ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

SEMITIC WORDS FOUND IN TIGRINYA BUT NOT IN GE'EZ

By
YEMANE TESFAY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN LINGUISTICS

OCT. 2009

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

SEMITIC WORDS FOUND IN TIGRINYA BUT NOT IN GE'EZ

By
YEMANE TESFAY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN LINGUISTICS

Approved by:

PROF. ORIN GENSLER — Orin D. Gensler

Advisor — Signature

Shimelis Mazengia — _____

Examiner — Signature

Abstract

This thesis deals with Semitic words found in Tigrinya but not Ge'ez. It contains four chapters: chapter one is general introduction, chapter two methodology, chapter three analysis of the data and chapter four is conclusion. The results show that there are indeed some such words, including basic vocabulary, but not many. This provides a lexical perspective on the question of how close Ge'ez was to proto-Ethiopic: very close, but not identical.

Table of contents

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest and heartfelt gratitude to Professor Orin Gensler, my advisor, for his devoted guidance, assistance and comments for the successful completion of this study, and for his help with translations from French and German. I am also grateful to Dr. Gideon Cohen for sponsoring me and for all the things he has done for me. I would also like to thank my typist, Mekdes Diro, for her patience in typing and correcting the mistakes.

Language Abbreviations

Akk	Akkadian
Amh	Amharic
Arab	Arabic
Arab. Eg.	Egyption Arabic
Arab. Magh.	Maghrebi Arabic
Arab. Malt.	Maltese Arabic
Arab. Or.	Oriental Arabic
Aram	Aramaic
Aram. Anc.	Ancient Aramaic
Aram. Jp.	Jewish Palestinian Aramaic
Aram. Talm.	Talmudic Aramaic
Arg	Argobba
Gaf	Gafat
Gog	Gogot
Gur	Gurage
Hbr	Hebrew
Jib	Jibbali
Jud	Judaic Aramaic
Mhr	Mehri
Min	Minaean
Sab	Sabaean
SAr	South Arabian
Sod	Soddo
Soq	Soqotri
Tgr	Tigre
Tna	Tigrinya
Ugr	Ugaritic
Wol	Wolane

Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 General Introduction

This study attempts to address the following question: what are the Semitic words or roots found in Tigrinya but not in Ge'ez? By Semitic words I mean words with clear Semitic cognates.

The background objective behind this study is to make a lexical contribution to the question, is Ge'ez the proto-language of Ethio-Semitic? My intention is certainly not to resolve this question, but to add new data that are relevant to it. Therefore, the goal of this research is to collect Semitic words found in Tigrinya but not in Ge'ez.

From the beginning Semitic linguists have examined the status of Ge'ez within Ethio-Semitic, that is to say, how archaic Ge'ez is in relation to the various modern Ethio-Semitic languages. One can approach this question from both a lexical and a grammatical perspective. Regarding the position of Ge'ez, different linguists have forwarded their argument in different ways. In some respects, for example in syntax, Ge'ez is certainly archaic. Hetzron presents his argument as follows:

The question whether Cushitic influenced Proto-Ethiopic syntax during the common stage or later influenced each cluster separately remains open. Ge'ez is the only Ethiopian language which preserved the old Semitic syntax and was but superficially affected by this influence. The northernmost living language, Tigre, is much less rigid in word order than the rest, and it may optionally have either the Semitic pattern or the Cushitic one. All the

remaining languages have exclusively a Cushitic-type word order system. This suggests that the Cushitic influence affecting syntax came later and was independent in the different branches of Ethiopian. (1972: 19)

But we can also ask, are there ways in which the various modern Ethio-Semitic languages appear to be more archaic than Ge'ez?

Leslau has presented many archaic features that occur in some south Ethio-Semitic languages (but not Amharic) in his article entitled "Archaic features in south-Ethiopic" (1951). These features, however, are also found in Ge'ez, so they are not more archaic than Ge'ez.

Hetzron, however, does give some grammatical features whereby some modern Ethio-Semitic languages do appear to be more archaic than Ge'ez. Specifically, he argues that Tigre and Tigrinya are not descended from Ge'ez. The following grammatical evidence, except the final point, is taken directly from Hetzron's book *Ethiopian Semitic* (pp. 19-21). (The list is not intended to be complete).

- **Pronouns of the third person**

Ge'ez	**Tigre**	**gloss**
3m. wə'ətu	hətu	'he'
3f. yə'əti	həta	'she'

In these words Ge'ez has lost the Semitic glottal fricative /h/ and replaced it by the glottal stop. The /h/ is preserved not only in Tigre but even in some South Ethio-Semitic languages.

- **The preposition 'from'**

This is one piece of grammatical evidence that makes Ge'ez innovative. Tigre has the archaic form *mən,* which is very close to Hebrew and Arabic *min*. Ge'ez has *əmənnä* or *əm-*.

- **Infinitive**

As Hetzron (1972: 21) mentions, citing Cohen (1931: 33), most of the modern Ethiosemitic languages, and also other non-Ethiopian Semitic languages, have infinitives based on the prefix *mV-*. Ge'ez does have many deverbative nouns with a preformative *mV-*, but they do not have the grammatical status of infinitives.

- **The negative morpheme**

Tigrinya and Tigre of Bogos have the negative *ay-*, corresponding to South Ethiopic *al-*, which is of Semitic origin. On the other hand, Ge'ez and Tigre of Mensa have the negative *i-* in both perfect and imperfect.

- **Presentative particle**

Tigrinya has a presentative particle *'ənnäh-* 'here it is', with pronominal endings. This particle is cognate to Hebrew *hinne*, Arabic *inna*, both of which also take pronominal endings and are similar in meaning. In Ge'ez it

exists only in the form *ʾən-ka* 'so then!' [Orin Gensler, personal communication]

The above discussion focuses on grammar. My concern in this thesis is with lexicon: Is there any lexical evidence that Tigrinya (or any modern Ethio-Semitic language) is more archaic than Ge'ez? In concrete terms: are there words of Semitic origin in Tigrinya which do not occur in Ge'ez? Very little work has been done especially on Tigrinya in this respect, although Leslau has looked at Amharic in this way. Leslau in his book *Amharic Cognates in Hebrew* (1969: 2-3) states that "It is interesting to note that there is a considerable number of Amharic roots with Hebrew cognates but without a correspondence in Ge'ez". For example:

Amharic	gloss	Hebrew	gloss
homṭaṭṭa	'sour'	ħomeş	'vinegar'
ḳ^{w}äyyä	'wait'	qiwwā(h)	'wait for'
mäsälal	'ladder'	sullam	'ladder, stair'

(The Hebrew sound q corresponds to the ejectivized velar ḳ = k' in Amharic.)

In general, if a word is attested in other Semitic languages including Tigrinya but not in Ge'ez, why? Perhaps it is only an accidental omission from the attested Ge'ez corpus; or perhaps it really didn't exist in Ge'ez at all. Often we have no way of knowing which of these is right, and no way to answer the question "why?" Sometimes one possible answer is because Ge'ez is a religiously oriented language. Many of the words found in Ge'ez have to do with religion, like blessing, cursing, praying. We would expect a

religiously oriented language like Ge'ez to be lexically impoverished in semantic fields having to do with technical details of (for example) farming, hunting, warfare, metal manufacture, carpentry, etc. Nor would such a language have a rich vocabulary of onomatopoeic words and interjections. This, at least, would be true for written Ge'ez as we know it; we have no access to spoken Ge'ez.

On the other hand, it turns out that there are some very everyday, non-religious words in Semitic (basic vocabulary) which do not occur in Ge'ez. That is, the concept would be expected to occur in Ge'ez and it does occur in Ge'ez, but Ge'ez expresses the concept with a different word-form. Here Ge'ez seems to have truly innovated, by losing the old word and creating a new one. "Accidental omissions" in the attested corpus seem unlikely for basic vocabulary.

1.2 Literature Review

I don't know of any literature which directly addresses my problem. There does exist literature which is indirectly relevant. As already mentioned, some scholars argue that there are some grammatical and lexical elements where Ge'ez appears to be innovative compared to modern Ethio-Semitic languages, as has been mentioned above. In Hetzron's book *Ethiopian Semitic* (1972), there are about eight grammatical features which support the argument against Ge'ez as the proto-Ethiopic language (see below). Leslau, in his article "Archaic features in South Ethopic" (1951), tried to show that the modern Ethio-Semitic languages, especially south Ethio-Semitic languages, appear to be as archaic as Ge'ez. In addition, several descriptive works have been done on the grammar of Tigrinya; probably the best

description is still Leslau (1941). On the other hand, less work has been done on the comparative lexicon of Ethio-Semitic, notably Kogan (2005), Leslau (1987) from the viewpoint of Ge'ez, and Leslau (1969) focusing on Hebrew and Amharic cognates, as well as the lexical part of the discussion in several Ethio-Semitic articles by Leslau (e.g. 1943, 1951).

In a project like this one, dictionaries are obviously indispensable. Fortunately, good dictionaries are (partly) available. There are large dictionaries of Ge'ez by Dillmann (1865) and Leslau (1987) and a very large dictionary for Tigrinya by Kane (2000), which I believe is the best lexical source for Tigrinya so far. There are also etymological dictionaries of Harari (Leslau 1963) and Gurage (Leslau 1979), but these were not relevant to this thesis.

There are also two major comparative dictionaries of Semitic, both incomplete. One is by Militarev and Kogan; it is organized according to semantic fields, and two volumes (I: Body parts (2000), II: Animals (2005)) have appeared so far. The other, in French, is by a team of scholars headed by David Cohen (1994-1999). It is arranged by roots in standard Semitic alphabetical order; 8 fascicles ('-z, corresponding to fidäl ኀ-ዘ in *abugida* order) have appeared so far. In addition, Fronzaroli has published smaller Semitic lexical works, in two versions, that is, Italian (1964-1971) and English (1975). When Fronzaroli cites Ethio-Semitic words, he almost always means Ge'ez, and accordingly his work was not very useful in this project.

Chapter two: Methodology

2.1 Qualitative procedure

In this work, it was necessary to use Semitic etymological dictionaries, or articles on comparative Semitic lexicography, in order to determine that a certain root is a Semitic root. The problem, though, is that there is still no full etymological dictionary of Semitic. As mentioned above, two different Semitic etymological dictionaries were used. Neither is complete. The first is by Militarev and Kogan (MK), and is organized by semantic fields. Two volumes have been published so far: the words are arranged in Latin alphabetical order. The second one, also incomplete, is by David Cohen (DC). It is in French and has eight fascicles. Apparently the intention was to cover the entire Semitic alphabet, but only eight fascicles have appeared so far, the last one in 1999. As mentioned, their alphabetical order is from '-Z according to the traditional Semitic order or *abugida*, which is only about the first one-third of the Semitic alphabet. I also consulted another comparative Semitic lexicon by Fronzaroli, which has two versions, that is, in Italian and in English. The Italian version (by far the larger one) is much smaller than MK and DC; it appeared in installments as a series of journal articles. The English version is only 60 pages long. But I found almost nothing in these two sources. The French lexicon (DC) is basically a lexical list, with relatively little discussion. Under a given root, there are usually several homonymous entries—roots that sound the same but have very different meanings. In such cases, the main entry is clearly divided into subentries, one subentry for each meaning. In my lexical search, I treated

each subentry as a distinct unit, completely separate from other subentries for the given root. (see further sec. 3.2)

Having collected these words (Semitic words found in Tigrinya but not Ge'ez) I checked them in the following large dictionaries: Kane Tigrinya-English, Leslau Ge'ez-English and August Dillmann Ge'ez-English. Furthermore, I also used Professor Orin Gensler's help with the translations in French, Italian, German especially with the Semitic languages like Hebrew, Arabic, South Arabian, Aramaic and the Hebrew Bible concordance as well. This help was unavoidable; I could not have done the project otherwise.

This is a qualitative approach. I wanted to find all the words possible that fit the given criteria. While I was collecting these data, however, I had some puzzles, involving things like regionalisms, problematic etymologies, onomatopoeia and interjections. These will be discussed in chapter three. By their very nature, such cases are weaker evidence than the non-problematic items. I will discuss these problematic types in detail.

2.2 Quantitative procedure

There are not many Tigrinya words which passed the test for inclusion in this thesis. Since there are so few, it is important to get a non-impressionistic statement of this scarcity. Hence I took a look at the data quantitatively.

There are two volumes in MK. The first one is about anatomy of man and animals. It has 382 entries. Out of these entries, I found just 7 good cases

that include Tigrinya words but no Ge'ez words, and six "problematic" cases (see discussion below). The second volume is about animal names. It has 255 entries. There are four good cases that have Tigrinya but not Ge'ez words, and three problematic cases.

For the French dictionary of David Cohen (DC) I counted the entries in just one representative fascicle, fascicle 7. This fascicle has 384 entries, and these include only two good words that exist in Tigrinya but not Ge'ez. There are several other entries that have been left out (onomatopoeic words and regional words).

This quantitative survey reveals two things. First, there do indeed exist Semitic words that are not attested in Ge'ez but are found in Tigrinya, including terms of basic vocabulary; here Ge'ez has innovated by losing the old Semitic word. But second, there are not many such words. This supports the common view of most linguists: if proto-Ethio-Semitic was not Ge'ez, it was very close to it.

Chapter Three: The data

3.1 Good data and problematic data

In demonstrating Semitic words or roots found in Tigrinya but not in Ge'ez, I have collected so-called "good words" as well as problematic words. By good words I mean words that show good sound correspondences across the languages and good agreement in meaning; many of the good words are basic ordinary nouns or verbs. Although this set of data is very small, the presence in it of basic lexical items makes the data interesting, because these lexical meanings are found (almost) everywhere, that is to say, in almost all human languages spoken in the world. Such words tend not to be easily lost or borrowed. Yet Ge'ez clearly did lose some inherited Semitic words, even basic words, for reasons that are unknown.

Words which are questionable or problematic fall into several types. First, the words may show good sound correspondences, but not show good semantic agreement. The opposite can also happen: the semantics is good but the sound correspondence is not. The third possibility concerns regionalisms. Some of the words in this paper are regional words, that is to say, they occur only in a geographically restricted area (Yemen and Ethiopia) and so could represent a borrowing from one another or an areal feature. With such words it is difficult to tell if it is an old Semitic lexeme or a regional word. The fourth point is obvious: if the word is attested only in Ethio-Semitic but not elsewhere in Semitic, I of course did not include it. The fifth type concerns onomatopoeic words and interjections. As is well known, these lexical items are common in every human language, and by

their very nature they often sound similar in unconnected languages. Onomatopoeic words imitate real-world sounds; interjections often have a physiological basis (e.g. a scream when you are frightened, a sigh "uff" sound when you sit down, a sigh "aah" when you are relaxed and happy). Hence these words, even if they have a similar sound in two languages, are not a very good indicator of any historical kin relation of the languages. The sixth and last type concerns words which may possibly have a cognate in Ge'ez, but where the cognacy is not obvious or straightforward.

Let us look at these problem types in a little more detail (for non-standard phonetic symbols, see sec. 3.2 below):

By regionalism I mean that if a word is only found in Ethio-Semitic, South Arabian and Yemeni Arabic, then the word might be a regional word (an areal feature), that is to say, it could be a borrowing, because it is not found in other Semitic languages.

For example:

Arab. Dathina	ḳanṭār	'clitoris'	MK I: 148
Tna.	ḳənṭər, ḳänṭirät	'clitoris, female genital organ'	
Amh.	ḳinṭər	'clitoris'	
Soq.	ḳánṭhir	'vulva'	

This lexeme is only found in Ethio-Semitic, South Arabian and Yemeni Arabic (Dathina); therefore, it is an example of a regionalism. Note that if a word occurs only in Ethio-Semitic and in (general, non-Yemeni) Arabic, I

will *not* call it a regionalism. The reason is clear:Yemen is geographically very close to Ethiopia, and the ancient and political contact between the two regions is a well-attested fact. By contrast, Arabic in general is spread over an immense area, and even in its original territory it does not seem to have had any specially close contact with Ethiopia.

On the other hand, there are words where it is difficult to tell if they are general Semitic or regional words.

For example:

Sab. 'ws 'plague, pestilence' MK I: 27

Min. 's

Tgr. 'aso, 'aso 'fever, malaria'

Tna. 'aso 'fever'

Jib. 'ayOs E. Jib. 'Os 'cold in the head'

Akk. ašû 'a disease (affecting the head, vision, etc.)'

Here the question is whether the Akkadian is realy cognate to the others, or just an accidental resemblance.

Another problem concerns data sets which show regularity of sound correspondences, but where semantically the words are not clearly related to each other. For example:

*ṭmm, *'ṭm 'to be deaf and mute, to stop up, block' MK I: 330

Akk. ṭummumu 'deaf'

Hbr. 'ṭm 'stop up (ears, etc.)'

Tna. ṭämämä 'close the eyes and mouth of dead person'

Here the semantics is not very close; to block one's ears (be deaf) and to close a corpse's eyes and mouth are quite different actions involving different body parts.

On the other hand, there are also words that are semantically related, but that lack the expected sound correspondences.

For example:

Arab.	mišfalat-	'stomach (of animal, bird)'	MK I: 243
Tgr., Tna.	šənfəlla	'ruminant's (second) stomach'	
Gog., Sod.	šənfəl		
Mhr.	hōfəl	'belly, stomach'	

Arabic š should correspond with Ethio-Semitic s (ሠ), but not with š; the sound correspondence here is irregular.

Words which are almost onomatopoeic are one of the problems I had in this study.

For example: DC 2: 50

Arab.	bāğa, tabawwağa	'to dazzle, flash'
Tna.	bägg, bogg, bägbäg, bogbog bälä	'shine, flash'
Amh.	bogg alä, boggbogg alä	'shine, flash'

Here the words appear to be "sound symbolic" (although not strictly onomatopoeic): a certain sound sequence (here bVg) may tend to be associated with a particular semantic field in a particular language family.

Interjections are another problematic case. For example:

Hbr.	hō, hōhō	(laughter sound)	DC 5:382
SAr.	Soq. hoho		
Tna.,	Amh. hoho		

Interjections often have a physiological basis. In an intuitively clear sense, they are not quite "real words".

The few examples mentioned above are just to illustrate the problems I had in collecting data for this paper, and that is the reason why I did not give more examples here. In general, many words were not included in this study because of the reasons mentioned above. Most importantly, many words are excluded because they only exist in Ethio-Semitic languages, although Greenberg and M. Cohen (cited below) suggest that even this seemingly obvious criterion is not foolproof.

'In order to give a quantitative answer to the question: "What can be reconstructed of the ...lexicon of the proto-language?", it is first necessary to lay down some principle of selection, in addition to the formal and semantic criteria which enable us to establish the existence of a common word. While the presence of a word in most of the Semitic languages is a good indication that it belongs to the common lexicon, and its presence in two languages may be considered positive evidence of its Semitic character (for example Greenberg 1950, 168), the fact that it is attested in only one language or dialect is not itself a proof of the contrary. The problem has been discussed, in its relation to etymological dictionaries, by M. Cohen (1947, 52 ff.), who is in favour of including words attested in only one language, providing that they are not obvious borrowings or innovations. At the opposite extreme we have the list drawn up by Bergsträsser (1982), who includes only words attested in all the five main groups (Akkadian, Hebrew, Aramaic, South Arabian-Ethiopic and North Arabic' (Fronzaroli 1975: 43).

The words included in this study are words that exist in at least one branch of Semitic besides Ethio-Semitic, in order to avoid or minimize borrowings, innovations or coincidences. Most of the words occur in at least 3 branches.

Finally, there were a few words where a Ge'ez cognate may possibly exist, but the situation is not clear. An example is H-L-L "be crazy; mock". Ge'ez does not have a semantically similar form from this root, but it does have the word häwläyä "to mock". This might represent the same root indirectly, or a related root. But Ge'ez also has häbläyä "to mock". The change b>β>w would be very natural; but if so, then häwläyä would not be related to a root H-L-L at all. This is an unsolved puzzle.

3.2 Format of presentation of the data

Almost all of the words below are taken from the two Semitic etymological dictionaries, that is, from MK and DC. These works have different formats and different abbreviations of language names. In MK, the proto-Semitic form is given with its meaning in English; in DC, the roots as such are not assigned a meaning. In DC, a proto-Semitic root is usually arranged into different sub-entries, each sub-entry having a different meaning and labeled in the dictionary with a distinct number (e.g. GLT-4, GLT-5); each sub-entry can be considered an accidental homonym, unrelated to the others. Thus words belonging to sub-entry x are ignored completely in examining sub-entry y. for example, my data includes an item W'L-2 'be useful'; here I ignore words like Tigrinya *wä'alä* 'spend the day' because it is listed under W'L-3. For some roots, however, all the cognate words fall into one single sematic group', in which case no sub-entries are used. In MK, the proto-form is fully vocalized; in DC, the roots are given only in consonants. In this study the words are organized the way they are organized in MK.

Additionally, I have often given only a subset of the full lexical data to be found in MK or DC—enough to show the word's distribution in Semitic. I have made minor changes to the DC abbreviations of some languages like 'CAN. h.' to 'Hebrew,' 'Oug.' to 'Ugr.', to make DC consistent with MK.

In the data presentation below, the transcription mostly follows the transcription in the dictionaries, to which the reader is referred. Usually the symbols should be self-evident. Note the following, however:

ṣ = emphatic s (ejective or velarized)

ṭ = emphatic t (ejective or velarized)

ḳ = emphatic velar /uvular (ejective k' or plain uvular)

O = "open o" (ɔ)

I have used these symbols here for typographical convenience.

3.3 Presentation of results

The results of this paper are presented below according to semantic field, that is, animal names, body parts, miscellaneous words, and onomatopoeic words and interjections. For each field, good cognate sets are presented first, followed by more problematic cases. In several cases, the given word is found in Hebrew but not in Ge'ez; in such cases, I have tried (with Professor Orin Gensler's help) to determine which Ge'ez word is used in the Ge'ez Bible translation to translate this Hebrew word.

3.3.1 Animal names

3.3.1.1 Good cognate sets

*garad- 'kind of insect' MK II: 124
DC 3: 182

Arab. žarād 'grasshopper'

Tna. gärädo 'a dark-colored spider the bite of which is believed to be fatal'

Jib. gerOd 'locusts'

[In DC this is part of a much larger group, with an extremely broad semantic range. I follow MK.]

*ḳ^{w}VrVd-// *ḳVrd- 'tick' MK II: 185

Syriac ḳardā 'a tick, louse (parasite of sheep and cattle)'

Arab. ḳurd- 'tick'

Tgr. ḳärad 'tick'

Tna. ḳ^{w}ərdid 'kind of small tick'

*dVg- 'a kind of insect' MK II: 100

Arab. dayažān 'swarm of grasshoppers'

Tna. duga 'a kind of reddish fly which afflicts cows'

Mhr. dəgdīg 'insect like a grasshopper'

*da'y(-at) 'bird of prey' MK II: 91-93
DC 3: 202

Ugr. d'iy 'raptor, conventionally "hawk"'

Hbr. dā'ā 'red kite' [Ge'ez translates the Hebrew as gip'p'a]

Jud. dayyūtā 'name of several unclean birds'

Arab. da'yat- (in 'ibnu da'yat 'epithet of the crow')

Akk. dimītu 'a bird or a locust'

Tgr. dah (also 'adha') 'a bird'

Amh. dudute 'a kind of bird'

Tna. duda 'a gregarious bird which feeds on maize and ṭaf'

3.3.1.2 **Problematic cognate sets**

*g^{w}a(n)dVr- 'kind of worm' MK II: 120

Mhr. gədərēt 'worm'

Tna. g^{w}ändäran, g^{w}ändära 'intestinal worm, earthworm'

→ Regionalism.

*pVl(y)- 'kind of insect, louse' MK II: 231-233

Akk. uplu 'head louse'

Jud. palyā, palyā bē'āri 'name of a locust on palm-trees'

Arab. fāliyat- 'kind of beetle'

Tna. 'afäl 'insects or fleas which live in grass'

→ The semantics is good, but the phonological correspondence is not perfect at the beginning of the words.

*'arVr 'kind of bird' MK II: 21-22

Akk. arru 'bird used for decoy'

Tna. 'irir, 'ərir 'bird which has an instinct to lead a honey gatherer to where there is honey'

→ A "cognate" attested only in ancient Akkadian and modern Tigrinya is not a reliable cognate.

3.3.2 Body parts (and bodily functions)

3.3.2.1 Good cognate sets

*ḳVrs/ṣ-Vll 'ankle' MK I: 152-153

Akk.	kiṣallu, kiṣillu, kisallu, kisillu 'ankle-bone'
Jud.	ḳarsullā, ḳarṣullā 'ankle'
Hbr.	ḳarsullayim 'ankles'[Ge'ez translates the Hebrew as 'əgr]
Tgr.	ḳarso 'ankle-bone'
Wol.	ənḳərša 'ankle'
Tna.	ḳərṭəmat 'arthritis', ḳärsämä 'beat s.o. on feet'
Mhr.	ḳərṣāt 'knee-cap'

[Note: Tigrinya semantics is different; but Tigre is semantically a perfect match.]

* ħVmm(-at)- 'breast, stomach, entrails' MK I: 108-109

Akk. (?)	umandu 'part of human insides'
Arab.	ħammāmat- 'area of the chest'
Tgr.	ħəmməto 'dish of entrails'
Tna.	ħəmməto 'tripe'
Soq.	ħɛʸm 'lower belly'

*warik (-at)- 'hip (-bone)' MK I: 258-259
DC 7: 628-629 (WRK -1)

Akk. (w)arkatu 'rear side'

Hbr. yārēk 'thigh' [Ge'ez translates the Hebrew in different ways, e.g. ḫ̬ərum, mänḳə^{c}t, 'ägäda, ħäḳ^{w}e]

Aram. Jp. yārēk 'thigh'

Arab. warik 'thigh, hip'

Tgr. wärkät 'hip'

Tna. wäräkät 'rump (of animal), pelvis'

*ḫ̬Vr'/y- 'excrement, dregs' MK I: 123

Akk. arāu (erru, ḫ̬arāru) 'rot, discharge a putrid liquid, defecate'

Ugr. ḫ̬r'u 'excrement'; ḫ̬r' 'defecate'

Hbr. ħărā'īm 'excrement' [Ge'ez translates the Hebrew as k^{w}əsħ]

Jud. ħārē, ħārayyā 'excrement'

Arab. ḫ̬ur'- 'excrement'

Tgr. ħarə'

Tna. ħar'i

Amh. ar

Soq. ħaryómoh 'excrement'

*gV(m)bVč/θ 'hump (of animal)' MK I: 77
DC 2: 98, 3: 152

Akk. gipšu 'a deformation of part of the exta'

Ugr. gbθt 'hump'

Tgr. gäbəs 'crook-backed'

Wol. gumbos 'hunchbacked'

Sod. gumbus, Gog. gumbəs

Tna. g^{w}ämbäs bälä 'bow down'

*ŝa(n)p-at- / *ĉa(n)p-at- 'lip' MK I: 235-236
MK II: 343

Akk. šaptu 'lip'

Eblaite sa-ba-tum

Ugr. špt

Hbr. śāpā [Ge'ez translates the Hebrew as känfär]

Arab. šafat- 'lip'

Tgr. šanəf 'mouth (of animals)'

Tna. šänfäf 'lip'

*hry 'to be pregnant, conceive' MK I: 286,
MK II: 345
DC 5: 452-454

Akk. erû (arû) 'to be pregnant, conceive'

Eblaite 'à-rí-tum /harītum/

Ugr. hry 'conceive'

Hbr. hārā 'to conceive, to be pregnant' [Ge'ez translates the Hebrew as şänsä]

Tna. haräyät 'to be pregnant (cow, ewe)'

3.3.2.2 Problematic cognate sets

* ḳanṭir 'clitoris' MK I: 148

Arab. Dathina ḳanṭār 'clitoris'

Tna. ḳənṭər, ḳänṭirät 'clitoris, female genital organ'

Amh. ḳinṭər 'clitoris'

Soq. ḳánṭhir 'vulva'

⟶ Regionalism

*ṭmm, *'ṭm 'to be deaf and mute, to stop up, block' MK I: 330

Akk. ṭummumu 'deaf'

Hbr. 'ṭm 'stop up (ears, etc.)'

Tna. ṭämämä 'close the eyes and mouth of dead person'

⟶ Semantic match is not very close; and Ge'ez has şamma 'be deaf' (related root şmm).

*mV(')n(-at)- 'tendon, sinew, muscle' MK I: 166

Akk. manānu 'sinews'

Syriac mentā 'hair, nerve; gut-string'

Arab. ma'nat- 'region around the navel'

Tna. mənat 'arm muscle'

⟶ Semantic range is quite broad.

*ŝV(n)pVl 'stomach (of animal, bird)' MK I: 243

Arab. mišfalat- 'bird's gizzard, crop'

Tgr., Tna., Amh., Zway šənfəlla 'ruminant's (second) stomach'

Gog., Sod. šənfəl 'ruminant's stomach'

Mhr. hōfəl 'belly, stomach'

⟶ Arabic s should correspond with Ethio-Semitic s (ሰ), not š.

*'aw/yš 'disease (fever, head cold; plague)' MK I: 27

Sab. 'ws 'plague, pestilence'

Min. 's

Tgr. 'aso, 'aso 'fever, malaria'

Tna. 'aso 'fever'

Jib. 'ayOs E. Jib. 'Os 'cold in the head'

Akk. ašû 'a disease (affecting the head, vision, etc.)'

⟶ Is Akkadian truly cognate? If not, regionalism.

*Wð' 'sweat' DC 6 :507
MK I: 57-58

Akk. zu't-, zūt-, izūt- 'sweat'

Hbr. zē'ah, yeza' [Ge'ez translates Hebrew as haf]

Ugr. d't 'sweat'

Aram. Jp.	de^{ca}tā
Amh., Tna.	wäz
Gaf.	wəzä
Gur.	wəz, wəza'at
Arab.	waða'a 'to flow (water)'

⟶ MK I: 58 mentions Ge'ez zo'a as 'cognate'. But this is from the different root z-w-' (DC 8: 707), which in most Semitic means basically 'shake, tremble'; only in Ge'ez does it (also) mean 'sweat'. A complex problem (see Leslau 1987: 645).

3.3.3 Miscellaneous common words

3.3.3.1 Good cognate sets

*W'L-2 DC 7 :577

Hbr.	hō'īl 'aid, help, serve'
Aram. Anc.	y'l 'usefulness'
Tgr.	'aw'alä 'save someone's life'
Tna.	wä'alä 'be useful, serve, aid, be fertile'

*BDL-1 DC 2: 45

Hbr. ni-bdal 'be separated' [Ge'ez usually translates the Hebrew with f-l-ṭ; also h-r-y, m-t-r, etc.]

Aram. Talm 'b^{e}dal 'to refrain from'

Aram. Jp. 'abdaltā 'separation'

Ugr. bdl(m) (plur.) 'merchant(s)'

Arab. badala, 'abdala 'exchange'

SAr. bdlt 'expiation'

Soq. bdl 'be changed'

Mhr. hebdūl 'to change'

Tna. bäddälä 'exchange, barter'

*GLT-4 DC 3: 134

Arab. 'iğtalata 'eat or drink, devour, eat to the bottom'

Tna. gältäwa 'drink to the bottom'

Tgr. gəllät 'lees' (sediment at the bottom of a glass of wine or beer)

*GLT-5 DC 3: 134

Arab. ğalata 'hit, beat'

Amh. angälatta 'throw back and forth, shake'

Tna. angälatä'ä 'throw back and forth' (personal knowledge)

*HLM-1 DC 5: 417

Ugr. hlm 'to hit'

Hbr. hālam 'to hit' [Ge'ez translates the Hebrew in different ways, e.g. säbärä, ḳäṭḳäṭä]

Tna. hallämä 'to give a slap'

3.3.3.2 Problematic cognate set

*HLL-4 DC 5: 415
MK I : 285-286

Hbr. *hālal 'be crazy, mad'

Aram. Syriac 'ahlēl 'to mock'

Arab. 'uhlūl 'vanity, futility'

Tgr. haläwläw 'unreasonable, insane; simple-minded'

Tna. hallay 'unreasonable, insane; simple-minded'

Ge'ez häwläyä "to mock" but also häbläyä "to mock"

→ Does the Ge'ez word belong to this root? Unclear (see sec. 3.1)

3.3.4 Onomatopoeia and interjections

All such words are considered problematic. I have only given a few representative examples.

*WPP-3 DC 7: 587

Arab. Or. woff, Magh. waf 'a sigh of satisfaction'

Tna. waf(f) bälä 'to sigh with relief'

*WŚ(Ś)- Arab. Eg. wašš 'to hum, buzz' DC 7: 639

Tna., Amh. wäšš(ä) 'a cry to drive donkeys'

Gur. wäšš, wəšš (same)

*GRMRM- Aram. Syriac. 'etg^{e}ramram 'get angry' DC 3: 188

Tgr. 'agrämrämä

Tna. 'ag^{w}rämrämä

Amh., Arg. 'ag^{w}rämärrämä

→ Almost onomatopoeic; sound symbolic.

*BWG-1 DC 2: 50

Arab. bāğa, tabawwağa 'to dazzle, flash'

Tna. bäg, bägbäg, bogbog bälä 'shine, flash'

Amh. bogg alä, boggbogg alä

→ Almost onomatopoeic; sound symbolic.

*HMHM-2 DC 5: 422

Arab. hamhama 'mutter, murmur'

Tgr. hamhamä 'growl; moo, howl; sigh'

Tna. hamhamä 'make a noise, neigh; roar'

Amh. həmhəm alä 'murmur, moan, coo, crack, growl'

*HYS-5

DC 5: 403-404

Arab. Malt. hess, hiess 'cry to drive oxen straight'

Tna. his 'cry to drive oxen'

Chapter Four: Conclusions

I tried my best to collect Semitic words found in Tigrinya but not in Ge'ez. This was a very time-consuming lexical project which yielded—and was expected to yield— only a small number of words. I found about 15 words of the type "Good cognates", and most of these belong to basic vocabulary. Thus the results are highly interesting, as they show that 15 or so Semitic lexemes did not survive in Ge'ez but did survive in Tigrinya. This shows that Ge'ez is not identical to Proto-Ethiopic, now from a lexical perspective. Even in basic vocabulary Ge;ez has lost some words that survive in Tigrinya. But the difference is very small, since there are very few such words. The project is necessarily incomplete, since both of the sources I have used, that is to say, MK and DC, are still works in progress; in DC fascicle 9 will be published soon, and the MK volume on Plant Names is being prepared.

Finally, I believe this thesis can be useful as a model for other researchers who want to conduct research on an analogous project for other modern Ethio-Semitic languages vis-a-vis Ge'ez— "Semitic words found in Harari but not in Ge'ez", etc.

REFERENCES

Bergsträsser, G. 1928. *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*. Munich: Max Hueber Verlag.

Cohen, David, François Bron and Antoine Lonnet. 1994-1999. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques*. 8 fascicles. Leuven: Peeters.

Cohen, Marcel. 1931. *Etudes d'éthiopien méridional*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.

Cohen, Marcel. 1947. *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris.

Dillmann, August. 1865. *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae*. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel.

Fronzaroli, P. 1964-1971. Studi sul lessico comune semitico. *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 19: 155-172, 243-280; 20: 135-150, 246-269; 23: 267-303; 24: 285-320; 26: 603-642.

Fronzaroli, P. 1975. On the Common Semitic Lexicon and Its Ecological and Cultural Background. *Hamito-Semitica*, eds. J. & T. Bynon, 43-53. The Hague: Mouton.

Greenberg, J. H. 1950. The Patterning of Root Morphemes in Semitic. *Word* 6: 162-181.

Hetzron, Robert. 1972. *Ethiopian Semitic: Studies in Classification*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kane, Thomas L. 2000. *Tigrinya-English Dictionary*. Springfield, VA: Dunwoody Press.

Kogan, Leonid. Common Origin of Ethiopian Semitic: The Lexical Dimension. *Scrinium* 1: 367-396.

Leslau, Wolf. 1943. South-East Semitic (Ethiopic and South Arabic). *JAOS* 63: 4-14.

Leslau, Wolf. 1951. Archaic Features in South Ethiopic. *JAOS* 71: 212-230.

Leslau, Wolf. 1963. *Etymological Dictionary of Harari.* Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Leslau, Wolf. 1969. *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Leslau, Wolf. 1979. *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Leslau, Wolf. 1987. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Militarev, Alexander & Leonid Kogan. 2000. *Anatomy of Man and Animals. Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. I. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Militarev, Alexander & Leonid Kogan. 2005. *Animal Names. Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. II. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.