EGYPTIAN 'AYIN IN VARIATION WITH D

Helmut Satzinger, Wien

Summary

Afroasiatic *d yields basically Egn. .' Before voiced consonants, however, both ' and d are attested. This provisional result is corroborated by an analysis of phonetic root doublets with an opposition ' versus d.*

In the second millennium B.C. Egyptian 'Ayin was used to render Canaanite 'Ayin, and in the first millennium Aramaic 'Ayin was used to render Egyptian 'Ayin (cf. as an overview Satzinger 1997: 27–29). This is more or less the basis on which the traditional Egyptological concept of the phonetics of 'Ayin rests. However, 'Ayin does not behave like a pharyngeal occlusive in respect to co-occurrence restrictions in Egyptian roots. Instead it behaves like a dental or alveolar occlusive. O. Rössler’s conclusion that it must be of a dental (or alveolar) articulation (Rössler 1971: 270–275) is cogent, although it is opposed to the numerous etymologies suggested so far that equate the 'Ayins of both Egyptian and Semitic. In Rössler’s view, Egyptian 'Ayin is a voiced plosive [d]. It must not be confused with the sound, or phoneme, that traditional Egyptological transcription renders as d. In Rössler’s view, the latter is rather an emphatic plosive, transcribed t. Many recently published etymologies imply that Egyptian d may correspond to an AA emphatic dental, although it corresponds in others to a voiced occlusive, *d. 1 1 In fact, it does not follow from Rössler’s deduction that Egyptian d must be emphatic in every instance. His primary argument is that the emphatic slot of the dentals is neither occupied by t, the unvoiced plosive, nor by ' [d], the voiced plosive, thus leaving d for it. He further supports his assumption by pertinent etymologies, such as, for example,

Egyptian knd, dnd ‘to become angry, furious,’ Semitic QNT, with meanings like ‘to become angry, to feel hurt, to frustrate, to despair, to fear, to be concerned’ (Rössler 1971: 285, § 5)

Egyptian kdp ‘to collect,’ Semitic QTP ‘to gather (fruits)’ (Rössler 1971: 282, § 2, following Calice 1936: 41 no. 94 and 32 no. 46)

On the other hand, it may be imagined that *d did not shift from the dental articulation [d] to a pharyngeal articulation [t] in all cases. A conservative articulation may have been retained in local idioms or linguistic norms (cf. Zeidler 1992: 208; Schenkel 1993;

---

* I am indebted to Agnes and Georg Stilfried for correcting my English.

1 Cf. Vycichl 1985: 179. For Egn. d as a reflex of AA *t see Diakonoff 1995: 26 no. 211; 29 no. 220; 30 nos. 221, 222; 31 no. 224 etc.; for Egn. d as a reflex of AA *d see Diakonoff 1996: 6 no. 246; 8 no. 249; 9 no. 250; 9–10 no. 252 etc. – Ehret 1995 claims AA *d to correspond to Egn. d (see pp. 125–137), but AA *t to Egn. s (see pp. 167–173).
Satzinger 1994: 202–204), or it may have been conditioned by particular phonetic contexts (cf.
Satzinger, printing). Whenever AA *d retained the dental plosive articulation in Egyptian it has obviously become “emphatic”. For Egyptian d (i.e. (d)) = Coptic T behaves all the same, whether < *t or < *d.

A decision in favour of Rössler’s results (viz., AA *d ~ Egn. ç, AA *t ~ Egn. d) or the traditional view cannot be made by simply adducing favourable etymologies and rejecting opposing ones (cf. Zeidler 1992: 206–207). Although critical assessments like the most recent contribution by J. Osing (1997) are welcome, attempts of a different dimension are called for. Rössler’s approach is not based on etymologies but rather on his crucial observation of the incompatibilities (co-occurrence restrictions) of root consonants. Until now, none of Rössler’s critics has been able to disprove this particular argument.

On a former occasion (Satzinger, printing) I tried to show a way to obtain more lucid results in respect to the etymological correspondences of the Egyptian dental plosives. I proceeded from the Afroasiatic roots established in D’jakonov’s Comparative-Historical Dictionary of the Afrasian Languages,2 endeavouring on the one hand to increase the number of Egyptian d reflexes of AA *d, and on the other to adduce evidence of Egyptian ç corresponding to AA *d. Although ample space was granted to the authors, I had to restrict my documentation to AA roots commencing with *d, and having a labial, dental, alveolar, palatal, lateral or velar occlusive as a second root consonant, thus leaving out the nasals, the liquids and what is called weak consonants, and all roots with consonants other than *d in the first, and *d in any but the first consonant position. This yielded, as a provisional result, a remarkable structuring of the etymologies. If the second consonant is *b, or *g/gw, possible Egyptian reflexes with d and others with ç in the first position were found. AA roots *dVd may appear in Egyptian either as ç or as dd. In AA roots with *s, *c, *č or *č in the second position, Egyptian reflexes with ç prevailed by far, the second consonant being realised as d (which is ç, according to Rössler). With *k/kw as the second consonant, Egyptian displays either ã (AA *k having become “emphatic”) or sk (!), whereas AA *dVk roots seem to have only ç reflexes in Egyptian.

Basically, AA *d yields Egyptian ç. In the context of voiceless occlusives, complicated co-occurrence restrictions provoke modifications that seem quite unexpected, like *p > b, *s > d (i.e., ç), *k > k. If, however, *k(w) is retained as k, it is the initial *d that is changed, though not to a plosive, but rather to s. In the context of m p h a t i c s, not only the dentals and alveolars but also the palatals and laterals seem to be excluded on the AA level already, and we are left with the labial, *p, and the velar/uvular, *k. Whereas the only instance for the former does not seem very significant (there being also an AA doublet with the voiced plosive, *b), *dVk may be

---
reflected by Egyptian ‘d. It is mainly in the context of voiced occlusives that AA *d may be reflected by either ‘ or d in Egyptian.3

As stated above, further evidence was omitted from the paper mentioned. It may, however, be summarised here: AA *dVm seems to appear in Egyptian as ‘m, ‘n, dm, dn, perhaps also as ‘j; *dVn may be ‘n, ‘dn, perhaps also as ‘j; for *dVr and *dVl there are tentative entries with ‘r and d‘; etc. Note that all these consonants in second position are voiced in AA.

For various reasons these results could be regarded as provisional or even premature. But to a certain extent they are corroborated by other evidence. If we accept that AA *d may be reflected by Egyptian d in a context of voiced consonants only, though also by ‘, a certain number of lexical doublets should be expected in Egyptian that display ‘ in one case and d in the other.

Such evidence has in fact been produced, such as the following:

1) ‘j ‘hand, lower arm’ (cf. *dj ‘hand’, deduced from hieroglyph ☞; probably extant in preposition m-dj for which see below, no. 11; perhaps related to dj.w ‘five’ (Vycichl 1985: 179; Roccati 1995: 361)

Rössler 1971: 285 § 6; Schenkel 1993: 140)

2) ‘t ‘here’ (cf. B TH ‘there.’)

The attestation of ‘ is slightly earlier. Coptic has preserved the d doublet only: Τά ‘here’, cf. B TH ‘there.’

2) ‘t ‘Leinenart’

As no semantic details are known, the agreement remains hypothetical.

Both forms are first attested in the Pyramid Texts. Coptic ΕΙΛΑΥ is regarded as deriving from ‘t.

In AA, one may compare *tVr II ‘to plait, to sew’ (Diakonoff 1995a no. 236).

---

3 In Diakonoff 1995a/b there is much variation between *t and *d (also cf. Zeidler 1992: 209). In some cases the Egyptian ‘ doublet may be derived from the AA *d variant, whereas the Egyptian d root may be connected with the AA *y variant: Diakonoff 1995b: 14 no. 265 *dac, var. *pac ‘knife; to cut’; Egn. ‘d ‘massacre’; ds ‘knife; flint; to cut.’

4 The publication of the paper in the Acts of the congress does not give the list mentioned, for reasons which the author explains (Kammerzell 1993), but cf. Zeidler (1992: 208). I am obliged to Dr. Kammerzell for sending me a copy of his hand-out.
3) 3,1. ‘spritzen’; 2. ‘erzeugen; Sperma’  d3d ‘ejakulieren’

The semantic agreement is satisfactory (pace Ossing 1997: 229). As d3d is attested as late as the New Kingdom when l had become mute, the presence of the final l may be interpreted as a graphic phenomenon – a sort of hypercorrect spelling. But also a variant structured ABAB for an ABA form would be nothing extraordinary. A root variant without reduplication is d3 ‘to copulate’ (Faulkner, Dictionary, 309; Book of the Dead).

4) 3b (Baumsorte)  d3b ‘Feige(nbaum)’

Perfect phonetic agreement. However, in the attestations of the “tree” there is no hint whatsoever to a fig-tree. For this reason J. Zeidler, in his evaluation of Kammerzell’s list (Zeidler 1992: 208), remained sceptical. In the meantime, R. Hölzl has referred me to a spelling 3b,6 for d3b ‘fig’ in an Old Kingdom inscription7 which she is republishing in the Corpus Antiquitatum Aegyptiacarum of the Vienna collection (Hölzl, in preparation). There is no doubt whatsoever about the meaning as the ‘figs’ here are an item of the canonical list of offerings that is otherwise spelt d3b (see Barta 1963: 49 no. 71).

Further corroboration comes from the verb 3b ‘to become pleasant.’ Actually, all other verbs of quality of similar meaning are related to words for sweet fruits and/or their trees which suggests that 3b is also related to d3b, var. 3b, ‘fig’, and that the 3b tree is the fig-tree:

jm3 ‘to become pleasant, friendly’  jm3, a fruit; jm3 ‘male date-palm’
bnj3 ‘to become sweet, pleasant’  bnj ‘date; bnj.t ‘date-palm’
ndm ‘to become sweet, pleasant’9  ndm ‘carob-tree’
3b ‘to become pleasant, desirable’  d3b, var. 3b, ‘fig’; 3b, a tree10

---

5 Pace Ossing 1997: 229. I have noted the following cases of ABA with ABAB doublets: ‘b3 ‘sich rühmen’, b3 ‘prahlen’; m’ve, m’m ‘Füße frottieren’; S3 ‘Kehle’; nkn ‘verletzen’, nknkt ‘verletztes Auge’; enk, enk ‘zerstören’; dfd, dfd ‘Tropfen’; drd, ddr ‘Blätter (der Bäume).’ The case of 3k, 3k ‘verfehlen’ may be compared with d3d for *d3d, the final l being possibly a hypercorrection. (All quoted, for my convenience, from the "Beinlich List", for which cf. http://www.newton.cam.ac.uk/egypt/test/beinlich.html.)

6 Junker 1943:236 fig. 98, fifth line, sixth entry from left.

7 Offering list from the Mastaba of Minu, Vienna 8533 (PM 2III/1, 140).

8 Beginning from the MK, it is usually written bnr which is most probably a hypercorrection; see Schenkel 1965: 114.

9 Arab. na’tma ‘to become excellent, soft, pleasant’, Heb. na’em ‘to become lovely, charming’; see Calice 1932: 69 no. 234 (according to Ehret (1995: 322 no. 626), from an AA root *na- ‘to be soft’ – also extant in Arab. na‘a ‘to become weak’ and na‘na‘a ‘to become limp’ – plus adjectivising suffix *-m; however, his Cushitic *na- is not found in Dolgopol’skij 1973).
The ḫb tree is first attested in the Pyramid Texts, and so is the verb ḫb; the variant ḫb ‘fig’ is of the late Old Kingdom. ḫb ‘fig’ is first attested in the Pyramid Texts. Neither form is preserved in Coptic.

Diakonoff (1995a no. 239) quotes Egn. ḫb for the AA root *ḥb ‘tree.’

5) ḫb ‘Horn’

From ḫ, Coptic B cairo is derived; from ḫb, Coptic ṭa. Osing (1997: 229) points to the difference in syllable structure and vocalisation (*ḏbVw versus ḫb or ḫb) which means that we are not dealing with two realisations of the same word, but rather — very probably — two realisations of the same root. It may be a taboo expression with a meaning like *’pusher.’ It could be imagined that ḫb, ṭa is the active perfective participle of a verb ḫdb ’to push,’ viz. ḫb (see Osing 1987: 340–341), while ḫb(w), ṭa is a nomen agentis, *ḏbVw (see Osing 1976: 186).

ację is from the Old Kingdom, ḫb from the Second Intermediate Period.

6) ḫ (Hundename) ḫb (Hundename)

The Wörterbuch has not ḫb, but ḫb.t.t, as also Janssen (1958: 181 no. 30; also cf. Fischer 1961: 153). ḫb ’jackal’ (Vycichl 1958: 383 no. 16) is a variant of ḫb in CT I, 289b and therefore a different lexeme and attests to a different phenomenon (viz., ḫb as variant of ḫb). Other forms are ḫw (Janssen 1958: 179 no. 15, from Old Kingdom; 181 no. 31, from Middle Kingdom), ḫw.tj.w (ib.: 179 no. 10; Old Kingdom).

This equation remains at best hypothetical as the meanings of these dog’s names are unknown. ḫ has been tentatively adduced (Satzinger, printing) for the AA root *dap II ‘to pursue, to search’ (Diakonoff 1995b no. 246; also cf. Orel / Stolbova 1994: 138 no. 596 *da’ap- ’to follow’, and no. 600 *dab-, id.).
7) ‘b.t ‘Weberin’ (?)

Zeidler (1992: 208) is sceptical about this item. There seems to be, however, additional evidence for these root doublets with meanings connected with weaving and linen: ‘b\.\(j\)t ‘ribbon’ (Meeks, AL 77.0612; Meeks, AL 78.0684); ‘by(t) ‘reins(?)’ (Meeks, AL 78.0678); sdb (s-db ?), smooth seam of linen-cloth (Wb. IV, 368); sdb (s-db ?), a dress (ib). Nevertheless, the equation remains hypothetical.

‘b.t has been tentatively adduced (Satzinger, printing) for the AA root *dap I ‘to plait, to sew’ (D’jakonov 1982 no. 105; this root is not included in the English edition, Diakonoff 1995b; but cf. Diakonoff 1995a no. 224, *taf II ‘tying, plaiting’).

8) ‘b.t (Pflanzenart)

Hypothetical, for lack of semantic details.

9) ‘nw (Steinsorte)

jnfr nfr n ‘nw ‘good white stone of ...’ is a term for limestone, in contrast to jnfr n r\(w\)dr which means sandstone; both expressions date back to the Middle Kingdom.

In addition to dnj ‘Steinblock’ (Wb. V, 466.8, with reference to O. Gardiner 51, dynasty 18), compare dnw, a piece (of stone?) used for mending a monolithic obelisk of granite, and probably being of the same material (cf. Wb. V, 464.6, with reference to Urk. IV, 367.2), and Late Egyptian dnw, probably a stone used for masonry (Wente 1961: 257 note n). The semantic agreement seems poor, one will doubt that the ‘ and d words are doublets.

10) ‘g (Verbum der Bewegung)

The semantic coherence is not cogent, though not impossible (it is rejected by Oising 1997: 229).

Orel / Stolbova (1994: 143 no. 619) quote d\(g\); for an AA root *dag-*/dig-v ‘to go’.

11) m- ‘mit, bei’

Both prepositions are assumed to mean ‘in the hand of’ (see, e.g., Schenkel 1993: 140). For ‘j) and dj, ‘hand,’ see above. Coptic has N\(\text{T\theta}\)=, N\(\text{T\epsilon}\).

12) b\(n\) ‘einfassen’

The semantic coherence is not cogent, though possible (it is rejected by Oising 1997: 229); the phonetic agreement is good, though bdn has a variant with metathesis, b\(d\)n.

All forms are attested in Late Egyptian only. Diakonoff (1994 no. 80) quotes bdn for AA *bad II ‘garment, wrapping, strap; to wrap, to tie.’ Ehret’s (1995: 91 no. 39) quoting of b\(n\) ‘mounting (what a statue, etc., sits on)’ for an AA root *-ba- ‘to sit’ is not convincing.
13) \( h\;bj.w \) (Bezeichnung für Feinde) \( \text{hdbj.t ‘Haufen geschlagener Feinde’} \)

For lack of semantic details, their relationship is only hypothetical. But see for the meaning the verb \( hdb \) ‘to overthrow’ \(^{15}\) (first attested in the Middle Kingdom), the enemies are probably ‘the overthrown ones.’ The forms seem to have an \( h\)-root prefix (cf. Thausing 1932), the root being \(*h*\) and \(*db*-\, respectively. It may be compared with AA \(*dab\) IV ‘to trample, to pound, to knock’ for which Diakonoff (1995b no. 252; Orel / Stolbova 1994: 139 no. 602 have \(*dab*- ‘to trample’) quotes for Egyptian: \( dblb \) ‘to knock, to thump (of heart),’ medical text; cf. also \( \text{bb ‘to knock (at door),} \) dynasty 18 (see Satzinger, printing).

\( h\;bj.w \) is attested in the Late Period only, \( \text{hdbj.t} \) from dynasty 20.

14) \( h^f ‘fassen, packen’ \)

\( \text{sf}^d ‘fassen, packen’ \)

Perfect semantic agreement. For a correspondence of \( h \) and \( s \) cf. \( z\;sh ‘to tear out (papyrus)’ and \( zh^j ‘to tear out (papyrus, Eye of Horus)’ \) (both attested in the Pyramid Texts, Old Kingdom). \( kf ‘to make captures, booty’ \) is probably due to a phonetic shift of the New Kingdom. \(^{16}\) \( h^f ‘is first attested in the Pyramid Texts, \( \text{sf}^d \) in the Coffin Texts.

Rössler (1971: 286 § 6) equated \( h^f \) with Semitic ‘\( BD \) ‘to serve’ (cf. Zeidler 1992: 206); one will agree with Oising (1997: 226) who rejects this for semantic reasons. Vycichl (1958: 375) quoted Ember (1930 § 5h. 1) who relates Egyptian \( h^f \) to Arabic \( hafa’a, \) but this does not mean ‘to seize’ but rather ‘to feel giddy.’ Instead, Arabic \( qabada ‘to seize (with the hand/fist), empoigner’, Hebrew \( qabas\), etc. ‘to assemble’ \) is here suggested. \(^{17}\)

Another couple of doublets have been suggested (see Zeidler 1992: 208; cf. Loprieno 1995: 45):

\( m\;sh ‘marschieren’ \) (Late Egn., from an Old Egn. root), Coptic \( \text{MOØÊ} \)

\( n[eu]\text{äg[yptisch]} \), Coptic \( \text{MOYǾ} \)

Phonetically, they correspond perfectly, but a semantic relation cannot be accepted on closer inspection (also cf. Oising 1997: 229). \( m\;sh \) is related to \( m\;sh ‘army’ and it means ‘to march’, later also ‘to walk.’ If there is a Demotic \( m\;sd ‘durchwandern’ \) it is certainly not derived from \( m\;sd \) in its oldest attestation, the “bulletin” of the Battle of

---

\(^{15}\) \( hdb \) is regarded as the etymon of Coptic \( \text{gTÔP} ‘fall, destruction.’ \)

\(^{16}\) Cf. \( Kw < *h^d\;ia ‘\); perhaps, also \( Kw\;h < *h^m\;ap \) (cf. Westendorf, \text{Handwörterbuch}, 62, but see Černý, \text{Etym. Dictionary}, 57). – Coptic \( Kw\;h ‘to compel, to seize by force’, and \( Kw\;a ‘vengeance, violence’ \) (Vycichl 1983: 71) are derived from \( kf ‘\), whereas \( hf ‘fist’ \) is continued in \( b^2\;k ‘hand (as measure)’ \) (for \( b < *\text{cf.}, \) e.g., \( B\;Z\;OY\;\;K < [5\;K\;O\;\;W<] < \text{Demot. d}^k ‘\), and \( sf^d \) in \( b\;WÔT ‘fist.’

\(^{17}\) Orel / Stolbova quote Egn. \( hf ‘\) for an AA root \( *gafV ‘to hold’ \) whose third radical solely depends on the Egyptian word (for Semitic they compare Akk. \( hapû). \)

\(^{18}\) No source is given. The Coptic word shows that the wandering is derived from the investigating: \( \text{MOYǾ ‘to examine, to search out, visit,’ ‘to consider, to visit; to wander’ (however, Crum, \text{Dictionary}, 207a adds to the latter, ‘\) confused with \( \text{MOØÊ} \) \) (which is \( < m\;sh ‘(w)’; it is originally a qualitative/old perfective, cf. Polotsky 1957: 229 note 1). \)
Qadesh. This *mšd has a variant form wšd in another copy of the text. It is probably identical with wšd 'to address,' 'to question (in court.)' Its meaning in the Qadesh text is obviously 'to interrogate' (Kitchen 1996: 15), and not 'to send away' (Meeks AL 79.1380). There is, however, a direct line of descendance to Demotic *mšt 'untersuchen, inspizieren' (Erichsen 1954: 182). Possibly, the verb *mšd is derived from a noun *mšd, 'investigation,' or the like, that is formed from the verb wšd with an m- prefix.

Our examination of the root or word doublets has yielded the following assessment.

Evident doublets:

- tj 'hand'; cf. m- 'mit, bei' (OEgn.)
- ? 'hier(her)' (MK)
- ´? 1. 'spritzen'; 2. 'erzeugen; Sperma' (PT)
- ?b 'fig (tree)' (OK)
- b 'Horn' (OEgn.)

Probable doublets:

- b.t 'Weberin' (?) (OEgn.)
- gji (Verbom der Bewegung) (dyn. 18)
- b'n 'einfassen' (LEgn.)
- hbj.w (Bezeichnung fü Feinde) (late)
- lff 'lassen, packen' (PT)

Possible doublets:

- tj.t 'Leinenart' (OK)
- b (Hundename) (OK)
- bj.t (Pflanzenart) (MK)

Improbable doublets:

- mw (Steinsorte) (MK)
- mš 'marschieren' (LEgn.)

In 10 of the 13 not improbable cases, ′j is in initial position. In one case, viz. h'b- lhd-, h- is prefixed to root-initial ′j. In b'n/bdn, ′j is positioned between two other consonants (the second of which may be a root suffix). In lff/šfd, ′j is in the third and final position. Where ′j is not in the final position it is followed by j (1 case), s (4 cases), b (5 cases), g (1 case), or n (1 case). It will be noted that these are virtually the same conditions under which AA *d is reflected by either Egyptian ′ or d. However, the force of this result is impaired by the co-occurrence restrictions of the Egyptian roots, which would not allow all consonants after ′ or d. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that no doublets have been discovered that have in the first position ′ or d, and in the second position one of the voiceless consonants, that are compatible with ′ and d, like p, h, b, z, š, k or d.19

19 I am indebted to Georg Brein for informations on the Vienna M.A. thesis he is preparing, viz. Wurzelinkompatibilitäten im Wortschatz der Pyramidentexte.
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