

CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF J.A. LAKARRA ET AL.
«EUSKAL HIZTEGI HISTORIKO-ETIMOLOGIKOA»
(EHHE), BILBAO, EUSKALTZAINDIA, 2019.

In the year 2019 was published by J. A. Lakarra et al. a big volume with the title *Euskal Hiztegi Historiko-Etimologikoa* (EHHE). The aim of the book is to present a broad scope of the research about the so-called putative Proto-Basque language and the state-of-the-art of that research.

The first important research about Proto-Basque has been initiated by the prominent L. Michelena and published in 1961(1977) in his landmark book *Fonética Histórica Vasca*. All followers of Michelena will have to take in account his magisterial work when working on Basque. It is what J.A. Lakarra is trying to do in his numerous articles and with his good knowledge of Basque as a mother language but nevertheless with more or less success in the field of etymology as we shall see. There is a lot of ideas in the reconstruction or classification tentatives. Some are correct, but many should be clearly and definitely rejected like for instance *ipurdi* 'arse' from an impossible and untenable rather fantastic **ibi-erdi* 'middle of the ford'. This is unfortunately the result of a research that bases itself exclusively on internal reconstruction, which may produce circularity and even some etymologic monsters.

The introduction.

The book begins with a very long introduction of 289 pages in Roman numerals until cclxxxix including lists and a very rich bibliography. All styles of linguistic references are used and the aim of the author seems to be the justification of his linguistic internal reconstruction. The model of what has been successful in the case of Indo-European is praised. In the mind of the author, this model can be applied to all languages and to the Basque language. But the perhaps too long introduction might be a bit boring for the reader and gives the impression of a rather big mixture of many different kinds of things and arguments without an actually clear structured development. The book presents the different researches and hypotheses about the eventual kinship of Basque that have been done. The huge bibliography is rich and very interesting and many new references of texts give the opportunity to allow more remote dates for words than the former attestations (for instance compared with the ones of the *Orotariko Euskal Hiztegia*). However the author does not mention in the bibliography some articles like the one of Roslyn M. Frank (journal ARSE, n°45, 2011: 17-64) which is in opposition with his own views. The mention of the book of Michel Morvan *Les origines linguistiques du basque* (Bordeaux, 1996) is forgotten. Only his doctoral thesis of 1992 is mentioned.

On page XV (xv) is it actually necessary to distinguish AEZ Aintzineuskara Zaharra and AEM Aintzineuskara Modernoa ? Proto-Basque is Proto-Basque. It should perhaps be also necessary to distinguish Proto-Basque and Pre-Basque. It is not exactly the same thing. Pre-Basque is not yet Basque, though we admit that Basque is so old that the distinction between Proto- and Pre-Basque is somewhat difficult.

On page XXXI (xxxvi) we agree that glottochronology has not shown a great success with the help of the Swadesh list or not.

On page XXXII (xxxii) we don't agree with the excessive critic of J.H. Greenberg. Multicomparatism has some value. If done with enough cautiousness, it may help, especially when establishment of series is possible, which is for instance the case for words like Basque *guti* 'little' or *oka* 'to vomit' that have correspondents in Dravidian (*kuti*) and Uralic (Hungarian *okád*, Finnish *okse*).

On page LIV (liv) of the introduction J.A. Lakarra mentions two specialists of Uralic who have written in 2004 in the journal *Finnisch Ugrische Forschungen* vol. 58: 454-456 a critic recension of M. Morvan *Les origines linguistiques du basque*, Bordeaux, 1996, saying that there is no link between Basque and Uralic. These authors did not understand that Basque is of course not an Uralic language, but has some cognacy with some Uralic vocabulary as it has with other Eurasian families since it is a Proto-Eurasian language. They use like always the argument of the chance resemblances. They do forget or don't know, and J.A. Lakarra also and many others, that the Basque people has a 12% or 13% component of the haplogroup U5 of the mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA). The haplogroup U5 is typical of the Uralic peoples. Thus it is not surprising to find some Uralic or Proto-Uralic words in Basque like for instance Basque *suge* 'snake' and Old Estonian *siug* 'id.' (from Proto-Uralic **suge* 'worm, snake') or Basque *san, sain* 'nerve, sinew' (graph *zan, zain*) and Mordvin *san* 'id.' (Uralic **sani* or **sVni*), **ne* 'woman' in Uralic and Basque *ne-ska* 'girl' with diminutive suffix *-ska* or the feminine suffix *-n* in the conjugated form *-dun* 'you have, you woman') of the second person singular (versus *-duk* for the masculine). If not from **anaie-ba*, cf. also **ne-ba* 'brother of a woman'. The very old Eurasian opposition *n/k* or *n/t* for feminine/masculine is thus very well represented in Basque. Cf. also Basque *no* for calling a woman versus *to* for calling a man, from the Eurasian alternance *k/t* versus *n*. As a Proto-Eurasian language, Basque is cognate with more than one particular Eurasian family. For 'woman' Uralic has **ne*, Finnish has *nieid, nais, neis, nis, naine*, Sami has *nis, niso, nieida*, Hungarian has *nő*, Sumerian has *nu*, Chinese has *nü-* Koriak has *ñe*. Cf. also for instance Proto-Basque **oka* 'to belch, vomit' and Uralic **ok-* 'id.', Finnish/Estonian *okse* 'id.', Hungarian *okád* 'id.' In Altaic: Turkish *ög-*, *ök-* 'id.', Mongolian *og-*, *ogi* 'id.', Tungus-Manchu *okor-* 'id.'. It cannot be of course a chance resemblance. The fact that it may be an expressive word is not a hindrance. Many prehistoric words are of expressive origin. The same is valid for Basque *khe* 'smoke' for instance, an old Proto-Eurasian word cognate with some Caucasian forms with the meaning 'cough, smoke' and even until some Amerindian languages (Hokan *qhe* 'smoke' in C. Jany, 2009, p. 49). It cannot come from **gene* > **gee* as given by the author.

On page LXXXI (lxxxii) we can see how J.A. Lakarra lets come many completely different words like *edin, jaiio, jarrain* from a unique root **din*. This way to do is again a consequence of the fact to rely exclusively on the internal reconstruction. Internal reconstruction is of course necessary but not with so much excess. There are other similar biases for instance with **bar* or *gain/gan* as we shall see.

On page LXXXV (lxxxv) appears the unfortunately untenable etymology *ipurdi* 'arse' from **ibi-erdi* 'middle of the ford' ! The right analysis is of course **i-purd-i* like for many other Basque words the stem of which is embedded within a prefix *i-* (or *e-*) and a suffix *-i*. Cp. **i-dur-i* > *iduri* 'appearance'. The Pre-Basque/ Eurasian expressive stem **pVrd* means also 'fart'. We should note that the Basque word *eper* 'partridge' is known also as *eperdikara* 'trembling of the arse'. The Basque word is not a borrowing from Latin *perdix*, but the Latin word comes also probably from the very old Eurasian stem **pVrd*.

The Dictionary.

The Dictionary does not follow exactly the alphabetical order since J.A. Lakarra gives after each entry the words that he thinks to be derived from the same stem. This makes the reading rather difficult.

Page 4. *abar* 'twig, branch'. Is analyzed as **a-bar* with **bar* meaning *behe, hondo* 'down, bottom' (?) as in *ibar* 'valley' or *barren* "inside" (?). The word *abar* has to be linked to *abe* 'wood, post, support' and has possibly undergone the influence of *adar* 'branch'. The author bases his etymology only on the segment *bar* of *abar* which is a rather poor argument for a putative comparison with *ibar* or *barren*. There is no semantic link between 'twig, branch' and 'down, bottom'. The only external shape of a phonetic segment is not sufficient for a correct comparison. This is one more time one of the flaws of the want to rely only on internal reconstruction under the pretext that Basque would be an isolate. But isolate does not mean that there is no links with other Pre-Indo-European languages.

Page 5. *abadia*. Why is the word followed by the date of 1562 Land. (Landuchio) ? It is very late. The borrowed Roman word is much older. Is there actually a good reason to distinguish the dates of the Roman or Middle Ages time from more recent ones even if the book is called Historiko-Etimologikoa ?

Page 5. *abaritz* 'holm oak' (Spanish *carrasco*). The following date 1765 Lar. is too late since the word is attested in 1205 (Guillermus de Avariç). Is it necessary to put 1765 Lar. (Larramendi) after the entry?

Page 5. *abaro* (= *zuhaitze*) 'refuge for the cattle' 1399. The word is probably older since it is a derivate from *abar* 'branch'. It is not very important.

Page 8. *abendu* 'December'. 1496 RS cannot be understood. The Refranes (RS) are dated from 1596, not from 1496. The author has taken the idea of putting the dates one century in advance from the thesis of Manuel Padilla about the souletin dialect (2017) where Oihenart is dated from 1567 instead of 1657. Why not two centuries, three centuries, four centuries in advance and so on?

Page 9. *abere* 'animal'. 1496 RS for Refranes 1596. The word is much older. Cf. 1193 *Auereco*. Is it necessary to put the date of the Refranes after the word ?

Page 14/15. *jarri* 'sat'. The analyze **e-arr-i* is correct but not the following **arr < *Car* or **arr < *dar* or even **bar* that are arbitrary.

Page 15. *lar* 'too much' (= *gehiegi*). 1496 RS for Refranes 1596. From *lar < *dar* and *adar* ? The link with *lahar* 'bramble' and the link with *larre* 'heath' are too dubious. The sole outside or external shape of words is of course not sufficient at all. Generally this way to do is rather the one of amateurs. There is also no real evidence that the original meaning should be *hazi, hazkor* 'grown, growing strong'.

Page 16. *larri* 'severe, excessive'. 1527 Zalgiz (de Sauguis) and *larritu* 1496 RS. The traditional date for Zalgiz (Bertrand de Sauguis) is 1627. The date for Refranes is 1596.

Page 16/17. *larre* 'heath' 869. The cognacy with *adar* 'branch, horn' from a root **dar* is absolutely untenable.

Page 17. *larratz* 'cog'. Of course no link at all with *adar* 'branch, horn' (+ wordlist p. 715).

Page 18. *larrain* 'area'. Of course no link at all with *adar* 'branch, horn' (+ wordlist p. 715). The word is a compound **larre-gain*.

page 22. *agur* 'salute, hello'. An etymology from Basque *gur* 'bent, reverence' is better than the unsure one from Latin *augurium* 'omen'.

Page 23. *ahaide* (*aide*) 'parent'. 1496 RS for Refranes 1596. The etymology from *anai* 'brother' is unsure because it would be strange that a so basic word could have lost its intervocalic consonant *n*, especially when there are some attested strong forms *annai* with geminate. Perhaps from *aho-ide*.

Page 24/25. *aho* (1173, *ao*) 'mouth'. From **ano* < **a-no*. Very doubtful. Certainly not from *ate* 'door' and *-n*

Page 31-33 *aita* 'father' 991. The old prehistoric word is attested in whole Eurasia (Turkish *ata*) until the Paleo-Siberian Ghiliak (Nivkh) *itix*. In Aquitanian *atta*. Of course J.A. Lakarra does not mention the inscription ATA of Veleia. He does not accept as authentic the inscriptions of Veleia (IVth-VIth centuries). But in these inscriptions we have not *aita* but *ata*, the older form of *aita*: IOSHE ATA TA MIRIAN AMA. It might be a rather good argument for the authenticity of the inscriptions.

Page 35. *aitatu* 'mentioned' 1496 RS for Refranes 1596 and *aipatu* (*aipha-*) 1527 Zalgiz for de Sauguis 1627. The original form is *aipatu* from *aipa*.

Page 36. *aizkora* 'axe'. From Latin *asciola* 'little axe' or from (*h*)*aitz* 'stone' like in other names of tools. The Basque forms with *h-* are not always etymological, far from it, what many authors have forgotten. The word *hezkabia* 'itch disease' (Latin *scabies*) is not crossed with *hatz* 'finger' as J.A. Lakarra writes. It is a borrowing from Roman *escabia* (Latin *scabies*). The *h-* is only not etymological like in *harma* 'weapon' for Roman *arma*. Many scholars did not see that there was an imitative or regressive systematization of *h-* in the northern dialects. It is a pitfall for those who don't know the reality and the subtleties of the Basque language.

Page 37. *alhatu* 'given food, pastured' 1527 Zalgiz for de Sauguis 1627. The etymology from Germanic **halon* wherefrom Roman **hala* (French *haler*) 'to pull, to haul, to tow' does not fit for the meaning 'to give food, to eat, to have pasture' (the meaning 'to itch' being secondary, cp. French *manger* and *démanger*, wherefrom the derivative meaning 'to torment'). The form *ala* 'to feed, pasture' seems to be attested in some Celtic or Germanic languages and perhaps even in Low Latin or Vulgar Latin.

Page 40. *halatu* 'towed' 1725. Probable confusion with *hala*, *ala* 'flat boat' and of course complete confusion with *alha* 'pasture'. The word *ala* 'flat boat', the meaning of which is also 'oar', is more probably derived from Roman or Spanish *ala* 'wing'. The initial *h-* is not always etymological in the northern dialects.

Page 41. *alhaba* 'daughter'. The right etymology is of course *alu* 'vagina' (*ala-* in compounds) + kinship suffix *-ba*.

Page 42/43. *ama* 'mother' 1028 San Millán. There is no known reason for a link with the toponymic suffix *-ama* in Zegama, Ultzama, etc. The word *ama* is of course much older than 1028. It appears in the inscriptions of Veleia : IOSHE ATA TA MIRIAN AMA. It is a very old prehistoric word known in whole Eurasia : Sumerian *ama* 'mother', Yeniseian *ama* 'mother', Paleo-Asiatic Ghiliak (Nivkh) *imi-x*, etc. It is not a recent Wanderwort even if originally expressive. A very old cognacy with Eurasian **eme* 'woman' is possible. Cp. Finnish *emä* 'mother'.

Page 44. *amona* 'grandmother' 1745 Larramendi. Not necessary. There is *Amunna* in San Millán (year 759).

Page 45. *amets* 'dream' 1527 Zalgiz for de Sauguis 1627. From *ambets* ? Absolutely untenable and fantastic hypothesis **gogoan-ets* > **owanets* > **owahets* > **owaets* > **awaets* > **awaents* > **abents* > **ame(n)ts* > **amets* (sic). This is not actually etymological science. Only a long chain with each time slightly changes giving opportunity to obtain anything one wants to obtain.

Page 46. *anaia* 'brother'. The variant *annai* with geminate N is an argument against the analyze of *ahaide* from *anai*. It would be strange that a so basic word would have lost its intervocalic *n*. The word is Proto-Eurasian: Dravidian *anna* 'brother', Turkish *anai* 'brother, uncle', Japanese *ani* 'brother', Inuit *ani* 'brother', Navajo *anaai* 'brother'. Possibly built on the same stem as Eurasian **ana* 'mother'. Cp. for instance Turkish *ana* 'mother', Tagalog *nanay* 'mother' with reduplication.

Page 48. *neba*. 'brother of a woman'. Not from *ama* 'mother' or *anai(e)* 'brother'. From Proto-Basque **ne* 'woman' and kinship suffix *-ba*. Uralic has **ne* 'woman'. Basque has also *neska* 'girl' (probably from **ne-ska* with diminutive suffix *-ska*) and the mark *n* for the feminine (*k* or *t* for the masculine) at the second person of the singular: *-dun* < *-*du-n*. Cf. also *no* for calling a woman (in opposition with *to* for a man).

Page 51. *apal* 'low'. The etymology **adval* < Latin *ad vallem* is dubious. Cf. *zapal*. Some scholars have said the same for the dubious etymology *ibar* 'valley' < Latin *in vallem*.

Page 52. *zapal* 'flat'. Not from the wrong analyze **za-pal*. What is the mysterious *za-*?. The right stem is **zap-* 'flat' (**sap-*) with adjectival suffix *-al*.

Page 55. *ate* 'door'. Would come from **a-te*. Very unsure. The cutting may be arbitrary.

Page 59. *zaldar* 'boil, furuncle' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The end *-dar* might perhaps be *adar* 'horn' or only a nominal suffix *-ar*.

Page 61. *zaldi* 'horse'. For J.A. Lakarra from **zal-di* ? Perhaps possible because of *zaldun* 'horse rider, knight' but only if the latter is not a contracted form **zaldi-dun*.

Page 64. *bake* 'peace' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The word is of course much older since it is a loanword from Latin *pace(m)*.

Page 68/69. *baratze* 'garden'. R. L. Trask links it with *baratu* 'gelditu', but it is not very convincing. In the present case, *baratu* could only mean 'closed'. It also does not come from *barat* (Corominas 1972) 'hole, ditch' (zulo, erreten) and also not from *vallis* 'valley' or Roman *prat* 'meadow'. The good etymology is probably **bara-tze* with *bara* 'bar, fence' (enclosure) and nominal or deverbal suffix *-tze*.

Page 70/71. *bare* 2. 'slug' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The word for slug is much older. It cannot be separated from *bare* 1 'slow' and *bare* 3 'spleen'. Already attested in 947.

Page 71. *baraistu* (Azkue) 'patience'. Perhaps from **bar-* or *bare* but certainly not cognate with *barren*, *barru* 'inside'. Why should we rely only on the outside or external shape of words with so different meanings? Only because of a segment *bar*? All words that contain *bar* cannot go back to the same root **bar-*. It is a very naive concept. The stem *bare* has a simple *r*, the stem of *barru* (**baRu*) a strong *rr*.

Page 74/75. *bare* 3. 'spleen' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The word is linked with *bare* 1 'slow' and with *bare* 2 'slug'. It has nothing to do with **barr-*, *barren*, *barru* 'inside' as mentioned. Only because of a similar segment *bar*? Absolutely untenable.

Page 75. *bazkari* 'meal'. There is no obvious link between *bazkari* 'meal' and *baratu* 'prepared' (Roman *parar*) in spite of the variant *barazkari*. The word *bazkari* 'meal' is very probably related to *bazka* 'to eat, pasture' and the form *barazkari* possibly crossed with *baratze* 'garden'.

Page 77/78. *barren* 'inside' 1049. De **bar-hen*. Why *-hen*? The stem is **barr-* and the suffix is *-en*. And what is the link with *bare*, *are* 'slug'? There is none. The link between *barren* and *ibar* 'valley' remains also unsure.

Page 80. *barrun* 'inside'. For Michelena from **bar + un (une)* 'place'. And for J.A. Lakarra from *bar + *bun, buno* (sic).

Page 81. *barre* 'to laugh' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. Again from **bar* 'down, bottom' (behe, hondo)! Only because of a common segment *bar*. Of course untenable.

Page 82. *bartz* 'louse' 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. Again analyzed as **bar-tz* from the alleged unique root **bar*! It is unsound.

Page 83. *baso* 'wood, forest'. Again from **bar-so* < **bar-* 'behe, hondo'. Not convincing. The examples of *ürsan* (S) > *usai* 'sneezing' or *mersede* > *mesede* are not sufficient to prove anything in this case. The want to derive so many words from a unique common stem **bar-* is untenable. It is a bad side effect of the 'all explained' with the help of internal reconstruction. It is complete circularity.

Page 85. *bat* 'one'. From **bade, bede* (cf. *bederatzi* 'nine'). From a curious **ba-de*? Dubious.

Page 84. *bazter* 'side apart' 1070. From **barzter* and even **barz-der*. Dubious. And again from **bar-* 'behe, hondo'. The want to let come so many completely different words (*barre* 'laugh', *bartz* 'louse', *baso* 'wood, forest', *bazter*, etc.) to only one and same root **bar-* is extremely strange and

of course in no way convincing. It is obviously a very excessive use of internal reconstruction based only on the partial external shape of words. It has no future.

Page 92. *beti* 'always' 1490 GaribAtsot. for 1590 Refranes de Garibay. From **be-ti* (?).

Page 94. *bage* 'without'. For J.A. Lakarra from *bat* 'one' + *ge* (?). Only *-ge* would be the privative. This is only possible if *-ge* is not itself a contracted form of *bage*. And there is the much used variant *gabe*.

Page 95. *begi* 'eye' 1080. Attested in 984. So why 1080 ?

Page 97. *begi* 'eye'. Still unsure for **b-egi* with **b-* as body class prefix or **b-* for *bi* 'two'. Cp. *egun* 'day' (**eg-un*), *eki*, *eguzki* 'sun', *egia* 'truth' (?). Would be the same as in *belaun* 'knee', *beso* 'arm', *belarri* 'ear', etc. In some languages a prefix *b-* or similar seems to exist with body parts or other things as a possessive of third person, so that for instance a word like *begi* would be to analyze as 'his eye'. This possessive hypothesis had been mentioned by C.C. Uhlenbeck in 1927. But many other Basque body part names have no prefix **b-*. And what about *buru* 'head' ? Or *belar* 'forehead' ? For these latter ones a prefix *bi* 'two' is not possible. For some of them like *belaun* 'knee', *bular* 'chest' or *belar* 'forehead' we would suspect an original Proto-Basque stem **bVl-* meaning 'rounded shape'.

Page 98. *begiratu* 'observed' 1527 Zalgiz for de Sauguis 1627. But this verb is already present by Echepeare 1545. Would come from Latin *uigilare*. Not impossible but difficult because of *begi* 'eye'. It might perhaps be from *begi* 'eye' and adlatve suffix *-ra*.

Page 100. *beharri* 'ear' 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. Probably from *beha*. The form *belarri* might be a variant due to a crossing with *belar* 'forehead' or influenced by it. Cf. the verb *behatu*.

Page 104. *belatz* 'crow' 1235. Why put 1235 since there is already *Belaza* in 950 ? The date 1235 is also from the Middle Ages. To separate the date of the entry of those of the Middle Ages is perhaps somewhat artificial.

Page 107. *berna* 'leg' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. Idem for *bernazaki*. What is *-zaki* ? The meaning is probably 'bone'. But for J.A. Lakarra from **zarki* 'haragi zahar' (old meat) ? Of course untenable. What is the semantic link of 'old meat' with the meaning 'bone' ? Old matter ? Unconvincing. The word *zaki* might perhaps be cognate with *zakil /makil* 'stick'. Cf. *zulazaki* (1745) 'palito para agujerar el pan'.

Page 108. *hezur* 'bone' (*azur*). The Proto-Basque reconstruction **enazur* for 'bone' (Basque *ezur*) has been proposed by L. Michelena. It is probably wrong. The presence of the nasalized initial vowel *e-* in the reconstruction **enazur* is due to the nasalized variant *enzur* of the Roncalese dialect. We give hereby the arguments against this reconstruction:

a) The nasalization of the Roncalese form might be secondary.

b) The presence of the vowel *a* between *n* and *z* is not justified. The interconsonantal insertion of the vowel *a* in the reconstruction **enazur* is probably a bias due to the influence of the Biscayan

variant form *azur* for 'bone'. It should not be forgotten that Biscayan has a variant *a* for *e* like in *berri* > *barri* (B) 'new', *berdin* > *bardin* (B) 'similar'. It is also valid at the initial: *ezur* > *azur*.

From the Proto-Basque reconstruction **enazur* which is very probably false, the author J.A. Lakarra has built an even more remote and also false Proto-Basque reconstruction **bernazur* 'wood of the leg' or 'bone of the leg' based on the argument that in some other languages the word for bone and the word for leg are issued from the same stem like for instance in Germanic languages, wherefrom English *bone* 'bone' and German *Bein* 'leg'. The argument might have been good but it does not fit for Basque since **bernazur* cannot be older than the extremely dubious **enazur* and of course *ezur* itself. The Basque word *berna* or *perna* 'leg' is a Roman borrowing (wherefrom Spanish *pierna*) and the Basque word *ezur* is a very old prehistoric word. Moreover there is absolutely no justification for an evolution *bern-* > *ben-* in this case. The Basque word *ezur* is valid for all bones. The word *bernezur* or *bernazur* 'tibia' exists now in modern Basque but only since the XVIIIth century (Larramendi 1745). On the contrary the word *ezur* 'bone' is attested since 1200 (*Garcia Ezurra*). The want to apply Indo-European semantic models to Basque may be sometimes misleading.

It should be also noticed that in Basque the initial *h-* (as in the variant *hezur*) is actually old and only remaining in the northern dialects but is also in many cases a big pitfall for the linguists because the *h-* is not always etymological, far from it. The initial *h-* in northern Basque, even if old, underwent a systemization. Many words who had no reason to begin with an initial *h-* have got one by a regressive analogy under the influence of other words with a possible etymological initial *h-*. For instance a word like the Roman borrowing *arma* 'weapon' has a variant *harma* or *arena* 'sand' which gives *harea*, *aize* 'wind' has a variant *haize* although it is very probably itself a variant of the Roman borrowing *aire* 'air' (Spanish *aire*). The same is probably valid for genuine Basque words and this makes the case very difficult. To know if a Basque word has an etymological initial *h-* or not is therefore a huge and very difficult puzzle and brain-teaser. This problem is also valid for many interior *h*, intervocalic or not, except when the case is obviously clear: *ahate* < **anhate* < Roman *anate* 'duck', *bahe* 'sieve' < **banhe* < Roman *vane*, **mihi* < Proto-Basque **bini* 'tongue', the latter being still present in the word *galbin* 'clapper of a bell'.

Page 109. *belaun* 'knee' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. From **bela-bun* (sic). Or even **berna-bun* (sic). Only **bela-un(e)* would be acceptable. We can see here that the so-called body-part prefix *b-* probably does not work since we would have a strange **elaun*. In fact the stem is probably **bel-* with the meaning 'rounded shape' like in *belar* 'forehead' from a Proto-Basque or Pre-Basque stem **bVI-*. Cf. also *bular* 'breast'. For the meaning cp. Tsezian *gurtu* 'knee' from **gur* 'round', Bedaue *kumba* "knee" from **kumb* 'round', Sheka *k'um*, Sino-Tibetan **gup* 'curved'. In Altaic perhaps Buriat *belhen* 'pastern', Kalmuk *belwn-ceg* 'pastern', Udighe *bäluga* 'knee', in Uralic **pol-w-* (?) 'knee' only if **pol-* means 'rounded form'.

Page 112. *bizi* 'life'. Is it the same thing as *bitxi* 1330 ? From **bis-i*. And is *bitxi* in *aitabitxi*, *amabitxi* the same word ? It is very strange. Why should it be cognate with *bizi* 'life' ? Is Altaic **bisi* 'life' a lookalike (especially Tungusic) ?

Page 113. *bizkor* 'lively' 1626. From **biz-kor*, from **biz-i* 'life'. No link with Gascon *biscòr* 'oblique, slanted'.

Page 116/117. *bortz/ bost* 'five'. The link with a putative **borts* 'hand, five fingers' (cp. Austronesian *lima, rima* 'five, hand') is possible, but hardly with **bor* 'round': *borobil, enbor* 'trunk' and let alone an untenable *ortzi* 'sky' from a fantastic **bortz-i* (sic).

Page 118. *zazpi* 'seven'. Some scholars have reconstructed a form **bortzaz-bi* 'five + two'. It remains very unsure. The segment *-az* has no solid justification (*hatz* 'fingers' ?). The probability of a cognacy with Latin *septe(m)* or a similar form remains very high. Cf. for instance Romanian *sefti* and Coptic *shashfi*. The same is valid for *sei* 'six', wrongly derived by the author from **sehi* < **seni*. The word *sei* is a Roamn loanword even if there is no final *-s* in the Basque form. Cp. Italian *sei* 'six'.

Page 119. *hoge* 'twenty' 1415. From **(b)or-gen-i* > **oh-gehi* > **ogehi* > *hoge* (sic). Probably too complicate. The comparison with Celtic *ugent* remains possible.

Page 120. *ortzi* 'sky' 1110. The word would come from **bortz-* (sic) which is an overrly doubtful hypothesis, especially when applied to *ortzegun* 'Thursday', the 'day of the sky'.

Page 122. *ortzi* 'sky, God' ? From **bortz* (sic) < **bor* 'round' like in *borobil* or *enbor*. Absolutely untenable. The other hypothesis *Urcia* from *hur* 'water' (rather *ur*) is a little bit better.

Page 123. *ortzegun* 'Thursday'. The hypothesis that it would come from **bortzegun* 'fifth day of the week' is completely wrong. The word is clearly 'day of the sky' corresponding to the Jovis dies of the Romans and Jupiter of the Greeks (cf. Spanish *jueves*). Moreover *ortzegun* is the fourth day of the week, not the fifth day (*astelehen* is 'monday', first day of the week). Absolutely untenable, all the more so as J.A. Lakarra lets come *ortzi* 'sky' from *bortz* 'five' (sic).

Page 130. *dolu* 'pain, mourn, claim' 1627 de Sauguis. But the word is already attested in 1203.

Page 133. *eban /ebaki* 'cut' 1393. *ebagi* 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The stem is **bak* or **ba*. If the stem is **bak*, there is no suffix *-ki*, only the participial suffix *-i*. It is a bit difficult, though not impossible, to let it come from a stem **ban*. It is the problem of the exact status of the ending *-n* in some verbs like *edan* 'to drink, drunk', *jan* 'to eat, eaten'. If the final *-n* does not belong to the stem, in this case the stems would be **da* for *edan* or **a* for *jan*.

Page 134/135. *epai* 'cut'. Would come from a curious form **ebanite*. Oihenart 1657 has *epatu* from *epe* 'space of time'. The form *epai* speaks rather for a contraction of **epaki /ebaki*.

Page 137. *edan*. 'to drink, drunk' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The verb would be cognate with *ardo* < **ardano* 'wine' (?). Dubious. Did the first Basques drink only wine ?

Page 139. *ardo* 'wine'. The reconstruction **ardano* is correct since we have *ardantza* 'vine' and variants like *ardao*. For J. A. Lakarra it would be the same stem **dan* as for the verb *edan* 'to drink'. But if so, how to explain *ar-* ? And did the Proto-Basques drink only wine ? Dubious.

Page 140/141. *eder* 'beautiful' 869. From **deder* < **der* ? The stem is actually **der*. J. A. Lakarra writes that the meaning of the root **der* is not obvious. We can see here once again that the internal reconstruction is not sufficient. It is necessary to make comparisons with other non-Indo-European

languages of Eurasia: Hungarian *der-ül* 'to shine', Ostiak *eder, ater* 'fine weather', Dravidian *ter* 'to shine', Japanese *ter-asu* 'to shine'.

Page 143. *ediren/idoro* 'found' 1490 Garib. Atsot. for 1590 Refranes de Garibay. *edaraite* 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. From **e-ra-din* ?

Page 156/157. *jaun* 'sir, lord'. Would come from **e-da-dun* ? And linked with *edun, dun* 'to have' ? Unsure. *jaube* 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596.

Page 160. *egosi* 'boiled, cooked' 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. For J.A. Lakarra from **e-gos-i* (correct) < **egorzte* < **e-gor-z-i* (?). Unsure. The stem is **gos*.

Page 162. *jauzi* 'jumped' 1571 Leiz. Would come from **e-da-goz-i* ? Unsure.

Page 163/164. *urgatzi (urgazi)* 'helped' 1496 RS for Refranes 1596. For J.A. Lakarra from **e-da-ra-goz-i*. Seems too complicated.

Page 168. *engoitik* 'already, (from) now on' 1545. Would come from **egun-goitik* ? Unsure. The segment *en-* might be only a Roman prefix.

Page 169. *higuin* 'digust' 1490 Garib. Atsot. for Garibay 1590. *higu* 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. Would come from **eguni* > **eguhi* > **hegui*. What is the semantic link of *higuin* 'disgust' with *egun* 'day' ?

Page 170. *uda* 'summer' 1496 RS for Refranes 1596. From *euda* ? Dubious.

Page 174/175. *gurdi* 'cart' For J.A. Lakarra from **egur-di*. The problem is that the word *egur* is the word for the heating wood, not for the construction wood.

Page 177. *ehe* 'washing water' 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. Might be from *erre* 'boiled'. In the Souletin dialect can happen sometimes a double loss of *rr* : *erre* > *ere* > *ehe*. Cp. for instance *arrats* 'evening' > *arats* > *ats*.

Page 177. *ile* 'hair' *ule* 1496 RS for Refranes 1596. Because of the variant *ule* many scholars have believed that the word was cognate with Indo-European **wul* 'wool'. Dubious.

Page 179. *ile* 'hair'. It is probably a mistake to believe that the variant *ule* would be directly cognate with Indo-European **wul-* 'wool'. It should be proven that *ule* is the primitive form and the same for other words like *iri / uri* 'domain, city'. Cp. perhaps Dravidian *ile* 'hair' ?

Page 183. *ero* 1 'kill, death' 1406. Would come from **e-ra-non* ? Very unsure.

Page 185. *haragi* 'meat'. From **erhagi* > **arhagi* ? From *ero* 'to kill' ? Unsure.

Page 185. *arakondo* (B, Azkue) 'nudo de árbol' (*tree knot*). What is the semantic link with *aragi* 'meat' ? Cf. rather *arakil* 'branch'.

Page 189. *eraman* /*eroan* 'taken, let go', *ezteramana* 1527 Zalgiz for de Sauguis 1627. The verb *eroan* is the factitive of *joan* (stem **oa*) and *eraman* the one of *eman* (stem **ma*). Are the two stems cognate ? Too dubious.

Page 190. *ekin* 'to do' (*akio*) 1490 Garib. Atsot. for Garibay 1590. Cannot be separated from *egin*. No obvious link with *jakin*.

Page 192. *jakin* 'to know'. Why should it have a link with *ekin* ? Untenable. The root of *jakin* is **aki* and the root of *ekin* /*egin* 'to do' is **ki* / **gi*.

Page 198. *elur* 'snow' from **euri-hur* 'rain water' > **erhur* ?. Not convincing. The word *elur* cannot be separated from *lur* 'earth'. Cp. *zur* 'wood' and *ezur* 'bone'. They are prehistoric doublets.

Page 200. *maite* 'to love, beloved, dear' 1527 Zalgiz. for de Sauguis 1627. For J.A. Lakarra from **emaite* < *eman* 'to give' ? Unsure.

Page 203. *eme* 'female'. The etymology from Latin *femina* > Occitan /Gascon. *hemne* is dubious for a so fundamental basic word. Like for its antonym *ar* 'male' (Turkish *är*, Chuvash *ar*, Ghiliak *ar*) the word *eme* 'woman, female' is present in the whole Eurasia.

Page 206. *ezagun* (*ezaun*) 'to know' 1490 Garib. Atsot. for Garibay 1590. The link with *entzun* 'to hear' is dubious.

Page 209. *zorne* 'pus' 1635, *zaurne* 1650. The link with *zauri* 'wound' is right. The word *zaurne* 'pus' is a compound of *zauri* 'wound' and *esne* 'milk'.

Page 210. *erraz* 'easy' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. What is the link with *erre* 'to burn' (p. 709) ?? Unsound.

Page 221-224. *gain/gan* 'on, top'. Certainly not the stem of *gari* 'wheat', *garbi* 'tidy', *garo* 'fern', *garo* 'dew' or *galdu* 'lost', *galde* 'question'. Why should all these words go back to a unique stem **ga(r)-* /**gan* ? It is due to the circularity of the internal reconstruction. It is obviously nonsensical and a big methodological bias. The word *gari* 'wheat' comes from a stem **gar-* 'cereal, grain' very well represented in the Near Eastern languages. It goes back to the first farmers of the Neolithic. Cp. Basque *garagar* 'barley' from **gar* with reduplication, Hebrew *gargar* 'grain', Armenian *gari* 'barley', Kurdish *garis* 'millet', etc. An old stem **gar* possibly reduced to zero degree **gr-* in some Indo-European languages.

Page 234. *gantz* 'grease'. A link with *gatz* 'salt' is possible. But to rely *gantz* with *gain* 'on, up, top' is highly dubious. As for *gatz*, it might perhaps be compared with some Eurasian words with the form **kas-* or **gas-*: cp. perhaps Mongolian *gasi* 'bitter' ?

Page 242. *garo* 'fern'. Like *gari*, *garbi*, *galdu* (sic) the word *garo* would come back to a unique stem *gain/gan* 'on, up'. Absolutely untenable. The same is valid for *garo* 'dew'.

Page 243/ 244 *gari* 'wheat'. From **gar-i* that would be a participle with the meaning 'what has been removed from the top' (*gainazal kendu*) and therefore from *gain* 'top'. Such an etymology is impossible and very tortuous. This is again the result of the want to explain all genuine Basque

words only with the help of the internal reconstruction. The stem **gar-* 'grain, cereal' is broadly attested in the Near East. Cf. Hebrew *gargar* 'grain', Armenian *gari* 'barley', Kurdish *garis* 'millet', etc. It goes back at least to the first farmers of the Neolithic time. With reduplication also Basque *garagar* 'barley'.

Page 248. *garbi* 'tidy, neat' 945. For J.A. Lakarra once again from **gar-* < **gain* = *gainazal kendu*, like for *gari* 'wheat' !! Absolutely untenable.

Page 251. *galdu* 'lost'. The verb is put in the same group as *gari* 'wheat', *garbi* 'tidy', *garo* 'fern' from **gar* < *gain* 'on, up'. Absolutely untenable.

Page 267. *bigel* 'liver' 1490 Garib. Atsot. for Garibay 1590. The word *gibel* is analyzed **gi-bel*. It could be correct for the meaning 'liver' (black matter) but *gibel* 'back' might be also **gib-el* for instance if it should not be the same word, perhaps from **gib-* 'rounded form, hump'.

Page 270. *izurde* 'delphin'. From *giz-* 'man' and *urde* 'pig'. But it may be also *iz* 'water, sea' and *urde* 'pig'. Cf. *izpazter* 'seaside' < **iz-bazter*.

Page 273. *gorri* 'red' 1027. From **gor* 'hard' ? Unsure. Cf. also *gori*.

Page 282. *gudu* 'war'. Perhaps from German **gund(ea)* (Uhlenbeck) ? Or from *cutud* > *cudu* ? Not very convincing. Iberian inscription *gudua deisdea*. The variant *guda* is secondary. But cf. for instance Dravidian *guddu* 'fight, quarrel' (Burrow /Emeneau, *Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, n° 1850).

Page 283/284. *gutun/kutun* 'letter'. The right etymology is Roman *coton*, not the Arabic plural *kutub* from *kitab* 'letter'. The cotton was used as pad and support on which it was possible to write and it is why the word means also 'amulet' because there was a tradition to put a propitiatory word in the little bell of the leading ewe of the herd.

Page 296. *handi* 'big'. From **han-di*. Possible. Not from Latin *grandis*.

Page 298. *anitz* 'much, many' 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. Would come from **han-* as in *handi* 'big'. Perhaps.

Page 298/299. *hamar* 'ten' 1110. From **han-bor* or **han-bar* ? But cf. *amai* 'limit' obviously derived from the same stem.

Page 304. *aker* 'he-goat'. For J.A. Lakarra from **a-kher*. What is **kher* ? What is *a-*? The word cannot be separated from *aketz* 'boar'. So that the stem is probably **ake-* with the meaning 'male animal'. Cf. *beh-i* 'cow' and *beh-or* 'mare' for the females, two words based on the same Proto-Basque stem **beh-* 'female animal' with two different suffixes. The double case of *aker* and *aketz* finds a parallel system in some Indo-European languages with Latin *caper* 'he-goat' and Greek *kapros* 'wild boar' from a common stem **kap(e)r-*.

Page 309. *aketz* 'boar' 1173 de **han-ketz* (-*getz*) ? But cf. *aker*. Both words *aketz* 'boar' and *aker* 'he-goat' are derived from a stem **ake-* 'male animal'. Cp. *behi* 'cow' and *behor* 'mare' (from Proto-Basque **beh-*) or *ardi* 'ewe' and *ahardi* 'sow' for females.

Page 317. *hausnar* 'rumination' 1643. It may be only from *esne* 'milk' since there is a form *esnar*.

Page 322. *atso* 'old woman' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The word cannot be separated from *aso* 'old' and *asaba* 'ancestor'.

Page 346. *hezkur* 'acorn' 1007 *Ezcurra*. The word comes probably from **esk-* with the meaning 'tree, oak'. Why should it come from *hezi* ? Moreover there is no evidence that the initial *h-* of *hezkur* is etymological. On the contrary the word is always written *ezkur*. The form *hezkur* appears only one time in 1908 !

Page 347. *ezker* 'left' 979. From **hez-ker* ? Unsure.

Page 351. *jaulki* 'gone out'. Would come from Proto-Basque **e-da-dul-ki* ? Unsure.

Page 351. *heztul* 'cough'. How to believe that the word could be cognate with *hezi* 'tamed, educated' ? From *heze* 'humid' ? Untenable.

Page 352. *ezti* 'honey' 1330. From *heze* 'humid' ? Perhaps.

Page 365/366. *alanor*, *ohalano* (Pouvreau, XVIIth c.), *alandor* (S). From *alan* and *hor* 'dog'. The word *alan* is probably a loanword from Spanish *alano*. It means 'dog of the Alans' (French Alains), a mountain people of the Antiquity around the Caucasus and Northern Iran. Cf. perhaps also Abkhaz *ala* 'dog'. Not necessary from German **alan* 'hazi'.

Page 367. *hartz* 'tooth' 1217. Supposedly from Proto-Basque **hor-tz* where *hor* would be 'dog'. Dubious.

Page 368. *otso* 'wolf' from **hartz-so* 'big tooth' itself from *hor* 'dog'. Very unsure. The dog is issued from the wolf, not at reverse. A form with *-r-* never appears with that word.

Page 370. *ogi* 'wheat, bread'. From **hor-gi* 'matter for dog' ? The hypothesis is based on the hapax form that appears in Aymeri Picaud in the XIIth century: *orgui*. All other writers have *ogi*. Now the question is to know if the form of Picaud is right or only a mistake.

Page 379. *idor* 'dry'. Would be cognate with the complete opposite *hur* 'water' (sic). Untenable.

Page 386. *hibai/ ibai* 'river'. From **hur-ban-i* 'cut water' ? For J. A. Lakarra the word (*h*)*ur* 'water' would have given *i-* in some words like *ibai* 'river' or *ibar* 'valley'. A bit strange. In the old toponymy the word *ibai* appears only as *bai* like in *Baigorri* or *Baiona*. And what means 'cut water' ?

Page 392. *ipurdi* 'arse' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The Basque word *ipurdi* 'arse' is built on the regular form of many Basque substantives embedded between two vowels *i-* or *e-* at the beginning of the word and *-i* at the end. These vowels don't belong to the stem or root. Here we have a stem

**purd*. There are some variants like *ipirdi* or *eperdi*, *epurdi*. This stem is a very old expressive Eurasian stem **pVrd* the meaning of which may also be 'fart'. For instance we shall find it in Albanian with *pordhë* 'fart' as given by M. Morvan (*Etymological Dictionary of Basque*, online). The variant *eperdi* means also 'partridge', a bird known for his moving arse (called also *eperdikara* with *ikara* 'trembling'). Although the Basque word *eperdi* is obviously not a borrowing from Latin *perdix*, it is likely that the latter goes back to the same Eurasian expressive stem **pVrd* 'arse'.

Thus it is not understandable why J. A. Lakarra lets come the Basque word *ipurdi* 'arse' from a Proto-Basque form **ibi-erdi* the meaning of which being 'half ford, middle of the ford', from *ibi* 'ford' and *erdi* 'half, middle'. The way to arrive to this conclusion is overly tortuous and of course absolutely untenable: middle of the ford = way for the fecal matters = arse ! (Lakarra 2019: 392). This is unfortunately the absurd result of the want to explain all genuine Basque words only with the help of the internal reconstruction and to refuse comparisons with other Eurasian languages.

Page 394 *legen /negel* 'lepra' 1650. From Latin *niger* 'black' (cp. French *nigelle* 'disease of plants').

Page 399. *hurran* 'near'. It is an enantiosemic word. Cf. *urrun*.

Page 401. *urrun* 'far, other side' 1448, *urrun* 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. From the same enantiosemic stem **(h)urr-* as in *hurran*, *hurbil* 'near'.

Page 413. *iño* 'to say'. Would be the stem of the conjugated forms *diozu*, etc. with **io*. Possible if not a secondary meaning of *jo*.

Page 417. *herots* 'reputation, fame'. It means 'reputation in the country' (cp. french 'ça va faire du bruit dans le bourg'). The word is Souletin, so that the loss of one *r* is highly probable in this dialect, from *herrots* < *herri-ots* 'noise of the country'.

Page 418. *euskara* 'Basque language'. From **enuskara* < *enausi*. Very dubious. It would come from *enaus-* 'to speak', variant of *erausi*, *erasi*. The hypothesis of a derivative **ausk-* > *eusk-* would be better. From the big Aquitanian tribe *Ausci* which has given its name to the city of Auch, department of Gers, the older *Elimberrum* (*ili-berri* 'new city'). The evolution *a* > *e* is common in Basque : *albitz* > *elbitz* 'hay', *arlatx* > *erlats* 'cornice'. Moreover the putative form **enaus* with fall of the intervocalic *n* would not give **eus* but **eaus*.

Page 421. *josi* 'sewn'. Would come from **e-Cos-i*. Dubious. The root is **os*. So we remains with **e-os-i* or **i-os-i*.

Page 423. *izeba* 'aunt'. From **ize-ba*. The stem is **ise*.

Page 424. *izter* 'thigh'. From **iztar* alternating with *iztai* like *amar* and *amai*, *bizkar* and *bizkai*.

Page 428. *josi* 'sewn'. From **e-os-i*. The root is **os*.

Page 429/430. *erosi* 'bought'. Would come from **e-ra-Cos-i*. The root is **ros*. The already very dubious hypothesis **e-ra-Cos-i* does not permit to rely the verb to *josi* 'sewn'. There is an obviously too big semantic gap between to buy and to sew.

Page 431. *ke* 'smoke' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. For J.A. Lakarra from **gene* (sic). This etymology **gene* is absolutely untenable and fantastic. The word *khe* 'smoke' (variants *ke*, *eke*) is a very old prehistoric Proto-Eurasian word of expressive origin as shown by the aspirated velar or uvular *kh*, *qh*. It imitates the sound of the cough provoked by the smoke. The original meaning is both cough or smoke generally. The word can be found in Caucasian languages (Cherkess, Dargwa *khe*, *qhe*) as well as in Sino-Tibetan languages (*khe*, *khew*) and even until Amerindian languages, for instance in the Californian Hokan (cf. *qhe* 'smoke', in C. Jany, *Chimariko Grammar*, 2009: 19). Note that the Paleosiberian Ainu has *eke* 'fire'.

Page 439. *labur* 'short' 1072. The word is wrongly cut as **la-bur*. What is **la* and what is **bur*? The mistake of J.A. Lakarra consists in analyzing wrongly many bisyllabic words: *za-har*, *za-bal*, *sa-bel*, *la-gun*, etc. The word *labur* should be analyzed as **lab-ur*. The stem is **lab-* and *ur* is an adjectival suffix.

Page 440. *lau(r)* 'four' 1174. Would come from *labur* 'short'. Five fingers less one. Perhaps.

Page 445. *lahar* 'bramble'. Curiously the word is mixed in the same group as *asu* and *ardui*? Not possible. The link with *larre* 'heath' and *larri* 'severe' is dubious.

Page 452. *lats* 'brook' 1013. Would come from **dats*. Unsure. Especially when *adats* 'hair, mane' 1571 Leiz. is also analyzed as **a-dats* from **dats* when it is clearly a derivative from *adar* 'branch'.

Page 467. *mihi* 'tongue', *mii* 1490 Garib. Atsot. for Garibay 1590. The old form **bin* is still visible in the word *galbin* 'bell's clapper'.

Page 479. *har*, *haar* 'worm' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596, *ar* 1520 Isasti for Isasti 1620. Does the Roncalese nasalized variant *anr* permit to reconstruct **anar* < **nanar* < from a root **nar*? Very dubious.

Page 481. *nigar* 'tear' 1527 Zalgiz. for de Sauguis 1627. There is an important variant *negar*. It seems that J.A. Lakarra has abandoned his former absurd hypothesis from Latin *lacrima* > Roman *(la)grima* > *grina* > *girna* > *nigar*.

Page 484. *neska* 'girl' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. Probably from **ne-ska* < **ne-* 'woman' and diminutive suffix *-ska*. Variant **niska*. Cp. *neba* 'brother of a woman' < Proto-Basque **ne-ba*. Cp. Eurasian **nV-* 'woman'. Uralic **ne*, Sami *nis*, *niso(n)*, Finnish *neis*, Hungarian *nő*. Basque has also *no* for calling a woman (*to* for a man) and *-n* for the feminine of second person singular.

Page 487. *odol* 'blood' 1401. The stem is **dol* 'to flow'. I don't know if the reduplication **dodol* is necessary. Cf. *idol*, *udol*.

Page 488. *erori* 'fallen' 1520 Isasti for Isasti 1620. The root **ror* of *erori* is compared with the one of *odol* 'blood' which is **dol* 'to flow'. Rather questionable.

Page 496. *orduan* 'so, now' 1490 Garib. Atsot. Wrong date for Garibay 1590.

Page 509. *sabel* 'belly' From **sa-bel* ? Unsure. Why should we have here *bel* 'black' ? What is the first segment *sa*-? An analysis **sab-el* would be perhaps better. The comparison with *samin*, *samur* is strange and dubious.

Page 519. *senhar* 'husband' 1527 Zalgiz. for de Sauguis 1627. The stem is **sen-*. The word is not cognate with Latin *senior*. Cf. *seni*, *sein*, *sehi*, *seme*, etc. The stem **sen-* seems to qualify any member of a family (and perhaps the family itself) and is already attested in Aquitanian.

Page 522/523. *sei* 'six'. For J. A. Lakarra it would come from **seni* (sic) and would mean **sehi-ume* ! Untenable of course. It is a Roman/Indo-European borrowing, even if there is no final -s. Cp. Italian *sei* 'six'. Cf. also *zazpi*.

Page 539. *sugate*, *suate* 'hearth' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The oldest form is *sugate* from 1562. From *su* 'fire' and place suffix *-eta*, *-ate*.

Page 547/548. *txakur* 'dog' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. Unproved etymology. The hypothesis **otso-kur* > *(*o*)*txa-kur* 'degenerated wolf' is too dubious. It may be also a metathesis of Hispanic *cachorro* 'little dog' . Cf. the variant *chacurro* (1593) : el dicho baile ha tomado un galgo chacurro perruno.

Page 555 *urratu* 'torn' 1490 Garib. Atsot. for Garibay 1590. Stem *urra*. A link with *urre* 'gold' is unsure.

Page 560 *uzatu* 'scared away' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. Var. *uxatu*. From an expressive *uxa*.

Page 562. *uzta* 'harvest' 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. From **austa* < **agusta* < **augusta* 'harvest of august'. Probably right even without the initial *a-*.

Page 565. *zabal* 'broad' . J.A. Lakarra mentions 'no clear etymology'. From **za-bal*. Why? It is not right to cut it as **za-bal*. This is the reason why J.A. Lakarra cannot find it clear. What is the segment *za-*, what is the segment *-bal* ? The correct stem is **zab-* / **zap-* (**sab-* / **sap-*) with adjectival suffix *-al*. Cf. *zapal* 'flat'. From Pre-Basque **sab-* / **sap-* 'flat, broad'. Cf. also *zahar* wrongly cut as **za-har*.

Page 567. *zahar* 'old' **za-har*. Why not **zanar* (**sanar*) ? Excess in continuous wrong cutting of *za-*. cf. also *zabal* < **za-bal* instead of the right cut **zab-al*, *zap-al*, etc. (**sab-*, **sap-*) with adjectival suffix *-al*.

Page 570/571. *zahagi* 'goatskin, wineskin' from < **zaha-gi* with *gi* 'matter' for *gai*, *gei*. But what is *zaha-* ?

Page 581. *xori* 'bird' 1527 Zalgiz. for de Sauguis 1627. The word would come from *zori* 'omen'. But it may be at reverse. In Latin the word *auspicium* 'omen' is coming from *avis spicere* 'to look at the birds'.

Page 587. *zurda* (*surda*) 'hair, horsehair' 1557 Oih. Atsot. for Oihenart 1657. Of course not from *zur* 'wood' as written! The word cannot be separated from *zerda* 1562 Landucchio, a loanword from

Spanish *cerda*. Probable influence of *urde* 'pig' because of the hair/ silk of the pig. Spanish *cerda*, *cerdo* 'hair, pig'.

Page 587/588. *zuri* 'white' . For J.A. Lakarra from *zur* 'wood' ? The Basque word **sur-i* 'white' might be perhaps also compared with Turkish *sur* 'grey', Chuvash *sur* 'white', Samoyed *siro*, *sira* 'white', Old Japanese *siro* 'white'. If cognate with *zur* 'wood', it would be only possible with reference to the white birch bark.

Page 590 *zuzen* 'straight' from **zu-zen*. The first part is possibly *zur* 'wood' (tree) like in *zuti*, *zutik*. The second part *-zen* would be the same as in *gizen* 'grease' ? Unsure, especially if the right cut is perhaps **giz-en*. What is the semantic link between *zuzen* 'straight' and *gizen* 'grease' ? None.

Page 591. *zoro* 'crazy, fool' 1527 Zalgiz for de Sauguis 1627. The first attested date is 1545 Dechepare. There is no reason to let come back this word once again from the stem *zur* 'wood' !

Page 600. *zuhur* 'wise, thrifty' < **zunur*. Of course not from *zun* < *zur* 'wood' !

Page 606. *zulo* / *zilo* 'hole'. Certainly not from *zur* 'wood'. The fact that there is sometimes a variant *zul* for *zur* (*oezul* 'bed-wood' by Añibarro or Deen) does not allow to make of *zulo* 'hole' a cognate of *zur* 'wood'. Unsound.

Page 609. *zimet* 'wrinkle' (1366) from *zumel* < **zun-bel* 'black wood' ? Very dubious. It does not match semantically. Cognate with *zimur* 'wrinkle'.

Page 615. *zidor* 'path, narrow way' 1496 RS. for Refranes 1596. The word is not very far from Spanish *sendero* ?

Page 616. *zigor* (*zihor*) 'little stick, whip' from *zur* 'wood' ? Cf. however Gascon *sigorre* 'seaside rush' (substratic word ?) . Eventually cp. also Hungarian *szigor* 'rigor' ? The latter unsure of course.

Page 617. *zibo* 'swing'. For J. A. Lakarra from **zi-bo* with **zi-* that would be an allomorph of *zur* 'wood'. Highly dubious. The Basque words for swing are of expressive origin. Cf. the variants *zabu*, *gabu*. They cannot come from *zur* 'wood'.

Page 617/618. *zil* 'navel' from *zur* / *zul* and *zilo* ? Possibly cognate with *zilo*, but certainly not cognate with *zur* 'wood' ! The fact that *zur* 'wood' has sometimes a variant *zul* (*oezul* 'bed-wood' by Añibarro or Deen) does not allow to make it cognate with *zulo* 'hole' !

Page 618. *zilbor* 'navel' < **zil-bor* , *zilbot* < **zil-bote*, *zilko* < **zil-ko*. It is of course not possible to rely the word *zil* 'navel' to *zur* 'wood' as done by J.A. Lakarra ! The chain *zur* > *zun-* is correct for the trees , but not *zil*. There is no semantic link between navel and wood.

Page 620. *zilar* 'silver'. The Indo-European hypothesis (*silubar*, *silabur* and Botorrita) is mentioned. But the author cannot help to mention again the root *zur* (!) with allomorphs *zir* > *zil*. As he lets come also *zuri* 'white' from *zur* 'wood', it becomes possible to imagine a compound **zuri-har* > **ziri-har* 'white stone' that would explain *zilhar* 'silver'. Of course untenable.

Page 622. *ziri* 'little stick'. From *zur* 'wood' ? Perhaps.

Page 623. *zirto* 'point, stitch'. Probably expressive from **sirt-* or eventually but very unsure from *ziri-to* 'little stick'.

Page 624. *txirbil* 'shaving, chip'. The link with *zur* 'wood' might be possible for the meaning (chips of wood) but remains very dubious. The word looks expressive and means rather something light. Cf. *txiribiri*. Note that *txiribiri* means also butterfly.

Page 624. *zirin* 'thin rain, excrement, diarrhoea' 1650 Pouvreau. The link with *zur* 'wood' is dubious. The word means something very thin and quasi liquid. It looks expressive. Of course one could think to the sawdust. But the word has probably also something to do with *irin* 'flour'. Eventually a contraction of **zur-irin*. Unsure.

Page 625. *zirpitz* 'thread, fibre, fringe' 1745 from **zir-* and again *zur* 'wood' ? Dubious. The word looks expressive.

Page 626. *zirtzil* 'torn, dirty' < **zir-tzil*. From *zur* 'wood' ? Very dubious. The word looks expressive.

Page 626. *pirtzil* 'wrinkled' . Expressive like *zirtzil*.

Page 628. *zintzarri* /*zinzarri* 'bell' 1527 Zalgiz for de Sauguis 1627. Root **sin(t)s-*.

Page 629. *zintzur* 'throat' 1620. If the word is attested since 1284 (Cinçurrçu), no need to put 1620. The stem **sin(t)s* is correct. No *zur* 'wood' in the word but only a nominal suffix *-ur*.

Page 631. *zin* 'faith, truth' 1590 Garibay. Would come from *zur/zun* 'wood' because in Indo-European the word for 'true' seems to be cognate with **dru* 'solid, firm' like a tree. It might be eventually possible for the oak (but the most solid is rather the stone or the rock). The semantic comparison with Indo-European words remains hypothetical. Unsure.

Conclusion.

The book of J. A. Lakarra et al. shows unfortunately a lot of flaws. The general form is confuse with a mixture of many different things. There are many mistakes and unrealistic, often poor hypotheses for the etymologies with often a lack of common sense and rationality negating the basic scientific principles of the general historical linguistics with self-invented or forged gratuitous own rules in order to explain all style of fantastic pseudo-etymologies. And of course we can see the very bad result of the enormous cognitive bias of the all-explained with the sole internal reconstruction seen as a holy grail for not to get hold to external comparisons with other non-Indo-European or Pre-Indo-European languages of Eurasia. It is obviously a thoroughly wrong methodology, with a blind adherence to some prejudices. This leads for instance to let a lot of words with a vague similar outside or external shape come from a unique stem with an obviously wrong analyze and cut of words like *za-bal* instead of **sap-*, *za-har* from an overputative common illusory first part like **za-* or like **ga(r)-* from *gain/gan* 'top' explaining as well words like *gari* 'wheat' or even *garbi* 'tidy', etc. J.A. Lakarra started unfortunately from the assumed anti-historical principle that Basque has never had another linguistic environment than the current or historically known environment. Basque is an isolate but not a complete isolate even if it cannot be included in a well-delimited

traditional languages family. It has undoubtedly some connections with other old languages of Eurasia. It is not sufficient to give to one's work a big volume and the appearance of a very scientific external shape with huge lists, all actually interesting references and big bibliographies. If the external form becomes more important than the content, the purpose remains unfulfilled, especially when the content contains unfortunately so many biases and unrealistic etymologies.

The time has come to rethink the question of the etymology of Basque, if possible without unconscious and unscientific nationalistic ulterior tendentiousness that could put some taboo on researches outside of the Basque language itself. If scholars have failed until now to find a linguistic cognacy of Basque with other Pre-Indo-European languages, in spite of their undoubtedly great erudition, the reason lies in the fact that they always tried to compare Basque each time with only one language family in a binary way. The great oldness of Basque should on the contrary lead us to compare it with the whole Pre-Indo-European Eurasia and not to try to include Basque in a precise and traditional language family. There is no other way. Basque is a Proto-Eurasian language.