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.
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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. Greenberg1) in his diagnostic lists. This negligence toward the fundamental principles of the comparative method was unfortunately

---

1 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. (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.

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,
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.

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 ◊.

4 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.; Gafiz, 500 C.E.; Tigrai, 2000; Tigre, 2000; Amharic, 2000; Argobba, 2000; Gafiz, 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; Daṯ — Daṯna Arabic; Dem. — Demotic; Ḍof. — Ḍofar; Dyn. — Dynasty; E. — East; Egyp. — Egyptian; ESA — Epigraphic South Arabian; ET — Epicraic Sout Arabian; Eth. — Ethiopian; Gaf. — Gafiz; Gez. — Geziz; Gur. — Gurage; Har. — Harari; Hdr. — Ḥadramaut; 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. — Mecaw 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. — Tigrinya (= Tigray); Tgr. — Tigre; Ugr. — Ugaritic; Urm. — Urmian Neo-Aramaic; W. — West; Wol. — Wolane.

Transcription and transliteration:
c — alveolar voiceless affricate [ts], ʒ — alveolar voiced affricate [dz], č — palato-alveolar voiceless affricate [ts], ẑ — palato-alveolar voiced affricate [dz], ʂ — hissing emphatic voiceless fricative, ѣ — emphatic voiceless affricate, ʐ — conventionally stands for what was likely ḍ, emphatic voiced interdental, or ŋ, emphatic voiceless interdental, 圪 — palato-alveolar emphatic affricate, ʂ — lateral voiceless fricative, ȷ — lateral voiceless affricate, ԃ — lateral voiceless emphatic affricate, ركة — lateral voiced emphatic fricative or affricate, 小编一起 — lateral voiced fricative, ḍ or q — emphatic velar stop, γ — uvular voiced fricative (Arabic “ghain”), ḡ — uvular voiceless fricative, ḡ — uvular voiceless fricative (only in Egyptian), ḡ — pharyngeal voiceless fricative, ḡ — laryngeal voiceless fricative, ḡ — pharyngeal voiced fricative, ḡ — glottal stop, ḡ — unspecified laryngeal or pharyngeal, ḡ — palatal resonant.

1 ALL:
(1) Akk. kalī; Ugr. kl; Hbr. kōl; Pho. kl; Bib. kōl; Pal. kəl, kol; Syr. kul; Mnd. kul; Urm. kol; Qur. kulla; Leb. koll; Mec. kull; Mlt. kolla; Sab. kll; Gez. kəllu; Tna. kəllu; Tgr. kollu; Amh. hulul; Gaf. yollu (<yolk-, met.); Sod. kullam; Cha. onnom; Har. kullu; Wol. hullam; Hrs. kal(l); Mhr. kal; Jib. ka(h)l // < Sem. *kəllu-ə (cf. in LGz 281).
(2) Arg. muli // < Sem. *mP ‘to be full’ (v. FULL No. 1).
(3) Soq. ḍahere // < Sem. *pḥrh ‘totality, gathering’; Mhr. Jib. fahr ‘together’ (JM 110, JJ 67), Akk. pḥraru ‘sich versammeln’ (AHw 810), ‘to assemble, congregate, gather, collect’ (CAD p 23), Ugr. pfr ‘assembly, cluster; group, faction, family’ (DUL 669), pfr ‘whole, totality’
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?

fine ash’ (an Arabism?).

The two forms, undoubtedly related, are not compared either in AHw 1370 or in DUL 165 where the Ukr.
term is viewed as having no definite etymology; direct, if tentative, comparisons (ibid.) with 5 phr ‘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).

Note what can be viewed as a variant root: Arb. rubd-at- ‘colour of ash, ashen’; cf. also Hausa rühüfi ‘hot
fine ash’ (an Arabism?).
(6) Gez. ḥamād; Tna. ḥamākṣ̄esti or ḥamād kṣ̄esti;11 Tgr. ḥamād; Amh. amād (syn.); Arg. ḥamād; Sod. Cha. amād; Har. ḥamād; Wol. amād // From the semantic point of view, more likely < Sem. *ḥmād (in which case h- in Gez. must be treated as a purely graphic variant of *ḥ-)  
Arb. ḥmād ‘cesser de flamber (se dit du feu, quand la flamme s’éteint, quoique y ait encore des tisons qui brûlent)’ (BK 1 630), Mhr. ḥmād ‘to be extinguished, burnt out’ (JM 443), Jib. ḥōd ‘to extinguish; to be extinguished’ (JJ 501); very probably also Hbr. pB. ḥmād ‘to produce shrivelling by heat’ (Ja. 475). Somewhat less likely < Sem. *ḥmād ‘to be hot’ represented by Arb. ḥmād ‘être intense (se dit de la chaleur)’, ḥamadat- ‘pétillement du feu qui brûle’ (BK 1 488) and Daṭ. ḥmād ‘to be hot, burn’ (quoted in LGz 232 together with Arb. ḥmād).12


◊ Hrs. remēd, Mhr. rmūd; Jib. ṛūd and Soq. rimūd are rather Arabisms than original retentions; no terms for ‘ashes’ found in the available sources for Bib., Sab. and Gaf.

→ Common Semitic 1:14 *(tV-ʃVmr- (#1). The only plausible, if isolated, parallel is W. Chad.: S. Bauchi *m/nuruy- ‘ashes’ (cf. EDE III 244), probably <*muruH- and consequently < *mrūH-: Jum mürūn and nūruy. 


3 BARK:

(1) Akk. kuliptu, kulpu; Hbr. kalippa; Syr. kalāp-t; Urm. kalpa; Hrs. kelfīţ; Mhr. kalifūţ; Soq. kalifoḥ // < Sem. *kali(t)ip- (v. in LGz 427).

(2) Mnd. masik- // < Sem. *maišk- ‘skin’ (v. in SED I No. 190).

(3) Leb. ṭišrī; Mec. gišra; Jib. kašrot // < Sem. (Arb.-Eth.) *kVšr-: Gez. kašsara ‘to peel, scrape, take off scales’, kašsā ‘fish scales, shell’ (LGz 448).

(4) Gez. ṭaḥṣ; Tna. ṭaḥṣ; Tgr. ṭaḥṣ; Amh. ṭiḥn̄ţo; Arg. ṭiḥn̄ţo; Har. inči ṭiḥnīţ (‘thin bark of tree’); Wol. lačcače // A deverbal noun < Common Eth. *lḥs ‘to peel, bark’ (LGz 312), likely < Sem. *lḥs/lḥ ‘to draw off, peel’: Arb. lahhsa ‘épurer en séparant les parties moins propres; enlever, tirer, extraire la partie la plus pure et la meilleure’ (BK 2 980), Akk. ḥalāṣu ‘to press, squeeze out; clean by combing’ (CAD h 40), Hbr. ḥalaṣ ‘to draw off’, pB. ‘to take off (shoe)’ (HAL 321), (nif.) ‘to be peeled off (skin)’ (Ja. 472), Jud. ḥalaṣ ‘to take off, undress’ (ibid).

11 kṣ̄esti is a variant stem of kṣ̄es kṣ̄āśā ‘to stir, poke, revive, relight a fire, to shake cinders, ash from a firebrand’ (Kane T 966–7, cf. Bulakh Dis. 119–120).
12 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. ḥmād ‘to produce shrivelling by heat’ and Akk. ḥamādiru ‘shrivelled or withered’ (CAD 浞 57; the form has an affixed fossilized -r, v. Mil RE) are compared not to Arb. ḥmād ‘to subside (of fire)’, which is more attractive in view of Akk. h-, but to Arb. ḥamād and ḥamadat, which implies an irregular, though not unattested correspondence: Akk. ḥ vs. Arb. ḥ.
13 Borrowed into C. Cush. Aungi are̞m´t ‘embers’ (App. CDA 61).
14 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).
15 On such cases as Hbr. ṭēpur, Amh. afār, when a similar meaning evolution from a different meaning of the common proto-form seems quite transparent, see note 18.
16 The Egyp. word (meaning debatable) is tentatively compared in EDE II 553 with Sem. *t[apar- ‘t[apar- ‘sand’ (two different roots, comparable as variants) and Mokilko.
473). It is hard to say whether -lḥ- in the Gez. root is a graphic variant of *ḥ* or reflects Sem. *ḥ*; cf. what looks like two variant roots with ḫ vs. ḫ in Arbr., both probably with the underlying meaning ‘bark’: ḫṣṣ ‘av. la paupière de l’oeil supérieur très charnue’ (BK 2 980) and laḥāṣ- ‘contraction de la paupière supérieure, au point qu’il s’y forme des plis’ (ibid. 974). Cf. Kog. Eth. 377.

(5) Tna. kərbaṭ (syn.); also ‘skin, rind, peel’) // < Sem. (Arbr.-Eth.) *kərb- at-: Arbr. kirbat- ‘grande ouître à lait ou à eau faite d’une seule peau cousue au milieu’ (BK 2 704), Gez. kərbaṭ ‘leather bag’ (LGz 440), Amhr. kərbat ‘skin’.

(6) Tgr. kəref (syn.); Amhr. kərefit (syn.); Sod. kərefit (‘hard bark of tree’) // < Sem. (Arbr.-Eth.) *kər- Vrp-: Arbr. kərif- ‘bark (n.)’, kəref ‘to peel’ (v. LGz 441).

(7) Sod. kana, Cha. kara // only Gur.17

◊ Mlt. baka is a lw., likely < English; no terms in Ugr., Pho., Bib., Pal., Qur., Sab. and Gaf.

Note: *kəl(?)p-, *kər- Vrp- and *kər- at- are scored differently as they go back to three different variant roots as early as in Afras. For *kər- Vrp- ~ *pVrk- cf. Brb.: E. Tawelmet e-fārāy ‘coquille’; W. Chad. *kəra-: Tsaqo kəropé, Barawa kworap, Wangday kwərip ‘bark’; Egyp. (Med.) pik-t ‘shell of turtle, skull’) (v. EDE II 403–4); and, perhaps, E. Cush.: Somali furar ‘smallpox’ (met. and a meaning shift ‘bark’ > ‘scab’); for *kər- at- , C. Chad.: Mandara kwələbə ‘bark’ (possibly < *kərab-), N. Cush.: Beja kurbe ‘skin’ (<kurb-), Omot.: Male kurubi ‘bark’, etc. (ADB).


### 4 BELLY:

(1) Akk. karṣu; Syr. kars-; Mnd. kars-; Urm. ki(r)s-; Tgr. kəršāt; Arg. kārs, hars; Gaf. orsā, Sod. kārs; Har. kārsi; Hrs. kərš; Mhr. kiraš; Jib. širš // < Sem. *kar(i)š- (SED I No. 151).

(2) Ugr. kbd (?); Gez. kabd; Tna. kābd; Tgr. kābd (syn.), Amhr. hod // < Sem. *kəbidd-at-,18 v. in Liver No. 2.


(5) Wol. däl; Cha. đin // according to LGur 210, “represents däl” with the l ~ n variation; if, indeed, < *dal ‘abdomen, belly, stomach, interior’ (including Selti dālimūt ‘intestine’) ibid., these forms are related to Amh. (Gondar) dülāt ‘mets de tripes de chèvre ou de mouton’ and Arb. dawlat- ‘jabot, gésier’ (DRS 235) going back to Sem. (Arbr.-Eth.) *dawl- ‘stomach, interior’. If, otherwise, the Gur. forms represent đin, they should be compared to redupli-

17 Tentatively compared in LGur 344 to E. Cush. Burji kən-oo ‘bark’, which can hardly be a source of borrowing into Gur. One wonders whether Sidamo konnonna id. could be such a source, with k- rendered as k- in Gur.

18 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 logics, 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 *kəbǐd- 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.

19 There are isolated parallels worth mentioning: E. Cush.: LEC: Bussa mỳy ‘liver’, which, according to EDE III 160, may be a borrowing from N. Omot. *mỳy-, regularly from *mỳy- (corresponding to Egyp. myy. t ‘liver’); cf., however, E. Chad.: Gadang mỳyò ‘liver’ (derived by Jungraithmayr and Ibriszimow from Chad. *m-lg-d, at first glace, rather suspicious). Could this stunning resemblance in root structure point to the vestiges of Afras. *mʌVy- ‘entails, liver’?
cated Gur. *danādānā (LGur 212), Gez. *dandana ‘to be fat, stout’, Amh. *dānādānā id. (LGz 136), probably further related to Akk. *dannám- ‘tont puissant’ (compared in DRS 280; ‘almighty’ in CAD d 87) connected with *danām (da’ānu) ‘strength, might, force’ (CAD d 81) and/or Sem. *duhr-, *dahūn- ‘fat’ (SED I No. 48).

(6) Hrs. höfel; Mhr. höfel; Jib. šofol (all syn.) // < Sem. š.V(n)pVl-20 Arb. mišfašat ‘gésier; esomac’, Tgr. šnifalla ‘one of ruminant’s four stomachs’, etc. (SED I No. 271).

(7) Soq. mer (miher) // likely < Sem. *mar-? ‘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. ḫant (syn.) // with the assimilation of *m- > -n- to the dental -t (< *t) in a contact position < Sem. *ẖVmt- ‘(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 *bašın- (#3) < Afras. *baluṭ(Vn)-: Brb.: Semlal a-buḍ ‘navel’, Ntifa a-buḍ ‘belly’ (and i-biṇid ‘navel’, met. *<biḍin-?), etc.; W. Chad.: Mupun a-buḍ, Angas ḫuṭu, Fyer ḫuṭo, 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. gādol // < Sem. *gVdVI- (HAL 177; 179); Egyp. (MK) dīl ‘fat’ (adj.) if < *gdīl (v. EDE I 245) is related, going back to Afras. *gVdVI- ‘big, fat’.

(3) Bib. šaggil (?) (syn.) // Aramaic only; the interpretation as ‘big’ is debatable.

(4) Qur. kabir-; Leb. kbeyr; Mec. kabiyr; Mit. kbir // < Sem.: Akk. kabaru ‘to become fat, heavy, thick,’ (CAD k 4), Syr. kbr ‘multus fuit’ (Brock. 316), Sab. kbr ‘great; richness, abundance’ (SD 76), etc.

(5) Gez. šabi; Tna. šabi; Tgr. šabī // < Sem. *šabī ‘to be big, thick’ (LGz 55).

(6) Amh. tələk (< t-llək); Sod. malək; Cha. nək // < Eth. *lhk ‘to grow, grow up’ (LGz 309) < Sem., if Lelsau’s interpretation of Soq. di-lek as ‘which is numerous’ (LS 129) is correct.

(7) Arg. làham, nāham // < Sem. *lVhVm-: Akk. lim, nom. limu ‘one thousand’ (CAD I 194), Arb. ləhmūm- ‘grand nombre’ (BK 2 1034); cf. also W. Chad. Hausa ləmũmũ ‘in quantity’ (Barg. 732), E. Cush. Darasa lumo ‘big’ (Huds. 27) < Afras. *IV(H)m- ‘big quantity’?

(8) Gaf. ammuna; Cha. ammiyā (syn.); Jib. ?um, Soq. ?ām (fem.) // likely < Sem. *ʔulimm- ‘mother’ (v. in LGz 22; cf. also LGur 49–50).21

20 On š, v. SED I XLVIII–CV. The decision to separate this root (*š.V(n)pVl-) from *spl ‘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. *ššf [ššf] → MEg. šf “to hate” = Soq. špl “to despise” < Sem. *spl “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)?

21 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. gōdār (syn.); Har. g(i)lār, Wol. gādārā // in Wol. and Zway gādārā is ‘to grow up (child), be big’ compared in LGur 264 (with hesitation, but quite reasonably) to Amh. (tā)gādārā ‘to germinate’ (‘that is, grow’ ibid.), further related to Arb. žār ‘sélever au-dessus du sol (se dit des plantes); se former (se dit des certain fruits)’ (BK 1 263) < Eth.-Arb. *gār ‘to grow, grow big’.22

(10) Hrs. šōl; Mhr. šōl (also ‘old’) // < Sem. *ṣyh- ‘to grow big or old’: Akk. šāhu (ṣiāhūm) ‘to grow (in size or age)’ (CAD §1 106), šāhu ‘tall, high, stately’ (ibid. §2 418), Arb. šayḥ- ‘vieillard; ancien, cheikh; maître’ (BK 2 1296).


(12) Jib. ?eb (syn.); Soq. ?eb, heb (syn. 1) // likely < Sem. *?ab- ‘father’ (v. in DLU 2; LGz 2).


◊ Urm. gür < Kurdish gaur, gür.

→ Common North and West Semitic: *rabb- (#1); cf. S. Omot.: Ongota arba ‘big’.


6 BIRD:

(1) Akk. ʾıṣṣuru;23 Ugr. ʾsr, ʾuṣṣuru (Huehn.) // < Sem. (Akk.-Ugr.) *ṭVṇṣṣur-.

(2) Hbr. ʾippōr; Pho. ʾpr; Bib. ʾippār; Pal. ʾṣpr; Syr. ʾṣaḥḥr; Mnd. ʾṣpr-; Urm. ʾṣpr-, Mlt. (gh)asfūr < Arb. ṣafṣūr-, with a secondary – (perhaps influenced by Sem. *ṭVṇṣṣur-, or even a remnant of a composite form) // < Sem. *ṣVp(ʾ)Ṭr-.


(4) Syr. ʾpārah-t- (syn. 2) // < Sem. *pāry- ‘chick, brood’ (SED II No. 179).

(5) Gez. šof; Tna. šuf; Tgr. šuf; Amh. wof; Arg. of, wof; Gaf. yafʿā; Sod. wof, of; Cha. ʾaf; Har. ʾuf; Wol. ʾuf/*wof // < Sem. ʾawp- ‘bird’ (SED II No. 48), related to ʾawp ‘to fly’, both < Afras. *sat(w)p- ‘bird; flying’; Egyp. (late) ṭp ‘to fly’; S. Omot.: Ari afṭi, aṭi, Dime iftu, Hamer aṭif’ti ‘bird’ (a generic term) < ʾawp-t-i < ʾawp- (ADB).24

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.

22 Presumably, with fossilized suffixed *(g)a/ihd-: Arb. židd- ‘beaucoup, extrêmement’ (ibid. 260), Sab. gdd ‘great’ (SD 49), Tgr. guddā ‘to be bigger, surpass’ (LH 602; unless an Arabism) < Afras. *gVḍ(ḏ)-: Brb. C. Morocco gudyy ‘é. nombreux, beaucoup, abonder’, sgudyy ‘produire beaucoup, en grande quantité’ (DRB 737–8 without specifying the language; cf. Ahaggar egdāh, Ayr egdū ‘suffire’ ibid. 727), W. Chad. Bolewa gūdū ‘many’ (Kr I 87), N. Cush. Beja gwud ‘many’, E. Cush. Arbore gudād ‘many’, Dasenech guddu ‘big’ (Bla. Om. No. 5.2), Oromo guddar ‘big; greatly, very’ (Gr. 184), S. Omot. Dime gēdd ‘big’ (Bnd Om. 205), Ongota gaddhun, gaddhino (Fl. Ong. 42), gaddafuṇi, pl. gaddafuṇa ‘big, old’ (S-T 117), V. in Mil. RE.

23 Certainly not < *ṭVṣṣur-, 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.

24 Cf. also EDE I 67, where the S. Omot. forms are compared with Egyp. ḫpd ‘bird’, implying an irregular — and non-existent — sound correspondence Egyp. ḫ – Omot. ḫ (the note on the Omot. forms *assim. < *Wpd- 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.
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the parallels to *nḳrṭ.

Application of criterion (2) is not so simple, since, while *ntk and *nkṯ co-exist in the same language, one being Gez.

According to criterion (1), there are two cases where both roots 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. *našak ‘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-nsak ‘jaw, jawbone’; the other, semantically less reliable, Syr. *nakath ‘momordit; offendit iram’ (Brock. 430) and *nakat ‘damno affectit’ (ibid. 452). Application of criterion (2) is not so simple, since, while *ntk has quite reliable matches in non-Semitic Afrasian, the parallels to *ntk unearthen so far are much less convincing.

7 BITE:


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

After some hesitation, scored differently from *ntk. 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 *ntki/* nkṭ 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-nsak ‘jaw, jawbone’; the other, semantically less reliable, Syr. *nakat ‘momordit; offendit iram’ (Brock. 430) and *nakat ‘damno affectit’ (ibid. 452). Application of criterion (2) is not so simple, since, while *ntk has quite reliable matches in non-Semitic Afrasian, the parallels to *ntk unearthen so far are much less convincing.

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

26 After some hesitation, scored differently from *ntk. 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 *ntki/* nkṭ 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-nsak ‘jaw, jawbone’; the other, semantically less reliable, Syr. *nakat ‘momordit; offendit iram’ (Brock. 430) and *nakat ‘damno affectit’ (ibid. 452). Application of criterion (2) is not so simple, since, while *ntk has quite reliable matches in non-Semitic Afrasian, the parallels to *ntk unearthen so far are much less convincing.

27 Quite likely, derivable from Afras. *ʕalai(ʕa)- ‘facial bone, lower cheekbone’ (see 10 BONE #3); the idea (in EDE II 574) that Arb. *ʕaḥ ‘to bite’ is related to Gez. ṣaḥ ‘vermin, worm, moth, caterpillar’, Tna ṣaḥ ‘larva’ (sustained by a similar connection between Aram. ṣəḥ ‘worm’ vs. nəṭṭləθə (pl.) ‘teeth’, but what is meant is perhaps Hbr. *jəw ’jew-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.


◊ No terms in Pho., Bib. and Sab.

→ Proto-Semitic: *ntf (#1) < Afras. *(n)V-čVk-: C. Chad.: Mofu -ččāk- ‘gōuter’, Mada āččaka ‘gōuter’, etc.; (?) Egy. NK ḥsk ‘essen von etw.’ (EG III 169; if <*h-čk with a hypothetical verbal prefix *h-).


8 BLACK:

(1) Akk. šalmu; Sab. zlm (SD 172; debatable, v. discussion in Bulakh Dis.); Gez. šālim; Tna. šālim; Tgr. šālim; Gaf. šālīma; Harari ṭāṭy; Wol. źem // < Sem. *zlm ‘to be black’ (v. in LGZ 553; Bulakh 2003 5–6 and Bulakh Dis.).

(2) Hbr. šāhōr // < Sem. *šhr ‘to be black’ (HAL 1465, 1466, 1457; Bulakh 2003 13–14).

(3) Pal. *ʔwkm, ḥkwum; Syr. ṭuḵkām-; Mnd. ʔkwum; Urm. kūm // < Sem. (compared in Bulakh Dis.): Akk. akāmu ‘cloud of dust, mist’ (CAD a1 259), Hbr. pB. ḥkm ‘to be sun-burnt, black, dark-colored’ (Ja. 64) < Afras. *kVm-: Egy. (Pyr.) km ‘black’; E. Cush.: Dullay: Gavwada kummay, Harso kūmma, Tsamay guma ‘black’, etc., Yaaku kumpu’ id.31

(4) Syr. ḥana? (syn.) // Akk. (from OB) uḵnu ‘Lapislazuli, Lasurstein, Türkis; (grün)-blau; künstliche Lapislazuli, blaue Glasur’ (AHw. 1426f.), Ugaritic iḵnu 1) “gem of lapis lazuli”; 2) “violet blue”; 3) “violet purple or violet textile” (DUL 93), (?) Pho. ḥkn? (lapis lazuli/purple; Phoenician blue/purple?) (HJ 100), Arb. kūnuwew- ‘couleur noir’, kām-in ‘très-rouge’ (BK II 826), ḥanaʔa ‘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’, takmīn ‘teindre en rouge foncé (les doigts, la barbe); teindre en noir (la barbe), ḥaknāʔ- ‘rouge’ (там же, 818). Cf. AA *kVn- ‘to (be) white, yellow’ (ADB).

28 A tentative parallel suggested in Kog. Ug. note 51 is Gez. saqara ‘to cause pain, torment, vex, etc.’, with cognates in other Ethiopic; this seems erroneous not only because of Gez. š 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 š instead of the expected f, corresponding to Jib. ḥ (the voiceless emphatic lateral affricate pronounced by several of my Jibbali-speaking informants; rendered by Johnstone as z; anyway, <Sem. š), quoted in LGZ 544; all of these forms are probably related to the Common Sem. verb šfr- ~ šfr ‘to be small’ with a meaning shift ‘to be small’ > ‘to be despised, neglected, treated badly’ > ‘to torment, vex, etc.’ (cf. HALOT 1043).

29 Cf. also W. Chad.: Paʔa kač ‘to insult’; probably also related are W. Chad.: Buli ngās-, Zaar ngās, C. Chad. Daba ṭač, etc. ‘to bite’ (CLR II 24–5), which, according to Stolb. 2005 No. 445, may go back to *ŋkač-, with voicing of the velar consonant.

30 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 < *nēkā (cf. App. CDA 33).

(5) Qur. ʿaswad-; Leb. ʿaswad; Mec. ʿaswad; Mlt. ʿiswet // Obviously comparable with Mhr. sātwad ‘to be disfigured, 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 waẓhahu ‘qui Dieu rende son visage noir!’ pour dire, ‘que Dieu le damne!’ BK 1 1161*). Cf. discussion in HALOT 1417 and especially 1418 (in connection with Arb. ʿaswad-) about such demon names as Akk. šēdu, Hbr. *šēd etc., including Mnd. ʿsdūm (with -m suffixed?) ‘a spirit of the darkness, one of those ruling the underworld’. Cf., finally, Akk. šēdu(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 soōd ‘dirt’, Zime-Batma suŋo, Masa siydoŋ ‘faeces’ (CLR II 129), E. Chad. Kera sōdī ‘Dreckigkeit’ (Eb. 108), Mokilko siidōŋ ‘earth (soil)’ (CLR II 117).

(6) Amh. ṭaŋ*or; Arg. Soc. Cha. ṭakur; Gaf. ṭakurũ (syn.) // Eth. ṭ/hr ‘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. *khtr- ‘smoke, incense’ (see LGz 452 and ADB).

(7) Hrs. hēwer; Mhr. hōwor (ḥwr); Jib. ḥr; Soq. ḥohar, ḥaur // < Sem. ḥwr ‘to be black and white’: Hbr. ḥwr ‘to grow pale’, Syr. ḥewwār-, Mnd. hiwar- ‘white’, Arb. ḥwr-‘.é. d’un noir et d’un blanc bien prononcé’ (BK 1 509) (cf. Bulak 2004 273–4).

◊ No terms in Ugr., Pho. and Bib.

→ **Common North and West Semitic:** *ṭlm (#1) < Afras. *cīl럼- “to be dark, black”: W. Chad.: Karekare cãlïm ‘shade, shadow’, C. Chad.: Bura cilīm ‘black soil used as a dye-stuff’, Buduma cîlîm ‘dark’, Makari sîlîm ‘black’, etc. (claimed by some Chadicists to be a Kanuri loan, which is out of the question in the light of Afras. data), E. Chad.: Mawa cîlîm ‘black, dark’; S. Cush.: Qwadza calam-‘green’; S. Omot.: Ari čelmi ‘to be dark’ (ADB).

**9 BLOOD:**


(2) Mnd. zmā // < 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 ʒàmà (ʒ-<ʒy-), Sha, Kulere zóm (cf. Stolb. 1987 190), S. Omot. Ari Hamar zum-ʔ-i, Dime ʒum-u (Bnd Om. 206), cf. SED I No. 296.30

---

32 M. Bulak 1 regards the possibility of borrowing into MSA as “undoubtful” (Bulak Dis.).
33 The other term for ‘black’, ǧāmānna, is from HEC, cf. Qabenna ǧamballa, Tembaro ǧembälla (LGur 281).
34 Possibly matching Egyp. (OK) b:iy ‘Bleicher, Wäscher’ (unless < *hViy-), v. EDE I 149.
35 This word’s identification as a strange phonetic variant of *dam- (also reflected in Mnd. as the less common form  ámba) by practically all the authors is one more Semitic “mythetymology”.
36 Not to be confused with another Afras. root, *ʒ/ǯVn- ‘blood’: Egyp. Pyr. znf (presumably zn-f “his blood”), Brb. Ahaggar a-hni (<*ʒ/ǯVn), Ayr a-zni, etc., W. Chad. Hausa ʒi (迮<ʒi); 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 *ʒam(?)- and *ʒ/ǯVn- 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 zamba, Bata ʒambe <*ʒam/nb/p- ‘blood’; S. Omot.: Hamar zambi, zōm̄h, Karo zunpi ‘animal blood’.
(3) Hrs. dōre?; Mhr. dōr-ah; Jib. dōhr; Soq. dōr // Generally regarded as derived from MSA *ḏVrr-: Mehri ḏor ‘to spread out; to spread (gravy, curry, seed)’ (JM 47), Jibbali ḏerr ‘to spread out’ (J 47) < Sem. *drr/ṛ/w/* to scatter, spread (seed), disperse, winnow37 (cf. HA-LOT 280; LGz 644; Mil. Farm.): Akkadian zarā ‘to sow seed; broadcast; scatter, sprinkle; winnow’, Hebrew zry ‘to scatter, winnow’, Judaic Aramaic dry, ḍr ‘to scatter, strew; winnow’, Arabic ḍry/w ‘vanner, nettoyer (le grain)’ (BK 1 771).

◊ No term in Bib.

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

10 BONE:

(1) Akk. esemtu; Ugr. ṣzm; Hbr. šāḵa;m; Pho. ṣ̣m; Qur. ṣzm–; Leb. ᵁazam; Mec. ᵃzum; Mlt. (gh)adma; Gez. ᵁazam; Tna. ᵁṣm; Tgr. ᵁaḵm; Amh. ḏat ; Arg. ᶡt, ᶡnt; Gaf. ᵃšʷ; Sod. Cha. Wol. ᵁt; Har. ᶡt // < Sem. *ḏatm(-at)- (SED I No. 25).


(4) Soq. ṣeḥloh // The comparison (made with reservations) to Soq. ḏalḥ ‘côté’ in LS 347 (Sem. *ʃil(a)- ‘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. *ḥVlṣ- ‘loin, hip’ with the same root consonants (Hbr. ḥ̣alāṣayim, Gez. ḥlṣ ‘loin’, etc., v. ibid. No. 118) seems more attractive.40

◊ No term in Sab.

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

11 BREAST:


(2) Ugr. ḏtd; Hbr. ṣōd; Pal. ḏtd; Syr. ᵁḍḥ; Hrs. ᵁḏi; Mhr. ᵁḏi; Jib. ᵁḏe?; Soq. ᵁṭdi // < Sem. *ḏVdy-(‘woman’s) breast’ (SED I No. 280).

(3) Bib. ḏādē; Syr. ᵁḏdy- (syn.); Mnd. ᵁḏdy // < Hbr.-Arb. *ḥaḏ(y)Vy- ‘breast’ (with plausible wider Sem. connections, v. SED I No. 112).

37 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. ḏr IV ‘laisser couler en abondance’, ḏrrat- ‘abundance (de lait, de la pluie)’ and ‘sang’ (BK 1 681–2). Cf. verbal forms of the same root as ‘blood’ in MSA: Mhr. ᵁḏārī (t-stem) ‘blood’ to flow’ (JM 81), Jib. ᵁḍr37 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’.

38 For the semantic development cf. Russian косточка ‘fruit-stone’, literally little bone’.

39 Cf. EDE 1 299, comparing the Cush. forms with Arb., but not MSA, and tentatively with Egyp. ḥaš-wy ‘Kinnbacken’, comparable only as a variant root, since Egyp. ḥ in no way corresponds to Afras. *ṯ.

40 Alternatively cf., with metathesis, Arb. ḥlṣ ‘to be fractured (bone)’ and ḥāṣ-li ‘tail’.

41 The interpretation of Akk. irtu as a reflexion of Sem. *ḥaḏ(a)yV- ‘breast’ proposed by some authors (e. g. Holma) is but another case of ‘mythetymology’ in Semitic linguistics.
(4) Qur. šadr-; Leb. sidr-; Mec. ṣadr; Mlt. sidēr // No clear cognates outside Arb. \(^{42}\)


(6) Tna. ṭub; Tgr. ṭub; Ambh. Arg. ṭut; Gaf. ṭūwwā; Sod. ṭōbuyyā; Cha. ṭu; Har. ṭōt; Wol. ṭub // < Arb.-Eth.-MSA ‘ṭVb - teat’ (SED I No. 277).

(7) Jib. ḍhe (syn.); Soq. ḍhe (syn. 1) // < Sem. *gaw(w)i?- ‘(front part of) body; chest, belly; interior’ (SED I No. 99).

(8) Soq. bērak (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.


12 BURN (tr.):

(1) Akk. šarāpu; Ugr. šrp; Hbr. šrp // < Sem. *šrp (HAL 1358).

(2) Ugr. ḥrr (syn.); Gez. ḥarara; Tna. ḥarārā, ḥarārā; Tgr. ḥarārā // < Sem. *ḥrr (HAL 357, LGz 243).

(3) Bib. Pal. yḵd; Syr. ṣ-ḵd; Urm. avax (met.) // < Sem. *yḵad (HALOT 430).

(4) Mnd. kla // < Sem. *ktw (v. in LGz 431; cf. also EDE III 645).

(5) Qur. ḥrḳ VIII; Leb. ḥarrwa; Mec. ḥarak // No Sem. parallels that I know of. Related to Afras.: Brb. *Hvrk ‘to burn’: Ghadames āry, Ghat āry, Rif āry ‘brûler’, Ahaggar ār̩y ‘ê. enflammé’, etc. (Kossm. 213), Egyp. Pyr. rkḥ (met.; also rk̩ - a variant root with k vs. k?) ‘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). \(^{45}\)

(7) Šab. ṭwfb; Gez. waʃaṭa (syn. 1) // Cf. also derived nouns: Gez. maʃat, maʃt, maʃt ‘oven, furnace, pit for firing pottery’, Tna. maʃt-i ‘firing of pottery’ (borrowed from Gez.?). Seems to be an Eth.-Šab. root with no parallels in other Sem. (v. LGz 607). \(^{46}\)

\(^{42}\) Cf. Arb. sidār- ‘chimney court, qui ne couvre que la poitrine, le thorax’, šadrīyatat- ‘vête, gilet; chemisette’ (BK 1 1319) apparently derived from šadr- ‘poitrine’ (ibid.) and Jud. šādrār, šārdār- (met.) ‘coarse web (of hemp), rough cloth’ (Ja. 1264; 1299), cautiously compared in LS 346 with Soq. mįsdĕrē ‘tapis, vêtement en poil, sac’. Cf. also Mhr. šēdār ‘stem, bow, prow (of a ship)’ (JM 358), šādir- ‘Vorderseite’ (ibid. after Jahn), Jib. šādēr ‘prow of a boat’ (JJ 235), which are obviously borrowed from Arb. šādir- ‘proue (d’un vaisseau)’. Finally, cf. Syr. šidaʃr- ‘crapula, nausée’ (Brock. 622); the sensation caused by crampulence, hangover, or nausea may, in principle, be associated with ‘breast’.

\(^{43}\) 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 ‘V’-; as for the Auslaut, cf. Gez. sanbuṭ, sambuṭ ‘lung’ vs. Akk. sinib/ptu ‘part of sheep’s lung’ (SED I No. 235) and similar examples (v. Mil. RE).

\(^{44}\) 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.

\(^{45}\) 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’.

\(^{46}\) The comparison with Egyp. wḥb ‘brûler’, mentioned in DRS 584 and strangely referred to in EDE I 285 as “not excluded”, is excluded, since Egyp. b does not correspond to Sem. *p. There are, however, two other possi-
(8) Gez. ?andada (syn. 2); Tna. ?anàddàá (syn. 1); Sod. ānàddàá // Likely metathetically related to Arb. nad ‘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. ?awfaya (syn. 3) // Eth. *wfy ‘to burn, be hot’ (LGz 603: perhaps Arb. wfy ‘to stir up a riot’, semantically vague).

(10) Tna. ?ākkāśālā (syn. 2); Amh. akaṭṭālā; Arg. akkāṭṭāla; Gaf. (tā)kaṭṭālā // No parallels that I could find in or outside Sem.\(^{47}\)

(11) Cha. mākkāra // < Gur. *māggārā, derived with m- prefixed from Gur. *gīrīr balā ‘to blaze, flicker, burn in a bright and wavy way, burn easily (dry wood)’ (ibid. 310). Related to Sem.: Amh. gārrā ‘spark (fire)’ (ibid.), Akk. gīrru ‘fire’ OB on (CAD g 93). Perhaps to be further compared to Akk. agurrū ‘kiln-fired brick’, according to Kauf. 33, a term of unknown etymology borrowed into Syr. ?gwr?, whence into Arb. *ażur- ‘brique cuite au feu’ BK 1 13), but, anyway, rather related than not to the present root.\(^{48}\)

(12) Har. māğāda; Wol. mağāda // only Eth.; the comparison in LGur. 393–4 with Sem. *w[yk]d is phonetically untenable.

(13) Mhr. ho-nhā; Jib. e-nē; Soq. a-nē // Comparable as forms containing the fossilized prefix n- to Gez. haw (haw) and Tna. hawwi ‘fire’ (v. FIRE No. 3). Another parallel, semantically questionable, is Arb. nāwāha ‘souffler du côté opposé à l’autre (se dit d’un vent)’ (BK 2 1363) with the common underlying meaning ‘to blow up fire’.

→ **Common North and West Semitic**: *ṣrp* (#1); no Afras. parallels found.

→ **Common West Semitic**: *ḥrr.*

### 13 CLAW (NAIL):

(1) Akk. ṣupru; Hbr. šippōrān; Bib. šaporan; Pal. tpr; Syr. Ṿṯpr-; Urm. ṣarp- (met.); Qur. ḍifr-; Leb. ṣafir; Mct. ḍifr; Mlt. dufri; Gez. šafar; Tna. ṣafri; Tgr. ḍafar; Amh. Sod. Cha. Wol. ṣafar; Arg. ḍafar; Gaf. ḍafar; Har. ṣifir; Mhr. ḍfēr; Soq. ṣif // < Sem. *ṭp(V)r-* (SDE I No. 285).

(2) Hrs. kef; Mhr. ḏef (syn.); Jib. ḏef (also ‘palm of the hand, paw’) // < Sem. *kapp-* ‘palm, flat of hand or foot’ (SDE I No. 148).


\(^{47}\) Cf. C. Cush. Khamir ḏāṭals, Kunfāl kānsāls ‘to burn’, considered an Amharism in App. CDA 39; could it be the other way round, i. e. an Agaw loan in Eth.?

\(^{48}\) Note, however, a related root in E. Cush. (e. g. Sidamo Hadiya gīir- ‘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.

\(^{49}\) While Bilin ṣafar and Qwara ṭeffer ‘claw’ (App. CDA 45) look like normal Ethiopisms, z in Xamtanga and ḏ with metathesis in Qwara (“the somewhat anomalous initial ḏ- of the Qu. form” App. CDA 67), if these forms are related, rather speak against borrowing from Eth.
zurup-mata ‘fingers’ (pl.). S. Cush: Alagwa, Burunge ćarafu ‘fingernail’ (this metathetic form can hardly be a loan from Amh.).

14 CLOUD:


(2) Bib. Sānān; Pal. ūnun; Syr. ūnān-; Mnd. anan-; Urm. (ū)nān- // < Sem.: Arb. ʿayn- ‘nuage qui couvre et assombrit le ciel’ (BK 2 527; ūnnat- and ūnān- ‘nuage’ ibid. 377 may be borrowed from Syr.).

(3) Hbr. šāb; Urm. šāyb- // < Sem.*šāyb- (HAL 773).


(6) Gez. dāmmān; Tna. dābānna, dāmmānna; Amh. Gaf. dāmmāna; Arg. dāmmāna, dona; Sod. dāmmānna, dābāna; Cha. dačāra; Har. dāna; Wol. dābāna // < Eth. *dāman- (with a variant root *dabun- in Mod. Eth. accounted for by *-m- dissimilated from -n- into -b-) // < Sem. *da/įm(m): Syr. ʾdimṭā ḏa-tallā ‘nebula tenuis’ (lit. ‘fog of dew’), Arb. ḏamm- ‘nuage qui ne donne pas de pluie’, ḏāṃm- ‘nuage sans eau’ (BK 1 728). The obvious connection with C. Cush. (Bilin denna, Khamir dēmāna, Kemant Qwara dāmāna, Aungi dammını ‘cloud’ App. CDA 46) and E. Cush. (LEC: Oromo dāmman-sa, Bayso dumbo, HEC: Burji dumman-ci, Darasa duwman-ca, Hadiya duwba i.d.) 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. I am inclined to regard the Sem. and Cush. forms, with some irrelevant exceptions, perhaps, as continuing Afras. *da/įm(-an) -, also including W. Chad. Tangale ḥadām ‘rain’, Hausa dāmun- and gigda dāmun ‘rainy season’, Bade dēmanu ‘rain’, dāmmān ‘rainy season’ and C. Chad. Logone dēman id. (ADB).


(8) Hrs. ʔāfor; Mhr. ʔafur; Lib. šafur // Perhaps a meaning shift from ‘dust cloud’ (cf. Hrs. ʔāfor ‘cloud, dust wind’ JH 6) // < Sem. *ṣaper- ‘dust’ (DLU 85; HALOT 861–2); less likely, metathetically related to (or influenced by) Sem. *ṣrp (v. #1). The most tenable comparanda, however, are in ESA: Sab. ḏpr ‘sowing (land) before rain’ (SD 13–14) and forms adduced in EDE II 389, under the discussion of possible various parallels to Egy. (Pyr.) pšt.t ‘irrigable land’, all of them fitting into Afras. *ṣaper- ‘(rainy) cloud, rain, rain-watered or irrigated

50 Though the initial consonants in both Qwara/Xamtanga and Burji are irregular and hard to explain, they are hardly unrelated to the present root.
51 Cf. HALOT 857–8, comparing Hbr. ūnān ‘clouds’ and the Arm. forms with just one word which is not quite clearly quoted as “Arb. ūnnma, or a primary noun”.
52 Also N. Omot.: Koyra dūma ‘cloud’.
53 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.

58
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 āpare ‘to shed, pour out’, C. Chad.: Zime-Dari pîwôr ‘pluie’, E. Chad.: Kera pârû ‘Regenzeit’; N. Cush.: Beja ḏfrà ‘Wolke’.

9 Soq. ḥeyhor // < ḥohar ‘black’ (v. BLACK No. 7).
10 Soq. šālîlo (syn.) // < MSA ‘yVIVI’: Mhr. ḥallêt, Jib. ḥiżû ‘mîst’ (JM 136). Compared in LS 310–11 with Arb. ṣālîl-– massae of nuages formée par l’amoncellement des uns sur les autres’ (BK 2 336), which, however, may go back to the verb ʕill ‘tenir lieu d’une autre chose’ (ibid. 334), thus having nothing to do with the present term; cf. also Arb. ḥalal- ‘eau stagnante qui couvre pendant quelque temps la surface du sol et disparaît ensuite’ (ibid. 488).

◊ No terms in Pho. and Sab.

→ Common Semitic: *Vṛp- (#1)\(^54\) with isolated parallels in E. Chad.: Jegu nyúrápè ‘cloud’ (with prefixed n-), Mogum (Jegu) yurupe ‘cloud’ (ADB).

15 Cold:

1 Akk. kāsû; Mlt. kiesa˘h // The two forms, if indeed related, may be traced to the phonetically immaculate Proto-Semitic form *kWṣa˘h-.

2 Hbr. ƙar; Pal. ƙryr; Syr. ḫarîr-; Mnd. ḫarîr-; Urm. ƙâyry; Gez. ḵerîr; Tna. ḵerûr // < Sem. *ḵerû ‘to be cold’ (v. in LGz 443; cf. *ḵurr- ‘freddo (s.)’ Fron. 147).

3 Pal. štnîn (syn.) // < Hbr.-Arm. *šînm-: Jud. šînət- ‘cold’, Hbr. *šînə id. (v. in HALOT 1037; no reliable parallels in other Sem.).

4 Mnd. karuš- (syn.) // < Sem. *kṟš ‘to be frozen’: Syr. kṟš ‘refrigeratus est’ (Brock. 701), Pho. kṟš ‘to become frozen’ (Tomb. 294), Arab. ƙṟs ‘è. très-rigoureux (se dit du froid); geler (se dit deléau)’ (BK 2 710).

5 Qur. bārīd-; Leb. berîd; Mec. bārīd; Gez. barud (syn. 1), Tgr. barud (syn. 1); Tna. bârîd (syn. 1); Amh. bārīd, bârrad; sod. Wol. bord; Har. bârīd // < Sem. *bârad- ‘hail; cold’, *brd ‘to be cold’ (LGz 103).\(^55\)

6 Tna. zâhû (syn. 2) // < Ethi.: Gez. zâhla ‘to cool down’ (LGz 634), Wol. zul, Selti zûl ‘wind with cold’. No parallels outside Ethi.\(^56\)

7 Amh. kâẕkazza (syn.): Arg. kâẕkazza // < Ethi.: Gez. kzz ‘to cool (off)’, etc. (v. in LGz 457) with parallels in C. Cush. (Khamta qaẕqaz-aw, Aungi kezkazz- considered loans from Amh. in App. CDA 46–47), N. Omot. (Dizi kec- ‘wet, cold’ Bnd Om. 220) and S. Omot. (Ari qâz-i, Dime kec-in, Hamar kâz- ‘cold’ Bnd Om. 47) — loans of Amh. kâz-, according to Bnd Om. 207. Cf. also W. Chad. Gwandara ákûšûka, E. Chad. Ubi keckeci, Munjile kâsûk ‘cold’, Mubi kiusûk ‘cold wind’ (ADB).

8 Hrs. ḥēbûr, Mhr. ḥabûr; Jib. ḥôr; Soq. ḥebhor // < MSA *Ḥvbûr; the only parallels I can suggest is metathetic Arb. bârîh- ‘hot wind’ and Chad.: W.: Kirîf bûrâ ‘harmattan’, C.: Mbara bârûwây, Munjuk ṣər âray ‘tornado’, Musgu bêrîh ‘cold (of wind)’ (sic!), E.: Bidiya ḥûbar ‘to blow (wind)’, Kwang kâ-bûr ‘wind’. If all these forms are related, Afras. *Ḥvbûr- ~ *bârîh- ‘(cold or hot) wind’ can be reconstructed.

9 Hrs. kâsûm (syn.); Mhr. kâṣôm (syn. 1); Jibb. kēṣm (syn. 1) // < MSA *kasûm-. No straight parallels in Sem. For possible Afras. matches cf. C. Cush.: Bilin ƙâkkâṣ, Khamir ḥâsâṣ ‘cool’.\(^57\)

\(^{54}\) 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.

\(^{55}\) 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.

\(^{56}\) Leslau’s suggestion (in LGur 707) ‘probably from Cushitic: Darasa didalloc ‘wind’’ does not look tenable.

\(^{57}\) According to App. CDA 47, Bilin ƙâkkâṣ, Khamta qaẕqaz-aw, Khamir ḥâsâṣ, Aungi kezkazz- “are all clearly cognate though the variation in the sibilants especially prevents reduction to a common proto-form. The root oc-
E. Cush. Oromo qaćcq- ‘to drizzle for many hours’, S. Cush. Alagwa qança ‘rainy season’ (Ehr PCR No. 147) and N. Omot. Dizi keč-, Sheko keṭns (Bnd Om 207), Janjero koču (ibid. 161) ‘cold’, supposedly < Afras. *kVc/s- (then -m in the MSA forms is to be regarded as a fossilized prefix).

(10) Mhr. čabil; Jib. čall (both syn. 2) // No parallels found.

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

◊ No terms in Ugr., Bib., Pho., Sab. Cha. zīza (only in Gur. LGur 724) is likely a borrowing from Omot., cf. Sheko zāuzzza ‘cold’ (Bnd Om 207), Ari zā(a)z- id. (Bnd Ar 147).
→ **Common Semitic** (if the comparison in #1 is valid): *kVšh-.**


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

16 COME:


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


(5) Qur. ży? (syn.); Leb. żā (met.); Mlt. ašā (met.) // < *gy?, likely related to Sem. *gV(ʔy): Gez. gawya ‘to run, flee’, Soq. ge ‘to flee, hurry’, etc. (in LGz 209 the Arba. verb is not compared; cf. also DRS 107) and its reduplicated variant *gVgV: Gez. gawgaw ‘to hurry, rush, flee’, etc., compared with Arb. (ia)ša ‘to flee’ in LGz 184. Arb. *gy? ‘to come’ has solid Afras. parallels in W. Chad. Kanakuru gāti, C. Chad. Kilba gwā-, Margi gwā, Masa gōi ‘to enter’, Glavda gwāiyā ‘to return’, E. Chad. Kabalai giya ‘to come’ (ADB); E. Cush. Afar gaa- ‘kommen’ (RAf 853), Oromo gaya (Gr. 171), Darasa ge- (Huds. 21) ‘to arrive’.

curs in Amh. kāzākkāzā, etc., and there has evidently been some cross interference; only Aungi and Khampa 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)?

58 With numerous Afras. parallels (ADB), some of them adduced in EDE II 81. Proposing Proto-Cush. *baḥ- ‘to go out’, based on E. Cush. *baḥ- ‘to go out’, Takács also quotes Agaw *ba-t- ‘to leave’ and further extends the comparison to N. Omot. forms (like Wolamo bā-, Yemsa bō-) 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 *ḥ nor *ḥ?, or are expected to preserve some traces of *ḥ (but not *ḥ?) which are obviously not there, I marvel at the author’s knowledge inaccessible to me when he asserts: “The common LEcu. -NWOmt. root (*baḥ-; I wonder how it is known that the Omot. root is < bāḥ- with *ḥ — AM) is often mistakenly (sic! — AM) equated with Bed. bāy “to go”, Agaw *fi- “to go out” [GT]...and Sem. *bāw “to enter.” [GT] stands for Gābor 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. *baḥ-, 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. dîša // According to LHAR 55 and LGur 315, borrowed, together with other S.-E. Eth. (Wol. żeñe, Selti žêše, Zway žîžî ‘to arrive, reach’) from HEC Darasa dâge, Sidamo dayâj. More likely, however, <dida, with *d > ţ (v. LHAR 7 and 9; LGur XLIV) < Sem. *dydy ‘to arrive, come, walk’ (v. in HALOT 214 and DRS 223).

(8) Cha. cânà-m // Only Gur., according to LGur 174; likely represents *tan- (on ċ <*t in Gur. v. ibid. LXII), comparable with Arb. in? ‘s’arrêter et séjourner dans un endroit’ (BK 1 208).

(9) Hrs. nôka; Mhr. nûka; Jib. nîka; Soq. nkţ // < Sem. (Arb.-MSA; the difference in meaning rather rules out Arb. borrowing into MSA); Arb. nkţ ‘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 -nakwā ‘aller, marcher’ etc. (Stolb. 2005 230).

(10) Jib. zahâm (syn.) // Likely a meaning shift from ‘to push one’s way in the crowd’, cf. zahnét ‘crowd’, sâ-zêm ‘to jostle in a crowd’, zâm ‘arrival; one who pushes’ (JJ 318) < Sem. (Arb.-MSA; unless an Arabism in MSA): Arb. zâm ‘serrer, reserrer (dans un espace droit)’, zamm- ‘foule qui se presse dans un espace étroit’ (BK 1 979).

(11) Soq. ?érah (syn.) // < Sem. *?urh ‘way, road’ (v. ROAD No. 1; HALOT 86).


Common West Semitic: *mît? (#2).

17 DIE:

(1) Akkad. muḫūt; Ugr. Pho. mt; Hbr. Pal. Qur. Sab. Gez. mwŒ; Syr. Urm. myŒ; Mnd. miŒ; Leb. mat; Mec. mît; Mlt. mît; Tna. motâ; Tgr. Amh. Wol. motâ; Arg. moda; Sod. motâm; Cha. mÈtŒ; Har. mûta; Hrs. Mhr. môt // < Sem. *mût (v. in LGz 375–6).

(2) Gaf. fâttâra // < S. Eth.: Amh. a-fâttâra ‘faire mourir subitement’ (LGaf 199 after Guidi), Endegñ (a)fêttâra ‘to hit someone so as to nearly kill him’.59 Cf. also Arb. fr ‘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. fōtē, Jib. fêtē ‘carcass of an unslaughtered animal’) and verbs: Mhr. fôt, fît ‘(animal) to die unslaughtered’ (JM109), Jib. fêt ‘to die without being slaughtered’ (JJ 67), related, in turn, to Arb. fêt ‘mournir’, unless the latter is a secondary semantic shift from the other meaning of fêt, ‘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 ṭuṭě ‘cadavre’ (compared with the MSA forms, but not with the Arabic one, in EDE II 540).

(3) Hrs. ʔâb (syn.) // Meaning shift from ‘to faint’ (ʔeyōb JJ 48), cf. Mhr. ħyōb, E. Jib. ʔāb ‘to faint, be absent’ (JM 146). Related to Arb. ʔyēb ‘é. absent, caché, disparaître’ rather than borrowed from it (cf. the expression in Arb. ħuyyabatu ħuyyabutan ‘il est mort’) BK 2 521. Note an isolated parallel in E. Chad.: Mokilko goʾobē ‘dead, corpses’ (ADB).

(4) Mhr. ʔāzōl (syn.) // An unusual meaning shift (rather than an homonym) from the other meaning of this verb — ‘to spin’ (JM 148); cf. Jib. ʔāzōl ‘to spin; to fall down in a sown, to be on the point of dying’ (JJ 92), Soq. ʔāzōl ‘to spin’ (JM 148) < Arb.-MSA (perhaps an Arabeism in MSA): Arb. ʔzl ‘filer (le lin, etc.)’ (BK 464).

59 In LGur 248 compared with hesitation to Cha. (a)fêttâra and the like ‘to finish (up)’, but, strangely, not compared with the Gaf. and Amh. forms.

(6) Jib. enūsum, ontsim (syn.) // Also ‘to breathe one’s last’ < ‘to breathe’: Hrs. ansūm ‘to breathe’, šenēsem ‘to sigh’ (JH 97), Mhr. hansūm ‘to breathe’ (JM 300) < Sem. *nšm ‘to breathe’ (SED I Verb No. 50).

◊ Soq. same is likely a loan of Arb śmy ‘tomber roide mort, ë. tué sur place’ (BK 2 1373).


18 DOG:

(1) Akk. kalbu; Ugr. Pho. Pal. klb; Hbr. kālāb; Syr. Mnd. Urm. Qur. kalb-; Leb. kalāb; Mec. kalb; Mit. kelp; Gez. Tgr. kālob; 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).


◊ Amh. ṭuḥša, w/shwašša, Arg. ṭuḥša, Gaf. ṭuḥšā, Sod. wuṣsa 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. *kʷVl- ‘dog, wolf’: (?) Sem.: Gez. kʷāhila ‘fox-like animal’; Brb.: Ahaggar ā-kūlen ‘loup, loup peint (lycaon)’ (non us. dans l’Ah.) F. 799; (?) C. Chad.: Logone kale, Buduma keli ‘dog’ (otherwise <*kVr-)*; C. Cush.: Waag kuli ‘dog’ (ADB).

19 DRINK:

(1) Akk. Ugr. Hbr. Pal. Syr. Urm. ṣty; Bib. šṭ; Mnd. šṭa; Gez. satya, Tna. sāṭāyā; Tgr. sāṭa; Arg. šāṭā; Har. sāṭa; Wol. sāče (<*tšt-)* // < Sem. *ṣty (v. in DLU 458; LGz 516).

(2) Qur. šrb; Leb. šarab; Mec. širib; Mlt. šorop; Gez. š/saraba // < Sem. *šrpšt- ‘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. šrp ‘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. š/sārabā ‘to approach (rain), condense (gas to liquid), etc. (Kane T 674), etc. (v. in LGz 533).

(3) Sod. sāččam; Cha. sāččam (<*kšt)*; Hrs. tek (hekō caus.; h- < *št-); Mhr. hutki <s-t-ky; Jib. šuṣ-ī // < Sem. *šky ‘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. ṭāṭṭa and Gaf. ṭiṭṭa, to which no parallels in Sem. seem to exist, are considered with hesitation in LGaf 242 to be loanwords from Oromo āduan, although the similarity is not overwhelming. No terms in Pho. and Sab.

→ **Common North and West Semitic:** *ṣty (1)* with a C. Chad. parallel: Bura sata ‘to drink’, Matakam sawat- ‘to be, make thirsty’.

---

60 Because of the difference in meaning, borrowing from Arb. is less likely.
61 On Sem. *ḥ* 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. *ḥbl; Hbr. ḥl ‘to dry up’, Arb. ḥbullat- ‘dried figs’ (v. in HALOT 7).

2. Hbr. yābšî; Pal. yḥyś; Syr. yābbīsî; Mnd. yabuśî; Qur. yābisî; Sab. ybûsî; Gez. Tgr. yabusù // < Sem. *ybs ‘to be dry’ (v. in LGz 626).

3. Leb. nēṣīf; Mec. naṣṣaf; Mitt. niṣef // I have not been able to find any parallels.

4. Tna. nākuś // Eth.: Gez. nāksa ‘to dry up, be exhausted, be split, etc.’, Tgr. nāksa ‘to become weak’, reasonably compared in LGz 400 with Arb. nḳṣ ‘to diminish, wane’, Sab. h-nḳṣ ‘to diminish’ (after Biella; in SD 98, ħnḳṣn and ḥḳṣn ‘to cede, concede’, mḳṣ-m ‘loss, damage’), Mnd. nḳṣ ‘to decrease’.


◊ 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: *ybs (2), perhaps < Afras. *bVš-: (?) Egyp. (Coptic): “Subahmimic” bōṣit, Sahidic bosît, bast (derived verbal forms)62 W. Chad.: Hausa bāśa ‘to be dry, dry up’, (?) Dera bāsà ‘harvest season’ (from ‘dry season, season with no rain?’).

21 EAR:

1. Akk. uznu; Ugr. ʔudn; Hbr. ṭōzān; Pal. ʔdn; Syr. ʔudn-; Mnd. ūdn-; Qur. ʔudn-; Leb. ṭadon; Mec. ʔidin; Mlt. widna; Gez. Tgr. ʔazan; Tna. ʔazni; Arg. izin, azan; Gaf. aznÄ; Sod. anznÄ; Cha. anzar; Har. uzun; Wol. azan; Hrs hayḏën; Mhr. haydın; Jib. ʔidën; Soq. idihan // < Sem. *ʔuddn- (SED I No. 4).

2. Urm. nāt- // L. Kogan (oral communication) thinks that it can hardly be separated from *ʔuddn-, 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. nāttn ‘enflé (membre du corps); saillant, protuberant’ (BK 2 1195), nāṭ? ‘qui est en sallie’ (ibid. 1191) or nyt ‘é. 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.

◊ Amh. ǯoro is borrowed from Oromo gurra (Gr. 188); on Amh. ǯ < *g V. SED I LXXIX–LXXX–LXXXV. No terms in Pho., Bib. and Sab.

→ Proto-Semitic: *ʔuddn- < Afras. *ʔuʕn- ~ ʔi/udn- ‘ear’: Egyp. ʔdn, phonetic value of the ‘ear’ hieroglyph determinative.63 E. Chad.: *ʔudun- ‘ear’.64 Dangla ḏĕngēi, Jegu ṭūdāŋē, ṭūdāŋē,

---

62 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 <yḥs, 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.

63 Egyp. d < Afras. ǯ is rare but confirmed by a few irrefutable examples, ĭdn being one of them, cf. EDE I 317–18.

64 It is hard to imagine that the E.Chad. forms are not related to Egyp. ĭdn and, hence, to the entire Afras. root, though d- < *ǯ- looks somewhat strange; perhaps, d- < *ǯ- in both Egyp. and E. Chad. reflects some unexplained
22 EARTH:


(3) Gez. maret, 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-n)66; with reliable Afras. parallels: Brb. Ghadames ta-nmur-t ‘terre, sol’ (Lan. 215), Rif ta-mur-t ‘pays, contrée, territoire’, Shawiya ta-mur-t ‘terrains propres à la culture’ (MCB 258), etc.; Egyp. OK nr ‘Viehweide’ (EG II 97); E. Chad. Sokoro māro ‘feuchte Erde’ (LZS 42).

(4) Gaf. afārī; Cha. Har. Wol. afār // Either < Sem. *apar- ‘dust, soil; ashes’ (Hbr. ṕēpār ‘loose soil crumbling into dust; ashes’ HALOT 80, Gez. ṕēfar ‘dust, soil’) or < Sem. *apar- ‘dust, soil’ (HALOT 861–2 erroneously includes “Eth. Ṗafèr”; should add Tgr. Ṗafur ‘dust; desert’ LH 492).


(7) Mhr. kār // Same as Hrs. kā ‘land, ground’ connected with Arb. kār- (<kvr) ‘plaine, terrain plat; terraine bas où l'eau demeure stagnante’ (BK 2 835);58 perhaps further related to Egyp. (MK) kār ‘Erdreich; Nilerde’ (EG V 12) and C. Chad. Musgu kāikāi, Mulwi käkāy, Munjuk ḥākāy ‘sand’ (ADB). Wol. dāčče (syn.) is borrowed from E. Cush.: Oromo dačči, Hadiya dāčče (LG 198).


---

65 Cf. Egyp. (Med.) mid ‘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 unacceptbale (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 Egyp. word with ‘earth’, in which case it is a potential match with Sem. *mādr- (through metathesis). See the discussion on some other possible connections of the Sem. term in EDE III 786–7.

66 See a more detailed discussion in EDE III 128–9.

67 In LGz 10, the 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. ṕēpār”.

68 Borrowing from Arb. into MSA cannot be ruled out.

69 With a peculiar phonetic development, due to the vicinity of i (< *?) and f in one root?

70 In EDE I 258 the unexpected f- (< *?) is tentatively explained as “interchange of i (which I prefer to render as y- so as not to confound it with j, often inconsistently rendering [j] in Afrasian studies — A.M.) — f in the proximity of g in Eg.”. I tend to explain it out of *?Vrd (< *Vṛ), with the guttural or uvular or “burring” [R] (rendered in Egyp. in this case, like in many others, by ��), which assimilated the glottal stop in the Anlaut. Cf. a similar process
23 EAT:


(2) Ugr. łyhm // < Sem. *laḥm- ‘food (bread or meat)’ (v. in DLU 243; HALOT 500; Kog. DD).

(3) Pal. ṣfm (syn.) // < Sem. *ṣfm ‘to taste’ (v. in LGZ 583).

(4) Gez. ḏḥ; Tna. bālfe; Tgr. bālā; Amh. bālla; Arg. bālla, ḏīa; Gaf. bālā; Sod. bālam; Cha. bānam; Har. bāla?a; Wol. bālā // < Sem. *bīl ‘to swallow, eat’ (LGZ 94–5).

(5) Hrs. ṭewā; Mhr. ṭu; Jib. ṭe; Soq. té // < Sem. *ṭw/y: Akk. ta?u ‘essen, weiden’ (AHw 1341; no MSA parallels quoted) < Afras. *ṭw/ʔ-?

Judging by the Afrasian comparanda, Sem. *ṭw/y might have been the original verbal root for ‘to eat’, later substituted in North and West Sem. by *ṭkl.

24 EGG:


(2) Hbr. bēqā; Pal. bysh; Syr. bēlt-; Mnd. bit-; Urm. biyy-; Qur. baydāt-; Leb. Mec. bayda; Mlt. bayda // < Sem. *bayśl-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. ʔankokho; Tna. ʔankkǎkʔo; Tgr. ʔankokho; Gaf. ankkǎ; Sod. anko; Har. akul; Wol. ankakot // Supposedly < Sem. *kǎkāřat- ‘egg’ (cf. SED I No. 160) with *k- prefixed and -h explained as the result of contamination with Mod. Eth. *ṅv-kułališ- (v. below). However, it must be somehow connected with Cush.: Beja kūḫi (RBed 137–8; <kǎh-), Saho unqōqahō (ibid.), Oromo hanqāqū (Gr.; < ḏhanqak-, with metathesis?), Dasenech ǧonqono (Tos. Das. 543), Hadiya kunka (Huds.), Ma’a ikokoha (HRSC 386; <ʔi-kvʔlkh-?), Iraqw qānḫi (ibid.; <k‘an-’) ‘egg’, while neither Eth. nor Cush. forms look like loanwords from each other (perhaps except Saho).

(5) Amh. Arg. ankulal; Cha. ankura; Mhr. kāwḥal; Jib. kēḫžin; Soq. kholhin // < Sem. *kâl(ʔ)/hîl- (cf. SED I No. 170). Relations with a Cush.-Omot. term (e.g. C. Cush.: Bilin kāhaluna, kāhal, Khamir qāluna, Khamta qululrena App. CDA 59–60; N. Omot.: Wolayta kukulliya Lmb-Sot 430) are not quite clear; as for C. Cush. Khamta enquqal, Aungi ankulal, Appleyard regards them as Amharisms, which is possible, but the rest of the Agaw forms require us to explain how Amh. ank- could become lost in the process of borrowing. For a possibility of a common Afras. root, cf. C. Chad.: Bata kwāl ‘egg’.

in Egyp. (OK) ṣlm ‘Asians’, rendering, in my opinion, ṣärāmmi ‘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.

71 Judging by the Afrasian comparanda, Sem. *ṭw/y might have been the original verbal root for ‘to eat’, later substituted in North and West Sem. by *ṭkl.

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

73 With many fantastic comparisons.
(6) Hrs. beḵešēt // < Sem. *bəkʷal- ‘plant, vegetation’ (v. in LGZ 100).

(7) Hrs. bēḏeh, Mhr. bēḏät, Jlb. bēḏ (all syn.) // < Sem. (Arb.-MSA; because of the serious difference in meaning cannot be supposed to represent an Arabism in MSA) *bayʕ-at-: Arb. bayʕat- ‘oeufs des fourmis’ (v. SED I No. 43 note). A variant root of *bayʕ-at-, to be scored differently.

◊ No terms in Ugr., Pho., Bib. and Sab.

→ **Common West Semitic:** *bayʕ-at- (~2) < Afras. *bayʕ-: W. Chad. *(m-)bwić- ‘egg’: Geji mbūšī, Zaar buūš, Sayanchi mbūš, Zul mbūš, etc. (ADB); cf. also discussion in EDE II 363–4).

### 25 EYE:

(1) Akk. ʾinu; Ugr. Pho. ʾunu; Hbr. ʾayin; Pal. ʾayyn; Syr. Urm. Qur.ʾayn-; Mnd. ʾayn-; Leb. Mecn. ʾayn; Mlt. (gh)ʾayn; Sab. ʾyn; Gez. ʾayn; Tna. ʾayni; Tgr. ʾen; Amh. ʾayn; Arg. Cha. ʾen; Gaf. inā; Sod. Wol. in; Har. ʾin; Hrs. ʾāyn; Mhr. Soq. ʾayn; Jlb. ʾilm // < Sem. *ʾayn- (SED I No. 28).

→ **Proto-Semitic:** *ʾayn- < Afras. *ʾayVn- ‘eye; to see’: Egyp. ʾunu, ʾyn, hieroglyph determinative sign for ‘eye’; Brb.: *HVnVy ~ nHVVy ‘to see’: Ayr ʾanay, Taneslent ʾanäh, Adghaq ʾanäh, Izyan ʾanī, etc.; W. Chad. *ḤayVn- ‘to see’: Bolewa ʾinn-, Polchi ʾenē, Paa han, Tule ʾyānī, Fyer ʾānā, Daffo-Butura ʾen, etc., C. Chad.: Gaanda ʾānī, Gerka ʾānana ‘to see, find’, (?) E. Chad.: Jegu ʾiim- ‘to know’; S. Cush.: Dahalo ʾeen-aḏ ‘to see from afar’; (?) N. Omot.: Gimirra ʾan ‘eye’ (ADB; Cf. EDE I 125–6, where this root is confounded with Afras. *ʾi(ʾ)n(t)- ‘eye’).

### 26 FAT (n.):


(3) Hbr. ḥešebb; Pho. ḥib // < Sem. *ṭilb ‘fatty tissue covering internal caul’; v. (SED I No. 131) or *ṭa/līVb ‘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 šārā ‘sediment after butter has been melted’ (in LGUR 584 quoted as a loan from E. Cush.: Hadiya Oromo šārā id.) or Muher šārārā, Wol. sore, etc. ‘to feed well a sick person’, Chaha, Muher, etc. šārāt ‘food’, Har. sör ‘food offered to a group of people on a special occasion’ (according to LGUR. 584, a loan from E. Cush.: Oromo sor, Somali sūr, etc. ‘food’).


---

24 Some of the above forms from languages, wherein ʾī is not preserved or distinctly reflected, may alternatively belong to other Afras. roots, cf., for example, *naʔ/wy- ‘to see’ (attested in Egyp. and Chad., see EDE I 126).

25 Should perhaps be divided into two metathetic variant roots — *sim-an- and *sim-am-.

26 Cf. the idea of ‘fat food’ as ‘good food’ and of ‘fat person’ as ‘healthy person’ in MSA sāldeh below.

27 Often included into Afras. *sim-an- (cf., e. g., EDE I 192), but better fits in with Sem. *ṣāhm-, requiring no explanation of what -ḥ- is doing in *ṣim-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 *-č-, 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
(8) Gez. šābh; Tna. šābbi; Tgr. šabeh; Amh. səb; Cha. swaũ; Har. sābah; Hrs. Jib. šabbi; Mhr. šabahi // < Sem. *šabhi- (SED I No. 261).
(9) Amh. mora (syn.: ‘animal fat, suet’); Sod. mora; Wol. morã // 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 mori. E. Cush.: LEC: Arbore moora, etc., HEC: Qa-benna, Sidamo mōra, etc., Dullay: Tسامay mooru, etc.; N. Omot.: Zaise, Yemsa mōra, S. Omot.: Ongota mōra (SLE 6), etc. At least part of these forms may continue Afras. *marV/STALL- ‘fat, oil’: Sem.: Akk. mara ‘to fatten’ (CAD m1 307), Ugr. mr ‘to fatten’ (DUL 570), Hbr. mr ‘to feed on the fat of the land, graze’ (HALOT 630), ESA: Sab. mr’m ‘Mast-vieh’; Arb. mr ‘trouver un aliment sain, bon’; W. Chad. Sura mwɔ́or, Bolewa mor, Barawa miyir, Kulere màr, C. Chad Tera mar ‘oil’, Nzangi mare, Bachama maray ‘fat’, etc. (ADB; EDE III 431).
(10) Gaf. buššara // Most likely a metathesis from *tarb- (v. above). Tentatively compared in EDE II 321 with an obscure Egyp. term bš, 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. sáyleh (both syn.) // Cf. other meanings: Mhr. sáyleh ‘to be fat’ and ḥasléh ‘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. faũ (syn.) // The only phonetically acceptable parallel with the same meaning that I could find is Egyp. OK fid ‘Fett’ (EG I 239), possibly < Afras. *fVũ-. One wonders if it is comparable semantically with the phonetically impeccable MSA-Arb. *fVũ/iũ- ‘bone, cartilage’ (v. BONE No. 3), if so, with the primary meaning ‘bone with fat on it’.
(13) Soq. finat // As suggested to me by L. Kogan, tentatively compared to Hbr. ŏná, probably meaning ‘oil, ointment’ (corresponding to Akk. piššatu, v. HALOT 855).
◊ Arg. ġoma seems borrowed from Oromo id. (Gr. 85), probably via Amh. id. (C. Cush. Kemant ġoma and Aungi ġumí are regarded as Amharisms by Appleyard). No terms in Bib. and Sab.

27 FEATHER:
(1) Akk. nāsu; Hbr. nōsā (both meaning ‘feathers’) // < Sem. *nāš(y)- (SED I No. 202).
(2) Syr. mrṭ- // < Sem. *mrṭ ‘to pluck, pull out hair’; Hbr. mrṭ ‘to pull out hair, depilate’ (HALOT 635), Arb. mrṭ ‘arracher le poil’ (BK 2 1092; cf. marît- ‘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.

80 The original meaning of Syr. mrṭ- must have been something like ‘hair that is easily plucked/pulled out’.

67
plumes (flèche) ibid.), perhaps also Akk. marātu ‘to rub, scratch’ (CAD m 276) with a meaning shift.  
(3) Syr. ṭēbr- (syn.) // < Sem. *ṭaibr- ‘pinion, wing’ (SED I No. 1).  
(4) Mnd. guļpar-; Urm. par-; Hrs. ferfāyfr // In Mnd., guļpar- 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’ 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. riṣṣa; Mit. r-š // No parallels that I know of.  
(6) Tgr. kānta // 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 and the Har. one with loss of -n-, if related) is connected to Tgr. kānta ‘to cut off (branches), to pluck off’ (LH 417).  
(7) Cha. zoẏa // < Gur.: Gyeto zāwyā, 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. zayy ‘kind of bird’ (ibid. 719). The latter opportunity seems more attractive; Amh. ‘kind of bird’ must go back to ‘goose’ (cf. Gez. ḕaṭ ‘goose’ regarded in LGz 646 as an Amharism), very likely related, with metathesis, to Sem. *ṭa(w)araz- ‘goose’.  
(8) Mhr. šīff(f); Jib. šīf d-ṭesfrā; Soq. šef(f) // All in Nak.; the orig. meaning is ‘hair’ (the Jib. form lit. means ‘hair of bird’), v. HAIR.  
(9) Mhr. ṭaf(f); Jib. ṭaṭaf (both syn.) // < Sem. *ḥaṭyap- ‘pluck (leaves, fruit)’ (see LGz 453). On the meaning shift see #2 and 6.  
(10) Soq. miliyaṭ (syn.) // According to LS 233, probably comparable with Arb. liṭ- ‘peau’. I would rather compare it to Arb. malit- ‘qui n’est pas encore garni de plumes (flèche); qui n’a pas encore de poil (foetus avorté)” (BK 2 1149).  
◊ Tgr. čogār (quoted by an informant as ‘feather’, but in LH 630 said to mean only ‘hair, fibre’—is a common Eth. loan from Cushi. ‘hair’; Amh. laba, lāboba, 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 zorū-ta, Alaba zorū-ta (ibid. 714). No terms in Ugr., Pho., Bib., Pal., Qur., Sab., Gez. and Gaf.  
→ Common Semitic 1: *nāṣ(y)- (#1).  

28 FIRE:  
(1) Akk. išātu; Ugr. ṭiš-t, ṭiš-tu; Hbr. ṭēs; Pho. ṭi; Pal. ṭyāsh, ṭaššā; Gez. ṭašāt; Tgr. ṭašat; Amh. Arg. Cha. asat; Gaf. asatā; Sod. asat; Har. isāt // < Sem. *ṭišt- (v. in LGz 44).  

81 The Hbr., Arb. and Akk. forms are erroneously derived in HALOT 635 from *mrz (mrн, in our rendering).  
82 In Syr. represented by gess- ‘coda, latus’ ibid. 126, v. also SED I No. 97; in Mnd. *-i- > -u- with accomodation to *p-.  
83 Cf. N. Omot.: Mao (Diddesa) kwīnte ‘hair’. An accidental look-alike?  
85 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.  
(3) Gez. ḥaw, haw (syn.); Tna. ḥawwî // Eth. (LGz 248; for its presumed connections with Gez. ḥələwāy ‘evening, the red glow of the evening sky’ and further with Arb. ?iḫwawā ‘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 ḥwaw-and, with metathesis, Sha ḥwoh ‘to burn’; C.: Kilba ḥiʔu, Mbara ḥū ‘fire’; E.: Mokillo ?iʔwɔ̀ id., etc.). Cf. also C. Cush.: Bilin ḥaww ‘to burn’, Khamir ḥāw-y, Khamta ḥawɔ̀ ‘to heat’ (all trans.), considered in App. CDA 39 borrowings in Agaw from Eth. (because of the presence of ḥ).


(5) Hrs. šewêt (syn.); Mhr. šiwɔ̀t; Jib. şot; Soq. šiát (ṣeytiʔ) // In LS 424 compared with Syr. ṣwɛt ‘è. enflammé’ (‘to burn, consume away’ CSD 364) and Arb. variant roots ściwąz,38 and šiwɔ̀t- ‘flamme pure, sans fumée’ (BK 1288), which may be cognate to the MSA terms (all < Sem. *šiwɔ̀t-), unless the latter ones are Arabisms.

◊ Wol. žirâ is from E. Cush.: Sidamo *žiira, Saho Afar girâ ‘fire’ (LGur. 319). No term in Sab.

→ North and West Semitic: *tś-[ā]-t (§1) < Afras. *tis- ‘fire’; Brb.: Ahaggar a-has ‘big fire’; W. Chad. *ʔyas- ‘fire’: Montol ʔūs, Ngamo ʔiṣi, Geruntum ʔiši, etc., E. Chad.: Dangla ʔiṣé ‘to make fire’, Migama ʔiṣ ‘warm’, Bidiya ʔōs, Birgit ʔiṣi ‘to burn’ (ADB).


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.89

(2) Ugr. ḏg; Hbr. ḏâg // DRS 216 also quotes Hbr. ḏâgäh ‘pêche’, Pal. ḏâqeh ‘barque de pêcheur’ and, with a question mark, Amh. ḏuʔ ‘paquet des poissons liés ensemble’.

(3) Qur. ḥūt-; Mlt. ḥēta // Only in Arb. Possibly < *ḥaw-t-; in this case possible Afras. parallels are: Egyp. (OK) mḥy-t ‘fish’ (<*mV-ḥVyt-?), W. Chad.: Tsagu ḥātī id., *HVyʔ-t ‘to fish’: Bolewa ḥuʔɛ, Tangale ọ, C. Chad.: Bura yîhâ ‘to fish in shallow water’, Mofu-Gudur āwêt ‘fish’, Gude (met.?) tóhwa ‘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.91

57 Note the comparison of Hbr. mēṣî (c*ṣeq, hif. ‘to gaze’), Jud. ṣeq ‘to look, see’ and Mnd. ṣeṣ, ṣeq ‘to look or shine (of the eyes)’ with the Arb. forms in HALOT 1013–14, which is vague semantically and hardly acceptable phonetically.

89 In fact, Soq. t may correspond to Arb. z < Sem. *t, but this is not the case as other MSA parallels clearly point to *t-

90 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 *ńiawya ‘salmon’).

91 Note Indo-European *dāghū- ‘fish’.

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


(6) Hrs. ṣayd; Mbr. caṣyad; Jib. ṣode; Soq. ṣode // < Sem. *ṣyd 'to fish, hunt'.

◊ Leb. nun seems more likely < Arm. than inherited < Arb. ancestor. Gez. ṣäsā, Tga. ṣasa; Amh. Arg. Sod. Cha. asa; Gaf. Wol. asā are, according to LGz 73, from C. Cush., while Appleyard qualifies the Eth. forms as "clearly of non-Semitic, and probably Agaw origin" (App. CDA 68). The term is also attested in N. Cush.: Beja ḥiśi, E. Cush. Saho ṣasa, and Omot. Ḥaṣ (Kafa ḥaṣso, Bworo ṣaso, Anfillo ḥaṣso, Nao ṣasa) 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. ğ; Hbr. ġ // < Sem. *ḡ 'to fly' (v. in HALOT 800; LGz. 78), related to ṣawp- 'bird' (SED II No. 48).

(3) Pal. Syr. Urm. prḥ; Mnd. prḥ (met.) // < Sem. *prḥ 'to fly' (v. in HALOT 966), related to *parḥ 'chick, brood' (SED II No. 179).

(4) Pal. ṭwš; Mnd. ṭwš (both syn.) // < Sem. *ṭwš ~ *ṭšš 'to flutter, jump': Hbr. ṭwš 'to flutter (on the ground)' (HALOT 373), Jib. ṭšš 'to jump up' (J 280), etc.

(5) Qur. ṭyr; Leb. Mec. ṭār; Mlt. ṭār // As a verb only in Arb.;94 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. sārā 'to mount', Tgr. sārra 'to jump, fly', sārerā 'bird', Amh. sārrārā 'jump, mount, climb', etc.95 Cf. Mnd. sūrara 'flock of birds, swarm' (DM 329) and Sem. *ś̄śr̄śr̄-: Akk. sūššuru (šūšuru) 'a dove', Arb. šāršur- 'petit oiseau' (SED II No. 216).

(7) Gez. bara; Tgr. bärra; Amh. Sod. bärrārā; Arg. bärrāra; Cha. bānārā; Harari bärrāra; Wol. bàrrārā // A root of debatable origin (cf. SED I No. 1). Contra LGz 107 and many others, not related to Sem. *prr (quoted as frr ibid.).96 Likely related to Sem. *a'ibr- 'pinion, wing', less likely borrowed from Cush. N. (Beja bir RBed 50), C. (Khamir bir-, Kemant bārūr, Aungi berer-, considered in App. CDA 70 borrowings from Amh.) or E. (Saho -ibrir, Oromo bārar-, Burji bārr-, Kambatta burri y-, Darasa birret-).97 Most likely, all the above Sem. and Cush. forms go back to Afras. *bēarr- 'to fly, jump', also including N. Omot. (Male bar-an 'to fly'), C. Chad. Mulwi biri 'to fly', Musgoy mbir 'to jump', Musgu bāra 'to fly, jump', E. Chad. Kwang bre, Birgit bēri 'to fly' (ADB; cf. also EDE II 274).

(8) Tna. nāfārā; Tgr. nāfra (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.

---

92 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.

93 However, upon quoting Bilin ṣasa and Khamir ḥaza (together with Bilin ṣasa, Kemant asa, Aungi asī), he points out "the influence of N. Eth., as neither f nor h occur in purely Agaw roots".

94 Gez. ṭaṣṣara ‘to fly’ and similar Eth. forms are regarded in LGz. 601 as Arabisms.

95 Some of the Sem. parallels quoted in LGz 514 look questionable.

96 Another mythetymology, extremely popular among Semitists and quite tenacious.

97 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).

(10) Mhr. (syn.) agōnôh // Jib. gēnâh ‘wing’ (an Arabism, according to JJ 77), Soq. ganâh ‘devant, milieu de la poitrine’ (Noged dialect gēnâh ‘sternum’), Arb. žānâh- ‘bras (chez l’homme); aisselle; aile (chez les oiseaux, les insectes, etc.), žānîh- at- ‘côte, surtout cette partie qui est du côté de la poitrine’ (BK I 338). See SED I.

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

→ **Common West Semitic:** *fwp* (#2) < Afras. *fwp- ‘bird; to fly’: (?) Egyp. (late) ṣâp ‘to fly’ (perhaps a Semitism); S. Omot. *Hwp/if-t- ‘bird’: Dime ipt, ifi, Ari apti, (?) aft-i, Hamer apt-i, aft-i (SED II; ADB).

### 31: FOOT:

(1) Akk. ēs̱pu; Soq. šâb, šaf // < Sem. *šaṛp- ‘foot, sole of foot; shoe’ (SED I No. 269).
(2) Ugr. pûn; Pho. pûm; Mhr. fîm; Jib. fâm // < Sem. *pâm/n- (SED I No. 207).
(3) Hbr. Bib. râgîl; Plm. rgl; Syr. râgîl; Mnd. lîgr- (met.); Qur. rîjîl-; Sab. rgl // < Sem. *rigl- (SED I No. 228), with semantically diverse but undoubted Afras. parallels (see below).
(10) Hrs. gedel; Mhr. gedêl (syn.); Jib. gedâl (syn.) // < Sem. *gêd(V)l- ‘limb’ (SED I No. 73).
(11) Soq. sukal (syn.) // < Sem. *s̱ukîl- ‘leg, thigh; elbow’ (SED I No. 242); derivation, with a fossilized prefixed -l, from Sem. *šîk- ‘thigh, leg’ (No. 8, above) is possible.

→ **Common Semitic 1:** *šayp- (#1) < Afras. *šaṛp- ‘foot, sole of foot; shoe’: Egyp. (Gr) šp ‘hoof’; N. Cush.: Beja šîb ‘to shoe’, šâb ‘to be shod, put on one’s footgear’; C. Cush.: *šânpb- ‘foot, heel’: Bilin šânpfi, Qwara šãmpaa, Dembea šânpa, Qemant šâmpaa, S. Cush.: Asa išîba ‘sandal’ (ADB).

**Common Semitic 2:** *pâm/n- (#2) < Afras. *pâm/m- ‘leg, foot’: W. Chad.: Fyer fûn (*fûnH-), C. Chad.: Fali Kiria pûnu ‘thigh’, Zime-Batna fun ‘buttocks’, E. Chad.: Soko-

*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.) dînh (*dwîn) ‘wing’; (?) C. Chad.: Mbara ƙarân- ‘wing’ (the second element is not clear); E. Cush.: HEC: Kambatta gonna-ta id.; N. Omot.: Dizi (Maji) gan ‘to fly’.

*Its widely accepted and much-discussed cognation with *rigl- is yet another mythetymology among Semitists.
ro offen, ḥ̱p̱n (<*?Vfyan-) ‘foot, leg’; E. Cush.: Orom. fana ‘trace’ (n.), S. Cush.: Qwadza pa?am-uko ‘foot’ (ADB).


**Common West Semitic 2:** *(i)n-galur-* (#6) < Afras. *(?i)n-gur- ‘leg, knee’: W. Chad. Warji ng̱garái, Miya ńg̱ar ‘leg’, Mbara m̱-gūrī, E. Chad. Kera g̱g̱ōr ‘knee’, Sokoro gorūn-gorundu ‘foot’; S. Cush. *gūrūn-guda ‘knee’: Iraqw, Gorowa gurūngura, etc. (cf. K-M 122), N. Omot.: Mocha gūrō ‘knee’ (LMČ 33; comparison with Amh. gulbāt, etc. is wrong) (ADB).100

**32 FULL:**

(1) Akk. malū; Ugr. ml?; Hbr. mālāʔ; Pal. mlī; Syr. mlē; Mnd. Urm. mlīy-; Qur. mlāʔan-; Leb. mlīn; Mec. mālān; Mlt. mēnīl; Gez. mālāʔ; Tna. mūluʔ; Tgr. mlūʔ; Amh. mlū; Arg. muli; Sod. mulāʔ; Cha. mūru; Har. mūlūʔ; Wol. mūli; Mhr. mūlaʔ; Jib. mūziʔ; Soq. mili // < Sem. *mlʔ ‘to fill, be full’ (v. in LGz 342).

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

→ **Proto-Semitic:** *(?i)n-galur-* ‘be full, filled’: Brb.: Ahaggar amālī ‘tout, entier’, Ayr mālū ‘. . . rempli entièrement, pleinement’, molūml ‘. . . complètement rempli’; W. Chad.: Hausa mālālā ‘to flow out, into; pervade entirely’, milālā ‘abundantly’, (?) C. Chad.: Mada m̱lā-kiya ‘full moon’ (kiya ‘moon’); S. Cush.: Iraqw mlālāt ‘to fill to the brim’ (with an f of unclear origin); (?) N. Omot.: Wolamo mūliya ‘totality, wholeness (?)’ (cf. kamma mūliya ‘the whole night’) (EDE III 413; ADB).

**33 GIVE:**

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


(3) Bib. Pal. yhb (both syn.); Syr. y(ḥ)b; Mnd. aḥb (syn.); Urm. yhb; Sab. Gez. ḡhb; Tna. habā; Tgr. habā; Arg. ḡawā; Gaf. wābā; Sod. abā; Wol. wābā // < Sem. *wḥ (LGz 609).

100 Very likely related to North African Afras. *(?n-V)*g “ar- ‘hand; holding, catching’: Egyp. (Pyr.) ḏt, ḏr.t ‘hand’ (cf. nūry ‘to catch’, ngr ‘to seize’; W. Chad.: Bolewa ṣ̱g̱ur ‘to snatch’, ṣ̱g̱ār ‘to pinch and hold tight’, Tangale ḵw̱ṟ ‘to hold tightly’, C. Chad.: Musgoy ṣ̱g̱ar ‘hand’, Gude ṣ̱g̱̱ṟ ‘to pick up, lift’, Musgu ṣ̱g̱ṟ ‘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.

101 Cf. also MSA: Mhr. adyén ‘to lend (money, supplies), to give credit’ JM 78, Jib. edyén id. JJ 44, Soq. *sêdyen caus.-refl. ‘s’emprunter’ LS 127 (unless all from Arb.)

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

103 Apparently another mythetymology, though more subtle in this case.
Soq. ụr (for details, see Mil. Tuar. 200).

34 possible to justify, since the correspondence Egyp. 


Common West Semitic 2: *ytn ~ *ntn (#2).

34 GOOD:

(1) Akk. ṭābu; Pal. ṭb; Hbr. ṭb; Bib. ṭāb; Syr. Mnd. ṭāb-; Qur. ṭayyib-; Mec. ṭayyib; Mlt. ṭayyip // < Sem. *ṭayVb- (v. in DLS 479; HALOT 370).

(2) Akk. ḏānk- (syn.) // < Sem. *dmk ‘to be pleasing, good, beautiful’ (v. in DRS 276; LGz 135).


(4) Syr. ṣappīr- (syn.); Urm. ṣāpīr- // < Sem. *ṣpr ‘to be beautiful, clean; to shine’ (v. in HALOT 1635).

(5) Qur. ḫasan- (syn.) // Translated as ‘beau, joli; bon, excellent’ in BK 1 428. Obviously connected with Tgr. ḫasna ‘to talk and do good’ (LH 73), Mhr. ḫassan ‘to improve in health’ (JM 189; marked as Arabism), Jib. ḫāsin ‘to be kind to so.’, ḫāsin ‘to improve’, ḥesin ‘to think so. or st. good’ (JJ 116); all these forms, however, may well be Arabisms. On one hand, likely related to Hbr. ḥāsin ‘strong’ (HALOT 338), Syr. ḫāsin- ‘firmus, robustus’, ḫsn (etpe.) ‘superatus est’ (Brock. 248), all < Sem. *ḫsn. On the other hand, cf. Arb. ḫisat- ‘salaire, prix du travail’ (BK 1 428) cognate to Jud. ḫsn (Itpa.) ‘to be fully compensated’ (Ja. 489) and E. Jib. Mhr. ḫasamēt ‘heavenly reward’ (JM 189; an Arabism?), also < *ḫsn. The question is whether these are two homonymous roots or just one, with polysemy.

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

105 Contrary to the established opinion (e.g. in EDE I 72–3), Egyp. (Pyr) ḥāb ‘to send (a letter or message inter alia), to write a letter’ , (MK-NK) ‘letter, message’ is not related, i.e. the implied Egyptian form would be *hwab-. This is demonstrated by forms in languages that have borrowed the Egyp. term in the meaning ‘to write’, namely Chad.: Hausa rubu, Buduma rebo, Afade okhābotu (the latter word perfectly conveys the consonant root composition of the Egyp. word) and Brb: Lybian (East Numidian) ḍhb, ḍhb-thn, Ghadames ḏhb, etc. < Brb. *Harah, a conspicuous case of *ḏb (v. in Ghadames and Audjila) < *ḏb with a laryngeal in the same root (for details, see Mil. Tuar. 200).

106 Cf. EDE I 261, comparing the Sem. and S. Cush. forms with Egyp. ḏfm ‘sweet, pleasant’, where ḏ is impossible to justify, since the correspondence Egyp. ḏ ~ Sem. ḏ does not exist.
(6) Leb. mlḥ ʿm( mlḥ) // Arb. mlḥ ‘è. 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. *mlḥ- ‘salt’, v. in LGz 343; this semantic shift is attested in several other roots, cf. Bulakh 2005), cf. Arb. mlḥ- ‘sel; lesprit, le piquant’, mlḥ ‘saler; è. salé’ (BK ibid.). Cf. also Gez. mlḥ, mǝlḥ, mǝlḥā ‘salt, taste, savor, common sense’ (LGz 343) and the comments by Leslau on mlḥā ‘to do, work’: “possibly ‘do good work’, salt being the symbol of good deeds” (ibid.).107

(7) Sab. ṣdık // The meaning ‘good’ is debatable (‘right; justice; justification; truth; that which is good, proper, satisfactory’ SD 141) < Sem. ṣdık ‘to be just, true’ (v. in HALOT 1003; LGz 548).

(8) Gez. šannāy // Tgr. sannī // Common Eth.108 External parallels, adduced in LGz 532, are not very convincing, except for Mhr. mǝşnā ‘fitness, efficiency’, quoted after Bittner, but having a different meaning in JM.

(9) Tna. šabbuk // To compare with Arb. sbk ‘devancer, arriver le premier’, ḡasbak- ‘qui devance les autres et arrive le premier; supérieur, excellent’ (BK 1 1046); perhaps an Arabism.

(10) Amh. ṯaru // Several etymological hypotheses may be proposed in the absence of direct parallels. Either we should derive it from ṭārra ‘to be pure, clear’ < Eth. ṣry id. (v. in LGz 564), or identify it, as a metathesis-enhanced ṭraw, with S. Eth. ṭor ‘to do things well, arrange well’ (v. in LGur 637), or with Sod. ḥirānnī ‘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. dōmma // Though no etymology is offered in LArg 198, likely related to Mod. Eth. *dāmnam ‘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’109 (Amh. addāma

107 Otherwise, to be compared with Brb. *m-lay ‘good, beautiful’ (Qabyle a-mellay ‘good, merciful’, Ayr mol-dn ‘good’, etc.); C. Chad.: Kotoko molah ‘sweet, pleasant’; N. Cush.: Bilin milmili ‘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) ml-ḥ (if <*mlt- ‘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.) mlḥ ‘richtig, trefflich’ (EG II 84), s-mlḥ ‘gut machen’ (ibid. IV 136), possibly <*mlḥ (cf. EDE III 313–16; note, however, Sem. variant forms with -n: the Leb. variant root mohn, Syrian Arabic mnh ‘nice’ and MSA: Mhr. muna ‘nice’, Soq. mɪnah ‘beau’); the latter parallel is much less tenable, since Egyp. ḥ vs. Sem. *ḥ is not regular (cf. discussion in EDE ibid.).

108 Tna. snínay is rare, according to my informants.

109 Curiously, the two roots with the same consonantal composition and obviously assocciable 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. *(ʔa)-dVm- ~ *diVm- ‘red’; Sem.: Akkadian (OAkk. on) adamu (adammu, adamu) ‘a red garment’ (CAD a1 95) (cf. metaphetic Standard Bab.) ʾadammu ‘dark-colored, dark-red’ ibid. d 74), Ugr. ʾadmn ‘red (earth)’ (Huhn., 104), Hbr. ṭōdm ‘reddish-brown’, of blood, grape-juice, lentils, cow, horse, skin’ (HALOT 15) (cf. also its reduplicated stem variant ṭōdmād ‘right red, reddish’ ibid.), Arb. ʾadmn– ‘red color’ (DAF 64), dmn ‘to paint red’ (BK 1 728), Gez. ʾadam ‘red’, ṭadmnā ‘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 dāmuy ‘red (maize)’, Cha., Muhur, etc. dāmyit ‘red, reddish’ (ibid. 210); Egyp. (OK) lām ‘red cloth’; Brb.: Tashelhit adomman, Tamazight adomman ‘brown, bronze coloured’, Qabyle dāmman ‘violet’; C. Cush.: Aungi dōmm, Kunfāl demē (App. CDA 114), E. Cush.: Saho duma, Oromo dimā, Konso tīm-, Sidamo duwmu ‘red’, Darasa diimma ‘to become red’, S. Cush.: Qwadza dinyayi- ‘red’; Omot.: Kafa damme ‘red’, Ongota damt ‘yellow’ (ADB).
A complete etymology-based hundred wordlist of Semitic updated


(12) Gaf. gunnä // Likely < Eth. *ģnn ‘to become important, abundant, numerous, strong; to exceed’ (LGz 198), Tna. gāñānā ‘to be lucky, fortunate’ (Kane T 2316), related to Arb. ġmn ‘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. wâḵe // Controversially commented upon in LGur 650 as “perhaps a phonetic variant of wâge”, in its turn commented upon as “perhaps a phonetic variant of wâke... coming from *wâke” (ibid. 646). Perhaps related to Gez. wâkaya ‘to shine, be brilliant’, etc. (LGz 612), reasonably compared ibid. with Akk. akukūtu ‘red glow in the sky’ (also ‘flame, blaze’ CAD a 1 285). Cf. interesting, though isolated, parallels in Chad.: W.: Hausa kyäu ‘goodness, beauty’ (Abr. Hs. 602) and C.: Gisiga kuwi ‘good’, kuko ‘beautiful’ (Sk. Hs. 164) and E. Cush.: Yaaku –eko ‘good’ (Hei. Ya. 126).

(14) Har. ṭōñam // < ṭōn ‘to exceed, excel’ < Eth. ṭsn ‘to be strong’ < Sem. *ṭsn ‘to make, act skillfully’ (v. in LGz 559).


(16) Jib. fשקš-ünk // Placed in JJ 56 under the same root as fשקš ‘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. fשקš id. (JM 92) and Arb. fשק ‘casser avec la main (un oeuf)’ (BK 2 621; cf. ibid. variant roots fḳs and fḳ with close meanings).

(17) Soq. diye // 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. Tumak ed; N. Cush. Beja day, E. Cush. Bayso ka-ida (<*yid-), Sidamo aada; N. Omot. Shinasha doʔa, Kafa deʔo making Afras. *dVyʔ~ *yVd- ‘good’ (Mil. 2004 317–18; ADB).

◊ Sod. fāyya 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 bīzza ‘generous’; Hrs. ged, Mhr. gid must be borrowed from Arb. ġayyid- ‘excellent, bon’ (BK 1 351).

→ Common North and West Semitic: *ṭayVb-.

Literature

ADB — Afrasian Data Base ((http://starling.rinet.ru and http://ehl.santafe.edu)).

110 For the “isosemantic row” demonstrating the same meaning shift, cf. C. Cush. Kemant sārāy, Qwara sāra, both meaning ‘red’ and ‘beautiful’ (App. CDA 30), and Russian красный ‘red’ and the derived form красивый ‘beautiful’.

111 And unconvincingly with Soq. ʔughe ‘to become reddish’, since Soq. g does not correspond to Sem. *k.

112 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.

113 Though an origin from Common Eth. and Sem. *bz/hlunule ‘to abound, be abundant, become more’, etc. (v. in LGur 168), cannot be entirely ruled out.


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 обширные соображения относительно методологии проведения лексикостатистических подсчетов.