

DOI: 10.14746/linpo.2022.64.2.6

Omotic lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic setting VII: Further addenda to Omotic roots with *b-¹

Gábor Takács

Department of Classical Philology, University of Łódź (UL)

Lexicographical Library of Afro-Asiatic Root Research at Balatonederics (LLAARR)

Member of the Associazione Internazionale di Studi sul Mediterraneo e l'Oriente, Roma (ISMEO)

e-mail: gabtak@datatrans.hu | ORCID: 0000-0002-2466-6451

Abstract: Gábor Takács, *Omotic lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic setting VII: Further addenda to Omotic roots with *b-*. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of Arts and Sciences, PL ISSN 0079-4740, pp. 145-175

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.

Keywords: Ethiopian languages, Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic), comparative linguistics, etymology.

Introduction

Omotic (West Ethiopia) and Chadic (Rep. of Chad, Cameroon, Nigeria), i.e., the 5th and 6th branches,² resp., of the immense Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-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 Witczak (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 I: 9-34.

dences compared with the other four branches: Cushitic (Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Kenya, Tanzania), Berber (Maghreb),³ Egyptian and Semitic. In Chadic, at least, we have the unique⁴ 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,⁵ 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.⁶ 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).⁷ 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-grammarians approach.⁸ 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 mehr 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 startingly low average of about 1%. Only among the neighboring ... Omotic and Cushitic languages ..., especially Omoto 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.”⁹ 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 forerunner¹⁰ 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-grammarians 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.¹¹

As for the elaboration of Afro-Asiatic inter-branch comparative phonology, in turn, already Ch. Ehret (1979: 52)¹² has proposed a working hypothesis in general at the same

⁹ Detailing the “*Uneinheitlichkeit*” of the Omotic conjugational patterns (suggesting a “*Neuerung*”) as well as its pronominal systems, “bei denen offenbar ältere und jüngere Schichten zu unterscheiden sind”, Sasse (1981: 149-150) found personally “noch interessanter ... als die morphologischen Afroasiatismen des Omotischen ... eine Reihe von Wortschatzgleichungen. Auch im Wortschatz des Omotischen ist bei flüchtiger Betrachtung sehr wenig Afroasiatisches zu erkennen. Fast alles, was sich beim ersten Durchsehen von Wortlisten anbietet, stellt sich bald als kuschitisches oder semitisches Lehnwort heraus. Sobald man jedoch ein bißchen tiefer eindringt, findet man plötzlich ein Paar echte ‘Leckerbissen’, die ... als Entlehnung nicht nur aus prinzipiellen Erwägungen, sondern einfach mangels einer Quelle ausgeschlossen ist.”

¹⁰ Sasse (1981: 152): “Dieser Art Beispiele findet man bei eingehender Untersuchung eine ... Reihe. ... es sei nur angemerkt ..., daß das Omotische einen vielversprechenden Kandidaten für die Mitgliedschaft im afroasiatischen Verein abgibt.”

¹¹ Aside from just *ex cathedra* composing the table of “Provisional Omotic Consonant Reconstructions” stated (op. cit., p. 10) as “differing only slightly from” the outcome of Bender 1988, Ch. Ehret (1995: 10-12), has failed to present a detailed demonstration for every single rule. One can hardly be satisfied by his vague reference to his ‘data’ (in general) drawn from Bender 1971 that are “confirmed and expanded upon by other materials” like Mocha (Leslau 1959), Koyra (Hayward 1982), Omoto (Hayward 1987), Yemsa, Bench/Benesho, Ari (Hayward 1990), from which, Ehret has only quoted some items sporadically scattered throughout his AA comparative lexicon (composed along an all too high quantity of methodological blunders, cf. Takács 2018: 237-239, §I), grasped out of their respective Omotic comparative contexts. On the other hand, M. Lamberti’s daring vision of Cushito-Omotic consonantal shifts (manifesting itself in other works by him also), including his vague hypothesis on original labiovelars, is radically different from that of the more conservative and cautious mainstreamers like Bender and Fleming and it is with regret that I must also state how much I had to refrain from using Lamberti’s all too unconvincing Cu.-Om. lexical matches. Besides, some other equally vague hypotheses of the eminent Italian researcher have evoked a series of rather bitter pieces of reciprocal polemy in Omotic studies, cf. Sasse 1990 vs. Lamberti 1992 or Lamberti 1991 and 1993c vs. Fleming 1992 and 1993.

¹² He even specified some of the “the correspondence patterns ... in roots of inter-branch occurrence ... (1) Reconstructible voiced stops in one branch normally correspond’ to the same ones ‘in the others ... (2) Emphatics tend to correspond to emphatics; where an emphatic is validly equivalent to a non-emphatic, the non-emphatic will be in a language which has deleted or greatly reduced or restricted the occurrence of emphatics ... (3) Laterals in one branch will correspond usually to laterals in other branches ...”

time when, independently and more precisely elaborated, the former Diakonoff team¹³ has presented their substantially similar new vision of the Proto-Afro-Asiatic phonological reconstruction (esp. as for the affricates and the postvelars)¹⁴ 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. Afro-Asiatic 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 Afro-Asiatic 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 Afro-Asiatic domain from the viewpoint of a systematic etymological elaboration of its immense inherited lexical treasures. This new series for the ‘Omotic lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic setting’¹⁵ 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. Dolgopolskij, a genuine mastermind of AA comparative-historical phonology and lexicon, in his brilliant etymological studies from the 1980s,¹⁶ 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-

¹³ SISAJa I-III (in Russian from 1981-6), revised English version: HCVA I-V (from 1993-7).

¹⁴ Elaborated pace SIFKJa (albeit not applied for Cushitic as therein) in the reports of the Russian AA dictionary project (cf. D’jakonov- Porhomovskij 1979, Diakonoff 1984, D’jakonov et al. 1987, 1993).

¹⁵ So far the following parts of this series have been published over the past ca. decade: ● Omotic Lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic Setting I: Omotic *b- with Dentals, Sibilants, and Velars.= Busetto, Luca (ed., scientific committee: Mauro Tosco, Livia Tonelli, Roberto Sottile): *He bitaney laagaa. Dedicato a / Dedicated to Marcello Lamberti*. Quaderni di Lingua e Storia 3. Milano, 2011., Qu.A.S.A.R. s.r.l. Pp. 57-74. ● Omotic Lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic Setting II: Omotic *b- with Nasals, *r, *l, and Weak Consonants.= Zuckermann, Gh. (ed.): *Burning Issues in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Cambridge, 2012., Cambridge Scholars Press. Pp. 161-184. ● Omotic Lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic Setting III: Omotic *p- and *p^h.= *Journal of Language Relationship* (Moscow) 8 (2012), 103-116. ● Omotic Lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic Setting IV: Addenda to Omotic *b-.= *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hung.* (Budapest) 75/1 (2022), 123-164. ● Omotic Lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic Setting V: Addenda to Omotic *b-, *p/f-.= *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hung.* (Budapest) 75/4 (2022), 651-708. ● Omotic lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic setting VI: Addenda to Omotic roots with *b^l-, *p^l-, *p^h- (or *f-.)= *Lingua Posnaniensis* (Poznań) 63/1 (2021), 85-112.

¹⁶ Cf. A.B. Dolgopolskij’s fundamental studies on the Semitic matches of Angas-Sura *-γ- (1982), initial consonant correlations in Sem.-ECu. (1983), SCu.-Sem. laterals (1987), Sem.-ECu. initial laryngeals (1988), the reconstruction of the AA laterals (1989), Sem. *š vs. Ch. (1990).

ther literature) originally for the case of Egypto-Semitic vs. South Cushitic examined by me since 1998,¹⁷ but then extended also for numerous other branches/groups of AA.¹⁸

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 fifth¹⁹ 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)²⁰ discussed basically additional Omotic roots with *b̥-, *p̥- 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

226. NOm.: Konta ba, -bi-ta (?) “many” [Fleming apud Bender 2003: 20, #86] ||| CCh.: Jimjimen (Bata-Zumo) bwà-n “élargir (un trou)” [Hoffmann apud Brt.-Jng. 1990: 87] | Lame bà “2. grand” [Sachnine 1982: 277].

¹⁷ Cf. Takács 1999b: 393-426; 2000a: 69-117; 2003: 143-162; 2005a: 65-83; 2005b: 207-231; 2005c: 213-225 and 2010: 91-122. For the case of Ma'a sibilants see Takács 2002a: 109-133; 2009b: 125-131; Ma'a š-; 2009c: 135-142.

¹⁸ E.g. I was using the Eg./Sem. mirror for the case of ● NBrb.: Tamazight d- and z- (Takács 2006), EBrb.: Ghadames b- + SBrb.: Ahaggar h (Takács 2000c: 333-356; 2004b: 31-65; 2011a: 83-103), ● Agaw/CCu. (Takács 2012: 85-118), ECu. *ā (Takács 2000b: 197-204; 2011a: 110-111), LECu.: Rendille ž- (Takács 2001b: 265-269; 2011a: 112-114), ● CCh.: Musgu and Masa h- vs. h̥- (Takács 2013: 153-184), ● ECh.: Mokilko (Takács 2002b: 145-161), ● ECh.: Dangla-Migama (Takács 2009-2010: 133-148: Bidiya b-; Takács 2009a: 119-124: Bidiya č- and ž-).

¹⁹ Published in *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hung.* 75/1 (2022), 123-164.

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

226.1. Reduplicated in WCh.: Hausa bábbá “1. big, 2. important, 3. adult, 4. elder/-st, 6. bigness” [Abraham 1962: 52] || CCh.: Musey búbù, Lew búbú, Marba búbú “largeur” [Ajello et al. 2001: 33], Zime-Dari bābā “1. (n.) force, 2. (adj.) fort(e)” [Cooper 1984: 2] || ECh.: Mubi bbá, pl. bōbú “groß” [Lukas 1937: 180].

Here might belong further varieties of the same root family with(out) an alef, cf.:

226.2. PAA *√bʔ (or *√bʔy) “big” [GT]: SCu.: Qwadza baʔ-at- “to increase (in size)”, baʔ-ati “long” [Ehret 1980 MS: 1] || CCh.: Mafa biyaʔa ~ biy-biyyaʔa “grand” [Brt.-Bléis 1990: 93] || Sem.: Ar. √bʔy “1. redresser la tête, se redresser au point de paraître plus grand, 2. s’élèver par la gloire au dessus des autres, 3. se vanter et se regarder comme supérieur aux autres”, baʔū, bāʔwāʔ- “1. gloire, illustration, 2. orgueil” [BK I 81; DRS 40].

226.3. PCh. *√by “big” [GT], cf. WCh.: Bokkos ḥây “groß” [Jng. 1970: 140] || CCh.: Musgu bai ~ abai [Krause] = boi ~ aboi [Rohlf] = aboi [Overweg] = abai [Décorse] “1. groß, 2. auch: dick (Krause), auch: viel (Rohlf)” [F. Müller 1886: 393; Lukas 1941: 42], Puss abay “grand, important” [Tourneux 1991: 71].

Cf. EDE II 13 with further discussion, also Takács 2009d: 316, #1 and EAAN 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 < *bʷ-/*bU-?]: Bokkos fú “Kind” [Jng. 1970: 141], Daffo-Butura fyè (pl.) “Knaben, Jungen” [Jng. 1970: 218], Sha foy “Knabe, Kind”, foy ʔa-món “mein Sohn” [Jng. 1970: 284], Kulere fo “männl. (?) Kind”, fwè “Junge, Kind”, fwèy (Richa dialect) vs. fwî (Ambul dialect) má mor “Mädchen, Tochter” [Jng. 1970: 352] | Kirfi (pl.) bōfóyò “son” [Schuh], Galambu bwe: “child” [Schuh] | Diri áviyà “child” [IL] || CCh.: Zime-Batna (Lame) vâi, pl. ʔúdò (dér. vèvâi) “enfant” [Sachnine 1982: 300], Zime-Dari vāy, pl. tàw “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 tumām- 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” [BK I 174-175] = “a skin of a young unweaned camel stuffed with straw or with tumām- (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 *√bʕw “1. hair (of body), 2. bark (of tree)” [GT]:

²¹ The Chadic parallels, given the *lautgeschichtliche* uncertainty of the labial radical, might alternatively be affiliated with Sem.: Ug. pyy “lad” [Gordon after Virolleaud] = pyy “boy” [Segert apud Blazek], py-t “girl” [Gordon 1955: 313, #1566] = py-t “junges Mädchen” [WUS #2246] | Ar. fayā- [*fayay-] “das Junge eines Tieres” [WUS]. See also Blazek 1994 MS Elam, 7, #27; 1999: 61, #27 (Ug.-Ron).

Sem.: Syr. ba^owā “poils de chameau” [DRS 74, b^ow3: isolated in Sem.] ||l WCh.: Hausa ḥááwóó “bark” [Abraham 1962: 92] = ḥááwó, also ḥááwá “1. bark, rind, 2. scales, 3. shell” [Skinner]²² | AS *ḥu (?) “bark (of tree)” [GT]: Chip ḥu-tiŋ “bark (of tree)” (tiŋ “tree”) [Kraft] (Takacs 2004: 36: isolated within AS). A remote PAA root variety with a voiceless Anlaut may have been retained by LEg. f^o ~ f^oj²³ (hair determinative) “lock of hair” (NE,²⁴ Pap. Turin 1983, vo. I 47-48, Černý 1958: 210, #6 after I. E. S. Edwards) = “cheveux” (AL 77.1544) = “lock of hair” (DLE I 190) = “Haarlocke” (GHWb 305) > Dem. f^o ~ f^oj ~ fj “Haar” (DG 144, 4) → Coptic (OSF) ϣω, (S) βω ~ ογω, (SBA₂) ϣωε, (A) βωε, (AA₂) ϣογε, (M) ϣοε, (BF) ϣωι, (F) βωι ~ ϣωογ “hair” (CD 623a; CED 265; KHW 345).

228.2. Otherwise, the Dizoid stem might be phonologically more safely rendered as a derivative via metonymy from PAA *√by “1. leaf, 2. sprout, 3. flower” [GT]: SBrb.: Ahaggar buyi (Foucauld: bouii) “produire des boutons qui donneront fleurs et fruits” [Foucauld 1951-2: 42; cf. DRB 142: isolated in Brb.] ||l Bed. báya ~ báye “Blatt, Baumblatt” [Reinisch 1895: 54] = bəyi ~ bəyi “leaf of the small crisp kind found on thorny acacias” [Roper 1928: 166] ||l HECu.: Hadiyya búyy-a “leaf”, Kambatta buyy-a “leaf” (HECu.: Zaborski 1989: 584, #45) ||l WCh.: Angas [m̀b̀ù] “guinea corn ‘ear’” [Burquest 1971: 43] = mbu “guineacorn flower” [ALC 1978: 38] (Takacs 2004a: 19: isolated in AS) | Tangale bayo “leaf (for preparing soup)” [Jng. 1991: 71] ||l CCh.: Fali-Muchella ba “leaf” [Kraft] | Gude ba? “leaf” [Kraft] | Hitkala báyá or báyà ùfù “leaf” [Lukas 1964: 106] | Glavda áábàya “leaf (worn by women behind)” [Rapp & Benzing 1968: 1] | PMasa *ḥo [*ḥ- < ?] “to flourish” [GT]: Masa ḥò “(intr.) fleurir”, (verbo-nominal) [ḥò-ná] “1. le fait de fleurir, 2. la fleur” [Caïtucoli 1983: 54], Masa-Bongor ḥó-ná (v.n.) “fleur” [Jng. 1971/2 MS: 77], Gizey/Wina, Masa, Ham, Musey, Lew, Marba ḥo “fleurir” [Ajello et al. 2001: 26] (CCh.: Kraft 1981: #131) ||l ECh. *√by “(to) flower” [GT] > Lele biyē “flower” [Garrigues] | DM *bōy- “(to) flower” [GT] > WDangla bóóyé (m), pl. booya “fleur”, bóòyè “fleurir” [Fédry 1971: 94], EDangla bóóyé “fleurir, être en fleur”, bōoyō (m), pl. bóoyì “la fleur” [Dbr. & Mnt. 1973:

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

²³ Can be read either f^o3 or f^o (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^o3 < *f^o3^o (metathesis) or *f^o < *f^o3^o („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^o or f^o3 < OEg. *f^o3^o = *f^o3^o) and so I was disposed to equate the Late Egyptian term with, cognate with Sem. *par^o- “capelli fluenti” [Frz.] = *par(a)^o- “hair (on top of the head)” [Belova et al. 1994 MS: #77] = *par^o- “(loose) hair of the head” [SED]: Akk. pērtu ~ pēretu “Haupthaar” [AHW 856] = pirtu “Haupthaar” [Holma 1911: 34] = pirtu “Kopfhaar” [Torczyner 1912: 770] ||l Hbr. pera^o “das volle Haupthaar” [GB 660] = “loosely hanging and unplaited hair on the head” [KB] | Ar. far^o- “das volle Haupthaar” [GB] = “chevelure” [BK] = “hair of women, shag of hair (космы волос)” [SISAJa] (Sem.: Holma 1911: 34; Frz. 1964: 268, #2.46; SISAJa I, #46; Belova 1992: 16; SED I 192, #218) ||l EBrb.: Ghadames ta-frī-t, pl. ta-fra-t-in “1. mèche de cheveux qui s’arrondit sur le front, 2. languette de chausson ou de chaussure qui recouvre le dessus du pied, ornée ou non de broderies de soie” [Lanfry 1973: 94, #140] ||l NBrb.: Mzab tu-frā-t, pl. tu-fra-t-in “mèche bouclée de cheveux” [Delheure 1984: 50] ||l LECu.: Afar bür^o-i [GT: regular ECu. *b- < AA *f-?] “tight wooly hair (like that of a negro)” [PH 1985: 74] ||l CCh.: Lame pēr “favoris, poils du visage” [Sachnne 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 z nb hr f^o “everyone with hair”.

52] = bòòyé “fleurir” [Brt. & Jng. 1990: 121] = bóóyé “blühen” [Ebobisse 1979: 132; 1987: 78], Bidiya booy (booyí, booyèŋ), pl. boyòw (boyòwí, boyòwèŋ) “fleurir”, bòòyò (m), pl. bòyóy “fleur” [AJ 1989: 60] = bòòyò “fleur” [Fédry], Migama (Dyongor) bòòyò (bòoyé, bòyáa) “fleurir”, búuyùmú (m), pl. búuyùmí “fleur” [JA 1992: 71-72] | Ubi bòy-in (an inf. with -in) “fleur” [Alio 2004: 268, #47] (ECh.: Fédry 1977: 107; JI 1994 II 147). Cf. EDE II 17; EAAN I 72-73, #325.

229. N.Om.: Ganza bubu “male” [Reidhead in Bender 2003: 277, #101: isolated in Om.] ||l WCh.: perhaps PAngas *b^wop ~/> *bop (prothetic nasal) “he-goat” [GT]: Angas bwòp “a he-goat (Hausa bunsuru)” [Foulkes 1915: 154] = ṃbwòp “Ziegenbock” [Jng. 1962 MS: 24] = mbop “he-goat” [ALC 1978: 38] = mbop “he-goat” [Kraft] (AS: Takacs 2004: 23) ||l NBrb.: Ntifa (ta)-bubbu-(t) “verge d’enfant”, Wargla bibb^(w)i “verge (grossier), bibi “verge (d’enfant)” | Shilh a-bubu “pénis”, (ta)-bubbu-(t), also bubba “verge d’enfant” ||l SBrb.: presumably Ahaggar ā-bbo, also bubbu “pipi (enf.)” (Brb.: DRB 6, B11) < PAA *√bb “male” [GT].

229.1. Any connection to WCh.: Hausa bábbá “1. big, 2. important, 3. adult, 4. elder/-st, 6. bigness” [Abraham 1962: 52] || CCh.: Musey búbù, Lew búbú, Marba búbú “largeur” [Ajello et al. 2001: 33], Zime-Dari bǎbǎ “1. (n.) force, 2. (adj.) fort(e)” [Cooper 1984: 2]?

Om. *b- + dentals

230. N.Om.: Kefoid *bad- “to split, cut (wood)” [OS in HSED falsely as P.Om.] = *bad- “to split (wood)” [Ehret 1995] = *badd- “to split” [Bender 2003: 200, #90]:²⁵ Kafa bād “brechen, spalten, trennen” [Reinisch 1888: 269]²⁶ = bádd-ete “egli spaccò” [Cerulli 1951: 410],²⁷ and Mocha bàdda-yé “to split wood” [Leslau 1959: 21], Shinasha (Bworo) bádd- “spalten” [Lamberti 1993a: 281] (Kefoid: Bender 2003: 344, #90: isolated in Om.) ||l ECu. *bad- “to separate” [Ehret]: Sidamo bad- “trennen, auseinanderhalten” [Lamberti] = bad-í “to separate” [Leslau quoted also by OS in HSED] | Sheko badd- “spalten” [Lamberti] (HECu.-N.Om.: Lamberti 1993a: 281) ||l Ch. *bVd(d)- “to untie, to separate” [CLD]:²⁸ WCh.: Kofyar bót ~ doe-bót [dǝ-] “half” [Netting 1967: 2, 7] (Takács 2004a: 19: isolated in AS) | Tangale abde “to split, divide, separate, depart” [Jng. 1991: 65], cf. WCh. *√bd “knife” [JS apud Ehret] || CCh.: Uldeme bīt “couper rapidement” [Sachnine, so also Colombel 1982: 132] | perhaps Munjuk-Puss aftiy [-ft- < *-bt-?] (f) “1. détacher, 2. divorcer de” [Tourneux 1991: 77], Mbara bût “détacher” [TSL 1986: 255], Vulum bídí “détacher” [Tourneux 1978: 288] (Musgu: TSL 1986: 198) | PMasa *but “to separate” [GT]: Masa bût “1. (tr.) séparer, 2. (intr.) se séparer, divorcer, 3. (tr.) [bût gīnā] détacher, découdre (litt.:

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 *-bānd- “to split (tr.)” [Guthrie 1971: 118]

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

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

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

séparer vers l'extérieur" [Caïtucoli 1983: 53], Gizey/Wina, Masa, Ham, Musey, Lew, Marba bût "déliér" [Ajello et al. 2001: 19], Marba bût "démolir" [Ajello et al. 2001: 20], Zime-Misme bût "to detatch" [Jng. 1978: 15] | Lame bût "1. détacher, 2. (se) dérouler, 3. démêler", + zèd mbráo („corde, vêtement") "4. découdre" [Sachnine 1982: 280], Zime-Dari pût "détacher, dérouler, démêler" [Cooper 1984: 21] || Sem. *√bdd "to separate" [Ehret] = *bud- (sic) "1. to take away, 2. separate, 3. disperse" [OS in HSED]: Akk. (NAss.) √bdd D "vergeuden, verschleudern" [AHW 95] || Ug. bd "separation, isolation" [DUL I 214] = "wegnehmen (?)" [WUS 46, #496], adopted as "to take away" (sic) [OS in HSED] | Hbr. √bdd "einsam sein" [WUS], adopted as "to separate" [OS in HSED] | Ar. √bdd I "1. he parted (his legs), straddled, 2. he removed far away, withdraw, drew away with, refrained, abstained from" [Lane 160] = "1. séparer, 2. écarter (les pieds), 3. éloigner, renvoyer qqn. et le tenir dans l'éloignement, l'empêcher d'approcher" [BK I 92] = "trennen, entfernen" [AHW] = "zer/verteilen" [WUS], adopted as "to separate" [OS in HSED] || MSA *√bdd "to separate, sever" [Johnstone 1977: 15; 1981: 22; 1987: 42] etc. < PAA *bad- "to separate" [OS in HSED] = *-pā/d- "to break off" [Ehret 1995] = *-p/bād- "to cleave" [Ehret 2000]. A better-known AA root with just some minor additions here.²⁹

Ad OmAA IV #88. NOm.: Sheko badú "brother" [Aklilu in Bender 2003: 207, #21: isolated in Om.] || WCh.: Boghom pambēt [Gowers] = pānpāt [Shimizu] "brother" (WCh.: JI 1994 II 48) || presumably NBrb.: Nefusa batti "tante paternelle" | Mzab, Wargla betti "tante paternelle, soeur du père" (NBrb.: DRB 135, BT11: isolated in Berber) < PAA *√bt "brother" [GT]. The North Berber root was affiliated by O.V. Stolbova (CLD VI 50, #57) with her Ch. *bVt- (pl.) "sisters, clan", *bVwVt- "sister" [CLD]: WCh.: Fyer bêt (pl.) "Geschwister (siblings)" [Jng. 1970: 83] || Toram bōt "sister", bèeta "clan" [Alio] | Sakun bwota "closely cooperating group of people" [CLD] || CCh.: Bidiya boote, pl. sèney "soeur" [AJ 1989].

Ad OmAA IV #89. NOm. *bed- (var. *bod-?) "1. to reach, 2. arrive, 3. suffice" [GT]: Gimirra *byedi "to arrive" [GT]: Gimirra-Benesho biedi "arrivare" [Montandon in CR 1925: 618] = both Benesho and She bièdi "to arrive" [Bender pace Montandon > CR] (Bender 2003: 161, #27: isolated in NOm.!) | Shinasha (Janjero) bod- (imper. stem: bōr-) "1. genug sein, 2. ausreichen" kept distinct from bōd- (imper. stem: bór-) "1. ankommen, 2. erreichen" [Lamberti 1993: 281] | Kafa Kafa bédde "it is enough", bedáche "it is not enough" [Beke] = bèdihè "bastante, suffisiente" [Cecchi] = bad "genügend vorhanden sein" [Reinisch 1888: 270]³⁰ = bed "1. giungere, 2. potere, 3. essere per ..., stare per ...

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", bádi-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] | 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 cognates³¹ 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-, qqf. bidd-at- “moyen, capacité, force / means, capacity, strength” [DAFA 434b].³² 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. PGimirra *bod- “road, path” [GT]: Gimirra (variety of Benchnon?) bod-i/e [Montandon] = bod [Fleming, Breeze] = bōd [Bender], She bod [Fleming, Muldrow] = bode [Montandon] (Gimirra: Bender 2003: 172, #108) | Kefoid: dubious reflex³³ || CCh.: Musgu *futi [GT: *fu- regular < *bu-] “way” [GT]: Musgu fití, pl. fatakáí (Krause), futii (Barth), fitti (Overweg), futi (Décorse), -fti- in taftída (Rohlf’s) “Weg” [Lukas 1941: 54], Mulwi-Katoa fütí, Mogrum fütí: “chemin” [Jng. 1971/2 MS 0-1], Munjuk-Puss fētīy (f) “route, chemin, voie” [Tourneux 1991: 87], (???) Mbara tîfāy (f), pl. tîfāàfá (metathesis???) “route” [TSL 1986: 278].

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] || ECh.: Dangla-Migama *botol “way” [GT]: WDangla bōtōl “chemin, route” [Fédry 1971: 93], EDangla bōtōl “chemin, route” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973: 52], Migama bōtōl (m), pl. bōttōllī “chemin, route” [JA 1992: 71], Bidiya bōtōl, pl. bōtōltīle “empreinte, sentier” [AJ 1989: 60], cf. Mokilko bōtīlè “trace laissée dans les herbes par le passage de gros animaux ou d’hommes” [Jng. 1990: 68] | Mubi-Toram *botol “way” [GT]: Mubi bōdōl (m), pl. bōdōlūl [-d- < *-t-] “Weg” [Lukas 1937: 181] = *bōdōl “road” [Bender-Doornbos] = bōdōl (m), pl. bōdōlūl “route, sentier, chemin” [Jng. 1990b MS: 5], Minjile *bōdōl “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 bedi-mi, Ubamer and Galila bedi “viele” (SOM.: Mukarovsky 1981: 200, #10) || HECu.: Sidamo bat-a “Reichtum, Überfluß” [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].

³¹ Sem.: Ar. √bdh I: badiha “arriver à l’improviste, survenir inopinément, avoir lieu d’une manière inattendue; surprendre qqn.” [BK: I 98] || ES: Tigre (tə)-bāddāhā “recevoir un cadeau inopinément” [DRS: 45].

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

³³ Cf. Kefoid *bočč-o [< **bod-čo???) “road, path” [GT] > Kaffa bočč-ō “via” [Cerulli] = bōčč-ō “Weg, Straße” [Reinisch 1888: 271] = bōč-ō “way (road)” [Beke apud Reinisch l.c.] = bōč-ō [Fleming: as Boshā, Lewis], Mocha bōčč-ō [Bender] < (???) NOM. *bod- “road, path” [GT]. Note that E. Cerulli (1951: 410), in turn, equated it with Chara bok-ā “via” (palatalization of *-k-č- in Kafa?).

[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.³⁴ The ECh.-NOm. match is due to G. Takacs (2009d: 332, #50).

232. POm. *bud- “heart” [Blažek] = ***būd-** “heart” [GT] > Basketo buda [Alemayehu Haile] = ’būda [Bender] = būdi [Fleming], Doko būda [Fleming apud Blažek] – all denoting: “heart” (Basketo: Bender 2003: 18, #69) || SOm./Aroid *būd “heart” [Bender 2003: 211, #69]: i.a. Ari búdi “1. breast, 2. heart” [Hayward, so also Bender in Bender 2003: 206, #18], Galila būda “heart” [Fleming apud Blažek], Dime būd “heart” [Bender, Fleming] = būd [Bender apud Blažek] (Aroid: Bender 1994: 152, #40; Basketo + Aroid: Bender 2003: 240, #69) || CCh. *√-bd (extended by prefixes) “heart” [JS 1981]:³⁵ Bachama hùbòtò, Mwulyen hùbòtì, Gudu móbùd “heart” (Bata group: Kraft apud Blažek) | Gidar bidē “breast” [Mouchet in JI 1994 II 47] || SBrb.: Ahaggar ā-bāda “3. sein (creux d’une personne couchée)” [Foucauld 1951-2], EWlmd.-Ayr ā-bada, pl. i-bada-n “2. sein” [PAM 1998: 3] (SBrb.: DRB 17, BD2: isolated in Brb.)³⁶ || Sem.: (???) Ar. ba’da/il-at- “1. partie entre la mamelle et l’aisselle chez l’homme, 2. mamelle (surtout la partie ...)” [BK I 78 adopted in DRS 40, b^odl2]³⁷ vs. bahdal-at- “sein, pectoraux” [DRS 47, bhd11], cf. bahdala (denom.?) “avoir la base des mamelons large” [BK I 78] < PAA *bud- “heart” [Blažek] = *√bd “1. breast, 2. heart” [GT]. Areal (?) parallel in PBantu *-bēdē “breast” [Guthrie].³⁸ The Aroid-CCh.-Ahaggar match is due to V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 18-19, #61) and independently Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 3, #1033), who both, besides, carefully avoided to compare to the reflexes of the following root:

232.1. PAA *√ph^od ~ *√pud “heart” [HCVA] > Sem.: Ug. pīd “gemütsvoll” [WUS 252, #2183] = “sincere, cordial” [HCVA] = pid “1. heart, 2. (hence) feeling, emotion, goodness” [DUL 658] | Ar. fu’ād-, pl. ?af’id-at- “1. (en gén.) viscères qui tiennent à l’œsophage, comme le cœur, le poumon, le foie, 2. cœur (siège du courage), 3. cœur, esprit, âme (syn. qalb-, ḥāṭir-, nafs-)” [BK II 528] = fu’ād- “the heart of man and of an animal other than man”, fawād- “heart” [Lane 2323 and 2456, resp.] = fu’ād- “Herz, Sinn” [WUS] = fu’ād-, dimin. fawād- “heart, mind” [HCVA] || WCh.: AS *pūt (from *puṣut?) “heart” [GT]: Sura

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

³⁵ Meant by H. Jungrathmayr & 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 EWlmd.-Ayr “1. pied d’une pente”, resp. (cf. DRB l.c.).

³⁷ Apparently segmented by M. Cohen (1947: 172, #383) into an infix -?- (which was, however, not the case regarding the variety with -h- quoted above) + primary *√bdl (???) that he affiliated with ES: Tna., Amh. darat “poitrine” (Cohen: *√db/mr “avec amuissement 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 *b^hreud- “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 bidduk “small, little” [Bender in Bender 2003: 217, #120: isolated in Aroid and Om.] || CCh.: Muktele bížigá, Mofu bizáhà “little” (Mafa-Mada: Rossing 1978: 284, #431) || Sem.: Ar. baḏq- and bayḏaq- “small and light or active” [Lane 174] = baḏq- “léger, de peu de poids (small, light, weighing little)” [DAFA 480, col. b, so also in DRS 47, BDQ2: isolated in Sem.] < PAA *√bžk (?) “small” [GT]. The case of Dime -dd- < AA *-ž- should, of course, still be demonstrated. Maybe a trilateral extension of the AA root **√bž “small” [GT] attested in NBrb. *√bz “child” [GT, cf. DRB 147]? Any other etymological approach is less credible:

233.1. Related to Ch. *√db “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 badàno “inutile” [Cecchi apud Reinisch] = **badan** “unnützig, vergeblich, eitel sein, ausser Gebrauch kommen”, denom. Refl.: badané-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. *√bt “useless, vain” [GT] > WCh.: Angas-Sura *b^yat ~ *b^yet (?) “useless” [GT]: Mushere kə-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 bətbət “in vain” [CLD].⁴³

235. NOM. *bUḏ- “bush” [GT]: Yemsa *buḏ-u⁴⁴ “1. bush, 2. forest” [GT]: Yemsa (Janjero) buḏu, buru [GT: -r- < (*)-ḏ-?] “bosco” [Cerulli 1938 III 70]⁴⁵ = bur’ù (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 *tāz “to fall”)? Metathesis from AS *turyup “heart” in Sura?

⁴⁰ He assumed in both the Arabic and Sura forms extended reflexes of AA *-pū? “to pound (intr.)” based on a simplex like SCU: Ma’a -pū?u “to thunder” [Ehret 1980a, 145, §I.B.23], which is impossible.

⁴¹ K. Nait-Zerrad (DRB l.c.) regarded this as a “formation expressive sur 2”, i.e. Brb. *√ftk “ouvrir etc.”.

⁴² The Sem. parallals (from Sem. *√btl) 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. essere per ..., stare per, 4. essere conveniente, convenire, 5. bastare, essere 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. *bVwVt- “distress, failure”.

⁴⁴ For the presumed Yemsa rule of -r’- < *-ḏ- see entries #235, #236 and #237 below.

for *-ḍ-?) “Wald” [Lamberti 1993b: 333: isolated in Om.]⁴⁶ | (?) Shinasha boddà (sic: -dd-) [GT: -dd- < *-ḍ-?]⁴⁷ “Busch” [Lamberti 1993a: 281] (Yemsa: Bender 2003: 338, #9: isolated in Om.) || perhaps LECu. *bʌḍ- “uncultivated field” [GT: provided < *“(thickets” area”]: Afar bōdha “Feld” [Lamberti: -dh- < *-ḍ-], Oromo baḍe “unbebautes Feld, Flachland” [Lamberti]⁴⁸ (Sns.-LECu.: Lamberti 1993a: 281)⁴⁹ || NBrb.: Shilh ta-buḍa “jonc de marais” | Qabyle ta-buḍa “jonc des marais” | Mzg. (Maroc Central) a-buḍa “esp. de roseau avec lequel on fait des cabanes et des treillis” (NBrb.: DRB 29, bḍ15) || Sem. *√bws: Akk. buṣinnu, buṣīnu, biṣinnu “1. (a plant), 2. lamp, wick” [CAD b 348a] = būṣīn-, buṣinn- “1. mèche, 2. molène, bouillon blanc (plante)” [DRS] || Syr. būṣīnā “bouillon blanc”, Pehlevi Aram. bwṣyn “espèce de concombre”, Mandaic buṣina “citrouille” | Ar. būṣ- (coll.) “roseaux” [DRS] = “tiges sèches du maïs, dont on fait des grillages pour les balcons et les jardins” [BK I 178] = (coll.) “1. roseau(x) (d’Égypte dont on fait des calames, des claies, etc.) / (Egyptian) reeds (gen., from which pens, hurdles etc. are made), 2. inflorescence (d’une plante herbacée?), 3. B: pousse, cœur d’une touffe de sparte / shoot, heart of a tuft of esparto grass, 4. LPM: inflorescence de l’alfa / inflorescence of alfa-grass” [DAFA 916] = “1. (coll.) nom d’unité à, nom applicable à tous les roseaux, mais plus particulièrement à l’arundo aegyptiaca, qui fournit de ’kalamas” à bon marché les écoles de l’enfance, 2. roseaux, cannes, roseaux à nœuds” [Dozy I 127-128] (Sem.: DRS 52, bwṣ2)⁵⁰ < PAA *buḍ/ḍ- “1. reed thicket (?), 2. bush zone” [GT].

Ad OmAA IV #178.: NOM.: PYemsa *bōḍ- (???) “earth” (?) [GT] > Yemsa bōrʔà “1. Grund, 2. Ursache, 3. (Postposition, die den Genitiv regiert) wegen” [Lamberti 1993b: 333: isolated] = “earth” (sic) [Lamberti’s alleged gloss apud Bender 2003: 340, #24: isolated]: both authors’ failure in any way affiliating the word in Omotic may easily be resolved by understanding the presumed Yemsa rule of -rʔ- < *-ḍ- (apparent from entries #235

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

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

⁴⁷ If, however, its C₂ originated from plain *-d-, its etymon may be rather affiliated (as a PAA root variety?) with PAA *√pd “wooden plank (?)” [GT]: Eg. pd (wood det.) “une partie du navire” (*hapax*, CT V 74u and 74cc, AL 78.1543) = “*Deck (des Schiffes)” (GHWb 299) = “decking” (DCT 143) || NBrb.: (?) Mzab ta-fedfad-t “1. bourre de palmier, 2. plaques de cette bourre” [Delheure 1984: 47; DRB 525: isolated] | Qabyle a-fud, pl. i-fud-en “bout de branche mal coupé, moignon de branche coupée qui reste sur un bâton, un manche” [Dallet 1982: 191] || NOM.: Badditu fadē “bosco” [Cerulli 1929: 61] || WCh.: SBAuchi *pit “1. tree, 2. wood” [GT]: Boodli, Kir and Laar (Balar) pīt, Zaranda pātī, Dikshi (Baraza) butā, Bandas bāta, Wangday putā, Dwot pēt (SBAuchi: Shimizu 1978: 33 and 49, #55) | Tangale pīdo “tree, log, plank, wood” [Jng. 1991: 131], Tangale-Waja pīdo “tree, wood” [Kwh. 1990: 101] | Bade pāt-ān (f) “Busch” [Lukas 1968: 222, also 1974-5: 104], Ngizim pātā, pl. pātātīn “bush” [Schuh 1981: 132] || ECh.: Somray áábdee “Baum, Holz” [Lukas 1937: 76]. Cf. EDE II 539; EAAN I 75, #334.

⁴⁸ Hard to localize in Oromo lexicography. Is Oromo badda “paese alto, regione fresca” [da Thiene 1939: 28] = baddā highland” [Gragg 1982: 30] meant here? If so, certainly out of the question in this context.

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. *būṣ- “byssus”.

above and #236-#237 below), cf. NOM. *√bwṭ “earth” ~ √byṭ “sand” [GT] || NBrb. *a-buḍ “fond” [GT after DRB 28-29, bḍ10] (provided < *‘‘earth’’ < *‘‘dust’’) || Sem.: Ar. √bwṭ I: bāta “tomber dans la poussière” [DRS 51, bwṭ1: isolated] < PAA *√bwṭ “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 mbōre “dust” [Atieb & Bender apud Bender 2003: 354, #23: isolated in Mao] || SOM.: Dime būlú [-l- < *-r-] “dust” [Mulugeta 2008: 224] < NOM. *bor(?) “sand (?)” [GT] (contrary to our earlier suggestion in OmAA V #162) as well as from PAA *√br “down, ground” (or sim.) [GT] (in spite of the very attractive parallel in CCh.: Gisiga vur ~ vōr ~ vr “1. Grund, 2. Ursache, 3. wegen, weil, denn, 4. um zu, damit” [Lukas 1970: 138] suggested in OmAA II #35).

236. NOM.: PYemsa *buḍ- (???)⁵¹ [GT] > Yemsa burʔa “Penis” [Lamberti] || LECu.: Afar buḍ-e (f) “penis” [PH 1985: 139]⁵² = Saho-Afar buddhe “Penis” [Lamberti: -ddh- < *-ḍ-] | Oromo bittoʔ “penis” [Lamberti]⁵³ > SOromo dialects biṭi “penis” [Stroomer 1987: 274] (Yemsa-LECu.: Lamberti 1993b: 333)⁵⁴ || NBrb.: Shilh a-bazza “verge (membre viril)” [DRB 155, bz7: isolated in Brb.]⁵⁵ || Sem.: NSyr. (?) būā [-ṭ- regular < Sem. *ṭ- < AA *-ḥ-] “pénis” [DRS 51-52: dubious Sem. etymology]⁵⁶ < PAA *√bḥ “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 *buḍ- (???)⁵⁷ “child” [GT] > Yemsa bur(?)ussi (nur als Plural belegt) in: burus-ni kit/yó “Kinder, Buben”, burussí-sà kit/yó “die Kinder, Buben” [Lamberti 1993b: 333: isolated in Om.] || LECu.: Saho and Afar bād-ā, fem. -ā “Kind: 1. Sohn, Tochter, Knabe, Mädchen, 2. bei Tieren das Junge” [Reinisch 1886: 829-830; 1890: 83-84]⁵⁸ = Saho barha “son”, barhā “daughter” [Vergari 2003: 53] = Afar bād-ā “figlio”, fem. bād-ā “figlia” [Colizza 1887: 112] || NBrb. *√bz: Wargla ta-bza “marmaille, enfants, jeu-

⁵¹ For the presumed Yemsa rule of -r’- < *-ḍ- see entries #235 above and #237 below.

⁵² Equated by Ch. Ehret (1995: 112, #101) with Ar. bazza- (verbal noun) “to grow fat” and NOM.: Bench(non) pūḥ “many, much” < AA *-pūḥ- “to increase (intr.)”.

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

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

⁵⁵ Affiliated by K. Naït-Zerrad (DRB l.c.) with a phonologically apparently distinct root, cf. EBrb.: Ghadames ta-baḥsuṣṣ “queue d’animal (cheval, chacal)” [Lanfray 1973: 7, #43] || SBrb.: Kel Ui ta-basus-t “queue” [DRB] || NBrb.: Shilh a-baṣṣa ~ a-ṣabba “queue (d’animal)” [DRB] | Tamazight a-baṣṣa, pl. i-baṣṣ-iw-n “queue (d’animal)” [Taïfi 1991: 35] = a-bassa ~ a-baṣṣa ~ ta-bzza-t [DRB] (Brb.: DRB 130, 133, 148).

⁵⁶ Cf. Sem. *bawḥ- “bottom” [GT]: Mandaic buṭa “bottom, anus (still used)” [Drower-Macuch 1963: 54] = “anus, derrière” [DRS 51], NSyr. būṣā “croupe” (borrowed < Ar.) [DRS] | Ar. būṣ- “fesses” and bawṣ- “3. chairs grasses et molles de fesses”, cf. √bwṣ II (denom.) “avoir les fesses très-grandes” [BK I 178] = būṣ- and bawṣ- “croupe saillante, callypigie” [DRS], cf. also Ar. buṭuṭ- (root ext. -ʕ- and -ṭ-?) “2. fondement, derrière avec les parties de la génération” [BK I 140].

⁵⁷ For the presumed Yemsa rule of -r’- < *-ḍ- see entries #235, #236 above.

⁵⁸ Of course, neither of the comparisons (Somali wil or Macro-Canaanite *√bn, *√br “son”) offered by L. Reinisch (1886: 829) is phonologically convincing.

nesse”, Figuig a-bziḡ “garçon”, Snus l-bezz “marmaille”, a-bzeḡ “petit enfant” | Tamazight bezz (var. de bezz) “enfanter” (NBrb.: DRB 155, bz11: var. to *√bz?) < PAA *√bč “2. offspring, child” [GT].

238. SOM.: Ari *√bđ “to go” [GT]: Ari bəda [Bender] = bad- ~ ba?- [Tully] = biḡ- [Ehret]⁵⁹ (Bender 2003: 210, #59) || PCh. *√bt “to go” [GT]: WCh.: Warji bátá [IL] || CCh.: Gudu pɪtʻ [IL] | Gidar mbat [Mouchet] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 162-163). Irregular SOM. *-ḡ- vs. Ch. *-t-. To be distinguished from Sem.: ES *√bšh [DRS] > Geez baṣṣa, Tigre bāšṣä, Tna. bāšṣe “ad/parvenir” (ES: DRS 77).

Ad OmAA IV 131, #92 NOm.: Kafa böttā “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:

92.1. PAA *√bt “1. feeble, 2. poor” [GT] > Sem. *√bt “to be feeble” [GT]: Ar. √btṭ II baṭṭata “être fatigué”, cf. baṭṭ- “3. malheur”, √btʻ I baṭuʻa “être lent, marcher ou agir avec lenteur”,⁶⁰ √btr IV “1. émousser, 2. fatiguer” [BK I 134-136], presumably⁶¹ also Ar. √bwṭ I: bāṭa “1. tomber dans la misère et l’avisement, ayant été riche et considérée” [BK I 178] = “1. tomber dans la misère / to be reduced to poverty” [DAFA 917] || ES *√bwṭ: Tigre boč “faiblesse de la vue”, Amh. boṭäbboṭä “1. émousser, 2. se brouiller” (ES: DRS 51, bwṭ2) || SBrb.: Ahaggar √bdw > i-bdaw (conj. II beḏew) “être chétif (peut avoir pour sujet de personne, des animaux, ou des végétaux)” [Foucauld 1951-2: 33; DRB 31, bd2: isolated in Brb.] || LECu.: Oromo bāḏḏa “unable to do sg.” [Ali & Zaborski 1990: 132] | HECu. *but- “to be poor”, but-a “poor (one)” [Hudson 1989: 115, 407] || WCh.: AS *b^wet [regular < *b^wet/ç] “1. fine, 2. weak” [GT]: perhaps Mushere lek-li-ḫwet “describing the act of making one’s body flexible” [Diyakal 1997 MS], Goemay biet (so, -i-) “poor” [Ftp. 1911: 219] = ḫiet [reg. < *ḫuet] (sg.) “to be weak (in strength or in class or for sg.)”, ḫiat [*ḫuat] (pl.) “to be weak (to do sg.)” [Hellwig 2000 MS: 3-4] (AS: Takacs 2004a: 43) || CCh.: Mbuko ḫutoy “se faner” [CLD: < *but-]. The Ar.-Goemay-Mbuko match is due to CLD VI 48, #53.

92.2. PAA *√bč “feeble” [GT] > Sem.: Ar. √bšw II: baṣṣā “rendre eunuque”, baṣiy- “eunuque” [BK I 133] = √bšw I: baṣā “émasculer” [DRS 76-77, bšw1: isolated in Sem.]⁶² vs. Arab. baṣ- “maigreur”, baṣšūs- “maigre et mince” [BK I 142] || EBrb.: Ghadames bāz “être épuisé (de faim, de soif)” [Lanfry 1973: 34, #0152] = bāz [DRB: 154, bz1: isolated in Brb.] || Ch. *bVç- “to diminish, weaken” [CLD]: WCh.: perhaps AS *ḫes “(to be) slow”

⁵⁹ Affiliated by Ch. Ehret (2000 MS: 565, #27) with Eg. bt “1. to abandon, forsake, 2. run” < AA *-bič- (*-tl-) “to leave”. Phonologically untenable.

⁶⁰ Affiliated (with a question mark) in DRS 59 with ES: Geez baḏawa “dormir”, which is both phonologically (Ar. ṭ ≠ Geez ḏ) 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. √bwṭ I: bāṭa “tomber dans la poussière”⁶¹ [DRS 51, bwṭ1: isolated]. Cf. the entry #238 in this paper.

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

[GT]: Angas bēs (hill dialect) “to dally” [Foulkes 1915: 149], Sura ḥes “langsam” [Jng. 1963: 60] vs. Mupun bées “not enough” [Frj. 1991: 7] (AS: Takacs 2004a: 32) | Tangale busi “feeble, weak” [Kraft > CLD] || CCh.: Lamang ḥaca “to diminish” [Wolff > CLD] | Chuvok méḥḥèčēy “effriter” [Ndokobai > CLD] | Dzepaw bàcè “faible” [Sachnine > CLD]. Ch.-Ar.: CLD VI 76, #157.

92.3. PAA *√bt “feeble” [GT] > WCh. *bVt(t)- “to be weak, tired” [CLD]: alleged Goemay reflex non-existing⁶³ | Bole mbutu “to tire out, be tired from” [Gimba] (WCh.: CLD VI 48, #53) || Sem.: Ar. √btt I “5. excéder 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 l.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.) “tomber de fatigue, d’épuisement, s’effaiser, s’affaler (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 bad “pauvreté” [DRS 44, BDD1: isolated in Sem., semantically at least]⁶⁴ || LECu.: Oromo badada (syn. gadada) “to become poor” [Gragg 1982: 30].

239. NOm.: Macro-Ometo (proper language unspecified) **báta** “forehead” [Bender 2003: 198, #35: isolated in Om.] || Bed. bīti (f), pl. bītia “forehead” [Roper 1928: 165] || CCh.: Musgu bēdebēde, pl. bēdebēdekái “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 C₂.⁶⁵ May a S/P^{???}AA *√bt, var. *√bd “forehead (i.e., front part)” [GT] underlie? Etymologically presumably related to a verbal root:

239.1. Sem./P^{???}AA *√bd “to begin (originally: to be in front???)” [GT] > CCh. (GT: from Ar.?): Chibak bàdì-číní and Bura badita “beginnen” [Hoffmann 1955: 133] || Bed. (GT: from Ar.?) bado “to begin” [Roper 1928: 159] || NBrb. (GT: from Ar.?): Qabyle e-bdu “commencer” [Dallet 1982: 8] || Sem.: OSA bd? “première fois” [DRS], Ar. badaʔa I “1. commencer, 2. faire qqch. le premier, être le premier à faire une chose, 3. créer, produire, inventer, 4. (avec bi-) préposer qq. à qqch., le nommer chef” [BK I 94 > DRS] ||

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 ḥiet (so: implosive ḥ- and -t-, not an -i-) [regular < *ḥuet], pl. ḥiat [< *ḥuat] “to be weak (in strength or in class)” [Hellwig 2000 MS: 3-4], which can only be derived from *√bwṭ 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 qqch. à qqn. 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. ḥāzè and Aram. ḥadyā “breast”, Ar. ḥādā “to be over against, opposite to” and ḥidāʔun “opposite, over against” (displaying a semantic derivation “breast” > “front” > “opposite”) with Eg. ḥzj “loben, billigen” (OK-, Wb III 154-155) = “to praise, reward” (Ember: originally < *to place a thing over against an another thing”).

MSA *√bd? “to begin” [GT]: Harsusi bedō “to begin”, abēd “to start (up)” [Johnstone 1977: 15], Jibbali (Shahri) bde? “commencer” [DRS] = bédé? “to begin” [Johnstone 1981: 22], Mehri šebedú “anfangen (commencer)” [Jahn apud DRS] = əbtōdi (CJibbali əbtóde?) “to begin” [Johnstone 1987: 42], Soqotri béde “commencer” [Leslau] (Sem.: Leslau 1938: 81; DRS 44, bd?1). Considering a series of Chadic forms “to begin” as Kanuri/Arabic loans, O.V. Stolbova (CLD VI 45, #44) equated the Sem. root with Ch. **badVH- > *baḍi “dawn, morning”.

240. NOm. *bVtt-/*bV̄t- “1. earth, 2. dust” [GT]:⁶⁶ Macro-Ometo *bitt-a “earth” [Bender 2003: 198, #24] > NWOmeto *bitt-a “earth” [Bender 2003: 76, #24] > extended Wolayta cluster *bitt-a “earth” [Bender 2003: 47 and 326, #24]: a.o., Wolayta bīta “soil, earth, land” [Lamberti], Dawro bīta, bitta “dust” [Lamberti], Dorze biyta “dust” [Linton], Dace biitta “soil, land” [Lamberti], Zala and Gofa bitta “soil, land” [Lamberti], Gamu bitta “soil, land” [Lamberti], Basketo bitt^l [Fleming] = bittā “earth” [Cerulli in Bender 2003: 326, #24], Malé bītā “country” [Cerulli in Bender 2003: 326, #24], Malo bitta “earth” [Alemayehu] = bīta [Siebert & Caudwell], Zala bittā “earth” [Cerulli] (NWOmt.: Bender 2003: 317, #24; Ometo: Bender 2003: 141, #24)⁶⁷ | Dizoid: Sheko bōta “dust” [Aklilu] (Dizoid apud Bender 2003: 347, #23: isolated) ||| Bed. būt (f) “earth, land” [Roper 1928: 165]⁶⁸ || Agaw *bət-a “land, country, soil” [Apl.]: Bilin bəta “soil, sand, filth”, Hamir bəṭa “soil” | Awngi bəṭf “earth” (Agaw: Apl. 2006: 59) ||| ECh.: Kajakse bütütü “sol” [Alio 2004: 240, #51].⁶⁹ 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.):

240.1. PAA *buṭ- “1. earth, 2. sand” [GT] > NOm. *√bwṭ “earth” ~ √byṭ “sand” [GT]: Dorze biyta “sand” [Linton et al.] = bīt/ṭa “sand” [Siebert] (isolated Ometo: Bender 2003: 22, #110) | Gimirra-Benesho (Bench) bwit “earth” [Fleming] = buyṭ^l “soil”, buyṭ⁵ “desert (n.)” [Wedekind 1990: 99] = bwit “earth” [Breeze] (isolated in Gimirra: Bender 2003: 339, #23) | PYemsa *bōḍ- (???) “earth” (?) [GT] > Yemsa bōr?à “1. Grund, 2. Ursache, 3. (Postposition, die den Genitiv regiert) wegen” [Lamberti 1993b: 333: isolated] = “earth” (sic) [Lamberti’s alleged gloss apud Bender 2003: 340, #24: isolated] ||| (???) NBrb. *a-buḍ

⁶⁶ M. Lamberti (LS 1997: 325) derived the Ometo and Agaw forms from an “Old Cushitic” (Cushitic and Ometo) stem *biy- with the addition of a formative suffix, which, however, can hardly be projected onto the Chadic cognates.

⁶⁷ Combined by M.L. Bender (2003: 335) with HECu.: Gedeo buttina, Ch. *√bt “ashes” of JI 1994 I 3, and NS *buT-.

⁶⁸ The assumption by Roper on its connection with Bed. būr ... is phonologically vague.

⁶⁹ 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 bēdeke “mud” [Kidna 1985: 201, #42] = bēdeke “mud” [Jng. 1991: 73] = budeke “mud” [CLD < Kraft or Jng.?], Dera büt “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 *√bt “(to be) dirty” [GT in EAAN I 21, #19] vs. PAA *√btk ~ *√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.

“fond” [GT after DRB 28-29, bđ10] (provided < *‘‘earth’’ < *‘‘dust’’) III Sem.: perhaps Ar. $\sqrt{\text{bw}\text{t}}$ I: bāṭa ‘‘tomber dans la poussière’’⁷⁰ [DRS 51, bwṭ1: 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] III CCh.: Muktele ftsú ‘‘earth’’ [Rossing 1978] | Musgu fūti (Rohlf’s), fetí (Overweg), fate (Décorse), fuuti (Barth) ‘‘Erde’’, vgl. áfti (Rohlf’s) [Lukas 1941: 54-55], cf. perhaps also Musgu áfti ‘‘Boden, Kalk’’ (Rohlf’s) [Lukas 1941: 43], Munjuk-Puss aftiy (f) ‘‘terre, sol’’ [Tourneux 1991: 72].

241. SOM.: Ari bita ‘‘left(hand)’’ [Bender and Tully in Bender 2003: 213, #80] III ECu. *bidḥ- ‘‘left side’’ [Sasse 1979: 16, 60]. The additional *-ḥ in the East Cushitic cognate must be identical with the common AA nominal class marker of anatomical terms (Takaacs 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:

241.1. P^{???}AA *√bd ‘‘(to cause) 1. trouble, 2. harm’’ [GT]: Sem.: Ar. badda I ‘‘5. causer du dommage à qqn.’’ > badīd-at- ‘‘calamité, malheur’’ [BK I 92-93] = badda ‘‘iniuria affecit’’ [Reinisch] III LECu.: Oromo badā ‘‘bad, spoiled, evil’’ [Ali & Zaborski 1990: 132] III WCh.: Ngizim bādāwāi ‘‘one who is always getting into trouble’’ [Schuh 1981].⁷¹

241.2. PAA *√bt ‘‘1. to (be) spoil(t), 2. be in disorder (mentally)’’ [GT]: Sem. *√bt[?]/w [DRS]: (?) Ug. *√bt(w) > t-bṭ ‘‘jaser, bavarder (?)’’,⁷² Hbr. $\sqrt{\text{btw}}$: bāṭa ‘‘bavarder, parler inconsidérément’’ (Can.: DRS 59, bt[?]/w1) III NBrb.: Wargla bbeḍbeḍ ‘‘se troubler, perdre le contrôle sur soi, perdre la tête’’, Mzab biḍḍu ‘‘1. perdre la raison, 2. être, devenir fou’’ (NBrb.: DRB 29-31, bḍbḍ17 and bḍw1, resp.) III LECu.: Arbore beḍḍ (f) ‘‘evil, badness, worthlessness’’, beḍḍ-aw- ‘‘to become bad, spoiled, dirty’’ [Hayward 1984: 347] III WCh.: Hausa ḥátá ‘‘to spoil’’ [Abraham 1962: 88].

241.3. P^{???}AA *√bwt ‘‘bad, trouble(some)’’ [GT]: Sem.: perhaps⁷³ Official Aram. bwt (substantive of unknown meaning, presumably: ‘‘trouble, distress’’ or ‘‘burden’’ or ‘‘shame’’) [DNWSI 148] III WCh.: BT *būti ‘‘trouble’’ [GT]: Bolewa buuti ‘‘unfortunate situation’’ [Gimba], Karekare buuti ‘‘distress, troubles’’ [Gambo-Karofi] = ‘‘Plage, Kummer’’ [Lukas]. Aram.-BT due to CLD VI 50, #58.

⁷⁰ It can belong here provided its root sense had to do with ‘‘dust’’ and not ‘‘poverty’’, cf. its alternative rendering: Ar. $\sqrt{\text{bw}\text{t}}$ I: bāṭa ‘‘1. tomber dans la misère et l’avitissement, ayant été riche et considérée’’ [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 bādāṛā ‘‘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-bṭ ‘‘elle est vue’’ < *√bt based on Gordon 1965: 371, #456 (DRS: ‘‘est aussi peu sûr’’); (2) the whole context, i.e., bh btt ltbṭ wbh tdmmt ?amht, was rendered by A. Caquot and M. Sznyczer (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. *√bwṭ ‘‘to feel shame’’ as implied in the DNWSI rendering.

241.4. LECu. *ba/it- “to cause difficulty” [Ehret] > Somali bad “1. Übeltat, Schädigung jemandes, 2. (tr.) Böses zufügen” [Reinisch 1902: 71] = bad “blackmailing, extortion (Erpressung)” [FH 1993: 110] = bad “to impose constraint, make unhappy” [Ehret], Oromo bita “devil, fiend, mischievous person” [Ehret] (LECu.: Ehret 1997 MS: 14, #1074; 2000 MS: 16, #1096).⁷⁴ One wonders if the root family of HECu. *bud-a “(one who has) evil eye” [Hudson 1989: 406]⁷⁵ can also belong here.

241.5. S^{???}AA *√bt “to err” [GT]: LECu.: Somali bādi “stray (verirrtes Tier)” [FH 1993: 110] ||l WCh.: Daffo-Butura fūt “sich verirren” [Jng. 1970: 214]

241.6. P^{???}AA *√bt “to be false” [GT]: Sem.: Ar. √bht I: bahata “2. calomnier qqn., lui imputer à tort et sciemment qqch., 3. mentir”, buht-(ān)- “calomnie, mensonge”, buhayt-at-and bahtar- “mensonge” [BK I 169-170] ||l Ch. *bVt- “to deceive” [CLD]: WCh.: BT *bāt-/batt- “to trick” [GT]:⁷⁶ Karekare bābāatu “to deceive, trick” [Gimba], Bolewa bāttaa “1. to trick; 2. scare” [Gimba, Ali and Madu Bah], Maka bètt- “to trick” (?) [Suzzi Valli] ||l CCh.: Buwal bāt “to deceive” [CLD] | Hdi batay “to plead, flatter” [CLD] | Mafa bēt-, béd-, pét- “amadouer qqn., tromper” [Brt.] | Musey mbaḍta “1. flatter, tromper; 2. la tromperie” [Shryock, Palomo and Martin] (W-CCh. data with sources: CLD VI 46, #50) ||l ECh.: Mokilko bútte “faux, mal préparé” [Jng. 1990: 70].⁷⁷ Variety with a voiced C₂ in Sem.: MSA *√bdw “to tell a lie” [Ehret].⁷⁸

242. NOm.: Sheko búť “to throw” [Aklilu apud Bender 2003: 352, #103: isolated in Dizoid] ||l WCh. *√bt “to throw, shoot” [GT]:⁷⁹ Bure bet- “to throw, shoot” [CLD < ?] | Miya bēta “to throw, shoot” [Skinner] < SAA *√bt “to throw” [GT]. May be part of a larger root family:

242.1. Sem.: MSA *√bdd “to throw (a stone in a game)” [GT]: Harsusi bed “to throw a stone” and Mehri √bdd > bəd “to throw (a stone) in the game called bədūn, throw any stone”, bədūn “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 bādžà “sorcerer”, Agaw *bawVd- “1. witch-doctor, 2. werewolf”, LECu. *bawVd- and Kefoid *bud-a “witch-doctor” < AA *bawVd- “sorcerer”.

⁷⁶ O.V. Stolbova (CLD I.c.): compensatory reduplication < *√bht?

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. badḥ- “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]: Kirfi bitú-wò [Schuh], Galambu báz-áalà [Schuh: -z- regular < *-t-] – all signifying “1. to fall, 2. throw” (BT: Schuh 1978: 144), where belongs also Kupto bātū-mà “falling down due to slippery” [Leger] ||l CCh.: Buwal bat “to sink” [CLD < ?] ||l Sem. *√hbt: Akk. abātu “to destroy, ruin”, abut “ruined, decayed” [CAD a 41] ||l Ar. √hbt “frapper, jeter en bas, précipiter en poussant” [BK II 1379] = “frapper, abattre, abaisser, avillir”, habt-at- “faiblesse d’esprit” [DRS 363 after Lane 2873].

242.2. Sem.: Ar. $\sqrt{hb}t$ “jeter qqn., frapper” [BK II 1381].⁸⁰

242.3. WCh.: AS $*b^w\text{et} \sim *b^w\text{ot}$ (or $*-a_3-$?) “1. to release, leave, 2. place, put, 3. sow” [GT].⁸¹

242.4. PAA $*\sqrt{bt}$ “to push” [GT]: Ch. $*bVt-$ (possibly, $< *HVbVt-$) “to push (down), to strike” [CLD VI 47-48, #52]: WCh.: AS $*bet \sim *bat$ “to push” [GT]⁸² = $*bet$ “to push (толкать)” [Stolbova 1977; 1987] || SBrb.: EWImd. $b\dot{a}tb\dot{a}t$ “conduire rapidement (pers./an.)” [PAM 2003: 18].

242.5. PAA $*\sqrt{bt}$ “to quit” [GT]: Sem.: Ar. \sqrt{bt}^c I “quitter qqn, s’en séparer” [BK I 82] || SBrb.: EWImd. $b\dot{a}ttu$ “céder définitivement” [PAM 2003: 55: borrowed from Ar.; DRB 134, BT7: isolated in Brb.] || Ch. $*but-$ “to untie, separate, release” [CLD VI 46, #48].

243. NOm.: Yemsa būtä “chicken” [Aklilu & Siebert in Bender 2003: 339, #13: isolated in Om.] || LECu.: Rendille $b\dot{e}t-o$ “Sohn, Kind” [PB apud Dlg.] | HECu. $*b\dot{e}lto$ (based on Darasa) “boy” [Hudson] = $*b\dot{e}t-$ (?) “boy” [GT].⁸³ Hadiya $b\dot{e}t-o$ “lad (парень)” [Dlg.] = $b\dot{e}t-\dot{o}$ “figlio” [Cerulli] = $b\dot{e}t-o$ “boy” [Hudson], Kambatta $b\dot{e}t-\dot{o}$ “figlio” [Cerulli] = $b\dot{e}t-a$ “boy” [Hudson], Sidamo $b\dot{e}tt-\dot{o}$ “figlio” [Cerulli] = $b\dot{e}t-o$ “son, boy” [Dlg.] = $b\dot{e}tt-o$ “boy” [Hudson], Darasa (Gedeo) $b\dot{e}lto$ “child” [Hudson] (ECu.: Cerulli 1938 II 196; Dlg. 1973a: 73; Hudson 1989: 30) || Eg.: possible trace of an extinct old word $*bt$ “lad”⁸⁴ || Sem. $*bat\dot{u}l-$ “young man, maiden” [Gray]: hence cf. esp. OSA: Qatabanian btl “Berufsstand” [GB] = $btl-(n)$ “clan or social group” [Rhodokanakis apud Ricks 1982: 49] (Sem.: GB 122; Gray 1934: 43; AHW 115-116; DRS 90; Leslau 1987: 112). Sem.-Eg.: SISAJa I #55.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Affiliated in CLD VI 51, #62 with Ch. $**bVt-$ $> *bVt-$ “to strike” [CLD]: WCh.: Mupun $b\dot{w}et$ “to hit, shoot, attack” [Frj.] | Dera $b\dot{w}at\dot{a}$ “a whip” [Newman] || ECh.: Mokilko $b\dot{a}tt\dot{e}$ “gifler” [Jng. 1990], which, in this direct way, is semantically risky. Otherwise, one would be disposed to set up a PAA $*\sqrt{(h)b}t$ “to push” [GT].

⁸¹ Attested by Gerka $b\dot{w}et$ “to put” [Ftp. 1911: 219], Angas $b\dot{w}ot$ “to release, let go, let drop” vs. $b\dot{w}ot$ “1. to lay, place, 2. spread out” [Foulkes 1915: 154-155] = $b\dot{w}ot$ “1. entlassen, gehen lassen, ausstoßen, 2. begleiten, weggeleiten, 3. legen, plazieren” [Jng. 1962 MS] = $b\dot{ot}$ “to release” [ALC 1978: 7] = $b\dot{w}at$ “to set” [Gochal 1994: 72], Sura $b\dot{w}ot$ “verwerfen, verstoßen (Frau), sich scheiden lassen” [Jng. 1963: 61], Mupun $b\dot{w}et$ “to lay (one) egg, release, put, shoot, attack, hit, pour” [Frj. 1991: 8], Kofyar $b\dot{w}ot$ “to leave it, stop” [Netting 1967: 4], Mushere $b\dot{w}ot$ “1. to sow by broadcasting or scattering and spraying of acha, 2. lay egg (e.g. hen), 3. allow, leave” [Diyakal 1997 MS], Goemay $b\dot{w}et-di$ “to put” [Ftp. 1911: 219] = $b\dot{w}et$ “to place, put, lay” [Sirlinger 1937: 19] = $b\dot{o}^?y\dot{e}t$ [reg. $< *b\dot{o}y\dot{e}t$], pl. $\dot{d}\dot{a}y\dot{e}$ [$*\dot{d}\dot{a}y\dot{e}$] “setzen, stellen, legen” [Jng. 1962 MS: 7] = $b\dot{w}et$ [$< *b\dot{w}et$] (sg.) “to put on a surface, put a book on a table (lying), put a pen, put a bottle lying” [Hellwig 2000 MS: 4] (AS: Stolbova 1987: 149, #46 & 240, #2; Takacs 2004a: 42-43).

⁸² Attested by Angas bat “to push” [Ormsby 1914: 314] = $b\dot{e}t \sim b\dot{a}t$ “to push, butt (of rams, etc.), any sort of shoving without piercing” [Foulkes 1915: 149] = bet (sg.), $b\dot{e}rep$ (pl.) “to push” [Gochal 1994: 74], Sura $b\dot{e}t$ “niederschlagen, stoßen” [Jng. 1963: 59], Mupun $b\dot{e}t$ “to push” [Frj. 1991: 5], perhaps Mushere $k\dot{a}-baat$ $siki$ (false long $-aa-$? compound verb?) “to put leg for somebody so that he falls down while walking or running” (lit. “to push with leg”? cf. $siki$ “leg”) [Diyakal 1997 MS: 138], Chip bet gwe “to push” [Kraft], probably Montol ba (so, no $-t$, error?) “to push” [Ftp. 1911: 219], Goemay bat “to push aside either with hand or foot” [Sirlinger 1937: 12] (AS: Stolbova 1977: 153, #11; 1987: 240, #1; Takacs 2004a: 13-14).

⁸³ G. Hudson (l.c.) reconstructed HECu. $*b\dot{e}lto$ “boy” based on Darasa (Gedeo).

⁸⁴ G. Takács (1999: 23; EDE II 345) assumed Eg. bt “Schafhirt” (OK, Wb I 483, 6) = “Hirtentitel” (Kaplony 1969: 37) = “le berger” (V., AL 77.1337) = “(O)Eg. 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. $*\sqrt{bt}$ “to separate” with Eg. bt and Sem. $*bat\dot{u}l-$, 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. \sqrt{bt}

244. NOm.: Hozo butó “knife” [Siebert & Wedekind apud Bender 2003: 355, #51: isolated in Mao] ||| WCh. *√bd “knife” (only attested in BT and Guruntum)⁸⁶ [JS 1981: 157, 288].

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 vithódàgλ “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].

246. SOm.: Aroid *√bT “river” [GT]: Ari bōda [Bender & Tully], Hamer baiti [Fleming] “river” (isolated in Aroid⁸⁷ apud Bender 2003: 255, 350, #74) ||| WCh.: AS *-but ~ *-ḅut ~ *-b^wa₂t ~ *-ḅ^wa₂t (with prefixes *či-, *ḅu-, *mat-) “source of water” [GT]: Angas čī-bút “water oozing out of a rock” [Foulkes 1915: 158] = ši-ḅut, cf. ?àm ši-ḅut (Kabwir dialect) “water from rocks” [Jng. 1962 MS: 38], Kofyar ḅə-but “spring (natural)”, cf. also ḅu-bwàt “bog” [Netting 1967: 4] = ḅu-bwàt “bog”, cf. ḅə-but “spring (natural)” [Netting 1967: 4], Mushere ši-but kuut “hill side” (so!), ḅu-bwet ~ ḅu-ḅwet “fountain, sprinkling water from the ground” [Diyakal 1997 MS: 379], Goemay mat-ḅut “a spring, a source” [Sirlinger 1937: 136] ||| Brb.: cf. perhaps⁸⁸ NBrb.: Tamazight a-badu “1. bordure d’un champ cultivé, 2. canal d’irrigation, aqueduc”, ta-badu-tt “canal d’irrigation, aqueduc”, Timimun ă-bādu “canal d’arrosage (amenant l’eau du réservoir au cultures)”, Rif badu “talus”, Figuig badu “sillon” (NBrb.: DRB 17, BD2).

*

Special symbols

P: any labial stop (f, p, b, ḅ), T: unspecified dental stop (t, d, ṭ), S: any voiceless sibilant and/or affricate (s, š, ś, c, č, è), Z: unspecified voiced sibilant and/or affricate (z, ʒ, ʒ̣), K: any velar stop (k, g, ʁ), Q: unspecified uvular or postvelar etc. (q, ɢ, ʕ, ḥ), H: any of the pharyngeals or laryngeals etc. (ʕ, ɣ, ḥ, h, ʔ). 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 = *√bt!?

⁸⁶ H. Jungraihtmayr & 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 baš, baz- (?) “river” [Lydall]? See in a distinct entry below.

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

Abbreviations of languages and other terms

(A): Ahmimic, AA: Afro-Asiatic (Afrasian, Semito-Hamitic), Akk.: Akkadian, Amh.: Amharic, Ar.: Arabic, Aram.: Aramaic, AS: Angas-Sura, Ass.: Assyrian, (B) Bohairic, Bab.: Babylonian, BAram.: Biblical Aramaic, Bed.: Bed'awye (Beja), Brb.: Berber (Libyo-Guanche), BT: Bole-Tangale, C: Central, CAA: Common Afro-Asiatic, Ch.: Chadic, Cpt.: Coptic, CT: Coffin Texts, Cu.: Cushitic, Dem.: Demotic, E: East, Eg.: Egyptian, ES: Ethio-Semitic, ESA: Epigraphic South Arabian, Eth.: Ethiopian, Eth.-Sem.: Ethio-Semitic, (F): Fayyumic, GR: Ptolemaic and Roman period, H: Highland (in Cushitic), Hbr.: Hebrew, Hgr.: Ahaggar, L: Late, L: Low(land), lit.: literature or literary texts, LP: Late Period, M: Middle, Mag.: magical texts, Med.: medical texts, MK: Middle Kingdom, MSA: Modern South Arabian, MT: Mubi-Toram, Mzg.: Tamazight, N: New, N: North, NAA: AA: North Afro-Asiatic (Semitic, Egyptian, Berber), NE (or NEg.): New Egyptian, NK: New Kingdom, O: Old, OK: Old Kingdom, Om.: Omotic, Omt.: Omoto, P: Proto-, PB: Post-Biblical, PT: Pyramid Texts, reg.: regular, S: South, (S): Sahidic, SAA: South AA: Afro-Asiatic (Cushitic, Omotic, Chadic), Sem.: Semitic, Sns.: Shinasha, Syr.: Syriac, Ug.: Ugaritic, W: West, Wlm(d): Tawlemmet.

Abbreviations of author names

Ab.: Abraham, AJ: Alio & Jungrauthmayr, Akl.: Aklilu, Alm.: Alemayehu, Apl.: Appleyard, BK: Bieberstein & Kazimirski, Brt.: Barreteau, Dbr.: Djibrine, Djk.: D'jakonov, Dkl.: Diyakal, Dlg.: Dolgopolsky, Dlh.: Delheure, Drn.: Doornbos, Ebs.: Ebobisse, Fcd.: Foucauld, FH: Farah & Heck, Frj.: Frajzyngier, Ftp.: Fitzpatrick, GB: Gesenius & Buhl, GT: Takács, Ibr.: Ibrizimow, IL: Institute of Linguistics, JA: Jungrauthmayr & Adams, JI: Jungrauthmayr & Ibrizimow, Jng.: Jungrauthmayr, Jns.: Johnstone, JS: Jungrauthmayr & Shimizu, KB: Koehler & Baumgartner, KM: Kießling & Mous, Kwh.: Kleinewillinghöfer, LS: Lamberti & Sottile, Mnt.: Montgolfier, NM: Newman & Ma, OS: Orel & Stolbova, PB: Plazikowsky-Brauner, PAM: Prasse, Alojaly, Mohamed, PH: Parker & Hayward, Prh.: Porhomovskij, RB: Rapp & Benzing, Rn.: Reinisch, Srl.: Sirlinger, Stl.: Stolbova, TC: Taïne-Cheikh, TG: Takács, TSL: Tourneux, Seignobos, Lafarge.

References

- Abraham, R.C. 1964. *Somali-English dictionary*.² London: University of London Press Ltd.
- AHW = Soden, W. von. 1965-1981. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Bde. I-III. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Ajello, R. & Karyo, M. & Melis, A. & Dobio, Ou. 2001. *Lexique comparatif de six langues tchadiques central (Gizey, Ham, Lew, Marba, Masa, Musey)*. Pisa: Edizioni Plus, Università di Pisa.
- AL I = Meeks, D. 1977. *Année lexicographique: Égypte ancienne*. Tome 1. 2^{ème} édition, 1998, Paris: Cybele.
- AL II = Meeks, D. 1978. *Année lexicographique: Égypte ancienne*. Tome 2. 2^{ème} édition, 1998, Paris: Cybele.
- AL III = Meeks, D. 1979. *Année lexicographique: Égypte ancienne*. Tome 3. 2^{ème} édition, 1998, Paris: Cybele.
- ALC 1978 = Angas Language Committee (in Cooperation with Nigeria Bible Translation Trust). 1978. *Shàk nkary kè shàtok mwa ndàn Ngas. Ngas-Hausa-English dictionary with Appendix showing some features of Ngas grammar*. Jos, Nigeria: Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.
- Alio, Kh. 2004. Préliminaires à une étude de la langue kajakse d'Am-Dam, de Toram du Salamaat, d'ubi du Guéra et de masraje du Batha-est. In Takács, G. (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) studies in memo-riam Werner Vycichl*, 229-285. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Alio, Kh. & Jungrauthmayr, H. 1989. *Lexique bidiya*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
- Barreteau, D. & Bléis, Y. 1990. *Lexique mafa: Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun*. Paris: ORSTOM, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Barreteau, D. & Jungrauthmayr, H. 1990. Les verbes monoradicaux dans les langues tchadiques. In Jungrauthmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.), *Études tchadiques: Verbes monoradicaux suivis d'une note sur la negation*

- en haoussa. *Actes de la XIIème réunion de Groupe d'Études Tchadiques LACITO-CNRS-PARIS*, 37-214. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Belova, A.G. 1992. La structure de la racine afroasiatique: Le cas d'extension phonétique. In Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E.R. & Thomanek, K.É. (eds.), *Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovsky anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags*, 15-20. Wien: Afro-Pub..
- Belova, A. & Homburg, J. & Kogan, L. & Kovalev, A. & Longinov, J. & Militarev, A., et al. 1994. Semitic anatomic lexicon: Body parts. MS. (Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 3 p. No proceedings were published.)
- Bender, M.L. 1971. The languages of Ethiopia: A new lexicostatistic classification and some problems of diffusion. *Anthropological Linguistics* 13(5). 165-288.
- Bender, M.L. 1975. *Omotic: A new Afroasiatic language family*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University.
- Bender, M.L. 1988. Proto-Omotic phonology and lexicon. In Bechhaus-Gerst, M. & Serzisko, F. (eds.), *Cushitic-Omotic. Papers from the First International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6-9, 1986*, 121-159. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Bender, M.L. 1994. Aroid (South Omotic) lexicon. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 38. 133-162.
- Bender, M.L. 1999. *The Omotic languages: Comparative morphology and lexicon*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Bender, M.L. 2003. *Omotic lexicon and phonology*. Carbondale: SIU Printing / Duplicating, Southern Illinois University.
- Bender, M.L. & Doornbos, P. 1983. Languages of Wadai-Darfur. In Bender, M.L. (ed.), *Nilo-Saharan language studies*, 42-79. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University.
- Biberstein Kazimirski, A. de. 1860. *Dictionnaire arabe-français*. Tomes I-II. Paris: Maisonneuve et C^{ie}.
- Blažek, V. 1989. Omotic lexicon in Afroasiatic perspective: Body parts cognates. MS. (Paper presented at the II. International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages (Torino, November 1989). 41 p.)
- Blažek, V. 1994. Elam: A bridge between Ancient Near East and Dravidian India? MS. (Paper presented at the 3rd World Archaeological Congress, New Delhi, December 1994. 26 p.)
- Blažek, V. 1999. Elam: A bridge between Ancient Near East and Dravidian India? In Blench, R.M. & Spriggs, M. (eds.), *Archaeology and language IV: Language change and cultural transformation*, 48-78. London & New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Blažek, V. 2008. A lexicostatistical comparison of Omotic languages. In Bengtson, J.D. (ed.), *In hot pursuit of language in prehistory: Essays in four fields of anthropology in honor of Harold Crane Fleming*, 57-148. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Burquest, D.A. 1971. *A preliminary study of Angas phonology* (Studies in Nigerian Languages 1.) Zaria: Institute of Linguistics; Kano: Centre for the Study of Nigerian Languages.
- CAD = *The Assyrian dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Since 1956. Glückstadt & Chicago: J.J. Augustin, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Caïtucoli, C. 1983. *Lexique masa*. Paris: Agence de Coopération Culturelle et Technique.
- Caprile, J.-P. 1975. *Lexique tumak-français (Tchad)*. Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- CD = Crum, W.E. 1939. *A Coptic dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CED = Černý, J. 1976. *Coptic etymological dictionary*. London, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Černý, J. 1958. Some Coptic Etymologies III. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 57. 203-213.
- Cerulli, E. 1938. *Studi etiopici*. II. *La lingua e la storia dei Sidamo*. III. *Il linguaggio dei Giangerò ed alcune lingue Sidama dell'Omo (Basketo, Ciara, Zaissè)*. Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cerulli, E. 1951. *Studi etiopici* IV. *La lingua caffina*. Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente.
- CLD I = Stolbova, O.V. 2005. *Chadic lexical database*. Issue I. L, N, NY, R. Kaluga: Poligrafiya.
- CLD VI = Stolbova, O.V. 2020. *Leksičeskaja baza dannyh po čadskim jazykam*. Vypusk VI. *Gubnyje b, f, p. / Chadic lexical database*. Issue VI. *Labials b, f, p*. Moskva: IV RAN, Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Vostokovedenija / Moscow: IV PAN (sic), Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Cohen, M. 1947. *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Colombel, V. de. 1982. Esquisse d'une classification de 18 langues tchadiques du Nord-Cameroun. In Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.), *The Chad languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigrific border area*, 103-122. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Cooper, K.N. 1984. *Lexique zime-français. Vūn tārī*. Sarh (Tchad): Centre d'Études Linguistiques.

- CT = Buck, A. de. 1935-1961. *The Egyptian Coffin Texts*. Vols. I-VII. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- DAFA = Blachère, R. & Chouémi, M. & Denizeau, C. & Pellat, Ch. 1967-1976. *Dictionnaire arabe-français-anglais (Langue classique et moderne)*. Tomes I-III. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.
- Dallet, J.-M. 1982. *Dictionnaire qabyle-français: Parler des At Mangellat (Algérie)*. Paris: SELAF (Société d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France).
- Delheure, J. 1984. *Dictionnaire mozabite-français*. Paris: Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologique de France (SELAF).
- DG = Erichsen, W. 1954. *Demotisches Glossar*. Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Diyakal, Ph. 1997. *Mushere-English dictionary*. Collection of words carried out by Mr. Ph. I. Diyakal started on September 10th, 1997 under the supervision of Herrmann Jungraithmayr (Univ. of Frankfurt). MS. 390 p.
- Diakonoff, I.M. 1984. Letter to the Conference. In Bynon, J. (ed.), *Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics*, 1-10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- D'jakonov, I.M. & Militarev, A.Ju. & Porhomovskij, V.Ja. & Stolbova, O.V. 1987. Obščefrazijskaja fonologičeskaja sistema. In Porhomovskij, V.Ja. (ed.), *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie: Problemy rekonstrukcii*, 9-29. Moskva: Nauka.
- D'jakonov, I.M. & Porhomovskij, V.Ja. 1979. O principah afrazijskoj rekonstrukcii (v svjazii s rabotoj nad sravnitel'no-istoričeskim slovarom). In *Balcanica. Lingvističeskie issledovanija*, 72-84. Moskva: Nauka.
- Djibrine, B.A.Z. & Montgolfier, P. de (etc.). 1973. *Vocabulaire dangaléat: Kawo danja*. (Place & publisher not indicated).
- DLE = Lesko, L.H. 1982, 1984, 1987, 1989. *A dictionary of Late Egyptian*. Vols. I-IV. Berkeley: B.C. Scribe Publications.
- DNWSI = Hoftijzer, J. & Jongeling, K. 1995. *Dictionary of North-West Semitic inscriptions*. Parts 1-2. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Dolgopol'skij, A.B. 1973. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika kušitskih jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Dolgopolsky, A. 1982. Chadic-Semitic-Cushitic: Epenthetic -γ- in Sura in the light of Hamito-Semitic comparative linguistics. In Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.), *The Chad languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigrific border area: Papers of the Marburg Symposium (1979, Berlin)*, 32-46. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Dolgopolsky, A. 1983. Semitic and East Cushitic: Sound correspondences and cognate sets. In Segert, S. & Bodrogligeti, A.J.E. (eds.), *Ethiopian studies dedicated to Wolf Leslau*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. 123-142.
- Dolgopolsky, A. 1987. South Cushitic lateral consonants as compared to Semitic and East Cushitic. In Jungraithmayr, H. & Müller, W.W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, 195-214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dolgopolsky, A. 1988. Semitic and East Cushitic: Word-initial laryngeals. In Taddese, B. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, University of Addis Ababa, 1984*, vol. 1, 629-637. Addis Ababa: Institute of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa.
- Dolgopolsky, A. 1989. On lateral obstruents in Hamito-Semitic. In Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.), *Reconstructing languages and cultures*, 99-103. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Dolgopolsky, A.B. 1990. On Chadic correspondences of Semitic *š. In Mukarovskij, H.G. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, Bd. 1, 213-225. Wien: Afro-Pub.
- DRB = Naït-Zerrad, K. Since 1998. *Dictionnaire des racines berbères (formes attestées)*. Paris & Louvain: Peeters. [Continuous pagination in the subsequent fascicles.]
- DRS = Cohen, D. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*. Fascicules 1-2 (1970-1976), Paris & La Haye: Mouton. Fascicule 3- (1993-): Leuven: Peeters. [With continuous pagination.]
- DUL = Olmo Lete, G. & Sanmartín, J. 2003. *A dictionary of the Ugaritic language in the alphabetic tradition*. Part One [ʔ(a/i/u)-k]. Part Two [-z]. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- EAAN I = Takács, G. 2016. *Etyma Afroasiatica nova: Roots with initial labials (*b-, *p-, *f-, *m-)*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ebobisse, C. 1979. *Die Morphologie des Verbs im Ost-Dangaleat (Guera, Tschad)*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ebobisse, C. 1987. *Les verbaux du dangaléat de l'est (Guera, Tchad): Lexiques français-dangaléat et allemand-dangaléat*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- EDE I = Takács, G. 1999. *Etymological dictionary of Egyptian*. Volume One: A phonological introduction. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

- EDE II = Takács, G. 2001. *Etymological dictionary of Egyptian*. Volume Two: *b-, p-, f-*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Ehret, Ch. 1979. Omotic and the subgrouping of the Afroasiatic language family. In Hess, R.L. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Ethiopian Studies. Session B. April 13-16, 1978, Chicago, Illinois, USA*, 51-62. Chicago: Office of Publications Services, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.
- Ehret, Ch. 1980a. *The historical reconstruction of Southern Cushitic phonology and vocabulary*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ehret, Ch. 1980b. *Kw'adza vocabulary*. MS. Los Angeles, California, IV + 17 p.
- Ehret, Ch. 1995. *Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian): Vowels, tone, consonants, and vocabulary*. Berkeley – Los Angeles, California: University of California.
- Ehret, Ch. 1997. (Additions to the Afroasiatic reconstructions.) MS. Los Angeles, California.
- Ehret, Ch. 2000. (Additions to the Afroasiatic reconstructions.) MS. Los Angeles, California.
- Ehret, Ch. & Ali, M.N. 1984. Soomaali classification. In Labahn, T. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Somali Studies*, vol. 1, 201-269. Hamburg: Buske Verlag.
- Ember, A. 1920. The etymological equivalent in Egyptian of Hebrew ḥāzē, “breast”. *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 325. 63-64.
- ESS = Ember, A. 1930. *Egypto-Semitic studies*. Leipzig: The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.
- Farah, M.A. & Heck, D. 1993. *Somali Wörterbuch*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Fédry, J. (avec la collaboration de Khamis, J. & o/Nedjei, M.). 1971. *Dictionnaire dangaleat (Tchad)*. Lyon: Afrique et Langage. (Thèse de 3^{ème} cycle, Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales.)
- Fédry, J. 1977. Aperçu sur la phonologie et la tonologie de quatre langues de groupe «mubi-karbo» (Guera) (dangaléat-est, dangaléat-ouest, bidiyo, dyongor). In Caprile, J.-P. (ed.), *Études phonologiques tchadiennes*, 87-112. Paris: Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.
- Fitzpatrick, J.F.J. 1910-1911. Some notes on the Kwolla District and its tribes. *Journal of the Royal African Society* 10. 16-52, 213-22.
- Fleming, H.C. 1969. Asa and Aramanik: Cushitic hunters in Masai-Land. *Ethnology* 8(1). 1-36.
- Fleming, H.C. 1974. Omotic as an Afroasiatic family. *Studies in African Linguistics. Supplement* 5. 81-94.
- Fleming, H.C. 1976a. Omotic overview. In Bender, M.L. (ed.), *The non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*, 299-323. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Fleming, H.C. 1976b. Kefa (Gonga) languages. In Bender, M.L. (ed.), *The non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*, 351-376. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Fleming, H.C. 1992. Omotic and Cushitic: A reply to Lamberti. *Anthropos* 87. 520-525.
- Fleming, H.C. 1993. Second reply to Lamberti. *Anthropos* 88. 557-558.
- Fleming, H.C. & Bender, M.L. 1976. Non-Semitic languages. In Bender, M.L. & Bowen, J.D. & Cooper, R. & Ferguson, Ch. (eds.), *Language in Ethiopia*, 34-58. London: Oxford University Press.
- Foucauld, Ch. de. 1951-2. *Dictionnaire touareg-français, dialecte de l'Ahaggar*. Vols. I-IV. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France.
- Foulkes, H.D. 1915. *Angass manual: Grammar, vocabulary*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
- Frajzyngier, Z. 1985. *A Pero-English and English-Pero vocabulary*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Frajzyngier, Z. 1991. *A dictionary of Mupun*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Fronzaroli, P. 1964. Studi sul lessico comune semitico. II. Anatomia e fisiologia. *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XIX, fasc. 7-12. 243-280.
- GB = Gesenius, W. (bearbeitet von Buhl, F.). 1962. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Unveränderter Neudruck der 1915 erschienenen 17. Auflage. Berlin – Göttingen – Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- GHwb = Hannig, R. 1995. *Grosses Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800-950 v. Chr.)*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Gochal, G. 1994. *A look at Shik Ngas*. Jos: Jos University Press.
- Gordon, C.H. 1955. *Ugaritic manual*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Gordon, C.H. 1965. *Ugaritic textbook*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Gragg, G. 1982. *Oromo dictionary*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University.
- Gray, L.H. 1933. Notes étymologiques sur les “verbes faibles” en hébreu biblique. *Archiv Orientalní* 5. 124-130.

- Greenberg, J.H. 1955. *Studies in African linguistic classification*. Branford, Connecticut: Compass Publishing Company.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1963. The languages of Africa. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 29.
- Hayward, R.J. 1982. Notes on the Koyra language. *Afrika und Übersee* 65. 211-268.
- Hayward, D. (= R. J.). 1984. *The Arbore language: A first investigation including a vocabulary*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Hayward, R.J. 1987. Terminal vowels in Omotic nominals. In Jungrauthmayr H. & Müller, W.W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, 69-109. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hayward, R.J. 1990. Notes on the Aari language. In: Hayward, R.J. (ed.), *Omotic language studies*, 263-299. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- HCVA I-V = Diakonoff, I.M. & Belova, A.G. & Militarev, A.Ju. & Porhomovskij, V. Ja. & Stolbova, O.V. (only in part I). 1993-1997. Historical comparative vocabulary of Afrasian. Parts 1-5. *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 2-6.
- Hellwig, B. 2000. *Goemai – English – Hausa dictionary*. MS. Draft. Printed out on 20 August 2000. 42 p.
- Hoffmann, C. 1955. Zur Sprache der Cibak. In Lukas, J. (ed.), *Afrikanistische Studien*, 118-143. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Holma, H. 1911. Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen: Eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie. *Suomalaisen Tiedekatemian Toimituksia*, sarja B, nid. 7. No. 1. 1-183.
- HSED = Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V. 1995. *Hamito-Semitic etymological dictionary*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Hudson, G. 1989. *Highland East Cushitic dictionary*. Hamburg: Buske.
- IL = Institute of Linguistics. 1972. *Bauchi Area survey report presented by N. Campbell and J. Hoskison*. MS. Zaria.
- JHUC = Johns Hopkins University Circulars.
- Johnstone, T.M. 1977. *Ḥarsūsi lexicon*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, T.M. 1981. *Jibbāli lexicon*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, T. M. 1987. *Mehri lexicon*. London: University of London.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1962a. *Wörterbuch der Angas-Sprache*. MS.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1962b. *Wörterbuch der Goemay-Sprache*. MS.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1963. Die Sprache des Sura (Maghavul) in Nordnigerien. *Afrika und Übersee* 47. 8-89, 204-220.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1970. *Die Ron-Sprachen: Tschadohamitische Studien in Nordnigerien*. Glückstadt: Verlag J.J. Augustin.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1973. *Masa (Bongor) Lexicon*. MS. Marburg (now in Frankfurt).
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1978. The Zime dialect cluster (“Kado”, “Dari”) in Southern Chad: Its verbal aspect system. *Afrika und Übersee* 61(1). 1-27.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1990a. *Lexique mokilko*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. 1990b. *Lexique mubi-français (Tchad oriental)*. MS. Frankfurt a/M. 50 p.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. (in collaboration with N.A. Galadima and U. Kleinewillinghöfer). 1991. *A dictionary of the Tangale language (Kaltungo, Northern Nigeria) with a grammatical introduction*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. & Adams, A. 1992. *Lexique migama*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. & Ibrizimow, D. 1994. *Chadic lexical roots*. Vol. II. *Documentation*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. & Shimizu, K. 1981. *Chadic lexical roots*. Vol. II. *Tentative reconstruction, grading and distribution*. Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Kaplony, P. 1969. Das Hirtenlied und seine fünfte Variante. *Chronique d'Égypte* 44. 27-59.
- KB = Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W. 1994-2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*. Vols. I-V. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- KHW = Westendorf, W. 1977. *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kidda, M.E. 1985. *Tangale phonology: A descriptive analysis*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Kleinewillinghöfer, U. 1990. Monoradical verbs in Waja. In Jungrauthmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.), *Études tchadiques: Verbes monoradicaux suivis d'une note sur la negation en haoussa. Actes de la XIIème réunion de Groupe d'Études Tchadiques LACITO-CNRS-PARIS*, 229-241. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

- Kogan, L.E. 2009. Semitskie jazyki. In Belova, A.G. & Kogan, L.E. & Lëzov, S.V. & Romanova, O.I (eds.), *Jazyki mira: Semitskie jazyki: Akkadjiskij jazyk, Severozapadnosemitskie jazyki*, Moskva: Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Jazykoznanija, 15-112.
- Kogan, L. 2011. 6. Proto-Semitic phonetics and phonology. In Weninger, S. (chief ed.) in collaboration with Kahn, G. & Streck, M.P. & Watson, J.C.E. (eds.), *Semitic languages: An interntional handbook*, 54-151. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kossmann, M. 1999. *Essai sur la phonologie du proto-berbère*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Kraft, Ch.H. 1981. *Chadic wordlists*. I-III. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Lamberti, M. 1991. Cushitic and its classifications. *Anthropos* 86. 552-561.
- Lamberti, M. 1992. Zu Sasses Rezension des dritten Bandes der Reihe 'Studia Linguarum Africae Orientalis': Kuliak und Cushitic erschienen 1988 bei Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag Heidelberg. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 28. 187-195.
- Lamberti, M. 1993a. *Die Shinassha-Sprache: Materialien zum Boro*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lamberti, M. 1993b. *Materialien zum Yemsa*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lamberti, M. 1993c. Omotic and Cushitic: A reply to Fleming. *Anthropos* 88. 555-557.
- Lamberti, M. & Sottile, R. 1997. *The Wolaytta language*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Lane, E.W. 1863-93. *An Arabic-English lexicon*. Vols. I-VIII. London & Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.
- Lanfry, J. 1973. *Ghadames*. II. *Glossaire*. Alger: Le Fichier Periodique.
- Leslau, W. 1938. *Lexique soqofri (sudarabique moderne), avec comparaisons et explications étymologiques*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Leslau, W. 1959. *A Dictionary of Moča (Southwestern Ethiopia)*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Leslau, W. 1987. *Comparative dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Lukas, Johannes. 1937. *Zentralsudanische Studien* (Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde von der Hansischen Universität, Reihe B, Band 45/24). Hamburg: Friedrichsen, de Gruyter & Co.
- Lukas, J. 1941. *Deutsche Quellen zur Sprache der Musgu in Kamerun*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Lukas, J. 1964. Das Hitkalanci, eine Sprache um Gwoza (Nordostnigerien). *Afrika und Übersee* 48. 81-114.
- Lukas, J. 1974-1975. Studien zur Bade-Sprache (Nigeria). *Afrika und Übersee* 58(2). 82-105.
- Lukas, R. 1968. Das Nomen im Bade (Nordnigerien). *Afrika und Übersee* 51. 91-116, 198-224.
- Müller, F. 1886. Die Musuk-Sprache in Central-Afrika: Nach den Aufzeichnungen von Gottlob Adolf Krause herausgegeben. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse* 112(1). 353-421.
- Netting, R.M. 1967. *Kofyar vocabulary*. MS.
- Newman, P. 1974. *The Kanakuru language*. Leeds: The Institute of Modern English Language Studies, University of Leeds in association with The West African Linguistic Society.
- Newman, P. 1977. Chadic classification and reconstructions. *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5(1). 1-42.
- Newman, P. & Ma, R. 1966. Comparative Chadic: Phonology and lexicon. *Journal of African Languages* 5(3). 218-251.
- Ormsby, G. 1912-1913 & 1913-1914. Notes on the Angass language. *Journal of the Royal African Society* 12 (1912-1913). 421-424 & 13 (1913-1914). 54-61, 204-210, 313-315.
- Parker, E.M. & Hayward, R.J. 1985. *An Afar-English-French dictionary (with grammatical notes in English)*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Prasse, K.-G. & Alojaly, Gh. & Mohamed, Gh. 1998. *Lexique touareg-français*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, Université de Copenhague.
- Prasse, K.-G. & Alojaly, Gh. & Mohamed, Gh. 2003. *Dictionnaire touareg-français (Niger)*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen.
- Rapp, E.L. & Benzing, B. 1968. *Dictionary of the Glavdá language*. Frankfurt am Main: Bible Society Frankfurt am Main.
- Reinisch, L. 1888. Die Kafa-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. II. Kafa-Deutsches Wörterbuch. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Classe* 116. 251-386.
- Reinisch, L. 1895. *Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache*. Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Reinisch, L. 1902. *Die Somali-Sprache*. Bd. II. *Wörterbuch*. Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Ricks, S.D. 1982. *A lexicon of Epigraphic Qatabanian*. Berkeley, California: Graduate Theological University, Berkeley, California. (Doctoral dissertation.)

- Roper, E.-M. 1928. *Tu Beḍawīe: An elementary handbook for the use of Sudan government officials*. Hertford: Stephen Austin & Sons.
- Rossing, M.O. 1978. *Mafa-Mada: A comparative study of Chadic languages in North Cameroun*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-Madison. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Sachnīne, M. 1982. *Dictionnaire lamé-français: Lexique français-lamé*. Paris: SELAF.
- Sasse, H.-J. 1979. The consonant phonemes of Proto-East-Cushitic (PEC). *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7(1). 1-67.
- Sasse, H.-J. 1981. Neue Perspektiven im Afroasiatischen? In Jungraithmayr, H. & Miede, G. (eds.), *Berliner Afrikanistische Vorträge: XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Berlin 24.-29. März 1980*, 145-165. (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A, Band 28). Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Sasse, H.-J. 1990. Rezension zu: 'Lamberti, Marcello: Kuliak and Cushitic: A Comparative Study. *Studia Linguarum Africae Orientalis* Bd. 3. Heidelberg, 1988.' *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 21. 165-168.
- Sauneron, S. 1964. Remarques de philologie et d'étymologie (§§26-35). *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* (Le Caire) 62. 15-31.
- Schuh, R.G. 1978. *Bole-Tangale languages of the Bauchi area (Northern Nigeria)*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Schuh, R.G. 1981. *A dictionary of Ngizim*. Berkeley, California: University of California.
- SED I = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A. (with assistance of Belova, A. & Kovalev, A. & Nemirovskaja, A. & Nosnitsyn, D.). 2000. *Semitic etymological dictionary*. Vol. I. *Anatomy of man and animals*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Shimizu, K. 1978. The Southern Bauchi group of Chadic languages: A survey report. *Africana Marburgensia*. Special Issue 2. 1-50.
- SIFKJa = Dolgopol'skij, A.B. 1973. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika kušitskich jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Sirlinger, E. 1946. *An English-Goemay dictionary*. Jos, Nigeria: Prefecture Apostolic of Jos.
- SISAJa I-III = D'jakonov, I.M. & Belova, A.G. & Četveruhin, A.S. & Militarev, A.Ju. & Porhomovskij, V.Ja. & Stolbova, O.V. 1981-1986. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskich jazykov*. Vypusk 1-3. Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XV-XIX godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR. Moskva: Nauka.
- Skinner, N. 1996. *Hausa comparative dictionary*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Stolbova, O.V. 1977. Opyt rekonstrukcii verhnepzapadnočadskih kornej. In *Jazyki zarubežnogo Vostoka. Sbornik statej*, 152-160. Moskva: Nauka.
- Stolbova, O.V. 1987. Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika i slovar' zapadnočadskih jazykov. In Porhomovskij, V.Ja. (ed.), *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie: Problemy rekonstrukcii*, 30-268. Moskva: Nauka.
- Takács, G. 1997. The common Afrasian nominal class marker *h. *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 2. 241-273.
- Takács, G. 1999a. *Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) comparative-historical linguistics in Russia and the former Soviet Union*. München, Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, G. 1999b. Sibilant and velar consonants of South Cushitic and their regular correspondences in Egyptian and other Afro-Asiatic branches. In Lamberti, M. & Tonelli, L. (eds.), *Afroasiatica Tergestina. Papers from the 9th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Trieste, April 23-24, 1998. Contributi presentati al 9^o Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semítica), Trieste, 23-24 Aprile 1998*, 393-426. Padova: Unipress.
- Takács, G. 2000a. South Cushitic consonant system in Afro-Asiatic context. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61. 69-117.
- Takács, G. 2000b. Compensatoric lengthening of *ā in East Cushitic: Some marginal etymological notes. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61. 197-204.
- Takács, G. 2000c. The origin of Ahaggar h in an Afro-Asiatic perspective. In Chaker, S. & Zaborski, A. (eds.), *Études berbères et chamito-sémitiques: Mélanges offerts à Karl-G. Prasse pour son 70^e anniversaire*, 333-356. Paris & Louvain: Éditions Peeters.
- Takács, G. 2001a. Towards Proto-Afro-Asiatic phonology: Ancient remnants in South Cushitic, Angas-Sura, and North Bauchi. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 54(2). 55-125.
- Takács, G. 2001b. A Rendille dictionary and Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics (Review Article). Review of Pillingier, S. & Galboran, L.: *A Rendille Dictionary Including a Grammatical Outline and an English-Rendille Index*. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 65. 265-269.
- Takács, G. 2002a. Ma'a lexicon and Afro-Asiatic III. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 55(1). 109-133.
- Takács, G. 2002b. Mokilko and Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 44. 145-161.
- Takács, G. 2003. South Cushitic sibilant affricates in a comparative-historical perspective. In Bender, M.L. (chief ed.) & Appleyard, D. & Takács, G. (eds.), *Selected comparative-historical Afrasian linguistic studies*

- in memory of Igor M. Diakonoff* (Lincom Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 14), 143-162. München & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, G. 2004a. *Comparative dictionary of the Angas-Sura languages*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Takács, G. 2004b. Ahaggar **h** and Ghadames **b** in an Afro-Asiatic perspective. In: Isaksson, B. & Laanata-Aringberg, M. (eds.), *About the Berbers: History, language, culture, and socio-economic conditions*, 31-65. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Takács, G. 2005a. Problems of Afro-Asiatic historical phonology: Ancient remnants of sibilant affricates in South Cushitic and Chadic. In Fronzaroli, P. & Marrassini, P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 10th Meeting of Hamito-Semitic (Afroasiatic) Linguistics (Florence, 18-20 April 2001)* (Quaderni di Semitistica 25), 65-83. Firenze: Dipartimento di Linguistica, Università di Firenze.
- Takács, G. 2005b. Recent problems of Semitic-Egyptian and Semito-Cushitic and -Chadic Consonant correspondences. In Olmo Lete, G. del (ed.), *Proceedings of the Barcelona Symposium on Comparative Semitic (19-20 November 2004)*, *Aula Orientalis* 23(1-2). 207-231.
- Takács, G. 2005c. New progress in the reconstruction of Southern Cushitic: Review of Kießling, Roland: Die Rekonstruktion der südkuschitischen Sprachen (West-Rift), Von den systemlinguistischen Manifestationen zum gesellschaftlichen Rahmen des Sprachwandels (Kuschitische Sprachstudien Band 19, Köln, 2002., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag) and Kießling, Roland & Mous, Maarten: The Lexical Reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic (Kuschitische Sprachstudien Band 21, Köln, 2004., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag). *Lingua Posnaniensis* 47. 213-225.
- Takács, G. 2006. Tamazight lexicon and its Afro-Asiatic background: The evidence of root-initial **ǧ**- and **z**-. In Allati, A. et al. (eds.), *Linguistique amazighe: Les nouveaux horizons. Actes du Colloque international: 17, 18, 19 février 2005*, 48-63. Tétouan: Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Tétouan, Université Abdelmalek Essaâdi.
- Takács, G. 2009a. Dangla-Migama and Afro-Asiatic II: Bidiya **č**- and **ž**-. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 51. 119-124.
- Takács, G. 2009b. Ma'a Lexicon and Afro-Asiatic IV: Ma'a **š**-. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 51. 125-131.
- Takács, G. 2009c. South Cushitic sibilant affricates in a comparative-historical Afro-Asiatic perspective II. In Monti, A. & Minetti, F. & Gallucci, F. (eds.), *Eastern perspectives: From Qumran to Bollywood*, 135-142. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Takács, G. 2009d. Mubi-Toram lexicon in Chadic and Afro-Asiatic perspective I: Initial ***b**-. *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hung.* 62(3). 315-336.
- Takács, G. 2009-2010. Dangla-Migama and Afro-Asiatic I: Bidiya **b**-. *Folia Orientalia* 45-46. 133-148.
- Takács, G. 2010. The Afro-Asiatic background of South Cushitic ***ḥ**, ***ḥ**, ***ʕ**, ***h**, and ***ʔ**. *Journal of Linguistic Relationship* 4. 91-122.
- Takács, G. 2011. *Studies in Afro-Asiatic comparative phonology: Consonants*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Takács, G. 2012. Agaw lexicon and its Cushitic and Afro-Asiatic background. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 65(2). 85-118.
- Takács, G. 2013. Musgu and Masa **h**- vs. **ḥ**- and Afro-Asiatic. In Ibriszimow, D. & Tourneux, H. & Wolff, E. (eds.), *Topics in Chadic linguistics: Papers from the 6th Biennial International Colloquium on Chadic Languages, Villejuif, Sept. 22-23, 2011*, 153-184. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Takács, G. 2015. Archaeologia Afroasiatica I: Disintegration of the parental language. *Mother Tongue* 20. 1-15.
- Takács, G. 2018. Methodological problems of Egyptian etymology. *Comptes Rendus du GLECS* 35/2002-2018. 235-295.
- Takács, G. 2022. Omotic lexicon in its Afro-Asiatic setting V: Addenda to Omotic ***ḃ**-, ***pʃ**-. *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hung.* 75(4). 651-708.
- Thiene, G. da. 1939. *Dizionario della lingua Galla con brevi nozioni grammaticali*. Harar: Vicariato Apostolico.
- Torczyner, H. 1912. Besprechung von Holma, H.: Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 66. 767-771.
- Tourneux, H. 1978. *Le mulwi ou vulum de Mogroum (Tchad): Langue du groupe musgu – famille tchadique*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS).
- Tourneux, H. 1991. *Lexique pratique du munjuk des rizières: Dialecte de Pouss*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Tourneux, H. & Seignobos, Ch. & Lafarge, F. 1986. *Les Mbara et leur langue (Tchad)*. Paris: Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.
- Ward, W.A. 1978. *The four Egyptian homographic Roots b3*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

-
- Wedekind, K. 1990. Gimo-Jan or Ben-Yem-Om: Benč-Yemsa phonemes, tones, and words. In Hayward, R. (ed.), *Omotic language studies*, 68-141. London: SOAS.
- WUS = Aistleitner, J. 1963. *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse 106(3).
- Zaborski, A. 1989. Der Wortschatz der Bedscha-Sprache: Eine vergleichende Analyse. In Schuler, E. von (ed.), *XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg: Ausgewählte Vorträge*, 573-591. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.