

DOI: 10.14746/linpo.2021.63.2.7

Semito-Hamitic or Afro-Asiatic consonantism and lexicon: Episodes of a comparative research II: The “old school” of Egypto-Semitic (Part 1: Pre-war phase)¹

Gábor Takács

Department of Classical Philology, University of Łódź (UŁ)

Lexicographical Library of Afro-Asiatic Root Research at Balatonederics (LLAARR)

Member of the Associazione Internazionale di Studi sul Mediterraneo e l’Oriente, Roma (ISMEO)

e-mail: gaktak@datatrans.hu | ORCID: 0000-0002-2466-6451

Abstract: Gábor Takács, *Semito-Hamitic or Afro-Asiatic consonantism and lexicon: Episodes of a comparative research II: The “old school” of Egypto-Semitic (Part 1: Pre-war phase)*. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of Arts and Sciences, PL ISSN 0079-4740, pp. 131-145

A retrospective account on the past of the comparative research on Semito-Hamitic / Hamito-Semitic (SH / HS, resp.) or Afro-Asiatic (AA) phonology (first of all consonantism, also root structure) and lexicon, segmented into episodes according to diverse (often overlapping in time) trends is now under way and will be presented part by part in a series of papers. Episode II evaluates the so-called “old school”, a rather introverted special trend of this domain (arbitrarily focusing on a comparison of just these two branches: Semitic and Egyptian), which split off from mainstream Semito-Hamitic studies at the end of the 19th century, more than a whole century ago. The present paper surveys the pre-war share (encompassing some half of a century), a blooming and most fruitful phase in the history of Egypto-Semitic studies.²

Keywords: science history, Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic), Semitic, ancient Egyptian, comparative linguistics

¹ This paper has been completed in the frames of my research project “Micro-reconstructions in the Southern Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) lexical root stock” facilitated by the research grant “Advanced Research in Residence” (ARR) of the University of Łódź (UŁ), which I gratefully acknowledge in this place. My special thanks go to Prof. K.T. Witzczak (Dept. of Classical Philology, UŁ) for selflessly supporting my ARR project facilitating my ongoing research on the AA root stock. Prof. em. W.G.E. Watson (Morpeh, UK), the doyen of Ugaritic philology, for his friendly favour of reading the draft version of this paper and improving its English style.

² Part 2, outlining the post-war phase of this trend, is supposed to appear in LP 65 (2023).

Dedicated to the memory of my teacher,
 Prof. V. Wessetzky (1909-1997)³ and
 to my senior colleague, Mr. Péter Gaboda (1963-2023)⁴
 on the 30th anniversary of my acquaintance with
 the Egypto-Semitic “old school” (5th Nov. 1991)

Introduction

The whole history of Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics, examined in all its aspects, would demand a whole of a heavy monograph. Even merely the (perhaps most neglected and evidently most controversial) segment of comparative consonantism and root etymology, systematically only studied since the late 19th cent., may well result in a thin volume, for which the present author has already released a number of pilot studies.⁵

More than two decades ago (1999), I offered an all too sketchy and all too Egyptian-oriented historical overview of this immense, albeit undeservedly little cultivated, domain

³ An eminent egyptologist representing *die Wiener Schule* of great W. Czermak, who, by the way, had later become master of Prof. H. Jungrathamy (1950-3), head of the African Linguistics Institute (1985-1996) at the Frankfurt J.W. Goethe University and, besides, my mentor in Chadic comparative linguistics from 1999 on. It was Prof. Wessetzky who introduced me to the hieratic script from the fall semester of 1990 and, among some other subjects, into Late Egyptian literature also in the fall semester of 1991. As a sometime visiting researcher of the Viennese *Doppelinstitut* of Egyptology and African studies (established by great Leo Reinisch) from the 1930s (on which cf. Thausing 1989: 48), i.e., from the very beginning of his egyptological career in the Egyptian Dept. of the Museum of Fine Arts in the Hungarian capital, he had been acquainted with the old Egypto-Semitic comparative works by F. von Calice, A. Ember and W. Vycichl, to whose names, having seen my ardent interest in this puzzling field, he was the first to call my attention during his course on Ancient Egyptian library on the 5th Nov. 1991 (as far as I have now been able to search back in my student records).

⁴ An excellent expert of the pharaonic museum artefacts and a true philologist not solely as an egyptologist, but also as an intimate knower of the 19th cent. intellectual history, whose unrepeatable thorough deductive method I have always been disposed to compare to the masterful ways of Sherlock Holmes. When I had attended the classical hieratic course of Prof. Wessetzky in the Egyptian Dept. of the Museum of Fine Arts, Péter Gaboda (presumably as the youngest fellow of the dept. at that time) was assigned to meet us at the staff entrance of the museum, where we had had to await him (out of security reasons) and from where he had to show us up to the cabinet of Vilmos Wessetzky every occasion. This is how I first met this reserved hidden treasure of Hungarian egyptology, although on these early occasions throughout that fall semester 1991, having no firm orientation in egyptology and any ideas about his hidden skills in Egyptian *Sprachgeschichte* so obscure to me, I had had no courage to initiate a conversation as yet. It was a whole year later that, upon the instruction of Prof. Wessetzky and my master, Prof. L. Kákósy (1932-2003), I started to visit P. Gaboda specially at the museum at the turn of 1991/2 when I have learnt his MA thesis on a prefix p- in Egyptian (ELTE, 1988) whereby he had studied in the 1980s, as it soon turned out to my true gladness, the old literature of Egypto-Semitic and some basic tools of Semito-Hamitic also like Cohen 1947 and Diakonoff 1965. It was due to him that I was first introduced into this old literature that winter, which has turned out to become an unforgettable start of my research adventures in our fascinating AA domain.

⁵ Cf. the volume on the Russian story of comparative AA studies (Takács 1999a), also the studies on the three decades of Muscovite Chadic comparative linguistics (Takács 1999b: 361ff.; 2009: 211ff.) as well as his series of a critical evaluation of the activities and individual output by some of the most fruitful (mostly either Viennese or Muscovite) authors of our field over the past century or so like F. von Calice (Takács 2006b: 139), A. Ember (Takács 2005: 78ff.; 2006c: 145ff.), W. Vycichl (Takács 2002: 19ff.: his bibliography; Takács 2004: ix-xi: his life; Takács 2006d: 154ff.: his research), I.M. Diakonoff (Takács 2003b: v-vii: biography and 2003b: ix-xii: bibliography, resp.), O. Rössler (Takács 2006a: 90ff.; 2007: 5ff.), V.M. Illič-Svityč (Takács 1999: 361ff.), A.B. Dolgopolskij (Takács 2009: 9-10; 2012: 19ff.).

where I only isolated three trends (cf. EDE I 1-8). Albeit its periodization and segmentation structure elaborated therein⁶ can be maintained two decades later also, but an overall survey of the whole AA domain must comprise by far more directions of comparative research phonology and lexicon. The enormous diversity, and a turbulent co-existence of trends and directions of research, and, sometimes, even, so to say, an all too menacing evolution of certain tendencies have altogether given me sufficient reasons for preparing a comprehensive retrospective evaluation thereof in the period of the past almost one and a half century.

This paper too, is purely and only dealing with the history of that segment of research where the root stock and consonantal inventory of the cognate branches have been subject to a comparative analysis. Other segments of comparative grammar are excluded, all the more since the history of the relatively more coherent research requires a pretty much different segmentation. Not wishing to reproduce here all those details of my old, primarily Egypto-centric, overview available in EDE I, but keeping the periodization invented by me in 1999, beside surveying purely the underlying taxonomies *ohne Anspruch auf die Vollständigkeit*, I would better like to focus here on certain emphases in the typical tendencies and trends specially and only in the little-frequented domain of comparative AA phonology and lexicon, including AA root structure, without a wish to present and cover here the full spectrum of comparative activities in all kinds of AA grammar by the authors, let alone for the gigantic output by well-known authors like Rössler, Greenberg or Diakonoff. Thus, some outstanding works may well be touched upon briefly and only with reference to comparative consonantism and lexicon, while sometimes perhaps more emphasis is laid upon some lesser-known or out-dated segments of our domain if these have an impact on the evolution of a trend.

What this paper is not at all intended to yield is encyclopaedically presenting the whole inventory of the works ever published in the chosen research field, which should be the objective of a separate volume. Although the entire literature of comparative AA is not in target zone of my paper and will be, as a rule, left unconsidered here, still, certain views pertaining to the reconstruction problems appear within works on theoretical issues, on AA comparative morphology, on the individual AA branches, which will thus be quoted here. Otherwise, these issues are going to be subject to a separate monograph on the history of the whole comparative AA domain. Instead, what I have had in my mind is an as complete as possible presentation of the extreme plurality of approaches and views, however astonishing these may look, especially placed beside each other in one overview where I did my best to reduce my own subjective opinion on the minimum by quoting directly as many as possible of thoughts considered typical or essential for a trend. The only task herein has been to present the trends as full as possible with all their pros and cons, irrespective of and often against the conviction of the present author, trying not to actively take part in these debates in a comprehensive overview like this – in the hope that even if not in every single detail, but at least sometimes, it may be more revealing, rather than “what?”, better to see the “how?”. All this is done, on the one hand, for shocking, in a way, the remaining and potential authors of our all too divided, atomized, little cultivated orphan domain and, on

⁶ The paper is part of the author's project for a comprehensive *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* of the AA comparative domains.

the other hand, for making the wider scientific audience conscious of how close or distant the state-of-the-art of this comparative linguistic field stands to that of neo-grammarians Indo-European research, say, a century before.

What this study on the history of inter-branch comparison is not going to offer either is, a beyond doubt highly urgent and long desirable retrospective survey of the state-of-the-art in reconstructing the consonantal systems and root stock of the individual AA branches, which should be subject to another extensive follow-up study of mine.

Previous overviews in general

“Eine umfassende Geschichte der Semitoamitistik gibt es bislang nicht, nur kurze Abrisse, die höchstens einige Schlaglichter und einzelne Epochen in der Entwicklung ... werfen” as rightly stated about the state of the affair three decades ago (valid, by the way, until now) by R.M. Voigt (1988: 155), whose general survey, however, also failed to offer a comprehensive survey of all trends and periods by his day. So will it remain with this paper too, which, focuses, as specified above, just on the most neglected and controversial segment of our research domain.

M. Cohen (1947) offered an almost exhaustive annotated bibliography and history of AA researches in general, which F. Hintze (1951) has neatly complemented in his very thorough and sharp-minded review. In the following half of century or so, a number of partial overviews were published, e.g., Hodge 1971, 1976b, Köhler 1975, Burrini 1978-9, Mukarovsky 1981, Petráček 1984 (on the research in the 3rd quarter of the 20th cent., typically comparative phonology hardly any echo among many other theoretical issues).⁷ The lengthy chapter “Stav hamitosemitských studií” by K. Petráček (1989: 10ff., §1.0.) contains a number of useful sections.⁸ R.M. Voigt (1988: 155-164; 2001: 1318-1323) has offered

⁷ Segmented into chapters like “La parenté des langues chamitosemitiques” (pp. 426-427), “Les types de comparaison” (pp. 427-428), “La reconstruction interne” (pp. 428-429), “Le système du développement diachronique” (pp. 434-435), “D’autres problèmes du comparativisme” (pp. 438-439).

⁸ Like his all too general “survey of results” (Petráček 1989: 10-17, §1.1.: “Hamitosemitská srovnávací jazykověda. Přehled výsledků.”), which no more than a discussion of some AA works by C.T. Hodge (pp. 10-11), followed by a short list of the AA conferences and *Festschriften* up to date (pp. 12-14), a very short summary of some studies by W. Vycichl (1978) and H.-J. Sasse (1981) as for “evaluating the perspectives” of comparative AA (p. 14: “Zhodnocení a perspektivy”), an enumeration of studies dealing with the comparative methodology (pp. 14-15), a small list of works on the history of our research – with a few gaps, unfortunately (p. 15), a brief and incomplete section on the very few periodical series of our comparative domain like the *Comptes rendus* of the GLECS sessions, the *AAL* issues ed. by R. Hetzron, and the *Africana Marburgensia* ed. by H. Jungraithmayr (p. 15: “Rozvoj výzkumu”), list of countries where AA studies were pursued (p. 16: “Centra studií”), and an account on the past of AA research in Czechia (pp. 16-17: “Tradice v našich zemích”). Then, Petráček (1989: 18-22, §1.2.) surveyed the history of AA comparative studies since Meinhof 1912 up to his day roughly and very little annotated: “Souborná spracování hamitosemitských jazyků (HS) a rekonstrukce prajazyka (P-HS)”. After a list of linguistic maps in the AA domain (Petráček 1989: 23-25, §1.3.: “Mapy hamitosemitských jazyků”) and a “Bibliografie hamitosemitské jazykovědy” (op. cit., pp. 26-27, §1.4.), Petráček (1989: 28-44, §1.5.) singled out the overviews of the state-of-the-art of internal comparison in the individual AA branches, like that of Semitic: “Semitská srovnávací jazykověda”, which is out of our scope in this paper, except for his section on Egyptian which offers in fact “Egyptština a hamitosemitská srovnávací jazykověda” (Petráček 1989: 45-64, §1.6.) hiding in itself, among others, a noteworthy section on “Egyptština a hamitosemitské jazyky

perhaps the most original and fairly (albeit not in every detail) objective survey of some selected (but not all) older episodes of the comparative SH research (with an original, albeit somewhat different periodization), which is especially useful as for the 19th cent. research and gets all the more unilaterally neglectful as for its progress in the 20th century. Less detailed is “le bilan de la linguistique chamito-sémitique des derniers cinquante ans” since Cohen 1947 by A. Zaborski (1998: 23) presenting rather the tendencies in our research field. In spite of its promising title, the H. Satzinger (1999: 367-374) released a by far incomplete survey of SH/AA comp. phon. lex. research of certain episodes, which is strangely pretty detailed as for what had happened over the first century of comparative SH/AA studies up to M. Cohen’s 1947 *magnum opus* (pp. 367-370), but suddenly gets rather taciturn (in less than 17 lines!) as to the details about how “seit Greenbergs grundlegender Arbeit ist die Forschung auf verschiedenen Wegen weiterschritten” in the comparative-historical study of the AA branches, where Satzinger, having briefly mentioned a few homeland theories, immediately switched to a pure reproduction of the copied-in AA family tree models (pp. 371-372), then again one further entry (p. 373) deals with some *Gemeinplätze* about Chadic and Cushito-Omotoc lexical reconstruction. A very brief history of the research was offered by P. Vernus (1999: 169-172, §1-§2) too, focusing on the affiliation of Egyptian retrospectively. Then, in the epochal vol. 20 of the IOS, in his chapter on the “1. History of the discipline” (p. 265), R.M. Voigt (2002) gave us just a very brief survey of the minimal items of what he called comparative “Semitohamitic”.

II. “Old School” of Egypto-Semitic comparison

I isolated and labelled this trend already back in 1999 (EDE I 2-4, §II) on the basis of some common features: (1) it was the first period when a whole system of regular consonantal correspondences has been established and used as a *communis opinio* primarily in Egypto-Semitic comparative studies,⁹ which (2) were characterized by an open-minded, experimenting attitude, but in the spirit of the strengthening philological methods of Oriental studies at the turn of the 19th/20th century, as well as (3) by a presumably misguided

...” (op. cit., pp. 49-54, §1.6.2.1.) with precious lightly annotated lists of studies comparing Egyptian with the AA branches, followed by “Egyptština a africké jazyky” (op. cit., pp. 54-55, §1.6.2.2.), “Egyptština a asijské jazyky (nostratické, makroboreální, Nilal, Lislakh, indoevropské)” (op. cit., pp. 55-56, §1.6.2.3.), a very exciting, inspiring section on the impact of AA comparison on the research of Egyptian prehistory (“Srovnávací jazykověda a egyptské dějiny”, op. cit., pp. 56-58, §1.6.2.4.). Similarly, the special section within Cushitic is devoted to “Význam kušitské jazykovědy pro srovnávací hamitosemitskou jazykovědu” (op. cit., pp. 66-67, §1.7.2.), whereas, after a very brief Omotic section (op. cit., pp. 72-73, §1.8.) and a poor one on Berbero-AA (op. cit., p. 74, §1.9.1.), the Chadic one (op. cit., pp. 80-88, §1.10.) contains a precious overview of the research on the external ties of Chadic (§1.10.2., pp. 82-83: “Vnější vztahy čadských jazyků”).

⁹ Rooting in the first comparative Egypto-Semitic grammar by Th. Benfey (1844), which used to be referred to as the starting point of this trend, cf. Bechhaus-Gerst 1998: 111; Voigt 1999: 348, §2 etc. Another thesaurus of *ad hoc* Egypto-Hebrew/Arabic lexical parallels from this early phase, not to be the subject to an analysis here in my paper, is H. Brugsch’s (1867-1882) gigantic *Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch*, on the etymologies of which A. Erman’s (1892) new system of *Lautgesetze* then was based on.

belief in a very intimate cognacy of both branches¹⁰ or even an identity of Egyptian as a “Semitic language”¹¹ (a label so typical for this trend). These ideas were commonly followed and shared by many authors in the attempt of exploring regularities from an amalgamate lexical stuff and of avoiding to conclude definitely in absolute terms, which is why perhaps it was all so fruitful in spite of all its shortcomings. As opposed to the *ad hoc* equations of the pioneering research throughout the 19th century, already this new era was yielding basically long-standing results with valid value until now. The elaboration and establishment of the northern core of the Afro-Asiatic *Lautgeschichte* dates back to these decades. It flourished in the period of the first decades of the 20th century (flourishing perhaps from the 1890s until the 1930s).

¹⁰ As C.T. Hodge (1976a: 6-7, §1.2.5) described: “This similarity struck early workers in the field as being very great”, for which he quoted the words by H. Brugsch (1867) himself, the first so productive mastermind of Eg.-Sem. etymology: “Im voraus kann ich es weissagen, dass die Sprachforschung eines Tages erstaunt sein wird über das enge Band der Verwandtschaft, welches die ägyptische Sprache mit ihren semitischen Schwestern zusammenknüpft, und über die mir jetzt schon feststehende Tatsache, dass alle eine gemeinsame Mutter haben”.

¹¹ Cf., e.g., Ember 1912: 86; Albright 1923: 70. Already F. Hommel (1894: 342) was more careful: although, admitting “Dass das Ägyptische ... mehr oder weniger nahe mit den semitischen Sprachen verwandt ist, wird längst nicht mehr bezweifelt” and then having once more abundantly examined a whole series of shared morphological traits of both branches, he (Hommel 1894: 354-355) too concluded thereof to two concurring scenarios (assuming either a tight Egypto-Semitic unit or that “das Ägyptische ursprünglich lediglich ein Dialekt des nordbabylonischen Semitisch war ..., eine Weiterentwicklung jenes nordbabylonischen Dialekts”), still, in the “*Nachtrag*” of August 1892 to his paper, Hommel (1894: 355-358) was careful enough to extend his comparative morphology onto Berber and Bedawye with the same traits. Reviewing A. Ember’s magnum opus (ESS), E. Mahler (1931: 469) made it clear “da ja im vorliegenden Werke nicht bezweckt wird nachzuspüren, wie etwaige hebräische oder sonstige semitische Ausdrücke auf entsprechende ägyptische zurückzuführen sind, sondern die Beziehungen des Aegyptischen zu den Sprachfamilien (*sic*) der Semiten aufzudecken und zu erläutern beabsichtigt.” In his report “Ägyptisch-semitische Sprachvergleichung” delivered for the “Sechste Deutsche Orientalistentag” (Vienna, 1930), F. von Calice (1930: 61), as many other authors of this trend sooner or later, formulated his Semito-centric hypothesis: “so kann das Ägyptische unmöglich mit dem ‘Hamitischen’ zusammen dem ‘Semitischen’ gegenübergestellt werden; es steht dem Semitischen näher als einem großen Teile der Hamitensprachen. Am ehesten entspräche dem Tatbestande die Annahme, daß in Ägypten ein semitisches Idiom von einer hamitischen oder teilweise hamitischen Urbevölkerung übernommen wurde.” In the light of lexical matches between Egyptian and Berber or Beja, Calice’s (1931: 28-29) dilemma was whether Egyptian was just a Hamiticized Semitic language: “Hat sich das Ägyptische durch die Ausbreitung eines semitischen Idioms auf eine hamitische oder teilweise hamitische Urbevölkerung gebildet, so ist der Bestand solcher, mit den hamitischen Sprachen verwandter Wörter ohne weiteres erklärlich ... Auch lautlich eine Annahme einer hamitischen Unterschicht im Ägyptischen sehr plausibel; da die hamitischen Sprachen im allgemeinen über die gleichen laryngalen Laute verfügen, wie die Semiten, ist die unveränderte Erhaltung der semitischen Laryngale im Ägyptischen, das sonst eine so starke lautliche Zersetzung aufweist, bei dieser Hypothese ohne weiteres verständlich. Aus anderen, als sprachlichen Erwägungen heraus bin ich geneigt, für die alte Bevölkerung des Niltals eine Mischung auch noch mit anderen als eine Mischung auch noch nicht mit anderen als hamitischen und semitischen Bevölkerungselementen für wahrscheinlich zu halten.” Even W. Vycichl (1959a: 38) spoke of “Egyptian and the other (*sic!*) Semitic languages” – pretty revealing. But elsewhere, towards the conclusions in the same paper, Vycichl (1959a: 41) hesitated as for “the question whether we are entitled to call Egyptian a Semitic language or not. Frankly speaking, in spite of all the parallels existing between Egyptian and Semitic, I feel some hesitation in doing so. **This is certainly not because of the vocabulary.**” But due to fact that Semitic had “rather a certain unity of history, social organization, religious beliefs and civilization that form a well defined group of tribes and peoples **distinct from the Egyptians.**” This problem was discussed by C.T. Hodge (1976a: 7, §1.2.5): “This view is often later abandoned by its proponents (such as Albright), but the fact that it could be seriously entertained is significant.”

This era was almost completely presented in the GÄSW 1-10 and was covered perhaps in its fullness by M. Cohen (1947: 28-38, §II.A), while R.M. Voigt (1999: 345-352), briefly, also surveyed the “old school” of Egypto-Semitic comparative linguistics¹² acknowledging some of its virtues. Years later, in turn, in his chapter “4. The phonological system of Semito-Hamitic”, R.M. Voigt (2002: 269), trying to present “The comparison of Semitic with ‘Hamitic’ languages”, he immediately narrowed the target area to its comparison with Egyptian listing just “the most important works”.

2.1. The beginning of a new era was hallmarked by the milestone study by **A. Erman** (1892), the first rigorous attempt at arranging and evaluating the *ad hoc* etymologies of the 19th century in a system of regular consonantal matches.¹³ In his chapter on the research history of the “(Hamito)semitische Lautgleichungen: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Einleitung” (full of gaps), W. Schenkel (1990: 41-43, §2.1.3.1) tried to minimize the signification of Erman’s paper by pressing on it the label of being merely a superficial résumé of H. Brugsch’s unsystematic mess of Egypto-Semitic etymologies.¹⁴ But this is just what we admire it for, let alone that effort invested in explicitly denying one’s efforts can inversely only stress its importance: a second case when Schenkel failed in conceiving the significance of a work on AA comparative lexicon.

2.2. As the most flourishing period of this field ever,¹⁵ it had been, at least for a few decades, attracting the interest of many great orientologists from diverse fields (various branches of Semitic studies, egyptology, berberology), who apparently and sensibly – more than ever – regarded publishing beside their respective main field, uncountable minor

¹² This part of his paper is divided into §§1-4, in all of which, however, the “old school” is described from the standpoint of the long-debated neurotic points of the Egyptian hieroglyphic transliterational system (declared in the ZDMG of 1892): “1. Geschichte der ägyptosemitischen Sprachvergleihung” (in fact, it is a discussion of how the values of Eg. <ṯ>, <d>, <ṯ>, <d> evolved in what he calls “*Transkriptionssystem*” during the egyptological research of the 19th cent., pp. 345-348), “2. Etymologien” (in fact, just a very sketchy presentation of the results from this period, just focusing on some etymologies concerning Eg. <d>, <d>, <z>, pp. 348-351), “3. ...?” (missing), “4. Die traditionelle Lehre” (in fact, a very brief discussion of the traditional conception of the Egyptian stops and affricates by J. Vergote 1945 and E. Edel 1955: 351-352).

¹³ As recognized already by some others also. E.g., W. Vycichl (1959a: 37): “Apart from the early attempts in the dawn of Egyptology, the first systematic study in this field has been published by A. Erman ... (1892), dealing with both grammar and vocabulary. This latter part contains about 250 etymologies, 50 of which are considered as sure by the author and 75 as probable.” W.A. Ward (1985: 231): “The pioneer work in Egypto-Semitic was a study by Erman ... in 1892 which began a fruitful four decades or so of scholarly contributions to this field.”

¹⁴ Op. cit., p. 42: “Hier bezieht sich ERMAN ausdrücklich als der Haupt-Materialbasis auf HEINRICH BRUGSCHS ‘Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch’ von 1867-82 ..., macht sich aber nicht die Mühe, über BRUGSCH hinaus die wissenschaftlich Tradition aufzuarbeiten. ... Da aber BRUGSCH – der geniale Schlamper, der er war – keineswegs als zusammenfassender Schlußpunkt der älteren Forschung gelten kann, steht zu vermuten, daß durch ERMANs jugendliche Unbekümmertheit manche Einsicht der älteren Ägyptologie verloren ging. Heute dürften sich nach den seit ERMAN unternommenen Anstrengungen auf diesem Gebiet Recherchen in der älteren ägyptologischen Literatur kaum mehr lohnen ...”

¹⁵ Which W. Vycichl (1959a: 37-38) described a bit less fruitful after Erman 1892: “In the following decades, until 1930, there was a slow but steady progress in this domain. Etymologies were published by K. Sethe, F. Hommel, G. Farina, A.M. Blackman, A. Ember, W.F. Albright and F. Calice.”

papers contributing to this peripheral comparative field,¹⁶ primarily Egypto-Semitic, as attractive, as – so to say – fashionable, as their exciting task: A. Erman, F. Hommel, L. Stern, W.M. (Max) Müller, F. von Calice, H. Holma, K. Sethe, A. Ember, A.H. Gardiner, W.F. Albright, F. Behnk, G. Möller, W. Spiegelberg, G. Farina, A. Cuny, C. Brockelmann, Sh. Yeivin, I. Eitan, F. Lexa, E. Zyhlarz, W. Vycichl, M. Cohen, G. Lefévre, V. Loret, P. Lacau, J. Vergote and others. This enthusiastic experimental “hobby”, pursued by the best orientologists of that day, resulted in valuable etymologies. On the (mostly bibliographic) details of the multitude of almost all these papers see ESS IX-XIV and Cohen 1947: 28-38, §II.A (therefore all these items will not be reviewed here in detail).

2.3. From this ocean of etymologies, some 4-5 decades after Erman 1892, there emerged almost half a dozen of outstanding syntheses.¹⁷ Culminating in the 1930/40s, this trend provided us with three fundamental comparative dictionaries of diverse scope and approach and two further phonological syntheses within a short period of time:

2.3.1. A. Ember,¹⁸ who, in his entire short-cut career (1911-1926), practically only researched and published new Egypto-Semitic etymologies, whence his (1930) *Egypto-Semitic Studies* (ESS) is the first monographical elaboration of the comparative consonantism, arranged according to the Eg.-Sem. phonological correspondences, whose basic points – unlike a multitude of etymologies – mostly stood the test of time.

¹⁶ At the end of this flourishing era, M. Cohen (1947: 3-42) has composed a very detailed *Aperçu sur la comparaison chamito-sémitique* comprising an almost complete list of comparative the works from this era and the preceding pioneering period of the 19th century in Chapter I (pp. 3-27: “Histoire et bibliographie générale”), followed by a second by a second set of retrospective overview of the enormously abundant outcome of the “old school” in our special field of research examined in this paper plus as for the internal lexical comparison of certain branches (Chapter II: “Bibliographie spéciale pour les comparaisons de vocabulaire et pour la phonétique”, divided into the following sections according to the AA branches, namely: “A. – Rapprochements égypto-sémitiques; égyptien” on pp. 28-38, “B. – Comparaisons concernant principalement le berbère” on pp. 38-39, “C. – Comparaisons concernant spécialement le couchitique” on pp. 39-41, “D. – Vocabulaire de la région méditerranée et mots voyageurs” on p. 41, “E. – Études étymologiques du sémitique” on pp. 41-42). This bibliographical treasure of this era was complemented by the *addenda* in the profound review paper by F. Hintze (1951: 66-67).

¹⁷ As formulated by W. Vycichl (1959a: 38): “Then comparative studies come to an apparent standstill and collections of existing equations are published: Ember ... (1930), Calice ... (1934) (*sic*) and J. Vergote ... (1945). M. Cohen’s *Essai comparatif* ... (1947) was severely criticized by F. Hintze (1951).” W. Vycichl (1958: 367) put it a year later so: “Dann ebdt die Welle der Veröffentlichungen ab und es erscheinen die Zusammenfassungen ...” Or by W.A. Ward (1985: 231): “Numerous scholars have made lesser contributions (surveyed by Conti, 1978: 1 ff), but the basic word-lists and the resulting pattern of phonetic correspondences were established by the 1930’s.”

¹⁸ More on this: Takács 2005: 78ff.; 2006c: 145-187. Taking part at the NACAL 27 (Baltimore, Maryland, USA, 19-21 March 1999), I managed to record the recollections (i.e., about the tragical fire accident of 1926 destroying A. Ember) of his daughter, Ruth Ember (then probably around/over 80) in her luxury doll shop of Ellicott City, many details of which are to be included once a comprehensive monograph will issue from the present sketchy study.

2.3.2. W. Czermak's two volumes (1931-4) of a historical phonology of Egyptian, although focusing predominantly on the internal evidence for surveying the processes, is not void of hints on the Semitic *comparanda* containing both cognates and loanwords.

2.3.3. F. von Calice's (1936) monumental *Grundlagen...* (GÄSW),¹⁹ the most complete thesaurus of all kinds of (not just Semitic) etymologies suggested during the decades of "Hamitology" and the "old school" from the known AA branches, exceeds both Ember's and Vergote's lexicons in quantity of Egyptian etymologies (948 including the uncertain cases). Although its gigantic material, arranged in 4 distinct comparative wordlists (ranging and depending on the grade of likelihood)²⁰ according to the sequence of the egyptological

¹⁹ Cf. Takács, G.: Seventy years after the first attempt at Egyptian Etymological Dictionary: Evaluation of F. von Calice's 'Grundlagen der ägypto-semitischen Wortvergleichung'. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 48 (2006), 139-163.

²⁰ • "Liste A" (#1-#111, pp. 23-47) "contient les racines qui paraissent pouvoir être attribuées sûrement au fonds commun chamito-sémitique" (Cohen 1947: 35). Or, as summed up by J. Vergote (1945: 127): "La liste A contient les mots égyptiens auxquels correspondent des racines chamitiques aussi bien que les sémitiques; ils semblent appartenir à la souche commune dont serait né le sémitique et le chamitique." R.H. Pfeiffer (1948: 186): list of "primitive Hamito-Semitic roots". • "Liste B" (#112-#390, pp. 48-95) "comprend des mots pour lesquels il semble n'y avoir un rapprochement sûr qu'avec le sémitique, et qui sont plus ou moins suspects d'être des emprunts à celui-ci" (Cohen 1947: 35) or as it was meant in the GÄSW 67: "jene ägyptischen Wörter, die ihrer Lautgestalt und Bedeutungsentwicklung nach wohl mit dem Semitischen urverwandt sein können, bezüglich deren es jedoch ... zunächst noch zweifelhaft bleiben muss, ob sie tatsächlich jener Schicht zuzuzählen sind oder ob sie zu jenem ältesten Lehngute gehören, dessen Existenz a priori wahrscheinlich ist". GÄSW 93: "Die Grenze zwischen der vorliegenden Liste und der ... Liste A ist natürlich eine fließende und z.T. willkürliche und einige hier angeführte Wörter hätten vielleicht ebenso gut in jener Platz finden dürfen. Man wird vielleicht bei einigen Wörtern Urverwandtschaft, bei anderen Entlehnung für wahrscheinlicher halten, ohne dass es an der Hand der un- zur Verfügung stehenden Daten möglich wäre, eine wirkliche Entscheidung zu treffen." J. Vergote (1945: 127): "Dans la liste B se trouvent les mots égyptiens qui semblent être hérités directement du protosémitique; certains d'entre eux peuvent toutefois aussi être des emprunts très anciens de l'égyptien au sémitique." R.H. Pfeiffer (1948: 186): a list of "possible Semitic loan words is Egyptian (omitting the well-known borrowings in late Egyptian)". • "Liste C" (#391-#459, pp. 96-108), as described by M. Cohen (1947: 35), "contient les termes pour lesquels l'emprunt de l'égyptien ancien au sémitique est vraisemblable. (Les emprunts assurés ou presque assurés du néo-égyptien ne sont pas insérés.)" GÄSW 107-108: "von diesen Vergleichen lassen sich einzelne gut in den Rahmen der bisher behandelten einfügen; ich habe sie darum dort nicht aufgenommen, weil sie mir aus Gründen der Lautentsprechung oder des Bedeutung nicht sicher genug vorkommen, um als Stütze für irgendwelche Folgerungen zu dienen. Andere sind wesentlich zweifelhafterer Natur bis zu solchen herunter, bei welchen nur mehr von einem Etymologisieren um jeden Preis gesprochen werden kann." J. Vergote (1945: 127): "Les racines égyptiennes de la liste C ont au contraire selon toute vraisemblance été empruntées à une langue sémitique." R.H. Pfeiffer (1948: 186): a list of "probable Semitic loan words is Egyptian (omitting the well-known borrowings in late Egyptian)". • The "Liste D" (#460-#948, pp. 109-227, NB: Cohen 1947: 35 misquoted the first item of this list as #451!), as conveyed by M. Cohen (1947: 35-36), "est composite: à côté de nombreuses étymologies très douteuses, qui ne sont insérées qu'en vue d'établir un catalogue complet et sont repoussées par un signe (? ou /), de nombreuses autres sont considérées comme valables, après examen, et souvent révision; en effet, dans un certain nombre de cas, F. Calice substitue à un mauvais rapprochement avec le sémitique un rapprochement avec le couchitique qui lui paraît bon ... En outre dans cette liste D, tous les numéros des listes A, B, C sont repris comme références, de sorte que c'est cette liste D qu'il faut consulter pour retrouver, comme dans un index, toutes les racines égyptiennes traitées par l'auteur." Or, to quote GÄSW 108: "Damit das nun folgende Verzeichnis zugleich als Index aller hier behandelten Wörter dienen könne, sind die bereits besprochenen Vokabeln in ihrer alphabetischen Stelle mit einem Hinweis auf ihre Nummer mit eingesetzt." In the estimation of F. von Calice (GÄSW 236) himself, "In den vorbestehenden Listen A bis D sind rund 960 Wortgleichungen besprochen, dazu kommen weitere 200, die ich als vornherein unmöglich, oder als deutliche späte Entlehnungen ... ausgeschieden hatte. Hiervon bleiben die unter A bis C gesammelten

alphabet, is typically Egypto-Semitic (comprising, among others, some 800 Arabic, 570 Canaanite-Aramaic, 250 Akkadian, and 150 SW-Semitic items), whereas, however, all possible etymologies from the African branches are also listed (including 115 Cushitic, 54 Berber, 17 Hausa matches). The views of von Calice (1923-6, 2) on the Eg.-Sem. vs. “Hamitic” dichotomy were rather ambivalent.²¹

The afore-listed three basic tools concluded and summarized all the achievements of a pioneering grand epoch of the “old school”, so popular and cultivated among the greatest Orientalists, which certainly definitely ended in 1930s. Though this accumulated great corpus has frequently been re-used in the below-listed subsequent comparative lexicons, these cannot be regarded as an extension of this period for diverse reasons:

2.3.4. J. Vergote’s (1945) *Phonétique historique de l’égyptien*, with its solid list of Egypto-Semitic isoglosses will be discussed in the following sub-episode devoted to a strange re/survival of the all the more ontroverted “old school” as this distinguished specialist of Egypto-Coptic linguistics in fact only started his research with this first magnum opus, which was, however, not followed by its extension either onto other AA branches or to new and original Egypto-Semitic *comparanda*.

2.3.5. M. Cohen’s (1947) epochal *Essai comparatif* reproduced, in the Egypto-Semitic domain, the results of the “old school”, so its novelty (if at all) lies not here as it yields perhaps something original rather in its pioneering, even if failed attempt at an etymological synthesis of the “Hamitic” branches, which is why it is discussed in the previous Episode (below).

2.4. The balance of the “old school” is, however, only partly flattering. One can agree in principle, on the one hand, with the objections by W.A. Ward on diverse disturbing phenomena in the philologically neglectful methodology of this comparative domain in the first decades of the 20th century²² As a result, Ward’s (1985: 245, §V) words about the

rund 460 Nummern und von den übrigen vielleicht noch 80-100 Stück als brauchbares Material zurück. Diese halbe Tausend Stämme stellt mit seinen Ableitungen zwar keinen ganz geringen Bruchteil des ägyptischen Wortschatzes dar. ... Die hier untersuchten Wörter bilden aber in der Masse des übrigen Wortschatzes offenbar keinen Fremdkörper.” J. Vergote (1945: 127): “Nous négligeons la liste D dans laquelle Calice reproduit les racines égyptiennes qui se retrouvent seulement en chamitique et, à titre documentaire, les nombreuses étymologies proposées ... mais considérées ... comme incertaines.” R.H. Pfeiffer (1948: 186): a list of “questionable comparisons”.

²¹ L.c.: “Ha a «hámi» és «szémi» nyelvről nemzedékek óta kialakult fogalmak nem volnának utunkban, egy nyelvkuató sem habozna az egyiptomi nyelvet a szémiakkal együtt ugyanabba a nyelvcsaládba utalni.” Translated from Hungarian: “If the conceptions on ‘Hamite’ and ‘Semite’ languages were not in our way, no linguist would hesitate to refer the Egyptian language with the Semite (*sic*) ones to the same language family.”

²² Ward (1985: 231-232): “1. There was too much dependence on dictionary meanings which are often vague or incorrect. Both Egyptian and Semitic words must be examined in actual contexts, a much more exacting and time-consuming process, but ... produced far more reliable semantic results. 2. There was little ... attention paid to the history of the words ...” which “In many cases ... shows that seemingly cognate terms have totally different origins in Egyptian and Semitic; it is the original ... meanings which must establish a true Egypto-Semitic cognate. 3. The chronology of the usage was ignored. ... words known only in late texts or languages were assumed to have long previous histories in order to support their supposed Egypto-Semitic origin. This

eclectic etymological diversity of the ESS and the GÄSW are painfully true: “It may be an unduly harsh judgement on earlier generations of scholars, but by the time the major collections of supposed Egypto-Semitic cognates were produced in the 1930’s and 40’s, the result was chaos. ...long lists of etymologies ..., only a relatively small minority of which can be called genuine.” This chaos of far-fetched forc/ged etymologies can be, in my view, first of all, traced back to the mistaken conception of this era, which has been even surviving into the 2nd half of the 20th century (!),²³ namely an ill-founded (or better: unargued *ex cathedra*) dogma of regarding Egyptian simply as “a Semitic language” (!), whereby it was erroneously implied that the root inventories of these two branches should certainly overlap to a much higher degree than they really do and so many homologous but phonologically all too dubious, different roots, *a priori* misbelieved to be cognate, were subject to forc/ged misconceived comparisons via *ad hoc* invented intermediate stages of *Lautübergänge*²⁴ irrespective of their phonological incompatibility. The papers by W.F. Albright provide typical examples thereof, whose etymologies of this kind penetrated even the ESS (posthumously ed. by him and F. Behnk).²⁵ This at once becomes clear by comparing the niveau of etymologies in his papers (most notably Albright 1918a-b: 1927) and in those of his master: A. Ember (1911-1926). Secondly, the even worse (if at all) lack of a *lautgeschichtlich* reliable paradigm in the contemporaneous “Hamitology” had certainly seduced certain authors to be led astray in this way. But, luckily, the misleading voluntarism of forging Egypto-Semitic matches by any means and at any scholarly price did not affect a number of authors like von Calice, Ember, Yeivin or Vergote, among whom Vycichl stands unparalleled by his refined and extremely careful research. Such linguists have secured our safe knowledge on the principal outlines of Egyptian historical phonology, on the other hand, even if many etymologies have proven since then to be false. Certainly, for some other

error is seen especially in the comparisons of Old Egyptian and Arabic where there is nothing earlier on the Semitic side.”

²³ This line of thoughts was maintained even by J. Vergote (1965: 105): “Nous croyons pouvoir conclure que l’égyptien est une langue sémitique à part entière. De même que l’inventaire phonétique et le système phonologique des consonnes est sémitique, ainsi que nous l’avons démontré antérieurement, le système des voyelles et la structure des sémantèmes sont sémitiques.” Cf. also O. Rössler’s ominous study from 1971 (!) entitled “Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache” (sic) on which W.A. Ward (1985: 232) justly concluded that “Rössler believes Egyptian to be a Semitic language which allows him to make some substantial changes in the accepted phonetic pattern of Egyptian. **I do not believe Egyptian is a Semitic language ...**” Considering the morphological features and the lexical stock of both branches, A.H. Gardiner (EG¹ 1927, §3) admitted Egyptian and Semitic to be very similar, but already he has wisely drawn a more cautious and realistic conclusion: “In spite of these resemblances, **Egyptian differs from all Semitic tongues** a good deal more than any one of them differs from any other, and at least until its relationship to the African languages is more closely defined, **Egyptian must certainly be classified as standing outside the Semitic group.**”

²⁴ As stated by C.T. Hodge (1976a: 7, §1.2.5): “Elaborate rationalizations of differences (as, e.g., in Albright) are to be avoided. This is not to say that etymologies supported by theories of sound change various sorts and degrees of are necessarily wrong. They are only held to be wrong when clearly better etymologies replace them or where they are seen to be based on erroneous views of the phonologies involved.” Therefore, in his research, “a strong effort has been made to correspond on clear phonologic grounds.”

²⁵ Cf. F. Von Calice’s contemporary words on the ESS: “EMBER’s bei seinem Tode noch in Vorbereitung befindliches Werk ... Die posthume Veröffentlichung des halbverbrannten Manuskriptes bearbeitet und ergänzt von Frida BEHNK) zeigt, dass nur die Sammlung des lexikalischen Stoffes, die auch ziemlich viel bis dahin noch nicht Veröffentlichtes umfasst, beim EMBER’s Tode fertig verlag.”

scholars, it may be hard to realize that pure fact that a considerable share of the Egyptian lexicon **cannot** be understood from Semitic and vice versa. With the enumerated *compensata* of the 1930/40es, the possibilities of an Egypto-Semitic lexical comparison have culminated, attained the maximum of their exploitation, I am afraid, even if not yet exhausted fully, of course.²⁶ At this point, esp. regarding both the almost fully introverted evolution of egyptological linguistics and the simultaneous rise of the availability of the cognate Berber, Cushitic and Chadic lexicons, one could have believed that a worse sort of monomaniac and all the less productive Egypto-Semitic etymologization – with all due respect to the few exceptions like, e.g., W. Vycichl who really gave further sense for maintaining this bipolar equation in the AA frames – soon better vanishes silently in order to yield to a more balanced and wider range of inter-branch comparison. It happened, however, otherwise with two groups of scholars: some from the post-war phase of this all the more improductive trend (§2.5 below) vs. the Rösslerians (§7, i.e., Episode VII of this series).²⁷

*

Abbreviations of languages and other terms

(A): Ahmimic, AA: Afro-Asiatic (Afrasian, formerly: Semito-Hamitic), Ar.: Arabic, (B) Bohairic, Bed.: Bed'awye (Beja), Ch.: Chadic, Cu.: Cushitic, Eg.: Egyptian, (F): Fayyumic, IE: Indo-European, L: Late, (L): Lycopollitan (Sub-Akhmimic), LP: Late Period, N: North(ern), OK: Old Kingdom, Om.: Omotic, P: Proto-, S: South(ern), (S): Sahidic, Sem.: Semitic, SH: Semito-Hamitic, Ug.: Ugaritic, W: West(ern).

Abbreviations of author names

BK: Biberstein Kazimirski, Dlg.: Dolgopol'skij, GT: Takács, IS: Illič-Svityč, KM: Kießling & Mous.

²⁶ W. Vycichl (1958: 367) was, of course, right stating about the post-ESS/GÄSW phase of the Eg.-Sem. track: "Es könnte nun scheinen, als sei das Thema erschöpft, und alles Wesentliche zur Sache gesagt. Das ist aber, wie man im folgenden sehen wird, durchaus nicht der Fall. Man weiß nicht einmal, wieviele der 948 Etymologien in CALICES Grundlagen zu Recht bestehen. ... Diese erschreckend hohe Unsicherheit hat es mit sich gebracht, daß die ägyptisch-semitische Sprachvergleiche von manchen Ägyptologen nicht ganz mit Unrecht mit einer gewissen Skepsis betrachtet wird. Zugegeben sei, daß man auf diesem Gebiet unter besonders schwierigen Umständen operiert: die vokallose Schreibung, ..., der starke lautliche Zerfall des Ägyptischen, der schon in den ältesten Texten zutage tritt und nicht zuletzt die verschiedenen Methoden der Wortklärung im Semitischen und Ägyptischen stellen Erschwerungen dar ... von denen man in anderen Sprachgebieten nichts zu spüren bekommt."

²⁷ Although he had never become an adherent of J.H. Greenberg's new AA conception and I.M. D'jakonov's vision of PAA phonology, W. Vycichl, a graduate of the Viennese double institute of Africanistics and Egyptology of Reinisch, a giant comparativist familiar with all the SH/AA branches and so exploiting Semitic, Egyptian, Berber, Beja, Somali, Hausa etc. from the very beginning of his extraordinary long research (1933-1999), needed not to shift the right track or course of his researches. Sadly, very few in this trend, and also among his contemporaries in general, followed his example.

References

- Albright, William Foxwell. 1918a. Notes on Egypto-Semitic etymology. I. *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 34(2), 81-98.
- Albright, William Foxwell. 1918b. Notes on Egypto-Semitic etymology. II. *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 34(4), 215-255.
- Albright, William Foxwell. 1923. The principles of Egyptian phonological development. *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* 40. 64-70.
- Albright, William Foxwell. 1927. Notes on Egypto-Semitic etymology. III. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 47. 198-237.
- Bechhaus-Gerst, Marianne. 1998. Old Egyptian and Afro-Asiatic: The state of the art. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 56. 111-129.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1844. *Ueber das Verhältniss der ägyptischen Sprache zum semitischen Sprachstamm*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Brugsch, Heinrich. 1867-1882. *Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch, enthaltend in wissenschaftlicher Anordnung die gebräuchlichsten Wörter und Gruppen der Heiligen und der Volks-Sprache und Schrift der Alten Ägypter nebst deren Erklärung in französischer deutscher und arabischer Sprache und Angabe ihrer Verwandtschaft mit den entsprechenden Wörtern des Koptischen und der semitischen Idiome*. Bde. I-VII. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Burrini, Gabriele. 1978 and 1979. Profilo storico degli studi camito-semitici. *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario di Napoli* 38. 113-153 and 39. 351-384.
- Calice, Ferenc (sic). 1923-6. Adalékok Egyptom (sic) őskori kultúrájához. *Archaeologiai Értesítő* 1-10.
- Calice, Franz von. 1930. Ägyptisch-semitische Sprachvergleichung. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 84. 61-62.
- Calice, Franz von. 1931. Über semitisch-ägyptische Sprachvergleichung. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 85. 25-37.
- Calice, Franz von. 1936. *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. Wien: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- Cohen, Marcel. 1947. *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Czermak, Wilhelm. 1931. *Die Laute der ägyptischen Sprache: Eine phonetische Untersuchung*. I. Teil: *Die Laute des Alt- und Mittelägyptischen*. Wien: Verlag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Ägyptologen und Afrikanisten in Wien.
- Czermak, Wilhelm. 1934. *Die Laute der ägyptischen Sprache: Eine phonetische Untersuchung*. II. Teil. Wien: Verlag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Ägyptologen und Afrikanisten in Wien.
- DELC = Vycichl, Werner. 1983. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*. Leuven: Peeters.
- EDE I = Takács, Gábor. 1999. *Etymological dictionary of Egyptian*. Volume One: *A phonological introduction*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- EDE II = Takács, Gábor. 2001. *Etymological dictionary of Egyptian*. Volume Two: *b-, p-, f-*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Edel, Elmar. 1955. *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum. = AÄG
- EG¹ 1927 = Gardiner, Alan Henderson. 1927. *Egyptian grammar*.¹ Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ember, Aaron. 1912. Notes on the relation of Egyptian and Semitic. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 50. 86-90.
- Ember, Aaron. 1917 (a) New Semito-Egyptian words. (b) Some African words in Old Egyptian. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 37. 21.
- Erman, Adolf. 1892. Das Verhältniss des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 46. 93-129.
- ESS = Ember, Aaron. 1930. *Egypto-Semitic studies*. Leipzig: The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.
- Farina, Giulio. 1923-25. Review of Sottas, H. & Drioton, E.: Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 10. 322-327.
- GÄSW = Calice, Graf F. von. 1936. *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. Wien: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- Hintze, Fritz. 1951. Zur hamitosemitischen Wortvergleichung. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5. 65-87.
- Hodge, Carleton T. 1970. Afroasiatic: An overview. *Current Trends in Linguistics* 6. 237-254.

- Hodge, Carleton T. 1971. Afroasiatic: An overview. In Hodge, Carleton T. (ed.), *Afroasiatic: A survey*, 9-26. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hodge, Carleton T. 1976a. An Egypto-Semitic comparison. *Folia Orientalia* 17. 5-28.
- Hodge, Carleton T. 1976b. Lisramic (Afroasiatic): An overview. In Bender, Marvin Lionel (ed.), *The non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*, 43-65. East Lansing, Michigan: African Studies Center of Michigan State University.
- Hommel, Fritz. 1894. Über den Grad der Verwandtschaft des Altägyptischen mit dem Semitischen. *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 2. 342-358.
- Köhler, Oswin. 1975. Geschichte und Probleme der Gliederung der Sprachen Afrikas. In Baumann, Herrmann (ed.), *Die Völker Afrikas und ihre traditionellen Kulturen* (Studien zur Kulturkunde 34), 135-373. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.
- Mahler, Eduard. 1931. Besprechung von Aaron Ember: *Egypto-Semitic Studies*. Aus dem Ueberresten des Originalmanuskripts hergestellt und nach älteren Arbeiten des Verfassers ergänzt von Frida Behnk. Mit einem Vorwort von Kurt Sethe. *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*. 467-469.
- Meinhof, Carl. 1912. *Die Sprachen den Hamiten*. Hamburg: Friedrichsen & Co.
- Mukarovsky, Hans G. 1981. Hamito-Semitisch, Afro-Asiatisch, Erythräisch: Zum Wandel von Begriffen und Verständnis. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 34. 511-526.
- Petráček, Karel. 1984. La méthodologie du chamitosémitique comparée: État, problèmes, perspectives. In Bynon, James (ed.), *Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics*, 423-462. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Petráček, Karel. 1989. *Úvod do hamitosemitské (afroasijské) jazykovědy I-II*. Edited by (k vydání připravil) Zemánek, Petr. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. 1948. Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique, by Marcel Cohen. Bibliothèque (sic) de l'École des Hautes Études, vol. 291. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1947. Pp. xi+248. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67(2). 186-187.
- Rössler, Otto. 1971. Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache. In Altheim, F. & Stiehl, R. (eds.), *Christentum am Roten Meer*, Bd. I, 263-325. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1981. Afroasiatisch. In Schadeberg, Thilo (ed.), *Die Sprachen Afrikas*. Band 2. *Afroasiatisch*, 129-148. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Satzinger, Helmut. 1999. Afroasiatischer Sprachvergleich. In Grunert, Stefan & Hafemann, Ingelore (eds.), *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch: Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie*, 367-386. Leiden: Brill.
- Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1990. *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft* (Orientalistische Einführungen in Gegenstand, Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Einzelgebiete). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Takács, Gábor. 1999a. *Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) comparative-historical linguistics in Russia and the former Soviet Union*. München – Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, Gábor. 1999b. Contribution of V.M. Illič-Svityč to Chadic comparative-historical linguistics. *Archív Orientální* 67. 361-378.
- Takács, Gábor. 2002. Publications de Werner Vycichl. In Naït-Zerrad, Kamal (ed.), *Articles de linguistique berbère. Mémorial Werner Vycichl*, 19-41. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Takács, Gábor. 2003a. Igor Mikhailovich Diakonoff (1915-1999). In Bender, Marvin Lionel & Appleyard, David & Takács, Gábor (eds.), *Selected comparative-historical Afrasian linguistic studies in memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*, v-vii. (Lincom Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 14). München & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, Gábor. 2003b. Selected linguistic bibliography of I.M. Diakonoff. In Bender, Marvin Lionel & Appleyard, David & Takács, Gábor (eds.), *Selected comparative-historical Afrasian Linguistic studies in memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*, ix-xii. (Lincom Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 14). München & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, Gábor. 2004. Werner Vycichl (1909-1999). In Takács, Gábor (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) studies in memoriam Werner Vycichl*, ix-xi. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Takács, Gábor. 2005. Aaron Ember and the establishment of Egypto-Semitic phonological and lexical comparison. Part I. *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 6/2. 78-101.
- Takács, Gábor. 2006a. Otto Rössler's new system of Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences. Part One. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 59/2. 90-127.

- Takács, Gábor. 2006b. Seventy years after the first attempt at Egyptian Etymological Dictionary: Evaluation of F. von Calice's 'Grundlagen der ägypto-semitischen Wortvergleihung'. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 48. 139-163.
- Takács, Gábor. 2006c. Aaron Ember and the establishment of Egyptian-Semitic phonological and lexical comparison. Part II. *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 7/1-2. 145-187.
- Takács, Gábor. 2006d. Werner Vycichl and his contribution to Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) comparative phonology and lexicon. In Morel, Mary-Annick & Danon-Boileau, Laurent & Lonnet, Antoine & Mettouchi, Amina (eds.), *Faits de Langues. Revue de linguistique n° 27. Les langues chamito-sémitiques (afro-asiatiques)*, vol. 2, 154-171. Paris: Ophrys.
- Takács, Gábor. 2007. Otto Rössler's new system of Egyptian-Semitic consonant correspondences. Part Two. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 60/1. 5-43.
- Takács, Gábor. 2009. Three decades of Chadic comparative-historical linguistics in the USSR and Russia (1966-1996). In Shevoroshkin, Vitaly V. & Sverdrup, Harald U. (eds.), *Bygone voices reconstructed: On the language origins and their relationships. In honor of Aron Dolgopolski*, 211-220. Copenhagen: Privatforlaget: Underskov Publishers ApS.
- Takács, Gábor. 2012. Aharon Dolgopolsky: The Semitic-Hamitic scholar and man. *Mother Tongue* 17. 19-23.
- Thausing, Gertrud. 1989. *Tarudet: Ein Leben für die Ägyptologie*. Graz/Austria: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Vergote, J. 1945. *Phonétique historique de l'égyptien*. Paris: Le Muséon.
- Vergote, Jozef. 1965. Le rapport de l'égyptien avec les langues sémitiques. *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, klasse der letteren* 27(4). 71-107.
- Vernus, Pascal. 2000. Situation de l'égyptien dans les langues du monde. In Fauvelle-Aymar, François-Xavier & Chrétien, Jean-Pierre & Perrot, Claude-Hélène (eds.), *Afrocentrismes: L'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique*, 169-208. Paris: Éditions Karthala.
- Voigt, Rainer Maria. 1988. Zur Geschichte der vergleichenden Semitohamistik – August Klingenberg und sein Beitrag zur semitohamitischen Sprachwissenschaft. In Brauner, Siegmund & Wolff, Ekkehard (eds.), *Progressive traditions in African and Oriental Studies*, 155-164. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Voigt, Rainer Maria. 2001. Semitohamitische Philologie und vergleichende Grammatik: Geschichte der vergleichenden Semitohamistik. In Auroux, Sylvain & Koerner, E.F.K. & Niederehe, Hans-Josef & Versteegh, Kees (eds.), *History of the language sciences. Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Histoire des sciences du langage. An international handbook on the evolution of the study of language from the beginnings to the present. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours*. Volume 2 / 2. Teilband / Tome 2, 1318-1325. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Voigt, Rainer Maria. 2002. The Hamitic connection: Semitic and Semitohamitic. *Israel Oriental Studies* 20. 265-290.
- Vycichl, W. 1958. Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleihung. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 16. 367-405.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1959. Is Egyptian a Semitic language? *Kush* 7. 27-44.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1978. L'état actuel des études chamito-sémitiques. In Fronzaroli, Pelio (ed.), *Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semita, Firenze, 16-19 aprile 1974*, 63-76. Firenze: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- Ward, William A. 1985. Reflections on methodology in Egyptian-Semitic lexicography. In Tubb, Jonathan N. (ed.), *Palestine and the Bronze and Iron Ages: Papers in honour of Olga Tufnell*, 232-248. London: Institute of Archaeology.
- Wb = Erman, A. & Grapow, H. 1957-1971. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*. Vols. I-V.² Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 1998. La linguistique chamito-sémitique cinquante années après l'Essai comparatif de Marcel Cohen. In El Medlaoui, M. & Gafaiti, S. & Saa, F. (eds.), *Actes du 1^{er} congrès Chamito-Sémitique de Fès, 112-13 mars 1997*, 23-35. Fès: Université Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdallah, Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines.
- ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden).