
Alexander LUBOTSKY

**EARLY CONTACTS BETWEEN URALIC
AND INDO-EUROPEAN: LINGUISTIC
AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The Indo-Iranian Substratum

1. Study of loanwords can be a powerful tool for determining prehistoric cultural contacts and migrations, but this instrument is used very differently in various disciplines. For instance, loanword studies are fully accepted in Uralic linguistics, whereas Indo-Europeanists are often reluctant to acknowledge a foreign origin for words attested in Indo-European languages. The reason is obvious: in Uralic, we know the source of borrowings (Indo-Iranian, Germanic, Baltic), but the source of possible Indo-European loans is usually unknown. Nevertheless, it is a matter of great importance to distinguish between inherited lexicon and borrowings, even if the donor language cannot be determined.

In recent years, the methodology of dealing with borrowings from an unknown source has been developed by Kuiper (1991; 1995), and applied by Beekes (1996) and Schrijver (1997). As these scholars have pointed out, an etymon is likely to be a loanword if it is characterized by some of the following features: 1) limited geographical distribution; 2) phonological or morphological irregularity; 3) unusual phonology; 4) unusual word formation; 5) specific semantics, i.e. a word belongs to a semantic category which is particularly liable to borrowing.

2. In my paper, I shall apply this methodology to the Indo-Iranian lexicon in search of loanwords which have entered Proto-Indo-Iranian before its split into two branches. As a basis for my study I use the list, gleaned from Mayrhofer's EWAia, of all Sanskrit etyma which have Iranian correspondences, but lack clear cognates outside Indo-Iranian. The complete list of some 120 Indo-Iranian isolates is presented in the Appendix.

The words of this list are by default characterized by the first of the above-mentioned criteria, viz. limited geographical distribution, but this in itself is not very significant because the lack of an Indo-European etymology

may be accidental: either all other branches have lost the etymon preserved in Indo-Iranian, or we have not yet found the correct etymology. Only if a word has other features of a borrowing must we seriously consider its being of foreign origin. The analysis of phonological, morphological and semantic peculiarities of our corpus will be presented in the following sections, but first I would like to make two remarks.

I use the term “substratum” for any donor language, without implying sociological differences in its status, so that “substratum” may refer to an adstratum or even superstratum. It is possible that Proto-Indo-Iranian borrowed words from more than one language and had thus more than one substratum.

Another point concerns dialect differentiation. In general, we can speak of language unity as long as the language is capable of carrying out common innovations, but this does not preclude profound differences among the dialects. In the case of Indo-Iranian, there may have been early differentiation between the Indo-Aryan and Iranian branches, especially if we assume that the Iranian loss of aspiration in voiced aspirated stops was a dialectal feature which Iranian shared with Balto-Slavic and Germanic (cf. KORTLANDT 1978: 115). Nevertheless, Proto-Indo-Iranian for a long time remained a dialectal unity, possibly even up to the moment when the Indo-Aryans crossed the Hindukush mountain range and lost contact with the Iranians.

3. Let us now look at the peculiar features displayed by some of the words from the corpus¹.

3.1. Irregular correspondences

In anlaut:

Skt. *s-*: PIr. **s-* (Skt. *sīkatā-*: OP *ḍikā-* ‘sand’; Skt. *sūcī-*: LAv. *sūkā-* ‘needle’);

Skt. *k-*: PIr. **g-* (Skt. *kéśa-* ‘hair’: LAv. *gaēsa-* ‘curly hair’);

Skt. *ph-*: PIr. **sp-* (Skt. *phāla-*: MoP *supār* ‘ploughshare’);

Skt. *ś-*: PIr. **xšy-* (Skt. *śépa-*, but Prākṛit *cheppā-*: LAv. *xšuuāēpā-* ‘tail’).

¹ We should not be discouraged by the often “normal” looks of a word: the early date of borrowing may be responsible for the fact that the loanwords were adjusted to the phonemic system of that moment and went through the whole historical development of the Indo-Iranian languages. Note that I did not use the laryngeals in the reconstructions because for the time being we do not know at which stage and in which form the words were adjusted to the Indo-Iranian phonemic system.

In inlaut:

Skt. *-a-*: PIr. **-u-* (Skt. *jáhakā-*: LAv. *dužuka-*, Bal. *jajuk*, *dužux*, MoP *žūža* ‘hedgehog’);

Skt. *-ā-*: PIr. **-a-* (Skt. *chāga-*: Oss. *sæg/sæǵæ* ‘billy-goat’; Skt. *āsā-* f.: LAv. *asah-* n. ‘region, space’);

Skt. *-v-*: PIr. **-b-* (Skt. *gandharvá-*: LAv. *gaṇḍarəβa-* ‘a mythical being’);

Skt. *-dh-*: PIr. **-t-* (Skt. *gandhá-* ‘smell’: LAv. *gaiṇti-* ‘bad smell’);

Skt. *-ar-*: PIr. **-ra-* (Skt. *átharvan-*: Av. *āθrauuān-/aθaurun-* ‘priest’);

Skt. *-ar-*: PIr. **-r-* (Skt. *gandharvá-*: LAv. *gaṇḍarəβa-* ‘a mythical being’);

Skt. *-ūr-*: PIr. **-r-* (Skt. *dūrśá-* ‘coarse garment’: Wakhi *ðars* ‘wool of a goat or a yak’).

3.2. Impossible root structure for an Indo-European word

There is a well-known root structure constraint in Proto-Indo-European, which does not permit two unaspirated voiced stops within a root. This means that **gadā-* ‘club’ and **grda-* ‘penis’ could not have been formed in the Indo-European proto-language.

3.3. Unusual structure (trisyllabic nouns with long middle syllable)

**pīūša-* ‘biestings’, **maiūk^ha-* ‘wooden peg’, **iavīā-* ‘canal’, **uarāj^ha-* ‘wild boar’, **kapauta-* ‘pigeon’, **kapāra-* ‘vessel, dish’.

The structure of these words is such that it is very difficult to explain them on the basis of IE morphology. For instance, Mayrhofer (EWAia II, p. 138) writes about Skt. *pīyūša-* ‘biestings’: “Gewiß zu *PAY^{II}* [‘to swell’], *páyas-* [‘milk, fluid’] gehörig” with a reference to Wackernagel 1954: 500. Wackernagel assumes in this word a suffix *-ūša-*, which is further only found in the late Sanskrit words *gaṇḍūša-* ‘water for rinsing the mouth’ and *mañjūṣā-* ‘box, chest’ (to which we may add RV *āṅgūśá-* ‘hymn’, KUIPER 1991: 19, 23), all of them being evident loanwords. Furthermore, even postulating a suffix *-ūša-* in *pīyūša-* does not solve all the problems, since we are still left with an unexplained long *ī*. The foreign origin of *pīyūša-* was already suggested by KUIPER (1968: 80; 1991: 46).

3.4. Phonetic peculiarities

Voiceless aspirates:

**(s)p^hāra-* ‘ploughshare’, **at^haruan-* ‘priest’, **kap^ha-* ‘mucus, phlegm’, **k^hā-* ‘well, source’, **k^hara-* ‘donkey’, **maiūk^ha-* ‘wooden peg’. Extremely frequent palatal stops: **anću-* ‘Soma plant’, **ācā-/ačas-* ‘region, space’, **ćarua-* name of a deity, **daćā-* ‘hem, thread’, **drća-/dřća-* ‘coarse garment’, **j^harmiia-* ‘firm structure’, **kaćiapa-* ‘tortoise’, **kaića-/gaića-* ‘head hair’,

**kućši-* ‘side of the body, flank’, **malj^ha-* (?) ‘belly’, **naij(s)-* ‘spit’, **ućig-* ‘sacrificing priest’, **uarāj^ha-* ‘wild boar’, etc.

Frequent clusters with *-s-*: **kućši-* ‘side of the body, flank’, **urćša-* ‘tree’, **matsia-* ‘fish’, **naij(s)* ‘spit’, **kšīra-* ‘milk’, **pusca-* ‘tail’, **scāga-/sāga-* ‘billy-goat’.

3.5. Peculiar word formation

“Suffix” *-ka-* (normally only denominal): **atka-* ‘cloak’, **stuka-* ‘tuft of hair’, **urtka-* ‘kidney’, **ja^ha/ukā-* ‘hedgheg’;

“Suffix” *-sa-* (rare in the inherited lexicon): **pīiūša-* ‘biestings’, **urćša-* ‘tree’;

“Suffix” *-pa-*: **kaćiapa-* ‘tortoise’, **pāpa-* ‘bad’, **stūpa-* ‘tuft of hair’, **šuaipa-* ‘tail’;

Other unusual suffixation:

**stu-ka-* vs. **stū-pa-* ‘tuft of hair’, **nagna(j^hu)-* (Skt. *nagnāhu-* m. ‘yeast’, Iran. **nagna-* ‘bread’), **karuš-* ‘damaged (teeth)’, **j^harm(i)ia-* ‘firm structure, permanent house’, **matsia-* ‘fish’, **naij(s)-* ‘spit’, **ućig-* ‘sacrificing priest’, **b^hišaj* (Skt. *bhišāj-* m. ‘physician’; LAV. *bišaziia-* ‘to cure’), **pavastā-* ‘cloth’.

3.6. Semantic categories

We can suspect that some words have been borrowed because they belong to a specific semantic field, even if they display no phonological or morphological anomalies. For instance, I assume that the religious terms **anći-* ‘Soma plant’, **carua-* name of a god, **mag^ha-* ‘gift, offering, sacrifice’ are likely to be loanwords. These words belong to the cult of Soma-drinking Aryans and thus form a semantically closely related group. The other members of the group do show anomalies: **at^haruan-* ‘priest’ and **g^(h)and^haru/b^(h)a-* ‘a mythical being’ have irregular correspondences, **indra-* shows irregular vocalization, **riši-* ‘seer’ has irregular accentuation in Sanskrit, while **ućig-* ‘sacrificing priest’ has an unusual morphological structure.

Also for semantic reasons, I assume foreign origin for words like **dačā-* f. ‘hem, thread’, **išt(i)a-* ‘brick’, **uāći-* f. ‘axe, pointed knife’, etc.

3.7. In general, we can state that although the foreign origin of some of the words is open to doubt, there is a small, but undisputable body of loanwords in Indo-Iranian². Our next task is to scrutinize the structure of the Indo-Iranian substratum.

² During the discussion of my paper in Tvärminne, Professor E. Helimski stressed the point that the number of Indo-Iranian loanwords is relatively small, so that the homeland of the Indo-Iranians is likely to be not so far from the Urheimat of the Indo-Europeans.

4.1. The phonological and morphological features of Indo-Iranian loanwords are strikingly similar to those which are characteristic of *Sanskrit* loanwords, i.e. words which are only attested in Sanskrit and which must have entered the language after the Indo-Aryans had crossed Hindukush. The structure of Sanskrit loanwords has been discussed by Kuiper (1991), so that a few examples will suffice.

The *majūk^ha*-type (trisyllabic words with long middle syllable) is abundantly attested in the foreign vocabulary of Sanskrit, cf. *urvārú-* f. ‘cucumber’, *úlúka-* m. ‘owl’, *uṣṇíṣa-* m.n. ‘turban’, *ṛbīsa-* n. ‘oven’, *kapolá-* m. ‘cheek’, *kárīṣa-* n. ‘dung’, *kilāsa-* adj. ‘of variegated color’, *kiṣorá-* ‘foal’, *mayūra-* m. ‘peacock’, *masūra-* m. ‘lentil’, *śārdūlá-* m. ‘tiger’, *śṛgālá-* m. ‘jackal’, etc.³

Voiceless aspirates are represented e.g. in *ulúkhala-* n. ‘mortar’, *khilá-* m. ‘uncultivated land’, *khārī-* f. ‘measure of grain’, *kharvá-* adj. ‘mutilated’, *phála-* n. ‘fruit’, *múkha-* n. ‘mouth, face’, *śíkhā-* f. ‘tuft of hair, crest’.

Palatal stops are very frequent. For instance, in Kuiper’s list of 383 foreign words in the RV I counted more than 90 words containing palatal *ś*, *j*, *ch* and *h*.

Clusters with *-s-* are: *kṣauma-* adj. ‘linen’ (cf. also *úmā-* ‘id.’), *chúbuka-* n. ‘chin’, *mukṣṛjā-* ‘?’ (V), *ikṣvākú-* NPr. (RV), *kútsa-* NPr. (RV), *kṣúmpa-* ‘?’ (RV 1.84.8), etc.

For the “suffix” *-pa-* cf. *álpa-* adj. ‘small’, *turīpa-* n. ‘seminal fluid’, *púspa-* n. ‘flower’, *śáspa-* n. ‘young grass, moulted barley’, *śilpá-* adj. ‘variegated’ (also *śilpa-* n. ‘ornament’), *śúrpa-* n. ‘winnowing basket’, etc.

For the “suffix” *-h-* cf. *malhá-* adj. ‘with hanging belly/udder’ (said of goats and ewes) vs. *bárjaha-* ‘udder’, *barjahyà-* ‘nipple’.

For the “suffix” *-ig-* cf. *ṛtvij-* ‘priest’, *vanij-* ‘merchant’, *bhurij-* ‘?’.

For the sequence *-ru-* cf. *urvārú* f. ‘cucumber’, *kharvá-* adj. ‘mutilated’, *turvása-* NPr., *pátharvan-* NPr. (RV 1.112.17), *phárvara-* ‘?’ (RV 10.106.2), probably *śárvarī-* ‘night’.

4.2. The phonological and morphological similarity of loanwords in Proto-Indo-Iranian and in Sanskrit has important consequences. First of all, it indicates that, to put it carefully, a substratum of Indo-Iranian and a substratum of Indo-Aryan represent the same language, or, at any rate, two dialects of the

³ Cf. also *ulúkhala-* n. ‘mortar’ with four syllables. In my opinion, also *karmāra-* m. ‘blacksmith’ is a loanword and is not derived from the root *kṛ-* ‘to make’, as is usually assumed. Also Skt. *pṛdāku-* ‘panther; kind of snake’ seems to be borrowed from the same language (the eventual origin of the word must be sought in the Near East, cf. the Iranian words Sogd. *pwrōnk-*, MiP *palang*, etc., Gr. *πάρδαλις* ‘leopard’).

same language. In order to account for this fact, we are bound to assume that the language of the original population of the towns of Central Asia, where the Indo-Iranians must have arrived in the second millennium BCE, on the one hand, and the language spoken in Punjab, the homeland of the Indo-Aryans, on the other, were intimately related⁴. At the present stage, it is useless to speculate about the possible identity of these languages, but this does not affect the argument.

Another consequence is that the Indo-Iranians must still have formed a kind of unity during their stay in Central Asia, albeit perhaps dialectally diversified. Judging by the later spread of the Indo-Aryans - to the south-west in the case of the Mitanni kingdom and to the south-east during their move to Punjab -, they were situated to the south of the Iranians, forming the vanguard, so to speak, of the Indo-Iranian movement. Accordingly, the Indo-Aryans were presumably the first who came into contact with foreign tribes and sometimes “passed on” loanwords to the Iranians. In this way, we may account for the difference between Skt. *síkatā-* and Iranian **síkatā-* ‘sand, gravel’ or Skt. *sūcī-* and Iranian **sūcī-* ‘needle’, which cannot reflect a single proto-form. At the stage when words with Skt. *s-* arrived in the Iranian territory, PIr. **s* had already become Iranian **h*, and PIr. **é* had turned into PIr. **s*, so that these words entered Iranian with PIr. **s-*. This direction of borrowing (rather than from Iranian to Sanskrit, as is usually assumed) also explains the irregular correspondences within Iranian. For instance, the word for ‘sand, gravel’ has no less than four different formations in Iranian, viz. **síká-* (OP *ṭikā-*, Bel. *six*, Pashto *šəga*), **síkaġa-* (Median *Sikayauvati-* ‘made of gravel’, the name of a fortress, Munji *səgya*, Išk. *səġio*, *sigioh*), **síkatā-* (Pahlavi *sygd = síkat*, Sogd. *šykth*, Khot. *siyatā*), **síkitā-* (Kurdish *sigit* ‘earth’, Oss. *syġyt/sigit* ‘id.’, etc.); the word for needle has two forms, viz. **sūkā-* (LAv. *sūkā-*) and **saucanġa-* (MiP *sozan*, Khot. *saujsaňa-*, Oss. *sūġin/soġīnæ*, etc.) (ABAEV 1958-95, III: 164-165, 187-188).

5.1. We can now turn to the culture with which the Indo-Iranians came into contact. Let us look at the semantic categories which are represented among the Indo-Iranian substratum words. I have arranged them in accordance with their frequency. One of the largest categories is “body parts, hair” (9 items: **kap^ha-* ‘mucus, phlegm’, **kaića-/gaića-* ‘head hair’, **kućši-* ‘side of the body, flank’, **grda-* ‘penis’, **malġ^ha-* ‘belly’, **pusća-* ‘tail’, **stuka-* ‘tuft of hair’, **šūaipa-* ‘tail’, **ur̥tka-* ‘kidney’), but this category, as well as “pejorative

⁴ The links between the culture of Central Asia and that of the Indus Valley are also repeatedly reported by archaeologists (cf. PARPOLA 1988: 204; HIEBERT 1995 with ref.).

adjectives” (**aka-* ‘bad’, **karuš-* ‘damaged (teeth)’, **pāpa-* ‘bad’), is not particularly telling for the identification of the culture.

“Religion, cult” (8) has been shortly discussed above.

“Wild animals” (8): **(H)uštra-* ‘camel’, **k^hara-* ‘donkey’, **kaćiapa-* ‘tortoise’, **kapauta-* ‘pigeon’, **ja^ha/ukā-* ‘hedgehog’, **matsīa-* ‘fish’, **mṛga-* ‘game’, **uarā^ha-* ‘wild boar’.

“Clothing” (5): **atka-* ‘cloak’, **dačā-* ‘hem, thread’, **dr̥ca-/dṛ̥ca-* ‘coarse garment’, **pauastā-* ‘cloth’, **sūcī-/ćūcī-* ‘needle’.

“Building technology” (4): **išt(i)a-* ‘brick’, **j^harmiija-* ‘firm structure, permanent house’, **mai^hūk^ha-* ‘wooden peg’, **sikatā-/ćikatā-* ‘sand, gravel’.

“Artifacts” (3): **kapāra-* ‘dish, bowl’, **naij(s)-* ‘spit’, **uācī-* ‘axe, pointed knife’.

“Water economy and irrigation” (3): **k^hā-* ‘well, source’, **čāt-* ‘pit, well’, **iavīia-* ‘canal’.

“Cattle breeding” (3): **kšīra-* ‘milk’, **pīiūša-* ‘biestings’, **scāga-/scāga-* ‘billy-goat’.

“Agriculture” (2): **nagna-* ‘yeast, bread’, **(s)p^hāra-* ‘ploughshare’.

5.2. Starting with the assumption that loanwords reflect changes in environment and way of life, we get the following picture about the new country of the Indo-Iranians. The landscape must have been quite similar to that of their original homeland, as there are no new terms for plants or landscape. The new animals like camel, donkey, and tortoise show that the new land was situated more to the South. There was irrigation (canals and dug wells) and more elaborate architecture (permanent houses with walls of brick and gravel). Agriculture still did not play an important role in the life of Indo-Iranians: presumably, they did not change their life-style and only used the products (‘bread’!) of the farmers, hardly tilling the land themselves. The paucity of terms for military technology (only **gadā-* f. ‘club’) can be seen as an indication of Aryan military supremacy. It seems further obvious to me that the Soma cult was borrowed by the Indo-Iranians.

This picture, which is drawn on exclusively linguistic arguments, is a strong confirmation of the traditional theory that the Indo-Iranians come from the north. Most probably, the Indo-Iranians moved from the Eurasian steppes in the third millennium BCE (Pit-Grave culture, 3500-2500 BCE) in the eastern direction, first to the region of the lower Volga (Potapovo, etc., 2500-1900 BCE) and then to Central Asia (Andronovo culture, from 2200 BCE onwards).

As we have seen above, there are reasons to believe that the Indo-Aryans formed the vanguard of the Indo-Iranian movement and were the first to come into contact with the original inhabitants of the Central Asian towns. Then,

presumably under pressure from the Iranians, who were pushing from behind, the Indo-Aryans moved further to the south-east and south-west, whereas the Iranians remained in Central Asia and later spread over the Iranian plateau. The urban civilization of Central Asia has enriched the Indo-Iranian lexicon with building and irrigation terminology, with terms for clothing and hair-do, and for some artifacts. It is tempting to suggest that the word **gadā-* ‘club, mace’ refers to the characteristic mace-heads of stone and bronze abundantly found in the towns of the so-called “Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex”. Also **uācī-* ‘axe, pointed knife’ may be identified with shaft-hole axes and axe-adzes of this culture.

6. Finally, I would like to shortly discuss the implications for the contacts between Indo-Iranian and Uralian speakers, which is the actual theme of this conference. As is well known, Uralic has borrowed heavily from Indo-Iranian, but I agree with those scholars who believe that many of the apparent early borrowings rather reflect an etymological relationship between Uralic and Indo-European, and I doubt that there are Proto-Uralic borrowings from Indo-European. At any rate, borrowings from Indo-Iranian start with the Finno-Ugric period. It is remarkable that the oldest layer of borrowings often concerns words which are only attested in Sanskrit and not in Iranian (e.g. FU **ora-* ‘awl’: Skt. *ārā-* ‘awl’; FV **reśmā* ‘rope’: Skt. *raśmī-* m. ‘rein’, *raśmán-* m. ‘id.’; FV **onke* ‘hook’: Skt. *anikā-* ‘hook’; FP **ant3* ‘young grass’: Skt. *andhas-* ‘grass’, etc.). This fact can be explained by the vanguard position of the Indo-Aryans, who were the first to come into contact with the Uralic population on their move to the east. The Iranians, who came slightly later, lived in the neighbourhood of the Uralians for a very long time and continuously contributed to the enrichment of the Uralian vocabulary.

Another problem is how to account for Indo-Iranian isolates which have been borrowed into Uralic. It is hard to believe that the new vocabulary, which most probably was acquired by the Indo-Iranians in Central Asia, could reach the Uralians in time, so that we only have two options: either the Indo-Iranian isolates are of Indo-European origin, or the Uralians borrowed these words from an Iranian source at a later stage. To the first group may belong PIIr. **raćm-* ‘rope, rein’: FV **reśmā* ‘rope’ (the *-m-* is only attested in Sanskrit); PIIr. **makš-* ‘fly, bee’: FU **mekše* ‘bee’ (the fact that the word can be reconstructed for FU precludes a late date for borrowing); PIIr. **surā-* ‘alcohol’: PP **sur* ‘beer’ (the PP word cannot be a late borrowing from Iranian because of its **s-*) and PIIr. **dasju-* ‘foreigner’: Vog. *tas* ‘stranger’ (the Uralic word cannot be due to late borrowing from Iranian because of the preserved **s*). On the other hand, I assume that FV **oraše* ‘(castrated) boar’ was borrowed from Iranian

(PIIr. **uarāj^ha-* ‘wild boar’ can hardly be an IE word). The same probably holds for FP **śuka* ‘chaff, awn’ because this form is only found in Iranian (LAv. *sūkā-* ‘needle’) and further for PP *vòrk* ‘kidney’ (PIIr. **ur̥tka-*), FP/FV **śaka* ‘goat’ (PIIr. **scāga-/scāga-*), PP **hān* ‘bread’ (PIIr. **nagna-*), PP **majäk/majäg* ‘stake’ (PIIr. **majūk^ha-*).

APPENDIX:

A list of Indo-Iranian isolates

The list presented below is based on Mayrhofer's EWAia. I have collected those Sanskrit etyma which have Iranian correspondences, but lack other IE cognates. In general, I follow the etymological analysis of Mayrhofer, and whenever I disagree with his judgement, this is expressly mentioned. Since it is often difficult to decide whether a particular word is a borrowing or not (the most important criteria have been discussed in the main body of the article), I have decided to present the evidence in full.

The list is divided into the following sections: A. Loanwords; B. Inherited words; C. Verbs; D. *Wanderwörter*, E. Words with uncertain IIr. etymology. The verbs are given separately, as at this stage it appears impossible to distinguish between inherited verbs and borrowings. The section “*Wanderwörter*” contains words which are attested both in Sanskrit and Iranian, but whose Proto-Indo-Iranian age cannot be ascertained.

Every lemma begins with a Proto-Indo-Iranian reconstruction, followed by grammatical information (in the case of agreement between Sanskrit and Iranian) and the meaning. In square brackets I have added words from other language families (mostly, Uralic) which are borrowed from Indo-Iranian or from which an Indo-Iranian word might have been borrowed.

A. Loanwords

- **aka-* adj. ‘bad’: Skt. *āka-* n. ‘pain’, *ākam* adv. ‘in a bad way’; Av. *aka-* ‘bad, evil’.
- **anću-* m. ‘Soma plant’ (probably ephedra): Skt. *aṃśú-* ‘Soma plant’; Av. *qsu-* ‘Haoma plant’.
- **atka-* m. ‘cloak’: Skt. *átka-*; LAv. *aḍka-*, *aṭka-*.
- **at^harūan-* m. ‘priest’: Skt. *átharvan-*; Av. *āθrauuān-/aθaurun-*.
- **ācā-/acās-* ‘region, space’: Skt. *āśā-* f.; LAv. *asah-* n.
- **b^hiš-* ‘medicine, medicinal herb’: Skt. *bhiṣáj-* m. ‘physician’; Av. *°biš-* ‘medicine’, LAv. *bišazi-ia-* ‘to cure’.
- **čarūa-* m. name of a deity: Skt. *śarvá-* name of a god; LAv. *sauruuā-* name of a daēva.
- **čāt-* ‘pit, well’: Skt. *cātvāla-* (Br.+) m.n. ‘pit (dug in order to get ground for the northern altar)’; LAv. *cāt-* f. ‘(dug) well’, Buddh. Sogd. *č’ t*, Bactrian *σαδο* ‘well’.

- **dačā-* f. ‘hem, thread’: Skt. *daśā-* ‘hem’; Khot. *dasa*, Bal. *dasag* ‘thread’.
- **dṛ́ca-/dṛ́ca-* (?) ‘coarse garment’: Skt. *dūrsā-* n. ‘coarse garment’; Wakhi *ḍirs* (Grunberg & Steblin-Kamenskij 1976, *dars*) ‘wool of a goat or a yak’, Shughni *doḡc* ‘id.; body hair; coarse cloth’ (cf. KARAMSHOEV 1991 s.v.).
- **gadā-* f. ‘club’: Skt. (Sū+) *gadā-*; LAV. *gaḍā-*, MiP *gad*.
- **gand^h/t-* ‘smell’: Skt. *gandhá-* m. ‘smell’; LAV. *gaiṅti-* ‘bad smell’.
- **g^(h)and^h(a)ru/b^(h)a-* m. ‘a mythical being’: Skt. *gandharvá-*; LAV. *gaṇḍarəḥpa-*.
- **grda-* ‘penis’: Skt. *grdá-* m.; LAV. *gəṛəḍə.kəṛəta-* adj. ‘cutting off the genitals’.
- **indra-* m. name of a deity: Skt. *indra-* name of a god; LAV. *iṇdra-* name of a daēva. Mayrhofer (EWAia s.v.) offers several etymologies, none of which is convincing however. From a semantic point of view, the most plausible etymology is Slavic **jědrь* ‘strong, fresh’, but the primary meaning in Slavic is clearly ‘pit, kernel’. Note the “wrong” vocalization, if this were an IE formation (from *(H)*indro-* we expect Iir. ***iadra-*).
- **išt(i)a-* ‘brick’: Skt. *iṣṭakā-* f. (VS+); LAV. *iṣṭiia-* n., OP *iṣṭi-* f., MiP *xišt* (cf. on this word WITZEL 1995: 103).
- **iaviā-* f. ‘canal’: Skt. *yavyā-/yavīyā/* ‘stream, canal’; OP *yauviyā-* ‘canal’.
- **j^harmiia-* ‘firm structure, permanent house’: Skt. *harmīyā-* n. ‘firm structure’, later ‘palace’ (for the meaning see ELIZARENKOVA 1995: 28-29); LAV. *zairimiiuuant-* adj. ‘with a permanent house’ (said of the moon), *zairimiiṅura-* m. ‘tortoise’ = ‘with toes in a house’.
- **ja^ha/ukā-* ‘hedgehog’: Skt. (YV+) *jáhakā-* f.; LAV. *dužaka-*, Bal. *jaḡuk*, *dužux*, MoP *žūža*. [Brahui *jaḡak*, Santali *ḡhik* are most probably late borrowings from Indo-Iranian languages]
- **kačīapa-* m. ‘tortoise’: Skt. *kaśyāpa-*; LAV. *kasiīapa-*.
- **kadru-* ‘reddish-brown’: Skt. (TS+) *kādru-* ‘reddish-brown’, Av. *kadruua.aspa-* name of a mountain, MoP. *kahar* ‘light brown’.
- **kaiča-/gaiča-* m. ‘head hair’: Skt. *kéśa-*; LAV. *gaēsa-* ‘curly hair’, *gaēsu-* ‘with curly hair’. Connection with Skt. *késara-* n. (YV+) ‘mane’ and Lat. *caesariēs* ‘head hair’ is uncertain.
- **kapauta-* m. ‘pigeon’: Skt. *kapóta-* ‘pigeon’; OP *kapautaka-* adj. ‘blue’, MiP *kabōd* ‘grey-blue, pigeon’.
- **kapāra-* ‘dish, bowl’: Skt. *kapāla-* n.; MiP *kabārag*, MoP *kabāra*.
- **kap^ha-* m. ‘mucus, phlegm’: Skt. *kapha-* (Up.+) ‘phlegm’; LAV. *kafa-* ‘foam, mucus’.
- **karuš-* adj. ‘damaged (teeth)’: Skt. *kārūdatin-* ‘with bad teeth’; Sogd. *krw ḍnt’k* ‘id.’.
- **kučši-* m. ‘side of the body, flank’: Skt. *kukṣi-*; Sogd. *qwšy-*. The often proposed connection with Skt. *kóśa-* m. ‘coop, cask’ is unconvincing.
- **kšīra-* ‘milk’: Skt. *kṣīrā-* n.; MiP *šīr*, Yidgha-Munji *xšīra*.
- **k^hara-* m. ‘donkey’: Skt. *khara-* (AVP+); LAV. *xara-*. [Akkadian (Mari) *ḡārum*, *ajarum* ‘donkey’; Tam. *kaṛutai* ‘id.’?]

**k^hā-* f. ‘well, source’: Skt. *khā-*; LAv. *xā-*.

**mag^ha-* n. ‘gift, offering, sacrifice’: Skt. *maghā-*; OAv. *maga-*. A connection with Gothic *mag* ‘can, may’ and its family is uncertain.

**majūk^ha-* m. ‘wooden peg’: Skt. *mayūkha-* ‘peg for stretching the woof’; OP <*myux*> = *mayūxa-* ‘doorknob’, Sogd. *myyk* ‘peg’, MiP and MoP *mēx* ‘peg, nail’, Oss. *mīx/mex* ‘stake’. The current etymology derives the word from the root *mi-* ‘to build, erect’, which explains neither its morphology (suffix **-ūk^ha-*?) nor its semantics (the verbal root only means ‘to fix in the ground’). The meaning ‘stake’ is only attested in Ossetic and is clearly secondary. [In view of its meaning, PP **majāk/majäg* ‘stake’ (RÉDEI 1986: 72) is probably borrowed from Pre-Ossetic]

**malj^ha-* (?) ‘belly’: Skt. *malhā-* adj. ‘with hanging belly/udder’ (said of goats and ewes)⁵; LAv. *mərəzāna-* n. ‘belly’, *maršuiiā* gen.sg. (the stem *maršuuī-* ?) ‘paunch’. Probably, also Skt. *bārjaha-* ‘udder’, *barjahyā-* ‘nipple’ belong here. The current IE etymology, connecting Lith. *milžtis*, Latvian *miļzt* ‘to swell up’, is phonetically impossible, since the Baltic acute points to IE **ǵ* (Winter’s Law).

**matsja-* m. ‘fish’: Skt. *mātsya-*; LAv. *masiia-*. The current IE etymology, which connects Germanic words like Gothic *mats* ‘food’ < *PGm. *mati-*, explains neither the meaning nor the morphology of the Ilr. word.

**mrga-* m. ‘game’: Skt. *mrgā-* ‘forest animal, bird’; LAv. *mərəḡa-* ‘bird’.

**nagna-* ‘yeast, bread’: Skt. *nagnāhu-* (AVP+) m. ‘yeast, ferment’; PIr. **nagna-* ‘bread’ (Sogd. *nḡny*, Pashto *nayan*, MiP *nān* with an irregular development, etc.). The old theory, according to which the Skt. word was borrowed from Iranian **nagnax^vād-* ‘bread seasoning’, seems improbable to me. [→ PP **nān* ‘bread’ from Iranian, RÉDEI 1986: 73]

**naij(s)-* ‘spit’: Skt. *nikṣ-* ‘to pierce’, *nīkṣaṇa-*, *nékṣaṇa-* n. ‘spit, fork’; LAv. *naēza-* n. ‘sharp point (of the needle)’, MiP *nēzag* ‘lance’, MoP *nēš* ‘sharp point’, *nēštar* ‘lancet’. The Sanskrit verbal forms (present *nikṣati* with its accented zero-grade) do not look old.

**pauastā-* ‘cloth’: Skt. *pavāsta-* n. ‘cover, garment’; OP *pavastā-* f. ‘thin clay envelope used to protect clay tablets’.

**pāpa-* adj. ‘bad’: Skt. *pāpā-*; LAv. *pāpa*^o.

**pīiūša-* ‘biestings’: Skt. *pīyūša-* m.n.; Wakhi *pyiṣ*, Munji *fəyū*.

**pusca-* ‘tail’: Skt. *puccha-* m.n.; LAv. *pusa-* m.

**rāci-* ‘heap’: Skt. *rāśi-* m. ‘heap, mass’; Pashto *ryāša* ‘heap (of grain)’ < **rāsiā*. A connection with **raćm-* ‘rope’ cannot be excluded, however.

**ṛši-* m. ‘seer’: Skt. *ṛṣi-*; OAv. *ərəši-*. The initial accentuation in Sanskrit is aberrant (LUBOTSKY 1988: 29, 54).

⁵ The word always refers to a female, usually pregnant, animal, cf. TS 1.8.19.1 *ādityām malhām garbhīṅm ā labhate* ‘he offers a *malha* pregnant female animal, dedicated to Āditya’ (similarly, MS 4.4.9; KS 13.1; TB 1.8.3.2), so that the meaning ‘dewlap’, given in the dictionaries, is improbable.

- **śāga-/śāga-* ‘billy-goat’: Skt. *chāga-* m.; Oss. *sæǵ/sæǵæ* ‘goat’, Wakhi *čəγ* ‘kid’. [→FP, FV
**śaka/śawa* ‘goat’, RÉDEI 1986: 59]
- **sikatā-/ćikatā-* ‘sand, gravel’: Skt. *sikatā-* f. ‘sand, gravel’; OP *ḍikā-* f. ‘gravel’, Khot. *siyatā-*
‘sand’, Buddh. Sogd. *šykth* ‘gravel’. [Kannada *usiku, usigu* ‘sand’ ?]
- **(s)p^hāra-* ‘ploughshare’: Skt. *phāla-* m.; MoP *supār*, Išk. *uspīr*, Wakhi *spūndr* (GRYUNBERG
& STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1976, *spundr* ‘plough’). It cannot be excluded that this is a mi-
gratory term and belongs to category D (Wanderwörter).
- **stuka-* ‘tuft of hair’: Skt. *stūkā-* f. ‘tuft of hair (esp. of a bull) or wool’; Oss. *styg/stug* ‘lock,
tuft of hair’. Cf. also Skt. *stūpa-, stupā-* m. ‘tuft of hair’.
- **sūčī-/čūčī-* ‘needle’: Skt. *sūčī-*; LAV. *sūkā-*, MiP *sozan*, Oss. *sūžīn/sožīnæ*. [→ FP **śuka*
‘chaff, awn’, RÉDEI 1986: 59; probably, from Iranian, cf. § 6]
- **śūaīpa-* (?) ‘tail’: Skt. *śēpa-* m. (with irregular anlaut), Prākṛit *cheppā-* f.; LAV. *xšuuāēpā-* f.
(for the etymology see LUBOTSKY 2000: 260, fn. 20).
- **ućig-* m. ‘sacrificing priest’: Skt. *uśij-*; Av. *usig-*.
- **uarāj^ha-* m. ‘wild boar’: Skt. *varāhā-*; LAV. *varāza-*. [→ FV **oraše* ‘(castrated) boar’, RÉDEI
1986: 54; probably, borrowed from Iranian, cf. § 6]
- **uāčī-* f. ‘axe, pointed knife’: Skt. *vāśī-* f. ‘axe, adze, chisel’; LAV. (YASNA 42.4) *vāsī-* ‘pointed
knife (?)’, Oss. *wæs* (better *was* ?)⁶ ‘axe, wood-chopper’.
- **urēša-* m. ‘tree’: Skt. *vrkṣā-*; LAV. *varəša-*.
- **ur̥tka-* m. du. ‘kidney’: Skt. *vrkkā-* (TS+ *vr̥kyau*); LAV. *vəṛəḍka-*. The usual etymology derives
this word from the root *vr̥t-* ‘to turn’, which can hardly be correct because the suffix *-ka-*
is only denominal in Indo-Iranian. [→ PP *vòrk* ‘kidney’, RÉDEI 1986: 79]
- **(H)uštra-* m. ‘camel’: Skt. *uśtra-*; Av. *uštra-*, OP *uša-bāri-* adj. ‘camel-borne’ (the laryngeal
may be responsible for *-ḥ-* in *zaraḍuštra-*).

B. Inherited words

- **(H)agra-* ‘top’: Skt. *āgra-* n. ‘tip, summit’; LAV. *ayra-* adj. ‘first, topmost’. The word has a
clear IE appearance, although there are no plausible cognates. Note that the connection
with Latvian *agrs* ‘early’ (EWAia s.v.) is impossible because of Winter’s Law.
- **(H)ainas-* n. ‘crime, mistake’: Skt. *éna-*; Av. *aēnah-*.
- **(H)and^ha-* adj. ‘blind’: Skt. *andhā-*; LAV. *aṇda-*. IE if Gallo-Latin *andabata* ‘gladiator
fighting in a helmet without openings’ (*‘blind-fighter’) belongs here.
- **(H)aruna-* ‘red-brown’: Skt. *aruṇā-*; Av. *auruna-*.
- **(H)aruša-* ‘reddish’: Skt. *aruśā-* ‘reddish’; Av. *auruša-* ‘white’.
- **(H)asra-* adj. ‘painful’: Skt. *asrá-*; OAv. *aṅgra-*, LAV. *aṅra-* ‘evil’.

⁶ As Johnny Cheung points out to me, this word is undocumented in Ossetic. Both
ABAEV (1958-95) and MILLER & FREJMAN (1927-34) s.v. *wæs* refer to MILLER 1903: 10, but
there this word is spelled as *vas*, i.e. *was*.

- **(H)atHtHi-* (?) m. ‘guest’: Skt. *átithi-*; Av. *asti-*. The laryngeal in the Proto-Indo-Iranian form makes a non-IE origin improbable.
- **(H)aud^hr/n-* ‘cold’: Skt. *údhani*, OAv. *aodərəš-čā*.
- **(H)auasa-* n. ‘provision’: Skt. *avasá-* (cf. also denom. *āvayati* ‘eats’); LAv. *auuaṅha-*.
- **carad-* f. ‘autumn, year’: Skt. *śarád-* ‘autumn, year’; LAv. *sarəd-*, OP <*θrd-*> ‘year’ (cf. Toch. A *śarme* ‘autumn’ < **kedmēn-*?, PINAULT 1998: 362).
- **dāsju-* m. ‘foreigner’, **dasiú-* f. ‘country (of the foreigners)’: Skt. *dásyu-* m. ‘enemy’; Av. *dašíiu-* f. ‘country’. [→ Vog. *tas* ‘stranger’] See the next word.
- **dāsa-* ‘(hostile) people’: Skt. *dāsá-*, *dāsa-* m.; LAv. *dāhī-* ‘belonging to the Dāha-people’. There are several suggestions for an IE etymology, but they are all doubtful (Gr. *δοῦλος* ‘slave’; Gr. *δῆμος* ‘people’, for the latter see LUBOTSKY 1995: 231, fn. 18).
- **drapsa-* m. ‘streak, banner’: Skt. *drapsá-*, LAv. *drafša-* (for the connection with Gr. *τρέφω*, German *Treber*, etc. see OBERLIES 1990: 153ff.).
- **īacas-* ‘fame’: Skt. *yásas-* n. ‘fame’; OAv. *yasō.xiiān* ‘to attain fame’, LAv. *yasō.bərəta-* ‘brought with dignity’.
- **īacīti-* f. ‘stick, branch’: Skt. *yaṣṭi-* (RVKh, ŚB+) f. ‘staff, pole’; LAv. *ōyaxsti-* ‘branch’.
- **īaj^hu-* ‘youthful’: Skt. *yahú-* ‘youthful’; OAv. *yazu-* ‘young’.
- **īātu-* ‘(black) magic’: Skt. *yātu-* m.; LAv. *yātu-* f. (m. ‘sorcerer’). In spite of its IE appearance, no convincing etymology for this word has been suggested.
- **īraīas-* n. ‘wide expanse, sea’: Skt. *īráyas-* n. ‘wide expanse’; Av. *zraīiah-* n., OP *drayah-* n. ‘sea’. Cf. also Skt. *ūpa jrayati* ‘extends’. [→ PP **sariǵ* < **ǵaris* < **ǵarjās* ‘sea’ from Iranian, RÉDEI 1986: 81]
- **karna-* m. ‘ear’: Skt. *kárṇa-*; LAv. *karəna-*.
- **d^hārā-* f. ‘blade of the sword’: Skt. *dhārā-*; LAv. *dārā-*. IE if identical with Skt. *dhārā-* ‘stream, pouring’ (→ ‘casting’).
- **d^hrigu-* adj. ‘poor, needy’: Skt. *ādhrigu-* ‘exalted’; OAv. *drigu-* ‘needy’, LAv. superlative *draējištō.təma-*.
- **makš-* f. ‘fly, bee’: Skt. *mákṣ(ā)-* ‘fly, bee’; LAv. *maxšī-* f. ‘fly’. [→ FU **mekše* ‘bee’, RÉDEI 1986: 45]
- **māīā-* f. ‘magic power’: Skt. *māyā-*; OAv. *māīiā-*, LAv. *maiīā-*. There are various etymological proposals, but they are all rather improbable. The word looks fairly IE though, and its IE origin is conceivable.
- **mušti-* ‘fist’: Skt. *muṣṭi-* m.f.; LAv. *mušti^o*. A connection with the word for ‘mouse’ (e.g. EWAia s.v.) is impossible, because the latter contains a laryngeal (**muHs-*). The best chance for an IE etymology is the connection with Lith. *mùšti* ‘to beat’, Toch B *mašce* ‘fist’.
- **naima-* adj.: Skt. *néma-* ‘some, half’; LAv. *naēma-* ‘half’.
- **pačšman-* ‘eyelash’: Skt. *pákṣman-* (YV+) n. ‘eyelash’; LAv. *pašna-* n. ‘eyelash or eyelid’, MiP and MoP *pašm*, Khot. *pe’ma-*, Oss. *fæsm/fans* ‘wool’. If the original meaning is ‘fluff’, then a connection with Gr. *πέκτειν* ‘to comb’ is plausible.

- **pāman-* ‘itch, scabies’: Skt. *pāmán-* m.; LAV. *pāman-* m. Probably connected with Gr. $\pi\eta\mu\alpha$ n. ‘evil, harm’.
- **pṛt-* f. ‘battle’: Skt. *pṛt-*; Av. *pəṛət-*.
- **rać-m-* ‘rope, rein’: Skt. *raśaná-* f. ‘rope’, *raśmí-* m. ‘rein’, *raśmán-* m. ‘id.’; MiP, MoP *rasan* ‘rope’. (Skt. *raśaná-*, MiP *rasan* < **raćmna-* ?) [→ FV **reśmä* ‘rope’, RÉDEI 1986: 57]
- **rūćša-* adj. ‘raw’: Skt. *rūkṣá-* (YV+) ‘raw, dry’; OAv. *uruša-* ‘needy, poor’. The connection with OHG *rūh*, etc. < PGm. **rūhwa-* is possible.
- **sainā-* f. ‘army’: Skt. *sénā-*; LAV. *haēnā-*, OP *hainā-*.
- **srakti-* f. ‘corner’: Skt. *srakti-* ‘corner’; LAV. *srxati*, *θraxti-* ‘corner, side’. Here probably also *sṛká-* ‘sharp point’. The variants like *sṛkāyín-* (Kāth+) : *sṛgāyín-* (MS+) : *sṛkāyín-* (TS), etc. ‘spear-bearer’ (see KUIPER 1991: 35) may point to a foreign origin, though.
- **striH-* f. ‘woman, wife’: Skt. *strī-*; LAV. *strī-*.
- **surā-* ‘alcohol’: Skt. *súrā-* f.; LAV. *hurā-* f. Probably, connected with the root **su-* ‘to press’. [→ PP **sur* ‘beer’, RÉDEI 1986: 77]
- **taukman-* n. ‘germ, germed seed’: Skt. *tókman-*; Av. *tauxman-*. Cf. also the root-noun Skt. *túc-* f. ‘posterity, children’.
- **uanća-* ‘roof-beam’: Skt. *vaṃśá-* m.; Wakhi *was*, Shughnī *wūs*. Most probably, related to Mir. *féice* ‘ridge-pole, top’ < **u(e)nkio-*.
- **urata-* n. ‘rule, command’: Skt. *vratá-* ‘commandment’; OAv. *uruuata-* ‘rule’.

C. Verbs

- **b^haru-* ‘to chew’: Skt. *bharv-*; LAV. *aš. baouruua-* ‘place where there is much to eat’, *baoir-ia-* ‘to be chewed’.
- **ćan-* ‘to ascend’: Skt. *śánaih* ‘gradually, quietly’; LAV. *san-*, Khot. *san-/sata-* ‘to rise’.
- **ćiā-* ‘to coagulate, congeal’: Skt. *śyā-*; Oss. *syjyn/sujun*.
- **d^huaǰ-* ‘to flutter’: Skt. *dhvajá-* m. ‘banner’, *kṛtá-dhvaj-* ‘with streaming flags’; LAV. *duuaž-* ‘to flutter’.
- **g^has-* ‘to devour’: Skt. *ghas-*; LAV. *gah-*.
- **g^has-* ‘to laugh’: Skt. *has-*; LAV. *jahī-*, *jahikā-* f. ‘prostitute’.
- **g^hauš-* ‘to make sound, hear’: Skt. *ghoṣ-*, Av. *gaoš-*.
- **(H)at-* ‘to wander’: Skt. *at-* ‘to wander’; Av. *x^vāθra-* n. ‘well-being’.
- **Huīad^h-* ‘to wound, hurt’: Skt. *vyadh-*; LAV. *vīd-* ‘wounding’.
- **ǰ^hi-* ‘to incite’: Skt. *hi-*; LAV. *frazaiiāmi* ‘ich lasse hindringen’.
- **kuć-* ‘to crook, bend’: Skt. *kuc-*; MiP *n-gwc-*.
- **nard-*: Skt. *nrd-* ‘to hum, growl’; Buddh. Sogd. *nrδ-* ‘to complain’.
- **raj^h-*: Skt. *rah-* ‘to be abandoned’; MiP *rāz* ‘mystery’.
- **sag^h-* ‘to be able to bear’: Skt. *sagh-*; LAV. *azgatō* ‘unbearable’.
- **srans-* ‘to fall apart’: Skt. *sraṃs-*; LAV. *rāḡhaiiān* ‘they make fall away’.
- **suag-* ‘to embrace’: Skt. *svaj-*; LAV. *pairiš.x^vaxta-* ‘surrounded’.
- **uand(H)-* ‘to praise’: Skt. *vand^l-*; LAV. *vaṇd-*.

**uap-* ‘to scatter’: Skt. *vap-*; OAv. *vīuuāpa* ‘scatters, robs, devastates’.

**uap-* ‘to shave’: Skt. *vap-*; Khot. *patāvutta-* ‘shaven’.

**uik-* ‘to separate, sift’: Skt. *vic-*; LAv. *vic-*, MiP *wēxtan/wēz-*.

**uiak-* ‘to encompass’: Skt. *vyac-*; MoP *gunjīdan*.

**uiatH-* ‘to be unsteady’: Skt. *vyath-*; LAv. *aiuiθura-* (< **aβiθura-*) ‘unshakable’.

**uriH-* ‘to oppress, collapse’: Skt. *vlr-*; LAv. *uruinaitīš* (acc.pl.f.) ‘pressing together’.

D. Wanderwörter

Skt. *úmā-* f. ‘flax’; Yidgha *imoyō, ümoyō*, Munji *yimagā* ‘linseed’ (cf. also Skt. lex. *kṣumā-* ‘id.’).

Skt. *māṣa-* m. ‘bean’; MiP *māš* ‘legume’, Shughni *maš* ‘bean’.

Skt. *mušká-* m. ‘testicle’; MiP *mušk* ‘musk’ (probably, a loanword from Indo-Aryan).

Skt. *sarṣapa-* m. ‘mustard seed’; Khot. *śśaśvāna-* ‘mustard’, Sogd. *šywp-δn*, MiP *span-dān* ‘mustard seed’ (cf. also Gr. *σίῶπι* n. ‘mustard’).

E. Words with uncertain IIr. etymology

Skt. *aváni-* f. ‘river bed, stream’; LAv. *aoniia-* n. ‘Heizvorrichtung’.

Skt. *ašⁱ-* ‘to eat’; Iranian cognates, mentioned by Mayrhofer, are uncertain. LAv. *āsitō* (Yasna 10.14) rather means ‘lying’, cf. HUMBACH 1960: 27-28; OBERLIES 1990: 159 and 166, fn. 55. At any rate, this form cannot be derived from PIr. **ačHta-* because laryngeal disappears in this position in Iranian. The explanation of LAv. *kahrkāsa-* m. ‘vulture’ as ‘chicken-eater’ has a strong flavour of folk etymology and is almost certainly false. Sogd. *črks*, Oss. *cærgæš* ‘eagle’ show initial *č- and short -a- in the second syllable, which are incompatible with the Avestan word. I suspect that this is a borrowing, which may have been interpreted in some of the Iranian languages as containing the word for ‘chicken’. The best candidates for Iranian cognates to Skt. *ašⁱ-* are MoP *āš* ‘food, soup’ < PIr. **āšja-*, Oss. *bas/basæ* ‘soup’ < **upa-āšja-*, etc.

Skt. *prasalaví* ‘to the right’; OP *frhrvm /frahavarvam?* ‘all round’.

Skt. *hirā-* f. ‘vein’; LAv. *zira-žan-* (Aogəmadaēcā 57) ‘striking the veins’ (?), cf. HUMBACH 1983: 120). The meaning of the Avestan compound remains hypothetical.

Skt. *valkā-* m.n. ‘bark’, LAv. *varəka-* (Frahang-i-ōīm 8 = Kling. 395) m./n. ‘leaf’.

ABBREVIATIONS

Av.	Avestan (i.e. both OAv. and LAv.)	OP	Old Persian
AVP	Atharva-Veda Paippalāda	Oss.	Ossetic
Bal.	Baluchi	PGm.	Proto-Germanic
Br.	Brāhmanas	PIr.	Proto-Indo-Iranian
FP	Finno-Permian	PIr.	Proto-Iranian

FU	Finno-Ugric	PP	Proto-Permian
FV	Finno-Volgaic	RV	Ṛgveda
Gr.	Greek	RVKh	Ṛgveda-Khilāni
IE	Indo-European	ŚB	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
Išk.	Iškašimi	SCr.	Serbo-Croatian
Khot.	Khotanese	Skt.	Sanskrit
KS	Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā	Sogd.	Sogdian
LAv.	Late Avestan	Sū	Sūtras
Lith.	Lithuanian	Toch.	Tocharian
MiP	Middle Persian	TB	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa
MoP	Modern Persian	TS	Taittirīya-Saṃhitā
MS	Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā	Up.	Upanishads
OAv.	Old Avestan	Vog.	Vogulian
OHG	Old High German	VS	Vajasaneṃyī-Saṃhitā
		YV	Yajurveda

REFERENCES

- ABAEV, V. I. 1958-95. *Istoriko-ètimologicheskij slovar' osetinskogoazyka*. Moskva.
- BEEKES, R. S. P. 1996. Ancient European loanwords. *Historische Sprachforschung* 109: 215-236.
- ELIZARENKOVA, T. Y. 1995. "Words and things" in the *Ṛgveda*. (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Post-Graduate and Research Department Series, 39; Professor P. D. Gune Memorial Lectures, sixth series.) Pune.
- EWAia = M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg, 1986-96.
- GRYUNBERG A. L. & I. M. STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1976. *Vakhanskijazyk: teksty, slovar', grammaticheskij ocherk*. Moskva.
- HIEBERT, Fredrik T. 1995. South Asia from a Central Asian perspective. In: George Erdosy (ed.), *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia. Language, Material Culture and Ethnicity*: 192-205. Berlin.
- HUMBACH, H. 1960. *Die Kaniška-Inschrift von Surkh-Kotal*. Wiesbaden.
– 1983: Review of: Kaikusroo M. JamaspAsa, Aogəmadaēcā. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 235: 116-125.
- KARAMSHOEV, D. 1991. *Shugnansko-russkij slovar' v trekh tomakh*, 1.2. Moskva.
- KORTLANDT, F. 1978. Proto-Indo-European obstruents. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 83: 107-118.
- KUIPER, F. B. J. 1968: Śailūṣā- and Kuśīlava-. In: M. Mayrhofer et al. (eds.), *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde (Gedenkschrift Brandenstein)*: 77-84. Innsbruck.

- 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Amsterdam.
 - 1995. Gothic *bagms* and Old Icelandic *ylgr*. *NOWELE* 25: 63-88.
- LUBOTSKY, A. 1988. *The System of Nominal Accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden.
- 1995. Reflexes of intervocalic laryngeals in Sanskrit. In: W. Smoczyński (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume*, I: 213-233. Cracow.
 - 2000. Indo-Aryan ‘six’. In: M. Ofitsch, C. Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*. (Arbeiten aus der Abteilung “Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft Graz”.)
- MILLER, Wsewolod 1903. *Die Sprache der Osseten*. Strassburg.
- MILLER, V. F. & A. A. FREJMAN 1927-1929-1934. *Osetinsko-russko-nemeckij slovar'*, I-III. Leningrad.
- OBERLIES, T. 1990. Zur Wortkunde des Kāṭhaka – I. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 51: 147-166.
- PARPOLA, A. 1988. The coming of the Aryans to Iran and India and the cultural and ethnic identity of the Dāsas. *Studia Orientalia* 64: 195-302.
- PINAULT, G.-J. 1998. Tocharian languages and pre-Buddhist culture. In: Victor H. Mair (ed.), *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Peoples of Eastern Central Asia*: 358-371. Washington D.C.
- RÉDEI, K. 1986. *Zu den indogermanisch-uralischen Sprachkontakten*. Wien.
- SCHRIJVER, P. 1997. Animal, vegetable and mineral: some Western European substratum words. In: A. Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound Law and Analogy (Festschrift Beekes)*: 293-316. Amsterdam.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*, II.2: *Nominalsuffixe*. Hrsg. von A. Debrunner. Göttingen.
- WITZEL, M. 1995. Early Indian history: linguistic and textual parameters. In: George Erdosy (ed.), *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia. Language, Material Culture and Ethnicity*: 192-205. Berlin.