Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
93. Band, Wien 2005, 319–345

Etymological Studies in the Semantic Field "Work" in Egyptian*

Von HELMUT SATZINGER (Wien) und GÁBOR TAKÁCS (Székesfehérvár)

In a recently published article, written by several scholars (including the present authors) who work in various fields,[1] attention has been drawn to the fact that the word for "work" of many African languages is related to, or even identical with, a word for "to send." This is insofar surprising as this is hardly ever the case in European languages. In the following, Egyptian words for "work" and their semantic development shall be considered beyond the article mentioned, as compared with other languages (Satzinger). On the other hand, the internal (Egyptian) and external (Semitohamitic / Afroasiatic) etymological background of the various pertinent lexical items is discussed (Takács). The two sections have been independently elaborated and express the opinions of the respective author.

* The authors presented this paper to the Third Aegyptus et Pannonia Symposium, held at Buda Castle from 17th to 19th November, 2004. Having been dedicated to the memory of Professor László Kákosy, "Diversity and Similarity in Egyptian Religions" was chosen as its motto. The organizer and convenor, Dr Hedvig Győry, was generous enough to agree that we demonstrate our respective reverence for the venerated friend and revered teacher by participating in it, though with a joint paper of linguistic content. We are, however, grateful to her for conceeding that an inclusion of the paper in the acts of the conference would have been slightly incongruous. Our gratitude also goes to the Editors of this Journal for accepting our paper here for print.

[1] Jungraithmayr, H., Leger, R., Satzinger, H., Storch, A. und Takács, G.: „'Geschickt arbeiten' – eine panafrikanische Isoglosse?" *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 154, 2004, 9–16.

Being Sent to Work: Some More Remarks on an African Etymological Pattern

Von HELMUT SATZINGER (Wien)

In the better-known European languages the lexemes of the meaning "work," or "to work" are usually derived from one of the following semantic fields.

1. Activity, especially a creative or productive act; performance
2. Drudgery, vexation, and
3. Slavery.

Case no. 1 has a positive implication. It means a creative activity which is assumed, not because of the constraint or pressure of another person, but rather by one's own insight and decision, and it is motivated by the urge to produce or create. This is the case of the IE root **ŭergĥ-* "to do; work," reconstructed from words like Greek *tò érgon* (< *wergon*), German *das Werk* "deed, opus, work", English *work*. Greek *tò prâgma* is a comparable case; it means "civil business, deed, act", from *prássein* "to do, act, perform". Latin *opera, opus* "deed, work" is also pertinent.

Case no. 2 speaks of suffering from compulsion or obligation to do hard, painful, consuming work, like tilling the field in order to have sufficient supplies for oneself and the family. Cf. Greek *ho pónos* "hard work," and *ponein* "to do toilsome work", and Latin *labor* "strenuous activity". An especially drastic case is French *travailler*, from Late Latin *tripaliare* "to torture with a tripalium". It is attested from the Middle Ages in reflexive use: "I am torturing myself for this or that", which eventually led to the somewhat weaker meaning of "I am working".[1]

German *Arbeit* is originally the hard work which *orphans* (IE **orbho-*, Old Indian *árbhaḥ*, Greek *órphanos*, Germanic **arb-*) had to do; Gothic *arbaiþs* "affliction, distress", Old High German *arabeit(i)*.

A nice case that is pertinent is Coptic *hise* "labour, product of labour, weariness, suffering", verbal noun of *hise* "to toil, to be

[1] Old French *travailler* "to work hard," from Vulgar Latin **tripāliāre* "to torture with a tripalium," from Late Latin *tripālium*, an instrument of torture, probably from Latin **tripālis* "having three stakes": *tri-, tri-* + *pālus* "stake".

troubled; to be wearied, suffering; to trouble, to weary", from Old and Middle Egyptian *ḫzj* "to be week, feeble, humble, mean, vile".

Case no. 3: Cf. Modern Greek *hē douleiá* "work, occupation, business; matter"; *tó doúleuma* "work, treatment"; *hē doúleusis* "service"; all from Ancient Greek *ho doúlos* "slave"; cf. *hē douleía* "servitude, slavery"; *tó doúleuma* "service, attendance".

Slavic **robū* "menial, slave" > Polish, Czech *robota* "compulsory labour," Russian *rabota* "work, labour".

"To be sent" = "to work"

Derivation of the word for "work" from a lexeme "to send" can be explained as a concept of a vertically structured society where work is done on command or commission. "Having been sent" may be then a near-equivalent to "working". Traces of such an etymology have been mainly ascertained in Niger-Congo languages of Africa.[2] Those Chadic languages which also attest to it are said to be found in vicinity of Niger-Congo languages. In addition, the phenomenon in question has been detected in ancient Semitic languages, and in Egyptian.

Semitic:

Akkadian *š-p-r* (infinitive *šapāru*) "to send"; from this, the noun *šipru* (1) "mission, message; (2) "work, opus" is derived.[3]

Hebrew: both *malʾāk* "messenger, angel" as also *mələā(ʾ)kā* "work" (Yiddish *mələ́xe*) are derived from a Semitic verbal root *l-ʾ-k* "to send", although this is lacking in Hebrew; cf. Arabic *ʾalʾaka* (IV.) "send out as messenger", Geez *laʾaka*, Amharic *lakä* "to send".

On Egyptian and Coptic lexemes for "work":

1) *kꜣ.t* "work" is attested since the Old Kingdom. *kꜣ.t* "work" has no verbal counterpart, such as "to work". No plausible derivation in Egyptian: it is hardly derived from the verb *kꜣj* "to think, to plan", *cf. kꜣ.t* "thought, plan, device".

2) *bꜣk* "servant" is first attested in Old Kingdom texts; so is also the rare verb, *bꜣk* "to employ as servant, to enslave", obviously derived from the noun. The following are attested from the Middle Kingdom onwards: *bꜣk.t* "maidservant"; *bꜣk* "to work"; *bꜣkw* and *bꜣk.t* "work".

[2] See *op. cit.*

[3] See *op. cit.*

Probably, the verb *bꜣk* "to work" is the origin of all other words mentioned: active participles, or actor nouns, masc. *bꜣk* "servant" (Coptic *bōk*, from **bā́ꜣik*; plur. Bohairic *ebjā͡ik*, from **bVꜣū́kiw* or similar[4]); fem. *bꜣk.t* "female servant" (perhaps **bVꜣā́kat*; cf. *nūte* from **nā́ṯVr* "god", plur. *əntā͡ir*, *əntēr* from **nVṯū́riw*; fem. *əntōre* from **nVṯā́rat* "goddess"; *eiō* from **lā́ʿVꜣ* "donkey," fem. *eō*[5] from **lVʿā́ꜣat*); verbal nouns *bꜣkw* and *bꜣk.t* "service" (Copt. *bekḗ*, from **bVꜣkī́t*, "wage").

In Coptic, there are two verbs *bōk*: (1) "to go" (stative: *bēk*, used for the present tense system), attested in the Valley dialects, *i.e.* in all except Bohairic; (2) "to send, to put into, to add to", a rare use, mainly found in documents from Thebes. For the first verb, *bōk* "to go", a somewhat higher age may be deduced from the existence of a causative verb, (**tbko*), *tbke-* "to send", from an earlier *dj.t bꜣk.t* "to cause him to 'go'". It seems difficult to derive the intransitive verb, *bōk* "to go", from *bꜣk* "to serve": J. Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*, 359, lists it among the Coptic words for which no etymologies are given. Neither does W. Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, give any etymological data (but *cf. p.* 493). However, W. Vycichl, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*, 27 surmises, "Peut-être il y a un rapport [of *bōk* "to go; to send"] avec *bꜣk* 'employer quelqu'un comme serviteur' " and concludes somewhat reluctantly that the transitive use of *bōk* is the primitive one, the intransitive use being derived from it. For corroboration he refers to the composite lexemes *bak-matou* (from **bā́ꜣik-mí/ū́twat*) "sending, casting poison" and *bak-ōne* (from **bā́ꜣik-lā́nVr*) "stone-thrower" which obviously attest to a transitive meaning comparable to "to send."

In the light of the etymological relations of *sending* and *working*, both in Egyptian and in other languages, we may assume that "to go" has developed from "to be sent", or "to have been sent". Just as Vycichl has suggested, we have to proceed from the transitive (factitive) verb,

[4] For the diphthong *ā͡i*, going back to *ū* due to *umlaut* effect, cf. Satzinger, H.: „Koptische Vokalphoneme und ägyptische Pluralformation", *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit.* Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.–26. Juli 1996, Volume 2, 365–374.

[5] See Diethart, J. M., Satzinger, H., „Eine griechisch-koptische Wörterliste", *Festschrift zum 100-jährigen Bestehen der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, 1983, 206–213, in particular p. 213, n. 20.

"to employ as servant, to enslave", which is near-equivalent to "to send". The stative form of this transitive verb would then be passive, *bꜣkw* "he has been put to work, he has been sent", eventually "he is going". In some Pre-Coptic idiom, this was reinterpreted as the stative form of an intransitive verb *bōk*, "to go". An Upper Egyptian idiom (at Thebes, realm of the Akhmimic dialect) has, however, preserved the original *bōk* "to send", etc.

Hypothetical development: "to work," in factitive use or form, "to make work" > "to send", stative: "has been sent" > "is being sent" > "is going"; by analogy, infinitive "to go" (Nile Valley only).

3) *hꜣb* "to send" yields a Coptic noun *hōb* "work": *hꜣb* "to send" (Old and Middle Egyptian) > "to send a message", "to write a letter" (Late Egyptian); verbal noun *hꜣb* "letter, message", in Demotic also "matter" (*i.e.*, originally the subject of a message). In Coptic, the noun *hōb* means "matter", "thing", "event", "work"; with auxiliaries, only the latter meaning is operative: *r-hōb* "to do work"; *ti-hōb* "to give work, employment". Hence, the semantic development is "to send (a person or thing)" > "letter, message" (Late Egyptian) > "matter, subject" (Demotic) > "work" (Coptic).

4) There is yet another pertinent Coptic word, *viz. eiope* "craft, art, occupation". It goes back to Egyptian *wpw.t, ỉpw.t* (*w/jápwat) "message; business, mission." *wpwtj, ỉpwtj* "messenger" is a nisba derivation of the latter. Semantically, it may be compared with Akkadian *šipru* (1) "mission, message"; (2) "work, opus", for which see above.

Marginal Notes on "Working" in Egyptian

By GÁBOR TAKÁCS* (Székesfehérvár)

For Miss Erzsébet Tóth remembering 1991-92 in the Hungarian Oriental Library.

Introduction

The only aim of this minor contribution to Egyptian and Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) etymology is to shed new light on some lesser-examined aspects of three Eg. terms in the semantic domain "work" (bꜣk, kꜣ.t, w/jp.wt). Hopefully, the ideas put forward by H. Satzinger, complemented by the present ones, will give a more precise picture on the question on a few points.

I. The etymology Eg. bꜣk "to serve" (or "to work"?)

The standard sources equivocally render the primary (Old Kingdom) meaning of the Eg. verbal root bꜣk as (intr.) "Diener sein, dienstbar sein" (first in Dyn. V) and as (tr.) "dienstbar machen, versklaven" (first in Dyn. VI), which may have apparently been of a denominative sense, whence "arbeiten" (first attested in the First Intermediate Period) developed only secondarily.[1] The noun bꜣk "servant" has been simultaneously envisaged in the light of the Coptic reflexes[2] as

* I express my true thanks to the OTKA (Hungarian Scientific Research Fund, project no. D 45976) for supporting my research in 2003-4. This paper was presented at the 3rd Pannonia Symposium (Buda Castle, November 2004).

[1] Wb I 426-7: "1. (OK) dienstbar machen, versklaven, 2. (MK) arbeiten, zinsen"; ÄWb I 411: (OK-1st IMP) "1. (1× 1st IMP) arbeiten (bes. körperlich schwere Arbeit), 2. (1× Dyn. V) dienstbar sein, Diener sein, 3. (1× Dyn. VI) dienstbar machen, versklaven".

[2] (BF) ϐⲱⲕ "Diener, Sklave", fem. (B) ϐⲱⲕⲓ, pl. (B) ⲉϐⲓⲁⲕ.

a deverbal participle both by J. Osing (NBÄ 213)[3] and by W. Vycichl (1955, 267; DELC 27).[4] These two assumptions are naturally in mutual contradiction. It is clear that either the verb bꜣk was denominal from bꜣk "servant" or *vice versa*.

Which scenario was the correct one cannot be decided in the light of the external etymologies either due to the far too wide range of solutions (fitting either of the mentioned scenarios). At the moment, we cannot do anything but list these alternatives for further analysis:

(1) Eg. bꜣk "slave" (original nominal stem) as *Wanderwort*? A number of authors[5] suggested its relationship to the designation of "slave" in the Chadic languages, cf. WCh.: South Bauchi *ḃiyak [Stl.][6] || CCh.: PMatakam *beke [GT][7] | Mandara baka [Rn. 1873, 8, fn. 2] | PMusgu bege (m), bagay (f) [GT][8] | PMasa *bʸek [GT][9]. The problem

[3] Who explained it through his passive participle pattern *sa̓ḍam.

[4] NBÄ 213: passive participle *bâꜣ(a)k, fem. *b(a)ꜣâk.at. Vycichl (ll.c.) reconstructed masc. *baꜣīk > *bâik > *bâk, fem. *baꜣāk.at, pl. *baꜣīkū > *bayīkū. As for the pattern of the masc., Vycichl (1955, 267) did not deal with the sense of this formation, he only noted the following: "*ich nehme eine Nominalform *qatīl für die m. Formen an ... Vielleicht wird man eine Wortform bâꜣīk, nâčīr als 'unägyptisch' empfinden*". The Sem. pattern *ḳaṭīl expressed in fact (1) adjectival sense (common in Sem.), (2) passive participles and adjectives (esp. Syriac, sporadically in Ar.), (3) *nomina actionis*, cf. Moscati et al. 1964, 78, §12.8.d; Grande 1972, 254-5.

[5] See Rn. 1873, 8, fn. 2; OS 1989, 132; 1992, 185; HSED #273; Orel 1995, 152, #2; Takács 1999, 107, #30; 1999, 348.

[6] Cf. Boghom (Burma) ḃiyak [Krf.], Buli ḃiyak [Stl.] = ḃi (sic) [Krf.], Polchi ḃiyə̀k [Krf.], Mangas ḃə̀ḃyə̀k [Csp.], Kir ḃiyak [Csp.] (SBauchi: Kraft 1981, #92; Stl. 1987, 261; Csp. 1994, 66).

[7] Cf. Gisiga bekẽ [Str. 1922-23, 119] = beke [Lks. 1970, 118] = békè [Rsg.], Muturwa beke [Str. 1910, 455], Mofu bèké [Rsg.], Mofu-Gudur bɛ́kɛ̀ [Brt. 1977, 22] = ʼbeke [Brt. 1988, 82], Moloko bèké [Rsg.] (Matakam group: Rsg. 1978, 328, #654).

[8] Cf. Musgu bege̱ (m), bágai (f) [Krause in Müller 1886, 393] = beggé (m) [Overweg] = bege (m), baɣaï (f) [Barth] = bége (m) [Rohlfs] = bege (m), bágai (f) [Decorse] "Sklave, Gefangener" [Lks. 1941, 46-7], Girvidik bakay (f) "Sklavin" [MB 1972-73, 69], Puss bege (m), bagay (f) "slave" [Trn. 1991, 76].

is, however, that the Chadic term itself is also considered to be a foreign loanword from a non-Afro-Asiatic source (cf. Rsg. 1978, 328, #654; Brt. 1988, 82).

(2) A. Ember (1930, #3.b.49) surmised Eg. bꜣk "to work" to have primarily denoted "to kneel down to work", being related to Hbr. brk "to kneel down", Ar. baraka "to kneel, sit down, apply oneself", III & VIII "to apply oneself diligently to some work". The denominative origin of the Sem. verbs (< common Sem. *bi/ark- "knee", cf. SED 1, 36-7, #39), however, makes this far-fetched equation improbable, let alone that the same denominal derivation process cannot be "exported" also into Eg., since its word for "knee" was mꜣs.t, while no trace of *bꜣk "knee" can be pointed out.

(3) The Russian linguists (SISAJa I, #128) explained Eg. bꜣk "slave" from an original sense *"digger, navvy (землекоп)", which they identified with Sem. *birk-at- "lake, cistern" ||| Brb. *b-r-k "to dig". Semantically possible, since there are a number of typological parallels for "to work" ~ "to dig" in Afro-Asiatic[10]. There was, however, no Eg. *bꜣk "to dig".

(4) In my opinion, a cognateship between Eg. bꜣk [< *bʔk] vs. CCh.: Glavda baga "arbeiten" & Glavda-Cena ḃágá [*ḃaka < *b-ʔ-k?] "arbeiten" [Wolff 1974-75, 205] should be also accounted for[11]. Note that, according to the traditional conception of Eg. historical consonantism, Eg. ꜣ < AA *ʔ was plausible (Edel 1955, 58, §131; Osing

[9] Reflected by Lame bʸèk "slave" [Scn. 1978, 199] = bèk "esclave, devenaient esclaves les captifs de guerre" [Scn. 1982, 278], Lame-Peve byek [OS], Zime-Dari pìèk "esclave" [Cooper 1984, 21].

[10] Cf. (1) OSA: Sabaic bʔl "1. to work, 2. excavate (bedrock)" [SD 26]. (2) WCh.: Angas bǎrǎng "1. to dig, 2. work, 3. trouble, tiredness" [Flk. 1915, 147], Kofyar ḃàlàng (so, with -l-) "work" [Ntg. 1967, 2]. (3) MHbr. plḥ "1. eig. spalten, einschneiden, 2. daher pflügen, Furchen ziehen, 3. übertr. bedienen" & Aram. plḥ "1. furchen, den Acker bebauen, 2. arbeiten, bedienen" [Levy 1924 IV,48] vs. Ar. flḥ "Boden bearbeiten" [AHW] = "1. (en gén.) couper, fendre, 2. (en surtout) fendre le sol, labourer la terre" [BK II 628] (Sem.: AHW 812).

[11] Voicing of intervocalic *-k-? It remains subject to further research whether there can be any connection to Ar. (Yemeni) byk II "to engage a workman", bāyik "engaged as workman" [Piamenta 1990, 47].

1997; EDE I 67-78, cf. also Ember 1930, 6-9; Calice 1936, 233, §11; Vergote 1945, 108, §1.a).

II. Coptic (S) ϩⲱⲕ "to go"

Aside from two problematic late lexical survivals of Eg. bꜣk, which we cannot discuss here in detail[12], there is a supposed third one already mentioned by H. Satzinger in the preceding section: this is Cpt. (S) ϩⲱⲕ "to go", whose origin is equally enigmatic, since it has no hieroglyphic attestation.

What we can draw from the vocalization of its Cpt. infinitive in the first step as to the consonantal sequence of its hypothetic OEg. etymon is also not too much and helpful, since $C_1ωC_2$ can reflect four diverse types of OEg. root patterns: (1) $C_1ωC_2$ < birad. OEg. C_1C_2[13]; (2) $C_1ωC_2$< IIIae inf. OEg. C_1C_2j[14]; (3) $C_1ωC_2$ < OEg. $C_1ꜣC_2$[15]; (4) $C_1ωC_2$ < OEg. $C_1C_2ꜣ$[16]. It means that – in principle – Cpt. (S) ϩⲱⲕ "to go" can derive either from OEg. *bk, *bkj, *bꜣk or *bkꜣ.

W. Vycichl (DELC 27), followed recently by C. Peust (2003, 349), considered the Coptic verb as a special "*semantische Fortentwicklung*" of Eg. bꜣk "arbeiten", for which Peust believes to have found even an older trace in Pap. Westcar 12:14, cf. jrj-ṯ r ṯnw jdj.t šrj.t "*wohin 'machst' (d. h. gehst) du, kleines Mädchen?*", which then he compared to the German dialectal idiom "(nach einen Ort) machen" ≈ "gehen". There are, however, two fundamental problems with this reasoning. First, the idiom of the Eg. passage in question may well be explained by an elliptic wꜣ.t (i.e., *jrj-ṯ wꜣ.t-ṯ r ṯnw "where do you make your way?"), which, moreover, works out well with jrj (cf. jrj wꜣ.t r "einen Weg gehen nach ...", Wb I 247, 10), but cannot be the case with bꜣk, which is not at all a replacable equivalent of jrj. Secondly, the basic sense of bꜣk had nothing to do with "to make" in general, therefore the reference to the German idiom and the like is simply irrelevant.

---

[12] (1) According to the Belegstellen to Wb I 416, 3, GR bꜣ "Abgaben" occurs 4 times (!) without the final -k (Edfu I 232, 288, 488, Mariette: Dendera I 61a; it is not listed either in PL 304 or in Cauville 1997, 149). It is henceforth rather enigmatic how it relates to old bꜣk.w "Steuer, Abgabe" (Wb I 428) and whether it has eventually anything to do with PCh. *b-r "to give" [JI 1994 I 76, cf. Nwm. 1977, 27, #57] or we are dealing with a chance similarity (as it now seems to be the case in all likelihood). (2) The other derivative of our root is Eg. bꜣk.t "Steuer der Ägypter, Abgaben, Tribute der fremden Völker" (MK, Wb I 428-9), which – in L. Reinisch' view – was borrowed Nub. bakt "Lieferung von Sklaven, wozu die Nubier vom Jahre 20 der Hedschra an gezwungen wurden" (Reinisch 1873, 8, fn. 2; 1879, 17). Recently, A. Zaborski (1986, 403, #1.1) extended this cultural loan also to Ar. baqt- "mutual obligation of the exchange of goods by two states" [Zbr.] (the term used for the Arabic-Nubian treaty of 652 AD, not in Class. Ar., Zaborski, p.c. on 15 Nov. 2004, cf. also Török 1977, 165-6) with an "etymological pre-Arabic" meaning "tribute", rejecting the view of modern historiography explaining it from Gk. πάκτον & Lat. pactum (perhaps Eg. bꜣk.t > Nub. bakt > Ar. baqt- via). The older view on a Greco-Latin origin, however, still holds its positions.

[13] E.g. (SABF) ϩⲱⲧ "bauen, töpfern" < OEg. qd (KHW 71); (SAF) ⲡⲱⲧ "laufen, gehen, fliehen, verlassen" < pd, hardly *pꜣd as in KHW 154; (SAF) ⲡⲱϩ "gelangen, erreichen, vollenden" < OEg. pḥ (KHW 157); (SAB) ⲣⲱⲧ "wachsen, sprießen" < OEg. rd (KHW 168); (S) ⲧⲱⲓ"schärfen, scharf sein" < OEg. dm (KHW 232); (SBF) ⲟⲩⲱⲓ"öffnen" < OEg. wn (KHW 273); (SABF) ϫⲱⲓ "anordnen, befehlen usw." < OEg. ḥn (KHW 378).

[14] E.g. (SB) ϫⲱϫ "singen, musizieren" < OEg. ḥsj (KHW 392); (SABF) ϫⲱⲟⲩ "regnen" < OEg. ḥwj (KHW 404).

[15] E.g. (SABF) ϩⲱϩ "falten, verdoppeln" < OEg. qꜣb (KHW 57); (SF) ϩⲱⲡ, (B) ϫⲱⲡ "verbergen" < OEg. kꜣp (KHW 66); (O) ϩⲱⲡ "räuchern" < OEg. kꜣp (KHW 66); (SABF) ⲥⲱϩ "ziehen usw." (?) < OEg. sꜣq (KHW 181) contra DELC 186 (< *skꜣ ~ sṯꜣ!); (SF) ⲧⲱϣ "begrenzen, festsetzen usw." < OEg. tꜣš "abgrenzen, teilen" (KHW 255); (SF) ⲧⲱⲣ, (B) ϯⲱⲣ "trüben" < OEg. tꜣḥ "trüben" (CED 203; KHW 257; DELC 226); (SB) ⲟⲩⲱⲧ "frisch, roh, grün sein" < OEg. wꜣḏ (KHW 279); (SABF) ⲟⲩⲱϩ "legen usw." < OEg. wꜣḥ (KHW 284); (SB) ϩⲱϩ"senden" < OEg. hꜣb (KHW 354); (SABF) ϩⲱⲡ "verbergen" < OEg. ḥꜣp (KHW 382); (S) ϭⲱⲟⲩ "eng sein usw." < OEg. gꜣw (KHW 470).

[16] E.g. (SF) ⲡⲱϩ, (A) ⲡⲱϩ, (B) ⲫⲱϧ "brechen, spalten, teilen" < OEg. pḥꜣ (KHW 156-7); (SA) ⲥⲱⲧ "ausstrecken, spannen, spinnen" < OEg. sṯꜣ (KHW 200); (SF) ⲧⲱϫ "anzünden, heizen, backen" (KHW 227) < Eg. tkꜣ "verbrennen" (XVIII., Wb V 332) = tkꜣ "to illumine, brighten, be hot (?)" (CT, DCT 742); (SBF) ⲟⲩⲱϣ, (A) ⲟⲩⲱϩ "wünschen, lieben, suchen" < OEg. wḫꜣ "suchen" (KHW 281; CED 220).

For me, however, most tempting appears the etymology proposed by W. Vycichl (1964, 228) in an earlier period of his research. This is Ar. (Yemeni dial. at Tihama) bwk: bāk (pf.), yibūk (impf.) "andare" [Rossi 1939, 192] = bāk (pf.), yibūk (impf.) "to go" [Piamenta 1990, 44] = (Yemeni Ar.) bwk: abūk "ich gehe", bukk ~ būk "laufe!" [Behnstedt 1993, 35], which has no Sem. background (cf. DRS 51)[17]. Strangely, I have so far failed to find any further semantically fitting cognate within the whole Afro-Asiatic phylum, which indicates a probable secondary meaning of the Yemeni Ar. vs. Coptic isogloss. Vycichl explained the meaning "to go" from the basic sense "to want", cf. AA *b-(w)-k "to want" [GT][18] (attested in Berber and Chadic), although he emphasized his strong reservations (Vycichl: "... *doch scheint mir diese Ableitung für das nicht-arabische Gebiet etwas an den Haaren herbeigezogen*"). Nevertheless, this tempting idea can be accepted in principle, since there are convincing parallels for the semantic shift "to want" ~ "to go"[19]. If this hypothesis proves correct, we would have to assume an

[17] Note that JPAram. *bāk (√bwk) "courir çà et là, être agité" [DRS] cannot be regarded as such (the basic sense of the underlying Sem. root being fully different). P. Behnstedt (1993, 35) assumed in the unique Yemeni Ar. bwk a metathesis of *wabaka "schreiten", which is equally unattested (DRS 485). There is only Class. and Modern Ar. wakaba "langsam gehen, vorrücken" [Zbr.] = "to walk, go, march along, in a leisurely manner, proceed at a quick pace" [Lane 2962] = "avancer par degrés, lentement" [BK II 1594]. The absence of any further Sem. comparanda has been confirmed for me also by Prof. A. Zaborski (p.c., 17th Jan. 2005).

[18] Reflected in EBrb.: Ghadames būk (only praet.) "1. avoir l'intention de ..., 2. consentir" [Lanfry 1973, 8, #49] || SBrb.: Ahaggar u-bak "wollen" [Vcl.] = e-buk "wollen, wünschen" [Hanoteau apud Lippert] = u-bak "1. avoir l'intention, 2. p.ext. être sur le point de, 3. vouloir", te-buk "intention" [Fed. 1951-2, 45], Tawllemmet i-boki "er will" [Wlf.], ETawllemmet u-bak & Ayr i-bak "1. avoir l'intention de, 2. vouloir faire (qqch.), 3. être sur le point de" [PAM 1998, 7] || Guanche: Gran Canaria vaka "quiero" [Wlf.] (Brb.: DRB 1, 46) ||| WCh.: Hausa buki "Wunsch, Sehnsucht" [Lippert] = bìkíí ~ bùkíí "needing" [Abr. 1962, 99, 116] | Daffo-Butura fuk [fu- < *b^{w}- reg.] "wollen" [Jng. 1970, 214] = Butura fuk "to want" [Magwa etc. 1985, 9]. Lit.: Lippert 1906, 343, #7 (SBrb.-Hs.); Wlf. 1955, 116 (SBrb.-Gne.-Hs.); EEWC (Eg.-AA).

[19] Modern Ar. fēn qāṣid "wohin willst du?", act. "wohin gehst du?" [Vcl.], cf. also EBrb.: Ghadames ə-ḇr "1. vouloir, désirer, tenter, essayer de, 2. avoir

OEg. biradical root *bk (with an original medial *-w/j- which usually disappeared in hieroglyphic Eg.[20]), which, coming from the deep layers of the *Volkssprache*, first manifested itself only in Coptic. Thus, it may well turn out that Cpt. (S) ϩⲱⲕ was unrelated to OEg. bꜣk "dienstbar sein/machen".

III. Eg. kꜣ.t "Arbeit, Werk" (OK, Wb V 98-101)

It seems to be an ancient nominal root in Egyptian. The underlying verbal root (if any) cannot be pointed out on Eg. grounds. In this respect, W. Westendorf's (1980, 99-101) attempt has failed, I am afraid. He suggested an inner Egyptian derivation from *kꜣ(j) "heben, tragen" which he surmises to be attested in Ptol. kꜣwt (so!) "tragen, hochheben" (Wb V 103) = kꜣwt (so!) "1. (tr.) to carry, support, raise (the sky), hold up (offering gifts), wear (a crown), 2. (intr.) be laden" (Edfu, PL 1080-1), which was, however, clearly a product of a reverse process, namely a late denominative verb derived from OEg. kꜣ.t "work" (as rightly assumed already by P. Wilson too in PL l.c.: "*The verb derives from the noun kꜣ.t* ..."), which is testified to also by the strange *Auslaut* -t inherited from the fem. ending of the noun kꜣ.t fossilized as part of the verbal root. Searching for further possible cognates of Eg. kꜣ.t, Westendorf did not hesitate to find links to a number of semantically most diverse Eg. lexemes, which seem to me, however, etymologically unrelated, namely (1) kꜣj "denken, beabsichtigen" (OK, Wb V 8ꜣ), actually *"geistige Arbeit" (!) according to Westendorf[21], (2) kꜣ "Geist als Teil der menschlichen Persönlichkeit:

l'intention de ..., 4. *aller*, 5. être sur le point de, être décidé à, assuré de, devoir" [Lanfry 1973, 24-5, #96]. Or cf. the reverse semantic process in Eng. to be going to.

[20] Cf., e.g., Eg. mt "to die" < AA *mwt, Eg. nk "to copulate" < *njk, cf. (S) ⲛⲟ(ⲉ)ⲓⲕ vs. Sem. *nyk.

[21] Hardly so. Note that this verb was usually written alphabetically, not with a kꜣ sign (D 28). Cf. instead MSA: Jibbali kwl, impf. ykōl "to think" [Jns. 1981, 138], cognate probably with Ar. kwl: pf. kāla "measurer" [BK II 949]. For the semantic connection see e.g. (1) ECu.: Burji makk- "to measure" [Sasse 1982, 139] vs. Afar makk-it- (med.) "to figure out, reason" [Hayward] ||| NOm.: Benesho mak "to say, mean, think" [Wdk. 1990, 107]; (2) or the well-known match of Eg. ḥsb "(be)rechnen" (PT, Wb III 166-7) ||| Hbr. ḥšb qal "to

sogenannter Ka, auch: Kraft, Eigenschaft" (PT, Wb V 86-89), whose *Grundbedeutung* was "Hebekraft" in Westendorf's opinion[22], (3) *k (attested only as hieroglyph) "Art Korb" (Wb V 83, 1) = "wickerwork basket with handle" (EG 1927, 510, no. V 31) = "Arbeitskorb (*symbolisches Ideogramm* von kꜣ.t 'Arbeit')" (Kaplony in CdE 41, 1966, 66, 87, n. 30) = "Trage(korb)" (Westendorf: < *kꜣj/w!)[23]. Etc.

This question can be decided, in my view, only in the light of external etymologies of which most attractive seems (1) the relationship

assume, plan, devise, invent", nif. "to be reckoned, be regarded as, count", pi. "1. to compute, 2. think of, 3. plan, devise" [KB 360] || Ar. ḥasaba I "compter", ḥasiba I "croire, penser, imaginer" [BK I 423].

[22] Debatable. There have been proposed a few other convincing etymologies which vary according to the different aspects of the Eg. term kꜣ. Thus, (1) if we take into account that "*der Ka ist Träger der Gefühle, des Willens u. dgl.*" (Wb V 87, 9), we may surmise an etymological connection with Eg. kꜣj "denken, beabsichtigen" (OK, Wb). (2) A. Ember (1917, 90, #146) and J. Vergote (1945, #1.d.26) emphasized its protective nature (Ember: "protective genius, double", Vergote: "Schutzgeist") and combined it with Ar. kalaʔa "to keep any one safe, guard, protect (of God)", kallāʔ-at- "safe-keeping, protection" [Ember] = kalaʔa "veiller sur qqn. et le préserver du mal (se dit, p. ex., de Dieu)" [BK II 919]. Note that Eg. 3 < AA *l – *r was plausible. (3) C. T. Hodge (1966, 47) and N. Skinner (1992, 354; 1995, 34), in turn, suggested WCh.: Hausa kùrwáá "the soul or personality which is supposed to leave a sleeper, returning when he awakes" [Brg. 1934, 656] = "soul" [Abr. 1962, 567] as a plausible cognate, whose native Chadic background has, however, still to be proven (note that a foreign origin from Kanuri is possible). (4) Or perhaps related to LECu.: Rendille kál "self, human ego", used only in phrases with ḍarán "weak, lazy", e.g. kálé ḍarányahe "he is weak in his human ego", i.e. "he is selfish" [PG 1999, 177]?

[23] Debatable. C. T. Hodge (1966, 52, #99; 1971, 42) associated the value k of the sign with the Sura (WCh.) prefix kà- "referring to things woven of reeds or the like, such as baskets" and (on the basis of acrophony) the initial k- of Ug. kpr-t ~ kpr "a basket woven of palm-fiber covered with bitumen or pitch" [Hillers, BASOR 173, 1964, 48; existence highly doubtful: not found in WUS; significantly reinterpreted in DUL 452-3!], Syr. kāpartā "a pitched basket" [Hodge] = kapurtā [Lsl.], Geez kafar "basket, container for measuring, bushel" (cf. Tna. kāfār "big basket") [Lsl. 1987, 276-7].

to Common Berber *a-kli, pl. *i-kl-an (indicating an ult. inf. etymon, perhaps *k-l-y) "slave" [Zhl. 1931-2, 3] ||| CCh.: Kotoko *kVlV "duty, service" [GT contra Prh. 1972, 19, #5.11], which may perhaps ultimately derive from a common AA *k-l-(y?) "to serve, have duty" (or sim.) [GT]. Other solutions are either less convincing (2-4) or false (5). Thus, cf. (2) Ar. kll II "2. faire des efforts, agir avec zèle et empressement dans qqch." [BK II 918] or (3) perhaps Ar. kalla I "1. être fatigué, las, et n'en pouvoir plus à force de ..." [BK II 918] (in the preceding article, H. Satzinger has demonstrated the semantic shift "to get tired, exhaust oneself" → "to work"). (4) C. T. Hodge (1978 MS, 2, #24; 1981, 234; 1981, 371), in turn, put apparently the emphasis on the determinative of Eg. kꜣ.t depicting a "man steadying a basket" (EG 1927, 436, A 9) when he assumed a connection to Akk. karāru "setzen, stellen, legen" [AHW 447] ||| LECu.: Somali kár-ayya ~ karáynayya "is able to do" [Abr. 1964, 148] ||| Ch. *karə "to carry" [Nwm. 1977, 24, #24] = *k-r- "to load" [NM 1966, 237], cf. perhaps also Brb. *skər "to do" [Mlt. 1987, 104, §8]. Finally, (5) F. Behnk (1928, 140, §58) identified Eg. kꜣ.t with WCh.: Hausa aiki "Arbeit" [Behnk] = "deed, act" [Abr. 1962, 11], which is phonologically false.

IV. Cpt. (S) ⲉⲓⲟⲛⲉ "work"

The etymology of the synonymous Cpt. (S) ⲉⲓⲟⲛⲉ, ⲓⲟⲛⲉ, (AA_2) ⲓⲁⲛⲉ, (B) ⲓⲟⲛⲏ, ⲓⲉⲃ, ⲓⲏⲃ, (OF) ⲓⲁⲛⲓ, (OB) ⲓⲟⲛⲓ etc. (f) "Arbeit, Handwerk, Beruf, Beschäftigung, Kunst(fertigkeit)" (KHW 50) = "craft, art, occupation" (CD 81) is also not void of dubiosity. It is well-known that it derives via Dem. wp.t "die Arbeit, Werk" (DG 86) = ip.t (Vycichl) (mostly only "horn" hrgl.) from OEg. jp.wt (or wp.wt?) "Botschaft, Meldung, Auftrag" (PT, Wb I 303-4) = "message, mission, task" (FD 60).

The correct reading, the underlying Eg. verbal root (if any), and the ultimate Afro-Asiatic etymon of Eg. wp.wt or jp.wt are, however all dubious. The most serious difficulty is represented by the contrast of the Coptic ⲉⲓ- < *j- vs. the supposed initial OEg. w-. Similarly, its nisbe, Eg. wpw.t.j (or jpw.t.j?) "messenger, envoy", as it is reflected in the cuneiform Amarna letters (14th cent. BC), seems to display the trace of w- provided we assume a weakening process *wa- > *u- (which, however, would have still to be proven), cf. EA 151:20 ú-pu-ti (gen. sg.

st. cstr.) vs. EA 152:56 ú-pu-ut (acc. sg. st. cstr.) [Knudtzon 1915, 1540]. This hypothetic NK *u- can be contrasted with the LEg. form (with *ja- in the *Anlaut*?) borrowed into Meroitic apête "Botschaft(er)" [Griffith] = apote qori-s "the king's envoy" [Török 1979, 45] = *APOV [Meeks 1973, 19], which shows just the opposite, i.e., the absence of w-.

In order to resolve this controversy, the authors elaborated diverse hypothetic chains of phonetic shifts. Thus, W. F. Albright (1946, 24, cf. also JEA 23, 1937, 196, n. 5) proposed OEg. *wápuwat → *wáp(u)we → *yápwe → Cpt. *yópe, while OEg. *wapúwatey → *wapúwtV̄j → *japúwtV̄j → *ewpúwtey → NK *upūti. J. Osing (NBÄ 70, 318, 532-533, n. 342), in turn, assumed OK *wāpw.(u)t "Botschaft" vs. *w(a)pwūtV̄j "Bote" → early (OK) dissim. of w...w into j...w, whereby the sg. of nomen agentis *japwūtV̄j < *wapwūtV̄j, while its pl.: *jawpūtj.V̄w < *japwūtj.V̄w (via metathesis). Note that Osing (NBÄ l.c.) mistakenly took EA 151:20 ú-pu-ti for pl. because of the -i, which is in fact the Akk. gen. ending in st. cstr. attached to the Eg. stem (attadin pānija ana miruti ú-pu-ti šarri). There is, however, also a third view on the question, which seems at the moment more convincing than the hazardous game with nowhere attested vocalized forms, in which one either believes or not, since they do not harmonize too well with the attested linguistic facts. It was W. Vycichl (cf. DELC 65) who rightly called the attention to the OK forms jpw.tj in which j- was written phonetically, while "*en revanche, aucune graphie à w initial ne figure dans le Wörterbuch*". Therefore, Vycichl firmly sided with an OEg. etymon containing an initial j- (i-): *yapya.t.

As noted by Vycichl (above), the supposed initial w- of the supposed OEg. *wp.wt(j) does never appear alphabetically as complement in the *Anlaut* – contrary to Eg. wpj "to open", in which the w- is well-attested, and whence the value wp of the "horn" sign (F 13) has been derived. At the same time, in the Pyramid Texts, an Anlaut j- was sometimes phonetically complemented in the occurences of jp.wt "message" (N 709 + 33) and jp.w.tj "messenger" (PT 920a:N & 1440c:M). This j- appears rarely also in Late Eg., cf. jp.wt (LRL 10, 6)[24]. In addition, the

[24] I thank to H. Satzinger for drawing my attention to this place. Note the rare Dem. wpw.tj occurs only once (according to DG 85) with alphabetic w-, which

Ptolemaic word jp.wtj.w "envoys" (pl.) systematically appears with a complement j- in the Edfu texts (PL 225-6). Given this ambiguity, most standard lexicographical works side with (or, at least, refer to) the actual reading ipw.t even if some of them list it under wp- due to some sort of convention[25]. In the light of these facts, it can be understood why we accept the bivalent value (jp or ip vs. wp) of the "horns" sign, which was suggested already by E. Edel (AÄG §144), W. Vycichl (DELC 65), and C. Peust (1999, 139, §3.13.4). The same problem is present also in the double phonetic value of the N 11 sign depicting a crescent moon (w^{c}ḥ ~ j^{c}ḥ).

Now, when it comes to searching for the underlying OEg. verb, we find that we are facing similar ambiguities as with Eg. kꜣ.t. Following his *Wurzelprinzip* (a far-fetched adherence to an inner Eg. deverbal origin of Eg. nomina), J. Osing (NBÄ l.c., cf. esp. p. 532) tried to explain OEg. jp.wt ultimately from OEg. wpj "to open" (!), which is both phonologically and semantically problematic. The fact that wpj "to open" is the only verbal root with this consonantal skeleton in OEg., does not make it obligatory to see an etymological connection between the two. First, if we assume the reading jp.wt, there remains little basis for deriving it from wpj. Secondly, the basic sense of OEg. wpj was "trennen, öffnen" (OK, Wb I 298), while the "mediatory" meaning "bestimmen, feststellen" of wpj, which is not even once attested in the OK (ÄWb I 332-3; cf. ÜKAPT VI 110-1) or the CT (DCT 91), occurs according to the Wb *Belegstellen* in fact only four times (!) in texts later than the Second Intermediate Period[26]. Thirdly, it should be also pointed out that in the Old Kingdom and the Coffin Texts, the words jp.wt and jp.wt.j.w have no Z 9 determinative ("two sticks crossed"), which is so typical of Eg. wpj "to open" and its derivatives in all periods. This is also quite revealing. All these facts seem to indicate the unrelatedness of OEg. jp.wt vs. wpj and the absence of the underlying verbal root in Eg.

was presumably influenced by wpj "trennen" (regularly written with initial alphabetic w-).

[25] Thus, EG 1927, 454, F13: "perhaps rather ip.t"; AÄG §144: jpw.t "Botschaft"; FD 60: wpw.tj < older ipw.tj; KHW 50: ipw/j.t; DELC 65: ipw/j.t; GHWb 192; ÄWb I 334-5: jpw.t (so!) listed after wpw.t (!).

[26] Pap. Berl. 6619, rto 4; Urk. IV 339; Edfu (Piehl Inscr. II 89); Kanopus 35,22.

It seems that the inner Eg. evidence cannot yield us the clue to revealing the origin of our Eg.-Cpt. synonym for "work" in this case either. Given this circumstance, the importance of external etymology again increases. Thus, (1) W. Leslau (1962, 45, §7) proposed to identify Eg. jp.wt with Ar. wfy: wafā III "6. remplir, accomplir" [BK II 1578] || Geez wfy: ʔawaffaya "to receive, grant, transmit, consign, hand over, deliver, transfer" [Lsl. 1987, 607] = fwy: ʔafwäyä [Lsl. 1962]. But the basic sense of the Sem. root(s?) might have been different, cf. Syr. ʔawpī "to bring to an end, achieve" [Lsl.], Ar. wfy I "5. être abondant, complet et plus que suffisant" [BK]. (2) In my view (EDE I 88), the inner Eg. circumstances considered above can only lead to the assumption that the correct etymon of OEg. jp.wt must have been *jp "to send on an errand (or sim.)". We know from a number of instances that OEg. j- was a palatalization of *l- > j- (as e.g. in Eg. jb < AA *l-b "heart"). This is how also our root can be explained from the common Afro-Asiatic heritage, cf. WCh.: Angas-Sura *lep ~ *lap ~ *lop "to send" [GT 2004, 228]: esp. Angas go-lup "messenger" (go "person") [Ormsby 1914, 313] = lèp "message", ngo lèp "messenger" [ALC 1978, 32-33, 44], Mupun lèp "message" [Frj. 1991, 33], Mushere lop "1. to send, 2. message", pih lop "to give message", ngu-lop "messenger" (ngu- "person") [Dkl. 1997 MS, 145]. There are no convincing Semitic parallels as yet. It is to be answered by a competent Semitist whether Ar. lafaʔa I "4. éloigner, écarter, repousser qqn." [BK II 1009] = "to turn s'one back, away (from his purpose)" [Lane 2665] = "vertreiben, hinwegfegen, to drive away, sweep a thing away" [WKAS II 959-960] might be taken from a basic sense "to send away".

*

Abbreviations of languages

(A): Ahmimic, AA: Afro-Asiatic, Akk.: Akkadian, Ar.: Arabic, Aram.: Aramaic, (B): Bohairic, BD: Book of the Dead, Brb.: Berber, C: Central, Ch.: Chadic, CT: Coffin Texts, Cu.: Cushitic, E: East(ern), Eg.: Egyptian, ES: Ethio-Semitic, (F) Fayyumic, GR: Greek and Roman period, Hbr.: Hebrew, IMP: Intermediate Period, Jbl.: Jibbali, M: Middle, Mag.: Magical Texts, Med.: Medical Texts, Mer.: Meroitic, MK: Middle Kingdom, MSA: Modern South Arabian, N: North(ern), NE(g.): New Egyptian, NK: New Kingdom, (O): Old Coptic, OK: Old Kingdom, Om.: Omotic, OSA: Old South Arabian, PT: Pyramid Texts, S: South(ern), (S): Sahidic, Sab.: Sabaean, Sem.: Semitic, Ug.: Ugaritic, W: West(ern), XVIII.: 18th Dynasty.

Abbreviations of author names

Abr.: Abraham, Alb.: Albright, BK: Biberstein & Kazimirsky, Brg.: Bargery, Brt.: Barreteau, Clc.: Calice, Csp.: Cosper, Dkl.: Diyakal, Fcd.: Foucauld, Flk.: Foulkes, Frj.: Frajzyngier, GT: Takács, JI: Jungraithmayr & Ibriszimow, Jng.: Jungraithmayr, Jns.: Johnstone, Krf.: Kraft, Lks.: Lukas, Lnf.: Lanfry, Lsl.: Leslau, MB: Meyer-Bahlburg, Mlt.: Militarev, Msc.: Moscati, NM: Newman & Ma, Ntg.: Netting, Nwm.: Newman, OS: Orel & Stolbova, PAM: Prasse & Alojaly & Mohamed, PL: Pillinger & Galboran, Prh.: Porhomovskij, Rn.: Reinisch, Rsg.: Rossing, Scn.: Sachnine, Skn.: Skinner, Ss.: Sasse, Stl.: Stolbova, Str.: Strümpell, Trn.: Tourneux, Vcl.: Vycichl, Vrg.: Vergote, Wdk.: Wedekind, Wlf.: Wölfel, Zbr.: Zaborski, Zhl.: Zyhlarz.

References

AÄG = Edel, E.: *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Abraham, R. C.: *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*.[2] London, 1962., University of London Press.

Abraham, R. C.: *Somali-English Dictionary*.[2] London, 1964., University of London Press Ltd.

AHW = Soden, W. von: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. I-III. Wiesbaden, 1965-1981., Otto Harrassowitz.

Albright, W. F.: Review of Vergote, J.: *Phonétique historique de l'égyptien. Les consonnes.*= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66/4 (1946), 316-320.

ALC 1978 = Angas Language Committee (in Cooperation with Nigeria Bible Translation Trust): *Shəìk nkarŋ kè shəktok mwa nḍən Ngas. Ngas–Hausa–English Dictionary with Appendix* Showing Some Features of Ngas Grammar. Jos, Nigeria, 1978., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.

ÄWb I = Hannig, R.: *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I. Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit*. Hannig-Lexica 4. Mainz am Rhein, 2003., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Bargery, G. P.: *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary Compiled for the Government of Nigeria.* London, 1934., Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.

Barreteau, D.: „Le mofu-gudur, langue tchadique du Nord-Cameroun." = *Africana Marburgensia* 10/1 (1977), 3-33.

Barreteau, D.: *Description d mofu-gudur. Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun.* Livre II. Lexique. Paris, 1988., Éditions de l'ORSTOM.

BASOR = *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research.*

Behnk, F.: „Über die Beziehungen des Ägyptischen zu den hamitischen Sprachen." = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 82 (1928), 136-141.

Behnstedt, P.: *Glossar der jemenitischen Dialektwörter in Eduard Glasers Tagebüchern* (II, III, VI, VII, VIII, X). Wien, 1993., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Biberstein Kazimirski, A. de: *Dictionnaire arabe-français.* Paris, 1860., Maisonneuve & Co. Editeurs. (Reprinted in Beyrouth, no date, Librairie du Liban.)

Calice, F. von: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung.* Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.

Cauville, S. (avec la collaboration de J. Hallof et H. van den Berg): *Le temple de Dendara. Les chapelles osiriennes.* Index. Bibliothèque d'Étude 119. Le Caire, 1997., IFAO.

CD = Crum, W. E.: *A Coptic Dictionary.* Oxford, 1939., Oxford, 1939., Oxford University Press.

CdE = Chronique d'Égypte.

CED = Černý, J.: *Coptic Etymological Dictionary.* London, Cambridge, 1976., Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, K. N.: *Lexique zime-français.* Vũn tàrí. Sarh (Tchad), 1984., Centre d'Études Linguistiques.

Cosper, R.: *South Bauchi Lexicon.* A Wordlist of Nine South Bauchi (Chadic) Languages and Dialects. Halifax, 1994., The Author (Saint Mary's University).

DCT = Molen, R. van der: *A Hieroglyphic Dictionary of Egyptian Coffin Texts.* Leiden, 2000., E.J. Brill.

DELC = Vycichl, W.: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte.* Leuven, 1983., Peeters.

DG = Erichsen, W.: *Demotisches Glossar.* Koppenhagen, 1954., Ejnar Munksgaard.

Diyakal, Ph.: *Mushere-English Dictionary.* Collection of words carried out by Mr. Ph. I. D. started on September 10th, 1997 under the supervision of Herrmann Jungraithmayr (Univ. of Frankfurt). MS. 390 p.

DRB = *Naït-Zerrad, K.: Dictionnaire des racines berbères.* Leuven & Paris, since 1998, Peeters.

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.

DUL = Olmo Lete, G. & Sanmartín, J.: *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition.* Part One [ʾ(a/i/u)-k]. Part Two [l-z]. Leiden, 2003., E.J. Brill.

EA = El-Amarna letters (quoted after the numeration by Knudtzon q.v.).

EDE I = Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian.* Volume One: A Phonological Introduction. Leiden, 1999., E. J. Brill.

Edel, E.: *Altägyptische Grammatik.* Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

EEWC = Takács, G.: *Egyptian etymological word catalogue* (inpublished, Székesfehérvár, ongoing since 1994).

EG 1927 = Gardiner, A. H.: *Egyptian Grammar.*[1] Oxford, 1927., Clarendon Press.

Ember, A.: *Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words* (New Series). Continued from Vol. 51 pp. 110-121.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 53 (1917), 83-90.

Ember, A.: *Egypto-Semitic Studies.* Leipzig, 1930., The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.

FD = Faulkner, R. O.: *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Oxford, 1962., Clarendon Press.

Foucauld, Ch. de: *Dictionnaire touareg-français, dialecte de l'Ahaggar.* Vol. I-IV. Paris, 1951-1952., Imprimerie Nationale de France.

Foulkes, H. D.: *Angass Manual. Grammar, Vocabulary.* London, 1915., Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

Frajzyngier, Z.: *A Dictionary of Mupun.* Berlin, 1991., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Grande, B. M.: *Vvedenie v sravnitel'noe izucenie semitskih jazykov.* Moskva, 1972., Nauka.

Hodge, C. T.: "Hausa-Egyptian Establishment." = *Anthropological Linguistics* 8/1 (1966), 40-57.

Hodge, C. T.: "Afroasiatic s- Causative."= *Language Sciences* 15 (1971), 41-43.

Hodge, C. T.: "Hausa and English: Related Languages." MS. Paper presented at the International Conference on Hausa Language and Literature, Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria, July 1978. 3 p.

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.

HSED = Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary.* Leiden, 1995., E. J. Brill.

JEA = *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.*

Johnstone, T. M.: *Jibbāli Lexicon.* London, 1981., Oxford University Press.

Jungraithmayr, H.: *Die Ron-Sprachen. Tschadohamitische Studien in Nordnigerien.* Glückstadt, 1970., Verlag J. J. Augustin.

Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibriszimow, D.: *Chadic Lexical Roots.* Volume I. Tenative Reconstruction, Grading, Distribution and Comments. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibriszimow, D.: *Chadic Lexical Roots.* Volume II. Documentation. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Kraft, Ch. H.: *Chadic Wordlists.* I-III. Berlin, 1981., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

KHW = Westendorf, W.: *Koptisches Handwörterbuch.* Heidelberg, 1977., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Knudtzon, J. A.: *Die El-Amarna Tafeln.*[2] Leipzig, 1915., J. C. Hinrichs.

Lane, E. W.: *An Arabic-English Lexicon.* I-VIII. London & Edinburgh, 1863-93., Williams and Norgate.

Lanfry, J.: *Ghadames.* II. Glossaire. Alger, 1973., Le Fichier Periodique.

Leslau, W.: "Semitic and Egyptian Comparisons." = *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21 (1962), 44-49.

Leslau, W.: *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic).* Wiesbaden, 1987., Otto Harrassowitz.

Levy, J.: *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim nebst Beiträgen von Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer.* Zweite Auflage mit Nachträgen und Berichtigungen von Lazarus Goldschmidt. I-IV. Berlin & Wien, 1924., Benjamin Harz Verlag.

Lippert, J.: „Über die Stellung der Haussasprache unter den afrikanischen Sprachggruppen." = *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen der Königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 9/3 (1906), 334-344.

Lukas, J.: *Deutsche Quellen zur Sprache der Musgu in Kamerun.* Berlin, 1941., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Lukas, J.: *Studien zur Sprache der Gisiga (Nordkamerun).* Hamburg, 1970., Verlag J. J. Augustin.

Magwa, J. G. etc. (20 members of the "Ron Language Committee"): *A Ron Alphabet.* Jos, Nigeria, 1985., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.

Meeks, D.: "Liste de mots méroitiques ayant une signification connue ou supposée. " = *Meroitic Newsletter* 13 (1973), 3-20.

Meyer-Bahlburg, H.: „Texte im Musgu von Girvidik (Nordkamerun)." = *Afrika und Übersee* 56 (1972-1973), 61-71.

Militarev, A. Ju.: „Afrazijsko-indoevropejskie leksičeskie svjazi." = *Irano-afrazijskie jazykovye kontakty.* Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 98-108.

Moscati, S. & Spitaler, A. & Ullendorf, E. & Soden, W. von: *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages.* Phonology and Morphology.[2] Wiesbaden, 1964., Otto Harrassowitz.

Müller, F.: *Die Musuk-Sprache in Central-Afrika. Nach den Aufzeichnungen von Gottlob Adolf Krause herausgegeben.*= Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Klasse 112/1 (1886), 353-421.

NBÄ = Osing, J.: *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen.* I-II. Maiz/Rhein, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Netting, R. M.: *Kofyar Vocabulary.* MS. 1967.

Newman, P. & Ma, R.: "Comparative Chadic: Phonology and Lexicon." = *Journal of African Languages* 5/3 (1966), 218-251.

Newman, P.: "Chadic Classification and Reconstructions." = *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5/1 (1977), 1-42.

Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: "Čadsko-egipetskie izoglossy v oblasti kul'turnoj leksiki." = *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka.* Čast' 1. Moskva, 1989., Nauka. Pp. 131-136.

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.

Orel, V. É.: "From Hamito-Semitic to Ancient Egyptian: Historical Phonology." = *Folia Linguistica Historica* 16/1-2 (1995), 143-155.

Ormsby, G.: "Notes on the Angass Language." = *Journal of the Royal African Society* 12 (1912-1913), 421-424 & 13 (1913-1914), 54-61, 204-210, 313-315.

Osing, J.: *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen.* I-II. Maiz/Rhein, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Osing, J.: „Zum Lautwert von 3 und ʿ."= *Studien zum Altägyptischen Kultur* 24 (1997), 223-229.

Prasse, K.-G. & Alojaly, Gh. & Mohamed, Gh.: *Lexique touareg-français.* Copenhague, 1998., Museum Tusculanum Press, Université de Copenhague.

Peust, C.: *Egyptian Phonology. An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language.* Göttingen, 1999., Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag GbR.

Peust, C.: Review of EDE vol. II.= *Indogermanische Forschungen* 108 (2003), 345-350.

Piamenta, M.: *Dictionary of Post-Classical Yemeni Arabic.* Part 1-2. Leiden, 1990-1., E.J. Brill.

Pillinger, S. & Galboran, L.: *A Rendille Dictionary.* Köln, 1999., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

PL = Wilson, P.: *A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu.* Leuven, 1997., Peeters.

Porhomovskij, V. Ja.: *Istoričeskij konsonantizm jazykov kotoko.* Moskva, 1972., Institut Jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Reinisch, L.: *Der einheitliche Ursprung der Sprachen der Alten Welt nachgewiesen durch Vergleichung der afrikanischen, erythräischen und indogermanischen Sprachen mit Zugrundelegung des Teda.* Wien, 1873., Wilhelm Braumüller Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung. Reprint: Wiesbaden, 1968., Dr. Martin Sändig oHG.

Reinisch, L.: *Die Sprache Saho-Irob in Abessinien.*= Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe 90/9 (1878), 89-142.

Reinisch, L.: *Die Nuba-Sprache.* II. Wien, 1879., Wilhelm Braumüller.

Rossi, E.: *L'arabo parlato a S'anʿā,* Roma, 1939. (Quoted after Vycichl 1964, 228.)

Rossing, M. O.: *Mafa-Mada: A Comparative Study of Chadic Languages in North Cameroun.* Ph.D. dissertation. Wisconsin, 1978., University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Sachnine, M.: „Liste lexicale en Lamé du Cameroun. " = Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique.* Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 195-201.

Sachnine, M.: *Dictionnaire lamé-français. Lexique français-lamé.* Paris, 1982., SELAF.

Sasse, H.-J.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji.* Hamburg, 1982., Helmut Buske Verlag.

SD = Beeston, A. F. L. & Ghul, M. A. & Müller, W. W. & Ryckmans, J.: *Sabaic Dictionary* (*English-French-Arabic*). *Dictionnaire sabéen* (*anglais-français-arabe*). Louvain-la-Neuve, Beyrouth, 1982., Peeters, Librairie du Liban.

SED 1 = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A.: *Semitic Etymological Dictionary.* Vol. I. *Anatomy of Man and Animals.* Münster, 2000., Ugarit-Verlag.

SISAJa I = D'jakonov, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Četveruhin, A. S.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.; Stolbova, O. V.: "Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskih jazykov. Vypusk 1. p-ṗ-b-f." = *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka.* XV godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR. Moskva, 1981., Nauka. Pp. 3-127.

Skinner, N.: "Body Parts in Hausa - Comparative Data."= Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E. R. & Thomanek, K. É. (eds.): *Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovsky anläßlich seines 70. Geburtstags.* Wien, 1992., Afro-Pub. Pp. 345-357.

Skinner, N.: "Evidence for Earlier Nominal Affixation in Afroasian."= Ibriszimow, D.; Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica.* Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 25-35.

Stolbova, O. V.: "Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika i slovar' zapadno-čadskih jazykov." = Porhomovskij, V. Ja. (ed.): *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie. Problemy rekonstrukcii.* Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 30-268.

Strümpell, F.: „Vergleichendes Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen Adamauas." = *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 42 (1910), 444-488.

Strümpell, F.: „Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen des Mandara-Gebirges (Adamaua)." = *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 13 (1922-1923), 109-149.

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

Takács, G.: "The "Aleph Problem" in Ancient Egyptian."= *Rocznik Orientalisztyczny* 52/1 (1999), 101-122.

Takács, G.: *Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages.* Berlin, 2004., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Tourneux, H.: *Lexique pratique du munjuk des rizières. Dialecte de Pouss.* Paris, 1991., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Török, L.: *Meroé és Núbia a 2-7. században.* Budapest, 1977., ELTE.

Török, L.: *Economic Offices and Officials in Meroitic Nubia (A Study in Territorial Administration of the Late Meroitic Kingdom).* Studia Aegyptiaca V. Budapest, 1979., ELTE.

ÜKAPT I-VI = Sethe, K.: *Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten.* I-VI. Glückstadt, Hamburg, 1935-62., J. J. Augustin.

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

Vycichl, W.: „Gab es eine Pluralendung -w im Ägyptischen?" = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 105 (1955), 261-270.

Vycichl, W.: „Die Verben der Klasse UBAK, UFAD, UHAL im Tuareg." = *Muséon* 77 (1964), 225-230.

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

Wedekind, K.: "Gimo-Jan or Ben-Yem-Om: Benč-Yemsa Phonemes, Tones, and Words." = Hayward, R. (ed.): *Omotic Language Studies.* London, 1990., SOAS. Pp. 68-141.

Westendorf, W.: „Der Wortstamm kꜣ(j) "heben, tragen" > "hervorbringen, erzeugen"".= *Bulletin de la Société d'Égyptologie,* Genève 4 (1980), 99-102.

WKAS II = Ullmann, M. (in Verbindung mit Spitaler, A.): *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache.* Band II: l-. Wiesbaden, 1983-, Otto Harrassowitz.

Wolff, E.: „Sprachwandel und Sprachwechsel in Nordostnigeria."= *Afrika und Übersee* 58/3-4 (1974-1975), 187-212.

Wölfel, J. D.: „Eurafrikanische Wortschichten als Kulturschichten." = *Acta Salamanticensia. Filosofía y letras* 9/1 (1955).

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

Zaborski, A.: „Marginal Notes on Medieval Nubia." = Krause, M. (ed.): *Nubische Studien. Tagungsakten der 5. Internationalen Konferenz der International Society for Nubian Studies, Heidelberg, 22.-25. September 1982.* Mainz am Rhein, 1986., Philipp von Zabern. Pp. 403-412.

Zyhlarz, E.: „Ältere und jüngere Pluralbildung im Berberischen."= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 22 (1931-1932), 1-15.

Zyhlarz, E.: „Die Sprache Numidiens. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Afrikanistik." = *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 22 (1931-1932), 275-280.