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[The paper represents the first instalment of a series of about thirty planned studies on the whole corpus of biconsonantal Semitic ‘roots’. The aim of these studies is, on the one hand, to identify such clusters as actual lexical units in the Semitic lexicon and, on other, to determine their productivity in terms of lexical expansions. To achieve this, all the biconsonantal ‘roots’ will have been empirically scrutinised by searching for all their possible combinations with the ten ‘morphemic’ determinatives (/’, h, l, m, n, r, s, t, w, y/) in all three possible positions: prefixed, infixed, and suffixed. This search has been carried out on the basis of the generally accepted dictionaries of the Semitic languages, ancient and modern, taking into account phonological and semantic feasibility as well].

0. Introduction

a) Premises

From the phonetic point of view, a Semitic lexical unit can be defined as a ‘polyphone(me)’ or cluster of phone(me)s. The minimal unit is formed by consonant+sonant/vowel, corresponding to an open syllable, and the total number of such units is equal to the monoconsonantal series of lexical units. We have already dealt with this series and its capacity to form lexical units in Semitic1. In fact, the number of Semitic monoconsonantal designative lexemes is extremely low, possibly almost null, as predicted by Diakonoff2. It is restricted almost to the functorial series, and in any case it is far below the possible total. This series probably goes back to a pre-Semitic level which cannot be traced with any degree of certainty. In this regard, however, the functorial monoconsonantal series is very productive in Semitics, on both the

* This paper has been elaborated within the frame of the research project “Study of the phonological and semantic congruence of the Semitic binary expanded radicals” (BFF2001-37-69), financed by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science. I thank Dr. W. Watson for the language revision and many illuminating suggestions.
2. Cf. I.M. Diakonoff, “Problems of Root Structure in Proto-Semitic”, ArOr 38, 1970, 460ff. (‘To sum up, a monosyllabic primary root morpheme can include: (1) two phonemes, the first being either a non-sonorant or a sonant, the second necessarily a sonant’).
morphological and lexical levels, mostly in the ‘deictic’ series, such as the pronominal series\(^3\), many of its items being deictic clusters in nature. These functorial elements are also sometimes found as lexical constituents in lexicalised syntags\(^4\) and above all as ‘determinative’ expansions of biconsonantal bases. In principle, these biconsonantal bases represent phonetic clusters of two consonants and two sonants/vowels, with four phonetic positions in all, with the inflected morphophonemes in final position. With this series we now enter an almost generally accepted dimension of the Semitic lexicon\(^5\). If we are able to delimit it, then we will have a very important etymological access to the third and more significant root corpus of the Semitic lexicon, the triconsonantal set, many of its items apparently being expansions of the previously defined biconsonantal bases. The organisation of the general Semitic lexicon can then proceed in a more logical and systematic way: from the minimal to the more complex phonetic/phonemic constituents\(^6\). It will help, then, to determine the semantic function of the expansive morphemes and of the resulting expanded patterns. In any case, we have to keep in mind the indissoluble relationship between phonology and semantics and also to remain within the limits of a well-controlled level of a structured language within the framework of a well-defined phonetic table. In this way we will avoid remote comparisons (with languages in other families), which would ultimately take us right back to glottogony (i.e. the very origin of language) or expressive phonetics\(^7\). If sometimes we adduce comparisons from Afro-Asiatic or even from ‘Nostratic’, that will be only in order to corroborate an etymology at an illustrative level and not to provide its foundation. In this respect, the Semitic subfamily is a late linguistic system which appears fully organised in its phonological and morphosyntactic constituents.

The usual reference to the ‘intensified’ realisation of the biconsonantal bases implies that often the ‘simple’ base is not actually documented. In such cases, the biconsonantal base is also an ‘abstract’ as a ‘root’. We are dealing then with hypothetical lexical units, which in this sense take us somewhat beyond the Semitic horizon to a deeper and more remote level of comparison. This means that pure Semitic etymology will often be a ‘penultimate’ inquiry, but nevertheless valid in itself and critically indispensable, in order to guarantee the realisation of such a broader etymological enterprise. And more importantly, it remains under control, phonologically and semantically.

Another problem that has to be faced is the determination of the functional nature of the etymological items. Are they ‘originally’ nouns or verbs, are they designative or predicative? Leaving aside the question of which is first\(^8\) and also the clear-cut and restricted category of the ‘primary nouns’, a category assumed

---

3. Cf. G. del Olmo Lete, “The Semitic personal pronouns. A Preliminary Etymological Approach”, in Y. Avishur, R. Deutsch, eds., MICHAEL. Historical, Epigraphical and Biblical Studies in Honor of Prof. Michael Heltzer, Tel Aviv 1999 (This study now needs to be brought up to date).
7. This seems to be the claimed depth of etymology in keeping with its illimited comparison (nostratic) range, according to U. Rapallo, “La parte alta del corpo nella preistoria delle lingue”; in P. Marrassini, ed., Semitic and Assyriological Studies Presented to Pelio Fronzaroli by Pupils and Colleagues, Wiesbaden 2003, pp. 560-584, especially pp. 579ff.
here without further criticism, we take for granted that the functions of nouns and verbs are simultaneous from the viewpoint of historical linguistics. Both functions represent the morphosyntactic articulation of the original inflected character assumed historically by this linguistic branch; a further horizon lies beyond our present inquiry. The fourth position of the biconsonantal unit is precisely this articulation, which consequently will be left undetermined. Historically, each language will develop its own aleatory system of lexical realisation, starting from the ample set of possibilities presented by the structure of the general or common Semitic system. This affects not only the morphological use of the base, but also its mere presence in the lexicon of each language. In the present study, all the biconsonantal bases attested in any Semitic language are collected, with the presupposition that all of them are or may be original Semitic lexemes.

All these phonological requirements of the original bases shape the iconic features of their referential contents, i.e. the original semantics of any of them. In this respect, if we speak of ‘basic sense’, we do so from a more or less exact ‘componential analysis’ or search for ‘semantic indicators’. Against a widespread view, our intention is not to reproduce the ‘original meaning’, often unattainable and of necessity always ‘concrete’, but to uncover the functional load of such a meaning. This function underlies its concrete meaning and explains the shifts or ‘radical metaphors’ present in the various semantic systems and born from the different environmental situations of the speakers. In this sense, the ‘basic sense’ (BS) is the semantic correlate of the ‘root’: an abstraction or metalinguistic element, not an item of the ‘original’ lexicon as such. Taking this into account, the semantic field (SF) is also indicated only for the original base; the derived bases are believed to be self-evident in the semantic development or to be explained from the point of view of the historical lexicon of each language and dialect.

Semantics, above all the analytical semantics of a dead language with no living speakers, will always be ‘subjective’, that is to say, it will always start from the fixed socio-cultural system of our own apprehension of reality, distant and different in many aspects from that of the language under study. To bridge the gap, we must follow a path that is not always clearly marked. The semantic shift that presides over this evolution and becomes the normal and ‘economic’ way of language development has no fixed rules and depends heavily on the psychological situation and perception of the group which generates it. This perception is to a large extent situation-dependent and unpredictable. The fragmentation, analysis or decomposition of the meaning is the only ‘objective’ tool we have to trace this development. In this way both the origin of this meaning (causality) and its fragmentation (aspect) can be ascertained. They are the two basic forms of metonymy. Also, the transposition of meaning, in the global structure of the presumed parallel semantic field or in its functionality (levels of comparison), can have taken place. This is the function of metaphor in its multiple forms. With it we enter the even more ‘subjective’ and almost free mechanism of semantic shift, for which there are no fixed rules either and which adds to the basic ‘subjective’ nature of the language as the coordinated perception of reality. Metaphor, which in the long run becomes ‘lexicalised metaphor’, is the foremost mechanism of the development and ‘enrichment’ of

9. PrimW are considered those semantical universals which are non-productive as predicative ‘bases’, aside from denominative use.
10. There are of course other morphemic positions (prefixed and infixed, internal and external) to carry out the whole inflected articulation and we do not wish to discuss priorities in this connexion.
11. In this regard, the many onomatopoeic bases, above all SS, may be considered late lexical innovations.
language. Its ‘economic’ character, then, dispenses with the creation of new lexemes, matching its creative nature, which makes of the linguistic evolution of any language not only a functional and practical process, but also one that is creative and poetic. Denomination or reference turns into connotation and intelligibility. Through the interplay of multiple level references or comparisons, ‘meanings’ acquire ‘sense’.

b) Treatment

As for the actual organisation of this paper, the basic default lexical sources used in it are listed below. Unless otherwise indicated, the lexical data literally come from them. In this way we can avoid quoting the source in each case. I have generally preferred medium-sized lexica written in English, on the one hand to avoid a further link in translation and on the other to put forward the primary and commonly accepted meanings, leaving aside the many semantic variations to be found in the larger source and context dictionaries. These are quoted occasionally, in order to point out semantic nuances that may be useful to trace the shifts that the basic sense experienced in some languages, above all in the case of remote comparisons. These and other bibliographical items are all given in a second list. This list has been kept to a minimum by referring to the principal dictionaries (AED, CDG, DRS, HALOT, etc.) of some individual languages which provide information on the traditional discussion on each lexeme. We have kept to the empirical data, reducing to a minimum the discussion of other opinions and leaving the reader to appreciate how much of what has been adopted here is appropriate.

First, each of the biconsonantal clusters of the series /'-X-/ has been submitted to an analysis of its simple phenotype (where attested) or its intensified phenotype in any of its second (-v-) or third (C₂) positions and also in any of its possible (re)duplicated or geminated phenotypes (/'-X'-X-/). We assume that these phenotypes are the actual witnesses of an originally simple biconsonantal root/base, that normally shows a strong tendency to internal expansion, here defined as ‘intensification’, a well-known trend operative at the morphological level in all the Semitic subgroups, specially in South Semitic (the Ethiopic languages).

Second, as in the sample already provided, the biconsonantal clusters identified in this way will be tested against a table of 10 expansive morphemes, recognised as such at the morphological level. They are as follows:

---

14. We have excluded Modern Hebrew, because from the etymological point of view its lexical material is found in Biblical and Middle Hebrew and in Aramaic and Arabic. The new lexical creations and adaptations are clear in their origin and belong to a historical dictionary. On this aspect cf. E. Klein, A Comprehensive Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English, Jerusalem/Haifa 1987. Also Arabic dialects have been put aside for the time being.


Besides these possible expansions of the biconsonantal lexemes in the three possible positions (prefixed, infixed, suffixed)\(^{17}\), which is the main subject of this article, the triconsonantal Semitic lexicon, also exhibits the well-known series of bases sharing two consonants, with a semantic relationship of varying strength. Once the biconsonantal series has been isolated, we will be able to ascertain whether this shared cluster has any correspondence in the biconsonantal series or whether the triconsonantal roots/bases sharing it have to be taken as aleatoric ‘allotheses’, generated either by phonetic variations within the same articulatory group or by alternative dialectal resonances, due to the functions of stress or to other analogous causes. In any case, we leave out of consideration this third class of ‘expansions’ of a hypothetical shared biconsonantal cluster. This is not, properly speaking, a radical expansion, but must be labelled the alternation or allothesis of a base that was triconsonantal in origin\(^{18}\). The analysis of this lexical class already corresponds to the compilation of a global comparative and etymological lexicon of the Semitic languages. We intend only to provide some contrasted material prior to this compilation, namely, the series of biconsonantal bases and their certain or probable expansions. Only one ‘original’ biconsonantal lexeme/sememe with two possible contrastive vocalic realisations (/aːː/ /aː/) is assumed, leaving aside ancient or late onomatopoeias, often limited to one language or linguistic family.

This is the first installment of a series of about thirty studies, the aim of which is to revise the whole Semitic lexicon and of which a first more detailed draft has been already set out\(^{19}\). The treatment here will be more sober and ‘algebraic’, and does not take account of the implicit explanations to emerge from the draft. This form of publication will make it possible for any useful criticism received to be included in the final redaction. Also the complete tabulation of the results, as far as the bearing of each expansion morpheme is concerned, will be left to the final article in the series. In the meantime, only a summary sketch is provided.

The Series /'-X-/\(^{20}\)

\(/{'}vB-/\)

1a - First level: a) simple base

\(/{'}ab-/\)

1) PrimW with frequent conson. intens. < /'ab-/ 1) > /'ab(b)-/, CS. BS: ‘generative and social male principle (life and power)’ > father, progenitor, head of the stirps, chief: Akk.: abu(m), pl abbā, ‘father’, abβitu(m), ‘fatherhood’; Ebl.: a-bu, ‘father, one who is responsible’ (TIE I 3, 6-7); Amor.: 'ab, ‘aba, ‘father’ (AOAT 271/1:406; ARES 3:200f.; APNMT:154); ‘abum, ‘father’ (CAAA:13);

---

Ug.: '(a)b (> 'i)b, ‘father, ancestor’; NWS: Phoen.-Pun., EpHeb., Moab., EpAram. ‘b, ‘father, ancestor(s)’; Hat.: ‘by, lord, patrician’ [< Phoen. ‘bt, ‘a father’s (legal) power, status of a father’(?)]; 


Apparently onomatopoeic (infantile) in origin (with the allophonic alternations /b/p/), with many semantic developments and attributions, social and religious, in most languages, Semitic and non-Semitic. One of the six nouns with a long suffix vowel (except in Meh.), probably due to secondary (compensatory /’ab/ > /’ab(b)-/ versus /’ab/- > /’ābū/) and analogical expansion (< ‘ābiju < ‘ābi‘, ‘who decides’(?)), since it affects the inflexional position (for a discussion cf. MacDonald 1963-1965:63-85; Schub 1978:223-225; Voigt 1988:64ff.; Voigt 2002:37-44; DRS 1; maker of pl. and coll. (?)).

A particular semantic shift by intens., not attested as an independent predic. base (< ‘to act as a father, generator’), may occur in Akk. abunnu(tu(m)), ‘umbilical cord’ (AHw 9 (?)); also Eth.: Tig.: atābā, ‘to cut the umbilical cord’, Amh.: attābā I, ‘to cut the umbilical cord’; MHeb LW ‘āb (DTT 1); Aram.: ‘ab, ‘Ab, ‘Av, the eleventh ‘ōbh, ‘Av, the fifth month’; JPA ‘ab, ‘Ab, ‘Av, the fifth month’; Syr. ‘Ab, ‘month of August’; Mand. ‘Ab, ‘month under the rule of Leo’; Eth.: Ge. ‘ab, ‘the fifth Jewish month’.

1a - First level: b) intensified base

/’āb/- 1) Denom. deriv. by vocal. intens. (< ‘/ab/- 1) > /’āb/-, as quantitative opposition of length (?), NWS.

BS: 1) cultural development from ‘father’ to ‘ancestor’: Ug. ‘ab, ‘ghost, spirit’ (l/ l’ab/-; cf. aby, ‘ancestral’ (?); but cf. Dietrich/Loretz UF 34 2002 937f.: ‘gar nicht existiert’); Heb. ‘ōb (<’āb/-), ‘spirit of the dead’ (cf. the idiom ‘to be gathered to his fathers’); Aram.: JPA ‘ōb, ‘ābá’, ‘necromancy/necromancer’ (DTT:21); JBA ‘ōbá, ‘underworld spirit’, ‘necromancer (’wb’ tmy’ < Akk. etemmu, DJBA 84/506). - 2) KW by semantic shift from (< ‘/ab/- 1), month, ES/NWS: the 5th Babylonian month, the 11th Jewish month: Akk. abu(m); Emar. ‘abí (Fleming 2000:174ff.); MHeb. LW ‘āb (DTT 1); Aram.: JPA/‘ab, ‘Av, the eleventh month; JA ‘b, ‘Ab, the fifth month’; Syr. ‘ab, ‘month of August’; Mand. ‘ab, ‘month under the rule of Leo’; Eth.: Ge. ‘ab, ‘the fifth Jewish month’.

'abû is ambiguous (cf. Fleming 2000:186ff.). Also the relationship to AA *'ab-/+'ub-, ‘to fall, descend’, on the basis of some Chad. and Cush. dialects, is not very compelling (HSED 2).

\[aB\]/ Denom. deriv. by conson. gemin. \(< /'ab-/ 1 \)> /'abb-/ , CS. BS.: ‘primordial, generating water’:  
Akk. \(abîbu(m)\), ‘flood, deluge’ (cf. \(abbu\), ‘swamp’?); Aram.: Mand. \(tababia\), ‘storms, hurricanes’; 
Ar. \('a/ubâbu\), ‘vague, flot, grande masse d’eau’ (DAF 2); Eth.: Ge. \('ababi\), ‘wave’.

Cf. Ge.-Amh. \('abûi\)'abûy/ 'abby, ‘(father) blue Nile’ \(< /'abaw:ya/\), as complementary expansions (cf. DRS 1); 
but cf. AED 1203, possibly \(< /'by/\), ‘the big one’. The conson. intens. is also found in \('ab-/\), especially in pl. forms. It is more difficult to determine the relationship of this cluster to Pers. \('âb\), ‘water’ (CPED 1ff.).

2a - Second level: expanded base

Of the possible prefix. series, WS /š'b//: Ug., Heb., Aram., ESA ‘to draw water’ and Ar. \(sa'aba\), ‘to squeeze’, ‘to widen a skin for water’, \(sa'iba\), ‘to be satisfied by drinking’, show only a remote semantic relationship to /'ab-/ through /'ab/-. Ar. \(sa'bâbu\), ‘shower, rain’ (AEL 1489) could represent such an expansion; cf. Ar. 
\('a/abûbu\) (supra), but as a prefix. /š/ expansion they would be phonetically anomalous in Ar. and on the other hand, this lexeme is not attested in NWS, indicating a LW. Instead the meaning ‘impetus, sharpness, vehemence, force’ seems to be a secondary metaphor. Shift. In any case, it would be a very old expansion or rather an original triliteral base of AA origin: cf. Eg. \(šwbty\), ‘a jar’, and maybe Eg. \(s3b\), ‘cross water’.

The suffixed series presents some clear radical expansions (-w:h/). The alternative form of suffixation clearly shows the expansive character of the base.

\[aBaWa\]/ Denom. predic. expan. suffix. \(< /'ab-/ 1 \)> /'ab(a)+wa/, WS/SS. BS: ‘to become a father’: Ar. 
\('abâ(w)\), ‘to become a father’, > ista’abba, ‘to adopt as a father’, possibly in contrastive distribution with /'abaw:ya/; >(? \(ubbiyyatu\), 'bâ'u, ‘self-magnification, greatness, majesty’; Eth.: Amh.: >? 
\(abûy\) or \(aby\), ‘one who feeds’, \(abbaye\), ‘daddy!’.

A semantic derivation is possibly to be seen in JPAr-am. \(bw\), ‘stick with a metal point’ (DJPA 32); and in Sab. 
\(tby\), ‘permanent residence’ // ‘ancestral boasting’.

\[aBaHa\]/ Denom. predic. expan. suffix.\(< /'ab-/ 1 \)> /'aba+ha/, SS. BS: ‘to act as a superior authority’/ ‘to make s.o. father’ > appoint a subordinate, give authority, entrust’: SAE: Sab. \(bh\), ‘appoint s.o. as an official’.

Other secondary nominal suffix. derivations may be seen in Tign. \(ab-\)sa, ‘term of respect used in addressing or referring to a woman older than the speaker’, and in Mand. abu-al, ‘offspring, young creature’. Also a suffix. /-t/ expansion may be seen in CS /br/, with the semantic connotation of ‘strength’, mainly sexual: Akk. \(abrur(m)\), ‘strong, robust’, ‘wing, fin’; Ug. \(ibr\), male animal, ‘bull, horse’; Heb. \(abbîr\), ‘strong’, \(éber\), ‘wing’; MHeb. 
\(éber\), ‘limb, membrum virile’ (DTT 9); JAr-am. \(éber\), ‘limb’; \(ébrâî\), ‘limb, membrum virile’ (DTT 44); Syr. 
\(ébrâ\), ‘limb, member’; Ar. \(ibratum\), ‘(extremity) member’ > ‘needle’ (< ‘that stings’); and possibly by enant. 
(? Tign. \(abbârâ\), ‘to be/become old’. This expan. may be also documented by AA: Eg. \(ibr\), ‘stallion’, ‘a-bi-ra, a Sem. LW (Benz 1971 507); Chad. \(a/wr\), ‘young animal in its prime’ (cf. Murtonen 1989:81).
1b - First level: simple and intensified base

*/"aB/- The simple original base is not attested, only the conson. nom./predic. intens. < */'ab-/> */'abb-/, SWS. BS.: ‘to want, to desire, to take a decision’: Ar. ‘abbo’, ‘tended, directed his course, determine’; ’abbu, ‘intention, projet’ (DAF 2); > */a:ib(a)b-/> ‘desire’ > ‘a:ibābatu, ‘way of acting, conduct’, and by multiple suffix derivation, ‘ibbānu, ‘time of preparing or making ready’; also Eth.: Ge. ebbā, ‘to refuse, disobey’ (by enant. contrast. alternation of ‘abaya).

Cf. Hurvitz 1913:77; Zaborski 1971:53-54. Moscati 1947:133 presupposes a root /hb/, an alloph. of */'b/; cf. infra - The isosemic series or ‘chain’: ‘to will > desire > love > decide’, can be best appreciated in the polysemy of Sp. ‘querer’, as a reflex of a diversified exercise of will. The possible relationship to */'ab/- 1) is not clear (‘to decide’ > ‘to act as a father/chief’; ‘to prepare himself for a journey [the first decision of a beduin chief]), taking us back to a pre-Semitic level; cf. Eg.: 3bì, ‘to desire, wish for’, 3bw, 3bt, ‘desire’ (cf. infra */'abaya/); so for the ent it is preferable to presume two independent radical clusters: a PriW of onomatop. origin and a nom./predic. base of phonological aleatoric for’ation (possibly even as a triconson. allothesis). - DRS 1 points to the ‘resonance’ {laryngeal + labial} */'BY, 'WH, YHB, THB, HBB, HMM/ as a source of allomorphs of this base/semi (=). Cf. also /BB/, /nbb/, for other possible allomorphs (DRS 1) and infra.

2b - Second level: expanded base

In the expanded series, the set with prefixes exhibits some relevant expansions of */'ab/- 2), beginning with the prefix. in EpAram.

/Ya’aBa/ Denom. predic. prefix. expan. < */'ab-/> */ya+’aba/, WS. BS: ‘to desire’: Heb. */'y'b/, ‘to long for’, hapax in the Bible and Qumran (HALOT 381; DCH IV 70) Aram.: EpAram. */'y'b/, ‘to desire’ (DNWSI 431); Syr. yi’eb, ‘to desire’, yaw’ābā, ‘to desire’.

Cf. Hurvitz 1913:89, Moscati 1947:134. To be compared with */'abaya/ (cf. infra) and also Heb. tā’ab.

/Ta’aBa/ Denom. predic. prefix. expan. < */'ab-/> */ta+’aba/, WS. BS: ‘to desire’: Heb. tā’ab, ‘to long for’/’to make repulsive’, tā’ābāh, ‘longing’; JAr. tē’ēb, ‘to have a desire’ (DTT 1641).

Cf. Hurvitz 1913:95; Moscati 1947:134. Both could be alternative phenotypes of the same biconson. base. The multiple affix. supports this view, although a triconson. allothesis cannot be ruled out here. The infixed series appears to be sterile; its clusters are apparently semantically unrelated either to */'ab/- 1) or to 2). Nevertheless, */awb/- could represent a denom. predic. by vocal. intens./glide < */'ab-/> 2) as a byform’ in altern. distrib. of */'ab-/, WS, BS.: ‘behaving arrogantly, intensively’ (?): Ar. ‘awiba, ‘être en colère’ (DAF 67); instead Aram.: Syr. ‘wb, Etpa. ete’awbat, ‘to burn with desire’, could represent a spont. labialization or simply an allomorph also with prefix. */y'b/ (cf. supra). The varying semantic concurrence of the three phenotypes */y'b/, */wb/ and */by/ (cf. also */ab(b)-/) seems to indicate them to be distrib., altern. expan. of the base */ab/- in the SF of primary subjective reactions. But non liquet.

In addition, a second phenotype of */awb/- could also represent a denom. predic. by vocal. intens./glide < */'ab-/, by enant. distrib. opposition to */'ab-/> 2) (?), SWS, BS: ‘return movement’ (< ‘decision in the opposite direction’): ?ENA.: Saf. ’b, to return’ (DRS 11); Ar. ’aba, ‘to return, repent, come’; >? meton. derivation Soq. ’yb, ‘to delay, doubt’. Notice the enant. development within this base: ‘desire’/?refuse’ (cf. supra). - For Heb.
'ôb, ‘ghost, spirit’, cf. supra */'ab/-1). It seems that Tig. erab, ‘family’, has no connection with this base, and the same applies to the multiple Tig. allomorphs of */'ib/.

/aBaYa/ Denom. predic. expan. suffix. < */'ab/-2) > */'ab(a)+ya/, WS/SS. BS.: ‘to take a decision, positive and negative: to will/refuse’ (but cf. */'ab/-2): Heb. 'ābā, ‘to be willing > ‘satisfy’ # ‘want’ (cf. HALOT 3, for other etymologies; ‘abī, ‘would that!’ could also be taken into account); NWS: Phoen. */'byt/, ‘desire’ (?); Aram.: EpAram. htn bw, ‘to long for, covet’(< /'n'b/, DNWSI 710-711, cf. Heb. /'n'p/); JPA 'abey / 'abah, ‘to be willing’ (DTT 5); ESA.: Min. sī'by, ‘refuser’ (DRS 3); Ar. ‘abî(y), ‘refused, disliked’; Eth.: Ge. 'abaya, ‘to refuse, be unwilling (to do), revolt, disobey, decline, say no, oppose, resist, reject, deny, disagree’ > */'abuy/, ‘disobedient’, ‘abay, ‘disobedience’; Tig. ‘aba, ‘to refuse, deny, hate’ > abây, ‘enemy’; Tigû. abâyû, ‘to refuse’, abû, ‘to fail, refuse’; Amh.: abîyû ‘to disobey, to rebel’; abaya ‘refractory ox’; Gur. abâ, ‘to give, allow, permit’ (EDG 5, see waba and the alternative phenotype ebbâ, ‘refuse, disobey’).

As pointed out above (cf. */'ab/-2), a connection of this expansion with */'ab/-1) > ‘exercise of ‘paternal’ authority > subjective power ‘of the chief, positive and negative”), is not self-evident (cf. Essai 77; AA [Eg.-Sem.]: original triconson. base; Murtonen 1989:79ff.). Cf. Zaborski 1971:53-54, who quotes also the allomorphs /ya'aba/ (Heb., Aram.) and /ta'aba/ (Heb.).

/aHaB-/ Denom. predic. infix. expan.(?) < */'ab/-2 > */'a+ha+ba/, NWS. BS: ‘to show a strong desire, love’: Ug. ahtb, ‘love’; Heb. 'āhēb, ‘to like, love’; Aram. ‘ahâhâ, ‘love’ (DTT 19).

Cf. Hurvitz 1913:86; Moscati 1947:133 (< /hb/). Other derivations from */'ab/-2) by multiple expan. may be: Aram. ‘abhâyah(y), ‘prayer’ (DDT 6); Mand.: ‘abayah (’abayi), ‘prayer; reader, preceptor’; cf. AA: Eg. 3hî, ‘to desire, wish for’ (CDME 2), 3hw, 3bt, ‘desire’ (GHÄD 3); cf. Murtonen 1989:79ff. Also Amor. abî’ānum, ‘poor’ (ARMT 10 296); Ug. abyn, ‘poor’; Heb. ebyôn, ‘poor’ (HALOT 5: ‘to be needy’); DDT 5: ‘because he ‘longs’ for everything’) could be a secondary deriv. from */'ab-. However, Eg. ebyēn, ‘miserable, poor’, seems to be a Semitic LW (cf. Lambdin 1953:145ff.).

1c - First level: a) simple base

This is a new base constructed from same radical cluster */'B/ and in vocalic distribution /ai:/ with the former. The possible semantic relationship of this base to */'ab/-1) cannot be confirmed, nor can the claim of a common base.

/aB/- PrimW with possible conson. inten < */'ab/-2) > */'ab(a)/, CS. BS: ‘vegetal germination’: Akk. ab/pu, ‘reed-bed, reeds’, apû, a spiny plant, apûtu, a plant > inbu, ‘fruit, flower’; Ug. 'ib-, ‘fruit’; Heb. 'eb(h), ‘fruit’; MHeb. ‘eb (pl. ‘ibbûn), ‘the young shoots of a tree’; Aram.: EpAram.: ‘b, ‘fruit(?) (DNWSI 3); JArarm. ‘ab, ‘(perhaps) sprout’ (DJA p. 29); ‘b(?), ‘ibbû, ‘(growing) fruit’ (DJBA 73); ‘ib’a, ‘growing fruit’ (DJBA 73); > inba/, ‘fruit, produce’ (DTT 80) > by meton. ‘inba’/ ‘nb’, ‘louse’s egg, nit’ (DJBA 118); Syr. ‘ebbû, ‘fruit’; Mand. aba, ‘product, swelling’; Ar. ‘abbu, ‘herbage’, ‘desert first fruit’, ‘whatever vegetable the earth produces’; Eth.: Tig. ‘abo, ‘a plant’, ‘oba/‘obo, ‘tree with edible fruit’; Gur. eba, ‘kind of tree’, ebbâbû ‘bloom, blossom, flower’, (a)nâbbâbû, ‘bloom, blossom, flower’ [but a possible deriv. < Cush. must be taken into account] and possibly by epenthetic deriv. >? ataba, ‘a small tree with sweet edible root’; Tigû. abo, ‘evergreen tree’, oba, obô, ‘a kind of tree’; Amh. attjâbu, ‘a kind of tree which has white flowers’. 41
Cf. Murtonen 1989:79. Akk. *i'en/mbu(m), 'fruit, flower', 'flower(-shaped jewellery)', suggests a possible dissimilation (‘/’ab/ – > ‘/’abb-a/-, ‘/’amb-b/), rather than a derivation from < /’-n-b/, (cf. AHw 234; LS 2). See also JAr. *inba, ‘fruit, produce’ (DTT 80). On the other hand, cf. Ug. *ib-, by metaph. shift > ‘gem, precious stone’ (cf. Lat. ‘gemma’), also > Akk. ebibu, ‘pure, brilliant’ and. Mand. aba, ‘to bring’ > ‘to shine forth’. However, speculations on the correspondence of the bases /’-n-b/ and /’-n-b/ (< /n-b-/) must be set aside for the moment, but possible root contamination should be taken into account. On the other hand, Syr. hab(b), hawboba, ‘to flower’, habbā, ‘flower’, may represent another allomorphic base.


Heb.: *‘abab, ‘to be thick, to be heavy, to press; to surround; to twist; to be warm, to glow’, quoted by DTT p. 2, does not exist as a verbal base in Biblical Hebrew (cf. HALOT 2). In this connexion, note the correspondence with the resonances /’b/, /'h/, /'q/, /'b/, /'b/ and /'bd/, /'bl/, /'bq/, /'br/, /'bs/, /'bh/, /'hb/ (cf. also DRS 1, [laryngeal+labial]). However, the option of an onomatopoeic etymology by repetition of the labial (DRS 2) does not seem acceptable. For a possible relationship to the root /’-n-b/ cf. supra.

2c - Second level: expanded base

This base furnishes only a suffixed expansion /-ya/ with a factitive/effective semantic nuance and in clear areal distribution with /’ab/- . The NWS semantic development is clearly secondary.

/’ab Ya/ Denom. predic. by suffix expan < /’eb/ > /’ab(a)+ya/, ES/WS. BS: ‘to produce fruit, to fructify’: Aram.: Mand. aba, ‘to bring out, to swell out, to shine forth’ << aba, ‘product’, ‘swelling’. From this base may also be derived < Akk. apū II and apūtu(m), ‘a plant’ (cf. Akk. abu, apu, ‘reed-bed, reeds’ supra); abiyānu, ‘a plant’ (AHw 6); as well a Heb. ‘ēbet(?)’, ‘reed, papyrus’ (hapax Job 9:26). - As a metonymic shift from /’abaya/ with the BS: ‘result of being fruitful’: Mand. aba, ‘to be
THE BICONSONANTAL SEMITIC LEXICON 1. THE SERIES /'X-/

thick, dark’, aba, ‘darkness, thickness, denseness’ > by intens. +expan. ababia, ‘thickets, dense growth’. Possibly also Akk. abbuttu(m), ‘a hair-style’.

The best witness of a semantic shift and radical contamination is to be seen in Mand. ABA I, CB I, ‘to be thick, become thick, dense, dark’; ABA II, CB II, ‘BB, ‘to bring out, come out, swell out’, ‘to grow hot, shine forth, glow’. In this connexion, a possible allophony or root contamination with /c/ and the seé ‘to cover, veil ...’ has to be taken into account (cf. supra on /'ab-/-).

An expan. prefix, may be seen in /na’ab-/ as a denom. predic. with privat./enant. < /'a-b/ > /'na+’ab:pa/, ES. BS: ‘to lose fertility’: Akk. na’āpu(m), ‘to become dry’.

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

The cluster /'b/ offers a series of radical homographs which cannot derive from the bases identified:

Heb. hapax ‘ôb, ‘bag (skin) for wine made of leather’, Job 32:19 (HALOT 20) has a possible reflex in Akk. apu, ‘a leather object’, and in the hypothetical Ar. ‘awwaba, ‘tailler (le cuir) en rond’ (DRS 11) and even in Ar. ‘ayyabu, ‘porter d’eau’ (DRS 11), not to be found in AEL or in DAE (but cf. Lisan I 143: šaggā’). Cf. also the possible prefix. and infix. expansions: Ar. sa’bu, mis’abu, ‘skin, receptacle of skin’, ‘ihāba, ‘skin, hide’; and the more problematic Amh. arrābā, ‘to make Moroccan leather’ (?). In this sense above all CS /$b/’, ‘to draw water (with a skinbag)’ (Murtonen 1989:407) could be considered as a possible /$-/ prefix. expansion, linked (?) with Heb. ‘ôb, mentioned above. In any case, its derivation from (ab/ 1) > /’ab/ > Heb. /ôb/, ‘spirit, ghost’, is uncertain in respect of the semantic shift involved. Cf. Rubiato/Lara/Gaviria 1991:145-162. The possibility that it is a LW/KW should be taken into account.

Akk. abbû, ‘swamp fauna’ (> abhu ‘swamp’); JARAM. yhw, ‘an unclean bird’; Syr. ‘abbā, ‘crocodile’ (generically related to Eg. 3by, ‘panther’, 3bw, ‘elephant’); Gur. abba, ‘leopard, tiger’. Also Akk. abāya, ‘a water fowl’, abbunnu, ‘a kind of bird’, abātu, abūtānu, ‘fish’ (AA, cf. Essai 77; HSED 3). The water animals may be related to l’ab- (cf. supra), as is fairly clear in Akk.; the other designations may be semantic expansion. Other radical homographs, such as Ar. ‘abbaba, ‘to shout, scream’ (DAF 2), and by etymonic gestural deriv. >? Ar. ‘abba (?), ‘to be astonished’ (DAF 2), Tig. ‘abbā, ‘to scream, shout’, point to an allothesis of /y-b-b/, ‘to put out a strong cry’ (< /BB/ (?), of onomatopoeic origin; DRS 1f.) as corroborated by Heb. yibbeb, ‘to lament’; JARAM., yibbeb, ‘to sound an alarm, a trumpet’; Syr. yabbēb, ‘to play the trumpet, to shout with joy, exult’; Ge. yab(b)aba, ‘to jubilate, shout with joy’, (cf. DRS 1f). Also from this allithetic cluster /y:b-b/ could derive (?) Amh. eba, ‘monkey, monkey’s cry’, anābha ‘to cry, shed tears’. Possibly also Gur. ṣmb’a *balā, ‘low, moo’. On the other hand, MHEB. yibbēb, ‘to speak in a trembling voice, to lament’ (DTT 560), JARAM. y’bab, ‘to sound an alarm’ (DTT 560) and Mand. ‘YBB/, ‘to make a hollow sound, to groan’, possibly indicate a contamination of bases (/nbb/, /ybb/). Another allothesis may also be found in Ar. hah(a)ba, ‘to blow the wind’.

For Ug. ib cf. Heb. ṣyyēb; Akk. ayyābu(m), ‘enemy’ < /’y/b/ in alternation with /’w/b/, Ar. wa’a’ba, ‘to contract oneself’, ‘to be disdainful’, wa’iba, ‘to be angry’; in my opinion it cannot be taken semantically as an expan. infix. of /’ab-, /’ab/ (cf. Murtonen 1989:89)

The claimed AA root *'ab-, ‘stone’, from which > CS /’bn/, on the basis of the only attestation in Cush, is not very convincing (HSED 1f.), especially when another common and better attested AA root *'abun- is postulated.

Akk. api’tu, a type of fallow land < ab/pu, ‘reed-bed, reeds’.
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"aD-/

1 - First level: a) simple base

"aD-/

PrimW with possible internal intens. < /"ad-/ > /"add-/, /"ād-/>, WS. BS: ‘original force, power’ > ‘father’ > with the semantic bias ‘lord’: Amor.: ad, ‘father’ (APNMT 156, but not in CAAA); Ug. ’ad, ‘father’; NWS: Phoen., Pun.: ‘d, ‘lord’ (The assimilation of -n/, does not seem probable; cf. infra /’dn/). There is a curious semantic transformation in Gur.: adi, ‘mother!, mistress!, lady’, form of address to an elderly woman, and also addoyye, ‘form of address which older women of the same age use when speaking to one another’; < possibly determined by the semantic shift to female family relatives in AA (HSED 6).


1 - First level: b) intensified base

"aD-/


"aD-/

Denom. predic./design. by conson. intens./gemin. < /"ad-/ > /"adda/, E/SS. BS: to ‘act with unconstrained force’ > to carry out’, with positive // negative (enant.) nuance: Ar. ‘adda, ‘to oppress’ // > ‘to arrive’ (by semantic shift (?)) ‘to show force’ > ‘to moo, low’), ta’addada, ‘to act with forced harness’, ‘a/id(d)u, ‘strength, power, force’, ‘wonderful thing’/’abominable thing, calamity’; cf. Akk. ū/ud(d)u, ‘distress, affliction’; addu ‘throwstick’, possibly by semantic metaphor. shift (or KW).

Cf. Zaborski 1971:54, who quotes both Ar. ‘āda and ‘adda, ‘to oppress’. Saf. wdd, ‘calamity’ (?), which seems to be an allophone of /’dd/ (cf. DRS 8), and ’ad- a contrastive one as well (cf. infra); also Murtonen 1989:89.

2 - Second level: expanded base

Prefix. expansions of this base are not certain, but the following can be considered:

/Ma’aD-/ Denom. predic./design. by prefix. /m-/ < /’ad-/ > /ma’ad(a)/, E/WS. BS: ‘(to be) abundant’: Akk. ma’du, mādu, ‘to be(come) many’, ma’dī, ‘(large) quantity, abundance’; Ug. /m’d/, mu/a/id, ‘to be immense’, ‘abundance’; Heb.: EpHeb. m’d, ‘very, much’, Heb., MHeb. mē’ōd, ‘strength, power’, ‘very’ (Murtonen 1989:253), in parallel with ESA n’d, ‘luxuriance’, ‘luxuriant crops’. And taking into account the quoted enant. value of Ar. ‘a/id(d)u, ‘strength, power, force’, ‘wonderful thing’/’abominable thing, calamity’; Akk. ū/ud(d)u, ‘eine Bedrängnis’, one could see another prefix. expan. in Ar. na’ada, ‘a calamity befell him’, na’du, ‘calamity’.

Cf. Hurvitz 1913:88, who suggests a deriv. < /ma’d/. The alternation of morpheme prefix. favours a derivation from a common base /’ad/.

As for infix. expansion, the following may be taken as an expan. glide (cf. supra /’ad-/):
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Finally, among the suffix. expan. the following are to be taken into account:

/aDaWa/ Denom. predic./design. by suff. expan. /'-y:wa/ < /'-a+y(a)+wa/, E/SWS. BS: ‘to show superior, dominant position or power’: Ar. ‘adā(w), ‘to (be) equip(ped), provide(d) with the necessary ...’, ‘adātu, ‘instrument’, ‘adīyyu, ‘armour, device’ (DAF 20); cf. Akk. udū, ‘Utensilen’ (AHw 1401); also Ar. ‘adā(y), ‘to cause, arrive’ (cf. supra ‘adda).

/aDaYa/ Denom. predic./design. by suff. expan. /'-y:wa/ < /'-a+y(a)+ya/, E/WS. BS: ‘to exert/suffer a superior/inferior dominant (economic) power’, by enant. [cf. Sp. ‘deudo’]; the economic semantic bias is clearly a derived one < as a power relationship (cf. Eng. ‘impost’ < Lat. ‘in-ponere’, for ‘tax’): Akk. idum, ‘wage, rental’ (CDA 15 < idum, ‘hand’); Ug. ud, ‘pay, payment’ (?); Aram.: Syr. ‘adī, ‘to provide’; Ar. ‘adā(y), ‘to cause to reach’, ‘adā’, ‘the act of causing to reach, performance’; SS: Amh. ada, ‘debt; tax, fiscal impost’, adāyyā, ‘to return, pay back’; an allomorph alternation may be seen in Tig. awādā, ‘1. to cause to have’. 2. to owe’.


As for Heb. ‘eden, ‘pedestal, base’; JAram. ‘udnā, ‘footstool’ (DTT 22; Murtonen 1989:83, related to /hdm/, ‘footstool’?; cf. Watson 1996:19; Watson 1997:89-95), we are possibly dealing with a KW, as is also the case with Akk. adattu, ‘succulent part of reed’ (cf. AHw 12: ‘nest, camp’); the semantic shift that generated these senses is not clear, nor is the relationship between them to claim a deriv. < /'-ad-/. Note that Phoen. ‘dn is of uncertain reading and meaning (DNWSI 17).


3 - Homographs/Loanwords

*/'ad-/ LW < Sum. a-dé-a, ‘flood from the deep’ > Akk. edūm, ‘flood, wave’; Heb. ‘ēd, ‘subterranean stream, groundwater’ (‘an apocopated form of ‘d’?; cf. DTT 15); Gur. undīyā, ‘river’ [intens.+ expans]. In connexion
with this base, the following also be considered: Ar. na’ada, ‘to make water spout to the surface’, na’du, ‘spouting water’ (DAF 1176); Soq., n’d, ‘to bring water’ < Meh. ‘ānāt, he-nid, ‘waterskin’; Šîk. ‘ānāt, nid, ‘waterskin’; and Heb. nō’d, ‘leather bottle’; JArAram. nōdā’, ‘leather bottle’ (DTT 884), better taken as a LW < Akk. nādu, ‘(water-)skin’, than as a prefix. /n-/ expansion of an original Sem. base or of the adduced Sum. noun (LW). See also JArAram. āša/ēd, ‘to pour out’ (DTT 126). Its possible relationship to /’ad-/, as an expression of primary force (cf. supra), is uncertain. But cf. the isosemantic chain /’ab-/ > /’ad-/ supra. If correct, a possible Semitic apophonc primary base */’ad-/, from which all those phenotypes may derive, including the Sum. lexeme, should not be ruled out.

/’aD/-

1a - First level: simple base

*/’ad-/* (?) PrimW, WS. BS: ‘a bad accident or damage in the general sense of disturbance of the usual state of affairs: disposition [order], colour, flow ...’. Ar. adda, ‘to cut, split’ (DAF 20: cf. DRS 10).

The simple base is only documented in its expanded form. Possibly /’ad-//’ad- is in contrastive opposition, or due to contamination or allophony. - SF: General situation.

2a - Second level : expanded base


There is a possible phonetic alternation (allophony) of dental phonemes: /’y-/ // /’d(-y)/. Ar. adiyuu, ‘vehement waves’, is possibly a metaph. shift (> ‘that harms, destroys’, cf. Sp. ‘rompientes’).

As a possible infix, expan. /-r-/, cf. Amh. arrāzā, ‘to wear out, become threadbare (clothing); to be wanting, lacking, deficient’, but the lack of parallels precludes certainty.

1b - First level: simple base


Cf. supra. Ug. and Ar. syntag. functors of this base can be found in: ArAram.: EpAram., JPAram., Syr. hāidēn, ‘then’; Eth.: Ge. ya’ae, ‘now’, mà’æx, ‘when?’; Tgr. æzē, ‘how’. A possible etymological relationship with the determinative functor /’ad/ is not to be ruled out; cf. Monoconsonantal 52f.; DRS 10. - SF: ‘Time’, ‘time precision’.

46
Among the possible expansions of this base to be taken into account, one could consider the suffix Aram./Heb. */zl/, ‘to go away’ (cf. Ar. ‘azaliyyu, ‘long since past, eternal’ [DAF 29], but this entails a somewhat irregular phonetic correspondence); more probably they are allophones. Also ESA */dh/, ‘to dismiss, to allow s.o. to depart’ (SD 2), could also be taken into consideration.

*/aD/-

1 - First level: a) simple base

*/aD/- Original, no attested simple base. BS: ‘penible sensation, oppressing’.

This base is to be distinguished semantically from */as/- (cf. infra), although both are very close to each other and dialectal contamination cannot be excluded, as is possibly the case in Tig. and in Heb. Cf. also supra */ad/ (and even */ad-/) as a possible original resonance allophone. - SF: Basic sensation.

b) intensified base

*/aDa/ Denom. predic. By conson. intens. < */a/ > */aD/, SW/SS. BS: ‘to cause pain, <to oppress’: Ar. ‘adda, ‘to affect painfully, to torment s.o.’ (DFA 37) > Har. ‘add, ‘pain, suffering’ (DRS 31); and with causative value > Tgr, ‘adda, ‘to yoke’ < ‘to cause oppression’.

*/aDa/ Denom. predic. by vocal. intens. < */ad/- > */aD/, NWS. BS: ‘to exert pressure upon’: Heb. ‘ās, ‘to urge, be in haste’. In contrasting intens. distribution with the former: Ar. ‘adda.

No affix. expansion of this base can be identified with certainty. Possibly Ar. ‘adima, ‘to be angry against, to persecute s.o.’ (DAF 38) and, as privative/enant. derivation, Ar. ‘amida, ‘to be indifferent to offences’ (DAF 55) could be considered expansions of it as psychological reactions. The consonantal homograph ‘adā, ‘trouble, distress’ ‘ay represent an alternative allophone of this cluster (SD 11; cf. supra */adaya/).

*/vG/-

1 - First level: a) simple base


Cf. AA */ug-, ‘to burn’ (HSED 33; cf. also */ah-, ‘fire’, HSED 7). Possible allophone of Nostr.: */āg-, */hāg, ‘to burn, to be on fire’ (NMF 588f.), but cf. infra on */aggān/ - SF: Natural Phenomena: fire.

b) intensified base

*/aGa/ Denom. predic. by conson. intens. < */āg/- > */aggā/, E/SS. BS: ‘to set fire’: by psychosomatic metaph. > Akk. agāgu, ‘to become furious’, aggū, akku, ‘furious’; SWS: Tham. ‘g, ‘burn!’ (DRS 10); Ar. ‘āgga, ‘to burn, flame fiercely’; allomorph hağga, ‘to burn fiercely (of fire)’ (cf. also AHw 14 < hāgīg, but cf. */hag/ infra) and derivatives; possibly Eth.: Har. aanggan-(be), ‘soon’ (DRS 6).
2 - Second level: expanded base

In the same SF the expansions of this base are almost non-existent. Only two suffixed expansions may be related to it:

/*aGaMa*/ Denom. predic. by conson. expan. /-m/ < */'aG-/ > /'aga+ma/ E/WS. BS: ‘to burn hot, glow’, by metaph. shift: < Akk. ḏāmu, ‘to be furious’; Heb.: ḏām, ‘to glow’; Ar.: ḏāma, ‘to loath so.’ < ‘to be angry against s.o.’, ‘to be glowing’, ḏāmu, ‘anger’ (DAF 14).


This CS lexeœ can be considered an expan. suffix. /-n/ of < */'uni0259g-/> /'aggān-/, ‘container originally related to fire’. It is well attested in all the Semitic families and so must be very primitive. Cf. also AA: /'iğan/, ‘vessel’ (HSED 25; Essai 78; De Calice 1936:123; Murtonen 1989:82; Rubiato 1986:411-420); Eg. ikn, ‘cup, jar’ (CDME 32, ḏak, GHÄD 109) // Eg.: ḏak, ‘to draw water’; Ber. tikint, ‘vessel’ (Essai 79); Chad.: EChad. jugûnèy, ‘calabash’ (ChLR I 125); Cush. ġūn, ‘jar’ (Essai 79). As for the morphol. deriv. cf. /'ad/'adn and other couples (DRS 7). - In this connexion we could consider the base as related to IE: egnis/ognis, ‘fire’ (IEW 293): Sansk. agnî-, ‘fire, sacrificial fire’, agnih-dhāna, ‘receptacle for the sacred fire’ (VED 5); Hitt. Agnis, ag-anını-, ‘plate’ (HEG 10; ‘Wanderwort’); Lat. ignis, ‘fire’ (DELL 451). But the /-n/ seems to be ‘radical’ in IE and the lexeœ means ‘fire’ not ‘container’ (but cf. Hitt.). Consequently an AA primary origin is more probable (but cf. supra AA *'ug-, to burn’, which will play for an expansive origin of the /-n/). – Note that Palm. ġān and ḏāg (DNWSI 9f.) are of unknown meaning.

On the other hand, a root /'g/, Ar. /'g/' > aḡga, ‘to run’/courir’ (Hava 3; cf. Bohas-Chekayri 1993:11), seems instead to be a secondary semantic shift (poetic(?), said of that proverbially swift bird, the ostrich) of the well attested homograph already quoted; as for Ar. ḏāq’a, ‘fuir’ (DAF 13), a relationship to the root /'g/' is preferable. Both phenotypes are rare in Arabic (dialectal?).

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

Two of the various consonant homographs of this cluster could have deriv. semantic relationship to */'eg-/ > */'eg-ay/'- [expanded or originally triconson. /'-g-/]: Heb. ḏéq (recall the pun of the ‘burning bush’ of Ex. 4); MHeb. ḏeq (DTT 11); EpAram. ḏeq, ‘thorn, thorn-bush’; Tig.: ḏeq, ‘kind of rush’ >? Amh. agam, ‘a thorny bush’ (Carissa edulis); Tig. amaggu, ‘a sort of maize’, ḏeq, ‘a bush’; Gur. ḏeq, ḏeqm, ‘kind of tree’; ḏeq, ‘kind of cereal’; anigq, ‘kind of tree’ (cf. Akk. egq, ‘a kind of camel-thorn’). The relationship is more difficult to define in the case of Akk. egq, eqq, ‘antimony’ (KW/LW?).
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1 – First level: b) intensified base

/’aH/- Deriv. predic. by conson. intens./gein. < /’ah/ > /’ahha/, SW/SS. BS.: ‘to bring out an /’ah/ cry’: Ar. ‘ahha, ‘to cry’, also the phenotypes ‘ahhi, ‘ahha, ‘āhah; by ´eton. deriv. > Ar. ‘ahhat, ‘tristesse’, ‘affliction; also as exclamation Heb. ‘āhāh, ‘alas!’ (HALOT 18); Eth.: Tig. ‘aha belā, ‘to call’ < ‘to utter a cry’ (cf. Cat. ‘cridar); Amh. ahah, exclam. of surprise, ahehe, ‘cry of mourning, pain or sorrow’ (AED 1091).

2 - Second level: expanded base

/’aW:YaH/- Deriv. predic. by expan. glide /-w:y-/, < /’ah/ > /’a+w:ya+ha/, SWS. BS.: ‘to utter a cry of grief’: Ar. * ‘āha, ‘awwaha, ta’awwaha, ‘ayyaha ‘to say āhi, from a motive of pain, ... affection, pity ..., to cry’, and the byforms āhi, āwh, āwhi, āwi(n), wāhan, hāh, hāhu ...; > ‘ṭh, ‘ṭha(n), a command ‘be silent’.

This expansion can also be considered a vocalic intensification, as usual. There is no other expansion, in keeping with the onomatopoeic nature of the lexeme.

/’aH/-

1 - First level: simple base

ancient, as Eg. 3ḥt, ‘field’, proves. In this case, Murtonen 1989:87 posits a second base as a LW from Eg.

Cf. Murtonen 1989:87. One of the ‘six nouns’; cf. */ḥa/>. The problem of case lengthening of the */-w/* or gemination, as in */ḥa/-, is involved here, because of the archaism and persistence of the case system in this field; cf. DRS 15. - AA: */ḥa* (HSED 7). Given this AA ancestry, the same ‘brother’ seems more original in relation to ‘side’, even if this same is more generic. Phonologically, a {pharyngeal + labial} symphoneme seems to be operative in this field: */ḥ/n/, */ḥ/m/, */ḥ/m/, but */ḥ/n/. Universal semantic. - SF: ‘Family relationship’.


While no prefix. and suff. expansions of this clustar can be identified, an apparent infix. expansion */ḥ/h/* may be considered:

*/ḥaH/* Denom. deriv. predic. by infix. */-n/* expansion < */ḥ/* > */a+n(a)-ḥa/*, E/WS. BS: ‘to express bad mood’: Akk. anāḥu, ‘to be(com)e tired’ >> ‘to sigh’; Ug. ‘aḥ, ‘complaining’; Heb. */’ḥ/, neʾēḥā, ‘to groan’.

2 - Second level: expanded base

*/ḥaWa/* Denom. nomin./predic. expan./-ya/* < */ḥ-/* 1) > */ḥ(a)+wa/*, CS. BS: ‘to become a brother, tied to’: Akk. aḥū(m) GT, ‘to fraternise, conspire’; Heb. */ḥh/* N, ‘to fraternise’; Aram.: JAr. */ḥ/*, ʾaḥā, ‘to unite’ (DTT 40); Syr. */ḥ(w)/ Etpe., ‘to become brothers’; ESA: Sab. ʾḥw, ‘to be allied’; Ar. ʾḥū(w), to ‘become a brother’; Eth.: Ge. taʾāḥawa, to be a brother’.


3 - Homographs/Loanwords


*/aH/*

1 - First level: a) simple base
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But an AA origin is also possible; cf. Eg. 'āḥ, ‘bird’ (GHÄD 158).

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/əHa/ Denom. predic. by conson. intens./gemin. < /'a:ha/ > /'ah(a)ha/, SW/SS. BS: ‘to bring out the /'a/ sound’: Ar. ahaḥa, ‘faire ahha! ahha!’ (‘comme fait celui qui tousse’, DAF 15); Tig. aḥu belā, ‘to cough’; Gur./Har. uhu' barā, ‘to cough’.

A suffix. /-l/ expansion of this exclamatory functor may be Ug. ahl, ‘if only!’; Heb. aḥlē, ‘oh!, if only!’.

No other expansion can be ascertained for the whole group of the exclamatory functors /'ah/, /'ā/,

2 - Homographs/Loanwords

Heb. āḥū, ‘sedge, marsh plant’, by meton. expansion > ‘reed-bed’, with regressive vocal. assimilation (cf. Eg.); EpAram. ēw(h), ‘grass, vegetation’; LW, cf. AA: Eg. ēhw, ‘leafy tree’ (GHÄD 96). It is necessary to distinguish this base/sense from /a-h/, ‘brother/side’.

Tig. aḥū, Tigā. aḥḥā, ‘cows’ < Eg. ē(w) (), ‘leafy tree’ (CDME 28; cf. Essai 78).


Universal semantic; cf. Monoconsonantal, 50, 55f. [':h:k/]. The initial vowel results either from contraction or from prosthesis. SF: Psychophysic expressionism.

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/əK-/ Deriv. nomin./predic. by conson. intens. < /'ak-/ > /'akk/, WS. BS: ‘to show) bad mood’, by cause/effect meton.: JArām.: 'aktānā (? /'kt/), ‘venomous, vindictive’ (DTT 66); Syr., akketā, ‘anger’, akktānā, ‘angry’; Ar. akkuṭu, ‘bad temper > ‘anger > ‘heat’, by metaph. transformation: Ar. 'akkā, ‘to be hot and without wind’ (day). Allomorph. by deriv. vowel. intens./glide (?): Ar. awkattu, ‘anger’ (DAF 69), but in this case a < /'-k/ cannot be ruled out (DRS 13).
2 - Second level: expanded base


Akk. i:ekû(m), ‘to starve, deprive (of food), ‘impovery, bereaved’, could be related either to this binary base or to the triconson. one /’akaya/, from which the whole group would derive. But the allomorphism /’akka/- /’akaya/, ‘bad mood’, in WS and SS, favours the common base /’ak-/. No other either prefix., infix. or suffix. expan. of this cluster is certain. Even the derivation of the intens. and exp. bases < the CS functor /’ak/, /’e(y)k/ is by no means clear (cf. DRS 18). In this regard it would be too risky to take Amh. akš, ‘s.th. disgusting, e.g. spittle, vomit, faeces’, as an exp. /-š(a)/ suffix. of /’ak/.

d) Homographs/Loanwords

Some conson. homographs show no relationship whatever to the proposed /’vK-/ and must be explained otherwise (cf. the related roots /k’y/, /kwy/, k’:h/; DRS 18). Of these, the following may be quoted: Akk. akkû, ‘Eule’ (AHw 29), possibly of onomatop. origin; other Akk. lexemes such as akayû, ‘object of wood, (donkey) stick’, ukû, ‘a part of the loom’, ëku, ‘field (a measure)’, akû, ‘anchor’, may be LW; also akitu, ‘New Year festival’, as its possible connexion with Akk. i:ekû(m), as a feast of ‘degradation’, is not apparent; Ar. ‘ikâ’, ‘akyu, caution, guarantee’, possibly also a LW; Tig. ‘awwäkä, ‘to feed’, and Amh.ahun, Har. ahja’, ‘maintenance’, ‘ah’ aštïnä, apparently < Cush. ak (cf. DRS 18); Tig. ‘uk belä, ‘to drive animals’, may be of onomatopoeic origin.

/’aL-/  

1 - First level : a) simple base


Of onomatopoeic origin, related to /yll/ and /ll/ < {laryng./velar + later.} resonance (cf. DRS 20-21). Cf. /’alaw-/ b) infra. Cf. Zaborski 1971:54, who quotes two presumed Heb. allographs/expansions: /’yl/ N, ‘to act foolishly’; ‘ewil, ‘fool’; both apparently alternative byforms of /’wl/ (cf. HALOT 21, 381), but I prefer to see them as semantically derived forms < /’al-/ (cf. infra), not from an original root /’wl/. Possible contamination of meaning. Amh. alâ, Tigñ. álâ, ‘to say’, could be related (?) to /’al/ c as an exclamative deixis (cf. also. /’gl-/ b)) - SF: Psychophysical expression.


1 - First level: b) intensified base


Cf. AA: *'al/ul, ‘stick’ (HSED 8). In DRS 12, 17, 21 there seems to be a confusion: the same base is listed under different ‘roots’ without cross-references.

/'aL-/ b) Deriv. predic. by conson. intens. < /'al-/ > /'al(a)la/, SWS. BS: ‘manifest himself powerful’: MHeb.: Aram.: ‘âlal, ‘to be strong’ > ‘to circle’ > ‘to spy’ (DTT 71); Ar. ‘allâ, ‘briller, étinceler’ > ‘se hâter, s’agiter’ (‘like a thunderbolt’: light and power as primary cosmic forces) (?). By meton. enant. deverb. noun: Ar. ‘ill, ‘enemity’ (?), better than < /'al(a)la/ a) (cf. DRS 21); ?> Tigñ. ‘alala, ‘to roast’ (?) (Essai 82).

The same ‘shine, flame’ has AA parallels (Essai 82).
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A denom. deriv. from ʼāl(a) is not to be ruled out.

The deriv. must be pre-Semitic; cf. AA ʼayal- ʼdeer, ibex’ (HSED 19; Murtonen 1989:89); Eg. ījr, seems a LW < Semitic. Akk., Ug. and Heb. make its relationship to ʼal- almost certain (< ‘powerful, sexually potent’, ‘the first’ [?]). Possible primitive totemic connotations.

2 - Second level: expanded base

Among the expansions of this cluster the following can be suggested as very probable:

Cf. Zaborski 1971:54, who quotes two presumed Heb. allographs/expansions: /y-ʼ/ N, ‘to act foolishly’: ʼewīl, ‘fool’, both apparently alternative byforms of /ʼwl/ (cf. HALOT 21, 381). But I prefer to see them as semantically derived forms from < ʼwl, not from an original root /ʼwl/. In antiquity a ‘fool’ was considered a ‘divine’ and ‘powerful’ entity. For Akk. this seems a better etymology than < ʼnm (cf. DRS 12). This deriv. has to be considered a real epenthesis, not a simple vocal. intensification. Also Heb./JAr. ʼēlām/ûlām(ʼ), ‘porch, entrance’, ‘in front of’ (DTT 26), possibly a secondary -am/ expan. suffix. of this expanded base (Murtonen 1989:85).
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THE BICONSONANTAL SEMITIC LEXICON

1. THE SERIES /'/-X-/

Cf. AA: *'alan-, *'alun-, ‘tree’ (HSED 9); Eg. innu (illn) // 'al-lā-细节 LW (WäS 1 98; Helecz 1971:507). It may be a pre-proto-Semitic triconson. PrimW with possible totemic connotations. However, Heb. *alā, ‘stick’, does not exist (HSED 8; cf. Diakonoff/Kogan 1996:27).

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\textit{\`aLaN-}} \text{ Nomin. deriv. by suff. expant. } \text{\textit{-n/}} & < \text{\textit{-l/}} > \text{\textit{-lū/}} > \text{\textit{-lān/-}}, \text{WS. BS: ‘supreme power, god’; Ug. \textit{iln}, ‘deity, god’; NWS: Phoen.-Pun. } \text{\textit{ln}}, \text{pl. } \text{\textit{lnm}}, \text{\textit{alonim}, ‘god’}. \\
\text{\textit{\`aLaW:Y-}} & \text{ a) Denom. predic. expant. } \text{\textit{w:y/-}} < \text{\textit{-l/}} > \text{\textit{al(a)+ya/-}}, \text{WS. BS: ‘to show/exert power’; Heb. \\`alāh, ‘to put s.o. under an oath, curse’, \\`alāh, ‘curse’; (magic as the greatest divine power); ESA: Sab. \textit{lh}, ‘curse’; Ar. \textit{alā}, ‘to be able to’, ‘to give’ // IV ‘to swear’ (cf. Murtonen 1989:91). By enant. and in the ambivalent field of curse (< ‘to be under another’s power, cursed’): Heb. */`alā/ > yō`el, ‘to fall short’; Ar. \textit{alā}, ‘to fall short of’ (it is not necessary then to postulate a specific AA etymon */VI-, ‘to be exhausted’: HSED 37). By metonym. concomitance: ‘consequence of a curse/oath’: NWS: Phoen.-Pun. \textit{lh/t}, ‘covenant’ (expression of power as ‘present’ and ‘curse’); allomorph. with vocal. glide: Phoen. */ylt/, ‘covenant’; by enant. Tig. /\`al/, ‘fault, weak point, danger spot’ (which manifests impotence)’. \\
\text{\textit{\`aLaY-}} & \text{ b) Denom. predic. expant. } \text{\textit{w:y/-}} < \text{\textit{-l/}} > \text{\textit{al(a)+ya/-}}, \text{WS. BS: ‘to utter an /`al/ cry’: Heb. \\`alāh, ‘to wail’; Aram. JAram. \textit{\`alā}, ‘to lament, wail’ (DTT 68): Syr. \textit{\`alā}, ‘to cry, lament’ (cf. Mand alia, ‘whither to go!’); > ? Ar. mi\`lātū, ‘piece of rag which a woman holds in wailing’.
\end{align*}\]

The same enant. can be seen in /l*/h/, /l*/y/, with the same semantic value, possibly by metathesis/resonance. Or are we dealing here with an intrinsically ambiguous seme? Also Akk. e\`elu, ‘to bind’, i\`lu(m), ‘contract, bond’, should be taken into account in this connexion. But this is probably another (allophone?, /y/- expant.) base (/y'l/) (cf. AHw 189). On the other hand, an AA etymon */iI/, ‘swear, oath’ (HSED 26), of Sem. */:y/h/ is very dubious.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\textit{\`aLaH-}} \text{ Deriv. nomin. by expant. } \text{\textit{-h/}} < \text{\textit{-l/}} > \text{\textit{-lū/}} > \text{\textit{-lāh/-}}, \text{W/SS. BS: ‘supreme power, god’: Ug. } \textit{lh(m)}, \text{‘the divine one’; NWS: ‘god’ = EpHeb., EpAram., Palm., Nab., Hatr. } \textit{lh; Hebr. } \textit{\`alāh(m); Aram. } \textit{lah; JAram. \`elāh; JBaram. \`alāhā; Syr. \`alāhā; Mand. alaha; ESA: } \textit{lh; Ar. } \textit{\`alāhū, with allomorph by conson. intens. \`allāhū, as DN; > Eth.: Tig. } \textit{ilahi}, \text{‘Lord God’ (< Heb.); Gur. allah, alla (< Ar.), ‘God’}. \\
\end{align*}\]


Other more uncertain expansions of the onomatop. binary cluster /\`al/ could be: CS /šVl/, BS: ‘to make one’s own cry heard’ > ‘to exclaim’ (Cat. cridar, ‘to call’), according to the causative force of the morpheme /š/-: ‘to ask’ = Akk. šālum, ša šālum; Ebl. /ša-il-tum/, /ši-\`a-lu/; Ug. šl; NWS: Pun., EpHeb., EpAram., Nab. šl; Heb. šā`al; Aram.: JP/Baram. /šVl/; Syr. šēl; ESA: Sab. šl; Ar. sa`ala; Eth.: Ge. sa`ala; Tig. tēšā`ala; Gur. tāsalā; but Amh. tāsalā, to make a vow < salāt, ‘vow’ (Murtonen 1989:407); especially in the semantic field of invoking the dead and soothsaying, whence šē`ōl, ‘wasteland’, ‘underworld’ (cf. HALOT 1368-1370; for this Heb. lexeme Murtonen 1989:407 suggests the root /šV/, which seems rather unlikely).

More uncertain is Heb. /\`lm/ ‘dumb’, according the enant. indicated above; also as an infix. expansion /m/ > /\`al/: Heb. um\`al, ‘to dry out, dwindle’, Phoen. /`ml/, ‘wither’ (cf. Murtonen 1989:93) – It is also difficult to
determine the relationship of this cluster to Eth.: Ge. hallawa, ‘to be’, Tig. halla, Tigä. ‘allo, Amh. allä, Gur. allä (cf. CDG 218; Diakonoff/Kogan 1996:27), according to its basic seme (‘first affirmation of power...’) recorded above; possibly an AA origin is to be presumed: Eg. iri, ‘to create’, Ber. el, ili, ‘to be’ (cf. Essai 80). This applies especially if one takes into account the absence in this area of the base /’al-/ ‘impersonal and personified cosmic, supreme power, the first’ / ‘the powerful, the first’ > ‘god’. This original perception of existence as an assessment of priority and power is possibly to be found in AA *’al-/*’il-, ‘to be’ (HSED 8).

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

The CS functorial values and their morphological expan. (pron., conj., adv.: negative, affirmative) are more the result of the prosthetic conj. < /’al/; also Heb. /’u-lay/, ‘possibly’, and Akk. ul- (id.), ul, ‘not’/’or’ (Monoconsonantal:49ff.), than due to derivation from an original cluster < /’al/.

Among the many homographs the following may be quoted:


Akk. elûnum, elûlu(m), ulûlu, ‘month name’ > Heb., JAram. ‘èlûl, Náb. ‘èlw, Ar. ‘aylûl (cf. Murtonen 1989:90; for a bibliography cf. DRS 21) < Sum. LW possibly, but a Sem. etymology is not to be ruled out./

Akk. alallum, elallum, ‘a stone’ < LW?

Akk. allantu, ‘a kind of bird’ < LW?

Akk. itu, illu, ‘reed bundle’ < LW?

Akk. illatu(m), illitu(m), allitu/m), ‘band, group’ <? ‘flock’ <? by conson. intensification < /’al-/ > /’èl-/ ‘male small cattle animal’.

Akk. illûtu(m), ‘saliva’ <? AA *’ilaw:y, ‘saliva’ (HSED 27); possibly related by metonymy to < /’al-/ > /’al(a)+w:ya/, ‘to utter an /’al/ cry’.

Ug. ‘wil, ‘wîlî, ’iwellet, ‘fool’; Meh. haywel, ‘mad’; Soq. halhal, ‘idiot’; the semantic enant. deriv. or possibly the semantic shift > as a ‘divinely powerful person’ offer better deriv. pattern than the etymology < ‘strong, fat’ > ‘stupid’ usually suggested (cf. DRS 12; HALOT 21; Murtonen 1989:85) cf. supra /’awal-./

Ar. ’uwâlu, ‘shark’ (cf. SDA 45; ‘indien’).

Ar. ﬂocclusion in far away pastures’ (DAF 44) < in relation to /’ayl/, ‘ram’, and its allophones, ‘powerful’ flock? On the other hand, the relationship of this cluster /’l-/ to /’l-/ > /’el-/ > /’al-/ > /’al(a)+w:ya/, ‘to utter an /’al/ cry’.

Ug. ‘wil, ‘wîlî, ’iwellet, ‘fool’; Meh. haywel, ‘mad’; Soq. halhal, ‘idiot’; the semantic enant. deriv. or possibly the semantic shift > as a ‘divinely powerful person’ offer better deriv. pattern than the etymology < ‘strong, fat’ > ‘stupid’ usually suggested (cf. DRS 12; HALOT 21; Murtonen 1989:85) cf. supra /’awal-/.

Ar. ’uwâlu, ‘shark’ (cf. SDA 45; ‘indien’).

Ar. ’uwâlu, ‘flock grazing in far away pastures’ (DAF 44) < in relation to /’ayl/, ‘ram’, and its allophones, ‘powerful’ flock? On the other hand, the relationship of this cluster /’l-/ to /’l-/ > /’el-/ > /’el-/ > /’al-/ > /’al(a)+w:ya/, ‘to utter an /’al/ cry’.

Ug. ‘wil, ‘wîlî, ’iwellet, ‘fool’; Meh. haywel, ‘mad’; Soq. halhal, ‘idiot’; the semantic enant. deriv. or possibly the semantic shift > as a ‘divinely powerful person’ offer better deriv. pattern than the etymology < ‘strong, fat’ > ‘stupid’ usually suggested (cf. DRS 12; HALOT 21; Murtonen 1989:85) cf. supra /’awal-/.

Ar. ’uwâlu, ‘shark’ (cf. SDA 45; ‘indien’).

Ar. ’uwâlu, ‘flock grazing in far away pastures’ (DAF 44) < in relation to /’ayl/, ‘ram’, and its allophones, ‘powerful’ flock? On the other hand, the relationship of this cluster /’l-/ to /’l-/ > /’el-/ > /’el-/ > /’al-/ > /’al(a)+w:ya/, ‘to utter an /’al/ cry’.

Ug. ‘wil, ‘wîlî, ’iwellet, ‘fool’; Meh. haywel, ‘mad’; Soq. halhal, ‘idiot’; the semantic enant. deriv. or possibly the semantic shift > as a ‘divinely powerful person’ offer better deriv. pattern than the etymology < ‘strong, fat’ > ‘stupid’ usually suggested (cf. DRS 12; HALOT 21; Murtonen 1989:85) cf. supra /’awal-/.

/’aM-

1 - First level: a) simple base

/’aM-


Cf. Murtonen 1989:92. Possibly the base was originally expansive: /’əm+ḥ-/ [> /’amah-at-/ > /’amat/-], with ellipsis of intervocalic /-h-/ and vocalic assimilation, as can be ascertained from the pl. forms. In Ar. it is subsumed under /’w/ (cf. AEL 103). – AA: *ʾam-, ‘woman’, Eg. ʾmwt (Essai 83; HSED 10), in her various functions, including that of ‘mother’ /’əm-/ (!); but cf. also Eg. (ʾhm), ʾmt, ‘woman’ (Essai 84). – BS: Family (social order).


*/’aM- 3) Onomatopoeic expression of breathlessness in deriv. predic. form by vocal. intens. SS. BS: ‘to utter this sound: Ar. ʾāma, ‘to gasp for breath from thirst’ (DAF 71); > Tig. ʾam bālā, ‘to moan, groan’.

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/’aM-/ Denom. predic. deriv. by intens.-gemin. < /’əm-/ > /’əm(a)ma/, W/SS. BS: ‘to be at the origin of …’: Ar. ʾamma, ‘to tend, to aim at …’, ‘to precede at the head’, ‘to become a mother’, VIII taʾammama, ‘to adopt as a mother’; ENA: Saf. ’m, > ‘to move towards’ (DRS 23); ESA: * ’mm, ‘to
be at the head of’ (DRS 23), refl. ‘tnm, ‘to obey, to be led’ (SD 6); Eth.: Tig. ‘ammāmā, ‘to go in a direction, to resolve’; Tig.ā ‘to plan, ‘to propose’ > deverb. noun Ar. amāmu, ‘the location that is before’, ‘amamu, ‘nearness, ‘in front of’, ‘imāmu, ‘a person whose example is followed’; Syr. ‘amawmā, ‘form, protoplasm’; Akk. ummum, ‘maître, chef de travaux’? (cf. ‘a’tamma ‘to follow the example of’ (cf. infra ‘atamma) (AEL 103).

/aM-/ Denom. predic. deriv. by vocal. intens./epenth. -w-/ < /’uni0259´-/ > /’ā´a/ as a contrast. allomorph of the former: Ar. ‘ā(w)ma, ‘to march at the head of, gouvern’ (DAF 71); > Ar. ‘awwama, ‘to thicken’ (DAF 71).

/aM-/ Denom. predic. derive. by vocal. intens./epenth. -y-/ < /’uni0259´-/ > /’ā´a/ as a contrast allorph., WS. BS: by enant.: ‘not to be a mother’: Ar. ‘oma, ‘not to have a husband’ (AEL 137) >> Ar. ‘aymu, ‘unmarried’ (DAF 75).

2 - Second level: expanded base

There are no clear expanded forms of these bases, except for some denominative phenotypes by a suff. -wa/:

/aMaW/- 1) Denom. predic. deriv. by expan. (wa) < */’uni0259´/ 1) > /’uni0259´(a)+wa/, WSS. BS: ‘to become a slave’: Ar. ‘amā(w), ‘to become a slave (a woman’)’.

/aMaW/- 2) Deriv. predic. deriv. by expan. (wa) < */’uni0259´/ 3) > /’uni0259´(a)(w)/, NSS. BS: ‘to utter the sound /’uni0259´/: Ar. ‘amā, ‘to mew (of a cat), ‘to utter a cry’.

This derivation may come from another independent onomatopeia. (cf. Sp. ‘miau’).


Following the reasoning of Murtonen 1989:269 (‘reference apparently to the noises . . .’), /n’m/ (Heb., Ar.) could be taken as a prefix. /n-/ expan. of */’uni0259´/ 3), with /nhm/ as an allophone. From this same onomatop. base CS r’t’m, a wild animal, could also derive, connoting the snuffling of the animal (?) (cf. Murtonen 1989:391: ‘a wandering word of unknown origin’).


3 - Homographs/Loanwords

There are many consonantal homographs which cannot be connected with this cluster, including:

CS functor ‘am, ‘him, by prosthesis of /+m/ (cf. Monoconsonantal 55, 59f.).

Akk. amu(m), ‘raft’ < hamu(m).

Akk. amū, a spiny plant < (?)

Akk. amū, ‘palate’ < Sum.

Akk. amūtu(m), ‘liver of a sacrificial sheep’ < (?)

Akk. amūtu(m), ‘meteoric iron’ < (?)
1. THE SERIES */-X-/ 

Akk. *ummu(m), ‘heat, fever’ < *emēmu < /hm/.


Syr. /āmawtā/, ‘wall lizard’; Murtonen 1989:89 (cf. Ar. /āmu/, ‘serpent’ (DAF 75)).

Ar. *āmmatu, ‘a wound’ >> /am/ 2), cf. Sp. ‘cudazo’);

Ar. *āmatu, ‘vice, default’ (DAE 75).

Ge. /'yás/, ‘ema, ‘ema, ‘to make a hedge for a pen’ < (?).

Tig., Tigñ. /om/, ‘tree, fruit tree’ < LW /m/.

*/'aN-/ 1) First level: a) simple base / b) intensified base

*/'a:/uni0259N-/ 1) PrimW nom./predic. with various alternative intens./expan. [/'anaya/, /'anna/, /'āna/], WS.


There is possibly contamination and allomorph. contrast between the two bases in as much as ‘effort’ includes ‘fatigue, pain’ and ‘strength’ at the same time. This is not merely a question of ‘pronunciations’, but of variant morphological vocalisations based on semantic shifts, a normal derivative device in any language (cf. Dulière 1970:24-25). On the other hand, the existence of an AA *'in., ‘to flow, to be wet’ (HSED 28), as an etymology of the rather obscure Ar. ‘inn/ is very debatable. - SF: Psycho-physical sensations, reactions.
2 – Second level: expanded base

Of the possible expansions of this cluster only the following can be singled out with a certain degree of probability:

\'/aNaY-\' cf. supra \'/a: \uni0259n-/ 1). \n
\'/aNaŠ-\' 1) Denom. predicat. deriv. by caus. suffix. \'/-š/ < \'/a: \uni0259n-/ 1) > \'/ana+ša/, WS. BS: ‘to manifest/produce physical pain’: Akk. enēšu, ‘to be(come) weak’; Ug. anš, ‘to languish, fall ill, to become livid’; Heb. \'/nš /, to be sickly’, ūnūš, ‘incurable’; Aram.: Syr. naš(š), ‘weak’, by apheresis and compensatory gimim.; Eth.: Ge. ne’sa, ‘to be small …’, by methat.; Tig. nā’asā, ‘to be small’; Tign. nā’asā, ‘to be small’.

As for Ug. anš, ‘muscle, tendon’?, and CS \'/nš/, ‘man’, cf. infra \'/\uni0259š/ a). Ug. lan, ‘power’ is to be related to > /l-\'-y/. Note that E/WS \'/\uni0259n\'/, ‘shoe’, seems to be a Hurr. LW (cf. Murtonen 1989:295; DUL 796, Heb. /ś\'/n/ (!)), although Is. 9:4 would support < \'/a:\uni0259-\'-/ 2), as ‘manifestation of (military) power’. The same could be said of Heb./Syr. \'/\uni0259n\'/, ‘be quiet, without anxiety’ < ‘that makes s.o. strong’ (?) (cf. HALOT 1279f.; Murtonen 1989:407); Hurvitz 1913:89 suggests the root \'/\uni0259n\'/.

Heb./Syr. \'/mn\'/, ‘to refuse’/‘be disgusted’ (Murtonen 1989:253) could be related to \'/a:\uni0259n-/ 1) as a prefix. /m/- expan., but this is not certain.

However, CS \'/mn\'/, ‘to be firm’ (HALOT 63) seems to < AA: Eg. mn, ‘to be firm’, and in any case is not related to /'-n/.

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

There are many consonan. homographs of this cluster:

First of all, the deictic lexemes of the pronominal and functorial series: CS \'/an(a)\', ‘I’ (cf. Pronouns, pp. 104ff.; DR25); ES/Akk. ana, ‘to, for’; Akk. annūm, ‘this’ and deriv.; Akk. īna, ‘in, on’; annānum, ‘here’; WS \'an, ‘wherever/where?’; Ar. ānnā, ‘whence?’; Aram., Syr., Ar. i’en(a), conditional functor; Akk. anna, ‘yes, certainly’, annū, ‘look!’; Heb., Aram. ʿānnāh, ‘please’; Ar., ān, anna, īnna, subordinating functors, Ge. ʿen(-ka), ‘so then’, etc., etc. These functorial /'-n/ morphemes in the various languages (pron., adv., conj.) are to be considered of deictic origin, along the lines of the 1st person pron. /'-a-na/ and according to various semantic shifts. The alternation \'/:hn\'/:hm/ proves the supposed deictic origin of the bases and of equivalent atomic constituents. In this case, the basic element is deictic /n/ + prothetic /'1/ and also encl. /'-a/ (cf. Barth 1967b:96ff.). Ar. ʿanā(y), ‘to be present, near to’/‘to come to its time’ and deriv., may be related to some of these locative/temporal functioners. Other phenotypes are related to the deictic base /'-y/ + -n (cf. infra; DR24-25).

Consonantal homographs of /'-n/ include the following:

Akk. ana:antu(m), ‘battle, strife’ < (?).
Akk. anatu, a ring < (?).
Akk. anu, a sort of wood or tree < (?).
Akk. anu(m), a metal < (?).
Akk. annūtu, a plant < (?).
Akk. īna(m), a musical instrument < (?).
Akk. inū, ‘job, craft’ < (?).
Akk. unû, ‘a kind of meat’ < (?): this lexical item only occurs in jB and scarcely justifies an AA etymology *‘unay-, meat’ (HSED 34).

Akk. unūtu(m), ‘tools, utensils’ < (?).

Ar. ‘awnu, ‘knapsack’ (DRS 13).

Ar. ‘awān, ‘tortoises’ (DRS 13).

WS /‘ny/, ‘ship’, possibly an Eg. LW (cf. Eg. ini, ‘to bring, carry off’, iny, ‘materials for handicrafts’ (CDME 22f.) and a supposed i-na-ya according to Albright; cf. HALOT 71), although a Sem. etymology is also proposed: /’ny/ ‘to hold’ (cf. HALOT 70f., CDG 410) > EpAram. m’n, ‘vessel, vase’, Syr. mānā, ‘vessel, ship’, in keeping with the isosemantic chain: ‘vessel, vase’ > ‘vessel, ship’; Ar. ‘inā’, ‘vessel, receptacle’; Ge. nāwāy, ‘vessel, instrument’, … wealth’; Akk. unūtum, ‘tools, equipment’. In any case it would be a very original derivation/ expansion if < /’an-/ 2) > the ‘vessel/ship’ as a manifestation of power/wealth. A possible AA origin must be taken into account: Eg. ḫrwv, ‘jar’ (Essai 80; Murtonen 1989:95).

/*aP-/

1 - First level: a) simple base


Cf. the expant. /-e/ infra; there is the possibility of an original triconson. /pn/ with regressive assimilation in Akk. (?). - SF: Basic instrument/action.


1 - First level: b) intensified base

/aP/- Denom. predic. deriv. by intens./gemin. conson. < /’ap-/ > /’ap(a)pa/, E/WS. BS: ‘to encircle’: Akk. ‘apāpu(m), ‘to ring, encircle’ (AHw 57); Heb. ‘āpap, ‘to encompass’.
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2 - Second level: expanded base

Some dubious infix. and suff. expansions of this cluster can be singled out. Some of them may go back to triconson. bases, of which the biconson. may be a reduction. However no prefix. expansion seems to be extant.

\( /'P(v)R-/ \) Denom. predic. expan. by suff. \(-/r/ < /'ap-/\), cf. > /'apa+ra/ ‘to cover’: Akk. \( \text{apāru(m)} \), ‘to cover (the head)’, aparu, a loincloth > Heb. ‘pēr, ‘band’.

Cf. supra.

\( /'vP(v)N- \) Nomin. deriv. by suff. expan. \(-/n/ < /'ap-/\), > /'apan-/\), NWS. BS.: ‘that binds, encircles’ > ‘round’: Ug. ‘pn’, ‘wheel’; Heb. ‘ôpan, ‘wheel’ > ‘open, '(proper) time, way’ > said of time (cf. ‘the wheel of time’ in many languages; DRS 29); NWS: EpAram. ‘pn, ‘fixed time’; Aram.: JArám. ‘ôpni’, ‘turn’ (DTT 31); Syr. *’upnâ, pl. *’upnē, ‘wheels’; said also of the (repeated, circular) way of behaviour; cf. supra Ar. ‘iffu, ‘iffān. (> Ar. fannu, ‘manner’).

The ‘wheel’ is not a primary instrument, so this would be a secondary deriv. KW (cf. Murtonen 1989:98f., but his division into two bases seems unnecessary). – For Cohen < ‘sans doute /p-p/, with /'/ prosthetic’ (DRS 29, cf. other expan.: /h-p-p/, /l-p-p/); but the expan. /’pn/ does not support this deriv.

\( /'aPaY- \) Denom. predic. expan. \(-/ya/ < /'ap-/ > /'apa+ya/\), NE/NWS. BS: ‘to encircle’ > ‘to cover’: Akk. apû, ‘to become veiled’ > upû, ‘cloud’; Aram.: Syr. ‘ap(p)ayē, ‘veil, curtain, binding’.

Nevertheless, the relationship to /’ap-/ is not clear (DRS 28). For JArám. ‘ôfā’, Mand. aupa, cf. /’ap:f/- supra.


Cf. Murtonen 1989:98. Common, primary and original conson. harmony in relation to ‘fire’ (‘blowing’). Its possible relationship to /’ap-/, ‘to encircle’, is not clear; but in any case ‘chasing/encircling’ (< /’ap-/) preceded ‘cooking’ (< /’ap-/), a secondary ‘modern’ activity, and ‘oven, kiln’ is instead a secondary cultural implement. Akk. and Ar. indicate different allomorphic ‘roots’: /p(y)/ // /wp(y)/ (?)
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The relationship to onomatop. /'ap-/ and to the same ‘to blow’ supposes a certain semantic shift that is not self-evident and in any case is very primitive. In this connexion, see Amh. afenta, ‘nose’ (< /nfl/, ‘to blow the nose’, with metath.; cf. CDG 28; cf. Eg. fnq, ‘nose’), that suggests a resonance [{attack glottal/nasal} + {labial}] as original, secondarily developed into an allothetic base in Amh., or simply a mix of bases. Instead, Cohen (Essai 83; cf. also Rapallo 2000:2020) suggests the AA root /fn/ which I find less suitable, given the dissimilatory character of /n/ and the persistence of the pharyngeal/velar attack in the AA languages.

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

Among the conson. homographs of this cluster, the functors /'p/, /'pw/, /'pnk/, etc. (< /p/) must be left out of consideration (cf. Monoconsonantal, pp. 62; ChCohen 2004:*15-*16, *18-*20; but the proposed distinction of two /'ap/ is apparently more a question of function than of etymology). Here are some others which cannot be easily derived from the present bases:

Heb./Aram. /š'p/, ‘to gasp for air, to pant, to strive’, may be considered a prefix. /š-/ expan. of /'ap:f-/ rather than related to the root /šwp/ (Murtonen 1989:407).

3.1 - First level: simple base

*/'aQ-/

A sterile cluster with no clear expansions; /n'q/, ‘to groan’, in Akk., Heb., JAram. and Tham., could be related to < /'nq/, /nhq/ (cf. HALOT 658; Murtonen 1989:269) as two alternative allothetic realisations (*/'-q' // */n-q/) of a resonance [{glottal attack glottal/nasal} + {velar}]. Ar. 'aqā, ‘to displease (of food)’ could provide a hint of an original biconson. base of onomat. origin expressing disgust (?). From it, through a descriptive / denominative shift, Ar. 'anāqu, ‘small goat’(?), Heb. 'aqqō, ‘wild goat’ (Akk. inqu does not seem to exist; Murtonenn 1989:99) could be derived (because of their bleating sound). But neither the original base nor the deriv. shift can be determined.

2 - Homographs/Loanwords

There are numerous conson. homographs of this cluster, but no common or a clear-cut biconsonantal root can be identified:

Akk. eqū, ‘to anoint’ (< ?)
Akk. āq, a cult object (< ?).
Akk. uq, ‘people’ (< ?).
Aram. iy, ‘to understand’(?), cf. Eth. /wq/, ‘to know, understand’.
Syr. 'iṣqīnā, ‘woman’s hair band’ (TLS 90); cf. < Ar. wiqāyatu < /waqā/, ‘to guard, protect’.
Ar. 'uqiyatu, 'awqiyatu, ‘a weight’ < Greek/Lat. ‘oukia !!Greek script!! /uncia’.
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Ar. 'awqu, ‘burden, misfortune’ < /r/āqa/, ‘to hang, to draw a disgrace’, possibly a denom. deriv. loan from the former. 
Ar. 'uqatu, ‘narrow well for rainwater’ (LAL 70);
Ar. 'awqatu, ‘group, crowd (of men)’ (LAL 70).
Ar. 'ayqu, ‘lower joint of a horse’s leg’ (<?).

/vR-

1 - First level: a) simple base


Cf. Zaborski 1971:54.; Murtonen 1989:85. AA *‘ur-, ‘to burn, be hot’/‘day’ (HSED 35). SF: Natural phenom/ climate: ‘fire’ and (>“light”, simultaneous, meton. relationship. The relationship of Heb. ‘ārim, ‘instrument for casting lots’, to this base is very dubious (cf. HALOT 25); it is a KW (/ tummīm) from the semantic field of magic. DRS 13 quotes the following ‘resonances’ /WRẖ, SHR, NWR, HHR/.

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/aR/ 1) Denom. predic. deriv. by conson. intens. < /aːr-/> /ar(a)ra/, CS. BS: ‘to set on fire’: Akk. arru, ‘tattooed, marked’ (AHw 71; = ‘branded’ (‘)), arrātu, pl., ‘brand mark on the hand of the temple slaves’ (CDA 24, but NB); said first of the fire and by metaph. shift also of the psychological state < Akk. arāru(m), ‘to be convulse’ (cf. infra Ar. ‘ār(y), ‘to inflame with anger’, DAF 27; while an AA *‘er-, ‘tremble’, supposed by HSED 21, is rather weak). As meton. effect of rage or fury (cf. Sp. ‘ardor’), a very common meton. in many languages > ‘curse’: Akk. arāru(m), ‘to curse’, arratu(m), ‘curse’; NWS: EpHeb. ‘rr, ‘to curse’; Heb. ‘ārar, ‘bind with a curse’, m’ērāh, ‘curse’, ‘rrh, ‘curse’ (Qumranic Hebrew); Aram.: JAr. ‘ār, ‘to curse’ (DTT 126); MSA: Soq. ‘rr, ‘to get angry’, ‘to curse’ (cf. SL 76); > meton. effect: Tig. ‘ārar, ‘presumption’, cf. the synon. equivalence in various languages between ‘curse’ and ‘disgrace’. A sexual metaph. deriv. can be seen in: Ar. ‘arra, ‘inivit (eam), to compress’, mi’arru, ‘much addicted to venery’, ‘āra, ‘to force a woman’ (DAF 68; cf. Sp. ‘caliente’, ‘el ardor de la pasión, said of the sexual œstrum). But a denom. deriv. from PrimW. Ar. ‘ayru, ‘penis’ cannot be ruled out.

Cf. Zaborski 1971:54; Murtonen 1989:1000; of AA origin according to HSED 31, but if the semantic break attested in the phylum (/‘to curse’/‘to insult’/‘to be angry’) is taken into account, the assumed derivation is valid for the whole. Instead, Syr. ‘ārā, ‘imprecation’, Ge. ‘ar, ‘oath’, seem to be related to Gr. arā, ‘vow’ (cf. CDG 36).
An onomatop. alluring sound to call animals. NW/SS: Ar. 'ar 'ar, 'irra 'irra, 'a cry to call sheep and goats'; > JAr. 'r', 'fowler' (DTT 113, originating from ādā < Heb. sōdeh, comp. Heb. ād, ād (?) is implausible); Aram.: Syr. arrā, 'bird lure' (?) (DRS 34); Eth.: Tig. Tigā 'arara ‘scaffolding in the cornfields to drive off birds’.

2 - Second level: expanded base

*/aR/- 2) An onomatop. alluring sound to call animals. NW/SS: Ar. 'ar 'ar, 'irra 'irra, 'a cry to call sheep and goats'; > JAr. 'r', 'fowler' (DTT 113, originating from ādā < Heb. sōdeh, comp. Heb. ād, ād (?) is implausible); Aram.: Syr. arrā, 'bird lure' (?) (DRS 34); Eth.: Tig. Tigā 'arara ‘scaffolding in the cornfields to drive off birds’.

On the other hand, a second */ar(a)+y:wa/ denom. predic. deriv. by expant. -/ya:wa/ < */a:ar>/ > */ar(a)+y:wa/, SS. BS: 'to burn': Ar. 'arā(y), 'to be burned', II 'to set fire (to)' (DAF 27); Eth.: Tig. 'arwā, 'to flame up, blaze'.

Other expansions are rather difficult to substantiate. Hypothetically, the following could be singled out from prefixed expansions:

NWS /t'r/: Ug. tar, 'glory' (?); Heb. to'ar, 'appearance, form'; Phoen.-Pun. t'r, 'presence, significance' (?), bt'r'm, 'according to' (cf. Sp. 'a la luz de'), t'r (Murtonen 1989:441). Heb. /n'r/, 'to repudiate', could be considered a dialectal expanded by-form of /'r/, 'to curse' (cf. HALOT 658; Murtonen 1989:269). In this connexion cf. also /m't'/ (Ar. ma'ara, 'somer des inimitiés', ma'ira, 'concevoir une haine contre', 'se rouvrir une plaie' [DFA 1052f., not extant in modern Ar.]; Heb. /m't'/ hif. 'painful, malignant') (Murtonen 1989:253), possibly as an /m/- expant. < */a:ar-/ , taking into account the semantic shifts which occur in */ar(a)ra/.

It would be more hazardous to assume the cluster /'mr/ as an infixed expansion of /'r/, although the BS 'light' > 'to manifest', 'put into light', 'to make visible', 'to make known' (HALOT 65) could easily explain the various 'dactical' shifts: Akk. 'to see', NWS 'to say', Ar./MSA 'to order', Eth. 'to show', MSA 'matter; huge; prince' (ML 6); ESA 'sign, omen, oracle' (SD 6). In this regard Jibb. 'ōr, 'to order', (=?) 'omer, 'matter, order' (JL 3, 5), could represent the missing link, unless this is a syncope/assimilation of 'sonants'/nasals (cf. Sanmartín 1973:263-270; Murtonen 1989:94). Another infixed expansion of /'t'/ could be Phoen. 'ṣr, 'joy', possibly through a metaph. shift (cf. Sp. 'se le iluminó el rostro'); Meh. 'ṣr, 'to point out, beckon' (ML 8), a parallel allomorph to the possible expansion /'mr/ already mentioned.

ESA 'hr, 'to be inflamed, infected (tooth)' (SL 39) could also be considered as an infixed expansion of /'t'/, while CS. /'tś/, 'to desire' (Akk., Ug., Heb., Aram.) is more difficult to establish as a suffixed form (cf. Murtonen 1989:102).

On the other hand, E/WS /nś/: Akk. nāru(n), 'light', Heb. nēr, nīr, 'lamp, light', Ar. nūru, 'light', JAram. nûrā, 'fire', Syr. nûrā, 'fire', Mand. nura, 'fire' and also ESA hnr, 'offer burnt offering', may be considered an /nś/ (?) allomorph of /'t'/ (cf. the Heb. derivatives māʾōr/mēnōrāh, 'lamp').
3 - Homographs/Loanwords

There are several homographs of this consonantal cluster; some are LWs and others belong to different first laryngeal/phyllaryngeal roots or to full triliteral roots. They include:

CS: Akk. *iria, arīta, e/ira, 'side by side'; Ug. arý, 'fellow, friend, kin'; Ar. 'ariyyu, place of confinement of an animal', 'ará, 'animal kept tied to …' < Eg. irí, 'companion'. HSED 14 proposes a AA *-ar-, 'husband', base mainly on Cush. But a possible connexion with /'arə/ > ‘tattooed, marked’ < ‘branded’ (cf. supra), said of slaves and animals, as a way of keeping them attached or under control, is not to be ruled out. On the other hand, the claim of a Sem. etymon *'ar[-] to explain Akk. erūtu, urû, 'fish spawn', related to AA. *'ur, 'fish', is probably unnecessary (cf. Akk. arû, 'to become pregnant'; CDA 80).

Akk. arūru, 'outlet of channel', LW/KW (?) or alloph. of æarārum(?).

Akk. erūtu(m), 'to become pregnant' < /hry/.

Akk. arû(m), 'result, product (ath.)' < Su'r. LW.

Akk. arû(m), 'to voice' < ? of AA origin (cf. HSED 31) or preferably onomatopoeic.

Akk. a:erû, 'branch, frond' < æarû, 'palr shoot' (< æarārum(?)).

Akk. arru, 'a weapon', arītu(m), 'shield' (cf. Ug. art).< SU' LW (?)


Akk. aru(m)/urru, 'roof' < Su' LW.

Akk. urû, 'a bowl' < Nuzi (?).

Ug. irt, 'breast, slope' (cf. Akk. irtu, e/arûtu, Syr. ra(ıt̓a), Ar. ri'atu; also Akk. aru(m)/hurû 'limb, shaft', possibly a PrimW of AA origin: *'ūr-, 'belly, stomach' (HSED 36; Murtonen 1989:390, suggests a monophon. root /h/, in turn related to eru(m)/hurû cited above, although a derivation from the base /hr(r)/, Akk. ḥarûru, 'to dig': 'ext. stat. of part of body …'; D 'of part of a body, stat. 'is hollowed out''; 'make incisions' (CDA 107), is not to be ruled out.

Ar. 'aruu, 'honey' (?)(this lexeme does not exist in Ug.; cf. nbt).

Tig. 'orora, 'slope, declivity' (< /'ʔr/). Amh. 'awwārā, 'poussière (soulevée par le vent)' (cf. DRS 13), <humo <fuego? smoke, fire.
THE BICONSONANTAL SEMITIC LEXICON I. THE SERIES /'-X-/  

1 - First level: simple base

*/'aS-/ PrimW (??), non attested as a simple base, N/SWS. BS: ‘sudden bad condition /situation’: Heb. "āson, ‘fatal accident’ (cf. HSED 25); by metonym. Ar. ‘asanu, ‘grief, sorrow, distress’ (cf. also DMWA 18), ma’satu/ ma’sātu, ‘tragedy, drama’ (DMWA 18); by conson. intens. Ar ‘assa, ‘to corrupt, expoil’ (DFA 30).

The deriv. morph. Ar. ‘aswatu, ‘example, model’ (DMWR 18), is not easily explained from this base (by enant. or as a metonym. shift < the painful situation as ‘exemplary’, ‘endurable’ (?)). - SF: Elementary human situation.

/*'aS/ Of onomatop. origin, WSS.: Ar. ‘as, ‘is, ‘cry used to keep the sheep afar’, ‘assa, ‘to keep away the sheep by crying ‘Is! Is!’ (DAF 30); also the epenth. intens. alloph. Ar. ‘aws, ‘shepherd’s cry on driving? the flock’ (according to DRS 13).

The lexeme is no longer documented in modern Arabic and may be a late dialectal innovation. - SF: Husbandry.

2 - Second level: expanded base

/*'aSwa-/ Denom. predic. deriv. by expan. /-ya/ < */'as- > */'aS(a)+ya/, SWS. BS: ‘to experience a bad condition’: Ar. ‘ṣiya, ‘to grieve, mourn’ (cf. also DMWA 17f).

Ar. ya’isa, ‘ayisa, ‘to despair’ (AEL 137, 2973f.; cf. also Ge. ‘ayasa, ‘to waste away, languish, be turbulent, quarrel, groan in distress’ [CDG 50]) could be considered prefix. and infix. expansions of this base. But the Heb. form /’y’s/ connects them with the base */'aS-/ (cf. infra), even if semantically the first proposal is more suitable; there is possibly a coalescence of bases. Although semantically related, the Heb. morph could be of different origin (‘despair’ # ‘to give up’). HSED 25 suggests an AA *‘icay, ‘to be sad, angry’, as the etym. of Ar. ‘ṣy/ (Murtonen 1989:97).


It is commonly derived as a LW from < Sum. a-zu, ‘Wasserkundiger’ (AHw 76; cf. also HALOT 73; DRS 27, CDG 45; etc.), later borrowed in Aram., Ar. and Eth. So we would be dealing here with a ‘cultural’ word, for which such a loan is quite appropriate. Nevertheless the final long vowel remains unexplained in Akk. and points to a verbal root */-'s-w/. This means that the loan must be considered as in the opposite direction, i.e. as a Sumerian etymologization of a Semitic lexeme (?) (cf. Steiner 2003:639). The verbal root, not extant in Akk., but present in all the other Semitic languages, points in the same direction, unless we assume a denom. predic. derivation from Sum.-Akk.
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On the other hand, NWS /ˈsm/., ‘to gather’, ‘granary’ (Ug., EpHeb., Heb., JAram./Syr. [‘assānā]; cf. DNWSI 88; HALOT 73f.; LS 35; LW < Akk. išittu < *išintu, NA isitu; cf. Murtonen 1989:97), CS /ˈsp/, ‘to gather’ (Akk. esēpu, Ug. and Heb. /ˈsp/) and also CS /ˈsr/, ‘to bind’, ‘bond’ (cf. HALOT 75), cannot be proved to be suffix. /-p.´:r/ expansions, through a traceable semantic shift, either from */ˈas-/ or from another hypothetical and unattested root (*′/vs-/). Instead it seems to be an instance of allothesis by aleatoric substitution of the third (sonant/labial) stop. Even /ˈsr/, ‘to gather’, in Ar., Heb., Aram. (cf. HALOT 82) points toward a more ample ‘resonance’.

The base /ˈms/, ‘to refuse’ (Akk., Heb., Aram.; Murtonen 1989:253), could be related to /ˈas-/ as a prefix. /-m/- expan.; but cf. supra /ˈm/ for a possible allothesis.

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

The following the conson. Akk. homographs can be listed:
asa’ītu, asītu, ‘tower’ < (?).
assu(m), ‘myrtle’ < (?).
assu(m), a wooden part of a loom < (?).
asu(m), issu, ‘jaw’ < (?).
asu(m), asu(m), ‘bear’ (< Sum.)
issu, essu, ‘hole in the ground, clay pit’.

/aš-

1 - First level: a) simple and b) intesified base


Possibly also Akk. ašāšu(m), ‘to be distressed’, may belong here by a privative (enant.) shift, as is possibly the case with the expansion Ar. ‘ašā, ‘to forge (a lie)’, ’ašiya, ‘to be in need’ (DAF 36), all of which are semes of psychological reactions. Possibly Soq. ‘ēš, ‘to push’, also belongs here. But this base is suspect and does not exist in any other Semitic language, not even in modern Arabic. Furthermore, no expansions can be clearly ascertained. Possibly this is a retro-contamination of sibilants in Ar. or an onomatop. resonance. Its relationship to Ge. ḥašaya, ‘to make happy, to give joy’, Akk. ḥašāšu, ‘to swell, be happy’, is not to be ruled out, as an allothetic variant and different expan. pattern. On the other hand, the Ar. homograph ‘aššu, ‘dry bread’, adduced by Cohen (DRS 34), is not listed in the principal lexica. – SF: Psychological reaction.

/aš-

1 - First level: a) simple base
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But as an alternative etymology cf. also < Amor. */wš/, ‘to help’ (CAA 14). An original trilit. base */awš-/ cannot be ruled out. Instead, HSED 17 takes *aš- as an AA base, with a correspondence in Sab. 's/y (!) (cf. infra, */yš-). - SF: Primary social action.


AA *ūš-, ‘man’ (HSED 36; also Rapallo 2000:2025ff. ). This is possibly a PrimW (cf. the following deriv.) not to be deriv. from any other base (but cf. Murtonen 1989:96f.: < */nš/). - SF: Elementary biological constituent.


Cf. Murtonen 1989:103. These are two different morphs. lexemes from the same base, produced by allomorphic distributive (vocal./conson.) intens. with different semantic shifts from the the same BS. - For Ar. *a'ysa [neg. laysa], ‘there is’, Arm. (Imp. Eleph. (?)) ‘ays, ‘existence, être’ (cf. DRS 18) cf. infra */v-. - SF: Elementary material and sociological constituent.

/*aš/ c) PrimW with no clear conson. intens. E/NWS. BS: ‘fire”: Akk. 'išatu(m); Ebl. */iššatu(m) (VE 783); Ug. 'iš, Heb. 'es, suff. 'išš-; Aram.: EpAram. ‘š, ’es; BAram. 'iššā’; JP/BAram., 'yšh/t’; Syr. ’iššā’, Mand. ’išata (MD 357f.); Eth.: Ge. ’esā; Tig. ’asat; Amh., asat; Gur., āsat, ‘fire’.

To be distinguished from */ar- (cultic/profané?) and without denom. derivations, unproductive in Sem. < possible (nostratic) IE (Sansk.) etym. (DRS 36), that justifies the original triple homography. By cause-effect meton. > Ge. te ‘št, ‘scum (of metals)” (CDG 569) - On the derivation < */iš- ‘gift, present” for Heb. 'iššeh, ‘sacrifice’, as preferable to denom. from < ‘fire”; cf. Pardee 2000:28 n. 57; HALOT 93f. (but this meaning for Ug. iš is dubious). Later contamination of roots is possible. Cf. AA *'s-, ‘fire’, HSED 22; Murtonen 1989:102f.

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/*aš/ Denom. predic. deriv. by vocal intens. < */aš/ > */aš/, WS. BS: ‘to offer a gift”: Heb. PNN 'lāšal, y’wš; Ar. ’āša, ‘donner, faire un présent” (DAF 68); cf. also the possible alternat. alaphon. expan. */ya/ ESA: Sab. (?) ‘š‘ w:y, ‘to bring, send, find, be present” (cf. HSED 17).

/*aš/ Denom. predic. deriv. by conson. intens. < */aš/ > */aš(a)s/, CS. BS: ‘to lay the foundations”: MHeb. ’iššēš, ‘to make firm, found’ (DTT 130); Ar. ‘assa, ‘assasa, ‘to lay the foundation”; Eth.: Tig. 'assāšā, ‘to set in order”. Cf. possible semantic shift > Amh. ‘assāša, ‘to scout, sweep’ (?), and Mand. ’ašāša, ‘bundle of reeds, raft’. And maybe also Akk. ašāšu, a type of nest made by water fowl.
For the possible Akk. isogloss uššu < ušš, ‘foundation’, cf. AHw 1442 (but possibly < eššu, edēšu, ‘to renew’).

On the other hand, Zaborski 1971:54 quotes a root ‘r’-š-/ ‘to despair’ with allomorphs in Ar. ya’isa, ‘ayisa, and also in Ge. ʔayasa, ‘esa, ‘to waste away, languish, be turbulent, quarrel, groan in distress’ (CDG 50), BHeb. /y’s/ N and Pi. (cf. HALOT 382), MHeb. yēʾēḵ, Aram. yʾaš, ‘to give up’ (DTT 560), possibly as privative (enant.) derivations (cf. Jastrow l.c.) of ‘aš-/’. But they could also be triconson. metathesis/allothesis: the biconson. base is not independently attested with that seme (‘r’-š/-, /y-s/-?). These Ar. morphs could also be allomorphic metathesis (allothesis) of ‘ašaya’ (cf. supra).

2 - Second level: expanded base

It is difficult to assess the prefix. expansions of this base.

CS. /raʾš-/ ‘head’, could be considered as such (< /ʾaš-/ ‘strong’; cf. in this connexion Eilers 1987-1988:39, following Keichrida 1984-1985 < Sem. /ušš-, ‘Grund(lage), Foundation’), but its nature of PrimW disallows this derivation (cf. Murtonen 1989:391). This derivation becomes more evident in the case of Heb./Aram. rōʾš, ‘poisonous plant’.

Other possible expansions are more controversial, above all the well-attested CS /nš/ has a strong probability of being an infix. expan. of < /ʾaš-, ‘strong’, BS: ‘manifesting strength, power’: Ug. inš, nšm, (< /ʾašm/), ‘man, individual’, ‘people > ‘(dead) human beings’, humāšu = Akk. amēlum (Ug. V 244-245); Heb. ‘nāš, ‘human beings, man’; Aram.: Baram. /nāš, ‘mankind’, ‘person’; Mand. anāša, ‘human being’; ESA: Sab. šs, ‘man, husband, leading warrior’; Ar. ‘uʿinsu, ‘insānu, ‘human being’, ‘a numerous company of men’, ‘insiyu’, ‘human’, and deriv. ‘anisa, to be sociable’; Eth.: Tig. enšs, ‘man’; MSA: Meh. āns, ‘human beings’; cf. Akk. tenēštum, ‘people’. And the apheretic forms /ns/ in various languages, for instance Ar. nāš, ‘people, mankind’ (Hava 15: < /ʾašm/; cf. also > nisā; ‘woman’, by complementary distribution(?), but cf. HALOT 93: < /nš/). This base, as an AA expansion (PrimW?), may be related to Ber. āles, ‘man, husband’ (Essai 82). Instead, HSED 28 considers that the common AA *i-nas, ‘man’, goes back, by epenthesis, to AA *nūs-, ‘man’ (p. 407), which however could well be an apheresic base as noted already (but a suffix. expan. /-ša/ < /ʾaš-/-?/), ‘strength, power’, cannot be ruled out; cf. also Rapallo 2000-2020, 2025ff.). On the other hand, the common deriv. < Ar. *anis, ‘to be friendly, intimate’, seems semiologically less feasible (cf. HALOT 73; DUL 84) and is to be explained the other way round. Instead, Murtonen 1989:96, distinguishes two Hebrew /nš/ roots, a distinction which I consider phonologically incorrect. Cf. CDG 382 for a discussion of the root in Eth. Also Ug, anš, ‘muscle, tendon’, points in another direction (< /ns/-; cf. Heb. nāšeh, Aram. našyā’).

In any case, this possible expansion is not to be related to /nt/, Ar. anuṭa. The partial semantic coincidence is secondary. As is clear from the ESA and Ar. Evidence: ESA ʾnt, Ar. ʾunṭatu, Meh. teṭ (< /nt/), Ug. anṭ, Heb. ʾiššat, Phoen. št, Baram. ʾnth, Jaram. in-tetā, Syr. atātā, Mand. anta, anat (cf. Akk. īšatu(m), aššatu, LW < Can.), Ge. anest, Tig. essi, anes, Tigh. anstī, Amh. anst, Gur. ansṭ, ‘female, woman’. An original phonological convergence (allophony) of both roots should not be presumed, since the semes are not related; a later contamination is quite evident. On the other hand, an infix. derivation/expansion of this root from /’aš-/ is not clear.

As it was the case for /r’s/, Akk. īšaru(m), Ug. usr, ‘penis’ could be taken as a suffix. deriv. from /ʾaš-/ b), ‘strong’, ‘male animal’, but this is probably a PrimarW. By the same analogy (cf. supra), Eilers 1987-1988:39, suggests the expansion /ʾaš-d-/ > Akk. īšdum, Ug. ʾisd, ‘foundation, Fuss’, Heb. ʾāšēd, ‘Berghang’; but the BS, as componential analysis indicates, is different: foundation as support/lower part. – Some consonantal homographs, such as Ar. awsu, ‘wolf, jackal’ Ge. awest, ‘bird of prey’, or Ar. āṣu, ‘myrtle’, may be denominative from this base in origin, but we cannot trace their semantic shift with certainty.
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3 - Homographs/Loanwords

Here are some of the conson. homographs of this cluster, among the many in Akk., for which no apparent relationship with the bases identified above is to be found:
Akk. āšâtu, ‘reins’ < (?).
Akk. āšiš, ‘part of a chariot’ < (?).
Akk. āšāšu(m), ‘to be distressed’ < (?).
Akk. āšītu(m), ‘metal band’ < (?).
Akk. āšītu(m), ‘midday’ < (?).
Akk. āšâ(m), ‘a disease of the head’ < (?).
Akk. āšu, a kind of field < (?).
Akk. āšu, ‘living creatures’ < (?).
Akk. āšu, ‘to retch’ < (?).
Akk. āšu(m), ‘distinguished, noble’ < (?).
Akk. ēšû(m), ‘to confuse’ < (?).
Akk. ušu(m), ‘diorite’ < (?).

/*āSH-/  
1 - First level: a) simple base  
/*āSH-/ PrimW with conson. intens. SWS. BS: ‘something strong enough to support/tighten anything’: Ar. īššu, ‘root, foundation’ (DAF 36); > ’āšū, ‘strong, robust’ (DAF 36). Not attested in modern Ar.

This is an alternative alloph. resonance of /*ās/-, also related to /*as/-, ‘tree, wood’ (cf. also /*az/- and /*az/ - SF: Basic structure/quality.

b) First level: b) intensified base  

/*āSa/ Denom. predic. deriv. by conson. intens. < /*aṣ-/ > */aṣ(a)ṣa/, SW/SS. BS: ‘to be strong, tight’: Ar. āṣṣa, ‘to be strong, robust’ > ‘to shine’ (DAF 36); āṣṣaṣa, ‘rarrermir’ (DAF 36) // by enant. ‘to be weak’ > ‘to shake’, āšṣu, ‘shivering, trembling’ (DAF 36); > Soq. ’ez, ‘to fear, be afraid’: Aram.: JBAram. /ṣṣ/, to press, squeeze’.

The various allomorph. expan. /’āṣa/, /’aṣṣa/, /’aṣā/ in Heb./Aram. (cf. DTT 32) strongly support a biconson. origin.

2 - Second level: expanded base  
/*āSaW:Ya/ Denom. predic. deriv. by expan. /w:ya/ < /*aṣ-/ > */aṣ(a)+w:ya/, SWS. BS: ‘to become/make tight’: Ar. āṣā, ‘to thicken (vegetation)’, āṣīya, ‘to appear fat, stout (camel’s hump) > ‘to be difficult, complicate (affair)’ (DAF 37); by meton.-metaph. shift: Ar. āṣiyatu, ‘date syrup’
(< ‘dense’) (DAF 37); and by different metaph.-meton. (poetic?) semantic shifts from the BS: Ar. ‘ašiyatu, ‘disgrace’/’favour’/’relationship’ (DAF 37).

As suggested above, resonance contamination with */aš(a)ša/* is possible in this expansion. The base is not extant in modern written Ar.

From other possible expansions of this base, the following infix. forms are quite probable: NWS: */ms/, ‘(to be) strong’; Ug., Heb., EpHebr. */ms/, Pi. ‘to make strong’/’strong’; and NWS: */š/ ‘to press’: Heb. */š/ Pi. ‘to importune’; Aram.: Syr. ‘elaš, ‘to oppress’; Mand. alš, ‘to press’; JAram., Syr., ‘ulšānāh, ‘distress’ (Hurvitz 1913:97); cf. NWS mlš? (DNWSI 645).

Also semantically Ar. *šiyatu, ‘root, foundation’ and *alašu, ‘to have root, to be firm’, and derivatives, seem lexically a suffix. expansion related to *iššu, ‘root, foundation’; the form is present in Heb. in the deriv. transformation *ašil, ‘noble’ (< ‘well rooted’); as well as in Nab. ġšl, ‘property’.

However, CS /n’s/, ‘to spurn, slander’ or the like (Akk., Ug., Heb., JAram.; cf. Ar. /nw/ ‘to avoid s.o.;’ cf. Murtonen 1989:269) is not easily explained as a prefix. expansion of */uni0259/-/. The same must be said of the consonantal homographs: Ar. *aššatu, ‘flowerpot’ (in use nowadays); Aram. *aššā, ‘basin’; Ar. *aššatu, ‘line of houses’. The possible semantic shift is not apparent.

/*aT-*/

1 - First level: a) simple base

/*aT-*/ 1) PrimW (?) with alternative conson./vocal. intens., E/WS. BS: ‘something indicating another thing > astonishing’: Akk. ittu(m), ‘sign’ (AHw 406); Heb. ʾōt, ‘sign’; Aram.: BAram. *aṭ, ‘sign’; JAram. īt, ‘sign’; Syr. īṭā, ‘sign’; Mand. āta, ‘mark, sign’; with glide ENA: Tham., ʿyt, ‘signe, prodige’ (cf. DRS 12; the reference to < */wy/ does not seem feasible); Ar. ʿayatu, ‘sign, token’. The Ar. verb ʿayā (ʿayatan), ‘to put a sign’, seems to be a denominative from this base, but a derivation of */ay/- as a functor of identification cannot be excluded; or else contamination should be considered.

Cf. Murtonen 1989:86. For the related term Akk. ittu, ‘peculiarity’ a deriv. from < i:edatu, adānu < /wēd(?) is suggested, but a semantic shift from the basic seme would explain the nuance adequately. Ug. at, ‘omen, ominous sign’ (cf. DUL 121) is discussed as a possible reading (cf. Pardee 2000:553). – SF: Basic experience.


A possible original relationship of the two morphs/phenotypes can be postulated, since the ‘side or frontier mark’ could be the prototype of sings. - SF: Dimension of landscape.

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/aTa/ Denom. predic. deriv. by conson. intens < /'at-/ > /'at(a)ta/ (?), SW/SS. BS: ‘to incline to one side’ (cf. Sp. ‘ladear’): Ar. ‘atta, ‘to conquer’ (DAF 7; no longer extant in modern Ar.); Eth.: Ge. ‘atata, ‘to be removed, taken away, faint’; Amh. ‘attätä, ‘to remove, take away, to commit ’; > by vocal. alternative intens. > (?) Soq. ‘ôti, ‘faible’.

2 - Second level: expanded base


Possibly AA *at- goes back to the PrimW /'at-/ as its predic. realisation or as a denom. deriv. indicating motion to or along the ‘border’ (Sp. ‘bordear’; cf. Essai 79; HSED 18; Murtonen 1989:104).

No other expansion can be assigned to this base with certainty. Ar. sa’atu, ‘throat side’ and the denom. predic. sa’ata, ‘to strangle’ (DAF 1035) are possible. On the other hand, the MHeb. form nḗ’ôt, ‘to be agreed’ (HALOT 26; cf. Pun. /'wt/ (?)) is in line with the semantic development as we find for instance in Sp. ‘ponerse del lado de’. Also Jibb. ‘ənt, ‘to, towards’, represents a lexicalised infix. expansion /-m-/ of this base. Instead, LS 77 distinguishes a second ‘ête, ‘to unite’, as a /-t-/ infixed form of /'wy/, ‘to go somewhere’.

The consonantal homograph Akk. atû(m), ‘gatekeeper’, is a < Sum. LW(?); also, both Akk. itû(m), ‘seed-funnel’, and Heb. ‘ôt, ‘ploughshare’, seem to be KW/LW < Sum. (?). However, it is difficult to see how Ar. ‘atwu, ‘butter’, can belong here.

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

Akk. uttûtu, ‘terror’ < (?).
1 - First level: simple base

/ʼaT-/ 1) Biconson. nomin. base with vocal. intens./epenth, CS. BS: ‘consistency, basic affirmation’: Akk. ʾišum, ‘to have’, neg. laššu, ‘(there) is not’; Ug. ʾit, ʾitti, ‘to be, exist’; Heb. ʾyēš/ʾiš, ‘to exist, be’, ‘property’ (with allop. /y/); NWS: EpHeb. yš, EpAram. ʾytt(y), ʾt, Palm., Nab. ʾytt(y), ‘there is’, ‘existence’; Aram.: BAram. ʾittay, ‘existence’ < ‘there is’ (HALOT 92); JPAram. ʾt, ‘there is’; Syr. ʾit, ‘to be’, ʾittyā, ‘essence’. With anomalous allop. transformation, Ar. neg. lašsa, ‘not to be’ (DAF 1048; < *[la-yīsa] < *[la-yītai (?)]; cf. HALOT 443); the original form is possibly reflected in the conson. intens. form Ar. ʾattu, ‘grand, abundant’, ʾatta, ‘croître en abundance’ (DAF 9f.).

No expansions are extant nor is the root present in Ar. Or should Ar. ʾatt(y), ‘to denounce a fact to the authorities’ < ‘to give it consistency’ (?) (DAF 12), be related to this root as an archaism? The base is possibly of nostratic origin, cf. IE es-, ‘to be’ (IEW 340) - SF: Elementary experience.

/ʼaT-/ 2) Biconson. predic. base. Of onomatop. origin. SWS: ‘sound produced by the saddle’: Ar. ʾattā, ‘to creak, produce a sound (the saddle)’ and similar, ʾattītu, ‘creaking sound of the saddle’, and deriv. in the world of the camel.


3 - Homographs/Loanwords

Among the conson. homographs:
Akk. ʾiṭu(m), ‘span, half-cubit’ < (?) (cf. Ug. ʾt; Ebl. Udum, DUL 123).

/ʼaW-/ 1) CS functor: ‘disjunctive as expression of choice, agreement, desire’.

/*ʼaW/ 2) Biconson. predic. base. Of onomatop. origin. SWS: ‘sound produced by the saddle’: Ar. ʾṭṭa, ‘to creak, produce a sound (the saddle)’ and similar, ʾṭṭītu, ‘creaking sound of the saddle’, and deriv. in the world of the camel.

Cf. Monoconsonantal 64-65. There is no evidence of a simple base */'aw-/N, NW/SS, BS: ‘action of meeting, agreement’; but */aw/ 1) could be derived from it by lexicalisation. Instead, Zaborski 1971:54 refers to the root */w:y/, ‘to be nice’, with allomorph. /n-/ /y-/ expansions in Heb., but I consider that the two bases have to be kept separate, since the second conson. is a constituent, not an alternative expan.; cf. infra /*-y-/. Contamination between the two bases is easy to assume. - SF: Elementary social experience / discourse function.


Cf. Monoconsonantal 64; Murtonen 1989:84f. < as an imper. form of /*’w(y)/, ‘choose!’; I would reverse the derivation): suprasegmental diversification, cry of onomatopoeic origin. By semantic objectivation the names of various animals can be derived from this onomatopoeic lexeme (cf. a wolf howl) in the various Semitic languages: Heb. iy(yim), ‘jackal’, Syr. (benat) ‘awway; ‘canes aurei’; Ar. (ibn) ‘âwâ, ‘jackal’. Possibly of AA origin (cf. Essai 81; HSED 31). - SF: Elementary exclamation.

2 - Second level : expanded base


With secondary expan. by /-an/: Syr. ‘awwânâ, ‘abode, house’, ‘awanta, ‘abode’; Mand. awana, ‘quarter, precinct, living-room’. Also Akk. awât(m), ‘value (of goods)’, could be related to this base through the seme ‘to wish’ or ‘agree’. The ambivalence of the psychological seme involved may explain the variety of the semantic nuances in the various languages: to choose > to wish > to love > to agree > to unite > to gather > to be compassionate > to take/give refuge… Note the following additional possible expansions: Heb. nâ’weh, /n’h/, /nwh/, /’wh/, i.e. the seme ‘beautiful, delightful’, may represent a contamination of bases or rather prefix. /n-/ expansions of the latter (HALOT 657, 678; cf. Zaborski 1971:55).

Heb. ‘ô’t, ‘antelope < appears to be a LW, but cf. the next entry.

Sab. i’w, ‘to collect (water)’ <? (cf. SL 10 < /*’wy/ as /t-/ expan.?).

Syr. ‘awtâ, ‘acacia nilotica’ <?

Ge. ‘awaya, ‘to be sweet’ <?

/*’aY/

1 - First level: a) simple base

particle used before participles (DIJA 47); JBAram. 'i(y), 'woe!(DIJA 109; as a particle > 'yt, supra); Syr. 'y, interj.; NArAm.'yw (u!), 'alas!', 'y(ê), ah!; Ar. 'ayâ, a vocative particle used in calling, 'O', 'ho there!', by semantic deriv. > 'no'; Akk., ai, ê, 'not; NWS: Phoen. 'y, negation (?)

**MA:** Soq. 'ê, part. of negation; Eth. Ge. 'i-, negative prefix. part.; Tig. 'i, 'not'; Tign. 'ay, expresses negative future; Amh. i, prefix. negative part. as a suprasegmental alternative imprecation; cf. Ar. 'i(y), 'yes!' (DMWA 36), due to the ambiguity of the psychological reaction.

**SF:** Elementary exclamation.

/'aY/- b) Lexicalised deictic exclam. < /'aY/: 1) with spontaneous conson. intens. /'ay-/; CS. BS: expression of surprise, identification: 'what is this' > 'voilà!' > 'which?' > 'anyone': Akk. ayyu(m), 'which?', ai, 'where?'; Amr. 'ajja, 'where?' (CAA 13); Ug. ay, 'anyone', iy, 'where?'; NWS: Phoen., Pun. ay, 'where?'; Heb. 'ê(y), 'where?', by intens. 'ayyêh, 'where?'; Aram.: Syr. 'aynâ, 'which?', 'aykâ, 'where?; NArAm. (')êkâ, 'where'; MSA: Meh. hô < /'yn/, where; Ar. 'ayyu, 'who?, which?'; 'ay, (that is to say), namely (DMWA 36); Eth.: Ge. 'ay, 'which, what?'; Tig. 'ayi, 'which?'; Tign. ayân, 'which?, who?'; Gur. e, 'where'. 2) With spontaneous vocal. intens. Ar. 'ayyatu, 'sign' > 'ayya, 'to put a sign by which to be known', 'ayyâna, 'when?'; cf. Sp. 'señalar la dirección') and its functorial use before the pers. pron. 'ywa- (but cf. supra l'at-/ 2). - Expan. /-ya/ > /-wa/ by dissim. or contrast. suff. (?): Ar. 'aywa, 'ouï' (DRS 16); > Meh. 'yw(h), 'ewa(h), 'yes' < 'ay-wâ(h), Eth.: Ge. 'awwa, Amh. awo, Gur. âwo; Jibb. 'êwa(h), 'aywêh., 'yes'.

Cf. ChCohen 2004:13*-15*. On the other hand, Ug.-Heb. /'i/, 'oh!' /'i/, 'surely', Ar. 'iy, 'yes!' (cf. Cohen 2004:16*-17*) may be considered a transformation from either of the quoted bases /'ay/ (cf. supra) through suprasegmental enant. - SF: Elementary exclamation.

Other phenotypes are related to the deictic base /'-y/ + -n (cf. infra; DRS 24-25): Heb. 'ayn, 'whence?'; Ar. 'ayna, 'where?'; < rhetorical question > negation: Ug. in, 'there is not'; NWS 'yn, 'there is not'; Heb. 'ayn, 'non-existence', 'there is not'; Pun. 'yn, 'there is not'; cf. metath. Akk. ya'anu, 'there is not < ayyânum, 'where', common semantic shift. Their possible relationship to IE éneu, énu, 'without' (IEW 318), is somewhat problematic. Also, the semantic shift from local to temporal meaning can be derived from the same lexical bases: 'moment, indefinite time' (AEL 119) when? < > where?, cf. Ar. ayyâna, 'where?' and 'ayyâna, 'when?'; Ar. (al-)/'ân, 'present time, moment' (DAF 71, 75) and its intens/exp.: 'a iwânu, 'a time' (AEL 129), Ar. 'ânâ, 'to come the time, be near ...'(AEL 118f.), 'inyu, 'moment, indefinite time' (AEL 119) and its shift 'the utmost point or degree'; > Tig., Tign. (')awan, 'time', cf. Heb. 'înâ, Pi. 'to cause to happen' (HALOT 70). Cf. AA: Eg. wnwi, 'hour' (Essai 83). The relationship to Nostratic 'amwa, 'time, moment', is problematic (NM 578).

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/'aY/- Denom. predic. expan. /'ay/ > /'ay(a)ya/ SS. BS: 'to become so and so, adequate to (< 'anyone')': Eth.: Ge ta'ayâya, 'to make equal, even out'; Tig. 'ayay, 'relative, kinsman'; cf. CDG 51 > Syr. /'yw/, to agree', 'âwê, 'in agreement'/, cf. supra).

This expan. (as well as those using /'aw-/ and 'â-y'ê-) may be connected with the metath. alternation /ya/- and its expan.: Heb. 'î/y', 'to be proper, fitting'; Ar. ya'yu'a, 'to show kindness'; Ge. yawwpha, yawha, 'to be gentle'; Pun. 'y', 'beautiful'; JPAram. yâ ê, 'fair, comely', y'yw, 'beauty'; JBAram. yâ', 'oh!', yâ iht, 'well, properly'; Syr. yâ', 'oh!', yâyâ, 'beautiful', yâyûhâ, 'beauty'.
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2 - Second level: expanded base

There are no clear expan. bases of this cluster:
Ar. 'ayā', 'to stop at, to head for...' (DAF 76; but not extant in modern written Ar.) is not easily related to any */'ay/- b). HSED 18f. proposes an AA base *'ay-, 'to come, run', possibly connected with AA *'a-, 'to walk, run' (?).
Heb. /'ým/ II, 'to frighten', < 'āyöm, 'terrifying', c(y)māh, 'fright, horror'; EpAram. ym, 'terror, frightful thing', JOAram. ymh/-ynt', 'fear'; BAram. / JP/BAram. 'ēmtān, 'fearsome, terrifying', may represent a suffix. /-m/ expan. of < */'ay/-a) (< 'to cry 'ah!' ').
Ug. šy, 'assassin'; Ar. sā' /sa'ā, 'to displease'/to create disorder', could also be taken as a prefix. /š/- expan. of */'ay/-a) (< 'to cause fright, to make s.o. cry 'ah!' (?)

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

As for the consonantal homographs:
Akk. ayyūtu, *(a leather strip) for a door* < (?).
Heb. ayyāh, 'vulture'; Ar. yu'/yu', hawk > possibly of onomatop.(?) origin from the animal’s cry; cf. supra */'aw'/; of AA stock, cf. Cush./Bilin ayyā, 'falcon' (Essai 78; Murtonen 1989:89).
Phoen.-Pun. y, 'coast, peninsula'; Heb. i, pl. iyyîm, 'island', instead, seems to be a LW < Eg. ĸw, 'island' (cf. Essai 81; Murtonen 1989:89).
JP/BAram. i(y), 'whether' < ĸm (NWS ĸm).
Elsewhere, the confusion of the bases */'aw/- and */'ay/- (and even of */'at/-) in some derivations, especially in Ar., must be taken into account.

*/'aZ-/

1 - First level: a) simple base

*/'aZ/- Biconson. base with spont. intens. WS/SS. BS: '(to be in) agitation, fever'.

Not attested as a simple base. – Cf. Eg. 3s, 'hurry, flow fats' - SF: Basic (physiological) experience (animal’s body).

1 - First level: b) intensified base

/'aZ-/ Denom. predic. deriv. by conson. intens. < */'az-/ > */az(a)za/. ES/SS. BS: 'to set in agitation, to heat': by intens. and expan. /-ya/ (cf. infra */'azaya/): Akk. ezēzu, 'to be(come) angry'; Ar. azzā/i, 'to boil, make a boiling sound'; 'azzā/ū, 'to kindle a fire to for boiling, to put in a state of violent motion, to stir up; /'tazza, 'to become angry'; by enant. Ar. azzū, 'sharpness' > 'cold', '(feverish) chill' (DAF 28; cf. Sp. ¡caliente, caliente!); Eth.: Ge. azzaza, 'order, command, exercise dominion'; Tig., Tigñ., Amh., Gur. azzā/ū, 'to command'; by meton. < 'to set in motion, incite', already in Ar. azza.

/'aZ-/ Denom. predic. deriv. by vocal. intens. < */'az-/ > */'aża/, SWS. BS: 'to become hot because of increasing proximity to the goal' (?) by meton [cf. Sp. ¡caliente, caliente!] > 'to heat by agitating together' > 'approaching each other' < cause-effect (Sp. ¡frotar, agitar! > includes both semes: 'to
join’ and ‘to heat’); Ar. āza, ‘être proche, vis-à-vis de’, as already by intern. conson. intens. and meton. deriv. (?) Ar. azza, ‘to approach something to another thing’ (DAF 28). The alternation of the two forms of intensification, prove the actual importance of the simple base, as does the semant. relationship: ‘hot/close’ (not listed either in DAF or in AEL).

2 - Second level: expanded base

/'aZaW:Ya/ Denom. predic. deriv. by expans /-w:ya/ < */'az-/ > */az(a)+ya/, WS. BS: ‘to irradiate heat’:
Akk. ezū(m), ‘to hurry, be hasty’, by metath. shift (?); Aram.: JPAram. ẓy, ‘to heat, burn’; Ar. azā, ‘to be high (said of the shadow)’, as a consequence of the heat/sun (DAF 30); > probably by semant. shift: Ar. azā, azīya, ‘to gather, to shrink’, by meton. cause-effect (?) < by boiling, possibly dialect. (DAF 30). Also Ar. azā’a, ‘to go back by fear’ (DAF 28), by deriv. contrast. distribution; ‘to satiate’, by metath. shift (< ‘to heat’?; possibly < */z(z)/, ‘to be strong’).

No other expan. can be proved for this cluster.

3 - Homographs/Loanwords

Ug. uz, ‘goose’ = Akk. ısu(m), Syr. wazzā, Ar. (i)wazzu, KW either < Sum. uz. (AHw 1438f.) or AA (cf. Murtonen 1989:85); the root is uncertain: /w-z/, /z-/. For Steiner 2002:635, 646) a LW in Sum. from Akk.
JBAram. azz, ‘to make erect (ears)’ < ? /zz/ (cf. DJBA 99); or better < /zn/ < /dn/, by progressive assimilation.
Ar. azā, ‘to put a front’, izā’u, ‘front, opposite, facing part’ > ‘corresponding’ > ‘manager’ > ‘means of sustenance’ > ‘place where the water is poured …’ (AEL 55f.; DMWA 14: IV and n.) < ?

* * * * * * *

Leaving aside the internal vocal. and conson. intensifications (lengthening) and geminations (reduplication) of the root, let us sum up the external root expansions in order to visualise their productivity and possible semantic significance. Some nominal lexemes with varying certainty as expansions are also mentioned.

Prefixation

Expansion by prefix. is rare in this series. We can propose, with a certain degree of probability, only the expansions by /y-/ and /t-/: 
/ta+a’aba/, ‘to long for’ < [*/a’ab- 2)] (NWS).
/ta+a’awa/, ‘to collect (water)’ < [*/a’aw/] (Sab.).
/ya+a’aba/, ‘to desire’ < [/*’ab- 2)] (NWS).
/ya+a’ala/ N, ‘to act foolishly’ < [/*’al/] (Heb.)

Other expansions by /h-/ /m-/ /n-/ and /š-:
/ha+a’aba/, ‘to flower’ < [/*’uni0259b-] (Syr.).
/ma+a’ada/, ‘to be (come) many, abundant’ < [*/a’d-] (E/NWS).
/ma+a’ana/, ‘to refuse’/’to be disgusted’ < [/*a:nn- 1] (Heb./Syr.).
/ma+a’ara/ ‘to be unfriendly, to hate’, ‘to reopen a wound’ <(?) [/*a:ēr/] (Ar.).
/ma+a’asa/, ‘to refuse’ (E/WS), cf. /m’n/ for a possible allothesis.
THE BICONSONANTAL SEMITIC LEXICON 1. THE SERIES */-X-/  

/na+‘qa/, ‘to groan’ < [/’aq-/] (CS).
/na+ata/, ‘to be agreed’ < /’at-/ (MHeb.; cf. Pun. /’wt/ (?); cf. Sp. ‘ponerse del lado de’).
/ša+ala/, ‘to make one’s own cry heard’ > ‘to exclaim’ > ‘to ask’ < [/’al/] (CS).
/ša+ap/, ‘to gasp for air, to pant, to strive’ < /’ap:f-/> (NWS).
/ša+a(y)a/, ‘to displease’/‘to create disorder’ < [/’ay-/] (Ar.).

Also, less certain and with enantiosemy, the /n-/ expansion(?):
/na+ap/, ‘to be(come) dry’ < (?) [//’uni0259b-//] (Akk.).

The semantic valence of these expan. morphemes is not specially significant. The lack of evidence precludes firm conclusions. The ‘causative’ valence of prefix /h-/, /š-/, and /y-/ is much clearer, in keeping with its morphosyntactic value in NWS. In fact all three affix. expansions may well represent lexicalised morphs of the inflexional verbal system that have survived as independent phenotypes.

Some nominal expansions can also be listed:
/l+’/, ‘people, tribe’ < [/’am-/] (CS).
/m+a’s-at-, ‘disaster’ < [*’as-/> ](Ar.).
/m+’r-/ hif., ‘painful, malignant’ (Heb.)
/m+š/, probably ‘votive gift’ < [*’aš-/> ] (Phoen.-Pun.).
/n+’/, ‘luxuriou’s, ‘luxuriant crops’ < [/’ad-/] (ESA).
/n+’/, ‘calamity’ < [/’ad-/] (Ar.), by enant.
/n+’/, ‘to murmur, emit confused noises’ [/’am-/] (Heb., Ar.)
/n+’r-, ‘to repudiate’ (Heb.),
/n+a’w/, ‘beautiful, delightful’ < [*’aw/> ] (Heb.; cf. /n’h/, /nwh/, /’wh/).
/r+’m-, a wild animal < [/’am-/] (CS).
/r+a’s/, ‘head’ < [/’aš-/] (CS).
/r+e’s-, ‘venom’ < [*’aš-/] (NWS)
/ša’al-/, ‘underworld’ < [/’al/] (Heb.).
/ša+’at-, ‘side of the throat’ > sa’ata, ‘to strangle’ < [/’at-/] (Ar.).
/ša+’a/, ‘disdain’ < [/’a-/> ] (Heb.).
/ša+’iy-, ‘assassin’ (Ug.)< [/’ay-/] (Ug.).
/t+’/, ‘twin’ < [/’am-/] (CS).
/t+’r-, ‘glory’, ‘presence’ < (?) [/’a:ēr-/] (NWS).
/ta’aw-, animal name < [*’aw/> ] (Heb.).

Infixed

Infixed seems to be not only rare in the series, but also semantically not very self-evident, sometimes implying a semantic shift that is not easy to trace. Possible examples are as follows:
’/a+ha+ba’, ‘to like, love’ < [*’ab-/ 2) (NWS).
’/a+ha+ra’, ‘to be inflamed, infected (tooth)’ < [/’a:ēr-/] (Meh.).
’/a+ha+ra’, ‘to press’ < [/’a:ēr-/] (NWS).
’/a+ma+a’, ‘(to be) strong’ < [/’aš-/] (NWS).
’/a+ma+a’, ‘(to be) sec’, ‘to say’, ‘to order’ < (?) [/’a:ēr-/] (CS).

The following are more obvious:
’/a+m(i)+da/, ‘to be indifferent to offences’ < (?) [*’ad-/] (Ar.).
’/a+n(a)+h:hal/, ‘to sigh, groan’ < [/’ah-/] (E/WS).
’/a+n(a)+ha/, ‘to breath hard, with a hemming in his throat’ < [*’ah/] (Ar.). Note also:
The expan. infix. /-w:ya-/ is very similar to the vocal. intens. and could be considered a secondary development of it. Much in the same line, the infix. /-n-/ expansion could be taken as a case of spont. nasalisation, especially of labial stops. Instead, the case of /-h-/ could be a clearer example of epenthetic infixation.

The following nominal infix. expansions can be mentioned:

/'u+l+§+ān-/ ‘distress’ < ['/uni0259§-/] (Syr.).
/'a+m+t/- ‘to towards’ < ['/uni0259t-] (Jibb.).
/'a+n+m+b-/ ‘fruit, flower’, ‘flower(-shaped jewellery)’ < ['/uni0259b-] (Akk.).
/’i+n+b-/ ‘fruit, produce’ < ['/uni0259b-] (JAram.).
/’u+n+t+b-/ ‘an internodal portion of a reed or cane’ ['/uni0259t-] (Ar.).
/'a+n+aq- ‘small goat’ < (?) ['/uni0259q-] (Ar.; > Akk. anāqāte, she-camels).
/'a+n+āš-/ ‘the strong’, ‘man’ < ['uni0259āš-] (CS).
/’i+n+y-/ ‘moment, indefinite time’ < ['ay-] (Ar.).
/'a+š+r- ‘joy’ < (?) ['a:ēr-] (Phoen.).
/’a+y(a)+l-/ ‘stag, deer’ < ['/uni0259l-] (CS).
/'a+t(a)+l-/ ‘the most prominent in power’, ‘the first’ < ['/uni0259l-] (E/WS).
/e+w+il-/ ‘fool’ < (?) ['/uni0259l-] (Heb.).
/a+w+s-/ ‘present’ < [*'/uni0259s-] (Ar.).
/e+y+al-/ ‘strength’ < ‘ayl’, ‘mighty tree, pillar of an archway’ < ['/uni0259l-] (Heb.).
/i+y+al-/ ‘help’ < (?) ['/uni0259l-] (Syr.).
/a+y+s-/ ‘existence, being’ < ['uni0259s-] (Aram., Ar.: neg. laysa).

Suffixation

The suffix, however appears as the most significant means of root expansion, with the possibility of singling out a particular semantic specification for each of the expan. morphemes. The most productive, as might easily have been expected, are the suffix. /-wa/ and /-ya/ expansions, the first with a more marked steady ‘stative’ aspect:

/’ab(a)+wa/ ‘to become a father’ < [*'/uni0259a- 1)] (WS/SS).
/’aḥ(a)+wa/ ‘to become a brother, tied to’ < [*'/uni0259h- a)] (CS).
/’am(a)+wa/ ‘to become a slave’ < [*'/uni0259m- 1)] (WS/SS). And less clearly:
/’as(a)+wa/ ‘to help escape from/to overcome a bad condition’, ‘to cure’ < [*'/uni0259s-]. In this case we have to take into account the deriv., if it is correct, the supposed enantiosemic process and in general the possible secondary exchange between /w/ and /y/ as expan. morphemes.

In this case the apparent ‘anomaly’ in South Semitic (Ar., Ge.) regarding the presumed ‘stative’ semantic value, must have been induced by the contrastive distribution imposed by Ar. ‘asinya, ‘to grieve, mourn’ from the same original etymon /as-/ with a transitory ‘stative’ aspect (cf. also /aša(a)+w:ya/ and /aš(a)+ya/). A similar situation can be seen in:

‘ad(a)+wa/, ‘to show superior, dominant position or power’ (< ‘ad-/) (E/SWS) and /’ad(a)+ya/, ‘to exert/suffer a superior/inferior dominant (economic) position or power’, although this time according to a more original normal distribution of the semantic values of both expan. morphemes.

The /-ya/ expansion, instead, has a clear ‘effective’ or factitive aspect regarding the basic meaning of the biconsonantal cluster involved:

/’ab(a)+ya/, ‘to take a decision, positive or negative: to will/refuse’ (< /’ab-/ 1) (WS/SS).

/’ab(a)+ya/, ‘to produce fruit, to fructify’ (< /’uni0259ba-/) (CS).

/’ad(a)+ya/, ‘to exert/experience a superior/inferior dominant (economic) power’ (< /’ad-/) (WS).

/’ad(a)+ya/, ‘to produce an */’ad-/, ‘damage’, of any kind’ (< /’ad-/) (WS).

/’ad+n/, ‘to dismiss, to allow s.o. to depart’ (< */’ad-/) (ESA).

/’ad(i)+ma/, ‘to be angry against, to persecute s.o.’ (?)< */’ad-/] (Ar.).

/’a+z+y/, ‘trouble, distress’ (?)< */’ad-/] (Sab.), allophone (?).

/’ak(a)+ya/, ‘to feel in a bad mood, to show it’ (< /’ak-/) (SS/Ar.), possibly originally /’ak(a)+wa/, according to the normal semiconsonantal switch in south Semitic. In any case, ‘to show a bad mood’ may easily equal ‘to behave in a bad mood’. Cf. also Akk. i:ekû(m), ‘to starve, deprive (of food)’, ‘impoverished, bereaved’.

/’aš(a)+ya/, ‘to utter an /’al/ cry’ (< /’al-/) (WS); normally the denom. predic. reproducing onomatop. sounds are factitives of the /-ya/ type.

/’al(a)+ya/, ‘to show/exert power’ (< /’al-/) (WS/SS), but the Ar./Heb. variant seems to be stative with enant. shift and so /’al(a)+wa/, ‘to fall short of’.

/’a:n(a)+ya/, ‘to groan’ (< */’a:n-/) (WS), of onomatop. origin.

/’ap(a)+ya/, ‘to encircle’, ‘to cover’ (< /’ap-/) (NE/NWS).

/’ap(a)+ya/, ‘to blow the fire’, ‘to cook, boil’ (< /’ap-f-/) (CS), of onomatop. origin.

/’aq(a)+ya/, ‘to displease (of food)’ (< /’aq-/) (Ar.).

/’ar(a)+ya/, ‘to burn’ (< /’a:r-/) (SS), once again the Eth. realization [-wa] is idiosyncratic.

/’as(a)+ya/, ‘to experience a bad condition’ (< */’as-/) (WS), cf. supra on the possible origin of this apparently anomalous morphosemantic phenotype.

/’as(a)+ya/, ‘to forge (a lie)’ (< /’as-/) (Ar.).

/’aš(i)+ya/, ‘to be in need’ (< /’aš-/) (Ar.).

/’aš(a)+ya/, ‘to bring, send, find, be present’ (< /’aš-/) (ESA), the phenotype is extant only in Sab., in alternation with the most common type /’aša/, ‘to offer a gift’ (Ar./Heb.).

/’aš(a)+ya/, ‘to become/make tight’ (vegetation)’ ‘to look out fat’ (< /’aš-/), this is the same alternation of factitive/stative phenotypes already pointed out in the case of /’as(a)+ya/ in Ar.

/’aw(a)+ya/, ‘to express/make choice’ (< /’aw-/) (WS).

/’az(a)+ya/, ‘to irradiate heat’ (< */’az-/) (WS), here also Ar. exhibits an alternative morphosyntactic variant [-w:ya].

/’a(y)n(a)+ya/, ‘to come the time, be near …’ (Ar.) > /’a(y)na+ya’, Pi. ‘to cause to happen’ (Heb.).

Other suffix. expansions appear to be less productive, especially in verbal phenotypes. In this connexion we can list a few with a factitive bias, in keeping with the semantic value of the morphemes:

/’ab+a+ha/, ‘to act as a superior authority’ > ‘appoint a subordinate’ (< /’ab-/ 1) (SS).

/’aga+ma/, ‘to burn hot, glow’ (< */’a:g-/) (E/Ws).
/ˈaːtə+ma/, ‘to stop up (one’s ear, lips)’ < [ˈaːtə-/] (WS).
/ˈaːya+ma/ ‘to frighten’, < ˈāyōm, ‘terrifying’; ˈē(y)māh, ‘fright, horror’ < [ˈaːya-/] (Heb.).
/ˈaːnə+ša/, ‘to manifest/produce physical pain’ < [ˈaːnə-/ 1]) (WS).
/ˈaːrə+ša/, ‘to desire’ < (?) [ˈaːrə-/] (E/NWS).
Expansion by a suffixed /-r/ seems to be less tolerated:
/ˈapa+ra/, ‘to cover’ < [ˈapə-/] (Akk.)

However quite a number of nominal suffixes expansions (/-h, -l, -n, -r, -y/) can be singled out, some based on intensified consons. bases:
/ˈab(b)(v)+r-/, ‘strong, robust’, ˈale aniˈal, ‘bull, horse’ < [ˈab-/ 1)] (E/NWS).
/ˈæb+r-/, ‘limb, wing, membrum virile’ < [ˈab-/ 1]) (E/WS).
/ˈab+ša/, ‘term of respect for women’ < (?) [ˈab+ša-/ 1]) (Tigñ.).
/ˈabu+al-/, ‘offspring, young creature’ < (?) [ˈab-/ 1]) (Mand.).
/ˈab(ə)y+ə-/ ‘prayer’ (Aram., Mand) < [ˈab-/ 1]) (WS/SS).
/ˈebɣ+y+ə-/ ‘poor’ (Amor., Ug., Heb.) < [ˈeby+ə-/] (WS).
/ˈad+ən-/ ‘owner of power, lord’ < [ˈadən-/] (NWS).
/ˈad+m-/, ‘man’ < (?) [ˈad-/] (CS).
/ˈad+r-/, ‘wonderful, strong’ < (?) [ˈad-/] (WS).
/ˈād+y-/ ‘violent waves’ < (?) [ˈād-/] (Ar.).
/ˈz+I-, ‘to go away’ < (?) [ˈz+I-/] (Aram./Heb.).
/ˈaza+I(y)+y-/ ‘long since past, eternal’ < (?) [ˈaza+I(y)+y-/] (Ar.).
/ˈab+ɬ-/ another’ < (?) [ˈab+ɬ-/] (CS).
/ˈəb+ɬ-/ ‘if only’ < [ˈəb+ɬ-/] (NWS).
/ˈak+ʃ/, ‘something disgusting, e.g. spittle, vomit, faeces’ < (?) [ˈak+ʃ-] (Amh.).
/ˈal(a)+h-/ ‘supreme power, god’ < [ˈal-/] (W/SS).
/ˈal+ən-, ‘supreme power, god’ < [ˈal-/] (WS).
/ˈal(l)+ən-/ ‘something that appears strong’ ‘oak’ < [ˈal-/] (E/WS).
/ˈul+m-, ‘strength, strong side’ < [ˈul-/] (Aram.)
/ˈeːul+əm-, ‘porch, entrance’ < [ˈul-/] (Heb./Jaram.).
/ˈap+n-, ‘that binds, wheel’ (Heb., Jaram., Syr.) < [ˈap-/] (NWS).
/ˈiš+ar-, ‘penis’ < [ˈiš-] (Akk., Ug.).
/ˈaš+ən-, ‘fatal accident’ < [ˈašən-/] (Heb.).
/ˈəs+ən-, ‘grief, sorrow, distress’ < [ˈəsən-/] (Ar.).
/ˈuːʃ-, ‘present, gift’ < [ˈuːʃ-/] (Ug.).
/ˈaš(i)+y+ə-/ ‘date syrup’ < ‘dense’ < [ˈašə-/] (Ar.).
/ˈaš+ɬ-, ‘root, foundation’ < [ˈəşɬ-] (Ar.).
/ˈaš+ɬl-, ‘noble’ (< ‘well-rooted’) < [ˈašɬ-] (Heb.).
/ˈʃ+ə-/ ‘property’ < [ˈʃə-/] (Nab.).
/ˈaːwə+ən-, ‘a time’ (Ar.) > əwan, ‘time’ (Tig., Tigñ.).
/ˈəc(i)y+n-, ‘there is not’, ‘non-existence’ (NWS) > yə anu, ‘there is not’ (Akk.).
/ˈəl(-)ət(ə)y+n-, ‘present time, moment’ < [ˈələy-/] (Ar.).
/ˈəw(w)ə+ən-, ‘abode, house’ < [ˈəwə-/] (Syr., Mand.).
/ˈəwə+ə-/ ‘value (of goods)’ < [ˈəwə-/] (Akk.).
/ˈəy+ə-/ ‘terror, frightful thing’ < [ˈəyə-/] (NWS).
/ˈəyn-, ‘whence?’ < [ˈəyə-/] (Heb.).
/ˈəy+ən-, ‘where?’ (Ar.) < [ˈəyə-/] (Ar.) > ayyənum, ‘where’ (Akk.).
/ˈəy(y)+ənə-, ‘when?’ < [ˈəyə-/] (Ar.).
Only at the conclusion of our research shall we able to draw more definitive conclusions on the significance of all the possible morphemic expansions of the biconsonantal bases and on their bearing as productive and inexpensive tools for the development of the Semitic lexicon.
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THE BICONSONANTAL SEMITIC LEXICON 1. THE SERIES /'-X-/ 


*Language abbreviations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language code</th>
<th>Language name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Afro-Asiatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Ancient Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akk.</td>
<td>Akkadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amh.</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amor.</td>
<td>Amorite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar.</td>
<td>Berber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAram.</td>
<td>Biblical Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Common Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cush.</td>
<td>Cushitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebl.</td>
<td>Eblaite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EChad.</td>
<td>Eastern Chadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eg.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emar.</td>
<td>Emariote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENA</td>
<td>Epigraphic North Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EpAram.</td>
<td>Epigraphic Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EpHeb.</td>
<td>Epigraphic Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>East Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Epigraphic South Arabian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eth.</td>
<td>Ethiopic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge.</td>
<td>Ge’ez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gur.</td>
<td>Gurage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har.</td>
<td>Harari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatrean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImpAram.</td>
<td>Imperial Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Judean Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaram.</td>
<td>Jewish Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBAram.</td>
<td>Jewish Babyl. Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibb.</td>
<td>Jibbali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPAram.</td>
<td>Jewish Palest. Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>Jewish Palest. Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lih.</td>
<td>Lihyanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaghrAr.</td>
<td>Maghrebi Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand.</td>
<td>Mandaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meh.</td>
<td>Mehri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHeb.</td>
<td>Middle Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Modern South Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAram.</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWS</td>
<td>North-west Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoen.</td>
<td>Phoenician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pun.</td>
<td>Punic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sab.</td>
<td>Sabaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saf.</td>
<td>Safaitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sansk.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>South-east Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Som.</td>
<td>Somali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soq.</td>
<td>Soqotri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>South Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syr.</td>
<td>Syriac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh.</td>
<td>Śārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tig.</td>
<td>Tigre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigā.</td>
<td>Tigrīnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur.</td>
<td>Ṭūrōyō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ug.</td>
<td>Ugaritic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YemAr.</td>
<td>Yemeni Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General abbreviations**

- **adv.** adverb, adverbial
- **affirm.** affirmative
- **allop.** allophone, allophonic
- **altern.** alternation, alternative
- **apoph.** apophonic
- **assim.** assimilation
- **biconson.** biconsonantal
- **BS** basic seme
- **conj.** conjunction
- **conson.** consonant, consonantal
- **contrast.** contrastive
- **denom.** denomination, denominative
- **deriv.** derivation, derivative
- **design.** designation, designative
- **deverb.** deverbation, deverbative
- **dialect.** dialectal
- **distrib.** distribution, distributive
- **emph.** emphatic
- **enant.** enantiosmic, enantiasmic
- **epenth.** epenthetic
- **etymol.** etymology
- **exclam.** exclamation
- **expan.** expansion, expanded
- **gemin.** gemination, geminative
- **infixed**
- **intens.** intensification, intensified
- **Kur.** Kuron
t
- **later.** lateral
- **laryng.** laryngeal
- **metaph.** metaphor, metaphorical
- **month.** month name
- **mythol.** mythological
- **neg.** negative
- **nom.** nominal
- **onomatop.** onomatopoeia, onomatopeic
- **part.** particle
- **p.p.** past participle
- **predic.** predication, predicative
- **prefix.** prefixed
- **PrimW** Primary Word
- **progr.** progressive
- **pron.** pronoun
- **reduplic.** reduplication, reduplicative
- **SF** semantic field
- **s.o.** someone
- **spont.** spontaneous
- **sth.** something
- **suffix.** suffixed
- **synon.** synonymous
- **triconson.** triconsonantal
- **vocal.** vocalic
- **#** with the antonym