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Introduction

This paper is aimed at the etymological reconstruction of several words from a number of Papuan languages belonging to the so-called Alor-Pantar language family - AP (sub-family of the Timor-Alor-Pantar language family - TAP), localized in the Alor-Pantar archipelago, South-Eastern Indonesia, Timor area. It offers, for the first time, a comprehensive etymological restitution of widespread forms that can be configured as a sampling for further research, trying to establish a methodological framework in this Papuan linguistic context.

The analysis is specifically focused on Papuan languages from Alor, including in the comparison Papuan languages from Pantar and also neighboring Austronesian languages.

The etymological analysis considers the geographical distribution of the different groups of speakers in the Alor-Pantar archipelago. This hermeneutic approach, connecting historical linguistics with linguistic geography, is valuable in testing the possibility of language contact and language alignment phenomena. Moreover, the paper tries, for the first time, to reconstruct a new and reliable historical phonetics of the original proto-language of the analyzed area, the so-called proto-Alor-Pantar (pAP), at least in the Alor Island context.

The reconstruction work is focused, in this initial stage, on common words (as ‘sky’ and ‘rain’) from the target languages, connected by their historical morphology and historical semantics.

The source of lemmas for this study is the Proto-Alor Lexicon Database developed at the Linguistics and Multilingual Studies Programme (LMS) at Nanyang Technological University (NTU). This is still a work in progress. However, the database includes around 2000-4000 words per language, listed according to a comparative criterion.

The database has been developed at NTU and it is based on a very large amount of data from fieldwork, collected, over time, in cooperation with scholars from other Universities. All lemmas have been double-checked with native-speakers and with available reference grammars and lexicons. It is still a work in progress, organized per semantic areas, as a dictionary, listing series of words corresponding to a specific notion per line from 9 Papuan languages of Alor.

The Place and the Language Family

The Alor-Pantar archipelago (geographic coordinates 8°15’S 124°45’E) is located in South-Eastern Indonesia, in the Timor area, within the Eastern Lesser Sunda Islands, in the province of East Nusa Tenggara.

Alor is the main island in the archipelago and is found at its Eastern corner. Other islands are Pantar, Kepa, Buaya, Ternate (belonging to Alor, not to be confused with Ternate, belonging to North Moluccas), Pura, and Tereweng.
To the East of the archipelago, there is the Ombai Strait, separating it from the islands of Wetar and Atauro, the latter belonging to East Timor. To the South, across the Strait of Alor, the Western part of Timor lies. To the North, no land, only the Banda Sea. To the West, the rest of the Sunda Islands lies.


The language family is conventionally divided into two branches, centered on the islands of Alor and Pantar. The two branches are outlined below (Perono Cacciafoco et al. 2015: 39-41):

a) Alor branch:

Abui, Kamang (Woisika), Kui, Adang / Kabola (Strait, West-Alor, ‘border language[s]’), Klon (West-Alor), Kafoa (Jafoo), Sawila (East-Alor, Tanglapui language), Kula / Lamtoka (East Alor, Tanglapui language), Wering / Kolana (East-Alor);

b) Pantar branch:

Teiwa, Kaera, Nedebang, Lamma (West-Pantar), Tubbe (West-Pantar), Mauta (West-Pantar), Retta, Blagar (or Blagar / Retta, Straits, East-Pantar / West-Alor, ‘border language[s]’).

Tereweng, plausibly a Blagar dialect (spoken on the Tereweng Island of the coast of Pantar), is, sometimes, classified as a separate language from Blagar. Blagar can also be considered as belonging to the Alor branch, as a West-Alor (Strait) language. Hamap, sometimes, is distinguished from Adang, even if it seems to be an Adang dialect. Kabola is socio-linguistically distinct from Adang, but is associated with it as a language (Haan 2001: passim). Abui, Kamang (Woisika), and Kabola should not be unitary languages.

From proto-Alor-Pantar - pAP (the original proto-language) should be derived Teiwa, Nedebang, Kaera, and the West Pantar group of languages (Mauta, Tubbe, Lamma), on one side, and Alor, on the other (Robinson and Holton 2012: 59-87). From Alor would have been ‘originated’ the West Alor and East Alor subgroups. West Alor should be the group of Klon and of the languages of the Straits, Blagar / Retta and Adang, East Alor would include Sawila and Wering / Kolana. Between West Alor and East Alor, the Alor group would incorporate also Kui, Abui, Kamang / Woisika, and – possibly – Kafoa / Jafoo (Holton et al. 2012: 114).

The ‘collector definition’ proto-Alor-Pantar (pAP) can be considered equivalent to proto-Timor-Alor-Pantar (pTAP), since the languages not belonging to the Alor group seem not to constitute a specific connection in opposition to the Oirata-Makasai languages of East Timor and the Bunak language on the Timorese border. Malcom Ross has postulated the existence of a so-called “West-Timor” group including Alor-Pantar and Bunak (Ross 2005: 15-66).

The Analyzed Languages

Our current work is focused on nine Alor-Pantar languages from Alor Island, namely Klon (kyo), Kafoa (kpu), Abui (abz), Papuna (pap), Tiyei (tiy), Suboo (sub), Woisika - Kamang (woi), Kula (tpg), Sawila (swt). These languages stretch from the West to the East of Alor Island and show deep relations among each other (with, sometimes, the exception of Kula and Sawila). For all of them, data has been collected during language documentation fieldwork and all has been deposited in the Proto-Alor Lexicon Database.

Klon (or Kelon) is a language from the Western side of Alor Island (Baird 2008; passim). It is closely related to Adang, spoken across Kalabahi Bay, to the North. ISO 639-3: kyo; Glottolog: kelo1247.
**Kafoa** (or **Jafoo**) is spoken in a border area between Klon and Abui territories (Perono Cacciafoco et al. 2015: 40-41). The name **Kafoa** is not recognized by native-speakers. It has not yet been ascertained which name they use themselves. ISO 639-3: **kpu**; Glottolog: kafo1240.

**Abui** is spoken by approximately 16,000 speakers in the central part of Alor. The native name of the language is **Abui tangà**, literally meaning ‘mountain language’. ISO 639-3: **abz**; Glottolog: abui1241.

**Papuna** (**pap**) is a language closely linked to Abui (Schapper 2014: 5-8), possibly deriving from an original unity between Abui and Papuna in remote times. It is currently spoken East of the Abui territory. ISO 639-3: N/A; Glottolog: N/A. The code **pap** is the commonly used code for ease of reference.

**Tiyei** (or **Tiayei**, or **Tiee**) is a language spoken North of the Papuna territory, at the Eastern border of the Abui area (Schapper 2014: 5-8). It is sometimes considered a dialect of **Kamang** (**Woisika**). ISO 639-3: N/A; Glottolog: N/A. The code **tiy** is the commonly used code for ease of reference.

**Suboo** is a language spoken North of the Tiyei territory, at the Eastern border of Abui area, South of the Kamang land (Schapper 2014: 5-8). ISO 639-3: N/A; Glottolog: N/A. The code **sub** is the commonly used code for ease of reference.

**Woisika** (or **Kamang**) is a Papuan language (Perono Cacciafoco et al. 2015: 40-41.). It is spoken North of the Suboo territory. It borders the Eastern part of Abui area. Several dialects belong to it: **Lembur**, **Sibo**, **Kamang**, **Tiyei** (or **Tiayei**, or **Tiee**), **Watang**, **Kamana-Kamang**. They may represent more than one unitary language. ISO 639-3: **woi**; Glottolog: kama1365.

**Kula** (or **Kola**) or **Lamtoka** (or **Lantoka**), also known as **Tanglapui**, is a Papuan language (Perono Cacciafoco et al. 2015: 40-41). Dialects of it are: the properly called **Kula**, **Kulatela**, **Watena**, **Kula Watena**, **Iramang**, **Larena**, **Sumang**, **Arumaka**. It is spoken in a territory at the Eastern side of Alor Island. ISO 639-3: **tpg**; Glottolog: kula1280.

**Sawila** (or **Tanglapui**, name shared with **Kula**), is a Papuan language (Perono Cacciafoco et al. 2015: 40-41). Its dialects are: the properly called **Sawila**, **Lona**, **Salimana**, **Lalamana**, **Sileba**. It is spoken at the extreme South-Eastern corner of Alor Island. ISO 639-3: **swt**; Glottolog: sawi1256.

**Origins of the Alor Languages**

The genetic unity of the Timor-Alor-Pantar (TAP) family is well established. However, the prehistoric origins of these languages are still quite unclear (Schapper 2014: 1-11). The chronology of the possible ‘arrival’, in remote times, of TAP speakers in Timor and in Timor’s area is still problematic in its reconstruction. It is generally thought that the TAP languages could be epichoric languages (O’Connor 2007: 523-535) spoken by the first prehistoric men settled in that area more than 40,000 years ago (Pleistocene). They were spoken by aboriginal people before the arrival of Austronesian speakers after 2000 BC.

It is impossible to exclude, in any case, that proto-Timor-Alor-Pantar (pTAP) settlers arrived from New Guinea following the documented spread of banana and taro trees in the Eastern Highlands of New Guinea around 8000 BC (Pawley 2005: 67-108). On the wake of this agricultural progress, the Trans New Guinea (TNG) languages could have expanded along the central cordillera of New Guinea and, later, plausibly towards Timor and the Timor area.

It is plausible to hypothesize, even though impossible to be proven through a historical linguistic approach (because of the lack of sources), some connections between the TAP language family and the mainland TNG languages. The chronological gap, surely considerable, separating the ‘foundation’ of the TAP languages from the possibly original proto-TNG, could be at the origins of this difficulty in establishing linguistic links (Schaffer 2014: 7).
Methodology

Our aim is to reconstruct reliable etymologies for the forms we will analyse. We will proceed following a comparative approach. Given a word, for instance, 'sky', all the forms belonging to the 9 languages mentioned above will be compared with each other trying to establish a (possibly) common historical-phonetics and to recover the related original root. The words come from the Proto-Alor Lexicon Database.

The etymological analyses will be conducted to try and establish common patterns of development (and phonetic laws). Previous etymologies or root’s reconstructions provided by other scholars, specifically, from Holton et al. 2012 will be discussed and taken into account.

The aim of this etymological process is not only the restitution of possible roots and proto-forms, but also an evaluation of language change and language contact phenomena among Papuan languages in Alor Island, following a theoretical ‘route’ from the West to the East.

The outcome of this preliminary survey could be useful for quantitatively deeper studies.

Etymologies

In this section we provide a series of possible etymologies of commonly used words from the nine Papuan (Alor) languages we are studying. Each language will be indicated through its code, as reported above. The different ways used to transcribe the words (phonetic and non-phonetic) derive from the need to follow the current convention of the NTU Proto-Alor Lexicon Database.

1.0 ‘Sky’

*kyo bulogen kpu fulaŋ abz ?a’di: pap adi goaŋ tiy doling, adi ta sub adi: gŋ, delan woi deling

tpq əpŋge(y)a swt ayaakani

pap and sub (partly) developed a mark *-gen, other languages (kyo, kpu, tiy, woi) a solution (prefixal form) *bulɔ(ŋ)-. But *-gen is from *-ɔ(ŋ)- in *bula(ŋ)- (and related to it), even if, at a certain point, it seems separated (not directly connected – morphologically and/or semantically? – with the main / original [?] form), and understood as a ‘suffixal stem’ itself.

The bilabial /b/ (kyo) should / could be more ancient than the forms in /d/ (possibly derived, tiy, sub, woi) – bilabial in roots could, sometimes, indicate a remote station of language – and /f/ (more difficult to think about a derivation in kpu without a specific phonetic law, maybe it is an original variant). /b/, in kyo, could be a ‘fossil’ and /f/, in kpu, the recentius lemma. /d/, as a ‘widespread form’, could represent a sort of ‘regularization’.

abz, pap, tiy, sub could have fixed an independent root *ad(i)- (impossible to think about a time for it), quite stable, combined, then, with the *-gen (apparently independent from *bula(ŋ)-?) solution in pap and sub, and with the proto-form *bula(ŋ)- in sub (apparently).

The stem *ad(i)- should be also the basis of *apŋŋ- in tpg, a sort of addition between *ad(i)- and *-ɔ(ŋ)- / *-gen, while, always in tpg, *-ge(y)a should derive again from *-gen, in a sort of reduplication of the form (*-ɔ(ŋ)-gen or *-gen-gen). If it were so, tpg could represent the link between the ‘abz-type’ forms and the ‘kyo-type’ forms, and əpŋŋe(y)a (tpg) would be the equivalent (or equate) of adi goaŋ (pap).

Independently from the semantics of the forms, it could be possible to reconstruct three stems, *bula(ŋ)- (derived *d-, epichoric variant *f-), *-gen (from *-ɔ(ŋ)- in *bula(ŋ)-), and *ad(i)-. We call them ‘stems’ and not ‘roots’, since *-gen appears as a sort of suffixal form, indeed directly derived from *bula(ŋ)- and related to it (*-ɔ(ŋ)-), not being properly a root. Those three stems are involved in the ‘making’ of the word for ‘sky’, allowing to distinguish two groups, the *bula(ŋ)-languages’ (kyo, kpu, tiy and sub – both in part –, and woi) and the ‘*ad(i)- languages’ (abz, pap, tiy and sub – both in part –, and tpg), with *-gen as ‘formant’ link involved in the ‘making’ of many lexemes.
It seems a tripartite system, with some double or parallel forms (sub and tiy).

swt ayaakani seems not connected with other lemmas, unless we do not want to see it in a quite improbable derivation of *ayaa- from *ad(i) = *a(d)i- = *ai- = (intensification?) *ay- = (widenign?) *aya- = (geminatio?) *ayaa-, plus *kani from *-gen = (change in the voiceless velar plosive) *-ken = (vocalic extension) *-kan = (vocalic addition) *kani. This process would represent a very singular phonetics. If accepted, the resulting form could be considered quite ‘innovative’.

1.1 Additional Notes

pAP: *bulan, ‘sky’;
kyo: *bulong+gen (linking Pantar / pAP to the *adi form);
abz: adi; adi+gen;
abz: *adi = abz /dl/ = no correspondence to pAP - not regularly inherited;
woi cluster: *b > d (not regular?), *bulong > doling (Holton and Robinson 2014: ad locum) - /dl/ is not a regular reflex: this is, more likely, regular lenition;
*ŋ (locative);
ge- 3sg. poss OR go-, ho-, guo-;
‘Sky’ + it-on > a type of PP, locative + noun > it also explains the tpg form apoaŋge(y)a < apaŋge(y)a (probable metathesis);
ap < *adi (d > p, irregular change),
or *ape < bu(ton) (but *b > p – regular! + prothetic a- - the less likely alternative, applying the Occam’s razor);
→ link to the sub atti baai, ‘star in the sky’ + ‘big’ > ['sky big'] NP.

2.0 ‘Sun’

kyo mədi kpu uru abz ‘war pap N/A tiy wat sub ‘wat woi wati tpg wad swt wadi
*war(i)- has been proposed (Holton et al. 2012: ad locum) as the possible original root.

However, *war(i)- could be considered, rather, a sort of ‘widespread more recent root’, ‘normalized’ as the stem in *war- (variant, indeed, with *wad-, of a possibly more ancient root).

The vocalic addition -(i)-, in the reconstructed root, is not omnipresent. It could be, therefore, not identified with the original root. *wad- could be ‘justified’ only considering kyo mədi as a ‘relic’ or ancient variant, variant of the original root, but phonetics should confirm that mədi is an ancient form derived from a more ancient root *wad- and modified through a passage /w/ ~ /w/.

The choice between two candidates as *wad- and *war- depends essentially from the pronunciation and its changes over time, by speakers, of /d/ and /t/.

Interesting is abz war, which could be a very significant ‘fossil’, readable through the mirror of kpu uru (perhaps *war- > *wur- > *uur- > *(u)ur- > *ur- > *ur(u)- > *uru). It could be the remote form, root *war-, from which derive the widespread variants (from developed, less ancient, roots) in *wad- and *war-, ‘normalized’, over time, in the pronunciation.

This could be confirmed by philological criteria. The lectio difficilior, generally, is the original one, the lectio facilior (widespread) only a ‘normalization’ of the same lectio difficilior. This aspect should be carefully evaluated. In kpu, uru should not *0-u-r-u, but a form like *u-(u)-r-u or *u-0-r-u. abz war, therefore, should be considered as the serius lemma, and kpu uru the lemma derived by it according to an original (particular, but easily reconstructable) phonetics. The forms in *wad- and *war- should be the ‘normalized’ ones, lemmas derived from *war-, kyo mədi could be considered as the recentius lemma, derived, with another original (particular, but easily reconstructable) phonetics, by *wad-. *war-, not showing variants (apart for the vocalic
addition of \( \tilde{a}l \), common also to \(^*wad\) - and plausibly later), could be identified as the more stable form, the real \textit{recentius lemma}, while \( m\dot{d}i \) should be only a form, not a root, derived from \(^*wad\) -. In any case, all the forms (and the roots) in this series are cognates.

\[ \begin{align*}
  ^*\text{war}- & \rightarrow \text{uru} \\
  ^*\text{wad}- & \rightarrow (\rightarrow \text{m}\dot{d}i) = ^*\text{wat}-.
\end{align*} \]

By comparing all these forms with others related, it should be possible to reconstruct a phonetic law useful to solve the etymological problem of the original root.

An interesting link is findable with the word for ‘day’, stable in \( \text{abz} \) as \( \text{war} \) and in \( \text{k}\dot{y}o \) as \( \text{m}\dot{d}i \), while the possible root \(^*\text{wat}-\) changes degree, in a hypothesized proto-form (root) \(^*\text{wad}\text{t} -,\) showing the absolute persistence of the base \(^*\text{wa}-\) and the ‘inconstancy’ of the added (indeed, not integral part of the stem) consonant, /\( \tilde{u} /\).

**3.0 ‘Moon’**

\( \text{k}\dot{y}o \) or \( \text{k}\text{pu} \) \( \tilde{a}l\text{w}a \) \( \text{p}\dot{a}\text{p} \) \( \text{ia} \) \( \text{bui} \) \( \text{sub} \) \( \text{wije} \): \( \text{woi} \) \( \text{wui} \) \( \text{tpg} \) \( \text{pila}\dot{w}\text{aka} \) \( \text{swt} \) \( \text{pileaka} \)

\( \text{tpg} \) \( \text{pila}\dot{w}\text{aka} \) and \( \text{swt} \) \( \text{pileaka} \), ‘moon’, are linked, if not derived, from the forms, in \( \text{tpg} \) and \( \text{swt} \), for ‘star’, respectively \( \text{ilelawa} \) and \( \text{lawaala} \) (that could be a derivation from \(^*\text{iawaala} \), or, more plausibly, from \(^*\text{ilawaala} \)). These forms for ‘moon’ show a prefixal \( p- \), which can be considered as the ‘formant consonant’ in the naming – or re-naming – process of these forms.

This reconstruction works if we think that the stem for ‘moon’ is more ancient than the stem for ‘star’. It could be possible also to infer the opposite and, in this way, we can hypothesize that the ‘\( p-\)forms’ for ‘moon’ are original and remote, while the ‘\( 0-\)forms’ (for ‘star’) are derived from them. In this case, /\( \tilde{p} /\) would be not a ‘formant’ prefixal additional consonant, but integral part of the root, fallen in the naming process of the forms for ‘star’.

It could be possible to hypothesize, for these words, a root \(^*\text{il}(e/a)\)- or \(^*\text{ij}(e/a)\)- (not \(^*\text{ji}-\), but \(^*\text{ij}-\)), according to the first reconstruction, or a root \(^*\text{pi}(e/a)\)- or \(^*\text{pij}(e/a)\)- (not \(^*\text{ji}-\), but \(^*\text{ij}-\)), according to the second reconstruction, with a stable, ‘fossil’ /\( /\tilde{p} /\) in the forms for ‘moon’ and with the fall of /\( /\tilde{p} /\) in the forms for ‘star’. The passage a \(~\) e, in the reconstructed roots, is a normal ablaut, definable also as a ‘vocalic interchange’.

The phonetic sequence between \( \text{tpg} \) \( \text{pila}\dot{w}\text{aka} \) and \( \text{swt} \) \( \text{pileaka} \) could be linked to the fall of /\( \tilde{w} /\) =

\( \text{tpg} \) \( \text{pila}\dot{w}\text{aka} \rightarrow ^*\text{pila}(w)\text{aka} \rightarrow ^*\text{pila}\dot{a}\text{ka} \rightarrow ^*\text{pila}靛\text{aka} \rightarrow ^*\text{pila}\dot{a} \rightarrow ^*\text{pila}靛\text{aka} \rightarrow \text{swt} \) \( \text{pileaka} \).

This about the \( \text{tpg} \) and \( \text{swt} \) forms for ‘moon’ (with a comparison with the words for ‘star’ in the same languages).

As far as the other languages, the root appears to be another and the word for ‘moon’ in the two previous languages should be, therefore, not related to the word for ‘moon’ belonging to these ones.

\( \text{k}\dot{y}o \) and \( \text{k}\text{pu} \) could allow to reconstruct a possible root \(^*\text{wur}-(\text{Holton et al. 2012: ad locum})/\(^*\text{uur}-,\) plausible, while \( \text{k}\text{pu} \) \( \tilde{u}\text{a} \), \( \text{woi} \) \( \text{wui} \), \( \text{tiy} \) \( \text{bui} \), \( \text{sub} \) \( \text{wije} \), \( \text{abz} \) \( \tilde{i}\text{ja} \), and \( \text{pap} \) \( \text{ia} \), in this order, with some possible variations, seem to witness phonetic passages implying an evolution of the form towards a sort of drastic ‘normalization’, until the definitively ‘normalized’ form \( \text{ia} \) in \( \text{pap} \).

However, it should be possible to hypothesize different steps and intersections among different forms, starting from a possible root \(^*\text{uur}-\) (or \(^*\text{wur}-\)), keeping \( \text{k}\dot{y}o \) or as the most conservative form, the ‘relic’ from where to start the root reconstruction. It could be possible to highlight, then, a development in \( \tilde{a}l\text{w}a \), in \( \text{k}\text{pu} \), and a standardization in \( \text{abz} \) \( \tilde{i}\text{ja} \), until the ‘normalized’ form \( \text{ia} \) in \( \text{pap} \).

Another hypothetical path would always start from a root \(^*\text{uur}-(\text{or \(^*\text{wur}-\))},\) passing through a reconstructable, not witnessed, ‘intermediate’ stem \(^*\text{wu}(i)r-\)/\(^*\text{wur}-,\) with a development in \( \text{woi} \) \( \text{wui} \) and \( \text{tiy} \) \( \text{bui} \).
(both forms are variants of each other), and in sub *wije*, which seems a sort of intersection between the development in /l/ (kpu, abz, and pap) and the development in /u/ (again kpu, and woi and tiy).

Sub *wije*: could be considered also as a ‘fossil’, a sort of intermediate level ‘relic’ of the developments between the two hypothesized groups of words / stems, fixed as an emblematic word in its specific language.

**tyi bui** and **woi bui** are two variants of the same derived form, and, in their specific case, being the sound /w/ (or /u/) predominant, in the sequence, the form bui, despite the general antiquity of the sound /bl/, should be considered the later variant, and, therefore, the recentius lemma.

### 3.1 A Possible Diachronic Sequence

**proto-form** *wur/-*uur - → kpu (?u.a) → woi (wui) → tiy (bui) → sub (wiJe) → abz (?ija) → pap (ia)

or

a) **proto-form** *uur- / *wur- → kyo or → kpu ?u.a → abz ?ija → pap ia

and

b) **proto-form** *uur- / *wur- → reconstructed, not attested, form *wu(i)r- / *wuir- → woi wui → tiy bui → sub wije: (sequence at the origins of the first one, possible tentative link between the two series).

### 4.0 ‘Star’

**kyo** ib kpu forfal abz ‘fîr pap br tiy ateibai sub ?a’i: woi atoibaai tpg ilelawa swt lawaala
tpg ilelawa and swt lawaala, ‘star’, are linked to (if not derived from) the forms, in tpg and swt, for ‘moon’, pilawɔka and pileaka. lawaala could be a derivation from *iawaala, or, more plausibly, from *ilawaala. The forms for ‘moon’ show a prefixal p-, which can be considered as a ‘formant consonant’ in their naming – or re-naming – process.

This reconstruction works if we think that the stem for ‘moon’ is more ancient than the stem for ‘star’. It could be possible also to think the opposite and, in this way, we can hypothesize that the ‘p-forms’ (for ‘moon’) are original and remote, while the ‘0-forms’ (for ‘star’) are derived from them. In this case, /p/ would be not a ‘formant’ prefixal additional consonant, but an integral part of the root, fallen in the naming process of ‘star’.

It could be possible to hypothesize, for these words, a root *il(e/a)- or *ij(e/a)- (not *ji-, but *ij-), according to the first reconstruction, or a root *pil(e/a)- or *pij(e/a)- (not *ji-, but *ij-), according to the second reconstruction, with a stable, ‘fossil’ /p/ in the forms for ‘moon’ and with the fall of /p/ in the forms for ‘star’. The passage a → e, in the reconstructed roots, is a normal ablaut, definable also as a ‘vocalic interchange’.

The phonetic link between tpg ilelawa and swt lawaala can be hypothesized through a proto-form *ilawaala, reconstructable for lawaala, proposing, therefore, a root *il(e/a)- or *ij(e/a)-, but it seems also plausible that the path could be different. We can isolate, for example, in the two forms, the ‘morpheme’ /-law/- that, based on an eminently phonetic analysis, can be considered as a proper root, *law-. According to this interpretation, swt lawaala would be the serius lemma, being adherent to the possible original stem, *law-, and tpg ilelawa would be a possible innovation with the insertion of a sort of prefix *ile-. Interesting note, this hypothesized prefix could derive from the tpg and swt forms for ‘moon’, pilawɔka and pileaka, in which it seems to be part of the original root of those forms, *il(e/a)- or *ij(e/a)-, if we consider the possibility of a ‘formant’ consonant *p-, or *pil(e/a)- or *pij(e/a)-, if we consider /p/ as an integral part of the original root.

In this possible reconstruction, we are witnessing the plausible combination of two different roots, *law- and *il(e/a)- or *ij(e/a)- (or *pil[e/a]- or *pij[e/a]-) in two (four) words expressing the notions of ‘moon’ and ‘star’, words surely linked to each other in the analyzed languages. In particular, in tpg ilelawa, ‘star’, the possible root *il(e/a)- or *ij(e/a)- of the words for ‘moon’ tpg pilawɔka and swt pileaka, shows an
insertion, as a prefixal root, of the same *il(e/a)- or *ij(e/a)- on the original root *law- (of tpg ilelawa), which becomes a sort of internal ‘morpheme’ (in reality, remote root).

swt lawala, instead, shows the original root, *law-, and is likely to be the serius lemma, not being necessary, in this reconstruction, to hypothesize an intermediate form *ilawaala.

The possible reconstruction *ilawaala, indeed, assumes tpg ilelawa as the serius lemma and swt lawala as the derived form, while this reconstruction presupposes swt lawala as the serius lemma and tpg ilelawa (*ile[pre]xial root linked to tpg pilawaka and swt pileaka)*law[original root witnessed by swt lawala]-a = *ile-law-a the recentius one.

This about the tpg and swt words for ‘star’, serius (swt lawala) and recentius (tpg ilelawa) lemmata (with a comparison with the words for ‘moon’ in the same languages).

As far as the other languages, we would like to propose a reconstruction that could be alternative (or complementary) to the one providing *jib(V) as a plausible root (Holton et al. 2012: ad locum).

It is possible, indeed, to reconstruct another proto-form, or common root, *iv- (not /b/, but /v/) for kyo, abz, pap, tiy, and woi. The root *iv-, with /v/, could explain the phonetics of kyo ib in pap and *f'ir (with passage /v/-/b/ to /f/) in abz.

kpu forfal is a non-related form, clearly derived from the root *uur-/ *wur- of the words for ‘moon’, with the change of f- explainable as a possible ‘alignment’ (through a process of historical semantics) with abz *f'ir, ‘star’.

sub ʔa'ti: is another non-related form, clearly derived from the root *ad(i)- of the words for ‘sky’ shared among the analyzed languages. However, it seems involved in the ‘making’ of the words for ‘star’ in tiy and woi, ateibai and atoibaai, two variants of the same form, composed by the root for ‘sky’, *ad(i)-, in the phonetic variant *at(i)-, plus the root *iv- (in the derived form *ib-) of the other words for ‘star’ (in kyo, abz, pap), ultimately meaning ‘star in the sky’. Interesting is the apophonic degree /el/ in tiy and the apophonic degree /o/ in woi, theoretically witnessing a dialectal variation findable also in the different ‘quantity’ of the vowel /a/ (ā in tiy and ā in woi).

### 4.1 Additional Notes

a) proto-form / original root *iv- (`star’) → kyo ib, abz *f'ir, pap bir
   +
   complementary original root / proto-form *ad(i)- (`sky’) → sub ʔa'ti: → tiy ateibai, woi atoibaai;

b) *jib > ij > igl > li (Alor, metathesis) + *law- (tpg, swt) < unclear origin. (*Wild hypothesis’, the ‘Timor connection’: > *ip[ibere] > *bere > were > were [phonotactics bans /l/ in word medial position in swt] > lewe; sub: ateibai = *-bai from ‘big’ or, perhaps, related to *bere [possible proto-Timor], definitely not inherited [PAP *b > p]).

### 5.0 ‘Cloud’ (and ‘Fog’)

kyo teʔeh, bontu kpu tabekel abz ta’bɔ pap tabek tiy wale sub wale: woi wale tpg

sakapila swt sakapulo

kyo, kpu, abz, and pap show a common root possibly reconstructable as *tab-. kyo, generally conservative, seems to offer an ‘innovative’ form, teʔeh, bontu, even if it could be again the most remote construction (the proto-root or the original pattern of the ‘making’ of the root?), if we consider teʔeh + bontu as at the basis of the possible root *tab-, through a series of phonetic passages, *teʔeh > *teeh > *t ēh > *t ē(h) > *t ē / ta (*-a for ablaut, due to the ‘strengthening’ of *-ee- in *-e- and to the fall of -h) = *ta + bontu = *ta- + -bontu (with solution equivalent to -bo of abz ta’bɔ, becoming possible equate of -be- of kpu tabekel and, again,
of -be- of pap tabeki). Following this reconstruction, kyo would seem to give us, here, the explanation of the ‘making’ of the possible proto-form *tab-. Before the root (proto-root?) indeed.

1) tiy, sub, and woi appear as quite regular forms, wale, wale:, wale. Seemingly stable, we can hypothesize for them a common root *wal-, without complicating the phonetic chain.

However, a possible phonetic link between *tab- and *wal- could be seen through *tabe- (kpu and pap), with this possible passage, *tabe- → *tabe- → *bate- → *w→a→l→l→t→e- → *w→(b)→a→l→(l)→e- = *w→a→l→e- = *wale(-).

tpg and swt sakapila and sakapulo are very peculiar forms. It is possible to hypothesize an epichoric suffix *-ila/*-ulo, with vocalic ‘rotation’, and a root *sakap-, possibly linked to the stem *tab- (kyo, kpu, abz, and pap) or with the stem *tabek- (kpu, pap), in its turn derived from *tab- (root from the proto-form of kyo?).

The phonetic chain could be double, *sakap- from *tab-, with a sort of ‘contraction’, *sa-(ka-)-p-, with fall of -ka- = *s-a-p- = *t-a-b-, with inverse spirantization of /t/, indeed the alveolarization of /s/.

Another path could be more effective, from the ‘intermediate’ stem *tabek- (kpu, pap) to *sakap-, with alveolarization of /s/ and a sort of metathesis, *tabek- → *sabek- ↔ *sakeb- → *sakap-, with ablaut and passage b ~ p.

All the forms seem, therefore, linked to each other, even if the phonetic chains are a little bit ‘complicate’ (but, in any case, explainable).

5.1 Summary

1) Proto-form (proto-root?) for *tab- (kyo, kpu, abz, and pap), from kyo teʔeh, bɔntu, teʔeh + bɔntu → teʔeh > *teeh > *t eh > *t e(h)ito (*-a for ablaut, due to the ‘strengthening’ of *-ee- in *-ɛ- and to the fall of -h) = *ta + bɔntu = *ta- + -bɔntu (with solution equivalent to -bɔ of abz ta bɔ and possible equate of - be- of kpu tabekel and, again, of -be- of pap tabeki);

2) *wal- (tiy, sub, and woi) → linked to *tab- (kyo, kpu, abz, and pap) through *tabe- (kpu and pap) → *tabe- → *tabe- → *bate- → *w→a→l→l→t→e- → *w→(b)→a→l→(l)→e- = *w→a→l→e- = *wale(-);

3) *sakap- (tpg and swt) → linked to *tab- (kyo, kpu, abz, and pap) → *sa-(ka-)-p, with fall of -ka- = *s-a-p- = *t-a-b-, with inverse spirantization of /t/, indeed the alveolarization of /s/ or *sakap- (tpg and swt) → linked to *tabek- (kpu, pap), from *tab- (kyo, kpu, abz, and pap) → *tabek- → *sabek- ↔ *sakeb- → *sakap-, with alveolarization of /s/ and a ‘pseudo-metathesis’, and with ablaut and passage b ~ p.

5.2 Notes

The words for ‘cloud’, in this series, are deeply connected with the words for ‘fog’, kyo bontui kpu tabekel abz ta bɔ; tabekil pap nabor tiy sakafu sub sakafu: woi safuu tpg sakapila swt sakapullo.

The forms ‘cloud’ and ‘fog’, with the related words, can be considered, therefore, as one set with a possible ‘compound root’, CVCV+CVC(V).

6.0 ‘Night’ (Possibly a new Proto-Alor [pA] Phonetic Law)

kyo ṣkan kpu akson abz tonta’ma pap aber tiy ti:la sub titla woi titla tpg tinan swt iduni

The words meaning ‘night’ show, in some of the languages we are analyzing, many interconnections with other words representing ‘items’ semantically linked to night, ‘dark’, ‘black’, and the verb for ‘to extinguish (the light?)’. The different stems of these words are all connected with each other, being all attributable to one or two common proto-forms.
kyo ōkan is linked, for example, to kyo kəray, ‘dark’, and to kyo aʔakan, ‘black’; kpu akoon to abz, ʔako’nu, ‘dark’, abz ʔa kan, ‘black’, pap akan, ‘night’. Also, tpg tinan, ‘night’, corresponds to tpg tinan, ‘dark’ (they are the same word or a diachronic calque), and swt iduni, ‘night’, to swt ido’nu, ‘dark’, and, possibly, to abz, ʔako’nu. tiy ti:la corresponds to sub tu:ta and woi titla, all meaning ‘night’. They are linked to tiy tuta, sub tu:ta, and woi ituta, all meaning ‘dark’. The verb ‘to extinguish (the light?)’, in abz (hakonj), pap (takoon), and swt (ʔaka’ni), is evidently linked, in principle, to the kyo, kpu, abz, and pap forms for ‘night’, ‘dark’ (not to this form in kpu), and ‘black’. It seems difficult, therefore, to semantically distinguish the different forms, giving them a specific (not generic) meaning.

Analysing the forms, we can hypothesize a root *ak-/*aq- (with possible vocalic ‘extension’, *aka-/*aka- for kyo ōkan and kpu akoon. The reconstruction of a proto-form *aqana, for words meaning ‘black’, could be a little ‘audacious’. It would be preferable to stop the reconstruction to a root *ak-/*aq-, with possible vocalic ‘extension’, *aka-/*aka-.

The series tiy ti:la, sub tu:ta, woi titla, and tpg tinan for ‘night’, linked to the series tiy tuta, sub tu:ta, woi ituta, and tpg tinan for ‘dark’, shows an autonomous development. Applying historical phonetics criteria, we can hypothesize a root *tui-, continued with the degree /i/ in the ‘night’ series and with the degree /u/ in the ‘dark’ series. The /l/ series could have developed a variant /l/ in place of the ‘double’ /l/, with woi titla as an intermediate form. Woi ituta could indicate a vocalic interexchange, *tui- → *itu-, at the beginning of the word or a reconstructable form *ti-tu-, due always to the vocalic interexchange at the beginning of the word, *ti-tu- → *itiu- → *(t)itu- → *itu-.

Following this reconstruction, it could be possible to establish (or, at least, to propose) a phonetic law. In these two series, the /u/ series maintains a solution /u/ (‘double’ r = tVt), while the /l/ series develops a /l/ solution (= tVI). This can demonstrate that the /l/ series is more ancient than the /u/ series and that the woi titla form is a sort of intermediate link between the two series. It could be possible also to hypothesize the opposite, i.e. that the /l/ series is more ancient, representing the /u/ series a sort of ‘normalization’, but the regularity of tVt of the /l/ series should indicate to be more ancient than tVI of the /l/ series, being this one, probably, an innovation. And, according to this reconstruction, tpg tinan for ‘night’ should be a calque of tpg tinan for ‘dark’ (also semantically, ‘dark’ comes before ‘night’).

On swt iduni, the form could seem independent from the series, but if we consider the possible root *tui-/*itu-, above hypothesized, and the comparison with swt ido’nu?, ‘dark’, abz, ʔako’nu, ‘dark’, woi ituta, ‘dark’, tpg akona, ‘black’, swt ʔaka’na, ‘black’, swt, ʔaka’ni, ‘to extinguish’, we can also postulate a link between the root *ak-/*aq- (*aka-/*aka-) and the root *tui-/*itu-, used alternatively or through a very singular consonantism k ~ d. The supposed *aqana proto-form, therefore, could allow us to ‘extract’ the suffix *-na, possibly involved in this onomastic series, with double vocalic degree, /l/ and /l/. Not a new, independent, root, therefore (*itu-?), but the *tui-/*itu- stem linked to the *ak-/*aq- (*aka-/*aka-) root, with the intervention of a possible suffix *-na with double vocalic degree, /l/ and /l/.

More difficult is to explain abz tonta’ma, possibly linked to the root *tui-/*itu-, but with independent development and phonetics (tonta- from *tui- [tVt], plus epichoric consonantal /n/ addition and -’ma from *-na?).

On closing, pap aber seems connected with sub tawek-taber, ‘to fight’, but it could be only a casual similarity. It should be possible to try to hypothesize some phonetic chains to link it to the two roots we have reconstructed, but it clearly appears as an independent form.

6.1 Summary
1) Root *ak-/*aq- (with possible vocalic ‘extension’, *aka-/*aka-) → kyo ōkan and kpu akoon;
2) Root *tui-/*itu- → tiy tuta, sub ḫuːta, woi itu, and tpg tinan (‘dark’) 
   ↓
   woi titla (‘night’) 
   ↓
   tiy tiːla, sub titla, woi titla, and tpg tinan (‘night’);

3) Roots *ak-/*aq-(*aka-/*aka-) and *tui-/*itu-, used alternatively or through a very singular 
   consonantism k ~ d, with the intervention of a possible suffix *-na with double vocalic degree, la/ and la/ 

7.0 ‘Day’ (A ‘Suffixal Root’?)
ko məɖi kpu teŋ abż ‘war, ta’den pap tadiŋ tiy watu sub wa ‘to woi watu tpg wante swt 

wateey

The series of words for ‘day’ is closely linked to the series of lemmas for ‘sun’, reproducing all 
the words possibly originated from a reconstructable root that, however, should not be *wad(i)-, but *war-/*wa-.

The ‘day’ series appears more interesting than the ‘sun’ one, since it shows at least two original 
roots and the combination, in some forms, of the two stems.

If we analyze the ‘day’ series, it should be possible to think that some of the sound changes in 
the ‘sun’ series derives from the ‘day’ series and not vice versa. It is possible to hypothesize this if we consider 
the ‘day’ series words not composed by the *war-/*wa- root plus one or more suffixes, but by the *war-/*wa-
root plus another root, become, in that series (not always, but often), a ‘suffixal root’ (‘morphemic root’?). This 
hypothesis is quite ‘audacious’, but it could help in the reconstruction of the etymologies of these series.

kpu teŋ could be (but it is questionable) a sample of a root, *den-/*ten-, become part of 
the other forms, since merged with another root, *war-/*wa-. abż ‘war, ta’den, tiy watu, sub wa to, woi watu, tpg 
wante, swt wateey, indeed, show the presence of the root *den-/*ten- (and it could be an original root become, 
then, ‘suffixal root’, not a simple suffix) preceded by another root, presumably *wa-. However, looking at abż 
‘war, ta’den (plausibly remote, in the form ‘war’), it could be better to say *war-, indeed, *war-/*wa-. The 
evidence from abż ‘war is really important, being ‘war the same word, in abż, for ‘day’ and for ‘sun’, valuable 
wisdom, as for kyo məɖi, of the antiquity of the form.

Following this reasoning, it could be plausible to reconstruct a proto-form *war-den(-), with a 
consonantism d ~ t in kpu teŋ, tiy watu, sub wa ‘to, woi watu, tpg wante, swt wateey, and with a consonantism 
w ~ m in kyo məɖi. Kyo seems often an archaic and conservative language. The consonant /d/, for the proto-
form > *-den[-], therefore, could be the better choice, and məɖi, in kyo, is the same word both for ‘day’ and for 
‘sun’.

In kpu teŋ, tiy watu, sub wa ‘to, woi watu, tpg wante, swt wateey, the root *den- becomes a 
‘suffixal root’, with consonantism /t/ and with different vocalic (non-apophonic) degrees, vocalic timbres /u/ and 
/ɛ/ (maybe also /i/). The root *wa(r)- (*wa- < *war-) apparently falls in kpu, but is stable in the other forms.

The apparent ‘addition’ of -n- in tpg wante could be due to an euphonic dialectal need, but, more 
probably, to a sort of metathesis in the suffixal root *den-, with this passage, *-den[-] → *-nde[-], and 
consonantism t.

If tiy watu is, in a way, the lemma simplicius for the possible proto-form *war-den(-), with fall 
of /t/ and consonantism d ~ t, abż (‘war,) ta’den and pap tadiŋ could represent a consonantism w ~ t 
synthesized in kpu teŋ, with syncope of the vowel of /a/ timbre. Kpu teŋ, therefore, could be not the reproduction
of the original root *den- with consonantism d ~ t, but the product of a syncope of the vowel of timbre /a/ in abz (*war,) taˈdɛŋ and in pap tadiəŋ. In this case, kyo mədi, with abz (*war,) taˈdɛŋ and pap tadiəŋ, would return to us the original sound /dl/ of this root (then ‘suffixal root’), *den-. It is possible, however, to theoretically hypothesize the three forms with the regular root *war- then fallen (apheresis), kpu *(war-)-təj, abz *(('war-) taˈdɛŋ, and pap *(('war-))-tadiəŋ, with the insertion of a syllable *-ta- (innovation?) to link the two roots.

Looking at the different forms and considering abz *war- as the original root with sound /tl/, it could be possible to hypothesize a phonetic law in the sound changes of this root, *war- / *wa-, and of the ‘suffixal root’ *den-. In all forms with consonantism /tl/ (< d ~ t) the root *war- loses the sound /tl/, becoming *war- (tiy watu, sub waˈtə, woi watu, tpg wante, swt wateen). At the same time, when the consonantism is /dl/ (presumably original, < *den-), the root *war- falls or changes itself according to different consonantal solutions, /tl/ and /ml/ (kpu təj, abz [*war,] taˈdɛŋ, pap tadiəŋ, kyo mədi).

7.1 Summary
Proto-form *war-den(-), ‘day’ < original root *war- (‘sun’) + original root *den- (here ‘suffixal root’)

\[\text{a)} \quad \text{with consonantism} /tl/ (< d ~ t) \quad \text{and fall of} /tl/ \quad \text{in} *\text{war} \rightarrow *\text{ta}dəj \]

\[\text{tiy watu, sub waˈtə, woi watu, tpg wante} \quad (< \text{waten} \rightarrow \text{wante} \quad < \text{*-den[-]} \rightarrow \text{*-nde[-]} \quad \text{and consonantism} /tl/, \quad \text{swt wateen} \]

\[\text{b)} \quad \text{with consonantism} /dl/ \quad (\text{presumably original, < *den-}) \quad \text{and fall of} *\text{war-} \quad \text{or change of} *\text{war-} \quad \text{according to different consonantal solutions,} /tl/ \quad \text{and} /ml/ \]

\[\text{kpu təj, abz [*war,] taˈdɛŋ, pap tadiəŋ, kyo mədi.} \]

7.2. Notes
pAP *t (*t-) is regularly inherited as /tl/ almost everywhere in Alor. This is an additional evidence for *taˈdəj.
Since ‘sun’ + *tədəj is a combination widespread in most of Alor, it is possible to consider this as an Alor innovation (proto-Alor / pA).
The polysemic of pAP *wad(i)- extends to Timor, where the concepts ‘day’ and ‘sun’ are expressed by the same root.
If *taˈdəj is reconstructed for pAlor, then pAP *d > r in abz and kpu would precede the innovation.
abz war + tadeng means ‘time’. Tadeng could represent, this way, a ‘time unit’, wad(i) + tadeng = ‘sun’ + ‘time’ > ‘day’. In woi, wati tanda means ‘time of the day’.

8.0 ‘Morning’ (A Problematic Reconstruction)
kyo kukkan kpu N/A abz akon pap N/A tiy N/A sub ˈtuːtaˈkaːɲ woi wilkang, wilboko tpg
idole(y)a swt ʔa, lkiˈlɪ

The situation for the words for ‘morning’ in the analyzed languages appears quite confused.
However, it is possible to try to establish some links, at least among some forms.
kyo kukkan, abz akon, sub ˈtuːtaˈkaːɲ, woi wilkang and wilboko (and, maybe, swt ʔa lkiˈlɪ) seem to show a possible common origin in a root with prevalent vocalic timbre /u/ - /o/. At least for kyo kukkan and abz akon the root should be common and easily reconstructable, *ku-, with an interesting reduplication (*ku-ku-) in kyo and vocalic prosthesis *a- in abz (maybe derived from another possible reduplication with vocalic timbre /a/, *ka-).
A possible root *k(a)- could be glimpsed in sub ‘tuːta kaːŋ’ and in woi wilkang (and wilboko), but with very isolated prefixal additions, even if sub - kaːŋ, woi -kang, kyo -kun, and abz -kon seem linked to each other. It is, therefore, possible to hypothesize a common root, *ku-/*ka-, with unusual vocalism, which, in sub and woi, shows the addition of very particular (and isolated?) prefixes or possible ‘prefixal roots’, maybe stems having independent, but related, meaning.

As far as tpg idole(y)a and swt ?a, lki ‘li, it is difficult to try reconstructions without entering the field of mere conjecture. Hypothesizing the possible presence of the root *ku-/*ka- in swt ?a, lki ‘li, we can just highlight a similarity between the two forms, considering serius lemma (between the two) swt ?a, lki ‘li and recentius lemma tpg idole(y)a, having, therefore, swt ?a, lki ‘li → *(?a,l)kɪ ‘li → *kɪ ‘li → *k(d)ɪ ’l(e)ɪ → *ɪ(k)dɪ ’l(e)ɪ → *ɪdɪ ’l(e)(a) → *ɪdɪ ’l(e)(a) → tpg idole(y)a.

According to this highly hypothetical sequence, the final -a could be produced by the ‘lenition’ of the final stressed /i/ of swt ?a, lki ‘li, giving origin to a ‘weak’ -y- and to the vocalic timbre /l/.

8.1 Notes
Root *ku-/*ka-

a) first level (related to pAP *aqana, ‘dark’ and ‘black’) → kyo kukun, abz akon;
b) second level (compositional derivation – ‘night’ / ‘day part’ + kaang or lee, perfective or completive aspectual marker) → sub ‘tuːta kaːŋ ([‘tuːta] kaːŋ), woi wilkang ([wil][kang]), and wilboko ([wilbo][ko]);
c) third level (lexical innovation in East Alor) → swt ?a, lki ‘li ([?a, li]ki[ ’li]? → tpg idole(y)a < swt ?a, lki ‘li → *(?a,l)kɪ ‘li → *kɪ ‘li → *k(d)ɪ ’l(e)ɪ → *ɪ(k)dɪ ’l(e)ɪ → *ɪdɪ ’l(e)(a) → *ɪdɪ ’l(e)(a) → tpg idole(y)a.

The words for ‘morning’ in the series are also related to the forms for ‘night’ and ‘dark’ in the same series, but woi wil is a puzzle (possibly connected with woi welang, ‘dew’).

In tpg, the word for ‘morning’ could be derived from the form for ‘night’ (‘iduni-type’).

In East Alor, the innovation is transparent, ‘night’ / ‘morning’ + lee / li, ‘finish’, ‘end’. In Wersing (ISO 639-3: kvw; Glottolog: wers1238, also known as Kolana – its primary dialect —, is spoken in some settlements on the Eastern coast of Alor, on the Northern, central, and Southern corners of the island), iding le means ‘night end’ (Schapper 2013: s.v. iding), in tpg, ide + leya = ‘night’ + ‘finish’, in swt, aliki + li = ‘morning’ + ‘finish’. Pantar forms, conversely, are completely different and unrelated.

9.0 ‘Yesterday’

kyo mleng kpu N/A abz ,ʔafej ’da pap tona tiy tiːlago sub ‘tiːnsa, ma woi tungsama tpg apalea

swt ?a ’paːli

The situation of the series of words for ‘yesterday’, among the analyzed languages, appears not clear.

kyo mleng seems, in some way, connected with tiy tiːlago, while the same tiy tiːlago, pap tona, sub ‘tiːnsa ma, and woi tungsama are evidently linked to each other and derived from the same root. Root that could be the same *tui-/*itu- that we have reconstructed for the series of words for ‘night’, at the origins, at least, of abz tonta ’ma, sub titla, woi titla, and tpg tinan. In the ‘night’ series, we have a more marked presence of the consonant /n/, fact that can indicate a development of tpg tinan and abz tonta ’ma for ‘night’, or another root (maybe linked to *tu(i)/*tiu-, as a possible ‘extension’ with vocalism /n/), *tu(i)n- (or *tu[i]-in-?) / *tun-. In this context, it could be useful to evaluate the semantic passage between ‘night’ and ‘yesterday’, being interpretable ‘yesterday’ as ‘the day before / after the night’. In any case, the two roots can be the same stem or two roots closely linked to each other.
abz tonta'ma for ‘night’ and sub ‘ti:nsa, ma and woi tungsama (the word is clearly the same, in sub and woi) for ‘yesterday’, seem linked to each other, with a ‘simple’ vocalism /ul - /i/ (better /i/ and an easily explainable consonantism t ~ s in the forms for ‘yesterday’.

abz, iafej’ da, ‘yesterday’, seems connected with the pap form aber, ‘night’, presumably not linked to the other forms of the series for ‘night’. The two words (possible root *ab-, with consonantism b ~ f and passage -r ↔ -j d[ə], with addition or fall of -a?) could be related and could witness the semantic shift or passage between ‘night’ and ‘yesterday’, being ‘yesterday’, maybe, ‘the day before / after the night’.

A possible root *ab- could explain also the tpg apalea and swt a’pa:li forms for ‘yesterday’, plausibly connected with pap aber, ‘night’, and abz, iafej’ da, ‘yesterday’, with clear consonantism b ~ p, passage r ~ l (a sort of ‘pseudo-rhotacism’), and vocalism – apophonics – /l/ - /el/.

kyo mleng shows, as often, to be a very particular form. It could relate to tiy tilago, if it would be possible to link *-leng to *-lago. Anyway, following this hypothesized reconstruction, we should at least postulate a solution *m- for *tui- (or, in any case, for *t- or *tui-). If we do not hypothesize an independent development of this ‘consonantism’ in kyo (often appearing, among the other languages of the Lexicon, the more conservative), all the interpretation could change, with the postulate of a proto-form and/or proto-root with *m- and not *t-, being *t- derived from *m-. This possible reconstruction is highly speculative and unlikely (unless we have the support of other related languages not belonging to the series). *m- could be ‘seen’ also in sub ‘ti:nsa ma and woi tungsama, ‘yesterday’, but it seems to be only casual.

9.1 Summary
1) Root *tui- (*itu-) → or possible ‘extension’, with vocalism /ul, *tui(и)n- (or *т[u]иn-?) / *tun- → tiy tilago, pap tena, sub ‘ti:nsa, ma, and woi tungsama, ‘yesterday’ → analogy with abz tonta’ma, sub titla, woi titla, and tpg tinan, ‘night’ (< *tui- / *itu-);
1a) abz tonta’ma, ‘night’ sub ‘ti:nsa, ma and woi tungsama, ‘yesterday’, with vocalism /ul - /i/ (better /i/) and consonantism t ~ s;
2) Root *ab- → pap aber, ‘night’ → abz, iafej’ da, ‘yesterday’, also war afeida ‘late afternoon’, war afeidi / war afeida, ‘the sun is setting’, ‘sunset’, possible root *ab- with consonantism b ~ f and passage -r ↔ -j d[ə], with addition or fall of -a; -da is a verbalizer suffix (afe-, ‘night’ + -da, ‘become’, inchoative derivational suffix) → tpg apalea and swt a’pa:li, ‘yesterday’, with consonantism b ~ p, passage r ~ l (a sort of ‘pseudo-rhotacism’); there are phonotactic restrictions, in swt and kpu, on coda consonants [l/ and /l/ in complementary distribution]), and vocalism – apophonics – /l/ - /el/;
3) kyo mleng → possible analogy with tiy tilago, if we accept a link between *-leng and *-lago (many more cognates in Pantar and the Straits Languages, e.g. Teiwa [ISO 639-3: twc; Glottolog: teiw1235] miyaag, Blagar [ISO 639-3: beu; Glottolog: blag1240] meleng, Retta [ISO 639-3: ret; Glottolog: rett1240] melen, but no obvious connection with ‘night’).

10.0 ‘Day Before Yesterday’
kyo N/A kpu N/A abz hetadengayokü pap gatadiana joko tiy te:a nok sub tam woi titla watuu yeok, tang nok tpg tualea swt ‘tols’ ri

The sequence of the forms for ‘day before yesterday’ is incomplete. pap gatadiana joko is a composed expression with an ‘isolate’ gatadiana plus joko, which is a numeral (‘two?’) or a morpheme with a role in the composition of numerals. sub tam is a curious word, since tam itself seems to be a suffix used especially in the making of words for body parts (‘arm’, ‘hand’) or for names of insects (data from the Proto-Alor Lexicon Database). Even if tam is findable also in tiy te:a nok and it seems connected with woi titla watuu yeok and tang nok (= tiy te:a nok). woi titla watuu yeok has a clear link to woi titla for ‘night’, as some forms for
‘morning’. The root could be, therefore, *tui-*, the one we have already reconstructed for ‘night’. **tpg tualea** and **swt ṭolɔ’riri** are related and show the suffix *-le(i)ya / *-lee / *-li* that gives a meaning of ‘finitude’. The root could be always the same, *tui-*, and the semantic connection would be always with ‘night’. **swt ṭolɔ’riri** should show and independent development of -l- as a change of **tpg tua-**, while -r-, always in **swt**, should be the form for **tpg -lea**, with a sort of ‘pseudo-rhotacism’.

**tiy teːŋ nok, sub tag, woi tila watuu yeok and tang nok (= tiy teːŋ nok), tpg tualea, and swt ṭolɔ’riri** should be related forms, linked also to the series of words for ‘night’ (and for ‘morning’), deriving probably from the hypothesized root *tui-*. **pap gatadiana joko** seems, conversely, a form unrelated to the other ones. A comparison with the words for ‘day before yesterday’ (that, currently, we do not have) in **kyo** and **kpu**, in this series, could help in investigating on this apparently ‘isolated’ double expression.

### 10.1 Summary

1) Root *tui-* (the same ‘night’ root with links to the ‘morning’ forms) → **tiy teːŋ nok, sub tag, woi tila watuu yeok** (literally ‘night day two’) and **tang nok** (literally ‘night one’ = **tiy teːŋ nok**), **tpg tualea** (-lea = ‘yesterday’?), and **swt ṭolɔ’riri** → **woi tila** (= **woi tila**, ‘night’) **watuu yeok** and **tang nok** (= **tiy teːŋ nok**, ‘day before yesterday’) → **ṭolɔ’riri < tpg tualea → swt ṭolɔ’riri** (with independent development of /l/) = **tpg tua-**; **swt -riri = tpg -lea** (‘pseudo-rhotacism’, suffix *-le(i)ya / *-lee / *-li*, with a meaning of ‘finitude’);

2) **pap gatadiana joko** (3poss-day two), unrelated form, with **joko**, a numeral (‘two’ < shortening of the NumP) or part of the composition of numerals → It would need a comparison with the forms for ‘day before yesterday’ in **kyo, kpu**.

### 10.2 Notes

In **Bunak** (also known as **Bunak, Buna**, **Bunake**, the language of the Bunak people of the mountainous region of central Timor, ISO 639-3: bfn; Glottolog: buna1278), the word for ‘night’ is **ene**.

### 11.0 ‘Tomorrow’

**kyo idil, wra kpu N/A abz akon pap ariːda tiy meːl ne sub fononj paːk woi paisan tpg ilea swt ‘lala’ma’**

The situation of the series of words for ‘tomorrow’ is not completely clear. **abz akon** is the same form used, always in **abz**, for ‘morning’ (**akom**). This **akom** can be interpreted as ‘the morning of the day after’ = ‘tomorrow’. We should consider also **kpu akoom**, ‘night’, surely related. The expressions for the ‘day after tomorrow’ are also related, in **abz, ajoko**, and in **pap, ajoko**. It is interesting that the **abz** form for ‘two’ (numeral) is **ʔaiko**, while the **pap** form for ‘two’ (numeral) is **ajoko**. It is a possible semantic shift, indicating an association of a day with another, ‘today and tomorrow’ or ‘tomorrow and the day after tomorrow’. To be noticed also the **pap** form **joko**, from **pap gatadiana joko**, ‘the day before yesterday’, which is always pertaining to the field of numerals, always ‘two’.

**kyo idil** is a **unicum**, as **kyo wra** (if **wra** is not from the root *war-*, ‘sun’). Maybe a comparison with forms from other related languages not in the series, or with **kpu** (we do not have that expression) can be useful to establish or to hypothesize links. **pap ariːda** seems an ‘isolate’ form, unless we want to link it to the possible root *war-* of some of the words in the series for ‘sun’ (**abz war**), hypothesizing an expression *w-ariːda*, with fall of *w*-.

‘Isolate’ form appears also **tiy meːl ne**, linked only to **tiy neːl ne** for the ‘day after tomorrow’.

**sub fononj paːk** is difficult to be interpreted. Maybe **fononj** could be, in some way, linked to the forms in *-on* (**akom-type**) in **abz akom**, ‘tomorrow’ and ‘morning’, **kpu akoom**, ‘night’, and **abz, ajoko**, and in **pap, ajoko**, for the ‘day after tomorrow’, even if the phonetic passages are unclear. It is difficult also to analyze
woi paːk, unless we think it is derived from a sort of syncope from the woi form paisan ok for the ‘day after tomorrow’, while woi, to indicate tomorrow, has paisan.

woi paisan, ‘tomorrow’, seems unrelated to other forms, except for woi paisan ok, ‘the day after tomorrow’ (> pack of sub fonon paːk?).

tpg ilea shows the suffix *-le(i)ya / *-lee / *-li that gives a meaning of ‘finitude’, with an *i- that can be a sort of ‘stem’ or that can derive from some related forms, in any case connected with tpg idole(y)a, ‘morning’.

swt 'lala' ma, ‘tomorrow’, seems linked to swt jaːla ko, ‘day after tomorrow’, with 'lala' = jaːla, and insertion of -ko (< the root *ku-?) from the ‘akon-type’ (e.g. abz).

11.1 Summary, Notes, and Hypotheses

1) kyo idil, wra, ‘isolated’ ↔ if wra is not from the root *war-, ‘sun’ (it may be linked with swt);
2) abz akon, ‘tomorrow’ = abz akon, ‘morning’ → ‘the morning of the day after’ = ‘tomorrow’ ↔ kpu akoon, ‘night’ ↔ abz, ajoko and pap, ajoko, ‘day after tomorrow’ ↔ abz ?ajoko, ‘two’, and pap ajoko, ‘two’ → association of a day with another, ‘today and tomorrow’ or ‘tomorrow and the day after tomorrow’ ↔ pap gataduŋa joko, ‘the day before yesterday’ ↔ joko is a numeral (‘two’?) or has a role in the composition of numerals;
3) pap ami da < *w-ari da, with fall of *w-, with the possible root *war- of some of the words in the series for ‘sun’ (abz ‘war), linked to the abz expression war ariad a ‘sun rises’, war ariidi, ‘sun rose’?;
4) tiy neːl ne, ‘tomorrow’ ↔ tiy neːl ne, ‘day after tomorrow’;
5) sub fonon paːk, ‘tomorrow’ → fonon → *-on of abz akon, ‘tomorrow’ and ‘morning’, kpu akoon, ‘night’, abz, ajoko, and pap, ‘day after tomorrow’? → paːk ↔ syncope from woi paisan ok, ‘day after tomorrow’ (woi paisan, ‘tomorrow’)?;
6) tpg ilea, with suffix *-le(i)ya / *-lee / *-li (‘finitude’), *i- = a) independent stem, or b) derived from / linked to some related forms → tpg idole(y)a, ‘morning’ → possibly connected with Adang (spoken in North-West Alor, ISO 639-3: adn; Glottolog: adan1252 [Haan 2001: passim]) and Kabola (spoken in North-Western Alor, East to the Adang territory, ISO 639-3: klz; Glottolog: kabo1247) dilele, ‘tomorrow’, and kyo, plus West Pantar (also known as Lamma – one of its dialects –, spoken in the Western part of Pantar island, ISO 639-3: lev; Glottolog: lamm1241) dalla), and, perhaps, again Bunaq e, ‘night’?;
7) swt 'lala’ ma, ‘tomorrow’ ↔ swt jaːla ko, ‘day after tomorrow’ (‘lala’ = jaːla, and insertion of -ko [< the root *ku-?, maybe from *yaku, ‘two’], from the ‘akon-type’ [e.g. abz]).

12.0 ‘Day After Tomorrow’

kyo N/A kpu N/A abz ajoko pap ajoko tiy neːl ne sub N/A woi paisan ok tpg lokana swt jaːla ko

We do not have the kyo, kpu, and sub forms for ‘day after tomorrow’. Analyzing the available words, the connections with the series of words for ‘tomorrow’ appear close and direct, abz, ajoko and pap ajoko are clearly linked to abz akon, in its turn corresponding to abz akon, ‘morning’. They are also linked, if not corresponding, to the abz form for ‘two’ (numeral), ajoko, and to the pap form for ‘two’ (numeral), ajoko. It could be possible to hypothesize a semantic shift, indicating an association of a day with another, ‘today and tomorrow’ or ‘tomorrow and the day after tomorrow’. It is also interesting to notice that the pap form joko from pap gataduŋa joko, ‘the day before yesterday’, is always pertaining to the field of numerals, always ‘two’ (joko is a numeral [‘two’?] or has a role in the composition of numerals). Interesting is also the connection with kpu akoon, ‘night’.

tiy neːl ne, ‘day after tomorrow’, seems to be ‘isolate’, linked only to tiy meːl ne, ‘tomorrow’.
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woi paisan ok, ‘day after tomorrow’, is related only to woi paisan, ‘tomorrow’. On these two last forms and the ones pertaining to the ‘akon-type’ (e.g. abz), we can hypothesize a connection with sub fononj pa:k, ‘tomorrow’, expression difficult to be interpreted. Maybe fononj could be, in some way, linked to the word in *-on (‘akon-type’) in abz akon, ‘tomorrow’ and ‘morning’, kpu akoom, ‘night’, and abz, ajoko, and pap, ajoka, for the ‘day after tomorrow’, even if the phonetic passages are unclear. It is difficult also to analyze pa:k, unless we think it is derived from a sort of syncope from the woi form paisan ok for the ‘day after tomorrow’, while woi, to indicate tomorrow, has paisan.

tpg ləkana, ‘day after tomorrow’, seems linked to swt 'ja:la ko, ‘day after tomorrow’ (*ləka- < *-la,ko, with fall of *'ja:- and addition of the suffix *-na, possibly ‘later’?), in its turn linked to swt 'lala'ma, ‘tomorrow’, with 'lala' = 'ja:la and insertion of -ko (< the root *ku-?) from the ‘akon-type’ (e.g. abz).

The ‘akon-type’ seems productive in the ‘naming process’ at least of the series of words for ‘morning’, ‘night’, ‘tomorrow’, ‘day after tomorrow’, and ‘two’.

12.1 Summary

1) abz, ajoko and pap, ajoko, ‘day after tomorrow’ ↔ abz akon, ‘tomorrow’ ↔ abz akon, ‘morning’ → ‘the morning of the day after’ = ‘tomorrow’ ↔ kpu akoom, ‘night’ ↔ abz ʔajoka, ‘two’, and pap ajoka, ‘two’ → association of a day with another, ‘today and tomorrow’ or ‘tomorrow and the day after tomorrow’ ↔ pap gatadiya joko, ‘the day before yesterday’ ↔ joko is a numeral (‘two’?) or has a role in the composition of numerals;

2) tiy ne:1 ne, ‘day after tomorrow’ ↔ tiy me:1 ne, ‘tomorrow’;

3) sub fononj pa:k, ‘tomorrow’ ↔ fononj ↔ *-on of abz akon, ‘tomorrow’ and ‘morning’, kpu akoom, ‘night’, abz, ajoko, and pap ajoka, ‘day after tomorrow’ (maybe related to abz fung ‘heap up’, ‘accumulate’, ‘grow in intensity [told of various things, including the light before the dawn’?) → pa:k ↔ syncope from woi paisan ok, ‘day after tomorrow’ (woi paisan, ‘tomorrow’);

4) tpg ləkana, ‘day after tomorrow’ ↔ swt 'ja:la ko, ‘day after tomorrow’ → *ləka- < *-la,ko, with fall of *'ja:- and addition of the suffix *-na, possibly ‘later’? ↔ (‘night’ + ‘two’ + LOC?) ↔ swt 'lala'ma, ‘tomorrow’ ↔ swt 'ja:la ko, ‘day after tomorrow’ (‘lala’ = 'ja:la, and insertion of -ko [< the root *ku-?] from the ‘akon-type’ [e.g. abz]).

13.0 ‘Twilight’

kyo N/A kpu N/A abz tiyeng akuung-akuungra, tiyeng akuungra, tapong halakda beeka, tuntamadia pap N/A tiy N/A sub N/A woi mitafeen tpg dole burana swt N/A

Very incomplete is the series of words for ‘twilight’, but the possible etymological reconstruction is quite interesting. We have just two words, woi mitafeen and tpg dole burana (the abz list of words / expression is still under review to ascertain if, semantically, it can be included in the series). woi mitafeen can be linked, in its possible root, to the forms in *mita- / *muta- of the series of words of Alor languages for ‘to drop’, pap nanok muta:ni, tiy mosta:n, sub mu:tan, woi mitansia. If the forms relate to each other, it could be possible to semantically hypothesize the interpretation of ‘twilight’ as a ‘light fall’. The Wersing form, miwiding le, is very indicative, in this reconstruction, since it means ‘twilight’ and, at the same time, ‘dawn’ (‘a fall of light’). It is also possible, applying historical-phonetic criteria, to try to hypothesize an ‘equivalence’ between woi mitafeen and Wersing miwiding le.

As far as tpg dole burana, dole is clearly connected with some of the (analogous) forms meaning ‘morning’, in particular with tpg idole(y)a. They are, in their turn, linked to tpg ilea, ‘tomorrow’, and tpg tualea, ‘day before yesterday’, always with an indication inherent in the notions of ‘morning’ and ‘day’. The connection is also confirmed, semantically, by West Pantar, where mabu means ‘twilight’, while dalla mabu besok pagi
means ‘tomorrow morning’ (Holton and Lamma Koly 2007: 44). About burana, it seems ‘isolated’, in this context. In tpg, we have another form in -urana, meaning ‘angry’, asurana.

13.1 Summary

1) Root *mītā-/*mūta- → pap nanok mutaːni, tiy montaːn, sub muˈtan, woi mītansia, ‘drop’ → woi mītafeen, ‘twilight’ ↔ ‘light fall’ ↔ ‘dawn’ ↔ ‘day’ ↔ ‘morning’ ↔ Wersing miwiding le, ‘twilight’ ↔ ‘dawn’ ↔ ‘day’ ↔ ‘morning’ ↔ ‘a fall of light’;


14.0 ‘Wind’

kyo nəmer kpu hımɔr abz tˈmɔj pap sɪːlai tiy sɪːlai sub somoi woi sumui, abel, pungpul tpg lapun swt lappoon

The words of the series for ‘wind’ appear ‘isolated’ in our Proto-Alor Lexicon Database, linked only (some of them) to each other. kyo nəmer seems connected with kpu hımɔr, hypothesizing a passage *nɔ- ~ *hɔ-, being *-mer and *-ɔr equivalent. pap sɪːlai and tiy sɪːlai are the same word, as well as sub somoi and woi sumui (abel, pungpul). abz tˈmɔj seems an ‘intermediate’ form between pap sɪːlai and tiy sɪːlai and sub somoi and woi sumui. abz *t- could be phonetically compatible both with pap and tiy *s- and with sub and woi *s-. abz *-ɔr ɪs in, in its turn, phonetically compatible with sub *-ɔr and woi *-ɔ.ri.

An interesting note is about kyo nəmer, where we have again a nasal initial where some other consonant could be expected, like in the kyo words for ‘sun’ and ‘day’, and, probably, in many others. The nasal initial, in kyo, can be considered an isogloss.

As far as woi abel and pungpul, it is difficult to complete an effective analysis. They appear ‘isolated’ forms. Unless we want to see a sort of ‘crasis’ between woi abel and pungpul in tpg lapun and swt lapoon, with a common element *(p)un(g) and *la- derived from a change in abel (1. *l-abel > *l-a-[be] > *la- or 2. abel > *a-[be]-l > *a-l- > metathesis *la-).

tpg lapun and swt lapoon are, in any case, the same word, closely linked to each other.

It seems possible, therefore, to affirm that, in this series of words for ‘wind’, kyo nəmer and kpu hımɔr are related, constituting a set themselves, while pap sɪːlai and tiy sɪːlai are the same word, as well as sub somoi and woi sumui. pap sɪːlai and tiy sɪːlai and sub somoi and woi sumui seem connected with each other through abz tˈmɔj, maybe an ‘intermediate’ form among pap, tiy, sub, and woi. tpg lapun and swt lapoon are the same word, maybe linked to each other, in a sort of ‘crasis’, through woi abel and pungpul, with a common element *(p)un(g) and *la- derived from a change in abel (1. *l-abel > *l-a-[be] > *la- or 2. abel > *a-[be]-l > *a-l- > metathesis *la-).

14.1 Summary, Notes, and Hypotheses

1) kyo nəmer = kpu hımɔr ↔ *nɔ- ~ *hɔ- and *-mer and *-ɔr (equivalent);

2) pap sɪːlai = tiy sɪːlai and sub somoi = woi sumui, but pap sɪːlai and tiy sɪːlai ↔ abz tˈmɔj ↔ sub somoi and woi sumui.

Possibly 1) and 2) are both related to and borrowed from proto-Austronesian (pAN) *timur (‘Eastern wind’), reconstructable as *simur for pAP. In the Alor-Pantar archipelago, it is the dominant wind direction throughout the year. The reflexes are regular and point to pAP initial *s-—that would make this an old loan, but the distribution is irregular —, concentrated in Central Alor, no reflexes in Pantar, although the Nedebang
(language spoken in the Northern part of Pantar, ISO 639-3: nec; Glottolog: nede1245) hangi, ‘wind’ is possibly another Austronesian loan, from the proto-Western-Malayo-Polynesian (pWMP) *hanin. Lamaholot (also known as Solor or Solorese, a Central Malayo-Polynesian dialect cluster of Flores, Indonesia, ISO 639-3: slp; Glottolog: lama1277) has angin for ‘wind’.

Reflexes of the pAN *timur with /s/ are found in South Halmahera-West New Guinea (SHWNG) languages, such as Buli (Austronesian language of Southern Halmahera, Indonesia, ISO 639-3: bzq; Glottolog: buli1255), with simi, ‘South’, ‘Southern wind’), but most of the Central Malayo-Polynesian (CMP) languages have reflexes with /t/, such as Lamaholot timu, ‘East’ (Blust and Trussels 2014: ad loca, for the last two paragraphs).

Question remains where does the *s- come from and whether it could have arrived with the other pAN loan words, such as ‘pig’, ‘dog’, and ‘salt’.

For ‘salt’, we find the same correspondence set with *s-, tentatively pAP *ʔasr being a reflex of the pAN *gasiRa. Interestingly, the reflexes of the first pAN syllable *ga- are not preserved in many of CMP languages. How much did the CV.CV syllable structure affect the pAP form, as well as if the final *-a should also be reconstructed, or not, are question with unclear answers, so far.

Proto-Timor-Alor-Pantar (pTAP) *baɪ, ‘pig’, is possibly a pAN loanword from *babuy, ‘pig’ (Holton and Robinson 2014b: 182). It seems, however, that words for ‘pig’ were borrowed separately into pAP and proto-Timor (pT) after the breakup of pTAP;

3) tpg lapun = swt lapoonj ↔ woi abel and pungpul, with a sort of ‘crasis’, from woi abel and pungpul, with a common element *(-)pun(g) and *la- derived from a change in abel (1. *label > *l-a-[bel] > *la- or 2. abel > *a-[be]-l > *a-l- > metathesis *la-).

15.0 ‘Rain’

kyo unuur kpu N/A abz ?a’noj pap anor tiy ai sub aj woi aii tpg aya (si) (si = ‘fall’) swt ajaa

The situation of the series of words for ‘rain’ seems simpler. tiy, sub, woi, and tpg share a (proto-?) form basically reconstructable as *ai. We have tiy ai, sub aj, woi aii, and tpg aya (si) (with si = ‘fall’).

abz ?a’noj and pap anor are the same word. We could link them to the forms of the *ai-series’, if we think that this *ai is derived from the fall of *-no/- *-nu- in abz ?a’noj and pap anor = a) abz ?a’noj → ?a’(noj) → ?a’j → aj < *ai, and b) pap anor → a(no) → ai < *ai. This solution seems the best one. Less probable is the hypothesis of an addition of *-no/- *-nu-, in abz and pap, to the *ai (proto-)form, based on the kyo word, unuur. As mentioned, kyo seems to be often conservative and the form unuur could be considered, therefore, ancient. It is conceivable a passage with initial ‘vocalism’ /a/ (/u/ ~ /u/) among kyo unuur and abz ?a’noj and pap anor. In this case, the final syllable -ur of kyo unuur would have produced a solution -oj in abz and -oi in pap. Following this reasoning, we can hypothesize the sequence towards the *ai-series’ of words.

We have not the kpu form for ‘rain’, while the swt word is ajaa.

An interesting note is about a parallelism with the forms of the series for ‘drizzle’. We do not have the kyo, kpu, abz, pap, tiy, and sub forms, but we have woi aii ilaiki and tpg aya bur, presumably corresponding, with a lexical addition per each, to the woi and tpg forms for ‘rain’, aii and aya (si) (with si = ‘fall’), from the *ai-series’, being part, therefore, of a later development of more ancient forms, as kyo unuur, giving us an idea of the transformation of forms in a diachronic way not only in morphology, but also in semantics (‘rain’ → ‘drizzle’).
15.1 Summary

1) kyo unuur → abz ?a’noj and pap ano:n, with initial ‘vocalism’ /a/ (/u/ ~ /a/) among kyo unuur and abz ?a’noj and pap ano:n. The final syllable -ur of kyo unuur would have produced a solution -oj in abz and -or in pap;

2) abz ?a’noj and pap ano:n → tiy ai, sub aj, woi aii, and tpg aya (si) (with si = ‘fall’) = *ai-series’. *ai-series’ is derived from the fall of *-no- / *-nu- in abz ?a’n oj and pap ano:n =
   a) abz ?a noj → ?a (no)j → ?a j → aj < *ai
   and
   b) pap ano:n → a(no)n → ai < *ai;

3) woi aii, and tpg aya (si) (with si = ‘fall’), ‘rain’ = woi aii ilaiki and tgp aya bur, ‘drizzle’.

Conclusions

Despite the outstanding work done so far by scholars, the Alor-Pantar languages still need to be analysed in depth. In particular, the reconstruction of their origins, through the etymological restitution of roots and proto-forms, and the establishment of a reliable historical phonetics are urgent desiderata in this field of study.

This paper offers a sampling of systematic etymological analysis of words and forms belonging to nine Alor languages, with the aim of providing a methodological framework (needing, of course, to be improved and standardized) for the diachronic reconstruction of proto-Alor-Pantar, highlighting the relations among the Papuan languages of Alor (and Pantar) and analysing their differences through a comparative approach.

The goal is not only a diachronic-linguistic reconstruction, but the possibility, through etymological analysis, to hypothesize remote (prehistoric) population movements and settlement dynamics, shedding a little bit of light on the origins of the Papuan people of Alor (and Pantar) and on their relations with their Austronesian neighbouring populations.

Such an interdisciplinary study cannot avoid mistakes or hypotheses that cannot be confirmed or disproved. However, it should be always developed in a systematic and comprehensive way. Always starting from etymological reconstruction. Etymological solutions are, often, a spectrum of possibilities and the Etymologist’s work, indeed, consists not in reducing that spectrum (of course, it is nice when the Etymologist can do it), but in completely delineating it. To make the picture complete and reliable.
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This paper reconstructs 15 Papuan etymologies from nine languages belonging to the Alor-Pantar language family. It offers a systematic attempt of a comprehensive etymological reconstruction, in this specific linguistic context, based on an all-embracing comparative methodology. The analysis is developed, in this initial stage, on a number of common words from the respective languages. The paper aims to offer a sampling of etymological restitutions inherent in the Papuan languages of Alor, establishing an unbiased methodology potentially applicable in the study and reconstruction of the proto-lexicon of Alor-Pantar languages (pAP). Working on a case-by-case basis, but moving in the framework of a historical-linguistic methodology connecting the different etymological reconstructions, the paper tries to draft, for the first time, a new and reliable historical phonetics of the Papuan languages of Alor. Moreover, it analyzes the ‘target languages’ considering the geographical distribution of the different groups of speakers, highlighting language contact and language alignment phenomena.
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