

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2018.17.06>

UDC: 81'374.4



Yan V. Kapranov

Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine

DIACHRONIC INTERPRETATION OF NOSTRATIC *wol[a] ON PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) AND PROTO-ALTAIC *ulu (~ -o) (According to S. A. Starostin's Version)

Bibliographic Description:

Kapranov, Y. V. (2018). Diachronic Interpretation of Nostratic Etymon *wol[a] Based on Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) and Proto-Altaic *ulu (~ -o) Forms (According to S. A. Starostin's Version). *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*. Kyiv. Vol. 17. p. 68–80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2018.17.06>

Abstract

The article represents the diachronic interpretation of the Nostratic *wol[a] verified by S. A. Starostin on the Proto-Indo-European *(e) wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) and Proto-Altaic *ulu (~ -o). These data were taken for analysis from the International Etymological Database Project "The Tower of Babel". The notion of etymon in general and the Nostratic one in particular have been specified. The Nostratic etymon is understood as a phonomorphological and semantic complex that is interpreted based on the reconstructed etymons at the level of every language family.

The following data has been demonstrated: using the comparative-historical method, the etymologist-macrocomparatist performed the external reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European *(e) wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) "great number; to heap" made on Proto-Tocharian *w'ältse; Ancient Greek *ἑλώμαι (ἑλόμενο, ἑλέσθω), *wáli-; Proto-Slavic *velъmi, -ma; *velъjъ, *velikъ; *vālъ, *vālovъ, *vālīti; Proto-Baltic *wal-ī-, performed with the help of internal reconstruction, as well as the Proto-Altaic *ulu (~ -o) "big, many; good" made on Proto-Turkic *ulug; Proto-Mongol *olon; Proto-Tungus-Manchu *ule-; Proto-Korean *ōr-. The procedural operations of S. A. Starostin performed with the use of the method of diachronic interpretation have been commented. It helped to assume that the Proto-Language forms of etymons at the level of the language family reach the Nostratic *wol[a]. This made it possible to establish and substantiate the degrees of language relationship between the reconstructed etymons of the two language families and the Nostratic etymon: within the Indo-European language family the following degrees have been registered: trivial – between the Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Slavic; notable – between the Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek, Proto-Slavic and Proto-Baltic; within the the Altaic language family: trivial – between the Proto-Altaic and Proto-Turkic; notable – between the Proto-Altaic and Proto-Tungus-Manchu; distant – between the Proto-Altaic and Proto-Mongol, Proto-Korean.

Keywords: Nostratic, Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Altaic forms, comparative-historical method, method of diachronic interpretation, degrees of language relationship.

1. Introduction.

The Linguistic Comparative Studies and other fields of modern anthropo-oriented linguistics (T. Gamkrelidze, V. Ivanov (Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1984), M. Makovskiy (Makovskiy 1982), V. Neroznak (Neroznak 1988), S. Starostin (Starostin 1989), S. Yakhontov (Yakhontov 1991), et al.) studies a human language in general and different world languages in particular. One of the major problems that is far from its solution is *the origins of languages* (M. Tamariz (Tamariz 2017), J. Heath (Heath 2015), et al.), mainly the principles of their relationship (W. Heeringa, F. Wet, G. Huyssteen (Heeringa et al. 2015)). The founders of Comparative-Historical Linguistics, as well as all subsequent generations (Th. Benfey (Benfey 1869), F. Dietz (Dietz 1836–1845), G. Curtius (Curtius 1862, 1867), A. Pott (Pott 1856) et al.) tried to prove it, while the fierce opponents also expressed the thoughts on this matter (among which there were also Neogrammarians). Nowadays this issue is considered comprehensively with the use of language data, research methods in linguistics, as well as the genetics data, neurophysiology, psycholinguistics, anthropology, archeology, paleolinguistics methodology, etc. But the main disputable issue since the time of the Classical Comparative Linguistics is the notion of etymon and the methodological procedure for its modelling, or the reconstruction of the Proto-Language Form, or the Form of Proto-Language, the Proto-Form (G. Jacques (Jacques 2017), A. Versloot (Versloot 2017), P. Zywczyński, N. Gontier, S. Waciewicz (Zywczyński et al. 2017)) as the initial state of the one or another language unit or group of languages that can hypothetically witness the origins of languages from the common ancestor.

More than 200 years have passed and the notion of language relationship is topical and it remains one of the central ones in the monogenetic theory. Its supporters tend to think that the area of the emergence of a human being and, accordingly, a human language was monocentric and existed on the territory of Eastern Africa (see the works of T. Bromage (Bromage 1995), R. Leakey (Leakey 1964), F. Tobias (Tobias 1991), etc.). According to this hypothesis, the Proto-language gave rise to the Proto-Languages of numerous language families because of the resettlement of ancient people from Africa to Eurasian continent and consequently because of the divergence processes of its dialects about 30–40 thousand years ago.

The monogenetic theory was developed by A. Thrombetti, the Italian neolinguist, and by M. Svadesh, the American linguist, who united the language families of into larger formations that were later called the macrofamilies. They also assumed the links /connections between these language taxons. This gave rise to the Macrocomparative Studies (A. Bomhard (Bomhard 1995, 2015), A. Dolgopolsky (Dolgopolsky 1998, 2008), V. Illich-Svitych (Illich-Svitych 1971), S. Starostin (Starostin 1989), etc.) as a new stage in the development of Linguistic Comparative Studies. At the present stage of development of the Macrocomparative Studies the monogenetic theory is considered to be more likely and has numerous supporters in the world scientific community. In particular, in Ukraine the monogenetic theory was supported by O. Melnychuk (1921–1977) (Melnychuk 1991), but now it is supported by O. Tkachenko (Tkachenko 2007), Yu. Mosenkis (Mosenkis 2007), A. Korolyova (Korolyova 2018) and other macro-comparative linguists. In the meantime *the alternative polygenetic hypothesis* is based on the assumption that a human being originated in at least two places on the Globe – in Eastern Africa (the Nostratic macrofamily (G. Jucquois (Jucquois 1996), Kh. Menges (Menges 1989)) and in Southern Asia (the Sino-Caucasian macrofamily (S. Starostin (Starostin 1996), A. Vovin (Vovin 2002), et al.).

2. Aim and Objectives.

The **aim** of the paper is to represent the versions of S. A. Starostin of the diachronic interpretation of the Nostratic *wol [a] on the Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) and Proto-Altai *ulu (~ -o).

3. Results.

The Nostratic hypothesis that was formulated by H. Pedersen (Pedersen 1903), the Danish scholar, in 1903 and assumed the distant relationship among languages in Europe, Northern, Western Asia and Northern Africa has become especially popular in linguistics in the 50–60 of the XX century. That is why, it was created into the *Nostratic linguistics* as a separate independent field of knowledge, which investigates the genetic relationship among languages of the Nostratic macrofamily, including Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic, Kartvelian, Dravidian, Ural and Altaic language families (according to the V. Illich-Svitych's version).

Nowadays the genetic relationship of the languages of the Nostratic macrofamily is proved by the presence of a large number of morphemes marking relationship that reach the *Nostratic etymon*, i.e. the reconstructed Proto-Form at the level of every language family and represented in the following lexicographic sources: “Nostratic Dictionary” (A. Dolgopolsky), the International Etymological Database Project “The Tower of Babel” (S. Starostin), “A Comprehensive Introduction to Nostratic Comparative Linguistics With Special Reference To Indo-European” (A. Bomhard) etc.

The term of the “Nostratic Proto-Form” was consistently used in the works of C. Babayev, N. Andreyev, A. Militaryov, S. Starostin et al.

To prove the genetic relationship of the languages of the Nostratic macrofamily the special *method of diachronic interpretation* (according to O. Szemerényi (Szemerényi 1980)) of the Nostratic Proto-Form, or Etymon that is based on *the genetic principle* has been developed. It consists of two methodological stages: *the comparative-historical method* with the procedures of the internal and external reconstruction was conducted on the first stage and it helped to prove the genetic relationship at the level of every language family; *the method of mass comparison* (according to J. Greenberg (Greenberg 1957)) was conducted on the second stage and it helped to compare the correspondences between the reconstructed forms of every language family that was involved to comparison.

It should be noted that the diachronic interpretation of the Nostratic **wol[a]* “big” represented on the International Etymological Database Project “The Tower of Babel” (Starostin URL: <http://starling.rinet.ru>) was based on the analysis of the genetic data of 5 language families (Indo-European, Altaic, Ural, Dravidian, Eskimo-Aleut).

It should be traced how the genetic data of the **Indo-European** and **Altaic language families**, as well as their reconstructed forms, have become the means for the diachronic interpretation of the above-mentioned Nostratic.

3.1. Reconstruction of the Indo-European **(e)wel-* (Gr *hw-* / *ew-*) with the following meanings: 1) “definite / indefinite quantity”, 2) “action”.

First, the **Indo-European language family** should be taken into account, at the level of which 3 language groups (Tocharian, Slavic, Baltic) and Greek language were involved to comparison. The genetic data allowed to reconstruct the intermediate Proto-Language forms (Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek, Proto-Slavic, Proto-Baltic). In this turn, they helped to demonstrate the reconstruction of the **Proto-Indo-European **(e)wel-* (Gr *hw-* / *ew-*)** with main meaning “**great number; to heap**”.

At the level of *the Tocharian language group* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: Tocharian A *wälts* “thousand” *waltsurā* “in brief”; Tocharian B *yaltse* “thousand”, *walke* “for a long time”, *wälts-* “put together, press together”. The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the vowels *ä / a* and consonants *w, l, t, s* typical for Tocharian A, B. However, the vowels *y, e* and consonant *k* can be traced in the Tocharian B. The attention should be drawn to the fact that the form of expression – the morphological organization – allows us to assume that the Tocharian A *wälts* “thousand” and Tocharian B *yaltse* “thousand” are numerals, Tocharian A *waltsurā* “in

brief” and Tocharian B walke “for a long time” are adverbs, Tocharian B wälts- “put together, press together” is a verb.

The form of content – the semantic organization – coincides in both Tocharian A wälts “thousand” and Tocharian B yaltse “thousand”, which, probably, became the constructs for the reconstruction of not only the form of content, but also the form of expression of the Proto-Tocharian. If the first position of the etymon is occupied by the consonant *w, which is traced in most of the above-mentioned cases; the second position is occupied by the vowel *ä; the third, fourth and fifth positions were occupied by the consonants *l, *t, *s, as they are typical for Tocharian A and Tocharian B. According to the scholar’s version, the etymon ends with the vowel *e, because, referring the Tocharian A waltsurā; Tocharian B yaltse, walke, wälts-, it should be assumed that a vowel must necessarily be represented after three consonants. The vowel *e was chosen not accidentally, it is traced in the Tocharian B yaltse, walke.

Thus, the reconstruction of the **Proto-Tocharian *w'ältse** “thousand” was proposed.

At the level of *the Greek language* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: ep., ion. ἑλέω, dor., el. weleō, etc.

The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the correspondence of the vowels e, o, consonants l, m, w; the form of expression – the morphological organization – is represented by the nouns; the form of content – the semantic organization – corresponds to the meaning pressing, stretching”.

Thus, the reconstructions of the **Ancient Greek *ἑλομαι** (ἑλόmeno-, ἑλέσθω), ***wāli-** were proposed.

At the level of *the Slavic language group* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: 1) *the Eastern Slavic*: Ukrainian великий, Old Eastern Slavic; 2) *the Southern Slavic*: Old Slavic великъ, Bulgarian велик, Serbo-Croatian великѣ, Slovenian vélik; 3) *the Western Slavic*: Czech veliký, velký, Slovak veliký, veľký, Polish wielki, Upper Lusatian wulki *language subgroups*.

The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the following correspondences: the vowels e, и and consonants в, л, к can be traced in the first group (Ukrainian великий, Old Eastern Slavic, Old Slavic великъ, Bulgarian велик, Serbo-Croatian великѣ); the vowels e, i and consonants v, l, k can be traced in the second group (Slovenian vélik, Czech veliký, velký, Slovak veliký, veľký); the vowel i and consonants w, l, k can be traced in the third group (Polish wielki, Upper Lusatian wulki). Therefore, the consonants в or v, л or l, к or k are typical for the above-mentioned, but the vowel e is typical for the first and the second ones. The form of expression – the morphological organization – allows to assume that all of them are probably the nouns and / or adjectives. The form of content – the semantic organization – is “great number”.

Due to the available data, the stem *vel is typical for the following reconstructed forms *vel'mi, -ma; *vel'jъ, *vel'kъ. The scholar also gives the variants of Proto-forms: *vālъ, *vālovъ, *vālītī, which have the stem *vāl with long proto-cowel *ā. At the same time the consonant w occupied the first position instead of v in the Polish wielki and Upper Lusatian wulki. However, according to morphophonological transcription represented in “Card Catalog of Etymological dictionary of Slavic languages” (Russ. “Картотека Этимологического словаря славянских языков”), eds S. Kotkova, A. Sumkina, the proto-consonants *v (*w, *u) are considered to be bilabial ones that are characterized by the bilabialism (Kartoteka Etimologicheskogo slovarya slavyanskikh yazykov 1967: 139). Moreover, S. A. Starostin also provides the short forms from the Russian велик, велика, велико.

Thus, the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic **velьmi, -ma; *velьjь, *velіkь; *vālь, *vālovь, *vālītī* were proposed.

At the level of the *Baltic language group* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: *the Eastern Baltic language subgroup*: Lithuanian *valīti* “gather”. The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the following correspondences: the vowel *a, i, ī* and consonants *v, l, t*. The form of expression – the morphological organization – allows to assume that the Lithuanian *valīti* is the verb. The form of content – the semantic organization – is “gather”.

Due to the available data, the form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – is represented by the proto-vowels **a, *î* and proto-consonants **w, *l* typical for the reconstructed form; the form of expression – the morphological organization – is the verb; the form of content – the semantic organization – was assigned the ‘accumulation’ effect.

Thus, the reconstructions of the the **Proto-Baltic *wal-î- vb.** “gather” was proposed.

By the way, all the above-mentioned genetic data show their own sense that is represented by this or that lexicosemantic variants (hereinafter – LSV): 1) *size / length*: *walke* “for a long time”; 2) *definite / indefinite quantity*: Tocharian A *wāłts* “thousand”; Tocharian B *yaltse* “thousand”; 3) *action*: *wāłts-* “put together, press together”; Lithuanian *valīti* “gather”; 4) *measure / volume*: *walsturā* “in brief”; 5) *size*: Ukrainian *великий*, Old Eastern Slavic, Old Slavic *великь*, Bulgarian *велик* Serbo-Croatian *велики*, Slovenian *velik*, Czech *veliký, velký*, Slovak *veliký, veľký*, Polish *wielki*, Upper Lusatian *wulki*.

The reconstruction of the **Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-)** with the main meaning “**great number; to heap**” was performed based on the reconstructed forms at the following language groups: 1) the Proto-Tocharian **w'āłtse* “thousand”; 2) the Ancient Greek **ēlomai* (*ēlómeno-*, *ēlésthō*), **wāli-*; 3) the Proto-Slavic **velьmi, -ma; *velьjь, *velіkь; *vālь, *vālovь, *vālītī*; 4) the Proto-Baltic **wal-î- vb* “gather”.

Analysing the above-mentioned reconstructed forms at the *phonological / phonemic, morphological* and *semantic levels* (Szemerényi 1980), the following characteristics may be outlined.

First, at the phonological / phonemic level the given etymons demonstrate the following correspondences: the Proto-Language vowel **ä / *a* and consonants **w, *l* typical for the Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek, Proto-Slavic and Proto-Baltic. However, if first position of the etymon is occupied by the consonant **w* taken from the Proto-Tocharian and Proto-Baltic, the second one is occupied by the vowel **e* taken from the Proto-Slavic and the consonant **l* taken from the Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek, Proto-Slavic and Proto-Baltic. Second, it should be noted that every Proto-Language has their own morphological organization: the Proto-Tocharian is the numeral, the Ancient Greek is the adjective, the Proto-Slavic are the nouns, the Proto-Baltic is the verb. Third, the form of content – the semantic organization – demonstrates the following correspondences: the “definite / indefinite quantity” layer is typical for the Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek and Proto-Slavic, the “action” layer – for the Proto-Baltic.

Thus, it should be assumed that the form of expression of the **Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-)** was modelled based on all the reconstructed forms at every language group (Tocharian, Slavic, Baltic), as well as the Greek language, the form of content – “**great number; to heap**” – represented by the two LSVs – “definite / indefinite quantity” and “action”.

3.2. Reconstruction of the Proto-Altaiic *ulu (~ -o) with the following meanings: 1) "size", 2) "definite / indefinite quantity", 3) "quality / characteristic / assessment".

Second, the **Altaiic language family** should be taken into account, at the level of which 4 language groups (Turkic, Mongol, Tungus-Manchu) and Korean language were involved to comparison. The genetic data allowed to reconstruct the intermediate Proto-Language forms (Proto-Turkic, Proto-Mongol, Proto-Tungus-Manchu, Proto-Korean). In this turn, they helped to demonstrate the reconstruction of the **Proto-Altaiic *ulu (~ -o)** with the main meaning **"big, many; good"**.

At the level of the *Turkic language group* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: 1) *Ancient Turkic* uluy 1; 2) *Karluq*, Kara-Khanid uluy 1 (MK, KB); Uyghur uluy 1; 3) *Oguz*: Turkish ulu 2; Azerbaijani ulu 2; Turkmen ulı 1; 4) *Kipchak*: Tatar ölkən 1; Bashkir ölkän 1; Kazakh ulken 1; Nogai 1; Karakalpak 1; Balkar ullu 1; 5) *Middle Turkic* uluy, uluq 1 (Pav. C.); 6) *Khakass (Kyrgyz)*: Khakassi uluy 1; 7) *Yakut*: Yakut ulaxan, ulu 1; Dolgan ulakan, ulu 1; 8) *Sayan (Tobas)*: Tuvan uluy 1; Tofalar uluy 1; 9) *Mountain-Altaiic (Central-Eastern)*: Kyrgyz uluu 2 *language subgroups*.

The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the vowel u and consonant l typical for the Ancient Turkic, Kara-Khanid, Uyghur, Turkish, Azerbaijani, Turkmen, Balkar, Middle Turkic, Khakassi, Yakut, Dolgan, Tuvan, Tofalar, Kyrgyz. However, the vowel ö can be observed only in Tatar and Bashkir, the vowel ü – in the Nogai and Karakalpak; the consonants k, n – in Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Nogai, Karakalpak and Dolgan. The attention should be also drawn to the consonant y at the end of the above-mentioned genetic data in some languages (Ancient Turkic, Kara-Khanid, Uyghur, Middle Turkic, Khakash, Tuvan, Tofalar). In this case, the meanings show that the form of expression – the morphological organization – is the adjectives. The form of content – the semantic organization – the first meaning 1) big – can be traced in: Ancient Turkic uluy 1; Kara-Khanid uluy 1; Uyghur uluy 1; Turkmen ulı 1; Tatar ölkən 1; Bashkir ölkän 1; Kazakh ulken 1; Nogai üjken 1; Karakalpak ülken 1; Balkar ullu 1; Middle Turkic uluy, uluq 1; Khakassi uluy 1; Yakut ulaxan, ulu 1; Dolgan ulakan, ulu 1; Tuvan uluy 1; tofalar uluy 1; the second meaning 2) great can be traced in: Turkish ulu 2; Azerbaijani ulu 2; Kyrgyz , uluu 2.

The form of expression of the Proto-Turkic – the phonemic / phonetic organization – was modelled with the help of the vowel *u, which occupied the first and third positions, the consonant *l – the second one, as they are typical for the Ancient Turkic, Kara-Khanid, Uyghur, Turkish, Azerbaijani, Turkmen, Balkar, Middle Turkic, Khakassi, Yakut, Dolgan, Tuvan, Tofalar, Kyrgyz. The consonant *g occupied the fourth position, as it is typical for the Ancient Turkic, Kara-Khanid, Uyghur, Middle Turkic, Khakassi, Tuvan, Tofalar. The form of expression – the morphological organization – is represented by the adjectives taken from all genetic data. The form of content – the semantic organization – is the three options: 1) "big" that is typical for the Ancient Turkic, Kara-Khanid, Uyghur, Turkmen, Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Nogai, Karakalpaks, Balkarian, Middle Turkic, Khakass, Yakut, Dolgan, Tuvan and Tofalar; 2) "great" – for the Turkic, Azerbaijani, Kyrgyz. It should be noted that S. A. Starostin also proposed the third meaning: 3) "grown-up, great" that reders to the internal form of the first two meanings.

Thus, the reconstruction of the **Proto-Turkic *ulug** with the following meanings: **"1) big; 2) great; 3) grown-up, great"** was proposed.

At the level of the *Mongol language group* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: 1) *Northern Mongol*: Written Mongol olan; Middle Mongol olon, ulān, ulan; Khalkha olon; Ordos olon; Buryat olon; 2) *Western Mongol (Mongol-Kalmyk)*: Kalmyk olı; 3) *Southern Mongol language subgroup*: Dunsian olon; Boan olon; Shari Yugur olon; Monguor olon; Dagur walan, ualen *language subgroups*.

The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the vowel o and the consonants l, n typical for the Written Mongol, Middle Mongol, Khalkha, Ordos, Buryat, Kalmyk, Dunsian, Boan and Monguor. However, the vowel e and consonant w can be traced in the Dagur. The form of expression – the morphological organization – is the adverbs. The form of content – semantic organization – is “many” that is typical for all the above-mentioned languages.

The form of expression of the Proto-Mongol *olon – the phonemic / phonetic organization – was modelled with the help of the vowel *o, which occupied the first and third positions, the consonants *l, *n – the second and fourth ones, respectively, as they are typical for the Middle Mongol, Khalkha, Ordos, Buryat, Dunsian, Boan and Monguor. Some reconstructed forms can be traced in the Written Mongol (the first, second, fourth positions), Kalmyk (the first, second, third positions), Dagur (the second, third, fifth positions). The form of expression – the morphological organization – is the adverbs taken from all the above-mentioned languages. The form of content – the semantic organization – is “many” that is typical for all the above-mentioned languages.

Thus, the reconstruction of the **Proto-Mongol *olon** with the meaning “many” was proposed.

At the level of the *Tungus-Manchu language group* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: the *Southern Western Tungus-Manchu (Jurchen-Manchu)*: Literary Manchurian ulin “goods”; the *Southern Eastern Tungus*: Ulch ule(n), Orok uliŋga, Nanai ulē (ОН.); Udege uligdiga` “beautiful” *language subgroups*.

The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the vowel u and consonant l typical for all the above-mentioned languages (Literary Manchu, Ulch, Orok, Nanai, Udege). However, the vowel e can be traced in the Ulch, Nanai, the consonant n – in the Ulch. The form of expression – the morphological organization – is the adjectives. The form of content – the semantic organization – is “good” that is typical for the Literary Manchu, Ulch, Orok, Nanai, but “beautiful” – for the Udege.

The form of expression of Proto-Tungus-Manchu *ule- – the phonemic / phonetic organization – was modelled with the help of the vowel *u (the first position) and consonant *l (the second position), as it is typical for the Literary Manchu, Ulch, Orok, Nanai, Udege. However, the vowel *e can be traced in the Ulch and Nanai. The form of expression – the morphological organization – is the adjectives typical for all the above-mentioned languages. The form of content – the semantic organization – is “good” that is typical for the Literary Manchu, Ulch, Orok, Nanai.

Thus, the reconstruction of the **Proto-Tungus-Manchu *ule-** with the meaning “good” was proposed.

At the level of *the Korean language* the following genetic data were involved to comparison: Modern Korean oro-ži, Middle Korean ōró’.

The form of expression – the phonemic / phonetic organization – demonstrates the vowel o and consonant r typical for all the above-mentioned languages. However, the vowel i and consonant ž are typical for the Modern Korean. The form of expression – the morphological organization – is the adverbs. The form of content – the semantic organization – is “completely, wholly” that is typical for all the above-mentioned languages.

The form of expression of the Proto-Korean *ōr- – the phonemic / phonetic organization – was modelled with the help of the vowel *o (the first position) and consonant *r (the second position), as it is typical for the Modern Korean and Middle Korean. The form of expression – the morphological organization – is the adverbs typical for all the above-mentioned languages. The form of content – the semantic organization – is “completely, wholly” that is typical for all the above-mentioned languages.

Thus, the reconstruction of the **Proto-Korean *ōr-** with the meaning “**completely, wholly**” was proposed.

By the way, all the above-mentioned genetic data show their own sense that is represented by this or that LSV: 1) *definite / indefinite quantity*: Written Mongol olan, Middle Mongol olon, ulān, ulan, Khalkha olon, Ordos olon, Buryat olon, Dugur: walan, ualen “many”; 2) *size*: Old Turkic uluy 1, Kara-Khanid uluy 1, Uyghur uluy 1, Turkmen uli 1, Tatar ölkən 1, Bashkir ölkän 1 with the following meaning: 1) big; Turkish ulu 2, Azerbaijani ulu 2, Kyrgyz uluu 2 with the following meaning: 2) great; 3) *quality / characteristic / assessment*: Literary Manchu ulin “goods”, Ulch ule(n), Orok ulinga, Nanai ulē with the following meaning “good”, Udege uligdiga “beautiful”; 4) *length / ending of action*: Modern Korean oro-ži and Middle Korean ōró with the following meaning “completely, wholly”.

The reconstruction of the **Proto-Altaiic *ulu (~ -o)** with the main meaning “**big, many; good**” was performed based on the reconstructed forms at the following language groups: 1) the Proto-Turkic *ulug “1) big; 2) great; 3) grown-up, great”; 2) the Proto-Mongol *olon “many”; 3) the Proto-Tungus-Manchu *ule- “good”; 4) the Proto-Korean ōr- “completely, wholly”.

Analysing the above-mentioned reconstructed forms at the *phonological / phonemic, morphological* and *semantic levels* (Szemerényi 1980), the following characteristics may be outlined.

First, at the phonological / phonemic level the given etymons demonstrate the following correspondences: the Proto-Language vowel *u in the first position was typical for the Proto-Turkic and Proto-Tungus-Manchu, the consonant *l in the second position was typical for the Proto-Turkic, Proto-Mongolian and Proto-Tungus-Manchu. The third position was occupied by *u that is typical for the Proto-Turkic or *o – for the Proto-Mongol. Second, it should be noted that every Proto-Language has their own morphological organization: the Proto-Turkic and Proto-Tungus-Manchu are the adjectives, the Proto-Mongolian and Proto-Korean are the adverbs. Third, the form of content – the semantic organization – demonstrates the following correspondences: the “size” layer is typical for the Proto-Turkic; the “definite / indefinite quantity” layer – for the Proto-Mongol, the “quality / characteristic / assessment” layer – for Proto-Tungus-Manchu, the “length / ending of action” layer – for the Proto-Korean.

Thus, it should be assumed that the form of expression of the **Proto-Altaiic *ulu (~ -o)** was modelled based on all the reconstructed forms at every language group (Turkic, Mongol, Tungus-Manchu), as well as the Korean language, the form of content – “big, many; good” – represented by the three LSVs – “size”, “definite / indefinite quantity”, “quality / characteristic / assessment”.

5. Genetic Data of the Indo-European and Altaic Language Families in Accordance to the Degrees of Language Relationship.

S. Burlak and S. Starostin point out that *the proof of language relationship* is the evidence that the represented similarity among the languages is most likely due to their common origin (and not by chance or by contact influence). According to scholars' view, this approach consists of two stages: 1) the observation of similarities and 2) the proof that the origin of such elements from the common ancestor language is most likely than the appearance of them as a result of contacts or merely by chance. However, the scholars also note that a comparative researcher does not deal with the numerical value of probability, but with a probabilistic assessment. This leads to the possibility of discrepancies: something that one scholar seems more likely to be, the other may seem less likely (Burlak, Starostin 2005).

The most demonstrative in determining the languages relationship is the establishment of regular phonetic correspondences in the basic vocabulary list. G. Klimov assumes that “while substantiating the language relationship the decisive criterion is represented by “the systemic complex of phonological correspondences or “soundconformities” in the data of the root and affixal morphemes, as well as the entire lexemes of the languages in comparison” (Klimov 1990: 24).

S. Burlak and S. Starostin emphasize that the probability of the language relationship is increased with the multiplication of phonemes in comparison in every row of converging words. In other words, the comparison of five-phonemic words, for example, is more reliable than the comparison of the two-phonemic ones. The comparison which takes into account only the first consonant of the considered lexemes is less demonstrative than the comparison that proposes the initial group (C)CVC in the converging words. The longer the chain of phonemes that corresponds to one another in words belonging to one proto-language lexeme, appears, the less is probability of accidental coincidence (Burlak, Starostin 2005).

Let us try to make sure and establish the degrees of languages relationship within the Indo-European and Altaic language families, taking into account the chain of phonemic correspondences.

The reconstruction of the **Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel-** (Gr hw- / ew-) with the following meanings: 1) “definite / indefinite quantity” and 2) “action” was conducted with the help of the reconstructed forms at different language groups: 1) the Proto-Tocharian *w'ältse meaning 1); 2) the Ancient Greek *ἔλομαι (ēlómeno-, ēlésthō), *wáli- 1); 3) the Proto-Slavic *velьmi, -ma; *velьjь, *velikъ; *vālь, *vālovъ, *vālītī 1); 4) the Proto-Baltic *wal-î- vb 2).

The trivial degree of language relationship can be established between the Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) 1, 2 and Proto-Slavic *velьmi, -ma; *velьjь, *velikъ 1, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of *the Slavic language group*: Ukrainian великий, Old Slavic, Bulgarian велик, Serbo-Croatian велик, Slovenian velik, Czech veliký, velký, Slovak veliký, veľký. The three phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 3 phonological correspondences (vowel *e, consonants *w / *v, *l) in the form of expression and the meaning “definite / indefinite quantity” in the form of content.

The significant degree of language relationship can be established among the Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) 1, 2 and Proto-Tocharian *w'ältse 1, Ancient Greek *ἔλομαι (ēlómeno-, ēlésthō) 1, *wáli-, Proto-Slavic *vālь, *vālovъ, *vālītī, *vālovъ, *vālītī 1, Proto-Baltic *wal-î- vb 2, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of the *Tocharian*: Tocharian A wälts, waltsurā; Tocharian B walke, wälts-; *Slavic*: Polish wielki, Upper Lusatian wulki *language groups*, and also *the Greek language*: Greek. ep., ion. ἔλεō, aor. inf., élsaī, ep., lyr. eélsaī. The three phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 2 phonological correspondences (consonants *w / *v, *l) in the form of expression, but in some cases, the first meaning “definite / indefinite quantity” in the form of content among the *Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek and Proto-Slavic*.

The reconstruction of the **Proto-Altaic *ulu** (~ -o) with the following meanings: 1) “size”, 2) “definite / indefinite quantity”, 3) “quality / characteristic / assessment” was conducted with the help of the reconstructed forms at different language groups: 1) the Proto-Turkic *ulug 1); 2) the Proto-Mongol *olon 2); 3) the Proto-Tungus-Manchu *ule- 3); 4) the Proto-Korean *ōr- with a separate meaning “length / the end of an action”.

The trivial degree of language relationship can be established between the Proto-Altaic *ulu (~ -o) 1, 2, 3 and Proto-Turkic *ulug 1, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of *the Turkic language group*: Kara-Khanid uluy 1, Uyghur uluy 1, Turkish ulu, Azerbaijani ulu, Balkarian ullu, Yakut ulū, Dolgan ulū, Tuvan uluy, Tofalar uluy. The three

phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 3 phonological correspondences (vowel *u, consonant *l) in the form of expression and the meaning “size” in the form of content.

The significant degree of language relationship can be established between the Proto-Altaic *ulu (~ -o) 1, 2, 3 and Tungus-Manchu *ule- 3, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of *the Tungus-Manchu language group*: Literary Manchurian ulin, Ulch ule(n), Orok ulinga, Nanai ulē, Udege uligdiga. The three phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 2 phonological correspondences (vowel *u, consonant *l) in the form of expression, but in some cases, the third meaning “quality / characteristic / assessment” in the form of content *between the Proto-Altaic and Tungus-Manchu*.

The distant degree of language relationship can be established among the Proto-Altaic *ulu (~ -o) 1, 2, 3 and Proto-Mongol *olon 2, Proto-Korean *ōr- with a separate meaning “length / the end of an action”, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of *the Mongol language group*: Written Mongol olan, Middle Mongol olon, Khalkha olon, Ordos olon, Buryat olon, Kalmyk olᠠ, Dunsian olon, Boan oloᠠ, Shari Yugur olon, Monguor olon; *the Korean language*: Modern Korean air-ḡi, the Eastern Korean ōró. The two phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 2 phonological correspondences (vowel *o / *u, consonant *r / *l) in the form of expression and the meaning “definite / indefinite quantity” in the form of content.

6. Conclusions.

The proof of the genetic relationship of the languages of the Nostratic macrofamily, i.e. the substantiation of the Nostratic, is carried out with the help of *the* specially developed **method of diachronic interpretation** of O. Szemerényi based on the genetic principle. It consists of two methodological stages: at the first stage, **the comparative-historical method** is used with the procedures of internal and external reconstruction (the level of one language family); in the second stage – **the method of mass comparison** of J. Greenberg, with the help of which the correspondences between the already reconstructed forms at every language family are compared.

The involved genetic data of the Indo-European and Altaic language families allowed S. Starostin to perform the diachronic interpretation of the Nostratic *wol[a] with the following meanings: 1) “size”, 2) “definite / indefinite quantity”, 3) “action” based on the Proto-Indo-European *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) with the meanings: 1) “definite / indefinite quantity”, 2) “action” and Proto-Altaic *ulu (~ -o) with the meanings: 1) “size”, 2) “definite / indefinite quantity”, 3) “quality / characteristics / assessment” (if the form of expression is interpreted using the vowel *o, which is traced in the Proto-Altaic, the consonant *w – in the Proto-Indo-European, *l – in the Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Altaic; then the form of content is interpreted based on the Proto-Indo-European 1) “definite / indefinite quantity”, 2) “action” and Proto-Altaic 1) “size”, 2) “definite / indefinite quantity”).

The data of the Indo-European and Altaic language families made it possible to identify the following degrees of language relationship taking into account the proto-language forms at the level of every language group and etymon – at every language family. Thus, within the Indo-European language family, the following degrees of language relationship were registered: 1) **the trivial degree** is established between the Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Slavic, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of the Slavic language group; the three phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 3 phonological correspondences in the form of expression and the meaning “definite / indefinite quantity” in the form of content; 2) **the significant degree** is established among the Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek, Proto-Slavic, the reflexes of which are observed in the words the Tocharian, Slavic language groups, and also the Greek language; the three phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 2 phonological correspondences (in the form of expression and

the first meaning “definite / indefinite quantity” in the form of content among the Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Tocharian, Ancient Greek and Proto-Slavic. Within the Altaic language family, the following degrees of language relationship were registered: 1) **the trivial degree** is established between the Proto-Altaic and Proto-Turkic, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of the Turkic language groups; the three phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 3 phonological correspondences in the form of expression and the meaning “size” in the form of content; 2) **the significant degree** is established between the Proto-Altaic and Tungus-Manchu, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of the Tungus-Manchu language groups; the three phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 2 phonological correspondences in the form of expression, and the third meaning “quality / characteristic / assessment” in the form of content between the Proto-Altaic and Tungus-Manchu; 3) **the distant degree** is established among the Proto-Altaic and Proto-Mongol, Proto-Korean with a separate meaning “length / the end of an action”, the reflexes of which are observed in the words of the Mongol language group, the Korean language; the two phonemic model CVC- with the same sum of 2 phonological correspondences in the form of expression and the meaning “definite / indefinite quantity” in the form of content.

References

- Benfey, Th. (1869). *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland* [History of Linguistics and Oriental Philology in Germany]. Munchen.
- Bomhard, A. R. (1995). *Indo-European and the Nostratic Hypothesis: History of Research, Current Trends, and Future Prospects*. Boston, Massachusetts. USA. 82.
- Bomhard, A. R. (2015). *A Comprehensive Introduction to Nostratic Comparative Linguistics (With Special Reference To Indo-European)*. 2d Rev., Corr., and Expand. Ed. Charleston, SC. 2258.
- Bromage, T. O., Schrenk, F., Zonneveld, F. (1995). Paleoanthropology of the Malawi Rift: an early hominid mandible from the Chiwondo Beds, northern Malawi. *J. Hum. Evol.* 28. 71–108.
- Burlak, S., Starostin, S. (2005). *Sravnitelno-istoricheskoye yazykoznanie* [Comparative-historical linguistics. M. : Akademiya. 432.
- Curtius, G. (1862). *Philologie und Sprachwissenschaft* [Philology and Linguistics]. Leipzig.
- Curtius, G. (1867). *Zur Chronologie der Indogermanischen Sprachforschung* [On the chronology of Indo-European language research]. Leipzig.
- Dietz, Fr. (1836–1845) *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* [Grammar of Romance languages]. Bonn. Bd. I–III.
- Dolgopolsky, A. (1998). *The Nostratic Macrofamily & Linguistic Paleontology*. McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. 116.
- Dolgopolsky, A. (2008). *Nostratic Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.dspace.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/196512>
- Gamkrelidze, T. V., Ivanov, Vyach. Vs. (1984). *Indoyevropeyskiy yazyk i indoyevropeysy. Rekonstruktsiya i istoriko-tipologicheskiy analiz prayazyka i protokultury (v dvukh chastyakh)* [Indo-European language and Indo-Europeans. Reconstruction and historical and typological analysis of proto-language and protoculture (in two parts)]. Tbilisi: Izd-vo Tbilisskogo un-ta. 1332.
- Greenberg, J. H. (1957). *Essays in Linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1957-06007-000>
- Heath, J. (2015). The nature and origin of language. *Linguistic Typology*. 19. 3. 463–468.
- Heeringa, W, Wet, F. de, Huyssteen, G. B. van (2015). Afrikaans and Dutch as closely-related languages: A comparison to West Germanic languages and Dutch dialects. *Stellenbosch Papers In Linguistics Plus-Spil Plus*. 47. 1–18. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5842/47-0-649>
- Illich-Svitych, V. M. (1971). Opyt sravneniya nostraticheskikh yazykov (semito-khamitskiy, kartvelskiy, indoyevropeyskiy, ural'skiy, dravidiyskiy, altayskiy) [Experience on comparison nostratic languages (Semitic-Hamitic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, Ural, Dravidian, Altaic)]. *Vvedeniye. Sravnitelnyy slovar (V–K)*. M. III–IV.
- Jacques, G. (2017). A reconstruction of Proto-Kiranti verb roots. *Folia Linguistica*. 51. 177–215. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1515/flih-2017-0007>

Jucquois, G. (1996). Macrocomparisons in genetic linguistics – Observations concerning Nostratic. *Linguistique*. 32. 2. 149–157.

Kartoteka Etimologicheskogo slovarya slavyanskikh yazykov. Lingvisticheskiye istochniki: fondy instituta russkogo yazyka [Card index of the Etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages. Linguistic sources: the foundations of the Institute of Russian Language] (1967). pod red. S. I. Kotkova, A. I Sumkinoy. M. : Nauka. 139.

Klimov, G. A. (1988). Rekonstruktsiya i diakhronicheskaya interpretatsiya v komparativistike [Reconstruction and diachronic interpretation in Comparative Linguistics]. *Voprosy yazykoznanija*. M. 3. 9–16.

Korolyova, A. V. (2018). Reconstruction of Early Migration Routes of Homo Populations. *Logos*. Klaipeda. 94. 159–166.

Leakey, L. S. (1964). *A New Species of The Genus Homo From Olduvai Gorge*. B.: Nature. 202. 4927. 7–9.

Makovskiy, M. M. (1982). *Angliyskiye sotsial'nyye dialekty (ontologiya, struktura,, etimologiya)* [English social dialects (ontology, structure, etymology)]. M. : Vysshaya shkola. 135.

Melnichuk, A. S. (1991). O vseobshchem rodstve yazykov mira [On the universal relationship of the languages of the world]. *Voprosy yazykoznanija*. 2–3.

Menges, Kh. (1989). Nostratic Linguistics – the 1st International-Symposium. *Anthropos*. 84. 4–6. 569–574.

Mosenkis, Yu. L. (2007). Obshchemirovoy prayazyk: teoreticheskiye osnovaniya rekonstruktsii [World-wide proto-language: theoretical fundamentals of reconstruction]. *Proiskhozheniye yazyka i kultury: drevnyaya istoriya chelovechestva*. 1, 2. 5–9.

Neroznak, V. P. (1988). Prayazyk: rekonstrukt ili realnost? [Proto-Language: Reconstruction or Reality?]. *Sravnitelno-istoricheskoye izucheniye yazykov raznykh semey. Teoriya lingvisticheskoy rekonstruktsii*. M. 26–43.

Pedersen, H. (1903) Türkische Lautgesetze. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen*. Gesellschaft. 57. 535–561.

Pott, A. F. (1844–1845) Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien. Ethnographisch-linguistische Untersuchung, vornehmlich ihrer Herkunft und Sprache, nach gedruckten und ungedruckten [The gypsies in Europe and Asia. Ethnographic-linguistic examination, mainly of their origin and language, printed and unprinted]. *Quellen*. Halle. Bd. 1–2.

Pott, A. F. (1856). Die Ungleichheit menschlicher Rassen, hauptsächlich vom sprachwissenschaftlichen Standpunkte, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von des Grafen von Gobineau gleichnamigen [The inequality of human races, chiefly from the linguistic point of view, under the special insistence of the Count of Gobineau of the same name] *Werke*. Lemgo; Deltmold.

Starostin, S. A. (1989). Sravnitelno-istoricheskoye yazykoznanije i leksikostatistika [Comparative-historical linguistics and lexicostatistics]. *Lingvisticheskaya rekonstruktsiya i drevneyshaya istoriya Vostoka: materialy k diskussiyam mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii*. M. 1. 3–39.

Starostin, S. A. (1996). Word-Final Resonants in Sino-Caucasian. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*. 24. 2. 281–311.

Starostin, S. A. (1998–2005) *The Tower of Babel*. <http://starling.rinet.ru/>

Szemerényi, O. (1980). *Vvedeniye v sravnitelnoye yazykoznanije* [Introduction to comparative linguistics]. M. 13.

Tamariz, M. (2017). Experimental Studies on the Cultural Evolution of Language. *Annual Review of Linguistics*. 3. 389–407. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011516-033807>

Tkachenko, O. B. (2007). *Issledovaniya po meryanskomu yazyku* [Studies on the Merian language]. Kostroma: Infopres. 352.

Tobias, P. V. (1991). The skulls, endocasts and teeth of Homo habilis. *Olduvai Gorge*. Cambridge. 4. 1–921.

Versloot, A. P. (2017). Proto-Germanic ai in North and West Germanic. *Folia Linguistica*. 51. 281–324. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1515/flih-2017-0010>

Vovin, A. (2002). Building a ‘bum-pa’ for Sino-Caucasian – A reply to Sergei Starostin’s reply. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*. 30. 1. 154–171.

Yakhontov, S. Ye. (1991). Prarodina nostraticheskikh yazykov [The ancestral home of the Nostratic languages]. *Slavistika. Indoevropеistika. Nostratika: k 60-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya V. A. Dybo*. M. 13–17.

Zywiczynski, P., Gontier, N., Waciewicz, S. (2017). The evolution of (proto-)language: Focus on mechanisms. *Language Sciences*. 63. 1–11. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2017.06.004>

Бібліографічний опис:

Капранов, Я. В. (2018). Діахронічна інтерпретація ностратичного етимона *wol[a] на основі праїндоевропейської *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) і праалтайської *ulu (~ -o) форм (за версією С. А. Старостіна). *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9 Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов.* К. Вип. 17. С. 68–80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2018.17.06>

Анотація

У статті представлено діахронічну інтерпретацію ностратичного етимона *wol[a], верифікованого С. А. Старостіним на основі праїндоевропейської *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) і праалтайської *ulu (~ -o) форм. Ці матеріали було взято для аналізу з Глобальної лексикостатистичної бази даних “Вавилонская башня”, яка є міжнародним Інтернет-проектом. Уточнено поняття етимона загалом і ностратичного етимона зокрема, під яким розуміється фонеморфологічний і семантичний комплекс, установлений на основі реконструйованих етимонів на рівні кожної мовної сім’ї.

Продемонстровано, як за допомогою порівняльно-історичного методу етимолог-макрокомпаративіст виконав зовнішню реконструкцію праїндоевропейського етимона *(e)wel- (Gr hw- / ew-) зі значенням “great number; to hear” на основі внутрішньої реконструкції пратохарського *w’ältse; давньогрецьких *ēlomaī (ēlómeno-, ēlésthō), *wáli-; праслов’янських *vel’mi, -ta; *vel’jъ, *vel’ikъ; *vālъ, *vālovъ, *vālītī; прабалтійського *wal-ī- етимонів, а також зовнішню реконструкцію праалтайського етимона *ulu (~ -o) зі значенням англ. “big, tapu; good”, що відбувалося на основі внутрішньої реконструкції пратюркського *ulug; прамонгольського *olon; пратунгусоманьчжурського *ule-; пракорейського *ōr- етимонів. Прокоментовано процедурні операції С. А. Старостіна, виконані ним на основі методу діахронічної інтерпретації, який дав змогу припустити, що реконструйовані форми прамовних етимонів на рівні мовної сім’ї сягають ностратичного етимона *wol[a]. Це дало змогу встановити й обґрунтувати ступені мовного споріднення між реконструйованими етимонами двох мовних сімей та ностратичним етимоном: в межах індоєвропейської мовної сім’ї: тривіальний – між праїндоевропейським і праслов’янським етимонами; помітний – між праїндоевропейським і пратохарським, давньогрецьким, праслов’янськими, прабалтійським; в межах алтайської мовної сім’ї: тривіальний – між праалтайським і пратюркським етимонами; помітний – між праалтайським і пратунгусоманьчжурським етимонами; далекий – між праалтайським і прамонгольським, пракорейським етимоном.

Ключові слова: ностратичний етимон, праїндоевропейська і праалтайська форми, порівняльно-історичний метод, метод діахронічної інтерпретації, ступені мовного споріднення.