ABSTRACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The book also has other methodological problems. Loanwords in Burushaski are noted as autochthonous and used in the comparisons, e.g. Bur baqta ‘a type of big sheep; fat-tailed sheep’ (also found in Shina and Khowar) is a loanword from Persian bakhta ‘a ram, a fat tail’ (Steingass 159) (pp. 122-123); Bur -co ‘a man’s brother, a woman’s sister’ is a loanword from Tibetan (Purik a-co, Kinnauri acho, Sherpa ajo, Tibetan jo, all ‘elder brother’), as noted by Parkin (1987a: 327) (pp. 131-133); various Indo-Aryan loanwords are analysed as original Burushaski words although they are marked as Indo-Aryan by Berger, e.g. Bur gamin ‘bottom, stump’ (B 145, T 4029) (pp. 138-139); Bur phus ‘free’ (B 337: T 9098) (p. 154); Bur pár ét- ‘to fly’ (only in Yasin, Tiffou 234, who states it is from Urdu and also rare in Yasin) (pp. 165-166); Bur tal ‘ceiling, roof; eyelid’ (B 416: T 5803) (pp. 149-151) etc.
There is often too much semantic latitude: e.g. Kartv ‘a wind’ : Bur reflexive suffix/stem (pp. 117-120); Kartv ‘blood’ : Bur ‘people’ (p. 138); Kartv ‘white’ : Bur ‘new’ (p. 155); Kartv ‘elbow’ : Bur ‘knee’ (p. 146); Sw ‘hand’ : Bur ‘elbow’ (pp. 136-137); Kartv ‘spread out’ : Bur ‘swell’ (p. 169); Kartv ‘to cover’ : Bur ‘cloud’ (pp. 170-171); Kartv ‘to cover’ (verb) : Bur ‘cap’ (noun only) (p. 169); Kartv ‘drink’ : Bur ‘eat’ (pp. 174-175); Kartv ‘man’ : Bur suffix (pp. 126-127); Kartv ‘heart’ : Bur ‘belly’ (pp. 128-129); Kartv ‘soul’ : Bur ‘heart’ (pp. 153-154); (only) Mi ‘hard’ : Bur ‘soft’ (pp. 156-157); there is recourse to a Kartvelian word for ‘pillow’ to compare it with Bur ‘ear’ citing analogically a marginal and rejected Slavic etymology (see Orel 2011 III: 66) (p. 109). In some examples the semantics is strained as well as the Burushaski internal reconstruction: Grg txem-i- ‘head, parting, peak’ is compared to Bur *tham ‘prince, king’ (B 436-437), thámkus, Ys thánus “tham”ship, kingship, sovereignty’, tháan ‘residence of the king, palace’ (B 435) and importantly, with -ee- as the stem vowel, also théen-us ‘king’s residence’ (B 439), most probably here also thaná ‘success, good reputation’ (B 437). The etymology shows that the forms with n are older, i.e. the change is n > m.4 Comparing ‘head’ to ‘king’ across languages involves an excessive amount of semantic latitude.

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

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

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

---

4 These words can be compared with Old ēngill, OSax ēngel ‘prince, master’, MLG dege ‘thriving, flourishing; progress’, MCymr brəhən teithiawc ‘rex legitimus’, Av taxma ‘brave, competent, energetic, heroic’, with the derived Indo-European meaning of ‘thrive, flourish’, developments according to Pokorny (IEW 1068) from IE *tenk-2 ‘to thicken, to clot, become firm, curdle’, OIr techt ‘coagulated’, ON fěi̯ ‘buttermilk’, Lith tankus ‘thick, copious’, Skt tānti ‘pulverous, full’, TochB tanki ‘very, fully, full’. The semantic correspondence with Germanic and Celtic is direct, specific and remarkable, both in the meaning of ‘prince, king’ and ‘success’.
2 Overview of phonological correspondences between Burushaski and Indo-European

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

IE a > Bur a; IE e > Bur e : Hz, Ng i; IE e (unstr.) > Bur a; IE ē > Bur ēe; IE o > Bur ó
IE o (unstr.) > Bur a, u; IE ō > Bur oō, ōō; IE i > Bur i; IE u > Bur u
IE ai, ei, oi; eu > Bur a; IE au, ou > Bur u

PIE h1- > Bur h-; PIE h1e- > Bur he-; PIE h1ge- > Bur har- : -war- : her-
PIE h2- > Bur h-; PIE h2e- > Bur ha-; PIE h2ge- > Bur -we- : -wa-
PIE h3- > Bur h-; PIE h3e- > h3a- > Bur ha-; PIE h3e- > Bur h-; PIE h3a- > Bur ha-
PIE h2e- > Bur h-; PIE h2ge- > h2o- > Bur ho-; PIE h2e- > Bur h-; PIE h2/3 > Bur i-

IE l, m, n, r > Bur l, m, n, r; IE y > Bur -w/-u; IE y- > Bur b-, also m-; IE j > Bur y/i
IE ny > Bur -um, -an; IE y > Bur -un, -an; IE j > Bur -ur, -ar; IE l > Bur -ul, -al

IE p > Bur p, ph, also b-; IE b > Bur b, also m (rare); IE bh > Bur b, also m (rare)
IE t > Bur t : th (rare) : t, and d; IE d > Bur d; IE dh- > Bur d-; IE VdhV > Bur -t-, -t-
IE k > Bur k : kh, k : q; IE k* > Bur k; IE ĵ > Bur k : kh, k : q
IE g > Bur g; IE gh > Bur g; IE g* > Bur g; IE g*h > Bur g; IE ĵ > Bur g, ĵ; IE ĵh- > Bur g, ĵ
IE s > Bur s or s : ě, čh; IE ks > Bur ē

3 Burushaski and unique Slavic isoglosses

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

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

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

### 3.1 Names of anatomical parts

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

[‘foot’]

---

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

[1] Bur -hútis (Ys) (Tiffou 2014: 148), Hz Ng -út and -útis ‘foot, lower leg’ (B 459, 460) and with the common Bur u: o alternation also Bur hóti ‘artificial penis’ (B 203). Note the collective -iut-ríin ‘feet/legs and hands’ (‘lower and upper limbs’). Most likely from IE *h₁ouh.dh- < *h₁euh.dh- ‘to swell (with fluid)’ (M-A 82) (in IEW 347: *udh-, *udh-, *udh-) (*hou- > u, *-dh- > -t-), from which stem Jakobson (1959: 273, also in Vasmer IV: 148) derives PSl *udh ‘limb, member’, OChSl udb, and throughout Slavic e.g. Srb, Croat úd (Croat also udo), Mcd ud, Sln ud, Cz and Skl úd, Russ ud ‘same’, Blg ud ‘extremity; leg’; membrum virile’, Pl udo ‘thigh’ (G 649, 671). Correlated here by Jakobson are also Russ udit ‘ripen (of grain); get filled with fluid; bloat, bulge, swell’ and PSl *vyume (< IE *udhm-en-) ‘udder’ (related to OLnd údhar ‘udder’, OEng üder ‘udder’, Lith pa-údė ‘abdomen’, Lat über ‘udder, teat, (lactating) breast, 2. richness, fullness, fruitful, copious, rich’, Gk oúthar ‘udder’ (M-A 82). The Burushaski-Slavic correspondence is a direct one. The Bur suffix -is continues the IE nominative sg. ending *-is.

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

It is most probable that the Bur Ys verb -hutén-, Ng -útin-, Hz -útin- [note the alternation -t-: -t-] ‘to fill with (mass noun objects), to pour into’ (L 56) (B 459) (Will 119) is related (in the sense of ‘swell, fill with liquid’) to fill with fluid; bloat, bulge, swell’ and PSl *vyume (< IE *udhm-en-) ‘udder’ (related to OLnd údhar ‘udder’, OEng üder ‘udder’, Lith pa-údė ‘abdomen’, Lat über ‘udder, teat, (lactating) breast, 2. richness, fullness, fruitful, copious, rich’, Gk oúthar ‘udder’ (M-A 82). The Burushaski-Slavic correspondence is a direct one. This would be a correspondence from remote antiquity.

[neck]

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

We find a match with PSl *šija ‘neck’, found throughout Slavic: Srb, Croat šija, Mcd šija, Slň šija, Blg šija, Cz šiče, U绍r šija, L绍r šija, Pl szyča, Ukr, Byruss šija, Russ šěja ‘same’ and generally interpreted (but not with full certainty) as having meant initially ‘collar’ and thus connected with the verb *stiti ‘to sew’ (Vasmer IV: 434-435) (Gluhak 606). Vasmer, however, also notes Srb ošíjati ‘to turn over, turn back’ which has led some linguists to seek a link with Lat sinus ‘bend, fold, hollow’, Alb gji, gjir ‘breast’, or with Alb shj ‘nape of neck’ (the latter rejected by Vasmer). Miklosich (apud Buck 233) connected the Slavic words with Skt si-, Lith sieti. Lett siet ‘bind’, OChSl sēt ‘cord’, Lith sija ‘joint’, noting that in Slavic we would have a form with š for s from a parallel form with ši-.

Barič (1919: I, 96) derived the Albanian shi from an IE *ksi(n)j-. The Burushaski word in its special locative form both semantically and phonetically parallels Slavic. Note also the first component se-ei- in Bur seéipas ‘band tied around the head’ (B 407) where the second component is -pas < basá ‘turban’ < Skt praśna ‘same’ (via Sh), i.e. ‘turban folded around the head’, an example that supports Vasmer’s conjecture and clarifies the vowel correspondence with Slavic, as well as the semantic correlations.

The Nager dialect has an additional word for ‘neck’, also of IE origin -qhiin pl. ‘breastbone (of humans and animals)’, Ng also ‘neck (of humans)’ (B 358). It is a plural form, as in Olnd and Arm below. Compare with IE *auhgh- *oggh- ‘nape’, Gk aykhén, énos m. ‘back of the neck, neck; strait’ (< *augh≥-en-), Olnd uyhā ‘nape’ (only pl.), Arm aw ‘throat, awijik pl. ‘collar’, Russ vjaz ‘nape’ (IEW 87). The IE reconstruction is different in M-A2 (176) from *haeŋgh(w)en- ‘neck’, and this from *haeŋgh ‘narrow’. 
Once again there is a direct match and the Slavic word does not have an agreed upon etymological interpretation (it is not included in Derksen 2008). (Amended entry from Časule 2016: 77-78.)

['vertex, centre line of head']

[3] Bur -thān 'top, tip, point; vertex, centre line of head; parting line of hair' also -thānas, Ys: -thānes 'centre line of top of head, top of mountain' (L 344) (B 437). Could be compared to PSI *tēmē 'vertex' (OChSl tēmē, Sr̄b tēme, Croat tjeme, Mcd tēme, Blg tēme, Sln tēme, Cz tēmē, Slk temā, L Sorb tynē, Pl ciemie, Russ temja, Ukr tīm'ja) a Proto-Slavic base without correspondences in the other Indo-European languages, also used in the meaning of 'top of mountain' and derived from *tēn-men (Bernštejn 1974: 189). Some authors point to a parallel with Ossetian tenka 'vertex, top of head', derived jointly with Slavic from IE *tem- 'to cut' (also PSI *tēti, *tēno 'hit', OChSl tēti 'to cut', Russ tjať', tnu- 'hit, pound' (in ORuss also 'cut, kill') (G 629) (Derksen 2008: 492), e.g. Gk tēmno 'I cut, separate' (IEW 1062-1063), a stem also found in Bur tan- 'pound, crush s-thing' (L 251, 344) (B 419). There are over 50 Burushaski examples with an alternation -as/-es indicating that the original stem refers to animal food in the west, but human food in the east. In this example, as is generally the case, the Burushaski word goes with the IE west as it denotes animal food. This complete derivational correspondence strengthens significantly this etymology. A rough approx.
It may be that not all the cited Bur words belong to this comparison, but the close semantic parallelism is remarkable: Bur ‘arm’ [for the relationship ‘arm’ – ‘branch’, e.g. Grm Baumarm ‘branch’ (liter. ‘arm of tree’) vs SSl ‘hand’; Bur ‘wicker, poles, sticks’ vs IE ‘branch’; Bur ‘to spread, open’ vs IE ‘branch that forks at the end’. The semantics and the presence in Burushaski of both a nasalised and non-nasalised form of the IE stem argue for an IE origin, with a more specific development shared with Balkan Slavic (from the substratum?). The initial ħ- is due to a development as in NPers and Arm (from ķs or ks – see the examples in Čašule 2017, Chapter 1, under 1.5.8.) i.e. we could have had in Bur *ksah-koh whereby ķs- > ħ- which possibly might have been the case with the Paleobalkanic substratum from where the word šaka may have entered the South Slavic languages.

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

[projecting bone of ankle]

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

[stomach] > ‘voracious’

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

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

[‘hand’]

[7] Bur -rén, pl. -rëi̇n, réi̇činı̇ Ys, HZ Ng -rëni, pl. -rëniĉin ‘hand’ (L 304) (B 364), also urï̇niĉi̇ćum urï̇niĉi̇naṭar ‘honour together, beat up together’ (‘gemeinsam ehren, gemeinsam

---

8 The unique correlations between Burushaski and South Slavic are analysed in detail in Čašule (2012a). Of these [22], [24] and [25] are reiterated in this paper.
verprügeln') (B 364). This idiomatic expression has the same semantic development as in Baltic below, of 'together' ('gather; assembly'). Burushaski has the underlying verb *du-ūr- 'to turn, (of mill) to work, to grind' (B 456), also *-wāre 'around' (B 465).

Compare with IE *yēr-k- and nasalised IE *yenk- 'to turn, wind, bend' > *yronkā- < IE *yer- 'turn', esp. PSL *roka 'hand', OCHSl roka, Blg roka, Srh, Croat ruka, Sln roka, Cz, Slk, Sorb ruka, Pl ręka, Russ ruka, Ukr, Byruss ruka, MCD raka, (in all of Slavic) 'hand' and Lith rankā, Lett rioka, OPruss rancko, all: 'hand', correlated with Lith renkū, riniki 'gather', surinkimas 'assembly'. The Latin (late) branca 'paw' (> Rom brincā 'hand, paw', Itl branca 'claw, paw') is considered a loanword from Grmc *uranyō. [Without the nasal: OICl vṛā 'angle, corner', OIr ferc 'hump, bunch', Cymr cywarch 'rope'.] (IEW 1155) (G 533-534).

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

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

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

The initial *y- would have been lost to avoid confusion with the pronominal prefix for the 3. p. pl u-, ū-. Consider in this regard Bur Hz Ng -ūlgiš 'nest': Ys ėlkiš (B 454). Lorimer (LYs 11-12) gives for Yasin also -ūlkiš and in fact states that the -u could be the Ys 3 p. sg. and 3 p. pl. pron. pref. forms (except 3 p. sg. hf). Note also Ys ȍstum 'waist-cloth, waist-belt' (without the pron. prefix), which has a pron. prefixed form *-tšin 'back of waist, loins, small of back' (LYs 11-12) (B 308). Also ulān-Ng : Ys lán-'to be able, can' (B 454). (Entry from Čašule 2017: 217-218.) In the following example the correspondence includes Latin.

[*thumb*]

[8] Bur phulûše -nîš 'thumb' (-niš 'finger') (BYs 174) (LYs phalot miš). From IE *polo-, *polo- 'swollen, thick, big' > 'thumb', e.g. Lat pollex 'thumb, big toe', OCHSl polćos 'thumb' (IEW 840-841) (MCD, Sln and Blg palec, Srh and Croat palec, Cz and Slk palec all: 'thumb' and Pl palec, Russ palec, Sorb palec, Ukr palec 'finger'), with a different suffix (G 464-465) (o:u alternation in Bur).

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

[*tongue*]

[9] Bur *yunus Ys, in Hz Ng -iumus 'tongue', Hay *unas (according to Berger for *u-unus) (L 54) (B 455-456). The Ys form *yungus (Zarubin (1927: 341) and in L I, XXX, in BYs 187 and Tiffou 2014: 337: *yngus, *yungus also -iumus) would have to be considered older (the change goes in the
direction *i>*m). Holst (2014: 104) considers the -,*y-* in the Yasin form secondary, i.e. historically from the pronominal prefix *i-.*

It could be derived from IE *dʰr̥̄h₂- ‘tongue’ (Eric Hamp’s reconstruction) with initial d-absent as in Slavic and Baltic e.g. OChSl jezyk ‘language, people’ [found throughout Slavic: Mcd jazik, Srb, Sln and Croat jezik, Blg ezik, Russ, Byruss, Ukr jazik, Pl jezyk, Cz, Slk, USorb jazyk, all ‘tongue, language’], OPruss insuwis, OLat díngua (Lat lingua), Toch A kāntu, OInd juhá, jihvá, all: ‘tongue’ (IEW 223). The Bur ending -us corresponds with the IE nominative sg. ending *-us. (Entry from Čašule 2016: 87-88.)

### 3.2 Objects

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


Significantly, there is also Bur gátal ‘go on foot, walk’, also katál (L 164) (B 150), and possibly here also Ng, Ys go, Hz Ng gon ‘go!, get along!, go ahead!, come on!’ (Will 57) (L 170, also gun) (B 157) which is correlatable with IE *gʰa- (see [10]).

Another possibility, esp. for Ys go and Hz Ng gon is PIE *gʰe-/*gʰa- ‘to go, to leave, to depart; to abandon, forsake’ (Bomhard II: 328), in M-A (349) *gheh- ‘to leave’: Skt já-hā-iti ‘to leave, to abandon, to desert, to quit’, Av azā-mi ‘to release’, Dan gaa ‘to go’, Grm gehen ‘to go’ (also found in Gk, Lat and widely in Grmc).

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

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

[12] Bur kábulé ‘roof beams’ (B 239, q. K 120), with almost identical formal and semantic development as in PSI *kobylika ‘pole for carrying loads, beam’ (and related meanings) (Mcd kobilka, Blg kobila, Cz kobylika, Pl kobyłka, ORuss, Russ kobyłka, Byruss dial. kobyłka, Ukr dial.
kobilka (derived from *kobyla 'mare', with the suffix -ika) (ESSJ X: 100) or PSl *kobylica 'a pole for carrying loads on the shoulder', 'beam of scales', 'trestle', 'horse-tree', 'saw-horse', 'wisp', and esp. 'scaffolding, supporting beams', widely represented in Slavic: OChSl kobylica, Blg kobilica, Mcd kobilica, Sr and Croet kobilica, Sln kobilica, Cz kobilica, Pl kobylica, Russ kobylica, Ukr kobilica, Byruss kabylica (derived from *kobyla 'mare' with the suffix -ica < *ika) (ESSJ X: 98). Burushaski also has kabišt 'white horse' (Tiffou 2014: 167). This could be a very old correspondence, as Slavic y corresponds with Burushaski u, and Sl a with Bur a.

Both Slavic and Burushaski words are from IE *kab-, *kabula- 'horse', Thrac *kabila, Phrg kubela 'horse' > Gk kaballēs 'working horse', according to Gluhak (326) from Thrac > OChSl kobyla 'mare', found throughout Slavic: Mcd kobilina, Blg kobilta, Slk and Cz kobyta, LSorb kobyta, Srb and Croet kobita, Byruss kobytya. Russ kobyta, all 'mare' and > Lat caballus 'gelding, work horse, horse' and late Lat cabō in glosses 'caballus, caballus magnus, equus castratus', Gk Hesyhius kābētos 'castrated' (ESSJ X: 93-98) (Buck 168 considers the Indo-European words to be certainly loanwords of "ethnic origin" (Anatolian or Balkan), probably with an original meaning of 'gelding').

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

[14] Bur pelët pl. pelëtišu (YS) 'shoe' (BYs 169) (Tiffou 2014: 236). We consider the plural suffix to be composite: -is-u (HZ Ng -iš-o) where the first component would be a remnant of the nom. sg. suffix -is and the second the plural marker (for a discussion of the Bur plural endings, see Čašule 2016: 48-50). Comparison is possible with derivations from IE *ploths- or *ploths- 'broad, wide' (< *pleth- 'spread'), PSl *plesno, *plesna, esp. OChSL plesna (< *pletna), plesneca 'shoe, sandal', with limited distribution in Slavic (not found in East Slavic): OCz plesna 'sole', Sln plesna 'sole', (BER 5: 340), (Derksen 403 who also notes ORuss plasmeno 'front part of the sole'), and further OR Ir leth 'side' (i.e. 'broad part of body'), Gk plass 'breath', Olnd prāthas 'breath' (M-A 83). From the same stem we should also note PSL *plass 'cloth', esp. *padyspalti, e.g. Mcd, Blg potplata 'sole, lining' (BER 5: 462). Burushaski continues the bare stem. Within Burushaski it can be correlated with -wałdas 'back (of body)' (PSL *pletje 'shoulder') or mal 'field' (see Čašule 2017: 187, 253). Another Burushaski word which may be related is phaltōočin 'Wickelgamaschen; puttees' (B 322) (L 284). (Amended entry from Čašule 2017: 203.)

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

[15] Bur batul 'Ys sg. and pl. 'a thorny plant' (BYs 133). There is a suffix -Vf- in Burushaski[11] (see also [11] phatasu ndal). There is a direct semantic and formal correspondence with PSI *bodhs : Blg bodel 'thistle, thorn', Srb bodalj 'a type of thorny grass; thistle, Cirsium arvense, Carduus', bodelj 'the plant teasel (with thorny leaves), Dipsacus silvester', Mcd bodilo 'pricker, thorn', Sln bodalj 'needle, thorn' derived from the verb *bostī, *boda 'to prick, to sting', from IE *bheda- 'to prick, dig': Hitt beda- 'dig', Lat fodō 'I dig, I prick', Cymr bedd 'grave', Goth badi 'bed', Eng bed, Lith bēstī, bedū 'to prick, to dig', TochA pa-, pāt- 'to plough' (G 142) (ESSJ II: 154-155) (Derksen 49). The word is almost exclusive to South Slavic - outside of it there is only RussChSl bodōl 'thorn' (which could be of SSI provenance), yet not in Russian. In Burushaski, -dh- > -t- : -f- (see also [1]), and unstressed e > a. (See Čašule 2017: 92, amended.)

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

3.4 Mythical creature

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

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

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

---

[11] For example: Bur dambālum 'slight ascent, easy ascent' (B 113). Compare with IE *dhmbhos- or *mbhos 'swelling, mound' > Gk tōmbos 'barrow, tomb' considered of “Pelasgian” origin (in Wat 92: perhaps a nasalised extended form *tum-bh)- or extended zero-grade form *tum- 'IE *teuh- 'to swell'), VLat tumba 'gravestone', Lat tumulus 'a rounded hill, knoll; a burial mound, grave; a swelling, protuberance (on a surface)’ (Glare 1982: 1989) (the Latin word also < IE *teuh- to swell', from a suffixed form *teuh-e-), also Arm damban 'grave', Rom dîmb 'hill, elevation' (considered by some to be of Balkan substratal origin) (Neronzak 1978: 208) (Georgiev 1981: 100) (Katičić 1976: 71-72). Consider here also Bur tum NH 'heap, pile, stack' (B 448). (See Čašule 2017: 115.)
semantics here of ‘wandering beggar’ and ‘prey’ goes in support of Pelikan’s etymology above. The derivation would be ⁶bilás + -oni, with the suffix < -nko.

3.5 Verbs and verbal expressions

These correspondences are more limited in number.¹²

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

[19] Bur lute- Hz, lat- Hz ‘to frown’ (Varma 1941: 138 - adapted to Berger’s notation). This verbal construction is only registered by Varma. It can be correlated with PSl *lju̯t ‘angry, displeased’, e.g. OChSl ljut ‘violent, frightful’, Big ljut, Srb, Sl and Croat ljut, Russ ljutij, Cz liūt, Pl luty, all: ‘angry, harsh’ and generally very productive in Slavic, which does not have a clear etymology (Buck 1136), although it is sometimes compared with Cymr llid ‘anger, annoyance’ (G 392, < *lu̯-to-s) (ESSJ XV: 231-6, which outlines the limited existing etymologies of the Slavic word). The semantic and phonological correspondence with Burushaski is direct. Not found in Derksen (2008).

[20] Bur turú- ‘to tumble down, to break up, to pull down’, also -ltu- ‘(of a house) to tear the roof off, to tear down; (of seam, embroidery) to tear, to shred, to undo’ (L 45) (B 433) (the -l- is a verbal prefix (Berger 2008: 81-82). Consider also Bur trúu man- ‘NH ‘go very quickly’ (B 431) and tur -l- ‘same’ to eat everything in a house and turkin ‘to drink greedily, with big gulps (impolite)’ (B433). We can relate it directly to PSl *turati, from which we have Mcd turne pf., turka impf. ‘push, push (to the ground), knock down (a house), overthrow, pull down’, turka se ‘to jostle’, and turi pf., tura impf. : turi / tura se ‘to do something excessively (esp. drink and eat); to have a plentiful harvest’ (e.g. se turi od jadenje ‘he ate till he burst’) and turi, tura ‘pour into; put’ and numerous prefixed forms (RMJ III: 413-4) and further in Slavic : Sn turati ‘push’, Big turjam ‘I put’, Srb, Croat turiti (so ‘push, urge, to crowd, crush’, Russ turit ‘to be in a hurry, to hasten’, Byruss turjat ‘hasten, get going’ (G 645). Orel (IV: 120) gives also Russ turnut ‘coll. ‘to chuck out’, Pl turnač ‘to push out’, Ukr turni ‘same’ and Cz dial. turniut ‘to pay attention, to look’ (the latter seems semantically removed) and suggests an etymology from IE *stev- ‘to push’ which is not without problems. Skok (III: 525) states that there are no Baltic or Indo-European parallels, but quotes Meyer’s Albanian example turr turrem ‘laufe, stürze los’, which could however be a loanword from Macedonian. The Macedonian examples appear to show the closest and most direct semantic and phonological correspondence with the Burushaski set of words, which, importantly, is also the case with d-ur- ‘knock down’: Mcd ur ‘knock down’. The Macedonian meanings ‘knock down’, ‘pour down’, ‘eat, drink excessively’, ‘push to the ground’ (with the prefix ras- : rasturi ‘undo; cause disorder; destroy’ etc.) are all shared with Burushaski. It

¹² Consider also the extensive analysis (Čašule 2017: 88-90) of the unique correspondence between Bur barén-, baré- ‘to look, to look at; look for, to search for; look after, look about’ (L 70-71) (B 40) and Mcd bara ‘to look for, demand’ for which there are wider Indo-European correspondences (although very limited in Slavic).
may be that some of the unique Macedonian meanings are a result of overlap of Slavic with a possible word from the Balkan substratum. Hamp (R) suggests it could be a calque of part of the meaning.

There is no certain etymology for the Slavic words, although Gluhak (1993: 645) suggests a link with IE *₂uer- / *₂ur- (and *₂ur-, also *₃ur-) ‘turn, stir, turn around’: OInd vrāte, turāti ‘is in a hurry, in haste’, in Indo-Aryan: Bengali turā, H turāi, tūrant ‘quickly, at once, immediately’, Si tura all: ‘quick’, Gk otrynō ‘I urge, compel, am in a hurry’, otralēōs ‘quick’, Lat trua ‘trowel’, OHG dwerp ‘stir, mix’ with numerous derivations in Indo-European: e.g. Lat turba ‘disturbance, noise, screaming, commotion; a crowd, a multitude of people’ (Tucker 1931: 247). The semantics in Indo-Aryan does not match the Burushaski development which would argue very strongly for a separate development which parallels remarkably Macedonian. (See Čašule 2017: 246, amended.)

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

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

From IE *preu-g- ‘to jump’; SrbChSl isprugnoti ‘to jump up, to step out’, Russ prygar ‘to jump’ (not found elsewhere in Slavic), Lith sprukti, sprukstu ‘to jump, slip’, OEng frogga ‘frog’, Olcl froskr (< Grmc *prug-skō) ‘same’ (without -g- found in OInd pravate ‘jumps’) (IEW 845). (Entry from Čašule 2017: 205.)

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

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

### 3.6 Special use of numeral

In this example there is a direct correspondence between the Burushaski and Slavic semantic developments for the IE numeral *₃sēm- / *₃som- ‘one’.

[23] Bur -chāmanum (L isamanum) Hz Ng ‘first-born (son, daughter, young animal)’, (in Ys without aspiration) (L 47) (B 73). Berger segments it as ? + manim. We accept this segmentation -chām + manim and compare it with IE *₃sēm- / *₃som- ‘one’, e.g. Gk heis ‘one’, Lat semel ‘once’, TochA sas m. sām f. ‘one’ also PSI *sams ‘alone’ (from IE *₃som-o-s), OInd samā ‘equal, same’ (not found anywhere in IA with the meaning ‘first’ or ‘one’), Av hema-, hāma-, OPers hama- ‘same’, Gk homos ‘common, similar, equal’, Lat similis ‘similar’, OIr -som ‘same’, OEng, Eng same, OHG samo (Grmc *saman) (G 539) (Buck 938).

Bur also has sam ‘(of animals) female’ (L 317) (B 384) and sumān ‘(of animals) male’ (L 317) (B 385), identified by Berger as the first component in sūmphalikis ‘young female sheep’ (L 318) (B 385) which parallels the semantic development from the above stem in Slavic, i.e. from PSI *sams ‘alone we have Russ, Cz samec, Pl samiec ‘the male (animal)’, Russ samka, Pl samica, Cz samice ‘the female (animal)’ (in Srb and Croat samica ‘female (of birds)’ (Buck 139–140). The Bur change a > w/m is common. Both semantic developments in Burushaski ‘first’ and ‘male/female of animals’ are
very removed from the meaning in Old Indian and Indo-Aryan, whereas the link with Slavic is remarkable.

Note also the direct correspondence between Russ samyj 'most' (used to form the superlative) from the same IE stem, and Bur sam 'very, quite', which has limited usage: sam-sań 'very light, broad daylight' (sani 'light; bright') (B 374) (L 309), in B also sum-sań 'radiant, glowing' (L 318), sam sada 'quite plain, simple' (L 309) and perhaps also čamčák 'quite straight, quite upright' < čako -t- 'to put up' (B 68) and čam-čan 'quite straight', where čan 'straight, direct' (B 74) (L 362). This usage shows the same č(h): s alternation as above.

Consider further the Burushaski ablative postposition -ćum also -ćimo 'from' (B 70) which can be compared with PSI *srcó 'with; of, from', OPruss sen 'with', Arm ham- 'with' (IEW 904), i.e. ultimately from IE *sem-s ~ *sem ~ *sm-ih-, 'united as one, one together' (for a detailed discussion see Čašule 2009a), the same stem from which we derive Bur -čhámnum. The Burushaski form is from a zero-grade form *sm- and in Bur mr- > -um, -am. (The ablative can be analysed differently, however, as composite -ć-um (Berger I: 63).

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

3.7 Particles

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

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

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

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

14 The basic Tibetan meaning of ‘now, at present’ is not found in Burushaski. The Tibetan meaning ‘then’ has a very restricted distribution (only in narration and rarely). On the other hand, the Burushaski meanings of ‘and’, ‘again’, ‘also’ and as an interjection are not found in Tibetan.
most probably an original Burushaski word. Furthermore, the vowel length would not be accounted for.

Consider further the demonstrative (proximate) morpheme \(d-\) in \(akh\)i ́l vs \(dakh\)ı́l, \(dakh\)ı́l ‘such as this, like this, of this kind’ (B 14).

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

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

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

Consider the following example: “\(dāā\a\) méne bariń ēti nē gusē har ka bōso khâčićim” translated by T-P (96) as “qui dirait un mot, enfermerait le taureau et la veau”, which can be translated, with the same conditional meaning into Macedonian as “\(da\ kaže nekoj eden zbor, kje gi zatvori i volot i teletọ\), “if someone says a word, (he) will enclose the ox and the calf”.

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

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

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

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

There is a direct correlation with South Slavic le (invocative) particle when addressing s-one, derived from IE distal deixis particle \(*-le\) (Berneker, apud ESSJ XIV: 171-173) [(Lehmann 2002: 91)], e.g. Macedonian (esp. in folk poetry), particle used with the vocative: majko le ‘mother, hey’, stara
le majko ‘old ‘hey’ mother’, also in Blg le and let ‘particle used in addressing s-one’ (also esp. in folk poetry), and Srb, Croat le ‘same’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl le, li ‘ever; only; but’, Russ dial. le ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Srb le ‘only’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl le, li ‘ever; only; but’, Russ dial. le ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Srb le ‘only’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl le, li ‘ever; only; but’, Russ dial. le ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Srb le ‘only’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl le, li ‘ever; only; but’, Russ dial. le ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Srb le ‘only’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl le, li ‘ever; only; but’, Russ dial. le ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Srb le ‘only’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl le, li ‘ever; only; but’, Russ dial. le ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Srb le ‘only’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there’. In the rest of Slavic we have OPl le, li ‘ever; only; but’, Russ dial. le ‘interrogative particle’, ‘emphasising particle’, Srb le ‘only’, and with emphasising function, Sln le also ‘only, that much’ and importantly as a suffix (also rarely as a preposition) to demonstratives, as in to – tole ‘that’, tle – tlele ‘there'.

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

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

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

In this respect note that from the same Indo-European stem: *h₂ol- ‘beyond; from that side’ (Wat 2-3) or *h₂él’ios ‘other’, Burushaski has hóle, hólo ‘out, out of’ and hóolum ‘outside, other; foreign, strange’ (B 201-202) and most likely the stem of the numeral ‘2’: altó Ys (Zarubin) baltó, altán, altá and altáč (Berger 2008: 10.4, Čašule 2009a). (Compare with Mcd lani ‘last year’ < *h₂ol-ni-.)

(Entry from Čašule 2016: 160-161.)

[26] Bur Ys deh ‘come on, get on with it’, dedé ‘there! look!’ (BYs 141-142) (Tiffou 2014: 87). There is a direct parallelism with the South Slavic particle de ‘interjection for getting cattle to go; productive particle used for confirmation, enticement, for expressing doubt’: Mcd de, de de (e.g. de de ne se luti ‘come on, don’t get angry’), Sln de, dej (dej ga vz digniti ‘come on, lift it up’), and further e.g. Blg nali de ‘isn’t it so’, Mcd ajde de ‘come on, get on with it’ (also the second component in the ubiquitous ajde ‘come on’). With a different semantics also Russ de particle for introducing indirect speech (Ord 2011: 1, 285). The South Slavic and the Russian forms have been derived from PSl *deff)jati ‘to put, to speak’ (BER I: 328, 333), with which we have related Bur -t- ‘to do, to put; to speak’ from IE *dhehj- ‘to do, to put’, in Burushaski also dook man- ‘to put or set down; make ( provisionally); place a stone’ (B 121) and this from IE *dh̃o-k- *dho-k- ‘to do, to make, to set, to put’ (IEW 235). With all the reservations applicable to comparisons of interjections and particles, we have here a very precise correlation. The Burushaski particle with the laryngeal corresponds exactly with IE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is a particularly important correlation in the special developments from the IE numeral *sem- / *som- ‘one’ [23]. Burushaski corresponds with Slavic in that it has developed adjectives/nouns from this stem denoting ‘male and female of animals’. It also correlates in developing a quantifier, which is shared with Russian. Furthermore, the Burushaski ablative postposition can be derived from the same root, paralleling the Slavic preposition. The shared word for ‘plate’ [11] also derives from the same stem.
Most difficult to interpret are the direct correspondences in names of body parts: [1] ‘foot’; [2] ‘neck’; [3] ‘vertex’; [4] ‘arm’; [5] ‘bone of ankle’ and (including Baltic) [7] ‘hand’\textsuperscript{15} and (including Latin) [8] ‘thumb’. Borrowing names of body parts on such scale is to say the very least, unusual and would certainly entail a very close contact situation. Once again, it is important to stress that there is no semantic latitude and that the terms are (except for two) unique in Slavic.\textsuperscript{16}

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

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

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

5 Conclusion

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

\textsuperscript{15} There are indications that Burushaski also had historically another Indo-European term for ‘hand’. Consider Bur \textit{d-mar} ‘take s-thing from s-one’s hands, take away; receive, pick up, take load’, also \textit{d-i-u mar} ‘take s-body’s hand to kiss it’, \textit{d-mar} ‘make s-one ask; take’; Ng offer hand to be kissed’ (B 280-1), which can be compared directly with the IE forms derived with an *\textit{r} extension from IE *\textit{h}em-, *\textit{meh}- ‘take, lay one’s hands on, grasp’: OIr \textit{ar-fom} ‘take’, Lat \textit{emō} ‘take, buy’, OPruss \textit{im} ‘take’, OSl \textit{i} ‘catch, hunt, gather, take’, with a distribution in northwest IE (M-A 564) [from which there is Bur \textit{d-hemia-} Ys, \textit{d-mi-} Hz Ng ‘gather, collect, obtain, acquire, get; to harvest (fruit); reap and store’, \textit{d-e-mi-} ‘gather together’, Ys \textit{de-hemia-} (L 122) (LYs 73) (B 287)], i.e. IE *\textit{mar}- (IEW 740) : Gk \textit{mērē} hand, wrist, Alb \textit{mar} ‘take, grasp’ (\textit{marnō} denom. from \textit{mar-} to receive in hand’ (Ilić-Svityč 376), note also Gk \textit{mērō} ‘grasp’.

The notion of ‘hand’ prevails in the explanations given both by Lorimer and Berger, and the Ng meaning of ‘offering one’s hand’ may also point to the original semantics. The Burushaski word \textit{marmūk} ‘handful’ and the construction \textit{marmūk} -\textit{Ng ‘take in hand; embrace’ (L 262) (B 282), may contain the same stem as the first component. The presence of both the bare stem and with the *\textit{r}- extension makes this a very firm correspondence. (See Cašule 2017: 191-192.)

\textsuperscript{16} We note separately, because of the semantic latitude, Bur \textit{śkil} ‘face’, Ng \textit{śkil}, in the Ys dialect also \textit{śkil} (B 380). Perhaps related (from a zero-grade) to IE *\textit{kēl} ‘to rise’, Gk \textit{kolhōs} ‘hill’, Lat \textit{antecellum} ‘I mount, excel’ I excels, \textit{celēs} ‘tall, upright’, Lith \textit{kelti}, \textit{keliu} ‘to rise’ and especially PSI \textit{cēlo} ‘forehead’ (G 174). Otherwise, consider the close phonetic correspondence with Russ \textit{skula} ‘cheekbone’ (without an agreed etymology) (Vasmer III: 661-662, Orel III: 248 compares it with ON \textit{s}jol (shelter, cover)’ or Byruss \textit{skivica} ‘jaw’ and Lett \textit{iķīva} ‘clef’ blended with the root of Russ \textit{skall} ‘grin’ (Shevelov 1964: 297).
The phonetic shape of most of the correspondences unfortunately doesn’t reveal enough about the chronology of the contact/relationship, although in a number of cases we can claim that the correlations go back to antiquity whereas in others the question remains open which could mean that there are several layers in the vocabulary discussed. One possibility is that all the isoglosses could be ancient.

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

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

A full analysis of all the correlations between Slavic and Burushaski within the general Indo-European correspondences\(^{17}\) and with Baltic in particular, might shed more light on the mechanism of contact or relationship. While there is a clear affinity between the two languages, Burushaski shows many specific correspondences with other languages of the North-Western Indo-European group, notably with Germanic, Baltic, Celtic, Italic, Albanian and Phrygian, which goes against a Slavic-Burushaski subgrouping.
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\(^{17}\) Consider e.g. the correspondence in the personal pronoun for 1. p. pl. Bur *mi* ’we’ (gen.-erg *mi-ı*; dat. (reduplicated) *mimar*, abl. *mičum*) and the pronominal prefix *mi-ı/mi-ı-mı-ı-mı-ı-mı-ı* which can be correlated directly within Indo-European with Arm *mek*, Blt-Sl *mes* e.g. OPruss *mes*, Lith *mės* and PSI *my* ’we’ (Fortson 2004: 127). For details see Čašule (2017: Chapter 1. 2.3).
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