

QUESTIONS OF EGYPTIAN HISTORICAL PHONOLOGY AND AFRO-ASIATIC*)

Gábor TAKÁCS
 Department of Egyptology
 Eötvös Loránd University
 Budapest, Hungary

Abstract

The new monograph on Egyptian historical grammar by J. P. Allen appeared merely some two decades after A. Loprieno's (1995) book with similar scope and aims. In this review article,¹ the reviewer is investigating whether the author has managed to yield a new synthesis in the swampy domain of historical phonology, by determining to what extent his material reflects and matches our knowledge on the subject hitherto accumulated on the one hand and how convincing the new solutions are on the other hand.

Another new attempt at summing up our knowledge on the Egyptian language from a diachronic standpoint is now presented by J. P. Allen, the celebrated and multi-talented Egyptologist. He set up the daring task of covering all major aspects of Egyptian grammar, i.e. phonology, morphology and syntax. The latter two areas being beyond my primary interests,² this review focuses on the first domain, where this book is, of course, not at all "the first of its kind" as one can read in the promotion text on the covering page. On the contrary, the basic question pursued throughout my review has been how this new work corresponds to the expectations in the light of many preceding syntheses on Egyptian historical phonology.

The technical chapter „Conventions” (pp. xi-xiv) gives lists of phonological symbols and abbreviations of technical terms. The first list – in spite of the author's statement (p. xi) that „this book follows the conventions standard in linguistic discussions of phonology” – contains some surprising definitions: ʕ is listed as a „uvular glide (or stop), like Arabic ʕ”, which proves that the author is unfamiliar with the fundamental literature of Semitics, where ʕ (ʕ, ʕ) is defined as a „voiced pharyngeal fricative”³ or an „epiglottal (pharyngeal) central approximant”⁴, i.e. one entire articulation place further. When he writes of the phone behind Eg. ɗ as a „palatalized unaspirated (or voiced) apical stop”, I am disturbed by the lack of any hint of its treatment as an „affriquée palatale faible et sourde” (Vycichl 1990, 45) or a „voiced palatal affricate” (EDE I 273). Another error is Allen's label for ɗ (marked in Semitic studies traditionally as ɗ) as a „voiced dental fricative”, although in fact it is an interdental, as is well-known in Semitic studies.⁵

Chapter 1, entitled „Ancient Egyptian” (pp. 1-8), is intended to lay out some general facts and principles of diachronic analysis. Allen's short introduction on the extraordinary continuity of Egyptian ends with note 2 (p. 201), where the author lists as „major diachronic studies” on the development of Egyptian only B. H. Stricker's 1945 monograph in Dutch, F. Junge's entry on „Sprache” in LÄ V 1176-1211, A. Loprieno's 1995 book on Egyptian, J.-M. Kruchten's paper on Middle vs. Late Egyptian (1999), and J. Winand's 2006 book on time and aspect in Egyptian. Bizarrely, the author failed to mention here J. Vergote's (1973, 1983) multi-volume work with its diachronic studies in all aspects of Egyptian grammar, and also the fundamental historical phonologies by J. Vergote (1945), P. Lacau (1970), W. Vycichl (1990) and C. Peust (1999). Why did he not study them? How can one think at all to attempt at achieving a new synthesis without re-discussing the materials of these works? A first and foremost question I kept asking, while I was reading Allen's chapters on phonology.

In subsection 1.1, very superficially and in an old-fashioned way, Allen examines the „affinities” of Egyptian, which the author acknowledges as belonging to the „Hamito-Semitic” family of languages, which, as he mentions (p. 201, n. 3), has been „also called, less accurately, Afro-Asiatic”. Why „less accurately”? He is not arguing but simply stating that „Arabic is both an African and Asian Semitic language”. Apparently, he is unfamiliar with the reasons why this new label „Afro-Asiatic” was introduced in the 1950s to replace the older term „Semito-Hamitic”. For an overview of the family, to my great surprise, the author relies solely on Petráček's 1988 Introduction (Úvod) in Czech completely ignoring the epoch-making fundamental comparative works on Afro-Asiatic as a whole by I. M. Diakonoff (1965, 1988) and by J. H. Greenberg (1955, 1963). From these he could have learnt some basic results of our domain and so easily have avoided the following terrible sentence on Egyptian, another surprising statement illustrating to what extent this author is neglecting the facts

*) Review article of: ALLEN, J. P. – The Ancient Egyptian Language. An Historical Study. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. (22,7 cm, XIV, 254). ISBN 978-1-107-66467-8 Paperback, ISBN 978-1-107-03246-0 Hardback. \$ 32,99-.

¹ My sincere thanks go to Prof. W. G. E. Watson (Morpeh, UK) for correcting the English of this text.

² These aspects of J. P. Allen's book were reviewed by W. Schenkel in *Lingua Aegyptia* 21 (2013), 321-328.

³ So E. Lipiński (1997, 107) and also L. Kogan (2009, 28; 2011, 54).

⁴ As formulated by A. Dolgopolsky (1999, 28).

⁵ Cf., e.g. Lipiński 1997, 117-122, §4; Kogan 2009, 26; 2011, 54.

of Afro-Asiatic linguistics: „It has affinities with Hamitic languages such as Beja, Berber, and Oromo, and with all the Semitic languages ...”, which makes in the reader a misleading impression as if the macrofamily had to be divided into Semitic and „Hamitic”, and as if not all of the latter languages were related to Egyptian. Since Greenberg we know that there was no Hamitic unit at all, the African branches of the macrofamily being separate, equipotential, and solely ultimately related entities (Berber, Cushito-OmotiC, Chadic). To be frank, an overview of the history of Egyptian in 2013 can hardly stand the test of time with such an inadequate preparatory research.

Allen’s totally out-dated label „Non-Hamitic features” (p. 1) sounds equally awkward. Among these, he lists „preponderance of triconsonantal roots” in Egyptian (almost 2/3 of the PT verbal roots were triradical), which is again an old „prejudice” about the root inventory of the African branches of our macrofamily. Suffice it to mention the triradicalisms of the reconstructed Proto-Chadic root stock (JungraiThmayr & Shimizu 1981; JungraiThmayr & Ibrizimow 1994 I) or of any Berber lexicon, which the author should have consulted at first before a hasty „conclusion”. Then, Allen goes on with „some lexical cognates” shared only by Egyptian and Semitic as a further „Non-Hamitic feature”, but the only instance he quotes in fact is Eg. sp.t vs. Sem. *šap-at- „lip”, which is, however, a great blunder as this root is also attested in South Cushitic,⁶ as I pointed out some time ago (Takács 1999, 401-402; 2000, 85, #15.1). Among „Hamitic features” we find the „vocalization pattern of some verbal derivatives” (p. 1), for which the author (in fn. 5, p. 201) provides no example, i.e. which patterns are in fact common to Egypto-Semitic, but not to the other branches – except for a general hint on the vocalization patterns summarized in NBA and Schenkel 1983, which were, by the way, elaborated by G. Fecht (1960), a fact the author is silent about. We learn here equally nothing about the other conceptions of Egyptian vowel reconstruction by W. Vycichl (DELC) and C. Peust (1999) – one wonders why. Among „non-Semitic features” Allen referred to „a dearth of lexical verb stems other than the root and causative” (sic), for which he – incomprehensibly to me – quoted (n. 6 on p. 201) the Egyptian Iae n- roots reflecting medio-passive Semitic n-stems and a supposed Egyptian factitive stem (pi^oēl of Hebrew) corresponding to the Akkadian D and Arabic stem II (unfortunately, he failed to mention that the idea comes from W. Vycichl 1957 on the basis of the Coptic evidence). But how these Egypto-Semitic isoglosses represent a „non-Semitic feature”, is a puzzle. On top that, Allen *ex cathedra* labelled the existence of the Egyptian pi^oēl as „questionable” (here again, no arguments were used). Moreover, it is here that the author seems to have difficulties regarding the use of the notions „root” vs. „stem”: when speculating on whether behind the meanings „to perish” vs. „to destroy” of Eg. ḥtm we have in fact *ḥt^hm vs. *ḥt^hm, respectively, or not, he surprises us by writing: „But it is also possible that Egyptian used a single root (sic) for both meanings”. The Afro-Asiatic consonantal root always carries lexical information only (e.g. Akkadian ṣprs „to cut”), and can thus by no means have any association with such a grammatical category as factitivity, causative etc., which was signified by the vocalized verbal stems (e.g. Akkadian purrus)! Awkward blunders in a small note – they are sadly revealing. After all this alarmingly poor presentation, the author mentions three Proto-Semitic words (*yad- „hand”, *ʿayn- „eye”, *ʾudn- „ear”) reflected by the phonetic values of the Egyptian hieroglyphs (d, ʿn, jdn, respectively), from which he hastily concludes (p. 2) „that Egyptian may be closer in origin to Proto-Semitic than to the Hamitic branch (sic) of Hamito-Semitic”. Where are the thorough analyses of the grammatical and lexical isoglosses shared by Egyptian and the other branches? The author is evidently unfamiliar with the lexicostatistic research by A. Ju. Militarev and V. Blažek.

Then follows a brief „Historical overview” (§1.2) of the phases of Egyptian language history (pp. 2-4). Here too, hardly anything new or original emerges. On the contrary, the author is silently skipping to discuss the most fundamental change, namely the transition between Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian – when did the first signs of the latter appear well before the Amarna times? We learn nothing, e.g. about the evidence for the LEg. b- negation in the Coffin Texts (cf. Clère 1956) or the infiltration of Late Egyptian phrases in Kamose’s texts or the tales of pWestcar.

In §1.4 (pp. 5-8), Allen lays out some facts of diachronic analysis in the domains of the Egyptian lexical stock and grammar with emphasis on the latter. Among Late Egyptian lexical neologisms, he mentions „Semitic (sic) tappūḥa (sic)” (p. 5) – two awkward elementary blunders at a time in a Cambridge University Press publication. First, the Hebrew word (he was evidently referring to) is in fact tappū^h „apple” [KB] with a *pattah furtivum*, which he failed to read correctly from the Hebrew script. Secondly, the word is not reconstructed for Proto-Semitic at all (Kogan 2011, 204, #4.4.3) as it is not common Semitic.

The next chapter (§2, pp. 11-22) is on Coptic phonology and it surveys the alphabet, syllable structure and stress, vowels and consonants. Discussing syllabic consonants (p. 13), the author uses a misleading dot beneath the consonant as a diacritic sign, e.g. (A) ΚΛ [kl] „doorbolt” or (ALMS) ΒΡΡΕ [bʁe] „new”, although this has been commonly applied to denote the emphatic (glottal) consonants, whereas the correct diacritic for the

⁶ Cf. Proto-Rift *šVfi „lip” [Ehret 1980, 212].

sonants, adopted from Indo-European, is a subscript circle,⁷ thus [k̲] and [b̲re], respectively. Similarly disturbing is Allen's misleading adherence to some long out-dated and ambiguous transliteration signs retained in Egyptian merely by tradition, which now he re-uses even for Coptic consonants, e.g. ḏ and ṭ, standing in Egyptian for a voiceless (aspirated) and voiced (unaspirated) palatal affricates (Allen: palatalized apicals) e.g. in the synopsis of the "Common Coptic" system of consonantal phonemes (p. 20), although in Semitics it is voiceless interdental spirant (̲ being a commonly accepted diacritic of spirantization and not of palatals), which the author now projects in the next row of the table even to Coptic palatalized velars signified in the work under review as ḏ and ṭ (!) implying for a professional Semitic or Indo-European linguist spirantized (begadkefat) velars and not palatalized ones (instead of k^h and g^h or k̲ and ḡ, resp.).

Speaking of the Coptic vowels (§2.3, pp. 13-17), the author presents a system (p. 15 and cf. p. 203, n. 24) based arbitrarily on Hintze 1980 and Peust 1999. Why all other approaches (by G. Fecht 1960, J. Vergote 1973, J. Osing in NBÄ, W. Vycichl in DELC etc.) were simply left out of the consideration and not even referred to in this context, we do not learn from Allen, who confessed of his model that „such a description, of course, can only be theoretical, since the actual phonetic quality of the vowels is unknown”. For me, to be frank, any system, whose elaboration is not accompanied by surveying the relevant literature and discussing the underlying arguments, is to be used with the greatest caution.

In the next chapter, „Coptic and Egyptian” (§3, pp. 23-30), the same basic problems may be addressed. Seeing Allen's Eg. *ḥām-naṭur (p. 24), for instance, one might ask: where is the evidence for *-u-, why did he not present it? So far, the Egyptian word for „god” has been vocalized as *nātār partly in the light of the cuneiform evidence.⁸ Where is Allen's reference to all this literature and where is the discussion of the alternative hypotheses as it is supposed to be, e.g. the one proposed by W. Vycichl,⁹ who reconstructed the word as *nātīr? Why did Allen consider an *ex cathedra* reconstruction as sufficient, without any references, arguments and critical discussion as sufficient? **If one is not aware of these facts, can one hope to carry out a well-founded research on this issue?** The author's (p. 33) reconstruction of LEg. ḥbr „partner” (borrowed from Semitic) as *ḥābira (sic, long -ā- and short -i-, for which no arguments were adduced) is equally astonishing in the light of the Coptic reflexes, cf. (SLM) **ϣBHP**, (A) **ϩBHP**, which evidently indicate either *ḥābīr or *ḥābūr pace Hoch¹⁰ with a short or reduced unaccented vowel in the first syllable.

Unfortunately, the case is no better regarding Allen's synopsis of Egypto-Coptic consonantal correspondences (pp. 26-27), which is already *prima vista* incomparably far below the level of, e.g. C. Peust's (1999) masterful treatment of Egyptian *Lautgeschichte*. First of all, what we miss here is its thorough elaboration including the conditional shifts in the context of their instances. The author presents Common Coptic *b (sic) as a reflex of both Egyptian b and p – in the latter case „occasionally”. Firstly, as is well-known,¹¹ Coptic **B** had the value [v] or less probably [β]. Secondly, the label „occasionally” is misleading as if claiming that the shift took place *ad hoc* and not in the cluster -pt- or -pd- > **-BT-**¹² and only a few pages later does Allen (p. 28) briefly touch upon -pd- < **-BT-**. Similarly *nichtssagend* is Allen's label on Coptic **M** < Egyptian b as "occasionally", e.g. (ALMS) **NIM** < nb "all", since the change was evoked by the proximity of another nasal in the root.¹³ The author mentions only *en passant* 2 pages later (p. 28) that Eg. b became p/m/w also Coptic – but where and why, remains unexplained. The same is the case with Allen's (p. 27) description of Coptic **P** < Egyptian n as happening "occasionally", e.g. (BS) **ϵPMONT** < jwn-mnṭ.w "Armant": this change was not *ad hoc* either, but here was due to the stimulating factor of the environment of n and also b.¹⁴ This could be completed by other similar instances, which testify to a superficial treatment of consonantal history, which adds nothing new to our common knowledge. Instead, the author has accumulated *something* from some selected works intended to be a small and brief illustration of a research domain, whose state-of-the-art in its complexity does not appear here.

The following sketchy chapter „Correspondents and cognates” (§4, pp. 31-36) deals in fact with rendering of Semitic words (loans, names) in Egyptian (§4.1) and genetic parallels in Afro-Asiatic (§4.2), respectively. What we can find here can hardly to be regarded as analyses based on the profound knowledge of

⁷ Cf., e.g. Brugmann 1897, 392-393, §429, 451, §497.

⁸ See Farina 1924, 317-318; Edgerton 1947, 16-17; Edel 1954, 40; 1987, 128; Volten 1955, 75; Fecht 1960, 176, §363; Schenkel 1968, 536-539; 1983, 223, 227; 2002, 18, 25-26.

⁹ See Vycichl 1958, 394; 1969, 26; 1990, 97, §3; 1990, 215; 1991, 119; DELC 145. His idea was followed by J. B. Callender (1984, 34, §13).

¹⁰ See Hoch 1994, 241, #333.

¹¹ Cf. Peust 1999, 136, §3.12.5.

¹² Cf. Peust 1999, 134, §3.12.3 and fn. 135 with old literature.

¹³ There are two instances apud Peust 1999, 167, §3.16.4.7.

¹⁴ Cf. Peust 1999, 165, §3.16.4.2.

the relevant linguistic evidence. Nevertheless, the scanty illustrative data were apparently sufficient for Allen to draw a number of hasty and sometimes too daring conclusions.

Discussing the „correspondents”, the author claims (p. 32) that there were „rare examples of $f \approx /p/$ ”, act. (in his terminology) cases of rendering Semitic *p with f in the Egyptian script, which “probably involve secondary spirantization, usually before *i”. However, as usual, not a single instance is cited except that „a similar phenomenon is attested in Egyptian fst/pfst/pst *fisit/^pfisit/pisit > AS ΠICE, B ΦICI, F ΠICI ‘cook.’”. I confess that I fail to understand how the latter case with only the reverse shift (old f- > younger p-), could somehow be relevant as its Anlaut had undergone no spirantization at all, but rather the contrary. The two certain instances of Sem. *p borrowed as Eg. f adduced by J. Hoch (1994, 401 and #301 + #398) and referred to by Allen (ibid.) indicate either a Semitic source where *p > f or a positional spirantization in Egyptian. In either case, this is absolutely to be kept distinct from OK fsj > MK pfsj > NK psj.

The hastily and carelessly composed subsection on Semito-Egyptian cognates (pp. 34-36) is full of awkward surprises and I am afraid I must say, unfortunately, that the level of this eclectic presentation hardly exceeds the output of the old works of Egypto-Semitic comparison from the 1930s (e.g., ESS or GÄSW). What the author has accomplished here, I can only conceive it as a *Muß-Arbeit* in a domain, where, thanks to J. H. Greenberg, I. M. D’jakonov and his outstanding Moscovite comparative dictionary team, and several further productive authors from recent decades, evidently much more can be known on the history of this segment of the Egyptian language.

For instance, to my great astonishment, Allen defines Proto-Semitic *q (more correctly glottal *ḳ) as a voiceless pharyngeal (!) stop (p. 34). In doing so, he even specially marked the place for the emphatic counterpart in the velar row as void in the chart composed by him “on the basis of most recent studies”. I wonder what kind of most recent studies he used, when the whole *Fachgebiet* of comparative Semitics knows it as a velar plosive (including those works he refers to on p. 206, n. 24: did he really read them?).¹⁵ This kind of “method” is truly regrettable. **Pronouncements *ex cathedra* ignoring the sources and the evidence are hardly the ways of achieving solid results.**

The extremely short discussion of Egypto-Semitic consonantal correspondences based on some selected lexical parallels is an arena of serious controversies, which Allen was, of course, unable to resolve. Instead, he assumed an eclectic set of consonantal correspondences in the same manner as A. Loprieno did in his 1995 book.¹⁶ This is a very poor elaboration of a magnificent field of research, which only uses some superficially selected examples SED I-II and EDE I and treats exceptions as equivalent to regular correspondences.

Thus, while admitting Eg. ζ = Sem. * ζ and * γ (p. 35), nothing prevented Allen from stating that “Egyptian ζ also seems to be related to Semitic *l in” using the disputable parallel of Eg. $\text{ḥ}^{\zeta}\text{q}$ „to shave” vs. Sem. * $\text{ḥ}^{\zeta}\text{l}^{\zeta}$ “shave, smooth”.¹⁷ Is it sufficient to have only one parallel to admit a regular (!) correspondence? At the same time, he (p. 35) also adopts the Rösslerian view on Eg. ζ that “it was originally an apical stop” and as

¹⁵ E. Lipiński (1997, 107): velar plosives *k, *g, *q. P. R. Bennett (1998, 8, table 3), A. Dolgopolsky (1999, 28), and SED I lxvii, §2.1.1: velar stops *g, *k, *ḳ. B. Kienast (2001, 26, Tabelle 3): velare Explosive *g, *k, *q. L. E. Kogan (2009, 26; 2011, 54, table 6.1): “велярные смычные” vs. “velar/uvular stops” *k, *g, *ḳ.

¹⁶ Where, e.g., Loprieno (1995, 31, §3.3.a) was able to accept both dental and pharyngeal values for Eg. ζ at the same time in the very same root (!) when he equated Eg. 3^{ζ}c „to speak a foreign language” (DLE) with Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{lyz}}$ > Hebrew $\sqrt{\text{l}^{\zeta}\text{z}}$ qal „unverständlich, barbarisch reden” [GB] and Ar. $\sqrt{\text{lyz}}$ IV „envelopper le véritable sens d’une pensée dans des paroles obscures” [BK] instead of assuming a cognacy directly with the biconsonantal Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{ly}}$ as correctly demonstrated by F. von Calice (1931, 36; GÄSW #1), J. Vergote (1945, 130, 133, §3.a.1), and C. T. Hodge (1981, 374, #34). Loprieno’s (1995, 32, §3.3.d) impossible AA * $\sqrt{\text{sp}^{\zeta}}$ (sic) „seven” (in fact, this AA root never had either * p^{ζ} or * γ^{ζ}) based on the well-known correspondence of Eg. $\text{sf}^{\zeta}\text{ḥ}$ and Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{sb}^{\zeta}}$ testifies to that he was unaware of the fact that ḥ appeared in this Eg. root due to the incompatibility law of AA * s^{ζ} > Eg. s^{ζ} (cf. EDE I 326), which, in turn, then affected the shift of * -b- > -f via metathesis. The same incompatibility shift occurred in Eg. $\text{ws}^{\zeta}\text{ḥ}$ „wide” akin to Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{ws}^{\zeta}}$, which Loprieno (1995, 35, §3.4.1) failed to realize and, instead, he assumed a baseless AA * $\sqrt{\text{wsy}}$, whose * -y never existed lacking, in fact, any real evidence. Equally puzzling is Loprieno’s (1995, 32, §3.3.d) arbitrary reconstruction of AA * x^{ζ} (in fact, a nowhere attested glottalized velar fricative!) on the basis of two contradictory instances, namely Eg. ḥr „on” vs. Sem. * $\text{c}^{\zeta}\text{al}$ and Eg. $\text{nd}^{\zeta}\text{m}$ „sweet” vs. Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{n}^{\zeta}\text{m}}$. Neither of these roots had ever that exotic phoneme, for which he failed to quote one single occurrence.

¹⁷ Cf. Hebrew $\text{ḥ}^{\zeta}\text{l}^{\zeta}$ “glatt, unbehaart sein” [GB] | Arabic $\text{ḥ}^{\zeta}\text{al}^{\zeta}\text{a}$ I “1. raser (la tête), 2. tondre (les chèvres)” [BK]. There are three further supposed instances, which Allen missed to mention, cf. Eg. ḥ^{ζ} “(eine Frau) schänden” (Wb) = “to violate (a woman)” (DLE) ||| Sem.: Hebrew $\sqrt{\text{ḥ}^{\zeta}\text{l}}$ nifal “sich entweihen, entweiht, entheiligt werden”, piel “entweihen, profanieren” [GB] = piel “to profane”, nifal “to be defiled” [KB] suggested by W. F. Albright (1918, 241, #82) and A: Ember (ESS §5.g.3); Eg. $\text{sh}^{\zeta}\text{.t} \sim \text{sh}^{\zeta}\text{.t}$ “Hase” (Wb) ||| Sem.: Arabic $\text{su}^{\zeta}\text{ḥ}^{\zeta}\text{-at}$ “petit/jeune lièvre qui ne suit plus sa mère” [BK] suggested by W. Vycichl (1958, 398; 1963, 150; 1990, 42), O. Rössler (1971, 313), and Ch. Reintges (1994, 218). A possible external origin (Indo-Iranian * $\text{s}^{\zeta}\text{asa}$ - “hare”) has also been proposed by V. Blazek (1990, 42).

"evidence for these values" he quoted merely Eg. ʿ3 vs. Sem. *ʿdl (sic) "door" and Eg. ʿff vs. Sem. *ʿḏbb "fly", which I had discarded some time ago (EDE I 347 and 362, resp.).

The whole treatment of Eg. f (p. 35) is also unacceptably distorted. In the first line of its entry, the author simply states: "The labial fricative f is related to Semitic *b, e.g. sḥw ≈ *šbʿ 'seven'; it is also cognate with Semitic *š/h in the 3MSG suffix pronoun f" – that is all (!) he has to say about Eg. f. To present Sem. *š as a regular match of Eg. f is astonishing. Naturally, the shift of Eg. =f < *su ~ Sem. *-šu in the 3rd person masc. sg. suffix, the only instance of its kind was unique and irregular in Egyptian. Both cases represent marginal, presumably conditioned irregular cases, whereas the regular match of Eg. f = Sem. *p < AA *f has been established and abundantly demonstrated,¹⁸ although it is not even mentioned by Allen. He was also silent about the considerable significance of Eg. f as an Afro-Asiatic archaism shared with Chadic, which was first realised by J. H. Greenberg (1958). The author has equally ignored the demonstration of the validity of this observation for Egyptian f in South Cushitic an Angas-Sura, where *f has been preserved distinct from *p.¹⁹ **All these results are strangely ignored in the new book.**

Another surprise is represented by Allen's all too daring statement (p. 35) that Eg. r "is primarily cognate with Semitic *l ... It is also related to Semitic *d in srsw ≈ šdθ 'six' ...", while he acknowledges only "one possible cognate with Semitic *r" (namely Eg. rd "foot" vs. Sem. *ʿrdy „to tread”). That is, in his opinion the regular matches of Eg. r would be Sem. *l and *d, which is far from current opinion. Firstly, Sem. *d is no more than a sporadic irregular match of Eg. r, definitely attested merely in the word for „six”, while the remaining of its suggested instances cannot be accepted (cf. EDE I 292-294). Secondly, Sem. *r is a regular match of Eg. r, just as *l is, and, strangely, Allen overlooked almost all the Egyptian words whose Afro-Asiatic cognates have *r-, i.e. Eg. rwj "fortgehen, verlassen" (Wb) = „to go/pass away, depart, leave” (FD),²⁰ rwj „to dance, clap hands” (FD) and rw.t "Tanz" (Wb),²¹ rwd „Bogensehne (vom Bogen abgespannt)" (Wb),²² rpʿ "Fürst" (Wb) = „hereditary noble” (FD),²³ ršw "sich freuen, froh sein" (Wb),²⁴ rd "wachsen" (Wb),²⁵ zr "Schafbock, Widder" (PT),²⁶ šrr "(to be) little, younger" (FD), hence šr „lad, younger son” (FD).²⁷

Allen's (p. 35) statement that "good cognates for Egyptian h are lacking."³¹ implies that he probably *a priori* disregarded those listed in Rössler 1971, 308 and EDE I 143-148 (referred to in his n. 31 on p. 207). It is a pity that the author also overlooked a number of very recent etymologies²⁸ reaffirming that Egyptian h reflects Afro-Asiatic *h, cf. Eg. jwh "beladen mit etwas" (Wb),²⁹ bht „Widersacher o.ä." (Wb) = "enemies (in texts for

¹⁸ In 1999, I collected, e.g., 15 instances (see EDE I 114-119).

¹⁹ See Takács 2011, 116-117 and 148-152, resp.

²⁰ Identical with SCu. *roʿ- „to go away” [GT]: Ma'a -ro "to leave" [Ehret] | Dahalo roʿ- "to go/pass by" [Ehret] || ECu.: Yaaku -reʿe „to run away” [Heine] = reʿ- „to run away” [Tosco] < AA *ʿrwʿ „to leave” [GT]. The comparison of Eg. rwj with Brb. *ʿrwl "to flee" [GT] suggested by G. Möller (1921, 196; 1924, 42) and F. Hintze (1951, 84, #429) is not acceptable for semantical reasons. Besides, O. Rössler (1952, 131, #8) correctly identified Brb. *ʿrwl with Arabic ʿhrwl: harwala "schnell gehen".

²¹ Cognate with SCu. *raʿ- "to sing, dance" [Ehret] || PCh. *ʿry ~ *ʿrw "to sing, dance" [GT] > i.a. WCh.: Hausa ráwáá "dancing, a dance" [Abraham] etc. (Chadic data: Mukarovskij 1987, 325; JI 1994 II, 100-101).

²² Related to PCh. *rig- ~ *rag- "bow, bow-string" [GT] = *rəga [Newman] = *r-g [Jungraihtmayr]. For the Egypto-Chadic etymology see Greenberg 1963, 53; Dolgopol'skij 1964, 29; 1964, 262; Orel & Stolbova 1989, 134; 1992, 189.

²³ Akin to Arabic rafāʿa "erheben", rafīʿ- "angesehen, vornehm" [Reinisch] = rafīʿ- "2. élevé, haut, 3. placé sur une hauteur, 4. haut, élevé en rang, d'un rang élevé" [BK] as proposed by L. Reinisch (1890, 33, fn. 7).

²⁴ Identical with Akkadian ʿrys: riāšu "jauchzen", rištu "Jauchzen, Jubel" [AHW] as proposed by A. Ember (1912, 90; ESS §12.a.25), H. Holma (1919, 39), G. R. Castellino (1984, 16).

²⁵ Cf. Arabic ʿrdy I "8. se multiplier, s'accroître (se dit des troupeaux), 9. augmenter au delà d'un certain nombre" [BK] = "to increase, exceed, multiply, augment" [Leslau] || Soqotri ʿrdy "to augment, increase" [Leslau] as pointed out by W. F. Albright (1918, 236; 1927, 223), M. Cohen (1947, #422), G. Conti (1978, 31-33), V. Blažek (1994, 432).

²⁶ Identical with NOm. *du/or- "ram, sheep" [Blažek] || WCh. *dVr- "баран (wether)" [Stolbova] || CCh.: Fali-Kiria žūrā "ram" [Kraft] as suggested by V. Blažek (1991, 361); V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 183; HSED #2634); G. Takács (1998, 159, #3).

²⁷ Cf. Akk. šerru "(little) child" [AHW] || Ug. trr „little” [Gordon] and (?) šrr "little, small (?)" [WUS but DUL: „powerful?!"] || Brb. *i-šir "child" [GT] (Brb. data: Laoust 1931, 230; Bynon 1984, 274-275, #35) || presumably also Om. *šEr- "thin" [Bender] (originally *ʿsmall?). For this AA etymology see Ember 1912, 90; ESS #12.a.40; Holma 1919, 45; Albright 1927, #64; Cohen 1947, #293; Gordon 1955, 339, #2080; Zavadovskij 1967, 22; Majzel' & Militarev 1983, 230; Bynon 1984, 274-275, #36.

²⁸ See Takács 2010, 153-156 and 2011, 144-145 for the South Cushitic evidence. In addition, I collected new instances from two Central Chadic groups (Musgu and Masa) in my lecture at the Biannual Meeting of Chadic Linguistics in Paris, Villejuif, September 2011 (cf. Takács 2013).

²⁹ Akin to SCu. *loh- "to carry load" [GT]: WRift *lōh- "to migrate, carry goods", *lōh-is "to carry, move house" [Kießling & Mous] > Iraqw loh- "to move house", loh-is- "to carry load", Alagwa loh-is- "to carry load" | Qwadza loh-is- "to move house" (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 206) || WCh.: Suroid *lē „load” [GT]: Sura lēe „Last” [Jungraihtmayr], Mupun lēe „load” [Frajzyngier] < AA *ʿl[w]h „to carry load” [GT].

Another careless assertion is that "Egyptian ḥ is also cognate with Semitic $*\text{ḥ}$ " (p. 35), which was the first one made by Allen (with a hint regarding Eg. sḥ vs. Sem. $*\sqrt{\text{šb}}\text{ḥ}$ „seven”, where, however, the shift of Eg. $\text{ḥ} < *\text{ḥ}$ was conditional). Only then he continued with what he regarded as its second Semitic match: "as well as with $*\text{ḥ}$ ", for which he quoted only Eg. ḥtm and Sem. $*\sqrt{\text{ḥtm}}$ "to seal" which I also carefully avoided mentioning among the genetically inherited cognates with Eg. $\text{ḥ} = \text{Sem. } *\text{ḥ}$ in EDE I 157-171. There, by the way, I listed 14 Egypto-Semitic and altogether 55 Afro-Asiatic parallels for Eg. $\text{ḥ} < *\text{ḥ}$. All this is symptomatic and revealing. Allen considers Sem. $*\text{ḥ}$ – in fact, the only regular correspondence of Eg. ḥ – as secondary and illustrates it, as a *Musterbeispiel*, with a probably old cultural *Wanderwort*, the least suitable for this purpose. On the other hand, he considers the irregular Eg. $\text{ḥ} = \text{Sem. } *\text{ḥ}$ as regular and quotes only that case where the shift of Eg. $\text{ḥ} < *\text{ḥ}$ was certainly due to combinatory circumstances he evidently failed to understand, having failed to consult EDE I 326-327. There, I examined the instances of Eg. ḥ resulting from a secondary combinatory shift in the proximity of incompatible dental consonants in the same root, both sibilants (s, z) and stops (t, d), namely Eg. wḥ "(räumlich) weit (ausholend), geräumig, breit" (Wb) $< *ws\text{ḥ}$;⁴² Eg. pḥ "verwirrt sein" (Wb) = „to be distraught, be strewn" (FD) $< *pz\text{ḥ}$;⁴³ LEg. ḥ "fett, gemästet (von Ochsen)" (Wb), probably OEg. $*d\text{ḥ} < *d\text{ḥ}$;⁴⁴ Eg. ḥb "ein-, betauchen, benetzen" (Wb) $< *t\text{ḥ}b$;⁴⁵ Eg. ḥḥ "verwirren, verworren sein" (Wb) = „to disorder (hair), crumple (papers)" (FD);⁴⁶ Eg. dḥ "sich verbergen" (Wb) $< *d\text{ḥ}$.⁴⁷

Erman (1892, 115), A. Ember (1912, 90, fn. 4; ESS §14.a.17), F. von Calice (GÄSW #257), J. Vergote (1945, 138, §12.a.10), M. Cohen (1947, #113), W. Vycichl (1958, 374; 1990, 50), A. B. Dolgopolskij (1967, 307), and C. T. Hodge (1981, 375).

⁴¹ Usually (Erman 1892, 119; Holma 1911, x, Ember 1926, 312, #7; Farina 1926, 20; GÄSW 197-8, #809) combined with Sem. $*\text{ša}^{\text{mal}}$ - „sinistro, mano sinistra" [Fronzaroli] = $*\text{šVm}^{\text{VI}}$ - [Militarev], attested in Akkadian šumēlu "Linke: 1. linke Seite, 2. linke Hand" [AHW] || Ugaritic šmāl "die/das Linke" [WUS], Hebrew šemo^{I} "die linke Seite, 2. Norden, Nordseite" [GB] | Arabic šam^{al} - "linke Seite, Norden" [Erman] || Jibbali šamli (m), šamlēt (f) "left" [Johnstone], Mehri $\text{šaymāl}/\text{šamōwāl}$ "left (hand)" [Johnstone], Soqotri $\text{šimhil} \sim \text{šémhel} \sim \text{šémel}$ "gauche" [Leslau] etc. This equation is, however, surrounded by puzzles. Except for the -m-, neither of the radicals in fact displays any of the regular correspondences. The connection (if any) of Eg. -mḥ- vs. Sem. $*\text{-ml-}$ has never been elucidated satisfactorily. In W. A. Ward's (1961, 38, #21) opinion, the Semitic word "doesn't appear in Eg. or Dem." at all (implying that Eg. smḥj is not cognate either), only on a Coptic ostrakon as ϣΜΟΥΛ "left/east (?)" (CD), which, being an evident a Semitic loan, is out of the consideration here. A. Ember (l.c. supra) assumed an implausible chain of smḥj (sic, -ḥ-) $< *šmḥj < **šm3j$ without any comparative evidence. The only way to explain this anomalous match would be to assume an equally striking connection between Eg. mḥ and Sem. $*\text{ml}^{\text{?}}$ „to fill" (expressed e.g. in GM 114, 1990, 92). But the former is most probably cognate with Punic mḥy "2. to (make) overflow", hence "to pay or weigh to the full weight" [DNWSI] || Bedawye muh "genügen" [Almkvist] = $\text{mḥ} \sim \text{mehū}$ "genügen, hinlänglich, genug sein" [Reinisch] = meh- "to suffice, be enough" [Roper] || Dullay: Dobase muh- "beenden", muh-e (f) "Ende" [Amborn, Minker, Sasse] || NOm.: Yemsa mūma "full, levelled" [Wedekind] = mūmā "full" [Aklilu] || CCh.: Lame $\text{mbúbú}^{\text{ú}}$ [mb- $< *m-$ reg.] "bien plain, rebondi, sans creux" [Sachnine] || ECh.: Kera me^{i} (adv.) "genug" [Ebert] | Tobanga máw "plein, rempli, bourré à ras bord" [Caprile]. For this Egypto-Cushitic comparison see Zyhlarz 1932-33, 168; Behrens MS; Takács 1999, 40.

⁴² Cognate with Sem. $*\sqrt{\text{wš}}\text{ḥ} >$ Hebrew yēša^{c} "Befreiung", lit. $*\text{"Weitmachung"}$ [Vergote] = „Hilfe, Rettung" [GB] | Arabic wasi^{a} I "1. être spacieux, vaste, ample", wasu^{a} I "avoir les jambes distancées" [BK]. A generally accepted equation. For literature see EDE I 326.

⁴³ Related to Arabic faza^{a} I "être effrayé, saisi de frayeur à la vue de/par qqch." [BK].

⁴⁴ Akin to Sem. $*d^{\text{c}}d^{\text{c}}$ "to move with heavy steps, with difficulty" [GT]: Arabic $\text{da}^{\text{c}}\text{da}^{\text{c}}\text{a}$ "courir d'un pas lourd" || Amharic da (da) ?alā "marcher lentement, avec difficulté, parler difficilement" (Sem.: DRS 289-290) || SCu. $*de^{\text{c}}$ - "to be fat" [Ehret]: WRift $*du^{\text{c}}\text{iya}$ "fat, oil", pl. $*du^{\text{c}}\text{áy}$ "pieces of fat" [Kieβling & Mous] $>$ Iraqw $\text{de}^{\text{c}}\text{-eta}$ "fat, lard" [Ehret] = $\text{dē}^{\text{c}}\text{ē}^{\text{c}}\text{ē}^{\text{c}}\text{ta}$ „fat", cf. $\text{d}^{\text{i}}\text{?i}$ „oil" [Whiteley] = $\text{di}^{\text{c}}\text{i}$ „oil, fat" [Maghway], Burunge $\text{dō}^{\text{c}}\text{ḥ} \& \text{dō}^{\text{c}}\text{gi}^{\text{a}}$ „Fett" [Meinhof] | Asa $\text{da}^{\text{?}}\text{-ara}$ "heavy" [Ehret] | Dahalo $\text{de}^{\text{c}}\text{-em-}$ "to be fat" [Ehret] = $\text{de}^{\text{c}}\text{-em-}$ „to be fat" [Ehret, Elderkin, Nurse] (SCu. data: Ehret 1980, 165, #22).

⁴⁵ Identical with Sem. $*\sqrt{\text{ḥb}}\text{ḥ}$: Akkadian ḥbū "untertauchen" [AHW] || Hebrew $\sqrt{\text{ḥb}}\text{ḥ}$ "hinein-, versinken, eindringen (ein Stein in die Stirn)" [GB] | Arabic $\sqrt{\text{ḥb}}\text{ḥ}$ I "1. faire une empreinte sur qqch., marquer qqch. en y imprimant un cachet, etc." [BK]. For the Egypto-Semitic match cf. Albright 1918, 95; 1918, 253, #124; Ember 1926, 308, #5; ESS §15.c.4; Vergote 1945, 144, §21.b.14.

⁴⁶ Cf. Sem. $*\sqrt{\text{tḥ}}\text{ḥ} >$ Old Hebrew $\text{t}^{\text{c}}\text{y qal}$ „umherirren, taumeln, abirren", nifal „herumirren, taumeln, getäuscht sein, irren", $\text{tō}^{\text{c}}\text{ā}$ „Irrsal, Verwirrung" [GB], Neo-Hebrew $\text{t}^{\text{c}}\text{ḥ}$ piel inf.: $\text{lā-ta}^{\text{c}}\text{ḥ}^{\text{a}}$ "to deceive, cheat" [Solomonick-Morrison] | Arabic $\sqrt{\text{tḥ}}\text{ḥ}$ I "2. bégayer, 2. agiter, faire aller ça et là", $\text{ta}^{\text{c}}\text{ḥ}^{\text{a}}$ - "1. difficulté de prononciation (surtout dans les lettres f et t), 2. trouble, confusion" [BK]. Suggested by Sh. Yeivin (1933, 111).

⁴⁷ Cf. SCu.: Asa $\text{da}^{\text{?}}$ - "to hide" [Ehret 1980, 163], which may possible derive from SCu. $*\text{da}^{\text{c}}$ - [GT].

When Allen (p. 36) speaks of "the occasional (sic) association of *d* with Semitic *g/q", he provides one example for each, i.e. Eg. *d3d3* "head" = Sem. **g*lgl and Eg. *dnd* = Sem. **g*knṯ "to be angry", resp., here too giving the the false impression that both correspondences were equal. In fact, however, the shift of Eg. *d* < AA *g is most frequent (29 instances in EDE I 249-255), while there are only 4 good cases (beside 7 unacceptable ones) for Eg. *d* < AA *k in EDE I 319-322. The latter shift seems to be due to a secondary palatalization of the sporadic interchange of Eg. *g* ~ *k*. The same is the case with Allen's claim that "Egyptian *d* is also cognate with Semitic *š and *c", for which he quotes only Eg. *db*ṛ = Sem. **š*bṛ "finger" and Eg. *ndm* = Sem. **n*ṛm "pleasant". In fact, the correspondence of Eg. *d* to the glottalized sibilant affricates (AA *č, *č̣, *č̥) is regular (24 exx. in EDE I 256-261), whereas the relation of Eg. *d* vs. Sem. ṛ is sporadic (8 exx. in EDE I 261-262),⁴⁸ although the reasons for this remain to be clarified.

The chapter concludes with a sketch outlining the Semitic reflexes of Egyptian consonants, which, in Allen's interpretation, ended up as a chaotic mess of the most diverse consonantal comparisons (e.g. Eg. ṛ = Sem. *ṛ, *ḡ, *d, *ḏ, *l or Eg.), whose alarming controversies were left simply unresolved.

The next chapter is „Egyptian phonology” (§5, pp. 37-56), where the author tries to sum up the scanty inner and external evidence collected (although hardly analysed) in the preceding parts. Allen addresses a number of exciting issues here, most importantly how to conceive the nature of Eg. *3* ~ *n* ~ *r*. The problem, however, is that his speculations are derived from poorly demonstrated „analyses” in the first chapters.

The author's bold declaration (p. 38) that "phonemic /y/ seems to be a secondary feature, deriving primarily from an original w ... This phoneme normally has no Coptic descendant" can by no means be approved in this exclusive form. What about the mass of Egyptian roots having *j* < AA *y? E.g. Eg. =j (1st pers. sg. suffix pronoun),⁴⁹ jj "to come" (FD),⁵⁰ *jw "Vieh" (Wb) = "newly dropped foal" (EG¹),⁵¹ jw "Art Hund" (Wb) = "dog" (FD) and jwjw "Art Hund" (Wb) = „dog” (FD),⁵² jb.w "refuge, shelter" (FD) = "Zufluchtstätte" (Wb),⁵³ jmn adj. "right(-hand)", noun "right side, the West" (FD),⁵⁴ nj3.w "Steinbock" (Wb) = "ibex" (FD),⁵⁵ nk "den Beischlaf vollziehen" (Wb), act. **n*jk, cf. Dem. (Ankhsheshonqi 13:12, 19:1) njk „fornicator” (CED) → (S) **NOEIK** "adulterer" (CED),⁵⁶ hj "husband" (Wb), act. **h*j → (SB) **2A1** "husband" (CED),⁵⁷ hj "(to be) high" and lj „height” (DLE),⁵⁸ sjn "Ton" (Wb)?⁵⁹ Has the author considered this evidence?

⁴⁸ 3 exx. are beyond any doubt: *ndm*, *nds*, *sdm*, 3 exx. are probable: *psd*, *db3*, *dns*, and 2 exx. are weak: *dgm*, *ddb*.

⁴⁹ Identical with Sem. *-ya ~ *-ī „my” [Moscati et al.] ||| PBrb. *-ī ~ *-y „1st pers. sg. suffix pron.” [Prasse] ||| Agaw *yā „me, my (obl. case)” [Appleyard] ||| ECu. *ya, *yi, *yu „me, my (obl. case)” [Appleyard], cf. PSam *-ay "my" [Heine] | HECu. *ē "me": 1st pers. sg. acc. pron. [Hudson] ||| SCu.: Pīraqw *-ʔayi „my” | Dahalo ʔi „my” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 289) ||| NOM.: Pometo *-ay- verbal affix „I” [Zaborski].

⁵⁰ Cognate with NBrb.: Qabyle e-yya imper. "come!" [Dallet] ||| SBrb.: Tamasheq a-yu "kommen" [Zyhlarz] ||| Bed. yi? ~ i? ~ ī "anlangen, kommen" [Reinisch] ||| NOM. *y- "to come" [GT] (Om. data: Cerulli 1938 III, 208; Fleming 1976, 318; Bender 1988, 149) ||| Ch. *ya "to come" [Newman]. Cf. Behnk 1928, 138; Zyhlarz 1932-1933, 165; Brockelmann 1932, 101, #8; Vycichl 1934, 78; 1960, 263; Cohen 1947, #25; D'jakonov 1965, 45; Dolgopol'skij 1970, 622, #33.a; Illič-Svityč 1971, #130; Fleming 1974, 88; Müller 1975, 69, #73; Zaborski 1989, 579; Bender 1990, 29, #3.1.1; Orel & Stolbova 1992, 175; 1992, 194; Belova 1991, 89; 1993, 54.

⁵¹ Cognate with Bed. yuwe ~ yiwe (f) "Ferse, Kalbin vom Stiere noch nicht besprungen" [Reinisch].

⁵² Akin to ECu. *yeyy-/yoyy- "wild/hunting dog, jackal" [Sasse] → HECu. *yayye "wolf, jackal" [Hudson]. Cf. EDE I 79.

⁵³ Cognate with SCu. *yab- "to protect" [GT]: Iraqw yaw- "to enclose, fence", Alagwa yaba "fence" | Dahalo žab- [*y-] "to save" (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 315). Cf. also PBantu *-yúb- "shelter (from rain or sun)" [Guthrie]. Cf. EDE I 79.

⁵⁴ Identical with Sem. *yamīn- "southern" [Fronzaroli] ||| WCh.: Hausa yámmáá < *yamn-? "1. westwards, 2. afternoon up to evening" [Abraham]. See Erman 1892, 107; Hommel 1894, 345; Holma 1911, X; GÄSW #8; Vergote 1945, 131, §2.a.2; Cohen 1947, #495; Ol'derogge 1952, 34; Vycichl 1958, 376; Pilszczikowa 1960, 123, #126; D'jakonov 1965, 47; 1967, 187; Hodge 1977, 933; 1981, 404; Mukarovskij 1994, 146; Skinner 1995, 34.

⁵⁵ Cf. Akkadian nayyalu "Reh" [AHW] ||| Tigre root ṽnyl > nāl-āt "she-antelope" [Leslau]. For the Egypto-Semitic etymology see Ember 1912, 87; ESS §11.a.18; GÄSW #54; Vergote 1945, 131, §2.a.4; Vycichl 1958, 376; 1990, 56.

⁵⁶ Sem. **ṽ*nyk > Akkadian ṽnyk: niāku "beischlafen", nīku "begattet" [AHW] ||| Arabic ṽnyk I "cohabiter avec une femme" [BK] ||| Modern South Arabian ṽnyk "to have sexual intercourse with, sleep with (a woman)" [Johnstone] ||| SBrb. **ṽ*nyky "coire, faire les mouvements de l'acte sexuel" [GT pace Foucauld] ||| WCh.: Bokkos nyök "to copulate with (koitieren), beget" [Jungrauthmayr]. See Müller 1909, 200, fn. 1; Ember 1916, 73; Trombetti 1923, 138, #248; Zyhlarz 1932-1933, 95; 1934, 119; GÄSW #62; Cohen 1947, #464; Vycichl 1958, 376; 1959, 39; D'jakonov 1965, 44; 1967, 188; Rabin 1982, 25; Sasse 1982, 153; Militarev 1986, 71, #3.3; Behrens 1987, 240, #3; Blazek 1989, 216; Belova 1993, 42, #195.

⁵⁷ Cognate with Bed. hīyo "husband, wife" [Reinisch] as suggested by L. Reinisch (1895, 133), A. Ember (1917, 21), M. Cohen (1947, #92), V. M. Illič-Svityč (1971, 241, #100), V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 169; HSED #1174).

⁵⁸ Identical with NAgaw *qāy- "big" [Appleyard].

⁵⁹ Akin to Jewish Aramaic sōyān and Syriac sōyānā "Lehm, Kot" [Levy] ||| ECh.: Somray siña „Lehm” [Lukas] = sinyā „earth” [Jungrauthmayr]. Cf. Ember 1912, 90; ESS §11.a.49; Cohen 1947, #297; Vycichl 1958, 376; 1990, 62; Castellino 1984, 17; Orel & Stolbova 1992, 187; HSED #2249.

How the author conceived the nature and origin of Eg. n (p. 39) is equally shocking: "Phonetically, the evidence for n indicates that it was primarily the nasal *[n].⁶⁰ Its relationship to /l/ in cognates, correspondents, and Common Coptic must therefore be allophonic, perhaps dialectal: this, ns 'tongue' may represent *nis as well as *lis ... The alternative survival of n in the other dialectal form, but also the ultimate influence of semantic oppositions: thus, ns 'tongue' > $\lambda\epsilon\zeta/\lambda\alpha\zeta$ vs. n.s 'for it' > $\nu\epsilon\zeta/\nu\alpha\zeta$." Does Allen seriously think the word for „tongue” to have ever had [n] instead of [l] in it? Where is this piece of evidence, when everything indicates the opposite, i.e. *[l-]? This kind of „method” of working without data resembles the way Allen arbitrarily vocalized LEg. ḥ(3)b(3)r "partner" as *ḥābira (p. 33, cf. above). The presence of [l] in this pharaonic word is definitely to be assumed in the light of both the Afro-Asiatic (AA *lis-) and Coptic (pre-Cpt. *līs) evidence.

Since morphology and syntax lie beyond the scope of my primary interests and research field, I refrain from passing any judgement on Allen's chapters on these areas of Egyptian historical grammar. My only general impression is that perhaps the author should have stuck merely to these domains, where he may have a more intimate and comfortable background knowledge. It is not the first occasion that I have to see a great authority of Egyptology erring in the rather uncertain domain of Egyptian comparative-historical phonology.⁶⁰

All in all, the phonological part of the book under review, whose presentation is, unfortunately, not always easily transparent, evokes in me little trust as a new and original synthesis or even as an overview of the state-of-the-art in our field. It should have been omitted from the present book and Allen should have focused on those domains he is indeed intimately familiar with and where he is apparently able to carry out thorough and original research (e.g. verbal system, syntax).

Imperfect understanding of Egyptian *Lautgeschichte* and the many of the underlying comparative data, the poor knowledge of the *Fachliteratur*, ignorance of the relevant data, problems and arguments instead of addressing and surveying them – all this makes the author's phonology for me unreliable. Some elementary blunders indicate that the author's preparations were not sufficient in comparative Egypto-Semitic studies. What we have here is not at all a comprehensive survey based on careful analyses of *all* relevant data and suggestions either in terms of quantity or quality. The new book's phonology can thus hardly be used as an up-to-date summary for academic purposes.

Abbreviations

(A): Ahmimic Coptic, AA: Afro-Asiatic, (B): Bohairic Coptic, Bed.: Bedawye (Beja), Brb.: Berber, Ch.: Chadic, Cu.: Cushitic, Dem.: Demotic, Dyn.: Dynasty, E: East(ern), Eg.: Egyptian, (F): Fayyumic Coptic, H: Highland, L: Lowland, (L): Lycopolitan Coptic, (M): Mesokemic Coptic, MK: Middle Kingdom, N: North(ern), NK: New Kingdom, Om.: Omotic, OK: Old Kingdom, S: South(ern), (S): Sahidic Coptic, Sem.: Semitic, W: West(ern).

Quoted sources

- AHW = Soden, W. von: Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. I-III. Wiesbaden, 1965-1981., Otto Harrassowitz.
 Albright, W. F.: Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. I.= American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 34/2 (1918), 81-98.
 Albright, W. F.: Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. II.= American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 34/4 (1918), 215-255.
 Albright, W. F.: Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology. III.= Journal of the American Oriental Society 47 (1927), 198-237.
 Amborn, H. & Minker, G. & Sasse, H.-J.: Das Dullay. Materialien zu einer ostkuschitischen Sprachgruppe. Berlin, 1980., Reimer Verlag.
 Behnk, F.: Über die Beziehungen des Ägyptischen zu den hamitischen Sprachen.= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 82 (1928), 136-141.
 Belova, A. G.: Struktura semitskogo kornja i semitskaja morfologičeskaja sistema.= Voprosy Jazykoznanija 1 (1991), 79-90.
 Belova, A. G.: Sur la reconstruction du vocalisme afroasiatique: quelques correspondances égypto-sémitiques.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band II. Wien, 1991., Afro-Pub. Pp. 85-93.
 Belova, A. G.: K voprosu o rekonstrukcii semitskogo kornevogo vokalizma.= Voprosy Jazykoznanija 6 (1993), 28-56.
 Behrens, P.: Review of Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte.= Enchoria 15 (1987), 237-245.

⁶⁰ First of all, the proposals by J. Osing (NBÄ) in the swampy area of root etymologies (*Wurzel-etymologien*) frequently turn out to be merely mechanically forged pseudo-etymologies as I had pointed out in several special papers (Takács 2005, 14ff.; 2005, 623ff.; 2015a and 2015b). J. F. Quack's output in Egyptian etymology was even more disappointing (cf. Takács 2003). Eventually, the same is the case with O. Röbner, whom one may admire for his genuine insights into Berber and Semito-Hamitic verbal morphology, whereas his both methods and results in Egypto-Semitic comparative phonology (esp. in his paper from 1971), which had already evoked severe criticism by W. Ward (1985), and also by W. Vycichl (1985), are most problematic (cf. Takács 2011, 34-82).

- Bender, M. L.: Proto-Omotoc Phonology and Lexicon.= Bechhaus-Gerst, M.; Serzisko, F. (eds.): Cushitic-Omotoc. Papers from the First International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6-9, 1986. Hamburg, 1988., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 121-159.
- Bender, M. L.: Coming and Going in Afrasian.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 22 (1990), 19-40.
- Bennett, P. R.: Comparative Semitic Linguistics. A Manual. Winona Lake, Indiana, 1998., Eisenbrauns.
- BK = Biberstein Kazimirski, A. de: Dictionnaire arabe-français. Paris, 1860., Maisonneuve & Co. Editeurs.
- Blažek, V.: A New Contribution to Comparative-Historical Afrasian Linguistics.= Asian and African Studies 24 (1989), 203-222.
- Blažek, V.: New Fenno-Ugric - Indo-Iranian Lexical Parallels.= Ivanov, V. V.; Sudnik, T. M.; Helimskij, E. A. (eds.): Uralo-Indogermanica. Balto-slavjanskije jazyki i problema uralo-indoevropskikh svjazej. Materialy 3-ej konferencii, 18-22 junja 1990 g. Čast' II. Moskva, 1990., Institut Slavjanovedenija i Balkanistiki Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 40-45.
- Blažek, V.: Kartvelian Material in Nostratic Lexicon.= Archív Orientální 59 (1991), 360-369.
- Blažek, V.: Review of Kaye, A. S. (ed.): Semitic Studies in Honour of Wolf Leslau.= Archív Orientální 62 (1994), 428-435.
- Brockelmann, C.: Ägyptisch-semitische Etymologien.= Zeitschrift für Semitistik 8 (1932), 97-117.
- Brugmann, K. & Delbrück, B.: Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Strassburg, 1897., Verlag Karl J. Trübner.
- Bynon, J.: Berber and Chadic. The Lexical Evidence.= Bynon, J. (ed.): Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 241-290.
- Calice, F. von: Über semitisch-ägyptische Sprachvergleichung.= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 85 (1931), 25-37.
- Callender, J. B.: Studies in the Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic. Berkeley, 1984., University of California Press.
- Castellino, G. R.: Relazione introduttiva.= Atti della Terza Giornata di Studi Camito-Semitici e Indoeuropei. Roma, 1984., Università degli Studi "La Sapienza". Pp. 8-18.
- CED = Černý, J.: Coptic Etymological Dictionary. London, Cambridge, 1976., Cambridge University Press.
- Cerulli, E.: Studi etiopici. III. Il linguaggio dei Giangerò ed alcune lingue Sidama dell'Omo (Basketo, Ciara, Zaissè). Roma, 1938., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Clère, J. J.: L'ancienneté des négations à b initial du néo-égyptien.= Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo 14 (1956), 29-33.
- Cohen, M.: Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique. Paris, 1947., Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Conti, G.: Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nel lessico egiziano dell'agricoltura. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- DELC = Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte. Leuven, 1983., Peeters.
- D'jakonov, I. M.: Semitohamitskie jazyki. Opyt klassifikacii. Moskva, 1965., Nauka.
- D'jakonov, I. M.: Jazyki Drevnej Perednej Azii. Moskva, 1967., Nauka.
- Diakonoff, I. M.: Afrasian Languages. Moscow, 1988., Nauka.
- DLE = Lesko, L. H.: A Dictionary of Late Egyptian. Volume I, II, III, IV. Berkeley, 1982., 1984., 1987., 1989. B.C. Scribe Publications.
- Dolgopol'skij, A. B.: Metody rekonstrukcii obščeeindoevropskogo jazyka i vneindoevropskie sopostavlenija.= Problemy sravnitel'noj grammatiki indoevropskikh jazykov. Moskva, 1964., Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta. Pp. 27-30.
- Dolgopol'skij, A. B.: Metody rekonstrukcii obščeeindoevropskogo jazyka i sibiroevropskaja gipoteza.= Étimologija (1964), 259-270.
- Dolgopol'skij, A. B.: Nostratičeskie osnovy s sočetaniem šumnyh soglasnyh.= Étimologija (1967), 296-313.
- Dolgopolski, A. B.: A Long-Range Comparison of Some Languages of Northern Eurasia. Problems of Phonetic Correspondences.= VII Meždunarodnyj kongress antropologičeskikh i étnografičeskikh nauk. Moskva, 3-10 avgusta 1964 g. Tom V. Moskva, 1970., Nauka. Pp. 620-628.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: From Proto-Semitic to Hebrew. Milano, 1999., Centro Studi Camito-Semitici di Milano.
- DRS = Cohen, D.: Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques. Fascicules 1-2. Paris & La Haye, 1970-1976., Mouton. Fascicule 3-. Leuven, 1993-, Peeters. With continuous pagination.
- EDE I = Takács, G.: Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume One: A Phonological Introduction. Leiden, 1999., E. J. Brill.
- Edel, E.: Zur Vokalisation des Neuägyptischen.= Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 2 (1954), 30-43.
- Edel, E.: Ein bisher unbeachteter Beleg für ein „Kompositum älterer Bildungsweise“.= Osing, J. & Dreyer, G. (Hrsg.): Form und Mass. Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst der alten Ägypten. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 65. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987. Wiesbaden, 1987., Harrassowitz. Pp. 124-136.
- Edgerton, W.F.: The Nauri Decree of Seti IA Translation and Analysis of the Legal Portion.= Journal of Near Eastern Studies 6/4 (1947), 219-230.
- EG¹ = Gardiner, A. H.: Egyptian Grammar.¹ Oxford, 1927., Clarendon Press.
- Ehret, Ch.: The Historical Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic Phonology and Vocabulary. Berlin, 1980., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ember, A.: Notes on the Relation of Egyptian and Semitic.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 50 (1912), 86-90.
- Ember, A.: The Etymological Equivalent in Egyptian of the Common Semitic Word for "Life".= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 19 (1916), 72-74.

- Ember, A.: (a) New Semito-Egyptian Words. (b) Some African Words in Old Egyptian.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 37 (1917), 21.
- Ember, A.: Partial Assimilation in Old Egyptian.= Adler, C. & Ember, A. (eds.): *Oriental Studies Published in Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary (1883-1923) of Paul Haupt as the Director of the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University*. Baltimore, 1926., The Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp. 300-312.
- Erman, A.: Das Verhältnis des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 46 (1892), 93-129.
- Farina, G.: Le vocali dell'antico egiziano.= *Aegyptus* 5/4 (1924), 313-325.
- Farina, G.: *Grammatica della lingua egiziana antica in caratteri geroglifici*.² Milano, 1926., U. Hoepli.
- FD = Faulkner, R. O.: *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford, 1962., Clarendon Press.
- Fecht, G.: Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache. Glückstadt, 1960., Verlag J. J. Augustin.
- Fleming, H. C.: Omotic as an Afroasiatic Family.= *Studies in African Linguistics. Supplement* 5 (1974), 81-94.
- Fleming, H. C.: Omotic Overview.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 299-323.
- GÄSW = Calice, F. von: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- GB = Gesenius, W. (bearbeitet von Buhl, F.): *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Unveränderter Neudruck der 1915 erschienenen 17. Auflage. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, 1962., Springer-Verlag.
- Gordon, C. H.: *Ugaritic Manual*. Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Greenberg, J. H.: The Patterning of Root Morphemes in Semitic.= *Word* 6 (1950), 162-181.
- Greenberg, J. H.: *Studies in African linguistic Classification*. Branford, Connecticut, 1955., Compass Publishing Company.
- Greenberg, J. H.: The Labial Consonants of Proto-Afro-Asiatic.= *Word* 14 (1958), 295-302.
- Greenberg, J. H.: The Languages of Africa.= *International Journal of American Linguistics* 29 (1963).
- Hintze, F.: Zur hamitosemitischen Wortvergleichung.= *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5 (1951), 65-87.
- Hintze, F.: Zur koptischen Phonologie.= *Enchoria* 10 (1980), 23-91.
- Hoch, J. E.: *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton, 1994., Princeton University Press.
- Hodge, C. T.: An Egypto-Semitic Comparison.= *Folia Orientalia* 17 (1976), 5-28.
- Hodge, C. T.: Review of Callender, J. B.: *Middle Egyptian*.= *Language* 53/4 (1977), 930-940.
- Hodge, C. T.: Indo-Europeans in the Near East.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 23/6 (1981), 227-244.
- Hodge, C. T.: Lislakh Labials.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 23/8 (1981), 368-382.
- Hodge, C. T.: Comparative Evidence for Egyptian Historical Phonology.= Young, D. W. (ed.): *Studies Presented to Hans Yakob Polotsky*. East Gloucester, 1981., Pirtle and Polson. Pp. 401-413.
- Hodge, C. T.: Relating Afro-Asiatic to Indo-European.= Wolff, E. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H. (eds.): *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*. Hamburg, 1983., Buske Helmut Verlag. Pp. 33-50.
- Hodge, C. T.: Were the Rekhyt Indo-Europeans?=*Discussions in Egyptology* 2 (1985), 13-23.
- Holma, H.: Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. Eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie.= *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia. Sarja B. Nid. 7. No. 1* (1911), 1-183.
- Holma, H.: Zur semitisch-hamitischen Sprachwissenschaft.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 32 (1919), 34-47.
- Hommel, F.: Die semitischen Völkern und Sprachen. Leipzig, 1883., Otto Schulze.
- Hommel, F.: Über den Grad der Verwandtschaft des Altägyptischen mit dem Semitischen.= *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 2 (1894), 342-358.
- HSED = Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, 1995., E. J. Brill.
- Illič-Svityč, V. M.: Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). *Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-Ķ)*. Moskva, 1971., Nauka.
- JI = Jungrauthmayr, H. & Ibrizimow, D.: *Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume I. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading, Distribution and Comments*. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- JS = Jungrauthmayr, H. & Shimizu, K.: *Chadic Lexical Roots. Vol. II. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading and Distribution*. Berlin, 1981., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- KB = Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W.: *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. I-V*. Leiden, 1994-2000, E. J. Brill.
- Kienast, B.: *Historische semitische Sprachwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden, 2001., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kogan, L. E.: *Semitskie jazyki*.= Belova, A. G.; Kogan, L. E.; Ljuzov, S. V.; Romanova, O. I. (red.): *Jazyki mira. Semitskie jazyki. Akkadskij jazyk. Severozapadnosemitskie jazyki*. Moskva, 2009., Akademija. Pp. 15-112.
- Kogan, L.: Proto-Semitic Phonetics and Phonology.= Weninger, S. (ed.) in collaboration with G. Khan, M. P. Streck, and J. J. E. Watson: *The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, Band 36*. Berlin, Boston, 2011., Walter de Gruyter, Mouton. Pp. 54-151.
- Kogan, L.: Proto-Semitic Lexicon.= Weninger, S. (ed.) in collaboration with G. Khan, M. P. Streck, and J. J. E. Watson: *The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, Band 36*. Berlin, Boston, 2011., Walter de Gruyter, Mouton. Pp. 179-258.
- Kruchten, J.-M.: From Middle Egyptian to Late Egyptian.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 6 (1999), 1-97.
- Lacau, P.: *Études d'égyptologie. I. Phonétique égyptienne ancienne*. Le Caire, 1970., IFAO.
- Laoust, E.: *Siwa. I. Son parler*. Paris, 1931., Librairie Ernest Leroux.

- LÄ = Helck, W. & Westendorf, W. (Hrsg., begründet von W. Helck und E. Otto): Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Band I-VII. Wiesbaden, 1975-92., Harrassowitz.
- Lipiński, E.: *Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar*. Leuven, 1997., Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies.
- Loprieno, A.: *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge, 1995., Cambridge University Press.
- Majzel', S. S. (additions by and edited by Militarev, A. Ju.): *Puti razvitija kornevogo fonda semitskih jazykov*. Moskva, 1983., Nauka.
- Militarev, A. Ju.: *Proishozhdenie kornej so značenim "tvorit', sozdavat'" v afrazijskih jazykah. = Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XIX godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*. Moskva, 1986., Nauka. Pp. 63-79.
- Möller, G.: *Aegyptisch-libysches. = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 24/9-10 (1921), 193-197.
- Möller, G.: *Die Ägypter und ihre libyschen Nachbarn. = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 78 (1924), 36-60.
- Mukarovsky, H. G.: *Mande-Chadic Common Stock. A Study of Phonological and Lexical Evidence*. Wien, 1987., Afro-Pub.
- Mukarovsky, H. G.: *Die Weltrichtungen im Ägyptischen, im Hausa und in einigen weiteren Sprachen Afrikas. = Zwischen den beiden Ewigkeiten. Festschrift Gertrud Thausing*. Wien, 1994., Eigenverlag des Institutes für Ägyptologie der Universität Wien. Pp. 146-153.
- Müller, W. M.: *The False r in Archaic Egyptian Orthography. = Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* 31 (NS 15) (1909), 182-201.
- Müller, W. W.: *Beiträge zur hamito-semitischen Wortvergleichung. = Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 63-74.
- NBÄ = Osing, J.: *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen. I-II. Maiz/Rhein*, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Ol'derogge, D. A.: *Proishozhdenie narodov Central'nogo Sudana (iz drevnejšej istorii jazykov gruppy hausa-kotoko). = Sovetskaja Étnografija* 2 (1952), 23-38.
- Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: *Čadsko-egipetskie izoglossy v oblasti kul'turnoj leksiki. = Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka. Čast' I*. Moskva, 1989., Nauka. Pp. 131-136.
- Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: *Cushitic, Chadic, and Egyptian: Lexical Relations. = Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind*. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 167-180.
- Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: *On Chadic-Egyptian Lexical Relations. = Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind*. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 181-203.
- Peust, C.: *Egyptian Phonology. An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*. Göttingen, 1999., Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag GbR.
- Petráček, K.: *Úvod do hamitosemitské (afroasijské) jazykovědy, Volume I-II*. Praha, 1988., Univerzita Karlova.
- Pilszczikowa, N.: *Le haoussa et le chamito-sémitique à la lumière de l'Essai comparatif de Marcel Cohen. = Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 24/1 (1960), 97-130.
- PL = Wilson, P.: *A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu*. Leuven, 1997., Peeters.
- Rabin, Ch.: *Ron-Semitic Etymologies. = Jungrauthmayr, H. (ed.): The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigrific Border Area*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 24-31.
- Reinisch, L.: *Wörterbuch der Saho-Sprache*. Wien, 1890., Alfred Hölder.
- Reinisch, L.: *Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache*. Wien, 1895., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Reintges, Ch.: *Egyptian Root-and-Pattern Morphology. = Lingua Aegyptia* 4 (1994), 213-244.
- Rössler, O.: *Der semitische Charakter der libyschen Sprache. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50 (1952), 121-150.
- Rössler, O.: *Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache. = Altheim, F. & Stiehl, R. (eds.): Christentum am Roten Meer. Band I*. Berlin, New York, 1971., Walter de Gruyter. Pp. 263-325.
- Sasse, H.-J.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*. Hamburg, 1982., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Schenkel, W.: *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur im Ägyptischen. = OLZ* 63/11-12 (1968), 533-541.
- Schenkel, W.: *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. Wiesbaden, 1983., Harrassowitz.
- Schenkel, W.: *Glottalisierte Verschlusslaute, glottaler Verschlusslaut und ein pharyngaler Reibelaut im Koptischen. Rückschlüsse aus den ägyptisch-koptischen Lehnwörtern und Ortsnamen im Ägyptisch-Arabischen. = Lingua Aegyptia* 10 (2002), 1-57.
- Schenkel, W.: *Besprechung von J. P. Allen: The Ancient Egyptian Language. An Historical Study. = Lingua Aegyptia* 21 (2013), 321-328.
- SED I = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A. (with assistance of A. Belova, A. Kovalev, A. Nemirovskaja, D. Nosnitsyn): *Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Vol. I. Anatomy of Man and Animals*. Münster, 2000., Ugarit-Verlag.
- SED II = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A. (with contributions by A. Arakelova, A. Belova, A. Kovalev, D. Nosnitsyn, E. Vizirova, M. Yakubovich): *Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Vol. II. Animal Names*. Münster, 2005., Ugarit-Verlag.
- Skinner, N.: *Evidence for Earlier Nominal Affixation in Afroasian. = Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (Hrsg.): Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 25-35.
- Stricker, B. H.: *De indeeling der Egyptische taalgeschiedenis. Thesis/dissertation*. Leiden, 1945., University of Leiden.
- Takács, G.: *Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) Substratum in the Proto-Indo-European Cultural Lexicon? = Lingua Posnaniensis* 40 (1998), 141-172.
- Takács, G.: *Refining Some Etymologies around the Root "Round" in Afrasian and Egyptian. = General Linguistics* 36/3 (1998), 153-166.

Takács, G.: Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) Comparative-Historical Linguistics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union. München, Newcastle, 1999., Lincom Europa.

Takács, G.: Sibilant and Velar Consonants of South Cushitic and Their Regular Correspondences in Egyptian and Other Afro-Asiatic Branches.= Lamberti, M. & Tonelli, L. (eds.): *Afroasiatica Tergestina. Papers from the 9th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics*, Trieste, April 23-24, 1998. *Contributi presentati al 9^o Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semitica)*, Trieste, 23-24 Aprile 1998. Padova, 1999., Unipress. Pp. 393-426.

Takács, G.: South Cushitic Consonant System in Afro-Asiatic Context.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61 (2000), 69-117.

Takács, G.: Questions of Egyptian and Afro-Asiatic Comparison.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 56/1 (2003), 59-132.

Takács, G.: Egyptian Lexicography and Etymology: Against or with Afro-Asiatic Comparison?=*Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 58/2 (2005), 14-113.

Takács, G.: On „Modern” Popular Etymology in Egyptology.= Kogan, L. & N. Koslova & S. Loesov & S. Tishchenko (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*. Winona Lake, Indiana, 2005., published for the Russian State University for the Humanities by Eisenbrauns. Pp. 623-685.

Takács, G.: The Afro-Asiatic Background of South Cushitic *h, *ḥ, *c, *h, and *ʔ.= *Journal of Language Relationship* 4 (2010), 135-166.

Takács, G.: *Studies in Afro-Asiatic Comparative Phonology (Consonants)*. Berlin, 2011., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Takács, G.: Musgu and Masa h- vs. ḥ- and Afro-Asiatic.= Ibriszimow, D.; Tourneux, H. and Wolff, W. (eds.): *Topics in Chadic Linguistics. Papers from the 6th Biennial International Colloquium on Chadic Languages*, Villejuif, Sept. 22-23, 2011. Köln, 2013., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 153-184.

Takács, G.: Gyöketimológiák az óegyiptomban [Root etymologies in Ancient Egyptian].= Bács, T.; Dezső, T.; Vér, Á. (szerk.): *Aegyptiaca et Assyriaca. Tanulmányok az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Ókortudományi Intézetéből. Antiqua & Orientalia 5*. Budapest, 2015., Eötvös Kiadó. Pp. 171-183. In Hungarian.

Takács, G.: Methodological Problems of Egyptian Etymology.= *Comptes Rendus du GLECS* 35 (2003-2006). Forthcoming in 2015.

Trombetti, A.: *Le origini della lingua basca*. Bologna, 1923., Arnoldo Forni Editore. Published also in *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna. Classe di scienze morali. Serie II, tomi 8-9* (1923-25).

Vergote, J.: *Phonétique historique de l'égyptien*. Paris, 1945., Le Muséon.

Vergote, J.: *Grammaire copte: introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes)*. Tome Ia: partie synchronique. Ib: partie diachronique. Louvain, 1973., Peeters.

Vergote, J.: *Grammaire copte. Morphologie syntagmatique. Tome IIb: partie diachronique*. Louvain, 1983., Peeters.

Volten, A.: *Zwei ägyptische Wörter, die im Wörterbuch nicht stehen*.= Firchow, O. (Hrsg.): *Ägyptologische Studien*. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 362-365.

Vycichl, W.: *Hausa und Ägyptisch. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Hamitistik*.= *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 37 (1934), 36-116.

Vycichl, W.: *Pi^celformen im Ägyptischen und im Koptischen. Die Etymologie von koptisch COOYN "wissen"*.= *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 5 (1957), 10-25.

Vycichl, W.: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleiche*.= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 16 (1958), 367-405.

Vycichl, W.: *Is Egyptian a Semitic Language?*= *Kush* 7 (1959), 27-44.

Vycichl, W.: *The Beja Language Tū Beḏawīye. Its Relationship with Old Egyptian*.= *Kush* 8 (1960), 252-264.

Vycichl, W.: *Die durative Form zweiradikaliger Verben im Ägyptischen und in den Berbersprachen*.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 88 (1963), 148-150.

Vycichl, W.: *Rezente Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Ägyptischen Sprachwissenschaft - Ergebnisse einer unveröffentlichten Arbeit*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Supplementa I, XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 27. Juli 1968 in Würzburg, Teil I*. Wiesbaden, 1969. Pp. 24-26.

Vycichl, W.: *Das Zeichen für d "Hand" in der Hieroglyphenschrift und die semitischen Entsprechungen des zugrunde liegende Etymons*.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 112 (1985), 169-179.

Vycichl, W.: *La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne. Tome I^{er}. La phonétique*. Le Caire, 1990., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.

Vycichl, W.: *Les langues tchadiques et l'origine chamitique de leur vocabulaire*.= Barreteau, D. & Tourneux, H. (éds.): *Relations interethniques et culture matérielle dans le bassin du lac Tchad*. Paris, 1990., ORSTOM. Pp. 33-42.

Vycichl, W.: *Hundert Jahre hamito-semitische Forschung*.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 103-109.

Vycichl, W.: *Etymology*.= Atiya, A.S. (ed.): *The Coptic Encyclopaedia. Vol. 8*. New York, 1991., MacMillan. Pp. 118-124.

Ward, W. A.: *Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic*.= *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20 (1961), 31-40.

Ward, W. A.: *Reflections on Methodology in Egypto-Semitic Lexicography*.= Tubb, J. N. (ed.): *Palestine and the Bronze and Iron Ages. Papers in Honour of Olga Tufnell*. London, 1985., Institute of Archaeology. Pp. 232-248.

Wb = Erman, A. & Grapow, H.: *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache. I-V*.² Berlin, 1957-1971., Akademie-Verlag.

Winand, J.: *Temps et aspect en égyptien: Une approche sémantique*. Leiden & Boston, 2006., Brill.

WUS = Aistleitner, J.: *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*.= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 106/3 (1963).

Yeivin, Sh.: *Haqirōt hašwa'a bəbalšanūt semīt-mišrīt. 2*.= *Ləšōnenū* 3 (1933), 105-111.

Zaborski, A.: Der Wortschatz der Bedscha-Sprache. Eine vergleichende Analyse.= Schuler, E. von (ed.): XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg. Ausgewählte Vorträge. Stuttgart, 1989., Franz Steiner Verlag. Pp. 573-591.

Zavadovskij, Ju. N.: Berberskij jazyk. Moskva, 1967., Nauka.

Zyhlarz, E.: Ursprung und Sprachcharakter des Altägyptischen.= Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 23 (1932-33), 25-45, 81-110, 161-194, 241-254.

Zyhlarz, E.: Konkordanz ägyptischer und libyscher Verbalstammtypen.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 70 (1934), 107-122.