

GÁBOR TAKÁCS

Otto Rössler's New System of Egypto-Semitic Consonant Correspondences (Part I)¹

Abstract

Semitist Otto Rössler – beside Igor' M. D'jakonov (1915–1999) and Werner Vycichl (1909–1999) – was one of the most outstanding minds of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) comparative linguistics in the 20th century. His activity has produced outstanding and the genuine results in the fields of historical consonantism and verbal morphology. This article is to evaluate in detail only one segment of his work, namely his theory on the historical consonantism of Egyptian and Egypto-Semitic comparative phonology, which is still a matter of great controversies and heavy debate.

I. The academic career of Otto Rössler²

Otto Rössler (1907–1991) was an eminent specialist of Semitic and Berber linguistics. He was born on 6 Februar 1907 in sometime Hungarian Kismarton (now Eisenstadt, the present capital of Austrian Burgenland). He grew up in Vienna, and studied there (1926–1933) Semitics (under V. Christian), Egyptology and Africanistics (W. Czermak, H. Junker), and Old Iranian philology (G. Hüsing). Beginning from 1934, he continued his studies in Berlin in ancient Oriental philology (H. Ehelolf) and

¹ The first draft of this paper has been originally compiled for the first volume of the *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian* (EDE I 333–393). The present version has been greatly extended and made up-to-date with new evidence and literature as part of the author's research project "The science history background of the Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian (EDE) in the context of the Egyptological and Semitic-Hamitic comparative linguistic research in Middle East Europe", which has been supported in 2004–5 by the Hungarian Ministry of Education (Oktatási Minisztérium) in the frameworks of a Deák Ferenc research fellowship (reg. no. 0030/2003).

² For further details on his life and career as well as an evaluation of his achievements see Arbeitman 1991; Müller 1991 (and its more detailed version published in 2001); Jungraithmayr 1993; Voigt 1995.

Iranian philology (H.H. S c h a e d e r). He received his Ph.D. degree in 1937 in Berlin for his thesis “Untersuchungen über die akkadische Fassung der Achämenideninschriften”. In 1941, in turn, he defended his habilitation thesis (guided by E. L i t t m a n n at Tübingen), in which he evaluated the the extinct native Berber language of the pre-Spanish inhabitants of the Canary Islands. His academic career was interrupted by a military service (as interpreter) in 1939–1941 and 1944–45. From 1942 to 1944 he worked as “Dozent” of the Oriental Department at Tübingen. After returning from the war captivity in France in 1947, he continued his research at Tübingen, but he was able to re-occupy there his “Dozentstelle” only in 1951. In 1950 he published his first fundamental comparative study on the Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) verbal system (*Verbalbau und Verbalflexion in den semitohamitischen Sprachen*). In 1954 he was appointed a professor at Tübingen. In 1964, in turn, he took a professorial position at the University of Marburg/Lahn, where he met Africanist Herrmann J u n g r a i t h m a y r, the outstanding researcher of the Chadic languages, who became his constant partner for more than two decades in fruitful debates on comparative Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) grammar. In 1971 he published his widely known study *Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache*, which has since then become a matter of serious discussion (its controversies will be dealt with below). His ideas and working methods influenced generations of German specialists of Semitic, Egyptian, and Afro-Asiatic linguistics, such as H. J u n g r a i t h m a y r (Frankfurt a/M), R.M. V o i g t (Berlin), and H. S a t z i n g e r (Wien) – to name only the most outstanding authorities.

II. The Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences as set up by Rössler and his followers

Rössler radically rewrote the Egyptian consonant system and its comparison with the Semitic in his famous study *Das ägyptische als semitische Sprache* (1971), which is an important milestone both for Egyptian historical phonology and Egypto-Semitic etymology. Rössler's theory has by now been accepted exclusively in the German-speaking area, primarily by the specialists of Egyptian linguistics. This new trend was named by Rössler (1981, 386) himself *neuere Komparatistik*, which was adopted also by Th. S c h n e i d e r (1997, 189), and it has become the commonly accepted designation of this school. The most important representatives of *neuere Komparatistik* are now H. S a t z i n g e r³ (Wien), F. K a m m e r z e l l⁴ (Berlin), J. Z e i d l e r⁵ (Trier), W. S c h e n k e l⁶ (Tübingen), Th. S c h n e i d e r⁷ (Basel), C. P e u s t⁸ (Göttingen), and A. L o p r i e n o⁹ (Basel).

³ Cf. Satzinger 1996; 1997, 27–33; 1999; 2001; 2002; 2003.

⁴ Cf. Kammerzell 1992, 168–173; 1994, 80–81; 1995, XLII–XLIX; 1998.

⁵ Cf. Zeidler 1992, 203–210.

⁶ Cf. Schenkel 1991, 29–30; 1993, 137–149; 2002.

⁷ Cf. Schneider 1993; 1993; 1997.

⁸ Cf. Peust 1999, 79f.; 2001; 2003.

⁹ Cf. Loprieno 1995, 31–35.

The controversies surrounding this trend make a detailed analysis of the etymological material adduced by Rössler and his followers in support of the new theory necessary. The starting point of Rössler's theory was his dissatisfaction with the conventional transcription of several Old Egyptian consonants, which had become standard and generally used in Egyptian philology especially after A. Erman (1892). Rössler claimed the traditional understanding of the Old Egyptian consonant system (Erman, Gardiner, Edel) to be mistaken on a few crucial points. As a consequence, Rössler significantly modified also the "traditional" conception of Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences established and justified by A. Erman, A. Ember, F. von Calice, W. Vycichl, M. Cohen, J. Vergote – to mention only the most important figures from the first half of the 20th century.

In general, one can agree with Rössler that the conventional transcription system, which reflects the knowledge of the 19th century, should be treated with caution. For instance, it is now generally accepted that Erman's OEg. t was actually [č] (voiceless palatal affricate), while d was something like [ž] (voiced palatal affricate). Nevertheless, only a few scholars use the symbols č or ž, while others stick to the conventional t and d even being aware of that these consonants had originally nothing to do with the Semitic interdental fricatives (*t and *d). Similarly, even if we keep the tradition of using Erman's 3 ("Egyptian alef"), we are aware that OEg. 3 derives in most of the cases from *r and *l. Using OEg. 3 does not imply that we automatically identify OEg. 3 with Sem. *ʔ (glottal stop), though in a limited number of cases we have to admit this possibility also. The traditional transcription has been preserved purely for the sake of convenience and using these sometimes outdated symbols does not necessarily imply comparing them with the same symbols used in Semitic just because they look similar. Besides, Rössler himself did not give up using most of the traditional transcription symbols even if he suggested a quite different pronunciation for a phoneme standing behind this or that symbol (e.g., Rössler kept using OEg. ʕ, though he supposed the underlying OEg. phoneme to have been pronounced as [d]). In order not to confuse the readers by introducing the mass of new symbols, it seems convenient to keep the conventional symbols irrespective of their actual pronunciations. Here is a list of symbols of Rössler that differ from the conventional transcription (Edel 1955):

Edel 1955	ḥ	z	s	t	<u>t</u>	d	<u>d</u>
Rössler 1971	ḡ	s	ś	t	č	ṭ	ž

For the pronunciation of the Old Egyptian consonants Rössler suggested radical changes, which are summarized in the following table (extended by the pronunciation postulated recently by Kammerzell 1998):

Edel	3	ʕ	f	n	r	ḥ	ḥ	ḥ	z	s	š	d	ḏ
Rössler	[r, l]	[d]	[p]	[n, l]	[l]	[ḥ', k]	[ɣ]	[ḥ]	[s]	[š]	[ḥ]	[t]	[č]
Kammerzell	[r]	[d]	[p ^h]	[n]	[l]	[ḥ', q]	[ɣ]	[ḥ]	[s]	[f, š]	[ḥ]	[t]	[k > č]

The traditional system of the disputed Old Egyptian consonants is characterized by the opposition of voiced vs. voiceless stops, affricates, and fricatives (e.g. Edel 1955, 47–66). Instead of this binary opposition, Rössler reinterpreted the underlying structure of OEg. consonantism on the basis of consonant “triads” (voiceless – emphatic – voiced). This system of Rösslerian triads is given here as summarized recently by Schneider (1997, 191–192). Contrary to most of the representatives of the “neuere Komparatistik” (who firmly adhere to Rössler’s Egyptian consonant “triads”), A. Loprieno (1995, 32–34; 1994, 372–373) has suggested only a voiced – voiceless opposition. But, unfortunately, these debates have been based on a too scanty comparative linguistic data to be seriously considered. Below, the classical Rösslerian triads are summarized, whereby I used the transcription system of Edel 1955, while Rössler’s alternative symbols are in brackets:

	1 st triad	2 nd triad	3 rd triad	4 th triad	5 th triad	6 th triad	7 th triad	8 th triad
voiceless	p	t	s/z (ś/s)	z (s)	s (ś)	k	ḥ (Sem. *ḥ)	ḥ (Sem. *ḥ)
emphatic	f	d (ṭ)	d (ṭ)	d (ṭ)	d (ṭ)	q (ḳ)	ḥ (Sem. *ḥ)	ḥ (Sem. *ʕ)
voiced	b	ʕ	ʕ	ʕ	ʕ	g	ḥ (Sem. *ɣ)	ḥ (Sem. *ʔ)

On these bases, Rössler (1971) proposed entirely new Semitic correspondences for a few Old Egyptian consonants (see also Schneider 1997, 192–193):

OEg.	PSem.
3	*r (as before Rössler), but *d as well (!)
j ~ r	*r (as before Rössler), but *g, *ɣ, *ʕ as well (!)
ʕ	*d, *ḏ, *z, *ḏ (*ś) (!)
f	*b
z of Edel = s of Rössler	*s, *ṭ
d of Edel = ṭ of Rössler	*ṭ (as before Rössler), but *ṭ, *ḏ (*ś), *š as well
ḏ of Edel = č of Rössler	*ʕ, *ʔ

On the other hand, Rössler (1971, 279) categorically declined a number of evident and well-founded Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences, setting aside the great mass of relevant etymological evidence published by the authors of the “old school” by that time:

OEg.	degree of correspondence	PSem.
3	never =	*ʔ
ʕ	never =	*ʕ, *ɣ
f (Rsl.: actually [p])	never =	*p (Ar.-Geez f)
r	never =	*r
ḥ	“ohne erkennbare Ratio” (Rössler) =	*ḥ
ḥ of Edel = ɣ of Rössler	never =	*ḥ
z of Edel = s of Rössler	never =	*z, *ḏ
š	never =	*š (= Hbr. š), *ṭ (= Hbr. š), *ṣ (= Ar. š)
d	never =	*d
ḏ of Edel = ʕ of Rössler	never =	*š, *ṭ, *ḏ (*š)
ḏ of Edel = ʕ of Rössler	never =	*g

Summing up, in the following table we may illustrate the differences between the two trends regarding the regular Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences:

OEg. (e.g. Edel 1955)	PSem. (old school)	OEg. (Rössler)	PSem. (Rössler)
3 [r ~ l ~/> ʔ?]	*r, *l, *ʔ	3 [r]	*r, *l, *d
j	*y, *w, *ʔ, *r, *l	j	*g, *ɣ, *ʕ, *r, *l, *ʔ, *y
ʕ	*ʕ, *ɣ	ʕ [d]	*d, *ḏ, *z, *ḏ, *r, *l ¹
w	*w, *y	w	*w
b	*b	b	*b, *p
p	*p	p	*p
f	*p	f [p]	*b
m	*m	m	*m
n	*n, *l	n	*n, *l, *d
r	*r, *l	r [l]	*g, *l, *d
h	*h	h	*h
ḥ	*ḥ	ḥ [h']	*ḥ, *q, *ʕ, rarely *ḥ
ḥ	*ḥ	ɣ	*ɣ, *ʕ
ḥ	*ḥ, *ḥ	ḥ	*ḥ, *ḥ

z	*z, *d̥	s	*s, *t̥
s	*s, *š, *t̥	ś	*š, *t̥, *š, *s
š	*š	š	*h̥, *h, *s
q or k	*k	k	*k ²
k	*k	k	*k
g	*g	g	*g
t	*t, *t̥	t	*t
t̥ [č < k]	*k	č	*k
d	*d, *t̥	ṭ	*t, *t̥, *d̥, *š
d̥ [ž < *g or *č, *č, *č̥]	*g and *s, *t̥, *d̥ (also *ʕ?)	č̥	*k, *h, *ʕ
OEg. (e.g. Edel 1955)	PSem. (old school)	OEg. (Rössler)	PSem. (Rössler)

Notes: (1) Schenkel 1993, 142, #3.3.a: Eg. ʕ = Sem. *g also possible. (2) Schenkel 1993, 141–142, #3.2.a: Eg. q = Sem. *g also possible.

Actually, only less than the third (i.e. 28–29%) of the Eg.-Sem. etymological corpus of the “neuere Komparatistik” (accumulated by Rössler 1971 and Schneider 1997) contains the radical Rösslerian phonological rules (esp. Eg. ʕ = Sem. *d, *z, *d̥; Eg. r ~ j = Sem. *g; Eg. d = Sem. *s, *t̥, *d̥) that it cannot be accepted (even as irregularities) within the framework of our “conventional” understanding of Egypto-Semitic comparative phonology. On the other hand, more than 2/3 (about 70%) of Rössler’s (1971) and Schneider’s (1997) material does not drastically contradict the traditional conception of Old Egyptian consonantism. These parallels could be accepted (purely from a phonological viewpoint) either as regular or irregular also in the traditional system of consonant correspondences.

	Rössler 1971	Schneider 1997
total number of etymologies	186 (note ¹)	117
number of new etymologies	115 (= 61.83%)	103 (= 88.03%)
number of examples supporting Rössler’s radically new laws, unacceptable in the “old” system	54 (= 29.03%)	33 (= 28.205%)
number of examples fitting into the “traditional” system too (either as regular or irregular)	132 (= 70.97%)	84 (= 71.795%)

Note: (1) This is the number of Egypto-Semitic/Afro-Asiatic parallels which Rössler considered to be genetic (the Egypto-Semitic parallels treated by Rössler as loans are, of course, not included here and are not listed in Rsl. 1971, 320–325 as well).

As for the fully new Rösslerian interpretation of certain Old Egyptian consonants and Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences (esp. Eg. ʕ = Sem. $*d$, $*z$, $*\underline{d}$; Eg. $r \sim j$ = Sem. $*g$; Eg. d = Sem. $*\text{ṣ}$, $*\text{ṭ}$, $*\underline{d}$): when it came to prove them, neither Rössler 1971 nor Schneider 1997 (nor any other author from the Rösslerian school) managed to adduce a satisfactory number of examples. Besides, as I demonstrate below, most of these new examples are either dubious or disprovable because Rössler and Schneider failed to consider alternatives in several cases.

Rösslerian correspondence	presented in Rössler 1971	number of cases (Rsl. 1971)	number of cases (Snd. 1997)
Eg. f = Sem. $*b$	#2	7 (note ¹)	3 (note ¹)
Eg. ʕ = Sem. $*d$	#6	7	14
Eg. d = Sem. $*\text{ṭ}$	#8	2	-
Eg. ʕ = Sem. $*\underline{d}$	#9	3	4
Eg. d = Sem. $*\text{ṣ}$	#11	11 (note ²)	8 (note ²)
Eg. ʕ = Sem. $*z$	#12	4	4
Eg. d = Sem. $*\underline{d}$	#14	3	-
Eg. ʕ = Sem. $*\underline{d}$	#15	3	4
Eg. = Sem. $*h$	#20	2	-
Eg. = Sem. $*\text{ʔ}$	#20	4 (note ³)	1 (note ³)
Eg. z = Sem. $*d$	#27	3	-
Eg. r = Sem. $*g$	#28	1	-
Eg. j = Sem. $*g$	-	-	2
Eg. = Sem. $*\gamma$	-	-	4
Rösslerian correspondence	presented in Rössler 1971	number of cases (Rsl. 1971)	number of cases (Snd. 1997)

Notes: (1) Some of these examples seem to be correct and acceptable, but in these few cases Eg. f may be due to incompatibility of $*b$ with some of the neighboring root consonants. These acceptable cases are discussed above among the irregularities, while all other examples of Rössler for Eg. f = Sem. $*b$ are analyzed below. (2) Some of these examples may be correct, because in these cases MEg. d may go back to an OEg. $*\underline{d}$, which regularly corresponds to Sem. $*\text{ṣ}$. Details below. (3) Three of these examples indeed seem fairly attractive but are not enough to establish a regular correspondence of Eg. = Sem. $*k$. In addition, I myself have also observed a further possible case of Eg. h = AA $*k$ (all these examples were discussed in EDE I among the irregular correspondences).

Rössler firmly and categorically rejected several of the well-founded Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences that have been recently reaffirmed also by the comparative Afro-Asiatic research of the D'jakonov group. Thus, Rössler and his followers tried to deny something what is supported by many dozens of semantically solid parallels. It is one of the most serious shortcomings of the Rössler theory.

correspondence categorically rejected by Rössler (1971)	number of semantically firm Eg.-Sem./AA etymologies proving the correspondence (cf. e.g. EDE I 49-262)
Eg. ʒ = Sem. *ʕ	more than 40
Eg. ʕ = Sem. *ʕ, *ḡ (*γ)	more than 20
Eg. f = Ar.-Geez f (i.e. Sem. *p)	more than 10
Eg. r = Sem. *r	more than 10
Eg. = Sem. *h ¹	more than 35
Eg. ḥ = Sem. *ḥ	more than 25
Eg. z = Sem. *z, *ḏ	more than 30
Eg. š = Sem. *š (Ar. š)	more than 15
Eg. d = Sem. *d	more than 25 ²
Eg. ḏ = Sem. *ṣ, *ṭ, *ḏ	more than 20
Eg. ḏ = Sem. *g	more than 25

Note: (1) Accepted by Rössler with reservations: “gewöhnlich wenigstens”, “ohne erkennbare Ratio”. (2) Firmly defended by Vycichl (1985, 169–179) and most recently by O sing (2000).

The recent results of comparative Afro-Asiatic linguistics, however, evidently confirm the traditional system of Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences (see SISAJa I-III; HCVA 1–5; MM 1983, 114–117; Dj. etc. 1986; 1986; 1987; 1993; Dj. 1984; esp. 1992; Dj.-Prh. 1979 etc.), which are nowadays verified by many dozens of solid Egypto-Afro-Asiatic lexical isoglosses. These results clearly disprove Rössler's radical statements (e.g. as to OEg. ʕ).

III. The ʕayin problem

The most radical element of Rössler's reform is the new interpretation of Eg. ʕ, on which W.A. Ward (1985, 240) rightly noticed that “Rössler's theory on the Egyptian ʕayin is illustrated by a series of identifications in which the Egyptian ʕayin equated with Semitic dentals and sibilants. The list is characterized by a rejection of perfectly sound Egypto-Semitic etymologies where ʕ = ʕ and replacing them by impossible comparisons because, according to Rössler, ʕ = ʕ cannot take place”. It is difficult not to agree with these comments, since (1) Rössler's examples for Eg. ʕ vs. Sem. *d etc. are mostly very weak (critically survey below) and can be often replaced by the relevant and much more convincing etymologies of the “old school”, (2) the etymological material proving the identity of Eg. ʕ vs. Sem. *ʕ & *ḡ (*γ) has only grown since 1985 rapidly, while the “neuere Komparatistik” failed to propose considerable new etymological arguments for Eg. ʕ = Sem. *d.

Moreover, neither Rössler (1971) nor recently Kammerzell (1998) managed to explain how (through which steps) OEg. ʕ [d] “weakened” to an [ʕ] by the New

Kingdom (when NWSem. *ʕ is clearly reflected by a NEg. ʕ [ʕ] in the loanwords) as Kammerzell suggested. One would expect the Rösslerian school to point out convincing typological parallels for the development of OEg. [d] > NEg. [ʕ]. Kammerzell (1998, 30) adduced only the Modern English pronunciation of a few frequent and frozen terms as “madam” [mæ:ʔm ~ mæ:ʕm], “mother” [mΛ:ʔ ~ mΛ:ʕ], “I don’t know” [ʔayʕno]. This is rather insufficient, because the Rösslerian theory evidently means a *regular* change of OEg. [d] > NEg. [ʕ] in *all* cases.

Not even Rössler (1971, 304) tried to deny such an evident correspondence as that of Eg. *ḏbʕ* ‘finger’ = Sem. **šbʕ* ‘finger’. In order to avoid an identification of Sem. ʕ = Eg. ʕ, Rössler assumed two alternative solutions: (1) Sem. **šbʕ* derives from a nowhere attested **šbḏ* (!) or (2) Sem. **šbʕ* < OEg. *ḏbʕ*. I wonder how Sem. *-ʕ could have been borrowed from OEg. -ʕ when it was not [ʕ] but something like [d] even around 2200 BC according to Kammerzell (1998, 37, fig. 17). Similarly, Rössler (1971, 292) accepted the connection of Eg. *š3ʕ* ‘to begin’ with Sem. **šrʕ* ‘to begin’ considering them an old loan. The same question may arise here as well: how could such a basic meaning (with no cultural impact) as “to begin” be borrowed (after 2200 according to the theory of Kammerzell)?

Rössler and his followers tried to justify the voiced dental stop [d] character of OEg. ʕ by the incompatibility of OEg. ʕ and t, d, z. But shouldn’t we then reinterpret OEg. g too as a dental stop because the sequences of OEg. gt, gd, gʕ, gz, tg, zg do not occur (see Kammerzell 1998, 30, fig. 11.a)? It is difficult to accept that incompatibility laws and consonant correlation calculations, etc., can substitute for the mass of well-founded etymologies. Should we reinterpret reality just because it is asymmetrical and does not correspond to our *a priori* calculations?

IV. The etymological corpus of the “neuere Komparatistik”

Although the Rösslerian school has recently produced a significant new literature on the theoretical problems of Old Egyptian phonology and Egypto-Semitic comparison, most of these works, unfortunately, only repeated (or just referred to) some selected items from Rössler’s (1971) original corpus of Egypto-Semitic etymologies and added hardly anything new to this collection with the sole¹⁰ exception of Schneider’s (1997) long article. In the etymological literature of the “neuere Komparatistik”, differing opinions and alternative etymologies have been often neglected, the basic source being mostly Rössler 1971, whose etymologies have been usually treated by the followers of Rössler as definite facts.

¹⁰ Schenkel (1993, 141–142) suggested just two further Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences: Eg. q = Sem. *g (three examples) and Eg. ʕ = Sem. *g (two examples). One should acknowledge Schenkel’s (1993) attempt at representing also some alternative consonant correspondences of Egypto-Semitic comparative phonology, which, however, he explained as dialectal phenomena (!).

Schneider's 1997 study is the richest contribution of the Rösslerian school to Egyptian etymology ever since 1971, although its originality can be doubted. Schneider proposed 117 (mostly) new Egyptian etymologies, while Rössler (1971) discussed 186 Egyptian roots. Not all of their etymologies are, however, new. At the beginning of his paper, Schneider (1997, 190) wrote: "Im folgenden werde ich 117 neue Wortgleichungen vorlegen". But contrary to the author's statement, more than 10% (14 etymologies) out of his 117 proposals were not new at all, but were long ago mentioned in the works of the "old school" (well before 1994 when Schneider's paper was submitted to the press, cf. Schneider 1997, 209):

"new" comparison in Schneider 1997, p. no.	proposed before Schneider 1997 by:
194, #5: Eg. 3tp 'to load' ~ Sem. *rkb	Ember 1926, 309, #9; 1930, #3.b.9; Hodge 1976, 14, #129
194, #8: Eg. jw 'to go' ~ Ar. ʔwy	Lsl. 1962, 48, #35; Dj. 1965, 45; Hodge 1976, 22, #91
195, #11: Eg. jn 'to say' ~ Brb. *yVnV	Trb. 1923, 131, #186; IS 1971, #146
195, #12: Eg. jzj 'go!' ~ Brb. *(yVw)as	Mlt. 1991, 255, #16.1
197, #29: Eg. bq (cf. bqbq) ~ Hbr. bq̄q, Ar. bwq	SISAJa I, #81
198, #38: Eg. msj 'to give birth' ~ Brb. *mVs	Zhl. 1932-33, 94; Vcl. 1964, 228
199, #40: Eg. njk 'to punish' ~ Ar. nky	Clc. 1936, #55; Vrg. 1945, 131, #2.a.6; Dlg. 1970, 621, #17
199, #43: Eg. nfr 'good' ~ Ar. nbl	Farina 1924, 324 (Sem. *nbl with the Ar. meaning)
201, #59: Eg. hrw 'day' ~ Sem. *hll	Hodge 1990, 372
203, #73: Eg. ḥtr 'to bind' ~ Sem. *ḥtl	Rössler 1971, 284 (!)
204, #77: Eg. ḥnj 'to play music' ~ Sem. *γny	Yeivin 1933, 110; Lsl. 1962, 48, #34; Djk. 1992, 28
205, #91: Eg. sw 'day (in date)' ~ Brb. *a-ss (sic by Snd.)	Chn. 1947, #276 (rejected already by Hintze 1951, 81)
206, #99: Eg. šps 'noble' ~ Sem. *ḥpt	Alb. 1918, 249; Ember 1930, #18.a.38, #19.c.3
207, #108: Eg. dnj.t 'basket' ~ Sem. *s[i]nn-	Ember 1930, #26.b.4

Rössler (1971), in turn, discussed 186 Egyptian roots, of which 160 were said by Schneider (1997, 190) to be Rössler's own proposals. I carefully examined

Rössler's 1971 study and found in fact only 115 Eg. roots for which Rössler was the first author to publish the etymology in question. It is all the more surprising, since in general, Rössler quite carefully quoted the sources of the etymologies taken from the old literature, while he labelled his own etymologies with the remark "Gl. d. Verf." ("comparison of the author"). Rössler, however, claimed also the following etymologies (at least ten) to be a "comparison of the author", though they were published long before Rössler:

"Gl. d. Verf." in Rössler 1971, p. no.	proposed before Rössler 1971 by
290: MEg. nwd [GT: *nwd] 'to move etc.' ~ Ar. nwṣ	Müller 1907, 304, fn. 1
294 and 318: Eg. q3j 'to be high' ~ Ar. qry etc.	Albright 1927, 231–232, #85
285, 295, 304: Eg. qnd 'to be angry' ~ Sem. *qnt	Vycichl 1938, 133; 1966, 185–187
298: Eg. ḥr '(up)on' ~ Sem. *ʕalay and *ʕly	Ember 1917, 89, #141 (after Sethe)
283, 310: Eg. nb 'lord' ~ Ar. nāb-, pl. ʕanyāb-	Vycichl 1960, 174–175, #4
313: Eg. (j)r 'to' ~ Sem. *l	Hommel 1894, 353; Farina 1924, 324; Ember 1930, #4.a.8; Yeivin 1933, 109
313: Eg. jrj 'to do, make' ~ Brb. (sic) ili	D'jakonov 1965, 45
317: Eg. b3q 'to be clear' ~ Sem. *brq	Ember 1913, 114; 1930, #3.b.13; Farina 1926, 19, #29; Behnk 1928, 139, #21; Greenberg 1963, 59; Dolgopol'skij 1967, 5–6, #1
317: Eg. pg3 'to broaden, open' ~ Ar. fḡr	Ember 1930, #23.a.12; Vycichl 1958, 396
317: Eg. md [Rsl.: *m3č] '10' ~ Brb. *mVrVw	Meinhof 1912, 240; Zyhlarz 1931, 137–138, #8; 1932–33, 104; 1934, 104, 106, 111, fn. 1; Mercier 1933, 314; Lefebvre 1955, 276 (misquoting Brb. as mzu!); Zvd. 1967, 43

These facts indicate that both Rössler and Schneider failed to consider and check a serious part of the older literature on Egyptian etymology. Of course, the fact that Rössler and Schneider observed these etymologies independently from previous authors of the "old school", may in principle strengthen the likelihood of their

correctness. It is another matter that most of these examples fit just as well into (or, at least, do not necessarily contradict) the “traditional” system of consonant correspondences and prove nothing about the radically new Rösslerian laws (e.g. Eg. ʕ = Sem. *d, *z, *ḏ etc.). Working with a limited and *a priori* selected material, however, may lead to mistaken results. The above-enumerated examples raise the most serious doubts as to whether Rössler and Schneider checked and weighed all possibilities (yielded by the traditional phonological laws) in those critical cases which are to prove their new theories about Egypto-Semitic correspondences.

Rössler (1971) and Schneider (1997) based their comparisons on selectively chosen Semitic material and included only a small part of the Egyptian vocabulary in their investigation. As one can see in my detailed appraisal of the most problematic Rösslerian etymologies below, it occasionally occurs that the representatives of the Rösslerian school – misled by the wish to have an attractive Egypto-Semitic parallel – ignore the basic sense of their *comparanda* (a classical example of this is the equation of OEg. ʕb3 = Sem. *dbr, below).

As a rule, neither Rössler nor Schneider discussed previously suggested etymologies or alternative solutions in detail. Very often, Rössler *a priori* left aside and *ex cathedra* disqualified (using the terms “unbrauchbares” or “naive”) the alternative etymologies which were semantically often even more convincing but would have contradicted his conception of phonological laws. Sometimes, when he was not able by any means to deny the connection of the evident Egypto-Semitic lexical parallels, Rössler treated them as loans even if semantically not justified.

Moreover, the Egyptian etymologies of Rössler (1971) and Schneider (1997) hardly go beyond Semitic and Berber. From the related Cushitic, Omotic, and Chadic branches, Rössler quoted very rarely, and even then only from some selected languages (esp. Agaw, Saho, Afar, Somali, Hausa). Actually, Hausa is the only Chadic language quoted by Rössler and Schneider, although the Chadic branch comprises about one hundred and fifty languages. By 1971 (comparative) wordlists and dictionaries of several Cushito-Omotic and Chadic languages had been published. It is especially painful that the most recent study by Schneider (1997) failed to quote and use practically any of the most recent results in the field of comparative-historical reconstruction of Cushitic, Omotic, and Chadic phonology and lexicon. Rössler and Schneider seem to consider Semitic or some selected Berber languages enough in most cases to decide an Egyptian etymology. It is difficult to suppose that Rössler and Schneider found the correct etymology of such a great mass of Egyptian lexical roots (Rössler: 186, Schneider: 117) when they surveyed only less than one half of the AA macrofamily. Is it then superfluous to have a look at the evidence from entire AA macrofamily? What if the correct cognates of an Egyptian root were preserved, for instance, only in South Cushitic or South Omotic (Aroid) or Central Chadic or East Chadic? How can such and similar cases influence the appraisal of the Rösslerian etymologies? Below, in my review on the Rösslerian etymologies, I try to answer these fundamental questions.

Probably W.A. Ward (1985, 234–242) was the first – and up to the nineties of the 20th century the only – scholar from the “old school” to publish a detailed analysis and appraisal of Rössler’s 1971 paper. Ward argued for rejecting the Rösslerian theory about Eg. *d* ≠ Sem. **d*, Eg. *f* = Sem. *b*, Eg. *ʕ* = Sem. **d*, **z*, **d*. Ward (1985, 245) writes in his conclusion: “Rössler’s untenable phonetic theories have now produced new lists of etymologies which, in my opinion, are full of errors”. To demonstrate all my doubts raised above I try to show here the problems of the linguistic material presented by Rössler (1971) and Schneider (1997) in support of the most radical assumptions of the Rösslerian theory. I will not discuss below that part of Rössler’s theory which actually does not differ from the “traditional” assumptions. But a healthy approach to the problem requires a detailed analysis, one by one, of all problematic etymologies proposed by Rössler (1971) and Schneider (1997) and by other representatives of “neuere Komparatistik”. Wherever possible, I try to show all alternatives which we have to face and which Rössler etc. did not discuss.

V. The examples for Rössler’s Eg. 3 = Sem. **d*

Eg. *d3j* “to oppose” (PT, FD 318): compared by Rössler (1971, 305) with Ar. *ʕdw* (or -*y*) “befeinden” [Rsl.] = *ʕdw* “5. être hostile à qqn., être ennemi de qqn., 6. être injuste, agir avec injustice envers qqn.” [BK II 194]. But the traditional etymology of Eg. *d3j* is semantically similarly plausible: Sem. **ḏrr* (or **ḏ-*) “to be hostile” [GT] (Sem.: WUS #2353; Zbr. 1971, #46; Blv. 1993, 34, #9). Lit. for Eg.-Sem.: Hodge 1969, 109, #18; Mlt. 1987 MS, #96; HSED #583, #587.

Eg. *d3j* “zu Schiff übersetzen; den Fluss zu Schiff überfahren” (PT, Wb V 511-3) = “to ferry someone across water; to cross (sky)” (FD 319): equated by Rössler (1971, 305) with Ar. *ʕdw* “überschreiten (Fluss)” [Rsl.] = “1. passer à côté de qqch., dépasser, aller au delà, 2. passer outre et négliger qqch., 4. dépasser des limites” [BK II 194]. But the basic meaning of Eg. *d3j* was probably *“(kreuzen, bes. den Fluss beim überfahren)” (cf. Wb V 511). Taking this assumption into account, a comparison with Sem. **gwl* “faire le cercle, rouler” [DRS] seems more suitable, cf. esp. Ar. *ḡwl* “aller, courir, tourner, voltiger en cercle, faire le tour de ..., tourner autour de ...” [BK I 358] (Sem.: DRS 108). Note that some other scholars (Alb. 1927, #98; Ember 1930, #3.c.23, #24.a.13) combined Eg. *d3j* [< **glj*] with Sem. **glw* “to emigrate” (semantically weaker).

Eg. *d3d3* “head” (OK, Wb V 530-1): compared by Rössler (1971, 305) and Schenkel (1993, 141–2) with Sem. **qadqad*- “head”. This etymology is doubly problematic (its critique has been voiced already by Brockelmann 1950, 60): Eg. *d* ≠ Sem. **q*, and Eg. 3 ≠ Sem. **d*. It has been generally accepted¹¹ that Eg. *d3d3* [< **glgl*]

¹¹ Lit. for this Eg.-AA etymology: Ember 1911, 88; 1911, 91; 1919, 32; 1930, #24.a.2; Alb. 1918, 90; 1927, #98; Farina 1924, 324; 1926, 23; Sethe 1927, 131; Vcl. 1934, 63; 1972, 174; Lexa 1938, 226; Vrg. 1945, #1.d.29; 1965, 86; Loret 1945, 240; Chn. 1947, #212; Grb. 1963, 58; Janssens 1967, 87; Ward 1972, 19; Hodge 1981, 406; 1990, 647, #24).

is identical with Sem. *gulgul-(at)- “skull” [Frz. 1964, 268, #2.43; cf. Holma 1911, 11] and its further AA cognates.

VI. The examples for Rössler's Eg. j = Sem. *g

Eg. j^ob “vereinigen” (OK, Wb I 40-41): compared by Schneider (1997, 194, #7) with Ar. ḡadaba “(her/an)ziehen” [Snd.] = “1. l'emporter sur qqn. en tirant, en traînant, 2. tirer à soi, extraire, 3. attirer, entraîner” [BK I 268]. Unconvincing. Schneider confused two different roots. On the one hand, Eg. j^ob is related with Ar. wa^oaba I “to take the whole (of a thing)”, IV “to assemble, gather, put one thing into another” [Ember] (Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1930, #4.c.5; Clc. 1936, #116; Vrg. 1945, 132, #2.d.5). On the other hand, for Ar. ḡadaba cf. perhaps Eg. ḡsf [< *gsf ~ *gzf?] “fangen (bes. Vom Vogelfang mit dem Netz)” (CT, BD, Wb V 609, 7), even though Ar. -b vs. Eg. -f would be irregular (but attested).

Eg. jw^o “to inherit, act as heir” (OK, FD 12; Wb I 50, 8–10): combined by Schneider (1997, 195, #9) with Ar. ḡāda “gut sein, großzügig werden; freigebig sein, spenden”. Semantically very weak. Eg. jw^o “to inherit” is clearly fully incompatible with the basic meaning of Sem. *gwd: cf. Ar. ḡwd “1. être bon, excellent, de première qualité (se dit des hommes), 3. être, se montrer généreux, libéral, large dans ses dons, ses faveurs envers qqn.” [BK I 350] | Mehri ḡid “good” [Jns. 1987, 128] (Sem.: DRS 105). Besides, Eg. jw^o [reg. < *lw^o] is a perfect match of NAgaw: Bilin law “erben, Erbe sein”, law-t (refl., pass.) die Erbschaft antreten, beerbt werden” [Rn. 1887, 260] = “to inherit” [Ehret 1987, 75, #315].

VII. The examples for Rössler's Eg. ^o = Sem. *d

Eg. jw^o “to inherit, act as heir” (OK, FD): see Eg. j = Sem. *g.

Eg. ^o “arm, hand” (OK, Wb I 156-7): according to Rössler originally *j^o, compared by several authors of the “neuere Komparatistik” (Rössler 1971, 285, #6; Knauf 1982, 35; Zeidler 1992, 206; Schenkel 1993, 139; Kammerzell 1998, 29) with Sem. *yad- “hand”. Rejected already by Osiṅg (1997, 226). Two different roots have been confused: (1) Sem. *yad- “hand”, which is cognate with Eg. *d “hand” (preserved by the hrḡl. depicting the hand)¹². (2) Eg. ^o [act. *^oy?], which has been vocalized by Osiṅg l.c. as *^oēw vs. *^oēw̃j (hardly compatible with the etymon *ja^o or sim. < *yad- suggested by the Rösslerists), may be cognate with Bed. ay, pl. áya “(Vorder)Arm, Hand” [Rn. 1895, 37] = eyi ~ äyi “hand, forearm” [Rpr. 1928, 158] ||l WCh.: Tala aa “arm” [Smz.], Buli a “hand” [Gowers] = a^o “hand” [IL] (SBauch: II 1994 II, 178). Note that

¹² Generally accepted equation, see Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; Sethe 1912; Ember 1918, 30; 1930, #26. a.17; Vrg. 1945, 131, #2.a.3; Chn. 1947, #493; Vcl. 1958, 373; 1959, 39; 1985, 174, #4; Hodge 1976, 12, #47; MM 1983, 219; Hodge 1990, 647, #23A etc.

Bed. *ay* can hardly go back to **yad* (this old derivation was rejected already in Zbr. 1989, 582; Blz. 1993 MS, 8, #5.5). Cf. also Takács 1997, 261, #7.3. Following Möller (1921, 196), Vycichl (1933, 180; 1934, 69, 84; 1951, 68) suggested an alternative etymology: Eg. $\epsilon < \epsilon^3$ = Common Brb. **a-γil* “arm”, which is less convincing, since the correspondence of Eg. ϵ vs. Brb. **γ* has not been sufficiently demonstrated, and for Brb. **-l* we would have to assume a not attested radical -3 in Eg.

Eg. ϵ^3 “Türflügel, Tür” (OK, Wb I 164–5) and ϵ .*rw*t, var. ϵ .*rr.w*t “Tor” (OK, Wb I 210-1): the “neuere Komparatistik” (Rössler 1971, 286; Zeidler 1992, 206; Schenkel 1993, 139; Loprieno 1995, 31; Kammerzell 1998, 29) equated it with Sem. **dal-t* “door” (attractive). Rejected already by Osing (1997, 226). The traditional etymology of Eg. ϵ .*rr.w*t and ϵ^3 is semantically equally convincing, cf. Sem. **ğll* “to enter etc.” [GT]: cf. esp. Aram. ϵ ll “kommen, hineingehen” [Levy 1924 III 653] = to go in, enter [KB 834] || LECu.: Oromo *ul-a* “porta, passaggio, entrata, uscita” [da Thiene 1939, 336] = *ul-ā ~ hul-ā* “gate, exit, saddle ridge, opening” [Gragg 1982, 389] || WCh.: (?) Siri *h^wuli* [**γ^w-/*ε^w-?*] “doorway” [Skn. 1977, 18], cf. also Pa’a *ḥwa* (so!) “doorway” [Skn.]. For Eg.-Aram. see Ember 1911, 93; 1926, 6, #4. For Eg.-AA: Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 8, #46.

Eg. ϵ^3m “Asiatic, Semite” (OK, Wb I 167, 19-20): identified by Schneider (1997, 195, #14) with Hbr. *dārōm* “Süden”, Aram.-Phn. *dr̥m* “Southern Judaea” etc. (Sem.: DRS 4, 314). Impressive, but Eg. ϵ^3m is usually identified with Ar. ϵ .*arab-* (coll.) “Arabes, population de race arabe” [BK II 207] (see Ember 1918, 6; 1926, 311, #6; 1930, #9.b.11; Alb. 1918, 247, #101; Hodge 1989, 304)¹³.

Eg. $\epsilon^3g.t$ “hoof” (OK, FD 38; Wb I 168, 5–6): compared by Schneider (1997, 196, #15) with Ar. *daraḡa* “(langsam) gehen, (vorwärts) schreiten” [Snd.]. We are dealing with two distinct roots: (1) Sem. **drg* “to tread, step” [GT]¹⁴ = Eg. *dg3* [**dgr*] “to walk, march, take steps” (NK, DLE IV 144; cf. FD 316; Wb V 499, 15) || Bed. *ragad* “leg, foot” [Rpr. 1928, 227] = “Fuß, Bein” [Rn. 1895, 190] || LECu.: Saho *ragad-* “treten”, *rigid* “Fuß, Bein” [Rn.] || SCu. **dVgVr-* [GT]: Iraqw *digir* “footprint”, Burunge *dagara* “foot” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 324). Lit. for Eg.-Sem.-Cu.: Vrg. 1945, 129; Chn. 1947, #333; Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 30. Similarly, Sem. **drgš*: MHbr. (Talmud) & Aram. *dargēš* “the footstool in front of a high bed” [Jastrow 1950, 321] = Eg. *dg3s* [**dgrs*] “to tread, walk” (MK, Wb V 501; FD 317) as proposed in Ember 1912, 88; Ember 1930, #18.a.41; Alb. 1927, #95.a. On the other hand, (2) Eg. $\epsilon^3g.t$ [**εlg < *jrg < *rlg?*] “hoof”, which may be perhaps regarded as the etymon of Cpt. (S) *alokj*, (B) *aloč* “thigh” (CD 7) < Dem. 3lg (BiOr 13, 222), in turn, has been frequently¹⁵ identified with Sem.

¹³ Less convincing Semitic parallels have been offered in Erman 1892, 108; Mlt. 1984, 16–17; Dj. etc. 1986, 69, fn. 17.

¹⁴ E.g. Akk. *daraggu* “Wegspur” [AHW 163] || Hbr. **drg* “to step (upwards)”, *madrgā* “hoher treppenartiger Berg” [GB 167, 400] | Syr. *dargā* “step” [DRS] etc. (Sem.: DRS 308–9).

¹⁵ For Eg.-Sem. see Ember 1917, 88, #136; 1926, 302, fn. 10; 1930, #3.c.8; Alb. 1918, 90; Clc. 1936, #129; Vrg. 1945, 130; Mlt. 1984, 17; Dj. etc. 1986, 69, fn. 17.

*rīg- “foot” [SED I, 201-2, #228]. Vycichl (1959, 39) combined Eg. ʿṣg.t with Sem. *ʿrg “to mount”, which is semantically less credible.

Eg. ʿb3 “(ein Schiff) kommandieren, leiten” (PT, Wb I 177, 1): compared by Rössler (1971, 286), Zeidler (1992, 206), and Kammerzell (1998, 29) with Syr. dbr “egit, duxit” [Brk.] and Ar. dbr II “verwalten, gut regieren” [Rsl.]. Rightly rejected already by W.A. Ward (1985, 241) whose words perfectly describe one of the most typical errors in the methodology of the “neuere Komparatistik”: “an excellent example of words in different languages having an apparent relationship which is shown to be illusory by an examination of their origins”. Rejected also by Osing (1997, 226). Following K. Sethe, Ward (l.c.) convincingly argues for OEg. ʿb3 being a denom. verb from OEg. ʿb3 “sceptre” (that is, who holds the sceptre he commands). Moreover, OEg. ʿb3 finds a clear match in OSA (Qatabanian) ʿbr “to command, order” [Ricks 1982, 169]. On the other hand, Syr dbr and Ar. dbr II derive from the primary sense “to say” (cf. GB 153–4). For the semantic shift cp. e.g. Sem. *ʿmr “to say” > Ar. “to order, command”.

Eg. ʿpj “to fly” (LP, Wb I 179): identified by Schneider (1997, 196, #18) with Ar. dff “mit den Flügeln schlagen”. But the full meaning of Ar. dff is “6. agiter les ailes, battre des ailes en restant par terre (se dit des oiseaux)” [BK I 710] = “battre ses côtes avec les ailes pour voleter près du sol, aller à pas lents” [DRS], which derives from Sem. *dapp-(at)- “upper torso” [SED I 52, #55] = “side” [GT, cf. DRS 300]. It is difficult compare Eg. “to fly” with Sem. “side”. Moreover, the match of Eg. ʿpj = Sem. *ʿwp “to fly” (for Eg. IIIae inf. = Sem. IIae *-w- c f. Vcl. 1953, 373-5) has long been commonly accepted.¹⁶

Eg. ʿnh “leben” (OK, Wb I 193–8): combined by Schneider (1997, 196, #19) with ES *dḥn: Geez dāḥna “to be saved, be unharmed, escape safely, be spared, be safe and sound, be released” etc. (ES: Lsl. 1987, 128–9). Schneider’s proposal is just as false as the previous etymologies suggested for Eg. ʿnh¹⁷. The only convincing Sem. parallel for Eg. ʿnh was proposed so far by Meyer (1960, 97–98, so also in IS 1971, #125; HSED #1511), who assumed a connection to Sem. *ʿnh (var. *ʿnh) “to sigh” [GT], cf. Akk. (a/jB) anāḫu “seufzen” [AHW 49] = (Dt) “to produce a moaning sound” [CAD a2 105] || Ug. ānh “seufzen” [WUS #299]. From AA *ʿ-n-q [GT]? This equation is possible only if we assume a change of PEG. *jnh > OK ʿnh under the influence of -ḥ- (for which cf. Osing 1980). As demonstrated by A.Ju. Militarev and O.V. Stolbova (1990, 71), the same root might be present also in WCh. *nʿok “to breathe” [GT] (attested in

¹⁶ Lit.: Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; Erman 1892, 108; Ember 1930, #8.a.2; Clc. 1936, #132; Chn. 1947, #65; Vcl. 1953, 373; 1958, 372; 1959, 39; Wif. 1955, 139; Mlt. 1991, 260, #30.2.

¹⁷ Thus, e.g., (1) Albright (1918, 96; 1918, 223; 1927, 208) and Ember (ESS 33, #5.a.12 & #15.d.2) compared it with Ar. ʿyṣ: ʿāša “vivre”, ʿayṣ- “vie” [BK II 420]. (2) Later, Albright (1927, 208) suggested an equation with Sem. *nʿs: Akk. nēšu (Oakk. naʿāšum) “(auf)leben, genesen” [AHW 783] || Ar. naʿāša I “relever qqn. qui a trébuché ou qui est tombé”, II “élever qqn.” [BK II 1294] = I “to animate, enliven”, II, IV “to revive, regenerate” [Baranov 1976, 813]. Perhaps PEG. *nʿš > OEg. ʿnh? (3) Or cf. areal parallels like PNubian *aṇ “to live” [Abe1 1933–34, 304] and PCKhoisan *an “to live” [Baucom 1972, 23]?

Angas-Sura *nʸok “to breathe, live” [GT] and Ron)¹⁸. As suggested in EDE vol. I 157, the historic spelling of Eg. ʸnh – in the light of its WCh. cognate and the well-known interchange of Eg. ʸ ~ j in the proximity of h – might well be explained from a pre-OEg. *jnh. Note that the OEg. etymon jnh can (sporadically though) also be pointed out in the OK¹⁹. That is, the interchange of ʸ ~ j can be projected to the OK, and the historic reading jnh is not just a question.

Eg. ʸh3 [*ʸhl] “(to) fight” (OK, Wb I 215–216): compared by Schneider (1997, 196, #21) with Sem.: Ar. dayara “angreifen, überfallen”. I have to decline both this and the traditional etymology, i.e., its being equated with Sem.: Ar. raḥala “to strike with a sword” [E m b e r] = “mit dem Schwert schlagen” [Vrg.] (ESS 35, #5.f.5; Vrg. 1945, 130; Mlt. 1984, 17), which is semantically very weak. Instead, Eg. ʸh3 [*ʸhlʔ] may be derived (via a dissimilative pharyngeal reduplication) from a PEG. *ʸl, which is perfect match of ECu. *ʸol- “war” [S a s s e 1979, 21]; PSam *ʸol “war” [H e i n e 1978, 77] | HECu. *ola “battle, war” [Hds. 1989, 419] ||l NOm. *ol- “to fight” [GT] (Cu.-Om.: Dlg. 1973, 162; 1987, 197, #23; E h r e t 1987, 117, #492).

Eg. ʸd “to hack up” (OK, Wb I 238) = “hakken, aushöhlen, graben (Fundament, Grab)” (OK, ÄWb I 297): compared by K a m m e r z e l l (1998, 24) with AA *d-k “to pound” (!), which is evidently out of question because of the semantic difficulties. S c h n e i d e r (1997, 197, #24), in turn, prefers equating Eg. ʸd with Ar. zqq “schinden”. There are serious semantical problems with this etymology: (1) “to hack up” and “schinden” are not so close. (2) Moreover, Ar. zqq “schinden” may be secondary too, cf. Ar. zqq “läutern” (quoted by S c h n e i d e r in 1997, 197, #23). It is clear that both S c h n e i d e r’s and K a m m e r z e l l’s Rösslerian etymologies fail in the light of the correct cognates of Eg. ʸd, which derives by regular palatalization from *ʸgʷ, cf. LECu.: Saho ḏʸoge “to bury” [Vergari 2003, 142] = -uʸug- “to bury” [W e l m e r s 1952, 150] = (Assaorta dial.) -ʸagʷ- “seppellire” [CR 1913, 39] = ʸag “be-/eingraben” [Rn. 1890, 60], Saho-Irob (dial.) ɣaga “begraben” [Rn. 1878, 137] (Saho: Dlg. 1973, 268) ||l SCu.: WRift *ʸāgʷ “to dig for water, dig a well” [K i e ß l i n g & M o u s 2004, 51] ||l WCh.: Angas-Sura *hok

¹⁸ WCh.: Angas nyok “1. breath, 2. to breathe” [O r m s b y 1914, 208, 314] = nyok “1. the lungs, 2. breathing, 3. rest, 4. life” [Flk. 1915, 257] = nyök (K) “1. breath, Atem, 2. Ruhe, 3. life, 4. lung” [Jng. 1962 MS, 31] = nyok [nʸök] “breath” [Brq. 1971, 24, #26, 50] = nyok “1. breath, 2. life” [Hfm.] = nyok “1. life, 2. breath” [ALC 1978, 30, 49] = nyök “life” [Krf.], Sura nʸok “Atem” [Jng. 1963, 77] = nook “1. breath, 2. to rest” (the tones differ) [Hfm.], Mupun nōok “1. to breathe, 2. rest”, nook “breath” [Frj. 1991, 44–45], Kofyar nook “1. to breathe, 2. soul” [Ntg. 1967, 30] = nook “to breathe” [Hfm.], Mushere nok “1. to breathe, 2. soul, 3. life” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 139, 157], Goemay niag [irreg. -g < *k] “1. to breathe, 2. rest” [Srl. 1937, 159] = niyaak “atmen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 9] = niyak “to breathe” [Hfm.] (AS: Hfm. 1975 MS, 22, #149; Mkr. 1987, 110) | Fyer nook “atmen” [Jng. 1970, 88] (WCh.: Mkr. 1987, 110; Stl. 1977, 156). The underlying AA root might have been *n-ʸ/y-q “1. to breathe, 2. live” [GT]. The Eg.-WCh. equation was first suggested in Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 71.

¹⁹ The hieroglyphic records from the archaic period and the OK are usually written with the logogramm ʸnh. There are also instances whereby the first ʸ- was occasionally written out, cf. FÄW I 83 (archaic period, Dyn. II), Urk. I 133:15 (OK). The OK PN ʸnh-f (Ranke PN I 67, #2), in which ʸ- was complemented phonetically, might now be completed by another OK PN, ʸnh-j (Ranke PN I 68, #3), in which, in turn, we find a first j- with phonetical sign, which points to an alternative pronunciation jnh.

[*h- < *ʕ- (?), *-k < *-g# reg.] “to dig (with a hoe?)” [GT 2004, 157]²⁰. All from AA *ʕ-g(ʷ) “to dig, hoe” [GT]? Areal parallel: PKuliak *ʕug “to dig” [Ehret 1981, 99]. Note that V.É. Orel and O.V. Stolbova (OS 1989, 135; 1992, 194, 196; Orel 1995, 151, #5; HSED #1106) preferred to combine Eg. ʕd with ECh. *yVgV “to hoe, plough” [GT]: Lele yagi, Kabalay yuwegé | Tumak yæg, Somray yīgə, Ndam yāgə (ECh.: OS l.c.), whose etymological position, however, cannot yet be clearly determined.

Eg. p^ʕ.t “die Menschen” (OK, Wb I 503) = “patricians, mankind (the autochthonous inhabitants of Egypt from the earliest times)” (AEO I 98*, 110*; FD 88) = “mankind, men, people, citizens, human beings, patricians” (DLE I 171) = “1. ‘Patrizier(geschlecht)’, Adelsgeschlecht, Oberschicht (Ägyptens), 2. Menschen, Menschheit, 3. das siegreiche Volk (der Vorzeit, die in Ägypten die Oberschicht bildeten)” (GHWb 274) > OCpt. ꞥꞥ (coll.) “patricians” (CED 124, not in CD) = “Menschen” (KHW 144) = “hommes” (DELC 158): compared by Schneider (1997, 197, #30) with Sem. *pḥd ~ *pḥz: Ug. pḥd “herd”, Palmyran pḥz ~ pḥd ~ pḥwz “clan, family”, Ar. faḥid- “subdivision of a tribe”. But Schneider failed to explain the medial Sem. *-ḥ-. The origin of OEg. p^ʕ.t is obscure. We have to account for the following possibilities: (1) Perhaps an irregular cognate of LECu.: Rendille ba (f) “Leute, Volk” [Schlee 1978, 110, #56] ||l WCh.: Kwami pée ~ fée “person” [Leger 1992, 25; 1993, 173], Kupto búu (m/f) “Mensch, Person, Mann” [Leger 1992, 18] || ECh.: Kabalay bā “man” [Cpr.], Lele bāy-ndí “man” [Garrigues] | Somray ʔabé “man” [Jng.] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 231)? The labial correspondences are often irregular. (2) Or did it denote originally *”creatures” > In this case it might be related to PCh. *p- “to do, make” [Brt.-Jng.] ||l LEg. p^ʕp^ʕ “gebären, geboren werden” (GR, Wb) either²¹.

Eg. m3^ʕ. “richtig, wahr” (OK, Wb II 12–15) → m3^ʕ.t “Rechte, Wahrheit” (OK, Wb II 18–20): compared by Rössler (1971, 286) with Syr. mārīd “munitus, tutus” [Brk.] || Ar. mrd “beständig sein” [Rsl.]. Semantically unconvincing. Rejected already by Osiṅ (1997, 226). The basic sense of Ar. mrd was quite different²². At the present, perhaps the most tempting seems the etymology proposed by V.É. Orel and O.V. Stolbova (HSED #1742): CCh.: Zeghwana marā “correct” [Kraft 1981, #287], for which cf. also ECh.: Somrai mārúwè “directement” [Jng. 1978, 205]. An alternative etymology – namely

²⁰ Reflected in Angas ok “to dig (e.g. a hole, grave, well, etc.)” [Flk. 1915, 258] = ʔḳ ~ fḳ (K) “to dig a hole”, ʔḳ ~ fḳ (K) “to dig a hole” [Jng. 1962 MS, 31] = [ʔḳ^h ~ ʔḳ] “to dig” [Brq. 1971, 33] = ʔok “to dig” [Hfm.] = ok “to dig” [ALC 1978, 50] = ok “to dig” [Gcl. 1994, 72], Kofyar ok “to dig down” [Ntg. 1967, 31] = ʔok “to dig” [Hfm.], Chip ḳk gwe “to dig” [Krf.], Goemai hok “to dig” [Ftp. 1911, 216] = hək [hḳk] “to dig”, cf. hak “to cut out with a hoe” [Srl. 1937, 74] = hok “to dig” [Hfm.] = ni hok “to dig” [Krf.] = hok “to dig” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 13] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 25, #244; Stl. 1987, 229, #772).

²¹ The semantic shift is quite typical, cf. e.g.: (1) Sem.: Syr. gbl “former, façonner, créer” [DRS], Plm. gbl “collectivité, peuple” [DRS] || Ar. ġabala “former, créer”, ġabl- “foule, multitude (d’hommes)” [DRS] = ġabil- “created mass, throng (of creatures)” [Mlt.] || ES: Tigre gābil(āt) “tribu (étrangère), population” [DRS] = “people, (foreign) tribe” [Mlt.] (Sem.: DRS 96; Mlt. 1986, 67–68). (2) Sem.: Ar. ḥlq “to create” [Mlt.] | MSA: Jbl. ḥlīlq “to create (God)” [Jns. 1981, 300] > mḥelēq “human being, mortal” [Mlt.], Mhr. ḥəlēq “to be born” [Jns. 1987, 440] > mḥeliq “human, being, mortal” [Mlt.] (Sem.: Mlt. 1986, 75). (3) PIE *gen- “erzeugen” [IEW 373–5] ? OInd. pra-jā- “mankind, people, subjects etc.” [Monier-Williams 1899, 658].

²² Cf. Ar. marīda “to be(come) destitute of leaves”, marada “to exalt o’self, be insolent, audacious” [Lane 2706].

AA *m-l-[^l] (?) “right, direct” [GT] – is represented by CCh.: Hwona mīlmīl “correct” | Kilba mīl mīlū “correct” (CCh.: Kraft 1981, #287), which – assuming a semantic dispersion seen e.g. in IE *rēǵ- “richten” – can be attached to Common Brb. *ǵ-mVl “se diriger vers” [Ksm. 2001, 93] > e.g. NBrb.: Kabyle ǵ-məl “se diriger vers” (!) [Ksm.] = e-mel “arriver à, échoir” [Dlt. 1982, 495] || WBrb.: Zenaga a-mǵǵ [Zng. ǵ reg. < *l] “se diriger vers” [Ncl. 1953, 209] = a-miy (!) [Ksm.] || Eg. m3^l “1. Einen Weg weisen (old), 2. Richtig sein (Weg) (GR), 3. Jem. Führen, an einen Ort leiten (old, GR), 4. Richtig gehen (NK)” (Wb II 22–23). Erosion of final *-^l in Chadic. OEg. m3^l < *mr^l or *ml^l? Much less convincing is Zyhlarz’ (1932–33, 93) equation of Eg. m3^l [if *m^l?] with NBrb.: Zayan i-ma “es ist wahr” (originally a verb), today adv.: “wahrlich, wahrhaftig” [Zhl.] = i-ma “c’est exact” [Lbg. 1924, 564].

Eg. n^lj “im Schiff fahren, gehen, kommen etc.” (OK, Wb II 206, 7-12): compared by Schneider (1997, 199, #41) with Sem. *nḏd: Ug. nḏd “gehen, wandern, eilen”, Hbr. nḏd “fliehen, flüchten”, Jewish Aram. nḏd “weichen”, Syr. nḏd “vor etwas zurückweichen”, Ar. nḏd “davonlaufen, entfliehen” (Sem.: GB 486; WUS #1755). Schneider confused again two different roots: (1) Sem. *nḏd = Eg. nwd “sich bewegen, weichen” (Med., Wb II 225). (2) Eg. n^lj > Cpt. (SAB) nā vs. (SF) nōy “gehen” (KHW 116, 118–9) is cognate with Ug. nw^l “to move” [Gordon 1955, 295, #1223], Hbr. nw^l “(sch)wanken, sich umhertreiben, herumschweifen” [GB 493], JArām. nw^l “sich bewegen” [GB] || Ar. nw^l: V “2. marcher le premier, prendre les devants dans la marche”, X “2. marcher en avant” [BK II 1368-9] || Geez na^la ~ na^lā ~ nā^lā (imper.) “come!”, Tna. nā^la “come!” etc., cf. nā^lawā “to move here and there” (ES: Apl. 1977, 62–63/104–5; Lsl. 1979 III, 445; Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 382; see Testen 1997, 175f. for a diff. etymology) || SOm.: Hamar ja “to come” [Bnd. 1994, 147] || WCh. *nay- “to come” [GT]: Geruma naya [Gowers] | Ngizim nāi “to come”, nī “to come, go” [Schuh 1981, 121, 128] || CCh.: Masa nānā “to go” [Jng. in JI 1994 II 163]. For Eg.-ES: Alb. 1918, 98; 1927, 219; Chn. 1947, #447 (contra Hintze 1951, 85, #447); Dlg. 1969, 237.

Eg. ḥ^lj “jubeln” (PT, Wb III 40-41): compared by Schneider (1997, 202, #66) with a certain Ug. ḡdd “to exult”. But the basic meaning and the Sem. etymology of Ug. ḡdd are different²³.

Eg. ḥp (OK) → (MK vars.) ḥ^lp(j) ~ ḥ^lpr ~ ḥpr ~ ḥrp “Nile” (OK, Wb III 42–43): compared by Schneider (1997, 202, #67) with Sem. *ḡdp: Hbr. ḡdp “to be superfluous”, Ar. ḡdf “to be abundant”. But the medial -^l- does not appear in the OK. Where this -^l- may have come from, it is subject to speculations. The Wb mistakenly proposed an original PEg. *ḥ^lpr. Most recently, J. Kahl (1992, 102) supposed a development of OEg. *ḥrpj (*-r- not written!) > MEg. ḥ^lpj, while I assume an old *ḥpr (defective OK -r) and a secondary dissimilation of ḥ- into ḥ^l- by the MK (cf. EDE I 329–332), which is confirmed by the traditional Sem. etymology, cf. Ar. ḥafala “reichlich fließen, strömen” [Clc.] (Alb. 1918, 93; Clc. 1936, #709).

²³ Cf. Gordon 1955, 309, #1468: Ug. ḡdd “to exult” = Hbr. ḡdd hitpaal “to (be) encourage(d)”, Ar. ḡdd II “to be swollen”. Similarly, WUS #2133: Ug. ḡdd tD stem “anschwellen” = Ar. ḡdd “Kropf oder fleischiges Kinn haben”.

Eg. ḥn^o “1. together with, 2. and” (OK, Wb III 110–111): compared by Schneider (1997, 202, #68) with Ar. ʿinda “bei”. But the traditional correspondences offer semantically much more convincing parallels: (1) Most probable seems an equation with WCh.: Ron: Fyer hóná “and” [Jng. 1970, 85]. Fyer h- < *ḥ- is attested. (2) A much weaker possibility is SCu.: Dahalo holló “with, and” [Ehret 1980, 306], where both Dhl. h- (instead of *ḥ-) and the lack of *-^o are irregular.

Eg. ḥ3^o “1. werfen, 2. legen, 3. (ver)lassen” (PT, Wb III 227–8) = “1. to throw, cast off, 2. abandon” (FD 184): compared by Rössler 1971, 286 and Zeidler 1992, 206 with Ar. ʿarada “werfen” [Rsl.] = “1. pousser, sortir de ... (se dit d’une dent, d’une plante qui a germé), 2. lancer une pierre au loin” [BK II 211]. Rejected already by O sing (1997, 226). Moreover, according to the old theory, Eg. ḥ3^o [from *ḥl^o?] finds a semantically more fitting cognate in Ar. ḥalaʿa “weglegen, verstossen (Frau), ausziehen (z.B. ein Kleid)”, ḥaluʿa “abwerfen” [Vcl.] (as pointed out by Albright 1927, #65; Ember 1930, #3.c.22; Vergote 1945, #1.d.20; Cohen 1947, 155; Vycichl 1958, 387; 1990, 39).

Eg. ḥ^oj “aufgehen, erscheinen (urspr. Sonne)” (PT, Wb III 239–241) = “to rise (of sun)” (FD 185): equated by Schneider (1997, 204, #77) with Sem.: OSA ʿwd “to return, turn back”, Ar. ʿwd “to return, come back”. Semantically absurd. In fact, Eg. ḥ^oj is identical with ECu. *ka^o- “1. to get up, 2. wake up” [Sasse 1979, 11]: e.g. PSam *ka^o- “to stand up” [Lmb. 1986, 443] || SCu. *ka^o- [GT]: Maʿa -ká “to get up, stand up, awake”, -káʿa “to raise, waken” [Ehret 1980, 331]²⁴ || WCh.: Angas-Sura *kā₂ (orig. *kay?) “to mount” [GT 2004, 160]²⁵. The regular correspondence of Eg. ḥ vs. PCu. & PCh. *k < AA *q, which is part of the system of PAA “uvular” or “postvelar” correspondences has been demonstrated on an extensive lexical material in a number of articles (beside EDE vol. I 157–171)²⁶.

Eg. ḥf^o “fassen, packen” (PT, Wb III 272) = “to seize, grasp” (FD 190) has nothing to do with Sem. *ʿbd “to work, serve” (as suggested by Rössler 1971, 286; Zeidler 1992, 206; Schenkel 1993, 139). The basic meaning of Eg. ḥf^o can hardly be based on the isolated (only PT 1288c) sense “für jemanden tätig sein, arbeiten (?)” (Wb III 272, 15: III.c), which, besides, Faulkner (AEPT 1969, 204: PT 1288c ḥf^o “to seize hold of”) and Ward (1985, 237) pointed out to be an unnecessary translation. Already

²⁴ Here may belong Agaw *g^w- [irreg. *g^w-?] “to get up, rise” [Apl. 1989 MS, 12] too.

²⁵ Attested in Angas kei “to climb” [Flk./Mgd. 1911, 386] = kai [orig. diphthong retained?] “to mount, rise”, pus-ke “sunrise” (pus “sun”) [Ormsby 1914, 210, 313–315] = kee “to climb, mount” [Flk. 1915, 212] = kèe “ersteigen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 16–17] = kè “to mount, climb” [ALC 1978, 25, 32] = kè “to mount” [Krf.] = kè “to come up, go up” [Gcl. 1994, 40, 48], Sura kaa “1. nach oben kommen, herauskommen, aufgehen (Sonne), 2. wachsen, 3. besteigen” [Jng. 1963, 68] = ka “to mount”, pus-kù-kà “east” [Krf.], Mupun kà “to mount, climb, go up, come up” [Frj. 1991, 24], Kofyar kaa “to go up, climb” [Ntg. 1967, 16], Mushere kaa ~ kah “to climb (a hill, tree, mountain), ascend, germinate”, yit puus ku kah “east”, kaa-met “to germinate (of a seed)” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 111, 131, 321] = kà “to rise, climb” [Jng. 1999 MS, 7], Chip kaa “(be-/ein-)steigen” [Jng. 1965, 166] = kà gwe “to mount”, ki-sàr-pus-kà “east” [Krf.].

²⁶ Cf. Takács 1999, 408–410; 1999, 162–164; 2000, 91–93. Note that the just as well valid match of Eg.-Sem. *k vs. Cu.-Ch. *k < AA *q betrays that the two underlying PAA phonemes (*q vs. *k) had merged in Cushitic and Chadic, while their distinction was preserved in Semitic and Egyptian in the fricative vs. stop opposition.

Ward (l.c.) and Osing (1997, 226) rejected the comparison of Eg. ḥfʿ and Sem. *ʿbd. Similarly incorrect is the equation of Eg. ḥfʿ “Faust” by Brugsch and Erman (1892, 116) with Hbr. ḥāpnayim “die Fäuste”, Ar. ḥafn-at- “eine Hand voll” ... (followed by Holma 1911, X, 118; Behnk 1927, 81, #12). The correct match of Eg. ḥfʿ is to be found in PCh. *Q-f-(H) “to grasp, hold” [GT]²⁷. Note that the Sem. cognates that have been frequently²⁸ equated with Eg. ḥfʿ are semantically problematic.²⁹

VIII. The supposed inner Egyptian evidence for the change of ʿ ~ d

Below I am going to discuss those supposed and semantically convincing examples which the recent Rösslerian school assumes to reflect the change of ʿ (ayin) and d within Egyptian. These examples were summarized by F. Kammerzell (1991; 1992, 170–172; 1998, 35, the examples analyzed below stem from these papers unless otherwise indicated), and then critically commented by J. Zeidler (1992, 208), W. Schenkel (1993, 140), and H. Satzinger (1999). Some of Kammerzell’s examples are omitted here, which were considered problematic even by Zeidler (1992, 208, fn. 71).

Zeidler (1992, 208) and Kammerzell (1998, 34–35) emphasized the diachronic character of this change of Eg. ʿ ~ d, though they seem to differ as to the solution to offered for this phenomenon. Zeidler proposes apparently a secondary reappearance of Afro-Asiatic *d in the *Volkssprache* of the New Kingdom (and later), i.e. AA *d → OEg. ʿ → LEg. d [t]. Alternatively, Zeidler did not exclude two parallel dialects or “social dialects” (*Soziolekt*) behind the interchange of Eg. ʿ ~ d. Kammerzell, in turn, accepted “the process of weakening” of OEg. [d] (transcribed conventionally as ʿayin) into LEg. [ʿ] “some time prior to the New Kingdom”. It would be, however, premature to elaborate such theories on the basis of such a limited number of examples, most of which are either untenable or problematic:

Eg. ʿ3 “hier(her), von hier” (MK, Wb I 164, 7–9) vs. **Eg. dj** “hier, dort, hierher” (NE, Wb V 420, 5–7). But the two adverbs are etymologically distinct: the former is a compound

²⁷ Attested in WCh. *gaf- “to hold, seize” [GT] = *qafu- [Stl.]: Angas-Sura *gʿāp ~ *kʿāp (var. *-ā3-?) > *gāp “to catch (with tongs)” [GT 2004, 142]: Angas gaap “tongs (for picking the iron out of the fire)” [Flk. 1915, 184] = gaap (K) “tongs, Feuerzange, Zwickzange” [Jng. 1962 MS], presumably Mushere gap “to catch” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 81, 319], Gmy. giāāp [giʾɔp < *gʿā3p] “pincers” [Srl. 1937, 71] | Bade gaf “to grasp, hold” [Stl.], Ngizim gāfāu “to grasp, hold (stationary object)” [Schuh 1981, 66] = gəfōn “to hold” [Kraft] || CCh.: Fali-Bwagira ngəft “to seize” [Kraft] || perhaps SBrl.: Ayr & EWlm. ə-kyəf “to fetter, entraver” [Alj. 1980, 105].

²⁸ Lit. for Eg.-AA: Holma 1919, 38; Alb. 1927, #65; Vrg. 1945, 139, #13.8; Vcl. 1958, 374; 1959, 39; IS 1966, 345, #11.10; Djk. etc. 1986, 51; Stl. 1986, 92; 1988, 115; OS 1990, 89, #26; 1992, 196, 198; HSED #2032.

²⁹ Cf. Ar. ḥafaʿa “être saisi de vertige, de tournoiement de tête (soit de faim, par qq. autre chose), et tomber par terre, 2. porter à qqn. un coup de sabre” [BK I 602–3] = “to be overcome, feeble, fall” [Alb.] = “schlagen, niederstürzen, vom Schwindel ergriffen werden” [Holma] = “packen” [Vrg.] = “packen (to seize)” [Vcl.] = “to get hold of” [Djk.]. As for Akk. ḥepū (Ass. ḥapāʾum) “zerschlagen, -brechen” [AHW 340] = “to smash, desroy, demolish, ruin” [CAD ḥ 170f] = “verpacken” [Lsl.], cf. rather LEg. ḥḥf “eine Statue beschädigen, zerstoßen” (XXVI., Wb III 274, 1).

of thwo juxtaposed deictic morphemes³⁰ while the latter one has certainly nothing to do with an etymon *ʕy (or sim.) as suggested, since it derives from AA *d- [GT]³¹.

Eg. ʕ3.t “Leinenart” (PT, Wb) vs. Eg. d3j.w “Leinenstoffe” (PT, Wb): as rightly noted by Satzinger (1999, 143, #2) himself, “as no semantic details are known, the agreement remains hypothetical”. Moreover, Eg. d3j.w denotes more specifically “*(großer) Schurz, Kilt, *Galabiye, Umhang” (OK, ÄWb I 1462) = “loin-cloth” (CT, DCT 779).

Eg. ʕ3ʕ “(den Speichel) spritzen” (PT, Wb I 166, 16) vs. Eg. d3d3 “koitieren, beischlafen, lasziv sein” (BD, GHWb 970) = “to copulate” (FD 309). Fully mistaken. Eg. ʕ3ʕ and d3d3 are two totally distinct roots (AA *ʕ-l “to well up from a source” or sim. [GT]³² vs. AA *t-l “to beget” [GT]³³, resp.). Zeidler preferred to translate d3d3 too as “ejakulieren” so as to have a meaning close to “spritzen” in spite of the standard view of Eg. lexicography (cf. FD, GHWb above).

Eg. ʕ3b “Art Baum” (PT, Wb I 167, 6) = “Baumsorte” (Kmr.) vs. Eg. d3b Feige(nbaum)” (PT, Wb V 417): this pair of Kammerzell was combined by Satzinger (1999, 144–5, #4) with an alleged unique spelling of d3b “fig” with initial ʕ- in a list of offering in an Old Kingdom inscription (from the Mastaba of Minu, Vienna 8533), which, however, may be due rather to a miswriting of d- (similar to the ʕ sign). As for the ʕ3b plant, as Satzinger also carefully stated, “there is no hint whatsoever to a fig-tree” in it. Moreover, R. Hannig recently recorded it as ʕ3b.(w) “ein Gewächs (im AR vermutlich ‘Lattich’)” (ÄWb I 261), which clearly excludes any connection to d3b.

Eg. ʕb “horn” (OK, Wb I 173–174) vs. Eg. db “horn” (Med., Wb V 434, 3–5). Perhaps the most attractive example, though it is also to be abandoned as both words seem to be different roots with entirely different history. (1) Eg. ʕb seems to go back to an extra-AA (African substratal?) heritage³⁴, cf. PKuliak *ɛb “horn” [Heine 1975, 293; 1975–76, 48; Ehret 1981, 92]. (2) At the same time, Eg. db is nothing else but an absolutely regular

³⁰ Already Vycichl (1933, 171, #1; 1934, 84) has pointed out that Eg. ʕ3 is a combination of the “lokales Grundelement” *ʕ- + the distance marker -3. The Eg. adverbs ʕf “dort” (NK, GHWb 138; Wb I 182, 3), ʕn “hier” (NK, GHWb 141; Wb I 187, 11), and ʕ3 form together a series derived by the distance markers -f, -n, and -3, resp. Vycichl has found the same “lokales Grundelement” *ʕ- (from AA *ʕ-) also in NBrb.: Shilh *ʕ- “lokales Grundelement”, cf. ʕi-d “hier”, ʕi-n “dort”, ʕ- “in” ||l WCh.: Hausa ga [g- < ʕ-] “da”, also “in, an”, cf. gu “place”. The correspondence of Eg. ʕ = Brb. *ʕ = Hausa g may be regular. Note that the comparison of Eg. ʕ3 with Hbr. ʕal “next to, toward” (Hodge 1995, 641) is semantically unconvincing.

³¹ The AA cognates are NBrb.: Shilh -d “dem. element: here”, in: ʕi-d “here” [opposed to ʕi-n “there”], ʕwa-d “der da” [opposed to ʕwa-n “der dort”] (NBrb.: Vcl. l.c.) ||l SBrb. (Tuareg) *d “in” [GT] ||l Bed. -d (locative suffix) [Dlg.] || Agaw *d (locative suffix) [GT] || LECu.: Saho -d (locative suffix) [Dlg.] || HECu.: Burji -ddi “locative suffix (with abs. case)” [Sasse 1982, 54] || perhaps Ch. *d- [< *d-H/*H-d] “this” [Nwm. 1977, 33]. Lit.: Vcl. 1933, 172–173; 1934, 88; 1958, 373; Hintze 1951, 83, #347; IS 1971, #59; Dlg. 1973, 238.

³² Eg. ʕ3ʕ “spritzen” is related to Eg. ʕ3ʕ [partial redupl. *ʕlʕ] “Wasserloch” (PT, Wb I 166, 15), cognate with ECu. *ʕel- “water hole, a well” [Black 1974, 109, 113; Sasse 1982, 67] || Agaw (borrowed from ECu.): Bilin ʕelā “der Brunnen” [Rn. 1887, 63], Hamir ʕelā “well” [Dlg.] ||l Sem.: cf. Ar. ʕaylam- [suffix -am?] “a well with much (or: salted) water” [Dlg.]. For Ar.-ECu.: Dlg. 1988, 634, #46.

³³ At the same time, Eg. d3 ~ d3d3 [*dl] “to copulate” may be cognate with ECu. *dal- “to beget, give birth” [Sasse 1979, 21, 30; 1982, 61–62; cf. Dlg. 1966, 85, #8.10; 1973, 58] ||l WCh.: PGmy. *tal “afterbirth” [GT 2004, 378].

³⁴ Note that Albright (1918, 222, #19) explained Eg. ʕb from Eg. ʕb “to join, bind”, which is semantically weak.

reflex of AA *dub-/bud- “horn” [GT]³⁵ Westendorf’s (1962, 20, #31.b.9) attempt of deriving MEg. db from a not attested OEg. *db, in order to combine OEg. *db with OEg. ʿb on the basis of the rare correspondence of Sem. *ʿ = Eg. d, is without evidence.

Eg. ʿb “Name eines Windhundes (?)” (OK, Wb I 176, 2) vs. db.t “als Hundename” (MK, Wb V 434, 12) = db (sic!) “Hundename” (Kmr.): Satzinger (1999, 145, #6) remained also sceptical: “this equation remains at best hypothetical as the meanings of of these dog’s names are unknown”. Moreover, in EDE I 45, I have argued for an areal origin of Eg. ʿb.

Eg. ʿb.t “Weberin (?)” (OK, Wb I 175, 2) vs. dbj.t “ein Stoff” (MK, Wb V 434, 14): Zeidler (1992, 208) is rightly sceptical. “This equation remains hypothetical” as Satzinger (1999, 146, #7) stated. Moreover, dbj.t was written with a particles det., which reveals nothing as to the alleged connection to cloths.

Eg. ʿb.t “Pflanzenart” (Kmr., not listed as such in Wb I 176, 9) vs. dbj.t “eine Pflanze” (Med., Wb V 435): rejected as “hypothetical” even by Satzinger (1999, 146, #8).

Eg. ʿm “verschlucken” (OK, Wb I 183–184): Kammerzell (1998, 36) tried to justify the actual pronunciation of its initial stop as [d] in this word with the help of a supposed chiasitic alliteration in PT 410a: jw w(n)m-f dšr.t, jw ʿm-n-f w3d.t “He has eaten the Red (Crown), he has swallowed the Green (Crown)”. Kammerzell supposes here an alliteration employing a rhyming of [w] ~ [w] (wnm ~ w3d.t) and [t] ~ [d] (dšr.t ~ ʿm). But he failed to quote any parallel PT evidence for such an alliteration. Moreover, it is very difficult to deny the connection of OEg. ʿm with Afro-Asiatic *ʿ-m “to eat” [GT]³⁶.

Eg. ʿn.w “Art Steine” (Lit. MK, Wb I 189, 18), cf. ʿjn “Kalkstein” (NE, Wb I 191) vs. dnj “Steinblock o.ä.” (NE, Wb V 466, 8): rejected already by Satzinger (1999, 146, #9): “the semantic agreement seems poor, one will doubt that the ʿ and d words are doublets”.

Eg. bʿn “fassen (kostbare Steine in Gold)” (NE, Wb I 447, 9) = bʿn.w “mounting (for a stone)” (DLE I 152) = bʿn “fassen (kostbare Steine in Gold)” (GHWb 249) vs. Eg. bnd ~ bdn [once] “einwickeln, bekleiden” (NE, Wb I 465, 2–3; 487, 14) = “to enfold, wrap up, gird oneself” (DLE I 157). Declined already by Satzinger (1999, 146, #12) himself as “the semantic coherence is not cogent”. The primary root must have been bnd (not bdn), cf. Eg. bnd “von der Vereinigung des Horus und Seth, deren Kraft sich im

³⁵ Cf. HECu. *bud- [met. of *dub-] “horn” [Hds. 1989, 81] | LECu.: Oromo buda “horn” [Hds.] ||l| ECh.: Tumak bá-dùbò [Cpr. & JI: prefix ba-] “horn” [Cpr. 1975, 55; cf. JI 1994 II, 193]. Cf. still perhaps WCh.: Nbauchi *n-diba “spear” [Stl. 1987, 251]; Diri ndiba, Pa’a ndiba (Nbauchi: Skn. 1977). Lit. for Eg.-AA: OS 1992, 170; 1992, 186; HSED #730.

³⁶ Cf. Bed. ʿām “to eat, devour” [Rpr. 1928, 148] = “essen, fressen” [Rn. 1895, 16] || Agaw *Həŋ- [-*ŋ- < *-m-] “to bite” [GT]: Qemant (y)əŋ- | Awngi əŋ- (Agaw: Apl. 1989 MS, 6) || LECu.: PSam *ʿun- [-n# regular < *-m#] “to eat” [Lmb.] = *ʿūn- [Heine]: Somali ʿun ~ ʿūn “to eat”, Rendille hūn “to drink milk, blood”, Boni -huŋ-/haŋ- “to eat” (Sam: Heine 1978, 78/100; Lmb. 1986, 439) ||l| WCh.: Pa’a ʾṛma “to eat” [Jng. 1967, 198] ||l| ECh. *ʔ-y-m “to eat” [GT]: Somray ʾám [Jng.] | Sokoro áyme [Saxon] | Dangla ɛme [Skn. 1977, 19], Mokilko ʾòdmí [Jng. 1990, 156], Migama ʾáymó/é [JA 1992, 67; Jng. 1977, 83] etc. (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 119, 121), all < AA *ʿ-m “to eat” [GT]. For this AA etymology see Mnh. 1912, 233; Behnk 1928, 139, #16; Zhl. 1932-1933, 166; Chn. 1947, #60; Djk. 1965, 44; Dlg. 1970, 623, #74.

Könige vereinigt" (XX., Wb I 465, 4). Improbable. The origins of both $b^{\text{c}}n^{37}$ and $bdn < (!) bnd^{38}$ can be disputed, but it seems that, both as regards form and basic meaning, they derived from distinct etymons.

Eg. m^{c} "im Besitze von, durch, wegen, von" (OK, Wb II 45–46) vs. Eg. mdj "mit, bei" (MK, Wb II 176–177). Both prepositions, however, are of different origins. (1) Eg. m^{c} is traditionally explained from a compound m^{c} "in the hand of" (Wb II 45; EG 1957, 132, #178 etc.). Alternatively, it may be cognate with Ar. $ma^{\text{c}}a$ "with" (suggested by Eitan 1928, 48; 1929, 47–50), which would exclude its inner Eg. etymology. On the other hand, (2) Eg. mdj has been analyzed as $*m\text{-}dj$ "in the hand of", compound of m "in" + $*dj < *jd$ "hand" (preserved also by the hrgl. for d), cf. Sem. $*yad\text{-}$ "hand" (see Vcl. 1983, 145; 1985, 174–177). Alternatively, it is not excluded that second element of Eg. mdj meant not "hand", but was also a prep. which could be identified with AA $*d\text{-}(y)$ "with" [GT]³⁹. **Eg. $mš^{\text{c}}$** "marschieren, reisen" (NE, Wb II 156, 5–8) = "to march" (FD 119) = "to march, travel, journey, depart" (DLE I 245) vs. Dem. $mšt$ [$< *mšd$] "durchwandern" (not in DG) $>$ Cpt. (S) $\mu\omicron\upsilon\gamma\omega\tau$ "durchwandern, besuchen, erforschen" (KHW 109). This proposal by J. Zeidler (1992, 208, cf. also Loprieno 1994, 127; 1995, 45) was declined already by H. Satzinger (1999, 147): "... a semantic relation cannot be accepted on closer inspection (also cf. Osing 1997:229)". Indeed, we are dealing here with two perfectly unrelated roots: (1) Eg. $mš^{\text{c}}$ may be identified either with Ar. $maša^{\text{c}}a$ "3. marcher doucement", var. $mala^{\text{c}}a$ (interchange of Sem. laterals $*\text{-}š\text{-}$ vs. $*\text{-}l\text{-}$?) "3. marcher avec rapidité, d'un pas léger et rapide (se dit d'une chamelle)" [BK II 1111, 1149], hence Ar. mal^{c} "troupe, bande, partie" [BK l.c.], which would explain even the connection to Eg. $mš^{\text{c}}$ "army". Cf. also WCh.: Tangale $mēṣe$ "journey, travel, walking" [Jng. 1991, 120]⁴⁰. (2) On the other hand, Dem. $mšt$ may be a denom. verb from Eg. $mšd.t$ "ford" (XVIII., FD 119)

³⁷ Eg. $*b^{\text{c}}n$ [$< *b^{\text{c}}l?$] may be connected with Sem.: Ug. $b^{\text{c}}l$ "machen, abeiten, verfertigen" [WUS #546]. A further (alternative) promising parallel can be found in WCh.: Angas-Sura $*\text{ḥ}al \sim \text{ḥ}āl$ "to fasten sg. to sg." [GT 2004, 25]; Sura $\text{ḥ}āl$ "verbinden mit, anschließen an, anbinden an" [Jng. 1963, 59], Mpn. $\text{ḥ}āal$ "to join", e.g. $yī \text{ ḥ}āal \text{ tē?}\text{-}é$ "are you joining a rope?" [Frj. 1991, 6], Msr. $bal\text{-}ka$ (so, b-) "to unite" [Dkl. 1997 MS], Gmy. $\text{ḥ}al$ "to fasten" [Srl. 1937, 10] = $\text{ḥ}al$ "to hang tightly" [Hlw. 2000 MS, 2]. Phonologically regular (AS $*b\text{-}l < *b^{\text{c}}\text{-}l$).

³⁸ Thus, it may well be that the $-d$ in NEg. bnd was originally not a dental plosive at all. For instance, G. Thausing (1941, 24) traced back NEg. bnd , act. [bnt] to OK $*bnt$ with regard to PT 426b $bbnt$ "Stirnband (?)" [Sethe] = "Strick, Band" [Thausing]. C.T. Hodge (1979, 500), in turn, postulated an older $*bnd$ without any Eg. evidence. At the same time, J. Osing (1976, 187, 713, fn. 831) and H. Satzinger (1994, 200) presumed NEg. bnd [$*bld?$] to be the etymon of Cpt. (S) $\text{ḥ}allot$ "Kleidungsstück, Beutel aus Fell". All these facts show that the etymology of Eg. bnd is uncertain even on Eg. grounds, and this word can hardly be a firm base for proving the change of Eg. $^{\text{c}} \sim d$.

³⁹ OLib. d (prep.) "and (with?)" || NBrb. $*yīd$ (prep.) "avec" vs. $*day$ "dans" || SBrb.: Ahaggar ad "together with, and", Tamasheq $i\text{-}daw$ "to be together with s'one" (Brb.: Prasse 1972, 158, 225–227) || Agaw: Bilin & Qwara $-dī$ "together with" (for its eventual connection with the element $-ta$ in Agaw numerals 6–9: Hetzron 1967, 170–171) || PCh. $*da[y]$ "with" [GT]: WCh.: Hausa da | Kulere tu | Bade $də$ || CCh.: Tera $ndə$ | Nzangi nda | Gidar $dī$, $dī$ || ECh.: Kera $də$ | Mokilko ti (Ch.: Nwm. 1977, 34, #148; CCh.: Mch. 1950, 57). AP: Bantu dialects. ndi "with". Lit.: Homburger 1928, 343 (Eg.-Bantu-Hausa); Vcl. 1933, 176 (SBrb.-Eg.); Bynon 1984, 279, #44 (PCh.-Brb.).

⁴⁰ Note that Sh. Yeivin (1933, 108; 1936, 70, #16) and W.E. Crum (cf. CD 203b) equated Eg. $mš^{\text{c}}$ with Ar. $mšw/y$ I "zu Fuß gehen, gehen, einhergehen, -schreiten, marschieren" [Wehr 811]. The correspondence of NEg. $^{\text{c}}$ vs. Ar. $-y$ is not regular. Was NEg. $^{\text{c}}$ due to a folk-etymology combining it with $mš^{\text{c}}$ "Heer"? Rejected already by W. Vycichl (DELIC 128-9).

= “Furt” (Wb II 158, 14), which, in turn, is a nomen loci of an unattested *šd, cognate with Sem. *štt: Ar. šaṭṭa “1. to be (come) distant, remote, far off, 2. go far, beyond the due bonds” > šaṭṭ- “the bank or side of a river and of a valley, the rising ground next the bottom” vs. šaṭaʔa “to walk on the bank or side of the river”, šaṭiʔ- “the bank or side of a valley” [Lane 1548–9] = šaṭṭ- “Seite” ~ šaṭiʔ- “Ufer” [GB 782] = šaṭṭ- “side, bank” [KB 1316] (Eg.-Sem.: Blv. 1989, 15). For the shift of meaning in Eg., cf. e.g. Russ. брод “ford” vs. бродить “to wander, roam”. The alternative etymology offered by Satzinger (1999, 147–8) for Eg. mšd (as denominal verb from a hypothetical unattested *mšd “investigation” based on Cpt. and Eg. wšd “to address”) is unconvincing.

Eg. ḥ^obj.w “als Bez. für Feinde” (GR, Wb III 42, 10) vs. ḥdbjt “Haufen niedergeworfener Feinde (XIX–XX., Wb III 205, 18): declined already by Satzinger (1999, 147, #13) “*for the lack of semantic details, their relationship is only hypothetical*”.

Eg. ḥf^o “fassen, packen” (PT, Wb III 272) vs. šfd “fassen, packen” (CT, Wb IV 461): suggested by Satzinger (1999, 147, #14) assuming an interchange of ḥ vs. š. Attractive.

IX. The examples for Rössler’s Eg. ^o = Sem. *z

NEg. 3^o “to gibber, speak a foreign language” (NE, DLE I 2) = “eine fremde Sprache sprechen” (Wb I 3, 1–2): compared by Loprieno (1995, 31) with Sem. *lyz: Hbr. l^oz “to speak a foreign language” || Ar. laṣa “to speak enigmatically”, whereby Loprieno compared at the same time (!) the medial Eg. -^o- with Sem. *-γ- (strictly prohibited in the Rösslerian theory) and the final Eg. -^o- with Sem. *-z. Loprieno seems to accept both Eg. ^o = Sem. *z and Eg. ^o = Sem. *γ simultaneously (!) in the same root (!), which is incomprehensible for me. As for the etymology of NEg. 3^o, two alternatives seem plausible (both ignored by Loprieno): (1) It is not fully certain that NEg. 3^o was the original form of the Eg. root. A noteworthy parallel seems to suggest that our NEg. 3^o may go back to an earlier *^ow (or sim.), cf. NEg. 3^o “to sleep” (NE, DLE I 2) < MEg. ^ow “to sleep” (MK, Wb I 169, 8). Thus, in principle, NEg. 3^o might be derived from OEg. ^o [*^oj/*^ow?] “Dolmetscher” (OK, Wb I 159, 8)⁴¹. On the other hand, (2) most probably, NEg. 3^o < OEg. *3^o < *1^o might be equated with Sem. bicons. *1-γ [GT] as well as it has been suggested for a long time.⁴²

⁴¹ Which W. Vycichl (1934, 84) equated with WCh.: Hausa gaya “dolmetschen, erklären” [Vcl.]. The correspondence of Eg. ^o vs. Hausa g- is plausible (note that Hausa g- may derive from AA *γ- > Eg. ^o-). The basic meaning of Hausa gaya was, however, only “to tell” [Abr. 1962, 313], which speaks against Vycichl’s Eg.-Hausa comparison.

⁴² Cf. Hbr. l^o (or l^oy or lw^o?) “irre reden” [GB 38] = “speak inconsiderately” [Lsl. 1969] = “to stutter” [Lsl. 1987] || Ar. lṣw: laṣā “1. parler, 2. dire des choses futiles, tenir des discours vains” [BK II 1006] vs. lṣy: laṣiya “scwatzen, daherreden” [WKAS II 904] = lṣw “schwatzen” & lṣy “erravit in dicendo” [GASW] = laṣā (-w) “schwätzen” [Clc. 1931] = laṣā (-w) ~ laṣiya “to make mistakes in speaking, talk nonsense” [Lsl.] || Geez lāʿlāʿā “to stammer, stutter, speak indistinctly” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 304). For Eg.-Sem. see Clc. 1931, 36; GÄSW 1936, #1; Vrg. 1945, 130, 133, #3.a.1; Hodge 1981, 374, #34.

Eg. ʕ3 “(to be) great” (OK, Wb I 161–162): compared by Schneider (1997, 195, #13) with Brb. *z-w-r “to be great” (!). But the basic meaning of the Brb. root was fully different (“to go first, precede”), not at all fitting a comparison with Eg. ʕ3, which can be explained the traditional in a much more convincing way⁴³.

Eg. ʕn (Rsl.: ʕjn) “schön (sein)” (MK, Wb I 190; cf. also Grapow 1914, 23): compared by Rössler (1971, 291) with Ar. zyn “verschönern, schmücken”. Declined already by W.A. Ward (1985, 240–1). We are dealing again with two distinct roots: (1) For Eg. ʕn [< *ʕl?] cf. HECu. *el- [< PCu. *ʕal-?] “to be better” [Hds. 1989, 409]. (2) Ar. zyn (cf. Eastern Ar. dialects. zyn “to be good”, zeyyin “good”, Iraqi dial. zayn “good”, ziēn “good!”, cf. Durand 1995, 150) may be cognate with Eg. jzn.w [Blv.: < *zyn] “etwas Gutes oder Freundliches” (PT, Wb I 129, 17) ||| WCh.: Bole-Tangale *zina “good” [GT]: Maha zinaḡ, Ngamo zina (WCh.: Nwm. 1965, 58). For Eg.-Ar. see Belova 1987, 279; 1989, 13; 1991, 85, #3; 1993, 50, #3. Note that Eilers (1987, 514) combined Ar. zyn with Akk. znn “versorgen, ausstatten” [AHW 1510], which is not too convincing.

Eg. ʕr “kleiner Stein, Kiesel” (NE, Wb I 208, 11) → Dem. ʕl “stone” (DG 68) → Cpt. (SAB) ʕʕ “Kiesel, Hagelkorn” (KHW 3): compared by Rössler (1971, 291) with Sem.: Ar. zill-at- “glatter Stein”. False. (1) Rössler neglected that Ar. zill-at- goes back to Ar. zll “to slide, glide, slip”, which is cognate with Eg. z3w ~ z3j [< *zll] “to creep” (MK, FD 208) = “schleichen” (Wb III 418–9). (2) On the other hand, Eg. ʕr [*ʕl] “kleiner Stein, Kiesel” may be related to ECU. *ʕal- [GT]: esp. Arbore el “stone”, Elmolo el “stone” (ECU.: Sasse 1979, 36)⁴⁴.

Eg. ʕš3 [< *ʕšr] “many, much, numerous” (OK, FD 49) = “viel” (Wb I 228): equated by Rössler (1971, 316) with Ar. zḥr “to grow, swell” [Rsl.] = “se gonfler, se remplir, grossir et s’étendre (torrent), être agité (la mer, les vagues)” [BK I 980]. Even semantically weak. Both of the well-known traditional Semitic etymologies for Eg. ʕš3 are semantically much more convincing: (1) Most of the authors⁴⁵ equate it with Sem. *ʕaš[a]r- “10” [Dlg. 1986, 79, #14]. For its basic sense (Vrg.: *’to unite, collect’) cf. Ar. maʕšar- “1. réunion, assemblée d’hommes, de personnes ou de démons, 2. famille, femme et enfants”, ʕišr-at- “société, réunion de plusieurs personnes de connaissance ou liées d’amitié” [BK II 261–2] ||| Eg. ʕš3.t “multitude, company, Menge” (OK, Wb I 229, 6–8). (2) Semantically even better appears the comparison (suggested by Ember 1911, 88; 1930, #5.b.6, #19.

⁴³ There are the following proposals. (1) GT: Eg. ʕ3 < *ʕr, cf. SCu. *ʕur- “strength” [Ehret 1980, 279] = WRift *ʕuru “force, strength, violence” [KM 2004, 310]. NB: This SCu. root is to be separated from SCu.: Iraqw ur [ʔur] “big, large” [Wtl. 1953, 98], which has ʔ- in the Anlaut, cf. NWRift *ʔur- “big, gown, many, numerous” [KM 2004, 309] (contra Hodge 1993, 339–340). (2) A.Ju. Militarev compared Ar. ʕurʕur-at- “top of mountain”, Hadramaut ʕurr “mountain” (Ar.-Eg.: MM 1983, 167). Semantically dubious. (3) Others suggest Eg. ʕ3 < *ʕl = Sem. *ʕly “to be high, ascend” > esp. Ar. ʕaliyy- “lofty, great, exalted” [Ember] (Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1917, 86–87, #125; 1930, #3.c.12; Vrg. 1945, 130; Chn. 1947, #58; Hodge 1993, 339–340). Note that SBrb. *a-lu “big” cannot be related, the underlying AA root being *l-w [GT]. (4) Or cf. Sem. bicons. *ʕl “to be expensive, profit” [Zbr. 1971, #65]? (5) Hodge’s (1968, 22) equation with Somali ʕān “well-known” is phonologically untenable.

⁴⁴ Note that Eg. ʕr can have nothing to do with Akk. gll “rollen, wälzen” (contra Schenkel 1993, 142).

⁴⁵ For Eg.-Sem.: Trb. 1902, 199; Ember 1917, 88, #135; 1930, #3.b.4; Alb. 1918, 92; 1931, 150; Vrg. 1945, 128, #1.c.8; Chn. 1947, #47; Hodge 1976, 15, #165; Blv. 1989, 15; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 65; OS 1990, 88, #17.

f.1; Chn. 1947, #47) with Sem. *ʕr, cf. Hbr. ʕsr “to be rich” [E m b e r] || Ar. ʕatara “to be luxuriant” [E m b e r]. Rejected in E m b e r 1917, 88, #135, although Eg. š = Sem. *t is attested.

Eg. ʕš3 “lizard” (NK, FD 49; EG 1927, 465: I1): combined by Schneider (1997, 196, #22) with Sem. *zhl: Hbr. zhl “to creep (of snakes)”, Jaram. zhl: zāḥlā “die noch kriechende, ungeflügelte Heuschrecke” || Ar. zhl “sich verkriechen” (Sem.: GB 196). False. (1) The Sem. root has clearly a different Eg. etymology, whereby the medial *-ḥ- in Sem. is a root complement, cf. OEg. z3j ~ z3w [< *zly/w] “to creep” (OK, FD 208) = “schleichen, sich einschleichen, sich fortschleichen” (Wb III 418, 15). (2) At the same time, Eg. ʕš3 [< *ʕšr] = NOM. *zar- “lizard” [Bnd. 1988, 151]⁴⁶.

Eg. ʕd “wohlbehalten, unversehrt, intakt sein” (MK, Wb I 237–238; GHWb 165) = “to be safe, whole” (FD 51): compared by Schneider (1997, 197, #23) with Sem. *zqq “sehen, läutern”. Semantically weak. According to the traditional conception, Eg. (MK, Wb I 237–238) finds a perfect match in AA *ʕ(y)-ĉ “1. to be unripe, fresh, 2. to prosper” [GT]⁴⁷. Its Arabic reflex displays the very same shift of meaning, cf. ʕadda I “être plein de vigueur, de sève, de jeunesse (se dit d’un homme, d’une plante)”, II “être dans le bien-être, prospérer”, ʕadd- “1. frais, tendre, nouveau, 2. plein de vigueur et de santé (homme)” [BK II 473–4]. The other traditional etymologies of Eg. ʕd (not *ʕnd) seem less convincing.⁴⁸

Eg. ʕd “to hack up” (OK, Wb I 238): compared by Schneider (1997, 197, #24) with Ar. zqq “schinden”. Semantically weak: “to hack up” and “schinden” are not so close. Moreover, Ar. zqq “schinden” may be a secondary sense, cf. Ar. zqq “läutern”. For the true cognates of Eg. ʕd (from AA *ʕ-g “to dig” [GT]) see the section for Eg. ʕ = Sem. *d.

Eg. wʕn ~ wʕr [*wʕl] “ein Nadelholz” (OK, Wb I 285, 16) = “*Wacholder, *rotfrüchtiger Sadebaum, *Juniperus phoenicea” (GHWb 185): compared by Rössler (1971, 291) with Ar. wazal- “Ginster”. The origin of Eg. wʕn is still obscure⁴⁹.

Eg. ḥmʕ “to seize, grasp” (PT, FD 191; Wb III 281–2): compared by Rössler (1971, 291) with Ar. ʕmz “to touch (with the hand)” and Bed. ʕmd (sic) “to seize, grasp”. False. Even the Ar. and the Bed. comparanda are clearly unrelated⁵⁰, let alone the fully

⁴⁶ E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 171) connected Eg. “lizard” with Nubian: Kunuzi-Dongola aši, Mahasi aža(r) “Gecko”.

⁴⁷ Cf. Sem. *ʕdd: Ar. ʕdd [BK] (discussed above) || Bed. yaḍaʕ “feucht, nass, unreif sein” [Rn. 1895, 241] || LECu.: PSam *ʕaydi “unripe” [Heine 1978, 77] || SCu. *ʕEĉ- [*-ĉ- < *ĉ-] “unripe, raw” [GT after Ehret 1980, 277] || WCh.: Diri yaḍa “unripe, wet” [Skn. 1977, 47]. Cf. Hodge 1968, 27 (Ar.-Eg.); Dlg. 1987, 209, #104 (SCu.-LECu.).

⁴⁸ These are: (1) Ar. ʕlg I “surpasser qqn. dans le traitemen d’une maladie”, III “1. manier, manipuler un objet entre les mains, le travailler ..., 2. traiter une affaire ..., 3. rivaliser avec qqn.” [BK II 338] = III: ʕālaḡa “kräftig, gesund sein” [Vrg.] = “to cure, treat (medically), restore” [Alb.] || Geez ʕallaga “to defeat, vanquish” [Lsl. 1987, 60] (suggested by Alb. 1918, 238; E m b e r 1930, #5.a.14; Clc. 1936, #137; Vrg. 1945, 135, #9.b.2, 146, #24.a.1). (2) Sem. *ʕzz “to be strong, powerful” (see Ward 1962, 412, fn. 3; 1968, 69). (3) ECu. *ʕēg- “to watch, look out” [Sasse 1982, 67] || SBrb. (Tuareg) agg “bewachen”. See Rsl. 1964, 207 (LECu.-SBrb.); OS 1992, 176 (Eg.-LECu.).

⁴⁹ No connection with CCh.: Logone wahan “wood”, Gulfei wān “firewood” (as suggested in HSED #2503).

⁵⁰ Bed. amid- is a variant of Bed. amit- “to seize, grip, grasp” [Rn. 1895, 19], which may be related to HECu. *abad- “to hold, seize” [Hds. 1989, 80]; Darasa (Gedeo) abid-, Hadiya amad-, Sidamo amad-, in which Hudson supposes an original *-b- (and not *-m-).

different basic sense of the Ar. root⁵¹. On the other hand, Eg. ḥm^ʕ and perhaps OK jḥḥm “*wegnehmen” (PT 61b, 89c, ÄWb I 211; GHWb 99) are both related with PCh. *q-H-m “to seize” [GT]⁵². Note also the remotely related isogloss represented by NEg. ḥm (GW ḥ3m) “besitzen, festhalten an etwas” (NE, Wb III 231, 8–10) = “to possess, gain mastery etc.” (DLE II 161) and Brb. *k-m “to hold” (< AA *q̣-m) [GT] ||l SCu. *kam-/*kom- “to hold” [Ehret]⁵³ < AA *q-m [GT].

X. The examples for Rössler's Eg. ʕ = Sem. *d

Eg. j^ʕb “vereinigen” (OK, Wb I 40–41): see the section for Eg. j vs. Sem. *g.

Eg. ʕ³ “(den Speichel) spritzen” (PT, Wb I 166, 16): equated by Rössler (1971, 288) with Hbr. zrr “niesen”, Ar. drrr “ausstreuen”. False. For the correct etymology see the section on the Rösslerian inner “evidence” for Eg. ʕ ~ d.

Eg. ʕw3 “to go bad, rot” (PT, FD 39) = “verderben, faulen” (Wb I 172, 3–4): identified by Schneider (1997, 196, #16) with Hbr. zwr pual “widerlich sein, stinken” || Ar. dyr I “stinken” (sic!), II “mit Mist beschmieren”. False. Ar. dyr I “stinken” is not attested in any of the standard dictionaries (BK, Lane, Dozy). Moreover, Schneider confused two distinct Sem. roots. As for Sem. *dwr, its basic meaning of the is hardly in agreement with that of Eg. ʕw3⁵⁴. As for Sem. *dyr, it was a distinct root with a different Eg. reflex⁵⁵. The etymology of Eg. ʕw3 is also quite different (*ʕwr/l)⁵⁶.

Eg. ʕff “Fliege” (MK, Wb I 182, 14–16): compared by Rössler (1971, 288), Schenkel (1993, 141), and Loprieno (1995, 31) with Sem. *dVbb- “Fliege”

⁵¹ Ar. ʕamaza I “1. faire un signe, 4. percer, paraître (se dit d'un défaut, d'un vice), 5. boiter, clocher et pencher d'un côté plus que de l'autre (se dit d'une bête de somme), 6. palper une bête pour s'assurer si elle est grasse” [BK II 503–4] can hardly be a cognate to a root with the sense “to seize”.

⁵² Attested in WCh.: Hausa káámà “to seize hold of” [Abr. 1962, 463] | Angas-Sura *kaʕam “to seize” [GT 2004, 161]; Angas kaam “1. to seize, catch, 2. press on, squeeze, 3. throttle” [Flk. 1915, 207] = kàam (Ks) “to seize sg. with teeth or mouth” [Jng. 1962 MS, 16], Sura kàʕam “festhalten, festlegen” [Jng. 1963, 68] | Karekare kum “herausnehmen, aufnehmen” [Lks. 1966, 202] | Geji kàmi & Buli kəmu “to lift” [Mkr.] (WCh.: Mkr. 1987, 315) || CCh.: Gidar gəma “to take” [Grb.] (Gidar-Hausa: Grb. 1963, 61, #63).

⁵³ Based on NBrb.: Tuat & Gurara & Rif-Botiwa & Nefusa a-kkīm “tenir” (NBrb.: Bst. 1887, 428) || SCu.: Dahalo kam- “to hold” | PRift *kom- “to hold, have” [GT]: Iraqw kom-, Burunge kom- | Asa kom-, Qwadza kom-os- (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 241) ||l SOM.: Hamar hAm- “to hold, keep” [Bnd. 1994, 152]. Lit. for Eg.-AA: IS 1984, #376; OS 1992, 198; HSED #2033.

⁵⁴ Cf. Hbr. zwr qal “Ekel erregen, widrig sein” [GB 196] || Ar. dwr “effrayer, faire peur à qqn.”, cf. dyr (daʕira, dāra) I “avoir en horreur, avoir de la répugnance pour qqn.”, II “éloigner, écarter (particul., le petit chameau et l'empêcher de têter sa mère” [BK I 788, 790] (Sem.: DRS 325–6).

⁵⁵ Cp. Ar. diyār- ~ dīʕār- “fresh camels” or similar dung (mixed with dust or earth” [Lane 990] = dīʕār- ~ diyār- ~ dīr-at- “fiente mêlée de boue, terre” [BK I 761, 790] | Sgt. zirho “dirt” [Lsl. 1938, 155] (Sem.: DRS 325–6) ||l Eg. zr (or sr?) “Schmutz” (GR, Wb IV 191, 14).

⁵⁶ It may be a variant of Eg. ḥw3 [*ḥwl] “faulig sein” (PT, Wb III 50) = “to rot, putrefy, be foul, offensive” (FD 166), hence ḥw3.w “Fäulnisgeruch, Gestank” (Med., Wb III 51, 6–7), cognate to SCu. *Hol- “to smell bad” [GT]: Qwd. ol- “to be rotten” | DhI. hul- “to smell bad”, ḥull-a “odor” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 298). Or – less probably – it might be combined with Ar. ʕwr: ʕawira “2. être gâté”, but its basis sense may be again different, cf. ʕāra “détruire” [BK II 404].

III NBrb.: Rif i-zebb “Fliege” etc. (for Sem.-Brb. see Rsl. 1983, 333). This Eg.-Sem. comparison was excluded already by H. Holma (1919, 37) and later by W.A. Ward (1985, 239). Moreover, Eg. ^ʿff has a fully different etymology⁵⁷. At the same time, A.Ju. Militarev and O.V. Stolbova (1990, 57-58) convincingly equated Sem. *dVbb- “fly” with Eg. zb.t (coll.) “Ungeziefer” (MK, Wb III 432, 14) → Cpt. (S) CIB “Zecke, Laus, Ungeziefer” (KHW 176)⁵⁸.

Eg. ^ʿrq “klug, verständig sein, verstehen, kennen” (MK, Wb I 212): compared by Schneider (1997, 196, #20) with Ar. dalq-, daliq- “spitz, scharf, zungefertig, redegewandt”. False. The basic sense of the Ar. root dlq was fully different from that of Eg. ^ʿrq⁵⁹. The traditional etymology (suggested in Vrg. 1945, 137, #10.b.6; Chn. 1947, #45) for Eg. ^ʿrq [< *ʿlq?], in turn, is satisfactory both in form and sense, cf. Ar. ^ʿaqala “6. comprendre, entendre, connaître, avoir de l’intelligence, saisir qqch. en homme d’esprit, d’intelligence”, ^ʿāqil- “intelligent, sensé, sage, qui a de la raison” [BK II 319–321] = ^ʿaqila “klug sein, verstehen” [Vrg.]. This is the most probable cognate of Eg. ^ʿrq⁶⁰.

Eg. nḥ “1. (PT) (das Gewölk) vertreiben, 2. (MK) sich eilig davon machen” (Wb II 252, 4–6; ÄWb I 624) = “1. to remove, 2. grasp” (CT, DCT 222): compared by Rössler (1971, 288) with Ar. nbd “wegwerfen”. Disprovable. Rejected already by Ward (1985, 239). The traditional theory offers more convincing parallels, a.o. MSA *nḥy “to throw (away)” [GT], that can be traced back to a common biconsonantal AA *n-p [GT]⁶¹ (also the -^ʿ of Eg. nḥ may be a secondary root complement).

⁵⁷ It has been combined with Sem. *^ʿwp “to fly” and NBrb. *āfiy “to fly” (see Hommel 1915, 18; Chn. 1947, #65; Wlf. 1955, 139; Vcl. 1983, 21; 1990, 47; Hodge 1990, 644, #3.b). On the other hand, interesting areal parallel has been observed by L. Bender (1975, 164) in and Igbo ifè “Fliege”. V. Blažek’s (1991, 53, #33) comparison with SCu.: Burunge afa, Asa ʾafo-tok “natural beehive” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 372) is less convincing.

⁵⁸ Note that Sem. *ḡbb can hardly have anything in common with Eg. dm “to be sharp” || LECu.: Somali dab-ayya “to haft” || WCh.: Hausa zumàà “honey, bee” as suggested by C.T. Hodge (1976, 11, #28).

⁵⁹ Cf. Ar. dalaqa “1. aiguïser, affiler (un couteau, etc.), 2. être bien affilé (se dit, *au fig.*, de la langue d’un homme), 3. abattre, affaiblir, énerver (se dit des jeunes ou d’un vent chaud qui affaiblissent l’homme)” [BK I 779–780].

⁶⁰ Its equation with Bed. erh ~ irh ~ reh ~ rih “to see” [Rpr. 1928, 153] || Agaw *ʾarq- “to know” [Apl. 1989, 6; 1991, 23] (suggested in Rn. 1884, 341; 1895, 29; Vrg. 1945, 137, #10.b.6; Chn. 1947, #45; OS 1992, 178; HSED #1074; Orel 1995, 104, #62) seems semantically somewhat weaker. Moreover, the Cu. root is cognate rather with Eg. rh “to know”. E. Zyhlarz’ (1934, 117) comparison of Eg. ^ʿrq with Brb. *l-γ “to be good” is false. Cp. instead OEg. 3h [< *lh] “splendid etc.” (OK, FD 4).

⁶¹ (1) Jbl. nḥy “(weg)werfen, weglegen (ein Kind)” [Bittner 1917, 54] = nḥy [Jns. 1977] = nḥy [Jns. 1987], Hrs. nḥy: nḥy “to throw” [Jns. 1977, 94], Mehri nḥy “to throw” [Jns. 1987, 283] = nḥy [Jns. 1977] = nḥy [Jahn]. (2) Ar. nḥ VIII “2. laisser qqch. chez qqn., la lui abandonner” [BK II 1295] | Jbl. nḥ: naʿáf “to chase”, nḥ “to chase, run after” [Jns. 1981, 178]. (3) Sem. *npy: Akk. (O/YBab.) ne/apūm “fortführen” [AHW 779] || Ug. npy “verstossen” [WUS #1816] || Ar. nḥy/w: nafa “chasser, expulser, bannir” [BK II 1317] = “vertreiben, verstossen” [WUS], Dathina nḥy “expulser, chasser” [GD 2810] | Jbl. nḥy: ntūfi (refl.) “sich entfernen” [Bittner 1917, 54] || NBrb.: Izdeg nḥy “proscrire (homme)” [Mrc. 1937, 206]. See also HSED #1894 (Eg.-Akk.). (4) Sem. *npp [GT]: MHbr. npp piel “treiben lassen” [Dalman 1922, 274] || Dathina nḥf “repousser brusquement, donner un coup transversal” [GD 2804] || NBrb.: perhaps Qabyle a-nḥ “sécarter du chemin, 2. laisser”, ss-inef écartier, dévier, reporter” [Dlt. 1982, 547]. Note that Eg. nḥ can hardly be related with Ar. nḥg “to jump up” [Lsl.] || SBrb. *n-f-g “sich schnell erheben, aufstehen” [Vcl.] (as suggested in Vcl. 1933, 180, #10; 1934, 84; Lsl. 1962, 47, #28), since Eg. -^ʿ does not derive from AA *-g.

Eg. r^ʕ (or **r^ʕ.w**) “sun” (OK, Wb II 401, 5): compared by Schneider (1993, 81; 1997, 200, #52) with Ar. laḏaʕa “brennen, versengen, stechen (Feuer usw.)”. False. It is clear and generally accepted⁶² that Eg. r^ʕ (act. *rj^ʕ, cf. cuneiform -rija > Cpt. **PH**) “sun” is cognate with Ar. ryʕ V “2. briller (l’huile, la graisse)”, rayʕ- “6. éclat du jour à l’heure de midi” [BK I 962] = rayʕ- “Helligkeit des Tages” [Vcl.] and Ar. r^ʕr^ʕ “2. briller” [BK I 881] = “glänzen” [Vcl.] III WCh.: Zaranda ri “sun” [Smz. 1978, 32], Geji li ~ ri “sun” [Stl.]. Less probable is an equation of Eg. r^ʕ with AA *l-ʕ “to shine (sun)” [GT]⁶³.

XI. The examples for Rössler’s Eg. ʕ = Sem. *ḏ (*ṣ)

Eg. j^ʕj “to wash” (OK, Wb I 39): compared with Ar. waḏuʕa “sauber werden” (Rsl. 1971, 293; Voigt 1992, 42). According to the traditional conception, Eg. j^ʕj could be cognate with ECu. *yaʕ-/yāʕ- “to flow away” [Sasse 1982, 192], cf. also HECu. *waʕ-a [-ʕ- reg. < *-ʕ-] “water” [Hds. 1989, 423] and SCu.: WRift *wāʕ “to vomit, flood, gush out” [KM 2004, 312]. The semantic shift “to wash” ~ “to flow” is evident⁶⁴. A.B. Dolgopolsky (1988, 631, #17) equated ECu. *yaʕ-/yāʕ- with Sem. *hyʕ (prefix *h-?) “to flow” [Dlg.], cf. OSA (Sabaean) hyʕ “to flow, run (of water)” [Beeston] = hyʕ “to offer a sacrifice” [Rhodokanakis] = “to pour out libation” [Lundin] (OSA: SD 57) and Ar. hyʕ I “3. couler et se répandre, 10. vomir” [BK II 1467-8] = hyʕ “to fuse (lead), flow, be spread, vomit” [Dlg.]. Secondary *h- in Sem.?

Eg. ʕw3j “rauben” (OK, Wb I 171) = “to steal, rob” (OK, FD 39): equated by Schneider (1997, 196, #16) with Ar. ḏw/yr “to harm, injure”. Even semantically very weak. Schneider confused two distinct roots. (1) It is generally accepted (WUS #2353; Zbr. 1971, #46; Blv. 1993, 34, #9) that the Ar. root is cognate with Hbr. ṣwr “to bring into straits, be hostile”, ṣrr “to show hostility”, OSA ḏr “war, enemy”, Ar. ḏrr “to harm, injure”, which

⁶² For Eg.-Ar. see Clc. 1936, #65; Chn. 1947, #414; Vcl. 1959, 30; 1959, 73; Vrg. 1965, 85; IS 1976, #346. For Eg.-SBAuchi: OS 1989, 131; 1990, 90, #46; Orel 1995, 147; HSED #2088.

⁶³ Attested in Ar. lʕlʕ I “2. briller d’un mouvement oscillatoire comme le mirage”, laʕlaʕ- “mirage ou vapeur que l’on voit dans un désert, surtout à midi, par un jour de chaleur” [BK II 1002-3] = V “to flash, gleam”, laʕl- “garnet, ruby” [Eilers 1978, 130] III Guanche: perhaps Gran Canaria a-lío “sun” [Mlt.] III LECu.: Saho läläʕ, pl. leläʕe “Tag” [Rn. 1890, 248] = lelleʕ, pl. lelläʕe “day” [Welmers] = lalaʕ “1. day, 2. time” [Flm.], Afar laʕó ~ loʕó, pl. loʕá “1. der Tag, 2. der Ost, Sonnenaufgang”, läläʕ, pl. leläʕ “Tag” [Rn. 1886, 873-5] = lo/aʕo “day” [Colizza] = lāʕo “east”, loʕo “daytime” [PH 1985, 152, 156] I Somali mīleʕ “1. Sonnenglut, -Hitze, -Glanz, 2. die Sonne” [Rn. 1902, 295], Isaq mīleʕ “Sonnenglanz” [Abr.] (ECu.: Flm. 1969, 23; Dlg. 1973, 163) III WCh.: perhaps Gerka laa “red” [Jng. 1965, 174], Montol laa [unless l- < *s-] “aufgehen (Sonne)” [Jng. 1965, 171], cf. also Angas le-ke [le reg. < *lā₂] “ascending” (cf. AS *kā₂, orig. *kay “to mount”) [ALC 1978, 32] I Daffo-Butura leʕ “anbrechen (Tag)” [Jng. 1970, 217]. Lit. for the Eg.-AA etymology: Rn. 1878, 136 et l.c.; Alb. 1927, 223; Clc. 1936, #65; Chn. 1947, #414; Flm. 1969, 23; Dlg. 1973, 163; IS 1976, #346; Dj. etc. 1986, 70, fn. 26; OS 1992, 173. A.B. Dolgopolsky (1973, 163) compared also SCu.: WRift *loʕ-/leʕ- “sun” [GT]: Irq. lōʕa “sun, god” [Wtl.] = lōʕā “sun, mirror, God, day” [Mgw. 1989, 117], Brg. le-tu “sun” [Wtl.], Alg. leleʕa “sun” [Wtl.] (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 25, #102), although SCu. *ʕ- < *ʕ- is irregular.

⁶⁴ Cf. e.g. PIE *plew- “rinnen, fließen”: hence i.a. Gk. πλύνω “I wash”, OHGerm. flouwen, flewen “waschen, spülen”, Lith. caus. pláuju “wasche, spüle” (IEW 835-836).

have fully different Eg. cognates⁶⁵. (2) On the other hand, the AA cognates of Eg. ^ʿw3j [act. *^ʿwry] are also different. It has a well-known⁶⁶ correspondence Sem. *^ʿṣwr “to raid” [GT]⁶⁷, supported by further cognates from Chadic, cf. WCh.: Angas-Sura *^ʿṣər (pl., from *^ʿṣir?) “to pick up and collect (a load?)” [GT]⁶⁸.

Eg. ^ʿbnḥ “frog” (Med., Wb I 178, 16): compared by Rössler (1971, 293) and Voigt (1992, 42) with Ar. ḏfďʿ: ḏifďiʿ-, ḏifdaʿ-, ḏafdaʿ-, ḏufdaʿ- “frog”. In Rössler’s view, the following rules operated here: Eg. ^ʿ = Sem. *ḏ, Eg. b = Sem. *p, Eg. n = Sem. *d (!), Eg. ḥ = Sem. ^ʿ, none of which is regular in the “traditional” frameworks. The equation of Eg. n = Sem. *d is incorrect even according to the Rösslerian principles. Moreover, MEg. ^ʿbnḥ “frog” can be better explained as a parallel of SOM.: Ari fanqá, Hamer fanʿa “frog” (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 150) || CCh.: Ngwahyi bənžà [< *bəŋga] “frog” [Krf. 1981], which represent an African areal *Wanderwort*, cf. Nilo-Saharan: PKoman *bāŋko “frog” [Bnd. 1983, 281]. These data clearly discard Rössler’s artificial and far-fetched comparison.

Eg. ^ʿḥ.t “farm-land” (OK, FD 46) = “Acker, bestelltes Feld” (Wb I 214, 5-6): compared by Voigt (1992, 42) with Ar. ḏayʿ-at- “Landgut”. False. (1) The Sem./Eg. etymology of Ar. ḏayʿ-at- (orig. *^ʿ“waste”?) may be quite different⁶⁹. (2): On the other hand, Eg. ^ʿḥ.t may be < *3ḥ.t ~ *jḥ.t [< *lḥ.t] = OEg. 3ḥ.t [*lḥ.t] “field, arable land, earth” (OK, FD 4) = “Acker(erde)” (Wb I 12, 17-18) || Ch. *l-y < *l-H (?) “earth, field” [GT]⁷⁰.

Eg. w^ʿb “(to be) pure” (OK, FD 57) = “reinigen, rein sein” (Wb I 280-2): compared by Rössler (1971, 293) and Voigt (1992, 42) with Ar. wḏb II “herrichten” [Rsl.] = “ajuster, assortir, accomoder” [DRS]. Perfectly false. (1) Semantically very weak. (2) Moreover, this proposal is all the more mistaken, because the conventional sound correspondences provide a semantically evident cognate of Eg. w^ʿb, in which, besides,

⁶⁵ Namely, Eg. ḏ3tj.t.w (pl. “Widersacher” (PT, Wb V 519, 1) = “opponents” (FD 319), ḏ3ḏ3 “hostile, enemy” (GR, Wb V 532-3). As for Ar. ḏwr, ḏyr, ḏrr, cp. also Eg. ḏrt “harm (?)” (NK Mag., FD 328) = “*Schaden” (GHWb 1011).

⁶⁶ For Eg.-Sem./AA cf. Embert 1917, 86, #122; 1930, #5.b.3; Djik. etc. 1986, 55; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 63; HSED #1024.

⁶⁷ Cf. Ar. ṣwr: ṣāra “7. faire une excursion contre une tribu et y enlever des troupeaux”, cf. also ṣyr: ṣāra I “2. commettre des ravages, faire main basse sur le bien des autres (se dit d’un homme), 3. enlever, emporter” [BK II 515, 418] = III: ṣāwara “to make a raid”, ṣār-at- “raid, predatory incursion” [Embert] || MSA: Harsusi ṣwr: ṣwīr “to distract, keep someone’s attention off”, šewṣor “to raid” [Jns. 1977, 47], Jibbali ṣwr: ṣyber ~ ṣyber “to raid, invade” [Jns. 1981, 91], Mehri ṣwr: ṣwīr “to distract, attract away someone’s attention”, ṣorət “raid” [Jns. 1987, 145]. A secondary contamination of this root with *ṣwr “to descend” is possible (esp. in Ar.).

⁶⁸ Attested in: Angas ṣur “1. to pick up, pick up (of many things such as stones, or the many articles comprising a load), 2. also to pillage, loot (in war)” [Flk. 1915, 187] = ṣər (pl. of ḏap) “aufnehmen, einsammeln” [Jng. 1962 MS] = ḥər “to pick up” [ALC 1978, 21] = ṣir (pl. “to pick up” [Gochal 1994, 73], Sura ṣər (pl. “aufnehmen, übernehmen, in Besitz nehmen, haben, tragen” [Jng. 1963, 73], Mupun ḥər “to collect, pick up” [Frj. 1991, 22], Mushere ir “load” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 97]. Note that the correspondence of Angas-Sura *ṣ vs. Sem. *ṣ vs. Eg. ^ʿ seems regular.

⁶⁹ It is hard to separate it from SWSem. *ḏyʿ “to be wasted”, cf. Ar. ḏyʿ “to perish, come to nought, pass away, become lost” [Lane 1812] | Harsusi žyʿ “to spoil”, žāyeʿ “something thrown away which is found useful by its finder” [Jns. 1977, 152], Jibbali žyʿ: žēʿ “to become thin, go to waste, get lost” [Jns. 1981, 327], Mehri žyʿ ~ žwʿ: žāwya “to get lost” [Jns. 1987, 478] || Eg. ḏʿ [< *ḥʿ] “wüst liegen” (XIX., Wb V 534, 12) || WCh.: perhaps Mupun čī “lack” [Frj. 1991, 9]. For Sem.-Scu. see Dlg. 1987, 208, #96.

⁷⁰ Attested in WCh.: Buli le “field, farm” [Gowers] || CCh.: Mofu léy “Feld, Acker” [Brt.] | Daba lay “earth, soil (Erde, Boden)”, lay biz “Feld, Acker” [LG] | Buduma ló “earth, soil” [Lks.] = lòd [Cyffer] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 117, 134-5).

the *w-* mobile was not even part of the primary root, cf. Eg. *ʿb.w* “purification, purity” (OK, FD 40; Wb I 175, 13-15) ||| Sem.: Akk. *G ebēbu* “to be clean, pure”, D *ubbubu* “to clean, purify” [AHW 180-1] ||| CCh.: PHigi **y[a]b-* [met. < **Hab-*] “to wash” [GT]: Higi-Nkafa *yəḅu-*, Kapsiki *yaḅu-*, Fali-Gili *ʿyēḅa-*, Higi-Ghye *yaḅa-* | Bachama *yəḅwə* “to wash” | Kuseri *ubau* “to wash” (CCh.: Stl. l.c.) < AA **ʿ/γ-b* “to clean by washing” [GT]. This is, besides, a widely accepted AA etymology.⁷¹

Eg. *whʿ* “scorpion” (end of NK, Wb I 351, 1), cf. *whʿ* (knife det.) “vom Stechen des Skorpions” (LP, Wb I 351, 3): compared by Rössler (1971, 296) with Ar. *whd* “stechen”. Unconvincing. Eg. vs. Sem. **ḥ* are also irregular. The etymology of Eg. *whʿ* is still obscure – in spite of some promising suggestions⁷².

Eg. *nʿʿ* “smooth” (NK, FD 126): compared by Schneider (1997, 199, #42) with Ar. *naḏada* “aufschichten, ordnen, in Ordnung bringen”, *naḏīd* “übereinandergelegt, ordentlich, ebenmässig”. Semantically absurd. The Ar. basic meaning is in stem I “mettre en un tas (les tapis, les nattes)”, hence II “mettre en ordre les uns sur les autres les tapis, les nattes, les feutres” [BK II 1280], which clearly falls very-very far from that of Eg. *nʿʿ* “smooth”.

Eg. *hʿ* “flesh, body” (PT, FD 164; Wb III 37-39): compared by Schneider (1997, 202, #65) with Ar. *ʿiḏw-* ~ *ʿuḏw-* “membre, partie du corps” [BK II 283]. Semantically highly dubious, cf. Ar. *ʿḏw:* *ʿaḏā* “dépécer (un mouton égorgé, etc.), séparer par membres, par parties, partager” > *ʿiḏ-at-* “partie séparée, portion” [BK] (see also Lsl. 1987, 57), which, besides, seem very close to Eg. *ʿḏ* [< **ʿḏ* poss.] “(Fleisch) zerhacken, (Feinde) zerstückeln” (GR, Wb I 238, 20–21)⁷³, hence *ʿḏ.t* (knife det.) “Gemetzelt” (MK, GR, Wb I 239, 1).

Eg. *ḥfʿ* “fassen, packen” (OK, Wb III 272): rejecting Rössler’s (1971, 286, #6) comparison with Sem. **ʿbd*, Satzinger (1999, 147, #14) equated it with Ar. *qabaḏa* “to seize (with the hand or fist) and Hbr. *qḅš* “to assemble”. Impressive, but improbable. For the correct AA cognates of Eg. *ḥfʿ* see the chapter of Eg. *ʿ* vs. Sem. **d*.

Eg. *ḏʿ* “catch, spear (fish)” (MK, Wb V 534, 11; FD 320; GHWb 998): compared by Schneider (1997, 208, #117) with Ar. *qḏḏ* “durchbohren”. But the traditional sound laws can provide a semantically just as well possible (if not better) etymology.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Cf. For Eg.-Akk.: Alb. 1918, 222, fn. 1; 1923, 67; Holma 1919, 37; Ember 1930, #5.a.17; Blv. 1991, 88, #16; 1993, 53, #16. Eg.-CCh. OS 1992, 200.

⁷² (1) The “old school” (Alb. 1918, 245, fn. 1; Ember 1926, 303, #7; 1930, #5.f.7; Vrg. 1945, 133, #3.c.6) combined Eg. *whʿ* with Ar. *waḥar-at-* “poisonous lizard” [Alb.] = *waḥr-at* “sorte de lézard de couleur rouge semblable à celui qu’on appelle sammu ʿabraṣa, et dont le venin occasionne à la fois les vomissements et la diarrhée” [BK II 1499], cf. also Ug. *yḥr* “lézard venimeux” [DRS]. Semantically unconvincing, though there are typological parallels for the etymological connection between “scorpion” and “lizard”. (2) W. Vycichl (1959, 74), in turn compared Ar. *wakaʿa* “stechen (speziell vom Skorpion)”, which is more probable, as the irreg. Eg. *-ḥ-* vs. Sem. **-k-* might be explained by the incompatibility of Eg. **-kʿ*.

⁷³ Note that its contamination with OK *ʿḏ* “hacken: (Gräber, Fundamente) aushöhlen, graben” (Wb I 238, 17–18) seems more probable than a real etymological connection.

⁷⁴ No convincing Sem. cognate so far. (1) O. Stolbova (1995, 154; cf. HSED #496) identified it with her PCh. **ḥa ~ *ḥi* “to take, catch”, var. of PCh. **ḥVw- ~ *ḥVy-* “to catch fish”. (2) If, in turn, Eg. *ḏʿ* < **gʿ*, cf. CCh.: Tera *gwà* “to obtain” [Nwm. 1964, 49, #543].

Eg. db^{c} “finger” (PT, Wb V 562–5): Rössler (1971, 304–5) was inclined to consider Sem. $*^{\text{?}}\text{V-}\text{ṣba}^{\text{c}}$ - “finger” as a loan from Eg. db^{c} in order to discard the generally accepted correspondence of Eg. $-\text{c} = \text{Sem. } *-\text{c}$. As a genetically related cognate, in turn, Rössler identified Eg. db^{c} with his enigmatic PBrb. $*\text{ṣ-b-d}$ (sic) “finger”, whereby Rössler evidently referred to the Berber “finger” words, whose common etymon and etymological position is highly disputable (and which can hardly be united under the suggested reconstruction)⁷⁵. The genetic relationship of Eg. db^{c} and Sem. $*^{\text{?}}\text{V-}\text{ṣba}^{\text{c}}$ - “finger” is doubtless and generally accepted in Afro-Asiatic linguistics.⁷⁶ Besides, it was just Rössler (1952, 132, #17) who identified the Eg.-Sem. parallel with EBrb.: Ghadames ta- ḍabbu-t “Fingerring” || SBrb.: Ahaggar ta- ḍeho-t [-h- from $*-\text{b-}$] “Fingerring”.

XII. The examples for Schenkel’s Eg. $\text{c} = \text{Sem. } *g$

Eg. $\text{c}^{\text{m}^{\text{c}}3}$ “to throw the throw-stick “ (OK, FD 42) = “das Wurfholz werfen” (Wb I 186, 1), $\text{c}^{\text{m}^{\text{c}}3.t}$ “throw-stick “ (CT, FD 42) = “das Wurfholz zur Vogeljagd” (Wb I 186, 2): equated by Voigt (1992, 41) and Schenkel (1993, 141) with Akk. gamlu “Krummholz, Bumerang” [AHW 279] = “objet tordu en bois recourbé, sorte de boomerang (?)” [DRS]. Possible. Note that Akk. gamlu is related with Ug. gml “sickle” [Gordon], JPArām. gamlā “sorte de joug” [DRS, not in Sokoloff 1990], perhaps also Arām. gamlā “1. Gespann, 2. Brücke, d.h. Überbrückung durch mehrere an einander gereihete Bretter” [Levy 1924 I 341] (Sem.: WUS #661; Gordon 1955, 251, #415; DRS 139), which points to a basic meaning “to be curved”.

Eg. r “small stone, pebble” (NE, Wb I 208, 11): combined by Schenkel (1993, 142) with Akk. galālu “rollen, wälzen” and galālu “Kiesel, Quader” [AHW 273]. False. Akk. $\text{gll} < \text{AA } *g-l$ “to be round” [GT] = Eg. $*\text{ḍ}3$ “to be round” (cf. Takács 1994; 1998). Besides, Akk. galālu “pebble” is supposed to be a loan from Arām. gālāl “eig. etwas Rundes: 1. Stein, Marmor, 2. Kügelchen” [Levy 1924 I 335], thus it can hardly derive directly from Akk. gll “rollen, walzen”. For Eg. r [$*\text{c}^{\text{I}}$] $\rightarrow$ Dem. c^{I} “stone” (GD 68), cf. rather ECu. $*\text{c}^{\text{I}}\text{-al-}$ [Ss.]: Arbore el “stone”, Elmolo el “stone” (ECu.: Sasse 1979, 36).

XIII. The examples for Rössler’s Eg. $f = \text{Sem. } *b$

This phenomenon must have certainly existed but it was by no means regular. A great part of Rössler’s examples for this rule are untenable, while in the doubtless or hopeful

⁷⁵ Cf. NBrb.: Zemmur a- ṭad , pl. i- ḍubd-an [Wlf. 1955, 48] || WBrb.: Zenaga a- ḍayḍi [Chn.] || SBrb.: Tadghaq a- ssəkəḍ [Chn.], Ahaggar (?) a- ssahəḍ [Chn.] (Brb. data quoted after Chn. 1947, #310).

⁷⁶ See e.g. Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; Erman 1892, 123; Holma 1911, X; 1921, 5; Ember 1918, 31; 1930, #5.a.24; Alb. 1918, 90; 1923, 68; Farina 1924, 325; Vrg. 1945, 147, #24.c.8; Rsl. 1952, 132, #17; Lefebvre 1955, 2; Vcl. 1958, 372; 1960, 262; 1972, 179; 1990, 46; Blz. 1989 MS, 13, #35; Mlt. 1989, 129; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 54; HSED #434.

examples the Eg. *f* seem to be combinatoric (secondary) due to partial assimilation or dissimilation. The acceptable cases for Eg. *f* = Sem. **b* are discussed in the chapter of irregular consonant correspondences (above). Here I examine the problematic examples adduced by Rössler and his followers:

Eg. 3hf [**rħf*] “Esslust (?)” (MK, Wb I 19, 4) = “fever of appetite” (FD 5): identified by Rössler (1964, 213; 1971, 296, 316) with Sem. **ryb* “to be hungry” [GT]⁷⁷. Acceptable. Despite the irregularities (i.e. Eg. *-ħ-* vs. Sem. **-γ-*, Eg. *-f* vs. Sem. **-b*)⁷⁸, it seems possible with special regard to Eg. *sħ* “7” vs. Sem. **š/sb*⁷⁹.

Eg. jfd “to flee” (XVIII., FD 17) = “davonrennen (wie Wild), (einen Ort) durcheilen” (Wb I 72, 1-2): equated by Schneider (1997, 195, #10) with Ar. *ʔabiša* “behend sein” [Snd.] = “être agile et rapide à la course” [BK I 4]. Attractive. But the old theory offers for Eg. *jfd* both in form and meaning a just as well excellent match, cf. Ar. *ʔafida* “se dépêcher” [BK I 39], cf. also Ar. *fadda* “to run”⁷⁹.

Eg. ʕff “Fliege” (MK, Wb I 182, 14-16): see the section for Eg. *ʕ* vs. Sem. **ḏ*.

Eg. wzf “to be slack, sluggish” (MK, FD 68) = “faul, träge sein, säumen, zögern” (Wb I 357, 2-4) can have nothing to do with Sem. **wṭb* “to sit, dwell” as suggested by Rössler (1971, 281). This Eg.-Sem. comparison has been rightly rejected already by Ward (1985, 239) on both semantic and phonological grounds. Moreover, Eg. *wzf* < **zwf* (Belova’s law) is a good parallel of Ar. *ḏwf* “marcher lentement les pieds écartés et tournés en dehors” [BK I 789] and Ar. *zwf* “se traîner, marcher comme un malade” [BK I 1027] (Eg.-Ar.: Blv. 1987, 280; 1989, 13; 1991, 87, #5; 1993, 52; Blz. 1989, 30).

Eg. wdf “to delay, be sluggish, zögern” (OK, Wb I 388-9): equated by Rössler (1971, 287-288) and Schenkel (1993, 141) with Ar. *wḏb* “beharren”. Mistaken. Most probably, Eg. *wdf* = Ar. *daffa* “marcher lentement, se traîner (comme les bestiaux ou les reptiles)” [BK I 710] = “langsam gehen” [Clc.] (Eg.-Ar.: Clc. 1936, #29; Vrg. 1945, 145, #23.a.7; Blv. 1987, 277). Besides, we cannot exclude that Eg. *wdf* and *wzf* (and their respective Ar. cognates) are variants (interchange of Eg. *z* ~ *d*).

Eg. f3k “kahl sein” (NK, Wb I 575, 19), *f3k* “der Kahle” (XIX. copy of MK lit., Wb I 575, 20): compared by Rössler (1971, 281) and Skinner (1996, 63) with Geez *bāk* “vacuus, inanis” [Dillmann] = *bakk* “(de)void, empty, single, useless” [Lsl. 1987, 94], for which cf. also NAgaw: Bilin *bāq^w* “kahle Stelle, Glatze” [Rn.], Qwara *boh^w* “kahl, leer sein” [Rn.] | SAgaw: Awngi *boh^w* “kahl” [Rn.] || LECu.: Saho *bak^w* ~ *bāk* ~ *bāq^w* ~ *bāq* “Kahlheit, Leere, Loch in einem Kleid” [Rn. 1890, 77], Afar *bāk-ā* “Glatze” [Rn. 1886, 827] (Cu.: Dlg. 1966, 50, #1.9). Attractive but probably false. Note that Rössler’s theory does not even allow comparing Eg. *-3-* vs. Sem. *-Ø-*. The Geez-Eg. comparison

⁷⁷ Attested e.g. in Hbr. *rāʕēb* “hungry”, *rāʕāb* “hunger, famine” || Ar. *raʕba ʕilā* “to desire”, *ruʕub-* “Essgier” || Geez *rāḥab* ~ *raḥab* ~ *raḥāb* [irreg. *-ħ-* < **-γ-*] “hunger, famine” (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 468).

⁷⁸ In the framework of the traditional sound correspondences, one would expect Sem. **ryb* to be reflected by Eg. **3ʕb* ~ **jʕb* instead of Eg. *3hf*. By the way, the equally irregular Geez reflex seems to display a similar problem.

⁷⁹ For Eg.-Sem. see Ember 1930, #4.a.15; Vrg. 1945, #2.b.2, 144, #23.a.1; Hodge 1968, 22; Blv. 1987, 279; 1991, 88, #1; 1993, 53.

was rejected already by Ward (1985, 239). The traditional etymology (whereby Eg. f = Sem. *p < AA *f) explains also Eg. -3-.⁸⁰

Eg. nfr “1. (PT) (das Gewölk) vertreiben usw.” (Wb II 252, 4–6): see the section for Eg. ^ʕ = Sem. *d.

Eg. nfr “gut, schön” (OK, Wb II 253–6): erroneously combined by Schneider (1993, 81; 1997, 199, #43) with Ar. nabula “edel, grossmütig, vornehm sein”, although the Cpt. evidence⁸¹ points to an original *-r (not *-l). This observation is, besides, not new: Farina (1924, 324) already long ago compared Eg. nfr with “*Sem. nābilat* (sic) *excellent*”. In the framework of the traditional sound correspondences, Eg. nfr finds perfect match in SBrb.: Ahaggar i-frar “être bon, en bonne quantité, nombreux, abondant” [Fcd. 1951–2, 354], EWlm. & Ayr i-frar “1. être bon, de valeur, de bonne qualité, 2. de bonne quantité, nombreux, abondant, 3. vaste, spacieux, large, aéré, 4. respecté, considéré” [PAM 1998, 67] || Bed. nefir “to find pleasure in, enjoy, be sweet”, nāfir “sweet, pleasant, satisfied” [Rn. 1895, 180–1], which is generally accepted⁸².

Eg. hfr “fassen, packen” (PT, Wb III 272) = “to seize, grasp” (FD 190): see the chapter for Eg. ^ʕ = Sem. *d.

Eg. sjf “(eine Göttin) beleidigen” & “Unreinlichkeit” (XX., XXII., Wb IV 37, 3–4): identified by Rössler (1971, 281, 292) with Sem. *šʔb “to pollute” [GT]: MHbr. sʔb piel “verunreinigen” vs. siyyābā ~ sīwāʔā “schmutzig, häßlich” [Levy 1924 III 461, 503] | Aram. sʔēb “unrein sein”, pael “verunreinigen, unrein machen” [Levy], Syr. syb: pael sayyeb “contaminavit, inquinavit” [Brk.] || Ar. šāʔib-at- “sordes, macula” [Levy] || Geez šāʔabā ~ šāʔba “pollutus est”, šāʔūb ~ šāʔub ~ sʔub “pollutus, contaminatus” [Dillmann] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 524). Probably correct. With regard to the very late attestation of the Eg. and Sem. roots, W.A. Ward (1985, 234) suggested a Sem. < Eg. borrowing, which is phonologically less credible.

Eg. šfj.t (MK) ~ ššf.t (PT) “majesty, respect” (Wb IV 457–461; FD 265): compared by Schneider (1997, 206, #98) with Sem. *hbb “to love, like”. Semantically very weak. The conventional etymology seems semantically more plausible, cf. Ar. šff “to grow, increase”, šwf IV “to be high”, V “to look down from above” [Alb.] || SCu. *šaf- “to grow” [Ehret 1980, 208] || WCh.: perhaps Ron *saf “king, chief” [GT]:

⁸⁰ There are two alternatives. (1) Most probably cognate to WCh.: Ngizim párák “1. openness 2. emptiness” [Schuh 1981, 132] || SBrb.: Ahaggar ferekk-et “être ouvert (décousu, désoudé, décollé, décollé, déplié)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 346], EWlm. & Ayr fərakk-ət “s’ouvrir (fleur)” [PAM 1998, 66]. For the semantic shift “open” vs. “bare”, cf. CCh.: Bura bwong kir “bareheaded”, i.e. bwong “wide open, uncovered, vacant” + kir “head” [BED 1953, 32]. (2) On the other hand, C.T. Hodge (1966, 45, #30) equated Eg. f3k with WCh.: Hausa fārkāá “to rip and remove (cloth-rags)”, cf. fārkā ~ fālkā “to rip” [Abr. 1962, 247, 255]. Further Chadic cognates: CCh. *f-l-k [GT]: Mada fallówák “complètement édenté” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 105], Mafa fālāka’a ~ fālāk-fālākka’a “édenté” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 136] | Musgu-Pus fulki “éplucher, décortiquer ou égrainer à la main” [Trn. 1991, 88], Vulum fūlkí “éplucher, décortiquer” [Trn. 1978, 293] || ECh.: Bidiya poròk “déplumer” [AJ 1989, 108] < Ch. *f-r-k (or *f-r-k?) “to pluck out” [GT]?

⁸¹ Cf. (S) **noqp** “gut sein”, (S) **noyṛe** ~ **noṛpe**, (SAA₂) **naṛpe**, (B) **noyṛi** [< fem. nfr.t] “Nutzen, Vorteil” etc. (KHW 133).

⁸² For the Eg.-SBrb.-Bed. etymology see: Rn. 1895, 181; Embere 1917, 21; Alb. 1927, 220; Zhl. 1932–33, 169; Chn. 1947, #458; Vcl. 1960, 260–261; Djk. 1965, 46; Blz. 1982, 244; 1992, 138; 1992, 141, #10; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 52; HCVA 1, #64.

Daffo-Butura sâf, Sha sâf, Kulere saf (Ron: Jng. 1970, 388; JI 1994 II, 72). See Alb. 1918, 249 (Eg.-Ar.); Dlg. 1987, 200, #41 (Ar.-SCu.).

XIV. The sole (!) example for Rössler's Eg. r = Sem. *g

Eg. wrd “to grow weary, tire” (PT, FD 65) = “müde werden” (Wb I 337-8): equated by Rössler (1971, 306) with Sem. *wg^c “to tire” [GT]⁸³. Hardly correct, since (1) we should assume a far-fetched metathesis (i.e., Eg. *wrg < *wgr ~ *wgγ < *wg^c?), (2) and there is a much more probable correspondence (according to Belova's law: *wld < *wlg < *lwg) for it in EWlm. & Ayr a-lāwag “fatigue, maigreur, faiblesse”, ə-lwəg “être fatigué, maigre, faible” [PAM 2003, 502]. Note that the rest of the alternative etymologies for both Eg. wrd⁸⁴ and Sem. *wg^c⁸⁵ are not better than Rössler's proposal.

XV. The examples for Rössler's Eg. ḥ = Sem. *γ

Eg. 3ḥf [*rḥf] “Esslust (?)” (MK, Wb I 19, 4) = “fever of appetite” (FD 5): see the chapter for Eg. f = Sem. *b.

Eg. wh3 “to be foolish, act stupidly” (MK, FD 68) = “töricht sein” (Wb I 354): compared by Schneider (1997, 197, #26) with Ar. wayāra ~ wayīra “heiss, zornig sein”. Semantically wrong. Besides, Eg. wh3 [*wḥr] may be related with WCh.: Angas goor “a lunatic, idiot” [Flk. 1915, 189] (Angas g- = Eg. ḥ- are regular).

Eg. ph3 “to split, open” (MK, FD 93; Wb I 542-3): combined by Rössler (1971, 298, 317) with Sem. *pyr: Hbr. p^cr “to open wide”, Ar. fayāra “to open”. The *communis opinio* is, however, that Eg. ph3 = *phl, met. of *plḥ, cf. Ar. falaḥa “pourfendre, couper en deux”, II “frapper qqn.” [BK II 629]⁸⁶ III ECh.: Bidiya palāk “bifurquer, abandonner” [AJ 1989, 106].

Eg. rh “to know” (OK, FD 151; Wb II 442-5): compared by Schneider (1997, 200, #54) with the reflexes of Sem. *lγ- “to stutter, speak nonsense”⁸⁷. Even semantically

⁸³ Cf. Akk. wg⁴: egū “ermüden” [AHW 191] || Hbr. yg^c [*wg^c] qal “1. ermüdet sein, 2. sich bemühen, arbeiten”, yāgēā “1. ermattend, sich abmühend, 2. müde” [GB 283] || Ar. waḡī'a “Schmerz leiden” [AHW].

⁸⁴ Sem. *wg^c may not be related to Eg. wgg “feebleness, weakness, misery” (MK, FD 71) either (as suggested in Alb. 1918, 220; ESS 1930, #23.a.10; Vrg. 1945, 128, #1.a.2). For Eg. wgg (< *gwγ?) cf. rather WCh.. Sura gōk [*-g] “Krankheit” [Jng. 1963, 66], Mupun gōk [-g] “to be slim, sick” [Frj. 1991, 20].

⁸⁵ The alternatives are: (1) Alb. 1918, 227, #36; E m b e r 1930, #12.b.6, #24.a.9: Eg. wrd < *wlg = Sem.: Ar. walaḡa “to enter”. (2) Clc. 1931, 37; Vrg. 1945, 147, #24.c.2: Eg. wrd < *brd ~ *rbd = Sem. *rbd: Akk. rbṣ “liegen, ruhen”, Aram. rb “sich lagern”, Ar. rbd “sich lagern”. (3) Brk. 1932, 104, #22: Eg. wrd ~ met. *dwr = Ar. dwr V “sich vor Schmerz oder Hunger krümmen”, d?l: ḡa?ula “schwach sein”, dūl-at-, later du?l-at- “Schwäche, Müdigkeit”. (4) GT: most probably, Eg. wrd derives from *wlg < *lwg (B e l o v a's law) ~ SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr. a-lawag “fatigue, faiblesse” [PAM 2003, 502].

⁸⁶ Sem.-Eg.: E m b e r 1911, 88; 1917, 88, fn. 2; 1930, #3.c.11; B e h n k 1927, 81, fn. 1; Clc. 1936, #190; Vrg. 1945, 130, #1.d.13; Chn. 1947, #370; K n u d s e n 1962, 34; IS 1966, 29; HCVA 1, #38; HSED #1929.

⁸⁷ Cf. Hbr. l^c (or l^y or lw^c?) “irre reden” [GB 38] = “speak inconsiderately” [Lsl. 1969] = “to stutter” [Lsl. 1987] || Ar. lγw: laḡā “1. parler, 2. dire des choses futiles, tenir des discours vains” [BK II 1006] vs. lγy: laḡiya “scwatzen,

absurd. Moreover, Sem. *ly- has been convincingly equated with Eg. 3^{cc} [*l^{cc} < *lyy] “to gibber, speak a foreign language” (NE, DLE I 2)⁸⁸. Thirdly, as is well known, Eg. rḥ corresponds to PCu. *ʔarQ- “to see, know” [GT] Bed. erh “sehen, schauen, erblicken” [Rn. 1895, 29] = erh, irh, reh, rih “to see” [Rpr. 1928, 153], Ammar’ar reh- ~ rh- “to see” [Dlg.], Bisharin rēh- ~ erh- “to see” [Almkvist] (Bed.: Dlg. 1973, 170) || Agaw *ʔarq- “to know” [Apl. 1989, 6; 1991, 23] || ECu. *ʔarg- “to see” [Sasse 1982, 26] (Cu.: Zbr. 1989, 587)⁸⁹.

Eg. ḥ3s.t “1. hill-country → 2. foreign land, desert” (PT, FD 185; Wb III 234): connected by Schneider (1997, 204, #76) with Ar. ḡṭ I “hungern”, supposing a semantic development “poor country” → “foreign land”! Absurd. Moreover, the correct Sem. and SBrb. cognates of Eg. ḥ3s.t [*ḥrs-t] indeed confirm its primary meaning “hill country” cf. Hbr. ḥoreš “Berge oder Wälder” [GB 264] = “forest (area)” [KB 358] | JAram. ḥuršā “Gebüsch, Dickicht, dichter Wald” [Levy 1924 II 119] || SBrb.: Hgr. ā-ḡuras “vallée” [Fcd. 1951–2, 487] = “place where many trees grow” [Mlt.], EWlm. ā-goras “dépression circulaire de terrain, 2. p.ext. forêt qui remplit un āgoras, 3. forêt, vallée boisée, 4. p.ext. brousse” [PAM 2003, 244, cf. Alj. 1980, 59] || CCh.: Mwulyen gārāḡi [-ḡ- < *-VčV-?] “forest” [Krafft 1981, #146]⁹⁰. Note that Akk. ḥuršānu “Gebirge” [AHW 360] = “mountain region” [CAD ḥ 253-4] || Ug. ḥršn “mountain” [WUS #1091] = “(divine) mountain, dwelling of the god El” [DUL 408] are usually explained as Sum. loanwords. But in the light of this AA etymology, I would not exclude an influence (instead of being borrowed) of Sum. ḥur.sag “mountain” leading to the extension of Akk. *ḥurš- → ḥurš-ān-.

Eg. ḥb3 [*ḥbl] “to destroy, lay waste, ravage” (PT, FD 187; Wb III 253, 2-3): compared by Rössler (1971, 297, 317) with Ar. ḡubr- “Rest”, ḡubār- “Staub” (sic)! Unacceptable. As is well known and generally accepted⁹¹, Eg. ḥb3 [*ḥbl] is a perfect match of Sem. *ḥbl “to injure” [Dlg. 1988, 633, #34]: Akk. ḥbl “Gewalt, Unrecht (an)tun” [AHW 302] || Hbr. ḥbl qal “to act corruptly”, piel “to ruin”, pual “to be destroyed, pulled down” [KB 285-6] | JAram. ḥbl pael “verwunden, verletzen, verderben” [Levy 1924 II 5] = “to damage, destroy” [KB] || ESA (Sabaic) ḥbl “ruin (noun)” [SD 58] = (Madhabī) ḥbl “ruiner, détruire” [Arbach 1993, 48], Ar. ḥabala “1. déranger à qqn. ses facultés, le rendre fou (un grand chagrin qui trouble la tête), 2. estropier qqn.”, ḥabila “1. avoir la

daherreden” [WKAS II 904] = lyw “schwätzen” & lyṯ “erravit in dicendo” [GASW] = laya (-w) “schwätzen” [Clc. 1931] = layā (-w) ~ layiya “to make mistakes in speaking, talk nonsense” [Lsl.] || Geez lāʿlāʿa “to stammer, stutter, speak indistinctly” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 304).

⁸⁸ For Eg.-Sem. see Clc. 1931, 36; GÄSW 1936, #1; Vrg. 1945, 130, 133, #3.a.1; Hodge 1981, 374, #34.

⁸⁹ This Eg.-Cu. etymology is commonly accepted (Hommel 1894, 357; Rn. 1895, 29; Zhl. 1932-33, 169; Vcl. 1934, 46, 77; 1938, 134; Chn. 1947, #415; Dlg. 1973, 170; OS 1992, 176). Besides, Schneider rightly declined the false comparison of Eg. rḥ with Sem. *ydc “to know” (suggested in Behnk 1927, 82, #23; Albright 1927, 203; Rösslers 1966, 228).

⁹⁰ For this Eg.-AA comparison see Ember 1917, 85, #112; 1930, #3.b.16; Vrg. 1945, 129; Chn. 1947, #152; Mlt. 1984, 16; 1987, #45; 1995, 248-249; HSED #1358. The semantic shift “mountain” ~ “forest” is known in AA.

⁹¹ Lit. for Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1913, 112, #19; 1930, #15.a.8; Lexa 1938, 222; Vrg. 1945, #1.d.21; Ward 1978, 43-44; Hodge 1976, 14, #137; 1981, 406.

tête dérangée, 2. être mutilé ou estropié (se dit d'un membre du corps)" [BK I 536] = ḥabala "to corrupt, disorder the brain, cripple" [Dlg.] = ḥabala "schädigen, schwächen" [GB].

Eg. ḥm^c "to seize, grasp" (PT, FD 191; Wb III 281-2): see the chapter for Eg. ^c = Sem. *z.

Eg. ḥnj "to play music" (CT, FD 192) and **Eg. ḥn** "speech, utterance" (MK, FD 192; Wb III 289): connected by Schneider (1997, 204, #78) with Sem. *^cny "to answer" (sic) and Sem. *^cny "to sing". Absurd. Schneider mixed up in a misleading manner three entirely distinct roots: (1) Despite the irregular Eg. ḥ ~ Sem. *^cγ, the comparison of Eg. ḥnj "to play music" with Sem. *^cny "to sing" may be correct, although this Eg.-Sem. etymology is not new at all⁹². (2) Sem. *^cny has a fully different basic meaning ("to turn back, turn away") and Eg. cognate.⁹³ (3) Eg. ḥn "speech, utterance" (FD) has also a different AA background, cf. PCh. *Q-n "speech" [GT]⁹⁴.

Eg. ḥr "fallen" (OK, Wb III 319-321): compared by Schneider (1993, 81; 1997, 204, #79) with Ug. γly "to lower" [Gordon 1955, 309, #1481] = "übermässig beugen" [WUS #2143] || Brb. *γ-l-y "to fall" [Snd.] and even Sem. *γll "to enter" [GT]⁹⁵. These forms represent three distinct roots (besides, comparing Eg. ḥr with NBrb.: Qabyle γ-l-y "to descend, fall" was first suggested by E. Zyhlarz 1932-33, 98). (1) Ug. γly "to lower" should be separated from Sem. *γll "to enter". (2) The latter root was convincingly identified by Ember (1911, 93; 1926, 6, #4) with Eg. *^crr.wt [< *γll] "gate" (OK, FD 45; Wb I 201-211). (3) The correct etymology of Eg. ḥr is Ar. ḥarra I "3. tomber en bas" [BK I 551] which is well known.⁹⁶

Eg. šhr "thought, plan" (OK, Wb IV 258-260): compared by Schneider (1997, 206, #93) with Ar. šaḥala "beschäftigen, beanspruchen" → šuḥl- "business, work, care, thing". Semantically dubious. The etymology of Eg. šhr is still unknown⁹⁷.

⁹² See Yeivin 1933, 110; Lsl. 1962, 48, #34; Djk. etc. 1986, 55; Djk. 1992, 28.

⁹³ See Akk. enū "1. umwenden, 2. ändern" [AHW 220] || Ug. ^cny "to answer, respond" [WUS #2060], Hbr. ^cny "to answer" [GB 603] || cf. Ar. ^cnn "begegnen, sich abwenden" [GB] = IV "1. retenir (le cheval) avec les rênes, 3. tourner qq. de tel ou tel côté" [BK II 377] || Eg. ^cn "umwenden" (MK, Wb I 188-189). For Sem.-Eg. see Erman 1892, 108; GB 603; Alb. 1918, 229; 1927, #61; Ember 1926, 302, fn. 10; Clc. 1936, #135; Vcl. 1958, 381; Ward 1961, 37, #19.

⁹⁴ Attested in CCh. *[ḥ]an- "Sprache, Rede" [GT]: Boka ḥan-šuda | Chibak kanyar | Higi-Ghye ḥàna, Higi-Kamale ḡàni, Fali-Kiria ngànù, Fali-Gili ḡàni (CCh.: Mkr. 1987, 232 < Krf. 1981) || ECh.: Mubi kân "Sprache" [Lks. 1937, 183] | Jegu gone "Geschichte, Erzählung" [Jng. 1961, 113].

⁹⁵ Cf. Ug. γll "to enter, wade in" [Gordon 1955, 310, #1482] = "hineintauchen" [WUS #2147], Hbr. ^cll "hineinstecken, senken" [GB 593] || Ar. γll "insérer, introduire une chose dans une autre" [KB II 487].

⁹⁶ Eg.-Ar.: Ember 1911, 94; 1930, #12.a.33, #15.a.17; Hommel 1915, 17; Vcl. 1958, 375, 388.

⁹⁷ (1) W. Leslau (1949, 316; 1962, 46, #10): Eg. šhr = Hbr. šaḥar "charm" (contra GB 820) || Ar. saḥara "zaubern". Improbable both phonologically (Eg. -ḥ- ? Sem. *-ḥ-) and semantically. (2) HSED #466: Eg. šhr = WCh.: Fyer čóór "Absicht, Plan" [Jng. 1970, 84]. But Fyer -Ø- ? Eg. -ḥ-. Eg. ḥ is regularly reflected by Fyer -k- ~ -g-. (3) GT: cp. perhaps CCh.: Lamang (Hitkala) cúrókú [tsúrókú] "Verstand" [Lks. 1964, 109]? Lamang k = Eg. ḥ seem regular.