

GÁBOR TAKÁCS

Layers of the Oldest Egyptian Lexicon II

Abstract

The papers of this series examine various domains of the Egyptian core lexicon in order to gather evidence for ascertaining to what degree the basic vocabulary is rather of clearly Semitic vs. African cognacy. The second part of my series focuses on the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology from the head to the upper torso not yet examined in the first issue.

Keywords: Ancient Egyptian Language, anatomical terminology, Semitic languages, African languages

Introduction

The first paper of this series¹ was generated by the controversies of P. Lacau's (1970) old observation on a binary opposition of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology, the much-quoted and thus exemplified basic terms of which I re-examined from the head to the upper torso in the context of many new results issuing from current progress in Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) comparative linguistics in order to see to what degree this segment of the lexicon is shared by lexemes of clearly Semitic cognacy vs. those evidently relating to African parallels. The etymological examination of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology presented therein has corroborated a surprising distribution: one member of the synonymous pairs is usually a Semitic word, whereas the other one(s) have non-Semitic cognate(s) solely attested in some of the African branches of our language macrofamily.

¹ „Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon I” was published in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Warszawa) 68/1 (2015), 85-139. It is with gratitude that I acknowledge the support of the Bolyai research fellowship (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, reg. no.: BO / 00360 / 12) facilitating my project on Egyptian linguogenesis.

A relatively deeper presence of the extra-Semitic vocabulary in Egyptian has become apparent. As the introductory part only contained the classical instances, the famous pairs like „eye”, „ear”, „hand”, extended onto some further items where the binary opposition is also to be observed like the basic terms „head”, „hair”, it was already then obvious that the rest of the anatomical terminology and other domains of the core vocabulary are also to be examined. This second part of the series „Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon” is devoted to an etymological research in the field of body parts on the head and the upper torso, i.e., the same area as what was targeted in the first part. The difference is that – leaving the well-known Semitic vs. African pairs for the basic terms behind – here, we study rather the origins of either the specific anatomical terms or those for body parts not yet set in this context the aim being the same: to clear if the binary opposition of Semitic vs. African cognates worked here too, or, if not, whether the Semitic or African component is overwhelming in this domain of the Egyptian core lexicon.

„(Plait of) Hair”

Here, additional entries stand for lexical roots in the semantical domain of hair (often with the nuance „plait of hair”), less frequently used than those generic terms examined in the first part of this series. Understandably, only roots with the basic sense „hair” (or sim.) can be considered here, while those with clearly different original root meaning have to be ignored (e.g., Eg. nbd.t, gmḥ.t).²

Eg. j3r.t (hair det.) „1. (XII.) *Haare (vom Tierfell), 2. (CT VII 156f) Seitenlocken (des Gottes)” (GHWb 25; ÄWb II 77b) = j3r.tj (dual) „side-whiskers (?)” (CT VII 156f, DCT 14) > „Stirnschlange des Re” (LP, Wb I 32, 3), cf. perhaps also 3r.t „*Perücke, Kopftuch” (LP, Wb I 11, 17-18), hence denominative *3r „to prepare wig” (unattested), whose nomen actoris might be j3r.tj „*Perückenmacher (nur in Personennamen belegt)” (OK, GHWb 25, cf. PN I 7:1) ||| CCh.: Musgu yiir na mada „Kopfhaar” [Krause] = air vs. áiir vs. iir, pl. yirái ~ yirakái „Haar” (cf. yir „Wolle”, and also: hir na máge-ni „Stirnhaar”, i.e., lit. „Haar seines Kopfes”) [Rohlf] = ayiir „Haar” [Barth] = auyír [Overweg] = ayír [Roeder] = áyər „cheveux” [Mouchet 1950, 31] || ECh.: Mubi álèè, pl. àlè „Haar, Federn, Wolle” [Lukas 1937, 180] = ?áliyò, pl. ?àlè „hair” [Jng. 1973 MS] (Ch. data: JI 1994 II 177).

Eg. wpr.t „Seitenlocke des Kindes” (GR, Wb I 305, 6), attested already in the Coffin Texts (CT II 119e, II 122-123c, VI 131g contra AECT) as wpr.tj (dual) „la double tresse, les deux tresses” (Barguet 1986, 144-145, 541, spell 533 + fn. 216) = „Seitenlocken” (GHWb 193; ÄWb II 660a) = „hair” (DCT 991), has the closest parallels in Sem.: Ar. √wfr I „être abondant, copieux, se trouver en grand nombre” > wafr-at- „2. chevelure abondante, tresse artificielle” (hence Maghrebi wafra „mèche de cheveux”), wāfir-at-

² Deriving from Eg. nbd „flechten” (NE, Wb II 246) vs. gmḥ.t „Schläfe” (CT, Wb V 171, 16-17), resp.

„queue grasse des moutons d’une certaine espèce” [DRS 589 pace BK II 1574-5] = waf-r-at- „hair collected together upon the head, hair hanging down upon the ears, hair extending beyond/to the lobe of the ear or to the ears” [Lane 2956b], Moroccan Ar. wufra „chevelure abondante, chevelure d’homme longue et abondante, mais qui ne descend qu’au niveau de l’oreille, les beaux cheveux noirs abondants d’une femme qui retombent sur le front”, mūfir (adj., poet.) „dotée d’une belle et abondante chevelure qui retombe sur le devant de la tête (femme)” [Premare et al. XII 236–237] ||| ECu.: Dullay-Gollango ufur-kó „Körperhaar” [AMS 1980, 246].³ One wonders whether the same root (via metathesis) hides also in Ar. farw-at- „1. une pelisse, une robe fourrée, 2. peau de la tête, 3. vêtement fait de poil de chameau” [BK II 588] = „Kopfhaut samt Haaren” [Torczyner]⁴ ||| NBrb.: Mzab √fr > tu-frā-t, pl. tu-fra-t-in „mèche bouclée de cheveux” [Dlh. 1984, 50] || EBrb.: Ghadames √fr > ta-frī-t, pl. ta-fra-t-īn „1. mèche de cheveux qui s’arrondit sur le front, 2. languette de chausson ou de chaussure qui recouvre le dessus du pied, ornée ou non de broderies de soie” [Lanfry 1973, 94, #140].

Eg. ḥnzk.t „Haarflechte” (PT-, Wb III 116, 4-8) = „1. Haarzopf, Flechte (der Frau, der Asiaten, der Götter), 2. *Stachelschwanz” (CT, ÄWb II 1715b) > (via metathesis) *ḥnkz.t reflected by ḥnks.tj „die Haarflechte (der Göttin, des Kindes, des fktj Priesters, als Bez. der Schlange)” (GR, WB III 120, 12-14 and 121, 2), ḥnks.t „Frau mit einer Haarflechte” (GR, Wb III 120, 15–121, 1) = „woman with braided hair” (PL 656). The suggestion by W. Vycichl (1938, 134) about the original reading of the Old Egyptian root as ḥnk.t (without root medial -z-) has recently been followed by R. Hannig (ÄWb I 850b and II 1715-6) even in those exx. where -z- was written out alphabetically. There are, however, indeed sporadic instances where -z- was in fact missing during the Middle Kingdom and later, cf. ḥnk.t „seltene Nebenform zu ḥnks.t ’Haarflechte’” (MK, Wb III 120, 10) = „plait of hair” (CED 279) = „braided lock of hair” (CT, DCT 341), hence ḥnk.tj.w „als Nebenform zu ḥnks.tjw die mit einer Haarflechte Versehene” (BD, WB III 120, 11). Strangely, it is this latter root and not the older one with -z- that Eg.

³ It would be tempting to connect the Dullay word with Ar. ʿufr-at- „2. crinière (du lion), long poil du cou (qui se hérisse chez certains animaux, quand ils sont en colère), 3. plumes du cou du coq, qui se dressent quand il est irrité”, ʿifr-āt- „2. cheveux du milieu de la tête”, ʿafra „1. plumes du cou chez le coq qui se dressent et s’ébouriffent quand il est irrité, 2. cheveux du derrière ou du sommet de la tête (chez l’homme), 3. toupet, crins ou poils qui descendent sur le front (chez les bestiaux)” [BK II 297-298], but this comparison is certainly out of the question for phonological reasons, since Sem. *ʿ- = ECu. *ʿ- (EDE I 270) > Dullay *ʿ- (Sasse 1979, 56), which has been neatly preserved as ʿ- in Gollango (AMS 1980, 195). Besides, A.G. Belova (1992, 16; 1998, 14) was disposed rather to see in the Arabic root metathesis to Ar. ʿurf- „12. crinière (du cheval)” and also Sem. *parʿ- „capelli fluenti” [Frz. 1964, 43] = *par(a)ʿ- „hair (on top of the head)” [Belova et al. 1994 MS, #77] = *parʿ- „(loose) hair of the head” [SED I 192, #218]. In addition, I have (EDE II 564-565) related the Semitic roots with LEg. fʿ ~ fʿ3 ~ fʿj (hair det.) „lock of hair” (NE, Pap. Turin 1983, vo. I 47-48, Černý 1958, 210, #6 after I. E. S. Edwards) = „cheveux” (AL 77.1544) = „lock of hair” (DLE I 190) = „Haarlocke” (GHWb 305) – provided it derived from an earlier (*fʿ3 (as is in fact written) < *√fʿr or *f3ʿ < *√fʿ.

⁴ H. Torczyner (1912, 770) linked the Arabic word to Akk. pirtu „Kopfhaar”, which has recently been, however, explained rather from PSem. *parʿ- „(loose) hair of the head” [SED I 192, #218].

h_{nk} „*festbinden” (CT III 378d, ÄWb II 1715b) = „to enwrap (with sheets of linen?)” (AECT I 199, also n. 3 ad spell 260) = „habiller (?)” (Barguet 1986, 224) plus old h_{nk} „Papyrusfloß” (V., ÄWb I 850b) = „Art Floss” (OK and XX., Wb III 220, 7) as well as the late evidence confirm in the form of *√h_{lk} „to plait” (or sim.) [GT] > Dem. h_{lk} „Art Geflecht” (DG 281) vs. h_{rg} ~ h_{rk} „Art Geflecht: Perücke (?)” (DG 280) = „object made in wicker work, wig (?)” (CED)⁵ > Cpt. (SBF) ζωακ „to twist, roll, braid” (CD 668b; CED 279) = „flechten, wi/enden, drehen, wickeln”, also used as a noun (m) in the sense „Flechte, Geflecht, Locke” (KHW 366) = „concinnus comae” (Rn.). It is very difficult at the moment to pass any judgement also among the problematic etymologies proposed for the Egyptian root:

(1) C. Brockelmann (1932, 109, #44) equated it with Ar. ḥazaka „1. serrer, presser, comprimer, 2. entourer et serrer (d’une corde)” [BK I 420] = „zusammenbinden” [Brk.], whose Semitic background is, however, not clear. In addition, this comparison ignores Eg. -n- < *-l-.

(2) E. Zyhlarz (1932-1933, 171), in turn, affiliated it with Bed. hānkūli „der Tituskopf der Beduan, die herabhängenden geflochtenen Haarlocken” [Rn. 1895, 123-4] = hankwīli „long hair that hangs to the shoulder” [Roper 1928, 198] = hankuli „Haarflechtenfrisur” [Zhl.], whose deverbal *Ableitung* is disputed. L. Reinisch (l.c.) derived it from Bed. hankūl „verstricken, flechten, binden”, while E.-M. Roper (l.c.) assumed a connection to Bed. hankwil „youth”. The etymology offered by Reinisch, however, is neatly in accordance with the deverbal derivation of the Egyptian word from *√h_{lk} „to plait” (above).

(3) W. Vycichl (1959, 146, #3; 1990, 17) surmised a relationship with Ar. √qnz^ʿ: I qanza^ʿa „avoir les cheveux dispersés autour de la tête” > qunzu^ʿ-(at)- „cheveux dispersés autour de la tête” vs. √qz^ʿ II „2. raser la tête en y laissant des mèches de cheveux çà et là” > qaz^ʿ- „4. flocons de laine, poil, que les animaux à laine ou à poil laissent tomber au printemps”, quz^ʿ-(at)- „1. mèche de cheveux qu’on a laissée sur la tête d’un petit garçon en la lui rasant, 2. mèche de cheveux laissée sur le sommet de la tête, 3. mèche de cheveux qui descend sur les tempes, boucle”, qazī^ʿ-(at)- „mèche de cheveux laissée au sommet de la tête”, ʔaqza^ʿu „qui mue, qui a mué et perdu de la laine, du poil (mouton, bouc)”, muquzza^ʿ- „3. qui a peu de crin au toupet (cheval)” [BK II 733-4, 821] = qunzu^ʿ- ~ qanza^ʿ-(at)- ~ qunza^ʿ-(at)- ~ qunzu^ʿ-(at)- ~ qinzi^ʿ-(at)- „la touffe de cheveux qu’on laisse sur le sommet de la tête du garçon quand on la rase ou bien cheveux longs, reste de plumes, coccyx, crête du coq, crête huppe, coiffure de femme” [Dozy II 411] = quz^ʿ-(at)- ~ qunzu^ʿ-(at)- ~ qundu^ʿ-(at)- „lock of hair” [Vcl., Lsl.] = qurzu/a^ʿ-(at)- ~ qunzu/a^ʿ-(at)- ~ qurzul- „la touffe de cheveux au lieu de la tête rasée” [Landberg 1923, 1331], Modern Lit. Ar. qunzu^ʿa ~ qanza^ʿa ~ qinzi^ʿa „Haarbüschel, Hahnenkamm” [Wehr 1952, 706], Yemeni qunza^ʿah „knot of hair peculiar to little boys” [Piamenta 1990-1, 414] || Geez q^wənzā^ʿt „lock/tuft of hair, ringlet, braid, plaited hairdo” [Lsl.] (Sem. data: Leslau 1987,

⁵ Due to a merger of ḥ > h in Late Egyptian, Roman Demotic and hieroglyphic texts confuse ḥ and h (cf. Lacau 1965, 12f.; Vergote 1973 Ib, §28h). For the weakening of old pharyngeal ḥ to laryngeal h beginning from the end of the New Kingdom (Ramesside) cf. NBÄ 367f., n. 47.

438). But Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{knz}}^{\text{c}}$ is little compatible with Eg. $\sqrt{\text{hnzk}}$. Secondly, the basic sense of the Arabic root („top, peak”) is hardly equal to that of our Egyptian root („to plait”).

(4) G. Takács (2000, 152, #174; 2000, 335, #1.9) ventured a comparison of the supposed Eg. * $\sqrt{\text{hlzk}}$ „to plait” with SBrb. * $\sqrt{\text{zlnk}}$ „peigner” [GT].⁶ As a rule, AA * h has become in Berber either * h (Militarev 1991, 243) or it has been lost (EDE I 270).

Eg. sw.t ~ zj.t „Zopf (?), Locke (?), Haarlocke (?)” (CT, GHWb 664, 674; ÄWb II 2099 and 2131) = sw.t „lock of hair” vs. zj.t „var. of sw.t (?)” (DCT 459) ||| PBrb. *zaw „hair” [GT]⁷ ||| WCh.: Ron *swV ~ *syV „hair” [GT]: Fyer so, Bokkos syah [secondary -h?], Daffo-Butura swé (Ron: Jng. 1970, 387) | Bole-Tangale *sow- „hair” [GT]⁸ | Nbauchi *sawa „tail” [GT]⁹ || CCh.: Margi šùù „tail” [IL] = šù [Hfm.] | PBata *sew- „hair” [GT]¹⁰ | Logone (Kotoko) zúee „tail” [Nct./Lks.] | Zime-Batna čyáw „tail” [Jng.] = céo (tséo) [Scn.] (Ch. data: JI 1994 II 176-177 and 316-317). The correspondence of Brb. *z- = Eg. s- < AA *c- is regular. The underlying Afro-Asiatic root may be projected as * $\sqrt{\text{cw}}$ „hair” [GT]. For the semantical shift „(lock of) hair” → *“(hair of) tail” cf. Eg. dbn.t (below).

Eg. šnbj „hair (?)” (MK, Wb IV 514, 5) ||| HECu. *šomba „(pubic) hair” [Hds. 1989, 421; cf. Lsl. 1988, 199] ||| CCh.: Sukur šimbut „hair” [Meek] = šumbùt [IL in JI 1994 II, 177] < SAA * $\sqrt{\text{šnb}}$ [GT]. These external parallels seem to justify the assumption that Eg. šnbj was not merely a miswritten form of Eg. šn „hair” (for the latter see part I of this series).

Eg. dbn.t „Haarflechte (besonders des Kindes: Seitenzopf)” (NK, GR, Wb V 438, 16) = „lock of hair” (FD 311) = „Haarlokke, Seitenzopf (des Kindes)” (GHWb 975) has been traditionally considered as just a metathesis of Eg. nbd.t „die Haarflechte” (BD, NE, Wb II 246, 7), although the reasons thereof have remained unexplained. On the other hand, it would appear almost as tempting to see in it a parallel to Geez dabl „bunch, bundle” < dabala „1. to bring together, gather, 2. make braids, plait”, whose Semitic root had, however, a different basic sense, cf. Ar. $\sqrt{\text{dbl}}$ „to unite” and Eth.-Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{dbl}}$ „to add, repeat” (Sem.: Leslau 1987, 120). In my opinion, however, Eg. dbn.t stands – admitting

⁶ Attested in Ahaggar hələnċ-ət, ETawllemmet šələnċ-ət ~ šərənċ-ət ~ s-, Ayr s/šərənċ-ət, Ghat žələnċ-ət (SBrb. data: Prasse 1969, 55, #256).

⁷ Attested in NBrb. *zaw „cheveux” [GT]: Mzab and Wargla a-zau „cheveux” [Lst.] = zaw „cheveu, chevelure, poil” [Dlh. 1984, 255; 1987, 399] | Nefusa zâu „capelli (coll.)” [Bgn. 1942, 222, 321] || EBrb. *zaw „hair” [GT]: Sokna zâu „cheveux” [Lst., Prd.], Sened zâu „cheveux” [Lst.], Fogaha a-zâu „capelli” [Prd. 1961, 297], Ghadames a-zau „cheveux” [Lst.] = a-zaw „cheveu, chevelure, poil, crin” [Lanfry 1973, 433, #1850] (EBrb.: Laoust 1920, 111, fn. 2; 1931, 214).

⁸ Cf. Bole šowə [Gowers] = sôwu [Krf.] = šowv (?) [IL], Geruma sówi [Gowers], Gera šwešə [Krf.] (Bole-Tangale data: Kraft 1981, #36).

⁹ Based on Tsagu šááwé [Skn.], Kariya sóò [Skn.], Miya sâu [Skn.], Pa’a suwa [IL] = sùwá [MSkn.], Siri sùwí [IL] = sùwí [Skn.], Mburku sáwázá ~ sáwá [Skn.], Jimbin sáwā [Skn.], Diri čúwáá (unexpected č-) [Skn.].

¹⁰ Cf. Bata-Garwa seò-né [Str.], Bata-Demsa šéwé [Str.], Bata séw nə [Mch.], Nzangi še^cwe [Meek] = šeo šeo [Str.] = səwə [Mch.], Bachama šewə-ne [Meek].

the semantic shift „hair” → „tail” seen, e.g., under the Afro-Asiatic reflexes of Eg. sw.t (above) – strikingly close to LECu. *[d]aban- „tail” [GT] and its reflexes: Saho dabán, dial. var. zabán ~ ḏabán „Rücken (back)” [Rn. 1890, 100] = daban, dial. var. zaban ~ ḏaban [Sasse] | Oromo *daban in compounds and derived words, cf., e.g., daballe < *daban-le „Zopf (plait of hair)” [Sasse] = daballe „coda, treccia di capelli” [da Thiene 1939, 81], cf. also Borana dial. of Oromo daballe-ni „bambino al quale no vengono tagliati gli capelli” [Venturino 1973, 33] = daballē „a child from which the hair has not yet been cut” [Stroemer 1995, 163] (LECu.: Sasse 1976, 140) ||| SOM.: Hamer-Karo dibin-i „tail” [Flm. apud Bnd. 1994, 159, #82] = duban „appendage” [Lydall apud Bnd. 2003, 218, #131]. Importantly, the Lowland East Cushitic isogloss presented above was united by H.-J. Sasse (1976, 140, #27) under his ECU. *zanb-/zimb- „Schwanz” [Sasse] = *zimb-/zaban- „tail” [Dlg.] as metathetic cognates, which, henceforth, he affiliated with LECu.: Somali-Isaq dambe „hinten”, damb-ayn-ayya „hinten sein” | Dullay: Harso simp-ō [s- < *z-] „unbeschnittener Penis (uncircumcised penis)”. Although W. Leslau (1980, 126, ad p. 140) opposed the connection of ECU. *√zbn vs *√znb, the latter giving „*the impression of being the Arabic danab ‚tail’*”, and viewed that „*its connection with dbn, zbn (by metathesis) is not convincing*”, A.B. Dolgopolsky (1983, 139, §11.1) maintained Sasse’s East Cushitic reconstruction, which he identified with Sem. *dánab- „tail” [Dlg. pace Djk. 1970, 469] = *di/anab- [SED I 60-61, #64]. This discussion may be completed by the fact that the Semitic stem was identified by C.T. Hodge (1993, 49) with Eg. znb „(Mauer)Zinne (auch eines Gebäudes), Bekrönung (einer Tür)” (PT, Wb III 458, 6; GHWb 717) = „battlement” (FD 231), apparently, as a metonymic reflex, which, if true, would also support W. Leslau (l.c. supra) in separating two distinct roots: (1) LECu. *√dbn = SOM. *√dbn = Eg.dbn.t vs. (2) ECU. *√znb = Sem. *√dnb.

Eg. d33 (≈ ḥnzkt) „Haarflechte” (BD, Wb V 520, 7) = „tress” (CT, DCT 817 pace AECT III 202, spell 657, n. 3) = „Haarzopf, Haarflechte” (GHWb 994), attested as personal name in diverse forms already from the Middle Kingdom onward,¹¹ was, following Wb V 524, 8, was connected by R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) too to Eg. d3n.w „junge Leute” (PT, Wb l.c.), although the 3rd radicals in the underlying word roots are evidently different and the appearance of -n- as C₃ has to be explained. V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #452), in turn, identified Eg. d33 with Sem.: Akk. (jB) šerretu (1x var. šurrītu) „Mähne (?): 1. Fötus, 2. (astr.) ein Kranz um einen Stern (?)” [AHW 1092-3] = „probably a feature near the mouth, perhaps the whiskers (?)” [CAD XVI: § 137] ||| WCh.: Hausa còdòró (còrò) ≈ túkkúú (túkkú) „1. plait of hair on crown of head, 2. bird’s crest or cock’s comb” [Abr. 1962, 890, 896] = „1. a cock’s comb, 2. a small tuft of hair on the front of head” [Brg. 1934, 1043] < AA *çor- „hair” [OS] = *√çr [GT], which seems attractive both phonologically and semantically, although both the Akkadian and

¹¹ Cf. Eg. d33 (with hair determinative) „(als Personenbezeichnung)” (MK, Wb V 520, 8-9; PN I 404, 12: masc. manifold, fem. 1x) = „PN: *der Bezopfte” (GHWb 994) and other personal names from the Middle Kingdom (mostly with the hair determinative) like d33.t (PN I 404, 13: fem. 1x), d3 (PN I 404, 9: masc. 3x, fem. 1x), d33.jj (PN I 404, 16: masc. 2x), d3.jj (PN I 404, 18: masc. 1x), d3.w.jj (PN I 404, 25: masc. 1x).

Hausa terms seem to be isolated in Semitic and Chadic, resp., whereas the initial *c-* of the Hausa word allows an alternative derivation from AA * \sqrt{cr} „hair” [GT], cf. Eg. *sr* (analyzed in the 1st part of this series). The Egypto-Akkado-(Hausa?) isogloss may be extended to NOm.: Bworo *c̄r-á* (tsi(i)rá) [Rn.] = *çir-a* (ts’iira) [Bulen] = *çir-á* (ts’irá) [Lmb.] = *šir-á* (s’iirá) „hair” [S(iebert?)] recorded by M.L. Bender (2003, 166, #65).¹²

Eg. $\underline{d}3f$ (m) and $\underline{d}3f.t$ (f), both attested with „hair” determinative as a personal name (MK, PN I 405:5 and 405:8, resp.; Wb V 523, 1). With regard to the hair determinative, we may account for a word root $\sqrt{d3f}$ connected with hair, for which the following possible alternative parallels might be considered (due to the dubious origin of OEg. \underline{d} < either AA **g* or AA * $\check{c}/\check{c}^*/\check{c}$, whereas OEg. 3 < AA **r* or **l* or seldom **ʔ*):

(1) Provided OEg. $\sqrt{d3f}$ < AA * \sqrt{grf} , cf. PCu. **gʷafarV* „long hair” [GT]: SAgaw: Awngi *gʷafer-e* „long hair” || LECu.: Arbore *gōfar-e* „mane” (Cu.: Ehret 1987, #52).

(2) If, in turn, OEg. $\sqrt{d3f}$ < * $\sqrt{\check{c}rf}$, cf. (via metathesis) AA * $\sqrt{\check{c}fr}$ „to plait (also of hair)” [GT] > Sem. * $\check{d}/\check{s}pr$ „to plait” [Dlg.]¹³ || ECu. * \check{d}_1ifr- „to braid, plait (also of hair)” [Sasse 1979, 27, 29].¹⁴ For the biconsonantal origin of the above described root cf. AA * $\sqrt{\check{c}f}$ [GT] > Sem.: Ar. *daḫḫafa* „to braid hair” [Dlg., not in BK, Dozy, Wehr] || WCh. * $\check{c}af-/*\check{c}AHaf-$ „расчёсывать волосы (to comb hair)” [Stl. 1987, 202, #530].¹⁵

„Crown of head”

Eg. *wp.t* „1. Gehörn (des Rindes), 2. Scheitel (des Menschen), 3. Zenit des Himmels, Scheitelpunkt, 4. Gipfel (des Berges), 5. Wipfel, 6. hochgelegener Punkt (des Landes)” (OK-, Wb I 297-8; ÄWb II 651-2) = „1. horns (PT 705, 1302), 2. top of head (JEA 22, 106), 3. brow (EG 1927, §462), 4. top of mountain (BD 219:2), of the earth, i.e., farthest south (Urk. IV 1165:5), 5. top-knot (PT 401), 6. head-dress (PT 546), 7. zenith (Urk. IV 1542:13)” (FD 59) = „somet de la tête” (Lacau 1970, 35, §74) has been convincingly affiliated – contrary to P. Lacau’s (l.c.) erroneous remark („rien en sémitique”) – by the Russian research group of the Afro-Asiatic comparative dictionary headed by I.M. Diakonoff (cf. HCVA I 1, #42) with the Semitic **pVʔ-at-* „face, front” [SED].¹⁶ The

¹² Note that NOm.: Kefoid * $\check{c}ēr-ō$ „tail” [Bender 2003, 175, #131] is unrelated, being a late borrowing from Ethio-Semitic, cf. Amh. *čara* „hair at the end of an animal’s tail” [Kane 1990, 2211] < Sem. * $\check{t}Vhr-$ „back” [SED I 254, #284].

¹³ Cf. NHbr. *šəpīrā* ~ *šəpār* „Geflecht, Kranz” [GB 693] = *šəpīrā* ~ *šəpīrā* „thread, wreath” [KB 1048] | Ar. *daḫara* „tresser (les cheveux) en larges tresses (d’une femme), tresser une corde”, *ḫafir-* „1. corde avec laquelle on attache un chameau, 2. tresse, large natte de cheveux” [BK II 31] || Geez *ḫafara* „to braid, plait, drape, weave, intertwine etc.” [Lsl. 1987, 148].

¹⁴ For the Semito-East Cushitic comparison see Dolgopolsky 1983, 141, #12.9; HSED #579.

¹⁵ For the West Chadic-Arabic etymology see Stolbova 1987, 202; Dolgopolsky 1989, 102; HSED #585.

¹⁶ Attested in Akk. *pūtu* „Stirn(seite)” [AHW 884 pace Holma] = „Stirn, Schläfe, Breitseite” (*pātu* „Grenze, Gebiet, Rand”) [GB] = „Stirn” (vgl. *pātu* „Stirn, Schläfe, Vorderseite”) [Torczyner] = „forehead, temple” [Lsl. 1945], Eblaite /*piʔ-at-um/* „temple” [Frz. 1984, 132, 138] || Ug. *pāt* „Saum, Grenzen, Gefilde” [WUS 252, #2181] = *pit* (m) „1. temple, 2. boundary, border, side, fringe, edge (technical meaning)” [DUL 659] = *pʔ-t* [Lsl. 1945],

ultimately same Afro-Asiatic root is presumably to be found in SAA * \sqrt{pw} „front part, forehead” [GT] > NAgaw **baw* „forehead” [GT]¹⁷ ||| WCh.: Bade-Ngizim **fuw-* „horn” [GT].¹⁸ The etymology of ECh.: Mokilko ʔòpi-só (segmentation pace H. Jungrauthmayr in JI l.c.), pl. ʔòmbá „horn” [Jng. 1990, 157] is still rather unclear for me.

Eg. whnn „der Scheitel des Kopfes” (Med., Wb I 346, 1-2) = „Schädeldecke, Scheitel” (WMT I 203) = „crown of head” (FD 65), apparently a C₁C₂C₃C₃ diminutive or intensive form (NBÄ 295-301), has so far lacked any etymology, which seems now to appear indirectly (void of any anatomical connotation) in Berber, cf. EBrb.: Ghadames ā-wən „1. monter, gravir, 2. partir” [Lanfry 1973, 391, #1672] || SBrb.: Ahaggar a-wn „monter sur: se transporter, en montant, sur, gravir, aller en montant” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1502], ETawlllemmet ə-wəṇ „monter sur/à (cheval etc.)” [PAM 2003, 826] ||| WCh.: perhaps Goemai haan, pl. hūan „to go up, climb, mount” [Srl. 1937, 72] = haan, pl. həyan „aufsteigen, (be) steigen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 8] = ni han „to mount” [Krf.] = haan, pl. hian „to climb” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 13] < AA * \sqrt{hwn} „to mount” [GT]. The reflection of a mediae hollow *-w-root as Iae w- in Egyptian is regular (Law of Belova, cf. EDE I 394-400). K.-G. Prasse (PAM l.c.) postulated a PBrb. *ā-hwī/ün on the basis of the Berber data, which, by the way, J. Bynon (1984) combined with WCh. * $\sqrt{h^wm}$, which, however, seems to reflect a distinct (albeit perhaps eventually related Proto-Afro-Asiatic var.) root.¹⁹

Eg. sm3 „1. behaarter Teil des Kopfes, Schläfengegend (mit Augenpartie, Haaransatz), Haare am Kopf, *Skalp, 2. Haarsträhne, 3. Seite, 4. auch von den Schamhaaren” (PT-, Wb IV 122, 1-6; GHwB 703; ÄWb I 1123a; ÄWb II 2203b-c) = „1. scalp, locks of hair, 2.

Hebrew pēʔā „1. Schnitt, Rand, 2. Seite” [GB] = „Kopfrand, Schläfe (nicht Rand)” [Torczyner] = „edge, rim” [Lsl. 1945] = „corner, side (esp. of the head)” [Apl.] | Aram. paʔtā „Rand, Ecke” [GB] || Soqotri fio „forehead” [Lsl. 1945] < $\sqrt{fy(?)}$ „front” + dial. vars. [SSL 1991, 1456] || Amhara fit „face” [Apl.] = „front” [Lsl. 1987]. For the Semitic data cf., e.g., GB 631; Leslau 1938, 332; 1945, 234; 1963, 65; 1987, 154; Appleyard 1977, 13/55; SED I 180-181, #204. There have been a few false etymologies of certain Semitic cognates. Thus, H. Torczyner (1912, 769) mistakenly explained this Akkadian word as a „Weiterbildung” from Akk. pū „Mund”. In GB 631, in turn, the Hebrew reflex was derived from Hbr. $\sqrt{pʔy}$ hifil „zerspalten, ausrotten oder in kleine Stämme auflösen oder wegblasen”, which, by the way, corresponds to Eg. wpj „trennen, öffnen” (OK-, Wb I 298-301).

¹⁷ Cf. Qwara and Dembea bō „Stirn” [Rn. 1885, 40], Hamir baū ~ bō „1. Stirn, 2. (postp.) vor, 3. schon, bereits” [Rn. 1884, 351], Kemant baw „front” [CR 1912, 181].

¹⁸ Cf. Bade fūw-āan „Horn” [Lukas 1968, 223] = fuak „horn” [IL], Ngizim fūwāk, pl. fūwāk-in „horn (of animal)” [Schuh 1981, 58] = fuwak [IL].

¹⁹ This latter suggestion is phonologically dubious. The Chadic *comparanda* are WCh.: Hausa háú [-au < *-am?] „to mount” [Abr. 1962, 381] | NBauchi * $\sqrt{h^wm}$ ~ * $\sqrt{h^wn}$ (dissimilation?) → * $\sqrt{həm}$ „to mount, climb” [GT]: Pa’a h̄wun „to climb, mount (animal)” [M. Skinner 1979, 183], Warji ɣəm-, Jimbin, Miya, Mburku ɣəma-, Siri ɣəmu, Kariya ɣimo [-i- < *-ə-?], Tsagu wum [w- < * \sqrt{w} -] „to mount, climb” (NBauchi data: Skinner 1977, 32), which G. Takács (2007, 118) equated with Ar. \sqrt{hwm} I: hāma „voler, voltiger tout autour, planer dans les airs en faisant des tours” [BK I 521] ||| perhaps Eg. h̄nw [dissimilation < * \sqrt{hwm} + metathesis?] „Verbum: vom Aufkommen (?) des Windes” (BD, Wb III 103, 23) = „in Zshg. mit Aufkommen des Windes” (GHwB 536) < AA * \sqrt{hwm} „to mount” [GT], which, remotely though in the Afro-Asiatic proto-language, may have eventually been related to AA * \sqrt{hwn} „to mount” [GT].

temporal region, side-locks, 3. to listen (to)” (CT, DCT 492-3) = „crown of the head with hair growing on it (the hair itself, not the location of it)” ≈ gmḥ.w (GR Edfu, PL 841) > (SBF) **CMAY** (pl., originally a dual < sm3.wj) „Schläfen, Augenlider, Wimpern” (KHW 187): as the listed renderings (including the Coptic evidence) indicate, its primary sense was „temporal region” and only in the late period it shifted secondarily to denote „top of head”. This root was discussed in my preceding paper „*Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon I*”.²⁰ Here, may we only remark that among the cognates, highly noteworthy is HECu. *samm-o „top of head” [Hds. 1989, 420].

Eg. q3b.t ~ qb3.t „Scheitel des Kopfes” (MK-, Wb V 11, 10; GHWb 849, 853; ÄWb II 2511c) = qb3.t „crown of head” (FD 277): so far no acceptable etymology has been offered except for combining Eg. qb3.t with Sem.: Ar. qubl- „front, face” suggested by C.T. Hodge (1966, 46), which is phonologically perfect, but semantically less convincing (albeit not impossible, cf. the case of Eg. wp.t above).²¹ At the moment, both semantically and phonologically, most attractive seems a connection with Sem.: Ar. √q(n)br,²² cf. qunbar-at- „2. crête au haut de la tête (chez certains animaux)”, qunburiyy- „qui a une crête au haut de la tête (oiseau)”, cf. also qibirr-āt- „gland de la verge” [BK II 659] = qanbūr- ~ qambūr- „bossu” [Dozy II 408], Syrian dial. qánbar I „hérissier (le coq les plumes de con cou pour se jeter sur la poule)”, tqámbar II „se montrer fier, hautain avec (qqn.), propr.: relever la crête, dresser la huppe”, qambūra and qámbara „crête de coq, 2. huppe, bosse”, qambūr „bossu et nain, petit bossu” [Barthélemy 1935, 683], Dathina √qnbr I „dresser la queue”, V „être hautain, lever la crête”, qunbar-at- „crête de coq” [Landberg, GD 2531], Yemeni qanbūr „hunchback (also a surname)” [Piamenta 1990-1, 414] ||| SBrb.: Ghat ḡəbber, pl. ḡəbber-ān „bosse postérieure (du chameau à deux bosses)” [PAM 2003, 269], cf. Ahaggar ḡubber „être écorché sur le dos en arrière de la bosse (le sujet étant un chameau)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1690] < NAA *√kbr „peak of a body part” [GT].

Earlier, I (Takács 2004, 70, #375) was disposed to assume in Eg. qb3.t ~ q3b.t an earlier *√qb? ~ *√q?b, a likely cognate – in spite of the irregular Eg. 3 vs. Sem.

²⁰ See *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Warszawa) 68/1 (2015), 92-93.

²¹ Almost all attempts have so far strangely ignored Eg. -b offering an etymology just for Eg. *√q3. Thus, (1) C.T. Hodge (1966, 46) equated Eg. q3b.t with WCh.: Hausa kwaryar kay „cranium” (derived from the basic sense *,to be circular”). Similarly, (2) N. Skinner (1992, 348) connected it with Tuareg: Ahaggar tā-kerkor-t „crâne (boite osseuse qui contient le cerveau)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 875], ETawlllemmet and Ayr ta-kārkor-t „1. sommet de la tête, vertex, 2. (ETawlllemmet) crâne” [PAM 2003, 402] and PCu. *kar- „peak, top” [Ehret 1987, 43, #150]. (3) Later, Hodge (1981, 374, #47) changed his mind and affiliated Eg. qb3.t with Ar. qubl- „front, face” (semantically uncertain) and even IE *g^heb^h-el- „head, gable”.

²² Following Dozy’s lexicon (l.c.), M. Piamenta (l.c.) also noted the connection of Ar. qanbūr- with Turkish kambur „bossu” [Dozy] = „1. Buckel (eines Menschen), 2. Buckel, Höcker, Erhöhung, Ausbuchtung, Beule, Wölbung, 3. bucklig, 4. gekrümmt, krumm, herausgewölbt, ausgebaucht, 5. was sich geworfen hat (spez. Holz)” [Steuerwald 1972, 478], which, in my view, can only be due to a borrowing from Arabic, not *vice versa* (as Prof. R.M. Voigt suggests me now in his kind p.c., August 2015), given the Arabic background root, let alone the secondary nature of -mb- < -nb-. Biberstein Kazimirsky, in addition, derived all Arabic terms listed above from Ar. √qbr, which can only corroborate a native Arabic nature of the root.

*^Ɔ – to Sem. *quba^Ɔ- „hood” [Mlt.-Sts. 1984, 37]²³ || SCu.: perhaps Iraqw qubu „hair” [Dempwolff, not attested in MQK 2002] || CCh.: PHigi *k^waba[?] [< *k^waba[?]] „brains” [GT]²⁴ < presumably AA *k^waba^Ɔ- „top of head” [GT]. Although now this alternative seems significantly less convincing than that described above, we may, however, not exclude a remote relationship of both roots (*√kbr „peak of a body part” vs. *√k^wb^Ɔ „top of head”) in the Afro-Asiatic parental language.

Eg. *qf3 „horn or top of head (?)” (GT, cf. Wb V 31) preserved by the hieroglyph depicting „the head and forepart of a ram” (PL) = „the head of a ram with horns” (GT) used as a (phonetic) determinative from Dynasty XXII on in Eg. qf3.t ~ qf3.w (from XXII.) „Ansehn” (XVIII.-GR, Wb V 31-32) = „dignity, awe, respect (it is a quality of gods, something frightening for foreigners to experience)” (PL 1055).²⁵ It was C.T. Hodge (1966, 46) who has already ingeniously equated this hypothetic form with WCh.: Hausa káfóó „horn” [Abr. 1962, 448], which can be extended now onto further cognates from a couple of Afro-Asiatic branches: Brb. *√yɸ(y) „head” [GT]²⁶ || WCh. *kafa → *kafu „horn” [Stl. 1987, 211]²⁷ || ECh.: Mubi-Toram *kōP- „1. top of head, 2. occiput” [GT].²⁸ A special isogloss with a substantially shifted semantics (opposing the Egypto-Chadic match) is represented by the match of Sem. *kapy- „occiput, back of the head” [Mlt.]²⁹

²³ Attested in Hbr. qōba^Ɔ „helmet” | Aram. qubbā^Ɔ ~ qub^Ɔā „hood” || Ar. qubba^Ɔ-at- „cap, hat” || Geez qob^Ɔ „monk’s hood, headband, skullcap (under a turban) etc.” (Sem.: GB 705; Leslau 1987, 418). The Semitic term was, however, supposed to be a loan of ultimately Hittite origin (see Leslau 1987, 418). If, however, it comes from the Afro-Asiatic heritage, we should assume that its *^Ɔ (shared apparently with Chadic parallels) was a secondary root complement.

²⁴ Cf. Higi-Nkafa kwāḅe, Higi-Baza kwāba, Higi Kamale ḡkwaḅe, Higi-Ghye kwāba, Higi-Futu kwōḅo[?], Fali-Kiria kwāḅa, Fali-Gili gwōḅwu, Fali-Jilbu gwōḅākū, Fali-Muchella gwōḅà, Fali-Bwagira gwōḅōn (CCh.: Kraft 1981, #37).

²⁵ It is possible, however, that the ram head determinative of qf3 was borrowed from Dynasty XXII on from the synonymous šfj.t as suggested in Wb l.c. In this case that above external etymology is to be given up. Besides, Eg. qf3.t [< *√qfr] is perhaps identical with WCh.: Hausa kárfíi „strength”, kárfáfa „to strengthen, encourage, urge, force, emphasize; become strong” [Abr. 1962, 486-487].

²⁶ Reconstructed also as *a-γfí [IS] = *γpp [Rössler] = *ṭ-yeɸ [Vycichl] = *e-γrif (sic: *-r-, certainly an error) [Zyhlarz 1932-1933, 98] = *yV-γ[a]f [Militarev 1991] = *i-γaf [Militarev 1999]. A common Berber word. Attested, e.g., in EBrb.: Siwa a-ḥfí [Laoust 1931, 301] || SBrb.: Ahaggar é-γəf [Fcd. 1952 IV 1700], Ayr and ETawillemmet e-γáf [Alojaly 1980, 65] (Brb. data: e.g., Zyhlarz 1942-3, 83; Vycichl 1933, 173, #2; 1955, 306; Militarev 1991, 264; 1999 MS).

²⁷ Attested in Hausa káfóó [Abr. l.c.] | SBauchi *kaP- (either *-f- or *-p-) [GT]: Chaari kápo, Zakshi kápu, Boot kápo, Zaari kafo (SBauchi: Shimizu 1978, 25). H. Jungrathmayr (JI 1994 II 192) surmised in the SBauchi word a Hausa loan.

²⁸ Attested in Mubi kōóbó (m), pl. kóóbúp ~ kōóbáp „nuque” [Jng. 1990 MS, 29], Jegu kofo, pl. koḑe „Hinterkopf, Gehirn” [Jng. 1961, 114], Kajakse káfú „crâne” [Alio 2004, 244, #173].

²⁹ Cf. Syr. qāp(ə)yā ~ qəpāyā ~ qappāyā „postica pars cervicis” [Brk. 1928, 683] | Ar. qafan „derrière du cou, nuque, derrière de la tête, occiput” [BK I 792] = qafā[?]- ~ qafan „Hinterkopf, Nacken” [Müller] || Harsusi keḑe „back” [Jns. 1977, 74], Jibbali kéḑe „back” [Jns. 1981, 142], Mehri kaḑe „back” [Jns. 1987, 226] || Geez qāf „shoulder-blade”, but also kup „head”, kop „top of skull” (Kogan in SED l.c.: variant roots?) [Leslau 1987, 289, 423], Harari kafāt „forehead” [Leslau 1963, 122], Gurage: Selti, Wolane, Zway káfāt „forehead” [Leslau 1979 III 473] (Sem.: SED I 148-9, #164). In the opinion of L. Kogan (SED l.c.), „occiput, back of the head’ ... is the

||| ECh.: Dangla-Migama *kUp- „neck” (originally < *, „back of the head”?) [GT].³⁰ One might assume here an AA *kafa?- ~ *kafay- „1. top of the head, horn, 2. back of the head, occiput” [GT]³¹ to underlie with an areal parallel in PKoman *kup „head” [Bnd. 1983, 270, #38]. Noteworthy is that, here too, the Egyptian term stands semantically the closest to the Chadic reflexes, which is in striking parallelism with PAA *k^waba?-/ *k^waba^o- „top of head” [GT] (cf. the preceding entry in this paper). Do these both reflect remote Proto-Afro-Asiatic root varieties?

„Skull”

Eg. **dnn.t** „Schädel, Kopf” (Med., Wb V 576, 13-17) = „skull” (FD 322) was conceived by P. Lacau (1970, 33, §68) purely as „une seconde forme du radical qui a donné d3d3” displaying a pre-Eg. *gll.t vs. *glgl, resp., which is indeed plausible in principle. In my view, however, we have here two distinct roots, Eg. **dnn.t** being clearly identical with Sem.: Gurage *gunnän „head, hair of head, *top, summit” [Lsl.] = *gunnän/r „tête, chevelure” [DRS 148, GN? #21],³² which stands isolated in Semitic.

H.G. Mukarovsky (1987, 202-203) combined the Gurage word with ECh.: Sokoro gón-du „mein Kopf” [AF apud Lukas 1937, 33] = gón-di „mein Kopf” [Barth] = gon, pl. gòné „head” [Saxon 1977 MS, 3, #1, cf. JI 1994 II 183], but also with a number of parallels, which, however, evidently reflect AA *√kn ~ *√hn „head” [GT] attested in North Omotic and Chadic.³³ Eventually, the latter root may be regarded in the Afro-Asiatic *Ursprache* as a root variety of AA *√gnn „head” [GT] preserved by the Gurage-Egyptian (and -Sokoro?) isogloss.

Any other etymology proposed so far for Eg. **dnn.t** is less convincing.³⁴

only one [GT: i.e., meaning] to account for such semantic shifts as 'back of the head' > 'head' > 'forehead' and 'back of the head' > 'back' ...”

³⁰ Cf. Dangla kòpò „nuque” [Fédry 1971, 295], Migama kúpó, pl. kòppippá „nuque” [Jng.-Adams 1992, 102].

³¹ For the Semito-Berber-Chadic comparison see Müller 1975, 64; Rössler 1952, 139; IS 1971, #195; Militarev 1991, 264; Blazek 1994, 428; HSED #1548; SED I 149, #164. If the Egyptian etymology is correct, we should modify the reconstruction of A.Ju. Militarev’s (1999 MS, #165 and SED I 149) PAA *-p- in this root (he figured as PAA *kəpəy-) to PAA *-f-.

³² Attested in Muher, Mäsqän, Gogot, Soddo gunnän, Chaha gunär, Ezha gunnär, Endegeny gu’nor, Ennemor, Gyeto gun’är (Gurage: Leslau 1979 III 284).

³³ NOm.: SEOmeto *kin- „head” [GT]: Koyra (Badditu) qin-ē/ō [Crl.] = kin-e/o [Corlett, Bnd.] = kin-e [Hyw.] = gin-ō ~ qin-ō [Mkr.], Haruro (Gats’ame) qin-o [CR] and (pace Müller 1975, 64) the Chadic reflexes of *√Qn „head” [GT] = *√kn [NM 1966, 236] = „Biu-Mandara” (CCh.) *√gn [Newman 1977, 27]. V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 17, #55) correctly affiliated the NOm.-CCh. root with Ar. qunn-at- „1. sommet d’une montagne, 2. petite montagne ou montagne isolée du reste de la chaîne et noire vers la sommet” [BK II 817]. A root variety is presumably present in Ar. ma-ħann-at- „1. bout du nez, 2. col d’une vallée, 4. tête, issue, entrée d’un chemin” [BK I 636].

³⁴ Thus, W.A. Ward (1963, 419, #4 and fn. 3; 1972, 19) assumed a semantically *a priori* doubtful connection with Hbr. šinnā „shield”, šinšenet „jar”, which he derived from the basic sense carried by Ar. √šwn I „to protect”, II „to surround with, enclose”, šawn-at- „a kind of jar or bowl” remarking that it is „impossible to prove” whether Eg. **dnn.t** is a Semitic loan (which is, of course, out of the question for semantical reasons) or represents a common

„Forehead, Face”

Eg. mnd.t³⁵ „1. (Med., XVIII.) Teil des Gesichts zwischen Nase und Jochbein längst dem Auge, 2. (BD-GR) Teil des Gesicht am Auge (dann auch für das Auge selbsts, gern im Dual)” (Wb II 93, 10-12) = „cheeks” (Dawson 1927, 20-21, §1) = „between the nose and nostrils on the one hand, and the temporal region and ear on the other: the cheek, the maxilla(ry bone) and the adjoining portion of the zygoma as far back as the temporal bone” (Breasted 1930, 243) = „Auge(npartie)” (Zyhlarz 1934-35, 173) = „a part of the face” (AEO I 18) = „1. la joue, 2. paupière (peut-être la partie inférieure)” (Lefébvre 1952, 14, §14 vs. 17, §18) = „Wangenpartie: (die rechts und links der Nase anschließende) Wangen” (Grapow 1954, 31, 37-39) = „cheek” (FD 110) = „1. les joues, 2. le globe oculaire, les yeux” (Meeks 1977, 81, fn. 1; AL 77.1756-7; so also Koemoeth 1993, 115 & fn. 33) = „Wange, Nasenlöcher” (Scheel 1985, 161 & fn. 113-4) = „Wange, Backe” (GHWb 343) = „1. cheek, 2. eyeball (?), eyelid (?)” (Walker 1996, 269) = „eyes” (PL 440) = „part of the face” (DCT 170). A metaphorical sense of the same word is represented by OK mnd.t (usually pl.) „vermutlich Teil des Schmelzofens” (Wb II 93, 9) = „Nasenlöcher” (Erman 1918, 41) = „cheek” (Dawson 1927, 23) = „Wange’ im Metallhandwerk: eine Bezeichnung für das dem Arbeiter zugewandte Ausgußloch bzw. Tiegelwand” (Drenkhahn 1976, 32, rejected by Scheel) = „point de fusion du métal, mais pourrait être ‚la panse, la paroi’ du creuset” (AL 77.1755) = „im Metallhandwerk eine Metapher: sicherlich die Wange des (Schmelz)Tiegels bzw. die Tiegelwabdung” (Scheel 1985, 162-163) = „*Melztiegelwand (,Wange’), *Ausgußloch, *Seite der Gußform, *Schmelzbrei” (GHWb 344; AWb I 344) = „Ausflußloch, Tiegelwand des Schmelzofens” (WD III 52 pace Scheel). Basic sense dubious. Etymology disputed:³⁶

(1) D. Meeks (1977, 81, fn. 1, cf. AL l.c.) explained it from a certain Eg. *mnd meaning „sg. round”, whence he derived also Eg. mnd „breast” (q.v.), mndj „la panse (?)” (which presumably stems from the preceding). Following him, P. Wilson (PL 440) also maintains that Eg. *√mnd „seems to refer to sg. spherical in shape and thus to parts of the body such as the breasts, cheeks, eyeball”. Improbable. The rendering „globe oculaire” is somewhat dubious in the light of Eg. bnr „ball of eye” (NK, CED 22; DLE

Egypto-Semitic root. On the other hand, the comparison with Sem. *√gnn „to cover” suggested by C.T. Hodge (1981, 407) was labelled as „uncertain” by himself. Elsewhere, Hodge (1978, 2, #67; 1981, 372, #20) extended to Egypto-Semitic comparison onto Brb. *a-g’yenna „sky” (where he mistakenly rendered the first radical as *γ) and CCh. *√gn „head” (in which, however, the *g- may not be reconstructed, but rather *k- or *h-, discussed above) and even IE *gen- „balled”.

³⁵ The original form was mnd.t, which developed to NK mnd.t (Wb l.c.) → GR dual mnd.(tj) ~ mntj (PL l.c.).

³⁶ Leaving aside suggestions that *prima vista* cannot be accepted. E.g., L. Homburger (1931, 252) and E. Zyhlarz (1934-35, 173) combined it with Nubian: Kunuzi missi, Mahassi mañi „oeil”. Absurd. In addition, Zyhlarz (1936, 444, fn. 1) ultimately connected this false parallel with Brb. (sic) mnid-ak „vor dir” < *emñid-a-ka „in Bezug auf deine Vorderseite” < *mnid „nach vorne schauen” (sic). A.M. Lam (1993, 379), in turn, combined it with Ful (Pulaar) mažnata „qui fait sourciller”, which was rightly rejected by H. Tourneux (2000, 92-93) pointing out that it is fact a conjugated form (maž- + factitive -n- + suffix -ata) without subject (not a participle) meaning „[ça] fait sourciller”.

I 156) < OK b33 (cf. EDE II 232). Eg. *mndj*, in turn, may be rather identical with Eg. *mnd* „breast” (q.v. above, cf. also DCT 170), which certainly represents a distinct Afro-Asiatic root.

(2) G. Takács (1997, 229, #11; 2004, 61, #351): perhaps < * \sqrt{mng} related with the Ethiopian *Wanderwort* **mangāg-* „jaw, chin” [GT]?³⁷ The ultimate etymology of these forms is, however, obscure. As H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) remarked: „*the ultimate source ... is hard to determine*”.³⁸ At the first glance, **mangāg-* resembles an m- prefix formation like **ma-ngag-* < * \sqrt{ngg} , for which cf. SCu.: Dahalo *n̄ḡaḡe* „jaw” [EEN 1989, 46]? If this derivation were true, we would have to give up the comparison with Eg. *mnd.t*.

(3) Alternatively, we might assume a root **mn-* extended with an affix (?) -*d* occurring as C₃ in a number of Egyptian anatomical terms (cf. Eg. *psd*, *fn̄d*, *n̄hd.t*, *hn̄d*), which would lead us to AA **ma/in-* „forehead” [Blz.] = * \sqrt{mn} „front of head” [GT].³⁹

Eg. ḥ3.t „Vorderteil, A. eigtl. als Körperteil I. des Menschen, selten allgemein: Vorderseite, zumeist: Antlitz, Stirn; II. eines Tieres: der Vorderkörper, Brust; B. Anfang

³⁷ Attested in Ethio-Semitic (from Cushitic?): Tigrinya *māngaga* ~ *māngaga* [Lsl.], Amharic and Argobba *māngaga* „Kiefer, Kinnlade, Kinnbacken” [Rn.] = „jaw-bone, molar tooth” [Gragg] = „molar tooth” [Lsl. 1949, 47], Harari *māngāga* „jaw” [Lsl.], Gurage-Zway *māngāga* „jaw” [Lsl.] ||| LECu.: Saho & Afar *mingāgā*, pl. *mingōg* „Kiefer, Kinnladen, Kinnbacken, Wange” [Rn. 1890, 269] = *mingāga* „jaw, chin” [Lmb.], Oromo *mangagā* „jaw” [Rn.] = *mangāgā* „jaw” [Gragg 1982, 277] = *māgāga* ~ *mangāga* „jaw” [Lsl.] = *mangāga*? [Lmb.], Dirayta *mankākó-tā* „jaw” [Lmb.] | HECu.: Burji *mangāg-ā* „lower jaw” [Sasse], Alaba *gangā⁷ma* [met. < **magang-?*] „jaw” [Lmb.], Hadiyya *mangāga* „jaw” [Lmb.], Kambatta *mangaga* [Lsl.] = *mangāga* [Lmb.] = *māngaga* „jaw” [Zbr.] ||| NOM. (from East Cushitic?): Wolamo *mangāga* „jaw” [Lmb.], Gamu *mangāgille* „jaw” [Lmb.] | Mocha *mangāgo* [Lmb.] | Sheko *mangāgo* „jaw” [Lmb.] (ECu.-NOM.-ES data: Reinisch 1886, 882; Leslau 1963, 108; 1979 III, 409; Sasse 1982, 140; Zaborski 1985, 90; Lamberti 1987, 533; Lamberti-Sottile 1997, 461).

³⁸ The derivation from Sem. **ḥanak-* „palate” (Praetorius 1879, 70) was rightly declined by W. Leslau (1979 III, 409). H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) thought of a borrowing either from Ethio-Semitic or Oromo, while G. Hudson (1989, 85) pondered a connection with HECu. **gānge* „molars” [Hds.]. M. Lamberti (1987, 533) compared also LECu.: Baiso *munḡe* „mouth, lip” [Lmb.], which is improbable. Later, he (LS 1997, 461) combined the East Cushitic root with his PCu.-Om. **marg-* > Wolayta *morgiy-a* „shoulder, hump”, which is impossible.

³⁹ Attested in ECu. **mīn-* [GT]: Saho & Afar *minin* „die Augenbrauen” [Rn. 1886, 882; 1890, 269] = *minin* „(part of the face around the eyebrow)” [Lmb.] | Rendille *mīn* „forehead” [PG 1999, 224] | PKonsoid **mīn-da* [Black] > Konso, Turo, Gato *mīn-ta* „forehead, face” [Black], Konso *mīn-tā*, Mossiya *mīn-ta* „forehead, face” [Lmb.], Dirayta *mīn-ta* „forehead” [Lmb.], Gidole, Mashile, Bussa *mīn-t* „forehead, face” [Black] (Konsoid: Black 1974, 255) | HECu.: Hadiyya *mīne* „forehead” [Lmb.], Kambatta *mīne* „forehead, face” [Lmb.], Alaba *mīne* [Lmb.] = *mīnita* „face” [Crass], Qabenna *mīnit* „face” [Korhonen etc.] = *mīnita* [Crass] (HECu.: Crass 2001, 47, #69) | Dullay **mīn-te* „forehead, face” [Lmb.]: Harso *mīn-čé* „Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite” [AMS], Gawwada *mīn-te* „Stirn, Vorderseite, Gesicht” [AMS] = „forehead” [Black], Dobase (Gobeze) *mīn-te* „forehead, face” [Black] = *mīn-čé* „Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite” [AMS], Gollango *mīn-té* „Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite” [AMS], Tsamay *mīn-te* „face” [Blz. < ?] (Dullay data: AMS 1980, 175, 213; Cu. data: Black 1975, 296; Lamberti 1987, 533; 2005, 233, §38) ||| NOM.: (?) Yemsa *maṅā* [-ṅ- < ?] „eyebrow” [Lmb. 1993, 365] ||| WCh.: Butura *maan* „forehead” [Magwa 1985, 15], Daffo-Butura *maán* „forehead” [Blench 2001 MS, 5] || CCh.: Hina *manēno* „Stirn” [Str. 1922-23, 113]. The ECu.-Hina etymology is due to V. Blazek (2000, 182-3, §7), who compared this Afro-Asiatic root also with IE **mein-* „face” [Blz.] (IE data: Jucquois, Orbis 16, 1967, 177-9; Tischler, HEG 1990, 197) and PDravidian **mun-* „front” [DED #5020a].

von etwas" (PT-, Wb III 19-20) was, beside a number of unsuccessful efforts,⁴⁰ fairly convincingly connected by W.F. Albright (1918, 224 pace Ember) to Hbr. $\sqrt{h}ll$ hifil „2. anfangen", hofal „angefangen werden" [GB 233-4] = hifil „to begin", hofal „to be begun" [KB 320], hence Hbr. $t\dot{a}hill\dot{a}$ „Anfang" [GB 875] = „beginning" [KB 1717]. This attractive suggestion, however, fails because of the entirely different semantic background of Sem. $\sqrt{h}ll$ „to untie" [KB]. Therefore, the etymology by G. Takács (2013, 162) remains at the moment as the only plausible one both semantically and phonologically, cf. Sem.: Geez $\sqrt{h}wr$: *hora* „to go forth, proceed etc." [Lsl. 1987, 249] ||| ECu. $\sqrt{h}or$ - (with a different laryngeal) „to be in front" [Sasse 1979, 40] > i.a. PSam $\sqrt{h}or$ „past, first, earlier", $\sqrt{h}orei$ „in front" [Heine 1978, 63] > i.a. Boni *hor* „Vorderseite" [Sasse 1980, 98] ||| CCh.: Masa *hùr* „faire avancer (en poussant), avancer" [Ctc. 1983, 90] < AA $\sqrt{h}r$ (var. $\sqrt{h}r?$) „front" [GT].

Eg. hr „Gesicht" (OK-, Wb III 125-127), act. $\sqrt{h}ar$ (NBÄ 350, 355, 420) > Cpt. (SALB) **20** etc. „Gesicht, Antlitz, Oberfläche, Seite, Gegend" (KHW 351) has up to now remained void of a convincing etymology:

(1) A. Ember (1913, 117, #64; 1917, 89, #141), followed by G. Thausing (1932, 292, fn. 1), F. von Calice (GÄSW 178, #723), and W. Leslau (1962, 66-67), assumed a (nowhere attested) original sense \sqrt{h} „head" and equated it with Sem.: Mehri *herē* „head" [Jahn, Ember] = here [Lsl.] = $h\dot{a}-r\dot{o}h \sim h\dot{a}-r\dot{o}h$, pl. $h\dot{a}-r\dot{a}h$ [Jns. 1987, 310], cf. also Qishn *herú* „Kopf, Spitze, Höhe, Vorbgebirge" [Jahn]. Ember even quoted Bittner, who, just like W. Leslau (1945, 235) half of a century later, had already correctly analyzed in the Modern South Arabian word a prefix $h-$ + \sqrt{reh} < \sqrt{res} (displaying the SARabian shift of $h < Sem. \sqrt{s}$), which is identical with Sem. $\sqrt{ra}^{\sqrt{s}}$ - „head". Following this chain of derivation, Leslau (1962, l.c.) was undisturbed to even *expressis verbis* project the same segmentation onto Eg. *hr*, „where $h-$ is also a prefix" (!), which, if this were true, would imply pure anachronism as the shift of Sem. $\sqrt{s} > h$ in certain Semitic languages is not at all to be observed in Egyptian, let alone that the common Afro-Asiatic nominal class marker \sqrt{h} (Takács 1997) does not occur as prefix (only as suffix) in Egyptian. By the way, the closest cognate of Sem. $\sqrt{ra}^{\sqrt{s}}$ - appears in Eg. *3js* (cf. part I of „Layers ...").

(2) W.F. Albright (1927, 224) combined it with Ar. *hurr-at-* „cheek (the name refers to the bright color of the cheek)" [Alb.] = „Wange (von der blühenden Farbe)" [Clc.], which, however, literally means only „3. franche, pure, intacte, vierge" [BK I 401] from

⁴⁰ H. Holma (1919, 40) identified it with Akk. *irtu* „Brust" explained from Sem. $\sqrt{hir-t}$ (labelled „*unsicher*"), which was listed by F. von Calice (GÄSW #703) among the dubious comparisons. As noted by Holma (l.c., fn. 1) himself, the Akkadian term was combined by C. Brockelmann (via metathesis) with Ar. *ri²-at-* „lung", which rules out any connection with Eg. *h3.t*. In order to avoid this, Holma arbitrarily considered the Arabic word as a loanword from Akkadian. Th. Schneider (1997, 201, #60), in turn, supposed a relationship with Ar. *γurr-at-* „1. weißer Stirnfleck bei Pferden, 2. Blesse, 3. Bestes, Schönstes (von einer Sache)", although its basic sense is rather far from that of Eg. *h3.t*: „1. whiteness, clearness of a colour or complexion, 2. a star or blaze or white mark on the forehead of a horse, the space itself of the face that is occupied by whiteness, (in a dog) a white speck or a small white spot above each of the eyes" [Lane 2238b], cf. also Bed. *êra* ~ *êla* „1. weiße Farbe, 2. licht, rein, weiß" [Rn. 1895, 27] || ECu. $\sqrt{a/irr}$ - „white, grey hair" [Sasse 1982, 28].

the verbal root \sqrt{hrr} „devenir homme de condition libre” [BK I 400]. Albright arbitrarily isolated the Arabic word from $h\ddot{u}rru-l-wa\ddot{g}hi$ „what appears of the face or what appears of the elevated part of the cheek, i.e., the ball, or most prominent place, of the cheek” hence $\text{ʔ}al-h\ddot{u}rr-at-u$ signifies „the elevated part of the cheek, what fronts one, of the face or the four tracks of the tears, from each corner of each eye” [Lane 539a] = $h\ddot{u}rru-l-wa\ddot{g}hi$ „proprement pommette, partie haute, éminente de la joue (s’emploie dans le sens de joue)”, cf. $h\ddot{u}rr-$ „joue” [Dozy I 262-263]. He even included Eg. $h\ddot{r}r.t$ „blossom” in this (probably wrong) comparison, which, in F. von Calice’s (GÄSW 178, #723) view, „ist abzulehnen, da das äg. Wort primär ‘Kopf’ heisst”. This argumentation (inspired by Ember’s etymology above) is unacceptable. Albright’s proposal is false, since he disregarded the basic sense of the Arabic root.

(3) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 185), in turn, equated Eg. $h\ddot{r}$ with their CCh. * $hir-$ „face”, which was based, in fact, solely on Daba $h\ddot{u}rra$ „1. eye, 2. face” [Kraft], for which, however, many more cognates are known, cf. still CCh.: Muyaŋ er „1. eye, 2. face” [Smith], Mada èrè „œil” [Nkoumou], Zulgo aré „eye” [Haller], Gemzek ere „eye” [Sabatai], Mbazla $\text{ʔ}aray$ „eye” [Trn.] = $\dot{a}r\dot{a}y$ [IL] | Hide iri „eye” [Bramlett] | Zina iri „eye” [Odden] | Vulum aray „yeux” [Trn.], Mbara ree „1. eyes, 2. face” [Trn.] | Gidar hara/a „eye” [Schuh] = hara [Hungerford] | Masa ira-no „1. eye, 2. face” [Kraft], Misme (Zime) ir „1. eye, 2. face” [Kraft], Banana irà „eye” [Kraft], Museye írí ~ íř „eye” [Kraft] || WCh.: Dera yerò „eye” [Kraft] | Burma yír „1. eye, 2. face” [Kraft], Polchi yír „eye” [Kraft], Dwot $\text{ʔ}ir$ „eye” [Kraft], Seya y’r „eye” [Kraft], Buli $\text{ʔ}ir$ „eye” [Kraft]. The common source of all these (and many further) Chadic cognates has been diversely reconstructed and is still a matter of controversies. R. Ma and P. Newman (1966, 234, #29) isolated a monoradical PCh. * $-d-$ „eye”. Later, P. Newman (1977, 26) set up PCh. * $id\dot{a}$ „eye”. V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1990, 90, #47; HSED #112), in turn, reconstructed PCh. * $\text{ʔ}ir-$ „eye”, which they identified with Eg. $jr.t$ „eye”. H. Jungraithmayr (JI 1994 I 60A) postulated PCh. * \sqrt{ydn} „eye”. R. Gravina (2014 MS, 61) has CCh. * $haday$. That is, most of the authors assumed a rhotacism in the parallels with $-r < *d-$. Consequently, the Afro-Asiatic parallels thereof are also disputed. In any case, there is little proof for an initial * $h-$.

All in all, so far only dubious suggestions have been published, neither of which is acceptable. I suspect Eg. $h\ddot{r}$ therefore to derive ultimately from the same Afro-Asiatic root as Eg. $h\ddot{3}.t$ „front” (above), i.e., AA * $\sqrt{h\ddot{r}}$ „front” [GT]. Only their derivational nominal stems (from the same root) were vocalized and syllabically constructed otherwise, which may have resulted in $-r/-3-$.

Eg. $h\ddot{f}t$ (no det.) „das Gesicht (?)” (NE hapax, Wb III 274, 2) seems to be an occasional term derivable from the basic sense of the most widespread prep. $h\ddot{f}t$ „1. in Gegenwart (einer Person), 2. gemäß (einer Sache), 3. zur Zeit von, gleichzeitig mit (etwas), usw.” (OK-, WB III 274). The etymology of Eg. $h\ddot{f}t$ is still fully obscure.⁴¹

⁴¹ No external parallels whatsoever have emerged over more than a century’s etymological research (in the period I scanned since Erman 1892), which *eo ipso* makes me suspect as if we were dealing with an Egyptian innovation

Eg. *ḥnt* „Gesicht, Vorderseite des Kopfes” (PT, Wb III 302, 1-5) is, as pointed out by G. Takács (2004, 193f.; EDE III 511), akin to Sem.: MSA **ḥnt* „to be in front (?)” [GT]: Harsusi *ḥntī* „one of the fore-teats of a camel” [Jns. 1977, 141], Jibbali *ḥntī* „front, front part of anything”, *ḥnt* „outside”, *aḥnīt* „to take, put out, go out in spring, etc.” [Jns. 1981, 303], Mehri *ḥntáy* „front udder of a camel” [Jns. 1987, 445]. This root apparently stands isolated not only in Semitic, but the entire Afro-Asiatic family also.⁴² Thus, here, we may speak of an exclusive Egypto-Semitic isogloss. Formerly, besides, for Eg. *ḥnt*, there had been suggested a great number of controversial etymologies, which are all problematic.⁴³

Eg. *dhn.t* „Stirn” (MK-, Wb V 478, 6-10; ÄWb II 2796) = „1. forehead” (FD 315) = „peak of brow” (Pap. Chester Beatty VII, Walker 1996, 321), metaphorically also used as *dhn.t* „Felswand, Bergvosprung, Bergspitze” (NK, Wb V 478, 11) = „mountain-top” (Amarna, FD 315), in fact **dīhn.at* (Vergote 1973 I b, 44, §37 and 147, §85; Vycichl 1990, 221) = **dēhn.ṭ* (NBÄ 400, n. 84) > Cpt. (S) **ṬḂṬṆḂ**, (B) **ṬḂṬṆṬ** „front” (CD 460b), hence denominative *dhn* „(den Boden) mit der Stirn berühren” (MK, Wb V

originating from *ḥnt* of clearly the same basic sense, where -n- may have perhaps been arbitrarily rendered as the *Distanzelement* *-n of the deictic pronouns (lit. *,this in front”) by the ancient ones’ popular etymology leading to a forged secondary variety *ḥft* with the element *-f (lit. *,that in front”).

⁴² As a remote root variety (with metathesis + different dental plosive) cp. perhaps also SBrb.: ETawllemet & Ayr *ə-nkəd* „1. aller au devant de, 2. prévenir (par des mesures préventives)” [PAM 2003, 609].

⁴³ Neither of the suggested solutions is satisfactory: (1) H. Holma (1911, x; 1919, 42) treated it falsely as a fem. **ḥn.t* (!) in order to equate it (via met.) with Akk. *naḥnaḥatu* „Nasenscheidewand” [AHW 715] = *naḥnaḥūti ša appi* „die Nasenknorpel” [Holma], for which cp. rather Syr. *naḥnaḥtā* „die Mandeln im Halse”, Ar. *nuḥnuḥ-* „Rachenmandel” (Sem.: AHW l.c.). (2) A. Ember 1918, 31; 1921, 177; 1926, 310, #6.2; ESS §11.d.2, §15.a.16, §25.b.8; W.F. Albright 1918, 90; 1918, 239, #74; F. Behnk 1928, 140, #38; HSED #1340: Eg. *ḥnt* < **ḥnt* via partial assim. of the labial *-m- to dental -t and the met. of **ḥtm* ~ Akk. *ḥuṭṭimmu* „snout” [AHW 362] || PBHbr. *ḥōṭām* „the distinctive feature of the face, nose, nostril” [Jastrow 1950, 431] | Ar. *ḥaṭm-* „bec, museau” [BK I 596] = „snout, muzzle” [Alb.]. (3) There is a long tradition of comparing Eg. *ḥnt* with WCh.: Hausa *hāncī*, pl. *hāntú-nà* „nose” [Abr. 1962, 369] supported by F. Behnk (1928, 140, #38), W. Vycichl (1934, 71), D. Ol’derogge (1952, 38; 1956, 12; 1960, 800), V.M. Illič-Svityč (1966, 336, #8.4), C.T. Hodge (1968, 20; 1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A; 1991, 160, §18). False, because (as pointed out in JI 1994 I, 129) the Hausa form can be divided into the ha- prefix of body parts + Ch. *-ntin/r „nose”. This Eg.-Hausa comparison was rightly rejected already by N. Pilszczikowa (1958, 99), who identified in Hausa *hāncī* the well-known Hausa prefix ha- occurring in Ch. names of body parts. (4) C.T. Hodge (1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A; 1991, 160, §18) combined the alleged Eg.-Hausa parallel with Ar. *ḥnn* „to speak nasally”, which contains no match for the Eg. C₃. In addition, the basic sense of Eg. *ḥnt* is „front”, not „nose”. (5) C.T. Hodge (1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A): Eg. & Hausa ~ SCu. **ntse* „in front” [Ehret]. (6) V. Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 19): ~ Bed. **hanat* „before” [Blz.] attested in *hānat-ʿāwi* „forenoon”, cf. *ʿāwi* „noon”. (7) Its long-range (Nostratic) comparison (often with the inclusion of Hausa *hantii*) with PIE **Hant-* „Vorderseite, Stirn”, loc. **Hanti* „im Angesicht, Gegenüber” [IEW 48-49] has been maintained by several scholars (Forrer 1930, 243, #3; Ivanov 1965, 15-16; 1966, 106-107, fn. 9; Illič-Svityč 1966, 336, #8.4; Hodge 1968, 20; 1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1991, 160, §18; Bomhard 1988, 446; Shevoroshkin 1988, 541; Ray 1992, 134, n. 15). (8) E. Zyhlarz (1934-5, 253): ~ ONub. **KOANT(I)** Vorfahr”. Genetic cognacy excluded. (9) L. Homburger (1930, 283): Eg. *mḥnt* (!) ~ Ful *ḥari* „visage”. Clearly absurd. (10) P. Lacau (1970, 49, §110) derived Eg. *ḥnt* < **ḥnr* ~ **ḥnj* (!) ~ Ar. *naḥara* „ronfler, renifler”, *maḥar-* „narine” with right reservation as a „pure hypothesis”. (11) C.T. Hodge (1991, 160, §18): ~ Brb. **himmīw* (?), „forehead” [Prasse, MGT II 171].

478-9) = „1. lit. Touch with the forehead, to bow to, 2. appoint, order” (FD 315): the underlying primary sense was figured by W.F. Albright (1918, 255, #130-133, cf. also ESS §11.a.60) as properly *„the lofty part” just like it is the case with Ar. ġabh-at-, and so he equated the deduced Eg. *√dhn „be high” (via metathesis) with Ar. √nhd „to be swollen and rounded (of breasts, skin-bottles)”, nahd- „female breast” (≈ waṭb- „skin-bottle, big breast”), which represent by-form of Sem. *√nʿd. This suggestion was received by F. von Calice (GÄSW 223, #925) with right doubts. During my Afro-Asiatic etymological research I have found no cognates with the sense „forehead” either. The only thing I have to agree with Albright in any case is that the sense of Eg. dhn.t as an anatomical term must necessarily be secondary due to an Egyptian innovation from a primary PEg. *√dhn „be high”, the only acceptable cognates of which I have so far detected in West Chadic, cf. Angas-Sura *ḍʷeŋ ~ *ḍʷa₂ŋ (or *gʷ₂eŋ ~ *gʷ₂a₂ŋ) „1. upper part, 2. up” [GT],⁴⁴ which has a possible root variety in Angas-Sura *ṭiŋ (var. *ṭuŋ?) > *ṭəŋ „1. high, 2. upper part, 3. sky” [GT].⁴⁵ Chadic *ŋ has been known as a possible result of an earlier plain nasal (*m or *n) + lost pharyngeal or laryngeal (cf. IS 1966, 33, fn. 11; CLD I 10).

„Eyebrow”

Eg. jnh ~ OK-MK var. **ʿnh** „Augenbraue” (Wb I 99, 1) = „eyebrow” (FD 23): the only etymology has so far been offered by W.F. Albright (1927, 206), who, along with a number of other (sometimes not even interrelated) Egyptian words, including Eg. jnh „umgeben” (XVIII., Wb I 99) = „to surround, enclose” (FD 24), traced it back to his hypothetical *√nh „to stretch”, which rightly evoked F. Calice’s (GÄSW 119, #499) objection: „wenn auch diese Zusammenhänge wenigstens zum Teil durchaus möglich sind, so greifen sie doch m.E. über das von uns gegenwärtig Erfassbare hinaus”. Following the old tradition,⁴⁶ J. Osing (2001, 576) was also convinced that for Eg. „jnh Augenbraue (zusammen mit dem zugehörigen Verb jnh umgeben, umranden) ... die ältere, sicherlich ursprüngliche Form ist ʿnh”, which he, however, has tried to justify by ill-founded arguments. First, in

⁴⁴ Attested in Angas yeng ~ yäng ~ yang „above” [Flk. 1915, 307] = kə ʿgiyán (K) „up” vs. ʿgéŋ (K) ~ ʿgyéŋ (Ks) „high up” [Jng. 1962 MS, 13, 18] = ka-dyeŋ „up there”, cf. kwaŋ ka-dyeŋ „west” [ALC 1978, 23, 29] = ka-dyeŋ „up”, cf. ka ḍyeŋ nyi „up there” [Gochal 1994, 61, 107], Sura déŋ „1. Oberseite, oben, 2. Himmel” [Jng. 1963, 63] = ḍeŋ ~ ḍeŋ naan „sky” [Krf.], Mupun déŋ „1. upper part, top, 2. sky, heaven”, cf. ḍeŋ (adv.) „on, about (Jipaari)” [Frj. 1991, 15] (Angas-Sura data: Takács 2004, 101).

⁴⁵ Attested in Gerka tung-mo „above” [Ftp. 1911, 214, 218], Angas ting „above” [Ormsby 1914, 207, 209, 314], Mushere ting „up”, ting-ting ~ tin-tin „highly” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 364, 366, 370], Montol ka-tun (sic: -n) „above” [Ftp. 1911, 214-5, 220], Goemay tung (sic: -u-) „tall”, ke-teng (sic: -e-) „above” [Ftp. 1911, 214, 217, 220] = toeng „height”, goe-toeng „1. (adv.) up, upwards, 2. the high part” [Srl. 1937, 66, 251] = teŋ „to be high, tall”, gə-teŋ „1. sky, 2. (adv.) up, upright” [Hellwig 2000 MS, 11, 36] (Angas-Sura data: Stolbova 1987, 168, #210; Takács 2004, 384).

⁴⁶ W. Spiegelberg (in his KHW 84 pace K. Sethe), similarly F. von Calice (l.c.: „ältere Schreibung ʿnh”), G. Fecht (1960, 177, #364).

support of the older ʿnh Osing (l.c., fn. 99) cited a number of CT places⁴⁷ that altogether comprise 23 occurrences of our word, where ʿnh is only attested 6 times, while jʿnh only twice, but the „younger” jnh occurs in 15 instances (!).⁴⁸ Surprisingly, Osing even quoted whole CT passages for ʿnh, which do not have even one single (!) instance of ʿnh (cf. CT IV 299b, IV 301c, IV 313b, VI 124b). Secondly, since most forms display jnh, it is no wonder that CT vars. are glossed as jnh even most recently in DCT 41 – similarly to the one single instance of OEg. ʿnh „Augenbraue” (V., ÄWb I 156: glossed as jnh!), which Osing left unnoticed. Thirdly, the fact that there is one single OK var. with ʿ- does not alter a bit the *Lautgeschichte* of PEg. *jnh > OEg. ʿnh ~ *jnh (together with PEg. *jnh > OK ʿnh ~ jnh „to live”, below) as an early example of the change PEg. *j- > OEg. ʿ- (hence later j-) in the proximity of h and ħ. Moreover, the metathetic change of OEg. roots containing ħ and a nasal (m, n) is known in a number of examples.⁴⁹ For all these reasons, I have to maintain (pace EDE I 91) the derivation of Eg. jnh < *√rnħ < **√nrħ (via metathesis) from AA *√nrħ ~ *√nyr „eyebrow” [GT] attested in SBrb. *a-nħar „eyebrows, sourcil” [GT] = *a-enēr [Ajh.]⁵⁰ ||| ECu. *nʿār- „1. eyebrow, 2. forehead” [GT]⁵¹ ||| ECh.: Mokilko nyínyàri (pl.) „Augenbrauen” [Lukas 1977, 219]. This South Berber-East Cushitic-Mokilko isogloss is obviously etymologically identical with AA *naħr- „front” [GT] attested in Arabic √nrħ,⁵² Berber (sine Tuareg) *√nyr > *√nyr

⁴⁷ Osing (l.c.): „S. CT IV 298/299b, 301c, 313b^{T2B3}, V 32d, VI 123k = 124b, VII 159g” (sic).

⁴⁸ The var. ʿnh occurs 6x (CT IV 298b: Sq4Sq, T1C^b; CT V 32d: B1C; CT VI 123k: M36C, M35c; CT VII 159g: P.Gard.III) and jʿnh 2x (CT IV 298b: B9C^b, CT V 32d: B2L), while jnh 15 times (CT IV 298b: B14, M4C, M54C; CT IV 299b: L1N4, T1Be, T3Be, M57c, M1N4; CT IV 301c: M4C, M54C, T1Be, T2Be, T3Be; CT IV 313b: T2Be; CT VI 124b: M1 Ann.).

⁴⁹ Cf. (1) OK ħmz (m) vs. ħmz.t (f) „alte Schreibung für mzh.(t)” > Gr. χάμψα, the Eg. name of crocodile acc. to Herodot (Wb III 96, 11-12), early vars. to mzh „Krokodil” (OK, Wb II 136), perhaps related to ES & Cu. (*Wanderwort?*) *ħazz- [GT: < *ħamz-?] „crocodile” (cf. Leslau 1963, 87; 1979 III, 119; Cerulli 1951, 408); (2) Eg. ħms „Kornähre” (BD, Wb III 367, 5) = ħms ~ ħmz „ear of corn” (CT, DCT 419) < OEg. *ħmz (unattested) [reg. < *ħmz], cognate to Ar. mazħ- „Kornähre” (Eg.-Ar.: Vycichl 1958, 388; 1959, 146, #4; 1990, 52), cf. also NOM.: Kaffā moč „metter la spiga (pianta)”, močč-ō „spiga” [Crl. 1951, 468]; (3) OK ħm^c, var. to mh^c ~ m^cħ „Flachs” (Wb II 121, 4; AÄG §93).

⁵⁰ Cf. Ahaggar ē-ner, pl. ā-nār-en „sourcil” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1399] = e-nār, pl. ā-nār-en [Prs.] = ē-nēr [Ajh. 1986, 9], Ghat a-nar, a-nar-en „sourcil” [Nehlil 1909, 207], Taneslemt i-nħar ~ a-nħar [Prasse], ETawllemmet a-nār-en (pl.) „cils” [Nicolas 1957, 574] = Ayr a-nar and ETawllemmet a-nar, pl. a-nar-ān „sourcil” [Alojaly 1980, 149; PAM 2003, 622], Tawllemmet i-nār ~ a-nar ~ a-nir ~ a-nirəħ [Prs.], Tadghaq a-nħar „sourcil” [PAM l.c.; Sudlow l.c.], Tudalt a-nar „eyebrow” [Sudlow 2001, 276] (SBrb.: Prasse 1969, 84, #560).

⁵¹ Cf. Oromo nyar-a „eyebrow, eyelash” [Foot 1913, 46] = nār-a „eyebrow”, nāra gura „to frown, wrinkle forehead” (cf. gūra „to bring together”) [Gragg 1982, 301] = nār-a „eyebrow” [Hudson 1989, 60] | Arbore nār (m) „forehead” [Hayward 1984, 388] = nār-a [Ehret 1987, 110, #466] | Tsamay nyār-a „forehead” [Ehret 1991, 264], cf. also Ongota nār-a „forehead” [Fleming 1992, 191]. Note that Oromo -ā- is regular < *aħ- (cf. Sasse 1979, 36).

⁵² Cf. Ar. naħr- „the uppermost part of the breast or chest”, cf. naħir- „faced or fronted”, nāħir-(at)- „the parts facing, in front of” [Lane 2774-5] = naħr- „3. vis-à-vis, 4. commencement”, cf. naħara I „4. faire face, vis-à-vis à un autre” [BK II 1213].

~ *√nry ~ *√rny „front” [Bst.],⁵³ and Lowland East Cushitic *nahār „breast” [GT].⁵⁴ In addition, the alleged „Ableitungsverbum”, i.e., Eg. jnh „to surround”, which is only attested from the NK onwards with no trace of an earlier ḥnh at all (as one might expect following Osing’s theory),⁵⁵ and is, henceforth, hardly fitting as the direct derivational source of Eg. jnh „eyebrow”⁵⁶, suspiciously displays in fact the very same Lautgeschichte as Eg. jnh ~ ḥnh „eyebrow” (i.e., < *rnḥ, metathesis of *nḥr) does, cf. WCh.: Suroid *nēr „to surround” [GT 2004, 267],⁵⁷ which can, in principle, deduced also from a hypothetical **√nḥr [GT]. One may not, of course, *a priori* exclude the remote (Proto-Afro-Asiatic) connection of AA *√nḥr „eyebrow” [GT] vs. AA *√nḥr „to surround” [GT] – provided AA *√nḥr „front part” comes from „eyebrow” and not *vice versa*.

Eg. smd „die Augenbraue” (als Körperteil nur GR belegt, Wb V 146, 10) = „sourcils” (Lacau 1970, 48, §105) = „eyebrows” (PL 850), whose eyebrow determinative occurs already in smd „Wink mit der Augenbraue” (XVIII., Wb V 146, 11) vs. smd.t „*Augenzwinkern” (XII., ÄWb II 2223) and smd.t „Rand”, cf. jnh m smd.t „mit einer Randinschrift umgeben” (XIX., Wb V 146, 12), has been regarded by G. Lefèbvre (1952, 18, §18) and P. Wilson (PL 850) as a corruption of smr.wt (fem. pl.) „paupières” (hapax from BD 172:15, Lacau l.c. pace Lefèbvre l.c., absent in Wb) = „eyebrows” (Wilson l.c.) equated by P. Lacau (1970, 48, §106) with Sem.: Hbr. (hapax from Ps 77:5) *šmurā, pl. cstr. šmurōt- „Augenlid” [GB 849] = „paupières” [Lacau] = „eyelid” [KB 1586] | Jaram. timmūrta „Wimper, Augenlid” [Dalman 1922, 444] = tūmūrā „Wimper, Augenlid” [Lévy 1924 IV 653] = tūmūrā „eye-lash, eye-lid” [Jastrow 1950, 1665], Syr. temrā „eyelid” [KB].

⁵³ Cf. NBrb.: Tamazight i-nir, pl. i-nra-un „front” [Abès 1916, 123] = i-nir, pl. i-nir-n, also a-nyír, pl. i-nyir-n „front (anatomie)” [Taïfi 1991, 495, 511], Zayan and Sgugu ṭa-iner-t, „front” [Lbg. 1924, 572] | Seghrushen a-nyír, pl. i-nyar „front” [Pellat 1955, 122] | PRif *-ynar „front” [GT] > Botiwa ṭa-inar-t [Biamay 1911, 187], Amert a-inār [Rns.], Tuzin ṭe-inar-in (pl.) [Rns.], Uriaghel, Iboqqoyen, Senhazha ṭa-warna (met.) [Rns.] etc. (Rif data: Renisio 1932, 391) | Iznasen ṭa-nīer-t, pl. ṭi-nir-iw-in „front” [Rns.] | Shenwa hi-nir-t, pl. hi-niar ~ hi-neri-in „front” [Laoust 1912, 149] | Ait Said ṭa-niar-t „front” [Biamay] = ṭa-nā-t „le front” [Allati 1986, 37] | Beni Said ṭa-niar-t „front” [Bst. 1909, 250] | Qabyle a-nyír, pl. i-nyír-en „front (anatomie)” [Dallet 1982, 589], Zwawa a-nir ~ a-nir, pl. i-nir-en „front saillant” [Bst. 1890, 326] = a-nir „front” [Biamay 1917, 101] = a-nyír „front” [Bst. 1909, 250] || EBrb.: Ghadames ṭ-nar „front (tête)” [Lanfry 1973, 246, #1153] = é-nar „front” [Dallet], Siwa ne-nnir (n- Genitivexponent) „Stirn” [Scholz apud Stumme 1914, 94-95] = e-nnir [Stumme 1914, 104] = i-nír „forehead” [Quibell 1918, 100] || WBrb.: Zenaga nēr, pl. nēr-un „front” [Ncl. 1953, 230] (Brb. data: Basset 1929, 19-20). Metathesis < *rnḥ [GT] in Uriaghel, Iboqqoyen, Senhazha.

⁵⁴ Cf. LECu.: Saho nahār „Brust” [Rn. 1890, 290] = nahār (so, with -ḥ-) „1. petto, 2. (talora anche il senso di) cuore” [CR 1913, 73], Afar nahār „Brust”, nahār-a „Anfang, Beginn” [Rn. 1886, 889-890] = nahar „chest, front (poitrine, avant)” [PH 1985, 173].

⁵⁵ It represented, nevertheless, no hindrance for J. Osing in his way of explaining it from an unattested and baseless OEg. *ḥnh (cf. also NBÄ 538-9, n. 373).

⁵⁶ Also J. Vergote (1971, 49) figured its primary sense as „that which encircles, surrounds” adhering to the Semitic pattern *qitalu (sic) = alleged Eg. *sidmu (sic) for „concrete nouns”.

⁵⁷ Attested at the moment, to the best of my knowledge, solely in Sura neer „umgeben, umliegen, umzingeln” [Jng. 1963, 76], Mupun neer „to surround, gang up on someone” [Frj. 1991, 42].

„Mouth”

Eg. wt „Zunge (?), Mund (?)” (PT 497c, Wb I 377, 19) = wtwt „*Gebrüll (wohl das Donnergeräusch, das die Fallsteine beim Herabstürzen machen)” (Spiegel 1971, 325 and fn. 13 pace ÜKAPT II 334; so also ÄWb I 387) = wtwt „roaring” (AEPT 97): rendering as an anatomical term highly disputed. A. Dolgopolsky (2008 MS, 2372, #2547) affiliated it with Sem.: Ar. $\sqrt{wt\ddot{t}}$ „to shout, make noise, cry out (children)” [BK II 1559] || Tigre-Tigray $\sqrt{wt\ddot{y}}$ „to sing” [DRS 528] || HECu. *odʔ- (?) „to cry, mourn” [Hudson 1989, 45] and even ECh.: Kera wááté „sagen” [Ebert 1976, 101]. For the latter, however, cf. rather HECu. *od-o „gossip, news”, *od-ēs- „to gossip, tell news” [Hudson 1989, 419] || NOm. *yot-/*wot- „to tell, say” [OS 1992 pace Dlg. 1973, 186] > i.a. Gamu od-a „voice, language” [Sottile 1999, 430].

Eg. r (perhaps **rj** pace Osing)⁵⁸ „Mund” (OK-, Wb II 389-390), vocalized *ráj, act. *ráj⁵⁹ > (SALB) ϩO, (F) λO „Mund” (NBÄ 369, 484), is evidently the same word as r „Öffnung, Tür” (OK-, Wb II 390-391) and the question is which item has preserved the original meaning. The total lack of Afro-Asiatic cognates for Eg. r with the meaning „mouth” is revealing and speaks for an Egyptian innovation either internally from Eg. r „opening” or from some Afro-Asiatic root with another basic sense, which represents a common starting point for most of the – often really attractive – etymologies.

(1) F. Behnk (1927, 82, #20, cf. also Albright 1927, 202) assumed Eg. r3 < *dl in the light of Eg. srs > sjs „6” ~ Sem. *šidš- „6” and equated Eg. r3 with Sem. *dal-(t)- „door”, which was declined by F. Calice (GÄSW 169, #686).

(2) W.F. Albright (quoted in ESS 9, §3.b; Lacau 1970, 10, §20) combined it with Ar. riʔ-at- „lung”, which did not convince – rightly – either F. Calice (GÄSW 169, #686) or G. Garbini (1971, 135) or O. Rössler (1983, 84).

(3) W. Vycichl (1934, 85), in turn, affiliated it with Common Brb. *ar „öffnen” [Vcl.], which may pose an option provided the root was merely *√r (and not *√Hr). Cf. also CCh.: Lame-Peve ar „to open” [Venberg 1975, 37], which, however, suggests that the 1st radical was a laryngeal.

(4) W. Vycichl (1959, 38; 1985, 396) has later changed his mind and proposed Eg. r33 (sic: -33) ~ Ar. $\sqrt{rw\ddot{y}}$ (I pf. rawā, impf. yarwī) „tradieren, erzählen” || Shhauri (Shahri) re „singen”. He adduced semantic parallels for the semantic shift „mouth” vs. „tell”.

⁵⁸ Although the word in all its meanings was overwhelmingly written with just one single consonant r, which is why I prefer the transliteration r, the ill-founded misbelief, that it was in fact r3 with a nowhere attested second radical -3, has survived until now in a number of authoritative lexicographical and grammatical works (i.a., the Wb). The 2nd consonant could hardly have been 3 as generally supposed in Egyptian linguistics as there is no written evidence for it. Moreover, as J. Osing (NBÄ 484) pointed out, PT 421b^w and CT VII 511 have both a written double -jj as C₂ in the plene writing of rjj „Tor” and rjj „Spruch”, resp. Henceforth, he already convincingly reconstructed the C₂ as -j.

⁵⁹ The symbol ‘ signifies in modern Egyptological linguistics an undetermined weak consonant (e.g., a „real” alif: ʔ, which is, as is well-known, other than an „Egyptian” alif: 3).

Similarly, C.T. Hodge (1966, 45) connected Eg. r with WCh.: Hausa rúúrífí „cry, roar, shout”, which is apparently akin to Sem. *√rwy, whose Chadic cognates have already been proposed by W.W. Müller (1975, 70). V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #2142) too compared Eg. r with Ar. √rwy „to render other person’s words”. Vycichl’s etymology was followed by G. Garbini (1971, 135-6) too, who extended this Egypto-Arabic comparison to Ar. √rwy „dar da bere” too arguing that „in entrambi i casi è implicata una azione di «aprire la bocca», che rivela l’origine denominale della radice in questione, da un sostantivo «bocca» attestato in egiziano ma non in semitico.”

(5) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 198), in an earlier publication, identified Eg. r with their reconstructions of Ch. *√w/yr „language”, which is certainly out of the question regarding the distinct syllabic structures, which are accompanied by deviant semantics, let alone that the Cushitic cognates of the Chadic root suggest *^ɕ- as the 1st radical (cf. e.g., Sasse 1982, 106). The Russian authors later abandoned this etymology and discussed the reflexes of their AA *√r (sic: *ʔ-) „tongue” (*sine* Eg. r) in three distinct entries (HSED #74, #79, #81)!

(6) O. Rössler (1971, 306, §28 and 313, §34) correctly presumed an Eg. *ri behind the Coptic reflexes, which he identified with Sem. √l^ɕ „Kehle” in spite of the anomalous Eg. -i/j ≠ Sem. *^ɕ, which was accepted in a rather hasty manner by W. Schenkel (1993, 180, fn. 135), who ignored that later O. Rössler (1983, 85, fn. 2) abandoned this etymology himself for the sake of a new one (below): „Des Verfassers frühere Zusammenstellung von äg. r3 mit akk. luʔu ‚Schlund’ wird damit aufgegeben”.

(7) Later, O. Rössler (1983, 85) changed his mind and, for some unknown reason, gave up even his correct reconstruction of Eg. *ri for the sake of the traditional, but false r3 he erroneously traced back to *lāl (in spite of Cpt. P-), which he compared to Hbr. *lū/ōl, pl. lūl-īm, an OT *terminus technicus* „der Architektur für allerlei Zugänge, Durchgänge und Luken von Gebäuden” [Rössler] = „Wendeltreppe (LXX, Vulgata), ein Hohlraum mit Steige (pace Stade in ZAW 3, 136ff.)” [GB 382] = „trapdoor” [KB 524], attested also later in this sense⁶⁰ from the primary meaning *„gewundener Weg” as J. Levy (l.c.) suggests, who correctly derived all these, along with OT Hbr. lullāʔōt „Schlingen, Schleifen, in die die Haken gehängt werden, um die Teppiche des Zeltheiligtumes zu verbinden” [GB 387], from Sem. *√lwy „winden” [Holma 1914, 156-158, §5; AHW 541],⁶¹ which, just like its C₁C₂C₁ reflex, Tigre lāwla „to wind around, twist” [Leslau 1982, 49; 1987, 321], is related to Dem. rwrw ~ *lwlw „umherirren” (DG 261). From all this it becomes apparent that Rössler’s comparanda share the least in common with

⁶⁰ In MHbr. lūl „1. Hohlweg, ein hohler Raum des Gebäudes, der von Wänden eingeschlossen ist und innerhalb dessen ein Steigeleiter oder eine Wendeltreppe zum Auf- und Absteigen sich befindet, 2. Nische, Verschlag eines Gebäudes, bes. Hühnersteige” [Levy 1924 II 486] = „space with staircase, skylight, hollow in ground, chicken ladder, small space with staircase leading to upper chamber” [KB] (according to Rössler here used also as an euphemism for „vulva”) and JAr. lūlā „Hühnerhaus, Hühnersteige” [Levy], cf. also Ar. lūl- „screw, winding staircase” [KB, not in BK].

⁶¹ Signifying in Akkadian „umschließen, umringen” [Aro 1964, 181] and in Arabic „gebogen, gewunden sein” [Levy].

the Egyptian term for „mouth”. But we have probably even an old pharaonic reflex too,⁶² which equally excludes a connection to Eg. r.

(8) In my opinion, a possible cognacy with LECu.: Baiso ra „hole” [HL 1988, 134],⁶³ Elmolo rá? „Höhle” [Heine 1973, 280] = rrá, rá (m) „cave” [Heine 1980, 209] should be examined in spite of a possible controversial Dullay reflex with -ʿʿ-.⁶⁴ This approach appears so far the most promising one as it seems to yield both phonologically – *sine* Dullay – and semantically a perfect match of Eg. *rǎʿ, i.e., *rǎʿ? „opening”.

„Chin, Jaw”

Eg. jnʿ „Kinn” (PT 1308a-, Wb I 94, 12; ÄWb I 153b) = „chin” (FD 23) = „menton” (Lacau 1970, 63), occurring also as fem. jnʿ.t „menton” (5x in pSmith, FD 23; Lacau 1970, 64; HAM 168), was later transformed via reduplication and metathesis also into ʿnʿn „Kinn” (NK, Wb I 191, 13) = „chin” (FD 43). Its origin is not yet evidently clear, although it has been much disputed in the etymological literature. We know a couple of tempting proposals:⁶⁵

(1) A. Ember (1926, 7, §10) combined it at a time (!) with both OHbr. (hapax) *loǎʿ (only attested in st. cstr.) „jaw-bone” [Ember] (with the remark that it „*appears also as*” Eg. ʿr at the same time ..., cf. below) and Ar. nīʿ- „palais (partie supérieure du dedans de la bouche)” [Dozy II 742, not in BK or Lane] = „jaw, mandible” [Ember], which, of course, cannot be true in this form at the same time. A connection with OHbr. *loǎʿ seems rather dubious due to Eg. j- ≠ Sem. *-w-/*-Ø-, whereas the phonological agreement between Eg. jnʿ vs. Ar. √nyʿ is perfect in the light of the law of Belova, i.e., Eg. Iae j- = Sem. IIae *-y-/*-ī- (cf. EDE I 394-400). Following the suggestion by G. Takács (EDE I 39), in addition to the Arabic root, WCh.: Boghom ɲa [GT: possible < *nʿa] „chin” [Gowers in JI 1994 II 76] || CCh.: Zime-Dari nyan [partial redupl. < *nʿaʿ-n(ʿaʿ)?] „chin” [Str. in JI 1994 II 77] might also be included here < AA *√nyʿ „chin (?)” [GT]. Noteworthily, the Egyptian term forms special isogloss with the Chadic parallels, whereas the Semitic counterpart seems to have undergone a semantical shift.

⁶² Eg. nw.t (AL 78.1977: var. nj.t) „Mistkugel des Sonnenkäfers” (NK, Wb II 217, 9) = „Oval” (GHWb 397).

⁶³ It is not yet clear if it should be separated from Baiso rā „road” [Hyw. 1979, 129] = ra „path, way” [HL 1988, 134], which H.C. Fleming (1964, 54) affiliated with Somali raʿ- „to go with, follow”, although the sense of Dullay raʿʿ-e (f) „Tal, Schlucht” [AMS l.c.] may also combine the two: „valley” as „pathway (through a hill)”.

⁶⁴ Whether Bed. re ~ ra (m, f) „Wasseransammlung, Cisterne, Brunnen” [Rn. 1895, 188] = re, ri „well” [Roper 1928, 226] || Dullay: Harso, Dobase raʿʿ-e (f) „Tal, Schlucht” [AMS 1980, 182] originate from the basic sense present in Baiso and Elmolo and thus from PCu. *raʿʿ- „hole, pit” [GT] is obscure. Was the -ʿʿ- in Dullay (instead of the expected *-ʿʿ-) due to a contamination of two distinct stems attested in Baiso as ra [GT: < *raʿʿ (?)] „hole” vs. ra [GT: < *raʿʿ (?)] „path, way” [HL 1988, 134]?

⁶⁵ Not counting the absurd idea of P. Lacau (1970, 64, §161) on a connection with Ar. daqan- „menton, barbe du menton”, which was rightly questioned by himself („*Mais il s'agirait là de concordances phonétiques actuellement isolées; on doit laisser de côté cette hypothèse.*”) and definitely excluded by W.A. Ward (1972, 20, #161) with full right „*as the phonetic shifts involved are impossible*”.

(2) C.T. Hodge (1968, 22), in turn, compared the later Eg. metathetic $\text{ʕn}^{\text{c}}\text{n}$ with LECu.: Somali $\text{ʕan} \sim \text{ʕān}$ „Kinnbacken, -lade, Backe, Wange”, labáda ʕan „beide Kiefer” [Rn. 1902, 59] = ʕán , pl. ʕám-án „cheek” [Abr. 1964, 13] = „chin” [Hodge] = ʕan „cheek, Backe, Wange” [Farah & Heck 1993, 187] = „inside of mouth next to cheek” [Blz.] and WCh.: Sura gən „Wange” [Jng. 1963, 66], which is not void of problems. First of all, Hodge ignored that Somali Auslaut -n# may well originate in *m#, which used to be revealed by the nominal plural forms. This the case here too: L. Reinisch (l.c.) recorded Somali pl. ʕam-án , which he (probably mistakenly) connected with NOm.: Kafa gam-o „guancia” [Cecchi] = gám-ō „Wange, Backe” [Rn. 1888, 285] and Kunama góm-ā „Kiefer, Backen, Kinn” [Rn. 1890, 49], which lead us to a phonologically certainly entirely distinct Afro-Asiatic root (cf. Eg. gm3 and gmḥ.t). For semantical reasons, it is difficult to agree with V. Blažek’s (1994 MS Bed., 26) ill-founded ECU. *ʕan- „cheek” combined by him with SCU.: Dahalo ʕéna „tongue”, which, besides, Ch. Ehret (1980, 274) set in a quite different South Cushitic context. Secondly, one can hardly ignore the oldest form of our Egyptian term as attested in PT 1308a.

(3) A.Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 255) envisaged Eg. $\text{jn}^{\text{c}} < *√\text{yl}^{\text{c}}$ and affiliated it with Akk. $\text{lē}^{\text{c}}\text{tu}$ „1. cheek, 2. side” [CAD I 148] = „Backe, Wange, Seite” [AHW 546]⁶⁶ || Hbr. $\text{mətal}^{\text{c}}\text{ōt}$ (pl.) and metathetic var. *malte^cōt (hapax in st. cstr., Ps. 58:7) „jawbones” [KB 654] = malte^cōt (sic) and metal^cōt (sic) „tooth” [MM] | JArAm. $\text{lū}^{\text{c}}\text{ā} \sim \text{lō}^{\text{c}}\text{ā}$ „jaw” [Jastrow 1950, 700] = lw^{c} „jaw” [Sokoloff 1990, 280] = „челюсть” [MM], Syr. $\text{lū}^{\text{c}}\text{ā}$ „maxilla” [Brk. 1928, 361] = „челюсть” [MM] < Sem. *IV^c- [MM], which he regarded as a var. to his Sem. *IVḥy- „челюсть” [Mlt.] = *liḥ(a)y-(at)- „cheek, jaw” [SED I 161, #178]. Excluding Akk. $\text{lē}^{\text{c}}\text{tu}$ from the reflexes of this root set up as Sem. *IVγ- „jaw”, L. Kogan (SED I 160, #177) included also Akk. $\text{laḥ}^{\text{c}}\text{u}$ [Kogan 1995: -ḥ- possible < i.a. *-γ-] „jaw” [CAD I 44] = „Kinnbacken, Kinnlade” [AHW 528]⁶⁷ || OT Hbr. hapax (Pr. 23:2) *loā^c (attested in st. pron.: lo^ce-kā) „Kinnbacke (Delitzsch, Strack et al.: Kehle, Schlund)” [GB 388] = „jaw-bone” [Ember] = „gullet” [KB 532] = „gullet or jaw” [Kogan] || Mehri-Qishn ləḥn^{c} „double chin” [SSL 1985-6, 281]. Eventually, Kogan did not exclude a remote connection of Sem. *IVγ- „jaw” and *liḥ(a)y-(at)- „cheek, jaw”.

(4) G. Takács (EDE I 39) supposed an extra-Afro-Asiatic affiliation, cf. PCKhoisan *!ani „chin” [Baucom 1972, 19], which, however, does not exclude the derivation from AA *√ny^c „chin (?)” [GT] (described above, #1).

⁶⁶ The etymological position of the Akkadian term has long been disputed. H. Holma (1911, 33) equated it with OT Hbr. (hapax) *loā^c. W. von Soden (AHW 546, 565) assumed it to share the same Semitic root with Akk. $\text{lu}^{\text{c}}\text{u}$ „Schlund” combined by him with JArAm. and MHbr. $\text{lō}^{\text{c}}\text{ā}$, which were then disconnected by L. Kogan (1995, 160) maintaining that our Akkadian term is unrelated with OT Hbr. (hapax) *loā^c „горгanhь”, PBHbr. loā^c and JArAm. $\text{lū}^{\text{c}}\text{ā}$, which are better to be related, in his view, with Akk. $\text{lu}^{\text{c}}\text{u} \sim \text{luḥ}^{\text{c}}\text{u}$ „throat” [CAD I 258] = „Schlund” [AHW 565] = „горгanhь” [Kogan]. Later, Kogan (SED I 161, #178) derived it from his Sem. *liḥ(a)y-(at)- „cheek, jaw”.

⁶⁷ Equated by W. von Soden (AHW l.c.) rather with the reflexes of Sem. *√lḥy.

Eg. ʿrt „der Unterkiefer, die Kinnbacken” (OK, Wb I 209, 2) = „jaw(bone)” (FD 45; DCT 175) = „mâchoire inférieure (d’animal – le boeuf?)” (Lacau 1970, 56), which was later transformed (just like Eg. jn^ʿ above) via reduplication into ʿrʿr „ein Körperteil” (BD, Wb I 210, 6) = „chin (?)” (FD 45), has also been controversially evaluated in the etymological literature. So its origin is still dubious:

(1) A. Ember (1918, 31; 1926, 7, #10; 1926, 302, #10), followed by W.F. Albright (1918, 85) and F. von Calice (GÄSW #138) combined it (assuming a metathesis) with the OT Hbr. hapax *loă^ʿ (only attested in st. cstr.) „Kinnbacke (Delitzsch, Strack et al.: Kehle, Schlund)” [GB 388] = „jaw-bone” [Ember] = „throat” [Ward pace Dahood] = „gullet” [KB 532] = „gullet or jaw” [Kogan], which was declined by W.A. Ward (1972, 19, #138).

(2) F. Behnk (1927, 81, #7), in turn, searched its cognates in a semantically close homorganic Semitic root, cf. Hbr. ləḥī „chin, jawbone, cheek” [KB 525] = „Kinnbacken” [Behnk] and Ar. laḥy- „jaw(bone), jowl” [WKAS II 401], which is certainly to be abandoned as the irregular Eg. ʿ- vs. Sem. *-ḥ- plus the metathesis at a time are to be rightly considered as hardly credible.

(3) P. Lacau (1970, 57, §138 and 77, §196), whom W.A. Ward (l.c.) also sided with, explained it from Eg. √ʿrj „to go up” arguing that „*c’est qu’elle descend et monte pour mâcher*” (p. 57) and „*c’est la mâchoire inférieure, celle qui est mobile, qui monte et qui descend*” (p. 77). A bit far-fetched of a name for the lower jawbone. Following Lacau’s way, one might expect it to have been named just as well from Eg. h3j „to descend”.

(4) It seems tempting at the first glance to connect the Eg. root with PCu. *ʿal- „cheek” [Ehret 1987, 78, #324] based by Ch. Ehret (l.c.) and N. Skinner (1995, 29) on the comparison of ECU.: Oromo ill-ē ~ hill-ē „cheekbone, cheek” [Gragg 1982, 224], Oromo-Bitima ill-ē „temple (of forehead)” [Stroemer 2000, 155] | Yaaku ɛl, pl. ɛlmô^ʿ „cheek” [Heine 1975, 123] || SCU. *ʿoš- (sic: *-š-) „cheekbone” [Ehret] and some further (certainly false) *comparanda*.⁶⁸ The problem is, however, that, on the one hand, the reconstruction of PCu. *ʿ- (lost in the quoted East Cushitic languages) is solely pending on the South Cushitic data, which reflect *-ĉ- (not *-š-) and this is speaking for a quite different Afro-Asiatic origin.⁶⁹ On the other hand, one may not ignore the stubborn semantic difference between Cushitic „cheek” (attested quite uniformly with not one instance for „jaw”) vs. Egyptian „jaw” even when these sense are sometimes related.

(5) Most inspring appears a possible cognacy with LECu. *ʿʿll „пережёвывать жвачку” [Dlg. 1972, 141] = *ʿalal- „to chew” [OS] based on Somali ʿálal „Kropf der Vögel, der erste Magen wiederkäuender Tiere, chymus, das Wiederkäuen”, caus. ʿalal-ī „das Kauen verrichten, (wieder)kauen” [Rn. 1902, 57] = ʿalal-inayya „to chew” [Abr.

⁶⁸ Ch. Ehret’s *comparanda* were merely Yaaku + Bed. ʿali „calf of leg” [Roper 1928], which is semantically untenable. N. Skinner (1995, 29) added Oromo and South Cushitic (misquoted from Ehret 1980, 278).

⁶⁹ Correctly, this is SCU. *ʿoĉ- „cheekbone” [Ehret 1980, 278], in which, in this case, *-ĉ- has nothing in common with *-l-, cf. ECU. *ʿad- „cheek” [GT]: e.g. Gollango ʿad- „Backe” [AMS 1980, 195] | Konso ad-á, Dirayta add-á (pl.), Mosiya add-etá „cheek” (Konsoid: Lamberti 1987, 533, #8.b) || Sem. *ʿaš(aš)- „bone” [Leslau 1945, 233] < PAA *ʿaĉ- [GT].

1964, 10] and Oromo alal-a „ruminazione, rimasticazione” [Thiene 1939, 15] = alāl-ā „chymus, das aus dem Magen Wiederkäuer aufgestoßene Gras”, alāl-fad „wiederkäuen” [Rn.], which V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #1063) affiliated with Ar. $\sqrt{\text{c}}$ II I: ʕ alla „I. donner à boire à qqn. une seconde fois peu de tempts après la première, *et métaph.*: frapper, battre une seconde fois, réitérer ses coups”, pass. ʕ ulla „être mangé, consommé; avoir déjà servi à manger” [BK II 334]. The semantic motivation in this case might be the same as with Eg. $\text{wgj.t} \sim \text{wgv.t}$ discussed in the following entry.

Eg. wgj.t (PT 686 var. **wgv.t**)⁷⁰ „Unterkiefer, Kinnlade” (OK-, Wb I 376, 3-5) = „jaw” (FD 71) = „mâchoire” (Lacau 1970, 59, §143), act. * wāgw.^{t} (NBÄ 187) = * wagya.t , hence * wayga.t and * wagga.t , later * wa3ga.t (DELCL 242) > Dem. wggj „Unterkiefer” (DG 103:1) > Cpt. (S) $\text{ⲟⲩⲟ(ⲟ)ⲟⲎⲉ, ⲟⲩⲟⲓⲟⲎⲉ}$ etc. „jaw, cheek” (CD 512b) = „Kinbacken, Unterkiefer, Wange” (KHW 287) = „mâchoire, joue” (DELCL 242). Its deverbal derivation from Eg. wgj „kauen” (OK-, Wb I 376, 1-2) has been commonly accepted.⁷¹ Nevertheless (having checked DRS and DRB), the *Illae inf.* verbal root, which did not survive into Coptic in this form, has apparently no cognates in North Afro-Asiatic with the sense „to chew”.⁷² All this makes the impression that we are dealing here with a reverse, i.e., denominal derivation. This may formerly have been the conviction of A. Ember (1913, 118, #71) and M. Cohen (1947, #501) too, who equated Eg. wgj.t with Ar. wāgh- „face, side” [Ember] = „Gesicht, Seite, Fassade, Richtung” [Calice] with special regard to Eg. wgj „rib (or side) of a ship” (Ember, FD 71), which, however, was rightly objected already by F. von Calice (GÄSW #577) regarding this etymology as „*unwahrscheinlich, da die Grundbedeutung verschieden scheint*”, let alone that Ar. -h- is not reflected in the supposed Egyptian cognate at all. The same criticism was expressed by P. Lacau (1970, 59, §145) too: „*En réalité le sens est trop différent et le redoublement de la voyelle exige que le radical ait comporté un j ou un 3 final.*” The right path towards the true external cognates of Eg. wgj.t was discovered by D. J. Wölfel (1955, 42), when he affiliated it with some of the reflexes of NBrb. * -ggay „1. jaw, 2. face” [GT].⁷³ Then, V. Orel

⁷⁰ J. Osing (NBÄ 187) regarded this PT var. as the older form. P. Lacau (1970, 59, §145), however, set up the root as $\sqrt{\text{wgj}}$.

⁷¹ See Grapow 1954, 43 (lit. „Kauknochen”); Vergote 1965, 60; Lacau 1970, 59, §145; NBÄ 187; KHW 288 (lit. „Kauer”); DELCL 242 (lit. „celle qui mâche” conceived by W. Vycichl as an „*ancien participe actif*”).

⁷² Strangely, it is only attested in Coptic in its late reduplication, cf. (S) $\text{ⲟⲩⲟⲟⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉⲥ, ⲟⲩⲟⲟⲩⲉ}$, (L) ⲟⲩⲁⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉⲥ etc. „to chew, crush” (CD 513b) = „kauen, nagen, zerfressen, zermalmen, zerstümmern” (KHW 288) = „mâcher, ronger, broyer” (DELCL 243). In principle, the Coptic reflex, esp. in its late sense „to crush”, might be forced together with Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{wg}}^?$ > Ar. wāga^{a} „frapper (avec un couteau ou la pomme de la main), taper, donner une tape, 3. écraser, châtrer (un bélier par écrasement, en lui comprimant les testicules)” [BK II 1486-7] || Soqotri ʕoge „to hit” [Lsl.] = ʕege „frapper” [DRS] || Geez wag^{a} ~ wag^{a} „to pierce, prick, butt, gore, beat, hit, strike, make turbid, etc.” [Lsl.] = „frapper (de la corne), percer, écraser” [DRS] (Sem.: Leslau 1987, 607; DRS $\text{WG}^{\text{a}/\text{c}}$), but regarding its original sense „to push, strike”, the Semitic root stands substantially distinct etymologically from Eg. wgj „to chew”.

⁷³ Attested in medieval Shilh a-gžay-en (or a-kšay-en) „parties inférieures des joues” [Ksm.], Shilh a-gža „mâchoire”, a-gžī-wn ~ a-lži-wn (sic: -lž-) „1. (les deux) côtés du visage, 2. le bas des joues” [DRB 753] = a-gžay „molaire” [Ksm.], Ntifā ta-gžay-t „joue” [DRB] | Tamazight a-ggay ~ a-gga, pl. a-ggay-n „joue, bajoue, mâchoire”,

and O. Stolbova (1992, 185; HSED #990) made the second step exploring the Chadic cognates they reconstructed as CCh. *guy(i)- „chin, beard” [OS], which was based, in fact, on Lamang (Hitkala) góyó „Kinn” [Lukas 1964, 107] | PMandara *gwVy- „1. chin, 2. beard” [GT]⁷⁴ | Muktele agwài „beard” [JI] = ágwáy „beard” [Rsg. 1978, 208, #51]. Most recently, G. Takács (2004, 52, #333) has identified the Cushitic relatives of Eg. wǵj.t, namely ECu. (actually, PKonso-Dullay) *gaw- „jaw” [Lmb.] = *gawgaww- [GT].⁷⁵ All these cognates speak for a PAA *√gwy, whence one may derive – in the light of Belova’s law (i.e., Eg. Iae w- < AA IIae *-w/u-, cf. EDE I 394-400) – absolutely regularly also Eg. wǵj.t ~ wǵw.t.

Eg. *bj3 „tusk (?)” may be deduced from the phonetic value bj3 of the sign depicting a tusk (Wb I 436-442). Following the suggestion by G. Möller (1900, 151) to render this sign in bj3 as „der Schnabel der Fußgefäßes”, A.H. Gardiner (EG 1927, 454: F18), too, assumed that the tusk hieroglyph „in words reading bj3 ... is possibly not a tooth, but a metal spout”, the existence of which, however, has not yet been satisfactorily corroborated in a lexicographical context, whereas the Afro-Asiatic data, on the contrary, seem to confirm the existence of an Eg. *bj3 „tusk” reflecting sg. like *√bʔl, cf. SOM.: Galila bāl-i, Dime bal-tu „horn” (SOM.: Bender 1994, 152) || PCh. *√bHl ~ *√bl „horn” [GT] > WCh. *√bl, regular from **√bHl [GT]: Angas-Sura *bīl ~ *būl (?) > *bəl „horn” [GT 2004, 33]⁷⁶ | Bole-Tangale *bāl(əm) [Schuh]⁷⁷ (WCh.: Stolbova 1987, 158) || CCh.:

ta-ggay-t, pl. ta-ggay-in „(petite) joue” [Taifi 1991, 172], Zayan, Sgugu a-ggai, pl. a-ggai, also fem. ta-ggai-t „joue” [Lbg. 1924, 546], Ndir, Ishqern, Zemmur, Warain a-ggay, pl. a-ggay-n „joue” [Wölfel], Izdeg a-ggay ~ a-gǵay, pl. a-ggay-n ~ a-gǵay-n „joue, mâchoire” [Mercier 1937, 147, 282] = a-gǵay „joue, mâchoire” [Ksm.] | Figig a-ggay ~ a-kkay „joue” [Ksm., DRB], Rif a-ggai ta-ggaš-t „joue” [Justinard 1926, 135], Iboqqoyen and Uriaghel (t)a-ggay-(t) „joue” [Rns. 1932, 354] | Iznasen (t)a-ggay-(t) „joue” [Rns. 1932, 354] = (t)a-ggay-(t) „joue” [DRB], Mzab a-ǵǵay, pl. i-ǵǵay-ən ~ a-ǵǵay-ən „joue” [Dlh. 1984, 71], Wargla a-ggay, pl. a-ggay-ən „pommette des joues” [Dlh. 1987, 107], Shawya a-ggay „joue” [DRB] | Nefusa a-ǵǵay „mâchoire” [Wölfel, DRB] etc. (Brb. data: Kossmann 1999, 166, #449 and 228, #698; DRB 917).

⁷⁴ Cf. Dghwede gwyé „beard” [Frick/JI 1994 II 13] = gwúyè „Kinn” [Wolff], Truade gwiye „Bart” [Büchner, Wolff], Glavda (Ghboko, Gvoko) and Bokwa gwiya „Bart” [Büchner], Gava (Yawotatakha) guya „Bart” [Büchner, Wolff], Alataghwa gwuya „Bart” [Büchner], Guduf gwúyè „Kinn” [Wolff] (Mandara data: Büchner 1964, 43-44; Wolff 1971, 70, 72).

⁷⁵ Attested in Konso kaw-k-á (m), pl. kawkaww-á „jaw” [Lmb.] | Dullay: Harso and Dobase káwkaww-o (pl. káwkaww-e) „Backenzahn” [AMS 1980, 167], Gawwada kawkaww-o „Kiefer” [AMS 1980, 252] = kawkaww-e „jaw” [Lmb.] (ECu. data: Lamberti 1987, 533).

⁷⁶ Attested in Gerka bil [act. *bəlʔ] „horn” [Ftp. 1911, 217] = bəl „horn” [IL] = bəl (error for *bəlʔ) „horn” [Smz.] = bəl [Stl. < ?], Montol bulu (sic, with -u#!) „horn” [Ftp. 1911, 217] (Angas-Sura data: Stolbova 1987, 158, #121; Takács 2004, 33).

⁷⁷ Cf. Gera biyenà [Krf.], Geruma bëeyi [Krf.] = beyi [Gowers], Karekare bëeləm [Stl.] = bëelün [Alío], Bole bəolúm [Stl.] = bəlum [IL] = bəlu [Krf.], Dera bīli [Krf.] = bīli [Nwm. 1974, 122], Tangale bəwol [Krf.] = bəl [Jng. 1991, 73] = bəl ~ bəlól [Mkr.] = bəl [Kidda 1985, 201, #48], Ngamo bəlú [Schuh] = bəlum [Nwm.-Smz.] = bəluhú [Krf.], Maha bəlem [Nwm.], Galambu bəlú [Stl.] = bəli [Schuh], Kirfi balla [Gowers], Bele bəlem [CWC in Mkr.] (Bole-Tangale data: Schuh 1984, 210; Newman 1965, 58; Zaborski 1984, 211, #36; Mukarovsky 1987, 213; 1989 MS, 4).

Bura-Margi *təmbəl- (compound?) „horn” [GT]⁷⁸ (Ch.: Kraft 1981, #206; JI 1994 II, 192) < AA *√b(?)l „horn” [GT] = *bal- [Blz.].⁷⁹ Perhaps this root is to be detected also in CCh.: PMatakam (Mafa-Mada) *ma-bele „elephant” (act. *”the tusked one”) [Rossing]⁸⁰ as suggested by V. Blazek (1990 MS, 2).

Eg. ḥd „Kinnbacken” (XVIII. in a very old text, Wb III 210, 11; GHwB 574) could be, of course, following an often misleading egyptological tradition,⁸¹ explained from the homophonous Eg. ḥd „white” provided one had parallel evidence for this semantic shift. This not being at our disposal, however, it appears plausible to project an AA *√ḥĉ [GT] as a variety to AA *√ĉĉ „jawbone” [GT]⁸² attested in Sem. *ĉaš(aš)- „bone” [Dlg. pace Leslau 1945, 233] || ECu. *ĉad- „1. lower jaw, 2. cheek” [GT]: e.g. Saho (?) áġ-ā „1. Gesicht, Kopf, 2. die Backen, Wangen, über welche die Haare herabfallen” [Rn. 1890, 30] (?) = áġ-a „molar” [Welmers] = ad-a „back teeth” [Lmb. 1987, 533] = ʿaṭ-a (arha) „1. one side of the lower jaw (parte inferiore della mascella), 2. molar (molare)”, ʿaṭṭoyt-a „cheek (guancia)” [Vergari 2003, 62], Afar ʿad-a „one side of the lower jaw (un côté de la mâchoire inférieure), side” [PH 1985, 52] | Ba’iso ačān-o (ext. -ān- of anatomic terms?) „chin” [Hayward 1979, 122] | Konsoid *ad- „cheek” [GT]⁸³ | Arbore ačáĉ „lower jaw” [Hayward 1984, 336] | Dullay-Gollango ʿad-o and Gawwada add-e „Backe” [AMS 1980, 195] || SCu. *ĉoĉ- [GT: regular < earlier *ĉoĉ-] „cheekbone” [Ehret 1980, 278] vs. WRift *ĉānĉ-ō „(molar) teeth” [KM 2004, 57] || POM. *ač- „tooth” [Bnd. 1988, 145] = *[h]ač- [Blz.] > Ometo *ač- [Bnd.] | Dizoid *ač/ž-u [Bnd.] || SOM. *ač-i „tooth” [Bnd.]⁸⁴ (Om.: Bender 2003, 122, 219)⁸⁵ || WCh.:⁸⁶ Geruma očo „tooth” [Gowers], Kirfi

⁷⁸ Cf. Bura timbìl [Krf.], Chibak təmbələ [IL] = tímbulə [Krf.], WMargi tímbil ~ tumbil [Krf.], Ngwahyi tímbil [Krf.].

⁷⁹ Literature for the comparison of these parallels: Mukarovsky 1987, 213-214 (WCh.-SOM.); 1989 MS, 4 (NOM.-SOM.-WCh.); Blazek 1989 MS Om., 20, #67; 1994, 197 (WCh.-SOM.); HSED #192 (WCh.-SOM.).

⁸⁰ Attested in Zulgo mbele, Mada mbile, Hurzo mbelele, Mbreme mbelele, Gwendele mbelele, Uldeme mbele, Muyang mbele (Matakam data: Rossing 1978, 244, #233).

⁸¹ Namely, an often merely mechanical derivation of nomina from homophonous (verbal) roots irrespective of the external evidence or typological parallels for the suggested semantical development, which was critically assessed recently by G. Takács (2015, 171ff.).

⁸² For the comparison of the Cushito-Omotoc root with the West Chadic and Semitic parallels cf. Mukarovsky 1987, 378; Dolgopolsky 1987, 209, #103; Blazek 1989 MS Om., 29, #101; OS 1992, 171; Takács 2010, 144.

⁸³ Attested in Konso ad-á [Lmb.] = ad-a [Flm.], Gidole (Dirayta) ad-á [Lmb.], Mosiya ad-étá [Lmb.] – all denoting „cheek” (Konsoid data: Lamberti 1987, 533, #8.b).

⁸⁴ Cf. Dime äco, Banna aci, Ari, Ubamer, Bako dials. aci ~ aci ~ aci, Hamer ʿaci ~ assi, Karo asi „tooth” (SOM.: Flm. l.c.).

⁸⁵ For the Cushito-Omotoc *comparanda* see Fleming 1969, 26-27; 1974, 90; 1976, 320; Dolgopol’skij 1973, 307; Lamberti & Sottile 1997, 275.

⁸⁶ O.V. Stolbova (1987, 226) based her WCh. *ḥäcwV „teeth” on the Bole-Tangale parallels (above) + the Angas-Sura term for „tooth”, whose etymological position is, however, disputable. Cf. Angas as [Ormsby 1914, 315] = äs [Flk. 1915, 144] = ʿääs [Jng. 1962 MS] = [ʿä:s] [Brq. 1971, 12] = ʿaas [Hfm.] = äs [ALC 1978, 3] = ääs [ʿä:s] [Krf.] = as [Gochal 1994, appendix], Sura ägäs ~ àyäs [Jng. 1963, 58] = ʿagas ~ ʿayas [Hfm.] = ʿàyäs [Krf.], Mupun öos [Frj. 1991, 47], Kofyar ägäs [Ntg. 1967, 1] = ʿayas [Hfm.], Chip ʿayäs [Jng. 1965, 166] = ägäs [Krf.], Montol ʿäəs [met. < *əyəs] [Jng. 1965, 171], Tal häss [IL] = haas [Smz.], Gerka ʿyas [Jng. 1965, 174]

ico (-ts-) „tooth” [Gowers] = iččó [Schuh] (WCh.: JI 1994 II 330). The ultimate verbal root this old Afro-Asiatic anatomic term may have originated from is AA * $\sqrt{\text{C}}\hat{\text{c}}$ „to bite, chew” [GT], cf. Ar. $\text{C}\hat{\text{d}}\text{d}$ „mordre à qqch., saisir avec les dents, et y enfoncer les dents” [BK II 276] ||| WCh. *H/ C a $\hat{\text{c}}$ - „to bite, chew” [Stl. 1991 MS, 7; 1995, 61]. A remotely related root variety (with a different pharyngeal as C₁ and a nasal root extension as C₂) is represented by SCu.: Dahalo $\text{h}\hat{\text{u}}\text{n}\hat{\text{c}}$ - [h - < * C - irregular] „to chew” [EEN 1989, 27] || HECu. *in $\hat{\text{c}}$ - „to chew” [Hds. 1989, 413] < PCu. * $\sqrt{\text{h}}\text{n}\hat{\text{c}}$ „to chew” [GT].

Alternatively, if one works with the basic sense „lower (jaw)”, Eg. $\text{h}\hat{\text{d}}$ might be perhaps affiliated with Ar. $\text{h}\hat{\text{a}}\text{d}\hat{\text{d}}$ - „1. bas, partie ou point extrême ou bas d’une chose, 2. abîme, 3. pied d’une montagne” [BK II 445] = „périgée, lieu d’une planète le plus proche de la terre” [Dozy II 297].

One wonders whether Eg. $\text{n}\hat{\text{h}}\hat{\text{d}}.\text{t}$ „tooth” (OK, Wb II 304, 5-8) conceals the same root as Eg. $\text{h}\hat{\text{d}}$. Should we treat it as identical with PCu. * $\sqrt{\text{h}}\text{n}\hat{\text{c}}$ „to chew” [GT], its C₂ extension -n- becoming a C₁ prefix n-? Or was it perhaps a nisba nj „which belongs to”? In this latter case, one might render it as *nj- $\text{h}\hat{\text{d}}.\text{t}$ as *„which belongs to the jaw”.

„Neck, Throat”

Eg. $\text{jw}3\text{j.t}$ „Kehle (des Gegners, der durchbohrt wird) (?)” (GR, WB I 49, 19) = „enclosure (d’un bovin)” (Ramses II, cf. KRI II 318:15, AL 79.0125) = „throat” (Edfu, PL 49): for P. Wilson (PL l.c.) the sense of the Ramesside occurrence „seems to be the ‚neck and throat’ of a bull’ ... in origin the term may be connected with iw3 ‚bull’”, i.e., one should accept here a nisbe form * $\text{jw}3\text{j.t}$ „belonging to ox”, which appears to be rather far-fetched. More realistic would be to assume pace Belova’s Law (described most recently in EDE I 394-399) a shift from *wiry-, which O.V. Stolbova (1996, 90-91; OS 1992, 186) has long convincingly affiliated with PCh. * $\sqrt{\text{wr}}$ „neck” [NM 1966] = *wəra [Nwm.] = * $\text{h}\hat{\text{a}}$ -wuyar [Stl.] = *(hV)-wurya(t) [Blz. 2001, 499, #10] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 252 3), which represents a good Egypto-Chadic match, which, as pointed out by V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 23, #81), has a remotely related parallel in NOm. *wul- „neck” also.

Eg. jz.t [perhaps < *rz-t?] „Lufttröhre (?), Schlund (?)” (GR, Wb I 128, 1) may be akin to SOM.: Dime $\text{ER}(w)\text{c}$ (-ts) [Flm.] = $\text{ER}(w)\text{c}$ (-ts) „neck, throat” [Bnd. 1994, 155, #56] ||| WCh.: Tangale $\text{r}\hat{\text{o}}\hat{\text{z}}\hat{\text{o}}$ „neck” [Kraft 1981, #49] = $\text{r}\hat{\text{o}}\hat{\text{z}}\hat{\text{o}}$ „neck”, $\text{k}\hat{\text{a}}\text{-r}\hat{\text{o}}\hat{\text{z}}\hat{\text{o}}$ „throat”

= $\gamma\hat{\text{s}}$ [IL], Goemay $\text{h}\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{s}}$ [Srl. 1937, 73] = hoos [Hfm.] = hoos [Jng. 1962 MS, 2] = hoos [Hlw. 2000 MS, 14], Mushere $\text{a}\hat{\text{k}}\hat{\text{s}}$ [-k- < * γ -] [Jng. 1999 MS, 1] (Angas-Sura data: Hoffmann 1975, 26, #246; Stolbova 1977, 152, #4; JI 1994 II 330; Takács 2004, 152). These reflexes speak for PAngas-Sura * $\text{h}\hat{\text{a}}_3\gamma\hat{\text{a}}_3\text{s}$ → * $\text{a}\hat{\text{y}}\hat{\text{s}}$ „tooth” [GT] = * $\text{a}\hat{\text{g}}\hat{\text{s}}$ [Stl.] = * $\text{h}\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{y}}\hat{\text{s}}$ „tooth” [Dlg.] with the typical medial * γ - (cf. Dolgopolsky 1982), which seems to point to two different scenarios of segmentation. Thus, our word might be either traced back to * $\sqrt{\text{hs}}$ (or sim., but this is hardly equal with AA * $\sqrt{\text{C}}\hat{\text{c}}$, since Angas-Sura * $\text{-s}\hat{\#}$ is not compatible with AA * $\hat{\text{c}}$ > * $\hat{\text{d}}$ > Angas-Sura * $\text{-t}\hat{\#}$) with an infix * γ - < ** -h - or to prefixed AA * h - + * $\text{g}\hat{\text{a}}\text{s}$ (or sim., which is, however, a distinct root). In either cases we are dealing with the common AA affix attested in body part names (cf. Takács 1997). Henceforth, the Angas-Sura word is irrelevant here.

[Jng. 1991, 138; JI 1994 II, 252]. V.É. Orel and O.V. Stolbova (1992, 186) have compared Eg. *jz.t* „gullet” to their hypothetic WCh. **raz-* „neck”, but from their article it is not clear before me which WCh. word (perhaps *Tangale?*) is meant by this reconstruction. Any connection to NBrb.: Qabyle $\sqrt{rz} > ruz$ „être creux (arbre)”, u-riz „creux du tronc d’un arbre” [Dallet 1982, 746] on the analogy of Eg. *šbb* (below)? Alternatively, in principle, one might assume Eg. * $\sqrt{jz} < * \sqrt{s} \sim$ SCu. **ʔās-* „neck” [Ehret 1980, 283, #16], for which, however, cf. Eg. *ʕšʕ* (below).

Eg. ʕnʕn „Hals (?)” (Lit. LP, Wb I 191, 14) seems to be identical with ʕnʕn „das Kinn” (NK, Wb I 191, 13) with a semantical shift in Egyptian.

Eg. ʕšʕ „die Kehle” (XVIII., Wb I 229, 13), ʕšʕš „die Kehle” (NK, GR, Wb I 229, 14), ʕšš.t „die Kehle” (BD, LP, Wb I 230, 1), whence we have a denominative verb ʕšʕš „erdrosseln (als Todesart)” (Mag. NK, Wb I 229, 15), all derive from a common biconsonantal * $\sqrt{ʕš}$, which seems to be unreflected in Semitic, Omotic, and Chadic. The Berber root inventories have still to be checked. The only available cognate seems at the moment to appear in SCu. **ʔās-* „neck” [Ehret 1980, 283, #16] based on PRift **ʔis-* „neck” [GT]⁸⁷ | Ma’a lu-ʔosu „(chain) necklace” [Ehret], in which, however, both radicals represent in fact merely irregular correspondences (Eg. ʕ- = SCu. *ʕ- vs. Eg. -š- = SCu. *-č/č-, cf. Takács 1999, 413; 2000, 105).

Eg. wsr.t „1. (PT, BD) Hals oder Nacken (der abgeschnitten wird, auf dem der Kopf befestigt wird u.ä.), 2. (NK royal tombs) Art Pfahl in der Form des wsr-Zeichens, an den im Jenseits böse Wesen gebunden sind” (Wb I 360, 1-2) = „cou (d’un animal à tête de renard?)” (Lacau 1970, 64, §162) = „neck” (PT 286, EG 1927, 453, F12, fn. 1; PL 258: GR Edfu) is etymologically obscure. Neither of the solutions offered so far convinces us:

(1) F. von Calice (GÄSW 139, #570) found an „*interessante Gleichung*” with Hbr. ʔāšērā „1. Baumstamm oder Pfahl neben einem Altar, 2. Benennung einer weibl. Gottheit” [GB 75], for which he seems to have supposed an ultimate connection with Eg. *wsr* „(Eigenschaftsverbium ... von nicht klar erkennbarer Grundbedeutung) 1. mächtig, stark (gegenüber Feinden), 2. als Eigenschaft des seligen Toten, 3. reich (sein) usw.” (OK-, Wb I 360-361) and Hbr. $\sqrt{ʔšr}$ piel „glücklich preisen”, pual „beglückt werden” [GB 73]. At the moment, this first option still appears as the most attractive one.

(2) P. Lacau (1970, 64-65, §163) supposed *wsr.t* to signify in BD 32 the „phallus” of Osiris instead of his „neck”, although he himself admitted it as not fitting the context, which did not hinder him in comparing it with Sem.: Hbr. *bāšār* „flesh” (sometimes used metaphorically for „phallus”). As W.A. Ward (1972, 20) rightly stressed, there is no reason to assume all this. Moreover, Lacau (o.c., p. 65, §164) concluded from the value of the hieroglyph *wsr* depicting the „head and neck of canine animal” (EG l.c.) that „*le cou avait un nom de même consonantisme que le nom du renard*”, viz. Cpt.

⁸⁷ Attested in WRift: Iraqw and Burunge isa | ERift: Qwadza is-ito, Asa is-at (Rift: Ehret l.c.).

(S) βαΨΟΥΡ reflected also by βασσάριον „le renard chez les Libyens” (Lacau, Herodot IV 192), whence he assumed that „*si le mot est un emprunt, il faut placer cet emprunt avant la constitution du système graphique.*”

(3) V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #506) combined it with Oakk. šawārum „Hals” [AHW 1087] || Hbr. šawwā(?)r „neck” [KB 1009] they derived from their ill-founded Sem. *ṭawār-, although the Semitic evidence examined by L. Kogan (SED I 229-230, #258) speaks for *š-, cf., e.g., JAram. šawwə(?)rā „neck (esp. front of the neck, throat)” [Jastrow 1950, 1265], Syr. šawrā „collum, gibbus cameli, dorsum montis” [Brk. 1928, 625] | Ar. šawr- „the side of the neck” [Lane 1744], which is why their AA *čawar- „neck” is also baseless, let alone that Eg. -s- does not agree with either Sem. *š- or *ṭ- as pointed out also by G. Takács (1997, 111 ad #508).

Eg. b3q.t (neck or throat det.) „gorge (?)” (NE Mag., AL 78.1254 after Borghouts), occurs in: m(w)t n b3q.t „als eine Todesursache” (NE, Wb I 426, 2; GHWb 242) may perhaps be akin to NOm.: Chara bork-ā „collo” [Crl. 1938 III, 165] = bork-a „neck, collo” [Bnd. 1974 MS, 10], provided its C₃ was part of the original root.⁸⁸ Alternatively, if not, we may assume Eg. b3q.t < *ṽbʔk, cf. LECu.: Oromo boqq-ū „1. neck, 2. back of neck, 3. stubborn” [Gragg 1982, 59] || WCh.: Fyer ḡayī, ʔe-ḡayī, pl. ḡagiyī „neck (Hals, Nacken)” [Jng. 1968, 7, #50; 1970, 84, cf. JI 1994 II, 252].

Eg. b^cn.t „1. Hals (o.ä.) eines Vogels (PT 1779), 2. Hals (o.ä.) als menschlicher Körperteil, als Stelle der Halskragen, Ketten u. dgl. (CT-GR)” (Wb I 447, 7-8) = „neck” (FD 81) = „1. Hals (und Schnabel eines Vogels), 2. Hals (bei Menschen), 3. ‘Schnabel’ (Teil des Sterbildes ‘Vogel’ in ramessidischen Sternuhren)” (GHWb 249) is a metathetic⁸⁹ reflex of Sem. *ṽbl^c „inghiottire” [Frz.]⁹⁰ > i.a. Ar. bul^cum- „1. oesophage, canal de déglutition, 2. ruisseau par lequel l’eau descend de la colline”, hence denominative bal^cama „avaler”, bal^cam- „glouton, très-gourmand, qui avale avec avidité et promptement” [BK I 161] = bul^cüm- „gosier, oesophage” [DRS] = „Schlund, Speiseröhre” [Eilers]⁹¹ || MSA: cf., i.a., Soqotri-Qalansiya ṡābʔlēʔḥ „luette” [SSL 1991, 1453-1454] = tēbleʔḥ [SSL 1992, 94] || Bed. bāla (f) „Kehle, Schlund” [Reinisch 1895, 47], Amar’ar dial. balaʔa „глотка” [Dlg. 1973, 198] || NOm.: Badditu (Koyra) bal-ā „neck (collo)” [Cerulli 1929, 60], Haruro bāl-ā „sommel del petto, sotto la gola” [CR 1937, 640] || WCh.: Bokkos bülèʔ „Kropf” [Jng. 1970, 140] || ECh.: Somray bwālā „goitre” [Jng. 1993 MS, 7] |

⁸⁸ H.G. Mukarovskij (1987, 271) derives the Chara word from AA *ṽbr „neck” [GT]. V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 24, #82) too assumed here a suffix -k- deriving it from his Om. *bar-/*bal- „neck” < AA *ba/il^c-.

⁸⁹ A.B. Dolgopol’skij (1970, 357, #1) presumed the development of Eg. b^cn.t < *b3^c-n (some kind of unexplained suffix -n) < *bl^c-n. A metathesis, i.e. b^cn.t from *bn^c.t = *bl^c.t, seems much more probable.

⁹⁰ For the Semitic reflexes cf., e.g., GB 101; DRS 68; Fronzaroli 1971, 631, #7.21; Rabin 1975, 87, 90, #23. Cf. also Ar. bulu^clu^c- „langhalsiger Wasservogel” [AHW 137]. Note that NAgaw: Bilin bəl^c „to eat” is a loan from Eth.-Sem. *ṽbl^c „to eat” (cf. Cerulli 1936, 239; Leslau 1945, 148; 1956, 188; 1979 III 138).

⁹¹ Already W. Eilers (1978, 128) analyzed -um-/-üm- in Arabic as suffix, whose Afro-Asiatic origin can be pointed out due to G. Takács (1997).

Bidiya béle, pl. bëlél „1. gorge, 2. voix” [AJ 1989, 58]. Whether AA * \sqrt{bl}^c [GT] was primarily a verbal root („to swallow”) or a nominal one („throat”), is difficult to decide.

It is dubious, however, whether these parallels are cognate also with NBrb.: Figig ta-bilul-t „luette” [DRB], Wargla ta-bulal-t „appendice charnu qu’ont certaines chèvres pendant sous la gorge” [Delheure 1987, 24; DRB 56] || SBrb.: Ghat bëlébêlé „luette” [DRB], Ahaggar bëlébêlé „luette (appendice charnu à l’entrée du gosier)” [Foucauld 1951-2, 58] (Brb.: DRB 53) || WCh.: Hausa bèèlúú ~ bèèlí „uvula” [Abr. 1962, 95], Gwandara bëlíbèli „uvula” [Matsushita 1972, 25] | Sura bèlbel „Zäpchen, uvula” [Jng. 1963, 59] | Bade bàal-án „uvula” [Lukas 1968, 224], these being apparently some areal term.

Eg. bbj.t „die Schlüsselbeinregion am Körper, Kehle” (Med., Wb I 455, 4; GHWb 251) = „region of throat” (FD 82) and hence **bb.t** „Kehle, Kehlkopf” (GR, Wb I 455, 6) may issue from a late semantical shift, cf. bb.wj (dual) „die Schlüsselbeine (claviculae)” (Med., Wb I 455, 3; GHWb 251) = „collar-bones” (FD 82). There is no evident etymology as yet. A number of plausible alternatives may be considered:

(1) Semantically, most tempting is an equation with Sem.: Akk. (a/jB) bubūtu „(Wagen-) Achse” [AHW 135] || WCh.: Kofyar báb „shoulders, horizontal part” [Ntg. 1967, 1]. Was Eg. *bb (sg.) „collar-bone” orig. considered as *„horizontale axis (of the body)”? Any connection to CCh.: Bachama baapa „wing” [Carnochan 1975, 466] | Buduma bībi „Oberarm” [Lukas 1939, 92]? Areal parallel: PBantu *-bābá „wing” [Guthrie 1971, 118].

(2) With special regard to Med. bbj.t and LEg. bb.t, cp. alternatively LECu.: Somali-Jabarti babāul-ā, pl. babaulayāl-ki „Luftrohre” [Rn. 1904, 52].

(3) If Eg. bb.t primarily denoted the cavity between the clavicula and the throat, it would be tempting to identify it with PCu. *bab- „armpit” [GT] = *bob- „armpit” [Ehret]⁹² as suggested by a number of authors,⁹³ which seems to be the most convincing etymology for Eg. bb.wj.

(4) G. Takács (2000, 72, #1.3) related Eg. bb.wj to AA *bub- „breast” [GT].⁹⁴ In addition, he (Takács 1996, 46, #9; 1996, 136, #30; 1997, 254-255, #5.4) suggested an

⁹² Cf. Bed. bába (f) „Achselhöhle, Armhöhle” [Rn. 1895, 40] = bab[?]ā (f) „armpit” [Rpr. 1928, 159] || ECu. *bahb- ~/> *bab- „armpit” [GT] = *bab^c- „Achselhöhle” [Sasse 1981, 156]; LECu.: Oromo bob-ā „armpit” [Gragg 1982, 428] = bób-a [Rn.] = bób-ā [Sasse] = bob-a [Lsl.] = bōb-a [Ehret] = bob-a? [Lmb.] | Arbore bēb-e[?] „armpit” [Lmb.] | Rendille bahāb „armpit” [Heine 1976, 212] | HECu.: Burji bob-ā [Sasse] = bob-a [Lmb.], Gedeo (Darasa) bob-a „armpit” [Dlg.] = bob-ā ~ bop-ā [Lsl.] (ECu. data: Dolgopol’skij 1966, 54; Sasse 1982, 37; Leslau 1988, 182; Ehret 1980, 140; 1987, #10) || NOM.: Mocha bōbbīh-o „armpit” [Lsl. 1959, 21]. For further details on this Afro-Asiatic root cf. EDE II 187.

⁹³ See Ehret 1995, #3; 1997 MS, 494, #3; HCVA II #138; HSED #167; Takács 1996, 46, #9; 1996, 136, #30; 1997, 254-255, #5.4.

⁹⁴ Cf. NBrb.: Shilh a-bubba „breast (Bust)” [Wlf.] = a-bubba „grosses mamelles”, ta-bubb(w)-at „mamelle, sein” [DRB] | Tamazight (CMaroccan) ta-bubb-ut „sein”, a-bubbu „gros sein” [DRB], etc. | Qabyle b-ubbu „sein” [Dlt. 1982, 5] (NBrb.: Wölfel 1955, 45; DRB 7) || SCu.: Dahalo būb-a „chest” [Ehret 1980, 140; EEN 34] = būb-a, pl. būb-addi „chest” [Tosco 1991, 130] || CCh.: Tera ðūḅu „female breast” [Nwm. 1964, 38] | Bata bwōbi „breast” [Mch.], Bachama bobe „breast” [Jng.] = bupto [Meek] = ḅwūpto [Skn.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 46-47).

ultimate relationship of PCu. *bab- „armpit” [GT] and AA *bub- „breast” [GT], which is semantically problematic.

Eg. bgs „Kehle (?)” (GR, Wb I 483, 2) = **bgs** ~ **bgs.t** „throat” (GR of Edfu, PL 336) may represent a late semantical innovation, cf. bgs.w „als Körperteil des Sternbildes ‘Riese’” (NK, Wb I 483, 1) = „perhaps the neck of the man constellation” (PL) and bgs.t „*Hüfte (Teil des Sternbilds ‘Riese’ in den ramessidischen Sternuhren, zwischen Oberschenkel und Brust)” (NK, GHWb 264), which are apparently (inter)related. It is not clear whether these represent in fact late forms of Eg. *bqs.t ~ bqs.w „Rückenwirbel, Wirbelsäule(kanal), Rückenmark (?)” (PT, Wb I 480, 8-12; Grapow 1954, 57; GHWb 263) = „spine” (FD 85). If not, because of the substantial semantic anomalies, which are, however, in my impression, not to be definitely ruled out, it would be difficult to compare Eg. bgs with either NBrb. *√bgs „se ceindre, mettre un ceinture” [GT pace DRB 35-36] or CCh.: PMandara-Lamang *bagaža „shoulder” [GT].⁹⁵

Eg. mr.t „Kehle o.ä. eines Gottes (von der m3^c.t ‚Wahrheit’ gebraucht, die ihm gereicht wird)” (GR, Wb II 107, 7) = „gorge” (Lefébvre 1952, 22) = „gorge, gosier” (Berlandini, LÄ IV 85; AL II 167, #1786; cf. Blackman, JEA 22, 1936, 105; Fairman, ZÄS 91, 1964, 8, vii) = „throat, voicebox, larynx” (Walker 1996, 269) = „throat, gullet (associated with Hathor and Maat regarded as the throat of god by which air and food were given to him)” (PL 445):⁹⁶ its meaning and etymology are to be treated with reservations due to the very late attestation:

(1) G. Lefébvre (1952, 22 & fn. 9), J. Berlandini (LÄ IV 85), W. Guglielmi (1991, 14), and P. Wilson (PL 445) identified it with OK mr.t „songstress” (PL) as an „incarnation de la chanteuse-chironome antique, officiante ...” (Berlandini) = „organ over which the songstress had particular authority” (Wilson), although Wilson seems to be undetermined whether the association of both lexemes with Eg. m3^c.t was because „*the three concepts make a potent pun*” being interchangeable as they „*may have sounded the same in sounding*” in the GR era.

(2) GT: both LEg. mr.t „throat” and OK „songstress” are perhaps connected with WCh.: Hausa múryà „1. voice, 5. throat extracted from chicken” [Abr. 1962, 687], Gwandara murya „voice” [Skinner 1992, 356], which would not exclude the first etymological option above.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Attested in Dghwede bagaža, Gvoko bəgaža, Kdupe bagaža, Paduko baɣaŋgara | Lamang (Hitkala) g^habaza-k [met. < *bag^haza] „shoulder” (CCh.: Wolff 1983, 224).

⁹⁶ No trace of the word from earlier than the Greeco-Roman times. D. Meeks (2000, 239, n. 1) observed a certain mr.t (?) (flesh det.) in Ostr. Petrie 36 = Ostr. DeM 1696, rt. 1 „désignant une pièce de boucherie ou une partie du corps (humain ou animal)” (not listed in the standard lexicons, cf. also Grandet 1999, 15, n. 68), although he regarded „*un rapprochement avec mr.t ‚gorge’ ...*” as „*très hasardeux*” in spite of „*des graphies de ce mot*” (listed in Guglielmi 1991, 113) that are „*assez proches de celles de nos ostraca*”.

⁹⁷ It is to be borne in mind that, in theory, there „*could*” be an etymological connection between Hausa murya ‚voice’ and wúyà ‚neck’ [Abr. 1962, 937] as confirmed to me by P. Newman (p.c., 13 Nov. 2006), although he has „*never been able to find good internal or comparative evidence to show that this is so. Semantically, there*

(3) I have combined it elsewhere (Takács 1996, 136, #30; 1997, 226, #3 2004, 61-62, #353) alternatively with ECu. *marmar- „neck” [Sasse],⁹⁸ to which a great number of extra-Afro-Asiatic areal parallels may be adduced as suggested already by M.L. Bender (1975, 177, §56.12) and H.C. Fleming (1983, 456), cf. Nilo-Saharan *mor- (?) „neck” [Bnd. 1994, 1161, #56] > PKuliak *morok „throat” [Ehret 1981, 92; Fleming 1983, 470], ESudanic *mur(u)t „neck” [GT], ENilotic *-murut- „neck” [Vossen 1982, 455].⁹⁹ In the light of H.-J. Sasse’s (l.c.) theory on the internal (innovative) derivation of the East Cushitic word,¹⁰⁰ one wonders if there may be any connection to WBrb.: Zenaga a-martī „nuque” [Basset 1909, 242] ||| ECh.: Sokoro mórol-dum „dein Schlund” [Lukas 1937, 36]. Here too, no cognates emerge in Semitic.¹⁰¹

Eg. *nfr „der Gegenstand, den das Schriftzeichen darstellt: das an der Lufröhre hängende Herz (nicht eine Laute), nur aus dem Lautwert des Zeichens zu erschließen” (Wb II 252, 12) = „wind-pipe” (Müller 1909, 186) = „heart and windpipe” (EG 1927, 456, F35; Walker 1996, 271) = „heart and oesophagus” (Czermak in his Viennese lectures as recorded by Vycichl 1953, 112; 1990, 22) = „(correctly:) stomach¹⁰² and esophagus (with the reservation that in ancient times oesophagus was probably confused with the windpipe)” (Vycichl 1953, 112) = „oesophage (plus tard confondu avec le pharynx)” (Vycichl 1954, 222) = „le coeur et la trachée-artère” (Lacau 1970, 96, §252) = „oesophage

*is no problem. Phonologically, however, the connection is problematic. Murya comes from *muri (the ya being a feminine suffix and not part of the stem) whereas wuya (where the /y/ is part of the stem) comes from *wura (or some such), the *r to y change being well documented. Initial /m/ in Chadic is generally quite stable, and so it would be hard to explain an *m to /w/ change that would be required if wuya went back to the same proto-form. And then, contrary to common practice among certain Chadicists, one cannot simply ignore vowels, i.e., the final -i in one case, final -a in the other”. Cf. WCh. *[h^w]-yara „neck” [Stl. 1987, 239, #860] < PCh. *ḥa-wuyar „neck” [Stl. 1996, 90-91].*

⁹⁸ Cf. Oromo mórm-ā „Hals” [Rn.] = morm-a „neck” [Gragg 1982, 291] = (Borana, Orma, Waata dials.) morm-a „neck, throat” [Stroemer 1987, 370], Somali mármar „der lange Hals und Nacken des Kamels” [Rn. 1902, 302] = mármar „nape of the neck” [Abr. 1964, 175] = marmar „neck of the camel” [Lsl.] | Burji marmari „(whole) neck” [Flm.] = marmár-i „neck, nape of neck” [Ss.] (ECu.: Sasse 1979, 24; 1982, 141). ECu. *marmar- was borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Harari mármär „shoulder”, Gurage *märmär [Lsl.]: Chaha, Ennemor, Gyeto mämär etc. „nape of neck”, Zway marmara „hump of the neck” (ES: Leslau 1963, 111; 1979 III, 406; 1988, 195).

⁹⁹ SOM.: Galila murut „neck” derives (pace Fleming 1983, 456) probably from Nilotic.

¹⁰⁰ He derived ECu. *marmar- „neck” from ECu. *mar- „round, to roll up” via the mediator meaning *, „to turn around”, which is possible, cf. PIE *k^wol-so- „Hals” > Lat. collum „Hals, Bergjoch”, Germ. Hals < PIE *k^wel- „drehen” [IEW 639-640].

¹⁰¹ Note that Ar. ʾamriʾ-at- „oesophage” [BK II 1086] = mariʾ- „oesophage, conduit alimentaire” [Dozy II 577] derives internally from Ar. maraʾa „2. manger qqch.” [BK], whereas Yemeni Ar. marīn „gullet” from √mrʾ II „to whet an appetite” [Pianta 1990, 463].

¹⁰² W. Vycichl’s rendering „stomach” was disproved by H.G. Fischer (1983, 25, F35: „it is clear, in any case, that the Old Kingdom scribe regarded the lower element as the hear and not the stomach”), who, having examined the archaic and Old Kingdom exx. of the hieroglyph nfr, observed that there was „a double pair of projections at the top” and that “the striation of the tracheal cartilage fails to appear even in the most detailed Old Kingdom exx., but was frequently indicated thereafter”, whence he concluded that „probably this detail is a secondary reinterpretation ... of may originally have been the esophagus...”

ou trachée-artère” (DELC 150) = „esophagus and (upper opening of) stomach or less probably windpipe” (Vycichl 1991, 122) = „windpipe of a bull or cow (actually a throat)” (PL 516). This rendering of the hieroglyph, although there is no perfect agreement among egyptologists on its acceptance,¹⁰³ goes back to Horapollo (Hieroglyphica 2:4), whose rendering for nfr as καρδία and φάρυγξ was presented, in fact, as for nfr „good” as a popular etymology: „*le coeur de l’homme lié au pharynx signifie le nom de l’homme bon*”. The Old Kingdom colouring of the sign nfr was examined by E. Staehelin (1990, 112), who found the heart „rot bzw. weiß mit roter Innenzeichnung, zusammen mit einer andersfarbigen (z.B. grünen) Speiseröhre”. Similarly, J. Kahl (1997, 49, F35) stated the instances from Dyn. III as „rot ... gefärbt”. There are supposed occurrences or derivatives of this word also in the Old Kingdom,¹⁰⁴ the Coffin Texts,¹⁰⁵ and the Ptolemaic and Roman periods,¹⁰⁶ so its existence is beyond doubt. Adducing etymological parallels for „windpipe” < „tube, pipe, flute” (like English wind-pipe or German Luftröhre),¹⁰⁷ W. Vycichl (1990, 22) viewed that Eg. nfr „rappelle par sa forme allongée et tubulaire”¹⁰⁸ Ar. nafīr- „trompette (qui donne le signal du départ pour le combat), tromp(ette) de gens qui partent pour la guerre” [Dozy II 700 pace Freytag & Quatremère], which Vycichl equated in a number of his works.¹⁰⁹ Cf. also Yemeni Ar. nafīr „trompet” [Piamenta 1990, 492] = nefīr, pl. nafwar „Trompette” [Deboo 1989, 200], whence (?) Bed. nafīr „Trompette” [Rn. 1895, 180] may have been borrowed. Vycichl gives further (unacceptable)

¹⁰³ A.H. Gardiner’s (Eg. l.c.) „*heart and windpipe*” was doubted, e.g., by P. Montet (1928, 35, F35) arguing that „*cependant il semble bizarre qu’ils aient donné un seul nom à deux organes distincts*” and referring back to the lectures at the University of Lyon by his master, V. Loret, who used to render the nfr sign as „un gouvernail” based upon nfr.t „*désignant un gouvernail à toutes les époques*”, which he eventually affiliated with Eg. nfr „parfait, bon”, nfr (negative word) < *√nfr „qui est à la fin”. It was the reign of Snofru (supposed time when the Memphite Theology was composed) that J. Spiegel (1971, 430) projected „*die Deutung der Hieroglyphe ‚gut’ (nfr) als Herz mit davon ausgehender Luftröhre*” back to, which, in his unargued view, „*sicher nicht die wirkliche Bedeutung des Zeichens ist*”.

¹⁰⁴ G. Vittmann (Göttinger Miscellen 42, 1981, 79, cf. AEB 35, 1981, 38, #81.277) found an Old Kingdom representation of three men „*die Gänse bzw. Fleischstücke heranbringen*” called nfr.tj, which he rendered as the nisbe of Ptol. nfr.t, lit. *√nfr „*der zur Kehle Gehörige, der mit der Kehle Befäbte*” → „*der, der die Kehle durchschneidet*”, which was in his conclusion „*offensichtlich ein nicht belegter Titel*” here, actually „Schlächter”. H.G. Fischer (1996, 252 & 258, 7) too assumed a nfr.tj „*who has to do with the throat (in slaughtering)*” as the nisbe of an otherwise unattested Old Kingdom *nfr.t „throat”.

¹⁰⁵ P. Lacau (1970, 97, §254) found the lost word preserved by the hieroglyph nfr depicting „trachée” in CT I 354c and 356a-b, which was ignored by R.O. Faulkner (AECT I 73), who nfr as „beauty” in spite of Lacau’s (l.c.) conclusion. Based on the context (where nfr is used parallel with r „mouth”, ḥfꜣ „fist”, šr.t „nose”): „*Le parallélisme entre ces quatre phrases montre bien que nfr ne peut être ici qu’une partie du corps*”.

¹⁰⁶ As pointed out by W. Vycichl (1972, 180), „*Je mot nfr ‚trachée’ était donc bien connu à l’époque historique*” as Ptolemaic and Roman period nfr.t „gosier” (Vycichl) = „throat, gullet” (Fairman 1964, 8, §vii; PL 516), which was admitted also by H.G. Fischer (1983, 54) as a word that provides the origin of the hieroglyph and favours the interpretation as the esophagus.

¹⁰⁷ To which one might add still the Semitic etymologies of Eg. zm3 „lung” and šbb „wind-pipe” (examined in this series).

¹⁰⁸ Elsewhere, Vycichl (1954, 222) supposed Eg. nfr to have „*primitivement*” signified „tube”.

¹⁰⁹ Vycichl 1953, 112; 1954, 222; 1958, 394; 1959, 39; 1972, 180; 1990, 22; 1991, 122; DELC 150.

cognates.¹¹⁰ In fact, we are probably dealing with reflexes of AA * $\sqrt{\text{nfr}}$ „to blow the nose” [GT]¹¹¹ in this exclusive Egypto-Arabic isogloss.

Eg. $\text{n}\dot{\text{h}}\text{b.t}$ „Nacken, Hals” (PT-, Wb II 292) = „la partie postérieure du cou” (Lacau 1970, 65, §165) = „posterior neck” (Walker 1996, 271) > Cpt. (SL) $\text{N}\dot{\text{A}}\text{Z}\text{B}\text{E}$, (B) $\text{N}\dot{\text{A}}\text{Z}\text{B}\text{I}$, $\text{N}\dot{\text{A}}\text{Z}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{I}$, (F) $\text{N}\dot{\text{E}}\text{Z}\text{B}\text{I}$ (f) „Nacken, Schulter, Rücken” (KHW 135; Till 1955, 328, §26) is evidently related with Eg. $\text{n}\dot{\text{h}}\text{b}$ „Joch für Pferde und Rinder” (XVIII-, Wb II 293, 1-2) and $\text{n}\dot{\text{h}}\text{b}$ „1. Pferde anschirren, 2. vom Wagen: bespannt sein mit Pferden, ins Joch spannen, 3. mit refl. Pron.: sich plagen (von der Mutter mit dem Säugling), 4. verpflichtet sein o.ä. (von Menschen und Vieh mit ihrer Arbeit für das Schatzhaus)” (NE-, Wb II 293; ÄWb II 1310c) = „to yoke (together), harness” (FD 136 pace RdE 10, 1955, 13-14, fn. 4) > Cpt. (SA) $\text{N}\dot{\text{O}}\text{Y}\text{Z}\text{B}$, (B) $\text{N}\dot{\text{O}}\text{Z}\text{E}\text{B}$ „to make ready by yoking beasts” (CD 243a; CED 117) = „anschirren, verbinden” (KHW 134) = „ateler” (DELC 151). The only question is which one derived from the other one and what its ultimate root meaning was as P. Lacau (1970, 66, §168) rightly formulated: „«Joug» et «mettre sous le joug» sont-ils dérivés du nom de la partie du corps où l'on pose le joug chez l'animal, ou bien le nom de cette partie du corps vient-il du fait que c'était l'endroit du corps où l'on fixait le joug?”.

(1) A. Ember (ESS §7.b.6) assumed that „Joch” was probably the original meaning, which he equated with Sem.: Syr. $\sqrt{\text{lh}}\text{m}$ „festfügen” and Ar. $\text{la}\dot{\text{h}}\text{ama}$ „verbinden”, for which cf. also Hbr. $\sqrt{\text{lh}}\text{m}$ nifal „to be closely packed, come to blows”, NHbr. $\sqrt{\text{lh}}\text{m}$ hifil „to join”, Tigre $\text{t}\dot{\text{a}}\text{-l}\dot{\text{a}}\text{h}\text{ama}$ „to be close to one another” (Sem.: Leslau 1958, 28). In principle, semantically plausible and even the anomaly of Sem. *l-...-m vs. Cpt. N-...-B is explainable, cf. the well-known case of Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{šlm}}$ vs. Eg. snb .

(2) H. Holma (1919, 39), in turn, affiliated it with Sem.: Akk. $\text{labi}\dot{\text{a}}\text{nu} \sim \text{lab}\dot{\text{a}}\text{nu}$ „Nacken(band)” [Holma 1911, xvi, fn. 1] = „Nacken(sehne)” [AHW 524] emended by him to $\text{l}\dot{\text{a}}\text{b}\dot{\text{a}}\text{nu} < * \text{la}\dot{\text{h}}\text{b-}\dot{\text{a}}\text{n-}$, in which Holma (1911, l.c.) segmented a suffix $\text{-}\dot{\text{a}}\text{n-}$ appearing in a number of Semitic names of body parts.¹¹² F. von Calice (GÄSW, #665) declined this as improbable arguing that Sem. * $\text{h}\dot{\text{a}}\text{-}$ > Akk. ê- .

¹¹⁰ Akk. nipru „offshoot, sprout, descendant, son” and Eg. * $\sqrt{\text{nfr}}$ (primitively) „young” → nfr.w „adolescents”, nfr.t „maiden”.

¹¹¹ Sem.: JNAram. npr „to blow the nose” [Sabar 2002, 234] || Eg. nf3 [reg. < * $\sqrt{\text{nfr}}$] „ausniesen, (aus)schnauben” (CT, Wb II 252, 3; Osing 1986, 209, n. a) = „respirer, souffler” (Lacau 1972, 36, §43, #5) = „expirer, expulser (du nez)” (Cannuyer 1983, 26) = „to blow, exhale” (DCT 222) || NBrb. * $\sqrt{\text{nfr}}$ „to exhale” [GT]: Nefusa e-nfer „se moucher” [Motylinski 1904, 138] | Tamazight (Zemmur) nfer „se moucher” [Taïfī 1991, 473] | Qabyle neffer „1. exhaler, expirer, souffler (l'air, fumée, vapeur), 2. fumer” [Dallet 1982, 551] || SBrb.: Ahaggar e-nfer „s'ébrouer (souffler fortement avec naseaux, d'une manière particulière, les lèvres restant presque fermées, le sujet étant un cheval, un âne, un boeuf), p. ext.: souffler vers une direction (vent)” [Foucauld 1951-2, 1319-1320], ETawillemmet & Ayr ə-nfər „renâcler (cheval, âne, chèvre, personne)”, nəfərnəfər „1. ronfler longuement par le nez (personne, animal), renâcler, s'ébrouer, frémir, expulser l'air avec bruit, 2. inspirer l'air avec bruit par le nez” [PAM 2003, 595-596]. This root eventually derives from a biconsonantal AA * $\sqrt{\text{nf}}$ as suggested on the Egypto-Semitic level already by G. Garbini (1971, 139-140) and G. Conti (1978, 97, fn. 2).

¹¹² Doing so, he ignored the alternative derivation from Akk. $\text{lab}\dot{\text{a}}\text{nu}$ „niederwerfen” on the analogy of Akk. tikku combined by H. Holma with Ar. takka (Christian 1912, 390, ad p. 39), which contradicts this analysis.

(3) C. Brockelmann (1932, 107, #34) identified it with Akk. *nīru* „Joch” and Ar. *naḥr-* „Hals” explaining the anomaly of Sem. *r vs. Eg. -b as being due to a contamination with Ar. *raqab-at-* „Hals, Nacken” (!) implying as if in Egyptian the latter root were also present, which was, besides, directly equated by O. Rössler (1971, 296) with Eg. *nḥb.t* in spite of the evident anomalies of Sem. *r- and *-ḳ- vs. Cpt. n- and -ʔ-, resp.

(4) W. Vycichl (DELC 151) firmly objected the proposal by Rössler regarding Eg. *nḥb.t* to represent probably an active participle of an intr. *√nḥb* „atteler” deriving from an original sense *”celle qui est attelée” and, henceforth, expressing what may have long been right.

(5) It is, moreover, suspicious that for the noun of anatomical signification, no convincing parallels have appeared in the whole Afro-Asiatic phylum I have scanned through in the past decade for parallel roots with initial n- and l-. The only noteworthy parallel is LECu.: *Arbore léḥḥe* (m) „throat” [Hyw. 1984, 381], whose East Cushitic source, **laʔb-/ʔlabʔ-* „breast-bone” [Sasse 1979, 53, 63], however, reveals that it is out of the question (ECu. *-ʔ- ≠ Eg. -ḥ-).

(6) G. Takács: accepting Vycichl’s position for the reason described in point 5 above, and agreeing, e.g., with how R.O. Faulkner (FD 136) and R. Hannig (ÄWb II 1310c) united *nḥb* „yoke” with the enigmatic *nḥb-k3.w* in one lexicographical entry, I also see the primary sense in Eg. *nḥb* „(transitives Verbum unklarer Urbedeutung)” occurring almost only in the compound *nḥb k3.w* „Würden, Ansehen verleihen” (PT, Wb II 291 pace ÜKAPT VI 142) + „(jem. eine Grabstiftung) ausstatten mit Äckern” (Lit. MK, XVIII., Wb II 293, 12) = „to appoint, combine (attributes/k3.w), provide” (FD 136) = „(wahrscheinlich) geben, verleihen” ≈ *mṯn* „anweisen, geben” (Barta, LÄ IV 388) = „to bestow (dignities upon), appoint (the positions), enlist” (CT, Shorter 1935, 41 pace JEA 16, 1940, 197, fn. 16; DCT 238) = „donner en dotation, assigner” (ZÄS 126, 1999, 129f.) = „1. die Kas zusammenfassen: verleihen, 2. zusammenstellen (Herde), 3. ausstatten (Grabstiftung mit Äckern)” (OK, ÄWb I 641), which was used in the Pyramid Texts as antithesis of *nḥm* „to take (away)” and, in addition, resulted in *nḥb.w* „Abgabe von Rindern” (MK, NE, Wb II 293, 14) = „Abgabe-Rind” (Störk, LÄ V 258) = „Steuerrinder” (Helck, LÄ VI 1037) contra „yoke-oxen” (FD 136). For me, henceforth, the underlying root is both phonologically and semantically identical with Ar. *naḥaba* I „1. faire un voeu, 2. parier, faire un pari, une gageure” [BK II 1211] = „to (make a) vow, put oneself under an obligation to do a thing, lay a bet or a wager, bet, wager” [Lane 2772].

Eg. ḥtj.t „die Kehle” (PT, Wb III 181): in his unpublished etymological files (collected in the early 1980s?),¹¹³ P. Behrens compared it with HECu.: *Burji kúḥ-ō* „nape of neck” ||| NOm.: *Zala ḳoḍiy-ā* „neck”, *Wolamo and Gofa ḳoḍ-e* „neck” | *Kafa ḳeṯṯ-ō* „neck”, *Mocha ḳäṯṯ-ó* „throat”. Phonologically, it is not to be excluded in the light of a few convincing

¹¹³ I owe thanks to V. Blažek (Brno, Czechia) for passing over this precious collection of files he obtained in Cologne as a Humboldt research fellow in 1994. P. Behrens seems to have collected Afro-Asiatic parallels to Egyptian roots.

instances of the irregular correspondence of Eg. *ḥ vs. AA *k.¹¹⁴ Later, however, Behrens (1987, 243, §9) identified Eg. ḥtj with Afar ʿadey-ta „larynx” [PH 1985, 50], in which too, both the *An-* and *Inlaut* consonant would be irregular.

Eg. ḥ^cm „der Hals (vorn an der Speiseröhre), Kehle” (MK, Med., Wb III 243, 19-20) ||| N.Om.: Dizi-Jeba kùm „neck” [Flm. 1990, 28]. No Semitic cognates here either. On the contrary, E. Zyhlarz (1934-35, 172) assumed an extra-Afro-Asiatic origin combining the Egyptian word with Kunuzi komkom „Halsknorpel, Kehle”.

Eg. ḥḥ „1. (PT-) der Hals des Menschen, 2. (Lit. MK-) die Kehle” (Wb III 331) = „neck, throat” (FD 197), act. *ḥīḥ (GT) > Cpt. (S) **ጸጸጸ**, (B) **ኃኃኃ** „Hals, Nacken” (KHW 406) ||| ECu. *kōnk- „throat” [Lmb.] = *kōnk- ~ *kokk- [GT]¹¹⁵ ||| SCu. *koḳ-o „throat” [Ehret]¹¹⁶ ||| N.Om.: Koyra (Badittu, Amarro) kok-e „throat” [Flm.]¹¹⁷ = kokk-ē „throat” [Sasse] | Kaffa kōkō „throat”, koḳkō „neck” [Lmb.] (Cu.-N.Om.: Flm. 1969, 26, #43; Lmb. 1987, 535, #21.a) ||| WCh.: Hausa mākōkō [prefix ma-] „1. goitre, wen on throat, double chin; 2. fatness on throat of young animals denoting good health” [Abr. 1962, 647], Gwandara mākōko „Adam’s apple” [Mts. 1972, 78] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 252).¹¹⁸ No Semitic cognates with the sense „throat”.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁴ Cf. (1) Eg. ḥtj „Rauch” (PT, Wb III 182, 9-11) ||| Sem. *√ktr „Rauch” [WUS #2404], (2) Eg. pth „to create” (XVIII., FD 96; DLE I 186) = „bilden, schaffen” (GHWb 298; cf. Wb I 565, 11) compared by W. Vycichl (1959, 146, #5) and O. Rössler (1971, 296) with Sem.: Akk. patāqu „formen, bilden”, pitqu „Formung” [AHW 847, 870], (3) Eg. ḥmm „Verbum, parallel zu smt ‘hören’” (PT, Wb III 95, 9) combined in EDE I 303 with ECu.: Dullay *kām- „ear” [AMS 1980, 261] ||| S.Om. *kām- „ear” [Blz.] ||| WCh. *kūma „ear” [Stl. 1987, 209]. For the Cu.-Om.-Ch. etymology see Mukarovskij 1987, 43-44; 1989 MS, 2; Lamberti 1987, 534, #16.b; Blažek 1989 MS Om., 11, #29.

¹¹⁵ Cf. LECu.: Oromo koḳkō „throat” [Sasse] = kōka ~ koḳko? „throat” vs. kokke? „uvula, Adam’s apple” [Lmb.] = kokk-ē „Adam’s apple” [Zbr.], Arbore kokke „throat” [Lmb.], Baiso kok-e „throat” [Flm.] = kōnke ~ kōke „larynx” [Lmb.], Elmolo ōk [< *kōk?] „throat” [Sasse] | HECu.: Sidamo kokke „throat” [Lmb.], Hadiyya koḳke?e ~ kokke?e „throat, Adam’s apple” [Lmb.] = qōnq-a? „Adam’s apple” [Lsl.], Gedeo (Darasa) koḳk-o „throat” [Flm.] = qonq-o „throat” [Lsl.], Gidole koḳko ~ kokke „throat” [Lmb.], Kambatta kōnke ~ kokke „throat” [Lmb.] = (so also Qabenna and Tembaro) qōq-ē „throat” [Lsl.] = qoqeha [Lsl. apud Zbr.], Burji kok-e „throat” [Flm.] = kōkk-ē and kok-ē „throat, uvula” [Sasse] = kokke „throat, uvula” [Lmb.] = qoqq-ē „throat” [Leslau] (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 116; Leslau 1988, 197; Zaborski 1985, 89). The parallel forms with *k- vs. *ḳ- in East Cushitic are still to be explained. In the view of H.-J. Sasse (1982, 116), perhaps ECu. *k- is to be set, not *ḳ-. According to W. Leslau (1988, 197), the HECu. forms with ḳ-/q- are loans from Oromo, whereas those with k- were borrowed into Gurage kokke, kokki „throat, Adam’s apple”.

¹¹⁶ Cf. (?) Iraqw -qunqu [nasal infix?] *,throat (?)” deduced from ala-qunqu „nape” ala- „behind” [Ehret] vs. gugi „throat” [Flm.] | Ma’a mkokéra ~ mḥohéra „throat” [Ehret] | Dahalo kōko „neck” [Flm.] = koḳo „throat” [EEN 1989, 19] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 253).

¹¹⁷ In the opinion of H.C. Fleming (l.c. supra), this is possibly a loan from Burji.

¹¹⁸ For this Afro-Asiatic etymology of Eg. ḥḥ see OS 1990, 87, #8; 1992, 186 (Hausa-Eg.); Skinner 1992, 355 (ECu.-Ma’a-Eg.); HSED #2069 (Eg.-Hausa-Dahalo).

¹¹⁹ W.F. Albright (1918, 90; 1918, 240, #76, cf. GÄSW #757) and M. Cohen (1947, #151) figured PEg. *ḥḥḥ < **ḥḥḥ to be equated with Sem.: Akk. ḥarurtu „Hals”, while H. Holma (1919, 42) combined Eg. ḥḥ with Akk. ḥāḥu „husten” ḥāḥū ~ ḥūḥū „Auswurf”, which is, however an onomatopoeia having no etymological connection with the „throat” words. V. Blažek (1991, 364), in turn, identified Eg. ḥḥ directly with Sem. *ḥaw- vs. *ḥawḥ(aw)-

Eg. š3š3.t ~ š3š3jj.t „Kehle” (Med., GR, Wb V 413) = „collar” (Lefèbvre 1952, §22) = „upper part of the oesophagus” (Smith apud PL) = „oesophagus” (Ebbell 1937, 300; Lacau 1970, 67, §172) = „throat (inside and outside)” (PL 991). P. Wilson (PL l.c.) was wondering if it „*may be as spelling of ḥ3ḥ ,throat' with š replacing ḥ as often happens in later texts*”, which is certainly not the case with regard to Eg. š3š3.wt ~ š3š3.jjt ~ š3š3 „Halskette” (XVIII., XX., Wb V 413, 10-11) = „a necklace or pectoral symbolising Maat” (NK-, PL 991 pace Goyon 1972, 128, n. 388) attested as early as the 1st Intermediate Period (ÄWb I 1282a), when no interchange š ~ ḥ or shift š < ḥ occurred as yet (Peust 1999, 123, §3.9.5), let alone that the latter was in fact ḥḥ since the oldest occurrences (above). Noteworthily, our word as an anatomic term seems at the moment to have no parallel whatsoever in the Afro-Asiatic lexical stock. On the contrary, it appears to be a secondary NK development of MK š3š3.wt „necklace”, which, in turn, was borrowed prior to 2000 BC from Semitic or Berber *šaršar-at „chain”.¹²⁰

Eg. šbb „Luftröhre als Körperteil des Menschen” (Med., Wb IV 439, 3-4) = „Luft-/Speise-Röhre” (WMT 843), beside which there was also a fem. variety šbb.t „throat (of antelope and oryx cut when ritually slaughtered)” (PL 998; Lacau 1970, §170 pace Brugsch Wb 1868, #1372) > Cpt. (S) **ϣΟΥΩΒΕ**, (SA) **ϣΟΥΩΒΕ**, (F) **ϣΟΥΩΒΙ**, (B) **ϣΩΩΒΙ** „Kehle” (KHW 335) = „throat” (CD 603a; CED 258),¹²¹ represents in fact a later semantic innovation from the basic sense „tube”, cf. šbb n nbj.t „Röhre aus Schilfrohr (durch das man Dampf einatmen soll)” (Med., Wb IV 439, 2) = „Rohr (vom Schilf) als Gerät zum Inhalieren” (WMT 843) ||| Sem.: Ar. šibāb-at- „flûte, roseau à jouer” [BK I 1181] = šabbāb-at- „espèce de flûte (flauta histola, citola)”, šabbāb- and mu-šabb-at- „joueur de flûte (citolero)” [Dozy I 718-719] = šibāb-at- „Flöte” [Vcl.] = šabbab-at- „тростниковая дудочка” [SISAJa] ||| NBrb.: Menacer ta-zābb-ut „flute” [SISAJa] < AA *šab „тростниковая трубочка, дудочка” [SISAJa] as suggested in the light of the analogy provided by Armenian p’og „throat, gullet” vs. „tube, trumpet” by W. Vycichl (1953, 112; 1958, 400; 1959, 39) and also by the Russian linguists (SISAJa III 39, #75; HSED #2319).

„empty space, mouth, entrance, gate” [Blz.] = *ḥawḥ- „hollow” [TG]: Hbr. ḥāwāḥīm ~ ḥōḥīm (pl.) [< *ḥawḥ-] „hole, crevice” [KB 296] = „das Felsspalten” [GB 217] = „hollows, recesses” [Lsl.] || Ar. ḥawḥ-at- „aperture in a wall, small doorway between houses” [Lsl.] || Geez ḥoḥat „door(way)” [Lsl. 1987, 260] = ḥōḥt „hole in the wall” [KB]. This Semitic root has, however, reliably a quite different Afro-Asiatic background, cf. SCu.: WRift **ḥoḥ > sg. *ḥoḥōḥw „hollow form”, pl. *ḥoḥēri [Kießling & Mous 2004, 323] || ECu.: Dullay *ḥoḥ- „hole” [GT] > Dobase ḥoḥr-o & Gollango hóhn-o „Loch” (Dullay: AMS 1980, 192) || WCh.: Angas-Sura *kuk ~ *kōk „(i.a.) be empty” [GT 2004, 207] > cf. especially Angas kok „empty” [Ormsby 1914, 209], Montol ku (so, without -k) „empty” [Ftp. 1911, 216] | Sha guk, pl. gukak „Tür” [Jng. 1970, 285]. The non-reduplicated root appears in Sem. *ḥwy „empty” [GT].

¹²⁰ As suggested by Sh. Yeivin (1930, 111), B.H. Stricker (1937, 5 and fn. 1) and W. Vycichl (1952, 201; 1958, 370). Cf. also Militarev 1984, 60, #11; 1985 MS, 2, #7 for its Afro-Asiatic background.

¹²¹ As both J. Černý (CED 258) and W. Westendorf (KHW 335, fn. 4) rightly emphasized, the Coptic word has nothing to do with Dem. šnb.t „Luftröhre, Kehle” (DG 515, 8; Spiegelberg 1921, 212) = „wind pipe, throat” (CED) < Eg. šnb.t „Brust” (Wb IV 512, 10f.).

Eg. šnb.t „Kehle” (LP, Wb) = „throat (mainly in non-medical, mythological and other texts), it can also be the breast of a nurse” (Ptol. Edfu, PL 1020) → Dem. šnb.t „die Luftröhre, die Kehle” (DG 515, 8; Spg. 1921, 212) was a late word due to semantical innovation from old šnb.t „Brust (des Menschen)” (MK-, Wb IV 512-513). Cf. also Eg. šnb „trumpet (?)” (Ptol. Esna, suggested by S. Sauneron, but disputed in PL 1020, not in Wb).

Eg. qbb.t „Kehle (von der Maat als Kehle des Horus u.ä.)” (GR, Wb V 25, 12) = „throat” (PL 1051): as rightly stated by P. Wilson (PL l.c.), „*its etymology is uncertain*”, there being at least three diverse origins:

(1) It may be either a late semantic shift from Eg. qbb „cool air (which passes down the throat)” < √qbb „to be cool” as suggested by P. Wilson (l.c.).

(2) Or to be derived as a late form from Eg. q3b.t „breast” (cf. below) as alternatively proposed by P. Wilson (l.c.)?

(3) Much less likely appears a metathesis of Eg. b3q.t (neck or throat det.) „gorge (?)” (NE Mag., AL 78.1254 after Borghouts, cf. above) ||| LECu.: Oromo boqq-ū „1. neck, 2. back of neck, 3. stubborn” [Gragg 1982, 59] ||| WCh.: Fyer ḃàgyi, ʔe-ḃàgyi, pl. ḃàgigyī „neck (Hals, Nacken)” [Jng. 1968, 7, #50; 1970, 84, cf. JI 1994 II, 252].

Eg. tẓ „der Hals” (OK-, Wb V 400, 8) seems to originate from Eg. tẓ „knoten, knüpfen” (Wb) similarly to tẓ „Wirbel(knochen) des Körpers (des Nackens, des Rückens)” (PT-, Wb V 400) vs. tẓ.t „die Rücken” (NE, Wb V 400, 14). I.e., „neck” < *”what ties (head to torso)”?

Eg. *ḏ3d „throat (or sim.)” is only to be deduced from its denominal verb, namely ḏ3d (throat determinative) „(Schlachtopfer) abkehlen” (PT 402a-, Wb V 527, 10) = „entkehlen” (ÜKAPT II 138, 158) = „to kill, strangle” (Ember) = „to strangle” (AEPT 131) = „abstechen (Schlachtopfer), ‘abkehlen’” (ÄWb I 1493a) = „to cut throat” (CT II 240b, DCT 818), for which so far just a phonologically ill-founded false etymology has been proposed.¹²² Only recently has G. Takács (1997, 253-254, #4.1) found the regular matches of Eg. *ḏ3d in the reflexes of AA *√grd „throat, neck” [GT], cf. Sem. *√grd- (with various C₄ root extensions: *√grdb ~ *√grdm) „to be gluttonous” [GT]¹²³ ||| NBrb.: Senhazha ta-meggart (possibly -t), pl. ti-mgard-in „nuque” [DRB 867], Mzab ggurdə^c „boire à longs traits”, a-gərdu^c „gorgée longue de liquide” [Dlh. 1984, 62] | Qabyle √grd: ggerdedd „être goulou, glouton, manger goulument” [Dallet 1982, 272] || WBrb.: Zenaga a-gard, pl. gard-un „1. gosier, 2. haut du cou, sous et autour des maxillaires, 3. goulot” [DRB] ||| LECu.: Afar gurdum-ē „Schlund, Rachen, Kehle” [Rn. 1886, 852], Saho ḏurgum-ā

¹²² Since Eg. ḏ- does not regularly correspond to Sem. *z-, the traditional equation of Eg. ḏ3d with Sem. *√zrd: Syr. √zrd „erdrosseln” [Vrg.] || Ar. zarada „erdrosseln”, zarida „schlucken”, ma-zrad- „Kehle” [Vrg.] suggested by A. Ember (1913, 114, #37; ESS §24.c.4, §3.b.43) and J. Vergote (1945, 130) has to be given up.

¹²³ Cf., e.g., Ar. ḡardaba „goinfrer”, ḡardab-ān- „vorace”, cf. also ḡardaḡa „allonger le cou, dresser la tête” || Tigre gardādā „être avide, ronger”, ḡärḡāmā „dévorer”, Tigrinya g^wärädāmā and Amharic g^wäräddāmā „manger avec bruit”, Gurage aṅurättāmā „manger et boire en même temps” (Sem.: DRS 182-183).

(metathesis) „1. der Halsknorpel, 2. Schlund, Rachen, Kehle” [Rn. 1890, 114] = *durgum-a* ~ *gurgum-a*¹²⁴ „trachea, windpipe” [Vergari 2003, 72, 94] (LECū.: Cohen 1947, #206) ||| WCh.: (?) Bole-Tangale **ŋgido* [-d- < *-rd-?] „neck” [Schuh 1984, 211] | (?) Diri *ŋg^wadu* [< **n^ward-?*] „neck” [Skn. 1977, 32] || CCh.: Lamang-Turu *gurdn*, Lamang-Hitkala *gírdá* „Hals, Nacken” (Lamang: Wolff 1971, 65) || ECh.: Sokoro *kerred-um* [irreg. k- < *g-] „dein Gaumen” [Lks. 1937, 35] = *kerred* „hard palate” [Skn.] (Ch.: Skinner 1992, 353). Noteworthy, the above examined root was retained as an anatomic term in Berber, Cushitic, and Chadic just like in Egyptian, while Semitic, on the other hand, has preserved it only as a denominal verbal root. We know of further root varieties too (with alternating C₃), which are eventually certainly interrelated. It is noteworthy in the history of all these roots that the (presumably primary) nominal reflexes were as a rule lost in Semitic, just like in Egyptian, where they survived in denominally derived verbal roots with shifts into the semantic domain „gluttonous” (cf. its Hungarian synonym *torkos* < *torok* „throat”).

● AA **√grt* (perhaps **gurt-*) „throat, neck” [GT] attested in Sem. **√grtm* [GT: AA affix *-um of anatomic terms] > Amharic *gārāččāmā* „mâcher avec bruit” [DRS 186] ||| NBrb. **√grd* „neck” [GT]¹²⁵ || EBrb.: Audjila *a-gārât*, pl. *gertâ-wen* „collo” [Paradisi 1960, 163] || WBrb.: Zenaga *a-garde* (sic: -d-) „cou” [Msq. 1879, 29] = *a-gard*, pl. *gard-un* (sic: -d) „1. gosier, 2. haut du cou, sous et autour des maxillaires”, *a-gard*, pl. *garða-wən* „3. goulot” [Ncl. 1953, 313] = *ə-garḏ*, pl. *u-gurḏ-a(w)n* „cou” [TC 2008, 211] || SBrb.: ETawllemmet and Ayr *é-gārāḏ* „nuque” [PAM 2003, 239] (Brb.: Kossmann 1999, 214, #628; DRB 868-869) ||| CCh.: PMatakam (PMafa-Mada) **gərḏa* „hard palate” [Skinner pace Rossing 1978] | Mbara *gúrdòy*, pl. *gúrdòdó* „gorge” [TSL 1986, 263].

● AA **√grz* (perhaps **gurz-*) „throat, neck” [GT] represents a third variety, cf. Sem. **√grz* > Ar. *ḡaruza* „être vorace” || Tigrinya *gärzaw/yä* „dépecer un animal égorgé” (Sem.: DRS 194-185) ||| NBrb. **a-gurz* „throat” [GT]¹²⁶ || SBrb. **a-gurəz* „larynx” [GT] (Tuareg data: Prasse 1969, 42, 110; Brb. data: DRB 899) ||| SOM.: Ari *gürz-i* „neck, throat” [Bnd.], Galila *gurž-i* „throat” [Flm.] (SOM.: Bender 1994, 155, #56; 2003, 214).

¹²⁴ This variety is also reflected by NBrb. **a-géržum* „gorge” [Destaing 1920, 143] > e.g. Shilh *a-geržum* „gorge” [Cid Kaoui 1907, 119] | Tamazight *ta-geržum-t* „gorge” [Cid Kaoui] ||| Bed. *gírguma* (m) „Halsknorpel, Adamsapfel, Schlund, Kehle, Rachen” [Rn. 1895, 101] || Agaw **gurgum* „neck” [GT] (Cu.: Blazek 1994 MS Bed., 16), which all carry the suffix *-um-. The etymons **gurd-um-* vs. **gurg-um-* may well have been rhyme-words.

¹²⁵ Attested in Medieval Shilh *a-gerḏ* ~ *a-greḏ* „cou” [Ksm.], Shilh *a-grḏ* ~ *a-mg(g)rd* ~ *ta-mg(g)rt* „1. cou, 2. col (d’un vase), 3. goulot, goulet” [DRB] = *a-mgerd* „cou” [Jst. 1914, 121], Sus *a-mggerḏ* „collo” [Prd.] | Ntifa and Demnat *a-hgruḏ* „gésier” [Hintze 1951, 79], Ntifa *a-mgerḏ*, pl. *i-mgraḏ* „cou, gorge” [Dray 1998, 129, 245], Tamazight *gerḏ* >/~ *yerḏ* „tordre le cou, détacher (au niveau d’une articulation, d’un nœud)”, *a-gerḏ* ~ *a-yerḏ* „i.a. col, voix, cou, gorge”, *a-mgerḏ* „long cou, gros cou”, *ta-mgerḏt*, pl. *ti-mgraḏ* „cou, (en)col(ure)” [Taïfi 1991, 166], Zayan *a-gerḏ*, pl. *i-gerḏi-wn* „épaupe” [Taïfi] | Iznasen *a-žerniḏ* „cou” [Ksm.] | Qabyle *a-g^werḏ* „(en)col(ure)”, *a-mgerḏ*, pl. *i-meḡraḏ* „cou, nuque, encolure”, *ta-mḡerḏt*, pl. *ti-meḡraḏ* „cou, gorge (corps humain), encolure” [Dallet 1982, 273]. G. Takács (1997 l.c.) treated the first radical of the Ntifa and Demnat cognate as the trace of the AA prefix **h-* (occurring in the names of body parts). K. Naït-Zerrad (DRB 869), in turn, regarded as „*un dérivé expressif*” hardly fitting for comparing.

¹²⁶ Cf., e.g., Beni Snus *a-gürzi* ~ *a-yerzi*, also *á-yeržum* „gorge” [Destaing 1914, 154-155], Shawya *i-gerzi* „gorge, gosier, pharynx” [Huyghe 1907, 272] | Qabyle *a-gurz* „goitre” [DRB, not in Dallet 1982].

„Lung”

A third synonym for „lung” appears in Egyptian in addition to Eg. wf3 and *zm3, which were discussed in the first part of my series „Layers ...” (Takács 2015, 108-109). In my impression, contrary to those both, this third one was perhaps denoting not „lung” in general, but rather „membrane” or „bladder”.

Eg. ffj ~ fjj „part of an ox, listed among the viscera” (NE, AEO I 17 & II 249*) = „les poumons” (AL 77.1545) = „ein Organ des Rindes: *Lunge (jwf n ffj 'Fleisch des ffj-Organen)” (GHWb 305) is presumably distinct from Eg. wf3 'lung' (Wb I 306, 3) as suggested by A.H. Gardiner (AEO Il.c.),¹²⁷ which is corroborated by the assumption proposed by myself (Takács 1999, 26; 2003, 192-193, #316; EDE II 567) that it is identical with SCu.: Ma'a ifofo-tá „lung” [Ehret 1980, 151, #15] ||| PCh. *√ff „lung” [GT]¹²⁸ deriving from a common SAA *√ff (presumably *fuf-) „lung” [GT].¹²⁹ An areal parallel occurs in PBantu *papu „Lunge” [Mkr.].¹³⁰ The underlying verbal root (of onomatop. origin) is preserved by PCu. *√ff (presumably *fūf) „lung” [GT].¹³¹ Cf. also AA *√wf(f) (or sim.) „to blow” [GT].¹³² No Semitic parallels. Cp., however, Sem.: Ar. fūf- „3. pellicule très-mince et pellicule qui enveloppe le grain” [BK II 647] = „peel, membrane (of grain)” [Baranov 1976, 613] and fawf- „vessie de bœuf” [BK II 647] = „bull's bladder” [HSED] ||| Bed. fūfāne ~ fūfāne „bladder” [Rpr. 1928, 179] || LECu.:

¹²⁷ Albeit the opposite position has been occupied by W. Westendorf (KHW 283).

¹²⁸ Attested in WCh.: Hausa hùhùhù [hu regular < *fu] [Abr. 1962, 390] | Angas fufwak [ALC 1978, 18] | Tangale pubu [Kidda 1985, 210, #341], Dera pùpùk [Nwm. 1974, 132] | Ngizim fúfú [Schuh 1981, 58] || CCh.: Tera fufuf [Nwm. 1964, 38] | Bura fufu „1. lungs, 2. blacksmith's bellows” [BED 1953, 69] | Mandara fofeža účā [Mch.] | Mafa-Mada *√žbf [Mch.] = *√mbf [GT]: Mada ámbáb [Br.-Brunet 2000, 200], Mafa baf [Br.-Bléís 1990, 85], Uldeme mbáf [Scn. 1986, 174], Gisiga bofok [Lks. 1970, 118] | Logone fúfu [Mch.] | Hitkala (Lamang) buf [Eguchi 1971, 197] | Musgoy fúfō [Mch.] | Lame páf [Scn. 1982, 269], Zime-Dari páf [Cooper 1984, 20] (CCh. data: Mouchet 1950, 37; 1953, 171) || ECh.: Kera bōbōfi [Ebert 1976, 33]. All forms mean „lung” (unless otherwise indicated).

¹²⁹ See also Illič-Svityč 1966, 21, 23 (Hausa-CCh.); Bynon 1984, 281 (Brb.-Ron); HSED #826 (Brb.-Ch.-Ar.).

¹³⁰ The Bantu-Berber-Hausa comparison was suggested by H.G. Mukarovskij (1959, 10, #12).

¹³¹ Cf. Bed. fūf „blasen” [Rn. 1895, 77] = fūf „to blow” [Roper 1928, 179] || NAgaw: Bilin fūf y „1. (an) blasen, 2. schnauben vor Zorn, erzürnt sein” [Rn. 1887, 117] = fāffi y- „to blow through the mouth” [Lmb.] || LECu. *afūf- [Black]: Afar fūf Tah „blasen” [Rn.] = fūffa-hē „to blow”, fūf-e (intr.) „to blow, breathe” [PH 1985, 105], Saho fūf dāh „blasen” [Rn.] = fuf-is- „to blow through the mouth” [Lmb.] | POmo-Tana *?afūf- „to blow” [Ehret 1987, 53, #194]: Somali bof ~ buf [dissim.] „blasen, pfauchen” [Rn. 1902, 74], PBoni *afūf- „to blow (of person)” [Heine 1982, 95] | Oromo afūfa „to blow (horn, trumpet), inflate, whistle” [Gragg 1982, 10], Gidole afuf- „to inflate, blow” [Black] (LECu.: Black 1974, 103) || SCu.: Qwadza fif- „to breathe” [Kohl-Larsen apud Ehret 1980 MS, 3] (Cu. data: Dolgopol'skij 1966, 63; 1973, 44; HL 1988, 63).

¹³² Cf. NBrb.: e.g. Shilh uf „sich aufblasen, aufgebläht sein” [Zhl.] ||| ECU. *?uff-/?ufuf- „blasen” [Sasse]: LECu. *uff- „bladder (others: 'to blow')” [Black]: Konso úff-āta „bladder” [Black], Gidole úff-ā „bladder” [Black] | Baiso ufūf- „to blow” [Hayward] (LECu.: Black 1974, 105) | HECu. *ufūf- „to blow (on fire)” [Hds. 1989, 423] (ECu.: Sasse 1979, 19; 1982, 183-184; Leslau 1988, 180) || SCu. *?ūf- „to blow” [Ehret]: Iraqw ufuf- | Asa ?uf- | Ma'a -úfu [< *ufuf] | Dahalo ?ūf- ~ žūf- [ž- < *y-] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 294, #88). Cf. also PNUbian *uff „blasen” [Abel 1933-4, 306].

Oromo buf-a „Blasebalg” [Rn. 1887, 117] ||| WCh.: PAngas *fūp „membrane” [Takács 2004, 111].¹³³ Were the Bedawye, Oromo, and Angas parallels all borrowed from Arabic or do they stem from a common Afro-Asiatic heritage?

Summary

Below, I present a synopsis of how the semantically closest cognates (marked +) of the Egyptian anatomical terms vs. the parallels stemming ultimately presumably from the same Afro-Asiatic root, but only indirectly (indir.) comparable, with some shift of meaning or some phonological/morphological difference (marked as (+) in brackets) vs. the uncertain (unc.) ones are distributed among the diverse branches of the Afro-Asiatic macrofamily and beyond.

In the semantic domain „hair”, including those three items I examined in the first issue of my series „Layers...” (Takács 2015, 86-89), i.e., the lexemes most commonly used in this general sense, only three synonyms have an evident match in Semitic (plus one unc. and perhaps two indir.), and so, here, it is substantially surpassed by the quantity of certain cognates from Cushitic (6 + 1 unc. + 1 indir.) and Chadic (5 + 2 unc.). The same is almost the case with Berber (4 + 1 unc.) and Omotic (4 certain cases) too, which are surprisingly nearly equally as well represented and are displaying here substantially higher scores than elsewhere on the upper torso.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
j3r.t					+
wpr.t	+	+?	+		
fʿ(3/j)	+	+	+?		+?
ḥnk(z).t			+		
sw.t		+			+
sr.(t)	(+)?	+		+	+
šn, šntj		+	+	+	+
šnbj			+		+
dbn.t	(+)?		+	+	
d33	+			+	+?
*d3f	(+)?		+/(+)?		

¹³³ Cf. Angas fuup „a membrane, thin skin (such as the bladder)” [Flk. 1915, 179] = fūúp (Kabwir dialect) „a thin membrane, skin over egg or over baby, newborn” [Jng. 1962 MS].

„Crown of head”, noteworthy, represents once again a domain of the Egyptian anatomical lexicon where direct cognates from the Semitic anatomical lexical stock are present in a relatively higher degree (possibly Σ three = 2 + 1 unc. instances out of the five) than elsewhere. The same is the case with the Egypto-Berber matches (Σ 3 = 1 + 2 indir.) here. But Cushitic and Chadic yielded also 2 certain cognate each. Apparently, Northern vs. Southern Afro-Asiatic terms were in this domain actually equally represented in the Egyptian lexicon.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
wp.t	+		+		+
whnn		(+)			
sm3			+		
q3b.t	+	+			
*qf3	(+)	(+)			+

For „skull”, Egyptian had just one inherited term, whose cognates are solely attested in Ethio-Semitic (Gurage). This strangely reminds us of Eg. $\underline{d}3\underline{d}3$ „head” (discussed in the preceding part of „Layers...”, cf. Takács 2015, 89-90), which is only and exclusively paralleled with this reduplicated structure by Sem. *gulgul-.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
$\underline{d}nn.t$	+			(+)	(+)

In the case of Egyptian terms for „forehead” and „face”, the situation radically differs from that outlined in the preceding segments: almost all direct matches appear only South Afro-Asiatic, viz. in Cushitic (2 + 1 unc.) and Chadic (3 certain cases) – but *sine* Omotic (with zero match!) – and only once or twice we have a certain match in Semitic (1 + 2 indir.) and nothing in Berber.

Eg.	inner Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
mnd.t				+?		
ḥ3.t		(+)		+		+
ḥr		(+)		+		+
ḥft	+					
ḥnt		+				
dhn.t						+
Eg.	inner Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.

As to „eyebrow”, we can observe the dichotomy demonstrated in the first part of my „Layers...” series: one item is exclusively Semitic, one is „African” (the root underlying here being only indirectly attested in Semitic). In the former item, Berber (1 + 1 indir.), Cushitic (1 + 1 indir.), and Chadic (1) are all represented except for Omotic, where, typically, our Egyptian root is not found.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
jnh	(+)	+, (+)	+, (+)		+
smd	+				

No Egyptian word for „mouth” is inherited from Common Afro-Asiatic or has direct cognate in any other branch. Typically, the least of all these indirect parallels appear here too from Berber and Omotic.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
wt	(+)		(+)	(+)	(+)?
r	(+)?	(+)?	(+)		(+)?

As for „chin, jaw”, no certain match in Semitic (+ 2 unc., 1 indir.) and just one in Berber, while Cushitic (2 certain + 2 unc.) prevails here too, followed by Chadic (2 certain matches), and Omotic is as poorly present (1 + 1 unc.) as Berber.

Eg.	inner Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
jn ^ʕ		+?		+?		
ʕr.t		+?		+?		
wgj/w.t			+	+		+
*bj3					+	+
ḥd		(+)		+	(+)	

The South Afro-Asiatic dominance becomes even more pervasive in the domain of cognates for „neck, throat”: all three southern branches almost equally share a high amount of Egyptian cognates: Cushitic (5 + 2 unc.), Omotic (5 + 3 unc.), Chadic (5 + 3 unc.), whereas both other northern branches are equally underrepresented: Semitic (1 + 1 unc., 4 indir.), Berber (1 + 1 indir., 1 unc.).

Eg.	inner Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
jw3j.t					+	+
jz.t			(+) (?)		+?	+
ʕnʕn	+					
*√ʕš				+		
wsr.t		+?				
b3q.t				+?	+?	+?
bʕn.t		+	+?	+	+	+
bb(j).t < bb.wj	+					
bgs, bgs.t	+?					+?
mr.t				+?		+?
nḥb.t	+	(+)				
*nfr		(+)				
ḥtj.t				+	+?	
ḥʕm					+	
ḥḥ		(+)?		+	+	+
š3š3(jj).t	+?					
šbb	+	(+)				
šnb.t	+					
qbb.t	+					
tz	+					
*d3d		(+)	+	+	+	+
Eg.	inner Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.

Direct matches for Egyptian words signifying „lung” are again only known from Chadic (2 + 1 indir.) and Cushitic (1 + 1 indir.) as well as some extra-Afro-Asiatic languages (2), whose presence is noteworthy already in the case of Eg. *ph* „breast”. In Semitic, in turn, only one certain and one uncertain indirect root cognate appears, Berber and Omotic cognates are once again missing.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.	extra-AA
wf3					+	+
ffj	(+)?		+, (+)?		+, (+)?	+
zm3	(+)					

Conclusion

In the first issue of the „Layers ...” series, I have demonstrated the binary (and sometimes trinary) system of the two opposite/suppletive layers of Egyptian anatomical terminology (with Semitic cognacy vs. „African” origin as well as inner Egyptian innovation, respectively) in certain segments of the ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology („head”, „hair”, „ear”, „eye”, hand”, etc.). As we have seen throughout this second paper and from the synopses above and below, in the majority of the Egyptian anatomical terms for the upper torso, it is difficult to see any of such a binary distribution, suppletive dichotomy of the anatomical terms having either Semitic or „African” etymologies. In the table below, I list the scores of certain = + vs. indirect = (+) vs. uncertain = +? matches in the individual branches according to semantic fields.

item	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
„hair”	3 +, 2 (+), 1 +?	4 +, 0 (+), 1 +?	6 +, 1 (+), 1 +?	4 +, 0 (+), 0 +?	5 +, 0 (+), 2 +?
„crown of head”	2 +, 0 (+), 1 +?	1 +, 2 (+), 0 +?	2 +, 0 (+), 0 +?	0 +, 0 (+), 0 +?	2 +, 0 (+), 0 +?
„skull”	1 +, 0 (+), 0 +?	0	0	1 (+)	1 (+)
„face, forehead”	1 +, 2 (+), 0 +?	0	2 +, 0 (+), 1 +?	0	3 +, 0 (+), 0 +?
„eyebrow”	1 +, 1 (+), 0 +?	1 +, 1 (+), 0 +?	1 +, 1 (+), 0 +?	0	1 +, 0 (+), 0 +?
„mouth”	0 +, 2 (+), 0 +?	0 +, 1 (+), 0 +?	0 +, 2 (+), 0 +?	0 +, 1 (+), 0 +?	0 +, 2 (+), 0 +?
„jaw”	0 +, 1 (+), 2 +?	1 +, 0 (+), 0 +?	2 +, 0 (+), 2 +?	1 +, 1 (+), 0 +?	2 +, 0 (+), 0 +?
„neck, throat”	1 +, 5 (+), 1 +?	1 +, 1 (+), 1 +?	5 +, 0 (+), 2 +?	5 +, 0 (+), 3 +?	5 +, 0 (+), 3 +?
„lung”	0 +, 2 (+), 0 +?	0	1 +, 1 (+), 0 +?	0	2 +, 1 (+), 0 +?

Instead of a Semitic vs. „African” dichotomy, in most of the cases (beginning from the „face” and lower down the torso), we can observe a surprisingly overwhelming extra-Semitic affiliation, where the relative distribution of the Cushitic and Chadic matches is outstanding, whereas the Berber and Omotic element is – strangely – usually either lacking or poorly underrepresented and, sometimes, the only etymological solution for an Egyptian anatomical term is displayed by the extra-Afro-Asiatic parallels. The rare

domain where the Semitic and Berber elements attain a relatively higher score of direct cognacy in comparison with the rest of the Egyptian anatomical terms is solely that of the head. Still, the number of indirect Semitic matches is strikingly higher than those in the African branches (Berber, Cushitic and Chadic), which may perhaps signify an innovative trait of the Semitic lexicon as compared with the common Egypto-Cushito-Chadic stock. As for „hair” and „neck, throat” and only, the Omotic scores are surprisingly as high as the dominant Cushitic and Chadic scores. Elsewhere, in many other items, the almost total lack of direct Omotic cognates was somewhat expectable. As outlined in my most recent study on Afro-Asiatic disintegration (Takács 2016), Omotic shares the least amount of isomorphs as well as lexical isoglosses with the rest of the Afro-Asiatic branches, whence it is presumable to be the most distant one from all other branches and the earliest one to separate from the proto-language. The synopsis below lists the total sums of matches in the diverse branches to Egyptian anatomical terms examined in this paper (including the items for „hair” and „lung” published in the first part).

etymology	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
direct	9	8	19	11	21
indirect	15	5	5	2	3
uncertain	5	2	6	3	5
total	Σ29	Σ15	Σ30	Σ16	Σ29

These results indicate the absolute dominance of Cushitic and Chadic direct cognates, which both phonologically and semantically stand closest to Egyptian anatomical terms, whose noteworthy rich system of synonymous terms might a priori make an impression as if Egyptian anatomical root inventory were composed of diverse proto-dialectal layers. Naturally, one might ponder where these layers issued from, since the synonyms mostly do not reflect a diachronic or branch-oriented distribution. If we take – at least, as a tendency in general, not necessarily in each individual case – direct matches as evidence of a shared semantical innovation due to secondary cohabitation, while indirect ones as traces of ancestral inheritance shifting semantically to innovations differing individual in the diverse branches in due course of areal separation, we can suppose a secondary areal community of Egyptian with Cushitic and Chadic, presumably subsequent to the separation of Egyptian from the older Northern Afro-Asiatic block (Semitic and Berber) sharing a highly apophonic morphology, whence the high number of the indirect parallels in Semitic may also stem from. The low scores of Berber are strange at the moment, while those of Omotic are in accordance with the minimal shared isomorphs in this branch (cf. Takács 2016). I need to carry on my research into further domains of Egyptian anatomical terminology, the tentative results of which seem to fundamentally corroborate this picture.

Abbreviations of languages

(A): Akhmimic, AA: Afro-Asiatic, Akk.: Akkadian, Ar.: Arabic, Aram.: Aramaic, (B): Bohairic, BD: Book of the Dead, Bed.: Bed'awye, Brb.: Berber, Ch.: Chadic, CCh.: Central Chadic, CT: coffin texts, Cu.: Cushitic, ECh.: East Chadic, ECu.: East Cushitic, E: East(ern), Eg.: Egyptian, EWLmt.: East Tawllemmet, (F): Fayyumic, GR: Greek (Ptolemaic) and Roman Period, GW: syllabic or group-writing, Hbr.: Hebrew, HECu.: Highland East Cushitic, IMP: Intermediate Period, JAram.: Jewish Aramaic, (L): Lycopolitan (or Subakhmimic), LECu.: Lowland East Cushitic, Lit.: literary texts, LP: Late Period, M: Middle, Mag.: magical texts, MK: Middle Kingdom, N: North, NBch.: North Bauchi, NBrb.: North Berber, NK: New Kingdom, NOm.: North Omotic, OEG.: Old Egyptian, OK: Old Kingdom, Om.: Omotic, OT: Old Testament, PB: post-Biblical, PCh.: Proto-Chadic, PCu.: Proto-Cushitic, PT: pyramid texts, S: South(ern), (S): Sahidic, SBrb.: South Berber, Sem.: Semitic, W: West(ern), WBrb.: West Berber, WCh.: West Chadic, WSem.: West Semitic.

Abbreviations of authors

Abr.: Abraham, AF: Adolf Friedrich, AJ: Alio & Jungrauthmayr, Ajh.: Ajhenval'd, Alj.: Alojaly, AMS: Amborn, Minker, Sasse, Apl.: Appleyard, Bgn.: Beguinot, BK: Biberstein & Kazimirsky, Blz.: Blažek, Bnd.: Bender, Brg.: Bargery, Brk.: Brockelmann, Brq.: Burquest, Brt.: Barreteau, CR: Conti Rossini, Crl.: Cerulli, Ctc.: Caitucoli, Djk.: D'jakonov, Dkl.: Diyakal, Dlg.: Dolgopol'skij, Dlh.: Delheure, Dlt.: Dallet, Dst.: Destaing, EEN: Ehret, Egc.: Eguchi, Elderkin, Nurse, Fcd.: Foucauld, Flk.: Foulkes, Flm.: Fleming, Frj.: Frajzyngier, Frz.: Fronzaroli, Ftp.: Fitzpatrick, GB: Gesenius & Buhl, Gcl.: Gochal, Hds.: Hudson, Hfm.: Hoffmann, HL: Haberland & Lamberti, Hlw.: Hellwig, Hyw.: Hayward, IS: Illič-Svityč, JA: Jungrauthmayr & Adams, JI: Jungrauthmayr & Ibriszimow, Jng.: Jungrauthmayr, Jns.: Johnstone, Jst.: Justinard, KB: Koehler & Baumgartner, KM: Kießling & Mous, Krf.: Kraft, Ksm.: Kossmann, Lbg.: Loubignac, Lks.: Lukas, Lmb.: Lamberti, Lnf.: Lanfry, LS: Lamberti & Sottile, Lsl.: Leslau, Lst.: Laoust, Mch.: Mouchet, Mkr.: Mukarovsky, Mlt.: Militarev, MQK: Mous, Qorro, Kießling, MSkn.: M. Skinner, Msq.: Masqueray, Mts.: Matsushita, Ncl.: Nicolas, Nhl.: Nehlil, Ntg.: Netting, Nwm.: Newman, Old.: Ol'derogge, OS: Orel & Stolbova, PAM: Prasse, Alojaly, Mohamed, PG: Pillinger & Galboran, PH: Parker & Hayward, Prd.: Paradisi, Rn.: Reinisch, Rns.: Renisio, Rpr.: Roper, Rsl.: Rössler, Scn.: Sachnine, Skn.: N. Skinner, Smz.: Shimizu, Spg.: Spiegelberg, Srl.: Sirlinger, SSL: Simeone-Senelle & Lonnet, Stl.: Stolbova, Str.: Strümpell, Strm.: Stroomer, TC: Taïne-Cheikh, TG: Takács, Vcl.: Vycichl, Vrg.: Vergote, Wlf.: Wölfel, Zbr.: Zaborski, Zhl.: Zyhlarz.

References

- AÄG = Edel, E.: *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
 Abel, H.: *Nubisch-ägyptisches Sprachgut*. = *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 24 (1933-34), 303-306.
 Abès, M.: *Manuel de berbère marocain*. (Place not indicated), 1916. (?), (publisher not indicated).
 Abraham, R.C.: *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*.² London, 1962., University of London Press.
 Abraham, R.C.: *Somali-English Dictionary*.² London, 1964., University of London Press Ltd.
 AEB = *Annual Egyptological Bibliography*.
 AECT = Faulkner, R.O.: *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*. Vol. I-III. Warminster, 1973-8., Aris & Phillips Ltd.
 AEO = Gardiner, A.H.: *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*. I-II. Oxford, 1947., Clarendon Press.
 AEPT = Faulkner, R.O.: *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. I. Oxford, 1969., Clarendon Press.
 AHW = Soden, W. von: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. I-III. Wiesbaden, 1965-1981., Otto Harrassowitz.

- Ajhenval'd, A.Ju.: Strukturno-tipologiĉeskaja klassifikacija berberskih jazykov. Material i metodika issledovanija. Imja. Mestoimenie. Moskva, 1986., Nauka.
- AL I-III = Meeks, D.: Année lexicographique. Égypte ancienne. Tome 1-3 (1977-1979). 2^{ème} édition. Paris, 1998., Cybele.
- Albright, W.F.: Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. I.= American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 34/2 (1918), 81-98.
- Albright, W.F.: Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. II.= American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 34/4 (1918), 215-255.
- Albright, W.F.: Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. III.= Journal of the American Oriental Society 47 (1927), 198-237.
- ALC 1978 = Angas Language Committee (in Cooperation with Nigeria Bible Translation Trust): Shòk nkarŋ kè shaktok mwa nðan Ngas. Ngas–Hausa–English Dictionary with Appendix Showing Some Features of Ngas Grammar. Jos, Nigeria, 1978., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.
- Alio, Kh. & Jungrathmayr, H.: Lexique bidiya. Frankfurt am Main, 1989., Vittorio Klostermann.
- Alio, Kh.: Préliminaires à une étude de la langue kajakse d'Am-Dam, de Toram du Salamaat, d'ubi du Guéra et de masmaje du Batha-est.= Takács, G. (ed.): Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl. Leiden, 2004., E.J. Brill. Pp. 229-285.
- Allati, A.: Phonétique et phonologie d'un parler amazigh du Nord-Est marocain (Le parler des Ait-Saïd). Tome III. Thèse de doctorat de 3^{ème} cycle. Université de Provence, Centre d'Aix-en-Provence, 1986. 4 p.
- Alojaly, Gh.: Lexique touareg-français. Copenhague, 1980., Akademisk Forlag.
- Amborn, H. & Minker, G. & Sasse, H.-J.: Das Dullay. Materialien zu einer ostkuschitischen Sprachgruppe. Berlin, 1980., Reimer Verlag.
- Appleyard, D.: A Comparative Approach to the Amharic Lexicon.= Afroasiatic Linguistics 5/2 (1977).
- ÄWb I = Hannig, R.: Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I. Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit. Hannig-Lexica 4. Mainz am Rhein, 2003., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- ÄWb II = Hannig, R.: Ägyptisches Wörterbuch II. Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit. I-II. Hannig-Lexica 5. Mainz am Rhein, 2006., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Bargery, G.P.: A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary Compiled for the Government of Nigeria. London, 1934., Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.
- Barguet, P.: Les textes des sarcophages égyptiens du Moyen Empire. Paris, 1986., Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Barreteau, D.: Description du mofu-gudur. Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun. Livre II. Lexique. Paris, 1988., Éditions de l'ORSTOM.
- Barreteau, D. & Bléis, Y.: Lexique mafa. Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun. Paris, 1990., ORSTOM, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Barreteau, D. & Brunet, A.: Dictionnaire Mada. Berlin, 2000., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Barthélemy, A.: Dictionnaire arabe-français. Dialectes de Syrie: Alep, Damas, Liban, Jérusalem. Paris, 1935-, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Basset, A.: Études de géographie linguistique en kabyle. (I. Sur quelques termes berbères concernant le corps humain). Paris, 1929., Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- Basset, A.: La langue berbère. Morphologie. La verbe: étude de thèmes. Collection du centenaire de l'Algérie. Paris, 1929., Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- Basset, R.: Loqmân berbère avec quatre glossaires et une étude sur la légende de Loqmân. Paris, 1890., Ernest Leroux.
- Basset, R.: Le dialecte de Syouah. Paris, 1890., Ernest Leroux.
- Basset, R.: Mission au Sénégal. Tome I. Étude sur le dialecte zenaga. Paris, 1909., Ernest Leroux.
- Baucom, K.L.: Proto-Central-Khoisan.= Third Annual Conference on African Linguistics, 7-8 April 1972. Bloomington, 1972., Indiana University. Pp. 3-37.
- Beguinet, F.: Il berbero Nefüsi di Fassâto². Roma, 1942., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Behnk, F.: Lexikalische Beiträge zur ägyptisch-semitischen Sprachvergleichung.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 62 (1927), 80-83.

- Behnk, F.: Über die Beziehungen des Ägyptischen zu den hamitischen Sprachen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 82 (1928), 136-141.
- Behrens, P.: Review of Vycichl, W.: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*.= *Enchoria* 15 (1987), 237-245.
- Behrens, P.: (Unpublished comparative wordlists from Afro-Asiatic). MS. Compiled in the 1980s (?).
- Belova, A.G.: La structure de la racine afroasiatique. Le cas d'extension phonétique.= Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E.R. & Thomanek, K.É. (eds.): *Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovsky anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags*. Wien, 1992., Afro-Pub. Pp. 15-20.
- Belova, A.; Homburg, J.; Kogan, L.; Kovalev, A.; Longinov, Y.; Militarev, A.: *Semitic Anatomic Lexicon. Body Parts*. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 3 p.
- Belova, A.G.: Omonimija v arabskom korneslove i struktura semitskogo kornja.= *Jazyki Azii i Afriki: tradicii, sovremennoe sostojanie i perspektivy issledovanij. Materialy konferencii (5-8 oktjabrja 1998 g.)*. Moskva, 1998., Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Vostokovedenija. Pp. 11-15.
- Bender, M.L.: *Word and Phrase List for Fieldwork in Western Ethiopia (rev. 1974)*. Chara I. MS. 1974.
- Bender, M.L.: *Omotic: A New Afroasiatic Language Family*. Carbondale, Illinois, 1975., Southern Illinois University.
- Bender, M.L.: *Proto-Koman Phonology and Lexicon*.= *Afrika und Übersee* 66 (1983), 259-297.
- Bender, M.L.: *Proto-Omotic Phonology and Lexicon*.= Bechhaus-Gerst, M.; Serzisko, F. (eds.): *Cushitic-Omotic. Papers from the First International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6-9, 1986*. Hamburg, 1988., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 121-159.
- Bender, M.L.: *Aroid (South Omotic) Lexicon*.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 38 (1994), 133-162.
- Bender, M.L.: *The Mystery Languages of Ethiopia*.= Marcus, H. (ed.): *New Trends in Ethiopian Studies. Vol. 1*. Lawrenceville, 1994., Red Sea Press. Pp. 1153-1174.
- Bender, M.L.: *Omotic Lexicon and Phonology*. Carbondale, 2003., SIU Printing / Duplicating, Southern Illinois University.
- Biarnay, S.: *Étude sur le dialecte des bet't'ioua du Vieil-Arzen*.= *Revue Africaine* 277 (1911), 1-261. Paris & Alger, Typographie Adolphe Jourdan.
- Biarnay, S.: *Étude sur les dialectes berbères du Rif. Lexique, textes et notes de phonétique*. Paris, 1917., Ernest Leroux.
- Biberstein Kazimirski, A. de: *Dictionnaire arabe-français*. Paris, 1860., Maisonneuve & Co. Editeurs.
- BIFAO = *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale (Le Caire)*.
- Black, P.D.: *Lowland East Cushitic: Subgrouping and Reconstruction*. Ph.D. dissertation. 1974., Yale University.
- Black, P.D.: *Regular Metathesis in Gidole*.= *Folia Orientalia* 15 (1974), 47-54.
- Black, P.D.: *Linguistic Evidence on the Origins of the Konsoid Peoples*.= Marcus, H.G. & Hinnant, J. (eds.): *Proceedings of the First U.S. Conference on Ethiopian Studies (Michigan State University, 2-5 May 1973)*. East Lansing, 1975., African Studies Center, Michigan State University. Pp. 291-302.
- Blažek, V.: *Omotic Lexicon in Afroasiatic Perspective: Body Parts Cognates*. MS. Paper presented at the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages (Torino, November 1989). 41 p.
- Blažek, V.: *Bedawye Etymologies*. MS. Příbram, around 1990. 10 p.
- Blažek, V.: *Elephant, Hippopotamus and Others: On Some Ecological Aspects of the Afroasiatic Homeland*.= *Asian and African Studies* 3/2 (1994), 196-212.
- Blažek, V.: Review of Kaye, A.S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honour of Wolf Leslau*.= *Archiv Orientální* 62 (1994), 428-435.
- Blažek, V.: *Toward the Position of Bed'awye within Afroasiatic. An Analysis of the Body Parts Terminology*. MS. Printout in Köln, March 1994. 49 p.
- Blažek, V.: *The New Dravidian-Afroasiatic Lexical Parallels*.= Starostin, S. A. (ed.): *Problemy izučeniya dal'nego rodstva jazykov an rubeže tret'ego tysjacheletija. Doklady i tezis naučnoj konferencii*

- (Moskva, 29 maja – 2 ijunja 2000 g.). Moskva, 2000., Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet. Pp. 180-193.
- Blažek, V.; Militarev, A. & Kogan, L.: Semitic Etymological Dictionary I. Review Article.= Archív Orientální 69 (2001), 495-510.
- Blench, R.M.: Why Reconstructing Comparative Ron Lexicon is so Problematic. MS. Paper prepared for the Biennial International Colloquium on the Chadic Language Family (July 5-8, 2001, in Leipzig). This printout: London, 11 July 2001. 13 p.
- Bomhard, A.R.: Peresmotr indoevropsko-semitskoj gipotezy.= Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike. Vypusk XXI. Novoe v sovremennoj indoevropistike. Moskva, 1988., Progress. Pp. 433-450.
- Breasted, J.H.: The Edwin Smith Surgical Papyrus. Vol. I. Chicago, 1930., The University of Chicago Press.
- Brockelmann, C.: Lexicon syriacum². Halle, 1928., Max Niemeyer.
- Brockelmann, C.: Ägyptisch-semitische Etymologien.= Zeitschrift für Semitistik 8 (1932), 97-117.
- Brugsch, H.: Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch. Bd. I-VII. Leipzig, 1867-1882., J.C. Hinrichs.
- Burquest, D.A.: A Preliminary Study of Angas Phonology.= Studies in Nigerian Languages 1 (1971).
- Büchner, H.: Vokabulare des Sprachen in und um Gava (Nordnigerien).= Afrika und Übersee 48 (1964), 36-45.
- Bynon, J.: Berber and Chadic. The Lexical Evidence.= Bynon, J. (ed.): Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 241-290.
- CAD = The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Vol. 1-21. Glückstadt & Chicago, Since 1956, J.J. Augustin, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Cañtucoli, C.: Lexique masa. Paris, 1983., Agence de Coopération Culturelle et Technique.
- Cannuyer, Ch.: Les formes dérivées du verbe en ancien égyptien. Essai de systématisation.= Göttinger Miscellen 63 (1983), 25-33.
- Caprile, J.-P.: Lexique tumak-français (Tchad). Berlin, 1975., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Carnochan, J.: Bachama and Chadic.= Bynon, J.; Bynon, Th. (eds.): Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 459-468.
- CD = Crum, W.E.: A Coptic Dictionary. Oxford, 1939., Oxford, 1939., Oxford University Press.
- CED = Černý, J.: Coptic Etymological Dictionary. London, Cambridge, 1976., Cambridge University Press.
- Černý, J.: Some Coptic Etymologies III.= Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 57 (1958), 203-213.
- Cerulli, E.: Note su alcune popolazioni sidāmā dell'Abissinia meridionale II: i Sidama dell'Omo.= Rivista degli Studi Orientali 12 (1929), 1-69.
- Cerulli, E.: Studi etiopici. I. La lingua e la storia di Harar. Roma, 1936., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cerulli, E.: Studi etiopici. II. La lingua e la storia dei Sidamo. Roma, 1938., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cerulli, E.: Studi etiopici. III. Il linguaggio dei Giangerò ed alcune lingue Sidama dell'Omo (Basketo, Ciara, Zaisse). Roma, 1938., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cerulli, E.: Studi etiopici. IV. La lingua caffèina. Roma, 1951., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Christian, V.: Besprechung von Holma, H.: Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 26 (1912), 388-392.
- Cid Kaoui, S.: Dictionnaire français-tachelh'it et tamazir't (dialectes berbères du Maroc). Paris, 1907., Ernest Leroux.
- CLD = Stolbova, O.: Chadic Lexical Database. Vol. I, II, III. Moscow, 2005., 2007., 2009., Polygraphiya.
- Cohen, M.: Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique. Paris, 1947., Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Conti, G.: Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nel lessico egiziano dell'agricoltura. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- Conti Rossini, C.: La langue des Kemant en Abyssinie. Wien, 1912., Alfred Hölder.
- Conti Rossini, C.: Schizzo del dialetto saho dell'alta Assaorta in Eritrea. Roma, 1913., Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei.

- Conti Rossini, C.: Contributi per la conoscenza della lingua Haruro (Isole del Lago Margherita)= Rendiconti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Ser. VI, vol. XII, fasc. 7-10 (1937), 621-679.
- Cooper, K. N.: Lexique zime-français. Vūn tārī. Sarh (Tchad), 1984., Centre d'Études Linguistiques.
- Crass, J.: The Position of K'abeena Within Highland East Cushitic.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 67 (2001), 5-60.
- CT = Buck, A. de: The Egyptian Coffin Texts. Vol. I-VII. Chicago, 1935-61., The University of Chicago Press.
- Dallet, J.-M.: Dictionnaire qabyle-français. Parler des At Mangellat (Algerie). Paris, 1982., SELAF (Société d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France).
- Dalman, G.H.: Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch. Frankfurt a/M, 1922., J. Kaufmann Verlag.
- Dawson, W.R.: Three Anatomical Terms.= 62 (1927), 20-23.
- DCT = Molen, R. van der: A Hieroglyphic Dictionary of Egyptian Coffin Texts. Leiden, 2000., E.J. Brill.
- Deboo, J.: Jemenitisches Wörterbuch. Arabisch-Deutsch-Englisch. Wiesbaden, 1989., Harrassowitz.
- DED = Burrow, T.; Emeneau, M. B.: A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary. Oxford, 1961., Clarendon Press.
- DELCO = Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte. Leuven, 1983., Peeters.
- Delheure, J.: Dictionnaire mozabite-français. Paris, 1984., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologique de France (SELAF).
- Delheure, J.: Dictionnaire ouargli-français. Paris, 1987., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologique de France (SELAF).
- Destaing, E.: Dictionnaire français-berbère (dialecte des beni-snous). Paris, 1914., Ernest Leroux.
- Destaing, E.: Étude sur les dialecte berbère des aït seghrouchen (Moyen Atlas Marocain). Paris, 1920., Ernest Leroux.
- DG = Erichsen, W.: Demotisches Glossar. Kopenhagen, 1954., Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Diyakal, Ph.: Mushere-English Dictionary. Collection of words carried out by Mr. Ph. I. D. started on September 10th, 1997 under the supervision of Herrmann Jungraithmayr (Univ. of Frankfurt). MS. 390 p.
- Diakonoff, I.M.: Problems of Root Structure in Proto-Semitic.= Archiv Orientalní 38 (1970), 453-480.
- DLE = Lesko, L.H.: A Dictionary of Late Egyptian. Volume I, II, III, IV. Berkeley, 1982., 1984., 1987., 1989. B.C. Scribe Publications.
- Dolgopol'skij, A.B.: Materialy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike kušitskich jazykov. Gubnye i dental'nye smyčnye v načal'nom položenii.= Uspenskij, B.A. (ed.): Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 35-88.
- Dolgopol'skij, A.B.: Nostratičeskie korni s sočėtaniem lateral'nogo i zvonkogo laringala.= Étimologija (1970), 356-369.
- Dolgopolski, A.B.: A Long-Range Comparison of Some Languages of Northern Eurasia. Problems of Phonetic Correspondences.= VII Meždunarodnyj kongress antropologičeskich i étnografičeskich nauk. Moskva, 3-10 avgusta 1964 g. Tom V. Moskva, 1970., Nauka. Pp. 620-628.
- Dolgopol'skij, A.B.: O nostratičeskoj sisteme affrikat i sibiljantov: korni s fonemoj *ʒ.= Étimologija (1972), 163-175.
- Dolgopol'skij, A.B.: Materialy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike kušitskich jazykov. Veljarnyj zvonkij v anlaute.= Ohotina, N.V. & Uspenskij, B.A. (eds.): Problemy afrikanskogo jazykoznanija. Tipologija, komparativistika, opisanie jazykov. Moskva, 1972., Nauka. Pp. 197-216.
- Dolgopol'skij, A.B.: Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika kušitskich jazykov. Moskva, 1973., Nauka.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: Chadic-Semitic-Cushitic: Epenthetic -ɣ- in Sura in the Light of Hamito-Semitic Comparative Linguistics.= Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): The Chad Languages in the Hamito-Semitic-Nigrític Boder Area. Papers of the Marburg Symposion (1979, Berlin). Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 32-46.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: Semitic and East Cushitic. Sound Correspondences and Cognate Sets.= Segert, S. & Bodrogligeti, A.J.E. (eds.): Ethiopian Studies Dedicated to Wolf Leslau. Wiesbaden, 1983., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 123-142.

- Dolgopolsky, A.: South Cushitic Lateral Consonants as Compared to Semitic and East Cushitic.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Müller, W.W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Amsterdam, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 195-214.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: On Lateral Obstruents in Hamito-Semitic.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): Reconstructing Languages and Cultures. Bochum, 1989., Brockmeyer. Pp. 99-103.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: The Nostratic Dictionary. MS, online, printout of December 2008.
- Dozy, R.: Suppléments aux dictionnaires arabes. Tome I-II. Leiden, Paris, 1881., E.J. Brill, Maisonneuve.
- Dray, M.: Dictionnaire français-berbère. Dialecte des ntifa. Paris, 1998., L'Harmattan.
- DRB = Naït-Zerrad, K.: Dictionnaire des racines berbères. Leuven & Paris, since 1998, Peeters.
- Drenkhahn, R.: Die Handwerker und ihre Tätigkeit im Alten Ägypten. Wiesbaden, 1976., Harrassowitz.
- DRS = Cohen, D.: Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques. Fascicules 1-2. Paris & La Haye, 1970-1976., Mouton. Fascicule 3-. Leuven, 1993-, Peeters. With continuous pagination.
- DUL = Olmo Lete, G. & Sanmartín, J.: A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One [ʔ(a/i/u)-k]. Part Two [l-z]. Leiden, 2003., E.J. Brill.
- Ebbell, B.: The Papyrus Ebers, The Greatest Egyptian Medical Document. Copenhagen, 1937., Levin & Munksgaard.
- Ebbell, B.: Ägyptische anatomische Namen.= Acta Orientalia 15 (1937), 293-310.
- Ebert, K.H.: Sprache und Tradition der Kera (Tschad). Teil II. Berlin, 1976., Dietrich Reimer.
- EDE I = Takács, G.: Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume One: A Phonological Introduction. Leiden, 1999., E.J. Brill.
- EDE II = Takács, G.: Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume Two: b-, p-, f-. Leiden, 2001., E.J. Brill.
- EDE III = Takács, G.: Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume Three: m-. Leiden, 2008., E.J. Brill.
- EG 1927 = Gardiner, A.H.: Egyptian Grammar.¹ Oxford, 1927., Clarendon Press.
- Eguchi, P. K.: Matériaux pour servir à l'étude de la langue hidé. Vocabulaire.= Kyoto University African Studies 6 (1971), 195-283.
- Ehret, Ch.: The Historical Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic Phonology and Vocabulary. Berlin, 1980., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ehret, Ch.: The Classification of Kuliak.= Schadeberg, Th. & Bender, M.L. (eds.): Nilo-Saharan. Proceedings of the First Nilo-Saharan Linguistic Colloquium (Leiden, 1980). Dordrecht, 1981., Foris. Pp. 269-289.
- Ehret, Ch.: Proto-Cushitic Reconstruction.= Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika 8 (1987).
- Ehret, Ch.; Elderkin, E. D.; Nurse, D.: Dahalo Lexis and Its Sources.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 18 (1989), 5-49.
- Ehret, Ch.: The Consonant Inventory of Proto-Eastern Cushitic.= Studies in African Linguistics 22/3 (1991), 211-275.
- Ehret, Ch.: Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian). Vowels, Tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary. Berkeley, Los Angeles, California, 1995., University of California.
- Ehret, Ch.: (Additions to the Afroasiatic reconstructions.) MS. Los Angeles, California, 1997. 522 p.
- Eilers, W.: Semitische Wurzeltheorie.= Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semítica, Firenze, 16-19 aprile 1974. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 125-131.
- Ember, A.: Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words. New Series.= ZÄS 51 (1913), 110-121.
- Ember, A.: Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words (New Series). Continued from Vol. 51 pp. 110-121.= ZÄS 53 (1917), 83-90.
- Ember, A.: Egyptian ʔidnw „Subordinate, Substitute”.= Johns Hopkins University Circulars 306 (1918), 29-31.
- Ember, A.: (a) The Phonetic Value of Several of the Egyptian Alphabetic Signs and Their Correspondence Etymologically in the Other Semitic Languages. (b) Metathesis in Old Egyptian.= Journal of the American Oriental Society 41 (1921), 177.
- Ember, A.: Several Egypto-Semitic Etymologies.= Oriens. The Oriental Review 1 (1926), 5-8.

- Ember, A.: Partial Assimilation in Old Egyptian.= Adler, C. & Ember, A. (eds.): *Oriental Studies Published in Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary (1883-1923) of Paul Haupt as the Director of the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University*. Baltimore, 1926., The Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp. 300-312.
- Erman, A.: Das Verhältnis des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 46 (1892), 93-129.
- Erman, A.: Reden, Rufe und Lieder auf Gräberbildern des Alten Reiches.= *Abhandlungen des Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse* 15 (1918), 1-62.
- ESS = Ember, A.: *Egypto-Semitic Studies*. Leipzig, 1930., The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.
- Fairman, H.W.: Some Unrecorded Ptolemaic Words.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 91 (1964), 4-11.
- Farah, M.A. & Heck, D.: *Somali Wörterbuch*. Hamburg, 1993., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- FD = Faulkner, R.O.: *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford, 1962., Clarendon Press.
- Fecht, G.: *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache*. Glückstadt, 1960., Verlag J.J. Augustin.
- Fédry, J. (avec la collaboration de Khamis, J. & o/Nedjei, M.): *Dictionnaire dangaleat (Tchad). Thèse de 3^{ème} cycle*, Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales. Lyon, 1971., Afrique et Langage.
- Fischer, H.G.: *Ancient Egyptian Calligraphy*. 2nd edition. New York, 1983., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Fischer, H.G.: *Varia Nova. Egyptian Studies III*. New York, 1996., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Fitzpatrick, J.F.J.: Some Notes on the Kwolla District and Its Tribes.= *Journal of the Royal African Society* 10 (1910-1911), 16-52, 213-22.
- Fleming, H.C.: Baiso and Rendille: Somali Outliers.= *Rivista degli Studi Etiopici* 20 (1964), 35-96.
- Fleming, H.C.: Asa and Aramanik: Cushitic Hunters in Masai-Land.= *Ethnology* 8/1 (1969), 1-36.
- Fleming, H.C.: The Classification of West Cushitic Within Hamito-Semitic.= McCall, D.F. & Bennett, N.R. & Butler, J. (eds.): *Eastern African History*. New York, 1969., Praeger. Pp. 3-27.
- Fleming, H.C.: Omotic as an Afroasiatic Family.= *Studies in African Linguistics. Supplement* 5 (1974), 81-94.
- Fleming, H.C.: Omotic Overview.= Bender, M.L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 299-323.
- Fleming, H.C.: Kuliak External Relations: Step One.= Vossen, R. & Becchaus-Gerst, M. (ed.): *Nilotic Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Languages and History of the Nilotic Peoples*, Cologne, January 4-6, 1982. Berlin, 1983., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 423-478.
- Fleming, H.C.: Omotica, Afrasiana and More: Ethiopia as the Ever-Flowing Vase.= *Mother Tongue* 12 (1990), 22-30.
- Fleming, H.C.; Aklilu Yilma; Mitiku, A.; Hayward, R.; Miyawaki, Y.; Mikesch, P.; Seelig, J.M.: Ongota (Or) Birale. A Moribund Language of Gemu-Gofa (Ethiopia).= *JAAL* 3/3 (1992) or (1992-93), 181-225.
- Foot, E.C.: *A Galla-English, English-Galla Dictionary*. Cambridge, 1913., University Press.
- Forrer, E.: Stratification des langues et des peuples dans le Proche-Orient préhistorique.= *Journal Asiatique* 217 (1930), 227-252.
- Foucauld, Ch. de: *Dictionnaire touareg-français, dialecte de l'Ahaggar*. Vol. I-IV. Paris, 1951-52., Imprimerie Nationale de France.
- Foulkes, H.D.: *Angass Manual. Grammar, Vocabulary*. London, 1915., Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
- Frajzyngier, Z.: *A Pero-English and English-Pero Vocabulary*. Berlin, 1985., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Frajzyngier, Z.: *A Dictionary of Mupun*. Berlin, 1991., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Fronzaroli, P.: Studi sul lessico comune semitico. II. Anatomia e fisiologia.= *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XIX, fasc. 7-12 (1964), 243-280.
- Fronzaroli, P.: Studi sul lessico comune semitico. VII. L'alimentazione.= *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XXVI, fasc. 7-12 (1971), 603-642.
- Fronzaroli, P.: *The Eblaic Lexicon. Problems and Appraisal*.= Fronzaroli, P.: *Studies on the Language of Ebla*. Firenze, 1984., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 117-157.

- Garbini, G.: Il corpo umano nella comparazione lessicale egitto-semitica.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 46 (1971), 129-141.
- Gardiner, A.H.: *Egyptian Grammar*.¹ Oxford, 1927., Clarendon Press.
- GÄSW = Calice, F. von: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- GB = Gesenius, W. (bearbeitet von Buhl, F.): *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Unveränderter Neudruck der 1915 erschienenen 17. Auflage. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, 1962., Springer-Verlag.
- GD = Landberg, Le Comte de: *Glossaire daïnois*. Vol. I-III. Leiden, 1920., 1923., 1942., E.J. Brill.
- GHWb = Hannig, R.: *Grosses Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800-950 v. Chr.)*. Mainz, 1995., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Gochal, G.: *A Look at Shik Ngas*. Jos, 1994., Jos University Press.
- Goyon, J.-C.: *Confirmation du Pouvoir royal au Nouvel An*, P.Brooklyn Museum 47.218.50. Le Caire, 1972., IFAO.
- Gragg, G.: *Oromo Dictionary*. East Lansing, Michigan, 1982., Michigan State University.
- Grandet: *Le Papyrus Harris I (BM 9999)*. *Glossaire*. Le Caire, 1999., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Grapow, H.: Über die Wortbildungen mit einem Präfix m- im Ägyptischen.= *Abhandlungen der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1914), 3-33.
- Grapow, H.: *Anatomie und Physiologie (Grundriß der Medizin der Alten Ägypter I)*. Berlin, 1954., Akademie-Verlag.
- Gravina, R.: *Central Chadic Reconstructions*. MS, online. 2014.
- Guglielmi, W.: *Die Göttin Mr.t: Entstehung und Verehrung einer Personifikation*. Leiden, 1991., E.J. Brill.
- Guthrie, M.: *Comparative Bantu. An Introduction to the Comparative Linguistics and Prehistory of the Bantu Languages*. Part I. Vol. 2. *Bantu Prehistory, Inventory and Indexes*. Westmead, Farnborough, Hants, 1971., Gregg International Publishers.
- Haberland, E. & Lamberti, M.: *Ibaaddo ka-Ba'iso. Culture and Language of the Ba'iso*. Heidelberg, 1988., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- HAM = Westendorf, W.: *Handbuch der altägyptischen Medizin*. Leiden, 1999., Brill.
- Hayward, R.J.: *Bayso Revisited: Some Preliminary Linguistic Observations*. II.= *Bulletin of the School of African and Oriental Research* 62 (1979), 101-132.
- Hayward, D. (= R.J.): *The Arbore Language: A First Investigation Including a Vocabulary*. Hamburg, 1984., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- HCVA I = Diakonoff, I.M.; Belova, A.G.; Militarev, A.Ju.; Porhomovskij, V.Ja.; Stolbova, O.V.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian*. Part 1.= *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 2 (1993), 5-28.
- HCVA II = Diakonoff, I.M.; Belova, A.G.; Militarev, A.Ju.; Porhomovskij, V.Ja.; Stolbova, O.V.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian*. Part 2.= *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 3 (1994), 5-26.
- HEG = Tischler, J.: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck, since 1977, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Heine, B.: *Vokabulare ostafrikanischer Restsprachen*. Teil I.= *Afrika und Übersee* 56 (1973), 276-283.
- Heine, B.: *Notes on the Yaaku Language (Kenya)*.= *Afrika und Übersee* 58/2 (1975), 119-138.
- Heine, B.: *Notes on the Rendille Language*.= *Afrika und Übersee* 59 (1976), 176-223.
- Heine, B.: *The Sam Languages. A History of Rendille, Boni and Somali*.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 6/2 (1978), 23-115.
- Heine, B.: *The Non-Bantu Languages of Kenya*. Berlin, 1980., Reimer.
- Heine, B.: *Boni Dialects*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Hellwig, B.: *Goemai – English – Hausa Dictionary*. MS. Draft. Printed out on 20 August 2000. 42 p.
- Hintze, F.: *Zur hamitosemitischen Wortvergleichung*.= *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5 (1951), 65-87.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Hausa-Egyptian Establishment*.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 8/1 (1966), 40-57.

- Hodge, C.T.: Some Afroasiatic Etymologies.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 10/3 (1968), 19-29.
- Hodge, C.T.: An Egypto-Semitic Comparison.= *Folia Orientalia* 17 (1976), 5-28.
- Hodge, C.T.: Hausa and English: Related Languages. MS. Paper presented at the International Conference on Hausa Language and Literature, Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria, July 1978. 3 p.
- Hodge, C.T.: Lislakh Labials.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 23/8 (1981), 368-382.
- Hodge, C.T.: Comparative Evidence for Egyptian Historical Phonology.= Young, D. W. (ed.): *Studies Presented to Hans Yakob Polotsky*. East Gloucester, 1981., Pirtle and Polson. Pp. 401-413.
- Hodge, C.T.: Relating Afro-Asiatic to Indo-European.= Wolff, E. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H. (eds.): *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*. Hamburg, 1983., Buske Helmut Verlag. Pp. 33-50.
- Hodge, C.T.: Were the Rekhyt Indo-Europeans?=*Discussions in Egyptology* 2 (1985), 13-23.
- Hodge, C.T.: The Role of Egyptian within Afroasiatic.= Baldi, Ph. (ed.): *Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology*. Berlin, New York, 1990., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 639-659.
- Hodge, C.T.: Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic.= Lamb, S.M. & Mitchell, D. (eds.): *Sprung from Some Common Source*. Stanford, 1991., Stanford University Press. Pp. 141-165.
- Hodge, C.T.: Letter to Harold Fleming.= *Mother Tongue* 19 (1993), 49-51.
- Hoffmann, C.: Towards a Comparative Phonology of the Languages of the Angas-Goemai Group. MS. University of Ibadan, faculty seminar on 19 March 1975. 32 p.
- Holma, H.: Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. Eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie.= *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia*. Sarja B. Nid. 7. No. 1 (1911), 1-183.
- Holma, H.: Lexikalische Miscellen.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 28 (1914), 147-162.
- Holma, H.: Zur semitisch-hamitischen Sprachwissenschaft.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 32 (1919), 34-47.
- Homburger, L.: Les représentants de quelques hiéroglyphes égyptiens en peul.= *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 23/5 (1930), 277-312.
- Homburger, L.: La morphologie nubienne et l'égyptien.= *Journal Asiatique* 218 (1931), 249-279.
- HSED = Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, 1995., E.J. Brill.
- Hudson, G.: *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary*. Hamburg, 1989., Buske.
- Huyghe, P.G.: *Dictionnaire chaouia-arabe-kabyle & français*. Alger, 1907., Typographie Adolphe Jourdan.
- IEW = Pokorny, J.: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band I. Bern-München, 1959., Francke Verlag.
- IL = Institute of Linguistics. *Bauchi Area Survey Report* presented by N. Campbell and J. Hoskison. MS. Zaria, 1972.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M.: Iz istorii čadskogo konsonantizma. Labial'nye smyčnye. = Uspenskij, B.A. (ed.): *Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii*. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 9-34.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M.: Sootvetstvija smyčnyh v nostratičeskijh jazykah.= *Étimologija* (1966), 304-355.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M.: Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskijh jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropejskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). *Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-Ḳ)*. Moskva, 1971., Nauka.
- Ivanov, V.V.: *Obščeeindoevropejskaja, praslavjanskaja i anatolijskaja jazykovye sistemy. Sravnitel'no-tipologičeskie očerki*. Moskva, 1965., Nauka.
- Ivanov, V.V.: O vozmožnom otaženii odnogo migracionnogo termina v hausa (hausa birnī „gorod“).= Uspenskij, B.A. (ed.): *Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii*. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 105-110.
- Jastrow, M.: *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. Volume I: ʔ-k, Volume II: l-t. New York, 1950., Pardes Publishing House Inc.
- JEA = *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* (London).
- Johnstone, T.M.: *Ḥarsūsi Lexicon*. London, 1977., Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, T.M.: *Jibbāli Lexicon*. London, 1981., Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, T.M.: *Mehri Lexicon*. London, 1987., University of London.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Beobachtungen zur tšchadohamitischen Sprache der Jegu (und Jonkor) von Abu Telfan (Republique du Tchad)*.= *Afrika und Übersee* 45 (1961), 95-123.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Wörterbuch der Angas-Sprache*. MS. 1962.

- Jungraithmayr, H.: Wörterbuch der Goemay-Sprache. MS. 1962.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Die Sprache des Sura (Maghavul) in Nordnigerien.= Afrika und Übersee 47 (1963), 8-89, 204-220.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Materialien zur Kenntnis des Chip, Montol, Gerka und Burrum (Südplateau, Nordnigerien).= Afrika und Übersee 48 (1965), 161-183.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: A Comparative Word List of the Ron Languages (Southern Plateau, N. Nigeria).= Africana Marburgensia 1/2 (1968), 3-12.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Die Ron-Sprachen. Tschadohamitische Studien in Nordnigerien. Glückstadt, 1970., Verlag J.J. Augustin.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Dictionnaire birgit-français. MS. 1973.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Lexique mokilko. Berlin, 1990., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Lexique mubi-français (Tchad oriental). MS. Frankfurt a/M, 1990. 50 p.
- Jungraithmayr, H. (in collaboration with N. A. Galadima and U. Kleiwillinghöfer): A Dictionary of the Tangale Language (Kaltungo, Northern Nigeria) with a Grammatical Introduction. Berlin, 1991., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H. & Adams, A.: Lexique migama. Berlin, 1992., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Lexique sibine (sumray)-français. MS. Frankfurt a/M, versions of 20 April 1993 (?a-bākūgāmī), 7 June 1993 (bālāwrān-gāndārā), 17 June 1993 (gānīny-sārā), 7 June 1993 (sār-? ywaaṛ). 67 p.
- Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibrizimow, D.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume I. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading, Distribution and Comments. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibrizimow, D.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume II. Documentation. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Justinard, (?): Manuel de berbère marocain (dialecte chleuh). Paris, 1914., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Justinard, (?): Manuel de berbère marocain (dialecte rifain). Paris, 1926., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Kahl, J.: Die Farbgebung in der frühen Hieroglyphenschrift.= ZÄS 124 (1997), 44-56.
- Kane, Th.L.: Amharic-English Dictionary. Wiesbaden, 1990., Harrassowitz Verlag.
- KB = Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W.: The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. I-V. Leiden, 1994-2000, E.J. Brill.
- KHW = Westendorf, W.: Koptisches Handwörterbuch. Heidelberg, 1977., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kidda, M.E.: Tangale Phonology: a Descriptive Analysis. Ph.D. thesis. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana, Illinois, 1985.
- Kießling, R. & Mous, M.: The Lexical Reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic. Kuschitische Sprachstudien, Band 21. Köln, 2004., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Koemoeth, P.P.: La «racine» w3b: du mythe à la métaphore.= SAK 20 (1993), 109-123.
- Kossmann, M.: Essai sur la phonologie du proto-berbère. Köln, 1999., Köppe.
- Kraft, Ch. H.: Chadic Wordlists. I-III. Berlin, 1981., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- KRI = Kitchen, K.A.: Ramesside Inscriptions - Historical and Biographical. Vol. I-VII. Oxford, 1968/1975-83/89., Oxford University Press.
- Lacau, P.: Le signe [wh/ħm] whm.= BIFAO 63 (1965), 1-18.
- Lacau, P.: Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique. Paris, 1970., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Lacau, P.: Études d'Égyptologie. II. Morphologie. Le Caire, 1972., IFAO.
- Lam, A.M.: De l'origine égyptienne des Peuls. Paris & Gif-sur-Yvette, 1993., Présence Africaine & Khepera.
- Lamberti, M.: Some Konsoid Etymologies.= Anthropos 82/4-6 (1987), 529-541.
- Lamberti, M. & Sottile, R.: The Wolaytta Language. Köln, 1997., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Lamberti, M.: Some Notes on the Gawwada Language.= Burtea, B.; Tropper, J.; Younansardaroud, H. (Hrsg.): Studia Semitica et Hamitosemitica. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004. Münster, 2005., Ugarit-Verlag. Pp. 217-241.

- Landberg, Le Comte de: *Glossaire daïñois. Deuxième volume (lettre r)*. Leide, 1923., E.J. Brill. Pp. 1039-1814.
- Lane, E.W.: *An Arabic-English Lexicon. I-VIII*. London & Edinburgh, 1863-93., Williams and Norgate.
- Lanfry, J.: *Ghadames. II. Glossaire*. Alger, 1973., *Le Fichier Périodique*.
- Laoust, E.: *Étude sur le dialecte berbère du chenoua comparé avec ceux des Beni-Menacer et des Beni-Salah*. Paris, 1912., Ernest Leroux.
- Laoust, E.: *Mots et choses berbères*. Paris, 1920., Challamel.
- Laoust, E.: *Siwa. I. Son parler*. Paris, 1931., Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- LÄ = Helck, W. & Westendorf, W. (Hrsg., begründet von W. Helck und E. Otto): *Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Band I-VII*. Wiesbaden, 1975-92., Harrassowitz.
- Lefébvre, G.: *Tableau des parties du corps humain mentionnées par les égyptiens*. Le Caire, 1952., Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Leslau, W.: *Lexique soqōtri (sudarabique moderne), avec comparaisons et explications étymologiques*. Paris, 1938., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Leslau, W.: *Vocabulary Common to Akkadian and South-East Semitic (Ethiopic and South-Arabic)*. = *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 64 (1944), 53-58.
- Leslau, W.: *Gafat Documents. Records of a South-Ethiopic Language. Grammar, Text and Comparative Vocabulary*. New Haven, Connecticut, 1945., American Oriental Society.
- Leslau, W.: *The Parts of the Body in Modern South Arabic Languages*. = *Language* 21 (1945), 230-249.
- Leslau, W.: *Examen du supposé argobba de Seetzen et de Lefebvre*. = *Word* 5 (1949), 46-54.
- Leslau, W.: *Étude descriptive et comparative du gafat (éthiopien méridional)*. Paris, 1956., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Leslau, W.: *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1958., University of California.
- Leslau, W.: *A Dictionary of Moča (Southwestern Ethiopia)*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1959., University of California Press.
- Leslau, W.: *A Prefix ḥ in Egyptian, Modern South Arabian, and Hausa*. = *Africa* 32 (1962), 65-68.
- Leslau, W.: *Etymological Dictionary of Harari*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1963., University of California.
- Leslau, W.: *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic*. Wiesbaden, 1969., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W.: *Southeast Semitic Cognates to the Akkadian Vocabulary. III*. = *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89 (1969), 18-22.
- Leslau, W.: *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic). Vol. III. Etymological Section*. Wiesbaden, 1979., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W.: *Proto-Sidamo *z = Afrika und Übersee* 53 (1980), 119-129.
- Leslau, W.: *North Ethiopic and Amharic Cognates in Tigre*. = *AION (Supplemento 31)*, vol. 42, fasc. 2 (1982), 1-86.
- Leslau, W.: *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden, 1987., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W.: *Analysis of the Geʿez Vocabulary: Geʿez and Cushitic*. = *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici* 32 (1988), 59-109.
- Leslau, W.: *Observations on Sasse's Vocabulary of Burji*. = *Afrika und Übersee* 71 (1988), 177-203.
- Levy, J.: *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim nebst Beiträgen von Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer. Zweite Auflage mit Nachträgen und Berichtigungen von Lazarus Goldschmidt. I-IV*. Berlin & Wien, 1924., Benjamin Harz Verlag.
- Loubignac, V.: *Étude sur le dialecte berbère des Zaïan et Aït Sgougou. Textes (deuxième section)*. Paris, 1924., Ernest Leroux.
- Lukas, J.: *Zentralsudanische Studien*. = *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde. Hansische Universität, Reihe B, Band 45/24* (1937).
- Lukas, J.: *Die Sprache des Buduma in Zentralen Sudan*. = *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 24/2 (1939).

- Lukas, J.: Das Hitkalanci, eine Sprache um Gwoza (Nordostnigerien).= Afrika und Übersee 48 (1964), 81-114.
- Lukas, J.: Studien zur Sprache der Gisiga (Nordkamerun). Hamburg, 1970., Verlag J.J. Augustin.
- Lukas, J.: Tschadische Studien I. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Mokulu.= Afrika und Übersee 60 (1977), 1-58, 182-229.
- Lukas, R.: Das Nomen im Bade (Nordnigerien).= Afrika und Übersee 51 (1968), 91-116, 198-224.
- Magwa, J.G. et al. (20 members of the „Ron Language Committee“): A Ron Alphabet. Jos, Nigeria, 1985., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.
- Majzel', S.S. (additions by and edited by Militarev, A.Ju.): Puti razvitija kornevogo fonda semitskih jazykov. Moskva, 1983., Nauka.
- Masqueray, E.: Comparaison d'un vocabulaire du dialecte des Zenaga avec les vocabulaires correspondants des dialectes des Chawiya et des Beni Mzab.= Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Littéraires, 3^{ème} série, tome 5^{ème} (1879), 483-533.
- Matsushita, Sh.: An Outline of Gwandara Phonemics and Gwandara-English Vocabulary. Tokyo, 1972., Tokyo Press.
- Meeks, D.: Notes de lexicographie (§5-8).= Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 77 (1977), 79-88.
- Meeks, D.: Mots sans suite ou notations rituelles? (O.DeM 1696 et O.Petrie 36).= Demarée, R.J. & Egberts, A. (eds.): Deir el-Medina in the Third Millennium AD. A Tribute to Jac J. Janssen. Leiden, 2000., Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten (NINO). Pp. 235-249.
- Mercier, H.: Vocabulaires et textes berbères dans le dialecte des Ait Izdeg. Rabat, 1937., René Céré.
- MGT = Prasse, K.-G.: Manuel de grammaire touaregue. I-III. Phonétique - écriture - pronom. Copenhague, 1972., Université de Copenhague. Vol. IV-V. Nom. Copenhague, 1974., Akademisk Forlag.
- Militarev, A.Ju. & Starostin, S. A.: Obščaja afrazijsko-severnokavkazskaja kul'turnaja leksika.= Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka. Tezisy i doklady konferencii. Čast' 3. Jazykovaja situacija v Perednej Azii v X-IV tysjačeljetijah do n.é. Moskva, 1984., Nauka. Pp. 34-43.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Afrazijsko-šumerskie leksičeskie svjazi.= Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka. Tezisy i doklady konferencii. Čast' 1. Moskva, 1984., Nauka. Pp. 58-61.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Sumerian-Afrasian Parallels. MS. Paper presented at the occasion of the 70th birthday of I.M. Diakonoff, Leningrad, 12 January 1985.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Istoričeskaja fonetika i leksika livijsko-guančskih jazykov.= Solncev, V.M. (ed.): Jazyki Azii i Afriki. IV, kniga 2. Moskva, 1991., Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 238-267.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Semitic Etymological Dictionary, Volume 1: Anatomy of Man and Animals. Handout for the paper presented at the 27th North American Conference on Afro-Asiatic Linguistics (NACAL 27, Baltimore, 20 March 1999). The handout contains pages from the 1st volume of the „Semitic Etymological Dictionary” published by Militarev, A.Ju. & Kogan, L. E. on the internet (website address: <http://starling.rinet.ru>) in January 1999.
- Montet, P.: Notes de lexicographie égyptienne à propos du Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache publié par MM. Ermann (sic) et Grapow.= Kémi 1 (1928), 3-18.
- Mouchet, J.: Vocabulaires comparatifs de quinze parlers du Nord-Cameroun.= Bulletin de la Société d'Études Camerounaises 29-30 (1950), 5-74.
- Mouchet, J.: Vocabulaires comparatifs de sept parlers du Nord-Cameroun.= Bulletin de la Société d'Études Camerounaises 41-42 (1953), 136-206.
- Mous, M. & Qorro, M. & Kießling, R.: Iraqw-English Dictionary with an English and a Thesaurus Index. Köln, 2002., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Möller, G.: Aegyptisch-libysches.= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 24/9-10 (1921), 193-197.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: Altmediterranes Wortgut in Westafrika.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 55 (1959), 1-48.

- Mukarovsky, H.G.: Mande-Chadic Common Stock. A Study of Phonological and Lexical Evidence. Wien, 1987., Afro-Pub.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: On the Relations of Cushitic, Omotic and Chadic Languages. MS. Handout for the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Torino, 1989. 6 p. Proceedings not published.
- Müller, W. M.: The False r in Archaic Egyptian Orthography.= *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* 31 (NS 15) (1909), 182-201.
- Müller, W.W.: Beiträge zur hamito-semitischen Wortvergleichung.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitica*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 63-74.
- NBÄ = Osing, J.: Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen. I-II. Maiz/Rhein, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Nehliil: Étude sur le dialecte de Ghat. Paris, 1909., Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- Netting, R.M.: Kofyar Vocabulary. MS. 1967.
- Newman, P.: A Word List of Tera.= *Journal of West African Languages* 1/2 (1964), 33-50.
- Newman, P.: A Brief Note on the Maha Language.= *Journal of West African Languages* 2/1 (1965), 57-58.
- Newman, P. & Ma, R.: Comparative Chadic: Phonology and Lexicon.= *Journal of African Languages* 5/3 (1966), 218-251.
- Newman, P.: The Kanakuru Language. Leeds, 1974., The Institute of Modern English Language Studies, University of Leeds in association with The West African Linguistic Society.
- Newman, P.: Chadic Classification and Reconstructions.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5/1 (1977), 1-42.
- Nicolas, F.: La langue berbère de Mauritanie. Dakar, 1953., Institut Français d'Afrique Noire.
- Nicolas, F.: Vocabulaires ethnographiques de la Tamâjeq des Iullemeden de l'est (Touâreg de la Colonie du Niger, Afrique Occidentale Française).= *Anthropos* 52 (1957), 49-63, 564-580.
- Ol'derogge, D. A.: Proishozhdenie narodov Central'nogo Sudana (iz drevnejšej istorii jazykov grupy hausa-kotoko).= *Sovetskaja Étnografija* 2 (1952), 23-38.
- Ol'derogge, D. A.: Proishozhdenie jazyka hausa. The Origin of the Hausa Language.= *Doklady sovetsoj delegacii na V Meždunarodnom Kongresse Antropologov i Étnografov. Papers Presented by the Soviet Delegation at the V International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences*. Moskva, 1956., Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 3-28.
- Ol'derogge, D. A.: The Origin of the Hausa language.= Wallace, A. F. C. (ed.): *Men and Cultures*. Philadelphia, 1960., University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. 795-802.
- Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: K rekonstrukcii praafrazijskogo vokalizma. 3-4.= *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2 (1990), 75-90.
- Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: Cushitic, Chadic, and Egyptian: Lexical Relations.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind*. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 167-180.
- Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: On Chadic-Egyptian Lexical Relations.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind*. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 181-203.
- Ormsby, G.: Notes on the Angass Language.= *Journal of the Royal African Society* 12 (1912-1913), 421-424 & 13 (1913-1914), 54-61, 204-210, 313-315.
- Osing, J.: Sprüche gegen die jbh3tj-Schlange.= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 43 (1986), 205-210.
- Osing, J.: Review of Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*, Vol. I.= *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 58/5-6 (2001), 565-581.
- Paradisi, U.: Il berbero di Augila. Materiale lessicale.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 35/3-4 (1960), 157-177.
- Paradisi, U.: El-Fógâha, oasi berberofona del Fezzân.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 36/3-4 (1961), 293-302.
- Parker, E. M. & Hayward, R.J.: *An Afar-English-French Dictionary (with Grammatical Notes in English)*. London, 1985., School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Pellat, Ch.: *Textes berbères dans le parler des Aït Seghrouchen de la Moulouya*. Paris, 1955., Éditions Larose.
- Piamenta, M.: *Dictionary of Post-Classical Yemeni Arabic*. I-II. Leiden, 1990-91., Brill.
- Pillinger, S. & Galboran, L.: *A Rendille Dictionary*. Köln, 1999., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

- Pilszczikowa, N.: Contribution à l'étude des rapports entre le haoussa et les autres langues du groupe nigéro-tchadien.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 22/2 (1958), 75-99.
- PL = Wilson, P.: A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu. Leuven, 1997., Peeters.
- PN = Ranke, H.: Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I: Verzeichnis der Namen. Band II: Einleitung. Form und Inhalt der Namen. Geschichte der Namen. Vergleiche mit andren Namen. Nachträge und Zusätze zu Band I. Umschreibungslisten. Hamburg, 1935., 1952., Verlag von J.J. Augustin.
- Praetorius, F.: Die amharische Sprache. Halle, 1879., Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Prasse, K.-G.: A propos de l'origine de h touareg (tahaggart).= *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 43/3 (1969).
- Prasse, K.-G.; Alojaly, Gh.; Mohamed, Gh.: Dictionnaire touareg-français (Niger). Copenhagen, 2003., Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen.
- Premare, A.-L. de: Dictionnaire arabe-français établi sur la base de fichiers, ouvrages, enquêtes, manuscrits études et documents divers de A.-L. de Premare et collaborateurs. Tome I-XII. Paris, 1993-1999., L'Harmattan.
- PT = Sethe, K.: Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte. I-II. Leipzig, 1908., 1910., J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Quibell, J.E.: A Visit to Siwa.= *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 18 (1918), 78-112.
- Rabin, Ch.: Lexicostatistics and the Internal Divisions of Semitic.= Bynon, J.; Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 85-102.
- Ray, J.D.: Are Egyptian and Hittite Related?= Lloyd, A.B. (ed.): *Studies in Pharaonic Religion and Society in Honour of J. Gwyn Griffiths*. London, 1992., The Egypt Exploration Society. Pp. 124-136.
- RdE = *Revue d'Égyptologie* (Paris).
- Reinisch, L.: Die Chamirsprache in Abessinien. II. Chamir-deutsches Wörterbuch.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 106 (1884), 330-450.
- Reinisch, L.: Die Quarasprache in Abessinien. II. Quarisch-deutsches Wörterbuch.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 109/1 (1885), 3-152.
- Reinisch, L.: Die °Afar-Sprache. II.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 113/2 (1886), 795-916.
- Reinisch, L.: Wörterbuch der Bilin-Sprache. Wien, 1887., Alfred Hoelder.
- Reinisch, L.: Die Kafa-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. II. Kafa-Deutsches Wörterbuch.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 116 (1888), 251-386.
- Reinisch, L.: Wörterbuch der Saho-Sprache. Wien, 1890., Alfred Hölder.
- Reinisch, L.: Das Zalwort vier und neun in den chamitisch-semitischen Sprachen.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 121/12 (1890).
- Reinisch, L.: Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache. Wien, 1895., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Reinisch, L.: Die Somali-Sprache. II. Wörterbuch. Wien, 1902., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Reinisch, L.: Der Dschäbärtidialekt der Somalisprache.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 148/5 (1904), 1-88.
- Reniso, A.: Étude sur les dialectes berbères des Beni Iznassen, du Rif et des Senhaja de Sraïr. Grammaire, textes et lexique. Paris, 1932., Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- Roper, E.-M.: Tu Bedawie. An Elementary Handbook for the Use of Sudan Government Officials. Hertford, 1928., Stephen Austin & Sons.
- Rossing, M.O.: Mafa-Mada: A Comparative Study of Chadic Languages in North Cameroun. Ph.D. dissertation. Wisconsin, 1978., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Rössler, O.: Der semitische Charakter der libyschen Sprache.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50 (1952), 121-150.
- Rössler, O.: Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache.= Altheim, F. & Stiehl, R. (eds.): *Christentum am Roten Meer*. Band I. Berlin, New York, 1971., Walter de Gruyter. Pp. 263-325.
- Rössler, O.: Das ägyptische Wort für Mund.= *Africana Marburgensia* 16/1 (1983), 84-85.

- RT = Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes (Paris).
- Sabar, Y.: A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dictionary. Dialects from Amidya, Dihok, Nerwa and Zakho, Northwestern Iraq. Wiesbaden, 2002., Harrassowitz.
- Sachnine, M.: Notes sur le zime (lame) parlé au Cameroun.= *Africana Marburgensia* 9/1 (1976), 71-86.
- Sachnine, M.: Dictionnaire lamé-français. Lexique français-lamé. Paris, 1982., SELAF.
- Sasse, H.-J.: Weiteres zu den ostkuschitischen Sibilanten.= *Afrika und Übersee* 59 (1976), 125-142.
- Sasse, H.-J.: The Consonant Phonemes of Proto-East-Cushitic (PEC).= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7/1 (1979), 1-67.
- Sasse, H.-J.: Textproben der Boni-Sprache.= *Afrika und Übersee* 63 (1980), 79-101.
- Sasse, H.-J.: Ostkuschitische und semitische Verbalklassen.= Diem, W.; Wild, S. (eds.): *Studien aus Arabistik und Semitistik Anton Spitaler überreicht*. Wiesbaden, 1980., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 153-174.
- Sasse, H.-J.: Neue Perspektiven im Afroasiatischen? = Jungrauthmayr, H. & Miehe, G. (eds.): *Berliner Afrikanistische Vorträge XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Berlin 24.-29. März 1980*. Berlin, 1981., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer. Pp. 145-165.
- Sasse, H.-J.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*. Hamburg, 1982., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Saxon, D.E.: *Sokoro Wordlist*. MS. Los Angeles, May-June 1977. 40 p.
- Scheel, B.: Studien zum Metallhandwerk im alten Ägypten I. Handlungen und Beischriften in den Bildprogrammen der Gräber des Alten Reiches.= *SAK* 12 (1985), 117-177.
- Schenkel, W.: Zu den Verschluss- und Reibelauten im Ägyptischen und (Hamito)Semitischen. Ein Versuch zur Synthese der Lehrmeinungen.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 3 (1993), 137-149.
- Schlee, G.: *Sprachliche Studien zum Rendille: Grammatik, Texte, Glossar*. Hamburg, 1978., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Schuh, R.G.: *A Dictionary of Ngizim*. Berkeley, California, 1981., University of California.
- Schuh, R.G.: West Chadic Vowel Correspondences.= Bynon, J. (ed.): *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 167-223.
- SED I = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A. (with assistance of A. Belova, A. Kovalev, A. Nemirovskaja, D. Nosnitsyn): *Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Vol. I. Anatomy of Man and Animals*. Münster, 2000., Ugarit-Verlag.
- Shevoroshkin, V.V.: On Laryngeals.= Bammesberger, A. (ed.): *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg, 1988., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. Pp. 527-546.
- Shimizu, K.: The Southern Bauchi Group of Chadic Languages. A Survey Report.= *Africana Marburgensia. Special Issue* 2 (1978), 1-50.
- Shorter, A. W.: The God Nehebkaui.= *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 21 (1935), 41-48.
- Simeone-Senelle, M.C. & Lonnet, A.: Lexique des noms des parties du corps dans les langues sudarabiques modernes. Première partie: la tête.= *Matériaux Arabes et Sudarabiques* 3 (1985-1986), 259-304.
- Simeone-Senelle, M.C. & Lonnet, A.: Lexique soqotri: les noms des parties du corps.= Kaye, A.S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau. Volume II*. Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 1443-1487.
- Simeone-Senelle, M.-C. & Lonnet, A.: Compléments à „Lexique soqotri: les noms des parties du corps“.= *Matériaux Arabes et Sudarabiques* NS 4 (1992), 85-108.
- Sirlinger, E.: *Dictionary of the Goemay Language*. Jos, Nigeria, 1937., Prefecture Apostolic of Jos.
- SISAJa III = D'jakonov, I.M.; Belova, A.G.; Militarev, A.Ju.; Porhomovskij, V.Ja.; Stolbova, O.V.: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskich jazykov. Vypusk 3. s-c-ç-ž, č-č-ž, š-č-č s labialami*. = *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XVI godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*. Moskva, 1986., Nauka. Pp. 3-46.
- Skinner, M. G.: *Aspects of Pa'anci Grammar*. Ph.D. thesis. Madison, 1979., University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Skinner, N.: North Bauchi Chadic Languages: Common Roots.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 4/1 (1977), 1-49.

- Skinner, N.: *Body Parts in Hausa – Comparative Data.*= Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E.R. & Thomanek, K.É. (eds.): *Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovskij anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags.* Wien, 1992., Afro-Pub. Pp. 345-357.
- Skinner, N.: *Evidence for Earlier Nominal Affixation in Afroasian.*= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (Hrsg.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica.* Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 25-35.
- Skinner, N.: *Hausa Comparative Dictionary.* Köln, 1996., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Sokoloff, M.: *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Bizantine Period.* Ramat-Gan, 1990., Bar Ilan University Press.
- Sottile, R.: *The Consonant System of Gamu.*= Lamberti, M. & Tonelli, L. (eds.): *Afroasiatica Tergestina. Papers from the 9th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Trieste, April 23-24, 1998. Contributi presentati al 9^o Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semita), Trieste, 23-24 Aprile 1998.* Padova, 1999., Unipress. Pp. 427-446.
- Spiegel, J.: *Das Auferstehungsritual der Unas-Pyramide.* Wiesbaden, 1971., Harrassowitz.
- Spiegelberg, W.: *Koptisches Handwörterbuch.* Heidelberg, 1921., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Stahelin, E.: *Zu den Farben der Hieroglyphen.*= Hornung, E. (Hrsg.): *Zwei ramessidische Königsgräber: Ramses IV. und Ramses VII.* Mainz am Rhein, 1990., Philipp von Zabern. Pp. 101-119.
- Steuerwald, K.: *Türkisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. Türkçe-almanca sözlük.* Wiesbaden, 1972., Otto Harrasswitz.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Opyt rekonstrukcii verhnepzapadnočadskih kornej.*= *Jazyki zarubežnogo Vostoka. Sbornik statej.* Moskva, 1977., Nauka. Pp. 152-160.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika i slovar' zapadnočadskih jazykov.*= Porhomovskij, V.Ja. (ed.): *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie. Problemy rekonstrukcii.* Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 30-268.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Lateral Sibilants in Chadic (Reconstruction) and Their Correspondences in Semitic and Egyptian.* MS. Paper presented at the Symposium on Chadic and Hamito-Semitic, Frankfurt am Main, 6-8 May 1991. 9 p. Its shortened version was published in 1995 (see below).
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Lateral Sibilants in Chadic (Reconstruction) and Their Correspondences in Semitic and Egyptian.*= Ibrizimow, D.; Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica.* Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 58-64.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Studies in Chadic Comparative Phonology.* Moscow, 1996., „Diaphragma” Publishers.
- Stricker, B.H.: *Trois études de phonétique et de morphologie coptes.*= *Acta Orientalia* 15 (1937), 1-20.
- Stroomeer, H.: *A Comparative Study of Three Southern Oromo Dialects in Kenya.* Hamburg, 1987., Buske.
- Stroomeer, H.: *A Grammar of Boraana Oromo (Kenya). Phonology, Morphology, Vocabularies.* Köln, 1995., Buske.
- Stroomeer, H.: *A Concise Vocabulary of Orma Oromo (Kenya).* Köln, 2001., Köppe.
- Strümpell, F.: *Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen des Mandara-Gebirges (Adamaua).*= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 13 (1922-23), 109-149.
- Stumme, H.: *Eine Sammlung über den berberischen Dialekt der Oase Sîwe.*= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse* 66/2 (1914), 91-109.
- Sudlow, D.: *The Tamasheq of North-East Burkina Faso. Notes on Grammar and Syntax Including a Key Vocabulary.* Köln, 2001., Köppe.
- Taïfî, M.: *Dictionnaire tamazight-français (parlers du Maroc central).* Paris, 1991., L'Harmattan-Awal.
- Taine-Cheikh, C.: *Dictionnaire zénaga-français. Berbère de Mauritanie.* Köln, 2008., Köppe.
- Takács, G.: *Some Berber Etymologies I.*= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 38 (1996), 43-59.
- Takács, G.: *Egyptian Lexics in an Afrasian Perspective: New Etymologies.*= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 1 (1996), 125-171.
- Takács, G.: *Review of V.É. Orel and O.V. Stolbova: Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary.*= *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 49 (1997), 108-117.

- Takács, G.: Selected New Egypto-Afrasian Correspondences from the Field of Anatomical Terminology.= Bausi, A. & Tosco, M. (eds.): *Afroasiatica Neapolitana. Papers from the 8th Italian Meeting of Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics*, Naples, January 25-26, 1996. Napoli, 1997., Istituto Universitario Orientale. Pp. 225-250.
- Takács, G.: The Common Afrasian Nominal Class Marker *h.= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 2 (1997), 241-273.
- Takács, G.: Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) Comparative-Historical Linguistics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union. München, Newcastle, 1999., Lincom Europa.
- Takács, G.: Sibilant and Velar Consonants of South Cushitic and Their Regular Correspondences in Egyptian and Other Afro-Asiatic Branches.= Lamberti, M. & Tonelli, L. (eds.): *Afroasiatica Tergestina. Papers from the 9th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics*, Trieste, April 23-24, 1998. Contributi presentati al 9^o Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semitica), Trieste, 23-24 Aprile 1998. Padova, 1999., Unipress. Pp. 393-426.
- Takács, G.: South Cushitic Consonant System in Afro-Asiatic Context.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61 (2000), 69-117.
- Takács, G.: Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XIV.= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 42 (2000), 151-160.
- Takács, G.: The Origin of Ahaggar h in an Afro-Asiatic Perspective.= Chaker, S. & Zaborski, A. (eds.): *Études berbères et chamito-sémitiques. Mélanges offerts à Karl-G. Prasse pour son 70^e anniversaire*. Paris & Louvain, 2000., Éditions Peeters. Pp. 333-356.
- Takács, G.: Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XVIII.= *Cahiers Caribéens d'Égyptologie* 5 (2003), 187-202.
- Takács, G.: Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages. Berlin, 2004., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Takács, G.: Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XIX.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 57/2 (2004), 47-89.
- Takács, G.: Angas-Sura Etymologies II.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 57/1 (2004), 55-68.
- Takács, G.: Some Berber Etymologies III: Berber Lexical Roots with *ḥ.= Naït-Zerrad, K. & Ibrizimow, D. & Voßen, R. (eds.): *Nouvelles études berbères Le verbe et autres articles. Actes du „2. Bayreuth-Frankfurter Kolloquium zur Berberologie“*. Berber Studies vol. 8. Köln, 2004., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. pp. 191-204.
- Takács, G.: The Afro-Asiatic Background of the North Bauchi Consonant System II.= Tourneux, H. (éd.): *Topics in Chadic Linguistics III. Historical Studies. Papers from the 3rd Biennial International Colloquium on the Chadic Languages*, Villejuif, November 24-25, 2005. Köln, 2007., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 103-131.
- Takács, G.: Musgu and Masa h- vs. ḥ- and Afro-Asiatic.= Ibrizimow, D.; Tourneux, H. and Wolff, W. (eds.): *Topics in Chadic Linguistics. Papers from the 6th Biennial International Colloquium on Chadic Languages*, Villejuif, Sept. 22-23, 2011. Köln, 2013., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 153-184.
- Takács, G.: Layers of the Oldest Egyptian Lexicon I.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 68/1 (2015), 85-139.
- Takács, G.: Gyökéttani tanulmányok az óegyiptomi nyelvről [Root etymologies in Ancient Egyptian].= Bács, T.; Dezső, T.; Vér, Á. (szerk.): *Aegyptiaca et Assyriaca. Tanulmányok az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Ókortudományi Intézetéből. Antiqua & Orientalia* 5. Budapest, 2015., Eötvös Kiadó. Pp. 171-183.
- Takács, G.: *Archaeologia Afroasiatica I: Disintegration of the Parental Language*.= *Mother Tongue* 20 (2016). Forthcoming.
- Thausing, G.: Über ein ḥ- Präfix im Ägyptischen.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 39 (1932), 287-294.
- Thelwall, R.: Wordlists of Bedawye (Tibḏaawyi). MS. 7 February 1970. 9 p.
- Thiene, G. da: *Dizionario della lingua Galla con brevi nozioni grammaticali*. Harar, 1939., Vicariato Apostolico.
- Till, W.C.: *Koptische Grammatik. Saïdischer Dialekt*. Leipzig, 1955., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Torczyner, H.: Besprechung von Holma, H.: Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 66 (1912), 767-771.
- Tosco, M.: *A Grammatical Sketch of Dahalo*. Hamburg, 1991., Helmut Buske Verlag.

- Tourneux, H.; Seignobos, Ch.; Lafarge, F.: *Les Mbara et leur langue (Tchad)*. Paris, 1986., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.
- Tourneux, H.: *L'argument linguistique chez Cheikh Anta Diop et ses disciples.*= Fauvelle-Aymar, F.-X. & Chrétien, J.-P. & Perrot, C.-H. (eds.): *Afrocentrismes. L'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique*. Paris, 2000., Éditions Karthala. Pp. 79-102.
- Tourneux, H.: *Lexique pratique du munjuk des rizières. Dialecte de Pous*. Paris, 1991., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Urk. IV = Sethe, K. & Helck, W.: *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Heft 1-16 & 17-22*. Berlin, 1927-30., 1955-58., Akademie-Verlag.
- ÜKAPT I-VI = Sethe, K.: *Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten. I-VI*. Glückstadt, Hamburg, 1935-62., J.J. Augustin.
- Venberg, R.: *Phonemic Statement of the Peve Language.*= *Africana Marburgensia* 8/1 (1975), 26-43.
- Venturino, B.: *Dizionario borana-italiano*. Bologna, 1973., Editrice Missionaria Italiana.
- Vergari, M. & Vergari, R.: *A Basic Saho-English-Italian Dictionary*. Asmara, Eritrea, 2003., (publisher not indicated).
- Vergote, J.: *Phonétique historique de l'égyptien*. Paris, 1945., Le Muséon.
- Vergote, J.: *Le rapport de l'égyptien avec les langues sémitiques.*= *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, klasse der letteren* 27/4 (1965), 71-107.
- Vergote, J.: *Egyptian.*= Hodge, C.T. (ed.): *Afroasiatic. A Survey*. The Hague, 1971., Mouton. Pp. 40-66.
- Vergote, J.: *Grammaire copte: introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes)*. Tome Ia: partie synchronique. Ib: partie diachronique. Louvain, 1973., Peeters.
- Voßen, R.: *The Eastern Nilotes. Linguistic and Historical Reconstructions*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Vycichl, W.: *Aigyptiaka. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Hamitosemitistik.*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 40 (1933), 171-180.
- Vycichl, W.: *Hausa und Ägyptisch. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Hamitistik.*= *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 37 (1934), 36-116.
- Vycichl, W.: *Festgabe für Hermann Junker zu seinem 60. Geburtstag.*= *Archiv für Ägyptische Archaeologie* 1/6 (1938), 131-140.
- Vycichl, W.: *Punischer Spracheinfluss im Berberischen.*= *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 11 (1952), 198-204.
- Vycichl, W.: *The Hieroglyph nfr.*= *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 39 (1953), 112-113.
- Vycichl, W.: *Notes sur la préhistoire de la langue égyptienne.*= *Orientalia NS* 23 (1954), 217-222.
- Vycichl, W.: *Der Umlaut in den Berbersprachen Nordafrikas. Eine Einführung in die berberische Sprachgeschichte.*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 52 (1955), 304-325.
- Vycichl, W.: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung.*= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 16 (1958), 367-405.
- Vycichl, W.: *Is Egyptian a Semitic Language?*= *Kush* 7 (1959), 27-44.
- Vycichl, W.: *Ägyptisch-semitische Anklänge.*= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 84 (1959), 145-147.
- Vycichl, W.: *Sur les noms des parties du corps en égyptien.*= *Chronique d'Égypte* 47 (1972), 173-182.
- Vycichl, W.: *Das Zeichen für d „Hand“ in der Hieroglyphenschrift und die semitischen Entsprechungen des zugrunde liegende Etymons.*= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 112 (1985), 169-179.
- Vycichl, W.: *La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne. Tome I^{er}. La phonétique*. Le Caire, 1990., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Vycichl, W.: *L'origine des verbes monoradicaux en haoussa.*= Jungrauthmayr, H. (éd.): *Verbes monoradicaux*. Paris, 1990., Paul Geuthner. Pp. 221-227.
- Vycichl, W.: *Etymology.*= Atiya, A.S. (ed.): *The Coptic Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 8. New York, 1991., MacMillan. Pp. 118-124.
- Walker, J. H.: *Studies in Ancient Egyptian Anatomical Terminology*. Warminster, 1996., Aris & Phillips Ltd.

- Ward, W.A.: Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic.= *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20 (1961), 31-40.
- Ward, W.A.: Notes on Some Semitic Loanwords and Personal Names in Late-Egyptian.= *Orientalia NS* 32 (1963), 413-436.
- Ward, W.A.: Review of Lacau, P.: Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique.= *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 29/1-2 (1972), 18-23.
- Wb = Erman, A. & Grapow, H.: Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache. I-V.² Berlin, 1957-1971., Akademie-Verlag.
- WD = Lapp, G. & Lüscher, B.: Wortdiskussionen. Provisorische Ausgabe. Band I-III. (Place not indicated), 2002-03., (no publisher).
- Wehr, H.: Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Leipzig, 1952., Otto Harrassowitz.
- WKAS I = Kraemer, J. & Gätje, H. & Spitaler, A. & Ullmann, M.: Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache. Band I: k. Wiesbaden, 1970., Otto Harrassowitz.
- WKAS II = Kraemer, J.; Gätje, H.; Spitaler, A.; Ullmann, M.: Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache. Band II, Teil 1-4: l-lyf. Wiesbaden, 1983-2001., Otto Harrassowitz.
- WMT = Deines, H. von & Westendorf, W.: Wörterbuch der medizinischen Texte. I-II. Berlin, 1961-2., Akademie-Verlag.
- Wolff, E.: Die sprachliche Situation im Gwoza-Distrikt (Nordostnigeria).= *Journal of African Languages* 10/1 (1971), 61-74.
- Wolff, E.: Reconstructing Vowels in Central Chadic.= Wolff, E. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H. (eds.): *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*. Hamburg, 1983., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 211-232.
- Wölfel, J.D.: Eurafrikanische Wortschichten als Kulturschichten.= *Acta Salamanticensia. Filosofia y letras* 9/1 (1955).
- WUS = Aistleitner, J.: Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache.= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 106/3 (1963).
- Yeivin, Sh.: Haqīrōt hašwaʿa bəbalšanūt šemīt-miṣrīt. 2.= *Ləšōnenū* 3 (1933/1930), 105-111.
- Zaborski, A.: Review of Schuh, R.G.: *Bole-Tangale Languages of the Bauchi Area (Northern Nigeria)*.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 79/2 (1984), 210-212.
- Zaborski, A.: Review of Sasse, H.-J.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*.= *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 7 (1985), 84-92.
- Zaborski, A.: Der Wortschatz der Bedscha-Sprache. Eine vergleichende Analyse.= Schuler, E. von (ed.): *XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg. Ausgewählte Vorträge*. Stuttgart, 1989., Franz Steiner Verlag. Pp. 573-591.
- ZAW = *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Berlin).
- ZÄS = *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* (Leipzig).
- Zyhlarz, E.: Ursprung und Sprachcharakter des Altägyptischen.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 23 (1932-33), 25-45, 81-110, 161-194, 241-254.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Die Sprachreste der unteräthiopischen Nachbarn Altägyptens.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 25 (1934-35), 161-188, 241-261.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Das geschichtliche Fundament der hamitischen Sprachen.= *Africa* 9 (1936), 433-451.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Der Zenāga-Dialekt des Berberischen.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 33 (1942-43), 81-111.