

DOI: 10.14746/linpo.2023.65.1.5

**Semito-Hamitic or Afro-Asiatic consonantism and lexicon:
Episodes of a comparative research II:
The “old school” of Egypto-Semitic (Part 2: Post-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)

gabtak@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 2: Post-war phase)*. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of Arts and Sciences, PL ISSN 0079-4740, pp. 85-132

My retrospective survey on the past and present trends in the comparative research of Semito-Hamitic / Hamito-Semitic (SH / HS, resp.) or Afro-Asiatic (AA) phonology (first of all consonantism), root structure and lexicon has been segmented into eleven episodes according to diverse (often overlapping in time) trends. This series of studies is now under way and will be presented part by part in a series of papers. The present paper surveys the post-war history (second half of the 20th century) of a rather introverted and fossilized special branch of comparative studies that has been arbitrarily focusing on a forced comparison of just Semitic and Egyptian, which was split off for more than a whole century by now from mainstream Semito-Hamitic studies at the end of the 19th century.

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. Witczak (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 (Morpeth, UK), the doyen of Ugaritic philology, for his friendly favour of reading the draft version of this paper and improving its English style.

Dedicated to the blessed memory of my sometime colleague,
Mr. Péter Gaboda (1963-2023)²
on the 30th anniversary of our fruitful sessions (1993)³
in the library of the Egyptian Collection
of the Hungarian Museum of Fine Arts

Introduction

The first part of this study⁴ had a lengthy intro into the aims of the whole series of studies this one also belongs to, preceding the main characteristics, works and figures of the comparative Egypto-Semitic “old school” in the enormously productive period of this trend flourishing between A. Erman’s epochal study of 1892 and WW II. The second half of this study details the long afterlife of this increasingly introverted trend in the 2nd half of the 20th century predominantly in terms of its taxonomical criteria as this trend has unfortunately

² Sometime research fellow (1988-2023) of the Egyptian Dept. of the Museum of Fine Arts, the only one I have known in Hungary among the so numerous local egyptologists and orientalists at all, who was capable and knowledgeable about comparative Semito-Hamitic and has learnt about the ways of this neglected domain. He had been the only one in my country I have ever been able to maintain reasonable and fruitful scholarly contact with. But the incredible range of his interests was far-far beyond mine and this paper is just a very modest reflection of the universe he had been at home in. In the footnote to the dedication (commemorating the 30th anniversary of when he, upon the instruction of Prof. V. Wessetzky, had made me familiar with some basic tools of comparative Semito-Hamitic), placed in the first part of this study (LP 63/1, 2021, p. 132, fn. 4), which went into press only in spring 2023 (which is why the word on his tragical loss could be considered in that issue), I have already described the personality of this exceptionally hidden treasure of Hungarian Oriental studies.

³ What I would like to specially emphasize with this second dedication to the genius of Péter Gaboda is that his guidance in the very beginning of my acquaintance with Semito-Hamitic throughout 1992-3 had been concluded by our unforgettable spring and summer sessions in the library of the Egyptian Collection, full of fun and so rare moments of distraction, in 1993, the last year when we had still been in weekly regular personal contact – precisely thirty years ago. Afterwards, my path turned away from him and the museum for a few years to start my research (1994-8) for my ph.d. thesis. But following that very turbulent period, our relationship took a new regular form: when I had begun my German studies and then my Humboldt research fellowship in Frankfurt am Main under the guidance of Prof. H. Jungraithmayr in summer-autumn 1999, our regular contacts were intensively renewed in a written form to become an incredible abundant and long correspondence lasting until the last months of his difficult life for more than two decades when we had hardly seen each other any more. In fact, practically only twice in the Hungarian capital throughout the first two decades of this century. Once we spent one nostalgic afternoon together early 2003, a whole of a decade after our museum sessions, when, having returned from my Frankfurt research, I took the position of a researcher at the university’s dept. of egyptology in my home university. Subsequent to this long chat, I multiply tried to seduce him back to the side of Semito-Hamitic, to the field of our sometime shared interests, but I was amazed by how deeply he had already by that day been engaged in his enormously genuine and fruitful researches overwoven by the European-Oriental science history of the 19th century. His research materials represent an incredible treasure of which he had only managed to publish a minor share. Finally, the second and very last occasion was in or around 2010 for another whole day of desperately nostalgic walk all along and around the Danube shores. Afterwards we haven’t seen each other any more, although we had been corresponding for another 12 years.

⁴ “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)”. = *Lingua Posnaniensis* 63/2 (2021), 131-145.

entirely failed in showing up any renewal in terms of quality. The entries' numeration is continued from Part I.

2.5. The post-war survival of the "old school"

While in the pre-war phase, the multitude of interested scholars and their outcome in Egypto-Semitic comparative linguistics was more or less in the same line with the level of general Semito-Hamitic studies of their day in the manner of Leo Reinisch, it was no longer the case with the post-war phase. What Egypto-Semitic has yielded in the 2nd half of the 20th century is a bizarre anachronism already *eo ipso*. This trend, hardly capable any longer to keep up with the all the speedier temp of modern Afro-Asiatic linguistics after J.H. Greenberg (1955 etc.) announced a substantially reformed vision of AA, and has often been yielding rather strange results. After WW II, this surviving trend has been typically represented merely by a few egyptologists (scattered around the world without founding any peculiar school) and Semiticists (esp. in Italy) in the traditional manner of the long out-dated treatises from the 1930s by the great predecessors whose work was progressive in their day, but it has not been adequately reformed by the more recent generations of this trend. Basically, these authors have been fundamentally refraining from dealing with and using the post-Greenbergian results and principles of modern AA comparison⁵ and they basically kept seeking

⁵ Therefore, the nice ideas formulated in his talk on the "Desiderata for the Historical and Comparative Study of Egyptian" delivered for the 1st International Congress of Egyptologists (Cairo, 2-10 October 1976) by E.S. Meltzer (1979: 465) are no more than a humble and optimistic desire: "A look at the recent literature makes it apparent that an increasing amount of attention is being paid to the historical and comparative study of the ancient Egyptian language. There are several reasons ...: ... 2. The growth of Afroasiatic studies. Over the past three or four decades the comparative study of the phylum encompassing Semitic, Egyptian, Libyco-Berber, Cushitic(-Omotic?), and very probably (sic) Chadic has become a recognized discipline within linguistics, and this study of course directly concerns Egyptian ... 3. The greater involvement of current linguistic ideas in Egyptology." But, in fact, the above-mentioned growing interest in comparing Egyptian with the non-Semitic (African) branches has regularly and almost exclusively emerged on the behalf of non-egyptologists, whereas Meltzer failed to name any single scholar from classical egyptology to have produced any kind of comparative phonology and/or word-lists comparing the AA branches in general. On the other hand, one can hardly agree with labelling comparative AA as being "a recognized discipline within linguistics", which is unfortunately not even today is the case and may be even worse, which is easy to understand from the pure facts that comparative AA linguistics infrastructurally hardly exists, since it (1) has by now lost almost all its journals (cf., e.g., the destiny of AAL and JAAL edited by R. Hetzron), (2) has no institutional bases whatsoever on its own rights at any of the universities or academies worldwide (cf., e.g., the tragical destiny of A. Zaborski's unique AA dept. shut down in 2013 at the Jagellonian University of Cracow immediately after he retired), (3) does not represent an organic and permanent part of egyptological training (cf. the sole course worldwide introducing egyptologist students into AA offered between 2003-2019 by the present author at the Hungarian ELTE, which is no longer available either), only to name just some principal factors. In his appraisal of the pioneering 1st Italian "Giornata di studi camito-semitici e indoeuropei" (Milan, 1980), A. Loprieno (1982: 86-87) rightly complained (even when it was voiced from the standpoint of the AA-IE comparison basically and not AA itself as such) that "die gesamte afroasiatische Forschung bis heute im Grunde von dem semitischen Bereich ausgegangen ist [footnote omitted], der Sprachsysteme aufweist, die einander verhältnismäßig ähnlich sind: die vergleichende hamito-semitisch-indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft beschränkt sich also auf den semitisch indogermanischen Vergleich. Aber insofern entstehen für das Fach Probleme, als die älteste belegte afroasiatische Sprache, d.h. das Ägyptische, praktisch unberücksichtigt bleibt". Later he (Loprieno 1982: 88-90) sought the reasons "weshalb das Ägyptische von den Komparatisten so wenig

cognates merely and by any means in two branches: Semitic and Egyptian,⁶ which has long been stimulated by the misconceived preconception of both's close kinship as the only two

oder so oberflächlich in den Sprachvergleich einbezogen wird. Das hat m.E. zwei hauptsächliche Ursachen: (a) Kritik von 'innen': die wenigen Ägyptologen, die sich vorwiegend auf das Terrain des Sprachvergleiches vorgewagt haben, haben es nicht erreicht, die im Fach gegen ihre Untersuchungen erhobenen Bedenken völlig auszuräumen, wohl wegen einer gewissen Unaufmerksamkeit gegenüber den historisch-philologischen Problemen und einer übermäßigen Beachtung der rein phonologischen Entsprechungen ...; (b) Kritik von 'außen': die Einbeziehung des Ägyptischen in die sprachvergleichende Analyse benötigt philologische Kenntnisse, die dem allgemeinen Hamitosemiten nicht geläufig sind. Es geschieht ... mit dem Ägyptischen genau das, was ... auch mit dem Akkadischen passiert, einer Sprache, die innerhalb der semitischen Sprachwissenschaft weniger berücksichtigt wird als etwa das Arabische oder das Hebräische, zweifellos wegen der innersprachlichen Probleme philologischer Natur [footnote omitted]. Mit anderen Worten: Nur dem Ägyptologen bzw. Assyriologen kann es gelingen, das von diesen Sprachen gebotene Material für die Zwecke des Vergleiches zu benutzen, da er als einziger imstande ist, mit dem ... textkritischen Aspekt zurechtzukommen." Similarly to Meltzer's report (above), the appraisal by W.A. Ward (1985: 232) sounds a bit optimistic and misguided about facts: "Egypto-Semitic studies have not lain dormant since the major word-lists appeared and a great deal of work has been done ... in its relation to the much broader field of Afro-Asiatic." Not at all. A great deal of work has not been done and so no "major word-lists" of Egyptian and all the other AA branches had been available until the 1980s or even later.

⁶ This out-dated Semitocentric trait of this trend was at last critically addressed by some scholars toward the turn of the 1970s and 1980s like G. Conti (1978: 2-9, §2) who devoted a whole chapter in his book to a thorough (and perhaps most detailed) analysis of the research on "L'egiziano come lingua semitica", which, however, was immediately followed by his chapter on "L'egiziano come lingua camitosemitica" (Conti 1978: 9-13, §3), which testified to this author's exceptionally wider range of outlook on the whole AA domain (so much unusual in the Egypto-Semitic "old school"). So was done by G. Garbini (1978: 48, §3) too, who, examining "La 'semiticità' dell'egiziano", stated that "dai tre settori di indagine in cui si è sviluppata la comparazione egitto-semitica, e cioè la fonologia, la morfologia e il lessico, emergono risultati contrastanti. La fonologia presenta diverse difficoltà, ma non insormontabili; la morfologia porta ad una quasi identità di forme; il lessico, infine, mostra una sostanziale cesura tra egiziano e semitico: i termini comuni sono pochi, e questi pochi appaiono spesso in egiziano trasformati da mutamenti fonetici estranei al semitico. ... Se, tuttavia, attraverso la comparazione, poniamo a confronto il sistema consonantico che stava alla base dell'egiziano con quello che stava alla base dei diversi gruppi semitici, possiamo constatare una fortissima affinità tra i due ... Ciò detto, la comparazione egitto-semitica ci si presenta in questa situazione: la fonologia e la morfologia dell'egiziano si identificano quasi con quelle delle lingue semitiche; il lessico è quasi completamente estraneo al semitico." Garbini (1978: 52, §5): "Se volessimo applicare un criterio rigidamente linguistico, mi pare difficile negare all'egiziano un 'certificato' di totale semiticità: la singolare situazione del suo lessico, rispetto a quello della altre lingue semitiche, mi sembra pienamente giustificata delle vicende storiche su cui ci siamo soffermati. Se però avremo incluso l'egiziano tra le lingue semitiche, ho il forte sospetto che dovremo ben presto includervi anche il libico-berbero e probabilmente, un po' più tardi, anche buona parte del cuscitico: vale a dire che saremo costretti a trasformare la famiglia semito-camitica in una famiglia semplicemente semitica." E. Meltzer (1979: 465-466): "if reconstructions are to have any validity, it is imperative that they be made on the basis of all available evidence. There are too many cases in the Egyptological literature in which scholars cite three three or four languages representing one or two of the other sub-families of Afroasiatic and think that they are providing an adequate basis and justification for a reconstruction. [footnote omitted] When dealing with as large, widespread, and diverse a group of languages as Afroasiatic, this is simply not viable. ... Along with this selective attitude toward reconstructions, scholars involved in Egypto-Afroasiatic studies have also tended to make highly impressionistic assertions regarding the relative closeness of the relationships between Egyptian and the other respective branches." Elsewhere, Meltzer (1979: 469) says: "There is a tendency to bias these comparisons toward Semitic, to form an idea of the proto-language modeled on a particular group of daughter languages. One in effect compares Egyptian with Proto-Semitic rather than Proto-Afroasiatic. This tendency to see in one daughter language or sub-family an approximatimation of the original state in the proto-language is something which also influenced early work in the Indo-European field ..." G. Roquet (1982: 17, §5, fn. 1): "Ce «sémitocentrisme» sélectif de la comparaison et de la reconstruction – qui déborde largement le domaine du

AA branches with ancient attestation.⁷ This is due to the fact that it has always been exclusively pursued by Oriental philologists with an unchanged background of either classical egyptology or of Semitic studies and with changing linguistic skills, who have usually been fundamentally and generally unfamiliar with the progress and all the methods of the post-Greenbergian comparative AA linguistic domain.⁸ Therefore, the seemingly never-ending story of this all the more desperately introverted and fossilized Egypto-Semitic trend has been surviving even into the new millennium, as an anachronistic relic from the beginning

lexique comparé de l'ancien égyptien – est critiqué par Meltzer ...” A. Loprieno (1982: 87) too demanded “eine Hamitosemitistik, der eine gründliche Auseinandersetzung sowohl mit dem Ägyptischen als auch mit den ältesten semitischen Sprachen (etwa dem Akkadischen) zugrundeliegt, denn: (1) diese Sprachen lassen es zu, daß man sie in eine historische Beziehung miteinander setzt, da sie sich durch Jahrtausende Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte getrennt sind, wie es hingegen für das Berberische oder das Tschadohamitische (sic) der Fall ist.” What an ill-founded prejudice about the alleged, but nowhere demonstrated close cognacy of Akkadian (and Semitic) and Egyptian (cf. contra, e.g., Takács 2013: 142) and the equally only supposed cultural and linguistic distance of the pharaonic world from Chadic (cf. contra Takács 2020: 72) so baselessly, without having first profoundly examined hundreds of Egypto-Chadic cultural isoglosses! Still, Loprieno (1982: 90) demanded “eine Neugestaltung der Hamitosemitistik aufgrund des ägyptischen (bzw. des akkadischen) Materials hinzuarbeiten, denn eine von diesen Sprachen ausgehende Neugestaltung ergibt sich aus der Notwendigkeit der historischen [footnote omitted] und der philologischen [footnote omitted] Betrachtung nicht nur in der innersprachlichen, sondern auch in der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft.” P. Vernus (2000: 190-191, §21 and fnn. 188-189) only refuted extremists like those maintaining Egyptian as a Semitic language: “Certains ont exagéré les apparentements jusqu'à vouloir faire de l'égyptien une langue sémitique¹⁸⁸ [fn. 188: “Certains ont été jusqu'à situer l'égyptien à l'intérieur du sémitique, par exemple J. Vergote (1975).”], ce qu'il n'est assurément pas; d'où le recours systématique et quasi exclusif au sémitique dans les études comparatives de l'égyptien. Ce parti pris a suscité des réactions dénonçant le « sémito-centrisme »¹⁸⁹. [fn. 189: “E.S. Meltzer (1979), p. 469; G. Roquet (1982), p. 17.”] ...” Still, Vernus (2000: 191, §21) too was convinced about the tightest cognacy of Egyptian exclusively with Semitic (and only) among all the AA branches: “Tout en rejetant les excès sémitocentristes, comment ne pas reconnaître que c'est bien avec le sémitique que l'égyptien présente les rapports les plus étroits, et depuis longtemps?” From this standpoint, the only significant exception seems to be W. Vycichl (with minor excursions into Beja and Berber), whose originality was far-fetched by W.A. Ward (1985: 232): “Two of the leading scholars of the present day ... Vycichl (1958) and Rössler (1971) present new approaches to the whole problem, my objections to the methodology used remain unchanged.” What is indeed true about this statement is Vycichl's enormous output in terms of quantity and solidness, albeit all this was done in the frames of a traditional theory.

⁷ Although the Egyptian verbal and nominal derivational morphology shares in many ways the same apophonical principle with Semitic and Berber and so these three branches may indeed be classified in a common NAA block (Takács 2015a: 12-13), this is by far not valid from an etymological standpoint about Egyptian significantly differing from the close Semito-Berber lexical affinities. A substantial majority of both the core and cultural lexicons in Egyptian, which simply cannot be understood from the rest of NAA (however desperate and far-fetched etymologies have been forged), displays astonishing affinities with SAA in general in the light of my current researches into this hardly explored domain (see the issues of the “Layers” series by Takács from 2015b, 2016a, b, c), let alone for the peculiar Egypto-Chadic isoglosses in the cultural and agricultural terminology.

⁸ So, the words of E.S. Meltzer (1979: 465) on this sensitive comparative matter sound rather as an idealistic dream of desires than a genuine reality based on facts: “We are now seeing (sic) more application in our field of ideas formulated in general linguistics, including transformational grammar. ... Of course Egyptologists should try (sic) to make use of whatever procedures will help them to elucidate the ancient Egyptian language.” This had certainly not happened by his day to help Egyptian linguistics get back integrated in modern AA comparative research. Revealing is what Maltzer (l.c.) had to say in his next clause: “but in so doing there is a danger of expecting a given theory to provide a panacea which will solve all of our linguistic problems, and of applying a line of research without seeing clearly all of the preparatory steps ..., or all of the corollary factors which make it necessary to qualify it.”

of the 20th century, with an old aversion towards SAA,⁹ repeating itself in egyptology from generation to generation,¹⁰ whose history has not yet been written.¹¹

Outstanding figures of the post-war “old school”

2.5.1. P. Lacau: although the overwhelming majority of his activities in the classical egyptological domains falls within the pre-war decades of the “old school”, his works touching Egypto-Semitic only appeared towards the last decades and the end of his career, well after the culmination of that trend: his 1954b study examined some shared morphological and lexical items in both branches, introduced by Lacau’s (1954b: 286) ingenious, but mostly ignored observation on the sharp objection to the ill-founded “Egypto-Semitic” preconception.¹² His volume *Phonétique égyptienne ancienne* (1970b),¹³ which has equally been little quoted ever since, was composed of chapters on diverse questions of internal evolution with a permanent outlook into Semitic and numerous logical and valid Egypto-Semitic cognate pairs. It was already Lacau (1970a: 30, fn. 2), in his equally little echoed pioneer study of *Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique* (1970a),¹⁴ who has observed and

⁹ Cf. the unusual (nowhere else attested) bizarre collective abbreviation of the SAA branches in a strange grouping “*kot.*” (= *kuschitisch-omotisch-tschadisch*) instead of, say, a more correct “*kotsch.*”, throughout the paper by J. Osing (2001) from Berlin. He did not find it necessary to explain on which scientific basis he separates out just these three branches from the rest of the Afro-Asiatic phylum, let alone why he has chosen as abbreviation just “*kot.*” carrying a rather unpleasant connotation in German. Equally disturbing is Osing’s fictitious and long out-dated term “*hamitische Sprachen*” (2001, col. 569), which hardly anybody maintains in recent AA studies. One wonders if he has heard of the fundamental works by J.H. Greenberg and I.M. Diakonoff regarding the new classification of the Afro-Asiatic languages in 5 (or 6) major branches, who demonstrated the baselessness of the untenable term “*Hamitic*”. There was no “*Hamitic*” unity and there were no “*Hamitic*” languages.

¹⁰ One can only agree with the sharp-sighted contemporary assessment by W.A. Ward (1985: 232) on the state-of-the-art: “... of all areas of research in ancient Near Eastern studies, Egypto-Semitic is perhaps the one most susceptible to subjective opinion. ... It is a field of research where hard facts are difficult to isolate and where at least some hypotheses and conclusions depend on the personal inclinations of the individual scholars.”

¹¹ The chapter “(Hamito)semitische Lautgleichungen: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Einleitung” by W. Schenkel (1990: 41-43, §2.1.3.1), due to being written for students of Egyptian, so probably therefore (?) full of awkward gaps, is listing at this point (p. 42) just the GÄSW by “*Franz Calice*” (sic for *F. von C.*!) 1934 (sic for 1936!), Vycichl 1958, “*vor allem aber*” Rössler 1971, “*der die Vergleichung einer ... strengeren Handhabung (sic!) zuführt ...*”, although the latter does not even belong to this trend (cf. §4 below). That’s all! “*Was das weitere Feld der äg.-hamitosemitischen Gleichungen angeht, steckt die Forschung noch in den Anfängen.*”

¹² Lacau’s (1954b: 286): “*tandis que la famille des langues sémitiques conserve une remarquable unité et une surprenante fixité, l’égyptien au contraire, dès l’époque très ancienne ..., diffère déjà beaucoup de la structure sémitique. Dans la suite, au cours de son histoire ..., nous assistons à une évolution de sa morphologie et la phonétique qui l’ont séparé plus nettement de l’ancêtre commun.*” What a sharp-sighted statement (esp. for an egyptologist) with an insight (valid even today) among those only mechanically repeating the old common place on Egyptian as “*a Semitic language*”!

¹³ In fact, a volume of his collected papers written and published (if at all) in the 1940es.

¹⁴ Posthumously published (ed. by first O. Guéraud, then by J. Yoyotte and G. Roquet), cf. the “*Note préliminaire*” (pp. ix-x) by J. Vandier: “*Lorsque Pierre Lacau disparut, il y a sept ans, il laissait plusieurs manuscrits ... L’ouvrage qui nous est livré aujourd’hui est une mise en forme des innombrables notes accumulées au cours d’une carrière aussi longue ... L’auteur n’a pas eu le temps de compléter sa documentation, et l’effort des éditeurs*

described for the first time “une série d’organes qui ont eu ainsi un double nom” in the Egyptian lexicon.¹⁵ This mostly binary opposition of the Egyptian anatomical terminology in a surprising distribution was dealt with again and reaffirmed a few decades later.¹⁶ Remarkable is another sharp-sighted conception by Lacau (1970a: 150) on the striking opposition between the dynamic linguistic change in Egyptian until Coptic (which I can fully agree with) and the conservatism of Semitic,¹⁷ where he was perhaps not fully correct in all its aspects.¹⁸ Still, the idea itself in the evident general trends is really striking.¹⁹ Both of the

a consisté, non pas à se substituer à l’auteur dans cette tâche, mais à présenter, d’une manière claire l’essentiel de ce que Pierre Lacau avait apporté de nouveau sur cette question.”

¹⁵ Elsewhere, Lacau (1970a: 92) described this puzzling phenomenon: “Quant à l’existence simultanée de deux désignations pour un même organe, nous en avons d’autres exemples en égyptien” and “un des deux noms devient alors une survivrance d’une appellation primitivement différente de l’autre nom”. Lacau has already put the unanswered question: “Bien d’autres parallélismes entre mots pratiquement équivalents demanderaient à être étudiés. Quels sont les sens premiers et la différence qui peut subsister encore entre *d.t* et *nḥ*; ‘3 et *wr*?”

¹⁶ E.g., in the EDE I 36-38, then in a special series of studies also reaffirming the assumption that one member of these synonymous pairs was usually clearly reflecting a Semitic word, whereas the other one, on the contrary, appeared to have a non-Semitic cognate solely attested in some of the African branches of the Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) language family. The series is entitled “Layers of the Oldest Egyptian Lexicon”, whose so far following parts are published: I: Head, hand (Takács 2015b: 85ff.), II: Head and neck (Takács 2016a: 59ff.), III: Upper torso (Takács 2016c: 275ff.), VI: Back parts (Takács 2018a: 269ff.), VIII: Numerals (Takács 2016b: 119ff.).

¹⁷ Contrary to Egyptian, he says, “pendant le même temps, au contraire, le groupe sémitique tout entier (sic!) a conservé une immobilité surprenante. L’arabe parlé d’aujourd’hui a la même constitution que l’accadien de 2.500 ans avant notre ère.”

¹⁸ Lacau (l.c.) is presumably erring in generalizing this immobility onto the whole Semitic branch (cf., e.g., the highly mobile development of Hebrew until Modern Ivrit, let alone for its as innovative consonantism as that of Old Egyptian!), but he is certainly right about the consonantal archaisms of Arabic, which by far exceed Akkadian in this respect! Surveying the diachronic stages of “Hamito-Semitic” and the state-of-the-art in Semitic, A. Zaborski (1984: 180, also fn. 3) could only conclude that “most if not all Semitists agree that Akkadian and Classical Arabic represent the most archaic or conservative stage [footnote omitted] and nobody would compare Akkadian ... directly with e.g. Amharic or Mandaic”, whereby he was objecting to “a tendency, actually a fashion, to consider Akkadian as the most archaic Semitic language and to reject or underestimate the archaism of Arabic”, rightly pointing to that “Akkadian, as it seems now, ... is more innovating as far as the phonology is concerned”, whereas “Arabic ... has in the best way preserved the older phonological system and represents also some other archaisms in comparison with Akkadian ...” Later, Zaborski (1994: 236) confirmed: “Since more than a quarter of century there has been a very strong tendency to consider not Classical Arabic but Akkadian as the most archaic Semitic language mainly on the basis of the ... verbal system which has cognates in other peripheric Semitic languages i.e. in Ethiopic and in Modern South Arabian group on the one hand and in Berber on the other. West Semitic is usually considered as less archaic because of its alleged loss of the geminated present ... and because of the introduction of the suffix-conjugated perfect as the main form expressing anteriority and the past.” Such a position was opposed by G. Takács (2013: 142) also from the standpoint of the historical consonantism about “Old Akkadian ... having incomparably many more consonantal innovations (shifts, mergers, losses) of Proto-Semitic than in the ultraconservative Modern South Arabian languages or Arabic and possibly Ugaritic”, while similar phenomena are to be observed in the other ancient AA branch too: “... quite close to the most innovative Berber consonantism, Old Egyptian appears penultimate according to our evaluation, which once more contradicts the misleading commonplace that ancient languages would necessarily retain the supposed proto-phonemes better than modern languages of the same family do, which evidently does not work in the case of Old Akkadian either”.

¹⁹ I have myself also long been obsessed by the exciting puzzle of the similarly strange contrast between Egyptian as the only AA branch represented by one single not divided language continuum over long millennia and all the other branches, which have long desintegrated into subbranches each, uncountable daughter languages. What may hide behind this evident fact, has certainly to do with the mysteries of Egyptian ethno- and linguogenesis

afore-mentioned observations make me regard Lacau as by far the most originally thinking genuine mind of pre- and post-war Egypto-Semitic “old school”, void of a fossilized preconception (otherwise so typical in this trend), even if he too was only working with the Semitic *comparanda* with no precise ideas about the other (usually labelled “African” or “Hamitic”) component of the Egyptian lexicon that he was so ingeniously able to surmise at least. Lacau’s vision of Semitic, Egyptian and Berber as tightly connected branches (as opposed to “Hamitic”)²⁰ has long been supported and can also today be approved.²¹ Lacau’s Egypto-Semitic anatomical etymologies were evaluated by G. Roquet (1968-9) in an annotated list,²² which the former scholar had classed according to their likelihood in F. von Calice’s (GÄSW) manner.²³ G. Garbini (1971a) presented a very profound review of Lacau’s (1970a)

(on which I have been working since 2012, see my “Layers” series) and the ethnically little explored history of Holocene Sahara, whose research is still in its infancy (whose materials started to be processed in my AA library in early 2020). What is evident even in this gigantic obscure prehistoric scenario is the apparent centripetal dynamism (culminating in the long unification process of the Neolithic Nile Valley peoples during the 4th mill. BC) permanently working throughout the ages of the Egyptian *Sprachgeschichte*. The rest of the AA branches, in turn, has followed just the perfectly opposite “normal” centripetal development, usual in the history of all kinds of language families, by diverging into new and new sub-units from the common ancestral core. In other words, the strangely permanent unity of Egyptian language history (in spite of the two parallel sociolects detectable from the Old and Middle Kingdoms and culminating in Neo-Egyptian and the very late Coptic dialectal differentiation) appears to point to a strong centripetal power issuing from its multinuclear linguogenesis in the Neolithic Nile Valley, the archaeologically clear refuge destination of several archaeological communities (including diverse splinters split off from a few non-AA ancestral communities, cf. Takács 1999b; EDE I 38-46) immigrating from diverse directions of the surrounding limitless Saharan areas during the long centuries of the starting process of Saharan desiccation, whereas the permanent diversification dynamism in the rest of the AA branches suggests a basically mononuclear linguogenesis normally resulting in diverse sub-units splitting off the core and drifting away thereof, once the ancestral core community extends beyond its capacities for different reasons (climatic, economic, population), which neatly agrees with the enormous territorial spread of the AA peoples from the supposed early Neolithic Levantine (PPN) homeland (Militarev *passim*) to such extremities like eastwards into Mesopotamia (Akkadian), westwards until the far reaches of Mauritania (Zenaga = West Berber) and the Canarian (Guanche Berber), and southwards down to the equatorial border zone of Kenya and Tanzania (Southern Cushitic).

²⁰ Lacau (1970a: 151): “Peut-on conclure qu’il a eu une période de vie commune entre le berbère et le vieil-égyptien, après leur séparation de l’ancêtre commun d’où sont sortis l’égyptien, le sémitique, le berbère, et le chamitique?” As for the common Egypto-Berber lexicon, he surmised “un vocabulaire emprunté en partie aux deux langues qui ont pu être parlées antérieurement au berbère, dans l’immense domaine géographique de la Berbérie ...”

²¹ So it was conceived, e.g., by Garbini (1971a: 131) too: “L’interrogativo attenua fortunatamente un’affermazione alquanto azzardata, desunta dall’osservazione di alcuni elementi comuni all’egiziano e al berbero ma estranei al semitico; più storicamente, la maggiore affinità riscontrata in questo caso tra l’egiziano e il berbero si spiega con i più stretti contatti che in età preistorica e in età storica queste due lingue hanno avuto tra di loro rispetto al semitico.” For the the history of the theory on grouping Semitic, Egyptian and Berber in a tightly connected NAA block, cf. Takács 2015a *passim*.

²² His paper appears to be a rare instance of a review appearing still before the reviewed work itself was published, although it is not entirely a review of Lacau 1970 *stricto sensu*, which is due to the fact that, as Roquet (1968-9: 88) writes, the editor of Lacau’s posthumous volume, “M. Yoyotte, Directeur d’études à l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, Vème Section, a bien voulu me charger de présenter au G.L.E.C.S. un aperçu des comparaisons proposées par l’auteur.”

²³ Roquet (1968-9: 88-90): “A.- Nombre de rapprochements sont des rappels d’opinions anciennes consignées çà et là dans la littérature égyptologique. ... L’ensemble des ces rapprochements ne est pas neuf. Néanmoins, il est bon de voir le parti qu’un tire l’auteur du point de vue de l’égyptien tout au long de l’ouvrage et notamment de

volume on the anatomical terminology. First, Garbini (1971a: 131-135) discussed such theoretical issues of Egypto-Semitic as genealogy,²⁴ root structure,²⁵ comparative phonology.²⁶ Then, Garbini (1971a: 135-140) assessed some individual etymologies in the light of an original and sovereign argumentation,²⁷ which makes his critical list and careful conclusions²⁸ so much precious.

2.5.2. W. Vycichl (1909-1999)²⁹ represented the bridge between the Viennese “Hamitology” and the *Sackgasse* of surviving “old school” Egypto-Semitic studies in the second half of the 20th century: having left the intellectually inspiring cradle of AA linguistics in the Viennese *Doppelinstitut*, where he was also trained, he continued the major part of his extraordinary research career after WW II for another half of century. Namely, first in Paris (1950-1960s), the other AA cradle (GLECS), and then finally pretty isolated in Geneva (1970s-1990s). During these decades, after a longer pause in the 1940s in his publication activity, having scattered uncountable articles abounding in Semito-Egypto-Berber parallels, he proved to be

considérer ses réflexions sur les renouvellements du lexique au cours de l’histoire de la langue ... B.- Sont donnés avec réserve les rapprochements suivants: ... C.- Quelques rapprochements, nouveaux autant qu’on puisse savoir, méritent de retenir l’attention. ... D.- Cette présentation des comparaisons rappelées, proposées ou suggérées par Lacau ne se veut en aucun cas critique et exhaustive, rappelons-le. Elle est schématique et doit inciter à prendre connaissance de l’ouvrage où les questions de graphie, de phonétique et de lexicologie comparée sont largement débattues pour justifier ou écarter les rapprochements et les intégrer dans un ensemble beaucoup plus vaste.”

²⁴ Basically confirming Lacau’s position on the matter, Garbini (1971a: 131) too believed in a NAA macro-unit comprising Semitic, Egyptian and Berber.

²⁵ The phenomena issuing from a common biconsonantism were superficially surveyed by Garbini (1971a: 132) in the frames of an ancient affinity with Indo-European (dating back to Levantine neolithic), so popular in Italian Oriental studies.

²⁶ On the diverse segments of a supposed common Semito-Egyptian consonantism, Garbini (1971a: 132-135) was dwelling pretty lengthily: all these matters were surveyed in the spirit of the pre-war core theory manifested in the ESS and GÄSW.

²⁷ Garbini’s insights, even though his appraisal was eventually supportive for most of the cases, yielded valuable addition to Lacau’s etymologies. E.g., when Lacau intuitively surmized the ultimate etymological *liaison* between OEg. *bw “foot” (only attested as a hieroglyph for foot with the phon. value b) and LEg. bw (negation), even Garbini’s (1971a: 136) negative appraisal (“Le due forme sarebbero pertanto semplici omografi.”) carries an asset with *addenda* (Sem. *bal “non” vs. Soqotri-Cushitic background of Sem. * $\sqrt{s_2}p$ “foot”) useful for the future research.

²⁸ Garbini’s (1971a: 140-141) final word on this volume: “In sede di conclusioni, il Lacau rileva il «ringiovanimento» subito dal lessico egiziano, in rapporto a quello semitico, nel settore studiato. Il fenomeno non è nuovo, e rientra nel quadro generale della lingua egiziana la quale, nonostante la sua antichità, presenta numerose innovazioni rispetto al semitico e alle altre lingue chamitiche ... Le innovazioni egiziane, pur ponendosi su di un altro piano, non possono venir considerate diverse da quelle che ritroviamo in accadico: in entrambi i casi si tratta di lingua cronologicamente arcaiche ma espressioni di due grandi civiltà, e per ciò stesso di lingue fortemente innovatrici. Ritenere innovatrice una lingua come l’accadico non significa ovviamente affermare che l’arabo sia «arcaico»: la prima è una lingua arcaica fortemente rinnovata, la seconda è una lingua recente con tendenze conservatrici. È dunque con una certa sorpresa che il lettore del libro del Lacau, dopo aver avuto la possibilità di ammirare la profonda dottrina egittologica, l’acutezza delle ipotesi e la prudenza dei giudizi dello studioso.”

²⁹ Cf. Takács 2006d: 254ff. On his person see Takács 2004: ix-xi.

the most productive³⁰ and convincing researcher of the “old school” ever. Still, aside from some significant albeit occasional rare insights into Beja and Hausa affinities, he was basically focusing in all his life dominantly on Semito-Egypto-Berber etymologies which, of course, he usually elaborated in a methodologically enchanting and almost flawless³¹ manner. Amidst the multitude of his works in this domain may we single out just some. Among his numerous papers on Egypto-Semitic lexical comparison, a most remarkable one is beyond any doubt his own “Grundlagen...” from 1958 (re-evaluating this corpus quarter of a century after F. von Calice’s 1936 *Grundlagen...*), in which, after having discussed methodological questions of this comparative domain, he has divided his material in the manner of von Calice. First – after ESS, GÄSW, Vergote 1945 – he too once more laid down the (mostly the same) fundamentals of consonantal matches in the two branches based upon an abundant lexical evidence (under §II. “Wortliste A”, pp. 370-379),³² then, in a further comparative wordlists, he put forward 76 (mostly new) etymologies in a masterful treatment.³³ Another outstanding study of his, entitled “Is Egyptian a Semitic language?” (Vycichl 1959a), reveals his unchanged vision on a tight Semito-Egyptian unity and his stubborn reluctance as to exploring in Egyptian the SAA segments (labelled by him as “Hamitic” in an outdated manner).³⁴ Surveying comparative morphology, he did his best to establish direct

³⁰ Which W. Vycichl (1959a: 38) quantified in the first two decades of his own research (following the great syntheses of the “old school” in the 1930/40s) as follows: “A hundred new etymologies were published recently by the author of these lines.”

³¹ Perhaps once exception. Having advanced his methodological admonitions about AA comparisons in general, J. Tubiana (1974: 80, §4) says: “Il est très imprudent de se risquer à des comparaisons entre langues dont on n’a pas une connaissance directe, par l’étude et par la pratique. ... vérification soigneuse de la réalité des faits et de la justesse de leur interprétation.” Then, on pp. 80-85, §5, he launched into a lengthy critical analysis of the falsely segmented Amharic and other Semitic *comparanda* in W. Vycichl’s (1952) paper on Punic influence on Berber with the “conclusion, quoi qu’il en soit des autres formes évoquées ..., l’amharique reste en dehors de la comparaison ...”.

³² Vycichl (1958: 370): “Die folgende Liste enthält bereits bekannte Etymologien, die wohl soweit als gesichert gelten können, daß sie die Aufstellung von Lautgesetzen ermöglichen. Sollte sich in Hinkunft die eine ... Wortgleichung als unrichtig erweisen, so wird das am Gesamtergebnis nichts ändern.”

³³ On his “III. Wortliste B” (pp. 379-401) Vycichl (1958: 379) says: “Diese zweite Wortliste enthält Etymologien, die hier eingehender besprochen werden. Es handelt sich teils um schon bekannte Gleichungen, bei denen hier neue Gesichtspunkte aufgedeckt werden, teils um völlig neues Material.”

³⁴ Which, in his words (Vycichl 1959a: 27), was usually “explained by a blend of an older autochthonous element of African origin, called Hamitic, and a younger Semitic wave. This opinion can hardly be maintained in view of the facts we possess now. ... recent studies have shown that not only do some grammatical features of Egyptian have a parallel in Semitic, but that the Egyptian grammar as a whole (sic!) is derived (sic!) from Semitic – with the exception of a few (sic!) points still obscure – and, ... that the Berber languages ... are, in the opinion of ... Rössler purely Semitic. On the other hand it has been impossible to find grammatical forms ... that could be called Hamitic. ... Under these new points of view, Egyptian is not situated as hitherto, on the **borderline** of the domaine of Semitic languages but at its **centre**. Obviously, nobody will **a priori** deny the existence of a non-Semitic substratum in Egyptian but as a matter of fact we cannot prove it from the evidence we possess. Even great lexicographical differences between Egyptian and Semitic are not necessarily the result of older, pre-Semitic elements.” Although, “at first sight, the phonetic systems of Egyptian and Semitic differ: instead of the 29 Semitic consonants as they occur in South Arabic, there are but 24 Egyptian consonants, three of which are obviously secondary (*ħ, j, ċ* as palatalized forms of *h, g, ħ* (sic: instead of *k*)). Though some characteristic sound are found on both sides (*z, ċ, h, ħ, q* or *k*), not less than eight primitive sounds of Semitic are lacking in Old Egyptian.”

matches even in the Egypto-Semitic verbal system (Vycichl 1959a: 30-37), which can never be fulfilled given the fact that both systems only agree in terms of their shared apophonic nature but not in the details of the respective morphological sets. Therefore any attempt at demonstrating Egyptian "as a Semitic language" is *a priori* doomed to certain failure. This chapter was followed in the same manner by an evaluation of the comparative vocabulary (Vycichl 1959a: 37-40) where, however, he too had to realize the substantial difference between the two branches except for some basic vocabulary.³⁵ This list of meanings non-compatible in Egyptian vs. Semitic, esp. in the semantic domains of social life and agriculture,³⁶ is not to be fully approved in this form in the light of recent Muscovite results in reconstructing PAA cultural terminology Vycichl (1959a: 38) could not have known yet known of.³⁷ Instead of admitting the poor outcome and drawing the due conclusions of his own demonstration, he blindly repeated *a priori* set stereotypes on Egyptian as Semitic.³⁸ His view on

³⁵ Vycichl 1959a: 37: "In spite of some common features, there seems to be a considerable difference ..."

³⁶ Typically of the "old school", Vycichl (1959a: 38) considered the lack of shared Neolithic terminology in Egypto-Semitic as indicative in itself not even posing the obligate question what if this segment of the Egyptian lexicon turns out to be utterly SAA: "When speaking of Egypto-Semitic etymologies, we obviously understand thereby only the primitive common elements ... and not loan words of the historic period ... This means that we have to exclude all terms created or introduced after the separation of **Egyptian and the other** (sic!) **Semitic languages**. So we cannot expect to find common names for the metals (gold, silver, iron, copper, lead, etc.) as the separation had taken place in neolithic times, nor words for 'knife', 'sword' or 'chain'. There was no common word for 'town', 'king', 'plough', 'cart', 'wheel' nor for 'camel', 'horse', 'cat', 'cock' and 'hen'."

³⁷ Cf. the milestone studies in this sphere by A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 1984, 1989, 1990a, b) and O.V. Stolbova (1997, 2005), also the joint paper by both Militarev and Stolbova (1990) as well as by V. Blažek & C. Boisson (1992).

³⁸ Thus, for Vycichl (1959a: 38), "in order to illustrate the language relationship in a limited space, it has seemed advisable to choose the names of the parts of the body together with the corresponding verbs. These words belong to the most conservative elements of the language and reflect to a high degree the relationship of related languages." Vycichl (1959a: 38) was, however, apparently and rightly, disturbed by the poor outcome gained in this domain also for demonstrating anything about Egyptian as "a Semitic language", since he added a very poor argument to explain it: "it must be borne in mind that geographical reasons can to some extent be invoked for a certain homogeneity on the Semitic side where incessant contacts favours a levelling of the terminology." Equally disappointing I find the way how Vycichl (1959a: 40), in the end of his carefully selected thin comparative wordlist, felt convinced enough to claim: "The above 32 etymologies show a narrow relationship between Egyptian and Semitic." Still, he failed to confront a whole number of Egypto-Semitic anatomical terms, which he thought sufficient to be dealt with in just a few words: "Obviously, some of the most common Semitic terms are lacking, as ..." The list of Semitic words was, however, not placed in a detailed etymological context here. Similarly, Vycichl's (1959a: 40) overall conclusions echo the same partial ignorance even of the facts issuing from his own results: "To judge from the foregoing comparisons there seems to be a close relationship between Egyptian and Semitic. Almost all (sic!) grammatical elements ... of Egyptian can be found in Semitic languages." He was undisturbed to acknowledge the "(h) differences in words of common usage: ... the numerals for 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 20, 100 and 1000 differ, there is not one common preposition in Egyptian and Semitic, there are hardly any common names for domestic animals, plants, weapons, etc. However, it does not seem as if the differences listed under (a)-(h) could be explained as survivals of a pre-Semitic substratum in Egyptian." Overconfident about the not too impressive isomorphs, Vycichl (1959a: 41) was yet content: "On the contrary there is in all likelihood no essential differences (!) between Egyptian and Semitic, at least regarding grammar." Still, on the following page (p. 41) he returned to (h): "The most difficult problem is in my opinion the question of the vocabulary (h). Some years ago I tried to collect words common to Egyptian and ... Berber ... but not found in Semitic (ZDMG, 1952). Still ... the fact remains that a great many Egyptian etymologies show no relationship with Semitic. (It is also possible that these words existed once at a very early stage in Semitic and were lost, while they were retained

the Egypto-Semitic prehistory was objected by W.A. Ward (1985) with skepticism even about genetic cognacy in general.³⁹ Another fundamental piece of “Studien der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung” by Vycichl (1959b), in its first part, presents his own system semantical vs. phonological criteria of evaluating Eg.-Sem. lexical matches by ranking in a ball system yielding a maximum of 6 or better 3 + 3 balls,⁴⁰ and, in the second part, he published 12 new etymologies with a convincing argumentation. This direction of his research was finally summed up in Vycichl’s (1990) *magnum opus* – *La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne*, tome I^{er}, *La phonétique*,⁴¹ which has however hardly brought any substantially new results other than those to be learnt from his previous studies and the volume by J. Vergote (1945). Already W.A. Ward (1985: 232) has expressed his partly right doubts (as not the only one, cf. below) about Vycichl’s usual method of working solely with Arabic

in Egyptian). So it is clear that Egyptian got its vocabulary or at least a considerable part of it, not from a pre-Semitic tongue, but from a language where the principle of the three root consonants was fully developed as is the case in Semitic itself.” The theoretical debate by Vycichl (1959a: 41-42) on the Semitic nature of Egyptian is also revealing: “As the relationship between Egyptian and Semitic is established now in the main outlines, we can examine 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.** Neither is English a Roman language in spite of its numerous loanwords nor in modern Persian and Arabic dialect. On the other hand, the term ‘**Semitic**’ comprises, in my opinion, somewhat more than a set of grammatical elements and 200 or 300 etymologies. It implies 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.**” Vycichl (1959a: 42) thus draw a scheme of a tight but parallel tie of “Pre-Berber”, influenced by “Pre-Egyptian” with an impact from “Early Semitic”.

³⁹ Vycichl (1959a: 38) regarded “Egypto-Semitic ...” as altogether “... those lexical and grammatical features common to both Egyptian and Semitic in a hypothetical, pre-literate linguistic stratum” before the “‘separation’ took place in Neolithic times”, which Ward (1985: 232-233) received highly critically: “But the evidence is from the historic period and this immediately presents a problem in methodology. ... The problem is ... partially a chronological one. ... First, we are able to define stages in the lexical relationships between Egyptian and Semitic, partially through differing patterns of phonetic change. Secondly, the farther we get in time from the supposed pre-literate Egypto-Semitic stage, the less certain we can be that lexical comparisons are truly Egypto-Semitic and not simply loan-words. ... This raises a fundamental question: how much of the so-called Egypto-Semitic vocabulary really belongs to prehistory?”

⁴⁰ This evaluation system was developed from his principles discussed in Vycichl’s (1958: 369-370) first “Studien der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung”. As summed up by Vycichl (1959b: 71) himself: “Die Sinnziffer ist: 3: wenn die Bedeutung auf beiden Seiten übereinstimmt, 2: wenn ein Bedeutungswandel vorauszusetzen ist, der hamitisch oder semitisch belegt ist, 1: wenn ein Bedeutungswandel vorliegt, der anderswo zu belegen ist. Die Lautziffer ist: 3: wenn alle Konsonanten lautgesetzlich übereinstimmt, 2: wenn eine Unregelmäßigkeit vorliegt (ungewöhnliche Lautentsprechung, Umstellung, Verlust eines Konsonanten), 1: wenn zwei solcher Unregelmäßigkeiten vorliegen: 0: wenn drei oder mehr Unregelmäßigkeiten vorliegen.” As a result, this system “der Kennzahlen ... ermöglicht ...: – die annehmbaren Gleichungen (Kennzahl 33) auszusondern, – die unmöglichen Gleichungen (Kennzahl 00) abzulehnen, – in anderen Fällen zu sehen, wo Abweichungen vorliegen und wieweit sie sich von der Norm entfernen, also auch zwei oder mehrere Vorschläge objektiv nach ihrer Wahrscheinlichkeit einzustufen.” This rank system was reproduced three decades later also in the chapter “Classification des étymologies” of his volume historical phonology (cf. Vycichl 1990: 14-18).

⁴¹ This volume, in spite of its title, examined both the consonantism and the vocalism of Egyptian, thus an all-round historical phonology was ventured. Only a part of the etymologies was compiled into a wordlist for an Egypto-Semitic comparative phonology (pp. 39-71), but many others are scattered *passim*.

parallels in the Egyptian etymologies.⁴² Another rare volume by Vycichl (1983) was his version of a Coptic etymological dictionary (DELC), entirely different from CED and KHW regarding the depth of analyses. Nevertheless, its entries are again full of mostly Arabic (only rarely common Semitic) etymologies to the Egyptian roots which was utmost critically received by P. Behrens (1987) in his review,⁴³ where, specially focusing comparatistic issues, he demonstrated how much can potentially be contributed to these entry by working beyond Vycichl's usual target domain, i.e., beyond Arabic and Semitic,⁴⁴ whence Behrens (1987: 242) rightly concluded that numerous entries "weisen auf die Bedeutung hin die auch **den nicht-semitischen Sprachen des Afroasiatischen** bei der Lösung etymologischer Probleme des Koptischen/Ägyptischen zukommen könnte. Doch VICICHL (sic: VI- for VY-!) **bedient sich dieses Material kaum.**" This was a very rare moment where one could see the articulation, *expressis verbis* manifested and etymologically thoroughly demonstrated, on the alarmingly growing distance between the outdated NAA-centric doyen of old/out-fashioned "Hamitology" and the young generation of those very few Oriental (even less egyptological) scholars who were open-minded enough towards the post-Greenbergian progress of our linguistic domain in the SAA branches for exploiting it in studying the puzzles of Egyptian lexicon. Behrens' partly unfair hypercriticism was refuted by R.M. Voigt (1989: 87) arguing not too convincingly with the allegedly uncertain affiliation of Omotic and the doubtful originality of Behrens' Cushitic etymologies.⁴⁵ From a personal point of view, it was certainly

⁴² As Ward (l.c.) remarked: "Vycichl believes that an Arabic equivalent to an Egyptian word, with no previous attestation in Semitic, is sufficient to establish a cognate. **I do not**, hence our differing views on the value of Arabic is a strong influence on what we accept or reject as viable cognates." The way Ward (1985: 234) argued against Arabic *comparanda* without the evidence or references to Semitological discussions, is however perhaps not fully well-founded: "It is a myth of modern scholarship that Classical Arabic preserves a very old stratum of Semitic so that words found only in this language must have an older history. I cannot accept this. Arabic stands at the end of several thousand years of linguistic development and, while it might preserve some more ancient vocabulary, a large part of the Arabic lexicon consists of derived terms with no counterparts in the earlier dialects. The Arabic language continues to expand in vocabulary even today so that derived forms which appear in Classical Arabic may never have been used previously." All this stands in clear contrast with A. Zaborski's (1984: 180, fn. 3) arguments for the archaism of Arabic within Semitic. Let alone for O.V. Stolbova's uncounted Chado-Arabic isoglosses (e.g., CLD passim). Objecting to labelling late *comparanda* as cognates, Ward (1985: 234) saw "another facet of this chronological problem" in "'Egypto-Semitic' cognates when the Egyptian evidence is early, often Old Egyptian, and the Semitic evidence is late, chiefly from Arabic. Even as careful a scholar as Vycichl regularly suggests such cognates, though he himself has stated with reference to comparisons between Old Egyptian and the North African dialects: 'Il est malaisé de comparer un terme égyptien du 3e millénaire avant J-C avec un mot d'une langue moderne dont nous ne connaissons pas le passé' (1972: 87). This is an excellent rule to follow and I would apply it ..." Then Ward (1985: 235-236) critically reviewed some of Vycichl's Arabic *comparanda*, some of which he found either usable (once one manages to explore their entire semantic history) or "some other Egypto-Arabic equations ..., however, ... wrong".

⁴³ So, Behrens' (1983: 244) hardly flattering *Fazit* is painfully true in general, when he states that "der Autor sich im Bereich des Semitischen zu sehr auf hebräisches/arabisches Material stützt, ... er gesamtmethodisch zu wenig das nicht-semitische Material berücksichtigt."

⁴⁴ Beside 2 Ug. > Eg. loanwords (#1, #2), Behrens added a number of attractive Cushito-Omotic cognates to several Egyptian items (#4-#13).

⁴⁵ So Voigt (1989: 87) argued *ex cathedra* in an off-hand manner without a sufficient demonstration of all the facts relating to these allegations: "Die Beispiele, die der Rez. als kognate Wörter des Koptischen vorschlägt, sind vorwiegend kuschitischen und omotischen Sprachen entnommen. Das Omotische ist dabei eine Sprachfamilie, deren genetische Beziehung zum Semito-hamitischen noch nicht als voll etabliert gelten kann. ... Bei seinen

a gentleman's gesture, albeit Behrens' criticism, perhaps impatiently and unjustly far-fetched for Coptic etymology in particular, holds painfully true about the state-of-the-art of Egyptian etymology in general.⁴⁶ Vycichl was only seldom extending his enormously fruitful NAA (Semitic-Egypto-Berber) comparative researches onto Beja also (with painfully all too few lexical matches though, which he then repeated paper to paper),⁴⁷ while he had unfortunately never again returned to his pioneering Egypto-Hausa comparative studies (1934) which stands as an isolated ground-breaking milestone at the beginning of his entire scholarly career. In his paper delivered for the London AA congress (1978), staying within the limits of the NAA block, Vycichl (1984) established morphological analogies of Semitic, Egyptian, and Berber as contrasted by the scarcity of lexical matches, which he explained by an amalgamation of two different "pre-Semitic superstrata" (called "Ifrican" ~ Berber vs. proto-Arabic ~ Egyptian) with a common local substratum called "Atlantic". In his review on the London proceedings (ed. by J. Bynon), A.S. Kaye (1985: 890) did not miss to note how disturbing Vycichl's old-fashioned terminology is.⁴⁸ The same criticism of the old "Hamitological" conception was repeated with Vycichl's (1987) paper among the proceedings of the 1983 Marburg AA congress reviewed by A.S. Kaye and P.T. Daniels (1992: 436).⁴⁹ Towards the end of his unpaired long career, life has shown the gaps in the safest and most reliable production of the "old school" ever, which was beyond any doubt due to W. Vycichl, who secured its enormously fruitful and most impressive survival in his person and its long outdated and belated peak and end in 1999.

2.5.3. J. Vergote: as an outstanding authority of egyptological linguistics, he was specialized on the Egypto-Coptic *Sprachgeschichte* where contributed to comparative Egypto-Semitic phonology and lexicon, albeit he worked primarily with the etymological corpus of his pre-

kuschitischen Etymologien erweckt der Rez. gerne den Eindruck, seine Gleichungen wären neu." Unfortunately, his statements were not demonstrated. The problem is with Voigt's objection, on the one hand, that Behrens' Cushitic and Omotic *comparanda* are perfectly welcome as these have brought in fresh air at last into the AA lexical comparison dominantly based on the NAA branches until then. So it is expressly an advantage to work with the SAA evidence in Eg. etymologies. On the other, Voigt forgot to mention the pure fact that the AA nature of Omotic has been accepted by the overwhelming majority of researchers and was demonstrated by the ground-breaking first monograph by M.L. Bender (1975), which was followed by a number of studies on the subject.

⁴⁶ Just as well as Behrens' (l.c.) remark in general when "... hat man einen Überblick über den Stand der Dinge, der vor allem eins zeigt: wieviel im etymologischen Bereich koptisch-ägyptischer Wortforschung noch zu tun bleibt."

⁴⁷ E.g., Vycichl 1953a: 157ff.; 1953b: 373ff.; 1960: 252ff.; 1988: 411-430 etc.

⁴⁸ Kaye (l.c.): "The final paper, by W. Vycichl, is inappropriately entitled 'Hamitic' and 'Semitic languages': all experts agree there is no such thing as Hamitic. V(ycichl) reiterates Diakonoff's point that the field desperately needs more work in comparative lexicography." A criticism which, however, did not hinder Kaye in "joining to V(ycichl)'s Buduma cognate ... to Sem. *yamm- "sea" that Kaye was attaching to the monoradical root for "water": "In light of this, I wish to add to Newman's (1980) PAA *m ..."

⁴⁹ Kaye & Daniels (l.c.): "W. Vycichl is the only major AA specialist, other than G. Garbini,¹⁹ who believes that there exists a special Ham(itic) sub-branch as distinct from the Sem. one. He thinks that PAA split off into PSem. (in Asia) and PHam. (Africa) ... He is in favor, however, of an Asian homeland for PAA ..." His paper "bases the separate identity of Ham. as a unit on shaky grounds as root biconsonantality. In doing so he must ignore the fact that there is much evidence in favor of biconsonantal roots in Sem. (hollow, third radical weak with determinatives), and that determinatives ... are merely a Sem. innovation."

-war predecessors, most importantly, F. von Calice (cf. Takács 2006b) and A. Ember (cf. Takács 2005b and 2006c). Thus, immediately one of Vergote's earliest works, his *Phonétique historique de l'égyptien* (1945) has soon turned out to be epochal primarily for his ingenious new theory on the historical signification of the Bohairic Coptic (non)-aspirated stops for rendering the pharaonic stops. But this magnum opus yielded much for the comparative domain too for it also contains an appendix with an Egypto-Semitic comparative wordlist (Vergote 1945, 127-148), entitled "Étymologies chamito-sémitiques" (sic), where the etymological items were arranged according to the laws of Egypto-Semitic consonantal matches, based primarily on the corpus of both the ESS and especially of the GÄSW.⁵⁰ The system of comparative consonantism as summed up here may be regarded as the quintessence gained out of all the convincing equations of the "old school", which practically hardly requires corrections on a few points. Unfortunately, his whole research later (also), hardly going beyond the limits of the Egypto-Semitic etymologies accumulated by the pre-war "old school" and so yielding little new for our comparative domain, was fundamentally conceived in a mechanical projection of the Semitic patterns onto the reconstruction of Egyptian morphology etc. So, it is no surprise that at the GLECS session of 23 May 1947 (CR du GLECS, vol. 4, 1945-8), he discussed the Middle Egyptian phonology in the mirror of Semitic. His 1965 long study was a novelty in our domain for its chapter "VI. Comparaison entre les sémantèmes égyptiens et sémitiques" (Vergote 1965: 79-102) where he compared, for the first time, the Egyptian and Semitic vocalisation in the derived (deverbal) morphological (nominal) stem patterns with an attempt at setting up all too directly forced concordances, but, unfortunately, he only occasionally worked with the direct evidence from Egypto-Semitic lexical comparisons. In his hasty conclusion, stimulated by the alleged identity of nominal syllable patterns in both NAA branches, Vergote (1965: 103) *ex cathedra* refuted the famous thesis by A.H. Gardiner (EG³ §3), echoed also by G. Lefèbre (1955: §1G), on the "African" substrate of Egyptian.⁵¹ As several authors from the "old school", Vergote (1965: 103) was (a priori) convinced about just the opposite, i.e., he too considered Egyptian as a basically "Semitic language" that was only refined by some foreign adstrate.⁵² The

⁵⁰ Vergote (1945: 127): "La présente liste ... donne seulement les étymologies qui présentent un intérêt particulier pour l'histoire des phonèmes égyptiens. Sauf avis contraire, nous réunissons dans chaque série ... les exemples des listes A.B.C. de Calice."

⁵¹ Lefèbre (1955: §1G): "L'égyptien comporterait donc essentiellement lui aussi un substrat africain (plutôt libyque), que pénétrèrent et modifièrent de fortes influences sémitiques: c'est bien plutôt, semble-t-il, une langue africaine sémitisée qu'une langue sémitique déformée."

⁵² Vergote (1965: 103): "Notre enquête a démontré à son tour l'étroite parenté existant entre l'égyptien et le sémitique dans un domaine aussi important que la formation des mots. ... On continuait à se demander jusqu'à quel point la langue des Pharaons est sémitique et dans quelle mesure elle a subi une évolution particulière sous l'influence d'un substrat étranger. Notre méthode est fondée les lois relatives à la place de l'accent et à la structure des syllabes qui furent déjà établies par K. Sethe et par G. Steindorff. Elle y ajoute la découverte de G. Fecht – qui apporte certains changements aux lois précitées – sur la transition de la loi de l'antépénultième à la loi de la pénultième." Laying aside some "Abstraction faite de ... cas peu importants", Vergote (1965: 105) maintained that "... la grande majorité des formes égyptiennes et coptes, distinguées par nous, peuvent être ramenées, au maximum à 31 et au maximum à 36, peut-être même à 43 types structurels sémitiques. ... Mais rien ne s'oppose même à l'origine sémitique des classes mentionnées ..., malgré l'absence de toute parallélisme. 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

“partie diachronique” to Vergote’s *Grammaire copte* (1973 volume Ib) offers in its chapter “Phonétique et phonologie” a reconstruction of the Egyptian historical consonantism in comparison with Semitic (renewed from his 1945 monograph), whereas in the chapter “Morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes)”, he followed the same way of directly equating the pharaonic stem patterns with the Semitic ones.

2.5.4. W.A. Ward (1928-1996), outstanding researcher of Egypto-Levante relations, sometime fellow of the American University of Beirut, later professor of egyptology at Brown University (Providence, Rhode Island):⁵³ he was, beside W. Vycichl, the most devoted and remarkable figure of the surviving “old school” in the second half of the 20th century. As a typical adherent of this trend, he released a whole series of etymological studies exclusively devoted to Egypto-Semitic cognates (usually accompanied by profound lexicographical analyses),⁵⁴ plus, a.o., a whole volume on the derivatives of the alleged four distinct homographic Eg. * $\sqrt{b3}$ roots (Ward 1978), full of precious philological-lexicographical investigations, conceived in the vision of an exclusive comparison with Semitic. This monograph was indeed a pioneering one by an egyptologist as it was rightly stressed by its reviewer, G. Roquet⁵⁵, who missed to mention both parallel volumes by G. Conti (1978, 1980), which will be examined below (sub-chapter no. 2.5.8.). In his profound review of Ward 1978, segmented into several chapters,⁵⁶ Roquet wisely formulated a number of critical remarks that fit not only Ward’s methods but the state-of-the-art of the surviving “old school” in general also. Thus, first of all, Roquet targeted as subject of his sharp objection such traditional phenomena of the “old school”, sensible in Ward’s work too, as the long surviving anachronistic Semito-centrism in Egyptian etymologies (taken as granted in advance)⁵⁷ and a complete

voyelles et la structure des sémantèmes sont sémitiques. Ce n’est que dans sa morphologie que l’égyptien s’écarte considérablement de la langue mère et qu’il s’est développé d’une manière indépendante ... ici encore tout peut s’expliquer par l’évolution interne et pas n’est besoin d’intervoquer une influence étrangère.”

⁵³ More on his life in the memorial volume edited by his successor at Brown University, Leonard H. Lesko (1998).

⁵⁴ Ward 1961, 1962, 1968, 1969, 1975, 1977, 1981.

⁵⁵ Roquet (1982: 15, §2): “c’est sans doute la première fois qu’en domaine chamito-sémitique un comparatiste, faisant état de la matière égyptienne, demande autant à la méthode comparative. À cet égard, l’ouvrage est sans conteste novateur par sa visée.”

⁵⁶ E.g., like “II. Sélection du niveau de comparaison”, “III. Appréhension du sens et comparaison: données de dictionnaires, énoncés et contextes”, “IV. Appréhension du sens et image: pertinence des données iconiques”, “V. Appréhension du sens et procès étymologiques: données coptes, reconstruction interne et traitement comparatif”, “VI. Changement linguistique et dialecte: données de l’égyptien”, “VII. Changement linguistique, chronologie relative et réécriture”, “VIII. Comparer: critère de validité et théorie «réfutable»”.

⁵⁷ In the reviewed work, Roquet (1982: 17, §5) rightly pointed out “... sémitique, traité par Ward comme terme directeur privilégié (3) d’une comparaison avec l’égyptien.” Elsewhere, Roquet (1982: 17, §5, fn. 1) says: “Ce «sémitocentrisme» sélectif de la comparaison et de la reconstruction – qui déborde largement le domaine du lexique comparé de l’ancien égyptien – est critiqué par Meltzer: «There is a tendency to bias these comparisons toward Semitic, to form an idea of the proto-language modeled on a particular group of daughter languages. One in effect compares Egyptian with Proto-Semitic rather than Proto-Afroasiatic. This tendency to see in one daughter language or sub-family an approximatimation of the original state in the proto-language is something which also influenced early work in the Indo-European field ...”

neglection of the evidence from the rest of AA branches in Africa,⁵⁸ an out-fashioned use of the ill-founded term „Hamitic”,⁵⁹ avoiding to use the modern ways of linguistic reconstruction in a comparative lexicon.⁶⁰ But he also addressed some personal deficiencies of the etymological analyses in Ward 1978, namely, the dangers of biconsonantal comparison,⁶¹ an unchecked reliance on Semitic standard dictionaries for his *comparanda* extracted from their contexts and etymological histories without checking back the lexicographical literature⁶² (a method criticized in Ward 1985 also, cf. below), an all too “generous” or negligent treatment of the consonantal history of some of his Egyptian *comparanda*,⁶³ ignoring the cuneiform and Coptic evidence,⁶⁴ an all too daring and ill-founded vision on pharaonic dialectal forms,⁶⁵

⁵⁸ Roquet (1982: 16, §4): “Les données lexicales du couchitique, du berbère, non plus que du tchadique ne sont pas prises en compte, sans justification préalable. On cherche vainement dans l’ouvrage [footnote omitted] la raison pour laquelle seraient écartées les données.”

⁵⁹ Roquet (1982: 16, §4, fn. 1): “À noter une mention du bedja ... des généralités sur un «Proto-Hamitic» est évacuée en une phrase!”

⁶⁰ Blaming Ward’s method of not wasting attention for Cushitic and Chadic cognates for his $\sqrt{b3}$ roots, Roquet (1982: 16, §5, fn. 3) praised A.B. Dolgopolskijs’s (1973) “liste comparative basée sur l’ensemble des langues couchitiques. ... À partir de restitutions systématiques de proto-formes pour chaque entrée comparative, un tableau de correspondances phoniques ... est dressé: éloquent, ce bilan donne toute la mesure des incertitudes qui pèsent sur la reconstruction d’un vocabulaire commun.”

⁶¹ Roquet (1982: 18, §7): “À ce niveau de reconstruction, pour une séquence de consonnes C1.C2., l’improbabilité qu’il y a pour le chercheur de «tomber» sur la «bonne» racine est maximale; les «chances» d’erreurs d’autant plus probables que sa sélection des termes comparés repose sur une appréciation intuitive du sens ... d’unités lexicales dont la structure phonématique n’est en rien garantie.”

⁶² Roquet (1982: 19-20, §9): “Dans l’ouvrage de Ward, le matériel sémitique sélectionné ne s’appuie pas sur des énoncés contrôlables, mais sur des données de dictionnaires. Comparer sur dictionnaires relève bien sûr d’une tradition ancrée dans la pratique: il n’est que de feuilleter nos listes comparatives plus ou moins classiques: Ember, Calice, Cohen M., ou Rössler ... Usage et habitude créent un conditionnement: nul n’est contraint d’y souscrire, d’y succomber, ou d’y sacrifier. Fussent-elles levées avec le plus grand soin, avec l’érudition le plus manifeste, ces listes ont, de toute évidence, un caractère lapidaire et simplificateur ...”

⁶³ For this purpose, Roquet (1982: 23-24, §§16-17) carefully examined how elsewhere, in some other studies, Ward treated the histories of, e.g., Eg. stj “to pour out” (OK) vs. stj “to sow” (OK), which are in fact surely unrelated (because -t- vs. -t- are strictly distinguished in the OK), or of Eg. $\sqrt{b.w}$ (pl., name of a bird, MK), derived by Ward from \sqrt{pj} “to fly” (LP) instead of $\sqrt{b3}$ “nom d’oiseau: un limicole migrateur (*Streptopelia turtur turtur*, s. *arenicola*)” (identified by E. Edelman in 1961 already): “Toutes les données internes à l’égyptien le plus anciennement noté l’invalident”.

⁶⁴ Roquet (1982: 25, §18): “Si donc l’on admet qu’un «observable», de la langue, soit l’égyptien sur toute son histoire, pèse plus dans une telle enquête qu’une conjecture d’ordre comparatif, on s’étonne que l’auteur n’ait pas d’abord dressé un inventaire scrupuleux et critique des morphèmes lexicaux qui, en transcription cuneiforme, en grec, en vieux-copte ..., en copte, sont en rapport étymologique manifeste avec les B + 3 ou avec P + 3, tenus pour problématiques.” Roquet (1982: 25-28, §§19-20) thoroughly checked the neglected Coptic reflexes to Ward’s pharaonic forms, whereby Roquet (1982: 28-29, §21) had to draw painful conclusion on Ward’s comparative method: “La qualité première du technicien de la comparaison généalogique est d’être un scrupuleux historien ... Le sous-titre de l’ouvrage laissait attendre des «etymological ... studies». À l’examen, l’on constate que l’étymologie interne n’est pas seulement subordonnée, mais sacrifiée à la comparaison: «egypto-semitic (sic) ... studies».”

⁶⁵ As for Ward’s ways of projecting a dialectal nature on alleged pharaonic varieties of his lexical *comparanda*, Roquet (1982: 40, §35) has rightly remained utterly reluctant: “Comment se dissimuler les difficultés que rencontre l’égyptologue s’il cherche à isoler le «dialectal» dans l’âge pharaonique de la langue? Tout ce qui est variante ne relève pas du dialectal. Aussi accumuler les variantes ne suffit pas. Encore faut-il être en mesure de démontrer que celles-ci sont à la fois quasi-isochrones et régionalisées: deux contraintes critiques.”

the alleged principle that “linguistic change does not have a specific chronology” (as declared by Ward 1978: §35),⁶⁶ ... Later, Ward gradually became specialized on late NWSemitic loanwords in Egyptian of the New Kingdom (Ward 1963, 1974, 1996), which is out of our scope to be examined here. Toward the eve of his fruitful researches, however, he returned to the questions of Egypto-Semitic cognates in a rather new mood, which was clearly stimulated by his research on Canaanite loanwords on the one hand and the appearance of alarming tendencies in this domain, on the other hand, such as O. Rössler’s (1971) ambitious “neue Komparatistik” posing in egyptological linguistics a matter of fierce debates already in the 1980s. Ward’s (1985) fundamental theoretical study, entitled “Reflections on methodology in Egypto-Semitic lexicography”, with his far-reaching critical statements on the principles of Egypto-Semitic etymological research, arranged in five chapters, has ever since its appearance been very little-known. His new conception on genetic ties in AA was apparently influenced on some points by his current research on Egyptian lexicon borrowed from Canaanite. One of these is his far-fetched objection against conceiving all kinds of otherwise cognate-looking Egypto-Semitic lexical matches as genetically related,⁶⁷ i.e., as issuing from a common ancestral proto-language in the Neolithic only due to some pretty mechanic reasoning⁶⁸ with a late textual attestation.⁶⁹ Another methodological contribution in this study by Ward was his profound critique of Rössler’s (1971) fundamental study with a radically

⁶⁶ Roquet (1982: 42, §38): “Là, on est loin de cette technique sommaire, qui s’octroie toutes les libertés pour multiplier les contre-exemples ..., en rapprochant les mots sans commentaire critique et sans référence à la chronologie éventuelle des sources. ... Mais bien plutôt la moindre règle avancée doit-elle définie ou ré-ajustée par un examen scrupuleux des graphies alternantes, de leur date et de leur localisation. Le recours à la comparaison ne disperse pas de cette contrainte primordiale: la qualité de l’une dépend de l’autre.”

⁶⁷ Ward (1985: 232-233, §I): “Could not much, or most, of this vocabulary be rather loan words (!) from Semitic into Egyptian, or vice versa, in historical times? No overall linguistic pattern has emerged which allows a satisfactory answer to this question. ... it has been the practice ... to assume that comparisons in which the Egyptian cognate is found in Old or Middle Egyptian are Egypto-Semitic. This may be quite incorrect, however, since nothing forbids such a comparison from being a loan word in the historic age. This is true even when phonetic shifts presumed to be Egypto-Semitic are involved. The shift or r/l to 3 ... may have originated in pre-literate times, but it still operated with genuine loan words much later, as witness its repeated occurrence in the Amorite personal names preserved in the Egyptian Execration Texts of ca. 1800-1750 BC ... Ideally, we should define Egypto-Semitic cognates only from texts of the third millennium BC since lexical comparisons from this period are more likely to reflect the prehistoric languages. In practice, it is rarely possible since the Semitic material of that period is limited. Indeed, the farther away we get from the earliest written evidence, the higher the possibility that a given comparison is not Egypto-Semitic but a loan of the historic period.”

⁶⁸ When speaking of seeing “there no semantic basis for this comparison”, one is reminded of Ward’s hasty assessment on mechanically treating such a great proportion of the Egyptian lexicon as borrowed that may by far not be that all-round, since he ignored, e.g., the phonological and semantical aspects peculiar of loans when treating *comparanda* as loanwords, which is not at all possible.

⁶⁹ Ward (1985: 234): “A serious error ... made with some frequency, is to compare Late Egyptian words with words in the later Semitic dialects and to call such comparisons as Egypto-Semitic. ... It is evident that the term ‘Egypto-Semitic’ is used very loosely. It is applied indiscriminately to lexical comparisons of all periods, usually with little regard to the history of the usage of the terms involved. We cannot assume that words known only in Late Egyptian and the later Semitic dialects ... have long previous histories stretching back to Neolithic times. ... Because of the long history of contacts between Egypt and Western Asia, we must always consider the possibility that a given cognate may not go back to prehistory at all, but was borrowed from one direction or the other in the historic period.”

new conception of Egypto-Semitic phonological matches, where Ward has made a number of valid observations. Thus, a great deficiency of Rössler was in his view that his "dependence on dictionary meanings sometimes leads to false etymologies".⁷⁰ Another one was treating possible loans as cognates.⁷¹ Finally, Ward (1985: chapter §IV,⁷² 242-245) addressed the wider AA comparison where his fundamental doubts are hardly in accordance with the post-Greenbergian state-of-the-art of modern AA linguistics. Ward, here too, voiced the obscure aversions towards global AA comparison, so typical of the whole trend of the "old school", arguing simply that "if lexical comparison between Egyptian and Semitic are often difficult, they are even more so in the broader field of 'Hamito-Semitic'" (Ward 1985: 242). Joining other authorities⁷³ fears of the same kind, Ward dug out the usual counter-argument against AA genetic comparison, a rather hypocrite one I am afraid, namely that the comparison of modern languages with no ancient attestation is a danger in general.⁷⁴ But arguing so one necessarily ignores, as did Ward too, the commonly accepted results of the modern comparative methods in Fenno-Ugric, Dravidian etc.⁷⁵ Regarding the "lexical contacts" among the AA branches, Ward (1985: 244) was disposed to eventually "explain certain equations" better as loans (!) instead of considering them as "the residue of some prehistoric linguistic substratum".⁷⁶ He joined G. Conti (1978) who "has shown that at least part of the ancient

⁷⁰ Or as Ward (1985: 237, §III) described: "It is evident ... that the words involved in any comparison should be studied in actual context and dictionaries not be used as the sole judge of their meanings." Listing some false examples, he states: "The dictionary is incorrect so there is no semantic basis for this comparison. These incorrect equations were made because the dictionary meanings were corresponded. But once the history of the words involved is examined in detail, it is evident that the dictionary is incorrect ..."

⁷¹ Ward (1985: 237, §III): "Other factors such as the late Semitic evidence ... and unacceptable phonetic equations ... add to the proof that neither of these comparisons can possibly be Egypto-Semitic. Egypto-Semitic comparisons can only be produced by examining the history of each root in both Egyptian and Semitic. If the phonetics, semantics and chronology agree, the comparison is valid. This must be the first rule in Egypto-Semitic lexical (!) methodology."

⁷² In the publication, the numeration "IV" (sic) of this chapter (pp. 242-245) is certainly false, since the preceding one (on Rössler's methods) was also counted as no. "IV" (pp. 237-242).

⁷³ Like W. von Soden (1965: 163ff.), J. Vergote (1973: 6ff.), C.T. Hodge (1970: 237).

⁷⁴ Ward (1985: 243) found here "one factor ... disturbing ... that the African languages from which lexical comparisons with Semitic and Egyptian are drawn are known only from modern times so that lexical equations are made which may span some 5000 years ... which advises great caution in making lexical comparisons with the African dialects. ... With such a wide chronological range in the written evidence, we are presented with very dubious comparisons." Then, Ward evaluated a few "African" cognates to Egyptian from this methodological standpoint, whereby he either discarded or accepted some. But he was sceptical even on the latter: "But is this connection Afroasiatic, that is, can we project it back into pre-literate times?"

⁷⁵ What a pity, since doing so, he could have mentioned some further most relevant facts of comparative linguistics by far more advanced as, e.g., in Fenno-Ugric or Uralic where one can only work with modern languages (mostly with attestation from the 19th century on) and even the most ancient written records (of Hungarian) stem from the 11th cent. AD only, i.e., much worse working circumstances which, however, have not hindered finding the ways of setting up the *Lautgesetze* among the branches resulting in a high quality reconstruction of the Proto-Uralic *Grundsprache*.

⁷⁶ "It is in this way that" Ward (1985: 244) "would explain" not only Somali gaʿan and Bed. ganʿa (-ʿ- misquoted as -ʿ-!) "arm, hand" < Ar. ǧanāh- "wing" < Coptic (S) ⲬⲏⲁⲒ etc. (!), but even the match of Hausa sunsuna vs. Eg. snsn "to smell" which, in his (Ward 1985: 245) view, "similarly, ... was brought into Hausa (sic!) in much the same manner, though here we do not have the Coptic and Arabic forms to assure this route of transmission

Egyptian agricultural vocabulary was borrowed as new agricultural techniques and tools were brought into Egypt from Western Asia”, which is misleading and hardly adequate here as technical terms of the agricultural vocabulary were in all latecomer societies and languages naturally disposed to being borrowed and such a special status can hardly be transposed onto the history of the core/basic lexicon. In the last chapter of this far-reaching paper, Ward arrived at a little flattering view on the pre-war “old school”⁷⁷ and at a rather deviant platform distantiating himself, partly rightly, from both trends of Egypto-Semitic comparison (surviving “old school” vs. “neuere Komparatistik”) in the second half of the 20th century.⁷⁸ As a result, he ended up rightly declining the artificial Egypto-Semitic unity.⁷⁹ In this respect, he was probably right. But he too failed to overcome another old error of the “old school”, namely, the aversion to involve the rest of the AA branches in the comparison, which doomed this trend to become hopelessly retarded and to keep failing to keep up with the progress in our field.

2.5.5. C.T. Hodge (1917-1998), a researcher of historical linguistics esp. of Egyptian and Hausa at Bloomington, can hardly be counted among the typical representatives (mostly egyptologists by training) of the classical “old school” (and so most of his output will be discussed in Episode VIII devoted to the Greenbergian trend): still, although he contributed in the first two decades of his research (1960s-1970s) mostly to broader AA (e.g., Hausa-Egyptian) comparison (labelled by him “Lisramic”, cf. Episode VIII), and purely to Egypto-Semitic, in the Greenbergian manner of “mass comparison”, and then he even widened this scale onto the AA-IE trend (labelled by him “Lislakh”, cf. Episode V) in the last two decades (1980s-1990s) of his career, Hodge had some papers joining the core trend of the “old school”, most notably his fundamental study entitled “An Egypto-Semitic Comparison” (1976a), which was conceived as “an effort to define more closely the relationship of Egyptian to Semitic” (Hodge 1976a: 5, §1.1), where he confronted the Semitic

(sic!). What seems perfectly clear to me is that Somali *gaʿan* and Hausa *sunsuna*, and **many words like them, do not have to be considered as remnants of a prehistoric Afroasiatic vocabulary**. I see no reason why they cannot be considered as more modern loans borrowed at some time during the long history of contacts between Africa and Asia.”

⁷⁷ Ward (1985: 245, §V): “I find myself increasingly less convinced that we have properly defined the lexicographical connections between Egyptian and Semitic. ... the major collections of Egypto-Semitic cognates were produced in the 1930’s and 40’s” whose “result was chaos.”

⁷⁸ Speaking of the heritage of the pre-war “old school”, Ward (1985: 245, §V) remains skeptical in general: “This situation has not changed in the intervening decades. Indeed, the chaos has been compounded by new approaches. Vycichl’s dependence on Arabic and Rössler’s untenable phonetic theories have now produced new lists of etymologies which, in my opinion, are full of errors. As far as lexicography is concerned, then, Egypto-Semitic studies remain as chaotic as ever. The number of acceptable etymologies remains very limited and I venture the guess that much of the ‘Egypto-Semitic’ vocabulary consists of loan-words in historic times.”

⁷⁹ Ward (1985: 245, §V): “It **may be** that **the concept of ‘Egypto-Semitic’** is a modern invention and ... **never really existed at all**. The small common vocabulary could just as well have been the result of linguistic borrowing in Neolithic times so that no so-called parent language never (!) existed and the whole idea of an ‘Egypto-Semitic’ linguistic stratum should be abandoned. In spite of almost a century of research in this elusive field, the central questions are still not answered and no concrete methodology has emerged. This may well be because we are dealing with a concept that has no reality except in modern speculation.”

lexicon (based on the list from G. Bergsträsser 1928: 181-192) with the Egyptian one.⁸⁰ Regarding the old theory on a tighter Egypto-Semitic cognacy, Hodge rightly remained better cautious and reserved,⁸¹ which reveals his reliance on the new ideas formulated by J.H. Greenberg. Drawing his conclusions, Hodge (1976a: 25, §3) states to have found just a total of 72 cognates as opposed to 98 no-cognates, whereby he excluded the out-dated belief about "Egyptian as a Semitic language" but he too assumed a relatively closer connection of both branches.⁸² Regarding the comparatistic output of Hodge in general, his all too liberal ways of connecting almost any, in fact, unrelated *comparanda* by forging *ex nihil* chains of nowhere attested intermediate forms by assuming diverse phonological shifts at a time, became his method practised esp. in the frames of his "consonant ablaut theory" (elaborated in his papers published after 1986), which strikingly resembles of W.F. Albright's (1918a, b, 1927) approach to elaborating a common Egypto-Semitic vocabulary, where comparative phonological criteria were as a rule arbitrarily overwritten by the semantical closeness, e.g., he was not hindered by the facts to equate Sem. **talāt-* with Eg. *hmt* only because both mean "3".

2.5.6. G. Garbini: as a similarly occasional side-effect of his researches in the traditional domain of Semitic philology, this outstanding Italian Orientalist also released a few papers on Egypto-Semitic. Thus, in his profound review on Lacau's (1970a) etymologies of the anatomical terminology (Garbini 1971a), he first re-discussed the segments of the Eg.-Sem. comparative phonology (pp. 133ff.), where he very correctly summed up both tendencies of a simplification through merger and erosion⁸³ as well as an innovative enrichment via

⁸⁰ Hodge (1976a: 5): "The proportion of Egyptian words found to be cognate should give us a good estimate of how closely Egyptian approximates Semitic (but not vice versa, which would entail an Egyptian and searching for general Semitic cognates)."

⁸¹ In the light of the old and his own etymologies, Hodge (1976a: 7, §1.2.5) believes that "It is therefore a fair assumption that there is a great deal of phonetic similarity between Egyptian and Semitic and that we should look for cognates with very similar phonetic shapes. (Phonetic identity of consonants transcribed by the same symbol is, of course, not assumed). ... This stress on close formal correspondence is not meant to imply that it is irrelevant or unimportant to study what meanings are held in common and how these meanings are distributed vis-à-vis form. Such a study would be very valuable."

⁸² Hodge (1976a: 25-26): "These figures indicate that of a vocabulary representative of general Semitic ... 42.35 per cent have ... genuine Egyptian cognates. Of these the closest relationship is shown when the usual Egyptian word is that which is cognate. ... The result is 19 or nearly 20 per cent, still a very respectable number. ... This high figure supports the view that **Egyptian**, while **not a Semitic language**, is closely related to Semitic. Such a large percentage of cognates in a limited corpus also raises one's hopes of establishing a reasonable proto-phonology for these two branches."

⁸³ Garbini (1971a: 133): "è noto che il consonantismo egiziano è fortemente innovatore rispetto a quello semitico: la perdita delle consonanti enfatiche (ad eccezione di q), un certo livellamento delle sonanti (scomparsa di l, frequente riduzione di r a ʔ o a y) e la confluenza in un unico fonema, s ... dei due fonemi semitici s₁ e s₂ (corrispondenti alle consonanti ebraiche ש e ש) hanno provocato una notevole riduzione del patrimonio consonantico originario, sì che, ad esempio, alle consonante egiziana t si trovano a corrispondere in semitico sia t sia ʔ."

palatalization⁸⁴ in the Egyptian system, whence he has given a valid and almost precise⁸⁵ synthesis of the “old school”. Unaware of the subsequent Russian results (first available towards the late 1970s only)⁸⁶ in reconstructing the PAA consonantism as yet, Garbini’s assumption on the secondary nature of the rich Arabic consonantal inventory⁸⁷ has later turned out, however, to be premature as similarly rich sets of correlates were proven to be inherited from PAA both in Southern Cushitic and West Chadic, but he was right in general about the innovative nature of Canaanite within NW-Semitic (except for just Ugaritic with an as archaic consonantism as that in Arabic). Garbini’s second paper from this year (1971b: 248), isolating a Sem. *p pronominal (deictic) morph, even in spite of focusing mostly on the Semitic evidence, ended up in a new (albeit false) theory on the origin of the Eg. morph *p- present in demonstratives like p3, pw, pf, pn,⁸⁸ which once more testifies to the genuinely initiative trait of Garbini’s fruitful research, even though these were restricted in the traditional Egypto-Semitic frames. In his talk for the 2nd Semito-Hamitic congress (Florence, 1974), Garbini (1978) addressed a few theoretical issues of Egypto-Semitic, i.a. and most notably, the Semitic nature of Egyptian, where his positively critical attitude was, however, not accompanied by professional insights into the African branches when examining Egyptian’s linguogenetical forming with some exciting, albeit speculative, outcome.⁸⁹

⁸⁴ Garbini (1971a: 133) says: “D’altra parte l’egiziano ha sviluppato una serie di nuovi fonemi, nati probabilmente per fonematizzazione secondaria di varianti fonetiche, analogamente a quanto si verifica in semitica: abbiamo in tal modo le consonanti f, h e la serie delle palatalizzate, č, ġ (nella quale è confluita anche l’enfatica semitica s) e š (la quale non corrisponde alla semitica s₂ [ʃ] ma è una creazione egiziana indipendente). Trattandosi di sviluppi secondari dell’egiziano, dei quali per di più sfugge il meccanismo, è naturale che una consonante semitica potrà corrispondere in tal caso indifferentemente alla consonante che conserva la realizzazione fonetica originaria ovvero a quella foneticamente evoluta ... senza che sia possibile stabilire a priori a quale delle due consonanti egiziane ci si troverà di fronte.”

⁸⁵ He is, however, incorrect in his hasty conclusion on Eg. f as an innovation in comparison with Sem. *p, since, on the one hand, closed in the Eg.-Sem. world of a classical researcher of the Orient, he too, ignored J.H. Greenberg’s (1958) ingenious discovery of the Egypto-West Chadic isophone proving the inherited nature of the labial triad *b-, *p-, *f- and, on the other hand, he could not yet have been aware of the very same etymological evidence in Southern Cushitic explored by G. Takács (beginning from 1999).

⁸⁶ Cf. D’jakonov-Porhomovskij 1979; Diakonoff 1984; Diakonoff, Militarev, Porkhomovskij, Stolbova 1987 and 1993.

⁸⁷ Garbini (1971a: 133): “... il ricco sistema consonantico dell’arabo classico, che pur tuttavia presenta un numero di fonemi inferiore a quello dei dialetti arabi moderni, è il frutto di una serie di fonematizzazioni secondarie e successive. Questo processo di arricchimento consonantico, che è ancora oggi in atto, è caratteristico dell’area innovatrice semitica nordoccidentale e trova la sua prima manifestazione concreta nell’ugaritico.”

⁸⁸ The problem is that, on the Egyptian side, the morph behaves purely as a *Genuselement* (to use the Viennese terminology of W. Vycichl etc.) associated solely with the masculine gender (cf. the respective fem. paradigms: t3, tw, tf, tn). For further discussion, see EDE II 375-376.

⁸⁹ Regarding Egyptian phonology and morphology as basically Semitic, Garbini (1978: 48, §3) was puzzled by the all too non-Semitic nature of its vocabulary unexpected in the light of other segments of the language: “E’ questa ... la ragione per cui è stata fatta l’ipotesi, variamente formulata dai diversi studiosi, dell’egiziano come una lingua autonoma dal semitico, sorta dall’incontro di una lingua locale, africana o libica, con un superstrato semitico. ... il lessico è quasi completamente estraneo al semitico.” Garbini (1978: 49, §3): “Resta il problema del lessico non-smitico, troppo ricco e troppo fondamentale per poter essere considerato come un semplice apporto di superstrato africano.” Garbini’s (1978: 51, §4) vision of the linguogenesis: “Questa duplice stratificazione grammaticale dell’egiziano trova un preciso riscontro nelle vicende storiche, almeno per quel che ce ne fa intravedere la ricerca archeologica. La fase più antica, semito-camitica, dell’egiziano va con ogni probabilità collocata nell’età

2.5.7. G. Conti (Florence), the eminent Italian egyptologist and Semiticist, published in 1970s (and only) a number of remarkable studies on Egypto-Semitic. But then, he too abandoned this marginal zone and returned to his Eblaite studies. Already his early paper on the exclusive Ethiopian etymology of Eg. 3zh "sickle" (Conti 1973-4), a prelude to some of the great ideas expressed in his 1978 book (such as isoglosses shared with Ethiopian reflecting some extra-AA African substrate),⁹⁰ and then the paper describing the Egypto-Semitic terminology for "roof" (Conti 1976b), both reveal his keen interest in exploring the mystery of linguogenesis in the neolithic Nile Valley in the frames of Egypto-Semitic, whose comparative consonantism Conti (1976a) has surveyed in a special study for the sake of better assessing Egyptian historical phonology in the light of all the relevant works to his day, esp. by J. Vergote, P. Lacau, M. Cohen, and, a.o., of the attempt at rewriting the Semitic correspondences of a few Egyptian consonants by O. Rössler (1971) that perhaps Conti was the first to comment on on the behalf of the "old school". His position was fundamentally theoretical and focusing on Rössler's new triadic system of the pharaonic consonantism and confronting it with Vergote's binary system in a rather descriptive manner as a whole. Still, Conti's (1976a: 54-55) final word was rejectful and cautiously reserved (which is why it has

neolitica, quella che vide la diffusione, lungo la costa africana settentrionale e lungo il Nilo, delle culture neolitiche di origine asiatica: una valutazione cronologica prudente ci riporta almeno al V millennio a.C. ... La fase più recente, quella delle innovazioni semitiche settentrionali, trova la sua più ovvia collocazione nelle fase finale de periodo pre-dinastico: tra il 3600 a.C. e la prima età dinastica l'Egitto appare sottoposto ad un fortissimo influsso di origine asiatica, effettivamente impensabile senza un corrispondente apporto etnico. Fu così che si formò il 'sostrato semitico' della lingua egiziana: un sostrato che dovette subito tener conto delle parlate locali-specialmente nel lessico. Quest'ultima affermazione non è fatta soltanto a posteriori, ma tenendo anche conto di un dato obiettivo: la particolari condizioni ambientali dell'Egitto, son il suo deserto e le sue periodiche inondazioni, con i suoi laghi e il progressivo inaridimento del Sahara, hanno fortemente condizionato molti aspetti della sua cultura materiale la quale grazie appunto all'eccezionalità di quelle condizioni, si è sviluppata in maniera altamente originale. ... verso la fine del IV millennio a.C. il lessico egiziano era notevolmente più vicino al semitico di quanto lo fosse alcuni secoli più tardi: in quel periodo, quando fu inventata la scrittura geroglifica, la mano si chiamava ancora **ad* e l'occhio ancora **in*. Per spiegarci perché in seguito questi due termini furono sostituiti rispettivamente da *grt* e da *jrt*, dobbiamo rivolgerci, ancora alla storia. La lingua egiziana ... è la lingua del regno unificato: ma l'unificazione fu realizzata da un sovrano di Hierakonpolis, una città del sud, dove più forte era l'elemento etnico e culturale africano. La contrapposizione di questo elemento meridionale africano a quello settentrionale fortemente asiaticizzato, se non complemente asiatico, costituisce un elemento basilare e costante di tutta la civiltà egiziana ... La vittoria politica del sud è la causa storica del superstrato africano della lingua egiziana."

⁹⁰ Conti (1973-4: 31): "Sulle diverse ipotesi che sono state presentate intorno alla formazione della lingua egiziana ha sempre avuto un peso notevole la supposta esistenza ... di un sostrato, o di un parastrato, o ... di una componente africana ..." Thus, Geez ṗəḏḥ "pietra focaia", "che non sia attestata in nessun'altra lingua d'Etiopia, eccetto forse il tigrino ṗəḏḥit, qəḏḥit, «quarzo», qualora sia da considerare originaria la prima forma e la seconda dovuta a ipercorrettismo", was for Conti (1973-4: 32-33) a further evidence of the "ipotesi di rapporti commerciali preistorici, rapporti che non trovano conferma archeologica se non in alcuni manufatti litici con caratteristiche proprie di culture neolitiche egiziane rinvenuti in Somalia [footnote omitted], regione geograficamente non ben distinguibile dall'Etiopia propriamente detta [footnote omitted]; in Etiopia le poche stazioni preistoriche studiate [footnote omitted] non hanno restituito, oltre la ceramica e le pitture rupestri di cui si farà cenno tra breve, che strumenti litici wiltoniani, e quindi di una facies culturale comune a tutta l'Africa sudoccidentale [footnote omitted]. D'altra parte alcuni disegni rupestri, che sono le testimonianze della preistoria etiopica maggiormente studiate [footnote omitted], presentano moduli stilistici già noti in Libia e in Egitto, con cui formano il trait d'union le pitture del Sudan egiziano ..." Trace of such an East African substrate may be supposed in another exclusive Egypto-Ethiopian isoglosses such as Eg. dng "pigmeo" to be explained either from Agaw or the Sudanese lexicon (Conti 1973-4: 34).

not by chance been so little quoted in the works of the so-called “neuere Komparatistik”, the primarily Germanophone Rössler followers, over the past half of a century): “... la ricostruzione del Rössler sembra molto più lontana di quella di Vergote dal sistema ricostruito per il semitico, che entrambi considerano il punto di riferimento per l’identificazione di uno stadio più antico, non ricostruibile storicamente: infatti per dentali, sibilanti, laringali il sistema del Rössler appare completamente scardinato rispetto al corrispondente semitico. Inoltre un sistema così preciso, così completo, simmetrico pare non tener conto di quella evoluzione della lingua che porterà alla creazione, nel copto, di un sistema nuovo, privo di enfatiche, sonore, aspirate, nel quale invece Vergote mostrava il logico compimento del processo di riassetamento iniziato dopo che forti spinte innovatrici avevano portato il sistema su posizioni instabili. Infine la rigide sistemazione schematica, l’assoluta simmetria che si postula per il livello originario camitosemitico, dove sarebbero state presenti perfino laringali enfatiche, che non appaiono atestate storicamente in nessuna lingua, sembra troppo attratta: innanzi tutto non tiene conto del fatto che le lingue rifuggono l’assoluta simmetria ... e poi in uno stato più sistematizzato è preferibile vedere, in genere, non il punto di partenza, ma piuttosto il punto di arrivo da uno stadio antico più libero ..., pur entro i limiti evidenti di una certa funzionalità, senza la quale ogni sistema sarebbe irrealizzabile.” All these sovereign thoughts, in all likelihood representing the first general critique of the arbitrary Rösslerian system, strikingly coincide with the general reservation formulated in EDE I 392 also, independently, more than two decades later: “In general, ... Rössler and his followers created a system which works brilliantly on the basis of some selected examples. But if we “throw” more and more linguistic data into this system, we find unfortunately that its supporters did not examine all alternatives to Egyptian etymologies when they were trying to set up some definitely new laws of Egypto-Semitic consonant correspondences.” Both of Conti’s volumes, along with the 1978 monograph by W.A. Ward on the Eg. $\sqrt{b3}$ roots (above), represent the modest culmination of this surviving trend in this domain during the post-war era. Among these three volumes, Conti’s (1978) magnificent book, in spite of all its necessary shortcomings issuing from the a priori restricted scope of comparison (not going beyond the limits of Egypto-Semitic benumbing the whole research), is undoubtedly by far outstanding in the whole history of this trend in the 20th century history as this *magnum opus* (not just for Conti but, in fact, for this whole trend ever) proposed not only a common Egypto-Semitic vocabulary of the agricultural terminology allegedly shared by both these branches (itself a sensational novelty and a far-reaching daring attempt in his day) but also because its abundant introductory chapters (Conti 1978: 1-29) have provided practically the richest survey of Egypto-Semitic studies to that day including the research history of Egyptian as compared with Semitic (Conti 1978: 2-9, §2) and the rest of the AA branches (Conti 1978: 9-13, §3), resp., also a relatively poorer chapter on the “Studi recenti” (Conti 1978: 13-15, §4) hardly presenting the all-round state-of-the-art except for the works by G. Garbini (above), and, finally, Conti (1978: 18-29, §6) released a profound discussion of the Egypto-Semitic phonological correspondences. This volume’s core corpus, the etymological dictionary (Conti 1978: 31-143), arranged in semantically isolated

chapters,⁹¹ offers a number of new, albeit phonologically all too vague Semitic etymologies with a laudable retrospective survey of the concurring proposals, plus the brief archaeological background of the respective terms. The analysis is concluded by Conti's (1978: 145-166) "Considerazioni finali", segmented into chapters following the diverse layers of the pharaonic agricultural terminology,⁹² which led him in his "8. Conclusioni" to assuming two basic layers, namely a pre-Semitic substrate of further segmentation⁹³ and an Egypto-Semitic one.⁹⁴ As for the first layer, Conti was only able to surmise its presence from some vague traces, whereas the second one was based on lexical parallels some of which are phonologically all too doubtful. Still, the merit of Conti's epochal attempt, which has not received the due reaction and appreciation except for great Diakonoff and the Muscovite Afrasian team, lies not necessarily in its individual etymologies, but in its author's brave, even if vain, effort itself to break out from the shroud of an old prejudice surrounding in this trend the "Semiticity" of Egyptian. Conti's pioneering first step to explore Nile Valley neolithic agriculture on Semitic bases, with its debatable etymologies, a.o., most notably that of Eg. sk3 "to plough" (PT-), clearly stimulated A.Ju. Militarev's (1983) very first study on reconstructing the Common AA agricultural lexicon, on whose first pages, his starting point was his revision of Conti's hypothesis on the alleged borrowing of agricultural terminology from Mesopotamia into Egyptian.⁹⁵ Instead of a forced and artificial restriction of an etymological analysis within the insufficient frames of Egypto-Semitic in this apparently multinuclear domain, Militarev (1983: 99) revised the whole matter around Eg. sk3 and its alleged cognates by "привлечение по возможности полного афразийского материала", which

⁹¹ Like "Capitolo I: Termini generali", "Capitolo II: L'agricoltura con la zappa", "Capitolo III: L'agricoltura con l'aratro", "Capitolo IV: I cereali", "Capitolo V: La coltivazione delle vite".

⁹² Of diverse origins like "1. Riepilogo del confronti egittosemitici proposti", "2. Egiziano e accadico/sumero", "3. Egiziano e camitosemitico", "4. Egiziano e arabo", "5. Egiziano e semitico nordoccidentale", "6. Egiziano e etiopico", "7. Egiziano e sostrato mediterraneo".

⁹³ Conti (1978: 165): "... si distinguono dunque due filoni: il primo è costituito da una serie di vocaboli culturali, prestiti evidenti, che si riconnettono al sostrato 'protoeufratico' e 'mediterraneo' i più antichi: al sumero, all'accadico e, i più recenti, al semitico nordoccidentale, e sono indizio e conseguenza di un protrarsi di rapporti e di scambi con le culture circostanti dell'Asia." Conti (1978: 166): "Quanto al sostrato, o alla componente africana, ..., non se ne sono identificate che deboli tracce, non mostrando l'egiziano particolari rapporti con le lingue d'Etiopia."

⁹⁴ Conti (1978: 165-166): "Il secondo è costituito da quei confronti egittosemitici che attestano un diverso rapporto, non di dipendenza diretta, ma di evoluzione indipendente nei due gruppi a partire da una base comune, senza legami particolarizzati con le tecniche agricole; e sono questi i confronti che definiscono il carattere camitosemitico dell'egiziano: permettono infatti di identificare non una lingua semitica, già costituita, che si sovrappone ad una lingua africana, né una lingua camitosemitica che si espande da un camitosemitico pressistente unitari, ma piuttosto una lingua (e una civiltà) formatasi, sulla base di una potenzialità comune in seguito ad apporti diversi."

⁹⁵ Supposed to have taken place via Palestina and the Sinai, which Conti gave little credit since the terms in question are not attested just in North-West Semitic, and, instead, he followed another theory assuming a water route all way around the Arabian peninsula via the Persian Gulf and through the Red Sea. Still, Militarev (1983: 98-99) doubted when, how and why the colonists with this agricultural knowledge and vocabulary could have arrived this circumstantial way, since, in his view, "в Египте в V, а возможно, и в VI тыс. до н.э. уже существовало мотыжное земледелие, да и подобные морские путешествия вряд ли могли иметь место в столь раннюю эпоху ...".

“создает совершенно иную картину”. This is, in fact, how and whence the Muscovite Afrasianist’s worldwide known revolutionary Natufian homeland hypothesis sprung from, but this will be examined in Episode IX of this series to be devoted to the bright Russian era of the AA phonological and lexical comparison re-established by I.M. Diakonoff. A similarly little echoed far-reaching giant step hides in Conti’s (1980) second (and, unfortunately, last) Egypto-Semitic volume touching upon another neuralgic segment of this trend as the author exclusively and encyclopaedically elaborated the peculiar root pattern $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$ (Conti: n1212), which is uniquely attested in Ethio-Semitic and older Egyptian (from Pyramid Texts until the classical medical texts). This volume testifies once more to the innovative nature of Conti’s research, even when it was closed within the limits of only two ancient AA branches. The volume first offers a lengthy introduction into the phenomenon of biliteral roots in general (including a brief outlook into the AA branches beyond Egypto-Semitic and even Indo-European), where Conti (1980: 1-33) managed to yield an all-round overview with an up-to-date literature. The core part of the book consists of a thorough survey of the root pattern $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$ in AA,⁹⁶ two voluminous comparative root lexicons containing comprehensively all possible $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots (with their etymologies) as attested in Egyptian and Ethio-Semitic, resp.⁹⁷ The enormously profound etymological analysis of these Egypto-Semitic roots ended up in the final chapter⁹⁸ comprising another series of excursions with an accordingly thorough examination of related problems such as the disputable biliteral background of the pattern $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$,⁹⁹ the root pattern and incompatibility of radicals in both branches,¹⁰⁰ the grammatical-semantic function(s) of this root type,¹⁰¹ the role of prefix n- in Semitic zoonyms and plant names,¹⁰² and finally, the African genesis of

⁹⁶ Namely, “Capitolo I: Il tema verbale N1212: Considerazioni generali” (Conti 1978: 35-46), which is segmented into diverse domains of attestation of this root pattern: “1. Il tema verbale n1212 in egiziano”, “2. Il tema verbale n1212 in semitico e in camitosemitico”, “3. Il tema verbale n1212 nelle lingue semitiche d’Etiopia”, “4. Problemi inerenti alla concordanza egitto-etiopica”, followed by two samples of etymologically identical Egypto-Semitic $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots.

⁹⁷ Namely, “Capitolo II: Le attestazioni egiziane” (arranged in Egyptian alphabetic order as declared in the ZDMG of 1892) and “Capitolo III: Le attestazioni etiopiche” (arranged in Latin alphabetic order), resp. (Conti 1978: 47-71 and 73-93, resp.).

⁹⁸ Namely, “Capitolo IV: Considerazioni finali” (Conti 1978: 95-119).

⁹⁹ Viz. “1. Validità dell’ipotesi bilittera” and “2. Consistenza del lessico bilittero, e conseguenze dell’ipotesi bilittera” (Conti 1978: 95-98), where the central question was to what degree can $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots project real biliteral roots into oldest Egyptian and Proto-Semitic.

¹⁰⁰ Viz. “3. Ambito fonetico” (Conti 1978: 98-102), where the author compared the occurrences of all the possible consonant phonemes as C₁ and C₂, resp., in the Egyptian vs. Ethio-Semitic $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots in accordance with incompatibilities.

¹⁰¹ Viz. “4. Valore del tema verbale n1212” (Conti 1978: 103-107), where Conti tried to consider all possible impacts of the preformative n- and the 1212 type of reduplication in the values of the $\sqrt{n}C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots, which was extended in some subsequent chapters to a comparative survey of this signification in certain Semitic groups in particular: “5. La testimonianza dell’accadico”, “6. Le attestazioni sudarabiche”, “7. Significato delle attestazioni accadica e sudarabica” (Conti 1978: 108-111).

¹⁰² Viz. “8. Nomi di animali e piante a prefisso n” (Conti 1978: 112-115), in which Conti (1978: 115) has concluded to that “La testimonianza dell’accadico, che attesta ... tracce di uno stesso modello espressivo, prova nuovamente che l’etiopico in questa preformante n unita a nomi di animali e piante conserva un modello espressivo arcaico comune.”

√nC₁C₂C₁C₂.¹⁰³ At this point, Conti has apparently ceased to carry on his fruitful Egypto-Semitic research, or, at least, to the best of my knowledge, he published no more in this domain, and returned to Semitic philology purely. Two decades later, however, his pupil, M. Franci started to be actively present on the comparative track of his master (cf. sub-chapter no. 2.5.20. below).

Post-war supporters of the “old school” of Egypto-Semitic

A common feature of the long history of this trend throughout the whole 20th century, be it pre- or post-war, is that it has always kept attracting a high number of orientalists from both egyptology and Semitic studies to occasionally devote some minor papers (as a sort of by-product to their mainstream philological activity) to the problems of Egypto-Semitic comparison in the unchanged introverted manner of “old school” (and only, i.e., without any outlook onto the rest of the Afro-Asiatic family), which clearly signifies the fundamentally unproductive, self-serving nature of this trend that has been maintained, aside from very few long-surviving enthusiasts like W. Vycichl, just by the sporadic *ad hoc* papers by numerous authorities in mainstream fields of oriental philology, especially scholars of Semitic from Italian universities, who were/are mostly outsiders in comparative linguistics and whose researches did not focus on Egypto-Semitic on a regular basis.

2.5.8. H. Brunner: this eminent egyptologist was only occasionally dealing with Egypto-Semitic as so many others in this trend. In a special study (Brunner 1965), he examined the various homophonous Eg. roots √k3p and some Semitic cognates thereof, most notably *kap-(sic) “Hand-, Fußfläche”, which was twice re-borrowed into Egyptian during its historical contacts with Semitic.

2.5.9. G. Roquet: one of the greatest figure of French egyptological linguistics, for whom Egypto-Semitic issues appeared to be an important marginal segment of his domain. He too, however, had a word on these issues from his strict and consequent methodological point of view. Evaluating Lacau’s (1970) Egypto-Semitic anatomical etymologies, Roquet (1968-9: 88-90) was still by far more reserved in his critical attitude than in his later reviews as, in his annotated list, he mostly approved the treatment of the comparative material in Lacau’s

¹⁰³ Viz. “9. Osservazioni sulla localizzazione africana del tema verbale n1212” (Conti 1978: 116-119) leading the author to diverse uncertain hypotheses: “il fatto che in egiziano, che pur deve aver usufruito, in età preistorica di una corrente africana di stimoli culturali comune con l’Etiopia [footnote omitted], una esigenza così vago respiro abbia portato, in maniera completamente autonoma, agli stessi risultati, è ipotesi possibile, ma non ovvia” (op.cit., p. 117). Elsewhere: “Il cuscitico d’altra parte non attesta il tema verbale n1212; se però la convergenza tra egiziano ed etiopico non è casuale, se cioè l’attuazione in questo modello espressivo comune camitosemitico ... può essere attribuita ad una azione sottile di sostrato, ciò è strano” (op.cit., p. 118). Or: “nelle lingue semitiche moderne d’Etiopia il tema verbale n1212 alterna con la coniugazione composta, di cui ha lo stesso significato. Fatto questo che pare legare il prefisso n, la coniugazione con l’ausiliare e il tema verbale n1212 in un cerchio da cui non è facile scappare, indicando nel sostrato un elemento che può aver influenzato la scelta e il rafforzamento di un modello espressivo camitosemitico” (op.cit., p. 119).

original work.¹⁰⁴ In his study on four Bedja words allegedly linked to Egyptian parallels, Roquet (1972-3) has masterfully pointed out how these could have only be borrowed from Late Egyptian or Coptic. While the rest of his examples can indeed only be explained via borrowing,¹⁰⁵ this can hardly fit the case of Bed. hiyo “mari, époux”.¹⁰⁶ Roquet’s (1973) paper,¹⁰⁷ completed on the 8th Nov. 1973, in which he did not yet take O. Rössler’s (1971) fundamental study into account, has examined the “Incompatibilités dans la racine en ancien égyptien”, whose outcome, even when no comparative research has directly been involved therein, will have great bearing on the future duel of the out-fashioned “old school” and the ambitious “neuere Komparatistik” established by Rössler, a.o., on the basis of the Egyptian root incompatibilities.

2.5.10. A. Loprieno: in the mosaic of his eclectic output in the Egyptian *Sprachgeschichte*, he has produced at the very beginning of his career something to be considered here: a contribution on the nature of the pharaonic dentals and velars (1977) with a modest demonstration of their reflection in both contemporary and genetic parallels he poorly reproduced from others’ research (like J. Vergote, M. Cohen, W. Helck). Doing so, he failed even to consider the fundamental research by O. Rössler (1966, 1971) on the subject. His 1986 LÄ entry on the Egyptian numerals has little original to say beside the stereotypes of the ca. century old literature on the subject. At this time, however, when he realized the rise of the neo-Rösslerian renaissance in the 1980s as a trend adopted almost in all main fortresses of Germanophone mainstream Egyptian linguistics, he very soon sided with this hypothesis in

¹⁰⁴ Roquet (1968-9,89): “Cette présentation des comparaisons rappelées, proposées ou suggérées par Lacau ne se veut en aucun cas critique et exhaustive, rappelons-le. Elle est schématique et doit inciter à prendre connaissance de l’ouvrage où les questions de graphie, de phonétique et de la lexicologie comparée sont largement débattues ...”

¹⁰⁵ E.g., among others, Bed. haymo “vague”, whose -m- testifies to a post-MK borrowing from some later Egyptian source as the -m# of LEG. h(3)m → *hjm > Coptic (S) **ⲪⲐⲈⲓⲙ**, **ⲪⲐⲈⲓⲎ**, **ⲪⲐⲈⲓ**, (SS^fF) **ⲪⲐⲈⲓⲙ**, (AL) **ⲪⲐⲈⲓⲙⲈ**, (A) **ⲪⲐⲐⲐⲈⲓ**, (F) **ⲪⲐⲐⲓⲙ**, (B) **ⲪⲐⲐⲓⲙⲓ** regularly derived from the cluster -nw of the underlying Old Egyptian etymon, h3n.w.

¹⁰⁶ Bed. hiyo “mari, époux” < Coptic (S etc.) **ⲪⲐⲓ** < Eg. h3j (Roquet 1972-3: 128-130, §4), which already L. Reinisch (1895: 26, 133) discovered, “sans pour autant préciser à quel niveau se situait cette comparaison” as Roquet rightly objected. This match has since then been maintained by several authors as cognates (often in comparison with Sem. *ḥwy “to love” too), cf. Ember 1917: 21; GÄSW 36, #68; Cohen 1947: #92; IS 1971: 241, #100; Militarev 1986: 72; Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 2. But the fact of the matter is that, aside from the fact that words for “husband” are not typical loans, the Beja-Egyptian match may eventually turn out to be illusory. On the one hand, the former finds hopeful cognates in LECu.: Saho-Afar heyó “Mensch” [Reinisch 1878: 134] || (?) SCu. *ḥaw-/*ḥāy- “husband” [GT] = *ḥā- (sic) [Ehret]: WRift *ḥawa-ta “husband” [KM 2004: 150] | Dahalo ḥāḥo [-ḥ- regular < *-y-], pl. ḥā’i “husband” [Ehret] = ḥāḥo, pl. ḥā’i ~ ḥāḥōma “man, husband, judge” [EEN 1989: 26] (SCu.: Ehret 1980: 299, #IX.C.2, also 386, Table 4) || CCh.: Logone yuye “Ehemann” [Lukas 1936: 96]. G. Farina (1923-5: 324) and V. Loret (1945: 242) combined Eg. h3 ~ hn “mari” with Sem. *ḥl > Ar. ḥala “se marier, prendre femme” [BK I 66] = “conjugium inivit, uxorem duxit” [Loret]. At the same time, on the other hand, Eg. h3j (with its -3- usually regular < *-l/r-) may find its true match in ECu.: Dullay *ḥal- “husband” [Ehret 2000 MS: 303, #2428]: Harso-Dobase ḥal-hó (m) “Ehemenn, Gefährte”, Gollango ḥāl-hó (m) “Ehemenn” (Dullay: AMS 1980: 163, 203).

¹⁰⁷ As Roquet (1973: 107, fn. 1) promised, “Cette communication faite au Colloque de Cologen (sic) est le résumé de certaines conclusions d’une étude plus vaste, à paraître prochainement.”

a controversial attempt at its bizarre fusion with the ideas of the "old school", which is why this later segment of his output will be dealt with in the Rösslerian Episode VII of this series.

2.5.11. F. Aspesi: as an eminent scholar of Semitic and classical philology, the Italian linguist has been mainly focusing on the old Mediterranean/Aegean (substratal) lexicon common to both Semitic or Canaanite vs. Indo-European and especially ancient Greek, and also of Linear A.¹⁰⁸ Among others though, he also examined a few Eg.-Sem. etymologies, e.g., the etymology of Eg. 3b.wt "family" hidden in his volume on grammatical gender distinction in Egypto-Semitic (Aspesi 1977: 36), the Eg. vessel name qd and its Sem. cognacy and their IE parallels (Aspesi 1983: 51, §2 and 52, §3 etc.), a few rarely mentioned items of the shared Egypto-Canaanite nautical terminology (Aspesi 1994b: 34), the mention of an alleged Old Egyptian noun nf.t¹⁰⁹ supposed to be cognate to Ug. nb-t and Hbr. nōpet "honey" (Aspesi 2004b), the Akkadian cognacy of Eg. k3n.w "vineyard" (Aspesi 2012-3: 3 and fn. 4) etc.

2.5.12. A. Saleh's (1979) paper was to demonstrate the phonetic values of certain hieroglyphs (w, 3, t, d) by long lists of sometimes uncertain lexical matches between Egyptian and Arabic, where, however, cognates were mingled with late loans. Thus, in Saleh's (1979: 563) words, "this study is meant to show to what extent the ancient elements – surviving, mainly in common Egyptian speech, and partly in Arabic – are capable of contributing to the history of Egyptian language."

2.5.13. A.A.H. Youssef: the egyptologist of Egypt has published a couple of papers with scattered Egypto-Semitic (mostly -Arabic) lexical parallels, which he was sometimes (cf., e.g., Youssef 1983 or 1987) inclined to treat better as loans borrowed by the former from the latter (labelled by him as words "of Semitic source" or "of Semitic origin") even when clear cognacy underlies. Youssef (1999: 83-88) proposed a bunch of Arabic cognates to PT and other roots of older Egyptian.

2.5.14. R. Mofteh: another egyptologist of Egypt, who has also hidden in some philological papers a number of Arabic matches to Egyptian. Mofteh (1987, esp. its notes on pp. 137-141) touched upon a number of early dynastic terms where he occasionally attached some ad hoc cognates from Arabic (and even Berber) without, however, any insight in their Semitic background. Mofteh (1990, 1992) dealt with some derivatives and Arabic reflexes of Eg. *√šd.

¹⁰⁸ Cf., e.g., Aspesi 1994a; 1997; 2001 and many more, partly re-edited in the volume of his collected papers (Aspesi 2004a).

¹⁰⁹ In Aspesi's view, the form attested from the OK (Niuserre sun-temple at Abu Ghorab, V.) was a hapax denoting, in fact "unrefined honeycomb honey", which was "inherited from a common Hamito- or Egypto-Semitic lexical patrimony". Hardly so as Eg. nf.t in question has been derived in egyptological lexicography from the well-known root √nfj (inf. nf.t) "ausatmen, hauchen (auch bei der Imkerei), pusten" (ÄWb I col. 624a, referring precisely to the occurrence in question from Dyn. V). By the way Sem. *nüb-t "honey" has to be better equated with Eg. nb.w "Gold" (OK-, Wb II 237-239).

2.5.15. A. Roccati: although out of his gigantic philological output, the eminent Italian Turinese egyptologist devoted but just a few pages to Egypto-Semitic comparison and etymology, all this proved to be brilliant *Volltreffer*, including a fine study on the notation of vocalism in hieroglyphs with some Semitic parallels (Roccati 1988), a new examination of the dichotomy in the pharaonic lexicon (Roccati 1998),¹¹⁰ and his convincing equation of Eg. kj “other” with Somali kalē “other” and Sem. *kilʔ- “two” (based on an adequate semantical argumentation) (Roccati 1994).

2.5.16. W.G.E. Watson, an outstanding specialist in Canaanite and especially in Ugaritic philology, has scattered a large number of Egypto-Semitic lexical parallels in his uncountable papers on Ugaritic lexicography since the 1970s,¹¹¹ throughout the past several decades of his fruitful researches, where he has been adhering to the Egypto-Semitic sound laws established by the “old school”.

2.5.17. R.M. Wright’s (1994) brief etymological note offered a further piece of Ugaritic contribution to the Egyptian lexicon.¹¹²

2.5.18. G. Bernard (1995-8) examined the semantical spectrum and history of the family of roots *√qrb and *√qlb, explained from the primary sense “giron”, within the frames of Egypto-Semitic comparison in a paper, which he labelled in his sub-title as a “Contribution à la reconstruction chamito-sémitique” in spite of quoting in the manner of M. Cohen (1947) just two Cushitic forms plus but one single Hausa word, whereas he too missed and/or failed to shed any light on the phonological anomalies of the three latter “Hamitic” *comparanda*.

2.5.19. J. Osing: the eminent egyptologist from Berlin, the author of the two volumes from 1976 elaborating the pharaonic deverbal nominal stem patterns (NBÄ), has also released some rather banal and by far not original papers adhering to this trend towards the new millennium. His study on the phonetic value of the hieroglyphs <3> and <ʕ> (Osing 1997), which conventionally have been rendered as alif and ayin, resp., is no more than a by far (quarter of a century) belated rejoinder to O. Rössler’s (1966, 1971) new theory on Egypto-Semitic consonantal laws, where we once more only find a mechanical repetition of the corresponding theses of “old school”, which were anyway well-known from the rejoinders by W. Vycichl (1985) and W.A. Ward (1985) examined above. Similarly, Osing (2000) defended the traditional values and the Semitic matches of Eg. <d> and <ḏ> in the manner of a mechanical copying E. Edel’s (AÄG from 1955) valuable theses against the *ex cathedra*

¹¹⁰ Where he, unlike P. Lacau (1970a) in his treatise about the anatomical terminology, tried to find different a background thereof: “La caratterizzazione del lessico egizio consiste non nel valore di ‘animato’, e neanche di ‘movimento’ (che è concetto serio), quanto di ‘performativo’. [footnote omitted] Le accezioni possono essere considerate solo nella loro valenza ‘inerte’ opposta a ‘performativa’, ovvero in entrambe, come risulta da una analisi di occorrenze che ho radunato.” (Roccati 1998: 87).

¹¹¹ Right here, I have only been able to track the series of his papers relevant here down to 1996 (see bibliography below).

¹¹² Ug. mpr “convulsion” <√pr(p)r “to shake” compared with Eg. np3p3 “to flutter, convulse” <p3 “to fly”.

hypothesis of O. Rössler. The author had hoped to compose his evidence, once more, by just copying the "old school" etymologies from the ESS and GÄSW, resp., published six to seven decades before his day. The funny thing is that Osing packed all this by far not original stuff in some kind of belated review some three decades after the reviewed study was published. That Osing's *magnum opus*, NBÄ, in turn, which is an otherwise useful tool for the vocalization of Ancient Egyptian, is at the same time so much abounding in astonishing ill-founded and fatally out-fashioned inner Egyptian deverbal root derivations (*Wurzeletymologien*) of primary nouns,¹¹³ has become apparent to the wider audience when this bizarre system of assumptions led Osing (2001) into a whole series of banal errors in his misconceived review of EDE I, which were corrected by Takács (2005a: 14ff.; 2005c: 623ff.), who was the first scholar ever to critically analyze the phenomenon of traditional root etymologies., and II, resp.

2.5.20. P. Vernus: the outstanding authority of Egyptian philology in Paris, has only released, to the best of my knowledge, just one long study (2000) with an all-round overview, where, however, he managed to cover most aspects of Egyptian's affinities with other AA branches and even beyond,¹¹⁴ including, of course, as its core a profound chapter on Egyptian and Semitic (Vernus 2000: 181-193) hastily concluding to the tightest cognacy of Egyptian exclusively with Semitic (and only) among all the AA branches.¹¹⁵ Here, he offered, as a sample, a considerable collection of the lexical isoglosses (o.c., pp. 186-190) reflecting "le vocabulaire fondamental",¹¹⁶ followed by some particular segments of Egypto-Semitic lexicon (Vernus 2000: 191-192, §22) which apparently testify to Vernus' being puzzled about their signification.¹¹⁷ For instance, he was only able to draw such superficial *ad hoc* limits of a segmentation in the oldest Egypto-Semitic lexicon as degree of formal

¹¹³ Which, e.g., made him produce many inner Egyptian *Ableitungen* that can hardly be regarded as scientific but rather as unprofessional and even comical. It is sad to observe how Osing uncritically allowed a number of errors of the kind that are not tolerated any more and have long been abandoned in better-established domains of comparative linguistics:

¹¹⁴ Such as "Isoglosses chamito-sémitiques" elaborating, in fact, the core isomorphs shared by Egyptian with the rest of the AA branches (Vernus 2000: 172-173, §5); "Isoglosses lexicales" of Egyptian vs. AA in general drawn primarily from Ehret 1995, plus etymological analysis of the Egyptian flora and fauna terminology (Vernus 2000: 174-176, §6 and 177-178, §8, resp.); "Place de l'égyptien dans le phylum chamito-sémitique" falling into sub-chapters like "Égyptien et tchadique" (§10), "Égyptien et couchitique" (§11), "Égyptien et libyo-berbère" (§13), "Égyptien et sémitique" comprising pp. 181-193 (§§15-23), "Situation de l'égyptien dans le phylum chamito-sémitique" (§24), "Égyptien et autres familles linguistiques que le chamito-sémitique" (§25) (Vernus 2000: 178-195).

¹¹⁵ Discarding but just the extremist theory on Egyptian as a Semitic language, still, Vernus (2000: 191, §21) too, ended up unable to avoid saying that: "Tout en rejetant les excès sémitocentristes, comment ne pas reconnaître que c'est bien avec le sémitique que l'égyptien présente les rapports les plus étroits, et depuis longtemps?"

¹¹⁶ Where "on ne laisse d'être frappé par le petit nombre de termes désignant les plantes ou des animaux, particulièrement susceptibles de voyager, et inversement par la prépondérance du vocabulaire individuelle que du comportement social et des activités" (Vernus 2000: 190, §20).

¹¹⁷ Vernus (2000: 191, §22): "l'examen des faits donne à penser que, même pour le stade le plus ancien, la situation est complexe. Cette complexité est manifeste dans le vocabulaire."

coincidence¹¹⁸ or semantical domains¹¹⁹ or Semitic words only reflected by the hieroglyphs¹²⁰ that eventually yielded for Vernus hardly any new serious conclusions other than the well-known theory of a secondary areal influence of Semitic on predynastic Egyptian. Vernus' study neatly testifies to the enormous gap between the output of the "old school" and modern AA linguistics.

2.5.21. J. Huehnergard, a renowned doyen of Semitic philology, also took part in a recent workshop designed to assess the position of Egyptian within AA and his paper approaching the Egypto-Semitic problem from the high standards of his own field, wasted in his comprehensive survey of diverse aspects of the whole grammar problem just 2 pages (2023: 141-142) on the comparative consonantism where he tried to lay bases for "the comparison to a reconstructed proto-form of" Semitic whose phonological system he then tried to compare with the Egyptian one on a few selected points without launching into any detail about the lexical parallels. At the end of his investigation of morphological and syntactical equations in Semitic vs. Egyptian, he turned back to the unsettled question of the lexical parallels which he cut short by a fundamental doubt taken as a granted fact that no sufficient material is underlying for setting up regular sound correspondences.¹²¹ Refraining from the task itself of drawing any consonantal laws between Old Egyptian and Proto-Semitic, Huehnergard was not that cautious about elaborating diverse hypotheses for what he had not

¹¹⁸ Vernus (2000: 191-192, §22): "Coexistent ..., en premier lieu, nombre de termes identiques à ceux du sémitique, compte tenu des correspondances à peu près réguliers (1), et, en second lieu, d'autres dont le rapprochement avec le sémitique est difficilement contestable, mais suppose d'importantes modifications phonétiques (2)." Under point (1) he classified, in fact, isoglosses believed to be exclusively Egypto-Arabic: "une série de mots dont la racine se retrouve pratiquement inchangée en arabe ... Ce sont là des mots très anciennement attestés: un paysan arabophone de la vallée du Nil, dans son arabe de l'an 2000, utilise encore, pour la notion de «sceller, fermer», une racine trilitère *h̄tm*, déjà présente ... dans les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques des premières dynasties ..." In the group (2), illustrated for some unexplained by the Egyptian numerals 1-10, Vernus arbitrarily segmented three further sub-classes: (2.1) „Trois d'entre eux montrent ... des correspondances phonétiques attendues avec leurs homologues sémitiques", where he listed, however, to our surprise, also Eg. *sjs* < *srs* "6" = Sem. **√sds* (sic apud Vernus) and Eg. *h̄mn* "8" = Sem. **√t̄mn* < ***√šmn*. (2.2) "Pour d'autres, un apparemment n'est pas exclu mais, s'il se laisse se reconstituer, c'est au prix de modifications phonétiques souvent importantes." (2.3) "D'autres ... proviennent d'une racine différente ...", e.g., Eg. *h̄mt* "3", *fd* "4", *dj* "5", *m̄d* (misquoted as *mdw* with -d-) "10".

¹¹⁹ Where Vernus (2000: 192, §23) extracted the "lexique des activités techniques et économique" that „montre tout à la fois des éléments pouvant avoir une origine commune, mais ayant subi des processus de dérivation [footnote omitted], et d'autres où les correspondances sont très étroites ..."

¹²⁰ Vernus (2000: 193, §23): "... la valeur phonétique de certains signes égyptiens correspondaient aux noms sémitiques de ce qu'ils représentent ..., ce qui fixe le début de l'écriture comme point de repère chronologique pour l'influence sémitique", whence his conclusion is not at all new: „... durant la période proto-dynastique, un très fort apport sémitique était venu se combiner à un substrat qui, lui-même, était antérieurement apparenté aux langues sémitiques, de quelque nature que soit cet apparemment (génétique, aréal, l'un et l'autre?). Certes, il faut se garder de confondre faits culturels et faits linguistiques, et il n'est pas question de recourir à la théorie de la race dynastique sémitique donnant son impulsion à la formation de la civilisation pharaonique ..."

¹²¹ Huehnergard (2023: 185-186): "But when we compare that Proto-Semitic lexicon with the rich lexicon of Egyptian, we do not find many items in common; we find so few, indeed, that we are hard pressed to formulate consistent sound correspondences."

even carefully examined.¹²² However worried I am about such a methodology, Huehnergard's superficial impression is something I can confirm to a certain degree from my researches over the past three decades: (1) if one is to confront strictly and purely Old Egyptian and Proto-Semitic lexicons, one really struck by the very low number of cognate sets suggesting a very remote separation in the AA past, but (2) if one holistically considers (later, but not borrowed) Egyptian and Semitic (daughter group or language) lexicons, the outcome points to a much higher degree of cognacy and lexical innovations in either of both branches,¹²³ which alters, however, a bit about their relative distance in the AA classification."

Future of the Egypto-Semitic "old school"?

Finally, with the above-enumerated scholars we have arrived at the slow expiration of that post-war generation of those sporadic great scholars from some mainstream orientalist field who were as, so to say, isolated enthusiasts stimulated at all towards making an occasional excursus in a border zone like Egypto-Semitic. Accordingly, Egypto-Semitic comparative grammar has usually, as far as I know from my own experience, not become part of the training in either of these orientalist disciplines, let alone for the lack of training pupils about comparative Afro-Asiatic globally, the ways of lexical comparison and phonological reconstruction.

At the turn of the new millennium, only a few younger fellows have emerged in this totally peripheral field, even less worldwide than ever in any other earlier phase of the history of this trend. But, just like the scholars mentioned above, every single one of these isolated

¹²² Huehnergard (2023: 186): "This lexical disparity has always puzzled me: if Egyptian and Semitic are genetically related—and ... I believe that they are—and if Proto-Semitic is dated some time in the fourth millennium, and we begin to have extensive attestation of Egyptian by the mid-third millennium, then the fact that their respective lexicons are so different must signify one of two things: either they separated from one another several millennia earlier, or, perhaps more likely, one or the other, or both, underwent replacement of much of the lexicon through contact with another language or languages."

¹²³ Having studied a whole series of segments in the Egyptian anatomical terminology in my series of studies elaborating the etymological background to the "Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon", I usually found that Chadic and Cushitic are by far overwhelming among direct cognates, whereas approx. the same amount of indirect cognates may be found in Semitic (Takács 2015b: 86-113: Semitic has 12 direct and 3 indirect parallels, while Cushitic 15 and Chadic 19 direct matches in the semantic domain of hair, head, temple, ear, eye, nose, tooth, tongue, lung, heart, hand; Takács 2016a: 104-105: additionally, Semitic has only 9 direct and 15 indirect parallels, while Cushitic 19 and Chadic 21 direct matches in the semantic domain of hair, crown of head, skull, face, forehead, eyebrow, mouth, jaw, neck, throat, lung; Takács 2016c: 306-308: Semitic has only 13 direct and 19 indirect parallels, while Cushitic 28 and Chadic 30 direct matches in the semantic domain of shoulder, arm, hand, breast, chest; Takács 2018a: 291-292: Semitic has 5 direct and 4 indirect parallels, while Cushitic 5 and Chadic only 4 direct matches in the semantic domain of back of head, back, spine, buttock, bottom, tail). These investigations are still ongoing in the further domains of the anatomical terminology. But what I have so far found indicates a basically Cushitic and Chadic anatomical lexicon to which Semitic partly only shares indirect cognates void of anatomical connotation and where the share Berber and Omotic cognates is as a rule clearly minimal. All this testifies to the likelihood of to the pharaonic lexical treasure fundamentally based on etyma found in Cushitic and Chadic, where we can only see a very remote relationship of Semitic vs. a fully peripheral zone shared with Berber and Omotic.

young scholars is following precisely the same track (as a trend wherever their research took place):

(1) all they, perhaps leaving aside the single exception of M. Franci, are primarily engaged in some other, mainstream orientalist domain and their MA theses¹²⁴ or some other work on Egypto-Semitic were just meant to be an occasional excursus.

(2) Their interest of comparison, in addition, is equally as introverted as that of their predecessors being simply restricted to Egypto-Semitic as if just these both were necessarily tightly connected,¹²⁵ where hardly anything beyond both these AA branches has penetrated the iron curtain and the *a priori* settled frames of their comparative researches.

Accordingly, any further real progress of this unproductive trend is not even thinkable. Considering, however, some signs evoking the sometime apparent predominance of the scholars of Semitic and Egyptian philology from Italian universities (particularly in the second half of the post-war phase), one might perhaps trust in a favorable influence issuing from the traditionally strong positions of the research over the Berber and Cushito-Omotoc branches (accumulated, among others, in Naples)¹²⁶ in the Italian academic world that might inspire these gifted friends towards embracing a larger view of the whole Afro-Asiatic family,¹²⁷ instead of the forced equation of just two arbitrarily chosen branches of a much wider unit,¹²⁸ if one is to resolve the mystery of the Egyptian *Sprachgeschichte*.

¹²⁴ To the best of my knowledge, there have been just two BA/MA/PhD theses on Egypto-Semitic submitted until most recently by authors who have otherwise (before/after) not distinguished themselves in this comparative domain. Both pieces will be dealt with here.

¹²⁵ Although even he himself has *a priori* chosen merely Egyptian and Semitic for his essay on comparison, Semiticist J. Huehnergard (2023: 167-168) rightly emphasized that “I should also state explicitly ... that although I am comparing Semitic and Egyptian, I do not mean to suggest that I think they form a subgroup within Afro-Asiatic; on the contrary, I do not think they do.”

¹²⁶ Thanks to a whole range of top researchers representing nearly all the AA branches in the Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Dipartimento di Studi e Ricerche su Africa e Paesi Arabi working on Berber and the Ethiopian languages.

¹²⁷ Of course, not in the manner of such fashionable, albeit data-poor projects as, e.g., the most recent workshop entitled “Ancient Egyptian and Afroasiatic: Rethinking the origins” with contributions filling up a whole volume (ed. by Almansa-Villatoro & Štubňová Nigrelli 2023) but painfully yielding once more yet another nice theoretical package of *nichtssagende Gemeinplätze* based on some elementary etymologies selected from the old literature and re-arranged for the 100th time, which signifies the failure of mainstream “Western” (Atlantic) egyptology and Semitic studies in performing an original research and bringing forth a genuine new synthesis. The volume disappoints those awaiting a renewal of the field. Even one of the truly competent participants of the workshop, J. Huehnergard (2023: 167-168), the outstanding authority of Semitic comparative linguistics, was bitterly confessing his failure in extending the out-fashioned Egypto-Semitic comparison: “... I also studied some Berber and Cushitic, hoping to gain a better understanding of early Semitic through a better understanding of its genetic siblings. But I ultimately grew frustrated in that enterprise; the dearth of clear cognate sets made it difficult to apply the comparative method either to reconstruct much of earlier, ancestral Afro-Asiatic with any confidence, or to sort out the interrelationships of its alleged descendant branches.”

¹²⁸ Perhaps the only significant outcome of the volume publishing the most recent workshop entitled “Ancient Egyptian and Afroasiatic: rethinking the origins” (ed. by Almansa-Villatoro & Štubňová Nigrelli 2023) is that this (too) ended up refuting the usual prejudice on an alleged closeness of Egypto-Semitic, whose interrelationship would display sg. special in the whole AA family, which hardly stood the test of time.

2.5.22. A. Rubin, in the very beginning of his otherwise purely Semiticist career,¹²⁹ encouraged by G. Rendsburg's tutoring in comparative Egypto-Semitic,¹³⁰ submitted his MA thesis (1999, published in 2004)¹³¹ on a comprehensive survey of the basic elements of a common Egypto-Semitic morphology (Rubin 1999: §II, pp. 7-39) and a comparative consonantism (Rubin 1999: §III, pp. 39-60). His work is an unexpectedly strict and solid, utmost minimalistic survey of just the safest shared elements of both branches in both morphology and phonology. His evidence was meticulously collected and evaluated from previous syntheses. The exceptionally solid thesis, void, in fact, of any substantially new observations and strictly limited onto Egypto-Semitic, modestly and correctly only confessed having failed in identifying many segments of the supposed common grammar, which led Rubin to assuming a relatively greater distance between Egyptian and Semitic.¹³²

2.5.23. M. Franci is a pupil of P. Fronzaroli, P. Marrassini, and G. Gonti (Florence), whose Egypto-Semitic comparatistic is hallmarked in his output also. He, beside his main field of research (Semitic toponyms attested in the Middle Egyptian execration texts), has over the past two decades or so released some papers restricted to a comparison of Egypto-Semitic in the of manner P. Fronzaroli's epochal "Studi sul lessico commune semitico" with a number of genuine new observations in the field of body parts (2003, 2005), natural environment, spontaneous vegetation and wild animals (2009) including a special analysis of some problematic phonetic matches (Franci 2009: 66-67, §§2.1-2.4). Franci (2007) re-examined a number of questions of Eg.-Sem. comparative phonology with some retrospective insights. He devoted a study (Franci 2010) also to the popular question of common biliteral roots in the Eg.-Sem. matches and the problem of the diverse root affixes of diverse functions (-ḥ-,¹³³ -ʿ-, -b-, -n-, -h-, -ʔ-, -t-) often based on unfortunately arbitrary etymologies lacking a full presentation of the often more convincing older alternatives. Franci (2014b, 398-404)

¹²⁹ As is well known, the research of A. Rubin has since then long turned away from Egypto-Semitic and has since then been only focusing on Semitic, esp. MSA.

¹³⁰ Acknowledged by A. Rubin in his preface (1999: v) as follows: "I would also like to thank ... Professor Gary Rendsburg for introducing me to the relationship between Egyptian and Semitic and for editing an earlier draft of this thesis."

¹³¹ *An introduction to the comparative grammar of Egyptian and Semitic*, presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (1999, 64 pp.), which the author made me acquainted with at the joint session of NACAL and AOS (Baltimore, March 1999).

¹³² Rubin (1999: 60): "The conclusions of this thesis are admittedly unsatisfying, as many questions remain unanswered. ... The difficulty in determining a complete system of phonological correspondences and the scarcity of shared lexical items indicate that Egyptian and Semitic had been diverging for a long time before they are first attested."

¹³³ Where he has chosen perhaps precisely not the best instance: "Questa ricostruzione permetterebbe anche una comparazione con il termine egiziano *mrḥt* "olio", "grasso", che può essere scomposto come segue: *mr-ḥ-t*, dove la -ḥ- indica il prefisso/suffisso, ormai lessicalizzato, funzionale in afroasiatico per la formazione nominale, di solito legata alle parti del corpo." The problem is that he ignored the traditional etymology of Eg. *mrḥ.t* as a nomen instrumenti m- derivation of Eg. *wrḥ* "to smear" (for the abundant literature on this explanation see EDE III 428) as well as almost all other plausible alternative etymologies (except for the least convincing comparison with AA * \sqrt{mr} "fat") dealt with in detail in EDE III 429-435. Moreover, speaking of an AA affix *-ḥ- in the body part terms he ignored that this whole problem along with all possible examples has been surveyed comprehensively in the special study by G. Takács (1997).

surveyed some tendencies of the Egyptian *Lautgeschichte* (consonants) from the Old Kingdom until Coptic among some other elements of historical grammar, which resulted in having a closer look at the already known palatalization shifts of diverse Egyptian consonants in the track of previous authors and demonstrated by a number of (old and own) Eg.-Sem. equations, both valid and disputable (Franci 2016: 43-49). He also re-examined the Eg.-Sem. correspondences with bilabials and dentals (Franci 2014a).

2.5.24. D. Calabro (a pupil of J. Johnson, Chicago Oriental Institute), perhaps the most outstanding promise of this long surviving old trend of Egypto-Semitic comparison, a gifted polyglott fluent in a number of Mediterranean languages. His talk at the 2008 Naples AA congress refined the Eg.-Sem. cultural term *sVgVII-at- “seal” on many points with philological analyses of the Hebrew, Ug., Qur’anic and Eg. textual evidence and a precious list of (partly new) Eg.-Sem. cognates with Eg. *s* = Sem. **s*- and Eg. *ḏ* = Sem. **g*, resp. (pp. 2-3). He presented in 2011 a bunch of Eg.-Sem. common roots sharing the sequence *-ḥt- with thorough philological insights.

2.5.25. S. Vittori (graduated in egyptology and Semitic studies from Pisa University, pupil of M.C. Betrò) defended his ph.d. thesis on the syllabic structure in Egyptian with regard to Semitic (2018). He has also dealt with the reconstruction of ancient Egyptian metrics. He has then started to collect literature on Egypto-Semitic,¹³⁴ whereby he established a database of common etymologies, but has so far not published on the subject.

2.5.26. E.T. Laor’s (Semitic studies, TAU) most recent (2021) MA thesis,¹³⁵ which also “supports the hypothesis that the Semitic and Egyptian branches have a more recent common ancestor than Proto-Afroasiatic” (p. 4), basically ventured to reconstruct the common ancestral phonemic inventory of the alleged Proto-Egypto-Semitic parental language phase.

2.5.27. A.M. Wilson-Wright, equally a Semiticist primarily specialized on Hebrew, devoted a whole of a long study (2023) to re-evaluating the lexical, phonological, and morphological evidence of the allegedly tight relationship between Egyptian and Semitic, which led the author (apparently just an outsider¹³⁶ in this marginal comparative field) to conclude in

¹³⁴ Partly during his visit for consultation with this author at Balatonederics (April 2017).

¹³⁵ Namely, a thesis entitled *The common ancestor of the Semitic and ancient Egyptian languages*, submitted on the 30 May 2021 by Eleana Tamar Laor, student of Tel Aviv University, under the guidance of Dr. Letizia Cerqueglini (Lester and Sally Entin Faculty of the Humanities Department of the Hebrew Language and Semitic Linguistics), which I had the honour to review for the TAU in the fall semester of 2021.

¹³⁶ The level of the author’s acquaintance with the very material of evidence can be easily ascertained by the treatment of such a banal and well-known cognate set like “tongue” (Wilson-Wright 2023: 189-190 and 194, §7.2.4): “Finally, some scholars engage in selective parsing in order to increase the similarity between Egyptian and Semitic forms. A marquee example of this practice is the word for ‘tongue’, Proto-Semitic **lisa:n* and reconstructed Egyptian **nís / nús*. ... Yet there is no inner-Semitic evidence for splitting **lisa:n* into two morphemes ...” It is a pity that the author has not yet heard of (1) the Coptic evidence clearly evidencing an Eg. **lís* (otherwise she would not have written down a never and nowhere attested “**nís / nús*”, cf. the explicit rejection of the same dilettant blunder of J.P. Allen 2013: 39 examined already in the lengthy critical rejoinder by G. Takács 2015c: col. 577), (2) the inner Semitic biradical verbal evidence of **√lš* with an *excursus* on Sem. *-ān- (Rössler 1952:

general even “that there is insufficient evidence to support a genetic (sic) relationship between Egyptian and Semitic.” To my surprise, Wilson-Wright’s (2023: 192-194, table 7.1 with note a) long list of “comparison of Proto-Semitic and internally reconstructed Egyptian basic vocabulary” was claimed to be composed “after Ehret 1995, 80–100”.¹³⁷ At any rate, her long list with alarming miswritten or even misplaced transcriptions¹³⁸ has *eo ipso* evoked equally little trust in the subsequent discussion of some banal Egypto-Semitic etyma as based by an outsider on a very poor material mechanically copied out from some of the previous works and carelessly¹³⁹ argued (Wilson-Wright 2023: 194-197, §§7.2.4-7.2.11).

*

135, #22; Gazov-Ginzberg 1965: 93, #15 and 1974: 25; D’jakonov 1967: 187; 1970: 469; Lacau 1972: 304-305, §§18-19; Vergote 1973 Ib: 126, §79; Dombrowski 1987: 113-114, §II; Zaborski 1991: 1677; Belova 1993: 33, #2; Jušmanov 1998: 177; Militarev 2005: 98) along with (3) the abundant common Berbero-Chadic nominal evidence of an underlying PAA *√ls (available in the ocean of works on the subject, apparently unknown to A.M. Wilson-Wright, all too numerous to be listed here, cf. most importantly Vycichl 1934: 72; Sölken 1957: 207, fn. 9; Pilszczikowa 1958: 77; Gouffé 1971-2: 105, §1; Vycichl 1972: 177; 1989; 1990: 56, 89; Bender 1975: 142, #87.1; IS 1976: #273; Rössler 1979: 22; Rabin 1982: 28, #27; Faber 1984: 202, #12; Dolgopolsky 1990: 213, 217, 219; 1994: 268-270, #2; 1999: 54-55, #181; HSED #1666; Stolbova 1996: 88; CLD I 78, #239; Militarev 2005: 104). Her familiarity with African linguistics is hardly better. Cf., e.g., how the author cites “Hazda” (sic: -zd-), a language whose name (infact, Hadza) clearly tells her nothing, mechanically copied from a professional publication on a neighbouring African language family.

¹³⁷ On whose alarming methods see the detailed critical analysis by G. Takács (2018b: 236-239, §I: “Amateurs and Egyptian philology”).

¹³⁸ Cf. Eg. pẓḥ “to bite” vocalized as *ḥpázvḥ (sic: *ḥp-) (Wilson-Wright 2023: 193, item #46). Or cf. the author’s (Wilson-Wright 2023: 193, item #91) erroneous ‘h’ (for the correct ḥ) even twice in Eg. nwh (sic) “rope” vocalized as *návhw (sic), which painfully excludes a typo/misprint. All this looks highly strange and embarrassing for a Pennsylvania State University publication with Eisenbrauns.

¹³⁹ How Wilson-Wright (2023: 196, §7.2.10) refutes, e.g., C. Peust’s Rösslerian equation of Sem. *ḏubb- “fly” with Eg. ḥff “fly”, vocalized as *ḥff/*ḥff < reconstructed Eg. *ḏuff is revealing about a strange way of thinking (of a generation?): “but this reconstruction rests on the argument (sic) that *d* shifted to ḥ in the Middle Kingdom.” Following this line of thoughts one would be disposed to believe or not an etymology because a relevant sound law is allegedly corroborated by someone else. I am afraid, basing a decision on a scholarly matter on belief is totally outdated. Instead, one is expected to examine and know the very evidence material underlying, which here has not even been raised. Science is based on knowledge of facts gained from one’s own genuine research. Undisturbed about such a need, she keeps arguing that, “as Richard Steiner and Orin D. Gensler have demonstrated, however, there is no cross-linguistic evidence that a voiced dental stop could change into a voiced pharyngeal fricative.” But was this statement meant to stand for the missing argument pro or con about the alleged Eg. *d* > ḥ? Following this prediluvian way of argumentation, could one then feel entitled to establish or decline a sound law in Egyptian because of its presence/absence, resp., in other languages? By the way, the *ad hoc* shift of *d* → ḥ/ayin does occur elsewhere (as confirmed to me by W. Behr, Bochum, in a p.c. in Frankfurt a/M, May 2000, cf. EDE I 342 from 1999, which the author failed to consult in 2023), which, however, cannot change a bit about the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Rösslerian etymologies for Eg. ḥ < *d, *z, *ḏ, *ḑ, examined by me long ago (EDE I 346-366; Takács 2011, etc., unmentioned in the reviewed paper), have turned out to be false and this is what has some evidence value about the question.

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): Lycopolitan (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.

References

- AÄG = Edel, Elmar. 1955. *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- 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.
- Allen, James P. 2013. *The Ancient Egyptian language: An historical study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Almansa-Villatoro, M. Victoria & Štubňová Nigrelli, Silvia (eds.). 2023. *Ancient Egyptian and Afroasiatic: Rethinking the origins*. University Park, The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, Eisenbrauns.
- Amborn, Hermann & Minker, Gunter & Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1980. *Das Dullay: Materialien zu einer ostkuschischen Sprachgruppe*. Berlin: Reimer Verlag.
- Aspesi, Francesco. 1977. *La distinzione dei generi nel nome antico-egiziano e semitico* (Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Milano 80). Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Aspesi, Francesco. 1983. Gr. κάρδος nella comparazione linguistica. *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* 36(1), 51-59.
- Aspesi, Francesco. 1994a. Parole come miele. In Brugnatelli, Vermondo (ed.), *Sem, Cam, Iafet. Atti della 7^a Giornata di Studi Camito-Semiti e Indoeuropei (Milano, 1^a giugno 1993)*, 1-18. Milano: Centro Studi Camito-Semiti.
- Aspesi, Francesco. 1994b. Nautica Mediterranea. In Filigheddu, Paolo (a cura di), *Atti del I Convegno internazionale di linguistica dell'area mediterranea sul tema circolazioni culturali nel Mediterraneo antico: sesta giornata camitico-semitica e indeuropea – Sassari, 24-27 aprile 1991*, 31-40. Cagliari: (publisher not indicated).
- Aspesi, Francesco. 1997. Possibili connessioni egee di ebraico ʔ^adāmā: A proposito di Lineare A (i)-da-ma-te. In Bausi, Alessandro & Tosco, Mauro (eds.), *Afroasiatica Neapolitana: Papers from the 8th Italian Meeting of Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Naples, January 25-26, 1996*, 253-264. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Aspesi, Francesco. 2001. Graeco-semitica: Divagazioni attorno a un χορός di nome γέρωνος. In Consani, Carlo & Mucciante, Luisa (a cura di), *Norma e variazione nel diasistema greco: Atti del Quarto Incontro Internazionale di Linguistica Greca. Chieti-Pescara, 30 settembre - 2 ottobre 1999*, 17-34. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Aspesi, Francesco. 2004a. Studi di linguistica camito-semitica. Milano: Centro di Studi Camito-Semiti.
- Aspesi, Francesco. 2004b. The lexical item nft of an old egyptian (sic: e-) inscription. In Takács, Gábor (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl*, 3-11. Leiden: E. J. Brill. [Also published in: Aspesi, Francesco: *Studi di linguistica camito-semitica*, 171-181. Milano: Centro di Studi Camito-Semiti.]

- Aspesi, Francesco. 2012-2013. Sacro vino. *Ἀλεξάνδρεια / Alessandria / Rivista di glottologia* 6-7. 3-17.
- ÄWb I = Hannig, Rainer. 2003. *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I: Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit* (Hannig-Lexica 4). Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Bechhaus-Gerst, Marianne. 1998. Old Egyptian and Afro-Asiatic: The state of the art. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 56. 111-129.
- Behrens, Peter. 1987. Review of Vycichl, W.: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*. *Enchoria* 15. 237-245.
- Belova, Anna G. 1993. K voprosu o rekonstrukcii semitskogo kornevogo vokalizma. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 6. 28-56.
- Bender, M. Lionel. 1975. *Omotiic: A new Afroasiatic language family*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1844. *Ueber das Verhältniss der ägyptischen Sprache zum semitischen Sprachstamm*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. 1928. *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*. München: Max Hueber.
- Bernard, Gilles. 1995-1998. La racine QRB et son sens: Contribution à la reconstruction chamito-sémitique. *Comptes-Rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques* 33. 5-22.
- Biberstein Kazimirski, Albert de. 1860. *Dictionnaire arabe-français*. Tomes I-II. Paris: Maisonneuve et C^{ie}.
- Blažek, Václav. March 1994. *Toward the position of Bed'awye within Afroasiatic (An analysis of the body parts terminology)*. MS. Köln. 49 p.
- Blažek, Václav & Boisson, Claude. 1992. The diffusion of agricultural terms from Mesopotamia. *Archív Orientální* 60. 16-37.
- 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.
- Calabro, David. 2008. Rolling out the etymology of Northwest Semitic *sglt*. MS. (Handout of the paper presented on the 12 Sep. at the 8th International Congress of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, Napoli, 11-13 September 2008. 4 p.)
- Calabro, David. 2011. On the roots ḥṭp and ḥṭt in Northwest Semitic. MS. (Handout of the paper presented at the 14th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, Torino, 15-18 June 2011. 4 p.)
- Calice, Ferenc (sic). 1923-1926. 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.
- CED = Černý, Jároslav. 1976. *Coptic etymological dictionary*. London, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CLD I = Stolbova, Ol'ga V. 2005. *Chadic lexical database*. Issue I. *L, N, NY, R*. Kaluga: Poligrafija.
- CLD II = Stolbova, Ol'ga V. 2007. *Chadic lexical database*. Issue II. *Lateral fricatives ʃ, ʃ̣, ʃ̥ with Semitic, Egyptian and South Cushitic parallels*. Moscow-Kaluga: Polygraphiya (sic: -ph-).
- CLD III = Stolbova, Ol'ga V. 2009. *Chadic lexical database*. Issue III. *Sibilants and sibilant affricates s, z, c, ç, č, ž, ẓ̌*. Moscow: Institut Vostokovedenija.
- CLD IV = Stolbova, Ol'ga V. 2011. *Chadic lexical database*. Issue IV. *Velars: *k, *ḳ, *g*. Moscow – Kaluga: Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian (sic: -sss-) Academy of Sciences / Moskva: IV RAN, Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Vostokovedenija. Moscow: IV PAN (sic), Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- CLD V = Stolbova, Ol'ga V. 2019. *Leksičeskaja baza dannyh po čadskim jazykam*. Vypusk V: *ʔ, h, ḥ, [ʕ], γ, fi*. *Chadic lexical database*. Issue V: *ʔ, h, ḥ, [ʕ], γ, fi*. Moskva: IV RAN, Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Vostokovedenija. / Moscow: IV PAN (sic) / Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- CLD VI = Stolbova, Ol'ga V. 2020. *Leksičeskaja baza dannyh po čadskim jazykam*. Vypusk VI. *Gubnyje b, f, p*. / *Chadic lexical database*. Issue VI. *Labials b, f, p*. Moskva: IV RAN, Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Vostokovedenija / Moscow: IV PAN (sic), Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences.

- Cohen, M. 1947. *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Conti, Giovanni. 1973-1974. Egiziano 3šh “tagliare col falchetto”, etiopico ʔəzh “pietra focaia”. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 48. 29-35.
- Conti, Giovanni. 1976a. Il sistema consonantico egiziano. *Oriens Antiquus* 15(1). 44-55.
- Conti, Giovanni. 1976b. Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nelle denominazioni egiziane del tetto. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 50(3-4). 265-273.
- Conti, Giovanni. 1978. *Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nel lessico egiziano dell'agricoltura*. Firenze: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- Conti, Giovanni. 1980. *Studi sul bilinguismo in semitico e in egiziano*. 1. *Il tema verbale N1212*. Firenze: Istituto Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- 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.
- Diakonoff, Igor M. 1970. Problems of root structure in Proto-Semitic. *Archív Orientální* 38. 453-480.
- D'jakonov, Igor M. 1967. *Jazyki drevnej Perednej Azii*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Diakonoff, Igor M. 1984. Letter to the Conference. In Bynon, James (ed.), *Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics*, 1-10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diakonoff, Igor & Militarev, Alexander & Porhomovskij, Victor & Stolbova, Olga. 1993 On the principles of Afrasian phonological reconstruction. *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 1. 7-15.
- D'jakonov, Igor M. & Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. & Porhomovskij, Viktor Ja. & Stolbova, Olga V. 1987. Obščefrazijskaja fonologičeskaja sistema. In Porhomovskij, Viktor Ja. (ed.), *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie: Problemy rekonstrukcii*, 9-29. Moskva: Nauka.
- D'jakonov, I.M. & Porhomovskij, V.Ja. 1979. O principah afrazijskoj rekonstrukcii (v svjazi s rabotoj nad sravnitel'no-istoričeskim slovarom). In *Balkanica. Lingvističeskie issledovanija*, 72-84. Moskva: Nauka.
- Dolgopolskij, Aron B. 1973. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika kušitskich jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Dolgopolsky, Aharon. 1990. On Chadic correspondences of Semitic *š. In Mukarovsky, Hans G. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, vol. 1, 213-225. Wien: Afro-Pub.
- Dolgopolsky, Aharon. 1992. *From Proto-Semitic to Hebrew: Phonology. Etymological approach in a Hamito-Semitic perspective*. Milano: CUS-CUS.
- Dolgopolsky, Aharon. 1994. Some Hamito-Semitic names of body parts. In Goldenberg, Gideon & Raz, Shlomo (eds.), *Semitic and Cushitic studies*, 267-287. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Dombrowski, Franz Amadeus. 1987. Leo Reinischs materieller Beitrag zur Bedeutung des Agaw, insbesondere des Bilin, für die Erforschung der hamitischen und semitischen Sprachen. In Mukarovsky, Hans G. (ed.), *Leo Reinisch: Werk und Erbe*, 107-124. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 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.
- EG¹ 1927 = Gardiner, Alan Henderson. 1927. *Egyptian grammar*. 1st edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ehret, Christopher. 1980. *The historical reconstruction of Southern Cushitic phonology and vocabulary*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ehret, Christopher. 1995. *Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian): Vowels, tone, consonants, and vocabulary*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, California: University of California.
- Ehret, Christopher. 2000. Appendix 1: Additional PAA roots. Appendix 2: Outcomes of co-occurrence constraints in Semitic and Egyptian. Appendix 4 (in fact, only 3): Roots found so far only in North Erythraean subbranch. Appendix 4: Added cognates to roots already in Ehret 1995. Appendix 6: Emendations of roots proposed in Ehret 1995. MS. Los Angeles, California. 585 p.
- Ehret, Christopher & Elderkin, Edward D. & Nurse, Derek. 1989. Dahalo lexis and its sources. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 18. 5-49.
- 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.
- Faber, Alice. 1984. Semitic sibilants in an Afro-Asiatic context. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 29(2). 189-224.
- Farina, Giulio. 1923-1925. Review of Sottas, H. & Drioton, E.: Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 10. 322-327.
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2003. Egypto-Semitic lexical comparison: New correspondences in the lexicon of anatomy and physiological functions and phonetic problems. MS. (Paper presented at the 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, Bergamo, 5-7 June 2003. 11 p.)
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2005. Egypto-Semitic lexical comparison: New correspondences and phonological problems in the lexicon of anatomy and physiological functions. In Mengozzi, Alessandro (ed.), *Studi afroasiatici: XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemitica. Afro-Asiatic Studies: 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*, 57-66. Milano: Francoangeli.
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2007. Alcune considerazioni sulla fonologia dell'egiziano antico in relazione alla comparazione egitto-semitica. *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica – Università di Firenze* 17. 233-249.
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2009. Egypto-Semitic lexical comparison – 2: Some considerations in the lexicon of physical environment, spontaneous vegetation and wild animals. In Popielska-Grzybowska, Joanna & Białostocka, Olga & Iwaszczuk, Jadwiga (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists. Egypt 2004: Perspectives of Research. Acta Archaeologica Pultuskiensia 1. Warsaw 12-14 May 2004*, 61-68. Pultusk: Institute of Anthropology and Archaeology, The Pułtusk Academy of Humanities.
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2010. Estensione della radice nella comparazione egitto-semitica. In Fales, Frederick Mario & Grassi, Giulia (eds.), *CAMSEMUD 2007. Proceedings of 13th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics Held in Udine, May 21st–24th, 2007*, 87-102. Padova: S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice e Libreria.
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2014a. Egypt-Semitic comparison: Some considerations on bilabials and dentals relationship. = *Folia Orientalia* 51. 189-200.
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2014b. La perdita dei markers delle categorie nominali in egiziano: Invito ad una analisi tipologica. In Bausi, Alessandro & Gori, Alessandro & Lusini, Gianfrancesco (eds.), *Linguistic, oriental and Ethiopian studies in memory of Paolo Marrassini*, 397-416. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Franci, Massimiliano. 2016. Some considerations on Ancient Egyptian palatalization. In Voigt, Rainer (ed.), *5000 Jahre semitohamitische Sprachen in Asien und Afrika*, 43-51. Köln: Köppe Verlag.
- Garbini, Giovanni. 1969. La position du sémitique dans le chamito-sémitique. MS. (Comunicazione al I Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Semitica et Camito-Semitica, Paris.)
- Garbini, Giovanni. 1971a. Il corpo umano nelle comparazione lessicale egitto-semitica. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 46. 129-141.
- Garbini, Giovanni. 1971b. Il tema pronominale p in semitico. *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 31, NS 21. 245-248.
- Garbini, Giovanni. 1974. La position du sémitique dans le chamito-sémitique. In Caquot, André & Cohen, David (eds.), *Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique*, 21-26. La Haye: Mouton.
- Garbini, Giovanni. 1978. L'egiziano e le lingue semitiche. In Fronzaroli, Pelio (ed.), *Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semitica (Firenze, 16-19 aprile 1974)*, 45-54. Firenze: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- Gazov-Ginzberg, A. M. 1965. Sledy monovokalizma v semitskih vnegrammatičeskikh glasnyh. *Kratkie Soobščeniya Instituta Narodov Azii* 86. 90-96.
- Gazov-Ginzberg, A. M. 1974. *Simvolizm prasemitskoj fleksii*. Moskva: Nauka.
- GÄSW = Calice, Graf F. von. 1936. *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. Wien: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- Gouffé, Claude. 1971-1972. Notes de lexicologie et d'étymologie soudanaises. *Comptes-Rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques* 16. 101-119.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1958. The labial consonants of Proto-Afro-Asiatic. *Word* 14. 295-302.
- 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.
- HSED = Orel, Vladimir É. & Stolbova, Olga V. 1995. *Hamito-Semitic etymological dictionary*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Huehnergard, John. 2023. Proto-Semitic and Egyptian. In Almansa-Villatoro, M. Victoria & Štubňová Nigrelli, Silvia (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian and Afroasiatic: Rethinking the origins*, 139-161. University Park, The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania: Eisenbrauns.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. 1971. *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij): Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-Ķ)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. 1976. *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij): Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (l-ž). Ukazateli*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Jušmanov, Nikolaj Vladimirovič (edited by Belova, A.G.). 1998. *Izbrannye trudy: Raboty po obščej fonetike, semitologii i arabskoj klassičeskoj morfologii*. Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
- Kaye, Alan S. & Daniels, Peter T. 1992. Comparative Afroasiatic and general genetic linguistics. *Word* 43(3). 429-458.
- KHW = Westendorf, Wolfhart. 1977. *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kießling, Roland & Mous, Maarten. 2004. *The lexical reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic* (Kuschitische Sprach-studien, 21). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- 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.
- Lacau, Pierre. 1954a. *Sur le système hiéroglyphique*. Le Caire: IFAO.
- Lacau, Pierre. 1954b. Égyptien et sémitique. *Syria* 31. 286-306.
- Lacau, Pierre. 1970a. *Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Lacau, Pierre. 1970b. *Études d'Égyptologie. I. Phonétique égyptienne ancienne*. Le Caire: IFAO.
- Lacau, Pierre. 1972. *Études d'Égyptologie. II. Morphologie*. Le Caire: IFAO.
- Lefèbvre, Gustave. 1955. *Grammaire de l'égyptien classique*. 2nd edn. Le Caire: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Lesko, Leonard H. (ed.). 1998. *Ancient Egyptian and Mediterranean studies in memory of William A. Ward*. Providence: Department of Egyptology Brown University.
- Loprieno, Antonio. 1977. A proposito delle consonanti dentali e velari in egiziano e nelle lingue semitiche. *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 37. 125-142.
- Loprieno, Antonio. 1982. Afroasiatische Sprachwissenschaft in Bewegung. *Göttinger Miscellen* 54. 85-94.
- Loret, Victor. 1945. La lettre l dans l'alphabet hiéroglyphique. *Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres. Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'année 1945*, avril-juin. 236-244.
- Lukas, Johannes. 1936. Die Logone-Sprache im Zentralen Sudan. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 21(6).
- 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.
- Meltzer, Edmund S. 1979. Desiderata for the historical and comparative study of Egyptian. In Reineke, Walter F. (ed.), *Premier Congrès International d'Égyptologie, Le Caire, octobre 2-10, 1976: Actes*, 465-476. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. 1983. Ob odnom obščefrazijskom zemledeľ'českom termine: Novye lingvističeskie dannye o proischoždenii zemledeľija. *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 4. 97-106.
- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. 1984. Sovremennoe sravnitel'no-istoričeskoe afrazijskoe jazykoznanie: Čto ono možet dat' isto-ričeskoj nauke? In *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka*, čast' 3, 3-26. Moskva: Nauka.

- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. 1986. Proischozhenie kornej so značeniem "tvorit', sozdatav'" v afrazijskikh jazykah. In *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XIX godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 63-79. Moskva: Nauka.
- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. 1989. Ešče raz o proischozhenii zemledelija po dannym praafrazijskoj (prasemitoamitskoj) lingvističeskoj rekonstrukcii. *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1. 128-131.
- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. 1990a. Afrasian cultural terms (Preliminary report). In Shevoroshkin, Vitaly (ed.), *Proto-languages and proto-cultures*, 33-54. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. 1990b. Evidence of Proto-Afrasian cultural lexicon (I. Cultivation of land. II. Crops. III. Dwelling and settlement). In Mukarovskij, Hans G. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, Bd. 1, 73-85. Wien: Afro-Pub.
- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. 2005. Root extension and root formation in Semitic and Afrasian. *Aula Orientalis* 23. 83-129.
- Militarev, Aleksandr Ju. & Stolbova, Olga V. 1990. First approach to comparative-historical phonology of Afrasian (Consonantism). In Mukarovskij, Hans G. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, Bd. I, 45-72. Wien: Afro-Pub.
- Moftah, Ramses. 1987. Frühgeschichtliche Anschaulichkeit und Onomation. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 66. 125-145.
- Moftah, Ramses. 1990. Der Laubbaum als Schriftzeichen. *Göttinger Miscellen* 119. 61-64.
- Moftah, Ramses. 1992. Le defunt et le palmier-doum. *Göttinger Miscellen* 127. 63-68.
- Mukarovskij, Hans G. 1981. Hamito-Semitsch, Afro-Asiatisch, Erythräisch: Zum Wandel von Begriffen und Verständnis. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 34. 511-526.
- Osing, Jürgen. 1997. Zum Lautwert von 3 und ʿ. *Studien zum Altägyptischen Kultur* 24. 223-229.
- Osing, Jürgen. 2000. Zum Lautwert von [d] und [d]. *Lingua Aegyptia* 9. 165-178.
- Osing, Jürgen. 2001. Review of Takács, G.: Etymological dictionary of Egyptian, Vol. I. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 58(5-6). 565-581.
- 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.
- Pilszczikowa, Nina. 1958. Contribution à l'étude des rapports entre le haoussa et les autres langues du groupe nigéro-tchadien. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 22(2). 75-99.
- Rabin, Chaim. 1982b. Ron-Semitic etymologies. In Jungraithmayr, Herrmann (ed.), *The Chad languages in the Hamito-semitic-Nigrític border area*, 24-31. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Reinisch, Leo. 1878. Die Sprache Saho-Irob in Abessinien. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe* 90(9). 89-142.
- Reinisch, Leo. 1895. *Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache*. Wien: Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Roccati, Alessandro. 1988. Ricerche sulla scrittura egizia – III. La notazione vocalica nella scrittura geroglifica. *Oriens Antiquus* 27. 115-126.
- Roccati, Alessandro. 1994. Per l'origine di egiziano "altro". In Brugnatelli, Vermondo (ed.), *Sem, Cam, Iafet: Atti della 7ª Giornata di Studi Camito-Semítici e Indoeuropei (Milano, 1º giugno 1993)*, 183-185. Milano: Centro Studi Camito-Semítici.
- Roccati, Alessandro. 1998. Lessico dinamico nell'egiziano antico. In Verhoogt, A.M.F.W. & Vleeming, S.P. (eds.), *The two faces of Graeco-Roman Egypt: Greek and Demotic and Greek-Demotic texts and studies presented to P.W. Pestman (P.L. Bat. 30)*, 87-91. Leiden: Brill.
- Roquet, Gérard. 1968-9 [sic]. A propos d'un ouvrage à paraître: "Les noms de parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique" de P. Lacau. *Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques (GLECS)* 13. 88-90.
- Roquet, Gérard. 1972-1973. Sur quelques emprunts du bédaïye à l'égyptien. *Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques (GLECS)* 17. 125-136.
- Roquet, Gérard. 1973. Incompabilités dans la racine en ancien égyptien I. *Göttinger Miscellen* 6. 107-117.
- Roquet, Gérard. 1982. Aspects critiques de la méthode appliquée à la reconstruction comparative du lexique égyptien ancien. *Chronique d'Égypte* 113. 14-54.

- Roquet, Gérard. 1983. Notes de lexique égyptien et copte. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 69. 321-356.
- Rössler, Otto. 1952. Der semitische Charakter der libyschen Sprache. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50. 121-150.
- Rössler, Otto. 1966. Das ältere ägyptische Umschreibungssystem für Fremdnamen und seine sprachwissenschaftliche Lernen. In Lukas, Johannes (ed.), *Neue afrikanistische Studien*, 218-229. Hamburg: Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung.
- Rössler, Otto. 1971. Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache. In Altheim, Franz & Stiehl, Ruth (eds.), *Christentum am Roten Meer*, Bd. I, 263-325. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rössler, Otto. 1979. Berberisch-tschadisches Kernvokabular. *Africana Marburgensia* 12(1-2) 20-31.
- Rubin, Aaron D. 2004. An outline of comparative Egypto-Semitic morphology. In Takács, Gábor (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) studies in memoriam W. Vycichl* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 39), 454-486. Leiden: Brill.
- Saleh, Abdel-Aziz. 1979. Notes on the phonetic values of some Egyptian letters. In Reineke, Walter F. (ed.), *Premier Congrès International d'Égyptologie, Le Caire, octobre 2-10, 1976: Actes*, 557-564. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1981. Afroasiatische. In Schadeberg, Thilo (ed.), *Die Sprachen Afrikas*. Bd. 2. *Afroasiatisch*, 129-148. Hamburg: Helmut Busche 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.
- Soden, Wolfram von. 1965. Zur Methode der semitisch-hamitischen Sprachvergleiche. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 10. 159-177.
- Sölken, Heinz. 1957. Seetzens Áffadéh: Einführung in die Bedeutung eines älteren Kotokovokabulars. *Anthropos* 52. 199-238.
- Stolbova, Olga V. 1996. *Studies in Chadic comparative phonology*. Moscow: "Diaphragma" Publishers.
- Stolbova, Olga V. 1997. Vocabulary of water in Chadic. In Jungraithmayr, Herrmann & Barreteau, Daniel & Seibert, Uwe (eds.), *L'homme et l'eau dans le bassin du Lac Tchad*, 81-87. Paris: ORSTOM.
- Stolbova, Olga V. 2005. Vocabulary of "fishing" and "hunting" in Chadic and Hamito-Semitic. In Mengozzi, Alessandro (ed.), *Studi Afroasiatici: XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemitica. Afro-Asiatic Studies: 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*, 29-41. Milano: Francoangelli.
- Takács, Gábor. 1997. The common Afrasian nominal class marker *h. *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 2. 241-273.
- Takács, Gábor. 1999a. *Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) comparative-historical linguistics in Russia and the former Soviet Union*. München, Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Takács, Gábor. 1999b. Marginal remarks on the classification of Ancient Egyptian within Afro-Asiatic and its position among African languages. *Folia Orientalia* 41. 175-196.
- Takács, Gábor. 1999c. 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. 2005a. Egyptian lexicography and etymology: Against or with Afro-Asiatic comparison? *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 58(2). 14-113.
- Takács, Gábor. 2005b. Aaron Ember and the establishment of Egypto-Semitic phonological and lexical comparison. Part I. *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 6(2) 78-101.
- Takács, Gábor. 2005c. On "modern" popular etymology in Egyptology. In Kogan, Leonid & Koslova, Natal'ja & Loesov, Sergej & Tishchenko, S. (eds.), *Orientalia et Classica: Papers of the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies, Vol. VIII Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff* (Babel und Bibel 2, Annual of Ancient Near Eastern, Old

- Testament, and Semitic Studies 2), 623-685. Winona Lake, Indiana: published for the Russian State University for the Humanities by Eisenbrauns.
- 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 Wortvergleichung'. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 48. 139-163.
- Takács, Gábor. 2006c. Aaron Ember and the establishment of Egypto-Semitic phonological and lexical comparison. Part II. *Acta Orientalia Vilmensia* 7(1-2). 145-187.
- Takács, Gábor. 2006d. Werner Vycichl and his contribution to Afro-Asiatic (Semito-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. 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 Semito-Hamitic scholar and man. *Mother Tongue* 17. 19-23.
- Takács, Gábor. 2013. Archaisms and innovations in the Semitic consonantal inventory. In Monferrer-Sala, Juan Pedro & Watson, Wilfried G. E. (eds.), *Archaism and innovation archaisms and innovations in the Semitic languages: Selected papers* (Series Semitica Antiqua 1), 137-144.. Córdoba: Oriens Academic – CNERU (Cordoba Near Eastern Research Unit) and DTR (Durham University).
- Takács, Gábor. 2015a. Archaeologia Afroasiatica I: Disintegration of the parental language. *Mother Tongue* 20. 1-15.
- Takács, Gábor. 2015b. Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon I. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 68(1). 85-139.
- Takács, Gábor. 2015c. Questions of Egyptian historical phonology and Afro-Asiatic. Review of Allen, J.P.: *The Ancient Egyptian language. Bibliotheca Orientalis* 72(5-6), col. 565-585.
- Takács, Gábor. 2016a. Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon II: Head and neck. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 69(1). 59-124.
- Takács, Gábor. 2016b. Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon VIII: Numerals. *Journal of Language Relationship* 14(2). 119-151.
- Takács, Gábor. 2016c. Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon III: Upper torso. *Folia Orientalia* 53. 275-325.
- Takács, Gábor. 2018a. Layers of the oldest Egyptian lexicon VI: Back parts. *Folia Orientalia* 55. 269-306.
- Takács, Gábor. 2018b (published in 2019). Methodological problems of Egyptian etymology. *Comptes Rendus du GLECS* 35/2002-2018. 235-295.
- Takács, Gábor. 2020. Anhang: Tschadisch – Afroasiatisch – Altägyptisch. In Jungrauthmayr, Herrmann, *Die "grüne Sahara" – Urheimat afroasiatischer Sprachen im Zentralsahara? Mit einem Beitrag von Gábor Takács* (Uni im Café, Neue Literarische Gesellschaft Marburg 27). Marburg an der Lahn: Verlag Blaues Schloss.
- Tubiana, Joseph. 1974. Le chamito-sémitique et les langues africaines. In *IV Congresso Internazionale di Studi Etiopici (Roma, 10-15 aprile 1972). Tomo II (sezione linguistica). Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, anno CCCLXXI – 1974. Problemi attuali di scienza e di cultura*, 79-103. Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Vergote, Jozef. 1945. *Phonétique historique de l'égyptien*. Paris: Le Muséon.
- Vergote, Jozef. 1945-1948. Le système phonologique du moyen-égyptien. *Comptes rendus du GLECS, séance du 23 Mai 1947*, vol. 4. 57-62.
- 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.
- Vergote, Jozef. 1973. *Grammaire copte: Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes)*. Tome Ia. *Partie synchronique*. Ib. *Partie diachronique*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Vergote, Jozef. 1975. La position intermédiaire de l'ancien égyptien entre l'hébreu et l'arabe. In Bynon, James & Bynon, Theodora (eds.), *Hamito-Semitic: Proceedings of a colloquium held by the Historical Section of the Linguistics Association (Great Britain) at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, on the 18th, 19th and 20th of March 1970* (Janua Linguarum. Series Practica 200), 193-199. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- 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 Semitoamitistik – August Klingenberg und sein Beitrag zur semitoamitischen Sprachwissenschaft. In Brauner, Siegmund & Wolff, Ekkehard (eds.), *Progressive traditions in African and Oriental Studies*, 155-164. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Voigt, Rainer Maria. 1989. Zur semitoamitischen Wortvergleihung. *Göttinger Miszellen* 107. 87-95.
- Voigt, Rainer Maria. 1999. On Semitoamitic comparison. In Renfrew, Sir Colin & Nettle, David (eds.), *Nostratic: Examining a linguistic macrofamily*, 315-325. Cambridge: The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Voigt, Rainer Maria. 2001. Semitoamitische Philologie und vergleichende Grammatik: Geschichte der vergleichenden Semitoamitistik. 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 Semitoamitic. *Israel Oriental Studies* 20. 265-290.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1934. Hausa und Ägyptisch: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Hamitistik. *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 37. 36-116.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1952. Punischer Spracheinfluss im Berberischen. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 11. 198-204.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1953a. Über eine Klasse ägyptischer Verbum ult. j. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 53. 373-377.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1953b. Das persönliche Fürwort im Bedja und im Tigré: Eine Studie zur Grammatik und Religionsgeschichte der Bedja Stämme. *Muséon* 66. 157-161.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1958. Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleihung. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 16. 367-405.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1959a. Is Egyptian a Semitic language? *Kush* 7. 27-44.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1959b. Studien der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleihung: Die Klassifikation der Etymologien. Zwölf neue Etymologien. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 84. 70-74.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1972. Sur les noms des parties du corps en égyptien. *Chronique d'Égypte* 47. 173-182.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1978. L'état actuel des études chamito-sémitiques. In Fronzaroli, Pelio (ed.), *Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semitaica, Firenze, 16-19 aprile 1974*, 63-76. Firenze: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1983. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1984. Hamitic and Semitic languages. In Bynon, James (ed.), *Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics*, 483-488. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1987. The origin of the Hamito-Semitic languages. In Jungraithmayr, Herrmann & Müller, Walter W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20-22 September 1983*, 109-121. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1989. Die hamitosemitische Bezeichnung der "Zunge". *Mediterranean Language Review* 4-5. 23-41.
- Vycichl, Werner. 1990. *La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne*. Tome I^{er}. *La phonétique*. Le Caire: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Ward, William A. 1961. Comparative studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20. 31-40.
- Ward, William A. 1962. Some Egypto-Semitic etymologies. *Orientalia* NS 31. 397-412.
- Ward, William A. 1963. Notes on some Semitic loanwords and personal names in Late-Egyptian. *Orientalia* NS 32. 413-436.
- Ward, William A. 1968. Notes on some Egypto-Semitic roots. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 95. 65-72.
- Ward, William A. 1969. The Semitic root hwy in Ugaritic and derived stems in Egyptian. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 28(4). 265-267.
- Ward, William A. 1972. Review of Lacau, Pierre: Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 29(1-2). 18-23.
- Ward, William A. 1974. The Semitic biconsonantal root sp and the common origin of Egyptian čwf and Hebrew šûp: "marsh(-plant)". *Vetus Testamentum* 24. 339-349.

- Ward, William A. 1975. The biconsonantal root *b3 and remarks on bilabial interchange in Egyptian. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 102. 60-67.
- Ward, William A. 1977. Lexicographical miscellanies. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 6. 265-292.
- Ward, William A. 1978. *The four Egyptian homographic roots b3*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Ward, William A. 1981. Lexicographical miscellanies II. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 9. 359-373.
- Ward, William A. 1985. Reflections on methodology in Egypto-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.
- Ward, William A. 1996. A new look at Semitic personal names and loanwords in Egyptian. *Chronique d'Égypte* 71. 17-47.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1986. Unravelling Ugaritic mdl. *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico* 3. 73-78.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1996. Non-Semitic words in the Ugaritic lexicon (2). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 28. 701-719.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1998a. Non-Semitic words in the Ugaritic lexicon (3). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 30. 751-760.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1998b. Delimiting Ugaritic *thm*: A brief report. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 30. 745-749.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1999a. "Message" in myth and missive: Ugaritic *thm*. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25. 1-16.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1999b. Wonderful wine (KTU 1.22 i 17-30). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 31. 777-784
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1999c. Ugaritic lexicography. In Watson, Wilfred G.E. & Wyatt, Nicolas (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic studies* (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/39), 122-133. Leiden: Brill.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2000a. Non-Semitic words in the Ugaritic lexicon (5). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 32. 567-575.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2000b. Non-Semitic words in the Ugaritic lexicon (4). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 31. 785-799.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2004. An Egyptian cognate for Ugaritic hwy (II)? In Takács, Gábor (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) studies in memoriam W. Vycichl*, 155-159. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2007. *Lexical studies in Ugaritic* (Aula Orientalis Supplementa 19). Sabadell: Editorial Ausa. Cf. esp. pp. 135-145 and *passim*.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2008a. Ugaritic ʿqq: An enigma. In Takács, Gábor (ed.), *Semito-Hamitic Festschrift for A.B. Dolgopolsky and H. Jungraithmayr* (Sprache und Oralität in Afrika 24), 361-365. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2008b. Non-Semitic words in the Ugaritic lexicon (7). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 40. 547-570.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2009. Review of the Etymological dictionary of Egyptian, Volume Three (EDE III). *Aula Orientalis* 27. 125-128.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2010a. Current work on Egyptian lexicography. *Historiae* 7. 91-96.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2010b. Non-Semitic words in the Ugaritic lexicon (8). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 42. 831-845.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2011. Semitic and non-Semitic terms for horse-trappings in Ugaritic. In Olmo Lete, Gregorio del (ed.), *Proceedings of the III Symposium on Comparative Semitics, Turin 10/3-4/2008* (Aula Orientalis 29), 155-176.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2012. Ugaritic terms for containers in the light of Comparative Semitics. In Corriente, Federico & Olmo Lete, Gregorio del & Vicente, Ángeles & Vita, Juan-Pablo (eds.), *Dialectology of the Semitic languages: Proceedings of the IV Meeting on Comparative Semitics, Zaragoza 11/6-9/2010* (Aula Orientalis Supplementa 27), 81-112. Sabadell: Editorial Ausa.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2013. Loanwords in Phoenician and Punic. In Loretz, Oswald & Ribichini, Sergio & Watson, Wilfred G.E. & Zamora, José Á. (eds.), *Ritual, religion and reason: Studies in the ancient world in honour of Paolo Xella* (AOAT 404), 327-346. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2017. Ugaritic military terms in the light of comparative linguistics. In Heffron, Yağmur & Stone, Adam & Worthington, Martin (eds.), *At the dawn of history: Ancient Near Eastern studies in honour of J.N. Postgate*, vol. II, 694-714. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2018. Updates for the Ugaritic lexicon: New meanings and overlooked cognates. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 49. 379-398.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2019a. The meaning of Phoenician *hsp* in the Ahirom inscription. *Folia Orientalia* 56. 363-371.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2019b. The meaning of Ugaritic ʿbb (KTU 1.92:14). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 50. 419-433.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2020. The meaning of Ugaritic ʿrp. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 51. 327-334.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. 2021 The Ugaritic lexicon revisited. In Feliu, Lluís & Millet, Adelina & Vidal, Jordi (eds.), *"Sentido de un empeño": Homenatge a Gregorio del Olmo Lete* (Monographica Orientalia 16), 563-589. Barcelona: Barcino.

- Wb = Erman, Adolf & Grapow, Hermann. 1957-1971. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*. I-V. 2nd edn. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Wilson-Wright, Aren M. 2023. Rethinking the relationship between Egyptian and Semitic: The lexical, phonological, and morphological evidence. In Almansa-Villatoro, M. Victoria & Štubňová Nigrelli, Silvia (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian and Afroasiatic: Rethinking the origins*, 187-219. University Park, The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania: Eisenbrauns.
- Wright, Robert M. 1994. Egyptian np3p3: A cognate for Ugaritic mpr “convulsion”. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 26. 539-541.
- Youssef, Ahmed Abdel-Hamid. 1983. A Nineteenth Dynasty new word for blade and the Semitic origin of some Egyptian weapon-names and other related words. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 39. 255-260.
- Youssef, Ahmed Abdel-Hamid. 1987. Two lines of the Pyramid Texts reconsidered. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 71. 261-264.
- Youssef, Ahmed Abdel-Hamid. 1999. Etymological and philological studies. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 74. 83-90.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 1984. The stages of Hamito-Semitic. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 43. 179-183.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 1991. Biconsonantal roots and triconsonantal root variation in Semitic: Solutions and prospects. In Kaye, Alan S. (ed.), *Semitic studies in honor of Wolf Leslau*, vol. II, 1675-1703. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 1994. Archaic Semitic in the light of Hamito-Semitic. *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 7(2). 234-244.
- Zaborski, Andrzej. 1998. La linguistique chamito-sémitique cinquante années après l'Essai comparatif de Marcel Cohen. In El Medlaoui, Mohamed & Gafaiti, Said & Saa, Fouad (eds.), *Actes du 1^{er} Congrès Chamito-Sémitique de Fès, 12-13 mars 1997*, 23-35. Fès: Université Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines.