

DOI: 10.14746/linpo.2022.64.1.6

**Semito-Hamitic or Afro-Asiatic consonantism and lexicon:
Episodes of a comparative research I
(Part 1: The long century of Semito-Hamitology
until the middle of the 20th century)¹**

Gábor Takács

Department of Classical Philology, University of Łódź (UŁ)

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

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

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

Abstract: Gábor Takács, *Semito-Hamitic or Afro-Asiatic consonantism and lexicon: Episodes of a comparative research I. Part 1: The long century of Semito-Hamitology until the middle of the 20th century*, The Poznań Society for the Advancement of Arts and Sciences, PL ISSN 0079-4740, pp. 135-173

A retrospective account on past comparative research on Afro-Asiatic (AA) or Semito-Hamitic / Hamito-Semitic (SH/HS, resp.) phonology (first of all consonantism, also root structure) and lexicon, segmented into episodes according to diverse trends (often overlapping in time) is now under way and will be presented part by part in a series of papers. The present paper contains the first ever direction of this research, labelled “Semito-Hamitology” covering studies seeking, in their conception, the “African”, i.e. “Hamitic” kinship of Semitic, without a permanent *communis opinio* over the whole century of this ‘trend’ (better: amalgamate era) regarding the limits of the family.

Keywords: Afro-Asiatic, comparative linguistics, phonology, lexicon, science history.

Introduction

The whole history of Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics, examined in all its aspects, would demand a whole of a heavy monograph. Even merely the (perhaps most neglected and evidently most controversial) segment of comparative consonantism and root etymology, systematically only studied since the late 19th cent., may well result in a thin

¹ This paper has been completed in the frames of my research project “Micro-reconstructions in the Southern Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) lexical root stock” facilitated by the research grant “Advanced Research in Residence” (ARR) of the University of Łódź (UŁ), which I gratefully acknowledge in this place. My special thanks go to Prof. K.T. Witzczak (Dept. of Classical Philology, UŁ) for selflessly supporting my ARR project facilitating my ongoing research on the AA root stock. To Prof. em. W.G.E. Watson (Morpeth, UK), the doyen of Ugaritic philology, I am equally indebted for his friendly favour of reading the draft version of this paper and improving its English style.

volume, for which the present author has already released a number of pilot studies.² The reader is invited to a longer journey throughout trends, phases, chapters of a by far not uniform, rather eclectic and utmost controversial and so hardly explored gigantic field of research on the comparative-historical phonology and lexicon of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic), the oldest and perhaps most puzzling linguistic family in world history (supposed to have sprung from one of the earliest neolithic communities) – guided but not led by me as my aim has been by working out these Episodes, by revealing approaches and tendencies, to make the wider readership also think about these facts of our scholarly literature and be conscious of the origins, background, reasons underlying the rather strangely retarded state-of-the-art of this endangered domain. By offering typical lines of thoughts formulated by the diverse authors *expressis verbis*, the linguistic mentality and attitude are hoped to be revealed and manifested. May the readers eventually judge themselves and form an own opinion by this guidance.

More than two decades ago (1999), I offered an all too sketchy and all too Egyptian-oriented historical overview of this immense, albeit undeservedly little cultivated, domain where I only isolated three trends (EDE I 1-8). Albeit its periodization and segmentation structure elaborated therein³ can be maintained two decades later also, an overall survey of the whole AA domain must comprise by far more directions of comparative research phonology and lexicon. The enormous diversity, and a turbulent co-existence of trends and directions of research, and, sometimes, even, so to say, an all too menacing evolution of certain tendencies have altogether given me sufficient reasons for preparing a comprehensive retrospective evaluation thereof in the period of the past almost one and a half century.

This paper too, is purely and only dealing with the history of that segment of research where the root stock and consonantal inventory of the cognate branches have been subject to a comparative analysis. Other segments of comparative grammar are excluded, all the more since the history of the relatively more coherent research requires a pretty much different segmentation. Not wishing to reproduce here all those details of my old, primarily Egypto-centric, overview available in EDE I, but keeping the periodization suggested by me in 1999, beside surveying purely the underlying taxonomies *ohne Anspruch auf die Vollständigkeit*, I would like to focus here better on the typical tendencies and stress certain emphases in these trends which are specially and only examined in the little-frequented domain of comparative AA phonology and lexicon, including AA root structure,

² Cf. the volume on the Russian story of comparative AA studies (Takács 1999a), also the studies on the three decades of Muscovite Chadic comparative linguistics (Takács 2009b: 211ff.; 1999b: 361ff.) as well as his series of a critical evaluation of the activities and individual output by some of the most fruitful (mostly either Viennese or Muscovite) authors of our field over the past century or so like F. von Calice (Takács 2006a: 139), A. Ember (Takács 2005: 78ff.; 2006b: 145ff.), W. Vycichl (Takács 2002: 19ff.: his bibliography; Takács 2004: ix-xi: his life; Takács 2006c: 154ff.: his research), I.M. Diakonoff (Takács 2003a: v-vii, bibliography; Takács 2003b: ix-xii), O. Röessler (Takács 2006d: 90ff.; 2007: 5ff.), V.M. Illič-Svityč (Takács 1999b: 361ff.), A.B. Dolgopolskij (Takács 2009a: 9-10; 2012: 19ff.).

³ This is part of the author's long-range project (ongoing since 1997) for a comprehensive *wissenschaftliche* survey of the research on Afro-Asiatic comparative phonology and lexicon. The special grouping of the authors in the trends, which the individual episodes are devoted to, represents the intellectual property of the author.

without a wish to present and cover here the full spectrum of comparative activities in all kinds of AA grammar by the authors, let alone for the gigantic output by well-known authors like Rössler, Greenberg or Diakonoff. Thus, some outstanding works may well be touched upon briefly and only with reference to comparative consonantism and lexicon, while sometimes perhaps more emphasis is laid upon some lesser-known or out-dated segments of our domain if these have an impact on the evolution of a trend.

What this series of papers is not at all intended to yield is encyclopaedically presenting the whole inventory of the works ever published in the chosen research field, which should be the objective of a separate volume. Although the entire literature of comparative AA is not in target zone of my series of papers and will be, as a rule, left unconsidered here, still, certain views pertaining to the reconstruction problems appear within works on theoretical issues, on AA comparative morphology, on the individual AA branches, which will thus be quoted here. Otherwise, these issues are going to be subject to a separate monograph on the history of the whole comparative AA domain. Instead, what I have had in my mind is an as complete as possible presentation of the extreme plurality of approaches and views, however astonishing these may look, especially placed beside each other in one overview where I did my best to reduce my own subjective opinion on the minimum by quoting directly as many as possible of thoughts considered typical or essential for a trend. The only task herein has been to present the trends as full as possible with all their pros and cons, irrespective of and often against the conviction of the present author, trying not to actively take part in these debates in a comprehensive overview like this – in the hope that even if not in every single detail, but at least sometimes, it may be more revealing, rather than “what?”, better to see the “how?”. All this is done, on the one hand, to awaken, in a way, the attention of the remaining and potential authors of our all too divided, atomized, little-cultivated orphan domain and, on the other hand, in order to make the wider scientific audience conscious of how close or distant the state-of-the-art of this comparative linguistic field stands to that of neo-grammarians Indo-European research, say, a century before.

What this study on the history of inter-branch comparison is not going to offer either is, a beyond doubt highly urgent and long desirable retrospective survey of the state-of-the-art in reconstructing the consonantal systems and root stock of the individual AA branches (such as Cushitic, Omotic, Chadic) which should be subject to other extensive follow-up studies.

Previous overviews in general

“Eine umfassende Geschichte der Semitoamitistik gibt es bislang nicht, nur kurze Abrisse, die höchstens einige Schlaglichter und einzelne Epochen in der Entwicklung... werfen” as rightly stated about the state of the affair more than three decades ago (which is valid, by the way, until now) by R.M. Voigt (1988: 155), whose general survey, however, instead of offering a comprehensive survey of all the trends and periods by his day, also entailed just part of them. So will it remain with this paper too, which focuses,

as specified above, just on the most neglected and controversial segments of comparative phonology and lexicon in our vast Afro-Asiatic research domain.

M. Cohen (1947) offered an almost exhaustive annotated bibliography and history of AA researches in general, which F. Hintze (1951) has neatly complemented in his very thorough and sharp-minded review. In the following half of century or so, a number of partial overviews were published: e.g., Hodge 1970, 1971, 1976, Köhler 1975, Burrini 1978-9, Mukarovsky 1981, Petráček 1984 (on the research in the 3rd quarter of the 20th cent., where, typically and unfortunately, comparative phonology had hardly any echo among many other theoretical issues).⁴ The lengthy chapter on the state-of-the-art of AA studies (“Stav hamitosemitských studií”) from the only available university course on AA, written in Czech, by K. Petráček (1989: 10-83, §1.) contains a number of useful sections.⁵ R.M. Voigt (1988: 155-164; 2001: 1318-1323) has offered perhaps the most original and fairly (albeit not in every detail) objective survey of some selected older episodes of the comparative SH research (with an original, albeit somewhat different periodization), which is especially useful as for the 19th century research and gets all the more unilateral, neglectful as for its progress in the 20th century. Less detailed is “le bilan de la linguistique chamito-sémitique des derniers cinquante ans” examined (since the

⁴ Segmented by him into chapters like “La parenté des langues chamitosemitiques” (pp. 426-427), “Les types de comparaison” (pp. 427-428), “La reconstruction interne” (pp. 428-429), “Le système du développement diachronique” (pp. 434-435), “D’autres problèmes du comparativisme” (pp. 438-439).

⁵ Petráček’s (1989: 10-17, §1.1) all too general “survey of results in SH comparative linguistics” (“Hamitosemitská srovnávací jazykověda. Přehled výsledků”) yields no more than a discussion of some AA works by C.T. Hodge (pp. 10-11), followed by a short list of the AA conferences and *Festschriften* up to date (Petráček 1989: 12-14), a very short summary of some studies by W. Vycichl (1978) and H.-J. Sasse (1981) as for “evaluating the perspectives” of comparative AA (Petráček 1989, 14: “Zhodnocení a perspektivy”), an enumeration of studies dealing with the comparative methodology (Petráček 1989: 14-15), a small list of works on the history of our research – with a few gaps, unfortunately (Petráček 1989: 15), a brief and incomplete section on the very few periodical series of our comparative domain like GLECS sessions, the AAL (ed. by R. Hetzron), and the African Marburgensia (ed. by H. Jungrathmayr) (Petráček 1989, 15: “Rozvoj výzkumu”), list of countries where AA studies were pursued (Petráček 1989: 16: “Centra studií”), and an account on the past of AA research in Czechia (Petráček 1989: 16-17: “Tradice v našich zemích”). Then, Petráček (1989: 18-22, §1.2.) surveyed the history of AA comparative studies since Meinhof 1912 up to his day roughly and very little annotated (“Souborná spracování hamitosemitských jazyků (HS) a rekonstrukce prajazyka (P-HS)”). After a list of linguistic maps in the AA domain (Petráček 1989: 23-25, §1.3.): “Mapy hamitosemitských jazyků”) and a “Bibliografie hamitosemitské jazykovědy” (Petráček 1989: 26-27, §1.4.), Petráček singled out the overviews of the state-of-the-art of internal comparison in the individual AA branches, like that of Semitic (Petráček 1989: 28-44, §1.5.): “Semitská srovnávací jazykověda”), which is out of our scope in this paper, except for his section on Egyptian which offers in fact “Egyptština a hamitosemitská srovnávací jazykověda” (Petráček 1989: 45-64, §1.6.) hiding in itself, i.e., a noteworthy section on “Egyptština a hamitosemitské jazyky ...” (Petráček 1989: 49-54, §1.6.2.1.) with precious lightly annotated lists of studies comparing Egyptian with the AA branches, followed by “Egyptština a africké jazyky” (Petráček 1989: 54-55, §1.6.2.2.), “Egyptština a asijské jazyky (nostratické, makroboreální, Nilal, Lislakh, indoevropské)” (Petráček 1989: 55-56, §1.6.2.3.), a very exciting, inspiring section on the impact of AA comparison on the research of Egyptian prehistory (Petráček 1989: 56-58, §1.6.2.4.: “Srovnávací jazykověda a egyptské dějiny”). Similarly, the special section within Cushitic is devoted to “Význam kušitské jazykovědy pro srovnávací hamitosemitskou jazykovědu” (Petráček 1989: 66-67, §1.7.2.), whereas, after a very brief Omotic section (Petráček 1989: 72-73, §1.8.) and a poor one on Berbero-AA (Petráček 1989: 74, §1.9.1.), the Chadic one (Petráček 1989: 80-88, §1.10.) contains a precious overview of the research on the external ties of Chadic (“Vnější vztahy čadských jazyků”, Petráček 1989: 82-83, §1.10.2.).

publication of Cohen 1947) by A. Zaborski (1998: 23) presenting rather the tendencies in our research field. In spite of the promising title of his paper, H. Satzinger (1999: 367-374) released a by far incomplete survey of SH/AA comparative phonological and lexical research of certain episodes, which is pretty detailed as for what had happened over the first century of comparative SH/AA studies up to M. Cohen's 1947 *magnum opus* (pp. 367-370), but suddenly gets rather taciturn (in less than 17 lines!) as to the details about how "seit Greenbergs grundlegender Arbeit ist die Forschung auf verschiedenen Wegen weitergeschritten" in the comparative-historical study of the AA branches, where Satzinger, having briefly mentioned a few homeland theories, immediately switched to a pure reproduction of the copied-in AA family tree models (pp. 371-372), then again one further entry (p. 373) deals with some *Gemeinplätze* about Chadic and Cushito-Omotiic lexical reconstruction. A very brief history of the research was offered by P. Vernus (2000: 169-172, §1-§2) too, focusing on the affiliation of Egyptian retrospectively. Then, in the epochal vol. 20 of the IOS, in his chapter on the "1. History of the discipline" (p. 265), R.M. Voigt (2002) gave us just a brief survey of the minimal items of what he called comparative "Semitohamitic".

I. "Hamitology" vs. "Semitic-Hamitology"

The long out-dated and ambiguous label of "Hamitology" is used here for the (in many ways long outdated) dubious amalgamate (better than to be called trend) of pre-Greenbergian comparative researches (running parallel to the "old school" of Egypto-Semitic comparison) on the kinship of the supposed African branches of AA identified as cognates to Semitic. This is not to mean all the authors of this era to have been misguided by the Semitic vs. Hamitic dichotomy implied by this term. H.-J. Sasse (1981a) distinguished between the authors of this long period as the adherents of "Die hamitische These" (Sasse 1981a: 132-135, §2.2) vs. "Die Schwesterfamilien-These" (Sasse 1981a: 135-136, §2.3), but we do not wish to segment this era that way, since we consider some other traits (better: controversies) more essential from the standpoint of phonology and lexicon regarding this very vague and long beginning of the comparative AA research over the century from the mid-19th century up to M. Cohen's *Essai comparatif*, namely: (1) no agreement on the limits of "Hamitic"⁶ and thus also of Semitic-Hamitic or Afro-Asiatic, (2) lack of convincing and sufficient comparative wordlists, hence: (3) failure in establishing regular consonantal correspondences among the examined languages. I regard Cohen 1947 as a pioneering, albeit highly disputable attempt at overcoming these deficiencies and so it can only be the culmination of this eclectic era.

⁶ C. Brockelmann (1950: 59) speaks about the "von R. Lepsius zuerst sogenannten hamitischen Sprachen Nord- und Ostafrikas" suggesting that he was the first to use this term. At any rate, already R. Lepsius (1863) classified Egyptian, Berber and Cushitic as part of "Hamitic" as opposed to Semitic, whence, as concluded by M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998: 112), it appears that "Lepsius was one of the few who did not believe in the close relationship between Semitic and Egyptian." Later, though, R. Lepsius (1880) conceived "die Sudansprachen als Misch-Negersprachen aus den Bantu-Negersprachen und den hamitischen Sprachen" (Satzinger 1999: 367). G. Maspero, in turn, "did not challenge the Semitic bias, but ... laid particular stress on the relationship to the Berber languages of North Africa" (Bechhaus-Gerst 1998: 111).

Since as an etymologist I feel not prepared as yet for discussing some hard theoretical issues around “Hamitic” in general (done by others) that lie beyond the scope of this overview strictly targeting the history of research on AA comparative phonology and lexicon, I do not consider it as my task as yet, even *wissenschaftsgeschichtlich*, to encyclopaedically survey and elaborate here all the controversies and problems with the often misused term “Hamitic” leading sometimes to darker pages of racism in the history of European science with impact even to certain segments of the “modern” research.⁷ But this sensitive issue will not be avoided either in a brief retrospective survey below⁸ or

⁷ Sasse (1981a: 135, §2.2) on the racial impact of “Hamitic”: “Die Hamitenhypothese hat nicht nur auf das vergleichende Studium der afroasiatischen Sprachen, sondern auf die gesamte Afrikanistik einen außerordentlich schädlichen Einfluß ausgeübt. Die Vorstellung des hochgewachsenen kaukasoiden Hamiten, der aufgrund seiner überlegenen geistigen Disposition und seiner effektiveren Waffen einen großen Teil des von negroiden Bevölkerung bewohnten Kontinents unterwirft, ging in zahlreiche ethnologische und afrikanistische Handbücher und enzyklopädische Lexika ein und setzte sich nachhaltig in den Vorstellungen der gelehrten Welt über die Vorgeschichte Afrikas ein.”

⁸ The diverse nuances of the term it used to be mentioned by the diverse authors would be worth a special study. To evaluate all these aspects is not our task here. At any rate, some sample quotations from works by some leading authors are offered here as to how the sense of “Hamitic” changed over the reviewed period. It was first used in Adelung’s *Mithridates* (1806: 300, cf. Burrini 1978-9: 114f., quoted in Newman 1980, 7, fn. 10 too with a vague reference; Kaye and Daniels 1992: 430) and then by A. d’Abbadie (1845, cf. Köhler 1975: 277). Voigt (2001: 1319): “Der später so gängige Begriff ‘hamitisch’ taucht in der frühen Zeit noch nicht bzw. noch nicht in der späteren Bedeutung auf. A. d’Abbadie scheint diesen Terminus zum ersten Mal verwendet zu haben. Er nennt ‘the important family of Ethiopian languages’ ‘Chamitic’ ... Wenige Jahre später faßt er unter der ‘famille kamitique’ neben den Agausprachen auch ‘Yamma, Pays des Janjaro’, Gonga, Kafa und viele andere Sprachen zusammen, während er das Kambata, Galla, Saho, ‘Afar, Somali, Hadiya u.a. einer ‘famille sous-kamitique’ zurechnet”. Then, Hamitic was applied by J.L. Krapf (1850, 1858) as a synonym of “schwarzafrikanisch” for the first (?) time as stated by H. Satzinger (1999: 367), who summed up the general use of this term “ansonsten speziell als Oberbegriff für diejenigen nichtsemitischen Sprachen Afrikas, die in ihrer Grammatik das Genus von Substantiven und Pronomina unterscheiden ... vielmehr wird der Begriff Hamitisch in erster Linie zur Abgrenzung gegenüber besser definierten Sprachgruppen verwendet, wie Semitisch und Bantu, aber auch gegenüber den ‘Sudansprachen’, die reziprok auf einer ähnlichen Abgrenzung beruhen”. Studying the “Divisions internes du chamito-sémitique”, Cohen (1934) followed how the limits of “Hamitic” were changing in this phase: “Plus tard, au xx^e siècle, des égyptologues, entraînés par leurs connaissances des faits sémitiques, ont tendu à constituer un groupement égypto-sémitique. Certains savants ont alors attribué le nom de chamitique à un groupement restreint fait des éléments restés en dehors de l’égypto-sémitique, à savoir les berbères et le couchitique (en y joignant parfois d’autres langues africaines).” What is meant by *historische Hamitistik* was determined by W. Vycichl (1935: 76) as follows: “Mit dem Terminus hamitisch im sprachwissenschaftlichen Sinne bezeichnet man seit Richard Lepsius eine Reihe afrikanischer Sprachgruppen, die charakteristische Erscheinungen mit dem Semitischen teilen.” This term, whose signification had undergone a few changes since the mid-19th cent., was defined by J.H. Greenberg (1962: 82): “Although the term Hamitic came into general linguistic usage, it was far from being well defined. On the one hand, the exact languages to be included differed from writer to writer, though in general all agreed on Egyptian, Berber and Cushitic. Even here usage differed, since some assigned Egyptian a separate status between Semitic and Hamitic. Further, in the presence of the rival hypothesis of a relation between Semitic and Indo-European ..., some scholars considered Hamitic to be a separate family whose relationship to Semitic must be regarded as unproven. Others, confident of this connection, used the hybrid Hamito-Semitic as a general designation for the entire family. It is beyond the scope of this article to consider the details of all the various opinions on what came to be the ‘Hamitic’ problem. One extreme point of view ... should be briefly mentioned, since by the reactions it evoked ..., it has colored discussion of the problem virtually up to the present. ... the thesis ... by Carl Meinhof ... In this work, the term ‘Hamitic’ was extended to include ... such other languages as that of the Fulani ..., the ... Masai ... and ... the Hottentots ...” In addition, after

whenever it occurs with the individual authors of this period, let alone the reasons of J.H. Greenberg for rightly reckoning with this ill-founded label (specified below).

Beside his (Cohen 1947: 3-22) immense and exemplary, albeit incomplete (extended in Hintze 1951: 66-67) bibliographical thesaurus of SH comparative studies, which has rightly been frequently quoted over the past decades, M. Cohen (1947: 23-26) also offered a rather eclectic analysis “des études chamito-sémitiques du dernier siècle”, i.e., the first half of the 20th century covering the “classical” and “post-classical” phases of “Hamitology”, in a not too consequent classification.⁹ A.S. Kaye and P.T. Daniels (1992: 430-432),

a profound discussion as to how the untenable racial aspect of the “Hamitic hypothesis” evolved over centuries in European science, E.R. Sanders (1969: 531) concludes that “It would be well-nigh impossible to point to an individual and recognize in him a Hamite according to racial, linguistic and cultural characteristics to fit the image that has been presented to us for so long. Such an individual does not exist. The word still exists, endowed with a mythical meaning: it endures through time and history, and, like a chameleon, changes its colour to reflect the changing light. As the word became flesh, it engendered many problems of scholarship.” Still, A.N. Tucker (1975: 473) stuck to the tradition: “Whatever shortcomings the term ‘Hamitic’ might have for philologists, the term ‘Hamite’ has been a major stand-by for students of race. It had long been known that Africa contained ethnic types completely at variance with the Negro type. The most outstanding (sic) of these types was to be found in the speakers of the so-called ‘Hamitic’ languages, who were regarded as early invaders from Asia Minor. ... The main characteristics of these invaders were that they were tall, dolichocephalic, straight-nosed, thin-lipped, ‘aristocratic’-looking, and kept cattle. It soon became apparent, however, that these characteristics were also to be found among speakers of other languages.” Describing in detail the theories by C. Meinhof and C.G. Seligman, Tucker asks: “As for the term ‘Hamitic’ – it has long satisfied the needs (sic) of historians, anthropologists, archaeologists, journalists and popular travel-book writers. Can anyone think of a suitable alternative?” (sic). A good overview of the Hamitic question was offered by H.G. Mukarovsky (1981: 511-514). On the multivalence of this term (pace Sanders 1969: 531 quoted a few lines above), W.A. Ward (1985: 242, §IV) also writes: see appendix. “... the term ‘Hamitic’ means different things to different writers (Rössler, 1952:123). To an older generation, ‘Hamitic’ meant the North African languages, ‘Semitic’ those of Western Asia, South Arabia and Ethiopia. The relation between them was thought to be that of a Hamitic substratum in North Africa strongly influenced by a Semitic superstratum which was said to account for the obvious connection between them. This somewhat simple scheme has now been replaced by others.” Finally, M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998: 112) wrote of the “infamous ‘Hamitic hypothesis’ with its well-respected champions Carl Meinhof and C.G. Seligman”.

⁹ Organized on criteria that are not clear to me that I am not always able to comprehend. Thus, he distinguished among the following groups of scholars or trends of research, apparently sometimes according to their degree of involvement in SH comparison, sometimes along criteria I cannot precise. The categories set up by Cohen (1947: 23-26) may be outlined as follows: (1) “En général, les sémitisants comparatistes ont admis la parenté chamito-sémitique. Une partie d’entre eux ont accordé une certaine place dans leurs ouvrages aux données comparatives de l’ensemble du domaine (Th. Nöldeke, H. Zimmern, J. Barth);” (2) “d’autres n’ont fait que mentionner cette parenté ... (Lindberg, Pedersen, Bergsträsser);” (3) C. Brockelmann who took a “position théorique qui permet des rapprochements, mais écarte l’idée de la filiation.” (4) “Certains savants ont essayé des tableaux comparatifs ... faisant une espèce de propagande: de Lacy O’Leary, Lexa, Worrell, Barton.” (5) “D’abord Leo Reinisch, avec des recherches étymologiques au départ du couchitique, puis ses ouvrages plus généraux.” (6) “Ensuite la pléiade des constructeurs de la comparaison de vocabulaire égypto-sémitique (qui ont utilisé à l’occasion aussi des données berbères et couchitiques): Albright, Ember, Calice, etc. (voir II, A).” (7) “Enfin des comparatistes ont entrepris une prospection active des différentes parties de la question (sic): E. Zyhlarz, Marcel Cohen” – perhaps most puzzling category. (8) “En général les linguistes, notamment les auteurs de tableaux des langues du monde, ont considéré comme acquis un groupement chamito-sémitique (d’ailleurs pas toujours défini avec les mêmes limites).” (9) A separate entry is devoted to “les réserves de A. Meillet ...: il lui semblait que la parenté chamito-sémitique était beaucoup moins bien définie que la parenté indo-européenne, et au reste, il émettait l’idée que la notion de parenté linguistique avait des chances de ne pas être uniforme suivant les familles ...: «Les concordances entre les langues de ces deux

and then R.M. Voigt (2001: 1318-1322, §§3-5) also, released a longer and a by far more comprehensive survey of the history of Hamitic studies.

1.1. The beginnings of the lexical comparison of Semitic with the African members of what was later considered as the Semito-Hamitic/Afro-Asiatic family by the mid-20th cent., are going back as long as to medieval North African Jewish scholarship of the 10th cent. The earliest,¹⁰ namely the occasional Semito-Berber comparisons by **Yehuda Ibn-Quraish**,¹¹ as well as to the late 18th cent. in the European scholarship, when the *Mithridates* by **Johann Christoph Adelung** and **Johann Severin Vater** summarized some similarities of the Hebrew words with certain Berber, Cushitic, Chadic ones.¹² The works from the 19th century (family trees, sporadic isomorphs and isoglosses) are mostly un-systematic and therefore out of consideration here.¹³

1.2. The era of “pre-classical Hamitology” may have started around the mid-19th cent. as suggested by H.-J. Sasse (1981: 132).¹⁴ For J.H. Greenberg (1962: 81-82), the *entrée* was F.W. Newman’s (1844) work first suggesting to compare Hausa too with

groupes [sémitique et chamitique] sont du même ordre que celles qui ont été signalées entre les langues indo-européennes.»”

¹⁰ Unless we consider the hypothetic and pretty romantic, albeit by far not impossible, scenario presented by R.M. Voigt (1988: 156) for the earliest possible occasion of a linguistic comparison of the Northern Afro-Asiatic branches 3 millennia before “ist gut denkbar, daß bereits Šošenq (I.), der 945 v. Chr. den Pharaonen-thron bestieg, Ähnlichkeiten zwischen seinem Idiom, dem Berberischen und dem Ägyptischen aufgefallen sind; vielleicht bemerkte er sogar Gemeinsamkeiten mit dem Hebräischen, als er 925 v. Chr. vor Jerusalem erschien – wie die Bibel ... berichtet – und das Volk war nicht zu wählen, das mit ihm aus Ägypten kam, Libyer, Sukkijter und Kuschiter – eine ideale Vorbedingung für sprachvergleichende Beobachtungen. Leider ist aber nichts dergleichen auf uns gekommen!”

¹¹ Published by D. Cohen (1971-2: 121): “Dans l’épître, comparatiste avant la lettre, qu’il adressait aux Juifs de Fès, Yehūda ibn Qurayš de Tahert (fin du IX^e-début du X^e siècle), leur recommandait, pour la bonne compréhension des Textes Sacrés, non seulement l’étude de l’araméen et de l’arabe, mais ... le recours aussi aux langues romanes et au berbère. Cette dernière langue devait être familière à l’écrivain originaire d’une région alors berbérophone.”. Thence, Cohen (1971-2: 126) concluded: “... le passage d’Ibn Qurayš consacré au berbère ne vaut pas essentiellement par la technique comparative. Pour l’auteur ... il s’agissait, dans les rencontres lexicales, de phénomènes de diffusion d’une langue à l’autre, encore qu’il n’explique pas comment une telle diffusion a pu se produire entre berbère et hébreu.” Strangely, J.H. Greenberg (1962: 79) failed to mention the Berber segment in this early comparative work: “as early as the tenth century the Jewish grammarian Judah ibn Kuraish (sic) had already noted empirically the extensive resemblances of Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic”.

¹² As shown by M. Cohen (1947: 5) and R.M. Voigt (2001: 1318, §2) in his section “Erste vergleichende Beobachtungen”.

¹³ For details see Cohen 1947: 3-14; Voigt 1988: 155ff., §I (“Erste sprachvergleichende Überlegungen”); Voigt 2001: 1318-1321, §3 (“Beginn der semitohamitischen Sprachwissenschaft”). Voigt also dealt with the subsequent works from the 19th century in detail, which we skip to reproduce here.

¹⁴ Sasse (1981a: 132): “Spekulationen über die Existenz einer Sprachfamilie, von der das Semitische nur einen Teil bildet verdichten sich um die Mitte des vorihen Jahrhunderts mit Lepsius (1844, vgl. ... 1863: 90), Beke (1845), d’Abbadie (1845) und Lottner (1860-61). Ungefähr gleichzeitig taucht die zu ‘Semitisch’ parallel ... gebildete Bezeichnung ‘Hamitisch’ bei Lepsius, Renan, Beke und d’Abbadie auf.”

Berber and Semitic etc., while J. Knapper's (1975-6) comprehensive account¹⁵ on this beginning phase of "Hamitology" starts from 1851 (until 1911). "The term 'Hamitic' was first proposed by the celebrated Ernest Renan in 1859 (sic, for 1855) as a general designation for the various African languages which showed significant resemblances to Semitic." This is also the era when the dichotomy of Semitic vs. all the rest of cognates in Africa was first doubted in 1845.¹⁶ Accordingly, the vision of equipotential branches in the SH family was first attested in the research by C.T. Beke (1845), followed by C. Lottner (1860-1).¹⁷ All this had been stated already a whole century prior to Cohen 1947 and Greenberg 1955! Unfortunately, this fact does not change a bit about the poor quality of lexical comparison from the whole era (if such was offered at all). The first half of this century-long period, until the end of the 19th century, is, however, beyond the range of this overview as the first considerable results of a lexical comparison were beginning to accumulate in its second half only. The only difference between the research in this first half vs. the second half (below) from our point of view is what is sometimes labelled as the "orthodox" conception of "Hamitology" or as simply summed up by H. Satzinger (1999: 367-368).¹⁸

A thorough retrospective historical analysis of the "Hamitistic" comparative researches throughout the aforementioned long century has been completed by G. Burrini (1978-9), H.-J. Sasse (1981a: 132-136) and then by R.M. Voigt (1998: 155-162, §§I-IV and 2001: 1318-1322, §§1-5).

1.3. "Classical Hamitology". I agree with R.M. Voigt (1988: 160, §III; 2001: 1321, §4) to a certain degree in that "Die klassische Periode" of the SH comparatist research started in the late 19th cent. with the fundamental comparative syntheses by F. Müller, L. Reinisch,

¹⁵ Burrini (1975-6: 114): "Utile come schizzo, il saggiaio offre tuttavia delle considerazioni molto generali, internamente slegate e non inquadrare in un organico profilo storico; nè mancano serie lacune, come la trattazione del periodo iniziale degli studi e dell'opera del Benfey."

¹⁶ Sasse (1981a: 132): "Im Jahre 1845 hielt Charles Beke vor der Philological Society in London einen Vortrag über die 'Sprachen ... Abessiniens und der südlich angrenzenden Länder' ... (Beke 1845: 94, zitiert nach Fleming 1976): 'M. d'Abbadie classes the Agau and Gonga languages together in one family, which he names the 'Chamitic'; to this classification and denomination I cannot object ... But ... I do not agree ... in the narrow sense in which he uses the term 'Chamitic' as opposed to 'Semitic'."

¹⁷ In Sasse's (1981a: 135, §2) view, it was the latter author "der ... Semitisch, Ägyptisch, Berberisch und Kuschitisch als gleichberechtigte, nebeneinanderstehende Unterfamilien einer großen Sprachfamilie ansah und an diesem Modell ein Konzept der genetischen Sprachverwandtschaft entwickelte, mit dem noch heute gearbeitet wird ...". As J.H. Greenberg (1962: 83) saw this matter a century later: "... the relationship between Semitic and Hamitic came up for fundamental reconsideration. In a remarkably prescient article in 1860, C. Lottner had not only decisively rejected the Indo-European relationship in favor of a connection between Semitic and Hamitic languages but had also denied any unity to Hamitic as such. [footnote omitted] Indeed, viewed objectively, Berber, for example, was as distant from Egyptian or Cushitic as it was from Semitic. In other words, Semitic was but one branch of a larger family in which the various 'Hamitic' languages ... constituted each a further separate branch."

¹⁸ Satzinger (1999: 367-368): "Zunächst umfasste das Hamitische Ägyptisch, Berberisch und die kuschitischen Sprachen sowie auch schon sehr früh das Hausa, die bestbekannte Sprache der Familie, die heute tschadisch heißt."

C. Meinhof.¹⁹ Unfortunately, however, a considerable part of the scientific fundament of this so-called “classical phase” of mainstream “Hamitology” was based on what has proven to be ill-founded and can by no means be maintained today.²⁰ Their ill-founded methodology, i.e., how the pre-classical or “orthodox” frames of “Hamitology” were extended in a confusing manner,²¹ was neatly described by H. Satzinger (1999: 367-368).²² Racial assessment was deeply involved in these classifications.²³ This is first of all why Hausa had long not been included in Hamitic, which was discussed by H. Satzinger (1999: 368-369) pace Jungraithmayr-Möhlig 1983: 105-106).²⁴ M. Cohen (1947: 24), who was also reluctant even as for accepting Chadic including Hausa, by the way, voiced only his reservations.²⁵

1.3.1. F. Müller is that scholar, as R.M. Voigt (2001: 1321, §4) states, whom we owe the first SH comparative grammar.²⁶ That this work doubtlessly opened a new era in

¹⁹ As Voigt (1988: 160, §III; 2001: 1321, §4) argues: “Den dritten Abschnitt möchte ich die klassische Periode nennen, weil in ihr grundlegende Werke geschaffen wurden, auf denen auch heute noch jede vergleichende semitohamitische Arbeit aufbaut.”

²⁰ Thus, their failure is perhaps best hallmarked by the statement of E. Zyhlarz (1936: 450), a prominent figure of post-classical (pos-Meinhofian) “Hamitology” (to use Voigt’s terminology): “Angesichts dieser Dinge wird es bereits klar geworden sein, dass gewisse ... naive Versuche, das Hamitische nach ein Paar lautlichen oder formativen Gesichtspunkten bald in das Bild von Negersprachen (sic), bald in das von Klassensprachen oder gar bis in den Rahmen des Indogermanischen einzubeziehen, überhaupt in gar keiner Weise mehr ernst zu nehmen sind.”

²¹ Which left its print even on the understanding of these issues by such an outstanding Oriental philologist and linguist as I. Gelb (1951: 61): “certain language families are well established and at the present time generally accepted. One of them is the Semitic-Egyptian group (sic), or rather a group including Semitic and all those languages which according to one scholar or another belong to Hamitic (Egyptian including Coptic, Berber or Libyan, Cushitic or (sic) Nilotic, and Hausa)”.

²² Satzinger (1999: 367-368): it was the inclusion of Hausa that started to pose the “Schwierigkeiten ..., dass nicht nur hamitisch die Sprachgruppe bezeichnete, sondern Hamiten auch ihre Sprecher meinte, und zwar sowohl im Sinn der physischen Anthropologie (Stichwort Rasse) ...” For mishandling further African phyla this way in this era, Satzinger (1999: 367-368) says: “Andererseits aber wurden bald auch Sprachen einbegriffen, die von andersartigem Typus sind. Nach heutigem Verständnis sind es Vertreter aller drei übrigen Makrophyla auf afrikanischem Boden: • Ful, die Sprache der Ful’be, ... eine westatlantische Klassensprache, somit ein Vertreter ... der Niger-Kongo-Familie bzw. des niger-kordofanischen Makrophylums ... • Nubisch und die nilotischen Sprachen ... Greenberg reiht sie in die ostsudanischen Sprachen, ... eine Unterfamilie der nilosaharanischen Untergruppe Chari-Nil ... • Mit dem Hottentottischen ..., heute Khoi(khoi) ... sind auch die Khoisan-Sprachen vertreten.”

²³ Thus, as described, e.g., by Satzinger (1999: 368): “Zu den Kriterien, die zum Einschluss dieser Sprachen führten, gehörte nicht nur das linguistische Moment ... Es spielte auch eine wesentliche Rolle, dass ihre Sprecher • zum Teil von heller Hautfarbe, allesamt aber typischerweise von nicht-negroider physischer Erscheinung sind; und dass sie • allesamt Rinder züchtende Nomaden sind, Vertreter einer angenommenen ‘hamitischen’ Großvieh züchterischen Kulturschicht.” Satzinger (1999: 369) touched upon the former distinction of the so-called “‘Subsemiten’ bzw. das Ergebnis einer Vermischung von ‘Semiten’ mit ‘Negervölkern’.” Diese Haltung ... ist typisch für das späte 19. und die ersten Jahrzehnte des 20. Jahrhunderts.”

²⁴ Satzinger (1999: 367-368): “Seine Sprecher sind typischerweise dunkel und von ‘negroider’ Erscheinung, und sie sind kein Rinder züchtendes nomadisierendes ‘Herrenvolk’, keine ‘Hirtenkrieger’”.

²⁵ Cohen (1947: 24): see appendix. Cohen (1947: 24): “pour les rapports avec les langues d’Afrique la question est plus complexe et plus irritante: il s’agit en effet de savoir si certaines de ces langues ou même le plus grand nombre d’entre elles ne devraient pas être comptées elles-mêmes comme faisant partie du chamito-sémitique, dont la définition devrait être révisée en conséquence.”

²⁶ Voigt (2001: 1321, §4): it is F. Müller whom “verdanken wir die erste vergleichende Grammatik der semitohamitischen Sprachen ... in seinem monumentalen sechsbändigen Grundriß der Sprachwissenschaft

Semitic-Hamitic comparative studies in general, was duly admitted by W. Vycichl (in his 1985 presentation at the Italian *Giornata ...*)²⁷ as well as by H. Satzinger (1999: 367 and fn. 2 pace Jungraithmayr & Möhlig 1983: 103) also.²⁸ Still, for our special interest in evaluating the history of research on AA comparative phonology and lexicon, Müller cannot take granted such a prominent position.

1.3.2. L. Reinisch, the monumental founding father of the Viennese *Doppelinstitut* of African studies and Egyptology (cf. §11.1 of Episode XI) was, in my view, beyond doubt, the epochal giant creating in the K.u.K. imperial capital the infrastructural frames of the first long enduring international cradle hosting “Semitic-Hamitic” comparison (like J.H. Greenberg and I.M. D’jakonov of “Afro-Asiatic” some half of a century after him). His field research on the Cushitic lexicon, on dictionaries abounding in SH etymologies represent a milestone of the era.²⁹ His gigantic *Lebenswerk* was deservedly celebrated and re-evaluated in 1987 in a whole volume published in Vienna (ed. by H.G. Mukarovsky). It is thanks to his extraordinary field research output and his Oriental philological background that this happy constellation of research directions had been concreted for a whole century to come in his Viennese *Doppelinstitut*, which then emitted generations of outstanding comparative researchers of our language family like F. von Calice, E. Zyhlarz, W. Czermak, W. Vycichl, W. Leslau, J. Lukas, O. Rössler, H. Jungraithmayr. The greatest merit of Leo Reinisch, from our point of view here, is the synchronic and comparative description of numerous Cushitic languages. Still, unfortunately, his omnicomparatistic³⁰ mass-comparative “methods” did not stand on firmly established rules of *Lautentsprechungen* between Cushitic, Semitic, Egyptian. So, his comparisons ended up with not being more decisive than those of his predecessors and contemporaries. With his authority, a chaotic way of affiliating the most diverse African groups became legitimate.³¹ In one of his first volumes, *Das einheitliche Ursprung*, Reinisch (1873) already gave a sample of his vision about the kinship of the diverse linguistic families when tried to combined SH + Indo-European (IE) on

(Wien 1876-1888). In der 2. Abt. ... des 3. Bandes (Die Sprachen der lockenhaarigen Rassen (sic)) werden auf 200 Seiten fast alle Gebiete der Grammatik miteinander verglichen (eine Kurzfassung liegt in Müller 1867 vor). ... Ein vergleichbares Werk ist erst 1965 mit Diakonoffs Semitic-Hamitic languages erschienen.”

²⁷ Vycichl (1987: 211): “Fra poco, nel 1987, celebreremo il centenario degli studi camito-semitici. Difatti, nel 1887, Federico Müller pubblicò nel suo ‘Grundriß der Sprachwissenschaft’ [footnote omitted] per la prima volta un capitolo sulle lingue ‘camito-semitiche’ (di più di 100 pagine) distinte chiaramente.”

²⁸ Satzinger (1999: 367 and fn. 2): his work on the “‘hamitic-semitischer Sprachstamm’ wurde innerhalb der Orientalistik zur Grundlage der Anerkennung der ‘hamitosemitischen Sprachwissenschaft’”.

²⁹ Voigt (2001: 1321, §4) on the output of Reinisch, “der Grammatiken und Wörterbücher von zehn kuschitischen Sprachen ... vorgelegt hat, behandelt in seinem Werk über Das persönliche Fürwort und die Verbalflexion in den hamito-semitischen Sprachen (1909) vor allem den Bau des Verbums in allen fünf Zweigen mit einem Material- und Ideenreichtum, der in der Geschichte dieser Wissenschaft einmalig ist. Er legte auch die erste etymologische Studie (über das Zahlwort vier und neun) vor (1890)”.

³⁰ He tried to include Egyptian in his “historische Hamitologie”, where, as E. Zyhlarz (1932-3: 27) also remarked: “nach der hamitischen Seite ... die Aussicht durch Reinisch’ liberale Allerweltsvergleich gründlich verbaut worden [wäre]”.

³¹ As stated by A.S. Kaye and P.T. Daniels (1992: 430-431), beside C. Meinhof (below), “D(iakonoff). (1988:14) also credits L. Reinisch for giving credibility to the term Ham(itic), a fact corroborated by Barton’s references to 7 of Reinisch’s books.”

the basis of Teda, on which R.M. Voigt (1999: 316) rightly notes: “Although his methodology does not correspond to the later achievements of this great scholar, [footnote omitted] this work marks an important step in the history of the discipline.” The latter thought is perhaps all too forgiving in the light of the former one, esp. in the age of the neo-grammarians. In his later comparative works, L. Reinisch ventured to extend the kindred of Hamitic onto a whole range of African languages like, e.g. Nubian languages, Nilotic,³² and even Bantu,³³ which would imply a kind of ill-founded ultimate African macrofamily,³⁴ and he has thus initiated a highly disputable way and frames of comparison in African linguistics.³⁵ It is perhaps easier to share the reservations voiced by W. Vycichl (1935: 76).³⁶

³² Reinisch (1911: 170) on the affinities of Cushitic with Nuba, Barea, Kunama: “... dass der Wortschatz des Nuba ... weit zahlreiche Übereinstimmungen mit den hamito-semitischen, als mit den nilotischen Sprachen aufweist, ist eine leicht begreifliche, weil ja das nubische Volk seit Jahrtausenden in unmittelbaren Beziehungen mit seinen nördlichen und östlichen Nachbarn gestanden hat: verwunderlich ist vielmehr die Tatsache, dass im nubischen Wortschatz verhältnismässig doch noch so viele Zusammenhänge mit demjenigen der südlichen Völker, der Dinka, Schilluk, Nuer, Bari usw. bestehen, ungeachtet von diesen die Nubier in Folge geschichtlicher Vorgänge seit so langen Zeiten örtlich abgeschnitten sind. Gerade diese Tatsache weist aber darauf hin, dass die Nubier aus dem Süden in ihre heutigen Wohnsitze eingezogen und ursprünglich mit den Neger-völkern der Dinka, Schilluk usw. gleicher Herkunft sind.” As commented by C. Meinhof (1921-2a: 242) on these ideas of Reinisch: “Er glaubte auch, dass ich ihm Unrecht getan hätte, er hätte das Nubische zu den Hamitensprachen gerechnet. Aber ich kann sein Buch ‘Die sprachliche Stellung des Nuba’ nicht anders verstehen.” H.G. Mukarovsky (1981: 515): “Zunächst erblickte Reinisch in den drei von ihm selbst erforschten nordostafrikanischen Sprachen Barea, Kunama und Nuba ‘protohamitische’ Sprachen. ... Die sogenannten Neger-sprachen seien zwar von anderem Bau, doch erkannte Reinisch: ‘Trotz ... von den hamito-semitischen Sprachen stark abweichenden Hauptzügen weisen jedoch sichere Tatsachen darauf hin, dass die sogenannten Neger-sprachen mit jenen gleichen Ursprunges sind, weil sie mit dem Hamito-Semitischen gemeinsame Elemente besitzen, welche deshalb nicht entlehnt sein können, da sie einen wesentlichen Bestandteil ihres Sprachbaues bilden ...’” H.G. Mukarovsky (1981: 516-517) labelled it as “durchaus realistisch” how “Reinisch selbst hat bereits bei der Verzweigung der hamitischen Sprachen die Bedeutung der Zeittiefe unterstrichen. So bereitet aber sein Versuch, Brücken zwischen den ostsudanischen Sprachen Nuba und Barea, ... Kunama und den kuschitischen Sprachen zu schlagen, Schwierigkeiten ... Reinisch hat so hinsichtlich der genetischen Zugehörigkeit des Nubischen tatsächlich eine durchaus moderne Auffassung vertreten.”

³³ H.G. Mukarovsky (1981: 515-516) on the “Urverwandtschaft des Hamito-Semitischen mit” Bantu suggested by L. Reinisch (1909: 319): “Dasselbe gilt ihm aber auch für die Bantusprachen, die nur ‘dem ersten Anschein nach völlig verschieden’ ... wären, während genauere Untersuchung zeige, ‘dass zwischen den Bantu und den Nordsprachen ein diametraler Gegensatz nicht besteht’ ” and on Reinisch 1909: 321: “Reinisch schließt daraus, ‘dass die hamito-semitischen, die Sudan- und die Bantusprachen auf eine gemeinsame Ursprache zurückführen und deshalb auch die Völker, welche diese Sprachen sprechen, aus ein und derselben Urheimat herstammen’ ...” Not all of these ideas gained acceptance, cf. the words by L. Homburger (1929: 150): “La théorie de Reinisch, qui formula en 1908 l’hypothèse d’une langue commune chamito-sémitique-bantoue, n’a rencontré que peu d’adhérents ...”

³⁴ Which echoed the *Zeitgeist*, cf. R. Hartmann (1879) who “held that Africans were an ethnic whole. He thought of the African continent as a ‘grand uniform physical creation’, which ‘hid in itself a great unitary stock’ of people”, but “as von Luschán remarks, ‘such a standpoint appears today really wonderful and scarcely to be conceived’ ” (Barton 1934: 9).

³⁵ What Mukarovsky (1981: 515) writes on Reinisch (1909: 315) in this respect: “Die Frage einer Urverwandtschaft des Hamito-Semitischen mit sonstigen afrikanischen Sprachen scheint vor Reinisch nicht gestellt worden zu sein. Das ist verständlich, da ja ‘Hamitisch’ eben die mit nichtafrikanischen, orientalischen Sprachen verwandten Idiome bezeichnen sollte.”

³⁶ Vycichl (1935: 76): “Demgegenüber ist Leo **Reinisch**, dessen hohe Verdienste in einer anderen Richtung liegen, nie zu einer Erkenntnis des inneren Gegensatzes zwischen dem Hamitischen, dem Nuba und den Nilotensprachen gekommen.”

1.3.3. C. Meinhof's genius was considered by H.-J. Sasse (1981a: 134) as most far-reaching within the whole history of "Hamitic" studies.³⁷ His epochal opus, *Die Sprachen der Hamiten* (Meinhof 1912), in which he tried to establish the so-called "Hamitic" features and traits,³⁸ contained in its attachment the famous and, for our present study most important, "Beigabe I. Vergleichendes Wörterverzeichnis" (Meinhof 1912: 230-240) with a precious comparative wordlist that was based on the comparison of Egyptian, Berber, Beja, Agaw, Oromo, Somali, Hausa. In spite of its imperfections admitted by Meinhof himself also,³⁹ this comparative list makes his work the first serious attempt of its kind to compare SH lexicon which carries the potential of becoming for the first time that extendable core material that might underlie a desired formulation of the *Lautgesetze* for later.⁴⁰ Nonetheless, the ill-founded inclusion of non-AA languages, such as Ful, Masai, Nama,⁴¹ was soon rightly criticized by both E. Zyhlarz⁴² and W. Vycichl⁴³ from the Viennese *Doppelinstitut* and then by others too.⁴⁴ Strangely, follow-

³⁷ Sasse (1981a: 134): "Der einflußreichste Vertreter der hamitischen Hypothese ... zweifellos".

³⁸ As stated by H.-J. Sasse (1981a: 134) on Meinhof (1912) where he "einen ersten umfassenden Versuch unternahm, die Gemeinsamkeiten der 'hamitischen' Sprachen herauszuarbeiten".

³⁹ Meinhof (1912: 230-231): "Natürlich bin ich mir über die Mangel dieser Liste ganz klar. Es wäre leicht im Anschluß an Reinisch viele Wörter zusammenzustellen, die den kuschitischen Sprachen gemeinsam sind. Das wird für ein vollständiges Stammwörterverzeichnis der Hamitensprachen wichtig sein, hier wäre es zwecklos. ... Auf Anklänge an das Urbantu und an sudanische Formen, die als Lehnworte zu den Hamiten kamen oder von ihnen ausgingen, habe ich mehrfach aufmerksam gemacht. Ich will damit nicht sagen, daß ich diese Worte für verwandt halte, sondern nur, daß es sich lohnt zu untersuchen, ob nicht eine Beziehung vorliegt."

⁴⁰ Meinhof (1912: 230-231): "... Außerdem muß aber an der Hand dieser Liste der Versuch gemacht werden, hypothetische Grundformen des Urhamitischen Wortschatzes aufzustellen. Das ist erst möglich, wenn uns die Lautverschiebung und andere Lautgesetze besser bekannt sind als heute. ..."

⁴¹ Nama grammar was identified as "Hamitic" (but with Bushman phonetics and vocabulary) by Meinhof (1930) much later.

⁴² Zyhlarz (1933: 81): "Die Sprachen der Hamiten' bedeuten für Meinhof linguistisch nicht dasselbe wie 'hamitische Sprachen' in unserem Sinn, sondern seine Bezeichnung umfasst vom ethnologisch-anthropologischen Gesichtspunkt aus eine Gruppe von vielfach stark diskrepanten Idiomen, welche aber deutlich eine historische Beeinflussung durch 'hamitische Sprachen' noch erkennen lassen, wenngleich manches darunter ganz anderen Sprachstämmen angehört, wie Ful und Masai." Zyhlarz (1936: 434-435): "Erst Meinhof gelang es ... gewisse sprachtypische Gemeinschaftszüge im Bereich des als 'Hamitensprachen' geltenden Gewimmels von innerlich vielfach diskrepanten Idiomen Nord- und Ostafrikas herauszuarbeiten. ... Damit war einerseits eine geistige Verbindungslinie im Sinne gewisser Allgemeinmerkmale sprachlicher Art (Artikulationscharakter, grammatisches Geschlecht, Polarität, gemeinsame Formantien sowie Anzeichen von bestehender Wurzelgemeinschaft) hergestellt, andererseits aber wies Meinhof unter Beihilfe Luschan auf scheinliche Parallelen anthropologischer Typusmerkmale ... Versuche aber, die Beihilfe ägyptologischer oder semitistischer Spezialisten dazu zu erhalten, erfuhren entweder keine Beachtung oder höchstens negativ beratende Zurückweisung."

⁴³ So it was evaluated by Vycichl (1935: 76): "Die Basis der modernen Hamitenforschung bildet Carl Meinhofs Werk über **Die Sprachen der Hamiten**, das erstmalig eine Scheidung der Sprachenwelt des nigritischen Afrikas von den Sprachen der hellen, lockenhaarigen Afrikaner bietet; diesem Prinzip zuliebe wurde allerdings auch das Ful (von Meinhof selbst dem Urbantu nahestehend gedacht) und wegen des grammatischen Geschlechtes auch das Masai in den Kreis der Betrachtung miteinbezogen, wodurch der Rahmen als zu weit gefasst erscheint."

⁴⁴ Admitting the leading role of Meinhof in Bantu linguistics and in elaborating the "Hamitic" theory, D.A. Ol'derogge (1949: 157) rightly queried the method of Meinhof of affiliating languages purely for having grammatical genders (following in this, by the way, R. Lepsius). Ol'derogge (1949: 159-162) rightly pointed

ing W. von Soden (1965: 163)⁴⁵ in this regard, R.M. Voigt (1999: 316) partly defended this commonly refuted position.⁴⁶ For example, as R.M. Voigt (2001: 1322, §4) rightly says, “das Konzept des Semitoamitischen wird ... verwischt”, yet defending Meinhof at the same time.⁴⁷ Still, other authors were of a different opinion, e.g., both outstanding Viennese figures of post-classical “Hamitology” (E. Zyhlarz, W. Vycichl). From the standpoint of our special survey, the only substantial advantage of Meinhof’s (1912) attempt that its wordlist reckoned with the chaotic and amorphous omnicomparison by L. Reinisch and for the first time formulated partly linguistic criteria (even if, at a time, also ill-founded racial ones) of including an African language in the “Hamitic” phylum, as it was pointed out already by E. Zyhlarz two decades later.⁴⁸ Finally, a whole range of scholars, particularly AA linguists like D.A. Ol’derogge (1949, *passim*),⁴⁹ J.H. Greenberg

out a number of flaws in Meinhof’s classing of Ful as “Hamitic”. Ol’derogge (1949: 169) blamed at the same time Meinhof’s wider understanding of “Hamitic” for having been ill-founded – beside Berber, Beja, Somali, and Hausa – also on languages (Ful, Masai, Nama) misconceived as isolated relicts and picked out from the natural contexts of their closer kinship cotexts. *Pace* D. Westermann, E. Zyhlarz, W. Vycichl *et alii*, J.H. Greenberg (1955: 3) too, excluded Ful, Masai, Hottentot from Hamitic: “The basic criticism of Meinhof’s method is simply that it does not lead to genetic classifications. It is primarily typological with evolutionary overtones.” J.H. Greenberg (1962: 83) firmly maintained that “Semitic is probably related to the Hamitic languages of Africa and is thus part of the Semito-Hamitic family. The membership in Hamitic (*sic*) is not clearly defined, but Egyptian, Berber and Cushitic must certainly be included. The various further extensions of the family by Meinhof are to be rejected or are at best highly speculative. Of these additional languages, the strongest case can be made for Hausa, but its inclusion in Hamitic (*sic*) cannot be regarded as proved (*sic*).” Or, as it was formulated by A.S. Kaye and P.T. Daniels (1992: 430) as well: “It is Meinhof (1912) ..., more than any other work, which can take the credit for the more or less successful perpetration of the ‘Ham.(itic) myth’ for so long. Meinhof added unrelated l(an)g(uage)s.”

⁴⁵ Speaking of the poor production of “Hamitistik” that “über einige bescheidene Ansätze ... nicht weit hinausgekommen ist” (opposed to the so fruitful field of Semitic), W. von Soden (1965: 163), in turn, released a praise about “C. Meinhof’s grundlegendem Buch *Die Sprachen der Hamiten* (1912)”.

⁴⁶ Voigt (1999: 316): “Carl Meinhof (1912) ... has classed Ful, Masai and Nama among the Hamitic languages of Africa. Although this concept has been given up subsequently on the account of more detailed linguistic research, his linguistic arguments are sometimes not fully disproved by hinting at the real cognate relationship of the languages under question.”

⁴⁷ Voigt (2001: 1322, §4): “Wenn er das Nama als sh. Sprache bezeichnet, zeigt dies, daß bei ihm rassische Kriterien nicht die entscheidende Rolle spielen.”

⁴⁸ As the point of the matter was summarized by Zyhlarz (1936: 434-435): “Erst Meinhof gelang es, aus der Masse der Blickhemmenden heraus gewisse sprachtypische Gemeinschaftszüge im Bereich des als im ‘Hamitensprachen’ geltenden Gewimmels von innerlich vielfach diskrepanten Idiomen Nord- und Ostafrikas herauszuarbeiten. Auch er betonte dabei die Zugehörigkeit des Altägyptischen in den Rahmen des Begriffes ‘hamitisch’. Damit war einerseits eine geistige Verbindungslinie im Sinne gewisser Allgemeinmerkmale sprachlicher Art (Artikulationscharakter, grammatisches Geschlecht, Polarität, gemeinsame Formantien sowie Anzeichen von bestehender Wurzelgemeinschaft) hergestellt, andererseits aber wies Meinhof unter Beihilfe Luschans auf sichtliche Parallelen anthropologischer Typusmerkmale der betreffenden Spracheigner hin. So war der Begriff ‘hamitisch’ neuerlich als feststehendes Sprachproblem stellig gemacht. Versuche aber, die Beihilfe ägyptologischer oder semitistischer Spezialisten dazu zu erhalten, erfuhren entweder keine Beachtung oder höchstens negativ beratende Zurückweisung.”

⁴⁹ Based upon a thorough review of Meinhof 1912 and the “Hamitic” theory of its followers (linguists, anthropologists and ethnographers) in Germanophone African studies (greatly inspired by the chapter by Seligman 1912 and his 1930 volume with subsequent editions in 1957 and 1966), already D.A. Ol’derogge (1949: 157-170), an authority of Soviet Africanistics (an élève of the Leningrad SH school from the 1930s

(1962: 82),⁵⁰ H.-J. Sasse (1981a: 134),⁵¹ and M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998: 112),⁵² warned of the heavy racial impact explicit in Meinhof's (1912) SH conception, ominously far-reaching for the further evolution of the "Hamitic" hypothesis, whose wider context in the history of European science was masterfully analysed by E.R. Sanders (1969).⁵³

along with I.M. Diakonoff), rejected the artificial racial grouping of the alleged "Hamitic" peoples in general, followed by generations (not just of German science) of those days: "В результате можно сказать, что антропологическое понятие а хамитах у немецких антропологов-расистов чисто негативное. Все, что не негрское, то хамитское, ..., антропологически хамитов не существует" (O'derogge 1949: 163).

⁵⁰ Greenberg (1962: 82): "One extreme point of view ... should be briefly mentioned, since by the reactions it evoked ..., it has colored discussion of the problem virtually up to the present. This is the thesis ... by Carl Meinhof, the leading Bantu specialist of his time. [footnote omitted] ... In this work, the term 'Hamitic' was extended to include, beside (Egyptian, Berber and Cushitic) ... usually classified as Hamitic, such other languages as that of the Fulani of West Africa ..., the language of the cattle-raising Masai of East Africa and ... of the Hottentots ..., likewise a cattle people, but linguistically and culturally similar in other respects to the non-pastoral Bushmen. Meinhof's work displayed a but thinly disguised racist tinge and became the basis on which much of the cultural history of Africa was reconstructed in the absence of historical documentation. To cite but one example, Charles S. Seligmann, a well-known anthropologist, in a work widely used as a textbook in courses of anthropology of Africa less than a generation ago, followed Meinhof in matters of language classification. The racist implications ... from his book are obvious: '... the incoming Hamites were pastoral Caucasoids ... better armed as well as quicker-witted than the dark agricultural Negroes.' [footnote omitted]" Greenberg (1962: 85) states with full right: "Conscious and subconscious ideological factors undeniably played a role in delaying the recognition of the African as a against the Indo-European connections of Semitic. A century of scientific anthropology which has taught us that the cultures of peoples without a literary tradition may exhibit values which deserve our respect, and the recent political emergence of African nations may have prepared the ground for the emotional acceptance of what now seems undeniable on scientific grounds."

⁵¹ Sasse (1981a: 134): "Charakteristisch für Meinhofs Ansatz ist die implizit vertretene Auffassung (ein Erbe der Sprachwissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts ...), daß es primitivere (einfach strukturierte) und höherentwickelte (komplexere) Sprachen gibt, und daß dieser Unterschied in direkter Weise mit den geistigen Fähigkeiten (!) der diese Sprachen sprechenden Völker korreliert werden kann. ... die Überzeugung, daß flektierende Sprachen den höchsten erreichbaren Sprachzustand (!) darstellten. Dies zeige sich unter anderem darin, daß die Träger der Hochkulturen der alten Welt sich ... überwiegend flektierenden Sprachen bedient hätten. Zu dieser ... Bewertung sprachtypologischer Erscheinungen gesellte sich ein ebenfalls den Zeitgeist reflektierender Rassismus: Nur die kaukasoide Rasse verfüge über die geistigen Fähigkeiten, die die Ausbildung von Hochkulturen voraussetze. ... Wenn in Afrika inmitten von 'primitiven (sic!) Negersprachen' flektierende Sprachstrukturen auftreten, so kann dies nur darauf zurückzuführen sein, daß kaukasoide Bevölkerungsteile sie dort hineingetragen haben. Diese ... waren eben die 'Hamiten', eine hellhäutige, lockenhaarige Rasse, hochgewachsene, schlanke (sic!), kriegerische Nomaden, deren reinste (sic!) Erscheinungsform man im altägyptischen und äthiopiden Typ erblickte."

⁵² Bechhaus-Gerst (1998: 112): the "infamous 'Hamitic hypothesis' with its well-respected champions Carl Meinhof and C.G. Seligman".

⁵³ Having thoroughly discussed the general scholarly background of "modern racism evolved from earlier nineteenth-century national romanticism ... echoed in all Western nations, culminating finally in the ideology of Nazi Germany", E.R. Sanders (1969: 529-530) has offered useful ideas about the aberrant way of regarding the AA history through the racial perspective of the traditional SH hypothesis: see appendix. Sanders (1969: 529-530): "The beginning of the twentieth century saw the Caucasoid-Hamite solidly established. Science supplanted theology as the alpha and omega of truth. Racial 'scientific' classifications, which had to face the physical diversity of the various 'Hamites', established a separate Hamitic branch of the Caucasian race, closely following the creation of a linguistic entity called a family of Hamitic languages. Linguistic typologies were based on racial types and racial classifications on linguistic definitions. The confusion surrounding the 'Hamite' was steadily compounded as the terms of reference became increasingly overlapping and vague. ... Linguistic classifications were based on geography, racial characteristics and occupation, rather than on rigor-

The study by C. Meinhof and M. Schmidt (1916-7: 251) identified Ethiopian elements in Bantu (Cohen 1947: 25). Although a decade later Meinhof slightly modified the limits of his “Hamitic” conception (cf. Meinhof 1921-2a: 242),⁵⁴ this could hardly change a bit about the enormous effects of his original thesis from 1912 on the later research. From our point of view in this special study, however, more essential are some lesser-quoted minor papers by Meinhof with a few pioneering observations in the most neglected field of SH comparative phonology. In his review on an “Egypto-Semitic” volume by E. Naville (1920),⁵⁵ Meinhof (1920-1a: 73) rightly declined the affiliation of Egyptian with Sudanic (researched by D. Westermann) and reaffirmed its closest kinship with “Hamitic”⁵⁶ stressing the common apophonic nature of Semitic, Egyptian, Cushitic (Somali)⁵⁷ and designated the tasks of a comparative SH phonology and root dictionary among the unfulfilled agenda of egyptologists (!) such as a comparative SH phonology, grammar and root dictionary.⁵⁸ In this brief review, he confirmed the common inherited

ous methodology pertaining solely to language. Grammatical gender became the main diagnostic of the so-called Hamitic languages. Although the grammatical gender exists in many unrelated languages of the world, it was not found in the languages of the ‘true’ Negro (racial category again). Thus linguistic typologies had racial bases just as racial typologies were based on linguistics.”

⁵⁴ Voigt (2001: 1322, §5): “Meinhof schon 1921/2 seine Hamitentheorie deutlich modifiziert hatte: ‘Hottentottensprachen’, ‘nilotische Hamiten-Sprachen’, das ‘proto-hamitische Ful’ und das Hausa möchte er jetzt etwas ‘beiseite’ stellen, da sie ‘den Semitensprachen bereits ferner’ stünden”. As Voigt sums up here, “Das Modell, das er nun aufstellt, ist komplexer und methodisch klarer als das von 1912. Die aspektuelle Hauptopposition zwischen den Vokalen i und a, wie sie in der sekundären Konjugation des Kuschitischen auftritt, gilt danach auch in den Sprachen, die über Präfixkonjugationen verfügen. Man beachte: je eingehender die Untersuchungen werden, umso mehr tritt der ‘hamitische’ Gedanke zurück ...”

⁵⁵ A work abounding in strangely misoriented assumptions on the matters of this comparative domain = “Old School” (see Episode II of this series of studies), which was neatly reflected by Meinhof’s (1920-1a: 73) words: “Der Verfasser behandelt in fünf Abschnitten sein Thema: Die ägyptische Schrift, die Grammatik, das Demotische und das Aramäische, das Koptische, das Hebräische. Man wird zu diesem Buch von sehr verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten Stellung nehmen können, aber ich fürchte, daß es von allen Seiten Ablehnung erfahren wird – wenigstens ich selbst befinde mich immer im Widerspruch mit dem Verfasser.” All this is so much revealing about the attitude towards SH matters in egyptological “linguistics”, which is in a way typical of the current state-of-the-art also, I am afraid.

⁵⁶ Meinhof (1920-1a: 73): “Wenn er das Ägyptische für eine afrikanische Sprache hält und glaubt, daß die von Westermann bearbeiteten Sudansprachen damit verwandt sein können, so bin ich ganz anderer Ansicht. Ich stelle es zu den Hamitensprachen, die ähnlich wie die Semitensprachen nach Afrika eingedrungen sein werden und von den Sudansprachen sich völlig unterscheiden. Eine Sprache, die wie das Ägyptische das grammatische Geschlecht hat, gehört eben zu den flektierenden und nicht zu den isolierenden Sprachen. ... Von einer Anlehnung an die Behandlung der Sudansprachen ist eine Förderung nicht zu erwarten.”

⁵⁷ Meinhof (1920-1a: 73): “Außerdem ist im Koptischen der Wechsel des Stammvokals nachweisbar, also auch für das Ägyptische wahrscheinlich. Dieser Wechsel des Stammvokals ist eine weite Eigentümlichkeit der flektierenden Sprachen und dem Sudanischen fremd. Deshalb hat Leo Reinisch die Wörterbücher der Kuschitensprachen nach den Konsonanten anlegen müssen ohne Berücksichtigung der Vokale – ganz wie im Semitischen. Ich bin freilich der Ansicht, daß die Ägyptologen die Beziehungen des Ägyptischen zu den Hamitensprachen in Zukunft mehr als bisher heranziehen sollten.”

⁵⁸ Meinhof (1920-1a: 73): “Es fehlt uns noch immer eine vergleichende Lautlehre, vergleichende Grammatik und ein Stammwörterverzeichnis der Hamitensprachen. Einstweilen blieb den Ägyptologen gar nichts anderes übrig, als sich an die Semitistik anzulehnen, genau so, wie wir es bei Bearbeitung der anderen Hamitensprachen getan haben und weiter tun werden, bis die Wissenschaft der Hamitensprachen auf eigenen Füßen stehen kann.”

nature of their ʔ, ʕ, h, ḥ (Meinhof 1920-1a: 74-75), which was, however, not demonstrated by lexical matches. The long study with Meinhof's (1920-1: 81-106) analysis of Semitic emphatic consonants in comparison with Berber, Beja, Lowland East Cushitic and Hausa was one of the first remarkable attempts at composing a comparative SH phonology,⁵⁹ with a few correct sound shifts (*Lautverschiebungen*) even if it missed to report etymological evidence. Finally, we owe the striking Hausa, Ful and Bantu parallels for the traces of Semitic nominal classes (determined by F.R. Blake 1920)⁶⁰ partly to Meinhof (1921-2b: 305-306), including the most famous class marker *-b in Semitic zoonyms,⁶¹ which has later been so frequently associated with the name of I.M. D'jakonov (who too, overtook it, in fact from his Leningrad master, N.V. Jušmanov in the 1930s).

1.3.4. A. Drexel (1924-5) too followed C. Meinhof in extending the limits of Hamitic onto a number of African languages most of which are now not considered as AA.⁶²

1.3.5. A. Trombetti: the well-known omnicomparativist of that age dealt with the elements of Semito-Hamitic phonology too. In his letter to H. Schuhardt on the relationship of SH to other language families of Africa and Eurasia, Trombetti (1902: 184-185) outlined some common SH morphological features.⁶³ Then, he discussed the cognacy of Eg. *zwr* "to drink" (Trombetti 1902: 193) and the numerals 1-10 (Trombetti 1902: 196-199). His chapter surveying shared isomorphs in "Il gruppo Camito-Semitico" in his

⁵⁹ Promising prospects of future research were at least formulated by Meinhof (1920-1b: 106) who raised the *dilemmata*: "1. Läßt sich erweisen, daß Wortstämme mit emphatischen Kehlverschlußlauten der Semitensprachen unverwandt sind mit Wortstämmen in hamitischen Sprachen, in denen die emphatische bzw. Kehlverschlußartikulation stattfindet? ... 6. Welche phonetischen und etymologischen Beziehungen bestehen zwischen ʕ sowie ʕ und den emphatischen Lauten? 7. Die Artikulation der emphatischen und Kehlverschlußlaute in semitischen und hamitischen Sprachen ist mit den Hilfsmitteln der experimentellen Phonetik systematisch zu untersuchen", behind which the author's working hypothesis about an emphatization conditioned by the vocalism was hiding: "4. Besteht ein Zusammenhang zwischen der Entstehung der emphatischen Laute bzw. der Kehlverschlußlaut in Hamitensprachen und den u-haltigen Lauten, wie z.B. im Bedauye vorkommen? 5. Läßt sich ein Zusammenhang zwischen den semitischen emphatischen bzw. Kehlverschlußlauten und den u-haltigen Lauten des Äthiopischen ... nachweisen?" How one might correctly reply these, has not been shown, however.

⁶⁰ Whose offprint Meinhof (1921-2: 305, §3: "Zur Entstehung der Klassen beim Nomen") quoted in a vague and unprecise way: "Soeben geht mir ein Separatum zu von F.R. Blake, ... anscheinend aus dem *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, S. 36-48" (no vol., year).

⁶¹ Meinhof (1921-2: 305-306): "Aber noch größer wird die Ähnlichkeit mit afrikanischen Klassensprachen, wenn Bl(ake) darauf hinweist, daß Tiernamen im Semitischen häufig auf -b endigen, wobei -b gelegentlich geradezu als Suffix erscheint" (referring to Akk. šēlibu, Ar. taʕlab- vs. Hbr. šūʕāl "fox") and "Das läßt an das Suffix des Ful für große Tiere -ba denken ... Während hier -ba als Suffix von Tiernamen erscheint, so ist in einem anderen Fall n- im Anlaut in Anlehnung an andere Tiernamen entstanden. Vgl. assyr. *nimru* 'Panter', *našru* 'Adler', *nadru* 'starkes Tier' ... Sicher ist hier nun nicht an eine wirkliche Klasseneinteilung zu denken, sondern an eine Anlehnung des einen Wortes an andere. Aber auch manche Klassenpräfixe des Bantu entstammen vermutlich solcher Analogie, wie z.B. das n- der Tierklasse wohl der Anlehnung an *nama* 'Fleisch, Tier' und das mu- der Menschenklasse der Anlehnung an *mntu* 'Mensch' seine Entstehung verdankt ..., vgl. Hausa *nama* 'Fleisch, Tier', *mutum* 'Mensch'; Ful *nama* 'essen'. Diese Ansätze zur Klassenbildung sind im Semitischen aber nur von Bedeutung für die Wortbildung, während im Bantu die Klassen das ganze System der grammatischen Beziehung beherrschen."

⁶² As stated by M. Cohen (1947: 25) on Drexel (1928), "l'auteur conclut que le peul, parent au bantou, et surtout au haoussa, bornou et nouba, n'est pourtant pas à séparer entièrement du <chamitique>."

⁶³ Thus, Trombetti (1902: 184-185) lists, a.o., the "suffisso -b che io dimostrai altrove formare nel Semitico dei nomi di animali" (whose parallels he thinks to have found in IE, Nama etc.).

1923 volume (2nd ed. 1977) followed the omnicomparatistic track of L. Reinisch and C. Meinhof extended by him, besides Semitic, Egyptian, Berber, and Cushitic (including Gongon) also onto “Nilotico nord” (Nuba, Barea, Kunama) vs. “Nilotico sud” (Dinka, Shilluk, Bari, Masai) (Trombetti 1923: §§51-53) vs. “Camitico merid.” (Sandawe, Mbulunge, Ufiomi,⁶⁴ Hottentotan, Bushman, Trombetti 1923: §54, 42-44) with a comparative essay of the numerals (Trombetti 1923: 52-53, §71) and an extra chapter on “Bantu-Sudanese e Camito-Semitico” (Trombetti 1923: 53-55, §§72-72). A minor progress is signified by his section dealing with some questions of SH comparative phonology (Trombetti 1923: 338-354).⁶⁵ Playing endlessly with the alleged “consonantal alternations” instead of drawing regular correlations, Trombetti’s summary on SH/AA phonology is, however, utterly disappointing: “Concludendo: noi abbiamo trovato in tutto il Camito-semitico ... un’alternazione tra esplosive e fricative in ogni posizione della parola. ... L’evoluzione spontanea di *k t p* sembra che abbia dato in molti casi delle spiranti ...”. One can hardly disapprove of the rational position occupied about these uncertain ways by one of the greatest authorities, C. Brockelmann (1950: 58) demanding firm rules of the comparative phonology.⁶⁶

1.4. “Post-classical Hamitology”: it is characterized by a significant normalization of the standards of SH root comparison, a delimitation of the field with respect to the former omnicomparatistic demands by L. Reinisch and C. Meinhof by minimalizing the boundaries of the SH family restricted to the linguistic space represented later by the *Essai comparatif*. It is this phase when serious results in the inter-branch comparison (beside Egypto-Semitic) appeared for the first time (esp. Möller 1924, Zyhlarz 1932-3, Vycichl 1934). As for the definition of “Post-classical Hamitology”, R.M. Voigt (1988: 160ff.; 2001: 1321-2, §4) attributed the “classical period” solely to Müller, Reinisch, Meinhof, which, in his view, was followed by a further “intermediate phase” (Voigt 2001: 1322, §5) singled out to cover the decades until M. Cohen’s (1947) *Essai comparatif*, previous to Rössler’s new era. The only reason Voigt (2001: 1322, §5) adduced for this chronological sequencing is that “die Forschung nach Meinhof strebte nicht einen Aufbau

⁶⁴ Mbulunge and Ufiomi were the only right hits in this amalgamate list, both being members of Southern Cushitic (Burunge and Asa, resp.).

⁶⁵ Trombetti’s (1923: 338-350) sections on the SH comparative phonology: vocalism (Trombetti 1923: 338-339, §409), vowel coloring in Coptic and vowel conditioned by surrounding consonantism in Cushitic stems (Trombetti 1923: 339-340, §410), vocalic shifts in Semitic and Coptic (Trombetti 1923: 341, §412), diphthongs (Trombetti 1923: 341-342, §413), Berber stops (Trombetti 1923: 343-344, §415), consonantal alternations in Agaw (Trombetti 1923: 344-345, §§416-417), “alternazioni tra esplosive e fricative gutturali in altre lingue cuscitiche” (Trombetti 1923: 345-346, §418), dental alternation in Cushitic (Trombetti 1923: 346, §419), “le alternazioni *r:t e r:P*” in Cushitic (Trombetti 1923: 347, §420), “alternazione *r:l* del Bilin” (Trombetti 1923: 348, §421), “alternazioni tra dentali in altre lingue cuscitiche” (Trombetti 1923: 348-349, §422), *b ~ f* interchange in Agaw (Trombetti 1923: 349, §423), and an interchange of *b ~ f* treated as the “frequentissima in tutto il Camito-semitico” (Trombetti 1923: 349, §424), *-b ~ -w-* in Nuba (Trombetti 1923: 350, §425).

⁶⁶ Brockelmann (1950: 58): “A. Trombetti wollte noch den einheitlichen Ursprung aller Sprachen nachweisen, musste dazu aber den eben von der Sprachwissenschaft erarbeiteten Begriff des Lautgesetzes durch die Annahme der Möglichkeit eines Wechsels aller Laute unter einander wieder aufheben.”

seines Systems an, sondern stellte Einzelprobleme und -vergleiche in den Mittelpunkt”, although just this phase witnesses M. Cohen’s research for his *Essai comparatif*, an epochal attempt for a first synthesis, which can hardly be labelled an “*Einzelproblem*”. Voigt (either in his 1988 or in his 2001 overview), in fact, has not discussed in detail those common features of the “Hamitological” research that made him isolate this alleged period as distinct in between Meinhof and Cohen/Rössler, he arbitrarily labelled it as “die Arbeit an Einzelproblemen” (Voigt 1988: 160, §IV)⁶⁷ or as the so-called “nachklassische Periode” or “Forschung nach Meinhof” (Voigt 2001: 1322, §5).⁶⁸ In my opinion, this segmentation is hard to follow, as the authors after Meinhof had been basically following his same track also, at least, in the field of comparative lexicon, i.e., they carried out *ad hoc* comparisons among the “Hamitic” branches, albeit luckily getting rid of including the non-SH satellites and with some occasional vague first attempts at drawing some phonetic rules in a non-systematic manner without synthetizing the whole system of rules. Well, perhaps this is what binds the below listed authors together. Unfortunately, in both versions of his overview, Voigt missed here any mention of works on phonological and lexical comparison where precisely this era witnessed the first serious results in the field of Egyptian, Berber, Beja and Hausa (with Semitic in the background) thanks to the outstanding efforts of two pragmatical Viennese giants, E. Zyhlarz and W. Vycichl. This kind of moderate approach then culminated in the *Essai comparatif*. Henceforth, contrary to Voigt’s assessment (who was silent about so many precious works of the “post-classical Hamitology” between Meinhof 1912 and Cohen 1947), this substantial “post-classical” phase was hallmarked by both dominant figures of the Viennese school who, luckily, abandoned the artificial “widened Hamitological” setting of the “classical” phase and so they returned to the more solid position of “pre-classical Hamitology” (to use Voigt’s labels). So may I set forth discussing the outstanding output of this “post-classical” trend:

1.4.1. M. Cohen: his presentation of the SH family (1924) in 4 distinct branches (where Hausa was fully excluded as yet) and the rejection of a separate Hamitic unity has renewed C.T. Beke (1845) and C. Lottner’s (1860-1) sister-branch theory.⁶⁹ Even

⁶⁷ Entitled still so by Voigt (1988: 160-162, §IV) because, in his view, “die Forschung nach Meinhof strebte nicht eines Aufbau seines – umstrittenen – Systems an, sondern stellte Einzelprobleme und -vergleiche in den Mittelpunkt der Bemühungen.” This chapter was practically restricted to Meinhof’s work after 1912 and Klingensheben, which by no means reflects the richness of these three decades. Curiously, in this 1988 study, Voigt discussed yet in the following chapter entitled “Erstellung von Systemen” (Voigt 1988: 162-164, §V) all the later great authors like Greenberg and Rössler, i.e., both classed in the very same trend (!), against which a whole number of arguments can be raised as will be seen in Episodes VII (Rösslerian trend) and VIII (Greenbergian era), resp., of this series of papers.

⁶⁸ The only argument Voigt (2001: 1322) adduced here is that allegedly dealing with “Einzelprobleme” was influenced by the fact that Meinhof himself abandoned his pan-African almost omnicomparatistic approach: “Dies fiel umso leichter, als Meinhof schon 1921/22 seine Hamitentheorie deutlich modifiziert hatte. ‘Hottentottensprachen’, ‘nilotische Hamiten-Sprachen’, das ‘proto-hamitische Ful’ und das Hausa möchte er jetzt etwas ‘beiseite’ stellen, da sie ‘den Semitensprachen bereits ferner’ stünden (1921/22: 242). Das Modell, das er nun aufstellt, ist komplexer und methodisch klarer als das von 1912.” These thoughts were literally reproduced from Voigt (1988: 161).

⁶⁹ Describing C. Lottner’s hypothesis on denying the Hamitic unity and on the equipotential SH branches, J.H. Greenberg (1962: 83-84) put it this way: “... Semitic was but one branch of a larger family in which the

though he mostly examined isomorphs, he also contributed to SH root research before his *Essai comparatif*. Thus, Cohen (1928) focused on the semantic domain of “knee” and related items, while his presentation at the GLECS session of 3 May 1933 compared (mostly Ethiopian and IE) roots signifying “Le double sens ‘testicule’ et de ‘œuf’” (triradicalized with some root extension).⁷⁰ In his next GLECS talk (20 Dec. 1933) on Sem. *√*gy*? “valley”, Cohen remained within the limits of Semitic again (?) with just an outlook on IE. Cohen (1934-5: 68-69) only ventured to draw very sketchy outlines of a “Consonantisme chamito-sémitique”. In his paper for the GLECS session of 28 Nov. 1934, Cohen (1934-7a) surveyed the previous research on the disputed affiliation of Hausa (mostly using morphological data), in which, retaining his preservations against this, Cohen (p. 2) devoted particular attention to D. Westermann’s detailed argumentation about the Hausa-“Hamitic” kinship suggesting, on the one hand, a cognacy of the personal pronouns in Hausa vs. Berber (regarding the grammatical genders),⁷¹ and a Hausa-Berber lexicon inherited from common SH, on the other hand,⁷² while he allowed also a substantial non-SH influence in Hausa.⁷³ But Cohen’s (1934-7a: 3) final word on the matter was sceptical.⁷⁴ Reflecting according to the same line of thoughts at that GLECS session,

various ‘Hamitic’ languages ... constituted each a further separate branch. This view of Hamito-Semitic was first advanced in the modern period by the eminent Semitist Marcel Cohen in 1924. [footnote omitted] It is formulated again in his general work of 1947, *Essai comparatif* ...” M. Cohen reaffirmed his position the same way in a number of subsequent papers also. In his lecture on the “Divisions internes du chamito-sémitique” (1934), e.g., beside the 4 independent branches, he refutes “Hamitic” as such: see appendix. Cohen (1934): “Un examen du soi-disant chamitique, pris soit au sens large soit au sens étroit, montre qu’il ne peut pas être défini par des particularités communes nettes et nombreuses qui excluraient le sémitique. De même, les particularités communes de l’égyptien et du sémitique sont contrebalancées d’un côté par des divergences entre égyptien et sémitique, d’un autre côté par des ressemblances soit de l’égyptien, soit du sémitique avec les autres éléments de l’ensemble. Il y a donc lieu d’abandonner la notion de «chamitique»; **le terme chamito** – dans chamito-sémitique – **ne représente pas plus une réalité dialectale** que européen dans indo-européen. Il est sage de poursuivre l’étude des données linguistiques **chamito-sémitiques sans préjuger d’aucun groupement** particulier entre les quatre grandes composantes de cette famille ...”

⁷⁰ Cohen: extended “avec une consonne postpalatale ou vélaire, une liquide (généralement l) et un troisième élément y, w, ou h”.

⁷¹ Westermann’s observation on Hausa (made at the GLECS session of 28 Nov. 1934), quoted in the *Comptes rendus des séances de GLECS* 1 (1934-7), 2: “Die personalpronomen (sic: p-) des Hausa zeigen deutlich Verwandtschaft” esp. in the 2nd person sg. masc. and fem. (exx. quoted from Shillh), while „Besonders interessant ist das Pronomen der 3. p. fem. dessen dessen entscheidendes Element *t* ist. Es bildet im Schillh das Feminin des Substantivs”. He isolated here the genitival morph *n* in Hausa, Berber and Beja.

⁷² Westermann’s note on Hausa in the *Comptes rendus des séances de GLECS* 1 (1934-7), 2 (session of 28 Nov. 1934): “das Hausa hat ein (sic) erhebliche Anzahl von Wörtern gemeinsam mit den Berberdialekten, was auf enger Beziehungen zwischen den beiden hinweist”. He referred even to W. Vycichl’s (1934) first *magnum opus* on “Hausa und Ägyptisch” (then still forthcoming, described here as “travail à paraître prochainement sous le titre *Hausa* (sic) und *altaegyptisch*”).

⁷³ Westermann’s remark on Hausa in the *Comptes rendus des séances de GLECS* 1 (1934-7), 2 (session of 28 Nov. 1934): “Er ist klar dass daneben das Hausa deutliche Züge der Sudansprachen trägt und nur in beschränktem Sinne eine Hamitensprache genannt werden kann.”

⁷⁴ Discarding even the common signification of the morphs *n* and *t* in Hausa and Berber, and claiming moreover that „certains autres [éléments] présentent une coïncidence curieuse avec des éléments pronominaux chamito-sémitiques”, Cohen (1934-7a: 3) hastily concluded: see appendix. Cohen (1934-7a: 3): “... les différences fondamentales du fonctionnement du haoussa et langues de son groupe d’une part, du chamito-sémi-

H. Labouret (GLECS 1, 1934-7, 3) too assumed here a wide range of loaning.⁷⁵ Cohen (1934-7b: 5-6), conducting an “Entretien sur la question des labio-vélaires en chamito-sémitique” at the GLECS session of 22 Dec. 1937, had a word on the issue from an IE perspective.⁷⁶ The joint paper by M. Cohen and W. Leslau (1934-7) focused solely on Amharic in discussing the palatalization shift of $k > \check{c}$ without an outlook on the AA parallelisms. Cohen (in the 1935-1941 issues of the *Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes Études, IV^e section*, also 1939) released a number of minor preliminary communications with “Études sur le vocabulaire chamito-sémitique”. Reflecting on the paper by R. Cotteville-Giraudet examining at the GLECS session of 22 June 1938 (published in vol. 3, 1937-40) the alleged equivalents of Eg. *bjn.t* “harp” in “négro-africain” and even Sumerian or Indonesian, Cohen better proposed to compare Geez *baganā* “nom de la grande lyre” but the match of the C_2 was not explained. The culmination of Cohen’s output in the domain of SH etymology was his *Essai comparatif* (1947) which, as a milestone concluding (even if not definitely closing) the era of post-classical Semitic-Hamitology, will be evaluated in a separate entry in Part 2 of this Episode I (§1.5).

1.4.2. G. Möller: beside his better-known egyptological studies, author of two papers (1921, 1924) on Berbero-Egyptian isoglosses exploiting the progress French progress in Berber lexicography.⁷⁷ Although several comparisons fail because of his ignorance about the Berber *Lautgeschichte*, he was perhaps the first pioneer to formulate some common Egypto-Berber *Lautgesetze* (Möller 1921: col. 196 and 1924: 42). One is disposed to agree with Möller (1924: 42) about a closer affinity of Egyptian and Berber.⁷⁸ But its reverse may also be true: Berber stands much closer to Semitic than to Egyptian. However, without having seen the lexical evidence, one can hardly approve the allegation of Möller (1924: 43) on the close cognacy of Egyptian, Berber and Cushitic.⁷⁹

tique de l’autre, et le manque de grandes séries de morphèmes communs, doivent faire écarter l’appartenance du haoussa à la famille chamito-sémitique. Y aurait-il eu, outre des emprunts de vocabulaire, des emprunts de certains pronoms? Ce serait un fait bien rare, presque inouï, de mélange morphologique; la question semble être à réserver.”

⁷⁵ As we read in the protocol of this GLECS session, Labouret “pense que les contacts intimes avec des populations nord-africaines ont pu amener dans le groupe du haoussa des emprunts très étendus.”

⁷⁶ Cohen (1934-7b: 5-6): “l’existence d’articulations labio-vélaires, qui jouent un rôle dans les oppositions morphologiques; mais, pas plus qu’en arabe, il ne s’agit d’une série de phonèmes indépendants s’opposant aux phonèmes non-labialisés”. It was in his reflection on Cohen’s paper where E. Destaing (1934-7: 7) confirmed the non-phonemic use of labiovelars in SH.

⁷⁷ Zyhlarz (1936: 435): “Liess man ja sogar die verdienstvollen Forschungen der französischen Berberologie unter Führung von René und André Basset seitens der Ägyptologen und Semitisten nahezu unbeachtet, und das obgleich der deutsche Ägyptolog G. Möller nach dieser Seite hin zur Sprachvergleichung aufgefordert hatte.”

⁷⁸ Möller (1924: 42): “Dass das ägyptische einst den libyschen Sprachen weit näher gestanden hat als den semitischen, würde gewiss klar in Erscheinung treten, wenn jene nicht nur in ihrer modernen Gestalt bekannt wären.”

⁷⁹ Möller (1924: 43): “Die Verwandtschaft des Ägyptischen mit den Sprachen der libyschen Berbern und der hamitischen Äthiopien steht also fest ...”, which, by the way, led Möller to an assumption, conceived in the frames of the “Hamitological” hypothesis, that “Wir dürfen also annehmen, daß ganz Nordafrika einst von einer ziemlich homogenen hamitischen Bevölkerung bewohnt war, die sich erst im Laufe des dritten Jahrtausends erheblich differenziert hat, und zwar dadurch, daß sich südlich des ersten Katarakts wohnenden Stämme

1.4.3. A. Klingenheben's great merit for SH studies in general is formulating the necessity of reconstructing the common SH verbal morphology in his fundamental study (1929),⁸⁰ demonstrating the Hausa verbal morphology to be evidently of a "Hamitic" nature.⁸¹ But, first of all, for our overview specially focusing on the history of research of AA comparative phonology, Klingenheben's (1927/8) pioneering study on Hausa historical phonology which, indirectly, has great bearing on the questions targeted here.⁸²

1.4.4. C. Brockelmann: his epochal study "Gibt es einen hamitischen Sprachstamm?" (1932) offers a rigorous and critical survey of the grammatical and lexical affinities between Semitic and "Hamitic". Noteworthy is his treatment of the isoglosses and isomorphs in the manner of the sister-branch theory, individually among the Semitic, Egyptian, Berber, and Cushitic branches. He was rightly reluctant to accept the scarce evidence for the unity of the "Hamitic" languages and instead, he was disposed to assume with R. Lepsius a loose areal phylum,⁸³ which received considerable echo.⁸⁴

mit dunkelhäutigen Bevölkerungselementen vermischt habe, während die Libyer blonde, weißhäutige und blauäugige Zuwanderer in sic aufgenommen haben." Anyhow, already Meinhof (1912: 253) had rightly assumed Egyptian to have resulted from a socially-historically amalgamated penetration of diverse multi-lingual ethnic groups: "Produkt der gegenseitigen sozial-geschichtlichen Durchdringung mehrsprachiger Volkselemente".

⁸⁰ Klingenheben (1929: 244): "Wenn ... die Hamiten und Semiten Brüder sind, so dürfen wir uns ... nicht auf diese den Semitensprachen vielleicht besonders nahestehende Untergruppe der Hamitensprachen beschränken, sondern müssen auch andere Glieder dieser Sprachfamilie ... einbeziehen. Es ist etwa zu untersuchen, ob das heutige, mehr oder minder reichlich ausgebildete Verbalsystem auch anderer Hamitensprachen ein ursprünglich kompliziertes ist oder ob wir hier etwa ältere oder jüngere Schichten feststellen können und ... wie diese Schichten auch hinsichtlich ihrer Form und Bedeutung zu dem semitischen Verbum verhalten. Hierbei wird sich schon apriorisch annehmen lassen, dass wir, je ferner eine Hamitensprache heute dem semitischen Sprachtypus steht, mit umso grösserer Wahrscheinlichkeit das, was sich in ihr als ein mit dem Semitischen gemeinsamer Bestandteil herauschälen lässt, auch als wirklich alten, präsemitisch-hamitischen Besitz der beiden Sprachfamilien ansehen können ..." R.M. Voigt (1988: 161-164) devoted a long chapter to the long surviving dispute between A. Klingenheben and O. Rössler on the questions of a common Semito-Berber verbal morphology, which are, however, of no relevance here to the history of AA comparative phonology.

⁸¹ Klingenheben (1929: 264): "die älteste Verbalform" was in Hausa as Proto-Semitic "ein präfigierender, zeitloser Aorist".

⁸² Translated into English and provided with abundant up-to-date commentaries by P. Newman (2004).

⁸³ Brockelmann (1932: 817): see appendix. Brockelmann (1932: 817): "... gänzlich unverwandte Sprachen, deren Gebiete aneinanderstoßen, nicht nur Wörter austauschen, sondern auch Laute und Formen. So wird es auch in Afrika gewesen sein. Schon Lepsius nahm er mit Recht an, daß sich hier nicht verwandte Sprachen in weitem Umfang miteinander gemischt haben." Brockelmann (1932: 818): "Schuchardt, der selbst noch an einem 'hamitischen' Sprachstamm glaubte, hat doch einmal mit Recht betont, daß es niemals möglich sein werde, eine hamitische Ursprache zu rekonstruieren. Er meinte doch wohl, daß die jungen Entwicklungsstufen, in denen uns diese Sprachen allein vorliegen, kein gesichertes Material dafür bieten, er wird aber wohl in dem anderen Sinne recht behalten, daß eine solche Ursprache nie bestanden hat. In einer künftigen Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft wird der hamitische Sprachstamm vielleicht ein ähnliches Schicksal haben, wie vordem der turanische, den Max Müller entdeckt zu haben glaubte."

⁸⁴ M. Cohen (1947: 23): "pour le principal auteur de manuels, C. Brockelmann, la position réservée et la non-utilisation des données ont finalement fait place à une prise de position théorique qui permet des rapprochements, mais écarte l'idée de la filiation." G.W. Tsereteli (1970: 271): C. Brockelmann arrived "zu der Schlußfolgerung, daß die Ähnlichkeit zwischen den genannten Sprachgruppen nicht durch gemeinsame Herkunft bedingt ist, sondern das Ergebnis von Kontakten zwischen ursprünglich gar nicht verwandten Sprachen darstellt, die ähnliche (sic) Wesenszüge im gegenseitigen Austausch untereinander und mit Substratvölkern entwickelt haben. Er weist darauf hin, daß, so wie in Amerika, gänzlich unverwandte Sprachen, deren Gebie-

1.4.5. E. Zyhlarz: among the *élèves* of the Viennese school, one of the most fruitful authors of the “post-classical Hamitology” in spite of all the shortcomings. After K. Sethe’s (1916) basic study on the Egyptian numerals, he re-examined the question but in a “Hamitological” context (1931), which had become the only etymological analysis of 1-10 for long decades to come. His fundamental study on the “Ursprung und Sprachcharakter des Altägyptischen” (1932-3), focusing on Egyptian’s cognacy with Berber and Cushitic,⁸⁵ listing 116 Egypto-Berber isoglosses and 113 Egypto-Beja matches, in spite of all its errors and untenable racial shade in his methods (leading him to exclude Hausa from “Hamitic”),⁸⁶ is still a by far more important contribution to SH comparative lexicon than any of the works of this kind by Meinhof and before him. Zyhlarz (1932: 72), who regarded himself as the first representative of the “historische Hamitologie” since the time of L. Reinisch, was perhaps the second one after C. Meinhof (1912) to give a larger list of 9 Hamitic distinctive features⁸⁷ which was misleadingly handled as an axiom.⁸⁸ It was here in this study, however, that he recognized the “Hamitic” nature of the “südwestkuschitische” Kafa language,⁸⁹ whereas he observed that among the

te aneinanderstoßen, nicht nur Wörter austauschen, sondern auch Laute und Formen, es ebenso in Afrika gewesen sein wird. Brockelmann meint deshalb, daß es richtig wäre, für die Bezeichnung von Beziehungen der semitischen Sprachen zu denen Nord- und Ostafrikas den von Trubetzkoy für solche Verhältnisse vorgeschlagenen Namen ‘Sprachenbund’ zu benutzen. Dieser Gesichtspunkt G. Brockelmanns fand in der Wissenschaft weder Anklang noch Beachtung. Gegenwärtig besteht die allgemein anerkannte Meinung, daß die semitischen Sprachen zusammen mit einer Reihe Sprachen Afrikas eine Gruppe verwandter Sprachen bilden, die sogenannte hamito-semitische oder semito-hamitische, afroasiatische (Greenberg), hamitische (Murdock) und erythräische (Tucker) Gruppe.”

⁸⁵ Zyhlarz (1932-3: 26): “... Bedawye, noch mehr ... Bilin und Agaw-Sprachen ... das völlig verfremdete Galla zeigen eine deutliche Modifizierung gegenüber dem ursprünglich wie das älteste Semitisch gearteten hamitischen Sprachcharakter. Im Niederkuschitischen ist das Saho in vielen Zügen gleichfalls von einer ähnlichen Fremdschicht unterwachsen; Somali dagegen hat auffallend starken Widerstand geleistet. Wortschatz und Syntax innerhalb der genannten mittleren Südgruppe war stark modifizierenden Faktoren unterworfen, so dass ein Vergleich in Bausch und Bogen ein völlig verwirrendes Bild vom Wesen des Hamitischen ergeben müsste”.

⁸⁶ E. Zyhlarz (1932-3: 27) labelled Hausa “Nigger-Hamitisch” (sic) which, in his vision, should be “erst in seinem hamitischen Fundament freigelegt”. In Satzinger’s (2002: 229) view, Zyhlarz (1932-3) “expressly attempts to counterbalance the predominance of Semitic in comparison with Egyptian by investigating various aspects of Egyptian and ‘Hamitic’ (Berber and Cushitic; Hausa – being what he termed ‘Niggerhamitisch’ (sic) – is not included”.

⁸⁷ As summarized by H.G. Mukarovsky (1981: 517): (1) emphatics, (2) “artikulatorische Raffung (unter dem Druck des Starktones)”, (3) “Sinnvokalismus (Innenvokale unterliegen sinngabendem Wechsel)”, (4) “strenge Unterscheidung des grammatischen Geschlechts”, (5) “dreifache historische Reihe des Personalpronomens”, (6) “zwei Genera verbi (Tätigkeits- und Eigenschaftsverba)”, (7) “Unterscheidung vollendeter und unvollendeter Verbalhandlung (Fiens/Faktum)”, (8) “Präfixkonjugation der Tätigkeits- und Suffixkonjugation des Zustandsverbum”, (9) “Stammerweiterungselemente des Verbum (s-Kausativ, n-Inversiv, m-Sozial, t-Reflexiv)”.

⁸⁸ Zyhlarz (1932: 72): “Jede Sprache Afrikas nichtsemitischen Ursprungs, welche sich historisch auf einen Sprachtyp mit allen hier genannten 9 Hauptmerkmalen zurückführen lässt, ist eine hamitische Sprache. Alle, bei denen dies nicht angeht, scheiden aus dem Vergleich aus”.

⁸⁹ Which, as assumed by Zyhlarz (1932: 72), had “seit Jahrtausenden das nichthamitische mittelländische und erythräische Sprach- und Völkergebiet überlagert ...”.

“Hamitic” branches displaying the clearest Semitic affinity is Berber,⁹⁰ which is essentially indeed true.⁹¹ Zyhlarz (1934) continued and multiplied G. Möller’s (1924) Berbero-Egyptian etymologies by far trying to set up common verbal root types becoming the first scholar ever to lay solid bases of a comprehensive comparative Egypto-Berber phonology even if some of his matches fail on the grounds of segmentation and some consonantal correspondences are no longer tenable. Zyhlarz (1934-5) discovered diverse layers of Egypto-Coptic (and even Berber) parallels also in Nubian, a considerable share of which, however, was not meant as genetic ones.⁹² Among his (1936: 438/9-446) further Berbero-Egyptian isoglosses some are false being erroneously segmented, where he (1936: 447) treated Berber as “nordhamitisch”, while Beja and Somali as “südliche Hamitensprachen”. In the same paper, Zyhlarz (1936: 446) proposed some Beja-Egyptian etymologies and finally (1936: 450) also Egypto-Berber-Beja isoglosses. Of course, Zyhlarz (1936: 450-451) put forward his own limited edition of the “Hamitic” theory correctly surmising „die grosse Entwicklungsferne zwischen den einzeln Gruppen der modernen Hamitensprachen”, viz. the enormous time depth in the separation of the African (i.e., “Hamitic”) branches.⁹³

⁹⁰ Or, as formulated by Zyhlarz, “Der historisch reinste (sic) Vertreter des hamitischen Sprachtypus ist Berberisch ...”

⁹¹ Cf. the paper by G. Takács (2015) on the classification of AA branches according to the isomorphs.

⁹² Whose idea was misconceived by Brockelmann (1932: 817) as maintaining cognacy and so it was by far not rightly refuted: “Auch im Nubischen erkennt ja Zyhlarz ... manche hamitischen Anklänge an, obwohl er den von Reinisch unternommenen Versuch, eine genealogische Verwandtschaft zwischen Nubisch und ‘Hamitisch’ zu erweisen, mit Recht nicht als gelungen erachtet.”

⁹³ Zyhlarz (1936: 450-451): “Klar wird ..., dass um die Zeit, wo das ... rekonstruierte libysche Altberberisch anzusehen ist, das gleichzeitige Osthorn-Hamitisch eine zwar verwandte, aber durchaus eigen gebaute Hamitensprache gewesen sein muss. Aus dieser ... Tatsache erklärt sich auch die grosse Entwicklungsferne zwischen den einzelnen Gruppen der modernen Hamitensprachen: der hamitische Sprachstamm hat sich sehr früh in durchaus eigengerichtete Einzelsprachen gespalten, deren allerletzte Ausläufer die heutigen Hamitensprachen darstellen. Die Dinge aber in dieser Weise erkennbar zu machen, darin liegt auch hier der Wert der etymologischen Transposition ins Ägyptische. Vorliegende kurze Skizze der für die historische Hamitistik unerlässlichen Konkordanz-Untersuchungen und ihre Vermittlung für das Bild historischer Grundlagen innerhalb dieses uralten Ablegers des Frühsemitischen, wie es sich über Nordafrika hin verbreitet hat, mag vorläufig zur Allgemein-Orientierung genügen. ... Das Hamitische als Sprachstamm hat es einmal gegeben. Derselbe gehört aber geschichtlich in das Entwicklungsbild des Semitischen. Dieser Zusammenhang mit dem Semitisch ist nun aber keineswegs in der Weise zu denken, dass da eine der heutigen asiatischen Semitensprachen als Aszendent in Betracht käme. ... Die Sache ist im Gegenteil sehr einfach: zur Zeit, wo das semitische Verbum noch seine älteste Gestalt hatte, nämlich die wie wir sie im alten Ostsemitisch (Akkadisch) vor uns haben, damals lagerte beduinisches Altsemitisch bereits weithin auf nordafrikanischen Boden. Naturgemäss bewirkte diese Isolierung einerseits und die zwangsläufige Symbiose mit Fremdstämmigen daselbst andererseits eine völlig von der asiatischen Entwicklung abweichende Richtung. ... Nunmehr aber, wo wir durch das im Ägyptischen erhaltene ... Material althamitisches Sprachgut zur Hand bekommen, ist es nur mehr eine detaillierte Kleinarbeit, ... durch die sich die einzelnen Gruppen des hamitischen Sprachgebietes als individuellen Varianten des einstigen frühsemitischen Gesamtzweiges kennzeichnen. Wenn wir also bei aller Betonung des semitischen Zusammenhanges die hamitischen Sprachen dennoch als eigenen Arttypus behandeln, so folgen wir dabei nur der geschichtlich-geographischen Gegebenheit. Das gemeinsame Abtrennungsschicksal vom alten frühsemitischen Ausgangsgebiet hat die afrikanischen Frühsemiten-Idiome zu einer historischen Sondergruppe gegenüber den unter anderen Bedingungen fortentwickelten asiatischen Semitensprachen gestempelt.”

1.4.6. E. Cerulli: beside his main field of interest, he research also Cushitic historical phonology and root structure theory on which he presented a number of lectures for the GLECS. Thus, his GLECS paper (1931-4a, session of 25 April 1934) restored ancient trilateral roots common to Semitic and Cushitic (either as inherits cognates or loans) which in the latter branch were *lautgeschichtlich* eroded to biliteral ones – his Semito-Cushitic comparative word-list was perhaps one of the first ones of its kind, at least, in the genre of the later inter-branch comparison evoking a number of comments at the session,⁹⁴ where especially remarkable is that by M. Cohen celebrating the Italian pioneer of Semito-Cushitic comparison.⁹⁵ Cerulli's talk at the GLECS session of 20 June 1934 surveyed the history of the Cushitic labiovelars, which, even if examined introverted within the frames of this branch, has resulted in some remarks from beyond these placing the matter in a SH context.⁹⁶ Cerulli's (1934-7b) lecture at the session of 22 May 1935 touched upon again a fundamental question, viz. the stable vocalism in Cushitic as opposed to the Semitic apophony which generated others' observations from global SH perspectives.⁹⁷ For the session of 28 April 1937, he elaborated the problem of trilateral roots in Cushitic with an original conclusion on a small Cushito-Semitic inherited share of original triradical roots.⁹⁸ Cerulli kept dealing with the Cushitic root structure at the

⁹⁴ Comptes rendus du GLECS 1 (1931-4), 45: "Il serait certes désirable d'avoir, surtout pour la comparaison sémitique-couchitique encore plus d'exemples que dans la liste de E. Cerulli, qui n'a pu être insérée entier" (J. Deny, M. Cohen); "Dans l'ensemble, ce qui est encore une confirmation, le copte, en face de nombreuses racines trilitères de l'égyptien ancien, a essentiellement un type analogue au couchitique" (J.-J. Clère); "De même le berbère a beaucoup de racines courtes, notamment à deux consonnes jointes: on peut quelquefois reconstituer une racine plus longue; par exemple on constate qu'une labiale tend à disparaître devant une consonne subséquente" (E. Destaing).

⁹⁵ Cohen (1931-4: 45): "**mais dès maintenant la preuve est suffisamment faite; l'obstacle théorique que certains voulaient opposer à la comparaison du couchitique et des autres langues chamito-sémitiques est franchi définitivement** par la démonstration de E. Cerulli, qui rend un service essentiel au comparatisme".

⁹⁶ Comptes rendus du GLECS 1 (1931-4), 49-50: "Les labiovélares sont instables dans beaucoup de langues; peut-être le couchitique, à qui le sémitique d'Éthiopie doit ses labiovélares, les doit-il lui-même à un substrat africain. L'on souhaiterait trouver moins de caprices et plus de correspondances systématiques dans le traitement des labiovélares à l'intérieur de chacun des dialectes" (M. Cohen); p. 50: "... l'on constate en berbère des phénomènes tout à fait semblables à ceux du couchitique" (E. Destaing).

⁹⁷ Thus, E. Dhome (1934-7: 27) compared the hollow roots in Akkadian and Hebrew "traitées morphologiquement comme des bilitères ... Les mots rattachés à ces racines expriment généralement des idées simples et élémentaires, ce qui ferait supposer un état très ancien du sémitique, où, comme en égyptien, le bilitéralisme n'avait rien d'anormal. Il fallait donc une voyelle stable entre les deux consonnes radicales pour prononcer le mot et lui faire exprimer exactement l'idée voulue." M. Cohen (1934-7: 27-28) too partly echoed this view: "à une époque ancienne du sémitique il y ait eu des racines bilitères à voyelle médiane ... Mais il n'est pas impossible que ces racines aient eu elles-mêmes une forme encore plus ancienne trilitère. Aussi bien peut-on observer en couchitique, comme l'a montré E. Cerulli la transformation d'anciens trilitères en bilitères; on observe le même fait dans le passage de l'ancien éthiopien à l'amharique. **Ce sera l'étymologie chamito-sémitique qui pourra éclairer mieux les différents états anciens auxquels on remonte historiquement.** D'autre part, l'évolution qui semble s'accomplir en couchitique de la présence à l'absence d'alternances vocaliques a son analogue dans l'évolution d'une partie des langues indo-européennes."

⁹⁸ Cerulli (1934-7b: 85-86, §1): "La diffusion du type trilitère est différente suivant les groupes de la famille couchitique. ... on peut dire déjà que le minimum de racines trilitères est dans les langues sidama et le maximum en bédja ... On peut donc dire provisoirement que le type trilitère de racine est mieux conservé dans les langues parlées au Bord de la Mer Rouge et de l'Océan Indien que dans les langues du plateau

GLECS session of 22 June 1938 (vol. 3, 1937-40) where he set up a number of Cu.-Om. isoglosses.

1.4.7. G.A. Barton (1934: 1) too, in his frequently quoted book yielding little for the comparative AA phonology and lexicon, represented better the “pre-classical” mainstream *communis opinio* of his age (in spite of his racial position due to a remarkable impact of C. Meinhof)⁹⁹ on a “Hamitic” unity in the narrower (Voigt’s “pre-classical”) sense, namely that of Egyptian, Berber and Cushitic,¹⁰⁰ whose common ancestors he also sought in Asia on a racial basis.¹⁰¹ Similarly to Zyhlarz, Barton also recognized the incomparable diversity of the branches he classed under “Hamitic” as contrasted with Semitic.¹⁰² He also surmised the background of Egyptian linguogenesis.¹⁰³ Surveying some common peculiarities of Semitic phonology, for Barton (1934: 17-18) “it is clear that Hamitic and Semitic possess in common very unusual articulation, and that this articulation is inseparable from primitive Hamitic and Semitic speech. It should be emphatically noted that this kindred phenomenon of the two groups of languages appears in its fuller and more primitive form in certain Hamitic languages and that its occurrence in the Semitic languages is best accounted for as a later narrowing of the early Hamitic usage.” He appears to have a pretty advanced vision of the originally predominantly biradical root stock of the “Hamitic” branches.¹⁰⁴ Here, Barton (1934: 20) surveyed the ways of

éthiopien.” Cerulli (1934-7b: 86, §4): “Le couchitique – surtout celui des groupes parlés au bord de la mer, au contact immédiat du sémitique – a conservé un certain nombre de racines trilitères à côté du type bilitère devenu historiquement le plus diffusé”.

⁹⁹ A.S. Kaye and P.T. Daniels (1992: 430-431): “Barton (1934) is excellent proof of the popularity of the Meinhofian point of view. ... In fact the Berbers are referred to as the ‘Hamites of purest blood’ (p. 11) whereas the ancient Egyptians were Hamites mixed with Semites, the Bedawye were Hamites mixed with Cushites and Nubians, the Somali and others were Hamites mixed with Cushites, while the Maasai were Hamites ‘mingled with a Negroid stock’ (pp. 11f.). As can be gleaned from Barton’s footnotes, the references are almost exclusively to Meinhof (1912).”

¹⁰⁰ Barton (1934: 1): “The term Hamite covers the ancient Egyptians and their descendants, ... Libyans and Berbers ..., certain tribes of Abyssinia and Somali Land, and some other tribes ...”.

¹⁰¹ Barton (1934: 9-10): “Most scholars ... have assumed that the Hamites developed in North Africa out of the Mediterranean race, after the last glacial epoch. This theory has received the endorsement of such ethnologists as Keane, Brinton, Sergi, Garland, Ripley, and von Luschan, and is accepted by philologists, such as Maspero, ... W. Max Müller, Meinhoff (sic: -ff), and Worrell. [footnotes omitted] ... It will appear, as we proceed, that this North African hypothesis best explains all the facts at present known to us, and is probably true.” Barton (1934: 10): “... Adolf Erman ... expressed his conviction that the so-called Hamitic race is simply Semites who migrated into Africa from southern Arabia, and who have been corrupted (sic!) by various admixtures of African (sic!) blood (sic!). ... scholars are not altogether agreed as to whether the ancient Egyptians should be classed with the Hamites or the Semites.”

¹⁰² Barton (1934: 13): “... the Hamitic languages ... present much greater differences among themselves than are seen in the Semitic languages.”

¹⁰³ Barton (1934: 14): “It is also well established that Egyptian was modified by contact with Semites. Of all the Hamitic languages, those in and north of the Sahara Desert have preserved the best what appears to have been the original Hamitic type. Here Hamites for many centuries came into less close contact with peoples of other races.”

¹⁰⁴ Barton (1934: 19): “Erman ... held that the roots of Egyptian and the Hamitic languages had also been trilateral [footnote omitted] – a view in which ... W. Max Müller then concurred [footnote omitted] ... Brockelmann ... in 1908 ... maintained this view, but ... in 1913, he abandoned it. [footnote omitted] The more

trilateralization, then he surveyed some elements of a common SH morphology (Barton 1934: 21-26). All this was done without discussing any linguistic evidence, however.

1.4.8. D. Westermann, in his preface to G.P. Bargery's (1934) Hausa lexicon (pp. ix-xix), analysed in chapter "2. Traditions concerning the origin of the Hausa people" (pp. xi-xii), where, among others, he mentions H. Barth¹⁰⁵ regarding Hausa as part of Berber which he appears to have also supported.¹⁰⁶

1.4.9. J. Lukas: the first field researcher of the Chadic languages to have isolated and distinguished the diverse language groups of the Lake Chad area (1934),¹⁰⁷ among which he found one akin to both Hausa and "Hamitic",¹⁰⁸ which he surmised to be due to an admixture,¹⁰⁹ so he has isolated "the Chado-Hamitic group" (Lukas 1936c: 344-346),¹¹⁰

complete and thorough study ... given to the Hamitic languages, especially by Reinisch [footnote omitted] and Meinhoff (sic), [footnotes omitted] has made it clear that the great majority of Hamitic roots – especially those which appear to be native, were bi-literal. Further study of the roots of the Semitic languages also tends to prove that probably a large number of its present tri-literal system ... were originally bi-literal. From these bi-literals, tri-literal roots have been built up."

¹⁰⁵ Whom Westermann (1934: xi-xii) claimed to be "convinced that they are a branch of the Berbers (Amazigh) in North Africa, that they lived for a long time in the region between Damerghu and Azben (Air) and immigrated into their present residences about A.D. 1000" which was based "not only on oral and partly written traditions, but also on linguistic affinities of the Hausa language with Logone and with the Berber dialects ..."

¹⁰⁶ Westermann (1934: xii): "But even if it is true that the **Hausin** of Ibn Said were the Hausas and they ... lived at that time near Lake Chad, this is not inconsistent with the presence of a Berber element in the Hausas of to-day. There can hardly be a doubt that this element exists, in the language as well as also in the physical appearance of many individual Hausas." Westermann, specifying in his section "4. The Hausa language" (pp. xiii-xiv), states first of all: "Hausa is a Hamitic language and belongs to the northern or Berber dialects of North Africa, although this relation is not a close one in point of etymology. The main proof of the Hamitic character of the Hausa language is its distinction of grammatical gender in noun and pronoun. This distinction ... shows ... clear affinities to the Berber dialects. This same characteristic ... is one of the connecting links between Hamitic and Semitic languages. ... The Hausa language is not, however, exclusively Hamitic in character. Just as the population has as a substratum a pure negro (sic) element, so the vocabulary as well as the grammatical peculiarities ... disclose definite connexions with surrounding Sudanic (Negro) languages. These relations need a close investigation, which has only recently been started."

¹⁰⁷ Ignoring Lukas' earlier publications on this matter, J.H. Greenberg (1962: 83) substantially postdated his discovery: "In 1938, Johannes Lukas pointed to the fact that Hausa could not be considered in isolation, but belonged to a much larger group of languages in West and Central Africa, to which he gave the name Chad-Hamitic."

¹⁰⁸ Lukas (1936c: 332): "... the existence of a Hamitic group in the Sudan is rather a surprise, and the inclusion of the respective languages in a special group, which seems to have resulted from a collision of a Hamitic and an older African world (the latter being perhaps to the Mandara Group of to-day) is a necessary adjustment ..."

¹⁰⁹ Lukas (1937-8: 181): "... um einen Ausdruck von Ernst Zylinder zu gebrauchen, diese Sprachen nicht als 'genuine' Hamitensprachen ansehen, sondern als Ergebnis einer Mischung hamitischen Sprachgutes mit älteren Sprachgütern, die nicht hamitisch gewesen sind, jedoch als solche Mischungen, deren 'tragende' Sprachschicht hamitisch ist."

¹¹⁰ Listed and classed by Lukas (1936c: 344-345) as **(1) "Western Sub-group"** (in the west of Bornu, east of Kano province): Bolewa, Karekare, Ngamo, Bade, Nəgzəm (= Ngizim), **(2) "Middle Sub-group"**: dialects of Kotoko (called Magəri by the Kanuri, today glossed as Makeri, "phonetically the most richly developed", its phonetic system was set in a table on p. 346), Buduma (lake Chadic islands dwellers), Muzgu, **(3) "Eastern Sub-group"**: Mubi, Kajagise (= Kajakse) and Masmaje (Lukas: "all three peoples can undersand

which has had an unfortunately sounding echo in modern AA linguistics,¹¹¹ along with the old “Hamitological” criteria (cf. Lukas 1936c: 345) in Chadic.¹¹² Lukas (1936d: 582-587; 1937-8) gave an even more detailed update of some common grammatical features of Chadic (as implosives, ejectives and laterals, grammatical genders, broken plural) shared with other SH branches, although neither of his papers launched into dealing with the lexical evidence.¹¹³ Curiously, M. Cohen (1947: 25) spared his words of recognition on Lukas’ (1936a and 1939a) significant discoveries.¹¹⁴ At any rate, it is in 1936 that Lukas practically founded the frames of later Chadic comparative linguistics, which, however, due to the decisive reluctance of M. Cohen in accepting its supposed SH bases, had to wait another two decades to come for its integration in comparative AA studies thanks to J.H. Greenberg (see Episode VIII of this series).

1.4.10. W. Vycichl: it is in his person (trained by L. Reinisch’s Viennese *Doppelinstitut*) that the most fruitful researcher and eminent figure of both the “Hamitic” common stock (luckily, mostly void of the usual far-fetched racial tones of his era)¹¹⁵ and the “old school” of Egypto-Semitic lexical comparison was brilliantly combined. It is just him whose extraordinary output may be regarded, in spite of all its shortcomings, as the culmination of both trends. From the very start of his enormously long career (1930es to 1990es) on, he had rigorously stuck to the neo-grammarians method of applying regular *Lautgesetze* in the ocean of his convincing etymologies. His very first study on the affinities of “Hausa und Ägyptisch” (1934) turned out to become epochal on the thorough comparison of both languages on almost the whole scale of the grammar, which, in the opinion of M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998: 116) “did not evoke many positive reactions”¹¹⁶

one another”). From these “subgroups” Lukas has still separated (Lukas 1936: 347-348) the Mandara group (“languages spoken by old tribes south of Bornu”): Bura and Pabir (in and around Biu), Kilba, Margi, Chibbak, Gamargu, Bura.

¹¹¹ In their lengthy review of the 1983 SH Congress in Marburg/Lahn, A.S. Kaye and P.T. Daniels (1992: 430-431) critically evaluated L. Reinisch’s and C. Meinhof’s “Hamitology”, a.o.: “To add more fuel to the fire we have the misleading term ‘Chado-Ham(itic)’ coined by the German Africanist school of J. Lukas for what is now recognized as a sub-branch of Ch(adic).”

¹¹² Lukas: “Grammatical gender is common to all these languages. ... The pronominal elements show in many respects the known Hamitic forms. In the Middle and Eastern Subgroups broken plurals occur.”

¹¹³ Except for the word for “bone” in Chadic (Hausa *kaši*) vs. Eg. *qs* (misquoted as *krš*) (Lukas 1937-8: 292), the numeral “4” in Chadic (Hausa *fūḍu*, Muzgu *pudu*, Mubi *faḍa*) and Beja *faḍig*, Eg. *fd.w* (Lukas 1937-8: 298).

¹¹⁴ Cohen (1947: 25): Lukas “a envisagé avec le haoussa les langues apparentées de la région du Tchad et il a lancé le terme de tchado-chamitique. Tout en marquant des points de contacts septentrionaux, avec le berbère semble-t-il, il pose surtout la théorie d’une extension du couchitique vers l’Ouest ...”

¹¹⁵ His ideas on the Berber ethnogenesis were not restricted purely to racial arguments. Cf. Vycichl 1935: 79: “Zur Entstehung der modernen Berbersprachen haben neben dem hamitischen Element noch eine Reihe anderer mitgeholfen ... besonders ... die blonden, hellhäutigen und blauäugigen Cmḥ-w-Libyer ..., die sich von dem rotbraunen und schwarzhaarigen Čḥn-w nicht nur rassisch, sondern auch in ihren Kulturelementen scharf trennen. Die Čḥn-w haben sich in ältester Zeit (prädynastisch) kaum von den Ägyptern unterschieden ...”

¹¹⁶ Her words are not really in accordance with those by other outstanding experts of SH like M. Cohen (1947: 25): “W. Vycichl s’est attaché surtout (sic!) à la question du haoussa et lui aussi a porté surtout son attention sur les rapports avec l’égyptien.” His thesis from 1934 was listed by both I.M. D’jakonov (1965: 112) and V.M. Illič-Svityč (1966: 14) among the basic tools of common SH comparison. Etc.

until much later when in 1966 Carleton T. Hodge took up Vycichl's idea in his 'Hausa-Egyptian establishment' ". Vycichl (1935: 77) also returned to the puzzle of the two linguistic layers of Egyptian.¹¹⁷ His other sharp-sighted observation made here agrees perfectly with the common assumption proposed a few decades later by several authors:¹¹⁸ on the close position of these three branches in the NAA block (Semitic, Egyptian, Berber).¹¹⁹ Listing the "Hamitic" features of Hausa (implosive and glottalized stops, gender, 2nd person personal pronouns, Egyptian and Berber cognates to some anatomical terms), it turned out to be an equally correct intuition when Vycichl (1935: 80) literally immediately joined and approved J. Lukas' epochal exploration about including a number of West Chadic languages in the AA family beside Hausa.¹²⁰ Similarly valid was his assumption on the fossil nominal classes in Arabic¹²¹ which, in his basically right theory, was presumably due to external non-Semitic influence.¹²² Vycichl's (1935: 88-89) moderate vision of the (N)AA prehistory appears also to contain a few pretty realistic moments:¹²³ "core Semitic" developed later closely under a later PIE influence after part of "Semitic" left the Levant.¹²⁴ Vycichl's (1952) study on Punic lexical influence in Berber was commented on by J. Lecerf (1957-60: 71-72). As an élève of the old Viennese school of Reinisch, Vycichl remained faithful to the concept of the "Hamitic" unity (the only

¹¹⁷ Vycichl (1935: 77), on the one hand, isolated "Das Urägyptische ... dem Arabischen nahestehend, doch viel altertümlicher als dieses", whereas, on the other hand, the younger "altwestsemitische" layer seemed to him tightly close to Hebrew, but he found "Hamitic" correlates phonologically to match only the "Urägyptische" layer.

¹¹⁸ Like I.M. D'jakonov (1965: 99-102 in Russian; 1965: 102-105 in English), Ch. Ehret (1979; 2000, 292, §11.4.2 based on 1995), R.M. Blench (2006: 148, fig.4.8 and pp. 152-162) and G. Takács (2015).

¹¹⁹ Vycichl (1935: 77): "Der Wortschatz des Berberischen weist von allen Hamitensprachen die meisten Parallelen zum Ägyptischen und Semitischen auf."

¹²⁰ Vycichl (1935: 80): "Neben dem Hausa wären ferner die besser als 'hamitoid' zu bezeichnenden Sprachen Angas, Bolanci, Ankwe, Montol, und neben anderen auch das kürzlich von Lukas als hamitisch erkannte Logonē zu erwähnen."

¹²¹ Vycichl (1935: 87-88): "Für die Existenz von Nominalklassen (Individualis *-t*, Menschen *-n*, Sachen *-l*, &c.) sprachen bedeutungsähnliche Nomina mit gleichem Auslaut; hier seien nur einige arabische Beispiele der hypothetischen Tierklasse auf *-b* (schon von Möller vermutet) gegeben: *ʿarna-b*, Hase, *ʿandālī-b*, Lerche, *ʿakra-b*, Skorpion, *dab-b*, Eidechse, *dhiʿ-b*, Wolfschackal, *dhibā-b*, Fliege, *dīb-b*, Fisch, *dub-b*, Bär, *kal-b*, Hund, *ḥanṭa-b*, Hedschaz-Ziege, *ḥaufa-b*, Kalb, *ḥinṣā-b*, ein Vogel, *ḥillī-b* (u. Varr.), Wolf, *ḥāʿna-b*, Widder mit rückgebogenen Hörnern, *fauha-b*, Igel, *fakaḥta-b*, Widder mit starken Hörnern, *fuhru-b*, Gezelle, *taula-b*, Eselin, *thaʿla-b*, Fuchs, *ʿuḳā-b*, Adler, *ʿunṣā-b*, Heuschrecke, *ḡurā-b*, Rabe, etc. Bemerkenswert ist *ḡayna-b*, Zwerg, neben *ḡayna* (cf. *ki* im Suaheli bei *ki-jana*, Kind, *ki-poḡu*, Blinder, zum Ausdruck des Kleinen, Verächtlichen, also Zwergtier) und *thaʿla-b* neben *thuʿāla*, Füchsin, hebräisch *ḡūʿāl* ohne *b*". The suffix *-b* was also isolated (independently from one another?) by C. Meinhof (1921-2) and N.V. Jušmanov (1934, re-published in 1998: 170 and 174) along with a few other noun class markers (= "классные показатели").

¹²² Which, as formulated by Vycichl (1935: 80), "durch ein äusseres Moment hervorgerufen worden ist".

¹²³ Even if the details do not overlap with those of A.Ju. Militarev's (1983 etc.) Natufian theory.

¹²⁴ Vycichl (1935: 89): "Ein Teil dieser 'Frühsemiten' wandte sich nach Afrika nach Afrika und prägte den dortigen Sprachen seinen Stempel auf. Die Entwicklung der Idiome auf asiatischem Boden ging dagegen vermoge ihres geschlosseneren Lebensraumes weit komformer vor sich. Viele Errungenschaften nach der Trennung, wie der Trilateralismus und die Laute *ʿAyin* und *Hā* werden daher zu Unrecht als 'ursprünglich' deklariert, während ihnen tatsächlich nur ein sekundärer Charakter zukommt."

issue he used to be blamed for in the post-Greenbergian era ...),¹²⁵ which he considered as valid until the end of his long life and research.¹²⁶ The “Hamitological” ideas left their imprint in his works also, luckily void of extremist racial nuances. Thus, as W.A. Ward (1985: 242 and 244, §V) has also observed and described, Vycichl (1954: 219ff.) recognized that “Hamitic languages, unlike the Semitic, do not show a homogeneous unity”, where he was echoing the old theory of a migration of “waves of Hamitic tribes” invading North Africa and thence into a large part of the African continent through the Eastern Egyptian Delta from Western Asia in the neolithic “at some time prior to the beginning of the Egyptian First Dynasty” and so he assumed that “this Hamito-Semitic stratum must have developed in Western Asia”. For Ward (1985: 244), “the implication is obvious: before this migration there was no Semitic influence in North Africa and it was this migration of tribes speaking Hamitic dialects (‘archaic Semitic’, according to Vycichl) which brought into the area languages which had a strong affinity to Semitic.” The same way Vycichl (1959: 27) echoed, even if with some right reservations, Rössler, who considered Berber as “purely Semitic”,¹²⁷ which Ward (1985: 244) regarded as a sign of what “he therefore ascribes to Hamitic as archaic Semitic character”. Vycichl’s views could hardly be altered by his and others’ fruitful etymological researches in the further decades to come as we can see in his theoretical study on “la cronologia del camitosemitico”, where Vycichl (1987b) briefly and superficially addressed a number of and far-fetching issues around the SH prehistory¹²⁸ reflecting his and others’ original ideas

¹²⁵ In his review on the proceedings of the 1978 London SH Congress (ed. by J. Bynon), A.S. Kaye (1985: 890) did not miss to note how disturbing Vycichl’s old-fashioned terminology is: “The final paper, by W. Vycichl, is inappropriately entitled ‘Hamitic’ and ‘Semitic languages’: all experts agree there is no such thing as Hamitic. V(ycichl) reiterates Diakonoff’s point that the field desperately needs more work in comparative lexicography.” The same case was repeated with Vycichl’s (1987a) paper reviewed among the proceedings of the 1983 Marburg AA congress by A.S. Kaye and P.T. Daniels (1992: 436): see appendix. “W. Vycichl is the only major AA specialist, other than G. Garbini, [footnote omitted] who believes that there exists a special Ham(itic). sub-branch as distinct from the Sem. one. He thinks that PAA split off into PSem. (in Asia) and PHam. (Africa) ... He is in favor, however, of an Asian homeland for PAA ...” His paper “bases the separate identity of Ham. as a unit on shaky grounds as root biconsonantility. In doing so he must ignore the fact that there is much evidence in favor of biconsonantal roots in Sem. (hollow, third radical weak with determinatives), and that determinatives ... are merely a Sem. innovation.”

¹²⁶ Vycichl (1935: 89): “Aus dem Voranstehenden geht hervor, dass die Bezeichnung ‘hamitisch’ im sprachwissenschaftlichen Sinne durcahus gerechtfertigt ist, da sie eine Reihe von Sprachen umfasst, die nach der semitischen Seite historisch und lautlich eindeutig als heterogen definiert ist. Einzig und allein die Gleichung ‘Gemeinsemitisch ist gleich Ursemitisch’ war es, die zur Überschätzung des Semitischen in sprachhistorischer Hinsicht geführt hat. Tatsächlich aber haben die Hamiten, die Träger der hamitischen Sprachschicht, eine Fülle archaischer Erscheinungen nach Afrika hinübergerettet, von denen im Semitischen kaum noch eine Spur zu finden ist.”

¹²⁷ Although, as Vycichl (1959: 27) stressed, Rössler’s “assertion that the Berber languages are Semitic is somewhat bold – I should prefer calling them rather an archaic type of Semitic language – it is nevertheless true that there is no real Hamitic element in North Africa unless we confer on it the meaning of a Semitic language with archaic features”.

¹²⁸ Such as the fragedmented ideas on “La patria delle lingue camitosemitiche” (Vycichl 1987b: 212), “L’uomo di Meshta el-Arbi” (Vycichl 1987b: 213), “I protomediterranei”, “Il cranio di Ain Mlila”, “Il cap-siano”, “Il natufiano” (all in Vycichl 1987b: 214). In the latter small section, he ventured again, some half a century after his first attempt, drawing some outlines on Proto-Semito-Hamitic in the same fashion of the old “Hamitological” hypothesis on “out of the Asia” influenced by IE (as seen above).

from half a century before as hardly changed ...¹²⁹ Vycichl's posthumously published Berber volume (2005) comprised texts from two unpublished manuscripts (deposited in the Oswin Köhler-Archiv of the J.W. Goethe university's African linguistics institute). The first one, a gigantic (mounting to some two and a half thousand pages), albeit incomplete and unfinished, universal introduction into Berber linguistics in general was published with great restrictions. Only those parts were selected for the volume that offered original comparative-historical analyses by the sometime author. Thus, among others, we have here a comprehensive description of Berber historical phonology (pp. 43-81) with some insights into its AA background. The second manuscript outlines a comprehensive grammar of Siwan Berber including some items of Siwi etymology (pp. 192-195).

1.4.11. G. Marcy (1934-7: 74-76), in his talk for the GLECS session of 23 Dec. 1936, critically analysed the supposed interrelationship of the terms for "iron" Semitic (Akk. *parzillu*, Hbr. *barzel*) and Berber **a-zali* (first identified by A. Cuny) isolating a common root * \sqrt{zl} .

1.4.12. A. Basset, the doyen of Berber studies, delivered a lecture at the GLECS session of 19 Dec. 1939 (vol. 3, 1937-40, 91-92) where, having thoroughly surveyed the common Berber term (t)ahyam(t) / (t)ahham(t) "tente, maison", he ended up in an attempt to find SH cognates in Semito-Egyptian. At the GLECS session of 27 Nov. 1946, he outlined a comprehensive set of the common Berber phonology with no outlook on SH.

¹²⁹ Vycichl (1987b: 214): "L'immigrazione dell'uomo protomediterraneo in Africa può dunque collocarsi dal 7500 a.C. in poi. Si dovrà probabilmente tenere conto di varie ondate successive che non corrispondono necessariamente ai quattro gruppi linguistici precitati. Inoltre vediamo abbastanza chiaro per quanto riguarda il semitico, l'egiziano ed il berbero, mentre la situazione è meno chiara per il cuscitico ed il ciadico per cui non disponiamo di date preistoriche sicure. Nel caso del cuscitico si può trattare anche di varie invasioni attraverso il Mar Rosso, come più tardi nel caso delle lingue semitiche come il ghe'ez ..." In Vycichl's (1987b: 215) view expressed in the chapter "Camitico e presemitico", "L'immigrazione dell'uomo protomediterraneo in Africa ... significa ... l'apparizione di un nuovo elemento etnico ... coll'avulsione dei denti, ... e di nuovi elementi linguistici che ritroviamo ancora oggi ... nei diversi gruppi. Chiamiamo questi elementi vamtici o protosemitici perché non appartengono al semitico comune, ma ad un stadio anteriore ... Mancano ...per finire il vocabolario comune del semitico." The following section "I componenti dell'etnia berbera" (Vycichl 1987b: 215) surveyed "Le principali componenti dell'etnia berbera", i.e., "l'uomo di Meshta el-Arbi; ... i Proto-mediterranei, con due varietà ...; ... tipo di Gerba, piccoli, brachicefali; ... i Berberi biondi a occhi azzurri già rappresentati nella tomba del re Sethos I nella Valle dei Re ...; ... elementi negroidi nelle oasi di Sahara, ma meno neri dei Wolof, ed elementi khoisanidi conservati nel tipo di certi Tuareg." Thence he (Vycichl 1987b: 216) deduced the linguistic traits of Berber: "Tutte queste componenti hanno contribuito alla formazione del vocabolario del berbero come lingua del tipo mbugu, [footnote omitted] ma non (o pochissimo) alla formazione del tipo grammaticale del berbero che è puramente protomediterraneo." By the term "Il lamechitico" Vycichl (1987b: 216) meant "Uno stadio più arcaico del protosemitico, ... lingua pra-prasemitica (sic) caratterizzata dall'anteposizione del genitivo come nelle lingue indoeuropee", whence he explained a number of Semitic nominal suffixes. Summing up "Il biliterismo", he dated "la generalizzazione del trilaterismo del semitico" between 7500-3000 BC where "la terza radicale del verbo semitico corrisponde: - a un prefisso verbale italiano ...; - ad un avverbio od una preposizione inglese ... Finora manca uno studio sui valori delle terze radicali in semitico." (Vycichl 1987b: 216-217). This demand was soon fulfilled, at least, in a way, by Ch. Ehret (1989).

Abbreviations

AA: Afro-Asiatic, Akk.: Akkadian, Aram.: Aramaic, Ar.: Arabic, Eg.: Egyptian, GLECS: Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques, Hbr.: Hebrew, IE: Indo-European, NAA: North Afro-Asiatic, SA: South Afro-Asiatic, Sem.: Semitic, SH: Semito-Hamitic, Syr.: Syriac.

References

- d'Abbadie, A. 1845. Lettres [...] à M. Jules Mohl: I. Sur les langues éthiopiennes. II. Sur la langue saho. *Journal Asiatique* 4, série, tome II (43). 102-118. [Quoted after Beke 1845 in Fleming 1976 and Sasse 1981 (who report the latter to have been written on the 12 April 1845 to the Athenaeum, London.)]
- Adelung, J.C. 1806-1816. *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in beynahe fünfhundert Sprachen und Mundarten*. Vol. I-III. Fortges(etzt). u(nd). bearb(eitet). v(on). Johann Severin Vater. Berlin: in der Vossischen Buchhandlung. [Nachdruck 1970: Hildesheim: Olms. The volume II quoted in this paper is from 1912: 3. Theil, 1. Abth. Berlin: Voss.]
- Bargery, G.P. 1934. *A Hausa-English dictionary and English-Hausa vocabulary compiled for the Government of Nigeria*. London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.
- Barton, G.A. 1934. *Semitic and Hamitic origins: Social and religious*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Basset, A. 1937-1940 (session of 19 Dec. 1939). Au sujet de berbère (t)ahyam(t) / (t)ahham(t) «tente, maison». *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 3. 91-92.
- Basset, A. 1945-1948 (session of 27 Nov. 1946). Le système phonologique du berbère. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 3. 33-36.
- Bechhaus-Gerst, M. 1998. Old Egyptian and Afro-Asiatic: The state of the art. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 56. 111-129.
- Beke, C.T. 1845. On the languages and dialects of Abyssinia and the countries to the south. *Proceedings of the Philological Society* 2. 89-107.
- Bender, M.L. 1995. Linguistics 450: Language families; Spring 1995: Afrasian, Tue. 17:30-20:00. Materials for a course at the Southern Illinois University (SIU), Illinois. 8 p.
- Blake, F.R. 1920. Congeneric assimilation as a cause of the development of new roots in Semitic. In *Studies in honor of Maurice Bloomfield by a group of his pupils*, edited by a group of his pupils, 36-48. New Haven and Oxford: Yale University Press.
- Blažek, V. 1999. *Numerals: Comparative-etymological analyses and their implications*. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita v Brně.
- Brockelmann, C. 1932. Gibt es einen hamitischen Sprachstamm? *Anthropos* 27. 797-818.
- Brockelmann, C. 1950. Bespr. von Marcel Cohen, Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 7. 58-61.
- Burrini, G. 1978 and 1979. Profilo storico degli studi camito-semitici. *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario di Napoli* 38. 113-153 and 39. 351-384.
- Cantineau, J. 1948. Review of Cohen, M.: Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 44/2. 173-180.
- Cantineau, J. 1952. Le consonantisme du sémitique. *Semitica* 4. 79-94.
- Cerulli, Enrico. 1931-1934a (session of 24 April 1934). Le bilitérisme en couchitique. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 1. 44-45.
- Cerulli, E. 1931-1934b (session of 20 June 1934). Traitement des labiovélares en couchitique. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 1. 49-50.
- Cerulli, E. 1934-1937a (session of 22 May 1935). La stabilité de la voyelle radicale en couchitique. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 25-28.
- Cerulli, Enrico. 1934-1937b (session of 28 April 1937). Le trilitérisme en couchitique. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 85-87.
- Cerulli, E. 1937-1940 (session of 22 June 1938). La racine monosyllabique (consonne + voyelle seule) en couchitique. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 3. 33-36.

- Cerulli, E. 1948. (Review of:) Marcel Cohen. – Essai compartait sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du Chamito-sémitique. Parigi, 1947, in-8o, 250 p. *Oriente Moderno* 28. 53.
- Cerulli, E. 1951. (Review of:) Marcel Cohen, Essai compartait sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du Chamito-sémitique (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences historiques et philologiques, 291). Paris 1947. H. Champion. In-8o, xi-248 pp. *Orientalia* 20. 505-505.
- Clère, J.-J. 1931-1934 (session of 25 April 1934). (Observation on the paper by E. Cerulli). *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 1. 45.
- Cohen, D. 1971-1972. Sur quelques mots berbères dans un écrit du IX^e-X^e siècle. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 16. 121-127.
- Cohen, D. 1972. Problèmes de linguistique chamito-sémitique. *Revue des Études Islamiques* 40. 43-68.
- Cohen, D. 1991. Berbère et couchitique: Notes comparatives sur des noms de parties du corps. In Kaye, A.S. (ed.), *Semitic studies in honor of Wolf Leslau*, vol. II, 225-233. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Cohen, M. 1924. Langues chamito-sémitiques. In Meillet, A. & Cohen, M. (eds.), *Les langues du monde*, 81-151. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Cohen, M. 1928. Genou, famille, force, dans le domaine chamito-sémitique. In *Mémorial Henri Basset: Nouvelles études nord-africaines et orientales*. Tome premier, edited by L'Institut des Hautes-Études Marocaines, Comité André Basset, 203-210. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Cohen, M. 1931-1934a (session of 3 May 1933). Dénominations du testicule et de l'œuf dans diverses langues chamito-sémitiques et autres. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 1. 25-26.
- Cohen, M. 1931-1934b (session of 20 Dec. 1933). gy?, ge, etc. «vallée, pays». *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 1. 34-35.
- Cohen, M. 1934. Divisions internes du chamito-sémitique. *Hespéris* 19. 186-187.
- Cohen, M. 1934-1935. Consonantisme chamito-sémitique. *Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes Études*, IV^e section: (1934-5). 68-69.
- Cohen, M. 1934-1937a (session of 28 Nov. 1934). La question de la parenté du haoussa (Soudan Central). *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 1-3.
- Cohen, M. 1934-1937b (session of 22 Dec. 1937). Entretien sur la question des labio-vélaires en chamito-sémitique. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 5-8.
- Cohen, M. 1935-1942. Études sur le vocabulaire chamito-sémitique. *Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes Études*, IV^e section: (1935-6). 81-82; (1936-7). 75; (1937-8). 110; (1939-40). 91; (1940-1 and 1941-2). 136.
- Cohen, M. 1939a. *Nouvelles études d'éthiopien méridional* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences historiques et philologiques 275). Paris: Éditions Honoré Champion.
- Cohen, M. 1939b. Comparaisons étymologiques chamito-sémitiques. In Bodelsen, C.A. & Jolivet, A. & Lindroth, H. & Zwirner, E. (eds.), [Résumé des communications préparé pour le] *Ve Congrès international de linguistes, Bruxelles, 28 août – 2 septembre 1939: rapports, résumés, documents, réponses*, 14-15. Bruges: Imprimerie Sainte Catharine.
- Cohen, M. 1947. *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Cohen, M. 1953. Sémitique, égyptien, libyco-berbère, couchitique et méthode comparative. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 10/3-4. 88-90.
- Cohen, M. & Leslau, W. 1937-1940 (session of 27 Jan. 1937). Mots amhariques présentant le traitement k > č. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 3. 11-12.
- Cotteville-Giraudet, R. 1937-1940 (session of 22 June 1938). A propos du nom de la harpe en vieil-égyptien. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 3. 32-33.
- Deny, J. & Cohen, M. 1931-1934 (session 25 Jan. 1933). (Observation on the paper by E. Cerulli). *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 1: 45.
- Destaing, E. 1931-1934 (session 25 Jan. 1933). (Observation on the paper by E. Cerulli). *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 1. 45.
- Destaing, E. 1934-1937 (session of 28 Nov. 1934). Les particules d et n en berbère. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 3-4.
- Diakonoff, I. 1965. *Semitic-Hamitic languages: An essay in classification*. Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, Central Department of Oriental Literature.
- Diakonoff, I. 1988. *Afrasian languages*. Moscow: Nauka.
- D'jakonov, I. Mihajlovič. 1965. *Semitohamitskie jazyki: Opyt klassifikacii*. Moskva: Nauka.

- Dhorme, É. 1934-1937 (session of 22 May 1935). (Observation on the paper by E. Cerulli). *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 27
- Drexel, A. 1924. Der semitische Trikonsonantismus und die afrikanische Sprachforschung. *WZKM* 31. 219-236, 249-277.
- Drexel, A. 1925. Der semitische Trikonsonantismus und die afrikanische Sprachwissenschaft. *WZKM* 32. 1-29.
- Drexel, A. 1928. Kann das Ful als hamitische Sprache gelten? In Koppers, W. (ed.), *Festschrift / Publication d'hommage offerte au P.W. Schmidt. 76 sprachwissenschaftliche, ethnologische, religionswissenschaftliche, prähistorische und andere Studien. / Recueil de 76 études de linguistique, d'ethnologie*, 45-60. Wien: Verlag von der Mechitharisten-Congregations-Buchdruckerei.
- EDE I = Takács, G. 1999. *Etymological dictionary of Egyptian*. Volume One: *A phonological introduction*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- EDE II = Takács, G. 2001. *Etymological dictionary of Egyptian*. Volume Two: *b-, p-, f-*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- EDE III = Takács, G. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Egyptian*. Volume Three: *m-*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Ehret, C. 1979. Omotic and the subgrouping of the Afroasiatic language family. In Hess, R.L. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Ethiopian Studies. Session B. April 13-16, 1978, Chicago, Illinois, USA*, 51-62. Chicago: Office of Publications Services, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.
- Ehret, C. 2000. 11. Language and history. In Heine, B. & Nurse, D. (eds.), *African languages: An introduction*, 272-297. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gelb, I.J. 1951. (Reviews of:) *Recherches sur le vocalisme, le consonantisme et la formation des racines en "nostratique", ancêtre de l'indo-européen et du chamitosémitique*. By (sic) A. Cuny. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1943. Pp. vii + 164. Invitation à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes et des langues chamito-sémitiques. By (sic) A. Cuny. Bordeaux: Éditions Bière, 1946. Pp. 245. Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique. By (sic) Marcel Cohen. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, publiée sous les auspices du Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale. Sciences Historiques et Philologiques. Deux cent quatre-vingt-onzième fascicule. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, Éditeur, 1947. Pp. xi + 248. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 10/1. 60-61.
- GLECS = *Comptes-Rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques* (Paris).
- Gouffé, C. 1969-1970. Compléments et précisions concernant le haoussa dans le cadre de l'Essai comparatif de M. Marcel Cohen. *Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques* 14. 27-43.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1955. *Studies in African linguistic classification*. Branford, Connecticut: Compass Publishing Company.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1958. The labial consonants of Proto-Afro-Asiatic. *Word* 14. 295-302.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1962. On the African affiliation of Hebrew and the Semitic languages. *Jewish Social Studies* 24. 79-85.
- Hartmann, R. 1879. *Die Völker Afrikas*. Leipzig: Verlag von F.A. Brockhaus.
- Hintze, Fritz. 1951. Zur hamitosemitischen Wortvergleihung. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5. 65-87.
- Hodge, C.T. 1966. Hausa-Egyptian establishment. *Anthropological Linguistics* 8/1. 40-57.
- Hodge, C.T. 1970. Afroasiatic: An overview. *Current Trends in Linguistics* 6. 237-254.
- Hodge, C.T. 1971. Afroasiatic: An overview. In Hodge, C.T. (ed.), *Afroasiatic: A survey*, 9-26. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hodge, C.T. 1976. Lisramic (Afroasiatic): An overview. In Bender, M.L. (ed.), *The non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*, 43-65. East Lansing, Michigan: African Studies Center of Michigan State University.
- Hodge, C.T. 1986. Indo-European consonant ablaut. *Diachronica* 3/2. 143-162.
- Homburger, L. 1929. Les langues africaines modernes et l'égyptien ancien. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 23/3. 149-174.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M. 1966. Iz istorii čadskogo konsonantizma: Labial'nye smyčnyje. In Uspenskij, B.A. (ed.), 9-34. *Jazyki Afriki: Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Jungrauthmayr, H. & W.J.G. Möhlig (eds.) (unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Stephan Hollah, Rudolf Leger, Ulrich Kleinewillinghöfer, Gudrun Mische, Roland Werner). 1983. *Lexikon der Afrikanistik – Afrikanische Sprachen und ihre Erforschung*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jušmanov, N. V. 1934. Struktura semitskogo kornja i ejo stadial'nyj analiz. In (unknown editor), *Jazyk i myšlenie*, kniga II, pagination unknown. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Institut Jazyka i Myšlenija.

- Jušmanov, N. V. 1998. *Izbrannye trudy: Raboty po obščej fonetike, semitologii i arabskoj klassičeskoj morfologii*. Edited by Belova, A. G. Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
- Kaye, A.S. 1985. Review of A.R. Bomhard: *Toward Proto-Nostratic: A new approach to the comparison of Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Afroasiatic*; J. Bynon (ed.): *Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics: Papers of the Third International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, both published in Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 1984. John Benjamins. *Language* 61. 887-891.
- Kaye, A.S. 1989. Review of V. Shevoroshkin and T.L. Markey, Eds., *Typology, Relationship and Time. Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 2. 222-226.
- Kaye, A.S. & Daniels, P.T. 1992. Comparative Afroasiatic and general genetic linguistics. *Word* 43/3. 429-458.
- Klingenheben, A. 1927/8. Die Silbenauslautgesetze des Hausa. *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 18. 272-297.
- Klingenheben, A. 1929. Die Tempora Westafrikas und die semitischen Tempora. *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 19. 241-268.
- Knappert, J. 1975-1976. Origin and development of the concept of Hamitic: The first sixty years: 1851-1911. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 6-7 (= Miscellanea in honorem Joseph Vergote). 303-320.
- Köhler, O. 1975. Geschichte und Probleme der Gliederung der Sprachen Afrikas. In Baumann, H. (ed.), *Die Völker Afrikas und ihre traditionellen Kulturen* (Studien zur Kulturkunde 34), 135-373. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.
- Krapf, J.L. 1858. *Reisen in Ostafrika, ausgeführt in den Jahren 1837-55*. Kornthal: Selbstverlag. Nachdruck 1964. Quoted after Satzinger 1999: 367.
- Labouret, H. 1934-1937 (session 28 Nov. 1934). (Observation on the paper by M. Cohen). *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 3.
- Lecerf, J. 1957-1960 (session of 24 June 1959). Les emprunts puniques en berbères. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 8. 71-72.
- Lepsius, R. 1836. Über den Ursprung und die Verwandtschaft der Zahlwörter in der indogermanischen, semitischen und der koptischen Sprache. In Lepsius, R. (ed.), *Zwei Sprachvergleichende Abhandlungen*, 81-150. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Lepsius, R. 1844. *Auszug aus einem Schreiben des Hrn. Lepsius an Hrn. Ehrenberg d. d. Philae 10. Sept. 1844*. [Berlin], s.n. 34 pp.
- Lepsius, R. 1880. *Nubische Grammatik mit einer Einleitung über die Völker und Sprachen Afrika's*. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz.
- Leslau, Wolf. 1934-1937 (session of 26 Feb. 1936). Sur le préfixe n- en soqotri. *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 45-46.
- Leslau, W. 1949. Review of Cohen, M.: *Essai comparatif etc.* *Language* 25. 312-316.
- Lottner, C. 1860-1861. On sisterfamilies (sic) of languages, specially those connected with the Semitic family. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 20-27. 112-132.
- Lukas, J. 1933. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Sprachen von Wadai (Mararet, Maba). *Journal de la Société des Africanistes* tome III, fasc. I. 25-55.
- Lukas, J. 1934. Die Gliederung der Sprachenwelt des Tschadsee-Gebietes in Zentralafrika. *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 10. 356-357.
- Lukas, J. 1936a. *Die Logone-Sprache im Zentralen Sudan* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 21/6). Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in Kommission bei F.A. Brockhaus.
- Lukas, J. 1936b. Über den Einfluß der hellhäutigen Hamiten auf die Sprachen des zentralen Sudan. *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 12. 180-181.
- Lukas, J. 1936c. The linguistic situation in the Lake Chad area in Central Africa. *Africa* 9/3. 332-349.
- Lukas, J. 1936d. Hamitisches Sprachgut im Sudan. *Zeitschrift der Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* 90/3-4. 579-588.
- Lukas, J. 1937. *Zentralsudanische Studien* (Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde von der Han-sischen Universität, Reihe B, Band 45/24). Hamburg: Friedrichsen, de Gruyter & Co.
- Lukas, J. 1937-1938. Der hamitische Gehalt der tschadhamitischen Sprachen. *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 28. 286-299.
- Lukas, J. 1939a. *Die Sprache des Buduma in Zentralen Sudan* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 24/2). Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Lukas, J. 1939b. Die Verbreitung der Hamiten in Afrika. *Scientia* Feb. 108-118.

- Lukas, J.¹³⁰ 1952. Section IX: The Chadic languages. Section X: The Chado-Hamitic languages. In Westermann, D. & Bryan, M. (eds.), *The languages of West Africa*, Part II, 153-161, 162-177, resp. London: Oxford University Press for International African Institute.
- Marcy, G. 1934-1937 (session of 23 Dec. 1936). Au sujet du nom berbère du «fer». *Comptes rendus du GLECS* 2. 74-76.
- Martinet, A. 1953. Remarques sur le consonantisme sémitique. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 49. 67-78.
- Meinhof, C. 1912. *Die Sprachen den Hamiten*. Hamburg: Friedrichsen & Co.
- Meinhof, C. 1916-1917. Sprachstudien im ägyptischen Sudan (vier Teile, u.a. eine Rezension zu Fokken über die Maasai). *Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen* 7. 251-252.
- Meinhof, C. 1920-1921a. Bespr. von Naville, E.: L'évolution de la langue égyptienne et les les langues sémitiques. *Zeitschrift für Eigeborenen-Sprachen* 11. 73-75.
- Meinhof, C. 1920-1921b. Was sind emphatische Laute, und wie sind sie entstanden? *Zeitschrift für Eigeborenen-Sprachen* 11. 81-106.
- Meinhof, C. 1921-1922a. Was können uns die Hamitensprachen für den Bau des semitischen Verbuns lehren? *Zeitschrift für Eigeborenen-Sprachen* 12. 241-275.
- Meinhof, C. 1921-1922b. Aus der Literatur. *Zeitschrift für Eigeborenen-Sprachen* 12. 304-306.
- Meinhof, C. 1930. Das Verhältnis der Buschmannsprache zum Hottentotischen. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 37. 219-229.
- Möller, G. 1921. Aegyptisch-libysches. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 24/9-10. 193-197.
- Möller, G. 1924. Die Ägypter und ihre libyschen Nachbarn. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 78. 36-60.
- Mukarovsky, H.G. 1981. Hamito-Semitisch, Afro-Asiatisch, Erythräisch: Zum Wandel von Begriffen und Verständnis. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 34. 511-526.
- Mukarovsky, H.G. (ed.). 1987. *Leo Reinisch: Werk und Erbe*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Müller, F. 1867. *Reise der österreichischen Fregatte Novara um die Erde in den Jahren 1857, 1858, 1859 unter den Befehlen des Commodore B. von Wüllerstorff-Urbair, Linguistischer Teil*. Wien: aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei in Commission bei Karl Gerold's Sohn. (Pp. 51-70: "Hamitische Sprachen".)
- Müller, F. 1876-1888. *Grundriß der Sprachwissenschaft*, Bde. I-VI. Wien: Hölder.
- Naville, Henri Édouard. 1920. *L'évolution de la langue égyptienne et les langues sémitiques*. Paris: Librairie Geuthner.
- Newman, P. 1980. *The classification of Chadic within Afroasiatic*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden.
- Newman, P. 2004. *Klingenheben's law in Hausa* (Chadic Linguistics: Linguistique Tchadique: Tschadistik 2). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Newman, F.W. 1844. On the structure of the Berber languages. In Prichard, J.C. (ed.), *Researches into the physical history of mankind IV*, 3rd ed., 617-626. London: Sherwood, Gilbert, and Piper. (Appendix 2).
- Ol'derogge, D. A. 1949. Hamitskaja problema v afrikanistike. *Sovetskaja Étnografija* 3. 156-170.
- Petráček, K. 1984. La méthodologie du chamitosémitique comparée: État, problèmes, perspectives. In Bynon, J. (ed.), *Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics*, 423-462. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Petráček, K. 1989. Úvod do hamitosemitské (afroasijské) jazykovědy I-II. Edited by (k vydání připravil) Zemánek, Petr. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Peust, C. 1997. Neue Impulse in der afroasiatischen Sprachwissenschaft: Zum Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary von Vladimir Ėmmanuilovič Orël und Ol'ga Valer'evna Stolbova. *Lingua Aegyptia* 5. 251-276.

¹³⁰ In the Foreword to the *Languages of West Africa* (1952), Westermann thanks Lukas for "most generous assistance, not only in supplying material and advising on arrangement, but also in drafting several sections of the present text"; but in the sections themselves, Lukas is not listed and mentioned as author. Kind p.c. by Prof. em. P. Newman (Bloomington, Indiana University). Still, the chapters are quoted in the reference used in this paper with Lukas' name, presumably just because of these having been regarded as the intellectual product of Lukas.

- Pfeiffer, R.H. 1948. Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique, by Marcel Cohen. Bibliothèque (sic) de l'École des Hautes Études, vol. 291. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1947. Pp. xi+248. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67/2. 186-187.
- Pilszczikowa, N. 1960. Le haoussa et le chamito-sémitique à la lumière de l'Essai comparatif de Marcel Cohen. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 24/1. 97-130.
- Quéménéur, J. 1948. Marcel Cohen, Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1947, 245 pages. *Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes* 11. 219-220.
- Reinisch, L. 1873. *Der einheitliche Ursprung der Sprachen der Alten Welt nachgewiesen durch Vergleichung der afrikanischen, erythräischen und indogermanischen Sprachen mit Zugrundelegung des Teda*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung. Reprint: 1968. Wiesbaden: Dr. Martin Sändig oHG.
- Reinisch, L. 1890. *Das Zahlwort vier und neun in den chamitisch-semitischen Sprachen* (Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe 121/12). Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Reinisch, L. 1909. *Das persönliche Fürwort und die Verbalflexion in den chamito-semitischen Sprachen*. Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Reinisch L. 1911. *Die Sprachliche Stellung Des Nuba*. Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Renan, E. 1855. *Histoire générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques*. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale.
- Rodinson, M. 1950. Le chamito-sémitique à la lumière d'un nouvel ouvrage. *Journal Asiatique* 238. 151-160.
- Rössler, O. 1952. Der semitische Charakter der libyschen Sprache. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50. 121-150.
- Sanders, E.R. 1969. The Hamitic hypothesis; its origin and functions in time perspective. *Journal of African History* 10/4. 521-532.
- Sasse, H.-J. 1981a. Afroasiatisch. In Schadeberg, T. (ed.), *Die Sprachen Afrikas*. Band 2. *Afroasiatisch*, 129-148. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Sasse, H.-J. 1981b. Neue Perspektiven im Afroasiatischen? In Jungrauthmayr, H. & Gudrun M. (eds.), *Berliner Afrikanistische Vorträge: XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Berlin 24.-29. März 1980*, 145-165. (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A, Band 28). Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Satzinger, H. 1999. Afroasiatischer Sprachvergleich. In Grunert, S. & Hafemann, I. (eds.), *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch: Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie*, 367-386. Leiden: Brill.
- Schenkel, W. 1990. *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft* (Orientalistische Einführungen in Gegenstand, Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Einzelgebiete). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Seligman, C.G. 1930. *Races of Africa*. London: Thornton Butterworth Ltd. 1st ed. revised in 1939, 2nd ed.: 1957, 3rd ed.: London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Sethe, K. 1916. *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern und was für andere Völker und Sprachen daraus zu lernen ist*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Takács, G. 1999a. *Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) comparative-historical linguistics in Russia and the former Soviet Union*. München – Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, G. 1999b. Contribution of V.M. Illič-Svityč to Chadic comparative-historical linguistics. *Archív Orientální* 67. 361-378.
- Takács, Gábor. 2002. Publications de Werner Vycichl. In Naït-Zerrad, Kamal (ed.), *Articles de linguistique berbère. Mémorial Werner Vycichl*, 19-41. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Takács, G. 2003a. Igor Mikhailovich Diakonoff (1915-1999). In Bender, M.L. & Appleyard, D. & Takács, G. (eds.), *Selected comparative-historical Afrasian linguistic studies in memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*, v-vii. (Lincom Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 14). München & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, G. 2003b. Selected linguistic bibliography of I.M. Diakonoff. In Bender, M.L. & Appleyard, D. & Takács, G. (eds.), *Selected comparative-historical Afrasian Linguistic studies in memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*, ix-xii. (Lincom Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 14). München & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, G. 2004. Werner Vycichl (1909-1999). In Takács, G. (ed.), *Egyptian and Semitic-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) studies in memoriam Werner Vycichl*, ix-xi. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Takács, G. 2005. Aaron Ember and the establishment of Egypto-Semitic phonological and lexical comparison. Part I. *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 6/2. 78-101.
- Takács, G. 2006a. Seventy years after the first attempt at Egyptian Etymological Dictionary: Evaluation of F. von Calice's 'Grundlagen der ägypto-semitischen Wortvergleichung'. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 48. 139-163.
- Takács, G. 2006b. Aaron Ember and the establishment of Egypto-Semitic phonological and lexical comparison. Part II. *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 7/1-2. 145-187.
- Takács, G. 2006c. Werner Vycichl and his contribution to Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) comparative phonology and lexicon. In Morel, Mary-Annick & Danon-Boileau, Laurent & Lonnet, Antoine & Mettouchi,

- Amina (eds.), *Faits de Langues. Revue de linguistique n° 27. Les langues chamito-sémitiques (afro-asiatiques)*, vol. 2, 154-171. Paris: Ophrys.
- Takács, G. 2006d. Otto Rössler's new system of Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences. Part One. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 59/2. 90-127.
- Takács, G. 2007. Otto Rössler's new system of Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences. Part Two. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 60/1. 5-43.
- Takács, G. 2009a. Aharon B. Dolgopolsky: The scholar and man. In Shevoroshkin, Vitaly V. & Sverdrup, H.U. (eds.), *Bygone voices reconstructed: On the language origins and their relationships. In honor of Aron Dolgopolski*, 9-10. Copenhagen: Privatforlaget: Underskov Publishers ApS.
- Takács, G. 2009b. Three decades of Chadic comparative-historical linguistics in the USSR and Russia (1966-1996). In Shevoroshkin, V.V. & Sverdrup, H.U. (eds.), *Bygone voices reconstructed: On the language origins and their relationships. In honor of Aron Dolgopolski*, 211-220. Copenhagen: Privatforlaget: Underskov Publishers ApS.
- Takács, G. 2012. Aharon Dolgopolsky: The Semito-Hamitic scholar and man. *Mother Tongue* 17. 19-23.
- Trombetti, A. 1902. Delle relazioni delle lingue caucasiche con le lingue camitosemitiche e con altri gruppi linguistici: Lettera al professore H. Schuhardt. *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 15. 177-201.
- Trombetti, A. 1923. *Le origini della lingua basca* (Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna, classe di scienze morali, serie II, tomi 8-9, 1923-5). Bologna: Arnoldo Forni Editore.
- Tsereteli, G.W. 1970. Zur Frage der Beziehungen zwischen den semitischen und hamitischen Sprachen. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 16. 271-280.
- Tucker, Archibald N. 1975. What's in a name? In Bynon, James & Bynon, Theodora (eds.), *Hamito-Semitic*, 471-476. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vernus, P. 2000. Situation de l'égyptien dans les langues du monde. In Fauvelle-Aymar, F.-X. & Chrétien, J.-P. & Perrot, Claude-Hélène (eds.), *Afrocentrismes: L'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique*, 169-208. Paris: Éditions Karthala.
- Voigt, Rainer Maria. 1988. Zur Geschichte der vergleichenden Semito-Hamitistik – August Klingenberg und sein Beitrag zur semito-Hamitischen Sprachwissenschaft. In Brauner, Siegmund & Wolff, Ekkehard (eds.), *Progressive traditions in African and Oriental Studies*, 155-164. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Voigt, R.M. 1999. On Semito-Hamitic comparison. In Renfrew, Sir Colin & Nettle, D. (eds.), *Nostratic: Examining a linguistic macrofamily*, 315-325. Cambridge: The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Voigt, R.M. 2001. Semito-Hamitische Philologie und vergleichende Grammatik: Geschichte der vergleichenden Semito-Hamitistik. In Auroux, S. & Koerner, E.F.K. & Niederehe, H.-J. & Versteegh, K. (eds.), *History of the language sciences. Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Histoire des sciences du langage. An international handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours*. Volume 2/2. Teilband/ Tome 2, 1318-1325. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Voigt, R.M. 2002. The Hamitic connection: Semitic and Semito-Hamitic. *Israel Oriental Studies* 20. 265-290.
- Vycichl, W. 1934. Hausa und Ägyptisch: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Hamitistik. *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 37. 36-116.
- Vycichl, W. 1935. Was sind Hamitensprachen? *Africa* 8. 76-89.
- Vycichl, W. 1952. Punischer Spracheinfluss im Berberischen. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 11. 198-204.
- Vycichl, W. 1954. Notes sur la préhistoire de la langue égyptienne. *Orientalia NS* 23. 217-222.
- Vycichl, W. 1959. Is Egyptian a Semitic language? *Kush* 7. 27-44.
- Vycichl, W. 1978. L'état actuel des études chamito-sémitiques. In Fronzaroli, P. (ed.), *Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semitaica, Firenze, 16-19 aprile 1974*, 63-76. Firenze: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- Vycichl, W. 1987a. The origin of the Hamito-Semitic languages. In Jungraithmayr, Herrmann & Müller, W.W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20-22 September 1983*, 109-121. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Vycichl, W. 1987b. La cronologia del camitosemitico. In Bernini, G. & Brugnatelli, V. (eds.), *Atti della 4a giornata di studi camito-semitici e indoeuropei. Bergamo, Istituto Universitario, 29 novembre 1985*, 211-218. Milano: Edizioni Unicopli.

- Vycichl, W. 2005. *Berberstudien & A sketch of Siwi Berber (Egypt)*. Hrsg. von/Ed. by Ibrizimow, D. & Kossmann, M. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Ward, W.A. 1985. Reflections on methodology in Egypto-Semitic lexicography. In Tubb, J.N. (ed.), *Palestine and the Bronze and Iron Ages: Papers in honour of Olga Tufnell*, 232-248. London: Institute of Archaeology.
- Westermann, D. 1934. Some notes on the Hausa people and their language. In Bargery, G.P., *A Hausa-English dictionary and English-Hausa vocabulary compiled for the Government of Nigeria*, ix-xix. London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.
- Westermann, D. & Bryan, M. (eds.). 1952. *The languages of West Africa*, Part II. London: Oxford University Press for International African Institute.
- Zaborski, A. 1983. Basic numerals in Cushitic. In Jungrathmayr, H. & Müller, W.W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20-22 September 1983*, 317-347. Amsterdam – Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Zaborski, A. 1998. La linguistique chamito-sémitique cinquante années après l'Essai comparatif de Marcel Cohen. In El Medlaoui, M. & Gafaiti, S. & Saa, F. (eds.), *Actes du 1^{er} congrès Chamito-Sémitique de Fès, 112-13 mars 1997*, 23-35. Fès: Université Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines.
- Zyhlarz, E. 1931. Die ägyptisch-hamitische Dekade. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 67. 133-139.
- Zyhlarz, E. 1932. Zur angeblichen Verwandtschaft des Baskischen mit afrikanischen Sprachen. *Prähistorische Zeitschrift* 23. 69-77.
- Zyhlarz, E. 1932-1933. Ursprung und Sprachcharakter des Altägyptischen. *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 23. 25-45, 81-110, 161-194, 241-254.
- Zyhlarz, E. 1934. Konkordanz ägyptischer und libyscher Verbalstammtypen. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 70. 107-122.
- Zyhlarz, E. 1934-1935. Die Sprachreste der unteräthiopischen Nachbarn Altägyptens. *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 25. 161-188, 241-261.
- Zyhlarz, E. 1936. Das geschichtliche Fundament der hamitischen Sprachen. *Africa* 9. 433-451.