

“Swadesh lists” of Albanian Revisited and Consequences for Its Position in the Indo-European Languages

By Hans J. Holm¹
Hannover, Germany
hjjaholm@arcor.de

In the last decade, several scholars claimed to have finally solved the subgrouping of Indo-European by new lexicostatistical attempts. The public of course was not able to perceive the questionable outcomes, of which the different and idiosyncratic positions of Albanian are particularly conspicuous. One reason for this is the inadequate methods, simply copied from bioinformatics (cf. Holm, H. J. 2007). That defective data may contribute a great deal to these mistakes, is now first demonstrated here by analysing the Albanian part of three representative lists frequently employed in these studies: Thirteen percent of the data on these lists contains errors and this mixes inextricably with the stochastic dispersion. Seventeen new etymologies are proposed; however, about thirty per-cent of the list remains unsolved or questionable. Moreover, the high amount of differently changing replacements in Albanian is one more compelling argument against the rate assumption in glottochronology.

Introduction

In the last decade, mathematical methods from the field of bioinformatics have been employed to “enlighten” the subgrouping of Indo-European. The low suitability of these methods was reviewed in Holm (2005, 2007).

These computations rely linguistically on presumed cognations in the employed data, which, therefore, deserve a similar critical survey. This, however, has only

¹I owe thanks to Xhelal Ylli (Yl.) for his valuable comments and corrections from the view as a native speaker, and in particular to Prof. Rolf T. Ködderitzsch for his repeated corrections and grammatical hints. Of course, any mistakes remain my own responsibility.

scarcely² been done.

The aim of this synopsis cannot be to revisit anew all studies from the last 150 years, but rather to evaluate those arguments that have survived into the newer etymological dictionaries, and then cautiously try to find decisions. The results will be confronted with three representative Swadesh lists, all so-called meaning lists, with the corresponding lemmata entered for every language, here Albanian. Note that the candidates – according to the rules of these representatives of lexicostatistics – decide only the question of whether any responses in a meaning (or character) line are cognates or not.

The first candidate is the often employed “COMPARATIVE INDOEUROPEAN [!] DATABASE” by Isidore Dyen (1997). However, in his list of English – the author’s mother tongue – alone, Sheila Embleton (1986:100) exposed 16 entries as loans from Nordic languages, of which seven were misjudged³ as original cognates in Dyen (1992). Albeit this should raise considerable mistrust, three teams of non-linguists used this list for several international widely published lexicostatistical studies and even the questionable glottochronology (regarding the latter, cf., e.g., Huld⁴ 1984:15, and, in more detail, Holm 2007:168ff).

Concerning the next test list, employed by Ringe, Warnow, and Taylor (2002), Holm (2007:206) wrote, “RWT place much emphasis on establishing their own professional, reliable list, in terms of historical linguistics⁵.” We will see. Regrettably, the data of Ringe have only been published in 2007, on the internet, where it is still difficult to fathom the coded entries for many meanings back to the lemmata of the word list.

The third list is that of the late Russian linguist Sergej

²In 2007, a similar study appeared on Old Irish as a PhD by Martina Lucht.

³Even a short glance into *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* would have helped.

⁴“I have not used Swadesh’s list because of any faith in the glottochronological dates that are obtained from it; indeed, the two tacit assumptions of glottochronology – that language change occurs as a continuous, logarithmically definable process irrespectively of cultural changes, ... seem questionable to me.”

⁵In particular for his employment of the oldest available sources.

Starostin⁶, a leading representative of Swadesh-type glottochronology.

Because it would exceed the time and available printing space, this study will be limited to the amount (=100) and choice (meanings) of the latest updated Swadesh list⁷ (1971:283), a standard in those lexicostatistics. Out of the many languages (94 in Dyen, 24 in Ringe, 97 in Starostin), we chose Albanian, because of its radically different positional outcome in the computations.

The entries consist of three parts:

First, the header, which starts with the alphabetically ordered concept of the 100-word list of Swadesh or Dyen (of the latter in their ORIGINAL CAPITALS, followed by the number of the Swadesh list in brackets). In some cases, there are gaps in one or the other list, due to changes between an older version of Swadesh’s 200-item list used by Dyen⁸ and the last one used here.

Within the header there follows, according to the rules of mainstream lexicostatistics, the primary response to the meaning in Albanian. This response is often ambiguous, because the choice between Geg (or Gheg, the northern) vs. Tosk (the southern dialect) for standard Albanian has not been settled yet in many cases. Thus, sources based simply on “Albanian” in general (e.g., Ringe, Starostin, and LIV) tend to raise difficulties. Frequently cited authors are given by their acronym in SMALL CAPS, which can be traced in the references. Where a dictionary contains more than one equivalent, the first is considered the primary one and marked as “1.”, etc.

Still in the header, there follow the attestations in the lists under review, beginning with the unambiguous ones of “The Indo-European wordlists” by D. Ringe⁹

⁶By courtesy of his son, Georgij Starostin, by e-mail, November 25, 2007.

⁷Verbs are only marked in Dyen (with to), regrettably not in Swadesh and Starostin.

⁸Because Dyen used a former 200-Word list of Swadesh, who, however, cancelled many words in later versions, we used additional words of the Dyen list, used in former Swadesh lists, which only totalled 97 words.

⁹Gives the verb forms in the 3rd pers. sg.

(RI#¹⁰), and S. Starostin (ST#), with their respective list numbers. The attestations of Dyen's list (marked by their ORIGINAL CAPITAL LETTERS¹¹) contain five Albanian dialects¹², cited by the abbreviations T.(osk), T(osk)Og.(rén "TOP"), G. (Gheg 1914), Kor.(inth Albanian), Sic.(ilian Albanian), Alb. = addenda after 1992.

Secondly, the etymological options follow as a bulleted list. These were checked¹³ in particular by newer literature, beginning with the thorough¹⁴ Huld 1984 (HU#). This study lacks 10% of our lists, and I had to transpose his 6-laryngeal notation into the modern 3-fold one. He took his forms from the then official *Fjalor i gjushës shqipe* ("FGS"). In every case I checked B. Demiraj 1997 (DM#), the most reliable source, in modern laryngealistic notation; this one, however, covers only half of the material by avoiding questionable cases and loans¹⁵, and additionally had to be cross-checked with the updated and thereby often differing online version in the Leiden IEED project (the latter noted "DM-O" for "o"nline). In fact, the most complete work is the "Albanian etymological dictionary" by the late¹⁶ V. E. Orel 1998. Orel gave abundant sources; however, their position is often concealed, he seldom dealt with their arguments¹⁷ (e.g., p219 lesh), and avoided giving PIE forms, namely of Pokorny, thus evading laryngealistic traps. His abbreviation "Rom" for Romance had to be changed to "Rmc" in order to avoid confusion with Romanian. In every case, I tried to trace back the PIE reconstructions to either roots/bases of Pokorny 1959 (PK#) or, for verbs, of Rix et al. 2001 (LIV#), a methodologically helpful step too often omitted

¹⁰ "#" here placeholder for all numbers.

¹¹ Due to the original work with punch cards, also responsible for the only use of lower ASCII.

¹² The details can be traced in Dyen et al. (1992).

¹³ It cannot be and is not the aim of this short review to recapitulate the entire history of all the scholarly work of the past, which is generally amply taken care of in the adduced newer studies.

¹⁴ Except his frequent off-putting, because uncommented, citations of the PK IEW.

¹⁵ Therefore, in cases of loans, the absence of entries in DM is not noted.

¹⁶ Died 5.8.2007

¹⁷ J. Matzinger (1998) gave some corrections in his review.

by the above experts. This is not in respect of the Albanian entries, where Pokorny unfortunately relied too often on questionable sources, which are dealt with and corrected in Huld 1984; moreover, Pokorny was sometimes unaware of self-contradictory entries. All entries were tested for possible loans in all directions, thus from Latin and Italian, referring, e.g., to Haarmann 1972¹⁸ (HAL#) and 1990 (HAG#), and to Bonnet 1998, further from Greek, from South-Slavonian (referring e.g., to Ylli 1997)¹⁹, and from Turkish (checking e.g., Boretzky 1976). The lemmata adduced by Dyen 1997 show that he seemed not to have used any of these sources, which was admittedly his philosophy: to prove that by his method it would be possible to find the correct relationship of languages by use of simple dictionaries.

Third and finally, the decision: Either "Yes" = the Albanian response is regarded as an Indo-European cognate; or "No", including a mark for its suspected reason, where No(C-) means that there are cognates (C) outside Albanian, however not under exactly this meaning (-); No(L) marks a loan. Question marks stand for too-uncertain or debated cases. This decision is then compared with those in each of the three databases²⁰: Dyen with his cognation code²¹ (- DY#), followed by Ringe, and Starostin, all noted in their already mentioned acronyms.

In some cases, there follow parts in reduced font size, for responses, where the Albanian differs in the sources.

Further Abbreviations: dem.(onstrative), FN (footnote); {f,m,n} the genders; iso.(lated), prf. (perfect), pres. (present), ptc. (participle), sg. (singular); Languages: Blg. (Bulgarian), Grm. (German), Gmc. (Germanic), Gre.(ek), Hit.(tite), IE (Indo-European), Itn. (Italian), Kel. (Celtic), Lat.(in), Lit.(huanian), OCS. (Old Church Slavonian), Phr.(ygian), Rmc.(Romance); Rom.(anian); SHr. (Serbo-Croatian < 'srpskohrvatski'), Skr.(Sanskrit), Sla.(vonian), T.(osk), Tok.(harian/

¹⁸ Rather a word-field study. His index numbers in italics, distinguishing these from page numbers of the other cited authors.

¹⁹ Svane, Gunnar (1992): *Slavische Lehnwörter im Albanischen*, does not contain relevant entries.

²⁰ To control these decisions, the reader has to go directly to the references, which cannot be reprinted here.

²¹ In this work, of course, transposed into a short text, explained in detail in the attachment.

Tocharian), Trk. (Turk), QIE (Quasi-IE of B. Demiraj); O(ld)-, P(roto), S(outh)-, V(ulgar)-.

Symbols: * unattested reconstruction; ** fake reconstruction; ~ similar, with marginal differences; / also, variant; before l after. Only in citations: [insertion by this author].

The Data and their Assessment

ALL (SW9) Adj.: **gjiθlē**, a. = R11, ST1. DY: G., Alb. GJITH; T., TOg. GITHE.

- (1) Possibly with PK902 ^{2*}*sem-* ‘one, entire’ > **sem-ko*: HU69 equates the rising of emls > ils with that in *mish* ‘meat’, however, finds a difficulty in the voiced reflex /-ð/ in one (Ukrainian) diaspora form, which should be secondary. Nevertheless, OR136 also clings to this /-ð/, explaining it by an alleged IE **-gho*-suffix, only questionably seen in Arm. *ez*, however, unparalleled in Alb.
- (2) Hardly from PK282 ^{3*}*eč-*, most times dem. pron.: In DM-O(188) indirectly referred to by noting [Hom.] Gre. *īa* ‘una’, via > IE **sih₂-ko* > PALb. *šīθ-* ‘each, whole’; this reconstruction, however, leads phonetically rather to
- (3) LIV544 **sh₂eč-* ‘bind together’ + *ko*, which would also match the semantics.

Yes(C?+) – DY008, and ST “iso.”, for the old solution (1), where both overlooked their SW-Ira. cognates: Doubtful. Only because the latter are not contained in RI, thus iso.: a weak OK.

ASHES (SW83): **hīlri**; G. *hīlni*. = R14, ST. DY: G. HINI; T., TOg. HI. · DM no attempt, the record entry “p398” is an orphan.

- From PK917 **skih₁-n* ‘shine, whitish’ (also > OEng. *scīnan*, Lat. *cinis* ‘Ashes’), > PALb. **skīno-*: so HU74; OR147 < PALb. **skina*. Today no cognates for ‘ashes’, thus:

No(C-) – DY010, R14, and ST “iso.” = all OK.

BARK (OF A TREE) (SW27): Ambiguous standard! YL 3., QE single entry:

1. **lēvozhglē**, a.; ~ (YL 2.) **lēvor**le {f.}. DY: T. LEVEZHGE.
 - Hardly reshaped loan < Lat. *velārium* ‘covering, screen’, of course neither contained in HAL nor BON.
 - Also hardly from LIV290 **h₂uer-* ‘to hang (intr.)’ > Alb. *vjerr* ‘to hang’: As in OR511 after half a dozen cross-references

> OR226 *lëvozhgë* < *lëvore* ‘peel, skin, rag’; semantically too different. Therefore, if we correctly

- reconstruct *lëvozhgë* < IE **leueHg^h-ske*, this should be an Alb. extension of PK681 **leuH-*, with the semantically close Gmc. **lawa* > *Lohe* ‘tan/ abgelöste Rinde als Gerbmittel’; the word might be influenced by SHr. *ljuska* ‘peel, crust, shell’, probably from the same root. No close semantic matches, thus:

No(C?) – DY001 „unique“: so far OK.

2. (YL 1.) **zhaplë** {f.} ‘rind, bark, leather’. DY: G., Alb. 1. ZHABA (typo! *zhablë,a* {f.} ‘toad’!). · Missing in QE, HU, DM, OR, YL! In early Alb., the sound law *s* > *sh-* ruled not only the loans from Lat., but also - up to 1000 AD - those from Sla. (YL317); analogically we should accept the voiced variant Sla. *z* > Alb. *zh-*; if so, the source could be Blg. *запари* ‘wrinkle’ (in YL291 > Alb. *zapëri* ‘id’-).

No(L?) – DY207 confused with next:

Besides two semantically false entries in DY:

- **cipjë** {f.} ‘thin (piece of) skin’ (see there). At – DY001 TOg. CIPE: Mistaken.
- **kujle,a** ‘crust of bread’ (!), obviously referring to this, DY: G., Alb.2. KUJA. – DY207 both (!) doubtful to derivatives of PK940 ^{4,*}(s)*ker-to* (Slav. *kora*, Ind. *chal*): Minor mistake. This latter might after BON209 be cognate to the next:

Beside 3. **kore** (HU after FGS 1954: *korë*, now out-dated); though single entry in St (e *druret!*), it is rather used for ‘crust (of bread)’. Only employed by ST3. – Missing in HU, and DM. BON209 considers a loan < Lat. *corium* (see, however SKIN). Better: YL129, OR191 ‘crust, bark’ = Loan < SSlav. (Srb., Blg.) *kora*: No(L), thus: – ST so far OK. Remains a dubious response.

Beside 4. **shkëlbozë**. Only brought in by R18. After OR419 ‘bark’, derivation in *-ozë* < [PK926] **skel(H)-b* ‘half-opened’ > e.g., ‘*silique*’ [the *-b* elsewhere only Gmc.]; questionable. Loan < SSlav? [cf. Rus. *skal(in)á* ‘birch bark’]. Isolated. No(?) – R1 dubious, missing the standard.

Beside: 5. **labë** ‘Rinde, Kork’ < **lHub^h-os* < PK690 **leub^h*, a phonetically good match, not noted in any of the lists.

BELLY (SW49): **barklu** {m.}. = R110, ST4. DY: G., Alb.1. BARKU, TOg., T. BARK.

- (1) Not from PK130 ^{1,*}*bher-* ‘tragen/to carry’: So HU0; similar OR18 via < PALb. **baruka*, obviously inspired by [Ill.] *βαρ(υ)κα*; however, rightly doubted by DM92 as all problematic, and now expelled online. All overlooked the direct, completely unproblematic, derivation
- (2) from (the extension?) PK110 **bharek^h* ‘vollgestopft/

‘jammed’.

No(C-) – Dy005, RI, and ST “iso.” = all so far OK.

Beside Yl 2. **mulllë**,a ‘belly, stomach’. Dy: G., Alb. 2. MULLA. Dy without further notice.

BIG (Sw5): i/e **madhle**. = Ri11, ST5. Dy: Sic., TOg., T. I MATH, E MADHE; G. MADH.

- From PK708 [reduced grade $*m_{\hat{g}}(e)h_2$] > *madha*: So HU88 in spite of difficulties with the vocal. DM42 and 250 tried to explain the /e/ (similar OR240) by “schwa secundum”, however, changed in DM-O completely to zero grade $*m_{\hat{g}}(e)h_2$.

Yes(C+) – Dy200 with Greek ML MEGALOS = Ri and ST: all OK.

BIRD (Sw20): **zogu**. = Ri12, ST6. Dy: G. ZOGU; TOg. ZOK; T. ZOG.

- Hardly from [PK86] $*h_2u(e)i-$ ‘bird’: So Hamp 97ff, under “lex Hamp” and even more far-fetched assumptions, p103 refuting the following solution as “unmotivated”:
- PK409 $*\hat{g}^h \hat{a}o^h$ ‘Junge eines Tieres, bes. eines Vogels’, also > Farsi غاچ <zaq> ‘chough’ (not ‘bird!’), unnecessarily declared as borrowed > Arm. ճագ <jag> ‘young of animals’. Influenced by this suggestion, HU135 amplifies the FGS by giving ‘(young) bird’, and declares it as ‘culture word’; copied by OR525 as “oriental Wanderwort”, though it is in no way a typical one and thus not convincing at all, only backed up by an incorrect translation of the Farsi word. DM429 translates ‘bird, in particular small one, also young of animals, nestling’, and avoids the otherwise wrong anlaut by inserting a /u/, via < Hamp 97ff, $*\hat{g}^{(h)} \underline{u}eh_2-G$ < “PK909” [typo], which also takes account of the Arm. word and is the more justified, as Djahukian (1990) attested all Balkan languages a tendency to labialization. The seme²² ‘small’ is elsewhere only attested in DH1664, e.g., *zog pule* ‘Küken/ chick’, *zog pate* ‘Gänseküken’, not in other adduced dictionaries.

Outside Alb. not primary response for ‘bird’, thus:

No(C-) – Dy004, RI, and ST “iso.” = all OK.

Not: shpeslë,a; **shpesëri**, **shpendë**, **shpendli** {m.} ‘fowl, poultry’. Dy: G., Alb.1. SHPENDI, SHPEZA. – In HU168 as homologous derivation < PK825 ⁶ $*pet-ont\bar{i}$ ‘fliegend/ flying’ with the meaning ‘bird’ in Kel. dialects. Contrasting: OR429, opaque (why ‘down?’), as derived

²²Elsewhere sememe, semanteme: smallest semantic component.

from *pendë* ‘feather’, thereby loan < Lat. All this remains questionable, note Grm. *Spatz* < *Sperling* ‘sparrow’. – DY004 takes no further notice.

BITE (Sw56) Verb: **kafshoj**, *kafshon*. ~ R113, ST7. DY: G., Alb. **KAPSHOJ**; TOg. **KAFSON** (AOR. **KAFSOVA**). T. ME **KAFSHUAR**. · Bonnet no entry.

- (1) Not from the formerly adduced PK931 **(s)ke/a-p* ‘to cut’, which would neither account for the /-sh-/ nor the /-f/.
- (2) Albeit the concept ‘bite’ is contained in all Swadesh lists, HU79 cites only **KAFSHË** ‘animal’ [better, ‘pack animal’], loan < Lat. *CAUSA* ‘thing’, not distinguishable from the homonym for ‘reason’ (HAL88, cf. DM72, 210). Thus remains, also semantically far more convincing:
- (3) Loan < Lat. *capessere*, possible in spite of Petersen 1905 (cf. HAL: p13): so OR164, citing HAL here, however, without mentioning his better proposal:
- (4) HAL78 loan < Lat. *captiare* ‘beißen, verschlingen’. In any case:

No(L) – DY004, RI, and ST (L) “iso.” = all OK.

BLACK (Sw91): i **zi**, e **zezë**. ~ R114 *zi* = ST8. DY: G., TOg. I-**ZI**, T. I **ZI**, E **ZEZE**.

- Hardly with PK483-5 **g^hh₁(udh-)* ‘Ekelhaftes?/unlucky, mourning’ > PALb. **džedi* > *zi* ‘black, mourning’: So OR524: Semantically and phonetically questionable. Also far-fetched:
- Nor from [PK469 **g^{ueid}(h)-* ~ ‘fluid filth?’] > PIE **g^{uidh}-s*: HU134 “If the semantics ... are acceptable.” Rather not. Presumably
- from [PK488] **g^uhⁱHi-d* ‘light, grey coloured’, > e.g., Gre. *φαίος* ‘brownish, grey’, and PALb. *d’id(i)*: So DM427, albeit uncertain. Elsewhere deviant meanings; therefore:

No(C) – DY011 and ST (C) “iso.” = OK. – RI expelled.

BLOOD (Sw30): **gjak**|u {m.}. = R115, ST9. DY: G., Alb. **GJAKU**; TOg. **GAK**; T. **GJAK**.

- From PK1044 **s(u)ek^uo-s* ~ ‘Pflanzensaft/juice of plants’ > *sok^uo* > PALb. *śak*: So HU67; DM-O(181); OR129 via < PALb. *saka*. Elsewhere deviant meanings; therefore:

No(C) – DY007 and ST (C) “iso.” = OK. – RI expelled.

BONE (Sw31): **1. kocklë**,a {f.} (QE, SI). = R117. DY: T.,

TOg. KOSKE.

- Loan < Blg. *kočka* (YL121); similar OR *koc*, as loan < PSla. **kostb*. Missing in HU.

No(L) – DY007 iso.: OK. – RI expelled.

2. **rrashtli** {m.} ‘bone’; **rrashtlë**,a {f.} ‘(skull) bone’ (BFU). Dy: G., Alb. RRASHTI.

- (1) Hardly composed of *më* + *asht* for ‘skull bone’: So Çabej (II: 101²³), and DM82, who skipped this possibility online, where only *asht* appears (cf. 3. below).
- (2) Possibly from [PK1181] ² **ureh₂g^h* ‘puff, beat’?? > Att. Gre. *ράπτω* ‘beat’, and Alb. *rah* ‘to beat’, as verbal noun > PALb. **wrag-šta*: OR379 assumes semantically a source ‘hammer bone’, referring to Lith. forms, rather meaning ‘hollow’ or ‘bent’ instead of the proposed connection with Lit. *káuti* ‘beat’; the adduced Gmc. forms around *bone*, etc., are far from settled, and the case remains questionable.

NO(C?-) – DY202 = not acceptable his doubtful connection with DY201 (~ Sla. KOST); doubtful with Dy200, containing, with others:

3. **ashtli** {m.} (BFU, DH43, not S1). From PK783 **h₂ost(h₂)* > PALb. **ast*. So HU38 along with the FGS, with many dialectal forms; DM82 as {m.}; similar OR11.

Yes(C+): – DY200 Sic. AST, here also – ST10: both OK, however, not primary response.

breasts (SW51, note the unambiguous plural; absent in DY): **gjliri**; G. **gjl̥ni** {m.} ‘bay, breast, tit, bosom’. = ST11; ~ RI18 **gji**, **sisë**.

- (1) The experts refer with empty remarks, however no decision, to Lat. *sinus*: HU153 via < **sinos* “cf.”, OR135 “identical”? Similar DM56, only hidden between sound laws: “uralb. **sin-*” should be the regular source, for which, however, no older root is detectable. A possibility:
- (2) From PK481 **g^hiieh₂* ‘string’ is derived > Skr. *jyá* ‘string’, borrowed as mathematical term into Arab. as **جيب** (*jība*) ‘pocket, wrinkle’, translated²⁴ as such into the (yet) unetymologized Lat. *sinus*.
- (3) A loan from Lat. *sinus*, however, would have ended in Alb. ***shinu*, and would not display this broad scale of meanings.
- (4) A derivation from PK990 **sp/steno* ‘Zitzen/tits’ would

²³Friendly hint from Xh. Ylli.

²⁴Translated into Latin by Gherardo da Cremona (1114 - 1187).

require either, a) an Alb. simplification at the border between *steni (> Gre. *στηνίον*, Arm. *stin*, normally Alb. ***shten*-), and NW-IE *speni- (> OIri *sine*), to ***seni*, which is improvable; or, b) a loan of early Kel. into both, Lat. and Alb. during the Celtic expansions around the fourth and third century B.C.

No(L?) – ST, unaware of the ambiguous meaning of his ‘breast’ with (3) = dubious. – RI expelled.

BURN (verb intr.) (SW84): **djeg**/digjem (Aor. u/ dogja). = ST12. RI20 digjet. DY: TOg. DIGEM (AOR. UDOGA); G. DIGJEM (DJEG); Alb. DJEG.

- With LIV133 **d^heg^h-e* ‘id.’ > PALb. **deg-*: So also HU53; DM138. OR68 via PALb. **dega*.

Yes(C+) – DY204 = cognate with Slav., Iri. = RI and ST: all OK.

CHILD (YOUNG) (skipped in SW later): **1. fëmijë**, a {original f., today m.: DH280}. DY: Sic. FEMIJA; G., Alb. FEMIJA ~ RI see below; ST no entry.

- Loan < Lat. *familia*: HU64; OR95; HAL209> Alb. *fëmilë*.

No(L) – DY009 iso.: OK.

Beside **foshnjë** {f.} ‘Säugling/infant’. DY T. FOSHNIJE, TOg. FOSNE. OR102 G. *foshi* ‘infant’. Neither in QE nor HU. – DY015, iso.: So far OK, superficial entry.

QE: **2. kalamalni** {m.} ‘kid up to 9 years’. – RI21 iso.: Acceptable, OK. Narrowed semantics!

QE: **3. vogëlush** ‘small child’ (cf. entry SMALL). Too different: **çilimi** ‘baby’.

claw (SW45, not DY): **kthetlër,ra** {f.}. (sharp, hooked, e.g. of lions, talons of falcons).

- All from the root LIV319 **kēh3-(i)* ‘schärfen/sharpen’, either
 - after OR200 via PALb. **tsā(i)nja* [?] > *thyej* [?] ‘to break [?]’ > *k-thej* [?] ‘to turn [?]’, which appears only semantically somewhat confused.
 - DM395, DM-O under k(ë)thap ‘hook, claw’ supports forms with –p-determinant, given in PK543 *koipo* ‘spike’, e.g. > *thep*.

Yes(C+). However, because ‘claw’ unambiguously refers to ‘nails’ of animals, all list authors miss the desired tight meaning:

Semantically different: *thlua,oi* ‘(finger)nail’: Hu120 reconstructs < PIE */*kēEn(T)-s*/, not mentioning PK567 *kent* ‘stechen, Nagel’. – RI22 (iso.) false ‘claw’; ST13 iso. (C-) for claw (nail); though both

codings seem to be correct, both missed the correct term (the ‘nail’ in ST should only apply to such languages, which do not distinguish between these expressions). The Albanian cover-term for claw, nail, and hook is *çapua*.

CLOUD (SW80): **relja**; G. *rê* {f.}. = R123, ST14B. DY: G., Alb. REJA; TOg., T. RĚ.

- Not from PK871². **reug-* (absent as verb in LIV509), a circulation only based on alleged PALb. **rougi*, not explaining the loss of the dorsal; moreover, the Gmc. attestations have originated from a meaning ‘to smell’ (cf. Kluge ‘*Rauch/smoke*’).
- Possibly from PK853⁵. **reh-* ‘dark’ (with different extensions PK334 ‘red-brown colours, PK857 ‘darkness’: DM-O(344) only uncertain < PALb. *(e)*reN* < **h₁reg^h-(s)*; connected with Alb. *ërvë* ‘darkness’, seen in Buzuku *er(r)ë- ‘nubës’*; the meaning ‘cloud’, however, appears nowhere else, nor the requested /-N/.
- Questionably under the sememe ‘wet, flow, rain’ as variants of a root **er-*, doubtful LIV498? **reg-* ‘fließen, tropfen (?)’, alone based on Alb. *rjedh*, ‘flow’ (~PK857 typo *rjeth*). The *rj-* and semantics (cf. the Roman aqueducts!) point to loan of Alb. *rjedh* < Lat. *rigare* ‘irrigate’.
- It remains either
 - without /i/: PK336². **h₁ers-* ‘to flow’, also > Alb. *resh* ‘(it) falls, showers’ (not followed by DM345, therefore missing at the corresponding LIV241), mostly extended by ‘snow, ashes, rain’; *reshje* ‘precipitation’; also here, with ablaut *ros* > Lit. *rasà* ‘dew’: so HU107 with doubts, and again the off-putting (see above) entry IEW 872 **reu(g)*; or – my choice:
 - To LIV305 **h₃reiH-* ‘wirbeln, fließen’ +n, > PALb. **rina* (cf. OInd. *rināti*, Sla. *rinō ti*; Ill. *řivos* ‘cloud’, +s in MHGrm. *risel* ‘rain’); PK330 > Alb. *ri-të*, adj. ‘wet’: so OR366 via singularized pl. < **ri*.

No(C-) – DY002 ~ ST “iso.” = both OK. – R123 expelled.

COLD (DY: WEATHER) (SW94, adj.): i/e **ftohtë**. = ST15a ~ R124 *ftohët* {noun}. DY: G., Alb. FTOFT, FTOFET; TOg. FTOTE ~ T. I, E FTOHTE.

- Hardly from [LIV616². **teh_ɣ*] ‘melt, thaw’ > *awa-tāja*: So OR105 under *ftolh/f* ‘to make cold’ as verb with negative prefix *awa-*: Phonetically and semantically (as ‘not melting’) not convincing. Better:

- From LIV 629 ¹**tep-* ‘to be warm/hot’ > {fientiv} **t_p-éh₁* > PALb. **tpo-*, in two possibilities:
 - Already PK1069-70 > **vētēp-skō*, entwärme/dis-warm’, in HU65 *ftohēt*, declaring *f* as the correct negative, privative prefix; where DM173 under *ftoh* ‘to cool’, remains undecided between this prefix solution or a –metathesis *tpē-(h)* < *tep* ‘warm’ > < *ptoh*, and inter-Albanian change of meaning to the contrary.
- In any case, for elsewhere with different meaning:
No(C?) – Dy008 and ST “iso.” = OK. – RI expelled.

COME (SW66) verb: **vij**, vjen; (aor. *erdha*, *ardhçë*; T. *me ardhur*, G. *me ardh*). = ST16a, RI25. DY: T. ME ARDHUR; Sic. VIN (PRET. ARTH -?- sg.), TOg. VIN (AOR. ERDHA); G., Alb. VIJ (INF. ARDH).

- Perhaps from LIV232 **h₁ei-* ‘gehen’ via *u* {prothesis}-*ō* {preverb}-: so Matzinger 2005:100, referring to former work of Klingenschmitt; this root, however, appears very far-fetched and over-employed, since the same root is also adduced for responses of WALK, GO. Mainstream:
- Loan < Lat. *venire* ‘to come’ (so HAL629; HU129; OR508; BON298 < [oblique forms of] Lat. *uen(is, it)*), because Alb. ***vënen* would have resulted > Tosk ***vëren*, as Matzinger (ibid.) correctly objects.

No(L) – Dy208, ~ ST loan: OK(?). – RI expelled.

DY connects the aor. forms too doubtful with his Dy209 (Gre. ERCHOMAI), *ἐρχομαι* < PK326/8, LIV238 **h₁er(ǵ^h)-*.

DIE (SW61) verb: **vdes** (aor. *vdiqu*, inf. Geg *me vdek*; Tosk *me vdekur*). = RI29, ST17a. DY: G., Alb. VDES, (AOR.VDIKJA, INF.VDEK); T. ME VDEKUR; TOg. VDES (AOR. VDIKA).

- (1) Hardly from LIV620 **tek^u*- ‘laufen, fließen/run, flow’ (also > Alb. *ndjek* ‘follow, pursue’ [?]) > iter. caus. *au-tok^u-eie-ti* ‘leaves’: so cited from HU124. Similar OR496 via < **awa-takja*. Not followed by DM288, who mentions no relation to *vdes* here nor has an entry for it. Formally and semantically better:
- (2) From LIV150 **d^hg^{uh}ei-* ‘hinschwinden, sterben/pass away, die’, > **d^heg^{uh}-(e)io* > PALb. **v-dez-*, dissimilated against *ndez* ‘to lighten’; cf. also > Att. Gre. *φθί-νω* ‘to die’. In this case:

Yes(C+) – ST (2): OK; vs. – Dy004 iso.: Wrong in any case. – RI expelled.

DOG (Sw21): **qenli** {m.}. = RI32, ST18a. DY: G., Alb. KJENI; Sic. KEN, T. GEN; TOg.1. KEN.

- Not from PK632 **kúuōn-*, because an > PALB. ***kōn* should have lost the *-n* (DM55, g), or rhotacized, if not so. Therefore:
- Loan < Lat. *canis* ‘dog’ presupposes that the ending has been lost before rhotacism: HU107, JA192, OR356; if not so, we must assume a late loan < Itn. **ken*, or neighbouring Rmc. dialects (BON115, 182).

No(L) – DY009, RI, ~ ST loan: all OK.

Besides YL: Tosk **bushlër**,ra. DY: TOg.2. BUSTER. Seldom, because of pejorative shift, cf. *bushër* ‘Hündin/bitch’ (DH116).

DRINK (Sw54) verb: **pī** (Geg inf. me pi). = RI33, ST19a. DY: T. ME PIRE; Sic. PI, TOg. PI, AOR. PIVA, G. PI, PIVA.

- LIV462 **peh₃(i)-* ‘to drink’ > pres. **piph₃é* > **pib(h₃)e* > **pibe* > ?PALB. **pīi*: so DM318; the reservation of HU103 against Lat. *pōto* hits a secondary form. OR324 via supposed PALB. **pīja*, (in LIV corrected to *pī-je*, after a newer, only Bal-Sla. *īepres.*, however not noting the long *ī*).

Yes(C+) – DY004 with the due forms in other languages, = RI, and ST: All OK.

DRY (SUBSTANCE) (Sw99) adj.: i/e **thatë**, to the verb *thaj*. = RI34 ~ ST20a. DY: TOg., G., Alb. THAT; T. I, E THATI.

- (1) Lubotsky²⁵ regards a PIE adj. **h₂sus* ‘dry’ as primary, belonging as prf. ptc. to PIE **h₂es* (~ PK68-9 **h₂es(d)* ‘to burn’); in LIV255, however, this is only acknowledged as *~h₂ed-* ‘to dry up’ > **h₂d-ié*, > Gre. *ἄζω* ‘to dry’, with no Alb. form. Contrasting:
- (2) From the adj. PK880 **saus/[h₂]seus* ‘dry’, we can derive the Alb. verb > **thaus-ni* > Alb. *tha-(n)j*: With HU117, the adj. with late suffix *-të*. Similar, however confining to the verb, DM-O (updating the different print version DM392), uncertain about the position of the *h₂*, and “Only under the assumption of an old regressive dissimilation of the two *s*.”, with Gre. *aḗa*. Without such reservations, OR473, as derivative of *thaj* ‘to dry’, via PALB. **sausnja*. Nothing of this is mentioned in the corresponding LIV285 ‘to become dry’. Obviously, both entries are related, thus

²⁵A study in particular refuting a PIE /a/.

Yes(C-) – DY003 iso. = mistaken. – ST with the forms in (2): OK. – RI expelled.

Besides non-standard: Sic. I-TERM. Perhaps verbal adjective to QE1.: **ter**, Si2. **terur**, with DM384 *ter* < PK1078 **ters*, trans. verb ‘to dry’. – DY005 connects his Sic. form with Nordic, seems OK.

EAR (SW39): **veshli** {m.}. = RI37, ST21b. DY: Sic., TOg. VES; G., Alb. VESHI; T. VESH.

- From PK785 ²[**h₂(e)us-*] ‘ear’ > dual **h₂(e)us-ós-ih₁* > PALb. **(a)uaś(i)* > umlaut of /a/: So HU127 **/Hu-/* > /ve-/*; also DM415 (clearer DM-O); ~ OR501 via PALb. **wauasi*.

Yes(C+) – RI, and ST: OK. : – DY002 mistaken, by connecting the Alb. exclusively with his Ira. forms, which may belong to a root LIV200 ?**g^{(w)h}eu-* ‘to hear’.

EARTH (SOIL) (SW79): **1. dhelu**. = RI38. ST22 de [!]. DY: TOg., T.1. DHE; G. DHEU.

- (1) Hardly from PK244 **dhejġ^h* ‘to form of clay etc.’, because of too-far-fetched semantics; thus only “perhaps” HU57, 147, with compensatory lengthening for the lost velar in most dialects. Rather the suggested option is
- (2) PK414 [**d^hġġ^he(h₃)m*] > (*d*)*đom* > *ðe^m*: DM155 with early loss of the /-m/ to account for the absent nasalization in Geg; for the same reason, MAR233 assumes an intermediate (*d^hġ^hōs*). Neglecting this problem: OR80 via PALb. **dzō*. The Gre., Ill., and Alb. forms suggest a Balkan-IE *ġ^hō-* (cf. PK414, bottom).

Yes(C+) – DY200 with many cognates = RI38-1 and ST (though typo): OK.

- 2. tokë** {f.} ‘earth’, < Sla. **tokb* ‘threshing floor’ (OR459); DY: T.2. TOKE, without further notice.

EAT (SW23) verb: **ha** (aor. Tosk *hëngra*, Geg *hângra*; ptc. Tosk *ngrënë*, hënger/Geg *ngrânë*, hângër). RI39 ha = ST23a. DY: Sic. XA; G. HA (INF. HANGER), TOg. HA (AOR. HENGERA); T. ME NGRENE.

- (1) DY and ST mistakenly equate HA with Hindi *ha(na)*, < OInd. *khādati*, this – if IE at all – < **k^(w)h₂ġd-* [LIV359], which can never give Alb. *ha*. Negative already
- (2) HU72, 151, who also rejects the second attempt, ~ Lat. *edo* [< LIV230 **h₁ed-* ‘id.’], for it would not yield the *h-* anlaut. OR140 takes up this connection, accounting for the *h-* as an archaic rest of < *-d-* in **edóm*, copied as footnote in LIV230; both, however are not aware that an

acrodynamic pres. **h₁éd-* should not end in Alb. *ha*, but ~ ***odh(am)* (cf. DM62).

- (3) HU72 himself resorts to only “possible” Lat. *aveō* < [copied at LIV274] **h₂eu-* ‘genießen/to enjoy’; this, however, following DM45, would have resulted in Alb. *a-*.
- (4) This in fact unsolved situation might have inspired an alleged “undetected sound law”²⁶ Gre. *φ* ~ Alb. /*h*/, thus connected with ~ *φαγείν* ‘to eat’, which, however, goes back < **b^hag-* (LIV65) without Alb. continuation, ~ ***ba(g)*.
- (5) LIV211 **g^herh₃* ‘verschlingen/to swallow’ is the source of the above suppletive forms; *ibid.*, footnote 5, cites an attestation²⁷ O-Geg *an-grë* ‘ate’, which changes the reconstruction of HU147(i), *h₁en-g^hh₃Cno-* into **h₂en-*, in which case, following DM59, the result are the attested *ha*-forms; so DM297, who in turn avoids discussing the difficult pres. *ha*. These could then well have split into the pres. *ha* vs. the suppletive forms without *ha-*, while OR140 chose the reverse order.

Yes(C?+), – Dy200, ST, both (1), clearly mistaken. – RI expelled. Still open case.

EGG (SW33): **vezlë,a** {f.}; (Geg *ve(o)lja*, also ‘widowler’). ~ RI40, ST24b. Dy: T. VE, VEZE; Sic. VE; G. VEJA. (DM157 only marginal remark).

- A phonetically possible **aueg^hlġh/g-* (cf. Pk84 and 1117-8) with meanings ‘(become) strong, increase’ is semantically not convincing.
- OR497 infers from an alleged contrast Tosk *v(a)e* ~ Geg *vo(e)* upon a “typical” loan < Lat. *ōvum*, overlooking that all other loans from Lat. *ō-* result in (*h*)*u-* (cf. HAL, p139); moreover, he simply keeps quiet about HU125, who had explicitly rejected such vocalism as “unique”, as well as MAR238 with more counter arguments. Thus, with
- HU125 VE,JA < Pk783 [**eh₃uġom*] ‘Ei’. Cf. Arm. *jvoj* _(Gen.), Cze. *vejce*.

Yes(C+) – ST: OK. – Dy006 and RI = iso. = mistaken.

Besides (Dy) TOG. KOKOVE, QE: *koqeve*, combination of Pk611 **koko* ‘hen’ + ‘egg’ above.

EYE (SW40): **syli** (Geg -ni) {m.}. = RI41, ST25b. Dy: Sic. SI;

²⁶Holst (1998: 83f) simply equates the anlaut /*h*/ of five Alb. forms with Gre. ones with /*φ*/, without tracing these back to IE (in this case **bh-*), overlooking that IE aspirated mediae are generally deaspirated in Alb.

²⁷Klingenschmitt 1982:279f.

G. SYNI; TOg., T. SY.

- All agree with PK775 [$*h_3(e)k^u-ih_1$] as source, however, disagree upon the /y/:
 - PK775 $*ok^u$ himself > Alb. (sy)sii < asii, is doubted by HU113, because /i/ would not yield “T.”/y/; his only evidence, however, is the N-Tosk dialect of Berat, which may well have been influenced by the bordering Geg, and remains without result;
 - DM43 demonstrates that $i > y$ in labial environment, and thus can DM356 reconstruct sy < tsui. Another labial proposes
 - OR405 via PALb. $*ats\tilde{i}-wi$ {dual}, after ORXVII-7 presuming Alb. /y/ in “isolated cases” to reflect PIE $*\tilde{i}$, and declares the development as secondary. Finally BON96, FN51 as concealed definite article like in *hy,-u* ‘deity’.
- Yes(C+) – ST OK; versus – DY007 and R141 iso., both mistaken.

FALL, DROP (skipped in SW 1972): **bie** (aor. rashë, ptc. rënë). = R142, absent in ST. DY: G., Alb. BI (INF. RA, RAN); Sic. BIE (PRET. RA), Kor. BIE (AOR. RAASE), TOg. BIE (AOR. RAS), T. ME RENE.

- All authors derive the word from [LIV80] $*b^h erH-$ ‘to work on sth. with sharp tool’, semantically ‘struck > fall’, following HU3 ‘strike, fall’ via < $*bher-ih_2$; DM100 ‘to fall, to lay (down), beat’ < *ber\tilde{i}*; OR24 via PALb. $*be(r)ja$. Elsewhere deviant meanings:

No(C-) – DY011 iso.: OK. – Ri expelled. Cf. also TO RAIN.

FAR (skipped in SW 1972): **larg**, = R143, ST. hidden at end of list DY: T. LURG, Tog. LARK, G., Alb.1. LARG.

- Probably loan < Lat. *largu(s)* ‘large, ample > far (away)’: So HAL305, ~ followed by HU85, OR214. BON357 « un adverbe roman », because of the preserved $-rg$, however, will not exclude Rom. *larg* or Itn. *largo*.

No(L) – DY005 and Ri “iso.” = OK.

Dyen’s further entries here, Sic. GHARGHU; Alb. 2., GJAN; G. 2. GJAT; QE **gjatë** are mistranslations, in fact meaning ‘long’ or ‘wide’ (e.g., of sleeves).

FAT (SUBSTANCE) (SW32 ‘grease’): **1. dhjamlë**,a; var. dhamli {m.} ‘fat’ {noun}. = R144, ST26b. DY: TOg. DHJAME; T. I, E DHJAMTE [!]; G.1. DHJAMI.

- (1) To avoid the objection of HU in solution (2), OR83 declares the [N-Geg] variants *vjam* as secondary and

establishes a new source, PALb.**dzel-mā*, from Alb. *dhallë* ‘buttermilk’, this after HU57 transformed < PK400 **glakt*- ‘milk’, followed by DM-O(153) with “no certainty”. Apart from the far-fetched semantics (Alb. *gjalpë* {m.} ‘butter’), Alb. *dh-* < *dz-* requires PIE/ *ǵ-*. Preferable is the old solution:

- (2) Under PK175 **deh_ɣ* ‘to flow’, where we find in all and only the three Balkan-IE languages an *-m*-derivation with the meaning ‘fat, wet’: Gre. *δημός* ‘fat of creatures’, Arm. *tamuk* ‘wet’, and Alb. *dhjamë*, however irregular (?) vocalism (unclear Rom. *zeámă* ‘juice, broth’). HU59f objects that Alb. /*ja*/ “can only reflect an original short *e*.”, will therefore not connect the word with Gre. (see, however, below), and remains without result. DM161 doubtfully keeps to this solution via < *dem-*. The /*a*/ may have arisen by loan < Gre., where the unstressed /*η*/ became /*ě*/, and thus (cf. HU153) > /*ja*/. Trk. *damlā*- ‘drop’ might additionally have influenced the phonetics.

No(C?) – DY208 - 210 all forms iso. = R144 ~ ST: all OK. In fact unsolved.

- 2. **lyrë** {f.}. DY: G., Alb. LYRA. 3. **yndyrĭ**ē,a {f.} ‘grease’ < Lat. *unctūra* (BON88): No(L). – DY: G., Alb. YNDYRA. Both latter forms neither in HU nor OR.

FEATHER (large) (SW36): **pendlë**,a. = R147, ST27a. DY: Sic. PEND; G. PENDA; TOg., T. PENDE. · Missing in HU.

- Loan < *penna* < Lat. *pinna* ‘feather, wing, pinion’: HAL444, BON384; likewise in OR315; as < ‘wings of yoke’ applied to ‘pair of draught oxen’, neither recognized by JA184, nor DM314, who therefore sought unsuccessfully for other etymologies. Not rhotacized because of *-nn-* (JA104).

No(L) – DY004, R147, ST “iso.” = all OK.

Besides the specialized: **puplël**,la {f.}, in fact ‘Daunenfeder/down’ (not in HU, DM, and OR).

FIRE (SW82): **zjarrli** {m.}. = R150, ST28b. DY: Sic., TOg. ZJAR, T. ZJARR; G. ZJARRI.

- From PK493 **gther* ‘warm’ > Balkan-IE **gth-ermo-* (Gre., Arm.; Alb. dialectal retained Geg *zjarm*) > **ǵtherm-*: So HU135, DM429; overlooked by OR525, who creates < PALb.**džera*, unnecessarily via an ablauting **gthhoros*, which additionally would not explain the *-rr*.

Yes(C+) – DY008 and ST = cognate with Riksmål, OK. – RI expelled.

FISH (SW19): **peshk**lu {m.}. = R151, ST29a. DY: Sic. PISK; G. PESHKU; TOg. PESK; T. PESHK.

- Loan < *pisce* < Lat. *pisces* because of /shk/ (HAL448, HU103, OR316), with regular shift of Lat. /ĩ/ > Alb. /e/ (JA182f).

No(L) – DY008, R1, and ST "iso." = all OK.

FLY (SW64) verb: **flutúroj**. = ST30a, ~ R156. DY: Sic., TOg. FLUTURON (AOR. FLUTUROVA); T. ME FLYTURUAR; G., Alb. FLUTEROJ. · No entry in HAL, HU, BON.

- At the outside < PK24^{1*} *al*, ~ Gall. *alouda* 'lark'?
- DM172 under *flugë* 'shingle', only *flutur* 'butterfly' as possible cognate; this is completed by
- OR101 under *flutur* 'butterfly' < *fluturoj*, as borrowed from Rmc. **fluctulāre* < Lat. *fluctuāre* 'to move to and fro in waves'; although missing in BON, an obvious suggestion:

No(L) – DY007, ST "iso." = both OK. – R156 expelled.

- R1 instead comes up with a new entry in his "screened list" 339 'fly' (v. or n.?), alleged cognate with e.g., Arm., Gre., Bal. (!?); obscure, because without attestations.

FOOT (SW46): **këmb**lë,a {f.} (also 'leg'). = R158, ST31a. DY: TOg., T. KEMBE; Sic. KEMB; G.1. KAMA.

- Loan < Lat. *camba*: HAL61. Slightly different, as equestrian term: EU116 < Lat. *camba* 'Schienbein, Sprunggelenk d. Pferdes'. HU80: < VLat. with "unclear direction"[?]. OR177 notes that he has only found *gamba* 'leg' in Balkan-Rmc. (Vlat. *camba* still exists in Occitan), and Gre. *καμπή* 'bend, foot joint of horses'.
- The vocalism might be influenced by < Gre. *σκαμβός* 'bow-legged'.

No(L) – DY006, R1 "iso." = OK. – ST only OK regarding the 'No', though loan not recognized.

Besides DY G.2. PUTER: **putër**,ra {f.}, in fact 'sole, paw', var. **shputlë**,a 'paw', not used.

full (SW 95, not DY): **1. i/e plotë**. = R162.1/2 = ST32a.

- LIV482 **pleh-* 'to (become) fill(ed)' > Palb. *plë-to* 'filled': So HU105, DM327; ~ OR335 via Palb. **plāta*.

Yes(C+), thus – ST: OK; – R162-1(4) iso. = mistaken.

- 2. **mbushur** 'filled' (ptc. of *mbush* 'to fill').

GIVE (Sw70) verb: (**j**)**ap**, (j)ep {pres. forms}. = ST33a ~ RI63. DY: T. ME DHENE; TOg. JAP (AOR. DHASE); Alb. AP (AOR. DHASH, INF. DHAN), G. AP (INF. DHAN).

- From LIV237 **h₁ep-* ‘to grasp, reach’ > causative **h₁op-éie-*, by completely normal development (even for *h₁e:*: cf. Hu154, DM42). HU77 notes Hit. *epzi* ‘gives’ (copied by OR, which, after Kloekhorst 614f, however, means ‘he takes’, while ‘to give’ is represented by Hit. *pai-* from the derivation <PIE **h₁p-(o)i-*; DM-O(79) places *h₂* instead of *h₁*, unnecessary after his own rule p42; OR157, unaware of these laryngealistic and morphological implications, notes the parallel Alb. *ap*).

No(C-), thus – RI63.1,2, and ST “iso.” = both OK, because after RI, ‘to give’ in Hit. = *pāi*.

Suppletive: Aor. **dhashë**, prf. **dhënë**; *dhânë*. From LIV105 **deh₃-*. – DY200 neglects the (j)*ap*-forms, and orders all finds according to this suppletive stem with derivations of *dā*.

GOOD (Sw97) adj.: i/e **mirë**. = RI64, ST34c. DY: Sic., G., Alb. MIR; TOg., T. I, E MIRE.

- Possibly loan (?) < Lat. *mīru(s)* ‘wonderful’: Neither in HAL nor BON; HU92 unclear. For the phonetics cf. *një-mijë* < Lat. *mīlia*, and *mërej* < Lat. *mīrāri*.
- Alternatively, with PK711 ⁷. **meiH-* ‘lieblich/mild’ > **mi-ro-*: so DM268, ~OR267.

No(C?-/L) – DY010, RI, ST “iso.” = all in any case OK.

GREEN (Sw88): Unclear standard: **1.** (SI, QE) i/e **gjelbër**. = RI66.1,2 = ST35a. DY006 TOg. GELBER ~ T. I, E GJELBER.

- Loan < Lat. *galbinu* and *gilvus* ‘gelb’: so HAL243; OR131; HU84 only marginal notice under KUQ. BON380 vert ‘pāle’.

No(L) – DY006 only forms 1. and 3. iso., RI ~ ST loan, all OK. Beside

2. (SI, QE) i/e **blertë** ‘maigrün/spring green’, not employed in tested lists. • From PK160 **b^hleh₁- d^hro-*: So HU5; DM-O(104) *bler(t)ë* < PALB. **blōr* (his hint to Lat. forms to enlighten the semantics is in vain, since color terms are known to be extremely variable, cf., e.g., Kober 1934).
3. **jeshil** (YL also for Tosk) ‘green of nature’. DY: G., Alb. JESHIL. • Obvious loan < Trk. *yeşil* ‘id.’ (with Bo70).

No(L) – DY005 sees form 3. isolated, OK.

False: i/e *kaltër*, because ‘light blue, azure’, not green. DY006 T. 2. I, E KALTERT. Loan < Lat. *calt(h)a*: HAL60, BON376, which is a further example for the variability of colour terms, following the

normal translation as ‘Marigold/Calendula’ or ‘Caltha’ with their orange blossoms. Double mistake.

HAIR (Sw37) unclear standard: **1.** (SI, BFU) **qimle**,ja {f.} ‘(single) hair’, HE ‘body-hair’, in compounds of animals’ colours. = ST36a. DY: G.2., Alb. KJIME.

- Loan (BON no entry)
- either < MLat. *cyma* (HAL166; OR361)? Or directly from the original source:
- < Gre. *κῦμα* ‘wave, swell, cabbage sprout’?

No(L) – DY006 iso. = ST iso.: so far OK (though loan not recognized).

2. (QE 1.) **floklu** {m.} ‘(shock of) hair’, HE **flokët** {pl.} ‘Kopfhaare’, in compounds with human hair colors. = Ri68. DY: G.1. FLOKU.

- Loan < Lat. or Rom. *floc(cus)*; BON390 *flokë* {pl.}, in list « incertaine ».

No(L) – DY006 iso. – Ri expelled.

3. (QE 2.) **leshli** {m.} ‘wool, fleece, hair’. DY: T. LESHRA, Kor. TOG. LES.

- Not convincing: OR219 via PALb. **laiša*, to Bal-Sla. forms for ‘foliage’ without a reference; semantically too far, and not mentioned in PK.
- Perhaps with PK681 ^{2*}*leuH-so* ‘abgeschnitten/cut off’. Self-contradictorily cited by HU85. the alternative
- from PK1139 ^{4*}*uelH-* ‘hair, wool’ > *Huļh₇-so* > PALb. (u)laš ‘wool, hair, fleece’: obviously HU85, by referring to OSax. *wlöh*, and PIE ?* *h₂uloh₂-so*; similar DM238.

No(C?) – DY005 “iso.” = OK, because elsewhere deviant meanings.

HAND (Sw48): **dorlë**,a {f.}. = RI69, ST37. DY: TOG., T. DORE; Sic. DOR; G., Alb. DORA.

- Out-dated: PK203 ^{1*}*deh₃r-om* ‘span of hand’, because of wrong vocalism.
- From PK447 **ghes_r* > *dērā*, via compensatory lengthening after loss of *-slr*: HU54 false < **/ghēs_r-/* and again bothering his readers by finally citing PK203 above; also possible a collective n. plural, singularized to f.: So DM44, 140; similar OR70 via his standard intermediate PALb. **dārā*.

Yes(C+) – DY203 with Greek D. CHERI, Arm. ZARK. = Ri, ST: all OK.

HEAD (Sw38): **1.** **koklë**,a {f.} (in anatomical sense). = Ri71. DY: TOG. KOKE. · Missing in HU.

- Hardly loan < (seldom) Lat. *cauca* ‘drinking vessel’, because the spectrum of meanings points rather to a

- Loan < VLat. *coccum* ‘berry’: HAL111, HAG5 astonishingly for anything else but ‘head’, e.g., ‘testicle’ (vulgar usage!); correct OR189 for ‘head, bulb, berry, grain’; BON390 « incertaine », citing Rom. *coc*, Gre. *κόκκος* ‘grain’ without explanation, presumably as possible sources.

No(L) – DY001, Ri “iso.” = OK.

2. **kryelt** {n.} (in mental sense, e.g., *rrugë pa krye* ‘cul-de-sac’). = ST38c. DY: G., Alb. KRYET, T. KRYE. DM no entry.
- Not loan < Lat. *corōna* (MAR236), which yielded in fact other, phonetically and semantically closer forms (cf. HUL139). Therefore:
- From PK574 ¹ **kērh₂-eu-* ‘Kopf, Horn’: OR199 via PAlb. **krasnjā* with a compensatory lengthening > **krānjā*, which, however, does not explain the /y/; therefore, with (though tacitly) HU83 via < **kīrh₂-eu-no-*.

Yes(C+) – DY003 = iso. = mistaken. – ST: So far, OK, though secondary response.

Not belonging here: *ballë* DM-O(88 not so clear) with now the correct meaning ‘forehead’ < PK118 **bhh₂-lo-*; puzzling, for all other meanings there are based on ‘shining white’.

HEAR (SW58) verb: **dëgjoj**. = ST39b, ~ Ri72. DY: TOg. DEGON, AOR. DEGOVA; T. ME DEGJUAR; G. NDEGJOJ. · Missing in HAL, HU, and DM; remains difficult:

- Not possible: Loan < Blg. *da cuva* ‘id.’, which perhaps influenced the aorist. The ending points to a
- loan from Lat., possibly:
 - < Lat. *degāvo* ‘have learned’ (extended meaning); or rather:
 - < Lat. *intelligere*. so OR62, recurring on dialectal forms like *diligonj*; BON273, 303, in spite of recurring on Sic. *ndëlgoj*, the lemma is not listed in his “Mots d’origine latine”.

No(L) – DY209, ~ ST (though loan not noted) “iso.” = OK. – DY208 doubtful with Sic., Kor. GEGEM, probably syncopated derivatives. – Ri expelled. Remains doubtful.

HEART (SW52): **zemplër**,ra {f.}. = Ri73, ST40b. DY: Sic. ZEMBER; G., Alb., T., TOg. ZEMER.

- (1) As “difficult word without any reliable explanation” described by DM426 *zë* ‘to grasp, catch’, and, similar OR520; both not following
- (2) HU132 questionably < ?PIE */*g^hhen-mer-*/, from [not mentioned PK491 ¹] **g^hen-* ‘to swell’, relating this with ‘stomach’; unbelievable. The homonym in
- (3) LIV218 **g^hen-* ‘to beat’ clearly describes the typical action of the heart, phonetically even closer in the labial

derivation PK490 **g^{uh}em(b)*- ‘springen/to jump’ > Eng. *game*, (cf. **kerd* ‘heart’, perhaps < PK933 *(*s*)*ker* ‘springen/to jump’).

No(C-) – DY002, RI, and ST “iso.” = all OK. The connection by ST via code 1920 to entries for ‘(to) see’, however, is mistaken.

horn (SW34): **brilri** (Geg *brîlni*) {m.}. = RI78, ST41. · Absent in DY and HU.

- All from different derivations of [PK166-172] ~ *h₃b^hreu/i*:
 - (1) Possibly from PK108 [**bhar*, **bhor*] > the zero-grade *bh₃*- ‘Hervorstehendes, Borste, Spitze/ projecting, tip’: So DM-O(110), uncertain via > *b^hrih₁* > *brî* > Alb. **bri(n)*; to this entry in DM-O, MDV reintroduced the following option in footnote {5}²⁸:
 - (2) From [PK172] **h₃b^hruH* ‘eyebrow’, because the root **b^hr* (obviously meaning *b^hr̥*) were hardly attested, not mentioning that DM110 refuted this solution. Better explaining the *-n*:
 - (3) Already PK168 **bhren-to-s* ‘Geweih(träger), Hirsch’, notes cautiously “vgl. dazu alb. *brî*”: So also tacitly OR36, via < PALb. *brina*, with irregular /*i*/ (cites DM110 only with (2) above). Thus even better, from the zero-grade **b^hr̥-na*.

No(C-) – ST iso., OK (notes Tok. cognate under deviant meaning). – RI expelled.

The form in QE 2. *bori* {f.} refers to the musical instrument!

I [Pers. Pron. 1.Sg.] (SW1): **unë**. = RI82, ST42a. DY: Sic. U; G. UN; TOg., T. UNE. – Goes in two directions:

- (1) From the general PIE PK291 **eĝ^(h)ō* > **eĝoh₂* > **edhe*. So alone Matzinger²⁹, in analogy to PIE *tu* > *ūd^hē*, before the Alb. shift *ū* > *Û* > *i*, with *-në* added after loss of the dental. He objects in particular that the use of a reflexive in nominative position was syntactically unusual; this can, however be disproved by many counterexamples, cf., e.g., the use of Engl., Kel. ‘me’, or ‘I myself’. Thus, the
- (2) mainstream assumption is a refl. pron. PK88 ^{2*}*s^uε* ‘oneself’ > *u-* + “pronoun suffix” *-në*. So HU122 (though doubtful); Sh. Demiraj177; DM400 under “*u*” as derived from Alb. Pron. refl. *vε*; and OR486 as pers. pron. *u*, identical with *u* ‘self’. Neither can be proved nor

²⁸ Date of last control: January 12., 2011.

²⁹ IF 103/1997:185f

disproved, thus:

No(C+?) – DY200 and ST as cognates; – Ri expelled. Remains questionable.

KILL (SW62) verb: **vras**, vret. = ST43b, Ri86. DY: T. ME VRARE; Sic., TOg. VRAS (AOR. VRAVA); G., Alb. VRAS (INF. VRA). · Difficult; missing in PK, HU, DM, and LIV!

- Possibly, though without Alb. forms there, from LIV510 **reuH-* ‘aufreißen/ to tear, to wound’: So tacitly OR515 via PALb.**awa-rautja*; explicitly Matzinger 2005:99. Also possible:
- From PK1163 ^{7.} **uer-* ‘aufreißen/to tear, to wound’ with different variants, e.g., OCS. *vrědb* ‘wound’, Blg. *vrada* ‘(to) damage’, SHr. *vrēd* ‘snake venom’, Alb. *varrë* ‘wound’; with this, uncertain, LIV701 [?]**uResk^(u)*- ‘to chop off’ with only Ved. forms. Semantically better, and typical for the anlaut:
- Presumably loan < OCS *u-rasiti* ‘durchbohren’ or other South-Slavonian form < PK1181 **ureh₂ĝ*, with association to Alb. *rah* ‘beat’ from the same root (cf. HU150).

No(L?) – DY010 iso. ~ ST (under deviant meaning with Blg. ‘walk [!]’): OK. – Ri expelled. Unsettled.

Hu90, not mentioning these general Alb. forms, gives *mbs* ‘to drown, to strangle, to asphyxiate’.

knee (SW47): (Tosk) **gjułri** {m.}; (Geg *gjũłni*). = Ri87, ST44a. · Not in DY.

- (1) Hardly with PK362 ^{D.*}*g(e)leu* ‘s. ballen’ (cf. > Gre. *γίγ-γλυ-μος* ‘Knochengelenk, Türrangel’), puzzling entered at HU70, who in fact defends the source
- (2) PK380 *ĝ(o)nu-* ‘Knie’ via PALb. **gluno*, dissimilated < *gnu-no-*, as also DM190, p63 adding that the initial cluster *g-* is preserved in Tosk diaspora and oldest literature; similar OR137. Because PIE /*ĝ*/ has early become >/*g*/, the reservation of PK362 is groundless.

Yes(C+) – With DM, OR, also both, Ri87 and ST44 list many cognates: OK.

KNOW (FACTS) (SW59) verb: **1. dī** /aor. dita/ ptc. ditur. = Ri88. DY: T. ME DITUR; Sic. DI, TOg. DI (AOR. DINE), G. DI (INF. DIT).

- With LIV141, PK243 **d^heiH-*, *dhejə* ‘see, regard’ > (also Alb. *diturë*, *ditme* ‘Weisheit/wisdom’): HU152 only under vocalism: <**dhiH-*, no further etymology given. DM-O

(altering DM132 < **dhiH-m*) PALb. < *dī* < QIE aor. *d^hiH-to*.
OR64 < PALb. **dīja*.

No(C-) – DY205 “iso.” = OK. (Doubtful with Dy206 = Wakhi [SE-Iran.] DIS-). – Ri expelled.

2. **njoh**, *njeh* ‘recognize’, with a different, albeit related meaning. This, with LIV168 **ġneh_ɣ* ‘erkennen/recognize’, pres. **ġ_ɳh_ɣs^ké* > *njā-h*: So HU101; DM305 with parallel *ngre*, DM-O < QIE **ġneh_ɣs^k/o*, also OR305. Additional Lat. and Gre. influence?

No(C-) – ST45a (C+): Questionable, deviant meaning!

LEAF (SW25): Tosk **gjethle**.ja, Geg **gjethli** {m.}. = RI91, ST46a. DY: G. 2., Alb. GJETHI.

- With PK480 **ġuos-d*: HU69. DM187 expelled his original entry and now online hides it under *gath* ‘catkins’ as “Other Alb. forms”. OR133 via PALb. **gadza* with irregular unvoicing of the auslaut, thus presuming a secondary *-th* suffix. Elsewhere slightly deviant meaning, therefore:

No(C-) – DY210/11 and ST “iso.” = OK. – Ri expelled.

Besides different: DY: Sic. FLET; ~ TOG., T. FLETE; G. 1. FLETA. • HU no entry, DM172 marginal remark. OR100 *flētē* ‘wing, leaf’, obviously unaware of the particular meaning ‘sheet (of letter)’, relates this etymologically to ‘wing’, which could be not be confirmed anywhere; additionally idiosyncratic his reference to OHG *lecken* ‘to kick’. Probably loan < Lat. *flōs+tē* < PK122 **bhleh₋₁* ‘Blatt, Blüte’ (missing in HAL). – DY209 = iso: so far OK.

LIE (ON SIDE) (SW67) verb: 1. **shtrihem**, var. of *shtrij*, *shtrin*. ~ RI94 *rrī shtirē* = ST47a. DY: Sic. STIXEM; TOG. STRITEM (AOR. USTRITA); T. ME U SHTRIRE.

- With LIV599 **sterh_ɣ*, pres. **str-né* > Alb. *shtrij* ‘breite aus/spread, stretch’: With HU115, DM378; OR442 via PALb. **strinja*; semantically > refl. ‘be stretched, laid down’.

No(C-) – DY007 and ST “iso.” = OK. – Ri expelled.

Besides 2. **gjendem**, refl. of *gjej* ‘to find’ (cf. DM185), in the different sense ‘sich (be)finden/to be situated, located’ < LIV194 **ġ^ded*; not used.

Besides 3. **rrej** ‘to lie’, as assumable misprint in Dy Alb. RRI [?]. – Dy001 = “no cognates known” – naturally. Otherwise not mentioned.

LIVER (SW53): **mëlçi** (in QE only form). = RI96 ~ST48a. DY: G. MELTSI E ZEZ; TOG. MELCIA EZEZE; T. MELCI.

- Loan perhaps already < Got. **milti* (cf. Catalan *melsa*) ‘milt, spleen’, later upheld via < Itn. *milzi* (OR259), from

the same source, with shifted meaning. The suppletion *zeze* ‘black’ follows Trk. usage of colors for entrails, cf. *karaciğer* ‘liver’ with *kara* ‘black’.

No(L) – DY007, RI, and ST (though loan not recognised) “iso.” = all OK.

Besides Sic. U-FIGHATU, loan < Lat. *figato* ‘stuffed (liver)’.

Besides Kor. SPREKE [?], if correct, contaminated from Tok **shpretkë** ‘milt, spleen’, loan < Lat. *spleneticum*. – Dy001 no cognates found, OK.

LONG (SW14): i/e **gjatë**. = RI97, ST49a. DY: G., Alb. GJAT; TOg. I-GATE; T. I, E GJATHE.

- From PK196-7 > **d̥lh₃g^hó* > *glh₃ð(V)-tā*: So HU68, arguing for the vocal, with DM50: CRHC > CaC; similar DM-O, without the doubts in DM184. Similar OR130.

Yes(C+) – Only ST OK. Mistaken both, DY203 and RI “iso.”. The doubtful connection with DY200 would be correct.

LOUSE (SW22): **morri** {m.}. = RI98, ST50a. DY: Alb. MORR; Sic., TOg. MOR; G. MORRA; T. MOZ. · Missing in HU.

- (1) Hardly from LIV439 **mer-* ‘to die’ > PALb. *mērwa*: OR274. Semantically better by far:
- (2) From LIV440 **merh₂* ‘zerdrücken, to squeeze’ (~PK735-7^{5*} *mer*) via laryngeal metathesis (?) > *meh₂r(e)n?*: So DM277 via PALb. < *mēr(e)n* [not PK739 in DM-O].

No(C-) – DY004, RI, and ST “iso.” = all OK. In ST however, his code [750], connecting this with Ind. forms for ‘meat’, going back to PK725 (see MEAT), uncovers a mistake.

Besides correctly not used Alb. *ergjēz* ‘newly hatched nit’.

MAN (MALE) (SW16): 1. **būrrlë**,i {m.}. = RI99. DY: T. BURRE; Sic. BUR; G. BURRI; TOg. BURE. “Grown, experienced man”:

- (1) OR42 “borrowed from OHG *giburo*” is historically inconceivable. PK cites two self-contradictory versions:
- (2) Hardly from PK130 ^{1*}*b^her-* ‘tragen, bringen/ to carry’ > Alb. *bir* ‘son’, not *burrë*, as defended by HU6 via **bhr̥no-*, to account for the *-rr*, and rejecting the following, because /*ū*/ would yield Alb. /*y*/; the latter, however, is unnecessary, and moreover, comparing Alb. *grurë* ‘wheat’ < **g̥na*, **bhr̥no-* would result in ***brurë*. Therefore preferably
- (3) from PK146, LIV98 **b^hueh₂* ‘to be/ thrive/ dwell’ ~ **bur-*: DM113 via **buro*, explains the /*r*/ (contrasting to HU and

his own ‘lex *burrë*’ p52) as expressive-intensive reduplication, however, remains (p113) too doubtful regarding the semantics. In such cases, a look at frozen residues is a deciding help: In fact the same semantic development > neighbor ‘next-dwelling’, as well as Grm. Bauer < *gabūra* (cf. Kluge97) decide the question; cf. also Alb. *bun*, *buj* ‘to spend the night, dwell’; *bujk,-u* ‘farmer’. The other way round argues Ködderitzsch³⁰: Analogous to Mess. *βύριον* ‘house, dwelling’ he suggests an Alb. **bhur*- ‘house’, from which > PALb. **bur-no* as ‘house-owner’ > *burrë* ‘man’. In any case:

No(C-) – DY213 “iso.” = OK. – RI expelled.

Beside 2. **Mashkull** ‘man, male’ not used in lists.

Besides 3. **njeri**, primarily ‘person, human’ (DM304 ‘homo, vir’, see PERSON). This false entry in ST51b results from a misinterpretation of the ambiguous concept in the Swadesh list.

MANY (SW10): **shūmë**. = R1100, ST52. DY: T. SHUME, TOg. SUME; Sic. SUM; G. SHUM.

• Loan < Lat. *summu(s)*: so HAL581, HU116 < Lat. *summa*, BON387, OR445.

No(L) – DY005 iso., ~ ST loan: both OK. – RI expelled.

MEAT (FLESH) (SW29): **mishli**. = R1101, ST53a. DY: Sic., TOg. MIS; G., Alb. MISHT; T. MISH.

• From PK725 **m(e)h₁msō-* via two lines of assumption
– via oxytonic *mēmśá-* to account for the irregular shift *ē > i* (DM269/ DM-O); we might, however, see an
– already IE variant **mi-ms-* in Got. *mimz*, TokA. *misa*, (Arm. *mis*); then > PALb. **minsa* > **miša* (with HU92, OR267).

Yes(C+?) – DY007 big class. = RI and ST: all OK.

moon (SW73): Tosk **hēnlë**,a; Geg **hânë** {f.}. = R1102, ST54a.

• Not in DY.

• From PK526 (s)kand- ‘leuchten/shine’ > **skand-nā-* > *handnë*. with HU74, DM-O(199) similar. OR146 with metathesis < PALb. *ksandā* (cites abandoned view of DM199).

• Against all others, Holst (1998: 83) declares this etymology as “äußerst gewagt” and mistakenly connects Gre. *φάρος* ‘Fackel, Leuchte’ (see already EAT), which in fact goes back to PIE **b^heh₂-n-* [> Alb. ***bona*].

No(C+) – ST with Indic forms, OK. – RI expelled from both

³⁰ Ködderitzsch 1995:81-84.

data sets (sic!).

MOUNTAIN (Sw86): **malli** {m.}. = R1104, ST55b. Dy: G., Alb. MALI; TOg., T. MAL. – All from PK721 ⁸mel- ‘Erhöhung/elevation’:

- (1) Hu89 via < **m_hdh-o*; modified by
- (2) Dm254, uncertainly via < PALb. **mall* < IE **molH(-i)*, noting the possibility of Non-IE substratum; similar OR243 via PALb. **mala*, who mentions the Balkan toponyms without comment. In any case:

No(C-?) , nowhere else primary response: Dy007, RI, and ST “iso.” = all OK.

MOUTH (Sw42): **gōjlë**,a {f.}; T. also golë (YL). = R1105, ST56a. Dy: Sic. GOJ; G. GOJA; TOg., T. GOJE.

- Loan < Lat. *gula* ‘Schlund’: So HU66. The vocalism however, is only accounted for by a late loan < Itn. *gola*, as demonstrated by EU117 and OR120. Missing in BON.

No(L) – Dy004 and RI = iso., so far OK; even clearer: ST, loan.

NAME (Sw100): Tosk **émłër**,ri ‘(first) name’; Geg **êmën** {m.}. = R1106, ST57a. Dy: G. EMEN, TOg., T. EMER.

- [PK321] **h₁n(h₃)-men* [Tosk; Geg exchanged!] > *h₁n-men* > **enmen*: So HU61 via for Alb. unnecessary -*m_h*, and DM165; in DM-O, MDV has added critical notes regarding difficulties with an anlaut *h₃*, which, however, is a special reconstruction at Leiden – thus suggesting a loan < Lat. *nōmen*; however, a loan < Lat. *nōmen* would have preserved the *n-*; moreover, this old universal is considerably resistant to borrowing, and thus may be influenced by substratum. OR87 *enmena* < IE *(*o*)*noHm_h* [!]; the plural –*na* is needed for the rhotacism. In any case,

Yes(C+) – Dy003 very big class. = RI, and ST: all OK.

NECK (Sw50). Albeit the primary response to this junction between the trunk and the head seems to be **1. zverklū**, all lists refer here (mistakenly?) to nape, rather the back part of the neck: **2. qafłë**,a. = R1109, ST58a. Dy: T. G/KAFE, G., Alb. KJAFA.

- Loan < Balkan-Trk. *kafa* ‘back of head’ (with HU106, OR353; not in BO).

No(L) – Dy208 iso., OK. His doubtful connection with derivations of **k^hel₁* [PK639 ‘drehen’, who, of course, gives other Alb. forms] contradicts all sound laws. The same in

ST58: mistaken. – RI expelled.

NEW (SW96): **i ri**, e re. ~ RI110 ri = ST59a. DY: G. RI, T. I, E RI, TOg. I-IRI, Alb. IRI.

- (1) After HU108 "impossible"; in DM344, 251 only marginal remarks, "waits for a closer study": no attempt.
- (2) Presumably < PK330 ^{3.*}*h,ere(i)-* 'something freshly coming in motion'; for the semantics cf. from the same root Phry. *εἰροι* 'children', in particular regarding the second seme 'young'. For the phonology, cf. DM346 *rī(me)* for Alb. *rītē* 'wet' from the same root. Similar OR371 as zero-grade via < PALb. **rija*. Because no other cognates with this meaning:

No(C-) – DY003 and ST "iso." = both OK. – RI expelled.

NIGHT (SW92): **nātĭē**,a {f.}. = RI111, ST60c. DY: T., TOg. NATE, G. NATA, Sic. NAT.

- From PK762 **nok^ht*: HU96, DM41,283 (notes unusual plural vocalism), OR282.

Yes(C+) – DY004 big class = ST, both OK. – RI expelled from both data sets (!).

NOSE (SW41): **hūndlĕ**,a {f.}. = RI112, ST61a. DY: Sic. XUND; G., Alb. HUNDA; TOg. UNDE; T. HUNDE.

- (1) From the general IE [PK755] **n(e)h₂s³¹* tries HU76,155 to derive this word via a questionable laryngeal metathesis *neh₂s- +te* > *noh+to* > *hon-to* > *hun-dĕ*, moreover, the shift *s > h* requires VsV environment, and the root is generally missing in the Balkan - Anatolian area. Thus, we have to look for another root that can be found via
- (2) the proper reconstruction *skuna* > PALb. *skun-tā* in OR152, also > Alb. *hu/hû*, pl. *hunjë* 'picket, pole', only under the latter combined with meanings 'thorn' [PK958]; the word may as well be retraced to < PK951 (*s)keu-*, with numerous different extensions, often 'shelter, canopy', or Gre. *σκόνυια* 'brows', or, without s-mobile PK592 ^{1.*}*ku-n-d*, cf. Arm. *sun* 'hole'.

No(C?) – DY008, RI, via ST "iso." = all OK.

³¹An alternative notation **h₂y̯ dh₁-os*, cited in MBR (L330, with ltr.) appears too far from all attestations, and long-windedly derived from LIV267 **h₂enhr-* 'to breathe'; there only cited Alb. *ënj*, after HU63, 155 and OR91 *ëj* 'to blow (up), swell', which, however DM171 (with otherwise no attempt) suspects as a ghost word (cf., however, entry PERSON).

NOT (SW8): **nūk.** = R1113 ~ ST62ab. DY: G., T. NUK; Sic. NG; TOg.2. NUK.

- (DM no attempt). HU99 '(Alb.) negation preceding verbs', doubts the "u arising from e" and remains without result, overlooking the
- obvious regressive assimilation from PK757 **nek^ho* > PALb. **neku* > *nuka*: So OR302.

Yes(C+) – DY005 ~ R1113, and ST62, OK.

Besides DY: TOg. 1. JO 'no, non-'; TOg. 3. MOS 'do not!' – only used in DY.

ONE (SW11): **një** (Geg *nji*). = R1115, ST63. DY: G. NJI; Sic., TOg. NE; T. NJE. ·DM207 only marginal remark, no entry, Pk only brings Alb. *gjith* 'all'. There are two difficult options:

- (1) Perhaps from PK286^{3D}. **oi-nos* (undoubtedly the source for the Western-IE words for 'one', except the special meaning Gre. *οἷνη* 'one on dye'): So OR304 via > PALb. **ain-ja* [> *en-je*]; it remains doubtful, how the e-anlaut should have got the required pretonic position. Thus rather:
- (2) From PK902 ^{2.*}*sem-* 'eins', via Balkan-IE **sm-ijos* > Arm. *mi*, Gre. *μία*, and PALb. **mja* > Alb. *një*: asserted by HU101, by assimilation of *m* → *n* | *i*; unnecessary his detour via back-formation of a {f.} **smieh₂* > **njo*.

Yes(C?+) – ST with (1): Minor mistake; – RI with (2): OK; – DY202 iso. = mistaken in both cases, too doubtful with DY200 for case (2). Debatable.

PERSON [human being] (SW111>42>18, switched several times between these expressions in his different list versions): **njeri** {m.}. = R1117, ST64. DY: G., Alb. NJERIU; TOg. NERI, T. NJERI.

- From LIV267 **h₂enh_r* 'to breathe' > PK765 **h₂ner-* 'man' > Balkan-IE **anér* > PALb. *(*a*)*ner-* (also > Arm. *այր*, Gre. *ἀνὴρ* 'id.'): With HU100, DM-O(304 with different auslaut), OR304 via PALb. **nera*.

No(C-) – DY003 and ST "iso." = OK, because the close Arm. and Gre. cognates are today no primary responses. – RI expelled from both data sets.

RAIN (SW76) verb: bie **shī**, literally, '(it) falls rain'. ~ only

the noun: RI122, ST65b. DY: Alb. BISHI; TOg. SI, RA SI, KA RENE SI, SHI; G. SHI (IT RAINS); T. ME RENE. – Compound of *bie* ‘to fall’ (cf. entry FALL) and the noun *shi* ‘rain’, the latter:

- From LIV545 /pres. *suh₂*- ‘to pour, to rain’, ~ PK912 *sh₂uH* ‘rain’ > *śū* > *shi*: HU113 doubts this standard derivation, because *s* > *sh-* in his view requires a pretonic vowel; however, has no alternative, and self-contradictorily leaves the reader with PK912 ^{1.*}*seuH-*. From that base: DM-O as sing. tantum (no longer undecided, as in his printed DM360). Also OR413 (for the noun) hypothesizes an idiosyncratic “intermediary” **jūja* > **sūja* out of the same reason. The *sh-* can, however, be substantiated in many other ways: DM56(b) considers “probably” *sIH* > *sh*, or before a pretonic vowel, which could be found in a later vanished pres. form **suh₂-ié*, as LIV notes for Gre. *ῥεῖ* ‘id.’; moreover, the shift *su-* > *shu-* is regular in all loans from Lat., e.g., *summu(s)* > *shumë*. In any case

Yes(C+) – DY012 iso. = false, because in his list OGr. is missing, with which RI122 and ST probably connect it.

RED (SW87): i **kuq**, e kuqe. ~ RI123, ~ ST66 kuq. DY: G. KUKJ; Sic., T., TOg. I-KUK.

- Loan < VLat. **coccu(m)* < Lat. *coccineu(s)* ‘scarlet’; HAL110, ~ BON342, ~ OR205.

No(L) – DY011 and ST “iso.” = OK. – RI expelled.

ROAD [~SW85 ‘path’ = better, for all cultures can be supposed to have had paths, rather than roads, or streets; therefore]: 1. **ūdhlë**, a ‘way, journey’. DY: T. UDHE; Alb., G.2. UDHA.

- (1) Hardly from [LIV660] **ued^hh_r*- ‘to beat, to break’: of which OR482 invents an o-grade **uodhā*, after Rus. *tropá* ‘beaten path, tracks’ [< PK1094 ^{1.*}*trep-* ‘step, pad’]; cf. Alb. *be* ‘oath’, where the *-d^h*- of < LIV71 **b^heid^h*- ‘to confess’ has been lost at all. Rather
- (2) With PK1119 **ueġh-* ‘to draw, drive’ „schwundstufig wohl alb. *udhë* ‚Weg, Reise‘ “ > **uġ^h-om* {n.} > *udā* {f.} : So also HU120 ‘road, path’, the gender shift is required, because otherwise the *-ġ^hā* would have vanished; referred to also by DM400 < quasi-IE **uġ^h-o[-s < -m?]*.

Yes(C+) – ST OK; versus – DY208 mistaken, for only doubtful with his class 209 (Grm. WEG), only half a mistake because of ambiguous concept:

Beside **2. rrūgë** ‘road, street’ = R1127. DY: G., Alb. 1. RRUGA. Loan < VLat. *rūga* ‘road’: HU110, after the FGS, translates ‘street’; similar OR390; not recognized by HAL; after BON314 loan < Itn., because « comme l’atteste la conservation de l’occlusive intervocalique », a reservation unnecessary for *-g-* (cf. Alb. *ligë*, *plagë*).

No(L) – Dy207 iso. (with 206 = Sard. ARRUGA) OK in his meaning. – Ri expelled.

Besides not standard DY: Sic., Kor. DHROM. Late loan < Gre. *δρόμος*, not < SHr. *drum*. – Dy009 iso., OK.

ROOT (SW26): (Tosk) **rrënjlä,a**, (Geg *rrâ(n)jë*) {f.}. = R1128, ST68b. DY: G., Alb. RRAJA, Sic. REN, TOg. RENE, T. RENJE.

- From PK1167 **uh₁reh₂d-* > *urh₂d-(nieh₂)* > *radniā*: So doubtful HU109, too reserved with “initial *rr-* has never been satisfactorily explained”; however, there are enough attestations given for /**ur-*/ > /*r-*/ at DM48,52. Moreover, DM350 as a native speaker explains *-një* as frequent Alb. botanical suffix. Similar OR384.

Yes(C+) – Dy003 big class = ST, both OK. Versus – RI, iso. = mistaken.

round (SW98): i/e **rrumbullak**(të/ët). = R1131; ~ ST69 *rrumbull* (rather ‘balled’ of wool). · Absent in DY. – HU, DM, BON no entry. Generally

- loan, either from
 - Lat. *r(h)ombu* > Tosk *rrum(p)*: HAL499, with different Alb. meanings, e.g., ‘stump, spindle, clapper’, all rather seldom today; or via
 - Rmc. *rombulus* (attestation?) > *rrumbull* ‘rolled into a ball’ (OR391); or
 - Rather directly from Att. Gre. *ῥόμβος* ‘Kreisel/top, gyro’? This in particular for the clerical use ‘bell-clapper’. Second syllable analogous to *sumbull* ‘round button’.

No(L) – R1131 iso. ~ ST loan: both so far OK.

SAND (SW78): **rërë** (Geg *rânë*) {f.}. = R1134, ST70a. DY001 Sic. RER. “unique”. G., Alb. RANA, generally used in compounds, e.g., *ranishtë* ‘sandy beach’. · HU no attempt with any form.

- (1) Generally assumed as loan < Lat. *arëna* ‘id.’: So HAL22, DM295 (in passing), and OR370. This, however, requires additional assumptions, for Lat. *ar-* normally yields Alb. *rr-*, and, e.g., Lat. *frënum* yielded Geg *frë(ni)* ‘fence’; hence BON113 regards it as « mot irrégulier(s) du guègue »;

further, it is a semantically doubtful loan, for the secondary meaning ‘theatre’ would – as cultural loan – be more convincing. Better directly:

- (2) From PK332 ^{4,5} **er* ‘Erde, Sand, locker’ (cf. Lat. *rārus*), as reduplication with r-r dissimilated > r-n. Even in this case, no recent cognates with the exact meaning, therefore,

No(C?) – Dy009 and Ri134 = iso., ST loan: all so far OK.

Besides Dy: T. SHUR, Kor. SUUR, rather ‘deaf’. (KÖ ‘literary’ form).
– Dy011 iso.

Besides non-standard TOg. KUM: Loan < Trk. *kum* ‘id’. (KÖ ‘literary’).
– Dy001 unique, OK.

SAY (SW71) verb: **them** (thom), thua, thotë; aor. tha(shë).
= Ri135, ST71. Dy: Alb., G.2., Sic. THOM (INF. THAN);
T. ME THENE, TOg., Kor. THEM (AOR. THASE).

- (1) Not from (and rightly not cited in) LIV326 **keNs-* ‘speak formally’ > **keh₁nsmi* > Alb. *thom*: So OR480 < PALb. **tsānsmi*; the PK again misleadingly cited by HU119, who in fact favors the athematic stem:
- (2) LIV318 **keHs-*³² ‘anweisen/to advise’, > PALb. *θēm* > pres. *thom*: DM57, 399 (= OPers. *θātiy*); the /a/ of the 1sg. aor. *thashë* ‘I said’ evolved regularly < **kHs-om* (DM61 with many examples), and may then have been analogically extended to the ptc., to mark the imperfect aspect in the pres./ipf. stem.

No(C-) – Dy012 and ST “iso.” = OK. – Ri expelled.

Deviant meaning: Alb. **rrëfen** ‘erzählt, gesteht/ confesses’ < Lat. *referre*. Not employed.

False: Alb. *dëftoj* ‘zeigen, angeben/show, demonstrate’. Dy: G.1. DIFTOJ. • Loan < Lat. *dictum*.

SEE (SW57) verb: 1. **sheh**, shoh ‘look at (each other)’. = ST72c, Ri138. Dy: Sic. SOX, G. SHOF (INF.PA); TOg. SO (AOR. PASE), T. ME PARE.

- (1) Not from LIV297 **h₃ek^h-* ‘to watch’: DM57, only in chapter phonetics, assumes³³ a long-grade *(*V*)*kšz-(šk)*, not mentioned under DM312 *pashë*; cf. EYE above.
- (2) From LIV525 ¹**sek^h-* ‘s. anschließen/ to follow (with the eyes)’, as caus.-iterative **sok^h-ēje* > PALb. **sašāj-sk-* > **šājh-*: With HU114 via < [**sok^hēh₁skē*]. Questionable OR425 via

³² Could be simply the base for the extended stem *kens*.

³³ By courtesy of an e-mail from Prof. B. Demiraj. The former entry DM-O < **h₃(e)k^hs-*, has been removed Dec., 2007.

PAlb. **sāk-ska*.

Yes(C+) – DY005 and ST with Gmc: both OK. Contrasting to – RI138(4) iso. = mistaken.

Cf. the variant QE 2. **shikoj**, *shikon* ‘look (after)’ < *siku-onj* (missing in DY and HU).

SEED (SW24): **farë**. = RI139, ST73b. DY: Sic. FAR, T., TOg.

FARE. – Both possibilities depend on the acceptance and time of a sound law Alb. *f* < (Balkan-IE.) *sp-* (DM56,c “most likely” for this sound law; otherwise no entry):

- (1) Under this law, old verbal noun from LIV580 ^{3*}*spēr* ‘ausstreuen/to scatter’ > PIE **spór-eh₂* > PAlb. **sparā*: HU63 doubtful; similar OR93.
- (2) Perhaps loan, either
 - (2a) under this sound law, early from Gre. *σπορά* ‘seed’; or, without the law,
 - (2b) rather later loan from Lat. *far*(īna) ‘flour, spelt’, e.g., as tribute.

No(C+/L?), not decidable: DY006 (2) iso. Contrasting ST (1) = cognate with Gre. – RI expelled from both lists.

Puzzling: For both, Alb. and Geg, DY000 found nothing usable.

SIT (SW68) verb: In Alb., this concept is often circumscribed, in two ways: **1. rri** (BFU alone, as well as extended by), *ndenjur* (literally ‘buttocks’, being single response in SI); contrasting: In QE, *ri* stands for ‘linger, stand, stay’, vs. i/e *ndenjur* for ‘stale’ (!). RI144 *ri ndenjur*; St74 *ri*. DY: G., Alb. RRI NE BYTH; TOg. RI (AOR. DENEA). · Alb. *ri* is missing in LIV.

- (1) Semantically not convincing as derivation of [LIV502] **reid^h*- ‘s. schwankend bewegen’, which rather represents meanings of motion: rightly with doubts HU109 for *RRI* ‘sit, remain’. The same applies to
- (2) LIV238 **h₁er-ei/eh₁* ‘to set in motion > arrive’ in the different sense ‘sit down, stand, stay’: DM-O (supplementing the secondary remark in printed DM351); OR386 indirectly via other derivations under *ri* ‘to sit, to stand, to stay, to remain’ with aor. *ndenja*, thereby no lemma for our head meaning alone.
- (3) Rather closely related to LIV269 **h₂er-[+ei]* ‘anordnen/to arrange’, as original essive or refl., today only used as pres. act., mainly with suppletions (~ *ndënjur* ‘to sit’, ~ *në/më këmbë* ‘to stand’, ~ *më gjunë* ‘to knee’). In

the same sense, BON40 translates « rester ».

1.: No(C?) – Dy005 iso. = ST: OK. Deviant meanings. – RI expelled from both lists.

2. **ulem** {3sg. pass./refl. of **ul**, **ulim**} ‘to fetch/put down’, also ‘to sit/settle down, be seated’. Only Dy: T. ME U UNJUR; Sic. (T)UJE. · Albeit often single (!) response (e.g., QE), no entry in HU (where, however, FGS is cited as explaining 1. above by “jam ulur ...”);

- Out-dated: DM317 erroneously under *përkul*, by his online update, see below:
- From PIE **uel-* under LIV674-9 = PK1138-43, not noted there, and only distinguishable by very close meanings like ‘to turn, to lock up, to wrap’: OR484 indirectly with the meaning ‘to lower’ via < PAlb. **wala*, the other forms via **ulnj* < **walnja*; DM-O now under new entry. These forms (the /ur/ in Tosk and the /t-/ in Sic.) might point to an influence of Balkan-Trk. *utur-* ‘id.’ (cf. BO223 with literature).

2. No(C-) – Dy003 iso., OK.

SKIN (OF PERSON) (SW28): **lëkúrlë**,a {f.} = RI145, ST75a. Dy: T. LEKURE; TOg. 2. LHEKURE; Sic. LIKUR; G., Alb.1. LIKURA. In connections with ‘leather’.

- Hardly from < *lakur* ‘naked’: OR222 ‘skin, hide’; the further derivation from IE **leuk-* ‘to shine’, however, is semantically too far from ‘hide’.
- A semantically possible loan < Lat. *lacerna* ‘wrap, originally of Roman legionaries’ (cf. Engl. (anat.) coat) leaves us with unexplained vocalism, also *lakuri*, loan < Trk. *lahuri* ‘cloth for women’s garments’, not mentioned in DM240, with wrong /h/ (cf. BO84; mostly of yellow silk satin, made in Lahore).
- Hardly from LIV559 **(s)kert* > e.g. ?Arm. *k’ert’em* ‘ziehe die Haut ab/skin’, Alb. *kÿ-no* ‘abgezogen’, does not help with the /u/.
- Perhaps with PK674 ^{2.*} *leh₂k-* ‘Fetzen/shreds’ > **lek*: So HU86, with a half-finished note that “in native words –r(os) is dialectally reflected as –ër(ë)”.
- PK951 **(s)kũ-ti-* (where, however, the meanings for ‘skin’ appear with a dental formant) > **ku-rã(?)*: DM240 with prefix *lë-* ‘off’ (DM-O);
- Proposal: Prefix *lë-* + *kur* = loan < Lat. *corium* ‘thick skin, leather’, for the vocalism cf. Alb. *kurorë*, metathesized < Lat. *corōna*. Cf. Alb. *lakurë*, *lakuriq* ‘naked’.

No(L?) – Dy003 and ST “iso.” = so far OK. – RI expelled from both lists.

Besides Dy: TOg. 1. CIPE. **cipë** {f.} rather ‘thin (piece of) skin’ (cf.

BARK). Isolated.

SLEEP (SW60) verb: **fle.** = R1147, ST76b. DY: Sic., G., Alb. FLE (FLEJT, INF. FJET); TOg. FLE (AOR. FLEJTA); T. ME FJETUR. · HU, DM no attempt.

- (1) Hardly from LIV332 **klej-* ‘s. anlehnen’ (MAR234), which presupposes a phonetically weakly attested **kl* > *fl*, against, e.g., **klew* > Buzuku *kluoj* > Tosk *quaj* ‘call’, or Balkan-IE LIV362 **kleh₂u* - ‘to cry’ > Alb. *qan* ‘he cries’. The semantically alleged parallel Tok-B *klānts* ‘sleep’ fits better to OInd. *klām(y)ati* ‘be(come) weary’, cf. PK602. Only semantically better, thus:
- (2) Nor from LIV398 **leg^b-e-* (e.g., > Gre. λέκτο ‘to lie down to sleep’) via PALb. *awa-leja* > *flê*: so OR99, indirectly by relating Slav. **lējati* [fake meaning?:] ‘to doze, to slumber’; rather³⁴ PSl. **ležàti* ‘to lie (down, ill)’; this root should, however, yield > Alb. ***leg-*. It remains:
- (3) From LIV406 **leih₂-ié* ‘schwinden/to fade’ (no Alb. entry), with prefix *f-*
 - either analogous to Alb. *flugë* < PK681 **leu-*; (cf. LIV400 **leh₁d-* > Alb. *lodhem* ‘get tired’);
 - alternatively, via PALb. *awa-leja* > *flê*: so far with OR99, however, not with (2) above. In any case:

No(C?) – DY010 and ST “iso.” = OK. – RI expelled.

Only the noun *gjumle ò, i* (PK1048) mentioned in HU71, DM192 <*subn-*. With this form, e.g., DY002 (Persian) would be cognate.

SMALL (SW15): *i/e vogël.* = R1148, ST77b. DY: G. VOGEL, Sic. I-VOGEL, TOg. I-VOGELH-I, T. I, E VOGEL. ·HU131 without result, DM no attempt. At least

- (1) OR513 tries with > PALb. **wagla*, relating this to Lat. *vagor* ‘to roam around’ (tacitly following the reconstruction of PK1120, however, not accepted in LIV); in spite of his explanation semantically implausible.
- (2) Probably loan < Trk. *ufaklik* ‘tiny-ness’ (< Arab. *faqir* ‘poor’). Missing in BO.

No(L) – DY009 Alb. *iso.*, OK. – ST’s [2987], with v. Windekens³⁵, connection with TokB. *yakte* (typo for *yäkte* / *yekte*, used as prefix) seems too weakly founded. Moreover, Ringe (as an expert in Tokharian), lists two other lemmata, however, not this one, – RI himself expelled.

³⁴Derksen online

³⁵Van Windekens, A. J.: Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Louvain, 1976: 586f.

SMOKE (SW81): **tymli** {m.}. = RI150, ST78. DY: G., Alb. TYMI; TOg., T. TYM.

- (1) PK345 **eh₂t-men* 'Hauch, Atem': Tacitly OR470, who cannot explain the /y/. He further refutes a
- (2) loan < Gre. *θυμός* because this "is unknown in any meaning close to 'smoke' "[sic]; perhaps these (of many more) will do: *θυμήριον* 'Räucher-pfanne/ smoke pan', *θὺμάλα-ωψ* 'Kohlenmeiler/charcoal kiln', all verbal nouns < LIV **d^hueh₂* 'Rauch machen/to make smoke'. HU117 favours a "recent loan", because an old /y/ would have changed to /i/ in Tosk; the required recent sources could well have been both, OBlg. *dymb* and Trk. *duman*, which at least might have influenced the vocalism. Thus in any case,

No(L) – DY201, RI = iso., ST loan: all OK. DY further doubtful cognate with 200 [< PK261⁴dheu]: Mistaken because of *t* and *y*.

STAND (SW69) verb: **rrī** (në/më këmbë). = RI158 rri më këmbë. Contrasting, QE: rri (aor. ndenja, ptc. ndenjurr) alone, with. SI, ST79a; however, see notes under 'SIT'. DY: Sic. RI STUERA, TOg. RI NE KEMBE, G. RRI ME KAM. · HU, for RRI alone, gives only the meaning → 'SIT'. For 'stand':

- Ambiguous: DM-0³⁶ *ri* 'to sit down, stand, stay' [!], uncertain as suppletive verb < IE **Hr-ei/eh₁* 'to set/put in motion'. Similar OR386 for both, 'to sit, to stand', without explaining the semantic discrepancy. Proposal:
- Essive form **h_{1/3}r-h₁ié* (cf. LIV25) of PIE **h_{1/3}r-* 'set in motion/to arrive somewhere' (cf. LIV238/299, with notes; ~ PK326 ³.*er-*); both without Alb. entry, however Hit. *arta* 'stood' (confirmed by Kloekhorst195), thus:

Yes(C+) – Dy003 not assessable; RI and ST "iso." = mistaken. Ambiguous standard!

Besides SI 1) **qëndroj** (ne këmbë) 'stay', therefore nowhere else used.

Confused from Portuguese: T. ME PENDRUAR – Dy001= no cognates known – naturally.

STAR (SW74): **ylli** {m.}. = RI159, ST80. DY: G., Alb. YLLI; TOg. YL, T. YLL.

³⁶reference DM353 typo for 351 *ris*.

- (1) Hardly from PK917 **skēh₂i* ‚schimmern, Schatten‘, where we find different Alb. forms with anlaut *hi-*, which would not explain the vocal: As usually, not referring to this, OR518 reconstructs PALb. **skūw-ila* < *hije* < *skija* ‚shadow‘, based on a parallel form *hyll* (Geg, not noted in the dictionaries³⁷); for further relations the reader is left with a self-reference. Not only semantically better:
- (2) From LIV245 **h₁eus* ‚burn, glow‘: So HU132 via PIE **h₁us-li-* (again with a self-contradictory final entry of PK881 **sāuel-* ‚sun‘); similar DM-O *yll via* < (*h*)*ūl*, in print DM206 *hyll*, “only in N.-Geg dialects”. For all cognates have deviant meanings today,
No(C-) – Dy006, RI, and ST “iso.” = all OK.

STONE (Sw77): **gūrli** {m.}. = RI161, ST81. DY: G., Alb. GURI; Sic., TOg., T. GUR.

- From PK477 ^{3.}**g^uer* ‚Berg/mountain‘ > *g^uH(i)* > PALb. *gur(i)*: HU66-7, DM181; OR127 via < PALb. **gura*.

Yes(C+) – Albeit most cognates have the deviant meaning ‚mountain‘, there are semantically agreeing Iranian dialects cited in ST, OK. Albeit also listed under STONE in Dy001, however not connected with Dy007 Alb. “iso.”, mistaken. These dialects do not belong to the database of Ringe, instead TokB. *kārweñe* ‚stone‘, not recognized as cognate, thus RI mistaken.

SUN (Sw72): **dielli** {m.}. = RI164, ST82a. DY: Sic. DIEX; G., Alb. DILLI; TOg. DIEL, T. DIELLE. · DM429 only marginal remark.

- (1) Hardly from [PK1045 ^{2.}] **suel-uo-* > Gr. *έλη*: So HU50,148 assuming *su* > *d* before stressed vowel, against DM48 (*su* > *v/h*), both with apparently contradictory parallels. Making no effort to refute this, OR65 presents
- (2) **ghel-uo* ‚yellowish to green colours‘ (again tacitly from PK429 ^{1.}, there, however nowhere ‚sun!‘), by as “tabooistic substitute” via PALb. **delwa*. Similar MAR233. Possible, however, why not directly
- (3) from LIV108 **deih₂-* ‚glänzen/to shine‘, plus *-lo*, as, e.g., *διη-λός* ‚clear‘. In DM-O(176) from this root only > Alb. *di(tē)* ‚day(light)‘. In any case:

No(C?) – Dy004, RI and ST “iso.” = OK.

³⁷ Cf., however, the Geg cultural journal „Hylli i Dritës“ (Köderitzsch, pers. e-mail).

SWIM (Sw63) verb: **nótoj**, nóton. = R1166; ST83 (typo) natoj. YL Var.: bëj/baj notoj ‘do swim’. DY: G. NOTI ME BA; T. NOTUAR; TOg. BEN MNOTE, AOR. BERA MNOTE; Alb. BAJ NOT.

- (1) Not typical for a loan < Rmc **notāre*, which OR301 cites without commentary p138 of HaL390, who in fact derives a homonym Alb. *notoj* ‘to note’ < Lat. *notare* (where the dictionaries prefer *shënoj* < Lat. *signare*). In BON391 (list only) “incertaine, peut-être pré-romane”. OR does not attempt to refute the following normal solution. Moreover, he and
- (2) LIV572 (under *(s)*neh*₂ no Alb.), overlooked the hidden entry in HU148 [sound developments] *notim* ‘swimming’ < *snéh*₂-*timo* with early lost /s-/, cf. Gre. *νήχω* ‘id.’. Convincing, thus:

Yes (C+) – Dy009 Alb. iso., not recognizing the connection with DY008 = ST, loan: both probably mistaken because of the vocalism. – RI expelled.

Besides: (YL) *plevas*, rather ‘to float’, loan < Blg.

TAIL (Sw35): **bishtli** {m.}. = R1167, ST84. DY: Sic., TOg. BIST; G., Alb. BISHTI; T. BISHT. · HU5 „obscure” because of the /*sht*/, without result.

- (1) Hardly from LIV98 **b^hueh*₂ ‘wachsen, entstehen/to grow’ > **bhū*: so OR27 via < PALb. **būšta*: Semantically idiosyncratic and phonetically problematic, as /*ū*/ yields /*i*/ only in final position. His citation of DM is out-dated, who only gives a noncommittal hint to DM100 *bij* ‘to sprout, grow out’ [cf. Alb. *bijon* ‘give birth’, *mbin* ‘come up (seed)’], however, proposes the better solution:
- (2) From LIV72 **b^heiH* > *b^hi(H)-st-σ* ‘schlagen/to beat’ > *bi-št*: Too uncertain DM-O(103) *bisht*. The /-*sht*/ has many parallels, e.g., Alb. *gisht* ‘finger’, perhaps also influenced by SSlav words for ‘whip’ (cf. OCS *bičb*, SHr. *bič*), seeming to express a semantically characteristic property, thus

No(C-) – Dy017, RI and ST “iso.” = OK.

THAT (Sw5) dem. pron.: **ai, ajó, atá** {m., f., n.}. R1168 ai = St85c. DY: ATA (M. PL. + N.); TOg. AY, AJO, ATA; Alb.*, AI; Sic. AJI, T. AJO, G. AI.

- Mistakenly OR3 regards /a-/ as an undefined proclitic particle, and the endings as demonstrative **ei* < [PK281³] **ei*, > e.g., Lat. *is*, which is in fact semantically different.

The contrary is much more convincing:

- This proclitic particle /a-/ is identical in all Alb. words combined with the meaning ‘there’, e.g., *a\ndej/-ty/-the/-tjĕ*, can thus only bear the deictic function, and can be derived
 - either from PK979 **so/sā* ‘ille, illa’ [unexplained loss of /s-/]: so HU37;
 - better, from PK73 **h₂eu-* ‘that’: so DM-O(70) – though not established as sound law.
- The second parts can easily be identified as the (Hu37 “widespread”) gender endings *-i/y* {m.}, *-jo* {f.}, *-ta* {n.} < PIE **tod*, identical with those in the following lemmata for THIS. In spite of ambiguous meanings:

Yes(C+) – DY200 with many other forms, = ST: OK. – RI expelled!

*Besides DY: Alb. KJO, noted here as well as with THIS below(!)

The following equivalents are correctly not noted in the tested lists:

QE 1. **qĕ** refers to the pron. rel. & conj. ‘that, which’: DM-O under *aq* ‘so much’, (DM80 under *áqĕ*) < **kai* < PK644 **kⁿo*, ‘that’), after OR360 loan < Lat. *quĕ*; QE 2. **i cili** (pron. rel.).

THIS (SW4): **ky, kjo, kĕtá** {m.,f.,n.}. ~ Ri174 *ky* = ST86a.

DY: G., Alb. KY; T. KJO; TOg. KY, KJO.

- (1) The attractive PK609 **k(i)io-* ‘this’ > Lit. *šis* ‘id.’, would have yielded Alb. ***thijĕ*.
- (2) The same gender endings as in the words for THAT above are again mistakenly interpreted by HU84 (who lists extremely variable dialectal forms), as demonstrative pronoun PK979 **so-* > *jo* before stressed vowel; similar OR208 via < PAlb. **ka-jā*, as demonstrative *-jo* as above.
- (3) Here, all accept a deictic prefix *k(ĕ)-* ‘hic/here’, which appears further in Alb. *kĕtu* ‘here’. This prefix remains an unexplained pronominal element **ka* in OR208, at least explained as loan < Lat. *quo* by MDV, noted under DM-O, which appears extremely unlikely, and should rather have been derived from PK644 **kⁿo*: So HU84; DM217-8 ¹*kĕ*; clearer, however still uncertain in DM-O³⁸ *k(ĕ)* ‘here’ < **kⁿu*; (> with different result in his ²*kĕ*).

No(C?) – DY200 and ST, who do just this (1): Both mistaken. – RI expelled.

THOU (different from SW2 ‘you’, in turn not used by

³⁸Not understandable is the contrasting interpretation in note {1} as particle of „remote“ [sic!].

Dyen): **1. ti** (QE under ‘you’ unspecified). = R1175, ST87a. DY: Sic., G., Alb., TOg., T. TI.

- From the general PIE PK1097 *tū ‘du/you’ > PALb. *tū: HU116 “thou, you [sg.]”. DM386 (unspecified), ~ OR455. Yes(C+) – DY200 with many others, = RI, and ST: OK.

TONGUE (SW44): **gjuhë**,a {f.}; YL: Geg gjula; Pl. gjuhna; (also ‘language’). = R1179, ST88. DY: Sic. GLUX; G., Alb.: GJUHENA; TOg. GUE, T. GJUHE.

• DM342 has only a secondary notice denying a relation with *qūaj* ‘to name’.

- (1) Nowhere accepted is a derivation from PK402 **gleh₃gh-* ‘tip’, neither as (1a) a direct derivation, as assumed by ST88, nor (1b) as a loan via Att. Gre. *γλωσσα*.
- (2) Semantically not convincing: From PK350 **gal-so* ‘schreien/to scout’ (no attestations for tongue): after OR138 via **gl₃so* > PALb. **glusā*, because of *gl-* in dialectal forms (see following). Therefore:
- (3) Probably from PK223 **dn̥ǵhuā* ‘tongue’, metathesized to **ǵhnud-*, plus *-skē*, with *gn-* > *gl-* > *gj-* (as in *gju* ‘knee’): HU71; the verb *gjuanj* with the same development belongs to the second meaning ‘language’.

Yes(C+) – DY201: Too doubtful with (3); – ST (1a): Mistaken; – RI iso.: Highly questionable.

TOOTH (FRONT) (SW46): **dhëmbli** {m.}. = R1180, ST89. DY: G. DHAM B I; Alb. DAM B I; Sic., TOg., T. DHEMB.

- With PK369 **ǵomb^h-os* ‘id.’: HU58; ~ DM158, extended in DM-O via PALb. **ǵamb*; ~ OR82 via < PALb. **dzamba*.

Yes(C+) – DY002 and ST with Slavic forms: OK. – R1180 expelled (!).

TREE (SW23): **1. drulri**, (Geg drûlni) {m. < older n.}, (so BFU, SI; vs. QE only ‘log’!). = R1181, ST90b. DY: G., Alb. DRUJA.

- From PK214 **d(o)ru* > *dru(n)-*: HU56 via PIE **dru-n-*; the *-n* was strictly refuted by DM146 (however reintroduced as analogical *-n*-stem in DM-O), confusing regarding loan < OCS. (not maintained in DM-O), finally via *dru-s*; OR76 via < PALb. **druwa*, declaring the /-n/ as secondary or taken from the plural forms.

Yes(C+) – DY206 with Slav. and Gmc. forms = RI, and ST: OK. DY207 too doubtful with = Gre. DENDRO.

- 2. (QE 1.) **pemlë**,a. TOg. PEME. In dictionaries for ‘(fruit) tree’ (!),

which enlightens the following HAL455 ‘Baum (G.), ‘Frucht’, loan < Lat. *pōmum*, plus other loans in Kor., Sic., and T. – DY001”unique”, so far OK. In BON384 only « fruit ».

TWO (SW12): **dy.** = R1183, ST91. DY: Sic., Geg, TOg., T. DY.

- With PK228 **dui* > *dúi* > *dy*: ~ HU56 via a PIE dual **duuai*, ~ DM151.

Yes(C+) – DY002 cognate with all others, = RI, and ST: all OK.

WALK (~ Sw65 go) verb: **1.** (Qe 1. for ‘go’) **shkoj** (nĕ/mĕ kĕmbĕ) ‘(I) go (by/on foot), drive, leave’. Misprinted in DY: Geg SKKOJ.

- Not from LIV346 **keih_z* ‘to start to move’, wrong anlaut (in spite of Arm. *çogay* ‘I went’).
- Hardly from LIV232 **h₁eĭ-* ‘to go’ > *(n)- *ik-ē* > : DM-O unexplained under *ik(i)* above as “Other Alb. forms” ‘to go away’ (thus moving away from printed DM119 under (n)*çolj*, Buzuku *ençúom* ‘to carry/send away’).
- Also hardly from LIV593 **steig^h*- ‘schreiten/walk’ > *shtég-onj* > *sht(e)kó(n)j*: OR421; with a detour HU114 via verbative suffix *-onj* from PIE noun **stóiGh*, where, however, the tectal would be preserved.
- Rather loan < Lat. *sequor* ‘to follow’, with typical anlaut and ending, perhaps influenced by SHr. *skočiti* ‘jump’:

No(L) – DY013 iso.: OK. – ST92a 2. sh-k-c (!?) opaque (see above).

QE 2. **eci**, *écĕn* ‘to hike, walk, pad’ (Yl: ‘to run’). ~ R1185. DY: Sic. JEC; T. ME ECUR, ME BARITUR; TOg. ECEN (AOR. ECA). – (Neither in PK nor HU).

- (1) Hardly from LIV232 **h₁eĭ-* ‘to go’,
– plus *-k*, which yields the semantic different *ik(i)lĕnj*: DM-O ‘to go away’ uncertain from QIE **h₁(e)iK*; in the referenced DM379 indirectly under *shtrij*, “eventually (ur)alb. **ik-ē*”, as parallel for *ē* > *o* (deverbative): ? > *shkoj* (see below), or,
– plus *-to* (normally a nominal suffix): OR85 < **etĕs* < PALb. **aitatja*; too far-fetched, implausible; in particular the *-ci-* should arise from */-k̄/*, while */t/* would be preserved; moreover, the same root is demanded for 2. *vete* below! Not convincing.
- (2) Rather loan < South-Slav. *ići* ‘to go’, influenced by < Trk. *yetiš-* ‘reach, catch up with’ with dialectically preserved */y/*, and */tiš/* late > */ci/*.

No(L) – DY012 iso.: So far, OK. – RI expelled.

3. vete, *vete* (aor. *vajtl(a,-ur)* ‘to go (away), apart’. DY: Alb., Geg VETE (INF. VOJT): (Neither in HU NOR DM).

- Hardly from [LIV664] **ueh₂d^h*- ‘to stride through’, (cf. Alb. *va* ‘ford’): So OR502 via < PALb. **wadmi* displays irregular vocalism,

his alleged cognate Arm. *gam* ‘(I) come’ belongs to LIV196 **g^heh_r* ‘to come, to go’; not convincing.

- Possibly, however, far-fetched, from the same [LIV232, with ?] **h₁eh_r* ‘to go’ (already claimed for 2. eci (1) above), of which the **ie* pres. should have been analogically transformed to **ue*, after an otherwise unattested aor. Alb. **uo* < **ēi* < **h₁e-h₁i*. (LIV, with literature; this alleged sound law is weakly established in HU155, not in DM44[1.3.1]).
- Only [PK83 ⁴] **h₂uh₁-t* ‘to wander hither and thither’ makes no difficulties (cf. Engl. to wander, went).

No(C?+) If so, – DY013 these two isolated: False. Not yet settled.

4. **iki**/ika/ikur, rather ‘escape, flee, go (away?)’. St92 1. i-k, not interpretable.

No(C?-) – St together with and under same code as third entry above, regarding both as IE cognate: highly questionable. – 5. Other existing forms not used.

WARM (WEATHER) (Sw see below): i/e **ngrohtë**/ë. = Ri186, St93b. DY: Sic. NGROXT, Kor. NGROXETE; T. NXEHTE; Geg, Alb. NGROFET.

- From Pk493-4 **g^hher* ‘heiß, warm’ > *gu^hr-eh₁* > PALb. **en-grē-sē*: So HU98 ‘slightly warmed’ via < **h₁en-g^horē-sk²-oh₂*. Similar DM298; OR296 (only the verb) via < PALb. **en-grāja*.

Yes(C+) – DY002 = ST: OK. – Ri expelled.

--- (Sw93 instead: hot, as opposite to cold): i/e **nxehhtë** ‘hot’. DM286 *ndez* ‘to set on fire’ > verb. adj. Neither this, nor the following used by any candidate:

Besides **valë** ‘wave, also of boiling water > hot’ < Pk1140 ⁶**ueł* (also > Arm. *gol* ‘heat’): DM407; while QĒ and OR493 both give only the meaning ‘wave’.

WATER (Sw75): **ūjlë**.i {m.}. = Ri188, 94a. DY: TOg., T. UJE; Sic. UJ; G., Alb. UJT. – All start from forms of PK79 ⁹ **h₂u(e)h_r*:

- plus *-r* > [PK80 ^{9c}] **h₂u(e)h_r-r* > *(*h₂*)*uh₁r-*io** > PALb. *urj* > *uje*. In DM-O only solution, with formant *-io*. With a similar formant, however
- from the noun with *-d*-infix, PK79 ^{9b})*uod-r* ‘water’ > **udriom*: So HU121, noting several N-Geg attestations with (long!) *ū*, which – strangely enough – DM401 missed, however required as normal result of a vanished *-d*. Similar OR483 via PALb. **udrjā*. • A variant with lost /r/ > *wedo*, also assumed³⁹ as source for Arm. *get* ‘river’, could have yielded PALb. *udo(h₂)* > via hiatic *-j* > *ujë*. Albeit unsolved

³⁹ Stempel 1994: 306.

details:

Yes(C²⁺) – DY004 and ST with WATER-forms: OK. – RI expelled!

WE (SW3): **ne.** = R1189; ST95 nam, ne. DY: Sic. NA; TOg. NEVE, NE; T., G. NE.

- From general PIE (Pk758) **nōs* > *ne.* HU96 NA, DM291, OR289 *ne.*

Yes(C+) – DY002 and ST with *ne*-forms: OK. – RI expelled from screened dataset and replaced by 189a *us* (acc.).

Additional meaning for Alb. *na* 'here you are'.

WHAT (SW7): *ç* (-farē/-ka). R1191 *ç*; ST96 *së* (?).DY: Sic., TOg. CE; G., Alb. TSH ~ *ç'*, T. CFARE. · DM no attempt.

- From PK 46 ^{2.} **k^uei-* > PIE **k^uid* > PALb. **iš̥i* > *ç*: OR2 *çē/ç'*. HU7 *Ç'*, after citing many possibilities, remains doubtful; cf. the same loss of auslaut in Arm. –*č* 'id.' (SHr. *ča*, cited by OR, seems to be a ghost word or typo).

Yes(C+) – DY007 many cognates, = RI, and ST: OK, by whatever explanation.

(Different: HU110 **SE** 'what?, than' < PK644 **quem*, is rather used as conjunction).

WHEN (SW skipped later): **kur.** = R1192. DY: Kor. KUUR; all others KUR.

- (1) Perhaps loan from Lat. *quā hōrā* 'at what hour, when': HAL480: Minor difficulties in the vocalism and far-fetched. More obvious, with only minor semantic difficulties arise
- (2) from PK 47 ^{3.*} *k^uu-* +*r*: HU84 via **ku+Vr(V)*, refuted as unnecessary by DM227 and OR206. The everywhere adduced Lit. *kuř* 'where', Arm. *որ <or>*⁴⁰ (PK and Or "ur") 'what', have different meanings.

Yes(C+) – DY200 (2) OK. – RI iso. (1)?: Presumably mistaken. – Not in ST.

WHITE (SW90): i/e **bardhë.** = R1194, St97c *bardë* (typo). DY: G. BARDH, TOg. I-BARDHE, T. I, E BARDHE.

- From PK139 **bherh₁ǵ-o* 'bright' > PALb. **b^horh₁ǵ-o* > *barða-* HU0 (against an o-grade, because elsewhere not confirmed); ~ DM90 via o-grade; similar OR17 via PALb. **bardza*.

⁴⁰ If belonging here at all, regrettably circumvented in Stempel 1994.

No(C-) – DY004 and ST "iso." = OK. – RI expelled.

WHO (SW6): **kush.** = RI195, ST98. DY: G., Alb., T. KUSH; Sic., TOg. KUS, CILI.

- From PK647 ³k^uu- > PIE *k^uu-s > ku-śa (cf. > TokB. *kuse*): HU84, DM228, regarding the -s as "some pronominal element", in OR207 via PALb. *ku-śa, the latter as "demonstrative *so-"; but why here another function than the m., f. ending in PIE k^ui-s?

Yes(C+) – DY200 with many cognates = RI with all others = ST: OK.

WOMAN (SW16): **grúa,-ja;** (Geg *grue*; pl. *gra*). = RI202, ST99a. DY: G. not found. Sic., T., TOg., Alb. GRUA.

- (1) From [PK473] *g^ue(h₁)n-ah₂ {f. ā-stem} 'woman', can be derived
 - regularly, the semantic different Alb. *zonjë* 'lady, madam'; however, a form Geg *zotnja*, cited from Bishop P. Budi around 1620 (cf. Ködderitzsch 1994:67) might – if not a folk analogy – suggest a derivation from Alb. *zot* 'lord (also addressing god), boss', derived either from < PIE *d̥ibu-* (DM-O/184, phonetically better), or from **uik̑* (HU137, HAMP95, semantically preferable, with many additional assumptions) + *-potis*⁴¹;
 - hardly Alb. *grua*, via an elsewhere as fem. weakly attested extension **g^unā-ns* > *gnōn* > *grōn*: so Matzinger (2000), not regarding that the anyway far-fetched /-n/ in that position would be preserved in Geg dialects (HU66, DM180 with literature), which they are not; further unnecessarily, but desperately sticking to an alleged Gre. *-iu-*suffix, and refuting the following in particular with debatable semantic considerations. Therefore:
- (2) From [PK390] **gréh₂* 'ripe, ready (of grain, grown up of people⁴²)' via > PALb. *gr₁wā* (cf. Geg *grunë* 'grain, wheat' from **gr₁nā*, JA84): HU66 *gréh₂-us* > *gróus* > *grua/e*, describing the conditions of this phonetic development p155 "When a final consonant cluster was lost after [PALb.] o, a diphthong resulted"; DM-O(180) via QIE *gréh₂u-* > PALb. *grāu-*. OR125 assumes < PALb. **grāwā*, which should have yielded ***grově*. Possible and straightforward would be QIE *grueh₂* > Buzuku *gruo* > *gru|a/e*. The

⁴¹ From that stem, we have the much more obvious derivations OInd. *pāti*, Gre. *πόσις, πότνια* 'lord, lady'.

⁴² Only there secondary > 'old'.

semantic doubts Matzinger levelled against this solution, overlook that similar meanings appear in ONor. *karl* ‘husband, freeman, etc.’, *kerling* ‘wife’, which can never go back to ‘old, broken’, as he suggests for this solution. This is further semantically not as singular as it seems, if we regard that (2) is used as standard, vs. *zonjë* (1), for the upper class or to honour someone (cf. Engl. *queen* from the same root). Contrary: *robinjë* [f.] ‘unripe person, serf (YL224).

No(C?-): – With (1) both, ST and DY203 (doubtful). – RI “iso.”, because old cognates replaced; not gradable, because the case remains debatable.

Beside *fémëlër*,ra ‘wife, female’. G.: DY000 no entry. HAL126 Tosk *femën* < Lat. *fēmina*.

YELLOW (SW89): i/e **verdhë**. = RI207. DY: G., Alb. VERDH; Kor., T., TOg. I-VERDHE. · HU and DM no entry.

• HAL646: loan < *vir(i)de* < Lat. *viridis* ‘greenish’; followed by OR499.

No(L) – DY007 Alb. iso. = RI: OK.

– ST100 comes with an idiosyncratic entry *delpër*; obviously a misprint from the typical Russian phonetic transcription of *gjelbër*, even then false: see GREEN above.

you (SW2 unspecified): here ‘2nd P.Pl’ **ju**. Not used by candidates.

• From PK513-4 ¹**iū*: OR159 < PALb. **ju*; DM209, in DM-O more decisive < IE* *iu(H)*-? Only “possibly” (for the oblique cases) < **usm* < **ues*, which is decisively favoured by:

• HU78 “from the oblique stem **wes*”.

Results

That in such a tremendous work, as undertaken by the three authors, e.g., Isidore Dyen with 95 languages with 200 controlled meanings each, errors occur, is not astonishing at all, and unavoidable. However, the relatively high amount of errors makes the data a bad source for the purpose for which they were designed, and still are (mis)used. Note that “errors” are only conceivable if under the required semantic restrictions and contents there are cognates or not. Note further that we have 107 entries, because those of Dyen are included that were part of a

former Swadesh list or are ambiguous, e.g., ‘walk : go’. Like this one, many questionable cases are due to the unprofessional description of Swadesh’s test list (cf. head, claw, warm, go, skin, etc.). Thus, in some cases we cannot decide which response represents Albanian proper, and had to evaluate additional forms.

To sum up probably:

- 42 lemmata of the Swadesh list are IE cognates under the given meaning (“C+”), including 6 “C?+” of debatable sources); plus 3 only in Dyen, including 1 questionable; 5 new solutions are proposed here.
- 33 are of IE origin, however, do not fulfill the tight semantic demands for lexicostatistical computations, i.e. there appear no cognates in the same meaning frame (“C-“), including 10 “C?-“ of debatable sources; plus 2 only in Dyen; 8 new solutions are proposed here.
- 34 appear to be loans (“L”), including 14 L? questionable or secondary cases; thereof 5(4?) Gre.; 22(6?) (V)Lat., Itn., Rmc., 1? Kel.; 3(2) Sla.; 3(1) Trk.); plus 1 only in Dyen; 6 new solutions are proposed here.
- All questionable cases, where the source of the Albanian respond(s) remains debatable, may overlap with other results. All these could as well go back to an aboriginal substratum.

It must be mentioned here that – due to the Zipf distribution – the above amounts of replacements are not at all representative for Albanian in general, where we encounter tremendous more non-IE lexemes (up to 90 per cent, cf. Holm 2005, 2008).

Applied to the three reviewed lists, and now regarding also the secondary responses, the scores are:

In **Dyen’s** list, 13 of the 97 entries appear to be erroneously coded, plus 6 minor faults, equating ~ 14%. Additionally, he is often unaware of giving grammatically wrong Albanian forms, e.g., under 042 FAT, 115 TO RAIN.

Ringe⁴³ had many words in his original list, which he later expelled because they did not fit into the “perfect” phylogenies of his mathematics advisors. Methodologically, this must be called a “Procrustean” procedure, for the qualitative decisions of the linguist have to precede quantitative computations. In any difficulty, it is rather the algorithm to be blamed, and the resulting phylogenies then, must be judged mistaken, in particular the various peculiar positions of Albanian. Astonishingly, also ~ 16% errors turned out from the 8 presumed mistakes and 3 questionable ones of 59 (non-expelled items) in Ringe’s screened dataset of 2007.

Starostin alone kept tightly to the last Swadesh list with 100 entries, of which he scores the minimum of 10 presumable mistakes, plus a maximum of 12 minor ones; this is partly due to the fact that he marked loans by a minus sign, and thus allows detecting differences here, which remain concealed in the other lists.

Questionable employment of these data

Knowing that the amount of substrata and replacements by loans, and consequently that of the residues, does not bear any evidence on the genealogical relationship of Albanian with any other language, and further that the amount of common residues between any two languages, when the amount of residues in any of the two partners is smaller, must also be smaller, any conclusions from these surface numbers of agreements alone are mathematically erroneous. The same applies to the number of presumed internal innovations against the other IE languages, in our list *ca.* 33. Regrettably, even today scholars use exactly these ones, unaware of Holm (2003 *passim*), where the consequences of their stochastic relationships have been demonstrated.

Additional to this logical flaw, basing these computations on Swadesh lists has even more distorting side effects: Because they are designed to contain those lemmata with the highest resistance to borrowing, the

⁴³Ringe, as the only professional Indo-Europeanist of these, rejects glottochronology, and only uses his list for lexicostatistical subgrouping.

differences between many languages are so small that the statistical dispersion surmounts them, and mixes inextricably with the linguistic mistakes, and unsolved cases, e.g., in Albanian, about 28.6%. As a result, the amount of about 36 (42-6) clear form-meaning relations just allows computationally distinguishing Albanian from other languages; its genealogical relationships, however, if only based on this small amount of surface data, remain extremely unreliable and may even be false or true by chance.

Third, the strict limitation in the use of such meaning lists to tight semantic agreement is also responsible for many false results, because Engl. *hound* proves relationship with Grm. *Hund* in spite of their shifted meanings, so does Lat. *homo* with OHG. *Bruti-gamo*/OEng. *brȳd-guma*, both expelled by traditional rules of lexicostatistics. This understood, it becomes clear that the only methodological choice that remains is the use of complete, etymologically based lists and additional amounts of data, as particularly applied by Holm 2008.

Outlook: Lexicostatistics and the position of Albanian

Early loans from Greek and Latin (cf. Ölberg 1993) suggest that Albanians around the last decennia, if not millennium, BC already inhabited the same area as today. Albanian can be assumed to have separated from the same amount of Balkan-Indo-European vocabulary as Greek and Armenian (cf. Holm 2007, 2008), and this separation should have happened approximately in the same historical era. Because the latter languages, however, since that time, and namely since Roman times, underwent quite different amounts of change, this is a further argument against the questionable "clock" assumption of glottochronology⁴⁴. It suggests again that not only these changes arise by socio-historical impacts, which of course can never be foreseen or computed. Moreover, already Jokl (1963) has amply demonstrated the linguistic position

⁴⁴That some glottochronologists are proud of expelling loans, and count only the core vocabulary with tight meanings is even worse, as demonstrated in argument (3) above.

of Albanian between the Western and Eastern (closest to Gre. and Arm.) part of the Indo-European languages, completely in contrast to Ringe/Warnow/Taylor (2002, with Gmc.), Gray & Atkinson (2003, with Iranian [sic!]), Starostin (2004, Alb. correctly with Gre. and Arm., however, mixed up with Aryan amongst the European part). Only the results of Holm (e.g., 2007:209) are in full agreement with the study of Jokl, and the statement in Huld (1984:161), “Albanian is a central idiom, transitional between Meillet’s ‘North-western’ and a looser South-eastern group of which Greek and Armenian are the most prominent members”, is backed up with many common innovations. This has recently again been confirmed by Matzinger (2000:82, with literature).

References (with acronyms for frequently cited authors)

Bo = Boretzky, Norbert

1976 Der türkische Einfluss auf das Albanische; Teil 2, *Wörterbuch der albanischen Turzismen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

BON = Bonnet, Guillaume

1998 Les mots latins de l’Albanais. Paris: L’Harmattan.

BFU = Buchholz, O.; Fiedler, W.; Uhlisch, G.

1990 *Wörterbuch Albanisch – Deutsch*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.

Çabej, Eqrem

1976-2002 (in progress): *Studime etimologjike në fushë të shqipës*. Tiranë. (Up to now 6 volumes from letters A-RR).

Derksen, Rick

as 2008, in progress. Slavic inherited lexicon. online www.indo-european.nl/cgi-bin/query.cgi?basename=\data\ie\slav&root=leiden.

Djahukian, Gevorg B.

1990 A variational model for the Indo-European consonant system. In: *Historische Sprachforschung*, 103-1: 1-16.

DH⁴⁵ = Dhrimo, Ali

2005 *Fjalor Shqip-Gjermanisht*. Tiranë: Infbotues.

⁴⁵I thank R. Ködderitzsch, Bonn for the attestations from Dhrimo, cited DH##.

- DM = Demiraj, Bardhyl
 1997 *Albanische Etymologien. Untersuchungen zum Albanischen Erbwortschatz.* Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- DM-O = DM in the shorter, formalized, and in many cases updated online-version of the “Albanian inherited lexicon” unter <http://www.indoeuropean.nl>.
- Demiraj, Sh.(aban)
 1993 *Historische Grammatik der Albanischen Sprache.* Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Dyen, Isidore; Joseph Kruskal; and Paul Black
 1992 An Indoeuropean classification: A lexicostatistical experiment. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 82-5.
- DY = Dyen, I., J. Kruskal, and P. Black
 1997 COMPARATIVE INDOEUROPEAN DATABASE COLLECTED BY ISIDORE DYEN; FILE IE-DATA1. Original URL cancelled. Available at www.wordgumbo.com/ie/comp/iedata.txt.
- Embleton, Sheila
 1986 *Statistics in Historical Linguistics.* [Quantitative Linguistics, Vol. 30], Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- EU = Euler, Wolfram
 1985 Körperteilnamen im Albanischen und ihre Herkunft. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 90: 104-122.
- FGS = Cipo, K. et al. (Eds.)
 1954 *Fjalor i gjuhës shqipe.* Tiranë. As cited by Huld 1984.
- Gray, R. D., & Atkinson, Q.D.
 2003 Language-tree divergence times support the Anatolian theory of Indo-European origin. *Nature*, vol. 426:435-8.
- HAG = Haarmann, Harald
 1990 “Basic” vocabulary and language contacts: the disillusion of glottochronology. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 95: 1-37.
- HAL = Haarmann, Harald
 1972 *Der lateinische Lehnwortschatz im Albanischen.* Hamburg: Buske.
- Hamp, Eric P.
 1997 A far-out equation. In: *Indo-European, Nostratic, and beyond; Festschrift for Vitalij V. Shevoroshkin.* Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man. JIES Monograph 22.
- He = Hetzer, Armin
³⁾1998 *Albanisch-deutsches und deutsch-albanisches Taschenwörterbuch.*

Hamburg: Buske. [Based on Fjalor i shqipes së sotme, Tiranë 1984].

Holm, Hans J.

- 2003 The proportionality trap, or: what is wrong with lexicostatistical subgrouping? *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 108: 38-46.
- 2007 The new Arboretum of Indo-European 'trees'; Can new algorithms reveal the phylogeny and even prehistory of Indo-European? *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 14-2: 167-214.
- 2008 The distribution of data in word lists and its impact on the subgrouping of languages. In: Preisach, C., H. Burkhardt, L. Schmidt-Thieme, and R. Decker (eds): *Data Analysis, Machine Learning and Applications*. Proceedings of the 31st Annual Conference of the Gesellschaft für Klassifikation e.V., Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, March 7-9, 2007. Berlin: Springer, 629 – 636.

Holst, Jan Hendrik

- 1998 Ein bisher unentdecktes Lautgesetz im Albanischen und damit im Zusammenhang stehende Betrachtungen. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 111-1: 83-98.

HU = Huld, Martin E.

- 1984 *Basic Albanian Etymologies*. Columbus OH: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

JA = Janson, Bernd

- 1986 *Etymologische und chronologische Untersuchungen zu den Bedingungen des Rhotazismus im Albanischen; unter Berücksichtigung der griechischen und lateinischen Lehnwörter*. Frankfurt/M: Lang. - Unaware of Huld!

Jokl, Norbert

- 1963 (posthumous): Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse des Albanischen zu den übrigen indogermanischen Sprachen. *Die Sprache* 9: 113-56.

Klingenschmitt, Gert

- 1982 *Das altarmenische Verbum*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Kloekhorst, Alwin

- 2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.

Kluge, F., bearb. v. Elmar Seebold

- 2002 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 24th ed.

Kober, A.E.

- 1934 Some remarks on color in Orek poetry. *The Classical Weekly*, 27: 189.

Ködderitzsch, Rolf

- 1994 Alb. *grua, grue* ‚Frau, Weib; Ehefrau, Gattin‘. In: Bielmeyer, R.; Stempel, R. (Eds): *Indogermanica et Caucasica; FS für K.H. Schmidt z. 65. Geburtstag*. Berlin, New York: W.de Gruyter.

Ködderitzsch, Rolf

- 1995 Thrak. **buros* ‚Mann‘, in: *Studia linguistica, Festschrift für Ivan Duridanov* [Archiv für bulgarische Philologie 3]. Sofia: Kliment Ochridski.

LIV = Rix, H.; Kümmel, M.; Zehnder, Th.; Lipp, R.; & Schirmer, B.

- 2001 *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben; die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 2nd. ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Lubotsky, A.

- 1985 The PIE word for ‘dry’. *Historische Sprachforschung* 98: 1-10.

Lucht, Martina

- 2007 Der Grundwortschatz des Altirischen. Available as pdf at http://hss.ulb.uni-bonn.de/diss_online.

MAR = Matzinger, Joachim

- 1998 Review of Vladimir Orel, *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, Brill. *Die Sprache* 40-2: 229-41.

Matzinger, J.

- 1997 Albanisch *unë* ‘ich’ im System der albanischen Personalpronomina. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 103: 185-201.

Matzinger, J.

- 2000 Albanisch *grā* ‘Frauen’. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 60: 75-87.

Matzinger, J.

- 2005 Neue Etymologien zu (alt)albanischen Verben. *Die Sprache* 45,1-2: 81-109.

MBr = Meier-Brügger, M.

- ⁸⁾2002 *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: de Gruyter. [1st Engl. Version 2003. Indo-European Linguistics. de Gruyter Textbook]

MbV = Michiel de Vaan

continued frequent addenda as footnotes to DM-O (NLINE), Leiden, IEED.

Ölberg, Hermann

- 1993 Die ursprünglichen Wohnsitze der Albaner auf der Balkanhalbinsel. Kurzreferat 1993, via www.albanischesinstitut.ch/pdf/text40.pdf, dated 2005/5/7.

- OR = Orel, Vladimir
 1998 *Albanian etymological dictionary*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Orel, Vladimir È.
 1985 PIE *s in Albanian. *Die Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- QE = Qeli, Albi
 2007 *English-Albanian & Albanian-English Dictionary*.
www.argjiro.net/fjalor/.
- R1 = Ringe, Don
 2007 The Indo-European word lists. The parallel wordlists of 24 Indo-European (IE) languages used in the Ringe, Warnow, Taylor 2002 paper (PDF), as available at www.cs.rice.edu/~nakhley/CPHL/. Internal date 2007-07-05. Also under this URL, his cognation tables, not containing the “expelled” entries:
- “ – Unscreened IE dataset. This dataset contains 22 phonological characters, 17 morphological characters, and 336 lexical characters;
 - “ – Screened IE dataset. This dataset contains 22 phonological characters, 13 morphological characters, and 259 lexical characters.
- Ringe, D., Warnow, T., & Taylor, A.
 2002 Indo-European and computational cladistics. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 100(1): 59-129.
- S1 = Simoni, Zef
 1997 *Wörterbuch Deutsch – Albanisch*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Starostin, Sergej A.
 2004 Workshop on the chronology in linguistics, Santa Fe; cited after Blažek, V., Development of tree-diagram models of the Indo-European languages. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 35 (2007): 84.
- Stempel, Reinhard
 1994 Zur Vertretung der drei indogermanischen Gutturalreihen im Armenischen. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 298-309.
- SW = Swadesh, Morris, post-mortem edited by Joel Sherzer
 1971 *The Origin and Diversification of Language*. Chicago: Aldine.
- YL = Yli, Xhelal
 1997 *Das slavische Lehnwort im Albanischen*. 1. Lehnwörter. München: Sagner.

Attachment: “Cognate classes” and their codes in I. Dyen (1992)

DY000 stands for missing or “unusable” data for that concept.

DY001 contains “unique” lexemes “unsuitable” for lexicostatistical purposes because Dyen found no cognates with the necessary tight meaning.

DY002-019 contain lemmata regarded cognate in this class alone, very often Albanian dialects alone; thus, these entries might be either borrowings confined to Albanian internal [“iso.”] or cognates with some further entries. Note in particular that “iso.” may consist of residual (homologous) Indo-European forms, which, however, elsewhere have no cognates as primary response for the meaning in question.

DR100-103 are regarded “doubtful” cognates even within the group.

DY200-224 are groups with cognates (including the necessary tight meaning) with additional relations to further groups, where Dyen distinguishes between 2 = faithful, vs. 3 = doubtful. The reason for not incorporating the outside faithful groups are the synonyms additionally listed there.