

ISCKMC 2020**International Scientific Congress «KNOWLEDGE, MAN AND CIVILIZATION»****REVISITING THE CLASSIFICATION OF CAUCASIAN
LANGUAGES ACCORDING TO BASIC VOCABULARY**

Arbi Dzhamalajlovich Vagapov (a)*, Khava Bakuevna Navrazova (b),
Musa Rukhmanovich Ovhadov (c), Luiza Borz-Alievna Abdulvakhabova (c)

*Corresponding author

(a) Chechen Pedagogical State University, Grozny, Russia, arby555@yandex.ru,

(b) Chechen Pedagogical State University, Grozny, Russia, baretk@mail.ru,

(c) Chechen State University, Grozny, Russia, ovhadov49@mail.ru

Abstract

The authors compare the basic vocabulary of the North Caucasian, Kartvelian and Indo-European languages from the 35 word-list of S.E. Yakhontov, which is a reduced sample from Swadesh word-list. Several critical remarks were made about the composition of this list and the strict requirements for the identity of the semantics of the compared words. During the process of comparison, it is recommended to take the main word used in the language to express a particular meaning, but this is not always possible, since many words have synonyms and it is often difficult to choose the “main” one from them. In such cases, a researcher is forced to take two or more synonyms and this immediately increases the number of actually compared words in the list. The authors studied more than 50 words in this article instead of 35. As a result of the analysis, it was established that in the list of S.E. Yakhontov there are 7 correspondences between the Nakh-Dagestan and Kartvelian languages, 8 correspondences between the Abkhaz-Adyg and Kartvelian languages, 13 correspondences between the Nakh-Dagestan and Abkhaz-Adyg languages, more than 50 correspondences between the Nakh-Dagestan and Indo-European languages (including synonyms). According to this data, the authors conclude that all the studied languages, despite Starostin and his followers, are related to each other, and the closest relationship exists between the East Caucasian (or Nakh-Dagestan) and Indo-European languages.

2357-1330 © 2021 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Swadesh word-list, Yakhontov word-list, Caucasian and Indo-European languages



1. Introduction

Nowadays the use of Swadesh 100-word list in order to establish the genetic links of languages is a common practice. Using this list, it is possible to make far-reaching conclusions about the degree of kinship and the time of separation of certain languages estimated in tens of thousands of years. Thus, due to the ideas of macrocomparativists, the North Caucasian languages became related to the Chinese language, as well as the Yeniseian languages, the Basque, the Sumerian, the Burushaski languages and the languages of the Na-Dene Indians, etc. The family of these languages is called the Sino-Caucasian and there is in no connection even with the Nostratic family of languages, which, along with Indo-European, Ural-Altai, Afrasian and Dravidian, oddly enough, includes the Kartvelian languages, which until recently were considered related to the North Caucasian languages.

2. Problem Statement

According to Starostin (2007), experience shows that in order to establish the presence or absence of genetic relationship between languages, it is possible to use only a small number of basic vocabulary, for example, S.E. Yakhontov word-list, consisting of the following words: *blood, bone, die, dog, ear, egg, eye, fire, fish, full, give, hand, horn, I, know, louse, moon, name, new, nose, one, salt, stone, sun, tail, this, tongue, tooth, two, wind, water, what, who, year, you.*

It is supposed that all related languages at the level of 5–7 thousand-year divergence have more than 20 coinciding words within this 35-word list, and this has been verified for Indo-European, Altai, Uralic, Dravidian, Sino-Tibetan, Austronesian and other languages, the relationship of which is “traditionally considered proven” (?). However, there are some doubts about the verification, because the preroots which they restored and their similarity in the compared languages provoke criticism of many researchers (Abdullaev, 1993; Xalidov, 2018).

3. Research Questions

The subject of the article is the basic vocabulary of the North Caucasian languages from the 35 word list of S.E. Yakhontov, compiled on the basis of Swadesh word-list.

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the research is to reveal the number of correspondences in the basic vocabulary of the North Caucasian, Kartvelian and Indo-European languages as part of Yakhontov word-list.

5. Research Methods

The authors used comparative-historical and comparative-typological research methods. As an illustration, let us give the example of the comparison of words with the semantics 'heart' in the East Caucasian languages.

Heart: Ch. *duog* < Nakh **dag* ~ Avar *rak'* (Bezht. *jak'o*) < **dak'* ~ Darg. *urk'i* < *uk'* // *ruk'* ~ Lak *dak'* ~ Lezg. *rik'*.

Proto-Nakh-Dagestanian root for the heart is reconstructed as **dag* 'heart, core, middle', which is confirmed by Dargva dialect data, which are still preserved *даг*, *баг* 'middle, waist' (Comrie & Xalilov, 2010; Temerbulatova, 2012) with gender marks. Etimon 'middle, core' for the heart is also present in Russian *сердце – сердцевина, середина*; Geo. *guli*, Kab. *гуы* 'heart' ~ *гуы* 'bullock cart (< 'chariot')', Ch. *guo* 'cicle'; Ubykh *гә* 'heart; middle' (NCED). Compare against this background the proposed for the heart in NCED (1994) PNC an archetype **jĕrk'wi* 'heart', that we have questions about: 1) on what basis was it restored in anlaut consonant *j*, when the vast majority of Nakh-Dagestanian languages we have *d* or *r*? 2) what are the reasons for choosing root vowel *ĕ*, while data from most languages indicates middletongue *a*, which in WC languages it is regularly converted to *e*, and not vice versa? 3) what is the logic of restoring the sonor *r*, when it is known, that the ND languages are characterized by its incertion, and not by its loss? (cf. *баул* 'wulf' > Lak *барул*, *бүтт* 'moon' > *бурул*, *рус* 'daughter' > *рурс*, *маи* // *муи* 'wind' ~ Lak *марч*; Lezg. *сас* 'tooth' > таб.-юж. *сарс*, Lak *ккарччи* 'tooth' < **ккаччи*, ср. Lak *ккаччи* 'dog' < 'large-toothed, biting').

6. Findings

As a result of the analysis, it was found that in Yakhontov word-list there are 7 correspondences between the Nakh-Dagestan and Kartvelian languages, 8 correspondences between the Abkhaz-Adyg and Kartvelian languages, 13 correspondences between the Nakh-Dagestan and Abkhaz-Adyghe languages, more than 50 correspondences between the Nakh-Dagestan and Indo-European languages (including synonyms). In accordance with these data, the authors come to the conclusion that all the studied languages are related to each other, and that the East Caucasian and Indo-European languages are most closely related. According to the opinion of Trubetsky (1930) the morphological characteristics of the Right East Caucasian are similar to the Proto-Indo-European. We suppose that in this article, the etymons were established for many Indo-European words for the first time.

1. BLOOD: 1) Ch. *пхъа* 'blood, blood feud' ~ Avar *би* 'кровь' ~ Darg. *хИи* < **пхИи* ~ Lak *оь* < **хЮь* < **пхЮь* (?) ~ Lezg. *ви*, Tab. *фи*, Udin. *ппи*.

Blood [2] Nakh *ghaur-*: Chechen *ghuoruon* 'to freeze', *ghuoruor* 'freezing', *ghura* 'frozen ground'. Original meaning for 'blood' was 'crud, coagulating (liquid)' ~ PIE **kreu-* 'raw flesh': OGreek *kryos* 'сильный мороз', L *cruor* 'blood', *crudus* 'bloody, raw', Skrt. *kruras id.*, Av. *χру* 'piece of blood's meat', Soghd. *ghwrnw* 'bloody', *χрura-* 'bloody', ON *hrar* 'row', Rus. *кровь*, Lat. *kreve* 'scab', *kruveši* 'замерзшая грязь', Lith *kraujas* 'blood' ~ PIE **krau-* // **kru-* // **ghru-* 'freezing' (Pokorny, 1959; Fasmer, 1967). Cf. also E. **gore** 'coagulating blood'.

Arno Furie thinks, that Nakh **c-ēgi* corresponds to PIE **H1es-* 'blood'. Однако, PIE **es-ar-*: Hittite *ešhar*, L. **aser* (> assyr), Greek. **esar*, Skrt. *aṣṭk-*, Lat. *asins*, Tokh. *yasar* 'blood' (Gamkrelidze, 1984), Afg. *acaū* 'frost' corresponds to PEC ***as** 'frost': Ch. *jis* 'frost', gen. *esar-an*, pl. *esarš*, dial. *asireš*, God. *asa* 'frost', *asar* 'dew', Bud. *isang* 'frost', PLezg. **is* / **jis* snow, WC **sy* 'snow', from which Germ. **is* 'ice', Avest. *isu* 'icy' inseparable.

2. BONE: [Nakh. *ban, *buon ‘to break’: Chechen buon, *past* boina ~ Germ. baina, OE ban, E bone. Unattested, cf Chechen da‘ak ‘bone’ ~ da‘a ‘to cut’, Rus. kost’ ‘bone’ ~ *костумь* ‘to cut’]

3. DIE¹: In this meaning Starostin (2007) reconstructed for WC root =iwlĒ (Ch. =al-, Lak =iĉ’a-, Darg. -ebk’-, q’i-, Khin. k’-), which is hardly convincing. PN root *v-al- ‘die’ (Ch. v-alaⁿ, Ing. vala, Tush. v-alaⁿ) exactly match Luv. wala- ‘to die’, Old Icelandic *valr-* ‘the slain in battle’, OE *wæl* ‘slaughter, carnage, field of battle’, *wælan* ‘to torment, to afflict’, OHG *wal* ‘battlefield’, Lith. *vele* ‘the soul of a dead person’, *velnias* ‘devil’, Tokharian A *wal* ‘to die’ (Gamkrelidze, 1984), PIE *ual- ‘die’.

In PWC the root this value is restored as *λV- (Adyg. λa-, Kab. λa-). Ubykh. *dəwa-*, originally ‘stiffen’ resembles Ch. *daj’a*, dial. *devan*, Tush. *divan* ‘kill’, corresponding to Greek *deio* ‘mortify’, Slav. *dawiti*, Luzh. *dajis*, OIce *deyja* ‘die’, AS *doian* – id., Goth. *divan*, PIE *deu- ‘disappear, vanish; kill’ (Vagapov, 2011).

Die² – PIE *dheu-, *dhuei- ‘disappear, die: Slav *daviti, Germ. *daujan ~ Nakh *dien ‘kill’, *daj’an ‘kill’: Chechen *die* ‘kill’, pl. *daj’a*, dial. *dava* ‘kill’;

Die³ – PIE *mrto- ‘dead’: Skrt. *mrta*, L *mortuus*, Lith. *mirti* ‘to die’ ~ Nakh *mard > *muord* // *mörd-ig* ‘hard film, dead tissue’], *muordala* ‘grow numb’.

4. DOG ?

5. EAR: Ch. *lerg* ‘ear’, Ing. *lerg*, Tush. *lark*. Formed with diminutive suff. -ig from stem *la-* ‘ear’, with an expander -r-, cf. *la-duogha* ‘listen’, literally ‘prick up your ear’. Ch. *lerg* is closer Darg. *lihi* ‘ear’, Hurrite *lele* ‘ear’ (reduplication?). It is also interesting to note the consonance with Basque *larri* in *bellarri* ‘ear’, as well as Ubykh. *la* ‘hare’ < ‘ear’. For typology cf. Ch. *lerg-jaxar* ‘hare’ from *lerg* ‘ear’, Rus. *ушан* ‘hare’.

Ear: [PN *ghasan > *χazan ‘hear’ (Chechen *khaza*, Ing. *khaza*, Bats. *khac’a* ‘ear, understand’ ~ PIE *ghaus- ‘hear; ear’: Goth. *hausjan* ‘hear’, OHG. *horen* < *xozen (G. *hören*), OE. *hieran* < *hiezan, Germ. *xauzjan [AHD 1523; Pok. *keu-* 587]; Skrt. *ghosa* ‘son, noise’, Av. *gaoša* ‘ear, hear’, OPers. *gauša* ‘ear’, Osset. *qūs* / *ghos* ‘ear’, *qūsyn* / *ighōsun* ‘hear’ (Abayev, 1989). Cf Hurrit. *xaz-* ‘hear’, Urartu. *xas-* ‘hear, listen’ (Desheriev, 1963).

6. EGG: [Nakh *ha’u ‘egg’: Chechen *ho’a* ‘egg; bullet; forage’, Tush. *oβ* ‘grain’ ~ PIE *auei- / *owyo-: Germ. *ajja(m) in OE *ag*, *egg* ‘cockney, kidney’, ON *egg*, L *ovum*, Gr. *oion*, Afg. *hoya* ‘seed, egg’, Pers. *xaia*, Iran. *aia, L. *ovum*, Greek *óon*, Slav. *aje (Pokorny, 1959).

7. EYE: Ch. *b’ärg* (< *b’ärig*) is diminutive form from of *b’a* ‘eye’. Avar *ber* ‘eye’, ‘wheel’ does not correspond to the Ch. *b’ärg* ‘eye’, contrary to some authors, but to another word *berə* ‘propeller, turbine, mill wheel’. Typologically compare Geo. *tvali* ‘eye’, ‘wheel’ (Megr.-Chan. *tol*) – Ch. *tuolla* ‘shuttle’; And. *harku* ‘eye’ – Ch. dial. *ħorkuna* ‘chariot’.

~ Nakh *aga ‘look, see’ > Ch. *ħazan* // *ħiežan* ‘to see, look’, *ħaga* // *iter*. *ħiega* ‘envy’; Bagv. *ɣbakla*, Tind. *ɣbakla* ‘eye’. ~ PIE *ag- // *eg- // *og- ‘fire, burn’: OE *eage*, OFr. *age* ‘eye’, E. *eye*. The *g* sound often palatalized and moves in *y*, that is observed in Botl. *ɣbai* (< *ɣbaɣ) ‘eye’, Godob. *ɣbaiu* (< *ɣbaɣ-), Cham. *ɣbai* (< *ɣbaɣ), Bezht. *ɣbai* (< *ɣbaɣ), E. *eye* < OE *eage*.

~ Nakh. *sa* ‘light; eyesight’, gen. *sin* ~ Alb. *si* ‘eye’ < PIE. *si- // *su- ‘light, shine’.

8. FIRE: PC *k’a-r ‘fire’ (Ch. dial. *ɣlapu* ‘stove’, Akhv. *ɣlapu* ‘fire’ < *ɣlapu, Lak *κlupu* ‘hot’), Nakh *c’e, *c’ar- ‘fire’ ~ Avar *ɣla*, Bezh. *ɣlu*, Kar. *ɣle*, Bud. *ɣla*, Rut. *ɣlai* ‘fire’, Agul. gen. *ɣlaep-un* ~

Geo. *цѡа* ‘burn’ – PIE ***k'ar-** / ***gar** ‘hot coal, fire’: Alb. *zjarm* ‘heat’, Rus. *жар* ‘burning coal’, *гореть, зарево, зарь*, Lith *gareti* ‘burn’. Cf. also Rus. *заря, зарница, зарево*.

PN ***qa-** // ***qe-** ‘fire’: Ch. *qe* ‘fire, hearth’, *qa* ‘alkaline solution’ (< ashes), Ing. *qa*, Tush. *qea, qe-bauk'u* ‘hearth’ ~ PCez. *Bezht. qo, Gunz. qo* ‘a smoke’ ~ PIE ***qeu-** // ***qu-** ‘burn’, ***kai-** ‘heat’, ‘burn’, Luv. *ki* ‘brazier’, Greek *kaio* ‘set fire to’ (Makovsky, 2004).

9. FISH: Proto-Nostratic ***degh-** ‘fish’: PIE ***dhghu-** ‘fish’; Proto-Semitic *dag*: Hebrew *dāgh* ‘fish’, *dāghāh* ‘fish’ (Bomhard, 1994), Sanskrit *deha* ‘body’ ~ PN. ***dagh** ‘body’, ‘elm’, ***ghad** ‘body, trunk’: Chechen *diegh*, pl. *doghmaš* < *daghumaš, ghad* ‘body, trunk’ (Vagapov, 2011), Lezg. *ghed* ‘fish’ (Comrie & Xalilov, 2010), Tab., Cakh. *Xad* ‘fish’ (Klimov, 1964). Cf. also Pokorny: ***ghdhu** ‘fish’.

PIE ***pisk-** // ***peisk-** ‘fish’ (L. *piscis*, Goth. *fisks*, OE. *fisc*, Ir. *iask*, Gael. *iasg* (< ***piasg**), вероятно, восходит к Ch. *pīsak* ‘oar; fin, flipper, spatula (for stirring)’, dial. *piesig*, pl. *pieskaš*, Ing. *peska* ‘oar; лапта́ (игра)’. Formed fr. ***peis-** // ***pies-** with dimin. suff. *-ik* // *-ig*. Hence for ‘fish’ reconstruct etymon ‘splashing, moving with fins’. Cf. for semantic Osset. *донигъазга* ‘fish’, literally ‘swashing in water’.

10. FULL: Ch. *hūdan* ‘hide, conceal; plunge into smth.’, Ing. *hūde*. In the first part we selected stem *hul-* (< ***phul-**), which brings together Megr. *pul* ‘hide’, Chan. *mpul-* - id., Geo. *pal* ‘bury, sink’, PIE ***plnos** ‘full’: Goth. *fulls*, Slav. ***полнь**. In the second part – verb *d-an* ‘do’. For semantic development cf. PIE ***pel-** ‘fill’ > ***pel-** ‘hide, cover’ (Makovsky, 2007); Ch. *buza* ‘fill’ > *buza* ‘sink, plunge into; sey (of sun)’. Cf. also Goth. *huljan* ‘wrap up, cover’ at Ch. *huljan* ‘to hide, plunge’.

11. GIVE: ПН ***d-alan** ‘give’ (Ch.-Ing. *dala*, Tush. *dal'a*), iter. *tiela* – Dag.: Lak *d-ulun*, Gwinukh. *молла*, Inkh. *мулла*, Khwar. *мулла*, Tsez. *телла* ‘give’ (Comrie & Xalilov, 2010). Given the transition *ð* > *л* (cf. Ch. *дōца* – Ing. *лōца* ‘short’, Ch. *диега* – Ch.-Ing. *лиега* ‘to fall’), can be linked to Mundzh. *dāl-* : *ley-* ‘give’, *dālam* ‘we give’, Osset. *daddyn* : *lævard* ‘give’ (cf. Ch. *lio* ‘gives’ < *lau, lah* ‘if you give’), Arm. *tal* ‘give’, Pers. *dadān*, Skrt. *da*, PIE ***do-**, ***da-** ‘give’ (Abayev, 1959).

12. HAND: PN ***dak** ‘willow twig, branch, arm, right hand’, ***dakin** ‘right’: Ch. *dak* ‘willow’, *dika* ‘good’ (< ***dekin** < *dak-in* < *dak* ‘right hand, good hand’), Tush. *dako* ‘goat willow’, *diki* ‘good’; Darg. *dukala*, *dikala* ‘wing’, *duka* ‘right’ (Vagapov, 2011) ~ PIE ***dek-** / ***dok-** ‘right hand; to take’, E. dial. *dook* ‘hand’, Greek *dekomai* ‘to take, to accept, to receive’; L. *doceo* ‘to teach, to instruct’ (Pokorny, 1959). Hence PIE ***dekə-m** ‘ten’: Greek *deka*; L. *decem*, Old Irish *deich* (Pokorny, 1959). Semantic development from ***dek-** ‘right hand’ to ‘and right hand, also right hand’ (= ‘five finger of left hand plus five finger of right hand’) > ‘ten’.

PN. ***dal** ‘elbow (as measure of length)’: Chechen *duol*, gen. *dalaran*, pl. *dalarš*, Ing. *duol*, Tush. *dol*. (Vagapov, 2011). Cf. also: Dargin *dulai* ‘forearm; right’, *dulgha* ‘рукав’, Dargva dial. *dulug* ‘shoulder, forearm’, *dalug* ‘elbow’, Avar. *rul'* ‘upper arm’, Tsakh. *d'oles, deles* ‘near by, close to’ (< ‘под рукой’). ~ PIE ***dal-** ‘elbow, lengthen’: Sanskrit *dirghah* ‘long, tall, deep’, Greek *dolixos* ‘long’; Hittite *da-lu-ga-e-eš* ‘long’, *da-lu-ga-as-ti* ‘length’, Old Church Slavic *дългъ* ‘long’ (Pokorny, 1959), Rus. *доль* ‘length’, *даль, длина*, Proto-Slavic ***dolъ** ‘hand, palm’ от ***dolъ** ‘lowest part (arm)’, E. *doll* ‘a doll’ (< ‘hand, arm’), cf. dial. *doll* ‘arm’ (Makovsky, 2004).

PN ***phars** ‘arm’ ~ PIE ***pars**: Osset. *fars* ‘side’, Kurd. *pirasu*, Avest. *parsva* ‘rib, border’, Khotan-Sak. *pharša* ‘judge, inquiring, interrogator’, Prus. *aparsam* ‘I asked’, Kurm. *p'ars* ‘begging’, *pъrs*

‘question’, Rus. *прос-ить, по-проси-айничать*. Ch. p̄hars ‘arm’ allows setting etymon PIE ***pers-** ‘ask’ as ‘extending a hand (in request)’.

13. HORN: [Nakh **kar* ‘horn (of deer); high hairstyle’ > Ch. kur, pl karraš; kura ‘proud’ ~ PIE **kar-*: Hittite, Luv. kar ‘deer’s horn’, Greek kar ‘head’, Slav. **korva* ‘cow’, Germ. **χurn-* ‘horn’ (OE, OHG, ON. horn). Cf. also OE. hær, OHG. hār, ON. hár ‘hair’ < Germ. **χαr-* < **kar*.] ~ Avar. *каp* ‘hair; чуб; summit’, *кyp* ‘top’, Lak *чурp* ‘lock’, Darg. *чури* ‘plait’, dial. *урчула кyp* ‘mane’, Gunz. *кера*, Bezht. *кера* ‘hair’ (Temerbulatova, 2012). Ultimately, this also includes Rus. *кyp* ‘cock’ < ‘crest’, *белокурьй* ‘blond, white-haired’.

12. I: PN **suo*, erg. **as** ‘I’: Ch. suo, as; Ing. az, Tush. *as*) ~ Adyg. *сэ-*, Abaz. *са-*, Dag. **ez-* // **zo* ‘I’ ~ хурр4го-урарт. **es* (Urat. *iese* ‘I’). The root is widely represented in IE languages: Balt. **es* (OPrus. *es*, Lith *aš*, ст.-Lith *eš*, Lat. *es*), OSlav. *азь* ‘I’, ORus. dial. *асъ*, Bolg. dial. *es*, Serbo-Croat. *јас*, Arm. *es* ‘I’, Iran. **az-*, Osset. *æz* ‘I’ (ЭССЯ, I, 100; Abayev, 1989), OPers. *iais* ‘я’, Thrac. *as*, Tokh. A *yas*, Tokh. B *yes* ‘I’.

15. KNOW¹ (kennen) [PIE **gen-* ‘to know’ (Pokorny, 1959): Goth. *kann* ‘I know’, Skrt. *janati* ‘he know’, Lith *žinoti*, Sl **znati* (Fasmer, 1967) ~ Nakh **gan* ‘to see’, *gina* ‘sow’ (‘to know’ < ‘to see’, known = seen’).

Know² (wissen) [PIE **weid-*, **woid-*, **wid-* ‘to see’: ORus *videti*, Pol. *widziec*, Lith. *veizdi*, *veizd* ‘look!’, L. *video*, *visum*, Greek *eidon* ‘sow’, OHG *wizzan* ‘know’, Goth. *weitan* ‘to see’, Av. *vista* ‘well-known’ (Fasmer, 1964) ~ Nakh **waudzan*, **weudzan* ‘to know’: Chechen *wouza* ‘to know’, *woiza* ‘I know’, *wieza* ‘to like, love’ (‘to see’ > ‘to know’, ‘to like’) ~ PD **ac`a*: Rut. *h-ac`a-s*, Tsakh. *ac`a-xes*, Kryz. *-ac`-az`*, Bud. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑ-*, And. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘know’, Cham. *-ac`-na* ‘see’. Dagestanian (And., Rut., Tsakh.) forms N.S. Trubetskoy (1930) compares with Ubykh *ꞑꞑꞑ-*, Adyg. *шьꞑꞑ* ‘know’, wich are closer to Abkh. *а-ꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘learn’ (Shagirov, 1977), Geo. *uc`q* ‘know’.

PN ***хаъа** ‘know’ (Ch. *хаъа¹*, *хаъадала* ‘to feel’, Ing. *ха*, Tush. *хаъа^h*, *хеъа^h*) does not have similar roots in Caucasian languages. Here, we compare Greek *koeo* ‘I feel’ < **koueo*, L. *caveo*, *cavere* ‘beveare of’, AS. *hawian*, OHG. *scouwon* ‘look’, OSlav. *чоути* ‘feel, hear’, Polab. *caja* ‘I feel’, Slav. **čujo*, **čuti* ‘smell, feel, know, hear’, Skrt. *kavi-* ‘claievoyant, wizard, poet’, Avest. *čəviši* ‘I know’, PIE ***kou-** ‘smell, feel’ (Fasmer, 1973).

We see that the concept ‘know’ (< ‘see’) has common roots in Caucasion and IE languages.

16. LOUSE: *Меза* ‘louse’ (Ing. *маза*, Tush. *маꞑꞑ*) ~ And., Akhv., Cham. *наꞑꞑꞑ*, Arch. *наꞑꞑꞑ*, Avar *наꞑꞑꞑꞑ*, Lak *наꞑꞑꞑ*, Darg. *нез* (Khaidakov, 1973), Udin. *неꞑꞑꞑ*). Naturally goes back to the root ***мадз(и)** ‘little insect’, also presented in compounds *ꞑꞑꞑꞑ-ꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘little, tiny’ < *ꞑꞑꞑꞑ-ꞑꞑꞑꞑ* (cf. Inkh. *mic`ik`i*, Ud. *mic`ik`i* ‘small’), *ꞑꞑꞑꞑ-ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘ring-finger’ (< ‘little finger’), Itum. dial. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* and further related Tsez. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘little finger’, Cham. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ*, Tindy *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ*, Bagv. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘little’, Botl. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ*, Cham., Bagv. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ*, Tindy. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘child, baby’, *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘finger’, Abaz. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ*, Adyg. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘little’), also OCzech. *mezenec* ‘ring-finger’, Rus. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘little finger, younger son, younder brother’, Lith *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ*, Lat. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘little’ (Fasmer, 1967). Cf. semantically Gunz. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘little lice’ ~ *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘light’ (< ‘small’), *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘small’, Ch. *ꞑꞑꞑꞑꞑ* ‘small’; Slav. **vašь* // **vošь* ‘louse; younger brother’ ~ Nakh **vašə* // **vošə* ‘brother’ (Vagapov et al., 2019).

The stem has a Nostratic level: Proto-Nostratic ***mag-** ‘young, child’ (Bomhard & Kerns, 1994):

~ Proto-Nord-Caucasian **maga* ‘small, little’: Chechen *māza* in *māza-p’ielg* ‘ring-finger’ < *māza* (little) and *p’ielg* (finger), Cez. *nak’ila* ‘little finger’, Tab. **mic’i t’ub* ‘little finger’, Cham. *mik’ib*, Tindy *muk’utub*, Bagv. *muk’ub* ‘little’, Botl. *mák’i*, Cham., Bagv. *mač’*, Tindy *mak’a* ‘child, baby’, *mik’a* ‘finger’, Abaz. *mač’*, Adyg. *mak’e* ‘little’ (Vagapov, 2011).

~ Proto-Kartvelian **mak’e-* ‘heavy’ (< ‘pregnant’), **mak’en-* ‘grow heavy’: Geo. *mak’e-* ‘cow with calf, sheep with lamb, in foal’; *mak’en-* ‘be (come) pregnant’ (Klimov, 1964) ~ PIE **mag-* ‘young’, **magu* ‘young person, child’ ~ Proto-Dravidian **maka* ‘young person, child’.

German **lus* ‘louse’ (OE *lūs*) have also the etymological meaning as ‘little insect’, from PIE **leus-* // **lous-* ‘small, tiny’, related to Nakh **lust* ‘small sheep droppings’, ‘trifle’ (Ch. *луьста* ‘frequent’, *луьст* ‘sheep droppings’, Ing. *луст*), Osset. *list-æg* ‘small, fractional’; Rus. *лúста* ‘slice of bread’, *лустá* ‘peel, pilling’, Ukr., Bel. *лúста* ‘a slice, a thin layer’, Lith *lustas* ‘a slice of bread’ (Fasmer, 1967). Inner form Nakh **lust* – ‘small sheep droppings’, in contrast Ch. *quo* ‘large litter’ (< PN **qau*) = PIE. **kau* // **gau-* ‘large litter, mullein’ > ‘a large horned animal, cow’.

17. MOON: PN **batt* (Ch. *butt*, obl. *batt-*) ~ Khvarsh. *буца*, Tsez. *буцу*, Tindy *буцу*, Cham. *буцубу*, Avar *моцубу*, dial. *муцубу*, Darg. Kubachy *бац*, pl. *буцце* (Comrie & Xalilov, 2010; Trubetskoy, 1987). It is interesting to note a certain similarity PNC **bund* // **mund* ‘moon, month’ (> **bunt* > *butt*) c G. *Mond* ‘moon’, Dan. *maned* ‘month’, E. *moon*, French. *monde* ‘world; planetes’, L. *mundus* ‘world, universe; heavenly body’.

PK **du(š)te-* moon: Georgian *twe-*, Megr. *tute*, Chan (m)*tuta*, Svan *došdul*, *došt’ul*. From **dust* < **d-utt* = Nakh **b-utt* moon, month. Related to Georgian *tetr-* ‘white’, Svan. *twetwene* (cf. Georgian *twe-moon*) ~ Nakh **d-ati silver*, cf. also PK **t’ut’a* ashes: Megr. *t’ut’a*, Svan *t’ət’a*, *dət*’ (Klimov, 1964) ~ Nakh *b-atta* / *d-atta* ‘bacen’.

Moon [PIE **mons* / **mens-* > **mes-* / **mas-*: Skrt. *mas*, *masa-* ‘month, moon’, Av. *ma*, *masca*, Arm. *amis*, Pers. *mah* ‘moon’, Greek Ion. *meis* (**mens*), Greek Dor. *mēs* ‘moon, month’, Cimr. *mis*, L. *mensis* (Fasmer, 1967; Gamkrelidze, 1984). ~ In view of the fact that the Moon was thought of as a measure of time (this is what is said in the Qur’an) a connection with Nakh **mas* ‘how much?’: Chechen *mass* // *masa*, Ing. *massa*.

18. NAME: PN **le*, obliq. **lap-* has reliable matches in Kab., Adyg. *лIэ*, Ubych. *нIуIе*, Cham. *лIуIе*, Lak *ла*, Udin. *лу*, Khin. *лIу*, Darg. *зу*, Avar *лIуIаp*, And. *лIуIеp*, Tab. *цIур*, Tsez. *ци* ‘имя’ (Trubetskoy, 1930), Udin. *цIу* < *цIур* < **лIуIур*, Arch. *лIуIор*, Lezg. *mlвар* (< **лIвар*). Apparently, it is connected with omonymous Ch. *ле* ‘fire’, cp. Turk *ot* ‘fire’ ~ *at* ‘name’. There are no correspondences found in Kartvelian and IE languages.

19. NEW¹: PN **k’an-* ‘new, young, virginal; clean, pure, renew’ (> Ch. *c’ani* > *c’ena*, Tush. *c’aini*, *c’ini*) ~ Dag. **c’in* ‘new’: Cham. *цIун*, Darg. *цIусси*, Lak *цIусса*, Lezg. *цIуйи*, Rut. *цIинид* (Comrie & Xalilov, 2010), Avar *цIуяб* ‘new’ ~ Adyg. *кIэ*, Abkh. *а-чIьа* ‘new, young’ ~ Megr. *č’e* ‘a few’ ~ PIE **k’en-* / **gen-* ‘new, young’: Greek *kainos* ‘new’, L. *re-cens* ‘fresh, new, young’, Avest. *kaini* ‘unmated young women’, Skrt. *kaninas* ‘young’, *kana* ‘girl’, Mlr. *con* ‘clean, pure’, Ir. *cinim* ‘I arise’, Rus. *кон*, *ис-кони*, *на-чин-ать* (Gamkrelidze, 1984).

NEW²: PN **naus* ‘a new son-in-law, new married’: Ch. *nuc*, gen. *neuc-an* / *nouc-an*, *nauc*, pl. *naucarij*) ~ Dag. **nus-* / **nuc-* ‘son-in-law’: And. *nuso*, Bagv. *nusa*, Cham. *nusa*, Arch. *nusdu*, Darg.

dial. nuca (Comrie & Xalilov, 2010). ~ PIE ***neus-** ‘new, beginner, youth’: L. novus ‘new, new married’, Lith. naujas ‘new’, Slav. ***новъсь**: Slovin. nove ‘a new person’, Rus. dial. *новѣц* ‘new man in the village’, Serbo-Khroat. *nóvica* ‘beginner’, novica ‘bride’, Sloven. *новица* ‘beginner, bride’, dial. *нович* ‘the groom’, *новича* ‘bride’ (Trubachev, 1999).

20. NOSE: [Nakh **marə* ‘nose’, *marš* ‘snot’: Ch. *marə*, Ing. *meraž*, Gunz *maru*, Lezg. *ner* ~ PIE **mari* ‘sea; pond; bog’, *marisk* ‘marsh’. Typologically cf. PIE **nos-* ~ G. *nass* ‘damp, wet’, Ch *noš-* ‘growing soft; juicy’; Rus. *сопеть, соплю* ~ *соплю*]. This point requires further research.

21. ONE: PN **ca* ‘one’ (Ch. *caʹ*, dial. *čaʹ*, Ing. *caʹ*, Tush. *čaʹ*) ~ PDag. **sa-* (Avar *цo*, Darg. *ца*, Lak *ca-*, Lezg. *ca-*) ~ Abkh.-Adyg. **zə* ‘one’ (Abaz. *за-*, Adyg., Kab. *зы*, Ubykh. *за*) ~ Hurrito-Urart. **sa-* ‘one’ ~ PIE ***sa-** ‘one’: Skrt. *sa*, *sa-hasram* ‘one thousand’, *sa-krt* ‘once’, Skrt. *sa-pàtni- ж.р.* ‘one of the wives’, OPers.. *ha-mata* ‘descended from the same mother’, Tokh. A *sa-*, Tokh. B *se* ‘one’.

22. SALT: Ch. *туьха* ‘salt’, Ing. *тух*, Tush. *туух*. From PN **тух* (> Ch. *тухин* > *туьха*), perhaps, related to Lak dial. *ттузъ* ‘dust’, Old Turkic *тозь* ‘dust’, Finn. *tuhu* ‘snowstorm, sand’ > Rus. *туха* ‘snowstorm’ (Fasmer, 1973). Alternating *x* : *s* may be related to Turkic. *тус*, *туз* ‘salt’, *туз* ‘dust’.

PIE ***sal** ‘salt’, L. *sal*, Greek *hals*, OSlav. *соль*, Lat. *sals*, OIr. *salann*, Goth. *salt*. Related to OIc. *hela* ‘frost’, Du. *hal* ‘frozen ground’, Lith *šaltas* ‘cold’, *šalna* ‘frost(s)’, Lat. *sals* ‘frost’, Avest. *sareta-* ‘cold’ (Fasmer, 1973), Gypsy *šyl* ‘n cold’, Osset. *sald* ‘frozen’ from *sælyn* ‘freeze’, PIE ***k-el-** ‘frozen; cold’ (Pokorny, 1959).

PIE ***sal** ‘salt’ corresponds, in our opinion, PN ***šal** ‘ice, crystal’, wic formed from *ša* ‘ice’ with suff. *-l-*, also represented in Nakh *ce* ‘tooth’ – *ce-l* ‘tooth, hoe’, Dag. **sa* ‘tooth’ – **sa-l* ‘tooth’ (Vagapov, 2011). The adjectives are usually formed from genitive nouns in Nakh languages, hence **šal-in* ‘cold, crystalline’ > *šel-in* (cf. Tush. *pšel-iv*) > *šijl-in* > Ch. *šijl-a* ‘cold’. The connection between the value of ‘salt’ ~ ‘ice, crystal’ explained by the fact that natural salt is «a white crystalline substance», lsrge piece of wic resemble blocks of ice. Typologecally cf. Rus. Sibirian *бузун* ‘a species of salt’, ‘sea salt’, ‘the crystallized’ (Fasmer, 1964) and Khakas *бузун* ‘salt, extracted from under ice’, Turk. *бюз* ‘ice’ (Anikin, 2000).

23. STONE: Ch. *t’uo* ‘gravel; stone, cobblestone’. Taking into account the form of genitive cases *t’uon* we bring closer to Armenian *t’in* ‘grape seed’, Goth. *steins*, E. *stone*, Greek *stia*, *stion* ‘flint’, proto-Slavic **stena* ‘rock, stone, wall’. Phonetic development is naturally restored in the form: **t’an* > *t’uon* > *t’uo*.

PN **t’ulg** ‘камешек’. Derivative with diminutive suffix (*-л*)*г* from the stem *mlyo* ‘щебень; камень’. Perhaps this also is related to Ch. *t’uol* ‘testiculus’ (< ‘small stone, acorn’), Hungar *tölg* ‘oak’, Osset. *tuldz* // *toldzæ* ‘oak’ (< ‘acorn’), cf. Ch. *наж* ‘oak’ but pl. *нежнаш* ‘oaks, acorns’, L. *quercus* ‘oak’ – Geo. *q’uer* ‘acorn’. Typologically compared to E. sleng rocks ‘testiculus’ at rock ‘скала, большой камень, валун’. It requires further research Geo. *t’ali* ‘flint’.

24. SUN: PN *malχ* ‘sun’ ~ P-And: Bagv. *милгъ*, *милъ*, And.. *милъи*, Akhv. *милъи*, *милли*, Кар. *милъе*, Godob. *милъи* ‘sun’, *милъа* ‘sunny slope’, Cham. *милъ* ‘sun, day’, Tindy *милъи* ‘sun; sunny slope’) ~ PIE ***(s)mel-** ‘burn slowly, smolder’, Slav. **smal-* ‘burn, freeze’, Sloven. *maleti* ‘flare, burn’, Rus. *смалить* ‘burn, roast, grill’. The material of ZK languages (Abkh. *а-мра*, Abaz. *мара* ‘sun’) can be

related to this only if transition is possible Abkh.-Abaz. $\mathfrak{p} > \mathfrak{p}$, as in Ch. dial. *mapx*, Darg. *бepxIu* 'sun' и Ch. dial. *napxa*, Darg. *нupx* 'oil' at Ch. *налx* 'dairy butter'.

25. TAIL I wonder why the 'tail' was included in the number of 35 basic words?

26. THIS: PN ***qa** 'this', Ch. *qu* 'this', pl. erg. *qa-ra* 'these' ~ PIE ***k'o-**, ***k'e**, ***k'i** 'pronominal stem this', Hittite *ki*, *kā* 'this' (Dzhakuyan 1963); Hittite *ki-i* 'this, that', Greek **ke* in *keinos* 'that', L *ce* in *cedo* 'give here', *ci* in *cis*, Old Irish *ce* in *bith ce* 'this world', Gothic *hi-* pronominal stem in *himma*, *hina*, *hiri* 'come here!' (Pokorny, 1959; Walde, 1927; Watkins, 1985).

PN **sa* / **a-sa* 'this, that, it': Chechen *cu* / *o-cu* 'that', erg. pl. *cāra* / *o-cāra* 'those', Ing. *cu*. Oblique stem of demonstrative and personal pronoun *i* 'he, that' (= PIE *i* 'that'). Phonetic changes: **sa* 'эТОТ, ТОТ' > **ca* > *cu* (cf. *qu* / *hoqu* 'erg. this' < **a-qu*). A sibilant *s* represented in Akki dialect *sigah* 'here', Bacbi *ise* 'here' but Chechen *cigah* 'over there', *eccah* 'in this place'.

~ PIE **sa-* 'demonstrative pronoun this, that, it': Sanskrit *sa-h demonstrative pronoun* 'that', Greek *ó*, Gothic *sa* 'that', Old Icelandic *sa*, *su* 'that', OE. *se* 'that, one, he', OHG *si* 'she'; Tocharian A *sā-* demonstrative pronoun (Pokorny, 1959; Walde, 1927; Watkins, 1985) ~ Proto-Afroasiatic **sa-* demonstrative pronoun; Proto-Ugrian **sā-* 'he, she, it': Finnish *han* (< **san*) 'he, she', Proto-Nostratic **sa-* / **sə-* 'this, that' (Bomhard & Kerns, 1994).

Nakh ***i** 'it, this; that; he' ~ PIE ***i-** 'it, this, he' (Pokorn, 1959).

Nakh ***is** 'this; he' (Ch. *iza*, Ing. *iz*, Tush. *is*), Darg. *зьиш* 'this; he', Akush. *ьиш*, Khaidak *зьеж*, Tsudakh. *ьуз* 'this; he' ~ PIE ***is-** 'this, that; he' (Pokorny, 1959): Lith *jis*, L. *is*, Goth. *is*, OHG. *ir* (< **iz* < **is*) 'he' < 'this, тот'. Formed from *i* 'that; he' with extender *-z(a)* < **s*, fonetically cf. also Ing. *az* 'I (erg.)' (< Nakh *as*: Ch. *as*, Tush. *as* 'I').

27. TONGUE: PN ***matt** (Ch. *muott*, Ing. *muott*, Tush. *mot't*) ~ Avar *mac'c*, Lak *maz*, Darg. *medz*, Lezg. *mez* ~ PIE ***ment** 'mouth; jaw': Alb. *mat* 'estuary', Goth. *munths* 'mouth, chin', OE. **math**, E. *mouth*, L. *mentum* 'chin', Cymr. *mant* 'jaw'. PN ***matt** 'tongue' < 'middle'. A variant without a nasal consonant is probably represented in PIE ***mat-** 'word' (Makovsky, 2004): Goth. *mathljan* 'reden', OE. *madelian* 'reden, schprechen', *mathlian* 'speak', Uells *medd* 'he speaks, tells'; Zend. *mathra* (Makovsky, 2004), French. *mot* 'word', Gallo-Rom. **mottum* (Oxford Eng. Etym. 302), Ital. *moto* 'motto', Rus. dial. *mat* 'word', 'loud voice, cray' (Makovsky, 2004), cf. *shout at the top of voice*, Bel. *mat* 'voice'. Note also Mary *mut* 'word'.

28. TOOTH: a) Ch. **ua** // **ue** 'the tooth of a horse' (Ing. *ua*) has reliable correspondences in Caucasian (Dag. **ue-* // **ua-*, Avar *ua*, Abkh.-Adyg. **cc(a)*: Abkh. *у-*, Abaz. *уы*, Ubykh. *ua-*, Shaps. *ууэ*, Abadz., Temirg. *уэ*, Kab. *дзэ* 'tooth' (Balkarov, 1969; Shagirov, 1977; Trubetskoy, 1930) and Slavic languages: Slav. **ce* 'tooth' in **ce-n-iti*, **ce-r-iti* 'grin, bare one's teeth', **сень* 'farynx'.

b) PN *cel* 'hoe' (< **cel* 'jaw' < *ce* 'tooth' + *-l*) ~ PD **sal* / **sel* 'tooth' ~ Gorg. *cel* 'hoe' < 'sickle with teeth'. Cf. Ch. *цел* 'hoe', Ing. *цел*, Tush. *цел* 'hoe'. It is common practice to relate it Geo. *цели* 'hoe'. However, in the light Nakh *ua* // *ue*, Adyg. *уы*, Dag. **сал-* // **сил-* 'tooth' (And.. *сол*, Kar. *сали*, Bagv. *салу*, Cham. *салв*, Darg. *цула*, Khin. *цулоз* 'tooth'), Lak *цулун* 'mow' the word can be decomposed on the basis of Nakh-Dag. languages: *це* 'зубец, острие' + suff. *-л* (com. Ch. *ча*, Tush. *чал* 'strow' at Geo. *чала* 'trow'). For ideosemantics com. Nakh *гәм* 'hoe' at *гәми* > *гәма* 'tooth; jaw', PIE ***gem-**

‘tooth’; Ch. *zauu* id. – Dag. **квацица* ‘hoe’. Consequently, Geo. *цел*- ‘hoe’ with And. *цел*, Cham. *цел*, Khvash. *цел* ‘hoe’, most likely come from the Nakh languages.

c) Proto-Nostratic **k'am-* / **k'am-* ‘to chew, to bite, to eat’: PIE. **k'emb-* / **k'omb-* ‘to chew, bite, crush’, *k'ombos* ‘yooth, spike, nail’ (Bomhard, Kerns, 1994), Sanskrit *jambhate* ‘to chew up, to recognize’, *jambha-h* ‘tooth’, Greek *gomfios* ‘a gringer-tooth’, OE *camb* ‘comb’, Latvian *zuobs* ‘tooth’; Albanian *dhëmb* ‘tooth’, Tokharian A *kam*, B *keme* ‘tooth’ (Pokorny, 1994; Gamkrelidze-Ivanov 1984).

~ Proto-Afroasiatic **k'am-* / **k'am-* ‘to chew, to bite, to eat’: Proto-Semitic **k'am-* ‘to chew, to bite, to eat, to grind’ > Arabic *kamah* ‘to eat’, *kamh* ‘wheat’, Hebrew *kemah* ‘flour’ (Bomhard & Kerns, 1994).

~ Proto-Nakh. **gāmi* / **qāmi*: Chechen *giēma* ‘leatherworker in the form of wooden jaws’, *qiēma* ‘jaw, denture’, *k'oms* / *q'oms* ‘tooth’, *k'omsar* / *q'omsar* ‘tusk, fang’, Ing. *giēmi* (Vagapov, 2011).

PK **k'bil* / **k'mil* ‘tooth’ (Klimov, 1964) ~ PN **gāmi* / **qāmi* ‘tooth, teeth, jaw’. If the original **k'bil*, then in comparison with a metathesis Arab. *kilab* ‘dog’ < ‘toothed, biting’.

~ PN **dant* / **datt* ‘thorn, bone of fish, tree’ (Ch. *ditt* ‘blade’, ‘thorn, bone of fish, tree’, Ing. *datt* / *ditt* mulberry bush) ~ PIE **dent* ‘tooth’: L. *dent*, Skrt. *dant*, OS *tand*, Goth *tunthus*, E. *tooth*, pl. *teeth*, OIr *det* (). For semantic cf. *уърсан* *ɔumm* ‘knife blade’ (cf. *каб. сэдзэ* ‘knife blade’ < *сэ* ‘knife’s’ + *дзэ* ‘tooth’), *ɔumm* ‘fish bone; blade; tree’ (E. *teeth*), Turk. *tut* ‘mulberry bush’ ~ E. *tooth*, Ch. *sallar* ‘silkworm’ – Dag. **sal* ‘tooth’.

~ Nakh **qali* ‘big tooth’ (Ch *qela*) ~ PIE **kel-* ‘to cut; big tooth’: Sl **kelu* ‘canine, fang’.

29. TWO: Avar *клу-*, Botl. *кле*, And. *чу*, Cham. *чле*, Darg. *кле-л*, *клев*, *квви*, Lak *клу-ва*, dial. *клу*, Khin. *клу*. Dagestan *кл* in Chechen language naturally corresponds *з*, *кI* (Vagapov et al., 2019), that is why we use in comparison Ch. *зе* ‘little span’, Ing. *зу*, which are probably related to Ch. *за* ‘twig’ (> ‘fork’ > ‘span’), Kartv. **ga-* ‘side, width’. To the typology *нядь* ~ *два* cf. Ch. *ша* ‘big span’ ~ Nakh **ша* ‘two, bifurcation’ (> Ch. *шу* ‘two’).

~ Here there is no phonetic relationship, contrary (NCED 924) Bezht. *кьона* ‘two’, Tsez. *кьано*, Arch. *кьве*, Bud. *кьа-*, Kryz. *кьва*, Lezg. *кьве*, Rut. *кьва-*, Tab. *кью-*, Tsakh. *кьол-* ‘two’ (Comrie, 599) < Dag. **тIкьа* / **тIкье* / **тIкьо*, relative to that of Nakh *тIкьа* / *тIкьуо* ‘twenty’ (*тIкьа*, dial. *тIкьуо*, Ing. *ткьуо*, Tush. *тIкьа*), Kab. *тIуу*, Adyg. *тIуы*, dial. *тIкьIуы*, Ubykh. *тIкьва* ‘two’, Kartv. **тIу-б* // **тIкьу-б* ‘two, twins’ (Klimov, 1964).

In Indo-European languages, they undoubtedly correspond to: *хетт.* *da* ‘two’, *dan* ‘second’, L. *duo*, Skrt. *duva*, *dva*, Avest. *dva*, OIr. *dau*, *do*, Ukr. *два*, PIE **duo* // **t'uo-* ‘two’ (Gamkrelidze, 1984). PN form – **da* // **тIa* ‘branch, bifurcation, two limbs’, ‘two dozen’, cf. Tush. *t'aw* ‘forked brunch’ (Comrie 411). Typologically compared to Semit.-Hamit. **gawt* ‘pair, two’ – Egipt. **gwt* ‘twenty’ (Dolgopolsky, 1967).

Now we talk about the main word for the number two in the Nakh languages *shi*, oblique. *shin*, “which has no etymology in the NC languages” (Starostin, 2007).

Numeral **шш** ‘two’ (ind. *шин-*) formed from Ch. *ша* ‘big span, step’ (dial. *ше*, Ing. *шy*, Tush. *ше* ‘span’ (Kadagidze & Kadagidze, 1984), related to Abkh. *ша*, Abaz. *шьа* ‘foot’, *шьа-мза* ‘hoof’ (Shagirov, 1977), Lak *ша* ‘step; trace’, Avar *шшy-го*, Bezht. *лъено* (< *хIено* < **шено*), Darg. *ше-*, *шy-*, *зьy-*, Lak *ххю-*, Rut. *хьy* ‘five’ (< ‘outspread five fingers, span’). For etimologization Nakh *шу* ‘two’ (<

ша) Ch. material, in particular is enough *шала* ‘double, even’, *шалха* ‘doubled’, *шолзла* ‘second’ (< *шала* *улзла*), *шозза* ‘twice’ (< *ша-узза* = Bats. *ша-цI*), *шалзу* ‘double pike’ (< *šala-gaw* ‘double branch’), *шада* ‘pitchfork’, *шад* ‘сук’. Indirect root *шин*, along with hurrīto-urart.**šin* ‘two’ (hurr. *šin*, urart. *si-se* ‘two’), Hebrew *šen* ‘two’, in our opinion, is also inseparable from Bagv. *sinu* ‘fork’, Bezht. *sino*, Gunz. *sinu* ‘fork; pitchfork’, Tsakh. *šana*, Kryz. *xiner* ‘fork’ (if is from **siner* // **šiner*, cf. Ch. *шинара*¹ ‘tuesday’, *шинара*² ‘two year calf’). In Indo-European languages, SK is connected **ša* ‘bifurcation, span, step’ with Osset. *sak’ex* ‘step’ < *ša-k’ax* ‘step of foot’ (Abayev, 1989), East Slav. *шаг*, Rus. *сажень*, Czech. *sah*, Slovak. *siaha* ‘сяг’, Rus. *святать*.

30. WATER Nakh *xu*, despite (NCED, 1994), it is related not with Avar *лъин*, And. *лъен*, Gunz. *лъи*^h, Arch. *лълъан*, Lak *шин*, Darg. *шин*, *гъин*, for which Arab. *хъин* ‘water’, а с Adyg. *хы* ‘sea’, Avar *их*, Guinukh. *иху*, Beht. *эхе* ‘river’, Geo. *хеви* ‘mountain stream gorge’. On the basis of *-хы-* ‘go down’, *-х(э)* ‘bottom’ N. Yakovlev (as cited in Shagirov, 1977) explains Adyg. *хы* ‘sea’ as «down place», « the place where all rivers flow», which is confirmed by Nakh *й-ух* ‘lowest part, bottom, низ, подол’, pl. *й-ахх-аиш*, *й-аха* ‘go’, iter. *иэха* ‘current’. Similar stems are also presented in Indo-European languages: Greek *xeo* ‘I pour’, Skrt. *kha*, Avest. *ха* ‘water, spring’, Khotanosak. *khyeha* < *khāha* ‘spring’, Yazgul. *хех* ‘water, river’ (BFL, 1981). Examples towards a semantic typology *низ (течь вниз) – вода* is below.

PIE ***dan-** ‘water, dew, moisture’ (Greek *Danay* ‘god of waters’, Iran. *danu* ‘dew, moisture’) ~ PIE ***dhen-** // ***dhon-** ‘lowland, bottom’, Germ. **danja-* // **danjo* ‘valley, bottom, lowland’, Slav. **дъно*, *мн. *donja*; E. *down*, Arab. *dunja* ‘bottom, lowland, lower reaches’ > G. *Dunav* ‘Dunai’. It undoubtedly corresponds Nakh **тлун* ‘moisture’ (Ch. *тлүна* ‘moist, damp’ from gen. *тлун-ин*, Tush. *тлвин* ‘dew, moisture’). PNakh dial. *тлвин-* // **двин-* ‘moisture’ it exactly corresponds the root *t’win-* in Geo. *t’win* ‘morrow’, *gan-t’win-wa* ‘smash’ (Etymological dictionary of the Kartvelian languages, 1964) and Pra-Slavic. **dwin-* in the name of Dvin River. Cf. also Geo. *t’eni* ‘moisture’.

PIE ***aud-** // ***ued-** // ***uod-** ‘water’, ***aued-** ‘moisten, wet’ (Rus. *вода*, Greek *hydor*, *hydros* ‘adj. water’, Hittite. *waatar*, OS. *watar*) are inseparable from Ch. *owda* ‘squeeze out, dehydrate’, *owdar* ‘squeezing’, iter. *ijda* ‘squeeze, squeeze out’, *ijdar* ‘squeezing out’. Compared to semantics Ch. *owda-dala* ‘squeeze out > dry out’, iter. *ijda-dala* ‘drip, ooze, flow’, *ijdalun* ‘oozing, dripping’. Indo-European roots with *-r*, most likely reflect the Nakh Masdar forms of the type *ловдар // луйдар*, as well as Rus. *смотреть* – Ch. *момта-р*, Rus. *зор-* // *зер-* ‘see, look’ – Ch. *зие-р* ‘look, inspect’ (Vagapov, 2011).

PIE ***aur-** // ***auer-** ‘watter, rain’ (Afg. *owre* ‘cloud’, Avest. *awra-*, Skrt. *abhra* ‘rain’, Greek *aura* ‘watter, spring’ в an-auros ‘waterless (about streams)’, Rus. *вар*, *варить*, Lith *wirti* ‘boil (up), seethe’) неотделимы от Nakh *owr* ‘rapid flow, rain or spring streams’, Ch. pl. *owraš*, Avar *or* ‘river’ (Vagapov, 2011). Further, this may also include Geo. *ghwari* > Tush. *ghor* ‘rain flow’.

Thus, in the Nakh (allegedly related to Chinese) and Kartvelian languages (“related” bypassing the North Caucasian languages to the Indo-European), the following correspondences for liquid were identified: 1. *xu* ‘water, river’ – *хеви* ‘canion’, 2. Ch. *цIалкъ* ‘dripping water, oozing water’ – *цIкъал-* ‘water’; 3. *тлун* / *тлвин* ‘moisture’ – Geo. *t’win* ‘brain’, *gan-t’win-wa* ‘smash’, *t’eni* ‘moisture’; 4. *ловр* ‘stream’ – *ghwari* ‘rain flow’.

31. WHAT: Ch. *hun* (Ing. *fu*, Tush. *vux*), has correspondences in German (OE. *hu*, E. *how*, OS. *hwo*, OHG. *wuo* 'how'; OE. *hwa*, ME. *hwo*, *hoo*, OSw. *ho* 'who') and some Dagestan languages, cf. Tab. *фy* 'what'.

32. WHO: Ch. *mineχ* 'somebody, someone', Tush. *менаχ* 'sombody' (Kadagidze & Kadagidze, 1984). Formed with suff. *-ieχ* from stem **man* 'who; somebody' (cf. Tush. *me* 'who'), corresponding, in our opinion to PIE **man* 'man, "Typologically, the nominal meaning 'person' and the pronominal indefinitely personal 'one of the people, someone (one)' receive an identical formal embodiment" (V. Martynov), cf. Ch. *цхьа стаг* 'somebody', literally 'one man', Gunz. *сукIу* 'who; man', *сукIу* 'to someone'. This also includes PIE **monogh-* // **menogh-* 'sombody, some, (an)other', Goth. *manags* 'many' (< 'any'), OHG. *manag*, *menig* 'иной, some', G. *manch* '(an)other', ODan. *menech*, OE. *manig*, Wels. *mynych*, OIr. *menice* 'numerous', OSl. *мъногъ* 'many'.

33. WIND: PN **max* (Ing. *мух*, Ch. *муох*, erg. *махо*) ~ PAnd. **maui* (> **муи* > **муч*) ~ PLak **maui* (> **мач* > *марч*) ~ PUdin. **maui* (> *муи*).

Since alternation *x*: *ш* in Nakh-Dagestan, and in other languages, is well known, we have a regular correspondence Nakh **max* 'wind' ~ Dag. **maui* 'wind', which corresponds to PIE **max* (**maš*) *mas* 'wineskin; мех, ash-pit': Slav. **mexъ* (Rus. *мех*, *мехи*, *мешок*; Lith *mašas* 'bag', *maiss* – id., OPrus. *moasis* 'bellows') (Fasmer, 1973). Dargin variants *дагI* / *дягI* / *догI* 'wind' (Temerbulatova, 2012), probably corresponds to Nakh *ḍ-aIa* / *ḍ-ueIa* 'twist, swing, spin', *ca daIa* / *ca dueIa* 'breathe', *Ia* 'breath, vapor', *Ia jina Ian* 'to seat breathlessly'. Semantically cf. OSl. *дыхание* 'breath, whiff', *дыхати* 'breathe, blow' (Shansky, 1973).

In ZK languages we have Abkh.-Abaz. *a-nua-* // *nua* 'wind', Adyg. *пиьын* // *пиьын* 'swell out', *-пиьэн* // *-пиьэн* 'blow' (Shagirov, 1977), corresponding to Ch. *naui* 'peditum'.

PK **kar-* 'wind' Starostin (2007) considers it to be isolated and inconsistent in the North Caucasian languages. However, if we take into account that for primitive man no less relevant than natural winds were such winds as *intestinal winds, blowers and bellows*, Kartv. *kari* can be related to Nakh **kari* 'stomach, belly' // **kieri* (Ch. *куйра*, Ing. *куер*), Akhv., Botl. *river* (< **кеpa?*) 'stomach'. It is known that the furs were made from wineskins, thus our comparison of the Caucasian forms with PIE **ker-* 'cut; belly': Slav. **čer-vo*: Rus. *intestines*, Bolg. dial. *чурво* 'intestine', Prus. *ker-mens* 'stomach' ().

Ch. *xIyō* '(fresh) air, breath, wind' (Ing. *фо*), Lak *haw* 'cold wind', Akhv. *λ^wē* (NCED, 1994), Cham. dial. *hä* 'air' (Comrie & Xalilov, 2010) ~ Adyg. *wa* 'sky' (< (? 'атмосфера, air') ~ ПИЕ **ue-*, **uo-*, **au(e)-* 'air, wind; ваять': Zaza *vā*, Afg. *wō*, Iškaš. *wuy* 'wind', Rus. *вей* (in *суховеи*). The Indo-European forms *c -da* // *-ta* Osset. *wad(æ)*, Pers. *wad*, Kush. *oado* 'wind god', Iran. **vata-* (Abayev, 1989), probably, correspond, как as in many different cases, nakh forms with expansion *-ḍ(a)*: *xIyō-ḍ(a)* 'wind (is)'.

In our opinion, the choice for the "basic" 35 word-list of the word *wind*, instead of the expected word *rain* - as rain is more important for the life of humans and animals than wind is explained by the adjustment of Yakhontov word-list to PIE languages, which have a common root for wind but not for rain. The same can be said about the words *give*, *salt*.

34. YEAR: PN *šaw ‘year’ (Ch. *ууо*, Ing. *уу*, Tush. *шо*) from *šaw ‘yea rtree ring’ (Vagapov, 2011). It can be related to Ubykh. šwa ‘year’ (Klimov, 1964), Abkh.-Abaz. *шы-* in *а-шыкыс / скышы* ‘year’ (Shagirov, 1977). Indirect basis of nakh word šar- ‘year ring, ring’, ‘year’ can be compared to Iran. *sard, Avest. *sarəd*, class.-Pers. *sal* (cf. Urart. *šalə*, Hurrite *sawal*), Manikh. *sar* ‘year’, as well as etymologically theme Rus. *уар*. Based on these data, instead of PNC *swani ‘year’, we restore the root *ša-w // *ša-r, genitive of which šar-in forms an adjective with the semantics ‘annual’, further changing in the direction of ‘a year ago’ > ‘last year’ > ‘old (harvest, offspring, etc.)’. Phonetically: šar-in > šerin > širin > širaⁿ > šira ‘old’.

Avar *dream*, And., Botl., Kar. *решии* ‘year’ < *dešin / *desin < *das, Lak *шин* (< *dešin), Darg. *дус*, Arch. *сан*, Lezg. *йус*, Rut. *сен*, Udin. *усен* ~ PN *das ‘timber, boards’: Ch. *duos*, but gen. *desaⁿ* from *das-in*, *duos-bux* ‘firewood cutting site’.

Geo. *c’eli* ‘year, weist’, *dzweli* ‘old’ – Ch. *c’ul-dečig* ‘a species of tree’, Avar *c’ul* ‘wood, timber’, Akhv. *č’uli* ‘stick’, Abkh.-Abaz. *c’la-* ‘tree’ (Vagapov, 2011).

PK *za ‘year’: *zāj*, *zāw* ‘year’ (Klimov, 1964), Gorge *dzweli* ‘old’ – Ch. *gul* ‘tree, ridge’, Ing. *ga* ‘tree’, Ch. *ga* ‘twig’.

Rus. *год* < *‘main, best time of the year, middle of year’ – Nakh *ghad* ‘stem, trunk; figure’, Dag. **гъвад-* ‘tree, trunk; time; day’: Avar *гъвети* ‘tree’, Bezht. *гъод* ‘linden tree’, Udin. *ход* ‘tree’, Tsez. *гъуду*, Ginukh. *гъведе*, Udin. *гъи* ‘day’, Lak *гъи*, Lezg. *гад*, *гъад* ‘summer’; Adyg. **гъуэ* ‘time, season; year’, Kab. *гъуэ* ‘year, summer’, Abaz. *гъа* ‘time’ (Shagirov, 1977; Trubetskoy, 1930). It also includes PIE **ghad* ‘tie tightly, fit’, ‘tree, trunk’: Skrt. *gad-*, *gadhya* ‘hold tight’, Germ. **Gad* ‘connect, fit, fit tightly’, Fr. *gadia* ‘unite’ (Fasmer, 1964; Pokorny, 1959).

35. YOU: PN *thuo ‘thou’ (Ch.-Ing. *thuo*, Tush. *huo*) together with Dag. (Darg. *хIу*, Rutul, Tsakh. *гъу*, Udin. *hun*, Dag. **гъван* ‘tthou’) mappings may be mapped (at least at that level, as do macrocomparativists) with PIE **thu* ‘thou’: Khotan-Sak. *thu*, Iškašim. *toh*, Afg. *tə*, Avest. *tu*, *tvam*, Goth. *thu*, Rus. *ты*. Cf. phonetically Ch. *tχuo* ‘we’ – erg. *оха* < **отха*.

7. Conclusion

As a result of the research, it is possible to state that the conclusion of S.A. Starostin (2007) on the belonging of the North Caucasian and South Caucasian (Kartvelian) languages to different macrofamilies is not confirmed by our studies: both groups of languages are genetically related to each other and belong to the Nostratic family. In this family, the Nakh-Dagestan languages show a special relation to the Indo-European languages rather than Kartvelian ones.

References

- Abayev, I. J. (1989). *Istoriko-etymologičeskij slovar osetinskogo jazyka* [Historical and etymological dictionary of the Ossetian language]. Nauka.
- Anikin, A. E. (2000). *Etymological Dictionary of Russian dialects of Siberia*. Hayka.
- Bomhard, A. R., & Kerns, J. C. (1994). *The Nostratic Macrofamily. A Study in Distant Linguistic Relationship*. Mouton de Gruyter.

- Comrie, B., & Xalilov, M. (2010). *Slovar jazykov i dialektov narodov Severnogo Kavkaza* [Dictionary of languages and dialects of the peoples of the North Caucasus]. Leipzig; Makhachkala: Max Planck Inst. for Evolutionary Anthropol.
- Kadagidze, D., & Kadagidze, N. (1984). *Cova-Toushian-Georgian-Russian Dictionary*. Mecniereba.
- Klimov, G. A. (1964). *The Etymology Dictionary of Kartvelian Language*. Izd-vo Akad. Sci. USSR.
- Makovsky, M. M. (2004). *The Etymology Dictionary of the German Language*. Izd-vo Azbukovnik.
- Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Francke Verlag.
- Starostin, S. A. (2007). *Problemy geneticheskogo rodstva i klassifikacii kavkazskix jazykov s tochki zrenija bazisnoi leksiki. Trudy po jazykoznaniju* [Problems of genetic relationship and classification of Caucasian languages from the point of view of basic vocabulary. Works on linguistics]. Moscow.
- Temerbulatova, S. (2012). *Otraslevoi slovar darginskogo jazyka* [Industry Dictionary of the Dargin Language]. Makhachkala.
- Trubachev, O. N. (1999). *Etymological Dictionary of Slavic languages*. Moscow.
- Vagapov, A. D. (2011). *The Etymology Dictionary of Chechen Language*. Meridiani.
- Vagapov, A. D., Makhaev, M. R., & Ovkhadov, M. R. (2019). To the Project of the Methodology of Integral Linguistic Analysis. *The Europ. Proc. of Soc. & Behavioural Sci. EpSBS, LXXVI*, 3265–3274.
- Walde, A. (1927). *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Valter de Gruyter.
- Watkins, C. (1985). *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Xalidov, A. I. (2018). *Jazyki i narody Kavkaza* [Languages and peoples of the Caucasus]. Izd-vo Universal.