

Aaron Ember and the Establishment of Egypto-Semitic Phonological and Lexical Comparison (Part I)¹

Gábor Takács

Institute of Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Science

The paper evaluates the Lebenswerk of Aaron Ember, one of the greatest figures of Egypto-Semitic linguistic comparison, accompanied by an evaluation and a detailed analysis of his etymological suggestions in the light of recent progress in Semito-Hamitic comparative linguistics. He was known as American Egyptologist and Semiticist of Johns Hopkins University. He was born in Tulnas (Kovno) of Lithuania in 1878. The 80th anniversary of his tragical and premature end (1926) represents the proper time when Ember's memory may be revived and his etymological research may gain a worthy appraisal. It is all the more actual since the so-called "old school" (or trend) of Egypto-Semitic comparative phonology, which he himself symbolized in the first decades of the 20th century, is nowadays undeservedly forgotten. It is hoped that the present paper revives the interest in an extremely productive and once influential trend of Semito-Hamitic linguistics, to which Egyptian historical linguistics until now owes so much.

The life of Aaron Ember

Aaron Ember (1878–1926) devoted almost his entire scholarly career to Egypto-Semitic linguistic comparison. He was given just 15 years (1911–1926) to

The present paper has been compiled as part of the research project "The science history background of the Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian (EDE) in the context of Egyptological and Semito-Hamitic comparative linguistic research in Middle East Europe", which has been supported from July 2004 to April 2005 by the Hungarian Ministry of Education (Oktatási Minisztérium) granting the author a Deák Ferenc fellowship (reg. no. 0030/2003). The final draft of this paper was accomplished in May 2005 during my stay at the Institut für Afrikanische Sprachwissenschaften of the J. W. Goethe-Universität (Frankfurt a/M). I gratefully acknowledge the support of the A. von Humboldt-Stiftung as well as Prof. H. Jungraithmayr who kindly improved (in Oct. 2005) the paper on some points.

¹ For technical reasons, the paper had to be divided into two parts. The second part will appear in the forthcoming issue of *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia*. Thanks are due to the editors of AOV for accepting the paper for their journal.

publish the results of his extraordinarily fruitful research – hundreds of new Egypto-Semitic etymologies, by which he became one of the ever greatest masters of this lesser-known and neglected domain of comparative linguistics. His scholarly heritage has been recently undeservedly forgotten, and now, at the 80th anniversary of his tragic end is perhaps a suitable occasion and the right time to appraise his results in the context of recent comparative-historical Afro-Asiatic linguistics.

Ember was an American Egyptologist and Semiticist. He was born in the old Tzarist times in Tulnas (Kovno) of Lithuania on 25 December, 1878 as son of Mendel Ember and Rebekah Quitz. He migrated with his parents, brethren, and sisters² to the United States as a child in 1891, where his family settled in Baltimore. He studied Hebrew with Paul Haupt (his later colleague) there at Johns Hopkins University. He received his B.A. in 1901 and his Ph.D. in 1904. From 1904 to 1910 he worked as a fellow of the Semitics at Johns Hopkins University (in 1904–07 he served as Rayner Fellow of the University). Soon he became interested in the Semitic connection of ancient Egypt and went in 1910 to Göttingen to study under Kurt Sethe, the great Egyptologist, who was at that time working on the Pyramid Texts. When Ember returned to the States, he was appointed an assistant professor of Semitics at Johns Hopkins University in 1911, where he became later professor of Egyptology (1924). In this time, he was one of the editors of *Oriens*, a review journal (the other co-editor was S. Schiffer in Paris).

Ember was an enthusiastic advocate of the Zionist movement and took an active part in the Jewish community of Baltimore. He worked also for the Jewish National Library at Jerusalem. Ember introduced reforms also in the methods of teaching Hebrew (Ivrit) in Baltimore. For many years, he was a director of the Baltimore Talmud Torah School and of the Isaac Davidson School and helped to found the Jewish Public Library there.

Just as he was on the eve of a trip to the East, a tragical fire broke out in Ember's home at Baltimore on 31 May 1926,³ in which he and some members of his family

² His brothers were Robert and Isaac. Sisters: Jennie and Annie.

³ His daughter, Ruth Ember (born 1916) survived the terrible accident. She was still active in March 1999 during my stay at Baltimore (for supporting my journey, cordial thanks are due to City Hall of Székesfehérvár, Hungary) and was able to tell me important details on the Ember family's history in personal communication when she received me (on 27 March) in her and her husband's (Louis Tankin) doll shop ("Tuskers' Collector Dolls of Ellicott City") in Ellicott City, Maryland (8167 Main Street). She told me her recollections, a.o., about the "terrible Sunday" (31 May 1926). Her mother, the wife of A. Ember (Regina Mandelstamm), her six-year-old brother Robert Ember (who was sick and had to stay at home), and their maiden all died still in the fire, which broke out late Sunday night in the house of the Ember family (12 Lawine Road, Windsor Hills, Baltimore). Aaron Ember tried to save from the burning house his manuscripts he had worked on several years, and threw them out of the window. He was taken badly burnt to hospital, where he died the next day (1 June) just when the funeral of his wife and son Robert started. Therefore, their joint funeral was delayed to the next day (2 June). Luckily, A. Ember's daughter Ruth and son Theodore escaped the tragic fate of their parents, because on Sunday they were picked up by their aunt Lidia Statler and

received fatal injuries. Ember died untimely in the local hospital on the following day (1 June 1926). Luckily, A. Ember's daughter Ruth escaped and, together with other relatives, provided (in a personal communication) interesting details on the history of the Ember family in Baltimore.⁴

Ember's life and scholarly achievements were evaluated by several of his friends and colleagues (Schiffer 1926; Sethe 1927; *Chronique d'Égypte* vol. 1, 1925–6, 63; *The Times*, 4 June 1926). His *magnum opus* ("Egypto-Semitic Studies", abbreviated henceforth as ESS) appeared posthumously in 1930. His two pupils, W. F. Albright and F. Behnk, continued their master's Egypto-Semitic comparative studies, unfortunately, with much less success. Both of them soon abandoned dealing with genetic comparison after the late 1920s.

Ember's conception of Egypto-Semitic sound correspondences

Ember's methods of comparison were in a few ways superior to those of his contemporary colleagues in this field. He paid attention to quoting the earliest attestation of the examined Egyptian lexical roots (possibly from the Pyramid Texts) wherever available. His primary interest was not purely increasing the number of cognates but first of all observing the regular phonological processes of the Egyptian lexical material, or as Ember (1930, 1, §1) himself formulated: "[...] it has been the aim of the author to determine and exemplify the phonetic relations which obtain between Egyptian and the other Semitic languages". Though a certain part of Ember's Eg.-Sem. hypothetic sound changes and etymologies are not correct or at least debatable, he firmly established and convincingly summarized the majority (but not all) of the Egypto-Semitic consonantal correspondences, which have been justified by other scholars after him and are accepted even today by most of the specialists. Ember's method was well characterized by his colleague, the great Egyptologist, K. Sethe (1927, 130): "Ember war sich über das Problematische in seinen Aufstellungen, die er als Vorschläge gewertet wissen wollte, nie im Unklaren; er war aber überzeugt, dass man nur auf dem Wege über möglichst viele solche Vergleichen, die natürlich innerhalb des Bereiches des Möglichen liegen müssten, zu einer Feststellung der mannigfachen

taken to her home for a reception, where they stayed that day. In the evening, just before the fire broke out, their mother phoned the aunt that it was time to return home, but the children had been already asleep, therefore their mother and the aunt agreed they would go back home only on Monday, which in fact saved them.

⁴A. Ember's surviving son, Theodore (who became a businessman), has still descendants in Baltimore. Similarly, his daughter Ruth (in 1999 owner of a doll shop in Ellicott City, Maryland) has a few children and grandchildren. Isaac Ember, the brother of A. Ember as well as both of their sisters (Jennie, who moved to New York, and Annie, who remained at Baltimore) have also (grand)children.

Lautübergänge, die zwischen beiden verwandten Sprachzweigen möglich wären, kommen könne”.

The present article will survey primarily Ember’s magnificent “Egypto-Semitic Studies” (ESS, 1930) and evaluate its etymological material in accordance with the results of recent Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics research. First, we summarize the Eg.-Sem. consonant correspondences suggested by Ember:

Eg.	3	j	ʕ	w	b	p
Sem.	*ʕ ¹ , *r ² , *l ³ , *ʕ ⁴ , *w ⁵	*ʕ ⁶ , *y ⁷ , *w ⁸ , *ʕ ⁹ , *r ¹⁰ , *l ¹¹ , *h ¹² , *n ¹³ , *d ¹⁴	*ʕ ¹⁵ , *g ¹⁶ , *ʕ ¹⁷ , *ʕ ¹⁸ , *h ¹⁹ , *r ²⁰ , *l ²¹ , *y ²² , *w ²³	*w ²⁴ , *y ²⁵ , *h ²⁶ , *b ²⁷ , *m ²⁸	*b ²⁹ , *m ³⁰ , *w ³¹ , *p ³²	*p ³³ , *b ³⁴ , *t ³⁵ , *t ³⁶

Notes (the paragraphs refer to the items of ESS, while in the brackets, the number of Ember’s etymologies for the underlying consonant correspondence): (1) §3.a (18 exx.), (2) §3.b (50 exx.), (3) §3.c (32 exx.), (4) §3.d (false, based on only 1 uncertain ex.), (5) §3.e (false, based on only three exx.), (6) §4.a (23 exx.), (7) §4.b (11 exx.), (8) §4.c (6 exx.), (9) §4.d (4 exx.), (10) §4.e (7 exx.), (11) §4.f (11 exx.), (12) §4.g (2 exx.), (13) §4.h (false, based on only 1 ex.), (14) §4.i (false, based on the irrelevant match of OEg. srs > later OEg. sjs ~ Sem. *šidš- “6”), (15) §5.a (24 exx.), (16) §5.b (7 exx.), (17) §5.c (existed, but irregular, based on 2 uncertain exx.), (18) §5.d (2 uncertain exx.), (19) §5.e (false, based on 1 ex.), (20) §5.f (problematic, 7 exx.), (21) §5.g (unacceptable, 5 dubious exx.), (22) §5.h (dubious, 2 exx.), (23) §5.i (false, 1 false ex.), (24) §6.a (25 exx.), (25) §6.b (1 ex.), (26) §6.c (1 ex.), (27) §6.d (dubious, 3 exx., of which only one can be accepted), (28) §6.e (only 1 unacceptable ex.), (29) §7.a (34 ex.), (30) §7.b (possible as irregular correspondence, 10 exx.), (31) §7.c (only one possible ex.), (32) §7.d (possible as irregular match, 2 good examples), (33) §8.a (23 exx.), (34) §8.b (possible as irregular match, 12 exx.), (35) §8.c (false, only 1 irrelevant match), (36) §8.d (false, only 1 improbable ex.)

Eg.	f	m	n	r	h	.
Sem.	*p ³⁷ , *b ³⁸ , *t ³⁹	*m ⁴⁰ , *b ⁴¹ , *n ⁴²	*n ⁴³ , *l ⁴⁴ , *r ⁴⁵ , *m ⁴⁶	*r ⁴⁷ , *l ⁴⁸	*h ⁴⁹ , *ʕ ⁵⁰ , *s ⁵¹	*· ⁵² , *h ⁵³ , *h ⁵⁴ , *ʕ ⁵⁵

Notes: (37) §9.a (15 exx.), (38) §9.b (irregular, 3 possible exx.), (39) §9.c (dubious, only 2 exx.), (40) §10.a (49 exx.), (41) §10.b (irregular match, 22 exx.), (42) §10.c (false, only 2 unconvincing exx.), (43) §11.a (61 exx.), (44) §11.b (28 exx.), (45) §11.c (false, 9 unconvincing exx.), (46) §11.d (false, 4 false exx.), (47) §12.a (52 exx.), (48)

§12.b (15 exx.), (49) §13.a (11 exx.), (50) §13.b (irregular, but existed, 1 good ex.), (51) §13.c (false, only 1 unconvincing ex.), (52) §14.a (34 exx.), (53) §14.b (false, only 2 false exx.), (54) §14.c (possible as irregular match, 4 exx., one of them plausible), (55) §14.d (possible as irregularity, 1 false ex.).

Eg.	<u>h</u>	<u>h</u>	<u>z</u>	<u>s</u>	<u>š</u>	<u>q</u>
Sem.	* <u>h</u> ⁵⁶ , * <u>ç</u> ⁵⁷ , * <u>ç</u> ⁵⁸ , * ⁵⁹	* <u>h</u> ⁶⁰ , * ⁶¹	* <u>z</u> & * <u>d</u> ⁶² , * <u>t</u> ⁶³	* <u>š</u> ⁶⁴ , * <u>t</u> ⁶⁵ , * <u>š</u> ⁶⁶	* <u>š</u> ⁶⁷ , * <u>š</u> ⁶⁸ , * <u>h</u> ⁶⁹ , * <u>k</u> ⁷⁰ , * <u>s</u> ⁷¹ , * <u>t</u> ⁷²	* <u>k</u> ⁷³ , * <u>k</u> ⁷⁴ , * <u>g</u> ⁷⁵

Notes: (56) §15.a (22 exx.), (57) §15.b (irregular, 4 exx., 2 of which are plausible), (58) §15.c (irregular, result of incompatibility changes, possible, 4 exx.), (59) §15.d (not excluded, 6 exx.), (60) §16.a (4 exx.), (61) §16.b (5 exx.), (62) §17.a (16 exx.), (63) §17.b (irregular, 1 good ex.), (64) §18.a (43 exx.), (65) §18.b (7 exx.), (66) §18.c-d (5 exx.), (67) §19.a (15 exx.), (68) §19.b (2 exx.), (69) §19.c (irregular, resulting from combinatoric changes, but possible, 6 exx.), (70) §19.d (false, 1 irrelevant ex.), (71) §19.e (1 false ex.), (72) §19.f (plausible, 3 exx.), (73) §20.a (23 exx.), (74) §20.b (irregular, 3 exx.), (75) §20.c (2 false exx.)

Eg.	<u>k</u>	<u>g</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>d</u>
Sem.	* <u>k</u> ⁷⁶ , * <u>k</u> ⁷⁷	* <u>g</u> ⁸⁰ , * <u>k</u> ⁸¹ , * <u>k</u> ⁸² , * <u>g</u> ⁸³	* <u>t</u> ⁸⁸ , * <u>t</u> ⁸⁹ , * <u>š</u> ⁹⁰	* <u>k</u> ⁷⁸ , * <u>g</u> ⁷⁹	* <u>d</u> ⁹¹ , * <u>š</u> & * <u>š</u> ⁹² , * <u>z</u> ⁹³ , *1 (!) ⁹⁴ , * <u>t</u> ⁹⁵	* <u>g</u> ⁸⁴ , * <u>š</u> & * <u>š</u> ⁸⁵ , * <u>z</u> ⁸⁶ , * <u>ç</u> ⁸⁷

Notes: (76) §21.a (15 exx.), (77) §21.b (false, one false ex.), (78) §22.a (27 exx.), (79) §22.b (1 false ex.), (80) §23.a (19 exx.), (81) §23.b (irregular, 3 exx.), (82) §23.c (irregular, only 1 ex.), (83) §23.d (1 false ex.), (84) §24.a (19 exx.), (85) §24.b (13 exx.), (86) §24.c (dubious, 5 problematic exx.), (87) §24.d (existed, result of some combinatoric change, 4 convincing exx.), (88) §25.a (14 exx.), (89) §25.b (16 exx.), (90) §25.c (irregular, only 1 good ex.), (91) §26.a (40 exx.), (92) §26.b (false, 3 irrelevant exx.), (93) §26.c (irregular, 3 exx.), (94) §26.d (false, 2 false exx.), (95) §26.d (2 good exx.)

As we can see from this summary, Ember has correctly stated the regular correspondences, but at the same time he also included a great number of rare and irregular or evidently false consonant matches. In the tables below, those Eg.-Sem. phonological correspondences are summed up that have since Ember's time been proven to be correct according to the so-called "old school" of Egypto-Semitic

comparison (on which cf. EDE I 2-4) as well as the Moscow school of Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics (cf. D’jakonov, etc. 1987 & 1993):

Eg.	3	j (î)	ʕ	w	b	p	f	m	n	r	h	ç
Sem.	*ʔ, *r, *l	*y, *ʔ, *l	*ʕ, *ɣ (*ğ)	*w, *y	*b	*p	*p	*m	*n, *l	*r, *l	*h, *~ʔ~	*ç

Eg.	ħ	ḥ	z	s	š	q	k	g	t	d	ṭ	ḏ
Sem.	*ħ	*ç, *ḥ	*z, *ḏ, *s	*s, *š, *ṭ	* , *ṭ	*k	*k	*g	*t, *ṭ	*d, *ṭ	*k	*š, *ṭ, *ṣ, *g, *ʕ

All other Eg.-Sem. consonant correspondences are either irregular (due to some combinatoric change or incompatibility law) or simply erroneous (lacking convincing etymological evidence).

An evaluation of Ember’s etymological material

Below, those Eg.-Sem. etymological proposals of ESS (and other papers by Ember) will be evaluated that have to be either abandoned or complemented in the testimony of current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistic comparison.

Eg. 3wj “lang, weit sein” (OK, Wb I 3-4): combined by Ember (1917, 38–39; ESS 6, 3.a.5 & 39, #6.a.15) and hence Albright (1918, 232; 1927, 209) and Brockelmann (1932, 101, #7) with Sem. *ʔwy “to intend, desire”, which is semantically risky. Abel (1933–4, 305) suggested Common Nub. * wir “ausbreiten” as parallel, which looks attractive, although Eg. and Nub. are not genetically related and a borrowing of such a term can hardly be assumed. Th. Schneider (1997, 194, #1) combined it instead with Tuareg: Ahaggar a-lu “être large” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1092], which is acceptable only if we suppose a change of the sense (“large” > “wide”). A further cognate may be found in LECu.: Oromo laww- “tall etc.” [Gragg 1982, 262] | HECu.: Sidamo low-o (adj./adv.) “much, many”, low-îdi “big”, low-inâ-te (m) “greatness” [Gsp. 1983, 212]. I would, however, not exclude a connection to Tuareg *riw “to be large” [Chn.] suggested already by M. Cohen (1947, #513), which can now be extended to WCh.: Ngizim ràwáu “to grow up” [Schuh 1981, 138].

Eg. 3bd (or to be read jbd?) “month” (OK, Wb I 65, 5-9): A. Ember (1913, 118, #73) combined it with Ar. badr- “full moon (pleine lune), moon (lune)” [DRS 46], which is apparently isolated in Semitic. This is a quite promising possibility, but the suggested metathesis is disturbing. Later, Ember (1930, #3.a.6) seems to have changed his mind

when equating OEg. 3bd with Sem. *ʔbd “wander, to be lost”.⁵ Not excluded. The origin of Eg. 3bd is, however, still obscure and so far there has been no satisfactory etymology found. The search for its origin is hindered also by the famous Egyptian “aleph-problem”.⁶ In this search for a possible etymon, the following solutions were offered in the literature or are to be accounted for:

- (1) G. Farina (1924, 323), followed by A. Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 232): OEg. 3bd = Ar. ʔabad- “eternity” and Sem. *ʔbd “to vanish”. Semantically unconvincing.
- (2) M. Cohen (1947, #5): OEg. 3bd = PCu. *[ʔ]arP- “1. moon, 2. month” [GT]. Phonologically untenable. There is no match for OEg. -d, unless the initial PCu. radical was *ʕ- and etymologized acc. to O. Rössler’s law (where OEg. 3bd = *rbd < *rbʕ could be admitted, which is far-fetched).
- (3) N. Skinner (1977, 31): OEg. 3bd identified with WCh.: Hausa wàtā “moon” [Abr. 1962, 929] | Diri afada “moon”. Phonologically unconvincing: the labial correspondences are at the present level of our knowledge to be judged as irregular.
- (4) SISAJa I (1981), 45-46, #58 confused OEg. jbd with various mutually unrelated AA roots: 1. Sem.-Brb.-WCh. *b-d “to open, begin”, 2. Eg. bd “erhellen” || WCh.: Angas-Sura *ḃit “morning”.
- (5) In my view, the similarity Eg. 3bd = with Agaw: Hamir bāt “beginnen (nur vom Monat gesagt)”, bāt- “Anfang des Monats” [Rn. 1888, 350] || LECu.: Oromo b t- “new moon” [Sasse 1982, 31] = b t- “month, moon” [Ali-Zbr. 1990, 132] | HECu.: Burji bāt-i “new moon” [Sasse 1982, 31], Darasa b t-è “new moon” [Lsl.] is probably misleading. Theoretically, OEg. jbd < *bad would be possible (Belova’s law), but OEg. -d = PCu. *-t is irregular. Moreover, W. Leslau (1969, 35; 1988, 184) suggests a fully different origin for the Cu. terms: Oromo b t- < Amh. batä “to begin (month)”, which is supposedly a denominative from baʔat “1. entry, 2. new moon” = Geez baʔat ~ bāʔat “entry, beginning of month” from boʔa “to enter” < Sem. *bwʔ.
- (6) I would perhaps ponder whether OEg. 3bd < AA *l-b-t, cf. HECu. *libd- “to vanish, disappear” [Black].⁷
- (7) Or perhaps cf. NOm.: Haruro bet “moon” [Mkr. quoting an old source, not found as such in CR 1937] (isolated?), which H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 234) linked to Barea f ta “moon”. C. Conti Rossini (1937, 642) gives only Haruro ʕolint- b tt-id s “la luna è nuova”. In this case, *b t could be identical with the ES-Cu. term described in paragraph 5.

⁵ Cf. esp. Hbr. ʔbd “1. umher-, sich verirren, 2. sich verlieren, 3. ruiniert werden, zu Grunde gehen” [GB 2].

⁶ Eg. 3 reflects usually AA *r & *l, but in some cases also *ʔ, which is so far unexplained.

⁷ Hohenberger (1975, 94) equated the ECU. root with Ar. labāta “to run”.

Eg. jwh “beladen mit etwas” (Westcar, Wb I 56, 17-19): combined in ESS 27, #4.b.6 with Geez yawaha “to be gentle, mild”, which is semantically unconvincing. Instead, I have recently suggested that Eg. jwh [$< *lwh$] should be identified with SCu. *loh- “to carry load” [GT]: Iraqw loh- “to move hose”, loh-is- “to carry load”, Alagwa loh-is- “to carry load” | Qwadza loh-is- “to move house” (Ehret 1980, 206) ||| WCh.: Angas-Sura *1 (met. *ʔ 1 in Angas, Mushere var. *1) “1. (to carry) load, 2. goods” [GT 2004, 226] = *1 “load” [Dlg.]⁸ < AA *l-[w]-h “to carry load” [GT].

Eg. jnr “Stein” (OK, Wb I): combined in ESS 26, #4.a.23 with Ar. ʔiram- “big stone” [Ember] = “1. grosse pierre, borne destinée à indiquer le chemin dans le désert” [BK I 26]. Dubious because of the metathesis and since Eg. n Ñ Sem. *m. Since Ember’s time, the true cognates of Eg. jnr [probably < *jnl] have become known, cf. Om. *lyal- ~ *nyal- “stone” [GT] = *1 l- “stone” [OS]: Bencho 1 | Maji al-u, Nao niol-u, Jeba of Dizi lyál-u || SOM.: Dime l lo (Om.: Bnd.-Flm. 1976, 49; Flm. 1990, 29) ||| WCh.: Anga-Sura *1 2r “flat stone with smooth surface” [GT 2004, 224] = *lar “ston” [Stl.]⁹ || CCh.: perhaps Muturwa lugur (or dugur?) “Stein” [Str. 1910, 462]. See OS 1992, 172; Mlt. in Sts. 1995, 25 (Eg.-Om.-AS). Any other etymology for Eg. jnr is less probable,¹⁰ cf., e.g., Mzg. MNR: a-mnir (Izdeg) “tas de pierres, borne en pierre constituant les limites d’une propriété” [Tf. 1991, 424], where the initial m- would remain unexplained. F. Hommel (1904, 109) saw in Eg. jnr a parallel to Sum. nar “Steintafel”. Similarly, Castellino (1984, 17) compared Sum. na₄ [nar].

Eg. ʕnh “leben” (OK, Wb I 193–8): equated in ESS 33, #5.a.12 & #15.d.2 (so also Albright 1918, 96; 1918, 223; 1927, 208) with Ar. ʕyš: ʕ ša “vivre”, ʕayš- “vie” [BK II

⁸ Attested in: perhaps Gerka un-ler [act.: -l] “to use” (un- obscure) [Ftp. 1911, 221], Sura l “1. Last, 2. Gerāt” [Jng. 1963, 72] = lee “load” [Hfm.] = lee “load” [Krf.], Mupun léé “1. load, 2. goods, 3. cloth” [Frj. 1991, 33], Chip lē “load” [Krf.], Kofyar lé “load” [Ntg. 1967, 23] = lee “load” [Hfm.], Mushere lo ~ loh (so, -o) “1. load, 2. property, 3. to possess, 4. take sg. to sy., 5. have sexual intercourse with a woman or girl”, ɖak-loo “1. to arrange load, 2. arrange anything” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 154], Goemai lê [lĕ] “1. load, goods, 2. to carry” [Srl. 1937, 124] = lee “load” [Hfm.] = lè “load” [Krf.] = le “thing, load” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 20] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 21, #130). For the 5th meaning of the Mushere reflex cf. e.g. Sem. *rkb “1. to mount, 2. have intercourse”.

⁹ Attested in Angas leer “a smooth more or less flat rock, on which corn, etc., is spread out to dry (Hs. pa)” [Flk. 1915, 237] = leer “nat. Stein, Felsen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 23] = ler ~ lèr pye “large flat rock” [ALC 1978, 33], Sura laar “Fels, Stein” [Jng. 1963, 72], Mupun l ar “boulder, stone”, cf. llóor “hailstone” [Frj. 1991, 32, 34], Mushere laar ~ lar “a smooth wide rock with smooth surface (used for threshing and winnowing acha, rice, corn, maize), a threshing-floor to spray acha, corn, millet and to winnow rice, rice, corn etc. on it”, lar-diyel “wide flat stone used as venue for judging cases or settling disputes” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 149, 151], Goemai laar “a large sized rock the surface of which is level with the soil” [Srl. 1937, 120] (AS: Stl. 1987, 243, #59).

¹⁰ In an astonishing manner, W. Vycichl (1975, 203) tried to demonstrate the correspondence of the Eg. vs. Sem. terms for “stone”: “a well known (!) etymology is Sem. ʔabn ‘stone’ ~ Eg. jnr [...], here we have not less than three discrepancies [...]. In this case, however, the sound changes seem to correspond to certain rules: ʔ ~ y, and b ~ n (bn first > *mn, then dissimilated *mr, then assimilated > *nr) [...]”. So also Bender 1975, 188: Eg. jnr < *mn < *bn! Needless to say, this idea is out of question.

420], although only the first root radicals could correspond. Albright's proposal is just as false as most of other previous etymologies suggested for Eg. ʕnh.¹¹ The only convincing Sem. parallel for Eg. ʕnh was proposed so far by Meyer 1960, 97–98 (so also IS 1971, #125; HSED #1511), who assumed a connection to Sem. *ʕnh (var. *ʕnʕ) “to sigh” [GT], cf. Akk. (a/jB) an ḥu “seufzen” [AHW 49] = (Dt) “to produce a moaning sound” [CAD a2 105] || Ug. ʕnh “seufzen” [WUS #299]. From AA *ʕ-n-q [GT]? This equation is possible only if we assume a change of PEg. *jnḥ > OK ʕnh under the influence of -ḥ- (for which cf. Osing 1980). As demonstrated by A. Ju. Militarev and O. V. Stolbova (1990, 71), the same root might be present also in WCh. *nʕok “to breathe” [GT] (attested in Angas-Sura *nʕok “to breathe, live” [GT] and Ron).¹² As suggested in EDE vol. I 157, the historic spelling of Eg. ʕnh in the light of its WCh. cognate and the well-known interchange of Eg. ʕ ~ j in the proximity of ḥ might well be explained from a pre-OEg. *jnḥ. Note that the OEg. etymon jnḥ can (sporadically though) also be pointed out in the OK.¹³ That is, the interchange of ʕ ~ j can be projected to the OK, and the historic reading jnḥ is not just a question.

Eg. ʕ 3 [*♦∞] “(to) fight” (OK, Wb I 215–216): after Ember (ESS 35, #5.f.5), it has been traditionally (Vrg. 1945, 130; Mlt. 1984, 17) equated with Ar. raʕala “to strike with a sword” [Ember] = “mit dem Schwert schlagen” [Vrg.], which is semantically

¹¹ Thus, e.g., (1) later, Albright (1927, 208) suggested an equation with Sem. *nʕ : Akk. nēšu (OAkk. naʕ um) “(auf)leben, genesen” [AHW 783] || Ar. naʕaša I “relever qqn. qui a trébuché ou qui est tombé”, II “élever qqn.” [BK II 1294] = I “to animate, enliven”, II, IV “to revive, regenerate” [Baranov 1976, 813]. Perhaps PEg. *ʕnš OEg. ʕnh? (2) Schneider (1997, 196, #19) combined it with ES *dḥn: Geez dāḥna “to be saved, be unharmed, escape safely, be spared, be safe and sound, be released” etc. (ES: Lsl. 1987, 128-9). (3) Or cf. areal parallels like PNUbian *aḥ “to live” [Abel 1933–34, 304] and PCKhoisan *ʕan “to live” [Baucom 1972, 23]?

¹² WCh.: Angas nyok “1. breath, 2. to breathe” [Ormsby 1914, 208, 314] = nyok “1. the lungs, 2. breathing, 3. rest, 4. life” [Flk. 1915, 257] = nyòk (K) “1. breath, Atem, 2. Ruhe, 3. life, 4. lung” [Jng. 1962 MS, 31] = nyok [nʕòk] “breath” [Brq. 1971, 24, #26, 50] = nyok “1. breath, 2. life” [Hfm.] = nyok “1. life, 2. breath” [ALC 1978, 30, 49] = nyòk “life” [Krf.], Sura nòk “Atem” [Jng. 1963, 77] = nook “1. breath, 2. to rest” (the tones differ) [Hfm.], Mupun n ok “1. to breathe, 2. rest”, nook “breath” [Frj. 1991, 44–45], Kofyar nook “1. to breathe, 2. soul” [Ntg. 1967, 30] = nook “to breathe” [Hfm.], Mushere nok “1. to breathe, 2. soul, 3. life” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 139, 157], Goemay niag [irreg. -g < *-k] “1. to breathe, 2. rest” [Srl. 1937, 159] = niyaak “atmen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 9] = niyak “to breathe” [Hfm.] (AS: Hfm. 1975 MS, 22, #149; Mkr. 1987, 110) | Fyer nook “atmen” [Jng. 1970, 88] (WCh.: Mkr. 1987, 110; Stl. 1977, 156). The underlying AA root might have been *n-ʕ/y-q “1. to breathe, 2. live” [GT]. The Eg.-WCh. equation was first suggested in Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 71.

¹³ The hieroglyphic records from the archaic period and the OK are usually written with the logogramm ʕnh. There are also instances whereby the first ʕ- was occasionally written out, cf. FÄW I 83 (archaic period, Dyn. II), Urk. I 133:15 (OK). The OK PN ʕnh-f (Ranke PN I 67, #2), in which ʕ- was complemented phonetically, might now be completed by another OK PN, ʕnh-j (Ranke PN I 68, #3), in which, in turn, we find a first j- with phonetical sign, which points to an alternative pronunciation jnḥ.

very weak. Instead, Eg. $\text{ʕ}\text{C}\text{3}$ [$\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{C}\text{1}$?] may be derived from PEg. $\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{C}\text{1}$ via a dissimilative reduplication of the pharyngeals (an attested phenomenon of pre-OEg. historical phonology, see EDE vol. I), which finds its perfect match in ECu. $\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{ol}$ - “war” [Sasse 1979, 21]: PSam $\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{ol}$ “war” [Heine 1978, 77] | HECu. $\text{*}\text{ola}$ “battle, war” [Hds. 1989, 419] || NOm. $\text{*}\text{ol}$ - “to fight” [GT] (Cu.-Om.: Dlg. 1973, 162; 197; 1987, #23; Ehret 1987, 117, #492).

Eg. $\text{ʕ}\text{d}$ “wohlbehalten, unversehrt, intakt sein” (MK, Wb I 237–238): Ember (1930, #5.a.14) – followed by a number of authors from the “old school”¹⁴ – compared it to Ar. $\text{ʕ}\text{1}$ I “surpasser qqn. dans le traitemen d’une maladie”, III “1. manier, manipuler un objet entre les mains, le travailler [...], 2. traiter une affaire [...], 3. rivaliser avec qqn.” [BK II 338] = III: $\text{ʕ}\text{ la}$ a “kräftig, gesund sein” [Vrg.] = “to cure, treat (medically), restore” [Alb.] || Geez $\text{ʕ}\text{allaga}$ “to defeat, vanquish” [Lsl. 1987, 60], whereby he assumed an original Eg. $\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{nd}$ < $\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{ld}$. Semantically weak, just as the two other alternative suggestions on Eg. $\text{ʕ}\text{d}$.¹⁵ Instead, I propose the (phonologically regular) derivation of Eg. $\text{ʕ}\text{d}$ from AA * -(y)- ĉ “1. to be unripe, fresh, 2. to prosper” [GT], attested in Sem. $\text{*}\text{d}\text{d}$: Ar. dd : $\text{a}\text{đ}\text{a}$ & $\text{a}\text{đ}\text{a}$ I “être plein de vigueur, de sève, de jeunesse (se dit d’un homme, d’une plante)”, II “être dans la bien-être, prospérer”, $\text{a}\text{đ}\text{d}$ - “1. frais, tendre, nouveau, 2. plein de vigueur et de santé (homme), tout jeune, né récemment (veau, etc.)” [BK II 473-4] || Bed. $\text{ya}\text{đ}\text{a}$? “feucht, nass, unreif sein” [Rn. 1895, 241] || LECu.: PSam $\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{ay}\text{đ}\text{i}$ “unripe” [Heine 1978, 77] || SCu. $\text{*}\text{E}$ 2- [$\text{*}\text{-tl-}$] [$\text{*}\text{-c-}$ < $\text{*}\text{-ĉ-}$] “unripe, raw” [GT]: Iraqw & Alagwa $\text{ʕ}\text{e}$ | Ma’a i é (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 277; SCu.-LECu.: Dlg. 1987, 209, #104) || WCh.: Diri $\text{ya}\text{đ}\text{a}$ “unripe, wet” [Skn. 1977, 47]. The Ar.-Eg. comparison was suggested already by C. T. Hodge (1968, 27). Noteworthy that the quoted Arabic reflex has produced clearly the same shift of meaning as Eg. $\text{ʕ}\text{d}$.

Eg. w^{c} “eins” (OK, Wb I 273–6): presumably independently from Reinisch (1874, XII, fn. 3) – Ember and hence generations of Eg.-AA etymology¹⁶ identified this numeral with Sem. $\text{*}\text{w}\text{ĉd}$ “1” (cf. Ar. $\text{wa}\text{ĉ}\text{d}$ -). For the evident problems of the phonetic correspondence of the Eg. and Sem. numerals “1”, the various authors invented diverse hypothetical scenarios,¹⁷ none of which has convincing analogies in Eg. Not better were

¹⁴ Albright 1918, 238; Calice (GÄSW #137); Vergote 1945, 135, #9.b.2, 146, #24.a.

¹⁵ (2) Sem. $\text{*}\text{ʕ}\text{zz}$ “to be strong, powerful” (see Ward 1962, 412, fn. 3; 1968, 69). (3) ECu. $\text{*}\text{g}$ - “to watch, look out” [Sasse 1982, 67] || SBrb. (Tuareg) agg “bewachen”. See Rsl. 1964, 207 (LECu.-SBrb.); OS 1992, 176 (Eg.-LECu.).

¹⁶ See Ember 1917, 87, #134; 1926, 305, #3.4; 1930, 34, #5.c; Alb. 1918, 90; 1927, 200; Behnk 1927, 81, #7; 1928, 139, #18; Zhl. 1931, 134; Dlg. 1967, 300, #5; Zvd. 1974, 105; 1975, 45.

¹⁷ Ember: Eg. w^{c} < $\text{*}\text{w}\text{ĉ}$ < $\text{*}\text{w}\text{ĉd}$ (partial assimilation of ĉ to the preceding sonant labial + loss of final -d, cf. Syriac dial. of Tur-Abdin $\text{ĉ}\text{a}$ “1”, Brk. 1907 I, 282, Behnk: Omani Ar. w $\text{ĉ}\text{i}$), Albright: Eg. w^{c} < $\text{*}\text{w}^{\text{c}}\text{d}$ < $\text{*}\text{w}\text{ĉd}$, or Dolgopolskij: orig. $\text{w}^{\text{c}}\text{tj}$ < $\text{*}\text{w}\text{ə}^{\text{c}}\text{t}\text{ə}$ (m) < $\text{*}\text{w}\text{ə}^{\text{c}}\text{d-t}\text{ə}$ < $\text{*}\text{w}\text{ə}\text{ĉd-t}\text{ə}$, or Zavadovskij: PEg. $\text{*}\text{w}^{\text{c}}\text{d-t}$ > OEg. fem. $\text{w}^{\text{c}}\text{-t}$.

the etymologies proposed by W. Leslau and H. Abel.¹⁸ Beginning from F. Behnk, a number of researchers¹⁹ have identified Eg. w^o [wá^oiy-aw/at] with PBrb. *iyyaw-an/at “1” [Mlt.] = *w-^o-y “allein sein” [Zhl. 1950, 407] = *ya-N (m), *ya-T (f) [Zvd. 1967] = *y w-an/*y w-at [Blz.] > SBrb. *iye-n/*iye-t (*ç wgy) [Zhl. 1931] || NBrb. *ye-n/*ye-t “1” [Zhl. suggesting Brb. *-g- = Eg. -^o!]. The Eg.-Brb. equation remains uncertain because of the irregular correspondence of Brb. *y vs. Eg. w. Note that Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1974, 105) tried to force the Eg.-Brb. isogloss together with Ar. w^od (via Brb. < *yiwə(d)-t > *yiwətt > fem. yiwət, ignoring the masc. counterpart having no *-t at all!). L. Bender 1975, 179 and hence V. Blažek (1990, 34) saw in Eg. w^o a cognate of the SCu. numeral “1”, cf. PWRift *wak “1” [KM 2003, 314] = PIraqw [Blz.] > Iraqw wək [Bnd.] | Ma’a wé “1” [Ehr.] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 312, #12; Zbr. 1987, 343) || WCh.: Karekare wàiké “jeder, all” [Lks. 1966, 206]. See also Blz. 1993 MS, 3, #1.9 (Krk.-SCu.). Ch. Ehret (l.c.) analyzed the SCu. stem as a compound of two juxtaposed dem. roots (*wa + *ka), which can hardly speak in favour of the Eg.-SCu. comparison. Summing up: both the Berber and the Cushitic etymologies for our Eg. numeral have considerable weaknesses sufficient not to accept them as certain. Last, but not least, Eg. w^o may nevertheless find its most reliable cognate in, Ar. w^oy “1. rassembler, ramasser, réunir sur un seul point, 5. s’amasser sur un seul point” [BK II 1570] = “sammeln” [GB] = “umfassen, enthalten” [Lsl. 1987, 23], although its Hebrew cognate²⁰ is semantically far from the basic sense of “to unite” that we might project to Sem. *w^oy in the light of the hopeful Eg.-Ar. isogloss.

Eg. wnj “(sich be)eilen” (OK, ÄWb I 346; Wb I 313–4) = “to hasten, hurry” (CT, DCT 93): combined in ESS 27, #4.b.10 (so also Alb. 1918, 225–6, #33; 1927, 211) with Ar. wan “to be weak” (!), which is semantically weak. Instead, we may put forward PCu. *wal-/*wil- “to hurry” [Ehret] = *w-l-l “faire vite, se dépêcher, courir” [DRS 543]²¹ as the true cognate.

Eg. whj “entgehen, entgleiten, verfehlen, Misserfolg haben” (MK, Wb I 339) = “to miss (of arrow), fail, be lacking” (MK, FD 65): the old school, beginning with Calice

¹⁸ Lsl. 1962, 47, #27 (cf. Conti 1978, 43, fn. 5): Eg. w^o ~ Tigre woro “1”, while Abel 1933–34, 305 (so also Homburger 1928, 335): Eg. w^o ~ Common Nub. *w r “eins”.

¹⁹ Behnk 1928, 139, #18; Zhl. 1931, 134; Zvd. 1967, 43; 1974, 105; 1975, 45; Blz. 1987 MS, #1.2; 1990, 34.

²⁰ Cf. Hbr. y^oy qal “wegraffen” [GB 306].

²¹ Bed. wílla ~ wúlla “1. Schnelligkeit, Geschwindigkeit, Eile, 2. (adv.) schnell, bald”, wúlla di- “sich beeilen, schnell sein” [Rn. 1895, 238], Ammar’ar wílla “quickly” [Dlg.] || NAgaw *wāl- “to hurry” [Ehret]: Bilin wālá y “sich beeilen, sich sputen, schnell tun” [Rn. 1887, 35], Qwara wāl-s “sich beeilen, schnell sein” [Rn.] = wāl-s- “to hurry” [Apl.], Qemant wāl “exciter”, wal “vite!” [CR 1912, 265] (Cu.: Dlg. 1973, 197; Ehret 1987, #575; Apl. 1989 MS, 23). D. Cohen (DRS 543) combined the Cu. root a.o. with Geez ?awlawā “agiter (la langue), s’agiter, battre”, Amh. wällälä “être agité”.

(1901, 146; 1936, #21; cf. Ember 1913, 117, #68; Alb. 1918, 226; ESS 76, #13.a.2) identified this with Ar. why: wah “to break, tear, be weak, threaten to fall (a wall)” [Ember] = “zerbrechen, zerreißen, schwach sein, einstürzen” (intr.) [Clc.], which is semantically rather weak. A. G. Belova’s (1987, 280) idea on Eg. whj vs. Ar. shw (extended by a prefix s-?) “to forget, miss” is not better. Neither of these proposals are correct. In 2000, I have already suggested that Eg. whj is both phonologically and semantically the correct match of LECu. *w y- [GT: < pre-PECu. *wahy- with compensatoric lengthening] “to fail, be unable to be or find” [Sasse]: Saho-Afar way- “to fail, be unable to be or find” [Rn. 1878] = Afar way “abgehen, fehlen: 1. nicht finden, 2. nicht erlangen, nicht bekommen, 3. nicht haben, enthaben zu ihm kein Vertrauen, 4. sich mit jemandem nicht abfinden, d.i. entzweit, uneins sein, im Streite liegen” [Rn. 1886, 914], Saho-Irob w y “to be without, not to have” [Rn. 1878, 141] | PSam *w y- “vermissen, versäumen” [Lmb. 1986, 447]: Somali w y (tr.) “1. ledig sein einer Sache, vermissen, nicht haben, nicht bekommen, nicht finden” [Rn. 1902, 383] (LECu.: Sasse 1979, 42) < AA *w-h-y “to miss” [GT].

Eg. wh3 “suchen, wünschen, begehren” (MK, Wb I 353–4): identified by Ember (1913, 114; ESS #6.a.12 & 81, #15.a.4) and his followers²² with Ar. why: wah “to purpose, aim at” [Ember] = “intendere” [Alb.], although Eg. 3 vs. Ar. y do not correspond at all. In my view, at the moment, there are two plausible etymologies: (1) either we assume that Belova’s law worked in Eg. wh3 < *hwr and compare it with Bed. haru(w) “suchen, wollen, wünschen, begehren” [Rn. 1895, 127] = haru ~ hari(w) “to want, wish, will, seek, look for, search for” [Rpr. 1928, 198]²³ || LECu. *gur-/*g^war- (?) “to seek” [GT];²⁴ or (2) we assume a metathesis (e.g., Eg. wh3 ~ *w3h < AA *w-r-g) and identify it with SEOmeto *wɔrg- “to want” [GT].²⁵

²² Alb. 1927, 206, 225; Ward 1962, 409, n. 8; HSED #2514.

²³ The Bed. root used to be (see Chn. 1947, #160; Zbr. 1971, #112; Blz. 1992, 138) equated with Sem. *h₁r “to select” [GT] = *h₁r “to choose, select” [Zbr.]: Akk. h₁ ru > h₁ru “erwählen, aussuchen” [AHW 342] || Ar. h₁r I: h₁ ra “1. obtenir qqch. de bon, être en possession d’une bonne chose, 4. choisir qqch”. [BK I 652] = taḥayyara & ?iḥt ra “to choose, select” [Lsl.] || Geez ḥar(a)ya “to choose, discern, (s)elect” [Lsl. 1987, 265], although I remain sceptical for semantical considerations.

²⁴ Attested in Saho g r “suchen” & Saho-Irob gurâ “wollen” [PW 1953, 392] = Irob g r [Rn.], Afar g r n ~ gâr n “suchen” [Rn. 1886, 852]. It is not yet clear if WCh.: Angas-Sura *k^yayar “to desire, long for” [GT 2004, 194] = *kyaHar “to demand ()” [Stl.] can be also related (since its medial *-γ- usually derives from an AA laryngeal or pharyngeal), cf. Angas čaar [č- < *k^y- reg.] “to want a thing very much” [Flk. 1915, 156] = aar ~ áár “stark wünschen, begehren, an etwas denken” [Jng. 1962 MS] = čaar “stark wünschen, begehren, an etwas denken” [Jng. 1962 MS] = čar “to desire strongly” [ALC 1978, 8] = čaar “to envy” (i.e., “to wish things of others”?) [Gcl. 1994, 69–70], Sura kyaγar “Begierde haben, begehren, verlangen” [Jng. 1963, 71] = kyahar [St. Matthew’s Gospel in Sura quoted by Stl.], perhaps Msr. kikar [ki- weakened < *k^ya-, i.e., *k^yakar < *k^yayar?] “to admire” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 282] (AS: Stl. 1987, 242, #39).

²⁵ Attested in Ganjule wɔrgo-koin, Kachama (Gatsame, Haruro) wɔrgo-koḥ, Koyra wɔrg , Zayse wɔrgot s, Zergulla wɔrgi (SEOmeto: Siebert 1994, 21).

Eg. wd “(den Säugling) entwöhnen” (PT, Wb I 409, 14) = “to wean (child)” (FD 76): identified in ESS 39, #6.a.16 with Ar. waḍaḥa “to be bright, clear”, naḍaḥa “to bud, form grain”. Semantically wrong. Instead, our Eg. root may be derived from *wgċ and be equated with Sem. *gċ “to draw out” [Zbr.]: Hbr. *gċy “hervorziehen” [GB 137] = “arracher” [DRS] = “to draw out” [Zbr.] = “to pull out” [KB 187] || Ar. ċw I & VIII “déraciner, extirper, arracher” [BK I 257] = ċw “arracher, déraciner” [DRS] = VIII “to root out, extirpate” [Zbr.], cf. also Ar. ċċ “traîner par terre” [Guillaume] = ċċ “to draw” [Zbr.] || Geez g^waċaya “déraciner, démolir” [DRS] (Sem.: Zbr. 1971, #53). Cf. also Ar. wċ I “to stray from (one’s path)” [Blachère I 1875]. Here might belong (with a sense even closer to that of Eg. wdċ) MSA *gċw [Jns.]: Jibbali egóċa “to acquire, get” [Jns. 1981, 74]. Perhaps Mehri šəg ċi “to have disagreement with s’one” [Jns. 1987, 118] is to be explained from * “to separate oneself from”?

Eg. b3.w (coll. pl.) “Ruhm, Ansehn, Macht, Gewalt, Wille, Schicksalsbestimmung” (OK, Wb I 413, 12–17) = “power, deeds of power” (FD 77) = “power, might, strength, will, glory, prowess, fame, wrath” (DLE I 145): A. Ember and his pupil F. Albright²⁶ identified it with Ar. b[?]y “to be glorious, lofty, to surpass, boast”, ba[?]w- “glory, pride”, which they extended to also a certain Akk. ma[?]u (sic) “great, powerful” || Geez m[?]a “powerful, victorious” (!). The cited Akk.-Geez root²⁷ is surely unrelated to Ar. b[?]y. But he suggested Ar.-Eg. comparison which is in principle (Eg. 3 = Sem. *[?]) possible. Besides, the Ar. root has a wide AA kinship.²⁸ The etymology of Eg. b3.w is, however, debated. The great dilemma (as so often) is whether it is an inner Eg. innovation or comes from the AA heritage. Judging by the data presented below, one is tempted to agree with A. Ember (1913, 116, #57; 1917, 85–86, #114), who suggested that the traditional interpretation of Eg. b3.w as a pure pl. of Eg. b3 “soul” may be a *Volksetymologie* and the two Eg. b3 words should be etymologically kept separate. Depending on the dubious origin of Eg. 3 (< AA *r, *l, *[?]), we may propose two alternative etymologies:

²⁶ See Ember 1913, 116, #57; 1917, 85–86, #114; 1930, #3.a.17, #6.a.19; Albright 1927, 213.

²⁷ W. von Soden (AHW 637) gives jB m[?]u “etwa: Herrscher”, which could be eventually cognate with Geez. The origin of Geez mw[?] is still rather obscure, a Cushitic etymology seems also plausible (Lsl. 1987, 374).

²⁸ Ar. b[?]y “redresser la tête, se vanter”, ba[?] & bā[?]wā[?]- “orgueil” [DRS 40] goes back to AA *b-[?] or *b-[?]-y “big” [GT], cp. SCu.: Qwadza ba[?]-at- “to increase (in size)”, ba[?]-ati “long” [Ehret 1980 MS, 1] || WCh.: Hausa bábbá “1. big, 2. important, 3. adult, 4. elder/-st, 6. bigness” [Abr. 1962, 52] || CCh.: Jimjimen (Bata-Zumo) bwà-n “élargir (un trou)” [Hfm. apud Brt.-Jng. 1990, 87] | Lame bà “2. grand” [Scn. 1982, 277] || ECh.: Mubi bbá, pl. bòbú “groß” [Lks. 1937, 180]. Here might belong also Ch. *b-y “big” [GT]: WCh.: Bokkos báy “groß” [Jng. 1970, 140] || CCh.: Mafa biya[?]a ~ biy-biyya[?]a “grand” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 93] | Musgu bai, abai [Krs.], boi, aboi [Rlf.], aboi [Ovw.], abai [Dcr.] “1. groß, auch: dick (Krs.), 2. auch: viel (Rlf.)” [FMr. 1886, 393; Lks. 1941, 42], Puss abay “grand, important” [Trn. 1991, 71]. The etymology of CCh.: Zime-Dari vīvī “grand, vaste, large” [Cooper 1984, 29], Lame vīvī “grand, vaste, étendu” [Scn. 1982, 303] is still obscure.

- (1) As assumed by G. Takács (1999, 25), Eg. b3.w might be explained perhaps from AA *b-r “great” [GT], which is a widespread AA root.²⁹ We know also numerous AA var. roots with the same basic sense extended from the same ultimate biconsonantal root.³⁰ Thus, here belongs also AA *b-b-r “great” [GT],³¹ which is a partial reduplication of the same root (with intens. meaning?). Similarly, AA *n-b-r “great” [GT]³² was enlarged from the same bicons. Root by the prefix *n-. Based on a special Afar-Chadic isogloss³³ we reconstruct also AA *b-r-l “great” [GT], a dissimilation of *b-r-r (?), cf. also AA *b-r-r “to spread out, be wide” [GT].³⁴ With an infixated laryngeal *-h-, AA

²⁹ Cf. ES: Gurage: Chaha burbur “big” [Lsl. 1979, 150: source unclear] || NBrb.: Tamazight a-baraw “1. large, 2. spacieux, 3. vaste, 4. épais, 5. gros” [DRB 1, 121] | Qabyle i-burar, pl. i-burar-en “1. énorme, très grand, 2. en grande quantité” [Dlt. 1982, 39] || NAgaw: cf. Qwr. bärto “strong” [Apl. 1996, 17] || LECu.: PSam *b r “big (of things)” [Heine 1978, 55]: Somali b r-an “stout” [Heine], Rendille b r ~ ab r “big (of things)” [Heine 1976, 212; cf. Zbr. 1974, 82] = abur “big” [Flm. 1964, 66] || NOM.: Haruro (Kachama) b r- (adj.) “grande” [CR 1937, 641] || Ch. *b-r [GT] = *^mb-r-(m) [JS 1981, 40A]: WCh.: Dera bambər-an “large” [Skn.] | Nbauchi: Mburku babar-ən “long, tall, big” [Skn. 1977, 30] | Sbauchi *bar- “big” [GT]: Dwot bəri, Dokshi bər, Buli bər, Barang & Bandas & Boodli & Zodi bəri, Langas bar-, cf. Zakshi vwär [*b^w-] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 42, #88) || CCh.: Bura bula [l < *r reg.] “to develop or grow rapidly” [BED 1953, 26] | Gudu búram & Nzangi bərem “big” [Mkr.] | perhaps Mada vvór vvór [if vv- < *VbV-] “avec force” [Br.-Brunet 2000, 259] || ECh.: WDangla bür bür “beaucoup” [Fédry 1971, 101], EDangla búrbírà “trop large” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1971–5, 55] | Toram bōr- “to widen (e.g., hole), évaser, agrandir, élargir” [Alio-Jng. 1988, 32]. This AA root was examined in a Nst. perspective (*bara) by V. M. Illi -Svity (1971, #7). Note that K. Naït-Zerrad (DRB 1, 121) supposes in Tamazight BRW: a-baraw a b- prefix, cf. i-riw “to be large” = Qabyle i-hriw “to be large” (for which cf. Eg. 3wj < *rwy). Note also that SBrb.: Hgr. huher “être gros, avoir du volume, être épais” [Fcd. 1951–2, 540] is unrelated, being < SBrb. *zuhər “être gros” [Prasse 1969, 50, #194].

³⁰ For a comparison of certain reflexes cf. Mkr. 1987, 91–92 (Chh.-Ch.-ECu.-NOM.); 1987a, 31 (SBch.-Gudu-Rendille-Kachama); Blz. 1989, 201–202, #7 (ECu.- Kachama-Dwot-Gudu); HSED #1889 (Glavda-Ar.).

³¹ Attested in NOM.: Kaffa bébber- (adj.) “robusto, forte” [Crl. 1951, 409] || WCh.: Mburku babar-ən “long, tall, big” [Skn.] || CCh.: Bura bubal [l < *r, Nwm. 1966, 227; 1977, 16–17, #3.13] “hard, firm, strong”, bwabul “very strong and energetic”, bwabulkur “great strength” [BED 1953, 24, 30]. Note that E. Cerulli (1951, 409) affiliated Kaffa bébber- with Somali barbar “giovanotto”. Doubtful.

³² Cp. Ar. nbr “to increase, grow” [...] || Ch. *^mb-r [GT] = *^mb-r-(m) [JS 1981, 40A]: WCh.: Dera bambər-an “large” [Skn.] | NBch. *^mbar- “long, tall, big” [GT]: Warji mb ra-na, Kariya mbarambara-na (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 30) || CCh.: Hitkala (Hide) mbra “force” [Eguchi 1971, 218] | Glavda mbər “to increase” [RB 1968] | Lame mbìr mbìr “en grande quantité” [Scn. 1982, 308], Peve mbri “important” [Venberg 1975, 37].

³³ LECu.: Afar bārli “greatness” [PH 1985, 64] || CCh.: presumably Mada bèlèrè “de/par force” [Br.-Brunet 2000, 68] || ECh.: WDangla bèrèl “large”, bèrìlkàw “largeur” [Fédry 1971, 84], EDangla béréel [b r l] “large, surtout pour les espaces: vaste, étendu, ample étendu, évasé, gros, épais, volumineux, enflé”, b r l w “largeur, grosseur, diamètre”, bèrl “élargir, devenir large” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1971–5, 43].

³⁴ Cf. Bed. berir “auf-, ausbreiten, ausstreuen” [Rn. 1895, 51] = “to spread, scatter (tr.)” [Rpr. 1928, 163] || NAgaw: Bilin bārbār “ausbreiten” [Rn. l.c.] || LECu.: Somali bārar “Anschwellung, Beule, Geschwulst, Kropf, leiblicher Answuchs” & “anschwellen (der Körper) infolge eines Schlages oder eines innerlichen Leidens” [Rn. 1902, 90] = barar “a swelling”, barār-ayya “is swelling” [Abr.

*b-h-r “to grow” [GT]³⁵ may be also related. AA *b-r might be ultimately related to AA *b-w-r [GT] attested, e. g., in Eg. bw3 “hoch sein” (Med., Wb).

- (2) I (Takács 1999, 25) suggested alternatively that Eg. b3.w may derive from AA *b-l ~ *b-l-l “big” [GT],³⁶ which – similarly to AA *b-r (above) – has a great

1964, 27] ||| CCh.: (?) Bura volvol [l < *r] “wide, big (of bugging out eyes)” [BED 1953, 217] | Mofu-Gudur bérére “1. très enflé, 2. nombreux” [Brt. 1988, 84].

³⁵ Cp. ES *bhr: Tna. bəhar ~ bahar “grand, fort”, Tigre bəhar-at “qui poussent, germent” (ES: DRS 49) ||| Ch. *b-r < *b-h-r (?) [GT]: WCh.: Kofyar bwer “many, plenty of” [Ntg. 1967, 4] | Dera bəaré “to grow up”, cf. bəmbəram “largeness, importance” [Nwm. 1974, 122] || CCh.: Gisiga biber “dick” [Lks. 1970, 119], Mada bərar ~ bərər “nombreux, innombrables (fruits tombés), à ras-bord, plein (liquide)”, bəbər ~ bəbərə “gros (bâton)”, cf. bər bər “solide (bâton, corde), solidement serré”, bər bər “(tenir) solidement, en serrant” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 74–75]. Note that Chadic *b-r could be explained alternatively from AA *b-r ~ *b-ʔ-r [GT], cf. Sem. *ʔbr “être fort” [Chn. 1970, 5]: Akk. (a/ʔb lit.) abru “stark, kräftig (?)” [AHW 7] || Hbr. ʔbr hifil “sich emporrschwingen (v. Habicht)”, ʔabb r “1. stark, tapfer, 2. mächtig, vornehm” [GB 5, 7] || perhaps Ar. ʔabira “1. être en bon état et intact, 2. être probe, intègre” | Amh. abret “orgueil, prédominance” (Sem.: DRS 5). I suppose Sem. *ʔbr to be ultimately related to AA *b-r. Note that H. Möller (1911, 177), H. Wagner (1958, 62), and U. Rapallo (1994, 173) suppose Sem. *ʔbr to be related to IE: MlIrish abar- ~ amar- (intens. prefix), Gothic abrs (adj.) “stark” as well as FU: Volga Cheremis a rə “Stärke”, which should be examined in the frameworks of the Nostratic theory.

³⁶ Cp. Sem. *bll “to abound” [GT]: OSA: Sab. bll “abundance, excess (in wrongdoing)”, bll “abundant” [SD 28–29], cf. Ar. balila “sich einer Sache bemächtigen” [Tarafa apud Brk.] | Grg.: Selti bällä “abundant, much, many” [Lsl. 1979, 138: < Cu.] ||| NBrb.: Qbl. bbelb-el “être gros, replet”, a-b-elb-ul “gros” (iron. ou péjor.) [Dlt. 1982, 20–21] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr b l l “avoir tout en abondance, être à l’aise” [Alj. 1980, 7] ||| LECu.: Oromo ball-a “large” | HECu.: Hadiya ball-e “abundant, many”, Kambatta bali-ta “abundant, many” (ECu.: Lsl. 1979, 138; not so in Hds. 1989) || SCu.: Iraqw b li “defeat”, b l-īm- “to win a victory” [Mgw. 1989, 111] = -bal-īm- “to exceed, win” [Wtl. 1953] ||| NOm.: Kefoid ball-, bell- “hundred” [Flm. 1987, 145, #3] ||| WCh.: perhaps Angas p l “(an emphatic particle) very” [Flk. 1915, 264; cf. Zbr. 1986, 183] | Diri bula “size, height” [Std.] = “big” [Mkr.], Pa’a bəl-am “long, tall, big” [Skn. 1977, 30] = bəl-an (m), bəl-éi (f) “big” [MSkn. 1979, 168] | Guruntum vūli “many, much” [Jgr. 1989, 186] || CCh.: Fali beloā “groß” [Lks. 1937, 110], Daba bililbilik “lourd, important” [Mch. 1966, 111] | Mafa mbálálaʔa, mbálál-mbálálaʔa, mbéléleʔe, mbélél-mbéléleʔe “nombreux (oeufs, enfants)” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 246] | Lame bəl “vast et plat” [Scn. 1982, 279] || ECh.: Kera àbəlāw [1974] = àbəlāw [1976] “viel, sehr” [Ebert 1974, 30; 1976, 22] = abelaú “viel” [Lks. 1937, 101–2] | WDangla bōllè “s’accroître, s’étendre, déborder d’un récipient” [Fédry 1971, 84], Mokilko bāâlè “grand (bouc)” [Jng. 1990, 61]. For Sem.: OSA: Sab. bll “abundant” [SD 28–29] | Grg.: Selti bällä “abundant, much, many” [Lsl. 1979] ||| NBrb.: Qbl. bbelb-el “être gros, replet”, a-b-elb-ul “gros” (iron. ou péjor.) [Dlt. 1982, 20–21] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr bālāl “avoir tout en abondance, être à l’aise” [Alj. 1980, 7] etc. see also (or alternatively) Eg. bnn “überquellen (von den Scheunen)” (XVIII., Wb I 460, 5) = “to overflow” (XVIII., FD 83) = “1. überquellen (Scheune), 3. überfließen” (GHWb 254). Note that C. Brockelmann (1932, 811–12) connected Brb. belbel “avoir tout en abondance” (sic, probably referring to Qbl.) and Ar. balila “sich einer Sache bemächtigen” [Tarafa] to Ar. balla “befeuchten, bewässern”, IV “sich an saftigem Futter leben”, which, however, represents a distinct AA root. The position of NBrb.: Lamta hul “zahlreich sein” [Zhl.] || WBrb.: Zenaga udž [už < *ull] “zahlreich sein” [Zhl. 1942–43, 96] ||| PTuareg *hull-an “très, beaucoup” [Prs. 1969, 55, #254] is questionable. In theory, PTuareg *hull-an could be derived from AA *b-l “big” [GT]. G. Takács (2000, 338, #5.2) suggests a different etymology: WCh.: Bade-Ngizim *b-l-n “good”, which is semantically less convincing.

variety of variants with diverse root extensions,³⁷ cf., e.g., Ch. *b-b-l “(very) big” (intens.) [GT],³⁸ which is a partial reduplication of the same AA root. AA *b-ʔ-l “big” [GT]³⁹ might be also related.

³⁷ For a comparison of the diverse reflexes see Brk. 1932, 811–12 (Qbl.-Ar.); Stl. 1996, 23 (Ch.); Mkr. 1987, 91–92 (WCh.-ECh.); Dlg. 1987, 198, #21 (SCu.-Akk.); Zima 1995, 77 (SBrb.-PCh.).

³⁸ Cp. WCh.: Pa’a bábələ “very big” [MSkn. 1979, 166] || CCh.: Musgu bobillo [Ovw.] = bóbolo [Barth] “groß” [Lks. 1941, 42], Musgu-Girvidik boblo (m) “alt und ehrwürdig” [MB 1972–73, 69] || ECh.: Kera bōbló “groß” [Ebert 1974, 18; 1976, 33] = bubulú “groß” [Lks. 1937, 101].

³⁹ Cp. Sem.: Akk. (bab., nA) baʔ lu bālu G “abnormal groß, lichtstark sein”, D “sehr gewichtig machen”, baʔlu (jB) “abnormal groß” [AHW 93, 100; DRS 40: isolated] || cf. SWSem. *ʔbl: Ar. ʔabila “être riche” [DRS] | Tigre ʔabbälä “s’étendre” [DRS] (Sem.: DRS 3) || SCu.: Qwadza biʔila “thousand” [Ehret 1980 MS, 1; 1980, 137] || Ch. *b-l < *b-ʔ-l “big” [GT] = *b-l [JS 1981, 40A₂]: AS *b-l “1. much, 2. more” [GT]: Angas bull (so, double -ll) “much”, cf. rot-e bull “to prefer” (act. “to like very much”) [Ormsby 1914, 313–14] = b l “a particle, also used in a comparative or superlative sense” [Flk. 1915, 151] = b̄l (ḏokɔ) “überaus, sehr (zum Ausdruck des Komparativs und Superlativs verwendet)” [Jng. 1962 MS] = b̄l “more” [ALC 1978, 7] = b̄l (particle of comparative and superlative), e.g. wok-wok b̄l “bigger”, wok-wok b̄l khi-ḅut “biggest”, son-son b̄l “taller”, son-son b̄l khi-ḅut “tallest”, rit-rit b̄l “better”, rit-rit b̄l khi-ḅut “best” [Gcl. 1994, 63], Sura b̄l “vermehrten” [Jng. 1963, 60], Mnt. bul-bul “many” [Ftp. 1911, 218] | Bokkos b̄al “1. viel werden, 2. groß werden” [Jng. 1970, 140], Daffo-Butura b̄al “1. im Überfluß vorhanden sein, 2. zu viel sein” [Jng. 1970, 212] | Diri b̄ala “long, tall, big” [Skn. 1977, 30], Kirfi b̄ullí “many, much” [Schuh 1978, 53], Kwami b̄ellí “Menge, viel, die meisten” [Leger 1992, 24] || CCh.: Mofu-Gudur -ḅaḅəl’- “grossir, engraisser” [Br. 1988, 88], Mada ḅòḅòl-ḅòl, óḅòḅòl-ḅoloá “beaucoup, nombreux (fruits)”, ḅòlòl ~ óḅòloloá “gros, épai (corde, boyau)” [Br.-Brunet 2000, 73] || ECh.: Somray b̄əl “1. être large (un trou p.ex.), 2. toucher grand, large” [Jng. 1993 MS, 8], Ndam-Dik ḅḅḅ “big” [Mkr.], Tumak ḅəl “1. agrandir un trou, élargir, évaser (tr.), 2. être large (intr.)” [Cpr. 1975, 50]. Cf. still WCh. *ḅala “big, strong (,)” [Stl. 1986, 83; 1987, 158, #125]: AS *ḅal “to be hard, strong” [Hfm.]: Sura b̄al “Stärke, Gewalt, Macht, Befehl”, ḅi-b̄al “1. hart, mutig, 2. verhärtet” [Jng. 1963, 59–60], Mupun b̄al “hard, strong”, b̄alḅal (adv.) “strongly” [Frj. 1991, 6], Kofyar b̄al “hard, strong” [Ntg. 1967, 2] = b̄al “to be hard, strong” [Hfm.], Goemai b̄al “to be hard, strong” [Hfm.] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 17, #18). Note that Ch. Ehret (1980, 137) set up SCu. *bil- “to embellish, make bigger/better, add onto”, based on the unconvincing equation of Dhl. bil- “to embellish, adorn, decorate” & Qwadza biʔila “thousand” [Ehret: met. < *biliʔa]. O. V. Stolbova (1996, 23) set up PCh. *ḅaHal- “to be large”, where she mixed together some of the above presented Chadic forms with *ḅ- and *b-. Ch. Rabin (1982, 26, #18) attached WCh.: Bokkos b̄al “to become much, many, big” via met. to Sem. *rbb “to become big” & HECu.: Burji lab h “many”, Sidamo lobōha “big”. Unacceptable. SISAJa I, #90 derived WCh. *ḅ-l from AA *baq̄^h (sic) “lord, master”, which is semantically perhaps less probable, although not impossible. Similarly, O. V. Stolbova (1986, 83) linked her WCh. *ḅala “big, strong (,)” to AA *b-ʔ-l “lord, master”. In 1995, in turn, V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1028) explained Ch. *ḅ-l via AA *ʔ-b-l, cf. Ar. ʔbl “to be thick”. These etymologies are not excluded as alternative solutions. Perhaps in the various Chadic ḅ-l forms there are two or three distinct AA roots which should be separated. To make such a distinction seems, however, at the moment rather difficult.

Eg. b3 “das männliche Glied (insbesondere die Harnröhre)” (Med., Wb I 419, 15) = “praeputium” (CT V 43f, Lacau 1970, 87–88) = “glans penis or phallus” (Ward 1978, 124) = “*Eichel (des männlichen Gliedes)” (GHWb 241) Cpt. (S) BAH ~ FAH “penis” (KHW 30; DELC 33): Ember has elaborated its most widespread etymology followed by long generations in Eg.-Sem. studies,⁴⁰ whereby Eg. b3C “penis” is accepted as cognate with Ar. b ċ “penis, pudenda”, used in the expression “son of b ċika”, i.e. “thy own son”, cf. bwċ IV: ?ab ċa “violenter une femme” [DRS]. More recently, the Ar. root has been pointed out also in OSA: Qtb. bċ-t “phallic symbol of fertility and procreation of pasture, offered for the rain god: votive phallus (?)” [Ghul] = “votive object” [Ricks 1982, 34], Sab. bċ-t [root bwċ] “votive phallus (?)” [SD 33] = “votive object (specifically on inscriptional plaque)” [Ricks l.c.] (Sem.: Ghul 1959, 18). There are a few problems with this Eg.-Ar. match. First of all, Eg. -3- ≠ Sem. *-w-.⁴¹ Secondly, the Ar. root is isolated within Sem. (apparently also in AA⁴²), and the origin of the OSA word is also debated.⁴³ The Russian Afrasianist team⁴⁴ extended this Ar.-Eg. comparison to a few further unrelated forms in Ethio-Semitic and Berber.⁴⁵ D. Cohen (DRS 51), in turn, connected Eg. b3C and Ar. b ċ to LECu.: Somali abaċ

⁴⁰ See Ember 1913, 119, #85; 1918, 31; 1930, #7.a.17 (Eg.-Ar.); Alb. 1918, 90 (Ar.-Eg.); Chn. 1947, #409 and Chn. 1970, 51 (Ar.-Eg.-Som.); Ghul 1959, 19 (Sem.-Eg.); Lacau 1970, 87–88 (Ar.-Eg.); KHW 30 (Eg.-Ar.); SISAJa I, 72, #92 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.); Djik. etc. 1986, 58 & Djik. 1992, 30 (Sem.-Brb.-Eg.); OS 1990, 88 (Ar.-Eg.); Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 51 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); HCVA 2, #104 (Sem.-Brb.-Eg.); HSED #320 (Sem.-Eg.); Kmr. 1999, 250 (Eg.-PSem.); Takács 1999, 106 (Eg.-Sem.).

⁴¹ The Eg.-Ar. comparison was first queried by W. A. Ward (1972, 21, #227–#229): “[...] Eg. 3 = Sem. w is a problem”, but he still felt that Eg. b3C = Ar. b ċ could be “maintained esp. in the light of the Old SA. evidence”. Later, however, Ward (1978, 125–6) rightly rejected this idea. F. Kammerzell (1999, 250) misquoted both the Eg. word (as bċ!) and the Ar. root (as “Sem. *bċ!”), which is an astonishing unprofessional handling of linguistic data.

⁴² Although I would not exclude a connection of Ar. b ċ with ECu.: Dullay *p ċ [GT: reg. < *b ċ-]; Harso & Dobase p ċ- (pl.) “1. weitere Verwandtschaft, 2. Saat” [AMS 1980, 180].

⁴³ M. A. Ghul (l.c.) considers the -t to be the fem. marker, and argues for an identification with Ar. b ċ and Eg. b3C and even with Cpt. BWWH, BOH “an idol at Alexandria destroyed by Michael on 12th Hathor” (CD 47), which is clearly wrong (cf. Eg. bh). S. D. Ricks (l.c.), in turn, derives the OSA word from *bċt “pure, unmixed” = Ar. baċt- (with -t- as part of the root).

⁴⁴ See SISAJa I, 72, #92; Djik. etc. 1986, 58; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 51; HCVA 2, #104.

⁴⁵ Geez bəċbāċe “form(ation, -ing), creation” [Lsl. 1987, 91] ||| NBrb.: Shilh a-bubu, pl. i-bub-an “penis” [Aplg. 1958, 45], Ntifa a-bubbu “penis” || EBrb.: Ghadames bəbbu & Siwa dimin. tə-bīb-ət “phallus” [Lst. 1931, 276]. This etymology is untenable. Geez bəċbāċe derives in fact from Geez bāċbāċa “to paint, draw, portray, create, make” [Lsl.], for which cf. perhaps Eg. bh [< *bċ] “to bear (a child)” (GR). The quoted Brb. forms, in turn, are just *Kinderwörter* (as noted already by E. Laoust l.c.), which can hardly be used for the purpose of etymology. In SISAJa I, 72, #92, even LEg. bċC “Samenerguss des Sobek (bildlich vom Überschwemmungswasser)” (GR, Wb I 450, 5) is included in the comparison (derived from *bċ!), which is clearly false, the basic meaning of Eg. bċC being quite different (“to overflow, outpour”).

“saillir”, which is semantically improbable. All in all, we have to refrain from the suggested Eg.-Ar. parallel and consider other (more probable) solutions, which are, however, disturbed by the vacillation in the exact rendering of the Eg. term.⁴⁶

- (1) In Egyptian philology, it is a popular view that Eg. b3Ā “penis” is etymologically connected to *b3Ā “front part” (present in the compound prep. m-b3Ā “in front of”). It is, however, not certain whether OEg. *b3Ā “front part” existed at all.⁴⁷
- (2) I (Takács 1997, 251–252, #3.7) did not exclude the possibility of -Ā being identical with the AA affix *Ā marking the semantic class of anatomical terms. This analysis (Eg. b3∞ = *b3 + -Ā) was first proposed by W. A. Ward (1978, 124), though he did not recognize the signification of the postfix -Ā and he based his analysis on a different etymology. This hypothesis allows us postulating a hypothetic PEG. *b3 “penis” < AA *b-r or *b-l “penis” [GT] + affix -Ā. Thus, Eg. *b3- might be equated either with AA *b-r (perhaps *bur-) “penis” [GT]⁴⁸ (which has a rich literature⁴⁹) or with AA *b-l “penis” [GT]⁵⁰ (with abundant

⁴⁶ The hrgl. for b3Ā depicts the whole human male organ. The translation “foreskin” offered by P. Lacau (l.c.) is improbable with respect to MEg. t3m “foreskin” (MK, Wb V 354, 20). The rendering “phallus” (in general) is also problematic, for which cf. Eg. Ānn “das männliche Glied” (PT-LP, Wb III 115, 1). Perhaps Ānn signified the phallus (with an erotic connotation), while b3Ā rather the penis (as an anatomic term, cf. Med.: place of the urethra).

⁴⁷ V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1990, 88) even equated the Eg.-Ar. isogloss “penis” with false CCh. Comparanda: Mbara b6y (sic) “before” (incorrect record) | Buduma bahu “forward” (goes back to *bas-!). OS were postulating an illusoric PSEM. *bV?uĀ (-!).

⁴⁸ Attested in Sem.: Ar. (Dathina) burr-at “gland du pénis” [DRS] || NBrb.: Rif a-brur “penis” [Wlf. 1955, 47] || LECu.: Somali (m) bĀy-o “Praeputium der Knaben”, (f) b ryā-di “Clitoris der Mädchen” (secondary innovation?) [Rn. 1902, 92] = būry-o “1. foreskin, 2. uncircumcized fellow (as insult)” [Abr. 1964, 36] = b ry-o “membrum virile” [Mkr.] || NOm.: Janjero (Yemsa) bur?à “penis” [Lmb. 1993, 333] || WCh.: Hausa būrāá “penis”, cf. (Sokoto) būrè “large penis” [Abr. 1962, 120–21].

⁴⁹ See IS 1966, 18 (Eg.-Hs.); Hodge 1966, 45, #24 (Hs.-Eg.); SISAJa I, #114 (Hs.-Bura); Mkr. 1987, 282 (Hs.-Som.); Blz. 1989 MS Om., 25, #88 (Rif-Som.-Hs.); Skn. 1992, 353; 1996, 26 (Hs.-Som.-Eg.); HCVA 2, #144 (Brb.-Hs.-Bura); Takács 1997, 251–252, #3.7; 1997, 372, #c (NBrb.-LECu.-Ch.-?Eg.). Note that Ar. (dialectal) *barbur “penis” might be a secondary euphemism, cf. Ar. (Oman) barbur “penis” [Lsl.], (Dathina) barb r “penis” [Lsl.], which are usually equated with MSA. Sqt. berbéroh “thigh” [Lsl.] | Gurage: Mhr. bǎrrǎ, Goggot & Soddo bǎrrǎ etc. “thigh” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 94; 1945, 240; 1979, 149; Chn. 1970, 81), which derive from AA *b-r “thigh” [GT], cp. NOm.: Kaffa barbor- “coscia (thigh)” [Crl. 1951, 415] = b6rbor- “Schinbein” [Rn. 1888, 273] || SOm.: Ari bar “thigh” [Bnd. 1994, 160] || WCh.: Ron *f^war “thigh” [GT]; Sha fw6∞ [*-r], Daffo-Butura fūūr, Bokkos ’af6òr, Kulere faráw (Ron: Jng. 1970, 139, 214, 285, 352; JI 1994 II, 324) || CCh.: Bata-Garwa b ré “Unterschenkel” [Str. 1922–23, 117]. For Sem.-Kaffa: Lsl. 1979, 149; Mlt. 1984, 19. It cannot be excluded that AA *b-r “penis” [GT] was related to AA *b-r “thigh” [GT] on the PAA level. Most recently, N. Skinner (1996, 26) and A. Ju. Militarev (1999, 4, #2) connected certain reflexes of AA *bur- “penis” to Sem. *?ibar-(at-) “membrum virile” [Mlt.]: PBHbr. & NHbr. ? ber “membre (viril)” [DRS], NHbr. ?ebr ha-mm n “membrum virile” [Šapiro 1963, 17] | JPAr. ?br “penis” [Sokoloff], JAram. ? b r ~ ? b6r “limb, membrum genitale” [Jastrow], Syr. ?ebr “member” [Brk.] || Ar. ?ibr-at- “penis, verge” [BK] (Sem.: DRS 5; Mlt. 1999 MS, 4, #2), which is

questionable, since these forms might be equally explained from Sem. *ʔbr “être fort” [DRS 5]. On the other hand, we cannot exclude an euphemistic origin of the meaning “penis” from the original sense “member, body part, limb” of P_{Sem}. *ʔibar-(at)-, which is also attested. I am afraid that it would be premature to reconstruct the original meaning of the P_{Sem}. word as “membrum virile” as Militarev suggests. M. Lamberti (1993, 333) equated Janjero (Yemsa) burʔà “penis” with LECu.: Saho-Afar buḍḍ-e “penis” | Oromo biṭtoʔ “penis”, which Lamberti derived from OCu. *buḍ-/ *muḍ- “sprossen” (!). Note also that some of the reflexes of AA *b-r “penis” [GT] were sometimes alternatively equated with MEg. b33.wt “virility” (MK, FD), see: Hodge 1966, 45, #24 (Hs.-Eg.); IS 1966, 18 (Hs.-Eg.); SISAJa I, #114 (Eg -Hs.-Bura); Skn. 1992, 353; 1996, 26 (Hs.-Som.-Eg.); HCVA 2, #144 (Eg.-Brb.-Hs.-Bura); HSED #339 (Eg.-Hs.-Bura); Takács 1997, 372, #c (Eg.-LECu.-WCh.).

⁵⁰ NBrb.: Shilh a-bellu “verge” [Jst. 1914, 115] = a-bellu, a-bellul, a-bʕalul “verge (membre viril)” [DRB], Sus a-bellu [Wlf.], Mzg. a-bllul “penis” [Bst.] = a-bellu “verge, pénis” [DRB] | Warain a-belul [Wlf.], Senhazha a-b l l “verge, penis”, dimin. t -b ʒ- t, pl. t -b l- t “petite verge d’enfant” [Rns.], Rif a-blul “verge, pénis” [DRB], Iznasen a-bežläl [dissim.] “verge, penis” [Rns.], Mzab ta-bəllal-t, pl. ti-bəllal-in “pénis, verge, membre viril” [Dlh. 1984, 7] (NBrb.: Rns. 1932, 294; Wlf. 1955, 47; DRB 1, 55–56, 159) || WBrb.: Zenaga a-boži [ž reg. < *i] “penis” [Zhl. 1942–43, 86] || LECu.: Arbore ball-á (f) “penis” [Hayward 1984, 346] || NOM.: Basketo búlli “penis” [Flm.], Doko bulli “penis” [Flm.] (NOM.: Blz. 2000, 188, #30) || SOM.: Dime bull-o “penis” [Bnd. 1994, 156] || WCh.: Bokkos ḥwél (f), pl. ḥwélál [b- < *C-b-?] “penis” [Jng. 1970, 140] | Bole bola “penis” [IS, not in Schuh 1978; Krf. 1981] || CCh.: Bata bóla “verge” [Mch. 1950, 39], Bata-Garwa b llé “männl. Glied” [Str. 1922–23, 118] | Kotoko: (?) Gulfei belewe “männl. Geschlechtsteil” [Roeder apud Lks. 1937, 148]. Areal parallels: SWMande: e.g., Mende mbùlú “penis” [Mkr.] etc., IE *b^h₁-no- “membrum virile” [IEW 120–121], (?) Drv. *pull- “penis” [DED 4309]. Note that V. M. Illi -Svity (1966, 18) identified Eg. b3C & Bole bola & Shilh a-bellu with Sem. *paC- “testicle”, which is not too convincing either phonologically (AA *b- ÑSem. *p- plus metathesis) or semantically, although the meaning “testicle” is attested only in Syr., while the same root in MSA means “penis” (MSA: Lsl. 1938, 335; Jns. 1977, 31; 1981, 54; 1987, 90). The AA etymology of the underlying Sem. root is provided by ECh.: PDangla-Migama *p le “penis” [GT]: WDangla p lè [Fédry 1971, 59] = p l [Mkr.], EDangla pèlè [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 241], Karbo p lé [Mkr.] (ECh.: Mkr. 1987, 282). Some linguists (Mkr. 1987, 282; Blz. 1989, 25, #88; Skn. 1992, 353; 1996, 26; HCVA #128; Blz. 2000, 188, #30) compare the reflexes of AA *b-l “penis” with ES: Amh. bəllət “part of body, sexual organ”, Grg.: Soddo bəllət “cut of meat, sexual organ” (ES: Lsl. 1979, 142), which is false, since – as stated by W. Leslau (l.c.) – these data ultimately derive from Sem. *blt “to cut”. Similarly, Akk. bātu “1. Scham (v. Mann und Frau), 2. Potenz, 3. Lebenskraft” [AHW] = baltu ~ bultu “Schamteile (männliche und weibliche)” [Holma] = baltu ~ bultu “pudenda” [Alb.] cannot have anything in common with AA *b-l (contra Blz. 1989 MS Om., 25, #88), since it derives from Akk. bātu < Sem. *bwt & *bht “to be ashamed, shy” (Holma 1911, 95; Alb. 1919, 183; AHW 112). V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (HSED #8) and N. Skinner (1996, 26) identified certain reflexes of AA *b-l “penis” (WCh.: Bks. ḥwel || CCh.: Bata bolle) with Eth.-Sem. *ʔabal: Geez ʔabāl “genitals” [OS] = “1. (piece of) flesh, 2. member (of body, community), limb, 3. genitals, 4. self, person” [Lsl.], Tigre ርabəl “sexual organ” [Lsl.], Amh. & Grg. abal “1. (member of the) body, 2. sexual organ” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1987, 3). The shift of meaning in the ES root was, however, clearly “member of body” “genitals” (as usually) and not *vice versa*. V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 25, #88; 1992, 155; 2000, 188, #30) reconstructs AA *bulC- (with regard to Eg. b3C), from which in his view AA *bull- might have originated by assim. Some scholars equated the reflexes of AA *b-l “penis” alternatively with Eg. b33.wt “virility” (MK, FD), cf. SISAJa I, #114 (Eg.-Bole); Blz. 1989, 25, #88 (Akk.-Soddo-Brb.-Arbore-NOM.-Ch.-Eg.). The reflexes of AA *b-l “penis” were sometimes (Wlf. 1955, 47; Blz. 1989, 25, #88; HCVA 2, #128; Skn. 1996, 26) mistakenly compared with Eg. bnn “to beget”, which is most probably cognate with Sem. *bny “to build”. A. B. Dolgopolsky (1967, 8, #4) equated Bole bola with LECu.: Afar mulli “penis” and even

comparative literature).⁵¹ Note that some of the authors⁵² confused certain reflexes of AA *b-r vs. *b-l “penis”.

- (3) I would not exclude either that proper meaning of Eg. b3ċ [< *brċ?] was *‘virga (virilis)’, and that it was identical with NWSem.: Ug. brċ ‘barre’ [DRS], Hbr. bər ċ ‘Riegel: 1. Querholz z. Verbinden der Bretter, 2. Querbalken z. Verschließen d. Tor, bei Festungen’ [GB] = ‘barre, verrou’ [DRS], Aram. (Palm.) br∞ ‘verrouilleur (?)’ [DRS] (Sem.: GB 115; DRS 83).

Eg. p3ḥ ‘kratzen (in die Augen)’ (PT 440d, Wb I 498, 13) = ‘to scratch’ (FD 87) = ‘kratzen (in Augen)’ (GHWb 272): rendered by A. Ember (1912, 87-88; 1913, 112; 1930, #15.a.5) in ESS 81, #15.a.5 as Eg. p3ḥ ‘to strike’ and considered to be a metathesis of Eg. pḥ3 ‘to cleave’, which he identified with Sem. *plċ ‘to cleave’ and Ar. falaḥa. False. If we take the correct meaning of PT p3ḥ, we find its cognates in Ch. *p-r-k ~ var. *b-r-k ‘to scratch’ [GT].⁵³ The equation of Ch. *p-r-k and Eg. p3ḥ points to AA *p-r-q ‘to scratch’ [GT], in which the third radical might be eventually a root extension from a bicons. AA *p-r ‘to scratch’ [GT], cf. CCh.: Mafa-Mada *fur ‘to scratch’ [Rsg. 1978, 320, #610] || ECh.: Migama pòrrò ‘griffer’, cf. pùrrùn ‘ongle, griffe’ [JA 1992, 117].

Eg. pn.w ‘Maus’ (OK, Wb I 508, 6–10) = ‘1. Nagetier, 2. Maus, Ratte’ (GHWb 277), hence Dem. pn ‘Maus’ (DG 131, 10) Cpt. (SA) PIN, (S) PEN, (B) VIN (m) ‘mouse’ (CD 263a; CED 125; KHW 147): following A. Ember, most authors⁵⁴

Hausa bùùráá ‘penis’, which is phonologically to be rejected. It may well be that AA *S-m-b-l ‘foreskin’ [GT] was orig. a genitive compound of AA *S-m ‘skin’ [GT] (cf. Ch. *z-m ‘skin’ [GT]) and AA *b-l ‘penis’ [GT] (as suggested in Blz. l.c., Skn. l.c.), cp. Bed. šimbili ‘foreskin’ [Rpr., not in Rn. 1895] || WCh.: Dera zumbulum ‘foreskin’ [Skn.] || CCh.: Bura zumbulum ‘foreskin’ [Skn.]. Thus we can deduce also an unattested Bed. *bili ‘penis’ [Blz.], Dera and Bura *bul ‘penis’. The final -um in Dera & Bura zumbulum might be identical with the AA body part suffix *-um (observed by G. Takács 1997 in Ar., Brb., Ch.). K. Naït-Zerrad (DRB 1, 55) compares Brb. *b-l-l ‘penis’ [GT] to NHbr. ? ber ‘pénis, verge, membre viril’ etc. (cf. DRS 5), which is clearly false (cf. NB2 of #3 in this entry).

⁵¹ See IS 1966, 18 (Eg.-Bole-Shilh); Mkr. 1987, 282 (CCh.-Soddo-Bokkos-ECh.-Mande); Blz. 1989, 25, #88 (Akk.-Soddo-Brb.-Arbore-NOm.-WCh.-CCh.-?Dangla); 1989, 202 (Brb.-Arbore--NOm.-Bole); 1992, 155 (LECu.-NOm.-?Eg.-Brb.-WCh.); 2000, 188, #30 (Eg.-Arbore-Om.-Ch.-NBrb. + areal parallels); Skn. 1992, 353; 1996, 26 (WCh.-Dangla-Arbore-Bed.-NOm.-Soddo-Brb.); HCVA 2, #128 (ES-NBrb.-Bole); Takács 1997, 252, #3.7.1 (Eg.-AA).

⁵² IS 1966, 16; Dlg. 1967, 8, #4; Mkr. 1987, 282; Skn. 1996, 26; Blz. 2000, 188, #30.

⁵³ Attested in CCh.: Mada fròh fròh [-h < *k?] ‘se gratter’ [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 105] || ECh.: Kera pírki ‘kratzen’ [Ebert 1976, 88] | Bidiya perékrèk ‘se gratter l’oreille (chien)’ [AJ 1989, 107], WDangla pòrkè ‘égratigner’ [Fédry 1971, 68]. A PCh. var. root *b-r-k ‘to scratch’ [GT] is preserved in WCh.: Angas burk ‘to scratch, scratching’ [ALC 1978, 5, not listed in Flk. 1915 & Jng. 1962 MS] | Tala birk ‘(finger)nail’ [Csp. 1994, 27] || CCh.: Mbara mbròk ‘to scratch’ [TSI 1986, 199, 256, 288], cf. perhaps Vulum ùrkí [*mburki?] ‘égratigner’ [TSL]. WCh.: SBauchi: Tala furgu & Zungur furgu ‘to rub’ [Csp. 1994, 31] are probably unrelated. For the Eg.-Ch. match cf. HSED #1988 (Eg.-Kera); Takács 1998, 159, #4.5 (Eg.-Kera); EEWC (Eg.-Ch.).

⁵⁴ Lit.: Ember 1911, 90; 1926, 302, fn. 10; 1930, #8.a.18 (Eg.-Ar.); Alb. 1918, 250, #106

equated it mistakenly with Sem. *paʔr- “mouse, rat” [Frz.]⁵⁵ and certain reflexes of its var. root, AA *b-r ~ *b-ʔ-r “mouse, rat” [GT].⁵⁶ Already V. É. Orel (1993, 41; HSED #267 & #1913) has excluded Eg. pnw from the discussion of the AA root for “rat”. This Eg.-AA comparison was firmly rejected by G. Takács (1999, 20–21) as phonologically impossible.⁵⁷ Eg. pn.w is most probably cognate with CCh.: Gude póoyànə “type of mouse” [Hsk. 1983, 260] = p yan “mouse specimen” [Skn.] || ECh.: Somray bápíní (f) “souris sp. (petite)” [Jng. 1993 MS] as suggested by N. Skinner (1996, 31: Gude-Eg.) and G. Takács (1999, 21: Eg.-Dhl.-Gude). The etymology of SCu.: Dhl. (Sanye) pánia “rat” [Flm. 1964, 74] = mpanye “rat” [Ehret 1974, 66] = *mbánye “rat” [EEN 1989, 45] is dubious, being presumed to be of Bantu origin. Takács (1999, 21) did not exclude a relationship to WCh.: Angas-Sura *fʷan, var. *fʷen (?) (mostly with prefixes *da-/*də- or *ka-) “hare” [GT] = *d 1-fw1an [Stl. 1977] = *fʷan [Dlǵ.] = *fwAn (< *fiwan?) “hare (a)” [Stl. 1987]⁵⁸ either as the semantic shift is not impossible, cf. Ik or “rat

(Eg.-Ar.); Holma 1919, 38 (Eg.-Sem.); Farina 1924, 325 (Sem.-Eg.); Behnk 1928, 139, #24 (Eg.-Ar.); Clc. 1936, #379 (Eg.-Sem.); Vrg. 1945, 136, #9.c.2 (Eg.-Sem.); Chn. 1947, #359 (Sem.-Eg.); Ward 1960, 325, fn. 28 (Eg.-Sem.); Pls. 1960, 119, #98 (Sem.-Eg.-Hs.); IS 1966, 29 (Eg.-Hs.-Smr.-Sem.) (adopted in Blz. 1984, 445, fn. 10); Gouffé 1974, 365 (Hs.-Eg.-Sem.); Mlt. 1976, 23, #3 (Sem.-Eg.-PCh.); SISAJa I, #47 (Sem.-Sml.-?Eg.-Hs.-ECh.); MM 1983, 256 (Sem.-Hs.-Smr.-?Figig); Djk. etc. 1986, 22; 1992, 12 (Sem.-Sml.-Eg.-Hs.-Tmk.); OS 1988, 78 (Sem.-Hs.-Tmk.); Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 50 (Sem.-NBrb.-Hs.-ECh.); HCVA 1, #48 (Sem.-?Eg.-Hs.-ECh.); Orel 1993, 41 (Sem.-NBrb.-Hs.-Smr.); HSED #267 (Ar.-Sml.-ECh.) & #1913 (Sem.-Hs.); Skn. 1996, 31 (Ch.-Eg.-Sem.); Takács 1999, 20–21 (Sem.-NBrb.-Ch. rejected).

⁵⁵ Attested in Akk. (a/jB) p r r tu “kleine Maus, Hausmaus” [Landsberger 1934, 106-107, #c] = “Hausmaus” [AHW 856] | Ebl. ba-ra-tum [*paʔr-at-um] (é Sum. nin.pés) “mouse” [Frz. 1984, 138] || (?) Hbr. *p r , pl. p r t [GB 657] || Ar. f r - ~ faʔr- “rat, mouse” [Blv., Lsl.] || ES: Harari f r “mouse, rat” [Lsl.], Amh. fərfər “kind of field-mouse” [Lsl.], Gurage: Ennemor & Endegeny & Gyeto fuʔur etc. “mouse, rat” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1945, 154; 1963, 63; 1979, 226). Note that W. Leslau (1945, 154) derived Amh. fərfər “kind of field-mouse” from fərfərə “to dig”, cf. also Eth.-Sem. *fVlfVl “mole” [GT] (ES: Apl. 1977, 43/85). There may be also a WCh. cognate to Sem. *paʔr-, cf. perhaps Mupun pəpéer “hedgehog” [Frj. 1991, 51].

⁵⁶ Which has been preserved in Ar. birr- “mouse, rat” [Mlt.] || NBrb.: Semlal a-bərr n “polecat” [Mlt.] | Figig bubara, pl. i-bubar “bat (chauve-souris)” [Ksm. > DRB 1, 95] || WCh. Hausa bééréáá “mouse, rat”, cf. dām báryà “any rat” [Abr. 1962, 86, 95] = ɓera ~ ɓira [Pls.] || CCh.: Hurzo kùm-bár “rat” (for kum- cf. Mada akúmǵà) [Rsg. 1978, 310, #563] || ECh.: Somray dé-ber “rat” [Lks. 1937, 77] = d -ver [Skn.] (prefix d-, cf. d -lesu “tongue”), Tumak bər n “souris” [Cpr. 1975, 49] = bórán (sic) “mouse” [SISAJa] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 270–71). Areal parallel: L. Reinisch (1874, 119) compared Eg. pnw to Nile Nub.: Mahasi bru “mouse”. In order to explain the anomaly of the initial AA *p- vs. *b-, the Russian team of Diakonoff (Mlt. 1976, 23, #3; SISAJa I, #47; Djk. etc. 1986, 22; OS 1988, 78; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 50; Djk. 1992, 12; HCVA 1, #48; Blv. 1995, 32) set up an initial glottalized *p̥- in this PAA root (rejected in HSED #1913).

⁵⁷ Eg. -n- ÑSem./AA *-r- (the parallels in Ember 1926, 302, fn. 10 for Eg. -n- vs. Sem. *-r- are unacceptable). Eventually, are we dealing here with a “heteroclitic” interchange of -n- ~ -r- as in Sem. *t-n ~ *t-r “two” and Sem. *b-n ~ *b-r “son”? The Russian linguists (SISAJa I, #47; Djk. etc. 1986, 22; 1992, 12) explained Eg. pn.w from an earlier *p3n.w < PEg. *p̥ir-n-, which can hardly convince.

⁵⁸ Attested in Angas ka-fwan “Hase” [Jng. 1962 MS, 16] = (ka)-fwan “hare, rabbit” [Hfm.] = nka-fwan “hare” [ALC 1978, 47] = nka-fwan “rabbit” [Krf.], Sura fwan “Hase”, dāa-fwan “Hase in Fabeln” [Jng. 1963, 62, 66] = fwan ~ daa-fwan “hare, rabbit” [Hfm.], Mupun dà-fwán “hare”, dè-f an

specimen” < PKuliak * or “hare” [Heine 1975–76, 51]. In the light of the Coptic evidence (pointing to an original OEg. -n) somewhat weaker is the second alternative for Eg. (mentioned by G. Takács 1999, 21), namely, Eg. pn.w < AA *p-l (or sim.) “rat” [GT],⁵⁹ which has var. roots with voiced *b- in Chadic.⁶⁰

Eg. pth “1. zu Boden werfen (PT), 2. sich niederwerfen (MK)” (PT, Wb I 565-6) = “1. to cast (to the ground), put down (s’one carried) (PT), 2. be stretched out (in obeisance) (XVIII.)” (FD 96):⁶¹ H. Holma (1919, 38) and A. Ember (1926, 302, fn. 10; 1930, #25.a.4), followed by F. von Calice (1936, 277, #194) treated as a metathesis of *h̥tp, which they identified with Akk. ḥat pu D “niederhauen, niederwerfen” [Holma]. Semantically unconvincing.⁶² Instead, Eg. pth is most probably cognate with SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr fətəqq-ət “tomber par terre (fruits, en abondance)”, Ayr tə-ftəqq-et, pl. tyə-ftəqqa “chute par terre”, EWlm. & Ayr fətəktək “tomber en grande quantité (pluie, fruits etc.)” [PAM 71] ||| HECu.: Sidamo fottoqa “to fall down” [quoted by Skn. 1996, 62, not found in Crl. 1938 II, Hds. 1989] ||| CCh.: Mofu-Gudur -pótk- “laisser tomber des déchets, vanner” [Br. 1988, 222] < AA *p-t-Q “to (let) fall” [GT].

“hare” [Frj. 1991, 11, 13], Kofyar dà-fan ~ doè-fan [dà-] “rabbit” [Ntg. 1967, 6] = (da)-fan “hare, rabbit” [Hfm.], Mushere di-fwan “hare” [Dkl. 1997 MS] = di-fwan “hare” [Jng. 1999 MS, 3], Chip dā-fwən “rabbit” [Krf.], Montol fwen (so, -e-) “rabbit” [Ftp. 1911, 219] = fwən (so, -ē-) “Hase”, dāa-fw n “personifizierter Hase” [Jng. 1965, 171], Goemai fwan “rabbit” [Ftp. 1911, 219] = fuan “hare, rabbit” [Srl. 1937, 52] = f an [f - reg. < *f^w-] “Hase, Kaninchen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 1] = fuan [füan < *f^wan] “hare, rabbit” [Hfm.] = fīwən (so, -ə- for -a-! error?) “rabbit” [Krf.] = f an [füan, reg. < *f^w- via *fū[?]-] “rabbit” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 9] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 18, #33; Stl. 1972, 184; 1977, 153, #30; 1987, 240–241, #8; Krf. 1981, #167).

⁵⁹ Attested in LECu.: Oromo fuli? “rat” [Gragg 1982, 456] || SCu.: (?) Qwadza pala-tiko [unless l < *r] “fat-mouse” [Ehret 1980 MS, 2] ||| ECh.: Bidiya pa?ila “rat gris de dos et blanc de ventre, le plus petit de tous” [AJ 1989, 106] | perhaps Mubi fólóók (compound?) “rat géant (Xerus erythropus)” [Jng. 1990 MS, 15]. From AA *p-[?]-l ~ *p-l-[?] “rat” [GT]? Cf. also Eth.-Sem. *fVlFVl “mole” [GT] (ES data: Apl. 1977, 43/85)? Areal parallels: Common Niger-Congo & Nilo-Saharan (“Niger-Saharan”) *-fil- “rat, mouse” [Blench 1998, cf. Grb. 1963, 156], NBantoid: Len vīl, Ngubin vīlp “rat” (Blench MS n.d., 23, #49). L. Reinisch (1874, 119) connected Eg. pnw to Nilotic: Kunama fīlā “mouse” [Rn. 1890, 44].

⁶⁰ (1) Ch. *b-l “rat” [GT]: WCh.: Tangale b̥l̥l̥ “rat specimen (near riverside and sometimes in the house)” [Jng. 1991, 72] || ECh.: Lele bóòló “souris des maisons” [WP 1982, 7] | Mokilko báláà á “rat sp. (de brousse, assez gros)” [Jng. 1990, 62]. (2) Ch. *b-l “rat” [JS 1981, 212 D]: WCh.: Daffo-Butura b̥l̥yân (m) “schwarze Maus” [Jng. 1970, 213] || ECh.: (?) WDangla kibilo [prefix ki-?] “small rat specimen” [Fédry/Skn.].

⁶¹ The Dem.-Cpt. reflex (if any) is debated. J. Osing (1976, 68) connected Eg. pth to Dem. ph̥t “niederwerfen” (DG 139, 6) Cpt. (SA₂F) PWH=T, (B) VWq=T, (A) PW|=T “to bend self, fall” (CD 283a) = “niederbeugen, sich beugen, niederfallen, sich ausstrecken, sich niederwerfen, fallen” (KHW 158), while J. erný (CED 132) and W. Westendorf (KHW l.c.) explained these from OEg. p3hd. Perhaps we are dealing with a contamination of the two OEg. roots in Dem.-Cpt.?

⁶² W. von Soden (AHW l.c.) rendered Akk. (bab., m/nA) ḥat pu as G “schlachten”, D “als hitpu-Opfer darbringen” [AHW 336], which corresponds to Hbr. ḥtp qal “fortreißen” [GB 269], JAram. & Syr. ptC “zerbrechen” [GB].

* * *

Abbreviations of languages and related terms

(A): Ahmimic, AA: Afro-Asiatic (Afrasian, Semito-Hamitic), Akk.: Akkadian, Alg.: Alagwa, Amh.: Amhara, Ar.: Arabic, Aram.: Aramaic, AS: Angas-Sura, (B) Bohairic, BAram.: Biblical Aramaic, Bch.: Bauchi, Bed.: Bed'awye (Beja), Brb.: Berber, Brg.: Burunge, BT: Bole-Tangale, C: Central, Ch.: Chadic, Cpt.: Coptic, CT: Coffin Texts, Cu.: Cushitic, Dem.: Demotic, Dhl.: Dahalo, E: East, Ebl.: Eblaite, Eg.: Egyptian, ES: Ethio-Semitic, ESA: Epigraphic South Arabian, Eth.: Ethiopian, Eth.-Sem.: Ethio-Semitic, (F): Fayyumic, Gdm.: Ghadames, Gmc.: Germanic, GR: Ptolemaic and Roman period, Grg.: Gurage, Grw.: Gorowa, H: Highland (in Cushitic), Hbr.: Hebrew, Hgr.: Ahaggar, Hrs.: Harsusi (in MSA), IE: Indo-European, Irq.: Iraqw, JAram.: Jewish or Judeo-Aramaic, Jbl.: Jibbali, L: Late or Low(land), Lit.: literary texts, lit.: literature, LP: Late Period, M: Middle, Mag.: magical texts, Math.: mathematical papyri, mB: Middle Babylonian, Med.: medical texts, MK: Middle Kingdom, MSA: Modern South Arabian, N: New, N: North, NE (or NEg.): New Egyptian, Nil.: Nilotic, NK: New Kingdom, NS: Nilo-Saharan, O: Old, OK: Old Kingdom, Om.: Omotic, OSA: Old South Arabian, OT: Old Testament, P: Proto-, PB: Post-Biblical, PT: Pyramid Texts, Qwd.: Qwadza, S: South, (S): Sahidic, Sab.: Sabaeen, Sem.: Semitic, Sgt.: Soqotri, Syr.: Syriac, TA(ram.): Aramaic of Talmud, Ug.: Ugaritic, W: West, Wlm.: Tawllemed.

Abbreviations of author names

Abr.: Abraham, AJ: Alio & Jungraithmayr, Ajh.: Ajhenval'd, Alb.: Albright, Apl.: Appleyard, Ast.: Aistleitner, BA: Birru & Adal, BG: Bechhaus-Gerst, BK: Bieberstein Kazimirsky, Blv.: Belova, Blz.: Blažek, Bmh.: Bomhard, Bnd.: Bender, Brg.: Bargery, Brk.: Brockelmann, Brt.: Barreteau, Chn.: Cohen, Clc.: Calice, Cpr.: Caprile, Crl.: Cerulli, Dbr.-Mnt.: Djibrine & Montgolfier, Djk.: D'jakonov, Dkl.: Diyakal, Dlg.: Dolgopolsky, Dlh.: Delheure, Dlt.: Dallet, Dst.: Destaign, EEN. Ehret & Elderkin & Nurse, Ehr.: Ehret, Fcd.: Foulkes, Flk.: Foulkes, Flm.: Fleming, Frj.: Frajzyngier, Frz.: Fronzaroli, GB: Gesenius & Buhl, Grb.: Greenberg, Grd.: Gardiner, Gsp.: Gasparini, GT: Takács, Hds.: Hudson, Hfm.: Hoffmann, Hlw.: Hellwig, IL: Institute of Linguistics, IS: Illi -Svity, JFQ: Quack, JI: Jungraithmayr & Ibrizimow, Jng.: Jungraithmayr, Jns.: Johnstone, KB: Koehler & Baumgartner, KM: Kogan & Militarev, Krf.: Kraft, Lks.: Lukas, Lmb.: Lamberti, Lnf.: Lanfry, Lns.: Lenssen, LS: Lamberti & Sottile, Lsl.: Leslau, Mgw.: Maghway, Mkr.: Mukarovsky, Mlt.: Militarev, MM: Majzel' & Militarev, Mrc.: Mercier, Msc.: Moscati, Ncl.: Nicolas, Nct.: Nachtigal, Nhl.: Nehlil, NM: Newman & Ma, Ntg.: Netting, Nwm.: Newman, OS: Orel & Stolbova, PAM: Prasse & Alojaly & Mohamed, PG: Pillinger & Galboran, Prh.:

Porhomovsky, Prs.: Prasse, Rn.: Reinisch, Rns.: Renisio, Rpr.: Roper, Rsg.: Rossing, Rsl.: Rössler, Skn.: Skinner, Smz.: Shimizu, Snd.: Schneider, Snk.: Schenkel, Srl.: Sirlinger, Ss.: Sasse, Stl.: Stolbova, Str.: Strümpell, Trn.: Tourneux, Vcl.: Vycichl, Vrg.: Vergote, Wlf.: Wölfel, WP: Weibegué & Palayer, Zbr.: Zaborski, Zhl.: Zyhlarz, Zvd.: Zavadovskij.

For a detailed list of the quoted literature see the second part of this paper to be published in the following issue of AOV.

Gábor TAKÁCS, Ph.D. (gabtak@datatrans.hu), Research Fellow, Institute of Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences