

Blažek, Václav

Indo-european "one" and "first"

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná. 1999, vol. 48, iss. A47, pp. [5]-25

ISBN 80-210-2098-9

ISSN 0231-7567

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/101542>

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK

INDO-EUROPEAN “ONE” AND “FIRST”

For Eva Havlová, the first lady of Czech etymology

§1. In Indo-European languages the numeral “one” was formed from one of two roots: A. *oy-, B. *sem-. The ordinal “first”, usually derived from the root *per-/ *pro-, meant originally “fore, foremost”. The most important forms can be projected in the following partial reconstructions allowing their deeper analysis.

Indo-Iranian:

A. *oy-

*oy-ko- “1” > Indo-Aryan *aika- > Mitanni Aryan *aika-* in *a-i-ka-wa-ar-ta-na* “one turn” (Puhvel 1984: 14), Old Indic *éka-*, Pali *eka-*, *ekka-*, Prakrit *ikka*, *igga*, *ēa*, Hindi *ek*, Oriya *eka* besides *e* (cf. Prakrit *ēa*), Sindhi *eku* etc., Kashmiri *akh*, Shina *ĕk*, Phalura *āk*, Torwali *ek*, *ē*, Tirahi, Kalasha, Dameli *ek*, Bashkarik, Maiyan *ak*, Shumashti *yāk*, Wotapuri *yek*, Gawar *yak*, Waigali *ēk*, *ew*, Kati *ev*, Ashkun *ač*, Pashai, Khowar *ī* (cf. Prakrit *ēa*). Let us mention that the alternative reconstruction *oy-k”o- (Waanders 1992: 370) is also quite legitimate.

*oy-wo- “1” > Iranian *aiwa- > Avestan *aēuua-*, Khwarezmian *ēw*, Sogdian (Buddhistic) *’yw*, (Manichean) *’yw*, (Christian) *yw*, Yaghnobi *i*, Pashto *yau*, Yidgha, Mundjan, Ishkashim *yū*, Wakhi *īu*, Shugni *yī(w)*, Sarikoli *ī(w)*, Ossetic Digor *ew*, Iron *īw*, Old Persian *aiva-*, Zoroastrian Pahlavi *ēv*, *ēvak* (**aivaka*, cf. Modern Persian *yak* “1” and *yekom* “1st”, already in Zoroastrian Pahlavi *ēkom* “1st”, Baluchi *ēyōk* “single”, *evak’ā* “alone”, Sanglechi *wok*, *yak*, Yazgulam *yū(g)* “1” and further Khotanese *śśūka-* “alone”, Parthian ‘wg id.), Modern Persian dial. *yaw*, Zaza *yau*, Talysh *i*; cf. also Old Indic adv. *evā* “just so”, exactly corresponding to Avestan *aēuua* “so”, Khotanese *ī* “indeed”. The seemingly deviating forms, such as Khotanese *śśāu* “1”, Tumshuq Saka *śo*, Ormuri *šē*, *šə*, Parachi *žū*, represent probably the compound **wiśwa-aiwa* “all” & “one” attested e.g. in Old English *eall-āna* “alone”, cf. Khotanese *biśśa-* “all”.

(Abaev I: 557–58; Bailey 1979: 31, 404; Berger 1986: 26–27; Emmerick 1992a: 165 and 1992b: 291–92; EWAI I: 262–63, 270; Gonda 1953: 76–80)

B. *sem-/*sm-

*sēmi- > Old Indic *sāmi* adv. “half” (EWAI II: 725)

*somHó- > Old Indic *samá-* “equal, the same”, Avestan *hama-* “equal”, Old Persian *hama-* “one and the same”, Khotanese *hama-*, Zoroastrian Pahlavi and Modern Persian *ham* “the same” (Bailey 1979: 457; EWAI II: 703)

*sm- “one”- in compounds like *sm-k^hrt “once” > Old Indic *sakṛt*; Avestan *hakərət* “once”, Khotanese *hatārra-* “once” (**ha-kṛtna-* ?; contaminated with the homonym meaning “former” < **fratarā-*), Old Persian *hakaram-ōiy* “jemals, wenn immer” (**hakr*’ -), Zoroastrian Pahlavi *hk(w)lč* (**hakarč*), Middle Persian (Turfan) *hgryč* (**hagriz*), Modern Persian *hargiz* “ever” (**hakrt* + *čid*).

(Bailey 1979: 448; Emmerick 1992b: 328–29; EWAI II: 683; KEWA III: 411)

*smHo- > Old Indic *sama-* “anyone, every”, pl. *samē* “all”, Avestan *hama-* “jeder beliebige”, Khotanese *hama-* “all”, Middle Persian *hamāg* id., *hamē* “always” etc.

(Bailey 1979: 457; Beekes 1983: 202–03; in EWAI II: 703 Mayrhofer reconstructs *smmo-)

*smo- > Old Indic *sma*, *smā* ‘enclitic’, more probably ‘emphatic particle’, orig. *‘in the same way’; *smāt* “together, jointly”, in compounds also *smād-*; Avestan *maṭ* “together, with, always”.

(EWAI II: 779; KEWA III: 547, 548; Hahn, *Language* 18[1942]: 94 compared it with Greek *μέτα*, Gothic *miþ* “with”)

C. *per-/*pro-

Indo-Iranian **pra-t(h)ama-* > Old Indic *prathamá-* “id., vordester, frühester”, Pali *paṭhama-*, Prakrit *paḍhama-*, *puḍhuma-* (**pr̥thama-*), Sinhalese *paḷamu*, Shina *pumú-ko* and Iranian **parθama-* > Zoroastrian Pahlavi *pahlom* “id., better, excellent”, Parthian *Parthama-* (in personal names) besides Avestan *fratama-*, Old Persian *fratama-* “vordester”.

In the suffix **-t(h)ama-*, Emmerick (1992b: 318) sees a contamination of two forms for “first”: **pratha-* (with **-tha-* as in *caturthá-*, *pañcathá-*, *ṣaṣṭhá-* etc. “4th”, “5th”, “6th”) x **prama-* (cf. Umbrian *promom*). Mayrhofer (EWAI I: 179) prefers to see here a contamination of the ordinal suffix **-tha-* and superlative in **-tama-*. A parallel formation **partāka-* continues in Khotanese *paḍāa-* “1st”, Zoroastrian Pahlavi *fradāg*, Modern Persian *farḍā* “early, next morning”.

Iranian **parwiya-* > Gatha-Avestan *paouruiia-*, Younger Avesta *paoiriia-*, Old Persian adv. *pr’uv’iyt*, a derivative of **parwa-* > Avestan *pauruua-* “prior”, Buddhistic Sogdian *prw’yčk* “former”, Khotanese *pīrūya* “former” (but *pīrma-* “first” resembles suggestively Lithuanian *pirmas* id.) besides Old Indic *pūrva-* “prior”.

(Bailey 1979: 240; Bartholomae 1907–08: 95–116; Berger 1986: 58; Emmerick 1992a:178–79 and 1992b: 318–19; EWAI I: 157, 179)

Anatolian:

A. *oy-

? **oy-pki* > **ayanki* > Hittite 1-*an-ki* = *a-an-ki* (KUB IV 2 IV 36, 38) “once” (Eichner 1992: 42–46; the reconstruction of the multiplicative suffix is based on

an exact parallel in Greek – see Benveniste 1962: 70; cf. e.g. Cretan ἀμάκις “once”). Unaccepted remains the attempt of Shevoroshkin (1979: 178) deriving Lycian B (= Milyan) *uni* translated “this only...” (Melchert 1993: 127 does not translate this word at all) and Hittite *un(i)* “that one” from **oyn*^o (Melchert 1994: 187 admits a development from **óm*).

B. **sem*-/**sm̄*-

**sm̄*-*yo*- (?) > Hittite *sani*- “one and the same, a single one” attested e.g. in *ša-ni-ia ú-it-ti* “in the same year” or “in the first year”, *ša-ni-ya ši-wa-at-t[i]* “on one and the same day”, *ša-ni-ya pí-di* “at one and the same place” (Eichner 1992: 45). Hittite *āšma* “firstly, on the first occasion” (always written *a-āš-ma*) also probably belongs here; following Neu, Eichner 1992: 43–44 derives it from **ō-smō*, lit. “at the one”, comparing the preposition with Vedic *á* “to, around”. The form **sem* or **som* can be also found in adverbs such as *kissan* “thus, in the following way”, *kenissan* “thus, in this way”, *enissan* “thus, in the manner mentioned”, *apenissan* “thus, in that way”, *annisan* “formerly”, *kussan* “when?” (Eichner 1992: 46). On the other hand, he rejects the relationship of the other forms proposed by Shevoroshkin (1979: 177), namely *sannapi sannapi* “each for itself, separate, scattered”, *sannapili*- “empty, alone; not impregnated”.

C. **per*-/**pro*-

Shevoroshkin (1979: 179–82) has collected various derivatives of the root **per*-/**pro*-, assuming that they mean “first”. But his interpretations are not generally accepted: Luvian *pāriyanalla/i*- is really built like Hittite *duyanalli*- “officer of the second rank”, but its meaning is “of the beyond” > “future” (Melchert 1993b: 169). There is another hypothetical cognate in the Anatolian titles: Hittite ^{L0}*parhuwala*- “a functionary having to do with garments”, cf. KBo 21.82 iv 17: 1 ^{TUG}BAR.SI ^{L0}*pár-ḫu-wa-la-aš pāi* “the *p*-man supplies one turban (?)” and KBo 22.157:6–8: ^{L0}*pár-ḫu-u-wa-la-a[š...]* / ^(TUG)*iš-kalli[ššar...]* / [(and)] *a pē[dai]* “the *p*-man [...] brings in a torn garment [...]” (CHD 1995: 148). The title *parhuwala*- can be derived from **p̄H₂wo-lo*-. But the semantic motivation connected with the meaning “first” (“the first valet” ?) cannot be proved. Lycian *prze/i*- does not mean “first”, but “front-, foremost” (Melchert 1993a: 57). The Lycian B (= Milyan) examples quoted by Shevoroshkin, namely *pirli*, *predi*, *prijāmie*, *prijē*, *prijelije*-, *pruwa*-, remain untranslated (Melchert 1993a: 122–23). In Hittite and Luvian the ordinal “first” is derived from Anatolian **hant*- “forehead”: Hittite *hantezzi(ya)*- “first, forward, front, first-born, earliest, foremost, first-rank”, Luvian *hantili*- “first” (Puhvel 1991: 108–12; Eichner 1992: 92; Melchert 1993b: 52).

Armenian:

A. **oy*-

oy-no*- > Armenian *ēn* “God”, lit. “the one”, *so-in* “derselbe hier”, *do-in* “derselbe da”, *no-in* “derselbe dort”, *andrēn* (andre-yn*) “ebendort”, *astēn* (**aste-yn*) “ebenhier” (Pokorny 1959: 286)

B. **sem*-/**sm̄*-

**smiH₂* “1” (f.) > Armenian *mi* “1” (Winter 1992c: 148 and Kortlandt 1994:

253; Meillet 1936: 99, 185 and Solta 1960: 454 reconstruct **smiyo-*); the unstressed variant *me-* appearing in *metasan* “11” and *mekin* “single”, can be derived from **mea-* < **miya-* < **smiya-*. Similarly *mēn* “each one” reflects **miya-* + *-in*. The alternative form *min* “1” can be analyzed as *(*i*)*m-in* < **sem-*, originally perhaps the m.-n. stem (Winter 1992: 348). The suffix *-in* probably appears in *ařaj-in* “1st”. Kortlandt (1994: 253) presents an alternative solution, interpreting *min* as acc. of *mi*.

The synonymes *mu* and *ez* remain without convincing etymologies (Winter 1992c: 148). The interpretation of Pedersen (*IF* 39[1906]: 414) who proposed *ez* < **sem-ĝ^ho-* and compared it with Greek (Cypriote) ἴγγία · εἶς. Πάφιοι (Hesychius) < **ěv-γία* (Solmsen, *KZ* 45[1913]: 333 finds the same suffix in Gothic adv. *ala-kjo* “all”), cannot be accepted without any explanation of the difference in aspiration.

**som-* > Armenian *omn* “some” (Meillet 1936: 90, 189; Strunk 1974: 380).

**smHV-* > Armenian *amēn(-ayn)* “all” (Pokorny 1959: 903). Mann 1984–87: 1126 also adds *samol(k')* “pair”, perhaps derivable from **smH₂ol-*, cf. Latin *similis*, Old Irish *samail* < **smH₂eli-* “equal, even” (see below).

C. **per-/pro-*

Armenian *ařaj-in* “1st” is evidently related to *ařaj* “before” which is derived from **pr_hH-* (Winter 1992: 354). The origin of the suffix *-in* was sought in the analogical formation *verjin* “last” vs. *verj* “end” (Brugmann 1892: 467; Kortlandt 1994: 253). Meillet 1936: 76 derived it from **-ino-*. The origin of *-j-* remains open. Winter 1992: 354 speculated about its locative origin. Hamp 1972: 470–72 proposed another solution. He derives the pair *ařaj* : *ařajin* from the heteroclitic paradigm **pr_hH₃-wr-iH₂ /-wen-* > **parwarya- /-wen-* > *(*p*)*arg^harya /-g^hin-* > **arrag^hya / *arrag^hin*, supporting the development of **-wy-* by analogy with *ofj* “entire”, reflecting more probably **solwoyo-* than **solyo-*. The form **pr_hHwo-* continues in Armenian *haraw* “south”; cf. Avestan *pouruua-*, *pauruua-* “primary, frontal south” (Djahukian, *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 11[1990]: §5).

Phrygian:

In Phrygian the numeral “one” can be identified in ἰαμβος “Kultanz für Dionysos”, lit. “Einschritt”, cf. θρίαμβος & διθύραμβος “Drei-, Vierschritt”. The first component **ǰ(α)-* corresponds to Greek Lesbian, Thessalian ἰα f. “ein und dieselbe/derselbe” (Haas 1966: 702). Beekes (1995: 212) derives it from **siH₂* corresponding to the feminine personal pronoun e.g. in Old Irish *sí*, Gothic *si* etc. (Brugmann 1911: 390). More probable seems to be the traditional point of view, connecting *ἰα* with the anaphorical pronoun or the root of the numeral “1” **oy-*. This solution can be supported by Cretan ἴρτον ἔν (Hesychius), remodelled after διττός, τριττός from **ǰ(o)-* (Schwyzer 1939: 588 with older literature).

Greek:

A. **oy-*

**oy-no-/ā* > Greek m. οἶνός (Poll.), f. οἶνη (Achae., Zen.) “one (on a die)”;

cf. also *οἰνίζειν* · *τὸ μονάζειν κατὰ γλῶσσαν* and *οἰνῶντα* · *μονήρη* (Hesychius);

**oy-wo-* > Greek *οἶος* (Hom., Hsd.), dat. *οἶφωι* (Cypr.) "alone", further *οιέτης* (Hom.) "eines Alters" < **οἶφο-φεταις* and probably Mycenaean *o-wo-we* = *οἶφῶφης* "with a single handle".

(Brugmann 1892: 465; Frisk II: 364, 367; Schwyzer 1939: 588; Waanders 1992: 370)

B. **sem-/sṃ-*

sem-s* nom. m., **sem* nom. n., **semei* dat. m.-n. "1" > Greek m. **ἕνς* > Attic-Ionian *εἷς*, Doric *ἦς*, Gortynian *εν δικαδδεπῶ* (ενς δ-*), n. *ἔν*, dat. *ένί*, but Mycenaean *e-me* = *hemei*

**sṃiH₂* nom. f. "1" > Greek *μία*.

**sēmi-* "half" > Greek *ἡμι-* "half-" in compounds.

**somHo-* > Greek *ὀμός* "equal; one and the same" (the reconstruction of the laryngeal after Indo-Iranian data – see EWAI II: 703). The same root vowel appears in *ὀμαλός* "equal", but the Latin and Old Irish parallel formations are derivable from **sṃH₂el-*; that is why Beekes 1983: 228 proposed that the original form was **ὀαμαλός*, influenced by *ὀμός*.

sṃ-* in **sṃHo-* > Greek *ἀμο-θεν* "irgendwoher"; **sṃ-* (in compounds) > *ἀ-*, *ἄ-*: *ἄπαξ* "once", *ἄπλοῦς* "single, simple", *ἄτερος* (Doric, Aeolic; Mycenaean *a₂-te-ro*), *ἕτερος* (Ionian-Attic) "one" or "the other (of two)"; *ἀδελφός* "brother", lit. "of the same womb, couterus" with the change *ἀ* > *ἄ* caused by Grassmann's law. The same prefix develops in a different way in compounds with initial laryngeals; so *μῶνυξ* "with a single (= uncloven) hoof" is derivable from **sṃ-H₃noḡ^h*- (Beekes 1971: 140). It is tempting to speculate about an analogical formation in Armenian *etungn* "fingernail, claw, nail, hook", if it reflects **en-ong-* + *-n* (cf. *ot-n* "foot", *ak-n* "eye" etc. – see Beekes 1969: 47) < **sem-H₃noḡ^h*-. Indo-European **ǵ* has been preserved in Armenian, but before nasal **ǵ* gives *i* (Meillet 1936: 41). A passable solution could consist in the assumption that the dissimilation **n...n* > *l...n* preceded the change **ǵN* > *iN*. Finally, Hittite *sanku(wa)i-* "fingernail" with a puzzling *s-*, can represent the same compound. In the case of "s-mobile" ([s+*]H₃ong^hu° after Eichner 1985: 165) one would expect Hittite **ishanku*° (Beekes 1969: 47). The idea of assibilation of the expected laryngeal (so Josephson 1979: 100–01) appears to be quite unconvincing. On the other hand, the compound **sṃ-* & **H₃e/ong^h-u-* would give Anatolian **sanhangu*° or **sananku*° (accepting the loss of all laryngeals before **o* in Anatolian – see Beekes 1988: 80–81) and further via haplology Hittite *sanku*°.

(Chantraine 326–27; Frisk I: 471–72; Schwyzer 1939: 588; Waanders 1992: 369–70)

C. **per-/pro-*

The ordinal "1st" is represented by two variants in Greek dialects:

(a) Attic-Ionic, Arcado-Cypriotic, Lesbian *πρώτος*, cf. also Mycenaean personal names *Po-ro-to* = *Πρώτος* (?) and *Po-ro-te-u* = *Πρωτεύς* (?);

(b) Northwest Greek, Doric, Boeothian *πράτος*.

Their origin is not sufficiently explained. Not all scholars accept even their compatibility.

So Schwyzer (1939: 595) discussed the reconstruction **πρόατος* < **πρώφατος* (Brugmann 1892: 466) indicating the original form **πρωφος* comparable with Old Indic *pūrva-*, while for Doric etc. *πῶτος* he preferred **pṛ̥to-* < **pṛ̥Hto-*. Rejecting the hypothetical protoform **πρόατος* because it would give *ω* in Doric, Beekes 1969: 215 reconstructed **πραφο-τος*, in which **πραφο-* would correspond to Old Indic *pūrvá-* (cf. also Lejeune 1972: 264, fn. 2 and Szemerényi 1996: 228). This solution implies the laryngeal reconstruction **pṛ̥H₂wo-* (cf. Beekes 1995: 214). Alternatively, Beekes (1969: 215) admits the metathesis of length in Doric: **προατος* < **πρωατος*, justifying the reconstruction **πρωφο-* < **pṛ̥H₃wo-*. Hamp (1972: 471) finds a support for the originality of **pṛ̥H₃wo-* in Greek in its probable derivatives *πῶρα* “prow, the foremost part of a ship” and *πῶν* “jutting rock” (i.e. “forward projecting”), deriving them from **πρώφαρια-* & **πρώφον-*. It is evident that this pair forms an ancient heteroclitic paradigm (with its feminine counterpart member) **pṛ̥H₃-wr-iH₂* vs. **pṛ̥H₃-won-* (cf. Armenian counterparts). Finally Waanders (1992: 378) reconstructs **proH₁-to-* “1st” (m.) > *πῶτος* and **preH₂(e)H₁-to-* “1st” (f.) > *πῶτος*, interpreting the **H₁* -extension as an instrumental, hence “by the frontside”. Confronting the presented opinions with external evidence, the solutions leading to the starting point **pṛ̥H_{3,2}wo-* also seem to be most hopeful for Greek.

Albanian:

A. **oy-*

**eni-* & **oy-no-* “that one” > proto-Albanian **(V)ni-ain-* > **ni-ēn* > common Albanian **ñâ(nV)* > Geg *njân-i*, Tosk *njër-i* “(the) one” (cf. Geg *tân(ë)*, Tosk *tërë* “all” < **tod oynoN*, lit. “the single”) besides Geg *njâ* and Tosk *një* “1”. The North Geg indefinite article *nji* can be derived directly from **eni-*, a proclitic postulated on the basis of Greek *ἔνιοι* “some”, *ἔνῃ* “the day after next”, Old Latin *enim* “fürwahr”, later “denn, nämlich” etc. (Pokorny 1959: 320), cf. also Messapic *ennan* “illam” < **enĭām* (Haas 1962: 95, 177; cf. Hamp 1966: 113).

(Hamp 1973: 2–6 and 1992: 903–04)

(B. **sem-*)

Huld 1984a: 101 tries to prove the origin of *një*, *nji* in the feminine **njā* < **(s)mjā* < **sm-i(e)H₂*, assuming the change **mj* > *nj*. (Hamp 1992: 903 rejects it, quoting a counter-argument in *qime* “single strand of hair” < **-miā*, def. *qimja*). Huld 1984b: 60, 65 finds support for his point of view in the Greek and Armenian counterparts to *njëzet* “20” = “1 x 20”, namely (East) Greek **ἐφίκοσι* < **se-wī-k̑mti* and Armenian *k’san* < **[sem]s-wī-k̑mt-* “1 x 20”.

C. **per-/*pro-*

**pṛ̥H-wo-* “1st” > Albanian (*i*) *parë* (Hamp 1992: 904 identified **H* = **H₃*, cf. also Huld 1984: 150).

Italic:

A. **oy-*

*oy-no- "1" > Old Latin *oinos (acc. sg. oino CIL I² 29, oenos Cic. leg. 3,3,9 etc.), Latin ūnus, Umbrian unu "unum".

(Coleman 1992: 389–90; EM 1084–85; WH 321–23)

B. *sem-/*sm̥-

*sm̥- in Latin *simplus*, *simplex* "single", *semper* "always" (cf. *parum-per*, *paulis-per*), *singulus* "solitary" (simplified from **singnulus* or dissimilated from **singno-* "born together", cf. *bignae* "twins" – see Coleman 1992: 419), *semel* "once", *similis* "similar, equal" (**semali-* < **sm̥H₂eli-* – see Beekes 1983: 228 who sees in *-el- the same, probably adjectival formation, as in Hittite *sel*, the genitive of the anaphora), *semol* (CIL I 1531), *simul* "at the same time" (usually compared with isolated Gothic *simle* "once upon a time"; instead of the traditional view seeking a counterpart of Gothic *mēl* "time" in the second part – see Wackernagel, KZ 30[1890]: 316; Coleman 1992: 415–16, 440, fns. 84, 85, 86 preferred a compound of **sem-/sm̥-* and the verbal root **H₁el-* "to go", continuing in Greek *ἐλθεῖν*, Latin *ex-il-ium* etc.), cf. further Umbrian *sumel* "at the same time".

**smiH₂* > *(s)mī- in *(s)mī-*ĝ^heslī* "belonging to one thousand" > early Latin **mīhēli* > **mīhīle* > *mīlle* "1000" (Rix 1991: 226).

**sēmi-* "half" > Latin *sēmi-* in compounds, *sēmō* "demigod" (Mann 1984–87: 1126).

C. *per-/*pri-/*pr-

**pri-yos-* > Latin *prior* "first of two" and

**pri-is-mo-* > Paelignian nom. sg. f. *prismu*, Latin *prīmus* "first" represent the root **pri* (Latin adv. *prī* "before"), extended by comparative and superlative suffixes respectively.

**prei-wo-* > Umbrian abl. pl. m. *prever* "one at a time", Latin *prīuus* "individual, peculiar".

**prō-mo-* > Umbrian adv. *prumum*, *promom* "primum".

(Coleman 1992: 408, 416, 419)

Celtic:

A. *oy-

*oy-no- "1" > Old Irish *oen*, *oin*; Welsh, Cornish, Breton *un* besides Old Irish *oenán*, Welsh, Breton *unan*, Cornish *onan* "alone" (Vendryes 1960: O 10–11). The innovation **oyno-m-eto-* "1st" > Old Irish *oīnmad* appears only in combination with tens, cf. also Medieval Welsh *unuet ar dec* "11" (Hamp, ZCP 45[1992]: 85).

B. *sem-/*sm̥-

**sm̥-* in **sm̥-ĝ^heslo-* "one thousand" > **san-gles-to-* > Hispano-Celtic (Botorrita) *san-CilisTara* "1000th" (Lambert 1994b: 372; Szemerényi 1994: 98); **sm̥-tero-* "one of two" > Old Welsh *hanther*, Cornish, Breton *hanter* "half" (de Bernardo Stempel 1987: 156);

**sm̥Ho-* "alone" (?) > Gaulish *Samo-* in personal names: *Samo*, *Samogenus*, *Samorix*, *Samotalus* etc. (Evans 1967: 252–53; Billy 1993: 131). The meaning "summer" proposed for the component *Samo-* by Schmidt (ZCP 26 [1957]:

264–65) does not appear to be probable in the light of the quoted compounds where *rix* means “king”, *talus* “front”.

**sm̥H-* > Old Irish *sam-* “together”, *saim* “pair, couple, yoke” (Vendryes 1978: S 19–20)

Cf. also Old Irish *samail* “resemblance”, Welsh *hafal* “like, equal”, Old Breton *-hemel* (in personal names) < **samali-* < **sm̥H₂eli-* (Beekes 1983: 228 and 1988: 92).

**smyo-* in Celtic **kon-sm̥jo-* > Old Irish *cummae* “equal, identical” (Vendryes 1987: C 288–89).

**sēmi-* “half” > Gaulish *semi-*, *simi-* (Billy 1993: 135, 137).

C. **per-/pro-*

prei-mo-* “1st” > Gaulish **rēmo-* reconstructed on the basis of the tribal name *Rēmi* “les premiers”. The same name also appears on coins, namely *REMO* and *REMOS* (Lambert 1994a: 34, 42, 183; cf. also Billy 1993: 124). Formally identical forms are attested in Welsh *rwyf* “prince, chief” and Middle Cornish *ruif* “king” while Old Irish adv. *riam* “formerly” reflects **preisamo-* (Vendryes 1974: R 26–27). The **prei-* derivative with the meaning “first” was replaced by the innovation **kentu-* attested in Gaulish (La Graufesenque) *kin-tux*[< **kintukso-* (Lambert 1994a: 131) or **kintusko-* (Vendryes 1987: C 83), cf. Breton comp. *kentoc’h* “formerly”, and further in personal names *Cintu-gnatos*, *-us* (= “Primigenitus”), *Cintusmos* (superl. **kintusamo-*) etc., similarly Welsh *cyntaf*, Middle Breton *quentaff* “the first”, and Old Irish *cétmae* id. (kentonyos*). A promising cognate could be found in Thracian **kentho-*, naturally if its meaning was “first” (Polomé 1986: 185).

Germanic:

A. **oy-*

**oyno-* “1” > Germanic **aina* > Gothic *ains*; Old Icelandic *einn*, Old Swedish *ēn*, *en*, *æn*, *in*, Old Gutnic *ann*; Old High German *ein*, Dutch *een*, Old English *ān*, Old Frisian *ān*, *ēn*; cf. the derivative in *-*ko-*: Gothic *ainaha* adj. “only”, Old Icelandic *einga*, Old High German *einac*; cf. Balto-Fennic borrowings: Finnish *aino(v)a*, Karelian *ainuo*, Vot *ainago*, Estonian *ainua*, Livonian *āinagi*; Lule Lappish *aeina*, *-u* “alone”. On the other hand, Gothic *ainakls* “standing alone”, Old Swedish *ænkil* “widower”, Dutch, Low German *enkel* “simple, single”, can represent a compound **oyno-ġnH₁o-* with dissimilation *n...n* > *n...l* (cf. Gothic *niuklahs* = Greek *νεογνός* – see Rasmussen 1987: 218) assumed also for Latin *singulus* – see Coleman (1992: 440, fn. 88) following Leumann & Hofmann. The compound of **aina-* (in Gothic **aini-*) and **līban* “to remain” forms the numeral “11” (similarly “12”): Gothic dat. *ainlibim*; Old Icelandic *ellefu*; Old High German *einlif*, Old Saxon *elleban*, Middle Dutch *elleven*, Old Frisian *andlova*, *allewa*, *elleve* etc., Old English *endlefan*, Middle English *alleven* etc.

Crimean Gothic *ita* “1” is explained from **ainata*, n. of *ains*. Hamp assumed an ‘emphatic’ compound **ita-aina* “that one” (with following loss of *aina-*), cf. Slavic **ed-inъ* (see Lehmann 1986: 128).

(Lehmann 1986: 16–17; Ross & Berns 1992: 559–60, 593–96, 656)

B. **sem-/*sṃ-*

**sem-* > Germanic **sin-* (in compounds) > Gothic adj. f. *sinteina* "daily", *sinteiно* "allways", Old Saxon *sin-nahti* "eternal night" etc. (Lehmann 1986: 305); extended in **sem(H)lom* > Gothic adv. *simle* "once, formerly"; Old High German *simblum*, *simble(s)*, Old Saxon *sim(b)la*, Old English *simbel*, *sible(s)* "always";

**sēmi-* "half" > Old High German *sāmi-*, Old English *sām-* in compounds;

**somH-ó-* > Gothic *sama* "the same one", in compounds e.g. *sama-leiko* "similarly", Old Icelandic *samr*, *sami*, Old High German *samo* "the same" etc. (Lehmann 1986: 294–95; the reconstruction of the laryngeal is based on the Indo-Iranian **samá-* "equal" where the absence of laryngeal would cause a lengthening in agreement with Brugmann's law – see EWAI II: 703).

**sṃ-t(e)ro-* > Gothic *sundro* adv. "alone, apart", Old Icelandic *sunder* "asunder", Old High German adv. *suntar* "separated from, apart, alone" etc.;

**sṃHo-* > Germanic **sum-* > Gothic *sums* "anyone", *suman* "once, formerly; in part", Old Icelandic *sumr* "some, any", Old High German, Old Saxon *sum* "some, any".

(Beekes 1983: 202–03; Lehmann 1986: 304; 328–29)

C. **per-/*pro-*

**pṛH-* plus 'comparative' suffix **-mo-* (a), superlative suffix **-isto-* (b), their mixture (c): a) Germanic **furma-* > Gothic *fruma* (modified on the pattern of the suffix **-uma-*, cf. Szemerényi 1996: 228), Old Saxon *formo*, Old Frisian *forma*, *furma*, Old English *forma*; b) Germanic **furista-* > Old Icelandic *fyrstr*, Danish *forste*, Old High German, Old Saxon *furisto*, Old Frisian *ferist*, Old English *fyr(e)st*, Middle English *first*, *furst*, *frist*, *frust*, *frest*; c) Germanic **furmista-* > Gothic *frumists*, Old Frisian *formest*, Old English *fyrmost*, Middle English *furmost*. The extensions (a) and (b) also form the derivatives of Germanic **air* "early" (Gothic *air*, Old Icelandic *ár*) with the meaning "first": (a) Old English *ærra*, Middle English *e(a)rre* etc.; (b) Old High German *êristo*, Old Saxon *êrista*, Old Frisian *êr(e)st(a)*, Old English *ærest* etc.

Old English *forwost*, *forwest* "the first" can reflect **pṛHwo-* plus superlative suffix **-isto-* (Pokorny 1959: 815; Ross & Berns 1992: 624–25)

Baltic:

A. **oy-*

**oyno-* "1" > West Baltic **aina-* > Prussian m. *ains*, acc. *ainan*, f. *ainā*, Yatwingian *anf* (= *ains* ?) (Toporov 1975: 62–64; Zinkevičius 1984: 9);

**wV-oyno-* > East Baltic **veina-* > Lithuanian m. *vienas*, f. *vienà*; Lithuanian *ie* may reflect **ey/*ay/*oy*; the proof for the diphthong **-ey-* has been sought in the compound *vič-veinelis* "a single" (Trautmann 1923: 3). Hamp (1973: 4) tries to demonstrate the origin of Lithuanian *-ie-* in the contraction: **wV-'oyno-* > **v' āina* – > **v' ēna-*. Latvian m. *viēns*, f. *vienà* has to be based on the feminine **wV-(o)ynā* > **v(V)in'ā* > **vēn'ā*. The first component probably represents a zero- grade of the pronominal stem known from Old Church Slavonic *онъ* – *онъ* "ὄς μὲν – ὄς δὲ", *ови* "ἄλλοι", Old Polish *owo* "ecce" and Old Persian *ava-* "jener" (cf. Trautmann 1923: 20).

The nil grade in the root vocalism appears in Latvian *viņš* “he” (**vinjas*) with the same pronominal prefix, and without it in Lithuanian *inas* “true, real” (Trautmann 1923: 3).

Lithuanian *vienūolika* “11” represents the original form **[dešimtis] vienūo liekuo* “[ten] with one extra”, consisting of a sociative-instrumental of the numeral “1” and *liėkas* “odd”, changed subsequently to *vienūolika* under influence of the higher teens with *-lika* (Comrie 1992: 763–64).

In Lithuanian the same pattern is used for all teens, while a similar formation in Germanic is limited only to “11” and “12”. It is remarkable that Old Lithuanian uses only *liekas* in the sense “11th”. In the rare phrase *dešimtas liekas* the numeral “one/first” is also deleted (Hamp, *Baltistica* 8.1[1972]: 55–56).

C. **p̄H-mo-* “1st” > Baltic **p̄irma-* > Prussian m. *pirmas*, *pirmois*, f. *pirmoi*, Lithuanian m. *pirmas*, f. *pirmoji*, Latvian *pīrmais*, *pirmais*, dial. (East) *pyrms*. (Comrie 1992: 729–30; Fraenkel 1962–65: 597–98; Trautmann 1923: 220)

Slavic:

A. **oy-*

There are two forms representing the continuants of **oyno-* in Slavic: (a) m. **edinъ* & **edъnъ*, f. **edъna* & **edъna* (and n. **edino* & **edъno*) “one; single”; (b) **ino-* “one-” in compounds, **inъ* “other”. These forms are attested as follows:

a) Old Church Slavonic m./f. (j)*edinъ*/(j)*edina* and (j)*edъnъ*/(j)*edъna*, Bulgarian *edin/edna*, Macedonian *eden/edna*, Serbo-Croatian *jedan/jedna*, Slovenian *eden/edna*, arch. *j-*, dial. *en/ena*, Slovak, Czech, Polish *jeden/jedna*, Upper Sorbian *jedyn/jedna*, Lower Sorbian *jaden/jadna*, Polabian *jadán/janā* (loc.), Slovincian *jăděn*, Old Russian *odinъ/odina*, Russian, *odin/odná*, Ukrainian *odyn/odná*, Byelorussian *adzín/adná* (Blažek, Peňáz & Erhart, ESJS 5: 276–77; Trubačev 1979: 11–12)

b) Old Church Slavonic derivatives: *inokъ* “solitary; monk”, *inogъ* “wild boar” (cf. French *sanglier* id.), later “gryph” (sometimes derived via haplology from **ino-nogъ* “one-footed”), adv. *inako* “otherwise” etc., besides numerous compounds: adv. *въ inq* “semper”, *inočedъ* “μονογενής”, *inomyslъnъ* “μονότροπος”, *inorogъ* “μόνοκερος” etc., besides *inojazyčnikъ* “ἑτερόγλωσσος”, *inoplemenъnikъ* “ἄλλόφυλλος” etc., and further *inъ* “some; other”, Bulgarian *in*, Serbo-Croatian *in*, *ini*, Slovak *iný*, Czech *jiny*, Upper Sorbian *hiny*, *jiny*, Lower Sorbian *hyny* (arch.), Slovincian *jini*, Old Polish *iny*, Polish *inny*, Byelorussian *inšy*, dial. *inny*, Ukrainian *inšyj*, dial. *yn(n)yj*, Russian *inój*, dial. *in(n)yj* “other” (Havlová & Valčáková, ESJS 4: 244–45).

There are more etymological interpretations of these two words. The older etymologies – see the discussion in ESJS. The following ideas have not yet penetrated in the etymological dictionaries. So Hamp 1973: 4 opined that the *i-* and *ъ-* forms reflect the old distinction between m. and f., namely m. **(j)ed-inъ* vs. f. **(j)ed-ъná* < **eyno-* vs. **-inā*. He offers a tempting solution based on the influence of the *e/∅* vocalism of m. **sem-f.* **smiH₂* (unattested in Slavic). But he does not explain the *e*-diphthong in **ino-* “μνο-” and **inъ* “other; some”.

A key to the solution should be sought in the reconstruction *ēyno-, supported by the intonation in Serbo-Croatian *ȝn* (Trautmann 1923: 3). The long diphthong can reflect *e + *oy where *e probably represents the same deictic particle as *e in Greek *ἐκεῖνος* "that", Oscan *eco* "hic", Russian *этот* "this" : *тот* "that" etc. (Pokorny 1959: 283).

A deictic/emphatic function was probably also characteristic for the particle *ed- appearing in the form (a): Old Church Slavonic (*j*)ed(ъ)va "scarcely, hardly" (-va corresponds to Lithuanian *võs* id.), Latin *ecce* "behold" (*ed-ke ?), *ecquis* "some, any", Siculish [e]d (Pisani, *IF* 48[1930]: 238), Oscan *ekum* "idem", Hittite dat.-loc. *edi* "ei", abl. *ediz* "ab eo", dat. pl. *etas* "eis", Lydian *eds* "this" (Pokorny 1959: 284; Tischler 1983: 118). The preceding thoughts imply the internal structure (a) *ed-e-oyno- "just/only this one" (cf. van Wijk, *IF* 30 [1912]: 383; Gonda 1953: 51) and (b) *e-oyno- "this one" (a similar idea was already proposed by Osten-Sacken, *IF* 33[1913-14]: 271 who assumed Slavic *e-ьнъ < *e-ino-).

B. *sem-

*sōm(H)o- "self, alone, single" > Slavic m. *samъ (f. -a, n. -o) > Old Church Slavonic *samъ*, Bulgarian, Macedonian *sam*, Serbo-Croatian, Slovenian *sâm*, Slovak, Czech *sám*, Upper & Lower Sorbian, Polish, Byelorussian, Ukrainian, Russian *sam*.

(Vaillant 1958: 471-73)

C. *per-/*pro-

*p̥H-wo- "1st" > Slavic *p̥rvъ(jь) > Old Church Slavonic *p̥rvъ*, *p̥rvyi*, Bulgarian *p̥rv*, *p̥rvi*, Macedonian *p̥rvi*, Serbo-Croatian *p̥rvi*, Slovenian *p̥rvi*, Slovak, Czech *p̥rvý*, Upper Sorbian *p̥jerwy*, Lower Sorbian *p̥erwy*, Polabian *p̥âr[w]y*, Old Polish *p̥ierwy*, Old Russian *p̥rvъ*, Ukrainian, Russian *p̥ervyj*. There are also extended forms *p̥rvъžьjъ > Slovak dial. *p̥ryšy* (Gemera), *p̥rujši* (Liptov), *p̥irši* (Bardejov), Slovincian *p̥jiērši*, Modern Polish *p̥ierwszy*, Ukrainian *p̥éršyj* and *p̥rvъjьhъ > Bulgarian and Macedonian dial. *p̥rvñi*, Old and Modern Czech *p̥rvní*. Both the forms represent comparatives (Illič-Svityč 1963: 81-84).

(Comrie 1992: 729-30; Vaillant 1958: 652-53)

Tocharian:

B. *sem-/*sm̥-

The most relevant forms of the numeral "1" in Tocharian are as follows:

	m.		f.	
	A	B	A	B
nom. sg.	<i>sas</i> (<i>sas-ak</i> "alone") <i>ša-</i> in <i>sāk šapi</i> "11"	(<i>šes-ke</i> "alone") <i>še</i>	<i>sām̥</i>	<i>sana/somo</i>
obl. sg.	<i>šom</i>	<i>šeme</i>	<i>šom</i>	<i>sanai/somo</i>
nom. pl.	<i>šome</i>	<i>šemi</i>	<i>šomaṃ</i>	<i>somona</i>

Cf. also A *sam*, B *sām* “equal, like”, A *ṣoma-pācār* “having one [and the same] father” etc.

There are more detailed analyses studying the Tocharian numeral “1” which have appeared recently (Hamp 1971; Van Windekens 1976: 415–16; Hilmarsson 1984 = 1986: 77–93; Pinault 1989: 60; Winter 1992: 98–103).

At least in the case of some forms they are in agreement:

**sēm-s* (Hamp, Hilmarsson; also **sēm-(s)* after Adams 1988: 122) or **sem-s* (Winter) “1” nom. sg. m. > A *sas* “1”, *sas-ak*, B *ṣes-ke* “alone”. The reconstruction **som-s* (Van Windekens) is probably wrong.

**smiH₂* (Hamp, Pinault) = **sm̄yA* (Winter) = **smijə* (Hilmarsson) “1” nom. sg. f. > **sāmyā* > Common Tocharian **sānā* > A *sām*, B *sana*. The reconstruction **sṃmā* (Van Windekens) does not explain the change **m* > **n* and it is also without any external support.

**sem* (Winter) = **sēm* (Hilmarsson) “1” nom. sg. n. > B *ṣe* “1”, A *ṣa-* in *sāk ṣapi* “11”. The following teens *sāk wepi* “12” and *sāk tāryāpi* “13”, contain nonmasculine forms of “2” and “3”. Winter (1992: 99) concludes: “...it is reasonable to assume that A *ṣa-* is a reflex of the old neuter nom.-acc. PIE **sem*”; the generalization of the neuter in B *ṣe* has an analogy in B *wi* “2”.

Hamp (1971: 440) and Winter (1992: 100) derive other cases including plural from **sēm(o)-*. Winter sees here an intra-Tocharian development, Hamp assumes an influence of the nom. **sēms*. On the other hand, Hilmarsson (1986: 92) reconstructs acc. (> obl.) sg. m. **semṃ*. Accepting the same starting point, Adams (1988: 122) proposes a rebuilding on the basis of a thematic derivative to **som(H)om*. A *sam*, B *sām* “like, equal” can be derived from **somHo-*, but they do not correspond mutually. West Tocharian should have preserved the thematic vowel; hence B *sām* could be a borrowing from A *sam* (so Van Windekens 1976: 415 who reconstructs A **sām* < **sōmo-*). Alternatively Hilmarsson admits even a borrowing from Sanskrit *samā-* “like”.

C. **per-/pro-*

**pṛH-wo-* “1st” > Tocharian B *pārweṣṣe* with adj. suffix *-eṣṣe* (= A *-aṣi*) < **-oskyo-*; further cf. adv. *parwe* “first, at first” and *yparwe* “first, firstly” < Common Tocharian **yän pārwe* “at first” < **H₁en pṛHwom*. The corresponding form in East Tocharian is *pārwat* “first-born, elder” with a *t*-suffix common for ordinals, cf. *wāt* “2nd” etc.

(Hilmarsson 1991: 189; Van Windekens 1976: 366 and 1979: 135; Winter 1992: 132)

§2. Reconstruction:

A. The most widespread Indo-European numeral “1” is formed by the root **oy-* plus one of the following three suffixes: a) **-k^(m)o-* (Indo-Aryan), b) **-wo-* (Indo-Iranian, Greek), c) **-no-* (? Anatolian, Armenian, Greek, Albanian, Italic, Celtic, Germanic, Baltic, Slavic). The original functions of these suffixes can be determined on the basis of the following examples: a) Old Indic *dvika-* “consisting of two”, *māmaka-*, *tāvaka-* “my”, “thy”, Old High German *sweiga-*

"wealth" < **swoy-ko-* "proper" besides Gothic *ainaha* adj. "only", Old Church Slavonic *inokъ* "solus" etc. > (Brugmann 1906: 482, 493); b) **sol-wo-* "whole, total", **wik-wo-* "every, all" etc. (Brugmann 1906: 202); c) **al-no-* > Oscan *allo* "entire", Gothic *alls* "all, every, whole", cf. also Gaulish (Coligny) *ci-allos*, (La Graufesenque) *ci-alli* "the other" (Hirunuma 1988: 40–41; Lambert 1994: 114–15), **sol-no-* > Old Latin *sollus*, Oscan *sullus* "omnes", Welsh *holl* "whole, all", **p_lH₂-no-* "full" etc. (Brugmann 1906: 257). In Albanian, Baltic and Slavic (plus Crimean Gothic ?) various deictic prefixes precede the stem **oyno-*.

In laryngealistic reconstruction the root **oy-* = **Hoy-*. Regarding the neutralization of all laryngeals before **o* (Beekes 1972: 117–31), the determination of the 'color' of the laryngeal remains open.

In opposition to **sem-* which has to express "togetherness, inclusion", the original meaning of **oy-* has been determined as "separateness, isolation" (Coleman 1992: 389).

B. Three genders **sems* m., **smiH₂/smy₂* f., **sem* n. are fully reconstructible only in Greek and Tocharian; the relics in other branches confirm their at least late Indo-European age. In **sems* Szemerényi (1996: 222) sees an innovation for older **sēm*. Beekes (1983: 225 and 1995: 190) reconstructs the whole paradigm: nom. **sóm(s)*, acc. *sém-ŋ* or **sóm-ŋ*, gen. **séms* or **sm-ós*, dat. **sm-éy*, loc. **sémi*, but his example having to support the form **sóm*, namely Slavic **samъ* "alone, self", reflects *o*-stem **sōmo-* and represents doubtless a later formation. The lengthening is typical for the whole class of Slavic adjectives, e.g. **malъ* "small", **nagъ* "naked", **slabъ* "weak" etc. (Machek 1956: 34 and 1971: 11 assumes an expressive lengthening, but it looks like a regular process of the type *Lex Brugmann*). Other reconstructible derivatives: **sŋ-* "one-" in compounds, also **sŋ-tero-* "half" = "one of two", **sēmi-* "half", originally probably locative of "one" (Beekes 1995: 190), hence "in one [of two]", **somHo-* "equal, the same", **sŋHo-* "anyone", and others.

C. Besides evident comparatives or superlatives ("first" = "former" or "foremost" – see Cowgill 1970: 123) or innovations (Hittite *hantezzi-*; Celtic **kintu-*), there was probably the only form inherited from the proto-language, namely **p_lH-wo-*. The laryngeal was **H₂* or **H₃*, depending on the interpretation of Greek data.

§3. Etymology:

A. The root **oy-* (**Hoy-*) has been etymologized in various ways:

a) The most popular solution identifies the root **oy-* with Indo-European anaphora (Pokorny 1959: 280–86; Sihler 1973: 111; Schmid 1989: 10; Hamp 1992: 904; Lehmann 1993: 254). There are various attempts to reconstruct the paradigm of the anaphoric pronoun. Let us confront the most recent reconstructions of the nominative according to the following scholars: Szemerényi 1996: 207; Kortlandt apud Beekes 1983: 209; Beekes 1995: 205; Hamp 1986: 398.

	sg.			pl.		
	m.	f.	n.	m.	f.	n.
Szemerényi	*is	*ī	*id	*eyes	*iyās	*ī
Kortlandt	*e	*ī	*id	*ei	*ās	*ā
Beekes	*H ₁ e	*iH ₂	*id	*H ₁ ei	*iH ₂ es	*iH ₂
Hamp	*ei	*i-eH ₂	*id	*ei-es		*i-H ₂

In agreement with Hamp, Mayrhofer (EWAI I: 103) reconstructed m. sg. *[H₁]eī, f. sg. *[H₁]iH₂, n. sg. *[H₁]i-d. It seems that the reconstruction *H₁ey conforms to the facts better than the others. The *e*-vocalization also implies the initial laryngeal *H₁ for the numeral "1" (*H₁oy-), naturally if they are related. And just it is not quite sure. The root of the numeral "1" is represented by the diphthong *oy, while in the paradigm of the anaphora, there is none of forms with *o. Naturally, the ablaut *ey* : *oy* is regular, but if the *oy*-forms do not appear in the paradigm of the anaphorical pronoun, the structural mechanism of this change is unclear.

Erhart (1982: 139) and p.c. (1997) proposes a tempting idea assuming for *(H)oy- (*H₃AI in his reconstruction, cf. Hamp 1973: 3 reconstructing *H₃ei- = *H₃ey-) an original meaning "one of two". This idea also allows to reinterpret the numeral "2". Erhart speculated about *dV-H₃AI "1x2". I prefer the following solution: obl. *dwoy- < *du + (H₁)oy "two" x "one of two", hence *"the second of two" or sim. The nom. du. *d(u)wō(u) could originate via a contraction from *duwoyH₁u where the final *-u was named 'dual collective' by Adams (1991: 20). Georgiev (IF 78[1973]: 48) also tried to eliminate the discrepancy between the nom. du. m. in *-ōu vs. nom.-acc. du. n. in *-oiH₁, assuming the development *-ōu < *-ow? < *-oi? (? = H₁) under the influence of the gen.-loc. in *-ow(s) and the nom. pl. m. in *-ōs < *-o-es.

b) Carruba 1979: 199 assumes a pronominal base *o- plus deictic *-i-, finding the same *-i- in the following numerals *du-i- "2", *tr-i- "3". This etymology is unconvincing. The evidence for the pronominal base *o- is rather doubtful (Pokorny 1959: 280). The idea of the common origin of the *-i- is also more than problematic. So Villar (1991: 136–38) opines that the *-i- in "2" and "3" represents a pronominal plural. It automatically excludes the same interpretation for "1". On the other hand, the forms *dwi- & *tri- are typical for compounds, but they are hardly primary.

c) The comparison of Indo-Aryan *aīka- and Latin *aequus* "even, level", also *aiquos*, *aequos* etc. (EM 16) was proposed already by Bopp (1829) and others (e.g. Brugmann 1892: 466 and 1911: 332, fn. 1). It implies the suffix *-k"o-, perhaps identical to *(H₁)k"o- with an individualizing function (cf. Hamp, BSLP 68[1973]: 77–92). The correspondence of *oy- expected in Indo-Aryan in agreement with the vocalization in other Indo-European branches and *ay- in Latin (cf. also *aemulus* "rival") is thinkable only in case of the ablaut *H₂oy- vs. *H₂ey-. Such a laryngeal excludes any relation with the anaphora proposed in a).

d) The neglected idea of Holmer (1966: 23–25), connecting **oy-* “1” with “egg”, is unconvincing not only semantically, but also phonetically, cf. the recent detailed analyses of Schindler, *Sprache* 15[1969]: 144–67 (**ō-huj-óm* “egg” = “das beim Vogel Befindliche” vs nom. **huj-ís*, gen. **huj-és* “bird”; *h* = *H*₂) and Rasmussen 1989: 72 (**o-h(a)ujH₁-óm*).

B. The etymon in question is evidently related to the preverb/preposition **sem*/**som*/**sṃ* “together” > Old Indic *sam*^o/*sa*^o, Avestan *ham* “together”, Khotanese *ham-jsam-* “to assemble”, Ossetic *æn-byrd* “assembly” etc. (EWAI II: 702, Bailey 1979: 446), Dakish *san-* in *Sanpaeus rivus* = Lithuanian lake *Saṃpe* (Duridanov 1969: 61), Messapic *sa-* (Haas 1962: 218), Lithuanian *saṃ-das*, *sam-dà* “hire, rent” (**som-d^hH₁-eH₂* * “Zusammenlegung”, cf. Old Indic *sahá*, Avestan *hada* “together with” – see Rasmussen 1989: 218–19), Old Church Slavonic *sъ* “with”, *sqdъ* “lawcourt” etc. Regarding the secondary creation of prepositions/preverbs, the primary meaning was probably “one”, perhaps in the sense “unity, togetherness” (Coleman 1992: 431, fn. 4; Szemerényi 1996: 222).

C. Brugmann (1906: 206) opines that the suffix **-wo-* forming **pr_ḡH-wo-*, extends an original adverb. The same root should be identified in the prepositions **pr_ḡH₂ós* “before” (originally gen.) > Old Indic *purás*, Greek *πάρως*, **preH₂i* “at the front” (originally loc.) > Oscan *prai*, Latin *prae*, Gaulish *are-*, Old Irish *air* (the Celtic innovation **pr_ḡH₂-i* remodelled after **pr_ḡH₂-os* – see Hamp, *Eriu* 33 [1982]: 181), Old Church Slavonic *prě-dъ*, and **pr_ḡH₂-eH₁* (originally perhaps instr.) > Old Indic *purá* “formerly”, Gothic *faura* “in front (of)” (Beekes 1995: 221; Brugmann 1911: 880–87). The starting point could be sought in an unattested noun **preH₂* “front, face” or sim. (cf. the hysterodynamic paradigm reconstructed by Beekes 1995: 182) or **perH₂* id. (cf. the proterodynamic paradigm reconstructed by Hamp, *IF* 93[1979]: 1–7). Alternatively, Demiraj (1997: 159–60) proposes a thematization of the ‘weak case’ **pr_ḡH-u-*, hence a *u*-stem in the zero-grade typical for adjectives (but one would expect the *e*-vowel in thematized form, i.e. **pr_ḡH-ú-* → **perHwo-*, see e.g. Hamp 1991: 117). In any case the etymology proposed above solves the question of the laryngeal: **H* = **H*₂. The same root, probably without the laryngeal extension, is attested in **pro* “before” (Beekes 1995: 221; Brugmann 1911: 873 and Pokorny 1959: 813 also reconstruct the variant **prō*).

§4. External parallels:

A. Møller (1909: 2) compared Latin *aiguos*, *aequus* “even, level” and *aemulus* “rival” with Geez *ḡayāy* “aequalis, par, socius”, *ta-ḡayaya* “to be equal, comparable, paired”. Leslau 1987: 51 adds *ḡayaya* “to be/make equal, even out”, *ḡayāwi* and *ḡayuy* “equal” etc. and further Tigre *ḡayaya* “relative, kinsman” and Syrian *ḡāwē* (*ḡ-w-y*) “agreeing, in concord”. If the identification of **H*₂ (> Latin *a-*) = *ʔ* and **H*₁ = *ḡ* is correct (cf. Beekes 1995: 148) and if these sounds correspond to their Semitic (Afroasiatic) counterparts one-to-one, the regular Indo-European correspondent to the Semitic root **ḡ-w-y*/**ḡ-y-y* is **H₁oy*.

Regardless of the determination of the laryngeal there are remarkable Uralic and Altaic parallels: Samoyedic **oj-*/**əj-* “1” (Helimski 1986: 136) /// Tungus:

Oroch *ojoke* “some, one” (TMS II: 9) // Korean *oi, ö* “only, a single”, *oi-nun-thoji* “one-eyed person” (Ramstedt 1982: 134) // ? proto-Japanese **uja* “the same” (Starostin) – see Blažek 1996–97: 3.

B. At first sight, the closest parallels appear in the Balto-Fennic languages: Finnish, Eston, Veps, Vod *sama*; Lappish (Norwegia) *sæmma*, (Inari) *sabma*, *samma* “the same”. But their Germanic origin is generally accepted (Thomsen 1870: 169; SKES 959), cf. Gothic *sama* “the same one”, Old Icelandic *samr*, *sami*, Old High German *samo* “the same” (Lehmann 1986: 294).

There are remarkable Altaic parallels: Old Turkic *sıgar* “one of a pair” // Written Mongolian *sonduyai* “odd” // Manchu *sonio* “one, a single”, *sonixon* “single, not in pairs”, *son son i* “one by one, each for itself” // Middle Korean *hannāh* “one” with the numerative *nā* (in North Korean) meaning “piece, face”. All the forms can be projected into proto-Altaic **sonjV* (Blažek 1997: 62–63). Due to assimilation to the following velar (in Turkic) or dental (Mongolian, Korean), the protoform **som-* is also thinkable. Similarly in Manchu, the development *sonio* < **somio* is also admissible. The alternatively reconstructed proto-Altaic **somjV* “one (of pair); single” is fully compatible with Indo-European **sem-/ *som-/ *smp-*. It is legitimate to see in Altaic and Indo-European numerals for “one” the forms inherited from a common proto-language (Nostratic).

C. If the identification $*H_2 = \text{ʃ}$ is acceptable (and $*H_3 = \text{ʃ}^w$ – see Beekes 1995: 148), the form $*p_1^r H_2$ – corresponds one-to-one to the Semitic root $*p-r-ʃ$: Ugaritic *prʃ* “first” (Segert 1984: 198; Gordon 1965: 471 also mentions the ordinal usage in *ym.prʃ* “the first day”) or “chief; excellent, the best” (Aistleitner 1965: 261), Hebrew *peraʃ* “chief” (cf. German *Fürst*), Arabic *farʃ* “top (of branch)”, *farʃ* “the first foal of a camel or young of a sheep”, *farʃiyy* “first-born, first” etc. The third radical probably does not belong to the root (similarly like the Indo-European $*H_2$), cf. Arabic *furr* “the best (of men, camels etc.)”, *furrat* “the first part” besides *farʃa* “he was first or foremost” (it was already Møller 1909: 110 who compared these Arabic examples with their Indo-European counterparts).

There are also remarkable parallels in Kartvelian: Georgian *pirw-el-* “first” (Klimov 1986:198), *pirmšo-* ($*pir-m-šwe-$) “first-born” = Old Indic *pūrva-sū-* id. (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 597, fn. 2, 878). They have been explained as borrowings from some unspecified Indo-European dialect (Klimov) or directly from the Indo-European proto-language (Gamkrelidze).

§5. Conclusion:

The analyzed forms denoting “one” and “first” can be reconstructed as $*H_1oy$ “one [of two]”, $*sem-$ “one” = “unity, togetherness” and $*p_1^r H_2-wo-$ “first” = “frontal”. The promising external parallels confirm that the analyzed words belong to the most archaic part of the Indo-European lexicon.

References:

- ABAEV, VASILIJ I., 1958, 1989: *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*, I. Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, Moskva -Leningrad / IV. Nauka, Leningrad.
- ADAMS, DOUGLAS Q., 1988: *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. American Oriental Series 71, New Haven.
- ADAMS, DOUGLAS Q., 1991: The Dual in Proto-Indo-European and Tocharian. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 5, pp. 11–43.
- AISTLEITNER, JOSEPH, 1965: *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
- BAILEY, HAROLD, W., 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. University Press, Cambridge.
- BARTHOLOMAE, CHRISTIAN, 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Trübner, Strassburg.
- BARTHOLOMAE, CHRISTIAN, 1907–08: Zu den arischen Wörtern für 'der erste' und 'der zweite'. *IF* 22, pp. 95–116.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S.P., 1969: *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*. Mouton, The Hague – Paris.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S.P., 1971: *μόνυχες ἵπποι*. *Orbis* 20, pp. 138–42.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S.P., 1972: *H₂O. Sprache* 18, pp. 117–31.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S.P., 1983: On Laryngeals and Pronouns. *KZ* 96, pp. 200–32.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S.P., 1988: Laryngeal Developments: A Survey. In: *Die Laryngalthorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, ed. A. Bammesberger. Winter, Heidelberg, pp. 59–106.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S.P., 1995: *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics. An Introduction*. Benjamins, Amsterdam – Philadelphia.
- BENVENISTE, ÉMILE, 1962: *Hittite et indo-européen*. Adrien Maisonneuve. Paris.
- BERGER, HERMANN, 1986: Die Zahlwörter in den neuindoarischen Sprachen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 47, pp. 23–77.
- de BERNARDO STEMPEL, PATRIZIA, 1987: *Die Vertretung der indogermanischen Liquiden und nasalen Sonanten im Keltischen*. *IBS* 54, Innsbruck.
- BILLY, PIERRE-HENRY, 1993: *Thesaurus Linguae Gallicae*. Olms – Weidmann, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York.
- BLANKENSTEIN, M. von, 1907: Griech. *κατά* und seine Verwandten. *IF* 21, pp. 99–115.
- BLAŽEK, VÁCLAV, 1996–97: Some thoughts about Uralic numerals. *Philologia Fenno-Ugrica* 2–3, pp. 1–18.
- BLAŽEK, VÁCLAV, 1997: Altaic numerals. *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 2, pp. 33–75.
- BLUMENTHAL, ALBERT von, 1930: *Hesychstudien*. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.
- BROCKELMANN, CARL, 1908: *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen I: Laut- und Formenlehre*. Reuther & Reichard, Berlin.
- BRUGMANN, KARL, 1906, 1892/1911: *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, 2.1. & 2.2*. Trübner, Strassburg ⁽¹⁹¹¹⁾
- BRUNNER, LINNUS, 1969: *Die gemeinsamen Wurzeln des semitischen und indogermanischen Wortschatzes. Versuch eine Etymologie*. Francke, Bern – München.
- BUCK, CARL D., 1905: *Elementarbuch der oskisch-umbrisch Dialekte*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- CARRUBA, ONOFRIO, 1974: I termini per mese, anno e i numerali in licio. *Rendiconti di Istituto Lombardo. Accademia di scienze e lettere. Classe di Lettere e Scienze* 108, pp. 575–97.
- CARRUBA, ONOFRIO, 1979: Sui numerali da "1" a "5" in anatolico e indoeuropeo. In: *Studies in Diachronic, Synchronic, and Typological Linguistics (Fs. for O. Szemerényi)*, ed. B. Brogyányi. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 191–205.
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE, 1968–80: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Klincksieck, Paris.
- CHD *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (P), eds. H.G. GÜTTERBOCK & H.A. HOFFNER. The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago 1994–95.

- COLEMAN, ROBERT, 1992: Italic [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 389–445.
- COMRIE, BERNARD, 1992: Balto-Slavonic [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 717–833.
- COWGILL, WARREN, 1970: Italic and Celtic Superlatives and the Dialects of Indo-European. In: *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*, eds. G. Cardona, H.M. Hoenigswald & A. Senn. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, pp. 115–53.
- COWGILL, WARREN, 1985: PIE *duyo '2' in Germanic and Celtic, and the nom.-acc. dual of non-neuter *o*-stems. *MSS* 46, pp. 13–28.
- DEBRUNNER, ALBERT & WACKERNAGEL, JACOB, 1930: *Altindische Grammatik III: Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen*. Vandhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- DEMIRAJ, BARDHYL, 1997: *Sistemi i numërimit të gjuhës Shqipe (vështrim diakronik)*. Instituti i gjuhësisë dhe i letërsisë, Tiranë.
- DURIDANOV, IVAN, 1969: *Thrakisch-dakische Studien, I: Die thrakisch- und dakisch-baltische Sprachbeziehungen*. Sofia: Linguistique balkanique XIII, 2.
- DŽAUKJAN, GEVORK B., 1967: *Očerki po istorii dopis'mennogo perioda armjanskogo jazyka*. Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Armjanskoj SSR, Erevan.
- EICHNER, HEINER, 1992: Anatolian [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 29–96.
- EM ERNOUT, ANTOINE & MEILLET, ANTOINE, 1932: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Klincksieck, Paris.
- EMMERICK, RONALD, 1992a: Old Indic [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 163–97.
- EMMERICK, RONALD, 1992b: Iranian [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 289–345.
- ERHART, ADOLF, 1965: Die ie. Dualendung *-ō(u) und die Zahlwörter. *Sborník prací Filosofické fakulty Brněnské university A* 34, pp. 11–33.
- ERHART, ADOLF, 1970: *Studien zur indoeuropäischen Morphologie*. Universita J.E. Purkyně, Brno.
- ERHART, ADOLF, 1982: *Indoevropské jazyky*. Academia, Praha.
- ESJS *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského* 1–8. Academia, Praha 1989–98.
- EVANS, ELLIS D., 1967: *Gaulish Personal Names*. Clarendon Press, Oxford
- EWAI MAYRHOFFER, MANFRED, 1986: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen, I*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- FAY, EDWIN W., 1910: Composition, not suffixation. *AJPh* 31, pp. 404–27.
- FRAENKEL, ERNST, 1962–65: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I-II* Vandhoeck, Göttingen / Winter, Ruprecht – Heidelberg.
- FRISK, HJALMAR, 1991: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I-II₁*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- GAMKRELIDZE, TAMAS V. & IVANOV, VJACESLAV V., 1984: *Indoevropskij jazyk i indoevropejcy*. Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo universiteta, Tbilisi.
- GONDA, JAN, 1953: *Reflections on the numerals "one" and "two" in ancient Indo-European languages*. N.V.A. Oosthoek's uitgevers-mij, Utrecht.
- GORDON, CYRUS H., 1965: *Ugaritic Textbook. Glossary. Indices*. Pontificium Institutum Biblicum (Annalecta Orientalia 38), Roma.
- GREENE, DAVID, 1992: Celtic [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 497–554.
- GVOZDANVIĆ, JADRANKA, ed., 1992: *Indo-European Numerals*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin – New York.
- HAAS, OTTO, 1962: *Messapische Studien*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- HAAS, OTTO, 1966: *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Linguistique Balkanique X, Sofia.
- HAJNAL, IVO, 1995: *Der lykische Vokalismus*. Leykam, Graz.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1966: The position of Albanian. In: *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, eds. H. Birnbaum & J. Puhvel. University of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles, pp. 97–121.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1971: Tocharian 'one' and Paradigmatic Reconstruction. *Chicago Linguistic Society Meeting* 7, pp. 437–44.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1972: Occam's razor and explanation in etymology. *Chicago Linguistic Society Meeting* 8.1, pp. 470–72.

- HAMP, ERIC P., 1973: (For Roman, who is always) number one. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 16, pp. 1–6.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1982: The anaphora *ei in Latin. *American Journal of Philology* 103, pp. 98–99.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1986: The Indo-European anaphora *ei in Umbrian. *American Journal of Philology* 107, pp. 398–40.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1991: Indo-European *?lengʰ(-ro-) and *?legh(-u-). In: Isabeart 1991, pp. 116–119.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1992: Albanian [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 835–921.
- HAMP, ERIC P., 1997: A Far-Out Equation. In: *Indo-European, Nostratic, and Beyond: Festschrift for Vitalij V. Shevoroshkin*, eds. I. Hegedüs, P.A. Michalove & A. Manaster Ramer. Washington D.C.: Journal of Indo-European Studies, Monograph Number 22, pp. 94–105.
- HELMSKI, EUGENE A., 1986: Etymologica 1–48. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 88, pp. 119–43.
- HILMARSSON, JÖRUNDUR, 1986: *Studies in Tocharian phonology, morphology and etymology*. Author, Reykjavik.
- HOAD, T.F., 1986: *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- HOLMER, NILS, 1966: The semantics of numerals. *Arsbok* 1963–64, pp. 14–48.
- IEN see GVOZDANOVIC 1992.
- ILLIĆ-SVITYČ, VLADISLAV M., 1963: Češ. prvni 'pervyj' – innovacija ili arxaizm? *Étimologija* 1963, pp. 81–84.
- ISABAERT, LAMBERT, ed., 1991: *Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea. Memoriae A.J. Van Windekens (1915–1989)*. Peeters, Leuven.
- JOSEPHSON, FOLKE, 1979: Assibilation in Anatolian. In: *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, eds. E. Neu & W. Meid. Innsbruck: IBS 25, pp. 91–104.
- KARULIS, KONSTANTINS, 1992: *Latviešu etimologijas vārdnīca, I–II*. Avots, Riga.
- KAZANSKIJ, V.P. & KAZANSKENE, N.N., 1988: *Predmetno-ponjatnyj slovar' grečeskogo jazyka. Krito-mikenskij period*. Nauka, Leningrad.
- KEWA MAYRHOFER, MANFRED, 1956–80: *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen I–IV*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- KLIMOV, GEORGIJ A., 1986: *Vvedenie v kavkazskoe jazykoznanie*. Nauka, Moskva.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK, 1983: Greek numerals and PIE glottalic consonants. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 42, pp. 97–104.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK, 1991: A note on the Tocharian dual. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 5, pp. 5–10.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK, 1994: Proto-Armenian numerals. In: *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (March 1993, Kopenhagen), ed. J.E. Rasmussen. Reichert, Wiesbaden, pp. 253–57.
- KRONASSER, HEINZ, 1966: *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache I*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- LAMBERT, PIERRE-YVES, 1994: *La langue gauloise*. Errance, Paris.
- LAROCHE, EMMANUEL, 1992: Observations sur les numéraux de l'anatolien. In: *Hittite and other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in honour of Sedat Alp*, eds. H. Otten et al. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara, pp. 355–56.
- LEHMANN, WINFRED P., 1986: *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Brill, Leiden.
- LEHMANN, WINFRED P., 1991: Residues in the Early Slavic Numeral System That Clarify the Development of the Indo-European System. *General Linguistics* 31, pp. 131–40.
- LEHMANN, WINFRED P., 1993: *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*. Routledge, London – New York.
- LEJEUNE, MICHEL, 1972: *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Klincksieck, Paris.
- MACHEK, VÁCLAV, 1956: Expressive Vokaldehnung in einigen slavischen Nomina. *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 1/4, pp. 33–40.
- MACHEK, VÁCLAV, 1971: *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Academia, Praha.
- MANN, STUART E., 1984–87: *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Buske, Hamburg.

- MEILLET, ANTOINE, 1936: *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée l'arménien classique*. Vienne: Imprimerie des Mekhitaristes.
- MELCHERT, H. CRAIG, 1993a: *Lycian Lexicon*. Lexica Anatolica Vol. 1, Chapel Hill.
- MELCHERT, H. CRAIG, 1993b: *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Lexica Anatolica Vol. 2, Chapel Hill.
- MELCHERT, H. CRAIG, 1994: *Anatolian historical phonology*. Rodopi, Amsterdam-Atlanta.
- MIRONOV, S.A., 1963: Čislitel'nye v germanskix jazykax. In: *Sravnitel'naja grammatika germanskix jazykax*, III. Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, Moskva.
- MØLLER, HERMANN, 1909: *Indoeuropæsk-semitisk sammenlignende glossarium*. Schultz, Kjøbenhavn.
- OETTINGER, NORBERT, 1988: Der indogermanische Nominativ Dual aus laryngalistischer Sicht. In: *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, ed. A. Bammesberger. Winter, Heidelberg, pp. 355–59.
- PINAULT, GEORGES-JEAN, 1989: Introduction au tokharien. In: *LALIES. Actes de sessions de linguistique et de littérature 7*. École normale supérieure (45, rue d'Ulm), Paris, pp. 1–224.
- POKORNY, JULIUS, 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Francke, Bern – München.
- POLOMÉ, EDGAR C., 1986: A note on Thracio-Phrygian numerals Alan S.C. Ross in memoriam. *JIES* 14, pp. 185–89.
- PUHVEL, JAAN, 1984, 1991: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, 1–2, 3. Mouton, Berlin – New York – Amsterdam.
- RAMSTEDT, GUSTAV J., 1982: *Paralipomena of Korean Etymologies* (coll. and ed. Songmo Kho). Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne 182, Helsinki.
- RASMUSSEN, JENS E., 1989: *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. IBS 55, Innsbruck.
- RIX, HELMUT, 1991: Urindogermanisch *ǵ^heslo- in den südindogermanischen Ausdrücken für "1000". In: *Isabeart 1991*, pp. 225–31.
- ROSS, ALAN S. & BERNS, JAN, 1992: Germanic [numerals]. In: *JEN*, pp. 555–715.
- SCHMID, WOLFGANG P., 1989: *Wort und Zahl. Sprachwissenschaftliche Betrachtungen der Kardinalzahlwörter*. Steiner-Verlag, Stuttgart / Wiesbaden (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwiss. Klasse, Jg. 1989. Nr. 8).
- SCHMITT, RÜDIGER, 1981: *Grammatik des klassisch-armenischen mit Sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen*. IBS 32, Innsbruck.
- SCHWYZER, EDUARD, 1939: *Griechische Grammatik, I: Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. Beck, München.
- SEGERT, STANISLAV, 1984: *A basic grammar of the Ugaritic language*. University of California Press, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.
- SHEVOROSHKIN, VITALY, 1979: On the Hittite-Luwian Numerals. *JIES* 7, pp. 177–98.
- SIHLER, ANDREW, 1973: Proto-Indo-European *sṃH- 'pair'. *JIES* 1, pp. 111–13.
- SKES Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja, 7 vols. Helsinki: 1955–81.
- ŚLAWSKI, FRANCISZEK et al., 1974: *Słownik prasłowiański I (A-B)*. Ossolineum, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH, 1989: *Studia bałto-słowiańskie, Część I*. Ossolineum, Kraków.
- SOMMER, FERDINAND, 1902: *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN S., 1966: *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo – Bergen – Tromsø.
- STEWART, CAROLINE T., 1906: The Origin of the Names of the Numerals. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 30, pp. 223–65.
- STRUNK, KLAUS, 1974: Zur Rekonstruktion laryngalhaltiger idg. Wörter bzw. Morpheme. In: *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Linguists (Bologna-Florence 1972)*, ed. L. Heilmann. Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna, pp. 375–81.

- SZEMERÉNYI, OSWALD, 1960: *Studies in the Indo-European System of Numerals*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- SZEMERÉNYI, OSWALD, 1994: *Etyma Graeca VIII (36–39)*. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92.2, pp. 89–101.
- SZEMERÉNYI, OSWALD, 1996: *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- THOMSEN, WILHELM, 1870: *Über den Einfluss der germanischen Sprachen auf die Finnisch-Lappischen*. Waisenhaus, Halle.
- THURNEYSEN, RUDOLF, 1946: *A grammar of Old Irish*. Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin.
- TISCHLER, JOHANN, 1983: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar I*. IBS 20, Innsbruck.
- TMS *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-maňčžurskix jazykov I-II*. Nauka, Leningrad 1975–77.
- TOPOROV, VLADIMIR N., 1975: *Prusskij jazyk. Slovar' A-D*. Nauka, Moskva.
- TRAUTMANN, REINHOLD, 1970: *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch₂*. Vandhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- TRUBAČEV, OLEG N., 1979, 1981: *Étimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*, 6, 8. Nauka, Moskva.
- VAILLANT, ANDRÉ, 1958: *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, II. Morphologie 2: Flexion pronominale*. Editions IAC, Lyon.
- Van WINDEKENS, ALBERT J., 1942: Die etymologische Erklärung von tocharisch A *ṣa*, B *ṣe* „eins“. *IF* 58, pp. 261–65.
- Van WINDEKENS, ALBERT J., 1976, 1979: *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes I. La phonétique et la vocabulaire. II.1. La morphologie nominale*. Centre International de Dialectologie Générale, Louvain.
- VENDRYES, J., 1960, 1974, 1987: *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien (Lettres M-P, R-S, C)*. Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin / CNRS, Paris.
- VILLAR, F., 1991: The numeral 'two' and its number marking. In: *Perspectives on Indo-European Language, Culture and Religion. Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé, I*. McLean: Journal of Indo-European Studies, Monograph N. 7, pp. 136–54.
- WAANDERS, FREDERIK M.J., 1992: Greek [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 11–28.
- WH WALDE, A. & HOFMANN, J.B., 1938–54: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch₃ I-II*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- WINTER, WERNER, 1992a: Some thoughts about Indo-European numerals. In: *IEN*, pp. 11–28.
- WINTER, WERNER, 1992b: Tocharian [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 97–161.
- WINTER, WERNER, 1992c: Armenian [numerals]. In: *IEN*, pp. 347–59.
- ZINKEVIČIUS, Z., 1984: Pol'sko-jatvjažskij slovarik ? *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija* 1983, pp. 3–29.

Václav Blažek

Ryneček 148

261 01 Přeborn III

e-mail: blazek@phil.muni.cz

