hurry, to hasten’, Byruss *turýć* ‘hasten, get going’ (G 645). Orel (IV: 120) gives also Russ *turnút*’ coll. ‘to chuck out’, Pl *turnać* ‘to push out’, Ukr *turnúti* ‘same’ and Cz dial. *turnút*’ ‘to pay attention, to look’ (the latter seems semantically removed) and suggests an etymology from IE **steu-* ‘to push’ which is not without problems. Skok (III: 525) states that there are no Baltic or Indo-European parallels, but quotes Meyer’s Albanian example *turr turrem* ‘laufe, stürze los’, which could however be a loanword from Macedonian. The Macedonian examples appear to show the closest and most direct semantic and phonological correspondence with the Burushaski set of words, which, importantly, is also the case with *d-ur-* ‘knock down’ : Mcd *urne* ‘knock down’. The Macedonian meanings ‘knock down’, ‘pour down’, ‘eat, drink excessively’, ‘push to the ground’ (with the prefix *ras-* : *rasturi* ‘undo; cause disorder; destroy’ etc.) are all shared with Burushaski. It

¹² Consider also the extensive analysis (Čašule 2017: 88-90) of the unique correspondence between Bur *barén-*, *baré-* ‘to look, to look at; look for, to search for; look after, look about’ (L 70-71) (B 40) and Mcd *bara* ‘to look for, demand’ for which there are wider Indo-European correspondences (although very limited in Slavic).

may be that some of the unique Macedonian meanings are a result of overlap of Slavic with a possible word from the Balkan substratum. Hamp (R) suggests it could be a calque of part of the meaning.

There is no certain etymology for the Slavic words, although Gluhak (1993: 645) suggests a link with IE **t_ur-* / **tur-* (and **t_ur-*, also **tru-*) ‘turn, stir, turn around’ : OInd *tvárate*, *turáti* ‘is in a hurry, in haste’, in Indo-Aryan: Bengali *turā*, H *turāi*, *túrant* ‘quickly, at once, immediately’, Si *tura* all: ‘quick’, Gk *otrýnō* ‘I urge, compel, am in a hurry’, *otraléōs* ‘quick’, Lat *trua* ‘trowel’, OHG *dweran* ‘stir, mix’ with numerous derivations in Indo-European: e.g. Lat *turba* ‘disturbance, noise, screaming, commotion; a crowd, a multitude of people’ (Tucker 1931: 247). The semantics in Indo-Aryan does not match the Burushaski development which would argue very strongly for a separate development which parallels remarkably Macedonian. (See Čašule 2017: 246, amended.)

In the following examples, the precise correspondence also includes Baltic.

[21] Bur *prik(in) dél-* ‘leap, jump, buck’ (also in Sh) (L 293, Ng also *prig*) (B 317). In Burushaski from a zero-grade **prug-* with alternation *i : u* (adjacent to *r*) > *prig*, *prik*, or assimilation *prikín* < **pruk/gín*.

From IE **preu-g-* ‘to jump’: SrbChSl *isprǎgnǔti* ‘to jump up, to step out’, Russ *prygat’* ‘to jump’ (not found elsewhere in Slavic), Lith *sprùkti*, *sprùkstu* ‘to jump, slip’, OEng *frogga* ‘frog’, OIcl *froskr* (< Grmc **prug-skō*) ‘same’ (without *-g-* found in OInd *právatē* ‘jumps’) (IEW 845). (Entry from Čašule 2017: 205.)

[22] Bur *d-mil-*, *d-smil-* ‘to pacify, placate, persuade’ (L 27, 116). [*d-* is a prefix] There is also *milí* as a title for the beloved in a folk song, which Berger considers related to the meaning of ‘medicine, drug, remedy’ (B 287), but which we would like to derive from *d-mil-*.

We find a close correlation with IE **mēilus* ‘dear, tender’ as in PSI **milb* ‘dear’, found throughout Slavic : OChSl *milb*, Mcd *mil*, Srb and Croat *mio*, Sln *mil*, Cz *milý*, Pl *mily*, Russ *milyj*, all: ‘dear’ (G 410), also Lith *mylas* and *mēilus* ‘dear’, and esp. the derivatives like Mcd *smili*, *smiluva* ‘to pacify, placate, to take mercy’ (RMJ III: 244) and these from IE **mēi-* ‘soft, mild, tender’ and IE **mēilus* with an *-l-* extension typical of Slavic and Baltic, also OInd *mayas* ‘happiness’, Lat *mītis* ‘soft, tender’ (IEW 711-712). (Entry from Čašule 2017: 195.)

3.6 Special use of numeral

In this example there is a direct correspondence between the Burushaski and Slavic semantic developments for the IE numeral **sem-* / **som-* ‘one’.

[23] Bur *-chámanum* (L *isamanum*) Hz Ng ‘first-born (son, daughter, young animal)’, (in Ys without aspiration) (L 47) (B 73). Berger segments it as ? + *manúm*. We accept this segmentation - *chám* + *manúm* and compare it with IE **sem-* / **som-* ‘one’, e.g. Gk *heīs* ‘one’, Lat *semel* ‘once’, TochA *sas* m. *sām* f. ‘one’ also PSI **sam̥b* ‘alone’ (from IE **som-o-s*), OInd *samáḥ* ‘equal, same’ (not found anywhere in IA with the meaning ‘first’ or ‘one’), Av *hama-*, *hāma-*, OPers *hama-* ‘same’, Gk *homós* ‘common, similar, equal’, Lat *similis* ‘similar’, OIr *-som* ‘same’, OEng, Eng *same*, OHG *samo* (Grmc **saman*) (G 539) (Buck 938).

Bur also has *sum* ‘(of animals) female’ (L 317) (B 384) and *sumán* ‘(of animals) male’ (L 317) (B 385), identified by Berger as the first component in *súmphalikis* ‘young female sheep’ (L 318) (B 385) which parallels the semantic development from the above stem in Slavic, i.e. from PSI **sam̥b* ‘alone’ we have Russ, Cz *samec*, Pl *samiec* ‘the male (animal)’, Russ *samka*, Pl *samica*, Cz *samice* ‘the female (animal)’ (in Srb and Croat *samica* ‘female (of birds)’ (Buck 139-140). The Bur change *a* > *u/_m* is common. Both semantic developments in Burushaski ‘first’ and ‘male/female of animals’ are

very removed from the meaning in Old Indian and Indo-Aryan, whereas the link with Slavic is remarkable.

Note also the direct correspondence between Russ *samyj* ‘most’ (used to form the superlative) from the same IE stem, and Bur *sam* ‘very, quite’, which has limited usage : *sam-sán* ‘very light, broad daylight’ (*sán* ‘light; bright’ (B 374) (L 309), in B also *sum-sán* ‘radiant, glowing’ (L 318), *sam sada* ‘quite plain, simple’ (L 309) and perhaps also *čamčák* ‘quite straight, quite upright’ < *čáko -i-* ‘to put up’ (B 68) and *čham-čán* ‘quite straight’, where *čán* ‘straight, direct’ (B 74) (L 362). This usage shows the same *č(h) : s* alternation as above.

Consider further the Burushaski ablative postposition *-cum* also *-cimo* ‘from’ (B 70) which can be compared with PSi **s̥n̥b̥* ‘with; of, from’, OPruss *sen* ‘with’, Arm *ham-* ‘with’ (IEW 904), i.e. ultimately from IE **sem-s ~ *sem ~ *sm-ih_a-* ‘united as one, one together’ (for a detailed discussion see Čašule 2009a), the same stem from which we derive Bur *-čámanum*. The Burushaski form is from a zero-grade form **sm-* and in Bur *m-* > *-um, -am*. (The ablative can be analysed differently, however, as composite *-č-um* (Berger I: 63).

Note also from the same stem the direct and specific correspondence between the Burushaski second component in [11] *phatasundal* ‘plate, vessel’ and Proto-Slavic **sodъ* ‘plate, vessel’.

3.7 Particles

[24] Bur *dáa*, Ys *dā* ‘1. again; 2. then, and then; 3. further, in addition; 4. also, and¹³; 5. else’, “this particle is one of the hardest worked words in the language. It has many shades of meaning which pass into each other, and in any given case the precise meaning is often difficult to determine” (L 103-104) (B 108). [Any student or scholar of Balkan Slavic could easily take Lorimer's definition and apply it to the complexity of the Balkan Slavic conjunction *da*.]

In Willson (1999: 33) *dáa conj* ‘then; and; also; moreover; otherwise; furthermore’, *daá¹ interj* ‘aren’t you?; isn’t he? wasn’t it?; Oh!’ (usually occurs at the end of a statement), *daá² adv* ‘again; more, extra; also; really; adj. another, other’. The interjection *daá¹* implies the development of an affirmative meaning of ‘yes?’.

Berger (B 108) notes Tib *da* ‘now, at present, just [main meaning] (in coll. language) it is true, to be sure, in narration sometimes (though rarely) then, at that time’ (Jäschke 246-247) which doesn’t correspond well¹⁴. Moreover, since according to Lorimer (L 534) (also Sprigg 2013) Balti, the Tibetan neighbouring language with which Burushaski is in contact, does not have this word, it is

¹³ Consider the other Burushaski IE conjunction with this meaning: *ke* (in Ys: *ka*) ‘also, too, and’ (L 231-232) (B 244). “Also serves as an emphasising particle. It frequently follows immediately after Indef Pron and Adj and Indef Adv of Time and Place when accompanied by a negative. Also used in association with the Indef Pron, Adj and Adv, but placed immediately after the pronoun. (...) Frequently occurs with the Future used as Historic Present.” (L 232). It parallels closely the use and the syntax of the Phrygian conjunction *ke* ‘and, also, but’ used “both between the joined words and also enclitically like Greek *te*, Lat *-que*, although placed somewhat differently (...) The conjunction is genuinely Phrygian, but it does not seem to have been much used in the Old Phrygian period. We must thus regard at least the wide use of *ke* as a Graecism if not a Latinism. (...) One [Phryg] inscription, the dialectal text C, uses *ka* for *ke*.” (Diakonoff-Neroznak 1985: 40). Derived from IE **k^we* ‘and’: Gk *te*, Myc Gk *-qe*, Goth *-h*, Arm *-k*’, Hitt *ki* ‘and’, Lat *que* ‘and; generalising particle’, OInd *ca*, Av *ča* ‘and’ (IEW 519).

¹⁴ The basic Tibetan meaning of ‘now, at present’ is not found in Burushaski. The Tibetan meaning ‘then’ has a very restricted distribution (only in narration and rarely). On the other hand, the Burushaski meanings of ‘and’, ‘again’, ‘also’ and as an interjection are not found in Tibetan.

most probably an original Burushaski word. Furthermore, the vowel length would not be accounted for.

Consider further the demonstrative (proximate) morpheme *d-* in *akhil* vs *dakhil*, *dakhi* ‘such as this, like this, of this kind’ (B 14).

Considering the productive use, semantics and the functions of Bur *dáa*, it could be correlated with the so-called complex “historical” Burushaski verbal prefix *d-*, which often refers to action directed towards the speaker and sometimes with an emphasising function, ultimately deriving from a deictic meaning (as pointed out by Bashir 2004) (Čašule 1998: 40).

A direct comparison is possible with PS1 **da* ‘and, in order to, yes’, Mcd ‘and, and so; so; (in order) to; introduces orders, wishes, requests; introduces a question; if, introduces conditional clauses, links modal and auxiliary verbs with the main verb; used in compound conjunctions’ (RMJ I: 125), found throughout Slavic, and note the additional meanings in Old Russian *da* ‘then, in that case’ or LSorb *da* ‘so, also’ (ESSJ IV: 180). Probably here also the Proto-Slavic prefix and preposition **do-* ‘to, next to’, which in verbs marks completion, action directed towards the speaker (Skok I: 418–419) and has been derived from the Indo-European demonstrative pronoun **do*, variant of **to*, OPers pron. *dim* ‘him, her’, OPruss *din*, *dien* ‘him, her’, Lat *demque* ‘then’ (ESSJ IV: 180) (IEW 181–182). Gluhak (186) points that the Slavic word is derived from IE **dā* [same as Burushaski] and points to Nostratic parallels (e.g. Altaic **dā* ‘also, and’). There is a very interesting direct correspondence between Lat *demque* ‘then’ and Bur *dóon ke* ‘all the same, yet’ (L 146) (B 121–122) which most likely belongs to this set.

This correspondence requires further elaboration, especially on the syntactic plane, where a preliminary analysis shows many uses of Burushaski *dáa* can be correlated with the developments in Balkan Slavic. Balkan Slavic *da*, as is well known, introduces finite verbal forms in constructions that have replaced the Old Slavic infinitive, and is used as an element of analytic modality and as a conditional conjunction. The loss of the infinitive is a core Balkan syntactic process that is one of the main characteristics of the Balkan Sprachbund.

Consider the following example: “*dā méne barin éti nē gusé har ka bóšo kháčičimi*” translated by T-P (96) as “qui dirait un mot, enfermerait le taureau et la veau”, which can be translated, with the same conditional meaning into Macedonian as “*da kaže nekoj eden zbor, kje gi zatvori i volot i telet*”, “if someone says a word, (he) will enclose the ox and the calf”.

Furthermore, the Burushaski definitions above show that there is a semantic development to denote affirmation as well as in interrogative use (at the end of a statement). The latter can be correlated with Mcd *dali*, Srb, Croat *dali*, Blg *da li* used as an interrogative particle in yes/no questions.

There is little doubt that the particle is autochthonous in Burushaski as it is part of a demonstrative pattern. If we were to consider borrowing, it would entail a very close correlation between Slavic and Burushaski. (Amended entry from Čašule 2016: 161–162.)

[25] Bur *le*, *léi*, *léei* ‘O!’ ‘an exclamation used in addressing a male person or persons and usually followed by their name or title’ (B 265), e.g. *Lēi padša* ‘O, King’ (also as ‘you there’) (L 249), and ‘oh!’ in general. Used also with the imperative, e.g. *mamú* [milk] *dusú* [bring] *le* (K 208) ‘bring milk!’ (B I 163).

In this example, the correspondence involves all of South Slavic and may, under one interpretation, have a very wide scope and representation in Indo-European.

There is a direct correlation with South Slavic *le* (invocative) particle when addressing s-one, derived from IE distal deixis particle **-le* (Berneker, apud ESSJ XIV: 171–173) [(Lehmann 2002: 91)], e.g. Macedonian (esp. in folk poetry), particle used with the vocative: *majko le* ‘mother, hey’, *stara*

le majko ‘old ‘hey’ mother’, also in Blg *le* and *lei* ‘particle used in addressing s-one’ (also esp. in folk poetry), and Srb, Croat *le* ‘same’, and with emphasising function, Sln *le* also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in *to – tole* ‘that’, *tle – tlele* ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl *le, li* ‘-ever; only; but’, Russ dial. *le* ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Slk *le* ‘only’, Slk dial. *-l’e* ‘emphasising particle’, OCz *le* ‘but, although’, Ukr *le* adv. ‘but; only’.

The PSI particle **le/*lē* has been compared to the Baltic permissive particle Lith, Lett *lai* (also with other emphasising and modal uses) and Toporov (q. in ESSJ XIV: 172) has proposed a connection with Hittite voluntative, e.g. 1. p. sg. *ašallu* ‘may I be’ (Machek in ESSJ XIV: 172-173, with the Hittite prohibitive *lē*) and the Tocharian gerund in *-l-*, which are all considered derived from a common Indo-European word form with *-l-* with a non-neutral semantics. The Armenian and Slavic past participles in *-l* are also included here, as well as the particle *le* in Albanian *pale* ‘even so, anyway’.

The fact that the use of the *le* particle for addressing is characteristic only of South Slavic may be an indication of a possible substratal origin in these languages, although in this case it can be argued that it could be an archaism.

It is very significant that Burushaski uses *-le* as a locative particle in the demonstrative system. The Burushaski particle/suffix *-le* (found also in *khóle* ‘here’, and *éle* ‘there’ and *itéle* ‘there’ < *it + éle* (B 217) can be correlated with the IE particle *-le* which conveyed distal deixis, e.g. Lat *il-le* ‘that’, *alius* ‘other’ (Brugmann, apud Lehmann 2002: 91). Particularly interesting is the same use of the particle in Slovenian and Burushaski.

In this respect note that from the same Indo-European stem: **h₂ol-* ‘beyond; from that side’ (Wat 2-3) or **h₂éļjos* ‘other’, Burushaski has *hóle, hóló* ‘out, out of’ and *hólum* ‘outside, other; foreign, strange’ (B 201-202) and most likely the stem of the numeral ‘2’: *altó* Ys (Zarubin) *haltó, altán, altá* and *altác* (Berger 2008: 10.4, Čašule 2009a). (Compare with Mcd *lani* ‘last year’ < **h₂ol-ni-*) (Entry from Čašule 2016: 160-161.)

[26] Bur Ys *deh* ‘come on, get on with it’, *dedé!* ‘there! look!’ (BYs 141-142) (Tiffou 2014: 87). There is a direct parallelism with the South Slavic particle *de* ‘interjection for getting cattle to go; productive particle used for confirmation, enticement, for expressing doubt’: Mcd *de, de de* (e.g. *de de ne se luti* ‘come on, don’t get angry’), Sln *de, dej* (*dej ga vzdigniti* ‘come on, lift it up’), and further e.g. Blg *nali de* ‘isn’t it so’, Mcd *ajde de* ‘come on, get on with it’ (also the second component in the ubiquitous *ajde* ‘come on’). With a different semantics also Russ *de* particle for introducing indirect speech (Orel 2011: I, 285). The South Slavic and the Russian forms have been derived from PSI **de(j)ati* ‘to put, to speak’ (BER I: 328, 333), with which we have related Bur *-i-* ‘to do, to put; to speak’ from IE **dheh₁-* ‘to do, to put’, in Burushaski also *doók man-* ‘to put or set down; make (provisionally); place a stone’ (B 121) and this from IE **dhō-k- *dhə-k-* ‘to do, to make, to set, to put’ (IEW 235). With all the reservations applicable to comparisons of interjections and particles, we have here a very precise correlation. The Burushaski particle with the laryngeal corresponds exactly with IE.

Within Bur, maybe Hz Ng *deé ét-* ‘to call out (shout) (while dancing)’ (B 117) derives from the particle/interjection above.

4 Discussion

There are more than several hundred general Indo-European etymologies of Burushaski which include correspondences with the Slavic languages, shared with the other groups and branches of Indo-European. It needs to be emphasised that the isoglosses analysed in this paper involve only the specific correspondences between Burushaski and *unique* Slavic words which do not have cognates elsewhere, or have a unique semantic development. In three examples in order to look at a wider context, the comparisons also involve Baltic and in one case Latin.

It is very important that there is no semantic latitude in the comparisons - they are direct and specific. This would suggest that whatever the genesis of these correspondences they involve a very close correlation.

Looking at the semantic make-up of the isoglosses it can be said that the words denoting objects ([10-14: 'clothes, trousers', 'plate', 'roof beams', 'shoe' also 'treasure']) could have been the outcome of cultural borrowing, although it is difficult to determine the direction of borrowing. These nevertheless indicate a situation of closeness between the two entities. The phonological shape of these words is such that it doesn't readily lend itself to a chronology, although in [10] *gaṭú* the Burushaski word reflects a situation before yodation in Slavic, and in [11] *phatasūndal* the indication is of a Burushaski development before the rise of nasal vowels in Slavic, which pushes the chronology at least 1000-1500 years back. In [14] *pelét* the shape and morphology of the Burushaski word also assumes an older period. Burushaski *kabulék* [12] could be a very old correspondence.

The correspondence of the words for 'pumpkin' [16] is a strong candidate for a cultural borrowing, and the word is considered a cultural word into Slavic from Southern Europe. In [15] 'thorny plant' the direct correlation is with South Slavic.

In [17] 'female demon' cultural borrowing could have taken place.

The particles [24], [25] and [26] can also easily be shared in a language contact situation, which however would need to be a close one, although they could equally be independent developments. In the case of [25] *le, léi, léei*, the direct functional correlation this time with South Slavic only is intriguing and suggests perhaps the Balkans or to their north-east as a possible point of contact. This needs to be seen in the context of a large number of unique isoglosses with the Balkan languages, especially in the shepherd vocabulary (Čašule 2009a). Examples [4], [13], [15], [~20], [25] and [26] are all such direct correspondences with South Slavic (for more details of other Burushaski-South Slavic unique correspondences see Čašule (2012a).

The correspondences of verbs or verbal expressions [18-22] can in principle be cultural borrowings, although less so than names of objects. Their phonetic shape is such that they do not reveal traits that could help establish a chronology - they could be ancient or more recent. In two cases [21] and [22] we include examples where there is wider distribution of the root but the phonetic match with Slavic is best and direct.

There is a particularly important correlation in the special developments from the IE numeral **sem-* / **som-* 'one' [23]. Burushaski corresponds with Slavic in that it has developed adjectives/nouns from this stem denoting 'male and female of animals'. It also correlates in developing a quantifier, which is shared with Russian. Furthermore, the Burushaski ablative postposition can be derived from the same root, paralleling the Slavic preposition. The shared word for 'plate' [11] also derives from the same stem.

Most difficult to interpret are the direct correspondences in names of body parts: [1] ‘foot’; [2] ‘neck’; [3] ‘vertex’; [4] ‘arm’; [5] ‘bone of ankle’ and (including Baltic) [7] ‘hand’¹⁵ and (including Latin) [8] ‘thumb’. Borrowing names of body parts on such scale is to say the very least, unusual and would certainly entail a very close contact situation. Once again, it is important to stress that there is no semantic latitude and that the terms are (except for two) unique in Slavic.¹⁶

The phonological shape in many of these examples is once again undiagnostic of a chronology, but this also means they could be ancient. Nevertheless in [1] Burushaski has the Indo-European suffix *-is/-es*, absent in the Slavic form, and the laryngeal, which pushes this correspondence quite significantly back in time. We have a similar position in [3] ‘vertex, centre line of head’, where the suffixes in Slavic and Burushaski are different, also in [8] ‘thumb’, with different suffixes in Latin and Slavic. The same goes for the term for ‘hand’ [7] where Burushaski has the nasal consonant in the stem which argues for an old correlation, and for [2] ‘neck’ which has an unclear etymology in Slavic. In [4] ‘arm’ which has a unique South Slavic correspondence, the change **ks > š* could have been of an older date.

Of all the correspondences in the names of body parts, [6] ‘voracious’ < ‘stomach’ is the only possible candidate for cultural borrowing (possibly from Russian?).

In [9] ‘tongue’ the Burushaski phonetic shape indicates an ancient point of divergence with Slavic (with the change *gh > g* as opposed to Slavic *z*), although the loss of initial *d-* and the development of a prothetic *y* is shared by the two entities.

5 Conclusion

The number of Burushaski words with direct and unique Slavic correspondences in Indo-European is considerable and involves on the Slavic side isolated, unclear, difficult or even lacking etymologies. It is difficult to say conclusively whether this set of isoglosses all come from the same source or from the same period, but it is clear that they are indicative of some kind of (close) language contact or relationship between Burushaski and Slavic.

¹⁵ There are indications that Burushaski also had historically another Indo-European term for ‘hand’. Consider Bur *d-mar-* ‘take s-thing from s-one’s hands, take away; receive, pick up, take load’, also *d-ú-mar-* ‘ask, ask for, request’, *riin dúmar* ‘take s-body’s hand to kiss it’, *d-mar-* ‘make s-one ask; take’; Ng ‘offer hand to be kissed’ (B 280-1), which can be compared directly with the IE forms derived with an **-r* extension from IE **h₁em-*, **meh₁-* ‘take, lay one’s hands on, grasp’: OIr *ar-foim* ‘take’, Lat *emō* ‘take, buy’, OPruss *imt* ‘take’, OSl *imati* ‘catch, hunt, gather, take’, with a distribution in northwest IE (M-A 564) [from which there is Bur *d-hemia-* Ys, *d-mi-* Hz Ng ‘gather, collect, obtain, acquire, get; to harvest (fruit); reap and store’, *d-ée-mi-* ‘gather together’, Ys *de-hémia-* (L 122) (LYs 73) (B 287)], i.e. IE **mar-* (IEW 740): Gk *márē* ‘hand, wrist’, Alb *marr* ‘take, grasp’ (< **marnō* denom. from **mar-* ‘to receive in hand’ (Illič-Svityč 376), note also Gk *máruptō* ‘grasp’. The notion of ‘hand’ prevails in the explanations given both by Lorimer and Berger, and the Ng meaning of ‘offering one’s hand’ may also point to the original semantics. The Burushaski word *marmúk* ‘handful’ and the construction *marmúk-i-* Ng ‘take in hand; embrace’ (L 262) (B 282), may contain the same stem as the first component. The presence of both the bare stem and with the **-r-* extension makes this a very firm correspondence. (See Čašule 2017: 191-192.)

¹⁶ We note separately, because of the semantic latitude, Bur *-skil* ‘face’, Ng *-škil*, in the Ys dialect also *-skul* (B 380). Perhaps related (from a zero-grade) to IE **kel-* ‘to rise’, Gk *kolōnós* ‘hill’, Lat *antecellō* ‘I surmount’, *excellō* ‘I excel’, *celsus* ‘tall, upright’, Lith *kėlti*, *keliù* ‘to rise’ and especially PS1 **čelo* ‘forehead’ (G 174). Otherwise, consider the close phonetic correspondence with Russ *skulá* ‘cheekbone’ (without an agreed etymology) (Vasmer III: 661-662, Orel III: 248 compares it with ON *skjól* ‘shelter, cover’) or Byruss *skivica* ‘jaw’ and Lett *škieva* ‘cleft’ blended with the root of Russ *skaliù* ‘grin’ (Shevelov 1964: 297).

The phonetic shape of most of the correspondences unfortunately doesn't reveal enough about the chronology of the contact/relationship, although in a number of cases we can claim that the correlations go back to antiquity whereas in others the question remains open which could mean that there are several layers in the vocabulary discussed. One possibility is that all the isoglosses could be ancient.

While many of the correspondences can be considered cultural borrowings, with the direction of borrowing unclear, the correlations in the names of body parts and the verbs and the particles do not lend themselves to that category.

The numerous consistent correspondences with South Slavic are important, as they can be explained jointly and coherently with the Burushaski correlations with the Balkan languages.

A full analysis of all the correlations between Slavic and Burushaski within the general Indo-European correspondences¹⁷ and with Baltic in particular, might shed more light on the mechanism of contact or relationship. While there is a clear affinity between the two languages, Burushaski shows many specific correspondences with other languages of the North-Western Indo-European group, notably with Germanic, Baltic, Celtic, Italic, Albanian and Phrygian, which goes against a Slavic-Burushaski subgrouping.

ABBREVIATIONS OF SOURCES CITED

B	Berger, Hermann. 1998.	BER	Georgiev, Vladimir et al. 1971-
BYS	Berger, Hermann. 1974.	E-K	Edel'man, Dž. and Klimov, G.A. 1970.
ESSJ	Trubačev, Oleg. 1974-	G	Gluhak, Alemko. 1993.
HAY	Hayward, G. W. 1871.	IEW	Pokorny, Julius. 1959.
K	Tikkanen, Bertil. 1991.	L	Lorimer, David L. R. 1938.
LYS	Lorimer, David, L. R. 1962.	M-A	Mallory, James P. and Adams, Douglas Q. (eds.) 1997.
M-A2	Mallory, James P. and Adams, Douglas Q. 2006.	T	Turner, Ralph L. 1966.
T-P	Tiffou, Étienne and Pesot, Jurgen. 1989.	WAT	Watkins, Calvert. 2000.
WILL	Willson, Stephen R. 1999		

¹⁷ Consider e.g. the correspondence in the personal pronoun for 1. p. pl. Bur *mi* 'we' (gen.-erg *mi*; dat. (reduplicated) *mímar*, abl. *míćum*) and the pronominal prefix *mi-* / *mí-* / *mé-* / *mée-* which can be correlated directly within Indo-European with Arm *mek'*, Blt-Sl **mes* e.g. OPruss *mes*, Lith *mēs* and PS1 **my* 'we' (Fortson 2004: 127). For details see Čašule (2017: Chapter 1. (2.3).

REFERENCES

- Alonso de la Fuente, José Andrés. 2006. "El burušaski, ¿una lengua aislada?" *Revista Española de Lingüística* 35.2: 551-579.
- Barić, Henrik. 1919. *Albano-rumänische Studien* I. Sarajevo: Institut für Balkanforschung.
- Bashir, Elena. 2000. "A thematic survey of Burushaski research". *History of Language* 6.1: 1-15.
- Bashir, Elena. 2004. "Le préfixe d- en Bourouchaski: deixis et point de référence". In: Tiffou, É. (ed.) *Bourouchaskiana. Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain* 113: 17-62. ("The d-prefix in Burushaski: Deixis and viewpoint"; French translation.)
- Bengtson, John D. 2008. "Materials for a comparative grammar of the Dene-Caucasian (Sino-Caucasian) languages". *Aspects of Comparative Linguistics* 3: 45-118.
- Bengtson, John D; and Blažek, Václav. 2011. "On the Burushaski-Indo-European hypothesis by I. Čašule". *Journal of Language Relationship* 6: 25-63.
- Bengtson, John D.; and Blažek, Václav. 2012. "Comments on Ilija Čašule's 'Correlation of the Burushaski pronominal system with Indo-European and phonological and grammatical evidence for a genetic relationship'". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 40.1-2: 156-162.
- Berger, Hermann. 1956. "Mittelmeerische Kulturpflanzennamen aus dem Burušaski". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 9: 4-33.
- Berger, Hermann. 1974. *Das Yasin Burushaski*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Berger, Hermann. 1998. *Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nager*. Teil I. *Grammatik*. Teil II. *Texte*. Teil III. *Wörterbuch. Burushaski-Deutsch; Deutsch-Burushaski*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag [Neuindische Studien 13].
- Berger, Hermann. 2008. *Beiträge zur historischen Laut- und Formenlehre des Burushaski*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag [Neuindische Studien 15].
- Bernštejn, Samuel B. 1961. *Očerk sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk.
- Bernštejn, Samuel B. 1974. *Sravnitel'naja grammatika slavjanskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Blažek, Václav; and Bengtson, John D. 1995. "Lexica Dene-Caucasica". *Central Asiatic Journal* 39: 11-50, 161-164.
- Bomhard, Allan R. 2008. *Reconstructing Proto-Nostratic*. Vol. 1-2. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1949. *A Dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1997. *American Indian languages: The historical linguistics of native America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Čašule, Ilija. 1998. *Basic Burushaski etymologies: The Indo-European and Paleobalkan affinities of Burushaski*. Munich-Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2003a. "Burushaski names of body parts of Indo-European origin". *Central Asiatic Journal*. 47.1: 15-74.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2003b. "Evidence for the Indo-European laryngeals in Burushaski and its genetic affiliation with Indo-European". *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 31.1-2: 21-86.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2004. "Burushaski-Phrygian lexical correspondences in ritual, myth, burial and onomastics". *Central Asiatic Journal* 48.1: 50-104.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2009a. "Burushaski shepherd vocabulary of Indo-European origin". *Acta Orientalia* 70: 147-195.

- Čašule, Ilija. 2009b. "Burushaski numerals of Indo-European origin". *Central Asiatic Journal* 53.2: 163-183.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2010. *Burushaski as an Indo-European "kentum" language: Reflexes of the Indo-European gutturals in Burushaski*. Munich: Lincom GmbH.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2012a. "Macedonian and South Slavic lexical correspondences with Burushaski". *Balkanistica* 25: 221-256.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2012b. "Correlation of the Burushaski pronominal system with Indo-European and phonological and grammatical evidence for a genetic relationship". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 40.1-2: 59-154.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2012c. "Correlation of the Burushaski pronominal system with Indo-European and phonological and grammatical evidence for a genetic relationship". Response to discussants. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 40. 1-2: 164-172.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2014a. "Burushaski kinship terminology of Indo-European origin". In: Owen-Smith, Thomas; and Hill, Nathan (Eds.), *Trans-Himalayan linguistics: Historical and descriptive linguistics of the Himalayan area*, 181-220. New York: De Gruyter.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2014b. "Names of plants of Mediterranean and Balkan origin in Burushaski". *Himalayan Linguistics* 13.2: 1-8. himalayanlinguistics_23702. Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/8kx5w9qw>
- Čašule, Ilija. 2014c. "Evidence for a Burushaski-Phrygian connection". *Acta Orientalia* 75: 3-31.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2016. *Evidence for the Indo-European and Balkan origin of Burushaski*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Čašule, Ilija. 2017. *Burushaski etymological dictionary of the inherited Indo-European lexicon*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Diakonoff, Igor M.; and Neroznak, Vladimir P. 1985. *Phrygian*. New York: Caravan Books Delmar.
- Edel'man, Džoj I.; and Klimov, Georgij A. 1970. *Jazyk burušaski*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Fortson IV, Benjamin W. 2004. *Indo-European language and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Georgiev, Vladimir et al. 1971-. *Bŭlgarski etimologičen rečnik*. Bŭlgarska akademija na naukite. Institut za bŭlgarski ezik. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Georgiev, Vladimir. 1981. *Introduction to the history of the Indo-European languages*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- Glare, Peter Geoffrey William. 1982. *Oxford Latin dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gluhak, Alemko. 1993. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb: A. Cesarec.
- Goddard, Ives. 1996. "The classification of the native languages of North America". In: Ives Goddard (Ed.), *Languages*. Vol. 17 of *Handbook of North American Indians* (Series Editor: William C. Sturtevant), 290-324. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Hamp, Eric. 1990. "The pre-Indo-European language of northern (central) Europe". In Markey, Thomas L.; and Greppin, John A. C. (eds). *When worlds collide: Indo-Europeans and Pre-Indo-Europeans*. Ann Arbor: Karoma. 291-305.
- Hamp, Eric. 2009. Handout of University of Chicago lecture.
- Hamp, Eric. 2012. "Comments on Čašule's 'Correlation of the Burushaski pronominal system with Indo-European'". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 40.1-2: 154-156.
- Hamp, Eric. (R) 2012. Review of Čašule 2012a.
- Hamp, Eric. 2013. "The expansion of the Indo-European languages: An Indo-Europeanist's evolving view". *Sino-Platonic Papers*. Number 239.

- Hayward, George W. 1871. "Appendices to letters on his explorations in Gilgit and Yassin. Vocabularies of the dialects of Dardistan, Wakhán, Shignán and Roshnan". *Journal of The Royal Geographical Society of London*. 4: 18-28.
- Holst, Jan Henrik. 2014. *Advances in Burushaski linguistics*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Holst, Jan Henrik. 2017. *Die Herkunft des Burushaski*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Holub, Josef; and Kopečný, František 1952. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Státní nakl. učebnic.
- Huld, Martin E. 2012. "Comments on Čašule's 'Correlation of the Burushaski pronominal system with Indo-European'". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 40.1-2: 162-164.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav Markovič. 1965. "Materialy k sravnitel'nomu slovarju nostratičeskix jazykov (indoevropskij, altajskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, kartvel'skij, semito-xamitskij)". In: Trubačev, Oleg N. (Ed.), *Etimologija*. Materialy i issledovanija po indoevropskim i drugim jazykam, 321-373. Moscow: Nauka.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav Markovič. 1976. *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov*. Vol. 2. Moskva: Nauka.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1959. "Marginalia to Vasmer's *Russian etymological dictionary*". *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 1.2: 265-278.
- Jäschke, Heinrich August. [1881] 2003. *A Tibetan-English dictionary*. New York: Dover Publications, Mineola [orig. edition: London: Routledge and Kegan Paul].
- Katičić, Radoslav. 1976. *Ancient languages of the Balkans*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Klein, Lev S. 2007. *Drevnie migracii i proisxoždenie indoevropskix narodov*. St. Peterburg. http://archaeology.ru/Download/Klejn/Klejn_2007_Drevnie_migratsii.pdf
- Klein, Lev S. 2010. *Vremja kentavrov. Stepnaja prarodina grekov i ariev*. St. Peterburg: Evrazija.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 2002. *Pre-Indo-European*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man [Journal of Indo-European Studies. Monograph Number Forty One.].
- Lorimer, David L.R. 1935. *The Burushaski language*. Vol. 1. *Introduction and grammar with a preface by George Morgenstierne*. Oslo: Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, H. Aschehoug&Co.
- Lorimer, David L.R. 1938. *The Burushaski language*. Vol. 3. *Vocabularies and Index*. Oslo: Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, H. Aschehoug&Co.
- Lorimer, David L.R. 1962. *Werchikwar-English vocabulary*. Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press.
- Mallory, James P.; and Adams, Douglas Q. (eds.) 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Mallory, James P.; and Adams, Douglas Q. 2006. *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*. Oxford: University Press.
- Morgenstierne, Georg. 1945. "Notes on Burushaski phonology". *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 13: 61-95.
- Neroznak, Vladimir P. 1978. *Paleobalkanskije jazyki*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Neroznak, Vladimir P. 1998. Foreword to Čašule (1998): ix-xiii.
- Orel, Vladimir. 2011. *Russian etymological dictionary* Vol. I-IV. San Bernardino: Theophania Publishing.
- Parkin, Robert J. 1987. "Tibeto-Burman and Indo-European loans in Burushaski kinship terminology". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 50.2: 325-329.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern and Munich: A. Francke.
- Rečnik na makedonskiot literaturni jazik*. (I-III) 1961-1966. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik Krste Misirkov.

- Sagart, Laurent. 1993. "Chinese and Austronesian: Evidence for a genetic relationship". *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 21: 1-62.
- Shevelov, George Y. 1964. *A prehistory of Slavic*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Skok, Petar. 1974 (I-IV). *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Smith, Alexander D. 2017. "Burushaski." In: Campbell, Lyle (Ed.), *Language isolates*, 117-138. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sprigg, Richard Keith. 2013. *Balti-English / English-Balti dictionary*. London: Routledge.
- Steblin-Kamenskij, Ivan M. 1999. *Etimologičeskij slovar' vaxanskogo jazyka*. St Petersburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie.
- Steingass, Francis Joseph. 1999 [1892]. *A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary, including the Arabic words and phrases to be met with in Persian literature*. [orig. edition: London: Routledge & K. Paul], Reprint: Lahore: Sang-e-Meel.
- Tiffou, Étienne. 2014. *Dictionnaire du bourouchaski du Yasin*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Tiffou, Étienne; and Pesot, Jurgen. 1989. *Contes du Yasin*. (Introduction au bourouchaski du Yasin avec grammaire et dictionnaire analytique). Paris: Peeters/Selaf.
- Tikkanen, Bertil. 1991. "A Burushaski folktale". *Studia Orientalia* 67: 65-125.
- Trubačev, Oleg. [ESSJ] 1974-. *Etimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Tucker, Thomas George. 1931. *A concise etymological dictionary of Latin*. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Tuite, Kevin. 1998. "Evidence for prehistoric links between the Caucasus and Central Asia: The case of the Burushos" In: Mair, Victor H. (ed.): *The Bronze Age and early Iron Age peoples of Eastern Central Asia*. Vol. 1: *Archeology, migration and nomadism, linguistics*, 448-475. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Turner, Ralph L. 1966. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Varma, Siddheshwar. 1941. "Studies in Burushaski dialectology". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* 7: 133-73.
- [Vasmer, Max] Fasmer, Maks. 1986-1987. *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. (I-IV). Moskva: Progress.
- Watkins, Calvert. 2000. *The American Heritage dictionary of Indo-European roots*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Willson, Stephen R. 1999. *Basic Burushaski vocabulary*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies/Summer Institute of Linguistics [Studies in Languages of Northern Pakistan, Vol. 6].
- Zarubin, Ivan Ivanovič. 1927. "Veršikskoe narečie kandžut'skogo jazyka". *Kollegija vostokovedov* 2: 275-364.

Ilija Čašule
ilija.casule@mq.edu.au