Layers of the Oldest Egyptian Lexicon I

Abstract

The paper re-examines the controversies of P. Lacau’s old observation on a binary opposition of the anatomical terminology of Ancient Egyptian in the context of many new results issuing from current progress in Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) comparative linguistics. The presented etymological examination of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology corroborated a surprising distribution: one member of the synonymous pairs is usually a Semitic word, whereas the other one(s) have non-Semitic cognate(s) solely attested in some of the African branches of our language macrofamily. A relatively deeper presence of the extra-Semitic vocabulary in Egyptian has also become apparent.

Introduction

Already P. Lacau (1970, 30, fn. 2) has observed in the Egyptian lexicon „une série d’organes qui on eu ainsi un double nom: ‘le cœur’: jb et ℣ פרטי tj …; ‘les sourcils’: smd. wj et jn writeFile hj ...; ‘la tempe’: m3Ω et sm3 ...; ‘le poumon’ zm3 et wf3.w ...; ‘le poing’: 3mm.t et ℣ pryty t ...; ‘l’ongle’: 3b et ℣ pryty n.t ...”. Elsewhere (o.c., p. 92): „Quant à l’existence simultanée de deux désignations pour un même organe, nous en avons d’autres exemples en égyptien” such as tp vs. ℣ pryty d3d3, zm3 vs. wf3, jn writeFile hj vs. smd etc. and „un des deux noms devient alors une survivance d’une appellation primitivement différente de l’autre nom”. Lacau has already put the unanswered question I am venturing here to examine below: „Bien d’autres parelléléismes entre mots pratiquement équivalents demanderaient à être étudiés. Quels sont les sens premiers et la différence qui peut subsister encore entre ℣ pryty t et ℣ pryty nhj; ℣ pryty 3 et ℣ pryty wr?”

Working on the introductory chapter of the „Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian” (cf. esp. EDE I 36-38) surveying the diverse segments of the ancient Egyptian lexical
stock 15 years ago, I was also impressed – to be frank, not yet aware of Lacau’s above cited observation – to see the mostly binary opposition of the anatomical terminology in a surprising distribution: one member of these synonymous pairs was usually clearly reflecting a Semitic word, whereas the other one, on the contrary, appeared to have a non-Semitic cognate solely attested in some of the African branches of the Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) language family. This phenomenon is worth being thoroughly examined as it might also shed light on the prehistory of the Egyptian language. It is now high time that this research be done in the frames of my current project (ongoing since 2012) aiming at mapping linguistic aspects of the Egyptian linguo- and ethnogenesis.\footnote{The project has been supported by a Bolyai research fellowship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences since autumn 2012, which the author gratefully acknowledges. The lexical-etymological data issue from the author’s long-range project for an Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian (EDE, whose first 3 volumes have already been published, Leiden with Brill, 1999-2008), which were accumulated for the present paper in spring 2014 in Székesfehérvár. The data were evaluated and the ideas to be deduced thereof were formulated in summer 2014 at Balatonederics.}

Below, in this first part, I am going to scan all these pairs from upper torso to the hair of head with an extensive etymological analysis, eager to elucidate the question whether my impression fifteen years ago was right. Finally, I try to sum up the distribution of „Semitic” vs. „African” segments of these pairs and venture to outline what is to be deduced thereof. Later, it should also be checked in some other segments of the primary or basic (i.e., inherited, not borrowed) lexicon, e.g. that of the natural phenomena, where, e.g., we have two basic words for the „sun” (\(^{r6}\) having an Arabic cognate vs. \(^{jtn}\) with non-Semitic parallels). Or, e.g., why do we have two synonymous terms for „eternity” (non-Semitic \(^{ḥḥ}\) vs. \(^{d. t}\) with an Akkadian cognate)\footnote{Eg. \(^{d. t}\) „Ewigkeit” (OK-, Wb), which J. Oising (NBÄ 760, n. 919) erroneously tried to derive from Eg. \(^{dwj}\) (hapax of obscure meaning, pSmith 18:3, v. supra) referring to an unconvincing semantical parallel not fitting the case (Eg. \(^{q3j}\) „hoch sein” > \(^{q3.w}\) „Höhe” \(\rightarrow\) „lange Zeit”), has long been successfully identified by a few authors (Hommel 1904, 110, fn. 1; Holma 1919, 47; GÄSW #931; Vycichl 1958, 383) with Sem.: Akk. \(^{šātu}\) > \(^{šātu}\) „ferne Zukunft, Ewigkeit” [Holma] = „ferne Zeit” [AHW] = „ferne Zukunft” [Vycichl] = „distant time, far-off days (with reference to past and future)” [CAD]. The synonymous Eg. (n)\(^{ḥḥ}\), in turn, appears to be an innovative derivation from the basic sense „high number”, cf. \(^{ḥḥ}\) „Million, große Zahl” ([-, Wb III 152-3].)\) used parallel throughout the millennia?

„Hair”

\(^{Eg. sr\) „1. (Lit. MK, LP) vom Haar einer Frau (wohl von der künstlichen Perrücke im Gegs. zum natürlichen Haar, 2. (Med., GR) Haar eines Tieres” (Wb IV 191, 3-4) = „1. tress, wig, 2. hide (of animal)” (FD 235) > Cpt. (S) \(^{CIP}\) „Haar, Streifen” (NBÄ),\footnote{Which may have passed into Nubian, cf. Kunuzi, Mahassi \(^{str}\) „Haar” as suggested by E. Zyhlarz (1934-5, 172).} A fem. form of this word is also attested: sr.t „Haar (des Rindes)” (LP, Wb IV 191, 5). These words were arbitrarily explained J. Oising from a far-fetched deverbal root etymology.\footnote{The nominal forms were ultimately derived by him (NBÄ 250) from Eg. \(^{srj}\) “ausbreiten” (GR, Wb 191, 15), i.e., from a verbal root attested almost two millennia later than its supposed nominal derivative. On the top of this, Oising (NBÄ 823, n. 1097) tried to justify this with a forced typological parallel, German Strähne < IE \(*sr-\text{ei-} “ausbreiten” (Kluge 1999, 800, 802), although either this root or its two sporadic Germanic reflexes with}}
Instead of such an artificial *Wurzeletymologie* forced upon Eg. sr, one might consider its comparison with Sem. *\(\sqrt{s^\circ}r\) „hair” suggested by C.T. Hodge (1976, 12, #45) as phonologically not entirely impossible, albeit it looks *prima vista* to be hindered by two fundamental obstacles. Further Afro-Asiatic cognates, however, may complicate the question, cf. Brb. *\(\sqrt{zr}\) „hair” (primary noun) and hence: „to pluck hair” (denom. verb) [GT] > NBBr.: Tamazigh a-\(\hat{\imath}\)zar „cheveux, chevelure”, ta-mzur-t, pl. ti-mzur-in „1. mèche de cheveux tombant sur les joues, 2. crête de cheveux au milieu du crâne”, zzer „1. épiler, 2. débarrasser une peau de sa laine, 3. déplumer, 4. arracher (herbe, cheveux, poils)” [Taïfi 1991, 811] || SBrb.: ETawllemmet & Ayr \(\varphi\)-zar „1. être dépoilié de ses cheveux / poils / sa laine (par maladie, grattage, arrachage), être déplumé, 2. être plume (avoir ses plumes enlevées)”, ETawllemmet i-\(\hat{\imath}\)zar (nomen instr.) „poils, laines provenant de peaux d’animaux morts qu’on a dépoillées de leurs poils, 2. poils rasés ou arrachées” [PAM 2003, 897] || NOm.: Dizoid *\(\tilde{s}\)-ar „hair” [GT] > Dizi sar [Flm.] = sâr-u [Keefer] = sârū [Bender] = sâr-\(\dot{o}\) [Bender], Maji sâru „hair of head” [Bender 1971, #35] (Dizoid: Bender 2003, 211, #65) || WCh.: Hausa côrô = tûkkû „1. plait of hair on crown of head, 2. bird’s crest or cock’s comb” [Abr. 1962, 890, 896] = „1. a cock’s comb, 2. a small tuft of hair on the front of head” [Brg. 1934, 1043]. All these reflexes – except for Sem. – appear to suggest a PAA *\(\sqrt{c}\)r „hair” [GT]. Hausa c- (ts-) can regularly derive from PAA *\(c\)-, but not from a lateral. Brb. *z* is equally regular < both PAA *\(c\)* and *\(\dot{c}\)*, whereas Eg. s- is a direct match of AA *\(c\)-, although its rare correspondence with the basic sense “strip” have clearly nothing to do with the notion “hair, hide” in general. The same is the case with the Swedish stripa “herabhängender Haarbüschel” < *str-ei-b- (IEW 1028-9).

5 Unfortunately, Osing’s NBÄ abounds in this kind of „etymologies”, many of which – through a more thorough examination with careful outlook at the AA data – have eventually turned out to be but pure fancy, cf. Takács 2005.

6 C.T. Hodge’s (1976, 12, #45) direct equation of Eg. sr with Sem. *\(\sqrt{s^\circ}r\) „hair” fails, since (1) Eg. s- vs. Sem. *\(s\)*- are not regular and (2) Sem. *\(s\)*- is not reflected in Eg. (where the expected reflex *\(s^\circ\)r/3 would not have been incompatible). There are, however, several instances of an irregular correspondence of Eg. s- to Sem. *\(s\)-, cf. Eg. sr „Vornemer, Fürst” (PT, Wb IV 188-9) vs. Sem. *\(s\)arr- „king, chief” [Djk.] (cf. Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; GB 795; Djk. 1965, 43; 1970, 472, fn. 89; Conti 1978, 28, fn. 2) or Eg. srf „warm sein” (PT-, Wb IV 195) vs. Sem. *\(s\)rp „to burn” [GT] (cf. Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; GASW 103-4; WUS #2690; Conti 1978, 28, fn. 1). As for the *\(s\)-, not reflected in Egyptian and Berber, it might perhaps be a Semitic innovation as root extension.

7 The Dizi-Eg. comparison was first suggested by A.Ju. Militarev (1991, 264, #38.11). Militarev, however, also compared NBBr.: Iznasen \(\varphi\)-\(\tilde{s}\)\(\tilde{s}\)-ar „wool, hide” provided it is not a late loan from Ar. \(\dot{a}\)\(\tilde{s}\)-\(\dot{s}\)\(\tilde{s}\)-r (in that case, though, when borrowed into NBBr., its *-r would have been retained).

8 O.V. Stolbova (1987, 201, #520) erroneously equated the Hausa term with Bokkos syah “hair” (misquoted as syah and assuming hence the regular shift of h/v < *r, which, however, does not apply for h), which is rather akin to its closest cognates Fyer-Tambas so and Daffo-Butura swé „Haar” [Jng. 1970, 387] indicating Ron *\(s\)\(\tilde{s}\)ah ~ *s\(\dot{a}\)h, which can have nothing to do with Stolbova’s artificial WCh. *\(\ddot{c}\)AHAr- „hair” (motivated by her equally false comparison with Sem. *\(s^\circ\)r). Note that Hausa šaari (sic) „hair on the chest of a ram” quoted by Orel (HSED l.c.) in comparison with Bokkos syah (sic, -*h), Dizoid *\(\ddot{s}\)-ar, and Sem. *\(s^\circ\)r is not recorded in Brg. 1934, 930 and Abr. 1962, 808.

9 It is to be noted that SAgaw: Awngi cárî „hair of tail” [Hetzron 1978, 138] does not belong here. Its Cushitic cognates indicate a proto-form *\(\ddot{c}\)Vr- „tail” (cf. Leslau 1979 III 187), which, by the way, might correspond to Sem. *\(\ddot{t}\)ahr- „back”.}
the initial Sem. lateral *š- < AA *ĉ- has also been observed. Sem. *š-, in turn, seems to originate from PAA *ĉ-. Therefore, if we accept the relatedness of the Hausa form, there seem to emerge two diverse PAA root varieties, namely *včr vs. *včr „hair”. The lautgeschichtliche situation in NOm. is not yet as clear so the data thereof are of no evidence value in this matter as yet. In any case, Eg. sr „hair” has presumably a Sem. cognate, whereas its synonym (below) has not.

Eg. šn > šnw ~ šnj „Haar” (PT-, Wb IV 499-501), whose old equation with Sem. *všcr „hair”10 is evidently untenable for phonological reasons, may be better affiliated with a set of cognates ultimately deriving from an old PAA stem *Sin-11 „hair” [GT] – which is only attested outside Semitic – with diverse C3 root extensions:

(1) AA *Sink- [GT] > NOm. *isink- „hair” [GT]: Basketo išinč, Zergula & Zayse isinjke (Nom. data quoted from Mkr. and Blz.v.s) ||| CCh.: Gude cinkín (ts-) [Str.] = šinčán [Meek] = šinčin [Krf.] = šinč [IL].

(2) AA *SinT- [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh-Sus a-šentūf „hair” [Dst. 1938, 62] = a-šantūf „chevelure” [Laoust], Senhazha senţef „arracher (cheveux, poils, alfa)” [Rns. 1932, 350] ||| Bed. šindáw (m) „fine head of hair, esp. on young girl” [Roper 1928] ||| CCh.: PHigi *čint- > *šint- „hair”12 [GT] = *všn [JS]: Fali-Kiria šínci [Krf.], Higi čenti [Str.], Higi-Ghye śiņji [Krf.], Higi-Futu čņš [Krf.], Higi-Nkafa šânti [Meek], Higi-Kamale čanči [Meek], Higi-Nkafa, -Baza, -Kamale šinti „hair” [Krf.], Kapsiki šinti [Str. 1922-3, 113].13

Which of these two AA stems is reflected by Eg. šntj „Haar” (Med., Wb IV 518, 12-13) is uncertain. It is clearly an extension of the simplex still and solely14 preserved by Eg. šn, although its -tj was originally not necessarily a dental plosive, but may very well be explained – with the well-known shift of old t > tj in the NK – from an older Eg. *šnt (unattested from the OK and MK), which would be a perfect match of AA *vŠnk.

Eg. fč (or fč3)15 ~ fčj (hair det.) „lock of hair” (NE, Pap. Turin 1983, vo. I 47-48, Černý 1958, 210, #6 after I.E.S. Edwards) = „cheveux” (AL 77.1544) = „lock of hair”

11 Its *S- stands for an unknown sibilant. Eg. š- evidently speaks for an initial lateral fricative or affricate, but the rest of the comparanda from NBrb., NOm. and Ch. seem to derive from some other sibilant (*s- or *č-?), although the data from the latter two subbranches are unfortunately not too helpful in deciding about which sort of the PAA sibilants is to be reconstructed.
12 Rather than *šint- > *šnt- via palatalization of the initial sibilant.
13 For the comparison of the AA data see Wölfel 1955, 49 (Eg.-NBrb.); Mukarovsky 1989 MS, 3 (NOM.-CCh.); Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 35 (Bed.-NOM.-CCh.).
14 It is to be noted that CCh.: Bata-Garwa ssčenče „Haar” [Str.] cannot belong here as cognate reflecting the same biradical root, since it is to be analyzed via a quite different segmentation < *sew-ne.
15 Can be read either fč3 or fč (group writing). The suggested Afro-Asiatic etymology of the word indicates that the Old Egyptian root was either *fč3 < *fč3 (met.) or *fč < *fč („lost” -3-). I prefer the second scenario.
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„Head”


16 S. Sauneron (1964, 20) pointed out the word for GR, namely in the Abaton Decree, which prohibited to approach the holy place for z nb hr f° „everyone with hair”. Beside this occurrence, Sauneron (1968, 10) proved the phonetic value f of the hair hrgl. in Esna (GR), supposedly created on the basis of the acrophonic principle from LEdg. f° „hair”.


19 For disproving the phonologically unacceptable Rösslerian etymology of Eg. dāḏ3 (Akk. qaqqadu < *vakdk) cf. Takács 2006, 102-3.
The exclusively Semito-Egyptian isogloss *√glgl was in fact the reduplication of AA *√gl „head, skull“ [GT]. Following the old view expressed frequently both in Sem. and Eg. linguistics (lit. infra), I have examined elsewhere (Takács 1994 and 1998) the etymological connection of the reflexes of Eg.-Sem. *ga/ulga/ul- „head“ [GT] with other derivatives of AA *√gl „round“ [GT].

Eg. tp „Kopf, Spitze“ (PT-, Wb V 263-8): this synonymous term, interestingly, has again no match in Semitic. On the contrary, its cognate has so far been only found in HECu.: Burji tāp-ḏ „skull“ [Sasse 1982, 177] as V. Blažek (1994 MS Elam, 5, #13) correctly suggested. Interestingly, the vocalism in the 1st root syllable of the Eg. word was also *-ī- as Eg. fem. tp.t, i.e. *tāp.āt > Cpt. (S) ᾳπε (abstraction from *tape, in which initial t- was falsely regarded and isolated in the pre-Coptic fem. form as the fem. definite article) indicates. One might perhaps extend this etymology unto CCh.: Daba tāp „to wear a cap“ [Brt. 1995, 226].

„Brain“

Eg. 3js [regular < *r9s] „Gehirn“ (Med., Wb I 2, 10-11) = „viscera“, 3js n ḏnn.t „the viscera of the skull, i.e.: brain“ (FD 1) ||| Sem. *ra?š- „head“ [Frz. 1964, 268, #2.42] = *raʔiš- [Dg. 1986, 78] = *raʔ(i)š- [SED I 198-9, #225]. The Egypto-Semitic match (observed first by O. Rössler 1966, 227 and then C.T. Hodge 1976, 12, #35) is certain, while the presence of the same Afro-Asiatic root in the Chadic daughter languages, as suggested by O.V. Stolbova (1991 MS, 7), seems to me phonologically dubious, cf. CCh. *√rš (?) „brain“ [GT]: PMandara *γurš- (?) [Krf.] > Glavda γyršā (-t-) [Krf.] = ruršā [Stl.], Nakatsa γaršā (-t-) [Krf.], Zeghwana (Dghwede) γynza [Krf.] | PMafa-Mada (or PMatakam) *haN-liš „brains“ [Rsg.] = *-riš (?) [GT] > Matakam (Mafa) màŋgərása (-t-) [Krf.], Mada ḏnēš (-tI) [Rsg.], Muyang àndī [Rsg.], Maktele ārī [Rsg.], Moloko èlc [Rsg.], Gisiga ?eleš [Lukas 1970, 117] = lēš [Rsg.] (CCh.: Rossing 1978, 216, #88; Kraft 1981, #37). The sibilant C3 may well indeed be due to the phenomenon of secondary laterals (i.e. *-s > *-š) so typical in Central Chadic, but the Lautgeschichte of its C2 (perhaps -r- < *n- due to Central Chadic rhotacism?) and the origin of the Anlaut (r- ~ γ- < *h-, i.e., the well-known root extension occurring in the names of body parts?) are highly questionable. In any case, the Semitic and Egyptian roots are in a fully regular agreement.

Eg. tbn „Gehirn“ (Med., Wb V 262, 1) = „bone-marrow“ (FD 296) = „Knochenmark“ (GHwb 922): its Chadic etymology is not yet fully certain in spite of the multitude of the attractive parallels, which are, however, not necessarily mutually interrelated:

---

20 Note that the Ar. forms like ǧulqul-at- [Holma] and ǧalqal-at- [KB] – as Kogan (SED l.c.) rightly remarked – „are not found in the available dictionaries“.  
21 As L. Kogan (SED l.c.) too has recently admitted, „Sem. *gl*l/*glgl ‘to be round’ ... may eventually be the source of Sem. ‘skull’“. 
V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 185; HSED #2393) identified Eg. tbn with CCh.: Gabin tìɓìn-de „brains“ [Kraft],\(^\text{22}\) where the final syllable could in principle be taken from *tiɓ-indV (lit. *"brain of head") via haplology (cf. Gabin indé „head"). The ultimate pre-Central Chadic root might have thus been **√ṭbn → *√tɓn via the metathesis of the glottalization well-known in the Chadic Lautgeschichte. This is how our attention might be grasped by Ar. ṭabana „entendre bien, savoir bien une chose”, ṭabin- „habile, intelligent” [BK II 58], which has a variety in Ar. tabina „2. être intelligent, fin et rusé”, tabin- „habile, intelligent” [BK I 192]. If the above chain of assumptions is right, we have here an exclusive Egypto-Chadic isogloss with a possible verbal root background retained in Arabic.

H.G. Mukarovsky (1987, 108) combined the Gabin word with the reflexes of WCh.: Angas-Sura *tabur ~ *tabuγur ~ *tabuk „brain” [GT 2004, 20] attested both in Angas and Suroid.\(^\text{23}\) One would be tempted to assume that *tubuk was originally due to a contraction of a compound *tubun-kā „marrow of head” (cf. Angas-Sura *kā₂, „head”). But the difference of the vowels in the 1st vs. 2nd syllables is atypical of original triconsonantal Angas-Sura roots and one has a priori the impression of having to do with a prefix ta- here, which seems to be reaffirmed by the isolated Goemay goebûr [gə́bUr] „the brain” [Srl. 1937, 62], in which the same stem *-bur (or *bûr) seems to appear, only with a different prefix (gə- < *kə-?). The same can by no means be the case with Eg. tbn and thus any comparison may be baseless.

A noteworthy extra-Afro-Asiatic parallel to Eg. tbn appears in PBantu *-dùbí „brain” [Guthrie 1971, 126, #682]. But whether this is related with the Chadic data is highly unlikely.

\(^\text{22}\) Which has further possible Central Chadic cognates. Cf. Masa tòon-ta, Banana towàn-da, Musey tə̀on-da, Lame towôm-bwà, Lame-Peve tə̀om-wa, Misme-Zime tòom „brains” (CCh.: Kraft 1981), whose Inlaut -? is perhaps explainable in the light of Gabin tiɓin- and Banana towan-.


[TG pace Shimizu 1978] || CCh.: Masa yám „head” [Jng.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 182-3) < AA *
√γmm „head” [GT].

„Temple”

Eg. gm3 „das Joch- und Schläfenbein des Kopfes” (Med., Wb V 170, 2) = „temple of head (a technical term peculiar to Pap. E. Smith)” (Ward 1972, 19, #124) = „cheekbone” (Allen 2000, 470) shares with gmh.t „Locke oder Flechte des Haares, Schläfe” (CT, Wb V 171, 15-17) = „1. temple of head, 2. plaited hair at the sides of the head” (Ward, l.c.)26 the same biconsoantal root *


Eg. sm3 „1. behaarter Teil des Kopfes, Schläfengegend (mit Augenpartie, Haaransatz), Haare am Kopf, *Skalp, 2. Haarsträhne, 3. Seite, 4. auch von den Schamhaaren” (PT-, Wb IV 122, 1-6; GHwb 703; ÅWb I 1123a; ÅWb II 2203b-c) = „1. scalp, locks of hair, 2. temoral region, side-locks, 3. to listen (to)” (CT, DCT 492-3) = „crown of the head with hair growing on it (the hair itself, not the location of it)” ≈ gmh.w (GR Edfu, PL 841) > (SBF) cmAY (pl., originally a dual < sm3.wj) „Schläfen, Augenlider, Wimpern” (KHW 187): here too, in the light of Eg. smk (hair determinative) „mit langer Locke (?)” (PT, Wb IV 144, 2), the third radical was apparently a root complement (indicator of a nominal class of the anatomical terminology as in Eg. gm3?) attached to a PEg. biconsonantal *sm, cf. HECu. *samm-o „top of head” [Hds. 1989, 420] || WCh.: Angas-Sura *ṣɔγɔm ~ *ṣeγem (var. *ṣyēm in Mushere and Tal) „horn” [GT 2004, 337] | Bokkos šôm and Daffo-Butura šôm „Horn” [Jng. 1970, 390]. Thinking of the widely known history of IE *kH-, one is disposed to assume an ultimate etymological connection with Sem. *
√šmγ > MSA: Mehri šômωγ and EJibballi šǔγ „fine hair shed by camel” [Ins.

---

25 An AA root variety with an original *g- is attested in Sem.: MSA *gVmγVm- „head” [GT, cf. Lsl. 1945, 234].

26 Misrendered as „forehead” or „crown of the head”, it was erroneously affiliated by W.F. Albright (1918, 254, #127) and A. Ember (1926, 306, fn. 8; ESS §10.b.4 and §14.c.3) with Ar. ġabh-at- and Hbr. gabbáḥat „baldness on the front part of the head”.

27 Attested in Mubi guûmûm (f), pl. guûmûm „Wange” [Lks. 1937, 182] = guûmûm (f), pl. guûmûm „1. joues, 2. tempe” [Jng. 1990 MS, 20], Kajakse guûgûm < *guγgum „joue” [Alio 2004, 243, #145], Kofa guûmè (f), pl. guûmmûn „cheeks” [Jng. 1977 MS, 3, #7].
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Several authors (Mukarovsky, Dolgopol’skij, Blažek) extended this comparison also onto CCh.: Fali-Jilbu šimčin, Fali-Muchella šimki, Fali-Bwagira šimkni „hair” l Banana šimita, Musey šimit „hair” (Ch.: Kraft 1981). They assumed a secondary š- < *š-, which is, in principle, possible. One would be tempted to identify the suffix -k with the C 3 root complement of Eg. smk „mit langer Locke (?”) (PT, Wb IV 144, 2). But the cognacy of the CCh. term (of a significantly different vocalism) with Eg. šntj „hair” (above) seems more likely at the moment. 31 Literature for this Afro-Asiatic root comparison: Dolgopolsky 1990, 215; Blažek 1989 MS Om., 15, #47 (MSA-Eg.-Cu.-Ch.); Mukarovsky 1989 MS, 3 (SCu.-Nom.-Ch.); Orel and Stolbova 1992, 170 (Nom.-Eg.-WCh.); Skinner 1992, 350 (WCh.-Cu.-Eg.); Orel 1995, 109, #135 (Ch.-Eg.-Cu.). 32 P. Lacau (1970, 53, #125) explained the phonetic value m3° of the feather hieroglyph (originally „la plume de la tempe”) from Eg. m3° „temple” as related to m3° „côté, bord”. 33 H. Grapow (1954, 29) renders it literally „die Seite des Kopfes” (so also Walker l.c.) assuming it to be etymologically related to Eg. m3° „Ufer des Flusses” (MK, Wb, above). G. Jéquier (1911, 64-65, §23), in turn, followed by P. Lacau (1970, 53-54, #125) proposed a derivation from Eg. m3° „côté, bord”.

31 Several authors (Mukarovsky, Dolgopol’skij, Blažek) extended this comparison also onto CCh.: Fali-Jilbu šimčin, Fali-Muchella šimki, Fali-Bwagira šimkni „hair” l Banana šimita, Musey šimit „hair” (Ch.: Kraft 1981). They assumed a secondary š- < *š-, which is, in principle, possible. One would be tempted to identify the suffix -k with the C 3 root complement of Eg. smk „mit langer Locke (?”) (PT, Wb IV 144, 2). But the cognacy of the CCh. term (of a significantly different vocalism) with Eg. šntj „hair” (above) seems more likely at the moment. 31 Literature for this Afro-Asiatic root comparison: Dolgopolsky 1990, 215; Blažek 1989 MS Om., 15, #47 (MSA-Eg.-Cu.-Ch.); Mukarovsky 1989 MS, 3 (SCu.-Nom.-Ch.); Orel and Stolbova 1992, 170 (Nom.-Eg.-WCh.); Skinner 1992, 350 (WCh.-Cu.-Eg.); Orel 1995, 109, #135 (Ch.-Eg.-Cu.). 32 P. Lacau (1970, 53, #125) explained the phonetic value m3° of the feather hieroglyph (originally „la plume de la tempe”) from Eg. m3° „temple” as related to m3° „côté, bord”. 33 H. Grapow (1954, 29) renders it literally „die Seite des Kopfes” (so also Walker l.c.) assuming it to be etymologically related to Eg. m3° „Ufer des Flusses” (MK, Wb, above). G. Jéquier (1911, 64-65, §23), in turn, followed by P. Lacau (1970, 53-54, #125) proposed a derivation from Eg. m3° „côté, bord”.
[GT] (without any trace of a third radical - postpone), one is disposed to assume in Eg. m3<
*ml< of anatomical terms (attested in East Cushitic).

Eg. ssk3 „Schläfe, Locke” (BD, Wb IV 279, 1) has been equated by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #125) with Sem.: Akk. usukku ~ sukkku „Schläfe, Oberteil der Wange” [AHW 1439], which, interestingly, yields a further case of an additional -3 in the Egyptian match for an Afro-Asiatic root denoting the „temple of head” (cf. Eg. gm3 and sm3 above), which one might only render as an additional root extension.

„Ear”

Eg. *jdn „Ohr: nur noch aus der Schreibung der folgenden Worte zu erschließen” (Wb I 154), cf., e.g., jdn „jem. vertreten” (Lit. MK-, Wb I 154, 1) written with an ear determinative/logogram. As J. Zeidler (1984, 43-44, §3.2) pointed out, this ear determinative (EG3 455, F21) appears also in the writing of a number of words spelled jd (Wb I 151-2) without the -n, which led him to „eine teilphonographische Schreibung jd nahelegen” assuming that „das Kuhohr ... hat demzufolge als Phonogramm wohl in erster Linie Lautwert jd (sem. „s), der mit [akk.] uznu ... nichts zu tun hat”. If this were true, one might wonder whether the association of the ear sign with the phonetic value was due to Eg. jd „taub sein” (OK-, Wb I 151, 13). Unfortunately, however, Zeidler ignored the paper by M. Gilula (1975, 251), where the word jdn „ear” was pointed out as a real word attested in CT VII 30k: jdn ggwj „attentive ear”.34 This suggestion was later corroborated also by W. Vycichl (1985, 172, §1; 1990, 45), C.T. Hodge (1977, 933), and by R. van der Molen (in her DCT 62 referring even to Hbr. 9reeze „ear”) etc., who correctly maintain the widely known35 equation with Sem. *?udn-, „ear” [Frz. 1964, 255] = *HNd- [Djk. 1970, 468] = *?ud(V)n- [Dlk. 1982, 36, #1; 1994, 271, #4].36 The correspondence of Eg. d vs. Sem. *d is rare, although attested. Moreover, strangely, also the Ugaritic reflex of this word displays -d- instead of the expected -d-.37 One might also ponder whether Eg. -d- is here due to an influence of Eg. jd „to be deaf”,38 which,

34 The rendering of jdn gg „attentive ear” is not commonly accepted. R.O. Faulkner (AECT III 18, spell 829), for instance, interprets this place as „he who was deaf (?) and who stared”. P. Barguet (1986, 556, spell 829), in turn, has here „celui qui remplace celui qui regarde (?)”, whereas R. Hannig (ÄWb II 455b) supposed here the occurrence of jdn „vertreten”.

35 Erman 1892, 108 (after Brugsch and Steindorff); Ember 1911, 92; Holma 1911, x; Wb I 154; Albright 1927, 208, fn. 8; ESS §4.a.2 and §26.c.2; GÄSW 51, #128; Cohen 1947, #16; Vycichl 1953, 43; 1953, 112-113; Hodge 1981, 234. Note that N. Skinner’s (1992, 348; 1995, 30) comparanda (namely Brb. *udm „face”, Eg. wšm „ear of grain”, SCu.: Qwadza wat-o „ear” < AA *vwk/2m „ear”) cannot be accepted for phonological reasons.

36 For Sem. cf. e.g. Leslau 1945, 233; Rabin 1975, 87, #21. n.

37 Cf. Ug. *?udn „Ohr” [WUS 8, #89] = údn „ear” [DUL 20].

38 The etymology of Eg. jdj is still obscure – unless it directly originates (via semantic opposition) from AA *vwɔ, „to hear” [GT]. A.B. Dolgopol’skij (1966, 70, #5.7) rightly found its equation with Agaw *ded- „deaf” [GT] ll ECU. *dud- „dumb, deaf” [Sasse 1982, 58-59] little convincing as he regarded PCu. *v’d as an onomatopoetic root. Equally untenable is P. Lacau’s (1954, 300, n. 1) direct derivation from Eg. *jdn via the erosion of its final -n:
besides, C.T. Hodge (1976, 12, #37) even directly affiliated with the Eg.-Sem. isogloss *√dn for "ear", outside which no evident cognates are found with this triliteral root structure.\textsuperscript{39} The Russian scholars, headed by I.M. Diakonoff (1981, 27, fn. 9; 1986, 47), and their followers\textsuperscript{40} isolated the third radical in Eg. and Sem. as a nomen instr./loci attached to an AA root *√wÏ "to hear". Also A.B. Dolgopol'sky (1994, 271, #4) speaks of a "nominal suffix" here. This supposition has, however, no evidence on the Egyptian side.

\textbf{Eg. msdr "Ohr" (PT, Wb II 154, 13-16):} its derivation as the m- prefix \textit{nomen loci} form of Eg. sdr „die Nacht zubringen, schlafen, liegen” (PT, Wb IV 390-2) has been widely accepted.\textsuperscript{41} This view has been expressed by most of the authors in the field of Eg. linguistics.\textsuperscript{42} The alternative comparison of Eg. msdr with common Brb. *√mẓg "ear" [GT] (first established by Rochemonteix) is almost as old as its derivation from Eg. sdr and has also been maintained by numerous specialists.\textsuperscript{43} Accepting the Brb. parallel of Eg. msdr, Ch. Rabin surmised the Eg. final -r to be an additional element that „occurs occasionally in HS as a suffix, cf. Hbr. -l”. But no such suffix -r has otherwise been observed in Egyptian – to the best of my knowledge. Another way of explaining the 4th Eg. -r would be assuming a secondary popular etymology of the Middle Kingdom: our word was still written in the Old Kingdom solely as msd, which was perhaps no longer

\textsuperscript{39} W.W. Müller (1975, 64, #5), followed by A. Militarev and O. Stolbova (1990, 66) and HSED #126, compared the Sem. word with WCh.: Karekare ḍéŋgei || ECh.: Jegu ṭūḏūnē "Ohr". But the ECh. comparanda are not even with one another interrelated. On the one hand, Mubi-Toram *ʔud(lo)- "ear" [GT] > Jegu ṭūḏūnē, pl. ṭūḏān "Ohr" [Jng. 1961, 117], Birgit ṭūḏūngā (i), pl. ṭūḏūngā [Jng. 2004, 359] might well be in fact a late Ar. borrowing, whereas, on the other hand, H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibriszimow (1994 I 53C) were disposed to compare ECh.: Dankla ḍēngēi, ḍēngfŋkō [Lks.] = ḍēngē [Fédry] (ECh. data: JI 1994 II 115) with PCu. *sVg(g)- "to hear" [Dlg. 1973].


\textsuperscript{41} The original sense of Eg. msdr has been rendered as „la partie de la tête sur laquelle on s’appuie pour dormir” (Lacau) = „endroit où l’on dort” (Vycichl: „it is on the ear that one sleeps”) = „место, на котором спят” (Ol’derogge) = „l’endroit sur lequel on dort” (Vergote) = „Stelle bzw. Vorrichtung zum Schlafen” > „Schlafstelle” (Schenkel).


\textsuperscript{43} Literature for the Eg.-Brb. etymology: Stern 1883, 26, fn. 2; Hommel 1893, 112; Bates 1914, 82; Lacau 1954, 300; 1970, 52, #120; 1972, 311, §31.A, fn. 4; Bender 1975, 160; KHW 113; Rabin 1977, 336, fn. 33; Rössler 1987, 384. Rejected by A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 359, #21) for the sake of an evidently false etymology.
understood as something resembling a noun deducable from a "native" triconsonantal verbal root, while the derivation from Eg. sdr „to lie (down)" was maybe at hand and this commonly conceivable reinterpretation led to a new form msdr. If the underlying PBrb. root contained *-g as supposed by M. Cohen, C. Brockelmann, P. Lacau, and A.Ju. Militarev (cf. below), 44 the equation of this hypothetic OEg. *msd and PBrb. *vmsg might be in principle established by the shift of AA *c/c/ or *-g > pre-Eg. *s- + *-g- > Eg. s- + -d- (loss of glottalization due to incompatibility, cf. EDE I 327-9). Does the Eg.-Brb. isogloss represent the nomen instrumenti of PAA *cHg- „to hear" [Mlt.] = *cçg [GT]? 45

Eg. *n₇₃.wj „die zwei Ohren (als Körperteil des Menschen)” (MK, Wb I 204-5): its root, *n₇₃ (which has no reasonable verbal source in Eg.) 46 may well be derived from AA *vHQ ~ *vHQ (with an epenthetic nasal) „to listen, hear" [GT], which is only attested in Cushitic 46 and Chadic47, but – again – not in Semitic. The Eg.-Cu. (sine SCu.) etymology has been known since the article by E. Zyhlarz (1932-33, 166). 48 All this makes us assume here an „African" Eg. word *n₇₃ „ear" synonymous to the long extinct „Semitic" Eg. *jdn „ear".

„Eye"

Eg. *n (act. **xn) „Auge (nur im Schriftzeichen erhalten)” (Wb I 189): a „prehistoric word” (Ember), or to put it in other words: „the value *n of a hieroglyph including an eye shows that Eg. earlier had *n (or *yn) for ‘eye’” (Hodge 1976, 19, n. 36), whose

---


45 In any case, an inner Egyptian derivation from *vHn „to live” seems far-fetched and much less probable.


48 D. Appleyard’s (I.c.) reluctance to accept this old Agaw-Egyptian etymology (i.e., the equation by Zyhlarz 1932-3, 166) – as "probably not related" – is not based on any exact argument.
equation with Sem. *c̣ayn- „eye”\(^{49}\) has widely been accepted\(^{50}\) whereas this Eg.-Sem. word as a noun has only dubious attestation outside Sem.-Eg. Quite a lot of scholars\(^{51}\) preferred to equate the Eg.-Sem. isogloss with LECu.: i.a. Saho c̣intò ~ intò, pl. òntìt „Auge” [Rn. 1887, 41] = pl. c̣intìt ~ intìt [Dlg. allegedly < Rn.]\(^{52}\) ll NOm.: Gimirra ?an „eye” [Bulatović] (Cu.-Om.: Dlg. 1973, 149-150) ll PCh. *ïḍa „eye” [Newman 1977, 26] = *ḍ- [NM 1966, 234, #28]. The ECh. forms, however, may well be due to an Arabic influence, whereas the reconstruction and external etymology of the Chadic word are hardly supporting any connection to Eg.-Sem. *c̣ayn-.\(^{53}\) The suggestion by O.V. Stolbova on a simultaneous (!) comparison of the above Common Chadic noun for „eye” with her all too suggestive WCh. *ïỵan- „видеть, глаз” [Stl. 1987] = *ïỵan- „to see” [OS] with a forged *c̣,\(^{54}\) is certainly out of question as its reflexes certainly represent a different verbal root, presumably AA *ṿḥ/γỵn „to see” [GT],\(^{55}\) whereas, nevertheless, we may isolate a remotely related PAA root variety *ṿ̄yn „to see” [GT], which, in turn, may have been the verbal root to Eg.-Sem. *c̣ayn-, cf. SCu.: Dahalo c̣en-āḍ- (with refl. suffix -āḍ-) „to see from afar” [Ehret 1980, 274] ll WCh.: Geji yenĩ „to see” [Smz.], Tule ỹa:ni „to see” [Smz.] l Bole ṭinn- „sehen, meinen” [Lks. 1971, 133] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 284) ll ECh.: Jegu ṭinn- „wissen” [Jng. 1961, 113]. In any case, Eg. *c̣n as a noun has a match only in Semitic.

**Eg. j̣ṛt** „Auge” (OK-, Wb I 106-7), act. *j̣ṛ.et „occhio” (Farina 1926, 23) = *j̣ṛ.t [GT] reflected in Greek letters as Й̣р̣и̣ и in Coptic as (L) ẹịp̣̣ẹ, (SA) ẹịp̣̣-, (BF) íep̣̣-,\(^{56}\) *j̣ṛ.t= (GT) > (S) ẹịa(ẹ)T= etc. „Auge” (KHW 51-52): the research has always

\(^{49}\) For the Sem. reflexes see, for instance, Leslau 1945, 233; Rabin 1975, 67, #25.

\(^{50}\) See Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; Erman 1892, 108; Holma 1911, x; Ember 1918, 30; Wb I 189; ESS §11.a.6; GÄSW #136; Vycichl 1958, 372, 381; Hodge 1976, 12, #36; HSED #1084.

\(^{51}\) See Müller 1896, 210-211; Meinhof 1912, 232; Trombetti 1923, 113; Cohen 1947, #63; Wölfel 1955, 42; Greenberg 1963, 56, #29; Dolgopolsky 1964, 59; 1982, 37, #5; 1994, 274-5, #5; Stolbova 1977, 64; 1987, 228; Skinner 1987, 74-77; Lamberti 1987, 534, #13; OS 1992, 170.

\(^{52}\) The reconstruction of an ECu. *c̣in- on the basis of its attested pl. *c̣in-TV „eye” [Dlg.] is but hypothetic, since all other ECu. reflexes show not even the trace of *c̣-.

\(^{53}\) The hypothetic PCh. *HindV [Dlg.] > WCh. *c̣inḍV „глаз” [Stl. 1977] are far-fetched, since the overwhelming bulk of the Chadic reflexes (except for Gwandara, Pero, and Dghwede, for further possible CCh. forms supporting the reconstruction of Ch. *c̣̄ỵnd see Mkr. 1989 MS, 2) do not show any trace of the (anyway secondary epenthetic?) nasal ង element and speak for *yid- fitting much better an equation with Sem. *ṿ̄ỵḍ- „to know”.

\(^{54}\) Already A.Ju. Militarev (1991, 258, #25.1) convincingly separated the Sem.-Cu. stem from Stolbova’s artificial WCh. *c̣inḍ- whose reconstruction „не вытекает из самого ... материала”.

\(^{55}\) Cf. WCh.: Hausa gání (g- regular < *g̣- and not *c̣-) „1. to see, 2. look at, 3. consider, 4. get”, gání „to understand, realize”, gání „to see from afar” [Abr. 1962, 296, 298, 301] = gani „видеть” [Old. 1954, 127] l NBauchi *han- (or *ḅan-?) [Skn.]: Pa’a hän (pf.), ñání (aor.), hänó (impf.). „to see repeatedly, keep on seeing” [MSkn. 1979, 181] = hän „to see” [Skn. 1977, 38] = hani „to see” [IL] ?? (?) Eg. ḥän (eye det.) „etw. ansehen” (GR, Wb III 104, 7).

\(^{56}\) Cf. (SA) ẹ̄p̣̣boone, (B) ẹ̄p̣̣bòni, (F) ẹ̄p̣̣báni „böser Blick”, adj. „neidisch” < Eg. j̣ṛt bjn.t „bad eye” (KHW 25).
been divided in two groups concerning its origin, although, phonologically, neither of these solutions is perfectly satisfying:

(1) As a noun, it could be prima vista neatly identified with NBrb. *allen, the pl. of sg. *tiṭṭ [<*ti₅-t?] ,,eye” [Zhl.][57] || Agaw *all- ,,eye” [Dlg. pace Apl. 1984, 57] = *[t]il- [Apl. 1991, 20, 23] || ECU. *il- ,,eye” and denom. *ilāl- ,,to look at” [Sasse 1979, 5, 22, 1982, 104-5] || SCU. *ila ,,eye” and (denom.?) *iley- ,,to know” [Ehret 1980, 291-2].58 Here, however, more attractive this comparison may seem, neither of the root consonants in fact corresponds: Eg. j- (here, ,,real” *y-) ≠ AA *r-, whereas Eg. -r- (here, in fact, ,,real” *r-) ≠ AA *l-.

(2) As a verbal root of dubious existence, the supposedly underlying Eg. *jrj “sehen”59 might be affiliated with Bed. iray ,,wissen, erfahren” [Rn. 1895, 30] || ECU.: Dullay *ar- ,,to know” [Orel] || SCU. *ar- ,,to (fore)see” [Ehret 1980, 286] || NOm. *ar- ,,to know” [Bender 1988, 147] (Cu.-Om.: Fleming 1969, 22, Dlg. 1973, 170-1; Bender 1988, 155; Zaborski 1989, 587-8; HSED #75; Orel 1995, 119). This etymology, however, does not take into account that Eg. j- is reflecting here a ,,real” *y-, not a glottal stop as the Coptic reflexes evidently indicate. Many authors are inclined to equate Eg. jr.t with Sem. *frʔy (met.?) ,,to see”.60 Equally ambiguous is others’ suggestion to affiliate Eg. jr.t with some sporadic Chadic forms for ,,eye” like ir (and sim.).61 Some authors even confused these diverse roots.62

Eg. b33 ,,pupil of eye” (MK Mag. 2x, Roccati) = ,,eyeball” (Ward 1978, 141) → bnr [*bl] ,,ball of eye” (NE, CED 22) = ,,balls (of eyes)” (DLE I 156) = ,,Augapfel, Auge” (GHWb 254)63 → br.wj ,,eyes” (GR, Wb I 465, 5) → Dem. bl ,,eye” (DG 120)

57 For an alternative etymology of the Brb. sg. form see Basset 1887, 458; Gouffé 1974, 361, Militarev 1991, 258, #25.1. The comparison of Eg. jr.t and Brb. sg. tiss was declined by P. Lacau (1954, 300).


59 Allegedly attested by the Eg. imperative jrj tw ,,pass auf, gib acht!” (OK-NE, Wb I 108, 4) and jr „das Sehen (als Personifikation neben sg. „das Hören””) (XVIII., Wb I 108, 3). Cf. Zeidler 1984, 44, n. 35.

60 Ember 1911, 29, fn. 92; 1926, 301, fn. 10; ESS §12.a.2; Hodge 1968, 26 (including Ch. *l- “to see”); Vycichl 1975, 203, Zeidler 1984, 44, n. 35; Bombhard 1986, 249; Hodge 1990, 646, §10.B.

61 See Greenberg 1963, 56, #29; Dolgopolov 1964, 59; OS 1990, 90, #47; 1992, 185; HSED #112. We are dealing here, however, with rhotaacism (-r- < *-d-), cf. WCh.: Bole-Tangale *ido “eye” [Schuh 1984, 208] < Ch. *d- “eye” [NM 1966, 234, #29] = *id [Newman 1977, 26 followed by Tourneux 1990, 253].


63 Already J. Černý (CED 22) and W.A. Ward (1978, 143-144; 1996, 43, fn. 6) explained (SB) BAAA from LLeg. bnr, which Ward ultimately related to PT 432a b33, whose meaning is, however, disputed: ,,hole” (Sethe in ÜKAPT) = ,,eyeball” (Faulkner in AEPT 87, followed by Ward 1978, 142) = ,,hole-inhabitant” (Borghouts 1971, 101) = ,,Pupille” (GHWb 240). The shift of OK b33 [act. *bl] → LLeg. bnr (suggested by Ward) is in theory possible. For the ,,reappearance” of *l as LLeg. -mr < OEg. -3, cf. MEg. -3 > NEG. -nr [act. *l-] ,,o daß doch” (Wb III 11). Because of semantical considerations, one would be, however, disposed to distinguish between GR br + PCpt. *bal ,,eye” vs. LLeg. bnr + OEg. b33 ,,ball of eye”. W. Vycichl (1951, 71; 1955, 314, fn. 12) supposed
Cpt. (SB)  bại, (ALFO) beschäftigt „eye” (CD 31b; CED 22; KHW 22): in this case, the word for „eye” apparently developed semantically pars pro toto from a basic sense „ball”, so it is presumably to be regarded as an inner Egyptian innovation. This is why the resemblance of Eg. br „sehen, erblicken” (GR, Wb I 465, 6), evidently a denominal derivative from the same root, to the reflexes of AA *√bl „to look at” [GT],64 with which the GR word has been usually equated,65 may be due to pure chance. The same may well pertain to Meroitic *bel „eye” [Zhl. 1956, 25].66 In any case, our Eg. word may have been a native innovation and not an inherited item of the common Eg.-Sem. anatomical terminology.

Eg. mr.t „Auge (einer Gottheit)”, dual mr.tj „die beiden Augen” (BD 1x, GR frequently, Wb II 107, 10-15) = „l’œil (du dieu)”, dual „les deux yeux” (Lefèbvre 1952, 16, §17; El-Sayed 1987, 64) = „Auge des Königs” (Edfu, Kurth 1994, 13, §52).67 W. Helck (1954, 76-77), followed by A. Volten (1959, 27), demonstrated the early existence of the word attested by an unusual writing (m + two eye signs) of the title mr „Vorsteher” (Wb) from Dyn. III on. If this is correct, we have here the fourth old Egyptian term for „eye”. Etymology disputed:

(1) In the view of W. Vycichl (1951, 72) and G. Takács (1995, 159), this is ultimately cognate with Eg. m33 „to see” (with an interchange of 3 ~ r). Cf. also LECu. m3.tj dual. „die Augen (Sonne und Mond als Augen des Himmels)” (LP, Wb II 11).

(2) P. Lacau (1970, 150, §406) derived it via m- prefix from Eg. jrt „eye”, which was approved by W.A. Ward (1978, 144-6, §287): „attractive suggestion and would strengthen the idea of a late dialectal variant” (specific for the Ptolemaic lexicon). Unconvincing. None of the functions of m- seems to fit here.

(3) W. Westendorf (KHW 22) and W. Guglielmi (1991, 16 & fn. 92 with lit.) suggested a connection between Eg. mr.t ~ OEG. b33 > NEg. bnr > GR br.wj (dual) „eye(ball)”, the trace of an OEG. *b3.t „eye” in the toponym of modern Ar. Hurbeyt < Cpt. (B) ფარბაით <ჰირბაით < LECu. *p3-hr-b3.tj [*p-hr-bañtij/*-bištajj] „Horus mit den beiden Augen”. More recently, however, A. Czapkiewicz (1971, 20, #23) rendered Hurbeyt as *pr-hr-j3btj „the eastern residence of Horus”. Others derived Ar. Horbeit ~ Horbēt from the Eg. toponym pr-hr-mr.tj, lit. „Haus des Horus der beiden Augen” (KHW 479; PL 446). G. Roeder (ZÄS 61, 1926, 58) was sceptical about this derivation (esp. as for LECu. ḫ- > Ar. ḫ- and Gk. -βαιθ- < Eg. mr.tj), but K. Sethe (1928, 99) collected evidence for Eg. ḫ- > Ar. ḫ- and LECu. ḫ- > Gk. β.


65 For the LECu.-LEg. comparison see Reinisch 1885, 98; Rössler 1971, 312; Hodge 1990, 171 (also a number of unrelated comparanda); Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 24.

66 Note that the Meroitic reconstructions by E. Zyhlarz are outdated and are usually unreliable.

67 Occurs esp. in the epithet of Horus of Pharaibthos hr-mr.tj.
which was rightly declined by W.A. Ward (1978, 144-145, §287). There was probably no etymological relationship to Eg. *bl (cf. EDE II s.v. br).

„Nose”

Eg. fnd „Nase” (OK, Wb I 577, 10-15): its etymology has not yet been unambiguously settled. In any case, most probable seems a Semitic connection (solution 1 below):

(1) It has often been equated with ES: Amharic and Argobba afənča „nose”, Tigrinya ወفائča „nose” (ES: Leslau 1949, 48). Phonologically, it would be plausible, but the etymology of the Ethio-Semitic word is also heavily debated.

(2) Frequently affiliated also with the derivatives of AA *√fn (perhaps *fʌn-) „nose” [GT] and the underlying verbal root, PAA *√fn „1. to blow, breathe, 2. smell” [GT].

---

68 For this Eg.-ES comparison see Ember 1917, 21; Albright 1918, 98, fn. 1; Cohen 1947, #35; Dolgopol’skij 1966, 59, #2.5; MM 1983, 217-218; Militarev 1987, 102, #4; HCV A I #62.


70 For this etymology see Meinhof 1912, 237; Cohen 1947, #35; D’jakonov 1965, 40; Dolgopol’skij 1966, 59, #2.5; 1970, 625, #109; 1973, 45; Bender 1975, 179; SISAJa I 125, #156; MM 1983, 217-218; Lamberti 1987, 533; Militarev 1987, 102, #4; Zaborski 1997 MS, 35, #1157.


which does not explain the third Eg. radical unless we assume here a marker -d occurring in certain Egyptian body part names.73

(3) Others74 supposed Eg. ḫnd to be a metathesis of *dnf < **gnf75 and equated it with Bed. genuž ~ ginuž, pl. genif ,,nose” [Rpr. 1928, 186] = genuž, pl. genif ,,Nase, Schnabel” [Rn. 1895, 98], which is, however, related to Agaw *gʷəmb- ,,nose, mouth” [Apl.]76 and their AA background is still unclear.77

Eg. šr.t ,,Nase” (PT-, Wb IV 523-4) is, as pointed out already by E. Zyhlarz (1934, 111 and fn. 2), followed by N. Skinner (1992, 353), akin to Brb. *ti-nzar-t ,,nose” [GT].78 The underlying Brb. *√nɔr may contain a root extension *n-, while it is lacking in Egyptian just like in the case of Eg. dr.t ,,hand” akin to CCh. *√ngr


74 For the Eg.-Bed.-Agaw comparison see Behnk 1928, 139, #26; Zyhlarz 1932-33, 173; Vyczichl 1933, 174, fn. 1; 1934, 63; 1938, 133; 1960, 263; 1990, 69. Cohen 1947, #35; Bender 1975, 179; Trombetti 1977, 349; Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 16.

75 Cp. also the nose determinative in Eg. gnf ,,abweisen” (MK, Wb V 174), which may perhaps speak for a once *gnf ,,nose”.


78 E. Zyhlarz (l.c.) quoted Tuareg (sic) ti-nzgr- t ,,Nase”. For Brb. data see Basset 1883, 179, 298, 312; 1887, 421, 458.
** „hand“ [GT] (cf. below), whereas its *-z- is a regular correspondence of Eg. š- < AA *Š- (Militarev 1991). All other attempts at solving the etymology of Eg. šr.t have remained vain.

** „Tooth“

**Eg. jbḥ „Zahn, besonders des Menschen, auch der Tiere, sogar Stoßzahn des Elefanten” (OK, Wb I 64, 2-4) > (S) OB2E „orig. Schneidezahn (?)” (KHW 137, fn. 7): origin obscure, all attempts until now have remained unconvincing. I only can put forward two weak, albeit plausible approaches:

1) On the one hand, a basic meaning „white” and an etymological connection with Sem. *ḥalab- „milk” [Lsl. 1987, 229] are in principle not to be ruled out.

2) One the other hand, the final -ḥ is suspicious as it used to occur in body parts’ names (Takács 1997). But I have been so far unable to find any external match for *jb „tooth”, which signifies the little chances of a non-Semitic etymology.

**Eg. nḥd.t, younger (MK) ndḥ.t „Zahn” (OK-, Wb II 304, 5-8 and 384, 2-3) = „fang, tusk, canine tooth” (Walker 1996, 271) = „molar” (Borghouts 1999, 177) > (S) NΛ(Λ)X2E, NΛ(Λ)XE, (B) NΛX2I etc. „orig. Reibezahn (?)” (KHW 137, also fn. 7):
here too, even after deleting the phonologically evidently false ones, one is disturbed by the multitude of the diverse and quite attractive equipotential etymological proposals:

(1) A. Ember (1921, 177; 1926, 302, fn. 10; ESS §24.b.3), whose suggestion was quoted in GÄSW 169, #685 with doubt, identified it with Ar. naḥaḍa „to sharpen (a lance), loosen (flesh from bone)”, naḥīḍ- „sharp, pointed (spear-head)” [Ember] = nahada I „3. rendre mince et effilé (le fer d’une lance, etc.)”, naḥīḍ- „effilé, rendu mince, réduit dans sa largeur (fer d’une lance, etc.)”.

(2) I. Teitelbaum (quoted and approved by C.H. Gordon 1955, 294, #1206) associated it with Ug. ngh N „mit Hörnern stossen” [Aistleitner 1948, 211] = „to gore” [Gordon] = „aneinanderstossen” [WUS #1745], Hbr. ṣorgh qal „stossen (v. gehörnten Tieren)”, piel „stossen (m. d. Hörnern)” [GB 483], which is possible as Eg. *ṣngh may indeed derive from AA *ṣngh.

(3) E. Edel (AÄG xxxix, lxiv, §256.A), followed by G. Fecht (1960, §374), J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 156), J. Osing (NBÄ 211), and W. Westendorf (KHW 137, fn. 8; LÄ VI 1319) saw in it an n-Bildung from Eg. ḥd „white”. Most of them also supposed a deverbal origin, namely from a lost Eg. *ḥd verb Iae n-, which was opposed by J. Osing (NBÄ 748-9, n. 908) arguing that there is no reason to assume *ṣnḥđ. Th Bardinet (1990, 43-44, 279), in turn, reconstructed *nj-ḥđ.t „la blanche” (sic, etymological rendering not given) supported by late puns.


(5) S. Cauville (1987, 183) equally applied a prefix n-, but she affiliated the word for „tooth” with Eg. ḥd „couper, séparer” derived by her (via an alleged p- prefix!) from Eg. ḥd (sic, in fact a verb IIIae inf.) „détruire”.

(6) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #1235) combined it with PRift *ḥunč- „to chew” [Ehret 1980, 302] via metathesis and explained both from their AA *ḥanVč-. This is the most tempting Afro-Asiatic etymology that has been so far offered.

(7) GT: or perhaps related to Sem. *nšḥ „to shine” [Leslau 1969, 60; KB 716] III NOm.: Kefoid (PGonga) *nečč-/neč- „white” [GT]: Bworo neč-a (-ts’-), Beke neč-o, Anfillo neč-o (-ts’-), Bosha neč-/nečč-o, Kaffa načč-o, Mocha nečč-o (Crl. 1951, 478; Fleming 1987, 148, #5)? E. Cerulli (I.c.) supposed the Kaffa to have been the source of

---

82 L. Reinisch (1895, 180) and E. Zyhtarz (1932-33, 169; 1934, 59) equated Eg. ndḥ.t with Bed. nad „Zahn” [Rn.], which was apparently supported by F. von Calice (GASW 169, #685) and reaffirmed by M. Cohen (1947, 186, #449), although it is clearly wrong (because Bed. d has nothing to do with Eg. ḥ) as it has been pointed out already W. Vycichl (1960, 262). On the other hand, C.T. Hodge (1969, 108, #8) affiliated the Egyptian term with Sem.: Ar. nataha „to butt” (phonologically false, since Sem. *ṭ- ≠ Eg. -d-) and LECu.: Somali ḍuḥ „marrow” [Abr.] (semantically baseless). Later Hodge (1992, 205-6) derived Eg. ndḥ.t from Eg. nd „grind” with an affix -ḥ.

83 Ch. Ehret (1995, 330, #644) extended this Arabo-Egyptian match to Ar. ṣnh „to shave, plane, scratch, saw off, carve wood or stone” III ECU. *ṭnḥ- „to shape to a point” III WCh. *ṭw „horn”, all these derived by him from his AA *ṭnḥ- „to shape to a point”. Baseless.

84 Strangely, A. Guillaume (1965 IV 16) equated Hbr. ṣorgh with Ar. nataha „to butt” (!), which is phonologically unacceptable.
Amh. näč (henceforth, not root inherited from Semitic), whereas W. Leslau (l.c.), on the contrary, supposed in Kafa and other Kefoid reflexes too an Amharic borrowing.

(8) GT: since our term suspiciously has no cognates meaning „tooth” on Afro-Asiatic grounds, it is impossible not to take ESudanic *nig-t- „tooth” [Bnd. 2005, 31, #59] and thus also Nilo-Saharan *nǐğh „tooth” [Ehret 2001, 317, #267] into account as extra-Afro-Asiatic areal parallels with regard to their strikingly identical root vocalism. The Coptic data suggest an Eg. *nīfıt > *nīfıt (Edel, Vergote, Osing). I.e., we may project a pre-OEg. *nīg-ḥ.at carrying the marker *-ḥ- of the nominal class of anatomical terms (Takács 1997). Actually, this scenario seems most convincing at the moment, i.e., we may have here a non-Afro-Asiatic word.

**Eg. tz „Zahn” (MK-, Wb V 401, 1), fem. tz.t „Zahn” (XVIII., Wb V 409, 9-12): here we have a large scale of Afro-Asiatic nominal root varieties for „tooth” that are phonologically to be distinguished even if ultimately they may be perhaps interrelated (and are henceforth frequently compared in the literature including Eg. tz):85


85 Dolgopol’skij 1964, 60 (sine Eg.); Bynon 1984, 271 (sine Eg.); Blažek 1989 MS Om., 29, #102 and 1994 MS Bed., 22 (sine Eg.); Orel Stolbova 1992, 171; HSED #1484.

86 W. Vycichl (1989, 18, §6.b) reconstructed the underlying PBrb. root as *ṿkwky (so, without the sibilant element), which does not agree with the facts attested in the Berber daughter languages.

87 A. Dolgopolsky (1983, 134, #7.8) affiliated the Ahaggar-Sidamo isogloss with Sem. *ṿkt „to bite”, which – provided its lae n- was indeed a root extension – might represent a further member of the above enumerated wide family of root varieties for „tooth”.

---

85 Dolgopol’skij 1964, 60 (sine Eg.); Bynon 1984, 271 (sine Eg.); Blažek 1989 MS Om., 29, #102 and 1994 MS Bed., 22 (sine Eg.); Orel Stolbova 1992, 171; HSED #1484.

86 W. Vycichl (1989, 18, §6.b) reconstructed the underlying PBrb. root as *ṿkwky (so, without the sibilant element), which does not agree with the facts attested in the Berber daughter languages.

87 A. Dolgopolsky (1983, 134, #7.8) affiliated the Ahaggar-Sidamo isogloss with Sem. *ṿkt „to bite”, which – provided its lae n- was indeed a root extension – might represent a further member of the above enumerated wide family of root varieties for „tooth”.
regard to Sem. *√kss, especially noteworthy is the OEg. hapax tss written with the same tusk determinative that is used also with Eg. jbh and nhq.t „tooth“ (EG1 454, F18). This obscure and otherwise unknown verbal root only occurs in PT 118a „In Verbindung mit śnb.t ‘Brust von Personen’“ (Wb V 410, 10), which R.O. Faulkner ventured to render (as a pure „guess“) as „to tear (breast)“ (AEPT 330). It was G. Roquet (1984, 367) who has already surmised that PT tss – albeit under a quite different translation not really compatible with the tusk determinative – is probably be related with Eg. tz.t. All this might only be possible if Eg. tz.t from the New Kingdom does not reflect the historical writing of the word, which has unfortunately not yet been attested from the Old Kingdom. It is to be noted here that A.G. Belova (1989, 13), in turn, equated NK tz.t with a modern dialectal Ar. √kzz „сжимать, стискивать зубы, скрежетать зубами“. My suggestion for PT tss would be „to picken“, which – along with the tusk sign – would be well understandable from a hypothetic Eg. *tss „to bite“ or the like.

„Tongue“


⁸⁸ The context is: j.ḥ$n n j hhₚn.w wṯj nb n tss.w śnb.t translated by R.O. Faulkner as „rejoice, o you who hoe (?)! Lift up the hearts of those who tore (?) the breast ...“ (AEPT 37). As for why the tusk determinative was applied for a verb denoting an action of birds, he (AEPT 37, utt. 204, n. 2) speculated that the birds were tearing the breast „with their nails in grief (?)“. G. Roquet (1984, 368), in turn, regarded ḫ(-)ss.w śnb.t as participium conjunctum characterizing a bird of prey (as bjk C3-šnb.t „faucon au jabot durci“, The text continues as ḫm-n=sn ś३ḥ br.w „parce qu’ils ont avalé l’Oeil d’Horus ...“ and Roquet was thinking here of „la voracité des prédateurs entraînant la dilatatio croissante de leur gésier ou de leur jabot ..., qui devient alors de plus en plus ferme et dur du fait de la saturation“.

⁹⁰ A. Roccati (1988, 118) attributes a value *nis (i.e., njs) to the tongue hieroglyph on the basis of the phonogrammatical plene writing njs in PT 383 with a complement -j- (cf. Wb II 324, 12) and also because of the application of the tongue sign in the writing of nj-sw „he belongs to“ (Wb II 197, 4).
A widely known (almost) common Afro-Asiatic root with abundant literature. The question to be addressed here is whether the Egyptian term was of Semitic etymology. Convinced of that this was the case, W.A. Ward (1972, 20, §155-159) forced a far-fetched theory that “it seems better to assume that the final -n has dropped out in Egyptian and Berber rather than that it has been added in Semitic”. But it is quite obvious that the Semitic triliteral stem is due to an innovation, while the Berber and Chadic reflexes as well as Egyptian have retained the older biliteral root. There is a communis opinio on that the final Sem. *-ān- was not part of the original root. All this implies that Eg. *lís cannot be rendered as coming directly from Semitic.

Eg. sn.w „Zunge” (GR, Wb IV 155, 15) = „tongue” (PL 854): as – among others – P. Wilson (PL 854) concludes (quite naturally), it may well be the late metathesis of Eg. ns, and snk, as pointed out by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #2248), may be akin to SAgaw *caŋ- < **cank- (?) „tongue” [GT] ll WCh.: NBauchi *sšiŋk- „tongue” [Skn. 1977, 45] = *sīnaK [Stl. 1987, 253] = *šin-(d/k)- [Skn. 1987, 81] > i.a. Diri šiındû [IL] = šındû [Skn.] ll CCh.: Hwona šene-wura „tongue” [Krf.] l Masa (Banana) sin-na „Zunge” [Lukas 1970, 33] = sin-da [Skn.] = sín-ná [Jng.]. N. Skinner (1987, 81) compared several of the above...

Eg. nt „Zunge” (PT, Spiegel 1971, 442, fn. 20; ÄWb I 1602a) = „tongue” (AEPT 180);95 here too, no Semitic cognates are attested. On the African side of the family, regular correspondences are known from LECu.: Arbore -læke (?) „tongue” [Bender 1971, 251, #87] ||| WCh. *√lk „Zunge” [JS 1981, 27A3]97 Dera yîl-Òk “tongue”, cf. yîlèk „saliva” [JI 1994 I 169] = yilik [Skinner 1987, 82] | SBauchi *√lk „tongue” [GT]. Whether CCh.: Lamang nəlɛ “tongue” [Meek] | (?) PMandara *√r “tongue” [GT] 99 (Ch. data: JI 1994 II 328-9) are directly related 100 or derive rather from a special Central

---

95 Attested (pace Spiegel l.c.) in nêt-bs „Flammenzunge” (PT 396c) and supposedly also in the divine name hr. h-r-nt=f (PT 1088b-c, Wb II 357, 9). Reluctant to accept it as a distinct lexeme on its own, K. Sethe (ÜKAPT VI 145) tried to render it as a „Nebenform zu” (!) Eg. ns „Zunge” (phonologically impossible) or ntt „die Fesselnde”. L.H. Lesko (1972, 110, n. j) rendered nêt in CT VII 422b-c too as „tongue” referring to PT 1088c, which was objected by R.O. Faulkner (AECT III 158, spell 1101, n. 5) as no tongue determinative is used in the CT exx.: „my impression is that 422b-c is quite corrupt”. R. van der Molen (DCT 256) too saw in these CT instances just a variety of nnt „secretion, saliva”. Similarly, D. Meeks (2005, 248, #669a) viewed that the writing in CT VII 422b and 435c „déterminé par la bouche qui crache suggère plutôt ‘sécréstion, crachat’. La référence à PT 396c est sans doute à comprendre ntb=s comme dans CT VI 270c”. Also B. Backes (2005, 395, 456) gives for CT VII (Zweiwegebuch) nêt „Gewölle (?), das Ausgespuckte”.
96 Misquoted as Tsamay laeke by N. Skinner (1987, 81).
97 H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibriszimow (1994 I 169), in turn, suppose that the West Chadic root (referred to by them as ly-g forms) stems from Benue-Congo *-lake (De Wolff), which is hardly probable in the light of the Afro-Asiatic cognates.
98 Cf. Geji leka, Zul and Booluu (Migang) lÚka, Zaranda lÚgà, Zaranda lÚgà, Zeem lÚgà, Tule, Chaari, and Dokshi lyaaga (SBauchi: Smz. 1978, 32, #50).
100 As O. Stolbova (2005, 59-60, #152) insisted. In order to derive both the West (with *l-) and the Central Chadic (*n- and C2 < *-k-/*-k-) forms, she created an artificial PCh. *n-IV[h]-k- „tongue”. By the way, Stolbova’s derivation of ECh.: Toram liho „tongue” [Alio] (Atio) as the same root is a rude error as this is merely a reflex of Ch. *lis- with a regular shift of *-s- > -h-.
Chadic root variety *√nk „tongue” [GT]. It cannot be decided which the Eg. word is directly cognate with. L. Reinisch (1884, 386; 1887, 257) and H.G. Mukarovsky (1987, 28 and 266) combined the Chadic root with Sem.: Ar. laqlaq- „langue” [BK II 1016]101 /// NAgaw *lanq- „tongue” [Apl. 1991, 20] /// LECu.: Oromo lag-ā „Zunge” [Rn.]102 (which seems to be isolated in ECu.).103

„Lung”

Eg. zm3 „Lunge” (PT-, Wb III 445-446)104 was correctly equated by C.T. Hodge (1990, 646, §15.B) with Sem. *√zmr „to blow, make music” [Hodge],105 among whose reflexes especially noteworthy are Ar. zamara „jouer de l’instrument à vent appelé zammār-at-, remplir une outre, crier etc.”, zammār-at- „espèce de flûte composée de deux tuyaux, sorte de collier en bois” [BK I 1010] = zamara „souffler dans un roseau, jouer de la flûte”, zammār-at- „espèce de flûte” [DRS] = „to pipe, play upon a reed, blow in a mizmār- (a musical reed or pipe, now called flute)” [Lane 1250] = zamara „embouchure (cor, trompette), chanter, gronder, remplir une outre” [Dozy I 602] (Sem.: DRS 751).106 In addition, Hispanic Ar. zummāra „gosier, panse des ruminants” as well as zamara „remplir une outre” [DRS] represent one step even further than „flute”107 does on the way towards how the sense „lung” developed in Egyptian.
Eg. *wf3 „Lunge” (BD, Wb I 306, 3): following Belova’s Law (cf. EDE I 394-400), we may safely presume Eg. *wf3 to have originated in AA *ful-; i.e. w- was part of the original biconsonantal root reflecting the ultimate AA root vowel *-u-.\textsuperscript{108} which is now corroborated by cognates like WCh.: Angas-Sura *folok ~ *felek → *fəlok (or perhaps *fw-?).\textsuperscript{109} „lungen” [GT 2004, 109] | Bokkos folok „Lunge” [Jng. 1970, 141] \& CCh.: Bachama fāfulàwey „lungs” [Krf.]. The underlying AA *ful-/ *fwal- „lunge” [GT],\textsuperscript{111} which finds an areal parallel in PWNilgiritic *pˈhul-, *-pˈulpul- „lungs” [Smz. 1981, 16, #70], may eventually have been derived from AA *√fw1 „to blow” [GT].\textsuperscript{112} 

\textsuperscript{108} P. Lacau (1970, 95, #248), however, supposed in it a w- prefix (Lacau: “suffixe formant les instrumentaux”) derivation from an unattested *f3, whose „nifal” stem he figured in Eg. nf3 [reg. < *nfr] „ausniesen, (aus)schnauben” (CT, Wb II 252, 3; Osing 1986, 209, n. a) = „respirer, souffler” (Lacau 1972, 36, §43, #5) = „expirer, expulser (du nez)” (Cannuyer 1983, 26) = „to blow, exhale” (DCT 222). But, unfortunately, Lacau ignored the external evidence, cf. Sem.: JNAram. nfr „to blow the nose” [Sabar 2002, 234] \& NBrb. *vnfr „to exhale” [GT]: Nefusa e-nfer „se moucher” [Mtl. 1904, 138] \& Tamazight (Zemmur) nfer „se moucher”, a-nfur, pl. a-nfur- n- „1. (gros) nez, 2. marine” [Taifi 1991, 473] | Qabyle neffe e-nfer „se moucher” [Mtl. 1904, 138] |Tamazight (Zemmur) nfr „to exhale” (BD, Wb I 306, 3): following Belova’s Law (cf. EDE I 394-400), we may safely presume Eg. *wf3 to have originated in AA *ful-; i.e. w- was part of the original biconsonantal root reflecting the ultimate AA root vowel *-u-.\textsuperscript{108} which is now corroborated by cognates like WCh.: Angas-Sura *folok ~ *felek → *fəlok (or perhaps *fw-?).\textsuperscript{109} „lungen” [GT 2004, 109] | Bokkos folok „Lunge” [Jng. 1970, 141] \& CCh.: Bachama fāfulàwey „lungs” [Krf.]. The underlying AA *ful-/ *fwal- „lunge” [GT],\textsuperscript{111} which finds an areal parallel in PWNilgiritic *pˈhul-, *-pˈulpul- „lungs” [Smz. 1981, 16, #70], may eventually have been derived from AA *√fw1 „to blow” [GT].\textsuperscript{112} 

\textsuperscript{109} Since the only evidence for *f- is one single Angas record [Flk.] (which can be secondary labialization as well), the reflexes could be alternatively explained from AS *folok ~ *felek. 


\textsuperscript{113} The Chadic words for “lungs” were erroneously affilianted in HSED #775 with HECu. *afale “liver” [Hds. 1989, 404] \& NOm.: Kefoid (PGonga) *afar-o „liver” [Bnd. 2003, 168, #81] = *afar- [GT]. But as H.G. Mukarovsky (1987, 103; 1989 MS, 5) rightly pointed out, this HECu.-Kefoid parallel represents a distinct AA root with different Chadic cognates such as WCh.: Angas-Sura *falak ~ *folok „liver” [GT 2004, 104]: Chip fələk < *fəlok? „liver” [Krf.], Tal fələk [Krf.], Montol fələk [Krf.], Goemay fələk „the liver” [Srl. 1937, 47] = fələ (so, no 3rd consonant) „liver” [Krf.] = falek [ə- < -e-] „lungs” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 9] \& CCh.: Fali-Bwagira faro „liver” [Krf.] = falak „flute”) and phonologically (Ma’a z- = Qwadza ʒ-, Takács 2011, 121) problematic. 

\textsuperscript{114} LAYERS OF THE OLDEST EGYPTIAN LEXICON I 109
"Heart"


Eg. ḥ3.tj „Herz” (PT, Wb III 26-27): all attempts at an external etymology[115] have proven vain for phonological reasons. Quite naturally, since this term, as formulated

[113] With regard to Eg. mjnb “ax” written sometimes with a heart hieroglyph carrying apparently the consonantal value jnb, C.T. Hodge (1976, 20-21, n. 56) concluded to that the word for “heart” is in fact jnb with a probable dialect var. j3b.


[115] H. Holma (1919, 40, n. 1) combined it, e.g., with Akk. irtu “Lunge”, whence he erroneously reconstructed a nowhere attested Sem. *hirtu „Brust” (sic), although the Common Semitic term for „lung” has never had *h-, cf. *rik?-at/*rik-at- (SED I s.v.). M. Cohen (1947, #134), in turn, compared – with some doubts – Brb. (sic, language
by several specialists of Egyptian philology, is nothing else but a nisbe of Eg. 3.t „front part” and so – as H. Grapow (1954, 64) writes – it „bezeichnet das Organ augenscheinlich als das ‘vorn’ im Körper befindliche”. Discussing this nisbe rendered as „celui du devant”, P. Lacau (1970, 93-94) was correctly concluding that „ce nom du cœur est une dérivation égyptienne; le mot n’a pas de correspondant en sémitique, il est relativement récent”.

Eg. jdr „Herz” (LP, Wb I 155, 1) was affiliated by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 186; HSED #127) with a number of attractive parallels, which, however, represent two distinct AA roots:

(1) PAngas *ḍūr (from *ḍugur?) „heart” [GT 2004, 97],116 which stands apparently isolated even within Angas-Sura.117 If there is a West Chadic cognate, it is perhaps Angas-Sura *ḍugur „kidney” [GT 2004, 96],118 which – strangely – has no reflex in Angas with the sense „kidney”, where *ḍūr is regularly derivable from **ḍugur.


„Hand”

Eg. *d (Osing: *jάd) „die Hand, als Hieroglyphe für d, nur im Schriftzeichen belegt” (Wb V 414, 3), hence dj.w (m), dj.t (f) „5” (OK-, Wb V 420, 9-12),121 reflected in Coptic as *dō(j.ă)w (m) → (S) ṭΟΥ, *dōj.ăt (f) → (S) Œ,122 which is usually regared to have

not specified) a-gad “intérieur de la poitrine”. W. Leslau (1949, 314) assumed it to be better to be connected with Eth. ̀ongad’a or ̀ongad’a „breast”. V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 186) CCh. ̀hay- „heart”.


117 A.B. Dolgopolsky (1982, 33) mistakenly identified the Angas word for “heart” (misleadingly rendered by him also as “chest”) with Sura tāḏūr “chest”, which is, however, to be derived from Common Angas-Sura *tṛγur ~ *tōγor „1. side/trunk of body, 2. chest, breast” [GT 2004, 386], which was followed by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (l.c.), who forged a false WCh. *d- „heart” with an unattested *d and a short *-u-. Dolgopolsky’s external comparison with Ar. zawr- „upper part of the breast” is equally unacceptable for phonological reasons (Angas d- ≠ Sem. z-).


119 Based by Ch. Ehret (l.c.) on the comparison of Iraqw durumi „first stomach”, Burunge durumiya „large intestines”, and Dahalo ḍuùr „intestines”, which he later (Ehret 1987, 55, #203) affiliated with Agaw *zhir- „intestines”. This latter etymology is, nevertheless, incorrect as the first radicals do not correspond.

120 This isolated form is, naturally, insufficient for assuming an ECh. *dur- “middle” as Orel and Stolbova (l.c.) suggested.

121 See Müller 1909, 191, fn. 2; Sethe 1916, 22, §5; 1927, 60-61; Ember 1917, 88, fn. 1; Albright 1918, 91; Homburger 1928, 336-337, Zyhlzar 1931, 136-137, #5; Brunner-Traut, LÄ II 582; Loprieno, LÄ VI 1308. Note that F. Lexa (1922, 176) erroneously explained the Eg. numeral from another word for “hand” (dř.t ~ d3.t).
originated in a nisbe **jād.īy (Oising, Loprieno) rendered as "belonging to hand" (GT) = „die zu einer Hand Gehörigen" (Oising) or „hand, pentad (of fingers)" (Albright pace Sethe). This derivation, paralleled by a number of analogical instances, is actually based on the commonly accepted comparison of Eg. *d with Common Sem. *yad-„hand”, which was denied by Rösslerian E.A. Knauf (1982, 31, 34) unconvincingly combining the Eg. word with Akk. ʾūtu „Spanne”.

Eg. dr.t ~ d3.t126 „Hand” (PT-, Wb V 580-9 vs. 516, 5-8) = „palm of the hand” (Müller 1909, 191) has no Semitic background. On the contrary, some researchers (e.g., Kaplony in KBIÄF 160, n. 208, presented by A. Loprieno in LÄ V 1212 as the „communis opinio”) suppose here an Egyptian innovation literally signifying *"Greiferin” derived from a hypothetic Eg. *√dr, whose root variety with an extension n- is attested as nḏrj „fassen, packen” (OK, Wb V 382-3). Not necessarily contradicting this theory, I have elsewhere (EDE I ) suggested a cognacy with CCh. *√ngr [GT]: Daba ngra "Arm” [Str. 1910, 453] = ṅgar ~ ṅgra „bras, main, doigt” [Mch. 1966, 143], Musgoy wūri ʾngra „hand” [Mch.], Kola ngrā „hand” [Schubert] l Musgum ḥngrange „arm” [Roeder] l Buduma ṑgru „shoulder” [Grb.] (CCh.: JI 1994 II 179) l ECh. *√grN „hand, wing, shoulder” [Skn. 1992, 346]: Karbo goreny „shoulder” [Grb. 1963, 62]. In A. Loprieno’s (LÄ V 1214, n. 31) opinion, however, „besser wäre m.E. in einer Sprachtabu-Perspektive die Interpretation ’die Fernhaltende’ bzw. ’Fernzuhaltende’”, i.e., a derivation from Eg. ḏr „fernhalten von jem., (einen Zustand) beseitigen, (Fuss, Schreiten) aufhalten” (PT-, Wb V 595, 5-7). It is a pity that he was unable to establish this semantical development in the light of convincing parallels. All other proposals for the etymology of Eg. dr/3.t are out of the question. The very old comparison with Hebrew zeret and Aram. zartā „span”127 fails because Eg. ƙ = Sem. *z can only occur in loans, but not genetic cognates. The same pertains to the frequent equation of Eg. dr.t with Sem. *dirāče- „shoulder” [Frz.

---

124 Hommel 1883, 440, n. 30; Ember 1913, 115, #50; 1918, 30; Sethe 1916, 22-23; ESS §26.a.17; GÄSW 25, #11; Vergote 1945, 131, #2.a.3; Cohen 1947, #493; Gordon 1957, 273; Vycichl 1958, 373; 1959, 39, 1985, 174-5, §4; Faulkner 1959, 102-3; Hodge 1976, 12, #47; DELC 223; MM 1983, 219; Loprieno in LÄ V 1212, 1213, n. 26, VI 1308; Hodge 1990, 647, #23.A.
125 Sem. data: Rabin 1975, 88, #37; Leslau 1945, 233.
126 Their variation (noted already by Erman 1892, 126, fn. 2; Müller 1909, 191; Möller 1921, 196, Lexa 1922, 176 without explanation) may be due – as W. Vycichl (1990, 40, 196) rightly pointed out – to that of the status absolutus *√dr.t > Cpt. (S) ṭawer vs. status pronominalis *√dr.t= > *dʒ3.t= > Cpt. (S) ṭoom=. G. Farina (1926, 17) noted also a pl. ḏ3.wt.
127 Sethe 1912, 94; Albright 1918, 90; Farina 1924, 324; 1926, 16; ESS §24.c.1; Yeivin 1932, 73, fn. 6; GÄSW 227, #946; Brunner 1969, 88, #483; Ward 1972, 22, #293, Conti 1976, 267, fn. 18. A cognacy was correctly rejected already by W. M. Müller (1909, 191) due semantical considerations. Following Bondi (1894, 132 and fn. 1), who established Hbr. mēzāḥ as a loan from Eg. mdḥ, Th. Lambdin (1953, 149-150) did not rule out a borrowing into Semitic in the MK or even before „when a *ḥart- was current” in Egyptian. This hypothesis is in full accordance with the rules of Canaanite nomina segolata (Dolgopolsky 1986).
LAYERS OF THE OLDEST EGYPTIAN LEXICON I

1964, 259] where the Sem. C would not even be reflected in Egyptian. Also C.T. Hodge’s (1979, 497) comparanda displaying an initial *ṭ- are evidently out of question as Eg. d- ≠ Sem. *ṭ-. In the opinion of E.A. Knauf (1982, 37, n. 19), „zweifellos gehört äg. /ṣrt/ mit akk. qatu zusammen”, whose „mittlere Liquide wurde im Akkadischen an den Vokal assimiliert” (!). One cannot be surprised enough at this astonishing suggestion contradicting the elementary rules of the Akkadian historical phonology. Th. Schneider (1997, 208, #116), in turn, projected a nowhere attested pre-Eg. *qaltu (sic) wishing to equate it with NBrb.: Tamazight i-γil „Arm, Vorderarm, Elle” || Qabyle i-γil „Arm, Elle” || Tuareg a-γil „(ganzes) Arm”, which lautgeschichtlich represents another mistake.

Eg. gd (NK)\textsuperscript{133} ~ qd.t (XXII.)\textsuperscript{134} ~ qd (4\textsuperscript{th} cent. BC)\textsuperscript{135} – all vars. are feminine and in group-writing typical (albeit not in absolute terms) of loans – „hand” (Černý 1958, 212, #10; CED 340) = „Hand(rücken)” (GHWb 870) = „.back of the hand” (DLE IV 28) > Dem. gīd ~ gd ~ kīd „Hand” (DG 595:4) > Cpt. (SALF) sīx, (BF) xīx, (F) xixx,\textsuperscript{136} (pBodmer VI) kīx, (MF) kō (f) „Hand, Vorderfuß (bei Tieren), Handvoll (als Maß), Handgriff, Bügel, Handarbeit, Führung, Handschrift” (KHW 472): as an anatomical term, i.e., part of the core lexicon (not typical to be borrowed), it must be rather an item of the Volkssprache with no Older Egyptian etymon attested in written form (henceforth, with no graphemic tradition) prior to the New Kingdom, which is why syllabic orthography was applied here. V. Blažek (1990, 30; 1991, 210) affiliated it with NOm. *k+wici „5” [Blz.] and NOm. *vkč „pyka” [IS 1971, #80] = *kuc-/*kis- „hand or arm” [Bnd.-Flm. 1976, 38] = *kuc „hand” [Bnd. 1988, 147]. This correspondence may be correct provided the C\textsubscript{2} of the Omotic root was a glottal affricate.

128 Yeivin 1932, 73, fn. 6; Bomhard 1984, 218 V. Blažek 1989 MS Om., 16, #52 also NOm.: Janjero zerum “hand” and some Chadic forms.

129 Where, by the way, one would expect a reflex like **z3 > *z3h (for the shift of *ṭ > ḫ in the proximity of dentals see EDE I 326-7).

130 Sem.: Ar. tar-„flank” || SBrb. (Tuareg) a-der „leg” || LECu.: Somali ḏar-ooyya „to bank up” || WCh.: Hausa caarā „to arrange”.

131 His two pieces of “evidence” (namely Mehri qūn “Horn” < *qrūm and Aram. y-hāk “er geht” < *vhlk), however, do not prove a bit about his ad hoc supposition about the alleged loss of *r- in Akkadian.

132 An apparent cognate appears in LECu.: Galab gīl, pl. gill-ū “hand” [Sasse 1974, 416], which – as I have demonstrated it elsewhere (Takács 2011, 148-150) – speaks in favour of an AA *γl „hand” [GT] as it had long been surmised by W. Vycichl (1934, 69, 84; 1951, 68).

133 Attested in the Leipzig NK stela no. 122, in a (fem.) PN ndm-gd „one with a tender hand”, recorded in PN I 215:20 and by Spiegelberg in his KHW 212, n. 12.

134 Occurs in p’orino 1984, vs. 20-21, in the enumeration of body parts listed between dr.t „hand” and k3p „hollow of the hand”, which led J. Černý (l.c.) to assuming our word to be „in the XXIInd Dynasty not quite synonymous with dr.t as the meaning of [ij might lead us to believe”.

135 Cf. pBM 10252 (Urk. VI 83:6): t3j=k qd 2, rendered by dr.tj=k(j) „your two hands” in pLouvre 3129.

136 Is the additional -h a trace of the AA marker *- of the nominal class of anatomical terminology (described in Takács 1997)?
Eg. j3bj „links, linke Seite, die Linke” (OK-, Wb I 30) > j3b.t „1. linke Seite, 2. Osten” (OK-, Wb I 30, 14-15): its etymology has not yet been definitely settled due to the plurality of attractive solutions:

(1) F. Hommel (1894, 346, 1904, 109), followed by G.R. Castellino (1984, 17), surmised here an old loan-word from Sumerian gùb, but Hommel’s supposition on the Sumerian term becoming „später etwa jib” as well as the lack of reflection (or source?) of the Eg. -b- in Sumerian hinder such an equation.

(2) W. Vycichl (1990, 91) affiliated it with Sem.: Ar. waפתח and yaواب „avoir honte, être en colère” arguing that „la main gauche” was „considérée comme étant de mauvaise augure, avec la quelle on ne mange pas et qu’ on ne tend pas aux amis”. Phonologically possible, albeit semantically far-fetched.

(3) H.G. Mukarovsky (1994, 148) found surprising correspondences in the languages of Central Chadic, where a proto-form *jàḅ(a) „zur linken Hand” > „Norden” [GT] emerges in the Higi and Mandara groups with a variety *jàḅ-, which may regularly be traced back to an older **làḅ-, i.e., a proto-form fully plausible for Eg. jàḅb too. Similarly, V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 200; HSED #1821) compared Eg. jàḅbj with WCh.: Seya (Zar) nàḅ „left” [Krf. 1981, #330], which is perhaps the reflex of the same **làḅ-. But their supposition on an eventual etymological link to AA *li/ub- „heart” [OS] is dubious because of the anomaly of *-b- in root for „left” vs. *-b- in that of „heart”.

(4) H.G. Mukarovsky (1994, 152, §4.2) suggested, at the same time, a semantically possible138 cognacy with NAgaw: Bilin arèbá „schwarz”, which is, however, phonologically dubious.139

(5) Another path has been opened by C.T. Hodge (1966, 44, #9; 1968, 26, #50; 1981, 375) pointing to a possible connection to WCh.: Hausa ʔàràewáà „northwards” [Abr. 1962, 36] (actually *,„to the left”), but whether Eg. -b- and Hausa -w- can be equated is obscure.

(6) In my opinion, the root meaning of Eg. *jàḅb might be better understood in the light of Eg. jàḅ „(Adjektiv und Verbum übler Bedeutung) vom Geruch der Leiche” (OK, Wb I 29, 19) = „übel riechen, krank sein” (NBÄ 84) = „übelriechend, stinkend sein” (GHWb 24), hence *jè/jàḅ.Ït „Krankheit u.ä.” (NBÄ) > Cpt. (S) ħla(ā)BC, (B) lâB1, (F) 1EC(ī)B1 (f) „Eiter, Krankheit” (NBÄ 84, 423, n. 94, 427, n. 97), for which

---


138 Cf. Ar. ʿṣîm- „malheur, infortune, adversité, 2. malheureux, 3. (qui est à) gauche, 4. (pl.) Noirs (en parlant des chameaux)” [BK I 1179].

139 L. Reinisch (1887, 47) has Agaw (sic) aràb „schwarz, blau sein” corresponding to LECu:: Saho Ṽrāba ~ wàrbā „schwarz gefleckte Kuh” [Rn.], which he affiliated with Sem. *jèṛb „untergehen (die Sonne), finster werden”. Nevertheless, a cognacy is by far not evident either semantically or phonologically. As I pointed out elsewhere (Takács 2011, 139-154), the regular match of Sem. *jè would be ECu. *g.
highly noteworthy is Ar. √rab: I 9ariba „1. être dans la misère, 2. avoir besoin de qqch., 4. être dur, difficile, défavorable (se dit des temps, du sort), 5. se sentir faible, flâche, sans vigueur”, √urb- „1. malheur, infortune, adversité, 2. scrupule” [BK I 22-23]. An Egypto-Semitic root?

Eg. smḥ.j „links (Adj.), die Linke (Subst.)” (NE, Wb IV 140) = „left (side, hand, arm)” (DLE III 53) has always been unisono combined with Sem. *ša²mal- „sinistro, mano sinistra” [Frz.] = *šVm(?)Vl- [Mlt.], although this equation is surrounded by a number of puzzles. Although – except for the -m- – neither of the radicals in fact display any regular correspondence, let alone that of Eg. -mḥ- vs. Sem. -*ml-, which has never been elucidated satisfactorily. As the evidence of Ar. √šm indicates and as A. Ember (1926, 312, #7) rightly stated, the Semitic stem might be segmented into *ša²m- + -*al-, a „secondary addition”. This opinion has been expressed also in the work by S.S. Majzel’ and A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 236), who, however, mistakenly supposed a quite different original sense. F. von Calice (GÄSW 197-8, #809) saw in both Sem. *ša²mal- and Eg. smḥj „verschiedene Weiterbildungen einer Wurzel šm (sic), die aber nicht der Urspruch angehören können, da das s im Ägyptischen westsemitischen Lautstand zeigt”. Nevertheless, Eg. smḥj can by no means be regarded as a loan from Canaanite (or whatever) due to the differing C3 in Egyptian, which may not be explained the same way as Sem. -*al-. Is it identical with the suffix -ḫ occurring in Egyptian

---

140 Erman 1892, 119; Holma 1911, x, Ember 1926, 312, #7; Farina 1926, 20; GÄSW 197-8, #809. Nevertheless, W.A. Ward (1961, 38, #21) remarked that the Semitic word „doesn’t appear in Eg. or Dem.”, just on a Coptic ostracon as smmol “left/east (?)” (CD 565b), which is evidently a Semitic loan.


142 A. Ember (l.c. supra) assumed an irreal chain of smḥj (sic, -ḥ-) < *šmḥj < **šm3j without any comparative evidence. The only way out to explain this anomalous match would be assuming an equally striking connection between Eg. mḥ and Sem. *ml⁹ „to fill”.

143 Cf. stem I: ša²ama „1. être de mauvais augure, sinistre, malencontreux, porter malheur à qqn.”, šu³ima „1. être sinistre, de mauvais augure, porter malheur, 2. être à gauche, se présenter du côté gauche”, ša³im- „1. (qui est à) gauche, 2. sinistre, de mauvais augure, qui porte malheur, 3. méchant”, šu³m- „malheur, infortune, adversité, 2. malheureux, 3. (qui est à) gauche” [BK I 1178-9].

144 Whether CCh.: Fali-Muchella mà-šîmbûr „left” [Krf.] is related and whether the same historical analysis can be made here too, is not yet clear (as long as as further Chadic cognates are not at our disposal).

145 S.S. Majzel’ and A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 236 and fn. 36), followed by A. Gluhak (1987, 163, fn. 11), assumed an etymological connection with Soqotri šē³emet „courbé, qui penche d’un côté” [Lsl. 1938, 409], but the initial sibilants differ (the term for „left” has š- and lacks -ṣ-). In addition, as W. Leslau (l.c.) points out, the Soqotri term is extended from źamt „côté” akin to Geez ṭanta „à côté de, vers” cf. Sem. *ẓamm-at- „Elle” [GT after GB 47; WUS 24, #272; AHW 44] || Eg. jm „1. (OK) ein Körperteil: ob Rippe (?)”, 2. (XIX.) auch als essbarer Teil einer Gazelle: Rippenstück (?)” (Wb I 77, 16-17) = „side” (FD 17) = „Rippe(nstück)” (ÄWb I 72a) || WCh.: Bade ḥâm-ḥn (f) „Arm (und Hand)” [Lukas 1968, 222], Ṯgizim ḥām-āi „arm, hand” [Schuh 1981. 9].
I.e., do we have here a nisbe of a lost Eg. *smḥ „left side”? On the other hand, the rare, albeit existing irregular correspondence of Eg. s- vs. Sem. *š-is attested.

Dem. ghjr „links” (DG 578:3) > (SL) őboy, (SMF) 2boy, (AL) őbi, (pBodmer VI) kbip (f) „left hand” (CED 275) = „linke Hand, linke Seite, links” (KHW 446). Its pre-Demotic history is obscure just like its external ties. At the moment just guesses can be made:

1. W. Vycichl (DELC 336) tried to affiliate it with Sem.: Ar. ṣḥbr I „1. panser, bander et remboîter, remettre (un os démis, cassé), 3. forcer, contraindre à qqch.” [BK I 247]. Semantically far-fetched.

2. A comparison with Sem. *ṣgrb „north” [GT] would be not better either because of the metathesis, although the association between „left” and „north” is well attested both in Semitic and Chadic (instances above).

3. From a phonological viewpoint, it is still difficult to understand whether and – if yes – how LEg. *gābir might be related to ECu. *gur- „left” [GT] (which was borrowed into Ethio-Semitic) ||| CCh. *g(w)ur- „left” [GT]. This would only be possible if we assume an earlier Eg. **gwr, for which we only have scanty support.

„Right”

Eg. jmn „rechts (Adj.), rechte Seite (Subst.)” (PT-, Wb I 85, 11-14) > jmn.t „rechte Seite, Westen” (OK-, Wb I 86) is evidently cognate with Sem. *yamin- „destro, mano

146 For a thorough analysis of this nominal class indicator in all related branches of the AA family see Takács 1997.


147 Attested in LECu.: Saho gürā „die linke Hand, Seite” [Rn. 1890, 161], Afar gūra „left (hand)” [PH 1985, 117], Rendille gūro „l. left (as opposed to right), 2. south(ern)” [PG 1999, 130] | HECu.: Kambatta gura-ta „left (side)”, gur-ču „left-handed (person)”, Sidamo gura „left (side)”, gura-ččo „left-handed (person)” (HECu.: Hudson 1989, 90).


150 Cf. Cpt. (S) ṭoṣob „to be hot, glow” (CD 137b), which J. Černý (CED 70) derived from Eg. nwḥ „1. verbrannt, versengt werden, 2. sich erwärmen, kochen” (CT, Med., XIX., Wb II 224, 10-12), but at the same time J. Oising (NBÄ 244, 814, n. 1062, cf. KHW 514) preferred to take it from Eg. 3bḥ „verbrennen” (CT VII 263c, GHWb 7; Āwb II 12c), although the latter etymon has recently been rendered „to join” (AECT III 129, spell 1033) = „to unite” (DCT 3). Cf. also SBrb.: Ayr ǝ-lbǝg „se réchauffer, se rallumer (dispute)” [PAM 2003, 447].
destra” [Frz. 1965, 265, #4.26] = *yamīn- „правый, южный” [Djk., Hodge]. 152 The Sem.-Eg. match has been usually extended to WCh.: Hausa yàmmáá „westwards” [Abr. 1962, 944], 153 which might only be accepted provided this form were assimilated from *yamn-, for which I see no proof. 154 Otherwise hardly, as the segmentation *yam- + *ī˘n. 155 seems unlikely. On the contrary, if one is to isolate here the ultimate biconsonantal root (if any), it is the first radical that might well turn out to be a *y- mobile, cf. AA *√ymn „right” [GT] > NOm.: Sezo 1 mànɛn, 2 mànì „right (side)” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 15] ||| WCh.: Maha monay „right (side)” [Nwm. 1965, 58, #89]. Or should we assume here a metathesis of the AA root varieties *√ymn ~ *√mny? In any case, Eg. jmn finds its closest match in Sem. *√ymn.

Eg. wnm.j „rechts (Adj.), rechte Seite (Subst.)” (OK-, Wb I 322, 1-12), actually *w˘nĭ́m.˘j in the light of Cpt. (S) OYNAM. In spite of its misleading similarity, an alleged connection to Eg. jmn is excluded. 156 Most probably we are dealing here with an inner Egyptian innovation. F.L. Griffith (1898, 60) was the first to point out a possible derivation from Eg. wnm „eat”, which was later corroborated by W. Vycichl (1959, 71; 1972, 178) rendering the right hand as „Eß-Hand” or „celle qui mange” in the light of numerous parallels in the African languages, cf. CCh.: Logone zĕm „manger” zĕmi „main droite” 157

---

152 See Stern in ZÄS 22 (1884), 74, fn. 1; Erman 1892, 107; Hommel 1894, 345, n. ***; Jahn 1906, 377, fn. 1; Holma 1911, x; Farina 1924, 316, 318; 1926, 13, 21; ESS §4.b.8 and §10.a.3; GÄSW #8; Vycichl 1958, 376; D’jakonov 1965, 47; Hodge 1976, 12, #48; 1977, 933; 1981, 404. F. Hommel (1904, 117-8, fn. 2) surprisingly changed his mind and explained Eg. jmn as the „altère Form” of wnm (sic, for wnm.j) „rechts”, which, in turn, he derived from hnm.w „widderköpfig wie ... Amon” implying an ultimate kinship with the theonym jmn “Amon”!

153 See Vycichl 1934; Vergote 1945, 131, §2.a.2; Cohen 1947, #495; Pilszczikowa 1960, 123, #126; Olderogge 1960, 800; D’jakonov 1967, 187; Mukarovsky 1994, 146. The meaning „Westen, Abend” associated to the Hausa word by J. Vergote (l.c.) is false. Similarly, M. Cohen (uncritically followed by N. Pilszczikowa, l.c. supra) misquoted Hausa yamma „right” (sic), which was disproved by D. Ol’derogge (1952, 34 and fn. 27) pointing to the fact that for that notion Hausa has a different word, viz. dáámá „right (hand, side)” [Abr. 1962, 178].

154 Let alone that no further parallels from the Chadic daughter languages are known to corroborate such a historical reconstruction.

155 N. Skinner (1995, 34) affiliated the Egypto-Semitic and Hausa isogloss with Sem. *yamm- „sea” (> LÉg. jm) and Cu. “yam(m)- „water, river”! This suggestion, not argued for by Skinner, remains baseless. How to render the signification of the C3 in Sem. *√ymn? 156 F. Hommel (1904, 117-8, fn. 2) assumed in Eg. √wnm the older form of √jmн and then eventually took both words from hnm.w „Chnum”! W.F. Albright (1923, 67) too related both roots via a „transposition of m and n”.

157 This term is cognate to a number parallel expressions for „right”, cf. WCh.: SBAuchi *sàm- (or sim.) [GT]: Dira (Zul) šimli, Burma nê-šipi, Geji à-šinti, Buli a-šám, Dwot to-ším, Polche šimli ll CCh.: PΤera *sàm- (or sim.) [GT]: Piędlimzi żuma, Hwona y’ll-sumà, Ga’anda hær-sûm, Gabin hår-kà-sûm, Boka hær-sîntà l Bura-Margì *zm- (or sim.) [GT]: Bura ma-zùm, Chibak tsi-sumà, WMargì çe-sumà?, Òwò-yìì, Ngwaiye tisìmà, Kilba çàsumà, Hyildì mà-zûmù, Wàndìtu màn-zùm, Margì tsi-sîm l PHi gi *zum- (or sim.) [GT]: Higi-Kamale kwa-zùmè, Higi-Ghye wa-sàmù, Higi-Futu wàa-zùmò, Fali-Kiria man-zùm, Fali-Giší kwa-nišìmu, Fali-Jilbu mà-zûmì l PBata *zum- (or sim.) [GT]: Gude (dà) ci-zàmù, Nza(i) Ngjaye a-zíme, Mwulyen wà-dì-zùmàn, Bachama zìmye, Gudu wàà-zàmì l Hina sëm (Chadic data quoted from Kraft 1981 I-III, #329, except for Hina quoted from Strümpell 1922-3, 122). The underlying root may be identical to PCh *√zm „to eat” [JI 1994 I 56B].
Ful nyāmo „droite” < nyām- „1. manger, 2. viande”. Ewhe du „manger” → nu-du-si „main pour manger → droite”, Swahili kula „manger” ~ mkono wa kulia „la main pour manger = main droite”. One might add that WCh.: Ngizim mà-tá „right (hand)” also derives from tāu „to eat” (which is akin, by the way, to Sem. *štwy „to eat”). All other suggestions on the origin of Eg. wnm.j¹⁵⁸ are, therefore, to be considered with much more reservation.

**Directions**

D. Olderogge (1960, 800) critically – and rightly – assessed K. Sethe’s hypothesis on an Asiatic origin of ancient Egyptians, whose ancestors – in the latter’s view – had penetrated into the Nile Valley from the North Delta and moved up the river facing the south with the west on the right side. But as the Russian Africanist argued, in those predynastic times, when the Proto-Egyptians are supposed to have invaded the Delta, it was merely a swamp impossible to open up. Is it necessary at all to identify the northern orientation with the supposed direction of the wandering? For Proto-Egyptians, such a point of orientation must have been the supposed source of Nile. This must be the reason why the notion „South” may have originated in the primary sense „head”¹⁵⁹, whereas that for „North” may be associated with „back”.¹⁶⁰

**Synopsis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>Semitic cognacy</th>
<th>„African” origin</th>
<th>Egyptian innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hair</td>
<td>sr, f³šn</td>
<td>šn and šntj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td>d³šn</td>
<td>tp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brain</td>
<td>³⁰šmm</td>
<td>tbn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁵⁸ There are a few further tempting solutions. (1) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 201; cf. also Orel 1995, 127, #53; HSED #2522) equated Eg. wnm.j with the apparently isolated ECh.: Kabalay uôlema „rechts” [Lukas 1937, 93], which Orel took from a Nostratic *wal(e)m- „right (side)”. Naturally, one would need much more Chadic data before venturing such a daring reconstruction. (2) With regard to the association of the notions „right” vs. „direct”, an etymological link to NBrb.: Tamazight všn: nem „être droit, direct, (re)dressé” [Taïfi 1991, 491] might in principle be conceivable (assuming a w- mobile in Egyptian). (3) Even less probable seems a connection to WCh.: Bade àanòm „south” CCh.: Margi ànim „north”, WMargi bw-war-?ànúw ani „south”, Wamdui ànim „north” l Mandara ?ànim „south”, Glavda (Ch.: Kraft 1981).

¹⁵⁹ Eg. rs.w „der Süden” (OK-, WB II 453) > (SBA) PHC, rendered by W.F. Albright literally as *„what belongs to the head-waters (of the Nile)”, has been usually affiliated with Sem. *ra?š- „head” (cf. Hommel 1894, 345-6; Müller 1909, 188, fn. 3; Holma 1911, x, 10; 1919, 39; Ember 1918, 31; Albright 1918, 90; 1923, 67; Farina 1924, 314, 324; ESS §12.a.24; GÄSW 27, #20).

¹⁶⁰ For Eg. mh.w „Unterägypten” (OK-, Wb II 123) cf. AA *v[h] „back, bottom” (discussed in EDE III 478, #3).
**Conclusion**

As we can see from the synopsis, the core lexicon of anatomical terminology, in its not insignificant part, is in fact a mostly binary (or sometimes triadic) system of synonyms, which have either Semitic cognacy or an African (non-Semitic) etymological background in its origins. Sometimes – as normally it is the case in the history of a language – an inner Egyptian innovation also appears as a third synonym. It is also apparent from the table above by what degree Semitic words are outnumbered in this domain as compared to those attested only in the African branches. What is more, scanning through – etymologically – all basic terms for „tongue” and „throat” (quite numerous, in addition), we have to state that none of them were Semitic. This seems to betray, at least in the examined field of human anatomy, a deeper presence of the extra-Semitic vocabulary in Egyptian, where the equivalent Semitic components may have perhaps been due to a subsequent cohabitation. The subsequent parts of this series are planned to survey the rest of anatomical terminology and numerals.
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