

Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon II

Gábor Takács

Abstract

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

Introduction

The first paper of this series¹ was generated by the controversies of P. Lacau's (1970) old observation on a binary opposition of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology, the much-quoted and thus exemplified basic terms of which I re-examined from the head to the upper torso in the context of many new results issuing from current progress in Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) comparative linguistics in order to see to what degree this segment of the lexicon is shared by lexemes of clearly Semitic cognacy vs. those evidently relating to African parallels. The etymological examination of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology presented therein has corroborated a surprising distribution: one member of the synonymous pairs is usually a Semitic word, whereas the other one(s) have non-Semitic cognate(s) solely attested in some of the African branches of our language macrofamily. A relatively deeper presence of the extra-Semitic vocabulary in Egyptian has become apparent. As the introductory part only contained the classical instances, the famous pairs like „eye”, „ear”, „hand”, extended onto some further items where the binary opposition is also to be observed like the basic terms „head”, „hair”, it was already then obvious that the rest of the anatomical terminology and other domains of the core vocabulary are also to be examined. This second part of the series „Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon” is devoted to an etymological research in the field of body parts on the head and the upper torso, i.e., the same area as what was targeted in the first part. The difference is that – leaving the well-known Semitic vs. African pairs for the basic terms behind – here, we study rather the origins of either the specific anatomical terms or those for body parts not yet set in this context the aim being the same: to clear if the binary opposition of Semitic vs. African cognates worked here too, or, if not, whether the Semitic or African component is overwhelming in this domain of the Egyptian core lexicon.

„Hair”

Eg. j3r.t (hair det.) „1. (XII.) *Haare (vom Tierfell), 2. (CT VII 156f) Seitenlocken (des Gottes)” (GHWb 25; *ÄWb* II 77b) = j3r.tj (dual) „side-whiskers (?)” (CT VII 156f, DCT 14) > „Stirnschlange des Re” (LP, Wb I 32, 3), cf. perhaps also 3r.t „*Perücke, Kopftuch” (LP, Wb I 11, 17-18), hence denominative *3r „to prepare wig” (unattested), whose nomen actoris might be j3r.tj „*Perückenmacher (nur in Personennamen belegt)” (OK, GHWb 25, cf. PN I 7:1) ||| CCh.: Musgu yiir na mada „Kopfhaar” [Krause] = air vs. áiir vs. iir, pl. yirái ~ yirakái „Haar” (cf. yir „Wolle”, and also: hir na máge-ni „Stirnhaar”, i.e., lit. „Haar seines Kopfes”) [Rohlf's] = ayiir „Haar” [Barth] = auyir [Overweg] = ayir [Roeder] = áyer „cheveux” [Mch. 1950, 31] || ECh.: Mubi álèè, pl. àlè “Haar, Federn, Wolle” [Lks. 1937, 180] = ?áliyò, pl. ?àlè „hair” [Jng. 1973 MS] (Ch. data: JI 1994 II 177).

Eg. wpr.t “Seitenlocke des Kindes” (GR, Wb I 305, 6), attested already in the Coffin Texts (II 119e, II 122-123c, VI 131g contra AECT) as wpr.tj (dual) „la double tresse, les deux tresses” (Barguet 1986, 144-145, 541, spell 533 + fn. 216) = „Seitenlocken” (GHWb 193; *ÄWb* II 660a) = „hair” (DCT 991), has the closest parallels in Sem.: Ar. √wfr I „être abondant, copieux, se trouver en grand nombre” > wafr-at- „2. chevelure abondante, tresse artificielle” (hence Maghrebi wafra „mèche de cheveux”), wāfir-at- „queue grasse des moutons d’une certaine espèce” [DRS 589 pace BK II 1574-5] = wafr-at- „hair collected together upon the head, hair hanging down upon the ears, hair extending beyond/to the lobe of the ear or to the ears” [Lane 2956b], Moroccan Ar. wufra „chevelure abondante, chevelure d’homme longue et abondante, mais qui ne descend qu’au niveau de l’oreille, les beaux cheveux noirs abondants d’une femme qui retombent sur le front”, mūfūr (adj., poet.) „dotée d’une belle et abondante chevelure qui retombe sur le devant de la tête (femme)” [Premare et al. XII 236-237] ||| ECu.: Dullay-Gollango ufur-kó “Körperhaar” [AMS 1980, 246].² One wonders whether the same root (via

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

² It would be tempting to connect the Dullay word with Ar. √ufr-at- “2. crinière (du lion), long poil du cou (qui se hérissent chez certains animaux, quand ils sont en colère), 3. plumes du cou du coq, qui se dressent quand il est irrité”, √ifr-āt- “2.

metathesis) hides also in Ar. farw-at- „1. une pelisse, une robe fourrée, 2. peau de la tête, 3. vêtement fait de poil de chameau” [BK II 588] = „Kopfhaut samt Haaren” [Torczyner]³ ||| NBrb.: Mzab √fr > tu-frā-t, pl. tu-fra-t-in „mèche bouclée de cheveux” [Dlh. 1984, 50] || EBrb.: Ghadames √fr > ta-frī-t, pl. ta-fra-t-in „1. mèche de cheveux qui s’arrondit sur le front, 2. languette de chausson ou de chaussure qui recouvre le dessus du pied, ornée ou non de broderies de soie” [Lanfry 1973, 94, #140].

Eg. ḥnzk.t „Haarflechte” (PT-, Wb III 116, 4-8) = „1. Haarzopf, Flechte (der Frau, der Asiaten, der Götter), 2. *Stachelschwanz” (CT, ÄWb II 1715b) > (via metathesis) *ḥnzk.t reflected by ḥnks.tj „die Haarflechte (der Göttin, des Kindes, des fktj Priesters, als Bez. der Schlange)” (GR, WB III 120, 12-14 and 121, 2), ḥnks.t „Frau mit einer Haarflechte” (GR, Wb III 120, 15-121, 1) = „woman with braided hair” (PL 656). The suggestion by W. Vycichl (1938, 134) about the original reading of the Old Egyptian root as ḥnk.t (without root medial -z-) has recently been followed by R. Hannig (ÄWb I 850b and II 1715-6) even in those exx. where -z- was alphabetically written out. There are, however, indeed sporadic instances where -z- was in fact missing during the Middle Kingdom and later, cf. ḥnk.t „seltene Nebenform zu ḥnks.t ’Haarflechte’” (MK, Wb III 120, 10) = „plait of hair” (CED 279) = „braided lock of hair” (CT, DCT 341), hence ḥnk.tj.w „als Nebenform zu ḥnks.tjw die mit einer Haarflechte Versehenen” (BD, WB III 120, 11). Strangely, it is this latter root and not the older one with -z- that Eg. ḥnk „*festbinden” (CT III 378d, ÄWb II 1715b) = „to enwrap (with sheets of linen?)” (AECT I 199, also n. 3 ad spell 260) = „habiller (?)” (Barguet 1986, 224) plus old ḥnk „Papyrusfloß” (V., ÄWb I 850b) = „Art Floss” (OK and XX., Wb III 220, 7) as well as the late evidence confirm in the form of *√ḥlk „to plait” (or sim.) [GT] > Dem. hlk „Art Geflecht” (DG 281) vs. hrg ~ hrk „Art Geflecht: Perücke (?)” (DG 280) = „object made in wicker work, wig (?)” (CED)⁴ > Cpt. (SBF) ϩωλκ „to twist, roll, braid” (CD 668b; CED 279) = „flechten, wi/enden, drehen, wickeln”, also used as a noun (m) in the sense „Flechte, Geflecht, Locke” (KHW 366) = „concinnus comae” (Rn.). It is very difficult at the moment to pass any judgement also among the problematic etymologies proposed for the Egyptian root:

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

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

(3) W. Vycichl (1959, 146, #3; 1990, 17) surmised a relationship with Ar. √qnz^c: I qanza^a „avoir les cheveux dispersés autour de la tête” > qunzu^c-(at)- „cheveux dispersés autour de la tête” vs. √qz^c II „2. raser la tête en y laissant des mèches de cheveux çà et là” > qaz^c- „4. flocons de laine, poil, que les animaux à laine ou à poil laissent tomber au printemps”, quz^c-at- „1. mèche de cheveux qu’on a laissée sur la tête d’un petit garçon en la lui rasant, 2. mèche de cheveux laissée sur le sommet de la tête, 3. mèche de cheveux qui descend sur les tempes, bouclée”, qazī^c-at- „mèche de cheveux laissée au sommet de la tête”, ^aaqza^cu „qui mue, qui a mué et perdu de la

cheveux du milieu de la tête”, ^afran „1. plumes du cou chez le coq qui se dressent et s’ébouriffent quand il est irrité, 2. cheveux du derrière ou du sommet de la tête (chez l’homme), 3. toupet, crins ou poils qui descendent sur le front (chez les bestiaux)” [BK II 297-298], but this comparison is certainly out of the question for phonological reasons, since Sem. *^c- = ECu. *^c- (EDE I 270) > Dullay *^c- (Sasse 1979, 56), which has been neatly preserved as ^c- in Gollango (AMS 1980, 195). Besides, A. G. Belova (1992, 16; 1998, 14) was disposed rather to see in the Arabic root metathesis to Ar. ^curf- „12. crinière (du cheval)” and also Sem. *par^c- „capelli fluenti” [Frz.] = *par(a) ^c- „hair (on top of the head)” [Blv. etc. 1994 MS, #77] = *par^c- „(loose) hair of the head” [SED I]. In addition, I have (EDE II 564-565) related the Semitic roots with LEg. f^c ~ f^c3 ~ f^cj (hair det.) "lock of hair" (NE, Pap. Turin 1983, vo. I 47-48, Černý 1958, 210, #6 after I. E. S. Edwards) = „cheveux” (AL 77.1544) = „lock of hair” (DLE I 190) = „Haarlocke” (GHWb 305) – provided it derived from an earlier (*f^c3 (as is in fact written) < *√f^cr or *f^c3 < *√fr^c.

³ H. Torczyner (1912, 770) linked the Arabic word to Akk. pirtu „Kopphaar”, which has recently been, however, explained rather from Psem. *par^c- „(loose) hair of the head” [SED I 192, #218].

⁴ Due to a merger of ḥ > h in Late Egyptian, Roman Demotic and hieroglyphic texts confuse ḥ and h (cf. Lacau 1965, 12f.; Vergote 1973 lb, §28h). For the weakening of old pharyngeal ḥ to laryngeal h beginning from the end of the New Kingdom (Ramesside) cf. NBÄ 367f., n. 47.

laine, du poil (mouton, bouc)”, muquzza^c- „3. qui a peu de crin au toupet (cheval)” [BK II 733-4, 821] = qunzu^c- ~ qanza^c-at- ~ qunza^c-at- ~ qunzu^c-at- ~ qinzi^c-at- „la touffe de cheveux qu’on laisse surle sommet de la tête du garçon quand on la rase ou bien cheveux longs, reste de plumes, coccyx, crête du coq, crête huppe, coiffure de femme” [Dozy II 411] = quz^c-at- ~ qunzu^c-at- ~ qundu^c-at- „lock of hair” [Vcl., Lsl.] = qurzu/a^c-at- ~ qunzu/a^c-at- ~ qurzul- „la touffe de cheveux au ilieu de la tête rasée” [Landberg 1923, 1331], Modern Lit. Ar. qunzu^a ~ qanza^a ~ qinzi^a „Haarbüschel, Hahnenkamm” [Wehr 1953, 706], Yemeni qunza^a „knot of hair peculiar to little boys” [Piamenta 1990-1, 414] || Geez q^wənzā^t „lock/tuft of hair, ringlet, braid, plaited hairdo” [Lsl.] (Sem. data: Leslau 1987, 438). But Sem. *√kⁿz^c is little compatible with Eg. √hⁿzk. Secondly, the basic sense of the Arabic root („top, peak”) is hardly equal to that of our Egyptian root („to plait”).

(4) G. Takács (2000, 152, #174; 2000, 335, #1.9) ventured a comparison of the supposed Eg. *√hlzk „to plait” with SBrb. *√zlnk „peigner” [GT]: Ahaggar hələn^k-ət, ETawillemet šələn^k-ət ~ šərən^k-ət ~ s-, Ayr s/šərən^k-ət, Ghat žələn^k-ət (SBrb. data: Prasse 1969, 55, #256). As a rule, AA *ḥ has in Berber either become *h (Militarev 1991, 243) or it has been lost (EDE I 270).

Eg. sw.t ~ zj.t “Zopf (?), Locke (?), Haarlocke (?)” (GHwB 664, 674; ÄWb II 2099 and 2131) = sw.t „lock of hair” vs. zj.t „var. of sw.t (?)” (DCT 459) || NBrb. *zaw^s „cheveux” [GT]: Mzab and Wargla a-zau „cheveux” [Lst.] = zaw „cheveu, chevelure, poil” [Dlh. 1984, 255; 1987, 399] | Nefusa zâu “capelli (coll.)” [Bgn. 1942, 222, 321] || EBrb. *zaw „hair” [GT]: Sokna zâu „cheveux” [Lst., Prd.], Sened zâu „cheveux” [Lst.], Fogaha a-zâu „capelli” [Prd. 1961, 297], Ghadames a-zau „cheveux” [Lst.] = a-zaw „cheveu, chevelure, poil, crin” [Lanfry 1973, 433, #1850] (EBrb.: Laoust 1931, 214; 1920, 111, fn. 2) || WCh.: Ron *swV ~ *syV “hair” [GT]: Fyer so, Bokkos syah [secondary -h?], Daffo-Butura swé (Ron: Jng. 1970, 387) | Bole-Tangale *sow- “hair” [GT]: Bole šow^o [Gowers] = sôwu [Krf.] = šowv (?) [IL], Geruma sówi [Gowers], Gera šwešè [Krf.] (Bole-Tangale data: Kraft 1981, #36) || CCh.: PBata *sew- “hair” [GT]: Bata-Garwa seō-né [Str.], Bata-Demsa šéwé [Str.], Bata sew ne [Mch.], Nzangi še^cwé [Meek] = šeo šeo [Str.] = sewé [Mch.], Bachama šew^o-ne [Meek] (Ch. data: JI 1994 II 176-177). Brb. *z- = Eg. s- < AA *c- is regular. The underlying Southern Afro-Asiatic root may be projected as *√cw.

Eg. šnbj “hair (?)” (MK, Wb IV 514, 5) || HECu. *šomba “(pubic) hair” [Hds. 1989, 421; cf. Lsl. 1988, 199] || CCh.: Sukur šimbut “hair” [Meek] = šumbùt [IL in JI 1994 II, 177] < SAA *√šnb [GT]. These external parallels seems to justify that Eg. šnbj is not merely a miswritten form of šn “hair” (see part I of this series).

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

(1) Provided OEg. √d3f < AA *√grf, cf. PCu. *g^wafarV “long hair” [GT]: SAgaw: Awngi g^wafar-e “long hair” || LECu.: Arbore gōfar-e “mane” (Cu.: Ehret 1987, #52).

(2) If, in turn, OEg. √d3f < *√çrf, cf. (via metathesis) AA *√çfr [GT] > Sem. *d/špr “to plait” [Dlg.]: NHbr. šəpīrā ~ šəpār “Geflecht, Kranz” [GB 693] = šəpīrā ~ šəpār “thread, wreath” [KB 1048] | Ar. ḍafara “tresser (les cheveux) en larges tresses (d’une femme), tresser une corde”, ḍafir- “1. corde avec laquelle on attache un chameau, 2. tresse, large natte de cheveux” [BK II 31] || Geez “to braid, plait, drape, weave, intertwine etc.” [Lsl. 1987, 148] || ECU. *d_iifr- “to braid, plait (also of hair)” [Sasse 1979, 27, 29].⁶ For the biconsonantal origin of the above described root cf. AA *√çf [GT] > Sem.: Ar. ḍafḍafa “to braid hair” [Dlg.] || WCh. *çaf-/*çAHAF- “расчёсывать волосы (to comb hair)” [Stl. 1987, 202, #530].⁷

„Crown of head”

Eg. wp.t „1. Gehörn (des Rindes), 2. Scheitel (des Menschen), 3. Zenit des Himmels, Scheitelpunkt, 4. Gipfel (des Berges), 5. Wipfel, 6. hochgelegener Punkt (des Landes)” (OK-, WB I 297-8; ÄWb II 651-2) = „1. horns (PT 705, 1302), 2. top of head (JEA 22, 106), 3. brow (EG §462), 4. top of mountain (BD 219:2), of the earth = farthest south (Urk. IV 1165:5), 5. top-knot (PT 401), 6. head-dress (PT 546), 7. zenith (Urk. IV 1542:13)” (FD 59) has been convincingly affiliated by the Russian research group of the Afro-Asiatic comparative dictionary

⁵ On the other hand, in principle, one should keep in mind a development *zaw < *zab^h or *zag^w too.

⁶ For the Semito-East Cushitic comparison see Dolgopolsky 1983, 141, #12.9; HSED #579.

⁷ For the West Chadic-Arabic etymology see Stolbova 1987, 202; Dolgopolsky 1989, 102; HSED #585.

headed by I. M. Diakonoff (HCVA I 1, #42) with the Semitic roots attested in Akk. pūtu „Stirn(seite)” [AHW 884 pace Holma] = „Stirn, Schläfe, Breitseite” (pātu „Grenze, Gebiet, Rand”) [GB] = „Stirn” (vgl. pātu „Stirn, Schläfe, Vorderseite”) [Torczyner] = „forehead, temple” [Lsl. 1945],⁸ Eblaite /piʔ-at-um/ „temple” [Frz. 1984, 132, 138] || Ug. pāt „Saum, Grenzen, Gefilde” [WUS 252, #2181] = pit (m) „1. temple, 2. boundary, border, side, fringe, edge (technical meaning)” [DUL 659] = pʔ-t [Lsl. 1945], Hebrew pēʔā „1. Schnitt, Rand, 2. Seite” [GB]⁹ = „Kopfrand, Schläfe (nicht Rand)” [Torczyner] = „edge, rim” [Lsl. 1945] = „corner, side (esp. of the head)” [Apl.] | Aram. paʔtā „Rand, Ecke” [GB] || Soqotri fio „forehead” [Lsl. 1945] < √fy(?) „front” + dial. vars. [SSL 1991, 1456] || Amhara fit „face” [Apl.] = „front” [Lsl. 1987].¹⁰ The same Afro-Asiatic root (AA *√pw „front part, forehead”) is presumably to be found also in NAgaw *baw „forehead” [GT]: Qwara and Dembea bō „Stirn” [Rn. 1885, 40], Hamir baū ~ bō „1. Stirn, 2. (postp.) vor, 3. schon, bereits” [Rn. 1884, 351], Kemant baw „front” [CR 1912, 181] || WCh.: Bade fūw-āan „Horn” [Lukas 1968, 223] = fuak „horn” [IL], Ngizim fūwāk, pl. fūwāw-ín „horn (of animal)” [Schuh 1981, 58] = fuwak [IL]. The etymology of ECh.: Mokilko ʔòpi-só (segmentation pace Jng.), pl. ʔòmbá „horn” [Jng.] is unclear.

Eg. whnn „der Scheitel des Kopfes” (Med., Wb I 346, 1-2) = „Schädeldecke, Scheitel” (WMT I 203) = „crown of head” (FD 65), apparently a C₁C₂C₃C₃ diminutive or intensive form (NBÁ 295-301), has so far lacked any etymology, which seems now to appear in Berber, cf. EBrb.: Ghadames ā-wən „1. monter, gravir, 2. partir” [Lanfry 1973, 391, #1672] || SBrb.: Ahaggar a-wn „monter sur: se transporter, en montant, sur, gravir, aller en montant” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1502], ETawllemmet ə-wəṇ „monter sur/à (cheval etc.)” [PAM 2003, 826] || WCh.: perhaps Goemai haan, pl. hūan „to go up, climb, mount” [Srl. 1937, 72] = haan, pl. həyan „aufsteigen, (be)steigen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 8] = ni han „to mount” [Krf.] = haan, pl. hian „to climb” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 13] < AA *√hwn „to mount” [GT]. The reflection of a mediae hollow *-w- root as Iae w- in Egyptian is regular (Law of Belova, cf. EDE I 394-400). K.-G. Prasse (PAM I.c.) postulated a PBrb. *ā-hwī/ūn on the basis of the Berber data, which, by the way, J. Bynon (1984) combined with WCh. *√h^wm, which, however, seems to reflect a distinct (albeit perhaps eventually related PAA var.) root.¹¹

Eg. sm3 "1. behaarter Teil des Kopfes, Schläfengegend (mit Augenpartie, Haaransatz), Haare am Kopf, *Skalp, 2. Haarsträhne, 3. Seite, 4. auch von den Schamhaaren" (PT-, Wb IV 122, 1-6; GHWb 703; ÄWb I 1123a; ÄWb II 2203b-c) = "1. scalp, locks of hair, 2. temporal region, side-locks, 3. to listen (to)" (CT, DCT 492-3) = "crown of the head with hair growing on it (the hair itself, not the location of it)" ≈ gmḥ.w (GR Edfu, PL 841) > (SBF) CMAY (pl., originally a dual < sm3.wj) "Schläfen, Augenlider, Wimpern" (KHW 187): as the listed renderings (including the Coptic evidence) indicate, its primary sense was „temporal region” and only in the late period it shifted secondarily to denote „top of head”. This root was discussed in my preceding paper „Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon I”.¹² Here, may we only remark that among the cognates, highly noteworthy is HECu. *samm-o "top of head" [Hds. 1989, 420].

Eg. q3b.t ~ qb3.t „Scheitel des Kopfes” (MK-, Wb V 11, 10; GHWb 849, 853; ÄWb II 2511c) = qb3.t „crown of head” (FD 277): so far no acceptable etymology has been offered except for combining Eg. qb3.t with Sem.: Ar. qubl- “front, face” suggested by C. T. Hodge (1966, 46), which is phonologically perfect, but semantically less convincing (albeit not impossible, cf. the case of Eg. wp.t above).¹³ At the moment, both semantically and

⁸ H. Torczyner (1912, 769) mistakenly explained this Akkadian word as a „Weiterbildung” from Akk. pū „Mund”.

⁹ GB 631 from Hbr. √pʔy hifil „zerspalten, ausrotten oder in kleine Stämme auflösen oder wegblasen” Eg. wpj

¹⁰ For the Semitic data cf. GB 631; Leslau 1938, 332; 1945, 234; 1963, 65; 1987, 154; Apolleyard 1977, 13/55.

¹¹ This latter suggestion is phonologically dubious. The Chadic *comparanda* are WCh.: Hausa háú [-au < *-amʔ], „to mount” [Abr. 1962, 381] | Nbauchi *h^wum- ~ *h^wun- (dissim.?) → *həm- „to mount, climb” [GT]: Paʔa h^wun "to climb, mount (animal)" [M. Skinner 1979, 183], Warji γəm-, Jimbin, Miya, Mburku γəma-, Siri γəmu, Kariya γimo [-i- < *-ə-?], Tsagu wum [w- < *γ^w-] „to mount, climb” (Nbauchi data: Skinner 1977, 32), which G. Takács (2007, 118) equated with Ar. √hwm I: ḥāma „voler, voltiger tout autour, planer dans les airs en faisant des tours” [BK I 521] || perhaps Eg. ḥnw [dissim. < *√hwm via meatathesis?] „Verbum: vom Aufkommen (?) des Windes” (BD, Wb III 103, 23) = „in Zshg. mit Aufkommen des Windes” (GHWb 536) < AA *√hwm „to mount” [GT], which, remotely in the Afro-Asiatic proto-language may have eventually be related to AA *√hwn „to mount” [GT].

¹² Forthcoming in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Warszawa) 68/1 (2015).

¹³ Almost all attempts have so far ignored Eg. -b offering an etymology just for Eg. *q3. Thus, (1) C. T. Hodge (1966, 46) equated Eg. q3b.t with WCh.: Hausa kwaryar kay „cranium” (derived from the basic sense *,to be circular”). Similarly, (2) N. Skinner (1992, 348) connected it with Tuareg: Ahaggar tā-kerkor-t „crâne (boite osseuse qui contient le cerveau)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 875], ETawllemmet and Ayr ta-ḳārḳor-t „1. sommet de la tête, vertex, 2. (ETawllemmet) crâne” [PAM 2003, 402]

phonologically, most attractive seems a connection with Sem.: Ar. $\sqrt{q(n)br}$,¹⁴ cf. qunbar-at- „2. crête au haut de la tête (chez certains animaux)”, qunburiyy- „qui a une crête au haut de la tête (oiseau)”, cf. also qibirr-āt- „gland de la verge” [BK II 659] = qanbūr- ~ qambūr- „bossu” [Dozy II 408], Syrian dial. qānbar I „hérissier (le coq les plumes de con cou pour se jeter sur la poule)”, tqānbar II „se montrer fier, hautain avec (qqn.), propr.: relever la crête, dresser la huppe”, qambūra and qāmbara „crête de coq, 2. huppe, bosse”, qambūr „bossu et nain, petit bossu” [Barthélemy 1935, 683], Dathina \sqrt{qnbr} I „dresser la queue”, V „être hautain, lever la crête”, qunbar-at- „crête de coq” [Landberg, GD 2531], Yemeni qanbūr „hunchback (also a surname)” [Piamenta 1990-1, 414] ||| SBrb.: Ghat ḡabber, pl. ḡabber-ān „bosse postérieure (du chameau à deux bosses)” [PAM 2003, 269], cf. Ahaggar ḡubber „être écorché sur le dos en arrière de la bosse (le sujet étant un chameau)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1690] < NAA \sqrt{kbr} „peak of a body part” [GT].

Earlier, I (Takács 2004, 70, #375) was disposed to assume in Eg. qb3.t ~ q3b.t an earlier $\sqrt{qb}?$ ~ $\sqrt{q}b$, a likely cognate – in spite of the irregular Eg. 3 vs. Sem. \sqrt{q} – to Sem. \sqrt{quba}^c - „hood” [Mlt.-Sts. 1984, 37]¹⁵ ||| SCu.: perhaps Iraqw qubu “hair” [Dempwolff, not attested in MQK 2002] ||| CCh.: PHigi $\sqrt{k^waba}?$ [$\sqrt{k^waba}?$] “brains” [GT]¹⁶ < presumably AA $\sqrt{k^waba}^c$ - „top of head” [GT]. Although now this alternative seems significantly less convincing than that described above, we may, however, not exclude a remote relationship of both roots (\sqrt{kbr} „peak of a body part” vs. $\sqrt{k^wb}^c$ „top of head”) in the Afro-Asiatic parental language.

Eg. $\sqrt{qf3}$ „horn or top of head (?)” (GT, cf. Wb V 31) preserved by the hieroglyph depicting „the head and forepart of a ram” (PL) = „the head of a ram with horns” (GT) used as a (phonetic) determinative from Dynasty XXII on in Eg. qf3.t ~ qf3.w (from XXII.) “Ansehn” (XVIII.-GR, Wb V 31-32) = „dignity, awe, respect (it is a quality of gods, something frightening for foreigners to experience)” (PL 1055).¹⁷ It was C. T. Hodge (1966, 46) who has already ingeniously equated this hypothetical form with WCh.: Hausa ḡāfōó “horn” [Abr. 1962, 448], to which now further cognates can be extended from a couple of Afro-Asiatic branches: Brb. \sqrt{yfy} “head” [GT]¹⁸ ||| WCh. \sqrt{kafa} → \sqrt{kafu} “horn” [Stl. 1987, 211]¹⁹ ||| ECh.: Mubi-Toram $\sqrt{kōP}$ - “1. top of head, 2. occiput” [GT].²⁰ A special isogloss with a substantially shifted semantics (opposing the Egypto-Chadic match) is represented by Sem. \sqrt{kapy} - “occiput, back of the head” [Mlt.]²¹ ||| ECh.: Dangla- Migama \sqrt{kUp} - „neck” (originally < \sqrt{k} , back of

and PCu. \sqrt{kar} - „peak, top” [Ehret 1987, 43, #150]. (3) Later, Hodge (1981, 374, #47) changed his mind and affiliated Eg. qb3.t with Ar. qubl- „front, face” (semantically uncertain) and even IE $\sqrt{g^hebe}$ -el- „head, gable”.

¹⁴ Following Dozy’s lexicon (l.c.), M. Piamenta (l.c.) also noted the connection of Ar. qanbūr- with Turkish kambur „bossu” [Dozy] = „1. Buckel (eines Menschen), 2. Buckel, Höcker, Erhöhung, Ausbuchtung, Beule, Wölbung, 3. bucklig, 4. gekrümmt, krumm, herausgewölbt, ausgebaucht, 5. was sich geworfen hat (spez. Holz)” [Steuerwald 1972, 478], which, in my view, can only be due to a borrowing from Arabic, not *vice versa* (as Prof. R. M. Voigt suggests now in his kind p.c., August 2015), given the Arabic background root, let alone the secondary nature of -mb- < -nb-. Biberstein Kazimirsky, in addition, derived all Arabic terms listed above from Ar. \sqrt{qbr} , which can only corroborate a native Arabic nature of the root.

¹⁵ Attested in Hbr. qōba^c „helmet” | Aram. qubba^cā ~ qub^cā “hood” || Ar. qubba^c-at- “cap, hat” || Geez qob^c “monk’s hood, headband, skullcap (under a turban) etc.” (Sem.: GB 705; Leslau 1987, 418). The Semitic term was, however, supposed to be a loan of ultimately Hittite origin (see Leslau 1987, 418). If, however, it comes from the Afro-Asiatic heritage, we should assume that its \sqrt{q} (shared apparently with Chadic parallels) was a secondary root complement.

¹⁶ Cf. Higi-Nkafa kwāḡe, Higi-Baza kwāba, Higi Kamale ḡkwaḡe, Higi-Ghye kwāḡa, Higi-Futu kwōḡo?, Fali-Kiria kwāḡa, Fali-Gili gwōḡwu, Fali-Jilbu gwōḡākū, Fali-Muchella gwōḡā, Fali-Bwagira gwōḡḡn (CCh.: Kraft 1981, #37).

¹⁷ It is possible, however, that the ram head determinative of qf3 was borrowed from Dynasty XXII on from the synonymous šfj.t as suggested in Wb l.c. In this case that above external etymology is to be given up. Besides, Eg. qf3.t [\sqrt{qfr}] is perhaps identical with WCh.: Hausa ḡārfīi “strength”, ḡārfāfā “to strengthen, encourage, urge, force, emphasize; become strong” [Abr. 1962, 486-487].

¹⁸ Reconstructed also as $\sqrt{a-yfi}$ [IS] = \sqrt{ypp} [Rsl.] = \sqrt{yef} [Vcl.] = $\sqrt{e-yrif}$ (sic: \sqrt{r} -, certainly an error) [Zhl. 1932-1933, 98] = $\sqrt{yV-y[a]f}$ [Mlt. 1991] = $\sqrt{i-yaf}$ [Mlt. 1999]. A common Berber word. Attested, e.g., in EBrb.: Siwa a-ḡfi [Laoust 1931, 301] || SBrb.: Ahaggar é-ḡaf [Fcd. 1952 IV 1700], Ayr and ETawillemmet e-ḡāf [Alj. 1980, 65] (Brb. data: e.g., Zyhlarz 1942-3, 83; Vycichl 1933, 173, #2; 1955, 306; Militarev 1991, 264).

¹⁹ Attested in Hausa ḡāfōó [Abr. l.c.] | Sbauchi \sqrt{kaP} - (either \sqrt{f} - or \sqrt{p} -) [GT]: Chaari kàpo, Zakshi kàpu, Boot kàpo, Zaari kafo (Sbauchi: Shimizu 1978, 25). H. Jungrathmayr (JI 1994 II 192) surmised in the Sbauchi word a Hausa loan.

²⁰ Attested in Mubi kōóbó (m), pl. kōóbúp ~ kōóbàp “nuque” [Jng. 1990 MS, 29], Jegu kofo, pl. koḡe “Hinterkopf, Gehirn” [Jng. 1961, 114], Kajakse káfú “crâne” [Alio 2004, 244, #173].

²¹ Cf. Syr. qāp(ə)yā ~ qəpāyā ~ qappāyā “postica pars cervicis” [Brk. 1928, 683] | Ar. qafan “derrière du cou, nuque, derrière de la tête, occiput” [BK I 792] = qafā^c- ~ qafan “Hinterkopf, Nacken” [Müller] || Harsusi keḡe “back” [Jns. 1977, 74], Jibbali keḡe “back” [Jns. 1981, 142], Mehri kəḡe “back” [Jns. 1987, 226] || Geez qāf “shoulder-blade”, but also kup „head”, kop „top of skull” (Kogan in SED l.c.: variant roots?) [Leslau 1987, 289, 423], Harari kafāt „forehead” [Leslau 1963, 122], Gurage: Selti, Wolane, Zway kəḡāt „forehead” [Leslau 1979 III 473] (Sem.: Mlt. 1999 MS, 6, #165; SED I 148-9, #164). In the

the head?") [GT].²² One might assume an AA *kafaʔ- ~ *kaʔay- "1. top of the head, horn, 2. back of the head, occiput" [GT]²³ to underlie with an areal parallel in PKoman *kup "head" [Bnd. 1983, 270, #38]. Noteworthy is that here too, the Egyptian term stands semantically the closest to the Chadic reflexes, which is in striking parallelism with PAA *kʷabaʔ-/ *kʷabaʔ- "top of head" [GT] (cf. the preceding entry in this paper). Do these both reflect remote Proto-Afro-Asiatic root varieties?

„Skull”

Eg. dnn.t „Schädel, Kopf” (Med., Wb V 576, 13-17) is clearly identical with Sem.: Gurage *gunnän „head, hair of head, *top, summit” [Lsl.] = *gunnän/r „tête, chevelure” [DRS 148, GN? #21],²⁴ which stands isolated in Semitic. H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 202-203) combined the Gurage word with ECh.: Sokoro gón-du „mein Kopf” [AF apud Lukas 1937, 33] = gón-di „mein Kopf” [Barth] = gon, pl. gòné „head” [Saxon 1977 MS, 3, #1, cf. JI 1994 II 183], but also with a number of parallels, which, however, reflect AA *√kn ~ *√hn „head” [GT].²⁵ Eventually, the latter may be regarded in the Afro-Asiatic *Ursprache* as a root variety of AA *√gnn „head” [GT] preserved by the Gurage-Egyptian (and -Sokoro?) isogloss. Any other etymology proposed so far for Eg. dnn.t is less convincing.²⁶

„Forehead, face”

Eg. jnh ~ OK-MK var. ʕnh „Augenbraue” (Wb I 99, 1) = „eyebrow” (FD 23): the only etymology has so far been offered by W. F. Albright (1927, 206), who, along with a number of other (sometimes not even interrelated) Egyptian words, including Eg. jnh “umgeben” (XVIII., Wb I 99) = “to surround, enclose” (FD 24), traced it back to his hypothetic *√nh „to stretch”, which rightly evoked F. Calice’s (GÄSW 119, #499) objection: „wenn auch diese Zusammenhänge wenigstens zum Teil durchaus möglich sind, so greifen sie doch m.E. über das von uns gegenwärtig Erfassbare hinaus”. Following the old tradition,²⁷ most recently, J. Osing (2001, 576) was also convinced that for Eg. “jnh Augenbraue (zusammen mit dem zugehörigen Verb jnh umgeben, umranden) ... die ältere, sicherlich ursprüngliche Form ist ʕnh”, which he, however, has tried to justify by ill-founded arguments. First, in support of the older ʕnh Osing (l.c., fn. 99) cited a number of CT places²⁸ that altogether comprise 23 occurrences of our word, where ʕnh is only attested 6 times, while jʕnh only twice, but the “younger” jnh occurs

opinion of L. Kogan (SED l.c.), „'occiput, back of the head' ... is the only one [GT: i.e., meaning] to account for such semantic shifts as 'back of the head' > 'head' > 'forehead' and 'back of the head' > 'back' ...”

²² Cf. Dangla kòpò “nuque” [Fédry 1971, 295], Migama kúpò, pl. kòppippá “nuque” [Jng.-Adams 1992, 102].

²³ For the Semito-Berber-Chadic comparison see Müller 1975, 64; Rössler 1952, 139; IS 1971, #195; Militarev 1991, 264; 1999 MS, 6, #165; Blazek 1994, 428; HSED #1548; SED I 149, #164. If the Egyptian etymology is correct, we should modify the reconstruction of A. Ju. Militarev’s (1999 MS, #165 and SED I 149) PAA *-p- in this root (he figured as PAA *kapaʔ-) to PAA *-f-.

²⁴ Attested in Muher, Mäsqän, Gogot, Soddo gunnän, Chaha gunär, Ezha gunnär, Endegeny gu'nor, Ennemor, Gyeto gunʔär (Gurage: Lsl. 1979 III 284).

²⁵ NOM.: SEOmeto *kin- „head” [GT] Koyra (Badditu) qin-ē/ō [Crl.] = kin-e/o [Corlett, Bnd.] = kin-e [Hyw.] = gin-ō ~ qin-ō [Mkr.], Haruro (Gats’ame) qin-o [CR] and (pace Müller 1975, 64) the Chadic reflexes of *√Qn „head” [GT] = *√kn [NM 1966, 236] = „Biu-Mandara” (CCh.) *√gn [Newman 1977, 27]. V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 17, #55) correctly affiliated the NOM.-CCh. root with Ar. qunn-at- „1. sommet d’une montagne, 2. petite montagne ou montagne isolée du reste de la chaîne et noire vers la sommet” [BK II 817]. A root variety is presumably present in Ar. ma-ḥann-at- „1. bout du nez, 2. col d’une vallée, 4. tête, issue, entrée d’un chemin” [BK I 636].

²⁶ Thus, W. A. Ward (1963, 419, #4 and fn. 3; 1972, 19) assumed a semantically *a priori* doubtful connection with Hbr. šinnā „shield”, šinšenet „jar”, which he derived from the basic sense carried by Ar. √šwn I „to protect”, II „to surround with, enclose”, šawn-at- „a kind of jar or bowl” remarking that it is „impossible to prove” whether Eg. dnn.t is a Semitic loan (which is, of course, out of the question for semantical reasons) or represents a common Egypto-Semitic root. On the other hand, the comparison with Sem. *√gnn „to cover” suggested by C. T. Hodge (1981, 407) was labelled as „uncertain” by himself. Elsewhere, Hodge (1978, 2, #67; 1981, 372, #20) extended to Egypto-Semitic comparison onto Brb. *a-gʷenna „sky” (where he mistakenly rendered the first radical as *γ) and CCh. *√gn „head” (in which, however, the *g- may not be reconstructed, but rather *k- or *h-, discussed above) and even IE *gen- „balled”.

²⁷ Spiegelberg (in his KHW 84 pace K. Sethe), similarly Calice (l.c.: „ältere Schreibung ʕnh”), Fecht (1960, 177, #364).

²⁸ Osing (l.c.): “S. CT IV 298/299b, 301c, 313b^{T2B3}, V 32d, VI 123k = 124b, VII 159g” (sic).

in 15 instances (!).²⁹ Surprisingly, Osing even quoted whole CT passages for ʕnh, (!) which do not have even one single (!) instance of ʕnh (cf. CT IV 299b, IV 301c, IV 313b, VI 124b). One cannot be astonished enough at this kind of „presentation” of data. Secondly, since most forms display jnh, it is no wonder that CT vars. are glossed as jnh even most recently in DCT 41 – similarly to the one single instance of OEg. ʕnh “Augenbraue” (V., ÄWb I 156: glossed as jnh!), which, Osing left unnoticed. Thirdly, the fact that there is one single OK var. with ʕ- does not alter a bit the *Lautgeschichte* of PEg. *jnh > OEg. ʕnh ~ *jnh (together with PEg. *jnh > OK ʕnh ~ jnh “to live”, below) as an early example of the change PEg. *j- > OEg. ʕ- (hence later j-) in the proximity of h and ħ. Moreover, the metathetic change of OEg. roots containing ħ and a nasal (m, n) is known in a number of examples³⁰. For all these reasons, I have to maintain (pace EDE I 91) the derivation of Eg. jnh < *√rnħ < **√nħr (via metathesis) from AA *√nħr ~ *√nyr “eyebrow” [GT] attested in SBrb. *a-nhar “eyebrows, sourcil” [GT] = *a-enēr [Ajh.]³¹ ||| ECu. *nʕār- „1. eyebrow, 2. forehead” [GT]³² ||| ECh.: Mokilko nyínyàrì (pl.) “Augenbrauen” [Lukas 1977, 219]. This South Berber-East Cushitic-Mokilko isogloss is obviously etymologically identical with AA *naħr- “front” [GT] attested in Arabic √nħr,³³ Berber (sine Tuareg) *√nyr > *√ynr ~ *√nry ~ *√rny „front” [Bst.],³⁴ and Lowland East Cushitic *naħār „breast” [GT].³⁵ In addition, the alleged “*Ableitungsverbum*”, i.e., Eg. jnh „to surround”, which is only attested from the NK onwards with no trace of an earlier ʕnh at all (as one might expect following Osing’s theory),³⁶ and is, henceforth, hardly fitting as the direct derivational source of Eg. jnh „eyebrow”,³⁷ suspiciously displays in fact the very same *Lautgeschichte* as Eg. jnh ~ ʕnh “eyebrow” (i.e.,

²⁹ The var. ʕnh occurs 6x (CT IV 298b: Sq4Sq, T1C^b; CT V 32d: B1C; CT VI 123k: M36C, M35c; CT VII 159g: P.Gard.III) and jʕnh 2x (CT IV 298b: B9C^b, CT V 32d: B2L), while jnh 15 times (CT IV 298b: B14, M4C, M54C; CT IV 299b: L1N4, T1Be, T3Be, M57c, M1N4; CT IV 301c: M4C, M54C, T1Be, T2Be, T3Be; CT IV 313b: T2Be; CT VI 124b: M1 Ann.).

³⁰ Cf. (1) OK ħmz (m) vs. ħmz.t (f) “alte Schreibung für mzh.(t)” > Gr. χάμψα, the Eg. name of crocodile acc. to Herodot (Wb III 96, 11-12), early vars. to mzh “Krokodil” (OK, Wb II 136), perhaps related to ES & Cu. (*Wanderwort?*) *ħazz- [GT: < *ħamz-?] “crocodile” (cf. Lsl. 1963, 87; 1979, 119; CrI. 1951, 408); (2) Eg. ħms “Kornähre” (BD, Wb III 367, 5) = ħms ~ ħmz “ear of corn” (CT, DCT 419) < OEg. *ħmz (unattested) [reg. < *ħmz], cognate to Ar. mazħ- “Kornähre” (Eg.-Ar.: Vycichl 1958, 388; 1959, 146, #4; 1990, 52), cf. also NOM.: Kaffa moč “metter la spiga (pianta)”, močč-ō “spiga” [CrI. 1951, 468]; (3) OK ħmʕ, var. to mħʕ ~ mʕħ “Flachs” (Wb II 121, 4; Edcl 1955 = AÄG §93).

³¹ Cf. Ahaggar é-ner, pl. ā-nār-en “sourcil” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1399] = e-nār, pl. ā-nār-ən [Prs.] = ē-nēr [Ajh. 1986, 9], Ghat a-nar, a-nar-en “sourcil” [Nehilil 1909, 207], Taneslemt i-nħər ~ a-nhar [Prasse], ETawllemmet a-nār-ən (pl.) „cils” [Nicolas 1957, 574] = Ayr a-nar and ETawllemmet a-nar, pl. a-nar-ān “sourcil” [Alojalj 1980, 149; PAM 2003, 622], Tawllemmet i-nər ~ a-nar ~ a-nir ~ a-nirəħ [Prs.], Tadghaq a-nhar „sourcil” [PAM l.c.; Sudlow l.c.], Tudalt a-nar „eyebrow” [Sudlow 2001, 276] (SBrb.: Prasse 1969, 84, #560).

³² Cf. Oromo nyar-a “eyebrow, eyelash” [Foot 1913, 46] = nār-a “eyebrow”, cf. nāra gura “to frown, wrinkle forehead” [Gragg 1982, 301] = nār-a “eyebrow” [Hds. 1989, 60] | Arbore nār (m) „forehead” [Hayward 1984, 388] = nār-a [Ehret 1987, 110, #466] | Tsamay nyār-a „forehead” [Ehret 1991, 264], cf. also Ongota nār-a „forehead” [Flm. 1992, 191]. Note that Oromo -ā- is regular < *-aħ- (Sasse 1979, 36).

³³ Cf. Ar. naħr- “the uppermost part of the breast or chest”, cf. naħīr- “faced or fronted”, nāħīr-(at)- “the parts facing, in front of” [Lane 2774-5] = naħr- “3. vis-à-vis, 4. commencement”, cf. naħara I “4. faire face, vis-à-vis à un autre” [BK II 1213].

³⁴ Cf. NBrb.: Tamazight i-nir, pl. i-nra-un „front” [Abès 1916, 123] = i-nir, pl. i-nir-n, also a-nyír, pl. i-nyir-n “front (anatomie)” [Taifi 1991, 495, 511], Zayan and Sgugu ʔa-iner-ʔ, „front” [Lbg. 1924, 572] | Seghrushen a-nyír, pl. i-nyar „front” [Pellat 1955, 122] | PRif *-ynar “front” [GT] > Botiwa ʔa-inar-ʔ [Biarnay 1911, 187], Amert a-inār [Rns.], Tuzin ʔe-inar-in (pl.) [Rns.], Uriaghel, Iboqqoyen, Senhazha ta-warna (met.) [Rns.] etc. (Rif data: Renisio 1932, 391) | Iznasen ʔa-nīr-ʔ, pl. ʔi-nir-iw-in „front” [Rns.] | Shenwa hi-nir-ʔ, pl. hi-niar ~ hi-neri-in „front” [Laoust 1912, 149] | Ait Said ʔa-niar-ʔ “front” [Biarnay] = ʔa-nā-ʔ „le front” [Allati 1986, 37] | Beni Said ʔa-niar-ʔ “front” [Bst. 1909, 250] | Qabyle a-nyír, pl. i-nyír-en „front (anatomie)” [Dallet 1982, 589], Zwawa a-nir ~ a-nir, pl. i-nir-en “front saillant” [Bst. 1890, 326] = a-nir “front” [Biarnay 1917, 101] = a-nyír „front” [Bst. 1909, 250] || EBrb.: Ghadames ī-nar „front (tête)” [Lanfray 1973, 246, #1153] = é-nar „front” [Dallet], Siwa ne-nnier (n- Genitivexponent) „Stirn” [Scholz apud Stumme 1914, 94-95] = e-nnīr [Stumme 1914, 104] = i-nīr „forehead” [Quibell 1918, 100] || WBrb.: Zenaga nēr, pl. nēr-un “front” [Ncl. 1953, 230] (Brb. data: Basset 1929, 19-20). Metathesis < *rnħ [GT] in Uriaghel, Iboqqoyen, Senhazha.

³⁵ Cf. LECu.: Saho nahār “Brust” [Rn. 1890, 290] = nahār (so, -ħ-) “1. petto, 2. (talora anche il senso di) cuore” [CR 1913, 73], Afar nahār “Brust”, nahār-a “Anfang, Beginn” [Rn. 1886, 889-890] = nahar “chest, front (poitrine, avant)” [PH 1985, 173].

³⁶ It was, nevertheless, no hindrance for Osing in his way of explaining it from an unattested and baseless OEg. *ʕnh (cf. also NBÄ 538-9, n. 373).

³⁷ Also J. Vergote (1971, 49) figured its primary sense as „that which encircles, surrounds” adhering to the Semitic pattern *qítalu (sic) = alleged Eg. *sídmu (sic) for „concrete nouns”.

< *rnḥ, metathesis of *nḥr) does, cf. WCh.: Suroid *nēr “to surround” [GT 2004, 267],³⁸ which can, in principle, deduced also from a hypothetic **√nḥr [GT]. One may not, of course, *a priori* exclude the remote (Proto-Afro-Asiatic) connection of AA *√nḥr “eyebrow” [GT] vs. AA *√nḥr “to surround” [GT] – provided AA *√nḥr “front part” comes from “eyebrow” and not *vice versa*.

Eg. mnd.t³⁹ "1. (Med., XVIII.) Teil des Gesichts zwischen Nase und Jochbein längst dem Auge, 2. (BD-GR) Teil des Gesichtes am Auge (dann auch für das Auge selbst, gern im Dual)" (Wb II 93, 10-12) = "cheeks" (Dawson 1927, 20-21, §1) = "between the nose and nostrils on the one hand, and the temporal region and ear on the other: the cheek, the maxilla(ry bone) and the adjoining portion of the zygoma as far back as the temporal bone" (Breasted 1930, 243) = "Auge(npartie)" (Zyhlarz 1934-35, 173) = "a part of the face" (AEO I 18) = "1. la joue, 2. paupière (peut-être la partie inférieure)" (Lefébvre 1952, 14, §14 vs. 17, §18) = "Wangenpartie: (die rechts und links der Nase anschließende) Wangen" (Grapow 1954, 31, 37-39) = "cheek" (FD 110) = "1. les joues, 2. le globe oculaire, les yeux" (Meeks 1977, 81, fn. 1; AL 77.1756-7; so also Koemoeth 1993, 115 & fn. 33) = "Wange, Nasenlöcher" (Scheel 1985, 161 & fn. 113-4) = "Wange, Backe" (GHWb 343) = "1. cheek, 2. eyeball (?), eyelid (?)" (Walker 1996, 269) = "eyes" (PL 440) = "part of the face" (DCT 170). A metaphorical sense of the same word is represented by OK mnd.t (usually pl.) "vermutlich Teil des Schmelzofens" (Wb II 93, 9) = "Nasenlöcher" (Erman 1918, 41) = "cheek" (Dawson 1927, 23) = "'Wange' im Metallhandwerk: eine Bezeichnung für das dem Arbeiter zugewandte Ausgußloch bzw. Tiegelwand" (Drenkhahn 1976, 32, rejected by Scheel) = "point de fusion du métal, mais pourrait être 'la panse, la paroi' du creuset" (AL 77.1755) = "im Metallhandwerk eine Metapher: sicherlich die Wange des (Schmelz)Tiegels bzw. die Tiegelwandung" (Scheel 1985, 162-163) = "*Melztiegelwand ('Wange'), *Ausgußloch, *Seite der Gußform, *Schmelzbrei" (GHWb 344; ÄWb I 344) = "Ausflußloch, Tiegelwand des Schmelzofens" (WD III 52 pace Scheel). Basic sense dubious. Etymology disputed:⁴⁰

(1) D. Meeks (1977, 81, fn. 1, cf. AL l.c.) explained it from a certain Eg. *mnd meaning "sg. round", whence he derived also Eg. mnd "breast" (q.v.), mndj "la panse (?)" (which presumably stems from the preceding). Following him, P. Wilson (PL 440) also maintains that Eg. *√mnd "seems to refer to sg. spherical in shape and thus to parts of the body such as the breasts, cheeks, eyeball". Improbable. The rendering "globe oculaire" is somewhat dubious in the light of Eg. bnr "ball of eye" (NK, CED 22; DLE I 156) < OK b33 (cf. EDE II 232). Eg. mndj, in turn, may be rather identical with Eg. mnd "breast" (q.v. above, cf. also DCT 170), which certainly represents a distinct Afro-Asiatic root.

(2) G. Takács (1997, 229, #11; 2004, 61, #351): perhaps < *√mng related with the Ethiopian *Wanderwort* *mangāg- "jaw, chin" [GT]⁴¹ The ultimate etymology of these forms is, however, obscure. As H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) remarked: "*the ultimate source ... is hard to determine*".⁴² At the first glance, *mangāg- resembles an m- prefix formation like *ma-ngag- < *√ngg, for which cf. SCu.: Dahalo nṣaṣe „jaw" [EEN 1989, 46]? If this derivation were true, we would have to give up the comparison with Eg. mnd.t.

³⁸ Attested solely in Sura nēer “umgeben, umliegen, umzingeln” [Jng. 1963, 76], Mupun neer “to surround, gang up on someone” [Frj. 1991, 42].

³⁹ The original form was mnd.t, which developed to NK mnd.t (Wb l.c.) → GR dual mnd.(tj) ~ mntj (PL l.c.).

⁴⁰ Leaving aside suggestions that *prima vista* cannot be accepted. E.g., L. Homburger (1931, 252) and E. Zyhlarz (1934-35, 173) combined it with Nubian: Kunuzi missi, Mahassi mañi "oeil". Absurd. In addition, Zyhlarz (1936, 444, fn. 1) ultimately connected this false parallel with Brb. (sic) mnid-ak "vor dir" < *emnid-aka "in Bezug auf deine Vorderseite" < *mnid "nach vorne schauen" (sic). A.M. Lam (1993, 379), in turn, combined it with Ful (Pulaar) maṣnata "qui fait sourciller", which was rightly rejected by H. Tourneux (2000, 92-93) pointing out that it is fact a conjugated form (maṣ- + factitive -n- + suffix -ata) without subject (not a participle) meaning "[ça] fait sourciller".

⁴¹ Attested in Ethio-Semitic (from Cushitic?): Tigrinya māngaga ~ mængaga [Lsl.], Amharic and Argobba māngaga "Kiefer, Kinnlade, Kinnbacken" [Rn.] = "jaw-bone, molar tooth" [Gragg] = "molar tooth" [Lsl. 1949, 47], Harari māngāga "jaw" [Lsl.], Gurage-Zway māngāga "jaw" [Lsl.] ||| LECu.: Saho & Afar mingāgā, pl. mingōg "Kiefer, Kinnladen, Kinnbacken, Wange" [Rn. 1890, 269] = mingāga "jaw, chin" [Lmb.], Oromo mangāgā "jaw" [Rn.] = mangāgā "jaw" [Gragg 1982, 277] = māgāga ~ mangāga "jaw" [Lsl.] = mangāga? [Lmb.], Dirayta mankākó-ṯ "jaw" [Lmb.] | HECu.: Burji mangāg-ā "lower jaw" [Sasse], Alaba gangā?ma [met. < *magang-?] "jaw" [Lmb.], Hadiyya mangāgga "jaw" [Lmb.], Kambatta mangaga [Lsl.] = mangāga [Lmb.] = māngaga "jaw" [Zbr.] ||| NOm. (from East Cushitic?): Wolamo mangāga "jaw" [Lmb.], Gamu mangāgille "jaw" [Lmb.] | Mocha mangāgo [Lmb.] | Sheko mangāgo "jaw" [Lmb.] (ECu.-NOm.-ES data: Rn. 1886, 882; Lsl. 1963, 108; 1979 III, 409; Sasse 1982, 140; Zbr. 1985, 90; Lmb. 1987, 533; LS 1997, 461).

⁴² The derivation from Sem. *ḥanak- "palate" (Praetorius 1879, 70) was rightly declined by W. Leslau (1979 III, 409). H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) thought of a borrowing either from Ethio-Semitic or Oromo, while G. Hudson (1989, 85) pondered a connection with HECu. *gānge "molars" [Hds.]. M. Lamberti (1987, 533) compared also LECu.: Baiso munṣe "mouth, lip" [Lmb.], which is improbable. Later, he (LS 1997, 461) combined the East Cushitic root with his PCu.-Om. *marg- > Wolayta morgiy-a "shoulder, hump", which is impossible.

(3) Alternatively, we might assume a root *mn- extended with an affix (?) -d occurring as C₃ in a number of Egyptian anatomical terms (cf. Eg. psd, fnd, nhd.t, hnd), which would lead us to AA *ma/in- "forehead" [Blz.] = *√mn "front of head" [GT].⁴³

Eg. ḥ3.t "Vorderteil, A. eigtl. als Körperteil I. des Menschen, selten allgemein: Vorderseite, zumeist: Antlitz, Stirn; II. eines Tieres: der Vorderkörper, Brust; B. Anfang von etwas" (PT-, Wb III 19-20) was, beside a number of unsuccessful efforts,⁴⁴ fairly convincingly connected by W. F. Albright (1918, 224 pace Ember) to Hbr. √ḥll hifil „2. anfangen”, hofal „angefangen werden” [GB 233-4] = hifil „to begin”, hofal „to be begun” [KB 320], hence Hbr. təḥillā „Anfang” [GB 875] = „beginning” [KB 1717]. This attractive suggestion, however, fails because of the entirely different semantic background of Sem. *√ḥll „to untie” [KB]. Therefore, the etymology by G. Takács (2013, 162) remains at the moment as the only plausible one both semantically and phonologically, cf. Sem.: Geez √ḥwr: ḥora "to go forth, proceed etc." [Lsl. 1987, 249] ||| ECu. *hor- (with a different laryngeal) "to be in front" [Sasse 1979, 40] > i.a. PSam *hor „past, first, earlier”, *horei „in front” [Heine 1978, 63] > i.a. Boni hor „Vorderseite” [Sasse 1980, 98] ||| CCh.: Masa ḥur "faire avancer (en poussant), avancer" [Ctc. 1983, 90] < AA *√hr (var. *√hr?) „front” [GT].

Eg. ḥr „Gesicht” (OK-, Wb III 125-127), act. *ḥár (NBÄ 350, 355, 420) > Cpt. (SALB) 20 etc. „Gesicht, Antlitz, Oberfläche, Seite, Gegend” (KHW 351) has up to now remained void of a convincing etymology.:

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

(2) W. F. Albright (1927, 224) combined it with Ar. ḥurr-at- „cheek (the name refers to the bright color of the cheek)” [Alb.] = „Wange (von der blühenden Farbe)” [Clc.], which, however, literally means only „3. franche, pure, intacte, vierge” [BK I 401] from the verbal root √ḥrr „devenir homme de condition libre” [BK I 400]. Albright arbitrarily isolated the Arabic word from ḥurru-l-waḡhi „what appears of the face or what appears of the elevated part of the cheek, i.e., the ball, or most prominent place, of the cheek” hence ʔal-ḥurr-at-u signifies „the

⁴³ Attested in ECu. *mīn- [GT]: Saho & Afar minín "die Augenbrauen" [Rn. 1886, 882; 1890, 269] = minín "(part of the face around the) eyebrow" [Lmb.] | Rendille mīn "forehead" [PG 1999, 224] | PKonsoid *mīn-da [Black] > Konso, Turo, Gato mīn-ta "forehead, face" [Black], Konso mīn-tá, Mossiya mīn-ta "forehead, face" [Lmb.], Dirayta mīn-ta "forehead" [Lmb.], Gidole, Mashile, Bussa mīn-t "forehead, face" [Black] (Konsoid: Black 1974, 255) | HECu.: Hadiya mīne "forehead" [Lmb.], Kambatta mīne "forehead, face" [Lmb.], Alaba mīne [Lmb.] = mīnita "face" [Crass], Qabenna mīnit "face" [Korhonen etc.] = mīni-ta [Crass] (HECu.: Crass 2001, 47, #69) | Dullay *mīn-te "forehead, face" [Lmb.]: Harso mīn-čé "Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite" [AMS], Gawwada mīn-te "Stirn, Vorderseite, Gesicht" [AMS] = "forehead" [Black], Dobase (Gobeze) mīn-te "forehead, face" [Black] = mīn-čé "Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite" [AMS], Gollango mīn-té "Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite" [AMS], Tsamay mīn-te "face" [Blz. < ?] (Dullay data: AMS 1980, 175, 213; Cu. data: Black 1975, 296; Lmb. 1987, 533; 2005, 233, §38) ||| NOM.: (?) Yemsa maṇà [-ḥ- < ?] "eyebrow" [Lmb. 1993, 365] ||| WCh.: Butura maan "forehead" [Magwa 1985, 15], Daffo-Butura maán "forehead" [Blench 2001 MS, 5] || CCh.: Hina manēnó "Stirn" [Str. 1922-23, 113]. The ECu.-Hina etymology is due to V. Blazek (2000, 182-3, §7), who compared this Afro-Asiatic root also with IE *mein- "face" [Blz.] (IE data: Jucquois, Orbis 16, 1967, 177-9; Tischler, HEG 1990, 197) and PDravidian *mun- "front" [DED #5020a].

⁴⁴ H. Holma (1919, 40) identified it with Akk. irtu „Brust” explained from Sem. *ḥir-t- (labelled „unsicher”), which was listed by F. von Calice (GÄSW #703) among the dubious comparisons. As noted by Holma (l.c., fn. 1) himself, the Akkadian term was combined by C. Brockelmann (via metathesis) with Ar. riʔ-at- „lung”, which rules out any connection with Eg. ḥ3.t. In order to avoid this, Holma arbitrarily considered the Arabic word as a loanword from Akkadian. Th. Schneider (1997, 201, #60), in turn, supposed a relationship with Ar. ḡurr-at- „1. weißer Stirnleck bei Pferden, 2. Blesse, 3. Bestes, Schönstes (von einer Sache)”, although its basic sense is rather far from that of Eg. ḥ3.t: „1. whiteness, clearness of a colour or complexion, 2. a star or blaze or white mark on the forehead of a horse, the space itself of the face that is occupied by whiteness, (in a dog) a white speck or a small white spot above each of the eyes” [Lane 2238b], cf. also Bed. êra ~ êla „1. weiße Farbe, 2. licht, rein, weiß” [Rn. 1895, 27] || ECu. *ʕa/irr- „white, grey hair” [Sasse 1982, 28].

elevated part of the cheek, what fronts one, of the face or the four tracks of the tears, from each corner of each eye" [Lane 539a] = ḥurru-l-waḡhi „proprement pommette, partie haute, éminente de la joue (s'emploie dans le sens de joue)", cf. ḥurr- „joue" [Dozy I 262-263]. He even included Eg. ḥrr.t „blossom" in this (probably wrong) comparison, which, in F. von Calice's (GÄSW 178, #723) view, „ist abzulehnen, da das äg. Wort primär 'Kopf' heisst". This argumentation (inspired by Ember's etymology above) is unacceptable. Albright's proposal is false, since he disregarded the basic sense of the Arabic root.

(3) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 185), in turn, equated Eg. ḥr with their CCh. *hir- „face", which was based, in fact, solely on Daba ḥirra „1. eye, 2. face" [Kraft], for which, however, many more cognates are known, cf. still CCh.: Muyaŋ er „1. eye, 2. face" [Smith], Mada èrè „œil" [Nkoumou], Zulgo aré „eye" [Haller], Gemzek ere „eye" [Sabatai], Mbazla ʔaray „eye" [Trn.] = áray [IL] | Hide iri „eye" [Bramlett] | Zina iri „eye" [Odden] | Vulum aray „yeux" [Trn.], Mbara ree „1. eyes, 2. face" [Trn.] | Gidar hara/a „eye" [Schuh] = hara [Hungerford] | Masa ira-no „1. eye, 2. face" [Kraft], Misme (Zime) ir „1. eye, 2. face" [Kraft], Banana irà „eye" [Kraft], Museye iri ~ ír „eye" [Kraft] || WCh.: Dera yerò „eye" [Kraft] | Burma yir „1. eye, 2. face" [Kraft], Polchi yir „eye" [Kraft], Dwot ʔir „eye" [Kraft], Seya yʔr „eye" [Kraft], Buli ʔir „eye" [Kraft]. The common source of all these (and many further) Chadic cognates has been diversely reconstructed and is still a matter of controversies. R. Ma and P. Newman (1966, 234, #29) isolated a monoradical PCh. *-d- „eye". Later, P. Newman (1977, 26) set up PCh. *idə „eye". V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1990, 90, #47; HSED #112), in turn, reconstructed PCh. *ʔir- „eye", which they identified with Eg. jr.t „eye". H. Jungraithmayr (JI 1994 I 60A) postulated PCh. *√ydn „eye". R. Gravina (2014 MS, 61) has CCh. *haday. That is, most of the authors assumed a rhotacism in the parallels with -r- < *-d-. Consequently, the Afro-Asiatic parallels thereof are also disputed. In any case, there is little proof for an initial *h-

All in all, so far only dubious suggestions have been published, neither of which is acceptable. I suspect Eg. ḥr therefore to derive ultimately from the same Afro-Asiatic root as Eg. h3.t „front" (above), i.e., AA *√hr „front" [GT]. Only their root derivational nominal stems were vocalized otherwise, which may have resulted in -r-/-3-.

Eg. ḥnt "Gesicht, Vorderseite des Kopfes" (PT, Wb III 302, 1-5) is, as pointed out by G. Takács (2004, 193f.; EDE III 511), akin to Sem.: MSA *√ḥnt „to be in front (?)" [GT]: Harsusi ḥenṯi „one of the fore-teats of a camel" [Jns. 1977, 141], Jibbali ḥanṯi „front, front part of anything", ḥnt „outside", aḥnīṯ "to take, put out, go out in spring, etc." [Jns. 1981, 303], Mehri ḥanṯáy „front udder of a camel" [Jns. 1987, 445]. This root apparently stands isolated not only in Semitic, but the entire Afro-Asiatic family also.⁴⁵ Thus, here, we may speak of an exclusive Egypto-Semitic isogloss. Formerly, besides, for Eg. ḥnt, there had been suggested a great number of controversial etymologies, which are all problematic.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ As a remote root variety (with metathesis + different dental plosive) cp. perhaps also SBrb.: ETawillemmet & Ayr ə-nkəd "1. aller au devant de, 2. prévenir (par des mesures préventives)" [PAM 2003, 609].

⁴⁶ Neither of the suggested solutions is satisfactory:

(1) H. Holma (1911, x; 1919, 42) treated it falsely as a fem. *ḥnt (!) in order to equate it (via met.) with Akk. naḥnaḥatu "Nasenscheidewand" [AHW 715] = naḥnaḥūti ša appi "die Nasenknorpel" [Holma], for which cp. rather Syr. naḥnaḥtā "die Mandeln im Halse", Ar. nuḡnyr- "Rachenmandel" (Sem.: AHW l.c.).

(2) A. Ember 1918, 31; 1921, 177; 1926, 310, #6.2; ESS §11.d.2, §15.a.16, §25.b.8; W. F. Albright 1918, 90; 1918, 239, #74; F. Behnk 1928, 140, #38; HSED #1340: Eg. ḥnt < *ḥnt via partial assim. of the labial *-m- to dental -t and the met. of *ḥtm ~ Akk. ḥuṯṯimmu "snout" [AHW 362] || PBHbr. ḥōṯām "the distinctive feature of the face, nose, nostril" [Jastrow 1950, 431] | Ar. ḥaṯm- "bec, museau" [BK I 596] = "snout, muzzle" [Alb.].

(3) There is a long tradition of comparing Eg. ḥnt with WCh.: Hausa hánčí, pl. hántú-nà „nose" [Abr. 1962, 369] supported by F. Behnk (1928, 140, #38), W. Vycichl (1934, 71), D. Ol'derogge (1952, 38; 1956, 12; 1960, 800), V. M. Illič-Svityč (1966, 336, #8.4), C. T. Hodge (1968, 20; 1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A; 1991, 160, §18). False, because (as pointed out in JI 1994 I, 129) the Hausa form can be divided into the ha- prefix of body parts + Ch. *-ntin/r „nose". This Eg.-Hausa comparison was rightly rejected already by N. Pilszczikowa (1958, 99), who identified in Hausa hánčí the well-known Hausa prefix ha- occurring in Ch. names of body parts.

(4) C. T. Hodge (1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A; 1991, 160, §18) combined the alleged Eg.-Hausa parallel with Ar. ḥnn "to speak nasally", which contains no match for the Eg. C3. In addition, the basic sense of Eg. ḥnt is "front", not „nose".

(5) C. T. Hodge (1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A): Eg. & Hausa ~ SCu. *ntse "in front" [Ehret].

(6) V. Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 19): ~ Bed. *hanat "before" [Blz.] attested in hánat-ʔāwi "forenoon", cf. ʔāwi "noon".

(7) Its long-range (Nostratic) comparison (often with the inclusion of Hausa hantii) with PIE *Hant- "Vorderseite, Stirn", loc. *Hanti "im Angesicht, Gegenüber" [IEW 48-49] has been maintained by several scholars (Forrer 1930, 243, #3; Ivanov 1965, 15-16; 1966, 106-107, fn. 9; Illič-Svityč 1966, 336, #8.4; Hodge 1968, 20; 1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1991, 160, §18; Bomhard 1988, 446; Shevoroshkin 1988, 541; Ray 1992, 134, n. 15).

Eg. dhnt „Stirn” (MK-, Wb V 478, 6-10; ÄWb II 2796) = „1. forehead” (FD 315) = „peak of brow” (pChester Beatty VII, Walker 1996, 321), metaphorically also used as dhnt „Felswand, Bergvosprung, Bergspitze” (NK, Wb V 478, 11) = „mountain-top” (Amarna, FD 315), in fact *d̥h̥n.at (Vergote 1973 I b, 44, §37 and 147, §85; Vycichl 1990, 221) = *d̥h̥n.ṯ (NBÄ 400, n. 84) > Cpt. (S) **TE2NE**, (B) **TE2NI** „front” (CD 460b), hence denominative dhnt „(den Boden) mit der Stirn berühren” (MK, Wb V 478-9) = „1. lit. Touch with the forehead, to bow to, 2. appoint, order” (FD 315): the underlying primary sense was figured by W. F. Albright (1918, 255, #130-133, cf. also ESS §11.a.60) as properly *, „the lofty part” just like it is the case with Ar. ḡabh-at-, and so he equated the deduced Eg. *√dh̥n „be high” (via metathesis) with Ar. √nhd „to be swollen and rounded (of breasts, skin-bottles)”, nahd- „female breast” (≈ waṭb- „skin-bottle, big breast”), which represent by-form of Sem. *√nʔd. This suggestion was received by F. von Calice (GÄSW 223, #925) with right doubts. During my Afro-Asiatic etymological research I have found no cognates with the sense „forehead” either. The only thing I have to agree with Albright in any case is that the sense of Eg. dhnt as an anatomical term must necessarily be secondary due to an Egyptian innovation from a primary PEG. *√dh̥n „be high”, the only acceptable cognates of which I have so far detected in West Chadic, cf. Angas-Sura *d̥ʲeŋ ~ *d̥ʲa₂ŋ (or *g̥ʲ₂eŋ ~ *g̥ʲ₂a₂ŋ) “1. upper part, 2. up” [GT],⁴⁷ which has a possible root variety in Angas-Sura *ṯiŋ (var. *ṯuŋ?) > *ṯəŋ “1. high, 2. upper part, 3. sky” [GT].⁴⁸ Chadic *ŋ has been known as a possible result of an earlier plain nasal (*m or *n) + lost pharyngeal or laryngeal (cf. IS 1966, 33, fn. 11; CLD I 10).

„Chin, jaw”

Eg. jn^c „Kinn” (PT 1308a-, Wb I 94, 12; ÄWb I 153b) = „chin” (FD 23), occurring also as fem. jn^c.t „menton” (5x in pSmith, FD 23; Lacau 1970, 64; HAM 168), was later transformed via reduplication and metathesis also into ʕn^cn „Kinn” (NK, Wb I 191, 13) = „chin” (FD 43). Its origin is not yet evidently clear, although it has been much disputed in the etymological literature. We know a couple of tempting proposals:⁴⁹

- (1) A. Ember (1926, 7, §10) combined it at a time (!) with both OHbr. (hapax) *loā^c (only attested in st. cstr.) „jaw-bone” [Ember] (with the remark that it „*appears also as*” Eg. ʕr at the same time ..., cf. below) and Ar. nī^c- „palais (partie supérieure du dedans de la bouche)” [Dozy II 742, not in BK or Lane] = „jaw, mandible” [Ember], which, of course, cannot be true in this form at the same time. A connection with OHbr. *loā^c seems rather dubious due to Eg. j- ≠ Sem. *-w/*-Ø-, whereas the phonological agreement between Eg. jn^c vs. Ar. √ny^c is perfect in the light of the law of Belova, i.e., Eg. Iae j- = Sem. Iae *-y/*-ī- (cf. EDE I 394-400). Following the suggestion by G. Takács (EDE I 39), in addition to the Arabic root, WCh.: Boghom ṇa [GT: possible < *n^ca] „chin” [Gowers in JI 1994 II 76] || CCh.: Zime-Dari nyan [partial redupl. < *n^ya^c-n(^ya^c)?] „chin” [Str. in JI 1994 II 77] might also be included here < AA *√ny^c „chin (?)” [GT]. Noteworthy, the Egyptian term forms special isogloss with the Chadic parallels, whereas the Semitic counterpart seems to have undergone a semantical shift.
- (2) C. T. Hodge (1968, 22), in turn, compared the later Eg. metathetic ʕn^cn with LECu.: Somali ʕan ~ ʕān „Kinnbacken, -lade, Backe, Wange”, labáda ʕan „beide Kiefer” [Rn. 1902, 59] = ʕán, pl. ʕám-án „cheek” [Abr. 1964, 13] = „chin” [Hodge] = ʕan „cheek, Backe, Wange” [Farah & Heck 1993, 187] = „inside of mouth next to

(8) E. Zyhlarz (1934-5, 253): ~ ONub. **KOANT(I)** Vorfahr”. Genetic cognacy excluded.

(9) L. Homburger (1930, 283): Eg. m̥nt (!) ~ Ful nari “visage”. Clearly absurd.

(10) P. Lacau (1970, 49): Eg. ḥnt < *ḥnr ~ *ḥnj (!) ~ Ar. naḥara „ronfler, renifler”, manḥar- „narine” („*pure hypothèse*”).

(11) C. T. Hodge (1991, 160, §18): ~ Brb. *himmīw (?) “forehead” [Prasse, MGT II 171].

⁴⁷ Attested in Angas yeng ~ yāng ~ yang “above” [Flk. 1915, 307] = kə ʔgíyáŋ (K) “up” vs. ʔgéŋ (K) ~ ʔgyéŋ (Ks) “high up” [Jng. 1962 MS, 13, 18] = ka-dyēŋ “up there”, cf. kwaŋ ka-dyēŋ “west” [ALC 1978, 23, 29] = ka-dyēŋ “up”, cf. ka dyēŋ nyi “up there” [Gochal 1994, 61, 107], Sura dēŋ “1. Oberseite, oben, 2. Himmel” [Jng. 1963, 63] = dēŋ ~ dēŋ naan “sky” [Krf.], Mupun dēŋ “1. upper part, top, 2. sky, heaven”, cf. dēŋ (adv.) “on, about (Jipaari)” [Frj. 1991, 15] (Angas-Sura data: Takács 2004, 101).

⁴⁸ Attested in Gerka tung-mo “above” [Ftp. 1911, 214, 218], Angas ting “above” [Ormsby 1914, 207, 209, 314], Mushere ting “up”, ting-ting ~ tin-tin “highly” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 364, 366, 370], Montol ka-tun (sic: -n) “above” [Ftp. 1911, 214-5, 220], Goemay tung (sic: -u-) “tall”, ke-teng (sic: -e-) “above” [Ftp. 1911, 214, 217, 220] = ʔoeng “height”, goe-ʔoeng “1. (adv.) up, upwards, 2. the high part” [Srl. 1937, 66, 251] = teŋ “to be high, tall”, gə-teŋ “1. sky, 2. (adv.) up, upright” [Hellwig 2000 MS, 11, 36] (Angas-Sura data: Stolbova 1987, 168, #210; Takács 2004, 384).

⁴⁹ Not counting the absurd idea of P. Lacau (1970, 64) on a connection with Ar. ḡaqan- „menton, barbe du menton”, which was rightly questioned by himself („*Mais il s'agirait là de concordances phonétiques actuellement isolées; on doit laisser de côté cette hypothèse.*”) and definitely excluded by W. A. Ward (1972, 20, #161) with full right „*as the phonetic shifts involved are impossible*”.

cheek” [Blz.] and WCh.: Sura gən „Wange” [Jng. 1963, 66], which is not void of problems. First of all, Hodge ignored that Somali Auslaut -n# may well originate in *-m#, which used to be revealed by the nominal plural forms. This the case here too: L. Reinisch (l.c.) recorded Somali pl. ʿam-án, which he (probably mistakenly) connected with NOm.: Kafa gam-o „guancia” [Cecchi] = gám-ō „Wange, Backe” [Rn. 1888, 285] and Kunama góm-ā „Kiefer, Backen, Kinn” [Rn. 1890, 49], which lead us to a phonologically certainly entirely distinct Afro-Asiatic root (cf. Eg. gm3 and gmḥ.t). For semantical reasons, it is difficult to agree with V. Blažek’s (1994 MS Bed., 26) ill-founded ECU. *ʿan- „cheek” combined by him with SCU.: Dahalo ʿéna „tongue”, which, besides, Ch. Ehret (1980, 274) set in a quite different South Cushitic context. Secondly, one can hardly ignore the oldest form of our Egyptian term as attested in PT 1308a.

(3) A. Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 255) envisaged Eg. jnʿ < *√ylʿ and affiliated it with Akk. lē/ītu „1. cheek, 2. side” [CAD I 148] = „Backe, Wange, Seite” [AHW 546]⁵⁰ || Hbr. mətalləʿōt (pl.) and metathetic var. *maltəʿōt (hapax in st. cstr., Ps. 58:7) „jawbones” [KB 654] = malteʿōt (sic) and metalʿōt (sic) „tooth” [MM] | JArAm. lūʿā ~ lōʿā „jaw” [Jastrow 1940, 700] = lwʿ „jaw” [Sokoloff 1990, 280] = „челюсть” [MM], Syr. lūʿā „maxilla” [Brk. 1928, 361] = „челюсть” [MM] < Sem. *IVʿ- [MM], which he regarded as a var. to his Sem. *IVhy- „челюсть” [Mlt.] = *liḥ(a)y-(at)- „cheek, jaw” [SED I 161, #178]. Excluding Akk. lē/ītu from the reflexes of this root set up as Sem. *IVγ- „jaw”, L. Kogan (SED I 160, #177) included also Akk. laḥū [Kogan 1995: -ḥ- possible < i.a. *-γ-] „jaw” [CAD I 44] = „Kinnbacken, Kinnlade” [AHW 528]⁵¹ || OT Hbr. hapax (Pr 23:2) *loʿʿ (attested in st. pron.: loʿe-kā) „Kinnbacke (Delitzsch, Strack et al.: Kehle, Schlund)” [GB 388] = „jaw-bone” [Ember] = „gullet” [KB 532] = „gullet or jaw” [Kogan] || Mehri-Qishn lḃənīn „double chin” [SSL 1985-6, 281]. Eventually, Kogan did not exclude a remote connection of Sem. *IVγ- „jaw” and *liḥ(a)y-(at)- „cheek, jaw”.

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

Eg. ʿr.t „der Unterkiefer, die Kinnbacken” (OK, Wb I 209, 2) = „jaw(bone)” (FD 45) = „jaw” (DCT 175), which was later transformed (just like Eg. jnʿ above) via reduplication into ʿrʿr „ein Körperteil” (BD, Wb I 210, 6) = „chin (?)” (FD 45), has also been controversially evaluated in the etymological literature. So its origin is still dubious:

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

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

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

(4) It seems tempting at the first glance to connect the Eg. root with PCu. *ʿal- „cheek” [Ehret 1987, 78, #324] based by Ch. Ehret (l.c.) and N. Skinner (1995, 29) on the comparison of ECU.: Oromo ill-ē ~ hill-ē „cheekbone, cheek” [Gragg 1982, 224], Oromo-Bitima ill-ē „temple (of forehead)” [Stroomer 2000, 155] | Yaaku el, pl. elmôʿ „cheek” [Heine 1975, 123] || SCU. *ʿoš- (sic: *š-) „cheekbone” [Ehret] and some further (certainly false) *comparanda*.⁵² The problem is, however, that, (on the one hand, the reconstruction of PCu. *ʿ- (lost in the quoted

⁵⁰ The etymological position of the Akkadian term has long been disputed. H. Holma (1911, 33) equated it with OTHbr. (hapax) *loʿʿ. W. von Soden (AHW 546, 565) assumed it to share the same Semitic root with Akk. luʿu „Schlund” combined by him with Aram. and MHbr. lō/ūʿā, which were then disconnected by L. Kogan (1995, 160) maintaining that our Akkadian term is unrelated with OTHbr. (hapax) *loʿʿ „горгань”, PBHbr. loʿʿ and JArAm. lūʿā, which are better to be related, in his view, with Akk. luʿʿu ~ luḥḥu „throat” [CAD I 258] = „Schlund” [AHW 565] = „горгань” [Kogan]. Later, Kogan (SED I 161, #178) derived it from his Sem. *liḥ(a)y-(at)- „cheek, jaw”.

⁵¹ Equated by W. von Soden (AHW l.c.) rather with the reflexes of Sem. *√lḥy.

⁵² Ch. Ehret’s *comparanda* were merely Yaaku + Bed. ʿali „calf of leg” [Roper 1928], which is semantically untenable. N. Skinner (1995, 29) added Oromo and South Cushitic (misquoted from Ehret 1980, 278).

East Cushitic languages) is solely pending on the South Cushitic data, which reflect *-ĉ- (not *-š-) and this is speaking for a quite different Afro-Asiatic origin.⁵³ On the other hand, one may not ignore the stubborn semantic difference between Cushitic „cheek” (attested quite uniformly with not one instance for „jaw”) vs. Egyptian „jaw” even when these sense are sometimes related.

(5) Most inspring appears a possible cognacy with LECu. *√^{cl}ll „перезёвывать жвачку” [Dlg. 1972, 141] = *^{cl}alal- „to chew” [OS] based on Somali ^{cl}alal „Kropf der Vögel, der erste Magen wiederkäuender Tiere, chymus, das Wiederkauen”, caus. ^{cl}alal-ī „das Kauen verrichten, (wieder)kauen” [Rn. 1902, 57] = ^{cl}alal-inayya „to chew” [Abr. 1964, 10] and Oromo alal-a „ruminazione, rimasticazione” [Thiene 1939, 15] = alāl-ā „chymus, das aus dem Magen Wiederkäufer aufgestoßene Gras”, alāl-fad „wiederkauen” [Rn.], which V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #1063) affiliated with Ar. √^{cl}ll I: ^{cl}alla „1. donner à boire à qqn. une seconde fois peu de tempts après la première, *et métaph.*: frapper, battre une seconde fois, réitérer ses coups”, pass. ^{cl}ulla „être mangé, consommé; avoir déjà servi à manger” [BK II 334]. The semantic motivation in this case might be the same as with Eg. wgj.t ~ wgw.t discussed in the following entry.

Eg. wgj.t (PT 686 var. wgw.t)⁵⁴ „Unterkiefer, Kinnlade” (OK-, Wb I 376, 3-5) = „jaw” (FD 71), act. *wāgw.ṯ (NBÄ 187) = *wagya.t, hence *wayga.t and *wagga.t, later *wa3ga.t (DELIC 242) > Dem. wggj „Unterkiefer” (DG 103:1) = > (S) ογο(ο)δε, ογοιδε etc. „jaw, cheek” (CD 512b) = „Kinnbacken, Unterkiefer, Wange” (KHW 287) = „mâchoire, joue” (DELIC 242). Its deverbal derivation from Eg. wgj „kauen” (OK-, Wb I 376, 1-2) has been commonly accepted.⁵⁵ Nevertheless (having checked DRS and DRB), the *Illae inf.* verbal root, which did not survive into Coptic in this form, has apparently no cognates in North Afro-Asiatic with the sense „to chew”.⁵⁶ All this makes the impression that we are dealing here with a reverse, i.e., denominative derivation. This may formerly have been the conviction of A. Ember (1913, 118, #71) and M. Cohen (1947, #501) too, who equated Eg. wgj.t with Ar. waġh- „face, side” [Ember] = „Gesicht, Seite, Fassade, Richtung” [Calice] with special regard to Eg. wgj „rib (or side) of a ship” (Ember, FD 71), which, however, was rightly objected already by F. von Calice (GÄSW #577) regarding this etymology as „unwahrscheinlich, da die Grundbedeutung verschieden scheint”, let alone that Ar. -h- is not reflected in the supposed Egyptian cognate at all. The same criticism was expressed by P. Lacau (1970, 59, §145) too: „En réalité le sens est trop différent et le redoublement de la voyelle exige que le radical ait comporté un j ou un 3 final.” The right path towards the true external cognates of Eg. wgj.t was discovered by D. J. Wölfel (1955, 42), when he affiliated it with some of the reflexes of NBrb. *-ggay „1. jaw, 2. face” [GT]: medieval Shilh a-gžay-en (or a-kšay-en) „parties inférieures des joues” [Ksm.], Shilh a-gža „mâchoire”, a-gži-wn ~ a-lži-wn (sic: -lž-) „1. (les deux) côtés du visage, 2. le bas des joues” [DRB 753] = a-gžay „molaire” [Ksm.], Ntifa ta-gžay-t „joue” [DRB] | Tamazight a-ggay ~ a-gga, pl. a-ggay-n „joue, bajoue, mâchoire”, ta-ggay-t, pl. ta-ggay-in „(petite) joue” [Taifi 1991, 172], Zayan, Sgugu a-ggai, pl. a-ggai, also fem. ta-ggai-t „joue” [Lbg. 1924, 546], Ndir, Ishqern, Zemmur, Warain a-ggay, pl. a-ggay-n „joue” [Wölfel], Izdeg a-ggay ~ a-gžay, pl. a-ggay-n ~ a-gžay-n „joue, mâchoire” [Mercier 1937, 147, 282] = a-gžay „joue, mâchoire” [Ksm.] | Figig a-ggay ~ a-kkay „joue” [Ksm., DRB], Rif a-ggai ta-ggaš-t „joue” [Justinard 1926, 135], Iboqqoyen and Uriaghel (t)a-ggay-(t) „joue” [Rns. 1932, 354] | Iznasen (t)a-ggay-(t) „joue” [Rns. 1932, 354] = (t)a-ggay-(t) „joue” [DRB], Mzab a-žžay, pl. i-žžay-ən ~ a-žžay-ən „joue” [Dlh. 1984, 71], Wargla a-ggay, pl. a-ggay-ən „pommette des joues” [Dlh. 1987, 107], Shawya a-ggay „joue” [DRB] | Nefusa a-žžay „mâchoire” [Wölfel, DRB] etc. (Brb. data: Kossmann 1999, 166, #449 and 228, #698; DRB 917). Then, V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 185; HSED #990) made the second step exploring the Chadic cognates they reconstructed as CCh. *guy(i)- „chin, beard” [OS], which was based, in fact, on Lamang (Hitkala) góyó „Kinn” [Lukas 1964, 107] | PMandara *gwVy- „1. chin, 2. beard” [GT] > Dghwede gwyé „beard” [Frick/JI 1994

⁵³ Correctly, this is SCu. *^{cl}oĉ- „cheekbone” [Ehret 1980, 278], in which, in this case, *-ĉ- has nothing in common with *-l-, cf. ECu. *^{cl}ad- „cheek” [GT]: e.g. Gollango ^{cl}ad- „Backe” [AMS 1980, 195] | Konso ad-á, Dirayta adđ-á (pl.), Mosiya adđ-etá „cheek” (Konsoid: Lamberti 1987, 533, #8.b) || Sem. *^{cl}aš(aš)- „bone” [Leslau 1945, 233] < PAA *^{cl}ač- [GT].

⁵⁴ J. Osing (NBÄ 187) regarded this PT var. as the older form. P. Lacau (1970, 59, §145), however, set up the root as √wgj.

⁵⁵ See Grapow 1954, 43 (lit. „Kauknochen”); Vergote 1965, 60; Lacau 1970, 59, §145; NBÄ 187; KHW 288 (lit. „Kauer”); DELIC 242 (lit. „celle qui mâche” conceived by W. Vycichl as an „ancien participe actif”).

⁵⁶ Strangely, it is only attested in Coptic in its late reduplication, cf. (S) ογοδογες, ογδδ, (L) ογλδογες etc. „to chew, crush” (CD 513b) = „kauen, nagen, zerfressen, zermalmen, zerstückeln” (KHW 288) = „mâcher, ronger, broyer” (DELIC 243). In principle, the Coptic reflex, esp. in its late sense „to crush”, might be forced together with Sem. *√wgʷ > Ar. waġaʷa „frapper (avec un couteau ou la pomme de la main), taper, donner une tape, 3. écraser, châtrer (un bélier par écrasement, en lui comprimant les testicules)” [BK II 1486-7] || Soqotri ʷoge „to hit” [Lsl.] = ʷege „frapper” [DRS] || Geez wagʷa ~ wagʷa „to pierce, prick, butt, gore, beat, hit, strike, make turbid, etc.” [Lsl.] = „frapper (de la corne), percer, écraser” [DRS] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 607; DRS WGʷ/ʷ), but regarding its original sense „to push, strike”, the Semitic root stands substantially distinct etymologically from Eg. wgj „to chew”.

II 13] = gwúyè „Kinn” [Wolff], Truade gwiye „Bart” [Büchner, Wolff], Glavda (Ghboko, Gvoko) and Bokwa gwiya „Bart” [Büchner], Gava (Yawotatakha) guya „Bart” [Büchner, Wolff], Alataghwa gwuya „Bart” [Büchner], Guduf gwúyè „Kinn” [Wolff] (Mandara data: Büchner 1964, 43-44; Wolff 1971, 70, 72) | Muktele agwái „beard” [JI] = ágwáy „beard” [Rsg. 1978, 208, #51]. Most recently, G. Takács (2004, 52, #333) has identified the Cushitic relatives of Eg. wġj.t, namely ECu. (actually, PKonso-Dullay) *gaw- „jaw” [Lmb.] = *gawgaww- [GT] > Konso kawk-á (m), pl. kawkaww-á „jaw” [Lmb.] | Dullay: Harso and Dobase káwkaww-o (pl. káwkaww-e) „Backenzahn” [AMS 1980, 167], Gawwada kawkaww-o „Kiefer” [AMS 1980, 252] = kawkaww-e „jaw” [Lmb.] (ECu.: Lamberti 1987, 533). All these cognates speak for a PAA *√gwy, whence one may derive – in the light of Belova’s law (i.e., Eg. Iae w- < AA Iae *-w/u-, cf. EDE I 394-400) – absolutely regularly also Eg. wġj.t ~ wgw.t.

Eg. *bj3 “tusk (?)” may be deduced from the phonetic value bj3 of the sign depicting a tusk (Wb I 436-442). Following the suggestion by G. Möller (1900, 151) to render this sign in bj3 as „der Schnabel der Gußgefäßes”, A. H. Gardiner (1927, 454: F18), too, assumed that the tusk hieroglyph „in words reading bj3 ... is possibly not a tooth, but a metal spout”, the existence of which, however, has not yet been satisfactorily corroborated in a lexicographical context, whereas the Afro-Asiatic data, on the contrary, seem to confirm the existence of an Eg. *bj3 “tusk” reflecting sg. like *√bʔl, cf. SOm.: Galila bāl-i, Dime bal-tu “horn” (SOm.: Bender 1994, 152) || PCh. *√bHl ~ *√bl “horn” [GT] > WCh. *√bl, regular from **√bHl [GT]: Angas-Sura *bīl ~ *būl (?) > *bəl „horn” [GT 2004, 33]⁵⁷ | Bole-Tangale *bāl(ə)m [Schuh]⁵⁸ (WCh.: Stolbova 1987, 158) || CCh.: Bura-Margi *təmbəl- (compound?) “horn” [GT]⁵⁹ (Ch.: Kraft 1981, #206; JI 1994 II, 192) < AA *√b(?)l “horn” [GT] = *bal- [Blz.].⁶⁰ Perhaps this root is to be detected also in CCh.: PMatakam (Mafa-Mada) *ma-bele “elephant” (act. “the tusked one”) [Rossing]⁶¹ as suggested by V. Blazek (1990 MS, 2).

Eg. ḥd “Kinnbacken” (XVIII. in a very old text, Wb III 210, 11; GHWb 574) could be, of course, following an often misleading egyptological tradition,⁶² explained from the homophonous Eg. ḥd „white” provided one had parallel evidence for this semantic shift. This not being at our disposal, however, it appears plausible to project an AA *√ḥĉ [GT] as a variety to AA *√ĉĉ „jawbone” [GT]⁶³ attested in Sem. *ĉaš(aš)- „bone” [Dlg. pace Leslau 1945, 233] || ECu. *ĉaḏ- „1. lower jaw, 2. cheek” [GT]: e.g. Saho (?) áḏ-ā „1. Gesicht, Kopf, 2. die Backen, Wangen, über welche die Haare herabfallen” [Rn. 1890, 30] (?) = áḏ-a “molar” [Welmers] = aḏ-a „back teeth” [Lmb. 1987, 533] = ĉaḏ-a (arha) „1. one side of the lower jaw (parte inferiore della mascella), 2. molar (molare)”, ĉaḏḏoyt-a „cheek (guancia)” [Vergari 2003, 62], Afar ĉaḏ-a „one side of the lower jaw (un côté de la mâchoire inférieure), side” [PH 1985, 52] | Ba’iso ačān-o (ext. -ān- of anatomic terms?) „chin” [Hayward 1979, 122] | Konso aḏ-á “cheek” [Lmb.] = aḏ-a [Flm.], Gidole (Dirayta) aḏḏ-á „cheek” [Lmb.], Mosiya aḏḏ-etá „cheek” [Lmb.] (Konsoid: Lmb. 1987, 533, #8.b) | Arbore ačéč „lower jaw” [Hayward 1984, 336] | Dullay-Gollango ĉaḏ-o and Gawwada aḏḏ-e „Backe” [AMS 1980, 195] || SCU. *ĉoč- [GT: regular < earlier *ĉoč-] “cheekbone” [Ehret 1980, 278] vs. WRift *ĉānĉ-ō „(molar) teeth” [KM 2004, 57] || POm. *ač- “tooth” [Bnd. 1988, 145] = *[h]ač- [Blz.] > Ometo *ač- [Bnd.] | Dizoid *ač/ž-u [Bnd.] || SOm. *ač-i “tooth” [Bnd.]⁶⁴ (Om.: Bender 2003, 122,

⁵⁷ Attested in Gerka bil [act. *bəl?] „horn” [Ftp. 1911, 217] = bəl „horn” [IL] = bəl (error for *bəl?) „horn” [Smz.] = bəl [Stl. < ?], Montol bulu (sic, with -u#!) „horn” [Ftp. 1911, 217] (Angas-Sura data: Stolbova 1987, 158, #121; GT 2004, 33).

⁵⁸ Cf. Gera ḥiyenā [Krf.], Geruma ḥeyi [Krf.] = beyi [Gowers], Karekare ḥeeləm [Stl.] = ḥeelūḡ [Alio], Bole ḥoolúm [Stl.] = ḥalum [IL] = ḥolu [Krf.], Dera ḥili [Krf.] = ḥili [Nwm. 1974, 122], Tangale ḥwol [Krf.] = ḥol [Jng. 1991, 73] = ḥól ~ ḥólól [Mkr.] = ḥol [Kidda 1985, 201, #48], Ngamo ḥálu [Schuh] = ḥalum [Nwm.-Smz.] = ḥaluhù [Krf.], Maha ḥelem [Nwm.], Galambu ḥálu [Stl.] = ḥali [Schuh], Kirfi balla [Gowers], Bele ḥelem [CWC in Mkr.] (Bole-Tangale data: Schuh 1984, 210; Newman 1965, 58; Zaborski 1984, 211, #36; Mukarovsky 1987, 213; 1989 MS, 4).

⁵⁹ Cf. Bura tímḥil [Krf.], Chibak təmbələ [IL] = tímḥil [Krf.], WMargi tímḥil ~ tumbil [Krf.], Ngwahyi tímḥil [Krf.].

⁶⁰ Literature for the comparison of these parallels: Mukarovsky 1987, 213-214 (WCh.-SOm.); 1989 MS, 4 (NOm.-SOm.-WCh.); Blazek 1989 MS Om., 20, #67; 1994, 197 (WCh.-SOm.); HSED #192 (WCh.-SOm.).

⁶¹ Attested in Zulgo mbele, Mada mbile, Hurzo mbelele, Mbreme mbelele, Gwendele mbelele, Uldeme mbele, Muyang mbele (Matakam data: Rossing 1978, 244, #233).

⁶² Namely, an often merely mechanical derivation of nomina from homophonous (verbal) roots irrespective of the external evidence or typological parallels for the suggested semantical development, which was critically assessed recently by G. Takács (2015, 171ff.).

⁶³ For the comparison of the Cushito-Omotoc root with the West Chadic and Semitic parallels cf. Mukarovsky 1987, 378; Dolgopolsky 1987, 209, #103; Blazek 1989 MS, 29, #101; OS 1992, 171; Takács 2010, 144.

⁶⁴ Cf. Dime äco, Banna aci, Ari, Ubamer, Bako dials. aci ~ aci ~ aci, Hamer ?aci ~ assi, Karo asi “tooth” (SOm.: Flm. l.c.).

219)⁶⁵ ||| WCh.:⁶⁶ Geruma očo “tooth” [Gowers], Kirfi ico (-ts-) “tooth” [Gowers] = iččó [Schuh] (WCh.: JI 1994 II 330). The ultimate verbal root this old Afro-Asiatic anatomic term may have originated from is AA * $\sqrt{c}\dot{c}$ „to bite, chew” [GT], cf. Ar. \sqrt{qd} „mordre à qqch., saisir avec les dents, et y enfoncer les dents” [BK II 276] ||| WCh. *H/ \sqrt{c} ač- „to bite, chew” [Stl. 1991 MS, 7; 1995, 61]. A remotely related root variety (with a different pharyngeal as C₁ and a nasal root extension as C₂) is represented by SCu.: Dahalo $\sqrt{hn}\dot{c}$ - [h- < * \sqrt{c} - irregular] „to chew” [EEN 1989, 27] || HECu. *inč- „to chew” [Hds. 1989, 413] < PCu. * $\sqrt{hn}\dot{c}$ - „to chew” [GT].

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

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

„Throat”

Eg. jw3j.t “Kehle (des Gegners, der durchbohrt wird) (?)” (GR, Wb I 49, 19) = “encolure (d’un bovin)” (Ramses II, cf. KRI II 318:15, AL 79.0125) = “throat” (Edfu, PL 49): for P. Wilson (PL l.c.) the sense of the Ramesside occurrence “seems to be the ‘neck and throat’ of a bull” ... in origin the term may be connected with iw3 ‘bull’, i.e., one should accept here a nisbe form *jw3.j.t „belonging to ox”, which appears to be rather far-fetched. More realistic would be to assume pace Belova’s Law (described most recently in EDE I 394-399) a shift from *wiry-, which O. V. Stolbova (1996, 90-91; OS 1992, 186) has long convincingly affiliated with PCh. * \sqrt{wr} “neck” [NM 1966] = *wəra [Nwm.] = *ḥa-wuyar [Stl.] = *(ḥV)-wurya(t) [Blz. 2001, 499, #10] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 252-3), which represent a good Egypto-Chadic match.

Eg. jz.t [perhaps < *rz-t?] “Lufttröhre (?), Schlund (?)” (GR, Wb I 128, 1) ||| WCh.: Tangale řožò “neck” [Kraft 1981, #49] = řořoř “neck”, k̄ā-řořoř “throat” [Jng. 1991, 138; JI 1994 II, 252]. V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1992, 186) have compared Eg. jz.t “gullet” to their hypothetic WCh. *ra3- “neck”, but from their article it is not clear before me which WCh. word (perhaps Tangale?) is meant by this reconstruction. Any connection to NBrb.: Qabyle \sqrt{rz} > ruz „être creux (arbre)”, u-riz „creux du tronc d’un arbre” [Dallet 1982, 746]?

Eg. b3q.t (neck or throat det.) “gorge (?)” (NE Mag., AL 78.1254 after Borghouts), occurs in: m(w)t n b3q.t “als eine Todesursache” (NE, Wb I 426, 2; GHWb 242) ||| NOm.: Chara bork-ā “collo” [Crl. 1938 III, 165] = bork-a “neck, collo” [Bnd. 1974 MS, 10].⁶⁷

Alternatively, if we assume Eg. b3q.t < * $\sqrt{b}q$, cf. LECu.: Oromo boqq-ū “1. neck, 2. back of neck, 3. stubborn” [Gragg 1982, 59] ||| WCh.: Fyer ḃāgyi, ?e-ḃāgyi, pl. ḃāgigyi “neck (Hals, Nacken)” [Jng. 1968, 7, #50; 1970, 84, cf. JI 1994 II, 252].

Eg. bb.wj (dual) “die Schlüsselbeine (claviculae)” (Med., Wb I 455, 3; GHWb 251) = „collar-bones” (FD 82), hence bbj.t “die Schlüsselbeinregion am Körper, Kehle” (Med., Wb I 455, 4; GHWb 251) = „region of throat”

⁶⁵ For the Cushito-Omoti *comparanda* see Fleming 1969, 26-27; 1974, 90; 1976, 320; Dolgopol’skij 1973, 307; Lamberti & Sottile 1997, 275.

⁶⁶ O. V. Stolbova (1987, 226) based her WCh. *ḥācwV „teeth” on the Bole-Tangale parallels (above) + the Angas-Sura term for „tooth”, whose etymological position is, however, disputable. Cf. Angas as [Ormsby 1914, 315] = äs [Flk. 1915, 144] = ?ääs [Jng. 1962 MS] = [?ā:s] [Brq. 1971, 12] = ?aas [Hfm.] = äs [ALC 1978, 3] = ääs [?ā:s] [Krf.] = as [Gochal 1994, appendix], Sura āgàs ~ āyàs [Jng. 1963, 58] = ?agas ~ ?ayas [Hfm.] = ?āyàs [Krf.], Mupun òos [Frj. 1991, 47], Kofyar āgàs [Ntg. 1967, 1] = ?ayas [Hfm.], Chip ?ayàs [Jng. 1965, 166] = əgàs [Krf.], Montol γḃəs [met. < *əγəs] [Jng. 1965, 171], Tal häss [IL] = haas [Smz.], Gerka yàs [Jng. 1965, 174] = γàs [IL], Goemay hâas [Srl. 1937, 73] = hoos [Hfm.] = hoos [Jng. 1962 MS, 2] = hoos [Hlw. 2000 MS, 14], Mushere ākàs [-k- < * \sqrt{g} -] [Jng. 1999 MS, 1] (Angas-Sura data: Hoffmann 1975, 26, #246; Stolbova 1977, 152, #4; JI 1994 II 330; Takács 2004, 152). These reflexes speak for PAngas-Sura * $\sqrt{ha_3\gamma a_3s}$ → *ayas “tooth” [GT] = *agas [Stl.] = *hayas “tooth” [Dlg.] with the typical medial * \sqrt{g} - (cf. Dolgopolsky 1982), which seems to point to two different scenarios of segmentation. Thus, our word might be either traced back to * \sqrt{hs} (or sim., but this is hardly equal with AA * $\sqrt{c}\dot{c}$, since Angas-Sura *-s# is not compatible with AA * \sqrt{c} - > * \sqrt{d} > Angas-Sura *-t#) with an infix * \sqrt{g} - < ** \sqrt{h} - or to prefixed AA * \sqrt{h} - + *gas (or sim., which is, however, a distinct root). In either cases we are dealing with the common AA affix attested in body part names (cf. Takács 1997). Henceforth, the Angas-Sura word is irrelevant here.

⁶⁷ H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 271) derives the Chara word from AA * \sqrt{br} “neck” [GT]. Suffix -k-?

(FD 82) → bb.t "Kehle, Kehlkopf" (GR, Wb I 455, 6). There is no evident etymology as yet. A number of plausible alternatives may be considered:

- (1) Semantically, most tempting is an equation with Sem.: Akk. (a/jB) bubūtu „(Wagen-)Achse” [AHW 135] ||| WCh.: Kofyar bāb „shoulders, horizontal part” [Ntg. 1967, 1]. Was Eg. *bb (sg.) „collar-bone” orig. considered as „horizontal axis (of the body)”? Any connection to CCh.: Bachama baapa "wing" [Carnochan 1975, 466] | Buduma bībi "Oberarm" [Lukas 1939, 92]? Areal parallel: PBantu *-bābā "wing" [Guthrie 1971, 118].
- (2) With special regard to Med. bbj.t and LEg. bb.t, cp. alternatively LECu.: Somali-Jabarti babāul-ā, pl. babaulayāl-ki "Luftröhre" [Rn. 1904, 52].
- (3) If Eg. bb.t primarily denoted the cavity between the clavícula and the throat, it would be tempting to identify it with PCu. *bab- „armpit” [GT] = *bob- "armpit" [Ehret]⁶⁸ as suggested by a number of authors,⁶⁹ which seems to be the most convincing etymology for Eg. bb.wj.
- (4) G. Takács (2000, 72, #1.3) related Eg. bb.wj to AA *bub- „breast” [GT].⁷⁰ In addition, he (Takács 1996, 46, #9; 1996, 136, #30; 1997, 254-255, #5.4) suggested an ultimate relationship of PCu. *bab- „armpit” [GT] and AA *bub- „breast” [GT], which is semantically problematic.

Eg. mr.t "Kehle o.ä. eines Gottes (von der m3^c.t 'Wahrheit' gebraucht, die ihm gereicht wird)" (GR, Wb II 107, 7) = "gorge" (Lefébvre 1952, 22) = "gorge, gosier" (Berlandini, LÄ IV 85; AL II 167, #1786; cf. Blackman, JEA 22, 1936, 105; Fairman, ZÄS 91, 1964, 8, vii) = "throat, voicebox, larynx" (Walker 1996, 269) = "throat, gullet (associated with Hathor and Maat regarded as the throat of god by which air and food were given to him)" (PL 445).⁷¹ its meaning and etymology are to be treated with reservations due to the very late attestation:

- (1) G. Lefébvre (1952, 22 & fn. 9), J. Berlandini (LÄ IV 85), W. Guglielmi (1991, 14), and P. Wilson (PL 445) identified it with OK mr.t "songstress" (PL) as an "incarnation de la chanteuse-chironome antique, officiante ..." (Berlandini) = "organ over which the songstress had particular authority" (Wilson), although Wilson seems to be undetermined whether the association of both lexemes with Eg. m3^c.t was because "*the three concepts make a potent pun*" being interchangeable as they "*may have sounded the same in sounding*" in the GR era.
- (2) GT: both LEg. mr.t "throat" and OK "songstress" are perhaps connected with WCh.: Hausa múryà '1. voice, 5. throat extracted from chicken' [Abr. 1962, 687], Gwandara murya "voice" [Skn. 1992, 356], which would not exclude the first etymological option above.⁷²
- (3) I have combined it elsewhere (Takács 1996, 136, #30; 1997, 226, #3 2004, 61-62, #353) alternatively with ECu. *marmar- "neck" [Sasse],⁷³ to which a great number of extra-Afro-Asiatic areal parallels may be adduced

⁶⁸ Cf. Bed. bába (f) "Achselhöhle, Armhöhle" [Rn. 1895, 40] = bab^cā (f) „armpit” [Rpr. 1928, 159] || ECu. *baḥb- ~/> *babb- „armpit” [GT] = *bab^c- „Achselhöhle” [Sasse 1981, 156]: LECu.: Oromo bobb-ā "armpit" [Gragg 1982, 428] = bób-a [Rn.] = bób-ā [Sasse] = bob-a [Lsl.] = bōb-a [Ehret] = bob-a? [Lmb.] | Arbore bēb-e? „armpit” [Lmb.] | Rendille baḥáb "armpit" [Heine 1976, 212] | HECu.: Burji bob-ā [Sasse] = bob-a [Lmb.], Gedeo (Darasa) bob-a "armpit" [Dlğ.] = bob-à ~ bop-à [Lsl.] (ECu. data: Dolgopol'skij 1966, 54; Sasse 1982, 37; Leslau 1988, 182; Ehret 1980, 140; 1987, #10) ||| NOm.: Mocha bəbbīh-o "armpit" [Lsl. 1959, 21]. For further details on this Afro-Asiatic root cf. EDE II 187.

⁶⁹ See Ehret 1995, #3; 1997 MS, 494, #3; HCVA II #138; HSED #167; Takács 1996, 46, #9; 1996, 136, #30; 1997, 254-255, #5.4.

⁷⁰ Cf. NBrb.: Shilh a-bubba "breast (Brust)" [Wlf.] = a-bubba „grosses mamelles”, ta-bubb^(w)-at „mamelles, sein” [DRB] | CMar. ta-bubb-ut „sein”, a-bubbu „gros sein” [DRB], etc. | Qbl. b-ubbu „sein” [Dlt. 1982, 5] (NBrb.: Wlf. 1955, 45; DRB 1, 7) ||| SCU.: Dhl. □ḥb-a "chest" [Ehret 1980, 140; EEN 34] = □ḥb-a, pl. □ḥb-addi „chest” [Tosco 1991, 130] ||| CCh.: Tera □ù□u "female breast" [Nwm. 1964, 38] | Bata bwōbi „breast” [Mch.], Bcm. bo□e "breast" [Jng.] = bupto [Meek] = □wūpto [Skn.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 46-47).

⁷¹ No trace of the word from earlier than the Greco-Roman times. D. Meeks (2000, 239, n. 1) observed a certain mr.t (?) (flesh det.) in Ostr. Petrie 36 = Ostr. DeM 1696, rt. 1 "designant une pièce de boucherie ou une partie du corps (humain ou animal)" (not listed in the standard lexicons, cf. also Grandet 1999, 15, n. 68), although he regarded "*un rapprochement avec mr.t 'gorge' ...*" as "*très hasardeux*" in spite of "*des graphies de ce mot*" (listed in Guglielmi 1991, 113) that are "*assez proches de celles de nos ostraca*".

⁷² It is to be borne in mind that, in theory, there "*could*" be an etymological connection between Hausa murya 'voice' and wúyà 'neck' [Abr. 1962, 937] as confirmed to me by P. Newman (p.c., 13 Nov. 2006), although he has "*never been able to find good internal or comparative evidence to show that this is so. Semantically, there is no problem. Phonologically, however, the connection is problematic. Murya comes from *muri (the ya being a feminine suffix and not part of the stem) whereas wuya (where the /y/ is part of the stem) comes from *wura (or some such), the *r to y change being well documented. Initial /m/ in Chadic is generally quite stable, and so it would be hard to explain an *m to /w/ change that would be required if wuya went back to the same proto-form. And then, contrary to common practice among certain Chadicists, one cannot simply ignore vowels, i.e., the final -i in one case, final -a in the other*". Cf. WCh. *[h^w]-yara "neck" [Stl. 1987, 239, #860] < PCh. *ḥa-wuyar "neck" [Stl. 1996, 90-91].

⁷³ Cf. Oromo morm-ā "Hals" [Rn.] = morm-a "neck" [Gragg 1982, 291] = (Borana, Orma, Waata dials.) morm-a "neck, throat" [Stroemer 1987, 370], Somali mármar "der lange Hals und Nacken des Kamels" [Rn. 1902, 302] = mármar "nape of the neck" [Abr. 1964, 175] = marmar "neck of the camel" [Lsl.] | Burji maḥmaḥi "(whole) neck" [Flm.] = marmár-i "neck,

as suggested already by M.L. Bender (1975, 177, §56.12) and H.C. Fleming (1983, 456), cf. Nilo-Saharan *mor- (??) "neck" [Bnd. 1994, 1161, #56] > PKuliak *morok "throat" [Ehret 1981, 92; Flm. 1983, 470], ESudanic *mur(u)t "neck" [GT], ENilotic *-murut- "neck" [Vossen 1982, 455].⁷⁴ In the light of H.-J. Sasse's (l.c.) theory on the internal (innovative) derivation of the East Cushitic word,⁷⁵ one wonders if there may be any connection to WBrb.: Zenaga a-marṭi "nuque" [Bst. 1909, 242] ||| ECh.: Sokoro mórol-dūm "dein Schlund" [Lks. 1937, 36]. Here too, no cognates emerge in Semitic.⁷⁶

Eg. ḥtj.t "die Kehle" (PT, Wb III 181): in his unpublished etymological files,⁷⁷ P. Behrens (in the early 1980s?) compared it with HECu.: Burji kúç-ō "nape of neck" ||| NOm.: Zala ḳoḍiy-ā "neck", Wolamo and Gofa ḳoḍ-e "neck" | Kafa ḳeṭṭ-ō "neck", Mocha ḳäṭṭ-ó "throat". Phonologically, it is not to be excluded in the light of a few convincing instances of the irregular correspondence of Eg. *ḥ vs. AA *ḳ.⁷⁸ Later, however, Behrens (1987, 243, §9) identified Eg. ḥtj with Afar ʿadey-ta "larynx" [PH 1985, 50], in which too, both the *An-* and *Inlaut* consonant would be irregular.

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

Eg. ḥḥ "1. (PT-) der Hals des Menschen, 2. (Lit. MK-) die Kehle" (Wb III 331) = „neck, throat” (FD 197), act. *ḥḥ (GT) > Cpt. (S) ረጸጸ, (B) ኮኮኮ "Hals, Nacken" (KHW 406) ||| ECU. *ḳōnk- "throat" [Lmb.] = *ḳōnk- ~ *kokk- [GT]⁷⁹ ||| SCU. *ḳoḳ-o "throat" [Ehret]⁸⁰ ||| NOm.: Koyra (Badittu, Amarro) kok-e "throat" [Flm.]⁸¹ = kokk-ē "throat" [Sasse] | Kaffa ḳōḳō "throat", ḳoḳḳō "neck" [Lmb.] (Cu.-NOm.: Flm. 1969, 26, #43; Lmb. 1987, 535, #21.a) ||| WCh.: Hausa māḳōḳō [prefix ma-] "1. goitre, wen on throat, double chin; 2. fatness on throat of

nape of neck" [Ss.] (ECu.: Sasse 1979, 24; 1982, 141). ECU. *marmar- was borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Harari marmär "shoulder", Gurage *marmär [Lsl.]: Chaha, Ennemor, Gyeto mämär etc. "nape of neck", Zway marmara "hump of the neck" (ES: Leslau 1963, 111; 1979 III, 406; 1988, 195).

⁷⁴ SOM.: Galila murut "neck" derives (pace Fleming 1983, 456) probably from Nilotic.

⁷⁵ He derived ECU. *marmar- "neck" from ECU. *mar- "round, to roll up" via the mediator meaning *"to turn around", which is possible, cf. PIE *k^wol-so- "Hals" > Lat. collum "Hals, Bergjoch", Germ. Hals < PIE *k^wel- "drehen" [IEW 639-640].

⁷⁶ Note that Ar. ʿamriʿ-at- "oesophage" [BK II 1086] = mariʿ- "oesophage, conduit alimentaire" [Dozy II 577] derives internally from Ar. maraʿa "2. manger qqch." [BK], whereas Yemeni Ar. marīn "gullet" from √mrʿ II "to whet an appetite" [Piamenta 1990, 463].

⁷⁷ I owe thanks to V. Blažek (Brno, Czechia) for passing over this precious collection of files he obtained in Cologne as a Humboldt research fellow in 1994. P. Behrens seems to have collected Afro-Asiatic parallels to Egyptian roots.

⁷⁸ Cf. (1) Eg. ḥtj "Rauch" (PT, Wb III 182, 9-11) ||| Sem. *√ḳṯr "Rauch" [WUS #2404], (2) Eg. pṯḥ "to create" (XVIII, FD 96; DLE I 186) = „bilden, schaffen” (GHwB 298; cf. Wb I 565, 11) compared by W. Vycichl (1959, 146, #5) and O. Rössler (1971, 296) with Sem.: Akk. patāqu "formen, bilden", pitqu "Formung" [AHW 847, 870], (3) Eg. ḥmm "Verbum, parallel zu smt 'hören'" (PT, Wb III 95, 9) combined in EDE I 303 with ECU.: Dullay *ḳām- "ear" [AMS 1980, 261] ||| SOM. *ḳām- "ear" [Blz.] ||| WCh. *kḳūma "ear" [Stl. 1987, 209]. For the Cu.-Om.-Ch. etymology see Mukarovsky 1987, 43-44; 1989 MS, 2; Lamberti 1987, 534, #16.b; Blažek 1989 MS Om., 11, #29.

⁷⁹ Cf. LECu.: Oromo ḳoḳō "throat" [Sasse] = ḳōḳa ~ ḳoḳoʿ "throat" vs. kokkeʿ "uvula, Adam's apple" [Lmb.] = kokk-ē "Adam's apple" [Zbr.], Arbore kokke "throat" [Lmb.], Baiso kok-e "throat" [Flm.] = ḳōnke ~ kōke "larynx" [Lmb.], Elmolo ōk [< *ḳōkʿ?] "throat" [Sasse] | HECu.: Sidamo kokke "throat" [Lmb.], Hadiyya ḳoḳeʿe ~ kokkeʿe "throat, Adam's apple" [Lmb.] = qōnq-aʿ "Adam's apple" [Lsl.], Gedeo (Darasa) ḳoḳ-o "throat" [Flm.] = qoḳ-o "throat" [Lsl.], Gidole ḳoḳo ~ kokke "throat" [Lmb.], Kambatta ḳōnke ~ kokke "throat" [Lmb.] = (so also Qabenna and Tembaro) qōq-ē "throat" [Lsl.] = qoqeha [Lsl. apud Zbr.], Burji kok-e "throat" [Flm.] = kōkk-ē and kok-ē "throat, uvula" [Sasse] = kokke "throat, uvula" [Lmb.] = qoqq-ē "throat" [Leslau] (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 116; Lsl. 1988, 197; Zbr. 1985, 89). The parallel forms with *k- vs. *ḳ- in East Cushitic are still to be explained. In the view of H.-J. Sasse (1982, 116), perhaps ECU. *k- is to be set, not *ḳ-. According to W. Leslau (1988, 197), the HECu. forms with ḳ-/q- are loans from Oromo, whereas those with k- were borrowed into Gurage kokke, kokki "throat, Adam's apple".

⁸⁰ Cf. (?) Iraqw -qunqu [nasal infix?] *"throat (?)" deduced from ala-qunqu "nape" ala- "behind" [Ehret] vs. gugi "throat" [Flm.] | Ma'a mkokéra ~ mḳohéra "throat" [Ehret] | Dahalo ḳōḳo "neck" [Flm.] = ḳoḳo "throat" [Ehret & EEN 1989, 19] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 253).

⁸¹ In the opinion of H.C. Flmeing, this is possibly a loan from Burji.

young animals denoting good health" [Abr. 1962, 647], Gwandara mākóko "Adam's apple" [Mts. 1972, 78] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 252).⁸² No Semitic cognates with the sense „throat”.⁸³

Eg. *d3d „throat (or sim.)” is only to be deduced from its denominal verb, namely d3d (throat determinative) "(Schlachtopfer) abkehlen" (PT 402a-, Wb V 527, 10) = „entkehlen" (ÜKAPT II 138, 158) = „to kill, strangle" (Ember) = „to strangle" (AEPT 131) = „abstechen (Schlachtopfer), 'abkehlen'" (ÄWb I 1493a) = „to cut throat" (CT II 240b, DCT 818), for which so far just a phonologically ill-founded false etymology has been proposed.⁸⁴ Only recently has G. Takács (1997, 253-254, #4.1) found the regular matches of Eg. *d3d in the reflexes of AA *√grd „throat, neck" [GT], cf. Sem. *√grd- (with various C₄ root extensions): Ar. ḡardaba „goinfrer", ḡardab-ān- „vorace", ḡardaḡa „allonger le cou, dresser la tête" || Tigre gardādā „être avide, ronger", gāḡāmā „dévorer", Tigrinya g^wārdāmā and Amharic g^wārāddāmā „manger avec bruit", Gurage əngurättāmā „manger et boire en même temps" (Sem.: DRS 182-183) || NBrb.: Senhazha ta-meggart (possibly -t), pl. ti-mgard-in „nuque" [DRB 867], Mzab ggurdəc „boire à longs traits", a-gərdəc „gorgée longue de liquide" [Dlh. 1984, 62] | Qabyle √grd: ggerdedd „être goulu, glouton, manger goûlument" [Dallet 1982, 272] || WBrb.: Zenaga a-gard, pl. gard-un „1. gosier, 2. haut du cou, sous et autour des maxillaires, 3. goulot" [DRB] || LECu.: Afar gurdum-ē "Schlund, Rachen, Kehle" [Rn. 1886, 852], Saho durgum-ā (metathesis) "1. der Halsknorpel, 2. Schlund, Rachen, Kehle" [Rn. 1890, 114] = durgum-a ~ gurgum-a⁸⁵ „trachea, windpipe" [Vergari 2003, 72, 94] (LECu.: Cohen 1947, #206) || WCh.: (?) Bole-Tangale *ḡgido [-d- < *-rd-?] "neck" [Schuh 1984, 211] | (?) Diri ḡḡ^wadu [< *ḡ^ward-?] "neck" [Skn. 1977, 32] || CCh.: Lamang-Turu gurdin, Lamang-Hitkala ḡirdā "Hals, Nacken" (Lamang: Wolff 1971, 65) || ECh.: Sokoro kerred-um [irreg. k- < *g-] "dein Gaumen" [Lks. 1937, 35] = kerred "hard palate" [Skn.] (Ch.: Skinner 1992, 353). Noteworthy, the root was retained as an anatomic term in Berber, Cushitic, and Chadic just like in Egyptian, while Semitic, on the other hand, has preserved it only as a denominal verbal root.

We know of a PAA variety *√grt „throat, neck" [GT] too, which is attested in Sem. *√grtm [GT: AA affix *-um of anatomic terms] > Amharic ḡārāččāmā „mâcher avec bruit" [DRS 186] || NBrb.: medieval Shilh a-gerd ~ a-gred „cou" [Ksm.], Shilh a-grd ~ a-mg(g)rd ~ ta-mg(g)rt „1. cou, 2. col (d'un vase), 3. goulot, goulet" [DRB] = a-mgerd „cou" [Jst. 1914, 121], Sus a-mggerd „collo" [Prd.] | Ntifa and Demnat a-hgrud⁸⁶ "gésier" [Hintze 1951, 79], Ntifa a-mgerd, pl. i-mgraḡ „cou, gorge" [Dray 1998, 129, 245], Tamazight gerḡ ~ yerḡ „tordre le cou, détacher (au niveau d'une articulation, d'un nœud)", a-gerḡ ~ a-yerḡ „i.a. col, voix, cou, gorge", a-mgerḡ „long cou, gros cou", ta-mgerḡt, pl. ti-mgraḡ „cou, (en)col(ure)" [Taifi 1991, 166], Zayan a-gerḡ, pl. i-gerḡi-wn „épaule" [Taifi] | Iznasen a-žernid „cou" [Ksm.] | Qabyle a-g^werḡ „(en)col(ure)", a-mgerḡ, pl. i-meḡraḡ „cou, nuque, encolure", ta-mḡerḡt, pl. ti-meḡraḡ „cou, gorge (corps humain), encolure" [Dallet 1982, 273] || EBrb.:

⁸² For this Afro-Asiatic etymology of Eg. ḡḡ see OS 1990, 87, #8; 1992, 186 (Hausa-Eg.); Skinner 1992, 355 (ECu.-Ma'a-Eg.); HSED #2069 (Eg.-Hausa-Dhl.).

⁸³ W.F. Albright (1918, 90; 1918, 240, #76, cf. GÄSW #757) and M. Cohen (1947, #151) figured PEg. *ḡḡḡ < **ḡḡḡ to be equated with Sem.: Akk. ḡarurtu "Hals", while H. Holma (1919, 42) combined Eg. ḡḡ with Akk. ḡḡḡ "husten" ḡḡḡḡ ~ ḡḡḡḡtu "Auswurf", which is, however an onomatopoeia having no etymological connection with the „throat" words. V. Blažek (1991, 364), in turn, identified Eg. ḡḡ directly with Sem. *ḡaw- vs. *ḡawḡ(aw)- "empty space, mouth, entrance, gate" [Blz.] = *ḡawḡ- „hollow" [TG]: Hbr. ḡāwāḡīm ~ ḡōḡīm (pl.) [< *ḡawḡ-] „hole, crevice" [KB 296] = „das Felsspalten" [GB 217] = „hollows, recesses" [Lsl.] || Ar. ḡawḡ-at- „aperture in a wall, small doorway between houses" [Lsl.] || Geez ḡōḡət „door(way)" [Lsl. 1987, 260] = ḡōḡt „hole in the wall" [KB]. This Semitic root has, however, reliably a quite different Afro-Asiatic background, cf. SCu.: WRift **ḡoh > sg. *ḡohōḡ^w „hollow form", pl. *ḡohēri [Kieβling & Mous 2004, 323] || ECu.: Dullay *ḡoh- "hole" [GT] > Dobase ḡohr-o & Gollango hóhn-o „Loch" (Dullay: AMS 1980, 192) || WCh.: Angas-Sura *ḡuk ~ *ḡok „(i.a.) be empty" [GT 2004, 207] > cf. especially Angas kok „empty" [Ormsby 1914, 209], Montol ku (so, without -k) „empty" [Ftp. 1911, 216] | Sha guk, pl. gukak "Tür" [Jng. 1970, 285]. The non-reduplicated root appears in Sem. *ḡhwy „empty" [GT].

⁸⁴ Since Eg. ḡ- does not regularly correspond to Sem. *z-, the traditional equation of Eg. d3d with Sem. *√zrd: Syr. √zrd "erdrosseln" [Vrg.] || Ar. zarada "erdrosseln", zarida "schlucken", ma-zrad- "Kehle" [Vrg.] suggested by A. Ember (1913, 114, #37; ESS §24.c.4, §3.b.43) and J. Vergote (1945, 130) has to be given up.

⁸⁵ This variety is also reflected by NBrb. *a-ḡeržum „gorge" [Destaing 1920, 143] > e.g. Shilh a-ḡeržum „gorge" [Cid Kaoui 1907, 119] | Tamazight ta-ḡeržum-t „gorge" [Cid Kaoui] || Bed. ḡirguma (m) „Halsknorpel, Adamsapfel, Schlund, Kehle, Rachen" [Rn. 1895, 101] || Agaw *gurgum „neck" [GT] (Cu.: Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 16), which all carry the suffix *-um-. The etymons *gurd-um- vs. *gurg-um- may well have been rhyme-words.

⁸⁶ G. Takács (1997 l.c.) treated its first radical as the trace of the AA prefix *ḡ- (occurring in the names of body parts). K. Naït-Zerrad (DRB 869), in turn, regarded as „un dérivé expressif" hardly fitting for comparing.

Audjila a-gârât, pl. gerâ-wen „collo” [Paradisi 1960, 163] || WBrb.: Zenaga a-garde „cou” [Msq. 1879, 29] = a-gard, pl. gard-un (sic: -d) „1. gosier, 2. haut du cou, sous et autour des maxillaires”, a-gard, pl. garda-wən „3. goulot” [Ncl. 1953, 313] = ə-gard, pl. u-gurđ-a(w)n „cou” [TC 2008, 211] || SBrb.: ETawillemmet and Ayr é-gârâd „nuque” [PAM 2003, 239] (Brb.: Kossmann 1999, 214, #628; DRB 868-869) || CCh.: PMatakam (PMafa-Mada) *gərđa "hard palate" [Skinner pace Rossing 1978] | Mbara gúrđòy, pl. gúrđòđó "gorge" [TSL 1986, 263]. In addition, AA *√grz „throat, neck” [GT] represents a third variety, cf. Sem. *√grz > Ar. ġaruza „être vorace” || Tigrinya gārzw/yä „dépecer un animal égorgé” (Sem.: DRS 194-185) || NBrb.: Beni Snus a-gūrzi ~ a-yerzi, also á-yeržum „gorge” [Destaing 1914, 154-155] Shawya i-gerzi „gorge, gosier, pharynx” [Huyghe 1907, 272] | Qabyle a-gurz „goitre” [DRB, not in Dallet 1982] || SBrb. *a-gurəz “larynx” [GT] (Tuareg data: Prasse 1969, 42, 110; Brb.: DRB 899) || SOM.: Ari gūrzi „neck, throat” [Bnd.], Galila gurži „throat” [Flm.] (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, ; 2003, 214).

It is noteworthy in the history of all these roots that the (presumably primary) nominal reflexes were as a rule lost in Semitic, just like in Egyptian, where they survived in denominally derived verbal roots with shifts into the semantic domain „gluttonous” (cf. its Hungarian synonym *torkos* < *torok* „throat”).

„Shoulder, arm”

Eg. ʕnd (determinative of wing)⁸⁷ "Teil des Flügels" (Wb I 207, 6; GHWb 148; ÄWb I 279b) = „Teil (Spitz) des Flügels oder Flügel” (ÜKAPT) = „(tip of) wing” (AEPT), which is attested solely twice in the Pyramid Texts, namely in PT 1377b: dj NN tp ʕnd dnḥ=k „setze den N. auf der Spitze deines Flügels” (ÜKAPT V 305) = „put me on the top of your wing” (AEPT 215), and in PT 1429b, in the expression d3j sw dḥwtj m tp dnḥ=k „setz ihn über, Thot, auf der Spitze deines Flügels” (ÜKAPT V, 353) = „ferry me over, o Thot, on the tip of your wing” (AEPT 221). Among those rendering these texts, this puzzling word was paid at least some attention only by K. Sethe (ÜKAPT V 312, cf. also 354), who rightly stated that whereas in PT 1377b it „wie ein Teil des Flügels erscheint”, so in PT 1429b it seems „alsob ʕnd allein 'Flügel' und erst tp-ʕnd 'Flügelspitze' bedeutete”. The word apparently does not occur later. Its reflex in Coptic supposed by W. Vycichl⁸⁸ is most probably unrelated for phonological reasons. This is typically the case when only external evidence may bring us closer to the solution, which has so far been examined perhaps solely by G. Takács (1997, 238, #39; 2004, 51, #331). He suggested a cognacy with HECu. *ang-a "hand, arm" [Hds. 1989, 75, 404; Sasse 1982, 26]⁸⁹ || WCh.: Sbauchi *āṅ “hand, arm” [GT]⁹⁰ || CCh.: Gisiga (Dogba dialect) haṅ "ganzer Arm, Hand" [Lukas 1970, 123] = hán (sic: -n) „hand” [Rsg.]⁹¹ (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 178-179). The underlying AA *ʕang- “hand, arm” [GT] may perhaps

⁸⁷ In some publications (e.g., ÄWb l.c.), this hieroglyph is reproduced rather a finger horizontally (D51).

⁸⁸ In his Coptic etymological dictionary (DEL 9), W. Vycichl derived Cpt. (S) ⲁⲗⲟⲟ, (B) ⲁⲗⲟⲗ "1. thigh, 2. (pl.) knees, 3. (pl.) arms, shoulders" (CD 7a) = „1. Schenkel, 2. (im Plural) Knie, Arme, Schultern” (KHW 5) from Eg. ʕnd, i.e., *ʕld, which is rather problematic given the fact that (S) ⲟ reflects an older Egyptian palatalized velar, not an affricate (Vergote 1973 lb 20, §21 and 22, §23; Peust 1999, 121, §3.9.4.1; Allen 2013, 52). Therefore, more realistic seems W. E. Crum’s (l.c. infra) proposal to relate the Coptic word to (B) ⲁⲗⲟⲕ „corner, angle” and (SALB) ⲟⲗⲕ „to be(come) bent”, which reflect Eg. ʕrq „krümmen” (OK-, Wb I 211). E. Dévaud’s (Muséon 36, 14) comparison of the Coptic forms to Hbr. yārēk "cuisse, hanche” etc. can be safely excluded (pace Vycichl l.c. supra) because of the phonological difficulties (Cpt. Ø- ≠ Hbr. y- and Eg. *l- ≠ Sem. *r-). Following F. Hintze, W. Westendorf (KHW 5) connected the Coptic word to SBrb.: Ahaggar ʕ-ley "foot", which is only possible if the underlying Afro-Asiatic root had *-k# in the *Auslaut*. J. Černý (CED 5) saw the etymon of (S) ⲁⲗⲟⲟ, (B) ⲁⲗⲟⲗ and Dem. 3lg attested in ʕ.wj n 3lg “cover of the thigh (made of silver)” (CED pace BiOr 13, 222) = „Futtermal von 3lg (Gegenstand aus getriebenem Silber)” (DG 8) in Eg. ʕrq „Gelenk der Füße (?)” (LP, Wb I 211, 18) = "joint of leg (?)” (CED), which seems indeed correct and satisfactory both phonologically and semantically.

⁸⁹ The etymological position of the Highland East Cushitic forms has been debated. H. C. Fleming (l.c.) connected them with phonologically unacceptable parallels reflecting *√HrK. On the other hand, H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) and A. Zaborski (1989, 582) saw in them metathesis of ECu. *ganʕ- „hand”.

⁹⁰ Cf. Guruntum aa(ng) “hand” [Gowers], Geji ang “hand” [Gowers] = ’āṅ "hand" [IL in JI] = aṅ „arm” [Krf.], Megang aṅ „arm” [Smz.], Gyaanzi āṅ „arm” [Smz. 1978, 20, #1]. The etymology of these forms is, however, not yet evident as in the same group forms like aa, am, and wam are also attested and their interrelation is obscure. H. Jungrauthmayr (in JI 1994 I 86-87 A) derived all these forms of South Bauchi from his PCh. *√kmm „hand”, the reconstruction of which appears for me equally problematic, possibly a result of a modern „contamination” of diverse distinct Chadic roots.

⁹¹ The background of the Gisiga word is also unclear. First of all, the shift of Gisiga h- < AA *ʕ- is not yet attested. On the contrary, I have so far only observed Gisiga h- < AA *h- (cf. Takács 2013, 158-159, fn. 11) and *s- (cf. JI 1994 I xxvii). But it is also difficult to agree with M. O. Rossing (1978, 266, #343), who traced the Gisiga word back to his PMafa-Mada (PMatakam) *ahal „hand”, because of the irregular *Auslaut*.

eventually be related to AA * $\sqrt{c}ng$ „to hold” [GT].⁹² In the light of PT 377b and the possible relationship to AA * $\sqrt{c}ang$ -, we may venture, in agreement with K. Sethe, that Eg. $\sqrt{c}nd$ denoted some part of the wing or was a synonym to $\sqrt{c}nh$ for the whole wing, but by far not "tip" in general.

Eg. mh "Arm (gern neben \sqrt{c})" (PT-, Wb II 120, 1) = "foeearm including hand" (FD 113; Walker 1996, 269) > (B) **MOI2I** "arm" (CD 133b s.v. **KOI2I**; CED 98) = "Ellenbogen" (KHW 89). From the same root: mh "Elle (auch der Ellenstab)" (PT, Wb II 120, 2) = "1. Elle, 2. Elle als Maß, 3. ein Flächenmaß" (GHwB 353; ÄWb I 552) = "cubit" (FD 113) > Dem. mh "Elle" (DG 173:1) > Cpt. (SAL) **MAZE**, (BF) **MAZI**, (M) **MEZE**, (F) **MEZI** (m) "ell, cubit" (CD 210b; CED 99) = "Elle, Unterarm" (KHW 110) = "avant-bras, coudée" (DELc 129). The Coptic evidence speaks in both cases for a quadriconsonantal word, namely * $\sqrt{c}mhj.w$ or * $\sqrt{c}mh^{\sqrt{c}}.w$ (!) (KHW 89, 110 & fn. 3) = * $\sqrt{c}m^{\sqrt{c}}hC_3^{\sqrt{c}}C_4$ (Vcl.) = perhaps * $\sqrt{c}mh_3.w$ (GHwB; ÄWb). Perhaps akin, as pointed out in EDE III 474, to Ethio-Sem.: Harari $\sqrt{c}mihi$ "vicinity, near, beside", $\sqrt{c}an mihiye-be$ "at my side", Gurage: Chaha, Gyeto, and Masqan $\sqrt{c}me^{\sqrt{c}}ä$ "rib", Wolane miyamo "side of ribs" || MSA: Soqotri $\sqrt{c}mi^{\sqrt{c}}eh$ [irreg. - \sqrt{c} -] "side" (Sem.: Leslau 1963, 105) || WCh.: Ngamo $\sqrt{c}ma$ "arm", $\sqrt{c}ma$ "wing" [Alio 1988 MS] || CCh.: Bata $\sqrt{c}me$ "bras" [Mch. 1950, 31] | Sao (Sso) $\sqrt{c}mwa$ "Arm" [Duisburg 1914, 41]. Semantically, here too, the closest cognates appear in Chadic. Other suggestions are unconvincing.⁹³

Eg. rmn „1. Oberarm, Schulter, 2. Seite, Hälfte” (PT-, Wb II 418), whence we have a denominal IVae inf. verb $\sqrt{c}rmnj$ „to support, carry on the shoulder” (PT-, Müller) = „tragen” (Wb II 419)⁹⁴ and whose Coptic reflex is also highly debated,⁹⁵ has been so far not yet unambiguously identified in its Afro-Asiatic kinship.

(1) A. Erman (1892, 113, also 127, fn. 3) equated it with Hbr. $\sqrt{c}rmn qal$ „auf dem Arm tragen”, nifal „fest sein” and Ar. $\sqrt{c}rmn$ „vertrauen”, which H. Brugsch (l.c.) attached (correctly) rather to Eg. $\sqrt{c}mn$ „bleiben”, which was opposed by Erman arguing that „bei dieser Gleichung bleibt das \sqrt{c} unerklärt und zudem pass die Bedeutung von $\sqrt{c}rmn$ m.E. besser zu $\sqrt{c}mn$ als die von $\sqrt{c}mn$ ”.

⁹² Cf. Ar. $\sqrt{c}anağa$ I „1. retenir, arrêter (sa monture), en tirant la bride à soi avec force; ramener sa monture dans la direction que l'on vent”, IV „2. raffermir, rendre plus solide, 3. éprouver des douleurs dans les vertèbres”, $\sqrt{c}ināğ$ - „1. corde dont un but est attaché au bas du seau ou aux deux anses et l'autre au bois, 2. douleur dans les vertèbres”, $\sqrt{c}ang$ -at- (pl.) „morceaux de bois verticaux qui forment comme des poteaux à l'entrée d'une litière portée à dos de chameau” [BK II 381] || Geez $\sqrt{c}anaga$ „to tie, bind”, $\sqrt{c}ang$ „ear-, nosering, chain for the neck” [Lsl. 1987, 64] || ECu.: Yaaku (Mogogodo) $\sqrt{c}inž-ān$ "to take hold of" [Flm.] = - $\sqrt{c}inč-am$ - "to hold (tr.)" [Heine 1975, 127]. The Yaaku verb was first connected with HECu. * $\sqrt{c}ang-a$ (above) by H. C. Fleming (1969, 25).

⁹³ (1) L. Reinisch (1873, 246-7): ~ Teda $\sqrt{c}tī, tihī$ "Ellbogen", $\sqrt{c}tumma, tunğa$ "Hand" (!). Absurd. (2) P. Lacau (1970, 107, #281) considered Eg. $\sqrt{c}mh$ to be an m- prefix form related to Akk. $\sqrt{c}aħu$ "arm, side", which W.A. Ward (1972, 22, §279-282) rightly declined as Eg. $\sqrt{c}h$ does not regularly correspond to Akk. $\sqrt{c}h$ (but cf. Kogan 1995). In addition, the function of m- in this case has not been explained. (3) Instead, he (Ward l.c.) derived Eg. $\sqrt{c}mh$ "forearm" from $\sqrt{c}mh$ "to seize, hold". A semantic connection between "fist" and "to grasp, seize" is understandable, but this is not the case here.

⁹⁴ Naturally, J. Osing (NBÄ 185) derived the noun deverbally, although already K. Sethe (1912, 103) had pointed to a denominal origin „des von $\sqrt{c}rmn$ abgeleiteten Verbums $\sqrt{c}rmnw$ 'tragen'”, which was corroborated by P. Lacau (1970, 104, §273): lit. „épauler, porter à l'épaule”.

⁹⁵ H. Brugsch (1881 Wb Suppl. 727), followed by K. Sethe (1912, 103), P. Lacau (1970, 104-5, §273 and §275), and J. Černý (CED 6), suggested that PT $\sqrt{c}rmnw$ was continued by Cpt. (B) **AMONI** „to be strong, possess” (CD 8a) = „ergreifen, verpflichten” (KHW 6), with (a nowhere attested) original sense „to hold”, where K. Sethe (l.c.) assumed the „Wegfall bzw. Übergang des r in j” just like P. Lacau (1970, 105, fn. 6): „Le r initial est passé à j et c'est ce j qui a changé en $\sqrt{c}le$ $\sqrt{c}ə$, voyelle prothétique, devant deux consonnes en contact direct”. This derivation was rightly queried by W. M. Müller (1909, 186): „it does not agree with early $\sqrt{c}rmn$ ”, W. Spiegelberg (1921, 5), the authors of Wb (l.c.), and W. Westendorf (KHW 486, fn. 2: „entspricht nicht der Struktur der IV. inf. Verben”). Indeed, there are worries both semantically („to carry on shoulder” vs. „to grasp”) and phonologically (syllable-initial r- is not supposed to shift in j-). W. M. Müller (1909, 186), who knew of no certain ex. of initial r- (i.e., where r- was palatalized into j-),⁹⁵ risked stating that „I only doubt an r here” because of MEg. $\sqrt{c}mnj_3$ „shoulder” (Illahun), which „suggests some hidden orthographic trick” guessed -j_3 for r- defective treatment of the r- in $\sqrt{c}rmn.wj$ written also as $\sqrt{c}mn.wj$ (RT 4, 25, l. 7). Instead, W. Westendorf (l.c.) and W. Vycichl (DELc 9) affiliated the Coptic verb with Eg. $\sqrt{c}mn$ (?) "1. (GR) in Empfang nehmen, 2. (gewöhnlich seit Pyr. in Ritualformeln) nimm in Empfang!" (PT, Wb II 60, 1-4) = "prendre" (AL 79.1188 with KRI exx.). I (EDE III 221) was disposed to see in the Coptic inf. a form reflecting in fact the NK j.mn imperative with the prothetic j- (XVIII-XIX., cf. Wb II 60). Then, W. Westendorf (KHW 6) changed his mind and assumed in (B) **AMONI** merely a "besondere Verwendung" of (B) (**AMONI**) "eig. anpflocken: 1. weiden (Vieh), 2. landen" (KHW 486).

(2) W. F. Albright (1927, 223) connected it with Ar. ʿamrān- (pl.) „nerfs du bras” [BK II 1096] = „Sehnen des Armes” [GÄSW] = „tendons of the arm” [Alb.] and √mrn I „être en peu dur (se dit d’un corps habituellement tendre au toucher)” [BK II 1096] = „to tighten, make flexible” [Alb.] = „zäh, widerstandsfähig, biegsam” [GÄSW], which was received by F. von Calice (GÄSW 169-170, #688) with doubts („*Sehr fraglich*”), albeit so far this.

(3) G. R. Castellino (1984, 13), in turn, assumed in Eg. rmn an instance of the „*poss. infiltrazioni di indoeuropeo in egiziano*”, cf. OIndic īrma- (m) „Bug, Arm, Vorderschenkel”, Avestan arəma- „Arm”, Armenian armuku „Ellenbogen”, Latin armus „der oberste Teil des Oberarms, Schulterblatt, Vorderbug der Tiere” etc. (IE data: LEW I 69). Here, one might object that anatomic terminology was hardly borrowed, let alone that Eg. -n was part of a triradical root not reflected on the Indo-European side.

Eg. ḥtt.t ~ ḥtt ~ ḥt.t ~ ḥt „aisselle” (MK, NK, Dévaud 1921, 161-163 with older lit.) = „shoulder” (Med., Breasted 1930, 417) = „1. Achsel, auch als Achselhöhle unter dem Arm, 2. Schulter, als Körperteil des Rindes: Schulterstück”, cf. šn n ḥtt.t “Achselhaar” (Wb III 204, 15-17; Grapow 1954, 50, §iv.3; GHWb 572; ÄWb II 1816) = “armpit (not shoulder)” (Caminos 1956, 15, fn. 1; FD 181; Ward 1972, 22, #276; DCT 367), act. *ḥṯṯ.t (Dévaud 1921, 162) = *ḥattāt < *ḥatṯāt (Fecht 1960, 197, fn. 553) = *ḥtyōwēt or *ḥttōwēt (Lacau 1970, 106, §277) = *ḥṯṯ.āt > *ḥṯṯ.ā? (NBÄ 122, 596, n. 540)⁹⁶ = *ḥṯṯ(ṯ)āt (Schenkel 1983, 232) reflected by Cpt. (S) 𐤨𐤓, 𐤨𐤓, pl. 𐤨𐤓𐤓, (B) 𐤨𐤓 (m) „Achsel, Achselhöhle, Schulter” (KHW 18, 412) = „arm-pit” (CED 309).⁹⁷ Most of the authors *a priori* agree that Eg. ḥtt.t would be deverbal noun deriving from Eg. ḥtt (hapax only attested in PT 2171b) “jem. hochheben (zum Himmel), tragen unter dem Arm” (Wb III 204, 14; GHWb 572) = „to shoulder, carry on the shoulder” (Breasted 1930, 417) = „to carry (something) under one’s arm” (Caminos 1956, 15, fn. 1, declined by J. Osing in NBÄ 596, n. 540) = „prendre sous ses aisselles” (Lacau 1970, 106, §276). The verbal root was conceived – pace Wb l.c. etc. – by W. Schenkel (l.c.) as Ilae gem.: √ḥtt, while P. Lacau (l.c.) figured it as IIIae inf. (√ḥtt) assuming that „*ce verbe serait un dénominatif d’un mot *ḥt perdu. Plus tard nous avons le substantif ... ḥtt.*” One is disposed to side with the assumption of P. Lacau as the external evidence seems to confirm the Afro-Asiatic background of the noun, but not that of Eg. ḥtt, which indeed seems to be an (*ad hoc?*) denominative verb. Since ṯ originated solely from a palatalized *k, we may safely project a PEG. *ḥkk.t. This is why the etymology of A. B. Dolgopolsky (1998, 83, #107), who equated this Eg. term with Sem.: Modern South Arabian *yatq-at “back of the knee” [GT]⁹⁸, can by no means be accepted.⁹⁹ Instead, G. Takács (2004, 63, #358) ventured comparing PEG. *ḥkk.t with WCh.: Kulere haw [< *kaw] “Achselhöhle” [Jng. 1970, 352]¹⁰⁰ | Pero yyágèw [< *yakaw?] “armpit” [Frj. 1985, 55]¹⁰¹ || CCh.: Muktele hähaw [< *ḥakaw?] „armpit”

⁹⁶ W. Vycichl (DELIC 323) firmly objected J. Osing’s (NBÄ l.c.) reconstruction of this word: „*Il n’y a pas le moindre doute que les deux ... ṯ étaient séparés par une voyelle. OSING dérive la forme copte de ... de reconstruction inadmissible qui n’explique pas la disparition du ... ḥ. Il prétend que la dittographie ... exprime en égyptien une gémination, opinion reconnue depuis longtemps comme erronée. Il compte dans ce cas avec une terminaison du féminin -at accentuée, pour un mot de genre masculin.*”

⁹⁷ In P. Lacau’s (1970, 106, §277) opinion, „*le 2 initial devant voyelle atone tombe régulièrement en bohairique*” (as it has been confirmed also for Sahidic by C. Peust 1999, 158, §3.14.7 and fn. 200 with further literature), but one can hardly agree with him in that „*en shaidique nous devons attendre *2𐤨𐤓 ou *2𐤨𐤓*” as Eg. ṯ did become 𐤨 or 𐤓 (but not 𐤓). For the loss of ḥ- in Coptic, cf., e.g., (B) 𐤨𐤨, (S) 𐤨𐤨 „magician, wizard” < Eg. ḥk3.w (CED 277). Further exx. apud Peust l.c.

⁹⁸ Attested as Jibbali 𐤨𐤨𐤨 “back of the knee” [Jns. 1981, 90] = “popliteal space” [Dlg.], Mehri 𐤨𐤨𐤨 “hollow at the back of the knee” [Jns. 1987, 144].

⁹⁹ These roots are phonologically “incomparable” (none of the underlying root consonants corresponds: Eg. ḥ- ≠ Sem. *ḡ-, Eg. ṯ ≠ Sem. *t, Eg. ṯ ≠ Sem. *k). Besides, MSA *yatq-at [assim. < **yatq-at?] might be eventually related to ECu.: Konso quḏittá “armpit” [Lamberti 1987, 536, #28.a].

¹⁰⁰ The first root consonant and its syllable was lost in Ron. Or was it a *ḥ- *mobile*, perhaps identical with the common Afro-Asiatic marker of the semantical category of anatomical terms (studied by G. Takács 1997)? Interesting is the unusual lack of the first syllable also in the supposed Coptic Sahidic reflexes of MEg. ḥtt.t, 𐤨𐤓 and 𐤨𐤓. The shift of Ron *h- < Ch./AA *k- is just as regular as Ron *k- < AA *ḳ- as shown by G. Takács (2000, 96-97).

¹⁰¹ AA *ḥ-, as a rule, was lost as such in the Bole-Tangale group or shifted to h- (Stolbova 1987, 61, table 1.7), but its syllabic trace was preserved by Pero yya-. The medial *-k- in Pero might have been subject to a regular voicing in intervocalic position (-VgV- < *-VkV-).

[Rsg. 1978, 202, #24].¹⁰² In the light of this Chadic etymology, it cannot be excluded that Ch. *(h)a[k]aw (or similar) “armpit” [GT] has an Egyptian cognate. At least, this seems to be by far the most hopeful Afro-Asiatic etymology of MEG. *h̄tt.t* at the present. But we should wait until further Chadic parallels become available to be able to judge whether the underlying Chadic root was in fact **√hkw* (neatly fitting Eg. **ḥtyōwēt* projected by P. Lacau 1970, 106, §277) or represents perhaps a quite distinct Afro-Asiatic root, something like **√hw* „hollow” [GT].¹⁰³

Eg. *ḥpš* „1. (PT-) (Vorder)schenkel, 2. (early MK-) der Arm, Kraft, eigtl. körperlich der Arm; schon sehr früh (seit D. 12) im Sinne von Kraft gebraucht” (Wb III 268-269) = “1. foreleg, thigh, 2. (strong) arm” (FD 189): after a couple of untenable etymological proposals,¹⁰⁴ the correct Cushito-Chadic parallels of the Egyptian noun have only recently been discovered by O. Stolbova¹⁰⁵ and G. Takács (EDE I 162), cf. ECu. **kafš-/kefš-* “1. shoulder → 2. chest” [Sasse 1982, 112] = **kesf-* „chest” [Sasse 1979, 54] = **ke(s)p-* „armpit, chest, shoulder” [Lmb. 1987, 536, fn. 4]¹⁰⁶ || WCh.: Hausa *kààfàdà*¹⁰⁷ [Abr. 1962, 446], Buli *gàpušà* [Kraft] || CCh. **paš(h)-*,¹⁰⁸ probably a metathesis < **ḥapš-* “shoulder” [GT] > Bura-Margi **pačVk-* (metathesis) „shoulder” [GT]: Bura *pačaha* ~ *pačahu* (-*thl-*) [BED 1953, 170] = *pačahn* (-*thl-*, -*n'*) [Hfm. 1955 in RK 1973, 95] = *pašahà* (sic, -*š-*) [Stl.], Margi *paškù* [Stl.], Kilba *pāšīkù* [Stl.], Ngwahyi *pašikà* [Stl.] (Bura-Margi data: Stolbova after Kraft 1981) | Mandara *ašépešépe* (metathesis) „épaule” [Mch.] | Gude *pašikən* “shoulder” [Kraft] | PMafa-Mada (PMatakam) **-paš* “shoulder” [Rossing] = **hapaš* → **pa(š)paš* [GT]: Mofu-Gudur *pepéš* „omoplate, épaule” [Brt. 1988, 219] = (misquoted as Matakam) *pəpəš* [Stl.], Mafa (Matakam) *peše-peše* [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 310], Mada *ahpás* [Rsg.] = *ahpás* [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 130], Hurzo *péšpéš* [Rsg.], Vame *péšpéš* [Rsg.], Muyang *hàpás* [Rsg.], Muktele *zá-bàšà* [Rsg.], Daba basa „épaule” [Mch. 1966, 110], Uldeme *mə-pápéš* [Colombel 1997, 201] (Mafa-Mada group data: Rsg. 1978, 325, #637) | Musgu *képeš* „épaule” [Mch.] (CCh.: Mouchet 1950, 33; Kraft 1981, #52; Stolbova 1991 MS, 5; 1996, 19). The etymological position of ECh.: Somray *bússomo* „Schulter” [Lukas 1937, 77] is not yet clear. Do we have here perhaps **bus-* + the common AA (Sem., Brb., Cu.) suffix **-um* of anatomical terms? The isogloss of CCh.: Gisiga *kəpəš* „Achselhöhle” [Lukas 1970, 125], Balda *kérpäss* „Arm” [Str. 1922-3, 116] | Musgu *kérpeθ* [**-š*] „Schulter” [Müller 1886, 398] = *kérpex* „Schulter” [Lukas 1941, 62], Musgu-Puss *kerpeš*

¹⁰² The Muktele parallel has been added for this paper. Since the M. O. Rossing’s (1978) Mafa-Mada reconstruction as well as the most recent Central Chadic phonology by R. Gravina (2014) provide little about the history of Muktele *h-*, it would be difficult to say anything. If, however, we look at the Pero parallel, it appears likely that we have here an etymon **ḥa-kaw*.

¹⁰³ Cf. Takács 2010, 140.

¹⁰⁴ On the one hand, Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1974, 108; 1975, 48) equated it with Sem.: Ar. *√hbs* „saisir, prendre avec la main” and *√hbš* „soulever, ramasser à la main”, Brb. *(h)a-fus „hand”, and, in his paper from 1975, even with Ar. *√hms* (sic, *h-*) „5”. The latter absurd idea was two decades later extended by E. Lipiński (1997, 287, §35.10) to a comparison of Eg. *ḥpš* with Sem. **ḥamš-* „5” || Brb. **səmmus* „5” || Bed. *asa* **ʔ5* (only attested in: *asa-gwir* „6”, act. **ʔ5 + 1*”, *asa-rama* „7”, act. **ʔ5 + 2*”) explained by him via **assa* < **ḥassa* < **ḥamsa*. All this was, on the top of it, was concluded by his absurd remark: „In the quinary system ... in Libyco-Berber, ... *afus* ‘hand’, related directly (!) to Eg. *ḥpš*, may be used instead of *səmmus*”. On the other hand, V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 185; HSED #1390): ~ WCh.: Montol *pəγas* “Wade” [Jng. 1965, 171] = “calf of leg” [OS] < **pVHač/s*, but as demonstrated by G. Takács (2004, 302), the *Anlaut* *pəγ-* of Montol *pəγas* regularly derives from **p^w-*, and so it is cognate with Goemay *paas* “calf of the leg” [Srl. 1937, 171] < Angas-Sura **p^wāš* ~ **pāš* “calf of leg”, for which cf. also Angas-Sura **bāš* “shinbone” [GT] || ECh.: Mubi-Toram **būsaw-* “lower leg” [GT]: Jegu *busawo* “calf of leg” [Jng. 1961, 111], Kofa *búusó* (m), pl. *búusaw* “Unterschenkel” [Jng. 1977 MS, 4].

¹⁰⁵ Stolbova 1995, 60, 62; 1996, 19; Orel 1995, 145. The Eg.-Buli match was also discussed in OS 1992, 186; HSED #2034. O. V. Stolbova (l.c.) included in this comparison also ECh.: Mubi *fósó* (f), pl. *fóósás* “Arm, Hand” [Lukas 1937, 182] = **fósó* “hand” [Doornbos-Bender] = *fòósó* (m), pl. *fòosús* ~ *fòosàs* “main” [Jng. 1990 MS, 15], which, however, represents a fully distinct Afro-Asiatic root.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. LECu.: Somali *šaf* „chest” [Abr. 1964, 229], Konso *ḥašš-ittá* „shoulder” [Lmb.] (borrowed from Dullay?) vs. *kess-a* “chest” [Sasse] | HECu.: Burji *káčč-ō* “shoulder” [Sasse: from **kafš-*] | Harso *hešš-é* and Gollango *haš-itto* „Schulter”, Gawwada *ḥaš-ito* “Schulterblatt” (Dullay data: AMS 1980, 267) | Yaaku *kehp-en* “shoulder” [Sasse: old **kesp-*] = *kehp-en* [Lmb.] etc. (ECu.: data: Sasse 1982, 112). For most of these forms, M. Lamberti (1987, 536, #25a) presented a different etymological analysis. Ch. Ehret (1987, #173), in turn, equated ECu. **kafš-* with Bed. *sikba* „pastern joint” and Sagaw: *Awngi cəgfí* „palm of hand”, which V. Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 31) rightly considered as uncertain.

¹⁰⁷ The Hausa word with its deviant -*ḍ* < AA **-č* (instead of the expected -*l* < AA **-š*) in the *Auslaut* represents a reflex of AA **√ḥpč*, a root variety to AA **√ḥpš*, which underlies the rest of the Chadic parallels.

¹⁰⁸ The reconstruction of the Proto-Chadic stem has been disputed: J. Mouchet (1950, 33) has CCh. **√kps* “épaule” based solely on the comparison of the Mandara and Muzuk exx., whereas O. Stolbova (1991 MS, 5; 1995, 60) suggested CCh. **HapačV* “shoulder”, which appears to be more realistic. Later, she (Stolbova 1996, 19) set up PCh. **Ha-paš-* > CCh. **pa-paš-* “shoulder”. The latter, however does not fit all the Central Chadic parallels.

„épaule” [Trn. 1991, 98] reflects *kerpeš (or sim.) [GT], which may eventually represent the same triconsonantal root extended with a parasitic -r-.

Another ultimately related isogloss (an old root variety inherited from the Afro-Asiatic parental language) reflecting AA *√bgz "shoulder" [GT] is attested in SCu. (possibly) *bVh/gVs/z- (?) [GT]¹⁰⁹: Qwadza be'es-iko "shoulders" (the suppletive pl. to belendayo) [Ehret 1980 MS, 1; 1980, 142, #74] ||| CCh.: Zeghwana bəgəɖza "shoulder" [Kraft] | Lamang-Hide (Hitkala) bažaga (metathesis < *bagaža) „épaule” [Eguchi 1971, 197].

No reflexes in Semitic, Berber, and Omotic are known for the time being. In South Berber, perhaps a possible cognate appears in Ahaggar ā-kāsuf „bâton (de moyenne ou faible grosseur et d'environ 1^m,50^c à 2^m de long)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 915], ETawlemmet a-ḵasuf „1. bâton court et gros, 2. cravache fouet, 3. p. ext. coup de bâton, fouet” [PAM 2003, 418] with a semantic shift suspiciously similar to that preserved by Eg. ḥpš „das sogenannte 'Sichelschwert' als Waffe” (MK-, Wb III 270, 1). All in all, Eg. ḥpš, as an anatomical term, seems to only have Cushitic and Chadic cognates. The Egyptian word has thence only South Afro-Asiatic cognacy.

Eg. *sq̣r, an old word for „elbow (?)”, not attested in Egyptian texts, only reconstructed from the hieroglyph depicts apparently a bent arm with the phonetic value sq̣r. As stated by A. H. Gardiner (1927, 524, Aa7), in the inscriptions of Dynasty VI, “it looks like an arm”. The existence of OEg. *sq̣r seems to be supported also by AA *√[ç]kl “elbow” [GT] based on ECu. *ḍiḵl- "elbow" [Sasse 1979, 26, 30; 1982, 176, 105]¹¹⁰ ||| CCh.: Mofu méckülék [-ts-] (prefix me-?) “elbow” [Rsg. 1978, 244, #232]. The Mofu-East Cushitic comparison is due to N. Skinner (1992, 348). Eg. *sq̣r issues regularly from an incompatible PEg. *√dql due to the obligatory loss of glottalization in the proximity of a velar, i.e., the combination of an AA glottalized affricate *ç/*ç/*ç + *k/*g/*k/*q becomes, as a rule, PEg. *sk/*sg/*sq/*sh (cf. EDE I 327-329).

Eg. q̣ḥ „1. Oberarm, Schulter, 2. (selten auch vom) Arm (allgemein)” (MK-, Wb V 19, 6-13) = "(upper) arm, shoulder, elbow" (FD 276; DCT 649), whose ultimate etymology is debatable, is, with its typical -ḥ, certainly the result of a dissimilative reduplication of one single pharyngeal (i.e., ḥ < either *ḥḥ < **ḥ or *ḥḥ < **ḥ, cf. EDE I 329-332). In addition, perhaps we must also take into account a possible shift of an incompatible PEg. *ḳḥ → OEg. q̣ḥ. Accordingly, one has to count with at least three promising alternative (almost equipotential) etymological possibilities:

(1) A. Ember (ESS 1930, §5.c) has already surmised Eg. q̣- < *k- to be due to medial -ḥ- (possibly rightly) and a also change of -ḥ to -ḥ due to q̣- or *k- in our word (i.e., pre-PEg. **ḳḥ > *ḳḥ > OEg. q̣ḥ), which he regarded as cognate with Ar. kāḥ- ~ kūḥ- „1. condyle, surtout os de la main qui touche au pouce ou au doigt articulaire, 2. os de la cheville du pied” [BK II 944] = kūḥ- „the extremity of the radius or bone of the fore-arm, next the thumb or the protuberance formed thereby” [Lane 3004] = „Handgelenk, genauer: Kopf des Unterarmknochens” [GÄSW 210, #867] = „vorspringendes Ende d. Unterarmknochens an d. Handwurzel, Knöchel d. Handgelenks (projecting end of the bone of the forearm at the wrist, wrist-joint)” [WKAS I 438a] = kūḥ- "wrist, elbow" [Ember]. Following C. Brockelmann (l.c. infra), L. Kogan (SED I 125-6, #140) affiliated the Arabic noun with Syr. kōḥā „articulus” [Brk. 1928, 323] || Ethio-Sem. *ḳwätt- „foot, hoof” [Kogan] > e.g. Amhara kotte „foot, hoof (of a horse)” [Kane 1990, 1426], Gurage-Soddo kotte „hoof” [Lsl. 1979 I 1075] etc., which he derived via **ḳwāt-at < **kūḥ-at- from his Sem. *ku/aḥ-at- „joint, ankle, foot”. Ember’s etymology was declined by F. von Calice (GÄSW 210, #867) arguing that Eg. q̣ḥ „shoulder” derives (as suggested later in NBÄ 228 too) internally from Eg. q̣ḥ „Ecke, Winkel, Seite” (OK-, Wb V 19-20). But these ideas are eventually not necessarily excluding one another. It is highly noteworthy to observe the parallelism between Eg. q̣ḥ „1. (PT) vom Stier, der sein Horn zur Seite wendet um dem Toten den Weg frei zu geben, 2. (CT/BD-) die Hand, den Arm beugen” (Wb V 18-19) = „to bend (arm, hand)” (FD 276-277; DCT 649) and Ar. kawīḥa I „e-n verkrümmten, verkrüppelten Knöchel d. Handgelenks haben, e-n hervorstehenden Knöchel d. Handgelenks haben”, II „j-m d. Knöchel d. Handgelenks verkrümmen, verkrüppeln”, kawīḥa- „Verkrümmung, Verkrüppelung d. Knöchels d. Handgelenks, Hervorstehen d. Knöchels d. Handgelenks” [WKAS I 437b-438b], which is evidently the denominative verb of Ar. kūḥ-. Ultimately, can the underlying AA *√ḳḥ „elbow, wrist” [GT] be related to the medially irregular isogloss of Sem.: Hbr. √yq̣ḥ qal „1. to turn away in disgust, 2. dislocate (a thigh)” and √nq̣ḥ qal „1. to free oneself (from lovesickness), 2. turn away in disgust” [KB 431, 722] ||| SCu. *kiḥ- „to turn aside,

¹⁰⁹ Qwadza -ʔ- is regular < SCu. *ḥ/g- as demonstrated by Ch. Ehret (1980).

¹¹⁰ H.-J. Sasse’s ECu. *ḍi- derives AA *ç- as pointed out by A. B. Dolgopolsky (1983). For the East Cushitic data cf. Black 1974, 51; Lamberti 1987, 536; Leslau 1988, 200; Hudson 1989, 56.

veer off course" [Ehret]: Iraqw, Burunge, Alagwa ki^c- „to return, turn back” | Dahalo ki^c- „to make a furrow for diverting water around house” (SCu.: Ehr 1980, 244, #27) < AA *√K^c „to turn away” [GT]?

(2) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #1622), in turn, equated it SCu.: WRift *k^wāḥa „shoulder blade”, pl. k^wāḥu [KM] = *k^wāḥ- "shoulder" [OS]: Iraqw and Gorowa k^wāḥa „shoulder blade” [KM] = kwaḥa „1. shoulder blade, 2. stick for scraping dung” [Ehret], Alagwa k^wāḥa „shoulder (blade)”, pl. kwaḥu „shoulders” [KM] = kwaḥu „shoulder” [Ehret], Burunge k^wāḥa „shoulder (blade)”, pl. kwaḥu „shoulders” [KM] = kwaḥa „shoulder”, kwaḥi „wrist” [Ehret] (WRift data: Ehret 1980, 269, #17 with a different SCu. etymology; KM 2004, 186). This may only be true if we assume an equally plausible chain of changes in Eg. q^cḥ < *k^cḥ < **kḥḥ.

(3) A. Ju. Militarev (in Starostin et al. 1995 MS, 15), in turn, affiliated it with Bed. hárka ~ hérka „der Arm Oberarm, Schulter, Achsel” [Rn. 1895, 126] = herka "upper arm, shoulder" [Roper 1928, 198] || ECu. *ḥark/ḥ- "arm, hand" [GT]¹¹¹ > i.a. Dullay *ḥark/q-o „Arm, Hand” [TG]: Harso, Dobase, Gawwada ḥark-ó, pl. ḥárq-e, Gollango ḥarq-ó (Dullay: AMS 1980, 230, 247; ECu. data: Dlg. 1973, 159; Lmb. 1987, 536, #27.a) || SCu.: Ma'a (Mbugu) mu-hālēya ~ mu-hālēka „Arm” [Meinhof] = mharéga ~ mharéya < *-haraka- "arm" [Ehret] (Ma'a-LECu.: Meinhof 1906, 314; Ehret 1980, 335; 1987, #524). This comparison is, in principle, also plausible if one assumes here an interchange of -^c- < *-r- (sporadically attested in older Egyptian),¹¹² i.e., Eg. q^cḥ < PEg. *qrḥ < AA *√hrḥ [GT] via metathesis.

Eg. *grḥ is possibly a lost word for „forearm” or „elbow” reconstructible from the fact that the words deriving from Eg. √grḥ „1. fertig machen, 4. aufhören” (Wb V 182-183) have a determinative representing the "forearm with palm of hand downwards", which A. H. Gardiner (EG 1927, 447, D41) explained, not too convincingly, as the determinative of „cessation of movement” only because the same sign appears in Eg. nj „ab-, zurückweisen” (MK-, Wb II 204), although one finds little in common. A much more reasonable explanation is to assume here a lost word originating from AA *gulḥ- ~ *guḥl- “1. knob on limb, 2. (hence extended to) forearm” [GT]¹¹³ being akin to Brb. *√gly [regular < **√glḥ] „nouer” [DRB] > (GT: or vice versa: denominal root?) i.a. WBrb.: Zenaga tā-ugall-ət, pl. tā-ugžēi-n (rare) „nœud” [Ncl. 1953, 306] = ta-ugell-et ~ te-gull-et [DRB] || SBrb.: Ahaggar tā-ḡalay-t „1. nœud (fait à une corde, une lanière, une étoffe), 2. p. ext. nodosité (renflement irrégulier se trouvant sur un tronc, une branche, une tige de végétal, ou sur un membre d'une personne)”, ta-ḡli-t „phalange (des mains et des pieds des personnes et des animaux)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 432], ETawillemmet té-ḡāllāy-t „nodosité (renflement de graisse sur le cou d'une p. ou d'un an.), 2. p. ext. jabot (d'oiseau)”, ta-gellāy-t „nœud” [PAM 2003, 218] (Brb. data: DRB 788-789) || NBrb.: Bed. gúlhe „Unterarm” [Almkvist 1885, 27] = gúlhe "Vorderarm bis zum Ellenbogen", gúlḥān “Vorderarm, Ellenbogen, Elle” [Rn. 1895, 95] = gilḥān ~ galḥān “edge, side” [Roper 1928, 185] || NAgaw: Bilin güllaw, güllaū „Knöchel, Fußknöchel” [Rn. 1887, 150] = ḡəllaw "knuckle" [Ehret]¹¹⁴ || SCu.: PRift *guḥul- [GT]: Iraqw ḡūḥlai “club” [Whiteley 1953] = guḥlay “knobbed club” [Ehret] = guḥulāy „club, stick with a knob” [MQK 2002, 41]¹¹⁵ | Qwadza guḥul-uko "ankle" [Ehret].¹¹⁶

The same root is possibly occurring in the Cushito-Chadic isogloss attested in Bed. o'g^wonnehil „die natürliche Elle” [Munzinger] = ökwanhil „Elle” [Seetzen] = g^winhāl ~ wínhal, pl. g^winhal „Ellenbogen, Arm” [Almkvist 1885, 27, 68] = g^wenhāl, pl. g^winhal ~ g^winhal, Nebenform: winhāl ~ we/inhāl ~ g^wanhāl ~ gülhín „Vorderarm bis zum Ellenbogen, Elle(nbogen)” [Rn. 1895, 98-99, 239] || WCh.: Angas-Sura *k^wañ-g^wayal > *-goyol ~ *-g^wāl „elbow” [GT]¹¹⁷ | Bole-Tangale *gungul- (?) “elbow” [GT].¹¹⁸ Already H. Almkvist (1885, 26) surmised the

¹¹¹ M. Lamberti (l.c.) erroneously set up an ECu. *ḥarg-, although the Dullay reflexes clearly indicate ECu. *ḥ- and *-ḥ- (for the underlying sound laws see Sasse 1979, 56). In addition, the Eth.-Sem. loans borrowed from ECu. corroborate the same: Harari ḥarāq, Gurage-Ennemor harāq "arm above elbow", cf. Leslau 1963, 86.

¹¹² Observed by K. Sethe (1899-1902 I §148), W. Czermak (1931-4, 117f., 135f.), J. Vergote (1948, 65f.), W. Westendorf (1962, §31.7), C. Peust (1999, 105-6, §3.6.4.4).

¹¹³ The *ḥ in these forms may eventually be identical with the common Afro-Asiatic affix (pre- or infix or suffix) *ḥ occurring in body parts' names (see Takács 1997).

¹¹⁴ L. Reinisch (l.c.) equated the Bilin word with Bed. kélīb and Hedareb (Barka) tū-klüb [Almkvist] = kelīb (mit dem Artikel tū-klīb, -klüb) „Knöchel” [Rn. 1895, 140].

¹¹⁵ The etymology of the quoted Iraqw word is highly dubious. Did it originally designate a knobly club resembling the shape of the body part in question?

¹¹⁶ The South Cushitic words were first affiliated by Ch. Ehret (1980, 365). For the common Cushitic comparison (Beja, Agaw, Qwadza) cf. Ehret 1987, 124, #534.

¹¹⁷ Attested in Gerka gan-gwal (so, gan-) [act. *gañ-gwal] „elbow” [Ftp. 1911, 216], Kofyar kong-gógól „elbow” [Netting 1967 MS, 20], Montol gwad-gwal (sic: -d, misprint for *gwan-?) „elbow” [Ftp. 1911, 216] (Angas-Sura data: Stl. 1987, 219, #692; Takács 2004, 135). The first component is identical with Angas-Sura *k^wam > *k^wañ „elbow” [GT].

etymological connection between Bed. *gwinhāl* and *gúlhe* (above). L. Reinisch (1895, 98), in turn, supposed that we have here „*sichtlich ein compos(itum). aus*” a hypothetic ***g^wenh > *g^wnh ~ *g^wlh + suffix *-āl*. The first component has been affiliated by him with Bed. *gánʔa* „Hand(fläche), Fußfläche/-sohle”. The problem is that the root underlying the latter was $\sqrt{\text{gn}^{\text{c}}}$, which hardly explains the medial -h-. For me, more convincing seems an older pre-PBed. etymon **g^wan-(g^w)ahāl*, whose both components might be identified with those of Angas-Sura **k^waŋ-* vs. **-g^waŋal*, resp. In this case too, in addition, we may semantically indeed hardly speak of a cognacy between the first part of this compound term and PCu. **gan^c-* „palm of hand” [Ehret 1987, 118, #498].

„Breast”

Eg. p̄h "Euter" (GR with a possible PT attestation,¹¹⁹ Wb I 533, 9), which occurs also extended with diverse prefixes,¹²⁰ was derived by W. Westendorf (1966, 143) and R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 1969, 235, fn. 4) from Eg. *p̄h.wj* "hinder parts" through the intermediate sense **"Unterleibs(region), Beckenraum"*, which is plausible. But, as G. Takács (1999, 81; 1999, 367; EDE II 491-2) has demonstrated, might be alternatively cognate to Ethio-Sem. (no Sem. etymology, borrowed from Cu.): Amharic *fäyā* "to suck the breast, drink milk by suckling", Gafat *fawatā* (1945) vs. *əf^watā* (1956) „milk”, Gurage: Muher *f^wat*, Soddo *āfat*, Gogot *āf^wat* "milk" (ES: Leslau 1945, 154; 1956, 172; 1979 III 247) ||| Brb. **iff < **ifh < **ifh (?)* „breast, teat” [GT pace DRB 508-9, $\sqrt{\text{f}}$, #5] > e.g. NBrb.: Shilh & Tamazight *if*, pl. *iff-an* „sein, mamelle” [Cid Kaoui 1907, 217] ||| LECu.: perhaps Afar *ifu*¹²¹ „nipple” [PH 1985, 134] || SCu.: Ma'a ma-fwáha [*f^w-* irregular < **p^w-*] "fresh milk" [Ehret 1980, 151] ||| Ch. **√py* „1. breast, 2. milk” [GT] = **p^h(Δ)jAw* „milk” [IS]: WCh.: NBauchi **-pi* "milk, breast" [Skn.] = **pī* [GT]¹²² || CCh.: Musgu *fāu* „milk” [Krause in Müller 1886, 395] = *fiáu* „milk” [Rohlf's in Lukas 1941, 54] = *fyaw ~ fyáw* "milk, breast" [Mouchet 1950, 26/38], Pus *fiyaw* "sein, lait" [Trn. 1991, 88] | PMasa **paʔ* „breast” [GT]¹²³ || ECh.: Sokoro *paíó* „milk” [Lks. 1937, 37] (Ch.: IS 1966, 22, #2.14; JI 1994 II, 46-47). If the Egyptian term is cognate, we may derive these parallels from PAA **√p̄h* „1. breast, 2. milk” [GT]. Extra-Afro-Asiatic areal parallels appear in PCKhoisan **pī* „breast”, **pī* „milk”, **pī* „to suck” [Baucom 1972, 19, 24, 27] and Ubangi: PMundu-Ndogo **pī* „to milk” [Saxon 1982, 77].

An ancient root variety with a voiced *Anlaut* can also be pointed out, cf. AA **√bh* „1. breast, 2. milk” [GT] is attested in NBrb.: e.g., Shilh-Tazerwalt *ti-bbi-t*, pl. *ti-bbā-t-in* „Zitze” [Stumme 1899, 234] = „sein, mamelle” [DRB] | CAlgerian *a-bebbuh* „sein (femelle), mamelle (animal)” [DRB] || EBrb.: Ghadames *baḥ ~ end-baḥ* „sein” [Lanfry 1973, 7, #40] (Brb. data: DRB I 41, 144)¹²⁴ ||| WCh.: Dera *biyá* „milk” [Nwm. 1974, 122] || CCh.: Hitkala (Lamang) *úḥá* „milk, breast” [Lks. 1964, 109] = *wu^cwa wu^cba* „breast” [Meek] | PMandara **ūḥa* [metathesis < **ḥuw-?*] „breast” [GT]¹²⁵ || ECh. **buw- (?)* "milk" [GT]¹²⁶.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Kwami *kùngili*, Kupto *gùnkùlli*, Kushi *gùṅùl*, Piya *gùlí*, Widala *gùṅùl* (Bole-Tangale data: Jng. & Leger 1993, 167).

¹¹⁹ Occurs perhaps already in PT 1548a (with an udder determinative), although both its reading and rendering are debated: *p̄h* "Bez. der Eingeweide als Abfall beim Schlachten (?)" (Wb I 533, 8) = *p̄h* "hinterer Teil oder Bauchhöhle" (Westendorf 1966, 143) = *mp̄h* "udder" (Faulkner 1969, 235, fn. 4) = *mp̄h* "Euter" (ÄWb I 526b). In my view, the reading *mp̄h* with *m-* as a radical is rather unlikely the co-occurrence of *m* and *p* in the same root being excluded by the consonant incompatibility laws (cf. EDE I 323 with further literature). K. Sethe (ÜKAPT V 500), in turn, saw in *p̄h.wj* „das Hinterteil”.

¹²⁰ From the same root: (1) *mnph.t* "1. Brust (NE), 2. Euter der Kuh (GR)" (Wb II 79, 14-15) = „Euter der Kuh” (NE, GHWb 339), (2) *nph.wj* "Euter der Kuh" (GR, Wb II 249, 15-17) = *nph.w* „Beckenraum” (NE, GHWb 407).

¹²¹ According to H.-J. Sasse (1979, 56), PECu. **ḥ* was reflected in Saho and Afar both as *ḥ* and zero. He (Sasse 1979, 37) was speculating about a possible explanation of a common pharyngeal loss in these languages.

¹²² Attested in Warji *pīi-na* [Skn.] = *pīyá-ná* [IL], Kariya, Miya *ápi* [Skn.], Paʔa *ápi* [MSkn.] = *api* [IL], Suri *ípi* [IL, Skn.], Diri *yápu* [Skn.] = *ya:p^hú* [IL], Mburku *pīi-hú* [Skn.], Tsagu *ipən* [Skn.] = *éépə-n* [IL], Jimbin *ifi* (irreg. -f) [Skn.] (NBauchi: Skinner 1977, 14; Stolbova 1987, 248, #2; JI 1994 II 46).

¹²³ Cf. Masa *pó* „sein” [Ctc. 1983, 126] = *pó-dá* [Jng.], Lame *pá* „sein, mamelle” [Scn. 1976, 75; 1982, 267], Zime-Dari *pāʔ* „sein, mamelle” [Cooper 1984, 20], Zime-Batna *páʔ* „breast” [Jng.] = *pá* [Scn.].

¹²⁴ Apparently not borrowed from Arabic. Note that -ḥ is unusual in inherited Berber roots. K. Naït-Zerrad (p.c. on 7 March 2001) considers the unusual -ḥ in Ghadames as an extension (suffix), not part of the root, typical for expressive words or *Kinderwörter* in Berber. Naït-Zerrad suggests a comparison to NBrb.: Shilh *ta-bubb-at* & *ti-bbi-t* | Tamazight *ta-bubb-ut* „sein” (cf. DRB I 7, #15).

¹²⁵ Attested in Mandara *úḥa* [Mch.] = *wuḥe* [Meek], Glavda *úḥá* [Rapp], Guduf *úḥá* [IL], Dghwede *wḥá* [Frick] = *úḥá* [IL], Ngweshe *úʔá* [IL] (Mandara group: JI 1994 II 47).

¹²⁶ Cf. WDangla *bùwà*, pl. *búwí* "lait" [Fdr. 1971, 98], EDangla *būwà* (coll.) "le lait, le latex" [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 56], Bidiya *būwa* (coll.) "lait" [AJ 1989, 61], Migama *bô* (pl.) "1. lait, 2. sève" [Jng.-Adams 1992, 70] | Mubi *bè* (coll.) "lait" [Jng. 1990

Eg. mnph.t "1. (late NK) Brust, 2. (GR) Euter der Kuh" (Wb II 79, 14-15) = "Euter, Unterleib" (Westendorf 1966, 143) is an inner Egyptian innovation: as pointed out by P. Montet (1911, 224, §3), H. Grapow (1914, 24), G. Fecht (1960, 181, fn. 507), W. Westendorf (1962, 27, §43.6.dd; 1966, 143), and H. Smith (1979, 162), it consists of the prefix *m-* attached to Eg. *nph(w)* "Teil des menschlichen Unterleibes (in der Gegend der Genitalien): ob Leistengegend?" (Med., Wb II 249) = "Hüften, Lenden" (Stern) = "pis" (Montet) = "les aînes, inguina" (Loret 1896, 176-9, §1) = "vermutlich: Kreuzbeingegend" (Ebbell 1937, 305-7) = "vorn unten am Leibe zu lokalisieren: Leistengegend, Euter der Kuh" (Grapow 1954, 83-84) = "iliac region" (FD 130) = "Beckenraum, Leistengegend, Unterleibsregion, Euter" (Westendorf 1966, 143) = "Beckenraum" (GHWb 407) = "rear parts, udder" (Smith l.c.) = "inguinal lymph nodes, region, groin" (Walker 1996, 251-6) = "groin" (PL 512).¹²⁷

Eg. mnd "Brust" (OK, Wb II 92-93) = "breast" (FD 110) = "breast, nipple" (Walker 1996, 269) > Dem. *mnt* "breasts" (CED 86, not in DG) > Cpt. (B) **ṢNOT**, dual **ṢNOṢ**, **ḤMNOṢ** "breast" (CD 176) = "Brust(warze)" (Sethe & Gardiner 1910, 43; Till 1955, 330, §34; KHW 96): its etymology is still disputed (let alone the quite numerous proposals that are evidently out of question)¹²⁸ there being two attractive alternatives:

(1) Most of the authors¹²⁹ equate it with Ar. *malaġa* (impf. *ya-mluġ-u*) I "saisir avec le bout des lèvres le sein de sa mère (se dit d'un enfant qui se met à téter)", *malġa* I "1. id., 2. sucer et ensuite mâcher une datte sauvage, 3. perdre son lait, ne plus en avoir (se dit d'une chamelle)", IV "allaier (enfant)", VIII "sucer (le lait), tirer tout le lait à force de sucer" [BK II 1143] = *malaġa* "to suck (at) the breast of his mother (child)" [Möller; Ember] = "lutschen" [Clc.] = "se mettre à téter" [Chn.], which is akin to PBHbr. & JAram. \sqrt{mlg} "eig. melken, dem Tiere die Milch entziehen" [Levy 1924 III 123], which has further cognates in ES: Amharic *mällägä* "to suck(le) (baby)", *mäläggägä* "to suck dry, suckle vigorously", cf. also *moläggägä* "to lick the hands clean with one's tongue" [Kane 1990, 161-2] = \sqrt{mlg} D "to suck strongly" [MM] (Sem.: MM 1983, 247) || LECu.: Afar *muluke* ~ *mulke* [irreg. -k-] "to be satisfied with milk", caus. *muluk-use* [PH 1985, 171], perhaps Oromo-Orma *mírġa* [-rg- < *-lg-?] "to yield milk, produce milk in abundance" [Stroemer 1987, 368; 1995, 209; 2001, 56]. A remote areal (?) parallel may appear in IE **melġ-* "Milch geben" as suggested by H. Möller (1911, 163-4). The Arabo-Egyptian comparison was rightly queried by I.M. Diakonoff and L.E. Kogan (1995 MS, #1815; 1996, 34-35, #1815) as "not so evident" with regard to the anomalous Coptic (B) **-N-**, although they did not exclude „*some assimilation processes*”.

(2) Already H. Grapow (1914, 4) and P. Lacau (1970, 71, #178) has ingeniously surmised (without any extra-Eg. evidence) that Eg. *mnd* may be a nomen loci or instrumenti (prefix *m-*) of an unattested Eg. **wnd* "to suckle (allaier)".¹³⁰ As pointed out by G. Takács (1997, 232, #22; 1998, 143, #6; 1999, 48; 2004, 60, #350), whose suggestion has been supported by D. Appleyard (1999, 308-9, §19), the hypothetical Eg. **wnd* (< **wng*) is hypothetically derivable from AA **nug* (according to Belova' law) and finds its perfect match in Cu. **ng^w-* / **nAg^w-* "сосок груди" [Dlg.] = **nag^w-* / **nūg-* "to suck" [Lmb. 1986, 42; HL 1988, 133-4] = **nug^w-* ~ **nūg-* "to

MS, 4], Birgit būwà (pl.) "lait" [Jng. 2004, 351], Jegu bú "Milch" [Jng. 1961, 111], Kofà bù? (pl.) "milk" [Jng. 1977 MS, 6, #92], Ubi paawò "lait" [Alio 2004, 274, #264].

¹²⁷ Akin to Ar. *ʔinfah(h)-at-* ~ *ʔinfih-at-* ~ *m/binfaḥ-at-* "the rennet or rennet-bag, of a kid or lamb [Lane 2821] = *ʔinfah-at-* ~ *ʔinfih-h-at-* "ventricule d'un agneau ou d'un chevreau" [BK II 1306]. For further parallels cf. Takács 2004, 59, #349.4.

¹²⁸ These are: (1) L. Homburger (1930, 286): ~ Ful (Peul) endu "sein". (4) E. Zyhlarz (1936, 444 & fn. 1) identified it with Brb. (sic) *mníd-ak* "vor Dir" < **emnid-a-ka* "in Bezug auf Deine Vorderseite" < **mnid* "nach vorne schauen" (sic), which he ultimately connected with Eg. *mnd* "breast" (q.v.) and even Nub.: Kunuzi *missi*, Mahassi *mañi* "oeil" (sic). (5) W. M. Müller (1907, 303) and F. Hommel (1915, 16, fn. 3) proposed an etymological connection with Eg. *mn^c* "to suckle" (above). But Eg. *mn^c* represents a distinct AA root. (6) D. Meeks (1977, 81), pace E. Zyhlarz (l.c., fn. 1), assumed a relationship with Eg. *mnd.t* "Teil des Gesicht am Auge" (BD, Wb, below) = "vordere Augenpartie" (Zhl.) = "globe oculaire" (Meeks) < Eg. **mnd* "to be round". Baseless. (7) V. Blažek (1982, 246, #16) compared it with PCu. **mVn-* "entrails" [Dlg. 1973, 182]. Rejected by G. Takács (1999, 48). (8) A.R. Bomhard (1984, 274, #287) derived from a certain AA **mā/anṭ^y-* "breast" (sic, otherwise unattested) ~ IE **mā/anṭ^y-* "breast, to suckle" (cf. IEW 729; WP II 232). Similarly, F. Kammerzell (1999, 250, table 15), in an astonishing manner, affiliated Eg. *mnd-* (sic, -d-) "säugen" (sic!) with IE **me/ond-* "säugen". (9) G. Takács (1999, 49): the similarity of Eg. *mnd* [< **mng?*] to PWNigr. **mung-* "to suck" [Smz. 1981, 19, #183] may be accidental.

¹²⁹ Ember 1911, 90; 1919, 32; ESS §10.a.17, §11.b.6, §24.a.5; Albright 1918, 90, 92, #4; Brockelmann 1932, 803; GÄSW #201; Vergote 1945, 135, §9.b.10; Cohen 1947, #483; Dolgopolskij 1968, 102; 1970, 620, #11; 1998, 28, §19; Ward 1972, 20, #178; IS 1976, #291; Militarev & Starostin 1994, 2; Orel 1995, 108, #120; 1995, 151, §6; HSED #1815; Ehret 1997 MS, 204, #1800; Vernus 2000, 187.

¹³⁰ Indirectly, already W.M. Müller (1907, 303-304, fn. 3) had referred to the eventual connection of "Hamitic" (sic) (i.e., presumably Somali) *nūg, nwg* (sic) with Eg. *mnd*, although it is true that he erroneously supposed both Eg. *mnd* and *mn^c* (!) to derive from an unattested **√n^c*.

suck the breast" [GT],¹³¹ which is eventually etymologically related (either extended with prefix *ʔa- or via met. < *nag^w-ʔ) with PCu. *ʔa/ung^w- "breast" [Ehret 1987, 109, #463] = *ʔang^w- "breast" [Bnd. 1994, 1162, #11]¹³² ||| CCh.: PKotoko *eng^w- "Weiberbrüste" [GT].¹³³ From AA *√ng^w ~ *√nwg „to suck the breast” [GT]?¹³⁴

Eg. šn^c „Brust, Oberkörper (des Menschen), Thorax” (CT-, Wb IV 506, 14; GHwB 828) = „breast” (FD 269; DCT 626) is apparently cognate with WCh. *ZVŋ „chest” [GT]: Angas-Sura *-zuŋ (mostly prefixed) “chest”,

¹³¹ Attested in Bed. oʔ-nug, pl. eʔ-nug "die Mutterbrust" [Munzinger apud Almkvist] = o-nūk (sic, -k) "Zitzen, Weiberbrust" [Seetzen apud Almkvist] = nūg, pl. nūg "(weibliche) Brust, mamelle" [Almkvist 1885, 52] = ū-nūg "Brustwarze" [Rn. 1884, 335] = nūg ~ nūg^we, pl. nūg "Zitze, die weibliche Brust" [Rn. 1895, 181] = nug^w, pl. nūg^wa "teat, nipple of breast or udder" [Roper 1928, 223] = nig "female breast" [Thelwall 1970, 1, §11] = nūkw "breast, udder" [Hds. 1996 MS, 101], Ammar'ar (ʔō)nīg^w, pl. (ʔē)ng^wa "сосок груди (nipple, teat)" [Dlg.], Halenga nóg^we, pl. nóg^wā "Brustwarze" [Rn. 1887, 35] ||| ECU. *nūg- "to suck (saugen)" [Sasse 1979, 24; 1981, 155] = "to suckle" [Apl.]: LECu. *nūg- [Black]: PSam *nūg "to suck from breast", *nūg-i "to suckle" [Heine 1976, 221; 1977, 291; 1978, 70; 1982, 130-1]: Somali nūg "saugen, spez. die Mutterbrust" [Rn. 1902, 311] = nūg-ayya "to suck" [Abr. 1964, 190] = "to suck" [Black], Pboni *nūg- "to suck", nūg-šīy- "to suckle" [Heine 1982, 148] > Boni nūg [Heine], Rendille a-nuga "ich sauge" [Schlee 1978, 143, #830] = nūga "to suck" [PG 1999, 235], Arbore indiy-nug-e "to suck" [Black] = nuge [Flm.] = nūg- "to suck", nūg-is- "to suckle" [Hayward 1984, 388], Elmolo inūūka "saugen" [Heine 1973, 281] = i-nūk-a "to suck" [Black] = nūk "to suck", nūk-is "to suckle" [Heine 1980, 208], POromoid *lūg- [Black; GT]: Oromo lūgū "to suck" [Btm. 2000, 183], Oromo-Wellega lūg- "to squirt milk from cow's udder into mouth" [Black], Oromo-Borana of Isiolo lūga "to milk outside the settlement (done illegally by herdsmen)" [Strm. 1987, 360; 1995, 205], PKonsoid *lūg- "to suck" [Black] > Konso, Gidole, Dirayta lūk- "to suck" [Lmb.] (LECu.: Black 1974, 140, 182, 222) | HECu.: Hadiya nug- "saugen" [Lmb.] | Yaaku -nūk- [-k- < *g-] (tr.) "to suck" [Heine 1975, 135]. NB6: Whether Afar nak- "to drink milk" [Black] = nake "to drink milk" [PH 1985, 174] is ultimately related with LECu. *nūg- "suck" is dubious. The reflexes of Cu. *nūg- have been often falsely equated with Sem. *√ynk "to suck" & Eg. snq "to suck(le)" (cf., e.g., Rn. 1887, 35; Müller 1903, 79; 1907, 303-304, fn. 3; Behnk 1928, 138; Djk. 1965, 43; 1967, 188; Dlg. 1973, 175-176; Djk. et al. 1986, 65; Zbr. 1989, 579; Skn. 1996, 209 with further unrelated comparanda), which is unconvincing, since the correspondence of Eg. -q ~ Sem. *-k vs. PCu. *-g is irregular. Cf. also PKuliak *naḳ^w "saugen" [Sasse 1981, 155; Flm. 1983, 434]? Similarly false is the direct equation of ECU. *nūg- "to suck" vs. SCU. *nūḳ- "to sip, savor" [Ehr.] > Dahalo nūḳ- "to suck beer through straw" (let alone Hamir noḥnaḥ "so. who speaks through his nose") apud Ehret 1987, 93, #395. O.V. Stolbova (2005, 60, #2.2) combined LECu. *nūg- ~ *lūg- "to suck" with Ch. *lig- "to lap, lick", which, however, certainly represents a distinct AA root: *√lk ~ *√lk "to lick" [GT].

¹³² Cf. Agaw *ʔəng^w- "breast" [Apl.; Ehr.]: NAgaw: Bilin unḡū, pl. unḡū-ī ~ rarely unḡū-ī "Brustwarze, Zitze" [Rn. 1886, 812; 1887, 35] = ʔəng^wi, pl. ʔəng^wik^w [Palmer/Dlg.] = ʔəng^wi [Sasse; LT 1997, 502] = ʔəng^wi/ī ~ ʔəng^wi [Apl.] = ʔāng^wi [SLEE apud Wdk. 1994, 10, #28], Hamir oq, pl. oq^w-tān "Brustwarze" [Rn. 1884, 335] = əq^w [Apl.], Hamta eròq^w (sic, -r-) [CR; Dlg.: act. *eʔoq^w?], Hamtanga ɨḳ^w "breast" [Apl.], Qwara engū "Brustwarzen, Busen" [Rn. 1885, 26 after Levévre] = ʔəng^wā [Rn. 1886, 35] = eng^wā [CR], Qemant angū, pl. angwā-t "sein, mamelle" [CR 1912, 166] = ɨngu /əng^wə/ [Bnd.] = /əngu/ [Sasse] = əngu [Bnd./Dlg.] = angu [Flm.] = əng^w(ə) ~ ɨng^w [Apl.] = /ɨng^w/ [Sasse 1972 MS, §11] = ang^w-o-t (pl.) [Dlg.] | SAgaw *ʔəng^w- [Apl.]: Awngi (Awiya) ang^wī [CR 1912, 166] = ang^w "breast" [Bnd. 1971, 238, #91; Hetzron 1978, 137] = ang^w(ī) [Apl.], Damot angū [CR], Kunfāl angu-k^h "breast" [Birru-Adal 1971, 101, #11] (Agaw: Sasse 1973, 121, §11& 126, §11; Apl. 1984, 46; 1989, 6; 1991 MS, 3; 1991, 21; 1996, 188) ||| LECu. *ʔəng- "breast" [Ehr.]: Saho angū, pl. ángūg "Brustwarze, weibliche Brust" [Rn. 1890, 38] = angu, pl. angug "female breast" [Welmers] = angu, pl. angug "breast" [Vergari 2003, 45], Afar angū ~ ángū, pl. ángūg "Brustwarze" [Rn. 1886, 812] = ángu "breast" [Bnd.] = angu, pl. ángūga "1. breast, 2. breast milk (lait maternel)" [PH 1985, 43], Somali-Jiddu ʔenek "breast" [Ehret, Nuuh Ali 1984, 244] = ʔeneg [Ehret 1987 l.c.] = ennek-kə "female breast, udder" [Lmb.] (isolated among the Som. dialects.), perhaps Baiso enneg- "to swallow" [Lmb.]. For the common Cushitic comparison see Rn. 1887, 35; Dlg. 1973, 175; Flm. 1983, 434; Djk. etc. 1986, 65; Lmb. 1988, 61; Apl. 1996, 188; Zbr. 1989, 579; Apl. 1989 MS, 6-7; Sasse 1991, 272, #1.6; Blz. 1997, 177.

¹³³ Cf. Sao empie (sic) [-mɨp- < *ngw-ʔ] "seins" [GD], Makeri ɛnkwe "female breast" [Barth], Gulfei emgwe "seins" [GD], Kuseri embwi [-mbw- < *ngw-ʔ] "seins" [GD] (Kotoko data: Sölken 1967, 260). V. Blazek (1994 MS Bed., 29) was the first to combine the Cushitic root (above) with the Kotoko parallels.

¹³⁴ One wonders whether this root is remotely related to AA *√lg^(w) [GT] > Ethio-Sem. *√lg^c „to suck the breast” Geez læga^c "the milk secreted a few days before and after childbed", Tigrinya læga^c ~ læga^c "colostrum", Muher lega^c "to suck (teats)", Gurage: Muher lagä, Chaha, Ezha nagä, Ennemor, Endegeny, Gyeto nägä "to suck too much (child, animal), Amharic lagä "to suck, milk the cow directly into one's mouth (considered to be of bad manners)" (ES: Leslau 1979 III, 375; 1987, 307) ||| SBrb.: ETawllemmet and Ayr ə-lgəw "1. nourrir autrement qu'avec la lait de sa mère, 2. élever (animal), 3. être nourri" [PAM 2003, 459] ||| SAgaw: Awngi lang-in "to plane, drink from udder" [Hetzron 1969, 101] ||| Bed. ligag "to sip milk for another (it is taboo for a man to drink what he has milked himself until another person has first sipped)" [Roper 1928, 211] ||| CCh.: perhaps Mofu-Gudur -ləgw- "2. manger le premier" [Brt. 1988, 155]. A.B. Dolgopolsky (1987, 201, #46) compared POromoid *lūg- with Sem.: Soqotri √šgg: pf. 3rd sg. masc. wi-n-šegig "to flow, couler" [Leslau 1938, 425] and SCU. *šik- "to sop up, slop, slurp" [Ehret 1980, 212]. Improbable both phonologically and semantically (there is significant difference between SCU. *-k ≠ POromoid *-g, and SCU. *-i ≠ POromoid *-ū-). POromoid *lūg- can be better explained from ECU. *nūg-. For Soqotri √šgg, in turn, cf. rather Ar. (Hadramaut) saḡa^ca „couler” [Lsl.].

hence *pV-zuŋ¹³⁵ „heart” [GT]¹³⁶ | PRon *ʒiŋ „breast, chest” [GT],¹³⁷ in which the final *-ŋ is a natural merger of an earlier *Auslaut* *-nH (including *-n^h). The only anomaly is that of Eg. š- vs. WCh. *Z-, behind which one is disposed to surmise a voiced lateral (*ʒ- or *ʒ̄-), the existence of which in the consonant inventory of the Proto-Afro-Asiatic parental language, however, has not yet been sufficiently demonstrated. Cf. perhaps also SBrb.: ETawillemmet ta-səŋi-t, pl. ši-səŋay „liste frontale (point blanc ou tache blanche au front d’un animal)” [PAM 2003, 728, 731-732]¹³⁸ All other suggestions are much less convincing:

(1) V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 19, #64) has derived it from his AA *š/čan^h- on the basis of the comparison with Om. *ši/un- „heart, belly” [Blz.] = *šVn- „heart” [Bnd. 1994, 1156, #40] > NOM.: Dizi-Maji cōnu „heart, belly” [Bnd.], Nao šunus „belly” [Bnd.], Sheko šun „heart, liver” [Flm.] = šon (?) „belly” [Bnd.] = šon „heart” [Mkr.]¹³⁹ = šon „heart” [Blz.] | Mao šin „belly” [Flm.] || SOM.: Dime šine „belly” [Flm.] (Om.: Flm. 1976, 317), although these parallels do not reflect the trace of the *-^h let alone the semantical difference.

(2) A. B. Dolgopolsky (1989, 94, #16) affiliated it with Sem.: Akk. šūlu „ein Totengeist (?)” [AHW 1269] < Sem. *[š]u[^h]- or *[š]ul[^h]- (baseless) and ECu. *saz^h- „heart” [Sasse], which he explained from PCu. *[š]Vz^h- (otherwise unattested), an assimilation from a hypothetical **šVI^h- (not supported by any of the Cushitic data).

(3) O. V. Stolbova (1994 MS, 1), in turn, saw in it a cognate of WCh.: Mupun dēŋ “1. upper part, top, 2. sky, heaven”, cf. also dēŋ (adv.) “on, about (Jipaari)” [Frj. 1991, 15], which, however, derives from Angas-Sura *d^heŋ ~ *d^ha₂eŋ (or *g^ha₂eŋ ~ *g^ha₂eŋ) “1. upper part, 2. up” [GT],¹⁴⁰ cognate with Eg. dh.n.t „Stirn” (MK-, Wb V 478, 6-10; ÄWb II 2796) as I have shown it in this paper above.

Eg. šnb.t „1. Brust des Menschen, 2. (LP) Kehle” (MK-, Wb IV 512-3) has been usually¹⁴¹ identified with the reflexes of Ethio-Sem. *sanbu^h/^h „lung” [GT]¹⁴² ||| Bed. šambūt (m) „lung”, cf. šambūkia „jugular vein” [Roper 1928, 238] = šanbūt „lung” [Dlg.] || Agaw *sāmb- „lung” [Apl. 1984, 39; 1989, 6; 1991, 23] || ECu. *šamb- „lung” [HL 1988, 138-9; Sasse 1982, 174]¹⁴³ > PSam *sambób „lungs” [Heine 1977, 289; 1978, 72] | HECu. *šomb-o „lung” [Hds. 1989, 95, 421]¹⁴⁴ ||| NOM.: Chara šomb-a „lung” [Bnd. 1974 MS, 11] | Kefoid *šomb-o „lungs” [Hodge] > Kafa šomb-ō [Crl.] = šumb-ō [Lsl. 1938], Mocha šomb-o [Lsl. 1959, 50].¹⁴⁵ There are, however, controversial views on the ultimate origin of all these parallels, which has essential bearing as to the credibility of the suggested Egyptian etymology also. Ch. F. A. Dillmann (1865, col. 370) assumed an extinct,

¹³⁵ O. V. Stolbova (1987, 151, #68) considered the final *-k in her arbitrary proto-AS reconstruction *zum-k (erroneously derived from her WCh. *mbA-mAĉi ~ *mbA-ĉi ami “breast, heart”) as an indicator of the nominal class of body parts, although this *-k is not reflected by any of the WCh. parallels.

¹³⁶ Attested in Mupun zūuŋ (sic, false long -uu-?) “chest” [Frj. 1991, 70], Kofyar fū-zūng [fu < *pu] “chest” [Netting 1967, 13], Chip zuŋ “chest” vs. bī-zūŋ “heart” [Kraft], Montol po-zum-den (sic, -m) “heart” [Ftp. 1911, 217] = po-sum-den (sic, s-!) [Stl. after Ftp.], Goemay pe-zzung (so, zz-) “heart” [Ftp. 1911, 217] = boe-zung [bə-] “chest, breast, bosom” [Srl. 1937, 18] = pò-zūŋ “Brust” [Jng. 1962 MS, 5] = pà-zuŋ “chest” [Krf.] = bə-zuŋ “chest” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 1] = pe-zung (so, with pe- & z-l) [Stl. < Ftp.] (Angas-Sura data: Stl. 1987, 151, #68; Takács 2004, 428).

¹³⁷ Cf. Bokkos ʔāžin, pl. āžyàn „Brustkorb”, Daffo-Butura žiŋ, pl. žiŋáš „Brust(korb)”, Fyer čén, pl. čèeni „Brust(korb)” (Ron data: Jng. 1970, 84, 139, 216).

¹³⁸ K.-G. Prasse (PAM 2003, 634) suggested that this is an s- prefix *nomen instr.* derivation from SBrb.: ETawillemmet əŋəy „2. commander, président sur, régner, dominer”.

¹³⁹ H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 206) combined the Shako word with WCh.: Geruma gumbà sóomi „liver”.

¹⁴⁰ Attested in Angas yeng ~ yāng ~ yang “above” [Flk. 1915, 307] = kə ’gíyáŋ (K) “up” vs. ’gēŋ (K) ~ ’gyēŋ (Ks) “high up” [Jng. 1962 MS, 13, 18] = ka-dyēŋ “up there”, cf. kwaŋ ka-dyēŋ “west” [ALC 1978, 23, 29] = ka-dyēŋ “up”, cf. ka dyēŋ nyi “up there” [Gochal 1994, 61, 107], Sura dēŋ “1. Oberseite, oben, 2. Himmel” [Jng. 1963, 63] = dēŋ ~ dēŋ naan “sky” [Krf.] (Angas-Sura data: Takács 2004, 101).

¹⁴¹ For the Eg.-Cu. comparison see OS 1992, 171; Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 34-35

¹⁴² Cf. Geez sanbu^h/^h [Dillmann and Lsl. 1945, 1987] = sanbū^h [Lsl. 1938] = also sambah [Lsl. 1987], Tigre sunbu (sic) [Crl.] = sambah^h [Lsl. 1938] = sambə^h [Lsl. 1945] = sänmbu^h (also „pulmonary disease”) [LH 1963, 173] = sambah^h [Apl.] = sänbu^h/^h (sic) [Blz.], Tigrinya sanmbu^h [Bassano] = sänbu^h (sic, -) [Crl.] = sambə^h [Lsl. 1938, 1945] = sänbu^h [Apl.] = samba ~ sambo [Lsl. 1987], Amhara sambah [Crl., Lsl. 1938] = sambah [Lsl. 1945] = samba [Gankin, Apl.] = sänba ~ samba [Kane 1990, 472, 538].

¹⁴³ F. Behnk (1928, 140, #40), J. H. Greenberg (1965, 91, #14), and C. T. Hodge (1990, 646, #15.B) all erroneously affiliated the East Cushitic etc. parallels with Eg. zm3 „Lunge”.

¹⁴⁴ For additional Highland East Cushitic reflexes (not listed in the Burji lexicon by Sasse 1982), cf. also Leslau 1988, 199.

¹⁴⁵ For the comparative survey of these Ethio-Semitic, Cushitic, and North Omotic parallels see, a.o., most importantly, Meinhof 1912, 236; Cerulli 1951, 497; Fleming 1969, 24; Dolgopol’skij 1973, 94; Appleyard 1977, 16/58; Leslau 1987, 505; Lamberti & Sottile 1993, 508.

otherwise unattested ES * $\sqrt{\text{nb}}^{\text{c}146}$ or * $\sqrt{\text{nb}}^{\text{c}147}$ (which he related to Sem. $\sqrt{\text{nb}}$, still in active use) that the Geez and the other Ethio-Semitic forms may have derived by a caus. prefix *sa-. Alternatively, he did not exclude a derivation from an equally hypothetical ES * $\sqrt{\text{sb}}^{\text{c}}/\sqrt{\text{sb}}^{\text{c}}$ via epenthetic nasal, which Dillmann affiliated with Hbr. nšb qal „wehen” [GB 526]. Similarly, W. Leslau (1938, 312; 1945, 240) too supported the idea of a caus. formation originating from a hypothetical ES * $\sqrt{\text{nb}}^{\text{c}}$ „to blow”, which he connected with Soqotri ʕamb „poumon” [Lsl.] with metathesis. Both of these scholars eventually meant this way a Semitic origin of the Cushito-Omotc parallels. This is well conceivable regarding both the Old Ethiopic quadrilateral root and the ES ʕayin (lost until the word entered Cushitic from some more recently eroded Ethio-Semitic source/es). This is why it is very difficult to accept others’ position maintaining a reverse way of borrowing. from HECu. A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1973, 94) set up PCu.-Om. *s(y)Vmp- „грудь (chest)” on the basis of comparing the above listed Cu.-Om. parallels for „lung” with NWometo *šēn- „to breathe” [GT] > Wolaita šēmp- „1. to breathe, 2. rest” [Lmb.], Dawro šēnf-o „heart” [CR] = „soul, breeze, breath” [Lmb.], Gamu šēmp-o „life, breath, genital parts of body” [Lmb.], Dache, Zayse šēmp-o „life” [Lmb.], Male šēmp-i „soul” [Flm.],¹⁴⁸ which neither semantically nor phonologically look like as cognates to the former. Dolgopol’skij regarded Kefoid „lung” as the source (!) of HECu. „lung”, whereas he derived the Ethio-Semitic words for „lung” from Cushitic. His idea was followed by M. Lamberti (LS 1997, 508), who assumed Common Cu.-Om. *šānb- „1. to breathe, 2. lung” on the basis of Dolgopol’skij’s and his additional *comparanda* (above) remarking that in the meaning „lung”, „this stem has also entered” Ethio-Semitic. Similarly, D. Appleyard (1977, 16/58) explained Ethio-Semitic „lung” as a loan either from Agaw or from East Cushitic. H.-J. Sasse (1982, 72) also derived Amhara „lung” from East Cushitic. Later, changing his mind (as expressed in his works from 1938 and 1945, quoted above), W. Leslau (1987, 505) too saw in Ethio-Semitic „lung” borrowing from Agaw. Breaking the domination of the view on the Cushitic origin of Eth.-Sem. *sanbu^{ʔ/c} „lung” [GT] in the second half of the 20th century, V. Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 34-35) claimed the latter to be a native Semitic word akin to Akk. (Standard Bab.) *sinib/ptu* „eine Haut auf der Lunge” [AHW 1047] = „part of sheep’s lung” [CAD s 285], whereas he regarded North Omotic „lung” as a loan borrowed from Highland East Cushitic. Following him, L. Kogan (SED I 207-209, #235), reconstructing PSem. *si/anp- „lung”, extended the underlying equation of Eth.-Sem. *sanbu^{ʔ/c} „lung” [GT] and Akk. *sinip/btu* onto PBHbr. *simpōn* and JArām. *simpōnā* „Blutader der Lunge” [Krauss] = „Röhre (PBHbr.: bes. oft die Blutader), Vene (der Lunge)” [Levy 1924 III 513] = „1. Röhre, 2. Bronchie, 3. Bronchialverzweigung” [Dalman 1922, 294] = „ramified blood-vessel, artery, bronchiae” [Jastrow 1960, 982] = „bronchial tube” [Klein] > NHbr. *simpōnōn* (dimin. suffix -ōn) „bronchial tube (smaller ramifications)” [Klein], which, however, S. Krauss (1898-99 II 389), R. Růžička (1909, 130), and – pace J. Levy (l.c.) and G. H. Dalman (l.c.) – E. Klein (1987, 450) all rendered as a loanword borrowed from Greek σίφων „siphon pour pomper un liquide, trompe des insectes suceurs, conduite d’eau, engin à feu” [Boisacq] = „pipe, tube” [Klein] < PIE *t^wrb^h- „röhrenartig hohl” [Boisacq 1916, 867; IEW 1102].¹⁴⁹ Nevertheless, L. Kogan and A. Militarev (SED l.c.) figured their PSem. *si/anp- „lung” as cognate (!) with the Cushito-Omotc words for „lung” and Eg. šnb.t in spite of the semantical and phonological differences (e.g., PBHbr. -p- ≠ ES *-b-, while Eg. š- ≠ Sem. *s-). Whether Semitic "lung" has anything to do with or this similarity is purely accidental, should be still investigated. All in all, the facts discussed above yield several arguments sufficient for considering ES *sanbu^{ʔ/c} „lung” [GT] as inherited from Semitic (within which it stands

¹⁴⁶ This view is supported recently by Prof. R. M. Voigt (Berlin, FU, kind p.c. on the 21st July 2015): „Die Verknüpfung mit der Wurzel $\sqrt{\text{nb}}^{\text{c}}$ gefällt mir sehr. Das s wäre dann das Kausativelement”. He conceives „die Lunge” as „das, was blasen läßt/verursacht” and supposes a connection with Ar. *nabaʕa* „entströmen”.

¹⁴⁷ For Prof. G. Hudson (East Lansing, MSU, kind p.c. on the 21st July 2015), „the Cushitic words generally look more like corrupted borrowings from Ethiosem., often Amharic.” He too is „willing to imagine (the) G(ee)z(.) (form) with final ʔ rather than ʕ (the ʕ secondary) and suppose the root nbʔ 'gush out, flow' (as in 'tear (of eye)') and the s- a preservation of the Sem. s- causative (Amharic prefix a-s-; the a- perhaps not prothetic as Lipinski suggests but secondarily extended from the a-causative).”

¹⁴⁸ To the best of my knowledge, the very first scholar to combine the Cushitic words for „lung” and Male $\sqrt{\text{šmp}}$ was H. C. Fleming (1969, 24), who thus preceded in that Dolgopol’skij 4 years.

¹⁴⁹ As a third etymology for PBHbr. *simpōn*, one might also compare Gurage: Muher *čāmbilla*, Wolane *čāmbillā*, Chaha *čāmbina*, Ezha *čāmbinna*, Selti *šābbinnā*, Endegeny *šāppi'nā*, Gyeto *šāmpəna*, Ennemor *šāmpən'a* etc. "vein of the leaf of the āsāt" [Leslau 1979 III 173], the underlying proto-form of which L. Kogan (SEC l.c.) reconstructed as PGurage *šāmpill/nn-, which he alternatively equated with Syr. *sabbōlā* „arteria trachealis” [Brk. 1928, 455] = *sābōlā* oder *sābōlā* [Voigt, kind p.c. on 29 July 2015], which, however, C. Brockelmann (l.c.) rendered as *portator < $\sqrt{\text{sbl}}$ „portare”, and if he was right doing so, the Syriac term vs. Gurage forms are hardly related. There are doubts due to their formal difference (Syr. -ō- vs. Gurage -i- in the 2nd syllable) either. But R. M. Voigt (kind p.c. on 29 July 2015) does not exclude this comparison: „Die Gleichung überzeugt aber”. For the Gurage word, highly noteworthy is in this context, however, SBrb.: ETawillemet *sənbub-ān* (pl. „tuberculose”, *sənbub-ət* „aspirer au moyen d’un tuyau (liquide)”, *ta-sānbab-ūt*, pl. *ši-sənbuba* „tuyau” [PAM 2003, 728-729]. There is no indication apud K.-G. Prasse (PAM l.c.) that it is an s- prefix *nomen instrumenti* form.

isolated), which suggests that the Cushito-OmotiC words for „lung” can only be late loans from diverse Ethio-Semitic sources as well as that Eg. šnb.t can by no means be related with these.

All other etymologies suggested in the *Fachliteratur* for our Egyptian word¹⁵⁰ are only worse than that discussed above. At the moment, the only plausible candidate for being its cognate is represented by the isolated CCh.: Gude acembá (-ts-) „Brust” [Str.] || ECh.: WDangla tyãmbiã [regular < *čamb-] (pl.) "poumons" [Fdr. 1971, 221],¹⁵¹ which seem to stand close to the equally sporadic biconsonantal root (*sine* -b) carried by CCh.: Bata-Garwa man-šumé (GT: compound?) vs. Bata ma:sũmčé (-ã-, -tsch-) „Brust” [Str.], Bata-Demsa šumšé „Brust” [Str.] | Gidar ssimiá „Brust” [Str.] (CCh.: Str. 1910, 452; 1922-23, 115 quoted also in JI 1994 II 46-47).¹⁵² Was the -b an additional C₃ in Gude perhaps like in Egyptian? Even more interesting is that the Central Chadic biconsonantal root finds its hopeful cognates in SCu. *-saʔam- „breast” [GT]¹⁵³, which, besides, H. C. Fleming (1969, 24) erroneously combined just with the Cushitic word for „lung” and Male √šmp (above). With regard to the South Cushitic attestation, the underlying Afro-Asiatic root can only be reconstructed with *s-, which, however, does not correspond regularly to the Eg. š- (cf. Takács 1999, 397-401 or 2000, 81-85, §12 and §14). Henceforth, at the moment, one can only conclude that Eg. šnb.t was only akin to the Gude-WDangla isogloss *čVmb- (or *c-?), whereas SAA *√sm „breast” [GT] is presumably not related at all.

Eg. q3b.t „die Brust (als Ganzes, nie im Dual)” (MK, Wb V 11, 2-8) = „nipple, breast” (Ember l.c. infra) = „sternum, toute la poitrine” (Lacau), act. *q3éḅ.t (Vergote, BIFAO 58, 1959, 17) = *qa3ṭb.at > *aq/ḳṭba (Vergote 1973 Ib 29, §28 and 148, §85) = *q3ṭb.ṭ (NBÄ 232) > Cpt. (S) **ϵKIBϵ**, **KIBϵ**, (A) **K(ϵ)IBϵ**, (B) **KIϵI**, (F) **ϵKIBI** (f) „weibl. Brust, Brustwarze” (KHW 33) has no unambiguous etymology. Only different (not always equipotential) alternatives can be considered:

(1) An inner Egyptian deverbal *Wurzeletymologie* has been proposed by a few egyptologists. Thus, J. Vergote (1973 Ib 148, §85) explained it from Eg. *q3b (always written qb) „1. verdoppeln, 2. zumeist allgemein: vermehren” (XVIII. Math., Wb V 8-9) as the „doubled” body part. Impressive, albeit there are a few further body parts in pair that could also have been named this way. Why just this term for „breast”? This etymology does not clarify it. J. Osing (NBÄ 232, 796-7, n. 1013), in turn, derived it as a „*pass. Ableitung*” from Eg. q3b „zusammenfalten (von einem Polster, das zwischen die Schulterblätter gelegt werden soll)” (Med., Wb V 8, 6) = „zusammenfalten, wickeln (Stoff)” (CT, ÄWb II 2506-7) with the Grundbedeutung „das Gefaltete”, which, frankly, I find hard to follow. W. Westendorf (KHW 33 with hint on Vergote in BIFAO 61, 1962, 73) took Cpt. (S) **ϵKIBϵ** directly (!) from Cpt. (S) **KWB** „falten” (in fact, < Eg. q3b „wickeln, falten”), although such a derivation can only be projected to older Egyptian.

(2) Most widespread¹⁵⁴ is its equation with Ar. kuʿb- „Brustwarze” [Vrg.], which poses a serious phonological question that W. F. Albright (1918, 220) and A. Ember (1926, 303, #11) thought to be able to answer by assuming a partial dissimilation in *qʔb < *√qʿb < **√kʿb, but they missed to detail which ruled governed these

¹⁵⁰ W. F. Albright (1918, 250, #106) – with right doubts – Sem. *bašar- „peau, chair” [DRS] supported by A. Ember (1926, 301, fn. 10) with instances for Eg. n vs. Sem. *r. This etymology was adopted also in GÄSW 207, #856 (with due criticism); Cohen 1947, #395; DRS 88. F. von Calice (GÄSW l.c.) correctly stressed his semantical reservations: „Das äg. Wort scheint tatsächlich urspr. 'Brust', und nicht, wie vielfach früher übersetzt wurde, 'Haut' zu bedeuten.” Th. Schneider (1997, 207, #100), in turn, identified Eg. šnb.t „breast” with Sem. *ḥalab- „milk” [Lsl. 1987, 229]. Elegant, but certainly incorrect. First, Eg. š- does not regularly correspond to Sem. *ḥ- except for a few instances of Eg. ḥ > secondary (mostly purely orthographic) š, which, however, evidently, not the case here. Secondly, we have to account for that the Semitic word is connected (perhaps via metathesis) with Eg. jbh „Zahn, besonders des Menschen, auch der Tiere, sogar Stoßzahn des Elefanten” (OK, Wb I 64, 2-4) Eg. b3ḥ [< *blḥʔ] „das Weisse (des Auges)” (NK, GHwB 241), cf. also b3ḥ „hell glänzen (von der Milch)” (GR, Wb I 423, 2).

¹⁵¹ Its coincidence with ES *sanbuʔʿ „lung” [GT] < *√nbʔʿ may be due to pure chance.

¹⁵² There is a variety with voiced sibilant in the *Anlaut*, cf. LECu.: (?) PSomali **ḥazam- [GT: *ḥa- prefix of body parts] „Brust” [Lmb. 1986, 198, 270, 273, 447] (GT: reconstruction uncertain as all reflexes are supposed to have undergone a metathesis *ḥamaz- > *ḥabaz-) || CCh.: PBata *-zum- „chest” [GT] > Gude ʔəzima [Krf. 1981 III 36, #50], Mwulyen nzúm-tígi „chest” [Krf. 1981 III 56, #50], Bachama ndùm-tò „chest” [Krf. 1981 III 66, #50].

¹⁵³ Cf. WRift *ʔisaʔamu (sg.), pl. *ʔisaʔami „nipple, teat” [KM] > Iraqw ʔisēmo (sg.), pl. ʔisēmaʔ „nipple, teat” [KM] = isēma (pl.: „breasts”) [Flm.], Gorowa ʔisāmó (sg.), pl. ʔisāmaʔ „nipple, teat” [KM], and Alagwa ʔisaʔamu (sg.), pl. ʔisaʔamēri „breast, nipple” [KM] | Maʔa ma-sému „breasts” [Flm.]. Interestingly, Ch. Ehret (1980, 183, #40) assumed a SCu. *sũm- „nipple, teat” on the basis of fully different comparanda, viz. Iraqw suma „shoulder” (GT: semantically vague) and Maʔa ki-sú [-Ø < *-m# possible] „udder”, which are certainly unrelated, whereas at the same time, on the same page, Ehret (1980, 183, #41) forced a possible cognate, Dahalo sũma „1. forehead, 2. in front” [Ehret] = suma „face, forehead” [EEN 1989, 25] under SCu. *sumba „peak, top (esp. of head)”.

¹⁵⁴ See Ember 1917, 88, #140; 1918, 31; 1926, 303, #11; Albright 1918, 90; 1918, 220; Behnk 1927, 81, #4; ESS 23, §20.b.2; Vergote 1945, 128, §1.b.4

processes. Where is the rule for the shift of $-3- < *-\text{ʕ}-$ in the proximity of q attested? Why should we accept the *ad hoc* change of $*k- > q-$ under the influence of b or ʕ ? A. Ember (1917, 88, fn. 3; ESS 23, §20.b.2) quoted K. Sethe and E. Littmann, who labelled this Egypto-Arabic match as „*sicher richtig*” having found a parallelism between ES $*\sqrt{k}^{\text{ʕ}}b >$ Tigrinya $ka^{\text{ʕ}}b\bar{o}$ „doppeltes $me^{\text{ʕ}}r\bar{o}$ ”, $ka^{\text{ʕ}}b\bar{i}$ „doppeltes $ental\bar{a}m$ ” (cf. ZA 18, 369) and Eg. $q3b$ „verdoppeln”, which, in principle, could corroborate Vergote’s suggestion (described above, #1) if one were able to justify the correspondence of Sem. $*k^{\text{ʕ}}$ vs. Eg. $q3$, which Sethe and Littmann rendered „*mit Wechsel der Emphase*”. But what kind of emphasis shifted from $*-\text{ʕ}-$ onto $*k-$, and where are the parallel instance thereof? Undisturbed by these unexplained controversies, and *ex cathedra* having discarded the equation with both Sem. $*\sqrt{k}^{\text{ʕ}}rb$ and $*\sqrt{k}^{\text{ʕ}}lb$ (#4 and #5, resp., below), W. A. Ward (1972, 20-21, ad §§193-195) eventually accepted this solution: „*Ember’s equation with Ar. $ku^{\text{ʕ}}b$ may be right after all*”. Ember (1926, 303, fn. 10) extended his Egypto-Arabic comparison onto WCh.: Hausa $gaba$ „breast” [Mischlich 1906, 143] = $g\bar{a}b\bar{a} \sim g\bar{a}b\bar{a}a$ „1. in front of the body, 2. (euphemism) genital organs (male/fem.), 3. fathom”, $g\bar{a}b\bar{a}$ (adv.) „in front” [Abr. 1962, 277-278], which is, once again, impressive, but phonologically problematic: as a rule, Hausa $g- < PCh. *g-, *h-, *h-, *-\text{ʕ}-$ (Stolbova 1996, 59, §i.5, table 5, 68, §i.6, table 6, and 74, §i.7, table 7, resp.). More promising seems the idea of V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 185) who affiliated Eg. $q3b.t$ with their ECh. $*k[u]b-$ „breast” [OS] presumably based on Kabalai $k\bar{u}b\bar{a}$ „breast” [Cpr.] | Sokoro $k\bar{u}p\bar{e}$ „breast” [Saxon] (ECh. data: JI 1994 II 47). There are further cognates in WCh.: Bade $k\bar{u}v-\bar{a}n$ „Brust” [Lukas 1968, 222], Ngizim $k\bar{u}v\bar{a}$ „chest” [Schuh 1981, 271]. These Chadic parallels (whose proto-form would be premature to reconstruct) may well be akin to Ar. $ku^{\text{ʕ}}b-$, although one is disturbed seeing no reflex of Ar. $-\text{ʕ}-$ in Chadic $*kuP-$, i.e., $**kuv-$ or $**kub-$ [GT] (as metathesis of glottalization, i.e., e.g., as $*kub-$). But there can be no talk of its cognacy with Eg. $q3b.t$ due to the lacking reflex of $-C_2-$.

(3) M. Cohen (1947, #230 bis), followed by V. M. Illič-Svityč (1966, 28), connected Eg. $q3b.t$ with WCh.: Hausa $kw\bar{i}f\bar{i}$ „côté du corps” [Cohen], which is hardly plausible from the standpoint of comparative phonology as the Hausa word can derive either $< *k^{\text{ʕ}}i^{\text{ʕ}}b-$ (then, one is to work with an irregular $k-$ vs. Eg. $q-$) or $< *k^{\text{ʕ}}\bar{i}b-$ (then, in turn, we have no trace of the $-C_2- = \text{Eg. } -3-$).

(4) W. Leslau (1949, 314, ad #230 bis) related Eg. $q3b.t$ „breast” (!) better with his PSem. $*q\bar{i}rb-$ „interior” (sic: $*-i-$!) „*rather than*” with Sem. $q\bar{e}b\bar{a}$ (sic) „stomach”. The idea was rightly declined by W. A. Ward (1972 l.c.) for semantical considerations.

(5) P. Lacau (1970, 77, §195) connected it with Ar. $qalb-$ „4. coeur (viscère), 5. coeur: esprit, âme, intérieur, pensée intime, 6. coeur, partie qui occupe le centre, 7. centre de l’armée, 8. moelle de tout arbre (et surtout de palmier), 9. noyau milieu, 10. la partie la plus pure, la plus essentielle, le coeur, la moelle, l’essence” [BK II 796], albeit with right doubts: „*Ces cascades de dérivations ne comportent aucune évidence. ... Il faudrait retrouver les mêmes dérivations sémantiques entre mots analogues dans des domaines différents.*” In the view of W. A. Ward (1972 l.c.), „*it is not likely*” and instead, he derived the Arabic term from Sem. $*\sqrt{k}^{\text{ʕ}}lb$ „to turn upside down, reverse” *ex cathedra*, which is, however, semantically not at all evident. I am disposed to leave Lacau’s attractive idea among the most likely cognate candidates.

(6) C. T. Hodge (1976, 14, #107) affiliated strangely both (!) this and Eg. $q3b$ „interior” with Sem. $*\sqrt{k}^{\text{ʕ}}rb$ „to draw near” without any attempt at justifying the semantical motivation. To be refuted.

(7) The coincidence of PEG. $*q\bar{a}r\bar{i}b.\bar{a}t$ (GT) with ECu.: Gawwada $kerp-e$ „Brust” [AMS 1980, 236] seems very tempting at the first glance, but Dullay $k-$ only derives from ECu. $*k-$ and $*g-$, but not $*k-$ (Sasse 1979, 56). In addition, the isolated Dullay word

(8) If we figure Eg. $q3b.t$ (from $*q\bar{l}b.t?$) „breast” with the basic sense „front part”, we will find certain reflexes of Sem. $*\sqrt{k}^{\text{ʕ}}bl$ „gegenüberstehen, entgegengehen, entgegennehmen, aufnehmen, empfangen” [GB] = „to face, anticipate, confront” [GT] highly noteworthy, cf. Akk. $qablu$ „Kampf, Schlacht”, $qitbulu$ Gt „kämpfen”, $muqtablu$ „Kämpfer” [AHW 675, 888, 924] || Ug. qbl „battle (?)” [DUL 692], Hbr. qbl piel 1. nehmen, empfangen, 2. annehmen, 3. aufnehmen”, $hifil$ „einander gegenüberstehen”, $*q\bar{a}bol$ „1. Bez. Einer Belagerungsmaschine, Mauerbrecher, Widder, 2. vor” [GB 698] = qbl piel „to accept, receive”, $hifil$ „to confront aggressively”, $*q\bar{a}bol/*q\bar{a}bel$, st. constr. $q\bar{a}b\bar{a}l(l)-$ „in front of” [KB 1061-2] | Ar. $qabala$ I „1. recevoir, accepter etc.”, $qabl-$ „le temps d’aparavant, temps antérieur”, $qabla$ ʔan „avant que”, $qub(u)l-$ „1. partie antérieure, le devant, 2. parties naturelles (de l’homme ou de la femme)”, $qibl-at-$ „1. côté qui nous fait face, point vers lequel nos regards se dirigent, 5. le devant, le côté le plus étroit de l’instrument de musique appelé ...”, $mu\bar{s}taqbil-$ „1. partie antérieure, côté qui nous fait face, 2. qui va au-devant de ...” [BK II 665-667, 669-670] = $qubul-$ „the front

or fore part, the former or first part, the anterior pudenda (vulva or vagina)" [Lane 2984]. The semantic dispersion is well attested.¹⁵⁵

Addition to „lung”

A third synonym for „lung” appears in Egyptian, which, contrary to Eg. wf3 and *zm3, was not discussed in the first part of my series „Layers ...”.

Eg. ffj ~ fjj „part of an ox, listed among the viscera” (NE, AEO I, 17 & II, 249*) = „les poumons” (AL 77.1545) = „ein Organ des Rindes: *Lunge (jwf n ffj 'Fleisch des ffj-Organen)" (GHwB 305) is presumably distinct from Eg. wf3 'lung' (Wb I 306, 3) as suggested by A. H. Gardiner (AEO II.c.),¹⁵⁶ which is corroborated by the assumption proposed by myself (Takács 1999, 26; 2003, 192-193, #316; EDE II 567) that it is identical with SCu.: Ma'a ifofo-tá „lung” [Ehret 1980, 151, #15] ||| PCh. *√ff "lung" [GT]¹⁵⁷ deriving from a common SAA *√ff (presumably *fuf-) „lung” [GT].¹⁵⁸ An areal parallel occurs in PBantu *papu "Lunge" [Mkr.].¹⁵⁹ The underlying verbal root (of onomatop. origin) is preserved by PCu. *√ff (presumably *fuf) "lung" [GT].¹⁶⁰ Cf. also AA *√wf(f) (or sim.) „to blow” [GT].¹⁶¹ No Semitic parallels. Cp., however, Sem.: Ar. fuf-, „3. pellicule très-mince et pellicule qui enveloppe le grain” [BK II 647] = „peel, membrane (of grain)” [Baranov 1976, 613] and fawf- „vessie de bœuf” [BK II 647] = „bull's bladder” [HSED] ||| Bed. fufāne ~ fufāne "bladder" [Rpr. 1928, 179] ||| LECu.: Oromo buf-a „Blasebalg” [Rn. 1887, 117] ||| WCh.: PAngas *fūp “membrane” [Takács 2004, 111].¹⁶² Were Bedawye, Oromo, and Angas all borrowed from Arabic or do they stem from a common Afro-Asiatic heritage?

Summary

Below, may I present a synopsis of how the semantically closest cognates (marked +) of the Egyptian anatomical terms vs. the parallels stemming ultimately presumably from the same Afro-Asiatic root, but with some shift of

¹⁵⁵ Cf. AA *√mgr "to encounter" [GT] > Sem.: Akk. maḥāru "gegenüberreten, angehen, empfangen": G "1. entgegentreten, 2. sich wenden an, jmd. angehen, 3. empfangen, annehmen, 4. auf sich nehmen", maḥru „1. Vorderseite, 2. (in praesens. Ausdrücken) vor, in Gegenwart von”, maḥrū „vorderer, erster, früherer” [AHW 577, 585], Hbr. māḥār "morgender Tag" [GB 416] | OSA: Sabaeen √mḥr "to face, run, extend towards (boundary)" [SD 84] = "to stand facing sg." [Lsl. 1969, 19] ||| NBrb.: Shilh √mkr ~ √mgr: makar ~ magr "to meet" [Aplg. 1958, 61] = mnaggar "se rencontrer" [Jst. 1914, 144] | Qabyle √mgr: mmag'er "1. rencontrer, 2. se rencontrer avec, 3. aller à la rencontre de" [Dlt. 1982, 490] = mmager "rencontrer, aller à la rencontre de" [Chaker 1987, 163], Zwawa mager "rencontrer" [Blf. 1910, 219] ||| SBrb.: Ahaggar meg'ur-et "recevoir l'hospitalité (de la nourriture)" [Fcd. 1951-2, 1171].

¹⁵⁶ Albeit the opposite position has been occupied by W. Westendorf (KHW 283).

¹⁵⁷ Attested in WCh.: Hausa hùùhùú [hu regular < *fū] [Abr. 1962, 390] | Angas fufwak [ALC 1978, 18] | Tangale pubu [Kidda 1985, 210, #341], Dera púpúk [Nwm. 1974, 132] | Ngizim fūfū [Schuh 1981, 58] ||| CCh.: Tera fufuf [Nwm. 1964, 38] | Bura fufu „1. lungs, 2. blacksmith's bellows” [BED 1953, 69] | Mandara fofeža účā [Mch.] | Mafa-Mada *√bf [Mch.]: Mada ámbbáf [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 200], Mafa baf [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 85], Uldeme mbəf [Scn. 1986, 174], Gisiga bofok [Lks. 1970, 118] | Logone fūfu [Mch.] | Hitkala (Lamang) buf [Eguchi 1971, 197] | Musgoy fūfō [Mch.] | Lame páf [Scn. 1982, 269], Zime-Dari páf [Cooper 1984, 20] (CCh. data: Mouchet 1950, 37; 1953, 171) ||| ECh.: Kera bōbōfi [Ebert 1976, 33]. All forms mean „lung” (unless otherwise indicated).

¹⁵⁸ See also Illič-Svityč 1966, 21, 23 (Hausa-CCh.); Bynon 1984, 281 (Brb.-Ron); HSED #826 (Brb.-Ch.-Ar.).

¹⁵⁹ The Bantu-Berber-Hausa comparison was suggested by H. G. Mukarovsky (1959, 10, #12).

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Bed. fūf "blasen" [Rn. 1895, 77] = fūf „to blow” [Roper 1928, 179] ||| NAgaw: Bilin fūf y "1. (an)blasen, 2. schnauben vor Zorn, erzürnt sein" [Rn. 1887, 117] = fəffī y- „to blow through the mouth” [Lmb.] ||| LECu. *afūf- [Black]: Afar fūf ḍah "blasen" [Rn.] = fūffā-hē „to blow”, fūf-e (intr.) „to blow, breathe” [PH 1985, 105], Saho fūf ḍah "blasen" [Rn.] = fuf-is- „to blow through the mouth” [Lmb.] | POmo-Tana *afūf- "to blow" [Ehret 1987, 53, #194]: Somali bof ~ buf [dissim.] „blasen, pfauchen” [Rn. 1902, 74], PBoni *afūf- „to blow (of person)” [Heine 1982, 95] | Oromo afūfa „to blow (horn, trumpet), inflate, whistle” [Gragg 1982, 10], Gidole afuf- „to inflate, blow” [Black] (LECu.: Black 1974, 103) ||| SCu.: Qwadza fif- "to breathe" [Kohl-Larsen apud Ehret 1980 MS, 3] (Cu. data: Dolgopol'skiĭ 1966, 63; 1973, 44; Haberland & Lamberti 1988, 63).

¹⁶¹ Cf. NBrb.: e.g. Shilh uf "sich aufblasen, aufgebläht sein" [Zhl.] ||| Ecu. *uf-/*ufuf- "blasen" [Sasse]: LECu. *uff- „bladder (others: 'to blow')” [Black]: Konso úff-āta „bladder” [Black], Gidole úff-ā „bladder” [Black] | Baiso ufūf- „to blow” [Hayward] (LECu.: Black 1974, 105) | HECu. *ufūf- "to blow (on fire)" [Hds. 1989, 423] (ECu.: Sasse 1979, 19; 1982, 183-184; Leslau 1988, 180) ||| SCu. *uf- "to blow" [Ehret]: Iraqw ufuf- | Asa uf- | Ma'a -úfu [\leftarrow *ufuf] | Dahalo uf- ~ žūf- [ž- < *y-] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 294, #88). Cf. also PNUbian *uff "blasen" [Abel 1933-4, 306].

¹⁶² Cf. Angas fuup “a membrane, thin skin (such as the bladder)” [Flk. 1915, 179] = fūúp (Kabwir dialect) “a thin membrane, skin over egg or over baby, newborn” [Jng. 1962 MS].

meaning (marked as (+) in brackets) are distributed among the diverse branches of the Afro-Asiatic macrofamily and beyond.

In the semantic domain „hair” (including those items, i.e., both lexemes most commonly used, I examined in the first issue of my series „Layers ...”), only synonym (Eg. wpr.t with a specific *nuance* „side lock”) has evident match in Semitic. The rest of the Egyptian terms are clearly of African (mostly Berber, Cushitic and/or Chadic) cognacy.

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

„Crown of head”, noteworthy, represents a domain of the Egyptian lexicon where Semitic cognates are present in a relatively higher degree (possibly three instances out of the five) than elsewhere. The same is the case with the Egypto-Berber matches here. Apparently, Northern vs. Southern Afro-Asiatic terms were in this domain actually equally represented in the Egyptian lexicon.

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

For „skull”, Egyptian had just one inherited term, whose cognates are solely attested in Ethio-Semitic (Gurage). This reminds us of Eg. d3d3 „head” (discussed in the preceding part of „Layers ...”), which is only paralleled with this reduplicated structure by Sem. *gulgul-.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
dnn.t	+				

In the case of Egyptian terms for „forehead” and „face”, almost all direct matches appear in Cushitic and Chadic and only once in Semitic and Berber.

Eg.	inner Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.	extra-AA
jnh		(+)	+, (+)	+, (+)		+	
mnd.t				+?			
ḥ3.t		(+)		+		+	
ḥr		(+)		+		+	
ḥnt		+					
dhn.t						+	

The Egyptian terms for „breast” have also their direct cognates mostly in Chadic. Their Cushitic and Berber matches are a bit less, whereas Semitic is again underrepresented with just one single direct match.

Eg.	inner Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.	extra-AA
pḥ		(+)	+	+		+	+
mnph.t	+						
mnd	+?	(+)?		+?/(+)?			
šn ^c			+?			+	
šnb.t						+	

q3b.t		+?					
-------	--	----	--	--	--	--	--

Direct matches for Egyptian words signifying „lung” are again only known from Cushitic, Chadic and some extra-Afro-Asiatic languages. In Semitic, only one certain indirect root cognate appears.

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

In the first issue of the series „Layers ...”, I have demonstrated the binary (and sometimes trinary) system of layers (with Semitic cognacy vs. „African” origin as well as inner Egyptian innovation, respectively) in certain segments of the ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology („head”, „hair”, „ear”, „eye”, „hand”, etc.). As we have seen throughout this second paper, the overwhelming majority of the Egyptian anatomical terms for the upper torso does not display such a binary system of synonymous terms of Semitic vs. „African” etymology, since in most of them, we can solely observe an extra-Semitic affiliation, where, usually the Berber element is also lacking and the relative distribution of the Cushitic vs. Chadic and, sometimes, the extra-Afro-Asiatic parallels is the only question. The tentative results of my research in further domains of Egyptian anatomical terminology fundamentally corroborate this picture.

References are to be attached later