

DOG - HORSE

HierLuw <i>zú-wa/i-n(i)</i> ‘dog’	HierLuw <i>azu(wa)</i> ‘horse’, Lyc <i>esbe</i> ‘horse’
Skr̥t <i>švā, š(u)vā</i> (Gen. <i>śúnas</i> , Acc. <i>śvānam</i>), Avest <i>spā, spānəm</i> (Gen. <i>sūnam</i>) ‘dog’	Skr̥t <i>áśva-h</i> , Avest <i>aspa</i> , OPers <i>asa-</i> , Osset <i>yaefs</i> (with prothetic <i>y-</i>) ‘horse’
Gk <i>κύων</i> (Gen. <i>κύνοϛ</i>) ‘dog’	Gk <i>ἵπποϛ</i> (dial. <i>ἰκκοϛ</i>) ‘horse’, Myc <i>i-go</i> (<i>ikk^wos</i>) ‘horse’
Lat <i>canis</i> ‘dog’	Lat <i>equus</i> ‘horse’
Goth <i>hunds</i> , OHG <i>hunt</i> , OEng <i>hund</i> , ONorse <i>hundr</i> ‘dog’	OEng <i>eoh</i> , ONorse <i>iōr</i> ‘horse’
OIr <i>cū</i> , Cymr <i>ci</i> (Pl. <i>cwn</i>) ‘dog’	OIr <i>ech</i> , Gaul <i>epo-</i> ‘horse’
Lith <i>šuõ</i> (Gen. <i>šuñs</i>), Latv <i>suns</i> , OPruss <i>sunis</i> ‘dog’	
Toch AB <i>ku</i> ‘dog’	Toch A <i>yuk</i> , B <i>yakwe</i> ‘horse’
Arm <i>šun</i> ‘dog’	Arm <i>eš</i> ‘horse’

Forms are taken from (Pokorny 1959, 301-302, 632-633; Mallory & Adams 1997, 168, 273-274). The semantics is perfect, for cross-linguistically words for horse and dog are often the same. Conventional reconstructions are **k'uwõn* and **ek'wo-*. Their combination yields **kH₂wekH₂wo-*. The ‘dog’ forms are modified with an *ōn*-affix, which signifies either ‘small’ or ‘of’. Comp. Lat *equīnus* ‘horsely’, OPruss *aswinan* ‘horse milk’, Lith *ašvienis* ‘stallion’. The anomaly of Arm *š-* in *šun* is not settled, but it repeats itself in *eš*. The puzzling gemination in Gk *ἵπποϛ* can be interpreted as a remnant of the original reduplicative root (**(H)k^wik^wos*). The vocalism and the *spiritus asper* of the Attic form remain obscure, but the new reconstruction **kH₂wekH₂wo-* seems to have a better chance of accounting for these difficulties. It has already been hypothesized that the IE roots for ‘dog’ and ‘horse’ are related, but treating **ek'wo-* as a thematic derivative of **k'uwo-* runs into obvious morphological problems (Mallory & Adams 1997, 273). The present reconstruction is morphologically cogent, but it does suggest that **kH₂wekH₂wo-* originally meant ‘dog’, that it was later extended to ‘horse’ (after its domestication and because horse and dog are beasts of burden), and then the ‘dog’ word was enlarged with a modifier *-ōn*. This is a little complicated but not impossible, since horse could very well monopolize the economy to such an extent that its name would become unmarked. Another intriguing consequence of the new reconstruction is the fact that it goes all the way back to the domestication of the horse (e.g. no later than 2000 years BP and possibly 4500 BP).