



# SPRACHE UND ORALITÄT IN AFRIKA

Frankfurter Studien zur Afrikanistik

begründet von Herrmann Jungraithmayr

## **Neunundzwanzigster Band**

Herausgegeben von

Rainer Voßen und Rudolf Leger

in Verbindung mit

Luc Bouquiaux (Paris) und W. J. G. Möhlig (Köln)

Die Reihe »Sprache und Oralität in Afrika« hat zwei Schwerpunkte, auf die ihr Name ausdrücklich hinweist: Sie konzentriert sich auf die Erforschung und Beschreibung afrikanischer Sprachen und bemüht sich gleichzeitig um die in Afrika immer dringlicher werdende Dokumentation der mündlich überlieferten Literaturen. Afrikas Vergangenheit, seine geistigen und sozialen Institutionen, die rechtlichen und religiösen Lebensformen und -inhalte, Poesie und Musik sind Bestandteile der ungezählten Gedächtniskulturen dieses im Übergang zur Schriftlichkeit befindlichen Kontinents. Die geistige Welt des Afrikaners erschließt sich daher wesentlich aus der oralen Überlieferungstradition. Dabei sind Stil und Technik der noch heute vom »L'homme de paroles« (C. Hagège) praktizierten Mündlichkeit durchaus derjenigen früher europäischer Barden und Sänger vergleichbar. »Sprache und Oralität in Afrika« hat sich die Aufgabe gestellt, bei der Rettung afrikanischen Geisteserbes mitzuhelfen und es wissenschaftlich zu dokumentieren.

DIETRICH REIMER VERLAG BERLIN

GÁBOR TAKÁCS

ETYMA AFROASIATICA NOVA

Roots with Initial Labials

(\*b-, \*p-, \*f-, \*m-)

2016

DIETRICH REIMER VERLAG BERLIN

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung/  
Printed with support from Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung

Dem Andenken der größten, jüngst gegangenen Geister der vergleichenden Semito-  
hamitistik (Afroasiatistik) gewidmet:

Devoted to the memory of the greatest minds of comparative Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-  
Hamitic) studies recently gone:

I. M. Diakonoff (1915–1999)  
W. Vycichl (1909–1999)  
M. L. Bender (1934–2008)  
A. B. Dolgopolsky (1930–2012)  
A. Zaborski (1942–2014)  
H. C. Fleming (1926–2015)

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;  
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2016 by Dietrich Reimer Verlag GmbH

Printing: Beltz Bad Langensalza GmbH, Bad Langensalza

© 2016 by Dietrich Reimer Verlag GmbH  
[www.reimer-verlag.de](http://www.reimer-verlag.de)  
All Rights reserved

Printed in Germany  
Printed on age-resistant paper

ISBN 978-3-496-01558-1

## Contents

Introduction ... 6

Structure of the lexicon ... 7

Principles of the root reconstruction ... 7

Transcription symbols ... 8

    Consonants ... 8

    Vowels ... 9

    Diacritical signs with vowel letters ... 9

    Transliteration and transcription of Egyptian ... 9

    Other symbols ... 10

Abbreviations of languages ... 11

Abbreviations of technical terms and certain expressions ... 14

Abbreviations of author names ... 15

AA \*b- ... 18

AA \*p- ... 74

AA \*f- ... 97

AA \*P- ... 110

AA \*m- ... 119

Quoted literature ... 203

## Introduction

Comparative-historical Afro-Asiatic linguistics has undergone a significant development since the appearance of „*Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*” (1947), a fundamental synthesis by M. Cohen<sup>1</sup> concluding the first period of the research on Afro-Asiatic lexical comparison, which was hallmarked by the so-called "old school" of Egypto-Semitic comparison (A. Ember, F. von Calice and others).<sup>2</sup> During the next period (second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century), whose beginning was hallmarked by the names of J.H. Greenberg and I.M. Diakonoff, a huge quantity of new lexical material from the entire Afro-Asiatic macrofamily (both descriptive and comparative) has been published, including a few most recent attempts at compiling an Afro-Asiatic comparative dictionary (either unfinished or rather problematic), where a revolutionary progress both in quality and quantity was achieved between the 1970s and 1990s by the extremely productive Russian team of comparative linguists headed by Prof. Diakonoff,<sup>3</sup> while the separate enterprise by Ch. Ehret (1995) suffers from fundamental methodological problems.<sup>4</sup> Towards the end of this period, the Russian linguists laid a solid foundation for many of the basic consonantal correspondences among the Afro-Asiatic branches. In this domain, especially worthy are the refreshingly original results on interbranch comparison by A.B. Dolgopolsky and O.V. Stolbova, which I have also been practising since 1998.<sup>5</sup>

During my research (ongoing since 1994) for the „*Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*” (EDE II-III), I have collected a very large number of new AA parallels, which – to the best of my knowledge – have not yet been proposed by others in the literature. In 1999, I have also started collecting new AA roots not yet attested in Egyptian for a separate catalogue of Afro-Asiatic roots from the beginning of my Humboldt research fellowship at the Institut für Afrikanische Sprachwissenschaften of the J. W. Goethe University at Frankfurt a/M (1999-2000 and 2002) under the guidance of Prof. H. Jungraithmayr. In 2002, I started to publish the new Afro-Asiatic lexical correspondences in the series of papers called „*Lexica Afroasiatica*”, the first eight issues<sup>6</sup> of which were devoted to new Afro-Asiatic roots with initial labials (\*b-, \*p-, \*f-, \*m-). As I had long since basically abandoned researching the roots with initial labials in the past decade and moved on to the Afro-Asiatic lexical stock with the subsequent articulation places for my databases, it seemed appropriate to collect all the new results of my series "Lexica Afroasiatica" with initial labials revised, updated, corrected and rearranged in a single volume called „*Etyma Afroasiatica Nova*”.<sup>7</sup> However, it is by no means the first volume of an Afro-Asiatic comparative lexicon, for which the time has definitely not yet come as yet. I only intended to present additional material that might later serve as the basis of a new and really comprehensive synthesis.

Today – after the devastating loss of giants like I. M. Diakonoff (1915-1999), W. Vycichl (1909-1999), M. L. Bender (1934-2008), A. B. Dolgopolsky (1930-2012), A. Zaborski (1942-2014), H. C. Fleming (1926-2015), to whose blessed memory I dedicate this lexicon – there are hardly more than half of a dozen of scholars worldwide (H. Jungraithmayr, A. Ju. Militarev, O. V. Stolbova, A. G. Belova, R. M. Voigt, H. Satzinger, V. Blažek, C. Peust, myself) who still actively cultivate and understand the research of comparative-historical Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) phonology and lexicon, which has become by now a seriously endangered domain lacking even the necessary infrastructure and thus also the frames of instructing the successors. May this volume gain new friends for the study of the linguistic macrofamily with the greatest written past in world history.

Balatonederics, June 2016

Gábor Takács

<sup>1</sup> A concise evaluation of the AA lexicons has been published by myself (Takács 2011, 8-9).

<sup>2</sup> Fundamentally, at that time, only Semitic and Egyptian were compared, while in the rest of our macrofamily just a few selected Berber and Cushito-Omotoc were sometimes considered. Chadic was mostly neglected except for the rare inclusion of Hausa. For more characteristics of this period cf. EDE I 2-4.

<sup>3</sup> The team elaborated a few AA roots with initial labials, dentals as well as sibilants (followed by a labial) published in three slim fascicles in Russian in the 1980s (SISAJa I-III), which were extended and brought up-to-date in the 1990s in an English version (HCVA I-V). A member of that team, namely O. V. Stolbova, greatly exploiting the materials of the D'jakonov team, ventured to compile a new comparative dictionary (HSED) in collaboration with V. É. Orel, an Indo-European linguist. The methods of the latter enterprise received harsh criticism (for more details on this cf. Takács 2011, 9, esp. fn. 23).

<sup>4</sup> As for the problems with this work in general cf. Takács 2011, 9 and fnn. 24-25. These methodological pitfalls of Ehret's material are demonstrated in my study „Methodological Problems of Egyptian Etymology” forthcoming in *Comptes Rendus du GLECS* (Paris) 35 (2003-2006), which is in fact still to be published. This paper contains also a critical analysis of several HSED entries.

<sup>5</sup> More on this principle and their results are to be found in Takács 2011, 19.

<sup>6</sup> Part I (AA \*b-) in: *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 67 (2002), 103-151 (this very useful and flexible journal of African linguistics ceased to exist shortly thereafter, unfortunately). Part II (additional roots with AA \*b-) in: Kogan, L. (ed.): *Orientalia: Papers of the Oriental Institute, Issue III: Studia Semitica*, Moscow, 2003., Russian State University for the Humanities, pp. 331-348. Part III (AA \*p-) in: Takács, G.: *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl*, Leiden, 2003., E. J. Brill, pp. 510-550. Part IV (AA \*f-) in: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae* 57/4 (2004), 457-473. Part V (AA \*p- and \*P-) in: *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 9 (2004), 159-178. Part VI (AA \*m- + dentals, palatals, laterals, velars, pharyngeals, and laryngeals) in: *Lingua Posnaniensis* 54/1 (2012), 99-132. Part VII (AA \*m- + sonorants) in: Takács, G. (ed.): *Semitic-Hamitic Festschrift for A. Dolgopolsky and H. Jungraithmayr*, Berlin, 2008., Dietrich Reimer Verlag, pp. 310-336. Part VIII (additional roots with \*m-) in: *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 62/2 (2009), 26-125. Cordial thanks are due to Dr. L. Kogan (Russian State University for the Humanities), P. Radder (Brill, HdO), Prof. I. Vásáry (chief ed. of *Acta Or. ASH*), Profs. S. Wiertlewski and K. Stroński (chief ed. and ed., resp., of LP), Prof. M. Dziekan (chief ed. of RO) for their kind permission and consent to use those materials substantially rearranged, extended, corrected, updated here in this volume.

<sup>7</sup> Thanks are due to Prof. R. Voßen (Institut für Afrikanistik, J. W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main) for inventing this final title of the volume as well as for accepting it for publication in the series „*Sprache und Oralität in Afrika*”. I am greatly indebted to my dear senior friend and colleague, Prof. H. Jungraithmayr (*ibidem*) for all his teaching about Chadic and his support over the past two decades or so.

## Structure of the lexicon

Each etymological entry is headed by the proposed PAA root (as tentatively reconstructed by myself). If a root is only attested in Semitic, Egyptian or Berber, the proto-form is labelled NAA, whereas if merely in Cushitic, Omotic and Chadic, the root will only be considered as SAA.<sup>8</sup> Author names or other source names – mostly in an abbreviated form<sup>9</sup> – are placed after the quoted linguistic forms in square brackets [] if attached to just one single form and in round brackets () if the quoted work pertains to more than one form in the quoted group of languages.

The lexical data in the individual lexicon entries have been arranged in the order of the current classification of the Afro-Asiatic daughter languages<sup>10</sup> into five (or six) equivalent branches:<sup>11</sup> (1) Semitic, (2) Egyptian, (3) Berber, (4) Cushitic, (5) Omotic,<sup>12</sup> (6) Chadic. The number of vertical strokes indicates the closeness of the language units from which data are quoted: ||| separate branches (the 6 largest units within the family), || groups (such as East vs. South Cushitic or West vs. East Chadic), while | divides data from diverse sub-groups (e.g., Angas-Sura vs. North Bauchi within West Chadic).

At the end of the entries I am listing the works where the quoted comparanda have already been equated. I did my best to find an overlapping with the existing Afro-Asiatic dictionaries. On the other hand, in some rare cases, I also noted when I observed an AA parallel independently from other scholars.

## Principles of the root reconstruction

Since we know little about the Proto-Afro-Asiatic vowel system, the list of the proposed proto-forms (even the nominal roots)<sup>13</sup> is arranged according to consonantal roots in the order of the place of articulation beginning from the labials down to the laryngeals.

The lexical parallels are reconstructed here within the frame of my working hypothesis based on the preliminary results achieved by I.M. Diakonoff's Russian team in reconstructing the Afro-Asiatic consonantal inventory and correspondences<sup>14</sup> as well as on my own observations refining the Russian results, which I have recently summarized elsewhere in a separate book.<sup>15</sup> The most important results discussed therein (q.v.) can be briefly summed up as follows.

The PAA labial triad of \*b, \*p, \*f remained unchanged in Egyptian, South Cushitic, and Chadic. I keep abstaining from assuming a common AA \*p̥ as the Russian team had long suggested, since the evidence adduced in favour of it is not yet sufficient, but I do not definitively exclude its acceptance later either. The PAA dental series \*d, \*t, \*t̥ was kept as such by Semitic and South Cushitic. AA \*t̥ continued as \*d̥ in Berber, Cushitic and Chadic, but was divided into t vs. d in Egyptian. The fine distinction between the various sibilant affricates and spirants (AA \*c, \*ʒ, \*ç, \*s, \*č, \*ʒ, \*ç, \*š, \*ç, \*ç̥, \*š̥) was best preserved in Semitic, South Cushitic and West Chadic (while some of these phonemes merged in other groups). The Russian scholars assumed a triad of postvelar (uvular) stops with a voiceless spirant counterpart: \*g, \*q̥, \*q, and \*h̥, to which \*ɣ may be added.<sup>16</sup> Their distinction of which was retained in Cushitic and Chadic, whereas all these merged in one common \*h̥ in Semitic and Egyptian. In a number of cases, however, it is still difficult to exactly reconstruct the root consonants on the basis of the available cognates (esp. when these are from the modern branches, e.g., Berber, Cushitic-Omotic, or Chadic). In such cases, the corresponding capitals are used (denoting only the place of articulation).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>8</sup> For the NAA vs. SAA dichotomy with further literature see Takács 2015.

<sup>9</sup> A key to these abbreviations is given below.

<sup>10</sup> Originating from J. H. Greenberg (1955; 1963) and I. M. Diakonoff (1965).

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed list of all the AA daughter languages cf. EDE I 9-34.

<sup>12</sup> Sometimes conceived as West Cushitic (e.g. in the works by A. Zaborski or M. Lamberti).

<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, occasionally when it was possible to establish the root vowel, the vocalised root is given additionally in round brackets.

<sup>14</sup> Available in (or better: sometimes just extractable from) a number of publications. Cf. Diakonoff 1984; 1988, 34-41; 1992; Diakonoff et al. 1987; 1993; SISAJa I-III; HCVA I-V. As for Semitic vs. PAA cf. SED I lxvii-cxxviii; for Berber vs. PAA cf. Militarev 1991, 238-249; for East Cushitic vs. Semitic cf. Dolgopolsky 1983; for Chadic cf. Stolbova 1996 as well as her new sketch of Chadic historical phonology published most recently in her „*Chadic Etymological Dictionary*” (Moscow, 2016., Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, pp. 28-45), not yet available for me before finishing the manuscript of this lexicon, which I am going to evaluate for the journal „*Linguistique & Langues Africaines*” later. Beside the Russian results on the AA historical phonology, I regard those published on the Berber *Lautgeschichte* by M. Kossmann (1999), on Bedawye by V. Blažek (in various papers), on Agaw by D. Appleyard (2006), on East Cushitic by H.-J. Sasse (1979), on Omotic by M. L. Bender (2003) as fundamental and to be followed. On the other hand, unfortunately, I have had to treat the results on the East and Southern Cushitic historical phonology by Ch. Ehret (1991 and 1980, resp.) as well as those by P. Newman (1966 jointly with R. Ma and 1977 alone) in the Chadic domain with reservation and cautiousness.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. my recent monograph on the comparative-historical phonology of Afro-Asiatic consonants (Takács 2011), which collects together my pilot studies into interbranch comparison from the past decade or so.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. my lengthy paper devoted to Semitic ghayin with a demonstration of the reflexes of a distinct PAA \*ɣ in the Egyptian, Berber, Cushitic, and Chadic branches (Takács 2011, 139ff.).

<sup>17</sup> E.g., the symbol (\*P-) signifies any unknown initial labial, just as, e.g., \*T stands for any unknown dental stop (\*d, \*t or \*t̥) or \*K for any unknown velar stop (\*g, \*k or \*k̥) or \*Q for any unknown postvelar/uvular (\*g, \*q or \*q̥), while \*H for any laryngeal or pharyngeal (\*ʔ, \*h, \*c̥, \*h̥, also \*ɣ).