

## A complete etymology-based hundred wordlist of Semitic updated: Items 1–34

The paper presents a detailed etymological analysis of the first 34 lexical items on the Swadesh 100-wordlist as attested in most of the living and extinct Semitic languages, aiming at a maximally precise lexical reconstruction of these items for Proto-Semitic as well as intermediate stages (West Semitic, South Semitic, etc.). All the etymologies are meticulously accompanied with evaluations of alternative possibilities of reconstruction, potential external parallels in other Afroasiatic languages, and — occasionally — discussions of a more generally methodological character.

*Keywords:* Semitic languages, lexicostatistics, Swadesh list, etymology, lexical reconstruction.

This study is the author's second attempt at compiling a complete one hundred wordlist ("Swadesh's List") for most Semitic languages, fully representing all the branches, groups and subgroups of this linguistic family and including the etymological background of every item whenever possible. It is another step toward figuring out the taxonomy and building a detailed and comprehensive genetic tree of said family and, further, of the Afrasian (Afroasiatic) macro-family with all its branches on a lexicostatistical basis.

Several similar attempts, including those by the author (Mil. 2000, Mil. 2004, Mil. 2007 and Mil. 2008), have been made since Morris Swadesh introduced his method of glottochronology (Sw. 1952 and Sw. 1955). In this paper, as well as my previous studies in genetic classification, I rely on Sergei Starostin's method of glottochronology and lexicostatistics (Star.) which is a radically improved and further elaborated version of Swadesh's method. One of the senior American linguists told me he had heard from Swadesh that his goal was "to get the ball rolling". I am absolutely sure that in a historical perspective this goal should be regarded as brilliantly achieved in spite of all criticism, partly justified, of Swadesh's method from various points of view.

That said, it is no secret that Swadesh did not care much about regular sound correspondences, the quality of etymologies or the problem of borrowing (being, in these aspects, very close to the mass comparison method authored by J. Greenberg<sup>1</sup>) in his diagnostic lists. This negligence toward the fundamental principles of the comparative method was unfortunately

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Greenberg, an outstanding American linguist who recently passed away at a respectable age (one of the creators of linguistic typology, a pioneer in the area of root-internal phonotactics as well as plenty of others) introduced this method as a way to envisage the preliminary and approximate genetic classification of linguistic families that comprise a huge number of languages, poorly studied in the comparative aspect, with "relatively little carnage" — without establishing sound correspondences and reconstructing protolanguage states. Endowed with a remarkable intuition, Greenberg has advanced far ahead that path, which cannot be said for most of his followers, few as they are, whose handling of the mass comparison method is as distinct from the much more labor-intensive comparative-historical method (which the Moscow school steadfastly holds on to) as the job of a lumberjack is distinct from that of a jeweler — and thus, somewhat discredits the very idea of distant language affinity in the eyes of the skeptics.

inherited by most of the students who have so far applied lexicostatistics to Afrasian (V. Blažek being a conspicuous exception). Even those who have claimed to follow these principles practically never adduce consistent etymological arguments in favor of their cognate scoring decisions<sup>2</sup>. (I regret to say that my own earlier studies, with their scarce and brief etymological remarks and only occasionally reconstructed protoforms, are no exception from this lamentable rule.)

Starostin's method, in my opinion, yields far more coherent results; however, it requires a thorough etymological analysis to distinguish between inherited and borrowed lexemes. His rule concerning the latter is that a loanword, if, of course, reliably qualified as such, (1) when matching the inherited lexeme in a related language, should not be scored as its cognate (or counted as a +), and (2) when not matching the corresponding inherited lexeme in a related language, should not be scored as its non-cognate (or counted as a -), (3) when matching another loanword in a related language, should not be scored as its cognate, and (4) in all the above cases it should be *eliminated* from the scores (counted as 0), therefore equaling the not infrequent case of a lexeme missing in a given language in a given position on the 100-wordlist.<sup>3</sup>

This paper is an attempt to meet these requirements to the extent that the present state of comparative Semitic linguistics allows, and supply the scoring choices, wherever possible,

---

<sup>2</sup> In view of these considerations, I was surprised at the publication in the Proceedings of the Royal Society (B – Biological Sciences) of a study, obviously arranged as a novel discovery and a serious breakthrough in scholarship, by Andrew Kitchen, Christopher Ehret, Shiferaw Assefa and Connie J. Mulligan, entitled “Bayesian phylogenetic analysis of Semitic languages. Supplementary data identifies an Early Bronze Age origin of Semitic in the Near East” (*Proc. R. Soc. B* published online 29 April 2009). The study refers to a supplement containing a modified version of the Swadesh list that includes 96 words for 25 extant and extinct Semitic languages, compiled by Chr. Ehret and subjected to “Bayesian phylogenetic analysis”. While the choice of the most representative lexemes for each language is also fraught with multiple problems, it is the etymological aspect, the basis of the scoring, that serves as argumentation for this or that etymological/scoring decision and is responsible for the resulting genealogical tree and the chronology of branching for a given linguistic phylum. Without this argumentation, the application of any methods, be it Bayesian-based phylogenetics, or the old Swadesh or Starostin methods or any others, no matter how advanced and sophisticated, remains fruitless: it is calculating nothingness. Being well acquainted with Prof. Ehret's work, I am more than assured that, when (and if) his etymological/scoring argumentation comes to light, there will be an enormous number of debatable – and objectable – issues; I am fully prepared to participate in these debates. Until this has happened, I can regard the sensational study in question only in a Shakespearean light, as “much ado about nothing”. Another detail that struck me was the absence of several of my studies on the subject (SED I, XV–XVI, etc.) from the list of sources referred to. This is more than strange, not only because of the incompleteness of references, but also in view of the fact that some of the non-trivial results, presented in the quoted paper and obtained in my studies, surprisingly coincide in regard to both classification and chronology.

<sup>3</sup> A conclusion to which both of us, Starostin and myself, came independently and, surprisingly, simultaneously (somewhere around 1984) after much hesitation and checking. I was finally convinced by the following: Tigre and Amharic, although undoubtedly belonging to the same (Ethiopian) group of Semitic, yielded incoherent results when compared lexicostatistically with Jibbali or Mehri: Tigre showed a much closer cognation with the latter languages than Amharic. That was simply impossible: a well-known Russian-Jewish joke tells us that the distance from Zhmerinka to Odessa cannot be longer than the distance from Odessa to Zhmerinka. The absurd situation that first seemed a deadblock for the whole method, cleared up only after I had eliminated the loanwords from the Ethiopian lists: 13 or 14 Cushitisms from Amharic (*wušša* ‘dog’, *ṭäṭṭa* ‘drink’, *žoro* ‘ear’, *laba*, *läboba* ‘feather’, *asä* ‘fish’, *ṭägur* ‘hair’, *gulbät* ‘knee’, *awwäkä* ‘to know’, *säga* ‘meat’, *ṭannäs* ‘small’, *dəngay* ‘stone’, *čara* ‘tail’, *zaf* ‘tree’, probably *wəha* ‘water’) and only four Cushitisms (*čägür* ‘feather’, *ṣasa* ‘fish’, *čägür* ‘hair’, *säga* ‘meat’) and one Arabism (*näfär* ‘person’) from Tigre. The lists, now reduced to 86–87 (Amharic) and 95 (Tigre) items, showed quite an even result for Amharic and Tigre, on one hand, and Jibbali and Mehri, on the other. The distance between Odessa and Zhmerinka turned out to be the same from both ends, and the method was – luckily, not posthumously – rehabilitated.

with explicit etymologies based on a clear and complete set of regular sound correspondences, at least in the area of consonantism. Compared with my previous paper dealing with the same 34 first items of the list (Mil. 2007), the present version is updated, corrected in some points, sometimes more reliable etymologies are proposed, and more Afrasian data are drawn to the comparison — not only in those cases when these data have to influence a certain etymological decision, but in others as well<sup>4</sup>.

In my previous papers on glottochronology I have already listed my informants to express my gratitude, and will not repeat that here, but I must reiterate that, for over thirty years, I have been inspired in my work by the prematurely deceased great linguist and my dearest friend Sergei Starostin.

This study was carried out within the frames of several projects: “Featuring early Neolithic man and society in the Near East by the reconstructed common Afrasian lexicon after the Afrasian database” (supported by the Russian Foundation for Sciences), “Semitic Etymological Dictionary” (supported by the Russian Foundation for the Humanities), “Evolution of Human Languages” (supported by the Santa Fe Institute), and “The Tower of Babel” (supported by the Russian Jewish Congress, the Ariel Group and personally Dr. Evgeny Satanovsky). I am highly thankful to all of the supporters. My gratitudes also go to my colleagues and collaborators in different projects — Prof. O. Stolbova (with whom I work on the Afrasian Database within the “Evolution of Human Languages” project, wherefrom I draw most of the data) and Drs. L. Kogan and G. Starostin for consultations and discussions.

The lists below are based on the following main sources (not referred to in the text except for special cases): Akk. — CAD and AHw; Ugr. — DUL and DLU; Hbr. and Bib. — HALOT; Pho. — Tomb.; Pal. — Sok.; Syr. — Brock.; Mnd. — DM; Urm. — Tser. and Sarg.; Qur. — Pen. and BK; Leb., Mlt. — native speakers, Mec. — Sat.; Sab. — SD; Gez. — LGz; Tna. — native speakers and Kane T; Tgr. — a native speaker and LH; Amh. — native speakers, Baet. and Kane A; Arg. — LArg; Gaf. — LGaf; Sod. and Cha. — native speakers and LGur; Har. — a native speaker and LHar; Wol. — LGur; Hrs. — a native speaker and JH; Mhr. — native speakers, JM and Nak.; Jib. — native speakers, JJ and Nak.; Soq. — data collected by Prof. V. Naumkin in Soqotra, LS, JM, JJ and Nak.

### The Data.

The data consist of the first 34 items of the “Swadesh 100-word list” (without any modifications and/or replacement of items that, in my opinion, are unnecessary and only multiply difficulties) of 28 Semitic languages representing all groups within the family. Every item consists of an array of synonyms with different etymological origin, each preceded by an entry number in round brackets. Each entry, in its turn, consists of one or several cognate lexemes divided by a semicolon; the etymological comments including, wherever possible, a reconstructed protoform follow after a double slash. Note that for cases when the choice of only one representative lexeme in a language is too difficult, Starostin’s procedure allows for several synonyms in the same language to be scored; in this case, synonyms from the same language would be present in two or more entries. Within each item there may occur two kinds of cases which are not scored — borrowings and lack of a corresponding term in the available sources; such cases form a separate section within the item, preceded by the symbol  $\diamond$ .

---

<sup>4</sup> The most significant updating is due to my thorough study of the three volumes of EDE: my critical remarks and disagreement with G. Takács on quite a few individual etymologies and certain methodological approaches (to follow) do not prevent me from considering this fundamental and, *in principle*, proper comparative-historical work as one of the most important recent advances in the field of Afrasian linguistics.

The following dates (some of them fairly conventional, some chosen after much hesitation and discussions with specialists in individual languages) have been attributed to individual languages: Akkadian, 1450 B.C.E.; Ugaritic, 1350 B.C.E.; Hebrew, 650 B.C.E.; Phoenician 850 B.C.E.; Biblical Aramaic, 200 B.C.E.; Palestinian Judaic, 200 C.E.; Syrian Aramaic, 200 C.E.; Mandaic, 750 C.E.; Urmian Aramaic 1900; Qur'anic Arabic, 600 C.E.; Lebanese Arabic, 2000; Meccan Arabic, 2000; Maltese Arabic, 2000; Sabaic, 200 B.C.E.; Geʿez, 500 C.E.; Tigrai, 2000; Tigre, 2000; Amharic, 2000; Argobba, 2000; Gafat, 1900; Soddo, 2000; Harari, 2000; Wolane, 2000; Chaha, 2000; Harsusi, 2000; Mehri, 2000; Jibbali, 2000; Soqotri, 1950.

### Abbreviations of languages, language periods and sources:

Afras. — Afrasian (Afroasiatic, Semito-Hamitic); Akk. — Akkadian; Amh. — Amharic; Arb. — Arabic; Arg. — Argobba; Arm. — Aramaic; BD — Book of the Dead; Brb. — Berber; Bib. — Biblical Aramaic; C. — Central; Chad. — Chadic; Clas. — Classical; Cush. — Cushitic; Daṭ — Daṭna Arabic; Dem. — Demotic; Ɖof. — Ɖofar; Dyn. — Dynasty; E. — East; Egyp. — Egyptian; ESA — Epigraphic Sout Arabian; Eth. — Ethiopian; Gaf. — Gafat; Gez. — Geʿez; Gur. — Gurage; Har. — Harari; Ḥḍr — Ḥaḍramaut; HEC — Highland East Cushitic; Hbr. — Hebrew; Hrs. — Harsusi; Jib. — Jibbali (= Shaḥri); Jud. — Judaic Aramaic; LL = lexical lists; Leb. — Lebanese Arabic; LEC — Lowland East Cushitic; Mlt. — Maltese Arabic; Mec. — Meccan Arabic; Med. — Medical Texts; Mhr. — Mehri; MK — Middle Kingdom; Mnd. — Mandaic Aramaic; Mod. — Modern; MSA — Modern South Arabian; N. — North; NK — New Kingdom; OK — Old Kingdom; Omot. — Omotic; P. — Proto; Pal. — Palestinian Aramaic; pB. — postbiblical; Pho. — Phoenician; Pyr. — Pyramid Texts; Qur. — Qur'anic Arabic; S. — South; Sab. — Sabaic; Sel. — Selti; Sem. — Semitic; Sod. — Soddo; Soq. — Soqotri; Syr. — Syrian Aramaic; Tna. — Tigriñña (= Tigray); Tgr. — Tigre; Ugr. — Ugaritic; Urm. — Urmian Neo-Aramaic; W. — West; Wol. — Wolane.

### Transcription and transliteration:

*c* — alveolar voiceless affricate [ts], *ɟ* — alveolar voiced affricate [dz], *č* — palato-alveolar voiceless affricate [tʃ], *ǰ* — palato-alveolar voiced affricate [dʒ], *ɬ* — hissing emphatic voiceless fricative, *ɮ* — emphatic voiceless affricate, *ɮ̣* — conventionally stands for what was likely *ɮ̥*, emphatic voiced interdental, or *ɮ̥*, emphatic voiceless interdental, *č̣* — palato-alveolar emphatic affricate, *ɬ̣* — lateral voiceless fricative, *č̣* — lateral voiceless affricate, *č̣̣* — lateral voiceless emphatic affricate, *ɮ̣̣* — lateral voiced emphatic fricative or affricate, *ɮ̣̣* — lateral voiced fricative, *ḳ* or *q̣* — emphatic velar stop, *ɣ* — uvular voiced fricative (Arabic “ghain”), *ħ* — uvular voiceless fricative, *ħ* — uvular voiceless fricative (only in Egyptian), *ħ* — pharyngeal voiceless fricative, *ħ* — laryngeal voiceless fricative, *ħ̣* — pharyngeal voiced fricative, *ʔ* — glottal stop, *H* — unspecified laryngeal or pharyngeal, *y* — palatal resonant.

### 1 ALL:

- (1) Akk. *kalû*; Ugr. *kl*; Hbr. *kōl*; Pho. *kl*; Bib. *kōl*; Pal. *kwl*, *kol*; Syr. *kul*; Mnd. *kul*; Urm. *kāl*; Qur. *kull-*; Leb. *kāl*; Mec. *kull*; Mlt. *kolla*; Sab. *kll*; Gez. *k<sup>w</sup>allu*; Tna. *k<sup>w</sup>allu*; Tgr. *kallu*; Amh. *hullu*; Gaf. *yalh<sup>w</sup>ä* (<\*yalk<sup>w</sup>-, met.); Sod. *kulləm*; Cha. *ənnəm*; Har. *kullu*; Wol. *hulləm*; Hrs. *kal(l)*; Mhr. *kal*; Jib. *ka(h)l* // < Sem. \**k<sup>w</sup>all-u* (cf. in LGz 281).
- (2) Arg. *muli* // < Sem. \**ml*? ‘to be full’ (v. FULL No. 1).
- (3) Soq. *faḥere* // < Sem. \**paḥr-* ‘totality, gathering’: Mhr. Jib. *fāḥrəh* ‘together’ (JM 110, JJ 67), Akk. *paḥāru* ‘sich versammeln’ (AHw 810), ‘to assemble, congregate, gather, collect’ (CAD p 23), Ugr. *pḥr* ‘assembly, cluster; group, faction, family’ (DUL 669), *pḥyr* ‘whole, totality’

(DUL 670),<sup>5</sup> Pho. *m-phr-t* ‘assembly’, ESA: Qatabanian *ftḥr* (-*t*-stem) ‘to enter into partnership, associate with’ (Ricks Qat. 129).

- **Proto-Semitic**<sup>6</sup> *\*k<sup>w</sup>all-u* (#1) < Afras. *\*k<sup>w</sup>al-* ‘all, each, much’: (?) Brb.: Ahaggar *tu-klā-t* ‘ê. réuni en masse’; Egypt. (Pyr.) *tnw* ‘each’ (<*\*kVlw?*?); W. Chad.: Pero *kālù* ‘to gather’, C. Chad.: Gude *kālā* ‘every’; C. Cush.: Waag *tākāl* ‘all’ (likely <*\*ta-kal*?);<sup>8</sup> S.: Iraqw *kila* ‘very much, completely’, Dahalo *ʔākkale* ‘all’; S. Omot.: Dime *kull* id. (cf. EDE I 136).

## 2 ASHES:

- (1) Akk. *tumru*; Ugr. *ḥmr* (also ‘dust’ // <*\*(tV-)ḥVmr-*?<sup>9</sup>
- (2) Hbr. *ʔēpār*, Amh. *afār* // < Sem. *\*ʔapar-* ‘dust, soil; ashes’ (v. HALOT 80; LGz 10).
- (3) Pho. *ʔry* (Tom. 29) // < Sem.: Hbr. *ʔūr* ‘firelight, fire’ (HALOT 25), Arb. *ʔry* II ‘allumer le feu’ (BK 1 27), *ʔirrat-* ‘feu’ (ibid. 22), *ʔawwara* ‘enflammer’ (ibid. 68), Tgr. *ʔarwa* ‘to flame, to blaze’ (LH 359).
- (4) Pal. *ḫṭm*; Syr. *ḫeṭm-*; Mnd. *giṭm-*; Urm. *ḫiṭm-* // < Sem. (Arm-Arb.) *\*ḫiṭam-*: Arb. *ḫatām-* ‘poussière’ (BK 2 675).
- (5) Qur. *ramād-*; Leb. *rmād*; Mec. *rumād*; Mlt. *armit* // In the absence of direct cognates,<sup>10</sup> one wonders whether it may be a metathesis < Sem. *\*midr-* ‘dust, dirt’: Hbr. pB *mādār* ‘ordure (material used for vessels)’ (Ja. 735); Syr. *medr-* ‘gleba (terrae), terra, lutum, pulvis’ (Brock. 373); Arb. *madar-* ‘boue sèche et tenace, sans sable’ (BK 2 1078), Gez. *madr-* ‘earth, ground, soil, etc.’ (LGz 330), Mhr. *mdêr* ‘Lehmziegel’ (Jahn 210), v. LGz 330.

<sup>5</sup> Surprisingly overlooked in Kog. Ug. 466, wherein Akk. *paḥāru* is referred to as “the only reliable Sem. cognate to the MSA forms.” In this respect, I would like to polemicize with my friend and co-author Leonid Kogan whom I consider one of the (if not the) best today’s Semitists. This is an example of our long-term controversy about what he regards as “unreliable cognates” — in this case, implicitly, the Phoenician and Qatabanian forms that he does not even quote in the main text, but rather in a footnote. My position is that in such cases, one should strictly observe the “presumption of innocence”. What is wrong with the two examples? Or with the fact that both of them represent *hapax legomena*? They do match the Akkadian form (let alone the Ugaritic and Soqotri ones) perfectly, both phonetically and semantically. Does this assertion cause doubts? Or are there doubts in the philological aspect — about their correct reading or interpretation? If there are, they should be explicitly exposed, otherwise they are invalid. Are there doubts as to their authenticity? If so, any suspicions about their having been borrowed and any suggestions about the source of borrowing should be openly discussed. Are there doubts about the qualifications of the author(s) of the corresponding source if he/she quotes the form in question without a question mark or any other sign of *his/her* doubts? Could he/she, for some whimsical reason, have forged the form in question, deliberately adjusting it to match the “reliable cognates”? Or can this affinity be the result of a chance coincidence? Perhaps there is some other *rational* justification that I have overlooked — besides the simple intuitive mistrust of the philologist, which is eventually of the same nature as the mutual mistrust that is often felt between students of “classical” literary ancient languages and those of non-literary modern living languages towards the data of each other. If not — what is the point of this self-restrictive overcautiousness?

<sup>6</sup> By “Proto-Semitic”, which I use in a somewhat conventional opposition to “Common Semitic” (see n. 10) I refer to a term represented in all the main branches of Semitic, according to my genealogical classification based on lexicostatistics: South Sem. (MSA), North Sem. (Akkadian), and West Sem. (all the rest).

<sup>7</sup> Tentatively compared in Vyc. 216 with *tr* ‘number’ (since the 20th Dyn.) with the following comment: “The writing *tnw*: *trw* speak in favor of reading as *\*tlw*”.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. PNAGaw *\*t-aḥar/-aḥar* ‘aunt’, a fem. derivative with prefixed *-t* (App CDA 26).

<sup>9</sup> These two forms, undoubtedly related, are not compared either in AHw 1370 or in DUL 165 where the Ugr. term is viewed as having no definite etymology; direct, if tentative, comparisons (ibid.) with *ḥpr* ‘polvo, tierra’ and other Hbr. and Arb. terms are unacceptable unless viewed as instances of *m : p* root variation, which in this case, however, is hardly possible to prove or disprove (on this phenomenon v. Maizel and SED I pp. LX–LXIII).

<sup>10</sup> Note what can be viewed as a variant root: Arb. *rubd-at-* ‘colour of ash, ashen’; cf. also Hausa *rúbúdí* ‘hot fine ash’ (an Arabism?).

- (6) Gez. *ḥamad*; Tna. *ḥamäk<sup>w</sup>əsti* or *ḥamäd k<sup>w</sup>əsti*;<sup>11</sup> Tgr. *ḥamäd*; Amh. *amäd* (syn.); Arg. *hamäd*; Sod. Cha. *amäd*; Har. *ḥamäd*; Wol. *amäd* // From the semantic point of view, more likely < Sem. \**ḥmd* (in which case *ḥ-* in Gez. must be treated as a purely graphic variant of \**ḥ-*): Arb. *ḥmd* ‘cesser de flamber (se dit du feu, quand la flamme s’éteint, quoqu’il y ait encore des tisons qui brûlent)’ (BK 1 630), Mhr. *ḥamūd* ‘to be extinguished, burnt out’ (JM 443), Jib. *ḥōd* ‘to extinguish; to be extinguished’ (JJ 301); very probably also Hbr. pB. *ḥmd* ‘to produce shrivelling by heat’ (Ja. 475). Somewhat less likely < Sem. \**ḥmd* ‘to be hot’ represented by Arb. *ḥmd* ‘être intense (se dit de la chaleur)’, *ḥamadat-* ‘pétitement du feu qui brûle’ (BK 1 488) and Daṭ. *ḥamad* ‘to be hot, burn’ (quoted in LGz 232 together with Arb. *ḥmd*).<sup>12</sup>
- (7) Tgr. *rämäč* (‘hot ashes’, syn.);<sup>13</sup> Mhr. *ramž*; Jib. *remč* // < Sem. \**ramš-* ‘hot ashes’, \**rmš* ‘to burn’ (v. LGz 470).
- ◇ Hrs. *remēd*, Mhr. *rmid*; Jib. *rīd* and Soq. *rimid* are rather Arabisms than original retentions; no terms for ‘ashes’ found in the available sources for Bib., Sab. and Gaf.
- **Common Semitic 1:**<sup>14</sup> \*(*tV-*)*ṣVmr-* (#1). The only plausible, if isolated, parallel is W. Chad.: S. Bauchi \**m/ḥuruḥ-* ‘ashes’ (cf. EDE III 244), probably < \**muruH-* and consequently < \**murḥ-*: Jum *mūrūḥ*, Mangas *mwürūn* and *ḥūruḥ*, Kir *mwuḥ* and *ḥūrəḥ*.
- Common Semitic 2:** \**ramš-* (#7).
- Common Semitic debatable**<sup>15</sup> (# 2) \**ʔapar-* < Afras. \**far-* ‘dry soil’: Egypt. (Pyr.) *ḫ.t* ‘dust (?)’; W. Chad.: Hausa *fārā*, C. Chad.: Gaanda *fīr-tā*, Boka *fur-tā* ‘ground’, E. Chad.: Mokilko *pùùré* ‘dust’; E. Cush.: LEC: Dasenech *faara* ‘clay’ (ADB)<sup>16</sup>.

### 3 BARK:

- (1) Akk. *ḫuliptu*, *ḫulpu*; Hbr. *ḫalippā*; Syr. *ḫalāpət-*; Urm. *ḫalpa*; Hrs. *ḫelfēt*; Mhr. *ḫalifūt*; Soq. *ḫalifoḥ* // < Sem. \**ḫal(i)p-* (v. in LGz 427).
- (2) Mnd. *masik-* // < Sem. \**malīšk-* ‘skin’ (v. in SED I No. 190).
- (3) Leb. *ʔišri*; Mec. *gišra*; Jib. *ḫašrot* // < Sem. (Arb.-Eth.) \**ḫVšr-*: Gez. *ḫaššara* ‘to peel, scrape, take off scales’, *ḫaššār* ‘fish scales, shell’ (LGz 448).
- (4) Gez. *lāḫš*; Tna. *lāḫši*; Tgr. *lāḫəš*; Amh. *lət*; Arg. *lihinto*; Har. *inči lāḫit* (‘thin bark of tree’); Wol. *lāččačē* // A deverbal noun < Common Eth. \**lḫš* ‘to peel, bark’ (LGz 312), likely < Sem. \**lḫš/hlš* ‘to draw off, peel’: Arb. *lahḫaša* ‘épurer en séparant les parties moins propres; enlever, tirer, extraire la partie la plus pure et la meilleure’ (BK 2 980), Akk. *ḫalāšu* ‘to press, squeeze out; clean by combing’ (CAD *ḫ* 40), Hbr. *ḫālaš* ‘to draw off’, pB. ‘to take off (shoe)’ (HAL 321), (nif.) ‘to be peeled off (skin)’ (Ja. 472), Jud. *ḫalaš* ‘to take off, undress’ (ibid).

<sup>11</sup> *k<sup>w</sup>əsti* is a variant stem of *k<sup>w</sup>äs<sup>w</sup>k<sup>w</sup>äsä* ‘to stir, poke, revive, relight a fire, to shake cinders, ash from a firebrand’ (Kane T 966–7; cf. Bulakh Dis. 119–120).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Kog. Eth. 379 (“None of the two alternative etymological approaches to this Proto-Ethiopian root outlined by Leslau is fully convincing”), where Hbr. pB. *ḥmd* ‘to produce shrivelling by heat’ and Akk. *ḥamadīru* ‘shrivelled or withered’ (CAD *ḫ* 57; the form has an affixed fossilized *-r*, v. Mil RE) are compared not to Arb. *ḥmd* ‘to subside (of fire)’, which is more attractive in view of Akk. *ḫ-*, but to Arb. *ḥmd* and *ḥamadat*, which implies an irregular, though not unattested correspondence: Akk. *ḫ* vs. Arb. *ḥ*.

<sup>13</sup> Borrowed into C. Cush. Aungi *areméč* ‘embers’ (App. CDA 61).

<sup>14</sup> What I conventionally call “Common Semitic” are cognate terms — provided they are definitely “above suspicion” of having been borrowed — represented at least in two of the three branches of Semitic (at least in one language of each branch).

<sup>15</sup> On such cases as Hbr. *ʔēpār*, Amh. *afār*, when a similar meaning evolution from a different meaning of the common proto-form seems quite transparent, see note 18.

<sup>16</sup> The Egypt. word (meaning debatable) is tentatively compared in EDE II 553 with Sem. \**ʔapar-* ~ \**ṣapar-* ‘sand’ (two different roots, comparable as variants) and Mokilko.

473). It is hard to say whether *-ḥ-* in the Gez. root is a graphic variant of *\*ḥ* or reflects Sem. *\*ḥ*; cf. what looks like two variant roots with *ḥ* vs. *ḥ* in Arb., both probably with the underlying meaning ‘bark’: *ḥṣ* ‘av. la paupière de l’œil supérieur très charnue’ (BK 2 980) and *laḥaṣ-* ‘contraction de la paupière supérieure, au point qu’il s’y forme des plis’ (ibid. 974). Cf. Kog. Eth. 377.

- (5) Tna. *ḳ<sup>w</sup>ərbät* (syn.; also ‘skin, rind, peel’) // < Sem. (Arb.-Eth.) *\*ḳ<sup>w</sup>irb-at-*: Arb. *ḳirbat-* ‘grande outre à lait ou à eau faite d’une seule peau cousue au milieu’ (BK 2 704), Gez. *ḳ<sup>w</sup>ərbābit* ‘leather bag’ (LGz 440), Amh. *ḳorbät* ‘skin’.
- (6) Tgr. *ḳārəf* (syn.); Amh. *ḳārfit* (syn.); Sod. *ḳərfit* (syn.); Har. *ḳārfit* (‘hard bark of tree’) // < Sem. (Arb.-Eth.) *\*ḳVrp-*: Arb. *ḳirf-* ‘bark (n.)’, *ḳrf-* ‘to peel’ (v. LGz 441).
- (7) Sod. *kana*, Cha. *ḳara* // only Gur.<sup>17</sup>
- ◇ Mlt. *barka* is a lw., likely < English; no terms in Ugr., Pho., Bib., Pal., Qur., Sab. and Gaf.  
Note: *\*ḳal(i)p-*, *\*ḳVrp-* and *\*ḳ<sup>w</sup>irb-at-* are scored differently as they go back to three different variant roots as early as in Afras. For *\*ḳVrp-* ~ *\*pVrk-* cf. Brb.: E. Tawllemmet *e-fārəy* ‘coquille’; W. Chad. *\*ḳ<sup>w</sup>arip-*: Tsagu *ḳorōpe*, Barawa *ḳworəp*, Wangday *ḳwòrip* ‘bark’; Egyp. (Med.) *pṣḳ-t* ‘shell (of turtle, skull)’ (v. EDE II 403–4); and, perhaps, E. Cush.: Somali *fuuruq* ‘smallpox’ (met. and a meaning shift ‘bark’ > ‘scab’); for *\*ḳ<sup>w</sup>irb-at-*, C. Chad.: Mandara *ḳwàlàbàa* ‘bark’ (possibly < *\*ḳ<sup>w</sup>arab-*), N. Cush.: Beja *ḳurbe* ‘skin’ (<*\*ḳurb-*), Omot.: Male *ḳurubi* ‘bark’, etc. (ADB).
- **Proto-Semitic:** *ḳal(i)p-* (#1) < Afras. *\*ḳalp-*: E. Cush. *\*ḳolf-*: Somali *qolof*, Konso *qolfa* ‘bark’, Oromo *qolofa* ‘foreskin’, Gawwada *qoffol* ‘bark’ (met.).

#### 4 BELLY:

- (1) Akk. *karšu*; Syr. *kars-*; Mnd. *kars-*; Urm. *ki(r)s-*; Tgr. *ḳäršät*; Arg. *ḳärs*, *hars*; Gaf. *ərsä*, Sod. *ḳärs*; Har. *ḳärsi*; Hrs. *kērəš*; Mhr. *kīrəš*; Jib. *sīrəš* // < Sem. *\*kar(i)š-* (SED I No. 151).
- (2) Ugr. *kbd* (?); Gez. *kabd*; Tna. *käbdī*; Tgr. *käbəd* (syn.), Amh. *hod* // < Sem. *\*kabid(-at)-*,<sup>18</sup> v. in LIVER No. 2.
- (3) Hbr. *bāṭän*; Qur. *baṭn-*; Leb. *baṭan*; Mec. *baṭin* // < Sem. *\*baṭn-* (SED I No. 42).
- (4) Bib. *\*məḷē* (pl. suff. *məḷōhī*) // < Sem.: Hbr. *məḷayim* (pl.) ‘entrails’, Arb. *maḷy-* ‘intestins’, etc. (SED I No. 185).<sup>19</sup>
- (5) Wol. *däl*; Cha. *dän* // according to LGur 210, “represents *däl*” with the *l ~ n* variation; if, indeed, < *\*dal* ‘abdomen, belly, stomach, interior’ (including Selti *dälmüt* ‘intestine’) ibid., these forms are related to Amh. (Gondar) *dulät* ‘mets de tripes de chèvre ou de mouton’ and Arb. *dawlat-* ‘jabot, gésier’ (DRS 235) going back to Sem. (Arb.-Eth.) *\*dawl-* ‘stomach, interior’. If, otherwise, the Gur. forms represent *dän*, they should be compared to redupli-

<sup>17</sup> Tentatively compared in LGur 344 to E. Cush. Burji *kán-oo* ‘bark’, which can hardly be a source of borrowing into Gur. One wonders whether Sidamo *ḳonnonna* id. could be such a source, with *ḳ-* rendered as *k-* in Gur.

<sup>18</sup> The treatment of such cases is a serious problem for lexicostatistics: on one hand, it seems obvious that the shift from ‘liver’ to ‘belly’ in Ugr. and Proto-Eth. should be estimated as two independent processes, not reflecting a common *inherited* feature; following this logic, the Ugr. and Eth. forms should be scored as unrelated which, however, would have looked strange. On the other hand, ‘belly’ could have been a secondary meaning of *\*kabid-* as early as in Proto-West Sem., accounting for the later semantic shift in both Ugr. and Proto-Eth. caused by this inherited common feature and allowing to score them as related.

<sup>19</sup> There are isolated parallels worth mentioning: E. Cush.: LEC: Bussa *māyē* ‘liver’, which, according to EDE III 160, may be a borrowing from N. Omot. *\*mayy-*, regularly from *\*mayz-* (corresponding to Egyp. *myz.t* ‘liver’); cf., however, E. Chad.: Gadang *mùyò* ‘liver’ (derived by Jungraithmayr and Ibriszimow from Chad. *\*m-l-d*, at first glance, rather suspicious). Could this stunning resemblance in root structure point to the vestiges of Afras. *\*maḷVy-* ‘entrails, liver’?

cated Gur. *dänäddänä* (LGur 212), Gez. *dandana* ‘to be fat, stout’, Amh. *dänäddänä* id. (LGz 136), probably further related to Akk. *dandann-* ‘tout puissant’ (compared in DRS 280; ‘almighty’ in CAD *d* 87) connected with *danānu* (*daʾānu*) ‘strength, might, force’ (CAD *d* 81) and/or Sem. *\*duhn-*, *\*daha/in-* ‘fat’ (SED I No. 48).

- (6) Hrs. *höfel*; Mhr. *höfel*; Jib. *šofəl* (all syn.) // < Sem. *\*š<sub>x</sub>V(n)pVl-*:<sup>20</sup> Arb. *mišfalat* ‘gésier; esomac’, Tgr. *šənfəlla* ‘one of ruminant’s four stomachs’, etc. (SED I No. 271).
- (7) Soq. *mer* (*mher*) // likely < Sem. *\*marʔ-* ‘fat’ (cf. LGur 418 and FAT No. 9); less likely < Sem. *\*mi/ar(V)r-(at-)* ‘gall, gall-bladder’ (SED I No. 188).
- (8) Soq. *ḥant* (syn.) // with the assimilation of *\*-m-* > *-n-* to the dental *-t* (< *\*t*) in a contact position < Sem. *\*ḥVmṭ-* ‘(lower) belly, uterus, womb’ (SED I No. 122).
- ◇ Mlt. *stonku* is a lw. from a European language (Italian or English?); no term in Ugr., Pho., Pal., Sab.

→ **Proto-Semitic:** *\*kar(i)š-* (#1).

**Common West Semitic** *\*baṭn-* (#3) < Afras. *\*ba/uṭ(Vn)-*: Brb.: Semlal *a-buḍ* ‘navel’, Ntifa *a-buḍ* ‘belly’ (and *i-biniḍ* ‘navel’, met. < *\*biḍin-?*), etc.; W. Chad.: Mupun *a-buḍ*, Angas *ḥwut*, Fyer *ḥúto*, etc. ‘belly, stomach’ (see more details in EDE II 241–2).

**Common West Semitic** (debatable) (#2): *\*kabid-*

## 5 BIG:

- (1) Akk. *rabû*; Ugr. *rb*, *rabbu*; Pho. *rb*; Bib. *rab*; Pal. *rb*; Syr. *rabb-*; Mnd. *rba* // < Sem. *\*rabb-* (DLU 382–3).
- (2) Hbr. *gādōl* // < Sem. *\*gVdVl-* (HAL 177; 179); Egyp. (MK) *ḏḏʔ* ‘fat’ (adj.) if < *\*gdl* (v. EDE I 245) is related, going back to Afras. *\*gVdVl-* ‘big, fat’.
- (3) Bib. *šaggī(?)* (syn.) // Aramaic only; the interpretation as ‘big’ is debatable.
- (4) Qur. *kabīr-*; Leb. *kbeyr*; Mec. *kabiyr*; Mlt. *kbīr* // < Sem.: Akk. *kabāru* ‘to become fat, heavy, thick, strong’ (CAD *k* 4), Syr. *kbr* ‘multus fuit’ (Brock. 316), Sab. *kbr* ‘great; richness, abundance’ (SD 76), etc.
- (5) Gez. *ḥabiy*; Tna. *ḥabiy*; Tgr. *ḥabi* // < Sem. *\*ḥ/γby* ‘to be big, thick’ (LGz 55).
- (6) Amh. *təllək* (< *tə-llək*); Sod. *malāk*; Cha. *nək* // < Eth. *\*lhk* ‘to grow, grow up’ (LGz 309) < Sem., if Lelsau’s interpretation of Soq. *di-leḳ* as ‘which is numerous’ (LS 129) is correct.
- (7) Arg. *lāham*, *nāham* // < Sem. *\*lVhVm-*: Akk. *lim*, nom. *līmu* ‘one thousand’ (CAD *l* 194), Arb. *lahmūm-* ‘grand nombre’ (BK 2 1034); cf. also W. Chad. Hausa *lùmùmù* ‘in quantity’ (Barg. 732), E. Cush. Darasa *lumo* ‘big’ (Huds. 27) < Afras. *\*lV(H)m-* ‘big quantity’?
- (8) Gaf. *əmmuna*; Cha. *əmmiyä* (syn.); Jib. *ʔum*, Soq. *ʔām* (fem.) // likely < Sem. *\*ʔu/imm-* ‘mother’ (v. in LGz 22; cf. also LGur 49–50).<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> On *š<sub>x</sub>* v. SED I XLVIII–CV. The decision to separate this root (*\*š<sub>x</sub>V(n)pVl-*) from *\*špl* ‘to be low’ was taken by the SED authors after a lot of discussion and hesitation; the fact that the two roots are usually represented as one is *not* what I call “mythetymology” (where the blunder usually lies on the surface, due to lack of professionalism in etymological technique, inertia, old stereotypes, overreverence toward one’s scholarly ancestors, or sloth of mind) — this case is really very complicated, with the difference in consonantism being fairly subtle and very likely involving traces of contamination. The fact that this entangled situation keeps triggering fancy ideas is evidenced by the following comparison in EDE I 324 (note 11): “OEG. *\*sḥ* [*\*sfl*] → MEg. *sḥ* “to hate” = Soq. *špl* “to despise” < Sem. *\*špl* “to be low.” One wonders how a word in one language can be equated with a semantically compatible word in another language, whose meaning (“despise”) is, however, openly recognized to be secondary and derived from quite a different meaning (“be low”, which is quite tenable)?

<sup>21</sup> For the semantic shift, cf. ‘big’ < ‘father’ below (#10). This case is similar to the one discussed in n. 18: it is hard to decide whether the shifts ‘mother’ > ‘big’ (in MSA, for nouns in the fem. gender and/or objects associated with the feminine as opposed to the ‘father’ > ‘big’ shift for nouns in the masc. gender and/or objects associated



- (9) Sod. *gəddər* (syn.); Har. *g(i)dīr*, Wol. *gädärä* // in Wol. and Zway *gädärä* is ‘to grow up (child), be big’ compared in LGur 264 (with hesitation, but quite reasonably) to Amh. (*tä*)*gäddärä* ‘to germinate’ (“that is, grow” *ibid.*), further related to Arb. *ždr* ‘s’élever au-dessus du sol (se dit des plantes); se former (se dit des certain fruits)’ (BK 1 263) < Eth.-Arb. \**gdr* ‘to grow, grow big’.<sup>22</sup>
- (10) Hrs. *šoḥ*; Mhr. *šoḥ* (also ‘old’) // < Sem. \**šyh-* ‘to grow big or old’: Akk. *šāḥu* (*šīāḥum*) ‘to grow (in size or age)’ (CAD š1 106), *šīḥu* ‘tall, high, stately’ (*ibid.* š2 418), Arb. *šayḥ-* ‘vieillard; ancien, cheikh; maître’ (BK 2 1296).
- (11) Hrs *nyōb*, Mhr. *nōb* (fem.) // < Sem.: Arb. *nāb-*, pl. *ʔanyāb-* ‘chief of a tribe’, *nawb-* ‘power’ < Afras.: Egyp. (OK) *nb* ‘lord, master’ (< \**nVb*, cf. Vyc. 138–9); E. Cush.: Afar *nabba* ‘big’ (see EDE I 107).
- (12) Jib. *ʔeb* (syn.); Soq. *ʔeb*, *heb* (syn. 1) // likely < Sem. \**ʔab-* ‘father’ (v. in DLU 2; LGz 2).
- (13) Soq. *ʔəkar* (syn. 2) // < *ʔəkar* ‘grandir’ (LS 325) < Sem. (Arb.-MSA): Jib. *ʔəkar* ‘to grow up’ (JJ 11), Arb. *ʔkr* ‘ê. grand, haut, d’une belle croissance (se dit des plantes)’ (BK 2 315).
- ◇ Urm. *gūr* < Kurdish *gaur*, *gūr*.
- **Common North and West Semitic:** \**rabb-* (#1); cf. S. Omot.: Ongota *arba* ‘big’.  
**Common Semitic** debatable (#8): \**ʔu/imm-* ‘big’, i.e. ‘mother’ < Afras. \**ʔVma* ‘mother’ represented in Sem., Chad. and Cush. (ADB).

## 6 BIRD:

- (1) Akk. *iššuru*;<sup>23</sup> Ugr. *ʔšr*, *ʔuššūru* (Huehn.) // < Sem. (Akk.-Ugr.) \**ʔVššūr-*.
- (2) Hbr. *šippōr*; Pho. *spr*; Bib. *šippar*; Pal. *šypr*; Syr. *šəppər-*; Mnd. *šipr-*; Urm. *šipr-*, Mlt. (*gh*)*asfūr* (< Arb. *ʔasfūr-*, with a secondary *ʔ-* perhaps influenced by Sem. \**ʔVššūr-*, or even a remnant of a composite form) // < Sem. \**šVp(p)Vr-*.
- (3) Syr. (syn. 1), Urm. (syn.) *ʔayr-*; Qur. *ʔayr-*; Leb. *ʔayr*; Mec. *ʔayr* // < Sem. \**ʔayr-* (SED II No. 235).
- (4) Syr. *pārah-t-* (syn. 2) // < Sem. \**parḥ-* ‘chick, brood’ (SED II No. 179).
- (5) Gez. *ʔof*; Tna. *ʔuf*; Tgr. *ʔuf*; Amh. *wof*; Arg. *of*, *wof*; Gaf. *yaf<sup>w</sup>ä*; Sod. *wof*, *of*; Cha. *af<sup>w</sup>*; Har. *ūf*; Wol. *ūf<sup>w</sup>* // < Sem. *ʔawp-* ‘bird’ (SED II No. 48), related to \**ʔwp* ‘to fly’, both < Afras. \**ʔa(w)p-* ‘bird; flying’: Egyp. (late) *ʔpy* ‘to fly’; S. Omot.: Ari *ʔafti*, *apti*, Dime *iftu*, Hamer *ap/fti* ‘bird’ (a generic term) < \**ʔap-t-i* < \**ʔap-* (ADB).<sup>24</sup>

with the masculine) took place independently in S. Eth. and MSA or the “potential” for this shift had already been there in the corresponding terms in Proto-Sem. — and the mentality of its speakers.

<sup>22</sup> Presumably, with fossilized suffixed \**-r* < Sem \**gal/idd-*: Arb. *židd-* ‘beaucoup, extrêmement’ (*ibid.* 260), Sab. *gdd* ‘great’ (SD 49), Tgr. *gäddä* ‘to be bigger, surpass’ (LH 602; unless an Arabism) < Afras. \**gVd(d)-*: Brb. C. Morocco *gudy* ‘ê. nombreux, beaucoup, abonder’, *sgudy* ‘produire beaucoup, en grande quantité’ (DRB 737–8 without specifying the language; cf. Ahaggar *egdeh*, Ayr *egdu* ‘suffire’ *ibid.* 727), W. Chad. Bolewa *godo* ‘many’ (Kr. I 87), N. Cush. Beja *gwud* ‘many’, E. Cush. Arbore *guudä* ‘many’, Dasenech *guddu* ‘big’ (Bla. Om. No. 5.2), Oromo *guddaa* ‘big; greatly, very’ (Gr. 184), S. Omot. Dime *geed* ‘big’ (Bnd Om. 205), Ongota *gadaḥ/hune*, *gaddahino* (Fl. Ong. 42), *gaddaḥuni*, pl. *giddeḥeta* ‘big, old’ (S-T 117). V. in Mil. RE.

<sup>23</sup> Certainly not < \**ʔišpur-*, proposed by some Semitists and uncritically repeated by others — a typical example of what can be described by the oxymoron “scholarly folk etymology”, by me called “mythetymology”. See SED II LIV–LV for more details on this.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. also EDE I 67, where the S. Omot. forms are compared with Egyp. *ʔpd* ‘bird’, implying an irregular — and non-existent — sound correspondence Egyp. *d* ~ Omot. *t* (the note on the Omot. forms “*assim.* < \**ʔVpd-*” is of no help, since no such process is attested in S. Omot. — otherwise it should have been demonstrated). Such forced “disposable” correspondences, “valid” only for one example (they occur in hundreds in Semitic and in thousands in Afrasian studies), are an insult to the comparative method — especially when they are proposed by one of the very few really professional adherents of this method in Afrasian linguistics.

- (6) Tgr. *särerät* // < Sem. \*šrr ‘to fly, jump’ (LGz 514).
- (7) Hrs. *ʔakāb*; Mhr. *ʔakabit* (the other term for ‘bird’, *teyrīt*, must be an Arabism); Jib. *ʔešyet* // < Sem. (Arb.-MSA, less likely, an Arabism in MSA because of difference in meaning): Arb. *ʔakāb*- ‘eagle’ (BK 2 310).
- (8) Soq. *noyhir* (another term, *ʔəsfəroh*, is more likely an Arabism) // < Sem. \*nVšr- ‘eagle, vulture’ (SED II No. 166).
- ◇ No term in Sab.
- **Common Semitic:** \*ʔVššūr- (#1), met. < Afras. \*čirāf-: S. Cush. Iraqw *čirfi*, Alagwa *ciraŋa*, Burunge *čiraŋa*, Asa *širaʔa* ‘bird’; E. Cush. Saho *čarāf*, *čarrāf* ‘Madenhacker, buphaga erythrorchynchus’, etc. (v. in SED II No. 43).
- Common West Semitic 1:** \*šVp(p)Vr- (#2) < Afras. \*čilapur-: W. Chad. Mburku *čápür*, C. Chad. Bura *cəvuř*, Margi *cəvuř* ‘guinea fowl’, Kilba *civir*, Hildi *civirəw*, Wamdiu *civür*, Mofu *cəvār* id. (v. in SED II No. 212).
- Common West Semitic 2:** \*təyr- (#3).<sup>25</sup>

#### 7 BITE:

- (1) Akk. *našaku*; Ugr. *nṯk*; Hbr. *nšk*; Gez. *nsk*; Hrs. *neṯōk*; Mhr. *nəṯk* // < Sem. \*nṯk (v. in LGz 402).
- (2) Pal. Syr. Mnd. *nkt*; Tna. *nākäsä*; Tgr. *nākša*; Amh. Arg. Gaf. *nākkäsä*; Sod. *nākkäsäm*; Cha. *nākkäsäm*; Har. *nākäsä*; Wol. *nākäsä* // < Sem. \*nkt (cf. LGz 402).<sup>26</sup>
- (3) Urm. *krṯ* // < Sem. \*kʷrṯ ‘to cut, pinch’: Arb. *krṯ* ‘to cut in pieces’, Tna. *kʷärtätä* ‘to pinch, break off leaves’, etc. (v. in LGz 444), further related with a fossilized -m suffix to Arb. *krṯm* ‘couper’, Gez. *kaṯama* ‘to munch, chew food that is hard’, Soq. *kaṯem* ‘to chew’, etc. (LGz 445). Formally is also compatible with Arb. *krz* ‘couper’ (BK 2 716).
- (4) Qur. Leb. Mec. *ʔdḍ* // < Sem. \*ʔšš: Arb. *ʔdḍ* ‘mordre; ê. rusé, astucieux’, *ʔidd* ‘méchant, qui mord; homme d’un mauvais caractère’ (BK 2 276), Gez. *ʔadḍa* ‘to deprive, cause harm, affront, do wrong’ (LGz 58), Soq. *ʔéd(ḍ)* ‘traître durement’ (LS 323). There are isolated Afras. parallels: W. Chad. Hausa *gàcā* (possibly < \*ʔač-), N. Omot. Dizi *wâç*. Probably related is HEC \*Hi(n)ç- ‘to chew’: Darasa *iñç-*, Hadiya *içç-*, Kambatta *iṯ-*, Sidamo *hinç-* (Huds. 413).<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> The only Afras. parallel found so far is in N. Omot.: Manjo *ṯōro* ‘vulture’ (H. Fleming. Kefa (Gonga) Languages, *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, Mon. No. 5).

<sup>26</sup> After some hesitation, scored differently from \*nṯk. I suggest two main criteria to allow variant roots, or root variants, to be scored as different lexemes in a lexicostatistical study (in a “normal” etymological entry it suffices to just describe the controversy without taking any dramatic decisions): (1) if the variant roots in question occur in the same language; (2) different sets of cognates in related languages (for which their origin should be traced to the deepest chronological/taxonomic level possible). It is according to these criteria that the difficult decision on the \*nṯk/ \*nkt case was made (counter to Kog. Eth. 373 averting: “the metathetic variation, well attested for this root within and outside Ethiopian, is intriguing, but can hardly be regarded as an obstacle for postulating an eventual etymological identity of both variants”). According to criterion (1), there are two cases where both roots co-exist in the same language, one being Gez. *nasaka* ‘to bite’, *ma-nsak* ‘jaw, teeth’ (ibid.) and *nakasa* ‘to bite’, marked in LGz 398 as an Amharism, but having a few derived forms including *ma-nkas* ‘jaw, jawbone’; the other, semantically less reliable, Syr. *nakat* ‘momordit; offendit iram’ (Brock. 430) and *natak* ‘damno affectit’ (ibid. 452). Application of criterion (2) is not so simple, since, while \*nkt has quite reliable matches in non-Semitic Afrasian, the parallels to \*nṯk unearthed so far are much less convincing.

<sup>27</sup> Quite likely, derivable from Afras. \*ʔač(ʔač)- ‘facial bone, lower cheekbone’ (see 10 BONE #3); the idea (in EDE II 574) that Arb. *ʔdḍ* ‘to bite’ is related to Gez. *ʔaḍe* ‘vermin, worm, moth, caterpillar’, Tna *ʔaṣe* ‘larva’ (sustained by a similar connection between Aram. *tōlēšā* ‘worm’ vs. *matallešōt* (pl.) ‘teeth’, but what is meant is perhaps Hbr. ‘jaw-bones’, v. SED I No. 177) implies some sort of association between ‘worm, larva’ and ‘tooth’ and, to me, looks funny in view of the fairly deep knowledge of animal anatomy by the ancient Semites, clearly reflected in their anatomic lexicon (SED I).

- (5) Mlt. *gidem* // Either < \**gdm* ‘to cut’ (v. in LGz 182) or < \**kdm* (g- < \*k- by assimilation with \*-d) < Arb *kdm* ‘mordre’ (BK 2 875); I could find no other parallels in Sem.
- (6) Jib. *ĉaṣar* // Perhaps metathetically related to Arb. *ṣird-* ‘nuée de sauterelles’ [BK 2 220] (and *ṣrd* ‘crever pour avoir mangé trop d’herbe (se dit des moutons)’) and Tgr. *ṣarṣat*, *ṣarṣätit* (also *ṣarṣetet*) ‘termites’ [LH 463], going back to Sem. \**ṣrṣ-* ~ \**ṣṣr* ‘to devour’.<sup>28</sup>
- (7) Soq. *ḳārdeb* // Related to Arb. *ḳrḏb* ‘couper, consumer tout, manger’ (BK 2 714).  
 ◇ No terms in Pho., Bib. and Sab.  
 → **Proto-Semitic:** \**ntk* (#1) < Afras. \*(*nV-*)*čV*k-: C. Chad.: Mofu -*čáčak-* ‘goûter’, Mada *áččaka* ‘goûter’, etc.; (?) Egyp. NK *ḥsk* ‘essen von etw.’ (EG III 169; if < \**ḥ-čk* with a hypothetical verbal prefix \**ḥ-*).
- Proto-West Semitic:** \**nkṭ* (#2) < Afras. \*(*nV-*)*kuč-* or \*(*nV-*)*k<sup>w</sup>Vč-* ‘tooth, biting’ (or ‘a biting tooth’): Egyp. (MK) *ṭs* (< \**kVs*) ‘tooth’; Brb.: Ntifa *uks*, Zenaga *ukši* ‘tooth’, Ahaggar *akš* ‘manger, mordre’; C. Chad. Malgwa *kúča* ‘to bite off’;<sup>29</sup> N. Cush.: Beja *kōs* ‘tooth, horn’, E. Cush.: HEC: Sidamo *kis-* ‘to bite’, S. Cush.: Qwadza *koʔos-iko* ‘molar tooth’.<sup>30</sup> (ADB; cf. also EDE I 239).

## 8 BLACK:

- (1) Akk. *šalmu*; Sab. *zlm* (SD 172; debatable, v. discussion in Bulakh Dis.); Gez. *šallim*; Tna. *šällim*; Tgr. *šällim*; Gaf. *šälläma*; Harari *ṭäy*; Wol. *ṭem* // < Sem. \**zlm* ‘to be black’ (v. in LGz 556; Bulakh 2003 5–6 and Bulakh Dis.).
- (2) Hbr. *šāḥōr* // < Sem. \**šḥr* ‘to be black’ (HAL 1465, 1466, 1457; Bulakh 2003 13–14).
- (3) Pal. *ʔwkm*, *ʔkw̄m*; Syr. *ʔukkām-*; Mnd. *ḡkum-*; Urm. *kūm* // < Sem. (compared in Bulakh Dis.): Akk. *akāmu* ‘cloud of dust, mist’ (CAD a1 259), Hbr. pB. *ʔkm* ‘to be sun-burnt, black, dark-colored’ (Ja. 64) < Afras. \**kVm-*: Egyp. (Pyr.) *km* ‘black’; E. Cush.: Dullay: Gawwada *kummay*, Harso *kúmma*, Tsamay *guma* ‘black’, etc., Yaaku *kumpu?* id.<sup>31</sup>
- (4) Syr. *ḳānā?* (syn.) // Akk. (from OB) *uḳnū* ‘Lapislazuli, Lasurstein, Türkis; (grün)-blau; künstliche Lapislazuli, blaue Glasur’ (AHw. 1426f.), Ugaritic *iḳnu* 1 “gem of lapis lazuli”; 2 “violet blue”; 3 “violet purple or violet textile” (DUL 93), (?) Pho. *ʔḳn?* (lapis lazuli/purple; Phoenician blue/purple?) (HJ 100), Arb. *ḳunuww-* ‘couleur noir’, *ḳān-in* ‘très-rouge’ (BK II 826), *ḳanaʔa* ‘être rouge, être teint en rouge (se dit de la barbe teinte en rouge, des doigts teints en rouge ou rougis du suc des mûres’, *taḳniṭ?* ‘teindre en rouge foncé (les doigts, la barbe); teindre en noir (la barbe)’, *ʔaḳnaʔ-* ‘rouge’ (там же, 818). Cf. AA \**ḳVn-* ‘to (be) white, yellow’ (ADB).

<sup>28</sup> A tentative parallel suggested in Kog. Ug. note 51 is Gez. *šaṣara* ‘to cause pain, torment, vex, etc.’, with cognates in other Ethiopian; this seems erroneous not only because of Gez. *ṣ* instead of the expected *d* — that might be accounted for by the scribe confounding the two graphemes which happens in Geez texts — but mainly because of reliable Aramaic matches with *ṣ* instead of the expected *ṣ̣*, corresponding to Jib. *ĉ* (the voiceless emphatic lateral affricate pronounced by several of my Jibbali-speaking informants; rendered by Johnstone as *ẓ*; anyway, < \*Sem. \**ṣ̣*), quoted in LGz 544; all of these forms are probably related to the Common Sem. verb \**ṣṣr* ~ \**ṣṣr* ‘to be small’ with a meaning shift ‘to be small’ > ‘to be despised, neglected, treated badly’ > ‘to torment, vex, etc.’ (cf. HALOT 1043).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. also W. Chad.: Paʔa *kačī* ‘to insult’; probably also related are W. Chad.: Buli *ngàs-*, Zaar *ngas*, C. Chad. Daba *ḡač*, etc. ‘to bite’ (CLR II 24–5), which, according to Stolb. 2005 No. 445, may go back to \**nkač-*, with voicing of the velar consonant.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. also the enigmatic Bilin (C. Cush.) form *nākāt-*, the main term for ‘bite’ (besides Qemant *nākās*, a regular-looking Ethiopism), with *-t* instead of *-s*, expected both in an Ethiopic loan and in an inherited term < \**nkč* (cf. App. CDA 33).

<sup>31</sup> Likely also C. Chad. Buduma *kaimē* ‘Schatten (eines Menschen)’ (LBud. 108) and, perhaps, C. Cush. Aungi *kem* ‘farsi sera’, Qwara *kūm* ‘giungere a sera’, N. Omot. Kullo *kamma* ‘notte’ (CR Aw 164).

- (5) Qur. *ʔaswad-*; Leb. *ʔaswəd*; Mec. *ʔaswad*; Mlt. *ʔiswet* // Obviously comparable with Mhr. *sátwəd* ‘to be disgraced, blackened’ (JM 353), Jib. *essōd* ‘to blacken, curse’, *estēd* ‘to turn black, be disgraced’ (JJ 232); however, lack of a direct meaning ‘black as color’ everywhere outside Arb. makes one suspect these forms to be metaphoric loans from Arb. (cf. *swd* III ‘parler bas à l’oreille de quelqu’un’ and the expression *sawwada llāhu wažhahu* ‘qui Dieu rende son visage noir!’ pour dire, ‘que Dieu le damne!’ BK 1 1161<sup>32</sup>). Cf. discussion in HALOT 1417 and especially 1418 (in connection with Arb. *ʔaswad-*) about such demon names as Akk. *šēdu*, Hbr. *\*šēd* etc., including Mnd. *šdum* (with *-m* suffixed?) ‘a spirit of the darkness, one of those ruling the underworld’. Cf., finally, Akk. *sēdu(m)*, attested in a lexical list and tentatively translated in AHw. 1034 as ‘rot’ (CAD *s* 206 gives no meaning). Outside Sem. there is a possible parallel in Chad. *\*sVdH-*: C. Chad. Lame-Peve Mesme *soḍ* ‘dirt’, Zime-Batna *suḍo*, Masa *súdo* ‘faeces’ (CLR II 129), E. Chad. Kera *sòḍi* ‘Dreckigkeit’ (Eb. 108), Mokilko *sùḍo* ‘earth (soil)’ (CLR II 117).
- (6) Amh. *ṭəkʷər*; Arg. Sod. Cha. *ṭəkur*;<sup>33</sup> Gaf. *ṭəkürä* (syn.) // Eth. *\*ṭkr* ‘to be black’, *\*ṭakar* ‘soot’ (LGz 596). The only Sem. parallel, problematic both phonetically and semantically, that can be tentatively suggested is the metathetic Sem. *\*ṭutr-* ‘smoke, incense’ (see LGz 452 and ADB).
- (7) Hrs. *héwer*; Mhr. *hōwər* (*hər*); Jib. *hór*; Soq. *hohar, haur* // < Sem. *\*hwr* ‘to be black and white’: Hbr. *ḥwr* ‘to grow pale’, Syr. *ḥewwār-*, Mnd. *hiwar-* ‘white’, Arb. *ḥwr-* ‘ê. d’un noir et d’un blanc bien prononcé’ (BK 1 509) (cf. Bulakh 2004 273–4).<sup>34</sup>
- ◇ No terms in Ugr., Pho. and Bib.
- **Common North and West Semitic:** *\*ṭlm* (#1) < Afras. *\*čilam-* ‘to be dark, black’: W. Chad.: Karekare *čàlúm* ‘shade, shadow’, C. Chad.: Bura *cilim* ‘black soil used as a dye-stuff’, Buduma *čilim* ‘dark’, Makari *silim* ‘black’, etc. (claimed by some Chadacists to be a Kanuri loan, which is out of the question in the light of Afras. data), E. Chad.: Mawa *čilim* ‘black, dark’; S. Cush.: Qwadza *calam-* ‘green’; S. Omot.: Ari *čelmi* ‘to be dark’ (ADB).

## 9 BLOOD:

- (1) Akk. *dāmu*; Ugr. *dm*; Hbr. *dām*; Pho. *dm*; Pal. *ʔādam, ʔydm* (< *\*ʔa-dam-*, with *\*ʔa-* prefixed); Syr. *dəm-*; Urm. *dim-*; Qur. *dam-*; Leb. Mec. *damm*; Mlt. *dem*; Sab. *dm*; Gez. Tna. Tgr. Amh. Arg. Sod. Cha. Har. Wol. *dām*; Gaf. *dāmʷä* // < Sem. *\*dam-* (SED I No. 50).
- (2) Mnd. *zma*<sup>35</sup> // < Sem. *\*zam-*: Arb. *zaʔama* ‘presser une plaie de manière que le pus en sorte, le sang se dessèche et forme une croûte’ (BK 1 967), Gez. *zam* ‘blood’ (LGz 638) < Afras. *\*zam(?)*- ‘blood’: W. Chad. Galambu *žāamá* (*ž-* < *\*žy-*), Sha, Kulere *zòm* (cf. Stolb. 1987 190), S. Omot. Ari Hamar *zumʔ-i*, Dime *zum-u* (Bnd Om. 206), cf. SED I No. 296.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>32</sup> M. Bulakh regards the possibility of borrowing into MSA as “undoubtful” (Bulakh Dis.).

<sup>33</sup> The other term for ‘black’, *gāmbāna*, is from HEC, cf. Qabenna *gamballa*, Tembaro *gāmbālla* (LGur 281).

<sup>34</sup> Possibly matching Eyp. (OK) *ḥḥ.ty* ‘Bleicher, Wäscher’ (unless < *\*ḥVI-*), v. EDE I 149.

<sup>35</sup> This word’s identification as a strange phonetic variant of *\*dam-* (also reflected in Mnd. as the less common form *dma*) by practically all the authors is one more Semitic “mythetymology”.

<sup>36</sup> Not to be confounded with another Afras. root, *\*z/žVn-* ‘blood’: Eyp. Pyr. *znf* (presumably *zn-f* ‘his blood’), Brb. Ahaggar *a-hni* (< *\*z/žVni*), Ayr *a-zni*, etc., W. Chad. Hausa *žiní* (< *\*z/žini*); N. Omot. Zaysse *zonn-e* ‘pus’ (Hay Om 265; for the semantic shift, cf. Sem.: Mhr. *dam*, Jib. *dihm* ‘pus’ JM 71 < *\*dam-* ‘blood’, v. #1). The variant roots *\*zam(?)*- and *\*z/žVn-* must have existed as *different* roots (*contra* EDE I 183 and 289) as early as in Proto-Afrasian and must be separated as such (with cross-references, of course), although eventually they appear to be related — one “simple” root and one with fossilized suffixal *\*-b* (this segment is frequently encountered in quite a few anatomic and non-anatomic terms: see Mil. RE): C. Chad.: Bachama *zambe*, Bata *žambe* < *\*zam/nb/p-* ‘blood’; S. Omot.: Hamar *zumbi*, *zōmbi*, Karo *zunpi* ‘animal blood’.

- (3) Hrs. *dōre?*; Mhr. *dōr-ah*; Jib. *dohr*; Soq. *dōr* // Generally regarded as derived from MSA \**dVrr-*: Mehri *dār* ‘to spread out; to spread (gravy, curry, seed)’ (JM 47), Jibbali *derr* ‘to spread out’ (JJ 47) < Sem. \**drr/y/w/?* ‘to scatter, spread (seed), disperse, winnow’<sup>37</sup> (cf. HALOT 280; LGz 644; Mil. Farm.): Akkadian *zarû* ‘to sow seed; broadcast; scatter, sprinkle; winnow’, Hebrew *zry* ‘to scatter, winnow’, Judaic Aramaic *dry*, *dr?* ‘to scatter, strew; winnow’, Arabic *dry/w* ‘vanner, nettoyer (le grain)’ (BK 1 771).

◇ No term in Bib.

→ **Common North and West Semitic:** \**dam-* (#1) < Afras. \**dam-* id. (ADB; EDE I 240).

#### 10 BONE:

- (1) Akk. *ešemtū*; Ugr. *šzm*; Hbr. *ššām*; Pho. *šm*; Qur. *šazm-*; Leb. *šazam*; Mec. *šazum*; Mlt. (*gh*)*adma*; Gez. *šašam*; Tna. *šašmi*; Tgr. *šāčam*; Amh. *ʔaṭant*; Arg. *haṭam*, *aṭant*; Gaf. *ašm<sup>w</sup>ä*; Sod. Cha. Wol. *aṭam*; Har. *āṭ* // < Sem. \**šaṭm(-at)-* (SED I No. 25).
- (2) Bib. *gəram*; Pal. *grm*; Syr. Urm. *garm-*; Mnd. *girm-* // < Sem. \**gVrm-* ‘body; bone’: Hbr. *gārām* ‘bone’, Arb. *širm-*, etc. ‘corps’, Sab. *grm* ‘body (of animal)’ (SED I No. 94).
- (3) Hrs. *ʔāzayz*; Mehri *šažayz*; Jib. *šayčēč* // < Arb.-MSA \**ʔVšā/iš-* (v. SED I No. 24): Soq. *šêḏ* ‘noyau (substance)’<sup>38</sup> (LS 323), Arb. *šudād-*, *šaddād-* ‘le haut du nez’ (BK 2 277), ‘os, cartilage’ (Belot 501) < Afras. \**šač(šač)-* ‘a facial bone’: E. Cush. \**šač-*: Afar *óde*, Konso *aḏa*, Gollango *šado* ‘cheek’, Arbore *ʔačēč* ‘lower jaw’, S. Cush. Iraqw Gorowa Alagwa Burungue *šünča* ‘cheek’ (cf. K-M 309), Maʔa *iʔóšo* ‘cheekbone’.<sup>39</sup>
- (4) Soq. *šēhloh* // The comparison (made with reservations) to Soq. *ḏalh* ‘côté’ in LS 347 (< Sem. \**šil(a)š-* ‘rib, side (of chest)’, v. SED I No. 272) is possible only if the two forms in Soq. are to be treated as variant roots; the comparison with metathetic Sem. \**hVlš-* ‘loin, hip’ with the same root consonants (Hbr. *ḥālāšayim*, Gez. *ḥalš* ‘loin’, etc., v. ibid. No. 118) seems more attractive.<sup>40</sup>

◇ No term in Sab.

→ **Common North and West Semitic:** \**šaṭm(-at)-* (#1). No Afras. parallels that I could find.

#### 11 BREAST:

- (1) Akk. *irtu*; Ugr. *ʔirt* // < Sem. \**ʔir(r)-at-* (rather ‘chest’ than ‘breast’, cf. Tgr. *ʔarra* ‘milt, by-stomach (of cattle)’ SED I No. 9; cf., with metathesis, Sem. \**riʔ-at-* ‘lung’ with Afras. parallels and Afras. \**warVy-* ‘lungs’ ADB).<sup>41</sup>
- (2) Ugr. *td*; Hbr. *šōd*; Pal. *td*; Syr. *taḏ-*; Hrs. *tōdi*; Mhr. *todi*; Jib. *tode?*; Soq. *todi* // < Sem. \**tVdy-* ‘(woman’s) breast’ (SED I No. 280).
- (3) Bib. *ḥādē*; Syr. *ḥady-* (syn.); Mnd. *hady* // < Hbr.-Arb. \**ḥad(V)y-* ‘breast’ (with plausible wider Sem. connections, v. SED I No. 112).

<sup>37</sup> The meaning shift seems uncommon unless we suppose an intermediate stage: ‘to spread out’ > ‘\*to (let) flow’ > ‘to bleed/blood’. Cf. the shift from ‘to flow’ to ‘blood’ in Arb. *drr* IV ‘laisser couler en abondance’, *drrat* ‘abondance (de lait, de la pluie)’ and ‘sang’ (BK 1 681–2). Cf. verbal forms of the same root as ‘blood’ in MSA: Mhr. *dátri* (-*t-* stem) ‘(blood) to flow’ (JM 81), Jib. *edré?* ‘to let an animal blood run over an invalid’ (JJ 47), the latter verb pointing to a magic ritual which may account for the semantic evolution ‘to flow’ > ‘blood’.

<sup>38</sup> For the semantic development cf. Russian *кочмоука* ‘fruit-stone’, literally ‘little bone’.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. EDE I 299, comparing the Cush. forms with Arb., but not MSA, and tentatively with Eyp. *ḥd-wy* ‘Kinnbacken’, comparable only as a variant root, since Eyp. *ḥ* in no way corresponds to Afras. \**š*.

<sup>40</sup> Alternatively cf., with metathesis, Arb. *ḥlš* ‘to be fractured (bone)’ and *ḥašil-* ‘tail’.

<sup>41</sup> The interpretation of Akk. *irtu* as a reflexation of Sem. \**ḥad(a)y-* ‘breast’ proposed by some authors (e. g. Holma) is but another case of “mythetymology” in Semitic linguistics.

- (4) Qur. *šadr-*; Leb. *sidr-*; Mec. *šadr*; Mlt. *sidēr* // No clear cognates outside Arb.<sup>42</sup>
- (5) Gez. *ʔangadʔā* or *ʔangadʔā* // < Sem.: Tna. *ʔangadʔā* (LGz 29), Arb. *naʒd-* ‘mamelle’, Hbr. *nägäd* ‘in front of’ (SED I No. 195)<sup>43</sup> < Afras. *\*nag(w)V(H)d-* ‘breast with neck’ (W. Chad.: Kirfi *ngiðò*, Galambu *ngiryà*, Diri *ṅgwáðù* ‘neck’), perhaps with *\*n-* prefixed < Afras. *\*gaʔid-* ‘upper part of breast with the neck’: Sem.: Arb. *ʒīd-* ‘*cou long et gracieux*’ [BK 1 361]; E. Cush.: LEC: Somali *gaaddo* ‘breast’ (ADB).
- (6) Tna. *ṭub*; Tgr. *ṭab*; Amh. Arg. *ṭut*; Gaf. *ṭūwäwä*; Sod. *ṭabuuyä*; Cha. *ṭu*; Har. *ṭōt*; Wol. *ṭub* // < Arb.-Eth.-MSA *\*ṭVb-* ‘teat’ (SED I No. 277).
- (7) Jib. *gēheʔ* (syn.); Soq. *gehe* (syn. 1) // < Sem. *\*gaw(w)iʔ-* ‘(front part of) body; chest, belly; interior’ (SED I No. 99).
- (8) Soq. *bérak* (syn. 2) // < Sem. *\*barak-* ‘chest, thorax’ (SED I No. 38).  
 ◇ No terms in Pho. and Sab.
- **Common South and West Semitic:** *\*ṭVdy-* (#2); no Afras. parallels.  
**Common Semitic:** *\*ʔir(r)-at-* (#1)<sup>44</sup> < Afras. *\*ʔVr(a)r-* chest and belly’: Brb: E. Tawllemmet *a-hāror* ‘poitrine’; C. Chad.: Padokwo *arwa* ‘chest’, E. Chad.: Jegu *ʔurre* ‘navel’; E. Cush.: LEC: Somali *ūur-*, pl. *ūurár* ‘stomach’, Rendille *ūr*, pl. *urʔár* ‘belly, abdomen’, HEC: Burji *ír-a* ‘stomach’, Yaaku *irêh* ‘belly’; N. Omot.: Mao *ʔaare* ‘breast’.

## 12 BURN (tr.):

- (1) Akk. *šarāpu*; Ugr. *šrp*; Hbr. *šrp* // < Sem. *\*šrp* (HAL 1358).
- (2) Ugr. *ḥrr* (syn.); Gez. *ʔahrara*; Tna. *ḥarārā*, *ʔahrārā*; Tgr. *ḥarārā* // < Sem. *\*ḥrr* (HAL 357, LGz 243).
- (3) Bib. Pal. *yḳd*; Syr. *ʔ-yḳd*; Urm. *ḳwd* (met.) // < Sem. *\*y/wḳd* (HALOT 430).
- (4) Mnd. *ḳla* // < Sem. *\*ḳlw* (v. in LGz 431; cf. also EDE III 645).
- (5) Qur. *ḥrḳ* VIII; Leb. *ḥarraʔ*; Mec. *ḥaraḳ* // No Sem. parallels that I know of. Related to Afras.: Brb. *\*HVrḳ* ‘to burn’: Ghadames *āry*, Ghat *ary*, Rif *ary* ‘brûler’, Ahaggar *aray* ‘ê. enflammé’, etc. (Kossm. 213), Egypt. Pyr. *rḳḥ* (met.; also *rḳḥ* — a variant root with *k* vs. *ḳ*?) ‘Feuer anfachen, verbrennen’ (EG II 457–8).
- (6) Mlt. *ṭabbat* // No straight parallels. To be tentatively compared either to Arb. *ṭbb* ‘exercer la médecine’ (BK 2 51; < Sem. *\*ṭbb* ‘to know, be wise, treat medically’, v. LGz 585) implying the semantic shift ‘to cure’ > ‘to cure by cautery, cauterize’ > ‘to burn’; or to Arb. *ṭūb-* ‘brique cuite’ (BK 2 116; related to or borrowed into Eth., v. LGz 585).<sup>45</sup>
- (7) Sab. *wft*; Gez. *wafaṭa* (syn. 1) // Cf. also derived nouns: Gez. *mafaṭ*, *maft*, *moft* ‘oven, furnace, pit for firing pottery’, Tna. *moft-i* ‘firing of pottery’ (borrowed from Gez.?). Seems to be an Eth.-Sab. root with no parallels in other Sem. (v. LGz 607).<sup>46</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Arb. *šidār-* ‘chemise court, qui ne couvre que la poitrine, le thorax’, *šadriyyat-* ‘veste, gilet; chemisette’ (BK 1 1319) apparently derived from *šadr-* ‘poitrine’ (ibid.) and Jud. *šadār-*, *šarād-* (met.) ‘coarse web (of hemp), rough cloth’ (Ja. 1264; 1299), cautiously compared in LS 346 with Soq. *mišdēreh* ‘tapis, vêtement en poil, sac’. Cf. also Mhr. *šēdar* ‘stem, bow, prow (of a ship)’ (JM 358), *šadēr-* ‘Vorderseite’ (ibid. after Jahn), Jib. *šédér* ‘prow of a boat’ (JJ 235), which are obviously borrowed from Arb. *šadr-* ‘proue (d’un vaisseau)’. Finally, cf. Syr. *šūdār-* ‘crapula, nausée’ (Brock. 622); the sensation caused by crapulence, hangover, or nausea may, in principle, be associated with ‘breast’.

<sup>43</sup> Leslau quotes the Arb. and Hbr. forms yet considers neither of them satisfactory, obviously, for phonetic reasons; I, however, see no problem at all if we assume a prefixal *ʔV-*; as for the Auslaut, cf. Gez. *sanbuʔ*, *sambuʔ* ‘lung’ vs. Akk. *sinib/ptu* ‘part of sheep’s lung’ (SED I No. 235) and similar examples (v. Mil. RE).

<sup>44</sup> One of the few exclusively Akk.-Ugr. isoglosses on the 100-word list, a remarkable fact discussed in Kog. Ug. 464., which, however, in no way implies any particular genetic closeness.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. also Eth. *\*ṭbs* ‘to roast’ ibid. 586, perhaps representing a relict causative with *-s* suffixed from *\*ṭb* ‘to burn’ with the meaning shift ‘to bake/burn bricks’ > ‘to burn’.

<sup>46</sup> The comparison with Egypt. *wbd* ‘brûler’, mentioned in DRS 584 and strangely referred to in EDE I 285 as “not excluded”, is excluded, since Egypt. *b* does not correspond to Sem. *\*p*. There are, however, two other possi-

- (8) Gez. *ʔandada* (syn. 2); Tna. *ʔanäddädä* (syn. 1); Sod. *änäddädä* // Likely metathetically related to Arb. *ndʔ* ‘faire un petit creux dans les cendres chaudes pour y mettre le pain, etc., qu’on veut faire cuire’ (BK 2 1224); cf. also Hbr. *nad* (Is. 17:11) translated by Driver as ‘to burn up’ (quoted in LGz 385; not in HALOT).
- (9) Gez. *ʔawʕaya* (syn. 3) // < Eth. *\*wʕy* ‘to burn, be hot’ (LGz 603: perhaps Arb. *wʕy* ‘to stir up a riot’; semantically vague).
- (10) Tna. *ʔakkašälä* (syn. 2); Amh. *aḳaṭṭälä*; Arg. *aḳkaṭṭäla*; Gaf. *(tä)ḳaṭṭälä* // No parallels that I could find in or outside Sem.<sup>47</sup>
- (11) Cha. *mākärä* // < Gur. *\*mäggarä*, derived with *m-* prefixed from Gur. *\*gírgir balä* ‘to blaze, flicker, burn in a bright and wavy way, burn easily (dry wood)’ (ibid. 310). Related to Sem.: Amh. *gärrärä* ‘spark (fire)’ (ibid.), Akk. *girru* ‘fire’ OB on (CAD g 93). Perhaps to be further compared to Akk. *agurru* ‘kiln-fired brick’, according to Kauf. 33, a term of unknown etymology borrowed into Syr. *ʔgwrʔ*, whence into Arb. (*ʔažur-* ‘brique cuite au feu’ BK 1 13), but, anyway, rather related than not to the present root.<sup>48</sup>
- (12) Har. *mägäda*; Wol. *magäda* // only Eth.; the comparison in LGur. 393–4 with Sem. *\*w/yḳd* is phonetically untenable.
- (13) Mhr. *hə-nḥü*; Jib. *e-nḥé*; Soq. *a-nḥi* // Comparable as forms containing the fossilized prefix *n-* to Gez. *ḥaw* (*haw*) and Tna. *ḥawwi* ‘fire’ (v. FIRE No. 3). Another parallel, semantically questionable, is Arb. *nāwaha* ‘souffler du côté opposé à l’autre (se dit d’un vent)’ (BK 2 1363) with the common underlying meaning ‘to blow up fire’.
- ◇ Hrs. *ḥrōḳ* is very likely a lw. from Arb.; no term in Pho.
- **Common North and West Semitic:** *\*šrp* (#1); no Afras. parallels found.  
**Common West Semitic:** *\*ḥrr*.

### 13 CLAW (NAIL):

- (1) Akk. *šupru*; Hbr. *šippōrān*; Bib. *ṭapar*; Pal. *ṭpr*; Syr. *ṭep-*; Mnd. *ṭupr-*; Urm. *ṭarp-* (met.); Qur. *zufr-*; Leb. *zafir*; Mec. *zafir*; Mlt. *dufrēy*; Gez. *ṣaḥar*; Tna. *ṣaḥri*; Tgr. *ṣaḥar*; Amh. Sod. Cha. Wol. *ṭaḥar*; Arg. *ṣaḥar*; Gaf. *ṣaḥrā*; Har. *ṭifir*; Mhr. *ḍfēr*; Soq. *ṭifer* // < Sem. *\*ṭip(V)r-* (SED I No. 285).
- (2) Hrs. *kef*; Mhr. *kaf* (syn.); Jib. *kéf* (also ‘palm of the hand, paw’) // < Sem. *\*kapp-* ‘palm, flat of hand or foot’ (SED I No. 148).
- ◇ No terms in Ugr., Pho. and Sab.
- **Proto-Semitic:** *\*ṭip(V)r-* (#1) < Afras. *\*ṣipar-* ~ *\*ṣarap-* ‘fingernail’ (not quite reliable):  
C. Cush.: Qwara *ṣarfā*, Khamta *zafēr* ‘finger’ (App. CDA 67)<sup>49</sup>, E. Cush.: HEC: Burgi

bilities: (1) Egyp. (Med.) *wft* ‘durchbohren’ (EG I 307), which fits in well phonetically (Egyp. *-t* reflects Afras. *\*ṭ* in quite a number of cases, cf. EDE I 231–4) and is semantically tenable (for the “isosemantic string (or series or row)” ‘to burn’ → ‘to drill’ see Maizel 206–7), referring to a special technique of drilling (may eventually be akin to possibility #2); (2) Egyp. (NK) *fty* ‘von der Bearbeitung von Metallwaffen’, commented upon in EDE II 593 “The OEg. root, however, might have certainly been *\*fd*” (*d* being the most regular reflex of Afras. *\*ṭ*) and compared with Chad.: C. Chad. *\*vVd-* (< *\*fVd-*: Gisiga (Dogba) *vúḍ* ‘to forge’, Mada *váḍ* ‘to forge’, *ávàḍ* ‘to heat, forge, pierce’, Mafa *viḍ-* ‘to forge, fabricate’, E. Chad.: E. Dangla *páḍé* ‘to hammer the brand iron, to forge hot’ (the Egyp. and Chad. forms are compared in EDE II 593). The resulting N. Afrasian root would be *\*fVṭ-* ~ *\*wVfVṭ-* ‘fabricate, process by heating’, perhaps (if Egyp. *wft* ‘to drill’ belongs here, and considering the meaning ‘pierce’ in Mada *ávàḍ*) ‘and drilling’.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. C. Cush. Khamir *kaṭəls*, Kunfāl *kanṣälš* ‘to burn’, considered an Amharism in App. CDA 39; could it be the other way round, i. e. an Agaw loan in Eth.?

<sup>48</sup> Note, however, a related root in E. Cush. (e. g. Sidamo Hadiya *giir-* ‘to burn’ Huds.) which, in principle, could be a source for the Gurage forms, if they are borrowed. For broad Afras. connections, see EDE III 678–680.

<sup>49</sup> While Bilin *ṣaḥar* and Qwara *ṭeffar* ‘claw’ (App. CDA 45) look like normal Ethiopisms, *z* in Xamtanga and *ṣ* with metathesis in Qwara (“the somewhat anomalous initial *j-* of the Qu. form” App. CDA 67), if these forms are related, rather speak against borrowing from Eth.

*zurup-mata* ‘fingers’ (pl.),<sup>50</sup> S. Cush: Alagwa, Burunge *čarafu* ‘fingernail’ (this metathetic form can hardly be a loan from Amh.).

#### 14 CLOUD:

- (1) Akk. *erpetu*; Ugr. *šrp-t* // < Sem. \**šVrp-*: Hbr. *šrp* ‘to drip’, Arb. *šarf-at-* ‘wind’ (cf. HALOT 887; EDE I 296).
- (2) Bib. *šānān*; Pal. *šānan*; Syr. *šānān-*; Mnd. *anan-*; Urm. (*š*)*nān-* // < Sem.: Arb. *šayn-* ‘nuage qui couvre et assombrit le ciel’ (BK 2 527; *šannat-* and *šānān-* ‘nuage’ ibid. 377 may be borrowed from Syr.)<sup>51</sup>.
- (3) Hbr. *šāb*; Urm. *šayb-* // < Sem. \**šayb-* (HAL 773).
- (4) Qur. *saḥāb-*; Mec. *siḥāb*; Mlt. *šāp* // Apparently < Arb. *šhb* ‘traîner par terre’ (BK 1 1957, cf. *saḥāb-* ‘nuage (surtout quand poussé par le vent il est en mouvement)’ ibid.) < Sem. \**šhb* ‘to drag, pull’ (LGz 492–3; HAL 749; LS 284).
- (5) Leb. *šeym* // < Arb.-Arm.: Arb. *šaym-*, Syr. *šaym-* ‘nebula’ (Brock. 522).
- (6) Gez. *dammanā*; Tna. *dābāna*, *dāmmāna*; Amh. Gaf. *dāmmāna*; Arg. *dammāna*, *dona*; Sod. *dāmmāna*, *dabāna*; Cha. *dabāra*; Har. *dāna*; Wol. *dābāna* // < Eth. \**daman-* (with a variant root \**daban-* in Mod. Eth. accounted for by \*-*m-* dissimilated from -*n-* into -*b-*) < Sem. \**dalim(m)-*: Syr. *dīmātā dā-tallā* ‘nebula tenuis’ (lit. ‘fog of dew’), Arb. *damm-* ‘nuage qui ne donne pas de pluie’, *dimām-* ‘nuage sans eau’ (BK 1 728). The obvious connection with C. Cush. (Bilin *dēmna*, Khamir *dāmēna*, Kemant Qwara *dāmāna*, Aungi *dammīni* ‘cloud’ App. CDA 46) and E. Cush. (LEC: Oromo *dūman-sa*, Bayso *dumbo*, HEC: Burji *dumman-ci*, Darasa *duuman-ca*, Hadiya *duuba* id.) forms would suggest a Cush. borrowing into Eth., if not for the Syr. and Arb. cognates; Ethiopisms in Cush. are hardly likely either (v. the Hadiya form), though certain influence in both directions is possible.<sup>52</sup> I am inclined to regard the Sem. and Cush. forms, with some irrelevant exceptions, perhaps, as continuing Afras. \**dalim(-an)-*, also including W. Chad. Tangale *hadam* ‘rain’, Hausa *dāmunā*, Ngizim *dāmān* ‘rainy season’, Bade *demanu* ‘rain’, *dāmānān* ‘rainy season’ and C. Chad. Logone *dēman* id. (ADB).<sup>53</sup>
- (7) Tgr. *gimāt* // < Eth. \**gim-*: Gez. *gime* ‘fog, cloud, dampness, mist, vapor’, etc. (contra LGz 193, not related to Arb. *šaym-*, Syr. *šaym-*). No reliable Sem. parallels. One wonders whether it could be related to or borrowed from (or to?) Cush.: N. Cush: Beja *gīm*, *gēm*, E. Cush.: HEC: Sidamo *goma* ‘cloud’, *gomi-ččo* ‘fog’, S. Cush.: Dahalo *ngúmine* (also N. Omot.: Wolayta *guma* id., admittedly borrowed from Cush. or Amh.) (ADB).
- (8) Hrs. *šāfor*; Mhr. *šāfur*; Jib. *šāfor* // Perhaps a meaning shift from ‘dust cloud’ (cf. Hrs. *šāfor* ‘cloud, dust wind’ JH 6) < Sem. \**šapar-* ‘dust’ (DLU 85; HALOT 861–2); less likely, meta-thetically related to (or influenced by) Sem. \**šrp* (v. #1). The most tenable comparanda, however, are in ESA: Sab. *špr* ‘sowing (land) before rain’ (SD 13–14) and forms adduced in EDE II 389, under the discussion of possible various parallels to Eyp. (Pyr.) *pšēt* ‘irrigable land’, all of them fitting into Afras. \**šapur-* ‘(rainy) cloud, rain, rain-watered or irrigated

<sup>50</sup> Though the initial consonants in both Qwara/Xamtanga and Burji are irregular and hard to explain, they are hardly unrelated to the present root.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. HALOT 857–8, comparing Hbr. *šānān* ‘clouds’ and the Arm. forms with just one word which is not quite clearly quoted as “Arb. *šanna*, or a primary noun”.

<sup>52</sup> Also N. Omot.: Koyra *dūma* ‘cloud’.

<sup>53</sup> EDE III 603 quotes the Agaw and Koyra examples meaning ‘cloud’, comparing them directly with various Afras. forms meaning ‘darkness’, ‘black’ and ‘night’. While the eventual kinship between the latter forms and the quoted group of terms meaning ‘cloud’ is not to be ruled out (the connection with ‘rain’ seems to me a stronger possibility), it would be methodically more correct to juxtapose the two groups taken separately, instead of mixing some of the terms from one group with the whole set of terms from the other.



area' (the MSA words meaning 'cloud' are unusually overlooked by a generally Argus-eyed Takács): Brb.: Ahaggar *a-fara*, pl. *i-ferw-ân* 'lieu couvert de végétation persistante'; W. Chad.: Dera *àpàre* 'to shed, pour out', C. Chad.: Zime-Dari *pùwōr* 'pluie', E. Chad.: Kera *páarú* 'Regenzeit'; N. Cush.: Beja *afra* 'Wolke'.

- (9) Soq. *ḥeyhor* // < *ḥohar* 'black' (v. BLACK No. 7).  
 (10) Soq. *ḡalīloh* (syn.) // < MSA \**ḡVIVL-*: Mhr. *ḡallēt*, Jib. *ḡízót* 'mist' (JM 136). Compared in LS 310–11 with Arb. *taḡlūl-* 'masse de nuages formée par l'amoncellement des uns sur les autres' (BK 2 336), which, however, may go back to the verb *ḡll* 'tenir lieu d'une autre chose' (ibid. 334), thus having nothing to do with the present term; cf. also Arb. *ḡalal-* 'eau stagnante qui couvre pendant quelque temps la surface du sol et disparaît ensuite' (ibid. 488).  
 ◇ No terms in Pho. and Sab.  
 → **Common Semitic:** \**ḡVrp-* (#1)<sup>54</sup> with isolated parallels in E. Chad.: Jegu *nyúrāpè* 'cloud' (with prefixed *n-*), Mogum (Jegu) *yurupe* 'cloud' (ADB).

### 15 COLD:

- (1) Akk. *kašû*; Mlt. *kiesah* // The two forms, if indeed related, may be traced to the phonetically immaculate Proto-Semitic form \**kVṣah-*.  
 (2) Hbr. *kar*; Pal. *kr̥yr*; Syr. *kar̥ir-*; Mnd. *karir-*; Urm. *qayr*; Gez. *ḡw̥arir*; Tna. *ḡw̥arri*; Tgr. *qarur* // < Sem. \**ḡw̥rr* 'to be cold' (v. in LGz 443; cf. \**ḡurr-* 'freddo (s.)' Fron. 147).  
 (3) Pal. *ṣ<sup>e</sup>nin* (syn.) // < Hbr.-Arm. \**ṣinn-*: Jud. *ṣinnat-* 'cold', Hbr. \**ṣinnā* id. (v. in HALOT 1037; no reliable parallels in other Sem.).  
 (4) Mnd. *karuš-* (syn.) // < Sem. \**ḡrš* 'to be frozen': Syr. *ḡrš* 'refrigeratus est' (Brock. 701), Pho. *ḡrš* 'to become frozen' (Tomb. 294), Arb. *ḡrs* 'ê. très-rigoureux (se dit du froid); geler (se dit de l'eau)' (BK 2 710).  
 (5) Qur. *bārid-*; Leb. *berid*; Mec. *bārid*; Gez. *b̥arud* (syn. 1), Tgr. *b̥arud* (syn. 1); Tna. *bārid* (syn. 1); Amh. *bārid*, *bārrad*; Sod. Wol. *b̥ard*; Har. *bārad* // < Sem. \**barad-* 'hail; cold', \**brd* 'to be cold' (LGz 103).<sup>55</sup>  
 (6) Tna. *z̥ahul* (syn. 2) // < Eth.: Gez. *z̥ahla* 'to cool down' (LGz 634), Wol. *zul*, Selti *zūl* 'wind with cold'. No parallels outside Eth.<sup>56</sup>  
 (7) Amh. *ḡāzḡazza* (syn.); Arg. *ḡāzḡazza* // < Eth.: Gez. *ḡzz* 'to cool (off)', etc. (v. in LGz 457) with parallels in C. Cush. (Khamta *qazqaz-äw*, Aungi *kezqazz-* considered loans from Amh. in App. CDA 46–47), N. Omot. (Dizi *ḡež-* 'wet, cold' Bnd Om. 220) and S. Omot. (Ari *ḡāž-i*, Dime *ḡež-in*, Hamar *ḡāž-* 'cold' Bnd Om. 47) — loans of Amh. *ḡaz-*, according to Bnd Om. 207. Cf. also W. Chad. Gwandara *ākūšūka*, E. Chad. Ubi *keckeci*, Munjile *kōšūk* 'cold', Mubi *kūsūk* 'cold wind' (ADB).  
 (8) Hrs. *ḡebūr*, Mhr. *ḡabūr*; Jib. *ḡōr*; Soq. *ḡebhor* // < MSA \**ḡVbūr*; the only parallels I can suggest is metathetic Arb. *bāriḡ-* 'hot wind' and Chad.: W.: Kirfi *būrā* 'harmattan', C.: Mbara *bārāwáy*, Munjuk *ḡaray* 'tornado', Musgu *berber* 'cold (of wind)' (sic!), E.: Bidiya *ḡabar* 'to blow (wind)', Kwang *ká-bār* 'wind'. If all these forms are related, Afras. \**ḡVbūr-* ~ \**bāriḡ-* '(cold or hot) wind' can be reconstructed.  
 (9) Hrs. *ḡašm* (syn.); Mhr. *ḡāšam* (syn. 1); Jib. *ḡešm* (syn. 1) // < MSA \**ḡašm-*. No straight parallels in Sem. For possible Afras. matches cf. C. Cush.: Bilin *ḡāšḡaš*, Khamir *ḡāšāš* 'cool',<sup>57</sup>

<sup>54</sup> This case is very similar to 11 BREAST #1, representing an exclusive Akk.-Ugr. isogloss (with some — if little — evidence from other Sem.); see note 44.

<sup>55</sup> EDE II 269 quotes a certain EEWC (I was unable to find this reference in any list of abbreviations in all three volumes of EDE) wherein this Sem. root is compared with Egyp. (NK) *brd* 'to be stark, stiff'; this is quite tenable.

<sup>56</sup> Leslau's suggestion (in LGur 707) "probably from Cushitic: Darasa *didallo* 'wind'" does not look tenable.

<sup>57</sup> According to App. CDA 47, Bilin *ḡāšḡaš*, Khamta *qazqaz-äw*, Khamir *ḡāšāš*, Aungi *kezqazz-* "are all clearly cognate though the variation in the sibilants especially prevents reduction to a common proto-form. The root oc-

E. Cush. Oromo *qaçaç-* ‘to drizzle for many hours’, S. Cush. Alagwa *qanca* ‘rainy season’ (Ehr PCR No. 147) and N. Omot. Dizi *keč-*, Sheko *keṭns* (Bnd Om 207), Janjero *koçu* (ibid. 161) ‘cold’, supposedly < Afras. *\*kVç/s-* (then *-m* in the MSA forms is to be regarded as a fossilized prefix).

(10) Mhr. *çabil*; Jib. *çall* (both syn. 2) // No parallels found.

(11) Soq. *šekak* (syn.) // Obviously to be connected with Har. *şikāk* ‘a cold’ (compared in LHar 146) with no other visible parallels in Sem.; cf., however, Brb. Siwa *šqi* ‘froid’ (Lao. 242) < Afras. *\*sVk(Vk)-?*

◇ No terms in Ugr., Bib., Pho., Sab. Cha. *ziza* (only in Gur. LGur 724) is likely a borrowing from Omot., cf. Sheko *záazzə* ‘cold’ (Bnd Om 207), Ari *zá(a)z-* id. (Bnd Ar 147).

→ **Common Semitic** (if the comparison in #1 is valid): *\*kVṣah-*.

**Common West Semitic 1:** *\*k<sup>w</sup>rr* ‘to be cold’ (#2) with parallels in E. Cush, if the latter are not loanwords from Amh.: LEC: Oromo *qorra* ‘intense cold’, HEC: Sidamo *qorre* ‘cold’. Possibly related to Afras. *\*kVr-* ‘dry’: Sem.: Akk. *karūru* ‘drying’, Urmian Arm.: *qayr-* ‘dry’; Brb. *\*k<sup>w</sup>ar-* ‘be dry’; C. Chad.: Mbara *kìwírì* ‘dry season’, E. Chad.: Bidiya *karay* ‘make dry (cereals, land)’; C. Cush.: Khamir *xíra* ‘dry’ (<*\*kír-*), E. Cush.: LEC: Oromo *qōrā* ‘dry’.

**Common West Semitic 2:** *\*barad-* ‘hail; cold’, *\*brd* ‘to be cold’ (#5).

## 16 COME:

(1) Akk. *alāku* // < Sem. *\*hlc* (v. in DLU 165).

(2) Ugr. *myy* (DLU 265; Kog. Ug.); Gez. *mṣ?*; Tna. *māṣ?e*; Tgr. *māṣ?a*; Amh. Arg. *mätta*; Sod. *mätta*; Wol *mätä*; // < Sem. *\*mt?* ‘to reach, arrive’ (v. in LGz 369–70; DLU 311; EDE III 877).

(3) Pho. *?t?*; Bib. *?ty/?*; Pal. Syr. Urm. *?ty*; Mnd. *ata*; Qur. *?ty*; Sab. *?tw*, Gez. *?atawa* // < Sem. *\*?ty/w* (v. in LGz 46–7).

(4) Hbr. *bw?* // < Sem. *\*bw?* (v. in HALOT 108; LGz 114–5; DLU 98).<sup>58</sup>

(5) Qur. *žy?* (syn.); Leb. *?əža* (met.); Mec. *žā?*; Mlt. *aža* (met.) // < *\*gy?*, likely related to Sem. *\*g<sup>w</sup>Vy(?)*: Gez. *g<sup>w</sup>ayya* ‘to run, flee’, Soq. *ge* ‘to flee, hurry’, etc. (in LGz 209 the Arb. verb is not compared; cf. also DRS 107) and its reduplicated variant *\*g<sup>w</sup>Vg<sup>w</sup>V?*: Gez. *g<sup>w</sup>ag<sup>w</sup>ə?a* ‘to hurry, rush, flee’, etc., compared with Arb. *(ta)žəžə?a* ‘to flee’ in LGz 184. Arb. *\*gy?* ‘to come’ has solid Afras. parallels in W. Chad. Kanakuru *gài*, C. Chad. Kilba *gwà-*, Margi *gwa*, Masa *gɔio* ‘to enter’, Glavda *gwiyà* ‘to return’, E. Chad. Kabalai *giyə* ‘to come’ (ADB); E. Cush. Afar *gay-* ‘kommen’ (RAf 853), Oromo *gaya* (Gr. 171), Darasa *ge-* (Huds. 21) ‘to arrive’.

curs in Amh. *käzäkkäzzä*, etc., and there has evidently been some cross interference; only Aungi and Khamta are obviously directly from Amh.” I am somewhat confused about this assertion: if all the above Agaw forms are “clearly cognate”, how come two of them are “directly from Amh.” and the other two are not (and cannot be, judging by their form)?

<sup>58</sup> With numerous Afras. parallels (ADB), some of them adduced in EDE II 81. Proposing Proto-Cush. *\*bah-* ‘to go out’, based on E. Cush. *\*bah-* ‘to go out’, Takács also quotes Agaw *\*ba-t-* ‘to leave’ and further extends the comparison to N. Omot. forms (like Wolamo *bā-*, Yemsa *be?*) and W. and C. Chad. forms (like Miya *bō-*, Margi *ba*). Since all the quoted C. Cush. (Agaw), N. Omot. and Chad. forms do not preserve either *\*h* nor *\*?*, or are expected to preserve some traces of *\*h* (but not *\*?*) which are obviously not there, I marvel at the author’s knowledge inaccessible to me when he asserts: “The common LECu. -NWomt. root (*\*bah-*; I wonder how it is known that the Omot. root is < *\*bah-* with *h?* — AM) is often mistakenly (sic! — AM) equated with Bed. *bāy* “to go”, Agaw *\*fi-* “to go out” [GT]...and Sem. *\*bw?* “to enter”.” [GT] stands for Gábor Takács, and it is hard to understand whether “mistakenly” refers to the author as well (which would be correct in the case of Agaw *\*fi-* that has nothing to do with the Afras. root in *\*b-*), or only to his unnamed opponents. Anyway, except for E. Cush. *\*bah-*, I cannot find any criteria to discern between the two roots, which, I am afraid, seriously endangers my professional reputation.

- (6) Gaf. *sällä* // S. Eth. only (LGur 542).
- (7) Har. *diža* // According to LHar 55 and LGur 315, borrowed, together with other S.-E. Eth. (Wol. *žeže*, Selti *žēže*, Zway *žīžī* ‘to arrive, reach’) from HEC Darasa *dáge*, Sidamo *dayi*. More likely, however, < \**dida*, with \**d* > *ž* (v. LHar 7 and 9; LGur XLIV) < Sem. \**dydy* ‘to arrive, come, walk’ (v. in HALOT 214 and DRS 223).
- (8) Cha. *čänä-m* // Only Gur., according to LGur 174; likely represents \**tan-* (on *č* < \**t* in Gur. v. *ibid.* LXII), comparable with Arb. *tn?* ‘s’arrêter et séjourner dans un endroit’ (BK 1 208).
- (9) Hrs. *nōka*; Mhr. *nūkaš*; Jib. *nikaš*; Soq. *nkš* // < Sem. (Arb.-MSA; the difference in meaning rather rules out Arb. borrowing into MSA): Arb. *nkš* ‘partir, s’en aller, s’éloigner’ (BK 2 1343); unconvincingly compared in LS 267 with Arb. *nkḥ* ‘cohabiter avec une femme’. Cf. a possible, if isolated, parallel in C. Chad. Mofu *-nakwá-* ‘aller, marcher’ etc. (Stolb. 2005 230).
- (10) Jib. *zahám* (syn.) // Likely a meaning shift from ‘to push one’s way in the crowd’, cf. *zahmēt* ‘crowd’, *šā-zéḥam* ‘to jostle in a crowd’, *zahmún* ‘arrival; one who pushes’ (JJ 318) < Sem. (Arb.-MSA; unless an Arabism in MSA): Arb. *zḥm* ‘serrer, reserrer (dans un espace droit)’, *zahm-* ‘foule qui se presse dans un espace étroit’ (BK 1 979).
- (11) Soq. *ʔéraḥ* (syn.) // < Sem. \**ʔurḥ-* ‘way, road’ (v. ROAD No. 1; HALOT 86).  
 → **Proto-West Semitic:** \**ʔty/w* (#3) < Afras. \**ʔa/it-* ‘walk, come and go’: W. Chad.: Bokkos *ʔat* ‘travel’, E. Chad.: Mokilko *ʔétté* ‘to go, leave, come’, Dangla *ḏtε* ‘to arrive’; N. Cush.: Beja *ʔat* ‘tread, march’, C. Cush. \**ʔant-(ät-)* ‘to come’ (CDA), E. Cush.: LEC: Arbore *ʔiʔit-*, Elmolo *iit* ‘to walk, go’; S. Omot.: Ari *aata* ‘to come’ (ADB).  
**Common West Semitic:** \**mṯ?* (#2).

**17 DIE:**

- (1) Akkadian *muātu*; Ugr. Pho. *mt*; Hbr. Pal. Qur. Sab. Gez. *mwt*; Syr. Urm. *myt*; Mnd. *mit*; Leb. *mət*; Mec. *māt*; Mlt. *mīt*; Tna. *motä*; Tgr. Amh. Wol. *motä*; Arg. *moda*; Sod. *motäm*; Cha. *m<sup>w</sup>ätäm*; Har. *mōta*; Hrs. Mhr. *mōt* // < Sem. \**mwt* (v. in LGz 375–6).
- (2) Gaf. *fättärä* // < S. Eth.: Amh. *a-fättärä* ‘faire mourir subitement’ (LGaf 199 after Guidi), Endegeñ (*a*)*fettärä* ‘to hit someone so as to nearly kill him’.<sup>59</sup> Cf. also Arb. *ftr* ‘tomber dans la longueur, faiblir après un effort’ (BK 2 534). One wonders whether these forms could be related, assuming a fossilized suffixal *-r*, to MSA nouns (Hrs. *fjet*, Mhr. *fōtēt*, Jib. *fētēt* ‘carcass of an unslaughtered animal’) and verbs: Mhr. *fōt*, *fōt* ‘(animal) to die unslaughtered’ (JM109), Jib. *fēt* ‘to die without being slaughtered’ (JJ 67), related, in turn, to Arb. *fwt* ‘mourir’, unless the latter is a secondary semantic shift from the other meaning of *fwt*, ‘passer’ (see BK 2 642), in which case the MSA forms should rather be treated as Arabisms. The only isolated form can be found in E. Chad.: Mokilko *púutè* ‘cadavre’ (compared with the MSA forms, but not with the Arabic one, in EDE II 540).
- (3) Hrs. *γāb* (syn.) // Meaning shift from ‘to faint’ (*γeyōb* JH 48), cf. Mhr. *γəyōb*, E. Jib. *γāb* ‘to faint, be absent’ (JM 146). Related to Arb. *γyb* ‘é. absent, caché, disparaître’ rather than borrowed from it (cf. the expression in Arb. *γuyyābatu γuyyābutan* ‘il est mort’) BK 2 521. Note an isolated parallel in E. Chad.: Mokilko *go’obè* ‘dead, corps’ (ADB).
- (4) Mhr. *γəzōl* (syn.) // An unusual meaning shift (rather than an homonym) from the other meaning of this verb — ‘to spin’ (JM 148); cf. Jib. *γzōl* ‘to spin; to fall down in a swoon, to be on the point of dying’ (JJ 92), Soq. *ʔəzōl* ‘to spin’ (JM 148) < Arb.-MSA (perhaps an Arabism in MSA): Arb. *γzl* ‘filer (le lin, etc.)’ (BK 464).

<sup>59</sup> In LGur 248 compared with hesitation to Cha. (*a*)*fättärä* and the like ‘to finish (up)’, but, strangely, not compared with the Gaf. and Amh. forms.

- (5) Jib. *ḥáróg* // < MSA: Mhr. *ḥrūg* ‘to take out, draw out, pull out’ (JM 447), Soq. *ḥrg* ‘cesser, ê. defendu’ (LS 188) < Sem. (Arb.-MSA):<sup>60</sup> Arb. *ḥrǝ* ‘sortir, quitter un endroit; paraître au dehors’ (BK 2 554).
- (6) Jib. *enúsum*, *əntsím* (syn.) // Also ‘to breathe one’s last’ < ‘to breathe’: Hrs. *ansōm* ‘to breathe’, *šenésem* ‘to sigh’ (JH 97), Mhr. *hənsōm* ‘to breathe’ (JM 300) < Sem. *\*nšm* ‘to breathe’ (SED I Verb No. 50).
- ◇ Soq. *šame* is likely a loan of Arb *šmy* ‘tomber roide mort, ê. tué sur place’ (BK 2 1373).
- **Proto-Semitic:** *\*mwt* (#1) < Afras. *\*mawVt-* ‘die’: Brb. *\*immut*; W. Chad. *\*mawut-*, C. Chad. *\*mVtV-*, E. Chad. *\*mawut-*; E. Cush.: LEC: Somali *mōd/t* ‘death’, Oromo *a-mutaa* ‘mourning’, Rendille *-mut-* ‘to die’, Gidole *muut-* ‘become very weak and close to death’ (ADB; EDE III 683–690).

**18 DOG:**

- (1) Akk. *kalbu*; Ugr. Pho. Pal. *klb*; Hbr. *kālāb*; Syr. Mnd. Urm. Qur. *kalb-*; Leb. *kalāb*; Mec. *kalb*; Mlt. *kelp*; Gez. Tgr. *kālāb*; Tna. *kālbi*; Jib. *kob*; Soq. *kalb* (viewed by some authors as an Arabism, their argument being that there originally were no dogs in the island of Soqotra) // < Sem. *\*kalb-* (v. in DLU 214; LGz 282).
- (2) Hrs. Mhr. *mābayl* // lit. ‘owned’, cf. Jib. *bašāl* ‘to own’ (JJ 22) < Sem. *\*bʕl* ‘to own’ (v. in HALOT 142–3).
- ◇ Amh. *wušša*, *wəšša*, Arg. *wəšša*, Gaf. *wəššä*, Sod. *wəssa* are < HEC (Sidamo *woši-ččo*, etc. LGz 667); Cha. Wol. *bučo*, Har. *buči* are < Oromo *buči* (LGz 130). No terms in Bib. and Sab.
- **Proto-Semitic:** *\*kalb-* (#1), perhaps continues, with *\*-b* suffixed (see Mil. RE) Afras. *\*k<sup>w</sup>Vl-* ‘dog, wolf’: (?) Sem.: Gez. *k<sup>w</sup>āhila* ‘fox-like animal’; Brb.: Ahaggar *ā-kūlen* ‘loup, loup peint (lycaon)’ (non us. dans l’Ah.) F. 799; (?) C. Chad.: Logone *kale*, Buduma *kelī* ‘dog’ (otherwise <*\*kVr-*); C. Cush.: Waag *kuli* ‘dog’ (ADB).

**19 DRINK:**

- (1) Akk. Ugr. Hbr. Pal. Syr. Urm. *šty*; Bib. *št?*; Mnd. *šta*; Gez. *satya*, Tna. *sātāyā*; Tgr. *sāta*; Arg. *šäčča*; Har. *säča*; Wol. *säče* (-č- < \*t) // < Sem. *\*šty* (v. in DLU 458; LGz 516).
- (2) Qur. *šrb*; Leb. *šarab*; Mec. *širib*; Mlt. *šōrop*; Gez. *š/saraba* // < Sem. *\*šrp*:<sup>61</sup> ‘to drink, swallow, suck’: Akk. *sarāpu* ‘to sip (?)’ (CAD s 172), Hbr. pB. *šrp* ‘to absorb, quaff, sip, suck’ (Ja. 1632), Jud. id. (ibid.), Syr. *srp* ‘suxit; sorpsit’ (Brock. 500), Gez. *sarāpa* ‘to celebrate Mass, bless an object, sip (the sipping of the blessed wine being a part of the Mass)’ (LGz 513), Tna. *s/šārābā* ‘to approach (rain), condense (gas to liquid), etc. (Kane T 674), etc. (v. in LGz 533).
- (3) Sod. *säččäm*; Cha. *säččäm* (-č < \*k); Hrs. *teḵ* (*heḵō* caus.; *h-* < \*š-); Mhr. *hutḵi* <*s-t-ky*; Jib. *šus-i* // < Sem. *\*šḵy* ‘to give to drink; to water, irrigate’ (v. in LGz 511).
- (4) Soq. *re* // < Sem. *\*rwy* ‘to drink one’s fill’: Hbr. *rwy* ‘to quench thirst, drink to saturation’, etc. (v. in LGz 478).
- ◇ Amh. *ḫätṭa* and Gaf. *ḫitṭä*, to which no parallels in Sem. seem to exist, are considered with hesitation in LGaf 242 to be loanwords from Oromo *ḫudān*, although the similarity is not overwhelming. No terms in Pho. and Sab.
- **Common North and West Semitic:** *\*šty* (#1) with a C. Chad. parallel: Bura *sata* ‘to drink’, Matakam *sawat-* ‘to be, make thirsty’.

<sup>60</sup> Because of the difference in meaning, borrowing from Arb. is less likely.

<sup>61</sup> On Sem. *\*š* v. SED I CV–CXVI and SED II LX–LXI.

**20 DRY:**

- (1) Akk. *šābulu* // < *abālu* 'to dry up, dry out' (CAD a1 29) < Sem. \*ʔbl; Hbr. ʔbl 'to dry up', Arb. ʔubullat- 'dried figs' (v. in HALOT 7).
- (2) Hbr. *yābēš*; Pal. *ybyš*; Syr. *yabbīš*-; Mnd. *yabuš*-; Qur. *yābis*-; Sab. *ybs*<sub>1</sub>; Gez. Tgr. *yābus* // < Sem. \*ybš 'to be dry' (v. in LGz 626).
- (3) Leb. *nešif*; Mec. *nāššaf*; Mlt. *nīšef* // I have not been able to find any parallels.
- (4) Tna. *nākus* // Eth.: Gez. *naḵsa* 'to dry up, be exhausted, be split, etc.', Tgr. *nākṣa* 'to become weak', reasonably compared in LGz 400 with Arb. *nḵṣ* 'to diminish, wane', Sab. *h-nḵṣ* 'to diminish' (after Biella; in SD 98, *hnḵṣn* and *hḵṣn* 'to cede, concede', *mḵṣ-m* 'loss, damage'), Mnd. *nḵṣ* 'to decrease'.
- (5) Amh. Arg. Sod. Har. Wol. *dārāk*; Cha. *ṭārāk* // Eth.: Tna. *dārāk* (rare, according to my informants, unless an Amharism). Compared in DRS 318 with Arb. *darḵ*- 'dur'. Cf. C. Cush.: Kemant *darḵ* and Aungi *dārḵ* 'draught', considered by Appleyard loans from Amh.
- (6) Hrs. *ḵōšā*; Mhr. *ḵayšaḷ*; Jib. *ḵāšaḷun*; Soq. *kešaḷ* // < Sem. \*ḵašVʔ-? (Arb.-MSA or an Arabism in MSA): Arb. *ḵašif*- 'sec, desséché' (BK 2 743); compared in LS 389. Cf. W. Chad.: Hausa *ḵèḵasà* 'to dry (soil, clothes)', possibly <\*ḵVčḵač-, perhaps implying Afras. \*ḵač(ʔ)- 'dry'.
- ◇ Urm. *bārūz*- has no parallels outside Neo-Aramaic and has to be treated as a loan-word. No terms in Ugr. Pho. Bib. and Gaf.
- **Proto-West Semitic:** \*ybš (#2), perhaps < Afras. \*bVs-: (?) Egyp. (Coptic): "Subahmimic" *bōsft*, Sahidic *bosft*, *bast* (derived verbal forms);<sup>62</sup> W. Chad.: Hausa *būšè* 'to be dry, dry up', (?) Dera *bāšà* 'harvest season' (from 'dry season, season with no rain'?).

**21 EAR:**

- (1) Akk. *uznu*; Ugr. ʔudn; Hbr. ʔōzān; Pal. ʔdn; Syr. ʔedn-; Mnd. ʔudn-; Qur. ʔudn-; Leb. ʔadān; Mec. ʔidīn; Mlt. *widna*; Gez. Tgr. ʔəzən; Tna. ʔəzni; Arg. *izin*, *əzən*; Gaf. *əznä*; Sod. *ənzən*; Cha. *ənzər*; Har. *uzun*; Wol. *əzən*; Hrs *ḵeydēn*; Mhr. *hayḵin*; Jib. ʔidēn; Soq. *idihən* // < Sem. \*ʔu/īdn- (SED I No. 4).
- (2) Urm. *nāt*- // L. Kogan (oral communication) thinks that it can hardly be separated from \*ʔu/īdn-, but I cannot imagine such a phonetic development. The only suggestion, though semantically rather weak, that occurs to me is to compare it (as a jargonism? borrowed from an Arb. dialect?) with Arb. *nāti<sup>m</sup>* 'enflé (membre du corps); saillant, protuberant' (BK 2 1195), *nāti<sup>?</sup>*- 'qui est en sallie' (ibid. 1191) or *nyt* 'è. très-faible au point de ne pas pouvoir se tenir solidement et au point de pencher d'un côté ou de l'autre' (ibid. 1375). Otherwise, to be treated as a loan from an unidentified source.
- (3) Hrs. *mēšmē<sup>?</sup>* (syn.) // < Sem. \*šmʔ 'to hear' (v. in LGz 501–2).
- ◇ Amh. *ḵoro* is borrowed from Oromo *gurra* (Gr. 188); on Amh. ḵ < \*g v. SED I LXIX; LXXXII–LXXXV. No terms in Pho., Bib. and Sab.
- **Proto-Semitic:** \*ʔu/īdn- < Afras. \*ʔi/uš-n- ~ ʔi/udn- 'ear': Egyp. *īdn*, phonetic value of the 'ear' hieroglyph determinative;<sup>63</sup> E. Chad.: \*ʔudulin- 'ear':<sup>64</sup> Dangla *dēŋgei*, Jegu ʔūdūŋê,

<sup>62</sup> According to Takács, who, in EDE II 318–19, compares the Coptic forms with W. Chad. and Sem. ones (and adduces some more fairly tenable Sem. examples, besides those <\*ybš, proposed by A. Zaborski and A. Belova), "the Egyp. root is undoubtedly related to AA (Afras. — AM) \*b-s 'dry'" (ibid. 318). Except for the adverb "undoubtedly", I am inclined to accept this comparison as plausible.

<sup>63</sup> Egyp. *d* < Afras. ḵ is rare but confirmed by a few irrefutable examples, *īdn* being one of them, cf. EDE I 317–18.

<sup>64</sup> It is hard to imagine that the E.Chad. forms are not related to Egyp. *īdn* and, hence, to the entire Afras. root, though *d*- < \*š- looks somewhat strange; perhaps, *d*- < \*š- in both Egyp. and E. Chad. reflects some unexplained

Birgit *ʔúdúñi*; C. Cush. \**waṣ-* ‘to hear’: Bilin *was*, Khamir *waz/ṣ*, Khamta *waš* (App. CDA 82); N. Omot. \**waṣ-*: Male *wayz* ‘to hear’, *woyzi*, Chara *wáúza* ‘ear’, etc. (ADB; cf. also EDE I 83).

## 22 EARTH:

- (1) Akk. *erṣetu*; Ugr. *ʔarṣ*, *ʔarṣu*; Hbr. *ʔārās*; Pho. *ʔrṣ*; Bib. *ʔāraṣ*; Pal. *ʔrṣ*; Syr. Urm. *ʔarṣ-*; Mnd. *arḵ-*; Qur. *ʔarḍ-*; Leb. *ʔaraḍ*; Mec. *ʔarḍ*; Mlt. *art*; Sab. *ʔrḍ*; Jib. *ʔerḥ* // < Sem. \**arṣ-* (v. in. DLU 51).
  - (2) Gez. *mādr*; Tna. *mādrī*; Tgr. Amh. Arg. Sod. *mādar* // < Sem. \**midr-* (v. in. LGz 330; Kog. Eth. 378; EDE III 786).<sup>65</sup>
  - (3) Gez. *mareṭ*, Tna. Amh. Arg. *māret* (syn.) // < Eth. \**mar-(V)t-*, probably also Sab. *mrt-n* ‘limestone’ (SD 86; compared in LGz 361 where the Sab. form is quoted as *mrt-m*)<sup>66</sup>; with reliable Afras. parallels: Brb. Ghadames *ta-mmur-t* ‘terre, sol’ (Lan. 215), Rif *ta-mur-t* ‘pays, contrée, territoire’, Shawiya *ta-mur-t* ‘terrains propres à la culture’ (MCB 258), etc.; Egypt. OK *mr* ‘Viehweide’ (EG II 97); E. Chad. Sokoro *māro* ‘feuchte Erde’ (LZS 42).
  - (4) Gaf. *afārū*; Cha. Har. Wol. *afār* // Either < Sem. \**apar-* ‘dust, soil; ashes’ (Hbr. *ʔēpār* ‘loose soil crumbling into dust; ashes’ HALOT 80, Gez. *ʔāfar* ‘dust, soil’<sup>67</sup>) or < Sem. \**ʔapar-* ‘dust, soil’ (HALOT 861–2 erroneously includes “Eth. *ʔafer*”; should add Tgr. *ʔafār* ‘dust; desert’ LH 492).
  - (5) Jib. *gādrēt* (syn.) // Compared in JJ 71 with Soq. *gādhār* ‘reddish-brown’ (not in LS). Probably to be compared (as a form with fossilized suffixal *-r*) to Arb. *ṣadad-* ‘terrain uni et dur’ (BK 1 260), having Afras. parallels in C. Chad. Masa *nàgàdà* ‘earth’ (CLR II 117), E. Chad. Sokoro *gédē* ‘fruchtbar Erde’ (LZS 43) and S. Cush. Dahalo *guddē* ‘land’ (EEN 32).
  - (6) Hrs. *hōhi*; Soq. *hohi* (*hohi*) // < Sem. \**ḥaṣaw/y-*: Jib. *ḥāši* ‘soil’, *aḥšé* ‘to play with dust’ (JJ 118), Tna. *ḥašāwa*, Amh. *aššāwa*, Arg. *ḥašawa*, Wol. *ašawa* ‘sand’ (LGur 102).
  - (7) Mhr. *kāṣ* // Same as Hrs. *kā* ‘land, ground’ connected with Arb. *kāṣ-* (<*ḵwṣ*) ‘plaine, terrain plat; terraine bas où l’eau demeure stagnante’ (BK 2 835);<sup>68</sup> perhaps further related to Egypt. (MK) *kṣḥ*<sup>69</sup> ‘Erdreich; Nilerde’ (EG V 12) and C. Chad. Musgu *káikai*, Mulwi *kàykày*, Munjuk *kaykay* ‘sand’ (ADB).
- ◇ Wol. *däčče* (syn.) is borrowed from E. Cush.: Oromo *dačči*, Hadiya *däččeʔe* (LGur 198).
- **Proto-Semitic:** \**arṣ-* (#1) < Afras. \**ariḥ-* ‘earth’: Egypt. (MK) ‘bewässertes land’ (EG I 168);<sup>70</sup> W. Chad.: Paʔa *riṣa*, Siri *raṣu*, etc. ‘earth’, E. Chad.: Bidiya *ʔrāḍyà* ‘valley’ (ADB).

secondary phonetic process, common of Egypt. and Chadic (making, together with Berber, the African North Afroasian subbranch of Afroasian, in my classification).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Egypt. (Med.) *mʔd* ‘ein mineralischer Stoff’, compared in EDE III 127, among other things, with ESA-Ethiopian root for ‘earth, soil, clay (or limestone)’ (\**mVr-t-*, see #3). Though phonetically unacceptable (with a meaningless comment: “perhaps an irregular (Eg. *d-* vs. Sem \**-t*)” ibid. 128), this comparison leaves open the possibility of comparing the meaning of the Egypt. word with ‘earth’, in which case it is a potential match with Sem. \**midr-* (through metathesis). See the discussion on some other possible connections of the Sem. term in EDE III 786–7.

<sup>66</sup> See a more detailed discussion in EDE III 128–9.

<sup>67</sup> In LGz 10, related to the S. Eth. forms and provided with the following comment: “Dillmann 808 considers G. an Amharic loanword, unless it is to be identified with Heb. *ʔēpār*”.

<sup>68</sup> Borrowing from Arb. into MSA cannot be ruled out.

<sup>69</sup> With a peculiar phonetic development, due to the vicinity of *ʔ* (<\*) and *ṣ* in one root?

<sup>70</sup> In EDE I 258 the unexpected *ṣ* (<\*) is tentatively explained as “interchange of *j* (which I prefer to render as *y-* so as not to confound it with *j*, often inconsistently rendering [ṣ] in Afroasian studies — A.M.) ~ *ṣ* in the proximity of *ḍ* in Eg.”. I tend to explain it out of \**Vrd* (<\**Vrḥ*), with the guttural or uvular or “burring” [R] (rendered in Egypt. in this case, like in many others, by *ʔ*), which assimilated the glottal stop in the Anlaut. Cf. a similar process

**23 EAT:**

- (1) Akk. *akālu*; Hbr. Pho. Bib. Pal. Syr. Urm. Qur. *ʔkl*; Mnd. *akal*; Leb. *ʔakal*; Mec. *ʔakal*; Mlt. *kiel* // < Sem. *\*ʔkl* (v. in DLU 21; LGz 15).
- (2) Ugr. *lhm* // < Sem. *\*lahm-* ‘food (bread or meat)’ (v. in DLU 243; HALOT 500; Kog. DD).
- (3) Pal. *ʔm* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*ʔm* ‘to taste’ (v. in LGz 583).
- (4) Gez. *blʕ*; Tna. *bälʕe*; Tgr. *bälʕa*; Amh. *bälla*; Arg. *bälla*, *alʔa*; Gaf. *bällä*; Sod. *bällam*; Cha. *bänam*; Har. *bälaʔa*; Wol. *bälä* // < Sem. *\*blʕ* ‘to swallow, eat’ (LGz 94–5).
- (5) Hrs. *tewō*; Mhr. *tu*; Jib. *te*; Soq. *té* // < Sem. *\*tʔw/y*: Akk. *taʔû* ‘essen, weiden’ (AHw 1341; no MSA parallels quoted) < Afras. *\*tiʔw-<sup>71</sup>*: Brb.: Ayr *ättyu*, Ahaggar *tatt*, Ghadames *tatt*, etc. (habitative) ‘to eat’; W. Chad.: Hausa *či*, Dera *twi/a*, Siri *tuu*, Daffo-Budura *čuh*, etc. ‘to eat (soft things)’, C. Chad.: Lame *-tí-*, etc. ‘to eat’, E. Chad.: Migama *tíyáw*, Birgit *túwà* ‘to eat soft things’; N. Cush.: Beja *tiyu* ‘to eat’ (ADB).
- ◇ No term. in Sab.
- **Common North and West Semitic:** *\*ʔkl* (#1), cf. W. Chad.: Hausa *kàlā-či* ‘food’ (ADB).

**24 EGG:**

- (1) Akk. *pelû* // Related either to Sem. *\*pūl-* ‘bean’ (Hbr. *pōl*, Arb. *fūl-* HALOT 918) or, more likely, to Afras. *\*pīl(?)*- ~ *\*pūlpul-*: W. Chad. Ngamo *ɸila* ‘egg’, C. Chad. Banana *bòlòʔá* ‘egg-shell’, E. Cush. Burji *bulbul-é*, *bubul-é* (treated by Sasse as N. Omot. loan), Yaaku *bolbōlíʔ*, N. Omot. Male *hūla*, Wolayta *pupuliya*, etc., S. Omot. Hamar *hūla* ‘egg’.<sup>72</sup>
- (2) Hbr. *bēysā*; Pal. *byʕh*; Syr. *bēʕt-*; Mnd. *bit-*; Urm. *biyy-*; Qur. *baydat-*; Leb. Mec. *bayda*; Mlt. *bayda* // < Sem. *\*bayʕ-at-* (SED I No. 43).
- (3) Syr. *bar-t-* (syn.) // Presumably < Sem. *\*barr-* ‘wheat’ (v. in HALOT 153; Mil. Farm. 138) with a meaning shift ‘corn’ > ‘egg’.
- (4) Gez. *ʔanqokəho*; Tna. *ʔanqʷakʷəho*; Tgr. *ʔanqokəho*; Gaf. *anqʷä*; Sod. *anqo*; Har. *akuḥ*; Wol. *anqakot* // Supposedly < Sem. *\*kʷakʷay-* ‘egg’ (cf. SED I No. 160) with *\*ʔan-* prefixed and *-ḥ* explained as the result of contamination with Mod. Eth. *\*ʔVn-ḳulaliḥ-* (v. below). However, it must be somehow connected with Cush.: Beja *kūahi* (RBeq 137–8; <*\*kʷah-*), Saho *unqōqahó* (ibid.), Oromo *hanqāqū* (Gr.; < *\*hanqak-*, with metathesis?), Dasenech *ḡonḡono* (Tos. Das. 543), Hadiya *ḳunḳa* (Huds.), Maʔa *ikokoha* (HRSC 386; <*\*ʔi-ḳVḳVḥ-*?), Iraqw *qānḥi* (ibid.; <*\*kanḥ-*) ‘egg’, while neither Eth. nor Cush. forms look like loanwords from each other (perhaps except Saho).
- (5) Amh. Arg. *ənqulal*; Cha. *ənqura*; Mhr. *ḳáwḥal*; Jib. *ḳeḥzīn*; Soq. *ḳḥolhin* // < Sem. *\*ka(w)ḥil-* (cf. SED I No. 170). Relations with a Cush.-Omot. term (e.g. C. Cush.: Bilin *kāhaluna*, *kāhala*, Khamir *qāluna*, Khamta *qululūna* App. CDA 59–60; N. Omot.: Wolayta *ḳukulliya* Lmb-Sot 430<sup>73</sup>) are not quite clear; as for C. Cush. Khamta *enqulal*, Aungi *ənqʷlal*, Appleyard regards them as Amharisms, which is possible, but the rest of the Agaw forms require us to explain how Amh. *ən-* could become lost in the process of borrowing. For a possibility of a common Afras. root, cf. C. Chad.: Bata *kwal* ‘egg’.

in Egypt. (OK) *ʕm* ‘Asians’, rendering, in my opinion, *ʔārammī* ‘Arameans’ (very likely, the common ethnonym for speakers of Proto-Canaanite-Aramaic, or, in my classification, Proto-South Levantine) and several other cases that deserve a separate study.

<sup>71</sup> Judging by the Afrasian *comparanda*, Sem. *\*tʔw/y* might have been the original verbal root for ‘to eat’, later substituted in North and West Sem. by *\*ʔkl*.

<sup>72</sup> Compared in EDE II 68, but with the following comment: “... Omoto *\*b* ... is difficult to explain from AA *\*b*”, Afras. *\*p* not admitted. Perhaps related to Egypt. *py.w* (pl., grain determinative), probably ‘small round object’ (EDE II 68–9; 413), if < *\*pVl-*; Afras. *\*p* yields Egypt. *p*.

<sup>73</sup> With many fantastic comparisons.

- (6) Hrs. *bēkelēt* // < Sem. \**baḳ<sup>w</sup>al-* ‘plant, vegetation’ (v. in LGz 100).
- (7) Hrs. *bēdeh*, Mhr. *bēḍáyt*, JIb. *béd* (all syn.) // < Sem. (Arb.-MSA; because of the serious difference in meaning cannot be suspected to represent an Arabism in MSA) \**bayṭ-at-*: Arb. *bayzat-* ‘oeufs des fourmi’ (v. SED I No. 43 note). A variant root of \**bayṣ-at-*, to be scored differently.
- ◇ No terms in Ugr., Pho., Bib. and Sab.
- **Common West Semitic:** \**bayṣ-at-* (#2) < Afras. \**bayṣ-*: W. Chad. \*(*m-*)*bwiṣ-* ‘egg’: Geji *mbúṣī*, Zaar *buùṣ*, Sayanchi *mbúṣ*, Zul *mbúṣe*, etc. (ADB); cf. also discussion in EDE II 363–4).

## 25 EYE:

- (1) Akk. *īnu*; Ugr. Pho. *ʕn*; Hbr. *ʕayin*; Pal. *ʕyyn*; Syr. Urm. Qur. *ʕayn-*; Mnd. *ayn-*; Leb. Mec. *ʕayn*; Mlt. (*gh*)*ayn*; Sab. *ʕyn*; Gez. *ʕayn*; Tna. *ʕayni*; Tgr. *ʕən*; Amh. *ayn*; Arg. Cha. *en*; Gaf. *inā*; Sod. Wol. *in*; Har. *īn*; Hrs. *ʔāyn*; Mhr. Soq. *ʕayn*; Jib. *ʕihn* // < Sem. \**ʕayn-* (SED I No. 28).
- **Proto-Semitic:** \**ʕayn-* < Afras. \**ʕayVn-* ‘eye; to see’: Egyp. *ʕn*, *ʕyn*, hieroglyph determinative sign for ‘eye’; Brb. \**HVnVy* ~ *nVHVy* ‘to see’: Ayr *ənəy*, Taneslemt *ənḥ*, Adghaq *ənḥi*, Izayan *anni*, etc.; W. Chad. \**HayVn-* ‘to see’: Bolewa *ʔinn-*, Polchi *yeni*, Paa *ḥan*, Tule *yāni*, Fyer *yaána*, Daffo-Butura *yen*, etc., C. Chad.: Gaanda *ànni*, Gerka *anana* ‘to see, find’, (?) E. Chad.: Jegu *ʔinn-* ‘to know’; S. Cush: Dahalo *ʕeen-aad* ‘to see from afar’; (?) N. Omot.: Gimirra *an* ‘eye’ (ADB; Cf. EDE I 125–6, where this root is confounded with Afras. \**ʔi(n)ṭ-* ‘eye’).<sup>74</sup>

## 26 FAT (n.):

- (1) Akk. *lūpū* (*lipiu*, *līlēpu*) // < Sem. \**li/apī?*- ‘fatty, fleshy tissue’ (cf. SED I 180).
- (2) Ugr. *šmt*, *šmn* // < Sem. \**šam(-an)-* ‘fat, oil’ (cf. SED I 248) < Afras. \**sim-an-* ~ \**sin-am-*<sup>75</sup> ‘oil, fat, (fat) milk’: Brb.: Ghat *isim* ‘graisse (de tout animal)’, *ésim* ‘graisse fondu’, Qabyle *ta-ssəm-t* ‘graisse animal’, Canarian (Ferro) *achemen* ‘milk’ (<\**a-šVmVn*); Egyp. (Med.) *smṯ* ‘fat milk, cream’; W. Chad.: Jimi *sin*, Diri *sinama* ‘oil’, E. Chad.: Somrai *swānī*, Kera *son*, Migama *séwén*, Sokoro *súnu* ‘oil’; N. Cush.: Beja *simma* ‘fat’ (n.), C. Cush.: Bilin, Khamir, Qemant *səna*, Aungi *səni* ‘butter’, E. Cush.: HEC: Gollango *šīinan-ko* ‘fat’, Gawwada (Dalpena) *šīinán-ko*, pl. *šīinam-aane* ‘butter’, S. Cush.: Qwadza *sum-* ‘to milk’.
- (3) Hbr. *ḥēlāb*; Pho. *ḥlb* // < Sem. \**ḥilb-* ‘fatty tissue covering internal organ; caul’ (v. SED I No. 131) or \**ḥalilVb-* ‘milk, fat’ (cf. LGz 229).
- (4) Pal. *trb*; Syr. *terb-*; Mnd. *tirb-*; Urm. *tarb-* // < Sem. \**ṭarb-* (SED I No. 283).
- (5) Urm. *šahr-* (syn.) // The only if problematic parallels I could find are either Zway *šāra* ‘sediment after butter has been melted’ (in LGur 584 quoted as a loan from E. Cush.: Hadiya Oromo *šāra* id.) or Muher *šārrä*, Wol. *sore*, etc. ‘to feed well a sick person’, Chaha, Muher, etc. *šārät* ‘food’, Har. *sōr* ‘food offered to a group of people on a special occasion’ (according to LGur. 584, a loan from E. Cush.: Oromo *sor*, Somali *sōr*, etc. ‘food’).<sup>76</sup>
- (6) Qur. *šaḥm-*; Mec. *šaḥam*; Mlt. *šaḥām* // < Sem. \**šaḥm-* (SED I No. 263). Obviously matching E. Cush.: LEC: SAM: Rendille *siḥim-e* ‘butter’, Somali *siḥin-* ‘curds’ making Afras. \**čaḥim-*.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>74</sup> Some of the above forms from languages, wherein *ʕ* is not preserved or distinctly reflected, may alternatively belong to other Afras. roots, cf., for example, \**na<sup>ʔ</sup>/w/y-* ‘to see’ (attested in Egyp. and Chad., see EDE I 126).

<sup>75</sup> Should perhaps be divided into two metathetic variant roots — \**sim(-an)-* and \**sin(-am)-*.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. the idea of ‘fat food’ as ‘good food’ and of ‘fat person’ as ‘healthy person’ in MSA *šāyleḥ* below.

<sup>77</sup> Often included into Afras. \**sim-an-* (cf., e. g., EDE I 192), but better fits in with Sem. \**šaḥm-*, requiring no explanation of what *-ḥ-* is doing in \**sim-an-*, and, if it is a hypothetical suffix (after Takács), why it is found in the medial position; as for reflexes of Afras. \**s-* and \**ṣ-*, they seem to have merged into *s-* in the SAM languages. A natural guess that the SAM word could be an Arabism (there are plenty of them in Somali) is contradicted by its



- (7) Leb. *dihn* // < Sem. \**duhn-* (v. in SED I No. 48).
- (8) Gez. *ṣabḥ*; Tna. *sabḥi*; Tgr. *šabeh*; Amh. *sab*; Cha. *səwä*; Har. *säbaḥ*; Hrs. Jib. *ṣabḥ*; Mhr. *ṣabaḥ* // < Sem. \**ṣabḥ-* (SED I No. 261).
- (9) Amh. *mora* (syn.: ‘animal fat, suet’); Sod. *mora*; Wol. *morä* // It is hard to say whether these terms are borrowed from Oromo *moora* (Gr. 291) or, vice versa, it is the latter that is an Amharism, borrowed by other Cush. and Omot. languages either directly or through Oromo mediation: C. Cush.: Aungi *morí*. E. Cush.: LEC: Arbore *moora*, etc., HEC: Qabenna, Sidamo *mōra*, etc., Dullay: Tsamay *mooru*, etc.; N. Omot.: Zaise, Yemsa *mōra*, S. Omot.: Ongota *mōra* (SLLE 6), etc. At least part of these forms may continue Afras. \**marV<sup>?</sup>/y-* ‘fat, oil’: Sem.: Akk. *marû* ‘to fatten’ (CAD m1 307), Ugr. *mr<sup>?</sup>* ‘to fatten’ (DUL 570), Hbr. *mr<sup>?</sup>* ‘to feed on the fat of the land, graze’ (HALOT 630), ESA: Sab. *mr<sup>?</sup>m* ‘Mastvieh’; Arb. *mr<sup>?</sup>* ‘trouver un aliment sain, bon’; W. Chad. Sura *mɔ̀ɔ̀r*, Bolewa *mor*, Barawa *miyir*, Kulere *mār*, C. Chad Tera *mar* ‘oil’, Nzangi *mare*, Bachama *marəy* ‘fat’, etc. (ADB; EDE III 431).
- (10) Gaf. *buššəra* // Most likely a metathesis from \**tarb-* (v. above).<sup>78</sup> Tentatively compared in EDE II 321 with an obscure Egyp. term *bšš*, probably ‘oil’ (<\**bšr?*), and several Chad. forms of the \**bVs-* type meaning ‘fat’ and ‘oil’ (other quoted Chad. and C. Cush. terms of the \**bVz-* type are too distant phonetically), implying a fossilized *-r* in Gaf. (cf. Mil. RE).
- (11) Hrs. Mhr. *ṣáyleh* (both syn.) // Cf. other meanings: Mhr. *ṣáyleh* ‘to be fat’ and *hašlēh* ‘to improve in health, change for the better’ (JM 363) < Sem. \**šlh* ‘to be or do well, be successful’ (v. in HALOT 1026).
- (12) Jib. *ṣəḥ* (syn.) // The only phonetically acceptable parallel with the same meaning that I could find is Egyp. OK *ṣḥ* ‘Fett’ (EG I 239), possibly < Afras. \**ṣVḥ-*. One wonders if it is comparable semantically with the phonetically impeccable MSA-Arb. \**ṣṣā/īṣ-* ‘bone, cartilage’ (v. BONE No. 3), if so, with the primary meaning ‘bone with fat on it’.
- (13) Soq. *ṣimat* // As suggested to me by L. Kogan, tentatively compared to Hbr. *ṣōnā*, probably meaning ‘oil, ointment’ (corresponding to Akk. *piššatu*, v. HALOT 855).
- ◇ Arg. *ṣoma* seems borrowed from Oromo id. (Gr. 85), probably via Amh. id. (C. Cush. Kemant *ṣoma* and Aungi *ṣūmí* are regarded as Amharisms by Appleyard). No terms in Bib. and Sab.
- **Common South and West Semitic:** \**ṣabḥ-* (#8) < Afras. \**ṣabḥ-* ‘fat, butter’: W. Chad.: Diri *ṣəḥu* ‘fat’; E. Cush.: Saho *subaḥ* ‘clarified butter’, Afar *sebaaḥ*, *subaḥ* ‘butter’; LEC: Somali subag (with irregular *-g* instead of the expected *-ḥ*) ‘clarified butter or animal fat’, Rendille *subaḥ* ‘butter; clarified animal fat’, Baiso *suba* ‘butter’ (ADB).<sup>79</sup>

## 27 FEATHER:

- (1) Akk. *nāṣu*; Hbr. *nōṣā* (both meaning ‘feathers’) // < Sem. \**nāṣ(y)-* (SED I No. 202).
- (2) Syr. *merṭ-* // < Sem. \**mrt-* ‘to pluck, pull out hair’:<sup>80</sup> Hbr. *mrt-* ‘to pull out hair, depilate’ (HAL 635), Arb. *mrt-* ‘arracher le poil’ (BK 2 1092; cf. *marīṭ-* ‘qui n’est pas encore garni de

presence in the much more culturally “virgin” Rendille and the difference in form and meaning between Somali and Arabic.

<sup>78</sup> Less probably < Sem. \**bi/ašar-* ‘flesh, (human) body’ (SED I No. 41), since we also have Gafat *bäsärä* (with *-s-*) ‘meat’, directly continuing Sem. \**bi/ašar-* id.

<sup>79</sup> The E. Cush. terms may in principle have been borrowed from Gez. or Amh., but the difference in vocalism would rather testify against this. That the Eth. forms could be loans from E. Cush., as asserted by some authors, is unlikely in view of the MSA cognates.

<sup>80</sup> The original meaning of Syr. *merṭ-* must have been something like ‘hair that is easily plucked/pulled out’.

- plumes (flèche) ibid.), perhaps also Akk. *marātu* 'to rub, scratch' (CAD *m* 276) with a meaning shift.<sup>81</sup>
- (3) Syr. *ʔebr-* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*ʔalibr-* 'pinion, wing' (SED I No. 1).
- (4) Mnd. *guspart-*; Urm. *par-*; Hrs. *ferfayr* // In Mnd., *guspart-* also means 'crest (of bird), comb (of cock)', related in DM to Syr. *gespār-* 'pinna (piscis)' (Brock. 127); both are likely compounds consisting of *\*gis-* 'side'<sup>82</sup> and *\*par-* 'feather', preserved in the Urm. term (otherwise < Persian, according to Tser. 0167) and, in a geminated variant, in Hrs. One wonders whether it is possible to trace this back to something like Sem. *\*par(par)-*?
- (5) Leb. *r-ši*; Mec. *riyša*; Mlt. *r-š* // No parallels that I know of.
- (6) Tna. *kāntit*; Har. *kāt* // LH 95 does not quote the Tna. form as a parallel to Har., implying that the latter is probably from Oromo *kočo* 'wing'. Unclear if the Tna. term<sup>83</sup> (and the Har. one with loss of *-n-*, if related) is connected to Tgr. *kānta* 'to cut off (branches), to pluck off' (LH 417).<sup>84</sup>
- (7) Cha. *zoyä* // < Gur.: Gyeto *zäwyä*, etc. (LGur 718). According to Leslau (ibid.), either "to be identified with *zorro* with palatalization of *r* to *y*" (v. Wol. below) or to be connected with Amh. *zäyy* 'kind of bird' (ibid. 719). The latter opportunity seems more attractive; Amh. 'kind of bird' must go back to 'goose' (cf. Gez. *zay* 'goose' regarded in LGz 646 as an Amharism), very likely related, with metathesis, to Sem. *\*ʔaiw(a)z-* ~ *\*waz(z)-* 'goose'.
- (8) Mhr. *šif(f)*; Jib. *šof d-šesfōr*; Soq. *šéf(f)* // All in Nak.; the orig. meaning is 'hair' (the Jib. form lit. means 'hair of bird'), v. HAIR.
- (9) Mhr. *kaṭfif*; Jib. *kaṭaf* (both syn.) // < Sem. *\*kVṭVp-* 'pluck (leaves, fruit)' (see LGz 453). On the meaning shift see #2 and 6.
- (10) Soq. *milyaṭ* (syn.) // According to LS 233, probably comparable with Arb. *liṭ-* 'peau'. I would rather compare it to Arb. *malīṭ-* 'qui n'est pas encore garni de plumes (flèche); qui n'a pas encore de poil (foetus avorté)' (BK 2 1149).<sup>85</sup>
- ◇ Tgr. *čəgär* (quoted by an informant as 'feather', but in LH 630 said to mean only 'hair, fibre') is a common Eth. loan from Cush. 'hair';<sup>86</sup> Amh. *laba*, *läboba*, Arg. *laba* are from Oromo *laboba* (LGur 373); Sod. *balle* is from E. Cush.: Oromo *balli*, Sidamo *bāla*, Somali *bāl*, etc. (ibid. 138); Wol. *zorro* is from HEC: Qabenna *zōrú-ta*, Alaba *zōrʔu-ta* (ibid. 714). No terms in Ugr., Pho., Bib., Pal., Qur., Sab., Gez. and Gaf.
- **Common Semitic 1:** *\*nāš(y)-* (#1).
- Common Semitic 2** (debatable): *\*par(par)-* < Afras. *\*Parw-*: Brb.: Ahaggar *a-fraw* 'plume' (F. 336), Ayr *afrut* 'aile' (Aloj. 42), etc.).

## 28 FIRE:

- (1) Akk. *išātu*; Ugr. *ʔiš-t*, *ʔišī-tu*; Hbr. *ʔēš*; Pho. *ʔš*; Pal. *ʔyšh*, *ʔäššā*; Gez. *ʔəsāt*; Tgr. *ʔəsāt*; Amh. Arg. Cha. *əsāt*; Gaf. *əsātā*; Sod. *äsāt*; Har. *isāt* // < Sem. *\*ʔiš-āt-* (v. in LGz 44).
- (2) Pal. *nūr* (syn.); Syr. Mnd. Urm. *nūr-*; Qur. *nār-*; Leb. Mec. Mlt. *nār-* // < Sem. *\*nū/ār-* (< *\*nawr-?* Cf. *\*nawir-* 'luminoso' Fron. 144) 'fire; light' (v. in HALOT 683; 696; 723; DLU 331).

<sup>81</sup> The Hbr., Arb. and Akk. forms are erroneously derived in HALOT 635 from *\*mrz* (*\*mrṭ*, in our rendering).

<sup>82</sup> In Syr. represented by *gess-* 'coxa, latus' ibid. 126, v. also SED I No. 97; in Mnd. *\*-i-* > *-u-* with accommodation to *-p-*.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. N. Omot.: Mao (Diddesa) *kwīnte* 'hair'. An accidental look-alike?

<sup>84</sup> On the meaning shift 'to pluck' > 'feather' v. Syr. *merṭ-* above and #9.

<sup>85</sup> For a somewhat paradoxical semantic connection between 'feather' and 'an arrow not yet furnished with feathers', cf. Arb. *marīṭ-* in #2 above. Another possibility is that the two lexemes represent variant roots with *l* vs. *r* and, as such, could have influenced one another.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. C. Cush. Bilin *šagar*, Qwara *ṭagur*, E. Cush. Somali *ḍagur* (LGz 550).

- (3) Gez. *ḥaww*, *haw* (syn.); Tna. *ḥawwi* // Eth. (LGz 248; for its presumed connections with Gez. *ḥə/awwāy* ‘evening, the red glow of the evening sky’ and further with Arb. *ʔihwawā* ‘to become red inclining to blackness’ v. *ibid.* 250; cf. discussion in Bulakh Dis.) with a debatable parallel in MSA *\*nḥy/w* ‘to burn’ (v. BURN No. 13). There are, however, clear cognates in Chad. (W.: Warji *ḥwa-* and, with metathesis, Sha *hwoḥ* ‘to burn’; C.: Kilba *húʔù*, Mbara *hū* ‘fire’; E.: Mokilko *ʔūwwo* id., etc.). Cf. also C. Cush.: Bilin *ḥaws* ‘to burn’, Khamir *háu-y*, Khamta *ḥawš* ‘to heat’ (all trans.), considered in App. CDA 39 borrowings in Agaw from Eth. (because of the presence of *ḥ*).
- (4) Hrs. *ḥawt* // MSA: Hrs. *ḥaw*, Mhr. *ḥaw* ‘light’ (JM 478) < Sem. *\*ḥawʔ-* (Arb.-MSA; unless an Arabism in MSA): Arb. *ḍawʔ-* ‘lumière, clarté’, *ḍwʔ* ‘briller, luire (se dit du feu, etc.)’ (BK 244).<sup>87</sup>
- (5) Hrs. *ḥēwēt* (syn.); Mhr. *ḥīwōt*; Jib. *ḥot*; Soq. *ḥiāt* (*ḥeyōt*) // In LS 424 compared with Syr. *swt* ‘ê. enflammé’ (‘to burn, consume away’ CSD 364) and Arb. variant roots *ḥīwāz-*<sup>88</sup> and *ḥīwāṭ-* ‘flamme pure, sans fumée’ (BK 1288), which may be cognate to the MSA terms (all < Sem. *\*ḥīwāṭ-*), unless the latter ones are Arabisms.
- ◇ Wol. *ḥirā* is from E. Cush.: Sidamo *\*ḥira*, Saho Afar *girā* ‘fire’ (LGur. 319). No term in Sab.
- **North and West Semitic:** *\*ʔiḥ-āt-* (#1) < Afras. *\*ʔis-* ‘fire’: Brb.: Ahaggar *a-həs* ‘big fire’; W. Chad. *\*ʔyas-* ‘fire’: Montol *ʔús*, Ngamo *yàsi*, Geruntum *iḥi*, etc., E. Chad.: Dangla *śósé* ‘to make fire’, Migama *ʔis* ‘warm’, Bidiya *ʔòs*, Birgit *ʔissi* ‘to burn’ (ADB).
- Common West Semitic:** *\*nū/ār-* < Afras. *\*nur-* ‘fire; coal, ashes’: W. Chad.: Boghom *nwur-əḥ*, Kiir *ḥūr-əḥ* ‘ash’, C. Chad.: Gude *ḥira-ḍu* ‘ash’, Logone *nur* ‘coal’, E. Chad.: Somrai *nyūrīḥ*, Ndam *nūrē* ‘coal’.

## 29 FISH:

- (1) Akk. *nūnu*; Pal. *nūn*; Syr. Mnd. Urm. *nun-* // It is hard to decide if Sem. *\*nūn-* (including Hbr. *nūn* and Arb. *nūn-at-* ‘un gros poisson’ BK 2 1373) is reconstructible (v. in HALOT 681) or if we deal with a chain of borrowings from an unknown source > Akk. > Arm./Hbr. > Arb.<sup>89</sup>
- (2) Ugr. *dg*; Hbr. *dāg* // DRS 216 also quotes Hbr. *dūgāh* ‘pêche’, Pal. *dagōgīt-* ‘barque de pêcheur’ and, with a question mark, Amh. *ḥuḥ* ‘paquet des poissons liés ensemble’.<sup>90</sup>
- (3) Qur. *ḥūt-*; Mlt. *ḥūta* // Only in Arb. Possibly < *\*ḥaw-t-*; in this case possible Afras. parallels are: Egyp. (OK) *mḥy-t* ‘fish’ (<*\*mV-ḥVy-t?*), W. Chad.: Tsagu *ḥāti* id., *\*HVy-w-* ‘to fish’: Bolewa *ʔyuw-*, Tangale *oi*, C. Chad.: Bura *yīha* ‘to fish in shallow water’, Mofu-Gudur *áwèt* ‘fish’, Gude (met.?) *təhwá* ‘type of fish’ (ADB); the Tsagu and Mofu-Gudur forms can theoretically represent Arabisms, but the rest of the quoted Chad. forms certainly cannot.
- (4) Mec. *samak* // Only Arb., with no parallels whatsoever, except for Gez. *samak*, which is clearly an Arabism (LGz 502).
- (5) Har. *tulām* // No parallels at all.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Note the comparison of Hbr. *mēšīš* (<*\*šwš*, hif. ‘to gaze’), Jud. *šwš* ‘to look, see’ and Mnd. *šus*, *šiš* ‘to look or shine (of the eyes)’ with the Arb. forms in HALOT 1013–14, which is vague semantically and hardly acceptable phonetically.

<sup>88</sup> In fact, Soq. *ṭ* may correspond to Arb. *z* < Sem. *\*ṭ*, but this is not the case as other MSA parallels clearly point to *\*-ṭ*.

<sup>89</sup> A common opinion, shared by my coauthor L. Kogan who insisted upon not including this root into SED II; for me, it remains baseless until the source of this presumed borrowing is presented (note, however, Uralic *\*ńowŋa* ‘salmon’).

<sup>90</sup> Note Indo-European *\*dhǵhū-* ‘fish’.

<sup>91</sup> Littman’s idea about the connection with Somali *kallun*, Afar *kullun*, with alternance *k : t*, which is regarded as possible in LH 149, does not really hold water.

- (6) Hrs. *şayd*; Mhr. *çayd*; Jib. *çod*; Soq. *şode* // < Sem. \**şyd* 'to fish, hunt'.<sup>92</sup>  
 ◇ Leb. *nun* seems more likely < Arm. than inherited < Arb. ancestor. Gez. *ḡāšā*, Tna. Tgr. *ḡasa*; Amh. Arg. Sod. Cha. *asa*; Gaf. Wol. *asä* are, according to LGz 73, from C. Cush., while Appleyard qualifies the Eth. forms as "clearly of non-Semitic, and probably Agaw origin"<sup>93</sup> (App. CDA 68). The term is also attested in N. Cush.: Beja *āši*, E. Cush. Saho *ḡaasa*, and Omot. \**Haš-* (Kafa *haašoo*, Bworo *aso*, Anfillo *haašo*, Nao *aša*) id. (cf. Bla. Fau. 237). No term in Sab.  
 → (?) **Common North and West Semitic:** \**nūn-* (#1), if not borrowed.

### 30 FLY (v.):

- (1) Akk. *naprušu* // According to AHW 740, related to Sem. \**prš* 'to spread out' (v. in HALOT 975).  
 (2) Ugr. *ḡp*; Hbr. *ḡwp* // < Sem. \**ḡwp* 'to fly' (v. in HALOT 800; LGz. 78), related to *ḡawp-* 'bird' (SED II No. 48).  
 (3) Pal. Syr. Urm. *prḡ*; Mnd. *phr* (met.) // < Sem. \**prḡ* 'to fly' (v. in HALOT 966), related to \**parḡ-* 'chick, brood' (SED II No. 179).  
 (4) Pal. *ṭws*; Mnd. *ṭus* (both syn.) // < Sem. \**ṭws* ~ \**ṭšš* 'to flutter, jump': Hbr. *ṭws* 'to flutter (on the ground)' (HALOT 373), Jib. *ṭšš* 'to jump up' (JJ 280), etc.  
 (5) Qur. *ṭyr*; Leb. Mec. *tār*; Mlt. *tār* // As a verb only in Arb.;<sup>94</sup> related to Sem. \**ṭayr-* 'bird; divination from birds, augury' (cf. SED II No. 235).  
 (6) Gez. *s/šarara* // Also 'to flee, leap up in the air, etc.' < Eth.: Tna. *sārärä* 'to mount', Tgr. *särä* 'to jump, fly', *särerät* 'bird', Amh. *särrärä* 'jump, mount, climb', etc.<sup>95</sup> Cf. Mnd. *si/ara* 'flock of birds, swarm' (DM 329) and Sem. \**šVršVr-*: Akk. *suššuru* (*šūšuru*) 'a dove', Arb. *šaršūr-* 'petit oiseau' (SED II No. 216).  
 (7) Gez. *barra*; Tgr. *bärä*; Amh. Sod. *bärrärä*; Arg. *bärrära*; Cha. *bänärä*; Harari *bärära*; Wol. *bärärä* // A root of debatable origin (cf. SED I No. 1). Contra LGz 107 and many others, not related to Sem. \**pr* (quoted as *frr* *ibid.*).<sup>96</sup> Likely related to Sem. \**a/ibr-* 'pinion, wing', less likely borrowed from Cush. N. (Beja *bīr* RBeḡ 50), C. (Khamir *bir-*, Kemant *bärär*, Aungi *berer-*, considered in App. CDA 70 borrowings from Amh.) or E. (Saho *-ibrir*, Oromo *barar-*, Burji *burr-*, Kambatta *burri y-*, Darasa *birret-*).<sup>97</sup> Most likely, all the above Sem. and Cush. forms go back to Afras. \**bi/arr-* 'to fly, jump', also including N. Omot. (Male *bar-an* 'to fly'), C. Chad. Mulwi *bìrì* 'to fly', Musgoy *mbìr* 'to jump', Musgu *bára* 'to fly, jump', E. Chad. Kwang *bre*, Birgit *bèrì* 'to fly' (ADB; cf. also EDE II 274).  
 (8) Tna. *näfärä*; Tgr. *näfra* (syn.) // Eventually, undoubtedly < \**n-pr*, with a fossilized *n-* prefix (v. Mil. RE). A debatable issue is whether the N. Eth. forms should be scored with the MSA ones (v. # 9 below). After much hesitation, I choose to follow L. Kogan's advice and score them differently.

<sup>92</sup> See HALOT 1010, where no MSA terms are quoted, and LS 349, where the MSA terms for 'fish' are justly related to the verb 'fish, hunt' in other Sem.

<sup>93</sup> However, upon quoting Bilin *ḡasa* and Khamir *ḡaza* (together with Bilin *ḡasa*, Kemant *asa*, Aungi *asi*), he points out to "the influence of N. Eth., as neither *ḡ* nor *ḡ* occur in purely Agaw roots".

<sup>94</sup> Gez. *ṭayyara* 'to fly' and similar Eth. forms are regarded in LGz. 601 as Arabisms.

<sup>95</sup> Some of the Sem. parallels quoted in LGz 514 look questionable.

<sup>96</sup> Another mythetymology, extremely popular among Semitists and quite tenacious.

<sup>97</sup> According to Appleyard, "some of these may be borrowed from or influenced by EthSem., others may represent an original Cushitic form of this AA root", which he (erroneously, after LGz 107), equals with Afras. \**pVr-* 'to fly' (another popular mythetymology).

- (9) Hrs. Soq. *fer*; Mhr. *farr*, Jib. *ferr* // For broader Sem. connections v. LS 342, 341 and 107. Goes back to Afras. *\*pilar-* 'to fly' (clearly different from *\*bilarr-* 'to fly, jump' above): Egyp. *p³* 'fliegen' (EG I 494), W. Chad. Hausa *firà* 'to soar into the air', Angas *piir* 'to stretch the wings', C. Chad. Mafa *párr*, *pérr* 'bird's flight', Gude *pær*, *fær* 'to fly away (bird)'; N. Cush.: Beja *fīr* 'to fly', S. Cush.: Maʔa *púru* id. (ADB; see also EDE I 55).
- (10) Mhr. (syn.) *agōnāḥ* // Jib. *gēnāḥ* 'wing' (an Arabism, according to JJ 77), Soq. *ganḥ* 'devant, milieu de la poitrine' (Noged dialect *gēnʷāḥ* 'sternum'), Arb. *ḡanāḥ-* 'bras (chez l'homme); aisselle; aile (chez les oiseaux, les insectes, etc.)', *ḡāniḥ-at-* 'côte, surtout cette partie qui est du côté de la poitrine' (BK 1 338).<sup>98</sup> See SED I.
- ◇ No terms in Pho., Bib., Sab. and Gaf.
- **Common West Semitic:** *\*ḡwp* (#2) < Afras. *\*ḡVp-* 'bird; to fly': (?) Egyp. (late) *ḡpy* 'to fly' (perhaps a Semitism); S. Omot. *\*HVp/f-t-* 'bird': Dime *ipt*, *ift*, Ari *apti*, (?) *aft-i*, Hamer *apt-i*, *aft-i* (SED II; ADB).

### 31 FOOT:

- (1) Akk. *šēpu*; Soq. *ḡab*, *ḡaf* // < Sem. *\*ḡayp-* 'foot, sole of foot; shoe' (SED I No. 269).
- (2) Ugr. *pḡn*; Pho. *pḡm*; Mhr. *fēm*; Jib. *faḡm* // < Sem. *\*paḡm/n-* (SED I No. 207).
- (3) Hbr. Bib. *rāḡāl*; Plm. *rgl*; Syr. *regl-*; Mnd. *ligr-* (met.); Qur. *riḡl-*; Sab. *rgl* // < Sem. *\*rigl-* (SED I No. 228), with semantically diverse but undoubted Afras. parallels (see below).
- (4) Mnd. *kraia* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*kʷirāḡ-* 'knee and shin-bone; lower leg' (SED I No. 157).
- (5) Urm. *ʔaḡl-* // < Arm.: Syr. *ʔaḡlān-* 'armilla, brachiale' (Brock. 44), probably related to Arb. *wḡl* 'lever un pied en l'air en posant l'autre sur le sol' (BK 2 1591).
- (6) Leb. *ʔāḡar*; Gez. Tgr. *ʔaḡar*; Tna. *ʔaḡri*; Amh. *aḡar*; Arg. *ingir*, *ägär*; Gaf. *aḡʳä*; Sod. Cha. *ägär*; Har. *ingir*; Wol. *aḡar* // < Sem. (Arb.-Eth.) *\*ʔi(n)gi/ur-* (SED I No. 7). Continues, with a fossilized prefixed *ʔV-*, Afras. *\*gVr-* (see below).<sup>99</sup>
- (7) Mec. *gadam* // More likely < *\*ḡadam*: Arb. *ḡadam-* 'le premier pas; pas; pied' (BK 2 691; the original meaning must be 'front leg of an animal') < Sem. *\*ḡdm* 'to precede, be in front' (v. in LGz 421; cf. *\*ḡudm-* 'parte anteriore' Fron. 265). Less likely, though not impossible, < *\*gad-am-*, with a fossilized suffix *-m*, < Sem. *\*gVd-at-* '(part or bone of the) leg of animal': Akk. *gudgudātu* 'part of the lower leg of a quadruped', Gez. *ʔagadā* 'thighbone, shinbone, leg, large bone of the leg, shoulder of animal', etc. (v. SED I No. 71).
- (8) Mlt. *siʔ* // < *\*sik*: Arb. *sāḡ-* 'jambe, tibia' < Sem. *\*šāḡ-* 'thigh, leg' (SED I No. 241).
- (9) Tgr. *ḡaḡab* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*ḡakib-*, *\*ḡiḡb-* 'heel' (SED I No. 14).
- (10) Hrs. *gedel*; Mhr. *gēdel* (syn.); Jib. *gēdal* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*gVd(V)l-* 'limb' (SED I No. 73).
- (11) Soq. *sukal* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*š/suḡl-* 'leg, thigh; elbow' (SED I No. 242); derivation, with a fossilized prefixed *-l*, from Sem. *\*šāḡ-* 'thigh, leg' (No. 8, above) is possible.
- **Common Semitic 1:** *\*ḡayp-* (#1) < Afras. *\*ḡayp-* 'foot, sole of foot; shoe': Egyp. (Gr) *šp* 'hoof'; N. Cush.: Beja *šib* 'to shoe', *šab* 'to be shod, put on one's footgear'; C. Cush.: *\*šanp/b-* 'foot, heel': Bilin *šaanfi*, Qwara *šaanpaa*, Dembea *šanfa*, Qemant *šaambaa*, S. Cush.: Asa *išiba* 'sandal' (ADB).

**Common Semitic 2:** *\*paḡm/n-* (#2) < Afras. *\*Paḡun/m-* 'leg, foot': W. Chad.: Fyer *fūḡ* (< *\*funH-*), C. Chad.: Fali Kiria *pūnuʔ* 'thigh', Zime-Batna *fun* 'buttocks', E. Chad.: Soko-

<sup>98</sup> This root is attested only in MSA and Arabic, which always causes suspicions of an Arabism in MSA; this is hardly the case, however, since the root has reliable Afras. cognates and the primary meaning seems to have been 'wing': Egyp. (Pyr.) *dnḡ* (< *\*gnḡ*) 'wing'; (?) C. Chad.: Mbara *ḡāḡ-lāḡ* 'wing' (the second element is not clear); E. Cush.: HEC: Kambatta *gonna-ta* id.; N. Omot.: Dizi (Maji) *ganḡ* 'to fly'.

<sup>99</sup> Its widely accepted and much-discussed cognation with *\*rigl-* is yet another mythetymology among Semitists.

ro *offen*, *òpán* (<\*<sup>?</sup>Vfyan-) ‘foot, leg’; E. Cush.: Oromo *fana* ‘trace’ (n.), S. Cush.: Qwadza *paʔam-uko* ‘foot’ (ADB).

**Common West Semitic 1:** \**riḡl-* (#3) < Afras. \**riḡalul-* ‘limb, leg’: Brb. Zenaga *tə-rgəl*, Ghadames *ta-rzǎ/el-t* ‘plume’, *tū-ragl-a* ‘gros pédoncule du régime de dattes’, Ayr *a-rgul* ‘penis’, Ahaggar *â-rḡal* ‘queue’; W. Chad. Tangale *argil* ‘inner side of upper thigh’ (Stolb 2005 233), etc. Cf. also Egyp. (Pyr.) *ʕg.t* ‘hoof (of cow and ass)’, (NK) *ʕgʔ.t* ‘claw (of lion and bird)’ (dissimilation <\*<sup>?</sup>gʔ <\**rglʔ*?) (ADB).

**Common West Semitic 2:** \**i(n)ḡilur-* (#6) < Afras. \*(<sup>?</sup>*i-n*)*gur-* ‘leg, knee’: W. Chad. Warji *ḡgarái*, Miya *âḡár* ‘leg’, Mbara *mù-ḡurí*, E. Chad. Kera *gàḡàr* ‘knee’, Sokoro *gorun-gorundu* ‘foot’; S. Cush. \**gurun-guda* ‘knee’: Iraqw, Gorowa *gurūngura*, etc. (cf. K-M 122), N. Omot.: Mocha *gurāto*, Gimirra (She) *gurāt* ‘knee’ (LMč 33; comparison with Amh. *gulbät*, etc. is wrong) (ADB).<sup>100</sup>

### 32 FULL:

(1) Akk. *malû*; Ugr. *mlʔ*; Hbr. *malāʔ*; Pal. *mly*; Syr. *malē*; Mnd. Urm. *mily-*; Qur. *malʔān-*; Leb. *mālīn*; Mec. *malʔān*; Mlt. *memli*; Gez. *maluʔ*; Tna. *muluʔ*; Tgr. *maluʔ*; Amh. *mālu*; Arg. *muli*; Sod. *mulä*; Cha. *mura*; Har. *mulluʔ*; Wol. *mulli*; Mhr. *mīlaʔ*; Jib. *mižiʔ*; Soq. *mili* // < Sem. \**mlʔ* ‘to fill, be full’ (v. in LGz 342).

◊ No terms in Pho., Bib., Sab., Gaf. and Hrs.

→ **Proto-Semitic:** \**mlʔ* < Afras. \**mlʔ* ‘be full, filled’: Brb.: Ahaggar *amāli* ‘tout, entier’, Ayr *māllu* ‘ê. rempli entièrement, pleinement’, *malumāl* ‘ê. complètement rempli’; W. Chad.: Hausa *mālālā* ‘to flow out, into; pervade entirely’, *mālālā* ‘abundantly’, (?) C. Chad.: Mada *māla-kiya* ‘full moon’ (*kiya* ‘moon’); S. Cush.: Iraqw *milalāʕ* ‘to fill to the brim’ (with an *ʕ* of unclear origin); (?) N. Omot.: Wolamo *mūliya* ‘totality, wholeness (?)’ (cf. *ḡamma mūliya* ‘the whole night’) (EDE III 413; ADB).

### 33 GIVE:

(1) Akk. *nadānu* (other verbal forms include *tadānu* and *idinu*) // The comparison, as an *n*-prefixed verb, with Arb. *dyn* ‘prêter; rétribuer’ (BK 1 757),<sup>101</sup> corroborated by Egyp. (Pyr.) *wdn* ‘opfern’ (EG I 391) and W. Chad.: Angas *tūn* (*t-* can reflect \**d-*) ‘tuwo as an offering’<sup>102</sup> seems more tenable than the widely quoted equation with Sem. \**n/ytn* (so in AHW 701; HALOT 733; DLU 543; EDE I 241; cf. a detailed discussion in EDE III 764),<sup>103</sup> where Akk. *d* vs. Sem. \**t* is impossible to explain other than by some kind of contamination of the two roots.

(2) Ugr. *ytn*; Hbr. Bib. Pal. *ntn*; Pho. *ytn* (*n-tn*) // < Sem. \**ytn* ~ \**ntn* (v. in HALOT 733).

(3) Bib. Pal. *yhb* (both syn.); Syr. *y(h)b*; Mnd. *ahb* (syn.); Urm. *yhb*; Sab. Gez. *whb*; Tna. *habä*; Tgr. *haba*; Arg. *hawa*; Gaf. *wabä*; Sod. *abä*; Wol. *wabä* // < Sem. \**whb* (LGz 609).

<sup>100</sup> Very likely related to North African Afras. \*(*nV-*)*gʷar-* ‘hand; holding, catching’: Egyp. (Pyr.) *dʕ.t*, *dr.t* ‘hand’ (cf. *ndry* ‘to catch’, *ndr* ‘to seize’; W. Chad.: Bolewa *gòru* ‘to snatch’, *ngàru* ‘to pinch and hold tight’, Tangale *kòrɛ* ‘to hold tightly’, C. Chad.: Musgoy *ḡar* ‘hand’, Gude *ngərə* ‘to pick up, lift’, Musgu *ḡranḡe* ‘arm’ (ADB; cf. EDE I, 321). The eventual kinship of the two roots, one meaning ‘leg, knee’, the other meaning ‘hand’, can be accounted for by assuming a common Pre-Proto-Afrasian ancestor lexeme meaning ‘limb, leg (of animal)’, with an eventual bifurcation.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. also MSA: Mhr. *adyēn* ‘to lend (money, supplies), to give credit’ JM 78, Jib. *edyín* id. JJ 44, Soq. \**šedyen* caus.-refl. ‘s’emprunter’ LS 127 (unless all from Arb.)

<sup>102</sup> Most likely continuing N. Afras. \**dVw/yVn-* ‘offering’ (note ‘to offer a sacrifice’ as one of the meanings of Akk. *nadānu* CAD n 42).

<sup>103</sup> Apparently another mythetymology, though more subtle in this case.

- (4) Qur. *ṣṭy* IV; Leb. *ʔaṣṭa*; Mec. *ʔaṣṭā*; Mlt. *ta* // Only Arb.
- (5) Amh. *säṭṭä*; Har. *säṭa* // < Sem. *\*(y/w)ṣṭw* ‘to hold out, give/take’ (v. in LGz 520).
- (6) Hrs. *wezōm*; Mhr. *wəzōm*; Jib. *əzōm*; Soq. *ʔézom* // Also ‘to lend’; related to Arb. *wzm* ‘payer, acquitter (la dette)’, *wazima* ‘éprouver quelques pertes dans son avoir’ (BK 2 1529). Likely cognates are: W. Chad. Hausa *zāmā* ‘to defraud a person of his proper share’, C. Chad. Logone *zum* ‘plündern’, Buduma *ham* id., Gude *zəmə* ‘to cheat, neglect to pay debt; extract payment from so.’ (ADB).
- (7) Soq. *mnḥ* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*mnḥ*: Ugr. *mnḥ* ‘entregar’, Hbr. *minḥā* ‘gift, offering’, Arb. *mnḥ* ‘donner, offrir; donner à quelqu’un l’usufruit des bestiaux’ (BK 2 1156), Gez. (metathetic) *maḥana* ‘to pay homage, make a gift’, etc. (v. in LS 246; DLU 282–283; HALOT 601; see also EDE III 306–7 for possible Cush. and Chad. parallels)<sup>104</sup>.
- **Common West Semitic 1:** *\*whb* (#3) < Afras. *\*wahab-* ~ *\*hVwab-* ‘to bring, give, take’: Brb. *\*Hubay-*: Ghadames *abbi*, Siwa *abba* ‘to drive, bring’, Ahaggar, Taneslemt *hub-at* ‘to drag’; W. Chad.: Sura *hwóp*, Ankwe *waap* ‘to borrow’, Pero *wábà* ‘offering’; E. Cush.: Saho-Afar *ab-it-* ‘to take for oneself’, HEC: Sidamo *ab-*, Hadiya *ēb-*, Alaba *ib-* ‘to bring’, S. Cush.: Alagwa *hub-* ‘to bring’ (ADB; EDE I 72–3)<sup>105</sup>.
- Common West Semitic 2:** *\*ytn* ~ *\*ntn* (#2).

### 34 GOOD:

- (1) Akk. *ṭābu*; Pal. *ṭb*; Hbr. *ṭōb*; Bib. *ṭāb*; Syr. Mnd. *ṭāb-*; Qur. *ṭayyib-*; Mec. *ṭayyib*; Mlt. *tayyip* // < Sem. *\*ṭayVb-* (v. in DLU 479; HALOT 370).
- (2) Akk. *damḫ-* (syn.) // < Sem. *\*dmḫ* ‘to be pleasing, good, beautiful’ (v. in DRS 276; LGz 135).
- (3) Ugr. Pho. *nṣm* // < Sem. *\*nṣm* ‘to be pleasant’ (v. in HALOT 705) < Afras. *\*nṣm* ‘to be sweet (of honey)’: W. Chad.: Dera *nəmnəm* (redupl.) ‘sweet’, C. Chad. *\*nVm-* ‘sweet, honey’ (CLR II 549); S. Cush.: Qwadza *naʔam-uko* ‘honey-comb’, Maʔa *naʔá* ‘honey’.<sup>106</sup>
- (4) Syr. *šappīr-* (syn.); Urm. *šapīr-* // < Sem. *\*špr* ‘to be beautiful, clean; to shine’ (v. in HALOT 1635).
- (5) Qur. *ḥasan-* (syn.) // Translated as ‘beau, joli; bon, excellent’ in BK 1 428. Obviously connected with Tgr. *ḥasna* ‘to talk and do good’ (LH 73), Mhr. *ḥássən* ‘to improve in health’ (JM 189; marked as Arabism), Jib. *aḥsín* ‘to be kind to so.’, *aḥtsín* ‘to improve’, *šḥesín* ‘to think so. or st. good’ (JJ 116); all these forms, however, may well be Arabisms. On one hand, likely related to Hbr. *ḥāsīn* ‘strong’ (HALOT 338), Syr. *ḥāsīn-* ‘firmus, robustus’, *ḥsn* (etpe.) ‘superatus est’ (Brock. 248), all < Sem. *\*ḥsn*. On the other hand, cf. Arb. *ḥisnat-* ‘salaire, prix du travail’ (BK 1 428) cognate to Jud. *ḥsn* (Itpa.) ‘to be fully compensated’ (Ja. 489) and E. Jib. Mhr. *ḥəsənēt* ‘heavenly reward’ (JM 189; an Arabism?), also < *\*ḥsn*. The question is whether these are two homonymous roots or just one, with polysemy.

<sup>104</sup> Tgr. *männāḥa* ‘to let a cow (as a loan) in usufruct’ (LH 127, compared in HALOT 601 without any comments), is certainly an Arabism.

<sup>105</sup> Contrary to the established opinion (e.g. in EDE I 72–3), Egyp. (Pyr) *hʔb* ‘to send (a letter or message inter alia), to write a letter’, (MK-NK) ‘letter, message’ is not related, since *ʔ* renders here *\*-r-*, i. e. the implied Egyptian form would be *\*hVr(V)b-*. This is demonstrated by forms in languages that have borrowed the Egyp. term in the meaning ‘to write’, namely Chad.: Hausa *rubutā*, Buduma *rebōde*, Afade *ohárbotù* (the latter word perfectly conveys the consonant root composition of the Egyp. word) and Brb: Lybian (East Numidian) *tt-rb*, *t-rb-thn*, Ghadames *ūrāb*, etc. < Brb. *\*Harāb*, a conspicuous case of *\*ḥ* (> *ḥ* in Ghadames and Audjila) < *\*b* with a laryngeal in the same root (for details, see Mil. Tuar. 200).

<sup>106</sup> Cf. EDE I 261, comparing the Sem. and S. Cush. forms with Egyp. *ndm* ‘sweet, pleasant’, where *d* is impossible to justify, since the correspondence Egyp. *d* ~ Sem. *ṣ* does not exist.

- (6) Leb. *mləḥ* (*mnəḥ*) // Arb. *mlḥ* 'ê. beau ou bon' (BK 2 1144), related to Ugr. *mlḥ* 'hermosura' (DLU 274; quoted with a question mark). The meaning 'good' is presumably derived from 'salt, salty' (< Sem. \**milḥ*- 'salt', v. in LGz 343; this semantic shift is attested in several other roots, cf. Bulakh 2005), cf. Arb. *milḥ*- 'sel; l'esprit, le piquant', *mlḥ* 'saler; ê. salé' (BK *ibid.*). Cf. also Gez. *malḥ*, *məlḥ*, *məlḥā* 'salt, taste, savor, common sense' (LGz 343) and the comments by Leslau on *malḥa* 'to do, work': "possibly 'do good work', salt being the symbol of good deeds" (*ibid.*).<sup>107</sup>
- (7) Sab. *ṣdk* // The meaning 'good' is debatable ('right; justice; justification; truth; *that which is good, proper, satisfactory*' SD 141) < Sem. *ṣdk* 'to be just, true' (v. in HALOT 1003; LGz 548).
- (8) Gez. *ṣannāy*; Tgr. *sānni* // Common Eth.<sup>108</sup> External parallels, adduced in LGz 532, are not very convincing, except for Mhr. *meṣnā* 'fitness, efficiency', quoted after Bittner, but having a different meaning in JM.
- (9) Tna. *ṣabbuḥ* // To compare with Arb. *sbḥ* 'devancer, arriver le premier', *ṣabaḥ*- 'qui devance les autres et arrive le premier; supérieur, excellent' (BK 1 1046); perhaps an Arabism.
- (10) Amh. *ṭaru* // Several etymological hypotheses may be proposed in the absence of direct parallels. Either we should derive it from *ṭarra* 'to be pure, clear' < Eth. \**ṣry* id. (v. in LGz 564), or identify it, as a metathesis-enhanced \**ṭrw*, with S. Eth. \**ṭwr* 'to do things well, arrange well' (v. in LGur 637), or with Sod. *ṭirāññe* 'to be strong, powerful, courageous' and similar S. Eth. forms (v. in LGur 631–2). In any case, no clear parallels outside Eth.
- (11) Arg. *damma* // Though no etymology is offered in LArg 198, likely related to Mod. Eth. \**dāmam* 'attractive, pretty', derived in LGur 209 from *dām* 'blood'. The meaning shift 'blood' > 'good, attractive' is not self-evident and needs more data to be convincing. An alternative semantic shift, although also debatable, is 'attractive' < 'red'<sup>109</sup> (Amh. *addāma*

<sup>107</sup> Otherwise, to be compared with Brb. \**-mally* 'good, beautiful' (Qabyle *a-mellay* 'good, merciful', Ayr *mol-ān* 'good', etc.); C. Chad.: Kotoko *mə̀lā* 'sweet, pleasant'; N. Cush.: Bilin *milmil-i* 'beautiful, graceful' (see EDE III 242), in which case we are setting up a different etymology, apparently not connected with 'salt'; the quoted Brb., N. Cush. and C. Chad. forms are not expected to reflect Sem. *-ḥ* and are thus comparable with the Sem. root; if, however, they are related to Egyp. (late NK) *mn.t* (if <\**ml-t*) 'happy state of being' (*ibid.* 241), bearing no traces of *ḥ*, the comparison with Arb. (and possibly Ugr.) *mlḥ* 'to be good' should be disregarded, which again returns us to the 'salt' version. Another much quoted parallel with Arb. *mlḥ* is Egyp. (Pyr.) *mnḥ* 'richtig, trefflich' (EG II 84), *s-mnḥ* 'gut machen' (*ibid.* IV 136), possibly <\**mlḥ* (cf. EDE III 313–16; note, however, Sem. variant forms with *-n*: the Leb. variant root *mnəḥ*, Syrian Arabic *mnih* 'nice' and MSA: Mhr. *menaḥ* 'nice', Soq. *mənaḥ* 'beau'); the latter parallel is much less tenable, since Egyp. *ḥ* vs. Sem. \**ḥ* is not regular (cf. discussion in EDE *ibid.*).

<sup>108</sup> Tna. *sānnay* is rare, according to my informants.

<sup>109</sup> Curiously, the two roots with the same consonantal composition and obviously associable meanings 'red' and 'blood' make up two different lexemes on the Proto-Afrasian level and thus should be qualified as homonymous on that level. Cf. Afras. \*(?*a*-)*dVm*- ~ \**di?m*- 'red': Sem.: Akkadian (Oakk. on) *adamu* (*adammu*, *adumu*) 'a red garment' (CAD *a1* 95) (cf. metathetic Standard Bab.) *da?mu* 'dark-colored, dark-red' *ibid.* *d* 74), Ugr. *ṣadmānu* 'red (earth)' (Huhn., 104), Hbr. *ṣādōm* 'reddish(-brown), of blood, grape-juice, lentils, cow, horse, skin' [HALOT 15] (cf. also its reduplicated stem variant *ṣādāmdām* 'right red, reddish' *ibid.*), Arb. *ṣudmat*- 'red color' (DAF 64), *dmm* 'to paint red' (BK 1 728), Gez. *ṣadama* 'be red', *ṣaddāmāwi* 'red' (LGz 8), Amh. *addāmā* 'to be blood-red' *ibid.* (otherwise < 'blood'), *dama* 'brown (mule, horse), reddish' (LGur 207) Gurage (all dialects) *dama* 'brown (mule, horse), reddish' (*ibid.*), Masqan *dāmyä* 'red (maize)', Cha., Muher, etc. *dāmyät* 'red, reddish' (*ibid.* 210); Egyp. (OK) *idmy* 'red cloth'; Brb.: Tashelhit *adəmmani*, Tamazight *adəmman* 'brown, bronze coloured', Qabyle *ddāmdām* 'violet'; C. Cush.: Aungi *dāmmā*, Kunfāl *demé* (App. CDA 114), E. Cush.: Saho *duma*, Oromo *dīmā*, Konso *tīm-*, Sidamo *duu?mo* 'red', Darasa *diimma* 'to become red', S. Cush.: Qwadza *dimaḥi-* 'red'; Omot.: Kafa *damme* 'red', Ongota *dama?tā* 'yellow' (ADB).



- 'to be blood-red', *dama* 'dark-red', Chaha *dämyüt* 'red', Harari *dāma* 'brown, dark-skinned', etc. < Sem. \**ʔadam-* ~ \**dVʔVm-* 'red').<sup>110</sup>
- (12) Gaf. *gunnä* // Likely < Eth. \**gnn* 'to become important, abundant, numerous, strong; to exceed' (LGz 198), Tna. *gänänä* 'to be lucky, fortunate' (Kane T 2316), related to Arb. *ʕnn* 'grandir et se développer dans une riche végétation, être abondant et touffu (se dit des plantes, des herbes)' (BK 1 331–2); cf. DRS 147.
- (13) Cha. *wäke* // Controversially commented upon in LGur 650 as "perhaps a phonetic variant of *wäge*", in its turn commented upon as "perhaps a phonetic variant of *wäke*... coming from \**wäke*" (ibid. 646). Perhaps related to Gez. *wākaya* 'to shine, be brilliant', etc. (LGz 612), reasonably compared ibid. with Akk. *akukūtu* 'red glow in the sky' (also 'flame, blaze' CAD a1 285).<sup>111</sup> Cf. interesting, though isolated, parallels in Chad.: W.: Hausa *kyāu* 'goodness, beauty' (Abr. Hs. 602) and C.: Gisiga *kuwi* 'good', *kuko* 'beautiful' (Sk. Hs. 164) and E. Cush.: Yaaku -*εεko* 'good' (Hei. Ya. 126).
- (14) Har. *toññam* // < *toñña* 'to exceed, excel' < Eth. \**ʕnɛ* 'to be strong' < Sem. \**ʕnɛ* 'to make, act skillfully' (v. in LGz 559).
- (15) Wol. *bēzzä* // According to LGur 168, from Kambatta *bizza* 'generous'. Otherwise from Common Eth. and Sem. \**bzḥ* 'to abound, be abundant, become more', etc. (v. in LGur 168).
- (16) Jib. *fəḵš-ün* // Placed in JJ 56 under the same root as *fəḵš* 'to tap st. until it breaks (as., e.g., an egg)'. If this similarity is not the result of homonymy, but represents a very specific meaning shift, then the forms are related to Mhr. *fəḵš* id. (JM 92) and Arb. *fəḵš* 'casser avec la main (un oeuf)' (BK 2 621; cf. ibid. variant roots *fəḵs* and *fəḵš* with close meanings).<sup>112</sup>
- (17) Soq. *dīye* // The only possible match that I could find is Hbr. \**day* 'sufficiency, what is required, enough' (HALOT 219), but there are several tenable parallels in other Afras. with the meaning 'good': E. Chad. Tumaq *ed*; N. Cush. Beja *day*, E. Cush. Bayso *ka-iida* (<\**yid-*), Sidamo *aada*; N. Omot. Shinasha *doʔa*, Kafa *deʔo* making Afras. \**dVy/?-* ~ \**yVd-* 'good' (Mil. 2004 317–18; ADB).
- ◇ Sod. *fäyya* is < E. Cush.: Oromo *fayya* 'to be in good health', Sidamo *fayyi* 'to feel better', etc. (LGur 252); Wol. *bēzzä* is, according to LGur 168, from Kambatta *bizza* 'generous'<sup>113</sup>; Hrs. *ged*, Mhr. *gād* must be borrowed from Arb. *ʕayyid-* 'excellent, bon' (BK 1 351).
- **Common North and West Semitic:** \**ṭayVb-*.

### Literature

- Abr. Hs. — ABRAHAM, R., 1965. *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*. London.
- ADB — *Afrasian Data Base* (<http://starling.rinet.ru> and <http://ehl.santafe.edu>).
- AHw — SODEN, W. VON., 1965–1981. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden.
- Aloj. — ALOJALY, Gh., 1980. *Lexique touareg-français*. Copenhagen.

<sup>110</sup> For the "isosemantic row" demonstrating the same meaning shift, cf. C. Cush. Kemant *sāray*, Qwara *sāra*, both meaning 'red' and 'beautiful' (App. CDA 30), and Russian *красный* 'red' and the derived form *красивый* 'beautiful'.

<sup>111</sup> And unconvincingly with Soq. *ʔughe* 'to become reddish', since Soq. *g* does not correspond to Sem. \**k*.

<sup>112</sup> One wonders if the MSA verb could be an Arabism. Similarity of a very specific meaning testifies in favor of borrowing; verbs, however, are not prone to borrowing in Semitic, and the MSA languages, full of nouns borrowed from Arabic, are not an exception in this matter.

<sup>113</sup> Though an origin from Common Eth. and Sem. \**bzḥ* 'to abound, be abundant, become more', etc. (v. in LGur 168), cannot be entirely ruled out.

- App CDA — APPLEYARD, D. A., 2006. Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages. *Kuschitische Sprachstudien / Cushitic Language Studies*, Band 24. Köln.
- Baet. — BAETEMAN, J., 1929. *Dictionnaire amarigna — français suivi d'un vocabulaire français- amarigna*. Dire-Daoua (Ethiopie).
- Barg. — BARGER, G., 1934. *A Hausa-English dictionary and English-Hausa vocabulary*. London.
- Belot — BELOT, J. B., 1929. *Vocabulaire arabe-français à l'usage des étudiants*. Beyrouth.
- Biella — BIELLA, J.C. *Dictionary of Old South Arabic*. Chico, 1982.
- BK — BIBERSTEIN-KAZIMIRSKI, A. DE., 1860. *Dictionnaire arabe-français*. Paris.
- Bla. Fau. — BLAŽEK, V., 2003. Fauna in Beja Lexicon. *Studia Semitica* (FS A. Militarev). Moscow, 230–294.
- Bnd Om. — BENDER, M.L., 2003. *Omotic lexicon and Phonology*. Carbondale.
- Brock. — BROCKELMANN, C., 1928. *Lexicon Syriacum*. Halle.
- Bulakh 2003 — BULAKH, M., 2003. Etymological Notes on the Akkadian Colour Terms. *Studia Semitica* (FS A. Militarev). Moscow, 3–17.
- Bulakh 2004 — BULAKH, M., 2004. Color Terms of Modern South Arabian Languages: A Diachronic Approach. *Babel und Bibel I*. Moscow, 269–82.
- Bulakh 2005 — BULAKH, M., 2005. Semantic notes in the lexical field of taste in Geez. *Varia Aethiopica. In Memory of Sevir B. Chernetsov (1943–2005)*. SPb, 325–353.
- Bulakh Dis. — BULAKH, M., 2005. *Цветобозначение семитских языков в этимологическом аспекте (Color nomination in Semitic in the etymological aspect)*. Doctorate dissertation. Russian State University in the Humanities, Moscow.
- CAD — OPPENHEIM, L., E. REINER & M.T. ROTH (ed.), 1956–. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute, the University of Chicago*. Chicago.
- CSD — A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, ed. J. Payne SMITH. Oxford 1957
- CLR — JUNGRAITHMAYR, H. & D. IBRIZIMOW, 1994. *Chadic Lexical Roots I–II*. Berlin.
- DLU — DEL OLMO LETE, G. & J. SANMARTÍN, 1996–2000. *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica I–II*. Barcelona.
- DM — DROWER, E.S. & R. MACUCH, 1963. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford.
- DRS — COHEN, D., 1970–. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*. La Haye.
- DUL — OLMO LETE, G. & J. SANMARTÍN. A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. 2003. Leiden-Boston.
- Eb. — Ebert, K., 1976. *Sprache und Tradition der Kera (Tschad)*. Teil II. *Lexikon*. Berlin.
- EDE I — TAKÁCS, G., 1999. *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*, Volume One: A Phonological Introduction. Leiden-Boston- Köln.
- EDE II — TAKÁCS, G., 2001. *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*, Volume Two: *b-, p-, f-*. Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- EDE III — TAKÁCS, G., 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*, volume Three. Leiden-Boston.
- EEN — EHRET, C., E. ELDERKIN & D. NURSE, 1989. Dahalo lexis and its sources. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 18, 1–49.
- EG — ERMAN, A. & H. GRAPOW, 1957–71. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, I–VII. Berlin.
- F. — FOUCAULD, le père C. de., 1951–1952. *Dictionnaire touareg-français* 1–4. Paris.
- Fron. — FRONZAROLI, P., 1965. *Studi sul lessico comune semitico*. III. I fenomeni naturali. *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XX, fasc. 3–4, pp. 135–150.
- Gr. — GRAGG, G., 1982. *Oromo Dictionary*. East Lansing.
- HALOT — KOEHLER, L. & W. BAUMGARTNER, 1994–1996, 1999–2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament I–III*. Leiden, New York & Köln. IV–V. Leiden, Boston & Köln.
- Hei. Ya. — HEINE, B., 1975. Notes on the Yaaku Language (Kenia). *Afrika und Übersee* 58/2. 119–38.
- HJ — HOFTIJZER, J. and K. JONGELING, 1995. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Leiden — New York — Köln.
- HRSC — EHRET, C., 1980. *The Historical Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic Phonology and Vocabulary*. Berlin.
- HSED — OREL, V. and O. STOLBOVA. 1995. *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Materials for a Reconstruction*. Leiden-New York-Köln.
- Huds. — HUDSON, G., 1989. *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary*. Hamburg.
- Huehn. — HUEHNERGARD, J. *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. Atlanta, 1987.
- Ja. — JASTROW, M., 1996. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York.

- Jahn — JAHN, A., 1902. *Die Mehri-Sprache in Südarabien. Texte und Wörterbuch*. Wien.
- JH — JOHNSTONE, T.M., 1977. *Ḥarsūsi Lexicon*. New York — Toronto.
- JJ — JOHNSTONE, T.M., 1981. *Jibbāli Lexicon*. New York (NY).
- JM — JOHNSTONE, T.M., 1987. *Mehri Lexicon*. London.
- Kane A — KANE, T.L., 1990. *Amharic-English Dictionary*. Wiesbaden.
- Kane T — KANE, T.L., 2000. *Tigrinya-English Dictionary*. Vol. I–II. Springfield.
- Kauf. — KAUFMAN, S. A., 1974. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Chicago-London.
- K-M — KIESSLING, R. and M. MOUS, 2003. *The Lexical Reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic*. Köln.
- Kog. DD — KOGAN, L., 2006. On Proto-Semitic Deverbal Derivation. Paper read at II Workshop on Comparative Semitic (Sitges, Spain)
- Kog. Eth. — KOGAN, L., 2005. Common Origin of Ethiopian Semitic: the Lexical Dimension. *Scrinium. T. 1: Varia Aethiopica. In Memory of Sevir B. Chernetsov (1943–2005)*.
- Kog. Ug. — KOGAN, L., 2005. *Between Akkadian and Cannanite: Lexical Evidence and the Genealogical Position of Ugartitic (manuscript)*.
- Kossm. — KOSSMANN, M., 1999. *Essai sur la phonologie du proto-berbère*. Köln.
- Lan. — LANFRY, J., 1973. *Ghadamès*. Vol. II. *Glossaire (Parler des Ayt Waziten)*. Alger.
- LArg — LESLAU, W., 1997. *Ethiopic Documents: Argobba*. Wiesbaden.
- Lao. — LAOUST, E., 1932. *Siwa: son parler*. Paris.
- LGaf — LESLAU, W., 1956. *Étude descriptive et comparative du Gafat (Éthiopien méridional)*. Paris.
- LGur — LESLAU, W., 1979. *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*. Vol. III. Wiesbaden.
- LGz — LESLAU, W., 1987. *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden.
- LH — LITTMANN, E. and M. HÖFNER, 1956. *Wörterbuch der Tigre-Sprache. Tigre-deutsch-englisch*. Wiesbaden.
- LHar. — LESLAU, W., 1963. *Etymological Dictionary of Harari*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Lmb-Sot — LAMBERTI, M. and R. SOTTILE, 1997. The Wolaytta Language. *Studia Linguarum Africae Orientalis*, Bd. 6. Köln.
- LMč — LESLAU, W., 1959. *A Dictionary of Moča (Southwestern Ethiopia)*. Berkeley & Los Angeles.
- LS — LESLAU, W., 1938. *Lexique Soqotri (Sudarabique moderne) avec comparaisons et explications étymologiques*. Paris.
- Maizel — МАЙЗЕЛЬ, С. С., 1983. *Пути развития корневого фонда семитских языков*. Москва. [MAIZEL, S. S., 1983. *Ways of Root Derivation in Semitic*. Moscow.]
- MCB — LAOUST, E., 1920. *Mots et choses berbères*. Paris.
- Mil. Farm. — MILITAREV, A., 2002. The Prehistory of a Dispersal: the Proto-Afrasian (Afroasiatic) Farming Lexicon. *Examining the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis*, eds. P. Bellwood & C. Renfrew. McDonald Institute Monographs. Cambridge, 135–50.
- Mil. RE — MILITAREV, A., 2005. Root extension and root formation in Semitic and Afrasian. *Proceedings of the Barcelona Symposium on comparative Semitic*, 19–20/11/2004, *Aula Orientalis* 23/1–2, p. 83–130.
- Mil. 2000 — MILITAREV, A., 2000. Towards the chronology of Afrasian (Afroasiatic) and its daughter families. *Time Depth in Historical Linguistics. Volume 1*. Ed. by C. Renfrew, A. McMahon & L. Trask. The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. Cambridge, 267–307.
- Mil. 2004 — MILITAREV, A., 2004. Another Step towards the Chronology of Afrasian (I). *Orientalia et Classica. Papers of the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies. Issue V. Babel and Bibel 1. Ancient Near East, Old Testament and Semitic Studies*. Moscow, 282–333.
- Mil. 2007 — MILITAREV, A., 2007. Toward a Complete Etymology-Based Hundred Word List of Semitic. Irem 1–34 (First Third). *Proceedings of the 7th International Semito-Hamitic Congress (Berlin, Sept.13–15, 2004)*. Aachen, p. 71–102.
- Mil. 2008 — MILITAREV, A., 2008. Toward a Complete Etymology-based One Hundred Wordlist of Semitic: Items 34–66 (Second Third). *FS H. Jungraithmayr and A. Dolgopolsky*. Ed. by G. Takacs, p. 194–222.
- Nak. — NAKANO, A. 1986. *Comparative Vocabulary of Southern Arabic*. Tokyo.
- Pen. — PENRICE, J., 1873. *A Dictionary and Glossary of the Koran*. London.
- RBeq — REINISCH, L., 1895. *Wörterbuch der Beḏaaye-Sprache*. Wien.
- Ricks Qat. — RICKS, S. D., 1982. A Lexicon of Epigraphic Qatabanian. PhD dissertation. Berkeley.
- Sarg. — САРГИС (архимандрит), 1909. *Русско-сирский лексиконъ*. Урмия. (SARGIS, archimandrite, 1909. *Russian-Syriac Lexicon*. Urmia.)

- Sat. — SATTERTHWIT, A. C., 1960. Rate of Morphemic Decay in Meccan Arabic. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. 26/3, 254–261.
- SD — BEESTON, A. F. L., M. A. GHUL, W. W. MÜLLER & J. RYCKMANS, 1982. *Sabaic Dictionary (English-French-Arabic)*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- SED I — MILITAREV, A. & L. KOGAN, 2000. *Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. vol. 1: *Anatomy of Man and Animals*. Münster.
- SED II — MILITAREV, A. & L. KOGAN, 2005. *Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. II: *Animal Names*. Münster.
- Sk. Hs. — SKINNER, N., 1996. *Hausa Comparative Dictionary*. Köln.
- SLLE — D. KUSIA and R. SIEBERT, 1994. Wordlists of Arbore (Irbore), Birayle (Ongota), Tsamai (Tsamaho). *Survey of Little-known Languages of Ethiopia. Linguistic Report No. 20*. Addis-Ababa. 1–12.
- Sok. — SOKOLOFF, M., 1990. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*. Jerusalem.
- Star. — STAROSTIN, S., 2000. Comparative-historical linguistics and lexicostatistics, in *Time Depth in Historical Linguistics*, vol. 1, eds. C. Renfrew, A. McMahon & L. Trask. (Papers in the Prehistory of Languages.) Cambridge: The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 223–265.
- Stolb. 1987 — СТОЛБОВА, О., 1987. Сравнительно-историческая фонетика и словарь западночадских языков. *Африканское историческое языкознание*. Москва, 30–268. (STOLBOVA, O., 1987. West Chadic Comparative-Historical Phonetics and Vocabulary. *African Historical Linguistics*. Moscow.)
- Stolb. 2005 — STOLBOVA, O., 2005. *Chadic lexical database. Issue I (L, N, Ny, R)*. Kaluga.
- Sw. 1952 — SWADESH, M., 1952. Lexico-statistical dating of prehistoric ethnic contacts: With special reference to North American Indians and Eskimos. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 96, 452–463.
- Sw. 1955 — SWADESH, M., 1955. Toward greater accuracy in lexicostatistical dating. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21, 121–137.
- Tomb. — TOMBACK, R. S. *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages*. Ann Arbor.
- Tos. Das. — TOSCO, M., 2001. *The Dhaasanac Language. Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary of a Cushitic Language of Ethiopia*. Köln.
- Tser. — ЦЕРЕТЕЛИ, К. Г., 1958. *Хрестоматия современного ассирийского языка со словарем*. Тбилиси. (TSERETELI, K. G., 1958. *A Neo-Assyrian Anthology (with glossary)*. Tbilisi).
- Vyc — VYČIHL, W., 1983. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*. Leuven.

Статья посвящена детальному этимологическому разбору первых 34 элементов из 100-словного списка М. Сводеша для подавляющего большинства живых и вымерших языков семитской семьи. Основная цель автора — максимально точная лексическая реконструкция соответствующих понятий на прасемитском, а также на промежуточных (западно-семитский, южно-семитский и т. п.) уровнях. Каждая этимология сопровождается подробным обсуждением альтернативных вариантов реконструкции и перечнем наиболее вероятных внешних параллелей в других языках афразийской макросемьи. В ряде случаев приводятся также общие соображения относительно методологии проведения лексикостатистических подсчетов.