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Abstract
For the Indo-European languages Pokorny’s etymon 700, manu-s and mon-us, comprises as meanings ‘man’ and ‘human being’. In the following article we will show that this etymon is not only the root for a variety of words in the Indo-European languages, but also has equivalent root forms in other language families, among them reconstructed roots in the Semitic, Uralic, Dravidian, Afroasiatic, Caucasian, and Sino-Tibetan language family. In these languages the above mentioned meaning attached to the words that derived from these roots is relatively stable besides some special meanings. After the description of the reflexes of the obviously widely spread root for the concept ‘man’ and ‘human’ in natural languages we will raise the discussion about the evidence for historical transcontinental language contact situations that distributed the linguistic material of this concept, when looking at the material. Finally, we present based on our findings an approach for the understanding of historical language contacts, their contents, and the development of varieties of languages based on concepts.
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Resumen

Para las lenguas indoeuropeas, el étimo 700 de Pokorny, manu-s y mon-us, comprende los significados ‘hombre’ y ‘ser humano’. En este artículo se mostrará que este étimo no solo es la raíz de una variedad de palabras en las lenguas indoeuropeas, sino que también tiene formas radicales equivalentes en otras familias lingüísticas, como en las raíces reconstruidas del semítico, urálico, dravidiano, y de las lenguas afroasiáticas, caucásicas y sino-tibetanas. En estos idiomas, el significado antes mencionado asociado a las palabras que derivan de estas raíces es relativamente estable, además de adoptar algunos significados especiales. Después de la descripción de los reflejos de la raíz ampliamente difundida del concepto ‘hombre’ y ‘humano’ en las lenguas naturales, plantearemos la discusión sobre la evidencia de situaciones históricas de contacto lingüístico transcontinental que distribuyeron el material lingüístico de este concepto. Finalmente, en base a nuestros hallazgos, presentamos un enfoque para la comprensión de los contactos lingüísticos históricos, sus contenidos y el desarrollo de variedades lingüísticas basadas en conceptos.

Keywords

lenguas indoeuropeas, étimos, familia de lenguas boreales, lenguas prehistóricas, lenguas históricas, raíces reconstruidas, significados de los conceptos

Resum

Per a les llengües indoeuropees, l’ètim 700 de Pokorny, manu-s i mon-us, comprèn els significats ‘home’ i ‘ésser humà’. En aquest article es mostrarà que aquest ètim no només és l’arrel d’una varietat de paraules en les llengües indoeuropees, sinó que també té formes radicales equivalents en altres famílies lingüístiques, com ara en les arrels reconstruïdes del semític, uràlic, dravid, i de les llengües afroasiàtiques, caucàsiques i sinotibetanes. En aquests idiomes, el significat esmentat, associat a les paraules que deriven d’aquestes arrels, és relativament estable, a més d’adoptar alguns significats especials. Després de la descripció dels reflexos de l’arrel àmpliament difosa del concepte ‘home’ i ‘humà’ en les llengües naturals, plantejem la discussió sobre l’evidència de situacions històriques de contacte lingüístic transcontinental que van distribuir el material lingüístic d’aquest concepte. Finalment, a partir de les nostres troballes, presentem un enfocament per a la comprensió dels contactes lingüístics històrics, els continguts i el desenvolupament de varietats lingüístiques basades en conceptes.
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1. Introduction: state of research of historical linguistics

1.1 The ‘Originality’ of language and the ‘Human Being’

The following article explores the linguistic basic concept for ‘human’ and ‘man’ showing identity and derivations of the conceptual and the morphological features of words in various language families, which represent this concept. Such an etymological range of a concept is presented in the mentally attached meanings to the morphological material. The concept for words of one etymological range is in most cases not isolated from other concepts; it can be associated and change to other concepts. The astonishing thing is that the history of relationships of words with the same conceptual meaning takes us to words from many languages, which are usually separated in research of linguists as ‘language families’, but obviously have the same morphological material. Historical linguistics, also called diachronic linguistics, is the branch of linguistics interested in the study of the history of languages approaching them from the perspective of phonological, grammatical, and semantic changes.

The reconstruction of earlier stages of languages is a part of this study. Methods are the comparison of the inventory of languages and their genetic relationships or the comparison of the individual languages concerning one concept. Before the modern branch of linguistics arose in the 18th century, etymology and philosophy of languages were the place of study in classical and medieval times. But in antiquity less studies were focusing on foreign languages, which were in general considered inferior or even ‘barbaric’. The philologists of the Renaissance began to make comparative study of Greek and Latin. Instead of empirical studies of scholars concerning the derivations of languages from each other and their similarities, the religious standpoint and the genealogy of the nations and their languages as described in the Old Testament a new awareness of language arose among scholars. With the text-critical studies of the 19th century and critical approaches to the writings of the Old Testament and the New Testament a new field of studies was established. The research of historical linguists obviously culminates in the presentation of theoretical earlier states of known historical languages. Among
them are even theoretical approaches, which present hypothetical languages or one hypothetical language for most languages on earth. For contemporary research historical linguists separate between a. the evident material and inventory of existing natural languages of the historical time and b. the hypothetical languages of the prehistoric time, which were reconstructed from earlier materials of the existing and documented historical times.

Besides the theoretical language varieties, which antecede natural languages, linguists have also developed the theoretical inventory of proto-languages, shared as origin among a group of hypothetical languages, with a commonly shared thesaurus, from which the later language varieties e.g. of the Indo-European languages, derived. Also roots for a hypothetical language have been established, which comprises most of the current language families called the Borean language. Actually, all interpretations of material and theoretical approaches support the assumption of the ‘originality’ of languages, the ability of languages to have an origin. Also the features of the human were discussed by philosophers. In philosophy the main quality of the human in contrast to other forms of being is the mind and the faculty of thinking in various ways. Bishop George Berkeley (1710) in *Of the Principles of Human Knowledge* (Part 1.2.) defined the ‘perceiving active being’ as mind, spirit, soul, and myself:

> This perceiving, active being is what I call MIND, SPIRIT, SOUL, or MYSELF. By which words I do not denote any one of my ideas, but a thing entirely distinct from them, wherein they exist, or, which is the same thing, whereby they are perceived – for the existence of an idea consists in being perceived.

The ‘human’ as the ‘being, which exists’ was the definition of Heidegger who wrote in *Existence and Being* (1949):

> The being that exists is man. Man alone exists. Rocks are, but they do not exist. Trees are, but they do not exist. Horses are, but they do not exist. Angels are, but they do not exist. God is, but he does not exist.

Marcuse wrote in *Eros and Civilization* (1966) that “culture constrains not only his societal but also his biological existence, not only parts of the human being but his
instinctual structure itself” (p. 11). In the chapter “The Hidden Trend in Psychoanalysis” Marcuse wrote: “The concept of man that emerges from Freudian theory is the most irrefutable indictment of Western civilization and at the same time the most unshakable defense of this civilization” (p. 11). Marcuse says that culture displays the repressive mental apparatus at an ontogenetic level of the individual person and at phylogenetic level of the growing process of a repressive civilization from the primal horde to the fully constituted civilized state. The actual point, which is relevant for the history of the etymology of the words related to ‘human’ and ‘man’, is that a development of humanity here is depicted. The following documentation of words with reference to the concept ‘human’ and ‘man’ also entail traces of the history of humanity. The following set of the etymological range for the semantic meanings ‘man’ and ‘human’ entails the ‘linguistic traces’ of such an evolutionary process of humanity with the documentation of the states of human development from the self-aware ‘I’ to the socio-cultural forms of human socialization.

1.2 Methodology and the current state of research: Concept vs. Hypothetical ‘Proto-Root’: ‘Lexicostatics’ and root based approaches in historical linguistics

The discussion of the evidence of the prehistoric transcontinental ‘language contact’ situation arises as soon as we see that wide topographical areas share the same theoretical linguistic material for the representation of the meaning ‘human’ and in the thesaurus of the natural historical languages these commonly shared hypothetical findings are preserved. The implications and theoretical and empirical levels of this approach that builds a bridge between the prehistoric reconstructions and the empirical historical linguistic material were discussed and described as ‘chaining’ by Haase (2019: 113-146).

Root-based approaches do not depend on the basic vocabulary assumption, their dataset is not restricted to the realm of basic vocabulary, and they use roots (proto-forms) as primary characters of comparison. It matches the needs of the comparative method. The ‘root based approach’ produces roots (hypothetical proto-forms).
contrary, lexicostatistics uses as replacement of words denoting basic concepts in semantic meanings. So it studies the gain and loss of roots. In lexicostatics compared words denote the same basic concept(s). Any words, which can be traced back to a single conceptual root is part of the etymology. Basic concepts form the origin of the roots (‘proto-forms’) in lexicostatistics. The lexicostatistic approach settles the commonly shares knowledge of the compared languages in the area of the conceptualized abstraction, which represents the different concepts. The root-based approach produces hypothetical proto-language roots, which are the reconstructed forms from older linguistic material. Slocum (2014) in *What is Historical Linguistics?* wrote that “the term ‘historical linguistics’ refers to the study of languages as they have evolved from past to present, which often includes periods of time that pre-date the art of writing — i.e., requiring ‘reconstruction’ of forgotten languages lacking written records, but which gave rise to languages in which texts were (and perhaps still are) written. It all began, as legend has it, with Sir William Jones”.

Borean is a hypothetical linguistic macrofamily, which comprises almost all language families except those native to sub-Saharan Africa. Harold C. Fleming and Sergei Starostin developed different models for the Borean language family. It is assumed that as an ancestor to history languages Borean was spoken 16000 years ago. Vernet (2011: 1) focused on root incompatibilities in Proto-Semitic and examined the importance of these laws with regard to historical root reconstruction. “As is well known, these rules can only be applied to verbal roots, not to derivative forms and affixed forms. The importance of these structural incompatibilities consists, then, in the fact that they reduce the possible number of combinations of the triconsonantal bases. Excluding onomatopoeic roots and loan words, these laws of incompatibility are fully regular in the verbal roots (but not in the nominal ones) and, therefore, do not have exceptions, as in all phonological laws. The structure of the Semitic verbal roots is, then, absolutely conditioned by these restrictions of incompatibility. These rules are universal in character and apply also to the different families of the Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European languages”.

The database Tower of Babel (2020) describes in its annotation to the databases of the Borean language theory the database of the so-called Borean etymologies as a database that “includes entries of various reliability — possible etymological matches
between Eurasiat, Afroasiatic, Sino-Caucasian and Austric, the four major macrofamilies of the Old World; potential parallels from Amerind and several African families have also been added, giving the database a distinctly ‘global’ nature”. Since the material is reconstructed, these data “are not etymologies in the usual sense of the word: it is still much too premature to talk about the reconstruction of ‘Proto-Borean’ and about regular phonetic correspondences between the respective macrofamilies” (Tower of Babel 2020).

1.3 The proto-languages and the question of the emergence of languages

With the proto-languages we reach in the research of historical linguistics the level of hypothetical languages. The inventory of these proto-languages was made and is presented in databases like The Tower of Babel. Since these languages may have also risen from a common source, the work of the historical linguistics who produced these proto-languages culminates in the question if they have a common origin. Starostin (1989) in Comparative Historical Linguistics and Lexicostatics asked the question if proto-languages share a common origin: “A prolonged period of comparative work with a wide range of language families has laid the foundation for the study of genetic relationships between remotely related languages or language groups. (...) This new level of comparative studies appears completely legitimate. In fact, if we take the theory of language divergence as axiomatic, we have to concede the fact that from around the sixth millennium B.C. to the first millennium B.C. there was quite a number of different reconstructable proto-languages throughout the world. Once the level of reconstruction of various proto-languages is improved, the question inevitably arises: are any of these proto-languages genetically related and, if so, can we prove this relationship?” The project Tower of Babel lists 13 Borean roots MVNV with roots in the Eurasiat, Afroasiatic, Sino-Caucasian, and Amerind language family.

1. Borean MVNV Meaning ‘many’
2. Borean MVNV Meaning ‘brain’
3. Borean MVNV Meaning ‘to think’
4. Borean MVNV Meaning ‘man’
In the long-range etymologies Borean MVNV has the meaning ‘man’. Related are the Eurasian root *mänV, the Afroasiatic root *ma/-in-, the Sino-Caucasian root *mVnxV, the Austro-Turanian roots *maŋ / *meŋ for ‘person’, the Amerind roots *man for ‘child’ and *mano for ‘husband’. In the Nostratic etymology the Eurasian root *mänV has the meaning ‘man’. Related are the Borean Indo-European root *MANw-, the Uralic root *mańčV, and the Dravidian root *man(-s-).

The concept ‘man’ is among the 100 item wordlist and is an important concept present in all natural languages. The variety of the meaning of the root for ‘human’ and ‘man’ can be also added by the variety of meanings the semantic fields entail in contemporary languages. We choose here the example of the English language and the meaning of ‘human’ in contemporary dictionaries of the English language. Besides the Borean root MVNV also other roots exist for reflexes of the semantic field ‘man’ and ‘human’. Borean KVCV has the meaning ‘man’. Related are the Eurasian root *kačV, the Sino-Caucasian root *GĀČĒ, the Austro-Turanian root *-kas for ‘swift’, ‘strong’, ‘energetic’, the Amerind root *kaći for ‘boy’, ‘child’, the Eurasian root *χwīre for ‘man’, ‘male’, the Indo-European root *(H)wīro-, the Altaic root *jōre, the Uralic root *urV, the Kartvelian root *xwir-, and the Dravidian root *ōr-. The Eurasian root *NajRV has the meanings ‘man’ and ‘male’. Related are the Indo-European root *āner-, the Altaic root *näfti, and the Uralic root *ñōre. The Eurasian root *mVSV has the meaning ‘man’. Related are Indo-European mās, the Uralic root *mēs/še for ‘man’, and the Dravidian root *māc-.
1.4 The case of the contemporary meaning of ‘Man’ and ‘Human’ in English and their different etymology

‘Human’ and ‘man’ in the English language come from different roots with separated basic conceptual meanings. The Proto-Indo-European root for ‘earth’ is *dhghem and the human is literally an ‘earthling’. From this root the word ‘human’ derived. Middle English human derived from Old French and Latin hmnus from the root *dhghem- of the Indo-European language family. Eurasiatic *mânV for ‘man’ is the root for the Indo-European language family. In The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2000) ‘man’ has the following definitions: It depicts an adult male human, a human regardless of sex or age, a person, a human or an adult male human belonging to a specific occupation, group, nationality, or other category. It is also used collectively for the human race and mankind. In zoology it is a member of the genus homo from the family of the Hominidae of the order Primates and the class Mammalia characterized by erect posture and an opposable thumb. It is used especially for the member of the only extant species, homo sapiens, which is distinguished by a highly developed brain, the capacity for abstract reasoning, and the ability to communicate by means of organized speech and record information in a variety of symbolic systems. Other meanings are male human endowed with qualities, such as strength, considered characteristic of manhood and informally ‘husband’, ‘male lover’.

The plural ‘men’ is used for ‘workers’ and the enlisted personnel of the armed forces. Other specific meanings are a male representative, a male servant or subordinate, an informal address for a man, someone who has sworn allegiance to a lord in the Middle Ages, and a slang expression for a person of power. The less used transitive verbs ‘manned’, ‘manning’, ‘mans’ mean ‘to supply with men’, ‘to take stations at’, and ‘to fortify’. The word ‘man’ in Middle English derived from Old English mann, which is part of the Indo-European root -man. In Old English the principal sense of man was ‘a human’. In Middle English man displaced wer as the term for ‘a male human’, while wyfman as antecedent form for woman was retained for a female human. ‘Human’ in contemporary
English is used for a member of the genus homo and especially of the species homo sapiens and a person. As an adjective it means the quality of being characteristic of humans, the quality of having or showing those positive aspects of nature and character regarded as distinguishing humans from other animals, the quality of being subject to or indicative of the weaknesses, and the quality of having the form of a human, or being made up of humans. Today in English the adjective ‘human’ comprises as meanings ‘relating to man, mankind, or human nature’, ‘consisting of people the human race a human chain’, ‘having the attributes of man as opposed to animals, divine beings, or machines human failings’, ‘kind’, ‘considerate’, and ‘natural’ (Collins English Dictionary 2003). Latin homo shares its root with humus, the Greek χαμαι, which come from another root than the here studied one for the concept ‘man’ and ‘human’.

2. The long etymological range of the roots for the meaning ‘Human’ / ‘Man’

2.1 Indo-European reflexes of Pokorny’s etymon 700 manu-s and mon-us as roots of ‘Man’ and ‘Human’ and ethnonyms of European tribes

The root as ethnonym appears in ethnonyms like ‘Norman’, ‘German’ or ‘Aleman’ In Old English monn and man means ‘man’ and ‘person’. Related are mon(n)-cynn/man(n)-cynn for ‘mankind’, wif-man for ‘woman’, literary ‘wife-man’, wīm-man for woman, lit. wife-man, and Middle English lefman/leman, which means literary ‘lief-man’. The word man means ‘man’; mankunde and mankyn(de) means ‘mankind’. Norman means ‘Viking’, literary ‘north-man’, and woman ‘women’. In English Barliman is the name of Bree innkeeper in Tolkien’s The Lord of the Rings. Holman is a hobbit name in Tolkien’s The Lord of the Rings. Mansbane is type name of Felarof in Tolkien’s The Lord of the Rings. Sandyman is a proper name for a hobbit used as surname. Saruman is the proper name for a treacherous white wizard and Woodmen are the Mirkwood dwellers in Tolkien’s The Lord of the Rings. Fugleman is a trained soldier posted as ‘model for men at drill’, leman is a lover and sweetheart, man and men mean adult male human being, manikin is a mannequin, mankind is human race and all human beings, and mannequin is a lay figure.
for an artist, tailor, or dressmaker. Mens(c)h is ‘one having admirable characteristics’; mermam and mermen are used for a fabled marine creature with the looks of a fish-tailed man, muzhik is a Russian peasant. Norman is the proper noun for a man from Normandy, an ombudsman is someone who investigates complaints and mediates settlements, a woman is an adult female human being, and yeoman is an officer or attendant in a royal or noble household.


2.2 Reflexes of the concept ‘Human’ / ‘Man’ in the Germanic languages

The most prominent example for an ethnonym derives from the concept ‘man’ is the ethnonym ‘German’ first recorded in the Latin word ‘Germanus’ by Tacitus. The Germanic languages have as main semantic field ‘man’ and ‘human’, and also the proper name for a legendary ancestor called ‘Mannus’. In Pokorny’s dictionary number 1221 is the root manu-s or monu-s. Related as reflexes are Old Indian mánu- and mánuś- ‘human’
and ‘Man’ (‘Godfather of humas’). In the Indo-European etymology the Proto-Indo-European root *mAnw- has the meaning ‘man’. Related are Tokharian A māškit, B māñcuske ‘prince’, Old Indian mānu- and mānu-, mānuṣa- for ‘man’, Avestan manuš-čiera-, the Slavic root *môžb, and the Germanic roots *mann-an- and *mann-. A person named Mannus is mentioned by Tacitus (Germania 2.2.) as the ancestor with three sons, who were the origin of the tribe of the Germans. Mannus was the son of the earth god Tuisco. As the source for their knowledge Tacitus mentions the old songs of the Germans, which preserved their legendary origin as a family:

Celebrant carminibus antiquis (quod unum apud illos memoriae et annalium genus est ) Tuisconem deum Terra editum et filium Mannum originem gentis conditorisque. Manno tris filios assignant, e quorum nominibus proximi Oceano Ingaevones, medii Herminones, ceteri Istaevones vocentur.

But Tacitus also was aware of the fact that the word ‘Germania’ was of recent origin and younger than these mythological ethnic origin of a nation (‘natio’) and the tribe (‘gens’), which is called ‘Germani’:

Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum, quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint ac nunc Tungri tunc Germani vocati sint; ita nationis nomen, non gentis, evaluisset paulatim, ut omnes primum a victore ob metum, mox a se ipsis invento nomine Germani vocarentur.

In the Germanic etymology the Proto-Germanic roots *mannēn, *mann-z, and *mana-n have the meaning ‘man’. In the Indo-European etymology Gothic manna means ‘man’ and ‘person’; mana-môrerja means ‘murderer’; mana-sē-e-s means ‘world’ and ‘mankind’; Old Norse mað-r and mann-r mean ‘man, ‘human’. Related are later languages like Norwegian with mann, Swedish man, Danish mand, Old English mann for ‘man’ and ‘a man who is under the authority of another’, English man, Old Frisian mon, Old Saxon man, Middle Dutch man and Dutch man, Old Franconian man, Middle Low German man, Old High German man used in the 8th century for ‘human’, ‘warrior’, ‘husband’, ‘son’, and ‘servant’. Middle High German man means ‘human of the male gender’ and ‘man’. New High German uses the word ‘Mann’ for ‘man’. The Germanic root *guman is used for

2.3 Reflexes of the concept ‘Human’ / ‘Man’ in languages of the Indian Sub-Continent and Iran and its Semantic Field. The concept ‘Human’ and Indian Languages

The Sanskrit word Manu is used for the name progenitor of human race in Hinduism. The basic meaning of the Sanskrit word manuḥ is ‘man’. In the Dravidian etymology the Proto-Dravidian root *man-s- has the meaning ‘man’. In the Nostratic etymology are the Proto-South Dravidian root *man-, the Proto-Gondi-Kui root *maṇes-, and the Proto-North Dravidian root *murs- related. In the South Dravidian etymology in Proto-South Dravidian the root *man- has the meanings ‘king’ and ‘chieftain’. Related are Tamil man with the meanings ‘king’, ‘kṣatriya’, ‘warrior’, ‘lord’, ‘chief’, and ‘husband’ and Malayalam mannan and mannavan with the meaning ‘king’ and Kannada manneya, which has the meaning ‘chieftain’ and ‘commander’. In Gondwan etymology the Proto-Gondi-Kui root *maṇes- has the meaning ‘man’. In the Dravidian etymology Proto-Gondi *maṇs-āl and Proto-Kui-Kuwi *mṇeh-a are related. In Gondi etymology the Proto-Gondi root *maṇs-āl has the meaning ‘man’. In the Gondwan etymology Betul Gondi mai-mansāl has the meanings ‘man and wife’ and ‘male and female’. Related are Mandla Gondi mārsāl, Mandla Gondi mārsāl, and Yeotmal Gondi marso for ‘husband’. In the Kui-Kuwi etymology the Proto-Kui-Kuwi root *mṇeh-a has the meanings ‘male’ and ‘man’. Kui mṛeha means ‘male’, Kuwi mṛēha means ‘man’, Kuwi mleha and mneha means ‘man’, Sunkarametta Kuwi mṛēha means ‘man’ and Kuwi mṇēha means ‘man’ and ‘husband’.

In the North Dravidian etymology Proto-North-Dravidian *murs has the meaning ‘man’. In Sanskrit mantuḥ is used for Śiva, ‘man’, ‘mankind’, in Vedic literature ‘adviser’,
The word *marya* is used in Vedic literature for ‘man’, ‘young man’, ‘male’, ‘lover’, ‘suitor’, ‘stallion’, ‘horse’, and ‘camel’ (Apte 1957-1959) In Hindi *insā:n* is a loanword from the same Arabic word for ‘human being’; the meanings in Hindi are ‘human being’ and ‘man’. The word *mān* comprises as meanings ‘mind’, ‘heart’, ‘desire’, ‘wish’, and ‘disposition’. The word *mania* is used for ‘man’. The word *mānū* has the meanings ‘wise’, ‘thinker’, and ‘thoughtful’; this word *mānū* as a proper noun is used for the primogenitor of human race. The word *mānushy* has the meanings ‘man’ and ‘human being’ (Caturvedi 1970). In Farsi we have in this etymology the existential self-identification as semantic association as conceptual meaning. In Farsi *من* (man) has the meanings ‘I’, ‘me’, ‘heart’, ‘mind’, and ‘soul. The word *من* (man) as a pronoun, which means ‘he who’, ‘she who’, ‘they who’, ‘who?’, ‘whosoever’, ‘whosever’, ‘every one’, and ‘a certain person’. (Steingass 1892) In Urdu the word *منہی* (manha’ī) comprised as meanings ‘man’, ‘husband’, and ‘groom’ (Fallon 1879). The word *من* (man’ī) is used for semen or female secretion. The word *منسو* (mānuso) is a man or husband, which indicated clearly the Indo-European etymology. Also in most south-eastern areas of the Indo-European language family, among the Iranian languages, we find the ethnonymic usage of a sun god in the etymological range. This sun god of the ancient Iranians is called Omanus with a cult temple in Zela. Hofmann (1598: 99) in his *Lexicon Universale, Historiam Sacram et Profanam omnis Aevi, omniumque Gentium* has an entry for ‘omanus’ with reference to Strabo. *Omanus* is a name for ‘sun’ (‘sol’) or a symbol. Strabo in his *Geography* (11.8.4.) writes about the Persian god Omanus (Ωμανος), which was worshipped obviously in a temple out of the region of the land Persia itself, but in another country.

### 2.4 Reflexes of the concept ‘Human’ / ‘Man’ in the Uralic languages

In the Uralic languages the concept has produced words, which are representing a legendary founding figure of an ethnic group. In the Uralic etymology the Proto root *mańćV* has the English meanings ‘man’ and ‘person’. Khanty (Ostyak) *mańt, mońt, and maś* is used for the name of an mythical ancestor of a tribe. *Mâńk’o* is a hero who’s deeds are told in a legend and *mâńiñe* is a female hero, while *mań ̣ǔṇk* is a ghost. The Mansi, an
ethnonym identical with the obsolete name ‘Voguls’, are an endangered indigenous people living in Khanty-Mansia in Russia. In the language of the Mansi mäńći, mänś, mänś, and mänśi mean ‘Vogule’ and ‘unbaptized child’ and mänś is the common ethnonym of the ethnic groups of the Voguls and Khanty, the word mansch-kum means ‘Vogule’ and ‘Khanty’. Hungarian Magyar means ‘Hungar’ and ‘Hungarian’. Here the general meaning of the concept is used for the description of ethnic groups; this is a semantic shifting process we also find in the Germanic language and the Semitic language, which generates ethnonyms.

2.5 Reflexes of the concept ‘Human’ / ‘Man’ and the semantics of Afroasiatic languages: Terms of Chiefdom of a tribal stateless society

In the family of the Afroasiatic languages the concept ‘man’ has developed into words, which describe the local leaders of a stateless tribal society in many sub-branches. The African Bantu root *-méné means ‘self’. In the Afroasiatic etymology the Proto-Afroasiatic root *ma/in- has the meaning ‘man’. Berber *i-man means ‘person’ and ‘man’. Egyptian mnyw used in the Old Kingdom means ‘shepherd’. Western Chadic *ma-n- means ‘man’, Central Chadic *mVn- means ‘man’ and ‘person’, the East Chadic root *mVn-means ‘chief of a tribe’, ‘husband’, and ‘someone’, the Low East Cushitic root *mun-means ‘male’, the High East Cushitic root *ma-n- means ‘people’, and the Omotic root *mVn- means ‘people’ and ‘warrior’. In the Berber etymology the Proto-Berber root *i-man has the meanings ‘person’ and ‘man’. Related are Ghadames i-man, Nefusa i-man, Zenaga min, Rif i-man, Mzab i-man, Wargla i-man, Figig i-man, and Qabyle i-man. In the Egyptian etymology Old Egyptian mnyw means ‘shepherd’. Related are Demotic mn, the Coptic root *mani, Fayumic mani, Akhmimic mane, Bohairic mani, and Sahidic mane. In the West Chadic etymology, the Proto-West Chadic root *ma-n- has the meaning ‘man’. Related are Polchi mâni, Geji maanì, Sayanchi mu-mwan, Dwot mani, Buli män â, Tule maanja, Wangday mânê, Zul móni, and Barang manî. In the Central Chadic etymology, the Proto-Central Chadic roots *mVn- and *mVn-d- have the meanings ‘man’ and ‘person’. Related are Lamang ùndù and wun-du as derivations from *mun-du, Hdi mudu and mun-
du, Dghwede ṭdē, Nzangi min-de, Logone mënî, and Zime-Dari mënî. In the East Chadic etymology, the Proto-Eastern Chadic root *mVn- has the meanings ‘chief of a tribe’, ‘husband’, and ‘someone’. Related are Kera kā-mān and kū-mnā, and Ubi mūn-. In the Low East Cushitic etymology, the Proto-Low East Cushitic root *mun- has the meaning ‘male’. Related is Somali mun. In the High East Cushitic etymology, the Proto-High East Cushitic root *man- has the meaning ‘people’. Related are Sidamo maana, Hadiya (Gudella) manna, Kambatta maana, and Tembaro mana. In the Omotic etymology the Proto- Omotic root *mVn- has the meanings ‘people’ and ‘warrior’. Related are Ometo minoo and Janjero (Yamma, Yemsa) monoo. In the Ethiopian language Ari the word ‘man’ is mane. The description of an ethnic group as ‘people’ and the depiction of a person as leader are the main semantic realizations of the etymology of the concept. But also the identification of the huma being as a person or ‘self’ is as semantic meaning in the Afroasiatic language family present.

2.6 Reflexes of the concept ‘Human’ / ‘Man’ and semantics of Sino-Caucasian languages

In the Sino-Caucasian etymology a change of the morphological inventory of the roots compared to other roots and reflexes in other language families occurred. In the Sino-Caucasian etymology the Proto-Sino-Caucasian root *mVnxVm has the meaning ‘man’. Related are the North Caucasian root *mVnxV, the Sino-Tibetan root *nVm, and the Yenisseian root *pixe. In the North Caucasian etymology, the Proto-North Caucasian *mVnxV has the meanings ‘male’ and ‘man’. Related are Proto-Nakh *nāχ, Proto-Avaro-Andian *miʎi-ča-, and in the Nakh etymology the Proto-Nakh root *nāχ with the meanings ‘men’ and ‘people’, Chechen naχ, Ingush naχ, and Batsbi naχ. In the North Caucasian etymology, the Avar-Andian etymology has the protoform *miʎi-ča- with the meaning ‘young man’, ‘male’, and ‘hero’. Related are in the Andian language milčaka, Chamalal miʎiša-, and Tindi miʎiča. In the Sino-Tibetan etymology the Proto-Sino-Tibetan root *nām has the meaning ‘person’.

The Chinese kanji 男 with the root *nām has the meanings ‘man’ and ‘male’. Related are Kachin num for a female, Lushai hnam for ‘clan’, ‘tribe’, and ‘race’, and Kiranti *nam. The Chinese character 男 means in Modern Beijing reading nán, in Preclassic Old
Chinese ʰn̚m, in Classic Old Chinese ʰn̚m, in Western Han Chinese ʰn̚m, in Eastern Han Chinese ʰn̚m, in Early Postclassic Chinese ʰn̚m, in Middle Postclassic Chinese ʰn̚m, in Late Postclassic Chinese ʰn̚m, and in Middle Chinese ʰn̚m and comprises as meanings ‘man’ and ‘male person’; it is also used for a feudal title. In the Kiranti etymology the Proto-Kiranti root *ʰn̚m has the meanings ‘man’ and ‘person’. Tulung namnamcō means ‘poor fellow’ and namnamsitami ‘wife’. Limbu nāp-mī means ‘man’, Kulung namme ‘daughter-in-law’, and namnamu ‘poor’ and ‘pitiable’. Yamphu nam-ba means ‘father-in-law’ and nam-ma ‘mother-in-law’. In the Yenisseian etymology the Proto-Yenisseian root *pixe has the meaning ‘man’. Related are Ket hīɣ, Yug fīk, Kottish fī, and Arin pa-nalikip. In the Sino-Caucasian etymology the semantic meaning ‘man’ as a male human and ‘female’ are dominant meanings; only sporadically higher social conceptualizations are expressed in this etymology.

2.7 Reflexes of the concept ‘Human’ / ‘Man’ of the Semitic languages

2.7.1 The Proto-Semitic root *man(nu) and semantically related semitic roots

The Proto-Semitic root *man(nu) and related Semitic Roots are carrier of semantic meanings for a personal identity. In Arabic the word َنَامَ (man) means as a pronoun ‘who’ or ‘which’. The Proto-Semitic root *man(nu) is realized besides in the Arabic word man in the Afroasiatic etymology with the meaning ‘who?’ also in Akkadian mannu, Aramaic Pal man and mʔn, Biblical Aramaic man, Syrian Aramaic man(-nu), Modern Aramaic Urm man, Mandaic Aramaic man, Epigraphic South Arabian mn, Ge’ez (Ethiopian) mannu, Tigre män, Tigrai (Tigriñña) män, Amharic man, Gafat man, Harari mān, Gurage Sod man, Cha mʷan, and on the Southern Arabian Pensinsula in Mehri mon, Jibbali mun, Harsusi mōn, and Soqotri mon. Alternatively Hebrew uses adam for ‘a human being’ and ‘man’ as derivation from the word dam for ‘blood’. Hebrew adam derived from a root with the meaning ‘to be red’ and ‘blood’ (Easton’s 1897 Bible Dictionary). Akkadian minu is used for the pronoun ‘who’ in questions as ‘who?’ (A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian 2000: 400). The following Semitic root is the root, which entails in reflexes genealogical
meanings, can also be considered part of the Borean language family. The Proto-Semitic root 1819 *ma/it_- has the meanings ‘child’, ‘twin’, ‘man’, ‘husband’, ‘male’, and ‘grown-up’. But this root number 1819 is not the root, which corresponds to the etymology of the concepts ‘man’ and ‘human’, even though Hebrew, Judaic, and Syriab reflexes cover the semantic range of the concept ‘man’ and ‘human’. Akkadian is an extinct Semitic language.

In the introduction of *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* (2000) was written about the dialects associated to the Akkadian language: “BC, we distinguish the two main dialects of the vernacular, each of which is divided chronologically into Old, Middle or Neo-Babylonian (OB, MB and NB) and Old, Middle or Neo-Assyrian (OA, MA and NA). These main periods may be further refined by geographical qualifications, such as (N.Mes.), (Bogh.) or (Urar.). After about 1500 BC, in a parallel development, a more or less degraded version of Old Babylonian was preserved by the scribal tradition in Babylonia, in Assyria, and in the various surrounding centres where Akkadian was used as a legal or scholarly medium. (*A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*: 25) So Akkadian is part of a dialect chain spoken in the North of the Fertile Crescent. In the introduction of *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* (2000: 26) was mentioned that “while mentioning dialectal distribution we should refer to the limits of our textual catchment area. Generally the dictionary includes words in Akkadian texts from the earliest Old Akkadian in the 24th century BC to the latest cuneiform texts of the 1st century AD. Akkadian was like 20th century English a *lingua franca* was practiced by Canaanite scribes and the language included loan words from other languages like Hurrian, Sumerian and the West Semitic languages, when they were incorporated into an Akkadian text. Akkadian *minu* is used for the pronoun ‘who?’ (*A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* 2000: 210). Akkadian *min(u) l + -ma* and *mimmu* and New Akkadian *memeni* and *mimmamu/a/i* have the meaning ‘everything’ and ‘all’. The following Akkadian words for professions consist of an extended root. So Akkadian *ummianu(m)* and Mari *ummenum, ummdnu*, and *ummannu* comprise the meanings ‘craftsman’ and ‘specialist’. Old Babylonian *ummidlenutum* was used for a ‘craftsman’ and ‘expert’ in the army. In New Babylonian and New Akkadian it mean ‘scholar’ and ‘expert’ as well as ‘(chief) scribe’ and also an ‘expert of trained plough-animals’. In Old Akkadian and Old and Middle Babylonian texts it was occasionally
used for ‘money-lender’ and ‘creditor’. Its roots can be traced back to the older language isolate Sumerian and Sumerian word *ummia + *-an, which was the origin for ummanitum and ummanutu zikru. In Akkadian umman-manda in Old Babylonian also ummtm-millniililiu means ‘barbarian horde’. In Mari ummannuhum is a kind of drinking vessel. In Akkadian ummanu(m) and ummannu mean ‘army’ and ‘troops’, but occasionally also ‘crowd’ and ‘common people’.

In Ugarite also the word ugnim for ‘crowd’ and ‘common people’ exist. Akkadian ummanutu and Mari ummenAtum mean ‘craftsmanship’ and ‘scholarship’. The Akkadian expression ummenAtam quttA means ‘perfect in skill’ (A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian: 422). Akkadian is an important source for the chain of North Semitic languages and the case of the etymology of the concept ‘man’ and ‘human’ might encompass also the specific types of professions as social differentiations of the community of speakers, which are here in this language produced. The root is Proto-Semitic *ʔVm(m)- in the Afroasiatic etymology with the meanings ‘group of relatives’, ‘family’, ‘clan’, and ‘people’. Akkadian ummānu for ‘crowd of people’, ‘army’, ‘troop of workers’ and Old Babylonian ummatu for ‘unit of home’ and ‘main power’ and ‘pack of savage animals’, Ugaritic umt for ‘familia’ and ‘clan’, and Hebrew ʔummā and ʔēm for ‘tribe’, ‘small group of people’(, which are not-Israelite), Biblical Aramaic ʔummā for ‘nation’, Syrian Aramaic ʔem(m)- for ‘origin’ and ʔūmūn- and ʔūmūt- for ‘people’ and ‘nation’, Arabic ʔumm-at- for ‘assemblée’, ‘foule’, ‘multitude’, and ‘family’, Epigraphic South Arabian ʔmm for ‘to obey’ and ‘be led’ and ʔm-t for ‘bondwoman’ and ‘female vassal’, Tigre ʔammāt for ‘people’ and ‘tribe’, and Mehri ʔāmma for ‘many people’ belong to this root.

2.7.2 Contemporary Arabic: Reflexes of the concept ‘Human’ / ‘Man’ in the Arabic language

In Arabic the word من (man) is used for a pronoun for ‘who’ or which’. Also in the Arabic language this root or a phonetically similar root is active for the production of ethnonyms. Arabic sources offer various origins and etymologies for the name Oman as an ethnonym refer to the idea of a legendary ‘founding father’ or a region. Ibn Al-A’rabi
says that *al-omn* means people resident in a place, an ‘*amin* or ‘*amoun* is a man who resides permanently in the homeland as settler and not a bedouin. So also here the etymology employs as social structure of the local society. Local sources state that Oman was derived from a river in Yemen called Oman, or from a Yemeni tribe with the name Uman. The historian Al-Zujaji argued that the nation was named after Oman, son of the Prophet Abraham. Ibn Al-Kalbi claimed that the country was named after a person called Oman, son of Siba, son of Yaghthan, son of Abraham, who built the city of Oman. Shaykh Al-Rabwah said that the namesake is Oman, son of the Prophet Lot. It is also said that the Azdi tribes called the land Oman, because their homes used to be in Valley of Ma’rib called Uman (*Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Oman*). Yule (2008) states that despite the Persians, who ruled the area, called the country Mazun, it was probably called among the speakers of Arabic ‘Oman’.

The term ‘Ommana’ was according to Yule coined relatively late in the history of this area short after the birth of Christ (Yule 2008: 330). The first mentioning of the name Oman in Arabic is known from a letter of the prophet Mohammed to the Sassanidian administrators of Oman asking if they would convey to Islam (Yule 2008: 336). While the databases of the project *Tower of Babel* lists various languages related to the meaning ‘human’, it lacks the inclusion of the Semitic languages. We select here the historical language Arabic, which among its roots contains the root ‘*ain*-mim-nun’. It has reflexes in the word ‘Oman’ (عُمان), which in the writings of the historical linguists and historians was ascribed as the origin of the name for the region as a derivation for a man’s proper name, a name of a region in Yemen, and a root with the meaning ‘to settle’. Abu Khalil doesn’t mention in the *Kitab al-Ain*, the first dictionary of the Arabic language, this root. This root was not accepted as a pure Arabic root among Arabic philologists; so, the author Ibn Farsi in *Maqayees al-Lugha* (مقايس اللغة) mentions as a textual critical comment that the root combination *ain*, *mim*, *nun* is not an accepted root for the Arabic language and mentions as example for a word derived from the root Oman العين والميم والميم وليس: (عُمان) ياصل، وفيه عُمان: بلدة. Arabic sources offer various origins and etymologies for the name Oman. Ibn Al-A’rabi says that *al-omn* means people resident in a place, an ‘*amin* or ‘*amoun* is a man who resides permanently in the homeland. Yule (2008) states that despite the Persians, who ruled the area, called the country Mazun, it was probably called
among the speakers of Arabic ‘Oman’. The term ‘Ommana’ was according to Yule coined relatively late in the history of this area short after the birth of Christ (Yule 2008: 330). The root *ain-mim-nun for ‘to settle’ does not exist any longer in contemporary Arabic dictionaries, but is the other dictionaries of Arabic scholars like the *Lisan Al-Arab* (لسان العرب) in the entry for ‘Oman’ (عمان). Today it is in the lexeme of the proper name Oman in contemporary dictionaries present. Borean MVNV has the meanings ‘stay’, ‘reside’ and has reflexes in Eurasiac *menV, Afroasiatic *man-and *min-, Sino-Caucasian *manV, Austric *mvʔn, and Amerind *ma(n)- for ‘dwell’ and ‘be’. If the Arabic is related to the word من (man) and the root ‘min – nun’ extended to the root ‘ain-mim-nun’ or the long-range etymology of the Borean MVNV, which has the meaning ‘man’, must be separated from this Borean root MVNV for ‘stay’ and ‘reside’ is open to discuss. The Borean root MVNV for ‘reside’ and ‘stay’ has reflexes in the Proto-Afroasiatic roots *män- and *min- as ‘house’ in the Egyptian mn (‘room’), Western Chadic *min- for ‘house’ and ‘place’, but also in the Indo-European languages, e.g. Latin manere (‘stay’). The languages of the Semitic language family cover as language variations and dialect chains a broad area. Here the semiotic range of the etymology encompasses the socialization of humans as ‘I’ and ‘person’, descriptions of professions and social structure of the area.

3. Discussion: Evidence for historical transcontinental language contact situations?

3.1 Conclusion and summary

3.1.1 The realizations and reflexes of the etymological roots for ‘Being Human’

The hypothetical Borean root MVNV and its presence in roots of five language families is the documentation for the transcontinental presence of this root. With Borean MVNV, which has the meaning ‘man’, the Eurasiac root *mänV, the Afroasiatic root *ma/in-, the Sino-Caucasian root *mũnxũ, the Austric PAA roots *maŋ and *meŋ for ‘person’, the Amerind roots *man for ‘child’ and *mano for ‘husband’, and the African
Bantu root *-méné for ‘self’ are related. The realizations and reflexes of the etymological roots for ‘being human’ in various languages show that this simple semantic meaning across various language families developed to different fields of semantic meanings. Even though the basic and commonly shared meaning ‘being human’ is present in all language families, the reflexes are different. In linguistics cognates are words with a common etymological origin as ‘blood relatives’. Cognates are related by descent from the same ancestral language. We can differentiate between:

1. Proper names for founders of an ethnic group
2. Ethnonyms: names given to a tribe or clan
3. Names for human professions: names, which describe a profession and activity of a human
4. Names for the social status: names for the social status reflect the status and prestige a person had
5. Names for the family status: Names, which indicate the status of a person among a family
6. Description of a gender

The Borean root MVNV is a tool for the understanding of the conceptualization of a long-range etymology. (Even though other roots are sometimes morphologically and phonetically similar, we can separate them. For example, the reflexes for ‘man’ and ‘human’ are by some linguists associated with the root *men- ‘to think’ and roots for ‘love’ in Semitic languages.) The case of the common origin of ethnonyms related to the semantic meaning of ‘human’ existing across language families, which in a long range etymological path across language families, seems to support the assumption of the quality of ‘originality’ of languages. The Semantic fields for the Etymology of the concept ‘man’ and ‘human’ comprises the category ‘identity’ with MAN for HE / SHE / SELF, the ‘general existence’ as MAN (for male and female humans), HUMAN, and PERSON. The ‘group existence’ as MAN for MEN and PEOPLE, the ‘type by gender’ for MAN in MAN / WOMAN and MALE HUMAN and FEMALE HUMAN. The ‘social state’ is determined in meanings for MAN as HUSBAND, PROFESSIONAL, or CHIEF/MASTER. As ‘individual state’ for MAN the concept proper name of legendary founders of an ethnic group is employed.

In the Germanic branch of the Indo-European languages the distinct meaning ‘male human’ occurred very late around 1000 CE. The first ancestor of the Indians was called
Manu. Mannus is the arch father of the Germanic tribe. In pharaonic Egypt Menes was the founder of the first dynasty. Minos was the founder and first king of Crete. The king of the Congo was called Mani Congo. Mani was a noble rank given to great chiefs. The realization of the root with a specific kind of semantic field for reflexes has a correlation to the specific language family it is in or at least related languages with speech contact regardless of the language family they belong to. The existence of a pre-historical chain of linguistic variations, whose members stood in speech contact with each other, might serve as the simplest explanation for the occurrence of the variations of the semantic meanings associated to this hypothetical ‘chain of linguistic speech variations’. Our material indicates that the semantic meanings attributed to the relative stable phonetic material found both at the level of hypothetical proto-languages and in the reflexes of historical natural languages in the case of the semantic field ‘man’ and ‘human’ varies according to the topographical area of its usage. The phonetic material shared between the members of a community might have been open to changes in any direction and the employment of the received for the ‘creation of ‘new meanings’. So the ‘creation’ of ethnonyms and proper names of a specific culture might be explains. We can also deduct from these findings, that a phoneme-like group of sounds was a relative stable linguistic phenomenon in the pre-historical time able to ‘travel’ across barriers of cultural groups, which were able to ‘reemploy’ the material according to their specific cultural needs.

ETHNIC GROUP
CHIEF / LEADER / FOUNDER
PROFESSIONAL
MAN / WOMEN
MAN / HUMAN
PERSON
I / EGO

3.1.2 The encompassing social range of the semantic chain of the concept ‘MAN’ and ‘HUMAN’ and related concepts across language families.
The wide range of linguistic reflexes of the concept ‘man’ and ‘human’ across the language families is an argument for the ability of a morphological /phonetic unit to produce variations of this concept encompassing the areas of the social aspects and serving as coverage for new social phenomena like the names of ethnic groups or individuals. Based on these finding we should take into account that conceptual variations are based on the social settings, but that language is obviously able to keep the connotation of a linguistic concept across language variations in different language families in a long diachronic range and a wide distance upright. Since the hypothetical proto-languages and roots are hypothetical reconstructions with an attached meaning, we can also assume that the above mentioned concepts are actually rhizomatically joint and reconfigured in each individual natural language, so that one single basic conceptual meaning does not exist.

References


HAASE, Fee-Alexandra (2019) “‘Chaining’. Studies of the Conceptualization of Genuine Concepts of
Linguistic Communication in the Roots of the Proto-language-Thesaurus and Reflexes
Across Language Families”, Dialectologia, 23, 113-146.
<http://www.edicions.ub.edu/revistes/dialectologia23/ >

HOFMANN, Johann Jakob (1958) Lexicon Universale, Historiam Sacram et Profanam Omnis Aevi,


Marcuse, Herbert (1966) Eros and Civilization. A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud, with a new
preface by the author, Boston: Beacon Press.


SLOCUM, Jonathan (2014) “What is Historical Linguistics?”, Linguistics Research Center of the
College of Liberal Arts at UT Austin. May 3, 2014.

STAROSTIN, Sergei (1989) “Comparative Historical Linguistics and Lexicostatics”. Tr. by I. Peiros and
N. Evans of Sravnitel’no-istoričeskoe jazykoznanie i leksikostatistika in Lingvističeskaja

<http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/steingass/>. 


<http://gutenberg.spiegel.de/buch/137/2>.


<http://starling.rinet.ru/cgibin/bdescr.cgi?root=config&morpho=0&basename=\data\eura\globe>
