

Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon VI: Numerals¹

Gábor Takács

Introduction

The first part of my series „Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon”² re-examined the controversies of P. Lacau’s old observation on a binary opposition of certain items of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology in the context of many new results issuing from current progress in Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) comparative linguistics. 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 also become apparent. The subsequent papers in this series („Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon II-V”) focused on the rest of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology,³ led by the wish to see to what degree was this etymological dichotomy characteristic there, and the outcome was that the overwhelming majority of the Egyptian body part names was merely South Afro-Asiatic. Now, similarly to my previous communications, the Egyptian numerals, as part of the basic vocabulary, are examined from the same standpoint so that we can see these diverse (South vs. North Afro-Asiatic) layers of our numeralia.

Eg. $\sqrt{w}\ll$ „eins” (OK-, Wb I 273-276): in spite of many unsuccessful attempts at its Afro-Asiatic etymology made over the past one and a half of a century,⁴ only recently has W. Vycichl (DELG 518), followed then by A. Ju. Militarev (in Starostin et al. 1995, 23), found its phonologically fully satisfactory cognates, which only appear in Semitic, where the latter scholar reconstructed the underlying root as $\sqrt{w}\ll y$ „to sweep together”, cf. OT Hbr. $\sqrt{y}\ll y$ qal (hapax, Is. 28:17) „wegraffen”, hence $y\bar{a}\ll im$ (pl.) „Schaufeln” [GB 306-7] = $\sqrt{y}\ll y$ „to sweep away (hail)”, hence $\sqrt{y}\bar{a}\ll$ or $\sqrt{y}\bar{a}\ll e(h)$ „shovel to clean the altar” [KB 419] = $\sqrt{y}\ll y$ „to sweep together and carry away” [Klein 1987, 261a] | OSA $\sqrt{y}\ll y$ „to snatch away” [Müller quoted in KB], Ar. $\sqrt{w}\ll y$ I: wa $\ll\bar{a}$ „1. rassembler, ramasser, réunir sur un seul point, 5. s’amasser sur un seul point (se dit, p.ex., du pus dans la plaie), 6. être guéri (se dit d’un os fracturé dont les éclats se réunissent)” [BK II 1570] = „sammeln” [GB] = „to collect, hold” [KB] =

¹ It is here that I have to express my gratitude to the Bolyai research fellowship (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, reg. no.: BO / 00360 / 12) facilitating my project on Egyptian linguogenesis, which resulted, a.o., in a number of papers including this and the preceding parts of my series „Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon”.

² Takács, G.: Layers of the Oldest Egyptian Lexicon I.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Warszawa) 68/1 (2015), 85-139.

³ Part II deals with the Egyptian anatomical terminology for parts of the upper torso, forthcoming in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Warszawa) 69/1 (2016). Part III (with the etymological study on the lower torso and beneath) is supposed to appear in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Warszawa) 69/2 (2016). Part IV (terms for back parts of the body) and V (terms pertaining to body in general, e.g., skin, flesh, blood etc.) are still under work, not yet prepared for publication, albeit the relevant raw lexical materials have already been accumulated and so certain preliminary impressions are already available.

⁴ The most widespread etymology was its combination with Ar. \sqrt{wd} and its Semitic kinred, cf. Sethe 1916, 21, §1; Ember 1917, 87, #134; 1926, 305, #3.4; Albright 1918, 90; 1927, 200; Behnk 1927, 81, #7; ESS §5.c; Dolgopol’skij 1967, 300, #5; Schenkel 1997, 114. In addition to this Eg.-Sem. comparison, which was rightly declined already by V. Blažek (1999, 30, §4.1), several authors, e.g., L. Reinisch (1874, xii, fn. 3), F. Behnk (1928, 139, #18), E. Zyhlarz (1931, 134-135; 1950, 407), Ju. Zavadovskij (1967, 43; 1974, 105; 1975, 45), and then E. Lipiński (1997, 284, §35.3.e) suggested further cognates in NBrb. $y\bar{e}n$ (m), $y\bar{e}t$ (f) and SBrb. $iye(n)$ (m), $iye(t)$ (f) „1” [Zhl.] derived by E. Zyhlarz from $\sqrt{w}gy$ (1931) and later even from an artificial $\sqrt{w}\ll y$ (1950) or most surprisingly by E. Lipiński (l.c.) from a $\sqrt{wa}\ll(-n)$. V. Blažek (1987 MS, §1.2; 1990, 34; 1999, 30, §4.1), in turn, identified both Sem. $\sqrt{w}\ll y$ and Eg. $w\ll$ (in 1990, strangely, only Eg. $w\ll$) with the Berber numeral for „1”, whose Proto-Berber etymon has been recently reconstructed as $\sqrt{y}\bar{i}w\bar{a}n\bar{a}t$ [Prs.] = $\sqrt{ya}\bar{N}/T$ [Zvd.] = $\sqrt{i}y\bar{a}w\bar{a}n/at$ (m/f) [Mlt.]. L. Homburger (1928, 335 along with many other untenable non-AA parallels) and H. Abel (1933-34, 305) connected Eg. $w\ll$ to Common Nubian $\sqrt{w\bar{e}r}$ „1”. Similarly, Leslau (1962, 47, #27, cf. Conti 1978, 43, fn. 5) assumed a relationship with ES: Tigre woro „1”. Both suggestions suffer from the fact that the correspondence of r to Eg. \ll is irregular. M. L. Bender (1975, 179), in turn, affiliated the Eg. numeral with SCu.: WRift \sqrt{wak} - „1” [GT pace Zbr. 1987, 343], in which, however, there is no trace of the $\sqrt{w}\ll$. In addition, as Ch. Ehret (1980, 312) pointed out, the WRift term is „probably” juxtaposed from two demonstrative roots ($\sqrt{wa} + \sqrt{ka}$), which is certainly not the case of Eg. $w\ll$. V. Blažek (1990, 34; 1993 MS, 3, §1.9) too, beside the Berber parallels (above), could not resist comparing SCu.: Ma’a (Mbugu) wé „1” [Green, Wtl.] and WCh.: Karekare wäiké „each, all” [Krf.], where he singled out an „element” \sqrt{wV} „1”.

„umfassen, enthalten“ [Lsl.]. Besides, it is this root that, following Rundgren (*Orientalia Suecana* 10, 1961, 121-127), W. Leslau (1987, 23) derived also the Semitic term for „Eingeweide“ (usually taken from $\sqrt{m\langle y \rangle}$) from assuming a primary stem $\sqrt{mi\langle w\langle ay \rangle}$ „(etwa) Sammlungsart, Gefäß“.

Eg. \sqrt{sn} (hence masc. dual sn.wj, fem. sn.tj) „zwei“ (OK-, Wb IV 148) is identical with Sem. \sqrt{tjn} „2“ [Djk.] = \sqrt{tny} [Vcl.] ||| Brb. \sqrt{sin} „2“ [Mt. 1991, 167],⁵ i.e., this numeral root is only attested in the northern branches of the Afro-Asiatic macrofamily of languages. Elsewhere, it is unattested with $\sqrt{-n}$. The Semitic root has, however, also a heteroclitic variety with $\sqrt{-r}$, which may be traced back even on the Proto-Afro-Asiatic level, cf. AA \sqrt{Dir} ~ \sqrt{Dar} „two“ [GT] > Sem. \sqrt{tir} > \sqrt{tr} „two“ [GT]⁶ ||| presumably SCu.: WRift \sqrt{Dar} (unless < \sqrt{Dad} -) „two“ [GT]⁷ ||| PCh. $\sqrt{v\check{c}r}$ „two“ [GT].⁸ The Sem.-SCu.-Ch. etymology was first suggested by V. Blazek (1987 MS, 8-9, #2.2; 1990, 36). Which of these root varieties (AA \sqrt{Dn} vs. \sqrt{Dr} „2“) is to be considered as the primary one, is not to be answered here. It is, however, noteworthy that only Semitic has both of them.

Eg. \sqrt{mt} (hence occurring as masc. pl. $\sqrt{mt.w}$, fem. $\sqrt{mt.t}$) „drei“ (OK-, Wb III 283): the mystery of its origins led sometimes to absurd etymologies.⁹ In his prestigious LÄ article on Egyptian numerals, A. Loprieno (1986, 1308), however, all too hastily and carelessly remarked that „eine überzeugende Etymologie liegt nicht vor“, which was by far not true even in his day. Surprisingly, he overlooked and did not even quote the most hopeful approach suggested by that time by a number of outstanding comparatist authors like A. Trombetti (1902, 196, §3), C. Meinhof (1912, 233), and M. L. Bender (1975, 192), who all combined the Egyptian numeral with NOm.: Kafa kāmō „3“ [Rn. 1888, 56] = kēmō [Mnh.] = kēmō [Crl. 1951, 461] = keymo [Bnd. 1971, 259], a numeral apparently standing fully isolated within Omotic. Whether the similarly isolated WCh.: Karekare kumu (sic, -m-) „3“ [IL apud JI 1994 II 326]¹⁰ is, in fact, also cognate, is hard to determine as elsewhere in the West

⁵ See Hommel 1883, 96, §11; Erman 1892, 118; Sethe 1916, 19, §2; Albright 1918, 91; 1926, 189; 1927, 200; 1923, 68; Ember 1926, 305, n. 7; Farina 1926, 15; Behnk 1928, 140, #44; ESS §11.a.50; Zyhlarz 1931, 135, §2; Vycichl 1955, 310; 1958, 378, 399; 1974, 62, §5; D'jakonov 1965, 46; 1974, 742; 1986, 61; Hodge 1968, 27, #113; 1981, 410; 1990, 646, §9.A; Zavadovskij 1967, 43; 1974, 106, §6.1; 1975, 45-46; Dolgopol'skij 1973, 111; Bender 1975, 194; Belova 1989, 14; Militarev & Stolbova 1990, 56; Militarev 1991, 75; Dombrowski & Dombrowski 1991, 343; Lipiński 1997, 284, §35.4; Blažek 1999, 30-31, §4.2.

⁶ Attested in Biblical Aram. $\sqrt{tr\check{r}n}$, fem. $\sqrt{tr\check{r}n}$ [GB 931], Mandaean $\sqrt{tr\check{r}n}$ ~ \sqrt{atrin} [Drower], Neo-Aram. $\sqrt{itr(i)}$, fem. $\sqrt{tare(i)}$ [Bergsträsser], Neo-Syriac $\sqrt{tr\check{r}n}$ ~ $\sqrt{t\check{r}tn}$ ~ $\sqrt{tirw\check{e}}$ ~ $\sqrt{tarw\check{e}}$ [Kutscher] (NWSem.: KB 2009) || MSA: Soqotri \sqrt{tro} (tiro) ~ (poetical) $\sqrt{tr\check{r}ho}$ (so, t-) [Lsl. 1938, 445] = \sqrt{trQ} , fem. \sqrt{trih} [Jns.], Harsusi $\sqrt{tr\check{r}o}$, fem. $\sqrt{tr\check{r}et}$ [Jns. 1977, 133], Jibbali $\sqrt{tr\check{r}oh}$, fem. $\sqrt{tr\check{r}ut}$ [Jns. 1981, 285], Mehri $\sqrt{tr\check{r}u}$ (tru), fem. $\sqrt{tr\check{r}it}$ [Jahn] = $\sqrt{tr\check{r}o}$ ~ $\sqrt{tr\check{r}oh}$, fem. $\sqrt{tr\check{r}ayt}$ ~ $\sqrt{tr\check{r}elt}$ [Jns. 1987, 418].

⁷ Based on the equation of Iraqw \sqrt{tsar} and Burunge \sqrt{Dada} (WRift: Ehret 1980, 229, #4).

⁸ Attested in WCh.: Nbauchi \sqrt{Dir} ~ \sqrt{Dar} [GT], cf. Jimbin $\sqrt{b\check{r}}$ [Skn.], Pa'a \sqrt{Dir} [MSkn.] = $\sqrt{c\check{r}u}$ [IL], Siri $\sqrt{bi-c\check{a}re}$ (ch-) [Gowers] = $\sqrt{b\check{r}D\check{a}r}$ [Skn.] = $\sqrt{b\check{u}-c\check{a}0i}$ [IL] (prefix \sqrt{bV} - of numerals), Miya $\sqrt{c\check{r}}$ (ts-) [Skn.], Mburku $\sqrt{c\check{r}}$ (ts-) [Skn.] (NBch.: Skinner 1977, 33) | Bade $\sqrt{s\check{r}\check{a}r\check{r}n}$ [IL], Ngizim $\sqrt{š\check{r}in}$ [Schuh] = $\sqrt{š\check{r}in}$ [IL] || CCh.: Musgoy \sqrt{sray} [Mch.], Daba \sqrt{sraj} [Pascal] = $\sqrt{s\check{r}\check{a}r\check{y}}$ [Lienhard], Kola $\sqrt{s\check{r}\check{a}r\check{y}}$ [Schubert] || ECh.: Sumray $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Jng.], Tumak $\sqrt{h\check{e}r}$ [Caprile], probably < $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [GT] | WDangla $\sqrt{s\check{r}\check{r}}$, $\sqrt{s\check{r}\check{r}S}$ [Fédry], Migama $\sqrt{s\check{r}\check{a}r}$ [Jng.], Mokilko $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Jng.] | Mubi-Toram $\sqrt{s\check{r}(i)}$ [GT] > Mubi $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Lks. 1937, 185] = $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Bnd.-Drn. 1983, 78, #90] = $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Jng. 1990 MS, 42], Birgit $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Jng. 2004, 358], Minjile $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Bnd.-Drn. 1983, 78, #90], Kajakse $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Bnd.-Drn. 1983, 78, #90], Masmaje $\sqrt{s\check{r}}$ [Alio 2004, 284, #151], Toram see [Alio 2004, 262, #397], Jegu $\sqrt{s\check{e}}$ [Jng. 1961, 117], Kofa $\sqrt{s\check{e}}$ [Jng. 1977 MS, 16, #402].

⁹ W. M. Müller 1907, 303, fn. 1 Sethe 1916, 21, §3 Albright 1918, 91; 1927, 199 followed by Farina 1926, 14 ESS §10.a.33 Eg. \sqrt{mt} < \sqrt{nt} < $\sqrt{šnt}$ < $\sqrt{šlt}$ < \sqrt{tlt} Sem. $\sqrt{tal\check{a}t}$ „3“ Sethe l.c. with hesitation „... aber m mit sem. l, t mit t zu identifizieren, fehlt mir vorläufig doch der Mut“, Bravmann 1933, 148-149 Eg. \sqrt{mt} < \sqrt{nt} < \sqrt{tlt} < $\sqrt{šlt}$ < $\sqrt{šnt}$ „there is no problem with m < *l in Egyptian“ Even W. Westendorf (1962, 27, fn. 1) mentioned the alleged cognacy of Eg. \sqrt{mt} vs. Sem. $\sqrt{tal\check{a}t}$ among the instances of the interchange of Eg. m ~ n! A. Ember (1917, 88, fn. 1) was also „inclined to believe“ that Sem. $\sqrt{mš}$ „5“ Following the idea, K. Sethe (1916, 23, fn. 2) „war bei der Trennung der beiden Sprachzweige noch ein unbestimmter Vielheitsausdruck, den der erste Zweig dann für das eine, der andere für das andere absterbende Zahlwort einsetzte“ and A. which A. Loprieno (1986, 1315-1316, n. 18) „vermag ich weder phonologisch noch semantisch zu verstehen“ L. Homburger's (1928, 336) non-AA African parallels (such as, e.g., Bantu satu, Agni nsā) are evidently out of the question equally for phonetic reasons. Zavadovskij (1967, 43; 1974, 107, §7; 1975, 47, §7.0) Brb. \sqrt{krT} „соответствует до некоторой степени“ to Eg. (1967: „параллелизм здесь выражен цепочкой 'гортанный + сонант + зубной'“; 1974: are of parallel structure: post-palatal + sonant + dental), which Blazek (1999, 63, §3.1) has already correctly rejected „does not respect any known phonetic law“

¹⁰ Note that J. Lukas (1966, 202) recorded Karekare $\sqrt{k\check{u}n\check{u}}$ (sic, with -n-), which is, contrary to the record made by the IL with the unexpected anomalous -m-, in accordance with the rest of the comparative evidence usually gained from West

Chadic daughter language groups (Angas-Sura, Ron, Bole-Tangale), there seems to emerge a proto-form *^hun-₃ [GT] = *kunu [Stl. 1987, 209, #595].¹¹ But where is the trace of a C₃ dental plosive in Kafa and Karekare? Nowhere. This lack of the third radical makes one search further.

The West Chadic biradical root was handled, e.g., by H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibriszimow (1994 I 168A) as a remnant of their triradical PCh. *^hknT „3” via apocopy. Interestingly, this is astonishingly precisely just that sequence of those root consonants that Eg. ^hmt also represents, i.e., velar + nasal + dental! All three radicals of this Proto-Chadic triradical root have until now been preserved, with the necessary *Lautverschiebungen*, of course, by the following daughter languages: WCh.: Jimbin k¹/₂ndí [Skn.], Diri hyíinzù [IL] = hínzù [Skn.] < *kind- [GT] || CCh.: PMasa *indi, regular < *Kindi "three" [GT]: Banana yìntì(di) [Krf.] = yinti [Zima], Musey hindi [Krf.], Gizey/Wina, Ham, Musey, Lew, Marba ìndì [Ajl. et al. 2001, 56], Lame hinzi [Lks. 1937, 139] = hínčì"i [Krf.] = hínù"i [Scn. 1982, 516], Zime-Batna híSì [Jng.] = hínzi"i [Scn.], Peve hín₁ [Krf.], Zime-Dari hinyi < *hin₁i < *hindi [Str.] = hinyi [Lks. 1937, 139] = hin₁i" [Venberg 1975, 41], Zime-Misme hindi [Krf.] (Masa group: Zima 1990, 268; Ch. data: JI 1994 II 326-7). In the light of these data, the reconstruction of PCh. *^hknT "3" [JI] might be modified on two points. First, the correspondence of k- in the majority of the Chadic daughter languages to h- in the Masa group speaks for a PCh. fricative *^h- (cf. Stolbova 1996, 68, §1.6, table 6) and not a plosive *k-. Secondly, the glottalized *-T is not really supported by any of the above enumerated reflexes, where we mostly find either plain -d and its palatalized sequence (-₁ > -y), which is not at all a typical phenomenon with a glottalized dental plosive and evidently speaks for the *-d. All in all, if the cognacy between PCh. *^hnd || Eg. ^hmt "3" is true, it is to be figured under the circumstance that the cluster -C₂C₃- of PCh. *^hind- resulted from a voicing process (influenced by *-n-)¹² and an assimilation ultimately from **imt- [GT]. To the best of my knowledge, nobody (not even V. Blažek in his quite thorough 1999 book on the numerals in Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European) has so far suggested this Ch.-Eg. comparison.

In a number of Chadic reflexes of this root, the medial nasal radical is not reflected, cf. WCh.: (?) Bokkos "átát [Jng.] < *^had- (?) [GT] | Warji k'ḷi [Jng. and Skn.] = k^hḷi (-dz-) [IL], Tsagu k'd' [Skn.], Kariya and Miya kǎdi [Skn.], Pa'a k'dù [Jng. & MSkn.] = kǎdu [IL], Siri bu-kudde [Gowers] = bù-kúdi [IL] = bu-kúdi [Skn.], Mburku kídí [Skn.] || CCh.: Mandara k'ḷi [Mch.] = kí₁e [Meek] = kí₁é [Eguchi] < *ki[r]de (?) [GT] | Masa hidi [Mch. 1950, 59, so also Krf.] = hidi" [Jng.] = [ìdī]¹³ [Ctc. 1983, 88] = ìdí "trois" [Ajl.], Masa-Bongor hìdī "trois" [Jng. 1973 MS] || CCh.: Mandara kǎTye [Wolff 1974, 16] || ECh.: (???) Mokilko "átó (perhaps < *^haT-, cf. kǎTuwé „zum dritten Mal") [Lks.] (Ch. data: JI 1994 II 326-7). These Chadic forms may be akin to Ecu.: Yaaku āt „3” [Heine quoted by Zbr. 1987, 342], regularly derivable from a hypothetical Ecu. **kād- [GT], which is fully isolated within the whole Cushitic family. Does the underlying etymon, in fact, represent the ultimate biconsonantal root? H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 35) combined, in addition, these reflexes with NOm. *^hkd/z „3” [Mkr.] = *^hḷmu [Zima] = *Kamu > *Kawmu > *Kay₁- [Blz. 1990, 39] < *^hayd- [GT],¹⁴ which only confirms this supposition on an ancient biliteral root. If all this latter

Chadic.

¹¹ O. V. Stolbova (l.c.) was unaware of the Tal and Goemay data, which betray a glottalized *^h- instead of plain *k-.

¹² The same voicing effect of the nasal has been observed in the cluster -nC- throughout the whole Egyptian *Sprachgeschichte*, cf. the shift of Cpt. (S) nc > nz attested in Eg. «.t-n.(t)-sb3 „school” > (SF) ancybe, (SL) ancyb, (S) anZybe, (B) anZyb, etc. (KHW 8); cf. already the OEG. alphabetic writing nzw for nsw „king”, which was certainly vocalized as *j/"insiw with a cluster *-ns- as cuneiform evidence also indicates from the 13th century BC (Wb II 325-9; Sethe 1911, 16-30; 1912, 98; Farina 1926, 16; ÜKAPT IV 54, ad PT 814c; AÄG 51-52, §116).

¹³ Erroneously reconstructed by Caitucoli (l.c.) as *idi0 or *idiT (!) purely led by the (false) assumption that all word/root-final [-"] reflect an old *-T/*-0.

¹⁴ Cf. NWometo *haymu- [GT]: Welamo hezzā [Moreno 1938, 37] = hēza [Bnd. 1971, 252] = esa, eza, heza [Chiomio 1938, 4; Da Trento 1941, 206], Gofa heḷa (-dz-) [Moreno 1938, 37], Zala hezzā [Moreno 1938, 37], Malo héza [Moreno 1938, 37], Kullo hezu [Allan 1976, 330] = hēza [Bnd. 1971, 252], Dache heḷa (-dz-) [Bnd. 1971, 253], Dorze hēḷa (-dz-) [Bnd. 1971, 253] = heiza [Flm.], Male hāyco (-yts-) [Da Trento 1941, 206; Bnd. 1971, 255], Oyda hāyḷi (-dz-), oyddi [Bnd. 1971, 254] | SEometo *haymu- [GT]: Zayse hayc (-ts) [Crl. 1938, 194], Zergulla hayc (-ts) [Bnd. 1971, 257], Gidicho hāyḷi (-dz-) [Bnd. 1971, 256], Koyra hayḷe (-dz-) [Hayward, also Bnd. 1971, 252], Mezo hayḷi (-dz-) [Chiomio 1938, 235], Basketo hayzā [Crl. 1938, 108] = hay/d/zi [Bnd. 1971, 254], Doko oyzē [CR 1927, 248] = hāyzā [d'Abbadie apud CR l.c.], Dollo ayz [CR 1927, 250] | Dizoid *kad(d)u [GT]: Dizi kadu [Toselli 1938, 13] = kādú [Allan 1976, 381] = kaddu [Crl. 1951, 309], Sheko kaddu [CR 1925] = kādu [Bnd. 1971, 262] = kadem [Crl. 1951, 309], Nao kaddu [CR 1925] = kādu, kaddō [Bnd. 1971, 262] | Janjero kēz [Crl. 1938, 57] | Chara kezā [Crl. 1938, 151] | Gimirra kazu [Toselli 1939, 35], She kaz [CR 1925], Bencho kəz [Bnd. 1971, 260] | Kefoid (or Gongga)

scenario is true, we would have to assume a PAA * \sqrt{d} [GT], which, however, contradicts the above outlined development of PCh. * \sqrt{ind} - < ** \sqrt{int} - < ** \sqrt{imt} - [GT] and eventually discards the equation with Eg. \sqrt{mt} .

It is very probable that CCh.: PDaba *makad „3” [GT] > Musgoy makat [Mch. 1950, 59] = maaka (sic) [Str.], Daba makat [Mch. 1966, 133] = maaka (sic) [Str.] = makāT [Lienhard], Hina maakáa (sic) [Str.], Kola makād [Schubert] (CCh.: Str. 1910, 456) represent merely the same biconsonantal root extended by an m- prefix instead of being the reflex of a hypothetical AA * $\sqrt{m}T$, i.e., the metathetic cognate of Eg. \sqrt{mt} „3”, however tempting this may *prima vista* seem.

Eg. \sqrt{mt} „3” was identified by C. Meinhof (1907, 123; 1912, 233),¹⁵ E. Zyhlarz (1931, 135-136, §3), W. Vycichl (1959, 33), H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 45), and V. Blažek (1987 MS, 14-15, §3.1; 1990, 38; 1993 MS, 5, §3.1; 1999, 32, §3)¹⁶ with the Bed. numeral „3”, which was apparently built on the root \sqrt{mhy} .¹⁷ Although J. D. Wölfel (1954, 5; 1965, 617) voiced only his reservations against this Eg.-Bed. comparison and in A. Zaborski’s (1987, 319) view too, „this is phonologically rather improbable”, one is tempted to ponder whether Zyhlarz (l.c. supra) was right having ingeniously envisaged a PBed. *māhādi (or sim.) on the basis of the supposed shift of Bed. y from an earlier palatalized dental, which is in fact valid for Bed. y = ECu. *z, cf. Bed. hayk „Stern” [Rn. 1895, 133] || LECu.: Somali haTig [Rn.] = iddig [Sasse] = hadig [Zhl.] < ECu. *izk-/uzk- „star” [Sasse 1979, 35 etc.]. Following this scenario, one might be inclined to surmise in both PBed. *mahadi „3” [Zhl.] and CCh.: PDaba *makad „3” [GT] (above) the same m- prefix extension of the same root. On the other hand, equally inspiring is to observe – together with H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 45) – the closeness of Bed. \sqrt{mhy} to WCh.: Sbauchi * \sqrt{mKy} (perhaps * $m^{(w)}ā$ [jay?] „3” [GT],¹⁸ since the latter can by no means be explained from *ma- $\bar{a}d$ (or sim.) the same way as in Bedawye, and – even more interestingly – the common biradical root * \sqrt{y} that might in principle be singled out by assuming an m- prefix here too finds a surprising match in the southernmost extremity of Cushitic, namely SCu.: Ma’a kai ~ $\bar{a}i$ „3” [Ehret], which is similarly attested with a prefix mi- (this, in turn, being from Bantu), cf. Ma’a mi- $\bar{a}i$ „3” [Mnh. 1906, 314]. As for the Southern Cushitic background of the Ma’a numeral, Ch. Ehret (1980, 249, #C2) suggests a comparison with Dahalo “áβa „3”. The loss of final consonants is indeed an attested feature of Ma’a *Lautgeschichte*. The problem is, however, that in the Ma’a *Auslaut* we have a -y (and not zero as expected) that can hardly be regarded as trace of former *-b.¹⁹ Anyhow, Blažek’s (1990, 38) AA * $\bar{a}mi$ (?) „3” based on the comparison of Eg. and Bed. „3” (including also the Guanche numeral „3”, cf. below) is not well-founded even if Bed. \sqrt{mhy} and Sbauchi * \sqrt{mKy} were related Eg. $\bar{m}t$ via metathesis. But this – as rightly stated by A. Zaborski (l.c. supra) – is at the moment truly improbable.

Another difficult question is how to etymologically evaluate CCh.: Mandara * \sqrt{krd} „3” [GT]: Glavda $\bar{k}C\bar{e}rda$ [Rapp] = $\bar{k}erda$ [Wolff], Guduf $\bar{a}kr\bar{r}T\bar{a}$ [Smz.] = $\bar{a}k^h\bar{o}t$ [IL] = $\bar{k}arde$ [Wolff] (Mandara group: Wolff 1974, 16), where, in principle, we may account for the regular shift of -r- < PCh. * \bar{n} - and for a prefix * \bar{a} - (of numerals???) which eventually leads to assuming ** $\sqrt{V-kind}$ -. The cognacy of the Mandara numeral seems thus phonologically fully possible, albeit it might just as well be combined with Brb. *kraT „3” [Zvd. 1974, 107, §7; 1975, 47, §7.0] as suggested in JI 1994 I 168A, which, however, leads to a fully distinct AA root. The dental radical, in addition, is apparently additional, cf. CCh. *ma-/ga- $\bar{k}ar$ < * $\bar{k}an$ [GT]: Lamang $\bar{k}n\bar{a}$ [Wolff] | Dghwede $\bar{k}r\bar{e}$ [Frick] = $\bar{k}are$ [Wolff] = $x^k\bar{o}è$ [IL], Ngweshe $k^w\bar{a}0\bar{o}$ [IL], met. < * $\bar{k}war$ - [GT], Ghvoko $\bar{k}waro$ [Wolff] | Kotoko $g\bar{a}h\bar{k}ar$ [Mch.] = $g\bar{a}k^r$ [Lukas] = $\bar{a}k\bar{e}r\bar{a}$ [Bouny] (CCh.: Wolff 1974, 16; Ch.: JI 1994 II 326-7).

* $ke_{\bar{a}}$ [GT]: Kafa $ka_{\bar{a}}$ (- \bar{g} -) [Rn. 1888], Mocha $k\bar{a}_{\bar{a}}$ (- $\bar{g}\bar{g}$ -) [Lsl. 1959] = $ke_{\bar{a}}$ (- \bar{g} -) [Bnd. 1971, 260], Shinasha (Bworo) $keza$ [Schuver in Grottanelli 1940, 103] = $ke^{\bar{a}}$ (- \bar{g} -) [Grottanelli 1941, 266] = $k\bar{e}ze$ [Brauner 1950, 70] = $k\bar{e}zza$ [Bnd. 1971, 259], Anfillo $ke_{\bar{a}}$ (- $\bar{g}\bar{g}$ -) [Grottanelli 1940, 103] = $k\bar{e}^{\bar{a}}$ (- $\bar{d}j$ -) [Bnd. 1971, 258] (NOM. Data: Zbr. 1983, 384-387). Note that V. Blažek (1990, 39) erroneously explained the NOM. stem from his AA * μaKu „3” via metathesis based on his comparison with Agaw * $seq^w/\gamma^w a$ „3”, Piraqw * $dakati$ „8”, WCh.: Hausa $takwas$ „8”, CCh. * $tVkwazV$ „8”.

¹⁵ In his paper from 1912 he meant this comparison beside the Kafa root \sqrt{km} for „3”.

¹⁶ Zyhlarz equated at the same time the Eg. numeral also with the Guanche term for „3”.

¹⁷ Recorded as (Bisharin) $meh\bar{e}y$ ~ $m\bar{a}hi$ ~ $m\bar{a}h\bar{a}y$ [Almkvist 1885, 46] = (Hadendoa, Halenga, Bisharin) $emh\bar{a}/\bar{a}y$ ~ $meh\bar{a}y$ ~ $m\bar{a}h\bar{a}y$ ~ seldom $m\bar{p}h\bar{a}/\bar{a}y$ [Rn. 1894, 10; 1895, 18, 167] = $m\bar{a}h\bar{e}y$ [Roper 1928,] = $m\bar{h}ay$ [Bnd.] = (Arteiga) $m\bar{h}\bar{a}y$ ~ $mih\bar{a}y$ [Hudson] = (Hala/enga) $m\bar{a}h\bar{a}y$ [Rn.] = (Ammar’ar) $m\bar{h}\bar{a}y\bar{y}\bar{t}$ (f) vs. $m\bar{h}\bar{a}y\bar{y}\bar{b}$ (m) [Dlg.] (Bed. data: Dlg. 1973, 319; Zbr. 1987, 328; 1989, 589, #85).

¹⁸ Attested in Boghom $m\bar{o}i$ ~ $m\bar{o}$ [Jng.] = $m\bar{w}\bar{a}y$ [Smz.], Zangwal $m\bar{a}y\bar{a}$ [Smz.], Wangday $m\bar{a}\bar{k}i$ [IL] = $m\bar{a}\bar{k}ai$ [Smz.], Zaranda $m\bar{a}ki$ [Smz.], Dokshi $m\bar{a}\bar{a}yi$ [Smz.], Dikshi and Bandas $m\bar{a}\bar{a}gi$ [Smz.], Boodli (Zumbul) $m\bar{a}\bar{a}y\bar{a}$ [Smz.], Zodi (Dwa/ot) $m\bar{a}\bar{a}gai$, Zakshi $m\bar{a}\bar{a}gi$ [Smz.], Boot, Zaari, Sigidi $m\bar{a}\bar{a}ki$ [Smz.], Zaar $m\bar{a}i$ [IL] = $m\bar{a}\bar{y}i$ [Smz.], Zaar of Kal $m\bar{a}\bar{a}yi$ [Smz.], Zaar of Gambar Leere $m\bar{a}\bar{a}i$ [Smz.], Zaar of Lusa $m\bar{a}yi$ [Smz.], Tala mee [Smz.], Sho (Ju) $m\bar{a}y\bar{a}$ [Smz.] (SBch. data: Shimizu 1978, 39, #76).

¹⁹ Cf., e.g., the zero reflex in Ma’a $we_{\bar{a}}$ „1” vs. WRift * $wak_{\bar{a}}$ „1”, although the case of Ma’a $hai_{\bar{a}}$ „4” vs. ERift * $hak_{\bar{a}}$ „4” speaks against (Zaborski 1987, 343, §1 and §2).

Another surprising coincidence is represented by SOM. *makan [Blz. 1990, 38] = *mākan > *makkan (hence *-m by assimilation) [GT]: Ari maakkan, makkán, mĀkkĀn [Bnd.] = māken [Bliese 1982], Banna məkəm [Bnd. 1971, 264] = m^okəm [Bnd.], Hamer makan [Crl. 1942, 262] = məkkan [Flm.] = m'a'an [Lydall], Dime məkəm [Bnd. 1971, 263] = mikkim [Flm.], Karo makämm [CR 1927, 252], Bako makken [Da Trento 1941, 206] (SOM.: Bnd. 1971, 263-264; 1994, 160, #86; Zbr. 1983, 388) || WCh.: Dira miya^ok'n [Krf.] | Sbauchi *mak^oan [Blz. 1990, 38] = *m^oa^o(k)an [GT]: Geji mekan [Gowers] = məkáj [IL] = meekaŋ/ŋ [Smz.] = mek^on [Krf.], Guruntum mian [Gowers] = myaŋ [Smz.], Kir ŋwe:n [Smz.], Buli min [Gowers] = miy^on [IL] = mye:n [Smz.], Tule mǎŋki [Smz.], Jimi mwaikan [Gowers], Pelu Tè-mèèkaŋ [Smz.], Zul mya^okan [Smz.], Barang myakan [Smz.] (SBch. data: Smz. 1978, 39, #76) || CCh. *ma-kanu [Blz. 1990, 38] = *m^oā^okan (?) [GT]: Ga'anda mahk^on [Krf.], Hwona ma^on [Krf.] | Bura and Margi makər [Wolff], Margi-Gwara makəno [Wolff], Chibak mak< [IL] = makər [Wolff] | Bata mooaakén [Str.] = mwakən [Mch. 1950, 59], Bachama mùwa:kún [Skn.], Nzangi mw^okən [Mch. 1950, 59] = menfén (sic) [Str.], Gudu makĀn [IL] | Sukur má:k^hĒn [IL] | Paduko makra [Mch. 1950, 59; Wolff] | Matakam makār [Schubert], Mofu máákār ~ mahkār [Br.], Gisiga-Dogba maakar [Lks.], Muturwa makir [Str. 1910, 456] (CCh.: Wolff 1974, 16). As far as I know, H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 36) was probably the first to point to the connection of the Ch. m-(^o)-k-n/r/d forms, Bed. √mhy, and SOM. *√mkn. V. Blažek (1990, 38) unified all extended varieties of PCh. *√kn „3” (prefix *m-, postfix *-d) with SOM. *makan under Common AA *(ma)-kanu-(di) „3”. Similarly, M. Lamberti (1993, 70) equated the South Omotic stem with the Chadic m-k-n forms under a South Afro-Asiatic *mVkkVn- „3”, which can only be true if we accept a prefix m- in both branches, which is certainly the case with PCh. *√kn „3”, but we do not yet know anything about SOM. *mākan in this respect, whereas Bed. √mhy can hardly be related as the ultimate root cannot be isolated as **√m^o.

Three scholars, E. Zyhlarz (1931, 135-136, §3), followed by O. Rössler (1966, 228; 1971, 284, 299) and V. Blažek (1987 MS, 14-15, §3.1; 1990, 38; 1993 MS, 5, §3.1; 1999, 32, §3) supposed a cognacy of Eg. √^omt with the Guanche word for „3” recorded as (Gran Canaria?) amelotti (cf. amierat-marava „13”) [Niccoloso da Recco], (Tenerife?) amiat [Pseudo-Sosa, Marín y Cubas, Berthelot] = amiet [Cedeño de Chil] (Guanche: Wölfel 1954, 4 and 14-18; 1965, 616 and 626-630), in which they (except for Rössler) included also Bed. √mhy. What the ultimate root of the Guanche forms (known to us only through the imperfect late medieval records and fully isolated in the whole Berber language family using a totally different root for „three”) is, has been answered different ways. E. Zyhlarz (l.c.) assumed √^omrt ~ √^omlt (with -t as part of the root), which he regarded as a correspondence of Eg. *√^om3t (???), but for the hypothetical -3- in the latter root he failed to present any proofs, let alone the enigma, how the Guanche *Anlaut* -Ø = Eg. -^o and where the reflex of the Guanche -r/-l- is in the Bedawye root. Later, however, Zyhlarz (1950, 407) offered a fully different analysis of the Guanche word: *amel^o-h^oT^o „der andere Zeiger” = „Mittelfinger”. J. D. Wölfel (1954, 4; 1965, 616), in turn, singled out the stems *amel(o)-, *amier- in the Gran Canaria records, but how these could be compatible with Tenerife (?) amia/et, he failed to definitely answer: „*Deux explications possibles: ou bien le -t appartient au radical, ou bien le -t de amiat est là à la place de -r- de amierat.*” Wölfel (1954, 6; 1965, 618) was convinced „*que le mot canarien pour « trois » n'a rien à faire ni avec l'égyptien, ni avec le mot bedja. ... ce mot reste inexplicé et complètement isolé.*” O. Rössler (l.c.) defined the root of the Guanche numeral as √^omt and derived it from an earlier AA *√«mt, which might theoretically be indeed a possible source Eg. √^omt may have originated from (due the incompatibility rule of AA *«t > Eg. ^ot, cf. EDE I 326-7). But he failed to explain why the Gran Canaria records have -r- and -l-. V. Blažek (1999 l.c.) has equally failed to explain both the anomaly of the *Anlaut* in Eg. vs. Guanche²⁰ and the -l-/-r- traceless in Egyptian. So his (Blažek 1990, 38) AA *^oami (?) „3” supposed to underlie in the Egyptian, Guanche, and Bedawye parallels remains also ill-founded.

²⁰ He solely relied upon an outline of Guanche vs. Berber consonantal correspondences (where Berber *γ/^o- > Guanche ^o-, h-, g-, but also Ø- is admitted) by A. Ju. Militarev (1991, 167-168, more precisely §7 on p. 168), who, however, did not present any etymological evidence either for the case of Guanche Ø-.

Eg. √fd (masc. pl. fd.w, fem. fd.t) „vier” (OK, Wb I 582): no Semitic cognates at all, although there were attempts at forcing it together with the numeral „4” in Semitic²¹ and Berber.²² Instead, its cognates are to be found in Cushito-Omotoc and they are especially widespread in Chadic, cf. Bed. *faTig „four” [GT],²³ supposed to derive from an older **fardig(a) [Blz. 1999, 33]²⁴ ||| NOM. *PeE- [from an older **fes-?] „four” [GT]²⁵ ||| Ch. *fwaTV [GT].²⁶ The common AA root here can only be *√fs.

In Lowland East Cushitic and in two Chadic groups, the root appears to be *√fr: LECu. *afr- [Black] = *afar-/*afur- [GT]²⁷ (LECu.: Rn. 1886, 845; PB 1963, 469; Black 1974, 104; Heine 1976, 215; Dlg. 1973, 231; Zbr. 1987, 328-340) ||| WCh.: Angas-Sura *fē₁r [Stl. 1977, 154] = *fir [Stl. 1987, 160] = *f'₂r [GT]²⁸ (Angas-Sura data: Grb. 1958, 300, #1; Jng. 1965, 166, 168, 180-181; Stl. 1972, 182; Hfm. 1975 MS, 18, #35; GT 2004, 105) || ECh.: PLayer

²¹ Several linguists (A. Trombetti 1902, 197, #4; K. Sethe 1916, 21-22; W. F. Albright 1918, 91 [with reservation]; A. Ember 1926, 302, fn. 10; 1930, #4.a.13; recently A. B. Dolgopolskij 1973, 231-232; 1983, 125; O. Rössler, followed by W. Schenkel 1990, 56; F. Kammerzell 1994, 170, 180 etc.) tried to demonstrate a relationship of Eg. fd (and/or LECu. *afar-) to Sem. *arba«- "4". The phonological anomalies were explained diverse irreal ways through unjustified steps in the suggested hypothetical chain of phonological changes, e.g. Eg. jfd < *rfd < *rbd < *rb« or Eg. jfd < *jfr < *jrf« < *rb«! The Eg.-Sem. equation was rejected already by numerous authors: W. F. Albright (1927, 201), E. Zyhlarz (1931, 136, #4), W. Vycichl (1934, 70, fn. 1; 1959, 33), W. A. Ward (1985, 239), V. Blažek (1999, 235-241; 1999, 32-38), H. C. Fleming (2000 MS, 6-7). As pointed out already by Zyhlarz (1931 l.c.), the expected correspondence of Sem. *arba«- would be Eg. *3f~ (or *rf~) on the analogy of Eg. sf~ = Sem. *šab«- "7". Besides, Stolbova (1987, 68) linked Sem. *arba«- to WCh. *rabu „2”, while Blažek (1997, 8; 1999, 235-241; 1999, 31-38) compared it to LECu.: Orm. (Wellega) bar"ū „palm of hand” [Gragg 1982] and eventually NOM. *biraT- (sic) „finger” [Blz.].

²² No evident cognates in Berber. The common Brb. root for "four" can by no means be related to Bed.-Eg.-Ch. *√fs "four" as proposed by Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1967, 43; 1974, 110; 1975, 50), H. Jungraithmayr (1982, 8; JI 1994 I, 73), cf. e.g. NBrb.: Shilh: Sus qqo [Dst. 1938, 237] | Nefusa okkoz [Lst. 1931, 285] || EBrb.: Ghadames aqqiz [Lst.] || SBrb.: Ahaggar okko [Lst.], Ghat okkoz [Nhl. 1909, 195]. Cp. WCh. *kuEA „nine” [Stl. 1987, 208, #590]. Comparing Berber „4” to Eg. fd was rightly rejected already by M. G. Mercier (1933, 309) and recently by V. Blažek (ll.c.). V. Brugnatelli (1982, 76), followed by V. Blažek (1997, 9; 1999, 235-241, #4; 1999, 32-38, #4) compared SBrb.: Ahaggar ê-feT, pl. ê-ft-en "quantité innombrable (nombre qui dépasse tout ce qu'on peut compter)" [Fcd. 1951-2, 305, cf. Prs. 1974, 407], ETawlemmet ə-fəT "se multiplier", e-fəT, pl. e-fəT-ən „1. million, 2. nombre immense” [PAM 1998, 59]. For the semantic shift Blažek quoted Khoe thiyà "four" vs. thiyà "many". Blažek (ll.c.) suggested alternatively NBrb.: Iznasen, Ait Ammart, Iboqqoyen, Ait Tuzin ta-ftèn-t "orteil" [Rns. 1932, 298] | Qabyle ti-fden-t „orteil” [Dlt. 1982, 191] = (dial.) ti-fədn-in "orteils, doigts de pied” [Zvd.] || EBrb.: Gdm. ta-fadən-t „toe” [Lanfry], which is semantically dubious.

²³ Attested as Bed. faTTeg [Kremer] = fardik [Krockow] = ferdik [Lucas] = faTig [Rn. 1894, 10; 1895, 76] = fáTig [Rn. 1890, 7; Rpr. 1928, 179] = faTig [Hds.], Bed. of Beni Amer farig [Rn.] (Bed. records: Dlg. 1966, 60; Blz. 1993, 6-7, #4.1; 1999, 235ff.; 1999, 32ff.).

²⁴ There are controversial theories on the etymological analysis of Bed. "4". A. Trombetti (1902, 197) explained it from PCu. *afar-dig. E. Zyhlarz (1932-1933, 167): Bed. *faTí-g extended by "ein Numeral zusammenfassendes Suffix *-ga", cf. Bed. -ga „a dual and plural ending” [Rpr. 1928, 183]. I. M. D'jakonov (1965, 47), did not exclude even an archetype *šaTig (sic). Acc. to W. Vycichl (1960, 255, 262; 1978, 75), Eg. fd and Bed. "4" are not at all cognates (Vycichl explained Bed. -T- from an ancient *₁ or *g!). V. Blažek (1993 MS, 6-7, #4.1; 1997, 5; 1999, 235-241, #; 1999, 32-38, #4) supposed PBed. *fa[rd]ig, derived from a compound *fari-da-g(a), where Bed. -g would be identical with Bed. -ga „a dual and plural ending” [Rpr. 1928, 183] and the prefix *g- of numerals (presumed already by V. Ja. Porhomovskij in PKotoko *gVTV "four" < *g-fVTV?). Ch. Ehret (1995, #93), in turn, derived Bed. -T- from PAA *-dl- [i.e. *-o-]!

²⁵ Attested in Janjero hēE-a [h- < *p^h-] „quarter (fraction)” [Flm.] | Mocha p³E-o [E < *s possible] „quarter” [Lsl. 1959, 44] = β³E-o „quarter, fourth” [Flm.] | Mao (sic) be@e ~ me@e [-ts'-] „four” [Flm.], Hozo bæcI [-ts-] „four”, Sezo bæ[é ~ bè[é „four” (Mao: Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 13; NOM.: Flm. 2000 MS, 6-7).

²⁶ The underlying root for "4" has been exceptionally well preserved nearly in all Chadic lgs. This uniformity cannot be found in the case of other Chadic numerals. For a very detailed presentation and analysis of the reflexes in the Chadic daughter languages see EDE II 600-602. D. Ibrizomow (1988, 68-69) supposed an old quadrinary counting system in Chadic. The PCh. etymon has been set up in various forms: *p^hwVTV [IS 1966, 21] = *f-T- [NM 1966, 235, #38] = *fwaTə [Nwm. 1977, 26] = *fwVTV/*VfwVTV [Dlg. 1983, 125] = *-p-T [JS 1981, 113; JI 1994 I, 73] = *(m)-p-T-(w/y) [JS 1981, 113A] = *fid-oT- (sic) [Stl. 1996, 29]. O. V. Stolbova (1987, 160, §136) has WCh. *firadu Bole

(PNancere) *p[o]ri [GT].²⁹ These data, according to our present knowledge, can by no means be explained from AA *√fs.³⁰

Eg. √dj (masc. dj.w, fem. dj.t) „fünf“ (OK-, WB V 420) has been unequivocally regarded as a nisbe (Osing: *dōy.aw „die zu einer Hand Gehörigen“) of the extinct Eg. word *d or *jd „hand“, akin to Sem. *yad- „hand“.³¹ A similar semantical shift is attested in SCu.: Dahalo dáwàtte „5“, act. *daḥa-wàtte, lit. „one hand“, cf. WRift-Dahalo *daba „hand“ (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 162, §ii.a.3). But out of phonological reasons, H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 45) and V. Blažek (1990, 30; 1991, 210) are presumably wrong in assuming a direct cognacy between the Dahalo and Ancient Egyptian numerals for „5“.

Eg. *√srs³² > √sjs (occurring as masc. pl. sjs.w, fem. sjs.t) „sechs“ (OK-, Wb IV 40) is, according to the *communis opinio*,³³ in the light of a few other instances of rhotacism of *d > Eg. r³⁴ (attested also in the Kefoid reflexes and a number of Chadic daughter languages quoted below), evidently identical with Sem. *šidš- „6“

pórdo [Koelle] = p'ordo (sic) [Stl.] elsewhere poTTo [Nwm., Lks.] = podo [Grb.] = poTTau ~ poTTo [Schuh 1982] = foTo [IS, NM, Haruna] = fōTTó [Schuh 1984] = fQTTQ [IL]. The PCh. etymon suggested by P. Newman (1977 l.c.) and A. Dolgopolsky (1983, l.c.) seems most convincing.

²⁷ The etymological connection of LECu. *afar- "4" to the Chado-Egyptian isogloss is debatable. E. Cerulli (1938 III, 153) traced back LECu. *af- to „common Cushitic“ (i.e., Cu.-Om.) *aft. A. B. Dolgopolsky (1973, 231; 1983, 125; 1988, 629, #6), in turn, with special regard to LECu. met. var. *arf- (above), connected LECu. *afar- to Sem. *arba- "4", which he explained as a met. of an earlier *√br<. Dolgopolsky's theory was queried by F. A. Dombrowski & B. W. W. Dombrowski (1991, 341). At the same time, Dolgopolsky (1983, 125) compared Sem.-LECu. "4" also to Bed.-Eg.-Ch. "4", although the LECu.-Sem. comparison excludes an equation of LECu. „4" with the Eg.-Ch. root. For the time being, most probable seems a common origin with LECu. *afar- from PAA *√fr.

²⁸ Contrary to O. V. Stolbova (1996, 29), who maintained AS *-r < Ch. *CVdVC (while PCh. *CVT- → AS *CVt), I see no justification for explaining AS *-r = PPlay *-r from common Ch. *-T.

²⁹ Cf. Nancere peri [Hfm.], Lele poring [Hfm.] = pōring [WP 1982, 77], Dormo porin [Hfm.], Gabri porin [AF] = pari [Dcr.], Chire porbu [Hfm.], Kabalay pori [Hfm.] (Lay gr.: Hfm. 1972, 204).

³⁰ The underlying PAA form has been heavily debated. Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1974, 110; 1975, 50): PAA *√fd (incorrect, since AA plain *-d > Bed. -d ~ -t = Ch. *-d). I. M. D'jakonov (1986, 61; 1988, 67): PAA *√fVdC/*√fVrC (where C denotes an unclear weak consonant in final position). V. Blažek (1987 MS, #4.2, 1990, 29; 1993, 6-7, #4.1; 1999, 235-241, #; 1999, 32-38, #4) suggested PAA *fira-du/*fari-du/*faru-di. He explained Eg. & Om. *-d- vs. Bed. & Ch. *-T- from a cluster *-rd-, i.e. PEg. *fida[r]wa.t < *faridwa.t (?) ||| PBed. *faridaga > *fa[rd]ig (still preserved in some old records as fardik [Krockow] = ferdik [Lucas], quoted after Almkvist 1883-1887) ||| POM. *aburd- or sim. ||| PCh. *faridu/*farudi (cf. Stolbova 1987, 160, #136: WCh. *firadu). This reasoning might be valid at least in Bed., cf. Bed. fTa ~ furda „Molo, Ankerplatz“ < Ar. furT-at- „anchorage, sea-port“ [Rn. 1895, 82]. In Eg. too (Eg. fd < *f3d = *frd would be plausible). The case of Chadic is more problematic, where we would need to collect sufficient and convincing evidence for common Chadic *-T- = Angas-Sura and PPlay *-r < AA *-rd-. F. Kammerzell (1994, 22-26; 1994, 180), in turn, proposed a development of Eg. fd = *fissá- < *firsá- < *firdá- to set up PAA *√PrD, var. *√PrG „four“ (though *-G is not justified by the reflexes), based on Eg., Bed., LECu., NOM., Ch. „four“ and Sem. *arba- (!).

³¹ Müller 1909, 191, fn. 2; Sethe 1916, 22, §5; 1927, 60-61; NBÄ 313; Brunner-Traut in LÄ II 582; Loprieno in LÄ V 1213, n. 26 and in VI 1308. Ultimately, the same idea was accepted by L. Homburger (1928, 336-337), albeit in a chaotic form (misquoting the Eg. word as d.t pace Lexa 1922, 176, a rude mistake!) and along with a number of dubious African parallels.

³² The older Eg. root *√srs was still preserved by srs ~ sjs „Art Leinen: Sechsgewebe“ (MK, Wb IV 40, 8 and 200, 17).

³³ For the Eg.-AA etymology see Erman 1892, 117 and 127, fn. 1; Ember 1911, 89; 1912, 90, fn. 4; 1914, 303; Sethe 1916, 19-20; Albright 1918, 90, fn. 2 and 91; 1926, 188-189; Farina 1926, 21; Behnk 1927, 82, #16; ESS §4.i; Zyhlarz 1931, 134, 137; Vycichl 1934, 42, 77; 1953, 42; 1957, 21; 1958, 378; Greenberg 1955, 60; 1963, 62; D'jakonov 1965, 47 (with doubts about Eg. srs); Rössler 1966, 227; Zavadovskij 1974, 108, #9; 1975, 48; Hodge 1975, 15 and 24, #161; Loprieno 1986, 1308 and 1316, n. 25-26; Blažek 1987 MS, 31; 1999, 39-42, §6; Bomhard 1988, 446-447; OS 1988, 79, #64 (excluding Eg. srs); Dombrowski-Dombrowski 1991, 342; Lipiński 1997, 287, §35.11; Schenkel 1997, 114, Abb. 4, n. 4. Apparently ignoring the facts of an occasional development of Eg. r < *d (below), V. Blažek (1990, 39-40) surprisingly denied the cognacy of Egyptian and Semitic „6“ and, instead, he preferred the phonologically naturally more comfortable equation of Eg. *srs with Sem. *talāt- „3“, which he even extended to ECU. *s/šaz(i)- „3“ explaining its *-z- with a nowhere attested shift of *-z- < *-ls- < *-lč-.

³⁴ Cf. (1) Eg. rj.t "Farbe zum Schreiben und Zeichnen, Tinte" (MK, Wb II 399, 9-12) equated by Th. O. Lambdin (1953, 149) and O. Rössler (1966, 227) with NWSem. *√dy: OT Hbr. (hapax) dāyō, Aram. dāyūtā, Syr. dāyōtā, dāyūtā "ink", which is suggested to be an early loan from MEG. But even so, the change r ~ d is highly remarkable. Contrary to Rössler, Lambdin explained OT Hbr. dāyō as a graphemic error for *rāyō, which contradicts the rest of the Canaanite evidence. (2) Eg. ḥrd "child" (PT, Wb III 396-398) equated by O. Rössler (1971, 296, 306) with Sem.: Geez ṭadās „a small amount, little, a little while, few in number ...“ [Lsl.], cf. Geez √-ss „to be small“ etc. (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 269).

[Sethe] = *šid̥t- [Djk., Lipiński]³⁵ ||| Brb. *√sds > *sadis (south) vs. *sddis (north) „6” [Zhl.] = *sids [Djk.] = *saTis ~ *sūTus with *-T- < *-dd- [Blz. pace Prasse] = *sTis [Lipiński]. Among the derivatives of Common Afro-Asiatic „6”, the above listed forms including Egyptian undoubtedly represent reflexes of a Northern AA *√sds, whereas the related Southern Afro-Asiatic daughter languages display the original biconsonantal *√sd, which had apparently a rhotacistic variety *√sr, cf. NOm. (borrowed from Ethio-Sem.): Sheko šir-itt-o „6” [Lmb.] | PKefoid (PGonga) *šir-itt- „6” [GT]:³⁶ Kafa šir-itt- ō [Crl. 1951, 307] = širr-it-o [Bnd. 1971, 259] = širr-it-o [Lmb.], Mocha šir-itt-o [Lsl. 1959, 52] = šir-itt-o [Bnd. 1971, 260], Shinasha šir-t-a [Schuver in Grottanelli 1940, 103] = šir-t-a [Grottanelli 1940, 103; 1941, 266] = (Bworo) šir-itt-ě [Brauner 1950, 70; Bnd. 1971, 259] = širr'ta [Lmb.], Anfillo šir-t-o [Grottanelli 1940, 103; Bnd. 1971, 258; so also Lmb.] (Kefoid data: PB 1963, 468; Zbr. 1987, 384; Lmb. 1993, 379) ||| WCh. *sidu „6” [Stl. 1987, 176, #288]: Hausa *sidda [Grb., Djk.] > šidà, Sokoto dial. šiddà [Abr. 1962, 809],³⁷ Gwandara šidà [Mts. 1972, 108] | Ngizim sedu [Koelle] = zĀdù [Schuh 1981, 179] = zìdù [Krf.], Bade Āzdù [Krf.] || CCh.: Gidar sèrré [Str. 1910, 457] = t̄irre (θ-) ~ šire [Mch.] | PMusgu *šār- ~ *šir- [GT] > Musgu saara (sic, s-, probably for sl-) [Roeder] = šáara (g-) [Krause] = taara (sic, t-, probably for tl-) [Overweg] = tará (sic, t-, probably for tl-) [Rohlfš], Mbara širá (V-) [TSL 1986, 270], Kad'a širè (sl-) [Brt.-Jng. 1993, 133], Munjuk šaara [Trn. 1991, 117] = šààrà [Brt.-Jng. 1993, 133] (Musgu group data: Lks. 1941, 76) || ECh.: Kwang-Modgel sidee [Lks. 1937, 96].³⁸ Especially from the standpoint of SAA *√sr, noteworthy is the suggestion by V. Blažek (1987 MS, 31) about a possible ancient areal parallel like PDravidian *caru „6” [DED §2051].

Eg. √sf̄ (masc. sf̄.w, fem. sf̄.t) "sieben" (OK, Wb IV 115) is identical with Sem. *šib«- [Conti l.c.] = *šáb«- "7" [Dlg. 1986, 79, #16] has long been commonly accepted.³⁹ The Amarna cuneiform evidence (šap̄-a) and the Coptic one, cf., e.g., (S) cas=f, corroborate the vocalization *saf̄.aw (m) vs. *saf̄.at (f). The *Lautverschiebung* of Eg. *-« > -̄ was explained by K. Sethe (1916, 20, §7), F. Behnk (1927, 82), and A. Loprieno (1986, 1316, n. 27) – correctly – on the basis of the analogy of Eg. ws̄ vs. Sem. *√wš« „wide”, although they did

(3) Eg. srq "öffnen" (PT, Wb IV 201-203) compared by O. Rössler (1966, 227) with Ar. √sdq "weit öffnen" [Rsl.] = „avoir les coind de la bouche très-larges (se dit d'un homme dont la bouche est très-large quand il l'ouvre)" [BK I 1205]. Surprisingly ignoring these facts, V. Blažek (1990, 39-40) denied the cognacy of Eg. and Sem. „6” and instead, he preferred the phonologically naturally more comfortable equation of Eg. *srs with Sem. *šalāṭ- „3”, which he even extended to ECu. *šaz-, *šiz-, *sazi- „3” [Sasse 1976, 138] explaining its *-z- with a nowhere attested shift of *-z- < *-ls- < *-lč-.

³⁵ Most reflexes in the Semitic daughter languages reflect the third radical as *-š, only Old South Arabian has -ṭ (cf. SD 175: Sabaic sḏṭ), which, following Garbini (1972), Loprieno (1986, 1316, n. 25-26) considered as a result of a dissimilation. The Ugaritic evidence, in turn, speaks for √ṭḏṭ (DUL 900), which G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín (l.c.) explained from *√ṭḏṭ via assimilation. For the Semitic derivatives with the assimilation of the 2nd and 3rd radicals see Brockelmann 1907, 170-171, §60.a; Moscati et al. 1964, 119, §14.8; Grande 1972, 107. Attractive is V. Blažek's (1990, 30; 1999, 41) approach towards the partially reduplicative root structure of the Sem.-Eg.-Brb. isogloss: he supposed in PSem. an older *šid-šid- „3 + 3” or *šid-ṭin- „3 x 2” and so assumed a hypothetical PSem. **šid- (with an earlier *-ḏ-) „3”, which he identified with the isogloss of Akk. šīzum, later šizū „Drittel-Elle” [AHW 1254] ||| ECu. *šaz-, *šiz-, *sazi- „3” [Sasse 1976, 138]. The problem is, however, that the Afro-Asiatic evidence does not a bit support the reconstruction of Sem. **šidš- à la Blažek, whose 2nd radical must have certainly been *-d-.

³⁶ Following E. Cerulli (1951, 309, §xxiv.1), M. Lamberti (1993, 379), V. Blažek (1987 MS, 31; 1999, 40) too explained the Kefoid forms as loans from Ethio-Semitic *√sds, but among its reflexes he referred to (Leslau 1963, 137) there is not one single with -r- < *-d-, let alone that the Northern Omotic reflexes do not at all reflect the semi-reduplicative root *√sds. The way W. Leslau (1959, 52) argued for a borrowing („the Semitic Ethiopic saddast was taken over in a modified form”) did not answer any of the phonological questions. It remains thus but to accept the genetically inherited nature of Kefoid „6”.

³⁷ Earlier, when the rest of the Chadic data was unknown to the comparative linguists, the Hausa word was explained as an Arabic loan (e.g., Greenberg 1945, 94 with the understandable note „derivation doubtful”), but the wide range of Chadic cognates (impossible to be regarded as coming from Arabic) has made it evident that the Chadic numeral is genetically inherited from the Common Afro-Asiatic lexical stock.

³⁸ **Strangely**, H. G. Mukarovskij (1987, 38), equated the Chadic numeral (instead of the Sem.-Eg.-Brb. isogloss < AA *√sds) with the ECu. numeral for „3”, which he reconstructed as *√sd, although H.-J. Sasse (1976, 138-139, 135) assumed ECu. *šazi-/*šVz- „3”.

³⁹ See Reinisch 1874, XII; Erman 1892, 118; Ember 1911, 91; 1912, 90, fn. 4; 1926, 308, #2; Sethe 1916, 20, §7; ESS §9.b.2; Albright 1918, 91; 1923, 68, fn. 1; 1926, 189; 1927, 199-201; Lang 1923-1924, 552; Farina 1924, 316; 1926, 14; Behnk 1927, 82; Zyhlarz 1931, 137, §7; Lexa 1938, 223; Rössler 1952, 142, #66; 1966, 228; Vycichl 1958, 378; Illič-Svityč 1964, 7, #22; D'jakonov 1965, 47; Zavadovskij 1974, 109, #10; 1975, 49; Hodge 1976, 15, #162; Conti 1978, 28, fn. 2; Loprieno 1986, 1308; 1994, 120; 1995, 32; Blažek 1990, 31; Lipiński 1997, 287, §35.12.

not realize the reason thereof.⁴⁰ We have here, in fact, to do with the influence of the *Anlaut* in the following numeral (Eg. $\bar{m}n$, cf. Blažek 1999, 43) and, more importantly, a *Lautverschiebung* generated by the incompatibility of *s* + \llcorner in the same Eg. root (EDE I 326). As for the anomalous Eg. *-f-*, W. Vycichl (1958, 398) postulated a combinatoric change due to the cluster $-f^- < *f^- < *p^- < *b^-$ (?).⁴¹ Whether the Berber numeral for „7” is also related as it was suggested by a number of authors,⁴² is, presumably, hardly a question itself, but the disturbingly anomalous loss of $*b^-$ even in the East Berber and Tuareg reflexes has to be answered,⁴³ cf. NBrb.: Tazerwalt *ssa* (m), *ssa-t* (f) [Prasse] || EBrb.: Ghadames *sā* (m), *sā-t* (f) [Lanfry 1973, 327, #1410] || SBrb.: Ahaggar *e-ssa* (m), *e-ssāh-et* (f) [Fcd. 1951-2, 1798] = *ə-ssa* (m), *ə-ssāh-ət* (f) etc. [Prasse 1969, 89, #620], Ghat *sah-et* (f) [Nhl. 1909, 66, 205]. The underlying PBrb. root is thus disputable.⁴⁴ The attestation of this root for „7” in Southern Afro-Asiatic is sporadic and not without doubts, cf. LECu.: Elmolo *s’ápa* „7” [Heine 1980, 209] = *sapa* [Lmb.]⁴⁵ || NOm. (borrowed from Ethio-Sem.?): Sheko *šabátto* „7” [Lmb.] | Kefoid **šab-att-* „7” [GT]⁴⁶ > Kafa *šabátto* (cf. *šábo* „70”) [Crl. 1951, 307] = *šabatto* [Lmb.], Mocha *šabátto* (cf. *šáb/bo* „70”) [Lsl. 1959, 49], Shinasha *sawáte* [Schuver] = *šawata* [Grottanelli 1940, 103; 1941, 266] = *šawatta* [PB] = *šawāta* [Lmb.], Bworo *šawátě* [Brauner 1950, 70; Bnd. 1971, 259], Anfillo *šabátto* [Grottanelli 1940, 103; Bnd. 1971, 258] (Kefoid: PB 1963, 468, 478; Zbr. 1983, 384; Lmb. 1993, 385) || SOM.: Hamer *so”b-a* [Flm.], Karo *sopb-o* [Flm.] (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 157)⁴⁷ || CCh.: PMafa-Mada **čib-* „7” [GT]:⁴⁸ Mofu *čibe* (tsch-) [Str. 1922-3, 122], Gwendele *cíba* [Colombel], Hurzo *cíba* [Colombel] = *čí0à* [Rsg. 1978, 322, #622]. It remains for the later research to clarify whether the isogloss of ECU. **tVzb-* „7” [Sasse 1976, 139]⁴⁹ || POM. **tabz-* „7” [GT]⁵⁰ is eventually also related with a prefix *t-* (?) and a secondary voicing of ***s-* in the cluster with **b-*, i.e., ***tasb(«)-* > **tazb-* (hence POM. **tabz-* via metathesis < ***tazb-*?). The lack of any trace **-«* is, in any case, a not too supportive circumstance.

Eg. $\sqrt{\bar{m}n}$ (masc. $\bar{m}n.w$, fem. $\bar{m}n.t$) „acht” (OK-, WB III 282) is to be vocalized on the basis of its Amarna cuneiform reflex $\bar{a}man$ (Albright 1926, 188-189) and the Coptic evidence, e.g., (S) *smoun* as $*\bar{a}mZn.[\check{a}]w$,

⁴⁰ W. F. Albright (1918, 91) assumed the chain of phonetic shifts: Eg. $sf^- < *sf^- < *sf^- < *sb^-$. A. Ember (1926, 308, fn. 4-6) was, in turn, inclined to explain the change by „*partial assimilation*” of \llcorner to *f* and that of *b* to *s*, for which he, however, failed to provide any parallel evidence. A. Loprieno (1994, 120) arbitrarily extracted the Egypto-Semitic parallel from a common $*\sqrt{s^3\gamma}$, but he failed to demonstrate the evidence for its nowhere attested $*-^3-$ and $*-\gamma-$.

⁴¹ Where V. Blažek (l.c.) attributed the presence of *-s-* also some importance with a hint on Eg. $\bar{s}b$ (PT 448c^w), an occasional variety of standard $\bar{s}f$ „*abwehren*” (OK-, AÄG 51, §114).

⁴² Zyhlarz 1931, 137, §7; Rössler 1952, 142, #66; 1966, 228; D’jakonov 1965, 47; Vycichl 1966, 269; 1974, 63; 1992, 385; Zavadovskij 1967, 43; 1974, 109, #10; 1975, 49; Blažek 1990, 31; Lipiński 1997, 287, §35.12

⁴³ There is a small number of Ghadames and Augila words, where PBrb. $*b^-$ is not reflected as expected (namely, as \underline{b}), cf. Kossmann 1999, 79-80, §3.11; also Blažek 1999, 43 (discussing the case of the word for „heart”).

⁴⁴ PBrb. $*\sqrt{sw}$ > Tuareg **sa* [Zhl.] = **assa* ^u < **asba* ^u [Rsl. 1952 l.c.] = **sa«* (sic, -«) < **sah«* < ***sab«* (?) [Djk.] = $*\sqrt{s^3}$ [Rsl. 1966 l.c.] = $*\sqrt{h_1sh_2}$ [Prasse l.c.] = **sa* [Zvd., Lpn.] = **sāh* [Blz. 1990 l.c.]. In the view of Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1967, 43), the „*берберская форма представляется апокопированной*”. M. Kossmann (1999, 76, §3.7, #106), in addition, who did not even list Brb. „7” among the instances of $*b^-$, conceived the *-h-* appearing in Tuareg fem. forms (Ahaggar *e-ssāh-et*, Ghat *sah-et*) as intrusive in certain fem. numerals whose stem ends in long vowel.

⁴⁵ B. Heine (1973, 282), however, recorded Elmolo *tôpa* „sieben”, which continues ECU. **tVzb-*.

⁴⁶ Generally in Ethio-Semitic and Omotic studies (e.g., Cerulli 1951, 309, §xxiv.1; Leslau 1959, 49; Lamberti 1993, 385), the Kefoid numeral is supposed to have been borrowed from Ethio-Semitic, cf. Amh. *sābatt*. But what explains the anomalous *Anlaut* in a loan?

⁴⁷ L. Bender (l.c.) suspected (with a question-mark) in these Southern Omotic forms borrowing from Arabic.

⁴⁸ Some of the Mafa-Mada group forms were first compared with Sem. **šab«-* by V. Blažek (1990, 31, 38), who, however, included in this equation also his ECh. **ca0u* „3” (although the evidence suggests rather **sūb-*, cf. JI 1994 II 327), for which cf. rather LECu.: Elmolo *s’pe* „3” [Heine 1980, 209].

⁴⁹ The East Cushitic word was borrowed into PBaz **tizzaba* → PSNilotic **tisAp* → NMa’a *sapa* (Heine & Rottland & Voßen 1979, 85).

⁵⁰ Attested in NOm.: Basketo *tabz-ā* [Crl. 1938, 108], Doko *tabz-ā* [CR 1927, 248], Dollo *tābez-ā* [CR 1927, 250] | Dizoid **tubs-* [GT]: Dizi *t³s-ú* [Allan 1976, 381] = *tus-u* [Toselli 1938, 13] < **tuss-* < **tubs-* [GT], Sheko *tubs-u* [CR 1925; Bnd. 1971, 262] || SOM.: Hamer *tobb-a* [Cr. 1942, 262], Karo *tsōb-ā* (sic, *ts-*) [CR 1927, 252], Ari *tabz-a* [Bnd. 1971, 263] = *tabž-á* [Bnd.], Galila (Ari) *tabž-á* [Flm.], Bako *tabz-e* [Da Trento 1941, 206], Dime *toss-um* [Bnd.] = *t³ss-o* [Flm.] < **tuss-* < **tubs-* [GT] (SOM. data: Bnd. 1994, 157).

which almost perfectly coincides with Sem. *ṭamāniy- „8”.⁵¹ This comparison has been commonly accepted⁵² in spite of the disturbingly anomalous *Anlaut*. After several vain attempts at resolving this mystery,⁵³ the most natural reason is easy to be found, namely the influence of the *Auslaut* of the preceding numeral ($\sqrt{\text{sf}^-}$), a quite natural phenomenon leading to phonologically irregular numerals,⁵⁴ i.e., analogy, which V. Blažek (1999, 45, §8) in this case avoided even to mention as an alternative. Whether Brb. *ṭam „8” [Djk.] = *ṭām/*hittām „8” [Prasse] belongs to the firmly established triconsonantal Sem.-Eg. *ṭmn, is heavily debated as both the lack of the C₃ and the *Anlaut* are anomalous.⁵⁵ Turning against the conventionally accepted equation of the Egyptian, Semitic, and Berber roots above, V. Blažek (1991, 210; 1993 MS, 6, §3.5; 1999, 45, §8) step by step excluded every single of the three *comparanda*. For him, Brb. *ṭ- vs. Sem. *ṭ- was an otherwise unattested match, which is, however, not fully true.⁵⁶ Therefore, he proposed a fully new etymology for Berber „8”, namely SCu.: PRift *ṭam- „3” [Ehret],⁵⁷ where he assumed a pattern of (5 +) 3 = 8 to have worked just as in the case of ECu. *šā/iz- „3” vs. *šā/izzet- „8”. This suggestion seems indeed attractive. But Blažek found (pace Holmer 1966, 35) it also evident that Eg. ṭmn is „*deriving quite naturally from*” Eg. ṭmt „3” (!) the same way, whereas he told us nothing about the way of this derivation, e.g., where did the -t of „3” disappear in „8”, or, what the function of -n

⁵¹ In a surprising manner, A. Loprieno (1986, 1308, n. 28), also here, misinterpreted Ar. ṭ- as a reflex of Sem. *š- (as in the case of Ar. $\sqrt{\text{sdt}} < \text{Sem. } *šdš$) and misleadingly presented it as a *communis opinio*, which is naturally not at all the case (cf., e.g., Moscati et al. 1964, 43, §8.59).

⁵² Hommel 1883, 96, #11; Erman 1892, 116; Ember 1911, 91; 1930, #10.a.32, #11.a.46; Albright 1918, 92; 1926, 188-189; 1927, 200-201; Farina 1924, 324; 1926, 20; Behnk 1928, 82, #28; Zyhlarz 1931, 137-138; Bravmann 1933, 147; Lexa 1938, 224; Rössler 1952, 146, #73; 1966, 228; Vycichl 1959, 33; 1966, 269; 1974, 63; 1992, 385; D’jatonov 1965, 47; Zavadovskij 1967, 43; 1974, 109, #11; 1975, 47; Hodge 1976, 15, #163; Loprieno 1986, 1308, cf. fn. 28; Belova 1989, 14; Blažek 1990, 31; Schenkel 1991, 116; Dombrowski-Dombrowski 1991, 347.

⁵³ So, for instance, K. Sethe (1916, 20, §8) correctly stated that Eg. ṭ- vs. Sem. *ṭ are „*sonst nicht belegt*”, but because of m + n, such a shift may undoubtedly have taken place, and, in addition „*vergegenwärtigt man sich*” assuming that Eg. ṭ > Cpt. S worked „*ebenso wie*” Sem. *ṭ > Hbr. š, which, however, is an error and does not prove a bit about Eg. ṭ- vs. Sem. *ṭ-. Sethe concluded that „*So wird man auf die Vermutung geführt, daß in diesem š nahestehender Laut das Ursprüngliche gewesen sei, und daß das äg. ṭ nur eine unvollkommene Wiedergabe desselben darstelle*”. W. F. Albright (1918, 92 and fn. 2), in turn, assumed a chain of shifts (Eg. ṭmn < *šmn < *ṭmn), where, in his view, „*š for θ arises by dissimilation from the dental n*”, although, *pro primo*, OK ṭ- has not been known as a phoneme issuing from older *š, and, *pro secundo*, the expected Egyptian reflex of Sem. *ṭmn is not at all *šmn but *smn! Of course, a shift of Eg. ṭ- < *s- is otherwise unknown. Later Albright (1927, 200-201) worked with the *Lautverschiebung* of Eg. ṭmn < *fmn < *ṭmn, which he equally failed to justify.

⁵⁴ Cf., e.g., Old Church Slavic devęť „9” < IE *new, under the influence of OChSlavic *desęť „10”.

⁵⁵ The Sem.-Eg.-Brb. comparison was supported by O. Rössler (1952, 146, #73; 1966, 228); W. Vycichl (1959, 33; 1966, 269; 1974, 63; 1992, 385); I. M. D’jatonov (1965, 47); Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1967, 43; 1974, 109, #11; 1975, 47). Rössler (1952, 146, #73) assumed PLibyan *ṭamnu(m), *ṭanatu (f), hence *ṭam, (m), *ṭam,t and regarded *ṭ- as regular (!) for Sem. *ṭ-. Later, in turn, Rössler (1966, 228) considered *Anlaut* of the Berber numeral „*mit t für lautgesetzliches s*” as being due to assimilation to „9” (Brb. *ṭh). The change of m < *mn was explained by D’jatonov (1965, 47) via assimilation < *ṭamn. Similarly, for Zavadovskij (1967, 43) too, the Berber „*форма кажется апокопированной*” from the triconsonantal PAA root.

⁵⁶ Cf. SBrb.: EWlmd. a-tākamma, pl. i-tākamma-t-än „bras supérieur” [PAM 2003, 785] ||| Sem. *ṭVkm- „neck and shoulders” [SED]: Ug. ṭkm „1. Nacken mit Schulter, 2. oberer Teil eines Gebäudes” [WUS] = „shoulder” [DUL 903], Hbr. š:kem „der Nacken mit den Schulterblättern, bes. als Körperteil, auf dem man eine Last trägt, der Teil des Körpers (Rücken), auf den man jem. schlägt, 2. Landstrich, eigtl. Rücken des Landes” [GB] = „1. the (nape of the) back or neck of a person, 2. shoulder (as a part of the body on which to carry a heavy load), the shoulder joint (as a part of the carcass of a sacrificial animal)” [KB] (Sem.: GB 826-7; WUS 334, #2866; Faber 1984, 210, #50; Lsl. 1987, 496; Voigt 1994, 107; KB 1492-3; SED I 251, §281) ||| PCu. *sVnk^w- „1. затылок, спина, плечо, 2. то место, на котором носят грузы” [Dlg.] = *sVkm- → *sVmk- „shoulder” [GT]. From AA *ṭčkm „shoulder” [GT]. Cf. also Dlg. 1983, 136, #9.2 (Sem.-Bed.-LECu.). Hardly a borrowing from Arabic, where its reflex (if related at all ...) has undergone serious semantical shift, cf. Ar. ṭakam- „1. (tracé du) chemin, (milieu de la) route” [BK I 231b] = ṭakam-, ṭukm-at- „1. milieu (du chemin), 2. chemin, voie” [Blachère 1210a] = ṭakm- (sic) „shoulder (of road)” (sic) [Faber]. Besides, A. Ju. Militarev (1991, 242) admitted AA *č > Brb. *s, (?) *š, and also *t (no question-mark), although he did not provide the lexical evidence.

⁵⁷ Which was combined by Ch. Ehret (1980, 290) with Dahalo „*ṭṭātṭṭni* „3rd day after tomorrow” to reconstruct SCu. *itām- „tris, set of three”.

of the latter numeral was. Thirdly, he saw in Sem. **tāmāniy*- "8", instead of a genetically inherited root **√tmn*, an inner Semitic innovation issuing from the contraction of a hypothetical compound ***tāniy-mā*/**tāniy-mā* „the second one no”, or alternatively from ***tāniy-*tāniy*-min*-(«*ašar*-) „the second from (ten)”. All this fails, however, due to the fact the same PAA biconsonantal root **√čm* for „8” appears also in Bed. *asemháy* ~ *asumhay* „acht” [Rn. 1895, 31] = *asimhél* [Roper 1928, 155]⁵⁸ ||| NOm.: PKefoid (Gonga) **šim-itt*- "8" [GT]⁵⁹. The Bedawye numeral is evidently not an Arabic loan, and a borrowing from Ethio-Semitic (suggested by E. Cerulli 1951, 309, §xxiv.1 and M. Lamberti 1993, 376) is also hardly the case with the Kefoid one (isolated within Omotic) for several reasons.⁶⁰

Eg. *√psd* "nine (9)" (OK, Wb I 558) is a word with very difficult etymology, traditionally identified with Sem. **tiš(a)*«- "9" [GT] (Sem. data: Moscati et al. 1964, 116),⁶¹ which may seem impossible at the first glance as, in fact, merely the second radicals agree. The initial *p*- in Eg. instead of an expected **t*- is unusual, which, after a few vain attempts,⁶² W. F. Albright,⁶³ followed by others,⁶⁴ correctly explained by the incompatibility of OEg. **ts*.⁶⁵ But they left the question, why this sequence turned into Eg. *ps*-, untouched. It is due to another incompatibility law, namely that of OEg. **s*«, which had to turn either to **s*ˀ (cf. EDE I 326) or **sd* (the irregular correspondence of Eg. -*d* vs. Sem. **-«* occurs in a number of convincing examples, among which there also roots void of *s*).⁶⁶ In either

⁵⁸ The Egyptian, Semitic, and Berber numerals „8” were first compared with that of the Beja by W. Vycichl (1959, 33).

⁵⁹ Attested in Kafa *šim-itt-ō* [Crl. 1951, 307; Bnd. 1971, 259] = *simm-ít-o* [PB] = *šimm-itt-o* [Lmb.: so also in Sheko!], Mocha *šim-ítt-o* [Lsl. 1959, 51; Bnd. 1971, 260], Shinasha *sim-it-a* [Schuver in Grottanelli 1940, 103] = *šim-at-a* [Grottanelli 1941, 266] = *šim-ítt-a* [PB] = *šamm-att-à* [Lmb.], Bworo *šim-ítt-ě* [Brauner 1950, 70; Bnd. 1971, 259], Anfillo *šim-itt-ó* [Grottanelli 1940, 103; Bnd. 1971, 258] (Kefoid data: PB 1963, 468; Zbr. 1983, 384; Lmb. 1993, 376).

⁶⁰ Hardly to be explained from **šimin-t*- to have the 3rd radical of ES **√smn* (as suggested by W. Leslau 1959, 51 with a hint on some Gurage dialects, where -*n*- was not preserved, cf. Chaha *sumut*, Muher, Selti *səmmut*, the vocalization of which do not fit, however), since, suspiciously, Kefoid 6, 7, 8 all have this suffix -*Vtt*-. In addition, how could have ES **s*- become Kefoid **š*- in case of a borrowing?

⁶¹ This Semito-Egyptian equation was accepted by A. Erman (1892, 111); W. M. Müller (1907, 303); A. Ember (1911, 91; 1912, 90, fn. 4; 1930, §8.c, 112, §18.a.9, §24.d.4); F. Hommel (1915, 16, #2); K. Sethe (1916, 20); W. F. Albright (1918, 92; 1923, 68; 1926, 189; 1927, 201); E. Zyhlarz (1931, 138, §7); Sh. Yeivin (1932, 137); H. Mercier (1933, 313-314); O. Rössler (1966, 228; 1971, 302, 307); Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1967, 43; 1974, 109, 112; 1975, 49); KHW 153; W. Schenkel (1990, 52, 57; 1991, 116; 1997, 114); J. Zeidler (1992, 205); G. Takács (1999, 141; 2000, 343-344, #8.3; EDE II 516-7). The Eg.-Sem. comparison was declined by C. T. Hodge (1976, 15, #164), V. Blažek (1997, 16; 1999, 250-251, #9; 1999, 46-47, #9), and E. Lipinski (1997, 288, #35.14).

Zhl. 1931, 138, #7 (Sem.-Brb.-?Eg.); Mrc. 1933, 313-314 (Brb.-Sem.-Eg.); Vcl. 1938, 135; 1966, 269; 1974, 63; 1992, 385 (Trg.-Ar.); Rsl. 1952, 143, #74 (Sem.-Brb.); 1966, 228; 1971, 302, 307 (Eg.-Brb.-Sem.); Zvd. 1967, 43 (Sem.-Brb.-?Eg.); 1974, 109, 112; 1975, 49 (Eg.-Brb.-Sem.); Zeidler 1992, 205 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); Takács 1999, 141; 2000, 343-344, #8.3 (Eg.-Brb.-ECh.-Sem.)

⁶² E.g., K. Sethe (1916, 20) compared this phenomenon to the regular change of PIE **k^wa/o-* → Gk. *πα/ο-* vs. PIE **k^we-* → Gk. *τε-*, which has, however, not been established in the Egyptian *Lautgeschichte* as a regular shift.

⁶³ Cf. Albright 1918, 92; 1923, 68; 1926, 189; 1927, 201.

⁶⁴ O. Rössler (1966, 228; 1971, 302, 307), W. Schenkel (1990, 52, 57).

⁶⁵ This reasoning seems acceptable, since the sequence of word initial **ts*- is not attested in Old and Middle Egyptian (cf. Wb I 328). Similarly, J. H. Greenberg (1950, 176) observed no instance of a dental followed by a sibilant in the Semitic root stock except for Sem. **√tš*« "9". For the frequent incompatibility problems in the Semitic numerals 1-10, cf. Greenberg 1950, 178, §5.

⁶⁶ (1) Eg. *sdm* < **smd* "to hear" (OK, Wb IV 144) ||| Sem. **√šm*« "to hear" (Eg.-Sem.: Hommel 1882, 9; 1894, 351, fn. 1; 1915, 16, fn. 3; Müller 1907, 303; Ember 1911, 91; 1912, 90, fn. 4; 1918, 30; 1926, 6; 1926, 309, fn. 8; Yeivin 1932, 137; Vycichl 1934, 63; Vergote 1945, 142, #16.b.23; Cohen 1947, #82; Schenkel 1993, 143 etc.). (2) Eg. *nds* "klein, gering" (PT-, Wb II 384-385) ||| Sem. **√n*«s "to be small, weak" [GT] (cf. Hommel 1883, 441, fn. 30; 1894, 351, fn. 1; 1915, 16, fn. 3; Erman 1892, 113; Ember 1912, 90, fn. 4; 1926, 6; 1926, 309, fn. 8; 1930, §11.a.43, §24.d.2; Vycichl 1934, 63; Vergote 1945, 147, §24.b.2; Cohen 1947, #80; Rössler 1966, 228). (3) Eg. *ndm* "süß, angenehm" (OK, Wb II 378-380) ||| Sem. **√n*«m "to be pleasant" [GT] (cf. Hommel 1883, 98; 1894, 351, fn. 1; 1915, 16, fn. 3; Erman 1892, 113; Müller 1907, 303; Ember 1911, 91; 1926, 6; 1930, §10.a.25, §11.a.41; §24.d.1; Vycichl 1934, 63; Vergote 1945, 147, §24.b.1; Cohen 1947, #81;

cases, we get a third radical which is compatible with p- only, the other possible voiceless stop to step in place of t- being k-, which is incompatible with both - and -d. The choice between -s- vs. -sd- was probably decided under the influence of Eg. *md* „10”.

Whether and how Berber „9” (usually bearing the consonants \sqrt{t} or \sqrt{tz}), reconstructed in various forms,⁶⁷ and frequently included in the Egypto-Semitic etymology above,⁶⁸ can be related, is disputed. It is evident, that the medial radicals (Brb. *- vs. Sem. *-š-) are not at all in agreement. In addition, V. Blažek (1999, 47) excluded the relationship of the Egypto-Semitic isogloss to Berber „9”, which he explained as a contraction of *t(V)-[k]ūah „[5] + 4”, cf. Brb. *hakkū „4” [Prasse].

The Southern Afro-Asiatic attestation of the root for „9” reflected in Semitic and Egyptian is scarce. It occurs in fact merely in ECh. * \sqrt{tgs} ~ * \sqrt{gst} „9” [GT]⁶⁹ as suggested by A. Trombetti (1977, 53) and G. Takács (1999, 141; 2000, 343-344, #8.3). The phonological correspondence of ECh. *-g- < AA *-« is not yet proven, however. As for the metathesis in East Chadic, it is noteworthy that V. Blažek (1990, 32; 1991, 210) supposes in Sem. *tiš«- „9” the reverse order of Sem. *«ašt- „1”.

Leaving aside the equation with Semitic „9”, G. Takács (EDE II 518) ventured alternatively a comparison of Eg. *psd* < *ps« with NOM. * \sqrt{bz} (stem vowel *-i-) „1” and „9” [GT],⁷⁰ which stands apparently isolated in Afro-Asiatic.

Eg. \sqrt{md} (masc. *md.w*, fem. *md.t*) "zehn" (OK, Wb II 184): in spite of the abundance of various etymologies suggested for it, until very recently a fully satisfactory solution has not been found. In any case, the Amarna cuneiform (14th cent. BC) evidence (*mu-su*)⁷¹ and Cpt. (SALMB) *myt* "ten" (CD 187b) suggest **mūdaw* (m) vs. (f) **md*’t (Edel 1955, 166-

Schenkel 1993, 143; Loprieno 1994, 120). (4) Eg. *dns* "to be heavy" (MK, Wb V 468-469) ||| LECu. *«ils-/*«uls- "heavy" [Sasse 1975, 245; 1976, 127] proposed by O. Röessler (1966, 228).

⁶⁷ PBrb. **tāah* (?) „9” [GT] = * \sqrt{ts} [Rössler 1966, 228] = *ta[[a]u [Rössler 1952, 143] = *ta [Zavadovskij 1974, 109; 1975, 49] = *tiāh ~ *tūah [Prasse 1974, 403, 404].

⁶⁸ See Zyhlarz 1931, 138, §7; Mercier 1933, 313-314; Vycichl 1938, 135; 1966, 269; 1974, 63; 1992, 385; Röessler 1952, 143, #74; 1966, 228; 1971, 302, 307; Zavadovskij 1967, 43; 1974, 109, 112; 1975, 49; Zeidler 1992, 205; Takács 1999, 141; 2000, 343-344, #8.3.

⁶⁹ Cf. Lay group * \sqrt{tgs} [GT]: Dormo tigesu [Hfm.], Gabri tigesu [AF] = tegès [Dcr.], Chire tíngěšū [Hfm.], Kabalay tegesu [Hfm.], Lay tegese [Hfm.] | PSomray * \sqrt{ts} or * \sqrt{ds} [GT]: Somray dōso [Barth], Ndam disa [Brue] = tiše [Décorse], Tumak disa [Décorse] = bisa [Brue], Miltu disa [Hfm.], Sarwa doso [Hfm.] | Mokilko gěssát [Lukas 1977, 210] = gěssát(t) [Jng. 1990, 101] (ECh. data: Hoffmann 1971, 9).

⁷⁰ Attested in SEOmeto *bizz-o „1” [GT]: Haruro (Kachama) bizz-o [Crl. 1936, 631, 642] = biz-ε [Sbr.], Zayse bizz-ō [Crl. 1938 III, 201] = bizz-o [Sbr.], Zergulla biz-o [Sbr.], Koyra (Badditu) bizz-ō [Crl. 1929, 60] = bīμ-o [Bnd.] = bížž-o [Hyw. 1982, 215] = bīμ-Q [Sbr.], Gidicho bīz-e [Bnd.] (SEOmeto: Bnd. 1971, 256-257; Zbr. 1983, 387; Sbr. 1994, 18) | Chara biz-ā „9” [Crl. 1938 III, 165] = biž-a ~ bi,-a „9” [Bnd. 1974, 19; Flm. 2000 MS, 7] | Sezo be[-é „9” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 15].

⁷¹ Occurs in a list of Egyptian words (EA 368), cf. Smith & Gadd 1925, 230-8, esp. 236, §15; Lambdin 1958, 186; Edel 1975, 11f.; 1980, 17 & fn. g.

176). Leaving aside the evidently untenable etymologies,⁷² we may only describe all the considerable solutions:

(1) F. Behnk (1928, 139, #33) saw in Eg. *m̄d* [possibly < **mg*] a metathesis of WCh.: Hausa *góómà* "10" [Brg. 1934, 397; Abr. 1962, 332] = *góómà* [Jl]. I.e., Eg. **m̄d*.*̃w* < ***ḍ*-*m*.*̃w* < pre-OEg. ***gm*.*̃w*? Noteworthy is that the sequence *dm*- was not typical in Egyptian. Regarded as "possible" also by V. Blažek (1989, 215-216; 1997, 17; 1999, 251-3, §10; 1999, 47-49, §10) and Ju.N. Zavadovskij (1974, 104; 1975, 50-51). The Hausa numeral for "10" is reflex of PCh. **g^wam*- "10" [Nwm. 1977, 32] = **ḡ^wm* [JS 1981, 263; Jl 1994 I, 165].⁷³ C. Hoffmann (1970, 12-14) and H. Jungraithmayr & D. Ibriszimow (1994 I, 165) considered PCh. **ḡ^wm* "10" to be an old Niger-Congo loan (cf. Benue-Congo **kumi* "10"), which would exclude its equation with Eg. *m̄d*. However, a genuine AA etymology of PCh. **ḡ^wm* is also possible, cf. AA **ḡm* "complete (or sim.)" [GT]. V. Blažek (1987, 41), in turn, combined the PCh.-Eg. parallel with SBrb.: Ahaggar *a-g^yim* (-ḡ- apud Fcd.) "millier" [Fcd. 1951-2, 444], Ghat *a-ḡim* (*a-djim* apud Nehlil) [-, - < **g^y-*] "mille" [Nhl. 1909, 179].

(2) V. Blažek (1987 MS, 41; 1990, 41) equated Eg. *m̄d* with CCh.: Higi gr. **muṅ*- "10" [GT]⁷⁴, which might only be valid if Eg. **m̄d*.*̃w* < ***m̄nd*.*̃w* (nowhere attested) and if the

⁷² **(1)** A. Trombetti (1902, 198), C. Brockelmann (1908, 487), W. Worrell (1926, 272), and G.A. Barton (1934, 30) erroneously equated LEg. *md*, Dem. *mt*, and Cpt. (S etc.) *myt* with Sem. **mi*-*át*- "hundred" [Dlg.]. Rightly been declined by W.F. Albright (1918, 92, fn. 6), later also by F.A. Dombrowski and B.W.W. Dombrowski (1991, 342), and by V. Blažek (1999, 251-3, §10; 1999, 47-49, §10). **(2)** There is a long tradition of comparing Eg. *m̄d* with the reflexes of PBrb. **moraw* "10" [Zhl. 1934-35, 185] = **marāw* [Prs. 1974, 403, 405] = **mra* (m), **mra-ut* (f) [Zvd. 1975, 50-51, §14.0] = **mārāw* (sic) [Vernus] = **maraw* [Mlt., GT], cf., e.g., Gabelentz (1894, 99); Meinhof (1912, 240); Zyhlarz (1931, 137-138, #8; 1932-1933, 104; 1934, 104, 106, 111, fn. 1); Mercier (1933, 314); Wölfel (1954, 58); Lefebvre (1955, 276) and Korostovcev (1963, 14): both misquoting the Brb. root as *mzu* (sic!); Rössler (1966, 227; 1971, 317); Zavadovskij (1967, 43; 1974, 111-112; 1975, 50-51, §14.0); Loprieno (1986, 1309); Blažek (1989, 215-216; 1990, 41; 1997, 17-18); Dombrowski and Dombrowski (1991, 344); Vernus (2000, 180, 192): Eg. *mdw* (sic) "*a un cognat possible avec le berbère*"! Rejected by W. Vycichl (1983, 124) and G. Takács (1995 MS, 4, #7; 1996, 139, #35; 1996, 442, #2.3) as there is no evidence for Eg. -*ḍ* ~ Brb. *-*r*-, while Brb. *-*w* is part of the root (contrary to Eg. masc. *m̄d.w* vs. fem. *m̄d.t*). **(3)** K. Sethe (1916, 17) and A. Loprieno (1986, 1309): Eg. *m̄d* "10" < *m̄d* "deep", but they failed to demonstrate the odd semantic shift with typological parallels. V. Blažek (1997, 17; 1999, 251-3, §10; 1999, 47-49, §10) excluded a direct connection. **(4)** Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1974, 112; 1975, 44) and A. Loprieno (1986, 1316, n. 32): metathesis of PCu. **√tmn* "10". Fully unreal. Eg. -*ḍ* ≠ Cu. **t*-. Cu. *-*n* not reflected in Eg. **(5)** I. M. D'jakonov (1986, 61; 1988, 67): ~ Sem. **ma*"d- "many", but Eg. *ḍ* ≠ Sem. **d*. Declined already by V. Blažek (1989, 215-216; 1997, 17) and G. Takács (1994, 217; 1996, 139-140, #35; 1996, 442, #4; 1999, 136; 1999, 203). **(6)** A. Loprieno (1986, 1309, 1316, n. 33) suspected the ultimate common origin of Eg. *m̄d* "10" and *m̄d* "deep" with Sem. **√m*["aufsaugen" (!), **√mdd* (!) "lang ziehen, ausdehnen", **√mss* (!) "lang ziehen, ausdehnen". Impossible. E.g., how should one figure a relationship between "aufsaugen" vs. "10"? Rejected already by V. Blažek (1999, 251-3, §10; 1999, 47-49, §10).

⁷³ Attested in WCh.: Gerka (Yiwom) [IL] | Dera (Kanakuru) gum [Pls.] = *gûm* [Krf., Jng.], Tangale *gbom̄o* [Jng.] < **g^wom*- [GT] | (?) Tsagu *wúúma* [Skn. 1977, 34: < PCh. **g-m*-] | Ngizim (< Hs.?) *guma* [IL] = *gum* [Krf.] = *gúumà* [Schuh], Bade (< Hs.?) *gúmā* [IL] = *guumà* [Krf.] (WCh.: also Pls. 1958, 85) || CCh.: Tera *gwàṅ* [Nwm. 1964, 36, #10], Tera-Jara *gwom* [Nwm.], Hwona *gumḍiTi* ~ *kûm* [Krf.], Boka *kum* [Krf.], Gabin *kùm* [Krf.], Ga'anda *kum* [Krf.] | Bura-Margi **kum*- [GT] > Margi *kūmú* [Hfm.] = *kumu* [Krf.], WMargi *kuma* ~ *kume* [Krf.], Chibak *kyme* [IL] = *kuma* [Krf.], Bura *kuma* [Krf.], Wamdiu *kumò* [Krf.], Hildi *kúmR* [Krf.], Kilba *kúmā* [Krf.], Ngwahyi *kuma* [Krf.] | Fali-Kiria *gwum(ù)* [Krf.], Fali-Jilbu *gumù* [Krf.], Fali-Mucella *gùm* [Krf.], Fali-Bwagira *po-gumu* [Krf.] | PMandara **g^wamgV* (?) [GT]: Dghwede *gwàngá* [Frick] = *wàngá* [IL], Ngweshe *ùwàngò* [IL], Paduko *uma* [Mch.] | Sukur *úwâṅ* [IL] < **g^wam* (?) [GT] | Musgoy *gup* [Mch.], Daba *gú0* [Lienhard] | Musgu *gum* [Roeder] | PMasa **g^wu0*- < ***g^wum*- (?) [GT]: Lame *gwú0ú* [Krf.], Lame-Peve *gwú0* [Krf.], Zime-Batna *gùp* [Jng.] = *gù0ù* [Scn.], Misme-Zime *goub* [Krf.] || ECh.: Mokilko *kòòmá(t)* [Jng.] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 43, 222; lbr. 1990, 211-212; Jl 1994 II 320-321).

⁷⁴ Attested in Higi *měngě* [Str.] = *m^wĀ[~]* [Mrl. 1972, 102] = *mùṅəy* [Brt.-Jng.], Higi-Nkafa *mùṅəy* [Krf.], Higi-Baza *mūnge* [Lks. 1937, 113] = *mùṅə* [Krf.], Higi-Kamale *mùṅε* [Krf.] vs. Kapsiki (= Kamale?) *mäng* [Str.] = *məṅ* [WL] = *m̄εṅ* (') [Brt.-Jng.], Higi-Ghye *mùṅəy* [Krf.], Higi-Bana *m̄εṅ* [WL] = *m'ṅ* [Brt.-Jng.], Higi-Futu *mùṅi* [Krf.], Fali-Gili *mùṅ* [Krf. 1972 MS] (Higi group data: Strümpell 1922-1923, 123; Wente-Lukas 1973, 7; Kraft 1981 II, 131, 141, 151, 161, 171, 191, #10; Brt.-Jng. 1993, 131).

Higi numeral < **mung-. Mentioned also by G. Takács (1994, 217) in the context of further AA parallels. The etymology of Higi gr. *muŋ- "10" is uncertain.⁷⁵

(3) C. T. Hodge (kind p.c. on 4 September 1994) has not excluded a connection to PBrb. *tē-mihTay, pl. *tī-muhāt "100" [Prasse 1974, 406].⁷⁶ Since PBrb. *T < PAA *H (cf. Mlt. 1991, 242; Takács 2006, 57-59, 62), the phonological correspondence of Eg. d ~ PBrb. *T is regular, although PBrb. *-h- has no match in Eg. md. The etymology of the Berber numeral is obscure.⁷⁷

(4) V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 202) identified it with their ECh. *m^wa₁- "10" (no reflexes mentioned), which is certainly a false reconstruction. This asterisk-form is solely based on the isolated ECh.: Somray mo₁ "zehn" [Nct. apud Lks. 1937, 80; Hfm. 1971, 9] = mwà₁ "10" [Jng. 1993 MS, 46; JI 1994 II, 321]. In theory, there could be a little chance that Somrai form derives from an earlier *√m(w)g,⁷⁸ but this is surely not the case here due to the firm evidence for that Somray mo₁ [Nct.] reflects *√mwd.⁷⁹ The Afro-Asiatic background of the ECh. numeral is disputed. V. Blažek (1997, 18; 1999, 251-3, §10; 1999, 47-49, §10): < *mVTV ~ Eg. md and even PBrb. *tē-mihTay "100" [Prasse 1974, 406]. In principle, Somray -₁ < ECh. *-T < AA *@/*E/*H is plausible,⁸⁰ but we have no sufficient evidence for *-T- in the East Chadic numeral against *-d-. Consequently, the available records provide hardly anything for equating Eg. and ECh. „10”. G. Takács (1999, 136; 1999, 202-203, #3.2) connected ECh. *√m(w)d with Sem. *ma^d- "many" [Djk.] ||| PBrb. impf. *ya-mduh, pf. *yu-mdah [Prasse 1975, 227] = *ə-mdu < *√md[h] "to complete" [GT] ||| SOm.: Ari mūda "all" [Bnd. 1994, 1158, #1]. If this comparison proves to be valid, the East Chadic numeral can have nothing in common with Eg. md.

(5) G. Takács (1994, 217-218; 1995, 5-6, #7; 1996, 140, #35; 1996, 443, #7; 1999, 40, 50-51, 143) affiliated Eg. md "10" with ECu. *mig-/mug- "fullness", *-mg- (prefix verb) "to fill" [Sasse 1979, 25] = *-meg- "to be full" [HL 1988, 127; Lmb. 1993, 353] = *-mig- "to be full" [Ehret 1997 MS, 196, #1771] = *mVg- "many, full" [GT].⁸¹ This Egypto-East Cushitic

⁷⁵ Contrary to V. Blažek (l.c.), D. Ibrizimow (1990, 211-2) excluded a metathesis of PCh. *gum-/*g^wam- "10" (above). Later, Blažek (1999, 251-3, §10; 1999, 47-49, §10) derived Higi gr. *muŋ- "10" from *mu-mg-, which might be etymologically identical with Agaw *mang- "many" [GT] || LECu. *mang- "many" [GT] ||| NOm.: Shinasha manga "heavy" [Lmb.] (discussed below). If this is correct, a remote kinship between Higi gr. *muŋ- with Eg. md is not impossible.

⁷⁶ Attested, a.o., in NBrb.: Nefusa te-mîsi [Mtl.] = tē-misi [Lst.] || EBrb.: Sokna sənətt t-mîtin "deux cents" [Lst.] || WBrb.: Zenaga ta-māde (sic, -d-) "100" [Ncl. 1953, 206] || SBrb.: Ahaggar té-mÉTÉ, pl. ti-maT "centaine" [Fcd. 1951-2, 1165] = ti-miTi [Mtl.] = tē-miTi [Lst.] = ti-midi [Mrc.], ETawllemmet ti-miTi [Bst.] = ETawllemmet & Ayr te-meTe ~ Ayr ti-miTa "1. centaine, 2. cent" [PAM 1998, 210; 2003, 524], Kel Ui ti-maTi [Wlf.], Ghat či-miTi "cent", senat či-maT "deux cents" [Nhl. 1909, 138; Mrc.] (Brb.: Lst. 1931, 209; Mrc. 1933, 316; Wlf. 1954, 74).

⁷⁷ **(1)** A. Klingenheben (apud Wölfel 1954, 75) and M. G. Mercier (1933, 316) erroneously explained it as a late borrowing from Ar. mi⁻at- (!), which has rightly been excluded by Wölfel (l.c.). Surprisingly, this absurd equation of the Brb. numeral with Sem. *mi⁻at- "1.000" has been recently adopted by E. Lipinski (1997, 291, §35.20). **(2)** F. Nicolas (1953, 206) combined it with WBrb.: Zenaga √md "finir, être fini". **(3)** GT: cf. ECh.: Mokilko mēedá (f) "cent, centaine(s)" [Jng. 1990, 138], although Mokilko -d- vs. Brb. *-T- seem irregular.

⁷⁸ Cf. perhaps ECh.: Somray "á₁ŋ [Jng.] vs. Ndam y'g^{1/2} "to cut, chop" [Jng.] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 99).

⁷⁹ Attested by its earlier record and its closest cognates listed by J. Lukas (1937, 74, 87) and C. Hoffmann (1971, 9): Somrai moid "10" [Adolf Friedrich] = moet [Gaudefroy-Demombynes], Dormo moid [Adolf Friedrich] | Gabri moid [Adolf Friedrich] = mwò₁ŋ [Caprile 1972 MS], Chire moodo "10" [Barth apud Lukas].

⁸⁰ Cf. ECh. *gaT- "cheek" [GT]: Kabalai kwa₁í [Cpr.] | Somray gà₁é "cheek" [Jng.] | WDangla gàTùmò [Fédry] | Birgit gàTáyó [Jng.] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 69) ||| SBrb.: Ahaggar ä-g^y/a (-ğ- apud Fcd.) "joue" [Fcd. 1951-2, 491] ||| PCu. *gAc(c)- "лицо, лоб" [Dlg.] > Bed. g¹di "das Gesicht, Antlitz, Auge" vs. g^wad ~ g^wáda ~ g^wa₁ ~ ga₁ "Auge, Gesicht" [Rn. 1895, 89-90] = (also) g^waT, pl. g^waTa "face, eye" [Dlg.] || NAgaw *gác "face" [Apl.] = *gä@ (?) [GT]: Bilin gāš, Hamir ga[, Qwara-Dembea gāš, Qemant gāš (NAgaw: Apl. 2006, 63) || ECu.* gaT- "jaw" [Apl., KM] || SCu.: WRift *gicē "forehead" [KM 2004, 117] < AA *√g@/E "cheek" [GT] (cf. Cohen 1947, #197; Dolgopol'skij 1973, 297; HSED #866 vs. #914).

⁸¹ Attested in Saho mag "anfüllen, voll machen" [Rn. 1890, 258-9] = mag "remplir" [Chn.] = -meg- (prefixed) "to fill" vs. mig-e "fullness" [Sasse] = -emmeg- "to be full" [HL] = emege (imp. amage) "to fill", mig-e "fullness" [Vergari 2003, 78, 135], Saho-Assaorta mag-, pass. m-mag "essere molto, in molti, essere pieno" [CR 1913, 70] = meg- "to be numerous, full (быть многочисленным, полным)" [IS], Afar mag "anfüllen, voll machen" [Rn. 1886, 880] = -eng- [< *emg-] "to fill" [Sasse] = -emmeg- "to be full" [HL] = enge "to fill" [PH 1985, 163], Afar-Tadjurah mog-o "many (много)"

equation was assessed by V. Blažek (1999, 251-3, §10; 1999, 47-49, §10) as the "most convincing" one of all the etymologies offered so far for Eg. *md*. The reflexes of ECu. *mig-/mug- [Sasse] and NOM. *magg- „full” [GT] have been often⁸² compared with the Cushito-Omotoc root containing an additional *-n-, cf. *√mng „much” [GT],⁸³ on whose etymology is no agreement in Cushitic studies.⁸⁴ The ultimate source of Eg. *md* and ECu.-NOM. *mVg- "1. many, 2. full, 3. heavy, 4. strong (?)" [GT] may be AA *√mg "1. big, 2. long, high" [GT].⁸⁵ The semantic shift of Eg. *md* "10" as a "full, big" number is supported by a number of typological parallels.⁸⁶ The same is to be observed about Afro-Asiatic „hundred”,⁸⁷ „thousand”,⁸⁸ „ten thousand”,⁸⁹ and „hundred thousand”.⁹⁰

Summary

[IS] | Oromo mog-a "fullness", mi₂-ū [-₂- < *-g-] "full" [Sasse], Oromo-Waata magā-ta "many" [Strm. 1987, 362], Oromo-Bararetta imieke "full" [Flm.], Konso imako-ta "full" [Flm.] = immak- "to be full" [HL], Gidole innako-ta "full" [Flm.] = innak- "to be full" [HL], Gato imako-da "full" [Flm.] | OSomali *ammūg- "füllen" [Lmb. 1986, 437] > Somali mug "Fülle, Vollheit" [Rn. 1902, 288] = múg- "fullness" [Abr. 1964, 182], PBaiso & Jiddu (sic) *u/ing- "full" [Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984, 229], Baiso mig-i "full" [Flm.] = mig-i "to be full" [HL] = "amoga "many" [Sbr. 1994, 17] | Yaaku -mok [< *-mog], pl. -mg₂e "many, much" [Heine 1975, 130] (ECu.: Dlg. 1973, 256-257; Sasse 1979, 25; HL 1988, 127). In H.-J. Sasse's (1979, 25) view, the Konso & Gidole parallels (with -n-/k-) "are obviously cognate, but display problematic correspondences", for which cf. NAgaw: Kemant imkuy "être abondant (le blé)" [CR 1912, 164] ||| WCh.: Tangale mukmuk "somewhat full" [Jng. 1991, 121] || ECh.: EDangla mak "(idéophone d'accomplissement)" [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 192]. Do these parallels display traces of an AA root var. *√mk "full" [GT]? The relatedness of further possible parallels is still to be cleared, cf. LECu.: Rendille mig, pl. amíge, mimíge "strong, hard" [Heine 1976, 216, 220] = mīg (f) "Kraft, Macht" [Schlee 1978, 140, #774] = mīg-e "strength" [Oomen 1981, 72] = mōg "strength, stiffness, tightness, heaviness, hardness, difficulty" [PG 1999, 224] ||| NOM. *magg- "1. full (?), 2. (hence) heavy" [GT]: Haruro māgg-āys "essere contento" (lit. "to be full"?) [CR 1937, 653] | Kefoid *magg- "to be heavy" [GT]: Kaffa mag- [Crl. 1951, 470] = magg- [Dlg.], Mocha maggi-yé "to be heavy", magg-o "heavy" [Lsl. 1959, 40], Sheko maggo "heavy" [Lmb.] (NOM.: LS 1997, 459 with semantically false comparanda) is semantically problematic. For the ECu.-NOM. comparison see Dlg. 1967, 9, #7; 1973, 256-257; IS 1976, 41-42; Lmb. 1993, 111 (Cu.-Om. *-mVg- "to be full, heavy").

⁸² Cf. Reinisch 1886, 880; 1890, 259; Conti Rossini 1913, 71; Leslau 1945, 163; 1979 III, 408-9; Illič-Svityč 1976, 41-42; Appleyard 1977, 26/68; Haberland & Lamberti 1988, 127; Lamberti 1993, 353; Lamberti & Sottile 1997, 459 (with semantically false comparanda).

⁸³ Cf. NAgaw: Qemant māngā "foule, quantité, multitude" [CR 1912, 230] = manga "multitude, crowd" [Lsl.] (Appleyard, p.c. on 20 April 2007: "without any doubt a loan from"Amharic mānga "herd, flock, crowd", which, in turn, is "obviously a loan from ECush.") ||| SAgaw *menči [-či < *-ki] "many" [GT]: Awngi ménč "many" [Htz./Bnd. 1971, 238, §50] = m^yenṅči (so!) [Flm./Bnd.] = ménči [Bnd. 1973 MS, 7, #51] = ménč „many" [Apl. 1991, 8], Kunfal menči "many" [Birru & Adal 1971, 102, #50] = minči "many" [Bnd. 1970, 3, #50] ||| LECu. *mang- "numerous" [GT] > Saho mang "viel, zahlreich werden, sich mehren" [Rn. 1890, 259, 269-270], Afar mang "angefüllt, voll werden/sein" [Rn. 1886, 880, 882] ||| NOM.: Shinasha-Bworo mang-á "heavy (schwer, gewichtig)" [Lmb. 1993, 111; 1993, 353].

⁸⁴ The Saho-Afar stem *mang- has been explained by L. Reinisch (1886, 880 1890, 259) from a pass. *m-ang "angefüllt werden", cf. Saho-Afar caus. s-ang < √mag. C. Conti Rossini (1913, 71) extended this also to NAgaw (Kemant) assuming a common PCu. *mag > *m-mag > *mamg > Kemant & Saho-Afar mang-. G. Banti (p.c., 19 April 2007), in turn, sees in the LECu. forms a prefix ma- ("the form is like mabla 'seeing'" in Saho-Afar). D. Appleyard (p.c., 20 April 2007) shares the same view: "mamga is certainly the more 'archaic' in so far as it is more transparently the nominal prefix ma- + the verbal root -mg-, i.e. PEC *mig-/mug- etc. 'be full' ... it seems to me quite reasonable to build a new 'root' on the basis of a nominal derivation *ma-m[V]g-; partial reduplication of the C₁VC₁VC₂- type seems less likely to me". The Cu. stem was probably borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Gafat māngā, Amh. mānga, Gurage-Soddo mānga "herd, flock" (ES: Leslau 1945, 163; 1979 III, 408-9; Appleyard 1977, 26/68 with less likely alternative Semitic etymologies). For reasons outlined here, the comparison of Cu.-Om. *mang- with CCh.: PHigi *muṅ- "10" [GT] (above) seems at the moment rather unlikely.

⁸⁵ Attested in Sem.: Akk. magāgu (also maqāqu) "(weg)spreizen" [AHW 574] ||| NOM.: Ometo *mēg- "col" [GT]: Wolayta & Dawro (Kullo) meg-uwa, Gofa & Gamu & Dorze mēg-o | Shinasha mēg-o (NOM.: Alm. 1993 MS, 8, #202b) ||| CCh. *√mg... "long (of stick)" [JS 1981, 169B₁]: Musgu masc. mógwa, fem. muguí, pl. mogwáákai "lang, hoch" [Krause apud Müller 1886, 401] = mógoa [Rohlf's] = mogó "lang" [Overweg] = ana-mogó "it is big" [Rohlf's] = mogó "groß" [Roeder] = mugwi "hoch" [Décorse] = mógo "groß" [Lks.], Musgu-Pus mogog (m), mogwi (f), pl. mogokai "hoch" [MB 1972 MS,

The results of the above presented etymological analyses lead us to the following table. Note that (+) in brackets signifies an exististing, albeit indirect, correspondence of an Egyptian numeral, displaying some deviation in form. E.g., North Afro-Asiatic „two” (*√čn) is ultimately related to Chadic „two” (*√čn), but only as ancient root heteroclitic root varieties in Proto-Afro-Asiatic.

Eg.	Sem.	Brb.	Cu.	Om.	Ch.
√w« „1”	+	+?	-	-	-
√sn „2”	+	+	-	-	(+)
√ ⁻ mt „3”	-	-	+	+	+
√fd „4”	-	-	-	+	+
√dj „5”	(+)	-	-	-	-
√srs „6”	+	+	-	(+)	(+)
√sf ⁻ „7”	+	+	+???	+	+
√ ⁻ mn „8”	+	(+?)	(+)	(+)	-
√psd „9”	+	+?	-	-	+?
√md „10”	-	-	(+)	(+)	+

4] = mogo (masc.), muguwiy (fem.) "long" [Trn. 1991, 106], Musgu-Girvidik mógó (m), mógwí (f), pl. mógwáy "hoch" [MB 1972 MS, 4] = mogo(m) "lang" [MB 1972-73, 70] (Musgu: Lukas 1937, 141; 1941, 68) || ECh.: Tumak mäg'n "nombreux", cf. mäg "être capable, pouvoir, beaucoup" [Cpr. 1975, 81]. For the AA etymology see IS 1976, 41-42; HSED #1704. Cf. also Ssem. *√mgn (root ext. *-n?) "very (much)" [GT]: Jibbali mékən "much, many, a lot of" [Jns. 1981, 170], Mehri maken [-k- < *-g-] "beaucoup, très" [Lsl.] = m³/₄ken [Jahn] = məkən "much, many, a lot of" [Jns. 1987, 264] || Amh. magan "très large" [Lsl.] = mägän "1. very large, unusually or strangely large (size), portentous, 3. type of long shield used by a fully-grown man" [Kane 1990, 343] (Sem.: Lsl. 1931-34, 35).

⁸⁶ (1) PCh. *g^wam- "10" [Nwm. 1977, 32] ~ WCh.: Angas-Sura *gam „to fill" [GT] (Angas-Sura data: Hfm. 1975, 24, #215; Stl. 1972, 181; 1977, 154, #65; 1987, 217, #676; GT 2004, 121) | Bole-Tangale *(ŋ)gamu "to fill, be full" [Schuh 1984, 216] = *(n)-g^wam [GT] | NBauchi *g-m- "to gather, join, meet" [Skn. 1977, 23] (WCh. data: Stl. 1987, 217-8; JI 1994 II, 156) || Sem. *√gmm "völlig sein/machen" [GB] > Hbr. gam "zusamt, steigernd" [GB 143] | Ar. ġamma I "1. être riche, 2. être abondant, se remplir de nouveau d'eau, 3. être comble" etc., ġamm- "1. abondant, exubérant, 2. complet, 4. (mesure) comble" [BK I 321-2] (for further Sem. cognates see Hodge 1971, 42; Zbr. 1971, #58; MacDonald 1963-65, 75; WUS #664; Vycichl 1987, 114) || Eg. ngmgm (prefix n-) "sich versammeln" (XVIII., Derchain-Urtel 1973, 39-40 contra Wb II 349, 15) || HECu. *gum "a "all" [Hds. 1989, 411] || NOm.: Oyda gāma "much, many" [Dlg. 1973, 78]. For the Ar.-WCh. comparison: Stl. 1987, 218; OS 1990, 80, #55; HSED #888.

(2) Sem. *«ašar- "10" [Dlg. 1986, 79, #14] || WCh.: Angas-Sura *[ār „ten" [GT] (Angas-Sura data: Jng. 1965, 182; Hfm. 1975, 20, #93; Stl. 1972, 182; 1977, 157, #188; JI 1994 II, 320; GT 2004, 334-5) || Eg. «š3 [< *«šr] "viel (sein)" (OK, Wb I 228, 8-26). For the Eg.-Sem.-Angas-Sura etymology: Trb. 1902, 199; Ember 1917, 88, #135; 1930, #3.b.4; Alb. 1918, 92; 1931, 150; Vrg. 1945, 128, #1.c.8; Chn. 1947, #47; Hodge 1976, 15, #165; OS 1988, 82; Blv. 1989, 15; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 65.

⁸⁷ Cf. NOm.: Kullo (Dawaro) tet-a "100" [CR 1913, 410] || Eg. twt "versammeln, versammelt sein" (PT, Wb V 259-260) || (?) WCh. *tvt- "to gather" [OS]. For Eg.-PWCh. see OS 1992, 195. Sem. *rbb "big" > Ebl. rib(b)a or ribab "10.000" [Brugnatelli 1984, 86-87; Gordon 1988, 261] || Ug. rbt, Hbr. rəbabā, Aram. ribbabtā "10.000" (Can.: Ember 1917, 87; WUS #2481).

⁸⁸ Cf. ECu. *kum- "1.000" [Sasse 1979, 12, 25; 1982, 120] || SCu. *kuma "1.000" [Ehret 1987, 30] || NOm. *kum- "1.000" [GT] ~ Eg. km "vollständig machen, vollenden" (MK, Wb V 128-130) || EBrb.: Siwa kōm, koma "tout, beaucoup" [Lst. 1931, 304] = "all, whole" [Mlt. 1991, 250] || LECu.: Baiso kamogani "much, many" [Ehret] || NOm.: Pometo *kum- "to be full" [GT] (NOm. data: LS 1997, 412).

⁸⁹ Cf. Sem. *rbb "big" > Ebl. rib(b)a or ribab "10.000" [Brugnatelli 1984, 86-87; Gordon 1988, 261] || Ug. rbt | Hbr. rəbabā, Aram. ribbabtā "10.000" (Canaanite: Ember 1917, 87; WUS #2481). Or perhaps Eg. db« "10.000" (I-, Wb V 365-366) ~ NOm.: She geba "many" [Flm.] || SOM.: Hamer & Karo gε"bi [Flm.: error for *gε0i?] "big" [Flm.] (Om.: Flm. 1976, 317) || ECh.: WDangla góó0é "remplir un récipient (en l'immergent dans l'eau)" [Fédry 1971, 329]. As noted by W. Vycichl (1934, 80), the comparison of Eg. db« with WCh.: Hausa dubu "1.000" (suggested by N. Skinner 1981, 187-8, #105 pace Barth) is excluded. For an alternative etymology of Eg. db« see Takács 1997, 217, #9.

⁹⁰ Cf. Eg. fn [< *fl] "100.000" (I-, Wb III 74, 1) ~ Sem.: Ar. afala I "reichlich vorhanden sein", V "sich in grosser Zahl versammeln", afl- "Menge", afil- "zahlreich" [Vrg., Vcl.]. For Eg.-Ar. see Sethe 1916, 13-14; Ember 1917, 87, #135; 1930, #9.a.7; Albright 1918, 93; Vergote 1945, 136, §9.b.26; Cohen 1947, #111; Vycichl 1958, 377; Loprieno 1986, 1310. For a different (less convincing) etymology of Eg. fn see Holma 1919, 41; Hodge 1976, 12, #49; 1990, 370.

Conclusion

The first two, i.e., the most elementary and primary numerals are evidently North Afro-Asiatic with no match in the southern block of the phylum, which clearly suggests an aboriginal northern affiliation of Egyptian just as the common North Afro-Asiatic apophony penetrating Semitic, Egyptian, and Berber morphology. But the obvious South Afro-Asiatic nature of Egyptian „three” and „four” seems to testify to later renewed ties of Proto-Egyptian with the southern block, i.e., a secondary areal cohabitation, which agrees quite neatly with the lack of prefix conjugation, an isogloss in the whole phylum shared by both Egyptian and Chadic grammar, which is paralleled by the undeniable domination of South Afro-Asiatic items in the overwhelming majority of Egyptian anatomical terminology, let alone the multitude of exclusively Egypto-Chadic lexical isoglosses. Egyptian „five” must be a very late innovation based on an extinct Eg. *jd „hand” = Sem. *yad- „hand” as a nisbe form, which was to render „5” only on the Egyptian side. The set of Egyptian numerals from „six” to „nine” are again Semitic (and Berber) words (only „seven” seems to be sporadically attested in South Afro-Asiatic too), but, for some suspicious reason, all of them suffer from some fundamental phonological irregularity in Egyptian (Eg. -r- vs. Sem. *-d- in „6”, Eg. -f- vs. Sem. *-b« in „7”, Eg. - vs. Sem. *- in „8”, Eg. p-/d vs. Sem. *t-/*-« in „9”). Does this puzzle speak for a borrowed and not inherited nature of these higher numerals during a later secondary areal contact with Semitic, perhaps in the neolithic Nile valley (5th mill. BC)? Finally, Egyptian „ten” is a South Afro-Asiatic word exclusively attested in Chadic (although the underlying verbal root is Common Afro-Asiatic), which may indicate a common decimal system created (together with SAA „3” and „4”) during the above mentioned secondary areal cohabitation of Proto-Egyptian with Chadic (or South Afro-Asiatic).

References are to be added later