Annotated Swadesh wordlists for the !Wi group (Peripheral Khoisan family).

Languages included: Xam [kwi-xam]; Ng!ke [kwi-Ing]; Khomani [kwi-kho]; N|uu [kwi-nuu]; Xegwi [kwi-xeg]; Auni [kwi-aun]; Haasi [kwi-haa].

Reconstruction: Preliminary version available.

DATA SOURCES

I. General

Bleek 1929 = Bleek, Dorothea F. Comparative Vocabularies of Bushman Languages. Cambridge University Press. // A collection of mid-size vocabularies from 12 “Bushman” dialects (several North, South, and Central Khoisan idioms are represented), with most of the data collected by D. Bleek herself. Not as thorough as Bleek 1956, and even less reliable in regards to data transcription, but the English-Bushman data organization principle makes it a useful source to consult in the preparation of Swadesh wordlists.

Bleek 1956 = Bleek, Dorothea F. A Bushman Dictionary. American Oriental Society: New Haven, Connecticut. // A huge (almost 700 pages) collection of comparative data on Khoisan that includes both Dorothea F. Bleek’s own collection and data from numerous other researchers published up until the 1930s (W. Bleek, L. Lloyd, etc.). Transcription quality varies in between all the different sources, but is generally unreliable, quite typical of all Khoisan data published before the second half of the XXth century. Nevertheless, the edition still contains a wealth of priceless data, particularly on extinct North and South Khoisan languages.

II. ||Ng!ke


III.ǂKhomani


Doke 1936 = Clement M. Doke. An outline of ŋKhomani Bushman phonetics. In: Bantu studies (Johannesburg), 10, pp. 433-461. // Description of the phonetic and phonological system of the ŋKhomani dialect, accompanied by a significant amount of illustrative lexical material, but without a separate vocabulary.

IV. Nǀuu

Sands et al. 2006 = Sands, Bonny; Miller, Amanda; Brugman, Johanna; Namaseb, Levi; Collins, Chris; Exter, Mats. 1400 item Nǀuu Dictionary. // Unpublished manuscript. All data have been provided courtesy of Bonny Sands.

Sands et al. 2007 = Sands, Bonny; Miller, Amanda; Brugman, Johanna. The Lexicon in Language Attrition: The Case of Nǀuu. // Brief paper discussing possible relations between peculiarities of the lexical inventory of Nǀuu and its current sociolinguistic status. Includes a little bit of illustrative data.

Miller et al. 2009 = Miller, Amanda; Brugman, Johanna; Sands, Bonny; Namaseb, Levi;


V. ||Xegwi


VI. |Auni

Very brief notes on ǀAuni grammar and a mini-selection of texts, accompanied by a vocabulary of several hundred lexical items. Based on D. Bleek’s own research with ǀAuni speakers in 1936, significantly superior to the results of her earlier work in 1911, published in [Bleek 1929].

VII. |Haasi


NOTES

1. General.

I. |Xam

The main entry, in the absolute majority of cases, represents Lucy Lloyd's transcription variant(s) of the |Xam word, extracted from [Bleek 1956]; transcriptional variants from Wilhelm Bleek's earlier records as well as their equivalents in [Bleek 1929] (this source usually follows W. Bleek rather than L. Lloyd) are added in the notes section. Everything has been properly transliterated into UTS, although a few diacritics (such as the diaeresis and the non-phonological vowel shortness markers) have been dropped. Morphemic boundaries have been added only where they are clearly required by Khoisan phonotactics (e. g. before all syllables that begin with a stop consonant).

II. ||Ng!ke

All data are from D. Bleek’s fieldwork, recorded in [Bleek 1929, 1956, 2000]. There are clearly several subdialects involved (as evidenced by significant variation in transcribed variants, including the occasionally emerging phenomenon of "click dropping"), but no significant lexicostatistical variation is observed.
III-IV. ḦKhomani and Nǀuu

This is ostensibly the exact same dialect, the recordings of which, however, are set 60-70 years apart. "ハウス" is the old name as recorded in the descriptions of L. Maingard and C. Doke, and Nǀuu is the name applied to the language as spoken by the few re-discovered speakers in the late 1990s / early 2000s, and described by N. Crawhall, B. Sands, A. Miller and others.

V. ||Xegwi

Notes on the extinct ||Xegwi were first taken by D. F. Bleek (who calls the language "Batwa") in the 1910s; and later still, by D. Ziervogel, and L. Lanham & D. P. Hallowes in the 1950s. The most detailed, although perhaps not the most phonetically reliable, description belongs to Ziervogel, whose lexical data are taken as the default source. Lanham & Hallowes’ description contains fewer lexical entries, but seems to be more accurate transcriptionally. A few empty slots have been filled out by data from D. Bleek’s records, which have to be taken cautiously due to occasional misglossings and poor transcriptional quality (in particular, a failure to perceive both the presence of uvular q and lateral affricates as autonomous phonological units).

VI. |'Auni

All the data on the extinct |'Auni come from D. F. Bleek’s research, undertaken first in 1911 (results published in [Bleek 1929]), and then during an ethnographic expedition in 1936 (published as [Bleek 1937] and later included in [Bleek 1956]). Data from 1936, accompanied by textual evidence, are much more abundant and precise than data from 1911, although still not free of phonetic and semantic mistakes typical of most of the early research on Khoisan languages.

VII. |Haasi

The only data on the extinct |Haasi come from Robert Story [Story 1999]; they are sufficient to fill in approximately 70% of the Swadesh wordlist, but raise numerous questions as to the exactness of both phonetic notation and semantic precision.
Nevertheless, as a language that is closely related to, but still distinct from |'Auni, this is a very important link whose inclusion in the overall lexicostatistics is quite useful.

NB: It should be kept in mind that, although most of the extinct !Kwi languages are still represented in the Ethnologue system, the current nomenclature is quite misleading in the case of |'Auni and |Haasi: both are listed in the system as "dialects" of !Xóó [nmn], but !Xóó actually belongs to a different branch of South Khoisan (Taa), and neither |'Auni nor |Haasi could ever be seriously considered as its "dialects". Hopefully, this error will be corrected in future editions.

2. Transcription.

Most of the transliterations concern old sources, collected in [Bleek 1956]; the major exception is data on Nǀuu, which has been transliterated from the orthographic conventions employed in [Miller et al. 2009] and other similar sources, with minor orthographic changes. These new sources also sometimes employ a more detailed phonetic transcription; in those cases when words in phonetic transcription are significantly different from words written in phonology-based orthography, their phonetic transcription is quoted in square brackets in the notes section. The following transliteration table may be useful for those who are unfamiliar with the tricky aspects of Khoisan phonology and phonetics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound or sound type</th>
<th>Bleek/Lloyd transcription</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription for Nǀuu</th>
<th>UTS representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clicks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied &quot;simple&quot; click</td>
<td>k, ŋk...</td>
<td>j, ŋ...</td>
<td>ŋ, ŋ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced click</td>
<td>g, ŋg...</td>
<td>ŋ, ŋg...</td>
<td>ŋ, ŋg...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasalized click</td>
<td>n, ŋn...</td>
<td>ŋn, ŋŋ...</td>
<td>ŋn, ŋŋ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirated click</td>
<td>kh, ŋkh...</td>
<td>h, ŋh...</td>
<td>ŋh, ŋŋh...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glottalized click</td>
<td>l, ŋl...</td>
<td>ŋl, ŋʎ...</td>
<td>ŋl, ŋʎ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Delayed aspiration&quot; click</td>
<td>h, ŋh...</td>
<td>ŋh, ŋŋh...</td>
<td>ŋh, ŋŋh...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple uvular release</td>
<td>not distinguished from k, ŋk...</td>
<td>q, ŋq...</td>
<td>ŋq, ŋq...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sound or sound type & Bleek/Lloyd transcription & Phonetic transcription for N|uu & UTS representation
---|---|---|---
Aspirated uvular release & *not distinguished from [kh, ḳh]* & |qʰ, ǂqʰ... | |qʰ, ǂqʰ... |
Velar/uvular fricative release & [x, ǂx...] & [χ, ǂχ...] & [x, ǂx...]
Velar/uvular affricate release & [kʰ, ǂkʰ...] & [χ', ǂχ'...] & [x', ǂx'...]

**Non-clicks:**

Voiceless palatal stop or affricate & ky ~ ty & c & ɕ
Voiced palatal stop or affricate & gy ~ dy & j & ʒ
Voiceless alveolar affricate & ts & ts & c
Velar or uvular fricative & x & x & x
Vowels:

e ~ ɛ & e ~ ɛ & e (~ ɛ)
o ~ ɔ & o ~ ɔ & o (~ ɔ)
a & a ~ ə & a (~ ə)
Nasalized vowels & ā, ē, ō... & aⁿ, eⁿ, oⁿ... & ā, ē, ō...
Pharyngealized vowels & aꜣ, eꜣ, oꜣ... & aˤ, eˤ, oˤ... & a, e, o...

Additional notes:

1. Glottalized release is in some Khoisan dialects accompanied with voiceless nasalization. Since glottalization is always recognized as the primary feature of these phonemes, and there do not seem to be any contrasts between pre-nasalized glottalized / non-nasalized glottalized clicks, nasalization is omitted from UTS transliteration. *Special note:* In [Bleek 1937], glottalized release in 'Auni words is sometimes marked in the usual way (i.e. the click symbol with no accompanying symbols), and sometimes with an explicit glottal stop (e.g. //a 'to go', but //a 'to dig'). It is not entirely clear what is meant by this, since such a contrast is unprecedented as far as phonetically well-described Khoisan languages are concerned. It may be that the explicit transcription of the glottal stop signifies additional glottalic articulation on the vowel (i.e. //a is really //aʔa, etc.).

2. This click is alternately described as combining ejective (glottalized) articulation...
with ensuing aspiration (e. g. by C. Doke for ḥKhomani) or as a "voiceless nasal aspirated" click (e. g. by A. Miller et al. for Nǀuu). Despite variation in actual pronunciation, from a phonological standpoint this is always the same phoneme.

(3) "Uvular" clicks are now being reinterpreted as a special type of "linguo-pulmonic" consonants, whose main distinction from "simple" "lingual" clicks is a difference in airstream mechanism (see [Miller et al. 2009] for a detailed explanation), since in reality all clicks have posterior uvular, rather than velar, constrictures. Despite this, the uvular q is still retained as a special transcription marker for "linguo-pulmonic" sounds, and a correlation between this and similar click releases and simple uvular consonants is not out of the question.

(4) This release, in all of the old sources, is consistently marked and described as "velar fricative", but newer recordings and descriptions indicate that its phonetic quality is usually (perhaps even always) uvular. Despite this, we retain the old notation with x rather than χ since uvular and velar fricatives are never known to contrast phonologically in Khoisan languages (at least, attested ones).

(5) This release correlates with the non-click phoneme that is usually described as a velar or uvular glottalic affricate. We retain one of the traditional notations for this affricate (x’ is preferred over the widespread notation kx for technical reasons of automated analysis purposes), although for Nǀuu at least, and probably for most other Khoisan languages, this is not phonetically exact.

(6) In transliterating the old sources, we are sometimes forced to re-transcribe ky ~ ki, ty ~ ti as k̯, t̯, in order to preserve the "contrast" between these two types of palatal articulation, even though in reality they must have been in free variation with each other (reflecting slightly different variants of the same palatal stop).

(7) In transliterating vowels, we follow these conventions: such pairs as e/e, o/o are retained for old sources which do not specifically indicate that these pairs are allophonic (although they might be and probably are), but unified (as e, o) for new sources which explicitly treat the pairs as allophones and only make the distinction in phonetic transcription.
3. Reconstruction.

The task of reconstructing Proto-!Wi is exceedingly hard and "ungrateful". The only !Wi language to have persisted into the 21st century and to have been recorded according to more or less "modern" standards of accuracy is Nǀuu, and even then it is not yet clear to which extent the speakers were influenced by Khoe languages. All the other languages suffer from all possible sorts of problems: primarily, phonetic inaccuracy (e.g. only Lanham & Hallowes' data on ||Xegwi recognizes the presence of uvular clicks and consonants in this language), but also semantic errors and data incompleteness (the latter particularly important in the case of !Haasi). Consequently, all historical-comparative research on !Wi has to be taken *cum grano salis*, at least until a complete and well-organized digital data collection has been made presentable.

Nevertheless, in many cases it is still possible to make relatively adequate choices, based on the following criteria: (a) visibly recurrent phonetic correspondences between the various languages (including those that may in fact represent notational errors, but are still recurrent enough to confirm the non-accidental nature of the comparisons); (b) distribution of phonetically corresponding or at least phonetically similar (identical) potential cognates between languages (including also scattered bits of information on other !Wi languages, data on which are too scarce to include them in our lexicostatistics, but quite useful for reconstruction purposes; these languages are ||Kuǁe, ||Kxau, !Gã!ne, and Seroa). Additionally, it is permissible to rely on external information (most importantly, data from the only well-described language in the Taa group - !Xóõ) to confirm or disprove certain hypotheses concerning optimal candidates for the Swadesh proto-wordlist: since !Wi-Taa relationship is well confirmed by regular lexicostatistics between living languages, their data may be "exchanged" to corroborate judgements about proto-wordlists as well.

A detailed table of phonetic correspondences is not given here, since in many cases the regularity of these correspondences remains questionable, reflexion splits remain unclear, and in even more cases it is not even perfectly understood whether the "correspondences" reflect actual phonetic discrepancies or transcriptional inaccuracies. Instead, whenever the correspondences are "non-trivial" (especially if this involves
correspondences between different types of clicks or between clicks and non-clicks), detailed comments are given in the "Reconstruction shape" section of the notes (sometimes with references to other examples that support the correspondence).

It should be noted that, contra T. Güldemann’s recent re-classification, we do not find the evidence in support of a "Taa + Lower Nǂossob" genetic grouping more overwhelming than evidence in support of a "|Xam-N|uu-ǁXegwi + Lower Nǂossob" grouping. In the lexicostatistical sphere, the isoglosses which tie together Taa and Lower Nǂossob languages may all be regarded as shared archaism rather than innovations (this is also somewhat confirmed by external comparison with the distantly related Ju languages). In the currently employed classification, "!Wi" is divided into "Narrow !Wi" (all varieties of |Xam, N|uu, and the slightly more distant ǁXegwi, as well as several other extinct and poorly described languages in D. Bleek’s dictionary, see above) and "Lower Nǂossob" (‘Auni + |Haasi).

Unfortunately, this binary split is very uneven in terms of available data, since the entire Lower Nǂossob branch is only represented by inaccurate, incomplete, and unverifiable (due to the languages’ extinction) old sources. This almost inevitably skews the "Proto-!Wi" reconstruction in favor of "Narrow !Wi" (with a particularly strong bias in favor of the best preserved and described !Wi language - Modern N|uu), and makes the reconstructed protowordlist largely unfit to help us in establishing the lexical replacement rates for various !Wi languages. It should, therefore, be regarded of more importance for the purposes of external comparison (with Proto-Taa) than for comparison with its alleged modern descendants.

Database compiled and annotated by: G. Starostin (latest version: August 2015). The compiler also expresses sincere gratitude to B. Sands for providing unpublished data on N|uu.
1. ALL

[Xam ku: (1), ||Ng!ke kwa: (1), Khomani huni-ğe (2), N|u|u huni-ki (2), ||Xegwi ʰi ~ ʰi # (3), ’Auni bà # (4), Proto-!Wi *ku # (1).

References and notes:

||Ng!ke: Bleek 1929: 15. Not found in [Bleek 1956] (possibly through accidental omission, since an unattributed form kwa 'all' is found in the English index).
¶Khomani: Maingard 1937: 240. The suffix -ğe is a frequent component of nominal and adjectival stems, although its function is not entirely clear.
N|u|u: Sands et al. 2006.
||Xegwi: Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 102, 110. Although the existence of a separate lexeme ʰi is mentioned, the quoted examples only include such pronominal forms as ʰi 'we all', ʰi 'you all' (i = "we", u = "you (pl.)"). The entry is, therefore, somewhat dubious. Not attested in [Ziervogel 1955] or any of D. Bleek's publications.
¶’Auni: Bleek 1937: 201. Suspiciously glossed as 'they, all' in [Bleek 1956: 13], but with at least one fitting textual example: tuka bà su !'ubuntu "men shall all return". The only possible competition is represented by ñani, one of the meanings of which is also glossed as 'all': cf. ku toto ñani "all the people" [Bleek 1956: 557]. However, both the external evidence and one of the other contexts (ñani e ñcí ki ʒo 'much it is raining in the night') show that the main semantics of this quasi-synonym is a designation of simply large quantities ('much, many') rather than exhaustive quantities. We tentatively fill the spot in with the most uncontroversial variant, even if it has no obvious cognates in the rest of South Khoisan and, with its initial labial, suspiciously looks like a word of non-native origin.
|Haasi: Not attested.
|Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in [Xam and the N|u|u cluster. The same morpheme was also in obvious use in the same meaning in Seroa, as the enclitic -ka 'all' [Wuras 1920: 84]. Replacements: There are no reliable etymologies for N|u|u huni-ki, [Xegwi ʰi or ’Auni bà. Precedence of *ku is hypothetically suggested only on the basis of the morpheme's relatively wide distribution; external considerations (a similar morpheme means 'all' in the Taa branch of South Khoisan); and the overall dubious nature of bà in ’Auni.
Phonetic shape: The root is known as ku (in [Xam and Seroa) and ku-a (in a somewhat dubious attestation in ||Ng!ke); the latter could simply represent a suffixal extension.

2. ASHES

[Xam lũi ~ lũi (1), ¶Khomani !wi (1), N|u|u !qui (1), ’Auni !ʰana (2), Proto-!Wi *!qui # (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 449. Quoted as lu in [Bleek 1929: 17]. Emphatic form: lũi-tan ~ lu=lũi-tan (with partial reduplication). Transcribed as lu by W. Bleek, but semantically glossed as 'meal, flour' [Bleek 1956: 449]. On the synchronic level the word is undistinguishable from the verb lu to burn (intr.); to smart, pain' [ibid.] and may be deemed a result of conversion; however, in the light of (a) typological unusualness of the situation (the meaning 'ashes' is more likely to develop from the transitive verb), (b) the additional meaning 'meal, flour' in W. Bleek's notation, (c) external parallels, all of which only confirm the nominal meaning ashes, it is quite probable that we are dealing here with graphic confusion of two phonetically similar, but etymologically different roots.
||Ng!ke: Not attested.
||Xegwi: Not attested.
|Haasi: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Found only in the |Xam-N|uu cluster. The rest of the data are either non-existent or not very reliable. Replacements: The only other attested !Wi form for 'ashes' is |Auni | ’ana, whose closest relative, if it is a relative, may be the form ǁq|‘na 'dirt, rubbish' in !Xoö; this would imply a semantic development ['dirt' > 'ashes']. However, nothing about this form or its external connections is really reliable. Phonetic shape: The modern N|uu form with the uvular click efflux is automatically projected onto the proto-level, since none of the old sources recognize the presence of uvular clicks in !Wi languages.

3. BARK
||Ng!ke Ɂv: (1), ǂKhomani ǁx’ũː (-1), N|uu ǁx’ũː-si (-1), |’Auni ǁõː (2).

References and notes:
|Xam: Not attested.
||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 383; Bleek 1929: 19. Somewhat dubious, since the word is not backed by any textual examples.
ǂKhomani: Doke 1936: 77. Not attested in Maingard’s data. The word has no parallels in the rest of !Kwi and is most likely a relatively recent borrowing from Central Khoisan (the root *ǁx’ũ ‘bark’ is safely reconstructible there).
N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. See notes on ǂKhomani.
ǁXegwi: Not attested.
|’Auni: Bleek 1937: 216; Bleek 1956: 582. Quoted as ǁõ in [Bleek 1929: 19].
|Haasi: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Not reconstructible due to lack of proper attestation. The only dialect cluster where the word ‘bark’ was consistently recorded is N|uu-ǂKhomani, and it seems to be just a recent borrowing from Central Khoisan. Regardless of whether |Auni ǁõ is also a (poorly transcribed?) borrowing or a native word, it is not sufficient to come up with a proper reconstruction.

4. BELLY
|Xam !áu-tu (1), ||Ng!ke ǁx’ãː (2), N|uu ǁx’ãː (2), |’Auni ǁai (3).

References and notes:
|Xam: Bleek 1956: 416. Quoted as /aːtu/ in [Bleek 1929: 21]. Attested only in W. Bleek’s notes (absent from L. Lloyd’s materials); meaning glossed as ‘belly, stomach’. The word is morphologically complex; the suffix -tu frequently appears in body part terms as well as other nouns.
||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 602. Highly dubious, since the meaning is glossed as ‘stomach, inside’. However, the only confirming textual example is ǁt’à ci “my stomach aches”, with a non-diagnostic context, and modern data from the closely related N|uu dialects does show the polysemy ‘belly / stomach’ for this word. No other candidates are attested for ||Ng!ke.
ǂKhomani: Not attested.
N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Dubious (acc. to B. Sands, the meaning should rather be ‘stomach’, whereas ‘belly’ is rather kunĩ, but this information probably needs additional confirmation; cf. a similarly questionable situation for Bleek’s ||Ng!ke).
ǁXegwi: Not attested; cf., however, /uːɡe/, pl. /uːɡe- ‘stomach’ [Ziervogel 1955: 43]. This is quite possibly the same word as ǁuũ ‘stomach’, quoted in [Bleek 1956: 323]; the discrepancy in the intervocalic consonant is disturbing, but in either case, the structure of the word is not typical for ǁXegwi or the South Khoisan family as a whole, indicating that this may be a loan from some unidentified source.
|Haasi: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Not reconstructible: each dialect cluster, in which the word ‘belly’ is attested, displays a different root. It is interesting that at least several languages seem to lexically distinguish between ‘belly’ and ‘stomach’, e. g. |Xam has !áu-tu ‘for belly’ and ǁõ [Bleek 1956: 317] for ‘stomach’ (at least, such a distinction is a valid hypothesis based on inspection of textual examples). The word
for 'stomach' is actually better reconstructible for Proto-Wi than 'belly' (since [Xam]̩ka is the etymological equivalent of [Xegwi ɛ̃g]).

5. BIG

[Xam] ǀ'ui-ya (1), [Ng!ke] ǀx: # (2), N[uu] ǀxɔ (3), [Xegwi] ǀxɛy a ~ ǀxɛy a (4), [Auni] ǀus ~ ǀu:si ~ ǀu:si (5), [Haasi] ǀ5-si (5) / ǀxw a: (3), Proto-!Wi ǀ*ǃxo # (3) / ǀ*u-si ~ ǀ*o-si # (5).

References and notes:

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 450. Quoted as ǀ'ui-ya, pl. ǀuicu-ta in [Bleek 1929: 22], Transcribed by W. Bleek as ǀtëciya and glossed as 'big, stout' in [Bleek 1956: 450]. The forms are morphologically complex and easily derivable from the verbal stem ǀ'ui 'to grow' [Bleek 1956: 449]. Secondary synonym: ǀtëri ~ ǀtëri-tom, pl. ǀtel-tëtten [Bleek 1956: 422] 'old / big / grown-up / great'. Attested contexts are insufficient to determine the exact semantic difference between the two words, but only the first one is given as the translation equivalent of English 'big' in [Bleek 1929], and most contexts for ǀtëri seem to confirm the semantics of 'grown-up / old' better than simply 'big' (in size).

[Ng!ke]: Bleek 1929: 22. For some reason, the word is not attested at all in [Bleek 1956], making the corresponding entry in the early source [Bleek 1929] somewhat dubious.

[Khomani]: Not attested.

[N[uu]]: Sands et al. 2006.

[Xegwi]: Ziemevogel 1955: 41, 55. Meaning glossed as 'large' or 'big'. Quoted as ǀxɛc ~ ǀxɛ-xo 'be big' in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 105]. In [Bleek 1929: 22] the meaning 'big' is rendered as ǀx and “confirmed” by the textual example in [Bleek 1956: 267]: ǀa kwe la ǀx ‘that man is big’. However, this is most likely an incorrect glossing: data from other sources clearly show that ǀx really means 'long / tall' q.v.

[ǀAuni]: Bleek 1937: 208; Bleek 1956: 249. This is the most statistically frequent word for which the meaning 'big' may be suggested unambiguously, cf.: ǀkọsi te ǀuí "the jackal is big", ǀfe ki e, se ǀũ u ǀus "that person's hut is big" [Bleek 1956: 249]. Two other words are also glossed as meaning 'big': (a) ǀfási 'big, long, tall' [Bleek 1937: 208], which, as in the case with [Xegwi], refers only to 'big' as 'tall, elongated' (cf. ǀe tari ǀfási 'that person is big' = 'that person is tall'), see 'long'; (b) ǀkí 'big' [Bleek 1937: 203], which is phonetically similar to ǀkí 'to grow, to swell' [ibid.] and could mean 'grown (up)', cf. the example: ǀfá ki, a ki skí ǀũn ǀkí 'the girl is big, sits on the hut floor' [Bleek 1956: 86]. It also looks suspiciously similar to Proto-Central Khoisan ǀkíi 'big' and could be a borrowing from that family.

[ǀHaasi]: Story 1999: 21. Story 1999: 21. Semantic difference between the two words is unclear. Judging by textual examples, both may be used in free variation, cf.: ǀfási ka ǀ3-si 'the child is big', ǀmatábā k' ǀxw a: 'Matabab is big' [Story 1999: 24, 25]. It is not excluded that ǀxw a: is a N[uu] word used alongside the authentic [Haasi] equivalent, but there is no way of certifying that.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Only attested in the basic meaning 'big' in N[uu], but preserved in [Xam] ǀxɔ: 'upright, tall' [Bleek 1956: 500]. Possibly preserved in [Haasi] as well, but could also be interpreted as a re-borrowing from !Khomani into that language.

Replacements: (a) [Xam] ǀ'ui-ya, morphologically derived from ǀ'ui 'to grow' ('grow' > 'big'); (b) [Xegwi] ǀxɛy a, of unknown origin; (c) Lower N!Ossob ǀ'u-si ~ ǀ'o-si, also of unknown origin. It is theoretically possible that this is the main !Wi root for 'big', but lack of parallels in the much better described [Xam] and N[uu] make this dubious. Phonetic shape: Correspondences between N[uu] and [Xam] are fairly straightforward. The Lower N!Ossob equivalent, also potentially of Proto-!Wi origin; see notes on ǀ*ǃxo.

6. BIRD


References and notes:
7. BITE

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 119. Plural form: *ćëc'ëm ~ xăx'ann. Transcribed as *ćărī ~ xäři in [Bleek 1929: 22]. All of these forms are always glossed in the meaning 'little bird'. For 'large bird', the correct word seems to be *ćërit-ti, pl. *ćërit-de ([Bleek 1956: 530]; [Bleek 1929: 22]), transparently derived from the word *ćërit-ga 'feather' ([ibid.]). It is not quite clear which one is more frequent statistically, but *ćănni is quoted in several contexts where the semantics 'bird' is clearly more important than 'small', indicating that this is probably the more "generic" word of the two in Xam.

[N|we: Brite 1956: 334. Quoted as [ćeq in [Bleek 1929: 22]. Plural form: či-ŋ ~ či-ŋaŋ. Judging by textual examples, the word can also be used in the meaning 'vulture': či-ŋ e mūiri "vultures eat goats" [Bleek 1956: 334].


N|ju: Sands et al 2006. Phonetically transcribed as [ŋ=k=či] in Miller et al. 2009: 152. Polysemy: 'bird / vulture', although in the latter meaning the word seems to be attested without the singularative suffix -si, i.e. as [ŋ=q=ui] [Miller et al. 2009: 155].


[|Auni: Bleek 1937: 205; Bleek 1929: 22; Bleek 1956: 170. The prefixal element si= is attested in several other [Auni words as well (e.g. si==lā 'kaross'), but its meaning remains unclear. It must, however, be a separate morpheme due to the general laws of the word structure in [Auni. Cf. also ke 'bird' ([Bleek 1937: 209]; [Bleek 1956: 280]), which could be, despite the difference in click efflux articulation, a prefix-less variant of the same root.

[|Haasi: Story 1999: 21. The prefixal element si= is the same as in |Auni.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved everywhere except in |Xam. Replacements: In |Xam, replaced by čănni, clearly related to Central Khoisan *xami 'vulture'; (> bird); the quirkiness of the situation is in that the original !Wi word for 'bird' was retained in |Xam, but in the meaning 'vulture': či ~ ā (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 334]. Perhaps the original meaning was narrowed down ('bird' > 'vulture'), while the new word was borrowed from Khoekhoe, although neither the source nor the very fact of borrowing can be ascertained.

Phonetic shape: The click efflux is reconstructed based on the attested reflexation in N|ju (none of the earlier sources consistently mark uvular effluxes), but is not very certain. "Narrow !Wi" consistently reflects the bivocalic stem *ŋ=q=ui, but comparison with the Lower N|ossob languages shows that -i is most likely a fossilized class marker.

7. BITE

[Xam či'i: ~ či: (1), [N|we: či ~ či (1), [ǂXamani čiː (1), N|juu čiː (1), [ǂXegwi či (1), [ǂHaasi čː (1), Proto-!Wi *či (1).

References and notes:


[ǂXamani: Maingard 1937: 257. Transcribed as či in [Doke 1936: 63].


[|Auni: Not attested.


Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages. Reconstruction shape: Glottalized articulation of the affricate is well supported by data from all primary branches.

8. BLACK

[Xam lwe:n ~ lwëŋ (1), [N|we: lwe ~ lœ (1), N|juu l'-œ (1), [ǂXegwi ċwa ~ nĉwa (1), [ǂHaasi lë (2), Proto-!Wi *lœ ~ *l'œ # (1).
References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 464. Attested only in L. Lloyd’s materials and therefore absent in [Bleek 1929]. A very close synonym exists in ǂǃœ-kā ~ ŋœ–kā ~ ǂǃœ-kān ([Bleek 1956: 289]; [Bleek 1929: 22]); however, in [Bleek 1956] the word is glossed as ‘dark; black; used for any dark colours’, and analysed as derived from the noun ŋœ: ‘darkness’ [Bleek 1956: 288]. The latter comparison is not certain (vocalic structure of the two words is quite different), but for ǂǃœ-kā several examples with the meaning ‘dark blue’, etc., are actually quoted, and, with the addition of external parallels that seem to confirm the archaic nature of ŋœ in the meaning ‘black’, the latter is currently the more eligible term for this position of the two.

[[Ngk]: Bleek 1956: 439, 463. Quoted as ŋœ in [Bleek 1929: 22]. The latter source adds a secondary synonym: ǂǀǀ, confirmed in the same orthography in [Bleek 1956: 280]. However, textual examples are provided only for ŋœ (even if they are not entirely diagnostic, cf.: ǂǀǀǀœ ku ǂǀǀœ “a snake which is black” [Bleek 1956: 439]); ŋœ is also much better confirmed by external data.

[Khɔami]: Not attested.

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.

[Xegwi]: Ziervogel 1953: 39, 40, 58. The n-prothetic form is, most likely, a samdhi variant. Quoted as ŋœ: ŋœ: ‘be black’ in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 108] (the authors note that, as a noun, the word means ‘pot’, but this is probably just a case of homonymy).

|Auni: Not attested.


Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved (at least) in the |Xam-N|uu branch and, quite possibly, in ||Xegwi. Replacements: |Haasi Ĺe has no etymology and is unlikely to correspond to |Xam-N|uu *ɓœ (the clicks are incompatible). The word could theoretically reflect something archaic (distribution-wise, this is possible), but, being attested only in a single, not very reliable source, and being completely devoid of internal and external parallels (for now), should not be eligible for proto-status as a primary candidate. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences between |Xam and N|uu are straightforward, with the exception of unpredictable aspiration in the latter (this could be a transcriptional error in one or more of the sources). Final nasal in |Xam is most likely suffixal. A particular problem concerns the form found in |Xegwi. If we analyze it as a separate root, then |Xegwi Ĺœ – nĽœ finds no suitable parallels in any other ǃWi languages and, especially in the light of the variant with the initial nasal, could look suspiciously like a potential borrowing from one of the click-dropping Kalahari Khoekhoe languages (cf., for instance, |Xam:ęp “black”); in fact, the click-dropping could have taken place within |Xegwi itself, since this language regularly dispenses with the palatal click along the same lines as East Kalahari Khoekhoe languages (see ‘wind’, etc.). However, mass borrowings into |Xegwi basic lexicon from Khoekhoe are not a norm, and this scenario is no more likely than, with certain reservations, an attempt to regard |Xegwi Ĺœ as a potentially regular development from Proto-ǃWi *ɓœ (> *ɓœ > Ĺœ > Ĺœ). At least one similar, if not completely identical, example exists that could also reflect the same palatalization of a former alveolar click or velar stop (see ‘stone’), and we also have evidence for palatalization before ŋ in |Xegwi in the case of the palatal click (cf. the reflexation of *ǀ in such items as ŋœ’, ŋœ; ‘short’, ‘wind’). For this reason, we tentatively select the etymological decision that the |Xegwi equivalent for ‘black’ continues the old ǃKwi stem.

9. BLOOD

|Xam |xáu-kə ~ |xáu-kən ~ |xáu-ki (1), ||Ngk| ke |xáu (1), N|uu |xáu-ke (1), ||Xegwi ļɛũ (1), |Auni |xåu (1), |Haasi |xåu (1), Proto-ǃWi */xåu (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 634. Emphatic form: |xáu-ka-kən. Transcribed by W. Bleek as |xáu-kən ~ |xáu-ki, emph. |xáu-ka-kən; quoted as |xåkın in [Bleek 1929: 22]. The form is morphologically complex, but only suffixal forms are attested. Possible secondary synonym: |xuć, emph. |xu-kan ~ |xu-ään [Bleek 1956: 378]; attested only in L. Lloyd’s records and not confirmed in any way by external data.

[[Ngk]: Bleek 1956: 634; Bleek 1929: 22.

|Khɔami: Not attested.

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.
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References and notes:


[’Auni]: Bleek 1937: 218. Quoted as ḡaunù in [Bleek 1956: 634].


Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages. Reconstruction shape: The most difficult question here is whether ±Xegwi Aːũ (a form attested only in the sparse data of Lanham and Hallowes) can go back to ḡaun-N; since normally the lateral affricate in ±Xegwi develops out of a palatal click in Proto-!Wi (see ‘dog’, ‘moon’, etc.). Very tentatively we accept this as part of the same etymology, due to the possibility of transcriptional error or a unique development of the lateral influx before a velar fricative efflux (no other examples in the corpus). Apart from ±Xegwi, most of the other forms correspond to each other on a trivial level. Semantics and structure: The stem is either used on its own or with a nominal extension (-ke ~ -ken), typical of many other basic nominal items as well.

10. BONE

[Xam] ṭuːwá (1), [Ng!ke] ḡabba (2), N|uu ḡaba (2), ±Xegwi ḡa (1), Proto-!Wi *ǃa (1).

References and notes:

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 457. Plural form: ḡaun-gan ~ ḡaun-ka-ken ~ ḡaun-ka-ken. Quoted as ḡaun, pl. ḡaunu in [Bleek 1929: 23] (the plural form is probably a misprint for ḡaun-gan). The word is very similar in form to ’leg, root’ [Bleek 1956: 457], but subtle differences such as a short vowel in ’bone’ (tuː) vs. long vowel in ’leg’ (tuː), or the fact that only ’leg’ forms its plural stem with the aid of reduplication (tuː=tuː-gan) indicate that these words are not even complete homonyms. Cf. also ḡa ‘bone of arm or foreleg’ [Bleek 1956: 401], similar in form but probably a different root nonetheless.

[Ng!ke]: Bleek 1956: 548. Polysemy: ’bone / bone knife’. Quoted as ḡaba, pl. ḡabə in [Bleek 1929: 23]; ḡaba, pl. ḡaba ~ ḡa in [Bleek 2000: 19]. Comparison of sg. and pl. forms shows that ḡa is likely to have been the original root, although this particular word-formation model is very unusual.

[Khomani]: Not attested.

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Polysemy: ’bone / shinbone’. For the plural, at least in compound forms the stem ḡai-ke is used (cf. ḡaː’u: ḡaːke ’chest bones’).


[’Auni]: Not attested.

[Haasi]: Not attested.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in [Xam] and ±Xegwi; replaced in the entire N|uu cluster; not attested in Lower N|osso languages. Replacements: Common N|uu ḡaba ‘bone’ regularly corresponds to [Xam] ḡaba ‘a piece of eland’s bone that forms part of the completed arrow’ [Bleek 1956: 548]; this allows to suppose a broadening of the original meaning: {’piece of animal bone’ > ’bone (gen.)’}. The opposite development is not excluded, but contradicts the general distribution of ḡa. Reconstruction shape: The correspondence of [Xam] ḡa to ±Xegwi ḡa is very rare, but all instances of ±Xegwi ḡa go back to a special phoneme that we tentatively mark as *ǃ-, which is also reflected in [Xam] as *-, so essentially the correspondence seems to be regular (see ’one’ for another example). Labialization in [Xam], as in many other similar cases, seems to be secondary (see ’foot’, ’liver’, etc.), although its causes and conditions have not yet been established.

11. BREAST

[Xam] ḡwain-tu (1), [Ng!ke] ḡwoen ~ ḡwoin-tu (1), N|uu ḡũi-ŋu (1), ±Xegwi ḡa-gu (2), [’Auni] ḡan (3), Proto-!Wi *ǃoiŋ # (1).

References and notes:

element -tu is a standard suffix for body parts. A possible synonym is hxux [Bleek 1929: 28], hxux [Bleek 1956: 564], but the word is only found in W. Bleek's early (less certain) records; examples of contexts given in [Bleek 1956] yield both the meaning 'chest' and 'women's breasts'. This may, in fact, be simply one specific usage of the word hxux ~ fxux 'side' [ibid.]. The principal word for 'chest' is quite distinct from the main word for 'female breast' (also 'milk'): ![wi] ~ ![wei-tan] [Bleek 1956: 431].

|Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 624. Quoted as fenx in [Bleek 1929: 28]. Possible secondary synonym: fent [Bleek 1929: 28], reproduced in [Bleek 1956: 560] as ![atu] ~ ![atu], pl. ![ate-ŋ], with no textual examples (for some reason, the word is marked there as "SI", i. e. [Xam rather than [Ng!ke], but this is almost certainly a mistake, since the form is credited to D.B., i. e. Dorothea Bleek, whose research was on [Ng!ke] rather than [Xam].

|Khomani: Not attested.

|Njuu: Sands et al. 2006. Distinct from pili 'female breast'. Secondary synonym: ![x]: (possibly 'sternum' or 'breastbone' rather than 'chest').

|Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 43. Quoted in the phrase ![n-ta] 'it is my chest' in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 98]. Distinct from ![a-zi] 'female breast' [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 102]. The same word is used as kac-zi in [Bleek 1929: 28] and [Bleek 1956: 84] (with the palatal consonant is transcribed as a velar), but the meaning is erroneously glossed as 'chest' (male).


|Haasi: Not attested.

**Proto-!Wi: Distribution:** Preserved in the entire [Xam-N]uu cluster, probably replaced elsewhere. Additionally, cf. [Ku]le ![santu] 'breast' [Bleek 1956: 532]. **Replacements:** (a) [Xegwi ![sa-qa] regularly corresponds to [Njuu ![q]: 'sternum / breastbone' (see notes on [Njuu]; the correspondence is exactly the same as in the word for 'wind' q.v.); it is likely that we deal here with a broadening of the original meaning ('breastbone' > 'male chest'), provided, of course, that the [Xegwi] item is accurately glossed as far as semantics is concerned; (b) [Auni ![an] 'chest' has no etymology: because of this, it is a serious contender for Proto-!Wi 'breast', but is not technically reconstructible to the same level of chronological depth as ![q].

Reconstruction shape: Reconstruction of the click efflux is approximate (nasalization, marked in early transcriptions by W. and D. Bleek, could technically reflect the influence of nasalized vowels), as is the reconstruction of the stem diphthong. It is quite probable that the stem incorporates the same nominal suffix -n as in other items on the Swadesh list (e.g. 'dog' q.v.), in which case one could think of a morphological segmentation into ![q] + *-n, with subsequent assimilative processes (*-oi > -oe or *-oi > -ui-) depending on the dialect. **Semantics and structure:** All of the discussed items are strictly limited to the semantics of 'male chest'; the meaning 'female chest' in !Kwi is usually expressed by the same stem as 'milk' and represented by other lexical roots.

12. BURN TR.

|Xam ![a] ~ ![a]: ~ ![â] ~ ![e] (1), ![Ng!ke] ![a] ~ ![e] ~ ![e]: (1), [Njuu ![a]xao (2), ![Auni ![â] (3), ![Haasi ![x] (1), Proto-!Wi *!/#/ (1).

**References and notes:**

|Xam: Bleek 1956: 544, 566. Quoted as ![e] ~ ![a] in [Bleek 1929: 25]. Transcribed as ![a]: ![e]: by W. Bleek. The vocalic variation is probably due to contraction with different class markers, although this is hard to verify based on available descriptions and examples. It is important to stress that, even though [Bleek 1929] quotes this stem under 'burn (intr.)', most textual examples in [Bleek 1956] explicitly confirm its transitive usage; conversely, 'burn (tr.)', for which she gives the equivalent ![uci], is the intransitive stem 'to burn / smart / pain' [Bleek 1956: 449], so there must have been some confusion.


|Khomani: Not attested.

|Njuu: Sands et al. 2006. The stem is used both as a transitive and intransitive verb.

|Xegwi: Not attested. In [Bleek 1929: 25], only ![k]a 'to burn (intr.)' is quoted, but the word is not even confirmed in [Bleek 1956].
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[Auni]: Bleek 1937: 209; Bleek 1956: 294. Meaning glossed as 'to burn, light a fire, roast'. The accompanying example is ǂi n ǂi 'light the fire' (typologically, 'light the fire' frequently = "burn the fire" in this region, so this may indeed have been the default verb for 'burn' in [Auni].


Proto-ǁWi: Distribution: Preserved in [Xam, ǁNg!ke, possibly also [Haasi. Additionally, cf. [Kulī ǂle 'to burn' [Bleek 1956: 545]. Replacements: (a) N|uu ǂla 'to burn' is comparable with [Xam ǂtšina 'to cook' [Bleek 1956: 498], but it is not possible to determine the original semantics based on this contrast, although distribution of the various terms for 'burn' shows that N|uu ǂla is clearly a semantic innovation; (b) [Auni ǂi is an isolated entry with no parallels in sight. The root ǂi is found in [Bleek 1956: 545] for both [Xegwi and [Auni, but only in the meaning 'to cook', which presupposes an areal semantic isogloss: ['to burn' > 'to cook']. Reconstruction shape: We select ǂle as the basic (original) variant of the root; ǂle seems to be the result of contraction with a suffixal marker. The issue of why the [Haasi equivalent was recorded with a labialized vowel is even more obscure; however, we do not find this a sufficient reason to exclude the word from the etymology, since it does not have a better one, and complicated, poorly understood vowel gradation in verbal roots is a commonality in all !Wi languages.

13. CLAW(NAIL)


References and notes:

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 593. Plural form: ǂłu-ǂụtt (with reduplication and suffixation). Quoted as ǂłu, pl. ǂłu-ǂụt in [Bleek 1929: 60]. Transcribed as ǂłu, pl. ǂłu-ǂụt by W. Bleek. Plural forms show that -ru in the sg. forms should be judged a detachable class suffix (at least, synchronically).


N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.

[Xegwi]: Ziervogel 1955: 43. Plural form: 'elope-ke. Cf. also ǂla 'fingernail' in [Bleek 1929: 60] and [Bleek 1956: 586]. The forms in [Ziervogel 1955] and D. Bleek's records are compatible only if we assume that at least one of them has been significantly mistranscribed.

[ǂAuni]: Bleek 1937: 216; Bleek 1956: 587. Quoted as ǂora in [Bleek 1929: 60].

[ǂHaasi]: Story 1999: 22. The form is probably plural (k’a- is a productive plural prefix). Cf. ǂũ 'finger' [Story 1999: 21]; despite the difference in click effluxes, this might be the same root.

Proto-ǁWi: Distribution: Preserved in all branches of the group, but possibly replaced in [Xegwi and [Haasi. Replacements: (a) [Xegwi 'elope-ke is a dubious entry in Ziervogel's materials; it contains a rare case of the alveolar click (attested either as a reflexion of the rare phoneme ǂh- or in borrowings) and contradicts the materials of D. Bleek, which clearly show that the old word for 'fingernail' was being preserved in at least some dialects of [Xegwi. Consequently, this may be a pseudo-replacement, particularly if the word was mistranscribed or its semantics was inaccurately glossed; (b) [Haasi k’a-ǂũ is formally a plural from ǂũ 'finger'; it is not understood whether R. Story simply misglossed the semantics of the 'word' or whether the meanings 'finger' and 'fingernail' were genuinely merged in [Haasi. In the former case, this is yet another pseudo-replacement. Reconstruction shape: The uvular efflux is tentatively set up for this word based on the accurately transcribed form in N|uu (earlier sources do not recognize the existence of uvular effluxes in most !Wi languages). The stem is always bisyllabic, but the second vowel is hard to reconstruct: reflexes of *ǂũ, *ǂũro, *ǂũri, and *ǂũra are all attested, with the variation reflecting either old morphological gradation (e. g. different suffixes for sg. and pl. numbers) or the results of vocalic assimilation (both with the first syllable vowel and the vocalism of additional suffixes, e. g. *ǂũra-sa > ǂora-sa in [Auni, etc.).

14. CLOUD
[Xam /waːɡː-/ (1), ‖Ng!ke tixo-ke (2), N|uu ʒar-si (2), ‖Xegwi /xeː # (3), ‖Auni /ˈhʊm-sa (4), Haasi lal=xwai # (5).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 329. Emphatic form: /waːɡː-/ transcribed as /waː-ɡː- in W. Bleek. Quoted as /waː-tn ~ /waː-ɡː in [Bleek 1929: 29]; the first variant here is, however, most likely a misunderstanding - in [Bleek 1956: 331] the same lexeme is glossed as 'star, cloud', even though all the textual examples quoted from W. Bleek's and L. Lloyd's records exclusively convey the meaning 'to star, cloud'. Even if both words are formed from the same root (typologically, very dubious), they are clearly distinguished through different suffixes (velar -tn for 'star', dental -tn for 'star' q.v.). As a possible secondary synonym, cf. also [!]uru 'white clouds' [Bleek 1956: 389] (apparently a more rarely encountered word than /waːɡː-, but analysis of contexts does not exclude the possibility that the latter is really 'raincloud' and the former is 'white cloud'; were this to be confirmed, we would have to swap the forms around).

‖Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 203; Bleek 1929: 29. In the former source, the form is defined as plural ('clouds': !i!xoa tixo.xe "rain falls from the clouds"), which makes sense, since -ke is one of the productive plural markers in ‖Ng!ke. Secondary synonym: !un ((Bleek 1956: 388); [Bleek 1929: 29]), with no textual examples.

‖Khomani: Not attested.

N|uu: Sanders et al. 2006.


‖Auni: Bleek 1937: 209; Bleek 1956: 290. Meaning glossed as 'cloud' (sg.) in the former source and as 'clouds' (pl.) in the latter; according to D. Bleek's observation, the suffix -sa generally marks singular forms (opposed to -si in the plural). The word is not found at all in [Bleek 1929: 29], which yields a different equivalent, /kʰani/, not confirmed in later sources.

‖Haasi: Story 1999: 21. Meaning glossed as 'clouds' (pl.). There are not enough data to decipher this compound properly.

Proto-Wi: Not reconstructible. Each language has its own equivalent for this Swadesh meaning, and the accuracy of semantic notation may be placed under doubt in most cases. Considering that the meaning 'cloud' is generally very unstable in the Khoisan area, we prefer to abstain from any attempts at Proto-Wi reconstruction here.

15. COLD

[Xam x′aʊ̯ ̅ ~ x′ao (1), ‖Ng!ke /ˈhʊː (2), ‖Khomani /ˈhʊː (2), N|uu /ˈhʊː (2), ‖Xegwi /keʔe (3), ‖Auni /ˈʃəɾa (4).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 119. Emphatic form: x′aʊ̯-aa. Transcribed as x′aʊ̯ by W. Bleek. The word is listed as the first equivalent for 'cold' in [Bleek 1929], said to be the lexical opposite of kau 'to be warm' in [Bleek 1956] and illustrated with several examples in which it is found in such noun phrases as 'cold wind' etc. Possible synonyms include: (a) sërrí ~ ssërrítn ~ ssërrí-tau 'cool, cold' [Bleek 1956: 167], also found as a noun: ssërrí: ~ ssërrí-tau 'cold wind' [ibid.]; (b) xæː ~ xxæː: 'to be cold, become cold', xæː-tau 'cold (n.)' [Bleek 1956: 639]. Attested examples and descriptions do not allow to estimate these words' real chances at filling the primary slot for 'cold'.

‖Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 289; Bleek 1929: 29. The latter source also mentions a special verbal stem sìya 'to be cold', but it is not confirmed anywhere in [Bleek 1956].

‖Khomani: Mai ngard 1937: 243. Attested in the phrase n̥a ˈhʊ 'I am cold'. Entirely different stem, not confirmed by external sources, is found in [Doke 1936: 63]: kāːr. n̥.

N|uu: Sanders et al. 2006.

16. COME

|Xam| xe| (1), Ng!ke| si ~ se ~ seya ~ sa| (1), Khomani| si ~ siya ~ sa| (1), N|uu| sa: ~ ca| (1), Xegwi| sa| (1), Auni| sa ~ sé ~ sí| (1), Haasi| ći| (1), Proto-Wi| *sa ~ *si| (1).

References and notes:

|Xam:| Bleek 1956: 165. Quoted as si ~ s̱i ~ s̱e in [Bleek 1929: 30]. Transcribed as se ~ xe ~ sse by W. Bleek. The same root is also encountered with different vocalism, transcribed as səx ~ səxa ~ səxə by W. Bleek and sa: by L. Lloyd [Bleek 1956: 161]; also saŋ ~ sanj ~ saŋ(y) (W. Bleek), səb’ (L. Lloyd) [Bleek 1956: 163]. The variations are typical of verbal roots (especially statistically frequent ones) and may indicate contractions with various class markers. Some of the variants, as attested in the accompanying examples, may also have the causative meaning ‘to bring’.

|Ng!ke:| Bleek 1956: 161, 165, 166, 168. Quoted as si ~ se ~ sa in [Bleek 1929: 30]; siya ~ sa in [Bleek 2000: 20, 22]. Vocalic variations are typical of simple verbal stems and may indicate contractions with various class markers or verbal particles.

|Khomani:| Maingard 1937: 245, 251. Transcribed as siya [Doke 1936: 75]. Secondary synonym: j|ə [Doke 1936: 69] - a highly dubious form, considering a complete lack of external parallels. Perhaps the real meaning is slightly different (‘to arrive’), or imperative (‘come!’).

|N|uu:| Sands et al. 2006. The second variant allegedly belongs to the Eastern dialect.


|Auni:| Bleek 1937: 205; Bleek 1956: 161, 165. Quoted as se: in [Bleek 1929: 30]. Vocalic variants may indicate contractions with class markers or verbal particles.

|Haasi:| Story 1999: 21. Secondary synonyms include: ji ~ j̱i ~ j̱i-sa. These forms may be the same as ći, provided the affricate could sometimes be misunderstood by Story as a dental click; in any case, unlike ći, they have no external links.

Proto-Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Additionally, cf. Kxau sa ~ se id., Kuje sa ~ si id. [Bleek 1956: 161, 165]. Reconstruction shape: Initial consonant is a sibilant (as opposed to ‘bite’ q.v.), as preserved in the majority of reflexes. Occasional attestations of a glottalized sibilant (s’i) or even a glottalized affricate (ć’i) most likely reflect the result of stem contraction: *sV-ʔ/u ~ *sV-ʔ/u (combinations with different suffixes) > *sVʔa ~ *sVʔi ~ *s’i ~ *s’i. As in many similar cases, original root vocalism is difficult to reconstruct because of contractions with various vocalic suffixes; both *a and *i are at least equally probable.

17. DIE

|Xam| ja ~ jə| (1), Ng!ke| ja| (1), Khomani| ja| (1), N|uu| ja| (1), Xegwi| jə| (1), Auni| jə| (1), Haasi| jbo| (2), Proto-Wi| *ja| (1).

References and notes:


|Haasi:| Not attested.

Proto-Wi: Not reconstructible; every language has its own equivalent for this Swadesh meaning. Curiously, the best candidate for Proto-Wi ‘cold’ is a word whose reflexes cannot be easily defined as the basic equivalent for ‘cold’ in any attested! Wi language: Proto-Wi *ɓ̣oe, marginally attested both in Xam and [Ng!ke (jə: ɓ̣oe: “night’s coolness, evening” [Bleek 1956: 639]) and possibly of the same origin as Auni ɓ̣au [Bleek 1929: 29] (although the coda correspondences would be quite irregular) and Xegwi ɓ̣oe [Bleek 1929: 29], under the condition that Bleek’s ! in this case mistranscribes the lateral click j. This choice is also indirectly supported by external parallels in Taa. Nevertheless, judging from a formal perspective, attested data are too scarce and ambiguous to postulate a lexical replacement from Proto-Wi to all of its modern day descendants.
18. DOG


[Ngk: Bleek 1956: 467. Emphatic form: t'winya, Quoted as t'winya, pl. t'winya in [Bleek 1929: 34].


Njuu: Miller et al. 2007: 58. The two variants allegedly reflect dialectal variants (first one is Western dialect, second one is Eastern). Quoted as t'wuna in [Westphal 1965: 141].

[Xegwi: Zierrovogel 1955: 37, 39, 44. Plural form: kw-me. Quoted as kw- in [Lanham & Hallows 1956: 112]. The plural form is quoted as kw-me in [Lanham & Hallows 1956: 104]. Quoted as kw- in [Bleek 1929: 34] and [Bleek 1956: 600]. The latter source also quotes the form kw- as a synonym [Bleek 1956: 499]. It is not highly likely that kw- and kw- are phonic variants, or even side effects of mistranscription; kw- is probably a different word (which, furthermore, could have been misglossed).

'Auni: Bleek 1937: 219; Bleek 1956: 663. Quoted as kw- in [Bleek 1929: 34] (could be the same root with a misheard click, cf. the transcription kw- in the closely related [Hasi language].

[Haasi: Story 1999: 21, 30. Plural form: kw-~ kw-

[Proto-!]wi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Additionally, cf. [Kxau kw-], [Ku]e kw- id., Gälne lingi id., Seroa kueninga id. [Bleek 1956: 104, 400, 495, 662]. Reconstruction shape: The original palatal click is correctly reflected as alveolar () in [Xam and Bleek’s Ngk, and expectedly develops into a lateral approximant in [Xegwi. The aspirated click efflux is tentatively reconstructed based on accurately transcribed Njuu data. Semantics and structure: The stem displays a significant number of suffixal variants: kw-[Xam, Ngk; modern Njuu kw- probably goes back to the same variant, with palatalization of the nasal and subsequent

References and notes:
contraction of the stem), \textit{*} ámb- \textit{a}ŋ (Lower N|ossob, with subsequent contraction in both dialects), \textit{*} ámb- æ \textit{a}ŋ-i (\textit{Xegwi}). Their functions in Proto-Wi and/or subsequent stages of language development remain uncertain (unfortunately, where some of these variants are attested in the same language, as in Ziervogel’s \textit{Xegwi} records, their respective functions are unknown).

19. DRINK

\textit{Xam} x'ũã ~ x'ũũ: (1), \|Ng!ke x'ãc ~ x'ã ~ x'ẽ ~ \|x'ã (1), ḞKhomani x'ã ~ x'ẽĩ (1), N|uu x'ãĩ (1), \|Xegwi x'ĩ (1), \|Auni x'ãc ~ x'ẽ (1), \|Haasi x'ã (1), Proto-Wi \textit{*} x'ã (1).

References and notes:

\textbf{\textit{Xam}}: Bleek 1956: 126. Transcribed as x'ũã ~ x'ũũŋ ~ x'ũã ~ x'ũw ~ x'ũq by W. Bleek. Quoted as x'ũã ~ x'ũũŋ in [Bleek 1929: 34]. Vocalic gradation, as in many other simple verbal stems, probably reflects results of merger with different class markers.

\|Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 117, 121, 601. Quoted as x'ã ~ x'ẽũ in [Bleek 1929: 34]. Occurrence of the lateral click in the variant x'ã is a unique idiosyncrasy that is most probably negligible (no etymological data can confirm click articulation for this stem).

\|Khomani: Maingard 1937: 257.

N|uu: Miller et al. 2009: 157. Transcribed phonetically as [k'ḁ̃]. In [Sands et al. 2006], additional (morphologically determined?) variants x'ã and x'ãũ are given.

\|Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 39. This is the present tense stem; the past tense is glossed as x'ãc. [ibid.]. Quoted as x'ẽĩ in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 115]. Quoted as x'ã ~ x'ẽ in [Bleek 1929: 34]; as x'ãc ~ x'ẽ in [Bleek 1956: 117, 604].

\|Auni: Bleek 1937: 204. Quoted as x'ãc ~ x'ã ~ x'ẽ in [Bleek 1956: 121, 217]; as x'ãc in [Bleek 1929: 34].


\textbf{Proto-Wi} Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Additionally, cf. \|Kupe kũã ~ kũ'ũũŋ, Seroa x'ã, \|Gāke x'ã id. [Bleek 1956: 109, 116, 609]. Reconstruction shape: Nasalization is such a persistent feature of this stem’s vocalism that it is tentatively included in the reconstruction, although it is also true that there are non-nasal reflexes as well (\|Xegwi, \|Haasi), and that nasalization could be a secondary feature, generalized to the root from contracted variants with verbal suffixes. Labialization in \|Xam is clearly secondary (no other language has this feature, and “superfluous” labialization, particularly after velars, is a very common feature in this language).

20. DRY

\|Xam l: ~ l: ~ l: (1), N|uu l: (1), \|Auni l:x'om (2), Proto-Wi \*l: (1).

References and notes:

\|Xam: Bleek 1956: 581, 606. Transcribed as l:o ~ l:x ~ l:x ~ l:xwã by W. Bleek. In [Bleek 1929: 35], this stem is only mentioned as the verb ‘to dry’ (transitive: l: intransitive: l:x), but there is no principal difference between verbal and adjectival roots in \|Xam, and Bleek’s given equivalent for ‘dry (adj.)’ x’r'o-kn = x’r'0-kn [Bleek 1956: 125] is supported by much fewer examples, always with the meaning ‘dried (in the sun), shrivelled, burnt’ rather than ‘not wet’. Conversely, for l:o cf. such examples as: l:aiNy \textit{face} se l:x ‘...so that the inside of the house may dry?’; ñ tu l-u-ŋ l:x ‘my mouth became dry’, etc. [Bleek 1956: 581], showing that this word has a wider range of application. Cf. also l:xwã ‘dry’ (of bones?), illustrated by one dubious context in W. Bleek’s records [Bleek 1956: 321]. We select as primary the word that is illustrated by the most examples (and also has the most immediate and explicit external correlations).

\|Ng!ke: Not attested properly. In [Bleek 1929: 35], the adjective ‘dry’ is given as x'ãc, but the form is not confirmed in the larger dictionary [Bleek 1956] and may have been erroneous. The same source [Bleek 1929: 35] also states that the “S1” (\|Xam) forms for the verb ‘to dry’ (l:j, etc.) are the same for “S2” (\|Ng!ke), but, again, this is not confirmed in [Bleek 1956] (external data on N|uu shows, however, that this is probably true). Since both of the stems are dubious, we prefer to leave the slot empty.

\|Khomani: Not attested.

22
Njuu: Sands et al. 2006.

[Xegwi: Not attested. Cf., however, ǃx ‘thirsty’ in [Bleek 1956: 581] (attested in the phrase n ǃx k’a ‘I am thirsty for water’); polysemy ‘dry / thirsty’ is typical for other !Kwi languages as well.


[Haasi: Not attested.

Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Common for the [Xam-N]uu cluster, not attested elsewhere (unless the [Auni form is related, which is dubious). Replacements: [Auni k’om is consistently marked by D. Bleek as possessing a velar affricate efflux and a coda in -m, which makes it incompatible with the forms attested in [Xam and N]uu despite general phonetic similarity. However, as a lexical replacement this term currently has no etymology. Theoretically, the [Auni form, as the only representative of the Lower Njossob branch, could also claim Proto-ǃWi status in the basic meaning ‘dry’, but external parallels in Taa support the priority of the [Xam-N]uu branch. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences between [Xam and N]uu are mostly trivial, although it is not clear why the word is sometimes transcribed with a velar affricate efflux in Bleek’s [Xam transcriptions.

21. EAR

[Xam ǂu-ntu ~ ǂu-ntu (1), [Ng!ke ǂwe- ~ ǂwe-ntu ~ ǂwe-ntu (1), [Khomani ǂu- ~ ǂu-si (1), N]uu ǂu-si (1), [Xegwi ǂwe (1), [Auni ǂu (1), [Haasi ǂ Blues =ǂa-amb (1), Proto-ǃWi *ǂ-(1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 485; Bleek 1929: 35. Plural form: ǂu-ntu. Transcribed as ǂu-ntu, pl. ǂu-ntu-ǂom by W. Bleek. Suffixal -tu is a regular extension for body part terms; its variant -ntu in this particular case is either due to assimilation with the nasal click or a combination with yet another suffix (*ǂu-tu), since reliable external data for this root generally do not support a second nasal in the medial or final position.

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 485, 488; Bleek 1929: 35. Concerning the extension -ntu, see notes on the respective [Xam entry.


[Auni: Bleek 1937: 220; Bleek 1956: 674. Quoted, with quite different vocalism, as ǂwe in [Bleek 1929: 35].

[Haasi: Story 1999: 21. Meaning glossed as ‘ears’ (pl.). The first morpheme is probably the 1st p. possessive prefix; ‘ǂu’ is the plural prefix; the rest of the word is written with a space (ǂu-am), possibly indicating diaeresis.

Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Reconstruction shape: Palatal click influx is unambiguously indicated by evidence from N]uu (where it is preserved) and [Xegwi (where it regularly yields a lateral affricate). Nasal influx is preserved everywhere except for [Xegwi, where it dissolves together with the click-type articulation as such. Root vowel is represented as ǂu in all daughter languages except for [Auni, where the reflexion of a should probably be regarded in connection with the unclear suffixal extension -ǂom. Semantics and structure: The basic monosyllabic root is always encountered in the company of various nominal formatives: ǂǂu-ǂ = ǂu-(i)-ntu.

22. EARTH

[Xam ǂkǂu (1), [Ng!ke ǂǂu (1), N]uu ǂǂu (1), [Auni ǂǂa (2), Proto-ǃWi *ǂǂu ~ *ǂǂǂu (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 372, 412. Same word as ‘sand’ q.v. Emphatic form: ǂkǂu-ǂ. Transcribed by W. Bleek as ǂǂu ~ ǂkǂu ~ ǂǂu, emphatic form: ǂǂu. Quoted as ǂǂu in [Bleek 1929: 35]. The Bleek/Lloyd transcription with ǂk- in the click efflux position suggests that the word may have been phonetically realized as *ǂǂǂu, with uvular articulation of the closure, but this is hard to prove.
23. EAT

[Xam hːa: ~ ha: (1), ||Ng!ke ʔãː i ~ ʔãː ʔi (1), ṬKhomani ʔa: ~ ʔaː (1), ||N|uu ʔa (1), ||Xegwi ʔi (1), ṬAuni ʔa: ~ ʔaː (1), ||Haasi ʔa: (1), Proto-!Wi *ʔaː (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 3, 36, 37; Bleek 1929: 35; Bleek 2000: 21. Vowel gradation, as in [Xam, may be reflecting mergers with different class markers.

|[Nglke: Bleek 1956: 3, 36, 37; Bleek 1929: 35; Doke 1936: 72]. Vowel gradation is typical of basic verbal roots and probably reflects mergers with different class markers. It is not clear whether the aspiration in the initial position is truly phonological (most external data do not corroborate this).

|[Xegwi: Ziemvogel 1953: 35, 50. Past tense form is transcribed as ʔiː. Quoted as ʔiː ~ ʔiː in [Doke 1936: 72], ʔiː ~ ʔiː in [Bleek 1929: 35].


Proto-!Wi: Distribution: In [Haasi, the proper cognate form to the Proto-!Wi root is glossed as ʔãː ʔi ~ ʔãː ʔi. Quoted as ʔãː ʔi in [Bleek 1929: 35]. Vowel gradation is typical of a complex interaction between click efflux and subsequent vocalic features (e. g. original ʔi, transcribed as ʔi in [ibid.], loaned to a Proto-!Wi root in [ibid.].

24. EGG

[Xam ǃauːi ~ ǃauwi ~ ǃk'áui:wi (1), ||Ng!ke !ʰãː (1), ṬKhomani ñwi # (1), ||N|uu ñui (1), ||Xegwi ñwi-ŋ (1), ṬAuni !ũi (1), ||Haasi k'ii (2), Proto-!Wi *ñui- (1).
References and notes:

| Xam: Bleek 1956: 414, 416, 467. Plural form: lwüns-t. Transcribed as lāwi = lāwi, emph. lāwi-y, pl. lwüns-t = lwüns-tm by W. Bleek. Quoted as lāwi, pl. lwüns-t in [Bleek 1929: 35]. Fluctuating articulation of the click efflux suggests reconstruction of the "real" [Xam form as *lə̆w:i where -i is a suffixal class marker; the plural form may be interpreted as reduction *lə̆w:i-tm > *lə̆w:i-tm]. |
| Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 396, 467; Bleek 1929: 35. Plural form: lwüns-t. In [Bleek 2000: 19] the nominal paradigm is presented as an irregular one: sg. lə̆u, pl. lwüns-t, but it is not clear if this is really an example of suppletivism (there is enough phonetic resemblance between the two forms so as not to rule out the possibility of a transcriptional error). |
| Khomani: Dook 1936: 85. Somewhat dubious, since the meaning is glossed as 'ostrich egg' rather than 'any egg'. However, the word is the same as 'egg' in N|uu, and no other South Khoisan language seems to have a root-reflected opposition between this general vs. specialized meaning, so it is relatively safe to include the word in the lexicostatistical calculations. Not attested in Maingard's data. |
| N|uu: Miller et al. 2007: 55. Meaning glossed as 'eggs' (pl.). |

| Auni: Bleek 1937: 214. Also lâ-sa, with singulative suffix, in [Bleek 1956: 493]. Slightly dubious, since the meaning is glossed as 'ostrich egg'. Considering, however, that this is the "default" egg among the [Auni] that no other words for 'egg' are attested, and that the word's external cognates all mean simply 'egg', the word may be deemed eligible for inclusion. |
| Haasi: Story 1999: 21. The double vowel is written with diaeresis (ii), possibly indicating a pronunciation like ki'i. |

| Proto-W| Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages except for Haasi (provided the [Xam and Ng!ke forms are indeed phonetically compatible with the rest, see below). Replacements: Replaced in [Haasi by kii, a word of unclear origin. Reconstruction shape: Click influx is palatal (regularly preserved in N|uu and shifted to lateral affricate in [Xegwi). Most of the reliable sources generally agree on zero (velar) efflux as the original articulation, but every now and then, a glottal stop appears in the transcriptions ([Xam, [Ng!ke, Lanham & Hallowes' transcription of [Xegwi]; this may be indicative of a more complex pattern of original articulation, e.g. *tu|]|. The appearance of -a- in the singular form of the [Xam equivalent is another problem; one possible scenario is an original paradigm that would look like *ta|u* (*tàì?), plural *twi-tmn with reduction and contraction. This would explain most of the variations and unusual features, but remains flimsy without additional confirming examples. For now, we prefer to leave the shape of the reconstruction closer to the most reliably attested form (N|uu). |

25. EYE

| Xam: Bleek 1956: 213. Plural form: caixá-tom = caixá-ta-kon. Transcribed as caixá, pl. caixäi-tom = caixäi-ta-kom = caixá-caixä-kon by W. Bleek. Quoted as caixä, pl. caixäi-tom = caixäi-caixä-kom in [Bleek 1929: 36]. The reduplicated plural form is probably "emphatic" in nature. Although L. Lloyd does not mark glottalized articulation, it is well confirmed by external data, and the "real" form in [Xam must be reconstructed as sg. *caix-, pl. caixäi-tom. |
| Khomani: Maingard 1937: 257, 274. Transcribed as caixä in [Doke 1936: 63]. |
| Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 44. Plural form: sa]g. Quoted as sa|g, pl. ca]-y in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 111] (in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956a: 48], it is also added that "one informant indicated ca] as the form used 'long ago'); as ca]- ca]x, pl. ca]y in [Bleek 1929: 36]; as ca] ~ ca]u, pl. ca]y in [Bleek 1956: 214]. |
| Auni: Bleek 1937: 207; Bleek 1956: 220. The double vocalism (not a long vowel!) may reflect a form like ca]t. The plural form is
There is some confusion in the vocabularies as to the paradigm: [Bleek 1929: 36] quotes it as co, pl. coo, whereas in [Bleek 1956: 214] we find caxu, pl. caxu-ke along with singular-only coo. No textual examples are available.


**Proto-!Wi: Distribution:** Preserved in all daughter languages. **Reconstruction shape:** In the singular number, most languages agree on *caxu ~ caxu*, with the second variant being more marginal and probably secondary if the internal etymology of the word is correct (see below). In the plural number, most N|uu dialects as well as Xegwi agree on *caxu-ŋ ~ caxu-m*, where the second variant is probably the result of assimilation. **Semantics and structure:** Based on the general phonotactic laws of !Wi languages, the stem *ca-xu* may only exist as an original compound of two root morphemes. Consequently, the second morpheme is easily identifiable with Proto-!Wi *tu* 'face' ([Xam xu, etc. [Bleek 1956: 261]); if so, the first may be reflecting the archaic root for 'eye' proper, with 'face' serving as a modifier, or it could have entirely different semantics. If *ca-xu* originally < *"something of the face"*, then it is important to pay attention to such a form as [Auni c'ou 'pips, seeds' [Bleek 1956: 220], with further parallels in Taa languages: the metaphoric shift 'seed' > 'eye' is quite common in Africa.

26. **FAT N.**

|Xam sweeney (1), ||Ng!ke soa ~ siη (1), ||Khomani soö (1), ||N|uu sun ~ suŋ (1), ||Xegwi suv: (1), ||Haasi cwa: (1), Proto-!Wi *so- (1).

**References and notes:**


[Khomani: Maingard 1937: 257.


[Xegwi: Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 98, 198. Not attested in [Ziervogel 1955]. Apparently, the word may be used both as the noun 'fat' and the adjective 'to be fat'.

[|Auni: Not attested; cf., however, sêa 'fat' (adjective) ([Bleek 1937: 205]; [Bleek 1956: 162]), etymologically cognate with the words for 'fat' in other !Wi languages (which normally do not distinguish between the noun 'fat' and the adjective).


**Proto-!Wi: Distribution:** Preserved in all daughter languages (where attested). **Reconstruction shape:** Reconstruction of the original shape *sλL* (where L is either *n* or *t*) is hardly under any serious doubt, as is the fact that the original root is encountered with different suffixal extensions in Lower N|ossob (|Haasi cwa: < *sL-a) and Narrow !Wi (*so-ŋ ~ *su-ŋ). Since the suffixal extension -ŋ is rather frequent in this branch, it is reasonable to reconstruct at least one of the original stems as *so-ŋ, capable of either progressive or regressive assimilation (> soŋ ~ suŋ).

27. **FEATHER**

|Xam ||erre ~ ||árrt # (1), ||Ng!ke |u ~ | tüm (2), ||Khomani l'am-si (1), ||N|uu l'uc-si (2).

**References and notes:**

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 527, 530. Possibly pluralis tantum (no distinction between sg. and pl. forms is explicitly stated). Transcribed as ||erri ~ ||erri-ya ~ ||árrt by W. Bleek. Slightly dubious. In [Bleek 1929: 38] the primary word for 'feather' is indicated as |u = 'hair' q.v., and in [Bleek 1956] there are several examples from W. Bleek and L. Lloyd's records that confirm such usage. All of these examples, however, only refer to the collective form ("feathers' = 'hair coverage on bird'), e. g. toi a: a, ha jà |tu l'xw [Lloyd] "this ostrich, its feathers are ugly" [Bleek 1956: 323]. The other item, quoted in [Bleek 1929: 38] as |fari, is translated there as 'feather on arrow', but in [Bleek 1956] this word can clearly refer to feathers on birds, as well as participate in such compounds as caxántan-ka ||erre 'eyelashes'
and, most importantly, serve as the derivation basis for the word 'bird' q.v. Unless the real meaning of this word is actually 'wing' rather than 'feather' (also a possibility), we choose to include it as the primary candidate for neutral 'feather' in Xam. Other items mentioned in [Bleek 1929: 38] (ǁtəm 'young feather (quill)', ǁna 'long ostrich feather') are even less eligible.

ǁNg!ke: Bleek 1956: 314, 323. Same word as 'hair' q.v. Quoted as ǁnì in [Bleek 1929: 38].
ǁKhoman: Doke 1936: 86. Not attested in Maingard’s data. Easily interpreted as a recent borrowing from Khoekhoe (cf. Nama !'amm-i, !Ora !'amm-a 'feather').
ǁNg!ke: Bleek 1956: 314, 323. Same word as 'hair' q.v. Quoted as ǀʰɯ in [Bleek 1929: 38].
ǂKhomani: Maingard 1937: 257. Not attested in Maingard’s data. The word itself is dubious; very few South Khoisan languages show any name for 'fish' at all, and, besides, there is no certainty in that the word denotes 'fish' in general and not some specific sort of fish.

28. FIRE

ǁXegwi: Not attested.
Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are mostly trivial, although the straightforward reconstruction *'| is contradicted by transcriptions without the glottal stop in some records of ǁXegwi and in ǁHaasi. Since this pattern is non-recurrent, we prefer to view it as an anomaly (either a transcriptional error or a rare positional development, e. g. elision of glottal stop between two "front" segments?).

29. FISH

ǂKhomani ǂebè # (1).

References and notes:

ǁXam: Not attested; the word may not have existed at all in the language at the time of its being recorded.
ǁNg!ke: Not attested; the word may not have existed at all in the language at the time of its being recorded.
ǂKhomani: Doke 1936: 63. Not attested in Maingard’s data. The word itself is dubious; very few South Khoisan languages show any name for 'fish' at all, and, besides, there is no certainty in that the word denotes 'fish' in general and not some specific sort of fish.
(possibly borrowed from an unknown source).

**N|uu**: Not attested.

|Xegwi: Not attested.

|’Auni: Not attested.

|Haasi: Not attested.

**Proto-!Wi**: Not reconstructible due to lack of attestation. Depending on the original home area of Proto-!Wi speakers, the word may not have existed in the language at all.

### 30. FLY V.

|Xam ǁai ~ ǁau ~ ǁ:u ~ ǁʰou ~ ǁxáu (1), ǁNg!ke ǁʰou ~ ǁʰou (1), N|uu ze: fputs (2), |’Auni zé (2), Proto-!Wi *ze#f posts (2).

**References and notes:**

|Xam: Bleek 1956: 560, 573, 632. Transcribed as ǁau ~ ǁ:u ~ ǁʰou ~ ǁxáu by W. Bleek. Quoted as ǁʰou ~ ǁxáu in [Bleek 1929: 40]. The abundance of variants, mostly differentiated by means of the click efflux, alongside the suggested, but not very probable, polysemy 'fly / throw up / above, over, up, upon, on / to come to' in [Bleek 1956: 560], suggests that we may be dealing with several mixed-up, phonetically and semantically similar, but ultimately different stems in |Xam. It is hardly possible to disentangle them without external comparison.

|ǁNg!ke: Bleek 1956: 588; Bleek 1929: 40.

|Khomani: Not attested.


|Xegwi: Not attested.


|Haasi: Not attested.

**Proto-!Wi**: **Distribution**: Preserved in N|uu and |’Auni. This distribution is technically sufficient to reliably project the word onto the Proto-!Wi level, but one must also keep in mind the attestation of tense contacts between the speakers of those two languages in the early 20th century, i.e. the |’Auni entry could really be a borrowing from N|uu, in which case |Xam-ǁNg!ke ǁxáu would turn out to be a better candidate for proto-status. **Reconstruction shape**: Correspondences between N|uu and |’Auni are trivial (pharyngealization is never marked by D. Bleek for |’Auni), although this may reflect genetic relationship as well as borrowing in this particular case.

### 31. FOOT

|Xam ǁxáu (1), ǁNg!ke ǁ:a ~ ǁ:a-xu (1), N|uu !x’u-ke (2), ǁXegwi ǁʰiʔi (3), |’Auni !x’ai (4), |Haasi n=!ʰai (4).

**References and notes:**


|Khomani: Not attested.


would rather seem to be 'thigh', as glossed in [Bleek 1956: 196]). Quoted as *kɛ in [Bleek 1929: 40] and as *kɛ in [Bleek 1956: 338].

|'Auni: |Bleek 1937: 213; Bleek 1956: 507. Quoted as *kɛi in [Bleek 1929: 40].

|Haasi: |Story 1999: 21, 30. The first morpheme (n=) is the 1st p. possessive prefix. Plural form: *ka=ŋi=1a-i.

Proto-Wi: Not properly reconstructible. Xam *ãũ and "old N|uu" *ã (in D. Bleek's attestation) may be etymologically compared with each other, as well as with *kxau *ã = *xai - *xai 'leg' [Bleek 1956: 144], but are not easily traceable to a higher level. Proto-Lower N|osseb *¡xai - *¡xai also has no etymology outside of that particular branch. Overall, the etymon is almost surprisingly unstable (particularly when compared to 'hand' q.v.).

32. FULL

[Xam !áun - !áun ~ !áun - !áunyanã (1), ||Ng!ke !x ñ (1), N|uu !qáï-ya (1), |'Auni ||x'ñn-si (2), Proto-Wi *!qauŋ # (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: |Bleek 1956: 413, 414. Polysemy: 'to be full / satisfied'. Transcribed by W. Bleek as !áun. This seems to be an intransitive or adjectival derivate from *kãů - !áun - 'to fill' [Bleek 1956: 411, 415]; the form !laun-a is also glossed as 'full' in [Bleek 1929: 41]. Occasional transcription of this root with a velar ejective click efflux is important in that it may reflect uvular articulation (earlier *!iãũ or *!iãũ).

||Ng!ke: |Bleek 1956: 503. Meaning glossed as 'to be full, make full'. Quoted as !x ñ in [Bleek 1929: 41].

|Khomanì: |Not attested.

N|uu: |Sands et al. 2006. Secondary synonym: *ùun-a (Western dialect) ~ *ùn-a (Eastern dialect). This word, however, relates rather to the meaning 'full (of stomach), satiated'.

|Xegwi: |Not attested.

|'Auni: |Bleek 1937: 217; Bleek 1956: 605 (erroneously listed as a form from "SV", Masarwa). Cf. also *fãů 'to fill' ([Bleek 1937: 215]; [Bleek 1956: 561]), which may be somehow related here, since most Peripheral Khoisan languages do not distinguish lexically between 'full' and 'full'. (Discrepancies in the click efflux could indicate poor quality of transcription).

|Haasi: |Not attested.

Proto-Wi: Distribution: Well attested in the Xam-N|uu cluster; in most other languages, the equivalent for 'full' simply remains unknown. Replacements: The relation of Xam-N|uu *!qauŋ to |'Auni ||x'ñn-si 'full', *!ãũ to fill' remains unclear; most probably, they are not connected, since N|uu ! does not properly correspond to |'Auni *!ã. If the |'Auni forms are not related, they have no separate etymology and could also lay claim to reflecting the Proto-Wi equivalent for 'full', but this is less probable than in the case of the Xam-N|uu match (more reliable and formally reconstructible to a deeper time level). Reconstruction shape: The original verbal root 'to fill', as attested in Xam, calls for the reconstruction *!qauŋ; the adjectival form, common to both Xam and N|uu, was most likely *!qauŋ-ya, with occasional contraction and reduction in Xam (> *!qauŋ).

33. GIVE

[Xam áː ~ áː ~ a-a ~ a-á (1), ||Ng!ke a ~ a: (1), N|uu ?ãː (1), ||Xegwi sa (2), |'Auni a # (1) / ûa ~ ûa ~ ûa (3), |Haasi i (1), Proto-Wi *a # (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: |Bleek 1956: 1. Transcribed as á by W. Bleek; quoted as a in [Bleek 1929: 42]. The latter source also lists as a: as a synonym, but in [Bleek 1956: 293] the word is glossed as 'to leave, let alone, give, wait, stay', and textual examples do not indicate any possibility of this lexeme representing the default verb of giving in Xam.

||Ng!ke: |Bleek 1956: 1; Bleek 1929: 42. The latter source also gives the synonym sa for the same meaning, but in [Bleek 1956] sa is
more frequently defined as 'to bring, fetch' (thus, the example ha sa: ke 'I give' in [Bleek 2000: 22] is 'she brings me a cloth for the head' rather than 'she gives me...'), which agrees well with the internal etymologization of this stem as a morphological variant of si ~ sa 'to come' q.v.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khomani:</th>
<th>Not attested.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**N|uu:** Miller et al. 2009: 156. Two variants, a and ä, are listed in [Sands et al. 2006]. The latter list also yields a secondary synonym: c'ə (Western dialect) ~ yə (Eastern dialect) 'to give, share, distribute, portion out'.

|Xegwi:| Ziervogel 1955: 36; Bleek 1929: 42; Bleek 1956: 161. Quoted as sa in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 115], with a contracted variant s- in such phrases as in za s-e 'I will give' [ibid.]. In [Bleek 1929: 42], š is listed as a synonym (presumably incorrectly, since the same word is listed with the semantics 'hold, carry' in [Bleek 1956: 566]).

|Auni:| Bleek 1956: 1. In [Bleek 1937: 201], the word is glossed as dë, but the textual example in [Bleek 1956: 1] segments this into the verb a and the verbal particle ke: šə ñam a ke "quickly give me". Earlier records yield two entirely different quasi-synonyms for 'give': šɨ and ñō [Bleek 1929: 42]. Of these, the former is probably the same as the verb 'to go, move' and should be disqualified; the second is, however, confirmed as 'give' in [Bleek 1937: 206] and in [Bleek 1956: 193], where it is supported with the text example təš ki ñwe "give me meat". Since this word has no clear-cut etymological connections, we do not include it as a synonym, but the overall situation is far from clear. Bleek 1937: 211; Bleek 1956: 341, 348. Not attested at all in [Bleek 1929], but textual examples in the indicative or imperative meaning are actually more frequent for this verb in [Bleek 1956] than for a.


**Proto-|Wi:** **Distribution:** Well reconstructible for Proto-|Xam-|N|uu; also probably attested in |Auni, which makes it the optimal candidate for Proto-|Wi 'to give'. **Replacements:** (a) Xegwi sa 'to give' is etymologically equivalent to |Ng!ke sa 'to bring, fetch, give' (see notes on |Ng!ke), and it may be reasonably argued that we are dealing here with the common semantic shift ('to bring' > 'to give'); the verb 'to bring', in its turn, is most likely a causative function of *sa ~ *si 'to come' q.v.; (b) |Auni ši 'give' is most frequently (although not always) observed in imperative forms, and etymologically corresponds to |Xam ši 'let, give' [Bleek 1956: 341] (usually also imperative). Distribution of the various functions of this root in |Wi indicates that the imperative function ('let!', 'give!') is the one to be projected onto the proto-level with the most certainty. If it is indeed used in an indicative meaning in any dialect, such usage is most likely secondary. **Reconstruction shape:** The root is usually encountered in the simple variant ša or with nasalization (*ũ < *a-ã through contraction with a suffix?). An additional problem arises with |Haasi i. This monovocalic stem could be legitimately compared with Proto-|Wi ša, since vocalic gradation in basic verbal roots is a commonality in this group - one could, in fact, think of reconstructing Proto-|Wi *a ~ *i 'to give', completely analogous to *sa ~ *si 'to come', etc. Nevertheless, to answer this question with more certainty, one would need a more thorough study of |Wi verbal morphophonology.

### 34. GOOD

|Xam a-|k'an ~ á-k'kan (1) / twá:i-i (2), |Ng!ke k'ai ~ k'âi (2), |Khomani x'âm-ãé # (-1), |N|uu ç'ã-kĩ (2), |Xegwi luga-ge # (-1).

**References and notes:**

|Xam:| Bleek 1956: 7. Quoted as a-k'an in [Bleek 1929: 43]. The word is glossed as 'to be nice / good / comfortable / handsome / beautiful / to do nicely, well' in [Bleek 1956], but no definitive textual contexts are given (such as antonymous expressions like 'good and bad', etc.) to determine if it is this word or twá:i that is the default |Xam equivalent for 'good' as such. It remains only to treat both items as synonyms. Bleek 1956: 243. Transcribed as twá:i ~ toki:i by W. Bleek. Quoted as twá:i in [Bleek 1929: 43].

|Ng!ke:| Bleek 1956: 92. Transcribed as kiai ~ kiaii, which represents palatalized articulation of the original consonant. This word is not mentioned in [Bleek 1929: 43], which, instead, quotes an alternate lexical item: *wëi], itself not confirmed in [Bleek 1956]. We choose the entry from the more reliable source (and one that is also better backed up by external parallels).

|Khomani:| Doke 1936: 77. Not attested in Maimangdi's data. The word is somewhat dubious. It is very likely a borrowing from Khoekhoe, where the actual meaning is 'right; true' (Nama am, !Ora xim); due to scarceness of data, there is no way to ascertain whether the correct meaning for |Khomani is indeed 'good' (= 'positive') or 'right, true, correct'. In any case, we mark the form with a negative cognition index, covering both possibilities (suitable meaning, but in a borrowed form; or lack of the appropriate item as such).
35. GREEN

[Xam kɛrru ~ kɛrru (1), Ng!ke /x’re/ (2), N|uu /ɔa-o-a/ (-1), Haasi /uu/ (-1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 87. Emphatic form: kɛrru-kan. Quoted as karava (a different morphological variant) in [Bleek 1929: 44]. In known textual examples, applied mostly to vegetation; glossed also in the nominal meaning 'grass, foliage, vegetation'. This is more likely to be the default [Xam word for 'green' than /aɛn/ (L. Lloyd), /aɛn ~ /aɛn-ya/ (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 297], since the latter is glossed as 'to be green, yellow, shining' and applied to all sorts of 'shining' objects, including even 'sky' (cf. /buŋŋu kwee /buxaka potency /wu /buxi “the sun cooled, the sky waxed green” [ibid.] - a very dubious translation).

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 336; Bleek 1929: 44; Bleek 2000: 26. This is the only equivalent for 'green' attested in all of the sources on Ng!ke, including a (rather pointless) textual example (ba ka /x’rɛ “it is green” [Bleek 2000: 26]). The phonetic structure of /x’rɛ/ is somewhat atypical for Ng!ke and Khoisan languages in general; the obvious explanation is reduction from an earlier *iVre (cf. a similar situation in the case of 'red' q.v.). One secondary synonym is /raava/ (Bleek 1929: 44; Bleek 1956: 302), with no textual examples at all.

[Khoman: Not attested.

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Most likely, a recent borrowing from Khoekhoe (cf. Nama /ɔa ‘to turn green; to grow’).

[Xegwi: Not attested.

[Auni: Not attested.

[Haasi: Story 1999: 22. Most probably, a Khoekhoe borrowing (see notes on N|uu).

Proto-WI: Not reconstructible due to lack of data; additionally, many of the forms that are actually attested turn out to be borrowings.

36. HAIR

[Xam |u ~ |u-ken ~ /u ~ /u-kan (1), Ng!ke /u ~ /u (1), Khoman /u ~ /u (1), N|uu /u-ke (1), Xegwi /u-zi (1), Auni /o (1), Haasi /o (1), Proto-WI */u (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 314, 323. Polysemy: 'hair / feathers / skin of insect'. Transcribed as /u ~ /u-ki ~ /u-kan, emphatic form /u-ka-kan by W. Bleek. Quoted as /u in [Bleek 1929: 45]. Although the word is more frequently transcribed as /u than /u, external connections of the word clearly indicate that /u, with aspiration, is the more archaic variant of the two.


N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.


37. HAND

|Xam| /x'a/ (1), ||Ng!ke| /x'a/ (1), ❧Khomani| /x'a/ (1), N|uu| /x'a/ (1), ||Xegwi| kyi| (2), |'Auni| /x'a ~ /x'an/ (1), |Haasi| n=x|an| (1), Proto-!Wi| */x'a/ (1).

References and notes:

|Xam:| Bleek 1956: 336; Bleek 1929: 45. Plural form: /x'a-x'a/ (with reduplication). Polysemy: 'hand / finger / shoot (of plants) / string' (meanings 'arm' and 'foreleg' are also listed, but this is very dubious).
||Khomani:| Maingard 1937: 240.
|N|uu:| Miller et al. 2009: 158. Transcribed phonetically as [x'î:].
||Xegwi:| Ziervogel 1955: 44. Plural form: /x'a-ŋ/ quoted as q'î:, phonetically [q'î:] in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 99]. It should be noted that the alleged suppletivism of the stem is not reflected in D. Bleek's data: the singular form is listed as /x'î/ in [Bleek 1929: 45] and as /x'a/ in [Bleek 1956: 336] (a /x'î/ is translated there as 'thy hand', not 'thy hands').
|'Auni:| Bleek 1937: 211; Bleek 1929: 45; Bleek 1956: 336. Polysemy: 'hand / arm / foreleg / wing'. In the specific meaning 'hand', a compound form is also quoted: /x'î-ʃ/ literally 'arm-head'.
|Haasi:| Story 1999: 22. The morpheme n is probably the 1st p. possessive prefix. The alternate listed variant kαŋ=k'ʉ=xαŋ likely represents the plural form (with the plurality prefix k'ʉ=). Cf. n=ʃ 'arm' [Story 1999: 21] (n= is probably the 1st p. possessive prefix).

38. HEAD

|Xam| /ʃa/ ~ /ʃ'a/ ~ /ʃ'ːa/ (1), ||Ng!ke| /ʃ'a/ ~ /ʃ'a/ (1), ❧Khomani| /ʃ'a/ (1), N|uu| /ʃ'a/ (1), ||Xegwi| /ʃ'a/ (1), |'Auni| /ʃ'a/ (1) / x:uu (2), |Haasi| η=xʃ (2), Proto-!Wi| */ʃ'a/ (1).

References and notes:

||Ng!ke:| Bleek 1956: 342; Bleek 1929: 46. Plural form: /ʃ'ːyan/. In [Bleek 2000: 19], however, the form /ʃa/ is said to be used both for sg. and pl.
||Khomani:| Maingard 1937: 257. Transcribed as /ʃə/ in [Doke 1936: 84].
|N|uu:| Sands et al. 2006. Quoted as /ʃə/ in [Westphal 1965: 140].
|'Auni:| Bleek 1937: 211; Bleek 1929: 46; Bleek 1956: 342. The situation is complex, since another word for 'head' is x'uu [Bleek 1937: 208], quoted as x'ːu ~ x'ːu in [Bleek 1956: 261]. Although it continues the common !Wi root *x'u 'face' (see the comparative evidence in
[Bleek 1956: 261]), in several attested [Auni examples the meaning is clearly 'head', not 'face', cf.: ti tani ke xu 'carry on the head' (hardly "on the face"). D. Bleek, therefore, suggests that [xe is, in fact, a N|uu/Khomani word in [Auni, along the same lines as in her argument for 'mouth' q.v. The situation here is, however, different from 'mouth', because: (a) only [xe and not xu is found in the meaning 'head' in Bleek's early records, published in [Bleek 1929]; (b) unlike the words for 'mouth', the word [xe 'head' is pan-Southern Khoisan, and its re-introduction into [Auni from [Khomani is a rather complex scenario. It would probably be easier to simply think of the situation in terms of 'transit synonymy': xu 'face' gradually replacing the original [xe 'head'. As is common in such cases, we list both synonyms.Bleek 1937: 2008; Bleek 1956: 261.

|Haasi: Story 1999: 22. The morpheme *ye is probably the 1st p. possessive prefix.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved throughout "Narrow !Wi"; in Lower N|ossob, possibly replaced either already at the proto-level or in individual dialects. Replacements: In either Proto-Lower N|ossob or a sub-section of [Haasi-[Auni dialects, replaced with *xe, originally 'face' (cf. [Xam xu 'face' [Bleek 1956: 261], etc.); the semantic shift ('face' > 'head') looks quite reasonable. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are trivial. Semantics and structure: The original paradigm is reconstructible as sg. *xe, pl. *xe-i.

39. HEAR

[Xam tu ~ túi (1), ||Ng!ke tu ~ tú ~ tuc (1), ṭKhomani ṭu ~ ṭu-wa (1), N|uu ṭu: (1), ||Xegwi tu (1), |'Auni tu: ~ tu-i (1), Proto-!Wi *tu (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 206, 239, 240. Transcribed as tu ~ tú ~ tum in [Bleek 1929: 46]. All forms traceable back to the stem *tu; vocalic variation is likely due to merger with various class suffixes, as in most simple verbal stems.


|Khomani: Maingard 1937: 251. Polysemy: 'to listen / to hear'.

|Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 36, 40, 52. The short stem, according to Ziervogel, is only used in the future tense. Past tense stem: tu-wa; present tense stem is tu-bi. Imperative forms glossed as to (sg.), to-u (pl.) [Ziervogel 1955: 48]. Cf.: ṭa ṭa tu-bi ṭa-le 'do you not hear' [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 115]. Quoted as tu-i ~ tu-a in [Bleek 1929: 46], but only as tu-i in [Bleek 1956: 240].

|'Auni: Bleek 1937: 207; Bleek 1956: 239, 240. The earlier source lists this word as taːi ~ taː [Bleek 1929: 46]; this either reflects a contraction with a class marker or particle or, more likely, represents a different root (cf. also tiː 'to feel' [Bleek 1937: 206]).

[Haasi: Not attested.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Additionally, cf. ||Kxau tū, Seroa tu [Bleek 1956: 239]. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are regular and unequivocally point to *tu (with predictable palatalization of the initial dental consonant in most dialectal varieties of N|uu).

40. HEART

[Xam /eː (1), ||Ng!ke lai ~ le (1), ṭKhomani le-ːi (1), N|uu le: (1), ||Xegwi kele (-1), |'Auni /eː ~ /e (1), |Haasi n=|a-e (1), Proto-!Wi */e ~ */e (1).

References and notes:


|Khomani: Maingard 1937: 267. Extracted from the NP an /eː/ 'my heart'.
N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Quoted as /t̥/ in [Westphal 1965: 140].
'|Auni: BLEEK 1937: 208; BLEEK 1956: 271. Quoted as /t̥: in [BLEEK 1929: 46], but that source has an additional synonym in the same meaning: /t̥ːa/, not confirmed in later sources (possibly = fan 'chest' q.v.?).
[Haasi: Story 1999: 22. Initial n- is probably the 1st person possessive prefix; the second click-containing morpheme -ī is unclear.

Proto!-Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages except for [Xegwi. Additionally, cf. [Xa]-[l]-i-[s]-i, [Ku]e /t̥ː/ id. [BLEEK 1956: 271, 296]. Replacements: In [Xegwi, the old word seems to have been replaced with a Bantu borrowing. Reconstruction shape: The stem shows a somewhat chaotic distribution of zero (velar) click efflux vs. glottalized efflux in daughter languages (usually glottalized in [Xam and [Auni, non-glottalized in N|uu and [Haasi]. Ignoring this glottalization is impossible, since it shows up in too many sources; the situation possibly reflects glottalized vocal articulation (i.e. *ŋə), as in several other such cases, but this solution is not conclusive.

41. HORN
[Xam /t̥ː: ~ /t̥ːi: (1), [Ng!ke /t̥ːɨ (1), [Khomani /t̥ː (1), N|uu /qʰ-oe-si (1), [Xegwi /i: (1), [Auni /t̥ː (1), Proto!-Wi *//t̥ː (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: BLEEK 1956: 567, 574. Plural form: /t̥:t̥ː- /t̥ː- /t̥ː- /t̥ː- /t̥ː- /t̥ː- (with reduplication). Transcribed as /t̥ː/, plural (emphatic?) /t̥ː/, pl. /t̥ː/ in [BLEEK 1929: 47]. Of note is the transcription's fluctuation between the aspirated and the zero efflux, possibly indicative of a 'non-trivial' type of articulation not detected properly by W. BLEEK and L. Lloyd. None of the materials distinguish this word from 'tooth' q.v., although external data very clearly speak in favour of their separate origin.
[Ng!ke: BLEEK 2000: 18. Plural form: /t̥ːja ~ /t̥ːja-sa. In [BLEEK 1956: 568] the word is confused with 'tooth' q.v., and most textual examples are on 'tooth', although the plural variant /t̥ːya-sa ~ /t̥ːya for 'horn' is also mentioned. Quoted as /t̥ːa, pl. /t̥ː-sa in [BLEEK 1929: 47].
[Khomani: Maingard 1937: 257.
[N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Quoted as /t̥-i-si in [Westphal 1965: 144].
[Haasi: Not attested.

Proto!-Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages (although see further on the somewhat divergent form in modern N|uu). Reconstruction shape: Most of the sources agree on the lateral click influx, zero (velar) accompaniment, and a front root vowel for the original protoform. The only uncomfortable exception is the form attested in Modern N|uu (kgʰ-oe-), which suggests a uvular aspirated efflux instead, as well as a labial component in the root vocalism. These correlations are quite irregular and find no explanation; however, due to lack of alternate etymologies, some degree of phonetic similarity, and the fact that uvular accompaniments had not been generally recognized by researchers prior to the modern era, we tentatively mark the form as an etymological cognate, pending further research on the issue. Additionally, the root is almost never encountered without nasalization, which may be part of the root or represent fusion with an old nasal class marker (*ŋ-?).

42. I
[Xam ŋ (1), [Ng!ke ŋ ~ n (1), [Khomani ŋ ~ na ~ n ~ na (1), N|uu ŋ (1), [Xegwi ʔŋ ~ ʔn ~ ʔim ~ ʔiŋ ~ ʔiŋ ~ ʔm ~ ʔim ~ ʔi (1), [Auni n ~ ŋ ~ na ~ m (1), [Haasi ŋ (1), Proto!-Wi *ŋ (1).

References and notes:
|Xam: | Bleek 1956: 140. Emphatic form: η-η. Also attested in a rare phonetic variant n, as well as m before the following labials (by assimilation). Possessive forms, according to W. Bleek, include the variants η - η-ka - η-ta - η-ga. Both W. Bleek and L. Lloyd also indicate the existence of a velar stem ka - ke - ki [Bleek 1956: 74, 85, 91], rarely, if ever, found in as the subject of the main clause and mostly limited to various bound usage in subordinate clauses. Available data are too ambiguous, however, to allow us to treat it as a regular “indirect stem-type” synonym.

|Ngke: | Bleek 1956: 140; Bleek 1929: 49; Bleek 2000: 21. D. Bleek notes that both variants are freely interchangeable. The rare positional variant m (before words starting with a labial consonant) is mentioned in [Bleek 1956: 132] and [Bleek 1929: 49]. Note also a special dative form ke, e.g., ha sa ke lxe e fa “she gives me a cloth for the head” [Bleek 2000: 22].

|Khomanı: | Maingard 1937: 244. All four variants are mentioned as representing the subject form; in the object position only η is encountered. Transcribed as na ~ na in [Doke 1936: 63]; both variants, as subject pronouns, are also said to be in free variation.

*N|uu: | Miller et al. 2007: 57.

|Xegwi: | Ziervogel 1955: 46. Cf. also the emphatic (absolute) form: ñu-ñe ~ ñu-ñe; the object form ñwe ~ ñwe; the possessive form ñe ~ ñ [Ziervogel 1955: 45-47]. The absolute form is quoted as ñepend ~ ñepend in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 108]. Quoted as ñ ~ aŋ ~ am in [Bleek 1929: 49]; as am ~ aŋ ~ n ~ η in [Bleek 1956: 9, 10, 141] (the variant am is an assimilated form, used before words beginning with labials).

|Auni: | Bleek 1937: 197; Bleek 1956: 132, 141, 142. The variant m is the result of samdhi, encountered only before words beginning with labial consonants. Quoted as ñ ~ ñ-ñ in [Bleek 1929: 49]. Possessive forms, as per [Bleek 1937: 197], include: n ~ n-ka ~ n-ga ~ m; there may also be a special dative form ki ‘to me’.

|Haasi: | Story 1999: 31. Cf. also the emphatic forms: g'ā=ŋa ~ g'ā=ŋə ~ ka=ŋ (the last form is not marked as “emphatic” by Story, but also represents a contraction with a prefix).

|Proto-Wi: | Distribution: Preserved in all modern languages. Additionally, cf. [Kxau η ~ n, Kułe η, Seroa ʔn, Głańte n ~ η [Bleek 1956: 141]. Reconstruction shape: The primary and most common form of the root is that of a syllabic velar nasal. Everything else is the result of contextual assimilations or combinations with various emphatic particles.

43. KILL


References and notes:

|Xam: | Bleek 1956: 293, 315. Transcribed by W. Bleek as ɾi ~ ɾi. Vocalic variation is typical of most simple verbal stems and is explained through merger with various class markers. Not to be confused with ɾa ‘to die’ q.v.: despite superficial similarity, the two stems are very consistently distinguished both in W. Bleek’s and L. Lloyd’s records through their effluxes (glottal stop for ‘die’, zero or aspiration for ‘kill’). Quoted as ɾi ~ ɾa ~ ɾa in [Bleek 1929: 50] (where this exact confusion has actually taken place).

|Ngke: | Bleek 1956: 293, 313, 315. Forms quoted as ɾa: ‘to kill’ : ɾa: ‘killed in [Bleek 2000: 24], although text examples in [Bleek 1956] show that the vocalic gradation is dependent not on tense or voice, but most likely, on class characteristics of the accompanying nouns. Quoted as ɾi ~ ɾa ~ ɾa in [Bleek 1929: 50] (where, as in [Xam, the word has been confused with the entirely different stem ɾa ‘to die’ q.v.).

|Khomanı: | Maingard 1937: 246.

*N|uu: | Sands et al. 2006.

|Xegwi: | Ziervogel 1955: 51. The simple stem is said to function as the future tense. Present tense stem is ƛŋ-â. Paroxysmal stem is ƛŋ-âa. Somewhat dubious. The meaning on p. 51 is glossed as ‘hit, strike’, but cf. on p. 62: ƛŋ-â avere “we kill a bird”, ƛŋ - â ƛŋ “we kill a spur-winged goose”. The same word is quoted as ƛŋ ‘to hit’ in [[Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 100].

|Auni: | Not attested.


|Proto-Wi: | Distribution: Found only in the [Xam-N|uu cluster. Replacements: (a) ǂXegwi ƛŋ could reflect something like Proto-Wi *ʔŋ or ʔŋ. However, the word has no external parallels, and its original meaning, as can be seen from attested examples, is clearly ‘to hit’ rather than ‘to kill’; (b) [Haasi ʔau ‘to kill’ = [Auni ʔau ‘to beat; to knock down’ [Bleek 1956: 411]; in this case, the local
replacement ['to beat' > 'to kill'] is more than evident. It is important to note that [Xam-N|uu] *fa is the only etymon in the whole group whose semantics is strictly confined to 'to kill', which is an additional argument for regarding it as a better candidate for Proto-!Wi status. Reconstruction shape: Modern N|uu shows that the root has to be reconstructed with an aspirated efflux. Original vocalism fluctuates between *a and *i, reflecting an obscure morphological pattern.

44. KNEE
[Xam] fjan ꞌfian (1), ||Ng!ke ꞌ póź: ꞌ jy (1), N|uu ꞌiti:-si (1), ||Xegwi ꞌo-ma (1), ||Auni ꞌo-wê-||uwe (2), Proto-!Wi *fua-ŋ ~ *jo-ŋa (1).

References and notes:
[||Khomani]: Not attested.
[N|uu]: Sands et al. 2006.
[||Auni]: Bleek 1937: 217. Quoted as loi in [Bleek 1929: 50]. In [Bleek 1956: 584], this form, quoted as foce-fowe, is marked as the (reduplicated) plural correlate to the singular foè. This would seem logical, but, for some reason, only the reduplicated form is attested in [Bleek 1937], glossed as singular 'knee'.
[|Haasi]: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Attested in most varieties of "Narrow !Wi". Cf. also Seroa gno-ma-tey 'knee' [Bleek 1956: 47], where g-transcribes a click. Replacements: "Narrow !Wi" ḟjan is opposed to |Auni (Lower N|ossob) *le ~ *kô. There are two reasons why the !Wi equivalent is preferable: (a) purely technical (the word is reconstructible to a much higher chronological level); (b) more importantly, |Auni foè coincides segmentally with the basic Central Khoisan equivalent for 'knee', and, although this does not per se prove borrowing, makes it quite probable. Reconstruction shape: Dental click with nasal efflux is regularly reflected in all daughter languages, as is the labial vowel (although its exact quality is hard to determine). The segment -ŋa in [Xam] and the corresponding nasalization of the vowel in N|uu is most likely of suffixal origin, since in [Xegwi] the same root is encountered with a different suffixal extension: fua-ma ~ fô-ma.

45. KNOW
[Xam] fein: ꞌfein-ATTRIBUTE fein ꞌfeina ꞌfen:-na (1), ||Ng!ke ||ai (2), N|uu ||xe (2), ||Xegwi ci-ya (3), |Auni ||xai ꞌxê-ki (2), |Haasi ||üma (4), Proto-!Wi *||xe # (2).

References and notes:
[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 643. Transcribed as fein ~ feinia by W. Bleek. Quoted as fen ~ fen-a in [Bleek 1929: 51]. The connection between these forms and fê ~ fê: 'to think, remember' [Bleek 1956: 642, 652] is unclear, as is their connection to phonetically similar Central Khoisan forms with the same meaning (cf., for example, Nama fen 'to know', fêi 'to think'); nevertheless, due to external parallels within !Kwi itself, we do not count this as a borrowing (at least, not a recent one). In [Bleek 1929: 51] another stem, jësaka, is listed as synonymous, but in [Bleek 1956: 596] it is glossed as 'to understand, be wise, clever, cunning', and textual examples confirm that the word is unlikely to have simply meant 'to know'.
[||Khomani]: Not attested.
46. LEAF

||Ng!ke xerro: (1), ṣKhomani kānʳʊ (2), Nǀuu blar-si (-1), ||Xegwi li=kʰasi-zí (-1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Not attested. The form ju niri in [Bleek 1956: 283] is tentatively glossed as 'leaf (?), stick (?)', based on a context from L. Lloyd’s records in which the exact meaning is impossible to determine properly. Words with the meaning 'leaf', as such, are extremely met in South Khoisan languages as a whole.

||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 259. Quoted as xero in [Bleek 1929: 52]. In the former source the meaning is glossed as 'leaves, foliage' (ঌo kan xerro 'the tree's leaves').

ṣKhomani: Doke 1936: 72. Not attested in Maingard’s data. An alternate, phonetically similar, but probably etymologically incompatible form, also glossed as 'leaf', is kānʳʊ-si ~ kāŋwal-si [Doke 1936: 69, 75]. Judging by the structure of the latter word, it is almost certainly a borrowing, but the source is unclear. The form kānʳʊ is also phonetically questionable (the cluster -n- is unique for this entry and should indicate a non-ǃKwi origin).


'|Auni: Not attested.

|Haasi: Not attested.

Proto-ǃWi: Not reconstructible. Due to areal conditions, the word 'leaf' consistently shows highly restricted usage and is in most cases /te/ introduced as a borrowing.

47. LIE

[Xam tːaː ~ taː ~ tːɛ ~ tːɛn ~ teŋ ~ tːɛn-tːen ~ teŋ-ya (1), ||Ng!ke tia ~ kia: (1), ṣKhomani ɣaː (1), Nǀuu ɣaː: (1), ||Xegwi |aː # (2), |'Auni tôa (1), Proto-ǃWi *tːa (1).

References and notes:
which of the variants should be slated as ‘sleep’ in Bleek’s examples, but ‘lie’ is almost certainly the primary meaning; for discussion, see explicitly acknowledged that tii and kii represent alternative pronunciations, which should be interpreted as one more example of a typologically frequent (for Khoisan languages) palatal articulation of t- before front vowels. The verb is frequently translated as ‘sleep’ in Bleek’s examples, but ‘lie’ is almost certainly the primary meaning; for discussion, see ‘sleep’.

References and notes:

48. LIVER

|Xam: Bleek 1956: 185, 196, 198. Transcribed as tã ~ ta ~ tːiː ~ tiː ~ ten ~ tìn by W. Bleek. Quoted as ta ~ ten ~ tìn in [Bleek 1929: 53]. Polyseny: ‘to lie / to lie down’; also attested in causative meanings (‘to lay (down)’). Vocalic variability is typical of verbal roots with short stems and probably reflects mergers with various class markers, although it is not clear which of the variants should be considered closer to the “pure” root (probably *ta, but it is also possible to denote the root as a monoconsonantal ‘t-‘. On the possible synonym /tʃ/ see under ‘sleep’.

[jNgke: Bleek 1956: 91, 202. Quoted as tɔ ~ tii ~ kii ~ kɛn in [Bleek 1929: 53]. The form kɛn is said to represent “past tense” in [Bleek 1956: 202], but its phonetic variant kien [Bleek 1956: 91] ~ kɛn [Bleek 1956: 87] is, however, said to be employed “after verbal particles”. In [Bleek 2000: 18] it is explicitly acknowledged that tii and kii represent alternative pronunciations, which should be considered as one more example of a typologically frequent (for Khoisan languages) palatal articulation of t- before front vowels. The verb is frequently translated as ‘sleep’ in Bleek’s examples, but ‘lie’ is almost certainly the primary meaning; for discussion, see ‘sleep’.

[jKhamani: Doke 1936: 63, 69. Not attested in Maingard’s data. Meaning is glossed as either ‘lie’ or ‘lie down’.

[jNuu: Sands et al. 2007: 61. Meaning glossed as ‘lie (down)’.

[jXegwi: Bleek 1929: 53; Bleek 1956: 294. The latter source gives a textual example: han ʃa, ha ðʊŋ “she lies, she sleeps”. The former source quotes the word ʃuː as a synonym, but its existence is not confirmed in [Bleek 1956]. Unfortunately, the word ‘to lie’ is not attested properly in more reliable sources. In [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 99], the phrase in-θìpe is translated as ‘I lie down’, but the usual meaning of the underlying verb, both in [jXegwi and in related languages, is ‘to sleep’ q.v.; without additional confirmation, we would rather regard this as a potential mistranslation and leave the slot empty. In [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 47], the form kala is added with the meaning ‘lie down’ (and explained as a potential borrowing from giTonga k’ala ‘stay, sit‘), but it is not clear whether it also has the required static semantics in [jXegwi.

[jAuni: Bleek 1937: 207. Meaning glossed as ‘down, to lie down, come down’; cf. also tãa ‘to lie curled up’ and the derived stem tã-a ‘to lay down, to bury’ [ibid.]. In [Bleek 1929: 53], the meaning ‘to lie down’ is glossed as tã ~ toa. Textual examples show both a dynamic and a static meaning for the verb: cf. kʰiː ta “water comes down” vs. o toa kiː “(he) lies on the ground” [Bleek 1956: 206]. Cf. also: tɔ di se tãa “the dog lies curled up” (maybe just “lies” as such?) [Bleek 1956: 240]. There is also a different stem, jɔ ([Bleek 1937: 209], [Bleek 1956: 280]), glossed only as ‘to lie down’, and attested only in examples with “dynamic” semantics.

[jHaasi: Not attested.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved everywhere, with the possible exception of [jXegwi. Additionally, cf. [jKxau da ~ ta ‘to lie’ [Bleek 1956: 19, 185]. Replacements: The situation with [jXegwi remains unclear; in any case, the hypothetical ja ‘to lie’ has no reliable external etymology. Reconstruction shape: The most frequent variant is *ta, with the first consonant regularly palatalized in jNuu. The variants *ten (< *ta-n?) in [Xam, *tu in [jKhamani, and *toa in [jAuni should be regarded as morphological variants.

48. LIVER

|Xam /wãːŋ ~ /yãːŋ (1), /Ng!ke /lain (1), jNuu /an ~ /ãːŋ ~ /ãːŋ (1), Proto-!Wi */ɑN(1).

References and notes:


[jKhamani: Not attested.

[jNuu: Sands et al. 2006. The two latter forms are said to represent the Eastern dialect.

[jXegwi: Not attested.

[jAuni: Not attested.

[jHaasi: Not attested.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages where attested. Additionally, cf. [jKxau ŋaŋ [Bleek 1956: 143] with regular elision of the click influx. Reconstruction shape: Labialization in [Xam seems to be secondary, as in multiple similar cases. A nasal is always present in the stem coda, but the variants fluctuate rather chaotically between *-ŋ, *-n, and *-in; the optimal scenario for working out this problem has not yet been found, but in any case, the nasal seems to be an inherent part of the root rather than a suffixal addition.
49. LONG
[Xam !xó:wa (1), ¶Ng!ke /a: (2), N|uu /ãː (2), ¶Xegwi /ã (2), ¶'Auni /á-si (2), Proto-!Wi */á (2).

References and notes:
¶Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 267; Bleek 1929: 55; Bleek 2000: 23. Applied to objects (ba !u /a: "his (ostrich’s) neck is long") as well as time periods (mj!a /a: "the night is long").
¶Khomani: Not attested.
N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.
¶Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 36. Quoted as jə 'be long' in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 115].
¶'Auni: Bleek 1937: 208; Bleek 1956: 270. Meaning glossed as 'big, long, tall', although 'big' is an incorrect addition (see notes on 'big' for more details). Entirely different equivalent for 'long' found in [Bleek 1929: 55]: xaras (not confirmed by later research or external comparison).
¶Haasi: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved everywhere except for [Xam]. Replacements: In [Xam, the only word glossed with the meaning 'long' is ǃxó-va, related to [Ng!ke ǃxó:wa 'tall, big' [Bleek 1956: 501] = N|uu: ǃxó: id. (see under 'big'). This allows to tentatively suggest a semantic shift {'big' > 'long'}, although much depends on the degree of accuracy in the glossing of [Xam data]. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are relatively straightforward. Vowel nasalization seems to be innate in the root.

50. LOUSE
[Xam ȍ'yn (1), ¶Ng!ke ȕvina: (1), N|uu ȕ-si (1), ¶Xegwi ȕ̃-zi (1), Proto-!Wi *ũ̃- (1).

References and notes:
¶Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 683; Bleek 1929: 55. The suffix -ya is either emphatic or plural.
¶Khomani: Not attested.
N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.
¶'Auni: Not attested.
¶Haasi: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages where attested. Reconstruction shape: Initial labial click with nasal accompaniment is attested in all languages and automatically projected onto the proto-level. Vocalism is harder to reconstruct; most dialects agree on a labial vowel, but [Xegwi does not, and it is not excluded that an assimilative process was at work in at least some of these dialects. Still, we provisionally follow the "majority rule". Semantics and structure: For the [Xam-N|uu cluster, the word is reconstructible as the complex stem *ũ̃a-iyn, with a productive nominal suffix (of class?).

51. MAN
[Xam !wi=gwai: (1), ¶Ng!ke t̀u ~ tū (2), ¶Khomani ṱ̃v: (3), N|uu ṱ̃v: (3), ¶Xegwi ambda (3), ¶'Auni
References and notes:

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 447, 469. Transcribed as "tu" by W. Bleek (for more on the shorter variant "tu ~ *tu" see under 'person'). Quoted as *tu=gwa in [Bleek 1929: 56]. The noun *tu by itself normally means 'person' without specification of gender (q.v.). The compound form *tu=gwa translates as 'person-male', where gwa = 'male' (of human beings as well as animals) [Bleek 1956: 52]. It is unclear how frequent this compound was in actual speech, but there are some neutral contexts in A. Lloyd's records suggesting that it could have indeed been the default designation for 'man' as opposed to 'woman' in the singular number. In the plural number, the usual designation for 'men' is suppletive: *tu-kon (Lloyd), *tu-kan (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 239]. The singular stem *tu is, however, not attested in Xam at all, and the lexeme is therefore ineligible for inclusion in the list. The lexicostatistically relevant morpheme is gwa.

[Ngk]: Bleek 1956: 240; Bleek 2000: 19. Plural form: *tu-kon = *tu-nyam = *tu-nam. Quoted as *tu, pl. *tu-nyam, *tu-nam in [Bleek 1929: 56]. This is the regular equivalent for 'male human being' as opposed to 'woman' (cf.: *jake, *hj *ke, *tukon *ja *ke, *hj *ke "women, they dance, those men, they dance" [Bleek 1956: 240]). The stem *ju [Bleek 1956: 383] more properly refers to 'male' being in general (cf.: *ju *ke: *e "male ostrich it is" [ibid.], although is occasionally used to designate male people as well (cf.: *a *jik *e, *a *jik *ke: *e "this is a woman, that is a man (= male)" [ibid.]).

[Xh]: Maingard 1937: 239. Functions both as the independent noun 'man' and the semi-suffix 'male', attached to names of animals (e.g. *g *ke: *male gemsbok, etc.). Transcribed as *jì (with a voiced efflux) in [Doke 1936: 85].

[Nj]: Miller et al. 2009: 155. Meaning glossed as 'man' (no text examples, so it is not clear if the exact semantics is that of 'male human being' or 'person'; external data clearly speak in favor of the former). Suppletive plural: *w *ke [Miller et al. 2009: 157]. Quoted as *jì, pl. *jì-kwe in [Westphal 1965: 139].

[Xeg]: Zier vogel 1955: 38. Meaning glossed as 'male'. In [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 112], the meaning 'man' is rendered by the compound form *gil-* *a, literally 'person' + 'male' (cf. 'woman' q.v.), Quoted as *jì in [Bleek 1956: 52]; as *jì in [Bleek 1956: 582].

[An]: Bleek 1937: 201; Bleek 1929: 56. Quoted as be ~ *be in [Bleek 1956: 15]. Glossed as 'man, male' in [Bleek 1937: 201]. Bleek 1937: 201. Meaning glossed as 'man, person'; technically, this word could be either completely synonymous with be or with fi 'person' q.v. However, the first option is preferable for the following reason: according to [Bleek 1937: 196], the suppletive plural for both be and de 'man' is *tu-tu = *tu-tus = *tu-tu-se, and the accompanying examples clearly support the semantics of 'man = male human beings', since the word is opposed to 'women', cf.: *jì *ke, *tukon *ja *ke: *e "women are clapping, men are dancing" etc. Additionally, in [Bleek 1929: 56], only the word *fi is given as the equivalent for 'person', although, admittedly, this is not a very strong argument due to the poor quality of the source. The fact that *fi de is not mentioned in [Bleek 1929] at all makes plausible the hypothesis that *fi de is the original [An] term for 'man = male person', and that in the early 20th century it was being replaced by the newer equivalent *fi be, whereas the original suppletive plural *tu-tu was still being retained. Regardless of whether the scenario is true, we have to treat *be and *fi as synonyms.

[Haa]: The word *ju *g *a is glossed as 'man' in [Story 1999: 22], but textual examples rather suggest the meaning 'husband', cf.: *ju *b *a; a "it is my husband" [Story 1999: 24] (the concatenation with the 1st p. possessive prefix *n further confirms this). The word *ju is encountered in the phrase *ju: *a: "it is a man" [Story 1999: 25], and the meaning 'man' is confirmed by the same situation in the closely related [Au].

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in most (but not all) dialects of Nj and in [Xeg]. Additionally, cf. [Kx]: *jì 'man, male, person' [Bleek 1956: 662]; [Kuku *jì 'male' [Bleek 1956: 206]. Replacements: (a) In some dialects of Nj, including Bleek's [Ngk], the singular form *jì 'man, male' seems to have been replaced by the formerly suppletive plural stem *tu 'people; men'; (b) the origins of *jì are obscure; it is not even completely excluded that *jì is *tu=gwa < *tu=gwi < *tu=ko-al with extra suffixation and irregular click loss (through dissimilation of two clicks in one compound formation?), in which case there would be no need to postulate a replacement. However, this scenario, resting on several unprovable assumptions, is somewhat far-fetched, and we currently prefer to regard the Xam situation as a lexical replacement of unknown origin; (c) Lower Ngossob *be ~ *bi 'man, male' finds no obvious parallels in the other !Wi languages, and its archaicity is quite dubious, since the phoneme *b- is not well reconstructible for Proto-!Wi. Reconstruction shape: Click influx is reliably reconstructible as palatal (with a regular shift to lateral affricate in [Xeg]), but click accompaniment unpredictably fluctuates between zero (velar) and glottal stop, sometimes even within the same language (cf. different transcriptions in different sources on [Xeg]). This could suggest an original *jì (glottalization on
the vowel, occasionally transferred to the consonant), but more research has to be carried out on the issue. **Semantics and structure:** The stem */le/ ~ */lo/ is sometimes employed on its own, but just as often functions as part of the compound */tu-*/le/ 'person-male', i.e. the original semantics is probably 'male' (of any species) rather than specifically 'man' = 'male person'.

### 52. MANY

|Xam| X’wái| ~ X’wai-yá (1), ||Ng!ke| ìÁi ~ IÁI ~ IÉ: (2), †Khomani òebe-òe (3), N|uu| kebe-ke (3), ||Xegwi| kʰyū ~ gyeĩŋ (4), |’Auni| ñáni ~ ñáři (5), |Haasi| x-x-ka (6). |

**References and notes:**

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 339, 340. Transcribed as /x’ɔːi/ ~ /x’ɔːya/ by W. Bleek. Quoted as ‘x’wái in [Bleek 1929: 57].

[Ng!ke]: Bleek 1956: 472, 477. Applied to countable ('many') as well as uncountable ('much') objects, cf.: /’i/: /’i/ “much water” [Bleek 2000: 20]. Quoted as /’i/ ~ /’i/ in [Bleek 1929: 57].

†Khomani: Maingard 1937: 240. The suffix -è is a frequent component of nominal and adjectival stems, although its function is not entirely clear.

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.


†’Auni: Bleek 1937: 215; Bleek 1956: 557. Meaning glossed as 'much, many, all' (see 'all' for more details). Quoted as /kari/ 'many' in [Bleek 1929: 57].


**Proto-!Wi:** Not properly reconstructible (each language has its own equivalent).

### 53. MEAT

|Xam| À: ~ À: ~ e˘ni ~ én-éñ ~ en-en-ya (1), ||Ng!ke| òwái ~ òwai (2), †Khomani òwαι ~ òwai (2), N|uu| òwai (2), ||Xegwi| ò: (2), |’Auni| òwe ~ òwi (2), |Haasi| òwai (2), Proto-!Wi *òoa (2). |

**References and notes:**

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 5, 9, 37, 39. Transcribed as ò: ~ ò: ~ ò: ~ ò: ~ ò:wai ~ òwai-yá by W. Bleek. Reduplicated forms are emphatic in nature. Quoted as ò: ~ ò: in [Bleek 1929: 57]. The word is most likely a [Xam-exclusive nominal derivate from hā ‘to eat' q.v. (although initial aspiration is completely lacking in the nominal forms, its status in the verbal root is probably secondary as well), and, as such, has replaced the older form ò: ù:; preserved only in the specific meaning 'game' (‘meat that moves’) [Bleek 1956: 685].

[Ng!ke]: Bleek 1956: 685; Bleek 1929: 57. Polysemic: meat / game / body'.

†Khomani: Maingard 1937: 246. Transcribed as /òwai/ ~ /òwai/ in [Doke 1936: 66]. Secondary synonym: hē-ʃiù ‘meat’ [Doke 1936: 77] (a strange compound form with no etymology). Finally, cf. also the word ġāri [Doke 1936: 69], with the meaning glossed as 'flesh'.


[Xegwi]: Ziervogel 1955: 52. Quoted as ò: in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 102]. Quoted as ò: in [Bleek 1929: 57]; as òwai ~ òwai-ʒẹ:n in [Bleek 1956: 687] (recorded with a ‘special’ variety of the labial click, said to be “released absolutely without the sound of a kiss, more like a plosive p” [Bleek 1956: 682]).


**Proto-!Wi:** Distribution: Preserved everywhere except for |Xam. Replacements: In |Xam, the word is preserved only in the narrow meaning 'game'; otherwise, replaced by ò:, a nominal derivative (through conversion) from the verb 'to eat'. The semantic
development [‘to eat’ > ‘food’ > ‘meat’] is typologically common. Reconstruction shape: Reconstruction of the labial click with zero (velar) accompaniment is completely reliable; vocalic reconstruction remains less clear due to possible contractions of the root vocalism with class marker suffixes in different languages.

54. MOON

|Xam| ləulárr (1), ||Ng!ke| ̓lərr̓ ~ ̓ləuru ~ ̓turro (1), ǂKhomani fɔ̌ɔ̌ɔ́ (1), N|uu| ̓fɔ́oro (1), ǂXegwi ̓lolo (1), |Auni| őo (2), |Haasi| ̓wə (2), Proto-!Wi *fɔ́oro ~ *fɔ́oro # (1) / *fɔ́i(-ŋ) # (2).

References and notes:

|Xam:| Bleek 1956: 417, 419. Transcribed as ləuláru ~ ̓lauláru ~ ̓ləlu by W. Bleek. Quoted as ̓lału ~ ̓lałəru in [Bleek 1929: 59]. Technically, the word looks like a reduplication, but it could just as easily be a compound, consisting of two parts that are not etymologizable internally (*lfu + *lfu).

||Ng!ke:| Bleek 1956: 242, 443, 454. Quoted as ̓fɔ́o in [Bleek 1929: 59]. The form turro is mentioned as an “unusual form of ̓fɔ́oro”; it is not highly likely that it goes back to a different root, but it does present a curious dialectal enigma.

|ǂKhomani:| Doko 1936: 64.


Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all Narrow !Wi languages. Additionally, cf. [Kxau ̓fə́ɔ̌], [Kulë ̓tə̌lə] [Bleek 1956: 207, 675].

Replacements: The Swadesh item ‘moon’ reflects the binary split between Narrow !Wi and Lower N|ossob languages, with no etymological way of determining which particular term, Narrow !Wi *fɔ́oro or Lower N|ossob *(h)ɔ́i, is more archaic. Naturally, the former is reconstructible at a deeper time level, making it a slightly more probable choice for Proto-!Wi status. Reconstruction shape: The “fluctuating” glottalization of the click efflux (as seen in some N|uu dialects, [Kxau] and [Kulë] crops up too frequently to be brushed off as a transcriptional inaccuracy; most likely, the original form was *fɔ́oro (i.e. contained a glottalized vowel, with glottalization occasionally transferred to or perceived as part of the click efflux). The Lower N|ossob equivalent for ‘moon’. See notes on *fɔ́oro ~ *fə́oro.

55. MOUNTAIN

|Xam| ləo ~ ̓ləo-gən ~ ̓ləu (1), ||Ng!ke| ləu (1), N|uu| ləo (1), ǂXegwi tʰə⁴ # (2), |Auni| ̓wə # (3), Proto-!Wi *ləo # (1).

References and notes:

|Xam:| Bleek 1956: 408, 444. Transcribed as ̓ləo-gən ~ ̓ləo-ka ~ ̓ləo-ka in [Bleek 1929: 59]. Same word as ‘stone’ q.v.; it is possible that in the meaning ‘mountain’ the root is more frequently used in conjunction with suffixal extensions, but no strict morphological opposition between ‘stone’ and ‘mountain’ can really be determined from available materials.

||Ng!ke:| Bleek 1956: 412. Same word as ‘stone’ q.v. Quoted as ̓ləu in [Bleek 1929: 59].

|ǂKhomani:| Not attested.

N|uu:| Sands et al. 2006. Same word as ‘stone’ q.v.

|ǂXegwi:| Ziervogel 1955: 60. Encountered once in the texts, within the noun phrase tʰə⁴ ̓fə́o ̓tə̌ wa “black mountains”; not very certain. In [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 106], a completely different compound form is quoted in the meaning ‘hill, mountain’, with two phonetic variants: ̓fə́a ~ ̓sə̌a (the second component here may be ̓fə́ ‘head’ q.v.).
56. MOUTH
|Xam tːu (1), ||Ng!ke tu ~ tu: (1), ḫKhomani tu (1), Nǀuu ʷuː (1), ||Xegwi tu ~ tʰu (1), ǀ’Auni ḫu: (2), |Haasi n=ída (3), Proto-ǃWi *ƫu (2).

References and notes:

||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 239; Bleek 1929: 59; Bleek 2000: 27.
|Khomani: Maingard 1937: 257.
Nǀuu: Sands et al. 2006.
|’Auni: Bleek 1937: 219; Bleek 1956: 664. A somewhat complicated case. The same source lists, as synonymous, the form tu ~ tʰu ‘mouth’ [Bleek 1937: 207], adding that the form *tu ‘may be ḫhomani’, i.e. borrowed from Nǀuu-ǃKhomani with whom the |’Auni, as described by D. Bleek, had been in close contacts. Although *tu ‘mouth’ is a relatively stable ǃWi stem, and there is nothing per se that would make its appearance in |’Auni unusual, Bleek’s idea is corroborated by the fact that her own earlier data on |’Auni, collected in 1911, although generally inferior in quality to later research, only lists ḫu and nothing else in the meaning ‘mouth’ [Bleek 1929: 59]. We go along with her suggestion and include ḫu as the basic equivalent for this meaning.
Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved only in |’Auni. Replacements: This is a case where our decision rests exclusively on external evidence. |’Auni ḫu: precisely corresponds to !Xóo (Taa) ḫ-œ ‘mouth’, and, unlike the isogloss between |’Auni tu and early Nǀuu tu ‘mouth’, the |’Auni-ǃXóo parallel is not easily interpretable as the result of areal contacts. This is significant evidence for regarding the |’Auni form as an archaism, and interpreting Common Narrow ǃWi *tu ‘mouth’ as an innovation (possibly ‘mouth’ < ‘hole’?) that took place before the subgroup’s primary split into ǃXegwi and ǃXam-Nǀuu. Another problem is the form attested in |Haasi, which corresponds to |’Auni ḫu: in its consonantal structure, but shows an entirely different root vowel. Unless it can be shown that |Haasi ḫu is contracted from *tu-a, where -a is a fossilized class suffix, we prefer to treat it as another lexical replacement of an obscure nature.

57. NAME
|Xam lː (1), ||Ng!ke ɫ (1), Nǀuu ka=li (1), ||Xegwi ʃeː (1), |’Auni lː ~ ɫn (1), |Haasi a=ʃa (1), Proto-ǃWi *e ~ *ẽ (1).

References and notes:

||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 307; Bleek 1929: 60.
|Khomani: Not attested.
Attestation in different varieties of Nǀǀ|nu: Sands et al. 2006. The prefix ka- is possessive in origin, reflecting "inalienability" ("someone's name").


[Haasi]: Story 1999: 22. Etymologically probably = "your name" (a= is the 2nd p. possessive prefix), but cf. aːlaŋa k'as ǂkabbo "my name is ǂKabbo" [Story 1999: 29].

Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are fairly straightforward. Nasalization is consistently marked everywhere except for |Xegwi, but variation in |Xam suggests that nasal articulation of the vowel may be due to contraction with a suffixal marker. The extended form in |Haasi may be emphatic in origin.

58. NECK

|Xam !lau ~ !lau ~ !³ou (1), ||Ng!ke !ǩ ~ kǔ (1), Nǀǀ|nuu ǂqu (1), ||Xegwi ǂele (2), |'Auni ǂú (1), Proto-ǃWi *ǂqu (1).

References and notes:


||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 103, 448. The clickless variant is mentioned as an "occasional form", reflecting a particular lect that tends to drop the alveolar click. Quoted as !tàn in [Bleek 1929: 60].

|Khomaní: Not attested.


[Xegwi]: Ziervogel 1955: 41. Quoted as ǂle[n] in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 104]. This form looks quite similar to Ziervogel's ǂele, but could represent the same word only if the transcription of the initial click in one of the sources is due to a mistake or typographic error.

|'Auni: Bleek 1937: 216. This word is reproduced in [Bleek 1956: 591], with a supporting textual example: sa ko ǂx'ësi, ho ha ŋú ǂfo "bring beads, on my neck put them". There is also a synonymous word for 'neck' attested in all the sources: ŋú [Bleek 1929: 60]; [Bleek 1937: 219]; [Bleek 1956: 663]); however, no textual confirmations for it are present.

|Haasi: Not attested.

Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved everywhere except for |Xegwi. Additionally, cf. ǂxau ǂu [Bleek 1956: 676]. Replacements: Replaced in |Xegwi with ǂele, a word of unclear provenance. Reconstruction shape: Attestation in different varieties of Nǀǀ|nu suggests *ǃqu as the original form of this word. Potential cognates in |Xam and |'Auni are somewhat problematic: (a) in |Xam, alveolar t is an expected correlate for the palatal click in Nǀǀ|nu, but the "epenthetic" vowel -a- (or -o-) is not very well understood; (b) |'Auni ŋi is only acceptable as a cognate if the lateral click in D. Bleek's records is a mistake for a palatal click (there is also an exotic possibility that *ǃq > ŋ in |'Auni could have been a regular development; cf. a similar case in the etymon 'short' q.v.).

59. NEW

|Xam ǂaːŋ (1), ||Ng!ke !xe:-k³a ~ !xe:-t³a (2), ||Xegwi ǂi (3).

References and notes:

|Xam: Bleek 1956: 556, 565, 573. Plural form: ǂbǂqalفاد a Transcribed as ǂkəŋ ~ ǂkəŋ by W. Bleek. Polysemy: 'new / fresh / raw'. Attested contexts clearly show that the word may be used both with the semantics of 'freshly grown / raw' and 'replacing a previous object' (e. g. ǂxe ǂkəŋ "new bag", ǂqeːŋ ǂqalفاد a new bags''). Quoted as ǂkəŋ in [Bleek 1929: 61]. The latter source adds a potential synonym: ǂkən = ǂqalفاد = ǂkəːŋ ~ ǂkəːŋ [Bleek 1956: 599] (only in W. Bleek's records), but rather scarcely attested examples only show this word in conjunction with 'moon', making its "basic" character in |Xam rather dubious (the adversial form ǂwëk: 'strongly' in the same
vocabulary entry is supposed to be derived from this stem, but this is semantically questionable).

[[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 499. Polysemy: ‘new / young’. Quoted as simply "new" in [Bleek 1929: 61]; the forms in [Bleek 1956] look like bimorphemic compounds, but the second component is unclear. The earlier source also lists fē as a synonymous form, but it is not confirmed in [Bleek 1956], whereas !xec- is even propped up by contextual examples (e.g., !xec !xec-t'ā "new dresses"; !xec /a ha !xec-k'ā "the girl is young").

|Khomanı: Not attested.

N|uu: Not attested.


|Auni: Not attested.

|Haasi: Not attested.

Proto-!Wi: Not properly reconstructible based on available data. External data in Taa show that the "marginal" form /we in |Xam, not eligible for basic item position in the attested 19th century varieties of the language, could actually be the best candidate for the meaning 'new' in Proto-!Wi.

60. NIGHT

|Xam /a ~ /a: (1), ||Ng!ke /a ~ /a: (1), ṬKhomanı /ǎː ~ /ǎʔā (1), N|uu /a: (1), ||Xegwi /a: (1), Ṭ|Auni /ãː ~ /ã (1), |Haasi /a-쑩 (1), Proto-!Wi *'/a (1).

References and notes:


||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 522. Quoted as ʧã in [Bleek 1929: 61].

ṬKhomanı: Doke 1936: 63, 72. Not attested in Maingard’s data.


|Haasi: Story 1999: 22. Reduplicated stem (reason for reduplication is, however, unknown).

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages. Additionally, cf. ṬKxau ʧe [Bleek 1956: 546], ṬKule ʧu [Bleek 1956: 522]. Reconstruction shape: The most frequently encountered variant is ʧu. The diphthong -au in |Auni finds no confirmation in other sources and must be the result of contraction with a nominal suffix. C. Doke's marking of glottalized articulation in this root (either as a click efflux or as glottalization on the vowel) is also not confirmed elsewhere and possibly reflects an extended variant like ʧu-ʧu.

61. NOSE

|Xam ʧiːnu (1), ||Ng!ke ʧu-tu (1), ṬKhomanı ʧu-tu (1), N|uu ʧu-ʧu (1), ||Xegwi ʧu (1), |Auni ʧō (1), |Haasi ʧu (1), Proto-!Wi *ʧu (1).

References and notes:


||Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 353; Bleek 1929: 62. Plural form: ʧu-tu-gom ~ ʧu-tu-ke (plural form meaning is given as 'nostrils' in [Bleek 1956]).

The suffix -tu is a standard element in anatomical (and some other) terms.

45
References and notes:

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 121. Transcribed as x'āu ~ x'āi-ki by W. Bleek. Quoted as k'āu ~ k'āu-ki in [Bleek 1929: 62] (only the complex variant k'āu-ki also quoted as the predicative negation 'no'). There also used to exist a dialectal variant oski [Bleek 1956: 155], with areal dropping of the initial velar affricate. The negative root morpheme is clearly *x'āu; -ki is a verbalizing suffix ('one of the connectives of double verbs', according to [Bleek 1956: 121]).

[Ngk]: Bleek 1956: 342, 348. Quoted as ṧa ~ ṧi in [Bleek 1929: 62]; ṧa ~ ṧe ~ ṧi in [Bleek 2000: 21]. The negation seems to behave like a verbal stem, judging by unpredictable vocalic variation that may have something to do with the usual verbal mergers with class markers in [Ngk]. Examples: ĕ ṧa yx tš ha "I did not understand him"; ĕ ṧa l̥ k̥o:k̥i: "I do not have any meat" [Bleek 1956: 342]; ĕ ṧa ṭai "I do not know"; ĕ ṧe ki:x̂i "I do not sleep" [Bleek 1956: 348]. Bleek 1956: 566, 582, 590. Other than ṧe, no other forms for the basic negation are mentioned in either [Bleek 1929] or [Bleek 2000]. [Bleek 1956], however, offers ample evidence for an alternate negative marker, ṧe, which also behaves like a monoconsonantal root with vowel gradation. Examples: ĕ tši ṧa k̥e: "rain does not fall" [Bleek 1956: 590]; n ʃh ʃh ʃh ʃh "I do not see the sun" [Bleek 1956: 582]; ha ʃh ʃh k̥e a "his brother he is not" [Bleek 1956: 566]. Based on available evidence, no differentiation whatsoever can be established between these two forms; we have to treat them as synonymous.

[Khomani]: Maingard 1937: 245, 246.

[Nj]: Sands et al. 2006.

[Xegwi]: Ziervogel 1955: 43, 53; Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 114. Said by Ziervogel to be pronounced with high tone, as opposed to ʔa 'thou' q.v. with low tone. Translations of 'not' as jëwa and ku in [Bleek 1929: 62] are erroneous; the latter form is not confirmed at all in [Bleek 1956], and jëwa is glossed in [Bleek 1956: 310] as the negative predicate 'not to be', with the example han jëwa ka "he is not here" (there is a possibility of incorrect morphemic segmentation).

[Auni]: Bleek 1937: 203, 206; Bleek 1956: 91, 185, 202. All the three particles are probably variants of one and the same negation *tš (with palatal realization of the initial consonant among some speakers). In [Bleek 1929: 62], 'not' is translated as either takšu (probably a contraction of tš and the verbal particle ku) or ʔa (probably erroneous, since its existence not confirmed in [Bleek 1937]).

[Haasi]: Story 1999: 22.

Proto-Wi: Distribution: On a strictly distributional basis, the item is not properly reconstructible; however, external comparison suggests that the lateral click stem, attested in various forms of N|uu, is the most archaic of all alternatives. Additionally, cf. Seroa ʃl̥u 'not' [Bleek 1956: 562]. Replacements: Essentially, each language or dialect cluster within Wi is represented by its own basic negation: Xam x'au, N|uu ʃl̥u, Xegwi ʔa, Lower Njōssob *tš. It does not seem possible at present to establish a reliable scenario for the historic development of this Swadesh item in Wi. Semantics and structure: Most of the variants of 'not' in Wi, including ʃl̥u, behave like verbal stems, with vocalic gradation in the root typical of most non-derived verbal stems.

63. ONE
the plural in people'. Clearly, this is the same suppletive plural as in are also given on the use of although it is not mentioned again in any of the dictionaries. The variant suppletive:
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N\textsuperscript{u}uu: Sands et al. 2006. See notes on \textsuperscript{\textit{h}}Khomani for analysis. It is not clear if the stem \textit{!ui} is encountered in isolation, but, in any case, it is \textit{!ui} that carries the central meaning of ‘person’, with \textit{!i} (‘home?’) serving as a modifier for self-designation. Suppletive plural: \textit{!hi \textit{fe}} ‘people’. Quoted as \textit{!e\textit{t-ke}}, pl. \textit{!e\textit{fe}} in [Westphal 1965: 139].


'[\textit{Auni: Bleek 1937: 216; Bleek 1956: 643, 652}. Although both forms are glossed as ‘men, people’ in [Bleek 1937] (e. g. as plural forms), this is contradicted by the fact that the same source also lists the specifically plural form \textit{fi-te}; textual examples confirming both variants as singular forms are also found in [Bleek 1956: 652], e. g. \textit{fi ti \textit{f}u-\textit{u}} “one person”. Quoted as \textit{fi}, pl. \textit{fi-te} in [Bleek 1929: 65]. On the possibility of the word \textit{da} to be translated as ‘person’, see under ‘man’.

[Haasi: Story 1999: 22. Plural form: \textit{ke} (with diaeresis, possibly = \textit{ke}?).

Proto-\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}Wi: Distribution: Preserved throughout Narrow \textsuperscript{\textit{h}}Wi, but seemingly dropped in the Lower N\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}ossob branch. Replacements: Most languages of the Narrow \textit{h}Wi branch present firm evidence that the paradigm of this noun was suppletive in the protolanguage: \textit{\textit{t}u-} (sg.) vs. \textit{\textit{t}e} ~ \textit{\textit{t}e} (possibly = \textit{\textit{t}e\textit{te}}) (pl.). In comparison, Lower N\textit{h}ossob languages only show reflexes of the second root both in sg. and pl. forms; this is most logically interpreted as an innovative generalization of the plural form, with a “new” plural formed wherever necessary (e. g. sg. \textit{fi} vs. pl. \textit{fi-te} in \textit{Auni}). The semantic shift {‘people’ > ‘person’} is quite trivial. Reconstruction shape: The basic root shape of the sg. ‘person’ is straightforwardly reconstructible as \textit{\textit{t}e\textit{e}}; \textit{\textit{tu-}} and \textit{\textit{tu-a}} are probably morphological variants, although only the former is widely distributed and clearly traceable back to proto-status.

65. RAIN

[Xam \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a}: \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a}}-\textit{\textit{g}o\textit{n}} ~ \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a}}-\textit{\textit{g}o\textit{n}} (1), \|N\textsuperscript{\textit{g}}\textsuperscript{\textit{l}}\textit{k}e \textit{\textit{h}a-\textit{\textit{a}}: (1), N\textsuperscript{\textit{u}}uu \textit{\textit{q}au} (1), \|Xegwi \textit{\textit{e}\textit{\textit{e}}\textit{\textit{u}}\textit{n} (1), ['\textit{Auni \textit{\textit{h}a\textit{\textit{a}}: (1), Proto-\textit{h}Wi \textit{\textit{q}a\textit{a}}- (1).}

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 431, 457. Transcribed as \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a}} by W. Bleek. Quoted as \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a}:} in [Bleek 1929: 68] (the latter source also adds the compound \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a} \textit{\textit{h}}} \textit{\textit{e}}, literally ‘water’s liquid’, in the same meaning, but this is hardly the basic denotation). External data show that the Proto-\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}Wi roots for ‘rain’ and ‘water’ must have been different, but phonetically similar, and it is not excluded that the two words had been confused in transcription, both by W. Bleek and L. Lloyd. There is, however, no direct evidence for such a confusion in any of the records, and it must be assumed that in Xam the two words simply merged into one.

[\|Ng\textsuperscript{\textit{l}}: Bleek 1956: 423; Bleek 2000: 28. Quoted as \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a}:} in [Bleek 1929: 68]. It is unclear if this word is exactly the same as ‘water’ q. v., or a phonetically similar stem obscured by inadequate transcription. See notes on [Xam for an identical situation in that language.

[\|Kh\textsuperscript{\textit{m}}: Not attested.

N\textsuperscript{\textit{u}}uu: Miller et al. 2009: 158. Transcribed phonetically as [\textit{\textit{q}au}].

[Xegwi: Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 100. Not attested in [Ziervogel 1955]. Attested mostly as a verbal root (e. g. \textit{la ga\textit{\textit{a}} ha\textit{\textit{a}} \textit{\textit{e}\textit{\textit{u}}n\textit{u}: \textit{\textit{a}} “the sky is raining” [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 118]), thus, slightly dubious. In [Bleek 1929: 68] an entirely different word is quoted: \textit{\textit{g}a\textit{\textit{a}} (\textit{\textit{g}a\textit{\textit{a}} in [Bleek 1956: 41]).

['\textit{Auni: Bleek 1937: 216. Quoted as \textit{\textit{t}u\textit{a}:} in [Bleek 1929: 68]. See notes on ‘water’ for further details.

[Haasi: Not attested. Cf., however, \textit{\textit{h}i} to ‘rain’ (verb) [Story 1999: 22].

Proto-\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}Wi: Distribution: Preserved everywhere where attested. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences for the click influx between [Xam, N\textsuperscript{\textit{u}}uu, and ['\textit{Auni are the same as in ‘neck’ q. v., allowing to trace all the attested forms to a common prototype; lateral click in ['\textit{Auni may have been a mistake on D. Bleek’s part, or the result of regular phonetic change from an original \textit{\textit{h}q}-. For the affricate in [Xegwi, cf. ‘short’ with an identical development. Click efflux varies between zero, aspirated, and uvular; we tentatively assume uvular articulation as primary because of the more recent and allegedly accurate N\textsuperscript{\textit{u}}uu data, but \textit{\textit{h}q}- is almost equally probable as the proto-phoneme. The vocalic coda is realized as -\textit{\textit{a}}(a) or -\textit{\textit{u}}, probably reflecting different nominal suffixation, but this situation is actually quite unique, and bears further investigation.
66. RED

[Xam ]!ː ~ */!ː-ya ~ !ʰ!ː-ya (1), [Ng!ke xreː-kʰa (2), ]Khomani įi (3), N|uu ]x'aba (-1), [Xegwi !e (1), [Haasi cxwe-ka (4), Proto-!Wi *j!e ~ *j!i (1).

References and notes:


[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 260. Meaning is glossed as 'red, brown', with a supporting text example: ]ː !e xreː-a "the sun is red" (?). In [Bleek 1929: 69], the word is quoted simply as xreː, without the second auxiliary morpheme. Root structure here is atypical of [Ng!ke and Khoisan in general and may represent a secondary reduction from *xVre.


[N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Meaning glossed as 'red; reddish brown'. The form is a transparent borrowing from Khoekhoe (Nama ]a!wa, !Ora ]e!aba 'red'). There is also a (presumably less used) synonym ku!-q!!, which must be more archaic (cf. the same equivalent in C. Doke’s recordings of ]Khomic).

[Xegwi: Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 115. Meaning glossed as 'be red'. The entry 'red' = ]anse in [Bleek 1929: 69] has to be amended in the light of the same word in [Bleek 1956: 300]: the earlier publication accidentally misprints 'reed' as 'red'.

[’Auni: Not attested.


Proto-!Wi: Distribution: An isogloss between [Xam and [Xegwi, making the word the optimal candidate for "Proto-Narrow !Wi". Reconstruction on a deeper level is impossible. Replacements: Except for N|uu ]x'aba, which is most likely a recent introduction of Khoekhoe origin, most of the other equivalents for the meaning 'red' in !Wi languages do not easily find internal correspondences. They also tend to be phonetically peculiar (e.g. xreː- in [Ng!ke), suggesting further possibilities of borrowing that have to be investigated. Reconstruction shape: The consonantal correspondence between [Xam ]ː- and [Xegwi !e is the same as in the etyma 'bone' and 'bone' q.v., which we currently mark as *j!i-. The vowel is unquestionably a front one, but the exact quality is not easily determinable. In N|uu, the expected click influx correspondence would have been lateral *j; consequently, ]Khomani įi in Doke’s transcription cannot be compared.

67. ROAD

[Xam ]!xárra (1), [Ng!ke tirau (2), N|uu ]an ~ !añ (3), [Xegwi kaŋ (3), ’Auni !án (3), Proto-!Wi *![añ] (3).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 497. Meaning glossed as 'path'. Transcribed as ]xárra by W. Bleek. Quoted as ]xára in [Bleek 1929: 64]. The latter source also mentions a second synonym: ]au-ː = ]au ~ ]ao in [Bleek 1956: 408, 412], where this word is understood as a figurative meaning of 'stone, mountain' q.v. Regardless of whether this is just homonymy or, indeed, a result of semantic shift, the accompanying text examples do not refer to man-made paths, cf.: he ha si!n !a!ka ka !an "of which (ostrich) he told me its path" [Bleek 1956: 412]; ]a kw!ay t!aj ka ]a!ki: ]i!n !i!re]!k!a-ka ]a!ib "I therefore intend to go passing through!Guru-[Na’s pass" [Bleek 1956: 408].

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 203; Bleek 1929: 64. Meaning glossed as 'path'.

[Khomani: Not attested.

[N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. The first form allegedly represents Western dialect, the second form is Eastern. Secondary synonym: ]uru-ke 'road, path, trail'.


[’Auni: Bleek 1937: 213 (quoted as k!in, with the click symbol omitted through a typographic error); Bleek 1956: 456 (with the click
symbol correctly restored). Quoted as ‘ane in [Bleek 1929: 65]: probably the same word in a misheard (or dialectal) variant. Meaning is glossed as ‘path’ in all sources. Cf. also additional synonyms: (a) ǂuru ‘path’ ([Bleek 1937: 216]; [Bleek 1956: 593]); (b) ǂxe ‘road, path’ ([Bleek 1937: 219]; [Bleek 1956: 668]); semantic difference unknown, but onlyǀan has external cognates.

[Haasi]: Not attested.

Proto-ǀWi: Distribution: Preserved in Nǀuu, ǂXegwi, and ǀAuni (unless the ǀAuni word is a borrowing from Nǀuu, in which case the reconstruction is only reliable for the “Narrow !Wi” level). Replacements: Forms in ǀXam and “old Nǀuu” (ǂNg!ke) have no known etymology. Reconstruction shape: Alveolar click *ǃ- is reliably reconstructed based on the correspondence between Nǀuu !- and ǂXegwi k- (click loss, like in the word for ‘person’ q.v.).

68. ROOT

Nǀuu ǂhabe-si # (1), ǀAuni ėau-si # (2).

References and notes:

[ǀXam]: Unclear. The only unambiguous candidate would be ǀau, given as the equivalent of ‘root’ in [Bleek 1929: 71]; however, the same word is translated more specifically as ‘wild onion’ in [Bleek 1956: 414]. Other possible candidates from the same source include ǂunu ‘roots, fibres’ [Bleek 1956: 352]; ǂɗa naï, pl. ǂɗaǂɗa naï “fibrous root” [Bleek 1956: 650] (both from L. Lloyd’s records); neither explicitly qualifies as the default word for ‘root’ (gen.), and it is not even clear if such a generic term existed in ǀXam in the first place.

[ǂNg!ke]: Not attested.

[ǂKhomani]: Not attested.

Nǀuu: Sands et al. 2006. According to B. Sands (p.c.), “only one of the Eastern Nǀuu speakers knows this word”, and a more suitable candidate may be ėao-si ~ ǂḏū-si ‘root of shepherd’s tree (Boscia albitrunca)’, also used in the meaning ‘root (general)’. The issue needs further elaboration.

[ǂXegwi]: Not attested.

ǀAuni: Bleek 1937: 219; Bleek 1956: 658. Meaning glossed as ‘small roots’, therefore, the lexicostatistical entry is dubious (although the word itself is not, since it is clearly the same as Nǀuu ėao-si ~ ǂḏū-si ‘root of shepherd’s tree’. The earlier, less reliable source lists the form ũoma ‘root’ [Bleek 1929: 71], but in [Bleek 1937: 214] the exact same form is listed with the meaning ‘tobacco’ (?).

[ǀHaasi]: Not attested.

Proto-ǀWi: Not reconstructible due to lack of proper attestation.

69. ROUND

[ǀXam] kũërre-kũërre (1), [ǂNg!ke] ǂkakerĩŋ # (1).

References and notes:

[ǀXam]: Bleek 1956: 113, 116. Reduplicated verbal stem, applicable to round objects (e. g. ‘sun’, ‘egg’). Transcribed as kũërre-kũërre ~ k ǃrɛc-k ǃrɛc by W. Bleek. Quoted as kũre-kũre ~ kuare-kuare in [Bleek 1929: 71]. Cf. also ňɛ̃r̥ɛn-ũɛ̃r̥ɛn [Bleek 1956: 570], also glossed as ‘round’ in one example (applied, however, to “a small troop of springbok”, so the exact meaning may be ‘to surround, encircle’).

[ǂNg!ke]: Bleek 1929: 71. Dubious; the word is not attested at all in the large dictionary [Bleek 1956].

[ǂKhomani]: Not attested.

Nǀuu: Not attested.

[ǂXegwi]: Not attested.

ǀAuni: Not attested.

[ǀHaasi]: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Not reconstructible due to lack of proper attestation. Items in |Xam and ||Ng!ke are quite likely cognate with each other, but their authenticity is not confirmed in any newer sources, and the forms belong to the expressive lexicon layer, not to mention the easy possibility of their areal diffusion.

70. SAND

|Xam !k'ãũ (1), N|uu !ãũ (1), Proto-!Wi *!ãũ ~ *!qãũ (1).

References and notes:

|Xam: Bleek 1956: 372, 412. Same word as 'earth' q.v. Quoted as !ãũ in [Bleek 1929: 71]. For all the phonetic/transcriptional variants with discussion, see under 'earth'.
||Ng!ke: Not attested. Should probably be the same word as 'earth' q.v., but there is no explicit confirmation of this in either [Bleek 1929] or [Bleek 1956].
|Khomani: Not attested.
|N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Same word as 'earth' q.v. Quoted as !ãũ in [Westphal 1965: 144].
|Xegwi: Not attested.
|’Auni: Not attested.
|Haasi: Not attested.

Proto-!Wi: In both of the languages where the meaning 'sand' is attested, it is expressed by the same word as 'earth' q.v.; there is no factual reason to suggest that this polysemy was not present in Proto-!Wi as well.

71. SAY

|Xam ŋa-kkən ~ ŋa-kka ~ ŋa-kan ~ ŋa-ka ~ ŋa-ggən (1), ||Ng!ke ka # (2), ṝKhomani ka ~ ku ~ k’u ~ kwa ~ kɔˤ ~ ku-ʔu ~ kuwa (2), N|uu ka (2), ||Xegwi kũ (2), |’Auni ko (2) / /u (3), |Haasi /wa (3), Proto-!Wi *ka ~ *ku (2).

References and notes:

|Xam: Bleek 1956: 654, 655. Transcribed as ŋa-kkən ~ ŋa-kka ~ ŋa’h-ʔkkan by W. Bleek. Quoted as ha-kən in [Bleek 1929: 71]. This is rather transparently the primary equivalent for ‘say’ in |Xam, being the main means of introducing direct speech (cf. ha oakan ḥakka hí... “their father says to them...”, etc.). The form is morphologically complex, with one of |Xam’s most common derivational suffixes that usually serves as a nominalizer. Other potential synonyms, listed in [Bleek 1929: 71], include: (a) ka, glossed as 'to wish, intend, think, say’ in [Bleek 1956: 73] and, judging from the contexts, generally applied to mental rather than verbal activity; (b) kuc = kici ~ kii-tan “speaking” [Bleek 1956: 104], also glossed in the meaning ‘think’ and featuring in a very limited set of contexts/examples.
||Ng!ke: Bleek 1929: 71. Dubious, since the word is not found in the large dictionary [Bleek 1956]. However, ka as the basic word for ‘say’ is strongly supported by external data (|Khomani, |N|uu), and the other quasi-synonym listed in [Bleek 1929: 71], ḥala, is clearly ineligible, since its meaning is confirmed as ‘to speak’ rather than ‘say’ in [Bleek 1956: 554], where it is quoted as ḥalaʔa ~ ḥalaʔa, cf.: a ḥaʔa’ luʔ-ta tuink’a “thou speakest the Bushman language”.
|Khomani: Maingard 1937: 251, 252. Differently vocalized variants may reflect mergers with class markers or other types of suffixation.
|’Auni: Bleek 1937: 203; Bleek 1956: 95. Meaning glossed as ‘says, cries’ (in [Bleek 1937]) or as ‘to say, scream’ (in [Bleek 1956]). This is one of the two main verbs that introduce direct speech in |’Auni. The other is lu ([Bleek 1937: 210]; [Bleek 1956: 322]); the difference is unclear - for instance, within one text dictated by a single woman ([Bleek 1937: 198]) the narrative begins with lu used several times,
after which the narrator suddenly switches to ko for no apparent reason. We have to count both forms as synonyms.

**Proto-Wi:** Distribution: Preserved everywhere except for [Xam] (where it seems to have undergone a semantic shift) and [Haasi] (if Story’s source is to be trusted). Replacements: (a) the source of [Xam] ka- remains unclear, but its textual attestation suggests that it had managed to more or less permanently replace the older ka as the basic equivalent for ‘say’; (b) Common Lower N[osso]b ‘ku- ‘to say’, functioning as a complete synonym of ko in [Auni], finds no reliable parallels in "Narrow !Wi". Reconstruction shape: The verb is commonly represented by either the variant *ka or the variant with a labial vowel (usually *ku), probably reflecting the usual (poorly understood) scenario of vocalic fluctuation in basic (CV-type) verbal roots.

72. SEE


References and notes:

[Xam]: [Bleek 1956: 341, 345, 347]. Transcribed as [aː] ~ [aː]; ~ [iː]; ~ [iː]; ~ [iː] by W. Bleek. Quoted as [iː] ~ [iː] in [Bleek 1929: 72]. Vocalic fluctuation is a typical [Xam] feature of short verbal stems and may reflect mergers with various class suffixes; the original root is arguably best denoted as [iː]. Secondary synonym: [œn ~ [œn] [Bleek 1956: 607], glossed as "to see, look" (transcribed as [œn ~ [œn] by W. Bleek; quoted as [œn in [Bleek 1929: 72]); some attested contexts suggest ‘see’ as a better semantic equivalent than ‘look’, but, overall, it is statistically evident that [iː] is the more basic item in this meaning.

[Ng!ke]: [Bleek 1956: 341, 345, 347]; [Bleek 1929: 72]; [Bleek 2000: 24]. Vocalic fluctuation, same as in [Xam], is typical of short verbal stems. Secondary synonym: [œn-ya] ([Bleek 1929: 72]; [Bleek 1956: 309]), attested in one dubious example (n [ę]ny [œn] "I have seen the animals"); clearly a different root, but statistically quite unlikely to represent the basic equivalent for the meaning ‘see’.

[Khomani]: [Maingard 1937: 245, 246, 252]. Secondary synonym: [ia] [ibid.]. The semantic difference is unclear and suggests incorrect translation (cf., among Maingard’s examples, such a strange opposition as a [ia] ña “you see me”, but a [ia] a “you see yourself”): most likely, [ia] is actually ‘look’ rather than ‘see’. This suggestion is further corroborated by the occasional translation ‘look’ even in [Maingard 1937] itself, as well as the more modern data from [N]uu.

Haasi: [Sands et al. 2006].

[Xegwi]: Ziervogel 1955: 36, 49. The past tense form is transcribed as [aː] [ibid.]. Infinitive: [œn-ya], imperative forms: [aː] (eg.), [aː]-u (pl.) [Ziervogel 1955: 48]. Quoted as [iː] ~ [iː] in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 105]; as [aː] ~ [iː] in [Bleek 1929: 72]; as [aː] ~ [iː] in [Bleek 1956: 341, 345].

[Auni]: [Bleek 1937: 211; Bleek 1956: 341]. Cf. also the phonetically similar form [iːn] ([Bleek 1937: 210]; [Bleek 1956: 327]; quoted as [iːn in [Bleek 1929: 72]). It is not clear if this is a separate root (and if yes, what is the difference between the two), or if it is yet another morphological variant of the same stem [iː].

[Haasi]: [Story 1999: 23]. Reduplicated stem.

**Proto-Wi:** Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Reconstruction shape: Nasalized dental click is preserved in all daughter languages and reconstructed without hesitation. Vocalic fluctuations are quite typical for all CV-type verbal roots.

73. SEED

[Auni] c’ou (1).

References and notes:

[Xam]: Not attested.

[Ng!ke]: Not attested.
74. SIT

[Xam s:'o ~ š:ō (1), ||Ng!ke so ~ so: ~ sx: (1), ÌKhomani sūĩ ~ swēĩ ~ swē̂ (1), N|uu sūĩ (1), ||Xegwi šøge (1), ]Àuni sā ~ sāo ~ so (1), ]Haasi c'i (1), Proto!Wi *soʔ- (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 171, 181. Transcribed as so ~ sx: ~ s'ō ~ šō by W. Bleek. Quoted as šīc ~ šōc in [Bleek 1929: 76]. This is the stative verb ('to sit, be sitting'); the dynamic action verb ('to sit down') is expressed by an apparently derivative stem: soęy ~ soęya ~ suęnya (W. Bleek), suęy ~ suęnya ~ suęy-suęy (L. Lloyd) [Bleek 1956: 172, 173, 175].

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 171; Bleek 2000: 20. Quoted as s'c in [Bleek 1929: 76]. This is the stative verb ('to sit, be sitting'); the dynamic action verb ('to sit down') is expressed by an apparently derivative stem: soęg ~ soęya ~ suęnyə [Bleek 1956: 172, 176].

[Khomani: Maingard 1937: 252. As in other cases, differently vocalized variants may reflect mergers with class markers or other types of suffixation. Transcribed as sōu in [Doke 1936: 63].

[N|uu: Miller et al. 2009: 156. Meaning glossed as 'to sit (of one person)'. The corresponding suppletive plural stem is pəu [Sands et al. 2007: 61].

[Xegwi: Zivervogel 1955: 40, 51. The simple form, according to Zivervogel, is used as the past or future tense; the present tense stem is šøge-ne [ibid.]. Possibly the same stem is quoted as so ałane 'sit and wait for me' in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 116], where it is analyzed as so šit + ała' wait + ne 'me'. Quoted as soč in [Bleek 1929: 76]; as soč ~ šo ~ šō in [Bleek 1956: 181, 232].

[Àuni: Bleek 1937: 205, 206; Bleek 1956: 161, 164, 171. Meaning glossed as 'to sit down, put down, set, stay', but textual examples confirm that this is also the basic equivalent for the static verb 'to sit'. In [Bleek 1929: 76], the form sū is listed in the meaning 'to sit', and a strange form !tawa, not confirmed in later sources, in the meaning 'to sit down'. Should be distinguished from šā 'to sit, to squat' [Bleek 1937: 213].


Proto!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all daughter languages. Reconstruction shape: The first consonant is clearly 's- (compare with 'c' 'bite' q.v. to make certain that reconstructing an affricate here is out of the question). However, in order to account for the glottal stop in [Xam and [Ng!ke, as well as the glottalized affricate in [Haasi, it has to be presumed that glottal articulation was at least defined on the original vowel (i.e. [Xam s'c < *soV, etc.). The basic root seems to frequently interact with verbal suffixes, e.g. *so-th-i (in [N|uu > sō or sūi with vocalic assimilation), *so-th-a (in [Àuni), *so-th-i (in [Haasi > c').

75. SKIN

[Xam tũŋ (1), ||Ng!ke tũ ~ twũ ~ diũ (1), ÌKhomani зо (1), N|uu ʒũ: (1), ||Xegwi tuŋ ~ tũ: (1), ]Àuni ũ: (2), ]Haasi ḧ (2), Proto!Wi *tuŋ (1).
References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 240. Transcribed as tʊ, emphatic form tʊŋ ~ tʊʊŋ] by W. Bleek. Quoted as tʊ in [Bleek 1929: 76]. The latter source also quotes a secondary synonym: ɠ, glossed, however, in [Bleek 1956: 531] as 'outer skin' and encountered in application to a snake's shed skin and the skin of a dead person. Clearly not the basic word for 'skin' in the light of both internal and external evidence.

[Ngk: Bleek 1956: 26, 240, 243. The form diŋ is somewhat dubious and may represent a different lexeme. Quoted as tʊ in [Bleek 1929: 76]. The same source lists ɭʊ as a synonym; in [Bleek 1956: 321] the word is glossed as 'skin, leather', with one textual example supporting only the second meaning (ŋ ɭʊŋ ɭʊ!xi 'I bring a skin dress').

[Khomani: Maingard 1937: 243. Applied to animals (faru ka ʒo 'sheep's skin'). Transcribed as ʒə (with a nasalized vowel) in [Doke 1936: 67].

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Quoted as ʒə in [Westphal 1965: 143].


'Auni: Bleek 1937: 218; Bleek 1956: 627.


Proto!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in Narrow !Kwi. Replacements: Narrow !Wi *tʊŋ is opposed to Lower N|ossob *ɭʊ (reconstruction relies on [Auni rather than [Haasi], but external comparanda in Taa languages (!Xõ ɭʊəm, etc.) show that the Narrow !Kwi variant is more semantically archaic. The Lower N|ossob variant finds an interesting etymological parallel in Narrow !Kwi; [Xam ɠ 'outer skin', 'shed skin', allowing to suggest a possible replacement ['outer skin / shed skin' > 'skin (gen.)], although the data are clearly insufficient to secure this conclusion. Reconstruction shape: The nasal coda seems to be retained in [Xegwi], but as a rule, dissipates into vowel nasalization in the other languages (*tʊŋ > tʊ). Palatalisation in N|uu is regular, but the reasons for voicing of the initial consonant remain unclear - an issue to be investigated further, possibly affecting the phonological status of the reconstructed segment.

76. SLEEP

[Xam ðɔɪɔɪ (1), ||Ng!ke ðɔwoŋ ~ ðɔweŋ ~ ðøŋ (1), ||Khomani ðwō ~ ðwonna (1), N|uu ðun ~ ðʊŋ (1), ||Xegwi ði (1), ||Auni ðwɔi (1), ||Haasi ðwa-ai (1), Proto!Wi *ðʊ- ~ *ði- (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 684, 686. Transcribed as ðʊŋ - ðøŋ *ʊŋ - ðøe-ʊŋ] by W. Bleek. Quoted as ðʊŋ in [Bleek 1929: 76]. There also exists a secondary synonym: ðʊŋ (L. Lloyd, W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 359], quoted as ðʊŋ in [Bleek 1929: 76]; its exact meaning is hard to determine based on attested examples, but it is likely to have been the dynamic action verb 'to lie down (to sleep)' (cf. such a diagnostic example as he si [ŋən ə ... ɡ a x’u:kí ðʊʊŋ “then we lay down... I did not sleep” [Bleek 1956: 359]).

[Ngk: Bleek 1956: 684, 686; Bleek 1929: 76. In D. Bleek's records, the verb kia 'to lie' q.v. is also very frequently glossed as 'to sleep' (e. g. within a complete transcribed "paradigm" ð i kia; a kia, etc., translated as 'I sleep, thou sleepest, etc.' [Bleek 1956: 91]). However, it may be assumed that the primary meaning of kia is 'to lie', based on (a) external evidence and, more importantly, (b) the fact that only for kia we also have contexts such as [i] ki kia ha [i] ai "the bird stays (= lies) in her nest" (certainly not *‘sleeps’) [ibid.]. Nevertheless, there must have been some actual overlapping between the two concepts, and it is possible that in this particular dialect the old etymon ðʊŋ was being gradually replaced by kia.

[Khomani: Maingard 1937: 256. Transcribed as ðʊʊnə in [Doke 1936: 63].


[Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 36, 39, 52. The simple stem, according to Ziervogel, is only used in the future tense. The present tense stem is ði-je; the past tense stem is ði-ya [Ziervogel 1955: 52]. Quoted as ðaʊn - ðaʊŋ - ðaʊən in [Bleek 1956: 685, 687] (with the same "special" type of labial click that D. Bleek perceives in the word 'meat' q.v.).

54
77. SMALL

[Xam] ǂ'ɛɲɲi ~ ǂ'ɛnni (1), [Ng!ke] ǂ'i (1), [ǂHombani] ǂ'kọ (2), [N]uu ǂ'i (1), [ǂXegwi] ǂ'i (1), [ǂAuni] ǂ'ai # (3), [ǂHaasi] nǂáí-si (4), Proto-ǂWi *ǂ'eni (1).

References and notes:

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 643. Plural form: ǂ'enn (on a formal synchronic basis, the singular stem is derived from the plural one). Transcribed as ǂ'eŋi by W. Bleek. Quoted as ǂ'eŋi in [Bleek 1929: 76]. This seems to be the least strongly marked equivalent for ‘small’ in Xam. Two more forms are listed in [Bleek 1929: 76]: (a) ǂ'eŋi = sg. ǂ'eŋi ~ ǂ'eŋi, pl. ǂ'en in (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 215]. This lexeme is said to be exclusively used in conjunction with the negative (ǂ'eŋi 'not small'), and all textual examples confirm this; (b) ǂ'jwe = ǂ'j (Bleek 1956: 684): this is a diminutive morpheme, mostly found in conjunction with words for ‘children’ or ‘young of birds/animals’ (ǂ'jwe 'little ostrich', etc.).

[ǂNg!ke]: Bleek 1956: 652; Bleek 1929: 76. The secondary synonym ǂ'win-kj [Bleek 1956: 685] ~ ǂ'win-ki [Bleek 1929: 76] is more rare and most probably applied only to young animals (cf. the given example ǂ'win-kj "little goats").

[ǂǂHombani]: Maingard 1937: 256. The efflux is marked with both a glottal stop and the velar obstruent k, whatever that might mean according to Maingard’s notation. Cf. ǂ'win 'small' in [Doke 1936: 73] (most probably the same root, but with a different click efflux and an extra suffix at the end).

[N]uu: Sands et al. 2006. Meaning glossed as ‘small, few’. Secondary synonym: ǂ'i (primarily used to form diminutives, as in [ǂXam and other !Wi-Taa languages].


[ǂǂAuni]: Bleek 1929: 76. Only attested in this early, not very reliable, source, so the entry is dubious.

[ǂǂHaasi]: Story 1999: 23. Proto-ǂWi: Distribution: Preserved in most of the Narrow !Wi dialects, but seems to have been largely lost in Lower Nǂossob. Replacements: (a) The situation with Lower Nǂossob languages is unclear, since the ǂǂAuni equivalent is only attested in an early dubious source, and the ǂǂHaasi entry, with its initial palatal nasal, is phonologically odd and looks like an "expressive" term; (b) ǂǂǂǂHombani ǂŋk in Maingard’s vocabulary is to be compared with a whole series of words meaning ‘child, son, daughter; young; little, small’ in !Wi languages [Bleek 1956: 682-687]: however, as a rule, this word is never used to denote objects that are small in size, so either the meaning in ǂǂǂǂHombani was inaccurately glossed or there was a minor semantic shift in that dialect of Nǂuu (‘young, little /of age/ > ’small /in size/’). Reconstruction shape: Initial palatal click is well preserved in [ǂXam and N]uu and regularly shifts to a lateral affricate in [ǂǂXegwi. Of particular note is the fact that in [ǂXam, the palatal click is consistently marked as such, rather than as an alveolar click (c.f. ‘dog’, etc.). The implications of this for the reconstruction are not yet clear (separate click phoneme? special positional development? result of recent borrowing?). Bisyllabic nature of the word is well preserved in [ǂǂXegwi and is reflected as vocalic nasalization in N]uu.

78. SMOKE
References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 533. Quoted as ụ in [Bleek 1929: 77]. Somewhat dubious (only attested in the compound form ụ-ka ụw “smoke’s man” (?)), but seems to be confirmed by external evidence.

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 334; Bleek 1929: 77.

[Khomani: Doke 1936: 64. Not attested in Maingard’s data.


[Auni: Bleek 1929: 77. Only attested in this early, not very reliable, source, so the entry is dubious.

[Haasi: Story 1999: 23. Said to denote both noun and verb, although the only textual example is within the phrase ‘I smoke’.

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: This is an isogloss between [Xam, N|uu, and [Haasi, and, consequently, the optimal candidate for ‘smoke’ in Proto-!Wi. Replacements: [Ng!ke ʰa, [Xegwi kʰa-za, and [Auni ʰa in [Bleek 1956: 453]. Overall, it must be stated that no truly diagnostic contexts, in which it would be transparently clear that the Swadesh meaning is present, are attested in Bleek’s corpus of examples.

Reference shape: We tentatively choose the N|uu form as the most conservative, simply because of the accuracy of transcription. It does not correlate well with such features as voiced articulation of the click in Doke’s Khomani, or the diphthong -au in [Haasi; however, we are not sure as to whether at least some of these features have not simply been inaccurately transcribed.

79. STAND

[Xam ḫe: ~ ḫe (1), [Ng!ke ḫa (2), N|uu ḫa: (2), [Xegwi ḫo-ge (3), [Auni ḫ (4), [Haasi ḫa (5).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 425. Polysemy: ‘stand / remain / stop’. Transcribed as ḫe ~ ḫe by W. Bleek. Quoted as ḫe in [Bleek 1929: 79]. The verb is quite distinct from the dynamic ‘to stand up’: kɔâŋ (L. Lloyd), kɔâŋ ~ kɔâŋ (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 97].

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 611. Quoted as ḫa in [Bleek 1929: 79]. Slightly dubious; the main meaning of this verbal stem in [Xam is ‘to stay, dwell, be somewhere’, and many particular contexts in Ng!ke display the same semantics, cf.: bu ḫa bu einki “they stay with their father”, ha ḫa ḫa “he is at the door” [Bleek 1956: 611]. However, cf. also: ʰa ḫi ḫi “I stand” [ibid.]. Also, no serious competition for this stem is attested, with the potential weak exception of ḫi [Bleek 1956: 453]. Overall, it must be stated that no truly diagnostic contexts, in which it would be transparently clear that the Swadesh meaning is present, are attested in Bleek’s corpus of examples.

[Khomani: Not attested.

[N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Secondary synonym: ʰa ‘to be in a vertical position / to stand up’.

[Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 48, 51. The simple stem, according to Ziervogel, is used as the past or future tense; the present tense stem is ḫo-ge-nc. The imperative forms glossed as ʰo-gena (sg.), ḫo- “stand ye!”. The same word is possibly quoted as ḫe in [Bleek 1929: 79], although it is not confirmed in [Bleek 1956].

[Auni: Bleek 1937: 212. Meaning glossed as: ‘up, to stand’. The same word is quoted in [Bleek 1929: 79] as ḫa ‘to stand’ (with the zero efflux, possibly erroneous); and in [Bleek 1956: 368], in the textual example: misis k’wi sa: ḫa “Missis is standing up”.


Proto-!Wi: Reconstruction of this item is postponed due to too many difficulties: many languages feature phonetically similar forms that, however, do not manage to “come together” under any plausible historical scenario.

80. STAR
All relevant data unequivocally agree on the reconstruction of the lateral click influx. Click efflux varies informants only. It is also proposed that this is not the common Bushman word for 'stone', and it was obtained from one group of Xam and Xegwi may have independently replaced the original etymon (an easy possibility if the old root \*?l- denoted a semantically close phenomenon, such as 'big star, planet', etc.). Replacements: No current etymologization for either the etymon seen in Xam and Xegwi or for \*Auni \*t/a. Reconstruction shape: All relevant data unequivocally agree on the reconstruction of the lateral click influx. Click efflux varies between several fluctuating reflexes. We tentatively accept the N|uu as 'big star, planet', etc.).

81. STONE

\[Xam \|uá\-\texttt{t}om (1), \|Ng!ke \|\texttt{w}ai\^{5}\texttt{-sa} \sim \|x\texttt{w}e\texttt{-sa} (2), \|Khomani \|\texttt{w}āi\texttt{-qē} (2), N|uu \|x\texttt{o}é\texttt{-si} (2), \|Xegwi \|\texttt{o}u\texttt{-ni} (1), \|\texttt{Auni} \!tʰa: (3), \|\texttt{Proto}-!\texttt{Wi} \*\|\texttt{x}\texttt{o}é\texttt{-} (2).\]

References and notes:

\[Xam: \text{Bleek} 1956: 331. \text{Emphatic form: } \|uá\texttt{tt}a, \text{plural form: } \|uá\texttt{-uá}\texttt{-tt}m (with reduplication). \text{Transcribed as: } \|y\texttt{t}m \sim \|\texttt{u}am \sim \|\texttt{y}\texttt{t}tii, \text{emphatic form } \|uá\texttt{-ta-kon} \text{ by W. Bleek. Quoted as } \|\texttt{u}am \text{ in } [\text{Bleek} 1929: 79].\]

\[\|Ng!\texttt{ke}: \text{Bleek} 1956: 596, 610. \text{Plural form: } \|\texttt{w}ai\texttt{-nkē} \sim \|\texttt{x}ē\texttt{c}ō\texttt{-gan}. \text{Quoted as } \|\texttt{w}ē\texttt{-sa} \text{ in } [\text{Bleek} 1929: 79]. \text{The suffix } \texttt{-sa} \text{ is a rarely encountered class marker.}\]

\[\|Khomani: \text{Doke} 1936: 67. \text{The form is glossed as plural ('stars'). } \text{Not attested in Maingard's data.}\]

\[N|uu: \text{Sands et al. 2007: 62. } \text{Polysemy: } \text{'star / hedgehog' (apparently a common association for South Khoisan speakers, known also in } \|\texttt{x}ōō). \text{Quoted as } \|\texttt{u}ō\texttt{-si} \text{ in } [\text{Westphal} 1965: 143] \text{ (meaning glossed as pl. 'stars').}\]

\[\|Xegwi: \text{Ziervogel 1955: 38, 45. The form is plural ('stars'); the singulative form is } \|\texttt{ouni}-zi. \text{ A completely different form, } \|\texttt{kale}, \text{ is found in } [\text{Bleek} 1929: 79] \text{ (quoted as } \|\texttt{kale} \text{'stars' in } [\text{Bleek} 1956: 78]).\]

\[\|\texttt{Auni}: \text{Bleek 1937: 213; Bleek 1929: 79. Quoted as } \|\texttt{t}u\texttt{a} \text{ in } [\text{Bleek} 1956: 394].\]

\[\|\texttt{Haasi}: \text{Not attested.}\]

\[\|\texttt{Proto}-!\texttt{Wi}: \text{\textbf{Distribution:} Based on these data, the optimal candidate for } \|\texttt{Proto}-!\texttt{Wi} \text{ (more precisely, } \|\texttt{Proto}-!\texttt{Narrow }!\texttt{Wi} \text{) 'star' should be the isogloss between } \|\texttt{Xam} \text{ and } \|\texttt{Xegwi}. \text{However, it must also be noted that the best external parallels (in } \|\texttt{Taa} \text{) are for the } \|\texttt{N|uu} \text{ entry, and there is no sufficient evidence to think of any intense secondary } \|\texttt{Taa}-\|\texttt{N|uu} \text{ contacts. Additionally, the item with the lateral click is also seen in several languages for which lexicostatistical calculations are impossible: cf. } \|\texttt{Ku} \text{'s}\texttt{au-}\texttt{tē} \text{'stars' (pl.), } \|\texttt{Kxau} \text{ 'x\texttt{a}n-}\texttt{si} \text{ id. } [\text{Bleek} 1956: 557]. \text{We consider this evidence more substantial, which would mean that } \|\texttt{Xam} \text{ and } \|\texttt{Xegwi} \text{ may have independently replaced the original etymon (an easy possibility if the old root } \|\texttt{?l-} \text{ denoted a semantically close phenomenon, such as 'big star, planet', etc.). Replacements: No current etymologization for either the etymon seen in } \|\texttt{Xam} \text{ and } \|\texttt{Xegwi} \text{ or for } \|\texttt{Auni }\|\texttt{t}u\texttt{a}.\]

\[\|\text{Reconstruction shape: All relevant data unequivocally agree on the reconstruction of the lateral click influx. Click efflux varies between several fluctuating reflexes. We tentatively accept the } \|\texttt{N|uu} \text{ form as archaic, and ascribe the fluctuations to various assimilative/dissimilative processes, caused by its containing a glottalized velar affricate in the click efflux position and pharyngealization of the vowel at the same time. Naturally, this is a temporary decision, pending more detailed work on correspondences.}\]

\[\|\texttt{x}\texttt{x}: 81. \text{\textbf{STONE}}\]

\[\|\texttt{Xam }\|\texttt{lau} \sim \|\texttt{l\texttt{u}u} (1), \|\texttt{Ng!ke }\|\texttt{lau} \sim \|\texttt{l\texttt{u}u} (1), \|\texttt{Khomani }\|\texttt{uru} (2), \|\texttt{N|uu }\|\texttt{ta} (1), \|\texttt{Xegwi }\|\texttt{ziu} (1), \|\texttt{Auni }\|\texttt{x}\texttt{x}\texttt{-} (3), \|\texttt{Haasi }\|\texttt{l\texttt{u}e} (1), \|\texttt{Proto}-!\texttt{Wi} \*\|\texttt{la} (1).\]

References and notes:

\[\|\texttt{Xam: } \text{Bleek 1956: 412, 444. Plural form: } \|\texttt{lau-\texttt{g}n} \sim \|\texttt{lau-\texttt{uk}m}. \text{Quoted as } \|\texttt{lau} \sim \|\texttt{l\texttt{u}u} \text{ in } [\text{Bleek} 1929: 80]. \text{Same word as 'mountain' q.v. (see 'mountain' for speculations on possible morphological differentiation between the two meanings).}\]

\[\|\texttt{Ng!ke}: \text{Bleek 1956: 412; Bleek 1929: 80. Same word as 'mountain' q.v.}\]

\[\|\texttt{Khomani}: \text{Maingard 1937: 274. Transcribed as } \|\texttt{fō\texttt{ku}} \text{ in } [\text{Doke} 1936: 64], \text{with the meaning, however, glossed as 'pebble'.}\]

\[\|\texttt{N|uu: } \text{Miller et al. 2007: 55. Quoted as } \|\texttt{la} \text{ in } [\text{Westphal} 1965: 144].\]

\[\|\texttt{Xegwi: } \text{Ziervogel 1955: 40. Quoted as } \|\texttt{ez} \text{ in } [\text{Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 100}]. \text{Cf. also the variant } \|\texttt{zē} \text{ 'stone' in } [\text{Lanham & Hallowes 1956a: 47}]; \text{the authors mention that 'this is not the common Bushman word for 'stone', and it was obtained from one group of informants only.' It is also proposed that this latter form may be a borrowing from Sotho } \|\texttt{li-}\texttt{zwe} \text{ id. In } [\text{Bleek} 1929: 80] \text{ and } [\text{Bleek} 1956: 265, 266], \text{two forms for 'stone' are quoted: } \|\texttt{zē} \text{ and } \|\texttt{zē}. \text{ It is not clear if they represent the same word as Lanham & Hallowes' } \|\texttt{ez} \text{ or } \|\texttt{zē} \text{ (or both?). Overall, a rather complicated situation.}\]

\[\|\texttt{Auni}: \text{Bleek 1929: 80. Only attested in this early, not very reliable, source, so the entry is dubious.}\]
82. SUN

[Xam /x’õŋ] (1), [Ng!ke /õi ~ /ûi ~ /õiŋ ~ /õi ~ /ûin (1), ḳKhomani /ûi (1), N|uu /ûi (1), Xegwi /ûmi (1), ‘Auni /ɛ ~ /ɛn (2), [Haasi /i (2), Proto-ǃWi */ûi (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 607, 626, 627. Polysemy: ‘sun / day / thirst’. Transcribed as ǂõiŋ ~ ǂõi ~ ǂõiŋ ~ ǂûin, emphatic form: ǂõiŋ-ya by W. Bleek. In L. Lloyd’s records, the form ǂûi is only recorded in the meaning ‘day’. Quoted as ǂõiŋ in [Bleek 1929: 81]. Irregular fluctuation of transcription between glottalic, velar affricate, and simple velar articulation of the click efflux suggests an original "non-trivial", undetected type of efflux, possibly uvular (*ǂõi or *ǂûi).

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 584, 585, 625, 626. Polysemy: ‘sun / day / thirst’. Quoted as ǂûi in [Bleek 1929: 81] and [Bleek 2000: 20]. Irregular fluctuation of transcription between glottalic and simple velar articulation of the click efflux is the same as in [Xam and suggests a "non-trivial" type of original articulation.


N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Quoted as ǂûi in [Westphal 1965: 143].

[Xegwi: Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 117. Not attested in [Ziervogel 1955]. In [Bleek 1929: 81], two forms are quoted: ǂûi and ǂûn; both of them are confirmed in [Bleek 1956: 584, 628]. It is not clear if these are two different words or dialectal variants. Likewise, neither of the forms can be equated with Lanham & Hallowes’ ǂûni, although external comparison shows them to be more archaic in shape than ǂûni.

[ǂAuni: Bleek 1937: 210. Polysemy: ‘sun / day’. Quoted as ǂe ~ ǂen in [Bleek 1956: 307]; as ǂe in [Bleek 1929: 81]. The latter source also adds a different synonym, ǂoi, not found in [Bleek 1937]. It corresponds to the general !Wi root for ‘sun’, but, since [Bleek 1929] is a generally unreliable source, we do not include ǂoi in our calculations - it could have been included by mistake, or represent a dialectal archaism, or, quite likely, a borrowing from N|uu.


Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved throughout Narrow !Wi. Additionally, cf. [Kxau ǃox: ‘sun’ [Bleek 1958: 625]. Replacements: In Lower N|ossob, the original root (whose archaicty is confirmed by external comparison with Taa languages) is replaced with *ǂ[e ~ ǂe (a from that closely resembles the Common !Wi equivalent for ‘fire’ q.v.; however, we hesitate to postulate a lexical merger, since the actual recorded forms for ‘fire’ in [Auni and [Haasi are phonetically different. Reconstruction shape: The majority of the languages agree upon the phonetic shape ǂûi ~ ǂûe (it is not yet clear if the diphthongs ǂûi and ǂe were opposed in Proto-ǃWi or if they were mere phonetic variants). The only major dissenting form is [Xegwi ǂûni, the way it is transcribed in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956]; assuming secondary labialization of the nasal under the influence of the preceding vowel, an earlier variant ǂûni may not only indicate that ǂûi is the result of consonantals lention, but would also better agree with external parallels in Taa (cf. !Xóô ǂûn ‘sun’). However, the lack of glottal efflux is rather confusing, as is the attestation of the variant ǂûi in [Xegwi by D. Bleek. Such ambiguity of the data implies that one should probably adopt the "majority rule" here, and suspend amending the reconstruction from the widely supported ǂûi to the [Xegwi-supported ǂûni until a detailed reconstruction of Proto-ǃWi is produced.

83. SWIM

[Xam ǂtxu: # (1).
References and notes:

| Xam: | Bleek 1956: 686. Quoted as ðtxu in [Bleek 1929: 82], along with the allegedly synonymous form gan = gaxu [Bleek 1956: 43]. Both forms are only attested sporadically in W. Bleek’s records. We choose the former as primary due to its being illustrated with an actual contextual example (ba-g ëk kui ðtxu: u !khi tiŋ !wax: “he swam on top of the water”), but its status is questionable all the same. |
| Ng!ke: | Not attested. |
| Khomani: | Not attested. |
| Nǀuu: | Not attested. |
| Xegwi: | Not attested. |
| ’Auni: | Not attested. |
| Haasi: | Not attested. |
| Proto-!Wi: | Not reconstructible due to lack of proper attestation. |

84. TAIL

| Xam | !ʰwi | (1), Ng!ke | lei | (1), Khomani | !āi² | (1), Nǀuu | !ʰai | (1), Xegwi | kʰi | (1), ’Auni | ʰwi | (2), Haasi | i=|³-a | (3), Proto-!Wi | */a-# | (1). |

85. THAT

| Xam | le: ~ l # | (1), Ng!ke | ā | (2), Nǀuu | kea | (3), Xegwi | ?e=ta | (4), ’Auni | ha ~ he ~ hi | (2), Haasi | ɔː-a | (5). |

References and notes:
References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 306. Transcribed as le ~ lê ~ lê: by W. Bleek. Correct definition of demonstrative pronouns in [Xam is problematic, since reliable grammatical descriptions are lacking, most dictionary information is contradictory, and most of the textual examples inconclusive. [Xam le is almost certainly a stem that is used to indicate a far degree of deixis; however, it is glossed in [Bleek 1956] as “there, yonder, far, that, here”, and the only textual example that is fully satisfactory for GLD standards is (from L. Lloyd’s records) jà-khi tño le “give me that piece of wood”. The same stem is quoted in [Bleek 1929: 83] as le-á, most likely a compound of le with another deictic stem, a ~ e (see under ‘this’). Unfortunately, no diagnostic contexts have been detected that would contrast ‘this’ and ‘that’ within one sentence. Another quasi-synonymous form in [Bleek 1929: 83] is ha, but it is glossed as “this, that” in [Bleek 1956: 55], with no possibility of evaluating the actual meaning.

||Ngke: Bleek 1956: 4. Listed as the first or default equivalent for ‘that’ both in [Bleek 2000: 20] and [Bleek 1929: 84], as opposed to a prosodically unmarked a ‘this’ q.v. The latter source lists three additional synonyms: (a) he, which is not confirmed in either [Bleek 1956] or [Bleek 2000]; (b) há, most likely a misprint for [le-a ([Bleek 2000: 20]; [Bleek 1956: 618]), a form which is best analyzed as a compound of a neutral-deictic stem [le] with the far-deixis stem á (cf. the same situation for ‘this’ q.v.); (c) lê-á, most likely a contracted variant form of [le-a.

|Khomani: Not attested.


|Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 55. The first morpheme is either a copula or a neutral deictic stem; the opposition between ‘this’ and ‘that’ is formed by the second component of the expression, cf. ‘that’. In [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 110], the form ?êta is defined as the “rarest” of all demonstrative pronouns; no differences in degree of deixis are indicated between the three demonstrative pronouns ?êna, ?êla, Ñêta. D. Bleek gives ha as the main deictic stem ([Bleek 1929: 83]; [Bleek 1956: 55]); however, it does not really function as a demonstrative adjective, but rather as a general pronominal proclitic.

|’Auni: Bleek 1937: 202; Bleek 1956: 55. Only the variants he and há are quoted in [Bleek 1929: 83]. According to [Bleek 1937: 197], the same word functions as the main 3rd p. sg. pronoun (‘he’, ‘she’, ‘it’). The fluctuating vocalism most likely reflects contraction with nominal class markers.


Proto!-Wi: Not properly reconstructible because of the highly unstable nature of the etyma and possible inaccuracies in available descriptions.

86. THIS

[Xam a ~ a: (1), ||Ngke a (1), N|uu a (1), |Xegwi ?ê-la (2), ’Auni a (1), |Haasi g³a-ŋ (3), Proto!-Wi *a (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 4. Transcribed as a ~ a: by W. Bleek. There is also a different vocalic variant: e, said to refer “to nouns in the pl. and to those in the sing., which take he, hi, instead of ha in the 3rd pers. sing.” [Bleek 1956: 36]. This means that a(1) and e(1) both represent contractions of a basic deictic stem ‘V’ (vocalism not defined) with different class markers, a situation not atypical of other South Khoisan languages as well. Quoted as a:á ~ a: ε-a: ~ e in [Bleek 1929: 84]. For more details on the [Xam system of demonstrative pronouns in general see under ‘that’.

||Ngke: Bleek 1956: 4. Listed as the first or default equivalent for ‘this’ both in [Bleek 2000: 20] and [Bleek 1929: 84], as opposed to a prosodically different a ‘that’ q.v. The allegedly synonymous form [le ([Bleek 1929: 84]; [Bleek 2000: 20]; [Bleek 1956: 612]) is probably a contraction of the adverbial word [lê ‘here, there’ + -a (for more details, see under ‘that’).

|Khomani: Not attested.


|Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 55. The first morpheme is either a copula or a neutral deictic stem; the opposition between ‘this’ and ‘that’ is formed by the second component of the expression, cf. ‘that’. There is also a phonetic variant (or, less probably, a separate synonymous stem) le-na id. [Ziervogel 1955: 55]. Secondary synonym: cela [Ziervogel 1955: 56] (encountered relatively rarely; semantic difference from [lê-la is unclear). Quoted as ñila ~ ñela in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 108], with the meaning is given as ‘that’;
however, Lanham & Hallowes actually fail to spot any semantic differences between Xegwi demonstrative pronouns (see notes on 'that').

[|Auni: Bleek 1937: 201; Bleek 1956: 4. In the earlier notes in [Bleek 1929: 84], the meaning 'this' is glossed as ti. However, in [Bleek 1937: 206] this word is already explained as part of the expression ti e 'that is, there', with no implications whatsoever about the semantics of 'near deixis'. Nevertheless, as in the case of nearly all !Wi languages, the data are somewhat controversial, and existing textual examples that never contrast 'this (near)' and 'that (far)' do not help matters much.


Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Seemingly preserved everywhere except for Xegwi and Haasi. Replacements: The forms in Xegwi and Haasi are not well understood from a historical perspective. Reconstruction shape: The monovocalic root *a generally stays the same in all descendant languages.

87. THOU

|Xam a ~ a-á (1), ||Ng!ke a (1), |Khomani a (1), N|uu a (1), |Xegwi òa ~ òan (1), |Auni a (1), |Haasi ǧáː=a (1), Proto-!Wi *a (1).

References and notes:

|Khomani: Maingard 1937: 244.
N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.
|Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 46. Said to be pronounced with low tone, as opposed to òa 'not' q.v. with high tone [Ziervogel 1955: 43]. Cf. also the emphatic (absolute) form: òa-će, the object form òanye ~ òai ~ òayi; the possessive form òanye [Ziervogel 1955: 45-47]. The absolute form is quoted as òa-će ~ òa-cē in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 108]. Quoted as a ~ an in [Bleek 1929: 85]; as a, emphatic an, possessive a-ka in [Bleek 1956: 3].
|Haasi: Story 1999: 23. Emphatic form (cf. the same emphatic prefix in 'I' q.v.).

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages. Reconstruction shape: The monovocalic root *a generally stays the same in all descendant languages.

88. TONGUE

|Xam ñénni ~ ñëñi (1), ||Ng!ke ñë (1), |Khomani ñë (1), N|uu ñën ~ ñët (1), |Xegwi ñë (1), |Auni ñëri (1), Proto-!Wi *ñëni (1).

References and notes:

|Xam: Bleek 1956: 272, 310. Transcribed as ýñi ~ ýñi by W. Bleek (the latter variant, not marking the glottal stop, is rare and probably erroneous). Quoted as ýñi ~ ýñi in [Bleek 1929: 86].
|Khomani: Maingard 1937: 257.
N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. The first variant allegedly reflects the Western dialect, the second corresponds to the Eastern one. Quoted as ñin in [Westphal 1965: 141].
89. TOOTH

[Xam ǀǀ'èː (1), ǁNg!ke ǁàː ~ ǁè ~ ǁē (1), ḂKhomani ǁē (1), N]|uu ǁʱàː (1), ǁXegwi ǁʱ (1), ǀ'Auni ǁē (1), ǀ|Haasi k'ĩ=ć (1), Proto-!Wi *ǁʱāf (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 574. Plural form: ǁef'ē. Quoted as ǁē, plural: ǁèː (with reduplication) in [Bleek 1929: 86]. None of the materials distinguish this word from 'horn' q.v., although external data very clearly speak in favour of their separate origin.

[ǁNg!ke: Bleek 1956: 551, 567, 568, 571. Plural form: ǁèːŋ ~ ǁèːŋ ~ ǁèːŋ. Quoted as ǁèː, plural ǁèː in [Bleek 1929: 86]. None of the materials distinguish this word from 'horn' q.v., although external data very clearly speak in favour of their separate origin.


[ǀ'Auni: Bleek 1929: 86. Plural form: ǁèː. Not attested in later, more reliable, sources, but the entry is believable because of secure external cognates.

[ǀ|Haasi: Story 1999: 23. Probably a plural form (k'ĩ=Ć is one of the variants of the plural prefix).

Proto-!Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages. Additionally, cf. ǁKu ǁe 'teeth' [Bleek 1958: 122]; !Gãhne ǁf-ǁŋ 'teeth' [Bleek 1958: 544]. Reconstruction shape: The lateral aspirated click is reconstructed based on [Xam, N]|uu, and [ǁXegwi; in other languages, aspiration may have either disappeared or, more likely, not been noticed by researchers. The nasalized diphthong is preserved everywhere except for [ǁXegwi (and even there it is still postulated by D. Bleek, if not by Lanham & Hallowes), so it is also reconstructed quite reliably.

90. TREE

[Xam ʘʰo (1), ǁNg!ke ʘo ~ ʘo: ~ ʘʰo (1), ḂKhomani ʘo # (1), N]|uu ʘo: # (1), ǁXegwi ʘo ~ ʘʰo ~ ʘʰoŋ (1), ǀ'Auni ʘwaxa ~ ʘwax-sa (1), ǀ|Haasi Ḃai (2), Proto-!Wi *ʘo (1).

References and notes:


[ǁXegwi: Maingard 1937: 256. Meaning glossed as 'wood'; no special lexeme for 'tree' is attested, thus, the entry is somewhat dubious. Cf. also ʘf-ːkã 'firewood' in [Doke 1936: 82].

N]|uu: Miller et al. 2007: 58. Meaning glossed as 'wood'. According to B. Sands, there is no special generic term for 'tree' in the language; the closest term is ǁfː 'shepherd's bush (Boscia albitrunca)', the plural form of which may possibly be used as a generic term. For the moment (until a published dictionary comes out), it is still reasonable to include the old word for 'wood / (growing)
tree' on the list, keeping in mind that this may be an erroneous inclusion. Cf. also ǂ'i 'tree' in [Westphal 1965: 144].


Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages, but the meaning is frequently restricted to 'wood' as material; this seems to be true in the case of at least [ǂHaasi and, possibly, Modern N|uu, where the meaning 'tree' has not been explicitly attested for this item. Additionally, cf. [ǂXau ǂòci:pl. ǂòci:ǃku 'tree' [Bleek 1956: 684]. Replacements: External data (in Taa) clearly show that ǂò used to be applied to 'wood' as material as well as 'tree' as a living organism. However, similarity of the attested situations in [ǂHaasi and N|uu (representing both subbranches of ǃWi) shows that already on the Proto-ǃWi level, the word *ǂ*i 'Bosca albitrunca' may have been used as a generic term with specific reference to living trees. On the other hand, the related forms found in [Bleek 1956], e. g. [ǂXam !ǂi 'umbrella-top tree, witgathboom' shows that already on the Proto-ǃWi level, the word *ǂ*i 'Bosca albitrunca' may have been used as a generic term with specific reference to living trees. Keeping this in mind, we have to treat the situations in Modern N|uu and [ǂHaasi as lexical replacements: [ǂshepherd's tree > 'tree (gen.)']. Reconstruction shape: The only thing that is not easily reconstructible for this form is the click efflux. In old data collections, almost every possible variant is attested [ǂXegwi, ǂXomani, ǂKhomani, ǂN|uu]. Additionally, cf. with a preglottalized nasalized efflux) indirectly validate that interpretation as (zero efflux, aspirated efflux, aspirated glottalized efflux, voiced efflux, nasal efflux, etc.), which should probably be interpreted as the original presence of some rare type of efflux, simplifying in different ways in different languages and phonetically misinterpreted by inexperienced researchers in others. External data (e. g. [ǂXôô ǂò-ǂqe with a preglottalized nasalized efflux) indirectly validate that interpretation as well. However, until more examples become available, we prefer to refrain from making the reconstruction too complex and tentatively choose the simplest variant, attested in Modern N|uu (with the zero efflux). Semantics and structure: Should be reconstructed with the polysemy 'tree / wood'.

91. TWO

[ǂXam ǂú: (1), ǂNg!ke ǂú ~ !ǃú (1), ǂKhomani ǂú (1), ǂN|uu ǂú: (1), ǂXegwi ǂhûû (1), ǂ!Auni ǂam (-1), ǂHaasi s=ǂa-ǂma (2), Proto-ǃWi *ǂ!u7 (1).

References and notes:

[ǂXam: Bleek 1956: 448, 492. Transcribed as ǂú: ~ ǂú: by W. Bleek. Quoted as ǂú: in [Bleek 1929: 88]. Fluctuation between simple and glottalized articulation for the click efflux in W. Bleek's records is hardly accidental or erroneous in the light of similar fluctuations in between other South Khoisan languages as well; for ǂXam, this may signify a "non-trivial" type of click efflux articulation.


[ǂN|uu: Miller et al. 2007: 59.


[ǂHaasi: Story 1999: 23. Composition of this numeral is unclear. The main root morpheme is probably ǂk.

Proto-ǃWi: Distribution: Preserved in all Narrow ǃWi languages. Additionally, cf. [ǂXau ǂku:; ǂKu:le ǂú [Bleek 1956: 492]. Replacements: (a) In ǂ!Auni, the original numeral was replaced by a borrowing from Nama; (b) internal composition of the form s=ǂa-ǂma: in [ǂHaasi is unclear; the sequence s=ǂa- can only reflect some sort of fused compound (*sV- + *ǂa-), but there are no definite ideas on what the separate parts might go back to. If this is indeed a complex idiomatic expression, it is clearly not archaic. Reconstruction shape: The word is commonly attested either in the variant ǂú or in the variant ǂú; sometimes both variants seem to be in "free variation" within the same language. This indicates either some uncommon type of efflux or an original combination of a non-glottalized efflux with a medial glottal stop (thus, *ǂú- could either be misheard as *ǂú-, or the glottal stop could genuinely undergo "metathesis"). See similar cases with 'one', 'sit', etc.
92. WALK (GO)

| Xam | €a ~ €a: ~ €aŋ ~ €e (1), Ng!ke €a ~ €a: (1), Khomani €a ~ €a (1), N|uu €aʔa (1), Xegwi €a ~ ka ~ ga (1), Auni €a ~ €e ~ €a ~ €aa (1), Haasi ʃa (2), Proto!-Wi *€a- (1). |

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleeck 1956: 512, 519. Transcribed as €a ~ €a: ~ €aŋ ~ €e: ~ €a~: by W. Bleeck. Quoted as €a ~ €a: in [Bleeck 1929: 42]. This is quite clearly the basic verb to designate beginning of movement towards an object, e. g.: €a ha ta Δ 'I go to that ostrich', etc. Vocalic fluctuation is typical of most basic monosyllabic verbal stems and may reflect either contextual phonetic variation or merger with class markers. Another quasi-synonym listed in [Bleeck 1929: 42] is tāi ~ tāi, but textual examples in [Bleeck 1956: 187] confirm rather strongly that the basic meaning of this verb is 'to walk' (i. e. with emphasis on the process of movement) rather than the required semantics of 'go'. |

[Ng!ke: Bleeck 1956: 513. Quoted as €a in [Bleeck 1929: 42] and [Bleeck 2000: 20]. Two more variants in [Bleeck 1929: 42] are not confirmed in [Bleeck 1956: ]; €a is actually 'to bring' and €a is not found at all (it is probably just a different variant of €a with a postpositional particle). |


[N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Distinct from xu'n ~ €a (Western dialect), Žaái (Eastern dialect) 'to walk'. |

[Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 35, 39. Past tense form is quoted as €a-ya [Ziervogel 1955: 51]. There is a second quasi-synonymous root: tālai-ne [Ziervogel 1955: 50, 60, 61] = taθa ~ taθan [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 118]. It is also listed as the main equivalent for 'go' in [Bleeck 1929: 42], as tean ~ antean (the second variant is contracted with a verbal or pronominal proclitic). However, comparative analysis of sources shows that the basic semantics of this second verb is more complex. Cf. the following examples with their (obviously, approximate) translations: l'ba antean "the cow goes away" [Bleeck 1956: 10]; n tean "I walk", ha tean "she goes away", tean "run away" [Bleeck 1956: 197]. Also, Ziervogel always gives the meaning 'walk' for this root; its external connections also confirm such meanings as 'go away', 'depart', 'travel'. Consequently, we prefer to exclude this lexeme from our calculations. |

[Auni: Bleeck 1937: 214, 215; Bleeck 1956: 513, 519, 545. The variety of variants indicates that the original form may have been *laθa. Not listed in [Bleeck 1929: 42], with two other quasi-synonyms suggested instead: (1) laθi, glossed in [Bleeck 1937: 206] as lāi ~ tāi, lāi 'to walk, to go'; its general semantics seems to be more or less the same as the one of its cognate in Xegwi, q.v.; (2) laθi, probably a marginal borrowing from a Central Khoisan language (cf. Proto-Central Khoisan *lai 'to go'). |

[Haasi: Story 1999: 22. Secondary synonym: ται-ai id. [ibid.]. This second word etymologically coincides with [Auni laθi and must probably reflect the same semantics ('walk' rather than 'go'). |

[Proto!-Wi: Distribution: Preserved in all languages, except for Haasi. Additionally, cf. Kxau €a ~ €a: ~ €aŋ ~ €a-ι in [Bleeck 1956: 513]. Replacements: The provenance of [Haasi ʃa is unclear. There is a possibility that it is really an inaccurate transcription of *ʃa, but this is not highly likely (no other evident examples of misinterpreting as j as j may be drawn from Story's vocabulary). Reconstruction shape: The majority of attested variants allows to reconstruct Proto!-Wi *ʃa- 'to go' without controversy. There are, however, some variants without the glottal efflux (e. g. in Xegwi) that are not so easily explainable. Semantics and structure: In Proto!-Wi, *ʃa- 'to go' was most likely opposed to *ta~: 'ta~iŋ 'to walk' (without a specific direction). |

93. WARM (HOT)

| Ng!ke øna (1), Khomani hā:i (2), N|uu ha: ~ ha:i (2), Xegwi kʰuru (3). |

References and notes:

[Xam: Not attested properly. In [Bleeck 1929: 48] the meaning 'to be hot' is translated as tā angular, literally 'to feel fire', but textual examples in [Bleeck 1956: 292] do not explicitly confirm this idiom as the main antonym for 'cold'. For 'warm', [Bleeck 1929: 90] yields
\lai = ‘to burn, smart, ache’ (see ‘ashes’ for more details), but this is probably incorrect; examples in [Bleek 1956: 449] clearly indicate negative semantic connotations (burnt’, ‘aching’, etc.) rather than the required positive associations. The likeliest candidate for [Xam ‘warm’] is k\lai (L. Lloyd), k\lai – k\lai-k\lai (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 80], but a convenient equivalent for ‘hot’ is still missing.

[Ng!ke]: Bleek 1956: 586. Quoted as \lai in [Bleek 1929: 48], \lai in [Bleek 2000: 20]. The item is not quite trustworthy, being attested in but one example: \lai “the sun is hot” [Bleek 1956: 586]; for contrast, cf. \lai “the sun is warm” [Bleek 1956: 56]. It is not clear just how reliable these particular translations are.

[Khomanî]: Maingard 1937: 243. Attested in the phrase \lai \lai h\lai “the sun is hot”. Transcribed as h\lai in [Doke 1936: 63], with the meaning glossed as ‘warm’.

[N\uu]: Sands et al. 2006. Meaning glossed as ‘warm, hot’ (of weather).

[Xegwi]: Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 102. Attested in the phrase in k\lai-a “I am warm”. It is unclear whether [Xegwi had a precise distinction between the meanings ‘warm’ and ‘hot’. Not attested in [Ziervogel 1955]. Quoted as k\lai-a ‘warm’ in [Bleek 1929: 90] and as k\lai-a “to be warm” in [Bleek 1956: 107].

[Auni]: Not attested.

[Haasi]: Not attested.

Proto-!Wi: Not properly reconstructible due to lack of reliable attestation in some languages and lexical instability in others.

94. WATER

[Xam \lai \lai ~ \lai \lai \lai (1), [Ng!ke \lai \lai \lai \lai \lai \lai \lai (1), [Khomani \lai (1), N\uu \lai \lai (1), [Xegwi k\lai (1), [Auni k\lai ~ k\lai ~ k\lai (1), [Haasi k\lai (1), Proto-!Wi \lai (1).

References and notes:

[Xam]: Bleek 1956: 427, 431, 457. Transcribed as \lai \lai \lai \lai by W. Bleek. Quoted as \lai\lai in [Bleek 1929: 90]. See under ‘rain’ for more details on this stem.

[Ng!ke]: Bleek 1956: 394, 402, 423, 572. Emphatic forms: \lai-gon ~ \lai-ke ~ \lai- ke ~ \lai-ke ~ \lai-gon ~ \lai-ke. Quoted as \lai in [Bleek 1929: 90]. Phonological variation between \lai ~ \lai also acknowledged in [Bleek 2000: 18]; it may be partially due to failure to distinguish between phonetically similar ‘water’ and ‘rain’ q.v., partially to non-trivial articulation of the click efflux (cf. the presence of uvular aspirated articulation in the professionally recorded correlate for present day N\uu).

[Khomani]: Maingard 1937: 257. Transcribed as \lai in [Doke 1936: 69].

[N\uu]: Miller et al. 2009: 158. Quoted as \lai \lai in [Westphal 1965: 144].

[Xegwi]: Ziervogel 1955: 46. Quoted as \lai in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 106]. An entirely different form, \lai, with a rare plural variant \lai-\lai, is also quoted in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 102, 111]. According to the authors, “the two forms... are not synonymous, but the precise difference in significance has not been accurately determined” [ibid.]. Both of these synonymous or quasi-synonymous forms are also attested in [Bleek 1929: 90] as \lai and \lai (without the erroneously transcribed lateral click, cf. k\lai: ‘to water’ [ibid.]). Quoted as \lai ~ \lai in [Bleek 1956: 88, 572] (this time, both variants are quoted in the nominal meaning ‘water’); as \lai in [Bleek 1956: 177].

Analysis of the few available textual contexts shows that k\lai may, perhaps, rather refer to ‘drinking water’, whereas \lai denotes ‘basin water’, cf.: (a) n q\lai, k\lai. n \lai “I am thirsty, water is wanting” [Bleek 1956: 88]; sa ne k\lai: “give me water” [Ziervogel 1955: 46]; (b) kan \lai ke e \lai “he stands in the water” [Bleek 1956: 177]; \lai \lai gi-t\lai “I am handsome”, literally “I am the water of Lake Chrissie” [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 117] (but also a-me \lai-x\lai \lai “do not drink water” [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 116]; context unknown, perhaps “do not drink lake-water”?

[Auni]: Bleek 1937: 203; Bleek 1956: 88. Meaning glossed simply as ‘water’, whereas for the alleged click-containing variant \lai [Bleek 1937: 216] the meaning is glossed as ‘water, rain’. This, as well as the uniqueness of the “variation” and, possibly, the difference in tonal characteristics, brings on the suspicion that we are actually dealing with two etymologically different words: k\lai ‘water’ and \lai ‘rain, rain-water’. However, in [Bleek 1956: 572], \lai is encountered once in the context “he drinks water” (whereas ‘rain’, without textual examples, is transcribed as \lai with additional pharyngealization, making the picture even more confusing). In [Bleek 1929: 90], ‘water’ is simply written as \lai, without any non-click variants. Allegedly, this could be a transcriptional error (particularly if the original consonant, as in [Xegwi, was actually a
95. WE₁


Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 168; Bleek 1929: 90. Exclusive stem. In [Bleek 2000: 21], besides the regular si, an alternate variant ci is also mentioned, but not confirmed in any other sources.

Khomani: Maingard 1937: 244. Exclusive stem.

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Exclusive stem.

[Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 46. Cf. also the emphatic (absolute) form: ñi-∅; the object form ?iye ~ ye; the possessive form ye [Ziervogel 1955: 45-47]. The absolute form is quoted as ñi-∅ ~ i-∅ in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 108]. Quoted as i in [Bleek 1929: 90] and [Bleek 1956: 67]. According to all known sources, there is no distinction between inclusive and exclusive pronouns in [Xegwi.


[Haasi: Story 1999: 24. Not listed in the vocabulary, but cf.: ci à k'i=θav: "we eat meat". Probably an exclusive stem (although Story does not elicit such an opposition explicitly).

Proto-Wi: Distribution: Preserved everywhere except for [Xegwi, where the old inclusive/exclusive opposition seems to have been neutralized in favor of the original inclusive pronoun. Reconstruction shape: The form *si is attested almost everywhere without change; Lower N|ossob ci has to be regarded as a "fortition" (cf. the same situation with 'sil', etc.).

95. WE₂


Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 67; Bleek 2000: 21. Inclusive stem. The rare variant e is also mentioned in [Bleek 1929: 90] and confirmed in [Bleek 1956: 36], said to be "only used before particle he".

Khomani: Maingard 1937: 244. Inclusive stem.

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Inclusive stem.


[Haasi: Story 1999: 32. Cf.: i 'au k'i: "we milk them". The stem is probably inclusive (considering external data). Story’s vocabulary gives the equivalent for ‘we’ as i-∅ə a [Story 1999: 23], where a is probably a verbal copula, and ə is some sort of emphatic.
96. WHAT

|Xam| c’a=de (1), ||Ng!ke dʰi-si ~ gi-si ~ ki-si ~ li-si (1), ||Khomani ʒi-si (1), N|uu ɕũĩ (1), ||Xegwi tʰiː (1), ||Haasi jʰa ~ li (2), Proto-!Wi ʰ- (2).

References and notes:

|Xam| Bleek 1956: 23, 210. This interrogative pronoun is a transparent compound of c’a ‘thing’ [ibid.] + basic interrogative morpheme de (L. Lloyd, W. Bleek: de). In [Bleek 1929: 91] a whole bunch of different variants is quoted: c’a-de ~ c’a=ba ~ xa=de ~ -ba ~ -de. However, textual examples in [Bleek 1956] rather suggest that ba and xa represent auxiliary clitics whose exact meaning is difficult to establish; only de (de) comes through clearly as the main interrogative morpheme in |Xam. See also ‘who’.

|Ng!ke| Bleek 1956: 26, 46, 93, 279. Quoted as kisi in [Bleek 1929: 91]; the alternate variant, -d’e, is incorrectly given as a synonym, because this postpositional lexeme is generally used as an adverbial interrogative (‘where’, etc.; see [Bleek 2000: 23]). The forms are clearly polymorphic in origin and may be analyzed as reflecting an original *dli-si, where dli is the interrogative component (= -d’e ‘where? ’; consonantal alternation dʰi ~ g ~ k reflects palatalization of the original dental) and -si is either a fossilized deictic stem or the remnant of an older word meaning ‘thing’. What remains completely obscure is the click-containing variant ʃi-si. Considering Bleek’s remark that speakers of the language occasionally drop clicks and the multiple examples that confirm this, one would be tempted to posit ʃi as the original form, and ʃi ~ ʃi as its later permutations. External data, however, speak very strongly against such a solution: no click-containing interrogatives are found anywhere in South Khoisan (except for |Haasi). The form is more likely to represent some obscure contraction with another morpheme or, perhaps, a rare case of secondary (‘expressive’) click formation.

|Khomani| Maingard 1937: 247.

|N|uu| Sands et al. 2006. Attested in such phrases as ɕũĩ xe "what is that?” or independently (ɕũĩ "what is it?”).


|‘Auni| Not attested.

|Haasi| Story 1999: 23.

Proto-!Wi Distribution: The old interrogative morpheme seems to have only been preserved in the Lower Nh!ossob branch (this is primarily supported by external comparison with Taa languages), or, to be more precise, only in |Haasi, since the situation in |Auni is unknown. Replacements: The main interrogative morpheme in Narrow !Wi is *TV, where T = coronal explosive (usually voiced d, less frequently voiceless t or aspirated ṭ) and V is usually a front vowel (e or i). It is usually combined with additional morphemes, such as |Xam c’a ‘thing’, to express the meaning ‘what?’ (= ‘which-thing?’). However, this morpheme finds no parallels in the Lower Nh!ossob data, where the basic equivalent for ‘what?’ has (in |Haasi the structure "dental click with zero efflux + vowel", which is furthermore corroborated by external data (Taa). Because of these external parallels, it makes more sense to postulate a replacement in Narrow !Wi, although its nature remains obscure at the moment.

97. WHITE

|Xam| !uí-ta ~ !uí-ta (1), ||Ng!ke jʰe:wa (2), ||Khomani l’uri-ya (-1), N|uu l’uri-a (-1), ||Xegwi ša (3), ||Haasi jʰa (4).

References and notes:

represented by two dubious textual examples and glossed as ‘pale’, ‘red’ (!) in [Bleek 1956]; item (b) is accompanied by only one equally dubious example. Examples for !ui-ta are more numerous and definitive, cf. ha !itx !ai-xai ti!a!a !ai-ti, hi-ta !u!a!a-ta!a-ta!a

References and notes:

(Xam: Bleek 1956: 535; Bleek 1929: 91.

&Khomani: Maingard 1937: 243. Also transcribed with facultative prenasalization (as ![u]-yo). The word has no known parallels within South Khoisan and is best regarded as a straightforward borrowing from Khoekhoe (cf. Nama ![u]-!ei ‘white’).

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. See notes on &Khomani.

[Xegwi: Ziervogel 1955: 58. Quoted as ![u]: ‘be white’ in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 115].

'Auni: Not attested.


Proto-!Wi: Not properly reconstructible due to lack of attestation in some languages, transparent borrowed origins in others, and instability in the remaining ones.

98. WHO

[Xam ![u]=de (1), &Ng!ke ![u]-e # (2), &Khomani ![u]-!ai-xai (2), N|uu ![u] # (2), &Xegwi tu: (2), ![Auni sa # (3), [Haasi ci: (3).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 447 (quoted there in the emphatic variant: ![u]=de-ken). Quoted as ![u]=de xa (with an extra particle) in [Bleek 1929: 91]. Like the corresponding inanimate pronoun, a clear compound of ![u] ’person’ q.v. with the basic interrogative morpheme -de; there is also a suppletive plural stem -dde xa [Bleek 1929: 91].

&Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 240. Highly uncertain; attested only in one example - ![u] e se ki!a ’who comes there?’ ([Bleek 1956: 240]; [Bleek 2000: 23]), in which D. Bleek sees three out of four morphemes (’![u] e followed by ki) constituting a single interrogative complex. The first morpheme, ![u], is almost certainly related to ![u] ’man’ q.v., meaning that the original interrogative morpheme is either ![u] or ki(a). On the other hand, comparison with &Khomani data shows that &Ng!ke’s closest linguistic relatives already treat ![u]- as the main interrogative segment, and this may have been the case in &Ng!ke as well.

&Khomani: Maingard 1937: 247. The suffixal component -xai is frequently met in interrogatives, although its function is not quite clear. Transcribed as ![x]i-xai in [Doke 1936: 71].

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006. Cf. ![u] xe ’who is that?’.


'Auni: Bleek 1937: 197. Only attested in the composite interrogative sa-!a ’whose?, where -ka is the general possessive particle, so it may be assumed that se is simply ’who?’.


Proto-!Wi: Not properly reconstructible.

99. WOMAN

[Xam ![a]=ti (1), &Ng!ke ![a]-ti ~ ![a]-ki ~ ![a]-ti ~ ![a]-ki ~ ![e]-ki (1), &Khomani ![a]-!e ~ ![e]-!e ~ ![e]-ki (1), N|uu ![e]-ki (1), &Xegwi ![a]-zi (1), ![Auni ![e]- (1), ![Haasi ![i] (1), Proto-!Wi */[a]- ~ */[a]- (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 626. Emphatic form: ![a]-ki-ken. Transcribed as ![a]-ti ~ ![a]-tse ~ ![a]-ti, emphatic form: ![a]-ti-ken by W. Bleek. Also attested in the same meaning is the compound form ![a]!a-ti, literally ’person-woman’ [Bleek 1956: 466]. Internal structure of the lexeme must be complex (otherwise, it would violate the basic rules of Khoisan phonotactics), although the element -ti is not known

68
to be a productive suffix in Xam. The "bare" root, however, may be seen not as /ā/, but rather as simply /a/, since it is also found in the compound form /tsw /a/ 'girl' [Bleek 1956: 267]. The plural form is suppletive: /já-gan/ (L. Lloyd), /já-gan/, emphatic form: /já-ka-kon/ (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 296] (an entirely different root, since the click effluxes do not match).

**Ng!ke:** Bleek 1956: 268, 274, 278; Bleek 1929: 92. The phonetic variation between -ti and -ki reflects one and the same phoneme (a palatal stop); the variation between click effluxes (glottal stop vs. voiced articulation) is harder to understand. The plural form, as in Xam, is suppletive: /lax-gan ~ lax-gan/ [Bleek 1956: 296]; cf. also /laŋ/ id. ([Bleek 1956: 300]; in [Bleek 1929: 92], this form is mentioned as singular, but the only textual example in [Bleek 1956] gives a plural usage). As in Xam, the "bare" root /a/ is discovered in bound forms: cf. /æ /a/, /jë:n /a/ 'old woman' [Bleek 1956: 268].

**Khomani:** Maingard 1937: 239, 253. Functions both as the independent noun 'woman' and the semi-suffix 'female', attached to names of animals (e. g. /i:'ei /aice 'female gemsbok', etc.). Transcribed as /jë:i/ in [Doke 1936: 63].

**Njuu:** Sands et al. 2006. The final suffix is fossilized. Suppletive plural form: /læ-ke/. Quoted as /le-qi/, pl. /læ-qi/ in [Westphal 1965: 139].

**Xegwi:** Ziervogel 1955: 36. Distinct from /giy/, pl. /guŋ/ 'female' [Ziervogel 1955: 44] (the same word is quoted as /qi/ŋ, phonetically /q'ai/ 'be a female' in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 99]). Cf., however, also the phrase /ha ñwī-q'īŋ/ "it is a woman" in [Lanham & Hallowes 1956: 102]), where ñwī-q'īŋ literally = 'person + female'. D. Bleek's data on this Swadesh item are confusing. In [Bleek 1929: 92], 'woman' is translated as /jë:cə/, pl. /jë:ze/. The first form, re-quoted as /jë:cə/ in [Bleek 1956: 635], may represent a corruption of /q'īŋ 'female'. The second form is a priori dubious as a "plural" form, since -ze (= Ziervogel's -zi) is, by definition, a suffixal morpheme with a singulative meaning. In [Bleek 1956], we find two entries in its place: (a) /læ:zə' woman' [Bleek 1956: 271] = Ziervogel's /jë:j/, (b) /læ-si ~ lə-kon 'woman, female', e. g. in /lai /jësi "female dog", /lə-fi /ləkən "female sheep" [Bleek 1956: 517]. The examples show that the meaning of the root /læ- is rather 'female' than 'woman' per se, but it is definitely a different word from /q'īŋ. One possible source is borrowing from a Central Khoisan source, although the Proto-Central Khoisan root /jë-'female' has a different click efflux.


**Proto-!Wi:** **Distribution:** Preserved in all daughter languages, albeit in different morphological variants. Additionally, cf. /Kull*e /a:-ti 'woman'; /KXau /a:-ti ~ /a:-u, pl. /a:-ki/ [Bleek 1956: 270, 302]. **Reconstruction shape:** The situation here is tricky. The paradigm that is reliably attested in Modern Njuu allegedly reflects a simple plural stem */a/- and a 'diphthongized' singular stem */a-i/ (> *-e/). However, it is impossible to ignore the evidence from old records of Xam and Ng!ke, where the plural */a/- is opposed to singular */a-i/, with a glottalized rather than a click zero efflux. Since the evidence comes from several different sources, it cannot be attributed to mistaken transcriptions: either we deal with some kind of old suppletivism (*/a- 'woman' vs. */a- 'women', with subsequent mergers in several languages), or with the results of morphophonological processes (e. g. the singular form could have originally been */a-/IV, with subsequent transposition of glottalic articulation to the click efflux; however, such a "suffix" would remain unclear). Currently, we just list both variants as potentially reconstructible for the proto-stage.

100. YELLOW

||Ng!ke /lā/ (1), |Haasi /a/ (2). |

**References and notes:**

[Xam]: Not attested properly, although cf. /laiy/ in [Bleek 1929: 94] = /fæːn ~ /fæːn-ya/ (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 297]; see under 'green' on the dubious character of this word (the only example for the meaning 'yellow' is /ha cixełtən dəd/ /laiyə au /təkən di/ 'his eyes were yellow with angry actions', which certainly does not qualify as diagnostic).

**Ng!ke:** Bleek 1956: 299. Quoted as /jə/ in [Bleek 1929: 94]. Somewhat dubious, since the word is not backed by any textual examples to verify its exact meaning.

**Khomani:** Not attested.

**Njuu:** Not attested.

**Xegwi:** Not attested.

[Auni]: Not attested.

**Haasi:** Story 1999: 23.
101. FAR

[Xam /wè-tan (1), ||Ng!ke härú ~ herú (2), †Khomani haru (2), N|uu haru (2), ||Xegwi /o:-i # (1), ′Auni háru (2), |Haasi n=twô (3), Proto-Wi */oe ~ */õè # (1).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 579. Transcribed as /wê-tan by W. Bleek. Secondary synonym: tán [Bleek 1956: 291], attested only in W. Bleek's records and quoted as tan in [Bleek 1929: 37]. The latter source also adds tɛ as one more synonym, but this word is glossed as 'there, yonder, far, that, here' in [Bleek 1956: 306] and clearly represents a pronominal deictic stem rather than a separate adjective (see under 'that' for more details).

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 58. Quoted as harú in [Bleek 1929: 37]. Secondary synonym: twéin-ya ([Bleek 1956: 464]; [Bleek 1929: 37]). The exact difference between the two words is unclear (cf. η by härú 'a my house is far', but sa a twéinga 'the eland is far' [Bleek 1956: 60, 464]).

Khomani: Maingard 1957: 268. Extracted from a phrase in which the word is transcribed as ṇharu; however, the initial η- is likely to represent a sandhi-type development (in the VP [a]-ṣharu 'marry far').

N|uu: Sands et al. 2006.

[Xegwi: Bleek 1929: 37; Bleek 1956: 585. The same sources also list the probably related form ṭũĩ, glossed as 'far' in [Bleek 1929: 37] and as 'very far' in [Bleek 1956: 591]. Not attested in [Ziervogel 1955] or any of Lanham & Hallowes' papers, therefore, somewhat dubious.


Proto-Wi: Distribution: Preserved in [Xam, possibly in ||Xegwi and also potentially in |Haasi. Replacements: In this situation, there are two potential candidates for Proto-Wi 'far'. The most obvious one would be ḵaru, an isogloss between the N|uu cluster and ′Auni. However, areal influence of N|uu on ′Auni is well confirmed by numerous other cases, and this particular case could also simply reflect a N|uu borrowing into ′Auni. On the other hand, the main attested equivalent for 'far' in [Xam may easily be correlated with the form in [Xegwi (dubious because of scarce attestation, but attested nonetheless), and perhaps even with |Haasi n=twô, assuming that the alveolar click in |Haasi was erroneously mistranscribed instead of the lateral one (admittedly, this is a somewhat feasible assumption, since no confirming examples of such confusion have been found). The clinching argument here is external comparison: Proto-Wi *oe is compatible with Taa forms (Tôô .Btni 'far away', etc.), confirming that N|uu haru should be seen as an innovation in the meaning 'far', and that ′Auni háru is either an independent innovation as well, or, more likely, a borrowing from N|uu. Reconstruction shape: It is unclear whether the nasalization (such as found in ||Xegwi ṭũĩ, etc.) is an inherent part of the root here or the result of contraction with a nasal suffix; external comparison would rather suggest the latter.

102. HEAVY

[Xam kwẹ́ŋ ~ kuẹ́ŋ (1), ||Ng!ke ṭũĩ (2), N|uu ūm (3), ′Auni geite (4).

References and notes:


[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 472. Transcribed as ṭũĩ in [Bleek 1929: 46]. In [Bleek 1956], the word is presented as polysemous: 'to be big / much / many / strong / heavy', with the meaning 'heavy' represented by only one textual example: ṭũĩ ṭũĩ 'the eggshell is heavy'. Considering that in the meanings 'big, many, much' (see notes on 'many' for these meanings) the word is transcribed without pharyngealization, this may be a case of partial homophony rather than polysemy.

Khomani: Not attested.
103. NEAR

[Xam †ʰiːŋ ~ †ʰiːŋ-ya # (1), N|uu ʃeː (2), Xegwi t’añay (3)].

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 397. Transcribed as †ʰiːŋ ~ †ʰiːŋ-ya by W. Bleek. Quoted as †ʰiːŋ in [Bleek 1929: 60]. The latter source also quotes the predicative stem ʃuːsĩj ‘to be near’; in [Bleek 1956: 391-392] it is already segmented into ʃuuː ‘to sling on, pass across, be opposite to, near to’ + ʃiʃ ‘to sit, stay’, and the basic meaning of the first stem is rather ‘to be opposite to smth.’ than ‘to be near to smth.’ More problematic is the additional synonym ʘwuru ~ ʘwuru-kon (L. Lloyd), ʘuru (W. Bleek) [Bleek 1956: 684, 686], also translated as ‘to be near’; although it is not mentioned in [Bleek 1929], it is formally eligible for inclusion.

[Ng!ke]: Not attested properly. In [Bleek 1929: 60], two equivalents are listed: (a) Ɂi, revealed in [Bleek 1956: 91] as a general morpheme indicating near deixis (‘here’); (b) Ɂu, whose real meaning is ‘to stay’, ‘to be somewhere’ [Bleek 1956: 611].

[Xegwi]: Not attested.

[N|uu]: Sands et al. 2006. Meaning glossed as ‘be close, be nearby’.

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 662. Quoted as ʃeː in [Bleek 1929: 71].

[Ng!ke]: Not attested.


[‘Auni]: Not attested.

[Haasi]: Not attested.

Proto-Wi: Not reconstructible due to relative scarcity of attestation and instability.

104. SALT

[Xam škɔː (1), N|uu ʃxːɔː (1), Xegwi ʃeː-zi (2)].

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 662. Quoted as ʃeː in [Bleek 1929: 71].

[Ng!ke]: Not attested.


[‘Auni]: Not attested.

[Haasi]: Not attested.

Proto-Wi: Not reconstructible, since the forms in [Xam and N|uu very likely reflect areal borrowings from Khoekhoe.

105. SHORT

[Xam ʃuɛrriː ~ ʃuɪrri (1), N|uu ʃqɔː (2), Xegwi čwe (2), ‘Auni ʃwã-si (2), Haasi ʃɔ-si (3),
Proto-Wi *ŋgoe(-ŋ) (2).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 362, 368. Plural form: *ți̞t̛tn. Said of people (ha ]axai ð̑au ķ̑e ]avrei: “her younger sister is short”) as well as objects (ha a, !la:wa:wa:n *ți̞t̛tn “it is one whose legs are short”) [ibid.]. Transcribed as *ți̞t̛tn by W. Bleek. Transcribed as *ti̞t̛ir in [Bleek 1929: 74]. The latter source adds *feni as a secondary synonym, but the main meaning of this word is ‘small’ q.v.

[Ng!ke: Not attested.

[Khomani: Not attested.

[N]uu: Miller et al. 2009: 156 (the complete adduced form is *qê a ‘be short’).


[Auni: Bleek 1937: 216.


Proto-Wi: Distribution: An isogloss between N]uu, Auni, and Haasi, thus perfectly reconstructible on the Proto-Wi level. Replacements: Etymologies of [Xam *grrì and [Haasi] Compra are unknown.

106. SNAKE

[Xam *érrí-tan ti # (1), *Ng!ke [x’ai-se (2), *Khomani [x’áu (2), N]uu |aⁿ-si ~ |aⁿ-si (2), *Xegwi ma=kele:λa # (-1), [Auni si=|[x’a (2), [Haasi c’i:-sa ~ c’i:-c’i:-sa (3), Proto-Wi */x’ai- (2).

References and notes:

[Xam: Bleek 1956: 570. Plural form: *érritan dë. Quoted as *érritan-ti in [Bleek 1929: 77]. A composite form, plausibly analyzed as “round thing” (cf. ti ‘place, thing, part’ [Bleek 1956: 201] and *érritan-*érritan ‘round’ q.v.; real meaning is quite possibly ‘to surround, encircle’, hence “the thing that coils”). The analysis makes it clear that the form is euphemistic in origin; a possibly more archaic, non-euphemistic root is suggested as a synonym in fáii [Bleek 1929: 77] = *frwi ‘snake, cobra’ [Bleek 1956: 579], quoted only within the compound *frwi fáii ‘cobra head, name of poison which is in the two glands, and used for poisoning arrows’ and not at all reliable.

[Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 338. Quoted as *kíse in [Bleek 1929: 77]. The supporting example is *físe kíse ‘the snake which is black’, suggesting that this may indeed be the generic term for ‘snake’. In contrast, the alternative equivalent *kíu [Bleek 1929: 77] ~ *kíu [Bleek 1956: 338] is glossed as ‘long yellow snake’, i.e. a specific kind. (Etymological connection between the two words is possible, but not self-evident).

[Khomani: Doke 1936: 84. Not attested in Maingard’s data.


[Xegwi: Lanham & Hallowes 1956a: 47. Judging by the form of the word, this may be a Bantuism, although the authors cannot identify the actual source; this is by no means a native South Khoisan word. (It is not entirely clear whether this is really the generic [Xegwi term for ‘snake’, though).

[Auni: Bleek 1929: 77.

[Haasi: Story 1999: 23. Probably a nominal derivative from c’i ‘to bite’ q.v.

Proto-Wi: Distribution: A N]uu-Auni isogloss (not likely to have been borrowed from the former into the latter because of morphological variations). Replacements: (a) In [Xam, most likely replaced with a qualitative euphemism (see notes on [Xam), thus [‘round thing’ > ‘snake’]; (b) in [Xegwi, probably replaced by a borrowing, although the source has not yet been identified; (c) [Haasi c’i:-sa is transparently derived from c’i ‘to bite’ q.v., thus [‘biter’ > ‘snake’).

107. THIN

72
\( N|uu \parallel x\text{’ui-}a \sim \parallel x\text{’ui-}si \) # (1).

References and notes:

\[ \text{Xam:} \] Not attested properly; possibly the same word as ‘small’ q.v., but this is hard to demonstrate based on available examples. In [Bleek 1929: 84], the word \( tâng \) is given in this meaning, but in [Bleek 1956: 188] it is only acknowledged with the semantics ‘soft, supple’, as well as the figurative meaning ‘cunning’ (= ‘subtle’).

\[ \text{Ng!ke:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{Khomani:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{N|uu:} \] Sands et al. 2006. Meaning glossed as ‘thin person’.

\[ \text{Xegwi:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{’Auni:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{Haasi:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{Proto-!Wi:} \] Not reconstructible due to lack of proper attestation.

108. WIND

\[ \text{Xam} \ ʰ\text{wé} \ (1), \ \text{Ng!ke} \ ʰ\text{we} \sim kʰ\text{we} \ (1), \ \text{Khomani} \ ʰ\text{wé} \ (1), \ N|uu \ ʰqʰ\text{oe} \ (1), \ Xegwi \ š\text{we} \ : \ (1), \ ’Auni \ ũ\text{we} \ (1), \ Haasi \ ũ\text{u}-\text{a} \ (2), \ Proto-!Wi \ *ʰqʰ\text{oe} \ (1). \]

References and notes:

\[ \text{Xam:} \] Bleek 1956: 432. Emphatic form: ʰ\text{wé}-\text{tan}. Transcribed as ʰ\text{we}, emphatic form: ʰ\text{wétan} by W. Bleek. Quoted as ʰ\text{we} in [Bleek 1929: 92].

\[ \text{Ng!ke:} \] Bleek 1956: 90, 432. The variant ʰ\text{uhé} [Bleek 1956: 358] is, in all likelihood, either very poorly transcribed or a different root altogether.

\[ \text{Khomani:} \] Doke 1936: 63. Not attested in Maingard's data.

\[ \text{N|uu:} \] Sands et al. 2006.


\[ \text{’Auni:} \] Bleek 1937: 219. Quoted as ũ\text{we}: in [Bleek 1956: 666]. The form č\text{use} ‘wind’ in [Bleek 1929: 92] actually means ‘to blow (of wind)’ = č\text{se} ‘č\text{use}’ [Bleek 1937: 207].

\[ \text{Haasi:} \] Story 1999: 23.

\[ \text{Proto-!Wi:} \] Distribution: Preserved everywhere except for Haasi. Replacements: No obvious parallels are found in !Wi languages for the strange Haasi form with an initial labial click. Its origin may be expressive (sound-symbolic reproduction of "blowing?''), but no factual evidence for this exists.

109. WORM

References and notes:

\[ \text{Xam:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{Ng!ke:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{Khomani:} \] Not attested.

\[ \text{N|uu:} \] Not attested.
Xegwi: Not attested.
'Auni: Not attested.
Haasi: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Not reconstructible due to lack of attestation.

110. YEAR

|Xam Ńa (1), Ng!ke Ńa (1).

References and notes:

|Ng!ke: Bleek 1956: 471. Polysemy: 'year / winter'.
|Khomani: Not attested.
|Nǃuu: Not attested in newer sources, although cf. gūli 'year' in [Westphal 1965: 143] (in any case, only treatable as a borrowing of Central Khoisan provenance).
|Xegwi: Not attested.
|'Auni: Not attested.
|Haasi: Not attested.
Proto-!Wi: Not reconstructible due to lack of data.