

Gábor Takács, A First Look at O.V. Stolbova's „Chadic Etymological Dictionary” (2014)

In the vast, still mostly unexplored field of reconstructing the historical phonologies of the Afro-Asiatic branches (Semitic, Egyptian, Berber, Cushitic, Omotic, and Chadic), the sixth branch poses probably the most difficult task: the quantity (around 170) and the diversity of the Chadic daughter languages is all too enormous to overcome. Chadic was only integrated in Afro-Asiatic comparative research in the second half of the 20th century thanks to J.H. Greenberg (1955; 1958; 1963; 1965). In the second half of the 20th century, only very few scholars, actually just four (!), namely V.M. Illič-Svityč (1966), P. Newman (1966 jointly with R. Ma; 1977), O.V. Stolbova (since the 1970s), and H. Jungraithmayr (1981 jointly with K. Shimizu; 1994 jointly with D. Ibrizimow), had devoted themselves to elaborating the Common Chadic *Lautgeschichte*.

O.V. Stolbova's first attempt at surveying the Chadic historical phonology (1996) was followed by the multi-volume Chadic Lexical Database (CLD I–IV), so far the most comprehensive collection of Chadic roots, from which now she extracted those with Afro-Asiatic background for the present volume under review. The aim of this book is no more than „to compile a body of Chadic roots with reliable Afrasian parallels, which could serve as a constituent part of a new Afrasian etymological dictionary” (p. 21) as the author formulated, who dedicated her new volume to the memory of her old master in Moscow from the late 1960s and early 1970s, late A.B. Dolgopolsky (p. 5),¹ one of the most original minds of modern Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistic research.

The scope of this review only allows me to outline my first general impressions gained at the first reading, leaving a detailed examination of the so numerous etymological entries out of the space limitations for another, much lengthier review article for later.² Thus, it has been out of my scope to verify the validity of this or that point in Stolbova's conception of the Chadic *Lautgeschichte* and confront these with mine as such a discussion requires much more room. Instead, here, assuming that the author's system is correct and works, I have been focusing to check out how, by what means she brought about what she had conceived.

Exceptionally, I have to begin with the strange, not at all reader-friendly outer form of Stolbova's work that the reader has to penetrate for grasping the point. One needs vading through an unexpected mass of mess before one can really conceive the very important contents. All this is due to the author's habit,

¹ Both scholars, viz. Stolbova and Dolgopolsky, had worked some time ago at the Institute of Linguistics (Sector of African Languages) of the Soviet/Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. For more on Dolgopolsky's person and work, cf., e.g., Shevoroshkin 2002; Takács 2008; 2009 and 2012.

² A very much shortened version of this article is scheduled to appear in *Linguistique & Langues Africaines* 3 (2018).

namely that – as we can read on p. 3 in Russian (!) – „*Работа публикуется в авторской редакции*”, i.e., „*The present work is published as edited by the author*”, who has clearly not been able to practise the necessary control.

The surprises begin already on the book's covering, where, just like in the impressum (p. 3), we find almost all the bibliographical details of the English book only in Russian, including the title: „*Этимологический словарь чадских языков*”, which is only translated into English on the inner title page (p. 1). Over almost the whole book (up to p. 391), however, almost the whole text runs in English and only the meanings of the reconstructed Proto-Chadic roots are translated into Russian also. The list of abbreviations (p. 20) is written in Russian. The list of abbreviations of grammatical terms (p. 22), in turn, is already again in English. A charming culmination of this language mixture is heading one of the subtitles (p. 31): „2б. (sic instead of 2b.) *Intervocalic position*”, i.e., Cyrillic numeration + English title ... Then, at the end of the book, the abundant and pretty substantial commentaries to the individual etymological entries (pp. 392–415) are written exclusively ... again in Russian. Noteworthy, many places of this Russian text have been corrected manually (!) after the printing of the book – presumably, not just in the copy I possess, which may have cost the author a rather time-consuming job. But at least she checked the Russian part even if after the printing. Finally, the „Contents” (p. 416) are ... again in English.

The inexactitude of the author in handling and quoting the various foreign forms, as in some former works of her, also here is unfortunately simply catastrophic. There are so many orthographical mistakes that my first impression was implying the question: has Stolbova or anyone else ever re-read the English text?³ Right in the beginning („*Acknowledgements*”, p. 4), she misquoted 4 foreign personal names at a time, namely those of her closest colleagues,⁴ and kept this habit manifold further on.⁵ She has also fundamental problems with common foreign words, esp. the German ones.⁶ How she was quoting even

³ I am afraid, this might be asked also about her earlier volumes (1996, CLD).

⁴ Tourneaux (sic: -eaux) for Tourneux (twice on p. 4), Djakonoff (sic: a sort of mixture of the Russian form Дьяконов = D'jakovon vs. the English version Diakonoff) for either D'jakovon or Diakonoff (p. 4), Václaw (sic: -w for -v) Blažek (p. 4).

⁵ E.g., Mwaghawvul (sic: -wv-) for Mwaghavul (p. 7), Wolff (sic: double -ll- and one -f) for Wolf (p. 8), D. Inrshimov (sic: -nr-, -sh- and -v, three rude errors in one word!) for D. Ibrizimov (p. 9), Würstburg (sic: -rstb-) instead of Würzburg (p. 9), Egguchi (sic: -gg-) for Eguchi (p. 10), Gieder (sic: -ie- and -d-) for Giger (p. 11), de Gröter (sic: -ö-) for Gruyter (p. 14), Welbeque (sic: -l- and -q- and -e) for Weibegué (p. 18), R. Shuh (sic: Sh- without -c- inbetween) for R. G. Schuh (p. 27), G. (sic: G. for J. H.) Greenberg (p. 29), G. Takács (sic: -cz, p. 46) and G. Takasz (sic: -asz, p. 350, fn. 72) for G. Takács.

⁶ E.g., Bibliotheca (sic: -te- without -h-) for Bibliotheca (p. 11), Gebrochenes (sic, -es) Plurale (p. 12), Schriften (sic: -ff-) for Schriften (p. 13), Examining (sic: -ming) for Examining (p. 14), Frankfurter Afrikanische (sic: without -sti- and with -sck-) Blätter for Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter (p. 16),

the year of publication, is sometimes also unreliable.⁷ Equally puzzling is why she allows an inconsequent variation of capitals and small letters in the quoted titles.⁸ That the definite vs. indefinite articles are regularly left out in her English text⁹ may be understood as being due to the strong influence of her Slavonic mother tongue and not because of an incomplete English training. It has not been my task to collect all these cases, which could be enumerated further on. In any case, normally this quantity would be really disturbingly numerous even for a philologically less-oriented work. I wonder after all this how one can hope for an adequate exactitude in the treatment of linguistic forms.

The chapter on the „*Classification of Afrasian Languages*” (pp. 22–27) has hardly anything new except for some precious comments on the alternative names of certain Chadic languages. All the more original looks the chapter „*Chadic phonological reconstruction*”¹⁰ (pp. 28–45), where Stolbova follows the *Lautverschiebungen* of the supposed Proto-Chadic consonants into certain (but by far not all) daughter languages. Doing so, she has become the third researcher in the history of Chadic comparative studies to come up with a new system of consonantal reconstruction.¹¹ Unfortunately, this chapter does not fulfil certain fundamental expectations.

First of all, the most serious deficiency is, in my view, that, in spite of more than four decades’ of intensive research, focusing solely on Chadic consonantism, Stolbova once again failed to establish a comprehensive overview

trahea (sic: -ah-) for trachea (p. 153, #280), Gerauch (sic: -a- and -ch) for Geräusch (p. 153, #280), Inscripten (sic: scr- and -p-) for Inschriften (p. 161, #303), hochfarend (sic: -ar-) for hochfahrend (p. 200, #418), rauch o/ä (sic: -ch, o/ä) for rauh o. ä. (p. 200, #418), fisher (sic: -sh-) for French ficher (p. 220, #471), beacoup (sic: -eac-) for beaucoup (p. 284, #646), Sonnengot (sic: single -t in the Auslaut) for Sonnengott (twice on p. 284, #646), als vierfachen (sic: -n) Teil for vierfacher (p. 284, #646), Gütes (sic: -ü-) for Gutes (p. 303, #696).

⁷ The „Сравнительно-историческая фонетика и словарь западночадских языков” dates not from 1986 (as on p. 6), but 1987. EDE is often misquoted as TAS (in her abbreviation), i.e., Takács 2004 (e.g., p. 239, #529; p. 278, #631).

⁸ Like „*The Proto-Afrasian Farming Lexicon. In: Examining (sic: -ming) the farming language dispersal hypothesis*” (p. 14) or „*A brief note on the Maha Language (sic: L-)*” (p. 15), „*Dictionnaire Pratique (sic) du Musey*” (p. 16). The list of abbreviations written in Russian (p. 20) also contains the same chaos of initial capitals vs. small letters: афразийский, Аккадский (sic: A-), Арабский (sic: A-), берберский, Египетский (sic: E-), кушитский, семитский, чадский. The list of abbreviations of grammatical terms (p. 22), in turn, which is already again in English, has all terms beginning with small letters except for Caus. (sic: C-) – for some unknown reason.

⁹ E.g., „*The binary system ... preserves in most of Central Chadic languages ...*” (p. 29); „*Alternatively, Chadic (sic) root may be cognate with ...*” (p. 200, #418).

¹⁰ So, avoiding capitals after the first word unlike in the preceding chapter title (p. 22).

¹¹ J.H. Greenberg (o.c.) usually worked with the method of „mass comparison” except for his masterful study from 1958 demonstrating and proving the regular correspondences of the initial labials (b-, p-, f-) in the Chadic and Egyptian roots for the first time in the history of Chadic linguistics, whereas V.M. Illič-Svityč (1966) only examined some of the Chadic roots with initial labials, esp. *b-

of the *Lautverschiebungen* in all the groups (let alone the daughter languages) in the very detail. Her 2016 survey is nothing but a broader version of her 20 years old, very sketchy „*Studies in Chadic Comparative Phonology*” (1996), extended by several exciting details. All in all, however, she failed to accomplish the desirable „step-by-step” reconstructions in all the subgroups (p. 28). Stolbova herself (p. 46) declared: „*the framework of the present project does not include reconstructions at the group level ...*” We will, of course, have no reliable PCh. until we have to rely on *ad hoc* asterisked forms. It is just this book where at last the solid bases could have been elaborated. This not being the case here, we have to wait for a new and comprehensive treatise.

Secondly, one may definitely miss here an overview and critical evaluation of the two other alternative attempts at reconstructing Proto-Chadic consonantism by P. Newman (1966 jointly with R. Ma; 1977 alone) and H. Jungraithmayr (jointly with D. Ibriszimow, 1994 I xix–xxxii). Just a few hints on Newman’s results are scattered in some of the footnotes (e.g., 15, 16) in spite of the author’s allegation that „*The results acquired in historical (sic) research of Chadic phonology and lexicon ...¹² were taken into account, especially – „sound laws”, described in [Nm 13–19]*” (pp. 21–22).

Thirdly, even more disturbing is here the total lack of any reference to two most recent (2014) basic tools on the phonological and lexical reconstruction of Central Chadic (the subbranch posing perhaps the most serious difficulties) by R. Gravina, whose preliminary research results in this domain were well-known in our field and available also online, who also presented at the Chadic gatherings Stolbova also used to attend.¹³ Why these fundamental results were ignored by her, is puzzling.

Another disappointment of the present historical phonology is that hardly any examples are adduced for the suggested consonantal shifts, which diminishes the credibility of Stolbova’s model. To check back every single allegation requires a comprehensive review. It is only possible here to touch upon just a couple of problems ignored by the author. It is hard to agree, e.g., with her allegation that „*The emphatic dental *t̥- is practically totally lost in Chadic languages, it is only preserved in a small number of roots in WCh 4*” (p. 30), i.e., North Bauchi. It is a pity that the 3 cases of AS *t̥- reflecting AA *t̥- (and not plain *t-) escaped Stolbova’s attention (cf. Takács 2005, 51, fn. 6). Another disprovable assumption is that „*An emphatic velar is registered in some sources on the Goemay language (WCh 2). However, according to prof. C. Hoffman (sic: -n) ...*

¹² Here, she listed in general works (abbreviated) by authors like Greenberg, Mouchet, Jungraithmayr, Hoffmann, Newman, Tourneux, Skinner, Schuh, Gravina, Takács.

¹³ She only quoted R. Gravina’s wordlists and his 2007 brief pilot presentation on his CCh. reconstructions, but ignored his milestone book on Proto-Central Chadic as well as his Central Chadic reconstructions online – both from 2014, let alone all other studies by him available online (<http://leidenuniv.academia.edu/RichardGravina>).

these languages (sic) have undergone the following consonant shift: ... voiceless initials (k and s) have become emphatic" (p. 37), which hardly agrees with the convincing evidence of 8 cases of AS *k- < AA *k- (not plain *k-) collected by G. Takács (2005, 51–52, fn. 6). I have to disagree also with Stolbova's statement that „*The general tendency for loss (sic) of sibilant (sic) affricates ended in the *ʒ > *z- change as early as the Proto-Chadic level, while ʒ in the languages of the Central (sic: C-) branch is an allophone of *ʒ- before -a-, -ə-, -u-*” (p. 31), which is not entirely true, since *ʒ-, albeit it must have been a rare phoneme, but must have existed as such in Proto-Chadic, for which some years ago I have found a pretty solid piece of evidence, viz. the CCh. reflexes (with *ʒ-) of AA *√ʒ(w)ʔ „1. to hit, 2. kill”, also *√ʒgm „shoulder”, *√ʒk „to sit” (cf. Takács 2011, 121–123).

The etymological entries from ʔ- to ž/ǰ- (pp. 47–391) represent, in fact, mostly just a selection from the author's previous (and forthcoming) CLD volumes, which will have to be reviewed and verified in detail separately, not here. This corpus, just like CLD, is full of exciting new Chadic and Afro-Asiatic etymologies, which cannot be praised enough for making Stolbova, in spite of all deficiencies listed above and below, the most productive author of Chadic comparative-historical linguistics of all times. In this review, I can only examine certain remarkable tendencies.

First of all, I often miss the punctual quotation of the authentic sources in the square brackets for the masses of lexical items. Sometimes, words are quoted „second-hand” from collections like JI 1994 („[JgIb]”) or Takács 2004 („[TAS]”), which is insufficient.

The author assumed such a wide range of PCh. root varieties with suspiciously similar or same sequences of homorganic consonants and with the same basic senses (with just a poor reflection in AA) that I keep wondering: are all these forms really not sprung ultimately from the same common source (as usually supposed in Chadic studies) and is this strange multiplication but the failure of Stolbova's model? For instance, she declared of her Ch. *hVrVm- „crocodile” (p. 172, #332): „*According to my understanding, this Ch root cannot be considered an integral part of Ch *kVdVm- 'crocodile'. Lenition (sic) of two consonants of one and the same root is doubtful*”. For her, e.g., ECh.: Lele urmo „crocodile”, whose initial Ø- cannot be traced back to PCh. *k- in her hypothesis, is more probably a reflex of *hVr-m- with an equally hypothetical and hardly explainable root extension *-m- (arbitrarily segmented by Stolbova), which would be rather akin to ECu.: Gollango hár-o „crocodile” [AMS] with no C₃. The Chadic words for the basic sense „to steal”, in turn, she traced back to four distinct PCh. roots, viz. *kVr- (p. 210, #445), *γV(ʔV)r- (p. 152, #278), Ch. *hVr- (p. 179, #358), CCh. *ñVl- (p. 157, #293). The problem is: why aren't there hardly any overlapping reflexes of these diverse „variant” roots

in the same daughter languages, i.e., why are the reflexations of the diverse varieties mostly complementing one another?

In some other cases, Stolbova's etymologies are untenable for phonological reasons. Her nowhere attested PCh. **ʔarnVb-* (sic) „hare” (p. 52, #11) is based only on Hausa *ánákóó* and her assumption that it is a metathesis of **nVbVr- > *bVr-* everywhere else. Akk. *annabu* < *arnabu* proves nothing about Hausa, where the author failed to quote any support for **ʔarnau-k- < *ʔarna-b-k-* (!) with two alleged suffixes (**-b-* and **-k-*) of animal names. I am afraid, this remains purely a product of imagination with no evidence. Stolbova's comparison of Ch. **čVr-* „(to shoot an) arrow” (p. 86, #111) with SCu.: *Dahalo tār-o* „spear” [EEN] is shocking. One can hardly agree with her ill-founded argument that „*Dahalo ṭ < AA *č happens rather regular* (sic)” (ibidem) regarding Ch. Ehret's (1980, 168–172) abundant material to SCu. **t*, where just the opposite is demonstrated, let alone that Ehret (1980, 169, #7) convincingly traced the *Dahalo* form back to SCu. **tār-* „to spear, pierce with a weapon”. Ch. **čVw/y-* „to fish” (p. 78, #87), i.e., **√čw*, can evidently have nothing in common with Sem.: Akk. *ašāšu* „to catch (in a net)” [CAD] and NOm.: *Yemsa ešš-* „to fish” [Lmb.] < **√HSS*, let alone SCu.: *Dahalo ta^c-ād-* „to trap” [EEN], in which neither of the radicals agree. Ch. **hVw/y/ʔ-* „to pour (liquid), flow”, which Stolbova (p. 162, #305) linked to Sem. **√hy^c* „to flow”, can hardly be the etymon for WCh.: *Siri h^wi* „rain”, cf. CCh.: *Hitkala ḡayùkù* „Regen” [Lukas 1964, 107] ||| Eg. *ḥw.t ~ ḥj.t* „Regen” (PT-, Wb III 49) ||| Sem.: Ar. *ḡayāʔ-* „pluie (rain)” [BK I 523; Lane 681].¹⁴ Ch. **k^wV(k)-* „(to make) hot, warm” (p. 196, #406) is surprisingly combined with Sem.: Ar. *√ʔkk* and *√^ckk* instead of the true cognate: Sem. **√kwy > *-kwy-* „bruciare (tr.)” [Frz. 1971, 636, #7.58]. Neither Ch. **nVs-* „to rest” (p. 267, #604) nor Ar. *√nws* can have anything in common with Sem.: Akk. *nēšu(m)* < *neʔāšum* < Oakk. *naʔāšum* (*√nʔ_{3/4}ʔš*) „(auf)leben, genesen” [AHW 783]. Stolbova ignored the Semitological research, e.g., W.F. Albright (1927, 208), who equated the Akk. root with Ar. *na^caša I* „relever qqn. qui a trébuché ou qui est tombé” [BK II 1294]. All these evidently favour Sem. **√n^cš*, which does not agree with the Ch. root, which, instead, is presumably identical with ECu. **nass-/ness-* „to breathe, rest” [Sasse 1979, 23].¹⁵ Stolbova's equation of her Ch. **zVʔ-* „to exist, last” (p. 338, #787) with Bed. *sāʔ* „sich setzen, sitzen, bleiben” [Rn. 1895, 194] = *sʔ(a)* „to sit (down)” [Roper 1928, 229] is doubtful not only semantically, but also because she failed to evidence her daring allegation that Bed. „*s-* regularly reflects AA **z-*”.¹⁶ In fact, we have

¹⁴ For Eg.-Sem. cf. Ember 1916, 74; ESS §14.a.15 (contra GÄSW 176, #713); Militarev 1987, 105; Blažek 1989, 205.

¹⁵ Although H.-J. Sasse (1979, 59) postulated an ECu. **nafs-/nafs-* with regard to Saho *-mfes/-mfis-* (prefix verb) [Rn.].

¹⁶ Moreover, V. Blažek (2007, 130, §§17–20) demonstrated, on the contrary, that ECu. **z-* is reflected by Bed. *d-*, ECu. **z-* by Bed. *-y-*, whereas Bed. *s-* and *-s-* = ECu. **s-* and **-s-*, resp.

here two clearly distinct AA roots. The Ch. root was apparently $*\sqrt{3w}$. The Beja one, in turn, is the intr. reflex of AA $*\sqrt{s}$ „to set, put” [GT].¹⁷

Semantically unconvincing etymologies also abound. The reflexes of Ch. $*\check{c}Vn-$ „to understand, explain, hear” (!) (p. 90, #124) can be classed, in fact, in at least three groups, viz. (1) CCh. $*\sqrt{c}n$ „to hear” → „to understand” vs. (2) WCh.: Angas čan „to interpret” vs. (3) WCh.: Mushere čiin „discussion, plan”. Only the latter may be akin to Sem. $*\sqrt{t}nn$ „to think” and NOm.: Wolayta činč- „to be clever” [Lmb.]. Stolbova’s Ch. $*\check{c}Vr-$ „1. to be clever, 2. surpasser (sic: -er)” (p. 85, #110) includes at least two distinct AA roots, one cognate with Sem.: Ar. $\sqrt{r}tr$ „se proposer qqch., projecter” [BK] and another one Ar. $\sqrt{r}tr$ „surpasser qqn. en qqch.” [BK]. Akk. šurū „to teach, instruct” [CAD] hardly belongs here (cf. below). It is a pity that the author adduced no parallels for the semantic links between „to be clever(er)” vs. „to generate ideas” (!) vs. „to explain, instruct”. Instead of Eg. šsr „Ausspruch, Gedanke” (Wb) add Eg. s33 „weise sein, verstehen” (PT-, Wb IV 16, 2-6), s3r „klug sein” (NK, Wb IV 18, 11). This Eg.-Ch. isogloss is to be separated from Ch. $*\check{c}V(w/\sqrt{V})r-$ „(to) plan, predict”, which may be akin to Eg. sr „vorhersagen, verkünden” (PT-, Wb IV 189–190). Stolbova’s PCh. $*\check{f}Vy-$ „to be meaningless, empty, idiot” (p. 154, #283) might be better segmented into at least 3 distinct roots: (1) WCh.: Tangale gáayi ~ káayi „empty, naked, nothing, vain, useless” [Jng.] may belong rather to Sem. $*\sqrt{h}wy$ „empty” [GT], whereas (2) PMasa $*\check{h}oy$ „1. drunken, 2. fool” [GT] is identical with ECu.: Gollango ḥayy-ōḍ- „betrunken sein”, ḥayy-āmpakkó „Trunkenbold” [AMS 1980, 204],¹⁸ from which (3) Masa ḥay „hésiter, être embarrassé” [Ctc. 1983, 87] ||| Sem.: Ar. $\sqrt{h}yy$ I: ḥayya „2. rougir, avoir honte”, X „1. rougir, avoir honte de qqch., 2. ne pas oser faire qqch., par pudeur ou réserve” [BK I 522–3] should be separated. Stolbova admitted a cognacy of Ch. $*\check{h}V\sqrt{y/w}-$ „to rise, high” (p. 163, #307) with Eg. h3j (misquoted by her as „erabsteigen”, sic: er- for her-!), which is out of the question here semantically, with the condition „if” the Eg. -3- < AA $*-\sqrt{?}$ -, which is possible, of course as the true cognates indicate.¹⁹ She perhaps misunderstood German „herabsteigen”, the true sense of Eg. h3j (Wb II 472). I am puzzled how Stolbova’s WCh. $*[\check{h}]Vm-$ „to harvest” (p. 177, #352) can have anything in common with SCu.: Iraqw ḥamḥám (misquoted by her as ḥāmḥám) „very much” [MQK 2002, 48].

¹⁷ As cognate with Sem.: Hbr. $\sqrt{š}wy$ „1. hinstellen, hinlegen, 2. machen, hervorbringen” [GB 813] ||| Eg. s.t „Sitz, Wohnsitz, Platz, Stelle” (PT-, Wb IV 1–6) ||| SCu. $*sa$ „in place of” [Ehret 1980, 178] ||| Ch. $*sə$ „to put” [Newman 1977, 30].

¹⁸ As I pointed out elsewhere (Takács 2013, 163).

¹⁹ E.g., SCu.: PRift $*hu\sqrt{?}$ - „to fall” [GT pace Ehret 1980, 381]. Cf. Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 66, thence HSED #1163 and EDE I 145 for further possible cognates from Sem., Brb., WCh. indicating an AA root variety $*\sqrt{h}(w)y$ „to fall”. The comparison of Eg. h3j vs. Sem. $*\sqrt{h}wy$ „to fall” has a long history (cf. EDE l.c.), but a direct equation is impossible due to Eg. -3- ≠ Sem. $*-w-$.

[BK], whose basic sense is: „monter sur une hauteur” [BK]. Ch. *gVw/y- „to speak” (p. 114, #180) is combined with Eg. *dwj*, which, however, denotes „rufen” (Wb) and not „to say”! Ch. *γVy/?- „compound, house” (p. 145-146, #257) can have nothing in common with Eg. *hw.t* „1. der Palast des Königs, 2. Heiligtum” (MK, Wb III 247, 1-2), which originates from Eg. *√hwj* „schützen, behüten, heilig” (PT-, WB III 244-245). No link between Ch. *γVf- „to be very ill, weak” (p. 148, #264) and Ar. *√hf* I „1. être saisi de vertige”, whose basic sense can be better grasped from the glosses (not quoted in this Chadic Etymological Dictionary) like I „2. porter à qqn. un coup de sabre”, IV „abattre” [BK I 602-603]. No comparison of CCh. *γVIVm- „boat” (p. 149, #267) with Eg. *hmn.tj* „Art Schiff” (OK-, Wb III 283, 5) can be made as the latter term evidently derives from the Eg. numeral *hmn* „8”. It is impossible to understand the equation of CCh. *γVm- „enemy” (p. 149, #269.a) with some alleged Eg. *jhm* „Bezeichnung der Feinde” (XVIII.), quoted by the author from Wb I 50 (sic), since on that page of the Berlin Wb, only words like *jwjw* and *jw^o* are listed, whereas on p. 125, Stolbova’s ghost-word is not listed among under *jhm*.²² Any connection between Ch. *hwVy-/ *hVy- „kind of corn (millet)” (p. 165, #310.b) vs. Eg. *o^ht* „Getreide: Gerste (?)” (MK, Wb I 205, 10) is excluded, since the latter is merely a development from Eg. *√o^h* „to live”.²³ Ch. *kVI- „(newborn) child, animal” (p. 229-230, #502) and its AA kindred have nothing to do with Late Eg. *qnj* (misquoted as *klj*, sic: -l!) „Kind auf den Schenkeln seiner Mutter” (XXII., Wb), which is in fact nothing but a metaphoric use of *qnj* „Schoß” (MK-, Wb IV 50-51), which, besides, actually never had *-l.²⁴ Stolbova’s comment on of the *comparanda* to Ch. *nVdVw/H- „to fall, throw, sit down” (p. 262-263, #589) is revealing: „Strangely enough, in [EDE I 318] Eg. *ndy* ‘niederwerfen’ is considered cognate ... also with Arab *nadān*- (sic!) ... The latter is a derived noun (cf. Sem. *ndn ‘to give’), which is a fatal mistake of Stolbova, who misunderstood the Ar. form. Sem. *√ndn did not leave a reflex in Arabic, where the root in question was in fact *√ndy*. She evidently did not bother to check the word in the lexicons in the original Arabic script: *√ndy* > *nadān* (not *nadān*-!) „8. générosité, 10. tout ce qui arrive à qqn. de la part de qqn.” [BK II 1230] = „bounty, liberality, a gift” [Lane 3030].²⁵

Under the rather rough surface there hides a precious material, there is no doubt. But editing the highly exciting immense material would have deserved

²² She may have presumably distorted Eg. *hmj.w* „Bez. für böse Wesen (GR: als Feinde der Tempel)” (BD-, Wb III 281, 6-7), which is nothing but a participle of *√hmj* „1. Häuser umstürzen, 2. jem. angreifen (Feinde, die Bösen), 3. jem. treffen (Ünglück, Böses)” (PT-, Wb III 281).

²³ For this semantic shift cf., e.g., Hungarian *élet* „life” → „grain” (first attested from 1584, cf. MNYTESz I 736).

²⁴ Cf. Cpt. (SF) *κοῦν*= „Schoß” (Vergote 1973 Ib, 47, §39; NBÄ 366).

²⁵ By the way, Stolbova’s only reference for the Eg.-Sem. equation is „*Djak 1967*” (sic, no p. no.) although there were, in fact, many others before him since A. Ember (listed in EDE I.c.).

much more care and all this perhaps should not have been published in this hasty manner. More serious editorial work should have been invested in order to make the text consumable for a wider audience not familiar with this field narrower as well as Russian and to improve the little credibility of the quoted data, which should have been treated carefully and re-checked attentively. This volume doubtlessly signifies a progress in terms of quantity, but hardly in quality as compared with the author's preceding works. Whether we really have here a coherent synthesis is a question that may only be answered in a more detailed review article after thorough checking back of all the individual etymological entries and their dubious details.

But all this does not diminish my admiration of Olga Stolbova as an outstanding researcher in our neglected and endangered domain.²⁶ She is a scholarly personality of great controversies. On the one hand, she has always surprised me by her quick publication of hastily composed works containing sometimes awkwardly grave errors, quite a lot of misunderstood and misquoted forms in the foreign languages, which are rather risky to be used for unexperienced readers. As a source, her unchecked materials are for me sometimes unreliable and are to be handled with the greatest of caution. A serious researcher is supposed to work more thoroughly and precisely. Reading Stolbova requires certain extra capacities, patience and tolerance. But it is worth, on the other hand. I have to suppose behind these etymologies a tremendous amount of diligent work. Paradoxically, it is just those few insiders of AA etymology who can really appreciate her ideas. She is undoubtedly the most original and most productive one of the very few masterminds of recent Chadic phonological and lexical reconstruction, a highly diligent and capable worker with ingenious insights into the *Lautgeschichte*, for which her old master, the great comparativist, Aharon Dolgopolsky (1930–2012) should also be praised.

Abbreviations of languages

AA: Afro-Asiatic, Akk.: Akkadian, Ar.: Arabic, BD: Book of the Dead, Bed.: Bed'awye, Brb.: Berber, Ch.: Chadic, CCh.: Central Chadic, CT: coffin texts, Cu.: Cushitic, E: East(ern), ECh.: East Chadic, ECu.: East Cushitic, Eg.: Egyptian, GR: Greek and Roman period, Hbr.: Hebrew, HECu.: Highland East Cushitic, LECu.: Lowland East Cushitic, LP: Late Period, Med.: medical texts, MK: Middle Kingdom, N: North(ern) or New/Neo-, NBrb.: North Berber, NEg.: Neo-Egyptian, NK: New Kingdom, NOm.: North Omotic, O: Old, OEg.: Old Egyptian, OK: Old Kingdom, Om.: Omotic, PCh.: Proto-Chadic, PCu.: Proto-Cushitic, PT: pyramid texts, S: South(ern), SBrb.: South Berber, Sem.: Semitic, Ug.: Ugaritic, W: West(ern), WCh.: West Chadic.

²⁶ More on this endangered status of comparative Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) linguistics, one can find in the bitter preface of my *„Etyma Afroasiatica Nova I”* (Berlin, 2016., Dietrich Reimer Verlag, p. 6).

Abbreviations of author names

Alb.: Albright, AMS: Amborn, Minker, Sasse, BK: Biberstein Kazimirski, Blz.: Blažek, Ctc.: Cañtucoli, Djk.: D'jakonov, Ehr.: Ehret, Frz.: Fronzaroli, GB: Gesenius and Buhl, Grb.: Greenberg, GT: Takács, IS: Illič-Svityč, Ji: Jungraithmayr & Ibriszimow, JS: Jungraithmayr & Shimizu, Lks.: Lukas, Lmb.: Lamberti, Mlt.: Militarev, MQK: Mous, Qorro, Kießling, NM: Newman & Ma, Nwm.: Newman, Rn.: Reinisch, Rpr.: Roper, Ss.: Sasse, Vrg.: Vergote, Zbr.: Zaborski.

Literature

- AHW = Soden, W. von: Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. I–III. Wiesbaden, 1965–1981., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Albright, W. F.: Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. III.= Journal of the American Oriental Society 47 (1927), 198–237.
- Amborn, H.; Minker, G.; Sasse, H.-J.: Das Dullay. Materialien zu einer ostkuschitischen Sprachgruppe. Berlin, 1980., Reimer Verlag.
- Biberstein Kazimirski, A. de: Dictionnaire arabe-français. Paris, 1860., Maisonneuve & Co. Editeurs.
- Blažek, V.: Lexica Nostratica. Addenda et Corrigenda I.= Archív Orientální 57 (1989), 201–210.
- Blažek, V.: A New Contribution to Comparative-Historical Afrasian Linguistics.= Asian and African Studies 24 (1989), 203–222.
- Blažek, V.: Beja Historical Phonology: Consonantism.= Amha, A.; Mous, M.; Savà, G. (eds.): Omotic and Cushitic Language Studies. Papers from the Fourth Cushitic-Omotic Conference. Leiden, 10–12 April 2003. Köln, 2007., Köppe. Pp. 125–156.
- CAD = The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Vol. 1–21. Glückstadt & Chicago, Since 1956, J.J. Augustin, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Cañtucoli, C.: Lexique masa. Paris, 1983., Agence de Coopération Culturelle et Technique.
- CLD I = Stolbova, O.V.: Chadic Lexical Database. Issue I. L, N, NY, R. Kaluga, 2005., Poligrafija.
- CLD II = Stolbova, O.V.: Chadic Lexical Database. Issue II. Lateral Fricatives ɬ, ɮ, ɮ with Semitic, Egyptian and South Cushitic Parallels. Moscow-Kaluga, 2007., „Polygrafija”.
- CLD III = Stolbova, O.V.: Chadic Lexical Database. Issue III: Sibilants and Sibilant Affricates s, z, c, č, ċ, ž. Moscow, 2009., Institut Vostokovedenija.
- CLD IV = Stolbova, O.V.: Chadic Lexical Database. Issue IV: Velars. Moscow, 2011., Institut Vostokovedenija.
- Conti, G.: Arcaismi in eblaita.= Fronzaroli, P. (ed.): Studies on the Language of Ebla. Firenze, 1984., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 159–172.
- D'jakonov, I.M.: Jazyki Drevnej Perednej Azii. Moskva, 1967., Nauka.
- DUL = Olmo Lete, G. & Sanmartín, J.: A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One [ʔ(a/i/u)-k]. Part Two [l-z]. Leiden, 2003., E.J. Brill.
- EDE I = Takács, G.: Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume One: A Phonological Introduction. Leiden, 1999., E.J. Brill.
- EDE II = Takács, G.: Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume Two: b-, p-, f-. Leiden, 2001., E.J. Brill.
- EDE III = Takács, G.: Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume Three: m-. Leiden, 2008., E.J. Brill.
- Ehret, Ch.: The Historical Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic Phonology and Vocabulary. Berlin, 1980., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

- Ehret, Ch. & Elderkin, E.D. & Nurse, D.: Dahalo Lexis and Its Sources.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 18 (1989), 5–49.
- Ember, A.: The Etymological Equivalent in Egyptian of the Common Semitic Word for „Life”.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 19 (1916), 72–74.
- ESS = Ember, A.: *Egypto-Semitic Studies*. Leipzig, 1930., The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.
- Fronzaroli, P.: Studi sul lessico comune semitico. VII. L'alimentazione.= *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XXVI, fasc. 7–12* (1971), 603–642.
- GÄSW = Calice, F. von: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- GB = Gesenius, W. (bearbeitet von Buhl, F.): *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Unveränderter Neudruck der 1915 erschienenen 17. Auflage. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, 1962., Springer-Verlag.
- Gravina, R.: *The Phonology of Proto-Central Chadic: The Reconstruction of the Phonology and Lexicon of Proto-Central Chadic, and the Linguistic History of the Central Chadic Languages*. Utrecht, 2014., LOT.
- Gravina, R.: *Central Chadic Reconstructions*. 2014. Available online at <http://leidenuniv.academia.edu/RichardGravina>.
- Greenberg, J.H.: *Studies in African linguistic Classification*. Branford, Connecticut, 1955., Compass Publishing Company.
- Greenberg, J.H.: The Labial Consonants of Proto-Afro-Asiatic.= *Word* 14 (1958), 295–302.
- Greenberg, J.H.: The Languages of Africa.= *International Journal of American Linguistics* 29 (1963).
- Greenberg, J.H.: The Evidence for */mb/ as a Proto-Afroasiatic Phoneme.= *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgie Kuryłowicz*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, 1965., Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Pp. 88–92.
- HSED = Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, 1995., E.J. Brill.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M.: Iz istorii čadskogo konsonantizma. Labial'nye smyčnye. = Uspenskij, B.A. (ed.): *Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii*. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 9–34.
- Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibriszimow, D.: *Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume I. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading, Distribution and Comments*. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H. & Shimizu, K.: *Chadic Lexical Roots. Vol. II. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading and Distribution*. Berlin, 1981., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Lane, E.W.: *An Arabic-English Lexicon. I–VIII*. London & Edinburgh, 1863–1893., Williams and Norgate.
- Lukas, J.: Das Hitkalanci, eine Sprache um Gwoza (Nordostnigerien).= *Afrika und Übersee* 48 (1964), 81–114.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Afrazijsko-indoeuropejskie leksičeskie svjazi.= *Irano-afrazijskie jazykovye kontakty*. Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 98–08.
- Militarev, A.Ju. & Stolbova, O.V.: First Approach to Comparative-Historical Phonology of Afrasian (Consonantism).= Mukarovskij, H.G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 45–72.
- MNYTESz = Benkő, L. (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára. I–III*. Budapest, 1967–76., Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Mous, M.; Qorro, M.; Kießling, R.: *Iraqw-English Dictionary with an English and a Thesaurus Index*. Köln, 2002., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

- NBÄ = Osing, J.: Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen. I–II. Mainz/Rhein, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Newman, P. & Ma, R.: Comparative Chadic: Phonology and Lexicon.= *Journal of African Languages* 5/3 (1966), 218–251.
- Newman, P.: Chadic Classification and Reconstructions.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5/1 (1977), 1–42.
- PT = Sethe, K.: Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte. I–II. Leipzig, 1908., 1910., J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Reinisch, L.: Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache. Wien, 1895., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Roper, E.-M.: Tu Bedawie. An Elementary Handbook for the Use of Sudan Government Officials. Hertford, 1928., Stephen Austin & Sons.
- Sasse, H.-J.: The Consonant Phonemes of Proto-East-Cushitic (PEC).= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7/1 (1979), 1–67.
- SED I = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A. (with assistance of A. Belova, A. Kovalev, A. Nemirovskaja, D. Nosnitsyn): Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Vol. I. Anatomy of Man and Animals. Münster, 2000., Ugarit-Verlag.
- Shevoroshkin, V.V.: First Preface.= Shevoroshkin, V.V. & Sidwell, P. (eds.): *Languages and Their Speakers in Ancient Eurasia. Dedicated to Professor Aharon Dolgopolsky on his 70th Birthday.* Canberra, 2002., Association for the History of Language. Pp. v–ix.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Studies in Chadic Comparative Phonology.* Moscow, 1996., „Diaphragma” Publishers.
- Takács, G.: Towards Proto-Afro-Asiatic Phonology: Ancient Remnants in South Cushitic, Angas-Sura, and North Bauchi.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 54/2 (2001), 55–125.
- Takács, G.: *Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages.* Berlin, 2004., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Takács, G.: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages.*= Mengozzi, A. (ed.): *Studi Afroasiatici: XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemitica.* Afro-Asiatic Studies: 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics. Milano, 2005., Francoangelli. Pp. 43–55.
- Takács, G.: Aharon Dolgopolsky.= Takács, G. (ed.): *Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Festschrift for A.B. Dolgopolsky and H. Jungrauthmayr.* Berlin, 2008., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. viii–ix.
- Takács, G.: Aharon B. Dolgopolsky: The Scholar and Man.= Shevoroshkin, V.V. and Sverdrup, H.U. (ed.): *Bygone Voices Reconstructed. On the Language Origins and Their Relationships.* In Honor of Aron Dolgopolski. Copenhagen, 2009., Privatforlaget: Underskov Publishers ApS. Pp. 9–10.
- Takács, G.: *Studies in Afro-Asiatic Comparative Phonology (Consonants).* Berlin, 2011., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Takács, G.: *Semitic Ghayin in an Afro-Asiatic Perspective.*= Pennacchietti, F. & Mengozzi, A. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 3rd Meeting of the IACS (Torino, Oct. 2008) published in: Aula Orientalis (Barcelona) 29 (2011), 139–154.*
- Takács, G.: *Lexica Afroasiatica XI: *n- + sibilants.*= *Journal of Language Relationship* 6 (2011), 141–171.
- Takács, G.: Aharon Dolgopolsky: The Semito-Hamitic Scholar and Man.= *Mother Tongue* 17 (2012), 19–23.
- Takács, G.: *Archaisms and Innovations in the Semitic Consonantal Inventory.*= Monferrer-Sala, J.P. and Watson, W.G. (eds.): *Archaism and Innovation Archaisms and Innovations in the Semitic Languages. Selected Papers. Series Semitica Antiqua 1.* Córdoba, 2013., Oriens Academic – CNERU (Cordoba Near Eastern Research Unit) and DTR (Durham University). Pp. 137–144.
- Takács, G.: *Musgu and Masa h- vs. ḥ- and Afro-Asiatic.*= Ibrizimow, D.; Tourneux, H. and Wolff, W. (eds.): *Topics in Chadic Linguistics. Papers from the 6th Biennial International*

- Colloquium on Chadic Languages, Villejuif, Sept. 22–23, 2011. Köln, 2013., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 153–184.
- Takács, G.: *Etyma Afroasiatica Nova. Roots with Initial Labials (*b-, *p-, *f-, *m-)*. Berlin, 2016., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Vergote, J.: *Grammaire copte: introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes)*. Tome Ia: partie synchronique. Ib: partie diachronique. Louvain, 1973., Peeters.
- Wb = Erman, A. & Grapow, H.: *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*. I–V.² Berlin, 1957–1971., Akademie-Verlag.
- WUS = Aistleitner, J.: *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*. = *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse 106/3* (1963).
- Zaborski, A.: *Biconsonantal Verbal Roots in Semitic*. = *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, prace językoznawcze 5* (1971), 51–98.