



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Tocharian and Samoyed: on the question of Uralic substrate influence in Tocharian

Warries, A.R.

Citation

Warries, A. R. (2025, June 18). *Tocharian and Samoyed: on the question of Uralic substrate influence in Tocharian*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4250485>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4250485>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Etymological reference list 1: Tocharian

In the following numbered list, the words adduced and discussed in chapter 2 are given with references to the literature, and, where relevant, a short discussion. The main source of Tocharian B etymological information is Adams (2013), which contains references to the earlier literature. Especially Malzahn (2010) and Peyrot (2013) also provide a lot of information on verbs, which are cited according to the system of Peyrot (2013), rather than those employed by Malzahn and Adams. Tocharian A lacks a dedicated etymological dictionary. The Tocharian A forms are cited after the Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A by Carling and Pinault (DThTA).

The words are listed according to the Proto-Indo-European reconstruction, or the Proto-Indo-European root from which the Tocharian word is derived. As elsewhere in this dissertation, Proto-Indo-European accents are omitted because they cannot always be determined with certainty, and they are generally irrelevant for the topics under discussion. The alphabetical order is:

b^h d d^h e ē ġ ġ^h g g^h g^w g^{wh} h, h₂ h₃ i k k^w l m n o ō p r s t u

Words do not start with the vowels **e*, **ē*, **o*, **ō*, or with the resonant **r*. Unlike some scholars, I do not write vowel colouring in the Proto-Indo-European reconstructions, so that, e.g., **h₂e* remains written as **h₂e* rather than becoming **h₂a*. I consider both the laryngeal colouring and syllabification of syllabic resonants to be post-Proto-Indo-European developments. In this list, the sign marking syllabic laryngeals **h₁*, **h₂*, **h₃* and syllabic resonants **l*, **m*, **n*, **r* and the sign for the glides **i* and **u* are omitted.

1. PIE **b^heh₂ġ^hu-* > PT **poko*, obl.sg. **pokay* ‘arm’
TB *poko**, obl.sg. *pokai* | TA nom/obl.sg. *poke* (DThTA: 285b)
Adams 2013: 434.
2. PIE **b^hreh₂tēr* > PT **prot^{er}* ‘brother’
TB *procer* | TA *pracar* (DThTA: 303b)
Adams 2013: 454–455.

3. PIE **bʰrǵh-ro-* > PT **pärk(ə)re* ‘long’
TB *pärkare* /pärkəre/ | TA *pärkär* (DThTA: 278a)
Adams 2013: 399–400.

4. PIE **dekm* > PT **śakə* ‘ten’
TB *śak* /śák/ | TA *śäk* (DThTA: 476a)
Adams 2013: 674–675.

5. PIE **demh₂-* > PT **tśama-* ‘grow, increase’
TB *tsama-* | TA *tsämā-* DThTA: 555b)
Adams 2013: 804; Malzahn 2010: 985–987; Peyrot 2013: 843.

6. PIE **der-* ‘split’ > PT **tśar-* ‘be separated, be apart; caus. separate’
TB *tsara-* | TA *tsärā-* ‘separate’ (DThTA: 556a)
Adams 2013: 805; Malzahn 2010: 987–988; Peyrot 2013: 845.

7. PIE **deuh₂-* > PT **tśawa-* ‘attach oneself, stick to (itr.)’
TB *tśawa-* | TA *tśawā-* ‘fit; obey’ (DThTA: 558b)
Adams 2013: 808–809; Malzahn 2010: 996–998; Peyrot 2013: 846.

8. PIE **deuk-* > PT **tśawka-* ‘suck (out)’
TB *tsawka-* | TA *tsäwkā-* (DThTA: 558b)
Adams 2013: 809; Malzahn 2001: 994–996; Peyrot 2013: 841.
— The etymology **dʰeugʰ-* ‘produce (milk)’, while not impossible, is semantically less fitting than a derivation from **deuk-* ‘pull (out)’; see Adams (2013: 809).

9. PIE **dnǵʰueh₂-* > PT **kāntwo* ‘tongue’
TB *kantwo* /kántwo/ | TA *käntu* (DThTA: 121a)
Adams 2013: 147.
— The dental and the velar were metathesised in Tocharian, with TB *kantwo* rather than ***tankwo*, TA *käntu* rather than ***täntku*.

10. PIE **doru-*, **dreu-* > PT **orə*, pl. *arwa* ‘wood’
TB *or*, pl. *ārwa* | TA *or* (DThTA: 86b)
Adams 2013: 127.

- The initial **d-* was lost by regular sound law in the oblique cases where it came into contact with the **r*, and it was subsequently removed in other forms by analogy. The singular TAB *or* shows *u*-umlaut of pre-PT **e* (PIE **o*) plural TB *ārwa* shows *a*-umlaut of pre-PT **e* (PIE **o*).
11. PIE **drem-* ‘run’ → ? **drem-wor* > PT *rāmer* ‘quickly’
TB *ramer* | ? TA der. *ymār* (DThTA: 379b)
Adams 2013: 571–572; Pinault 2011: 168; Van Windekens 1976: 592; Winter 1962: 30.
— TB *ramer* could theoretically be from **drem-or* if this is simplified from **drem-wor*. Pinault (2011: 168) explains TA *ymār* as a local adverb formation from PT **rāmer* with prefixation of **yə(n)-* and pluralization in *-a*, yielding pre-TA **yrmārā* with umlaut; after regular apocope and dissimilation of the two *r*’s, this became TA *ymār*. In this way, TA *ymār* would not be a reflex of **h₁i-mōr*, as assumed by Van Windekens (1976: 592).
12. PIE **duei-* > PT **wəy-* ‘be frightened’
TB *wəy-* | TA *wäyā-* (DThTA: 446a)
Adams 2013: 652; Malzahn 2010: 900–901; Peyrot 2013: 818.
13. PIE **dui-dkmt* → ? **duih₁kmt* > PT **wikən* ‘twenty (20)’
TB *ikäm* /yəykən/ | TA (analogical) *wiki* (DThTA: 443a)
Adams 2013: 66–67
— It is generally assumed that TB *ikäm*, TA *wiki* can be derived via pre-PT **wikəmt* from a preform **duih₁kmt* with a development from PIE **ih₁*, to pre-PT **ī* (Adams 2013: 66–67; Hackstein 2017: 1314), but the reconstruction of the **h₁* to the Proto-Indo-European level is uncertain. The development thus remains a tentative approximation that cannot strictly be used to show the development of true PIE **ih₁*. At the same time, there does not seem to be any other known way to get the TAB *i* than by assuming a development of **dui-dkmt* via **duih₁kmt* at some stage.
14. PIE **dui-to-* > PT **wəte* ‘second’
TB *wate* /wəte/ | TA *wät* (DThTA: 433a)
Adams 2013: 625–626.

15. PIE **duoh₂*, **duoi* > PT **wu*, **wey* ‘two (2)’
 TB *wi* (m/f.) | TA *wu* (m.), *we* (f.) (DThTA: 446b)
 Adams 2013: 651.

16. PIE **d^heg^{wh}-* > PT **t^sək-* ‘burn (act. = tr.; mid. = intr.)’
 TB *tsək-* | TA *tsäk-* (DThTA: 553b)
 Adams 2013: 802; Malzahn 2010: 980–981; Peyrot 2013: 842.

17. PIE **d^heig^h-* ‘form’ > PT **t^sika-* ‘form, shape’
 TB *tsayk-* | TA *tsāykā-* ‘form tr.’ (DThTA: 557b)
 Adams 2013: 807; Malzahn 2010: 991–992; Peyrot 2013: 844.

18. PIE **d^heih₂g^w-* → *d^hih₂g^w-* > PT **t^saka-* ‘pierce, bite’
 TB *tsaka-* | TA *tsākā-* ‘pierce’ (DThTA: 552b)
 Adams 2013: 800; LIV: 142; Malzahn 2010: 975–976; Peyrot 2013: 840.
 — The laryngeal in this root is only reconstructed for the benefit on the Tocharian, and is not necessary for Latin *figō* ‘drive in, insert; fasten’ or Lithuanian *diegti* ‘plant; sting’, for which **d^heig^w-* would work too (De Vaan 2008: 219; Derksen 2015: 127). However, the other etymologies provided by Adams do not work phonologically for Tocharian: PIE **dē(n)k⁻nh₂-* would have become ***śakna-*, **tēg^h-nh₂-* should have become ***cakna-*, and the lengthened grades are difficult to account for, so that a connection with PIE **d^heih₂g^w-* remains the best option.

19. PIE **d^heng^h-* > ? PT **t^sənk-* ‘(a)rise’
 TB *tsənk-* | TA *tsänk-* (DThTA: 554b)
 Adams 2013: 802–803; Malzahn 2010: 983–984; Peyrot 2013: 834.
 — PT **t^sənk-* has also been connected with a PIE **d^heng^h-* ‘reach’ (see Adams 2013: 802–803 with references). However, the supposed cognate Skt. *daghnōti* ‘reach toward’ is rather taken together with Gr. *φθάνω* ‘anticipate, be ahead’ from **d^heg^{wh}h₂-* ‘reach toward’ in LIV (134–135), thus, crucially, without an internal nasal; see also Malzahn 2010: 983–984. Other supposed cognates OIr. *daingen* ‘strong, firm’, Russian (dial.) *djágnut^h* ‘get well, recover’, *djáglyj* ‘healthy, strong’, and Latvian *deĩkts* ‘strong, healthy, important’ rather point to a root **d^heng-* on account of the accentuation (Derksen 2008: 106), and do not fit with Tocharian semantically. The Proto-Indo-European antecedent of this Tocharian verb is thus very uncertain.

20. PIE **d^heub^h-* → **d^hub^hro-* ‘deep’ > PT **təpre* ‘high’
 TB *tapre* /təpre/ | TA *tpär* (DThTA: 221a)
 Adams 2013: 296–297.
 — This word is traditionally reconstructed as **d^hubro-*, but Kroonen (2011: 253) has shown that the root should be **d^heub^h-* on account of the Germanic evidence.
21. PIE **d^hugh₂tēr* > PT **təkat^{er}* ‘daughter’
 TB *tkācer* /tkācer/ | TA *ckācar* (DThTA: 188b)
 Adams 2013: 330–331.
 — The initial *c-* of TA *ckācar* is the result of assimilation to the internal *-c-*.
22. PIE **ǵneh₁-* ‘be born’ > PT **kən-* ‘come about’
 TB *kən-* | TA *kän-* (DThTA: 120a–121a)
 Adams 2013: 169–170; Friis 2024: 373; Malzahn 2010: 568–570; Peyrot 2013: 731.
 — Friis has adduced the optative TA *knitär* as an example where PIE **i* failed to palatalize the preceding consonant, potentially due to the intervening laryngeal: **ǵnh₁-ih₁-* (Friis 2024: 373).
23. PIE **ǵneh₃-* > **kna-* ‘know’
 TB *nana-* ‘appear : erscheinen’ | TA *knā-* (DThTA: 158a)
 Adams 2013: 3; Malzahn 2010: 610–611, 678–679, Peyrot 2013: 440–442, 762.
 — PT **kna-* could in principle reflect either the *e*-grade of the root **ǵneh₃-*, in which it would be one of the few examples of **eh₃* in Tocharian – and all examples are uncertain in some way – or it could reflect the zero-grade **ǵnh₃-* with the much more commonly attested vocalization of laryngeals to PT **a*. The latter option seems more likely, although the former cannot be entirely excluded (see Peyrot 2013: 440–442 for a more detailed discussion).
24. PIE **ǵomb^ho-* > PT **keme* ‘tooth’
 TB *keme* | TA *kam* (DThTA: 95a)
 Adams 2013: 208.
25. PIE *g^(h)ul-* > PT **k^wəla-* ‘fail, weaken, recede’
 TB *k^wəla-* | TA *k^wälā-* (DThTA: 144a)
 Adams 2013: 256; Kim 1999: 153.

- The most probable of the proposed cognates are to be found in Baltic, e.g., Lith. *gul̃ti* ‘lie down’, *gul̃ėti* ‘lie, be ill’ (see Adams 2013: 256, Kim 1999: 153; though the Tocharian connection is not mentioned by Derksen 2015: 193).
26. PIE **g^weh₃-u-* > PT **kew* ‘cow’
 TB *ke_u* | TA *ko* (DThTA: 151a)
 Adams 2013: 201–202; Lubotsky 1990: 133–134; Beekes 2010: 232–233; Nielsen Whitehead 2018.
- The precise Proto-Indo-European reconstruction is debated. If we depart from **g^weh₃-u-*, one might theoretically expect **eh₃* to yield a long vowel like pre-PT **ō*, but the *e* in TB *ke_u* clearly reflects a pre-PT short **o*. The particular development of **h₃* in combination with **e* in **g^weh₃-u-* is mirrored in TB *kaw-* ‘kill’ from PIE **keh₂u-* ‘hew, strike’, with laryngeal colouring of the **eh₂* to **ah₂* but no further lengthening to **ā*. The traditional reconstruction is **g^wou-*, but this foregoes the attractive connection with the verb **g^weh₃-* ‘feed, tend’, clashes with the short *a* in Rigvedic forms like dat.sg. *gáve* where lengthening of **o* to ***ā* should have occurred in accordance with Brugmann’s Law, and leaving the accent of Greek βούς unexplained (Lubotsky 1990: 133–134; Beekes 2010: 232–233). Nielsen Whitehead reconstructs an original hysterodynamic paradigm with a nom.sg. **g^wh₃-ēu(-s)*, acc.sg. **g^wh₃-eu-m* and a consistent initial cluster **g^wh₃-* (Nielsen Whitehead 2018). If such a cluster underwent delabialization and the laryngeal blocked palatalization (see 2.4.2), a reconstructed **g^wh₃-ēu(-s)* might regularly have become TB *ke_u*. With a change from **h₃e* via **o* to PT **e*, **g^wh₃-eu-m* might also provide the basis for TB *ke_u*. There are thus many ways to interpret the development of ‘cow’ in Tocharian depending on the specific reconstruction taken as a point of departure, each involving theoretically possible or even plausible changes that are not directly paralleled elsewhere in Tocharian.
27. PIE **g^wen_{h₂}-* > PT **k^yəna* ‘wife’
 TB *śana* /śána/ | TA *śām* (DThTA: 466b)
 Adams 2013: 676–677.

28. PIE **g^wi_hu-* > PT **k^yaw-* ‘live’
 TB *śaw-*, *śay-* | TA *śāw-* (DThTA: 466a)
 Adams 2013: 683–684; Malzahn 2010: 916–119; Peyrot 2013: 825.
29. PIE **g^wm-sk-* > PT **k^wəmnəsk-* ‘come’ (present stem)
 TB *kənməsk-* | TA *k^wämnäs-* (DThTA: 122a)
 Adams 2013: 170–171; Malzahn 2010: 571–572; Peyrot 2013: 732.
30. PIE *g^wreh₂-* → **g^wrh₂-mr-* > PT **kramər* ‘heaviness’, der.adj. *kramərt^stse* ‘heavy’
 TB *krāmār* /krāmār/, der.adj. *kramartstse^{*}* /kramərt^stse/ | TA der.adj. *krāmārts*
 (DThTA: 161a)
 Adams 2013: 230–231; Kroonen 2013: 312; Ringe 1996: 8.
 — The precise derivation of this word from the root PIE **g^wreh₂-* ‘be heavy’ is unclear, as there is no exactly corresponding formation elsewhere in Indo-European. The reconstruction with a zero-grade, **g^wrh₂mr-*, is attractive because we know that a vocalized laryngeal became PT **a*. An An *o*-grade as in the reconstruction **g^wroh₂-mr-* (Ringe 1996: 8) would be unexpected, and the development of **oH* in Tocharian is quite unclear (see subsection 2.4.5).
31. PIE **g^wrh₂-uon-* > PT **kərwen^ye* ‘rock, stone’
 TB *kärweñe^{*}*, pl. *kärweñi* /kärwéni/ | TA *kärwaṃ^{*}* (DThTA: 125b)
 Adams 2013: 176; Ringe *apud* Kim 1999: 151 fn. 26.
 — The lack of an initial labiovelar in Tocharian A may be due to a dissimilation with the following *-w-* (Ringe *apud* Kim 1999: 151 fn. 26). The laryngeal was not vocalized in this position, see also 2.3.1.
32. PIE **g^when-* ‘hit’ → *g^wh₁n-sk-* > PT **kəsk(a)-* ‘scatter, strike apart’
 TB *kəsk(a)-* ‘scatter’ | TA *käskā-* (DThTA: 134a)
 Adams 2013: 189; LIV: 218–219; Malzahn 2010: 596; Peyrot 2013: 739.
33. PIE *h₁eg^wh-* → ± **h₁e-h₁g^wh-* > PT **yok-* ‘drink’
 TB *yok-* | TA *yok-* (DThTA: 373a)
 Adams 2013: 551–552; Kim 2000: 153–155; Kloekhorst 2008: 236–237; Malzahn 2010: 810–811; Peyrot 2013: 801.
 — Kim instead reconstructs a paradigm **h₁ēh₂g^wh-* : **h₁eh₂g^wh-* > PT **yek^w-* : **ok^w-*, from which **yok-* resulted by a crossing of the two forms, dismissing the possibility of secondary rounding from **e* to **o* due to **k^w* as required by the

reconstruction **h₂eh₂g^{wh}-* (Kim 2000: 153-155). The Anatolian cognate can be better understood departing from **h₂eg^{wh}-*: **h₂g^{wh}-*, however, with no place for the **h₂* added by Kim (see Kloekhorst 2008: 236-237), so that a reduplicated reconstruction of **h₂eh₂g^{wh}-* for Tocharian and subsequent rounding from **yek^w-* to PT **yok-* seems preferable to me.

34. PIE **h₂ei-* → imp. **h₂id^{hi}* > PT imp. **pəṣə* ‘go!’ (**p-* marks the imperative)

TB *paṣ* /pəṣ/ | TA *piṣ*

Jasanoff 1987: 106-112.

— The TA vowel *i* does not correspond to TB *a* /ə/, and would have to be analogical on the basis of the corresponding verb root *y-* ‘go’.

35. PIE **h₂ekuo-* > PT **yək^{we}* ‘horse’

TB *yakwe* /yəkwe/ | TA *yuk* (DThTA: 370b)

Adams 2013: 528-529.

36. PIE **h₂esh₂-r* > PT **yəsar* ‘blood’

TB *yasar* /yəsar/ | TA *ysār* (DThTA: 382b)

Adams 2013: 525; Beekes 2010: 366; Kloekhorst 2008: 256-260.

— Adams derives this from a “collective” **h₂esh₂ōr*, but PT **yəsar* matches the “non-collective” **h₂ésh₂r* quite exactly, and it is the latter that has direct correspondences in other Indo-European languages, such as Hitt. *ešhar*, Gr. *ἔαρ*, etc. (Kloekhorst 2008: 256-260; Beekes 2010: 366)

37. PIE **h₂i-tr-* → ?**h₂itōr* > PT **yatar* ‘path, road, way’

TB der. *ytārye* /ytārye/ | TA *ytār* (DThTA: 376a)

Adams 2013: 559; Kortlandt 1988b: 84-85.

— The precise reconstruction of the suffix is difficult, since non-Tocharian cognates like Latin *iter* show a zero-grade. Such a reconstruction will not work for Tocharian: **h₂itr* should yield ***yatar* with a /ə/ rather than /a/ in the second syllable. This /a/ needs to be accounted for in some way. Adams reconstructs a collective **h₂itōr*, which is dubious due to the lack of other evidence for this formation. Kortlandt (1988b: 84-85) takes the **-ar* as analogous after PT **yəsar* ‘blood’ (TB *yasar*, TA *ysār*), replacing expected ***yatar*. The reason for this analogy is rather unclear, however, as there is no other connection between the two words, aside from a superficial similarity.

38. PIE **h₁leng^{wh}-* > PT **lānk-* ‘hang, dangle’
 TB *lānk-* | TA *lānk-* (DThTA: 399b)
 Adams 2013: 598 (**leng-*); Malzahn 2010: 839–841; Peyrot 2013: 476, 808.
39. PIE **h₁leng^{wh}-* ? → **h₁long^{wh}o-* > PT **lenke* ‘valley, cleft’
 TB *lenke*
 Adams 2013: 608.
 — Might be derived from the verb for ‘to hang’ with semantics similar to German *Hang* ‘slope, hill’, *Abhang* ‘slope’. Chams Bernard (p.c., 28-03-2024) instead suggests a loanword from Old Steppe Iranian **laenækæ*, as reflected in Ossetic Iron *laenk* and Digoron *laencæ* ‘ravine’, although this word itself does not have an etymology.
40. PIE **h₁leng^{wh}-* → **h₁lng^(w)hu-* → **h₁lng^(w)hu-tio* > PT **lānk^wtse* ‘easy, light (not heavy)’
 TB *lañk_utse* /*lānk^wtse*/
 Adams 2013: 590–591.
 — To be derived from a *u*-stem **h₁lng^(w)hu-* also seen in Gr. ἐλαχύς ‘small’ and Skt. *laghú-* ‘light’, *raghú-* ‘swift’ rather than directly from the root **h₁leng^{wh}-*. This accounts for the labiovelar reflex.
41. PIE **h₁nek-* → **h₁nk-* > PT **enk-* ‘seize, take’
 TB *enik-* | TA *emtsa-* (DThTA: 70a)
 Adams 2013: 81–82; Malzahn 2010: 538–539; Peyrot 2013: 725.
42. PIE **h₁reg^w-* → **h₁rg^wmō-* or **h₁rg^(w)-u-mō-* > PT **orkāmo* ‘dark; darkness’
 TB *orkamo* /*orkāmo*/ | TA *orkām* (DThTA: 86b)
 Adams 2013: 128.
 — The derivation of PT **orkāmo* via **h₁rg^(w)-u-mō-* rather than directly from **h₁rg^wmō-* was suggested to me by Professor Lubotsky (p.c., 15-10-2024). It would account for the vowel TAB *o* with *u*-umlaut instead of by *o*-umlaut caused by PIE **ō*, which has no good parallels. See the discussion at the end of 2.5.3.
43. PIE **h₁reg^w-* → **h₁rg^wont-* > PT **erkent* ‘black’
 TB m.obl.sg. *erkent* | TA m.obl.sg. *arkant* (DThTA: 15b)
 Adams 2013: 101.

44. PIE **h₂rud^h-ro-* > PT **ratre* ‘red’
TB *ratre* /rǎtre/ | TA *rtär* (DThTA: 394b)
Adams 2013: 570–571.

45. PIE **h₂eǵ-* > PT **ak-* ‘lead, guide, drive’
TB *ak-* | TA *āk-* (DThTA: 23a)
Adams 2013: 38–39; Malzahn 2010: 519–520; Peyrot 2013: 720.

46. PIE **h₂eǵu-* > PT der. **ak^wat^se* ‘sharp’
TB *akwatse* /ak^wǎt^se/
Adams 2013: 5; Pinault 2008: 445.

47. PIE **h₂enh₁-* → **h₂enh₁-ske/o-* > PT **anask-* ‘inhale’
TB *anask-*
Adams 2013: 12–13; Malzahn 2010: 524; Peyrot 2013: 721.

48. PIE **h₂enh₁-* ‘breathe’ > **ana-* > der. *ana-elme* > PT **ǎnǎlme-* ‘living being’
TB *onolme*
Adams 2013: 121; Peyrot 2010: 72.

49. PIE **h₂erǵ-* → **h₂erǵu-* > PT **ark^{wi}* ‘white’
TB *ārkwi* | TA *ārki* (DHTA: 43b)
Adams 2013: 52–53.

50. PIE **h₂nt-b^hoh₁-* > PT **antpu-* ‘both’
TA f. *āmpuk* (DThTA: 39a)
Hilmarsson 1989b: 56–58; Ringe 1996: 89
— The feminine gender of TA *āmpuk* is unexpected with its derivation from PIE **h₂(e)ntb^hoh₁-*, see Hilmarsson (1989b: 56–58). The masculine form is TA *āmpi*.
Cf. TB *antapi* /antǎpǎy/ ~ *antpi* /ǎntpǎy/

51. PIE **h₂og-eh₂-*, or **h₂eug-* → *?*h₂ugeh₂-* > PT **oko* ‘fruit; result, effect’
TB *oko*
Adams 2013: 115; Del Tomba 2002: 190.
— TA *oko* ‘id.’ is borrowed from Tocharian B (DThTA: 78b). The derivation from the root PIE **h₂eug-* ‘grow’ to **h₂ugeh₂-* is proposed by Del Tomba (2020: 190),

while **h₂ogeh₂* has parallels in Lith. *úoga* ‘berry’, OCS *agoda* ‘fruit’, etc., and more distantly Goth. *akran* ‘fruit’, Eng. *acorn*, etc. (see Adams 2013: 115). Both PIE **h₂ogeh₂* and *?*h₂ugeh₂* would likely give the same result in Tocharian, as we find both *o*-umlaut of pre-PT **e* (from PIE **o*) and of **u*, cf. quasi-PIE **someh₂m* > TB *somo* ‘one:F.OBL.SG’ and PIE **uksōn* > TB *okso* ‘ox’.

52. PIE **h₂ster-* > PT der. **ścārəye* ‘star’

TB *ściryē* | TA *śre**, nom.pl. *śreñ* (DThTA: 482b)

Adams 2013: 701.

53. PIE **h₂ueh₂nto-* > PT **w^yente* ‘wind’

TB *yente* | TA *want* (DThTA: 423b)

Adams 2013: 546.

54. PIE **h₃emso-* > PT **anse* ‘shoulder’

TB *āntse* /*ánt^se*/ | TA *es* (DThTA: 74a)

Adams 2013: 46; Beekes 2010: 1679–1680; Kloekhorst 2008: 178.

— Initial **h₂* could be reconstructed as one way to account for the Tocharian **a-* (Kloekhorst 2008: 178), but that would require an unexpected *o*-grade in Greek *ᾠμος*. **h₃* would cause a development to **o* from the *e*-grade **h₃emso-*, and is therefore reconstructed by Beekes (2010: 1679–1680). The development of initial **h₃e-* in Tocharian is uncertain due to a lack of reliable examples, and thus could in principle be assumed to be *a-* just like **h₂e-*; cf. **h₃ewis* ‘sheep’ for the same issue. However, laryngeal colouring of PIE **e* to pre-PT **o* does seem to be found in PIE **g^weh₃u-* to TB *ke_u* ‘cow’ (q.v.) and in **h₃eros-* to TB *ere* ‘form, appearance’ (q.v.), if this does not reflect **h₃oro-* instead, so that it difficult to decide either way. Adams assumes **Hōmso-*, with the very uncertain development from **ō* to **a* (see subsection 2.4.5). Both the precise reconstruction and the phonological development of this word are too uncertain to use it in further argumentations.

55. PIE **h₃er-* ‘rise up’ → **h₃er-* or **h₃or-* > PT **er-* ‘evoke, cause’

TB *er-* | TA *ar-* (DThTA: 14a)

Adams 2013: 98–99 (**h₃or-*); Kloekhorst 2008: 200; Malzahn 2010: 541–542; Peyrot: 2013: 726.

- Tocharian has a causative meaning of the Indo-European root. The ablaut grade from which PT **er-* is derived is unclear, as this could in principle reflect either **h₃er-* or **h₃or-*. Adams argues that the Hittite cognate precludes a reconstruction of **h₃*, and thus reconstructs **h₃or-* instead, but see Kloekhorst (2008: 200) in favour of **h₃*.
56. PIE **h₃er-* → **h₃er-os-* or **h₃or-o-* > PT **ere* ‘form, appearance’
TB *ere*
Adams 2013: 99; Del Tomba 2020: 84.
- The s-stem PIE **h₃eros-* derived from the verb **h₃er-* is paralleled in Greek ὄρος ‘mountain’ and Hittite *ḫaršar*, *ḫaršn-* ‘head; person; front; beginning’. For Tocharian, a thematic **h₃oro-* from the same root would phonologically have the same outcome. If initial **h₃e-* is taken to become TB *a-*, as appears to be the case in TB *āntse* /*ánt^se*/ from **h₃emso-* (q.v.) and TB *ā_uw* ‘ewe’ from **h₃eui-* (q.v.), the reconstruction **h₃eros-* would not be possible for TB *ere* and thus **h₃oro-* should be preferred. The validity of the change **h₃e-* to TB *a-* remains uncertain, however. The thematic inflection of TB *ere* with an obl.pl. *erem* can be secondary and does not provide conclusive proof for a reconstruction **h₃oro-* over **h₃eros-* (Del Tomba 2020: 84). The reconstruction **h₃eros-* has better parallels in the other Indo-European languages.
57. PIE **h₃eui-* ‘sheep’ > PT **awā*, pl. *awāyā* ‘ewe’
TB *ā_uw* /*āw*/, pl. *awi* /*awāy*/
Adams 2013: 38; Beekes 2010: 1061; De Vaan 2008: 437–438; Kloekhorst 2008: 338; Lubotsky 1990: 130.
- Alternatively reconstructed with initial **h₂-* specifically to account for the Tocharian **a-* (e.g., Adams 2013: 38). The argument that Lycian **χawa-* ‘sheep’ would also require **h₂* has been addressed and rejected by Kloekhorst (2008: 338). Initial **h₃* would accord well with the reflexes in the other Indo-European languages, especially the initial *h-* of Armenian *hoviw* ‘shepherd’ from **h₃eui-peh₂-* (Lubotsky 1990: 130). The general assumption is that **h₃e-* yields Tocharian **o-* rather than **a-*, but there are only very few possible examples of that development, and none seem to be completely reliable. The *e*-grade expected in an *i*-stem would not yield the *o*-vocalism of Latin *ovis* ‘sheep’, Greek ὄϊς ‘sheep’ with **h₂* instead of **h₃* (see De Vaan 2008: 437–438, Beekes

2010: 1061), and an *o*-grade could not regularly yield Hitt. *ḫāui-* ‘sheep’ ($*h_3o >$ Hitt. $/ʔā/$; see Kloekhorst 2008: 75), Skt. *ávi-* (with Brugmann’s law, $*h_3oui-$ should have regularly become Skt. $**ávi-$; see Lubotsky 1990: 130). A reconstruction $*h_3eui-$ thus best accounts for all reflexes except the Tocharian one, where it would require the assumption that $*h_3e-$ became PT $*a-$. On this same issue, see the discussion under PIE $*h_3emso-$ ‘shoulder’ above.

58. PIE $*h_3ok^w-s-$ > PT $*ek$ ‘eye’
TB ek^* | TA ak (DThTA: 1b)
Adams 2013: 78–79.

59. PIE $*kleu-$ → $*kleu-mō-$ > PT $*klyomo$ ‘noble’
TB $klyomo$ | TA $klyom$ (DThTA: 171a)
Adams 2013: 250.

60. PIE $*kmtom$ ($*h_1kmtom$ / $*dkmtom$) > PT $*kante$ ‘hundred (100)’
TB $kante$ / $kānte$ | TA $kānt$ (DThTA: 121a)
Adams 2013: 146–147.

61. PIE $*kuō$, acc. $*kuonm$ > PT $*k^{(w)}u$, obl. $*k^wenə$ ‘dog’
TB ku , $kwem$ | TA ku , obl. kom (DThTA: 136b)
Adams 2013: 190.

62. PIE $*kedh_2-$, prs. $*kdnh_2-$ / $*kndh_2-$ > PT $*kəta-$, prs. $*kānta-$ ‘strew’
TB $kəta-$, $kānta$ (>> $kətna-$) | TA $kātā-$, $kānā-$ (DThTA: 119a)
Adams 2013: 166–167; Malzahn 2010: 564–565; Peyrot 2013: 730.

63. PIE $*keh_2u-$ ‘strike’ > PT $*kaw-$ ‘kill’
TB $kaw-$ | TA $kāw-$
Adams 2013: 222; Malzahn 2010: 606–607; Peyrot 2013: 728.

64. PIE **k^wek^wlo-* ‘wheel; circle’ > PT **k^wək^w(ə)le* ‘cart, wagon, chariot’
TB *kokale* | TA *kukäl* (DThTA: 137a)
Adams 2013: 214.

65. PIE **k^wel-* ‘turn’ → **k^wolo-* > PT **kele* ‘navel’
TB *kele*
Adams 2013: 211.

66. PIE **k^wetuores* > PT **k^ʷətwerə* ‘four (4)’
TB *śtwer* | TA *śtwar* (DThTA: 478b)
Adams 2013: 703.

67. PIE **k^wi-so* > PT **k^wəse* ‘who’
TB *k_ise* | TA *kus* (DThTA: 146a)
Adams 2013: 199–201.

68. PIE **k^wo-* → ±**k^wo-tos* > PT **kete* ‘whose, to whom, for whom’
TB *kete*
Adams 2013: 203–204.

69. PIE **k^wreih₂-* → **k^wrih₂-wor* > PT **k^wəryār* ‘commerce, trade’
TB *karyor* /*káryor*/ | TA *kuryar* (DThTA: 143a)
Adams 2013: 153.
— See the discussion in subsection 2.3.3.2.

70. PIE **k^wrih₂-*, prs. **k^wrinh₂-* > PT **kərya-*, prs. **kərna-* ‘buy’
TB *kərya-*, prs. *kərna-*
Adams 2013: 174–175; Malzahn 2010: 577; Peyrot 2013: 734.

71. PIE **leuk-* > PT der. **lək^wtse* ‘bright, light’
TB *lak_itse* /*lák^wt^se*/
Adams 2013: 589.

72. PIE **leuk-* → **leuk-o(s)-* > PT **l^ʷuke* ‘shine, splendour’
TB *l^ʷuke*
Adams 2013: 616.

73. PIE **limn-* > PT **lyamə* ‘lake’
 TB *lyam* /lám/ | TA *lyäm* (DThTA: 410b)
 Adams 2013: 614.
74. PIE ? **lug-lo-* > PT **ləkle* ‘pain, sorrow’
 TB *lakle* /lákke/
 Adams 2013: 589–590.
 — There is no exact corresponding formation in other Indo-European languages, but Gr. λευγαλέος ‘wretched, unhappy’ and λυγρός ‘id.’ are close. If assimilation of **r* to **l* in Tocharian is assumed, a PIE **lugró-* could potentially have yielded both TB *lakle* and Gr. λυγρός (cf. Adams 2013: 589–590), but this assimilation in Tocharian would be without parallels and thus uncertain.
75. PIE **luHs*, pl. **luHs-h₂* > PT obl.sg. *luwa*, pl. **hwasa* ‘animal’
 TB *luwo*, obl.sg. *luwa*, pl. *hwāsa* | TA *lu*
 Del Tomba 2019: 131–133; differently Adams 2013: 606–607.
 — Del Tomba (2020: 131–133) has argued that the nominative singular *luwo* is an analogical creation replacing expected nom.-obl.sg. *luwa* on the basis of the names of other animals that show nom.sg. *-o* ~ obl.sg. *-a*. The meaning ‘louse’ found in the Germanic **lūs* and Celtic **luwā* probably developed from the meaning ‘animal’ of the Tocharian. Cf. Irish *míol* ‘animal, insect, creature; louse’ from Old Irish *míl* ‘id.’ next to Scottish Gaelic *mial* ‘louse’. In Scottish Gaelic the archaic meaning ‘animal’ is preserved only in certain cases such as the name of a sea monster, *mial-mhòr a’ chuain* lit. ‘great *mial* of the sea’, where *mial* is not a ‘louse’.
76. PIE **medʰ-u-* > PT **mʷətə* ‘honey’
 TB *mit*
 Adams 2013: 494.
77. PIE **meh,n-s-* → *meh,n-ē(n)-* > PT **mʷenʷe* ‘moon, month’
 TB *meñe* | TA *mañ* (DThTA: 329b)
 Adams 2013: 503.

78. PIE **-mh₂no-* > PT **-mane* present participle suffix
TB *-mane* | TA *-māṃ*
Klingenschmitt 1975.

79. PIE **nek̑-* → *nek̑u-*, gen.sg. *n̑kuos* > PT **enk̑we* ‘man’
TB *enk̑we* | TA *oñk* (DThTA: 80a)
Adams 2013: 82–83.

80. PIE **neud-* → **nud-sk-* > PT **natk-* ‘hold off, push away’
TB *natka-* | TA *nätk-*
Malzahn 2010: 682–683; Adams 2013: 356–357; Peyrot 2013: 764.

81. PIE **-nti* > PT **-n̑t̑ə* prs.act.3pl. verbal ending
TA *-ñc*
Malzahn 2010: 35–36; Peyrot 2013: 415
— Both Malzahn (2010: 35–36) and Peyrot (2013: 415) with ample further references.

82. PIE **nok̑wt-* → **nok̑wt-u-* > PT **nok̑tə* ‘night’
TA adv. *nok̑te* ‘last evening’, adv. *nok̑tiṃ* ‘in the evening’ (DThTA: 257a, 257b)
Pinault 1990: 184–190; Pinault 2008: 424.

83. PIE **nok̑wt-* → **nok̑wt-eu-io-* > PT **nekt̑əw̑ye* ‘at night, last night’
TB *nekc̑iye* / *nekc̑iye* | TA *nak̑cu* (DThTA: 239a)
Adams 2013: 363; Pinault 1990: 184–190; Pinault 2008: 424.

84. PIE **ok̑tō* > PT *ok̑tə* ‘eight : acht (8)’, der. **ok̑tukə* ‘eight (80)’
TB *ok̑t* | TA *ok̑ät, ok̑tuk* (DThTA: 77a, 79b)
Adams 2013: 115–116; Ringe 1996: 89.
— The base numeral TB *ok̑t* lost the expected final *-u* under the influence of *ʃukt* ‘seven’ or its ancestor PT **s̑əptə* (TA *ʃpät*), but it remained in the Tocharian A decad *ok̑tuk* ‘eighty’ (Ringe 1996: 89).

85. PIE **peh₂-nt-* → **peh₂-nt-es* > PT m.pl. **pon̑t̑ə* (**pān̑t̑ə*) ‘all’
TB *poñc* | TA *poñś* (DThTA: 286b)
Adams 2013: 432–433.

86. PIE **peh₂-nt-* → **peh₂-nt-ih₂* > PT **pont^sa-* (?**pānt^sa*) ‘all’
 TA f.obl.sg. *pontsām* (DThTA: 286b)
 Pinault 2008: 524.
 — The feminine displays the development of PIE **-ntih₂*, which this word is meant to illustrate in the main text. The TA *o* can probably only result from PIE **eh₂* as in *poke* from **b^heh₂ǵ^hu-* ‘arm’ above.
87. PIE **pek^w-* > PT **pək-* ‘cook, ripen (act. = tr.; mid. = intr.)’
 TB *pək-* | TA *päk-* (DThTA: 275a)
 Adams 2013: 393–394; Malzahn 2010: 700–701; Peyrot 2013: 770.
88. PIE **pek^w-* → **pek^w-l* > PT **p^ʷək^wəl*, pl. *p^ʷək^wəla* ‘year’
 TB *pikul*, pl. *pikwala* | TA *p_ukäl* (~*pkul*), pl. *puklā* (DThTA: 288b)
 Adams 2013: 410–411; Pinault 2008: 446.
89. PIE **preK-* → **prK-ske/o-* → pre-PT **proskeh₂* > PT **prosko* (?**prāskā*) ‘fear’
 TB *prosko*, der. *proskiye* | TA der. *praski* (DThTA: 308a)
 Adams 2013: 455.
90. PIE **penk^wto-* > PT **p^ʷənkte* ‘fifth’
 TB *pinkte* | TA *pänt* (DThTA: 277a)
 Adams 2013: 411.
91. PIE **ph₂tēr* > PT **pacer* ‘father’
 TB *pācer* /*pācer*/ | TA *pācar* (DThTA: 268a)
 Adams 2013: 390.
92. PIE **plh₂-no-* ‘full’ > PT der. **pəllewə* ‘full moon’
 TB *pälle_u* /*pəlléw*/, obl.sg. *pällent* /*pəllént*/
 Adams 2013: 406.
 — The laryngeal was evidently lost, see also 2.3.1.
93. PIE **prHuo-* > PT **pərwe* ‘first’
 TB *parwe* /*pərwe* | TA der. *pärwat* ‘first, oldest’ (DThTA: 279a)
 Adams 2013: 383–384.

94. PIE **puh₂-r* > PT **pəwar* ‘fire’
TB *puwar* /pəwar/ | TA *por*
Adams 2013: 421–422; Winter 1965a: 192–193.

95. PIE **seh₂i-* > PT **soy-* (**sāy-*) ‘be sated’
TB *soy-*, prt.ptc. *sosoyu* | ? → TA prt.ptc. *sasyu* with *sāy(n)-* in 96.
Adams 2013: 770–771; Malzahn 2010: 955; Peyrot 2013: 833 fn. 949, 835.

96. PIE **seh₂i-* → **sh₂i-nu-* > PT **səyn-* ‘satisfy’
TB *səyn-* | TA *sāy(n)-*, prt.ptc. *sasyu* (DThTA: 522a–b)
Adams 2013: 757; Friis 2024: 372–373; Hackstein 1995: 299–300; Malzahn 2010: 945–956; Peyrot 2013: 833.
— The lack of palatalization may be due to the laryngeal blocking it in the sequence **sh₂i*, but it could also have been removed due to analogy with the related verb PT **soy-* ‘be sated’ (see Friis 2024: 372–373.).

97. PIE **sem-* → f. **someh₂-* > PT **somo* (**sāmā*) ‘one (1), some’ (f.obl.sg.)
TB *somo* | TA *šom* (DThTA: 511b)
Adams 2013: 721–722; Hilmarsson 1986: 33; Pinault 2008: 437–438.

98. PIE **septm* > PT **sʷəptə* ‘seven (7)’
TB *šukt* | TA *špät* (DThTA: 501b)
Adams 2013: 720.
— The consonant cluster in Tocharian B was influenced by *okt* ‘eight’ (Adams 2013: 720).

99. PIE **skHi-eh₂* > PT **skəyo* ‘shadow’
TB *skiyo* /skəyo/
Adams 2013: 773; Beekes 2010: 1351; Del Tomba 2020: 144–146; Ringe 1996: 18–19.
— The development of the word for ‘shadow’ in Tocharian is very difficult. See the discussions by Ringe (1996: 18–19) and Del Tomba (2020: 144–146), and cf. subsection 2.4.2.

100. PIE **sneh₂-ru*, pl. **sneh₂-ur-h₂* ‘sinew’ > PT **sʷnʷorə*, pl. *sʷnawra* ‘sinew’
TB *šñor*, pl. *šnaura*
Adams 2013: 729; Del Tomba 2020: 87–88.

- The nominative is from pre-PIE **sneh₁-ur* with metathesis of final *-ru-* (Del Tomba 2020: 87–88). The original order **-ur-* is preserved in the plural *šnaura* (ibid.).
101. PIE **sok^wo-* ‘sap’ > ? PT **sek^we* ‘pus’
 TB *sekwe* | TA *saku**, ins.sg. *sakuyo* (DThTA: 506a)
 Adams 2013: 764; Beekes 2010: 1093.
 — The etymological connection with Gr. ὀπός ‘plant juice’ (secondary loss of expected initial *h-*, see Beekes 2010: 1093), Lith. *sokaĩ* (m.pl.) ‘resin’, OCS *sokъ* ‘sap, juice of fruits’, Alb. *gjak* ‘blood’, though semantically not quite exact, nevertheless seems reasonable.
102. PIE **solh₂uo-* > PT **selwe* ‘whole’, der. **solme* ‘completely’
 TB der. *solme* | TA *salu* (DThTA: 511a)
 Hilmarsson 1986: 32; Adams 2013: 771
 — TA *salu* clearly has not undergone *u*-umlaut of **e* (PIE **o*), apparently because the word was **selwe* at the time, with a consonantal **-w-* rather than umlauting **-u* (cf. TA *maku* from **mekwa*, TB *mekwa* ‘nails’). TB *solme* did undergo *u*-umlaut, presumably from a derivation that looked like **selu-me-* at the time, whence **solume* to **solāme* and eventually PT **solme* with syncope, and ultimately TB *solme* without further changes.
103. PIE **spend-* > PT **spānta-* ‘trust’
 TB *spānta-* | TA *spāntā-* (DThTA: 543a)
 Adams 2013: 785–786; Malzahn 2010: 967–968; Peyrot 2013: 838.
104. PIE **splend-* > PT **planta-* ‘be pleased’
 TB *planta-* | TA *plantā-* (DThTA 315a)
 Adams 2013: 459; Malzahn 2010: 741–742; Peyrot 2013: 781.
105. PIE **stemb^hH-* > PT **stāma-* ‘stand’ (sbj./prt. stem, suppletive with prs. *kāl-*)
 TB *stāma-* | TA *štāmā-* (DThTA: 131a)
 Adams 2013: 184–186; LIV: 595; Kroonen 2013: 473; Peyrot 2013: 547.
 — Adams prefers a connection with **stem-* (or rather, **stemH-*, cf. Kroonen 2013: 473), as found in Germanic (e.g., ON *stemma* ‘stem, stop, dam up’) and Baltic (e.g., Lith. *stūmti* ‘shove, push’), but the preterite TB *ścama* /*ścōma*/

corresponds closely to Ved. *ástambhūt*, from **(h,e-)stemb^hH-t*, so that this connection is to be preferred (see Peyrot 2013: 547, LIV: 595).

106. PIE **sueh₂d-* → **suh₂d-ro-* > **sware* ‘sweet’
 TB *swāre* /*swāre*/ | TA *swār* (DThTA: 547b)
 Adams 2013: 795–796.

107. PIE **suid-ie-* > PT **saya-* ‘sweat’
 TB *saya-* | TA *syā* (DThTA)
 Adams 2013: 756; Malzahn 2010: 947; Peyrot 2013: 832.

108. PIE **teh₂-ns* > PT **tons* (?**tāns*)
 TB (arch.) *tom* | TA *tos-āṃ*
 Del Tomba 2018: 347; 2020: 216–220

109. PIE **tek^w-* → *tek^wos-* > PT **tʰəke* ‘river’
 TB *cake* /*cáke*/
 Adams 2013: 267.

110. PIE **temp-* > PT **tʰəmp-* ‘be able to’
 TB *cəmp-* | TA *cāmp-* (DThTA: 184a)
 Adams 2013: 272–273.
 — The semantic connection with PIE **temp-* ‘stretch’ is not entirely compelling, but possible; cf. German *reichen* ‘reach; suffice, be enough’ from an earlier meaning ‘stretch’ as more obvious in Dutch *reiken* ‘reach, extend, stretch out’. From ‘suffice, be enough’, a development along the lines of ‘I am enough (for ...)’ to ‘I am able to do (...)’ can be assumed.

111. PIE **-ti* > ? PT **-sʷə* prs.3sg. verbal ending
 TA *-(ä)ṣ*
 Jasanoff 1987: 110–111; Malzahn 2010: 32–33; differently Peyrot 2013: 413, differently again Pinault 2008: 620.

112. PIE **-ti* > ? PT **-sʷə*
 TA *-(ä)ṣ* (ablative ending)
 Jasanoff 1987: 109–110.

113. PIE **tuHom* > PT **tawe* ‘you (sg.)’
TB *tuwe* /tǎwe/ ~ *twe* | TA *tu* (DThTA: 216b)
Adams 2013: 319–320.
114. PIE **ueǵh-no-* > PT **wǎkne* ‘way, manner’
TB *yakne* | TA *wkäṃ* (DThTA: 448b)
Adams 2013: 518.
115. PIE **ueh₂st-u-* > PT **wostə* (?**wāstə*) ‘house’
TB *ost* | TA *wašt*
Adams 2013: 134; Beekes 2010: 158.
— A zero-grade **uh₂st-* (generalized in Greek ἄστυ; Beekes 2010: 158) should have yielded PT ***wastə*, whence TB ***wāst* /wást/ and TA ***wāšt*, since there is no known *u*-umlaut of **a* (from **h₂* or **h₂e*) to **o*. Tocharian must thus reflect the full-grade **ueh₂st-*. The vocalism of TA *wašt* cannot be explained as the result of *a*-umlaut in the plural **wostwa* (pace Adams 2013: 134), since all other certain cases of *a*-umlaut affect **e* rather than **o*.
116. PIE **ueik-os-* > PT **wǎike* ‘place’
TB *ike*, pl. *ykenta*
Adams 2013: 67.
117. PIE **uelh₂-* → **ulh₂-ntih₂* > PT **lant^sa* ‘queen’
TB *lāntsa* | TA *lānts* (DThTA: 397a)
Adams 2013: 594.
118. PIE **uelh₂-* → **ulh₂-ōnts*, gen. *ulh₂-ntos* > PT **wəlo*, gen. *lante* ‘king’
TB *walo* /wǎlo/, gen. *lānte* /lānte/ | TA *wäl*, gen. *lānt* (DThTA: 439b)
Adams 2013: 631; Lubotsky 1994.
119. PIE **uerǵ-* → **uerǵ-unt-ōn* > PT **wǎrk^wānto* ‘wheel’
TB *yerkwantō**, obl. *yerkwantai* | TA *wärkänt* (DThTA: 436a)
Adams 2013: 547–548; Kim 1999: 168.
— The *ye-* of Tocharian B does not match the *wä-* of Tocharian A and may be secondary, perhaps analogous to the *ye-* of *yerter* ‘wheelrim fellow’ (Kim 1999: 168; Adams 2013: 547–548).

120. PIE **ues-r* ‘spring’ → ? **uesōr-* > der. PT **wʷəsare* ‘wheat; grain’
TB *ysāre* | TA *wsār* (DThTA: 456b)
Adams 2013: 567–568; Peyrot 2018b: 251–252.
121. PIE **uid-uon-* > PT **wəwe* ‘learnèd, skillful’
TB *uwe*
Adams 2013: 76–77.
122. PIE **uih,ro-* ‘man’ > PT **wʷire* ‘young, juvenile’
TA *wir* (DThTA: 446a)
Friis 2024: 22–24; Hackstein 2017: 1314.
— The semantic match between Tocharian *wir* and the other Indo-European forms is inexact, since elsewhere it means ‘man, hero’ rather than ‘young, juvenile’. For a discussion, see Friis (2024: 22–24).
123. PIE **uiso-* > PT **wəse* ‘poison’
TB *wase* /wəse/ | TA *wäs* (DThTA: 442b)
Adams 2013: 634.
124. PIE **uksōn-* > PT **okso* ‘ox’
TB *okso* | TA *opäs**, pl. *opsi* (DThTA: 83b)
Adams 2013: 117.
125. PIE **ulkʷo-* > PT **wəlkʷe* ‘wolf(?)’
TB *walkwe**, pl. *walkwi*
Adams 2013: 632.
— The meaning of the Tocharian is not quite certain. PK NS 30 a2: /// *ma ywārcä walkwi ramtä wīyäskeṃ m(ñ)cu(ṣkeṃ)* /// ‘amid ... they frighten the princes like *walkwi*’ with *walkwi* plausibly meaning ‘wolves’ (Adams 2013: 632). The preservation of the labiovelar next to PIE **o* is rare, but potentially paralleled in PIE **sokʷos* > PT **sekʷe*, q.v.
126. PIE **uod-r* → *ud-r-*, der.adj. *ud-r-io-* > PT **wər* ‘water’, der.adj. *wəṛəye* ‘dew; watery’
TB *war* /wər/, der.adj. *wriye** | TA *wär*, der.adj. *wri* (DThTA: 435a)
Adams 2013: 627–628, 672.

127. PIE **uōkʷs*, *uokʷ-* > PT **wek* ‘voice’

TB *wek* | TA *wak* (DThTA: 422a)

Adams 2013: 660; Beekes 2010: 1138.

- The Proto-Indo-European paradigm was nom.sg. **uōkʷs*, elsewhere *uokʷ-*: Sanskrit nom.sg. *vák*, acc.sg. *vácam*, Latin nom.sg. *vōx*, acc.sg. *vōcem* with a long vowel next to Greek acc.sg. ὄπα with a short vowel; the Greek nominative is not attested (see Beekes 2010: 1138 for details). The long vowel in Sanskrit *vácam* can derive from members of the paradigm with the shape **uokʷV* and the change from **o* to **ā* in open syllables (Brugmann’s Law), so that it can be derived from an alternating paradigm **uōkʷs*, *uokʷ-* regularly. The long vowel in Latin *vōcem* can be due to analogy with the nominative. The vowel **e* in PT **wek* must derive from the PIE short **o*, meaning that the vocalism of **uokʷ-*, as found in the Greek acc.sg. ὄπα, was generalized in Tocharian (Adams 2013: 660).

Etymological reference list 2: Samoyed

Below follows a numbered list of the Samoyed etymologies cited in chapter 3, with references to various Samoyed dictionaries, wordlists, and articles in which the etymologies are proposed or discussed. Translations of the Samoyed words are provided in English and Russian for the Proto-Samoyed head words, to aid in the retrieval of these words in current and any future dictionaries of Samoyed languages that use Russian as the matrix language.

- **Proto-Uralic** reconstructions are based on Janhunen (1981), *Uralisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (UEW), Sammallahti (1988), and various other sources which are cited for specific entries.
- **Proto-Samoyed** forms are generally reconstructed on the basis of *Samojedischer Wortschatz* (SW) by Janhunen (1977) or *Matorische Sprache* (MS) by Helimski (1997), which differ only in some details, with the updated interpretation of the development of PU **ä* and **e* as per Helimski (2005). If I deviate from their reconstruction or other reconstructions in the literature, the note will explain why. Some words in the individual Samoyed languages that are not found in more recent dictionaries are cited according to SW, whereby the abbreviations for authors of the original sources are kept; relevant here are only (C) for Castrén, (L) for Lehtisalo, (M) for Mikola and (T) for Tereščenko (see SW for the exact references).
- **Nganasan** forms are generally cited after the Nganasan-Russian dictionary of Kosterkina, Momde and Ždanova (2004) with a transliteration from the Cyrillic to the Roman alphabet. The abbreviation “NgSl.” is here used to refer to this dictionary. Whenever another source has a relevant Nganasan word missing from this dictionary, that source is cited instead.
- **Tundra Enets** forms are provided on the basis of Helimski’s unpublished Tundra Enets dictionary, here abbreviated as “EnSl.”.
- **Forest Enets** forms are taken from Olesya Khanina and Andrey Shluinsky’s unpublished Forest Enets wordlist, here abbreviated as “EnWl.”.
- **Tundra Nenets** is cited based on the dictionary of Tereščenko (1965), abbreviated as “T65” with the phonological transcription of Salminen (1998).
- **Forest Nenets** is phonologized similarly to Tundra Nenets after the rules of Salminen’s system (Salminen 2007), and as a direct transcription from Cyrillic of

the relevant entries in the Forest Nenets-Russian dictionary by Barmič & Vello (2002), here abbreviated “NeSl.”, in parentheses. The entries in Barmič & Vello are in some ways phonologically underdifferentiated when there are no minimal pairs, so that some information would be lost if only those entries are copied. For example, <a> may represent /a/ or /ǎ/.

- **Selkup** is cited after Alatalo’s Sölkupisches Wörterbuch (SkW; 2004), which provides “Common Selkup” headwords on the basis of the attested variation of the different dialects. Asterisks are employed to mark roots or stems that only exist in derivations, but other “Common Selkup” forms are given without asterisks as in the dictionary. Underlined segments indicate uncertainty. The number cited along with these forms refers not to the page number, but to the entry number in the dictionary.
- **Kamas** words are taken over from Kamassz Szótár (KSz) by Tamás Janurik (2021). As with Selkup, the associated numbers correspond to the entries, not to the pages.
- **Mator** is provided on the basis of Matorische Sprache (MS) by Helimski (1997). Helimski made a phonological and morphological analysis of all attested Mator material and provided Proto-Samoyed reconstructions where appropriate. I refer to the entry numbers of the Samoyed words in Helimski’s wordlist, rather than to the page numbers.

The order in which the words are presented in the alphabetical order below. Of these, the consonants * γ , * δ , * η and * r only occur word-internally, never word-initially:

a ä á č γ δ δ' e ė i ĵ j k l m n ŋ o p r s t u ü w

Some words show a discrepancy between Finno-Ugric * u and Samoyed * o (see subsection 3.6.3). They are here reconstructed with * o in Proto-Uralic, but the reconstructions with * u are provided as well for ease of interpretation. Whenever the entry with * u would have been placed differently in the relative order of the list, an unnumbered entry with a reference is provided. The general phonological developments from Proto-Uralic to Samoyed are discussed in chapter 3, with further references to the relevant literature), and will not be repeated here unless they are in some detail directly relevant for a specific entry.

1. PU **ačkal* > PS **asVL-* ‘step : шагать’
 Sk. *āsəl-* (SkW 230) | Km. *azəʔ-* (KSz 0077)
 Aikio 2002: 40–41; 2006a: 30; UEW: 19; Zhivlov 2023: 158.
 — The quality of the second-syllable vowel strictly speaking cannot be seen from either Selkup or Kamas, the only Samoyed languages with a reflex of this word. Expected to be PS **asəl-* with a **ə* rather than **ā/a* on the basis of the development of the first-syllable PU **a* to PS **a* rather than **ā* (cf. 3.7.2).
2. PU **aja-* ‘open’ > PS der. **íajâ-* ‘take off (clothes) : снять (одежду)’
 NeT der. *nyaasy*^o ‘id.’ (T65) | NeF *nyajăqsy*^o (NeSl. *njaŋaʃ*) | Sk. adj. *íajə* ‘naked : nackt’ (SkW 1675)
 Aikio 2002: 50, 2020: 20–21; SW: 106; UEW: 11.
 — The initial PS **í* is a secondary prothetic nasal. This **í-* would arise secondarily before word-initial vowels in Nenets, but not in Selkup, which thus suggests that it has to be reconstructed. However, the vowel in Selkup is also irregular, seeing as Sk. *a* normally reflects PS **ə* rather than PS **a*, which is expected to become Sk. *ā*. The same meaning as in Samoyed is found in Mansi and Khanty (see Aikio 2020: 20).
3. PU **aji* > PS **aj* ‘mouth : рот’
 Ng. *ŋaj* (NgSl.) | EnT *eʔ* (EnSl.) | NeT *nyah* (T65) | NeF *nya^oŋ syĩ* lit. ‘opening of the mouth’ (*nya^oŋ* from gen.sg. **ajən*) (NeSl. *njaŋ ši*) | Sk. *āj* (SkW 215) | Km. *aj* (KSz 0049) | Mt. *äŋ* (MS 76)
 SW: 20 (**äŋ*); UEW: 11.
4. PU **ajti* > PS **ajtâ* ‘blade : лезвие’
 Ng. *ŋatə* (NgSl.) | EnT *edo* (EnSl.) | NeT *nyant^o* (T65) | NeF der. e.g. *nyantutampyosy^o* ‘sharpen a knife : точить нож’ (NeSl. *njantutampjoš*) | Sk. *ājta* (SkW 217) | Km. *aj* (KSz 0050) | Mt. *ändä* (MS 74)
 SW: 20–21 (**äjta*); UEW: 12–13.
5. PU **äjmä* > PS **äjmä* ‘needle : игла’
 Ng. *nejmü* (NgSl.) | EnT *ee* (EnSl.) | EnF *nee* (EnWl.) | NeT *nyíbya* (T65) | Km. *ñimi* (KSz 0753) | Mt. *ime* (? *ime*) (MS 342)
 Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 22 (**ejmä* ~ **nejmä*); UEW: 22.

- With a prothetic initial nasal in most Samoyed languages, entirely regular in Nganasan and Tundra Nenets, but not in Kamas and Forest Enets. Tundra Enets and Mator show the expected original vowel-initial form.
6. PU **čaḍa-* > PS **sārā-* ‘rain : ишти (о дожде)’, der.n. **sārō* (?**sārāw*) ‘rain : дождь’
Ng. *sorud’a*, der.n. *sor’a* (NgSl.) | EnT *sara-*, der.n. *sare* (EnSl.) | EnF der.n. *sare* ‘rain’
| NeT der.n. *saryo* (T65) | NeF *xatasy*^o, der.adj. *xatyoj*^o (NeSl. *xātaš*, *xatjoj*) | Sk. *suārə-*
(SkW 2677a.) | Km. der. *surno* ‘rain : Regen : дождь’ (KSz 0985) | Mt. der.n. *sörüh* (?
sirüh ~ *sürüh*) (MS 908)
SW: 135–136; Sammallahti 1988: 540.
7. PU **čala-* > PS **čālā-* ‘flash : блестеть’
Ng. der. noun *solā* ‘brightness : блеск’ (NgSl.) | NeT der. *sal^owə*(*sy*^o) (T65) | Mt. *salə-*,
der. *saləmər-* (MS 842, 843)
Aikio 2002: 27–29; 2006a: 30.
— The change from PU **a-a* to PS **ā-ā* in this word is unusual and quite unique:
expected would be PS **čālā-* (cf. PU **kala* > PS **kālā* ‘fish’) or PS **čālā-* (as in
PU **kama* > PS **kamā* ‘scale’).
8. PU **čayka-* > PS **sāykV-* ‘stick into : воткнуть’, noun *sāykhā* ‘penis : пенис’
EnT noun *sago* (EnSl.) | EnF noun *sago* (EnWl.) | NeT noun *saŋk*^o (L) | Sk. *suāykhā-*
(SkW 2625)
Aikio 2006a: 24.
9. PU **čājćimä* | *čäčćimä* > PS **sāj³t³wə* ‘seven : семь (7)’
Ng. *šajbā* (NgSl.) | EnT *seḷo* (EnSl.) | EnF *seḷo* (EnWl.) | NeT *syíq^ow* (T65) | NeF *syeq^ow*
(NeSl. *še^ow*) | Sk. *sēlcu* (SkW 2741) | Km. *sej^obü* (KSz 0951) | Mt. *kej^obā* ~ ?*kej^obü* (MS
451)
Aikio 2020: 109–111; 2022a: 25; SW: 139.
— The development from PU **m* to PS **w* is irregular.
10. PU **čerki* > PS **ser* ‘ice; white; salt : лёд; белый; соль’
Ng. *sir* (NgSl.) | EnT *si^o* (EnSl.) | EnF *si^o* (EnWl.) | NeT *ser* (T65) | NeF *xēt* (NeSl. *xet*)
| Sk. *serā* (SkW 2697) | Km. der.? *siri* (KSz 0968) | Mt. der. *seret* (MS 874)
Aikio 2020: 126; SW 138.

- The consonant-final forms of the northern Samoyed languages should be taken as the regular reflex, indicating PS **sēr*. The Selkup reflex also derives from this, as it should have become ***sīrə* rather than *sērə* if derived from a PS **sērə* (see Helinski 2007 on the sound laws involved).
11. PU **čilmä* > PS **sājmä* ‘eye : глаз’
 Ng. *šejmī* (NgSl.) | EnT *sei* (EnSl.) | EnF *sej* (EnWl.) | NeT *sæw*^o (T65) | NeF *xäm*^o (NeSl. *xēm*) | Sk. *saji* (SkW 2562) | Km. *sima* (KSz 0957) | Mt. *sīme* (MS 886)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 132; UEW: 479.
 12. PU **čoδ’a* > PS **sājā* ‘wage war : вести войну’
 Ng. der. *souru* ‘warrior : воин’ (NgSl.) | NeT der. *sayu*^o ‘enemy army : войско противника’, *sayuw*^o ‘army : войско’ (T65)
 Aikio 2002: 27; 2015: 61.
 13. PU **čoji-* > PS **soj-* ‘be heard, be audible : быть слышным, слышаться’
 EnT der. *sōδoru* ‘loud sound : сильный шум’ (EnSl.) | EnF *sɔ-* (EnWl.) | NeT *sosy*^o (T65) | NeF *xosy*^o (NeSl. *xoš*)
 Aikio 2020: 132; UEW: 482–283.
 14. PU **čojma* > PS **sājmā* ‘sound’
 Ng. *sojmü* (Aikio 2015a: 16 fn. 5) | Sk. *sūmā* (SkW 2483)
 Aikio 2015: 16 fn. 5; 2020: 133
 15. PU **čoma* > PS **somā* ‘good : хороший’
 Ng. der. *sumugu* ‘success : удача’ (NgSl.) | EnT der. *sojda* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *sojza* (EnWl.) | NeT *səwa* (T65) | NeF *xoma* (NeSl. *xoma*) | Sk. *soma* (Skw 2469)
 Aikio 2020: 135; Salminen 2023: 380–385; SW: 132–133 (**sāmā*).
 — Tundra Nenets and Forest Enets seem to reflect PS **sāmā*, but Nganasan, Forest Nenets and Selkup can only reflect PS **somā*, which is in line with other Uralic cognates (see Aikio 2020: 135, Salminen 2023: 380–385).

16. PU **ćowi* (**ćuwi*) > PS **soj* (or **soâj?*) ‘throat : горло’
 EnT *sôô* (EnSl.) | EnF *so* (EnWl.) | NeT *syo* (T65) | NeF *syö* (NeSl. *šo*) | Sk. *sōl'* (SkW 2568) | Km. *soj* (KSz 0974) | Mt. *soj* ?*sōj* (MS 897)
 Aikio 2020: 145; Sammallahti 1988: 540 (**śoxi*; SW: 142).
 — Theoretically, a reconstruction PS **soâj* would also be possible. This might even be implied by the long vowel reflexes in Tundra Enets *sôô*, Selkup *sōl'* and potentially Mator *soj* ?*sōj* (thus given in MS, attested as ⟨soóschto⟩, analysable as /sosto/ or /sōsto/ with poss.3sg. *-to* and a regular development from *-j-* to *-s-* before the *-t-*). Nenets, Forest Enets, Selkup and Kamas would not show a clear reflex of a vowel sequence, and there is no Nganasan cognate to either confirm or disprove it. The Finno-Ugric languages reflect a preform **ćuwi* rather than **ćowi*.
- PU **ćuwi* ‘throat’ → see **ćowi*.
17. PU **ćüδ'i* > PS **sijä* ‘coal : уголь’
 EnT in compound *tuúsiö* (EnSl.) | Sk. *sićä/siće* (SkW 2556) | Km. der.? *si?* (KSz 0956) | Mt. *ki* (? *kī*, ? *kiji*) (MS 479)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 140; UEW: 477.
18. PU **ćülki-kći-* > PS **siäsä-* ‘spit : плевать’, der. noun *siäsö* (?**siäsäw*) ‘foam : пена’
 EnT *šiosi* (EnSl.) | Sk. *siäsä-* (SkW 2659) | Km. *suzä-*, der. noun *suzu* (KSz 0986)
 Aikio 2020: 148; Sammallahti 1988: 549 (**šülki-/šüδ'ki-*); UEW: 479–480.
19. PU **ćünćä* > PS **sünsä* ‘breast : грудь’
 Ng. *šinsä* (NgSl.) | EnT *šúđo* (EnSl.) | EnF *šuzu* (EnWl.) | ? cf. NeT *syunc*^o ‘youngest, dearest child : последний, младший ребенок’ | Mt. *künžü* (MS 595)
 Aikio 2020: 149–150; Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 144; UEW: 480.
 — The retention of PU **ü* as PS **ü* rather than **i* is surprising, as is the reduction of the second-syllable PU **-ä* to PS **-ä*, but the comparison otherwise seems too close to ignore (and cf. the development of PU **peksä-* ‘soften a hide’, where **-ä* was reduced as well and even lost); see also the discussion by Aikio (2020: 149–150)

20. PU *čaŋa- > PS *cāŋā- ‘rub, wear out (tr.) : натереть’ intr. *cāŋo- (?*cāŋāw-) ‘wear out (intr.) : изнашиваться’
 NeT *taja*(sy°), intr. *tajo*(sy°) (T65) | NeF der.tr. *tajałasy*°, der.intr. *tajałäsy*° (NeSl. *tajałáš, tajałäš*) | Km. *tajo-* (KSz 1150)
 Aikio 2002: 11–12; SW 151.
21. PU *čečä > PS *cecä ‘uncle (mother’s younger brother) : дядя (младший брат матери)’
 Ng. der. *titiďa* (NgSl.) | NeT *tyidyä* (T65) | Sk. *čičä (SkW)
 Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 33 (*cicä).
22. PU *čočki (*čučki) > ? PS *cocâ ‘pole : шест’
 Sk. čōčā (SkW 1060)
 Aikio 2013: 163–164.
 — The vowel *o instead of *u is unexpected, but the correspondence with PSaa. *coske ‘block of wood’, MdE čočko ‘log’ is otherwise regular (Aikio 2013: 163–164).
23. PU *d’emi > PS *jem ‘bird cherry : черёмуха обыкновенная’
 Sk. čemā, čīmā- | Km. *lem* (KSz 0533)
 Aikio 2012: 228; Sammallahti (1988: 536 (*d’ixmi); UEW: 65–66.
 — The vowel-final base čemā as given by SkW is secondary: PS **jemā would have become **čīmā, as in the genitive čīmān from *jemān (cf. Helimski 2007 on the relevant sound developments).
24. PU *d’ümä > PS *jimä ‘glue : клей’
 Ng. *d’imi* (NgSl.) | EnT *dee* (EnSl.) | EnF *d’ii* (EnWl.) | NeT *yibya* (T65) | NeF *jīmya* (NeSl. *djimja*) | Sk. čīmā (SkW 1469) | Km. *nīme* (KSz 0695) | Mt. *nīme, *nime* (MS 755)
 Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 45; UEW: 66.
25. PU *elä- > PS *elä- ‘live : жить’
 Ng. *ńilidi* (NgSl.) | EnT *ire-* (EnSl.) | EnF *d’iri-* (EnWl.) | NeT *yilye*(sy°) (T65) | NeF *jītyesy*° (NeSl. *djiłješ*) | Sk. *ilā- (SkW 344) | Km. der. *tīli* ‘lively : lebendig : живой’ (KSz 1371) | Mt. *ilā-* (MS 340)
 Sammallahti 1988: 536 (*ilā-); SW: 27 (*ilā- ~ *jilā-); UEW: 73.

- Forest Enets, Nenets and Kamas reflect a pre-form with a secondary initial palatal glide **j-*, thus seemingly reflecting PS **jelä-*. On account of other Uralic cognates without the initial **j-* and the lack of **j-* in the Nganasan and Selkup reflexes **elä-* is proper Proto-Samoyed form as well, with later prothesis of **j-* in Enets, Nenets and Kamas; see Sammallahti (1988: 536) and Zhivlov (2023: 167) rather than the alternating Proto-Samoyed reconstructions by SW and Aikio (2020: 43).
26. PU **ećiw-* > PS **eśo-* (**eśāw-*) ‘camp : встать чумом’
EnT *usu-* (EnSl.) | EnF *usu-* (EnWl.) | NeT *ηeso-* (T65)
Aikio 2012: 241; UEW: 18–19.
27. PU **eđi* ‘year’ > PS der. **erö* ‘autumn : осень’
NeT *ηeryo* (T65) | Sk. *era* (SkW 277) | Km. *ere* (KSz 0210) | Mt. *örö(h)* (MS 819)
Aikio 2012: 233–234; Sammallahti 1988: 552 (Proto-Finno-Permic **ooti*); SW 22 (**erâjâj* **erö*); UEW: 335–336 (**ode*).
28. PU **ekta-* > PS **itâ-* ‘hang up : повесить’, der.intr. **itö-* (**itâw-*) ‘hang : висеть’
Ng. *ηitidi* (NgSl.) | EnT *iða-* (EnSl.) | EnF *iða-* (EnWl.) | NeT *ηida*(sy°), *ηidyö*(sy°) (T65)
| NeF der.intr. *ηityosy*° (NeSl. *ηičoš*) | Sk. **it(t)ə-*, itr. *it(t)i-* (SkW 92) | Km. *edə-* (intr. *edü-*?) (KSz 199) | Mt. *idə-* (MS 335 **ita-*)
Aikio 2020: 51 (**itâ-*; **itö-*); SW: 25–26 (**it3-*; **itâ-*); Sammallahti 1988: 536.
29. PU **ela* > PS **il(ä)* ‘under; space underneath : вниз, под’
Ng. *ηilä* (NgSl.) | EnT *iro-* (EnSl.) | EnF *iro-* (EnWl.) | NeT *ηilä-* (T65) | NeF *ηilä-* (NeSl. *ηila-*) | Sk. **il-* ‘under : unter’, *ilä* ‘underside : das Untere’ (SkW 322) | Km. *jil* (KSz 0259)
Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 24; UEW: 6.
30. PU **ena-ep̄pi* > PS **ināpā* ‘father-in-law : тесть’
Ng. (C) *~inaba* (/ηinābə/) (SW) | EnT *inobo* (EnSl.) | NeT *ηināb*° (T65) | NeF (L) *ηinnap* (/ηināp°/) (SW) | Km. *ömbə* (KSz 0784)
Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 24–25; UEW: 9.

31. PU **ęńa* > PS **įńâ* ‘tame : ручной’
NeT *įįy*^o (T65) | Sk. **įńâ* (Aikio 2020)
Aikio 2020: 55; Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 25.
32. PU **ępti* > PS **ęptâ* ‘hair (of the head) : волосы’
Ng. *įabtâ* (NgSl.) | EnT *ito* (EnSl.) | EnF *itu* (EnWl.) | NeT *įebt*^o (T65) | NeF *įept*^o (NeSl. *įept*) | Sk. *õptâ* (SkW 24) | Km. *eʔbdâ* (KSz 197) | Mt. *ębtę* (MS 246)
Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 21; UEW: 14–15.
33. PU **imi-* > PS **äm-mä(-)* ‘suckle; breast : быть грудным; женская грудь’
NeT verb *įamyā*(sy^o), noun *įamyā* (T65)
Aikio 2020: 59–60; UEW 82–83; Sammallahti 1988: 536.
34. PU **ipsä-* > PS **äptä-* ‘smell (v.) : пахнуть’
NeT *įabtye*(sy^o) (T65)
Aikio 2020: 60–61; Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW 16; UEW: 83–84 (**ipз ~ *ipз-зз ~ *ipз-śз*).
35. PU **ipsi* > PS **äptä* ‘smell (n.) : запах’
Ng. (C) *~obta* / *įobtâ* / (SW) | EnT irreg. *opto* (expected ***oto*) (EnSl.) | EnF *otu* (EnWl.) | NeT *įabt*^o (T65) | Sk. *aptâ* (SkW 20)
Aikio 2020: 60–61; Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 16; UEW: 83–84 (**ipз ~ *ipз-зз ~ *ipз-śз*).
- The development from the initial PU **i* to PS **ä* is not phonologically regular, but can be understood as the result of analogy with the verb PU **iptä-*, where it is expected (see Aikio 2020: 60–61).
36. PU **itä-* ‘appear’ > ? PS **âtâ-* ‘see : видеть’, der.refl. **âti-* ~ **âtu-* ‘be visible : быть видным’, ? der.trsl. *±*ätj̄m-* ‘become visible, appear : явиться, появиться’
Ng. *įatâdâ*, der.refl. *įat̄üśâ*, der.trsl. *įatumsj̄*, der.n. *įat̄u* ‘physical appearance; colour : внешний вид; цвет’ | EnT der.refl. *od̄i-*, der.trsl. *od̄im-* (EnSl.) | EnF der.refl. *ozi-* (EnWl.) | NeT der.refl. *įadyä*(sy^o) ‘be visible : быть видным’, der.trsl. *įadyimcy*^o (T65) | Sk. *at̄ä-*, der.refl. *atu-*, der.trsl. *atom-* (SkW 66) | Km. *id̄ä-* (KSz 0243) | Mt. *?ad̄ä-*, der.trsl. *ad̄am-* (MS 7, 8)
Helinski *apud* Aikio 2002: 49; Aikio 2020: 65; SW: 16; UEW: 85.

- The reconstruction of the base verb is quite difficult. Ng. *ɣətad'a* ‘meet; find; check; attempt; encounter : увидаться; найти; проверить; попробовать; встретить’ and *ɣəðüsa* ‘see, watch, observe : видеть, следить, наблюдать’ are both back vocalic while only *ɣəɬumsɨ* ‘appear; be born : появиться, показаться; родиться’ is front vocalic, as would be expected from (a derivative of) front-vocalic PU **itä-*. Ng. *ɣəðüsa* would be expected from a PS **ətu-*, while NeT *ɣədyə-* ‘be visible : быть видным’ seems to require **əti-*. The meaning ‘see’ rather than ‘appear’, presumed as the base **əṭə-* in SW, is not found in the Uralic cognates, and the phonological derivation of this back vocalic form from front vocalic PU **itä-* is unclear to me.

37. PU **jasi* > PS **jat* ‘early winter : ранняя весна’

Sk. *čāt(ə)* (SkW 1475)

Aikio 2015: 52.

- Presumably, the final vowel is given in SkW in parentheses as a possibility because the dialects in which this word is attested would not have preserved it either way; this makes the reconstruction of the Proto-Samoyed word as a consonant stem uncertain, even though it is expected based on the regular change from Proto-Uralic words of the type **CVCi* to PS **CVC*.

38. PU **jäwji* > PS **jüjə* ‘lichen (on trees) : ягель’

Ng. *d'ia* (NgSl.) | NeT *yuy°* (Aikio 2006)

Aikio 2006a: 12–14; UEW: 96.

39. PU **jeɣi-* > PS ders. **er-*, **ekəl-* ‘drink : выпить’

EnT *ixoro-* (EnSl.) | EnF *ixuru-* (EnWl.) | NeT *ɣercy°*, *ɣexəlcy°* (T65) | NeF *ɣetsy°* (NeSl. *ɣetšš*) | Sk. *ēr-* (SkW 276) | Mt. *er-* (MS 249)

Aikio 2002: 38–40; SW: 21–22.

40. PU **joŋsi* > PS **jintə* ‘bow : лук’

Ng. *d'intə* (NgSl.) | EnT *ido* (EnSl.) | EnF *idu* (EnWl.) | NeT *ɣin°* (T65) | NeF *ɣin°* (NeSl. *ɣin*) | Sk. **intə* (SkW) | Km. *jinə* (KmSz.) | Mt. *mindī* (analogical **w-*, which was consequently assimilated to *m-*; see MS 678 for details)

Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 25 (**intə*).

- Nganasan *d'intə* alone seems to have preserved the initial PU **j-*, a potential archaism of this language, since there do not seem to be any examples where an initial PS **j* developed a secondary **j-* in Nganasan. The initial *j-* in Kamas

jina is not original, as it should otherwise have become a ****t-* (cf. PU **juka* > PS **jâkâ* > Km. *tağa* ‘river’ and PU **ęla* > PS **ıl(â)* > Km. *jil* ‘below’).

41. PU **juka* > PS **jâkâ* ‘river : река’
 EnT *d'axa* (EnSl.) | EnF *d'ɔxa* (EnWl.) | NeT *yaxa* (T65) | NeF *jăxa* (NeSl. *djăxă*) | Sk. *ćaqə* ‘hole filled with water’ (SkW 1530??) | Km. *t'aga* (KmSz.) | Mt. *čaga* (MS 169)
 Janhunen 1981: 223; Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 35.

42. PU **jupta-* > PS **jâptâ-* ‘say, tell : говорить, рассказывать’
 Ng. der. *d'ebtəđasa* (NgSl.) | Sk. *ćaptâ-*, der. *ćaptâ* ‘tale : Märchen’ (SkW 1443, 1444)
 Helimski *apud* Aikio 2002: 48; SW: 35.

43. PU **juri-* > PS **jür-* ‘get lost : теряться’
 EnT *đuro-* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *d'urota-* ‘forget’ (EnWl.) NeT *yurə*(sy°) ‘forget’ | NeF der. *julipyosy°* (NeSl. *djulipjoš*) | Sk. der.? *üru-* (SkW 285) | Km. *tür-* (KSz 1413)
 Aikio 2002: 46–48.
 — The final **-i* should have been lost, so that the final *-â* of the northern Samoyed forms is likely to be secondarily introduced by analogy. Kamas *tür-* then reflects the expected outcome.

44. PU **kaća-* > PS der. **kâso* ‘gift : подарок’
 EnT *kasu* (EnSl.) | NeT *xaso* (T65) | NeF (L) *kāssū* (/kasu/) (SW) | Sk. *qosə* (SkW 2190)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 61 (**kâsâj*); UEW: 111.

45. PU **kađ'a-* > PS **kâjâ-* ‘leave : оставить’, itr. **kâjo-* (**kâjâw-*) ‘stay : остаться’
 Ng. tr. *koid'a*, itr. *kousa* (NgSl.) | EnT tr. *kae-*, itr. *kai-* (EnSl.) | EnF tr. *kaji-* ~ *kaja-*, itr. *kaji-* ~ *kaja-* (EnWl.) | NeT tr. *xaye*(sy°), itr. *xayo*(sy°) (T65) | NeF tr. *kajesy°*, itr. *kajosy°* (NeSl. *kadješ*, *kadjoš*) | Sk. *quâćə-*, itr. *quâći-* (SkW 2057) | Km. itr. *kojo-* (KSz 0405) | Mt. *kojo-* (MS 531)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 58; UEW: 115–116.

46. PU **kaja* > PS **kâjâ* ‘sun : солнце’
 Ng. *kou* (NgSl.) | EnT *kaja* (EnSl.) | EnF *kaja* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *xayera*(sy°) ‘become sunny’, *xayer°q* ‘sun’ (T65) | Sk. *quâćə* ‘heat : Hitze’ (SkW 2054) | Km. *kujā* (KSz 0474) | Mt. *kaja* (MS 389)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 58.

47. PU **kaji* > PS **kââ* ‘slender object : тонкий предмет’
 Sk. *qū* (Aikio 2013)
 Aikio 2013: 166–167.

48. PU **kajši-*, noun **kajšo* > PS **kâjtâ(-)* ‘be sick, sickness, der. noun **kâjto* ‘sickness’
 Ng. *koṭā*, *koṭāda* (NgSl.) | EnF *katē* (SB) | NeT *xædo* (T65) | Sk. **qūtā-* (SkW 1970)
 Aikio 2014a: 3–5; SW: 58–59.

49. PU **kajwa* > PS **kajwâ* ‘spade : лопата’
 Ng. *kajbu* (NgSl.) | EnT *sea* (EnSl.) | EnF *sεε* (EnWl.) | NeT *syiwa* (T65) | NeF *syewa*
 (NeSl. *šewa*) | Km. *ko* (KSz 0395)
 Aikio 2002: 41–42; SW: 63.

50. PU **kala* > PS **kâlâ* ‘fish : рыба’
 Ng. *kolî* (NgSl.) | EnT *kare* (EnSl.) | EnF *kare* (EnWl.) | NeT *xalya* (T65) | NeF *katya*
 (NeSl. *kâlja*) | Sk. *quâla* (SkW 2362) | Km. *kola* (KSz 0407) | Mt. *kâlâ* (MS 461)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 59; UEW 119.

51. PU **kali-* > PS **kââ-* ‘die : умереть’, der.caus. **kâ-tâ-* ‘kill : убить’
 Ng. *kuod’a*, der.caus. *kotud’a* (NgSl.) | EnT *kaa-*, der.caus. *kaḍa-* (EnSl.) | EnF *ka-*,
 der.caus. *kaza-* (EnWl.) | NeT *xasy*^o, der.caus. *xada(sy)*^o (T65) | NeF *kasy*^o, der.caus.
katasy^o (NeSl. *kāš*, *katāš*) | Sk. *qū-*, der.caus. *quât-* (SkW 1759, 1901) | Km. *kü-*, *kut-*
 (KSz 0504, 0501) | Mt. *kā-*, der.caus. *kadā-* (MS 367, 374)
 Aikio 2015: 52; Sammallahti 538 (**kâxli-*); SW: 56–57; UEW: 173.
 — The causative **kâtâ-* appears to be made on the basis of **kââ-* after the
 intervocalic **-l-* had disappeared, so that **kâ-* could be taken as the new
 “consonant stem” from which to derive a causative. I think that this is
 paralleled in the derivative PS **nánsâ-* ‘lick’ next to underived PS **náâ-* ‘lick’
 from PU **náli-* (entry 116 below). Selkup and Kamas both analogically removed
 the final vowel of PS **kâtâ-* and reflect **kât-* instead.

52. PU **kama* > PS **kamâ* ‘scale : чешуя’
 NeT *syaw*^o (T65) | NeF *syam*^o (NeSl. *šam*) | Sk. *kām~kāmā* (SkW 1822)
 Aikio 2015: 55; SW 63; UEW: 121–122.

53. PU **kani-* > PS **kân-* ‘go : уйтти’, der.caus. **kântâ-* ‘carry : увести’
 Ng. der. *konïd’a*, tr. *kontud’a* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *kane-*, tr. *kada-* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *kañe-*,
kada- (EnWl.) | NeT tr. *xana*(sy^o) | NeF tr. *kanasy*^o (NeSl. *kanāš*) | Sk. *quân-* (SkW
 2002) | Km. *kan-* (KSz 0306) | Mt. tr. *kandə-* (MS 415)
 Janhunen 1981: 231; Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 59–60; UEW 124.
 — Only the causative **kântâ-* is found in the other branches of Uralic, so that PS
**kân-* represents a valuable archaism of the Samoyed branch. The vowel reflex
 PS **â* is phonologically unexpected in underived **kân-*, but regular in **kântâ-*.
54. PU **kari* > PS **kar* ‘skin, surface, bark : кожа, поверхность, корочка’
 NeT *syar* | NeF *syat* (NeSl. *šat*)
 Aikio 2012: 233.
55. PU **kâli* > PS **kâj* (~ ?**kää-*) ‘tongue : язык’
 Ng. der. *šiad’a* (NgSl.) | ? EnT der. *siʔoro* (EnSl.) | ? EnF der. *šiʔoru* (EnWl.) | NeF *syě*
 (NeSl. *še*) | Sk. *šē* (SkW 2420) | Km. der. *šekə* (KSz 1050) | Mt. *kej* (? *kāj*, ? *kēj*, ? *kij*; MS
 450 **keʔj*)
 Aikio 2012: 228; Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW 66.
 — The precise Proto-Samoyed reconstruction is difficult, cf. Aikio (2012: 228).
 There may have been a paradigmatic alternation between **kāj* and **kää* that
 was resolved in different ways in the different Samoyed languages (cf. PU
**woli-* > PS **āj-* ~ **āā-* ‘be’ in entry 198 below). Nganasan *šiad’a* could reflect **kää*,
 with a derivational suffix **-jə*, while Mator should go back to **kāj* or **kää-j*.
 Forest Nenets *syě* and Selkup *šē* can reflect PS **kāj* (cf. the vowel development
 of PS **sājswä* ‘seven’ to NeF *syeqw*^o, Sk. *sēl’cu*), but it is unclear how **ää* would
 have developed in Selkup: expected would be **ē* or perhaps **ī*. Nganasan could
 perhaps also reflect a derivation in **-jə* from **kāj*, via **kāj-ə-jə* with loss of **-j*-
 between the first and second syllable.
56. PU **kâri-* > PS **kâr-* ‘dress, put on (clothes) : надеть’
 Ng. *šerəd’i* (NgSl.) | EnT *seri-* (EnSl.) | EnF *sero-* (EnWl.) | NeT *syerə*(sy^o) (T65) | NeF
syetäsy^o (NeSl. *šetasš*) | Sk. *šēr-* (SkW 2701) | Km. *šer-* (KSz 1054) | Mt. *ker-* (MS 470)
 Aikio 2002: 18–20; SW 68.
 — The northern Samoyed languages have a vowel stem, which is probably
 secondary as a result of analogy, since the consonant stem reflected in Selkup,
 Kamas and Mator is phonologically expected (cf. section 3.3).

57. PU **kätki-* > PS **kätä-* ‘wrap up : привязать’
 Ng. *šetädi* ‘load : погрузить’ (NgSl.) | NeT *syedä*(sy°) (T65) | Mt. *kEdä-* (MS 447)
 Aikio 2002: 20; 2006a: 29.

58. PU **käwädi* > (in derivations) PS **kürä* ‘band (for tightening) : лента’
 Ng. der. *kirämäsi* ‘tighten : затянуть’ (NgSl.) | EnT *šurobo-* ‘tighten (with a strap) :
 стянуть (шнурком)’ (EnSl.) | NeT *syur°q* ‘waistband for trousers : объём пояса’
 (T65)
 Aikio 2006: 19–20.

59. PU **keti* > PS **ket* ‘shape, appearance; figure : образ, изображение’ (also a pronoun
 stem)
 Ng. *si?* (NgSl.) | EnT *ši?* (EnSl.) | EnF *ši?* (pronoun stem) (EnWl.) | NeT *syiq* (T65) |
 Sk. *ši-* (pronoun stem) (SkW 2428)
 Aikio 2006a: 17–19.

60. PU **kečči-* > PS **kečä-* ‘bad smell, stench : вонь’
 SkTaz *qēti*, SkKet *qēči-* (Aikio 2014: 6)
 Aikio 2014a: 6.

61. PU **kočki-* > PS **kāšä-* ‘be dry, dry out (itr.) : высохнуть’
 Ng. *kosäda* (NgSl.) | EnT *kaso-* (EnSl.) | EnF *kasu-* (EnWl.) | NeT *xasä*(sy°) (T65) | NeF
kasäsy° (NeSl. *kasas*) | Sk. **kūsä* ‘shallow’ (SkW 2202) | Km. *ko?* (**kāš-*; KSz 0397)
 Sammallahiti 1988: 537; SW: 60–61.

62. PU **koδ’ka* > PS **kājka* ‘spirit, god; idol : идол, шайтан’
 Ng. *kojkä* (NgSl.) | EnT *kaxa* (EnSl.) | EnF *kixu* (EnWl.) | NeT *xæx°* (T65) | NeF *käx°*
 (NeSl. *këxë*) | Sk. der.? *qāka* (SkW 2097)
 Aikio 2002: 13–15 ; SW: 51.
 — Selkup has an unexpected *ā* rather than *ī*, as if from PS **kakä*. Perhaps it was
 affected by the second-syllable vowel *-a*, which looks to be a derivational suffix
 (expected would be *-ä*).

63. PU **kojra* > PS **korā* ‘male, male reindeer : бык, пороз (самец оленя)’
 Ng. *kuru* (NgSl.) | EnT *kōra* (EnSl.) | EnF (!) *kōra* (EnWl.) | NeT *xora* (T65) | NeF *koṭa*
 (NeSl. *koṭa*) | Sk. *qorā* (SkW 2259) | Km. *kora* (KSz 0430)

SW: 74; UEW: 168–169; Zhivlov 2023: 162.

— The vowel development from PU **kojra* to PS **korâ* rather than **kârâ* is unusual, see subsection 3.6.3.

64. PU **koki-* > PS **ko-* ‘see, find : найти’

EnT *ku-* (EnSl.) | EnF *ko-* (EnWl.) | NeT *xosy*^o (T65) | NeF *kosy*^o (NeSl. *kōš*) | Sk. *qo-* (SkW 1749) | Km. *ku-* (KSz 0459) | Mt. *ko-* (MS 513)

SW: 72; UEW: 171.

65. PU **kompa* > PS **kâmpâ* ‘wave : волна’

Ng. *kojhu* (NgSl.) | EnT *kaba* (EnSl.) | EnF *kaba* (EnWl.) | NeT *xampa* | NeF *kampa* (NeSl. *kampa*) | Sk. *qōmpâ* (SkW 1851)

Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 59; UEW: 203.

66. PU **konta* > PS **kântâ(-)* ‘hunt, kill; sacrificial animal’

Ng. *kontâ* (NgSl.) | EnT *kado* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *kadta-* ‘kill hunting : убить на охоте’ | NeT *xan*^o (T65) | NeF *kan*^o (NeSl. *kān*) | Mt. *kandagat* ‘pugnacious, eager to fight : raufsuchtig, raufstüchtig’ (MS 416)

Aikio 2006a: 15–17.

67. PU **kopa* > PS **kopâ* ‘skin : кожа, кора’

Ng. *kuhu* (NgSl.) | EnT *kôba* (EnSl.) | EnF *koba* (EnWl.) | NeT *xoba* (T65) | NeF *kopa* (NeSl. *kōpa*) | Sk. **qopâ* (SkW 1794) | Km. *kuba* (KSz 0463) | Mt. *koha*, *koho* (MS 520)

Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 73; UEW: 180–181.

— The vowel development from PU **kopa* to PS **kopâ* rather than ***kâpâ* is unusual, see subsection 3.6.3.

68. PU **korpi-* ‘blaze’ > PS **kârpâ* ‘northern lights : северное сияние’, der. *kârpâr-* ‘blaze’

EnT *kabo* (EnSl.) | EnF *kabu* (EnWl.) | NeT *xarp*^o, der. *xarpârcy*^o (T65)

Aikio 2002: 15–16.

— A loan etymology for this Samoyed word has also been suggested, from Proto-Tungusic **garpa-* ‘radiate light, shine’, **garpa* ‘ray, beam’ (Helimski *apud* Aikio 2006a: 29). The similarities may also be accidental.

69. PU **kosi-* (**kusi-*) > PS **kot(-)* ‘cough : кашель, кашлять’, der.augm. *kotâjr-* ‘cough : кашлять’
 Ng. *ku?*, der.v. *kutăduša* (NgSl.) | EnT *ku?*, der. *kuḍur-* (EnSl.) | NeT *xoq* (T65) | NeF *kot*^o (NeSl. *kot*) | Sk. **qot*, verb **qotă-*, der. **qotar-* (SkW 1915) | Km. *ku?* (KSz 0462) | Mt. der. *kodor-* (MS 517)
 Sammallahiti 1988: 537; SW: 74; UEW: 223.
 — The Finno-Ugric languages reflect a preform **kusi-* rather than **kosi-*.
70. PU **koska* > PS **kâtă* ‘grandmother : бабушка’
 Ng. *kotu* (NgSl.) | EnT *kaḍa?* ‘mother’s sister’ (EnSl.) | EnF *kaza* (EnWl.) | NeT *xada* (T65) | NeF *kata* (NeSl. *kāta*) | ? Sk. **kotă* ‘old’ (SkW 1918) | Mt. **kada* → Tuvan *kada* ‘aunt, grandmother, mother-in-law’ (MS 378)
 Sammallahiti 1988: 537; SW: 62.
71. PU **kuḍa* > PS **kâră* ‘morning’
 Sk. *qară* (SkW 2217) | Km. der. *karăld'en* ‘in the morning : morgen : утром’
 Aikio 2002: 42–43 (PU **kuḍi*, PS **kâr*); 2022: 27 (PU **kuda*); UEW: 193.
 — Aikio first reconstructed PU **kuḍi* (2002), but more recently **kuḍa* (2022a: 27), which fits better with the Samoyed vowel developments.
72. PU **kuj-* > ? PS **kijčV-* ‘lie : лежать’
 Sk. der. *kučal-* ‘lie down : sich legen’ (SkW 1943) | Mt. *kistă-* (MS 504)
 UEW: 197; Zhivlov 2023: 164.
 — Zhivlov reconstructs PS **kijtV-*, but, to my knowledge, a development from **-jt-* to Sk *-č-* would be unparalleled; cf. the development in PS **săjtă-* ‘sew’ > Sk. *sūt-* (SW 134–135). The vowel correspondence between Selkup and Mator does not seem to be regular either, so that this etymology should be treated with great caution.
73. PU **kulki-* > ? PS **kăj-* ‘go : пойти’
 NeT *xăsy*^o (aor. *xăya*) | NeF *kăsy*^o (aor. *kăja*; NeSl. *kěš*, aor. *kadja*) | Mt. *kaj-* (MS 384)
 Aikio 2002: 26; SW: 51.
 — The connection of **kăj-* with PU **kulki-* is posited by Aikio (2002: 26). This reflex of PU **kulki-* competes with the following entry. In principle, we could imagine a paradigmatic split where **kulki-* regularly becomes pre-PS **kujă-*, whence the vowel stem in forms like the connegative **kujă-k* develops into PS **kuă-* while the consonant stem in forms like the aorist develops via **kuj-ŋă*

into PS **kâjŋâ* (> NeT *хэҥа*). A stem **kâj-* could have been extracted from the latter. However, as far as I can tell, it is technically unclear whether PS **kaj-* was originally front vocalic or back vocalic.

74. PU **kulki-* > ? PS **kuâ-* ‘float downstream : поплыть (по течению)’
NeT der. *xúqla*(sy°), der. *xúw*° ‘driftwood’ (T65) | Sk. der. *qūrā-* (SkW 2284)
SW: 76; UEW: 198; Zhivlov 2023: 164.
— This Samoyed reflex of PU **kulki-* competes with the preceding entry, q.v.
75. PU **kuma-* > PS **kâmâ-* ‘fall : повалиться, развалиться’
Ng. *kamāda* (NgSl. *кәмәдя* II) | EnT der. *kooha* ‘fallen tree’ | NeT *хэwэsy*° (T65) | NeF *kāmāsy*° (NeSl. *kamaš*) | Sk. **qam-* (SkW 1823) | Mt. der. *kamaga* ‘fallen tree’ (MS 405)
Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 52.
76. PU **kuńa-* > PS **kâńâ-* ‘be closed, close (the eyes) : закрыть глаза’
Ng. der. *kâńadusa* (Keheinen 2023: 80) | EnT *końi-* (EnSl.) | NeT *хэwэsy*° (T65) | Sk. *qāńâ-* (SkW 2074) | Km. *kaj-* | Mt. **kańâ-*, *kajâ-* (MS 420)
Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 53–54.
— The vowel of Sk. *qāńâ-* is irregular; expected would be ***a*. The retention of **-ń-* in Nganasan, rather than a development to **-j-*, is also unexpected, and I have no explanation for it.
77. PU **kuńíci* > PS **kunsâ* ‘urine : моча’
Ng. (M) *kunsâ* (SW) | Sk. *kūsâ*, verb *kūsâ-* ~ *kūšâ-* (SkW 2212) | Km. *künzâ* (KSz 0512) | Mt. *kunẓ̌z* (MS 596)
Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 77; UEW: 210.
78. PU **kupsa-* > PS **kâptâ-* ‘extinguish, put out : тушить, погасить’, itr.der. *±*kâptō-* (*?*kâptâw-*) ‘go out, die away : погаснуть’
Ng. tr. *kâbtudâ*, itr. *kâbt'asa* (NgSl.) | EnT tr. *kota-*, itr. *koti-* (EnSl.) | EnF *kota* (EnWl.) | NeT tr. *xâbta*(sy°), itr. *xâbtyo*(sy°) (T65) | NeF tr. *kâptasy*°, itr. *kâptyosy*° (NeSl. *kâptâš*, *kapčoš*) | Sk. tr. *qaptâ-*, itr. *qapti-* (SkW 1789) | Km. *kuʔbdâ-*, itr.der. *kuʔbdō-* (KSz 0465) | Mt. tr. *kaptâ-* (MS 372)
Janhunen 1981: 223; Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 54.

79. PU **kura* > PS **kârâ* ‘bend, curve : изгиб, извилина’
 Ng. *kæru* ‘манера, привычка : manner, habit, custom’ (NgSl.) | EnT *kora* (EnSl.) |
 NeT *xæra* (T65) | Sk. der. **qaru* (SkW 2225) | Km. *kara-* (KSz 0318)
 Aikio 2006: 14–15; SW: 55; UEW: 220.
80. PU **kura* > ? der. PS **kârû* (?**kârâw*) ‘knife : нож’
 EnT *koru* | EnF *kæru* (EnWl.) | NeT *xær°* (T65) | NeF *kât°* (NeSl. *kaŧ*) | Mt. *kuru(h)* (MS
 611)
 Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 54.
81. PU **kurki* (**kərki*) > PS **kârö* (?**kârâw*) ‘crane : журавль’
 EnT *kori* (*xario* borrowed from NeT; EnSl.) | NeT *xæryo* (T65) | NeF *käq̣tyu*
 (unexpected *-q̣t-*; NeSl. *ka”ṭju*) | Sk. *qara* (SkW 2223) | Km. *kuro, kuru?jo* (KSz 0498)
 | Mt. *körüh ~ köröh* (MS 557 **kərö*)
 SW: 54 (**kârâ, ? *kârâjâj*)
 — This is in origin an onomatopoeia of the sound that cranes make in flight, a
 trill with a rather abrupt start, so ±“*гrrr*”. Correspondences and formations
 may be irregular and partially independent; cf. also Ng. *kokæri* ‘crane’ (NgSl.).
 — PU **kusi-* ‘cough’ → see **kosi-*.
82. PU **kuwakka* > PS **kuâkâ-nâ* ‘long ago : давно, раньше’
 Ng. *kuogunu* (NgSl.)
 Aikio 2012: 244.
83. PU ±**kuwi* > PS **kij* ‘moon, month : луна, месяц’
 Ng. der. *kit’ädä* (NgSl.) | Km. *ki* (KSz 0379) | Mt. *kistit ~ kisti?n* (MS 507)
 Sammallahti 1988: 537 (**kixi*); SW: 69; UEW: 211–212.
 — The medial consonant is difficult to reconstruct in this Proto-Uralic word. PS
**kij* could theoretically reflect a derivative in **-j* rather than a change from **-w-*
 to **-j*. Cf. PU **ćowi* > PS **soj* (curiously enough, these two words are
 structurally very similar). The Samoyed vowel **i* differs from the vowel **u*
 reflected in the other Uralic languages.

84. PU **küłki* > ? PS **käj* ‘side : сторона’, der. **käjwä* ‘id.’
 Ng. *kai* (NgSl.) | EnT *koo* (EnSl.) | EnF *ke* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *xæw*^o (T65) | NeF der. *käw*^o (NeSl. *këw*) | Sk. der.? *qō* (SkW 1768)
 Salminen 2023: 377–380; SW: 57–58.
 — This etymology is proposed by Salminen 2023: 377–380. The development from PU **ü* to PS **ä* is unexpected, but may be paralleled in PU **küñil* ‘tear’ > PS **känäli*. Ng. *kai* instead of **kaj* probably does not directly reflect PS **käj*, but rather seems to be a derivative like ?**käjä-j*. A derived body part ‘rib : ребро’ is also shared widely in Samoyed with the same derivational suffix **-tä(jä)*: Ng. *käiðäə*, EnT *koodi*, EnF *kiuze*, NeT *xæw*^o*di*^o, NeF *käw*^o*ti*^o, Sk. *qōtä*, Km. *kot*, Mt. *kajbədV*.
85. PU **künti* > PS **küntä* ‘smoke, vapour : дым, пар’
 Ng. *kintä* (NgSl.) | EnT *śudo* (EnSl.) | EnF *śudu* (EnWl.) | NeT *syun*^o, der. *syinyo* ‘fog : Nebel : туман’ (T65) | NeF der. *syūnyu* ‘fog : Nebel : туман’ (NeSl. *šunju*) | ? Sk. *s’ümtä* (SkW 2487) | Km. *šünü* (KSz 1098) | Mt. *kündü* (MS 593)
 Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 79 (**küntä*); UEW: 158 (**kintä*, **küntä*).
 — The preservation of PU **ü* as PS **ü* in this word is unexpected, cf. 3.6.1.
86. PU **küñil* > PS **känäli* ‘tear : слеза’
 Ng. *käəli* poss.3sg. *-ti* (NgSl.) | EnT *koori* (EnSl.) | EnF *kəjilu* (EnWl.) | NeT *xəyəl*^o (T65) | Sk. **qani* (SkW 2072) | Km. *kajəl* (KSz 0285) | Mt. *kañ(ə)li*, *kaj(ə)li* (MS 421 **känäli*)
 Sammallahti 1988: 537; SW: 53.
 — The reconstruction of this word in Proto-Uralic is difficult, but the Proto-Samoyed form should be front vocalic PS **känäli* on account of the front vowel harmony of the Nganasan reflex, making the reconstruction PU **kuñili* (Janhunen 1981: 255, Sammallahti 1988: 537) difficult (see Salminen 2023: 379). Selkup is missing the **-l* for some unexplained reason (cf. SW).
87. PU **lapta* > PS **jāptā* ‘thin : тонкий’
 Ng. der. *dəbtəgəə* (seemingly **jāptä*; NgSl.) | EnT *d’ata* (EnSl.) | EnF *d’ata* (EnWl.) | NeT *yabta* (T65) | NeF *japta* (NeSl. *djāpta*) | Sk. **čōptä* (SkW 1450) | Mt. der. *čabtəmbuj* (MS 163)
 SW: 38; UEW: 238; Zhivlov 2014: 125.

88. PU **läcä-* > PS **jäsä-* ‘cover the tent : покрыть чум’
 EnT *ḏese-* (EnSl.) | NeT *yesyē(sy°)* (T65) | Sk. *čes₂-* (SkW 1578)
 Helimski *apud* Aikio 2002: 49.
89. PU **lämi* > PS **jämvjā* ‘broth : суп’
 Ng. *d'eməə* ‘porridge made of blood, meat, flour and water’ (Aikio 2012: 231) | NeT *yewey°* ‘soup, broth’
 Aikio 2012: 231.
 — Ng. *d'eməə* suggests PS **jämvjā* while NeT *yewey°* suggests PS **jämvjā*.
90. PU **lämpi* > PS der.? **jämpV* ‘clothes : одежды’
 Ng. der.? *d'eṅh'a* | EnT der. *ḏebiḏe?* | NeT der. *yimpit°q* | Sk. der. *čēmpāt-* (SkW 1472)
 Aikio 2002: 13; SW: 42–43.
91. PU **läsi-* > PS **jät(ä)-* ‘by, near, for : к, на, о’
 Ng. *d'atə-*, lat. *d'atəṅ* (NgSl.) | EnT lat. *ḏeḏo?* (EnSl.) | EnF *d'ez* (EnWl.) | NeT *yeq*, lat. *yed°h* (T65) | Sk. *čātə* (SkW 1477)
 Helimski *apud* Aikio 2002: 48; SW: 44.
 — Sk. *čātə* as if from **jatə* instead; PS **jätə* should have become Sk. ***čītə*, while PS **jät* should have become Sk. ***čēt*.
92. PU **lewi-* > ? PS **jeä-* or **jew-* ‘shoot : стрелять’
 Sk. *čü-* (SkW 1434)
 Aikio 2002: 53; Salminen 2023: 392.
 — NeT *yenyer-* ‘id.’ is connected to the Selkup verb by Alatalo (SkW), but not mentioned by Salminen (2023: 392); the connection is indeed phonologically difficult, as PU/PS **e* does not become Nenets *e*, but rather *i*. The Proto-Uralic reconstruction is given by Zhivlov as **lexi-* rather than **lewi-*, which would only be reconcilable with the Selkup verb if this developed from a vowel sequence PS **jeä-*. A vowel sequence is found as a reflex of PU **Vyi* only once in PU **suyi-* ‘row’ (entry 157 below), and once potentially as the result of PU **Vwi* in PS **tiä* from PU **siwi* ‘year ring’ (entry 155 below). As far as I can see, in the word for ‘shoot’, the nature of the medial consonant cannot be reliably established as either PU **-γ-* or **-w-* based on the other Uralic cognates. However, even PU **lewi-* would perhaps be expected to develop to PS **ji-*, whence Sk. ***čī-*, as in the derivatives from PU **sewi-* ‘eat’, PS **ti-* (entry 151 below), this etymology

remains very uncertain. If PS **eä* develops in Selkup like PS **iä*, Sk. *ü* would be the regular reflex of a hypothetical PS **jeä*.

93. PU **leđi-* > PS **ler-* ‘be frightened : испугаться’, der. **lerö-* (?**lerâw-*)
 NeT der. *leryo*(*sy*^o) | NeF *lityosy*^o (NeSl. *litjoš*) | Sk. der. *leri-* (SkW 2895), ? *nir*(*ak*)*kə-*
 ‘fürchten’ not the same acc. to SkW (1411) | ? Km. *nere-* (KSz 0687) | Mt. *ner-* (?) (MS 747)
 Aikio 2014b: 85–86; SW: 83.
 — NeT *leryo-*, NeF *lityo-* and Sk. *leri-* clearly belong together, but it is unclear to me whether the *n*-initial forms in Selkup, Kamas and Mator really belong here, or if they can be the result of an irregular change from **l-* to *n-*.
94. PU **ləmpi* > PS **lĩmpâ* ‘swamp : болот’, **lĩmpâ-* ‘be swampy : быть болотистым’,
**lĩmpâ-* ‘sink into a swamp : повалиться в болото’
 Ng. *lĩnhâ* ‘boggy place’ (Aikio 2014b: 86) | EnT *lubo* (EnSl.) | EnF *lubu* | NeT
lĩmpa(*sy*^o), *lĩmpa*(*sy*^o), der. *lĩmpâd*^o ‘swamp : болото’ (T65) | NeF der. *lĩmpât*^o
 ‘swamp, bog : болото, топъ’ (NeSl. *lĩmpat*) | Sk. der.? *lĩmpä* ~ *lĩmpi* (SkW 2803)
 Aikio 2014c: 86; SW: 83; UEW: 235 (**lampe*).
95. PU **lənti* > PS **lĩntâ* ‘plain, valley : равнина, долина’
 Ng. *lĩntâ* (NgSl.)
 Aikio 2014b: 86; Sammallahti 1988: 552 (Proto-Finno-Permic); UEW: 235–236.
96. PU **ləpci* > PS **ləpsâ* ~ *jəpsâ* ‘cradle : люлька’
 Ng. *lapsâ* (NgSl.) | EnT *lĩto* (EnSl.) | EnF *l’iču* (EnWl.) | NeT *yebc*^o (T65) | Sk. *ćopsâ*
 (SkW 1452) | Km. *təpsâ* | Mt. *čəpsə* ~ *səbsə* (MS 205 **l̥(ə)psâ*)
 Aikio 2002: 48; SW: 41 (**jəpsâ*, ?**jəpsâ* ~ **ləpsâ*); UEW: 260.
 — The vacillation of initial **l-* or **j-* in this word is unique and therefore puzzling. Salminen (2023: 384) argues for a reconstruction PS **ləpsâ* (so, too, Helimski MS), with an initial palatal **l̥* reconstructed up to the Proto-Uralic stage (cf. also UEW). Since the Proto-Uralic phoneme **l̥* would be quite unique to this word, alternative explanations should also be considered, such as an assimilation in palatality to the originally palatal PS **s* from PU **ć*, which could have taken place within early Samoyed; i.e., (pre-)PS **ləpsâ* > **ləpsâ* vel sim. The resulting PS **ləpsâ* could have developed with **l̥* to **j* in all branches except for Nganasan and Enets, as posited by Salminen and Helimski.

97. PU **ləwi* > PS **lə* ‘bone : кость’

Ng. der.? (**lə-jā*) *laa* ‘ring : кольцо’, der. (**lə-tājā*) *latə* ‘bone : кость’ (Kaheinen 2023: 167; NgSl.) | EnT der. *lidi* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *lizi* (EnWl.) | NeT *li*, *le-* (T65) | NeF *li*, *te-* (NeSl. *li*, *le-*) | Sk. *li*, *le-* (SkW 2761) | Km. *le* (KSz 0529) | Mt. *le* (? *lə*) (MS 618)

Sammallahti 1988: 538 (**lixi*); SW: 82; UEW: 254–255 (**luwe*); Zhivlov 2023: 161 (**ləwi*)

— Nenets and Selkup show a shared distribution of long **i* in the nominative singular and **e* in the other cases, but it is unclear how this might best be explained. Perhaps a reconstruction such as nom.sg. **ləw* > **li* next to acc.sg. **lə(w)m* = **ləm* could be attempted, but there are no direct parallels.

98. PU **lomi* (**lumi*) > PS **jom(-)* ‘snow (v. and n.) : снег, идти (о снеге)’

Ng. *dum* (NgSl.) | NeT der. *yomcyah* (T65) | Sk. **com-* (SkW 1459)

Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 46.

— The Finno-Ugric languages reflect a preform **lumi* rather than **lomi*.

99. PU **luča* > PS **jācā* ‘block of wood : доска’

Ng. *d'etə* (Aikio 2006: 29) | EnT *d'oḍo* (EnSl.) | EnF *d'ɔzu* (EnWl.) | NeT *yəd°* (T65) | NeF (L) *j'āt* (*jāt°*) (SW) | Sk. *čacā* (SkW 1474)

Aikio 2002: 12–13; 2006a: 29; SW: 36 (**jātIā*).

— A reconstruction PU **luča* is needed to unite Fi. *luta* ‘tool for removing birch bark’ with the Samoyed words, but requires Saami forms like SaaN *lohti* ‘wedge’ to be borrowed from Proto-Finnic, since *lohti* could only reflect PU **luta* (Aikio 2006: 29).

— PU **lumi* ‘snow’ → see PU **lomi*.

100. PU **lupsa* > PS **jāptā* ‘dew : poca’

Ng. der. *d'ebtua* (NgSl.) | EnT *d'ota* (EnSl.) | NeT *yābta* (T65) | NeF *jāpta* (NeSl. *djāpta*) | Sk. der. *čaptu* (SkW) | Km. *teḇbda* (KSz 1338) | Mt. чипталъ (-лъ unclear; MS 208)

Janhunen 1981: 223; Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 35–36; UEW: 261.

101. PU **meni-* > PS **men-* ‘go : идти, ехать’

Ng. *minsi* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *midir-* ‘carry : нести’ (EnSl.) | EnF der. *midir* ‘carry : нести’ | NeT *myincy°* (T65) | NeF *myĩnsy°* (NeSl. *minš*) | Km. *mĩn-* (KSz 0592)

Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 94; UEW: 272.

102. PU **meyi-* > PS **mi-* ‘give, sell : дать, продать’
 Ng. der. *miši* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *mis-* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *mis-* | NeT der. *myicy*^o (T65) |
 NeF *myiqsy*^o (NeSl. *mi’š*) | Sk. *mi-* (SkW 735) | Km. *mī-* (KSz 0588) | Mt. *mi-* (MS 667)
 Aikio 2012: 248; Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 94; UEW: 275 (**miye-*).
103. PU **meksa* > PS **mītā* ‘liver : печень’
 Ng. *mitā* (NgSl.) | EnT *muḏo* (EnSl.) | EnF *muzu* (EnWl.) | NeT *mid*^o (T65) | NeF *mīt*^o
 (NeSl. *mīt*) | Sk. *mītā* (SkW 757) | Km. *mīt* (KSz 0604)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 93–94; UEW: 264 (**maksā*).
104. PU **minä* > PS **mān* 1sg. personal pronoun ‘I : я’
 Ng. der.? *mānā* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *modī* (EnSl.) | EnF *mod’i* der. (EnWl.) | NeT der.
māny^o | NeF der. *māny*^o (NeSl. *man’*) | Sk. *man* (SkW 771) | Km. *man* (KSz 0550) |
 Mt. *mān* (MS 627)
 Janhunen 2013: 214; SW: 86.
105. PU **močki-* > PS **māsā-* ‘wash, smear : вымыть, смазать’
 EnT *masu-* (EnSl.) | EnF *masu-* ~ *māsu* (EnWl.) | NeT *masā(sy)*^o (T65) | NeF *masāsy*^o
 (NeSl. *masaš*) | Sk. *mūsā-* / *mūsā-* (SkW 860) | Km. *buzā-* (KSz 0170) | Mt. *masā-* (MS
 642)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 89; UEW: 289 (**muške-*, *moške-*).
106. PU **muḏ’a* > PS **mājā* ‘earth, land, terrain : земля, страна, край’
 Ng. *mou* (NgSl.) | Sk. *mačā* ‘Wald(rücken)’ (SkW 799) | Km. *mija* ‘mountain’ | Mt. *bijā*
 ‘mountain : Berg’ (MS 124)
 Aikio 2002: 22–23; SW: 85.
107. PU **muja-* > PS **mājā-* ‘become happy : обрадоваться’
 NeT *māyā(sy)*^o (T65) | NeF *mājāsy*^o (NeSl. *mādjāš*)
 Aikio 2002: 22.
108. PU **muka* > PS **mākā* ‘back : спина’
 Ng. *māku* (NgSl.) | EnT *maxa* (EnSl.) | EnF *maxa* (EnWl.) | NeT *māxa* (T65) | NeF
māxa (NeSl. *maxa*) | Sk. *moqā*, der. *moqal/moqol* ‘id.’ (SkW 818) | Km. der. *begal* (KSz
 0120) | Mt. *baga* (MS 90)
 Janhunen 1981: 223; Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 85.

109. PU **muna* > PS **mânâ* ‘egg : яйцо’
 Ng. *mənu* (NgSl.) | EnT *mona* (EnSl.) | EnF *məna* (EnWl.) | Sk. *manə* ‘penis’ (SkW 772)
 | Km. der. *munoj* (KSz 0626)
 Janhunen 1981: 223; Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 86; UEW: 285–286.
 — For the semantics of the Selkup word, cf. the Finnish cognate *muna* ‘egg; penis, testes’.
110. PU **mura* > ? der. PS **mârVŋkâ* ‘cloudberry : морошка’
 Ng. *muriŋga* (NgSl.) | EnT *moraga* (EnSl.) | EnF *mɔroga* | NeT der. *mərayka* | NeF
mălayka (NeSl. *maŋayka*)
 Janhunen 1981: 223–224; Sammallahti 1988: 538; UEW: 287.
 — The vowels of Nganasan *muriŋga* do not regularly correspond to Enets and
 Nenets forms; expected would be Ng. ***mərunga*, cf. PS **mânâ* ‘egg’ > Ng. *mənu*.
111. PU $\pm$ **nataw* > PS **nâto* (? **nâtâw*) ‘brother-in-law : деверь’
 NeT *nado* (T65) | Km. *nado* (KSz 0644)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539 (**nâtîw*); SW: 98 (**nâtʔ ? *nâtʔj*); UEW: 299–300.
112. PU **nimi* > PS **nim* ‘name : имя’
 Ng. *ñim* (NgSl.) | EnT *ñiʔ* (EnSl.) | EnF *ñiʔ* (EnWl.) | NeT *nyum* (T65) | NeF *nyim* (NeF
nim) | Sk. *nim* ~ *ñim* (SkW 1349) | Km. *nim* (KSz 0691) | Mt. *Nim* ~ *nüm* (MS 756)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 102; UEW: 305 (**nime*).
113. PU **nokki* > PS der. **nâku* ‘neck : затылок’
 Sk. *nuku* (SkW 1385)
 UEW: 328–329; Zhivlov 2016: 299.
114. PU **nusi-* > PS **nât-* ‘scrape : выскоблить’
 EnT (analogical) *nos-* (EnSl.) | EnF (analogical) *nɔs-* (EnWl.) | NeT *nəcy*^o (T65) | Sk.
**nat-* (SkW 1351) | Km. *năʔ-* (KSz 0676)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW 97; UEW: 309.
 — The reduction of PU **u* to PS **â* before PU **-i* rather than before **-a* seems
 irregular here, but it may have been extracted and generalized from common
 forms like the verbal noun PU **nusma* > PS **nâtma* and the aorist stem, quasi-
 PU **nusya-* > PS **nătŷâ-* (NeT *nəqya-*, etc.).

115. PU **nüdi* > PS **nir* ‘handle : рукоятка’
 Ng. *nir* (NgSl.) | EnT *nii?* (EnSl.) | EnF *nii?* (EnWl.) | NeT *nyir* (T65) | NeF *nyit* (NeSl. *nit*) | Sk. *nir* (SkW 1417) | Km. der. *nirže* (KSz 0754)
 Sammallahti 1988: 538; SW: 102–103; UEW: 304 (**niðe*, **nüðe*).
116. PU **nāli-* > PS **nāâ-* ‘lick : лизать’, der. **nā-nsâ-* ‘id.’
 Ng. der. *nonsæda* (NgSl.) | EnT *naâo-* (EnSl.) | EnF *naso-* ~ *nazo-* (EnWl.) | NeT *nyancə*(sy°) | NeF *nyansäsy°* (NeSl. *njansäš*) | Sk. *nū-* (SkW 1627) | Km. *nü-* (KSz 0723)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539 (**nāxli-*); SW: 105; UEW: 321.
 — Nganasan *nonsæ-* has to be derived from a stem *nāâ-*, while the other cognates, especially Selkup and Kamas, suggest the more expected reconstruction PS **nāâ-*. It would be preferable to derive the Nganasan, Enets and Nenets forms from the same ancestral form, however, so that the absence of the vowel sequence needs to be accounted for. I find it probable that **nā-nsâ-* was simply based on a new “consonant stem” of the root **nāâ* after disappearance of the **-l-*, cf. PS **kâ-tâ-* ‘kill’ rather than ***kââ-tâ-* as the causative of PS **kââ-* ‘die’ (see the entry of PU **kali-* ‘die’). At least the vowels of underived Sk. *nū-* and Km. *nü-* are entirely parallel to those of PS **kââ-* from PU **kali-* ‘die’.
117. PU **ñeli* > PS *±*ñej* ‘arrow : стрела’
 NeT compound *tu°nyi* ‘rifle, shotgun : ружьё, винтовка’ | Sk. *ñej₂* (SkW 1663) | Km. *ñie* ‘arrow : Pfeil’, *ña* ‘bullet : Kugel’ (KSz 0734) | Mt. *ñej*, *nej* (MS 729)
 Aikio 2012: 228; Sammallahti 1988: 539 (**ñixli-*); SW: 108.
118. PU **ñeri* > PS **ñer* ‘cartilage : хрящ’
 Ng. *nir* | EnT *ni?* (EnSl.) | EnF *ni?* (EnWl.) | NeT *nyer* (T65) | NeF der. *nyeläqku* (NeSl. *njelaqku*) | Sk. *nir* (SkW 1707)
 Aikio 2006: 20–21; SW: 108; UEW: 324.
119. PU **ñimi-* > PS **ñim-* ‘suck : сосать’, n.der. *ñimsä* ‘breast, milk : молоко’
 Ng. der. *ñimibtisi* (NgSl.) | EnF der. *nuutagu-* (EnSl.) | NeT der. *nyimnye*(sy°) (T65) | NeF der. *nyimnyapyosy°* (NeSl. *nimnjapjoš*) | Sk. *ñim-*, n.der. *ñipsə* (SkW 1638) | Km. der. *ñimer-* (KSz 0752) | Mt. der. **ñümnə-*, *nümnə-* (MS 786)
 Aikio 2002: 23–25; SW: 110.

120. PU **ńoyi-* (**ńuyi-*) > PS **ńo-* (or **ńoǵ-?*) ‘pursue : преследовать’

NeT der. *nyoda*(sy°) (T65) | NeT *nyotasy*° (NeSl.) | Sk. *ńō-*, der. *ńōt₂-* (SkW 1625) | Mt. **ńodā-*, *nodā* (MS 766)

Sammallahti 1988: 539 (**ńoxi-*); SW: 111; UEW: 323–324 (**ńoηδa-*, **ńowδa-*).

— None of the attested Samoyed descendants reliably show a difference between **o* and **oǵ*, so that there is no way to be absolutely sure which should be reconstructed. Most words of the structure PU **CVγi* end up as PS **CV*, but PU **suyi-* does seem to have become PS **tuǵ-* rather than **tu-* (q.v.). The Finno-Ugric languages may reflect a preform **ńuyi-* rather than **ńoyi-*.

121. PU **ńoma* > PS **ńātmā* ‘hare : заяц’

Ng. *ńomu* (NgSl.) | EnT *naba* (EnSl.) | EnF *n’aba* (EnWl.) | NeT *nyawa* (T65) | Sk. (der.?) *ńoma* (SkW 1633)

Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 106.

— Selkup (Tym) *ńoma* should probably be a derivation, since PS **-ā* usually becomes *-ə* in Selkup. The Finno-Ugric languages reflect a derived **ńoma-la* ‘hare’ instead of the underived PS **ńāmā*. An etymological connection with the verb PU **ńoyi-* ‘pursue’ (Janhunen 1981: 242) is possible if the Samoyed **o* vowel of **ńo-* ‘pursue’ is more archaic than the **u* of FU **ńuyi-* (against this connection, see Zhivlov 2023: 162, who reconstructs a development of PU **ńuyi-* to PS **ńo-* rather than of PU **ńoyi-* to PS **ńo-*, FU **ńuyi-*; cf. the discussion in subsection 3.6.3). The etymologized reconstruction PU **ńoyma* is not expected to develop differently from **ńoma*.

122. PU **oδ’a* > PS **ǵjā* ‘meat, body : мясо, тело’

EnT *aja* (EnSl.) | EnF *aja* (EnWl.) | NeT *ηaya* (T65) | NeF *ηaja* (NeSl. *ηadja*) | Sk. *uǵcā* (SkW 162) | Km. *uja* (KmSz.) | Mt. der. *ojobtu* (MS 799)

Aikio 2006: 11–12; SW: 17.

123. PU **ojwa* > PS **ǵjwā* ‘head : голова’

Ng. *ηajbu* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *aburi* (EnSl.) | EnF *εba* (EnWl.) | NeT *ηæwa* (T65) | NeF *ηǵwa* (NeSl. *ηajwa*) | Mt. *ajba* (MtSpr.)

Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 17; UEW: 336–337.

124. PU **pala-* > PS **pālā-* ‘swallow’

NeT *pałye-* | Sk. *pōlā-* (SkW 693)

Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 116; UEW: 350.

125. PU **pata* > PS der.v. **patâ-* ‘put something in a pot, in water : положить на котёл, в воду’, der. ?**patü-* ‘id.’

Ng. *h'atida* ‘dip, plunge (pfv.) : окунуть’, *h'atätäsa* ‘id. (ipfv.)’ (NgSl.) | EnT *peḍi-* (EnSl.) | NeT *pyadä*(sy°), intr. *pyadä*(sy°) ‘be put in the water : быть опущенным в воду’ (T65) | NeF *pyatäsy*° (NeSl. *pjätäš*) | Sk. *pōt-* (SkW 431) | Km. *padä-* ‘insert; feed : hineinstecken, füttern : воткнуть; кормить’ (KSz 0798)

Aikio 2015: 55; Sammallahti 1998: 548 (FU); SW: 118; UEW 358 (FU).

— The Uralic connection is with the noun PU **pata* ‘pot’, found in a number of Finno-Ugric languages, but the use of the Samoyed verb also seems to be more general than simply inserting things into pots specifically. Sk. *pōt-* is also used for laying nets in the water, and the next entry in SkW 432 *pōti* ‘ice hole for a drawnet : Wuhne für das Zugnetz’ seems to be a likely derivative on the basis of this semantic link. Loss of the more general meaning found in Samoyed could in principle be a shared innovation in the Finno-Ugric languages relevant for the phylogeny. As for the formal reconstruction in Samoyed, Ng. *h'ati-*, EnT *peḍi-*, NeT *pyadä-*, NeF *pyatä-* might all reflect PS **patü-*, but the Nenets forms may also go back to PS **patâ-*, **patu-* or **patj-*. Sk. *pōt-* rather seems to derive from a form **pat-*, with the frequent analogical removal of final schwa (and a development from **a* to *ō* rather than to ***ā* due to the initial *p-*). Km. *padä-* can certainly derive from PS **patâ-*, which is also necessary for derived Ng. *h'atätä-*, and which forms the basis for a secondary consonant stem in Sk. *pōt-* as well.

126. PU **pawi* > PS **pa* ‘tree : дерево’

Ng. der. (**pa-jâ*) *h'aa* (NgSl.) | EnT *pe* (EnSl.) | EnF *pε* (EnWl.) | NeT *pya* (T65) | NeF *pyä* (NeSl. *pja*) | Sk. *pō* (SkW) | Km. *pa* (KmSz.) | *hã* (MS 267)

Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 117 (**pã*); UEW: 410–411.

127. PU **päli* > PS **pää* (~ **päj*?) ‘edge, outside : остриё’

Ng. der.? *h'ai* (NgSl.) | EnT *pio* (EnSl.) | EnF *pe* (EnWl.) | NeT *pyí* | NeF der. *pyinyan* ‘out : наружу’ (NeSl. *pīnjaŋ*) | Sk. *pō* | MS loc. *hegen* (MS 276)

Aikio 2012: 239; Janhunen 1981: 241; SW: 124 (**piâ*).

— Ng. *h'ai* could reflect PS **päj*, or perhaps a schwa-final form like **päjä* or derivative **päjä-j*, while the other Samoyed languages can go back to PS **pää* (especially EnT *pio* and NeF *pyinyan* rather than ***pyenyany* point to this reconstruction in favour of **päj*). Selkup *pō* could probably reflect PS **päj* with

rounding from expected ***pē* due to the initial labial consonant, but it is unclear if PS **pää* would not develop in the same way in this language.

128. PU **pälkä* > ? PS *±*peä* ‘thumb : большой палец’

Ng. der. *hiadä* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *pütu* (EnSl.) | NeT der. *pyıkcyä* (T65) | Km. der. *pida* (KSz 0840) | ? Mt. der. *hegäbti* (MS 275)

Aikio 2020: 95; SW: 123.

— The Proto-Samoyed reconstruction is difficult, and the precise connection and relation with PU **pälkä* is not at all straightforward.

129. PU **pä/iŋi* > PS **päŋ* ‘hollow hand : ладонь’

Ng. *h'ay* | EnT *peo* (EnSl.) | NeT *pyeh* (T65) | NeF *pyëŋ* (NeSl. *pjeŋ*) | Sk. *p̄ŋ* (SkW 597) | Km. *p̄ŋ* (KSz 0853) | Mt. *höŋ* (MS 309)

Janhunen 1981: 257–258; Sammallahti 1988: 539.

— Sk. *p̄ŋ* is due to pre-schwa lengthening of **ä* to Proto-Selkup **ī*, see Helimski (2007: 129); EnT *peo* similarly reflects a schwa-final variant or case form (ibid.). The vowel correspondence with the cognate Finnish *pivo* ‘hand, palm’ (and other Finnic forms) is not regular.

130. PU **peyi-* > PS **pi-* ‘cook, ripen (by cooking) : свариться’, der.caus. PS **pirä-* ‘cook (tr.) : сварить’

Ng. der.caus. *hirid'i* (NgSl.) | EnT *pi-*, der.caus. *pire-* | EnF *pi-*, der.caus. *piri-* (EnWl.) | NeT *pyisy°*, der.caus. *pyirye(sy°)* (T65) | NeF *pyışy°*, der.caus. *pyityesy°* (NeSl. *piš*, *piłjěš*) | Sk. der.caus. *pirä-* (SkW 680) | Km. *pü-*, der.caus. *pürä-* (KSz 0875)

Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 123–124; UEW: 368.

131. PU **peksä-* > PS **pet-* ‘hit, soften a hide : размять шкуру’

Ng. *hit-* (Aikio 2015: 14) | NeT der. *pyidyelcy°*, *pyidyercy°* (T65) | Sk. *pit-*, *pitä-* (SkW 462) | Km. *pü?* (KSz 0877)

Aikio 2002: 54 fn. 8; 2014a: 14; SW: 126; UEW: 368–369.

— The reduction of PU **-ä* to **-ə* or $\emptyset$ in Samoyed is very infrequent and not properly described or understood.

132. PU **peli-* > PS **pej-* ‘be afraid : испугаться’
 Ng. der. *hümsi*; der. *hil’i?ši* ‘fear : бояться’ (NgSl.) | EnT der. *püro-*, *püis-* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *pizi-* ‘frighten : испугать’ | NeT der. *pyílcy°*, der. *pyínä(sy°)* (T65) | NeF *pyinäsyo°* (NeSl. *pinášš*) | Sk. *pī-* (SkW 393b.) | Km. der. *pim-* (KSz 0844) | Mt. der. *himər-* (? *hīmər-*) (MS 300)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 125; UEW: 370.
133. PU **peni-* > PS **pen-* ‘put : положить’
 Ng. *h’ansa* (NgSl.) | EnT *pun-* (EnSl.) | EnF *pun-* (EnWl.) | NeT *pency°* (T65) | NeF *pensyo°* (NeSl. *penšš*) | Sk. *pen-* (SkW 491) | Km. *pen-* (KSz 0829) | Mt. *heñ-* (MS 288)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 118; UEW: 353–354 (**pane-*).
134. PU **piði* > PS der. **pirä* ‘height : высота’
 Ng. *hirə* (NgSl.) | EnT *piro* (EnSl.) | EnF postp. *piro* (EnWl.) | NeT *pyir°* (T65) | NeF der. *pyītāt°* (NeSl. *pitat*) | Sk. postp. *pīr*, *pīrə* (SkW 677)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 125.
135. PU **piðkä* > PS **pirkä* ‘high : высокий’
 EnT *pidē* (EnSl.) | EnF *pise~pize* (EnWl.) | NeT *pyircya* (T65) | NeF *pyītsya* (NeSl. *pitšša*) | Sk. *pirkä* (SkW 977) | Km. *pīrže* (KSz 0855) | Mt. *hirge* (MS 305)
 SW: 125.
136. PU **pījri* ‘circle, around’ > ? PS **pijr* ‘inner bark of birch : камбиальный слой берёзы’
 NeT *pyír*
 Salminen 2023: 388–390.
137. PU **piksi* > PS **pütä* ‘net string, cord : нитка’
 NeT *pyud°* (L 390 *pūd°*) | Sk. *pūtə* (SkW 458)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539; UEW: 380.
- With an irregular development from **i* to **ü*, possibly due to the initial **p-*; this is also seen with **wi* to **(w)ü* in PU $\pm$ *wijitti* > PS **wüät* ‘ten (10)’ and PU **wiyi-* > PS **ü-* ‘drag’ (s.vv.), but I know of no further examples of **pi* to **pü*; rather, the other, reliable example of PU **pi* yield PS **pi* in Samoyed derivatives from the root **piði* ‘long’. Not in SW; Selkup cognate absent in UEW, SkW gives the connection with Nenets.

138. PU **ponči* > PS **pāncâ* ‘hem, lower edge : нижний край’
 Ng. der. *hontə* | EnT *padi* (EnSl.) | EnF *pade* (EnWl.) | NeT *pan*^o (T65) | NeF *pan*^o (NeSl. *pan*) | Sk. der. *pōnčar* (SkW 486) | Km. *pandar* (KSz 0804) | Mt. ? *handā* (MS 258)
 Aikio 2006a: 23–24; SW: 116.
139. PU **pori-* (**puri-*) > PS **por-* ‘eat : съесть’, der.vn. **porsā* ‘fish meal : варка’
 Ng. der.vn. *hursu* (NgSl.) | EnT der.vn. *podā* (EnSl.) | NeT der.vn. *porca* (T65) | Sk. der.vn. *porsə* (SkW 647, derived there from Even *hopočō* instead) | Mt. *hor-* (MS 316) Sammallahiti 1988: 539; SW: 127–128; UEW: 405–406 (**pure-*).
 — PS **porsā* is a derivative of the same type as PS **āmsā* ‘food’ from **ām-* ‘eat’ (SW 15), and it has a wide distribution from Nganasan to Selkup. The underived verb in Mator **hor-* confirms the Proto-Samoyed reflex of the verb PU **pori-*. The Finno-Ugric languages reflect a preform **puri-* rather than **pori-*.
140. PU **poski* > PS **pātā* ‘cheek : щека’
 Ng. der. *xotuə* (NgSl.) | En. (C) der.? *fāru*, irreg.? *faede* ~ *paede* (SW) | NeT der. *padu* (T65) | Sk. der. *pūtāl* | Km. der. *puʔma* (KSz 0869) | Mt. der. *hoʔlo* (MS 306) Sammallahiti 1988: 539; SW: 117; UEW: 396.
141. PU **pučki* > PS **pucâ* ‘core : сердцевина’
 Ng. der. *hūtəḏä* ‘torso, body, figure : туловище, тело, фигура’ (NgSl.) | EnT der. *puḏodo* ‘torso, body : туловище, тело’ (EnSl.) | EnF der. *puzuj* ‘spinal cord’ (EnWl.) | NeT *pud*^o ‘that which gives balance, steadiness’, *pyah pud*^o ‘core of a tree : сердцевина дерева’ | Sk. *pūčā* (SkW 442) | Km. *pūt* (KSz 0898) | Mt. *hudu-* ‘self : selbst, sich selbst’ (MS 321)
 Aikio 2014a: 11–15; Sammallahiti 1988: 539; SW: 129–130.
142. PU **puḏ’a-* > PS **pājä-* ‘chop wood : нарубить двор’
 Ng. *hoidi*, der. *hoiʔši* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *petur-* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *peturu-* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *pæ°cy°* (T65) | NeF der. *pājāqsy°* (NeSl. *padjaʔ*) | Sk. der. *pačal-* (SkW 499) | Mt. der. *hājäl-* (MS 277)
 Aikio 2006a: 22–23; SW: 112; UEW: 389–390 (**poḏʔ-*).

143. PU ?**puji* > PS **puâ* ‘the backside : сзади, назад’
 Ng. *huə*, adv. (loc.) *huənu* (NgSl.) | EnT der.adv. (lat.) *puoʔ* (EnSl.) | EnF adv. (loc.) *pəna*, der.adj. *pənuj* (EnWl.) | NeT adv. (loc.) *púna*, (abl.) *púd°* (T65) | NeF adv. (loc.) *puna*, (abl.) *put°* (NeSl. *puna*, *put*) | Sk. adv. *pūn* (SkW 379) | Km. der. *puʔmo* (KSz 0873) | Mt. adv. (loc.) *huna* (? *hūna*) (MS 325)
 Aikio 2012: 247; SW: 129 (**puâ*, ? **puwâ*); UEW: 401.
144. PU **puna-* > PS **pân-* ‘braid, weave : заплести’
 Ng. *honsa* (NgSl.) | EnF der. *pəguru-* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *pəŋkəɫcy°* | NeF der. *pəŋkəɫsy°* (NeSl. *pəŋkəɫš*) | Sk. *pan-* / *pač-* (SkW 473) | Km. *pūn-* (KSz 0888)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 133; UEW: 402–403.
 — The final *-a is unexpectedly lost in Samoyed, most likely because it is of the type that became PS *-â, which could be eliminated by analogy (see subsection 3.7.1).
145. PU **pura* > der. PS **pârājŋ* ‘drill : сверло’
 EnT der. *polidu* (?) ‘awl : шило’ (EnSl.) | EnF *polidu* (EnWl.) | NeT *pəreh* | NeT *pālŋ* (NeSl. *paŋŋ*) | Sk. *parāŋ* / *pariŋ* ‘icepick : Eishaue’ (SkW 629) | Km. *paraŋ* (KSz 0808)
 Sammallahti 1988: 539; SW: 114; UEW: 405.
 — PU **puri-* ‘bite’ → see **pori-*.
146. PU **purki* > PS **pur-* (in derivations) ‘smoke : дым’
 NeT der. *pur°q* (T65) | ? Sk. der. *purqə* (SkW 661)
 Aikio 2002: 25–27; SW: 131.
 — The Selkup might be a loan from Khanty instead, KhE *pörki* ‘id.’ (see SkW, Aikio 2006: 30).
147. PU **puwa-* > PS **puâ-* ‘blow : дуть’
 Ng. der. *hüarsa*, der. *hüoləsa*, der. *hüoltəsa*, etc. (NgSl.) | EnT der. *puaro-*, ? der. *pueso-* (EnSl.) | EnF ? der. *pəsa-pesa-* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *púcy°*, der. *púglyo(sy°)*, ? der. *posə(sy°)* (T65) | NeF ? der. *pusipyosy°* (NeSl. *pusipyoš*) | Sk. *pū-*, der. *pūl-* ‘swell : schwellen’ (SkW 381, 700) | Km. der. *pūʔ-* (KSz 0877) | Mt. der. *hal-* (MS 255)
 Aikio 2012: 244; SW: 128–129; UEW: 411.

148. PU **sala-* > PS **tālā-* ‘steal : украсть’, der.augm. *tālēr-* (?**tālāj-*) ‘steal (ipfv.) : воровать, красть’
 Ng. *tolīda-*, der.augm. *tolarsa* (NgSl.) | EnT *tare-*, der.augm. *tarir-* (EnSl.) | EnF *tari-* (EnWl.) | NeT *tałye*(sy°), der.augm. *taler-* (T65) | NeF *tałyesy*° (NeSl. *talješ*) | Sk. *tuâlā-*, der.augm. *tuâlir-* (Sk 1306) | Km. *toler-* (KSz 1232) | Mt. *tälär-* (MS 975)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 150–151; UEW: 430–431.
149. PU **sarka* > PS **tārkā* ‘fork, bifurcation, branch : отросток, ветвь, ответвление’
 EnT *taga* (EnSl.) | NeT *tarka* (T65) | NeF *taṭka* (NeSl. *taṭka*)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 152.
150. PU **säji* > PS **täj* (~ **tää*?) ‘pus : гной’, der.v. ‘rot : сгнить’
 Ng. *tüim-* | EnT *tüim-* (EnSl.) | NeT *tyüm-* | Sk. *tē*, verb *tē-* (SkW 950) | Km. verb *te?*- (KSz 1291) | Mt. *ti* (?) (MS 1007)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540 (**sexji*); SW: 161 (**ti* ~ **te*).
 — Cf. PU **käli* > PS **käj* (~ **kää*?) ‘tongue’. The Mator reflex “*ki*” ‘tongue’ next to “*gei*” and “*káschtä*” ±|*kä*j-tä| ‘his/her tongue’ (MS 1007) may point to a parallel reconstruction of these two words. The vowel reflex of Selkup *tē* is also identical with that of *śē* ‘tongue’. Ng. *tüim-*, EnT *tüim-* and NeT *tyüm* probably reflect **täjm-* rather than **tääm-*, but **tääj-* might also be a possibility.
151. PU **sewi-* ‘eat’ > der. PS **timä* ‘tooth : зуб’
 Ng. *timi* | EnT *tii* (EnSl.) | EnF *čii* (EnWl.) | NeT *tyibya* (T65) | NeF *tyim*° (NeSl. *čim*) | Sk. *timä* (SkW 1037) | Km. *time* (KSz 1198) | Mt. *time* (MS 1091)
 Aikio: 2002: 34–36.
 — This etymology is called into question by Salminen (2023: 394), since, according to him, only PU **seyi-* should yield PS **ti-*, while PU **sewi-* should become PS ***tew-*. However, other instances of **Vwi* normally behave very much like sequences of **Vy* in Samoyed as well (cf. subsection 3.4.3) so that a development from PU **sewi-* to PS **ti-* seems plausible enough (as in PU **mey-* > PS **mi-* ‘give, sell’). The reflexes within Samoyed are furthermore regular, with the exception of the second-syllable vowel of Forest Nenets *tyim*° rather than expected ***tyĩmya*. There, we can assume the same analogical development as took place in PU **čilmä* ‘eye’ > PS **šjämä* >> NeF *xäm*°, NeT *sæw*° rather than expected NeF ***xämya*, NeT ***sæbya*, only this time Tundra Nenets *tyibya* did not undergo the same change (not NeT ***tyiw*° to regularly correspond to NeF *tyim*°).

152. PU **sewi-* ‘eat’ > der. PS **titü* (?**titäw*) ‘bait : приманка’
 Ng. *tütü* (Aikio 2021: 173) | EnF *čidi* (Aikio 2021: 173) | Sk. *tütu* (SkW 1089)
 Aikio 2021: 173.
 — This recently proposed etymology by Aikio strengthens the derivation of PS **timä* from PU **sewi-*, since it corroborates the reflex **ti-* of this root.
153. PU **seksa* > der. PS **tjtaŋ* ‘Siberian pine : кедр’ (*Pinus sibirica*)
 EnT *tiđii* ‘log without branches : чистое бревно без сучьев’ (EnSl.) | NeT *tideh* (T65)
 | NeF *titiŋ* (NeSl. *titiŋ*) | Sk. *tjtaŋ* (SkW 1075) | Km. *tedaŋ* (KSz 1180) | Mt. *tidEŋ* ~ *tüdeŋ*
 (MS 1012 **tjteŋ*)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 160; UEW: 445–446.
154. PU **seŋi* > PS **ceŋ* ‘sinew : жила’
 Ng. *taŋ* (NgSl.) | EnT *ti?* (EnSl.) | EnF *ti?* (EnWl.) | NeT *teh* (T65) | NeF *těŋ* (NeSl. *teŋ*)
 | Sk. **čeŋ*, *čjŋə-* (SkW: 1122) | Km. *ten* (KmSz.) | Mt. *təŋ* (MtSpr: 1004)
 Aikio 2012: 231; Sammallahti 1988: 548 (PFU); SW: 32–33.
 — The development from PU **s-* to Sk. *č-* is irregular; expected would be ***t-* (cf. Aikio 2012: 231). It is technically impossible to tell for certain if the irregularity occurred in Selkup or in earlier Samoyed, since PS **t* and **c* merge in all other Samoyed languages. However, in all other cases of Selkup *č*, this is reconstructed for Proto-Samoyed, so that the internal logic of the reconstruction demands PS **ceŋ* rather than PS **teŋ* in the absence of good arguments in favour of the latter reconstruction.
155. PU **si/äwi* > PS **tiä* ‘year ring (of tree) : годичное кольцо на дереве’
 Ng. (C) *tĭ* (SW) | EnT *tü* (EnSl.) | NeT *tyi* | NeF *tyi* (NeSl. *či*) | Sk. *tü* ‘fibre (in tree) :
 Faser (im Baum)’ (SkW 952)
 Aikio 2012: 244; Sammallahti 1988: 540 (**süxi*).
 — The Proto-Uralic reconstruction is made uncertain due to SaaS *sieve* ‘line, streak’ indicating *säwi* rather than *siwi*, but for the **i* of Samoyed PS **tiä*, PU **siwi* seems to work quite well (see Aikio 2012: 244). A vowel sequence like **iä* resulting from PU **Vwi* is unusual, however, as **Vwi* normally yields a simple vowel **V* (cf. subsection 3.4.3).
156. PU **soski-* > PS der. **tātu-* (?**tâtâw-*) ‘chew : жевать’
 Sk. *tutü-* (SkW 1068) | Km. *tudo-* (KSz 1256)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; Zhivlov 2016: 299

- The word family PS **tât³wâ-* ‘chew’ to Ng. *tubud’a* (NgSl.), EnT *tô²a-* (EnSl.), NeT *təqwa(sy^o)*, Mt. *to²bə-* (MS 1039) looks superficially similar, and is hesitantly compared by Helinski (MS), but proper reconciliation with the Selkup and Kamas forms from PS **tātu-* is difficult. The vowels and the internal consonants do not match.

157. PU **suyi-* > PS **tuâ-* ‘row : грести’

Ng. der.instr. *tuobsa* (NgSl.) | Sk. *tū-* (SkW 941) | Km. der. *tu²-* (KSz 1254)

Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 166; UEW: 449–450.

- The vowel sequence is necessary for the Nganasan instrument noun, which should have been ***tubsa* if derived from a stem **tu-*; Sk. *tū-* also accords better with a vowel sequence than with a simple vowel, cf. PS **ju-* ‘melt : Schmelzen’ > Sk. *ču-* ‘id’ (SkW 1427).

158. PU **suδ’a* > PS **tâjâ* ‘finger : палец’

Mt. *taja* (MS 941)

Janhunen 1981: 224; Sammallahti 1988: 540 (**suwδ’â*); UEW: 449.

- The hypothetical connection with SaaN *čuvdi*, etc., requires a PU **čuwδ’a*, while the Ugric cognates and Samoyed (Mator) require initial **s-* and do not show any **-w-* (see although the latter may in principle have been lost regularly, there are no parallels to confirm or disprove such a loss).

159. PU **suxsi* > PS **tutâ* ‘ski : лыжа’

Ng. *tutâ* (NgSl.) | EnT *tu²do* (EnSl.)

Sammallahti 1988: 540; UEW: 450.

- Sk. *tât-* ‘gehen, Ski laufen’ (SkW 1043) is connected by UEW, but this would rather have to go back to a pre-form **tat-* and cannot regularly be derived from PS **tutâ*.

160. PU **suŋi* > PS **tâŋ* ‘summer : лето’

Ng. *təŋə* (NgSl.) | EnT *too* (EnSl.) | EnF *tɔɔ* (EnWl.) | NeT *təh* (T65) | NeF *tăŋ* (NeSl. *taj*) | Sk. *taŋə* (SkW 1211) | Km. *taŋa* (KSz 1146) | Mt. der.adv. *taŋan* (? *taŋən*) (MS 962)

Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 148; UEW: 454.

- Nenets does not have a final **-â* in this word, as expected due to apocope; in the other branches, a **-â* was probably analogically introduced to the base word from forms like the adverbial **tâŋân*, adjectival **tâŋâjâ*, or other such derivations. Enets *to²* (from **tâŋ*) seems to be attested in older material (see SW).

161. PU **süli* > PS **tij* ‘fathom : сажень’, der. **tj̥mä* ‘id.’
 Ng. (C) *t̥mi* (SW) | EnT *íiee* (EnSl.) | EnF *čibi* (M 305) | NeT *tyíbya* (T65) | NeF *tyimya* (NeSl. *čimja*) | Sk. *tī* (SkW 962) | Mt. *timE* (? *tīmE*) (MS 1020)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 163; UEW: 444.
162. PU **šelki-* > PS **tej-* (or **teä-* ?) ‘fly (pfv.) : полететь, улететь’, der.ipfv. **tej-r-* ‘fly (ipfv.) : летать, лететь’
 Ng. (der.?) *t̥ud̥i*, der.ipfv. *t̥air̥si* (NeSl.) | EnT *íio-*, der.ipfv. *íiir-* (EnSl.) EnF *či-*, der.ipfv. *čir-* (EnWl.) | NeT *tyísy*^o, der.ipfv. *tyírcy*^o (T65) | NeF *tyísy*^o, der.ipfv. *tyítsy*^o (NeSl. *čiš*, *čibš*) | Sk. *tī-* (SkW 965) | Mt. *tī-* (? *tī-*) (MS 1009)
 Aikio 2002: 26; Sammallahti 1988: 550 (PFU); SW: 161–162 (**tī-* ? **tj̥j-*).
 — PS **tej-* (in the older reconstruction, **tj̥j-*) is normally given as the Proto-Samoyed stem, but EnT *íio-* may instead point to **teä-*; this is expected to become NeT *tyí*, NeF *tyi-* in the same way as **tej-*, and the other languages are not entirely clear either. The vowels in the Nganasan forms are difficult to understand. While *t̥air̥si* ‘fly (ipfv.)’ may reflect PS **tej-r-* (or **teä-jr-*?), the second-syllable vowel of the perfective *t̥ud̥i* ‘fly (pfv.)’ is unaccounted for; cf. Kaheinen (2023: 172–173). Since *t̥ud̥i* is disyllabic, it might match EnT *íio-*, but it is unclear how exactly.
163. PU **šera-* > PS **tj̥r̥a-* ‘dry out (intr.) : высохнуть’
 EnT *tira-* (EnSl.) | EnF *tira-* (EnWl.) | NeT *tira*(sy^o) | NeF *tīlasy*^o (NeSl. *tīláš*) | Sk. *tj̥r̥a-* ? (SkW 1299, meaning not entirely certain) | Mt. der.adj. *tiri*, der.caus. *t(i)ribt̥a-* (MS 1028, 1029)
 SW: 160; UEW: 502; Zhivlov 2023: 160.
164. PU **taka-* > PS **tak̥a-* adv., postp. ‘the back : задняя часть’
 Ng. lat. *tag̥a*, loc. *tak̥anu*, abl. *tak̥əð̥a* (NgSl.) | EnT loc. *taxane*, abl. *taxaδ* (EnSl.) | EnF *taxa* (EnWl.) | NeT lat. *tyax*^o*h*, loc. *tyax*^o*na*, abl. *tyaxəd*^o (T65) | Sk. *tāk-* (SkW 1155) | Km. *tak-* (KSz 1121)
 SW: 154; UEW: 506–506.
 — The expected form is PS **tak̥a* with the final vowel, so the consonant-final especially seen in Selkup is probably analogical.

165. PU **talwa-* > PS **tājwā-* ‘reach : добратъся’

Ng. *tojbusa* (NgSl.) | EnT *taa-* (EnSl.) | EnF *tɔɔ-* (EnWl.) | NeT *tæwə*(sy°) (T65) | NeF *tāwās*y° (NeSl. *tēwaš*) | Km. *tu-* (KSz 1253) | Mt. *tajbə-* (MS 942)
Aikio 2002: 29–30; SW: 146.

166. PU **täyḍi* or **täwḍi* > PS **tärä* ‘contents; full : содержимое; полный’

Ng. *terä* (NgSl.) | EnT *tero* (EnSl.) | EnF *tero* (EnWl.) | NeT *tyer*° (T65) | NeF *tyet*° (NeSl. *čet*) | Sk. *tīr* (SkW 1295)
Aikio 2002: 31–34; Sammallahti 1988: 550–551 (FU); SW: 158 (**terä* ~ **tirä*); UEW: 518; Zhivlov 2023: 167.

— Salminen (2023: 392) argues for a Proto-Samoyed reconstruction with retained **-w-* to account for the Selkup long vowel reflex *ī*, but Helimski has shown that PS **tärä* (SW notation **terä*) regularly yields Proto-Selkup **tīrä* (Helimski 2007: 129). Aikio’s reconstruction PU **täwḍi* (Aikio 2002: 31–24) would show a different vowel development from PU **käwḍi* ‘rope’ > PS **kūrä* and also PU **jäwji* ‘lichen’ > PS **jüjä*, so that Zhivlov’s reconstruction as **täyḍi*, with **γ* rather than **w* may be preferable (Zhivlov 2023: 167).

167. PU **täwiw* > PS **tä/ew* ‘lung : лёгкое’

Ng. der. *teiṇdä* (NgSl.) | EnF der. *čji* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *tyiwak*° (T65) | Sk. *tū* (SkW 956) | Km. *tu* (KSz 1252) | Mt. *tüh* (MS 1081)
Sammallahti 1988: 541; SW: 164.

— The vowel is difficult to reconstruct. Ng. *teiṇdä* should probably reflect PS **ä* rather than **e*, since **e* normally becomes Ng. *i* or *i*, but **e* fits better with the *i* in Enets and Nenets. The other reflexes are more ambiguous, with rounding effects of the **w* having changed the vowel quality.

168. PU **tinä* > PS **tän* ‘you (2sg.) : ты’

Ng. der.? *tənə* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *todī* (EnSl.) | Sk. *tan* (SkW 1100) | Km. *tan* (KSz 1136) | Mt. *tən* (MS 928)
Janhunen 2013: 214; SW: 147.

169. PU **toyi-* > PS **tā-* (~ **tā-*) ‘bring, give : давать’, der. **tātā-* ‘id.’

Ng. imp. (T) *tə?* (SW), der. *tätudä*, imp. *təḍu?* (NgSl.) | EnT *ta-*, der. *teḍa-* (and *toḍa-*) (EnSl.) | EnF *taa-*, der. *tɔza-* (EnWl.) | NeT *tasy*°, fut. *tātä-* (T65) | NeF *tasy*° (NeSl. *tāš*) | Sk. der. *tat-* (SkW 1042) | ? Km. *det-* | Mt. ? *ta-* (MS 930)

Sammallahti 1988: 550; SW: 145; UEW: 529–530.

- Strikingly, the reflex PS **tâ-* from PU **toy-* is different from PS **ño-* ‘pursue’ from PU **ño-*. PU **o* normally becomes PS **â* in stems of the type **CoCa* or **CoCCi*, not in the type **CoCi* as here. To understand this, we could potentially consider forms like the aorist stem PS **tâ-ŋâ-* (NeT *ta^o*) or the imperfective participle PS **tâ-ntâ* (NeT *tana*), which can be derived regularly from the consonant stem as in **toy-ŋâ* and **toy-ntâ* with disappearance of the **γ* and a shift from PU **o* to PS **â*. The reflex **tâ-* in the derivative **tâtâ-* has a wide distribution in Samoyed as well, but there is no known parallel for the development from PU **o* to PS **â*. If there was a variant PU **tuy-*, the **â* in PS **tâtâ-* could be explained as an effect of a following suffixal **-â* in **tâtâ-*, as argued by Peyrot (2019b: 193), but then the vowel difference between a hypothetical **tuy-tâ-* on the one hand and **toy-ntâ* (etc.) on the other would still need to be accounted for. The other evidence supports **toy-* (e.g., SaaN *duohkat* ‘sell’ rather than ***duhkat*), so that Peyrot’s explanation for the vocalism of the derivative **tâtâ-* cannot be confirmed.

170. PU **toli-* (**tuli*) > PS **toj-* ~ *tu-* ‘come : прийти, приехать’

Ng. *tujša*, cneg. *tu?* (NgSl.) | EnT *tô-*, cneg. *tu?* (EnSl.) | EnF *to-* (EnWl.) | NeT *tosy^o*, cneg. *tuq* (T65) | NeF *tosy^o*, cneg. *tūq* (NeSl. *toš, tu*) | Sk. *tū-* (SkW 958) | Km. *šo-* (KSz 1070) | Mt. *toj* (MS 1047)

Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 164; UEW: 535.

- The connegative/imperative form of Tundra Enets and both Tundra and Forest Nenets seems to reflect PS **tu-k*, with a different vowel than the one found in the normal stem **toj-* (Nganasan *tu?* is ambiguous and can reflect either PS **tuk* or **tok*). To my knowledge, this vowel discrepancy is not explained, and there seems to be no productive way to obtain it within Samoyed. The Finno-Ugric languages reflect a preform **tuli-* rather than **toli-*. If departing from PU **tuli-k* in the connegative/imperative, PS **tuâk* should be expected, whence NeT ***tūq*, NeF ***tuq* with a long vowel and Ng. ***tuo?* with a vowel sequence. Thus, I see no regular way to derive PS **tu-k*.

171. PU **tolwa* > PS **tajwâ* ‘nail, wedge : гвоздь’

EnT *tea* (EnSl.) | NeT *tyiwa* | NeF *tyewa* (L ± *tšjëββaâ* SW) | Mt. *täjbä* (MS 975)

Aikio 2002: 54 fn. 8; SW: 154.

172. PU **tora-* > PS der. **tāro-* ‘wrestle : бороться’
 Ng. der. *torasa*, der. *torarsa* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *tarur-* (EnSl.) | EnF *tarur-* (EnWl.) |
 NeT der. *tarocy*^o (T65) | Mt. *toro-* (MS 1064)
 Samallahti 1988: 540; SW: 152; UEW: 531.
173. PU **totki* > PS der. **tātu* ‘crucian carp : карась’
 Sk. *tutu* (SkW 1066)
 UEW: 532; Zhivlov 2016: 299.
174. PU **towī* (**tuwī*) > PS **to* ‘lake : озеро’
 Ng. der. *turku* | EnT *tu* ? (EnSl.) | EnF *to* (EnWl.) | NeT *to* (T65) | NeF *tō* (NeSl. *to*) | Sk.
tō~tū, to- (SkW 936) | Km. *tu* (KSz 1251) | Mt. *toh* (MS 1043)
 Gusev 2008; Sammallahti 1988: 540 (**toxi*); SW: 164; UEW: 533.
 — The Finno-Ugric languages reflect a preform **tuwī* rather than **towī*.
175. PU **tuli* > PS **tuj* ‘fire : огонь’
 Ng. *tuj* (NgSl.) | EnT *tu* (EnSl.) | EnF *tu* (EnWl.) | NeT *tu* (T65) | NeF *tū* (NeSl. *tu*) | Sk.
tū (SkW 954) | Km. *šü* (KSz 1088) | Mt. *tuj* (MS 1085)
 Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 166; UEW: 535.
- PU **tuli-* ‘come’ → see **toli-*.
176. PU **tulka* > ? PS **tuā* ‘feather, wing : перо, крыло’
 Ng. *tūo* (NgSl.) | EnT *tua* (EnSl.) | EnF *tō* (EnWl.) | NeT *to* (T65) | NeF *tō* (NeSl. *to*) |
 Sk. *tū* (SkW 940) | Mt. *tua, tuga* (? *toga*) (MS 1070)
 Aikio 2012: 229; Sammallahti 1988: 540; SW: 166; Zhivlov 2023: 164.
177. PU **tumti-* > PS **tumtā-* ‘know, recognize : узнать’
 Ng. *tumtāda* (NgSl.) | EnT *tudo-* (EnSl.) | EnF *tudu-* (EnWl.) | NeT *tumtā*(*sy*^o) (T65) |
 Km. *tīmna-* (KSz 1207) | Mt. *tumdā-* (MS 1091)
 Sammallahti 1988: 541; SW: 167; UEW: 536.
178. PU **tunta-* > PS **tāntā* ‘teach : учить’, der. *tāntō-* (? **tāntāw-*) ‘learn : учиться’
 EnF *tadda-* (M 2433) | NeT der. *tānara*(*sy*^o) ‘punish, teach : наказать, проучить’, der.
tānyo(*sy*^o) ‘calm down : уговориться’ (T65) | Sk. **tan(t)₂-* (SkW 1105)
 Aikio 2002: 44–45; SW: 147.

— PU **tuwi* ‘lake’ → see **towi*.

179. PU **tütki* > PS **titä* ‘open : открыть’

Sk. *tütä* (SkW 1096) | Km. *šiʔdä* (KSz 1060)

Aikio 2006a: 26.

180. PU **uji* (**owji*-) > PS **uâ* ‘swim : плыть’

NeT der. *ɲoxolcy*^o (T65) | NeF *ɲusy*^o (Salminen 2012: 349), der. *ɲuxuʂsy*^o (L *ɲuxur*’ś)
| Sk. *ū-*, der. *ūqəl-* (SkW 4) | Mt. *u-* (? *ū-*) (MS 1108)

Aikio 2020: 82 (PU **owji*-, PS **uâ*-); Salminen (2012: 349–350; PS **uj*-); Sammallahti 1988: 536 (PU **uxi*-, PS **u-*); SW: 29.

— As Aikio (2020) points out, Salminen’s (2012) reconstruction as PS **uj*- does not accord with the Selkup vowel, which should have become Sk. ***ū*; PS **uâ* regularly yields NeT *ú* and Sk. *ū*, rendering PS **uâ* the more fitting reconstruction.

181. PU **ukti* > PS **utâ* ‘way, track, footprint : путь, след’

Ng. *ɲutə* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *uđi* (EnSl.) | EnF *uʔ* (EnWl.) | NeT *ɲuq* (T65) | NeF *ɲut*^o (NeSl. *ɲut*)

Aikio 2012: 230; 2020: 86; SW: 30 (**uât*); UEW: 546 (**utka*).

— Ng. *ɲutə* and NeF *ɲut*^o point to PS **utâ* while EnF *uʔ* and NeT *ɲuq* point to PS **ut*; PS **utâ* is the expected form on account of the Proto-Uralic cluster **-kt-*, after which PU **-i* is normally preserved (cf. section 3.3).

182. PU **ulki* > PS **uj* ‘pole : шест’

Ng. *ɲij* (NgSl.) | EnT *ɲu* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *ɲuzu* (EnWl.) | NeT *ɲu* (T65) | NeF *ɲǔ* (NeSl. *ɲu*) | Sk. *ū* (SkW 8)

Aikio 2002: 26; Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 29–30; UEW: 543.

183. PU **üli* > PS **i* ‘on; space above, top : на; вершина’

Ng. *ńi* (NgSl.) | EnT *ńiʔ* (EnSl.) | EnF *n’i* (EnWl.) | NeT e.g., lat. *nyih*, abl. *nyid*^o | NeF e.g., loc. *nyĩnya*, abl. *nyĩt*^o (NeSl. *ninja*, *nĩt*) | Sk. *i-* (SkW 10) | Km. *ni* (KSz 0690) | ? Mt. ?der. “нем-” ? *ńim-*, *nim-* ‘raise : hochnehmen, heben’ (MS 734)

Sammallahti 1988: 536; SW: 26.

— With the initial nasal in all Samoyed languages except Selkup seems to be taken over from the genitive **-n* (SW 26). The reduction to PS **i* rather than

more expected **ij* or **iä* is probably because this is a postposition, a function word, which are susceptible to phonological reductions.

184. PU **ülkä* > ? PS **ij* ‘son : сын’

? NeT der. *nyicy*^o ‘calve : отелиться’ | Sk. *ī* (SkW 13)

Aikio: 2020: 95.

— The phonological development from PU **ülkä* (PSaa. **ēlkē* ‘son’, Fi. *ylkä* ‘bridegroom’) to PS **ij* would require a development as though it were **ülki*, like in **ulki* ‘pole’ to PS **uj*. This could be paralleled in **pälkä* (q.v.) but remains poorly understood (see Aikio 2020: 95).

185. PU **üwä* > PS **(n/l)ä* ‘belt : пояс’

Ng. der. *ɲiədä* | EnT *niojo* (EnSl.) | EnF *n’aju* (EnWl.) | NeT *nyí* (T65) | NeF *nyĩ* (NeSl. *nĩ*) | Sk. *čü* (SkW 1433) | Km. *tĩ* (KSz 1361) | Mt. *Ni* (MS 750)

Aikio 2012: 230; Sammallahti 1988: 536 (**üxji*); SW: 102; UEW: 90 (**jäje*).

— Ng. *ɲiədä* should derive from **iä* rather than from **niä* or **jiä*. The initial **n-* (in Enets and Mator) and **j-* (in Selkup and Kamas) are both prothetic elements. In Nenets the initial nasal would be automatic in any case.

186. PU **wajni* > PS **wajj* ‘breath; soul : дыхание, душа’

Ng. der. *batüü?*, der. *batäda* ‘breathe : дышать’ (NgSl.) | EnT ? *beu*, der. *bedu?o* (EnSl.) | EnF *bedu?* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *yínt^oq* (T65) | NeF der. *wyent^o* (NeSl. *wjent*) | Sk. *kuâj(i)* (SkW 2078) | Km. *majä* (KSz 541) | Mt. der. *möjüh* (? *mojuh*) (MS 684)

Sammallahti 1988: 541; SW: 173; UEW: 552–553.

187. PU **wala* > PS **wālā* ‘song : песня’

Ng. *bālī* (NgSl.) | EnT *bare* (EnSl.) | EnF *bare* (EnWl.) | ? NeT der. ? *wal^oq*

Aikio 2006: 26–27; UEW: 812.

188. ? PU **wali-* > PS **wāâ-* ‘speak, promise : говорить, обещать’, der.n. *wāâtā* ‘word : слово’

Ng. *buod’a*, der.n. *buodu* (NgSl.) | EnT *baa-* (EnSl.) | EnF der.n. *baza* (EnWl.) | NeT *wasy^o*, der.n. *wada* (T65) | NeF der.n. *wata* (NeSl. *wāta*) | Mt. der.n. *bāda* (MS 89)

SW: 171.

— A hypothetical Proto-Uralic verb corresponding to the noun PU **wala* > PS **wālā* ‘song’ with the same stem-final vowel alternation between **-i* and **-a* in verbs and nouns as discussed briefly by Aikio (2002: 54 fn. 10). The

reconstruction to PU **wali-* is based on this likely relationship to the noun **wala* ‘song’, which is found in other Uralic languages as well. The phonological development would be entirely parallel to that of PU **kali-* > PS **kââ-* ‘die’. Not the same word as PU **wali-* ‘carve’, which is unknown from Samoyed.

189. PU $\pm$ **wančaw* > PS **wāncō* (**wāncāw*) ‘root : корень’

Ng. *bəntu* (NgSl.) | EnT *badu* (EnSl.) | EnF *badu* (EnWl.) | NeT *wano* (T65) | NeF *wanu* (NeSl. *wanu*) | Sk. *končə* (SkW 2023) | Km. *mona* (KSz 0614) | Mt. *mondo(h)* (MS 689) Sammallahti 1988: 541 (**wāncā*); SW: 171 (**wāncə ? *wāncāj*); UEW: 548–549.

190. PU **wara* > PS **wārā* ‘mountain, ridge : гора, скала’

Ng. *bəru* (NgSl.) | Sk. *kūrə* (SkW 2288) | ? Km. *bor* (KSz 0146) Aikio 2006a: 27–28; Sammallahti 1988: 551 (PFU).

191. PU **watka-* > ? PS **wât-* ‘debark (a tree) : обдирать’

NeT *wacy°*, der. *watə(sy°)* (T65)

Aikio 2015b: 56; UEW: 561.

— The combination of loss of the final vowel and the development of the first-syllable vowel is aberrant: expected would be PS ***watâ-* (NeT ***yadə(sy°)*), secondarily **wat-* (NeT ***yacy°*) or PS ***wâtâ-* (NeT ***wada(sy°)*), based on the behaviour of other, structurally similar words. A reconstruction PU **wotka-* would be better for Nenets, as this could yield PS **wât(â)* and thus NeT *wacy°* similar to PU **wočə* to PS **wâc(â)*, NeT *waq* ‘enclosure’, but this does not work for the other Uralic cognates like MdE *vatka-* ‘debark’. Other possible reconstructions based on the Nenets form are PS **wâk-/ *wâs-/ *wâc-*, which, combined with the unexpected vocalism, makes the Uralic etymology less than compelling, despite the good semantic match and general phonological similarity.

192. PU **weyi-* > ? PS **î-* ‘take : брать’

Sk. *î-* (SkW 14) | Km. *î-* (KSz 0229)

Aikio 2013: 171.

— The initial **w-* was apparently unstable, and disappeared in a few cases, cf. PU **woli-* ‘be’ > PS **ââ-*, **âj-* and PU **woδ’i* ‘new’ > PS **oj-*. This is similar to the disappearance of the other glide **j-* in PU **jeki-* ‘drink’ to PS **ē-* and in PU **joŋsi* ‘bow’ everywhere except in Nganasan.

193. PU **weti* > PS **wet* ‘water : вода’

Ng. *bi?* (NgSl.) | EnT *bu?* (EnSl.) | EnF *bu?* (EnWl.) | NeT *yiq* (T65) | NeF *wyiq* (NeSl. *wi?*) | Sk. *üt, ütə-* (SkW 107) | Km. *bü* (KSz 0172) | Mt. *bü* (MS 143)

Sammallahti 1988: 541; SW: 176; UEW: 570.

194. PU $\pm$?**wijit(t)i* > PS **wüät* ‘ten : десять (10)’

Ng. *bii?* (NgSl.) | EnT *biu?* (EnSl.) | EnF *biu?* ~ *bi?* (EnWl.) | NeT *yúq* (T65) | NeF *juq* (NeSl. *dju?*) | Sk. *kōt* (SkW 1965) | Km. *beʔn* (KSz 0187) | Mt. *čūt-čüʔn* (MS 245)

Aikio 2012: 241–242; Sammallahti 1988: 541; SW: 177; UEW: 577.

— In NeF **wyuq* would be expected rather than *juq*. The exact Proto-Uralic reconstruction is unclear, cf. Aikio (2012: 241–242).

195. PU **wiyi-* > ? PS **ü-* ‘drag : тащить’, der. *ükəl-* ‘id.’

NeT der. *nyuxəlye(sy°)* (T65) | Sk. *ũ-*, der. *ūqəl-* (SkW 9)

Helinski *apud* Aikio 2002: 49; SW: 30–31.

196. PU **woča* > PS **wāc(ā)* ‘enclosure : загон’

Ng. (T) *bə?* (SW) | EnT *ba?* (EnSl.) | NeT *waq* (T65) | NeF *wat°* (NeSl. *wat*) | Sk. der. *kuāču* ‘fishing weir; tributary : Damm, Wehr; Zufluß’ (SkW 1903)

Aikio 2015b: 62; Sammallahti 1988: 541; SW: 171; UEW: 577–578.

— Cf. also Sk. *quāččə* ‘town : Stadt’ (SkW 1912), which is given as the Selkup reflex by UEW. However, the initial *q-* is at least unexpected (normally PS **w-* to Sk. *k-* with possible assimilation to a following *-q-*, of which this word has none), and so is the geminate *-čč-*. The second-syllable vowel is clearly lost in Nganasan, Tundra Enets and Tundra Nenets, perhaps due to analogical removal from expected PS **wācā*. Forest Nenets *wat°* could reflect this expected pre-form, but it may also have (re-)obtained a second-syllable schwa secondarily as the result of an analogical change in the opposite direction.

197. PU **wod’i* (or **wuδ’i*) > PS **oj-* ‘new : новый’

SkTaz der.adv. *oćij* ‘again, anew’ (Zhivlov 2023: 166)

Sammallahti 1988: 551; UEW: 587; Zhivlov 2023: 166.

— The Finno-Ugric language reflect a preform **wuδ’i* rather than **wod’i*. The initial **w-* was apparently unstable, and disappeared in a few cases, cf. PU **woli-* ‘be’ > PS **āḍ-*, **āj-* and PU **weyi-* ‘take’ > PS **i-*. This is similar to the

disappearance of the other glide **j-* in PU **jeki-* ‘drink’ to PS **ġ-* and in PU **joŋsi* ‘bow’ everywhere except in Nganasan.

198. PU **woli-* ‘be’ > PS **ââ-* ~ **âj-* (**aj*) ‘be : быть’

Ng. (**ââ-*) imp.2sg. *ŋuo?* | EnT *a-* (EnSl.) | EnF (**âj-*) *ε-*, (**ââ-*) *ŋa-* (EnWl.) | NeT (**âj-*) *ŋæsy°*, (**ââ-*) *ŋa-* (T65) | NeF *ŋäsy°* (NeSl. *ŋěš*) | Sk. (**aj-*) **ē-* (SkW) | ? Km. (**aj*) *i-* (KmSz.) | Mt. (**aj-*) *âj-* (MS 59)

Janhunen 2020: 134–135; SW: 16–17; UEW: 580.

- The initial **w-* was lost irregularly. This verb shows an alternation between reflexes of PS **ââ* and **âj* in Nenets and in Forest Enets (the two sequences regularly merge in Tundra Enets); cf. Janhunen (2020: 134–135). I think that PS **ââ* represents the original vowel stem of **woli-*, while PS **âj-* reflects the consonant stem **wol-*, used before suffixes longer than a single consonant. The southern Samoyed languages seem to reflect a vowel **a* rather than **â*, an issue that is found in various words and still requires a proper explanation. Kamas *i-* is put here as well in SW, but this may rather reflect PS **(j)i-* ‘be’, as in Ng. *ísa* (suppletive with imp.2sg. *ŋuo?*), NeT *yib°q* ‘if it is’ (see Janhunen 2020).

199. PU **wolka* > PS **wajk* ‘shoulder : плечо’, der. *wajkkâ* ‘neck : шея’

Ng. der. *bakəðəð* (NgSl.) | EnT der. *beko* (EnSl.) | EnF der. *beko* (EnWl.) | NeT der. *yík°* (T65) | NeF der. *wyeqk°* (NeSl. *wje°k*) | Sk. *quâq* ‘shoulder’ (SkW 2106) | Km. der. *bajka* (0091) | Mt. der. *bäjkä* (?) K ~ *böjkö* (?) *büjkü* M (MS 107)

Sammallahti 1988: 551 (PFU); SW 173; UEW: 581.

- The loss of PU **-a* may have occurred via a reduction to **-â*, cf., e.g., PU **woča* ‘enclosure’ > PS **wâc*. The development of PU **-lk-* to PS **-jk-* seems to be unique to this word, cf. PU **ulki*, PU **ülkä*, PU **šelki-*, PU **tolka*, where the cluster develops like **-j-*. A hypothetical PU **wolkka* cannot account for this, since such a reconstruction is incompatible with cognates such as SaaN *oalgi* (rather than **oalki*) and Fi. *olka* (rather than **olkka*).

200. PU **woŋki* > PS **wâŋkâ* ‘hole, cave : яма’

Ng. *baŋkə* ‘dugout : землянка’ (NgSl.) | EnT *bago* (EnSl.) | EnF *bago* (EnWl.) | NeT *wajk°* (T65) | NeF *wâŋk°* (NeSl. *wajk*)

Sammallahti 1988: 551; SW: 171–172; UEW: 583; Zhivlov 2023: 163.

- PU **wuδ’i* ‘new’ → see **woδ’i*.

201. PU **(w)uwa* > PS **wuâ* ‘current : течение’

Ng. *buo* (NgSl.)

Aikio 2012: 244.

- The Saami cognates such as SaaN *avvit* ‘flow’ do not show the initial **w*-reflected in the Nganasan *b*-, meaning that it was either irregularly lost in Saami or irregularly added in Samoyed/Nganasan.

Bibliography

Bibliographical abbreviations

CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts (CEToM)*. Created and maintained by Melanie Malzahn, Martin Braun, Hannes A. Fellner, and Bernhard Koller. <https://cetom.univie.ac.at/>

DThTA = Carling & Pinault 2023.

EnSl. = Евгений Хелимский. Энецкий словарь. [Eugene Helimski. Enets dictionary.] Manuscript.

EnWl. = Olesya Khanina & Andrey Shluinsky. Forest Enets wordlist. Manuscript.

INEL Selkup Corpus = Maria Brykina, Svetlana Orlova & Beáta Wagner-Nagy. 2021. *INEL Selkup Corpus. Version 2.0*. Publication date 2021-12-31. Archived at Universität Hamburg. <https://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-F4D9-1>. In: The INEL corpora of indigenous Northern Eurasian languages. <https://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-F45A-1>.

KSz = Janurik 2021.

LIV = Rix & Kümmel 2001.

MS = Helimski 1997.

NeSl. = Barmič & Vello 2002.

NgSl. = Kosterkina, Momde & Ždanova 2001.

SkW = Alatalo 2004.

SW = Janhunen 1977.

SWTF I = Waldschmidt & Bechert. 1973.

T65 = Tereščenko 1965.

UEW = Rédei 1988–1991.

References

Abaffy, Erzsébet E. 2001. On the origin of the Hungarian verbal number and person markers: some controversial issues. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 48, 321–335.

Abondolo, Daniel. 1998. Introduction. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, 1–42.

- Adams, Douglas Q. 1983. Studies in Tocharian Vocabulary II: Words pertaining to the Lower Limbs in Tocharian B. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, 611–614.
2000. Some observations of peoples, places, and languages in the Tarim Basin in the first millennium AD. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9, 1–28.
2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.
- Aikio, Ante (Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte). 2002. New and Old Samoyed Etymologies. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 57, 9–57.
- 2006a. New and Old Samoyed Etymologies (Part 2). *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 59, 5–34.
- 2006b. On Germanic-Saami contacts and Saami prehistory. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 91, 9–55.
2012. On Finnic long vowels, Samoyed vowel sequences and Proto-Uralic *x. In Tiina Hyytiäinen et al. (eds.), *Per Urales ad Orientem: Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festschrift tillägnad Juha Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 227–250.
2013. Studies in Uralic Etymology I: Saami Etymologies. *Linguistica Uralica* 3/2013, 161–174.
- 2014a. Studies in Uralic Etymology II: Finnic Etymologies. *Linguistica Uralica* 1/2014, 1–19.
- 2014b. Studies in Uralic Etymology III: Mari Etymologies. *Linguistica Uralica* 2/2014, 81–93.
- 2014c. On the reconstruction of Proto-Mari Vocalism. *Journal of Language Relationship* 11, 125–157.
- 2014d. The Uralic-Yukaghir lexical correspondences: genetic inheritance, language contact or chance resemblance? *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 62, 7–76.
2015. ‘Finnic ‘secondary e-stems’ and Proto-Uralic vocalism. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 95, 25–66.
2020. Uralic Etymological Dictionary (draft version of entries A-Ć). https://www.academia.edu/41659514/URALIC_ETYMOLOGICAL_DICTIONARY_draft_version_of_entries_A_Ć
2021. Studies in Uralic Etymology V: Permic Etymologies. *Linguistica Uralica* 3/2021, 161–179.
- 2022a. Proto-Uralic. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso & Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–27.
- 2022b. *-kkAs: a Proto-Uralic inclinative suffix. In Kaisla Kaheinen et al. (eds.), *Hämeenmaalta Jamalille. Kirja Tapani Salmiselle 07.04.2022*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 15–33.

- Aikio, Ante & Jussi Ylikoski. 2016. The origin of the Finnic *l*-cases. *Fenno-Ugrica Suecana Nova Series* 15, 59–158.
- Akao, Miyu. 2020. Internal and External Factors behind the Development of the Tocharian Secondary Cases. In David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles, November 8th and 9th, 2019*. Tübingen: Buske, 1–16.
- Alatalo, Jarmo. 2004. *Sölkupisches Wörterbuch aus Aufzeichnungen von Kai Donner, U.T. Sirelius und Jarmo Alatalo*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Alhoniemi, Alho. 1996. Zur verwendung der Objektkonjugation im Mordwin-ischen. In Lars-Gunnar Larsson (ed.), *Lapponica et Uralica. 100 Jahre finnisch-ugrischer Unterricht an der Universität Uppsala: Vorträge am Jubiläumssymposium 20.-23. April 1994*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 145–152.
- Allentoft, M.E. et al. 2015. Population genomics of Bronze Age Eurasia. *Nature* 522, 167–172.
- Anderson, Gregory D.S. 2006. Towards a Typology of the Siberian Linguistic Area. In Yaron Matras et al. (eds.), *Linguistic Areas: convergence in Historical and Typological Perspective*. Basingstoke-New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 266–300.
- Anikin & Helimski 2007. = A. E. Аникин & E. A. Хелимский 2007. *Самодийско-тунгусо-маньчжурские лексические связи*. [Samoyed-Tungus-Manchu lexical connections.] Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
- Anthony, David. 2007. *The horse, the wheel and language*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
2013. Two IE phylogenies, three PIE migrations, and four kinds of steppe pastoralism. *The Journal of Language Relationship* 9, 1–21.
- Anthony, David & Don Ringe. 2015. The Indo-European Homeland from Linguistic and Archaeological Perspectives. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 1, 199–219. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguist-030514-124812>
- Authier, Gilles. 2012. New strategies for relative clauses in Azeri and Apsheron Tat. In Volker Gast and Holger Diessel (eds.), *Clause linkage in cross-linguistic perspective: Data-driven approaches to cross-clausal syntax*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 225–252.
- Bakró-Nagy, Marianne, Katalin Sipőcz & Elena Skribnik. 2022. North Mansi. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso & Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 537–564.

- Barmič & Vello 2002. = М. Я. Бармич & И. А. Вэлло. 2002. *Словарь ненецко-русский и русско-ненецкий (лесной диалект)*. [Nenets-Russian and Russian-Nenets dictionary (forest dialect).] Санкт-Петербург: Просвещение.
- Bateman, Nicoleta. 2007. *A Crosslinguistic Investigation of Palatalization*. PhD-dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
2011. On the Typology of Palatalization. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5/8, 588–602.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek. 2015. Non-Indo-European features of the Tocharian dialects. In Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld and Barbara Podolak (eds.), *Words and Dictionaries*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 55–67.
- Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
2011. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Second edition. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Belyaev, Oleg. 2010. Evolution of Case in Ossetic. *Iran and the Caucasus* 14, 287–322.
- Bereczki, Gábor. 1988. Geschichte der wolgafinnischen Sprachen. In Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages: Description, History and Foreign Influences*. Leiden: Brill, 314–351.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1973. The Mordvinian Conjugation as a Problem of Reconstruction. In Erkki Itkonen and Alho Alhoniemi (eds.), *Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Erkki Itkonen sexagenarii die XXVI mensis aprilis anno MCMLXXIII*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 44–52.
- Bernard, Chams. 2023. *Like Dust on the Silk Road. An investigation of Iranian loanwords in Tocharian, with a focus on the oldest ones*. PhD-dissertation, Leiden University.
- Bernhard, Franz. 1958. *Die Nominalkomposition im Tocharischen*. PhD-dissertation, Göttingen.
- Bernhardt, Mariann. 2020. The variation of conjugation types in Erzya perception verbs. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 27, 21–48.
- Bjørn, Rasmus G. 2022. Indo-European loanwords and exchange in Bronze Age Central and East Asia: Six new perspectives on prehistoric exchange in the Eastern Steppe Zone. *Evolutionary Human Sciences* 4, e23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2022.16>
- Broomhead, J.W. 1962. *A textual edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean manuscripts. With transliteration, translation, grammatical commentary and vocabulary*. PhD-dissertation, Cambridge: Trinity College.

- Brosman, Paul W., Jr. 2010. The *nt*-participles and the verbal adjectives in *-to*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115, 22–34.
- Budzisch, Josefina. 2021. *Definitheit im Selkupischen*. Szeged: University of Szeged.
- Burkova, Svetlana. 2022. Nenets. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 674–708.
- Burlak, Svetlana. 2000. *Историческая фонетика тохарских языков* [The historical phonetics of the Tocharian languages.] Москва: Российская Академия Наук, Институт Востоковедения.
- Burlak, Svetlana & Ilya B. Itkin. 2003. A sound change that never happened: The fate of Proto-Tocharian**o* (B *o*) in Tocharian A. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 10, 17–35.
- Carling, Gerd. 1999. The Tocharian inflected adverbials and adpositions in relation to the case system. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 8, 95–110.
2000. *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
2005. Proto-Tocharian, Common Tocharian, and Tocharian - on the value of linguistic connections in a reconstructed language. In Karlene Jones-Bley et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual UCLA Indo-European conference*. Washington, C.D.: Institute for the Study of Man, 47–71.
2006. Notes on the Syntactic Functions of the Tocharian Clitic Pronouns. In Gerd Carling (ed.), ^{GIS.HUR} *gul-za-at-ta-ra: Festschrift for Folke Josephson*. Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning, 32–45.
2012. Development of form and function in a case system with layers: Tocharian and Romani compared. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13, 57–76.
- Carling, Gerd & Georges-Jean Pinault. 2023. *Dictionary and thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Čeremisina 1991 = М. И. Черемисина. 1991. *Селькупский глагол: формы и их синтаксические функции*. [The Selkup verb: forms and their syntactic functions.] Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State University.
- Childebayeva, Ainash et al. 2024. Bronze age Northern Eurasian genetics in the context of development of metallurgy and Siberian ancestry. *Communications Biology* 7.
- Collinder, Björn. 1940. *Jukagirisch und Uralisch*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Cooreman, Ann M. 1987. *Transitivity and discourse continuity in Chamorro narratives*. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter.

- Coppock, Elizabeth & Stephen Wechsler. 2010. Less-travelled paths from pronoun to agreement: the case of the Uralic objective conjugations. In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG10 Conference*. Standord: CSLI Publications, 186–206.
- Couvreur, Walter. 1947. *Hoofdzaken van de Tochaarse klank- en vormleer*. Leuven: Beheer van Philologische Studiën.
- Cowgill, Warren. 1967. Ablaut, Accent and Umlaut in the Tocharian Subjunctive. In Walter W. Arndt et al. (eds.), *Studies in Historical Linguistics in Honor of George Sherman Lane*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 171–181.
- Csepregi, Márta. 2023. Khanty. In Daniel Abondolo & Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi (eds.), *The Uralic Languages*. Second Edition. London-New York: Routledge, 703–752
- Csúcs, Sándor. 2005. *Die Rekonstruktion der permischen Grundsprache*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Däbritz, Chris Lasse. 2017. Zur Markierung von Numerus an Nomina in den samojedischen Sprachen – Synchronie und mögliche Implikationen für die Rekonstruktion des Protosamojedischen und des Protouralischen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 41, 63–101.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Irina Nikolaeva. 2011. *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Damgaard, P. de B. et al. 2018. 137 ancient human genomes from across the Eurasian steppes. *Nature* 557, 269–374.
- Del Tomba, Alessandro. 2018. On the pronominal feminine plural in Tocharian, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 123, 339–356.
2020. *The Tocharian Gender System: A Diachronic Study*. PhD-dissertation, Leiden University.
- Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
2015. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- De Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Dragoni, Federico. 2023. *Watañi lāntaṃ: Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2010/11. A magyar tárgyas és alanyi igeragozás kialakulásának szintaktikai hátteréről. [On the syntactic background of the evolution of the Hungarian

- objective and subjective conjugations.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 107, 131–146.
2013. From Proto-Hungarian SOV to Old Hungarian Top Foc V X. *Diachronica* 30, 202–231.
- Erdal, Marcel. 2004. *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Eyþórsson, Þórhallur. 1993. Proto-Indo-European origins of Tocharian accent: Class V subjunctives in Tocharian B. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 6, 43–94.
- Fellner, Hannes. 2005. *Die Vertretung der Labiovelare im Tocharischen*. MA-thesis, Universität Wien.
2013. *Studies in Tocharian adjective formation*. PhD-dissertation, Harvard University.
2014. Tocharian special agents: the *nt*-participles. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15, 53–67.
- Fellner, Hannes. & Laura Grestenberger. 2018. Die Reflexe der **-nt-* und **-mh,no-* Partizipien im Hethitischen und Tocharischen. In Elisabeth Rieken (ed.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanische Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 63–82.
- Filchenko, Andrey Yury. 2007. *A Grammar of Eastern Khanty*. PhD-dissertation, Houston, Texas.
- Friis, Louise S. 2021. Tocharian B agent nouns in *-ntsa* and their origin. *Indo-European Linguistics* 9, 1–25.
2024. *Studies in Tocharian verbal morphology relevant to the cladistic position of Tocharian in Indo-European*. PhD-dissertation, Leiden University.
- Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1972 = Т. В. Гамкрелидзе, В. В. Иванов 1972. Лингвистическая типология и реконструкция системы индоевропейских смычных. [Linguistic typology and reconstruction of the system of Indo-European stops.] In C.B. Bernstein et al. (eds.), *Конференция по сравнительно-исторической грамматике индоевропейских языков (12-14 декабря), предварительные материалы*. Moskva: Nauka, 15–18.
- Georg, Stefan. 2023. Connections between Uralic and other language families. In Daniel Abondolo and Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi (eds.), *The Uralic Languages*. Second edition. London-New York: Routledge, 176–209.

- Georg, Stefan & Uwe Seefloth. 2019. Uralo-Eskimo? In E. V. Golovko et al. (eds.), *Лингвистика и другие важные вещи. Памяти Александра Павловича Володина (1935–2017)*. Sankt-Peterburg: RAN, 436–451.
- Gippert, Jost. 1987. Zu den sekundären Kasusaffixen des Tocharischen. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1, 22–39.
- Givón, Talmy. 1994. The pragmatics of de-transitive voice: Functional and typological aspects of inversion. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Voice and Inversion*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3–44.
- Grestenberger, Laura. 2020. The diachrony of participles in the (pre)history of Greek and Hittite. Losing and gaining functional structure. *Diachronica* 37(2), 215–263.
- Griffith, Aaron. 2011. Old Irish pronouns: agreement affixes vs. clitic arguments. In Andrew Carnie (ed.), *Formal approaches to Celtic linguistics*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 65–93.
- Grünthal, Riho et al. 2022. Drastic demographic events triggered the Uralic spread. *Diachronica* 39, 490–524.
- Goldstein, David. 2016. Variation versus Change: Clausal Clitics between Homer and Herodotus. *Indo-European Linguistics* 4, 53–97.
- Gusev 2008 = Валентин Ю. Гусев. 2008. Ауслautное -w в самодийских языках: нганасанско-маторская изоглосса. [Auslaut -w in the Samoyed languages: a Nganasan-Mator isogloss.] *Материалы 2-й между-народной конференции по самодистике*. Санкт-Петербург: Нестор-История, 114–128.
- Hackstein, Olav. 1995. *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsenstamm-bildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
2003. Zur Entwicklung von Modalität in Verbaladjektiven. In Eva Tichy, Dagmar S. Wodtko & Britta Irslinger (eds.), *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indo-germanischen Gesellschaft, Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001*. Bremen: Hempen, 51–66.
2017. The phonology of Tocharian. In Jared Klein et al. (eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics*. Volume 2. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1304–1335.
- Häkkinen, Jaakko. 2012. Early contacts between Uralic and Yukaghir. In Tiina Hyytiäinen et al. (eds.), *Per Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festschrift tillägnad Juha Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 91–101.
2023. On locating Proto-Uralic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 68, 43–100.

- Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1984. Wäre es schon an der Zeit, den Stammbaum zu fällen? Theorien über die gegenseitigen Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, Neue Folge, Band 4, 1–24.
- Hale, Mark R. 1987. *Studies in the comparative syntax of the oldest Indo-Iranian languages*. PhD-dissertation, Harvard University.
- Hall, T. A. 2000. Typological generalizations concerning secondary palatalization. *Lingua* 110, 1–25.
- Hall, T. A. & Silke Hamann. 2006. Towards a typology of stop assibilation. *Linguistics* 44, 1196–1236.
- Hall, T. A. & Silke Hamann & Marzena Zygis. 2006. The phonetic motivation for phonological stop assibilation. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 36, 59–81.
- Hamari, Arja & Rigina Ajanki. 2022. Mordvin (Erzya and Moksha). In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 392–431.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1994. Passive Participles across Languages. In Paul J. Hopper and Barbara A. Fox (eds.), *Voice: Form and Function*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 151–177.
- Havas, Ferenc. 2004. Objective conjugation and medialisation. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 51, 95–141.
- Helimski, Eugene. 1983. *The Language of the First Selkup Books*. Szeged: University of Szeged.
1986. = Евгений Хелимский. 1986. Etymologica 1–48: Материалы по этимологии маторско-тайгийско-карагасского языка. [Etymologica 1–48: Materials on etymologies of the Mator-Taigi-Karagass language.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 88, 119–143.
- 1992/93. = Евгений Хелимский. 1992/93. Etymologica 49–79: 'Материалы по этимологии маторско-тайгийско-карагасского языка.' [Etymologica 49–79: Materials on etymologies of the Mator-Taigi-Karagass language.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 93, 101–123.
1993. = Евгений Хелимский. 1993. Прасамодийские *ǵ и *ǝ: прауральские источники и нганасанские рефлексy. [Proto-Samoyed *ǵ and *ǝ: Proto-Uralic sources and Nganasan reflexes.] In Marianne Bakró-Nagy & Enikő Szűj, *Hajdú Péter 70 Éves*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet, 125–133.
1997. *Die Matorische Sprache*. Szeged: University of Szeged.

1998. Nganasan. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, 480–515.
2005. The 13th Proto-Samoyedic vowel. In Wagner-Nagy Beáta (ed.), *Mikola-konferencia 2004*. Szeged: University of Szeged, 27–39.
2007. = Евгений Хелимский. 2007. Продление гласных перед шва в селькупском языке как фонетический закон. [Pre-schwa vowel lengthening in Selkup as a sound law.] *Linguistica Uralica* 43, 124–133.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1986. *Studies in Tocharian Phonology, Morphology and Etymology with special emphasis on the o-vocalism*. PhD-dissertation, Leiden University.
- 1989a. Rounding and exceptions from rounding in East Tocharian. *Indogerman-ische Forschungen* 94, 101–134.
- 1989b. *The dual forms of nouns and pronouns in Tocharian*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
1991. *The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian: A Study in Word Formation*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
1993. Development of labiovelars (and tectals plus *ʉ*) in initial position in Tocharian (an overview). *Die Sprache* 35, 176–86.
- Hoffner, Harry A. & H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A grammar of the Hittite language. Part 1, Reference grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Holopainen, Sampsa. 2019. *Indo-Iranian borrowings in Uralic. Critical overview of the sound substitutions and distribution criterion*. PhD-dissertation, University of Helsinki.
2021. On the question of substitution of palatovelars in Indo-European loanwords in Uralic. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 98, 197–233.
2023. Hunting for the Uralic accusative(s). Review of: László Honti, *Az ősi uráli tárgyrag története és vesszőfutása: Accusatum et expulsum*. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 68, 237–244.
- Honti, László. 1976. Az osztják személyjelölő suffixumok történeti áttekintése. [A historical overview of the Ostyak personal suffixes.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 78, 71–119.
1995. Zur Morphotaktik und Morphosyntax der uralischen/finnisch-ugrischen Grundsprache. In Heikki Leskinen et al. (eds.), *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Jyväskylä 10.–15.8.1995. Pars I: Orationes plenariae et conspectus quinquennales*. Jyväskylä: Moderatores, 53–82.
1998. ObUgrian. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, 327–357.

- 1998/99. Gondolatok a mordvin tárgyaz igeragozás uráli alapnyelvi hátteréről. [Thoughts on the Proto-Uralic background of the Mordvin objective conjugation.] *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 96, 106–119.
- Hopper, P.J. 1973. Glottalized and murmured occlusives in Indo-European. *Glossa* 7, 141–166.
- Hualde, José Ignacio. 2005. Quasi-phonemic contrasts in Spanish. In Vineeta Chand et al. (eds.), *WCCFL 23: Proceedings of the 23rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 374–398.
- Huard, Athanaric. 2022. *Recherches sur les textes de méditation en tokharien*. PhD-dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.
- Imamura, Satoshi. 2022. A corpus analysis of two by-passives in Japanese from the viewpoint of information structure. *Lingua* 272.
- Itkin, Ilya B. 2011. Review of: Gerd Carling & Georges-Jean Pinault, A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Volume 1: Letters a-j. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 243–254.
- Ivanov, V. V. 1985. Tocharian and Ugrian. In U. Pieper and G. Stickel (eds.), *Studia Linguistica. Diachronica et Synchronica*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 411–419.
- Jakob, Anthony. 2023. *A history of East Baltic through language contact*. PhD-dissertation, Leiden University.
- Jalava, Lotta. 2022. *Tundraa myöten, joen mukana. Prosekutiivisijan alkuperästä samojedilais-itämerensuomalaisiin vertailuin*. [Across the tundra, along the river. On the origin of the prosecutive case with a Samoyed-Finnic comparison.] In Kaisla Kaheinen et al. (eds.), *Hämeenmaalta Jamalille. Kirja Tapani Salmiselle* 07.04.2022. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 145–158.
- Janda, Gwen Eva, Johanna Laakso & Helle Metslang. 2022. Person marking. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 894–903.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1976. Adalékok az északi-szamojéd hangtörténethez. Vokalizmus: az első szótagi magánhangzók. [Additions to the sound history of Northern Samoyed. Vocalism: the first-syllable vowels.] *Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány* 19–20, 165–188.
1977. *Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
1981. Uralilaisen kantakielen sanastosta. [On the vocabulary of the Uralic protolanguage.] *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 77, 219–274.

1982. On the structure of Proto-Uralic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen*, 44, 23–42.
 1983. On early Indo-European-Samoyed contacts. In Juha Janhunen et al. (eds.), *Symposium Saeculare Societatis Fenno-Ugricae*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 115–127.
 1989. Samojedin predestinatiivisen deklinaaation alkuperästä. [On the origin of the Samoyed predestinative declination.] *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja*. 82, 298–301.
 1991. = Юха Янхунен. 1991. Нганасаны и распад прасамодийской языковой общности. [The Nganasans and the disintegration of the Proto-Samoyed speech community.] In Семинар “Проблемы происхождения народов уральской языковой семьи”. Izhevsk, 16–19.
 1998. Samoyedic. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, 457–479.
 2000. Reconstructing pre-Proto-Uralic typology spanning the millennia of linguistic evolution. *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum: pars I*, 59–76.
 2002. The Nenets imperative sentence and its background. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen Band 24/25*, 71–85.
 2007. The primary laryngeal in Uralic and beyond. In Jussi Ylikoski and Ante Aikio (eds.), *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 203–227.
 2009. Proto-Uralic—what, where, and when? In Jussi Ylikoski (ed.), *The Quasiquicentennial of the Finno-Ugrian Society*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 57–78.
 2013. Personal pronouns in Core Altaic. In Martine Robbeets and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.), *Shared Grammaticalization: With special focus on the Transeurasian languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 212–226.
 2020. Issues of comparative Uralic and Altaic Studies (6). Uralic copulas and their analogues in other Eurasian languages. In Ёмас сымын нэ́кве вёртур этност самы́н натум – *Scripta miscellanea in honorem Ulla-Maija Forsberg*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 129–140.
 2022. = Юха Янхунен. 2022. Великое прошлое малых народов (на примере самодийцев). [The great past of small peoples (the case of the Samoyeds).] *Археология Евразийских Стеней* No. 2, 283–289.
- Janurik, Tamás. 2021. *Kamassz Szótár*. [Kamas Dictionary.] Székesfehérvár: Budenz Alkotóház.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 1987. Some irregular imperatives in Tocharian. In Calvert Watkins (ed.), *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985). Papers from the Fourth East*

- Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985.* Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 92–112.
2013. The Tocharian subjunctive and preterite in *-a-. In Adam I. Cooper et al. (eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday.* Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 105–120.
2015. The Tocharian B accent. In Melanie Malzahn et al. (eds.), *Tocharian texts in context. International conference on Tocharian manuscripts and Silk Road culture held June 26–28, 2013 in Vienna.* Bremen: Hempen, 87–98.
- Kaheinen, Kaisla. 2023. *Etymologia ex silentio: Nganasanin äännehistoria ja kielikontaktit.* [Etymologia ex silentio: Nganasan historical phonology and language contact.] PhD-dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- Kallio, Petri. 2001. Phonetic Uralisms in Indo-European? In Christian Carpelan et al. (eds.), *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 221–234.
2004. Tocharian loanwords in Samoyed? In Irma Hyvärinen et al. (eds.), *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen: Festschrift für Jorma Koivulehto zum 70. Geburtstag.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 129–137.
2006. Suomen kantakielten absoluuttista kronologiaa [On the absolute chronology of the Finnic protolanguages]. *Virittäjä* 110, 2–25.
2012. The non-initial-syllable vowel reductions from Proto-Uralic to Proto-Finnic. In Tiina Hyytiäinen et al. (eds.), *Per Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festschrift tillägnad Juha Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 163–175.
- Kazakevič, Olga. 2022. Selkup. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 777–816.
- Kenesei, István & Krisztina Szécsényi. 2022. Hungarian. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 636–658.
- Keresztes, László. 1998. Mansi. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages.* London-New York: Routledge, 387–427.
1999. *Development of Mordvin definite conjugation.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Khanina, Olesya & Andrey Shluinsky 2015. = О. В. Ханина & А. Б. Шлуинский. 2015. Прямой объект в энецком языке: объектное согласование глагола

- [Direct object in Enets: verbal object cross-reference]. In *Типология морфосинтаксических параметров: Материалы международной конференции "Типология морфо-синтаксических параметров"* Volume 2. Moscow: MPGU, 392-410.
http://mpgu.su/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/hanina_shluinskij.pdf
2023. Forest and Tundra Enets. In Daniel Abondolo & Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi (eds.), *The Uralic Languages. Second Edition*. London, New York: Routledge, 793–852.
2024. Uralic object agreement on the verb: Enets evidence for a topic-marking strategy. In S. Björklöf et al. (eds.), *Itämeren kieliapajilta Volgan verkoille: Pühendusteos Riho Grünthalile 22. mail 2024*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seura, 333–358.
- Kim, Ronald I. 1999. The development of labiovelars in Tocharian: A closer look. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 8, 139-187.
2000. 'To drink' in Anatolian, Tocharian and Proto-Indo-European. *Historische Sprachforschung* 113, 151–170.
2003. Uncovering the Prehistory of the Tocharian Preterite II. *Historische Sprachforschung* 116, 190–233.
- 2007a. The Duke of York Comes to Xinjiang: Ablaut, Analogy and Epenthesis in Tocharian B Nasal Presents. *Historische Sprachforschung* 120, 66–104.
- 2007b. Vowel Weakening in Tocharian A Preterite Participles and Abstract Nouns. *Kyoto University Linguistic Research* 26, 1–30.
2013. The Indo-European, Anatolian, and Tocharian 'secondary' cases in typological perspective. In Adam I Cooper, Jeremy Rau and Michael Weiss (eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 121–142.
2018. *The Dual in Tocharian, From Typology to Auslautgesetz*. Dettelbach: J.H. Röhl.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1975. Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch. In Helmut Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indo-germanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9–14. September 1973*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 148–163.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
2016. The Anatolian stop system and the Indo-Hittite hypothesis. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121, 213-247.
2018. Anatolian evidence suggests that the Indo-European laryngeals $*h_2$ and $*h_3$ were uvular stops, *Indo-European Linguistics* 6, 69–94.
- Klump, Gerson. 2002. *Konverbkonstruktionen im Kamassischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

2022. Kamas. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 817–843.
- Klumpp, Gerson & Josefina Budzisch. 2023. In Daniel Abondolo and Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi (eds.), *The Uralic Languages*. Second Edition. London-New York: Routledge, 897–938.
- Koller, Bernhard. 2018. On the internal structure of the Tocharian A comitative suffix. In David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 28th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen, 167–184.
- Kölver, Bernhard. 1965. *Der Gebrauch der sekundären Kasus im Tocharischen*. PhD-dissertation, Universität Frankfurt am Main.
- Koponen, Eino. 2022. Saami. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 103–112.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1967. *Die Konjugation im Lappischen. Morphologisch-historische Untersuchung. I. Die finiten Formkategorien*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
1981. *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan*. [An introduction to the history of the Saami language.] Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
1988. The Lapp Language. In Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages: Description, History and Foreign Influences*. Leiden-New York: Brill, 41–57.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H.H. 1985. Proto-Indo-European Glottalic Stops: the Comparative Evidence. *Folia linguistica historica* 19, 183–202.
- 1988b. On the development of PIE final syllables in Tocharian. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, 80–88.
- Körtvély, Erika. 2005. *Verb conjugation in Tundra Nenets*. Szeged: Goldpress Nyomda.
- Kosterkina, Momde & Ždanova 2001. = Н.Т. Костеркина & А.Ч. Момде & Т.Ю. Жданова. 2001. *Словарь нганасанско-русский и русско-нганасанский*. [Nganasan-Russian and Russian-Nganasan dictionary.] Санкт-Петербург: Просвещение.
- Kövesi, Magda A. 1973. Zu den “umstrittenen” Fragen der objektiven Konjugation in den ugrischen Sprachen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 40, 96–106.
- Krause, Wolfgang. 1951. Zur Frage nach dem nichtindogermanischen Substrat des Tocharischen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 69, 185–203.
1952. *Westtocharische Grammatik 1: Das Verbum*. Heidelberg: Winter.

- Krause, Wolfgang & Werner Thomas. 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I. Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2011. False exceptions to Winter's Law: On the effects of Kluge's Law on the Proto-Germanic consonantism. In Tijmen Pronk and Rick Derksen (eds.), *Accent matters: Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 251–61.
2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Kroonen, Guus et al. 2022. Indo-European cereal terminology suggests a North-west Pontic homeland for the core Indo-European languages. *PLOS ONE* 17(10). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0275744
- Kroonen, Guus, Gojko Barjamovic & Michaël Peyrot. 2018. Linguistic supplement to Damgaard et al. 2018. Early Indo-European languages, Anatolian, Tocharian and Indo-Iranian. doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1240524.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2012. The Proto-Indo-European Case System and its Reflexes in a Diachronic typological Perspective: Evidence for the Linguistic Prehistory of Eurasia. *Rivista degli studi orientali*. Nuovo serie 84, 289–309.
- Kulonen, Ulla-Maija. 1989. *The passive in Ob-Ugrian*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
1993. *Johdatus unkarin kielen historiaan*. [An introduction to the history of the Hungarian language.] Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Kümmel, Martin Joachim. 2007. *Konsonantenwandel: Bausteine zu einer Typologie des Lautwandels und ihre Konsequenzen für die vergleichende Rekonstruktion*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
2009. The range of Tocharian *a*-umlaut. In Thomas Olander and Jens Elmegård Rasmussen (eds.), *Internal reconstruction in Indo-European: Methods, results and problems, Section papers from the XVIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics held at the University of Copenhagen*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 171–179.
2012. Typology and reconstruction: The consonants and vowels of Proto-Indo-European. In Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead et al. (eds.), *The sounds of Indo-European: Proceedings of the conference on Indo-European linguistics held at Copenhagen University 16–19 April 2009*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 292–329.
2020. The development of the perfect within IE verbal systems. In Robert Crellin and Thomas Jügel (eds.), *Perfected in Indo-European Languages and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 15–47.

- Künnap, Ago. 1971. *System und Ursprung der kamassischen Flexionssuffixe*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
1999. *Kamass*. München: LINCOM.
2004. On the evidence of the verbal 3rd person suffix *-sV in Uralic. *Linguistica Uralica* 40, 81–86.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1970–72. Gli aggettivi in -l- e il perfetto slavo. *Ricerche slavistiche* 17–18, 321–328.
- Kuritsyna, Anna V. 2022. Tocharische Präsenspartizipien im attributiven Gebrauch. Presentation on 15-09-2022 for the Deutsche Orientalistentag held from 12 to 17 September 2022 at the Freie Universität Berlin.
2023. = Анна В. Курицына. 2023. *Синтаксис тохарских языков в сопоставительном аспекте*. [Syntax of Tocharian languages in comparative aspect.] PhD-dissertation, Moscow.
- Kuznecova, Helinski & Gruškina = А. И. Кузнецова, Е. А. Хелимский & Е. В. Грушкина. 1980. *Очерки по селькупскому языку. Тазовский диалект. Том I*. [Essays on the Selkup Language. Taz Dialect. Volume I.] Moscow: Moscow University.
- Laakso, Johanna. 2022a. Finnic. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso & Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 240–253.
- 2022b. Finnish, Meänkieli, and Kven. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 254–268.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1984. *Der Relativsatz*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Leisiö, Larisa. 2006. Passive in Nganasan. In Werner Abraham and Larisa Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and Typology: Form and Function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 213–230.
- Li, Chunxiang et al. 2010. Evidence that a West-East admixed population lived in the Tarim Basin as early as the Bronze Age. *BMC Biology* 8, 15.
- Liimola, Matti. 1963. *Zur historischen Formenlehre des Wogulischen. I. Flexion der Nomina*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
1973. Noch einmal über das *l* der objektiven Konjugation des Wogulischen. In Erkki Itkonen and Alho Alhoniemi (eds.), *Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Erkki Itkonen sexagenarii die XXVI mensis aprilis anno MCMLXXIII*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 196–204.

- Lowe, John J. 2015. *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit: the syntax and semantics of adjectival verb forms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lubotsky, Alexander M. 1990. La loi de Brugmann et *H₃e-. *La Reconstruction des Laryngales*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 129–136.
1994. The original paradigm of the Tocharian word for ‘king’. In B. Schlerath (ed.), *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Berlin, September 1990*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands, 66–72.
2001. The Indo-Iranian Substratum. In Christian Carpelan, Asko Parpola and Petteri Koskikallio (eds.), *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 301–317.
- Lubotsky, Alexander & Starostin Sergei. 2003. Turkic and Chinese Loan Words in Tocharian. In B.L. Bauer and G.-J. Pinault (eds.), *Language in time and space: A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the occasion of his 80th birthday*. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter.
- Lundquist, Jesse & Anthony D. Yates. 2018. The morphology of Proto-Indo-European. In Jared Klein et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*. Volume 3. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2079–2195.
- Lyutikova, Ekaterina & Andrei Sideltsev. 2020. On the Syntax of Argument Clitics in Hittite. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 118, 29–78.
- Macdonell, Arthur. 1927. *A Sanskrit Grammar for Students*. 3rd ed. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mallory, James P. 1989. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames & Hudson
2015. *The Problem of Tocharian Origins: An Archaeological Perspective*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Mallory, James P. & Victor H. Mair. 2000. *The Tarim Mummies: Ancient China and the Mystery of the Earliest Peoples from the West*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.
2011. Die tocharischen Präsens- und Konjunktivstämme auf suffixales -sk- und eine innertocharische Vokalschwächungsregel. In Thomas Krisch and Thomas Lidner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog, Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 361–366.
2014. Tocharian A *śorki* ‘fear’ and two other TA scary words. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15, 87–94.

2016. The second one to branch off? The Tocharian lexicon revisited. In Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard Hansen et al. (eds.), *Etymology and the European lexicon. Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17-22 September 2012, Copenhagen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 281–292.
- Marcantonio, Angela. 1985. On the definite vs. indefinite conjugation in Hungarian: a typological and diachronic analysis. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 35, 267–297.
- Marchenko, Z.V. et al. 2017. Radiocarbon chronology of complexes with Seima-Turbino type objects (Bronze Age) in southwestern Siberia. *Radiocarbon* 59, 1381–1397.
- Marggraf, Wolf-Jürgen. 1970. *Untersuchungen zum akzent in Tocharisch B*. PhD-dissertation, Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel.
- Maslova, Elena S. 2003. *Tundra Yukaghir*. München: LINCOM.
2008. Review of: Irina Nikolaeva. A historical dictionary of Yukaghir. *Studies in Language* 32, 254–264.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Band 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Meillet, Antoine & Joseph Vendryes. 1948. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. 2^e édition revue et augmentée par J. Vendryes. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2002. Review of: G. Carling, Die Functionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122, 107–108.
- Meunier, Fanny. 2017. Quelques éléments de syntaxe des adjectifs verbaux (gérondifs) et participes en tokharien. In Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages. Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (Indogermanische Gesellschaft), Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014*. Bremen: Hempen, 221–232.
- Meyer, Robin. 2017. *Iranian-Armenian language contact in and before the 5th century CE*. PhD-dissertation, University of Oxford.
- Mikola, Tibor. 1988. Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen. In Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages: Description, History and Foreign Influences*. Leiden-New York: Brill, 219–263.

1995. *Morphologisches Wörterbuch des Enzischen*. Szeged: University of Szeged.
2004. *Studien zur Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen*. Szeged: University of Szeged.
- Morgunova, N. L. & O. S. Khokhlova. 2013. Chronology and periodization of the pit-grave culture in the region between the Vogla and Ural Rivers based on radiocarbon dating and paleopedological research. *Radiocarbon* 55, 1286–1296.
- Mus, Nikolett. 2023. Nenets. In Daniel Abondolo and Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi (eds.), *The Uralic Languages*. Second Edition. London-New York: Routledge, 853–896.
- Narisimhan, Vagheesh et al. 2019. The Formation of Human Populations in South and Central Asia. *Science* 365(6457).
- Napolskikh, Vladimir. 2001. Tocharisch-uralische Berührungen: Sprache und Archäologie. In Christian Carpelan, Asko Parpola and Petteri Koskikallio (eds.), *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 367–383.
- Nielsen Whitehead, Benedicte. 2018. PIE **g^wh₃-éu-* ‘cow’. In Lucien van Beek et al. (eds.), *Farnah: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ann Arbor-New York: Beech Stave Press, 217–231.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 1999a. *Ostyak*. München: LINCOM.
- 1999b. Object agreement, grammatical relations, and information structure. *Studies in Language* 23, 341–386.
2001. Secondary topic as a relation in information structure. *Linguistics* 39, 1–49.
2006. *A Historical Dictionary of Yukaghir*. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter.
2014. *A Grammar of Tundra Nenets*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.
2015. On the expression of TAM on nouns: evidence from Tundra Nenets. *Lingua* 166, 99–126.
2020. *Yukaghir morphology in a historical and comparative perspective*. München: LINCOM.
- Ning, Chao et al. 2019. Ancient genomes reveal Yamnaya-related ancestry and a potential source of Indo-European speakers in Iron Age Tianshan. *Current Biology* 29, 2526–2532.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 2013/14. Die Indo-Hittite-Hypothese aus heutiger Sicht. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 67/2, 149–176.
- Olander, Thomas. 2020. To **b* or not to **b*, Proto-Indo-European **b* in a phylo-genetic perspective. *Historische Sprachforschung* 133, 182–208.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 1999. *The noun in Biblical Armenian. Origin and word formation – with special emphasis on Indo-European heritage*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Onishi, Teigo. 2022. *Pronominal clitics in Tocharian: a study in the morphology-syntax interface*. PhD-dissertation, University of California Los Angeles.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte. 2010. Contact and Siberian languages. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 714–737.
2012. Patterns of relativization in North Asia: Towards a refined typology of prenominal participial relative clauses. In Volker Gast and Holger Diessel (eds.), *Clause linkage in cross-linguistic perspective: Data-driven approaches to cross-clausal syntax*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 253–284.
- Papp, István. 1968. *Unkarin kielen historia*. [The History of the Hungarian Language.] Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Parpola, Asko. 2012. Formation of the Indo-European and Uralic (Finno-Ugric) language families in the light of archaeology: Revised and integrated “total” correlations. In Riho Grünthal and Petri Kallio (eds.), *A linguistic map of prehistoric northern Europe*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 119–184.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2007. Review of: Haruyuki Saito, *Das Partizipium Präteriti im Tocharischen*. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 64, 798–801.
2008. *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.
2010. On the formation of the Tocharian preterite participle. *Historische Sprachforschung* 121, 69–83.
- 2012a. The Tocharian A match of the Tocharian B obl.sg. -ai. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13, 181–220.
- 2012b. Tocharian ‘eat’ and the strong imperfect in Tocharian A. In Olav Hackstein and Ronald I. Kim (eds.), *Linguistic developments along the Silk Road: Archaisms and innovation in Tocharian*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 85–119.
2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive*. Leiden: Brill.
2017. On the part of speech and the syntax of the Tocharian present participle. In Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit & Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages. Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (Indogermanische Gesellschaft), Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014*. Bremen: Hempen, 327–341.
- 2018a. Interrogative stems in Hittite and Tocharian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 123, 65–90.
- 2018b. Tocharian agricultural terminology: Between inheritance and language contact. In Guus Kroonen et al. (eds.), *Talking Neolithic: Proceedings of the workshop on Indo-European origins held at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary*

- Anthropology* (Leipzig, December 2–3, 2013). Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 242–277.
- 2019a. The deviant typological profile of the Tocharian branch of Indo-European may be due to Uralic substrate influence. *Indo-European Linguistics* 7, 72–121.
- 2019b. Indo-Uralic, Indo-Anatolian, Indo-Tocharian. In Alwin Kloekhorst and Tijmen Pronk (eds.), *The Precursors of Proto-Indo-European: The Indo-Anatolian and Indo-Uralic hypotheses*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 186–202.
- 2022a. Tocharian. In Thomas Olander (ed.), *The Indo-European language family – A phylogenetic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 83–101.
- 2022b. Notes on Tocharian A o(k), A oram and B sorromp ‘down’, B ošno, B nanāmo ‘recognising’, B pāwe, and B †səwm- ‘trickle’. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 21, 163–177.
- Peyrot, Michaël & Federico Dragoni & Chams Bernard. 2022. The spread of iron in Central Asia: On the etymology of the word for ‘iron’ in Iranian and Tocharian. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 85, 403–422.
- Piispanen, Peter S. 2013. The Uralic-Yukaghiric Connection Revisited: Sound Correspondences of Geminate Clusters. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 94, 165–197.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1990. Notes sur les manuscrits de Maitreyasamiti. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 4, 119–202.
2005. Tocharian ‘woman’. In Nikolai N. Kazansky (ed.), *Hṛdā́ mānasā. Studies presented to Professor Leonard G. Herzenborg on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 201–214.
2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne*. Leuven-Paris: Peeters.
2009. On the formation of the Tocharian demonstratives. In Elisabeth Rieken and Paul Widmer (eds.), *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 221–245.
2010. Le pronom d’ipséité en tokharien. In Injoo Choi-Jonin, Marc Duval & Olivier Soutet (eds.), *Typologie et comparatisme. Hommages offerts à Alain Lemaréchal*. Leuven: Peeters, 351–365.
2011. Let us now praise famous gems. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 155–220.
2012. Tocharian -nt- participles and agent nouns. In Olav Hackstein and Ronald I. Kim (eds.), *Linguistic developments along the Silk Road: Archaism and innovation in Tocharian*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 179–204.

- Pinault, Georges-Jean & Michaël Peyrot. fthc. A dramatic “Life of the Buddha” in Tocharian B. Edition of manuscript PK AS 12 of the Pelliot Collection.
- Poliakov, Andrey V. et al. 2019. A review of the radiocarbon dates for the Afanasyevo Culture (Central Asia): shifting towards the “shorter” chronology. *Radiocarbon* 61 (1), 243–263.
- Pronk, Tijmen. 2009. Reflexes of the deletion and insertion of Proto-Tocharian *ä in Tocharian B. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 11, 69–113.
2018. Language contact and prosodic change in Slavic and Baltic. *Diachronica* 35:4, 552–580.
- Pystynen, Juho. 2014. *Close vowel reduction in Samoyedic*. Blog post.
<https://protouralic.wordpress.com/2014/09/22/close-vowel-reduction-in-samoyedic/>.
2017. *ü > *i, *ü in Samoyedic. Blog post.
<https://protouralic.wordpress.com/2017/10/07/u-i-u-in-samoyedic/>
- Rau, Jeremy. 2017. The derivational history of the perfect participle active. In Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages. Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (Indogermanische Gesellschaft), Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014*. Bremen: Hempen, 377–389.
- Raun, Alo 1988a. The Mordvin Language. In Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages: Description, History and Foreign Influences*. Leiden-New York: Brill, 96–110.
- 1988b. Proto-Uralic comparative historical morphosyntax. In Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages: Description, History and Foreign Influences*. Leiden: Brill, 555–571.
- Rédei, Károly. 1988. Geschichte der permischen Sprachen. In Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages. Description, history and foreign influences*. Leiden: Brill, 351–394.
- 1988–91. *Uralisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
1989. A finnugor igeragozásról, különös tekintettel a magyar igei személyragok eredetére. [About the Finno-Ugric conjugation, with special attention for the origin of the Hungarian verbal conjugations.] *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 90, 143–160.
- 1998/99. Gondolatok az uráli tárgyas igeragozásról. [Thoughts about the Uralic definite conjugation.] *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 96, 124–128.
1999. Zu den uralisch-jukagirischen Sprachkontakten. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 55, 1–58.

- Riese, Timothy. 1998. Permian. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London: Routledge, 249–275.
- Rießler, Michael. 2016. *Adjective attribution*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Ringe, Donald A. 1987. On the prehistory of Tocharian B accent. In C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985). Papers From the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference. Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985*. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 254–269.
1989. Tocharian B *ausu, aušu, aultsu*. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, 35–50.
1990. The Tocharian active s-preterite: a classical sigmatic aorist. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 51, 183–242.
1991. Evidence for the position of Tocharian in the Indo-European family? *Sprache* 34, 59–123.
1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian*. Volume 1. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
- Rix, Helmut & Martin Kümmel. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Róna-Tas, András. 1998. The Reconstruction of Proto-Turkic and the Genetic Question. In Lars Johanson and Éva Á. Csató (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, 67–125.
- Saag, Lehti et al. 2019. The Arrival of Siberian Ancestry Connecting the Eastern Baltic to Uralic Speakers further East. *Current Biology* 29, 1701–1711.
- Saarikivi, Janne. 2022. The divergence of Proto-Uralic and its offspring. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 28–58.
- Saarinén, Sirkka. 2022. Mari. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 432–470.
- Saito, Haruyuki. 2006. *Das Partizipium Präteriti im Tocharischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Salminen, Tapani. 1996. A commentary address to László Honti's "Zur Morphotaktik und Morphosyntax der uralischen/finnisch-ugrischen Grundsprache". *Congressus octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Jyväskylä 10–15.8 1995. Pars VIII*, 25–27.
1997. *Tundra Nenets Inflection*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
1998. *A morphological dictionary of Tundra Nenets*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

2002. Problems in the taxonomy of the Uralic languages in the light of modern comparative studies. In A.E. Кибрик (ed.), *Лингвистический беспредел: сборник статей к 70-летию А.И. Кузнецовой*. Москва: Издательство Московского университета, 44–55.
2007. Notes on Forest Nenets Phonology. In Jussi Ylikoski and Ante Aikio (eds.), *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 349–372.
2012. Traces of Proto-Samoyed vowel contrasts in Nenets. In Tiina Hyytiäinen et al. (eds.), *Per Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festschrift tillägnad Juha Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 339–358.
2014. Suomalais-samojedilaisia muotovertailuja. [Finnic-Samoyed morpho-logical comparisons] In Nobufumi Inaba et al. (eds.), *Juuret marin murteissa, lehvät ylittää Uraliin. Juhlakirja Sirkka Saarisen 60-vuotispäiväksi 21.12.2014*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 289–300.
2023. Suomalais-samojedilaisia sanavertailuja. [Finnic-Samoyed lexical comparisons] In Sampsa Holopainen et al. (eds.), *Elämä ja Etymologia. Janne Saarikiven 50-vuotisjuhlakirja*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 377–399.
- Sammallahti, Pekka. 1974. *Material from Forest Nenets*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
1988. Historical phonology of the Uralic languages with special reference to Samoyed, Ugric and Permic. In Denis Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages. Description, history and foreign influences*. Leiden: Brill, 478–554.
1990. On the relationships of the Uralic languages. In László Jakab et al. (eds.), *Congressus Septimus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, 3A, Sessiones Sectionum – Dissertationes Linguistica*. Debrecen: Kossuth Lajos tudományegyetem, 7–12.
1998. Saamic. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, 43–95.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1990. The Postulated Pre-Indo-European Substrates in Insular Celtic and Tocharian. In T.L. Markey & A.C. Greppin (eds.), *When Worlds Collide: the Indo-Europeans and the Pre-Indo-Europeans*. Ann Arbor: Karoma, 179–202.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. 1985. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der tocharischen Verbalmorphologie. In Bernfried Schlerath (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte, Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.–25. Februar 1983*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 424–434.
1992. Archaismen des Tocharischen und ihre Bedeutung für Fragen der Rekonstruktion und der Ausgliederung. In Robert S.P. Beekes, Alexander Lubotsky and Jos Wietenberg (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie*.

- Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 31. August - 4. September 1987*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 101–114.
1997. Zu einigen Archaismen unter den tocharischen Präteritalbildungen. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 7, 255–261.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2020. Paradigmatisation of the perfect and resultative in Tocharian. In Robert Crellin & Thomas Jügel (eds.), *Perfects in Indo-European Languages and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 215–244.
- Shagal, Ksenia. 2018. Participial systems in Uralic languages: an overview. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric linguistics* 9 (1), 55–84.
2019. *Participles – A Typological Study*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.
- Sieg, Emil. 1944. *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Siegl, Florian. 2013. *Materials on Forest Enets, an Indigenous Language of Northern Siberia*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2020. Urindogermanische Lehnwörter in den uralischen und finno-ugrischen Grundsprachen: Eine Fata Morgana? *Indogermanische Forschungen* 125, 239–265.
- Sipos, Mária. 2022. North Khanty. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 582–607.
- Skribnik, Elena. 2001. Pragmatic structuring in Northern Mansi. In Tõnu Seilenthal (ed.), *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-ugristarum. 7.-13.8.2000 Tartu. Pars VI. Dissertationes sectionum: Linguistica III*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool, 222–239.
- Sorokina 2010. = И. П. Сорокина. 2010. *Энецкий язык*. [The Enets Language.] Санкт-Петербург: Наука.
- Sorokina & Bolina 2001. = И. П. Сорокина & Д. С. Болина. 2001. *Словарь энецко-русский и русско-энецкий*. [Enets-Russian and Russian-Enets dictionary.] Санкт-Петербург: Просвещение
- Starostin 1982. = Сергей А. Старостин. 1982. Праенсейская реконструкция и внешние связи енисейских языков. [Proto-Yeniseian reconstruction and external connections of the Yeniseian languages.] In: Е. А. Алексеев et al. (eds.), *Кетский сборник. Антропология, этнография, мифология, лингвистика – Studia Ketica. Physical anthropology, ethnography, mythology, linguistics*. Leningrad: NAUKA, 144–237.

- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1933. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America/University of Pennsylvania.
- Tambets, Kristina et al. 2018. Genes reveal traces of common recent demographic history of most of the Uralic speaking populations. *Genome Biology* 19.
- Tereščenko 1965 = Н. М. Терещенко. 1965. *Ненецко-русский словарь*. [Nenets-Russian dictionary.] Москва: Советская Энциклопедия.
1973. = Н. М. Терещенко. 1973. *Синтаксис самодийских языков*. [The syntax of the Samoyed languages.] Ленинград: Наука.
- Thomas, Werner. 1952. *Die tocharischen Verbaladjektive auf -l*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
1957. *Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
1994. Zur Frage der nichtindogermanischen Komponente im Tocharischen. In Roland Bielmeier & Reinhard Stempel (eds.), *Indogermanica et Caucasica. Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag*. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 222–233.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkely-Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Thurneysen, Rudolph. 1946. *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Revised and enlarged edition, translated from the German by D. A. Binchy and Osborn Bergin. Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Thorsø, Rasmus & Andrew Wigman et al. 2023. Word Mining: Metal Names and the Indo-European Dispersal. In Kristian Kristiansen, Guus Kroonen and Eske Willerslev (eds.), *The Indo-European Puzzle Revisited. Integrating Archaeology, Genetics and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 105–126.
- Trosterud, Trond. 2006. *Homonymy in the Uralic Two-Argument Agreement Paradigms*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Þórhallsdóttir, Guðrún 1988. Tocharian contraction across *-w-*. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, 184–210.
- Urmanchieva 2023 = Анна Ю. Урманчиева. 2023. Реконструкция глагольного спряжения в самодийских языках: лично-числовые показатели индикатива и форманты типов спряжения. [Reconstruction of verbal conjugation in Samoyedic languages: Personal inflexions of the indicative and markers of conjugation types.] *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 19 part 1, 256–300.

- Vajda, Edward. 2022. The Dene-Yeniseian Hypothesis. In Michael Fortescue & Edward Vajda, *Mid-Holocene Language Connections between Asia and North America*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 235–480.
- Van Windekens, Albert J. 1976. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. I: La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale.
1979. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. II, 1: La morphologie nominale*. Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale.
- Viitso, Tiit-Rein. 1998. Fennic. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London:-New York Routledge, 96–114.
- Virtanen, Susanna. 2014. Pragmatic direct object marking in Eastern Mansi. *Linguistics* 52, 391–413.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2016. Null objects and clitics in some early Indo-European languages. In Rosemarie Lühr (ed.), *Idiosynkrasie. Neue Wege ihrer Beschreibung*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 13–32.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1, 333–436.
- Wagner-Nagy, Beáta. 2019. *A Grammar of Nganasan*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Wagner-Nagy, Beáta & Sándor Szeverényi. 2022. Samoyedic. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso and Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 659–673.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst & Heinz Bechert. 1973. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvastivada-Schule, I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Warries, Abel R. 2022. Towards a new comparison of the pre-Proto-Tocharian and pre-Proto-Samoyed vowel systems. *Indo-European Linguistics* 10, 169–213.
- fhc. An investigation of Tocharian loanwords in Samoyed.
- Winter, Werner. 1962. Die Vertretung indogermanischer Dentale im Tocharischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 67, 16–35.
- 1965a. Tocharian evidence. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for laryngeals*. The Hague: De Gruyter, 190–211.
1977. Internal structure and external relationship of two verbal paradigms: Tocharian B *weñ-*, A *weñ* ‘SAY’. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 5, 133–159.

1990. The importance of fine points in spelling: Deletion of accented vowels in Tocharian B. In Jasek Ficiak (ed.), *Historical Linguistics and Philology*. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 371–91.
1993. The development of underlying accented “schwa” before dentals in Tocharian B. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, 197–205.
- 1994a. Syncope in Tocharian A. In Benedicte Nielsen and Jens E. Rasmussen (eds.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 401–415.
- 1994b. Zum tocharischen Verb. In Bernfried Schlerath (ed.), *Tocharisch, Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands, 284–309.
1997. Lexical archaisms in the Tocharian languages. In Hans Henrich Hock (ed.), *Historical, Indo-European and Lexicographical studies. A Festschrift for Ladislav Zgusta on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 183–193.
- Ylikoski, Jussi. 2011. A survey of the origin of directional case suffixes in European Uralic. In Seppo Kittilä et al. (eds.), *Case, Animacy and Semantic Roles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 235–280.
2016. The origins of the western Uralic s-cases revisited: historiographical, functional-typological and Samoyedic perspectives. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 63, 6–78.
2017. On the tracks of the Proto-Uralic suffix **-ksi*: a new but old perspective on the origin of the Mari lative. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 96, 369–419.
2018. The so-called relation forms of nouns in South Saami: A byproduct or remnant of Uralic **-mpV*? *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 64, 6–71.
- Zaicz, Gábor. 1998. Mordva. In Daniel Abondolo (ed.), *The Uralic Languages*. London-New York: Routledge, 184–218.
- Zhang, Fan et al. 2021. The genomic origins of the Bronze Age Tarim Basin mummies. *Nature* 559, 256–261.
- Zhivlov, Mikhail 2014. Studies in Uralic Vocalism III. *Journal of Language Relationship* 12, 113–148.
2018. = Михаил Живлов. 2018. Прасамодийский **s* – фонология и фонетика. [Proto-Samoyed **s* – phonology and phonetics.] Семинар по сравнительно-исторической фонетике самодийских языков (Москва). Conference presentation. Powerpoint available at: [https://www.academia.edu/38048065/Прасамодийский s фонология и фонетика](https://www.academia.edu/38048065/Прасамодийский_s_фонология_и_фонетика).

2022. Pre-Proto-Yukaghir Consonant Clusters. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 4, 41–59.
2023. Reconstruction of Proto-Uralic. In Daniel Abondolo and Riitta–Liisa Valijärvi (eds.), *The Uralic Languages, Second Edition*. London–New York: Routledge, 117–175.