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The paper constitutes part of a long-range series aiming, step by step, to identify the inherited Afro-Asiatic stock in the etymologically little explored lexicon of the Omotic (West Ethiopia) branch of the Afro-Asiatic family displaying the least of shared traits among the six branches of this macrofamily, which suggests a most ancient Omotic desintegration reaching far back to the age of post-Natufian neolithic.
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Introduction

Omotic (West Ethiopia) and Chadic (Rep. of Chad, Cameroon, Nigeria), i.e., the 5th and 6th branches, resp., of the immense Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) language macrofamily have so far been the least studied from the standpoint of their external lexical correspon-

1 This paper has been prepared in the frames of the ARR grant of the University of Łódź. I am indebted to Prof. Krzysztof Tomasz Witzczak (Department of Classical Philology, University of Łódź) for his encouragement and support.

2 The numeration of the branches follows the commonly accepted nomenclature of the Afro-Asiatic classification established by J.H. Greenberg (1955: 51 and fn. 10; 1963: 48-49), who still distinguished five branches: (1) Semitic, (2) Berber, (3) Ancient Egyptian, (4) Cushitic, (5) Chadic, which was due to Omotic languages having been in his day still classified under West Cushitic until the pioneering studies in the 1970s by H.C. Fleming (1969, 1974, 1976a, 1976b) and by M.L. Bender (1975), cf. also Fleming & Bender (1976), who established Omotic as a separate (i.e. 5th) branch of Afro-Asiatic, distinct from Cushitic. The Afro-Asiatic classification has thence become complete and so it is presently valid, which has been recently presented in a practically complete up-to-date list in EDE 1: 9-34.
ences compared with the other four branches: Cushitic (Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Kenya, Tanzania), Berber (Maghreb), Egyptian and Semitic. In Chadic, at least, we have the unique and lasting achievements accumulated by O.V. Stolbova (Moscow) over the past five decades of her permanent and fruitful research for both its inner reconstruction and its external comparison. This kind of research on the inherited Afro-Asiatic stock of the Omotic root inventory, let alone the elaboration of the underlying historical phonology, has by far been advanced in this branch to the same extent as in Chadic, even though this branch, according to both the isomorphic and provisory glottochronological calculations, appears as the very first unity of the Afro-Asiatic parental community to have branched off (cf. Takács 2015) and so promises to end up as the inventory consisting of the most archaic segments of the Common Afro-Asiatic (CAA) lexicon.

We owe much to H.C. Fleming, M.L. Bender, and M. Lamberti for their pioneering studies on the internal lexical comparison and phonological reconstruction of Omotic. The latter two authors did even manage to produce monographs on the subject, where, however, a systematic phonological-lexical equation with the other branches was not even targeted. The lexical comparisons by M. Lamberti were always, as a rule, restricted to Cushitic and Ethio-Semitic, which is overwhelmingly true about both other authors. Ironically, the very first book by M.L. Bender (1975) contains merely a loosely composed list of supposed parallels to Omotic roots in- and outside Afro-Asiatic, but this attempt, unfortunately, had not even reached the level of J.H. Greenberg’s (1955, 1963) “mass comparison”, and is nothing more than a collection of putative guesses on often unconvincing look-alikes.

But, whereas that was understandable half of a century before, as the unity and structure of this 5th branch had not even been recognized by that time at all, today, in the era of a more advanced inter-branch comparison as demonstrated in the masterpieces by Ch. Rabin, A.B. Dolgopolsky and his pupil, O.V. Stolbova, this method is no longer tenable. For the case of Omotic, this demand has first been formulated perhaps by Ch. Ehret (1979: 52) in his assessment of M.L. Bender’s (1975: chapter 5) Omotic-AA comparative lexicon: “It is indicative of the rapid advances ... in phonological reconstruction within different recognized branches of Afroasiatic that we can already begin to consider refining Bender’s core vocabulary comparisons with a view toward identifying true cognates and lexical isoglosses that define a possible pattern among the six branches, and toward evalu-

3 Tamazight being the native designation for ‘Berber language’ preferred primarily among scholars and the intelligence in general with a Berber (Amazigh) background, we better stick to the traditional term ‘Berber’ commonly accepted in all international circles of Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics also.

4 Due homage should be paid, of course, to the merits of P. Newman (1966 jointly with R. Ma, 1977) and H. Jungraithmayr (JS 1981, JI 1994) too, but their output is, nevertheless, no match for that of A.B. Dolgopolsky (1930-2012) in this regard, both in terms of quantity or quality, nor to that of O.V. Stolbova, who focused solely on Chadic consonantal-lexical reconstruction with ingenious insights into its AA relations over the half a century of her enormously fruitful research, following in the footsteps and reminiscent of the skills of her sometime Muscovite master, one of the most original experts of AA comparative consonantism ever, may his memory be blessed.

5 Bender 1975, 1999, 2003 (all these volumes deal with Omotic as a whole), Lamberti 1993 (two volumes at a time: Yemsa and Shinasha, resp.), Lamberti and Sottile 1997 (Wolayta).
ating the conclusions about the Omotic relationship to the rest of Afroasiatic implied by Bender’s grammatical isoglosses.” However, Ehret (1979: 53-56) only listed just a few sets of isoglosses between Omotic and the diverse branches of Afro-Asiatic. But farther than this he has not reached either except for arriving at some tentative estimation of Omotic’s position among the Afro-Asiatic branches. Thereby, Ehret (1979: 61) has concluded to a few historical implications as for the dispersal of the parental PAA community, their spread through North Africa. As for the “Vocabulary and phonological reconstructions”, accordingly, Ehret has suggested a valid and truly supportable option for handling Omotic core lexical stock as an especially archaic segment reflecting the most ancient layer of the parental Afro-Asiatic vocabulary void of subsequent areal innovations (that is, like the well-known Twareg-Chadic parallels, not loans, or Berbero-Cushitic isoglosses). One must add here a similar pilot study into the Omotic lexicon by H.-J. Sasse (1981: 147-148), perhaps the most rigorous and convincing reconstructeur ever in Afro-Asiatic aside from great Dolgopolsky, for whom the only plausible way of treating cognates was the classical neo-grammian approach. This is how the idea of applying it at last for Omotic also occurred to him (Sasse 1981: 148-149): “Wie man auf diese Weise zu Ergebnissen gelangen kann, soll im folgenden am Beispiel des Omotischen demonstriert werden” especially because “... scheint nun seine Afroasizität mehr und mehr in Zweifel gezogen zu werden.” Thus, “... es sei sinnvoll, bei vergleichenden Untersuchungen das Omotische zunächst auszuklammern ...: Berberisch und Semitisch sind ganz offensichtlich miteinander verwandt ... Zieht man jedoch das Omotische hinzu, so vermindert sich die Anzahl der Isoglossen plötzlich so stark ...” Nevertheless, Sasse (1981: 149) confessed: “Über die Afroasizität des Omotischen denke ich heute nicht ganz so pessimistisch wie vor acht Jahren, da mir heute mehr Material zur Verfügung steht, das mein Bild vom Omotischen leicht

---

6 Ehret (1979: 6§): “The final cognation percentage range is that between Omotic and all the rest, at a startlingly low average of about 1%. Only among the neighboring ... Omotic and Cushitic languages ..., especially Ometo and Highland East Cushitic, and between Eastern Omotic speeches and Eastern Cushitic (and sometimes between Omotic and Agew) do Omotic scores ... much exceed 0-2%. ... Bender’s conclusion that Omotic forms one primary branch of the Afroasiatic family versus ... all the rest ... stands up.”

7 Ehret (1979: 61-62): “a number of intermediate stages will have to be reconstructed also if the truly proto-Afroasiatic remnants are to be effectively distinguished from later but geographically widespread innovations. Semitic will need to be compared first against Berber and Egyptian to see if confirmatory phonological innovations linking the three as against the rest of the family turn up. Similarly there should be shared Cushitic phonological developments attesting that grouping and, at a deeper remove, innovations setting off ‘Erythraic’ from Omotic. ... The over-weight of knowledge ... on Semitic ... can be felt in the common tendency to treat Semitic as most representative of the original state ... and the others as diverging from the prototype in whatever degree ... From what the vocabulary isoglosses suggest, even the occurrence of a feature through all the Afroasiatic divisions except Omotic does not guarantee its proto-Afroasiatic presence. ... Omotic might be more typical of proto-Afroasiatic in many features ...”

8 Namely, in his words (l.c.): “das Aufzeigen von Zusammenhängen, die nur dann einen Sinn ergeben, wenn man vom Zugrundeliegen eines gemeinsamen Ursystems ausgeht. Solche Zusammenhänge sind ... nicht leicht aufzufinden ...: je breiter gestreut die Gemeinsamkeiten sind, desto unwahrscheinlicher ist, daß sie auf Entlehnung oder Zufall zurückzuführen sind. Wesentlich ist dabei vor allem ... die Unterscheidung von Neuerungen und Archaismen ... – man schämt sich fast, das auszusprechen, so selbstverständlich sollte es sein.”
verschoben hat.’’ Then Sasse proposed all in all just 4 Omotic vs. Afro-Asiatic matches making this pioneer study, however, a real pioneering masterpiece (even venturing to establish certain consonantal correlates), a promising forerunner of the present series ‘‘Omotic lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic setting’’.

As for the internal consonantal correspondences of the Omotic groups, our vision is still just forming as no definitive and thoroughly demonstrated Lautgeschichte of Omotic has been achieved as yet in a convincing neo-grammian manner as it was completed in some other luckier Afro-Asiatic branches like Semitic (cf. esp. Kogan 2009 and 2011), Berber (Kossmann 1999) or East Cushitic (Sasse 1979). But the tentative results by M.L. Bender (1987: 23-28, 31-32; 1988: 122-127, 136-137, 139-144; 2003: 310-313), even if these are based on an extensive Greenbergian ‘‘mass comparison’’ of the basic vocabulary, are, so to say, of a precious orientation value for our research, as well as the masterful treatment of Omotic sibilant correspondences by R. Hayward (1988), whereas the outlines of Omotic consonantal matches by Ch. Ehret (1995: 9-12) and M. Lamberti & R. Sottile (1997: 253-260) are, unfortunately, to be treated with much more caution for a few reasons.

As for the elaboration of Afro-Asiatic inter-branch comparative phonology, in turn, already Ch. Ehret (1979: 52) has proposed a working hypothesis in general at the same...
time when, independently and more precisely elaborated, the former Diakonoff team has presented their substantially similar new vision of the Proto-Afrasiatic phonological reconstruction (esp. as for the affricates and the postvelars) and some items of the inter-branch correlates which my own research has fundamentally corroborated (cf. esp. Takács 2011a). These are the principles we are following in this investigation also.

To the best of my knowledge, the only special studies devoted to a systematic treatment of Omotic vs. Afrasiatic lexical matches are due V. Blažek (then Příbram, now Brno, Masaryk University), who presented comprehensive sets of etymologies for an all-round range of the Omotic anatomical terminology at the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages (Turin, November 1989), which had long remained unpublished until these results were most recently (partly) included in the lengthy paper by V. Blažek (2008) on the sketchy lexicostatistical comparison of Omotic languages comprising 100 items of the basic vocabulary, where, unfortunately, not every single lemma was provided with an Afrasiatic cognate.

In my experience, in the light of the above enumerated scarce research record, I venture to claim that perhaps this branch represents the least cultivated field within the whole Afrasiatic domain from the viewpoint of a systematic etymological elaboration of its immense inherited lexical treasures. This new series for the ‘Omotic lexicon in its Afrasiatic setting’ started some decade ago precisely for filling as many as possible of the innumerable gaps in the scanty etymological research on Omotic. The etymological entries are arranged according to consonantal roots, i.e. in the order of how the articulation places follow (in the C1, C2 etc.) from the labials down to the laryngeals ending in the sonants.

As for the methods in elaborating the cognate sets, I have long been adhering to the methods of AA inter-branch comparison so masterfully practised by A.B. Dolgopol’skij, a genuine mastermind of AA comparative-historical phonology and lexicon, in his brilliant etymological studies from the 1980s, whence I have elaborated the principles of ‘bi/tri-polar mirror’ of comparison (on which cf. esp. Takács 2011a: 19 in general and with fur-

---

ther literature) originally for the case of Egypto-Semitic vs. South Cushitic examined by me since 1998, but then extended also for numerous other branches/groups of AA. In the preceding issues of my series (labelled OmAA in these papers), I was publishing those new etymologies of Omotic roots that I had observed during my work (1994-2007) on the vols. II-III of my Egyptian etymological dictionary (EDE, with initial labials). Since then, I have managed to turn Bender’s (2003) epoch-making Omotic comparative phonology and lexicon (arranged according to groups and English meanings of the basic lexicon) upside down by the work of several years (by spring 2020) and, henceforth, now I possess an as complete as possible Common Omotic comparative wordlist arranged A-Z according to the initial consonants of the Omotic roots, which may accelerate research for a more secure assessment of the Afro-Asiatic nature of the Omotic lexicon and, potentially, for turning Bender’s provisional sets of consonantal correspondences and ad hoc lexical reconstructions into definitive ones. This new research of mine, starting in 2020, has brought forth a formerly unseen mass of new isoglosses between Omotic vs. esp. Semitic (Arabic) or Berber or West Chadic (Angas-Sura) which could not have been accomplished without my new Omotic alphabetic wordlist, which may in all likelihood alter our views on the degree of inter-branch relationship and make us better understand the special position of Omotic.

The preceding fourth and this fifth parts of my series, designed for the etymological analysis of the Omotic lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic setting, contain new comparanda with initial *b-, whereas the sixth part (completed simultaneously) discussed basically additional Omotic roots with *b-, *p- and the initial voiceless labials. This seventh and the subsequent eighth parts will survey again additional items of the Omotic lexical stock with initial *b- plus dentals and sibilants, resp.

**Om. *b-* + Ø**


20 Omotic Lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic Setting VI: Addenda to Omotic *b-*, *p-*, *pʃ-*= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 63/1 (2021), 85-112.


Cf. EDE II 13 with further discussion, also Takács 2009d: 316, #1 and EAA N I 40, #138.

**227.** NOm.: Kullo bā “boy, child, son” [Alemayehu Abebe in Bender 2003: 13, #17] || Ch. *vway (?) “child” [GT]:21 WCh.: PRon *fway (?) [*fw- regular < */b-//*bU-?]: Bokkos fū “Kind” [Jng. 1970: 141], Daffo-Butura fyè (pl.) “Knaben, Jungen” [Jng. 1970: 218], Sha foy “Kinde, Kind”, foy ?a-món “mein Sohn” [Jng. 1970: 284], Kulere fo “männl. (?) Kind”, fwé “Junge, Kind”, fwèy (Richa dialect) vs. fwí (Ambul dialect) má mor “Mädchen, Tochter” [Jng. 1970: 352] || Kirfi (pl.) bòfóyò “son” [Schuh], Galambu bwe: “child” [Schuh] || Diri ávìyà “child” [ILL] || CCh.: Zime-Batna (Lame) vài, pl. ?údò (dér. vòvài) “enfant” [Sachnine 1982: 300], Zime-Dari và “enfant” [Cooper 1984: 29] (Ch.: also Ji 1994 II 74-75) || Sem.: Ar. baww- “1. petit de chameau, 2. sot, stupide, 3. peau de petit de chameau empaillée avec l’herbe tumâm- qu’on amène à une chamelle pour lui faire croire que c’est son petit, ce qui fait qu’elle donne du lait ou en allaite un autre” [BIK I 174-175] = “a skin of a young unweaned camel stuffed with straw or with tumâm- (i.e. panic grass) or with dry herbage to which a she-camel is made to incline when her young one has died: it is brought near to the mother of the young camel (that has died) in order that she may incline to it and yield her milk over it, 2. also: a she-camel’s young one, 3. stupid, foolish, having little sense or intellect” [Lane 270b] = “chamelon nouveau-né” [DRS 51, BWW/Y1: isolated in Sem.].

**228.** NOm.: Dizoid *bi “feather” (once also attested in the meaning “hair”) [Bender 2003: 209, #49: isolated in Om.] might at the moment, until we gain more Omotic cognates enabling us to specify the C₂ closer, be attached to two alternative AA roots: **228.1.** More probably, it might be conceived, although neither the ʕayin nor the awa are reflected in Dizoid, as a reflex of PAA *√b downfall “1. hair (of body), 2. bark (of tree)” [GT]:

---


22 Affiliated by N. Skinner (1996: 31) with Hausa baya “outside”, boora “to remove bark”, all derived by him from OS’s AA *pak- “bark, skin” and *pok- “to peel, skin” etc. Phonologically false.

23 Can be read either f′ or f′ (if we assume here a syllabic or group writing). Cannot be certainly decided whether reading the final -3 is “superfluous” (syllabic or group writing). The suggested Afro-Asiatic etymology of the word indicate that the OEg. root was either *f′3 < *f′3 (metathesis) or *f′ < *f′ (lost, i.e., eroded -3-). Back two decades ago (Takács 1999a: 20; EDE II 564-565) I had preferred the second scenario (i.e., LEg. f′ or f′3 < OEg. *f′3 = *fr′3) and so I was disposed to equate the Late Egyptian term with:, cognate with Sem. *par- “capelli fluenti” [Frz.] = *par(a)- “hair (on top of the head)” [Belova et al. 1994 MS: #77] = *par- “(loose) hair of the head” [SED]: Akk. pēru-tu – pēretu “Haupthaar” [AHW 856] = pirtu “Haupthaar” [Holma 1911: 34] = pirtu “Kopfhaar” [Torczyner 1912: 770] ||| Hbr. pero “das volle Haupthaar” [GB 660] = “loosely hanging and unplaited hair on the head” [KB] ||| Ar. far- “das volle Haupthaar” [GB] = “chevelure” [BK] = “hair of women, shag of hair (космы волос)” [SISAJa] ||| LECu.: Afro būr-ti [GT: regular ECu. *b- < AA *f-?] “tight wooly hair (like that of a negro)” [PH 1985: 74] ||| CCh.: Lame pēr “favoris, poils du visage” [Sachinine 1982: 268].

24 S. Sauneron (1964: 20) pointed out the word for GR also, namely in the Abaton Decree, which prohibited to approach the holy place for з n b h f′ “everyone with hair”.

GÁBOR TAKÁCS


**Om. *b- + dentals**


---

25 M.L. Bender (l.c.): cf. Bantu *ba(n)d- (sic), but no meaning was given. In fact, he may have referred to Bantu *bād(ud)- and *bænd- “to split (tr.).” [Guthrie 1971: 118]

26 Equated by L. Reinisch (l.c.) with NAgaw: Bilin fätfäf (no meaning).

27 Combined by E. Cerulli (l.c.) with NAgaw: Bilin bì “esser spaccato”, Hamir ba “spaccare”.

28 Attached to dubious Chadic comparanda along with the correct Vulumi one.


29 The Kefoid-Sem.-Sidamo match was first published in HSED 43, #171, whereas the Mocha-Sem.-ECu.-WCh. comparison was first suggested by Ch. Ehret (1995: 114, #104; 2000 MS: 2, #1029 and 53, #1261) and Vulum-Sem.-Sidamo (with dubious Chadic comparanda) by O.V. Stolbova (CLD VI 40-41, #29). The rest of the Chadic cognates were added by myself here.

30 Whose primary sense was rendered significantly otherwise by L. Reinisch (l.c.), although the older records cited in his own entry are clearly indicative of the true basic sense in Kafa (which can only corroborate the careful interpretation with the manifold semantical shifts offered by E. Cerulli, l.c. supra, and our comparison with the West Chadic cognates carrying the same shift from “to reach” to “to suffice”), namely: “reichlich vorhanden sein”, bādī-te (refl.) “reichlich werden, sich vermehren”, which is pretending as if the primary sense
(ausiliario per la coniugazione perifrastica), 4. esser conveniente, convenire, 5. bastare, esser sufficiente, 6. essere a punto per …” [Cerulli 1951: 410-411]. Mocha "bäddi(yé) “1. to arrive, 2. join, touch, 3. be enough” [Leslau 1959: 21] l Sheko bed(d)- “1. genug sein, 2. ausreichen” [Lamberti 1993: 281]: in the former discussion over this Omotic root (OmAA IV #89.), beside West Chadic, only Semitic cognates
d31 were suggested whence a cognate root √bdh “to arrive suddenly” (or sim.) seems to emerge in the latter branch. Not disputing an eventual cognacy thereof, esp. with regard to NOm. *bed- (var. *bod-?) “1. to reach, 2. arrive”, there seems to hide an isolated reflex of NOm. *bed- (var. *bod-?) “3. suffice” in Sem.: Ar. badad-, badd-at-, bidd-at- “power or ability (to do sg.)” [Lane 162a] = bidd-at- “pouvoir” [BK I 93] = badd-at-, qff. bidd-at- “moyen, capacité, force / means, capacity, strength” [DAFA 434b]. All this may suggest that the full semantic spectrum of the PAA root has until now much better preserved in Omotic, whereas in Semitic has long been merely retained in its fossilized fragments.


231.1. The same AA root appears in a triradicalized form in LECu.: Somali budul “(beaten) path, track” [Ehret, not found in Reinisch 1895; Abraham 1964; Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984; FH 1993] l l ECh.: Dangla-Migama *botol “way” [GT]: WDangla bótöl “chemin, route” [Fédry 1971: 93]; EDangla bótól “chemin, route” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973: 52], Migama bótól (m), pl. bótòllì “chemin, route” [JA 1992: 71], Bidiya bótöl, pl. bótoltile “empreinte, sentier” [AJ 1989: 60], cf. Mokilik bótli “trace laissée dans les herbes par le passage de gros animaux ou d’hommes” [Jng. 1990: 68] l Mubi-Toram *botol “way” [GT]: Mubi bódôl (m), pl. bódôlul [-d- < *-t-] “Weg” [Lucas 1937: 181] = *bôdôl “road” [Bender-Doornbos] = bôdôl (m), pl. bûdôlül “route, sentier, chemin” [Jng. 1990b MS: 5], Minjile *bôdôl “road” were “to abound”. Reinisch’s Tigre parallel (signifying “abundavit”) is also quite suggestive. That was also the idea of M. Lamberti (1993: 281), which would mislead us towards an entirely different AA root, cf., e.g. SOm. *bEd- “many” [GT]: Bako bêdi-mi, Ubamer and Galila bêdi “vielle” (SOm.: Mukarovsky 1981: 200, #10) l HECu.: Sidamo bat-a “Reichturn, Uberfluß” [Lamberti l.c. supra] etc., whose AA background was discussed in part I of this series (entry #1). See OmAA I entry no. 1 with a discussion for SOm. *bEd- “many” [GT].


32 Rendered in DAFA from Ar. bdd C carrying the “notion de base: partage, répartition (sharing out, distribution)”.

[Bender-Doornbos] (MT: Bender-Doornbos 1983: 77, #65) < SAA *butul (?) “way” [GT]. Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 2-3, #1032) combined the Somali term with Ch. *√bd(m) “path” [JS 1981: 210A1-2], but he did not specify the reflexes in the Chadic daughter languages. The ECh.-NOm. match is due to G. Takacs (2009d: 332, #50).


34 According to H. Jungraithmayr & K. Shimizu (l.c.), the biliteral root (A1: *√bd, occasional ext. *-l) occurs in WCh.: Buli (?), CCh.: Chibak, Kotoko, Musgu and Masa groups, ECh.: Mubi, whereas the triliteral one (A2: *√bdm) occurs in WCh.: Tsagu, Bade, CCh.: Mandara group, ECh.: Somray and Sokoro (?) groups.

35 Meant by H. Jungraithmayr & K. Shimizu (l.c.) to be PCh., since they equated the Bata group forms with Kotoko and the Sura one (see entry #232.1. below).

36 Apparently meant in Berber lexicography to be a secondary sense of the homophonous word denoting in Ahaggar “1. pied des pentes (relief), 2. région qui s’étend au pied …” and EWlm.-Ayr “1. pied of an animal other than man”, fawād- “heart” [Lane 2323 and 2456, resp.] = fuʔād- “Herz, Sinn” [WUS] = fuʔād-, dimin. fawād- “heart, mind” [HCVA] || WCh.: AS *pūt (from *puyut?) “heart” [GT]: Sura

37 Apparently segmented by M. Cohen (1947: 172, #383) into an infix -ʔ- (which was, however, not the case regarding the variety with -ʔ- quoted above) + primary *√bdl (???) that he affiliated with ES: Tna., Amh. darat “poitrine” (Cohen: *√db/mr “avec amusissement de la labiale?”), Brb. *√dmr “poitrine”, and even Eg. bnd.t “sein, mamelon”, which are here phonologically out of the question as comparanda.

38 Combined by M.L. Bender (1975: 155) with Eg. bn.t “bosom”, Fula end- and even PIE *bʰreud- “breast”, which are phonologically out of the question, let alone for the question of genetic links among these phyla.
pùut “Herz” [Jng. 1963: 79] (Takacs 2004a: 293; isolated in AS)\(^{39}\) || ECh.: Tumak pòdpòd “poumon” [Caprile 1975: 91]. Sem.-Sura-ECh.: HCVA I 19, #39; HSED 430-431, #2016. This Arabo-AS etymology was adopted by Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 33, #1167) also, albeit with a strange further segmentation.\(^{40}\)

233. **SOm.: Dime bıddıık** “small, little” [Bender in Bender 2003: 217, #120: isolated in Aroid and Om.] \(|||\) CCh.: Muktele b́ı́zígá, Mofú bizáhà “little” [Mafa-Mada: Rossing 1978: 284, #431] \(|||\) Sem.: Ar. badq- and baydaq- “small and light or active” [Lane 174] = badq- “léger, de peu de poids (small, light, weighing little)” [DAFA 480, col. b, so also in DRS 47, BDQ2: isolated in Sem.] < PAA *\(\sqrt{b}_{3} \)k (?) “small” [GT]. The case of Dime -dd- < AA *-\(\text{t} \)- should, of course, still be demonstrated. Maybe a trilateral extension of the AA root *\(\sqrt{b}_{3} \) “small” [GT] attested in NBrb. *\(\sqrt{b} \)z “child” [GT, cf. DRB 147]? Any other etymological approach is less credible:

233.1. Related to Ch. *\(\sqrt{d} \)b “small” [JS 1981: 238, B1: only in Boghom and Kotoko] via metathesis and on a biradical basis?

233.2. Any connection to NBrb.: **Shawya ftuttek** “être cassé en petit (sic) morceaux” [DRB 669, FTK3: isolated in Brb.?]?\(^{41}\)

234. **NOm.: Kafa badāno** “inutile” [Cecchi apud Reinisch] = badan “unnütz, vergeblich, eitel sein, ausser Gebrauch kommen”, dem. Refl.: badanë-te “unbrauchbar, untauglich werden” [Reinisch 1888: 270] = bedánō (adj.) “1. sconveniente, 2. inutile” [Cerulli 1951: 411]: etymology disputed in the older sources.\(^{42}\) Still, if this is not an inner Kafa derivation but an isolated relict from SAA, cf. PCh. *\(\sqrt{v} \)bt “useless, vain” [GT] > WCh.: Angas-Sura *\(b^\prime\)at ~ *\(b^\prime\)et (?) “useless” [GT]: Mushere kø-bat “useless(ness), in vain” (= Hausa bánzáá “uselessness”, Abraham 1962: 76) [Diyakal 1997 MS: 283], Goemay biet “useless, worthless” [Sirlinger 1937: 14] (AS: Takacs 2004a: 24) \(|||\) CCh.: Hdi bótbó “in vain” [CLD].\(^{43}\)

235. **NOm. *bUdT-** “bush” [GT]: Yemsa *buḍ-u\(^{44}\) “1. bush, 2. forest” [GT]: Yemsa (Janjero) buḍu, buru [GT: -r- < (*-)d?] “bosco” [Cerulli 1938 III 70]\(^{45}\) = burù (GT: -r’-)

---

\(^{39}\) Practically, no cognates were found within AS. The Russian authors (HCVA I 19, #39; HSED 430-431, #2016) quote a certain Angas puut “heart” also, but such a form has not been recorded in the Angas wordlists known to me. Cf. perhaps Montol put-ta “to upset” [Ftp. 1911: 221] (lit. “the heart falls”, cf. AS *\(\tau\)₂ “to fall”)? Metathesis from AS *\(\tau\)\(\text{t}u\) “heart” in Sura?

\(^{40}\) He assumed in both the Arabic and Sura forms extended reflexes of AA *-p\(\text{t} \)- “to pound (intr.)” based on a simplex like SCu.: Ma’a -p\(\text{t}\)u “to thunder” [Ehret 1980a, 145, §1.B.23], which is impossible.

\(^{41}\) K. Nait-Zerrad (DRB l.c.) regarded this as a “formation expressive sur 2”, i.e. Brb. *\(\sqrt{v}\)tk “ouvrir etc.”.

\(^{42}\) The Sem. parallels (from Sem. *\(\sqrt{v}\)tl) adduced by L. Reinisch (l.c.) are phonologically out of the question. It was treated by E. Cerulli, in turn, on fully Kefoid grounds: he regarded it as a “relativo negativo di bed”, i.e., another root meaning “1. giungere, 2. potere, 3. esser per..., stare per, 4. esser conveniente, convenire, 5. bastare, esser sufficiente, 6. essere a punto per...”. It is a question if the latter derivation < *bed-an- is correct and agreeing with the Kafa morphology.

\(^{43}\) Miscompared in CLD VI 50, #58 with alleged reflexes of a supposed Ch. *b\(\text{V}\)vw\(\text{V}\)t- “distress, failure”.

\(^{44}\) For the presumed Yemsa rule of -r’- < *-d- see entries #235, #236 and #237 below.


45 Affiliated by E. Cerulli (l.c.) with NoM.: Wolayta and Zala worâ and HECu.: Hadiya wor, which is phonologically vague.

46 Curiously, M. Lamberti (l.c.) failed to find any of its cognates in Omotic.


49 The Shinisha word was combined by M. Lamberti (l.c.) with further dubious comparanda via metathesis like NoM.: Wolayta, Gamu, Dache demba “Flachland”, HECu.: Kambatta dubbu and Hadiya dubbo “Busch”, Sidamo dubo “Wald”.

50 The Drs l.c. did not exclude a connection to Sem. *bûš- “byssus”. 
above and #236-#237 below), cf. NOm. *\sqrt{bw}\textsuperscript{t} “earth” \ < \ \sqrt{by}\textsuperscript{t} “sand” [GT] \ ||| NBrb. *\sqrt{a}-\textsuperscript{bu-} “fond” [GT after DRB 28-29, b110] (provided \ < \ *“earth” \ < \ *“dust”) \ ||| Sem.: Ar. \ \sqrt{bw}\textsuperscript{t} \ i: b\textsuperscript{a}ta “tomber dans la poussière” [DRS 51, bw[1: isolated] \ < \ PAA *\sqrt{bw}\textsuperscript{t} “1. earth, 2. ground, bottom” [GT]. For the details see OmAA IV #178. This is why the Yemsa term should be thus detached from NOm.: Mao-Bambeshi mb\textsuperscript{c}re “dust” [Atieb \& Bender apud Bender 2003: 354, #23: isolated in Mao] \ ||| SBrb.: Dime b\textsuperscript{u}l\textsuperscript{u} [-l- \ < \ *-r-] “dust” [Mulugeta 2008: 224] \ < \ NOm. *\sqrt{b}-\sqrt{o}\textsuperscript{r}(?)- “sand (?)” [GT] (contrary to our earlier suggestion in OmAA V #162) as well as from PAA *\sqrt{v}\textsuperscript{r} “down, ground” (or sim.) [GT] (in spite of the very attractive parallel in CCh.: Gisiga vur ~ v\textsuperscript{r} ~ vr “1. Grund, 2. Ursache, 3. wegen, weil, denn, 4. um zu, damit” [Lukas 1970: 138] suggested in OmAA II #35).

236. NOm.: PYemsa *\sqrt{bu}- (???)\textsuperscript{51} [GT] > Yemsa bur\textsuperscript{a} “Penis” [Lamberti] \ ||| LECu.: Afar bu\textsuperscript{d}-e (f) “penis” [PH 1985: 139]\textsuperscript{52} \ = \ Saho-Afar buddhe “Penis” [Lamberti: -ddh- \ < \ *-d-] \ | Oromo bi\textsuperscript{t}\textsuperscript{to} “penis” [Lamberti]\textsuperscript{53} \ > \ SOromo dialects bi\textsuperscript{t}\textsuperscript{i} “penis” [Stroomer 1987: 274] (Yemsa-LECu.: Lamberti 1993b: 333)\textsuperscript{54} \ ||| NBrb.: Shilh a-bazz\textsuperscript{a} “verge (membre viril)” [DRB 155, b7: isolated in Brb.?]\textsuperscript{55} \ ||| Sem.: NSyr. (?) b\textsuperscript{u}t\textsuperscript{a} [-t- regular \ < \ Sem. *-\textsuperscript{-t-} \ < \ AA *-\textsuperscript{-ç-} “pénis” [DRS 51-52: dubious Sem. etymology]\textsuperscript{56} \ < \ PAA *\sqrt{v}č “genitalia” [GT]. For further members of this wide-ranging PAA root family see entry no. 153 in my parallel paper “Mubi-Toram Lexicon and Afro-Asiatic III” on the pages of this LP issue.

237. NOm.: PYemsa *\sqrt{bu}- (???)\textsuperscript{57} “child” [GT] > Yemsa bur\textsuperscript{?}ussi (nur als Plural belegt) in: burus-ni kit/yō “Kinder, Buben”, burussí-sà kit/yō “die Kinder, Bube n” [Lamberti 1993b: 333: isolated in Om.] \ ||| LECu.: Saho bâd-ä, fem. -ä “Kind: 1. Sohn, Tochter, Knabe, Mädch, 2. bei Tieren das Junge” [Reinisch 1886: 829-830; 1890: 83-84]\textsuperscript{58} \ = \ Saho barha “son”, barhâ “daughter” [Vergari 2003: 53] = Afar bâd-ä “figlio”, fem. bâd-ä “figlia” [Colizza 1887: 112] \ ||| NBrb. *\sqrt{b}z\textsuperscript{a} “Wargla ta-b\textsuperscript{a} “marmaille, enfants, jej-

\textsuperscript{51} For the presumed Yemsa rule of -r’- \ < \ *-d- \ see entries #235 and #237 below.

\textsuperscript{52} Equated by Ch. Ehret (1995: 112, #101) with Ar. bazz\textsuperscript{a} (verbal noun) “to grow fat” and NOm.: Bench(non) \ pûč “many, much” \ < \ AA *-pûč- “to increase (intr.)”.

\textsuperscript{53} M. Lamberti (l.c.): “Entsonorisierung des Ejektivs” in Oromo.

\textsuperscript{54} Whence M. Lamberti (l.c.) set up an “altkuschitische” stem *b/\textsuperscript{mu}- “penis” which he eventually derived from the homophonous verbal root “sprossen” assuming an interchange of *b- vs. *m-.

\textsuperscript{55} Affiliated by K. Naït-Zerrad (DRB l.c.) with a phonologically apparently distinct root, cf. EBrb.: Ghadamis ta-bâ\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{u}š\textsuperscript{s} “queue d’animal (cheval, chacal)” [Lanfry 1973: 7, #43] \ ||| SBrb.: Kel U\textsuperscript{i} ta-b\textsuperscript{a}su-t “queue” [DRB] \ ||| NBrb.: Shilh a-b\textsuperscript{a}ssa ~ a-sâbba “queue (d’animal)” [DRB] \ ||| Tamazight a-b\textsuperscript{a}ssa, pl. i-b\textsuperscript{a}ss\textsuperscript{i}-w-n “queue (d’animal)” [Taïfi 1991: 35] = a-b\textsuperscript{a}ssa ~ a-b\textsuperscript{a}ssa ~ ta-b\textsuperscript{a}sa-t [DRB] (Brb.: DRB 130, 133, 148).

\textsuperscript{56} Cf. Sem. *bav\textsuperscript{c}t- “bottom” [GT]: Mandaic b\textsuperscript{u}t “bottom, anus (still used)” [Drower-Macuch 1963: 54] = “anus, derrière” [DRS 51], NSyr. b\textsuperscript{u}š\textsuperscript{a} “croupe” (borrowed \ < \ Ar.) [DRS] \ ||| Ar. b\textsuperscript{u}- “fesses” and b\textsuperscript{w} “3. chairs grasses et molles de fesses”, cf. b\textsuperscript{w}w\textsuperscript{II} (denom.) “avoir les fesses très-grandes” [BK I 178] = b\textsuperscript{u}- and b\textsuperscript{w} “croupe saillante, calappigé” [DRS], cf. also Ar. b\textsuperscript{u}\textsuperscript{t}- (root ext. -\textsuperscript{-f-} and -\textsuperscript{-t-}) “2. fondement, derrière avec les parties de la génération” [BK I 140].

\textsuperscript{57} For the presumed Yemsa rule of -r’- \ < \ *-d- \ see entries #235, #236 above.

\textsuperscript{58} Of course, neither of the comparisons (Somali wil or Macro-Canaanite *\sqrt{b}n, *\sqrt{b}r “son”) offered by L. Reinisch (1886: 829) is phonologically convincing.
nesse”, Figuig a-bźni “garçon”, Snus l-bezza “marmaille”, a-bżez “petit enfant” | Tamazight bezza (var. de bezza) “enfanter” (NBrb.: DRB 155, bz11: var. to *bẓ?) < PAA *b∯č “2. offspring, child” [GT].


Ad OmAA IV 131, #92 NOm.: Kafa bôt“A weak” [Lamberti apud Bender 2003: 344, #106: isolated in Kefoid/Om.]. So far, merely its Ghadames cognate (cited below under #92.2.) has become known from our previous communication. Now, we may outline the context of its root family by a whole series of additional comparative data as follows:


59 Affiliated by Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 565, #27) with Eg. b t “1. to abandon, forsake, 2. run” < AA *-bić- (*-tl’) “to leave”. Phonologically untenable.

60 Affiliated (with a question mark) in DRS 59 with ES: Geez baʃawa “dormir”, which is both phonologically (Ar. t ≠ Geez d) and semantically vague. Otherwise treated in DRS as isolated.

61 Provided its root sense had to do with “poverty” and not “dust”, cf. its alternative rendering: Ar. *b∯t I: bάτα “tomber dans la poussière”61 [DRS 51, bǎt1: isolated]. Cf. the entry #238 in this paper.

62 This fact led the eds. of DRS l.c. to assume a connection to Sem. *bʃsʃ- with the basic sense “couper, déchirer, fendre”.

58 This fact led the eds. of DRS l.c. to assume a connection to Sem. *bʃsʃ- with the basic sense “counter, déchirer, fendre”. 

59 Affiliated by Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 565, #27) with Eg. b t “1. to abandon, forsake, 2. run” < AA *-bić- (*-tl’) “to leave”. Phonologically untenable.

60 Affiliated (with a question mark) in DRS 59 with ES: Geez baʃawa “dormir”, which is both phonologically (Ar. t ≠ Geez d) and semantically vague. Otherwise treated in DRS as isolated.

61 Provided its root sense had to do with “poverty” and not “dust”, cf. its alternative rendering: Ar. *b∯t I: bάτα “tomber dans la poussière”61 [DRS 51, bǎt1: isolated]. Cf. the entry #238 in this paper.

92.3. PAA *√bt “feeble” [GT] > WCh. *bVt(t)- “to be weak, tired” [CLD]: alleged Goemay reflex non-existingbole mbūtu “to tire out, be tired from” [Gimba] (WCh.: CLD VI 48, #53) || Sem.: Ar. √bt “1. excédé de fatigue, surmener (une bête de somme), 7. être excédé de fatigue et exténué”, bātt- “1. amaigri, excédé et exténué de fatigue, 2. sot, 3. ivre” [BK I 81-82]. Ar.-WCh.: CLD I.c. supra.

92.4. PAA (?) *√bd “1. feeble, 2. poor” [GT] may represent a root variety with a voiced C2 preserved in Sem.: Ar. badd- “épuisement, fatigue (exhaustion, weariness)”, II (abst.) “tombre de fatigue, d’épuisement, s’affaissier, s’affaîler (to drop with weariness, with exhaustion, collapse, sink down)”, V “dépérir, se délabrer (santé), s’épuiser, se fatiguer (to decline, become impaired of health, wear o’ self out)”, mu-ta-baddad- “1. maigre, malingre, à la santé chancelante (thin, puny, in a delicate state of health), 2. exténué, épuisé, à bout de forces (exhausted, weary)” [DAFA 435-436] = mu-ta-baddid-at- “emaciated (woman)” [Lane 163, col. a] || ES: Tigre badd “pauvreté” [DRS 44, BDD1: isolated in Sem., semantically at least] ||| LECu.: Oromo badada (syn. gadada) “to become poor” [Gragg 1982: 30].

239. NOm.: Macro-Ometo (proper language unspecified) bāta “forehead” [Bender 2003: 198, #35: isolated in Om.] || Bed. bīt (f), pl. bītia “forehead” [Roper 1928: 165] || CCh.: Musgu bèdebéde, pl. bebedakái “Stirn” (Krause) [Müller 1886: 393; Lukas 1941: 47] (GT: isolated in the Musgu group) || NBrb.: a plausible trace of a root variety with a voiced C2. May a S/P??AA *√bt, var. *√bd “forehead (i.e., front part)” [GT] underlie? Etymologically presumably related to a verbal root:


63 O. Stolbova’s Goemay byet (sic: b- and -y-) “1. to be too weak for smth., be too weak to do smth., 2. become weak or useless’ [Hellwig apud CLD VI 48, #53] is due to misquoting Goemay bêt (so: implosive b- and -t-, not an -i-) [regular < *bêt], pl. bêt < [*bêt], “to be weak (in strength or in class)” [Hellwig 2000 MS: 3-4], which can only be derived from *√bw via a glottal metathesis.

64 In fact, the Tigre word was listed among in that DRS entry among semantically unrelated roots it was confused with.

65 Cf. perhaps Qabyle budd “1. favoriser, avantager, 2. destiner qqqch. à qqq. par faveur préférentielle, 3. souhaiter, vouer” [Dallet 1982: 5: Arabism?; DRB 17, BD2: isolated in Brb.]. For the semantical shift cf. the suggestion by A. Ember (1920: 63-63; JHUC 39, 697; ESS §14.a.20) who was inclined to affiliate Sem.: Hbr. hāzē and Aram. ḥādā “breast”, Ar. ḥādā “to be over against, opposite to” and ḥādūn “opposite, over against” (displaying a semantic derivation “breast” > “front” > “opposite”) with Eg. hūz “loben, billigen” (OK-, Wb III 154-155) = “to praise, reward” (Ember: originally < *to place a thing over against another thing”).

240. NOM. *bVtt-/*bVt- “1. earth, 2. dust” [GT]:


Some remote root varieties of this PAA root family that have already been discussed elsewhere in our earlier communication (see in OmAA V #178 = Takacs 2022: 683-683, #178.1-2.):


- Derived by O.V. Stolbova (CLD VI 48, #54) from her Ch. *but- “soil, mud” [CLD], whose all further alleged reflexes, however, only reflect the sense “dirt”: WCh.: Tangale bêdêke “mud” [Kidda 1985: 201, #42] = bêde “mud” [Jng. 1991: 73] = bude “mud” [CLD < Kraft or Jng. ?], Dera bût “filth” [Newman 1974] || CCh.: Bura buta “to fill in dirt for a floor or for grading a road” [Blench] (CLD: denom. verb). Doing so, Stolbova failed to distinguish between AA roots with plain *-t- (discussed by me elsewhere) whence her Chadic comparanda clearly derived: SAA *bût “(to be) dirty” [GT in EAAN I 21, #19] vs. PAA *bút ~ *bdk “dirt” [GT in EAAN I 21, #23]. Whether both these roots are eventually akin to the AA root family for “soil” discussed in this entry, represents the matter of another dispute.

- Combined by M.L. Bender (2003: 335) with HECu.: Gedeo buttina, Ch. *bût “ashes” of Ji 1994 I 3, and NS *buT-.

- The assumption by Roper on its connection with Bed. bûr ... is phonologically vague.
“fond” [GT after DRB 28-29, bd10] (provided < **“earth” < **“dust”)) ||| Sem.: perhaps Ar. √bwṣ I: bāṭa “tomber dans la poussière” [DRS 51, bwṣ1: isolated] (provided < **“dust”).

240.2. SAA *fut- “1. earth, 2. sand” [GT] with a voiceless Anlaut and plain Auslaut *-tis represented by NOm.: Yemsa *fūtu [unless its fu- < *bw- as in Ch. supra?] “sand” [GT after Bender 2003: 172, #110] ||| CCh.: Muktele ftsū “earth” [Rosing 1978] | Musgu fūti (Rohlfs), fetī (Overweg), fuuti (Barth) “Erde”, vgl. āfti (Rohlfs) [Lukas 1941: 54-55], cf. perhaps also Musgu āfti “Boden, Kalk” (Rohlfs) [Lukas 1941: 43], Munjuk-Puss atfi (f) “terre, sol” [Tourneux 1991: 72].

241. SOm.: Ari bita “left(hand)” [Bender and Tully in Bender 2003: 213, #80] ||| ECu. *bidh- “left side” [Sasse 1979: 16, 60]. The additional *-h in the East Cushitic cognate must be identical with the common AA nominal class marker of anatomical terms (Takacs 1997). So, one may safely assume it to have signified sg. like **“left/bad/wrong hand”. This suggests searching the roots of these terms in the following branches of a wider root family with a fundamentally negative connotation:


241.2. PAA *√bs “1. to (be) spoil(t), 2. be in disorder (mentally)” [GT]: Sem. *√bs/w [DRS]: (?) Ug. *√bs(w) > t-bṣ “jaser, bavarder (?)”, Hbr. √bs(w): bāṭa “bavarder, parler inconsiderément” (Can.: DRS 59, bṣt?/w1) ||| NBrb.: Wargla bbeḍbeḍ “se troubler, perdre le contrôle sur soi, perdre la tête”, Mzab bīḍī “1. perdre la raison, 2. être, devenir fou” (NBrb.: DRB 29-31, bdūd17 and bdw1, resp.) ||| LECu.: Arbore bēd(f) “evil, badness, worthlessness”, bēd-aw- “to become bad, spoiled, dirty” [Hayward 1984: 347] ||| WCh.: Hausa bāta “to spoil” [Abraham 1962: 88].


70 It can belong here provided its root sense had to do with “dust” and not “poverty”, cf. its alternative rendering: Ar. √bwṣ I: bāṭa “1. tomber dans la misère et l’avilissement, ayant été riche et considéré” [BK I 178] = “1. tomber dans la misère / to be reduced to poverty” [DAFA 917]. Cf. the entry ad OmAA IV 131, #92 in this paper.

71 Connected by Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 460, #3131) with Sem.: Ar. badda “to harm, injure” (correcting its attribution in Ehret 1995: #103) and WCh.: Ngizim bāḍāfā “sorcerer” < AA *-bā/ad- “to harm”.

72 Meaning uncertain. J. Aistleitner’s suggestion was quoted and regarded by D. Cohen (DRS l.c.) as “une interprétation douteuse”, who reports of further alternative ways of rendering the Ugaritic word: (1) Ug. t-bṣ “elle est vue” < *√bt based on Gordon 1965: 371, #456 (DRS: “est aussi peu sûr”); (2) the whole context, i.e., bh btt tbt wbh tdmmt āamht, was rendered by A. Caquot and M. Szynicer (in their Textes d’Ougarit) “ne voit-on pas ici la honte et l’inconduite des servantes ...”

73 Unless, of course, it derives from Sem. *√bwt “to feel shame” as implied in the DNWSI rendering.


242. **NOm.: Sheko bút “to throw” [Aklilu apud Bender 2003: 352, #103: isolated in Dizoid] || WCh. *√bt “to throw, shoot” [GT]; Bure bēt- “to throw, shoot” [CLD < ?] | Miya bōta “to throw, shoot” [Skinner] < SAA *√bt “to throw” [GT]. May be part of a larger root family:

242.1. **Sem.: MSA √bd “to throw (a stone in a game)” [GT]: Harsusi bed “to throw a stone” and Mehri √bd “bad “to throw (a stone) in the game called bādūn, throw any stone”, bādūn “1. the target in a stone-throwing game, 2. the stone-throwing game itself (in the game tow or three boys throw stones from a fixed point at one of two targets)” [Johnstone 1977: 15; 1987: 42].

---

74 Combined by Ch. Ehret (1997 MS: 16, #1074; 2000 MS: 16, #1096) with Eg. bt3 “wrong(doer), crime” < AA *ba-it- “to cause difficulty for, harm”. This may indeed be correct on a triradical basis in the context of an equally wide range variant roots, for which see EDE II 348-349.

75 Combined in HSED 62, #247 with WCh.: Ngizim bādā “sorcerer”, Agaw *bawVd- “1. witch-doctor, 2. werewolf”; LECu. *bawVd- and Kefoid *bud-a “witch-doctor” < AA *bawVd- “sorcerer”.

76 O.V. Stolbova (CLD l.c.): compensatory reduplication < */bh?

77 Miscompared in CLD VI 50, #58 with alleged reflexes of a supposed Ch. *bVwVt- “distress, failure”.

78 Affiliated by Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 2, #1028) with Sem.: Ar. badh- “to communicate a secret” and LECu.: Somali badbad-i- “(caus.) “to exaggerate” < AA *bad- “to misspeak”.

79 Derived in CLD VI 47 from PCh. *bVt- “1. to fall, 2. throw” [CLD] which was graded under O.V. Stolbova’s Ch. *bVt- (possibly, < *HVbVt-) “to push (down), strike” and based on a comparison with WCh.: Bole-Tangale “to fall” [GT]: Kirī bītū-wō [Schuh], Galambu bāz-ālā [Schuh: -z- regular < *-t-] – all signifying “1. to fall, 2. throw” (BT: Schuh 1978: 144), where belongs also Kupto bātū-mā “falling down due to slipperiness” [Leger] || CCh.: Buwal bat “to sink” [CLD < ?] || Sem. *hb “Akk. abātū “to destroy, ruin”, abut “ruined, decayed” [CAD a 41] || Ar. √hbt “frapper, jeter en bas, précipiter en poussant” [BK II 1379] = “frapper, abattre, abaisser, avilir”; habt-at- “faiblesse d’esprit” [DRS 363 after Lane 2873].
242.2. Sem.: Ar. √hbṭ “jeter qqn., frapper” [BK II 1381].

242.3. WCh.: AS *b̪*b̪êt ~ *b̪*b̪ot (or *-a3-?) “1. to release, leave, 2. place, put, 3. sow” [GT].


242.5. PAA *vbt̪ “to quit” [GT]: Sem.: Ar. *vbt ţ I “quitter qqn, s’en séparer” [BK I 82] ||| SBrb.: EWImd. bát “to quit” [GT]: Ch. *but- “to untie, separate, release” [CLD VI 46, #48].


80 Affiliated in CLD VI 51, #62 with Ch. *bVt̪ > *bVt- “to strike” [CLD]: WCh.: Mupun bwêt “to hit, shoot, attack” [Frj.] ||| Dera bwât “a whip” [Newman] ||| ECh.: Mokilko bêt-ô “giffer” [Jng. 1990], which, in this direct way, is semantically risky. Otherwise, one would be disposed to set up a PAA *v̪(h)btt “to push” [GT].


83 G. Hudson (l.c.) reconstructed HECu. *belto “boy” based on Darasa (Gedeo).

84 G. Takács (1999: 23; EDE II 345) assumed Eg. bt “Schafhirt” (OK, Wb I 483, 6) = “Hirntentitel” (Kaplon 1969: 37) = “le berger” (V., AL 77.1337) = “(OEg. form of) Bata, a deity: the impregnator” (Ward 1978: 128-132) = “Schafhirt, zum Gott Bata Gehöriger” (GHWb 264) to have primarily signified **young man (?)”.

85 The authors of SISAJa I #55 combined Sem. √btt “to separate” with Eg. bt and Sem. *batul-, which the Russian linguists explained from their PAA *bat “1. outside (вне, снаружи), 2. to be separated (быть отделенным), external (внешним), 3. cut off (отрезать)”. Already GB l.c. assumed a connection to Ar. √btl...

245. **Nom.**: *Dizi Botku* “babun” [Fleming apud Bender 2003: 213, #88] (unless < (?) Dizoid *bark- “monkey” [GT], on which see OmAA V 679, #170) ||| WCh.: Tangale *pidok “monkey” [Jng.] || CCh.: *Guduf vitt “monkey” [IL] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 236-237). This may be an extension of the biliteral AA root represented by Ch. *√bd (-i, -m, -k) “monkey” [JS 1981: 179A].


*Special symbols*

P: any labial stop (f, p, b, ũ), T: unspecified dental stop (t, d, ũ), S: any voiceless sibilant and/or affricate (s, š, c, č), Z: unspecified voiced sibilant and/or affricate (z, š, ẓ, ž), K: any velar stop (k, g, k), Q: unspecified uvular or postvelar etc. (q, g, q, h), H: any of the pharyngeals or laryngeals etc. (¢, γ, h, h, ?). The vertical strokes signify the degree of closeness of the language groups (e.g. Kotoko | Masa), subbranches (e.g. North Berber || East Berber), and branches (Semitic ||| Egyptian), from which the individual lexical data are quoted.

“trennen, absondern”. Unacceptable in this form. But a comparison between Eg. bt and Sem. *batūl- should not be excluded. Perhaps Eg. bt act. *√bt3 = *√bt3?  

86 H. Jungraithmayr & K. Shimizu (l.c., F₁) assumed *√wd “knife” to be a PCh. variety thereof, which, if there was at all an etymological connection, could only be the opposite way around. But all this requires further research of the underlying historical phonology.

87 To be separated from SOM.: Hamer *báš, baz- (?) “river” [Lydall]? See in a distinct entry below.

88 Unless these parallels stemmed from the root sens “border(line)”. 
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