

HdO

Etymological
Dictionary of
Egyptian
Volume Three

m-

by

Gábor Takács

Brill

ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF EGYPTIAN

HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK
HANDBOOK OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

ERSTE ABTEILUNG
DER NAHE UND MITTLERE OSTEN
THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON
H. ALTENMÜLLER · B. HROUDA · B.A. LEVINE · R.S. O'FAHEY
K.R. VEENHOF · C.H.M. VERSTEEGH

ACHTUNDVIERZIGSTER BAND
ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF EGYPTIAN

VOLUME THREE



ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY
OF EGYPTIAN

Volume Three: m-

BY

GÁBOR TAKÁCS



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available on
<http://catalog.loc.gov>.**

ISSN 0169-9423

ISBN 978 90 04 16412 3

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission
from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by
Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to
The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

In memoriam J. Harmatta (1917–2004)

CONTENTS

Foreword	ix
Acknowledgements	xi
Introduction	xvii
Abbreviations	xix
Abbreviations of Languages, Eras and Certain Sources	xix
Abbreviations of Technical Terms and Certain Expressions	xxiv
Abbreviations of Author Names	xxv
Corrigenda to EDE II	xxxii
m-	1
Quoted Literature	887

FOREWORD

In this volume, Egyptian words beginning with m- are examined from an etymological standpoint. Collecting external (Afro-Asiatic) parallels for m-words started back in 1994 (with pauses), while additional Egyptian lexicographical data for m- were gathered in summer 2002 and since 2004. A preliminary draft of the m-section of the lexicon was completed in March 1998. The research for volume three was interrupted between 2001 and March 2004, when work on the comparative dictionary of the Angas-Sura languages (Takács 2004) was carried out. Then, during two years of intense filing from March 2004 to June 2006, the Egyptian etymological word catalogue (ongoing in Székesfehérvár since 2004) was enriched with the materials that have accrued in recent years. As a result, the new – significantly enlarged and revised – manuscript of the present volume was prepared during the summer and autumn of 2000 and from June 2006 to August 2007.

G.T.
Székesfehérvár, August 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to a number of colleagues for their precious communications on etymological matters. Naturally, any shortcomings of EDE III are solely my responsibility. The most outstanding assistance in Egyptian lexicography since 2004 has been provided for me by Hofrat Prof. H. Satzinger (Institut für Ägyptologie, Wien), whom I cannot thank enough for his moral correctness as well as for his divine patience and readiness to provide any detail at any time over the past three years. Warm thanks are due to Prof. D. Meeks (Aix-en-Provence and Cairo) for his innumerable comments on rare Egyptian words between 2000 and 2004 as well as for providing me with several inaccessible publications. I am greatly indebted also to Drs. O. Witthuhn (Seminar für Ägyptologie, Marburg an der Lahn) for his unselfish help throughout 2006 with unavailable Egyptological literature. As for questions of Semitic etymology, I have had the privilege of being guided by Prof. R. M. Voigt (Freie Universität, Berlin). I am indebted also to Dr. W. G. E. Watson (Newcastle upon Tyne), Dr. A. Măcelaru (București and Riyadh) and Dr. L. Kogan (RGGU: Russian State University of the Humanities, Moscow) for their occasional communications. In Berber linguistics, my heartfelt thanks go to Prof. K.-G. Prasse (Værløse, formerly København) and Dr. M. Kossmann (Leiden), whose constant professional guidance throughout 2006–2007 has helped me to avoid several mistakes. My thanks are due to Dr. C. Taine-Cheikh (Paris) for her help with the Zenaga (West Berber) material. On issues of Cushitic etymology, I have consulted Prof. D. Appleyard (SOAS, London, for Agaw and Ethio-Semitic), Prof. G. Banti (for Lowland East Cushitic) and Prof. M. Tosco (for Dahalo, both from the Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi e Ricerche su Africa et Paesi Arabi, Napoli), Prof. Ch. Ehret (UCLA, Dept. of History, Los Angeles, for South Cushitic), Prof. H.-J. Sasse (Universität zu Köln, Institut für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, for East Cushitic), and Dr. M. Vanhove (CNRS-LLACAN, Villejuif, Paris, for Beja). Questions of Omotic lexicon and linguistics have been discussed with Prof. Emer. M. L. Bender (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale). For his invaluable support and help in Chadic linguistics over the past ten years, I wish to express my utmost gratitude to Prof. H. Jungraithmayr (Institut für Afrikanische Sprachwissenschaften, J. W.

Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main). Certain details of Hausa and Chadic linguistics were clarified to me by Prof. P. Newman (Indiana University, Dept. of Linguistics, Bloomington) and Prof. H. Tourneux (LLACAN, CNRS, Villejuif, Paris), respectively. I had the privilege to discuss some relevant questions of Indo-European linguistics with Prof. J. Puhvel (Encino, California).

Those facilitating and unselfishly assisting the success of my numerous research fellowships in the period of preparing this volume deserve due acknowledgement. During my stay at the Institut für Afrikanische Sprachwissenschaften (J. W. Goethe-Universität) in Frankfurt am Main (April–August 2002 and May 2005), which was sponsored by the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung (Bonn), I have been assisted considerably by the accomodating and truly helpful staff of the “Orientalistik, Judaistik, Afrikanistik” Department of the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek. I managed to greatly enrich my Berber lexical materials significantly thanks to my visit to the Fonds Roux in May–June 2002 (IREMAM: Institut de Recherches et d’Études sur le Monde Arabe et Musulman, Aix-en-Provence), where I received invaluable help from Mme C. Brenier-Estrine, the charming librarian of this Berberological collection. I am highly grateful to Dr. M. Arbach (Aix-en-Provence, now at CEFAS: Centre Français d’Archéologie et de Sciences de Sanaa, Sanaa, Yemen) for his generous permission to use his extensive specialist library in Semitics in Aix. Mrs and Mr Scherp (Frankfurt am Main) deserve my heartfelt thanks for their friendly help with transporting my scholarly materials from Aix to Frankfurt. My research at the Oriental Library of Leiden University (April 2003) has also brought considerable results. Most fruitful and pleasant were my unforgettable stays (supported by the Hungarian National Scientific Research Fund) at the Ägyptisch-Orientalische Sammlung of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Wien (June and then October–November 2004, June–September 2007) thanks to the exceptional assistance and generosity – that I cannot sufficiently appreciate – of the charming staff of the Sammlung: first of all to Hofrat Dr. E. Haslauer (by whose rare self-sacrificing kindness I am still moved) as well as to Dr. R. Hölzl, Dr. M. Hüttner, Mrs G. Döbbelin, Mrs R. Egner, Mrs M. Gregor, and Mrs B. Poropatitsch. I am indebted also to Prof. Holaubek as well as to Mag. I. Kaplan and Miss M. Buhl for facilitating my fruitful research at the Institut für Ägyptologie, Universität Wien. I wish to express my sincere thanks to the DAAD (Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst) for granting me a fellowship for my research in Berlin in August–September 2004, during which I was

able to consult the old files and the library of the research project “Altägyptisches Wörterbuch” at the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (thanks are due to Dr. I. Hafemann and Dr. Topmann for their assistance) as well as the library of the Institut für Semitistik und Arabistik der Freien Universität (upon the kind invitation of Prof. R. M. Voigt). Last, but not least, it is with deep gratitude that I mention my brief visit at the Seminar für Ägyptologie in Marburg an der Lahn in early May 2006, where, in spite of its brevity, I was able to collect significant additional materials on Egyptian lexicography thanks to the assistance of Drs. O. Witthuhn.

I have received many otherwise inaccessible publications and much data over the past five years from countless colleagues. It is impossible to list all of them. In 2007, outstanding help was provided by Hofrat Dr. E. Haslauer (Ägyptisch-Orientalische Sammlung of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien), Drs. H. Kovács (library of the Oriental Institute of Chicago), Hofrat Prof. H. Satzinger (Institut für Ägyptologie, Wien), and Prof. R. M. Voigt (Institut für Semitistik und Arabistik der Freien Universität, Berlin). I also wish to thank (in alphabetical order) Prof. Kh. Alio (N'Djamena), Prof. Emer. M. L. Bender (Carbondale, Illinois), Dr. R. M. Blench (Cambridge, London), Prof. B. Caron (CNRS-LLACAN, Villejuif, Paris), Dr. R. Cosper (Linguistics Program, Dept. of Sociology, Saint Mary's University, Halifax), Prof. M. Dziekan (Oriental Institute, Warsaw University), Miss C. Geisenheyner (Institut für Afrikanistik, Hamburg) for sending me rare and older sources on Angas-Sura, Prof. R. Hannig (Seminar für Ägyptologie, Marburg an der Lahn) for sending me the volumes of his magnificent Ägyptisches Wörterbuch (ÄWb I–II), Prof. J. Huehnergard (Harvard University), Prof. R. Keißling (Institut für Afrikanistik, Hamburg), Prof. U. Luft (ELTE, Hungary), Dr. G. Savà (Dept. of African Languages and Linguistics, Leiden), Prof. R. G. Schuh (Dept. of Linguistics, UCLA, Los Angeles), Dr. R. Sottile (Università di Napoli “L'Orientale”), Prof. H. Tawil (Yeshiva University College, New York), and Dr. W. G. E. Watson (Newcastle upon Tyne).

I am deeply indebted to several persons and organisations for their generous help in very many technical matters, especially to the staff of the former ARÉV Printing Works (Székesfehérvár): first of all, Mrs Anna Huber for her scrupulous work over the past fifteen years (since 1992) that I greatly appreciate, Mrs Júlia Rácz and Mr L. Bárdosi for their friendliness. My sincere thanks go also to Mr A. Szilágyi (formerly Raszter Print Nyomda, now BriBen Nyomda Kft., both in

Székesfehérvár), Mr Á. Reiter and Mr B. Luttor (Printer Nyomda, Székesfehérvár) for their generosity as well as to the pleasant and friendly teams of the copy-shops in the Adalbertstraße in Frankfurt a/M (Kopie-Corner) as well as in the Dorotheenstraße in Berlin (TAT-Triumph Ost GmbH). Over the past five years (August 2002, September and November 2004, May 2005, June 2007), my father, Mr J. Takács, has given me outstanding and invaluable technical help with transporting hundreds of kilogrammes of scholarly materials from abroad back to Székesfehérvár. Special thanks are due to Drs. E. Tóth (Institute of Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences) for her unselfish technical help over the past three years and especially for creating the pdf version of my manuscript.

I am indebted to Prof. E. Gaál (1941–2005), my revered old teacher and to Dr. T. Bács (both at ELTE, Hungary) as well as to Prof. I. Kenesei and Prof. R. Simon (Institute of Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences) who have allowed me a flexible timetable in both my positions since 2003, facilitating a maximal exploitation of time. The wonderful conversation with Prof. Kenesei on 13 May 2003 remains unforgettable. I thank Mrs Alice Csoba and Mrs Judit Tiba (ELTE, Hungary) as well as Mrs Mária Kovács and Mrs Anikó Ferenczi (Institute of Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences) for their care and friendly interest. It is here that I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the diligent assistance of Miss Terézia Horváth and Mrs Szilvia Muhr (ELTE, Hungary) over the past five years in countless practical matters.

I am glad to acknowledge the support given by a number of foundations to my various projects, which helped me to finance my scholarly work at different stages over the past five years: Lánosz-Szekfü Foundation (City Hall, Székesfehérvár), Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung (Bonn), OTKA (Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alap, National Scientific Research Fund, Hungary), Deák Ferenc fellowship granted by the Hungarian Ministry of Education (Oktatási Minisztérium), Talentum Prize (Hungary). It is here that I wish to thank to Mrs Armène Vycichl (Genève), this wonderful lady, for her vivid attention and generous support.

Over the past five adventurous years, I could not have overcome the difficulties that arose without the constant and implicit moral support of my four elder friends, four outstanding figures of Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics of our time (in alphabetical order), namely Prof. Emer. M. L. Bender (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale), Prof. A. B. Dolgopolsky (University of Haifa), Prof. H. Jungraithmayr (Insti-

tut für Afrikanische Sprachwissenschaften, J. W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt a/M), and Prof. A. Zaborski (Jagellonian University and Institute of Oriental Philology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków). I hold their trust and friendship in high esteem. I wish to express my gratitude for the enthusiastic attention and encouragement of Drs. M. I. Sokolova (Moscow), Dr. C. Taine-Cheikh (Paris and Nouakchott, Mauritanie), Dr. A. Boucherit (Sorbonne, Paris), and Prof. A. Lonnet (GLECS: Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques, Paris) as well as my colleagues in the Oriental Research Group at the Institute of Linguistics (Hungarian Academy of Sciences). I thank Prof. R. Hannig (Seminar für Ägyptologie, Marburg an der Lahn) for both of our lengthy conversations (May 2005 and May 2006), which provided precious background information. I was honoured by the warm Sicilian affection and hospitality of Mr P. Galfo and Mr G. Scrofani as well as other friends from Via degli Normanni during my stay in Ragusa-Ibla (June 2005). Most recently, my short visits to Balaton in 2006–2007 and to Martinique in June 2007 (my cordial thanks go to Mme F. Péaud and Dr. A. Anselin for their friendliness) helped me to recuperate from a heavy schedule over the past half decade, and so have significantly facilitated the completion of this volume as planned.

I am grateful to Michael Mozina (E. J. Brill, Boston) for all of his hard work with volume three. Special acknowledgement is due to Patricia Radder (E. J. Brill, Leiden) for her efficient editorial work on both previous volumes of this dictionary and for her exceptionally friendly attitude.

My special thanks go to Dr. W. G. E. Watson (Newcastle upon Tyne), who was kind and unselfish enough to take out the necessary time from his many-sided commitments in order to check the English of the introductory paragraphs.

This volume is dedicated to the memory of Acad. J. Harmatta (1917–2004), my former teacher, and it is here that I wish to commemorate Mr. Eduárd Káldor (1921–2006), the dear old friend, who had always shown true interest in my work. בְּרוּךְ הוֹשֵׁם.

INTRODUCTION

The aims and principles of this etymological dictionary remain, as outlined in EDE II xiii–xviii. The structure of etymological entries is also unchanged. Two important aspects have, however, gained more emphasis than before in the light of my experience with EDE II.

On the one hand, Semitic loan-words are from now discussed in full without exception (unless there is absolutely no suggestion for an etymology), since there are often diverse (sometimes equally unconvincing) etymologies suggested for the same Ramesside form, and a critical discussion and appraisal of the competing views is desirable. In other words, the standard works dealing with this segment of the Egyptian lexical stock (Helck 1962, 1971; SCR 1992; Hoch 1994) are unfortunately not as reliable as it seemed to me a decade earlier when EDE II was prepared.

On the other hand, as I declared right in the beginning (cf. EDE I ix), EDE is merely an etymological compendium presenting and analyzing the Afro-Asiatic parallels to the Eg. roots and by no means a dictionary examining “...*the philological and textual background of the discussed Egyptian roots*”, since “*my work does not and was not intended to serve such purposes*”. Nevertheless, I partly revised this reluctant position, in spite of seeing the controversies of Egyptian lexicographical research (including the diverse trends of vowel reconstruction). Accordingly, from 2002 on, the primary and secondary literatures of Egyptian philology have also been filed in my Egyptian etymological word catalogue (EEWC) *ohne Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit*, although I still maintain that this kind of analysis (demanding double amounts of efforts and time) should be basically the task of another project even if our standard dictionaries of Egyptian are evidently imperfect. Whether the extra efforts invested in securing this additional aspect of the etymological analysis will essentially contribute to the fundamental aim of EDE (cf. vol. I ix) and will be thus ultimately compensated by a corresponding scientific profit, has to be decided by the reader.

Unfortunately, the etymological investigation of Egyptian has recently been disturbed by the reappearance of certain alarming negative tendencies influencing even some leading authorities of Egyptian linguistics. These are either a distorted interpretation of the so-called *Wurzelprinzip*

or a far-fetched application of the Rössler theory, which has otherwise given us a number of brilliant observations (for a critical survey and analysis of these phenomena cf. Takács 2003, 59ff; 2005, 14ff; 2005, 207–211; 2005, 623ff). It is hoped that – as in more fortunate areas of comparative-historical linguistics, such as Semitic or Indo-European, where similar teething problems have already been successfully eliminated (e.g., Kogan 2003) – these difficulties of Egyptian linguistics will be also overcome.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS OF LANGUAGES, ERAS, AND CERTAIN SOURCES

(A): Ahmimic	Bdm.: Buduma (Yedina)
(A ₂): “Subahmimic” (Asyutic)	Bdy.: Bidiya
aA or OAss.: Old Assyrian	Bed.: Bedawye (Beja)
AA: Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic)	Bgm.: Boghom (Burrum, Burum)
aAK or OAKk.: Old Akkadian	BH: Biblical Hebrew
aB or OObab.: Old Babylonian	BH: Beni Hasan (Newberry)
Adm.: The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage (Gardiner 1909)	BHyil: Bura-Hyil
Afd.: Af(f)ade	Bks.: Bokkos
Akk.: Akkadian	BM: Bura-Margi
Alg.: Alagwa	BMns.: Beni Menaser
Alt.: Altaic	Bmr.: Ait Baamran
Altg.: Alataghwa	BN: Bade-Ngizim
Am.: Amarna	Bnn.: Banana (Masa)
Amh.: Amharic	Bns.: Benesho
Amr.: Ammar’ar	BPb.: Bura-Pabir
Anf.: Anfillo	BPl.: Bura-Pela
AP: (mostly African) areal parallel	Bqy.: Iboqqoyen
Aram.: Aramaic	Brb.: Berber
Arb.: Arbore	Brg.: Burunge
Arg.: Argobba	Brw.: Barawa
AS: Angas-Sura	Bsk.: Basketo
Ass.: Assyrian	Bsr.: Bisharin
Av.: Avestan	BT: Bole-Tangale
B: Beni (in Berber)	Bth.: Bathari (Basari)
(B): Bohairic	Cbk.: Chibak (Kyibaku)
BA: Biblical Aramaic	Ch.: Chadic
Bab.: Babylonian	Chh.: Chaha
Bcm.: Bachama	Cl.: Celtic
BD: Book of the Dead	CMar(oc): Central Maroccan
	CPA: Christian Palestinian Aramaic
	Cpt.: Coptic

CT: coffin texts	Gbn.: Gabin
Cu.: Cushitic	Gbr.: Gabri
Cvk.: Chuvok	GCnr.: Gran Canaria
DB: Daffo-Butura	Gdc.: Gidicho
Dbs.: Dobase	Gdf.: Guduf
Dds.: Diddesa (Didessa)	Gdl.: Gwendele (Pelasla)
Dem.: Demotic	Gdm.: Ghadames
DeM: Deir el-Medineh	Gdr.: Gida/er (Kada)
Dgq.: Tadghaq	Ger. and Germ.: German
Dgr.: Dugwor	Gk.: Greek
Dgw.: Dghwede (Truade)	Glf.: Gulfei
Dhl.: Dahalo	Glg.: Gollango
Dng.: Dangla	Glm.: Galambu
DP: distant (mostly non-African) parallel	Gmg.: Gamergu (Magwa)
Drm.: Dormo	Gmr.: Gimirra
Drt.: Dirayta	Gnj.: Ganjule
Drv.: Dravidian	GR: Ptolemaic and Roman period
Dsn.: Dasenech	Grg.: Gurage
Dtn.: Daṭina (Dathina)	Grm.: Geruma
E: East(ern)	Grt.: Guruntum
EA: cuneiform tablets of the Amarna correspondence	Grv(d): Girvidig
EA(ram.): Egyptian Aramaic	Grw.: Gorowa
ES & Eth.-Sem.: Ethio-Semitic	Gsg.: Gisiga
Eg.: Egyptian	Gur.: Gurage
End.: Endegeny	Gvk.: Gvoko (Glnada)
Eng.: English	Gwd.: Gawwada
Enm.: Ennemor	Gwn(d): Gwandara
ESA: Epigraphic South Arabian	Gwr.: Gawar
Eth.: Ethiopian (dynasties)	Gyt.: Gyeto
(F): Fayyumic	H: Highland
FB(gr): Fali-Bwagira	Had.: Hadiyya
FG: Fali-Gili	HBn.: Higi-Bana
FJ: Fali-Jilbu	Hbr.: Hebrew
FK: Fali-Kiria	HBz.: Higi-Baza
FMb.: Fali-Mubi	HD: Higi-Dakwa
FMc.: Fali-Muchella	Hdn.: Hadendiwa
Fr.: French	HECu.: Highland East Cushitic
Frtv.: Fuerteventura	HF: Higi-Futu
	HG: Higi-Ghye

Hgr.: Ahaggar	Kts.: Katsina
Hitt.: Hittite	L: Late
HKml.: Higi-Kamale	L: Lowland
HNkf.: Higi-Nkafa	(L) or (A ₂): Lycopolitean or
Hrk(t): Harakta	“Subahmimic” (Asyutic)
Hrr.: Harari	Lat.: Latin
Hrs.: Harsusi (Ḥarsūsi)	LB(ab.) or spB: Late Babylonian
Hrw.: Harawa	LECū.: Lowland East Cushitic
Hz.: Hurzo/a	LE(g): Late Egyptian
HS: Hamito-Semitic	LEg.: Lower Egyptian
Hs.: Hausa	LEth.: Late Ethiopian
Htk.: Hitkala (Lamang)	Lgn.: Logone
Hurr.: Hurrian	Lib.: Libyan
HW: Higi-Wula	Lit.: literary texts
IA(ram.): Imperial Aramaic	lit.: literature or literally
IE: Indo-European	LL: lexical list
IMP: Intermediate Period	LL: Lislakh (Hodge)
Irq.: Iraqw	Lmg.: La(a)mang (Hitkala)
Itl.: Italian	Lnz(r): Lanza/erote
JA(ram.): Jewish Aramaic	LP: Late (Third Intermediate)
jB or YB(ab.): Jungbabylonisch	Period
Jbl.: Jibbali or Shahri (Shawri, Ṣherí)	LP: Lame-Peve
Jmb.: Jimbin	LR: Lisramic (Hodge)
Kbl.: Kabalay/i (Gablay, Lay)	M: Middle
Kjk.: Kajakse	(M): Coptic dialect called
Kjr.: Kujarke	Middle Egyptian or
KK: Kera-Kwang group	Oxyrhynchitan
Klf.: Ait Khalfun	mA or MA(ss.): Middle Assyrian
Klg.: Ku/olong	Mag.: Magical
Klr.: Kulere	Mat.: mathematical papyri
Kls.: Klesem	mB or MB(ab.): Middle
Kmb.: Kambatta	Babylonian
Kps.: Kapsiki	Med.: medical texts
Krkr.: Karekare	MEg.: Middle (Classical)
Krt.: Kartvelian (South Caucasian)	Egyptian
Kry.: Kariya	Mfl.: Mefele
Ksr.: Kuseri	MG: Mofu-Gudur
Ktk.: Kotoko	Mgm.: Migama (Jonkor of Abu Telfan)
	Mhq.: Tamahaq

Mhr.: Mehri	Ngw.: Ngweshe (Gvoko?)
Mjl.: Minjile	Ngz.: Ngizim
MK: Middle Kingdom	NK: New Kingdom
Mkl.: Mokilko (Mokulu)	Nkt.: Nakatsa/i (Chineni)
Mkr.: Makeri	Nnc.: Nancere
Mkt.: Muktele (Matal)	Nsl.: Taneslemt
MLA(r): modern literary Arabic	Nst.: Nostratic
MLk.: Moloko	O: Old
Mlw.: Mulwi (Vulum)	(O): Old Coptic
MM: Mafa-Mada gr. (Matakam gr.)	OA(ss.): Old Assyrian
Mnd.: Mandaean/aic (in Semitic) or Mandara (in Central Chadic)	OAK(k): Old Akkadian
Mns(r): Menaser	OB(ab.): Old Babylonian
Mnt.: Montol	OEg: Old Egyptian
Mpn.: Mupun	OI(nd.): Old Indic (Sanskrit)
Msg: Musgu (Munjuk, Mujuk)	OK: Old Kingdom
Mshq.: Tamasheq	Om.: Omotic
Msq.: Masqan	Omt.: Ometo
Msm.: Mi/esme	OP(rs.): Old Persian
Msmj.: Masmaje	Orm.: Oromo
Msq.: “Tamasheq”	OSA: Old South Arabian
Msr.: Mushere	Ostr.: ostracon/a
Mtk.: Matakam (Mafa)	(P): Coptic dialect of the Book of Proverbs (Papyrus Bodmer VI)
Mtr.: Muturwa	Pap.: papyrus
Mwl.: Mwulyen	PB: Post-Biblical
Mzg.: Tamazight	PBH(br.): Post-Biblical Hebrew
Mzq.: “Tamazheq”	Pdk.: Paduko (Padokwo, Parekwa)
Myg.: Muyang	Pdm.: Pidlimdi
N: New	Peas.: The Story of the Eloquent Peasant (Bauerngeschichte)
N: North(ern)	PEg: Proto-Egyptian
nA or NA(ss.): New Assyrian	Phn.: Phoenician
nB or NB(ab.): New Babylonian	Plc.: Polchi
Ncr.: Nancere	Plm.: Palmyrene
NE(g): New Egyptian	PT: pyramid texts
Ndr.: Ndreme (Mbreme, Vame)	Pun.: Punic
Nfs.: Nefusa	Qbl.: Qabyle
Ngl.: Ngala	Qbn.: Qabenna
Nglm.: Ngilemong	Qtb.: Qatabanian

- Qwd.: Qwadza
 Ramess.: Ramesside
 Rel.: religious texts
 Rnd.: Rendille
 RT: religious texts of the
 Theban royal tombs
 S: South(ern)
 (S): Sahidic
 SA: Saho & Afar
 Sab.: Sabaean
 Sam.: Samaritanean (Aramaic)
 Sdm. or Sid.: Sidamo
 Sem.: Semitic
 Sgr.: Ait Seghrushen
 Shn. or Sns.: Shinasha
 Sid.: Sidamo
 Sin.: Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions
 Sin.: The Story of Sinuhe
 Skr.: Sokoro (Bedanga)
 Skt.: Sokoto
 Slv.: Slavic
 SH: Semito-Hamitic
 Sml.: S emlal
 Smr.: Somray/i (Sibine)
 Snw.: Shenwa
 Sns. or Shn.: Shinasha
 Snz.: Senhazha
 Som.: Somali
 Sonnenlit.: Sonnenlitanie
 spB or LB(ab.): Late Babylonian
 Sqt.: Soqotri (Soqosri)
 ST: Sino-Tibetan
 Syn.L.: synonym lists (Akk.)
 Syr.: Syriac
 Tbg.: Tobanga (NGabri)
 TH(br.): Talmudic Hebrew
 Thmd.: Thamudean/ic
 Tmb.: Ta/embaro
 Tmk.: Tumak
 Tna.: Tigrinya (-ña)
 Tng.: Tangale
 Tnrf.: Tenerife
 Trg.: Tuareg (Twareg)
 Trm.: Toram
 TT: Theban tomb
 TTM: Talmud, Targum,
 Midrash
 UEg.: Upper Egyptian
 Ulb.: Ulbarag (Urbarag)
 Uld.: Uldeme (Udlam, Vuzlam)
 Ur.: Uralic
 Urg.: Ait Uriaghel
 Ur(ar)t.: Urartean
 Vlm.: Vulum (Mulwi)
 W: West(ern)
 Wlm(t): Tawllemmet
 Wln.: Wolane
 Wlt.: We/olaitta (Wolamo)
 Wrg.: Warji
 Wrs(n): Warsenis
 Wrz.: Werize, Werizoid
 YB(ab.) or jB: Jungbabylonisch
 ZGL: Zaar of Gambar Leere
 Zgw.: Ze/aghwana (Dghwede)
 ZK: Zaar of Kal
 ZL: Zaar of Lusa
 Zlg.: Zulgo
 Zng.: Zenaga
 Zns.: Beni Iznasen
 Zrd.: Zaranda
 Zrg.: Zergulla
 Zrw(l): Tazerwalt

ABBREVIATIONS OF TECHNICAL TERMS AND CERTAIN EXPRESSIONS

ä(hnl): ähnlich(es) (Wb)	gen.: genitive
Abk.: Abkürzung (Wb)	GW: group (or syllabic) writing
abl.: ablative	hrgl.: hieroglyph(ic)
abstr.: abstract	impf.: imperfect
acc.: accusative	imp(rv): imperative
act.: active or actually	inf.: infinitive
adj.: adjective	interj.: interjection
adv.: adverb	intr.: intransitive
allg.: allgemein (Wb)	irreg.: irregular
AP: areal (mostly African)	iter.: iterative
parallels	j(e)m(dn/m): jemand(en/m)
Bed.: Bedeutung (Wb)	(Wb)
bes.: besonders (Wb)	l.: line
Bez.: Bezeichnung (Wb)	lg(s): language(s)
bildl.: bildlich (Wb)	lit.: literature
bzw.: beziehungsweise (Wb)	loc.: locative
caus.: causative	m(asc.): masculine
coll.: collective	med.: medial, medium
cstr.: (status) constructus	mng.: meaning
dat.: dative	n(eutr): neutrum
denom.: denominative	n.: noun, note
dgl.: des/rgleichen (Wb)	neg.: negation, -ive
dial(s): dialect(s) or dialectal	no.: number
diff.: different	nom. instr.: nomen/ina
disc.: discussion	instrumenti
DP: distant (not African)	nom. loci: nomen/ina loci
parallels	o.: oder (Wb)
eig(tl): eigentlich (Wb)	o.ä.: oder ähnlich(es) (Wb)
encl.: enclitic	off. verw.: offizinell verwendet
esp.: especially	(Wb)
etym.: etymology	orig.: original(ly)
ex(x): example(s)	Ostr.: ostracon/a
f(em.): feminine	Pap.: papyrus
fig.: figure or figurative(ly)	part.: particle or participle
folg.: folgende(s) (Wb)	pass.: passive
fut.: future	pers.: person(al)
Gegs.: Gegensatz (Wb)	p.ex.: par excellence

p.ext.: par extension	suff.: suffix
pf.: perfect	syll.: syllable, -ic
phon.: phonetic(al)	t.: table
pl.: plural	TN: toponym
pl.t.: plurale tantum	tr.: transitive
PN: personal name	TT: Theban tomb
poss.: possessive	u.a.: und anderes, unter anderem (Wb)
postp.: postposition	u.ä.: und ähnlich(es) (Wb)
praes.: praesens	u.a.m.: und anderes mehr (Wb)
praet.: praeteritum	u.H.: unbekannter Herunft (AHW)
prep.: preposition	urspr.: ursprünglich (Wb)
prob.: probably	usw.: und so weiter (Wb)
proh.: prohibitive	v.: verb
pron.: pronoun	var.: variant
ptc.: participle	v.adj.: verbal adjective
rdg.: reading	vb.: verb(al)
redupl.: reduplication, -ed	versch.: verschiedene (Wb)
reg.: regular(ly)	vgl.: vergleiche (Wb)
rel.: relative	viell.: vielleicht (Wb)
sg.: singular, singulative	v.n.: verbal noun
sogen.: sogenannter (Wb)	wtg.: writing
st.abs.: status absolutus	z.B.: zum Beispiel (Wb)
st.cstr.: status constructus	zus.: zusammen (Wb)
st.nom.: status nominalis	zw.: zwischen
st.pron.: status pronominalis	
subj.: subject	

ABBREVIATIONS OF AUTHOR NAMES

AC: Andreu & Cauville	AM: Abdel-Massih
AF: Adolf Friedrich	AMS: Amborn & Minker & Sasse
AJ: Alio & Jungraithmayr	Apl.: Appleyard
Ajh.: Ajhenval'd	Aplg.: Applegate
Ajl.: Ajello	Ast.: Aistleitner
Akl.: Aklilu	BA: Birru & Adal & Cowley
Alb.: Albright	Bdc.: Bedecha
Alj.: Alojaly	BG: Bechhaus-Gerst
Alm.: Alemayehu	

- Bgc.: Bougchiche
 Bgn.: Beguinot
 Bhr.: Behrens
 BK: Biberstein Kazimirski
 Blc.: Blachère
 Blf.: Boulifa
 Blv.: Belova
 Blz.: Blažek
 Bmh.: Bomhard
 Bn.: Bouny (apud JI 1994 II)
 Bnd.: Bender
 Bnt.: Benton
 Bntl.: Bentolila
 Brg.: Bargery
 Brk.: Brockelmann
 Brn.: Baranov
 Brq.: Burquest
 Brt.: Barreteau
 Brz.: Brenzinger
 Bst.: Basset
 BSW: Berhanu, Sisay, and
 Wedekind
 Btm.: Bitima
 Cfr.: Cyffer (apud JI 1994 II)
 Chn.: Cohen
 Ckr.: Chaker
 Clc.: Calice
 Clm.: Colombel
 Cpk.: Czapkiewicz
 Cpr.: Caprile
 CR: Conti Rossini
 Crl.: Cerulli
 Crn.: Carnochan
 Csp.: Cosper
 Cst.: Castellino
 Ctc.: Caitucoli
 Dbr.: Djibrine
 Dbr.-Mnt.: Djibrine &
 Montgolfier
 Dcr.: Decorse
 Djk.: D'jakonov (Diakonoff)
 Dkl.: Diyakal
 Dlg.: Dolgopol'skij (Dolgopolsky)
 DL: Dietrich & Loretz
 Dlh.: Delheure
 Dlt.: Dallet
 DM: Drower & Macuch
 Dmd.: Dimmendaal
 Drnb.: Doornbos
 Dsb.: Duisburg
 Dst.: Destaing
 Ebr.: Ebert
 EEN: Ehret & Elderkin & Nurse
 Egc.: Eguchi
 Ehr.: Ehret
 Eld.: Elderkin
 Emb.: Ember
 Fbr.: Faber
 Fcd.: Foucauld
 Fdr.: Fédry
 FH: Farah & Heck
 Flk.: Foulkes
 Flm.: Fleming
 FM or FMlr.: Friedrich Müller
 Frc.: Frick (apud JI 1994 II)
 Frj.: Frajzyngier
 Frz.: Fronzaroli
 Ftp.: Fitzpatrick
 GD: Gaudefroy-Demombynes
 GB: Gesenius and Buhl
 Gdc.: Gaudiche
 Gdk.: Goedicke
 GI: Gamkrelidze & Ivanov
 Grb.: Greenberg
 Grd.: Gardiner
 Grg.: Garrigues (apud JI 1994 II)
 Grs.: Gerstmann
 Grt.: Grotanelli
 Gsp.: Gasparini
 GT: Takács

- Gtr.: Guthrie
 GW: Gamer-Wallert
 Gwr.: Gowers
 Hbr.: Haberland
 Hdg.: Hodge
 Hds.: Hudson
 Hfm.: Hoffmann
 Hhn(b): Hohenberger
 HK: Hinz & Koch
 Hlw.: Hellwig
 Hmb.: Homburger
 Hml.: Hommel
 Hnrg.: Huehnergard
 Hrn.: Haruna
 HRV: Heine & Rottland &
 Voßen
 Hsk.: Hoskison
 HSW: Hailu & Sisay &
 Wedekind
 Htz.: Hetzron
 Hyw.: Hayward
 Ibr.: Ibrizimow
 IL: Institute of Linguistics (apud
 JI 1994 II)
 IS: Illič-Svityč
 JA: Jungraithmayr & Adams
 Jgr.: Jaggar
 JI: Jungraithmayr & Ibrizimow
 Jng.: Jungraithmayr
 Jns.: Johnstone
 JS: Jungraithmayr & Shimizu
 Jst.: Justinard
 JW: Jansen-Winkeln
 KH: Koch & Hinz
 KM: Kießling & Mous
 Kmr.: Kammerzell
 Krf.: Kraft
 Krs.: Krause
 Ksl.: Kießling
 Ksm.: Kossmann
 Kvl.: Kovalev
 Kwh.: Kleinewillinghöfer
 Lbf.: Lebeuf
 Lbg.: Loubignac
 Lfb.: Lefèbvre
 LG: Lienhard & Giger
 LH: Littmann & Höfner
 Lks.: Lukas
 Lmb.: Lamberti
 Lnf.: Lanfry
 Lns.: Lenssen
 Lpr.: Loprieno
 LR: Loualy-Raynal
 LS: Lamberti & Sottile
 Lsl.: Leslau
 Lst.: Laoust
 LT: Lamberti & Tonelli
 MB: Meyer-Bahlburg
 Mch. (or Mct.): Mouchet
 Mck.: Muchiki
 Mgd.: Migeod
 Mgw.: Maghway
 Mk.: Meek
 Mkr.: Mukarovsky
 Mlt.: Militarev
 MM: Majzel' & Militarev
 Mnh.: Meinhof
 MNS: Molčanov, Neroznak, and
 Šarypkin
 Mnt.: Montgolfier
 Mntsr.: Mountassir
 MQK: Mous & Qorro &
 Kießling
 Mrc.: Mercier
 Mrn.: Moreno
 Mrs.: Marrassini
 Msc.: Moscati
 MSkn.: M. Skinner
 Msp.: Maspero
 Msq.: Masqueray

MSSL: Maddieson, Spajić, Sands, and Ladefoged	Rns.: Renisio
Mtl.: Motylinski	Rpr.: Roper
Mts.: Matsushita	Rsg.: Rossing
Ncl.: Nicolas	Rsl.: Rössler
Nct(g):. Nachtigal	Sbr.: Siebert
Nhl.: Nehlil	Scn.: Sachnine
Nkn.: Nakano	SCR: Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey
NM: Newman & Ma	Sgn.: Seignobos
Ntg.: Netting	Sh.: Schuh
Nwm.: Newman	Skn.: N. Skinner
NZ: Naït-Zerrad	Slk.: Sölken
OL: Olmo Lete	Smn.: Simons
Old.: Ol'derogge (Olderogge)	Smz.: Shimizu
OS: Orel & Stolbova	Snd.: Schneider
Ovw.: Overweg	Snk.: Schenkel
PB: Plazikowsky-Brauner	Snr.: Šnirel'man
PDP: Panova, Dolgopol'skij, Porhomovskij	Spg.: Spiegelberg
PG: Pillinger & Galboran	Spr.: Šapiro
PH: Parker & Hayward	Srl.: Sirlinger
PK: Posener-Kriéger	Srn.: Sarnelli
Pls.: Pilszczikowa	Ss.: Sasse
Plz.: Plazikowsky	SS: Simeone-Senelle
Pnc.: Penchoen	SSL: Simeone-Senelle & Lonnet
Pnv.: Panova	Stl.: Stolbova
Prd.: Paradisi	Str.: Strümpell
Prh.: Porhomovskij	Strm.: Stroomer
Prs.: Prasse	Sts.: Starostin
Prv.: Provotelle	Stz.: Seetzen (or Satzinger)
Psc.: Pascal	Svs.: Ševoroškin (Shevoroshkin)
Ptr.: Petráček	Sxn.: Saxon
PW: Plazikowsky & Wagner	TB: Tucker & Bryan
RB: Rapp & Benzing	TC: Taine-Cheikh
Rdk.: Rhodokanakis	Tf.: Taifi
Rdr.: Röder (Roeder)	Tlb.: Talbot
RK: Reutt & Kogan	Tlm.: Tilmatine
Rlf.: Rohlfs	Trb.: Trombetti
RM: Rapp & Mühle	Trn.: Tourneux
Rn.: Reinisch	TSL: Tourneux, Seignobos, and Lafarge
	Uld.: Ullendorf

Vcl.: Vycichl	Wst.: Westendorf
Vrg.: Vergote	Wtl.: Whiteley
Wdk.: Wedekind	WWM(lr.): W. W. Müller
WL: Wente-Lukas	Zbr.: Zaborski
Wlf.: Wölfel	Zdl.: Zeidler
WMM(lr.): W. M. Müller	Zhl.: Zyhlarz
WP: Weibegué & Palayer	Zvd.: Zavadovskij

CORRIGENDA TO EDE II

<i>place</i>	<i>printed</i>	<i>should be</i>
p. xi, l. 15	upublished	unpublished
p. xxiii	–	add Tna.: Tigrinya
p. 6, ■ 1., l. 14–15	„le génie de la brousse, 2. génie, diable, fantôme (terme générale).	„1. le génie de la brousse, 2. génie, diable, fantôme (terme générale), 3. brousse, plaine“ [Ctc. 1983, 58].
p. 250, ■ 5., l. 7	abwaar	nbwaar
p. 259, ■ 1., l. 2	«bush yarn»	«bush yam»
p. 301, ■ 1., 1.1., l. 5	lait»,	lait» [DRS]
p. 309, entry for bs.t «way», l. 3	būs-á	būs-á
p. 359, last l.	byş	byđ
p. 407, entry for p3d, NB2, l. 8	p3d	p3đ
p. 409, ■ 2., NB1, l. 3	p3d	p3đ
p. 444, ■ 1., NB1, l. 4	šúúkà «to sow»	šúúkà «to sow» [Abr. 1962, 815]
p. 515, entry for psg, l. 14	form	forms
p. 521, ■ 2., NB, l. 4	28] Uld.	28] CCh.: Uld.
p. 540, ■ 2., l. 1	Sem. *pyđ	Sem. *pyđ
p. 590, ■ 7., l. 1–2	correspondences	correspondence
p. 591, entry for *ft.t, NB, l. 1	(1644)	(1643)
p. 592, heading	FT	*FT.T
p. 600, l. 2	[Grb.],	[Grb.] =
p. 603, l. 6	specialist	specialists

In the bibliography (pp. 617–636), the following items have to be added:

Barreteau, D. & Brunet, A.: *Dictionnaire Mada*. Berlin, 2000., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

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

Reinisch, L.: *Die 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. Neudruck: Wiesbaden, 1968., Dr. Martin Sändig oHG.

Wit, C. de: *Some Values of Ptolemaic Signs*. = BIFAO 55 (1955/6), 111–121.

m-

***m...** “(a species of) owl”, to be reconstructed on the basis of the hrgl. with the phonetic value m depicting an owl specimen: “Eule” (Wb II 1, 1) = “eagle owl (*Bubo ascalaphus*)” (EG¹ 27, 460, G17) = “barn owl (*Tyto alba alba*)” (Newberry 1951, 72 reaffirmed recently also by Houlihan 1986, 108–110, #56) = “plusieurs espèces de la famille des strigides” (Vycichl 1990, 55).

NB: For further discussion of the hrgl. cf. also Griffith 1898, 20; BIFAO 43 (1945), 71; Keimer 1951; Newberry 1951, 72–74; Fischer 1983, 10–11. Newberry (1951, 72) debated Griffith’s definition of the hrgl. (“*varies but is not long-eared until very late times*”) and maintains that “*the type invariably employed in the Protodynastic period is the Eagle Owl and this bird occurs sporadically from Dynasty III throughout dynastic times*” and that “from Dynasty III the common type for the hrgl. m is the barn owl. Newberry (1951, 72, fn. 2) equally disputed the opinion of Cotteville-Giraudet (that the prototype of the hrgl. m was the small owl, which is, however, round-headed and did not appear before Dyn. XXVI) as well as that of Gardiner (since eagle owl has no ears). Shaheen (1996, 77) holds the “horned” form of the hrgl. m to be the earliest hieratic shape of the sign (he examined also the OK inscription evidence for the “horned” m).

- We know only the first radical with certainty, the rest of the word is still debated.
- **1.** In Egyptology (cf. e.g. Müller 1899, 259; Sethe 1912, 92; 1916, 153; Wb I 1; Ember 1930, 61; Newberry 1951 with further lit.; CED 82; Vcl. 1990, 55), the hrgl. m is usually explained on the basis of acrophony from Cpt.: (O) ***EMOYΛX** (KHW) = **E[MOYΛΔX]** (Spg. KHW), (S) **(2Λ)MOYΛΔ2X**, (B) **MOYΛΔ(2)X** “night raven” (CD 165–6, cf. xix) = “**νυκτικóραξ**” (Champollion, cf. Newberry 1951, 73) = “owl” (CED 82, for vars. see Smith 1975, 198f.; 1978, 360) = “night raven” (CD 166b) = “Nachteule” (Spg. KHW 59 & fn. 7; OLZ 35, 254; KHW 92), which occurs also in Dem. as **3mwld** “Nachteule” (DG 5, dem. mag. pap. of London & Leiden 24:31, 27:9, 3rd cent. AD, cf. Griffith & Thompson 1908, 24, 31) = **ʿmwld** (so, ʿ-!) “eagle owl” (Newberry l.c.). The hypothetical PEg. ***mwld** [perhaps irreg. < ***mwlt?**] could be perhaps identical with Bed. miláike (f) “owl” [Rpr. 1928, 216; absent in Rn. 1895] || LECu.: perhaps Afar milliko (f) “bird of prey (= osprey, *Pandion halinitus?*)” [PH 1985, 168] || ECh.: WDng. múrkúkù [-rk- perhaps < *-lk-] “chouette” [Fédry 1971, 139], which all would lead to assuming AA ***m-l-k** “owl” [GT], whose *-k would, however, be irregular in comparison with Dem. -**d** < PEg. *-g.

LIT.: the Bed.-Eg. comparison was observed independently by V. Blažek (2000 MS, 21 on Beja fauna; 2003, 266: Bed.-Eg.-Afar) and G. Takács (EEWC: Eg.-Bed.-WDng.). NB1: The origin of the Dem.-Cpt. word is obscure. The above listed Cu.-ECh. parallels speak for an inherited tricons. AA etymon. In Egyptian philology, in turn, the Dem.-Cpt. word has been usually analyzed as a compound of *HOY- and *-ΛΔΧ in various unconvincing ways. W. M. Müller (1899, 259–260) was unable to identify either parts of his “Kompositum” mw + lš (?), and rightly added that “*doch ist es sehr unsicher*”. The identification of both components is disputed. K. Sethe (1912, 92) identified the second component of Cpt.: (S) HOYΛΔΖΧ, (B) HOYΛΔΧ with Cpt.: (B) *ΛΩΧΙ “to hide”, (S) qual. ΛΗΧ+ “to be hidden” (KHW 83), and translated Cpt. *HOY-ΛΔΧ as “die im Verborgenen lebende Eule”. Newberry (1951, 73) rightly criticized Sethe giving HOY (sic) “Eule” as a word of its own (without query-mark), which does not exist. A. Ember (1930, 61) suggested that the Cpt. element *HOY- was onomatopoeic. J. Černý (CED 82, 226) and W. Westendorf (KHW 92), in turn, equated Cpt. *HOY- with the element *-HAY of (S) KAKKA-HAY, (B) XAKKA-HAY “small night owl, kleine Nachtule”, in which *KAKKA- is supposedly related to (S) KOYK “a bird” ~ Ar. qūq- “small owl” (KHW 59). Kaplony (cited in KHW 92) sees in the first component OEg. m33 “to see” (!).

NB2: Smith (1975, 198–200, §3) suggests a fully different etymology for Cpt. (S) ΖΔHOYΛΔΖΧ (hapax, Pierpont Morgan MS 51:35, considered in CD as var. (B) HOYΛΔΧ), cf. Dem. ḥmr ~ ḥm3r (associated with ghosts, dead men, monsters, monsters, demons and other noxions, Sethian creatures who might afflict the living with death or disease, thought to arrive upon the death of a man and to carry his soul off to the underworld). Rejecting its comparison with (SB) ΖPIH “pelican” (suggested by Thompson), he sided with a derivation of (S) ΖΔHOYΛΔΖΧ, (B) HOYΛΔ(Ζ)Χ from *ḥm3r-ḥd “destroying owl”, cf. (SF) ΖΩΧ “to be in straits (of death)” > ΖΔΧ “some sort of plague which pursues the dying man like strong wind and devouring fire” (cf. CD 742b), whereby Dem. ḥm3r > *ΖΔHOYΛ. Alternatively, Smith proposes (“less plausibly”) a connection with late NK ḥmrq (GW, name of a demon, mag. Pap. Leiden 343, 3:9 & 6:4, cf. Wb III 96, 6).

NB3: The initial Dem. 3- (claimed by Hodge 1990, 168 to be “unexplained”) was treated by Edel (1963, 99–101) as a reflex of an older j-.

- **2.** N. Skinner (1996, 204) suggested another explanation with acrophony, comparing WCh.: Hausa múúžìyáá “owl” [Abr. 1962, 682], Gwandara múžiya “owl” [Mts. 1972, 83]. Cp. perhaps also CCh.: Daba mimbizimbižim “hibou” [Mch. 1966, 136]. Improbable with regard to #1.

NB1: O. V. Stolbova (1987, 77; 1996, 112) thinks that Hausa -žì- can derive from WCh. *-ž- (= OEg. -z-). If the suggested Hausa-Eg. etymology nevertheless proves correct, we have to postulate OEg. *mz (or sim.) “owl”.

NB2: Skinner (l.c.) mistakenly combined the Hausa form with Eg. mšc “ein Vogel” (Med., Wb II 156, 17).

- **3.** There are further ways of explaining the hrgl. m by acrophony (of which #3.1. appears especially tempting).

NB: Cp. (1) CCh.: Mada máwwá “hibou sp.”, but cf. wáwwá “hibou” [Brt. & Brunet 2000, 195], which would fit very well Sethe’s (1916, 153) hypothetical *HOY “owl”. (2) NBrb.: Zayan & Sgugu muka “chouette” [Lbg. 1924, 569] ||| ECh.: Lele mígi “un oiseau: rapace nocturne” [WP 1982, 62]. (3) SBrb.: Ayr mátyoyyān “esp. d’oiseau (ressemble au hibou)” [PAM 1998, 228].

- **4.** The value of Eg. m has hardly anything to do with Sem. *būm- “owl” [DRS 52, #2] as seemingly maintained by C. T. Hodge (1990, 168), who attached here also Lat. būbō from a common AA-IE “proto-base” beginning with *b-.

- **5.** E. Edel (1963, 95, 99–101), followed by W. Vycichl (1983, 112), W. Westendorf (LÄ VI 588), W. Schenkel (LÄ V 716), and Th. Schneider (1997, 252), explained the hrgl. value *m* from an unattested **jm.w* (Edel), which they identified (as defective wtg.) with the word *m* (*Weltkammer*). Thus they tried to link the hrgl. *m* to LEg. *jm* “Name eines Vogels” (XXII., Festival-Hall of Osorkon II, Wb I 78, 5) = “entenähnlicher Vogel” (Edel 1963, 99), for which they suppose an onomatopoeitic origin < *jm* “wehklagen, jammern” (Wb I 77, 12), arguing that it was act. “Jammervogel” (Edel), since “*hibou est prob. l’oiseau qui émit des sons plaintifs*” (Vcl. l.c. referring to semantical parallels in IE), because of “*das unheimliche, klagende ‘Uhu’ dieses Nachtvogels*” and “*der Ruf der Athene noctua glanx, einer der drei Eulenarten, die nach Newberry... in der Spätzeit das Schriftbild des m bestimmt*” (Edel), “*the call being a plaintive ‘kew-kew’*” (Newberry 1951, 1951, 72). Edel saw the “*vermutliche Grundform*” of Cpt. st.cstr. (⊖)MOY- vs. st.abs. *⊖MOOY (**ěmōw*) “Eule” (sic) in OK **jm.w* (**j̃máw*, accepted by Schenkel l.c.) “*der Klagende, der jammernde (Vogel)*”, a nomen agentis formed with -*w* (cf. AÄG §225–232). Unconvincing. Declined already by H. S. Smith (1978, 199, fn. 6).
- **6.** P. Kaplony (IÄF 388) explains the hrgl. **m* “owl” from a **m(3)* “*der Sehende (Vogel)*”, since “*besonders deutlich gezeichnet sind die Augen der Eule an der Städtepalette*” (so!). Weak.

m “1. in, 2. mit, 3. als” (OK, Wb II 1–2) = “1. in, 2. with, by means of, together with, 3. from, out of, 4. as, namely (m of predication), 5. (before suff. conj.) when, as, though etc.” (FD 99; cf. Grd. 1927, §162) → adv. *jm* “da, dort, dorthin” (OK, Wb I 72) = “there(in), therewith, therefrom” (FD 17).

NB1: Vocalized as **ma* (MBab., Amarna) vs. **me* (NAss., 7th cent. BC) acc. to the cuneiform evidence reflecting Eg. personal names (KMAV 50; Czermak 1934, II, 196; Edel 1948, 15, §VIII; 1954, 38; 1980, 16, 20, 37f.). Thus, Fecht (1960, 40, §72) and Osing (1979, 313) reconstructed it as **ma-* in st. nom. Edel (1948, 15) set up **jmā=* and Fecht (1960, 189, §392) *(*j̃*)*ma=* in st. pron. Note, however, that Vergote (1962, 74) segmented the prefix in the underlying cuneiform personal names only as -*m-* (leaving the subsequent vowel for the following noun), e.g. MBab. Pa-ria-m-aḥū < p3-r^c-m-ḥ3.t, NAss. Manti-m-ehē < mntw-m-ḥ3.t. The latter PN is attested in a cryptographic form (seated Month holding a sail) read mntw-mḥj.t (as suggested by Spg. in ZÄS 65, 1930, 131 and corroborated by Smither 1939, 168, fn. 1), which, however, suggests -*em-*, cf. (L) Ḥ2H (note that Drioton 1943, 177–8 proposed an alternative cryptographic reading mntw-m-ḥt3w).

NB2: The bilabial articulation of the prefix shifted to a dental one by the NK (sporadically, acc. to Czermak, only in a “weak syllable”, but acc. to Böhlig “*sehr*

häufig”), which yielded (SALBF) \bar{n} - prep. of diverse functions, i.a. nota accusativi (Erman NÄG 1933, §603, §606; Czermak 1934, II, 196–7; Fecht 1960, 40, §72; Böhlig 1977, 17–23; Osing 1979, 313). For a detailed discussion of the acc. marker usage of LEg. $m > \bar{n}$ -, $\bar{n}HO = v$. Spg. 1904, 34–35, §XII. Similarly, the “intrusive” m - of the LEg. indep. prons. seems also relevant to this LEg. phonetic shift $m > n$. Albeit Erman (NÄG 1933, §98) assumed m - to indicate that n - was not lost (NB: this could have been achieved rather by the doubling of nn -) as in the rel. pron. $ntj > eT$, while Černý & Groll (1978, 5) explained it via assimil. of $[m]/[n]$ before $-t$ -, S. Uljas (2005, 87–90) has now demonstrated that m - in $mntk$ etc. was a relict of an old jn (in the construction $jn + nomen$), which is explainable by an $[jn]$ value of m , which was also functionally assimilated to jn . Similarly, Dem. $jn-jw > of$ (S) HHY (stative of jw “to come”, which in Dem. it refers to a progress, not a state) is usually explained from MEg. $m-jj.t$ “in coming” (so most recently e.g. L. Depuydt 1998, 63 noting that qualitatives with jn - always indicate progressive actions just as MEg. $m + inf$).

NB3: For a new use of m “together with” (with $exx.$ from OK, MK, LEg.) see Smither 1939, 166–9, also EG³ §162.7a. For its additive meaning see Gdk. 1967 (KDAR), 46.

- Not excluded that behind the many-sided functions of Eg. m we have to suspect three (unrelated?) AA morphemes: (1) “in, from” vs. (2) “with” vs. (3) “as, like”. Thus,

(1) Eg. m with locative function may be \sim Sem.: perhaps Geez ʔəm “from, out of (place) etc.” [Lsl. 1987, 22] and Gafat $\text{əmmä} \sim \text{mä}$ “à, dans (lieu, temps), de” [Lsl. 1956, 176] ||| Agaw: Kemant -ḡā [reg. $< *mā$] (postp.) “dans” [CR 1912, 239] ||| NOm.: Benesho $-m \sim -n$ “on, at, in” [Wdk. 1990, 115] ||| WCh.: Fyer $\text{ʔm} \sim m$ “nach, zu, an, in” [Jng. 1970, 87] | Kupto $-m/-m$ “in”, cf. $mā$ “von” [Leger 1992, 20, 27] || CCh.: Glavda $mā \sim má$ “in, from, within, out of” [RB 1968, 61], Mnd. óm (preverb) “hinein, herein” [Wolff 1974, 19], Dghwede me “in, into, apart” [Frick 1976, 8] || ECh.: Mkl. $\text{ʔumméy} \sim \text{ʔummèy}$ “là, là-bas, voilà” [Jng. 1990, 190] | Mubi $má$ “1. her von, 2. beim Komparativ, 3. und” [Lks. 1937, 184] $< AA *m$ “in” [GT]. Here might belong the Akk. adv. case ending $-um$ (Djk.: $-m$ here was not the mimation) which I. M. Diakonoff (1988, 61) took from AA $*Vm$ “locativus-adverbialis”.

NB: The Eth.-Sem. parallels are problematic. These were derived by W. Leslau (1945, 161) from Eth.-Sem. $*əmnā \sim *əm$ “from”. The origin of the Gafat prep. is dubious. Leslau (1956, 213) proposed two alternatives: (1) $< \sqrt{mn}$ in the sense “de” (i.e., $< Sem. *min$) with the loss of $*-n$ just as in the case of e.g. S’a^cdah (Yemen) $mē$ “von” [Behnstedt 1987, 305], (2) perhaps a “variante phonétique” of Gafat $bā$ in the sense “dans”.

(2) Eg. m “with \rightarrow by means of” \sim Om.: cf. perhaps Ongota (if it belongs with Om.) $-mi \sim -me$ “by (means of), with (noun suffix, agentive or instrumental)” [Flm. 1992, 212] ||| WCh.: Sura $móó$ (prep.) “and, with” [Jng. 1963, 75], isolated in AS (GT 2004, 250) | Kupto $má$ “zusammen, mit” [Leger 1992, 20] || CCh.: Hide (Htk.) $mā$ “de,

à partir de, dans, à” [Eguchi 1971, 216] | Mbara máy ‘ “with” [TSL 1986, 271, 284] || ECh.: Mgm. má “avec” [JA 1992, 105].

- (3) Eg. m *der Identität* ~ NBrb.: Ikhebdanen & Iqrayen & Temsaman & Uriaghel am “comme, ceque” [Biarnay 1917, 83], Sgrs. am “comme” [Pellat 1955, 103], Izn. & Bqy. & Amr. am “comme” [Rns. 1932, 382] = am “comme, environ” [Abès 1916, 110], Bettiwa am “comme” [Brn. 1911, 183], Mzg. am(m) “(indique la comparaison, la manière) comme, tel (que), à l’instar de, 2. aussi bien que, aussi... que” [Taifi 1991, 398], Ait Said m “quand, comme” [Allati 1986, 10], Mzab am ~ an (prép.) “comme” [Dlh. 1984, 113], Wrg. am “comme” [Dlh. 1987, 181], Zayan & Sgugu am “comme” [Lbg. 1924, 563], Nfs. am “come (comparativo di uguaglianza)” [Bgn. 1931, 259] | Qbl. am (prep.) “comme” [Dlt. 1982, 478] || EBrb.: Siwa & Sokna am “comme” [Lst. 1931, 217], Audjila am “come (avverbio di maniera)” [Prd. 1960, 163] || SBrb.: Hgr. am “as, like” [Prasse 1972, 230] ||| WCh.: Krkr. mú “Partikel am Ende des Temporalsatzes: als” [Lks. 1966, 230] || ECh.: Mubi má “beim Komparativ” [Lks. 1937, 184].

AP: L. Homburger (1929, 168; 1930, 283) compares Eg. m with various Afr. words like Bantu (sic) mu “dans”, Mande ma “dans”, Peul ma- (prefix of possessive pronouns). Similarly, Th. Obenga (1993, 291, #19) suggests that Eg. m = Bantu (sic) mu ~ omu “dans, au moyen de, hors de, ainsi, précisement”, Mbochi m- (mo, ma, m) “id.”, LECu.: Oromo mo “aussi” (!), Ngambay mē “dans”. A certain part of all these forms (“aussi”) is surely irrelevant.

NB1: For the locative function cf. still SCu. *yam- “stay in a place” [GT]: WRift *yam-u: Irq. yamu “under, below, floor”, Grw. yamu “places, country”, Brg. yamu “place, district, under, below”, Alg. yamu “land” | Dhl. řem- [*y-] “to stay in a place” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 315).

NB2: Cf. also AA *mV “when, while” [GT] > NBrb.: Warsenis & Tarudant ma “lorsque” & Shawya ma “si” [Bst. 1890, 310], Bettiwa mi “lorsque” [Brn. 1911, 183], Mzab mmi “quand, lorsque” [Dlh. 1984, 114], Wrg. mmi “quand, lorsque” [Dlh. 1987, 182] | Qbl. mi “lorsque, quand” [Dlt. 1982, 477], Zwawa ma “si” [Bst. l.c.] etc. || SBrb.: Hgr. emmi [Fcd. 1951–2] ||| CCh.: Bura ma “if, when” [BED 1953, 126], Margi mà “1. if, when, 2. before” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 123] | Malgwa má “wenn, falls” [Löhr 2002, 212], Glavda ma “if” [RB 1968, 61] || ECh.: Mgm. máa “lorsque, quand” [JA 1992, 105].

- To the best of my knowledge, there are no unambiguous cognates in Sem. despite the various attempts to find a Sem. etymology. There are also other unacceptable suggestions. Note:
- 1. For phonological reasons, Eg. m cannot be related to Sem. *b- (prep.) “in, from” as supposed by many scholars. Rejected already by W. Vycichl (DELC 134–5). This misleading similarity was correctly formulated already by J.-J. Clère (1945–8, 25), who pointed to that the identical meanings of Eg. m vs. Ar. bi- are due to “l’évolution simplement parallèle, sans liens historiques”.

LIT.: for this Eg.-Sem. etymology see Hommel 1894, 353; Grd. 1900, 324; Ember 1911, 90, fn. 1; 1918, 5; 1930, #10.b.14; Smither 1939, 167; Gordon 1952, 121; 1957, 274; Ward 1963, 424, fn. 2; Böhlig 1977, 17, fn. 27 & 18–23; Hodge 1976, 15, #168; 1976, 49; 1981, 234; 1981, 374, #35; 1983, 43; 1985, 17; 1986, 144; 1991, 99; 1991, 382; 1991, 640; 1995, 636; Castellino 1984, 14–15; Petráček 1987, 319, §2.3; Lipinski 1997, 462, #48.5).

NB1: Eg. m vs. Sem. *b are irregular and nothing seems to justify a secondary change of *b → m or *vice versa*.

NB2: For Sem. *b- cf. also OEg. bw “place” (above).

- **2.** H. Möller (1911, 66) combined a whole range of unrelated terms: Eg. (j)m “in(ter)”, mt.t “Mitte”, mtr.t “Mittag” ~ Sem. *matn- “Hüfte” (Möller: < **Mitte’!) ~ Gk. μέτα < IE *(e)m-/*m̥- + ext. *-t- as well as with IE *médh-jo-s (with ext. *-dh-) “medius” (sic). Unacceptable.
- **3.** F. Behnk (1927, 81, #11) and A. Ember (1930, #10.b.14), followed by V. Blažek (2004, 5), equated Eg. m mistakenly with Sem.: Akk. ema “in”. But the Akk. form is correctly ēm ~ ēma, which is a compound of ai ~ ē + -ma, i.e.: “wo immer” [AHW 210] = “in whatever/every part of”, conj. “whatever” (< Sem. *ʔay-ma) [GAG §114.i & CAD].
- **4.** G. Feichtner (1932, 219) combined Eg. m *der Identität* with the Eg. verbal prefix m- (sic) and the “Hamitic” marker *m expressing a “Tätigkeit mit/gegeneinander ausgeübt”. Similarly, K. Petráček (1987, 319, §2.3) compared AA prefix *mV- ~ i.a. Eg. m- (noun prefix) & m (prep.) “in” and even (S) mλ “place”, which is unacceptable (cp. LEg. m3^c).
- **5.** C. T. Hodge (1976, 49; 1981, 374, #35; 1983, 43; 1985, 17; 1991, 640; 1995, 636) used to combine Eg. m and Sem. *b- with Hbr. prep. mē-, positional var. of min- “from, in” (Dahood 1970, 391, 395). NB1: Difficult to accept, since Hbr. mē- is actually just a variant of Hbr. min- before the definite article ha- via assimilation, i.e. *min-ha- → *mih-ha- → mē-ha- (confirmed to me by D. Testen in a p.c. on 12 April 1999). Hbr. min- goes back to Sem. *min ≠ Eg. m. NB2: Moreover, C. T. Hodge (1991, 156, #15.1) traced back the following words to an ultimate common origin: Cpt. mλ “place”, OEg. m- (prefix of nomina loci), m “in, from” ~ Sem. *min “from” and *m- (place prefix) [cf. Msc. etc. 1964, 80] ~ Brb. *mīn “without” (!) ~ Ch. *mbə “place” [after IS 1966, 19] and *m- (place prefix) and further IE words. No doubt, these are different roots, treated in EDE under bw, m, m-.
- **6.** G. R. Castellino (1984, 14–15) connected the OEg. m *der Identität* to the Slavic ending -om, cf. Russ. он был солдатом “he was a soldier” etc.! To be examined in a wider Nst. context, which is out of range of EDE.
- **7.** Ju. N. Zavadovskij (1980, 141–142) views that the NEg. (!) nisba jm.j “which is in...” is actually *imi-j “belonging to mouth” (sic)

and goes back to an unattested etymon “mouth”, which is cognate with Brb. *imi “mouth”. Baseless. Rightly rejected by W. A. Ward (1985, 243): “*impossible*”.

NB1: On the analogy of Eg. jmj, Zavadovskij (l.c.) derived Ar. fi “in” from Psem. *p- “mouth”!

NB2: By the way, for the etymology of Brb. “mouth” cf. Eg. mh.wt.

- **8. R. M. Voigt** (1999, 42) combined Eg. m & jm “da” with Akk. in (a) “in” derived from *ima (with a shift of *-m- > -n- under the influence of Akk. ana), which was rejected by Blažek (2004, 5) pointing out that Akk. ina is cognate to Ebl. in (whereby Akk. ana has no traces in Ebl.).

m- (nominal prefix with several functions).

NB: Its examples are listed e.g. apud Grapow (1914, 16–17), who classified the following sorts of m- prefix: (1) nomen instr., (2) nomen loci, (3) abstracts (e.g. m^cš3 “Menge”, msh^c “Erscheinung”), (4) act./tr. participle (e.g. mnhp “Begatter”, mnhz “Wachender”), (5) pass./intr. participle (mhnk “Beschenkter”), (6) prefix of body parts (Grapow’s exx. are very uncertain: mjz.t “Leber”, mndr “Eingeweide”, msjn.t, q.v.), (7) prefix of “Zeitnomina” (exx. weak). Grapow himself recognized that the existence of the last two prefixes is dubious. G. Jéquier (1921, 145) explained the m- in a group of fem. “noms d’objets” in the MK coffins other way: “le sens apparaît clairement dès qu’on a établi celui de la racine originale: le préfixe se présente alors comme une simple préposition, avec son sens usuel”.

- Prefix of nomina loci & instr.: common AA heritage (e.g. Old. 1960, 797; Sasse 1981, 143): Sem. *mV- (prefix of nom. loci, instr.): e.g. Ar. ma- (nom. loci), mi- (nom. instr.) [Vcl.] ||| Cu. *mV- (morpheme for nom. instr. & loci) [Zbr. 1991, 76–77, #17] ||| Ch. *m- (nom. instr. & loci prefix) [Jng. 1992, 380; 1994, 227]: e.g. WCh.: Hausa ma- (nom. loci), ma-...-ii (nom. instr.) [Gouffé 1981, 423, #5.2.2] = ma- (nomina loci, instr. actoris prefix) [Old.] | Ron *m- (prefix of place, time) [GT after Jng.] || CCh.: Margi mə- (prefix nom. loci) [GT] | Mofu-Gudur ma-, me- (nom. loci & instr.) [Brt. 1988, 161]. Etc.
- Prefix of participles and nomina agentis (common AA), cp. Sem. *mV- (nom. agentis) [GT]: e.g. Ar. mu- (nom. agentis) [Vcl.] ||| Brb. *m- (nomen agentis) [GT after Vcl.] ||| LECu.: Saho-Assaorta ma- (nom. acti & agentis) [IS] | HECu.: Kmb. -ma (adj. suffix) [IS] ||| Ch. *m- (nom. agentis) [Jng. 1992, 380; 1994, 227]: e.g. Hausa ma-...-ii (nom. agentis) [Abr. 1962, 624; cf. Gouffé 1981, 423, #5.2.2] | Ron *m- (prefix of agent, passive participle) [Jng.]: Sha ma- (nom. agentis) [Jng. 1970, 287] || CCh.: Margi mə-...-i (nom. agentis) [IS] | Bata ma- (agential prefix) [Pweddon 2000, 52] | Mofu-Gudur ma-, me- (nom. agentis) [Brt. 1988, 161].
- Prefix of abstract nouns: common AA, cp. Cu. *mV- (deverbal noun derivation morpheme) [Zbr. 1991, 76–77, #16]: e.g. Bed. m- ~ ma- ~

mi- ~ me- [mi- before s,š] (prefix of deverbal abstract nouns) [Rn. 1895, 161] || SAgaw: Awngi -ŋ [$< *m$] (verbal noun suffix) [Lmb.] || LECu.: Afar ma- (verbal noun prefix) [Lmb.], Som. -mo (verbal noun suffix) [Lmb.] | HECu.: Sdm. -ummā (suffix of abstract nouns) [IS] || NOm.: Kaffā -mo, Shinasha -ma (verbal noun suffix) | Mao (forming abstracts) || SOM.: Ari -ma (verbal noun suffix) (Om.: Bnd. 1990, 684; 1991, 286) || WCh.: Ron *m- (prefix of “dimension”, e.g. Daffo mà-ḍor-án “depth” $<$ ḍor “absteigen”) [Jng]: Klr. mu- (verbal noun prefix) [Jng. 1970, 354] | Dera má (nominalizing particle) [Nwm. 1974, 129] || CCh.: Paduko ma- (verbal noun prefix) [IS] | Gidar mu- (verbal noun prefix) [IS] | Musgu mu- (prefix of deverbal nouns) [IS]. Etc.

The underlying AA *ma- [Old.] = *mV- [Dlg. & GT] = *ma(i)- or *-m- (!) [Bnd. 1991, 286] = *m- (sic) [Vernus] seems to unite all or some of these meanings (Ol’derogge 1956, 7–8: PAA “formant” of deverbal participles, nomina loci & instr. & actoris; Petráček 1987, 319, §2.3: prefix of nomina loci, abundantiae, temporis; Vernus 2000, 173 & fn. 18 with further lit.: prefix of place, instr., “participant of action”; Dlg. 2005, 27: prefix of derived nouns, mainly devb.).

AP: NS has a noun derivation morpheme *m in Songhay-Komuz [Bnd. 1994, 51]. K. Petráček (1987, 319, §2.3) compared Eg. m i.a. with the Saharan -m suffix “der Lokativität, des Instruments und der Art”, PBantu *mu- prefix of “Lokativklasse” [Mnh.] = *mo- “inside” [Welmers], Niger-Congo class prefix & prep. *mo- [Welmers], but rejected a connection to Teda mu- (as suggested by Reinisch).

DP: A. Dolgopolsky (2005, 27, §36) observed the traces of his Nst. *mA “marker of nominalized syntactic constructions” in AA (above) as well as in IE *mo- (suffix of denom. and devb. derivatives) ~ Ur. *-ma/ä (derivational suffix of deverbal nomina) ~ Alt.: Turkic *-(i/i)m & *-u/üm (nomina actionis suffix) ~ Drv. *-may (suffix of derived abstract nouns) ~ Krt. *m(e)- (prefix of participles and nomina agentis).

LIT.: the diverse AA prefixes *m- are often mixed together in the lit. For details see Ceugney 1880, 3 (Hbr.-Eg.); Grapow 1914, 16; Vcl. 1934, 101–103 (Eg.-Hausa-Ar.-Brb.); 1958, 376 (Eg.-Ar.); Ol’derogge 1956, 7–8 (Eg.-Hs.-Sem.); Grb. 1963, 48 (Ch.-AA); Djk. 1965, 37–38, fn. 58 (Eg.-Brb.-Bed.); Dlg. 1967, 4–5 (Sem.-Brb.-Hausa-Margi); Jng. 1967, 21 (Ron.-Sem.); IS 1976, #284 (Sem.-Eg.-Tuareg-Bed.-ECu.-Ch.); Hodge 1983, 43 (Eg.-Sem.-PCh.); Lmb. 1989, 11; 1991, 556; 1993, 42 (LECu.-Agaw-Om.); Zaborski 2005, 25, §5.6 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.).

NB1: It requires further investigation to clarify whether this AA morpheme is related to Eg. prep. m “in etc.” and its supposed AA reflexes (above). Recently, A. Zaborski (2001, 598) surmises an etymological connection to Eg. mn “bleiben” and its Ch. cognates (HSED #1795). Elsewhere, Zaborski (1999, 36–38; 2005, 25, §5.6) derived the AA participial prefix *m- from AA *VnV ~ *VmV “to be”.

NB2: The comparison of this common AA derivational morpheme with Sem. *b- “in” & *min “from” (!), Eg. bw “place”, common Cpt. mΔ “place” (NB: $<$ LEg. m3^c, q.v.), Brb. *mīn “without” (!), Ch. *m-bə “place” (!), IE *me- “in middle” etc. (proposed by C. T. Hodge 1990, 653, similarly also Petráček 1987, 319, §2.3) can be certainly excluded.

NB3: Similarly unconvincing is the comparison (going back to a long tradition) of the AA *ma- prefix with the Eg.-Sem. interrogative pron. *mā “who?” (e.g. apud Ol’derogge 1956, 7–8; Vycichl 1994, 247), which was rightly rejected by A. Zaborski (2005, 25, §5.6).

m “wer, was?” (OK, Wb II 4, 3–13) = “who, what?” (FD 100). Cp. Grd. 1927, #227.

- Hence (combined with jn introducing an emphasized subject): jn-m (OK) > nm (MK, XVIII.) ~ njm (since XIX.) “wer? (als Subjekt)” (Wb I 96, 11 & II 263) > (SALMBFO) **nm** “we(lche)r, was?” (KHW 122).

NB: H. Goedicke (1961, 155) observed twice a sportive wtg. of jnm in the inscr. of hr-wr-r^c. Naturally, there is no kind of etymological connection between this compound interrogative pron. and Cpt. **nm** “all” (old nb) as erroneously surmised by Piehl (1891, 240, fn. †).

- Common AA, cp. Sem. *mī “what?” (→ “who?”) [Gray 1934, 17] = *mī < *m-ya (human, personal interrog.!) [OL 1998, 59]: (?) Akk. (all) mīnu “what?” [AHW 655] || NWSem. *mī “who?” [GT]: Ug. my “wer?” [WUS], Hbr. mī “who?” [KB 575] || Geez mī (rare) “what?” [Lsl.], Te. mi “quoi?” [LH, Munzinger] etc. (Sem.: WUS #1557; Lsl. 1987, 323) & Sem. *mā “what?” [Msc. etc. 1964, 114] = *mah [Fbr. 1988, 232] = *mā < *m-ha “what, how (much)?” [OL 1998, 59]: Ug. m “was?” [WUS], Hbr. mā(h) “what?” [KB 550] | OArām. mh [*mā] “what?” [Jean & Hoftijzer] || Ar. mā “quoi? qu’est-ce?” [BK II 1051] || Muher & Masqan mō “what?” [Lsl.] (Sem.: GB 401; WUS #1489; Lsl. 1968, 358, #1437) || PBrb. *mā “what?” vs. *mī “who?” [Prs. 1972, 216, 239; cf. Dlg. 1970, 620, #8; Hodge 1990, 646, #8]: NBrb.: e.g. Shilh ma “wer? was?” [Mnh.] = ma “que? qui? quel? de quoi? en quoi?” [Jordan 1934, 91], Mzg. ma(y) “1. quoi, que, ce que, qu’est-ce que, 2. qui, celui qui?” (interrogatif ou relatif) [Taifi 1991, 393, 446] = mi “who, what” [Ajh.], Sgrs. ma “qui? qui, celui qui, quoi? quoi, ce que” [Pellat 1955, 102] = ma “est-ce que?”, mah “pourquoi?”, may “qui? que?” [Bntl. 1981, 435], Ait Ayash & Sgrs. *may “who, what”, may “where”, *mi “what, who” [AM 1971, 403], Mzab ma ~ ba “quoi, ce que? (démonstr., interrog.)”, cf. mi “pourquoi?” [Dlh. 1984, 113–4], Wargla ma “quoi? que? qui?” [Dlh. 1987, 181], Sened mai ~ ma “que (interrog.)” [Provotelle 1911, 134], Zayan & Sgugu ma ~ (often) mai ~ (rarely) maïd ~ mi “qui? que?” [Lbg. 1924, 564], Zemmur & Sgugu & Mgild mi & Ndir & Zayan mi ~ mai ~ mag “who, what” [Ajh. 1986, 45], Ndir m-ay “what, who”, m-ilmi “when”, m-ani “where” [Pnc. 1973, 106] || EBrb.: Gdm. mī “1. ce que, que, 2. quoi, que?” [Lnf. 1973, 191, #954] || SBrb. *ma “what?” & *mi “who?” [Ajh. 1990, 120, fn. 1]: e.g. Hgr. mi “qui (quelle personne)?” & ma “quoi, que?” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1140], EWlm. & Ayr ma “que? quoi?”, Ayr mi “qui?” [PAM 2003, 516], Udalan ma “quoi, que?”, mi “qui?”, əmmay “quand?” [Prs. & Dicko 2002, 27] || PCu. *mā “what?” vs.

*mē? “how many?” [Bnd. 1989 MS, 19, #17; 1990, 667, #301–2; 1991, 269; 1994, 1163] > NAgaw *-mā (postpos. interrog. particle) [GT] = (Fragepartikel) [Rn.]: e.g. Bilin -mā, Qwara -ma, Hamir -ma “Fragepartikel” (NAgaw: Rn. 1887, 262; 1884, 390; 1885, 96) | Awngi (Awiya) -mā (interrog. postp.) [CR 1905, 167] || ECu. *ma ~ *mā “what?” [Sasse 1982, 138, 146] & *mē “how many?” [Sasse 1982, 143; Lsl. 1988, 195]: LECu. *maḥ- [Black]: e.g. Saho (only Assaorta, Taru^cwa) mā ~ mī “we(lch)er?” [Rn. 1890, 253], Afar māhá “was?” [Mnh.] = maḥa “what?” [HL] = maḥ-tiya ~ mā-tiya “what?”, mā “which” [Black] | Orm. ma-li ~ ma-l “was?” [Mnh.] = má-na ~ má-la “what” [Black] = māl “what” [Hds.], Konso mā-na & Gdl. mā-n “what” [Black] | Somali ma (Fragepartikel), mahá “was?” [Mnh.] = mē ~ mayé “wo?” [Rn. 1902, 281] = maḥay “what?” [HL] = maḥa “was?” [Ss.] = máḥ “what” [Black], Rnd. a-maḥ-ai “what” [Black] = maḥ ~ máha ~ méhe “was?” [Schlee 1978, 139, #725] = mé “is where?”, méhe ~ máha (also relative) “what?” [PG 1999, 222], Boni má ~ mahá “was? warum?” [Sasse 1980, 99], Baiso me “what?” [Hyw., HL: < *ma- interrog. part.] = -me “what?” [Brz. 1995, 26, #289], Arbore máh ~ maha ~ mā ~ ma “who?”, méh ~ me ~ méhete “what?” [Hyw. 1984, 383–4] = me-te “was?” [Bnd. apud Ss., also Black], Dasenech (Galab) mē-te “was?” [Ss.] = mé-te “what” [Black] = māya “wer?” [Mkr.] etc. (Omo-Tana: Sasse 1973, 275; LECu.: Black 1974, 202) | HECu. *ma-ha “what?” & *me^o “how many/much?” & *mi-ha (?) “why?” [Hds. 1989, 418], cf. also Sid. mama “who?” [Hds.: isolated in HECu.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 166–7, also Sasse 1982, 143; Lsl. 1988, 195) | Dullay: Dbs. má ~ má “was? wie?” [AMS], Harso & Dbs. mó^o “was?” [AMS], Glg. má “was? wie?” [AMS], Tsamay mó “who?” [Kusian & Sbr. 1994, 12] = mō “what?”, me? “how many?” [Sava 2005 MS, 257] (Dullay: AMS 1980, 173, 176, 211; ECu.: HL 1988, 126) || SCu. *ma-ka “what?” & *ma “which?” & *me “how many?” & *mi “what (kind of)?” [Ehret 1980, 153–159] > e.g. Ma’a mé “how many”, ki-mómó “how?” [Ehret 1974 MS, 45] = -mo (interrogative suffix) [Copland 1933–34, 244, fn. 1] = mu “how?” [Green apud TB 1974, 206] | Dhl. ma-ka “what?”, má-ka “which?” [EEN 1989, 36] || POM. *am “what?” [Bnd. 1989 MS, 19, #17; 1990, 667, #301–2; 1991, 269] > NOM. *am [Bnd.] = *^cammV- [Lmb.] = *am-o “what?” [GT]: SEOmt.: Koyra am “what?” [Flm. 1990, 29], Zayse al-ma “what?” [Lmb.] | Chara am-ā “perché?” [Lmb.] | Kefoid: Kaffa ámō “was?” [Mnh.] = āmo “what?” [Lmb.], Mocha ámo “what?” [Mrn. in RStO 17,

359] | Dizoid: Sheko am-o “what?” [Bnd.] | Sezo am “how many?” [Bnd. 1990, 604, #141] (NOM.: Bnd. 1990, 679; Lmb. 1993, 68; Lmb. 1994, 112) || SOm. (Aroid) *-ame “how many?” [Bnd. 1989 MS, 19, #21]: e.g. Ari méym “how many?” [Bnd.], Galila mīmmi “how many?” [Flm.], Dime amē “how many?” [Bnd.] (SOm.: Bnd. 1994, 152), cf. also Ongota miyá ~ mīya “how much?” [Flm. 1992, 192] || Ch. *mV “who, what?” [Dlg. 1973, 178–179] = *mi/ə “what?” [Nwm. 1977, 34]: e.g. WCh.: Hausa: Kano mee “what?”, maa “who?”, Skt. & Kts. mi ~ miī “what?” [Pls. 1958, 83] = mēè ~ miī “quoi?” [Gouffé], Gwnd. mi “what?” [Mts. 1972, 81] | AS *me ~ *mi (orig. long *-ē?) “what?” [GT 2004, 244]: Angas mee ~ miī “what?” [Flk. 1915] = me “what?” [Grb., Hfm.] = mai [Ormsby], Sura mé “was?” [Jng. 1963, 74], Goemai mme [mmo] “what?” [Hfm.] etc. (AS: Hfm. 1975, 18, #47) | Ron *mV “was?” [GT]: Fyer mi, Bks. -mi, DB ma-, Sha mà, Klr. ʾa-mû (Ron: Jng. 1970, 391) | Bole mi “what?” [IS], Tng. -m (interrogative suffix) [Jng. 1991, 118], Krkr. miyà “what?” [Alio 1991, c055], Dera má “wer?”, máámí “wann?”, mi “was?” [Jng. 1966 MS, 10–11] = má(-ndái) “who?”, mó(-ndái) “what?”, máámó “when?” [Nwm. 1974, 129–130], Ngamo miya “was?” [Jng. 1963 MS, 3] = miyà “what?” [Alio 1988 MS], Kirfi màámí “what? where” [Schuh 1978, 157] | Bade-Bersali -m “was?” [Lks. 1974–5, 103], Ngz. -mòò (in associative construction with preceding word) “what?” [Schuh 1981, 115] || CCh.: e.g. Margi mi “what?” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 123], Margi-Gwara mímó “was?” [Wolff 1974–5, 201], Chibak mi “was?” [Hfm. 1955, 130, #44], Ngwahyi maya “wer?” [Mkr.] | Gude mí “what?” [Hsk. 1983, 243] | Malgwa má “was?” [Löhr 2002, 301] | PMafa-Mada *ma “what” [Rsg.]: e.g. Mofu may “où?” [Mch.], Mofu-Gudur ma (rel.) “qui, que, ce qui/e”, me “quoi, qu’est-ce que, quel?”, cf. (a)ma “où?” [Brt. 1988, 75, 161–2], Mafa mé, me “quoi?, qu’est-ce que, quel?” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 219], Gisiga ma (interrog. Pronomen), me “was?” [Lks. 1970, 35, 127–8], Uld. may “où?” [Mch.] = māy “quoi?”, mē “alors, quoi?” [Clm. 1997, 194, cf. Clm. 1986, 133] (Mafa-Mada: Rsg. 1978, 358, #799; also Mch. 1953, 192) | Daba mi “quoi” [LG 1975 MS, 99] | Musgu-Puss ma “quoi?” [Trn. 1991, 103] | Masa mé “quoi” [Jng. 1973 MS], Lame mī “quoi?” [Scn. 1982, 316], Zime mi “what?” [Nwm.], Zime-Dari má ~ mī “quoi?”, māmá ~ má “comment?” [Cooper 1984, 16–17] || ECh.: Nancere me ~ mene “what?” [Hfm. 1971, 11, so also apud Nwm. 1977], Lele mē “quoi?” [WP 1982, 62] | Smr. mo (particule d’interrogation, fin de phrase) [Jng. 1978, 206]

| Kera ma mó “was?” [Ebert 1976, 78] | Skr. -ma “what? (interrog. particle)” [Jng.] | EDng. mā (marque l’interrogation) “quoi? quelle chose?” [Dbr. & Mnt. 1973, 191], Bdy. má “quoi, qu’est-ce?” [AJ 1989, 96], Mgm. mēc ~ mēe ~ inimé “quoi?” [JA 1992, 106], Mkl. môomê “was?” [Lks. 1975, 224] = móò(dè) ~ mô “quoi?” [Jng. 1990, 141] | Mubi mû “was?” [Lks. 1937, 184], Minjile mî “what?” [Doornbos 1979 MS, 3; 1980 MS, 11, #95], Jegu mê “was?” [Jng. 1961, 115] (Ch.: NM 1966, 240, #117; Nwm. 1977, 34; Jng. 1990, 51). From PAA *ma- “interrog. pron. for non-living” [Sasse 1981, 143] = *mā “what?” [Bnd. 1990, 679] = *ma “what?” vs. *mi “who?” [Bnd. 1990, 667, #301–2; 1991, 269] = *mi “what?” [Dlg. 1994 MSA, 4].

AP: Songhay mai “wer?” [Mkr.] < NS *ma & *mi (interrogative stem) [Ehret 2001, 277, #98]. L. Homburger (1930, 283) and Lam (1993, 414) compared Eg. m to Ful (Peul, Pulaar) mo “qui?”. Similarly, Th. Obenga (1993, 334, #91) adds further Afr. parallels from a common root *m.

DP: Starostin’s and his co-authors’ list (1995 MS, 33 published later in Sts. 2003, 481) compares the AA interrog. pron. with Krt. *mi-n, NCauc. *mV-, Yenisseian *wi-/we-, all denoting “who?”.

LIT.: Rn. 1885, 96; 1887, 262 (Agaw-Sem.-Eg.); Erman 1892, 111 (Eg.-Sem.); Mnh. 1912, 240 (Hausa-Shilh-ECu.-Agaw-Kaffa-Eg.); Ember 1930, #10.a.9 (Eg.-Sem.); Vcl. 1934, 88 (Hausa-Eg.); 1958, 376 (Eg.-Sem.); Grb. 1955, 61; 1963, 63 (Ch.-ECu.-Shilh-Eg.-Sem.); Dlg. 1964, 59 (Sem.-Eg.-ECu.-Shilh-WCh.-Buduma); 1970, 620, #8 (PSem.-Eg.-PBrb.-ECu.-Hausa); 1973, 178–179 (Cu.-PSem.-Eg.-Brb.-PCh.); Djk. 1965, 75 (Sem.-Eg.-Shilh-ECu.-Hausa); Mkr. 1966, 13, #6 (Afar-Sem.-Eg.-Brb.); 1987, 404 (Ch.-ECu.-NOM.-Sem.); Gouffé 1974, 362 (Hs.-Trg.-Ar.); Bnd. 1975, 196, #95.1 (Sem.-NBrb.-Ch.); IS 1976, #300 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Agaw-ECu.-NOM.-Ch.); cf. Bengtson-Ruhlen 1988, 24, #19; Nwm. 1980, 26, #28 (PCh.-PBrb.-Eg.-Hbr.-Rnd.); Hodge 1981, 404, 411; 1990, 646, #8 (Eg.-PSem.-PBrb.-PCh.-PECu.-POM.); Bynon 1984, 272, #32 (Ch.-Shilh); Djk. 1988, 83, #4.4.2 (Sem.-Som.-Hgr.-Eg.-Hs.); Faber 1988, 232 (Sem.-PBrb.-PSCu.); Mkr. 1989, 27, #73 (Songhay-ECu.-Ngwahy); Bmh. 1990, 387–388 (Sem.-Eg.-NBrb.-ECu.-SCu.-PCh.); Lmb. 1994, 112 (NOM.-ECu.); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 33 (PSem.-Eg.-PBrb.-PAGaw-PECu.-SCu.-Ch.); Ehret 1995, 301, #571 (Ar.-Eg.-PCu.-PCh.-PNOM.); GT 2000, 98, #29.1 (AA); Stz. 2002, 233 (Sem.-Eg.); Prasse in PAM 2003, 516 (Brb.-Sem.-Hs.).

NB1: The etymology of Akk. (all) mīnu “what?” is disputed. It could be supposed that -n- was emended on analogy of Akk. mannu. On the one hand, W. von Soden (AHW 655) and W. Leslau (1987, 352 with further lit.) suggest an different etymology: Geez mōnt “what?”. Cf. ES: Geez mōnt “quoi?” [Dillmann], Tna. mōn(tay) “quoi?” [de Vito, Bassano], Amh. mōn “quoi?” [Guidi], Gafat mōn “what?” [Lsl. 1945, 162], Arg. mōn “quoi?” [Chn., Lsl.], Harari min “quoi?” [Crl., Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1961, 67, §4).

NB2: A similar (?) problem appears in Sem. *man < *m-(a)n “who?” [OL 1998, 59] = *man “who?” [Stz.], cp. Akk. mannu, Oakk., NAss. also man, NAss. also maʔu “wer?” [AHW 603] || BA man “who?” [KB] || OSA: Qtb. mn “he who, whoever” [Ricks], Sab. mn “who, whosoever” [SD 86] = mn “who, what?” [Lsl.], Ar. man “1. celui qui, tel qui, 2. (av. interrogation) qui?” [BK II 1154] || Sqt. mon “qu(o)i?” [Lsl.] || Geez mannu “who?” [Lsl.] = “qui?” [Dillmann], Te. mǎn “qui?” [LH, Munzinger, Lsl.], Tna. man [de Vito, Bassano, Coulbeaux], Amh. ma(n) [Guidi], Gafat man ~ mano “who?” [Lsl. 1945, 162], Argobba man [Cohen, Lsl.], Harari mʔan [Crl., Lsl.], Chaha man [Lsl.] etc. (ES: Lsl. 1961, 67, §4; Sem.: WUS #1592;

Ricks 1982, 142; Lsl. 1987, 348). Note that N. Skinner (1995, 33) derived ES *mannu “who” from AA *m-n “person” [GT], which is not feasible.

NB3: Perhaps the same extension *-n is to be found in NBrb.: Shilh man “who?” [Bnd.], Sgrs. man “quel?” [Bntl. 1981, 435], Ikhebdanen man “quel, où”, cf. main “ceque, quoi, comment” [Biarnay 1917, 83] ||| WCh.: Krkr. mánà “wieviel?” [Lks. 1966, 203] | Pa’a m̀nàá “what?”, m̀nécé “why?” [MSkn. 1979, 194] || CCh.: Bcm. munə “what?” [Nwm. 1977, 34], Bata m̀nō “what?” [Pweddōn 2000, 57] | Bdm. mení “was?” [Nct.] = mení “was?” [Lks. 1939, 119, 145] = mini “what?” [Grb.] | Mafa mán “1. celui/celle qui, ce qui, celui/celle de, 2. qui, que, dont” [Brt. & Bléis 1990, 226] || ECh.: Kwang men “quoi” [Jng. 1973, 47] | Somray man “wieviel?”, man mo “wie?” [Lks. 1937, 80] | Sokoro míni “wieviel?” [Lks. 1937, 36] | EDng. mán(mán) “comment?” [Dbr. & Mnt. 1973, 191], cf. also EDng. m̀nàw “combien?” [Dbr. & Mnt. 1973, 191], Bdy. many “qu’est-ce” [AJ 1989, 97] | Mubi mìn “who?” [Bnd.]. See Bnd. 1975, 197, #97.1 (Sem.-Shilh-Mubi).

NB4: M. Lamberti (1993, 68) set up POm. *ʔammV- “what?”. Later, Lamberti (1994, 112) gave a different analysis and trated POm. *ʔayma “what?” as a fusion of the interrogative pron. *ʔay- + *-ma “interrog. particle”.

NB5: O. D. Ol’derogge (1956, 8) combined AA *ma- (prefix of nomina loci, instr., etc.) with the interrog. morpheme, which, would, however, require justification. Similarly, G. del Olmo Lete (1998, 59) combined the Sem. interrogative base *m- with Sem. *-m (“emphatic, specifying, coordinative postpositive functor”, sic) as well as Sem. *ma (“negative functor”), which is rather improbable. For the Sem. enclitic particle *-ma (originating in the interrog. base *m-), which is used for deriving indef. prons. and adverbs, see Faber 1988, 221 with further lit.

m “Imperativ des zur Negierung bestimmter Verbalformen dienenden Verbums jmj” (OK, Wb II 3, 3–8) = “do not” (FD 100).

NB: As noted in Wb, related to and probably derived (orig. meaning: *‘do not do!’) from OEg. jmj (negation det.) “Verbun unsicherer Bedeutung zur Negierung bestimmter Verbalformen: nicht sein (?)” (PT, Wb I 70, 10).

- Cognate with Sem. *ma [Fbr.] = *ma (negative “functor” [OL 1998, 59–60] = *mā [GT]: attested only isolated in Ar. mā (comme part. nég.) “ne...pas” [BK II 1052] || Gafat -m (élément suffixé servant à former le parfait négatif, l’impératif négatif) [Lsl. 1956, 212], Har. mē “no!” [Lsl. 1963, 102] ||| PBrb. *mā “not” [Prs. 1972, 247], cf. NBrb.: Shilh a-mia “nichts” [Mnh.] | Nfs. mō “non” [Bgn. 1942, 305] || SBrb.: Ayr ma ~ var. mad (négation) “1. ne pas, 2. nég. de l’imperatif” [PAM 1998, 207; 2003, 516] ||| NAgaw: Hamir -m “Negativpartikel: nicht” [Rn. 1884, 390] || LECu. *ma? (particle of verbal negation) “not” [Black 1974, 210]: Afar mā- “nicht” [Mnh.] = ma ~ mā ~ mi (particella negativa) [CR 1913, 69] = ma- [Sasse], Saho mā- “nicht” [Rn. 1890, 253], Saho-Assaorta ma ~ mā ~ mi (particella negativa) [CR 1913, 69] | Oromo (Wellega & Borana) mī(ti) (negative copula), (Orma) mayā “no”, (Borana, Orma, Wellega) mū (neg. copula), (Borana) muyō “1. worthless (person, thing), 2. no value” [Strm. 1987, 365, 367, 371, cf. also Strm. 1995, 211; 2001, 55, 58] | Som. ma ~ mā (neg. Partikel) “nicht”, máya [Rn.: < *má- +

-yahay “es ist nicht”) (neg. Partikel) “nein” (als verneinende Antwort auf eine Frage), máyo [$< *m\check{a}$ “nicht” + subjunct. of a “sein”] (bildet mit dem vorangehenden Inf. das neg. Präs.) [Rn. 1902, 28] = ma- [Mnh.] = má “not”, cf. perhaps mayya “he’s doing without it (lit. he’s avoiding having to require this)” [Abr. 1964, 168, 175] = ma’- [Sasse], OSom. *ma “nicht” & *mā “es ist nicht, daß” [Lmb. 1988, 444], Som.-Jabarti dial. ma- ~ mi- [Rn. 1904, 77–79], Boni mó-, má-, mí- [Sasse 1980, 99], Rnd. ma- (Verbalpräfix der Verneinung) [Schlee 1978, 138, #722] = má “(is) not (aux.)”, mē “not (s’one or sg.)” [PG 1999, 214, 222], Dsn. ma- “not” [Black] = ma “not (negat. marker of declarative clauses)” [Tosco 2001, 516] | Yaaku -meá- (tr.) “to dispense with” [Heine 1975, 123]: act. *“(not to have)” (ECu.: Rn. 1886, 877; Sasse 1979, 52) || SCu.: Irg. m- (prohibitive particle) [IS] || NOm.: Jnj. (Yemsa) miy-ò “Verbot” [Lmb. 1993, 369] || SOM.: Hamer m- (basic element in most negatives, both verbal and non-verbal) [Bnd. 1991, 105, 108, #3] = -ma “no” [Bnd. 1994, 155] || WCh.: AS *mu ~ *mow ~ *m^wa (?) “not” [GT 2004, 253-4]: Chip *ma [$< *m^wa?$] “not”, ði ma “there is not” (cf. ði “there is”) [Krf.], Msr. mu “not”, mop n̄ji mu “they did not come” [Dkl. 1997 MS] = mù “not” [Jng. 1999 MS, 11], Gmy. mou “not (term expressing negation in a sentence)” [Srl. 1937, 145] = mou (part. neg.) vs. mu (excl.) “isn’t it” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 24] | Tng. -m “negative suffix”, e.g. nèè “is there” vs. nè-m “is not there”; n lókò “I love” vs. n lókó-m “I do not love”; kòŋ “(it is) good” vs. kòŋ-ó-m “(it is) not good”; mù “somebody” vs. mù-m “nobody” [Jng. 1991, 118; Jng. 1988, 488, #2.1] | Bade -m (negative suffix) [Lks. 1974–5, 103] || CCh.: (?) Bura am [met. $< *ma?$] “no! never! certainly not!” [BED 1953, 7], Margi mài “not” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 123] | Glavda mááy ~ maay ~ may “no, not, not to be, not to have”, mǎy “there is not” [RB 1968, 64] | Gsg. máy... ði “ne...pas” [Ajello 2001, 39] | Masa máy... ði “ne...pas” [Ajello], Lame mì “ne...pas” [Scn. 1982, 316], Zime-Dari mì “ne...pas” [Cooper 1984, 17].

AR: A. Militarev (2005, 372, #62; 2005, 589, #62.1) equated the Cu. and Sem. cognates with Ongota ma “not (imper.)”, mi- “not (verb prefix in non-imperative phrases)” [Flm. 1992, 193]. J. Hohenberger (1958, 386) related LECu.-Eg. to Masai m- “neg. Part. fürs Präsens”.

DP: H. Möller (1911, 158) and A. R. Bomhard (1981, 447) compared Ar. mā & Eg. m with IE *mē “ne”. S. Starostin (2003, 476) suggests a relationship of Sem. *ma- (sic) to ST *ma “not” and Yeniscean *wə- “not”.

LT.: Ceugney 1880, 2, #5 (Eg.-Ar.); Rn. 1886, 877; 1902, 28 (ECu.-Xmr.-Eg.); Mnh. 1912, 237 (Shilh-ECu.-Xmr.-Eg.); CR 1913, 69 (LECu.-Ar.); Ember 1914, 305–306, #4 (Eg.-Ar.-LECu.); 1930, #10.a.8 (Eg.-Ar.); Hhn. 1958, 386 (LECu.-Eg.);

Dlg. 1964, 60; 1970, 620, #7 (Ar.-Eg.-ECu.-Angas); IS 1976, #290 (Ar.-Eg.-Shilh-ECu.-Xmr.-Irb.-Angas-Margi); Hodge 1981, 374, #39 (Eg.-Sem.); Bmh. 1984, 272; 1990, 387 (Sem.-Eg.-PECu.); Faber 1988, 232 (Sem.-PECu.-Eg.-Ayr); Blz. 1990, 208 (Har.-PECu.); Hodge 1990, 170, #2 (Eg.-Sem.-PBrb.-ECu.) OS 1992, 202 (PWCh.-PCCh.-Eg.); Ehret 1995, 301, #572 (Ar.-Eg.-PCu.); Militarev 2005, 372, #62 (Hamar-LECū.-Ar.).

nb1: W. Vycichl (1953, 373-374, #4) identified OEg. *jmj* “not to do” with Ar. *ʔym* “gattenlos sein”, *ʔām-at-* “Fehler, Schaden”, *ʔayyim-* “ohne Gatten, ohne Frau”. Improbable. Probably the following suggestion represents a better solution.

nb2: As already noted by Ch. Ehret (1980, 323), the original meaning of the underlying AA (verbal) root should be sought elsewhere. Thus, he compared Som. *maya* “not” with SCu. **maw-* “to avoid” [GT] = PRift **ma-* “to avoid, leave alone” [Ehret 1980, 342, #1], cf. WRift **maw* “to let, leave, avoid” [KM 2004, 205] > Irb. *maw-* “to leave” [Wtl. 1960, 86] = *maw-* “to leave alone” [Wtl. 1958] = *maw-* “to avoid, leave alone” [Ehret] = *māw* “to stop doing” [Mgw. 1989, 115] = *maw* “to stop doing, leave, let” [MQK 2002, 72], Brg.-Alg. *maw-* “to leave alone” [Wtl. 1958] (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 56, #44) | Qwd. *may-ikwa* “avoidance object” [Ehr.], Asa *maʔ-* & *moʔ-os-* “to avoid, leave alone” [Ehr.] ||| NOm.: Sns. *māw-* “2. nicht im Stande sein” [Lmb. 1993, 363 with false etymon: < OCu. **lāb-* “müde, schwach, weich”!] ||| WCh.: perhaps Ngz. *mūwāu* “to despise, scorn” [Schuh 1981, 116] (from **“to avoid”?*) || ECh.: Kera *mé* “zurückweisen” [Ebert 1976, 80] | perhaps EDng. *mōwē* “maulen” [Ebs. 1987, 88].

nb3: The AA neg. **m* might alternatively be combined with AA **m-w* ~ **m-y* “to annihilate” [GT], cf. SBrb.: Hgr. *mew-et* “différer, renoncer” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1216], EWlm.-Ayr *māw-āt* “1. être annulé (rendez-vous etc.), 2. être ajournée, 3. revenir sur ses pas”, EWlm. *a-māwi* & Ayr *e-māwi* “1. annulation, 2. ajournement, 3. désistement, renonciation” [PAM 1998, 229; 2003, 567] ||| SCu.: Irb. *miyayāʔ* “to destroy, exterminate, erase” [MQK 2002, 72] ||| WCh.: Ngamo *mi-t-* [-t- prob. affix] “to extinguish” [Ibr. 2003, 7]. For a similar origin of another AA negative particle cf. Eg. *bw*.

nb4: Ch. Ehret (1995, 301, #572) set up PAA **ma-* “not to have” from Ar. *mā*, Eg. *jmj* & *m*, and PCu. (!) **ma-* “to avoid” and linked Ch. **m-y* “hunger” (Ehret: < **“lacking of food”*) too to this root.

nb5: C. T. Hodge (1990, 170, #2) takes the Eg.-Sem.-Brb.-ECu. data plus PIE **mē* “(that) not, lest” [IEW 703] from a “proto-root” **b* (with nasal prefix: **Nb-*), suggesting an ultimate relationship with the AA **b* neg. particle. Hardly so. The suggestion on the relationship of the AA **m* particle and IE **mē* should be discussed in the frameworks of the Nst. theory.

nb6: G. del Olmo Lete (1998, 59) combined the Sem. **ma* “negative functor” with the Sem. interrogative base **m-* as well as Sem. **-m* (“emphatic, specifying, coordinative postpositive functor”), which is rather improbable. I. M. Diakonoff (1988, 83), in turn, following his master A. P. Riftin, assumes that the AA demonstrative stem **m-* “sometimes evolved...into negative and prohibitive particles” (without providing any typological evidence), which is equally highly dubious.

m (non-encl. part.) “1. siehe, 2. denn” (OK, Wb II 4–5) = “behold” (Grd. 1957, 178, #234; FD 100) = “siehe (hier)” (GHWb 370) = “argumentative Partikel” (LEg., JW 1996, 206–7, #346).

- Usually welded together with a 2nd person suffix: *mk* (mostly), also *mṭ* and *mṭn*.

- Origin disputable. #2 & #4 seem to be the most promising solutions.
- **1.** K. Jansen-Winkeln (1996, 205–6, #346) denied the imperative nature of the particle (“*Bei mk/mtn hat man es... sicher nicht mit einem Imperativ zu tun, wie manchmal vermutet wird...*”), although he says “*Dennoch wird Edel letztlich recht darin haben, mk... mit den Imperativen jmj ‘gib’, mj ‘komm’ und nj ‘nimm’ zusammenzustellen...*” (cf. Edel AÄG §606–613), and finally ends up with assuming for all these words an underlying Eg. “deiktisches Element” *m(j) “hier, da!” (sic).
NB: For a Sem. enclitic deictic element *-m see recently W. W. Müller’s (1985, 272) paper. Cf. also Testen 1993, 306–8, #4.
- **2.** G. Takács (1996, 17, §7.2): agreeing with A. H. Gardiner (1957, 178, #234: “*possibly an obsolete imper. meaning ‘behold’*”) and W. Czermak (1931, 46: “*Element m etwa ‘siehe’ imperativischer Bedeutung*”), OEG m can be rightly supposed to have originally been a frozen impv., lit. “see!” (cf. also AÄG §612–3). Thus, the otherwise unattested OEG. *m or *mj “to see” (or sim.) could be equated with NBrb.: (?) Qbl. ta-maw-t “regard, attention” [Dlt. 1982, 527] ||| LECu.: Afar ma^ʕaye [unexpected -^ʕ-] “to expect, look at” [PH 1985, 158] | (?) Baiso mut- [Hbr.-Lmb.: pass. -t-] “to be seen, appear” [Hbr.-Lmb. 1988, 131: Bys.-Hdy.] | HECu.: Hdy. moʔ- ~ mōʔ- “1. to see, 2. look (at), 3. visit” [Hds. 1989, 94, 130, 294: isolated in HECu.] = moʔ- “to see” [LS 1997, 312] | Dullay: Harso & Dbs. ma^ʕ-ad- [unexpected -^ʕ-] “1. schauen, nachprüfen” [AMS 1980, 173] ||| WCh.: Sha mây “to see, sehen” [Jng. 1968, 7, #57; 1970, 287] = Sha & Mundat mây “to see” [Seibert 2000 MS, f092] | Bole-Tangale *mayu “to see” [Schuh]: Tangale me “to see” [Schuh] = meyi “to look at/after, perceive, take care of, be aware of, attend to, regard”, and esp. mō ~ mó “see! there you are!” [Jng. 1991, 120–1], Tng.-Billiri mòy- “to see” [JI 1994 I, 145], Bole moy- “inspizieren”, moyy- “erwarten, warten auf” [Lks. 1971, 137], Krkr. màayú “to see” [Schuh] = mààw “to look at, examine, look for, search” [Alio 1991 MS, #f093-4] = mai- “to see” [Jng./JI] = mayaw [IL], Bele móo-(kò) “to see” [Schuh 1978, 152], Ngamo moy- “to see” [Schuh] = moi- “sehen” [Jng. 1963 MS, 3] = mòyî “to see, look at”, cf. màayî “to look for, search” [Alio 1988 MS, also in JI] = moy “1. to see, 2. think” [Ibr. 2003 MS, 7], Kwami mòyáy “sehen” [Leger 1992, 28; 1993, 172], Dera mòì “to wait for” [Nwm. 1974, 130] = mo- “erwarten” [Jng. 1966 MS, 11] = mói, móy- “to wait” [Kidda 1991 MS, 9] (GT: orig. “look forward to”?), Maha moy- “to see” [Leger/JI] (BT: Schuh 1984, 217) || CCh.:

Buduma *mo* ~ *mō* ~ *mē* “to see” [Lks. 1939, 119] = *me* [Lks./JI] = *ámó* [Cyffer] || ECh.: Kera *mí* “warten” [Ebert 1976, 81; so also Pearce 1998–9, 67] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 284–5). The only problem to hinder this Eg. < AA derivation might be the unexpected medial ECu. *^ʕ- (the apparently purely orthographic ^ʕ in the Eg. particle after *m* has hardly anything to do with it).

AP: NS *⁽⁻⁾*mo* “eye, face” [Bnd. 1994, 1160, #25; 2005, 101, #148] vs. NS **má* “to pay attention, be on the lookout” [Ehret 2001, 277, #99] ~ PCKhoisan **mū* “to see” [Baucom 1972, 26] (for Khoisan cf. also Planert 1905, 115, 119, 174; Wandres 1918–1919, 27–28; Ehret 1982, 174).

NB1: As noted by Takács (1996, 17, §7.2), this Eg.-Cu.-Ch. isogloss is to be separated from OEg. *m33* [**mrr*/**mll*] “to see, look” (Eg. -33 ≠ Ch. *-y), although the WCh.: Bole-Tangale **mayu* “to see” and its African areal parallels have been frequently compared with Eg. *m33*, see Mnh. 1912, 238 (Khoisan-Eg.); Pls. 1960, 125, #2 (Eg.-Ngamo); OS 1992, 200–201 (PWCh.-PCCh.-Eg.); JI 1994 I, 145 (Eg.-Ch.); HSED #1761 (Eg.-Buduma) etc.

NB2: G. Lefèbvre (1940, #361) derived OEg. *m* directly from OEg. *m33*, which, as said above, is improbable.

NB3: H. Jungrauthmayr and D. Ibriszimow (1994 I, 145) take the Chadic forms from PCh. **m-y-d* “to see” with a supposed erosion of the final *^ʔ-d > -y in all BT examples but Kupto *mēḏ-*, which is in fact the only argument for the final *^ʔ-d in this PCh. root. JI l.c. opinion that “this root may be analysed (so, -s-) in the light of the possible cognates in Anc. Eg. *mrr* (sic!) ‘to see, look at’ and Akk. *amaru* (so, -a-) ‘to see’...”, which, however, explains neither Ch. *-y- nor *^ʔ-d. But with respect to the extra-Ch. evidence, and also to my observations in inner Chadic historical phonology, it seems more defensible to assume two distinct Ch. roots, namely **m-y-d* (Kupto) and **m-y* (Sha, BT, Bdm.). By the way, in an earlier work H. Jungrauthmayr & K. Shimizu (1981, 219D) still set up bicons. PCh. **m-y* “see”.

NB4: There can be no connection between Hdy. *mo*?- and “OCu.” **bek-* “to see” [Lmb.] as suggested by M. Lamberti and R. Sottile (1997, 312).

NB5: It is uncertain if the developed meaning “to think” < “to see” of the same AA root is attested in WCh.: Kulere *mà* “denken” [Jng. 1970, 353] || CCh.: Mafa *maya* “intelligence, manière, savoir-faire” [Br. Bléis 1990, 236] || ECh.: WDng. *mòyè* “méditer, avoir la nostalgie de, regretter, penser à, songer, être triste” [Fédry 1973, 136], EDng. *móyé* “se rappeler, se souvenir, se remémorer, se ressouvenir, penser, songer, méditer, réfléchir, rêver, rêvasser, être préoccupé, être triste, ressasser, se soucier, se faire des soucis, être en soucis” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 210] = “sich erinnern, sich Sorgen machen” [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 81, 93], Bidiya *moy* “penser, réfléchir, se souvenir” [AJ 1989, 100] (as it is in fact attested in WCh.: Ngamo *moy* “1. to see, 2. think” [Ibr.], above) or we should assume a cognacy with Eg. *mhj* “sich Sorge machen” (Wb, q.v.). From this viewpoint especially noteworthy is the alternative equation of the AA root for “to see” (described above) with Eg. **mḥ* (?) → Cpt. (S) *MOY*2, (B) *MOH* “to see” (below).

- 3. A. Ember (1914, 305, #3) suggested a comparison with Akk. *mā* “thus, as follows”. But W. von Soden classifies the functions of Akk. -*ma* as follows: “hervorhebende Partikel und Konjunktion: 1. zur meist identifizierenden Heraushebung einzelner Wörter, 2. zwischen koordinierten Sätzen und Infinitiven nach dem ersten Präd.: und dann, und daher” [AHW 560].

NB: I suggest that the conjunctive, viz. emphatical function of the Sem. particle *-ma, should be distinguished:

(1) On the one hand, cp. Ug. -m (copulative) “and” [WUS #1492] || Tigre -mä “and etc.” [Lsl.] etc. (Sem.: Lsl. 1969, 19) || NAgaw: Hamir -me, -im, -m “und, nun” [Rn. 1884, 390] || CCh.: Bdm. ma (Konjunktion) [Lks. 1939, 118]. This cognate set might be identified, following Ember’s proposal, with OEg. m (of m-k etc.), although semantically not too suggestive.

(2) On the other hand, cp. ES: Geez -mma “particle of emphasis: precisely, quite, then” [Lsl. 1987, 323], Har. -ma “as to, indeed” [Lsl. 1963, 102], for which cf. rather the OEg. encl. part. m (below).

- **4.** If the deictic sense *“here you are” or “dann, then” of Eg. m was the original one, cf. Ch. *m with deictic and demonstr. function: CCh.: Mafā má, mé “pour le bon, cette fois, maintenant” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 218], Mada máyá “alors, donc, vraiment” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 197] || ECh.: Mkl. mē, mē, mī, mī “là” [Jng. 1990, 138].

NB: Perhaps of the same origin are Sem.: Akk. -m of mimation [Djk.: origin. an article] || WCh.: Angas ma ~ mwa “they” || CCh.: Buduma ma “this” | Masa mu “he” etc.? See IS 1976, #303 (Sem.-Ch.).

- **5.** F. Calice (unpublished, quoted by W. F. Albright 1937–1939, 71), followed by C. H. Gordon (1955, 288, #1098), W. G. E. Watson (1996, 707), and recently Y. Muchiki (1999, 282) equated Eg. mk with Sem.: Ug. mk “behold” [Alb.] = “lo” [Gordon & Segert 1984, 192] = mk (adv.) “1. dort, 2. dann” [WUS #1652] = mk II (deictic functor!) “behold, see!” [DUL 542: etymology uncertain].

NB1: This parallelism is all the more indeed striking, because Ug. mk – to the best of my knowledge – has no safe common Sem. etymology as confirmed also by Muchiki l.c. (unless what noted in NB2 is valid). But Eg. mk is a combination of the m (particle) + -k (2nd person masc. sg. suffix). It is questionable whether Ug. mk can be analyzed the same way as Eg. mk. Another solution could be that OEg. mṯ and mṯn (suggesting a common root m-) were just secondary back formations due to a *Volksetymologie* which treated the orig. OEg. bicons. (?) root *mk as suffixed by -k. Otherwise, the Eg. and Ug. forms cannot be genetically cognate. Or, as W. G. E. Watson (l.c.) and Muchiki (l.c.) suggestively argue, Ug. mk could have been borrowed from Eg. (before the reign of Suppiluliuma I as Muchiki l.c. assumes q.v.).

NB2: J. Aistleitner (WUS #1652) and DUL 542 related the Ug. particle mk to Ug. mk “dort, dann” [WUS] and Akk. amma-ka(m) → NAss. maka “there”, cf. amma interj. “da (ist)!” [AHW 43] = “lo!” [Muchiki 1999, 282], which DUL l.c. divides into m(h) + enclitic -k. S. Segert (1984, 192), in turn, compares it with Akk. (NAss.) muk(u) ~ mū (nach 1.Sg. vor dir. Rede stat mā) [AHW 669: of obscure origin] = muk(u) ~ mu (particle, introducing direct speech after verbs in the first person sing.) [CAD m 180]. Not clear whether the Sem. forms have any connection to EBrb.: Gdm. MK: əmmək “conjonction et adverbe: emploi à l’affirmatif, et à l’interrogatif” [Lnf. 1973, 208, #993] || SBrb.: Ayr ənka/ǎ < əmmək-a (pron. dém. coll.) “ceci (auprès de moi), cela, ce dont, il est question, 2. adv.: ainsi etc.” [PAM 2003, 608].

- **6.** A. S. Chetveruhin (1990, 137–138) derived Eg. m directly from PAA *m-l “day, light etc.”. Cf. also Takács 1996, 16, §7.

NB: To be rejected for semantic reasons. For the problem cf. OEg. m33 (below). Hardly any etymological connection between OEg. m “see, behold” and m33 (for which cf. also Czermak 1931, 46).

- 7. C. T. Hodge (1990, 171, #3) had a similar, but perhaps even more far-fetched proposal: Eg. m [< *mj after E. Edel] “behold!” < **ʔə-NblV- ~ Eg. *bl = bnr & br “eye” (q.v.) ~ m33 (q.v.), all from an AA-IE (Lislakh) proto-root **b-l “eye, to see”.
NB: Eg. m vs. *bl vs. m33 are three different roots.

m ~/< mj (encl. particle) “doch: 1. nach einem Imperativ (z.B. sage doch, komme doch!), 2. jw m (MK) als Satzanfang in Briefen” (OK, Wb II 36, 6–7) = “enclitic particle occasionally found after imperatives or ... after the sdm.f form when used to express a wish” (Grd. 1957, 185, §250) = “pray” (Caminos 1954 LEM 460 with further lit.) = “(nach Imperativ, selten davor) bitte, dich!” (GHWb 323) = “please, pray” (DLE I 210).

NB1: Perhaps originally mj as suggested e.g. in Wb (NK & GR exx. for mj), GHWb l.c. after E. Edel (AÄG 62, §140) who gives sporadic OK (PT) exx. for mj (cf. also ÜKAPT VI 129) compared with (S) ʔə-ḥOI “o daß doch, wenn doch” (KHW 372) < LEg. h(3)n-mj “o that!” (DLE II 80, cf. AL 77.2477). The var. mj occurs also in Edfu (PL 392 and 410).

NB2: Occurs also non-enclitically before “cohortative” sdm=f (Caminos l.c.).

NB3: Note that the interpretation of PT (429c & 687b) mjw “Imperativ oder Interjektion als Imperativersatz” (K. Sethe, ÜKAPT VI 129) is disputed (cf. e.g. ÄWb I 512). The same is the case with PT 264 & 520 mj (following dd “sagen”) rendered as “vielleicht eine Form des Fragewortes m” (Wb II 36, 8), which has been compared with the enclitic particle m(j) of Wb II 36, 6–7, cf. JEA 16 (1930), 171–2; AL 77.1639.

NB4: W. G. E. Watson (1999, 130) as well as G. del Olmo Lete & J. Sanmartín (DUL 519) see in Ug. m^c “I pray (enclitic of entreaty)” [Watson] = (postpositional emph. after an impv.) “please!” [DUL] a probable match of Eg. m(j), but the -^c vs. Eg. -Ø can hardly be explained. Note that the occasional -^c in the writing of the Eg. particle was purely orthographical.

- A. Ember (1914, 303–304, #2) combined the Eg. particle with certain reflexes of Sem. *-ma (emphatic part.) [GT] = *-m (“emphatic, specifying, coordinative postpositive functor”) [OL 1998, 60]: Akk. -ma “hervorhebende Partikel und Konjunktion: 1. zur meist identifizierenden Heraushebung einzelner Wörter” [AHW 560] || perhaps Ug. -m (emphatic, determinative encl. morpheme) [DUL 509, cf. also Watson 1996, 259–268], Canaanite (Amarna) -ma (“adds special emphasis” on an inf. functioning as a finite verb) [Rainey vs. Hnrg. 1998, 75, III.229] || Ar. mā “Partikel zum Nachdruck”, e.g. yā ʿayni fā-bkī mā banī asadi “O mein Auge beweine die Bani Asadi” [Nöldeke apud Ember] || ES: Geez -mma “particle of emphasis: precisely, quite, then” [Lsl. 1987, 323], Har. -ma “as to, indeed” [Lsl. 1963, 102]. The Eg.-Sem. isogloss seems to have an AA background, cf. LECu.: Orm. mē (particle) “please, well (used to make

polite commands)” [Gragg 1982, 283] = (Borana, Orma, Wellega) *mē* [mē] (particle used in questions and commands) [Strm. 1987, 365, cf. Strm. 2001, 55] | Dullay: Dbs. *má* (emphatische Partikel bei Fragen) “etwa?” vs. (bei Imperativen) “doch!” vs. (bei Negationen) “keineswegs!” [AMS 1980, 173] ||| WCh.: Goemai *ma* (kind of adv.) “indeed” [Srl. 1937, 132] (GT 2004, 239: apparently isolated in AS) | Dera *mà* “hortative marker” [Nwm. 1974, 129] || CCh.: Gisiga *ma* “verstärkerndes *ma*: doch, auch” [Lks. 1970, 127] || ECh.: Mokilko *mê*, *mè* “Verstärkungspartikel” [Lks. 1975, 224].

NB1: The conjunctive, viz. emphatical function of the Sem. particle **-ma* should be distinguished, cp. Ug. *-m* (copulative) “and” [WUS #1492] || Tigre *-mä* “and etc.” [Lsl.], Gafat *-m* (conjunction d’instance) [Lsl.] etc. (ES: Lsl. 1956, 212; Sem.: Lsl. 1969, 19) ||| NAgaw: Hamir *-me*, *-im*, *-m* “und, nun” [Rn. 1884, 390] ||| CCh.: Bdm. *ma* (Konjunktion) [Lks. 1939, 118] || ECh.: Mubi *mà* “et, puis” [Jng. 1990 MS]. This cognate set could hardly be identified (contra A. Ember’s l.c. proposal) with the non-encl. OEg. *m* (of *m-k* etc.). Beside the conjunctive particle, there is also an AA **m* particle of opposition, which should also be separated, cf. NBrb.: Mzab & Wargla *ammwa* “mais” [Dlh. 1984, 113; 1987, 182] ||| WCh.: Dera *àmmá* “but” [Nwm. 1974, 121]

NB2: G. del Olmo Lete (1998, 59–60) combined Sem. **-m* (“emphatic, specifying, coordinative postpositive functor”, sic) with the Sem. interrogative base **m-* as well as Sem. **ma* (“negative functor”), which is rather improbable.

NB3: Cf. perhaps also Akk. *-mi* ~ *-me* (all) “wird in zitierter direkten Rede an betonte Wörter angehängt” [AHW 650]?

m “nimm!” (PT, Wb II 36, 1; GHWb 323) = nimm! empfang!” (ÜKAPT VI 127) = “take!” (FD 100).

NB1: The commonly accepted reading *mj* (suggested e.g. in Wb l.c.; CED 79; NBĀ 510, n. 233; DELC 107; and GHWb l.c. DCT 151; ĀWb I 507) seems, for the time being, questionable. J. Černý (CED l.c.) rightly put a query-mark to his hypothetic *mì* (?) “take!”. At any rate, Osing’s pre-Cpt. form **má*? < Eg. **máj/w-* (NBĀ 510) seems less risky than Fecht’s (1960, 131, §252) twofold far-fetched Eg. **jm3* (sic!) < (pl.) **j má3j* ~ **j mē3j* (with **j-* and **-3*), but neither is proven.

NB2: Whether the special orthography of *mn n-k* “nimm im Empfang (eigtl.: nimm für dich!)” (PT, Wb II 60, 1–4) = “take to yourself!” (FD 106; Grd. 1927, #336) = “nimm!” (GHWb 333) with the *mnw*-sceptre covered an impv. (*j.mn* “take!” (cf. e.g. Hodge 1990, 173), or a contraction of *mj* + *dat.* (as alluded to in Wb l.c.), is uncertain. Cf. s.v. *mn* below.

- Cpt. reflexes: (S) $\bar{\text{m}}\text{m}\text{O}$, mw , pl. $\bar{\text{m}}\text{m}\text{H}\text{E}\text{I}\text{T}\bar{\text{n}}$, (SB) mO (m), (B) mE (f), (A) mAY “nimm!” (KHW 87) = “prends!” (DELC 107, cf. Vcl. 1990, 240) = “take!” (CD 159a).
- 1. I suggest it is cognate with WCh.: Ngamo *maa-t-* [-*t-* prob. affix] “to take back” [Ibr. 2003 MS, 6] | Ngizim *máw* [Frj. & Schuh] = *māu* “to take (up), pick up, take up as a load” [Schuh 1981, 112] = *mì* “to take” [Schuh], Duwai *mùwó* “to take” [Frj., Schuh] = *àmí* “to take” [Schuh] (Ngz.-Duwai: Schuh 1977, 151, 155; Frj. 1982, 32). Any connection to MSA: Jbl. *míy* “to touch” [Nkn. 1986, 80, #597]?

AP: L. Homburger (1929, 171) combined OEg. m with Mal. mo “prends!”. Th. Obenga (1993, 290, #18) also suggested tempting Afr. parallels: Mbochi má “prends!”, Bantu (sic) má “prends, tiens, viens!”, Sotho mme “prends!”, Senúfo ma “tiens!”, Bambara mo “tiens!”, Yoruba mu “prendre”, Sango mu “prendre”, Kuba (Bushong) mmá “prends!”, Isekiri mü “prends!”.

NB1: It seems that ECh.: Somray mì ~ myə “voler (to steal)” [Jng. 1978, 188, also JI 1994 II, 309] does not belong here. It derives presumably from PCh. *m-r “to steal” with erosion of *-r (for further details cf. Eg. m3r “to rob”).

NB2: V. M. Illič-Svityč (1984, #376) treated OEg. m as the only reflex of AA *m “take!” < Nst. *qamV “хватаѣ”. Hardly so. For the suggested Nst. proto-form cf. rather Eg. ḥm^o.

- **2.** Alternatively, if the OEg. impv. was indeed *mj [< *ml], it might be compared with Sem.: OSA (Sab.) mly “to get, win, obtain as booty”, ml-t “booty, loot, prize of war” [SD 86] = mly “to take as booty” [Biella 1984, 276] ||| CCh.: Vulum (Mulwi) mīli “to pick up, lift, take, ramasser, prendre” [Trn. 1978, 304; Brt. 1995, 217], Mbara màl “to pick up, lift, ramasser”, cf. mùl “1. ramasser, 2. prendre (plusieurs choses à la fois)” [TSL 1986, 199, 273], Musgu-Puss mili “prendre (plusieurs choses)” [Trn. 1991, 106], Musgu-Girvidik məl- ~ mul- “nehmen” [MB 1972–73, 70].

NB: Biella’s l.c. etymology for OSA mly is dubious (Ar. mlw). Cf. perhaps rather Akk. mll (under Eg. m3r “to rob”).

- **3.** C. T. Hodge (1990, 172–3) presented a far-fetching hypothesis on the origin of Eg. m [Hodge: alternatively jm] “take!” (PT), which he relates to OEg. jmj ~ m “give!” (from an earlier *má3 < *ʔəmbá3 < *ʔə-Nb-l). The supposed ultimate source would be Lislakh (IE-AA) **b-l “to carry” with the semantic shift: “moving an object by hand” → i.e. “carrying it” → “to take” (cp. Hausa ðàùkáá “to take away” & ðáúkóó “to bring”). Unacceptable for me, just like the author’s further proto-roots and suggestions summarized in the NB.

NB: Hodge derives the following forms from LL **b-l “to carry” in the frameworks of his consonant ablaut theory (more on this in Hodge 1986, 143–162): Eg. nb3 “carrying-pole” ||| Sem. *w/ybl “to bring, lead” [GT] ||| LECu.: Oromo bāl-ča “to hand over sg.” [Gragg 1982, 27] ||| WCh.: Bade bálú [Lks.] “to give” ~ IE *wel-k- “to pull” [IEW 1145] and *wel- “to tear” [IEW 1144] – LL **b-lH: Ug. bʔr “to bring” [Fensham] ||| SBrb.: Hgr. a-bbar “seizing with whole hand” [Prs. 1974, §2.42] ||| Ch. *barə “to give” [Nwm. 1977, 27] ~ IE *wer- “to find, take” [IEW 1160] – LL **b-Nl: NAgaw. Bilin ben “to distribute” ||| CCh.: Mwulyen úvən “to give” [Kraft 1981 III, 60] – LL **b-C: Eg. tḥj “to pay” with prefix t- (!) ||| LECu.: PSam *biḥ-i “to take out” [Heine 1978, 91] ||| Ch. *ba “to get” [Schuh 1977, 160] – LL **bH-C: Hitt. pāi- “to give”, Lydian bi- “to give” (Gusmani 1964, 78) – LL **bH-l: Eg. f3j “to lift” – LL **bH-lH: IE *bher- “to carry” [IEW 128] – LL **bH-Nl: Eg. fmf. w “recompense (?)” – LL **Nb-l: Ar. ḥamala “to carry” ||| Eg. j3m “to offer”, m3^o “to offer” – LL **Nb-lH: Eg. mrj “sounding pole” ||| Ch. *mari “to give” [JS 1981, 116] ~ IE *mǝr/n- “hand” [IEW 740] – LL **nb-Nl: Sem. *ymn “right-hand” ||| Eg. mn “take!” (sic, treated separately from OEg. m as cognate of Sem. *ymn!) – LL **Nb-C: jm “give, take!” ||| LECu.: Afar mise “to offer” [PH 1985, 168] ||| Om. *im- “to give” [Flm. 1976, 318] ~ IE *em-/mē- “to take” [IEW 310]. More than far-fetched.

m3: the object depicted by the hrgl. (its colour was black in the 1st Dyn., Kahl 1997, 54): “die Sichel (nur indirekt bezeugt durch das Schriftzeichen)” (Wb II 6, 1) = “sickle (hrgl.)” (Grd. 1927, 501, U1; Redford 1994, 209, §7) = “Bug- und Heckverzierung des ‘papyrusförmigen Bootstyps’, ein überlängter Sichel ähnlicher Typ in vielen Varianten” (Bieß, also Moore in *The Mariner’s Mirror*, Greenwich 6, 1920, 377–8 quoted apud Düring 1995, 57) = “Sichel” (Hornung 1963 II, 86, n. 303; Drenkhahn, LÄ V 921) = “falchetto” (Conti 1978, 90) = “sickle (the OK hrgl. shows the flint blades along the cutting edge)” (Fischer 1983, 43, U1). Perhaps the same (?) word is attested in NEg. m3.w “(Plural, unter Anderem in Verbindung mit mds)” (mds with knife det.) (NK, Wb II 6, 2) = mds m3.w t3 of dubious interpretation: “Neues (m3.w) (!) Schneidendes (mds) der Erde” or “Schneidendes (mds) der Erdsicheln (m3.w-t3)” (Hornung 1963 II, 86, n. 303).

NB: E. Edel (1944, 31) points out the value $\underline{h}3b$ for the U1 sign in Urk. I 204:9, cf. (B) $\text{ḥ}3\text{P}3\text{B}$ (f) “Sichel”.

● Further words that may be related:

(1) m3 (OK, CT etc.) “das Hinter-, auch das Vorderende des Schiffes” (Wb II 6, 3–4) = “deux parties du bateau, en bois, qui ont la forme de faucilles, l’un à l’avant, l’autre à l’arrière: précisément la proue et la poupe recourbées en forme de faucille” (Jéquier 1911, 44, #1–2) = “sickle-shaped end (of the wj3-boat)” (Grd. 1927, 501, U2) = “stern (of boat)”, m3-s $\underline{h}3.tj$ “its bow” vs. m3-s $\text{p}\underline{h}w.j$ “its stern” (FD 100) = “extrémité (d’un navire)”: m3 $\underline{h}3.tj$ “proue” vs. m3 $\text{p}\underline{h}w.tj$ “poupe” (Meeks, AL 78.1592) = CT V 125b m3 $\text{p}\underline{h}w.tj$ “sternpiece (of boat)” vs. CT V 125a m3 $\underline{h}3.tj$ “bowpiece (of boat)” (Jones 1988, 166, #61–62; AECT III 203 index; DCT 152–3) = “Vorder- und Hinterende des Rumpfes des Schiffes” (Düring 1995, 57: attested in Dyn.V.–XX.!) = “sichelförmiges Steven, Heck, Hinterende, Hintersteven, Bug, Vorderende, Vordersteven” (GHWb 313; ÄWb I 494 with OK ex.).

(2) D. Meeks (AL 77.1572; 1994, 258 ad Jones 1988, 166, #61–62 with lit.) points to an OK fem. form m3.t “proue (d’un navire)”, which occurs in the phrase $\underline{h}^c.j$ m m3.t wj3 “l’Or (Hathor) apparaît à la proue du bateau” both in Abusir (V.) and TT 65 (PK 1976, 104, n.s; Fischer 1968, 173, fn. 736; also Fischer in ZÄS 86, 25–26).

● The original meaning of the root is obscure. No evident cognates.

■ 1. D. Meeks (AL 77.1572 & 78.1592) suggests a connection with Eg. m3.tj “extrémités (?)” (below). Eventually, it may have denoted *“sickle” (unattested), which later developed into “stern of a boat (shaping a sickle)”.

- **2.** With regard to the mng. “sickle”, we might consider ES: Gurage (unless borrowed from ECu.): Chaha, Ennemor, Gyeto mureya, Ezha muriya, Mäsqaṇ muräṇ “knife used for cutting the leave of the äsäṭ” [Lsl. 1979 III, 425] ||| CCh.: PKotoko *miryo (~ *moryo) “knife (Messer, couteau)” [GT]: Lgn. mio [Lks.], Ksr. mōrəyō [Lbf.] = moröo [Lks.], Glf. mīr ~ mio [Röder apud Lks.] = miō, pl. miòé [Lks.] = miō [Lbf.], Shoe mio [Lks.], Afd. sba mīyo “handiron, dagger” [Barth] = miyo [Lbf.], Mkr. skūā mīyo “handiron, dagger” [Barth] = miō [Lbf.] (Ktk.: Lks. 1937, 145, 148, 150; Lbf. 1942, 165; Slk. 1967, 326, #609; CCh.: Blz. & Boisson 1992, 20, #2). An eventual deverbal origin (“to cut, reap” → “knife, sickle”) is not to be excluded, cf. AA *m-r “to cut into pieces (with knife)” [GT]: NBrb.: (?) Qbl. (& Menaser) a-mur, pl. i-mur-en “part, portion” [Dlt. 1982, 513] ||| ECu. *mur- “to cut” [Sasse]: cf. esp. POromoid *mur- “to cut” [Black 1974, 186, 258] | Dasenech mūr “to cut, harvest” [Tosco 2001, 519] | Sdm. mur-a “1. to cut, 2. decide, 3. emasculate” [Gsp. 1983, 241], Burji mur- “1. to cut (general term), 2. harvest, 3. slaughter (for sacrifice)” [Ss.] = mur- “to cut”, muranu “harvest-time” [Hds.], Hdy. mur- “to cut crops, reap” [Hds. 1989, 46] (ECu.: CR 1913, 423; CrI. 1938 II, 215; Sasse 1979, 23; 1982, 149; Lsl. 1988, 195; Hds. 1989, 46, 76, 418) ||| NOm.: Kaffā mur-eččo “eunuco” < *mur- “tagliare, recidere” [CrI. 1951, 473] ||| CCh.: Bdm. maru “raser (tête)” [Gaudiche 1938, 30].

AP: PNil. *mur “to circumcise, cut” [Dimmendaal 1988, 34, #28].

LIT.: IS 1976, #310 (Brb.-ECu.-Kaffā).

NB1: PMusgu *māram(ay) “sickle” hardly belongs to this AA root as suggested by V. Blažek & C. Boisson (1992, 20, #2), cf. CCh.: Vulum mā:rām, Mbara mā:rāmáy (Musgu gr.: TSL 1986, 199). More probably it was a nomen instr. < *ma-Hramay (or sim.).

NB2: Note that, however attractive may seem, forms like NBrb.: Tamazight myer “moissonner” are unrelated, the root being *m-g-r (cf. Vcl. 1995, 22).

NB3: Similarly, no connection with NAgaw: Hamir mayir “Sichel”, which is a nom. instr. of Hamir ayer “mähen, schneiden (Gras, Korn)” [Rn. 1884, 345].

NB4: N. V. Jušmanov (1998, 169) regarded Sem. *br- and *mr- “резать, колоть” as root variations. V. Blažek (1990, 210, #310) takes ECu. *mur- “to cut” from Nst. *murV “to break”.

- **3.** Another, less probable, way of explaining OEg. *m3 “sickle” is a relationship with AA *m-l “to cut off, shave (?)” [GT]: Hbr. mll II qal & mwl qal “beschneiden”, mūlā(h) “Beschneidung” [GB 404, 430–1] = mwl & mll qal “to circumcise” [KB 555, 594] ||| LECu.: Afar mōle “to shave (se raser)” [PH 1985, 170] ||| SBrb.: EWlm. tē-mmōlei “circoncision” [Ncl. 1957, 571].

LIT.: the comparison of Eg. m3 “sickle” vs. Hbr. mūl “to cut grass” (so) was first proposed by Redford (1994, 209, §7).

NB1: From the same bicons. Sem. root *ml (for which cf. also Zbr. 1971, #143; Frj. 1979, 2; MM 1983, 185; Eilers 1987, 518) may derive also Hbr. *mhl “recidere” [Msc.] → mähül qal pass. ptc. “(vom Weine: vinum) castratum” [GB 403; cf. Msc. 1947, 127] with an infix -h-.

NB2: GB 404 derive Hbr. mwl from mül (prep.) “vor, gegenüber von, unterhalb (einer Gegend usw.)”.

- **4.** GT: if OEG. m3 denoted primarily a curved object, cf. AA *m-l “to bow, turn aside etc.” [GT].

NB: Attested in Sem. *myl: Ar. myl: māla “1. se pencher, s’incliner, être penché, incliné vers le bas, vers la terre” [BK II 1174] | MSA *myl: Hrs. meyöl “to turn away, aside” [Jns.], Jbl. mēl [Jns. 1977] = mēl “to turn sideways, incline”, emyēl “to (make) turn aside, slip, do sg. wrong” [Jns. 1981], Mhr. meyöl [Jns. 1977] = mōyūl “to look, turn sideways, turn aside, incline to one side” [Jns. 1987] (MSA: Jns. 1977, 92; 1981, 177; 1987, 276) ||| LECu.: Som. mēlmel “auf die Seite schauen, das Gesicht seitwärts wenden” & “Abwendung des Gesichtes” [Rn. 1902, 296] ||| WCh.: Hausa mēlú & Katsina dial. mēlì “to feel inclined” [Abr. 1962, 673] ||| ECh.: Lele mōl “2. se courber, se pencher du côté” [Cooper 1984, 64]. Presumably Hbr. mll I qal “sich schlaff senken (von den Pflanzen), verwelken” [GB 430] vs. Ar. mll “gebeugt sein, sich hinschleppen” [Berggren & Cuche] (Hbr.-Ar.: GB l.c.) are also related.

LIT.: for Som.-Ar. see Abr. l.c.

- **5.** A. R. Bomhard (1981, 446; 1984, 271, #272): Eg. m3 “to reap, harvest” (sic!) ~ IE *mǝʔ- (or *meʔ-/*mē-) “to mow, reap”. False.

m3.t “das Rohr des Schilfs” (V., Niuserre, Weltkammer, Wb II 6, 11) = “joncs” (Bissing 1955–6, 333) = “Phragmites communis” (Edel 1961, 252, cf. pl. 13) = “tūge” (Charpentier apud Baum, also Borghouts 1978, 30–31 apud AL 78.1595) = “Phragmites australis (plante, herbe aquatique)” (Baum 1988, 120, 241) = “*gemeines Schilfrohr (Phragmites communis syn. Phragmites australis)” (GHWb 313; ÄWb I 494).

NB1: The same word m3.t was defined by Andreu & Cauville as “un arbre” (AC 1978, 8) = “Name eines Baumes” (WD II 59). D. Meeks (AL 77.1575), however, warns of a possible emendation in the Weltkammer scene into m3m3.t “palmier doum” (which occurs usually as m3m3 masc., but CT VI 244y has also a fem. m3m3.t, cf. also DCT).

NB2: F. L. Griffith (1898, 56) did not rule out a rdg. m3^c.t (sic) and a connection to m3^c (erroneously rendered as “flute”), which is out of question. J. Osing (NBÄ 745, n. 902) treated OK m3.t “Schilfrohr” (Niuserre) as a variation of m3w.t “1. Stab, Stange, 2. Halm” (q.v.), which is an error. The distinction of m3.t vs. m3w.t is to be maintained (as in most of the standard lexicons).

- Cf. also m3.t sw.t “(in offizineller Verwendung)” (Med., Wb II 6, 12) = “(wohl) der Halm oder Stengel der sw.t-Pflanze” (Germer 1979, 193). NB1: Perhaps identical with OEG. as the m3.t-flute with apparently the same lengthy tube det.
- NB2: Both R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) and H. G. Fischer (1996, 29, fn. 422) follow the Wb l.c. in assuming an etymological connection with Eg. m3w.t “staff” (q.v.).
- Cognate presumably with ES: Amh. māla “kind of grass or reed”, cf. Geez mǝʔilu = Amh. čǝfrəgg “low-growing bush which is used like a brush in washing large crocks” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 324) ||| NBrb.:

Mzab mawal, pl. i-mawal-ən “1. roseau, 2. baguette de roseau ou de palme, 3. p.ext. tringle de bois ou de métal” [Dlh. 1984, 125] ||| LECu.: Orm.-Borana mellā “a papyrus-like reed, found in swampy areas” [Strm. 1995, 209] ||| NOm.: Haruro māylē “canna” [CR 1937, 655] ||| WCh.: AS *mīl “high grass or reed sp.” [GT 2004, 248]: Angas miil “a very coarse grass, used for making ‘zena’ mats” (≈ Hs. gámbà “the grass *Andropogon Guyanus*”, Abr. 1962, 202) [Flk. 1915, 245] = miil (K) “name of grass used for making pagan harp (Hs. molo)” (cf. Hs. móólóó “three-stringed guitarre”, Abr. 1962, 677), mil (K) “very coarse grass, straw, used also for making harp” [Jng. 1962 MS, 26], Kfy. mīil “1. reed, 2. plucked reed instrument (molo)” [Ntg. 1967, 26], Gmy. mil “kind of very high grass” [Srl. 1937, 139].

NB1: Does HECu.: Kmb. mulu?la (?) “ensete tree trunk” [Hds. 1989, 58] perhaps also belong here?

NB2: Any connection to AA *m-l “arrow, spear, lance” [GT]: Sem.: Akk. (m/jB, m/nA) mulmullu ~ malmullu “Pfeil” [AHW 671] ||| NOm.: Haruro (Gats’ama) mala “arrow” [Sbr. 1994, 11] ||| ECh.: Ndam-Gulei mal “Speer” [Lks. 1937, 95], Tumak mà:l “lance (nom générique)” [Cpr. 1975, 82] = mà:l “sagaie” [Cpr. 1971, 54], Tumak-Mawer mal “sagaie” [Cpr. 1971, 54], Somray mālē [Lks.] = malē [AF] = mal [Benton] “Lanze” [Lks. 1937, 80]?

m3.t “die Flöte, sowohl »Längsflöte« als auch »Doppelklarinette«” (OK, Wb II 6, 8) = “clarinette, flûte (à double anches et à tuyaux parallèles)” (Hickmann 1958, 124, fn. 3) = “Lang-Flöte (aus Bambus, selten aus Holz, vereinzelt aus Metall)” (Hickmann, LÄ II 266) = “flute” (AL 78.1594) = “Langflöte, Nay” (GHWb 313; ÄWb I 494) = “the open-ended flute” (Fischer 1996, 29, fn. 422).

- Perhaps identical with OEg. m3.t-reed with apparently the same lengthy tube det., which would not necessarily exclude its perfect match, Sem.: Akk. (jB) malīlu “Flöte” [Boissier, Revue Sémitique 7, 51 apud Holma 1911, 158] = malīlu “eine Schalmei oder Flöte”, cf. jB malīliš “wie eine Schalmei (?)” [AHW 595] = malīlu “reed flute”, ša malīli “flutist” [CAD m1, 164–5]. Perhaps the Eg.-Akk. parallel is ultimately related to Eg. m3.t “reed”. A direct derivation from Eg. m3.wt “Stab, Stock” (as suggested by Hickmann, LÄ II 266) can, however, be hardly correct.

NB1: Acc. to G. Sava (p.c., 5 Jan. 2006), the -k- of ECu.: Tsamay mālka (f) “flute, pipe stem” [Sava 2005 MS, 254] was part of the root, and thus it is probably unrelated.

NB2: Perhaps both OEg. m3.t and Akk. malīlu derive from a basic meaning *“(the) long(er) sort of flutes)”? Cp. AA *m-l “long” [GT]: Sem.: Ar. ml “être long, paraître long”, cf. maliyy- “long, prolongé” [BK II 1140, 1154], cf. Ar. mlw V “jouir longtemps de” [Dozy II 615] | MSA *mll: Sgt. ?imol “paraître long, gêner” [Lsl. 1938, 245: Sgt.-Ar.], Jbl. mell “to be fed up, despair of finishing sg. with so.”, mallún “easily bored” [Jns.], Mhr. mōlāyl “sy. never ready, procastrinator, dallier” [Jns.] (MSA: Jns. 19781, 171; 1987, 265) || ES *mll: Geez malala “to lengthen”,

Te. mǎlmála “to be long astraight”, Tna. molāl bālā “to be tall”, Amh. mǎllälā “to be straight and tall”, cf. Har. mulōyō “oblong” [Lsl. 1963, 108] (ES: Lsl. 1987, 344) || NAḡaw: Qwr. mōlālā “oblong” [Flm. apud Rn.] = “länglich” [Rn. 1885, 98], Qmt. molālā “oblong” [CR 1912, 229], cf. Xmr. mōlāl-t “schmal, dünn sein” [Rn. 1884, 393] || WCh.: Hausa millā “1. to travel far, 2. project (missile) far” [Abr. 1962, 675] | Tng. miḷc “to stay/be a long time” [Jng. 1991, 120] || CCh.: Mafa milet- “(s’)allonger” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 225] || ECh.: (?) Nancere mrāmra [*-ml-?] “langsam” [Lks. 1937, 89].

m3 “Antilope” (PT 806, Wb II 11, 3) = “oryx-antilope” (FD 100) = “nordafrikanischer Säbelantilope, Oryx-Antilope (*Oryx gazella dammah*)” (GHWb 313; ÄWb I 494).

NB1: Hence OEg. m3-ḡd “weiße Säbelantilope” (OK, Wb II 11, 4–8, so also Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker) = “weiße Säbelantilope, eigtl. das weiße Wüstentier” (Edel 1963, 166, 180) = “oryx” (Grd. 1911, 40* & fn. 5; FD 101) = “das weiße Wild, die weiße Antilope des 16. oäg. Gaues” (Kees 1965, 109: “dann mythisch umgedeutet als ‘weißgesehen’”).

NB2: Eg. m3 “Wüstentier, Wüstenwild” (GHWb 313; ÄWb I 494: 2x in OK) = “Wild der Wüste, Wüstentier” (Edel 1961, 245 & fn. 66 following Montet 1925, 86), isolated by R. Hannig (GHWb 313) as a distinct lexeme absent from Wb, was still identified by A. Erman & Grapow (Wb II 11, 3) and R. O. Faulkner (FD 101) with OEg. m3 “Antilope” (PT).

NB3: W. Westendorf (KHW 88) assumes a certain Cpt.: (B) *MOYI (m) “Widder” (see OEg. *m3j below), which, however, does not exist (Osing 1978, 189, cf. NBÄ n. 195).

- Most promising is solution #1 (& less probable is #2).
- **1.** GT: presumably related to Sem.: Ar. māriyy-at- “1. antilope blanche”, cf. māriy-at- “jeune veau femelle au pelage blanc” [BK II 1097] || SCu.: perhaps Dhl. morro “duiker” [EEN 1989, 38: < ENil.?] || WCh.: Hausa mààriiri “white oryx”, cf. also mááràyáá, pl. mááráyóóyí “Western Cob: *Adenota cob* (medium antelope)” [Abr. 1962, 657, 659] | Warji mārai “kob” [Skn.] | Saya mááriyá “antilope, harness” [Csp. 1994, 30] | Ngizim máaràyá “Western or buffon’s kob (*Kobus (Adenota) kob*)” [Schuh 1981, 111] (WCh.: Skn. 1996, 197; Skn. 1984, 30) || CCh.: Masa murí “antilope sp., prob. cob *défassa*” [Ctc. 1983, 111] || ECh.: Toram múro, pl. mure “gazelle (gen.)” [AJ 1988 MS, 2; Alio 2004, 260, #340].
LIT.: the Hausa-Eg. parallel has been first suggested in Skn. 1996, 197.
NB1: The WCh. forms were probably borrowed from Hausa. But this is not the case with CCh. & WCh.
NB2: OEg. m3 (esp. in its sense “Wild”) might be related also to CCh.: Masa múr “1. animal sauvage ou animaux sauvages, 2. le gibier” [Ctc. 1983, 109].
NB3: Whether Ch. *m-r “antilope” [GT] has anything to do with AA *m-r “ram” & “calf” etc. (for details see OEg. *m3j), remains an open question.
- **2.** GT: cp. alternatively SCu.: Ma’a maló [unless -l- < *-r-] “kudu” [Ehret 1974 MS, 44] || Ongota moíle ~ moile “sp. antelope, Bohor, gerenuk” [Flm. 1992, 212]?

NB: Cf. also NBrb.: Shilh a-mlal “gazelle” [Jordan 1934, 32], Mzg. a-mlal, pl. i-mlal-n “gazelle mâle”, fem. ta-mlal-t, pl. ti-mlal-in “gazelle (symbol de beauté)” [Taifi 1991, 417] = ta-mlal-t “Gazelle” [Abès 1916, 136], Izdeg a-mlal, pl. i-mlal-en, fem. ta-mlal-t, pl. ti-mlal-in “gazelle” [Mrc. 1937, 127], Zayan & Sgugu ta-miall “gazelle” [Lbg. 1924, 569] || SBrb.: Ghat ta-mellal-t, pl. či-mellal-in “antelope addax” [Nhl. 1909, 127], Hgr. ä-mellul, pl. i-mellâl-en “antelope adax” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1193], Wlm. a-mellâl “antelope addax” [Bst. 1887, 447] = EWlm. a-mellâl “Addax nasomaculatus (Blainville)” [Ncl. 1950, 18] = EWlm. a-möllal & Ayr e-möllal “antelope addax (Addax nasomaculatus, Blainville)” [PAM 1998, 217; 2003, 539] – unless the Brb. forms derive from Brb. *m-l-l “white” as usually suggested in Berberology (e.g. by Ch. de Foucauld, K.-G. Prasse l.c.).

- All other solutions are false:
- **3.** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova: OEg. m3 related to Agaw: Qmt. mēwā “kind of gazelle” [OS] ||| CCh.: Margi mwa[?]yu “roan antelope” [Skn. 1984, 23] | Lame & Peve & Zime miyeo “antelope” [OS]. False.
NB: Phonologically wrong (Eg. -3 ≠ AA *-w), cf. rather LEg. mḥ “die Säbelantelope” (GR, Wb II 121, 11).
LIT.: OS 1992, 181 (PCCCh.-Margi-Eg); Orel 1993, 42 and HSED #1765 (Eg.-CCh.-Agaw).
- **4.** N. Skinner (1984, 33) treated OEg. m3 as a reflex of AA *-B-?- “oryx, oribi” together with a great number of unrelated forms. Phonologically untenable.
NB: Such as Sem.: Ar. wa^oal- “oryx” (!), Jbl. nbe^oet “oryx” (!) ||| Bed. baha “dikdik” || LECu.: Saho-Afar be^oida “oryx” || SCU.: Brg. ba^ouru “oryx” ||| WCh.: Hausa warwaa^oji “oryx” & zawarii “male oribi” | Kirfi kaame “oribi” || CCh.: Glavda buḥta “antelope” etc. (!).
- **5.** L. Homburger (1957, 30) identified OEg. m3 with Drv.: Tamil māṅ (sic). No comment.

m3.tj (dual) “two ends (?) of a sinew” (late NK hapax: Pap. Chester Beatty VII, rt. 4:1, Grd., HPBM III 58) = “the two shafts (of the crest of a heron)” (Dawson 1936, 106) = “terminaisons (d’un tendon) (?)” (AC 1978, 8) = “extrémités (?)” (AL 77.1573 & 78.1593) = “termination of a tendon” (DLE I 208) = “*die beiden Enden (der Sehne, vom Kopf der Phoenix)” (GHWb 315). Hapax: Pap. Chester Beatty VII, rt. 4:1 (late NK Mag.).

NB: Quoting Dawson (l.c.) apud AC l.c. is misleading, since the former author did in fact not accept the rendering “two ends (?) of a sinew” from a bird’s brow (Grd.) in the context (m3.tj n rwd m wp.t=f) referring to a ‘phoenix’, i.e., a heron with a long crest springing from the top of the head (wp.t “vertex, division, parting of the hair”) and directed backwards similarly to “two long filaments”. According to Dawson, rwd denoted here the semi-flexible shafts of these crest-feathers, which were made of gut, while the bird in question was presumably a wooden model.

- **1.** D. Meeks (AL 77.1573) regarded it as a dual of OEg. (Abusir) m3.t “proue (d’un navire)” (above), which is disproved by the rendering by Dawson (above), which would lead instead rather to assuming an etymological connection with Eg. m3w.t “Stange, Schaft (des Speeres)” (PT, Wb, below).

- **2.** GT: in principle, the common rendering “end” (or sim.) would make a derivation from AA *m-l “end” [GT] probable, cf. LECu.: Afar mùluy (m) “end, finish, last time”, muluye “to terminate” [PH 1985, 171] ||| WCh.: perhaps Sha máh ~ má “beenden” → mumáh ~ múmáʕi [ʕ/h reg. < *r] “Ende” [Jng. 1970, 287] | Dera mal- “enden, aufhören” [Jng. 1966 MS, 10] = máalè [-l- < *-l-/*-r-] “to have finished” [Nwm. 1974, 129].

nb1: At the first glance, SBrb.: EWlm. ā-mur, pl. i-marr-ān “pointe de flèche” [Ncl. 1957, 55] could also belong here. But its etymology is questionable, cf. EWlm. & Ayr ə-mur ~ ə-m̄mur, pl. i-m̄arr-ān “flèche” [PAM 1998, 221], Hgr. ā-mor, pl. i-murr-en “flèche” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1224]. Any connection with AA *m-l “arrow, lance” [GT] (see Eg. m3w.t “shaft” below)?

nb2: Ch. Ehret (1997, 203, #1799) suggests that Afar muluy ~ OEg. mnq (q.v.) < AA *-mul- “to end” (intr.). Wrong.

- **3.** GT: less probably, provided Eg. m3- derived from *mʔ-, a connection to the monoradical Brb. root *m should not be ruled out, cf. NBrb.: Snh. ʔa-ma, pl. ʔa-mi-win “pan d’un vêtement” [Rns. 1932, 384], Temsaman & Bqy. ʔi-mû-an “board” [Brn. 1917, 93], Mzab t-ma, pl. ti-mi-wa “côté, direction” [Dlh. 1984, 114], Bugi ʔa-ma & Tarudant tsa-ma “côté” [Bst. 1890, 312], Qbl. ta-ma, pl. ta-mi-win “1. côté, face, 2. lisière” [Dlt. 1982, 479] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ʔā-ma, pl. ʔā-ma-wen ~ ʔā-ma-ten “1. bout, extrémité, 2. limite, périphérie, bord(ure), 3. frontière” [PAM 1998, 207; 2003, 518].
nb: These forms might well be derived from the root *m “mouth” (as suggested by K.-G. Prasse in PAM). On the other hand, the Berber root might be alternatively equated with Sem.: Sqt. myʕ: míʕeh “côté” [SSL 1991, 1466, cf. Lsl. 1938, 248 with false Sqt. etymology], which, naturally, excludes a connection with Eg. m3.tj.

m3 “eine wohlriechende Pflanze” (LP, GR, Wb II 11, 10) = m33 (!)
“un arbre ou arbuste de la famille des platanacées (non indigène en Égypte), qui produit à la fois l’oléo-résine (recherchée pour la parfumerie sacrée); un végétal arborescent, odorant, porteur de ‘graines’, contenant une gomme-résine” (Goyon 1984, 82). Cf. also Dem. m33 “scented plant used in preparing styrax” (Pap. Wien 3873, Vos 1993, 349, no. 238).

nb: Reading (m3 or m33) and meaning debated. Similarly to Wb. l.c., Junker (1959, 154) identified this m3 of Wb with the second component of LEg. g3j(w)-m3 “eine wohlriechende Pflanze” (LP, GR, Wb V 158, 5). Following this idea, Goyon (1984, 81–82, cf. also AEB 84.303) assumed a resin name *g3l-m33 “Styrax officinalisL. (Styraceae)” (identified with mnjb “Liquidambar Or. Mill.” and its product styrax in a text from the laboratory at the Edfu temple of Horus) with the second component -m33 akin to Eg. m3 (Wb II 11, 10) transcribed by him as m33 and designating, in Goyon’s view, the family of platanaceae (where Liquidambar also belongs). Goyon saw the same word in nh.t-m33 “un arbre ou arbrisseau producteur de gommés ou oléo-résines” (botanically unidentified) as well as in m33 (Pap. Ramesseum V 56:53,

see below). But Aufrère (1986, 9–10, §XI.4 & p. 10, fn. 2) denied the equation of the 2nd element of g3jw-m3 with that of nh.t-m3 (which he defined as “une arbre odoriférante, le *Liquidambar orientalis*”), and considered (contra Goyon l.c.) LEg. m3 (Wb II 11, 10; Mariette: Dendara I 72c) as “une écriture fautive pour” m3t.t (q.v.), which in Dendara “servait de phylactère à la déesse Hathor de Dendara” and “désignait le céleri et non le calotrope” (i.e., it is = m3t.t, q.v. ≠ m3t.t, q.v.).

- Etymology unknown. Difficult to judge whether it has any connection with either of the forms listed below. Thus, any etymology is hardly more than mere guess:

- **1.** GT: if -3 < *-r, one may perhaps consider the following terms (the mutual relationship of which is uncertain): NBrb.: perhaps Ait Said [mīāru] “sorte d’herbe” [Allati 1986, 15] ||| LECu.: Oromo-Orma mirā “leaves of *Catha Edulis*, a stimulant grass sp.” [Strm. 2004, 55] ||| CCh.: Lame [mb- < *m-] mbíri “herbe sp. (ivraie?), croît dans les champs et mit aux cultures” [Scn. 1982, 311] || ECh.: Bdy. mara “herbes dont sont friands les phacochères” [AJ 1989, 97] | Mubi moṛó (f) “*Hibiscus esculentus*, Okra” [Lks. 1937, 184].

NB: SBrb.: EWlm. a-māri “*Zornia diphylla*, Papillonacée (graines en petites gousses, fleurs rouge-clair)” [Ncl. 1950, 28] = EWlm. & Ayr e-māri “esp. d’herbe (*Zornia diphylla*: herbe qui s’appelle en anglais beggar’s lice parceque ses graines s’accrochent aux vêtements comme des poux)” [PAM 2003, 551], explained by PAM l.c. from EWlm. & Ayr āru “aimer”, probably do not belong here.

- **2.** GT: or cf. AA *m-r “grass (sp.)” [GT]?
NB: Attested in ES: Amh. muri ~ mure “kind of grass”, cf. perhaps also Geez murā “kind of flower” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 356) ||| LECu.: Oromo-Orma marra “grass” [Strm. 2004, 55] ||| NOM.: Mao of Bambeshi má:ré “grass” [Sbr-Wdk. 1993, 16] ||| WCh.: PAngas *m’ār “grass sp. (*Vetiveria zizanioides*)” [GT 2004, 261]: Angas myaar “a grass (Hs. žeme), it grows near water chiefly, ‘faifais’ are made of it by the Hausas, but it is used for ornamental armllets by the Angass girls” (≈ Hs. žécémà “the scented grass *Vetiveria zizanioides* used for making dàràmbúúwáá-armlets”, Abr. 1962, 421) [Flk. 1915, 251] = myār “wohlriechendes Gras, *Vetiveria zizanioides* (Hs. žécémà), zum Flechten vo Bastellern und Armringen gebraucht” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] || CCh.: perhaps Bura mur [unless -r < *-n] “new grass that springs up after the bush is burned (?)” [BED 1953, 145] | Bata mwéré “grass often grown to demarcate farm boundaries” [Pweddton 2000, 58].

- **3.** GT: if Eg. m3 < *m-l, cf. LECu.: Somali málmal “die Myrrhe” [Rn. 1902, 296] = málmál “1. *Commiphora Playfairi*, 2. *Commiphora Ellenbeckii*, 3. gum of *Commiphora molmol*” [Abr. 1964, 172], which seems promising regarding Goyon’s rendering.

NB: Or, less probably, cf. either (1) SBrb.: Ayr a-mol “fleur d’afāgag (acacia), très odorante”, a-mol “esp. de plante rampante (*Cocculus pendulus*)” [PAM 2003, 537]; (2) SBrb.: Ayr te-māle, pl. ti-māla-wen “esp. d’herbe” [PAM 2003, 536] ||| CCh.: Mofu-Gudur máalá, málálá “herbe sp.” [Br. 1988, 174] | Masa māl “plante sp., prob. *Hyparrhenia rufa* (Nees) Stapf., Gramineae” [Ctc. 1983, 105], Lame mbāl [mb- < *m-] “plante sp.” [Scn. 1982, 309]; or (3) EWlm. a-mil, Ayr e-mil “esp. d’arbuste (*Leptadenia hastata*)” [PAM 2003, 537].

m33 “sehen” (OK, Wb II 7–10) = “to look, see” (FD 100).

NB1: H. Satzinger (1994, 200; cf. Hodge 1966, 44; Lpr. 1982, 78 & 88, n. 23) sees in the MEg. subjunctive m3n=f [$< *mll-f$] “daß er sehe” (cf. also Snk. LÄ IV 210, n. 19; Vrg. 1971, 55 quoting Thacker 1954) the trace of an original $*-ll > -33$, cf. also the CT divine name m3-h3-f ~ mn-h3-f, act. $*\text{“der hinter sich schaut”}$. C. Peust (1999, 169) assumes three allomorphs: m33, m3, m3n $>$ later mn (see Smith 1984), and leaves undecided whether m33 or m3n was the basic form. For the wtg. of m33 in CT cf. Cenival 1977. Note that Wit (1979, 446) explained the GR value mn of the two eyes hrgl. from an interchange of m3n ~ m33 (with the loss of $-3-$?).

NB2: Sh. Allam (1987, 3) surmizes a *Nebenbedeutung* “beaufsichtigen” (not in Wb) in a few occurrences of m33 or its derivative m3.w “inspection” from Dyn. XVIII (Urk. IV 57, 124:9, 1006:16, 1119:16), which, in his view, is surviving also in Eg. Ar. dial. māʾa “etwas anstarren, scharf beobachten”. Allam even reinterpreted the famous Dyn. III ex. of mr “overseer” (cf. Helck 1954, 76; for sources cf. also Allam 1987, 1, fn. 6) as m3.(w) “Beaufsichtiger”, which is very dubious.

- From the same root (m33 $< *mll$ or $*mrr$) derive i.a. the following forms: **(1)** m3.w-ḥr “Spiegel” (CT, Wb II 10, 15). **(2)** m3.tj “die Augen (von Sonne und Mond als Augen des Himmels)” (LP, GR, Wb II 11, 12) = “les deux yeux (du Soleil et de la Lune)” (El-Sayed 1987, 64), attested already in CT m33.tj (RT 14, 1893, 165) “les deux voyants (comme désignation des yeux)” (Volten 1959, 27, fn. 3) = m33.w.tj “eyes” (DCT 153: CT VI 123b). Cf. also m33.t (dual m33.tj) “Auge” in Mundöffnung, Spruch 33 (Helck 1967, 35). Dubious whether the same word occurs in CT I 241e m3.tj (sun det.) “(subst. de sens inconnu)” (AL 78.1599 referring to Wb II 11, 12!), since Faulkner (AECT I 52, n. 5 of Spell 53) surmised here a noun “light” (identical with m3w.t “rays of light”). **(3)** mr.t “Auge (einer Gottheit)” (BD, GR, Wb II 107), q.v. **(4)** m3r “surveiller, supervisor” (Edfu IV 279:1, Meeks 1999, 580). **(5)** Probably m3r.w “viewing-place (in sun-cult)” (XVIII., FD 103).

NB1: W. Helck (ZÄS 79, 1954, 76–77) derived also Eg. mr “Aufseher”, alongside with m33 “sehen” and mr.t “Auge”, from the root $*mll$. Sh. Allam (1987, 3), in turn, explained the Dyn. III ex. of the title mr (written with the owl + 2 eyes) directly from m33 (for an early wtg. of m33 “to see” with owl see IÄF 388). Both suggestions are improbable in this form. See the entry for Eg. mr below.

NB2: This root $*mll > m33$ has been connected Edel (1956, 9, fn. 1), Volten (1959, 27 & fn. 3), Helck (1967, 35), Roccati (1970, 32), Westendorf (KHW 22), and Loprieno (1982, 88, n. 23) also with Cpt.: (SB) $\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{l}\mathfrak{l}$ “Auge”, which is certainly unacceptable phonologically (as rightly pointed out already by W. A. Ward 1978, 145, #288 & #289.3), since the true Eg. etymon of the latter was GR br.wj “die beiden Augen”, cf. br “sehen, erblicken” (Wb I 465, 5–6) $<$ AA $*b-l$ “to see” [GT]. For details see the entry for Eg. br in EDE II.

- Difficult to decide whether #1 or #2 is the correct etymology because of Eg. $-33 (< *-rr$ or $*-ll)$:
- **1.** Most frequently, it has been compared with Sem. $*mr$ “sehen (lassen)” [Rundgren] = “1. to see, 2. show, 3. notify, order” [Frz. 1984, 109] = “2. to see, 3. make visible, make known” [KB] = “1. to see,

know, 2. make known, say” [Hnrg. 2000, 2062]: Akk. ʔmr G “sehen” [AHW 40] || Ug. ʔmr Qt “sichtbar sein, sehen” [WUS #283] = “to see, look at” (!) [Gordon apud Lsl. 1968 l.c.] = “1. sehen, 2. sagen” [Sanmarín 1973, 263–270], Hbr. ʔmr qal “1. say, 3. mention, praise, call, assure, 4. think (say to o’self), 5. intend, 6. give orders” [KB 66] | BAram. ʔmr peal “1. sagen, 2. befehlen” [GB 895], JNAram. mār “(that is to) say, let us say, quote (a saying)” [Sabar 2002, 210], Aram. of Baḥ^ʿa mr “1. sagen, 2. jmdm. etw. geben, 3. zu/versprechen” [Correll 1969, 170] || OSA (Sab.) ʔmr “sign, omen, oracle” [SD 6], Ar. ʔmr “ordonner, commander” [BK I 53] | Jbl. ʿmr: ʿōr “1. to say, 2. order” [Jns. 1981, 13], Mhr. ámūr “es sagte” [Bittner 1915, 49, #12] = ʔamōr “to say” [Nkn. 1986, 66, #511] = ʿmr: ʔāmōr “1. to say, 2. compose, sing poetry” [Jns. 1987, 25], Sqt. ʿémor [irreg. ʿ- < *-ʔ-] “to say” [Nkn. 1986, 70, #539] | Geez ʔammärä II “to show, indicate, tell, make a sign, make known, etc.”, ʔaʔmärä “to know, recognize” [Lsl. 1968, 349, #229] = ʔammara “zeigen”, ʔaʔmara “wissen” [Rundgren], Tigre ʔamra “wissen”, ʔāmər “verständig” [LH quoted apud Rundgren] = ʔamära “to know”, ʔattəʔamära “to announce” [Lsl. 1982] = āmärä “to know, understand” [Lsl. 1987] etc. (Sem.: Lsl. 1944, 54; 1982, 6; 1987, 25; Rundgren 1963, 181; Aro 1964, 153; DRS 24; Marrassini 1971, 106–110; Rabin 1975, 89, #73; MM 1983, 173; Müller 1985, 269), which derive < AA *m-r “1. to see, 3. say, 4. show” [GT] attested also in Bed. ʔmērū “finden” [Munzinger] = mēri “finden” [Almkvist 1885, 47] = mir “to see, attend to” [Rpr. 1928, 218] = mir “to find” [Hds. 1996, 94] || LECu.: Rendille mōro “Wahrsager, Wahrsagefähigkeit” [Schlee 1978, 141, #787] = mōr-o “soothsayer, star-gazer, who sees visions” [PG 1999, 227] | Orm.-Waata mar-āḏḏa “to look for, search for” [Strm. 1987, 364] || NOm.: perhaps Mocha marà ra(yé) “to dream”, mara r-o “dream” [Lsl. 1959, 42, 11] || WCh.: AS *mer (var. *mar?) “to look for” [GT 2004, 246]: Mnt. mai (so, -a-) [-i reg. < *-r#] “to seek” [Ftp. 1911, 220], Gmy. mēr [-ε-] “to spy on, look for” [Srl. 1937, 138] || CCh.: Lamang (Hitkala) mar- “to show” [Lks. 1964, 108] = mar-a “zeigen” [Wolff 1972, 198] | Mandara mar-a “zeigen” [Mirt 1970–1971, 67], Glavda mar- “1. to show, publish, make known, 2. betray, deliver up” [RB 1968, 63], Malgwa mára “zeigen” [Löhr 2002, 301] (CCh.: JI 1994 II, 293) || ECh.: Kera kə-maará (coll.) “1. Stäbchen mit deren Hilfe wahrgesagt wird; 2. Wahrsagerei” [Ebert 1976, 67] | Bidiya mēr “lorgner” [Alio & Jng. 1989, 98]. Eventually related may be perhaps also AA *m-(y)-r “2. to

think” [GT], cf. SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr a-myar, pl. EWlm. i-myar-ān, Ayr ə-myar-ān “pensée, réflexion” [PAM 1998, 230; 2003, 570] ||| LECu.: Som. mīy(y)ir ~ mīr ~ mūr (f) “Verstand, Klugheit” [Rn. 1902, 300], Arb. mariy-aḏḏ- “to discuss” [Hyw. 1984, 384] | Orm. mariʔ-aḏḏa “to plan, discuss”, marī “plan” [Gragg 1982, 280] ||| NOm.: Gimira-Benesho mar “hypothesis” [Wdk. 1990, 107].

LIT.: Hommel 1899, 347; 1904, 110, fn. 1 (Eg.-Akk.); Alb. 1927, 218 (Eg.-Sem.); Ember 1930, #10.a.11 (Eg.-Akk.); Clc. 1936, #616 (Eg.-Akk.); Chn. 1947, #9 (Eg.-Sem.); IS 1971, #124 (Eg.-Sem.); Marrassini 1971, 108, fn. 2 (Eg.-Sem.); Ward 1972, 19; 1978, 144–6 & #288, #289.3 (Akk.-Eg); Hodge 1978, 3, #91; 1981, 404; 1986, 339, #91 (Eg.-Sem.); Chetveruhin 1990, 139, fn. 18, 140 (Sem.-Eg.); JI 1994 I, 145 (Eg.-Akk. with false Ch. cognate); HSED #1761 (Sem.-ʔEg.-Bdy); Takács 1995, 183; 1996, 15, §6.1 (Sem.-Eg).

DP: H. Möller (1911, 166) combined Sem. *ʔmr “sagen, sprechen” with IE *m-r (sic) “verkündigen”.

NB1: There were debates on the basic sense of Sem. *ʔmr (see KB 65 with further lit.). Although the semantic shift “to say” vs. “see” (presumably via “to let see, know”) is widely attested, Rundgren (1963, 181) claimed the etymological connection between Hbr. ʔmr “sagen” vs. Akk. amāru “sehen” as “*nie erklärt*”. Instead, rightly and correctly, Rundgren (l.c.) pointed to such typological parallels as IE *sek- “1. bemerken, sehen, 2. zeigen” [IEW 897] > i.a. Gk. (Homer) ἔννεπε (= Lat. īnsequē) “sage an! erzähle!”, German sehen vs. sagen etc.; or IE *deik- “zeigen” [LEW I 348] > Lat. dicō “spreche” vs. Gk. δείκνυμι “zeige”. He explained (1) Ar. ʔamar-at- “Zeichen, Wegweiser”, tu-ʔmūr- “sign, or mark, set up to show the way in the waterless desert” [Lane 97–98] from *ʔsehen lassen”; (2) Hbr. ʔāmar as a “*neu gebildet*” after yōmar < *yāmir < caus. *yaʔmir “sehen lassen, zeigen, befehlen, sagen” or via *ʔaʔmar < *haʔmar; (3) Tigre ʔamra “wissen” as a denom. verb < ʔāmōr “verständlich” [LH]. Finally, however, Rundgren (as several authors also) concluded that the underlying root might be etymologically connected to Sem. *ʔmr “hell sein, strahlen” (cf. Geez ʔamīr “sol, diēs”) via a “*possessivischer Stativ*” *ʔamīr “ist gesehen” (cf. Or.Succ. 9, 1961, 98) with the same semantic shift as in Ar. ʔabšara “erblicken”, denom. < bašar- “Blick” (orig. *ʔGlanz”) or German blicken < Gmc. *bleik-a- “glänzen” [Kluge 1999, 119]. Interestingly, Rundgren (l.c.) found Koehler’s *Grundbedeutung* “hell sein, sichtbar machen, kund tun” as hardly fitting. Leslau (1958, 11) also compared Sem. *ʔmr “to see, say” with Tigre ʔammāra “hell, klar sein”. Similarly, KB 65: PSem. *ʔmr basic sense “to be light”. J. Sanmartín (1973, 263-270), in turn, discussed the Ug. & Sem. exx. of *ʔmr “sehen” vs. “sagen” separately.

NB2: H. Bauer (1935, 174, #2) derived Syr. dmr “admirari” from a t-prefix (sic) + Sem. *ʔmr “to see”.

NB3: A. Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 173) found W. Leslau’s (1938, 315) explanation of the sporadic change ʕ- < *ʔ- in MSA (as being due to the influence of *-r) unsatisfactory, and instead sought in MSA *ʕ- a Sem. heritage shared with Ar. ʕammār- “grave et doux dans ses paroles” [BK II 366], which is a mistake, since the basic sense of Ar. ʕmr was fully different. The same is valid for Militarev’s (l.c.) comparison of Sem. *ʔmr with Ar. hammār- “2. bavard, loquace, qui, pour ainsi dire, répand un torrent de paroles”, which is in fact a metaphoric sense of “1. qui verse à la fois une grande quantité de pluie (nuage)” < hamara I “2. répandre, verser (de l’eau, des larmes)” [BK II 1445].

NB4: As rightly pointed out by Rundgren (1963, 181), von Soden’s (AHW 40) “Eth. ʔmr sehen” (sic) does not exist.

NB5: Cf. also NAgaw: Hamir mirmir “untersuchen” [Rn. 1884, 394], Qmt. mārāmār “examiner, épier, espionner” [CR 1912, 232] | SAgaw: Awngī marmara-ḳḳ “to

examine” [Hetzron 1969, 102] || HECu.: Kmb. maramárró “to examine” [Lsl. 1956, 989] || NOm.: Mocha marà:mar-yé “to examine” [Lsl. 1959, 41], which are presumably Amh. loans.

NB6: Jungraithmayr & Ibrizimow (1994 I, 145) equated the isogloss of Eg. m33 vs. Akk. ʔamāru with their PCh. *m-y-ḏ “to see”, which is phonologically highly disputable: PCh. *ḏ ≠ Eg. 3 vs. Akk. r. In addition, the WChadic (Sha, BT group) forms in question (JI 1994 II 284–5) display rather an etymon *may ~ *moy, cf. Bole-Tangale *mayu “to see” [Schuh 1984, 217], which is hardly cognate with the single piece of evidence for PCh. *ḏ set up by JI, namely WCh.: BT: Kupto mèḏ-, for which, cf. rather perhaps Ar. mṭw: maṭā I “7. ouvrir les yeux” [BK II 1124].

- 2. The assumption on Eg. m33 = *mll (above) speaks rather in favour of tracing it back to AA *m-l “1. to look at (attentively)” [GT] attested in Sem.: Ar. ʔml V: taʔammala “1. regarder avec attention, contempler qqch., 2. réfléchir à qqch., 3. penser, être en méditation” [BK I 56] = “examiner” [DRS 22] || NAgaw: NAgaw *mäl-äy/t- “to guard” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mnj “weiden”): cf. esp. Qwr. mäl- “spähen, beobachten, herumschauen” [Rn. 1885, 98] (NAgaw: Apl. 1994, 248) || HECu.: Sdm. malammala “to enquire, examine” [Gsp. 1983, 221], Hdy. mal- “1. to examine, investigate, 2. doubt” [Hds. 1989, 52, 59], Gedeo (Drs.) mall- “to examine, investigate” [Hds.] || NOm.: Kaffä mall-et- “osservare” [Crl. 1951, 471]. Here may eventually belong NAgaw: Bilin mil^ʕ y “hinschauen, sich umsehen” [Rn. 1887, 269] vs. LECu.: Orm. mil- “guardare” [Crl. 1951, 471] = mil^ʔ-aḏḏa “to look back, glance”, mil^ʔú “glance, look” [Gragg 1982, 287, 432] = mil^ʕ-aḏa “anblicken”, mil^ʕ “Blick” [Rn. 1887, 269] = mill-eḏḏa “to look at one point” [Strm. 2001, 56] = mill-aḏḏa “1. (Borana) to look at, observe sg. sharply, pay attention to, 2. (Waata) have a quick look at” [Strm. 1987, 368] = (Borana) mill-aḏḏa “to look at, observe sg. sharply, glance, watch, pay attention to” [Strm. 1995, 209], which form a special Cu. isogloss *m-l-^ʕ (ext. *-^ʕ) “to look” [GT]. The intr. sense of the AA root is to be seen in LECu.: Orm. mul^ʔ-aḏḏa “to appear, become clear, apparent”, mul^ʔ-isa “to reveal, make known, show” [Gragg 1982, 294; Hds. 1989, 21: no HECu. cognates], Orm.-Borana mul-aḏḏa “to appear” [Strm. 1987, 368; 1995, 211].

NB1: Presumably the very same root is to be found (with a developed semantics) in AA *m-l “3. to show, 4. say” [GT] = *mVl- “to speak, call” [HSED], cf. Sem.: (?) Ug. mll “to speak (?)” or “honey (?)” [Watson 1996, 709–710], Hbr. mll piel “reden, sprechen” → millā(h) “Wort, Rede” [GB] | Aram. (Old, Jewish, Official) mll pael “to speak” [DNWSI 645], Samar. Aram. mll pael “to speak, say, talk” & “speech” [Tal 2000, 473], Mand. mll I “1. to speak, talk, 2. show forth, appear” [DM 273] || Ar. mll IV & ml^ʔ IV “diktierten” [Kautzsch] = mll ~ mlw IV “dicter qqch. à qqn.” [BK II 1141, 1153] (Sem.: GB 426, 431) || Brb. *m-l “to show” [GT]: NBrb.: Shilh mēl “montrer” [Jst. 1914, 143] = mel “montrer, indiquer, renseigner” [Jordan 1934, 92] = ml “to direct, conduct, show” [Aplg. 1958, 61],

Shilh-Tazerwalt m'1 “zeigen” [Stumme 1899, 209], Mnsr. mel “dire” [Bst.], Wargla mæl “(ra)conter, indiquer, faire part” [Dlh. 1987, 188], Shenwa emmel “indiquer” [Lst. 1912, 147] | Qbl. mel “indiquer, faire savoir, faire part” [Dlt. 1982, 497], Zwawa imela (aor.) “indiquer, montrer” [Bst.] = mel “indiquer” [Brn. 1917, 92] = mel “indiquer” [Bf. 1910, 219] | EZenet *m-l “dire” [GT]: Sened emmel “dire” [Prv. 1911, 110] = ǝ-mmāl [Lst.], Djerba a-mæl [Lst.], Nfs. é-mel “dire” [Bgn. 1942, 288; 1931, 274] = ǝ-mæl [Lst.] = mel “parler, dire, indiquer” [Bst.] || EBrb. *m-l “dire” [GT]: Siwa u-mmāl “dire” [Lst.] = a-mel “parler” [Bst.], Sokna ǝ-mmāl [Lst.] (EZenet-EBrb.: Lst. 1931, 226) || Zenaga a-melli “parler” [Bst.] || SBrb.: Hgr. a-mel “indiquer” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1188], Kel Ūi a-mel “to say” [Bst.], EWlm. & Ayr ǝ-mæl “1. indiquer, nommer, 2. informer de, 4. décrire, 5. dire” [PAM 1998, 215; 2003, 536], Tadghaq & Tudalt a-mæl (imper.) “to praise, confess, explain”, ǝ-mæl “to explain” [Sudlow 2001, 144] (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 310, 336; 1890, 78, 317; Rns. 1932, 387) || LECu.: Afar mallōwa “to discuss sg. and come up with a solution” [PH 1985, 162] || CCh.: Hide (Htk.) malaḡmala “être montré” [Egc. 1971, 217], Logone máláhé “zeigen” [Nct. in Lks. 1936, 107; JI 1994 II, 293], cf. CCh. *m-l “to show” [JS 1981, 227C] || ECh.: Bdy. melya, pl. melèy ~ meléeliye “1. mot, 2. histoire, 3. querelle, affaire, problème”, cf. milay “être sage” [AJ 1989, 98–99], EDng. māliyā (f) “l’histoire, le couté” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 193] | Mubi mèlél “discuter” [Jng. 1990 MS, 33]. For Aram.-Brb. see HSED 392, #1814. Note that L. Kogan (2005, 522–3, #10) considers the relationship of common Aram. *mll “to say” vs. Ar. mll as “possible, but hardly certain”, while is inclined to compare Geez ta-māhlala ~ ta-māhlala “to beseech, supplicate” [Lsl. 1987, 335], which is, however, evidently to be treated as a distinct root both on semantic and phonological grounds.

NB2: We may assume that AA *m-l “2. to think” [GT] was also related, cf. SBrb.: perhaps Ayr a-mæl “1. préconcevoir, prédestiner (Dieu + sort: p.ex. salut, beauté), 2. recommander” [PAM 2003, 537] || ECu. *mal- “to think about, suppose” [Lmb.]: LECu. *mal- [Black]: Afar mal-a (f) “opinion, plan, consultation”, mal-ite (intr. “to be devised, planned” [PH 1985, 162] | Som. mal-á “Gedanke, Erwägung, Bedenken, Zweifel”, caus. mal-ay- “Gedanken machen, Bedenken tragen, vermuten, glauben, nicht bestimmt wissen, zweifeln” [Rn. 1902, 294] = mal-áyn-ayya “to think, have opinion, not to be sure, think so, consider, guess” [Abr. 1964, 172], Som.-Isaq malaynayya “opinion” [Abr. 1964, 172], Rnd. mál “thought, idea, suggestion, plan” [PG 1999, 217], Baiso mal-ab- “to know sg., understand” [Hbr.-Lmb.] = malab “to know” [Bnd. 1971, 241, #43] = mall-/máll- “to reflect, think about” [Lmb.-Sottile 1997, 460] | Oromo mala “1. to plan, design, 2. do mischief” [Gragg 1982, 275] = malū “1. to find means, seek a method, 2. plan, design, 3. plot” & mala “1. method, means, 2. plan, scheme, design” [Btm. 2000, 187], Oromo-Waata māl- “to come up with a plan” [Black], Oromo-Borana mala “knowledge, opinion, plan, decision, idea” [Strm. 1995, 207], Konso mal- “to apply a tactic” [Black], Gidole mal- “to prepare a plan of action” [Black] (LECu.: Black 1974, 163; cf. Zbr. 1975, 323) | HECu. *mal- “to guess, suppose” [Hds. 1989, 74, 417] > i.a. Sdm. mala “to ponder, consider, take a decision”, mala (m) “advice, agreement, plan” [Gsp. 1983, 220] = malá “consulting”, mal- ~ amāl- “to advise” [Hds. 1989, 19], Kmb. mal-essa “wise person” [Hds. 1989, 169] (ECu.: Mrn. 1940, 228; Hbr.-Lmb. 1988, 127), cf. also ES (borrowed from ES): Tna. māla “plan”, Amh. māla “opinion, prediction”, cf. also Tigre mela “trick, artfulness” (ES: Lsl. 1982, 51) || NOm.: Wlt. mil- “credere” [Crl. 1929, 32; 1938 II, 214], Male mal-eni “he thinks” [Siebert 1994–1995, 11] | Zys. molʔ-otəsin “to think” [Siebert 1994, 21] || CCh.: perhaps Bata málé(ye)-tō “well-known, famous, fame” [Pweddton 2000, 53] || ECh.: Mkl. mālā (f) “savoir, connaissance, spécialité, préférence”, adj. “habile, intelligent, savant” [Jng. 1990, 136]. For combining the various Cu.-Om. forms meaning “to see” vs. “to think” see Cerulli 1951, 471; Dlg. 1973, 180.

NB3: L. Reinisch (1885, 98) and C. Conti Rossini (1912, 228) equated Qwr. mäl, viz. Qmt. mēl- with Saho-Afar bal “sehen” and Eg. br, Cpt. bal, but Qwr. m- seems ≠ LECu. *b- & Eg. b-.

NB4: Hardly any connection with NOm.: Wlt. mālal- “to be astonished” (contra Lmb.-Sotile 1997, 460).

NB5: Brb. *m-l is not related to Sem. *ʔmr as supposed in Chn. 1947, #9; Mrs. 1971, 108, fn. 2.

NB6: For a possible Hausa loan from SBrb. *m-l see Gouffé 1974, 369.

NB7: G. Takács (1995, 106) suggested a remote relationship between AA *m-l “to look at” and AA *m-l (connected with light) > Eg. m3w.t “rays of light” (q.v.) ||l ECU.: Brj. milī-i “lightning” & PSam *mālim “day”. The proposal made on the affiliation of WCh.: Ngamo moi “to see” in the same article (Takács 1995, 107, #5) is mistaken.

LIT.: Clc. 1936, #616 (Eg.-Brb.); Crl. 1938 II, 214; 1951, 471 (Kf.-Agaw-ECu.); Chn. 1947, #9 (Brb.-Eg.); IS 1971, 260–261 (Ar.-Eg.-Brb.); Mrs. 1971, 108, fn. 2 (Eg.-Brb.); Dlg. 1973, 180 (Agaw-ECu.-NOM.); Hodge 1978, 3, #91; 1986, 339, #91 (Eg.-PCu.); Chetveruhin 1990, 130 (Eg.-PCu.); OS 1992, 176 (Agaw-Om.-Eg.); Sts. etc. 1995, 17 (Brb.-PAGaw-PECu.-PNOM.); Takács 1995, 95–96, #4 (Ar.-Eg.-Cu.-NOM.); 1995, 106–107, #4 (?Eg.-Brb.-Cu.-NOM.-Ar.); 1995, 159 (Eg.-Brb.-Cu.-NOM.); 1995, 183; 1996, 14, §6 (Eg.-Brb.-Cu.-NOM.).

● Any other etymology of Eg. m33 is out of question:

■ **3.** It is impossible to accept the frequent comparison of Eg. m33 with WCh.: Bole-Tangale *mayu “to see” [Schuh 1984, 217] || CCh.: Bdm. mo, mo “to see” [Lks. 1939, 119], etc. – and their AP, cf. PNS *-mo “eye” [Bnd. 1994, 1160, #25] ~ PCKhoisan *mũ “to see” [Baucom 1972, 26], etc. Note that OEg. -33 ≠ Ch. *-y.

LIT.: Mnh. 1912, 238 (Khoisan-Nama-Eg.); Pls. 1960, 125, #2 (Eg.-Ngamo); OS 1992, 200–201 (PWCh.-PCCh.-Eg.); HSED #1761 (Eg.-Buduma).

■ **4.** Eg. m33 has nothing to do with OEg. b33 “eyeball” (q.v.) or Akk. bâru “to see” as suggested by A. Ember (1930, 10, #3.b.12), F. Calice (1936, #616), W. A. Ward (1972, 19), W. Westendorf (KHW 22), C. T. Hodge (1982, 311) etc. Later, Ward (1978, 144–146) correctly abandoned this comparison.

■ **5.** L. Homburger (1930, 284, 306): Eg. m33 ~ Peul yiʔude “voir” (sic). Absurd.

■ **6.** C. T. Hodge (1986, 339, #91) traced back Sem. *ʔmr, Eg. m33 and j.r.t “eye” (!), PCu. *malla^c- “to look at”, PCh. *l- “to see” & “eye” (!), and IE *wel- “to see” to one and the same common root. Later, Hodge (1990, 171) developed his idea further, where his ultimate proto-root is Lislakh **b-l “to see, eye” with the following reflexes: LL **b-l: OEg. b33 “eyeball” & NEg. bnr.w “eye(s)” (q.v.) – LL **Nb-l: Eg. m33 ||l Hgr. a-mel “to show” ||l Ch. *m-l “to show” [JS 1981, 227] ||l PCu. *mAllA^c- “to look at” [Dlg. 1973, 180] ~ IE *mel- → Gk. μελετάω “I think about” – LL **Nb-lH: Sem. *ʔmr.

- **7.** J. D. Ray (1992, 134, n. 15) suggested a relationship of Luvian *mana-* “to see” (!) to Eg. m33 ~ m3n or *m3l (prospective form). Absurd. (1) Eg. -33 < *-ll or *-rr ≠ IE *-n-. (2) The meaning of the Luvian word is debated (cf. HEG l-m, 117).
- **8.** A. M. Lam (1993, 379) equated LEg. mr.tj with Pulaar mērtu- “ouvrir les yeux”.

m33 “ein Baum, dessen Früchte officinell verwendet werden” (Med., WÄDN 212, cf. Germer 1979, 368) = “un arbre” (AL 79.1099) = “un végétal arborescent, odorant, porteur de ‘graines’, contenant une gomme-résine (il possède des ‘graines’ utilisables dans la pharmacopée)” (Goyon 1984, 85, n. 55) = “ein Baum” (GHWb 315). Hapax (?): Pap. Ramesseum V 56:53.

nb1: Dawson (apud Barns 1956, section VIII, 56 & p. 32, quoted by Deines & Grapow in WÄDN l.c.) and recently Hannig (GHWb l.c.) surmised m33 to be merely a miswriting of Eg. m3m3 “Dumpalme” (q.v.), which was firmly denied by Goyon (1984, 82) and Baum (1988, 120).

nb2: Goyon (1984, 82, 85, n. 55), followed by Baum (1988, 120), assumed in Eg. m33 vs. LEg. g3j-m33 < *g(3)l/r-m33 “*Styrax officinalis* L. (Styraceae)” (identified in the laboratory text of the Edfu temple with nnjb “*styrax*, Liquidambar Or.”) combined in Wb II 11, 11 with LEg. m3 “eine wohlriechende Pflanze” (Phylae, Wb, q.v.) vs. LEg. nh.t-m33 “arbre ou arbrisseau, producteur de gommages ou oléo-résines” (*Dendera*, Edfu, botanically unidentified) the very same word: m33 “arbre ou arbuste de la famille des platanacées, qui produit à la fois l’oléo-résine et la gomme-résine (recherchée pour la parfumerie sacrée)”. Thus, in his view, pr.t-m33 (≈ pr.t-nnjb) may have been the “grains” from which the gum resin was gained (although it usually was produced from the bark of the tree).

- Species not clear. Etymology obscure. Only mere guesses can be offered:

(1) LECu.: Somali málmál “die Myrrhe” [Rn. 1902, 296] = málmál “1. *Commiphora Playfairii*, 2. *Commiphora Ellenbeckii*, 3. gum of *Commiphora molmol*” [Abr. 1964, 172]. Seems promising regarding Goyon’s proposal.

(2) SBrb.: Hgr. tā-mil-t, pl. ū-mil-in “nom d’un arbrisseau très vert qui atteint 1^m à 1^m, 50° de hauteur” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1198] ||| LECu.: Som. mú/óli “der Drachenbaum, *dracaena Schizantha*” [Rn. 1902, 294–5]?

(3) NBrb.: Rif *ti-s/ne-mlel-t [GT]: Snh. ū-se-mlel-t ~ ū-se-mleṣ “osier”, Izn. ū-ne-mlel-t “tremble, espèce de peuplier”, Bqy. ū-ne-mrer-t “tremble, espèce de peuplier” (Rif: Rns. 1932, 387)? From Brb. *m-l-l “white”.

(4) NOm.: Kaffa mell-ō “sicomoro” [Crl. 1951, 471]?

(5) HECu.: Sdm. marēra “name of a plant (its wood is used to make house utensils)” [Gsp. 1983, 224]?

nb: Sem.: Oakk. marratu “(a tree)” [Gelb 1973, 183] is hardly related, being a deverbal derivation < marāru “to be bitter”.

(6) WCh.: Bokkos maráy “Baumart: locust bean tree” [Jng. 1970, 144] | Dera móriryó “locust bean tree (*Johannisbrothbaum*)” [Jng. 1966 MS, 11] || ECh.: Bdy. mòoriyò (m) “arbre sp.” [AJ 1989, 100]?

m3j “Löwe” (OK, Wb II 11, 14–19) = “lion” (FD 101). In the NK, it denoted also “die Gattung der großen Raubtiere” in general (Wesendorf 1966, 137).

NB1: Triconsonantal root. The final -j is preserved in Cpt. too: (SBAF) ΜΟΥΤΙ (m) “Löwe”, (f) “Löwin”, also (B) ΜΟΥΙΗ, ΜΥΗ, ΗΗ, ΗΙΕ (f), (F) ΗΕΥΙ (pl.) “Löwin” (KHW 88). NB2: There are quite numerous vocalization attempts. I.a., Sethe (1908, 38): (f) *m3éjet. A. Śmieszek (RO 13, 1937, 14–15, §5 & p. 18) set up (m) PEg. *mā3ij-īw-u (sic) > Eg. *mā3j’w > *māj’w > pre-Cpt. *mōj(’w) vs. (f) PEg. *mā3ī’j-āt-u > Eg. *mā3īj-āt-u > *m3īj’c > *m3īj’c > pre-Cpt. *m3ī vs. *mujē ~ *muē < *mujī (via secondary contamination with the masc. stem). W.F. Albright (1946, 25): (m) *mā3ē? < *mā3ū’a vs. (f) *ēmýē < *ēm3é’ē < *ēm3ú’ē(t) < *m3ú’ātā < *mā3ú’ātā. Garnot (1958, 139, fn. 5): (m) *mó3ej. Vergote (1973 Ib, 38, 143): (m) *mā3uy > *māyuy > *māy vs. (f) *amyū < *mayūya < *ma3ūyat vs. (pl.) *mayūywu > *mayūwwu reflected in Gk. -μευς. NBĀ 482–3, n. 149: (m) *mā3(ej) vs. (f) *m(a)3éj. ’t vs. (pl.) *m(a)3éj.w’w. Callender (1987, 34, #14): (m) *mā3ej’w → *mā3’j → *mā3j. Note that G. Fecht (1974, 197) spelled its instance in Pap. Hearst 244 as m^c3j (sic) and treated it as an ex. of the alleged shift m3 > m^c.

NB3: The LEg. PN p3-m3j “The Lion” (cf. Ranke PN I 105:5) is reflected in the Gk. PN Φιμουις ~ Πμουι(ς) ~ Φμο(υ)ις ~ Πμοις ~ Πιμουις ≠ Πεμους < Libyan period PN p3-m3jw (m) “The Cat” vs. Τεμους (f) < t3-mj.t (Yoyotte 1988, 155f. & 157, fn. 23 with sources). Vergote (1973 Ib, 38) sees in Πανομοις an Eg. etymon *p3-(n)-n3-m3j.w “celui des lions”.

NB4: Occurs also in the compound m3j-hz3 “Bez. des Löwen” (OK, Wb II 12), whose lit. sense has been interpreted quite diversely: “le lion terrible” (Naville 1916–17, 189) = “lion qui influe ou fascine par l’oeil” → “lion fascinateur” (Moret 1895, 87 considering hz3 “flux, fluide”, sic, to be the 2nd component!). The compound was conceived and reinterpreted in CT V 389 (with knife det.) as “scharfsichtig” or “wildblickend” (Kees 1965, 107, fn. 3).

- **1. GT:** most probably m3j < *mry, cognate with LECu. *mōr- [GT]: Dsn. (Geleba) mor “lion” [Hhn. 1966, 97] = mór, pl. mòr “leopard” [Sasse 1974, 418] = muor “leopard” [Tosco 2001, 519], Orm. mōrē “civet(-cat)” [Btm. 2000, 200] = morre “zibetto” [da Thiene 1939, 153] || SCu.: Rift *mar- “sort of wild feline” [Ehret]: Alg. mariyamo “wild cat”, Grw. mariri-ka “leopard” | Asa mero-k “lion” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 342) ||| WCh.: Dera muumuru “cheetah” [Nwm. 1974, 130] || CCh.: Mtk. màrè-žile “lion” [Krf. #159] = mariy-žélé [Brt. apud JI 1994 II, 227] | Lame mēr “serval” [Scn. 1982, 317], Lame-Peve mereo “cat” [Krf.].

AP: NS *mèrih “leopard” [Ehret 2001, 283, #125] = *mEr “leopard, lion, cat, dog” [Bnd. 2005, 100, #123]. Songhay mar “leopard” [Mkr.]. PWKuliak *merit “leopard” [Ehret 1981, 92].

LIT.: Flm. 1969, 12 (SCu.-Orm.); Mkr. 1989, 23, #46 (Songhay-Mtk.); HSED #1760 (Lame-SCu.); Skn. 1996, 206 (Eg.-Rift); Takács 2000, 99, #29.6 (SCu.-LECu.-Eg.-CCh.); SED II 218, #164 & Mlt. 2005, 89 (Eg.-WCh.-Masa gr.-Orm.-SCu.).

NB1: Cp. also Bed. miralai “cheetah” [Hds. 1996, 95] || ECu.: Dullay: Tsamay mirle (f) “cheetah sp.” [Sava 2005 MS, 250] ||| Ongota merila, mē’ri’la, mirila “leopard”, cf. mërle “genet, serval (similar to small leopard, maybe the same word)” [Flm. 1992, 212], which seem to have only extra-AA areal parallels (a local *Wandervort?*). C. Meinhof (1907, 120) has ESud.: Nandi merindo, Suk meril “leopard”, while H. C. Fleming (1983, 451) lists Kuliak: Nyangi merihl ~ SNil.: Tatoga marir-d, Suk meril, Kony merim-do, Sogoo melil-to “leopard”.

NB2: H. G. Mukarovsky (l.c.) combined the 2nd component of the Mtk. ex. with Mande: Vai žala & Guro žèla “Löwe”.

NB3: Cp. perhaps also Orm.: Bararetta & Tana moróde [3rd -d- unclear] “wild cat” [Flm.] & Arb. mōrdé “servil cat” [Hyw. 1984, 385]. The origin of the 3rd root cons. is obscure. These comparanda were declined by A. Militarev (SED II 218).

NB4: Apparently no Sem. cognate. L. Kogan & A. Militarev (SED II 218, #164, cf. also Mlt. 2005, 89) analyzed PSem. *namir- “leopard” as *na- (fossilized prefix) + AA *ma/ur- “a (large) feline”.

NB5: Militarev (l.c.) compared also the reflexes of WCh. *mur- “jackal, hyena” [GT]. Semantically problematic.

NB6: Cf. also Lame mérián “wild cat” [Krf.], Lame-Peve merian “wild cat, serval” [HSED]. Note that a comparison with CCh.: PMasa *me-ryaw “cat” [GT]: Lame méryāw “chat” [Scn. 1978, 196] = méréō “chat” [Scn. 1982, 317] = mériáù “cat” [Krf.], Zime-Dari méréw “chat” [Cooper 1984, 16], Zime-Batna ráw ~ mé-ráw [Jng.] = mé-riāo “cat” [Scn.] would be misleading, since the underlying root was Ch. *r-w, cf. CCh.: Masa ráw “chat” [Mch.], Zime-Batna ráw ~ mé-ráw “cat” [Jng.] (CCh.: JI 1994 II, 65) || ECh.: Tumak ərēw “leopard” [Cpr. 1975, 59] | Mubi ʔórúwá “lion” [Jng. in JI 1994 II, 227] || Sem. *ʔarway- “wild beast, lion” [SED] || Eg. rw “lion” (PT, Wb II 403, 8). For AA *r-w see Möller 1921, 195; Clc. 1936, #66; Chn. 1947, #34; Grb. 1963, 59; Hodge 1976, 11; OS 1992, 183; Orel 1993, 43; SED II 24–25, #17.

- 2. GT: provided m3j < *mly, an alternative cognate set might be SBrb.: EWlm. molli, pl. molli-t-ān “esp. de léopard” [PAM 2003, 537] || LECu.: Afar mol-ta (f) “lioness” [PH 1985, 170] || WCh.: Angas mulut “leopard” [ALC 1978, 40] | perhaps Tng. máàlá “name given to lion in stories” [Jng. 1991, 118] | Kry. mùl “leopard” [Skn. in JI 1994 II 222] || CCh.: perhaps Ngala mali “hyaena” [Mgd. 1922, 237] | Mulwi á-míl “Viverra civetta, civette” [Trn. 1978, 206] || ECh.: Kabalay mlaia “Löwe” [Lks.] = mlàṅə [Cpr. in JI], Lele mlá “lion” [Garrigues in JI] = mláng (so, -á-) [Simons apud JI] = mlàng (so, -à-) “lion” [Simons 1981, 18, #284], Nancere melí “Löwe” [Lks.] | Skr. melā “cat” [Lks. in JI 1994 II, 65] (ECh.: Lks. 1937, 89, 93; JI 1994 II 227).

AP: Nilotic: Kalenjin: Sogo meliltó “leopard” [Heine 1974, 42].

NB1: Parker & Hayward (l.c.) connected Afar mol-ta to Afar mōle “to shave” (!).

NB2: C. T. Hodge (1992, 219) identified Ch. *m-l “leopard” [JS 1981, 163] with Eg. 3m [*rm/*lm] “Löwe (als Name eines Gottes, als Bez. des Königs)” (GR, Wb I 10, 6). False. Eg. 3m ~ WCh.: NBch.-SBch. *r-m “leopard” [GT] || CCh.: PMasa *lum- “lion” [GT] || ECh.: Mgm. áárúm “lion” [JA 1992] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 222–223, 227). For Eg.-Ch.: Hodge 1992, 219; OS 1992, 183; HSED #2134.

- 3. V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova prefer equating OEg. m3j [< *mʔy?] with ECh.: Somray gr. *muy “lion” [GT]: Tumak mūy [Cpr. 1975, 85], Mawer mūy [Cpr. 1971, 52], Ndam mui (sic) [OS, not so in JI 1994 l.c.], Gulei mui [Lks.], Somray mī: [Jng./JI] = mī [AF] = mui [Lks.] = mī [Jng. 1993 MS, 45], Sarwa mūyí [Jng. 1977, 12, #284; 1990 MS, 8, #151] (Somray gr.: Lks. 1937, 80, 95; JI 1994 II, 227).

AP: PKuliak *mau “lion” [Heine 1975–76, 50; 1975, 295; Ehret 1980, 92]. H. Fleming (1983, 452) lists the following words for “lion” in NS: Kuliak *mau > Ik mau ~

ENil.: Lopit lo-imi, Lerya & Owe o-umi ~ Surma: Murle, Didinga, Longarim ma, Yidinit muhu, Yidenich mōho.

LIT. for ECh.-Eg: OS 1990, 89, #38; 1992, 183; Orel 1993, 43; HSED #1810; Takács 1999, 107, #34.

NB1: The striking similarity of PSomray *muy- “lion” and Cpt.: (SBAF) ΜΟΥΓΙ “lion” may be due to a pure chance too. In any case, the explanation of Eg. -3- would be a bit problematic, although the 3rd yods are in perfect match. Nevertheless, I would identify PSomray *muy “lion” rather with OEg. mhj.t (below).

NB2: Is HECu. *mōyy- “beast of prey” related (Takács 1999, 107, #34)? Cp. Burji mōyy-a, Had. mō-čča, Kmb. mō-čču, Sid. moy-ččo etc. (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 25; 414; Lsl. 1988, 195). Or does belong to OEg. mwt (q.v.)?

- **4.** K. Piehl (1893, 492) views that Eg. m3j “lion” can hardly be separated from mj.w “cat”, since “*les deux doivent avoir été différenciés originellement d’un même mot*”, which eventually may perhaps hold true of PAA (where roots *m-r ~ *m-l for both animals were present), but hardly of Eg.
- **5.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 215, #1839) suggests AA *-ma?- “to become big” → Sem. *m? “to be come large, wide” [Ehret] ~ Eg. m3j ~ SOm.: Ari ma?at “big”. Unacceptable.

m3j “die Samenflüssigkeit im Mutterleibe” (Amarna, Wb II 12, 10) = “foetus” (FD 101) = “Foetus” (GHWb 315). Fem.: m3j.t “semence” (KRI II 197, 11, AL 79.1103).

● Presumably from the same root:

(1) NK mjw “seed of man” (FD 104: Urk. IV 1679:7) vs. mj ~ mjw “1. der Same des Menschen, 2. Sohn” (XIX.-GR, Wb II 36, 4–5) = mj “seed” (de Wit 1956, 114: Edfu IV 178:12) = mj “semence, germe” (AL 79.1176 quoting KRI II 179:11, 603:3) = mj “seed (human)” (XIX., DLE I 210) = mj “1. Same (des Menschen), 2. (fig.) Sohn, Foetus” (GHWb 323) = mj “semen” (Edfu, PL 413).

(2) mwj “Same (bildlich für Sohn)” (LP hapax, Wb II 53, 4) = “semence, germe” (AL 79.1176).

NB1: Written with the hrgl. “three ripples” (N35) due to a contamination with mw “water, urine”?

NB2: Its earlier attestation is uncertain. The attempts to find one seem rather to be artificial projection of a late hapax to rare and obscure PT forms. Ch. Leitz (1996, 417–8) suggested for PT 426b mwj (written alphabetically) “(Wort im Zaubertext, anscheinend im Wortspiel mit mw ‘Wasser’)” (Wb II 53, 10, hapax) the sense “Same” in a very obscure *Schlangenzauber*: jbh mwj m mw “Der Same (= das Gift) vermische (jbh für 3bh??) sich im Wasser”, which was rendered by R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 86) quite differently (but equally speculatively): “(spit them out at once?) they (= the poison-sacs) being filled (?) with water” by adopting K. Sethe’s (ÜKAPT VI 92) artificial jbhmwj (sic) (m mw) “reich an Saft, überfüllt (mit Wasser)”.

NB3: R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 38, utt. 205, n. 4) read the divine name in PT 123a as mw.t “Mowet: Semen personified as goddess?”. R. Hannig, in turn, reconstructs mm.t “Memet, ‘Hervorquellendes Wasser’ (e. Personifikation)” (AWb I 1593).

- Origin uncertain due to the late attestation and because of -3-. At the moment, most hopeful seems a genetic relationship either with #1 or #2.
NB: LEg. mj can hardly be “a corruption of mw(t) semen” (as suggested e.g. in AL 79.1176 and PL 413). The orthography of Amarna m3j was clearly distinguished from that of mw “water”. The former was probably only later assimilated occasionally to that of mw “water” as a result of a possible contamination, which proves no etymological relationship between Eg. mw “water” and Amarna m3j “seminal fluid”.
- **1.** G. Takács (2004, 57, #345): ~ WCh.: Bks. màyòl (coll.) “Sperma” [Jng. 1970, 144] unless ma- is a prefix.
NB1: Of deverbal origin? Cp. CCh. *m-l “to sow” [GT]: Mada ámal “semer (arachides, coton, souchet)” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 184] | Vulum (Mulwi) míli “semer” [Trn. 1978, 304; 1978, 93].
 NB2: Cf. perhaps also LECu.: Som. mílil “Schlangengift, Gift vom Biß der Schlange” [Rn. 1902, 295–6] with a semantic shift just as seen in Eg. mt.wt “sperm” vs. “gift” (q.v.)? Cf. also Leitz 1996, 418.
- **2.** G. Takács (2004, 57, #345): or cf. perhaps AA *m-r (?) “seed, sprout” [GT]: LECu.: Afar mîrû ~ mîrô “Frucht” [Rn. 1886, 884] = mîro “Frucht, Same” [Rn. 1904] = miru ~ miriru “fruit, flower” [PH 1985, 169] | Som.-Jbr. mur “Frucht, Same” [Rn. 1904, 78] | HECu.: Sid. mur?- “germogliare, spuntare”, mur?-o “germoglio” [Mrn. 1940, 231] = mu?r- “to sprout”, mur-a “sprout” [Hds. 1989, 141, 387] ||| CCh.: perhaps Mofu-Gudur -mər'- “réensemencer” [Brt. 1988, 183].
NB: The etymology of the Sid. root is disputable. G. Hudson (l.c.) suggests mu?r- < *mut-i?r- ~ Orm. muṭṭ-ē & Kmb. mut-a “sprout”. But the latter root has a clear reflex in Sid. muḍ-ē.
- **3.** G. Takács (1997, 237, #37): a somewhat weaker possibility is represented by AA *m-l “pregnant” [GT]: LECu.: Rnd. mulúl “schwanger, während das vorangegangene Kind noch gestillt wird” [Schlee 1978, 141, #795] ||| CCh.: Musgu mulí “schwanger” [Müller 1886, 401; Lks. 1941, 69], Puss mǎliy “pregnancy, gravid” [Trn. 1991, 105], Musgu-Girvidik mùlí “schwanger” [MB 1972 MS, 8] || ECu.: Jegu mur “to become pregnant”, fem. mùrêl “pregnant” [Jng. 1961, 115].
NB: W. W. Müller (1975, 68, #62) identified CCh.: Musgu mulí with Sem. *ml? “to be full”. Cf. Takács 1997, 109, #195.
- **4.** GT: or to be combined with AA *m-l “to give birth” [GT]: WBrb.: Zng. o?-muṣṣi^h [-ṣṣ- < *-ll-] “enfanté, accoucher” [Ncl. 1957, 220] ||| LECu.: Som. ummul- & Baiso umul- “to give birth (of women)” [Hbr.-Lmb. 1988, 68] = Som. umul- vs. Baiso ummul- “to give birth”, umule “to beget” [Hyw. 1979, 74, 120] || SCu.: Ma’a mílɔ, pl. va-~ “child” [Tucker & Bryan 1974, 193] = wa-milɔ “Kinder” [Copland 1933–34, 244, fn. 5] ||| NOm.: NMao mimelti “partorire”

[Grt. 1940, 356], Sezo mímélú & Sezo málmálá “to bear a child” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 10, #113].

NB: Ch. Rabin (1982, 27, §22) erroneously affiliated Maa mílb with Ron *m-r “child” as well as Sem. *√bn ~ *√br.

- 5. GT: or cf. LECu.: Orm. mi[?]-ō “semen, sperm” [Btm. 2000, 196, not in Gragg 1982], which might be connected with NAgaw: Hamir mayuw-á “Kalb, junges Rind, das noch nicht eingejocht worden ist” [Rn. 1884, 397] || ECu.: Dirayta & Mossiya mē-ta “Kind” [Lmb.] | Dullay *mi[?]- “cild” [GT]: Harso & Dbs. mi[?]-é “Kind, Jungtier” [AMS], Glg. mi[?]-áye, pl. mi[?]-áḏḏe “Kind” [AMS], Gwd. me[?]-aye “Kind” [Lmb.] = mi[?]ay “baby, boy” [Black 1976, 228] (Dullay: AMS 1980, 175, 213; Lmb. 2005, 232, #22; ECu.: Lmb. 1993, 366) || WCh.: Pa’a mewá, pl. mewí “baby” [MSkn. 1979, 193] || CCh.: Ktk. màywè (pl.) “garçon (boy)” [Bouny 1978, 62; 1975, 23, #361] || ECh.: Kera may “girl” [Ebert 1976, 80] | Tumak màí “child” [JI 1994 II, 75; not in Cpr. 1975]. This etymology suggests that XIX.-GR mj displays the original root (Amarna m3j being GW?).

LIT.: the Ēg-Dly-ÉCh. etymology was first proposed by V. Ē. Orel & O. V. Stolbova: OS 1989, 132 (ECh.-Eg); HSED #1764 (Gwd.-Eg). Similarly, Ch. Ehret (1997, 216, #1841) combines Amarna m3j “foetus” & (?) LEg. mj “sperm” with PCu. *mi[?]- “child, young of animal”.

NB1: Ultimately related to AA *m-y “grain, particle” [GT] > HECu.: perhaps Burji máyy-i “bead” [Ss. 1982, 142; Hds. 1989, 24: isolated in HECu.] || perhaps SCu. *mē “granary” [Ehret 1987, #431] || NOm.: Kaffá mǎy-ō “Saat, Samen” [Rn. 1888, 321] || WCh.: Diri míyá “seed” [JI 1994 II 286] || CCh.: Bdm. miaw “corn” [Barth 1851, 214]? Note that Kaffá mǎy-ō “1. Korn, Getreide, 2. Nahrung, Speise” [Rn.] = mǎy-ō “cibo” [Crl. 1951, 476] is supposed to derive from √mā “to eat”.

NB2: M. Lambertü (1993, 366) explained the ECu. cognates from his OCu. *nagw- “saugen”, which he combined also with NOm. *na[?]- “child” [GT], Ari nāsi “älteres Kind” [Lmb.], LECu. *nāg- “child” [GT], which cannot be accepted.

- 6. L. Homburger (1929, 158) identified Eg. mj ~ mw with Ful (Peul) ɓi “fils, fruit” & Bantu (sic) mbeyo “semence”. Irreal.

*m3j (?) → Cpt.: (B) *MΟΥI (m) “Widder” (KHW 88) = “ram” (CD 161a).

NB: For the development of Cpt. MΟΥI (*mūy) < OEg. m3j, cf. e.g. Cpt.: (SABF) MΟΥI “lion” < OEg. m3j (q.v.).

- Existence of the word is highly doubtful. Probably just a ghost-word. NB: Occurs only in the (B) place-name ΘMΟΥI (Gk. Θμουις, Ar. Temāy el-ʿAmdīd), which W. Spiegelberg (KHW 299) erroneously derived from (t3)-hw.t-b3.(w). The existence of (B) *MΟΥI (m) “Widder” assumed by W. E. Crum (l.c., cf. Smith 1978, 362) was doubted by most of the authors, Thus, i.a., A. H. Gardiner (AEO II 151*), J. Yoyotte (GLECS 8, 1957–60, 100f; GLECS 9, 1960–63, 5–9), and A. Czapkiewicz (1971, 69), J. Osing (1978, 189; 1985, 60, n. 11; NBĀ 489, n. 159), W. Westendorf (KHW 481), and recently W. Schenkel (2002, 21) explained (B) ΘMΟΥI from a LEg. *t3-m3wt “die Insel”.

- GT: provided the hypothetical OEg. *m3j [< *mry?] “ram (?)” was not merely a ghost-word, it might be eventually derived from AA *mar- “sheep, ram” [Blz. 1992, 28, n. 25] = *maru “ram, goat, calf” [Blz. 1992, 157] = *(?i)-mar- “goat, ram” [Mlt. in SED II 9].

NB1: Attested in Sem. *ʔimmar- “lamb” [Mlt.]: Akk. immeru “Schaf, Widder” [AHW 378] = “sheep (and goats), ram” [CAD i 129] || Ug. imr “lamb” [DUL 72], Phn. ʔmr “lamb” [Tomback], Hbr. ʔimmēr (hapax) “lamb” [KB 67] | BA ʔimmēr “lamb” [KB 1816], JA ʔimmar (det. ʔimmərā) “lamb” [Jastrow 1950, 51] || Ar. ʔimmar- ~ ʔammar- “agneau” [BK I 54] = “young lamb, kid” [Lane 98] (Sem.: GB 895; WUS #287; DRS 24) || OCu. (Cu.-Om.) *mar- “kid, sheep” [LS] > LECu.: Saho & Afar mārū “Schafbock, Widder” [Rn. 1886, 883] = mārū “Schaf(bock), Widder, Ziegenbock” [Rn. 1890, 271], Afar maruw ~ maruy, pl. marwa “ram” [PH 1985, 164], Saho maruy “Schafbock” [Lmb.] = marū “ram” [Vergari 2003, 132] || NWomt.: Wlt. mara “offspring of sheep or goat” [LS], Male marei, pl. mar-ato “sheep” [Bnd. 1997, 4] = marai “sheep” [Bnd. 2003, 329], Basketo & Dokka (Doko) marzi “ram” [Blz.], Gamu mara “calf” [Sottile 1999, 431], Dawro mitsa-mara (prob. wrong transcr. for *mīza-mara) “calf (lit. offspring of cow)” [Borelli apud LS] | SEomt.: Koyra (Badditu) marrē “pecora” [Crl. 1929, 62] = marre “sheep” [Blz.] | Gongga (sic) mērā “moutone” [CR 1913, 407], Shinasha merērā “(allgemeiner Terminus für) Schaf”, mērū-ʔurrā “unkastrierter Widder”, mērō-gattāū “kastrierter Widder, Hammel” [Lmb.] = merēra “sheep” [LS] = mērā (sic) “ram” [Blz.] (Cu.-Om.: Lmb. 1993, 356; LS 1997, 465) || WCh.: Bokkos maray “ram” [Jng. 1970, 144], Fyer-Tambas ʔa-mará “Widder” [Jng. 1970, 389], Sha àmará “Widder” [Mlt., not in Jng. 1970] | Tangale mara “large castrated he-goat” [Jng. 1991, 119; cf. JI 1994 II, 168] = mara “he-goat” [Kidda 1985, 208, #271] | NBauchi: Diri mari “goat” [Blz.] | SBauchi *mār- “he-goat” [GT] = *mar “козел” [Stl.]: Jimi mǎalo [Csp.], Tala mǎar [Csp.], Geji mal [Gowers] = mǎal [Csp.], Buli maro [Gowers] = mar [Stl.] = maar [Csp.], Polchi mar [Stl.] = maar [Csp.] (SBauchi: Stl. 1987, 263; Cosp. 1994, 19; JI 1994 II, 166) || CCh.: Gidar mǎrgo “he-goat (Ziegenbock)” [Mch. in JI 1994 II, 169].

NB2: Any connection between Sem. *ʔimmar- and OEg. jm3.t [*ʔjmr-t] “1. Weibchen des Steinbocks, 2. Weibchen anderer Wildarten” (OK, Wb I 79, 1–2) = “1. female ibex, 2. hence female of any wild animal” (FD 19)? Eg. jm3.t can have nothing in common with Sem. *imm- ~ *umm- “mother” as suggested by A. B. Dolgopolsky (1988, 215, #11).

NB3: A. Ju. Militarev (SED l.c.) surmizes an eventual relationship of AA *(?i)-mar- “goat, ram” vs. AA *ma/ir- “bull” (for further details see the entry for Eg. mr).

AP: Cf. Sum. ^{GU}amar “young of animal, calf” [Labat 1976, 197: #437; Wagner 1958, 66]. Sum. borrowed from Akk. or *vice versa*? Cf. also PBaz *maR “calf” [HRV 1979, 86] ~ SNil. *mɔ:i “calf” [Ehret 1974, 93: < *mɔ:ri] (borrowed < ECu.?). R. Blench (1999, 64, table 10) examined the AA forms in the light of further Afr. parallels, all treated as derivatives of a common Afr. *m-r-k “castrated small ruminant”. H. G. Mukarovsky (1965, 71, #9.9) compared Mande: Bozo mɔrō “Haarschaf” & Songhay molgo “Haarschaf” with Basque marro “unkastriertes Schaf, Bock”, while J. D. Wölfel (1955, 56, #5) equated the Sem. word with Bsq. umerri “agneau”.

LIT.: Skn. 1984, 30 (Ma’a-WCh.); Mlt. 1985, 6, #22 (Sem.-WCh.); 1990, 38 (Sem.-LECu.-WCh.); 1995, 119, #8 (ECu.-NOM.); 2005, 91 & SED II 9, #5 (Sem.-WCh.-SA-NOM.); Blz. 1990, 207 (ECu.-NOM.-WCh.-PSem.); 1992, 28, fn. 25 (ECu.-NOM.-SBauchi); OS 1992, 168 (ECu.-PWCh.); HSED #1729 (Sem.-WCh.-LECu.); Blench 1999, 64, table 10 (NOM.-WCh.-Masa).

m3jn.w (PT) → m3n.w (NK) “Bezeichnung des Westgebirges” (BD, Wb II 12 & 29) = “the Western Mountain” (FD 103) = “le Couchant (en rapport avec le Soleil)” (AL 77.1615 with PT m3jn.w; El-Sayed 1987, 64) = “1. Westgebirge (wo die Sonne untergeht), 2. (lit.) Westen” (GHWb 320, cf. Zibelius 1978, 84–85). Further lit.: SAK 22, 1995, 298.

- G. Takács (1998–99, 105 f.) analyzed OEg. m3jn.w as a *nomen loci* (with m- prefix) of an unattested *3jn, which could be a regular OEg. reflex of AA *r-y-n, *l-y-n, *r-y-l etc. OEg. m3jn.w was the “place of *3jn”. Summing up my etymologies, I propose that the Western Mountain meant actually either the “place of overnighing” (*ma-līn.aw) or the “place of darkness and shadow” (*ma-rīn.aw or sim.).

Which of the two solutions is the correct one, remains open:

NB1: This is how F. Kammerzel’s (1994, 61, n. 37) bold and purely speculative statement made without any analysis (“...eine Derivation mit präfigiertem m-...für m3jnw > m3nw ‘Westgebirge’ ist...wohl ausgeschlossen”) breaks down.

- **1.** A possibility could be identifying OEg. *3jn = Sem. *lyn/*lwn “to overnight” [GT]: Ug. ln [*lyn] G “übernachten” [WUS #1470] = “dormir, pernoctar” [DLU I 246] = “to sleep, stay the night” [DUL 500], Phn. lyn [DNWSI 575], OHbr. & NHbr. lyn qal “übernachten, die Nacht zubringen” [GB 385]. Should we postulate OEg. m3jn.w = *m[a]-līn.aw (?) “place where (the sun) overnights”?

NB1: The attestation of Sem. *lyn ~*lwn is, however, rather limited. The GB knows of a Hbr. attestation only. Moreover, Gesenius’ Dictionary (followed by A. Zaborski l.c.; Gray 1934, 22) explains the Hbr. root lyn from OHbr. lāyil & lāylā “night” as a secondary denominative verb by an assimilation of l- to n-. Acc. to DLU, this root is attested also in Phoenician (ln). A. Zaborski (1991, 1686), in turn, gives also a certain Ar. lwn “to spend a night”.

- **2.** Eg. *3jn could be cognate with also Sem. *layl- “night”, although this possibility is semantically less suggestive (i.e., we should suppose OEg. m3jn.w to have meant something like *“(place of) night”), cf. Akk. līliātum, later līlātu (pl. tante) “evening” [AHW 552], Ug. ll “noche” [DLU I 245], Hbr. lāyil & lāylā “night” [GB] || Ar. layl- & layl-at- “nuit” [BK II 1050] || Geez lelit “night” [Lsl.] etc. (Sem.: GB 385; Djk. 1970, 463; Rabin 1975, 88, #61; Dlg. 1986, 81, #25; Lsl. 1987, 314). The AA etymologies offered for Sem. *layl- are uncertain.

NB1: The Sem. root has been equated by the “old school” of Egypto-Semitic comparison with LEg. nn “Finsternis, Nacht” (GR, absent in Dendera, Wb II 274, 5) = nn & nn.t “l’obscurité” (AL 78.2126 & 2127). For this Eg.-Sem. etymology see: Erman 1892, 113; Clc. 1936, #424 (as a late loan!); Vrg. 1945, 136, #9.b.15; Chn. 1947, 183, #440; Vel. 1958, 377; Hodge 1976, 13 (comparing Eg. nn.t “lower heaven”). On the other hand, it should be noted that V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1992, 200) risked a fragile comparison of LEg. nn with their WCh. *n’an- “darkness, shadow”.

Actually, this WCh. reconstruction is based only on Dera nóoni [Nwm. 1974, 130 & Schuh] = nòni [Kraft] and Ngizim nunuwò “shadow” [Kraft] = nónúwà “shade, -ow” [Schuh 1981, 120] (Dera-Ngizim: Mkr. 1987, 319), which represent possibly a dissimilation < Ch. *r-n “shadow” (discussed below) ≠ LEg. nn.

NB2: V. É. Orel (1995, 107, #102) combined Sem. *layl- with his hypothetical LECu. *lul- “to slumber (дремать)” (by the way, Orel uses the classificatory term “Galla-Somali”, which is a non-existing unity!). But this proto-form relies solely upon Somali ú-o (f) “Schläfrigkeit, Schlummer”, lúl- “schläfrig werden, nicken mit dem Kopf infolge Schläfrigkeit” [Rn. 1902, 277] = lúl-o (adj.) “drowsy” [Abr. 1964, 166]. Not too convinced, semantically too vague.

NB3: In another publication, V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1988, 77) identified Sem. *layl- falsely with WCh.: Zaar lii, liil “moon”. It cannot be accepted both for the evident semantical lapse and for the fact that this South Bauchi root has a fully different history, cf. AA *li^c- “moon” [GT] > OEg. j^oh [< *li^oh] “moon” (OK, Wb I 42, 8) ||| (?) SBrb. *ta-lli-t ~ *ta-illil-t “moon, month”: EWlm. ta-lli-t, Ayr te-lli-t, Ghat ta-illi-t, Ahaggar ta-illil-t, ta-llil-t, Azger (Adjer) ta-lli-t (SBrb.: Alj. 1980, 108; Bst. 1883, 325; 1887, 457) ||| ECu. *le^c- “moon” [Sasse 1979, 21] ||| WCh.: SBauchi *li ~ *liH “moon” [GT]: Tala lii, Sho (Ju) lii, Zangwal (Soor) lii, Boghom lio, var. lyo-ŋ, Dikshi & Bandas li-m (SBauchi: Smz. 1978, 27, #28; JI 1994 II, 238). For the Eg.-ECu.-WCh. etymology see Takács 1997, 253, #3.8.1.

NB4: The only (and so far unnoticed) Afro-Asiatic parallel of Sem. *layl- may be SCu.: Ma’a (Mbugu) -lašu [dissim. < *-lalu?] “evening” [Flm. 1969, 12, #28].

- **3.** The most likely solution for the etymology of OEg. m3jn.w is identifying PEg. *3jn with PCh. *r-n “shade” [Schuh 1982, 14] = probably *rin- “shadow” [GT], cp. WCh.: Gwandara áwriŋya “shade” [Mts. 1972, 21] | AS *rīn > *rēn (secondary var. *rigin in Gmy.?) “1. shadow, 2. spirit” [GT 2004, 310] = *rīn [Stl. 1977] = *r[ī]n “shadow” [Dlg.]: Angas rin “shade” [Ormsby 1914, 314] = riin “the shadow of inanimate objects”, ma-riin “the shadow of animate moving objects, supposed to be essential of life, if not the life itself” [Flk. 1915, 272, 243] = riin “Schatten (Sache)”, mà-riin “Schatten (Mensch und Sache)” [Jng. 1962 MS, 25, 35] = riin “shadow” [Hfm.] = rin “shade, shadow” [ALC 1978, 55] = rin “shadow” [Krf.], Sura riin “Geist, Dämon, Schatten” [Jng. 1963, 80] = riin “shadow” [Hfm.] = riyin “shadow” [Krf.], Mpn. riin “shadow, reflection, spirit”, mì-rīn “shadow, picture” [Frj. 1991, 12, 37], Kfy. riin “shadow” [Ntg. 1967, 34] = riin “shadow” [Hfm.], Msr. riin ~ rin “1. shade, shadow of person, 2. spirit”, rin sekep “shade of a tree” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 261, 271], Chip rin “shadow” [Krf.], Gmy. rùn [rūn < *rēn] “shade, shadow” [Srl. 1937, 192] = rūun [rūn] “shadow” [Hfm.] = rigin (so, -g-) “shadow” [Krf.] = rūun “shade” vs. rigin (so, -g-) “shadow” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 30] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 21, #122; Stl. 1972, 183; 1977, 157, #182; 1987, 236, #833) | BT *rūni “shade” [Schuh]: Tng. riwin ~ rigin [Jng. 1991, 137], Kirfi rùnni [Schuh], Glm. rúuná [Schuh], Krkr. rùni [Kraft] = rènni [Schuh], Bole rùuni [Schuh], Ngamo rùnni [Schuh], Gera rini [vowel harmony < *rūni] [Schuh] (BT: Schuh 1978, 153; 1984, 212) | NBch. *(^o)r-N “shadow,

shade” [Skn.] = *a-rena “shadow” [Stl.]: Warji arnái, Tsagu arné, Kariya arín, Mburku rëena, Jimbin aréná, Diri ma-rna, Pa’a árna (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 39) (WCh.: Kraft 1981, #261; Stl. 1987, 236–237, #833) || CCh.: Mbara rìgín “black” [TSL 1986, 276] || ECh.: Kera gèsáatárna [Stl.: *gèsáa-tó-rna] (adv. “im Schatten” [Ebert 1976, 50] | Tumak mù-róèñ “nuit” [Cpr. 1975, 85] | Mokilko dô-rnònò (adj.) “ombrageux, sombre, ténébreux”, cf. ráàñé “suie (dans les cases-cuisine), noir de fumée, moisissure” [Jng. 1990, 84, 165], Bidiya ’érenɛ “nuit” [AJ 1989, 74] (Ch.: Stl. 1996, 31–32).

nb1: Noteworthy are still WCh.: Hausa rínà “to dye (with indigo, with henna)”, rínè “to dye all of...” [Abr. 1962, 736–737] = rine “to become dark in colour” [Stl.] | Tangale riine “to dye” [Jng. 1991, 137], which, however, may represent an areal word. N. Skinner (1981, 192, #137) explained these with a query-mark ultimately from Ar. (?an)-nil-(u) “plante dont on tire l’indigo (indigifera tinctoria)” [BK II 1376].

nb2: Cf. also WCh.: Tng rim & Waja rim “darkness” (Kwh. 1990, 101) | NBch. *r-m-n “black” [Skn.] < *r-n-n (?) [GT]: Warji rən-na, Miya rimni, Kariya rimina (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 13).

nb3: Some of the Ch. forms (display an assim. *r-n → *n-n, cf. Dera nóóni [Nwm. 1974, 130 & Schuh] = nóni [Kraft] | Ngizim nunuwə “shadow” [Kraft] = nónúwá “shade, -ow” [Schuh 1981, 120] (Dera-Ngizim: Mkr. 1987, 319) || ECh.: Bdy. nynto (f) “ombre” [AJ 1989, 102].

nb4: The position of WCh.: Bade rórwan [Lks. 1968, 223] = rərwán “shadow” [Kraft] is dubious, since R. Lukas analyzed it as rərw-án, i.e. the was here supposedly *r-w-r, with suffix -an. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded at the present that Bade *r-w-r was an assimilation from *r-w-n, thus connected to Ch. *r-n, nevertheless (although its difference from the Ngizim form is strange).

nb5: O. V. Stolbova (1996, 31) explains ECh.: Kabalay tən, Lele tūnò, Gabri tūnò, Somray dun etc. “shadow” from *t-urn- by the “lenition” of the medial *-r-.

- 4. E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 172) combined the Eg toponym with Nubian (Kunuzi, Dongola) maīn “links”, which cannot be accepted for more reasons.

nb1: First of all, in accordance with the results of Afro-Asiatic comparative linguistics, we may safely claim that Egyptian and Nubian are not related genetically (despite A. Ju. Militarev’s 1984 efforts).

nb2: If, in turn, we suppose a borrowing, it is almost impossible to explain how and why the meanings shifted in case of a loanword, not to mention that in Egypt, the notion of “West” was associated not with the left, but with the right side.

- *m3^c (the object depicted by the hrgl. m3^c, Aa11) “pedestal (for Min, Ptah), an indication of the earth (in the oldest times)” (Kristensen 1926, 51) = “terrace with a step” (Boeser 1932, 45) = “base, socle, piédestal” (AL 77.1585, 79.1104) = “platform or pedestal” (Brovarski 1987, 28) = “Sockel (dem Zeichen ähnlich)” (GHWb 315).

nb: Gardiner (1927, 525, Aa11) still failed to define the hrgl. sign, but rightly abandoned the old identification with the flute (m3.t) suggested by Griffith (1898, 56) pace Maspero, Loret, and Erman. Rejecting most of the former proposals (e.g., 1. Champollion: “coudée égyptienne”; 2. listed by Brugsch among the musical instruments; 3. Loret followed by Müller 1894, 29, fn. 2 & Borchardt 1897, 104, Nr. 37: “wahrscheinlich eine Doppelflöte, später vielleicht eine einfache Flöte”; 4. Erman:

“ein Hausgerät”), Boeser (l.c.) relied with his definition of the hrgl. m3^o on a hymn (MK Cairo stela 20089): *šhm wj mnw r ḥtjw* “How mighty is Min on (his) terrace!”. Nevertheless, H. G. Fischer (1996, 229 & fn. 420–421) explained the hrgl. from a certain m3^o.t (sic) “baton, i.e., a short stick (with a variety of wedgelike form)”, and saw in it originally “sg. straight (a straight-edge or cubit-rod?)” (i.e., a derivative of Eg. m3^o “richtig”), whose tapered variants “*might be reproducing the beveled edge*” (NB: at least one species of cubit rod with a beveled edge survived).

- Perhaps related to Eg. m3^o “ein hölzerner Teil der Barke” (CT, Wb II 25, 14), and also “als Teil des Sonnenschiffes: ob Bord?” (XX., Wb II 25, 1) = “Bord (e. Schiffes)” (GHWb 318).
- To the best of my knowledge, it has not been much discussed in the etymological lit. so far. In the light of its false rendering “flute”, F. L. Griffith (1898, 56) affiliated it with Eg. m3.t “stick, cane” (above) and tried to explain both from Eg. m3^o “straight, just, true” (which he regarded “*an idea that may be connected either with the cubit rod or with the flute*”). I have two suggestions. The first solution seems more convincing than #2:
 - **1.** ES: Geez *mərā^o ~ mər^oā ~ mər^orā* “earthenware tripod on which the cooking pot rests above the fire” [Lsl. 1987, 356, 327] ||| HECu.: Burji *mero ~ mera* “pot-support (ring)” [Hds. 1989, 115, 212]. NB: Led by the wish to link the word to Geez *mar^oa* “to carry” (treated in the same lexical entry as Geez *mərā^o ~ mər^oā* “leather”!), W. Leslau (1987, 356) added to *mərā^o ~ mər^oā* quite suggestively: “that is, the tripod that supports the pot”.
 - **2.** With respect to the etymology of Eg. *psh* (suggested in EDE II q.v.), a derivation from a basic meaning “wide” might be also justified. Cp. Bed. *māra^o* [-^o < *-^o reg.] (intens.) “breit, weit, geräumig, entfernt sein” [Rn. 1895, 172] = *mir^o(a)* “to be wide”, *mar^oā* “wide, broad, ample, numerous” [Rpr. 1928, 218] = *marrai* “broad, spacious” [Hds. 1996, 94] ||| ECh.: Kbl. *mári* “weit”, Nnc. *márin* “weit” (ECh.: Lks. 1937, 90, 93). NB1: N. Skinner (1995, 29) combined the Bed. ex. with SBrb.: Tuareg (sic) *mar* (sic) “to be wide”. NB2: There are parallels for the supposed semantic shift, cf. e.g. IE **plāt-* “breit und flach” > i.a. OIndic *prthiví* “Erde” < “Erdoberfläche”, OSaxon *flet*, *fletti* “Fußboden im Haus”, OHGerm. *flazzi*, *flezzi* “geebneter Boden, Tenne, Hausflur” (IEW 833–4).

m3^o “richtig, wahr” (OK, Wb II 12–15).

- The quite diverse verbal meanings of Eg. m3^o (as classified in Wb II 22–23 & GHWb 317) can be summed up as follows (with additional references). From these, the original idea of Eg. m3^o seems to have been “to (be) direct(ed) in the right direction”:
 - (1) “1. eigentlich: richtig, in Ordnung sein” (Wb) = “in guter Richtung sein” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza IV 59f., 63) = “to set aright (light)” (DCT 155). Cf. Allen 1984, 557: PT m3^o adj. “in order, proper”.
 - (2) “2. mit Bezug auf Opfern: (MK-LP) dargebracht werden, (alt) etwas geben” (Wb)

(3) “3. mit Bezug auf gehen, leiten: (alt) einen Weg weisen (tr.)” (Wb) = m3^c “to set aright, direct” (PT, Allen 1984, 557) = “to lead, guide”, as a noun “leadership, guidance” (DCT 155).

(4) “4. (BD, GR) den Arm ausstrecken” (Wb) = “3. ausstrecken (Körperteil)” (GHWb) = “to direct (limbs, winds)” (DCT 155).

(5) “5. (old, GR) jmdn. führen, an einen Ort leiten, jemd. aussenden” (Wb) = “1. führen, leiten, weisen (Weg), 2. aussenden” (GHWb). The sense ‘schicken’ occurs already in Illahun (MK, Pap. Berlin 10016, rt. 2, Luft 2004 MS, 23). Zeidler (1999 II, 251, fn. 4): m3^c “zuführen” (Pfortenbuch, scene 55). Cf. also “5. hinauswerfen (Tau aus Land)” (GHWb) = “to throw out (a rope)” (DCT 155).

(6) “6. (since NK) richtig gehen: fahren, (herbei)kommen” (Wb) = “6. aufbrechen, sich auf den Weg machen, 7. fahren (e. Schiffes), usw.” (GHWb) = “to go straight, lead” (Edfu, PL 395).

(7) “7. das Ziehen des Schiffes” (CT, Wb II 23, 7) = “treideln, das Ziehen von Schiffen vom Ufer aus durch Menschen (oder durch Tiere?)” (Martin-Pardey in LÄ VI 755, n. 4) = “4. steuern (Schiff), paddeln” (GHWb) = “to navigate ariht” (DCT 155). For this verb cf. also SAK 13 (1986), 105, fn. 57; WD III 49. Hence: m3^c “Zugseil” (Amduat, Hornung 1963 II, 86, n. 303) = “guide-line” (AECT I 109–110, Spell 117, n. 6: CT II 13 & AECT II 39, spell 398, n. 52: CT V 147a, cf. also CT II 135d–e, 137c) = “cordeau” (AL 78.1610: CT II 134d & V 147a; also Barguet 1986, 354, spell 398 & Lacau in RT 30, 1908, 68, no. 43) = “cordage d’avant” (Barguet 1986, 84, spell 644) = “[prow?]-rope in boat” (Jones 1988, 167, #64: CT VI 264m, cf. AECT II 220, spell 644) = “Vordertau, Zugseil” (GHWb 318).

• Hence, i.a.:

(1) m3^c.t “das Rechte, Wahre, Wahrheit” (OK, Wb II 18–20) = “cosmic order” (Vergote 1971, 47) = “ordine, (propriamente) ciò che è diritto, ciò che mette (in) ordine” (Roccati 1998, 90). For a critical discussion of m3^c.t defined by J. Assmann (1990) see Quirke 1994. W. Vycichl (DELC 105) isolated the Cpt. reflexes in three groups: (OS) $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon$, (SM) $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon$, (BF) $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}$, (F) $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}$ vs. (SAL) $\text{M}\text{H}\epsilon$, (BF) MHI vs. (A) $(\Delta)\text{M}\text{I}\epsilon$, (AL) $\text{M}\text{I}\epsilon$ “Wahrheit, Gerechtigkeit” (KHW 86).

NB1: Cuneiform (14–13th cent. BC) -mu-a- (KMAV 50; Alb. 1946, 16, #29 & 17, #36 & 23, #65 & 23, #66; Edel 1954, 40; 1980, 17; NBÄ 149; Vcl. 1990, 193) ~ -mu- (Steindorff 1890, 334–7; Virolleaud 1945–48, 18). Unstressed m3^c.t in Gk. -μα-, cf. Οὐσιμαρής < wsr-m3^c.t-r^c and also Λαμαρής < nj-m3^c.t-r^c (KMAV 50; Steindorff 1890, 337, fn. †; Buchberger 1993, 621f.).

NB2: The vocalization of *mú3^c.at is generally accepted (Albright 1946, 17, #36; Lambdin 1958, 187, fn. 47; NBÄ 149; Edel 1980, 17; Vcl. 1990, 193; Buchberger 1993, 624) contra Sethe’s (1908, 38) *mē3^c.et, although Osing (NBÄ 149) projects an adj. OK *mē3^c “wahr” > (O) MH “wahr”. Zunke (1923/1997, 44, 46): (A) $\text{M}\text{I}\epsilon$, (oldS) $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon$ < *mī/ĕ3^c/(t) < *mō3^c.e(t) < *mō3^c.t < *mú3^c.t. Vergote (1971, 47; 1973 Ib, 42) set up two abstract fem. stems: *ma3ū^c.at via *am(3)ū^c.a > (SAL) $\text{M}\text{H}\epsilon$, (A) $(\Delta)\text{M}\text{I}\epsilon$ “truth” vs. *mú3^c.at (substantivized adj.) > (SO) $\text{M}\epsilon$. NBÄ 149: *mú3^c.t > *mū^c. > pre-Cpt. *mē^c. Loprieno (1995, 39): */muR^c.at/ > */mú^cʔa/. DELC 105: PEg. *mur^c.a.t. W. Vycichl (1936, 172): Cpt. of Pi-Solsel māi “Wahrheit” < *mō^c.a.

NB3: The interchangeability of Eg. mr (bull sign + phallus det.) “als Synonym für m3^c.t” (GR, Wb II 106, 10, cf. also Fairman in ASAE 43, 1943, 255f.) with m3^c.t has been explained by Fecht (1960, 9, §12) with the identical pronunciation of both m3^c.t and mr “bull” in the Ptol. era. Orel and Stolbova (1992, 201; HSED #1742), however, compared Eg. mr (q.v.) with CCh.: Zeghwana mara” adj. “right” [OS], which is probably baseless.

(2) m3^c.w “(richtiger) Wind (gern mit dem Zusatz nfr ‘günstiger Wind’)” (MK: Peasant B 1:55, Wb II 23) = “wahrer Wind” (Vogelsang) = “wind, breeze (with a nuance of good sailing wind, blowing upstream from the north, enough to fill the sails and propel a boat or ship, but not too fiercely)” (Edfu, PL 395) > denom. m3^c “segeln (mit Objekt des Schiffes oder Gewässers)” (late NK, GR, Wb II 24) = “to sail (with the implication that this is smooth, true sailing)” (Edfu, PL 395).

NB: The derivation of Dem. mj “wind, breath” (only in the myth of the sun-eye 3:30) from this root (Cenival 1987, 3–8; cf. Manning 1991, 156) is phonologically dubious.

- Etymology is disputable due to the various senses of OEg. m3^c. Another obstacle is the disputable origin of OEg. -3- (*-r-, *-l-, *-ʔ-?). NB: W. Vycichl (DELC 105) assumed the original *-r- > -3- to have been preserved by (B) ΣΗΑΡΦΟΥΤ†, qual. of ΣΗΟΥ “segnen” (KHW 185, 187) < sm3^c “beten zu einem Gott, ihn anrufen” (late NK, Wb IV 125, 17–18) = “to pray to god” (CED), but this is not evident. Although Černý declined the derivation by Brugsch from *ΣΗΑΥΡΦΟΥΤ, he (CED 152) preferred to analyze it as a secondary qual. from *ΣΗΑΡΟ < ΣΗΟΥ ΕΡΟ= (on the analogy of ΗΑΡΟ < ΗΑΥ ΕΡΟ=).
- **1.** At the present, perhaps the most tempting seems the etymology proposed by V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1742): CCh.: Zeghwana mařa “correct” [Kraft 1981, #287], for which cp. also ECh.: Smr. máruwè “directement” [Jng. 1978, 205]. There exist vars. with *-l- as well in NOM.: SEOmt. *mol-o “straight” [Bnd. 2003, 110, #94]: e.g. Zayse & Zrg. mol-o [Bnd. 2003, 336, #94] || CCh.: Hwona mīlmīl “correct” | Kilba mīl mīlú “correct” (CCh.: Kraft 1981, #287). The primary meaning of the underlying AA root *m-r-^c ~ *m-l-^c might have been “straight” [GT]. NB1: Erosion of final *-^c in Chadic. OEg. m3^c < *mr^c or *ml^c? NB2: For these CCh. data cp. also Eg. mr (below) and OS 1992, 201.
- **2.** G. Takács (2006, 107–8): or perhaps cf. Brb. *ǎ-mVl “se diriger vers” [Ksm.] > NBrb. *ǎ-məl “arriver à” [Ksm.]: Qbl. mel “arriver à, échoir” [Dlt. 1982, 495] = ǎ-məl “arriver à” [Ksm.] || WBrb.: Zng. e-mel (sic, -l) “hingehen, sich wohin wenden” [Zhl. 1942–3, 87, 104, #34] = a-məǰ [ǰ reg. < *l] “se diriger vers” [Ncl. 1953, 209] = a-miy “se diriger vers” [Ksm.] || SBrb. *ǎ-məl “être dans un lieu” [Ksm.] (Brb.: Ksm. 2001, 93–94, n. 7) < AA *m-l-^c (?) with a semantic dispersion seen e.g. with the reflexes of IE *reg- “gerade (richten), (st)recken” [IEW]? NB1: Cf. OIndic řjyati “streckt sich, eilt (Pferd)”, rajī- “sich aufrichtend, gerade”, Av. raz- “(gerade) richten, ordnen”, rašnu- “gerecht”, Lat. regō “gerade richten, lenken, herrschen” > dirigō etc. (IEW 854–7). NB2: As pointed out by M. Kossmann (2001, 93 & 94, n. 7), WBrb.: Zng. a-miy || NBrb.: Qbl. ǎ-məl may be etymologically related with Hgr. e-mel “être dans un lieu”, which have been compared (below) with LEG. m3^c “place”, which would imply an eventual connection of both Eg. m3^c roots.

- **3.** GT: with special regard to the semantic shift in CT m3^c “guide-line”, cf. ES: Geez marḥa & Tigre mārḥa “to guide” [Lsl. 1987, 83], which was borrowed into Cu., cf. Bed. melah [-l- < *-r- reg.] “(an)führen, den Weg zeigen” [Rn. 1895, 168] = milh “to guide, go before, precede, announce” [Rpr. 1928, 216] = melah “to lead the way” [Hds. 1996, 93] ||| NAgaw: Bilin marh “den Weg zeigen, (an)führen” [Rn. 1887, 274] || LECu.: SA marah (-h) “den Weg zeigen, führen wohin”, marāḥ (-h) “Führer, Wegweiser” [Rn. 1886, 884; 1890, 271] ||| NOm.: Yemsa marraʔe/o “to lead” [Wdk. 1990, 130] | Kafa mar “guidare” [Crl. 1951, 473]. AA root vars. *m-r-^c vs. *m-r-h “to direct” [GT]?

NB1: L. Reinisch (1886, 884; 1887, 274) falsely derived the Cu. forms from SA arāḥ “Pfad, Weg”. E. Cerulli (l.c.), in turn, erroneously explained the Kafa verb as a caus. counterpart to HECu. *mar- “andare” [GT], which, however, represents a fully distinct AA root (cf. Eg. mrr.t “street”, q.v.).

NB2: Strangely, W. Leslau (l.c.) considered the connection with Bed. melah “guide” (suggested already by M. Bittner in WZKM 23, 1909, 146) to be “doubtful”, although the shift of Bed. -l- vs. ECu. *-r- is attested.

- All other etymological suggestions ignore the basic sense of Eg. m3^c:
- **4.** GT: a semantically weaker solution would be the comparison with NOm.: Jnj. (Yemsa) māʔār “good” [Aklilu n.d.; Aklilu-Sbr. 1993, 21] (unless its root is *maʔ-) ||| WCh.: Hausa móórè “to feel enjoyment” [Abr. 1962, 678], which might be connected rather with OEg. m^cr (q.v.).

NB: Probably related (via infix -^c?) to the AA *m-r-(y/w) “good” [GT] attested in EBrb.: Augila (m) mrī, pl. mrīy-en, (f) mrīy-et, pl. mrīy-īt “bello” [Prd. 1960, 161] ||| WCh.: Tng. marmara “successful(ly) (of a spear thrust)” [Jng. 1991, 119] | Jimbin mur “good, beautiful” [Skn. 1977, 23] || CCh.: Chibak mār-ti “1. verbessern, 2. reinigen” [Hfm. 1955, 135] | Glavda mārāw(à) “good” [RB 1968] = marawà “good” [Kraft 1981, #293] | Puss mariya “mieux vaut..., plutôt” [Trn. 1991, 103] || ECh.: Kera marya (adv) “besser” [Ebert 1976, 80] | (?) Dng. mæeram “good, beautiful” [Skn. 1977, 23].

- **5.** The most widespread etymology is its equation with reflexes of AA *m-^c (or *m-ʔ-^c?) “1. good → 2. sweet” [GT], which is, however, semantically problematic, cp. ES: Grg. (< ECu.): End. muʔ, Enm. moʔ, Msq. m^wam^wä “good, well” (Grg.: Lsl. 1979 III, 386) ||| LECu. *ma₁^c- [Black] “1. good, 2. sweet” [GT]: Saho maʔ- “3. gutes erweisen, edel, gut sein”, ma^c-é “Güte, Edelsinn” [Rn. 1890, 254], Assaorta ma^c “esser buono, prosperare” [CR 1913, 69], Afar ma^c- “well, content”, ma^c-o “good” [Black] = em^ce “to become good”, me^ce “to be good, right”, me^ceh “all right, OK” [PH 1985, 96, 167] | Som. ma^c-i “Klarheit, Deutlichkeit, Annemlichkeit, Güte, Süßigkeit” [Rn. 1902, 281] = ma^c “esser buono, prosperare” [CR 1913, 69], PBoni *màʔàà “sweet” [Heine 1982, 131]: Boni maʔāʔ

“sweet” [Heine] = maʔá [Tosco 1996, 43] | “Macro-Orm.” *me^c- [Black]: Orm. miʔ-a- “to taste good” [Black], Konso & Gidole meʔ-āw- “to taste good” [Black] = Konso meʔ-awa “sweet” [Lmb.] | Dsn. (Galab) meʔ “sweet” [Black] | HECu.: Sdm. mâ(y)e (part.) “alright” [Gsp. 1983, 227] = maw-ō [< *maʔō] “good” (ECu.: Rn. 1886, 878; 1902, 281; Crl. 1938 II, 45; Chn. 1947, #81; Dlg. 1973, 179; Sasse 1973, 268, #3; Black 1974, 136; Hhn. 1975, 88; Heine 1977, 293; 1978, 69; Blz. 1991, 49) || SCu.: Alg maʔ-at- ~ maʔ-as- [irreg. < *ma^c-?] “to be savoury” [Ehret 1980, 323] ||| NOm.: Jnj. (Yamma) maʔā ~ maʔō “buono” [Crl. 1938 III, 79] = maʔá ~ maʔár “1. nett, 2. gut” [Lmb. 1993, 362–363] ||| WCh.: Fyer mó “Süße” [Jng. 1970, 88], cf. Bks. mimya “sweet” [Magwa etc. 1985, 10] | Kir mwà- “good” [Smz. 1978, 42, #91] || CCh.: Muskum míyáwá “bon, beau” [Trn. 1977, 18] || ECh.: Tobanga mōwāʔ “duceur sucrée” [Cpr. 1978, 146] | Sokoro maia “schön, gut” [Lks. 1937, 35].

LIT.: Rn. 1886, 878; 1890, 254; 1902, 281 (LECu.-Eg.); Hintze 1951, 84, #400 (ECu.-Eg.); Dlg. 1973, 179 (ECu.-Jnj.-Eg.); Ehret 1980, 323 (Alg.-ECu.); Mkr. 1987, 197 (Skr.-LECu.-Jnj.); OS 1992, 178 (PECu.-POm.-Eg.-PECh.); Takács 1999, 107, #35; 2004, 207, #945 (Eg.-Zayan-ECu.-NOm.-Sokoro).

NB1: L. Reinisch (1890, 254) sees the primary sense of the LECu. root in Saho ma^c- “1. spalten, zerteilen, 2. öffnen, 3. offen, ehrlich handeln gegen jmdn. etc.” compared with LEg. m3^c (knife det.), which is problematic. We are dealing here with m3^c (read only m^c?) “to slay” (Edfu III 4:2), the simplex of LEg. m^cm^c (q.v.), which is apparently a distinct root.

NB2: V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1992, 200; HSED #104) combined ECh.: Sokoro maia with Eg. jm3 “to be kind, pleasing etc.” (OK, FD 20), which is improbable (cf. of ECu. *^c).

NB3: The final -r in Janjero [Lmb.] is unexpected. Not recorded by E. Cerulli (1938 III, 79).

NB4: M. Lamberti (1993, 362–363; cf. also LS 1997, 450–451) derived Elm. mak-a “sweet” [Lmb.] = mákoʔ “süß” vs. māk “Honig” [Heine 1973, 280] from OCu. *me^c- “to be tasty” [Lmb.]. But I think Elm. mak- represents a distinct root, cf. AA *m-K or *m-Q “sweet” [GT]: NBrb.: Mzab a-məč [č reg. < *k] “bien, bon, mieux (un degré, non une qualité)” [Dlh. 1984, 115] ||| LECu.: (?) Som.-Jabarti múki, pl. múkyo “fig” [Rn. 1904, 78] ||| WCh.: Angas myäk “tasty, sweet, well flavoured” [Flk. 1915] = myék [sic with -k] “tasty” [Jng. 1962 MS] || CCh.: Bura mimehyu [h < *h] “sweet and delicious” [BED 1953, 138] | Lamang mək “honey” [JI 1994 II 191].

NB5: M. Lamberti & R. Sottile (1997, 450–451) connect the LECu. data to NOm.: POmt. *malʔ-/*maʔl- “to taste well” (but they yield no explanation to its alleged “suffix” *-l-). See Eg. mnḥ.

NB6: E. Cerulli (1938 III, 79), in turn, connected Jnj. (Yamma) maʔā ~ maʔō “buono” to Bdt. moḏ-ē and Orm. miḏag (sic). Probably mistaken, although Jnj. -ʔ- < *-ḏ- seems in principle possible. See Eg. mtj.

- 6. F. Hommel (1899, 347) affiliated Eg. m3^c with Akk. miḥru ~ meḥru “Entsprechung”, miḥurtu “Zusammentreffen, Harmonie”.

NB: Wrong both phonologically (Eg. ^c ≠ Sem. *ḥ) and semantically, the Akk. root being mḥr “empfangen, gegenübertreten” [AHW 640, 662, 577].

- **7.** A. Ember (1917, 86, #118; 1926, 303, #9, 311, #4) and M. Cohen (1947, #400): Eg. m3^c ~ Ar. bariʔa “to be free from guilt”, bariʔ- “acquitted, innocent, free”.
 NB: Phonologically untenable: there is but one regular correspondence (Eg. -3- = Ar. -r-). This etymology was rightly rejected already by F. Calice (1936, #617).
- **8.** W. F. Albright (1923, 68) sought the cognate of Eg. m3^c in Ar. bara^c-at- “excellence, merit, perfection”.
 NB1: Phonologically improbable: Eg. m- vs. Ar. b- are irregular. I see in this case no motivation for an eventual change of PEg. *b- → OEg. m-.
 NB2: D. Cohen (DRS 85) gives no sure Sem. etymology for Ar. bariʔa “to excel, be superior”.
- **9.** L. Homburger’s (1930, 284) idea on Eg. m3^c = (>) Peul mody- “vrai, bien” is perfectly wrong.
 NB: By the way, this word could be an AP for Eg. mtj (q.v.).
- **10.** E. Zyhlarz (1932–1933, 93; cf. also KHW 86) identified the Eg. root with NBrb.: Zayan i-ma “es ist wahr” (which was originally a verbal form), now an adv. “wahrlich, wahrhaftig” [Zhl.] = i-ma c’est exact” [Lbg. 1924, 564]. See also Takács 1999, 107, #35.
- **11.** C. T. Hodge (1966, 45, #31) derived Eg. m3^c = *mr^c from a supposed *3^c = *r^c (via prefix m-) which he identified with WCh.: Hausa ɓàì “life”, ɓáyá ~ ɓááyà “to give live to” → márááyáá “place of safety or well being” [Abr. 1962, 716, 729, 657]. Semantically very weak. In the same article, Hodge (1966, 50–51, #31) extended the Eg.-Hausa etymology to Hbr. r^cy “to pasture, tend, govern, rule”, Aram. rəʕā “to pasture, take pleasure in”, Ar. r^cy “to pasture, rule”, Geez réʕya “to pasture, lead to” arguing that “*the pastoral background of ancient Egyptian culture also supports the hypothesis that the order of the universe is that imposed by the divine cattle tender*”.
 NB1: Hodge supposed to have found the cognate of Sem. *r^cy without a prefix m- in OEg. j3^c (word used in connection with the handling of calves).
 NB2: For Sem. *r^cy cf. rather PBoni *rā^c- < PSam *rā^c- “to follow” [Heine 1982, 107].
 NB3: Later, Hodge (1992, 212) derived Eg. m3^c “to offer” and m3^c “to lead, guide” erroneously from Lislakh (AA-IE) **b-l “to carry”!
- **12.** O. Rössler (1971, 286): Eg. m3^c < *mrd ~ Sem. *mrd: Syr. mərīd “munitus, tutus” [Brk.] | Ar. mrd “7. être audacieux, hardi” [BK II 1088] = “beständig sein” [Rsl.].
 NB: Declined already by G. Conti (1976, 52, fn. 80), J. Osing (1997, 226), and G. Takács (2006, 107–8). The latter pointed out that the basic sense of Sem. *mrd was rather different: “widerspenstig, trotzig, unbeugsam sein, sich auflehnen, empören”, which has hardly anything in common with that of Eg. m3^c. O. Rössler’s examples for the *Lautensprechung* of Eg. ʕ = Sem. *d are disprovable (cf. EDE I 346–352). Cf. also Eg. m^cr (q.v.).
- **13.** Treating the very rare NK m3^c “to come” (Wb II 23, 6: act. “von herbeigebrachten Dingen, die zu jem. »kommen« u.ä.”!) as a

distinct root, C. T. Hodge (1990, 172) gives the following cognates: Lislakh ****b-l** *Urwurzel* → LL ****Nb-l**: Eg. m3^o – LL ****b-lH**: WCh. ***Hbr** “to enter” [Stl. 1987, 55] – LL ****Nb-Nl**: Ch. ***m-n** “to come” [JS 1981, 74]. No comment.

- **14.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 314, #605): Eg. m3^o “to lead, guide, direct, etc.” ~ PCu. ***-mg-** “to start toward” < AA ***-m-ʔ-** “to go toward” (sic).

m3^o “1. dargebracht werden, geopfert werden, 1. etwas geben, schenken” (MK, Wb II 22, 5–9) = “1. to present, offer, make a presentation to, 2. fit to be offered” (FD 102) = “to (make) offer(ings), present, sacrifice, slaughter” (DLE I 204) = “opfern (Nebensinn: auf rechte Art und Weise), präsentieren (Opfer, Geschenke)” (GHWb 317; ÄWb I 503: in PT 1556a) = “1. to offer, sacrifice, 2. slaughter” (PL 396) = “to present, offer, make presentation, fit to be sacrificed” (DCT 155).

- Evidently, we are dealing with an inner Eg. innovation from the root m3^o “regō” (above), *not* a separate root with an original meaning ***“to offer, give”** (or sim.) as often erroneously suggested in the etymological literature.

- **1.** In Egyptian philology, explained from the verbal sense of OEg. m3^o “richtig; richten” (above). P. Wilson (PL 396): a variation of m3^o “to lead” (i.e., to their recipient). F. von Calice (1936, #618): m3^o (which he mistakenly attributed solely to the GR) from sm3^o “richtig machen”. GT: perhaps in fact ***“reach sg. to s’one (darreichen)”** with a semantic shift known from the reflexes of IE ***reǵ-** “gerade (richten), (st)recken”?

NB1: Cf. Gk. ὄρεγμα “das Recken der Hände, Darreichen”, Gothic rahtōn “darreichen” vs. OIndic ṛjyati “streckt sich, eilt (Pferd)”, rajī- “sich aufrichtig, gerade”, Av. raz- “(gerade) richten, ordnen”, rašnu- “gerecht”, Lat. regō “gerade richten, lenken, herrschen” > dirigō etc. (IEW 854–7).

- All other etymologies are unacceptable:
- **2.** GT: a connection with AA ***m-()r** [GT] > LECu.: Arb. mār-ó “presents given to a bride’s family” [Hyw. 1984, 383] ||| ECh.: EDng. mírì “impôt” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 206] seems tempting, since Arb. -Ø- < ***-o-** is reg. (Sasse 1979, 36), but, for the reasons outlined above, it is here fully improbable.

NB: V. È. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1992, 194) equated Eg. m3^o with CCh. ***mar-** “to give” (sic). But the only accessible reflex is Chibak mari “to give” [IL in JI 1994 II, 188]. False, should be rejected. PBura-Margi ***-r-** is regular < PCh. ***-n-** (NM 1966, 227; Nwm. 1977, 17, #3.14; JI 1994 I, XXII). NB: Or cf. WCh.: Bks. mál “Geschenk” [Jng. 1970, 144]?

- **3.** L. Reinisch (1873, 274, fn. 1) gives the following Afr. parallels for Eg. m3^o: Hausa & Lgn. bā, Teda ti, tin, Asanti be, Fanti ma “geben”, etc. Pure fancy.

- **4.** F. Hommel (1899, 347; 1904, 110, fn. 1): Eg. m3^c ~ Akk. mḥr “Opfer darbringen” (sic), whose basic meaning is, however, “gegenübertreten, angehen, empfangen” (AHW 577).
NB: Evidently untenable both semantically and phonologically (only Eg. m- = Akk. m- correspond regularly).
- **5.** A. Ember (1926, 310, #2) suggested a development Eg. m3^c < *ml^c < *bl^c ~ Ar. balāya “to reach”. Unconvincing. Rejected already by F. Calice (1936, #618).
- **6.** C. T. Hodge (1990, 173) presented the following Lislakh etymology: LL **Nb-l: Eg. j3m [met.?] “to offer” & m3^c “to present” ||| Ar. ḥamala “to carry” – LL **Nb-lH: Eg. mrj “sounding-pole” (q.v.) ||| Ch. *mari “to give” (sic, cf. JS 1981, 116) etc. Further details see apud Eg. m “nimm!”.
NB: In his paper, Hodge derived the following Eg. words from an ultimate LL proto-root **b-l: Eg. jm “give, take!”, mn “take!” (sic), mrj “sounding-pole”, j3m “to offer”, m3^c “to present”, fnfn.w “recompense (?)”, f3j “to lift, present”, tbj “to pay” (sic), nb3 “carrying-pole”.

m3^c “Art Ente” (OK, Wb II 24, 8) = “a duck” (EG 1927, 464, H2) = “sp. de la famille des ardéides” (Godron apud Vycichl).

NB: Hapax. Depicted in a mastaba (Dyn. V or VI) in the company of two other duck species (ḥp and z.t), cf. Godron (1957, 20).

- Reading and existence of the word is doubtful. Seems to be a ghost-word.

NB1: G. Godron (1957, 20), followed by R. Hannig (cf. GHWb 321), suggested to read OK m3š (q.v.), which seems more convincing than m3š, since (1) Eg. m3š has a further OK (V./VI.) ex. (ÄWb I 505), and (2) Eg. m3š [< *mrš] “duck” can be convincingly identified from an etymological standpoint, which would also justify the existence of m3š.

NB2: The possibility (pondered in Wb l.c.; EG l.c.) of OK m3^c being related to the det. depicting the “head of a crested bird: heron (?)” (EG l.c.) in m3^c “Schläfe” (MK, Wb II 24) seems weak, since we are probably dealing with two clearly distinct species (duck vs. heron).

NB3: W. Vycichl (1983, 106) pondered whether Cpt.: (S) mε (f) “name of a bird” (hapax, CD 157a) represents its trace or that of a different Eg. etymon: CT m3^c “le héron cendré” (below). Finally, however, Vycichl, followed by D. Meeks (1994, 204–5, #8) proposed rather the second solution.

NB4: J. Osing (1998, 258) assumes a very late (2nd cent. AD) ex. of Eg. m3^c (?) “Ente (?)” in a papyrus from Tebtunis. The context (preceded by bn “Reiher”, rd “Art Reiher” . . ., followed by qb < *gb “Art Gans (?)”, smn “Nilgans”), however, does not exclude that the bird in question was identical rather with m3^c “egret”.

- No suggestive etymologies proposed. G. Godron (1957, 19–20) and W. Vycichl (1983, 106) rightly separated it from the supposed Eg. *m3^c.t “héron”. Vycichl suggested a connection to Ar. mur^c-at- “appartenant à la famille des gallinacés” [Vcl.] = mur(a)^c-at- “sorte d’oiseau de la famille des gallinacés” [BK II 1093] = mura^c- “the bird so called” [Lane 3019] and eventually with Ar. mur^c-at- “graisse” [BK l.c.].

(*)**m3^c**, hrgl. depicting the “head of a crested bird: heron (?)” (EG 1927, 464, H2 & n. 1) = “la tête d’un oiseau de la famille des ardéidés, appelé *m3^c.t: l’aigrette” (Godron 1957, 19–20) = “un oiseau qui porte deux plumes sur la tête, vraisemblablement une sur chaque côté” (Lacau 1970, 53) = “héron” (Vcl. in DELC 106) = “l’ardéidé, le héron cendré, image du phénix égyptien (bénou)” (Meeks 1994, 205, cf. also Houlihan 1986, 15–16).

NB: The sign is usually a (phonetic) det. (beginning from MK) in m3^c “forehead” (q.v.). This sign appears already in the OK ex. of m3^c “Ufer” (from Dyn. VI, AWb I 503).

- The same word may occur also in CT VI 285c as m3^c (!) “heron” (Faulkner, AECT II 231) = “heron (?)” (DCT 156 following EG l.c.). NB1: The reading of the CT hapax has been disputed. Meeks (1994, 204): m3^c.wj.f(j), which would literally mean “celui aux deux aigrettes”. R. van der Molen (DCT l.c.): m3^c.wj. Faulkner (AECT II 233, n. 34), in turn, probably correctly rejects the reading m3^c.wj=f(j) considering (1) the dual strokes after the word as being due to confusion with the two truth-goddesses (cf. CT VI 282ef), and (2) the suffix after m3^c as an error. NB2: Osing (1998, 258) assumes a very late (2nd cent. AD) Eg. m3^c (?) “Ente (?)” in a papyrus from Tebtunis. Its context (preceded by bn “Reiher”, rd “Art Reiher”, followed by qb < *gb “Art Gans (?)”, smn “Nilgans”), however, does not exclude that the bird in question was identical rather with m3^c “egret” or “heron”.
- Hence: D. Meeks (1994, 204) supposes a Cpt. attestation of the word: (S) MЄ (f) “un oiseau” (CD 157a) = “a bird named MЄ” (Godron). NB: This is a hapax occurring in a pun with (S) MЄ “justice”, cf. ΔΡΗΛΥ ΕΥΔΑΛΗΤ ΕΨΑΛΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΙ ΧΕ ΤΗΕ...ΠΕΧΑΔ ΗΑΔ ΗΒΙ ΑΝΔΡΕΑΔ ΧΕ ΕΙΧΕΡΟΚ ΗΤΟΚ ΠΡΑΛΗΤ ΠΛΙΚΑΙΟΔ “He saw a bird, which is called ‘MЄ’,... Andrew told her: it is to you that I am speaking, (o) truthful bird’.” (the latter phrase was rendered by Godron l.c. as “oiseau juste”, while by Meeks l.c. as “l’oiseau de la justice”).
- Etymology highly debated. Cannot be decided with certainty whether the bird’s name was an inner Eg. derivation or an inherited AA term. In any case, probably unrelated to OK m3^c “Art Ente” (above) as rightly noted by G. Godron (1957, 19–20) and W. Vycichl (1983, 106).
- 1. P. Lacau (1970, 53, §125) explained the name of the bird (lit. “celui qui a deux plumes aux tempes”) via *m3^c “une plume placée sur la tempe” (cf. the feather hrgl. with the phon. value m3^c, orig. “celle de la tempe”) ultimately from Eg. m3^c “Schläfe” (MK, Wb, below). The same idea was expressed by Meeks’ (1994, 204) rendering of the exceptional instance of our word in CT VI 285c as m3^c.wj.fj “celui aux deux aigrettes”.
- 2. W. Vycichl (DELC 106) identified the etymon of the (S) MЄ-bird arguing that “il est plus probable que ce soit le héron, en raison de ses aigrettes «droites» (m3^c)...”. Note that Crum (l.c.) listed Cpt. (S) MЄ-bird simply under the entry for (SO) MЄ “justice”. Similarly, D. Meeks (1994,

204–5, §8) postulates the bird's name to be connected with m3^c “right”, but another way: the phoenix, the “*symbole de la renaissance, devient à l'époque chrétienne une image du juste*”, although it is anachronistic to project this conception to the CT or the age when the script was developed. But already G. Godron (1957), without knowing the CT VI 285c ex., correctly separated the intuitively supposed etymon *m3^c.t > (S) ME-bird from m3^c.t “truth” as terms that are purely homonymous, but etymologically unrelated.

- **3.** GT: there is only one striking AA etymology to Eg. m3^c [< *mr^c] “l'aigrette” (Godron), cp. CCh.: Kotoko māràʔù “cattle egret, garde-boeuf” (≈ Hs. bālbéélà “the buff-backed heron or cattle egret, Bubulcus ibis”, Brg. 1934, 69; Abr. 1962, 68) [Bouny 1975, 22, §341.a], which represents a perfect match both semantically and phonologically.

m3^c “ein Gewässer am Himmel” (PT 1084b, Wb II 25, 5) = “lac” (AL 78.1614) = “Mao-Kanal (mythologisch)” (ÄWb I 503) = (?) “waters (?)” (CT IV 219d, DCT 156 referring to Wb II 25, 5 & 7).

- Perhaps from the same root (?): **(1)** m3^c.tj “ein Gewässer” (MK, BD, GR, Wb II 25, 8, already in Heqanakhte I vs. 10, cf. Goedicke in JEA 43, 1957, 82f.; Kaplony 1969, 31) = “un canal” (AL 78.1615) = “canal, stretch of water, used as a var. term for the flood of the Nile” (PL 399) & **(2)** m3^c “Gewässer (?)” (NE, Wb II 25, 6) & **(3)** m3^c “Name des pww-Gewässers im Gau von Sebennytos” (GR, Wb II 25, 7) = “canal (in the 12th Lower Eg. and the Theban nomes)” (PL 399), cf. m3^c (spitting mouth det.) “name of the mr (canal?) of the Theban nome” (Edfu IV 175:6–7, de Wit 1956, 113–114) = “Kanal im thebanischen Gau” (Kaplony 1969, 31).

- Etymology debated:

- **1.** In Egyptian philology, several possible inner Eg. etymologies have been surmised for the diverse canal names m3^c. Thus, P. Kaplony (1969, 31, fn. 2) suggests that the supposed etymon m3^c “Kanal am Uferdamm” was a derivation from m3^c “das Ufer des Flußes” (MK, Wb, below), while m3^c.tj act. “ein Fahrwasser für die m3^c.tj-Barken” (?) < m3^c.tj “Barke der Sonne” (OK, Wb II 25, 11–12). P. Wilson (PL 399), in turn, assumed a connection either with m3^c “right” or m3^c “to offer” (because the canal ran “straight” or because it “brought” water). Neither of these solutions is too suggestive.

- **2.** GT: < unattested *m3^o = Sem.: Ar. maraʿa “couler (manar por algo, por diversas cosas), maraʿ-at- “fontaine, source, endroit où il y en a” [Dozy II 583]?
NB: Any connection with SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ta-māyor-t, pl. ši-, ti-māyor-en [m-y-r < *m-ʿ-r reg.] “1. gros nuage pluvieux, 2. (Ayr) aussi petits nuages très bas (qui apparaissent au milieu de l’hivernage), 3. (EWlm.-Ayr) p.ext. déluge” [PAM 1998, 230]?
- **3.** GT: or, provided m3^o < *ml^o, cp. perhaps ECh.: Lele mùlàlī “nuage” [WP 1982, 65] | Migama mìlà (f) “fine pluie qui dure longtemps” [JA 1992, 107]?

m3^o “das Ufer des Flußes oder eines Sees” (MK, Wb II 25, 2–3) = “bank of river or lake” (FD 102) = “water’s edge, river bank, shore” (DLE I 205) = “bank of river, etc.” (CT VI 248h, VI 285c: DCT 156) = “Ufer (Fluss, See), Wasserrand, Gestade” (1x VI., ÄWb I 503, cf. ASAE 36, 33f.).

NB: Muchiki (1999, 161) explains Aram. my^o from Eg. m3^o “river bank”.

- Origin disputable. At the moment, most tempting seems #3.
- **1.** Brinks and Westendorf (1977, 26) treated Eg. m3^o “Seite, Rand, Ufer” as a general figurative (“übertragene”) sense of Eg. m3^o “Schläfe”.
- **2.** The rendering of Eg. m3^o “treideln, das Ziehen von Schiffen vom Ufer aus durch Menschen (oder durch Tiere?)” by E. Martin-Pardey (LÄ VI 755, n. 4) suggests a relationship with the Eg. root m3^o (basic sense “to direct”? above).
- **3.** GT: NBrb.: Qbl. a-mur “part, portion” [Dlt. 1982, 513] ||| Bed. mar “Seite” [Rn. 1895, 171] = mari “direction, side” [Rpr. 1928, 218].
NB: L. Reinisch (l.c.) quotes further phonologically unconvincing Cu. parallels: LECu.: Som. bārbar “Seite” | Orm. bíra “Seite” & “bei, neben”.
- **4.** GT: or any connection to MSA *mr̥y: Hrs. meryét “dust”, Jbl. míráyət “dust”, EJbl. mэрáyт “dust”, Mhr. mэрyāt “dust, place where the soil is rough or roughened so that camels can scratch themselves” (MSA: Jns. 1977, 89; 1981, 173; 1987, 269) ||| NBrb.: Qbl. mṛīre^o “se rouler dans la poussière, se coucher à même le sol” [Dlt. 1982, 519]?
- **5.** GT: did MEg. m3^o orig. signify the fertile part of land alongside the bank of Nile? Cf. Ar. maraʿa I & IV “abonder en pâturages, en produits de terre (se dit d’une vallée)”, marʿ- “abondance de pâturages” [BK II 1093] = mr^o I “essere fertile (in pascoli)” [Moscati] = marʿ- “grazing-area”, mr IV ʿamraʿa “to intensively covered with grass” [Zbr].
NB: S. Moscati (1947, 127) and A. Zaborski (1971, 85, #213) derive the Ar. root from Sem. *rʿy “to tend a flock, herd”.

- **6.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 313, #604) erroneously split Eg. m3^c “bank” into a root *m3 & partitive suffix *-^c (sic) (Ehret: “i.e. bank is off to the side of the water”) which he falsely equated with Sem. *m? “to be wet” ||| PCu. *ma/i?- “to be wet” ||| NOm.: Jnj. (Yemsa) mē?- “to wash” ||| WCh.: Ngz. màrà “coldness” < AA *-mā/i?- “to be wet”. No comment.

m3^c “die Schläfe” (MK, Wb II 24; Grapow 1954, 29) = “certaine partie du corps humain, semblable des deux côtés, peut-être l’épaule, mais plutôt la joue” (Jéquier 1911, 64–65, §23) = “la tempe” (Lefèbvre 1952, 14, §13; Massart 1959, 233, §28) = temple of head” (FD 102; DCT 156: already in CT VII 184g, IV 58g) = “1. la tempe, 2. les boucles de cheveux de la tempe” (AL 79.1115) = “1. Schläfe (Mensch, Tier, Ort wo der Zopf sitzt), 2. (fig.) Auferksamkeit” (GHWb 318) = “side of the head, temple” (Walker 1996, 269) = “1. Schläfe (cf. SAK 27, 1999, 74), 2. Zopf (cf. Graefe in SAK 7, 1979, 58, n. a)” (WD III 49).

NB1: P. Lacau (1970, 53, #125) explained also the phon. value m3^c of the feather hrgl. (orig. “la plume de la tempe”) from m3^c “temple” as related to m3^c “côté, bord” (q.v.).

NB2: K. Piehl (1898, 322) combined it with Brugsch’s (Wb VI 637) m3^c.t (horn & flesh det.) “Wange, Backe”, but this sense has not been confirmed. Cf., however, m3^c.t (flesh det.) “Schläfe” (Mag. Pap. Vatican 36: Erman 1893, 123, §6).

- Origin debated:

- **1.** H. Grapow (1954, 29): lit. “die Seite des Kopfes”, etymologically related to Eg. m3^c “Ufer des Flußes” (MK, Wb, above). Following Jéquier (1911, 64–65, §23), P. Lacau (1970, 53–54, §125) also proposed a derivation from Eg. m3^c “côté, bord”. Similarly suggestive is Walker’s (l.c.) rendering “side of the head”. Not excluded.
- **2.** G. Takács (2004, 57, #346): Eg. m3^c < *ml^c (suffix *-^c of anatomical terms attested in ECu.?) which represents a perfect match of AA *m-l “temple (of head)” [GT]: SAgaw: Awngi ηari [η- < *m- reg.] “temple of head” [Lmb.] || LECu.: Orm. mall-a “guancia, gota” [da Thiene 1939, 234 apud Lmb.] ||| NOm.: Kaffa mallall-o/ō “tempie, osso temporale” [Crl. 1951, 471] = “Schläfe(nknochen)” [Lmb.], Sns. (Bworo) mālal-á “temple of head” [Lmb.], Mocha māll-o “temple of head” [Lsl.], cf. also Kaffa male-to “faccia” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 318] | Sheko māll-o “temple of head (Schläfe)” [Lmb.] (NOM.-Cu.: Lmb. 1987, 533, #6.b; 1993, 105; 1993, 353) ||| CCh.: Mada mlom “tempe” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 185]. Cf. perhaps also CCh.: Glavda úúməla “cheek” [RB 1968, 96] | Hurzo múlà “cheeks” [Rsg. 1978,

223, #124: isolated in Mafa-Mada] | Lame mbə̀làn [mb- < *m- reg.] “côté, profil” [Scn. 1982, 314].

NB1: M. Lambert (1987, 533; 1993, 105) identifies the Cu.-NOm. forms with ECu. *mīn- “forehead, eyebrow”: i.a. Konso-Dullay *mīn-tV “forehead”, all derived from an OCu. *mīn- “a certain part of the face around the forehead”. For me unacceptable both semantically (“forehead” ≠ “temple”) and phonologically (strong -n- ≠ -l- opposition in Cu.-Om., even if there are well known exceptions, cf. *lam?- “2”). Moreover, most recently V. Blažek (2000, 182–183, #7) has suggested a convincing AA etymology for ECu. *mīn- in CCh.: Hina maněno “Stirn” [Str. 1922-1923, 113]. He proposed also some extra-AA parallels: Drv. *mūn- “front” [DED 5020a] ~ IE *mein- “face” [Jucquois, Orbis 16, 1967, 177–179].

NB2: The position of ECh.: Bdy. mumūr “milieu de la tête” [AJ 1989, 101] is obscure.

- **3.** F. Hommel (1899, 347–348) identified Eg. m³° with Akk. maḥru “Stirn” (sic). Untenable both semantically and phonologically.

NB4: The Akk. noun correctly means “Vorderseite” [AHW 585] = “past, bygone time” [CAD m 105], and the underlying Akk. root was mḥr “empfangen, gegenüber-treten” [AHW 577]. Moreover, only Eg. m- = Akk. m- correspond.

m³°w “ein hölzerner Teil der Barke” (CT, Wb II 25, 14) = “les parois extérieures, les deux côtés du bordage, la bordage, fait de pièces de bois assemblées” (Jéquier 1911, 64–65, §23) = “a term for a kind of wood” (AECT II 38, spell 398, n. 33, cf. AECT III 203, index: mng. in CT V 136a–b unknown!) = “partie du navire” (AL 78.1616) = “boat’s temple or prow” (Perry quoted by Düring l.c.) = “Bord (eines Schiffes)” (GHWb 318) = “die Bordränder, oberer Abschluß der Bordwand (bilden in der Aufsicht eines Schiffskörpers die Form eines Mundes, ein Lippenpaar): als Schiffsteil (CT V 136a) nicht zu identifizieren” (Düring 1995, 54, 62, 88: since end of OK) = “kind of wood” (DCT 156: CT V 136a–b) = “ein hölzerner Teil der Barke” (WD II 58: cf. RdE 29, 1977, 180, n. 7).

- From the same root: **(1)** m³°w “Art Holz” (Lit. MK: Adm. 3:11, Wb II 25, 13) = “kind of wood” (FD 102) = “eine Holzart” (Düring 1995, 54) = “Art Holz” (WD II 58); **(2)** m³° “als Teil des Sonnenschiffes: ob Bord?” (XX., Wb II 25, 1) = “le bord d’un navire” (AL 77.1595) = “(meaning unknown)” (XX., Jones 1988, 166–7, §63); **(3)** m³° “partie du navire” (Taharqa, AL 79.1116) = “(meaning unknown)” (Jones 1988, 166–7, §63). Cf. perhaps also **(4)** m[°]3° (wood det.) “Planke oder ein anderer Schiffsteil” (early MK, Hornung 1980, 236 after James 1962, 62, n. 31).

NB1: E. Hornung (l.c.), however, affiliated MK m[°]3° with PT m m[°]3°w.j “die beiden Stangen der Leiter” (q.v.) as well as PT m[°]j3.t “Wurfholz” (q.v.). Dubious.

NB2: Düring (l.c., cf. also WD II 58) supposes in LEg. m[°] (GW) “poteau, bille de bois” (AL 77.1661, cf. Vernus in RdE 29, 1977, 180, n. 7) = “*Holzstangen” (GHWb 326–7) a continuation of the same word.

- G. Jéquier (1911, 64–65, §23) derived m3^c.w “le bordage” (lit. “la joue du bateau”) from Eg. m3^c “temple (of head)” (falsely rendered as “certaine partie du corps humain, semblable des deux côtés, peut-être l’épaule, mais plutôt la joue”), which he eventually related to Eg. m3wt “une partie du char égyptien” (usually rendered “barre de bois, perche”), which is certainly erroneous (-^c ≠ -w-).
NB: Similarly suggestive is the rendering by Perry (quoted by Düring l.c.) “boat’s temple or prow”.

m3^c “Teil der Tür (bes. des Schlosses) aus Metall” (NE: Pap. Harris I 59:3 & 77:8, Wb II 25, 15) = “part of the door or of its lock (exact nature unclear, looks to be some kind of mounting)” (Janssen 1975, 394, §145) = “mountings (of door)” (DLE I 205) = “Beschläge (auch aus Metall, für Tür oder Türschloß)” (GHWb 318) = (m3^c.t) “metal object, part of a door or its lock” (WD III 49, cf. JEA 82, 1996, 119).

NB: Janssen (l.c.) finds this word also in the price ostr. of Cairo 25588, 9 (middle of Dyn. XX) but with a slightly different sense denoting a separate object not connected to door.

- GT: from an unattested Eg. *m3^c (< *ml^c or *mr^c) “to smear, plaster”? Cf. Sem.: Ar. (Dathina) mala^c “to smooth away” [Lsl.] || Geez mal^ca “to anoint, grease, smear” [Lsl. 1987, 342].
NB: Var. with -r- in Ar. mara^ca “2. oindre abondamment d’huile (la tête, les cheveux)”, II “couvrir tout à fait de poussière et rendre poudreux” [BK II 1093].

m3^c “lieu, place” (LP 1x, GR 5x, Meeks 1994, 203–204, #7) → Dem. m3^c “Ort, Platz” (DG 149, cf. Polotsky, ZÄS 67, 1931, 7, fn. 5) → Cpt.: (SALBF) μα, (S) μαα-, (F) με, μι, (B) μαι, (BF) μοϥ (m) “1. place (in gen.), 2. (πϵι)μα (this) world, 3. dwelling-place, 4. chamber, monk’s cell, 5. temple, shrine, monastery, 6. part, district, 7. part, duty” (CD 153a).

NB1: The 6th Cpt. sense is attested in Dem. m3^c rs “southern part or region” (established by Spiegelberg in Pap. Loeb. 1, rt. 8–9 & Dem. Pap. Leiden I 379) > μαρχις “Southern Part (of Egypt)”, cf. Tait 1977, 4, n.c. Cf. also Dem. m^c “place (of burial)” (JEA 37, 1951, 81). Beauregard’s (1892, 182) m3 (sic, with house det.) has not been confirmed.

NB2: J. Osing (1985, 58) analyzed Manamūn (alternative name of the town of Charga beside the Ar. el-Ḥārga, still in use) as Ma-n-amūn < *m^c-n-jm “Platz/Gebiet des Amon”, to be identified with Menamoon (mentioned by J. G. Wilkinson in 1843 as name of the whole oasis Charga). Following D. Montserrat & D. Frankfurter, M. Malaise (1999, 224–5, fn. 6), projected the toponym Μένουθις back to a LEg. *m3^c.t-ntr “la place de la divinité” (although one expects *ma-, cf. Vergote, BIFAO 61, 1962, 76–78).

- No unambiguous earlier attestation. Origin highly disputed. The inner Eg. etymologies failed:

- **1.** Traditionally, Cpt.: (SAB) mΔ has been derived from OEg. bw “place” (e.g. Czermak 1934 II, 194; so also recently P. Lacau 1970, 24, #2; C. T. Hodge 1976, 49; 1981, 234; 1981, 374; 1983, 43; 1985, 17; 1990, 653; 1994, 531–532; K. Petráček 1987, 319, §2.3). Following Till (BIFAO 30, 1930, 364), the supposed shift of OEg. bw → Cpt.: (SAB) mΔ has been convincingly disproved by G. Fecht (1960, 98, §183), W. A. Ward (1972, 19, #2), J. Černý (CED 77), W. Westendorf (KHW 85), W. Vycichl (1983, 103), cf. also Till (BIFAO 30, 364) and Smith (1978, 360).

NB1: The b- of Eg. bw has been retained unchanged till the very late times (cf. m-bw-nb “an jdem Platz” > nbcinim, Fecht quoting Crum, JEA 28, 1942, 29).

NB2: C. T. Hodge (1991, 156, #15.1) explained the alleged shift of (SAB) mΔ < OEg. bw in the frameworks of his “consonant ablaut” theory from an ultimate Lislakh proto-root **b-w “place”, from which he took LL **Nb-w (nasal infix *-N-) with the following reflexes: Cpt. (SAB) mΔ & Eg. m- (place prefix) & m “in, from” || Sem. *min “from” & *m- (place prefix) || Brb. *mīn “without” [Prs.] || Ch. *mbə “place” [IS 1966, 19] & *m- (place prefix) ~ IE *me- “in the middle” etc. Baseless.
- **2.** G. Fecht (1960, 99, §183–4 & 180, §373): *má^oej → *má^o (cf. (BF) MOY) vs. *má^oj^o(?) ~ *má^oj^ow < *má^oej^ow, analyzed as m- prefix + *^oej^o? ~ var. *^oej > (S) Hl “Haus”. Similarly, J. Osing (NBÄ 321, 866, n. 1380): LEg. *má^o(y^oj) ~ var. *má^o(y) “Ort, Platz” < m- prefix + ^owj (*^oé/uw^oj) ~ var. ^o(w) (*^oé/uw) “1. einzelnes Stück, 2. Arm, 3. Gegend, Seite, 4. Haus”. Semantically not too convincing, and leaves LEg.-Dem. -3- unexplained.
- **3.** W. Westendorf (KHW 85) preferred to derive Cpt.: (SABF) mΔ < MEg. mj^o.t “Art Haus (?)” (MK, Wb II 42, 13) = “loom (?)” (FD 104), which G. Fecht (1960, 99, fn. 300) explained as a fem. *Paral-
lelbildung* (*máj^ot < *má^oj^ot via met. of *-j- > *-j^o-) to his *m^oj^o (sic) “place”. Semantically unconvincing.
- **4.** W. Vycichl (DELIC 104) did not exclude a derivation from Eg. m3^o “Ufer des Flußes” (OK, Wb, above), which, in his view, might have shifted to a sense “place”, for which there is no evidence.
- **5.** K. Petráček (1987, 319, §2.3) assumed its relationship with the common AA prefix *mV- (Ar. ma-, Brb. mē-, Bed. mē-, Hs. ma-) of nomina loci (as well as the Eg. prep. m “in”!), which W. Vycichl (DELIC 104) correctly *a priori* declined.
- **6.** D. Meeks’ (1994, 204, §7) idea on deriving LEg. m3^o from b3.t (with house det., following s.t, preceding bw, Mag. Pap. Budapest 51.1961, Dyn. XX) interpreted by Meeks as a hapax for “endroit”, is very weak. As he himself admitted, “*l’absence du ^oayin final est gênante et le rapprochement ne peut être fait qu’à titre indicatif*”.

NB: Moreover, L. Kákósy (1971, 163, n. u), the editor of the text, correctly rendered b3.t as “cavity”, which fits both the context and the lexical background of the word.

- Since neither of the suggested inner Eg. etymologies convinces us, we have to consider a possible AA heritage. At the present, most promising seem solutions #7 & #8.
- **7.** GT: perhaps of common origin with WBrb.: (?) Zng. e-mer [unexpected -r] “sein” [Zhl. 1942-1943, 104, #32] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-mel “être dans un lieu” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1187], Ayr & EWlm. ə-məl “être dans un lieu”, e-mel “existence, occurrence (dans un lieu)”, EWlm. a-sə-məl, pl. i-sə-mal “1. lieu, emplacement, place, 2. lieu de résidence, domicile” [Alj. 1980, 127; PAM 1998, 215; 2003, 535-536], Tadghaq & Tudalt ə-məl “1. to arrive, 2. be (in a place)” [Sudlow 2001, 149] ||| LECu. *mēl- “place” [GT]: Saho mēl-ā ~ mēl-ā “Wohnort eines Stammes, Stammsitz eines Tribus” [Rn. 1890, 265], Afar mēl-ā “Stammsitz/-ort eines Tribus, Aussiedlung” [Rn. 1886, 881] | PSam *mēl [Heine 1978] vs. *mèl [Heine 1982] = *mēla [Lmb.]: Boni mēl “Platz, Ort” [Sasse 1980, 99; Heine 1977, 291], Rnd. mēl “place” [Heine 1976, 219] = mēl “Ort, Stelle, Platz” [Schlee 1978, 140, #769] = mēle (f) “place” [Oomen 1981, 70], PSom. *mēl “Platz” [Lmb. 1986, 445] > Som. mēl “Ort, Platz, Wohnsitz” [Rn. 1902, 294] = mēl “place” [Abr. 1964, 177] (Sam: Heine 1978, 69; 1982, 121; Lmb. 1986, 210, 328; LECu.: Rn. l.c.) ||| CCh.: Mada mla “lieu, endroit”, cf. mlam “lieu, endroit, monde, place, temps, époque, saison” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 184], Muyaṅ mələṅ “place” [Rsg. 1978, 304, #533] (unless < *ma-lam) || ECh.: perhaps Kera mélé “to lace” [Pearce 1998-99, 67].
LIT. for Eg.-AA: Takács (EEWC). Th. Obenga (1993, 285, #7) has already referred to the common origin of OEg. bw & (SAB) ṁḏ & Rnd. mēl, but he believed Rnd. -l to be an “additional element” (not part of the root).
NB1: As pointed out by M. Kossmann (2001, 93 & 94, n. 7), Hgr. e-mel “être dans un lieu” may be etymologically related with WBrb.: Zng. a-miy “se diriger vers” || NBrb.: Qbl. ə-məl “arriver à”, which have been compared (above) with Eg. m3^c “to direct (or sim.)”, which would imply an eventual connection of both Eg. m3^c roots. For the semantic shift cf. IE *re?- “gerade (richten), (st)recken” > i.a. OIndic rájas- & Av. razah- “Raum”, Lat. regiō “Richtung, Gegend”, vs. OIndic rajī- “sich aufrichtend, gerade”, Av. raz- “(gerade) richten, ordnen”, rašnu- “gerecht”, Lat. regō “gerade richten, lenken, herrschen” > dirigō etc. (IEW 854-7).
NB2: L. Reinisch (1902, 294) considered LECu. *mēl- a nom. loci *ma-[w^c]il-, derived from ES *w^cl “to spend the day”. Hardly so. The *-^c- is not reflected in LECu.
NB3: WCh.: NBch. *burV “place” [GT]: Pa’a mbùrà (m) [MSkn. 1979, 195], Siri bəri “place” [Skn.] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 34) are probably unrelated.
- **8.** GT: possible that the OEg. etymon of GR m3^c was a nom. loci (as intuitively surmised already by Vycichl, DELC 104 without recognizing the simplex) from a hypothetical OEg. *w3^c (i.e., *w^cl ~ *wr^c) “to stay” (or sim.), cf. ES *w^cl: Geez wa^cala ~ wə^cla “to pass the day, remain, stay, do sg. during the day”, nom. loci: məw^cāl ~ mu^cāl “place of custody, place of detention, prison” etc. (ES: Lsl. 1987, 603).

- **9.** GT: a relationship to CCh.: PTera *mV- “place” [GT]: Tera ma [Nwm. 1964, 44, #323], Pidlimdi miyà, Ga’anda mîta, Gabin mîta etc. (CCh.: Kraft 1981, #264) || ECh.: Mokilko ʔùmé “Ort” [Lks. 1977, 222] = ʔimé/ʔùmé (m) “place, endroit, lieu” [Jng. 1990, 112, 190] seems phonologically (unless LEg. m3^c < *m^c) doubtful.
NB: The initial PTera *m- is supposed to go back to *^mb- = OEg. bw “place” (q.v.). Or was PTera *mV- a distinct root?

m3^c “to swallow” (GR: Hibis, Cruz-Uribe 1988, 267).

- **GT:** cognate with Sem.: Ar. (Dathina) ml^c “avaler” [GD 2717]?
NB1: Cf. also Ar. mala^ca “teter sa mère (se dit d’un petit chameau)” [BK II 1149] || SCu.: Dhl. mila^c- “to stick out the tongue” [Tosco 1991, 143, not in EEN 1989]?
NB2: For a different Sem. etymology (Ar. bly with a distinct basic sense) of the Dathina root cf. Růžička (in WZKM 27, 1913, 1f.).

m3w “neu werden, sich erneuern” (OK, Wb II 25–26) → m3 “neu” (OK, Wb II 26, 5–15).

NB: The *IVae inf.* root m3wj appears only from Dyn. XVIII (cf. Wb II 25) and later in Dem. m3j “neu” (DG 148:1) > Cpt.: (SF) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\iota$, (F) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\omicron\Upsilon\iota$, $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\epsilon\iota$, (F) $\mu\alpha\iota$ “neu” (KHW 88), while in the earliest attestations (OK) only m3 was written. The inf. was masc. Thus, W. Vycichl (DELC 108) and C. Peust (1999, 131) rightly suggested Eg. $\sqrt{m3w}$ “to be new”. Note that the old -w- is confirmed also by the supposed Chadic cognates (#1).

- **Hence:** m3w.t “Neuland: das neu vom Nil abgesetzte flache Acker-land” (since Amarna, Wb II 27, 8) = “not only islands lying in the stream, but also all the lands situated between the high- and low-water marks” (H. Lyons quoted in Grd. 1948, 27) = “(doubtless really) a new island thrown up by the shifting course of the river” (Grd. l.c.) = “(lit.) ‘new land’ (that has recently emerged from the Nile)” (CED 79) = “neues Land” (NBÄ 611) = “the new land: common word for a special kind of arable land” (Janssen 1961, 79: first attested under Thotmes III: Urk. IV 747:10) = “(m3w) banc de sable terre nouvelle” (Aufrère 1990, 673) = “low lying land situated on the edge of the river” (PL 400 after Yoyotte in GLECS 8, 100–1) → Dem. m3j “Insel” (DG 148, 2) → Cpt.: (SL) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\epsilon$, (S) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\epsilon\iota$, $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\iota\epsilon$, $\mu\omicron\Upsilon$, (SB) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\iota$ (f) “Insel, Neuland” (KHW 87).
NB1: Following A. H. Gardiner (1948, 27), J. Černý (CED 79) surmises m3w.t to be probably an abbreviation of *jw-n-m3w.t ‘new island’ (‘island of newness’), which has been confirmed by C. J. Eyre (1994, 75–76), who examined the nature of m3w.t in detail, concluding that it denoted a genuine island only exceptionally, while typically, it may have signified (as an equivalent of Eg. Ar. gezīra, pace Grd. l.c.) the riverside low land between high and low water that emerged from retreating waters, often bordering the Nile or the major seasonal water-courses or lying around swamps. P. Wilson (PL 400), in turn, assumes that this land received a “new” layer or silt during the flood every year and this how it would be “renewed”. The sense “Insel (in Fluß oder Meer)” is first attested in Ptol. Eg. (Edfu VI 199:2f. etc., cf. PL 400) acc. to Schenkel (1978, 62 with further discussion on the semantic history of Eg. m3w.t), who saw in NK m3w.t the highest parts of the land most difficult to water and thus brought into use as “new”.

NB2: Vergote (1959, 19): (S) $\text{HOY}\epsilon$ < *ma3āwat. The derivation from NK m3w.t has not been declined in Grd. (l.c.) as erroneously noted in Janssen (l.c.).

NB3: The etymology of the (B) place-name ΘHOYI (Gk. Θμοις , Ar. *Temāy el-ʿAmdīd*) is debated. W. Spiegelberg (KHW 299) erroneously derived it from (t3)-ḥw.t-b3.(w). W. E. Crum (CD 161a) assumed in it a (B) * HOYI “Widder” (cf. also Smith 1978, 362), whose existence was doubted by J. Osing (1978, 189; 1985, 60, n. 11; cf. NBA 489, n. 159) and by W. Westendorf (KHW 481), who, in agreement with A. H. Gardiner (AEO II 151*), J. Yoyotte (GLECS 8, 1957–60, 100f.; GLECS 9, 1960–63, 5–9), A. Czapkiewicz (1971, 69), and recently W. Schenkel (2002, 21), explained (B) ΘHOYI from a LEG. *t3-m3w.t “die Insel” (Snk. l.c.: *t3-mā3w.t). Note that the same etymon has been assumed also for Idmū ~ Dumū (dumwa) by Czapkiewicz (1971, 68) and Schenkel (2002, 20).

- 1. GT: most probably, OEg. m3w < *mrw is cognate with NOm.: Chara mēr-a “new” [Bnd. 1974 MS, 22; 1994, 15, #57] || PCh. *m-r-w [GT] = *m[a]ru-hu [Std.] = *m-r-b [JI 1994 I, 127] “new”: WCh. *m-r-w ~ *m-w-r [GT] = *marV [Std.]: NBch. *marh^w- “new” [Skn.]: Wrj. márhú-ná [Skn.], Kry. márhū-ná [Skn.], Pa’a mārhwán (m), mārhwī (f) [MSkn. 1979, 193], Siri marū-nəsi [Skn.] = mūrúú-nəsi [Skn. in JI], Diri mal [Skn.] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 33) | SBch. *m-w-r “new” [GT]: Dwot mambur [GT: < *mā-m^wur?], Polchi məri, Zem mòdri, Saya muuri ~ moori, Tule mòdri, Dokshi mboori, Zakshi muuri, Boot moori, Zaar muuri (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 44, #96; WCh.: Std. 1987, 235) || CCh.: probably Higi mǎíf^v [via *m-r-v?] “new” [Mohrlang 1972, 100] | PMandara *w-l-w [JI: reg. < *m-r-w] “new” [GT]: Guduf wuliw-nà [Smz.], Dghwede wliwá [Frick] = wiléwà [IL] | PMasa *^mb-r-w [JI: ^mb- < *m- reg.] “new” [GT]: Lame mbirèdò “neuf, nouveau” [Scn. 1982, 312], Zime-Dari mbōrēw “neuf, nouveau” [Cooper 1984, 17], Zime-Batna mrrèw [Jng] = mbireò [Scn.] = ḥrrew [Jng in JI 1994 I 127], Mesme mīrèw “neuf” [Ksk. 1990, 46] || ECh. *m-r-w “new” [GT]: Kera ki-mirwī (m), temerwá (f), pl. kə-marwáŋ [Ebert 1976, 71; 1977 MS, 4; 1978, 43, #21], Kwang múrwē (m), múrwa (f), pl. ká-múrw-aan “neuf” [Jng. 1973, 52] = māràwân, pl. ká-mārùudân [Ebert 1985, 62], Kwang-Mobu mārùwân [Jng.] = mārwe (m), mārwa (f) “neu” [Ebert 1977 MS, 4] = múrwAn [Coates], Ngam mirwe [Coates], Kwang-Gaya mērwan [Coates], Kwang-Alowa muruwe [Coates], Kwang-Minderera murwän [Coates], Tchagine Golo mērwan [Coates] (Kwang: Coates 1991 MS, 2, 5) | WDng. mārbitò [< *marw-] “neuf, neuve (pour un objet)” [Fédry 1971, 116], Mgm. māràwtà “neuf” (adj.) [JA 1992, 106] | Birgit mārìyùntà [Jng. 1973 MS] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 254; Std. 1996, 133).

AP: ONub. mīpī- (with vars.) “new” [Browne], Nuba mīr [Rn. 1879, 116] = mīrī “new” [Hohenwart-Gerlachstein 1979, 280], Fadidja miri [Abel], Kunuzi & Mahas

mīr(i) “new” [Zhl.]. Note that H. Abel (1933–34, 305) and E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 177), followed by C. Peust (1999, 131: beside Eg. m3w), mistakenly linked the Nub. root to Cpt.: (SA) ʔḫḫḫ “new, young” (KHW 27). Borrowing in either direction is problematic due to the initial labials.

LT.: Peust 1999, 131 (Nub.-Eg.); Mlt. 2005, 371, §59 (Chara-Eg.-Mgm. apparently independently from EEWc).

NB1: H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 234) identified Chara mēra with Mocha boro “new” [not found in Lsl. 1959] and Barea wer “new”. But the alleged Mocha form represents a distinct AA root, cf. Eg. *brj (q.v.).

NB2: Any connection to Bed. mir “to prepare, make ready” [Rpr. 1928, 218]?

NB3: Jungraithmayr & Ibrizimow (1994 I 127) mistakenly assume PCh. *m-r-b solely on the basis of WDng. mārbitò [Fédry] with the weakening of *-b- > -w- in all other daughter lgs. (not vice versa). Similarly, they ignored the Eg. cognate (m3w < *mrw), and instead surmised that “a final decision on the ultimate source (!) of this root should take into account the Kanuri form bālīn” (!). A form that stands improbably far from PCh. *m-r-w [GT].

- **2.** A less convincing solution is comparing Eg. m3w with another AA root (whose 2nd root cons. is not clear: *-ʔ- or *-h-?), cf. LECu.: Orm.-Borana mī “fresh” [Strm. 1987, 367; 1995, 209] || SCu. *muʔ- “to be in front, be the first” [Ehret]: Irq. imuʔ-um- “to begin” [Ehret 1980, 159 with false SCu. cognates] ||| WCh.: Ron *m-w-y or *m-h^w-y “new” [GT]: Bokkos (má)mwáyí [Seibert], Fyer mu [Jng. 1968, 9, #96; 1970, 88; Blench 2000 MS, 2, §c019] = mo [Seibert], Tambas mbuhóí [Smz.], Klr. mūuhwè [IL in JI] = mōhwε (sic) [OS!], Daffo mwa & māmwa [Smz.] = DB (mà)mwá [Seibert] (Ron: Jng. 1970; Seibert 2000 MS, c019) || CCh.: Tera mewa “new” [Nwm. 1964, 45, #370] | PMafa-Mada *m-w-y “new” [GT]: Muyang múwèné [Rsg.], Mofu móúyà [Brt. in JI], Mofu-Gudur máwúya “neuf, nouveau” [Brt. 1988, 192], Mkt. máùgá [Rsg. in JI] = máwgá [Rsg.], Gsg. máwàyà [Rsg.] = nawaya (so, n-) [Gerstmann apud JI, not found in Lks. 1970], Mtk. ηwiyájà “new” [Rsg.], Mlk. wàwígà [< m-w-g] [Rsg.] (Mafa-Mada: Rsg. 1978, 297–298, #499; Ch.: JI 1994 II, 254–255). LT.: OS 1992, 201 & HSED #1778 (Eg.-Ch.); Ehret 1997, 216, #1842 (Eg.-Irq.). NB1: H. Jungraithmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I 127) explain the quoted Ch. (Ron, Tera, Mafa-Mada) forms from their PCh. *m-r-b “new”, which they believe to be best preserved in Dangla mārbi-ntò, while its *-r- and *-b- were reduced to zero in Ron, Tera, and Mafa-Mada. Hardly.

NB2: Was the underlying Chadic root an innovation by m- prefix? Note that the Mafa-Mada gr. has a root *w-y-h/g “new” too (see Rsg. 1978, 297–298, #499).

- All other solutions are unacceptable:
- **3.** C. Peust (1999, 131) assumed a relationship with Cpt.: (SA) ʔḫḫḫ “new, young” (KHW 27), which, however, represents a distinct AA root (cf. EDE II).
- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 284) compared a certain Eg. m3wt “jardin” (sic!) with Peul dyubarde “jardin”. Absurd.
NB: The underlying word is undoubtedly NEg. m3wt “Neuland: das neu vom Nil abgesetzte flache Ackerland” (NK, Wb), derivative of Eg. m3w.

m3wt “Stab, Stock, Stange, Schaft (des Speeres)” (OK, Wb II 27, 9–10) & “Halm des Getreides” (BD, Wb II 27, 14) = “1. bois long, droit et lisse, 2. tige” (Ceugney 1880, 6 after Brugsch) = “1. Schaft vom (vom Stock), 2. Stengel, Halm (von dünnen Pflanzen)” (Müller 1893, 33) = “1. shaft of spear” (PT 1212), 2. staff (XVIII.), 3. stalk of corn (BD), 4. measuring-rod (?) (OK)” (FD 102) = “(NK) Wagen-deichsel” (Helck, MWNR 907) = “poles, spokes” (2x in LEg., DLE I 207) = “(OK) bâton (un signe d’uatorité, e.g. Urk. I 216)” (Posener-Kriéger 1991, 300, n. p) = “1. Stab, Stock, *Rohrstock, 2. Stange, Schaft (d. Speeres), 3. Speiche (beim Wagen), 4. Halm des Getreides, 5. *Meßstab, Rute” (GHWb 315; ÄWb I 504) = “1. staff, harpoon shaft (used to slay the Sethian foes), 2. stalk or stem (of a plant, in particular of corn)” (PL 401) = “Stengel, Stab” (Snk. 1999, 88 & fn. 6: CT exx.) = “staff, shaft, stalk of corn” (DCT 151, 156) = “poles (?), spokes (?)” (WD II 58: cf. RdE 43, 1992, 121y).

NB1: J. Osing (NBÄ 745, n. 902) treated OK m3.t “Schilfrohr” (Niuserre, q.v.) as a variation of m3wt “1. Stab, Stange, 2. Halm” (q.v.), which is an error. The distinction of m3.t vs. m3wt is to be maintained (as in most of the standard lexicons).

NB2: The rendering of m3wt (in Pap. Anastasi IV 16:11) as “une partie du char égyptien: la caisse du char ou barre de bois, perche” (Jéquier 1911, 64–65, §23, so also Wb II 27, 12) has been declined by Caminos (1954, 551), who suggests “spokes” (instead of “the pole or the axle of the chariot”) identified with m3wt “sunrays” (cf. Lat. radio, French rayons). Besides, Jéquier (l.c.) doubted the usual rendering “barre de bois, perche” (as well as “banc de rameurs”).

- Its etymology is disputed. Most promising seem solutions #1, #2 and #3.
- **1.** In Egyptian philology (Ceugney 1880, 6; Müller 1893, 33; 1896, 188; Grapow 1914, 22; Osing 1976, 206, 745–6, n. 902; Schenkel 1999, 88), usually derived from OEg. 3wj “to be long”, which seems plausible, but not fully certain. Nevertheless, the wtg. with the 3w hrgl. (F40) that appears only later (NK), may indicate a secondary re-etymologization of the word, which may have misled modern research.

NB1: Cf. the supposed analogous derivation of Hbr. matte(h) “1. Ast, Rebe, 2. Stab, Stecken” < nṯy “ausstrecken” (GB 417 vs. 500; recently also Djk. & Kogan 1996, #1807).

NB2: Osing (l.c.) assumed m3wt/*m³áw.w(e)t > (B) ΗΩΟΥΤ (m) “Glanz” to unite both (1) “Stäbe, Stangen, Halme” vs. (2) “Strahlen, Glanz” (q.v.).

NB3: Müller (1896, 188) erroneously read m3f3wt (sic) < f3w (sic).

- **2.** GT: an attractive AA parallel appears in EBrb.: Fodjaha a-mûl “1. bastone per battere il grano o l’orzo, 2. pestello” [Prd. 1961, 300]. With regard to the special meaning of Eg. m3wt “shaft of spear” (PT 1212b, ÜKAPT VI 129: “hölzerner Schaft eines Spießes”; Posener-Kriéger 1991, 300, n. p: “bâton assimilé à un harpon”) and

“stalk of corn” (BD) as well as “lance” (GR: Edfu, Drioton 1948, 19), is there any connection between Eg. m3w.t and AA *m-l “arrow, spear” [GT]?

NB: Cp. Sem.: Akk. (m/jB, m/nA) mulmullu ~ malmullu “Pfeil” [AHW 671: isolated in Sem.] || Ar. malmūl- “1. aiguille dont on se sert pour appliquer du collyre sur les paupières, 2. burin, pointe, tout instrument avec lequel on trace des caractères sur un corps dur” [BK II 1153] || NOm.: Haruro (Gats’ama) mala “arrow” [Sbr. 1994, 11] || ECh. *m-l “spear” [JS 1981, 264: B.]; Ndam-Gulei mal “Speer” [Lks. 1937, 95], Tumak mà:l “lance (nom générique)” [Cpr. 1975, 82] = mà:l “sagaïe” [Cpr. 1971, 54], Tumak-Mawer mà:l “sagaïe” [Cpr. 1971, 54], Somray málē [Lks.] = malē [AF] = mal [Benton] “Lanze” [Lks. 1937, 80].

- **3.** GT: or < AA *m-r [GT], cf. Sem.: Hbr. *ʿēmer “brindille” [DRS 24: isolated] = “twig”, ʿimrē-šeper “branched antler” [KB 67] || (?) NBrb.: Mzg. (CMaroccan) a-mūr “harpon, crochet, bâton ferré, aiguillon, flèche” [Lst. 1942, 131, §552] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ə-mur ~ ə-ṁmur, pl. i-mārr-ān “1. flèche, 2. p.ext.: tout petit bâton sans tête” [PAM 1998, 221; 2003, 550], Hgr. ā-mor, pl. i-murr-en “flèche” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1224], Tadghaq & Tudalt ā-mor, pl. i-mārr-ān “arrow” [Sudlow 2001, 292] || WCh.: Angas myaar “the pegs of wood stuck into the walls, on which to hang articles” [Flk. 1915, 251; GT 2004, 262: isolated in AS] || ECh.: Bdy. màrúmàruṅ “perche des circoncis” [AJ 1989, 97].
- All other etymologies are clearly false:
- **4.** G. Jéquier (1911, 64–65, §23) identified it falsely with Eg. m3^c.w “ein hölzerner Teil der Barke” (CT, Wb II 25, 14) = “les parois extérieurs, le bordage, fait de pièces de bois assemblées, les deux côtés du bordage” (Jéquier), although -^c ≠ -w-.
- **5.** L. Homburger (1930, 284) equated Eg. m3w.t with Peul dyabere, pl. dyabe “pied de mil” (sic). Absolutely false.
- **6.** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (OS 1992, 192; HSED #1777): OEg. m3w.t ~ CCh.: Musgu umo “Gerte” [Lks. 1941, 79 – apparently absent in Müller 1886; Trn. 1991]. Phonologically improbable.
- **7.** Ch. Ehret (1997, 216, #1840): Eg. m3w.t ~ Ar. mʿy “to put forth leaves” || PCu. *māʿa “shoot, plant, growth”.

m3w.t “die Strahlen der Sonne, ihr Glanz” (XVIII., Wb II 28, 1) = “rays of light” (FD 103) = “les rayons (du soleil)” (AL 78.1624 with Dendera exx.; AL 79.1125: KRI exx.) = “rayons (de lumière)” (El-Sayed 1987, 64) = “Strahlen der Sonne, Strahlenglanz, Glanz (a. Objekte), Licht” (GHWb 319) = “rays, beams, brightness” (PL 400). NB: R. Caminos (1954, 214) sees in Pap. Anastasi IV 16:11 m3w.t “spokes (part of a chariot)” (falsely rendered as “the pole or the axle of the chariot” and usually identified with m3w.t “staff, shaft”) “undoubtedly the same word as” m3w.t “sunrays” (cf. Lat. radio, French rayons).

- Hence: Dem. mwj “light” (CED 79, not in DG) > Cpt.: (B) $\mu\omega\omicron\gamma\iota$, $\mu\omicron\gamma\epsilon$, (F) $\mu\omicron\gamma\omicron\gamma\iota$ “Glanz” (KHW 87) = “light, brightness” (CD 160a) = “lumière, clarté” (DELIC 108).
NB: Vocalized as *m³āw.w(e)t → (B) $\mu\omega\omicron\gamma\iota$ vs. *m³(a)w.wét → (B) $\mu\omicron\gamma\epsilon$ (NBÄ 340, n. 6) = *(e)m³ōwet (DELIC 108).
- From the same root (as denom. verb): m³wj “bestrahlen, erleuchten” (GR, Wb II 28, 5) = illuminer” (Taharqa, AL 79.1124) = “strahlen” (Osorkon II, JW 1985, 52, n. 19) vs. m³w.tj “le Rayonnant (titre du dieu Soleil)” (El-Sayed 1987, 64) = “der Strahlende” (GHwB 319).
NB1: J. Osing (NBÄ 746) did not exclude an alternative derivation of GR m³wj as “eine unter Einfluß dieses Substantivs [i.e., m³w.t “Strahlen, Glanz”] erfolgte Bedeutungserweiterung von m³wj ‘sich erneuern’ (häufig auch von der Sonne und vom Mond)”. Improbable.
NB2: The rendering of m³.tj (in CT I 241e) is controversial. R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 52, spell 53, n. 5): in the version of B10C^b & B16C (p.t m³.tj) an old perf. “(the sky) is in light” from the root m³(w)j, while in B12C (p.t m m³.tj) & B10C^c (p.t mm m³.tj) might be a noun “light”. DCT 157: m³w.tj (sic) “radiation”.
- Its origin is disputable. Premature to claim with certainty whether the inner Eg. or the exteneral (AA) etymology is correct.
- 1. In Egyptian philology (Ceugney 1880, 6; Grapow 1914, 22; NBÄ 206), usually derived with m- prefix from Eg. 3wj “to be long”, i.e. “those stretching out (from the sun)” (GT) = “étendu ou grand en lumière, en splendeur” (Ceugney). Thus, it would be the same derivation as Eg. m³w.t “Stab, Stange, Halm” (OK, above). Not impossible.
- 2. G. Takács (2005, 176, #116): if the root was *m³w (from AA *m-l-w), the closest cognates could be SBrb.: Hgr. meluw-et “scintiller: briller vivement (d’un éclat tremblant, des étoiles, des éclairs, d’un feu, d’un objet de métal poli...)”, melumelu “miroiter: réfléchir la lumière en produisant des reflets tremblants” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1191], EWlm.-Ayr mäləw-w-ət “scintiller”, partial redupl. mäləw-ləw (EWlm. also mälulu) “miroiter, refléter de la lumière”, full redupl. mäləw-mäləw ~ mälum-əlu “miroiter longuement”, EWlm. e-mäləw-ləw, pl. a-/i-mäläö w-ləw-än “mirage”, ta-miləw-t “brillement, éclat, chose brillante” [PAM 1998, 217; 2003, 541], Tudalt & Tadghaq mäləw-ləw (impr.) “to shine, be lit up” [Sudlow 2001, 196] ||| HECu.: Dasenech (Galab) mülüč, pl. mülü “bright” [Sasse 1974, 421] | Burji milil-i “lightning” [Ss. 1982, 144] = milil-é “lightning (in sky)” vs. milil-i “lightning to earth” [Hds. 1989, 92: isolated in HECu.] ||| NOm.: Kachama mal-ə-o “rainbow” [Sbr. 1994, 18] || SOM.: Hamer melela “bright, shiny” [Flm. 1990 MS, 13] ||| WCh.: perhaps PAngas *ma₂la₂m (?) or *melem (partial redupl.?) “star” [GT 2004, 240] | Dera melí “lightning” [Nwm. 1974, 130] = mólí “Blitz” [Jng. 1966 MS, 10] = melí ~ mili [Mkr.], Gera perhaps melkimbi “Blitz” [Mkr.] || CCCh.: perhaps Mwulyen málwúlkédò (compound?) “lightning” [Kraft 1981,

#115] | Bdm. malayi “éclair” [Gaudiche 1938, 23] = àmòlì “éclair” [Souley 1993 MS, 92] || ECh.: Mkl. ʔimilá “to lighten” [Lks. 1975, 223] = (t)imilá “briller (par ex. éclairs)” [Jng. 1990, 112].

AP: NS *mél “to glare, shine” [Ehret 2001, 281, #117]. Songhay meli “Blitz” ~ Mande: Mende melomelo, Bobo mɔ̀là “Blitz” (Songhay-Mande: Mkr. 1989 l.c.).

LT.: Mkr. 1987, 239; 1989 MS, 18, #1 (Songhay-Mande-WCh.-Mwulyen-Burjì); Takács 1995, 106, #4 (Eg.-Brj.) 2002, 153 (Mkl.-Dera-SBrb.-Burjì).

NB1: It is difficult to pass any judgement on the etymology of some further Chadic terms for “lightning” with an unknown third radical, cf. WCh.: Pero málàč [*-sʔ] “lightning” [Frj. 1985, 41] || CCh.: Bdm. hâw amə̀lâʒi “es blitzt” [Lks. 1939, 133]. For Pero-Mwulyen-Brj. see Mkr. l.c.

NB2: Does Common Brb. *m-l-l “white” also belong here? Cf. e.g. NBrb.: Shilh mlul “to be white, grow whiter” [Aplg. 1958, 61], Mzg. mellul “être blanc, de couleur blanche, blanchir (intr.)” [Taifi 1991, 416], Ait Izdeg mlil “être blanc”, amellal, umlil “blanc” [Mrc. 1937, 35], Ait Mgild mllul “to be(come) white, light-colored” [Harries 1974, 239], Botiwa m-l-l: še-mrar “blanchir, rendre blanc” [Brn. 1911, 184], Mzab mɔ̀l “être/devenir blanc, blanchir” [Dlh. 1984, 117], Wargla ə-mɔ̀l “être, devenir blanc, blanchir” [Dlh. 1987, 188], Shenwa a-mellal “blanc” [Lst. 1912, 147], Sened a-melläl “blanc” [Provotelle 1911, 102] | Qbl. i-mlul ~ u-mlul “être blanc” [Dlt. 1982, 497], Zwawa a-mellal “blanc”, mellul “blanchir, devenir blanc” [Bst.] | Nfs. mellél (m) “bianco” [Bst. & Bgn. 1942, 305] || EBrb.: Gdm. mellil “blanc” [Mtl. 1904, 106] = ə-mɔ̀l “être blanc” [Lanfry 1973, 210, #999] = mellal “blanc” [Bst.], Djerba a-mellal “blanc” [Bst.], Siwa a-millal “blanc” [Bricchetti-Robecchi] = a-melalle [Cailliaud] || WBrb.: Zng. mälliʒ “blanc” [Ncl. 1953, 210] = möllüʒ “blanc” [Bst. 1890, 35] = mulli “blanc” [Bst. 1887, 448] = [mëyLiy/mälliy] “blanc” [TC 2002, 439] || SBrb.: Hgr. i-mlal “être blanc” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1191], EWlm. & Ayr i-mlal “être blanc”, cf. EWlm. mul-ət “1. avoir du blanc à la face, tête, 2. avoir la tête blanche” [PAM 2003, 537–8], Ghat & Kel Ui i-mellal “blanc” [Bst. 1883, 320] = Ghat mellul “blanc” [Nhl. 1909, 134] etc. (Brb. data: Bst. 1883, 290, 334; 1887, 403, 448; 1890, 35, 317; 1891, 7; Dst. 1925, 274–275; Lst. 1931, 203; Mlt. 1991, 257, #24.1). The semantic shift “light” → “white” is banal, cf. e.g. Eg. ḥd “1. hell, 2. weiß” (OK, Wb III 206–8) → ḥd.wt “Licht (des Tages), Mondlicht” (NK, Wb III 208, 14–15) ~ Ar. ḥaḍaʿa “erleuchten, erhellen” (Eg.-Ar.: Vcl. 1936, 109; Vrg. 1945, #12.a.17).

NB3: O. Kössler (1952, 136, #36) suggested a different etymology of Brb. *m-l-l “white”: Sem.: Hbr. poal mill “welken (to fade away, wither)”, although the basic meaning of the Sem. root is probably quite different, cf. Hbr. mll qal “sich schlaff senken (Pflanzen)”, Ar. mll “to be bent, drag, last long (sich hinschleppen)” (Sem.: GB 430).

- **3.** GT: alternatively cp. AA *m-r “light” [GT]: ES *ʔmr “hell sein, strahlen” [Rundgren 1963, 181–3]: Geez ʔamir “sun, day, time”, Tigre ʔammära “to be bright”, Gft. aymərə “sun”, Grg. imir (with dial. vars.) “sun” etc. (ES-Agaw: Lsl. 1982, 6; 1987, 26; 1988, 91; cf. DRS 24) || NBrb.: Izn. ta-miri “moonlight” [Rns. 1932, 386] || SBrb.: Hgr. é-mmar, pl. é-mmâr-en “chaleur rayonnée (du soleil, du feu, d’un corps en combustion)”, cf. ä-sammer, pl. i-summâr “rayons de soleil chauffant doucement” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1223], EWlm. √m-r: a-săssa-ṛmṛar ~ ä-səssə-ṛmṛar, Ayr i-səssə-ṛmṛar “rayon de soleil chauffant doucement, chaleur du soleil en temps froid” [PAM 1998,

221; 2003, 541] ||| Agaw (< ES?) *ʔamär- “1. morning, 2. tomorrow” [Apl. 1991, 23; 1994, 3; 1984, 39]. Cf. also NAgaw: Bln. amär “klar, licht sein/werden” [Rn. 1887, 30].

DP: For deriving Eg. m3w.t < Nst. *m[e]rV “to flash” (Brb., IE, Alt., Drv.) [Dlğ. 1991 MS, #1014a] see Takács 2004, 208.

NB: Questionable is the etymological position of the Sem. (and henceforth Agaw) data. It is also problematic who borrowed from whom (unless we are dealing with a genetic parallel). M. Cohen (1947, #9), V. M. Illič-Svityč (1971, #124), and most recently W. Leslau (1987, 26) derived the ES forms from Sem. *ʔmr “to see” via an ultimate basic meaning *‘to shine, be light’. Rundgren (1963, 181–3), in turn, assumed an opposite semantic shift: Sem. *ʔmr “sehen” < “hell sein, strahlen”, which seems more convincing, cf. e.g. IE *leuk- “1. leuchten, 2. sehen”: i.a. Gk. λευκός “licht, glänzend, weiß”, Lat. lūx “Licht” vs. OIndic lókate “erblickt, wird gewahr”, lokáyati “schaut, betrachtet”, Gk. λέωσσω “sehe, betrachte” (IEW 687–8; LEW I 823–4; KEWA III 112–3). Cf. Eg. m33 “to see” (q.v.).

● Other proposals are out of question:

■ **4.** W. M. Müller (1893, 36): Eg. m3w (sic) “denken”, m3(j.t) (sic) “Syenitstein”, m3wj “glänzen” & “Glanz” “*sind etymologisch verbunden*”. Naturally they are not.

NB: Cf. Eg. m3t (orig. *m3wt?) “to think”, m3t “granite” (q.v.).

■ **5.** W. F. Albright (1927, 213), in turn, equated both m3w.t and OEg. m3wj “new” with Ar. bahā “glänzend sein”. Unconvincing both semantically and phonologically. Querried by F. Calice (1936, #619) as “höchst unsicher”.

■ **6.** P. Wilson (PL 400) derives (pace Osing in NBÄ 746) GR m3w “rays etc.” from m3w “to be new” (“*because new things are bright!*”) and assumes that m3w refers to “the renewing of life giving properties of the rays of the sun”.

m3w.t (or **m3wt** < ***m3t**?) “der Refrain eines Liedes” (NK 3x, Wb II 27, 15) = “(technical term for) repeat” (Brunner, JNES 25, 1966, 130–1) = “refrain (?)” (AL 77.1606) = “chorus, refrain (?)” (NE 2x, DLE I 207, cf. also Lichtheim in JNES 4, 193, n. 4) = “*Chor, Refrain (eines Liedes)” (GHWb 319) = “title (< announcing of the name)” (Hodge 1997, 201–4) = “Wiederholung, Erneutes, Refrain” (WD III 49).

NB: To the NK occurrences of m3w.t (the Harper’s Song in Pap. Harris 500, 7:1–2; also Med. Pap. London 18:5 & 17:2), P. Wilson adds GR ones meaning “songs, chanted utterances” (Edfu, PL 402), whose phon. det. (W7, granite bowl), however, suggests a different etymology (cf. m3t “to think out” below?), while in all three NK exx. the det. is T19 (harpoon-head) occurring in NK m3wt “Stab, Halm” (Wb).

● Origin debatable.

■ **1.** In Egyptian philology (Wb l.c., GHWb l.c., D. Meeks in AL 77.1606, C. T. Hodge 1997, 198, PL 401–2), usually derived from Eg.

m3t̄ “erdenken, ersinnen” (Wb, q.v.), which would logically imply that -t < -t̄ was part of the root (contrary to Wb’s segmentation ‘m3wt’). The rather problematic semantic shift has, however, so far not been satisfactorily elucidated in either of the quoted proposals.

NB1: Moreover, Meeks (l.c.) assumes a relationship to LEg. m3wt “tristes pensées, complaints” (below).

NB2: Hodge (1997, 201–4) presumed in the case of m3t̄ a large root family eventually derived from AA *l-k (!).

- **2.** The suggestive rendering “repeat (Erneutes)” by H. Brunner (JNES 25, 1966, 130–1, cf. WD III 49) and “to renew, repeat again” by J. Assmann (quoted in PL 402) implies a derivation from Eg. m3w “(to be) new”, since the refrain begins a short paraphrase of the whole text.
- **3.** GT: in agreement with the rendering “refrain” (perhaps < **“the part to be repeated”*), one might postulate an unattested underlying Eg. *m3 [*< *ml*] “to repeat (or sim.)” (of which m3.wt may be an abstract), for which one might consider AA *m-l “to repeat (???)” [GT], cf. HECu.: Hdy. múla “other” [Blz.] = mulleka [Hds. 1989, 108] || SCu.: PRift *mel- “again” [Ehret]: Iraqw male ~ male?ale “again” | Asa mile-k “1. day after tomorrow, 2. (with extension of mng.) day before yesterday” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 343, 324, #37) ||| NOm.: NWOmt. *mell-a “other” [Bnd. 2000 MS, 60, #99] = Omt. *mEl- “other” [Bnd. 1988, 147].
NB: The Cu.-Om. stem is supposed to be related to Bed. “2”: Bisharin málo [Rn.], Beni Amer málo ~ málo (cf. málho “Zweiheit”, málya “zweiter”) [Rn.], Ammar’ar málo- [Dlg], Arteiga mhalō [Hds.] (Bed.: Rn. 1894, 8–9; Zbr. 1987, 328) || LECu.: Saho male-ḥen “7” (“[5 +] 2”) [PB], Afar mal-ḥe’na “7” [Bliese] = malḥin [Zbr.] (Cu.: Zbr. 1989, 589; Blz. 1987 MS, 11) ||| CCh. *m-l → *miṣu “2” [Blz.]: Margi māsū, Wamdiu miḷu, Kilba méšū, Hyildi mīlū (CCh.: Kraft 1981 II; JI 1994 II, 332–3).
LIT.: Ehret 1987, 103, #433 (Bed.-PRift); Blz. 1987 MS, 11; 1990, 37 (CCh.-Cu.).

m3w.t > m3wj (or **m3wt < *m3t̄?**) “sorrow (?)” (Faulkner 1936, 128, 137–8: 2x in Pap. Bremner-Rhind, i.e., BM 10188, 7:23 & 11:6, end of 4th cent., around 300 BC) = “tristes pensées, complaints” (AL 77.1632, 77.1606: also Edfu V 71:16, also AL 78.1623) = “tristesse (?)” (AC 1978, 14) = “sorrow” (DLE I 208) = “sad thoughts” (PL 401 after AL l.c.) = “ritual recitation of someone’s name and attributes, commemoration” (Hodge 1997, 203, §14) = “Traurigkeit” (WD II 58).

- Hence: also m3w.t (water det.) “tears (?)” (1x) (Faulkner 1936, 128, 137–8, Pap. Bremner-Rhind 3:3) = “tristes pensées” (AL 77.1606, 78.1623) = “larmes” (AC 1978, 14) = “Tränen” (WD II 58).

NB: D. Meeks (AL l.c.) apparently does not see any reason to maintain the special sense “tears” for this ex., while C. T. Hodge (l.c.) denies that m3wt of Pap. Bremner-Rhind 3:3 belongs to the root of the other two Pap. Bremner-Rhind exx.

- **1.** The view on its derivation from Eg. m3t (> GR m3wt) “to think” (or sim.) expressed by D. Meeks (AL 77.1606), C. T. Hodge (l.c.), and P. Wilson (PL 401) may be correct, although the literary sense of the underlying exx. is debated (Hodge: “recitation of name”, Wilson: “thoughts, sad ones”). D. Meeks (AL 79.1149), in addition, pointed out the underlying verbal root in m3t “se lamenter” (KRI II 883:3), which, if correct, definitely decides the question.

NB: All exx. have the W7 hrgl. (granite bowl, present also in m3t “to think”), which also suggest this etymology.

- **2.** P. Wilson (PL 401) assumed the “extra dimension” of old Eg. m3t → m3wt “thought” obtaining a negative connotation in LEg. to have arisen from confusion with m3trw “to weep for” (since CT, q.v.). Or, *vice versa*, should we account for an evolution of LEg. m3wt via *m3t < NK *m3tj < OK-CT m3tr with a deviant orthography due to the influence of LEg. m3wt < old m3t, the only comparable root after the extinction of old m3tr?

NB: There is, however, some evidence for that the old root m3tr was still known (as m3tj) in the latest centuries of Eg. (cf. Osing 1998, 272, n. ag & fn. 1287).

- **3.** GT: the *Zusammenklang* of LEg. m3wt “tears (?)” (Pap. Bremner-Rhind 3:3) with AA *m-l “tears” [GT] may be presumably only illusory.

NB: Cf. Bed. melo (f) “Träne” [Almkvist 1885, 47] = te²-melo “die Träne” [Munzinger] = melo “Träne”, mel-öt “weinen” [Rn. 1895, 168] = mile (f) “tear”, mil-öt ~ mel-öt “to weep” [Rpr. 1928, 216] = maloi (f) “tears” [Hds. 1996, 93] ||| ECh.: Tumak mülöl “larme” [Cpr. 1975, 85] | Mokilko mólól “weinen” [Lks. 1975, 224]. For Bed.-Tumak see also Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 27; Skn. 1997, 78; Takács 1998, 135, #1.5.

m3wtj “als Bez. der Hoden” (GR: 2x in Dendera, II 79a & III 20g after Mariette, Wb II 28, 9).

NB: Dawson (1934, 135, §5) supposes an earlier ex. of the word in m3wt (flesh det.) “(possibly) testicle” (in a mag. text of Theban Ostr. C1, line 6).

- Origin debated:

- **1.** W. R. Dawson (1934, 135, §5) apparently suggests an etymological connection to Eg. m3t.(t) “mandrake” in the Mag. Pap. Leiden I 348, 5:8–6:1, where its “fruit” is identified with the testicles (jns.wj=fj m pr.t m3t) and which eventually derives from OEg. (PT 1440e) m3t.t “mandrake goddess” (Dawson) = “Oschor, Apfel von Sodom (Calotropis procera): ein Strauch mit großen, steifen, rundlichen, blau bereiften Blättern und viel Milchsaft” (ÄWb I 506). This theory implies a shift from OK m3t.t via NK m3t.t down to GR m3wt.

NB: Dawson (o.c., p. 134) cites further exx. for mandrake conceived as testicles (a Syr. med. MS q.v.: fruit of mandrake is compared with testicle of man; one of the Ar. names of mandrake is “devil’s testicles”).

- **2. G. Takács (2004, 56, #345):** if m3w.tj was a *nomen actoris* (suffix -tj), lit. *“(producer of seminal fluid)”, it might be in principle etymologically connected with NEg. m3j “sperm” (q.v.)?

NB1: It would be tempting to compare also SBrb.: Ayr & EWlm. muləy “être male, entier (mâle)”, ə-meli, pl. i-mela-n ~ i-mulay “1. mâle entier (animal mâle non castré et pleinement développé), 2. étalon, chameau étalon” [Alj. 1980, 128; PAM 2003, 537, 541], Hgr. a-mâli “not castrated male animal (he-goat, camle etc.)” [Gouffé], Ghat a-mali, pl. i-mulay “étalon” [Nhl. 1909, 158]. But these forms look rather like m- prefix participial derivations from Brb. *l-y “to mount” [GT] = *ā-hlū/iy “monter” [PAM 2003, 509]. Note that C. Gouffé (1974, 371) derives Hausa amááli ~ amáâlè “chameau reproducteur et chef du troupeau” [Gouffé] = amáâlè “monstrous ram, horse, donkey, or camel” [Abr. 1962, 28] from Tuareg.

NB2: The etymology suggested in Takács 1997, 235, #26.1 is unconvincing.

- **3. G. Takács (2004, 56, #345; 1997, 237, #37):** or, if.tj was the fem. dual ending (somewhat strange in the case of testicles), one would not exclude a relationship with AA *m-l “egg” [GT].

NB1: NAgaw: Hamir mīlā “testiculi” [Rn. 1884, 392] || LECu.: Saho mīl-ā “Hoden, testiculi” [Rn. 1890, 265], Afar mīlā “testicolo” [Crl.] || NOm. *mUl- “egg” [GT] = *mbul- [Bnd. 1994, 1156, #24]: Omt. mol- & mōl- “egg” [Bnd.] | Chara molā “egg” [Crl.] = mōla [Bnd. 1974 MS, 16] | Gmr. *mul [GT]; Benesho mul “egg” [Bnd., also Wdk. 1990, 107], She mul “testicolo” [CR 1925, 621, also Bnd.] | Dizoid: Maji mUlm [Bnd.] = mulm [Mkr.] = mūlm [Keeter apud Bnd. 1996 MS, 1, #24], Sheko mialgu (quoted as ‘Dizi’) “egg” [Bnd.-Flm.] = mi’yalku [Bnd. 1971] = miag ~ mialgu (quoted as ‘Dizi’) [Bnd. 1974 MS, 16], Nao (Nayi) mola [Bnd.-Flm.] = mōla “egg” [Mkr.] = mōla, mōla [Bnd. 1996 MS, #24] || SOM.: Dime mōllo “egg” [Bnd. 1971, 263, #23] = mōllo, mōló [Mkr. after Flm.] = mōl(l)-o [Bnd. 1994, 149] = mōlu [Sbr. 1996 MS, #24] (Om.: Bnd.-Flm. 1976, 49; Bnd. 1971, 260–3, 279, #23; 1988, 149; 1994, 1154, 1156, #24; Mkr. 1987, 33) || CCh.: Hina milti “Eier” [Str. 1922–23, 134]. See also Crl. 1938 III, 172 (NOm.-LECu.-Xamir); Skn. 1995, 31 (NOm.-SBrb.).

NB2: Brb. *ta-mōllal-t “egg” is generally accepted in Berber studies as a derivation from common Brb. *m-l-l “(to be) white” (cf. Bst. 1885, 180–181; Dst. 1925, 270–271, #1; Bynon 1984, 256–257; Mlt. 1991, 257, #24.1), cf. e.g. NBrb.: Izn. ta-mellāl-t “oeuf”, Bqy. ta-meḣḣar-t “oeuf”, pl. i-meḣḣar-en “testicules” (Rif: Rns. 1932, 387) | Qbl. ta-mellal-t, pl. ti-mellal-in “1. oeuf, 2. testicule” [Dlt. 1982, 497]. Thus, it cannot be compared with NOm. *mUl- “egg” unless there was a secondary contamination between PBrb. “egg” vs. PBrb. *m-l-l “white”.

NB3: NOm. *mUl- should be etymologically separated from Om. *pūl-/*bul- “egg” [GT] (Om.: Mkr. 1987, 33) || HECu.: Burji bubūle “egg” [Sasse]. For details cf. Eg. pj (EDE II 414). M. L. Bender (l.c.) reconstructed POm. *mbul “egg” for all Om. forms. But assuming two different AA roots seems more justified.

m3w.tj (dual) “die Arme”, m3w.tj-ḥr “Horusarm (als Name des Geräts im Armgestalt zum Räuchern)” (GR, Wb II 28, 7–8) = “Schultern” (von Bergmann apud Piehl) = “les deux mains” (Piehl 1897, 129–131, §3) = “two arms (in general)” (PL 402).

- Cf. also m3wj “la patte d’un oiseau (les longues pattes de l’ibis)” (Ceugney 1880, 6 after Brugsch) = “bras” (Lefèbvre 1952, 59: Edfu I 16:10), considered by Piehl (1897, 130) as a dialectal form (!) of m3w.tj.
- Etymology debated:
- **1.** Traditionally (Ceugney 1880, 6; Wb l.c.; PL 402) considered to be an m- prefix nomen instr. derivation from Eg. 3wj [*rwy] “to stretch out, reach” (cf. Wb I 3–4), whose origin is debated.
NB: (1) Most probably derives from AA *r-w “large” [GT], cf. PBrb. *r-w “to be large” [GT]: NBrb.: Rif. Uriaghel ti-riu^k-t “largeness” [Rns.], Shilh: Sus tu-rrū-t “largeness” [Dst. 1938, 167], Izn. mi-riu “to be large” [Rns.], Shawya i-rao “large” [Msq. 1879, 517], Shenwa mi-riw “large” [Lst. 1912, 146] (NBrb.: Rns. 1932, 328–329) || SBrb.: Hgr. riu “être large” [Chn.] ||| WCh.: Ngizim rawáu “to grow up” [Schuh 1981, 138]. For Eg.-Tuareg see Cohen 1947, #513. (2) Or, if 3- < *1-, it may be cognate with SBrb.: Hgr. a-lu “être large” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1092], Ghat i-lua “large”, ta-lui-t “largeur” [Nhl. 1909, 172] ||| WCh.: (?) Dwot lō(yi) [unless < *š-y-r] “long” [Kraft 1981, #291]. For Eg.-Hgr. see Snd. 1997, 194, #1. Note that HECu.: Sdm. lowo “much, many”, lowidi “big”, lowināte (m), lowimma (f) “greatness” [Gsp. 1983, 212] cannot be related, since it comes from HECu. *lob-a “big” [Hds. 1989, 417]. (3) Eg. 3wj has been combined also with Sem. *ʔwy: Hbr. ʔwy piel-hitpael “to wish, desire”, *ʔawwā “desire”, ʔawwat nepēš “desire of the soul”, Ar. ʔwy “(in)tendere, sich hinbegeben” (Sem.: GB 15). Lrr. for Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1917, 38–39; 1930, 39, #6.a.15; Alb. 1918, 232; 1927, 209; Brk. 1932, 101, #7. Semantically plausible, cf. e.g. Eng. long vs. to long for ~ Germ. lang vs. verlangen, Sem.: Hbr. hps “to stretch out” → “to desire”; or cp. Sem.: Hbr. qwy qal-piel “to wait, hope” vs. Ar. qawiya “to be stretched, strong, gespannt, fest, stark sein” (Sem.: GB 706). But Sem. *ʔwy seems to be related rather with CCh.: Logone wá ~ wáá (uwá) “1. to want, 2. say, 3. remember” [Lks. 1936, 125]. For the Hbr.-Lgn. etymology see Kogan & Stolbova 1994, 2, #15. (4) H. Abel (1933–1934, 305) compared OEg. 3wj with common Nub. awir “ausbreiten”. Improbable. Such meaning is usually not borrowed, and Nub. -r vs. Eg. -Ø would be unexplained.
- **2.** K. Piehl (1897, 130): originally “celle... qui donne”, derived from Eg. m3^o “donner”. False, since the -^o cannot shift into -w.
- **3.** P. Wilson (PL 402) did not exclude a connection with Eg. m3wḏ “die Arme” (NE, Wb II 28, 16), which she defined as “referring to sg. straight or strong”. Besides, m3wḏ derives rather from m3wḏ “Art Stock” (NE, Wb II 28, 14) = “perche, palanche” (AL 77.1610) = “carrying-pole” (NE, DLE I 207) = “Stab, Tragestange, Stange (an e. Kasten)” (GHWb 319). Plausible provided we assume OK m3wḏ > NK m3wḏ > GR m3wt (secondarily conceived as fem. m3w.t).

m3w3 (GW for **m3w**, **mw3**, or **mw²**) “unbotmäßig, ungehorsam sein” (late NK, Wb II 28, 10; GHWb 319) = “être désobéissant” (AL 78.1626).
NB: The actual root might have been *mw3 [from *mwr ~ *mw]. Wb & GHWb read m3w3, while D. Meeks m3w(3).

- Apparently not a late loan-word. At least, no NWSem. (or other) etymology has been proposed. Depending on in which form we assume the unattested OĒg. etymon, diverse alternative AA cognate sets may be suggested (the first one seems most probable):
- **1.** GT: derives from AA *m-r (perhaps *mur) “to be stubborn (or sim.)” [GT]? Cf. Sem. *mry: OHbr. mr? ~ mry qal “rebellisch, widerspenstig sein” [GB] = “to be recalcitrant, rebellious”, hifil “to behave rebelliously” [KB], MHbr. mry hifil “to be recalcitrant” [KB], NHbr. mry “widerspenstig sein” [GB] | Samar. Aram. mry “rebellion” [Tal 2000, 485] || Ar. mry I “i.a.: jem. das ihm Gebührende vorenthalten”, III “disputieren, sich gegenseitig provozieren” [GB] = I “to incite”, III “to wrangle” [KB after Wehr & Cowan] (Sem.: GB 458–460; KB 632 with further parallels) || NBrb.: Qbl mari “1. s’entêter, 2. se forcer, 3. agir par esprit de contradiction” [Dlt. 1982, 512, 518] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ṣur-ət “s’entêter, être têtu, s’obstiner”, EWlm. ă-ṣṣuru, pl. ă-ṣṣur-ut-ăn “entêtement, fait d’être têtu, obstination” [PAM 1998, 221; 2003, 551] || LECu.: Orm. mormī “opposition, resistance”, mormū “to oppose, argue, contest” [Bitima 2000, 202], Orm.-Borana & Orma) morma “to argue, quarrel”, (Borana, Waata) moroma “argument, quarrel, fight” [Strm. 1987, 370] = Orm.-Borana morma “to argue, quarrel, refuse a suggestion”, morm-aḏḏa “to argue, fight, disagree”, morom-aḏḏa “to disagree, refute, contradict” [Strm. 1995, 210], Som. múrm-ayya “to contradict”, múran [-n < *-m#], pl. múrámmó “argument, disagreement, dispute” [Abr. 1964, 183] | HECu. *morōm- “to argue” [Hds.]: Brj. morom- ~ morōm- “to deny” [Hds.], Darasa (Gedeo) morom- “to argue” [Hds.], Sid. morōm- ~ morom- “to deny” [Hds.] = moroma “to contradict, deny to have done sg.”, morom-âno (f) “one who denies to have done an offence, one who denies the truth” [Gsp. 1983, 237] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 48) || SCu.: perhaps Iqr. mār-īt “to bend, refuse after agreeing earlier” [MQK 2002, 71] || SOM.: Ari mer- “to forbid” [Hyw. 1988, 290] = mér- “to forbid” [Bnd.-Flm.], Dime mir- “to forbid” [Bnd.] (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 150) || CCh.: Bura mula [-l- reg. < *-r-] “1. to become unruly or stubborn, 3. to rebel, 3. get out of hand, give trouble”, mulmula “stubborn, unruly, rebellious”, mulmul-kur “obstinacy, stubbornness” [BED 1953, 144] = mula(î) “sich widersetzen”, mulmula “widersetzlich, -spenstlich, ungehorsam, aufständisch” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 92] || ECh.: perhaps EDng. miré “versagen” [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 98], less probably cf. EDng. màarē “poursuivre (une querelle)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 196].

NB1: Gasparini (1983, 237) surmises apparently an onomatopoetic origin for Sid. moroma rendering the recipr. pass. form moromama- as “to murmur, dispute, contradict what another is saying”, which is rather improbable in view of the AA cognates.

NB2: Dasenech muor “stubborn, fierce, fearless” [Tosco 2001, 519] is probable unrelated, its 1st mng. being “leopard”.

NB3: Leslau (1958, 31) compared Hbr. mry with Tigre t̄-b̄arra < √bry “to lie, deny” with alternation of labials. Uncertain.

- **2.** GT: or perhaps m3w < *mlw? Cf. ECh.: Dangla-Migama *mell-/*mēl- “to refuse” [GT]: WDng. mēlè (tr./intr.) “contester, douter” [Fédry 1971, 128], EDng. mēllyē “douter, contester, contrer, ne pas croire, refuser” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 201], Mgm. mēlò “refuser” [JA 1992, 106].
- **3.** GT: provided it was a GW for *mw, cf. ECh.: EDng. mòwē & WDng. múwè “bouder, être de mauvaise humeur, faire la tête quitter son mari pour retourner chez sa mère” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 210]

m3wj “als Name eines Windgottes (des Westwindes)” (GR, Wb II 28, 6).

NB1: Cf. perhaps also LEg. m3m3 (wind det.) in bh3j.w n m3m3 “?” (GR, Wb II 29, 9).

NB2: Cenival (1987, 3–8; cf. Manning 1991, 156) derived Dem. mj “wind, breath” (only in the myth of the sun-eye 3:30) from m3^c.w “(richtiger) Wind (gern mit dem Zusatz nfr ‘günstiger Wind’)” (MK, Wb II 23), which is phonologically dubious.

- Obscure word. Etymology uncertain. Of interest may be eventually the following AA roots:
 - **1.** GT: cf. WCh.: Gwandara múrà “cold” [Mts. 1972, 83]?
NB: Akk. (jB) merru “Wind” [AHW 646] is out of question, being a Sum. loan.
 - **2.** GT: or cf. LECu.: Rnd. malálwa “sand storm” [Oomen 1981, 71] = “sand storm, dust storm” [PG 1999, 218]?
NB: Cf. also Sem.: OSA (Sab.) mly II “1. winter, 2. winter crop”, cf. mly-m “of winter (?)” [SD 86]? The semantic shift “cold” ~ “wind” is common in AA.
 - **3.** GT: or cf. WBrb.: Zng. a-maya “trombe précédant la tornade” [Ncl. 1953, 203] ||| Bed. mē ~ mī “1. Hagel, 2. Hagelkorn” [Rn. 1895, 161] = mi ~ mī “hailstone” [Rpr. 1928, 213] || SCu.: Ma’a má “blasen” [Mnh. 1906, 312] (unless identical with Ma’a ma “schlagen”) ||| WCh.: Ngizim màrà “coldness, the harmattan, cold season” [Schuh 1981, 110] || CCh.: Hina mii, Musgoy (Daba) mbúí “Wind” (CCh.: Str. 1910, 460) || ECh.: Mokilko màayé “wind” [Lks. 1977, 224] = màayé “vent, air”, cf. móyòyò adj. “frais, froid” [Jng. 1990, 135].
LIT.: Takács 1999, 107, #33 (Eg.-Hina-Mkl.).
- NB1: V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (OS 1992, 188; Orel 1995, 107, #106; HSED #1707) equated ECh.: Mokilko màayé “wind” with MEg. m3^c.w “richtiger Wind” (MK, Wb II 23–24), which derives < OEg. m3^c “right (etc.)” (!).
- NB2: L. Reinisch (1895, 161) suggested a far-fetching etymology for Bed. mē ~ mī, which is phonologically untenable: *may < *mar < *mard = Sem. *brd.

m3wd “Beischrift zu gefangenen kleinen Tieren, die man in Kasten trägt” (since OK, Wb II 28, 13) = “porter, transporter, porter à l’aide d’une palanche” (AL 77.1609: m3wd of Edfu V 119:8 replaced in the parallel text of Edfu IV 186:13 by jwh “charger, transporter”) = “tragen, transportieren (mit einer Tragestange)” (GHWb 319; ÄWb I 504).

• From the same root derive:

(1) m3wd “Art Stock” (late NK, Wb II 28, 14) = “corniche” (Ceugney 1880, 6) = “Stab” (Wreszinski 1909, 175) = “une palanche (sur l’épaule), aux bouts de laquelle sont suspendues des bottes” (Keimer 1942, 318) = “Holzstab” (Helck 1958, 27; MWNR 857) = “Stock” (WMT 349; MWNR 852) = “perche, palanche” (AL 77.1610; 79.1126 with lit.) = “Tragstange oder Joch, urspr.: Querholz bei Pferden und Rindergespanssen, auch: ein einfacher, wenig bearbeiteter Holzbalken” (Hassan 1979, 121–4, esp. 121, fn. 19–30 with a list of NK etc. occurrences) = “carrying-pole, two variations: (1) carried by two men (the load hanging in between them), (2) carried by a single man” (Janssen 1975, 385–7) = “carrying-pole” (late NK 5x, DLE I 207; Vrg. 1982; cf. also Janssen 1961, 44 and Leitz 1999, 33, fn. 13 with exx. and lit.) = “Tragstange” (Helck 1989, 140, §6) = “Stab, Tragestange, Stange (an einem Kasten)” (GHWb 319) = “balancier, palanche” (Vernus 1997, 439–441) = “type of stick, refers to a simple unworked or lightly worked length of wood, used as a stick with which to carry things like a yoke, carried in the hand and can also be used as a measuring stick” (PL 402).

nb1: K. Sethe (ÜKAPT) and D. Meeks (AL 77.1610) found an OK trace of this noun in PT 445d m3d.w nw zm.t (Wb II 35, 7) = “Joche, Holzbrücken” (ÜKAPT VI 129) = “Brückenjochen” (ÜKAPT II 321–2) = “*Brückenjoch, *Stäbe” (GHWb 322), which Meeks read as m3wd. P. Vernus (1997, 439f.), followed by F. Junge (2003, 247, n. 417), translated m3d.w (obscure det., identified by Vernus with D41 + pl. strokes) of Pap. Prisse 13:2 (Wb II 35, 4; Žaba 1956, 153–4, n. 417: “impartialité”) as “les balanciers, les équilibres” (Vernus) = “Balancierstange, Tragejoch” (Junge) and linked it to PT 445d m3d.w.

nb2: A. H. Gardiner (1948, 18) rendered m3wd “stick, staff” in Pap. Wilbour in a figurative sense “foundation” (following Breasted’s translation “endowment”, which Gardiner treated as “at least approximately correct”). Hassan (1979, 121–4), in turn, found the general sense “stick, staff” incorrect and preferred “Joch” and hence metaphorically “Feldbezeichnung” (on the analogy of Lat. iugum “Querholz” vs. iugerum “die von einem unter dem Joch stehenden Gespann beim Pflügen erreichte Leistung”). P. Vernus (1997, 439–441), however, declined the meaning “yoke” (as less convincing) in favour of “balancier, palanche”, from which he derived the figurative sense “apports, revenus, fondation” (in Pap. Wilbour). P. Kaplony (LÄ I 635, n. 6) derived m3wd “Totenstiftung” from m3wd “versehen” (q.v.).

nb3: Naturally, m3wd has nothing to do with m3w.t “Schaft (vom Stock)” (q.v.) as erroneously supposed by Brugsch (Wb 540) and P. Wilson (PL 402), cf. Müller 1893, 33 & fn. 3.

NB4: P. Vernus (1997, 442 & n. 21) sees in the hrgl. (from the 1st IMP) depicting a man carrying a balance with the reading k3rj “gardener” (cf. Fischer 1968, 154–5) the proof for the existence of m3wḏ “balance”, cf. Pap. Sallier II 6:5–8: k3rj ḥr jn.t m3wḏ “le jardinier en train de porter le balancier” (cf. also Brunner 1944, 133; Seibert 1967, 155).

NB5: W. Helck (1971, 513, #86; 1989, 140, §6) suggests a GW reading má-wad (not ma-wad) for NK m3wḏ based upon its suggested Hbr. etymon mōt, which, in view of the OK attestation, cannot be accepted.

NB6: Smith & Gadd (1925, 235, 4) found a cuneiform (Amarna) reflection of *pds n m3wḏ as pišaš ni muʾda (rendered as “the kind of box in which the m3wḏ were carried”) in a list of Eg. words (in the tablet of Ashmolean Museum from Tell el-Amarna 1921, nr. 1154, rt. 4), in which they recognized but misunderstood m3wḏ. J. Vergote (1982) rendered pišaš ni muʾtu “coffre à brancard” declining the rendering “pets carried in a cage”.

(2) m3wḏ “die Arme” (late NK, Wb II 28, 16, cf. Brunner 1944, 34, text 6:5; Janssen 1961, 44).

NB1: A poetic expression (Ostr. Edinburgh 916, 9, cf. W. R. Dawson & T. E. Peet: “The so-called poem on the king’s chariot” in JEA 19, 1933, 173, pl. 29.3). Derives metaphorically from m3wḏ “carrying-pole” as rightly confirmed by Hassan (l.c.).

NB2: P. Kaplony (LÄ I 635, n. 6) denied the sense “Arme” (to be replaced with “Totenstiftung”).

(3) m3wḏ “gezwungen sein etwas zu tun” (late NK, Wb II 29, 1).

Hence also: m3wḏ “vassal (?)” (late NK 1x, DLE I 207) & “Frohnde” (XXII., Wb II 28, 15). Further details in the entry below. Perhaps via a shift of meanings “to be burdened by a duty” < “to carry on shoulder”?

(4) m3wḏ “versehen sein, geschmückt sein mit etwas” (late NK, Wb II 28, 17): for further details see the entry below. Perhaps via “to be equipped” < “to be burdened” < “to carry on shoulder”?

- The original meaning of the Eg. root is questionable. The origin of the strange consonant structure is also dubious. Most probable is solution #3.

- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 22) saw in OEg. m3wḏ a prefix m-, but he was unable to identify the basic root (OEg. *3wḏ or sim.). It would imply that OEg. *3wḏ must have been a verb and m3wḏ its nom. instr. So far, however, I was unable to find parallels of OEg. *3wḏ in AA.

NB: The derivation from wḏ “élever” (sic!) > wḏ “stela” proposed by Ceugney (1880, 6) is certainly out of question.

- 2. Uncritically following the unchecked commentary of Wb II 28, 14 and ignoring the probable OK attestation of the root m3wḏ, a number of authors have erroneously presumed LEg. m3wḏ to represent a foreign loan-word, whereby they treated Eg. m3wḏ as a GW for mwd “carrying-pole” [Ward] = má-wad (not m-wad) [Helck] = m3-wd [Snd.] (sic!) and suggested a borrowing from Can., cf., e.g., Hbr. mōt ~ mōṭā “1. Tragstange, Tragesstelle, bestehend aus mehreren dergleichen Stangen, 2. Joch” [GB 404] = mōṭ “1. carrying-frame, 2. pole” vs. mōṭā “1. yoke, 2. carrying-pole” [KB 555], NHbr. mōṭ

“größere Tragstange”, *mōtā* “kleinere Tragstange” [Dalman 1922, 227; cf. Levy 1924 III, 44–45] etc. This solution has rightly been rejected already by W. M. Müller (1893, 33, fn. 3).

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Helck (1971, 513, #86; 1989, 140, §6), Loprieno (1977, 128), Hassan (1979, 121–4), Vergote (1982), Ward (1989, 76), Th. Schneider (1996, 175).

NB1: With respect to the OK attestation of its root, NEg. *m3wd* cannot be a loanword borrowed from NWSem. If there was a connection, perhaps the Can. word was borrowed from LEg.

NB2: Th. Schneider (1996, 175), in addition, falsely combined Hbr. *mōt* ~ *mōtā* even with Hbr. *maṭṭeh* and Ug. *mṭ* “rod, staff, riding crop” [DUL 602] = “Stab, virga virilis” [WUS #1551], although the two should be carefully separated from one another (cf. Eg. *mdw* below). Similarly false is Hassan’s (1979, 121–4) derivation of Hbr. *mōt* from an absurd *√mdṭ* (sic!). Besides, in GB 404 and KB 555, Hbr. *mōt* is affiliated with Sem. **√mwṭ* attested by Hbr. *mwṭ qal* “wanken”, nifal “wackel, wanken”, Palm. *mwṭ* “Schwankung”, Ar. *myṭ* “abweichen” (these are explained in GB as denom. from Hbr. *mōt!*), which seems equally unconvincing.

- **3. G. Takács** (2004, 57–58, #347, cf. already Takács 1997, 230–1, #15): OEg. *m3wd* < **mrwg* with the primary meaning * “to carry on the shoulders” (whence later: “to carry on a carrying-pole”), which is perhaps a denominative verb from AA **m-r-g* “1. shoulder, neck, back, 2. (denom. vb.) to press the neck, choke” (or sim.) [GT]: Sem.: perhaps Ar. *maraḡa* “4. presser et manipuler un membre du corps” [BK II 1086] (remnant of the old denom. vb.?) ||| LECu. **marg-* “neck” [GT]: Baiso *marg-i* “front of neck” [Flm. apud Brz.] = *marg-i* “front neck” [Hyw. 1979, 127] = *marg-i* “throat” [HL apud Brz.] = *marg-i* “neck”, *marg-is-* (caus.) “to strangle, choke” [LS] = *marg-i* “neck” [Brz. 1995, 19, #26], Som. *māreg* ~ *méreg* “in Verwicklung, Verwirrung, in einem Gedränge sein”, *merg-ī* ~ *mirg-ī* (caus.) “(be)drängen, jemanden am Halse packen und würgen”, *mārg-o* ~ *merg-o* (refl.) “1. sich in ein Gedränge einlassen, 2. sich würgen an etwas, ins Ersticken kommen”, cf. *mérg-i* ~ *mirg-i* “Hals- und Nackensehne” [Rn. 1902, 301] = *mārég*, pl. *mārég-ó* “rope for neck of lamb or kid”, *merg-in-ayya* “to tangle (rope), stick (of meat in throat)” [Abr. 1964, 175, 178] = *marg-at-* “to choke” [Lmb.], Jiddu *merṣ-ə* ~ *merṣ-e* [*-g-] “neck” [Lmb.], Dsn. (Galab) *morg-oč* “hump of cow” [Sasse 1974, 419] (LECu.: Lmb. 1988, 88, #130) || SCu.: cf. perhaps Ma’a *miarega* “Arm” (unless it is a var. of *mu-hālēya* “Arm” [Mnh. 1906, 314] ||| NOm. **mUrg-* “shoulder” [GT]: Omt. (sic) *morg-e* “dorso, spalla” [Mrn. 1938, 153], Wlt. *muorg-ē* “spalla” [Crl. 1929, 33] = *morgiy-a* “1. shoulder, 2. hump” [Lmb.], Gamu *morg-e* “hump” [Lmb. 1985 MS, 3, #62; Sottile 1999, 432], Gofa *morg-e* “shoulder” [Lmb.] | Shinasha (Bworo) *mangr-à* [< **marg-*] “shoulder” [Lmb.] (NOm.-LECu.: Lmb. 1988, 54; 1993, 109; 1993, 354; Hbr.-Lmb.

1988, 129; LS 1997, 466; Bys.-Wlt.: Boisson 1989, 50; 1990, 28) ||| ECh.: Kera ámàrgá “Rückentrage für Säuglinge” [Ebert 1976, 26] | perhaps Smr. márǰē [if -ǰ- < *-g-] “gorge” [Jng. 1993 MS, 44].

AP: Kuliak: Ik morok “throat” [Lmb. 1988, 88, #130: Ik-ECu.].

DP: C. Boisson (1989 MS, 50; 1990, 28) compares distant Nst. parallels like Alt. *omurg- “front part of the shoulder” [Dybo 1989, 205, #13] and Ur.: Samoyed m8rka “shoulder” [Janhunen] (for Ur.-Alt. cf. also Dybo 1989, 200, #23 & 205, #14) as well as Sum. mur₇-gú ~ murgu ≈ Akk. enšēšēru “épine dorsale” & arkatu “back” & būdu “shoulder” [Labat 1976, 233, #567] > Sem.: Akk. murgu “Rückgrat, Schiffskiel” [Deimel, absent in AHW] as to. With regard to the apparent lack of Sem. cognates, the Akk. form seems to be rather a loan from. In addition, the Sum. form may be a compound (cf. Sum. gú “neck”), which excludes the comparison of the Akk. & Sum. forms.

NB1: In the Cushitological lit. (e.g. Sasse 1982, 148; Lmb. 1988, 88, #130; Hbr.-Lmb. 1988, 129; LS 1997, 466), the ECu.-NOM. words for “shoulder, neck” etc. are combined with the reflexes of ECu. *murk- “gristle (?)” [Sasse] = “soft part, tendon (?)” [GT], cf. LECu.: Orm. mórg-ā [Rn.] = morg-aya “tendon, nerve” [Sasse, Hbr.-Lmb.], Orm.-Borana of Isiolo morg-ā “tendons, muscles” [Strm. 1987, 369], Konso murq-a “soft band” [Sasse], Gdl. morq-a “bone of nose, soft part of ensete” [Sasse], Arb. morgi (m) “tendon, sinew” [Hyw. 1984, 385] | Som. múruq “die sehnigen Bestandteile am Oberarm oder an den Waden, Muskeln” [Rn. 1902, 302] = muruq “muscle” [Sasse], Arb. morg-i “tendon, sinew” [Hbr.-Lmb.] | HECu.: Drs. (Gedeo) morgē-o “tendon (of neck?)” [Hds. 1989, 256], Sdm. morgogg-e “hock” [Lsl.], probably Burji *morg- “(?)” in morg-ánka miča “ankle” (miča “bone”) [Sasse 1982, 148] (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 195) | Yaaku morǰ-i “sinew (of neck)” [Heine 1975, 133].

NB2: The etymology of ECh.: Lele mòrngó ~ mòròngó “manche à houé” [WP 1982, 65] is questionable.

- **4.** GT: another possibility is OEg. m3wd < *mlwg = (?) ES: Amh. malogiya “pole for carrying a heavy burden/object”, translation of Geez malgam (sic) “means of carrying, pole used in acrrying burdens, litter” given by Tayyā (ES: Lsl. 1987, 342).

NB: Again arises the question of the quadrilateral root. W. Leslau (l.c.) rightly derives Geez malgam from a *lgm, which is, however, unattested. The Amh. -y- ≠ Geez -m- is strange. The hypothetical OEg. *3wd [*lwg] would be comparable with Amh., but hardly with Geez *lgm.

- **5.** GT: or cp. perhaps Brb. *m-r-ǰ > NBrb.: Swy. i-merǰi-n (pl.) “en suite, auprès cela” [Bst.] || WBrb.: Zng. a-merǰi, pl. a-merǰ-un “dos” [Bst.] = a-merǰi “Rücken” [Zhl. 1942–43, 89] (Brb.: Bst. 1890, 314)?

m3wd “gezwungen sein etwas zu tun” (late NK, Wb II 29, 1; GHWb 319) = “être contraint à faire qqch.” (AL 77.1611) = “to be compelled” (DLE I 207).

- Hence also: m3wd “vassal (?)” (late NK 1x, DLE I 207) & “Frohnde” (XXII., Wb II 28, 15).
- GT: the semantically closest parallel appears in WCh.: Hausa múrgù “payment made by slave to his owner in lieu of working personally” [Abr. 1962, 685].

NB: The semantic development of LEg. m3wđ “to be burdened by a duty” < “to carry on shoulder” is not to be excluded, see OEg. m3wđ (above) and esp. Ar. maraġa “4. presser et manipuler un membre du corps” [BK II 1086] ||| LECu.: Som. märeg ~ méreg “in Verwicklung, Verwirrung, in einem Gedränge sein”, merg-ī ~ mirg-ī (caus.) “(be)drängen, jemanden am Halse packen und würgen”, märg-o ~ merg-o (refl.) “1. sich in ein Gedränge einlassen, 2. sich würgen an etwas, ins Erstücken kommen” [Rn. 1902, 301] = Som. märeg ~ mereg “to be in a throng”, merg-īn “thronging” & Jbr. márek “to be in a throng” [Hhn. 1975, 92 with Nil. parallels].

m3wđ “versehen sein, geschmückt sein mit etwas” (late NK, Wb II 28, 17; GHWb 319).

- GT: the semantically closest parallel appears in EBrb.: Gdm. e-mrəġ “être armé (piège)” [Lanfry 1973, 216, #1023].

NB1: The semantic development of LEg. m3wđ “to be equipped” < “to be burdened” < “to carry on shoulder” and thus an ultimate derivation from Eg. m3wđ “to carry on shoulder” (see above) is not to be excluded. Is this shift of meaning valid also for Gdm.?

NB2: Lanfry connected Gdm. e-mrəġ (as var.) to e-rməġ “donner une fête, être désarmé (piège)”. Dubious.

m3f.t “Art Baum, dessen drđ offizinell verwendet wird” (Med.: Pap. Ebers 614, i.e., 77:19, Wb II 29, 2) = “ein unbekannter Baum, dessen Blätter offizinell verwendet werden” (WÄDN 213) = “une plante” (AL 79.1127: cf. Germer 1979, 368 & Aufrère 1990, 262–3, 288–290 yielding no rendering either) = “e. Baum” (GHWb 319).

NB: W. Westendorf (1962, 25, §40.c) pondered a connection with the hapax Eg. mnf.t (q.v., existence dubious, error for mnš.t of šnf.t?), which would suggest an orig. *mlf.t. Improbable.

- From the same root (?): m3f (plant det.) “ein pflanzlicher Stoff (Bez. für Myrrhen)” (GR, Wb II 29, 3) = “Myrrh” (Junker, Philä I 107:6) = “a plant” (PL 402 comparing m3f.t of Ebers).
- Specimen obscure. No clear etymology. Any connection to LECu.: Afar malif “grass which springs up after the first fall of rain” [PH 1985, 162]?

NB: NBrb.: Mzab t-maləf-t, pl. ti-mulaf “madrier (en troue de palmier surtout)” [Dlh. 1984, 118] is probably unrelated

m3fd.t “ein katzenartiges Tier (mit scharfen Krallen): Art Gepard (?)” (OK, Wb II 29, 5–6) = “Art Panther (?)” (Grapow 1914, 22) = “mongoose or cat” (Gardiner in JEA 24, 1938, 89–90) = “lynx (?)” (Drioton 1942, 102) = “un félin (à préciser) qui coupe la tête du serpent” (Lacau 1954, 127 & fn. 1) = “eine Ginsterkatzenart: Ginetta” (Kees 1956, 33) = “a cat (?)” (FD 103) = “eine Großkatze: Gepard (?), Pantherkatze (?), Jagdleopard (?) (als Schlangenvertilgerin)” (West-

endorf 1966, 131, 140) = “lioness” (Smith 1979, 162) = “un félin, le guépard (?)” (AL 77.1612) = “perhaps a mongoose” (Faulkner in AECT III 47 & 49, spell 885, n. 2) = “Ginsterkatze” (Störk in LÄ II 598, so also Osing 1998, 257, debated by Leitz 1996, 402) = “Gepard (?)” (Störk in LÄ II 530 & n. 5) = “Schlangenhalspanther” (GHWb 319) = “cat (or ichneumon or mongoose) goddess (protective)” (PL 402–3) = “a cat-goddess (?)” (DCT 157).

NB1: FÄW 173: first attested under Semerkhet (Dyn. III), although attestation from Dyn. I has also been proposed (WD II 58, cf. RdE 4, 1940, 220f; LÄ III 1132).

NB2: For the *Schlangenkämpferin* nature of PT m3fd.t see Grd. in JEA 24 (1938), 89–90 & Leitz 1996, 402. For a detailed discussion of Mafdet see Westendorf 1966, 128–143.

NB3: Sometimes written as masc. m3fd (Jéquier 1921, 99; 1921, 146: MK; FÄW 173: OK; PL 402–3: GR Edfu, “*masc. form of Mafdet or a word for tom cat?*”).

- Exact specimen disputed. No fully satisfactory etymology. Although almost all specialists agree in presuming a derivation by a prefix m-, the etymon *3fd is disputed.

NB: The details of its supposed etymologies were most recently discussed by F. Kammerzell (1994), who, however, failed to consider or apparently overlooked several pieces of the etymological literature on m3fd.t, e.g. the works by Reinisch, Jéquier, Brockelmann, Smith discussed below.

- 1. L. Reinisch (1873, 249) combined the following parallels: Eg. bḥwj “Hyäne” (sic) bgs.w “Tiger” (sic) & p3ḥ.t & m3fd.t & m3j “Löwe” ~ Teda duguli “Löwe”. Absurd.
- 2. H. Grapow (1914, 6, 22): OEg. m3fd.t derived by m- prefix. But he left *3fd unidentified.
- 3. G. Jéquier (1921, 146–7, also 1921, 100): probably m- prefix + fd “4” (the additional -3-caused in his view by the initial “a” [sic!] of fd “4”) → m3fd.t meant originally “pour les quatre (membres)”. Very weak.
- 4. C. Brockelmann (1932, 105, #26; cf. GÄSW #620) and (apparently independently) A. Militarev (2005, 98; also SED II 226) suggested a relationship of the supposed OEg. *3fd with Sem.: Ar. fahd- “Gepard” [Brk., cf. BK II 640] = “the lynx, lupus cervarius (a well-known beast of prey, with which one hunts, and which sleeps much)” [Lane 2452]. Militarev: “*a striking semantic coincidence makes this comparison interesting in spite of only a partial similarity*”.
NB1: Phonologically improbable: Eg. 3-vs. Ar. -h- are irregular. Militarev (l.c.) assumed an infix (!) -h- in Sem.
NB2: This proposal was apparently overlooked by F. Kammerzell in his 1994 monograph.
NB3: For further Sem. cognates see Kogan (2000, 1, #1) & SED II 225–6, who set up PSem. *pahd- “хищное животное” (Kogan) = “cheetah” (SED).
- 5. H. Kees (1941 & 1956, 33), followed by W. Westendorf (1966, 137; cf. ZDMG 118, 1968, 249f.), M. Smith (1979, 162), and K. Kuhlmann

(LÄ II 701): Eg. m3fd.t originally meant “die Kletterin” (Kees) = **“die Läuferin”* (Westendorf) = “the ranging (lioness)” (Smith) = **“die Rennende”* (Kuhlmann), a substantivized participle derived by m- from Eg. jfd “to flee” (XVIII., FD 17) = “to hasten through” (Smith) < orig. *3fd (Kees). Cf. also LEg. mfd [< *m3fd?] “(ein Land) durchlaufen” (GR, Wb II 58, 6) = “to travel through” (Smith) and mfd “der Dahinstürmende” (Westendorf: Edfu I 312). Dubious. No proof for NK jfd < OK *3fd.

NB: Cf. the det. of m3fd.t depicting “die senkrecht am šms-Gerät hrauflaufende m3fd.t” (Westendorf).

- **6.** H. Altenmüller (1972, 242): OEg. m3fd.t meant actually **“die Feblerin”*, akin to MEg. m3fd “Art Armband” (CT, Wb II 29, 4), derived from an unattested OEg. *3fd “schnüren, fesseln”. Not too convincing.

NB: PT 672 tt.t ʿ3.t “die Große Feblerin” is parallel with PT 440–441 m3fd.t “Mafdet”.

- **7.** F. Kammerzell (1994, 17–31) renders OEg. m3fd.t as **“reißende Katze”* or **“reißender Löwe”*, composed of m3j “lion” + fdj “ausreißen” (on the analogy of m3j-ħz3). Impressive.

NB1: But the mass of AA *comparanda* offered by Kammerzell for Eg. fdj is more than problematic (details discussed in the entry for Eg. fdj in EDE II, q.v.).

NB2: W. Westendorf (1966, 137) cites evidence for Eg. m3fd.t occasionally apparently conceived as a compound. Thus, BD (Naville) 39 (var. Ba) has m3j instead of m3fd.t, while BD 34 (Pc) has only fd.t (cat det.) as if only the 2nd component were written. Westendorf considers the writing f3jfd.t (sic) quoted by Allen (1960, 123) as a proof for a reinterpretation of the compound as *f3j-jfd “die von vier Füßen getragene”, while he conceived the later var. writing mjfd.t either (1) as a pseudo-etymology mj.t “cat” (+ fd “?”) or (2) as a derivation by m- prefix + jfd still in use.

- **8.** GT: *3fd < *rfd, perhaps cognate with WCh.: Hausa furdi “lion, wild beast” [Robinson apud Pls. 1960, 106, #12] = húrdì < *furdi “epithet of: 1. chief, 2. lion, 3. energetic person” [Abr. 1962, 392].

NB: N. Pilszczikowa (l.c.) analyzed Hausa -di as complement (sic), not as part of the root, which seems unjustified.

m3m3 “Dumpalme” (BD, Wb II 29, 7; cf. Brugsch 1891, 29–30; Müller 1894, 31, fn. 1) = “cucifère: Cucifera thebaïca” (Loret 1880, 23, 25, fn. 4 after Unger and Brugsch) = “dom-palm” (FD 103) = “Dumpalme (palmier doum): Hyphaene thebaïca Mart., Cucifera thebaïca Del.” (Keimer 1984 II, 64, §99; Loret 1892/1975, 140 & 33–34, §36; Devauchelle 1980, 68; Germer 1985, 235; 2002, 39; GHWb 320; Manniche 1999, 108–9; for a detailed discussion see esp. Caminos 1954, 322; Wallert 1962, 50–52; Śliwa 1975, 11 & fn. 12; and Baum 1988, 106f., §4).

NB: Cf. NK m3m3 n h3nn.t (Urk. IV 73) “doum à noyaux, Hyphaene Argun Mart.” (Loret 1892/1975, 140 & 34, §37) = “Medemia argun (nahe Verwandte der Dumpalme), eig. Dumpalme mit (besonderen) Kernen” (Wallert 1962, 53) = “Argunpalme” (Keimer 1984 II, 64; Germer 1985, 235) = “Medemia argun Württemb. et Mart.” (Baum 1988, 179f., §14).

- Hence: m3m3.w “les fruits du palmier doum” (AL 77.1614).
- 1. GT: perfect match of NBrb.: Mzab a-mlaw, pl. i-mlaw-ən “datte molle, à demi mûre” [Dlh. 1984, 118] || SBrb.: Hgr. ě-mellé, pl. i-mellĭt-en “nom d’une espèce de dattiers, 2. dattes produites par les dattiers ě mellé” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1193] || NOM.: Mao mulu “palma” [Grt. 1940, 356] || ECh.: Lele milí “deleb-palm” [Simons 1981, 8, #110.c] = “Borassus flabellifer: palmier rônier, Rônier” [WP 1982, 63]. Cf. perhaps also NOM.: Kaffa mell-ō “sicomoro” [Crl. 1951, 471]?
- 2. GT and W. G. E. Watson (2001 MS, 3): alternatively, cf. Sem.: Akk. marratu (jB) “Bez. einer Dattelpalme (eig.: das Bittere)” [AHW 612] = (Oakk.) “name of the date palm, a tree” [CAD m1, 286] || Ug. mrr-t “date-palm”, only in mrrt tyll bnr “date-palm which produces dates” [Watson 1976, 374, fn. 20; 1998, 752, #3; 2001, 118]. Less probable.

NB: M. C. Astour (JAOS 108, 1988, 550) explained Ug. mrrt as “bitter lettuce” derived from Sem. *mrr “bitter” (cf. Watson 2001, 118, fn. 21).

m3r.w (rope det.) “als jüngere Deutung eines m3rw der Pyr.” (CT, Wb II 30, 10) = “(pl.) *Binden, Fesseln” (OK: V. 1x, GHWb 320; ÄWb I 505).

- GT: derived from *w3r, cf. Eg. w3r.w “Armband” (OK, Wb II 252, 9), w3r “(das Netz mit Getreide) zusammenschnüren” (OK, Wb I 252, 2), later w3rt “Schnur, Strick” (BD, Wb II 252). The same root is present in Eg. w3 “Schnur, Strick” (OK, Wb I 244, 1–3) || WCh.: Angas-Sura *wā₂r “necklace” [GT 2004, 400]: Angas weer “beads, which are generally worn only round, round the waist” [Flk. 1915, 301–302] = wèr ~ nwèr (K) “necklace”, ηwèer (Ks) “beads (around the neck)” [Jng. 1962 MS, 29–30] = nwèr “necklace” [ALC 1978, 49], Mpn. ηwàar “string of beads” [Frj. 1991, 46], Kfy. wàar (tok) “necklace” (tok “neck”) [Ntg. 1967, 42] | Daffo-Butura wàar “dünnes, gedrehtes Metallarmband” [Jng. 1970, 222].

NB: Eg. w3r has nothing to do with Sem. *wat- (as suggested by W. Spiegelberg 1914, 424 and W. F. Albright 1918, 90, fn. 2; 1918, 247, #99). Similarly, it is hardly related to Ar. w’y “to promise, vow”, wa’y- “promise, band, troop, crowd” (contra Ember 1930, 8, #3.a.16).

m3r “der Elende, Hilfsbedürftige” (since end of OK: VI., Urk. I 269:7, Wb II 30, 2–3) = “wretched man, pauper” (FD 103; DCT 157: CT VII 466e) = “der Elende, Hilfsbedürftige, Arme, Unterdrückter” (GHWb 320; ÄWb I 504–5). Cf. GR m3r “to be wretched, lowly” (PL 403). NB: For a new rdg. and translation of PT 222 m3rw rendered as “die Nöte (der Unterwelt)” (ÜKAPT I 116) = “needs” (AEPT 50) = “Bedrängnis” (Spiegel 1971, 214f.) see Altenmüller 1988, 7, fn. 14.

- From the same root: m3r “das Elend, die Not des einzelnen Menschen” (MK, Wb II 30, 4) = “misery” (FD 103; DCT 157: already in CT I 233d) = “Misere, Elend, Problem” (GHWb 320).
- Etymology debatable depending on whether the m- represents a root radical or a prefix:

- **1.** In Egyptian philology (Grapow 1914, 22, 17; Wb l.c.; Sethe in ÜKAPT VI 129; Edel in AÄG 110, §256; NBÄ 588–589, n. 518; Hannig in GHWb 320; also Zbr. 2005, 25, §5.6), usually derived from Eg. 3r “verdrängen von” (MK, Wb I 11) = “to drive away from, oppress (the poor)” (FD 3), which implies an originally passive meaning (*“der Bedrängter”) formed by the Eg. prefix m- of participles. Plausible and probable.

NB1: MEg. 3r has no convincing etymology. A. Ember (1930, #3.a.15) combined it with Akk. ʔrr “verfluchen” [AHW 65], cf. also Hbr. ʔrr qal, piel “to curse, verfluchen” [GB 68]. Semantically incorrect.

NB2: K. Sethe (l.c.) mentioned also an Eg. simplex w3r without details, cf. w3r “verwünschen, tadeln” (XXII., Wb I 252, 12). Semantically dubious.

- **2.** GT: less probably, in turn, if its m- was part of the root, Eg. m3r [< *mrr?] could be a reflex of AA *m-r “1. hungry, 2. poor” [GT], cf. PCu. *mar- [GT]: SAgaw: Awngi merki [Waldmeyer] = märketúya “ho fame” [Beke] = märki “affamato, fame” [CR 1905, 168–9] = märki “hunger”, mərək-t-əŋ “to be hungry” [Apl. 1994 MS, 14] || LECu.: WOmō-Tana: Elmolo mār “hunger” [Heine 1973, 280] = mār; m’arra (m) “hunger” [Heine 1980, 207], Arb. mār “hunger” [Hyw. 1984, 383] || WCh.: Hausa máúrò “poor man, ‘the man in the street’”, cf. màýáá-tà & màýàà-ćéé “to become poor” [Abr. 1962, 669–670] | Ngamo mùrèè “poor” [Alio 1988 MS] || CCh.: Musgu-Girvidik mǎrgà & Pus morga-kai “arm” [MB 1972 MS, 1]. Cf. also NBrb.: Qbl. e-mri “être tourmenté, troublé”, cf. a-mray “être difficile, lourd, grave” [Dlt. 1982, 518]?

NB1: It is unavoidable to mention PCh. *maya [Nwm. 1977, #71] = m-y “1. hunger, 2. want, desire” [JS 1981, 145A] = *m-y “hunger” [JI 1994 I, 96], whose reflexes apparently show no trace of a medial *-r-. Therefore, the relationship of PCh. *m-y with SAgaw & WOmō-Tana *mar- “hunger” [GT] can be safely ruled out. But, in principle, if MEg. m3r was in fact a “pseudohistorical” orthography (Müller 1909; Schenkel 1965, 115; Vycichl 1951, 71; 1983, 29: *graphie archaisante*) of OEg. *m3j < *m-ʔ-y, we may not exclude an eventual connection with PCh. *m-y. H. Jungraithmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I, 96) mention “a remote possibility that Ch.

*my is related to Sem. *mny ‘wünschen, wollen’ (A. B. Dolgopolsky p.c.). Hardly so. There is no match of Sem. *-n- in the Chadic root.

NB2: The semantic shift “poor” < “hungry” is attested in AA, cf. e.g. in OEG: ḥqr “hungry” (OK, Wb III 174) → Dem. ḥqr “1. hungry, 2. poor” (DG 334) → Cpt.: (S) 2HK€ “poor” (CED 277).

m3r (T12 “bow-string” det.) “berauben von... (m)” (MK, Wb II 30, 5) = “berauben an (m)” (Anthes 1928, 49 after Sethe) = “to dispossess (s’one of)” (FD 103) = “verdrängen, beseitigen aus (m)” (GHWb 320). NB: Cf. perhaps also the name of the god mj (with T12 det.) in CT 292b (hapax, DCT 160)? R.O. Faulkner (AECT III 134, sp. 1041) sees in a var. of 3j < 3r (T12 “bow-string” det.) “Oppressor” (CT *ibid.*: vars. B13C, B4L, B2Bo). L. Lesko (1972, 46, n. h), in turn, interprets it as “Mummy-wrapper” (or alternatively “Equalizer”).

● Etymology debatable depending on whether the m- represents a root radical or a prefix:

■ **1.** In Egyptian philology (Wb l.c.; Reintges 1994, 226; GHWb l.c.), usually derived directly from Eg. 3r (T12 “bow-string” det.) “jem. verdrängen von” (MK, Wb I 11) = “to drive away from, oppress (the poor)” (FD 3) = “to dispossess” (Reintges), i.e., as verbal prefix m-. Plausible.

NB: R. Anthes (l.c.) declined his earlier rendering for m3r “jmdn. verelenden auf ...” and thus apparently also its denom. derivation from m3r “wretched”.

■ **2.** G. Takács (2005, 169, #88): less probably, Eg. m3r (if < *mʔr) might be perhaps cognate with the reflexes of AA *m-(ʔ)-r “to rob” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Bed. maray “nehmen, rauben”, meri ~ meru “nehmen, erbeuten, bekommen, finden”, mára “Beute, Fund” [Rn. 1895, 171, 173] = miri “to find, get” [Rpr. 1928, 218] || NAGaw: Qwara mir “rauben, plündern” [Rn. 1885, 100], Kemant mirəḥ ~ -k “piller, faire des prisonniers de guerre” [CR 1912, 231] || LECu.: perhaps Saho mir “ohne Rast marschieren um einen Ort zu erreichen, einen feindlichen Überfall machen” [Rn. 1890, 271] | HECu. *mōr- “to steal” [Hds. 1989, 418]: Drs. (Gedeo) mōr- [Hds.], Sid. mor- ~ moḏ- “rubare”, mor-āncō “ladro” [Crl. 1938 II, 213; Mrn. 1940, 230] = mōr- “to steal” [Hds. & LS] = môra “1. to steal, rob, 2. (m) theft” [Gsp. 1983, 237] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 143, 152) || PCh. *m-r- “to steal” [Nwm.]: WCh. *m-H-r [Std. 1987, 233–4]: AS *muḃur > *mūr → *mōr “to steal” [GT 2004, 254]: Gerka mur “to rob, steal”, kur-go-mur “thief” [Ftp. 1911, 219–220] = mur [Nwm.], Msr. mukur “1. to steal, 2. dump” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 185], Gmy. muggur (sic, -gg-!) [old *-γ- retained as -gg-?] “to rob” vs. muggur (so, -ggr) “to steal”, gurrum-go-mugr (so, -gr) “thief” (gurrum “man”) [Ftp. 1911, 219–220] = mūr [mūr < *mūr via *mōr] “1. to thief, 2. theft” [Srl. 1937, 148] = mīr [mūr] “stealing”, ni mīr “to steal” [Krf. I, 55, #386] = mur [mūür] “1. to steal, 2. thief” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 23] | BT *mōru [Schuh]: Glm. mūr-aalā [Schuh] = mór “thief”, mór “1. to steal, 2. theft” [Alio 1988 MS], Grm. mōorə- [Schuh], Gera mōorə-mí [Schuh], Kirfi mōyóru-wò [Schuh] (BT: Schuh 1978, 154; 1984, 218) | SBCh.: Burma pù-mùre, Buli pì-murù, Saya bi-miri [Smz.] = mōor [Csp.], Grnt. fi meerè [Jgr. 1989, 188] = méré “to steal”, méré “theft” [Haruna 1992 MS, 23] = meere [Csp.], Zaar fi mugür [Csp.], Polchi miyiri [Csp.], Tala muur [Csp.], Bgm. mōii [Csp.], Mangas muur [Csp.], Kir mwùr [Csp.], Bubure mórè “theft, thief”, móorèè “to steal” [Haruna 1993 MS, 28, P040 & 29, P043, fl11] (SBCh.: Csp. 1994,

34, 67; WCh.: Std. 1987, 233–234) || CCh.: Tera muura [Nwm. 1977] = múru “to steal”, nà-múru “thief” [Nwm. 1964, 39, #132 & 48] || ECh.: Smr. mi [*-r] “voler (derober)” [Jng. 1993 MS, 45] | Jegu marɲ “stehlen” [Jng. 1961, 115], Mubi mérɲ [Lks.] = màràɲ “voler, derober” [Jng. 1990 MS, 33], Birgit màmèrɲà “voleur” [Jng. 1973 MS; 2004, 356] (Ch.: NM 1966, 239; Nwm. 1977, 32; JI 1994 II, 308–309). LIT.: Müller 1975, 69, #76 (Sid.-PCh.); JI 1994 I, 159 (Ch.-HECu).

NB2: C. T. Hodge (1966, 44) quotes WCh.: Hausa ʔàmóórèè “highway robbery”, equated mistakenly with Eg. ʔw3j “to steal, rob” (OK, FD; cf. Wb I 171). But Eg. -w- ≠ Hausa -m-. Moreover, R. C. Abraham (1962, 31) gives only Hausa ʔyaɲ àmóórè “Northern Filani bowmen-highwaymen”.

NB3: L. Reinisch (1885, 100) linked Qwr. mir “rauben, plündern” to Bln. wårär and further ES forms. Unacceptable.

NB4: The HECu. root was sometimes extended by *-g-, i.e. HECu. *morg- “to steal” [Sasse 1982, 148]: Kmb. moggaʔ- “to steal” [Hds.: -rg- < *-rg-], Brj. mōrg-ēd- ~ morg-ēd- “to steal”, mōř-ō “thief” [Sasse 1982, 147] = morř-o “ladro” [Mrn. 1940, 230] = morřó “thief” [Hds.], Tmb. mogg-áʔeʔ “to steal” [Lsl.], Alb. mogg-é “to steal” [Lsl.], Qbn. mogg-ānčo “thief” [Lsl.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 152; Lsl. 1988, 195). H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibrizimow (1994 I, 159) suggest that this additional HECu. -g- be compared with the hypothetical PCh. *m-g-r “to steal”, which is based on WCh.: Kirfi mòγòrú-, Zaar mugùr and ECh.: Mkl. ʔòògrá [JI: < *ʔowgra < *ʔomgra < *mogra?] (while in the other reflexes an erosive process is postulated: *m-g-r → *m-γ-r → *m-H-r → *m-r). With respect to the AA data, I suspect that -g- & -γ- were in the quoted Chadic words only secondary (cf. Dlg. 1982). JS 1981, 252A set up Ch. *m-g-r (Kirfi, SBch., Smr.) vs. *m-r-ɲ “to steal” (Tera, Sokoro, Mubi-Toram).

NB5: Ch. Ehret (1987, #425) identified Bed. meri & maray with HECu.: Kmb. mass- [Ehret: caus. *mar-s-] “to take” and SCu.: Irq. mara “1. load of ivory; 2. cow bought with ivory” | Ma’a mmarú “load” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 154). Recently, V. Blažek (2000, 70, #103) adopted the Bed.-HECu.-SCu. comparison, quoting an interesting extra-AA parallel: OElam. muri- “to grasp” [Koch-Hinz 1987, 885]. The SCu. etymology seems to me semantically unconvincing. I am reluctant to compare Kmb. mass- with HECu. *mōr- esp. because of the different vocalism. Cf. OEg. mz(3).

NB6: M. Lamberti (LS 1997, 465) affiliated Sid. mōr- “to steal” with NOm.: Wlt. mōr- “1. to make a mistake, 2. destroy, etc.”. Dubious (see Eg. mɲ “stranden”).

NB7: P. Newman (1977, 32) suspected in PCh. *m-r- “to steal” an *m- (agental prefix) + *x-r- “to steal” (sic).

- **3.** GT: alternatively (provided MEg. m3r < *mll), cf. Sem.: Akk. malālu G (a/jB) “ausplündern”, Št (spB) “(alle Güter) überall weghehlen (?)”, hence (aB) millatu “Plünderung” [AHW 594, 652] || OSA: Madhabi *mly & Sab. ml-t “pillage, prise de guerre” [Arbach 1993 MS, 70: absent in Qtb. and Hdrm.] || Amh. mälämmälä “to take a portion of” [Lsl.] (Akk.-Amh.: Lsl. 1969, 20) ||| HECu.: Hdy. malāyye hōr- “to rob” [Hds. 1989, 125: isolated in HECu.] ||| CCh.: perhaps Mofu-Gudur máyal “voleur” [Brt. 1988, 193] (unless prefix ma-).

NB: W. Leslau (l.c.) forced comparing Amh. mlml both with Akk. mll and Geez mällha “to extract, extirpate”, which is unacceptable for me. Amh. mlml clearly belongs with Akk. mll, while Amh. mlḥ displays a different root (cf. Eg. mnh). Thus explaining Amh. mlml from an orig. tricons. *mlḥ (so Leslau) is baseless.

m3rw “Lusthaus o.ä., auch als Bez. der Haltestellen beider Prozession”, p3 m3rw n jtn “Name einer Gartenanlage in Tell Amarna” (since Amenhotep III, Wb II 30, 6–8 & GHwB 320) = “viewing-place (in sun-cult)” (Badawy 1956; FD 103) = “garden house” (Stadelmann 1978, 179) = “Landkapellen (?) bis GR errichtet an Tempeln” (Stadelmann, LÄ V 1260) = “repositoir, belvédère” (AL 77.1618; cf. JNES 10, 1951, 241; AL 79.1135) = “(GR Edfu) le lieu où réside l’animal sacré et vers lequel se dirige la procession au matin du 1^{er} tybi, c’est-à-dire un édifice (qui peut atteindre ou même dépasser l’importance du mammisi et qui se trouve à proximité du temple)” (El-Sayed 1979, 180, n. ar pace Alliot 1954 II, 577–9) = “Marw(-Aten)” (DLE I 207) = “belvédère” (Cauville 1987, 197) = “Lusthaus (Stätte höfischer Vergnügungen und der Verehrung des Gottes)” (Hanke in LÄ III 1102, cf. LÄ VII 464 index) = “sortes de repositoirs où l’on exposait les statues divines au cours des processions” (Chassinat in Edfu VIII introduction, p. xiii) = “summer house, pavilion, (in general) a place in which a god can appear and be seen when he is resting; small temple (such as the mammisi and pylon gate, the falcon’s temple or even the balcony of appearance and the whole of the temple building itself” (GR Edfu, PL 404–5). Hence: Dem. m3rw “kiosk, belvedere” (Dem. Pap. Ashmolean D.7, line 4, 2nd cent. BC, Reymond 1973, 78–79 & n. 7). NB1: Cf. also PN ḥ³j-m-m3(3)nr with eye (D6) + house det. (XIX., Wb II 30, 1; Ranke PN I 263:25), in which -m3(3)nr (Wb: -m3nr; Ranke: -mnr) may be a GW for *-ml. Similarly, the var. m33 in Pap. Sallier IV (Leitz 1994, 399: to be read m3rw) is written just like m33 “to see” (+ D35: “arms in gesture of negation” + house det.). NB2: For archaeological evidence as well as for a supposed m3rw in the late MK cf. El-Sayed 1979, 180, 202.

● Etymology disputed:

- **1.** A. S. Chetveruhin (1990, 139, fn. 18); G. Takács (1995, 106, #4; 1995, 159): if the suggestive rendering “viewing-place” proves correct, there seems to be an etymological connection with Eg. m33 “to see” (q.v.). NB: Eg. m3rw was usually written with the eye hrgl. (D6) accompanying also m33 “to see” as det.
- **2.** A. Badawy (1956, 58–64) explained m3rw lit. “viewing-place (where Aten could be seen every day)” eventually (to be derived with prefix m-) from Sem. *r²y “to see”, cf. Hbr. mar²eh “1. seeing, 2. appearance, 4. lustre, brilliance” [KB 630]. P. Wilson (PL 405) extended this equation (“*from the same Semitic root!*”) to GR m3r “likeness” (hapax, Edfu IV 279:1). Unacceptable.
- **3.** W. M. Müller (quoted in GB 426) explained Eg. “manra” (sic) as a borrowing from OT Hbr. millō’ “Name eines Teiles der Festungswerke an der Burg von Jerusalem” [GB 426] = “landfill, earthwork, rampart, terraced structure (used for different purposes)” [KB 587],

rendered also as “Bauwerk auf Terrasse und zwar an der Ostflanke des Südosthügels (Ophel) Jerusalems, der alten Davidsstadt” [B. Mazar apud Görg] = “eine besonders hervorgehobene Auffüllung, die beispielsweise die Residenz des Stadtfürsten trug, dann auch die Aufschüttung für Tempel und Palast (im Norden der (nach)salomonischen Davidsstadt) oder einfach die salomonische Akropolis” [P. Welten apud Görg 1976, 30, n. 6–7].

- 4. Following Müller’s (l.c.) idea, M. Görg (1976, 29), in turn, insists on a continuity between NK mr.w “(nicht Kanäle, sondern) Gärten vor einem Tempel” and the m3rw-“Anlagen” (which he considered as a GW for mr.w). Similarly, W. Helck (LÄ II 378) assumed a relationship of OK mr.t “Häuser mit einem Kult von Hathor und Horus” ~ NK mr.w “Gärten, die vor einem Tempel angelegt sind” and XVIII. m3rw. In addition, Görg (1978, 30) ponders whether the OT term was borrowed (!) from NK m3rw, i.e. GW mrw (Görg: act. *mallu) with an original sense “Bez. einer parkähnlichen, wohl auch mit auffälligen Bauten besetzten Anlage im Süden des solomonischen Tempelbezirks”, that is, a “Miniaturausgabe des M3rw-Jtn, ein Gottesgarten in Jerusalem”, concluding with a poetic query “*lag das Paradies... vielleicht im Ägypten?*”. Rather problematic.

NB1: The OT term was compared by Schwally (ZDMG 52, 137) and Haupt (AJSL 26, 235 & 27, 53) with Akk. mulû & tamlû “Erdaufschüttung, Terrasse (der Tempel und Paläste)” [GB] that has recently been rendered as mulû “1. Höhe von Mauern usw., 2. Anhöhe, 4. Aufstieg (Berg)” [AHW 671] = “1. height, 2. hill, high ground, 3. ascent” [CAD m 193], which would imply an eventual derivation from Sem. *cl̥y. But in Hebrew, the underlying root was ml̥ “to fill” (KB 584).

NB2: OK mr.t (q.v.) and NK mr.w can hardly have anything in common with Sem. *ml̥, for which cf. rather Eg. mrj.t (q.v.).

m3r “als Bez. für den Himmel” (GR, Wb II 30, 9) = “sky” (PL 405: Edfu I 59:11–12).

NB: Probably not a hapax (as in PL l.c.). Osing (1998, 296 & n. b, p. 304) identified in a pap. from Tebtunis (2nd cent. AD) Eg. m3nr (m3l) as a “Wort für Himmel”, which was listed in the index as mrw (sic).

- GT: perhaps < Eg. m3r.w “viewing-place” (above)?

m3h.t “Tür: 1. Außentür des Tempels zwischen den Türmen des Pylons, 2. Tür der Tempelräume, 3. Kapellentür” (GR, Wb II 30, 11–13) = “lieu à ciel ouvert, vestibule” (Ceugney 1880, 2, §4) = (masc. var. m3h) “Tür” (Edfu, Kurth 1994, 12, #48).

- Etymology disputable due to the late attestation and -3- (< *-l-, *-r- or *-ʔ-ʔ):

- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 2, §4, also p. 7): prefix m- + htj (sic!) “plafond”. Similarly, following Brugsch, P. Wilson (PL 405) saw in m3h.t a compound of *m3-h3.t “place of gateway” (sic!). Unacceptable both phonologically and semantically.
NB1: OK h.t ~ MK h3j.t denoted “(Vor)Halle” (Wb II 476) and h3j.t “1. Himmel (end of NK), 2. Dach eines Gebäudes (Lit. MK)” (Wb II 476, 12–13).
NB2: The LEg. word for place was m3^o (q.v.), not m3.
- **2.** GT: if LEg. m3h.t < *mrh-t, cf. AA *m-r-h “opening, hole” [GT]: Ar. murh-at- “2. creux en terre où l’eau demeure stagnante” [BK II 1097] ||| WBrb.: cf. perhaps (with semantic opposition?) Zng. iemmar (aor.) “être fermé”, i-mir “bouchage” [Bst. 1925, 8: √γ-m-r] = ïè-mmār “il est fermé, bouché” [Ncl. 1953, 212: < Ar. ^omr?] ||| NAgaw: Bilin mār-ā “der Raum unmittelbar vor dem Hause, Gehöfte, vor der Türe, daher auch: die Türe, nämlich der Platz vor der Türe” [Rn.], Hamir mir-ā, pl. mir “Tür” [Rn.], Qwara mey-ā ~ mäy-ā [-y- < *-r-] “Tür” [Rn.] = mäy kana “door” [Apl.], Falasha meya “door” [Apl.] (Agaw: Rn. 1884, 394; 1887, 273; Apl. 1996, 14) ||| CCh.: Mada miré “intervalle, espace vide entre objets” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 192].
- **3.** GT: if LEg. m3h.t < *mlh-t, cf. AA *m-l-[h] “to open” [GT]: LECu.: Saho malho [irreg. -h- < *-h-?] “small opening (in the house or stable)” [Vergari 2003, 131] ||| Ch. *m-l (loss of *-h?) “to open” [JS 1981, 199 I]: WCh.: (?) Jmb. mbəl- [mb- < ?] “to open” [Skn. apud JI, not found in Skn. 1977] ||| CCh.: Uldeme mələwə “fente horizontale dans le rocher entre deux pierres, anfractuosité, cavité” [Clm. 1997, 199] | Puss mili “ouvrir” [Trn. 1991, 106], Vulum (Mulwi) milí “ouvrir” [Trn. 1978, 304] = m’l “ouvrir” [Trn. 1978, 92] | Masa & Musey & Lew & Marba mál “ouvrir” [Ajello 2001, 41], Zime-Dabrang mál “to open” [Jng. 1978, 12], Zime-Mesme mál (pf.) “to open” [Jng. 1973 MS; 1978, 17] = mál “ouvrir” [Ksk. 1990, 32] ||| ECh.: Kwang male “ouvrir” [Jng. 1973, 44], Mobu male “ouvrir” [Lenssen 1982, 109; 1984, 69], Ngam mal kónà túsi “commencer” [Lenssen] | Mubi málá “hole” [Jng. in JI 1994 II 189: isolated in Ch.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 264). Interchange of LEg. -h-/-h- (cf. NBĀ 367)?
- **4.** GT: if LEg. m3h.t is act. *mh.t, cf. CCh.: Bata maahéé “door, Tür” [Str. 1910, 463], Bata-Garwa māmāvē “Tür” [Str.] | Hide (Htk.) muhə “bailler” [Egc. 1971, 220] | Moloko máháy “doorway” [Rsg. 1978, 239, #204], Balda mewá “Tür” [Str., quoted also apud Trn. 1987, 54], Gsg. miwing “Tür” [Str.] (CCh.: Str. 1922–23, 129).
NB: Cf. also the common Brb.-Ch. root *m-(H?) “1. mouth, 2. door” [GT] (for details see Eg. mh.wt).

m3h “in die Hände klatschen, Takt schlagen” (OK, Wb II 30, 14) = “produire du bruit en frappant, battre la mesure (aux hommes qui dansaient dans la cuve pour écraser des raisins)” (Montet 1913, 119) = “battre la mesure” (Hickmann 1956–57, 214) = “claqueurs” (Ziegler apud Meeks in AL: not noun) = “rythmer au moyen de claqueurs” (AL 79.1136: cf. also Fischer 1968, 24, n. 98; RdE 29, 1977, 15, fn. 18) = “klatschen (in die Hände), Takt schlagen (mit Klappern), taktieren” (GHWb 320).

- From the same root: OK m3h.t “les rythmiciennes” (Hickmann 1956–57, 214) = “*das Klatschen, *die Klatschende” (GHWb 320) = “clap” (Fischer 1996, 183, 257) = “person who keeps the beat, clapper player” (Jones 2000, 422, #1564 with further lit.).

- Etymology dubious due to the -3-.

- **1.** GT: from PEg. *mrh, basic meaning “*to hit, beat”? Cf. WCh.: Hausa mààràá “to slap”, máàrè “to slap sy. so hard that he falls over” [Abr. 1962, 655, 658], Gwnd. mári- “to slap” [Mts. 1972, 79] | Ngamo maar- “to slap” [Ibr. 2003 MS, 6] || CCh.: Mofu-Gudur -márh- “taper fort” [Br. 1988, 183], cf. Mofu -hùrm- [met. < *murh-?] “to beat (person, drum etc.)” [JI 1994 II, 17].

NB1: Acc. to O. V. Stolbova (1987, 89), WCh. *-h- yields Hausa -g-.

NB2: Met. in Mofu: *h̄rm < *mrh? D. Barreteau (1988, 134), however, gives only Mofu-Gudur -hur̄m- “to be bent (of an aged man), se courber (de vieillesse)”.

- **2.** GT: if -3- < *-l-, cf. Ar. malaḥa “5. agiter avec rapidité les ailes en volant, voler à tire d’aile (se dit d’un oiseau)” [BK II 1144] ||| WCh.: Tng. malī “to beat” [Jng. 1991, 118] = mál- “to beat”, málò “beating” [Kidda 1985, 208, #268 & 217, #61].

- **3.** P. Montet (1913, 119) explained it from a root *m3h “frapper” (m3h being written “au-dessus des musiciens qui frappent des mains pendant que leurs compagnes dansent”), which he treated as an m- prefix derivative of the OEg. root ḥ3j (inf. ḥ3.t) “1. klagen, 2. tanzen (beim Begräbnis)” (ÄWb I 754). Unacceptable.

NB: In addition, Montet erroneously combined ḥ3j and m3h also with sh3.t (as caus.!) “(légende à des gens qui conduisent des ânes à coups de bâtons)”, which denotes in fact “Eselherde” (ÄWb I 1176).

- **4.** F. Kammerzell (1994, 61, n. 37) ponders a different analysis without any proof: “*es ist unklar, ob es sich bei m3h um eine Derivation mit präfigiertem m- handelt*”. On the contrary: it is probably not an m- prefix form, since no simplex *(j/w)3h is attested.

m3h “(r n m3h) als Ortbezeichnung” (Lit. MK, Wb II 31, 6) = “pasture” (FD 103) = “Weide, wohl: der in der Niederung am Wasser gelegene Bruch” (Guglielmi 1973, 136: cf. Lüddeckens in MDAIK

11, 1943, 32, first under Amenemhat II) = “*Bruch (in der Niederung am Wasser gelegen), in der Niederung am Wasser gelegene Weide” (GHWb 320) = “(it is evidently somewhere to keep animals, though not a walled enclosure; may be) an open space where flocks or herds could be kept watched over” (PL 405–6).

- Basic sense questionable. Etymology dubious also because of -3-.
- 1. P. Wilson (PL 406) surmised an etymological connection with Cpt.: (S) οΥΡΕ2 “free space” (CD 492a) = “Zwischenraum, freier Raum, Grundstück, Hof, Platz” (KHW 276), which leads to (SL) οΥΩΡ2 “1. to be open, free, 2. set free, open, renounce” (CD 491b) = “freigeben, öffnen, aufgeben, entlassen, überweisen, senden, zulassen” (KHW) < Dem. wrḥ “Grundstück, Bauplatz” vs. wrḥ “freigeben, zulassen” (DG 94), cf. also CED 216. I.e., should we assume a nomen loci *mrḥ ~ var. m3ḥ derived with prefix m- from *wrḥ “to set free (or sim.)” (related with w3ḥ “legen, lassen”)?
- 2. GT: any connection with AA *m-r-ḥ “to descend” [GT]? Cf. Ar. maraḥa II “4. sortir sur le champ de bataille, descendre dans l’arène” [BK II 1087] ||| SCu.: Ma’a -dí-mi “to descend” (dí- “down”), -dí-mirí “to put down” “to put down” [Ehret 1980, 158, #40] ||| WCh.: Gwandara mómóri “1. furrow in the field, on which rice or cotton is planted, 2. low ground where water gathers” [Mts. 1972, 82]. NB: Ehret (l.c.) combined the Ma’a ex. with Dhl. mir- “to stay awake all night” < SCu. *mir- “to continue on (without stopping)”, which is semantically very dubious.
- 3. GT: or, if m3ḥ < *mlḥ and the sense “Bruch” < *“(opening (or sim.))” is correct, cf. perhaps LECu.: Saho malḥo [irreg. -ḥ- < *h-?] “small opening (in the house or stable)” [Vergari 2003, 131]?

m3ḥ (hence GR **mḥ**) “1. Kranz aus Blumen, auch: Ranke, Rebe (von Blumen, von Wein) als Mass, 2. Kranz aus Gold (WD II 58: cf. ZÄS 122, 1995, 52)” (XVIII., Wb II 31, 1–3) = “guirlandes de fleurs, couronne” (Ceugney 1880, 6) = “wreath of flowers” (FD 103) = “Kranz, Maß für Blumen, Weintrauben” (Helck in LÄ III 1203) = “couronne (de pampre)” (Aufrère 1990, 221–2) = “garland, crown (GR), headband tied around the head (from XVIII.)” (PL 451–2).

- Hence: Dem. mḥ “Kranz” (DG 173) = “wreath” (CED) > Cpt.: (L) MΔ2- in (L) MΔ2N6NOYT “(wahrscheinlich) Kranz von 6NOYT-Blättern” (KHW) = “couronne de 6NOYT” (DELIC) identified (CED 99; KHW 112, 522; DELIC 130) as reflex of Dem. mḥ-n-knw.t “Name einer Pflanze” (DG 174, 1: hapax), lit. “wreath of the plant *knūt”.

нВ1: W. Vycichl (DELIC) compared the second component with GR *qn.w* “als Bez. der Pflanzen auf dem Acker” (Wb V 47, 17) = “plant of the field” (PL 1060). Improbable, cf. Dem. *k-* as well as the preservation of Cpt. *-т* < Dem. *-t*.

нВ2: There is no agreement as for the ultimate origin of Dem. *mjh* “ein Maß für Futter” (DG 153:5) > Cpt. (S) *μΟΘΙ2* etc. (m) “1. a measure for fodder etc., reeds, or grain, 2. a vessel (?)” (CD 208a; CED 98) = “ein Maß für Futtermittel” (KHW 89), which passed into Gk. as *μóιον* (var. *μóειον*, *μóυειον*) “boîte, récipient, jarre” (Fournet 1989, 70–71, §11). Following G. Mattha, J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 132), W. Westendorf (KHW 89), J. Osing (NBÄ 214, 762, n. 924), W. Schenkel (1983, 224), and W. Vycichl (DELIC 109–110) explained these words eventually from Eg. *mḥ* “füllen” (OK, Wb, q.v.) occasionally with a hint on Eg. *mḥ.t* (vars. *mḥ.w*, *mḥ.t.t*) “Schale, Napf” (XVIII., Wb II 126, 11–15). J. Černý (CED 98) and J.-L. Fournet (l.c.), in turn, derived the Dem.-Cpt.-Gk. term from Eg. *m3ḥ*, which W. Vycichl (l.c.) eventually (but unconvincingly) explained equally from Eg. *mḥ*. Fournet (l.c.) rendered the Gk. mng. “récipient” (not to be deduced from Eg. *m3ḥ*) as secondary (from “mesure”) arguing that “*la mesure déterminée par un contenant a pu engendrer ce nouveau sens*”.

- H. Grapow (1914, 15) correctly explained it as an *m-* prefix derivation from Eg. *w3ḥ* “Kranz aus Blumen” (PT, Wb I 257, 13).

нВ: Other suggestions cannot be accepted. C. Ceugney (1880, 6) erroneously took *m3ḥ.w* from *jḥ* (falsely quoted as *jḥt*) “entourer, corde” (sic) = ziehen” (PT, Wb I 148). W. Vycichl (DELIC 109–110) considered NK *m3ḥ* as a writing of the participle *mḥ* (**mayḥaw*) “qui remplit”.

m3ḥj.t (wood det.) “variété de bois ou de plante” (early MK, hapax: Pap. Reisner I, AC 1977, 8) = “une variété de bois (?)” (AL 77.1621) = “Art Holz oder Pflanze” (WD II 58, so also Hafemann, p.c. on 19 May 2000).

- Meaning and origin obscure.
- 1. GT: any connection to NK *m3ḥ* “Kranz” (Wb)?
- 2. GT: or cf. perhaps ECu.: Tsamay marraḥe (f) “edible wild plant” [Sava 2005 MS, 252]?
- 3. GT: or cf. SCu.: Irq. *mulḥi* (f) “Euphorbia candelabrium, tirucalli, Cyathogyne bussei, wolf’s-milk plant, anything grown fat (the plant is cultivated, chewing a twig helps against tonsillitis)” [MQK 2002, 74–75].

m3ḥ “Korngarbe” (OK, Wb II 31, 7; also Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza VI 144, XI 191) = “sheaf” (FD 103) = “gerbe, botte” (AL 78.1634, 79.1138) = “Doppelgarbe” (Guglielmi, LÄ II 375) = “(gebündelte) Korngarbe” (GHWb 321; ÄWb I 505) = “ein in der Mitte zusammengeschnürtes Ährenbündel (eig.: Bündel)” (Jansen-Winkel 1996, 34). нВ: Cf. also the divine name *m3ḥj* “der von der Korngarbe” (Amduat, Hornung 1963 II, 53, n. 175).

- Etymology debated:

- **1.** K. Jansen-Winkel (1996, 34) derived it from a hypothetical Eg. *m3hj (sic) “zusammenbinden”, from which he erroneously explained also two further unrelated terms, namely Eg. jm3h “(backbone with marrow (issuing from it))” (EG 1927, 456, F39) as well as Eg. jm3h.w “ehrwürdig, der Würdige (von Alten und Verstorbenen)” (OK, Wb I 82). Highly improbable. Rejected by Takács (2005, 45, #4.9). Both of the suggested Eg. comparanda are out of place.

nb1: Deriving jm3h “Wirbelsäule” < *m3h “zusammenbinden” has been supported also by Osing 2001, 574. But Eg. jm3h “Stück der Wirbelsäule mit dem hervorquellenden Rückenmark” (Wb I 81, 11) = “spinal cord” (Dawson, JEA 22, 1936, 107; DCT 36) = “moelle (aussi d’une plante) > essence” (Grdseloff 1952, 485; inscription of Shabaka) = “Wirbel(säulen)kanal” (Grapow 1954, 58) = “Rückenmark” (Otto: *ÄMÖR* II 108–110: in pun with jm3h.w) = “spinal cord, spinal marrow” (CT, FD 20) = “Rückgrat” (Hornung 1963 II, 188, n.1: *Amduat*) = “un fragment de la colonne vertébrale avec la moelle qui s’en échappe” (Lacau 1970, 75, §189) = “backbone and spinal cord” (Fischer 1983, 25, F39) has probably a fully different AA etymology (mentioned already by W. Vycichl 1958, 404), cf. Sem. *muḥḥ- “midollo, cervello” [Frz. 1964, 267, #2.37] = “brain” [SED I 169–170, #187]; Akk. muḥḥu “skull, upper part” [AHW 667] || Ug. mḥ “Mark” [WUS], Hbr. mōḥ “Mark” [GB] = mōḥ “bone-marrow” [KB 567] || Ar. muḥḥ- “moelle, cervelle” [BK II 1071] = muḥḥ- “Mark, Gehirn” [GB] (Sem.: GB 413; Holma 1911, 12; WUS #1542; Frz. l.c.; SED l.c.) || CCh.: perhaps Mandara məkḥyəkḥè “brain” [Kraft 1981, #37]. For Sem.-Mandara see HSED #1800. Note that Bed. mikw’āl ~ mik’āl (f) “Mark, Knochenmark” [Rn. 1895, 167] || WCh.: AS *m^waya “1. fat (adj.), 2. muscular, strong” [GT] = *m^waya “fat, greasy (жирный)” [Stl.] (AS: Stl. 1972, 184; 1977, 156, #140; most detailed: GT 2004, 256) seem to belong here with an extension *-l (or suffix *-al as proposed by LS 1997, 459). Should we assume AA *m-ḳ-l “marrow, grease” [GT], whence Eg. jm3h [*j-mḥ?] may also derive?

nb2: On the other hand, the way JW (l.c.) reinterpreted the basic sense of Eg. jm3h as “materiell versorgt → angesehen” < orig. “(in die Wirkungssphäre eines Gottes) eingebunden” (< *m3h supported also by P. Vernus 2000, 180, fn. 91) is also highly uncertain. Beside its rendering “als Bez. der Totenversorgung” (Gdk. 1966, 47, fn.5, cf. Helck, MDAIK 14, 1956, 69f.) = “attaché à, solidaire de” (Lacau 1972, 48, nr. 2), the former understanding of jm3h is also maintained: e.g., “être favorisé” (Vernus) = nb-jm3h “possessor of reverence, venerated state” (Jones 2000, 478, #1778), which is supported also by the external evidence:

(1) E. Zyhlarz (1934, 115–6) linked Eg. j.m3h via metathesis [< *j-mrḥ < *j-mḥr] to Brb. *m-γ-r “être grand, vieux, notable” [Dlg], for which, cf., e.g., NBrb.: Wargla a-myar “ancien, vieux, notable du clan, de tribu, anciens chefs” [Dlh. 1987, 193], Qbl. u- ~ i-myar “1. être grand, grandir, 2. être considérable en proportion ou valeur”, a-myar “1. homme âgé, 2. vieillard, 3. beau-parents, (pl.) les anciens, témoins de la tradition” [Dlt. 1982, 508], Irzhen a-myar “vieillard, notable” [Picard], Ait Mgild a-myar “old person, leader of performers, head of tribe” [Harries 1974, 224] || EBrb.: Gdm. ə-mqūr “1. être âgé, ancien, 2. être notable” [Lanfry 1973, 214, #1019] || WBrb.: Zng. ṽm-γ-r > ṽm-ʔ-r “être grand, grandir” [Ncl. 1953, 210] || SBrb.: Hgr. a-myar “homme grand (d’âge, de situation dans sa famille ou dans la société)”, i-myar “être grand (de dimensions, d’âge, de position sociale)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 235, 237] (Brb.: Bst. 1890, 316; Dlg. 1967, 7, #3). Any connection to Ar. maḥara I “5. élargir qqch. à force de se mouvoir dans l’intérieur”, ya-mḥūr- ~ yu-mḥūr- “long, allongé, trop long” [BK II 1072]?

(2) W. Vycichl (1958, 404), in turn, combined Eg. *jm3h* [perhaps < **j-mʔhʔ*?] with Sem.: Geez *ʔmh*: *ʔammēha* “salutavit”, *ʔammēhā* “osculum salutatio, munus, donum, munera (venerationis causa oblata)” [Dillmann] = “to greet, salute, worship, revere, pay respect to” [Lsl. 1987, 23]. Cf. also Eg. *mḥ* “jem. ehren” (MK, Wb, q.v.).

(3) Or, less probably, cf. CCh.: PLamang **m-l-h* [-*l*- < **r*- poss.] “old” [GT, cf. Büchner 1964, 41–42; Wolff 1971, 65, 69, 71; Mkr. 1987, 279] || ECh.: Bdy. *murāk* “vieillir, s’user”, *múrkō* “vieux, ancien, âgé” [AJ 1989, 101]?

- 3. GT: the etymon **m3h* ~ **mlh* “to bind” to which Eg. *m3h* “Korngarbe” might indeed in theory be traced back has perhaps in fact Cpt. evidence overlooked by Jansen-Winkel (l.c.): (SL) *MOYλ2*, (B) *MOλ5* etc. “zusammenfügen, verbinden, befestigen, einhüllen”, (B) *MOYλ5(τ)* “Verbindung” (KHW 91). For the re-appearance of old **l* > Eg. *3* > Cpt. *λ* see Satzinger 1994.

NB: The Cpt. verb has been usually traced back to Eg. *mnḥ* “(einen Halskragen, Perlen auf einen Faden) aufziehen” (OK, Wb, below), but its basic mng. is debated. Thus, for Eg. **mlh* cf. also (or instead?) AA **m-l-h* “to bind (?)” [GT] > NBrb.: Mzab *ta-mʔil-t* [met. < **mliʔ*-?] “collier formé de tout petits coffrets” [Dlh. 1984, 120] || NAgaw: Qmt. *məḥ* “a “thread” [Leyew 1994, 5] || LECu.: Arb. *mulk-ó* “iron anklets which are worn as a set” [Hyw. 1984, 386] | Dullay: Tsamay *mulge* “anklet” [Hyw. 1989, 11] = mogol [< **molog*], pl. *molge* “black iron bracelet” [Savà 2005 MS, 248] || SCu.: perhaps PRift **munga* [irreg. **ng-* < **lg-*?] “bracelet” [Ehret 1980, 344, #17].

- 2. GT: alternatively, *m3h* could be also a var. to an unattested Eg. **m3g*, which, in principle, might be regarded as extended by prefix *m-*, cf. Eg. *3gg-t* “gerbe de tiges de lin” (OK, AL 78.0107) = “Garbe (der Flachsstengel)” (GHWb 16; ÄWb I 21: VI., hapax).
- 4. GT: most probably OEg. *m3h* < **mrh*, cognate with Sem.: perhaps Yemeni Ar. *marḥ-ah* [irreg. -*h*-?] “heap of corn”, *merḥi* “bunch of bananas” [Piamenta 1990, 463] || NAgaw **mu[h]r-*, met. < **murḥ-* (?) [GT]: Hamir *mḥr-ā*, pl. *mūr* “Garbe” [Rn. 1884, 394] || HECu.: Gedeo (Drs.) *mirḥ-* [irreg. -*ḥ*-] “to bundle”, *mirḥ-es-anṣo* “bundle” [Hds. 1989, 33] || ECh.: cf. Lele *mòrṣò* [-*ṣ-* < **g-*?] “botte (ensemble)” [WP 1982, 64].

NB1: The Eg.-Hamir comparison is not problematic. Eg. -*h* = PAgaw **h* & **γ*, which are regularly reflected by Hamir zero (Apl. 1984, 51). As D. Appleyard (p.c. on 20 April 1999) confirmed to me, Hamir *mḥr-ā* could conceivably derive from a PAgaw **mur[γ/h]-*, but it could equally derive from PAgaw **mut[γ/h]-*. He has also confirmed that the Hamir word has no parallels in Bilin, Qemant, and Awngi. Another etymology for Hamir *mūr-ā* could be HECu. **mut-* “to sprout” [Hds. 1989, 418], which is semantically improbable.

NB2: A striking parallel appears also in Akk. (aAK, a/jB) *birahḥu* ~ *birihhu* etwa “Bund (von Gemüse u.ä.)” [AHW 128] = “botte (de légumes, etc.)” [DRS 83: isolated], whose *b-* is, however, hard to explain. In view of its Oakk. attestation, *birahḥu* ~ *birihhu* can be hardly a Hurr. loan (cf. -*hḥu*).

NB3: The origin of LECu.: Som. perhaps *máraq* (m) “Werg zum Verbinden des Euters der Kamelstute, um das Fohlen am Saugen zu verhindern, der Zitzenstrick” [Rn. 1902, 302] is uncertain.

NB4: Any connection to AA *m-r-K “to encircle” [GT] > NOm.: Chara mǝrga “fence” [Bnd. 1974 MS, 4] ||| CCh.: PKtk. *(m)ʌrgʌ “кольцо” [Prh.] = *marg- “ring” [GT]: Mkr. marge “bague” [Lbf.], Glf. mǎrəŋge “bague” [Lbf.], Ksr. arga [*m-?] “bague” [Lbf.], Afd. marge “bague” [Lbf.] = markéh “Fingerring” [Stz.] [Ktk.: Lbf. 1942, 163; Slk. 1967, 318, #564; Prh. 1972, 78, #49.10)?

- **5. G. Takács** (1999, 49): with special regard to the sense “Doppelgarbe”, a further possibility is equating OEg. m3h (lit. *‘‘bundle, couple’’?) with PCu. *mVlIV[ǰ]- “Zweiheit, Paar” [Dlg. 1973, 196] = *mVlh- “1. pair, couple, 2. sg. in between (two things)” [GT]: Bed. málh-o (m) “1. Zweiheit, ein Paar, 2. Mitte, 3. zwischen” [Rn. 1895, 168] = malh-é (M) “centre, midst”, malh “amongst, midst” [Rpr. 1928, 216] || NAgaw: Qmt. mǎlh-ī “middle” [CR], Hamir maḥíl [met.] “mitte, zwischen” [Rn.] || SCu.: cf. perhaps Irq. mǔlkū-mo, pl. mǔlkē “friend” [Wtl.] = mulqmō “friend” [MQK 2002, 75] (Cu.: Dlg. 1973, 196). Semantically more problematic than the comparison with AA *m-r-K. NB: Cf. also the NBrb. term for “index finger” (orig. *‘‘second finger’’?): Shilh mel(l)ey “index” [Jordan 1934, 92], Izdeg melley “index (doigt)” [Mrc. 1937, 141], Mzge melley-tazlafī “index” [Abés 1916, 129)?

m3h (MK var. **m3h**) “verbrennen durch Feuer” (MK, Wb II 31, 8–11) = “to burn” (FD 103; PL 407).

- Hence: Dem. mh ~ mh “(ver)brennen” (DG 173, 177) > OCpt. (Pap. BM 10808) st. pron. m3h = (st. nom. of inf. -m3-) “Brennen” < *m3(̃)hēw ~ *m(̃)3h(e)w (Osing 1976, 20, 60, 76–77) > Cpt.: (SALBF) mOY2, (B) mO2 “to burn, glow” (CD 210a; CED 98) = “(ver)brennen, glühen” (KHW 111) = “brûler” (DELIC 131).

NB1: On the basis of Dem. m3h, W. Vycíchl (DELIC l.c.) assumed two etymons: *m3h vs. m3h, whereby the former was the older one (note the possible shift of PEg. *h > OK h discussed in EDE I 171–3).

NB2: Ernstedt (1953, 156) explained Gk. σμύχω “cuire à l’étouffée” from Eg./Cpt., which is clearly false with regard to its convincing IE etymology (Boisacq 1916, 886–7).

- Its etymology is still obscure.

- **1. G. Takács** (EEC): the only (both phonologically and semantically) plausible cognate is found in WCh.: PAngas *m^walak > *muluk “blister caused by burning” [GT 2004, 257]: Angas mulk ~ mwalk “a blister caused by heat”, mwalk “the skin all burnt off by fire (as by one falling into it)” [Flk. 1915, 247, 249] = mwólk “to get burned” [Jng. 1962 MS].

NB: The correspondence of Eg. h ~ h vs. AS *g & *k is regular. We may not, however, exclude a derivation of the Angas root from AA *m-l-k “scar, ulcer” (perhaps *mulk-, whence sec. *murk-) [GT], which excludes the comparison with Eg. m3h, cf. SCu.: Irq. mulk-i, pl. mulk-ā “scar” [Mgw. 1989, 115] ||| Ch. *m-l-k “ulcer” [GT]: WCh.: Karekare mǎrəku, Gera mǎriki, Ngamo mǎrəkō ||| CCh.: Chibak mbilkū, WMargi mbulkū, Ngwahiy mbilikū, Wamdiu mbùlugu | Fali-Jilbu mbùlùkiy (Ch.: Kraft 1981, #256).

- Other suggestions are out of question:
- **2.** L. Reinisch (1873, 277, fn. 1) equated Eg. m3h with Ar. bāhūr- “Hochsommer”, Nika & Pokomo moho “brennen” and further unacceptable Afr. parallels.
- **3.** C. Ceugney (1880, 7) combined it with Eg. mh3j “action de brûler” (XX., q.v.), which he considered as the “forme complète” of Eg. m3h and derived from h^ow “bûcher”. False.
- **4.** F. Hommel (1907, 383, #4): Eg. m3h ~ Ar. myr “to be red”. Unacceptable both semantically (“red” vs. “to burn”) and phonologically (Eg. -h vs. Ar. -γ- are irregular, normally Eg. h = Ar. ~ ḥ).
- **5.** A. Ember (1911, 88), followed by W. Czermak (1931, 101) and F. von Calice (1936, #521), linked Eg. m3h to Ar. marḥ- “2. sorte d’arbre (cynandum viminale) dont le bois, frotté contre celui de l’arbre” [BK II 1088] = “a tree used for striking fire” [Ember] = “Holz zum Feuerbohrer” [Clc.]. Unacceptable, since the Ar. root mng. was significantly different.
NB1: Ar. marḥ- is act. “ein Baum, durch dessen Reiben man Feuer gewinnt” [Clc.] = “wood, used to kindle fire by friction” [KB 634], and comes from the root maraḥa “frotter d’huile” [BK II 1088] = “to rub in, anoint” [KB], cf. OHbr. mrḥ qal “mit einem Heilmittel bestreichen” & NHbr. mrḥ piel “zerreiben, abreiben, glätten” [GB 461]. Czermak (l.c.) even extended the Eg.-Ar. etymology to Hbr. mrḥ, which is semantically rather improbable. Cf. also (as an Ar. loan) LECu.: Som. móroh “eine Gattung Baum (Cynanchum pyrotechnicum D.), dessen getrocknetes Holz bes. geeignet ist, durch Reiben (Ar. mrḥ) Feuer zu geben” [Rn. 1902, 302].
NB2: Evidently no connection with WCh.: Hausa múrhù < múrfù “the three stones which form native cooking-place” [Abr. 1962, 685], which, besides, N. Skinner (1977, 21; 1996, 205) falsely equated with ECh. *rug- “to cook” (sic). Of course, Hs. -fu- > -hu- ≠ *-gw-.
- **6.** L. Homburger (1957, 30): Eg. m3h equated with Drv.: Kannada marugu, Telugu maragu (sic). No comment.
- **7.** Th. Obenga (1993, 294, #22) compares such Afr. words as Mbochi míá “fire”, Mangbetu ope “brûler”, Gurmanche mu “fire”, Bobangi mëya “fire” etc. Untenable.

m3h “(bildlich vom Herzen) 1. (MK) Angst haben um (n), 2. (GR) Sorge tragen für (hr)” (Wb II 31, 9–11) = “2. (fig.) sich ängstigen, Angst haben (um jdn.)” (GHWb 321).

- **1.** Traditionally (Wb l.c.; GHWb l.c.), this word has been conceived to represent figurative senses of Eg. m3h “to burn” (q.v.). Plausible.
NB: E.g., as explained in Wb l.c.: “die Herzen der Feinde brennen → sie haben Angst < eig. verbrennen durch Feuer”.
- **2.** GT: a distinct status is, however, not to be excluded either, whereby Eg. m3h < AA *m-r-g “1. to be disturbed, 2. afraid” [GT].

NB1: Attested in ECu. *murg- [-g- reg. < *-g-] “to be surprised, startled” [GT]: HECu.: Brj. murg- “to become startled, bolt, shy (of horse)” [Ss.] = murg- “to be surprised”, caus. murg-is- “to surprise, startle, wake up, waken” [Hds.], Sid. mogg-a (m/f) “calamity (as war), sg. that frightens”, mogg-ata ~ mogg-âwa “to be afraid, frightened (before the coming enemy)” [Gsp. 1983, 236], Hdy. mugg- [Ss.: reg. < *murg-] “to be frightened” [Ss.] = mugg- “to be surprised”, mugg-is- “to surprise, startle (tr.)” [Hds.] (HECu.: Sasse 1982, 149; Hds. 1989, 146–7, 163, 214) | Dullay: Glg. murk- “erschrecken (intr.)” [AMS 1980, 213], Tsamay mugur [met. < *murug], caus. murg-is “to be surprised” [Savà 2005 MS, 247] ||| CCh.: Musgu-Pus mirgi “embrouiller” [Trn. 1991, 106].

NB2: Cf. perhaps also NBrb.: Mzg. a-marey, pl. i-muray “douleur, mal d’amour” [Abès 1916, 110] ||| LECu.: Rnd. mîrâg “brünftig” [Schlee 1978, 141, #783] (from the primary mng. “to be excited”?)?

- **3.** A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1967, 9, #6) prefers comparing Eg. m3h with Bed. mäh “1. erschrecken, 2. aus dem Schlaf plötzlich mit Schreck erwachen”, mäh-a “Schreck” [Rn. 1895, 164–165] = miha “to start from fear/surprise” [Rpr. 1928, 215]. See also Takács 1999, 40; 1999, 108, #36.

NB: Following L. Reinisch (l.c.), A. B. Dolgopol’skij (l.c.) identifies Bed. mäh with NAgaw: Bln. bayâγ-â “Schreck” [Rn.] and LECu.: Som. bago “erschrecken” [Rn.], which, however, seem to derive from a distinct AA root (cf. the entry for Eg. bqbq in EDE II).

m3ht.t (from ***m3hrt.t?**) “als Beischrift zu einem Napf mit Kügelchen” (MK coffin friezes, Wb II 31, 12) = “mortier (?)” (Jéquier 1921, 132, fn. 1) = “die Reibschale (in den Gerätefriesen der M.R.-Särge dargestellt: sie ist flach und besitzt innen eine Vertiefung, in der mit Hilfe eines Stößels verschiedene Substanzen zerrieben werden können)” (Lapp 1986, 49: MK 3x) = “Reibstein (für Farbe)” (GHWb 321).

NB: The old reading m3hn (maintained in Wb & GHWb) based on Jéquier’s (1921, 132, fn. 1) misreading of one single ex. (coffin of Mzḥ.tj from Assiut, cf. Lacau 1906 II, 125:27, nr. 28118) has been disproved by Lapp (1986, 49–50) and corrected (after re-checking the photo) to m3ht.t, which is confirmed by the 2nd ex. (coffin of Jdj from Assiut, cf. Brunner-Traut & Brunner 1981, 213, n. 8). The 3rd ex. (coffin of Jm3 from Thebes, cf. Jéquier 1921, 314) was read by Lapp as m3hrt.t (against Jéquier’s l.c. m3grgt identified with mgrg “Krug”), which he considered to be a fuller var. of m3ht.t.

- The original root consonants are not exactly known. Etymology obscure.
- **1.** GT: difficult to find an etymology on Eg. grounds. Perhaps a nomen instr. derived by prefix m-? But the root (*3ht or perhaps *3hr?) cannot be certainly identified. The same is the case if we assume a compound (*m3- + *-ht or *-hr?).
- **2.** GT: perhaps from a root *m3h < AA *m-r-h “to rub” [GT]? For Eg. h < *ḥ cf. EDE I 171–3.

NB1: Attested in Sem. *mrḥ > e.g. OHbr. mrḥ qal “mit einem Heilmittel bestreichen” [GB 461], NHbr. mrḥ piel “zerreiben, abreiben, glätten” [GB] || Ar. maraḥa “frotter d’huile, oindre (le corps, la peau)” [BK II 1087], Dathina mrḥ “enduire, oindre” [GD 2685] || Brb. *m-r-y [-y < *ḥ reg., cf. Vcl. 1992] “to rub” [GT]: cf. e.g. NBrb.: Mzg. mreḥ “1. (se) frotter, 2. frictionner, 3. masser, 5. râper” [Taifi 1991, 434], Izdeg ta-merray-t “râpe”, mri “râper” [Mrc. 1937, 214] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ə-mrəy “1. frotter avec qqch. de dur, 2. effacer en frottant, 3. écorcher” [PAM 1998, 223; 2003, 555].

NB2: A Sem. var. root *mrḥ also exists, cf. perhaps Ug. mrḥ “überziehen” [Ast. 1948, 212, §7, not listed in DUL] || Ar. maraḥa “2. frotter d’huile, oindre” [BK II 1088], cf. also Ar. marḥ- “ein Baum, durch dessen Reiben man Feuer gewinnt” [GB] || MSA: Jbl. mirəḥ “to smear (paint, etc., on sg.) with one’s hands” [Jns. 1981, 174]. Note that Eg. ḥ < *ḥ is equally possible (EDE I 173–6).

m3z “Messer” (PT 1999c & GR, Wb II 31, 13) = “Klinge” (GÄSW #408) = “spine” (AEPT 288, utt. 674, n. 13, cf. p. 236–7 & n. 2) = “ein altes Wort für Messer” (Helck, LÄ IV 111–2) = “ein Messer” (PT 1999c, GHWb 321; ÄWb I 505) = “knife (may have originally been a flint knife)” (Edfu, PL 407).

NB: PT 1999c: m3z.w tpj.w rmn.wj ḏḥwtj m ds prj m stš “m3z auf den beiden Armen des Thoth aus Feuerstein, der aus Seth gekommen ist” (Helck) = “the spines which are on the arms of Thoth, and the sharp knife which came forth from Seth” (AEPT) = “knives in (sic) Thoth’s hands (sic)” (PL). There are further supposed PT (1560: mj3z) and CT (I 289c: mj3z.w, VI 103h: mjz.w or rather mj3z.w?) occurrences of the word in a similar context (associated with the “spines” of Thoth). For the supposed identity of PT m3z.w vs. mj3z.w cf. also RdE 27 (1975), 147, n. y; WD II 58. The impression, however, that originally there were two words (mj3z “spine” vs. m3z “knife”) confused in PT 1999 and CT I 289c (T1C), is corroborated by Wb l.c. and recently R. Hannig listing PT 1999 m3z “Messer” vs. PT 1560 mj3z “Stachel usw.” in two separate entries as two distinct lexemes (ÄWb I 505 vs. 512, resp.). For further details cf. Eg. mj3z.w (below).

- **1.** G. Takács (1996, 135, #26; 1997, 99, #42; 1999, 133; 1999, 199, #1.1.2; 2000, 336, #1.16): Eg. m3z perhaps < *mrz, to be identified with SBrb. *a-mrəz “sickle with dentation” [GT]: NTrg.: Hgr. a-mreh, pl. i-mreh-en “1. faucille à dents (faucille dont le tranchant est dentelé et forme scie), 2. scie à main (à lame droite ou recourbée)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1226] = a-mrəḥ, pl. i-mrəḥ-ən [Prs.] = a-mrəḥ “Handsäge, Sichel” [Zhl. 1934, 111] | STrg.: Wlm. a-mrəz, pl. a-mariz “faucille à dents” [Prs., not in PAM 2003, 555] (SBrb.: Prs. 1969, 81, #527; Mlt. 1991, 152; 1983, 104, fn. 31) || LECu.: presumably Som. márad [-d < *-z reg.] “ein Messer zum Einritzen von Figuren und Verzierungen in Leder und Holz” [Rn. 1902, 300]. Cf. also Ar. maraza “3. couper un morceau, p.ex., de pâte, 5. frapper qqn. avec la main” [BK II 1089]?

LIT. for SBrb.-Eg: Takács 1996, 125, #26; 1997, 99, #42. Queried by Quack (2002, 174): “die semantische Verbindung zu ‘Sichel’ muß (sic) als unsicher gelten”, for which see Takács 2003, 79, #4.3 and esp. fn. 84 with etymological evidence for the semantic shift “knife” vs. “sickle”.

NB1: K. G. Prasse (1969, 81) combined SBrb. *a-mrəz with NBrb.: Qbl. ə-mṙər “faucille” and SBrb.: Hgr. a-māris “époque de la moisson”, which is phonologically improbable. Besides, Qbl. ə-mṙər “faucille” < Brb. *m-g-r “moissonner”, for which cf. perhaps Eg. mḥr “granary” (q.v.).

NB2: SBrb.: Hgr. a-mreh has nothing to do with OEg. mdḥ (below) as proposed by E. Zyhlarz (1934, 111, fn. 1).

NB3: A. Ju. Militarev and S. A. Starostin (1984, 39) suggest an areal parallel of SBrb. *a-mrəz in NCauc. *mirć(w)E “knife, sickle” [NCED 822–3].

NB4: L. Reinisch (l.c.) suspects in Som. a nom. instr. *ma-hrad referring to i.a. Hbr. ḥrṣ, Ar. qṙṣ “scidit”, maqrāṣ- “cultur inflexum”. The Som.-Sem. comaprison is unconvincing.

- **2.** W. F. Albright (1918, 228) erroneously suggested equating Eg. m3z with Ar. mawsā “rasoir” [BK II 1540] = “razor blade” [Alb.] = “Rasiermesser” [Clc.]. Fully unacceptable. Declined already by F. Calice (1936, #408).

NB: Eg. -z ≠ Ar. -s-. Moreover, Ar. mawsā [< *ma-wsay-] is a nomen instr. of wsy “to shave”.

m3z (or **mz**?) “verwunden, schlachten” (GR, Wb II 32, 1) = “to slay, slaughter” (PL 407).

- Hence: “OCpt.” (of Pap. BM 10808, 6) MC- “verwunden”, cf. MCN&CQ < m(3)z-n=f st (Zeidler: *miz-nā=f s’t) “(indem) er ihnen Wunden beigebracht hat” (Osing 1976, 31, 63; KHW 520; Zeidler 1999, 290 & fn. 31).
- Correct reading of the OK etymon (*m3z, *m3s, *mz, or *ms?) disputable due to the late attestation. Etymology uncertain.
- **1.** GT: a late denom. verb from OK m3z [< *mrz] “knife” (q.v.) as suggested e.g. by P. Wilson (PL 407)? Seems probable. In this case cf. esp. Ar. maraza “3. couper un morceau, p.ex., de pâte, 5. frapper qq. avec la main” [BK II 1089]?
- **2.** GT: it would be tempting to read LEg. m3z as *mz (without -3-) and to identify it as cognate with NBrb.: perhaps Ait Said māz [unless < *√m-r-z] “blessure à la tête” [Allati 1986, 14] ||| PCu.-Om. *maz- “to wound” [Lmb.] > HECu. *maz- “to wound” [Lsl.] = *madz- “id.” [Hds.]: Brj. mad-, Hdy. mad-, Kmb. maz-, Sid. mad-īss-, hence HECu. *maz-a “wound” [Lsl.] = *madz-a “sore, wound” [Hds.]: Kmb. maz-ata, Tmb. maz-ata, Drs. mad-a, Hdy. mād-a’a, Brj. mad-ā, Sid. mad-a (HECu.: Lsl. 1980, 125; 1988, 195; Ss. 1982, 138; Hds. 1989, 139, 170, 417) | LECu.: Orm. madā “wound”, madāwa “to be wounded, have a wound” [Gragg 1982, 273] | Boni mād-a? [-d- reg. < *-z-] “Wunde” [Heine 1977, 294] ||| NOM.: Gamu mad-untsi & Dache mad-untsi “wound” [LS: maybe < HECu., since Omt. -d- ≠ *-z-] | Yemsa mazà “1. Wunde, 2. Verletzung”, mazay- “sich verletzen”, mazay-s- (caus.) “verletzen (tr.)” [Lmb.] | Kaffā may-o [-y- <

*-z- poss.] “wound” [Lmb.] = māy “essere ferito” [Crl. 1951, 476], Mocha ma-o [*may- < *maz- poss.] “wound” [Lsl. 1959, 39] | Dizi: Sheko māy-o [poss. -y- < *-z-] “wound” [Lmb.] (NOM.-HECu.: Lmb. 1993, 100; 1993, 369; LS 1997, 456–7) || SOm.: Ari mād-a [-d- < *-z-?] “scar” [Bnd. 1994, 157] ||| WCh.: perhaps Ngz. mášâ [irreg. -š- < *-ž- < *-ž-?] “wound” [Schuh 1981, 112].

NB: The Cu. root passed into ES: e.g. Gafat mǎzā, most of the Gurage dials. (except for Endegeny) mǎza “blessure” (ES: Lsl. 1956, 218).

- 3. GT: or, provided Eg. m3z < *mlz, cf. alternatively Ar. malāḍa “3. percer qqn. avec une lance” [BK II 1146]?

m3s.t “1. Knie (als Körperteil des Menschen), 2. als Körperteil eines Tieres: als essbares Fleischstück, Kniestück eines Rindes, (GR) allgemeiner: Schenkel” (OK: PT 378b, 701c, Wb II 32; ÜKAPT II 107) = “lap” (Faulkner 1936, 135: Pap. Bremner-Rhind, i.e., BM 10188, 4:17, end of 4th cent. BC) = “1. lap, 2. thighs (or the like, syn. of mn.t) as an edible part of an ox” (AEO II 242*, §588 & 286, index; followed by Janssen 1961, 21) = “jambe (ce membre tout entier)” (Lefèbvre 1952, 51–52, §59) = “Oberschenkel” (Erman followed by Grapow 1954, 92–93: “Knie zu eng”; WD I 83: not “knee”) = “1. (primitivement) cuisse, 2. (puis m3s.t s’étant annexé) genou, mollet et pied, toute la jambe, toutes les parties de l’une et l’autre jambe” (Lefèbvre 1955, 206–7, §4) = “1. (basic mng.) knee, hence: 2. thigh, haunch (as a joint of meat), hock (of animals, Wb’s ‘Kniestück’)” (Faulkner 1959, 104, cf. AECT I 11, spell 20, n. 2) = “1. knee (of man), 2. hock (of animal)” (FD 103) = “knee, lap, thigh” (Smith 1979, 161) = “(urspr.) Oberschenkel > Knie, Rumpf (?) des Menschen” (Westendorf 1987, 461) = “1. Knie(region), Schoß, Kniegelenk, 2. Kniestück (eines Rindes als Speise)” (GHWb 321; ÄWb I 505) = “1. knee (of man), 2. hock of animal” (DCT 157).

NB1: For a survey of senses cf. also Barns 1956, 16, n. 3f. Grapow’s (1909, 107) rendering “Schoß” is incorrect. Similarly, A. H. Gardiner’s debatable rendering of the idiom (in *Sinuhe* R10; Westcar 12:20) tp hr m3s.t (Wb II 32, 10: “Kopf auf dem Knie als Haltung eines traurig Hockenden”) as “*head on lap (as sign of mourning)*” (which “*would be an impossible physical contortion*” as pointed out by Faulkner 1959, 104) is a very weak argument for declining “knee” and translating m3s.t as “thighs” (AEO II 242*), which has been rightly abandoned in most of the standard dictionaries. Nevertheless, R. Caminos (1954, LEM 129) explained m3s.t “shoal” in Pap. Anastasi IV 1b:5 “doubtless” from the sense “thigh” (not “knee”). G. Lefèbvre (1952, 51–52, §59) rejected both “genou” and “cuisse”. R. O. Faulkner (1958, 31) maintained m3s.t “lap” also in Pap. BM 10569 (Book of Horus, 3rd cent. BC): ntr. w m3s.tj.w “the gods of the laps (?)” (sic, cf. CT m3s.tj.w “squatting gods”, DCT 158), although a year later (Flk. 1959, 104), he strongly sides with the basic sense “knee”, which is eloquently confirmed also in CT I 56: dwn-n=f n=k m3s.wt=k qrf.t “(Geb) has straightened for thee thy knees which are bent” (Faulkner).

NB2: LEg. m3s.t should be carefully distinguished from msd.t “haunch” (AEO II 243*; Janssen 1961, 21).

- Hence denom. verb: m3s “knien” (PT 1057a, 1535c, Wb II 32, 2; ÄWb I 505) = “to kneel” (FD 103), which quite evidently proves the primary sense of m3s.t “knee” (as recognized even by Grapow 1954, 92–93).
- One of the “hard words”. Its etymology has been up to now a puzzle.
- **1.** GT: most probably, OEg. m3s.t < *mls-t akin to CCh.: Gisiga-Dogba muluwes “knee” [Lks. 1970, 131; JI 1994 II, 215], Balda (Baldamu) mēlēmíss “Knie” [Str. 1922–23, 118] = lilimíš “genou” [Trn. 1987, 53]. The Eg.-Gsg. etymology was also observed (independently) by A. Militarev (2005, 366: “very likely”).

NB1: The quoted Gisiga and Balda words seem isolated in Chadic. Their strange quadrilateral structure is still to be explained (perhaps *m-l-m-s with prefix m-?). It is highly questionable whether they have anything to do with CCh.: PBata *magils-(?) ~ /> *magirs- “knee” [GT]: Nzangi magiršé [Str.] = mágəršyě “genou” [Mch. 1950, 33], Holma máglěssě [Str.] = magilhsen [magilšen] “knee” [Meek 1931 I 121, #18], Bata-Zumu (Jimo) magirsho [magiršo] “knee” [Meek 1931 I 80, #18], cf. Wadi mágērřs... [Str.] | PMafa-Mada *g-l-m-z ~ *g-r-m-z “genou” [Mch.] = *g-r-m-č ~ *g-l-m-ṣ “knee” [GT]: Mofu gürmėč [Str.], Zulgo (Zelgwa) & Mofu gürmėč [Mch.] = gürmėč [Rsg.], Mofu-Gudur merengwez [Brt. 1988, 183], Mtk. gürmḥtz [Str.] = di gurumbež [Mch.], Mboku girmėč [Mch.], Hurzo galamzəy [Mch.], Vame nágáləmdzay [Rsg.], Balda(mu) gürmbėš [Str.] (Mafa-Mada: Str. 1922–23, 118; Mch. 1953, 168; Rsg. 1978, 277, #401).

NB2: I wonder whether SCu.: Ma’a (Mbugu) múlŋ, pl. ma-muḷu “knee” [Mnh. 1906, 315] = i-múro “knee” [Ehret 1974 MS, 46] = i-múró ~ i-múrv “knee” [TB 1974, 195] could also belong here. This possibility is, of course, irrelevant as to the “short” wtg. of Eg. m3 (sic) “knee” (cf. RdE 1, 1933, 62, b; WD I 83), which must be purely an orthographical problem. Note that, in principle, a hypothetical final *-s could have disappeared in Ma’a, i.e. < PMbugu *murus, var. to the Eg.-MM isogloss *m-l-s? Cf. also LECu.: Som. mirš ~ míriš “die Füße, Hufe der Tiere als Speise” [Rn. 1902, 303; cf. WZKM 13, 194, 9]. Ch. Ehret (1980, 158, #42) connected Ma’a “knee” to Irq. mondorəq-at- “to slither, move in the fashion of a snake” < SCu. *mōdok- “to bend (joint of body)”, which seems unconvincing both phonologically and semantically.

NB3: Eg.-MM *m-l-s “knee” [GT] should be presumably distinguished from AA *m-s-l “thigh” [GT] represented by the isogloss of LEg. mnz.t (act. mns.t) [< *msl-t?] “Oberschenkel” (LP, Wb, q.v.) ||| NBrb. *m-s-l “thigh” [GT].

- Other suggestions are semantically much weaker and most of them are clearly out of question:
- **2.** K. Sethe (1910, 80, fn. 2), A. Ember (1913, 117, fn. 1), G. Thausing (1932, 292, fn. 1): OEg. m3s “to kneel” and ḥmsj “to sit” are of common origin (ḥmsj was supposed to contain a ḥ- prefix). Cannot be accepted for several reasons.

NB: Semantically (“to kneel” vs. “to sit”) not as problematic as phonologically: the OEg. root for “to sit” was not OEg. *ḥm3sj as Sethe’s hypothesis would require). In

spite of Sethe's etc. unconvincing idea, the presence of the *h-* prefix in Eg. *ħmsj* "to sit" cannot be ruled out, cf. CCh.: Masa (Banana) *músā* "to sit down" [Brt. 1995, 218], which shows not even syllabic trace of an initial **hV-* (i.e. **Vmúsā* or sim.). This Eg.-Masa comparison, however, can by no means justify the false derivation of OEg. *ħmsj* from OEg. *m3s*.

- **3.** P. Lacau (1970, 3, fn. 1 & 133, §356) saw in Eg. *m3s.t* a nomen instr. of Eg. *3s* "se hâter" (MK, Lacau) = "to hurry, flow fast (of water)" (FD 5) = "eilen, fließen" (Wb I 20). Semantically evidently wrong. The etymological connection of "foot, leg" ~ "to run" would be in principle plausible, but it is not at all valid for "knee".
NB: Westendorf (1987, 461, fn. 14) declined Lacau's idea arguing that the derivation *m3s* < *3s* should have taken place before the shift of OK *z* > MK *s*, which is, besides, ill-founded, since Westendorf's OK **3z* is not attested (ÅWb I 18: the first ex. originates from the 1st IMP written with -s).
- **4.** C. T. Hodge (1976, 20, #51) speculated whether the *m3-* of OEg. *m3s.t* could be related to the first two root radicals of Sem. **birk-* "knee" [DRS 84]. Out of question.
NB: (1) Eg. *m-* ≠ Sem. **b-*, and (2) Eg. -s was not a suffix (as it is supposed about Sem. **k-*).
- **5.** H. Smith (1979, 161) too saw in Eg. *m3s.t* a prefix *m-*, while the etymon in his view was (3).*s.t* "place, seat" and/or *3s.t* "Isis" (since she "typically nurses Horus on her lap").
- **6.** W. Westendorf (1987, 460–1) explained Eg. *m3s.t* from the primary sense "Stütze, Träger" derived from a hypothetical (unattested) Eg. **w3s* "heben, tragen, erhöhen", whose existence he tried to demonstrate on equally certainly mistaken parallels (q.v.).
- **7.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 313, #603) analyzed Eg. *m3s* "to kneel" as a reflex of AA **-ma/i?*- "to bend, fold (tr.)" extended either by a "non-finitive" suffix **-š* or a "fortative" suffix **-š*. Baseless.
NB: Ehret equated Eg. *m3s.t* with SCu. **ma?*/*°*- "to bend, fold" ||| NOM.: Mocha *mi?*-o "bundle" ||| Ch. **ma* "to return" [Nwm.] (!), which are probably even mutually unrelated.
- **8.** GT: a relationship to NBrb.: Zemmur *ta-měšaš-t* "rotule" [Lst. 1918, 4] ||| LECu.: Afar *māsayya* (f) "joint of body" [PH 1985, 158] is rather improbable.
NB: First, we should assume Eg. *-?* < **-Ø-*. Secondly, the NBrb. data suggest an old initial **n-*, cf. NNtifa *ta-něšš-t* & Zayan *ta-něšš-at* [Lst.].

m3s ~ m3s.t: name of a mammal, whose identification is debated.
NB: Ch. Leitz (2000, 275) listed the arguments for "fox": (1) its red colour (BD Naville 84:6, CT VI 241a), (2) hide of fox known as material for aprons, (3) occurs in OK lists of aprons among leopard (*b3-šm°*), gepard (*ntr.t*), lynx (*jnjb*), jackal (*wnš*), (5) a possible connection with **ms* (hrgl. depicting "drei Fuchsfelle"). The latter one is certainly false as $\sqrt{ms} \neq \sqrt{m3s}$. Moreover, Leitz failed to explain how then *m3s* can go in teams (Gespann) in the NK (Camino 1956, 32) and ignored the CT evidence speaking in favour of a horned mammal (cf. Edel 1975, 29).

- The instances of (possibly) the same (?) word are as follows (this list is not complete, for some further exx. cf. PL 408):
- (1) m3s.t (Dyn. III) rendered by J. Kahl (etc. 1995, 249) ambiguously: “Antilope(nfell)” (cf. below).
NB: Osing (1998, 122, fn. 548) and Leitz (l.c.) equally abstained from rendering the recently found new instance from Balat, Dakhla (late OK, cf. Posener-Krieger: “Les tablettes en terre crue de Balat”, in: *Bibliologia, Elementa ad librorum studia pertinentia* 12, 1992, 45). D. Meeks (2005, 245, #505c) is uncertain whether this animal is identical with that known from later sources.
 - (2) m3s.w (CT VI 241a, sg. despite the pl. strokes) “unidentified animal” (AECT II 208, spell 624, n. 6) = “taureau (au poil roux)” (AL 78.1640) = “(wahrscheinlich) Fuchs” (Leitz 2000, 275) = “antelope, gazelle, or bull (?)” (DCT 158). Cf. also m3s.w “Masu-Tiere (des Onuris-Tempels)” (1st IMP, ÄWb I 82, not listed on p. 505, cf. Meeks 2005, 245, #505c).
 - (3) m3s (BD Naville 84:6) “e. Tier von roter Farbe” (Wb II 33, 2) = “red deer” (Allen 1973, 72) = “taureau sauvage” (Barguet 1967, 122) = “red animal” (PL 408).
 - (4) m3s.t (Memphis stela of Amenhotep II, line 11, cf. Urk. IV 1304:6, with pl. strokes, but sg., no det., published by A. Badawy in *ASAE* 42, 1943, 1–23 & E. Edel in *ZDPV* 69, 1953, 97–176) rendered as “Art Gazelle, Hirsch, Antilope” (Keimer, *BIE* 30, 1948, 119f.; cf. Vikentiev, *BIE* 30, 1948, 266f.) = “ein rotfarbiges Tier” (GHWb 321).
NB1: Badawy (*ASAE* 42, 1943, 14, n. e) identified it as a rare wtg. of NK msj.t (nt ssm.t) “Füllen” (XVIII., Wb II 140, 15).
NB2: R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 208, spell 624, n. 6) conceived it as fem. pl. (m3s.wt) for of m3s.w in CT VI 241a (above).
 - (5) m3s (text of the “Sporting King”, XVIII.) “unidentified mammal (was red, go in teams perhaps pulling the divine bark in the feast of Sokar?): could be Typhonic animals of some kind (donkeys?)” (Caminos 1956, 32 & fn. 5 with further lit.) = “taureau (au poil roux)” (AL 78.1640) = “(team of) ox(en) pulling the bark of Sokar” (Brovarski, *LÄ* V 1069, n. 69) = “donkey” (Westendorf 1989, 80 after Caminos) = “ein Rind (roter Farbe)” (GHWb 321) = “ein Tier von rot(braun)er Farbe, das im Gespann eingesetzt werden kann” (Osing 1998, 122, n. i & fn. 549).
NB: Caminos (l.c.) speculates about a connection with CT I 289c mz.t “horned animal” (reading debated, cf. DCT 161), which is rightly considered in PL 408 as improbable (cf. the entry for mjz.t below). D. Meeks (AL 78.1639) speaks of a “confusion” of the two terms.
 - (6) m3s.t (Edfu V 270:1), var. m3s.tj (Edfu V 219:2) “taureau (au poil roux) comme épithète d’Horus” (AL 78.1640) = “ein Tier” (Kurth 1994, 12, §49: Edfu) = “animal (deer?) with red colour (fox?)” (PL 408: Edfu).

(7) m3s.t (Tebtunis onomasticon, 2nd cent. AD) “Art Wildtier (das in Syrien gejagt werden konnte, (Osing 1998, 122, n. i & fn. 548–9).

- From the same root: perhaps m3s.t “Art Schurz” (OK, Wb, discussed below).
- Obscure word. Origin unknown. Solution #1 represents only a weak theoretical possibility. Other etymological suggestions are much less tenable:
 - **1.** GT: should we assume an OEg. *m3s “red” < *mrs as a var. root to LEg. mrš “red” (q.v.)?
 - **2.** W. Westendorf (1987, 461, fn. 16; cf. also 1989, 80) derived m3s “Tier, dessen Fell dem Toten als Schurzumhüllung dient” from a hypothetical Eg. root *w3s “heben, tragen, erhöhen” (!), from which he eventually explained a number of etymologically certainly unrelated Eg. terms: *ms “Dreierbündel von Fuchsfellen” (q.v.), msj “gebären” < orig. *“tragen, hervorbringen” (q.v.), and m3s.t “knee” (q.v.).
 - **3.** GT: probably unrelated to SBrb. *m-l-s.
NB: Cf. Hgr. mules “avoir une liste, avoir au milieu du chaudière une ligne ou une bande blanches partant du front et allant vers la bouche (cheval, âne, chameau, boeuf)”, a-mūlas “animal à liste” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1194], EWlm. & Ayr mulās “avoir du blanc (une liste, étoile) au front (animal)” [PAM 1998, 217] = EWlm. a-mūlas “cheval au front blanc” [Ncl. 1957, 59].

m3s.t “Art Schurz” (OK, Wb II 32, 15) = “knee-length skirt or apron (?)” (Smith 1933, 155) = “a long garment” (Smith 1935, 141) = “Gewandart, Schurz” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza I 188, 230, 258) = “peau du taureau m3s(tj)” (AL 78.1640: m3s in CT VII 22x) = “Fell des m3s-Tieres, das dem Toten als Schurzhüllung dient” (Westendorf 1987, 461, fn. 16) = “ein Fell (des roten Rindes oder des m3s. t-Tieres)” (GHWb 321; ÄWb I 505) = “Fuchsfell als Schurzmaterial” (Leitz 2000, 275) = “ein Gewand aus Antilopenfell” (FÄW 173: Dyn. III, cf. Keimer, BIE 30, 1948, 119f.).

- Etymology highly debated:
 - **1.** The philological lit. usually echoes the view formulated by E. Edel (1975, 29, §34): “*ich zweifle nicht, daß das m3st-Gewand aus der Haut dieses m3st-Tieres hergestellt wurde*”, cf. e.g. Meeks (AL l.c.), Westendorf (1987, 461, fn. 16), Hannig (GHWb 321; ÄWb I 505), Leitz (2000, 275).
 - **2.** W. Westendorf (1987, 461, fn. 16; cf. also 1989, 80), in addition, extended this etymology to a derivation from a hypothetical Eg. root *w3s “heben, tragen, erhöhen” (!), from which he eventually explained a number of etymologically certainly unrelated Eg. terms such as

*ms “Dreierbündel von Fuchsfellen” (q.v.), msj “gebären” < orig. **“tragen, hervorbringen”* (q.v.), and m3s.t “knee” (q.v.). Similarly, Ch. Leitz (2000, 275) assumes a connection with the Eg. hrgl. ms (F31) defined as “drei zusammengebundene Fuchsfelle” (Borchardt, ZÄS 44, 1907, 75–76 & Ranke, ZÄS 45, 1908, 92). Excluded, since $\sqrt{\text{msj}} \neq \sqrt{\text{m3s}}$.

- **3.** S. Smith (1933, 155) pondered a connection to Eg. m3s.t “knee”, since “*the word m3s.t would suggest that it was a knee-length skirt or apron*”. At the same conclusion arrived E. Stahelin (1966, 35) too: “*es ist möglich, daß...m3st...ein Kleidungsstück...[ist], das nur bis zu den Knien reicht*”. P. Kaplony (IÄF 328), albeit with a query-mark, repeated this equation, although already Smith (l.c.) himself *a priori* declined this assumption, because some representations show the m3s.t much longer, which has been confirmed also by E. Edel (1975, 29, §34): “*nicht zu halten, da das Gewand auch länger als knielang ist*”.
- **4.** GT: the external evidence is also not too helpful. Cf. perhaps NBrb.: Mzab LMS: a-ləmsu, pl. i-ləmsa ~ met. var. a-məlsu, pl. i-məlsa “peau tannée servant de sac” [Dlh. 1984, 106, 118]?
NB: Akk. maršu “(a garment of green and blue wool)” [CAD m1, 296: with akkado-gram in Hittite] is out of question.

m3s.t “Sandbank, Untiefe” (late NK, Wb II 32, 16) = “flaque d’eau, marais” (Ceugney 1880, 6 after Maspero) = “shoal (lit. thigh-deep waters), a shallow place or half-submerged sandbank” (Camino 1954, 129) = “shoal” (DLE I 208) = “lieu où se tient le crocodile” (Auffrère 1990, 672) = “Sandbank, Untiefe, knietiefes Wasser” (GHWb 321).

● Etymology debated:

- **1.** Usually derived from Eg. m3s.t “knee” (q.v.), cf., e.g., the suggestive rendering in Camino 1954, 129; GHWb 321.
- **2.** C. Ceugney (1880, 6) saw in m3s.t an m- prefix + s.t “endroit, lieu, place”. False both on semantic (“place” vs. “shoal”???) and phonological grounds (since s.t \neq *3s.t).
NB: The reconstruction of *3s.t for Eg. s.t “seat” is problematic and etymologically unjustified.
- **3.** Similarly, W. Westendorf (1987, 460–1, fn. 16) explained “Sandbank” (lit. **“Bank”*) from his hypothetical *w3s “heben, tragen, erhöhen” (!), from which he eventually derived a number of etymologically certainly unrelated Eg. terms such as s.t (*3s.t) “Sitz”, *ms “Dreierbündel von Fuchsfellen” (q.v.), msj “gebären”, orig. **“tragen, hervorbringen”* (q.v.), and m3s.t “knee” (q.v.).

- **4.** GT: or perhaps < *mrs.t (lit. “wet place?”), akin to Ug. mrt̄ “benetzen, wässern” [WUS #1684] || Ar. maraṭa “mouiller, humecter etc.” [BK II 1086] = “erweichen, in Wasser auflösen, einweichen” [WUS]?
- **5.** GT: a relationship with Ar. marš- “2. terre que la pluie vient de tremper et dont les parties terreuses sont emportées par le torrent”, ʔal-maršāʔu “sol qui abonde en végétation, couvert d’herbes” [BK II 1091] || NBrb.: Zayan & Sgugu √mrs: a-maṣas, pl. i-maṣas-ḥ [–s < *–š reg.] “averse, forte pluie” [Lbg. 1924, 566] seems rather improbable.

m3s.tj (wood det.) “pièce de bois unique sur laquelle sont fixées d’autres pièces, également en bois... et qui ne peut évidemment pas avoir le même sens de ‘coupler’” (late NK, Jéquier 1911, 63–64, §21) = “unidentified wooden object” (Černý, JEA 31, 1945, 39: Pap. Deir el-Medine I, pl. 24, rt. 1.6.8) = “une pièce de mobilier” (AL 78.1636) = “?” (DLE I 208) = “ein Möbelstück”, rd.wj n m3s.tj “Beine des m3s.t-Möbels” (GHWb 321).

NB: Acc. to GHWb l.c., to be read fem. m3s.t.

- Meaning and etymology obscure.
- **1.** G. Jéquier (1911, 63–64, §21) saw in it the younger form of MK msrj.t (var. 1x: mspr.t, q.v.). Improbable for phonological reasons.
- **2.** GT: a striking parallel appears in Akk. (Syn.L.) muruš “Bett” [AHW 677: of unknown origin] = “(a foreign (?) word for bed)” [CAD m2, 230], which, however, lacks the Akk. ending -u and seems to be a foreign form.

m3s.tj ~ ms.tj (wood det.) “ein Schiffsteil” (GR: Edfu VI 80:2, Wb II 31, 14) = “ped” (Lefébure 1890, 96) = “part of a ship (exact meaning unknown)” (Glanville 1932, 17, §32; PL 408–9) = “le pont arrière, la partie postérieure du bateau, à partir de l’endroit où la quille se relève obliquement au-dessus de la ligne de flottaison” (Drioton 1948, 37 & n. b) = “la fourche de poupe” (Alliot 1954 II, 767 & n. 7) = “footstep” (Fairman 1954, 102, n. 40; cf. also Blackman & Fairman in JEA 30, 1944, 6, n. 1) = “die Heckpartie des Schiffes” (Düring 1995, 59)?

NB: P. Wilson (PL 409) finds a comparable word in Edfu II 227:6–7 (laboratory text), where a bull is sph ḥr m3stj nt nbs “fastened in a reed mesh” (rendering by Fairman l.c.).

- May be eventually connected with NK m3s.tj (above), which is, however, still to be proven.

- **1.** E. Lefébure (1890, 96), followed by A. M. Blackman (l.c.), explained the word from Eg. m3s.t “knee” (q.v.), which breaks down in the light of the alternatively suggested sense “back of the boat” (Alliot, Drioton, Düring, above).
- **2.** S. R. K. Glanville (1932, 17, §32), followed by P. Wilson (PL 408), regards an eventual connection with NK mstj “boat” (Pap. BM 10056, under Thotmes III; Pap. Anastasi IV 10:1f.) = “a type of small craft” (PL l.c.) as plausible. They do not even exclude a derivation of NK mstj < m3stj. Hardly so, esp. because of the -3-.
- **3.** GT: with respect to the rendering “back of the boat”, and provided the reading ms.tj is the correct one, cf., purely theoetically, AA *m-s (perhaps *mas-?) “back” [GT].
 NB1: Attested in NBrb.: Qbl. a-mmas “les hanches et le bas du dos”, cf. also a-meššaš “fesse” [Dit. 1982, 481 & 520] ||| Ch. *m-s “back” [JS 1981, 32]: WCh.: Fyer & Tambas & Bokkos más “Rücken” [Jng. 1970, 88, 144] || CCh.: Hina mesé “Gesäß” [Str. 1922–23, 116] || ECh.: EDng. máasá “rein, région médiane du dos” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 197], WDng. mààsò “région médiane du dos” [Fédry 1971, 123].
 NB2: In the equally hypothetical case if our LEg. mstj reflects an old (unattested) *mst < *msk, cp. Sem.: Gurage (< Cu.?): Selti & Wolane & Zway məskät “1. back of body, 2. clitoris, 3. buttocks, anus” [Lsl. 1979 III, 428] = Zway misköt “back” [Bedecha 1994, 2], Harari miskät “buttocks” [Lsl.] ||| LECu.: Somali misikti “hip” [Lsl.] ||| CCh.: Ktk. mùsku “anus” [Bouny 1974, 4, #34].

m3s “von der Apophisschlange die sich nicht von der Stelle bewegen kann” (LP, Wb II 33, 4) = “être immobilisé” (AL 78.1641 after Borghouts 1978, 94, 144).

- GT: presumably not identical with OEg. m3s “to kneel”. Perhaps cognate with Ar. malaṭa I “4. ne pas pouvoir courir (se dit d’un lièvre)” [BK II 1143]?
 NB: Cf. also ECh.: EDng. màlsiyē “se faire une entorse ou une foulure, se luxer”, cf. mērsō “boiteux, claudiquant, clopinant, impotent, infirme, bancal” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 194] = màlsiyē “sich verrenken” [Ebs. 1979, 149; 1987, 98]?

m3š “eine Ente” (OK, GHWb 321; ÄWb I 505).

- NB: This is the (probably correct) alternative reading of m3^c “Art Ente” (OK, Wb, q.v.). G. Godron (1957, 20), followed by R. Hannig (cf. GHWb 321), suggested a reading m3š, which seems more convincing than m3^c, since (1) Eg. m3š has a further OK (V./VI.) ex. (ÄWb l.c.) and (2) Eg. m3š [< *mrš] “duck” can be convincingly identified from an etymological standpoint.
- GT: if the new reading is correct, cf. LECu.: perhaps PBoni *mērīs (m) “honey bird” [Heine 1982, 147] ||| CCh.: perhaps Mafa méréz [-zl] “Ponogarthia squarrosa (Poacees)” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 231] || ECh.: Somray màrsá ~ màsàrá (old form), pl. màrsé “canard” [Jng. 1993 MS, 44; 1978, 182].

m3q.t “Leiter (Himmelsleiter)” (PT, Wb II 33, 6; WD I 83: referring to ZÄS 100, 1973, 63) = “ladder” (FD 103) = “Leiter (mit festen Seitenhölzern)” (ÄWb I 505c).

NB1: Vocalized as *mä3q̣t (Zunke 1923/1997, 63) < *mä3̣q̣t (Fecht 1960, 180, §373), later *mó3qet > *móqet > *móqe (Černý 1943, 178–9).

NB2: Var. p3q (q.v., hapax in a pun of PT 995, cf. Sander-Hansen 1948, 3; Cauville 1987, 183; Gaboda 1989, 94–95, §2.a).

- Hence: Dem. mkj “Leiter (?)” (Dem. Pap. Wien 27, 15:22, Spg. 1920, 27) = “Leiter” (DG 183) → Cpt.: (B) ΜΟΥΚΙ “ladder” (CD 161b).
- A nomen instr. (derived with prefix m-) of Eg. j3q [< *yrq or *ryq] “emporsteigen” (PT, Wb I 33, 15), which is cognate with Sem. *rky: Ar. raqiya “to ascend (a stair or a ladder)”, ma-rqā-t- ~ mi-rqā-t- [< *mV-rqay-t-] “a place of ascent: a series of steps or stairs, a ladder” [Lane 1140–41] ||| LECu.: Orm. riqa “to climb (a ladder)” [Gragg 1982, 416] ||| WCh.: Ron *r-g-(y) “to ascend” [GT]: Kulere řegy- “klettern, aufsteigen”, Sha ḥâg ~ ʿâg [ḥ & ʿ reg. < *r] “hinaufklettern, -steigen”, ḥâgó “heraufklettern” (Ron: Jng. 1970, 286, 354, 391).
LIT. for Eg. m3q.t < j3q: Ember (quoted below); Grapow 1914, 22–23; Vrg. 1945, 128, #1.c.3 and 131, #2.a.1; AÄG 109, §255; Fecht 1960, 180, §373; DELC 110; Cauville 1987, 183; Blv. 1987, 278, #3.1.2; 1991, 86, #9; 1993, 52, #9. For Eg.-Sem. see Ember 1912, 88; 1913, 113, #30, fn. 4; 1926, 302, fn. 10; 1930, #3.b.3, #20.a.8; Albright 1927, #85; Czermak 1931, 101; Vrg. 1945, 128, #1.c.3 and 131, #2.a.1; DELC 110; Blv. 1987, 278, #3.1.2; 1991, 86, #9; 1993, 52, #9; Mlt.-OS 1989, 154; HSED #1743. For Ar.-Klr.-Orm. see HSED #2108.
NB1: Ron *g- (instead of *k-) is unexpected (for AA *k > Ron *k cf. Takács 2000, 96–97). Note that Sha ḥ & ʿ are reg. < *r (cf. Jng. 1966).
NB2: Ceugney (1880, 9) derived a certain Eg. m3q (P6 + M3 det.) “mât d’un navire” (Brugsch) falsely from q3 “élever”.

m3q (GW for mq? fire det.), in: p3 m3q “der...(als spottender [?] Beinamen)” (late NK hapax in Pap. Anastasi I 9:5, Wb II 33, 8) = “firebrand (?)” (Grd. 1911, 13* & fn. 1).

- Reading and etymology debated, but most probably a variation of m^cq (q.v.).
NB: (1) A. H. Gardiner (l.c.) regarded it as GW to be read as mq. I.e., he falsely assumed a distinct status of this word just as the authors of Wb. (2) D. Meeks (p.c. on 21 May 2004), in turn, with special regard to the fact that the parallel text (lit. Ostr. Deir el-Medine 1623, 8) has here m^cq (fire + person det.), identified it with Eg. m^cq “brochette (Grillspieß)” (since OK, below). (3) Ignoring this and overlooking the OK attestation of m^cq, J. Hoch (1994, 170–1, #227) treated both aforementioned examples as var. forms of late NK mgr “to boil, grill” (q.v.), which was rightly rejected by J. F. Quack (1996, 510, #227) and D. Meeks (1997, 43, #227).

m3kj “ein Mineral, das bei Elephantine gefunden wurde” (LP hapax: *Hungersnotstele* of Sehel, l. 16, Wb II 33, 9) = “(in der Aufzählung von Mineralien..., welche sich angeblich in den Bergen Äthiopiens

und zwar auf nubischem Gebiete in der Landschaft von Elephantine vorfinden sollen)” (Brugsch 1891, 31, §2).

NB: The reading of the *Anlaut* is debated. H. Brugsch (1891, 129) saw before the hrgl. m3 two dots (which could be equally conceived also as two eye-balls accompanying the hrgl. m3, cf. Wb II 7–11) and preferred to restore F18 (h). Similarly, P. Barguet (1953, 25) reconstructed an initial h- lost because of the break in the stone. Henceforth, J. R. Harris (1961, 118) is of the view that “a reading ḥm3ky may... be accepted” (so also in the new Berlin Wb, p.c. by Hafemann on 19 May 2000).

- Possibly a late (and damaged?) instance of ḥm3gt “ein kostbarer Stein aus Nubien von roter Farbe” (XVIII., Wb III 95, 1).

m3gf (or **m3g²**) “produce” (CT VI 338t, only in the var. B2L, AECT II 267) = “repas” (AL 78.1642) = “eine Mahlzeit” (GHWb 321) = “provisions” (DCT 158).

NB: R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 267, spell 707, n. 13) and R. van der Molen (DCT l.c.) read m3g, considering -f as “surely a misplaced suffix” (i.e., m3g=f “its produce”) and not part of the root, while D. Meeks (AL l.c.) defended m3gf, although R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) too put after m3gf a question-mark.

- Reading and etymology dubious.
- **1.** R. O. Faulkner (AECT l.c.) took it as “an m- formation” of Eg. 3g “to make to sprout” (PT 513d) = “pflanzen, wachsen lassen, aufsprießen lassen” (ÄWb I 21). Semantically problematic.
- **2.** GT: there is a very weak possibility that Eg. m3g (if < *mgl) might be perhaps related (via met. < *mgl ~ *mkl) to the common Brb. term for “midday meal” (discussed s.v. Eg. mtr.t infra).

NB: The hypothetic Berber etymology would also speak for Eg. m3g (with suffix =f) as suggested by Faulkner. In principle, Eg. m3g could derive from *3g or *w3g or *j3g. But common Brb. *k vs. Eg. g are irregular. From the viewpoint of this Eg.-Brb. etymology, most noteworthy are two facts: (1) Zng. -g- < *-k- (cf. the irregular Eg. -g < *-k?), (2) the met. in SBrb. *l-k-w < *k-l-w (cf. Eg. *m-lg < *m-gl?).

m3t.t “eine Nutzpflanze, die besonders im Delta, am Ufer, und in der Wüste vorkommt” (Med., Wb II 33, 11–15) = “curcuma” (Brugsch) = “céleri cultivé (Apium dulce Mill.)” (Loret 1894, 4–11, esp. 7 & 11, §1) = “wild celery” (Blackman 1910, 120, n. v) = “céleri cultivée (Apium graveolens L.)” (Keimer 1924, 39–40) = “carthame” (Deny 1948–51, 13–14) = “une plante de la famille des ombellifères: céleri cultivé (Apium graveolens L.)” (Lefébvre 1955, 208–9, §6) = “Sellerie/ Petersilie” (WÄDN 216) = “le persil (Petroselinum crispum)” (Darby & Ghalioungui apud AL 77.1628) = “celery (Apium graveolens)” (Germer 1979, 92–99; 1985, 137; 2002, 60, so also Ebbell quoted in WÄDN 217; PL 409; Manniche 1999, 76–77) = “soit le céleri Mill. (i.e., Apium graveolens, L.), soit le persil (Petroselinum crispum, Apium petroselinum, L.)” (Aufrère 1986, 10) = “*Sellerie” (GHWb 322).

NB1: Since parsley can be first attested only in Ptol. Egypt (as a medicinal herb), R. Germer (1985, 137) excluded identifying m3t.t with parsley.

NB2: Vocalized as *m³īt.ṭ (Edel l.c. excluding an etymon *m³īṭ.rjṭ yielding in principle a PCpt. *m³ītōje) = *m³īt.ṭ > *m³īt.t (Peust 1992, 122).

NB3: Should be carefully distinguished from Eg. m3t(r).t “Baum oder Gesträuch *Calotropis procera* (mit Doppelfrüchten)” (PT 1440e, CT, Edel, q.v.) as correctly pointed out by F. Daumas (1957, 59–66), E. Edel (1969, 12–13, n. e), and S. Aufrère (1986, 10). This differentiation is sometimes possible only in the light of context, since the distinction of old -t- vs. -t- disappeared by the MK. For further discussion of the frequently confused m3t.t vs. m3t.t cf. also Kákosy 1971, 164, n. v. For m3t.t smsm.t in Pap. Ramesseum III 26 see Barns 1956, 19, n. 26. Note that m3t.t in Pap. Leiden I 348, 5:8 has been rendered “mandrake” (Edel l.c.). Med. m3t.t has been identified by Dawson (JEA 19, 1933, 133–5, §5 followed in FD 103) falsely as “mandrake” and traced back to PT 1440e m3t.t (q.v.) just as Blackman (1910, 120, n. v), which was rightly rejected already by Lefébvre (1955, 208) and Germer (1979, 93) and ignored in WÄDN 216–7. On the other hand, Aufrère’s (1986, 4 & 9, XI) m3t.t (sic, -t!) “céleri” (sic!) is equally false, since m3t.t “celery” has no attestation older than Med. (WÄDN 216). For further details cf. also the entry for Eg. m3t.t “mandrake” (q.v.).

NB4: The expression m3t.t n.t swt in Pap. Budapest 51.1961, rt. 2:4 was mentioned already by Dawson (1934, 137) as “cannot be commented”. It was equally left untranslated by Kákosy (1971, 161, 164, n. v), who pondered two alternatives: (1) either a mistake for m3.t n.t swt “Halm der Binse”, or (2) m3t.t n.t swt as a not yet identified species of “celery”. Since swt “Binse” would make little sense in the latter case, the first solution is to be preferred with Dawson (l.c.), who, however, baselessly surmised that m3t.t was “*originally the name of a specific plant*” and then “*may have become a generic term for magical plants of various kinds...*”.

NB5: Aufrère (1986, 10, fn. 2) considered (contra Goyon 1984, 81–82, cf. AEB 84.303) LEg. m3 (Wb II 11, 10, Mariette: Dendara I 72c) as “*une écriture fautive pour*” m3t.t, which in Dendara “*servait de phylactère à la déesse Hathor de Dendara*” and “*désignait le céleri et non le calotrope*” (i.e., it is = m3t.t ≠ m3t.t, q.v.).

● Occurs also in the following compounds:

NB: R. Germer (1985, 137) assumed in m3t.t ḥ3s.t and m3t.t mhj.t “*nur unterschiedliche Herkunftsbezeichnungen, aber nicht zwei verschiedene Pflanzenarten*” as Loret and Lefébvre thought.

(1) m3t.t mhj.t “persil (*Apium petroselinum* L.)” (Loret 1894, 11, §4, followed by Jonckheere 1944, 18, fn. 4 & 19, fn. 2) = “*Apium dulce* Mill. (?)” (Keimer 1924, 39–40, so also LÄ II 521) = “céleri du Nord, une variété propre au Delta, peut-être: *Apium dulce* Mill.” (Lefébvre 1955, 208 contra Loret) = “céleri cultivé” (Aufrère 1986, 4).

NB: Dawson’s (l.c.) rendering “*Mandragora autumnalis* Bertol. (of the Mediterranean region)” for m3t.t mhj.t is false.

(2) m3t.t jdḥ.w “céleri sauvage, ache de marais (*Apium graveolens* L.)” (Loret 1894, 11, §2).

(3) m3t.t ḥ3s.t “*Crithmum pyrenaicum* Forsk.” (Loret 1894, 11, §3) = “céleri du désert, persil (*Apium petroselinum* L.)” (Lefébvre 1955, 208; so also Keimer 1924, 39–40 & LÄ II 521) = “céleri sauvage” (Aufrère 1986, 4) = “*Sellerie des Berglandes*” (HAM 838) = “mountain celery, parsley: *Apium petroselinum* L. (?)” (Manniche 1999, 78).

NB1: Cf. Lat. petro-selinum “selinum des rochers ou des pierres” (DELG).

NB2: Dawson’s (l.c.) rendering “*Mandragora officinarum* L. (common to Syria and Palestine)” for m3t.t. ḥ3s.t is false.

- Hence: Cpt.: (SB) MIT , (B) EMIT “σέλινον, apium *ou céleri*” (Loret 1894, 11) = “celery *or* parsley” (CD 188; CED 92) = “Petersilie, Sellerie” (KHW 104 referring to Daumas, BIFAO 56, 59–66) = “persil *et* céleri” (DELIC 124).

NB1: Reflected apud Dioscorides as μέθ ≈ Gk. σέλινον κηπαίων (Keimer 1924, 40; Lefébvre 1955, 208, fn. 4). For the rejection of formerly suggested Cpt. and Gk. reflexes see Loret 1894, 4–5.

NB2: As pointed out by W. Vycichl (DELIC 124), the Cpt. forms cannot derive from a fem. m3t.t, but a masc. etymon m3t would be equally improbable, therefore he explained (SB) MIT from *m3t.w (*ma3ūt.aw > *(e)m3ūtew).

- Origin obscure. No evident cognates.
- 1. W. Vycichl (DELIC 124) derived m3t.t from PT m3t.t “Art Gewächs, Baum” (Wb II 33), while he explained (SB) MIT from a hypothetic masc. etymon *m3t.w (*ma3ūt.aw > *(e)m3ūtew). The reason why Med. m3t.t < PT m3t.t cannot be accepted is discussed above.
- 2. GT: in principle, m3t.t could go back *mlt.t, but the comparison with ECu.: Tsamay mält-itte(f) “fenugreek” [Sava 2005 MS, 253] would be semantically weak.
- 3. GT: equally improbable is the hypothetic assumption that m3t.t < *m?t.t ~ NOm.: Wlt. māiy^a “cabbage” [LS 1997, 475] ||| WCh.: Hausa mààcéé [-tē] ~ mààcéé [-ts-] “cooked sorrel-leaves” [Abr. 1962, 627].

NB: Cf. also AA (or just Cu.-Om.?) *m-t “grass” [GT] > LECu.: Dirayta māta “a certain kind of grass” [LS: < Orm.] ||| Om. *māt-a [Bnd. 1987] = *mat- “grass” [Bnd. 1988]: NOm.: Wlt. mat-a [Bnd.] = māt-a [Lmb.] = māt-ā [Crl. 1929, 33, 62], EWlt. cluster *māt-a [Bnd.], Kullo (Dawro) māt-a [CR], Malo māt-a [Bnd. & Alemayehu] = mat-a [Flm.] = māt^h-a [Sbr. & Candwell], Oyda māt-á [Bnd.] = mat-a [Flm.], Bsk. mat-a [Alm.] = mat-i [Azeb] = māt-ε [Bnd.] = māt-á [Flm.], Doko mat-ā [CR], Male māt-i [Azeb] = māt-i [Bnd.] = māt-a [Donham] = mat-i [Lewis] (NWomt.: Bnd. 1999 MS, 17, #63; 2000 MS, 57, #63) | Bdt. māt-ā [Crl. 1929, 33, 62] | Gmr. mat [Montandon] = māt (“erba verde”) [CR 1925, 622] | Dizi mātkn (sic) [Bnd.] | Mao: Ganza mat-i, Bambeshi mār-a [*-t-] (Mao: Bnd. 1983, 344) || SOm.: Ari māt-a (Om.: CR 1913, 406; Lsl. 1959, 40; Bnd. 1975, 166; 1987, 33; 1988, 145; 1994, 1156, #35; LS 1997, 471) ||| CCh.: perhaps Lgn. mááda [-d- < *-VtV-?] “eine Grasart” [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 106]?

- 4. GT: if m3t.t < *m?t.t, of special interest might be also LECu.: Konso mič-ā “edible leaves” [Ss.], Gdl. mič-a “edible leaves” [Ss. 1979, 28].

NB: Perhaps to be connected with Cu.-Om. *m-ṭ “grass” [GT]? Cf. LECu.: Orm. muṭ-ā “kind of grass used in basketry (esp. gundō)” [Gragg 1982, 296] | HECu.: Sdm. mičīč-a [-č- < *-ṭ-] “grass” [Lsl.] = mičīč-a “grass for basket-work” [Hds. 1989, 73, 386] ||| NOm.: Kefoid *mōč-o [-č- < *-ṭ-] “grass” [GT]: Kaffa mōč-ō [Rn. 1888, 316] = moč-ō [Crl. 1951, 469] = mōč [Bnd. 1988] = moč-o [Bnd. 1975] = mōč-o [CR] = moč-o [Flm.], Mocha mōč-o [Lsl.], Sns.-Bworo muč-ō [Crl.] = muč-o [Flm.], Anf. mōč-o [-tsʰ-] [Flm.], Boshā moč-o [Flm.], “Gonga” múč-o [Beke apud CR] (Kefoid: Flm. 1987, 146, #7) | Mao: Sezo mič-i [-tsʰ-] “grass” [Bnd. 1983,

344]. Note that H.-J. Sasse (1979, 28) linked Konso *miḏ-ā* & Gdl. *miç-a* “edible leaves” to Orm. *miḏ-āni* “fruit, grain”, but comparing with Orm. *muṭ-ā* “kind of grass” [Gragg] seems semantically more convincing.

- **5.** GT: if Eg. *m3t.t* is to be interpreted as a formation from **m3* [**mr*] like *mj.t.t* “Gleiches” < *mj* (Wb II 40), i.e., the 3rd root radical was originally a formative, cp. perhaps Akk. (a/jB) *murār(t)u* etwa “Endivie (zu den Zichorien gehörende, leicht bitter schmeckende, grüne Salatpflanze)”, (mA) *murārītu* “Salatgärtchen” [AHW 675] = “bitter lettuce” [CAD m2, 218]?

NB: From Akk. *marāru* “bitter werden/sein” [AHW 609]. Cf. also Akk. *murrutu* “(an edible plant)” [CAD m2, 223]?

m3t.t “Name eines Skorpions” (LP, Wb II 33, 16).

- Original reading (*m3t.t*, *m3ṭ.t*, *mt.t*, *mṭ.t*?) and etymology debatable due to the late attestation. V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 183; cf. Orel 1993, 38) compared it with WCh.: Bokkos *matá-gáreṅ* “scorpion” [Jng. 1970, 144; cf. JI 1994 II, 282].

NB1: For the second component of Bokkos cf. WCh.: Daffo-Butura *gáryétj*, Kulere *gírír* ~ *gûr* “scorpion” (Ron: JI 1994 II, 282), akin to Eg. *d3r* [< **gʔr*?] “scorpion” (OK, Wb V 526–7)?

NB2: Perhaps eventually to be connected with LECu.: Saho & Afar & Som. *mūd-*, Orm. *múta* “stechen” (LECu.: Rn. 1886, 879) || SCu. **mut-* “long narrow point” [Ehret 1980, 158] || CCh.: Masa *mètá* “to pinch” [Brt. 1995, 223]?

m3t “von der auf der Bahre liegenden Osirisfigur” (GR, Wb II 33, 10) = “(used of an Osiris-figure) lying on a bier” (Smith 1979, 162) = “le gisant (?)” (AL 79.1145).

NB: Hardly from the same root as *m3dd* “somnoler” (LP, Vernus apud AL 78.1651).

- As pointed out by H. S. Smith (1979, 162), it derives via an unattested **m3ṭ* (lit. “who is on the bier” or sim.) eventually (by participial *m-*) from OEg. *3ṭ.t* “1. Bett, 2. auch von der Bahre des Osiris” (OK, Wb I 23, 11), which goes back to **rk.t* and comes from the AA heritage, cf. AA **r-k* “bed” [GT].

NB1: Attested in NAgaw **ʔar[ə]g-* “bed, couch” [Apl. 1991] = **ʔaräg-* “bed” [App. 1994]: Bln. *ʔarəg/ʔarát*, Xmtg. *arət* ~ *arät*, Xmt. *ʔirät*, Qmt. *arg-a*, Qwr. *alg-a* | SAgaw: Awngi *ʔag* [< **rag*?] (Agaw: Apl. 1991 MS, 2–3; 1994, 2; 1996, 13) || HECu. **irk-aḏ-* (med.) “to lean upon” [Hds. 1989, 414] || WCh.: Ngz. *rákàì* “bed” [Schuh 1981, 136], WBade *rákè-n* “bed” [Schuh], Bade-Gashua *lákàì* [**r-*] “bed” [Schuh 1975, 112]. Any connection to NBrb.: Shilh & Mzgh. *ta-rik-t* “selle” || EBrb.: Gdm. *ti-rik-ət* “selle” || SBrb.: Hgr. *ta-rik* “selle” (Brb.: Lst. 1931, 294)?

NB2: Whether WCh.: Fyer *ràk*, Bokkos *ràk* “to sleep” (Ron: Jng. 1968, 7, #60; 1970, 393; JI 1994 II, 198) belong here is questionable both semantically (Ron “to sleep” vs. HECu. “to lean upon”) and phonologically (Ron **k* < AA **ḳ*).

NB3: A. G. Belova (1987, 277) compared Eg. *3ṭ.t* “bed” with Ar. *wkʔ* “to lean on”. Phonologically false (Eg. *3-* ≠ Ar. *w-*). H. Satzinger (1999, 381), in turn, combined Eg. *3ṭ.t* with AA **dVḳ* “Stufe, Sitz” [SISAJa II #129], which is hardly acceptable esp. because of Eg. *3-* vs. AA **d-*.

m3tj “(in einem Titel: m3tj des Min)” (OK, Wb II 33, 17).

- Usually explained as m3.tj (mnw) (i.e., nomen actoris of m33 “to see”): “der (den Min) zu sehen pflegt” (Junker: Giza VII 233) = “der den Min schaut” (o.c. XII 102, so also in IÄF 582, 584) = “der den Min sieht” (Helck apud Jones l.c. as well as Kahl et al. 1995, 13D, 242 index; so also Osing 1998, 272, n. ag) = “einer, der sieht” (AÄG §247) = “der den Gott Min sieht” (GHWb 314) = “celui qui contemple Min” (Piacentini apud Jones l.c.) = “he who beholds Min” (Jones 2000, 423, §1566). The same rendering has been suggested for the OK title m3tj-ḥq3 (?): “der den Herrscher schaut” (Goedicke, MDAIK 17, 1961, 72, pl. 15:3 followed by Hannig in GHWb 314) = “he who sees the ruler (?)” (Fischer in ZÄS 86, 1961, 25–26, fig. 1 & n. 2 followed by Jones 2000, 423, §1568).

NB1: W. Helck (1954, 50) finds in one OK instance m33.tj used as *Nebenform* to m33. R. Hannig (GHWb 314) too prefers to transcribe m33.tj.

NB2: H. Kees (1965, 109) declined any connection with Eg. m3tj.t “Löwengöttin” (OK, q.v.).

m3tj.t (lion det.) “Name der Göttin des XII. Gaus von Oberägypten” (OK, XX., GR, Wb II 34, 1) = “lion-goddess Matjet” (AEO II 69*, fn. 1) = “Löwengöttin (Kultname): Löwin als die charakteristische Gottheit des 12. Gaus” (Kees 1965, 104) = m3jtj.t “Maitit (Göttin des 12. oäg. Gaus)” (Kmr. 1994, 17–18). Attested first under Qaa, Dyn. I (FÄW 169).

- Etymology debatable. Most probable is solution #1.
- **1.** H. Kees (1965, 106–9), followed by F. Kammerzell (1994, 18), assumed on the basis of its “zerschneidender Charakter” in m3tj.t (Kmr.: lit. “ZermalmLöwin”) a compound of Eg. m3j “lion” (q.v.) + tj “zerstampfen” (PT, Wb V 237, 10–12) = “zerstoßen, zerstampfen, zermalmen” (Kmr.), cf. also redupl. tjtj “1. (since MK) niederschlagen, 2. (since XVIII.) niedertreten, zertreten” (Wb V 244).
NB1: In the chapel of Sesostri I at Karnak (Kees 1965, 104, 108), the name is written indeed as if it were a compound m3.t tj.t (as a fem. counterpart to m3j-ḥz3 “wildblickender Löwe” or m3-ḥd “das weiße Wild”).
NB2: Kammerzell (1994, 65, n. 102) analyzed rw.tj “Bez. des Löwenpaares” (PT, Wb II 403, 10) the same way: *rw.(wj)-tj.(wj), lit. “die beiden zermalmenden Löwen”.
- **2.** F. Kammerzell (1994, 65, n. 102) pondered alternatively identifying the -tj- of m3tj.t with a rare diminutive suffix -t of AA origin (Behrens 1982; Schenkel 1985) surmised in Eg. z3.t “Kindchen” and t3.t “Jüngchen”, which he projected also to rw.tj (lit. “die beiden Löwenjungen”). Improbable due to the anomaly of -tj vs. -t.
- **3.** H. Kees (1965, 109) declined any connection with Eg. m3tj (of Min, title, q.v.).

m3tj “un bâton” (AL 78.1645 referring to Fischer in Metropolitan Museum Journal 13, 18) = “*ein Stab” (GHWb 321).

- Obscure word. The underlying root also (perhaps *m3?). Etymology unknown.

NB1: Provided the root was *m3t < *mr̥t (improbable), it might be a match of NBrb.: Mzab a-mruḍ, pl. i-mraḍ “canon d’arme à feu” [Dlh. 1984, 121] ||| ECh.: Mokiiko mōrḍyē “manche (de lance)” [Jng. 1990, 142].

NB2: Less probably, provided Eg. m3tj < mʔtj, cf. perhaps Sem.: Akk. (a/jB) muttū ~ mattū “eine Stange” [AHW 690: no clear etymology] = “pole” [CAD m2, 313] (although it seems a mV- prefix form) ||| HECu.: Sid. mēta “the piece of woad upon which the fibre of *wēse* is fastened to be scratched” [Gsp. 1983, 230].

m3tn (fire det.) “subst. de sens inconnu (quelque chose que l’on peut mordre)” (CT III 390c: S1C, hapax, AL 78.1646).

NB: R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 201, spell 262, n. 3), R. Hannig (GHWb 322), and R. van der Molen (DCT 158) all transcribed it as m3tn but abstained from any rendering; Faulkner (l.c.) assumed that “there may have been some corruption here”. The context (CT III 390c–d) is also of little help: nḍ=s n=j m3tn ḥr djḍ.t n=j t “she grinds for me... because what is given to me is bread” (AECT l.c.).

- Meaning and reading uncertain, origin obscure.

NB: Cf. the following possibilities: **(1)** Perhaps an m- prefix nomen instr. of *3tn? But no such root can be found with which it could be identified. **(2)** If miswritten (or misread?) for *m3t < *mr̥t, cf. Sem.: Dhofar mrt “glühen (Ofen)” [Rdk. 1911, 55] and MSA *mr̥t: Sgt. mrt “être chaud” [Lsl.], Hrs. mēret “to become red-hot” [Jns.], Jbl. mīret [Lsl.] = mīrt “to become red-hot” [Jns.], Mhr. merōt [Lsl.] = mīrāt “to be heated to red-hot, become red-hot” [Jns.] (MSA: Lsl. 1938, 251–252; Jns. 1977, 90; 1981, 174; 1987, 270). **(3)** There can be hardly any connection to LECu.: Som. matán-a “das Brenneisen um Tieren eine Merke aufzubrennen” [Rn. 1902, 306] | HECu.: Had. matēn-čo “scar (of burn)” [Hds. 1989, 128].

m3t.t (shirt det.) “ein Hemd” (III.: Sekhemkhet, FÄW 175; Kahl et al. 1995, 249). Also masc.: m(3)t (shirt det.) “(auf Stoff-Etikette)” (IÄF 328).

NB1: For the det. cf. Kahl 1994, 715, s7.

NB2: R. Hannig rendered the masc. occurrence of the word (Dyn. III, mentioned between tm3.t and šnḍ.t on a tablet found near the pyramid of Sekhemkhet, cf. Helck, WZKM 54, 1957, 72–76) as mṯ(3m) “*Schleier” (ÄWb I 574), but D. Meeks (2005, 246, #574c) prefers to read it as mṯ or m(3)t for which he found a further OK instance in PK 2004, pl. 15 (II vs. D3), where mṯ (or m3t) is preceded by mṯm regarded by Meeks to be a defective form of mṯ3m (q.v.).

- Origin obscure. P. Kaplony (IÄF l.c.) explained m3t from Eg. t3m “sich verhüllen” (MK, Wb V 354, 12) = “sich verhüllen (bes. Gesicht), verschleiern” (1st IMP, ÄWb I 1443) via met. (“*Konsonanten-Umstellung*”). Improbable given the met. and the different special connotation of old t3m at the same time.

m3t “Granit (und zwar zumeist der rote, auch der schwarze) von Elephantine” (OK, Wb II 34, 3–16; Sethe 1933, 17; FÄW 174: since

III.) = “Syenitstein” (Müller 1893, 36) = “eine Steinart: Blutstein oder Haematit” (Ebers 1895, 12) = “granit de Syène” (Weill 1907, 32) = “Assuangranit” (Balcz 1932, 66, § 2 with detailed discussion of its vessel det.) = “general term for granite, esp. the common red variety” (Harris 1961, 72–74) = “granite” (FD 103) = “(red) granite” (DLE I 209) = “Granit (rote Varietät, auch schwarze), Assuangranit” (GHWb 322).

NB1: Cf. NK m3t km.t (m3t > m3t treated as fem. m3.t) “schwarzer Granit” (XVIII., Wb II 34, 16: Urk. IV 640) = “Diorit” (WD II 59: ZÄS 124, 1997, 135, fn. 25).

NB2: H. Goedicke (1967 KDAR 31) assumes in a Dyn. V ex. the sense “Granitsteinbruch”.

NB3: K. Sethe (1933, 17) surveyed the *Lautgeschichte* of the word from OK m3t via MK m3t (falsely conceived as fem.) to Dyn. XX m3 (Pap. Harris I) ~ m3jw (Pap. Torino, under Ramses IX).

- Hence: m3t “Granitschale” (IÄF 281: 1x also mjt) = “Salbvase” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza X 155) > m3t “granite bowl” (CT VII 18b, DCT 158).

NB1: The root m3t (or m3wt?) was written with the hrgl. representing a “heart-shaped vase (not heart)” (Platt 1909, 173) = “granite bowl” (EG 1927, 512, W7) = “ein flaches bauchiges Gefäß mit zwei Henkelösen” (Sethe 1933, 17).

NB2: Following K. Sethe (1933, 13), J. R. Harris (1961, 72) supposed an opposite way of derivation, i.e., that the name of the stone derived “from that of a particular type of vessel of which granite was the characteristic material”.

- Etymology debated.
- 1. According to the traditional Eg.-Sem. etymology, it was met. of *mṯ3 < *mkr being akin to Sem. *mkr “to be red” [GT]. Improbable. Cf. rather Eg. mkrr (below). Besides, it is doubtful if the original meaning was “red” and it was expressed by a root unattested in Eg. with this sense.

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Alb. 1918, 230, #48; Ember 1930, #3.b.45, #10.a.12, #22.a.21; Clc. 1936, #622.

NB: Attested in Akk. (aA, jB) makrû “rot” [AHW 590] || Syr. mkr “schwarz sein” [Brk. apud Clc.] || Ar. makira “être rouge”, makr-, pl. makūr- “terre rouge avec laquelle on marque en rouge”, muntakir- “marqué de terre rouge” [BK II 1138] = makira “to be red”, IX “to be red”, makr- “red (noun), red chalk” [Ember]. May be cognate also with CCh.: PMusgu *m-k-l “red” [GT]: Musgu mekelē (m), makalāi (f) “rot, braun” [Krause apud Müller 1886, 400 & Lks. 1941] = mekelē “rot” [Lks. 1937, 142] = mekele “weiß” [Decorse apud Lks. 1941, 67] = meḳeḷe “rouge” [Mch. 1950, 37], Kaykay mekelē “rot” [Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 26], Puss mekele (m), makalay (f), pl. makalakay “rouge” [Trn. 1991, 104] | (?) Masa bakāl [false for b- < *m-?] “rot” [Lks. 1937, 99]? Perhaps, with special regard to Ar. makr-, SBrb.: EWI. & Ayr ta-ṃrək ~ ta-ṃrək (via met.) “1. marque de propriété (faite au fer rouge), 2. fer à marquer, fer rouge” [PAM 1998, 222] should be also compared. As confirmed by K.-G. Prasse (p.c., 6 August 2006), the Tuareg form is not a French loan (not indicated as such in PAM l.c. either) but rather “it should be a genuine Tuareg word, although it seems to be an isolated word with no other words akin to it of the same root”.

- 2. GT: although Eg. m3t < *mlk is fully plausible, a comparison with AA *m-l-k “clay” [GT] > Ar. milāk- “4. boue” [BK II 1152] || WCh.: Angas mwalk “clay (for building houses, pots, etc.)” [Flk.

1915, 249] = mwàlk “clay” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] | Dwot (Zodi) mulkut “clay for pottery” [Caron 2002, 210] would be semantically rather problematic.

- Other suggestions are out of question:
- **3.** W. M. Müller (1893, 36) erroneously assumed an etymological connection to m3w (sic) “denken” (see m3t below) and m3(wj) “glänzen, Glanz” (see m3wt above).
- **4.** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1758; Orel 1995, 152, #1) combined Eg. m3t with Sem.: Akk. mekku ~ mikku (Ugarit, nA) “ein Stein” [AHW 642: of unknown origin] = “a type of (raw) glass” [CAD m2, 7]. False.

NB: In the theoretical and very improbable case if LEg. m3kj (hapax, q.v.) were to be read mkj (and not *hm3kj < hm3g,t), it might be compared with Akk. mekku ~ mikku “ein Stein” [AHW], which breaks down also because of the CAD rendering.

m3t (originally **m3wt**?) “1. erdenken, ersinnen, 2. bes. auch vom Ersinnen eines Namens für jem., 3. den Namen verkünden, 4. jem. mit (m) Namen benennen” (OK, Wb II 34, 17–21) = “von der Namengebung: benennen, (den Namen) nennen” (Sethe 1928, 22, 57) = “Namen bestimmen” (Sethe 1933, 18, fn. 61) = “to excogitate” (AEO II 286 index) = “to proclaim” (CT I 141, Urk. IV, BH: FD 104; DCT 158) = “(be)nennen” (Junge, LÄ II 885) = “concevoir par la pensée” (DELC 127) = “1. erdenken, ersinnen (auch einen Namen), 2. sich vorstellen, 3. verkünden (Namen, Bezeichnung), 4. benennen (mit Namen)” (GHWb 322) = “to pronounce (in the ritual endowment of s’one or s’thing with a name and its attendant attributes) “ (Hodge 1997, 200) > LEg. m3wt ~ m3jw ~ m3w (AEO II 286 index: m3j) “to think, imagine” (XIX., DLE I 208) → Dem. mwj “denken” (DG 156) → Cpt.: (SAL) MЄ(Є)YЄ, (S) MЄЄY (rare), (B) MЄYI, (A) MЄOYЄ, (F) MH(H)OYI, MЄЄYЄI “to think” (CD 199; CED 95) = “denken, überlegen, merken, vorstellen” (KHW 106) = “penser, réfléchir, s’imaginer” (DELC 127).

NB1: On the basis of the LEg., Dem., Cpt. reflexes, several works (Wb; GHWb; PL; Hodge l.c.; Peust 1999, 151, etc.) postulate a root *m3wt vocalized as *m3w̄t̄ (Fecht 1955, 396, fn. 4) = *m3VwtV (Peust l.c.). W. Vycichl (1983, 127) regarded the appearance of -w- in NEg. m3wt etc. surprising and the Cpt. reflexes difficult to explain, since normally, *m3w̄t̄ would yield (S) *MAYЄ, (B) MAYI.

NB2: K. Sethe (1933, 18, fn. 61) categorically declined the connection of old m3t “Namen bestimmen” to LEg. m3wt (sic) “denken” > (S) MЄЄYЄ (fem. inf. < *m3wj), which is untenable. As rightly formulated by W. Vycichl (DELC 127), “*Il est certain qu’il s’agit toujours du même mot attesté de l’Ancien Empire jusqu’à l’époque grecque*”.

NB3: Even worse is the analysis by W. M. Müller (1893, 35–36): (S) MЄЄYЄ < m3-3w (sic) with 3w considered by him as a false replacement of the det. interpreted in the Tanis “Sign Papyrus” as “ein fliegendes (oder hüpfendes) Herz” (ЄQ-ΠЄI). False,

since the this det. (in use since XVIII.) derives ultimately from a reinterpretation of the old phon. det. depicting a “granite vessel” (W7) accompanying diverse roots $\sqrt{m3t}$ (Sethe 1933, 18, fn. 61).

- In the light of the evidence listed below, the primary root sense might have been “to think out” (as rightly suggested in Wb, AEO, DELC l.c.), whence a secondary association with names could have resulted in a semantic shift to “to proclaim, give a name” (or sim.). This assumption seems confirmed by the AA cognates (discussed in #1 below) too.

NB: C. T. Hodge (1997, 196–204) surveyed and (re)interpreted certain occurrences of the verb $m3t$ as follows: **(1)** Louvre C15.7 stela (XI.): $m3t$ “to ritually enumerate (the sacred bark for its beauty)” (Hodge) contra “to acclaim” (FD), treated after Wb & GHwB as a distinct root meaning “preisen” (q.v.); **(2)** CT I 141c, also VI 237f, VII 135k “to proclaim” (Faulkner, AECT I 26, spell 36; DCT 158); **(3)** Beni Hasan tomb of Khnumhotep II (Newberry 1893, pl. 25, ll. 68–69): $m3t$ “the acclamer (of the King of Upper Egypt)” (Breasted 1906 I, 284), i.e., “who magically endows s’one with a name” (Hodge), which hardly fits a nomarch; **(4)** coronation scene of Hatshepsut on the wall of her mortuary temple at Deir el-Bahari (Urk. IV 260:2, 261:3, 261:11): “to announce (the name as king)” (Hodge modifying Breasted 1906 II 98); **(5)** London Med. Pap. (BM 10059, time of Tutankhamon): “to enumerate” (bones); **(6)** BD passim ($m3t$, $m3wt$, $m3$): “to announce” (after Faulkner); **(7)** temple of Sethi I, eastern section of Sethi’s chapel, north wall (Calverley & Broome 1935 II, pl. 30; David 1973, 162–4): “to proclaim (years in life, stability and dominion)” (Hodge); **(8)** Pap. Turin 1996 (around 1350–1200 BC, Pleyte & Rossi 1869–75, 132:10): “to think (out name)” (Pritchard 1969, 13) = “to formally give (a name by pronouncing it)” (Hodge); **(9)** Song of the Harpist in Pap. Harris 500, 7:1–2: $m3wt$ “der Refrain eines Liedes” (Wb II 27, 15) = “title (< announcing of the name)” (Hodge), treated in a separate entry (q.v.); **(10)** Onomasticon of Amenope (ca. 1090 BC): “to formally give things their names” (Hodge) contra “to excogitate” (Gardiner, AEO I 2*, bottom); **(11)** Pap. Berlin 3055, 16:3–4 (“Berlin Service-Book”, XXII.): $m3w$ “den Namen (eines Dinges) ersinnen” (Assmann 1975, 265; cf. Grapow 1931, 36) = “to give name to (with a creative word)” (Hodge); **(12)** Pap. Pushkin 127 (about 1000 BC): $m3j(w)$ “to bring into being by ritual” (Hodge) contra “to imagine, think” (Camino 1977, 45, 58); **(13)** Theology of Memphis (Shabaka stone, BM 498, about 700 BC): $m3t$ “(twice: l. 3 and 13) to identify (by the great name)” & “(l. 55) to pronounce (for reification, formally announce (for magically endowing the recipient with the name of power))” (Hodge somewhat differing from Sethe 1928, 21, 32, 57; Wilson in Pritchard 1969, 4–6); **(14)** Pap. Bremner-Rhind (BM 10188) 11:6 (around 300 BC): $m3wj$ “commemoration (for)” (Hodge) contra “sorrow (because of?)” (Faulkner 1936, 128), discussed in a separate entry (cf. $m3wt$ above); **(15)** Mendes stela (Cairo 22181, 264 BC, Urk. II 44:16–45:1): “to formally announce (the reduction of taxes)” (Hodge) contra “to decide” (Roeder); **(16)** Decree of Canopus (238 BC, Urk. II 131): $wn=sn hr m3w \text{Ϝ}3 \approx Gk. \text{πολλὰ μὲν προνοηθέντες}$, where $m3w$ is rendered by “to formally enumerate” (Hodge) contra “to give (a matter) much thought” (Roeder 1960, 155).

- **1.** G. Takács (1995, 159; 1996, 13–14, §1–5), C. T. Hodge (1997, 208), and Th. Schneider (1997, 198, #32) identified (independently from one another) OEG. $m3t$ [reg. < *mlk] with Sem. *mlk “to give advice, counsel” [Hodge] = “einen richtigen Rat geben, entscheiden” [Kottsieper, UF 22, 1990, 150, n. 3], cf. Akk. (all) $malāku$ G “(be)raten”,

Gt “sich beraten: 1. mit etwas anderen, 2. mit sich zu Rate gehen, sich überlegen”, N “i.a.: 3. sich bedenken”, hence *milku* “Rat(schluss)” (all), *māliku* “Ratgeber, Berater” (all), *mitluku* “umsichtig, klug” (j/spB), *muttalku* (nA) ~ *mundalku* (j/spB) “überlegt, besonnen” (nA, j/spB), *mundalkūtu* “Besonnenheit” (m/nA) [AHW 593–595, 652, 663, 673] = (Oakk.) *malākum* “to counsel”, *mālikum* “counsellor (or prince?)” [Gelb 1973, 176] = (Amarna) *malāku* G “raten, sorgen für (ana), achten auf (ana), sich entschließen, bedenken, daß (inuma)” [Ebeling 1915, 1461] || Hbr. *mlk* II *nifʿal* “mit sich selbst zu Rate gehen” [GB 429] = *nifʿal* “to debate with sʿone, think over” (< *qal* **to advise, counsel*) [KB 591], NHbr. *mlk* “(be)raten” [GB] = “1. sich beraten, 2. mit sich zu Rate gehen, den Sinn ändern” [Dalman 1922, 238] || BAram. **məlak*, st.cstr. *milk-* “Rat” [GB 913], Aram. of TTM **milkāy*, *milkəyā* “deliberation, vacillation” [Jastrow 1950, 790], Samar. Aram. *mlk qal* “4. to advise”, *ʔetpəʿel* “to consult”, *mlkwn* “mind, sense” [Tal 2000, 471–2] = *ʔetpəʿel* “to deliberate” [KB], JPAr. *mlk* “1. to consult, 2. reconsider” [Sokoloff 1990, 310], Mnd. *milka* “advice, counsel”, *mlk* “to advise, counsel” [DM 267, 273] (Sem.: GB l.c.).

NB1: In Semitic etymology, Sem. **mlk* “to give advice, counsel” is usually linked to Sem. **mal(i)k-* “king”. The traditional assumption that “to give advice” was the basic meaning, whence “to rule” vs. “king” were derivative, goes back to Ibn Janāh (around 1000 AD, cf. Fürst & Ryssel 1876 I, 742), but in recent lexicographical works the two roots are separated (e.g., König 1936, 226; Holladay 1971, 198 after Koehler & Baumgartner; Klein 1987, 350). Jastrow (1950, 790–1) derived MHbr. *mlk* “1. to preside, officiate, 2. be ruler” from an original sense **to lead in council*, while *melek* “chief, king” from “leader in council”. Kopf (1976, 202–3, §17), in turn, explained the kinship of Hbr. *mlk* “herrschen” & Ar. *mlk* “besitzen” vs. Hbr. *mlk nifʿal* “mit sich selbst zu Rate gehen” with a shift from the primary sense “besitzen, in Besitz nehmen” > “sich einer Sache bemächtigen” > “(mein Herz) wurde mir entrissen” (i.e. “ich war außer mir, geriet außer Rand und Band”). Murtonen (1989, 260) assumed “influential advice” as a common basic meaning for both Sem. **mlk* “to advise” and **mal(i)k-* “king”, while A. Măcelaru (p.c., 22 April 2004), in turn, assumes a primary sense “to guide” for Sem. **mlk*, whence all other meanings can be derived. Thus, for instance, Ar. *malik-* may have originally signified “the one who guides”, i.e. Ar. *mlk* “to possess” was a secondary denom. verb. These hypotheses do not satisfactorily clarify if there was indeed an etymological connection between Sem. **mal(i)k-* “king” and Sem. **mlk* “to advise”. Was Sem. **malk-* “king” a pass. participle (pattern **pars-*), i.e., “the one who was advised” (that is: “suggested, appointed” for chief)? From this viewpoint, noteworthy is Emar *mal-lu-ki* “intronisation” [Zadok 1991, 117, #24]. This reasoning would be externally corroborated by Eg. *m3t* “to proclaim”. For a different biconsonantal etymology of Eg.-Sem. **mlk* see Takács 1996, 14, §6.

NB2: Steinthal (1857, 408) saw in Hbr. *mlk* a biconsonantal root **lk*. For an alternative biconsonantal origin of Eg.-Sem. **mlk* (eventually < AA **m-l*), cf. Takács 1995, 159 and the entry for Eg. *m33* (below).

NB3: Aside from Eg. m3t, Sem. *mlk has no known AA parallels. The only extra-Sem. cognate may be perhaps NOm.: Kaffa mulèkk-o “intenzione” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 317], which, however, L. Reinisch (l.c., following A. Cecchi) derived from a compound of two juxtaposed forms: mulé “stecken” + kavu “desiderare”.

- Other proposals on the etymology of Eg. m3t are evidently false:
- **2.** L. Reinisch (1873, 245) compared Eg. m3t with Cpt. MERMOK (q.v.), Eg. mh (q.v.) and Teda ten “denken” (sic). False.
- **3.** W. M. Müller (1893, 35–36) assumed an Eg. etymon m3-3w (sic), in which he treated 3w as “nur eine Entstellung” of the det. explained as “fliegendes Herz” (since XVIII., derivining ultimately from the old det. W7 depicting “granite vessel”). He combined the “old stem” *m3 (!) with Eg. m3(j).t (sic) “Syenitstein” (correctly m3t “granite”) and m3wj “glänzen”.
- **4.** W. F. Albright (1927, 205) and C. T. Hodge (1976, 15, #145; 1997, 208) suggested comparing Eg. m3t = Sem. *brk ~ *krb “to bless”. Impossible both phonologically and semantically.
- **5.** L. Homburger (1929, 158; 1930, 284) and H. G. Mukarovsky (1959, 7, #8) compared Eg. m3t with Ful midy-āde “denken, betrachten, réfléchi” (Homburger adds Malinke miri, Ateso mita). Impossible even as areal parallels, since Eg. -t < *-k.

NB: Following Taylor, Mukarovsky derives from Peul midy- < *mic-.

- **6.** C. T. Hodge (1997, 212–213) postulated OEG. m3wt “to formally name”, which he derived from Lislakh **l-k “to vocalize”. Hodge’s theory summarized below needs no comment.

NB1: Hodge suggested the common origin i.a. of the following roots according to his so-called “consonant ablaut” theory (cf. Hodge 1986): **(1)** LL **l-k “to vocalize”: Sem.: Akk. malāku “1. to give advice, 2. care for”, Ar. lwk: lāka “to mumble”, ʔalāka “to transmit a message”, Geez malkə “poetic eulogy” ||| Eg. j3k “to lament” & j3kb “mourning” & m3tj.t “mourner” ||| SCu.: Irq. alki^c-a (inf.) “to narrate” ||| WCh.: DB & Bks. lak “to say” ~ Hitt. laknuwanzi “keep reciting”, OI lakšya- “magic formula recited over weapons” – LL **l-gH(-s): Geez laqasa “to mourn” ||| WCh.: Fyer-Tambas lak’ “to speak, say” – LL **l-Ng: Hitt. link- “to swear”, OHGerm. ant-lingen “to answer” – LL **lH-k: Sem. *brk “to bless” ||| WCh.: Gwandara rōko “to beg” ~ IE *rek- “to say etc.” & *erk^v- “to praise” – LL **lH-kY: Russ. врач “physician” < **sorcerer” (!) – LL **lH-gH: Ar. raqā “to enchant”, Geez raqaya “to recite incantations” ||| Eg. ʔrq “to swear an oath” – LL **lH-Ng: Sem.: Hbr. rnn “to rejoice”, Ar. ranna “to lament, cry loudly” ||| Eg. rnn “to rejoice” – LL **Nl-k: IE *enq- “to sigh, groan” – LL **Nl-kY-ʔH: Eg. nṯṯḥ “to shout for joy”. **(2)** LL **l-k “to think”: Eg. m3wt “to think” ||| CCh. *lak- “to think” (OS). **(3)** LL **l-k “to identify”: Sem. *malk- “ruler” (one designated) & Geez malkata “to signify” (!) ||| SBrb.: Hgr. e-lek “to elevate victoriously” ~ OI lakšate “to recognize, characterize, define” – LL **l-gH: Geez lakʔa “to mark, set down in writing” – LL **l-Ng: Cpt.: (F) λϵN “name” (!) ~ OI liŋga- “mark, sign” – LL **lH-Ng: Eg. rn “name” (!) – LL **Nb-l-w-kY: Eg. m3wt “title”. **(4)** LL **l-k “to allot”, hence LL **lH-k: Eg. rk “time” ~ IE: OChurch Slv. rokь “term, law”. Unreal.

nb2: Hodge (1997, 207–213) treats these four Lislakh roots in the frameworks of a greater word-family, which ultimately originates in LL proto-root **l-k* “tongue” (acc. to Hodge, the following sematic shifts are involved: 1. “tongue” → 2. “lick” & “suck, suckle, milk” & “spit, spurt, pour out” – 3. “vocalize” → “special speech, advise, think, knowledge” & “identify by naming” etc.). Hodge suggests an ultimate etymological relationship of the most diverse Eg. roots: *nt* “tongue”, *snk* “tongue”, *3t* “to nurse”, *rnn* “to nurse”, *jrt.t* “milk”, *z3t* “to pour out”, *b3q* “olive oil”, *nk* “to copulate”, *nq.wt* “moisture”, *j3k* “to lament”, *j3kb* “mourning”, *m3tj.t* “mourner”, *ʿrq* “to swear an oath”, *rnn* “to rejoice”, *nḥth* “to shout for joy”, *m3t* “to think”, *rn* “name”, *m3wt* “title”, *rk* “time”. Unacceptable.

m3t.t “Art Gewächs, Art Baum” (PT 1440e: M, Wb II 34, 23; WD II 59: cf. RdE 42, 1991, 23, fn. 22) = “mandrake (a sweet, palatable, mildly astringent herb growing in the Delta or imported from foreign lands)” (Dawson 1933, 133–5 followed by FD 103) = “un arbuste, qui croît en Égypte et abonde au Soudan, qui possède un fruit qui a précisément l’apparence des testicules mais est sensiblement plus gros: le *Calotropis procera* R. Br., appartenant à la famille des Asclépiadacées (ar. ʿuṣar- ‘*Asclepias gigantea*’, BK II 261)” (Daumas 1957, 59–60) = “sehr wahrscheinlich ein Gesträuch mit dem Namen *Calotropis procera* mit seinen Doppelfrüchten” (Edel 1969, 11–13, d; cf. Edel 1981, 49) = “a plant of fragrant smell: sodom apple tree” (Borghouts 1971, 93, #160, cf. also 245) = “Art Baum” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza V 96) = “le calotrope (*Calotropis procera*)” (AL 77.1633) = “1. mandrake (?), 2. sodom apple tree (1x)” (DLE I 208) = “le calotrope, le Bed el-Ossar des Arabes, au lait particulièrement caustique employé comme dépilatoire (est incommestible)” (Aufrère 1986, 10) = “ein Baum” (Kahl 1992, 102, 110–1) = “Oscur, Apfel von Sodom (*Calotropis procera*): eine Art Strauch mit großen, steifen, rundlichen, blau bereiften Blättern und viel Milchsafte” (GHWb 322; ÄWb I 506).

nb1: The OK form was *m3t.t* (in a Giza offering list and PT 1440e, cf. Wb II 34, 23; ÄWb I 506). In the view of some authors (following Edel 1969), the same word appears in CT II 401a as *m3tr.t* (5 times: B1Bo, B2Bo, B4Bo, Y1C, T3C) vs. *m3t.t* (B6C, BH2C, G1T). Thus, E. Edel, D. Meeks, R. Hannig, J. Kahl and others assume the original form as *m3tr.t* (Edel: from **m3trj.t*), which later was reduced to *m3t.t* due to the erosion of *-r*. Or assimilated to **j-*: **m3trj.t* > **m3trjj.t* (Edel)? But since both cases of OK *m3t.t* are attested without *-r*, while the occasional CT var. *m3tr.t* may be due to a later contamination with *m3tr.t* “female mourner” (below), the hypothetic original form **m3tr.t* remains dubious.

nb2: The interpretation of the CT instances is not completely evident. In the view of Edel (1969, 11–13, n. d) and Borghouts (1971, 93, n. 160) followed by Aufrère (1986, 10, n. 160), it was the name of a tree-goddess in PT 1440e, CT II 401a and VII 228q. Among the older occurrences, in the view of Borghouts (l.c.), *m3t.t* meant the very plant only once (OK, Junker: Giza V, fig. 26). R. O. Faulkner saw in all vars. of CT II 401a (AECT II 140–1, spell 162, n. 12) the mythological figure M3tr.t, the plant det. of B6C and tree det. of Y1C being evidently due to a

“misreading” as the m3t.t plant. The same confusion occurs in the case of CT VII 228q, where Faulkner (AECT III 112, spell 1012, n. 4) restores m3tr.t from m3t.t (with plant det.). Note that R. van der Molen (DCT 158–9) reads the tree-goddess basically as m3t.t. In CT IV 121b, it signifies clearly the plant (AECT II 242, 244, n. 38 of spell 317; DCT 158). CT IV 122h is out of question, m3tr.wt evidently standing here for “female mourners” (AECT II 242, 244, n. 45 of spell 317; DCT 159). According to D. Meeks (AL 78.1648), in turn, CT II 401a (!) m3t.t ~ m3tr.t & CT IV 121b m3t.t signified the plant, while at the same time, he (AL 78.1650) translated CT II 401a (!) m3tr.t and CT IV 122h m3t.t as “pleureuse”. Note that among the five vars. of CT II 401a m3tr.t only one (Y1C) has a tree det., the others do not differ from the wtg. of m3tr.t “female mourner”.

NB3: As rightly pointed out by Daumas (1957, 59–66), Borghouts (1971, 93), Kákósy (1971, 164, n. v), Meeks (AL 77.1633), Aufrère (1986, 10) and others, Eg. m3t.t “mandrake” has been later confused with Eg. m3t.t “celery” (not attested before Med., q.v.), which it has nothing to do with as mistakenly supposed even most recently (e.g. by W. Vycichl in DELC 124 and C. T. Hodge 1997, 209). Sometimes, due to the merger of t vs. t after the OK, only the context can decide (cf. Barns 1956, 19; Aufrère 1986, 10). Against the false interpretation of Med. m3t.t as “mandrake” (Dawson 1933, 133–5) see Loret (1894, 4–11), Lefébvre (1955, 208), and WÄDN 216–8. Daumas (l.c.) declined the sense “mandrake” also for OK-CT m3t.t. Dawson (1933, 137) erroneously projected the plant-name m3t.t (as “a generic term for magical plants of various kinds”) into m3t.t n.t sw.t (Pap. Budapest 51.1961, rt. 2:4), which may be an error for Med. m3.t n.t sw.t (cf. Wb II 6, 12; Kákósy l.c.).

● Etymology debated.

- 1. E. Edel (1969, 11–13, d; also 1981, 49) proposed to identify OK-CT m3t.t < m3tr.t as the name of plant and tree-goddess (Edel: act. “der Baum Calotropis procera am Himmelstor, der schützend den Eingang zum Himmel bewacht”, lit. “die Preisende”) with OK-CT (since Dyn. IV) m3tr.t (pl. m3tr.wt) “Frauenbezeichnung” (Edel: actually “Baumgöttin personifiziert”, lit. “die Preisenden”), which he eventually explained from Eg. m3t (orig. *m3tr?) “preisen”. Thus, in his view, the m3tr.t-tree was “der Baum, der die Sonne bei ihrem...Aufgang ‘preise’”, while the OK-CT m3tr.t-women (NK m3trj.t) were ultimately “im Ritualspiel die Darstellerinnen des heiligen m3t(r)t-Baumes, der als Wächterin des Himmelstores des Morgens die aufgehende Sonne ‘preisend’ begrüßt”. That is, Edel suggested the following derivational chain: “to praise” → “tree praising the sun” → “Calotropis”. This theory breaks down on a few points.

NB1: Following Dawson (1933, 133) and Sethe (ÜKAPT V 373–4), Edel assumed a continuity between PT 1440d m3t.t (giving its arms to the dead and named “die Türhüterin des Himmels”, jrj.t-³ n.t p.t) and CT II 401a m3tr.t (named “Tochter des Morgensterns”, z3.t ntr dw3.j), whose jaws (^rtj “die beiden Kinnladen”) they considered as a metaphor of both door-leaves (“die beiden Türflügel”) of the heavenly gate. This led Edel to the assumption that “nichts scheint im Wege zu stehen, in den m3tr.t-Frauen des Alten Reiches die Darstellerinnen jenes Himmelsbaumes zu sehen, der dem Toten hilfreich seine Hände entgegenstreckt, um ihm den Eintritt in den Himmel zu gewähren”. He took it granted that the “auffallende imposante Laubfülle” of Calotropis procera, which grows “in Gestalt riesiger Stauden und nimmt selbst Bauform an” (Keimer 1967, 26–27), was conceived in ancient Egypt “als ein die ‘Türe’ des Himmels ausfüllendes Hindernis, das... dem Toten den Durchgang nicht verwehrt, sondern freundlich ‘seine Arme (Zweige)’

hinstreckt". Besides, "*wegen ihrer hohen Giftigkeit... ist Calotropis procera als Türwächter auf beste geeignet*" (Edel). Indeed, this function of the plant as protection of houses is attested in modern Egypt (cf. Keimer 1967, 27; Aufrère 1986, 10; cf. also Borghouts 1971, 112–3, n. 235). According to R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 140–1, spell 162, n. 12), however, the name of the goddess m3tr.t was only misread as the m3t.t-plant, i.e., these are two distinct words.

NB2: This far-fetching theory can hardly be founded on MEg. m3t "preisen" (hapax), which, according to the Belegstellen to Wb II 34, 22, is attested only on one stela (XI., Louvre C 15, 7), and was rendered "to acclaim" in FD 104, which expresses more properly the sense of the underlying verb m3t "to proclaim" (CT, FD 104; DCT 158). Moreover, this must go back to m3t "erdenken, ersinnen (bes. einen Namen)" (OK, Wb, below), whose root was, besides, certainly not $\sqrt{m3tr}$, but rather $\sqrt{m3wt}$ (details below s.v. m3t). Thus, the derivation of OK-CT m3tr.wt "female mourners" from m3t "to praise" is certainly excluded both on semantical and phonological grounds. The name of the tree-goddess, in turn, with an extra -r in CT II 401a may be due to a contamination with m3tr.t "female mourner" (discussed above).

- **2.** GT: provided CT II 401a indeed reflects the correct reading (m3tr.t) of the plant, and with respect to the milk-like juice issuing from *Calotropis procera*, it would be tempting to risk interpreting it as the *"weeping tree" and identifying it with Eg. m3tr "to weep for" (DCT 159). The milky juice of the tree is presumably has no link to the association of the plant-name with the testicles (below).

- **3.** W. R. Dawson (1933, 135, §5) considered it to be etymologically akin to Eg. m3w.tj "testicles" (above), which in principle might derive from *m3t via *m3wt. This assumption, based on the rendering "mandrake", however, implies a derivation of LEg. m3wt(j) "testicles" from OEg. m3t.t, not *vice versa*, since the former has no OEg. etymon.

NB1: There might have been an association between the "fruit" of the m3t.t-plant (due to its shape) and the testicles in Egypt, cf. Mag. Pap. Leiden I 348, 5:8–6:1 (in an enumeration of parts of the body ascribed to gods): jns.wj=fj m pr.t m3t.t "seine Testikeln sind die Früchte der m3t.t-Pflanze" (Edel l.c. after Dawson 1933, 133). Similarly, in a text from a Dendera socle (BIFAO 56/1, 1957, 44: col. 11 & 46, n. 3), m3t.t is compared to the testicles (Daumas l.c.). Dawson (1933, 134) explained the dets. of m3t.t in PT 1440e (P727: circle, M751: two grains) as due to an association with the testicles and quoted a Syriac med. manuscript with a long passage devoted to the mandrake: "...and after the flower of this root... had died away, there remain on the top thereof two little balls which are like the testicles of a man".

NB2: Ar. marik- "jeune homme supçonné de se livrer à la prostitution" [BK II 1095] can hardly be a fitting external parallel to a hypothetical OEg. *m3t (or sim.) "testicle".

- **4.** GT: the most convincing AA parallels suggest PAA *m-l-k ~ *m-l-g "tree with sticky fruit or yielding gum resin" [GT], which meets certain features of Eg. m3t.t.

NB1: Attested in Ar. muġ- "datte sauvage", ʔumlūġ- "sorte d'arbrisseau semblable au cyprès et qui croît dans le désert" [BK II 1143] ||| NBrb.: Mzab muləç, pl. i-mulč-an [č < *k reg.] "rejeton de palmier-dattier non séparé du tronc, du pied de sa mère" [Dlh. 1984, 116] ||| Bed. melúk ~ belúk "Dattel" [Rn. 1895, 48, 169] = belúk "dates usually in conglomerate mass" [Rpr. 1928, 161], NBisharin mulúk

“1. Dattel, 2. Gummi” [Hess 1918–19, 223] || LECu.: Som. múlog [-g < *-k] “eine Gattung Baum mit eßbaren Früchten” [Rn. 1902, 295] || WCh.: Angas-Sura *m^walak ~ *m^wayalak “tree sp. yielding rubber (lit. the ‘sticky?’)” [GT 2004, 257]: Angas mwalk “1. the Hs. *dafara* tree (its sap is used in making anything sticky, e.g. as a binding ingredient of a sort of cement)” (cf. Hs. dááááráá “a vine, *Vitis pallida*, from whose root a gum is obtained forming an ingredient of the cement”, Abr. 1962, 165) [Flk. 1915, 249] = mwàk ≈ Hs. dafara “a tree (lit. ‘sticky’)” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27], Mpn. mùlák [mu- weakened < *m^wa-] “climbing tree: *Landolphia awarensis*” [Frj. 1991, 38], Kfy. mwagálak [< *m^wayalak, secondary epenthetic *-γ-?] “edible fruit” [Ntg. 1967, 27]. Netting (l.c.) defined the Kofyar word with Hs. chiwa (so!), which may be identical with Hs. çüwo “a climber which yields a good rubber and has also edible fruit” [Brg. 1934, 166] = çüwóó “types of climber yielding rubber (*Landolphia owariensis*, L. florida)” [Abr. 1962, 149]. NB2: The underlying PAA root (*m-l-k) might have signified a tree with sticky fruits. Noteworthy is a possible ancient (PAA?) association inherited in NBisharin as “gum” vs. as the milky juice issuing from *Calotropis procera* in Eg.

■ 5. GT: an etymon *m-r-k is in principle also possible.

NB: The AA tree-names found with the radicals *m-r-k ~ *m-r-g can, however, hardly be of any use other than for guesses. Even their mutual relationship is questionable. Thus, cf. perhaps Akk. mirgu (j/nB) “ein Lauchgewächs” [AHW 658] = “(an alliaceous plant)” [CAD m2, 106] || LECu.: Afar marka “species of tree with long thin branches” [PH 1985, 164] || WCh.: Hausa márkée “chew-stick tree (*Anogneissus leiocarpus*)” [Abr. 1962, 659] || ECh.: Tumah mürög “goyavier (guava-tree)” [Cpr. 1975, 85] | Dangla mirgiti “tree specimen” [Skn.]. See also Skn. 1996, 197 (Hs.-Dng.-Afar). Cf. perhaps also Ar. makr- “*Polycarpia fragilis*” [Hess] = “sorte de plante servant de fourrage aux bestiaux (*herniaria lenticulosa*)” [BK II 1138] || Bed.: NBisharin mukur “eine Staude” [Ar.-Bed.: Hess 1918–19, 223] || LECu.: Som. makáray (m) “eine Gattung Baum aus dessen Holz Lanzenschäfte verfertigt werden” [Rn. 1902, 291] with met.?

m3t.w “ein Szepter” (1st IMP, hapax, GHWb 322; ÄWb I 506).

● GT: m3t is regular from *mlk. Any connection to Sem. *malk- “king”?

NB: Whether it derives together with Eg. m3t “couronne” (NK, AL 77.1630: “*l’existence... est... très incertaine*”) ultimately from the same root is dubious, since the latter may be perhaps rather a verb (Kees quoted in AL l.c.).

m3t “preisen” (XI., Wb II 34, 22: hapax, Louvre C15.7 stela, cf. Gayet 1886, 54) = “to acclaim” (FD 104) = “prier” (AL 79.1149) = “preisen” (GHWb 322) = “to ritually enumerate” (Hodge 1997, 201).

NB1: Occurs in the following context: ḥzj km.(t) ḥrw nhm nṯr m3t nšm.t nfr:w=s “Egypt praised Horus; the god danced for joy, acclaiming the sacred bark for its beauty” or “...ritually enumerating the beautiful aspects of the sacred bark” (Hodge: “this magically endowed the bark with eternal names, qualities”).

NB2: Note the orthography of our word (A30 det., no W7 and/or A2 det.) significantly differing from that of m3t “erdenken, ersinnen” (OK, Wb II 34).

● Rendering and etymology debated.

■ 1. R. O. Faulkner’s (FD 104) suggestive rendering “to acclaim” and P. Wilson (in PL 401) presumed an etymological connection with Eg. m3t “erdenken, ersinnen” (Wb) = “to proclaim” (FD).

NB: Plausible provided we accept the sense “acclaim”. Questionable on semantical grounds if we stick to the sense “to praise”.

- **2.** E. Edel (1969, 14) explained m3ṭ from an older *m3ṭr > *m3ṭj, which he etymologically related eventually with CT m3ṭr “beweinen” (q.v.). Semantically untenable.

NB: D. Meeks (AL 79.1149) rightly distinguished our Dyn. XI hapax from LEg. m3ṭ “se lamenter” (KRI II 883:3).

- **3.** GT: if we maintain the sense “to praise” and treat it as a distinct lexeme (but not necessarily as a different root), it could be compared with the secondary denominative sense of ES *ʔamlak (formally pl. of *mälk) “God” [Lsl.]: Geez ʔamlāk “Lord, God”, hence denom. ʔamlaka “to worship God, a deity, idols”, ʔamləko(t) “cult, godliness, Godhead, divine worship, adoration”, Tna. ʔamlākā & Tigre ʔamlāka “to worship, adore God”, Amh. amlak “God” > amällākā “to worship” etc. (ES: Lsl. 1969, 24, 53–54; 1987, 344; cf. Apl. 1977, 56/98) ||| NAgaw (borrowed from ES): Qmt. amälāk “adorer” [CR 1912, 164].

NB: Since ES *mlk ultimately derives from Sem. *malk- “king” (cf. Leslau l.c.), we may assume an eventual relationship with Sem. *mlk “to advise”, and thus possibly also with Eg. m3ṭ “to proclaim”. If this is the case, the following semantic development in Sem. may be postulated: “to give an advise” → “one who was advised (i.e.: appointed) → (deverbal noun) “king” → denom. Ar. mlk “to rule, possess” vs. ES pl. *ʔamlak “God” → denom. “to worship”. The semantic shift in our Dyn. XI hapax might be thus compared to that of ES *mlk.

- **4.** GT: alternatively, provided Eg. m3ṭ [< *mrkʔ] “preisen” represents a fully distinct root, it is to be derived from AA *m-r-k “to praise (?)” [GT] attested in HECu.: Sid. morke (f) “boasting, bragging” [Gsp. 1983, 237] ||| ECh.: Kera mīrgī [-rg- < *-rk-] “grüßen” [Ebert 1976, 82] = mīrkī “to greet” [Pearce 1998–99, 67].

NB: For the semantic shift “to boast” < “to praise” cf. AA *m-l “to praise” [GT]: EBrb.: Gdm. ū-məl “vanter” [Lanfry 1973, 209, #997] || SBrb.: Hgr. a-mel “2. louer: faire d’éloge de” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1180] ||| HECu.: Sid. mālala “to admire, be surprised”, mālala “(obj. of) admiration”, māla(?)lo “1. wonderful thing, miracle, 2. astonishment” [Hds. 1989, 220–1].

m3ṭr.w “le pleurer (un mort)” (CT VII 231k, AL 78.1649) = m3ṭr.w “einen Toten beweinen” (GHWb 322) = m3ṭr “to weep for, mourn for” (DCT 159).

NB1: The exact interpretation of m3ṭr.w in CT VII 231k is somewhat debated. R. O. Faulkner (AECT III 114, spell 1013, n. 12) treated this ex. as a corruption of pl. m3ṭr.wt “wailing-women”. D. Meeks (AL l.c.), in turn, saw in it a verbal noun (“en fait subst.”), while R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) apparently assumed a verbal root ult. -w.

NB2: Does m3ṭ “se lamenter” (KRI II 883:3, AL 79.1149) belong here or represent a variation of m3ṭ “ersinnen” (Wb)?

• Hence:

- (1) OK m3tr.t “Frauenbezeichnung” (2x in tombs of Dyn. IV–V, Edel 1969, 9–11, §25) = “Frauentitel” (Edel 1981, 49) = “mourner” (Fischer 1976, 70, nr. 12 & fn. 16; so also in LÄ IV 1102) = “Klagefrau” (LÄ VII 464 index; GHWb 322; ÄWb I 506b: 3x) = “pleureuse” (Baud 1999, 216, n. 178 & 658) = “title: (female) mourner, ululator (?)” (Jones 2000, 424, §1569 with further lit.) → MK m3tr.t “pleureuse” (CT IV 122h, AL 78.1650) = “female mourner, wailing-woman” (AECT I 245, spell 317, n. 45, cf. o.c. III 114, spell 1013, n. 12; DCT 159) → NK m3trj.t “female mourner, wailing woman (walking in processions)” (XVIII., Caminos 1956, 28, 31, also p. 3, l. 3) vs. m3tj.t “Klagefrau” (Amduat, Wb II 34, 2) → perhaps GR m3tj “eine Priesterin” (Tebtunis onomasticon, 2nd cent. AD; also in Edfu XV, pl. 10; Osing 1998, 272, n. ag & fn. 1287). Occurs in the OK & MK usually in pl.

NB1: For the meaning of m3tr.t in CT II 401a cf. the discussion in the entry of m3tj.t-tree.

NB2: E. Edel (l.c.) assumed an etymon *m3trj.t (OK *m³t³rj³t > NK *m³t³j³t).

NB3: A. Moussa and H. Altenmüller (SAK 9, 1981, 292, n. 6) figured the function of OK m3tr.t somewhat differently: “Die m3tr.t/m3tj.t genannten Frauen sind Bedienstete von Frauen und offenbar mit dem Schmuck und der Kleidung ihrer jeweiligen Herrin befaßt”. Similarly, P. Munro (1993 I, 91f.) rendered the OK title as “die zum m3tj.t-Gewand Gehörige”, which is hardly correct (cf. below). It is true that the m3tr.t-women are some way connected with garment or strip of cloth both in OK and NK instances, but how it relates to the duties of m3tr.wt remains open (cf. Edel l.c., esp. fn. 8).

NB4: J. Osing (l.c.) is inclined to see in both exx. of GR m3tj the old fem. title m3tr.t rather than old m3tj mnw (or hrw) “Der Min (oder Horus) sieht”.

- (2) LEG. m3wt (m3wt?) “tears (?), sorrow (?)” (Pap. Bremner-Rhind, BM 10188, 3:3, 7:23, Faulkner 1936, 137) = “larmes (?), tristesse (?)” (AC 1978, 14; AL 79.1149) represents probably a distinct root (discussed s.v. m3wt, q.v.).

NB: Explained in AC 1978, 14 from m3(w)t “to think”. P. Wilson (PL 401), in turn, assumed the “extra dimension” of m3t > m3wt “thought”, i.e., the negative connotation of LEG. m3wt to have arisen from confusion with m3tr “to weep for”. D. Meeks (AL 79.1149) suggests a derivation from m3t “se lamenter” (KRI II 883:3).

• Most probable is etymology #1.

- 1. GT: m3tr < either *m³kr or *mrkr (?), which may be identified with AA *m-r-k “to be feel passion, sad” [GT]: NBrb. *m-r-g [irreg. -g]: Shilh a-marg “2. regret” [Jst. 1914, 121] | Mzg. √m-r-g: a-marg ~ a-mary, pl. i-murag/y “1. amour, 2. chagrin d’amour, 3. mélancolie, 4. tristesse, 5. nostalgie, 6. désir de voir ses parents etc.” [Tf. 1991, 430] ||| HECu.: (???) Sid. mirg-a “to love, feel inclined to, like” [Gsp. 1983, 233] ||| ECh.: Bdy. morok “être en deuil”, morókò “deuil” [AJ 1989, 100], WDng. mòrkè “être en deuil”, mórókíká “deuil” [Fédry 1971, 137].

NB1: Hbr. morek “despair” [KB 636] = “Furchtsamkeit” [GB 462] derives from a distinct root (Hbr. rkk qal “to be gentle”).

NB2: NAgaw: Qwara mākar-ā “Trauer, Kummer, Angst, Elend” [Rn. 1885, 98], Qemant mākarā “malheur” [CR 1912, 228], Hamir miker-ā “Kummer” [Rn. 1884, 392] | SAgaw: Awngi mekeri “misfortune” [Hetzron 1978, 139] || HECu.: Sid. makkarāra “to be worried about sg.”, (m) “tribulation, vexation”, (adj.) “unfortunate” [Gsp. 1983, 220] may represent a root borrowed from some ES source, cf. Geez makkara “to tempt, put to the test etc.” > makarā “testing, temptation, tribulation etc., also: distress, ordeal”, makkarāwi “tested, tried, stricken with misfortune” [Lsl. 1987, 340–1].

NB3: WCh.: DB muk & Klr. mohoh [h < *k] “schreien, weinen” [Jng 1970, 219] || CCh.: Namshi mikākā “weinen” [Str. 1922–23, 113] can be related only on a biconsonantal basis (cf. the lack of *r, and Ron *k < AA *k).

NB4: Cf. perhaps LECu.: Afar malk-ite [-lk- < *-rk-?] (intr.) “to complain”, malk-it “complaint” [PH 1985, 162]?

- Other proposals are unacceptable.
- **2.** E. Hornung (1963 II, 67, §214) rightly declined a connection to OK m3tj.t “Löwengöttin des 12. oäg. Gaues (Deir el-Gebrawi)”. Instead, he preferred a derivation from m3t “erdenken, ersinnen, den Namen verkünden”, although Hornung himself referred to m3trj.t (XVIII.) published by R. Caminos (1956, 28). Rightly rejected by Edel (l.c.).
- **3.** E. Edel (1969, 11–14; also 1981, 49) identified the mythological tree-goddess m3t.t (PT 1440e: jrj.t-^c3 n.tp.t “Türhüterin des Himmels”), m3tr.t (CT II 401a: z3.t ntr dw3.j “Tochter der Morgensterns”), m3t.t < *m3tr.t (CT VII 228: daughter of Re, AECT III 112, n. 4), which he regarded a personification of m3t.t “Calotropis procera” (Daumas 1957, 60) with a literal meaning “die Preisende” (“*Baumgöttin personifiziert, durch Frauen dargestellt, die bei den Bestattungszeremonien eine Rolle spielen*”). Eventually, Edel sought the etymon of OK m3tr.t in the Eg. hapax m3t “preisen” (XI., Wb, q.v.), since – as he was arguing – “eine ‘Preisende’” fits “*gut zu der Weinenden, Trauernden und Klagenden*...”. Dubious for several reasons.

NB1: For Edel (l.c.) “*nichts scheint im Wege zu sein, in den m3tr.t-Frauen des Alten Reiches die Darstellerinnen jenes Himmelsbaumes zu sehen, der dem Toten hilfreich seine Hände entgegenstreckt, um ihm den Eintritt in den Himmel zu gewähren*”. Moreover, he extended the features of PT-CT m3tr.t to an unattested conception “*wonach der Baum die Sonne bei ihrem...Aufgang ‘preise’... ‘preisend’ begrüßt*...”.

NB2: There is no proof for that m3t “preisen” (XI.) represents a root *m3tr > *m3tj as Edel surmised, since not even the trace of *j was preserved (as e.g. in Amduat m3tj.t). According to R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 140–1, spell 162, n. 12), the name of the goddess m3tr.t was only misread as the m3t.t-plant, i.e., these are two distinct words.
- **4.** P. Munro (1993 I, 91f.) connected OK m3t(r)j.t (as a nisbe) to m3t.t “ein Hemd” (III., FÄW, q.v.): “die zum m3tj.t-Gewand Gehörige”. Hardly so.

NB: This etymology ignores the -r- of OK m3tr.t. Besides, a nisbe of m3t.t would be *m3t.t.j. Moreover, it has not been satisfactorily clarified how the cloth relates to the duty of the m3tr.wt.

- **5.** C. T. Hodge (1997, 212, #5.1), ignoring CT m3tr.t, derived NK m3tj.t from Lislakh (proto-AA-IE) ****l-k** “to vocalize” (ultimately: LL ****l-k** “tongue”) based on – in the frames of his consonant ablaut theory (cf. Hodge 1986) – the most diverse alleged cognates, the overwhelming majority of which are evidently even mutually unrelated.

NB: Such as **(1)** Akk. malāku “1. to give advice, 2. care for”, Ar. lwk: lāka “to mumble”, ʔalāka “to transmit a message”, Geez malkəʔ “poetic eulogy” ||| Eg. j3k “to lament” & j3kb “mourning” & m3t “to proclaim” ||| SCu.: Irq. alki^c-a (inf.) “to narrate” ||| WCh.: Ron: DB & Bks. lak “to say” ~ Hitt. laknuwanzi “keep reciting”, OI lakšya- “magic formula recited over weapons”; **(2)** LL ****l-gH(-s)**: Geez laqasa “to mourn” ||| WCh.: Fyer-Tambas lak’ “to speak, say”; **(3)** LL ****l-Ng**: Hitt. link- “to swear”, OHGerm. ant-lingen “to answer”; **(4)** LL ****lH-k**: Sem. *brk “to bless” ||| WCh.: Gwandara ròko “to beg” ~ IE *rek- “to say etc.” & *erk- “to praise”; **(5)** LL ****lH-kY**: Russ. врач “physician” < * “sorcerer” (!); **(6)** LL ****lH-gH**: Ar. raqā “to enchant”, Geez raqaya “to recite incantations” ||| Eg. ʔrq “to swear an oath”; **(7)** LL ****lH-Ng**: Sem.: Hbr. rnn “to rejoice”, Ar. ranna “to lament, cry loudly” ||| Eg. rnn “to rejoice”; **(8)** LL ****Nl-k**: IE *enq- “to sigh, groan”; **(9)** LL ****Nl-kY^cH**: Eg. nṯṯh “to shout for joy”. Irreal. For further details see OEG. m3t (#5).

m3d “ein mineralischer Stoff in offizineller Verwendung” (Med., Wb II 35, 1) = “ein Mineral, nach Ebbell 1937, 132: Bimsstein” (WÄDN 218) = “probably (the lumps of) pumice (found in Egypt as native, its abrasive properties well known in the ancient world)” (Harris 1961, 171) = “*Bimsstein” (GHWb 322) = “ein mineralischer Stoff, Bimsstein (für den Spiegel, zur Politur der Metalloberfläche)” (Junge 2003, 247, n. 417).

NB: Although m3d n ʔnh “Bimsstein (als Poliermittel) für einen (Metall-)Spiegel” (WÄDN) = “pumice of the mirror, an abrasive to polish the face of a mirror and then remove the verdigris” (Harris) = “Bimsstein für den Spiegel (zum Polieren der Metalloberfläche)” (GHWb) clearly excludes the former (Stern, Joachim) derivation of Med. m3d from old m3t “granite”, J. R. Harris (1961, 171) views that “...the evidence for m3d ‘pumice’ is slight, the meaning is purely conjectural”.

- There are diverse (nearly equally) plausible etymologies that are to be accounted for in a further research (neither of them suggested so far):
- **1.** GT: ~ Sem. *mlṯ “1. to rub, scratch, 2. make sooth by plucking out” [GT]: presumably Hbr. mlṯ nifal “entschlüpfen, entkommen” [GB] || Syr. mlṯ “überstreichen” [GB] | Ar. maliṯa “glatt, unbehaart sein”, malaṯa “1. überstreichen, 2. rasieren” [GB] || Jbl. mlṯ “to pluck the hair off a camel” [Jns. 1981, 172] | Geez malaṯa “to peel, scrape off, strip off, depilate” & Amh. mäläṯṯätä “to shave, peel off” [Lsl.] (Sem.: GB 428; Lsl. 1987, 346)?

NB: May be root var. of Sem. *mrṯ. GB 428: Syr. mlṯ “überstreichen” is denom. from Hbr. melet & Ar. milāt- “Mortel, Cement”. Similarly, W. Leslau (l.c.) considers the connection to Syr. mlṯ “überstreichen” unlikely. Nevertheless, a semantic shift

“to smear (e.g. with plaster)” → “rub (with sharp instr.)” → “to shave” → “pluck out hair” should not be excluded.

- **2.** GT: ~ Sem. *mrṭ “1. to rub, scratch, 2. make sooth by plucking out” [GT]: Akk. (m/jB, m/nA) marāṭu “abkratzen, abschaben”, mertu “Abschabung (?)” [AHW 610, 646] = “(ab)reiben” [GB] = “to rub, scratch” [CAD m1, 276] || Hbr. mrṭ qal “1. Haare ausraufen, 2. v. Schwerte: glätten, schärfen (‘fegen’), nifal “kahl werden (v. Kopfe)”, pual “1. geglättet, poliert sein (v. Metalle usw.), 2. geschärft sein (v. Schwerte)” [GB] = “to make sooth, bare, bald” [Brown, Driver, Briggs quoted by Frolova] | Aram. mrṭ “raufen, kahl machen” [GB] | Ar. mrṭ “to pluck out hair” [Lane 2709c] = “arracher le poil” [BK II 1092] = “Haare ausraufen” [GB] || Geez maraṭa “to uproot, pull out” [Lsl.], Har. mārāṭä “to strip off” [Lsl.] (Sem.: GB 461; Lsl. 1969, 20; 1987, 361; Frolova 2003, 83, §13)?

NB1: May be root var. of Sem. *mlṭ. For the semantic shifts see NB of #1.

NB2: S. Moscati (1947, 128) explains the third radical of Hbr. mrṭ as a suffix, cf. mrḥ, mrq.

- **3.** GT: or < AA *m-r-d “to scrape, file” [GT]? Cf. NAgaw: Hamir miürd “feilen” [Rn. 1884, 397] || LECu.: Afar murdini “to be coarse, pebbly” [PH 1985, 172] || (?) NOm.: Kaffä móder-ō “Feile, Raspel” [Rn. 1888, 315], Mocha modar-o “rasp”, mòdari-yé “to sharpen” [Lsl. 1959, 40] || CCh.: Margi mùrdù “to scrape” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 126].

NB1: L. Reinisch (1885, 100–101) linked Hamir miürd to Qwara. mōrē “feilen”, mōry-ā ~ mōrē-ā ~ mōrey-ā [Rn.: *-rd-] “Feile” and even to Amh. moräd “file”. Phonologically unconvincing.

NB2: The Cushitic forms like LECu.: Orm. mōrod-á “file, rasp” [Rn. 1888 l.c.], Som. morúd (m) “Instrument womit man beim Gerben die Haare vom Fell wegkratzt” vs. (vb. tr.) “ein Fell enthaaren” [Rn. 1902, 300] | HECu.: Sdm. morod-à “whetstone, hone” [Gsp. 1983, 238] = morod-a “rasp, file” [Hds.], Drs. (Gedeo) morod-a “rasp, file” [Hds.], Brj. morad- “to file” [Sasse 1982, 147] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 121) are hardly to be compared with Eg. m3d, since these represent a late borrowing from ES, cf. Amh. moräd “file”, denom. morrädä “to fire”, which, in turn, ultimately come from a nomen instr. *mä-wräd < *mä-bräd < Sem. *brd, cf. Amh. bärrädä “to file off”, Tigre bärräda “to polish, file off”, nomen instr. mäbräd “file”, Geez mabrad “file, rasp”, Ar. mibrad- “file, razor” etc. (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 103). L. Reinisch (1888, 315) and W. Leslau (1959, 40) saw in Kaffä móder-ō and Mocha modar-o too loans with a met. from Amh. moräd “file”. Questionable. Note that L. Reinisch (l.c.) erroneously affiliated the Somali form with Sem. *mrṭ “enthaaren”.

NB3: Margi mùrdù seems unrelated to WCh.: Hausa múrzà “1. to roll some thread, 2. rub sg. between one’s palms, 3. massage (husband’s) limbs to remove tiredness (of wife)” [Abr. 1962, 687], Gwandara múrṣa “to rub” [Mts. 1972, 83–84] (Hausa-Margi: IS 1965, 358; 1976, #310), since WCh. *z seems to have a distinct reflex in BM (Stl. 1996, 114, table 22).

- **4.** GT: or m3d < mrd, perhaps an irregular (Eg. -d vs. Sem. *-t) reflex of OSA: Sab. mrt “clay(ey)” [Ricks] = “clay(ey soil)” (listed with squared stones, muddy soil, lead) [Biella 1984, 285] = “lime-

stone (?)” [SD 87; Lsl.] = “calcaire” [Arbach], Qtb. mrt “Lehm” [Rdk. 1924, 47 rejected by Sima] = “limestone, gypsum” [Ricks 1982 MS, 145] = “calcaire” [Arbach] = “Ziegel, Keramik” [Sima], Madhabi mrt-n “sorte de perre taillé” [Arbach 1993, 71], Min. mrt “Keramik” [Sima] || Geez marēt “Erde, Lehm, Ton” [Sima after Dillmann] = “dirt, dust” [Ricks] = “clay(ed soil)” [Biella] = maret “earth, dust of the ground, dirt, soil, clay, plaster, dung” [Lsl. 1987, 361] = “vielleicht ein dem Ziegel ähnliches Baumaterial?” [Sima], Tigre & Tna. & Amh. märet “earth, ground” [Lsl.]?

NB: The Sem. etymology of the OSA-ES isogloss is debated. The Sem. cognates (Ar. malāt “gypsum”, Modern Yemeni Ar. mrt “to plaster”) suggested by M. A. Ghul (1959, 4) are doubtful for the consonantal correspondences. Sima (2000, 299–301) assumes for the OSA forms a root $\sqrt{\text{mrr}}$ with the basic sense “unglasierte, gebrannte Keramik, d.h. Terrakotta” etymologically based on Yemeni Ar. murr- “eine Erde, die für Landwirtschaft und als Rohmaterial für Keramik sehr geeignet ist” [Sima, not in Piamenta 1990–91, 462; Behnstedt 1993, 194], but he failed in explaining the connection with the ES forms which derive from $\sqrt{\text{mrt}}$ (“ist nicht eindeutig zu klären”).

- 5. GT: the *Zusammenklang* with LECu.: Afar modód & Saho mōdód “1. Reibstein, womit das Korn gerieben, gewalzt, gemahlen wird, 2. der obere, kleinere Reibstein” [Rn. 1886, 879; 1890, 258] | Tsamay mid “lower grindstone” [Sava 2005 MS, 259] seems to be accidental, since there is no reflex (*-r/1/?-) for Eg. -3-.

NB1: L. Reinisch (l.c.) assumes in Saho-Afar a nomen instr. from a root akin to Ar. waṭada, waṭada, cf. mi-yṭad-at- “Walze”. Phonologically problematic.

NB2: Cf. also ECu. *mat- “grindstone (?)” [GT]: HECu. *mēt-a “scraping board for use in preparing ensete” [Hds. 1989, 129]: add Brj. mat-ē “small grindstone used on top of larger” [Ss.] | Konso mat-ēta & Gdl. mat-et “small grindstone” [Ss.] | Dullay *mat- [GT]: Harso & Dobase mat-akkó “Gleitstein (des Reibsteins)” [AMS 1980, 175] (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 142).

m3dj.w (pl.) “Diener, die Speisen zutragen” (XIX., Wb II 35, 5) = “(pour désigner des) pourvoyeurs d’offrandes (dans un temple)” (KRI II 332:8, AL 79.1150) = “waiters, servers (of food)” (DLE I 209) = “Diener, Aufwärter” (GHWb 322).

- Etymology uncertain due to the late attestation. Only guesses are possible. Nevertheless, the solution nr. 2 seems quite promising.

NB: Questionable whether NEg. -3- is to be read or not (GW for *mdj.w?). NEg. -d- from OEg. *-d- or *-d-?

- 1. GT: the det. (W8: “granite bowl”) suggests *prima vista* (perhaps misleadingly) a connection with the root m3t. Perhaps a nisbe of *m3d < MK m3t < OK m3t, lit. “carriers of granite dishes?”, akin to Eg. m3t “Granitschale” (IÄF, discussed above)?
- 2. GT: in spite of the (purely phon.?) det. W8, perhaps a substantivized part. (on the pattern of sdm.jw, wnnj.w) of an old *m3d (var. of the attested m3wḏ, above?) “to carry (on shoulder?)”?

- The chances of external etymologies are here rather little:
- **3.** GT: assuming mdj.w (GW), a comparison with LECu.: Som. midīdīn “servant, assistant” [Abr. 1964, 179] ||| NOm.: Omt. mad- “lavorare, servire, ministrare, aintare” [Mrn. 1938, 143] ||| Ch. *m-d “slave” [JS 1981, 236: B4] > CCh.: Gisiga modro “Diener” [Lks. 1970, 130], Balda(mu) mádai “Sklave” [Str. 1922–23, 119; not recorded by Trn. 1987, 54] || ECh.: Tumak màād “esclave” [Cpr. 1975, 81] should not be excluded.
NB1: Gisiga -r- is not clear, not reflected by the supposed cognates (unless Balda -i < *-r). Was it part of the root?
NB2: Of deverbal origin? Cf. AA *m-d “to help, protect” [GT]: Ar. madda I “10. prêter assistance à qqn., l’aider avec qqch.”, IV “2. aider, assister qqn., lui donner des secours (en troupes, en vivres, etc.); envoyer des troupes auxiliaires à qqn.”, X “1. demander des secours, de l’assistance chez qqn. contre qqn.” [BK II 1075–6] ||| LECu.: Som. mād “protection”, mād-iy- “to protect, safeguard” [LS] ||| NOm. *mād- “to help” [LS 1997, 456] ||| WCh.: perhaps Tng. maḍi “to protect, help, save” [Jng. 1991, 118]. O. V. Stolbova (1996, 113) equated Tng. maḍi (semantically unconvincingly) with CCh.: Mafa meč- “donner tout ce que est dû à qqn.”.
- **4.** GT: or act. substantivized part. of an unattested Eg. *m3d “to wait” < *mld (lit. ≈ Eng. “waiter”, German “Aufwärter”?), eventually cognate with WCh.: Tala milidu “to wait for” [Csp. 1994, 37]?

m3dd “sommoler” (LP, Vernus 1978, 145, n. 1; AL 78.1651).

NB: Its det. (A7: “man sinking to ground from fatigue”, EG 1927, 436) suggests tiredness.

- Etymology uncertain due to the late attestation. No evident cognates.
- **1.** GT: any connection to LEg. m3t “von der auf der Bahre liegenden Osirisfigur” (GR, Wb II 33, 10) = “le gisant (?)” (AL 79.1145)?
NB: LEg. m3t (q.v.) comes from an unattested *m3t “who is lying on the bier (or sim.)”, derived (by participial m-) from OEg. 3t.t “1. Bett, 2. auch von der Bahre des Osiris” (OK, Wb I 23, 11).
- **2.** GT: or GW for mdd, eventually cognate with LECu.: Orm.-Borana mudda (var. of muga!) “to feel sleepy” [Strm. 1987, 370; 1995, 211] ||| WCh.: Zeem (taarù) maḍai, Tule (dar) məḍə “to sleep” (NBch.: Smz. 1978, 37, #71)?
NB: Very uncertain comparison. The main form in Orm. was apparently muga “to sleep a little, slumber” [Gragg 1982, 293], while the SBch. forms seem isolated within Chadic, unless they are somehow connected to SBch. *mUr- (or sim.) “to sleep” as H. Jungrauthmayr and D. Ibrizimow (1994 II, 298) are suggesting, which excludes any connection to LEg. m(3)dd.

m3d.w (pl.) “(?)” (PT, Wb II 35, 7) = “Brückenjochen (?)” (ÜKAPT II 321–2) = “Joche, Holzbrücken” (ÜKAPT VI 129) = “perche, palanche” (AL 77.1610, 77.1635) = “Brückenjoch (?), Stäbe (?)” (GHWb 322; ÄWb I 506c).

nb1: Context obscure. Occurs in the expression m3d.w jpn n.w zm.t “these m3d.w of the desert” (AEPT), cf. OEg. zmj.t ~ zm.t “Wüste” (OK, Wb III 444–5). R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 89, utt. 300, n. 7) found “difficult to accept” K. Sethe’s (ÜKAPT l.c.) rendering, though he had “no alternative to offer”. Indeed hard to imagine how this meaning can fit context, cp. perhaps NK m3wd “yoke (?)” in its figurative sense “foundation” in Pap. Wilbour (Gardiner 1948, 18) = “endowment” (Breasted received by Grd. with reservation) = “Feldbezeichnung (vgl. lat. iugum ‘Querholz’ vs. iugerum ‘die von einem unter dem Joch stehenden Gespann beim Pflügen erreichte Leistung’)” (Hassan 1979, 121–4).

nb2: Meeks (l.c.) reads m3d.w not as pl. (contra Wb; ÜKAPT; GHWb; ÄWb), but as sg. m3wd (q.v.) changing the sequence of d + w to w + d. The three dets. speak, however, in favour of a pl. *m3d.w.

- From the same root (?): m3d.w “(Substantiv)” (hapax, Pap. Prisse 13:2; Wb II 35, 4) = “impartialité (renvoie probablement à la distribution et au nombre égal des pions avant l’ouverture du jeu)” (Žaba 1956, 153–4, n. 417) = “les balanciers, les équilibres” (Vernus 1997, 439f.) = “Balancierstange, Tragejoch” (Junge 2003, 247, n. 417).

nb1: Its obscure det. (left in hieratic in Wb) was identified by P. Vernus (l.c.) with a ligature of D41 (forearm with palm of hand downwards) + pl. strokes, while Z. Žaba suggested “peut-être le damier”.

nb2: The context suggests a figurative sense “impartialité” (Žaba) derivable from “balanciers” (Vernus).

nb3: Already P. Vernus (l.c.), followed by F. Junge (l.c.), linked Pap. Prisse m3d.w to PT 445d m3d.w.

- If the rendering “Balancierstange” (or sim.) is correct, we may assume evidently an old *m3d as var. to the better attested m3wd. The AA cognates, besides, suggest a primary form *m3d < *mrg, which is a perfect match of ECh.: Kera ámàrgá “Rückentrage für Säuglinge” [Ebert 1976, 26], cf. also NOM. *mUrg- “shoulder” [GT] (further details s.v. Eg. m3wd).

nb: Note that, in spite of the speculation on the context of PT m3d.w and the metaphoric sense of Eg. m3wd in Pap. Wilbour (above), there can hardly be any kinship with ECh.: WDng. mórgó “champ” [Fédry 1971, 137] = mórgó “fields (farm)” [JI 1994 II, 135], which V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1741) erroneously equated with Ar. marġ- “pré, prairie” [BK II 1087] = “meadow” [Kogan]. The latter is an Iranian loanword, cf. Av. marəyā “Wiese” [Bartholomae 1901, 1147] as pointed out by L. Kogan (2002, 195, #1741).

- **mj** “komme!” (OK, Wb II 35, 9–14) = “come!” (FD 104, cf. EG §336).
nb: Note the OK pl. form mjw (AL 77.1636).

- Hence: Cpt.: (SBAF) ΔΜΟΥ (m), (SBF) ΔΜΗ (f), pl. (S) ΔΜΗΕΙΤῆ “komme!” (KHW 5).

nb: Vocalization by Fecht (1960, 131, §252): *jamájĵ (m) vs. *jaméjĵ (f). Edel’s (AAG §296) *j mĵ[?] was declined by C. Peust (1992, 120), who, following W. Vycichl (1936, 172), identified in the Cpt. endings -ΟΥ < *-á(m) vs. -Η < *-í(f) the AA gender markers *-a vs. *-i, resp., cf. e.g. the imprs. like Ar. ʾisma^c (m) vs. ʾisma^c-i “höre!” or Bed. dir-a (m) vs. dir-i “töte!” as well as the 2nd person suffix: Akk.-Ar. -ka vs. -ki ~ Eg. -k vs. -t < *-ki. Peust (1995, 71): *iámá (m) vs. *iámí (f), cf. LCpt. (Pi-Solsel) amū (m) vs. amī (f) “komm her!” (Vcl. l.c.).

- Cognate with PCu. *mV?- “to come” [Apl. 2005 MS, 27; 2006, 47]: Bed. *ma?- “kommen” (attested only in impv.): má?-a (m), má?-ay (f) “komme!”, pl. ma?-āna “kommt!” [Rn. 1895, 161] = mʔā ~ mʔāā “come!” [Rpr. 1928, 213] = mʔa “come” [Thelwall 1970, 1, §16] = ma (suppletive impv. of i, defective) “come!” [Hds. 1996, 89] || LECu.: Saho & Afar maw “kommen, anlangen” [Rn. 1890, 277] | Arb. maye “to come” [Bnd. 1971, 251, #16], Bys. me?- [Flm. apud Dlg.], Rnd. -mi- “kommen” [Schlee 1978, 140, #772] | HECu.: Drs. (Gedeo) mē?- “andare, camminare” [Mrn. 1937, 237] = mi?- [Flm. apud Dlg., Zbr.] = me?- ~ meʔe [Bnd.] = meʔ?- “to go”, meʔ?- “going, journey” [Hds. 1989, 71, 86] (ECu.: Dlg. 1973, 246; Zbr. 1973, 579) || PCh. *ma “to return” [Nwm.]: WCh.: Hausa-Kts. máyà “to return there, go there”, mayóó “to return here, come here” [Abr. 1962, 670] | Pero mé- “to return” [Frj. 1985, 41] | BT *mā “to return” [Schuh]: Bole m(a)- “1. zu einem Platz gehen, 2. dorthin zurückkehren” [Lks. 1971, 137] = máa- “to return” [Schuh], Ngm. ma- “to return” [Schuh], Dera máí “to return” [Schuh], Glm. máyà “journey”, yí máyá “to travel” [Alio 1988 MS] (BT: Schuh 1984, 217) | Grnt. maa “to go” [Jgr. 1989, 185] | Duwai ma- “to return” [Schuh] (WCh.: Schuh 1982, 14) || CCh.: Bura mwa “to go, walk” [BED 1953, 145] = mû “to start up and run”, cf. máí “to go (away), departure” & “go!” [RK 1973, 123], Wamdiu mâ-y “aller” [Krf., Brt.-Jng. 1990, 78], Cbk. mwa “to go away” [Hfm.] (Bura-Margi: Hfm. 1955, 136) | Gsg. me “dorthin zurückkehren” [Lks. 1970, 128] = “to return” [Nwm.] | PMasa *ma > *mba “to come” [GT]: Masa ma “venir” [Mch.] = mà “venir” [Ctc. 1983, 110] = ma “venir” [Dieu quoted apud Brt.-Jng. 1990, 107] = mà-ná “aller”, mà-ná “venir” [Jng. 1973 MS, also in JI 1994 II 83], Masa-Gizay mà “arriver, venir” [Ajello], ZB & ZD mba ~ mbú “to come” [Jng. 1978, 12, 25], Mesme mbà “came” [Jng. 1978, 15], Ham & Musey & Lew & Marba mbà “arriver, venir” [Ajello] (Masa gr.: Ajello 2001, 6, 57) || ECh.: Kwang-Mobu mǎyǎ “fuir, dépasser” [Ebert 1977 MS, 3] (Ch.: Nwm. 1977, 30).
LIT.: Rn. 1886, 877 (Bed.-LECu.-Eg.); Brk. 1932, 805 (Eg.-Bed.); Zhl. 1932–33, 165, fn. 1 (Eg.-Saho); Lefèbvre 1936, 275 (Eg.-Bed.); Chn. 1947, #484 (Eg.-Bed.); Korostovcev 1963, 14 (Eg.-Bed.); DELC 9 (Eg.-Bed.); Hodge 1988, 274 (Eg.-PCh.); Zbr. 1989, 579 (Bed.-LECu.); Bnd. 1990, 32, #4 (Bed.-Drs.); Peust 1992, 120 (Eg.-Bed.); HSED #1752 (Ch.-LECu.); Apl. 2005 MS, 27 & 2006, 47 (Cu.-Eg).
NB1: E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 165, fn. 1): Eg. mj < *m-jj ~ Bed. imper. *m-ʔa < ʔiy (sic). Zyhlarz supposed in both Eg. and Bed. a prefix m- of the “Sozialstamm”. Untenable. The m- in both related words belongs to the root.

nb2: Ch. Ehret (1987, #442) equates Bed. *maʔ- with SAḡaw: Awngi mic- [Ehret: caus. *mi-t-s-] “to marry, lit. make enter” [Apl. 2006, 164] || SCu.: Irq. imuʔ-um “to begin” [Ehret] = imuʕ-üm [MQK 2002, 56]. Unconvincing.

nb3: Chadic “to return” is hardly related to NOm. *makḵ- “to return” [GT], cf. NWOmt.: Gamo māḵ(k)- (dial. māʔ-), Male maʔ-, Zala māḵ(k)- | SEOmt.: Kyr. (Bdt.) māḵ(k)- (NOm.: Hayward 1994 MS, 3). Cf. Eg. mq3 (below).

nb4: Many authors identified LECu. *mVʔ- “to come” and/or Eg. mj with ECu. *ʔam- “to come” [GT]: HECu. *am- imper. “come!” [Hds. 1989, 404] | Saho am-ō “komm!” [Rn. 1890, 277], Afar sg. am, am-e, pl. am-o ~ am-ō “come!” [Ss.] | Som.-Hawiya im-az “come!” [Crl.] = im-aw [Lmb.], cf. im-ād- “to come” [Lmb.] (for Som. dialects cf. Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984, 259–262), cf. Rnd. -imi “to arrive” [Heine 1976, 212] (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 21; Dlg. 1973, 246) ||| NOm. *ʔam- “to go” [GT]: Bdt. aḡ “andare” [Crl.] | Gmr.-She ham ~ am “andare” [Crl.] | Kaffa ham “andare” [Crl.], Shn. am- “to go” [Lmb.] (ECu.-NOm.: Crl. 1938 II, 188; Shn.-Som.: Lmb. 1994, 115), although these parallels suggest a Cu.-Om. root *ʔam- [GT]. Lit. for Eg.-Cu.: Rn. 1886, 877 (Afar-Eg.); Zhl. 1932–1933, 165, fn. 1 (Saho-Eg.); Chn. 1947, #484 (Som.-Eg.); Rsl. 1987, 384 (Eg.-LECu.); Hodge 1990, 172 (Eg.-PCu.); Ehret 1995, 301, #570 (Eg.-PCu.); Blz. 1997, 177 (Bed.-HECu.); Apl. 2005 MS, 27 & 2006, 47 (Eg.-Cu.). But H.-J. Sasse (1982, 21) analyzed the LECu. root as *am- + vowel ending, which would be misleading to compare with the Coptic reflexes of OEg. mj (with a prothetic j- of the imperative).

nb5: It is difficult to find an agreement in Cushitic studies concerning the etymological analysis of the Cu.-Om. verbs for “to come” described in this entry, cf. e.g.: (1) L. Reinisch (1886, 877), M. Cohen (1947, #484): Bed. maʔa ~ LECu. *mVʔ- ~ LECu.: Afar am, Somali imo ~ Eg. mj. Reinisch (1890, 277) treated Saho amō “komm!” as impv. of the maw “kommen” under the same root. (2) E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 165–166, fn. 1): Saho impv. analyzed as a-mō < mat- “to come”. (3) A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1973, 246), followed by A. Zaborski (1989, 579): ECu. impv. *am-/*im- “come!” ~ LECu. *mVʔ- “to come”, derived (Dlg.) from ECu. *mVt- “to come”. (4) H.-J. Sasse (1982, 21) and G. Hudson (1989, 404): HECu. impv. “come!” < *am- ~ Saho impv. am-o (Sasse). (5) M. Lamberti (1986, 684): Arb. impv. sg. may ~ Som. impv. imaw < “OCu.” *imāt-/*imit-. Later Lamberti (1994, 115) proposed Sns. am- ~ Som. im-ād- < “OCu.” *im-. (6) Ch. Ehret (1995, 301, #570): Cu. *ʔim(t)- (with a “durative” suffix *t) ~ Eg. mj ~ Ch. *ʔb- “to come” [Jng.] < AA *im- “to come”. Similarly, D. Appleyard (2005 MS, 27; 2006, 47): stem *mVʔ- > HECu. *am-, Bed. mʔa, Agaw *ʔənt-(āt)-, ECu. *mVt- ~ Eg. mj.

nb6: L. Reinisch (1887, 253) combined máʔa “veni!” with a number of impossible parallels, e.g. Bilin laḥʷ, laḥḥ/h “komm!” and its Agaw cognates, Eg. nʕ (q.v.) > нноу “venire”.

nb7: P. Newman (1977, 30) derives also CCh.: Zime mbu “to come” from PCh. *ma “to return”. Although the change mb- < *m- seems plausible in the Masa group, the vowel -u and the slightly different meaning suggest that Zime mbu and Ch. *ma are not connected. Cf. also Lame mbù “1. venir, 2. apporter” [Scn. 1982, 308], Zime-Dari mbù “venir” [Cooper 1984, 18].

nb8: J. Lukas (1975, 224) gives ECh.: Mkl. mâaʔédí “come!” (which looks as if the root were *mâaʔ-), but recently H. Jungraithmayr (1990, 97) has recorded only Mkl. k-édí/k-âádi “viens!” (cf. Mkl. ’éttó “venir, arriver, s’approcher, amener, apporter”).

nb9: Of course, Bed. *maʔ- “kommen” has nothing to do with Eg. nʕ as suggested by L. Reinisch (1895, 161). This Eg. etymology was rightly abandoned (as “fern-legendes”) already by C. Brockelmann (1932, 805).

nb10: L. Homburger (1930, 283) equates Eg. mj with Ful (Peul) ma “auxiliaire futur impératif” (sic). No comment.

NB11: In the frames of his “consonant ablaut” theory, C. T. Hodge (1990, 172) derived Eg. *mj* & Cu. **ʕim(t)*- “to come” [Ehret 1987, 107] from Lislakh ***ʕ*-NbCV- and **Nb-C, resp. (ultimately from LL **b-C) with the following alleged cognates: Sem. **bʔ* (sic) “to enter” [WUS #45] ||| LEg. *nbnb* “to come” (GR, Wb II 245) ||| Cu. **bAh-* [Hodge: suffix **-h-*] “to go in” [Dlg. 1973, 318] ||| PCh. **mb-* “to go, come” [JS 1981, 118] & Ch. (act. only NBch.) **buw-* “to come” [Skn. 1977, 16] || CCh.: Ga’anda *ḥa-* “to come” [Nwm. > Hodge]. These forms represent at least three (or four) distinct roots. Cf. Eg. *b3ḥ* & *bj3* & *nbnb*.

mj.t “Art Schiff (bei der Fahrt des Toten)” (MK, Wb I 41, 12) = *mj.t* ~ *mj.tj* “kind of boat” (MK, Jones 1988, 137, #32) = “ein in seiner auf eine elliptische Bogenform reduzierten Seitenansicht archaisch wirkender, papyrusförmiger Bootstyp, aus dem die gesamte Flottille der Bestattungsfahrt besteht” (VI–XII., Düring 1995, 150) = *mj.t(j)* “Art Schiff (bei der Fahrt des Toten)” (VI. 3x, ÄWb I 515).

NB: R. Hannig (ÄWb l.c.) assumes an older *mrt* (fully plausible, since the word is written with the hrgl. W19).

- J. Settgast (1963, 75, fn. 1) connected it to MK *mr.t* “Art, Schiff” (Wb, q.v.). Approved by Düring (l.c.), who extended this comparison (in a semantically rather unconvincing manner) to *m3.t* “proue (d’un navire)” (AL 77.1572; Meeks 1994, 258, discussed above), since “*die Gleichsetzung des mj.t mit m3.t mit der... Lesung mr.t bereitet keine Schwierigkeiten*” (cf. AÄG §30).

mj.w “Käter” (MK, Wb II 42, 1–3) & **mj.t** “Katze” (MK, Wb II 42, 4–7).

NB1: K. Zibelius (1978, 89) surmizes an OK attestation in personal names (Ranke PN I 145b) as well as in the hapax TN *mjw.w* (?) “die Katzen” (occurs also in Dem.) from the reign of Pepi II written with three cats Cf. fem. var. *mjw.t* (ASAE 18, 134, n. 4).

NB2: Vocalized as (f) **mjūj**t > **mmūj**(t) > **mmū* (Śmieszek, RO 13, 1937, 15, §6 & 18, §6) = **mi(3)āyat* (f) vs. **mi(3)yu* (Vrg. 1959, 17). Reflected in the Gk. PN Πεμους < Libyan period PN *p3-mjw* (m) “The Cat” vs. Τεμους (f) < *t3-mj.t*, not to be confused with Gk. PN Φιμουις ~ Πμουι(ς) ~ Φμο(υ)ις ~ Πμοις ~ Πμουςις < LEg. PN *p3-m3j* “The Lion” (cf. Ranke PN I 105:5; Yoyotte 1988, 155–157, esp. fn. 19 & 23 with sources).

- Hence: Dem. *mj* ~ *jmj* “Kater, Katze” (DG 151:2) > (SB) εμοϋ “cat” (CD 55b; CED 35).
- 1. Purely onomatopoeitic (and thus no reason to search for AA cognates) just like, e.g., SCu.: Grw. *mau*, Brg. & Asa *nyauʔu* “house cat” (SCu.: Swynnerton 1946, 24) ||| CCh.: Musgu *ḥiáu* “Kater”, *ḥiui* “Katze” [Müller 1886, 402] = *ḥiáu* (m) “Kater” vs. *ḥiui* (f) “Katze” [Krause, Rohlf] = *niäu* ~ *nyau* (m) [Barth] (Musgu: Lks. 1941, 71)?
- 2. GT: or **mj-* < AA **m-r* “cat” [GT]? Cognate with SCu.: Alg. *mariy-amo* “wild cat” [Ehret 1980, 342] ||| CCh.: Lame *mēr* “serval” [Scn. 1982, 317], Zime-Dari *mīēr* “genette” [Cooper 1984, 16]?

LIT.: for SCu.-Lame see HSED #1760.

NB1: Already K. Piehl (1893, 492) surmized, purely on Eg. grounds, that Eg. *mjw* “cat” vs. *m3j* “lion” differentiated from a common root. Thus, a remote relationship with AA **m-r* “lion” [GT] seems indeed possible (for further details cf. Eg. *m3j*). NB2: Cf. also Lame *mérián* “wild cat” [Krf.], Lame-Peve *merian* “wild cat, serval” [HSED]. Note that a comparison with CCh.: PMasa **me-ryaw* “cat” [GT]; Lame *méryāw* “chat” [Scn. 1978, 196] = *mérēō* “chat” [Scn. 1982, 317] = *mériāu* “cat” [Krf.], Zime-Dari *mérēw* “chat” [Cooper 1984, 16], Zime-Batna *rāw* ~ *mé-rāw* [Jng.] = *mé-rīāo* “cat” [Scn.] would be misleading, since the underlying root was Ch. **r-w*; cf. CCh.: Masa *rāw* “chat” [Mch.], Zime-Batna *rāw* ~ *mé-rāw* “cat” [Jng.] (CCh.: JI 1994 II, 65) || ECh.: Tumak *ērēw* “léopard” [Cpr. 1975, 59] | Mubi *ʔórúwā* “lion” [Jng. in JI 1994 II, 227] || Sem. **ʔarway-* “wild beast, lion” [SED] || Eg. *rw* “lion” (PT, Wb II 403, 8). For AA **r-w* see Möller 1921, 195; Clc. 1936, #66; Chn. 1947, #34; Grb. 1963, 59; Hodge 1976, 11; OS 1992, 183; Orel 1993, 43; SED II 24–25, #17.

- **3.** GT: or **mj-* < AA **m-l*, cp. CCh.: Mulwi *ámíl* [prefix *a-*] “Viverra civetta” [Trn. 1978, 206] || ECh.: Skr. *melā* “Katze” [Lks. 1937, 36]? Cf. AA **m-l* “lion” [GT] s.v. Eg. *m3j* “lion” (q.v.)
- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 284) compares Ful (Peul) *musuru* “chat”. Baseless.

mj “(god)” (hapax, CT 292b: B1L, B2L, B1C, B2P, DCT 160: not translated).

- Meaning and etymology debated.
- **1.** L. Lesko (1972, 46, n. h): lit. “Mummy-wrapper” ~ L. Eg. *mj* “Mumienbinde” (q.v.), or alternatively “Equalizer” < *mr* “as, like” (prep., q.v.).
- **2.** R. O. Faulkner (AECT III 134, sp. 1041): var. of *3j* < *3r* “Oppressor” (CT *ibid.*: vars. B13C, B4L, B2Bo).

mj “part of a building (refers to some kind of building or structure, requires stone blocks to be hewn for it)” (early NK 2x, Hayes, JEA 46, 1960, 44) = “partie d’une construction en pierres” (AC 1978, 14 after Hayes) = “partie du bâtiment” (AL 78.1659) = “ein Steinverband, Mauerverblendung” (Düring 1995, 61 after Hayes l.c.) = “Teil eines Steinbaus” (WD II 59 after AC 1978, 14).

NB: Occurs in two ostraca from Deir el-Bahri (year 44 and 45 of Thothmes III): no. 16 and 17 apud Hayes l.c. (MMA field no. 23001.66 and 23001.51).

- From the same root may derive:
 - (1) If existed, possibly *mj.w* (hapax, reading doubtful) “(ce pourrait être) les marches (d’un escalier) ou le pan incliné (d’une rampe d’accès)” (CT IV 119b: S1C, AL 78.1659).
- NB1: Compared with NK *mj* by D. Meeks (l.c.).
 NB2: The versions S1P and B2L of CT IV 119b have *s3* (lit. “back”) instead, which Faulkner (AECT II 241) rendered here “(hill-)sides”.

(2) GR (Edfu VI 80:8) mj.w “bulwarks (?)” (Blackman & Fairman in JEA 30, 1944, 7, n. k) = “die Beplankung einer Bordseite mit kurzen Holzteilen” (Düring l.c.).

NB: Compared with NK mj by N. Düring (l.c.). This word is discussed separately below.

- GT: mj (via an older mr) < *ml, perhaps akin to Hbr. of TTM mll “3. heften, säumen”, mālāl “Saum, Naht” [Dalman 1922, 238] || Ar. malla “1. bâtir (une pièce d’étoffe)” [BK II 1140] = “to sew, tack (the garment or piece of cloth)” [Lane 3022c] < AA *m-l “to attach” [GT]?

NB: For further AA cognates of Sem. *mll cf. Eg. mr “sich anschließen” (PT, Wb, GHwB, q.v.), with which Eg. mj (< *mr?) may eventually be related.

mj.t “ein berauschendes Getränk (?)” (Lit. MK, Wb II 41, 11; GHwB 324).

- 1. GT: mj.t < *ml.t, cognate with AA *m-l “alcoholic drink (made with honey)” [GT]? Cf. Sem.: perhaps Ug. mll “honey (?)” [Watson 1996, 709–710: mng. uncertain] || LECu.: Arb. múl “liquid part of raw honey” [Hyw. 1984, 386], cf. Baiso mülē “to brew” [Hyw. 1979, 121] || SCu. *mala “honey beer” [GT]: Ma’a (Mbugu) māl-a [Mnh. 1906, 313] = māl-a “beer (generic)” [Ehret 1974 MS, 44] | Dhl. mól-a, pl. mólalle “mead” [Tosco 1991, 143] = mól-a “(honey) mead” [EEN 1989, 38] = móla “honey beer” [MSSL 1993, 42, #143] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 154) || ECh.: perhaps Bdy. mole (coll.) “boisson (terme générique)” [Alio-Jng. 1989, 100] = “alcoholic drink” [Blz.].

LIT.: Blz. 1990, 207, #276 (Arb.-SCu.); 1991, 49, #26 (SCu.-Ch.).

NB2: W. G. E. Watson (1996, 709–710) renders Ug. mll alternatively as “to speak (?)”.

NB1: V. Blažek (1991, 49) compares also ECu. *malab- “honey” and Eg. mnḥ “wax” (q.v.), although the Cu. *comparanda* show no trace of *-ḥ.

NB3: CCh.: Musgu émel (n ámi) “honey” [Mch. 1950, 27; JI 1994 II, 191], Puss emel “oil, liquide sirupeux, visqueux ou gras” [Trn. 1991, 86] do not belong here.

- 2. GT: or ECh.: Tuburi-Kera ko-mí “Bier” [Lks. 1937, 100], Kera ku-muy “Bier” [Ebert 1974, 14] = ku-møy “Hirsebier” [Ebert 1976, 75], Tuburi-Fianga ko-moi “Bier” [Lks. 1937, 101].

NB: Perhaps connected with WCh.: Hausa mãàyécé “intoxication” [Abr. 1962, 670] || ECh.: Mgm. mòwwò “s’énivrer” [JA 1992, 107], Bdy. miyaw “s’énivrer” [AJ 1989, 99] | Jegu miw- (miwa, miyaw) “betrunken sein” [Jng. 1961, 115]? See, however, also Eg. mhj “to forget”.

mj.t (fem.) “Weg, Straße” (late NK, Wb II 41, 13–15) = “road, way, path” (DLE I 210–1) = “Weg, Straße” (GHwB 325) > Dem. mj.t (fem.) “1. Weg, 2. auch in der Bedeutung: Lehre, Art u.ä.” (DG 152:3).

NB1: LEg. mt (with a different orthography and masc. article p3!) “Weg” quoted by Fischer-Elfert (1986, 76, 89: three exx.) is probably not the same word, but may directly continue old mṭn (q.v.).

NB2: For LP mj.t see also Jansen-Winkeln (1996, 95, §148).

● Origin debated:

- **1.** Most authors (e.g., CED 92; KHW 89; AL 77.1646 & 1938; DELC 109) agree on the continuity of OEg. mṭn “way” (OK, Wb II 176), act. *máj̃ ṭ̃ n > *máj̃ ṭ̃ n (Fecht 1960, 180, §373) → NK mj.t → Dem. mjt (masc.) “Weg” (DG 153:11) → Cpt.: (S) מוּעִיט, (A) מַעִיט etc. “1. Weg, 2. Ort, Stätte” (KHW 89) = “road, path” (CD 188a).

NB: The OEg. > Cpt. derivation is certainly correct, but the etymology for the fem. NEg. mj.t remains doubtful. The shift of OEg. -n > NEg. -j or -Ø is indeed explainable (Lacau 1970, 29–41; cf. also NBÅ 592f., n. 534; Vcl. 1990, 220f.; Peust 1999, 157, §3.14.5). Thus we might assume OK mṭn > NK *mṭj (cf. masc. mt apud Fischer-Elfert l.c.) > Dem. mjt (m) with metathesis > Cpt. Burkard (1977, 21) explains the unexpected replacement of old mṭn of the original text of Merikare by mj.t.t “similarity” (!) in the P var. as *Lesefehler* for NK mj.t which was purely a younger synonym of old mṭn (contra Scharff assuming a *Hörfehler*, i.e., an identical pronunciation of *mṭj < old mṭn vs. mj.t.t already in the NK). Moreover, NK mj.t had a fem. article, the root being apparently conceived as *mj. Thus, in spite of their similarity, old mṭn and NK mj.t may represent two distinct etymons that were probably only confused as correctly surmised by Smith (1978, 360). It was presumably Dem. (with the vacillation in gender) when the two had merged. Similarly, the identification of the two has been carefully avoided already in Wb (l.c. vs. II 176).

- **2.** H. Smith (1978, 360) admitted that the derivation of (S) מוּעִיט from old mṭn may be valid, but “*it seems conceivable that*” LEg. mj.t was a distinct word derived by m- preformative from Eg. √w3 (sic, cf. w3.t “road, way”) and not “directly” connected with the late form of old mṭn.

NB: Dubious because of the lack of an old etymon *m3.t proving the alleged shift -3- > -j-.

- **3.** GT: perhaps from *√mj, cognate with ES: Gafat mäya “road” [Lsl. 1945, 165] = mäyā [Lsl. 1956, 219], Grg. *meya “road, way” [GT]: Enm. meya, End. meyä, Gyeto mäya (Grg.: Lsl. 1979 III, 441) ||| WCh.: Bokkos & Butura ma? “bridge” [Magwa etc. 1985, 10]?

NB1: The ES parallels are isolated in Sem. W. Leslau (1945, 1956 l.c.) connected the Gafat word to MSA: Sq̄. mi^oeh “side” | ES: Harari mihe ~ mihiye “side” vs. miḥi “vicinity, near, beside”, Grg.: Chaha ema, mea, meyä etc. “rib, side of the body”. Later, however, Leslau (1979) avoided this semantically unconvincing equation.

NB2: The semantic shift “road” > “bridge” is banal, cf. e.g. Lat. pōns < IE *p̄nt- “path” (LEW 336).

NB3: The underlying verbal root may have eventually been AA *m-() “to go, come” [GT] (with an uncertain weak second root consonant), cf. esp. WCh.: Glm. máyā “journey”, yí máyá “to travel” [Alio 1988 MS]. The same semantic shift may be observed also in SCu.: WRift *ʔam-o “path, way” [GT]: Alg. amo, pl. amamu, Brg. amo, pl. amaʔi (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 24, #79), which seems to be related to Cu.-Om. root *ʔam- “to come, go” [GT]. For further details see Eg. mj “komm!” (q.v.).

mj “Mumienbinde (ob richtig?)” (LP, Wb II 41, 10).

NB1: L. H. Lesko (1972, 46, n. h) interprets the name of the god mj in CT 292b (B1L, B2L, B1C, B2P, hapax, DCT 160: not translated) as “Mummy-wrapper” (or alternatively “Equalizer”), although R. O. Faulkner (AECT III 134, sp. 1041) sees in it a var. of 3j < 3r “Oppressor” (CT *ibid.*: vars. B13C, B4L, B2Bo).

NB2: Note that mj (written with W19) in CT III 217b (T1Be, T2L) is to be regarded as a var. of mr (written usually with U7) “to bind” (as suggested in DCT 160).

● Meaning dubious, origin obscure.

■ **1.** GT: perhaps a variation of Eg. mr “to bind” (q.v.)?

■ **2.** GT: or, if represents a distinct root, perhaps to be connected with SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr māymāy “attacher solidement (selle etc.)” [PAM 2003, 570] ||| Mgm. máay-àné (m), pl. màay-igèe “ceinture de femme” [JA 1992, 105]. The etymology of CCh.: Gsg. maʔi “Bündel” [Lks. 1970, 127] || ECh.: Smr. mā “nouer, attacher avec une corde” [Jng. 1993 MS, 42; 1978, 186] is uncertain (rather < *m-H?).

NB: Cognate perhaps also with NOM. *mayʔ- “to dress” [GT]: Omt. maʔ- “rivestirsi, esser rivestito” [Mrn. 1938, 150] > Wlt. mayy- “to dress”, mayy-uwa “clothing” [LS] = may-uwa “clothing” [Alm.], Gamu mayy- “to dress oʻself”, mayy-ó “cloth” [Sottile 1999, 436 after Lmb. 1985 MS, 4, #574–6] = maʔ-o “clothing” [Alm.], Dache may-y- “to dress oʻself”, mayy-o “cloth(ing)” [LS], Dorze mayʔ-o “clothing” [Alm.], Dawro-Kullo may-uwa “clothing” [Alm.] = maiyua “clothes” [LS], Gofa maʔ- “to wear, dress” [LS] | Zys. maʔ- “to wear, dress” [LS], Zrg. ma-o “clothing” [Sbr.], Kyr. māʔ-o “clothes”, māʔ- “to dress” [Hyw. 1982, 218] = maʔ-o “clothing” [Sbr.] = maʔ-o “cloth(ing)” [LS], Haruro (Kcm.) māy “vestirsi, cingersi”, māy-ā ~ māʔ-o “veste” [CR 1937, 653, 655] = maʔ-o “clothing” [Sbr.] = māy- “to dress oʻself”, māy-a ~ māʔ-o “cloth(ing)” [LS], Gnj. maʔ-o “clothing” [Sbr.] | Yemsa may- “1. sich anziehen (to have on clothes), 2. Kleid anhaben (dress)”, may-à “Kleidungsstück (clothing)” [Lmb. 1993, 368–9] | Sns. mayʔ-o “clothing” [Alm.] (NOM.: Alemayehu 1993, 9; Sbr. 1994, 12; LS 1997, 476)? Note that M. Lamberti (LS l.c.) derived the NOM. data from an old *māk- “to dress, cloth”, but aside from the uncertain Agaw: Qwara māḵ “a kind of clothing” there is no proof for the shift *ʔ < *ḵ in this root. He (LS l.c.) equally falsely compared NOM. *mayʔ- with Bed. máʔwad “das Alltagskleid, Leibtuch” [Rn. 1895, 162], which is a late loan-word from Ar. miʔwaz- “habit de tous les jours” < √ʔwz [BK II 407].

■ **3.** GT: if mj (via an older mr) < *ml, perhaps akin to Hbr. of TTM mll “3. heften, säumen”, mālāl “Saum, Naht” [Dalman 1922, 238] || Ar. malla “1. bâtir (une pièce dʻétouffe)” [BK II 1140] = “to sew, tack (the garment or piece of cloth)” [Lane 3022c] < AA *m-l “to attach” [GT]?

NB: For further possible AA cognates of Sem. *mll cf. Eg. mr “sich anschließen” (PT, Wb, GHWb, q.v.), with which Eg. mj (older *mr?) may eventually be related.

mj.w (wood det., pl.) “ein Teil des Schiffes” (GR hapax: Edfu VI 80:8, Wb II 41, 9: mj) = “bulwarks” (Blackman & Fairman, JEA 30, 1944, 7 & n. k; Fairman 1954, 103, n. 55) = “les loges” (Drioton 1948, 38) = “les soutes à cordages” (Alliot 1954 II, 769 & n. 4) = “(mng. unknown)” (Jones 1988, 168, §67 with lit.) = “die Beplankung einer

Bordseite mit kurzen Holzteilen (meist kleine, dünne Holzteile, Bretter, die auch an jeder anderen Stelle des Schiffes verwendet werden können)” (Düring 1995, 61) = “part of ship” (PL 413).

- Meaning disputed. Origin obscure.
- **1.** N. Düring (l.c.) and D. Jones (l.c.), followed by P. Wilson (PL 413), linked it to Eg. *mj* “some kind of building or structure” (Hayes, JEA 46, 1960, 44) = “ein Steinverband, Mauerverblendung” (Düring), discussed above.
- **2.** GT: alternatively, cf. perhaps NBrb.: Qbl. *ta-maway-t*, pl. *ti-muway* “branche assez longue qui sert de chevron de charpente, de perche” [Dlt. 1982, 527]?

mj “apporter” (GR: Dendera VIII 65:4, AL 78.1654) = “to bring” (PL 410).

- Origin disputed. D. Meeks (AL l.c.) and P. Wilson (PL l.c.) prefer to see in it (1) either a faulty writing of *mz* “herbeibringen” (Wb, q.v.) or (2) the impv. *jmj* “gib!” (Wb I 76) treated in this case as a distinct verb. Nevertheless, in the improbable case if we have to do here with the poorly attested relict of an independent verb, cp.:
 - **1.** GT: perhaps < AA **m-y* ~ **m-w* (?) “to carry” [GT].

NB1: Preserved in NBrb.: Mzg. *ʿm-w*: *a-mawa* “mobilier (ensemble de meubles), 2. fait de transporter, d’un lieu à un autre, des choses les unes après les autres” [Taifi 1991, 445] ||| NOm.: Kaffa *mih* “tragen” [Rn. 1888, 317] = *miy* “portare indosso”, caus. *miṣ* “caricare, porre il carico a...”, *miy-ō* “carico” [Crl. 1951, 470, 476], Mocha *miya-yé* “to carry on the back”, *mi’-o* “load” [Lsl. 1959, 39, 43] ||| WCh.: Saya moi “to carry” [Csp. 1994, 44] || CCh.: Hurzo *mia* “apporter” [Mch. 1953, 174: isolated in MM]. Cf. also Eg. *mm* “to transport (cattle)” (1st IMP, FD, q.v.) ||| Ar. *ʾamma* “to go, lead” > *ʾimām*- “leader, imam” explained by J. Huehnergard (2000, 2062) from *ʾumm*- “mother”.

NB2: This AA root should be separated (contra Reinisch l.c.) from NA_{gaw} **məqʷ*- [Apl. 1989] = **mVɣʷ*-T- “to carry (on the shoulders)” [Apl. 1991] = NA_{gaw} **maû* (sic) [Conti Rossini]: Bln. *muqʷ-r* ~ *muqʷ-r* “tragen” [Rn.] = *məqʷ-r*- [Apl. 1989] = *miṣʷ-r*- [Apl. 1991], Qwara *mô-t* ~ *meû-t* ~ *maû-t* (refl.) “tragen eine Last” [Rn. 1885, 96], Hamir *miû-t* ~ *mû-t* “tragen, sich aufladen” [Rn. 1884, 390], Xmtg. *māw-t/r-* [Apl. 1989] = *məw-r-* “to carry” [Apl. 1991], Qemant *mo-t* “porter, lever” [CR 1912, 234] = *məɣʷ-t-* ~ *mäɣʷ-t-* [Apl. 1989] = *miɣʷ-t-* “to carry” [Apl. 1991] (Agaw: Apl. 1989 MS, 16; 1991 MS, 3) || LECu.: Rnd. *meh*, pl. *meháh* “load” [Heine 1976, 218] ||| ECh.: Kera *móké* “etwas Schweres hochheben” [Ebert 1976, 82] | Bdy. *mòg* “aider qn. à porter un lourd fardeau” [AJ 1989, 99]. From AA **m-Q* “to carry” [GT].
 - **2.** GT: or, if *mj* < **mr* ~ **ml*, cp. either SCu. **mar-* “load” [Ehret]: Irq. *mar-a* “load of ivory” [Ehret] | Ma’a *mmarú* “load” [Ehret] (Ehret 1980, 154, #12) or ECh.: WDng. *mìlè* “supporter, porter un enfant dans le dos, supporter une peine” [Fédry 1971, 132], EDng. *mìlè* “tragen” [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 95].

mj “Wind” (Dem. hapax, DG 151:3) = “vent” (Cenival 1987, 4–4).

- Supposed by W. Spiegelberg (followed by Erichsen, DG l.c.; Cenival l.c.) to derive from Eg. m3^c.w “(richtiger) Wind” (since MK, Wb) = “bon vent” (Cenival), which, in turn, originated in Eg. m3^c “richtig” (Wb, q.v.). Thus, it has hardly anything to do with AA *m-y “(cold) wind” [GT].

NB: Attested in WBrb.: Zng. a-maya “trombe précédant la tornade” [Ncl. 1953, 203] || SCu.: Ma’a má “blasen” [Mnh. 1906, 312] (unless identical with Ma’a ma “schlagen”) || WCh.: perhaps Ngizim màrà “coldness, the harmattan, cold season” [Schuh 1981, 110] || CCh.: Hina miì, Muşgoy (Daba) mbii “Wind” (CCh.: Str. 1910, 460) || ECh.: Mokilko màayé “wind” [Lks. 1977, 224] = màayé “vent, air”, cf. mójòyò adj. “frais, froid” [Jng. 1990, 135].

mj3.t “ein Wirtschaftsgebäude” (late NK, Wb II 42, 12) = “a farm-building of some sort” (AEO II 215*, #456) = “ein Wirtschaftsgebäude (*Weberei)” (GHWb 325).

NB: In both instances of the onomasticon of Amenope, mj3.t precedes mḏ.t “cow-house” (AEO l.c.),

- Interpretation and etymology obscure.
- **1.** A. H. Gardiner (AEO II 215*): may be “*in all likelihood different from*” Eg. mj^c.t “(prob.) looms (or the like)” (Admonitions 4:12, AEO, q.v.).

NB: The recent Berlin Wörterbuch project (p.c. by I. Hafemann, 19 May 2000): “*vermutlich identisch*” with mj^c.t. This is the equation R. Hannig’s (GHWb l.c.) rendering “Weberei (?)” (not proposed elsewhere) is apparently founded on.

- **2.** GT: was mj3.t in fact a GW (mj.t < *mr.t²) for old mr “Weberei” (MK, Wb, below)?

- **3.** GT: if it was a synonym to Eg. mḏ.t, cf. perhaps either of the following AA roots:

(1) If Eg. mj3 < *mj_r, cf. PCu. *mayr-/mawr- [GT] > NAgaw: Bln. maùrà “1. Rinderlager, Lagerplatz wo das Vieh bei Nacht sich aufhält, 2. die Herde” [Rn. 1887, 278] = mawr-a “cattle camp, herd” [Ehr.] = marā (sic) “yard, place immediately in front of house, homestead” [Mlt.-OS], Hamir mirā [< *mayr-] “Lagerplatz des Viehes” [Rn.] || SAgaw: perhaps Awngi mur-í “village” [Apl. 1991 MS, 13] || LECu.: PSam *mawr-o “cattle pen” [Ehret] = *mör- [GT] = *mörād- “Gehege” [Lmb.]: Som. mör (f) “Lagerplatz des Viehes während der Nacht” [Rn. 1902, 300], Som. dials. mör-o, mör-ə, mür-ə “Gehege” [Lmb.], PBoni *móórə (f) “home, overvillage” [Heine 1982, 112, 147] > Boni mör “das Zuhause, das heimatische Dorf” [Sasse 1980, 99] = mör-ə “Heimat” [Lmb.] (Sam: Lmb. 1986, 211) | Orm. mōrā “Lagerplatz des Viehes” [Rn.] = mör-a “cattle pen” [Ehr.] | Dullay *mör- [GT] > Harso & Dbs. & Glg. mór-e (f) “1. Platz, 2. Marktplatz, 3. Kultplatz” [AMS 1980, 176, 213], Gwd. mör-bo “meeting area” [Mlt.-OS 1989, 154] (Cu.: Ehret 1987, 103, #429) || ECh.: perhaps Bdy. mòoro “grenier en paille tressée enduite de bouse” [AJ 1989, 100].

NB: Neither the connection of Hamir mirā “Türe” [Rn. 1884, 394] to the NAgaw stem nor the derivation from *mayd- is probably correct.

(2) LECu.: Saho mar-o “residence”, mar- “to reside, pass time” [Ehr. 1974, 78] = mar- “to dwell” [MQK] || SCu.: PRift *mar-a “house” [Ehr. 1980; KM] = “resi-

dence” [Ehr. 1974]: Irq. *mâray* (pl.) “houses” [Wtl.] = *mâray* (pl.) “houses” [MQK 2002, 71], Brg. *mara*, *mârâ* “Haus” [Mnh. 1906, 332] = *mara*, pl. *mara’i* “house” [Wtl.], Grw. *mâray* (pl.) “houses” [Wtl.] = *marai* [Ehr.] (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 24, #54; KM 2004, 203) | Asa *morog* [Flm.] = *morok*, pl. *mariya* “house” [Ehr.], Qwd. *maliko* “in the house” [Kohl-Larsen apud Ehret 1980 MS, 4] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 342) ||| NOm.: Male *mari* “house” [Siebert 1994–95, 9] ||| CCh.: Nakaci *mare* “house” [Stl.]. Cf. also. From Rift: Masai *ε-marō* “large homestead” [Ehret 1974, 78]. Lrr.: Flm. 1969, 9 (SCu.-Saho-Male); Ehret 1987, #426 (Saho-Agaw-SCu.); Mlt.-OS 1989, 154 (Bilin-SCu.-Nakaci); HSED #1732 (Bilin-SCu.-Nakachi). NB: Burunge *mara* etc. is unrelated with LECu.: Somali *mēl* “Wohnsitz” as suggested by C. Meinhof (1906, 332).

(3) Less probably AA *mayl- “hut (?)” [GT] > SBrb.: Hgr. *tā-mail-t*, pl. *ti-mūial* “abri (naturel ou artificiel) derrière lequel on se tient à l’affût (du gibier)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1179], EWlm. & Ayr *tā-mmāl-t* “petit abri provisoire” [PAM 2003, 537] ||| (?) CCh.: Musgu *mulai* “Haus” [Müller 1886, 401] = *mulai* [Krause] = *melaï* [Ovw., Rohlfš] = *melaï* ~ *malai* ~ *molai* [Rohlfš] “Hütte, Haus” [Lks. 1941, 69]. NB: Cf. perhaps also LECu.: Saho & Afar *mēlā* ~ *mēlā* “1. Stammsitz eines Tribus, Wohnort eines Stammes, 2. Geschlecht, Tribus, Volksstamm” [Rn. 1890, 265], Saho *mēl-a* “1. house, 2. paternal clan, family” [Vergari 2003, 135] vs. Afar *mēla* “clan, tribe” [PH 1985, 167], although its etymology may be quite different (< *ma^l-?), cf. LEg. m3^v “place” (q.v.).

mj3z.w (pl., in CT VI 103h reduced to *mjz.w*) “Stacheln” (PT 1560c, Wb II 42, 11; so also ÜKAPT VI 129) = “spines” (PT, CT, FD 327) = “spines, shafts (of the feathers on the wing of Thoth, identified with the plumes)” (PT 1560c, AEPT 236–237, utt. 582, n. 2 & 329 index) = “spines of the finger-nails (which are on the fingers of Thoth), presumably their sharp outer edges (which can scratch)” (CT I 289c & VI 103h, AECT I 63–64, spell 67, n. 33 & II 147, spell 516, n. 3, resp.) = “les piquants” (PT, Leclant 1975, 144) = “(CT I 289c) pointe, piquant (d’une griffe d’oiseau), aussi (CT VI 103h): ‘extrémité, le tranchant’ de l’ongle” (AL 78.1663) = “scharfe Spitze (der Krallen, Fingernägel)” (GHWb 325) = “knives (for the indication of pinions of birds, talons)” (DCT 158, 160) = “Stacheln” (WD II 59) = “*Dorn, Stachel, *scharfe Spitze (der Krallen, Fingernägel)” (ÄWb I 512: PT 1560c only).

NB1: Here may belong PT 1999c *m3z.w* too rendered by R. O. Faulkner “spines (possibly refers to the shafts of the feathers on the wing of Thoth)” (AEPT 288, utt. 674, n. 13) = “Messer” (PT 1999c & GR, Wb II 31, 13) = “ein altes Wort für Messer” (Helck, LÄ IV 111–2) = “ein Messer” (PT 1999c, GHWb 321; ÄWb I 505). P. Wilson’s untenable rendering of PT 1999c *m3z.w* *tpj.w* *rmm.wj* *dhwtj* as “knives in (sic) Thoth’s hands (sic)” (PL 1.c.), contra Faulkner’s (AEPT 1.c.) “the spines which are on the arms of Thoth”, continues presumably an ancient contamination, which, in fact, the use of *m3z* “knife” (with knife det., m3 hrgl., no -j-) in PT 1999c (and also the TIC var. of CT I 289c) instead of *mj3z* “spine” (spines det., usually spelled alphabetically or with initial *mj/mr*) is due to. This assumption is corroborated by further instances of the same context (PT 1560, CT I 289 & VI 103h), where clearly *mj3z* is used in association with the “spines” of Thoth. Thus, following Wb (II 42, 11 vs. 31, 13), R. Hannig rightly lists PT 1999 *m3z* “Messer” vs. PT 1560 *mj3z* “Stachel usw.” in two separate entries as two distinct lexemes

(ÄWb I 505 vs. 512, resp.). In CT 289c, the “grains of corn” (M33) det. of mj3s.w (T2C) vs. mj3z (T9C) is probably a transformation of the old “spines” det. (PT 1560c), which, along with the “knife” det. of T1C var. of CT I 289c as well as in CT VI 103h, also testifies to that the original sense of mj3z was no longer fully understood. Note that K. Sethe (ÜKAPT VI 129) transliterated PT 1560c mj3z falsely as m3z. Cf. also Leclant 1975, 144.

NB2: Thoth in this context could have hardly been envisaged as a baboon (as Faulkner AECT II 147 thinks), but rather as an ibis (cf. PT 1560c: šw.wt tpj.wt rmn.wj=fj m mj3z.w “the plumes on his shoulders being like spines”, AEPT), and the shaft of its feathers (AEPT) or its pinions (DCT) are meant, although it may have been equivocal originally which part of the bird was exactly meant. Thus, in both PT 1999b-c (“your nails which are on your fingers, the spines which are on the arms of Thoth”) and CT VI 103h (mjz.w ‘n.t tpj.t db^c.w=k mj mjz.w tpj.w db^c.w dhwtj “the spines of the nails which are on your fingers”), presumably the claws (AECT) or talons (DCT), resp., on the bird’s toes are referred to.

● Origin obscure.

- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 23) and P. Lacau (1970, 149, #406; 1970 phon., 39, §19) surmised in mj3z.w (Lacau: *ml3z-/*mn3z-!) a prefix m-, though they were unable to identify the unattested supposed etymon (*j3z or sim.?).
- 2. Usually (FD 327; AEPT 237, utt. 582, n. 2 & 288, utt. 674, n. 13; AECT I 63–64, spell 67, n. 33; RdE 27, 1975, 147, n. y; DCT 158, 160; WD II 58–59) identified with OEg. m3z “knife” (since PT 1999, discussed above) as a “fuller writing” of the latter. Hardly correct (discussed above).
- 3. GT: perhaps met. of *jm3z < *jmrz ~ var. *jmrđ? Any connection to Akk. (jB) amaridu “eine Dornpflanze” [AHW 40] = “ein Dorngewächs” [Holma 1913, 97] = “bramble” [CAD a2, 3], cf. (m/jB) (a)murdinnu “Rose” [AHW 45] = “Dorngewächs” [Holma 1913, 65, fn. 1] = “bramble” [CAD]?
NB: Following H. Jensen, H. Holma (l.c.) and W. von Soden (AHW l.c.) supposed in amaridu a loan-word from a source related to Ar. ward- “rose”, which hardly fits the MBab. attestation. Nevertheless, if this assumption proves correct, the Eg.-Akk. equation is out of question.
- 4. L. Homburger (1930, 284): Eg. mj3z “épine” equated with Peul (Ful) gi⁷e (pl. “épines”). Irreal.

mj^c.t (house det.) “Art Haus (?)” (Lit. MK, hapax: Admonitions 4:12, Wb II 42, 13) = “looms (or the like)” (AEO II 215*) = “loom (?)” (FD 104) = “Kammer” (KHW 85) = “métier à tisser (?)” (AL 77.1651).
NB: Cf. its “connexion with” (AEO II 215*) n3.t “weaving-rooms” (FD 125) in Adm. l.c.

● Obscure word. Origin unknown.

- 1. A. H. Gardiner (AEO l.c.): there was “in all likelihood” no etymological relationship with Eg. mj3.t “probably a farm-building of some kind” (q.v.).

NB: There is a significant difference both semantically and phonologically, although in the view of I. Hafemann (new Berlin Wörterbuch project, p.c., 19 May 2000), the two are “*vermutlich identisch*”.

- **2.** G. Fecht (1960, 99, fn. 300), followed by W. Westendorf (KHW 85) and A. Ju. Militarev & V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1989, 153), saw in MEg. mj^o.t the fem. counterpart of the hypothetic etymon *m^oj^o? (sic) reflected by Dem. m3^o > Cpt.: (S) $\mu\lambda$ etc. “place”, which Fecht ultimately traced back (via met. of *mǎ^oj^o? > *mǎj^o?t) to Eg. ^o (Fecht: *^oj^o?) “1. Gegend, Seite (eines Landes), 2. Stelle” (OK, Wb I 157) with an m- prefix. Semantically unacceptable.

NB: D. Meeks (AL l.c.) too found this comparison “*curious*”, although the alternative etymology for Dem. m3^o (proposed by J. Osing, NBA 321 after G. Fecht) he referred to is equally dubious.

- **3.** A. Ju. Militarev & V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1989, 153) compared it with SCu. *mē “granary, storage place” [Ehret] = *meHu > *mew- [Mlt.-OS] based on Irq. mewe “storage bin” | Ma’a (Mbugu) imi’á “storage loft” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 157; 1987, #431) < AA *m[e]H- “storage place”. Clearly false.

NB1: MEg. -^o ≠ SCu. *Ø. The rendering by A. H. Gardiner (AEO II 215*) evidently contradicts this etymology.

NB2: Any connection to SCu.: Ma’a mī “Haus” [Mnh. 1906, 313] || NOm.: Sns-Bworo mā ~ ma’á “Haus” [Lmb. 1993, 348], or are these words related to Cu. *min- “to build, house” as C. Meinhof and M. Lamberti suggest?

NB3: Ch. Ehret (1987, #431) linked SCu. *mē “granary, store” to Bed. mē ~ mī “hail(stone)”. Semantically unconvincing. SCu. *mē is apparently cognate with WCh.: PGoemai *mē “granary” [GT 2004, 245] > mē [mē] “granary” [Srl. 1937, 137] = me “barn” [Hellwig 2000 MS, 22].

- **4.** GT: mj^o.t “looms” may be a nomen loci of an unattested Eg. *j^o (or *wj^o) “to weave” < *r^o or *wr^o (via palatalization of *r-), perhaps akin to Ch. *raH “to weave, plait” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in WCh.: AS *rā, “1. to tie grass (esp. for thatching), 2. weave, plait” [GT 2004, 304] = *rā “to weave” [Dlg.]: Angas ree “to tie grass together in flat long strips for thatching, making fences, etc. (Hs. yenta)” [Flk. 1915, 272] = rée (K) “to tie grass in flat long stripes for thatching” [Jng. 1962 MS, 34] = ree “to tie grass for thatching” [Hfm.] = re “to weave cornstalk” [ALC 1978, 55], Sura raa “flechten (Matte), weben, spinnen, binden” [Jng. 1963, 80] = raa “to weave, plait” [Hfm.] = raa “to weave”, ra “weaving” [Krf.], Mpn. rá “to weave” [Frj. 1991, 51], Kfy. rá “to bind grass for roofing” [Ntg. 1967, 33] = raa “to tie grass for thatching” [Hfm.], Msr. rah [rā] “to weave or knit (a basket and cloth)” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 261], Gmy. raa’ [rá] “to plait, interweave” [Srl. 1937, 188] = raa “to weave” [Hfm.] = nī ra “to weave”, bi-rā “weaving” [Krf.] = ra “to weave”, ra “weaver” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 29] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 21, #14) || CCh.: Tera ra “to plait” [Nwm. 1964, 49, #545], Pidlimdi ra “to weave” [Kraft] (Ch.: Kraft 1981, #429).

NB2: Is this hypothetic Eg.-Ch. isogloss connected with ES *r^ow ~ *rw^o “to join”: Geez ra^oawa “to yoke, join”, Tigrinya rā^owe, Tigre rā^owa “to have intercourse” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 459)?

mjw (**mj.w?**) “Frisur (?)” (late NK, Wb II 42, 10) = “Frisur” (GHWb 325).

NB: Its original reading is unclear. Used with fem. article t3. Perhaps from an older fem. etymon?

● No certain etymology. The suggestions listed below are based on the (unproven) assumption that the underlying root was *mj-:

■ **1.** GT: cp. AA *m-? ~ *m-y “hair” [GT] > HECu.: Kmb. *mummi* “2. hair of head (human)” [Hds. 1989, 75: isolated in HECu.] = *mūm̄mi* “hear (of head)” [Wdk. 1990, 673, #35] || SCu. *mu?- “hair (?)” [GT]: Brg. *mu?u* “chaff, grain husks” [Ehr.] | Ma’a *mamu?u* “wool, fur” [Ehr. 1974 MS, 46] = “plummage, fur” [Ehr. 1980] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 160, #54) ||| CCh.: perhaps Higi *m’a* “beard” [Mohrlang 1972, 102] || ECh.: EDng. *màya* “changanier tressé de façon ordinaire” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 199]? The sense “hair” may derive from AA *m-? ~ *m-y “(top of) head” [GT], cf. Bed. *moi*, pl. *moia* ~ *moiya* “1. crown of head, 2. top (tree, hill)” [Rpr. 1928, 213] = *moi* (m) “top of the head” [Hds. 1996, 89] || HECu.: Kmb. *mummi* “1. head, 2. hair of head (human)” [Hds. l.c.], Qbn. *mūmi* “head” [Korhonen] = *mūm̄mi* “head” [Crass 2001, 49, #107] | LECu.: Afar *moyy-a* (f), pl. *moyyāyi* “brain, head, skull” [PH 1985, 170] (Bed.-Afar: Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 28) || SCu.: Ma’a *muá* [muha], pl. *mia* “Kopf” [Mnh. 1906, 314] = *mu’a* “head” [Ehret 1987, 387: isolated in SCu.] ||| CCh.: Musgu *m̄o* [unless < *mog] “head” [Mch. in JI 1994 II, 183: isolated in Ch.] || ECh.: perhaps WDng. *màwó* “parure de tête féminine, comme deux ailes de chaque côté de la tête, en doum” [Fédry 1971, 110].

NB1: The semantic shift “top of head” → “hair of head” is attested, cf. e.g. the history of LECu.: Saho-Afar *am-ú* ~ *am-ô* “Kopf, Scheitel” [Rn. 1886, 810; 1890, 34] = Afar *am-o* “head, summit, top, intelligence, hair” [PH 1985, 40] || HECu. *um-o “head” [GT]: Drs. (Gedeo) *um-o* “head, hair”, Sid. *um-o* “head” (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 77) ||| Sem.: Ar. *ʔmm* “marcher en tête, être à la tête de”, OSA *ʔmm* “être à la tête de” || Tigre *ʔammämä* “aller dans une direction, résoudre” (Sem.: DRS 23). Should we assume a similar semantic shift in the case of Ma’a *mu’a* “head” vs. Irq. *imu?um-* “to begin”? The latter was, besides, affiliated by Ch. Ehret (1980, 159–160, #53–54) with the reflexes of SCu. *mu?- “hair” (albeit falsely explained by him from the hypothetical sense “first layer”).

NB2: A. Militarev (2005, 364, #38) combined Ma’a *mu’a* “head” [Ehr.] directly with SA *am-ú* ~ *am-ô* “Kopf, Scheitel” [Rn.] and HECu. *um-o “head” [GT]. Unconvincing, since both underlying proto-forms (*m-? vs. *ʔ-m, resp.) are corroborated as distinct roots by the AA evidence.

NB3: H. Jungraithmayr and K. Shimizu (1981, 132D) combined the isolated Musgu *m̄o* with Benue-Congo *mudu- “head”. Dubious, since Musgu -Ø < *-d is not proven.

■ **2.** GT: perhaps OEg. *mj.t < *mr.t? Cp. CCh. *m-H-r (perhaps with an affix *-ḥ- of body parts?) “hair” [GT]: Uld. (Uzlam) *muhur*

“cheveux” [Mch.], Mada humar “cheveux” [Mch.] = àmár “hair” [Rsg.], Muyang móhàr “hair” [Rsg.] (Mtk.: Rsg. 1978, 266, #341) | Gidar muhuró “Kopfhaar” [Str. 1910, 451] = mugur [-g- via -γ- < *-h-?] “cheveux” [Mch.] | Mbara mèt “hair, cheveu” [TSL 1986, 286, 271] (CCh.: Mch. 1953, 166)?

AP: NS *mūr “fur, hair of body” [Ehret 2001, 290–1, #156].

NB: Following the semantic development “hair” < “head”, cp. also SAgaw: Awngi (Damot) ḡarī “testa, capo” [CR 1905, 171] = nari [Murray] = ḡári [Beke] = iḡari [Waldmeyer] = ḡári “head” [Hetzron] = ḡari [Bnd. 1971] = nari “head” [Bnd. 1973 MS, 5, #38] = ḡari [Apl. 1984] = ḡári “head” [SLLE] (Awngi: Wdk. 1995, 13, #2), whose origin is still debated. The shift of Agaw *ḡ- < Cu. *m- is regular. It can be safely separated from NAgaw *ḡayər- “head” [Apl. 1991 MS, 6]. Ch. Ehret (1987, 110, #466) set up PCu. *ḡar- “forehead” based on Agaw *ḡar- and LECu. *ḡār- (!) “forehead”, which is certainly incorrect, since the latter root had a palatal *ny- (i.e., *n-), not a velar nasal. Recently, D. Appleyard (2005 MS, 16; 2006, 36) derives Awngi “head” from PAgaw *ḡat-a “brain” (Kemant nara, Awngi nalí!) ~ ECu. *maḡ- “head”, but neither he could explain the anomalous Awngi -r-vs. -l- < Cu. *-t-.

- **3.** GT: or, provided Eg. mj- < *ml-, cf. AA *m-l [GT] > NBrb.: perhaps Mzab a-mul, pl. i-mul-ən “1. crête (supérieure, d’un coq, etc.), 2. marque de couleur en ligne sur le nez, le menton, le front” [Dlh. 1984, 118] || WCh.: Mupun móol “hairy” [Frj. 1991, 38; GT 2004, 250: isolated in AS] || CCh.: Mafā mamóláy “touffé de poils an poitrail d’un béliér” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 226] || ECh.: Sokoro múliḡ “Haarbüschel” [Lks. 1937, 36]?

NB: The Sem. parallels are dubious: Aram. of TTM mē/īlā “1. a lock of wool, woolly substance, 2. fine wool, 3. a cloak of fine wool” [Jastrow 1950, 773] = “Wolle” [Levy 1924 III 101] and Hbr. of TTM mēlat ~ melet & Aram. mēlat ~ mēltā “1. (lock of) wool, down, 2. cloak of fine wool” [Jastrow 1950, 773] are explained by Jastrow (ibid.) from √mll nifal “to be compressible, soft”, while Levy (l.c.) prefers a borrowing from Greek (cf. NGk. μαλί, μαλίον and OGk. μαλλός “touffé de cheveux, de poils” derived in Boisacq 1916, 606 from the IE heritage). Note that Akk. (m/spB) malú “schmutziges, verfilztes Körperhaar” [AHW 597] = “unkempt hair” [CAD m1, 173] is clearly unrelated, being a derivative of luḥú “beschmutzen” [AHW 565].

- **4.** L. Reinisch’s (1873, 248) comparanda, viz. Teda diya (sic) “Mähne”, Eg. mh “Feder”, Cpt. Ϙοι, Ϙωι, Ϙω, ϖω “Haar”, are unacceptable.

mjw (GW) “Art Gerät aus Metall” (late NK 2x: Pap. Mayer A 1:20, 1:24, Wb II 42, 9) = “(hat sehr wenig mit der Bedeutung ‘Erzstichel’ zu tun)” (Seibert 1967, 116–7, n. f) = “un utensil” (AL 77.1650) = “ein Gerät aus Metall” (GHWb 325).

NB: In the view of D. Meeks (AL l.c.), the ex. in Pap. Mayer A 1:20 (written m3jw) “représente peut-être un mot différent” (cf. Or.Ant. 16, 190, 200, vs. 2:11). Is the striking coincidence of the other ex. (mjw) in Pap. Mayer A 1:24 with mj “axe” (miswritten for mjb) in Ostr. Deir el-Medine 347, 2 (Janssen 1975, 322) due to pure chance?

- Supposed to be reflected by Cpt.: (S) mḥi “(mng. unknown) an implement of brass” (CD 158b) = “ein Gerät aus Bronze (zum Weinbau?)” (NBÄ 497, n. 178) = “ein Gerät aus Bronze” (KHW 517; AL 77.1650). Dubious.

NB: Distinct from (S) ḥoṭi “metal utensil, lit. ‘lion’, probably bronze (later iron) lion serving as bolt in a certain type of Egyptian locks” (CD xix addenda, 80).

- Meaning and origin obscure. Only guesses can be made. GT: a genetic kinship with terms like CCh.: Ktk. mì(i)yó , pl. mìyówé “knife, couteau” [Bouny 1975, 10, #127; 1978, 54], Shoe mio “Messer” [Lks. 1937, 154] || ECh.: Kera māawāy “or, (bracelet en) cuivre” [Ruelland 1978, 167; Ebert 1977 MS, 7] = māawāy “bronze” [Pearce 1998–99, 62], Tuburi māwāy “or, (bracelet en) cuivre” [Ruelland, Ebert] is rather unlikely, although at least two metal names (AA *b-r and *s-b-l) can be in fact reconstructed in PAA.

NB1: These forms are probably unrelated to SCu.: WRift *mah-āṅ , pl. *mah-ēri “arrow” [KM 2004, 198] || NOm.: Kaffā ma-ō [< *mah-?] “freccia” [Crl. 1951, 467].

NB2: SBrb.: Hgr. tā-ma “lame d’épée de fabrication soudanaise” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1140], Ghat tā-ṃa “lame d’épée de fabrication locale (mauvaise)” [PAM 2003, 519] are out of question, since these forms were borrowed from WCh.: Hausa tāmāá “1. ore (usually of iron), 2. a cheap kind of sword” [Brg. 1934, 985].

NB3: The origin of Bed. moi “large spoon” [Hds. 1996, 89] is unknown.

mjb.t (orig. **mr̥b.t**) ~ **mnjb.t** ~ **mnb.t** (all OK spellings < act. *mlb.t) “Beil als Handwerkszeug” (OK, Wb II 42, 14) = “la hache de menuisier du modèle ordinaire” (Jéquier 1921, 147) = “a long-handled axe with which men are smoothing the log of a tree” (Smith 1933, 153) = “une variété de hache” (Lacau 1970, 38–39, §18) = “Beil, Axt” (Pusch 1974, 20) = “axe” (FD 104) = “wood working axe” (PL 411) = “Beil als Handwerkzeug” (ÄWb I 512). From the MK on, it was written usually mjnb and its meaning was extended to “Beil (als Handwerkszeug und als Waffe)” (MK, Wb II 44, 7–8) = “1. first and foremost a tool used by carpenters, 2. also a battle-axe” (Janssen 1975, 322–323, §92 & fn. 55) = “axe as a generic term for war weapons or carpentry axes” (PL 411).

- There was no uniform orthography of the root especially until the MK (as is shown by the table of Edel 1986, 32–33; Hodge 1992, 211–2 listing the various spellings of the word, for a survey cf. also Smith 1933, 153; Drenkhahn 1976, 117 & fn. 59): (1) mnjb.t with nb hrgl. (V30: basket) in the place of det. (Edel: III./IV., cf. Mogensen 1930, pl. 93, ÄWb I 513a: 2x also in VI.), (2) mjb.t for *mjnb.t (Edel) = mjb.t (ÄWb) = mr̥b.t > mjb.t (GT) with initial mj < mr (W19) hrgl. (ÄWb I 512a: 3x in IV–VI.), (3) mnb.t (VI.), (4) mjnbj.t (VIII., Qubbet el-Hawa), (5) in the MK coffin friezes: mnjb ~ var. mjnb.t (Jéquier 1921, 147; 1921, 271 & fn. 5), (6) from the MK on

till GR usually mjnb (masc., cf. JNES 36, 1977, 150f.), although (7) mjb occurs again in the late NK also: both in pap. (Doomed Prince 8:4, cf. LES 8:3) and ostr. (Janssen 1975, 322).

NB1: The original form of our word has been much disputed. In E. Edel's (AÄG lvii Nachtrag to §34 & 17, §34; 1986, 32) view (pace Hodge 1976, 20–21; 1981, 408; 1992, 204), the OK writing with the hrgl. jb (heart) was used actually for *jnb (Hodge: var. *j3b!), thus OK mjb.t would act. have to be read *mjnb.t (cf. also Janssen 1975, 322–323, §92 & fn. 57; Osing 2001, 576), which can hardly fit the earliest attestation mnjb.t (III./IV.), where we should thus read an improbable *mnjb.t. E. Kühnert-Eggebrecht (1969, 3) surveyed all vars. that, in her view, “*sind sämtliche Schreibungen mnjb.t zu lesen*”. P. Lacau (1970, 38–39, §18), in turn, assumed in OK mjb.t (IV.) an instance of the change of -j- < -n-, the hrgl. mj- in his opinion reflecting an older *ml-/*mn- (!), which he considered justified in the light of MEg. mnjb (MK coffin, Lacau 1906 II, 13, nr. 20) and mjnb (Sinuhe R 160). Against Barta's view (“*vielleicht... mjnb, das erst vom M.R. an vorkommt, nur eine andere Schreibung des alten mjb.t-Beiles*”), Drenkhahn (1976, 119 & fn. 65) distinguished two etymons: mjb.t vs. mjnb (not necessarily to be explained from the former). Similarly, D. Meeks (AL 77.1652 & 1655: cf. JNES 36, 1977, 150f.): “*mjb.t... peut-être un mot différent de mjnb*”. The resolution of all these controversies is, however, only possible if we assume a reading of OK mjb.t as mrb.t (with respect to the value mr of the sign W19 mj in the early OK), which was accepted already by C. T. Hodge (1992, 211): “*the reading can only be m-r-b-t*”. The variation of OK -r- ~ -n- can only reveal an *-l- corroborated also by the Bed. cognate (m-l-w < *m-l-b). MEg. mjnb and the late NK reappearance of mjb probably cover *mlb. This is why Edel's (1986, 31) purely speculative Cpt. *mḏḏw, pl. *mḏḏoꝥ breaks down.

NB2: For a description of the object see Śliwa 1975, 22–24, §1.

- The *-l- in the root is confirmed by the correct etymology discovered by V. Blažek (1990 MS Bed., 5–6, #9; Blz. & Boisson 1992, 20): OEg. mjb.t < mrb.t [*mlb-t] is cognate with Bed. (to?)-melaū “(die) kleine Axt” [Munzinger] = mallo “Axt” [Krockow] = málau (f), pl. málawa “kleine Axt” [Almkvist 1885, 45] = maláw ~ maláû, pl. málawa [-w < *-b reg.] “Axt, kleines Beil” [Rn. 1895, 170] = mʔálaw, pl. mʔaláwa “adze” [Rp. 1928, 217] = mallo (f), pl. mallauwā “axe” [Hds. 1996, 92], which, being the only known parallel to Eg. mjb.t, A. Zaborski (2000, 152) is inclined to regard as an Eg. loan-word.

NB1: The change of -w < *-b is reg. in Bed. The correspondence of Eg. b = Bed. w is also attested elsewhere. Bed. maláw might have derived from *malab via *malav ~ *malab.

NB2: OEg. *mlb-t and Bed. maláw have probably nothing to do with CCh.: Buduma màràḅ “lance” [Br.-Trn. 1993, 134].

- Any other etymology is either unproven or erroneous:
- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 23), P. Lacau (1970, 38–39, §18), and E. Edel (1986, 29–30) saw in it a nomen instr. with a prefix m-, but they were unable to identify the underlying simplex, which Lacau defined as *nb/*lb, although he also confessed that “*l'étymologie du mot nous échappe*”. Edel treated late OK mnjb.jt (VIII.) < *mjnb.wt as “*die ausführlichste Schreibung*” reflecting the pattern m-ABC-wt > -yt of nomina instr.
- 2. G. Jéquier (1921, 147; 1921, 271 & fn. 5) assumed in MK mnjb a compound of the prep. (!) m- “pour” (!) + nbj “former, façonner,

bâtir”, since “une hache de menuisier est en effet un outil ‘pour façonner’ le bois”. Clearly false.

- **3.** L. Homburger’s (1929, 158; 1930, 284) etymology for Eg. mjnb Ful (Peul) dyambe-re, pl. dyambe “hâche”) is evidently false. Later Homburger (1931, 253) equated Eg. mjnb with Nub. gambu “hâche”. Unconvincing.
- **4.** C. T. Hodge (1992, 211 & 220–222, §6), following Grapow, supposed OEg. mrb.t to be a nomen instr. derived with a prefix m- from a root *lb, which Hodge identified with his Lislakh (AA-IE) **l-b “to pierce, cut, strike”, suggesting very problematic parallels.
NB: Such as Eg. 3b “fingernail” (LP, Wb I 7, 21) & 3b.t “chisel” (sic after Shorter, cf. Wb I 7, 10; not translated) = “Unrecht, Böses” (ÄWb I 5) ||| LECu.: Orm. alb-ē “knife” [Gragg 1982, 15] ||| Ar. huliba “to be cut off entirely (tail)” [Lane 2897], ‘alaba “to make a mark, impression on” [Lane 2125], laḥaba “to strike, wound, make a mark on” [Lane 2653] ||| WCh. *rab- “to divide” [Stl. 1987, 236, #826] etc. To list and evaluate all further (both semantically and phonologically far too distant) *comparanda* is not possible. Most of these forms are evidently unrelated.

mjm.t “eine offizinell verwendete Pflanze” (Med.: Pap. Ebers 93:1–3, Wb II 42, 15) = “eine unbekannte Pflanze (die Blätter müssen saftig sein)” (WÄDN 220) = “eine Pflanze, deren Blätter Saft enthalten” (Edel 1970, 23–24, §11) = “eine Pflanze”, g3b.t n.t mjm.t “Blatt der mjm.t-Pflanze” (GHWb 325) = “an unidentified plant” (PL 411) = “eine Pflanze” (HAM 838).

- Meaning and etymology obscure. Only guesses are possible.
- **1.** E. Edel (1970, 23–24, §11), followed by P. Wilson (PL 411), compared Med. mjm.t to a number of terms of dubious relationship, which hardly accord with its medical application (as described in Aufrière 1986, 8):
 - (1) Late OK (Qubbet el-Hawa) mm.t “eine Pflanze” (GHWb 333; ÄWb I 527) > CT mm.t “une plante comestible” (CT VII 424d, AL 78.1695) = “a form of grain” (Spaull 1969, 222, §3), q.v.
NB: Combined by Lesko (1972, 145), followed by Meeks (AL l.c.) and Edel (l.c.), with PT 1362 mm.t (“throw-stick” det., T15, Wb II 58, 16), whose reading and rendering is, however, disputed (q.v.).
 - (2) OK mm (OK) ~ mmj (XVIII.) ~ mjmj (Pap. Ch. Beatty XV 5:8) “seed-corn of emmer” (Grd. 1948 II 113–4) = “Samenkorn des Emmers” (Edel), q.v.
 - (3) LP mm-nṯr vs. mm.t-nṯr “das mm(t) des Gottes in kultischer Verwendung (vgl. Fest der mmt-Pflanze)” (Edel) = “citron” (Daressy 1916, 232, 239).
- **2.** GT: the possibilities of external etymology are equally limited:
 - (1) Perhaps < *mlm.t, related to CCh.: Mafā málámá “herbe à sauce sp.” [Br.-Bléis 1990, 225]?

NB: Cf. also WCh.: Angas-Sura *m^walam “cocoyam” [GT 2004, 257–8]: Angas mwalm “a vegetable (Hs. gwaza)” [Flk. 1915, 249] = mwalm ~ mwálm (K) ~ málám (P) “a vegetable: Kokoyam (Hs. gwáázáá)” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] = mwálm “coco-yam” [Brq. 1971, 19] = mwalm “cocoyam” [ALC 1978, 40] = (usual) mwálm ~ mwálm, (hill) málm “cocoyam” [Gcl. 1994, 34, 41], Sura málóm “Kokoyam, zur Familie der *Aroidae* gehörig” [Jng. 1963, 74], Mpn. mülēm [mu- < *m^we-?] “cocoyam” [Frj. 1991, 39], Gmy. mualam “a tubercle growing in the bush (a kind of flour is made of it)” [Srl. 1937, 146] = mualam “similar to Irish potatoes turned into flour” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 23]? NB: ECh.: Tumak mǎǎm “cucurbitacée sp. (‘melon’ en français local)” [Cpr. 1975, 83] is out of question.

(2) SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ta-ṁṁom-t, pl. ta-ṁṁom-en “1. fruit mûr de tādant (juteux), 2. jus de ce fruit (très sucré, sorte de miel végétal), 3. sucre végétal en gén.” [PAM 2003, 541–2].

NB: Explained by K.-G. Prasse (PAM l.c.) from Brb. *t-hämmim-t “miel”. Any connection to Ug. mm (?) “an oil-yielding substance”, zt-mm “oil of mm” [Gordon 1955, 289, #1121]?

(3) LECu.: Afar mīm “mimosa” [PH 1985, 168]?

(4) Partial reduplication of *m-y? Cf. SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr a-mäyo “esp. de marguerite (en buisson; à fleurs jaunes très odorantes, *Pulicaria undulata*)”, EWlm. ta-mäyo-t “esp. de plante (esp. d’immortelle grise: *Asteriscus graveolens*)” [PAM 2003, 569]?

NB: A comparison with WCh.: Sbauchi: Polchi mǎy, Geji mǎye “grass” (SBCh.: Kraft 1981 I, 184, 236) || CCh.: Kada müyǎ “brousse” [Brt. 1990, 195] is out of question.

mjn “1. heute, 2. jetzt” (PT, Wb II 43, 1–9) = “today” (FD 104) = “1. maintenant, 2. ici” (AL 78.1664) = “1. heute, jetzt, 2. hier” (GHWb 325; WD II 59: cf. ZÄS 124, 1997, 29f.).

NB1: Several CT exx. denote “here” (DCT 161). Thus, CT VI 57h mjn “clearly means ‘here’ in this passage rather than ‘today’; note the var. ‘3 ‘here’ in B1Bo” (AECT II 128–9, spell 484, n. 13). The same is the case with CT I 88b, II 159b, and IV 102b (cf. AECT I 20, spell 30, n. 11; I 116, spell 134, n. 3; I 240, spell 316, n. 15). Cf. also James 1962, 111–2.

NB2: The rendering of the nominalized OK mjn (hr) “Zeitgenosse” (Wb II 43, 10) and even its connection with mjn “today” has been declined by E. Edel (MIO 1, 1953, 213–7) and H. Goedicke (RdE 11, 1957, 63–66), who suggested quite different (albeit less convincing) inner Eg. etymologies for it, cf. also J. F. Quack (1997, 331). Edel (l.c.) concluded that mjn (hr) must express sg. honorific like “geschätzt, geachtet, geehrt” and combined it with mjn.t “Art Gewässer” (PT, Wb, q.v.) as well as mjn “Trank aus Weinbeeren” (GR, Wb, q.v.), in which Goedicke (1957, 66) – contra Meeks (1999, 580–1) – saw a masc. form of mjn.t “ein Getränk” (Lit. MK, Wb, above) and a derivative of mjn “today” (as suggested in Grd. 1917, 41 and in the Belegstellen ad Wb II 65, where the rendering has been changed for “tägliche Speise”). Rejecting this connection as well as a prefiguration with m- proposed by Edel (as “rather implausible and hazardous”), Goedicke (1957, 67 & fn. 8) was disposed to render OK mjn (hr) (in his view, “closely related to an activity in the fields of art”) as “companion, attaché” (explained from the original meaning “one who is attached, namely the one who is closely connected to the Pharaoh”) and affiliate it rather with Eg. mn.w “monument” (OK, Wb, q.v.) or mnj.w “throne-room (?)” (cf. Wb II 75, 15: “Art Räumlichkeit”), although, as he confessed, “a link of this kind is principally not impossible, it nevertheless has to be considered as rather uncertain”.

NB3: As A. Erman (1896, 57, fn. 1) surmises, mj-n3 “hierher” (NE, Wb II 44, 1; first attested in the MK, cf. Caminos 1954 LEM, 273) vs. (B) 𐌱𐌶𐌳𐌰 “here, hence, hither” (CD 174) “*könnte dasselbe Wort sein, das von Zeit und Ort gebraucht wäre*”. Old mjn was later apparently reanalyzed as shown by the writing of mj-n3 (suggesting a compound “like this”) as well as by the pair of Cpt. (B) 𐌱𐌶𐌳𐌰 vs. (B) 𐌱𐌶𐌶𐌰 “there, thither” (CD 174b) as if we had to do with an old compound of *m-n3 “in this” vs. *m-nw “in that”. K. Sethe (1912, 103), however, denied any connection to Eg. mjn and instead explained (B) 𐌱𐌶𐌳𐌰 from Eg. rmn “Arm, Seite”.

- Most probable seems the first solution, but nr. 4 *c* cannot be ruled out either.

- **1.** G. Takács (1998, 129, #5) assumes it to be cognate with WCh.: Gwnd. mànà “now” [Mts. 1972, 78] | Angas-Sura *minʷi > *mənʷi “here” [GT 2004, 248]: Angas mīñi “here” [Flk. in Mgd. 1911, 383] = mini (an euphonic form of ʰbe-ni) “here” [Flk. 1915, 245] = máni ~ mīñi “hier, here” [Jng. 1962 MS, 25–26] = mīñi [mūñi: < *mənʷi] “here” [Brq. 1971, 30] = mənʷi “here” [ALC 1978, 39] = mīñi [mūñi] “here” [Krf.] = mini “here” [Gcl. 1994, 107] || CCh.: Tera mení “today” [Nwm. 1964, 46, #392]. Most probably, these Ch. cognates contain the deictic element *-ni, cf. AS *nʷi ~ *ni “he, she, it” [GT 2004, 274]. Should we project a similar fossilized compound of two juxtaposed morphemes in Eg. (cf. the Distanzelement -n in Eg. pn etc.)?

AP: Tubu mene ~ bëni “heute” [Lks. 1941, 192] ~ NBantoid *mwan (?) “today” [GT]: Mambiloid: Vute mwén, Nizaa mún & Dakoid: Nnakenyare imòàn (NBantoid: Blench n.d. MS, 27, #68).

NB1: J. Baillet (1907, 7, §18) and G. Takács (1998, 129) suggested an ultimate relationship with Eg. m-mn.t “täglich” (and its AA cognates, q.v.), which is mistaken and was declined already by A. Erman (1896, 57, fn. 1).

NB2: LECu.: PSam *mán-tà “today” [Heine 1978, 68] > e.g. Som. mán-ta “today” [Abr. 1964, 173], PBonī *mán-ð “today, these days” [Heine 1982, 147] was in fact a compound (lit. “this day”), so its element *mán- is probably not related.

NB3: Whether CCh.: Lame mbāñ.(ʔà).nī (adv.) “maintenant, récemment, toute desuite” [Scn. 1982, 310], Zime-Dari mbāñ mbāñ “tout de suite” [Cooper 1984, 17] (mb- < *m- reg. in Masa gr.) || ECh.: Kera māj “jetzt”, cf. mañ(-mañj) “nahe bei” [Ebert 1976, 79] are also related remains open, although their common *-ŋ is still to be explained.

- **2.** L. Homburger (1930, 284, 309) equates Eg. mjn with Ful (Peul) dyoni “maintenant” (while NEg. mj-n3 “comme cela” with Ful nōn). Pure fancy.
- **3.** V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1992, 174) connect Eg. mjn with NAgaw: Bln. e- ~ imānā “time, past” || LECu.: Saho amāna & Som. imin ~ amin “time” (Cu.: Dlg. 1973, 132). Semantically false.
- **4.** R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) assumes a primary root *mrn. If so, Eg. mjn is related with LECu.: Orm. mīlana “this time, now” [Gragg 1982, 286], Arb. ʔamálo “now” [Hyw. 1984] | HECu.: Sid. mulé-

nmi “recently, just now (in the past), soon (present or future)” < mulè “near, soon” [Gsp. 1983, 240], which (similarly to AS) contain a deictic morpheme *-ni.

mjn.t “1. (PT 857a) Art Gewässer, 2. (GR) als Gewässer bei Bubastis” (Wb II 43, 13; WD II 59: cf. RdE 33, 1981, 98, n. af) = “Kanal” (PT 857a, ÜKAPT IV 121, VI 130) = “plots that were well-watered and susceptible of cultivation” (Grd. 1948 II 166, §3) = “canals” (PT, Mercer 1952 I 158) = “kind of sheet of water” (Gdk. in RdE 11, 1957, 66) = “irrigation ditches” (AEPT 152) = “a designation of a special sort of land” (PT 857a, Borghouts 1971, 117, n. 251) = “ditches round the fields which receive the water from the ‘streams’ and which in turn pass it into the network of runnels which supply the seed-beds” (CT II 173f, VI 281e, AECT I 120, spell 140, n. 1 & II, 232, spell 660, n. 3) = “canal” (Meeks 1977, 85, fn. 3) = “eaux stagnantes (?) (tous les contextes suggèrent des eaux riches en fleurs aquatiques)” (CT & GR exx., AL 78.1665) = “*stehendes Gewässer, Bassin, *Bassinfelder” (GHWb 325; ÄWb I 512) = “ditches around fields which receive water from jtr.w ‘streams’ (!) and take it to runnels to supply the seed beds (flowers and plants grow in or because of it)” (PL 411–2) = “ditch (?)” (DCT 161).

NB1: There is direct contextual continuity between the PT and CT occurrences, cf. PT 857a ḥtp š3.w j3ḥj mjn.wt “the fields are content, the ditches (?) overflow” (AEPT 152) vs. CT II 173f (B2L) 3ḥ3ḥ jtr.w m mjn.wt “the streams overflow into the ditches (?)” (AECT I 120, spell 140, n. 1) = “the rivers and (sic!) ditches bloom” (PL 412).

NB2: The only reference to Wb II 43, 13 in the Belegstellen PT 857a, where it is warned that (in spite of the indication in Wb l.c.) “*Neuäg ist das Wort nicht belegt*”. J. F. Borghouts (1971, 117, n. 251) was disposed to identify the entry of Wb II 43, 13 with 43, 15 rendering the sole ex. of the former (PT 857a) as “a designation of a special sort of land”.

NB3: Since the form is attested in the GR too, a direct connection with GR mn.w “Gewässer mit Wasserpflanzen” (Wb II 72, 1) = “waterway with plants” (PL 425) seems unlikely.

- From the same root (but not the same word?): NK mjn.t “Landgut o.ä.” (late NK, GR, Wb II 43, 15) = “a type of land” (Grd. 1948 II 165–7, §3, cf. also JEA 27, 1941, 24) = “a class of crownlands” (Camino 1954 LEM, 12, 328: Pap. Bologna 1094, 3:2, Pap. Sallier I 9:7, resp.) = “a particular kind of crown-land” (Gdk. in RdE 11, 1957, 67) = “kind of land” (FD 104) = “ein Land” (Helck, MWNr 275, 11, 18–19) = “1. in general a special sort of land, often a species of crown land (in administrative texts), 2. or the name of phw ‘backland’ of the 18th Lower Eg. nome (cf. Barguet 1962, 18), 3. (Pap. Leiden

I 348, rt. 11:1, cf. 11:8) rather a town than a land, (Pap. Leiden I 346, 1:2) town as cult-place (?)” (Borghouts 1971, 117, n. 251) = “a kind of land, presumably originally refers to a land watered by mjn.t-ditches” (AECT I 120, spell 140, n. 1) = “sol inondable, saisonniérement cultivé” (Ryhiner 1986, 233) = “Lehnsfeld” (GHWb 325).

NB1: J. F. Borghouts (1971, 117, n. 251) identified the entry of Wb II 43, 13 with 43, 15 considering PT 857a (“a designation of a special sort of land”) as the first attestation of NK mjn.t. A. H. Gardiner (1948 II 165–7, §3) also saw a continuity between the PT vs. NK vs. GR exx., which H. Goedicke (1957, 67, fn. 4) firmly doubted: “seems rather unlikely”. R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 120, spell 140, n. 1) assumed PT-CT mjn.t “ditch” to have shifted by the NK to the sense denoting the land watered by such ditches. Similarly, P. Wilson (PL 412) surmised that the exx. of both Wb entries “may be related some way”.

NB2: There are uncertainties as to the interpretation of the GR occurrences. E.g., C. de Wit (1956, 116) rendered GR mjn.tj in Dendera IV 56:9 as “a kind of field”, equating it thus with NK mjn.t “type of land” (described by Grd. 1948 II 165–6), while D. Meeks (AL l.c.) saw in it an ex. of mjn.t “eaux stagnantes”.

NB3: H. Gauthier (DNG III 11) tried to trace back modern Ar. El-^cEtmāniyah (Qāw el-Kebīr, 10th UEg. nome, where a statue was found naming Anubis “lord of mjn.t”) to Eg. mjn.t, although the Eg. name of this town was ꜥbw.

● Origin disputed:

- 1. V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (OS 1992, 188; HSED #1770) identified it with CCh. *min- “river” [GT]: Fali-Gili m̀nì “dew” [Krf.] = mini “river” (sic) [OS] | Fali-Muchella m̀nù “river” [Krf.], Mwulyen minu “river” [OS, not in Krf.] || ECh.: Minjile menì “river” [Doornbos 1979 MS, 5, #162].

NB1: From AA *m-n “wet” [GT]? Cf. Ar. manaʿa “macérer la peau avant de la tanner” [BK II 1156] || LECu.: Orm. mānya “ocean” [Btm. 2000, 184] = (Borana, Orma, Waata) māña (f) “sea, ocean” [Strm. 1987, 361; 1995, 206] || CCh.: Kapsiki minē “dew” [OS, not in Krf.] | Bdm. imán “rain” [Barth 1851, 214] | Daba m̀m̀m̀nì “dew” [LG 1974, 10, #215] | Masa m̀n-dà “la saison des pluies” [Jng. 1973 MS] = m̀n-tā “la saison des pluies” [Ctc. 1983, 114] || ECh.: Kwang-Gaya k̀i-m̀n “pluie” [Coates 1991 MS, 2] | Somray maani “Regen” [AF apud Lks. 1937, 80]. LECu. *mān “sea” was analyzed by I. M. D’jakonov (1965, 42) as *m-ān (!). Unproved.

NB2: Cf. also ECh.: Tumak nām “eau” [Cpr. 1975, 85], Sarwa nām [met.?] “water” [Jng. 1977, 4, #58], Gadang nām “eau” [Jng. 1972 MS, 51] with met. (< *mān)?

- 2. GT: perhaps mjn.t < *mrn-t (as surmised in ÜKAPT VI 130), cf. AA *m-r-n “wet substance, water” [GT]: (?) Ar. marana “rendre mou, imbiber” [Dozy II 585] || CCh.: Fali-Bwagira m̀r̀n “river” [Krf.] = m̀r̀m “river” [quoted by Dlg. falsely as Nzangi] || ECh.: Gadang m̀r̀r̀n “1. pluie, 2. dieu” [JI 1990 MS, 4, #76].

NB: A. B. Dolgopolsky (1998, 26, #14) combines Nzangi m̀r̀m with OEg. mr “pool” (q.v.).

● Other suggestions are less probable:

- 3. A. H. Gardiner (1948 II 166, §3): “an etymology from m̀n ‘to-day’ is not improbable”, which was rightly rejected by H. Goedicke (RdE 11, 1955, 67): “seems rather unlikely to me”.

- **4.** E. Edel (MIO 1, 1953, 213–7) affiliated it with Eg. *mjn* (hr) “Zeitgenosse (des lebenden Königs)” (OK, Wb II 43, 10), whose connection with *mjn* “today” he denied, as well as with Eg. *mjn* “Trank aus Weinbeeren” (GR, Wb, q.v.). Untenable.
- **5.** H. Goedicke (RdE 11, 1957, 67 & fn. 4), declining the suggestions by Edel (l.c.), proposed to derive it with *m-* prefix from Eg. *jn.t* “valley”: “*a conjecture which is not unlikely in view of Pyr. 857a where it occurs parallel to š3*” (the flat inundated land).

mjn.w “Beischrift zu Beuteln (unter Schmucksachen genannt)” (CT, Wb II 44, 4) = “*Beutel” (GHWb 326).

● Etymology obscure.

- **1.** J. R. Harris (1961, 106): whether it is connected with *mjn.w* “Art Halbedelstein” (Wb II 44, 5) “*is not possible to reply*”.
- **2.** GT: eventually from **mjl* ~ **mwl*? Cf. perhaps SBrb.: Hgr. *tāmûl-at*, pl. *ti-mûl-ât-in* “poche” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1198]?
NB: Or Eg. *mjn.w* < old **mrn.w*? However, a relationship with Ar. *marn-* “vêtement” [BK II 1096] ||| LECu.: Som. *mar(r)în* (m) “Frauenkleid” [Rn. 1902, 302] is unlikely.

mjn.t “ein Getränk (vgl. *mjn*)” (Lit. MK: Sinuhe 87, Wb II 43, 11) = “daily fare” (Grd. 1917, 42) = “tägliche Speise (statt Getränk)” (Belegstellen to Wb l.c. influenced by Grd. 1917, 41) = “(loaves made) daily (?)” (AEL I 227) vs. “drink” (AEL I 235, n. 6) = “Tagesration” (Hornung 1980, 132 & n. 7: also Pfortenbuch 28) = “ration quotidienne de boisson” (Meeks 1999, 580–1).

NB: Some authors (Goedicke in RdE 11, 1957, 66; PL 411) suppose a masc. counterpart in GR *mjn* “Trank aus Weinbeeren” (GR, Wb, below). Declined by D. Meeks (1999, 580–1).

● Etymology debated.

- **1.** As pointed out by A. H. Gardiner (1917, 41), whose etymologically motivated rendering was followed by E. Hornung (l.c.), H. Goedicke (RdE 11, 1957, 66–67), and D. Meeks (l.c.), it may derive from Eg. *mjn* “today”. Dubious. Declined by P. Wilson (PL 411).
NB: Goedicke was misquoted in WD II 59 as if he derived *mjn.t* “ein Getränk” (Wb) from *jn.t* “valley” with *m-* prefix, which Goedicke actually considered “*rather implausible and hazardous*”. The proposal in question by Goedicke on *mjn.t* < *m-* + *jn.t* in fact pertains to *mjn.t* “Art Gewässer” (Wb, q.v.).
- **2.** W. Westendorf (KHW 94) erroneously affiliated it with Eg. *m-mn.t* “täglich” (Amarna, Wb, q.v.), which represents a distinct root.

mjn.w “Art Halbedelstein” (late NK 2x, Wb II 44, 5) = “glass” (Birch/Harris) = “(would seem) a species of semi-precious stone” (Harris 1961, 106) = “Quarz (?)” (Hafemann, p.c. on 19 May 2000).

NB: As material in Pap. Harris I for a scarab (15b:3) and for a statuette of the Nile god (41a:1).

- Etymology uncertain. Following Wendel (quoted in Harris l.c., fn. 8), I. Hafemann (l.c.) assumes it to be identical with mnw “Quarz”. J. R. Harris (l.c.): “*in fact no conclusion can be reached, though it is just possible that minw is a writing of mnw, which does not otherwise occur in Harris*”. He equally abstained from affiliating it with MK mjn.w “Beischrift zu Beuteln (unter Schmucksachen genannt)” (CT, Wb, above).

mjn “Trank aus Weinbeeren” (GR, Wb II 43, 12) = “grape juice” (PL 411).

NB: There may be an older attestation in Sinai inscr. 123B, l. 4: mjn.(w)j “two min pots (of wine)” (Grd. & Peet 1955 I, pl. 46 & II 128, 2), cf. also PL 411.

- Origin uncertain:

- 1. E. Edel (MIO 1, 1953, 213–7) affiliated it with Eg. mjn (ḥr) “Zeitgenosse (des lebenden Königs)” (OK, Wb II 43, 10) ≠ mjn “today” as well as with Eg. mjn.t “Art Gewässer” (PT, Wb, q.v.). Untenable.
- 2. H. Goedicke (RdE 11, 1957, 66) and P. Wilson (PL) explained it as a masc. counterpart of MK mjn.t “ein Getränk” (Wb, q.v.). Declined by D. Meeks (1999, 580–1): “*je ne crois pas que ce mot soit identique à mjn.t ‘ration quotidienne’ de boisson*”.
- 3. GT: cf. perhaps WCh.: Dera méèn “beer” [Nwm. 1974, 129]?

***mjh.t** (?) → Dem. mjh ~ mjḥ (f) “Wunder” (DG 153) = mjḥ3.t “wonder, amazement” (Dem. Pap. BM 10507, l. 9, Smith 1987, 168) → Cpt.: (S) ḥṓ(ḗ)ḥḗ, (AL) ḥḗḥḗ, (ALF) ḥḗḥḗ, (F) ḥḗḥḗ, (A) ḥḗḥḗ, (L) ḥḗḥḗ (m, rarely f) “wonder” (CD 211b; CED 99) = “Wunder” (KHW 89, cf. Spg. KHW 70).

- Origin highly disputable. No evident cognates.

- 1. Following W. Brugsch (Wb Suppl. 561f.), V. Loret (Kêmi 17, 1962, 17), W. Westendorf (KHW 89), and W. Vycichl (1983, 110) derived the Dem.-Cpt. word from Eg. mhj “vergessen” (MK, Wb II 113, 8–11). Semantically weak.
- 2. J. Osing (NBÄ 587) equated Cpt.: (S) ḥṓḗḥḗ etc. with Syr. tmaihā (sic) “Wunder” (not attested apud Brk. 1928). False.

NB: As confirmed by R. M. Voigt (p.c., 23 April 2004), the diphthong -ai- is not attested in Syr. apud Brk. Rightly rejected by W. Vycichl (DELC l.c.) pointing out that the Syr. root was in fact ṯmh, cf. tēmah “miratus est”, temhā “mirror”, tēmihā “1. stupens, 2. mirabilis” [Brk. 1928, 827]. Cf. also NHbr. tmh qal “sich wundern,

staunen” [Dalman 1922, 444a], BAram. *tamah* “miracle” [KB 2007], Mandaic (ambiguous) *tuhma* “stupefaction, bewilderment, dismay” < *thm* (met.) “to be torpid, stupid, stupefied, astounded, dull, inert, listless, inactive, rigid, motionless, senseless, stunned, struck aghast, astonished, amazed, confounded” [DM 483a]. R. M. Voigt (p.c., 23 April 2004) can figure the suggested Eg.-NWSem. etymology only inversely: “*die Idee, hbr.-aram. TMH aus dem Äg. abzuleiten ist ingenios*”.

- **3.** GT: the only semantically acceptable (albeit phonologically irregular) parallels are found in SCu.: Ma’a -*máka* “to wonder, be astonished” [Ehret 1980, 155, #21] ||| WCh.: Hausa *mààmááki* “being surprised”, *àbím mààmááki* “wonder, marvel” [Abr. 1962, 652].

NB1: There is no regular correspondence between Eg. -h- vs. Ma’a & Hausa -k-. Should we assume Eg. **mjh.t* (cf. Dem. *mjh*) < **m-y-k* with an irreg. shift of Eg. < **k* (demonstrated in EDE I 302–4)? Besides, there is one ex. of an irreg. Eg. h < AA **k* (EDE I 295). In this case, the Eg. reflex could be a var. to the underlying AA root (either **m-k* or **m-Q* with an unknown uvular).

NB2: Ch. Ehret (l.c.) traced back Ma’a -*máka* to SCu. **mā/āk-* “to be happy”, which would be in principle phonologically possible, but is semantically unconvincing. Moreover, Hausa (where the distinction of AA **k* vs. **k̄* was retained) -k- speaks for Ma’a -k- < SCu. *-k- in this case.

- **4.** GT: a connection with SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr e-*măy* “1. conte merveilleux, légende, 2. conte en l’air, fable (destiné à tromper qqn.)”, pl. i-*măyy-ăn* “fantaisies, hallucinations, fantasmes” [PAM 2003, 569] ||| HECu.: Sid. *maha* “1. to do the job of a sorcerer, a wizard, 2. divine, profesy” [Gsp. 1983, 219].

NB: K.-G. Prasse (PAM l.c.) explained the Tuareg word from PBrb. **ē-māhāy* compared with Akk. *ūmu* “dragon”, Hbr. *ʿēmīm* (pl.) géants préhistoriques”, Ar. *ʿaym-* “diable”. Semantically dubious.

mjz “(Substantiv)” (PT 280c, Sonnenlit. 52, Wb II 44, 10) = “la tige, la pointe arrière de la couronne rouge” (AL 77.1657) = “Stengel, Stütze (der Roten Krone)” (GHWb 326; ÄWb I 515: “unklar”).

NB1: D. Meeks (AL l.c.) brings two further exx. (*mjz* ~ *mjs.t*) from the Karnak chapel of Hatshepsut. Strangely, R. Hannig (l.c.) treated the PT word too as fem. *mjz.t*, although the -t is there not attested.

NB2: In both of its contexts (quoted in Wb Belegstellen), it occurs as tp *mjz=f*, which K. Sethe (ÜKAPT VI 203) conceived as a compound prep. equivalent with tp-*rd.wj* “vor”. Similarly, R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 63): “before”.

- **1.** Wb l.c.: identical with PT *mj3z* (q.v.)? Cannot be excluded taking into account its rendering “spines, shafts (of the feathers)” by R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 236–237, utt. 582, n. 2 & 329 index). The lack of -3- remains, however, unexplained.

- **2.** GT: or cp. perhaps HECu. **mizāz-* “rib” [Lsl.] = **miṣāṣ-o* (**midzādz-o*) [Hds.]?

NB1: Attested in Kmb. *māzāššú* [**māzāz-čú*] (sg.), coll. *māzāz-ú* [Lsl. 1956, 988], Alb. & Tmb. *mizāššu* [**mizāz-š-*], Qbn. *mizāššu* (sg.), Hdy. *midād-o*, Sidamo *midaššo* [*-d-č-] (sg.) (HECu.: Lsl. 1980, 120; Hds. 1989, 123, 418). This comparison would fit semantically quite well, but phonologically would be problematic. HECu. **mizāz-*

would be regularly reflected by an OEg. *mzz (or sim.). In the view of G. Hudson (p.c., 17 Aug. 2006), it cannot be certainly decided whether the HECu. stem contains an m- prefix or derives from a root *m-ʒ-ʒ: “It’s not obvious that this word is a derivation. Superficially it seems so, though”.

NB2: M. Lambert & R. Sottile (1997, 476) connect HECu. *mizāz- to NOm. *mayz- “liver” & LECu.: Afar masan-gale “rib, side of body” & Bed. biye “rib” & Dhl. makk-o “liver” (sic)! Untenable both semantically and/or phonologically. For NOm. *mayz- see Eg. mjz.t.

mjz.t “animaux à cornes (?)” (CT I 289c, AL 78.1667) = “*Horntiere” (GHWb 326).

● Exact meaning and origin uncertain.

■ 1. D. Meeks (AL 78.1667) surmizes that it “*paraît se rattacher à*” PT mjʒz.w “pointe, piquant” (q.v.), while later it “*a pu être confondu avec m3s(tj)*”. Plausible only from the viewpoint of historical phonology (PT mjʒz > CT mjz attested, see above), but rather unconvincing to seek the origin of “horned cattle” in a word which signified merely “spine (Stachel)”.

■ 2. GT: perhaps cognate with NOm. *miz- [Crl.] = *mīz- [Mlt.]: NWOmt. *miz- [Bnd.] = *mīzz- [Philippson 2003 MS, 3]: Bsk. miz-ō “bue” [Crl.], Wlt. cluster *miz-a [Bnd.] > Wlt. (Wlm.) mí-a ~ míz-a [Rn.] = mizz-ā “vacca” [Crl.] = mizz-a “cow” [Alm.] = mīz-a “livestock, cattle” [LS 1997, 477], Malo mīs-a “bue” [CR], Zala mizz-ā “vacca” [CR] = miz-ā “vacca” [Crl.] = miz-a “cow” [Lmb.], Gofa mizz-ā “vacca” vs. mis-ē “bue” [CR, Crl.] = miz-a “cow” [Lmb.], Gamu mīz-i ~ mīz-a “cow” [Lmb.], Dawro miz-a “cow” [Alm.], Doko mīse “bue” [CR], Dorze mīz “cow” [Alm.] (NWOmt.: Alm. 1993, 6, #148) | SEOmt. *mīs- “cow” [Bnd.]: Zys. mis-ō “vacca” [Crl.] = mīs [Sbr.], Zrg. mīs “cow” [Sbr.], Koyra (Bdt.) mis-ā “vacca sterile” vs. mis-ē “bue” [Crl.] = miz-a “ox” [Lmb.] = mīse “cow” [Sbr.], Haruro (Kcm.) mis “vacca” [CR] = mīs “cow” [Sbr.], Ganjule mis [Sbr.] (SEOmt.: Sbr. 1994, 13) | Chara miy-ā [*-z-] “vacca” [Crl.] | Jnj. (Yemsa) miy-ā [*-z-] “vacca” [Crl.] = mišà “cow” [Aklilu n.d. MS, #148] | Sns. mīz-ā “vacca” [Crl.], Wamera mīz-a “cow” [Flm.], Bworo miz-o “cow” [Flm.] (NOm.: Rn. 1888, 318; CR 1927, 249; 1936, 655; Crl. 1929, 33, 50, 62; 1938 III, 80, 115, 173, 206; 1951, 471–473; Flm. 1987, 146, §5; Lmb. 1993, 100, 106; Bnd. 2003, 115, #31 & 162) ||| ECh.: Barein múúzo “Ochse” [Lks. 1937, 51] = (misquoted as Birgit!) muuzo “ox” [OS] | Birgit múuséy (f) “biche” [Jng. 2004, 357].

AP: H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 135) compared NOm. *mizz- with Mande “cow, cattle”: NMande mīsi ~ nīsi, Mandinka nīnsi, Xassonke nyīnsi, Bambara mīsi, Jula mīsi.

NB: The etymology of NOM. *mĩz- “cow” [Mlt.] is highly disputed:

(1) There seems to be a great confusion in the handling of the reflexes of NOM. miz- “Rind” (above) and NOM. *minʒ- “cattle” [GT]: Gofa mínʒ-o “Rind” [Rn.] | Kefoid *minʒ- [GT]: Kaffa minʒ-ō “bestiame bovino (?)”, cf. minʒ-ifō “sterco di bovini” [Crl.] = minʒ-o “cattle” [Lmb.], Sns. minʒ-ā [d’Abbadie/Crl.] = minʒ-ō “vacca” [Beke/Crl.] = mĩnz-a “cattle” [Lmb.], Anf. mints-ō “bestiame bovino” [Crl.] = mints-o “cow, cattle” [Flm., Lmb.], Guba minz-a “cow, head of cattle” [Flm.], Naga minʒ-o “id.” [Flm.] (Kefoid: Flm. 1987, 146, §5) | Sheko mĩnʒ-o “cows, cattle” [Lmb.] (NOM.: Lmb. 1993, 106). The reflexes of both NOM. roots are usually mentioned together in Omotiic etymologies by L. Reinisch (1888, 318), E. Cerulli (1929, 33; 1938 III 80; 1951, 471–2), H. Fleming (1987, 146), M. Lamberti (1993, 100, 106) as if the coll. NOM. *minʒ- “cattle” had derived from a reduplication (*mimʒ- < *mimz-?) of NOM. *miz-. On the other hand, NOM. *minʒ- “cattle” (palatalized < *ming-?) is fairly close to ES: Amh. mānga, Gafat mānga “flock, herd”, which Praetorius (1879, 169) derived from *nħg “to guide, conduct”, while D. Appleyard (1977, 26/68) prefers a Cushitic borrowing, cf. LECu.: Afar mango-o “herd” < mag- be full”.

(2) L. Reinisch (1888, 318) equated the NOM. root with Cpt. ስጋጭ, ስጋጭ “bos vitulus”. Incorrect both phonologically and semantically, the underlying Eg. being msj “to bear (child)”.

(3) H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 135) compared it with Sha nísi mú ràðón “Kuh” [Jng. 1970, 288], which is false, since the latter lit. means “female of cattle”, cf. Sha nísi “weiblich” [Jng.].

(4) M. Lamberti (1993, 100; 1993, 355; LS 1997, 473–4) derived Wlt. mĩza, Sns. mĩnz-a (treating the sibilant as a “formative suffix”) from an OCu. (Cu.-Om.) *māl- “to milk” (sic). The segmentation of -z- is unfounded. Moreover, the shift of Om. *-n- < older *-l- cannot be accepted on historical phonological grounds. A similar position has been taken by Philippson (2003 MS, 3) who assumed “an -s- increment” added to a root *mĩ- attested in Chara & Yemsa mi(y)-, Kafa mĩm-, Mao: Sezo & Hozo ʔim(m)-, which is equally dubious, since the shift of *-z- > -y- is well known in NOM., while the Mao form represents a distinct root.

(5) V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 182; HSED #1809) ECh.: Birgit mũzo “ox” combine with Eg. md.t (coll.) “stalled cattle” (MK, FD 123) = “Vieh, Herde” (Wb II 185). Incorrect both phonologically and semantically (rejected already by G. Takács 1996, 443, #6.1; 1996, 140). Orel and Stolbova ignored that MEg. md.t “stalled cattle” is a secondary meaning developed from OEg. md.t “byre” (FD 123) = “Vieh Hof, Stall” (OK, Wb II 185). Moreover, Eg. -ḏ vs. ECh.: Birgit -ʒ seem irregular.

(6) A. Militarev (SED II 200–1, #148) affiliated NOM. “cow” with the reflexes (denoting “goat” and “antelope”) of his AA *maʕi(n)ʒ- “kind of ungulate” (see below).

- 3. GT: or perhaps cp. Ch. *maʒ(VH)- “kind of antelope” [Stl.] = *maHʒ- “1. antelope, 2. goat” [GT]: WCh.: Hausa mààzóó ~ mààʒíí “harnessed antelope (Tragelophus scriptus)” [Abr. 1962, 672, 640] | Mburku maazu “antelope sp.” [Sk. 1996, not in Sk. 1977] | Mangas (from Hs.) màazoo “harness antelope” [Csp. 1994, 40], Zul (from Hs.) maazóo [Csp. 1994, 237] | (?) Bade mázàrèn (compound?) “Ziegenbock” [Lks. 1968, 224] || CCh.: Fali-Bwagira munza-ħwun [< var. *manz-?] “male goat” [Sk.] | Ktk. *mʌzʌ “Antilopa hamariya” [Prh. 1972, 64, #38.2]: Logone mázā, pl. mázē-n “Antilope Hamaraya” [Lks. 1936, 108] = maza “femelle du Cob de Buffon (Adenota

cob Erxleben) [Lbf. 1976, 18] | Mtk. múzàk “he-goat” [Rsg. 1978, 260, #312], perhaps Gsg. mazawal (compound?) “male goat” [Skn.] (Ch.: Skn. 1996, 200)?

NB1: Cf. also Sem. *ma/i^o(a)z- “goat” [SED]: OSA: Min. (Mdb.) m^ozy (dual, hapax) “chèvre” [Arbach 1993, 59], Safaitic m^ozy “Ziegen” [Sima], Ar. ma^oz- ~ ma^oaz- “nom gén.: chèvres et boucs, espèce, race caprine”, mā^oiz- “(masc. et fem.) chèvre ou bouc, pièce du troupeau de l’espèce caprine”, mi^ozā?- ~ mi^oāz- ~ ma^oiz- “chèvre ou bouc”, *am^oūz- “1. chèvre ou bouc, 2. troupe de gazelles ou de chamois”, etc. [BK II 1127, cf. Lane 2724], Yemeni Ar. ma^oaz, ma^oiz, mi^oz (coll.) “Ziegen” [Behnstedt 1985, 210, 213] (Sem.: Hommel 1879, 243; Kogan 2000, 1, #2; Sima 2000, 116–7; SED II 200–1, #148) < AA *m-(^o)ḡ “1. antelope, 2. goat” [GT]? In this case, a shift of OEg. mjz.t < *m^oz.t (incompatible) would have to be accounted for.

LIT.: Skn. 1977, 191 (Ar.-Ch.); SED II 200–1 (Sem.-Ch.-NOM.). A. Militarev (2005, 87) considers Sem. *ma/i^o(a)z- as a mV- prefix formation from Sem. *^oVnz- “goat” [SED II #35]. L. Kogan (SED l.c.) treats JA mē^oazzē, mē^oazzayā, mō^oizzē, mō^oizzayā “from goats, goats-hair, horn etc.” [Jastrow 1950, 814] = “was von Ziegen kommt, Ziegenhaar u. dgl., caprinum” [Levy 1924 III 185] as reflexes of the same PSem. stem with a “secondary derivation” (adopted also in Sem. lexicography) from Sem. *^oVnz- “goat” (via the synchronic analysis of JA mē^oazzē < *min-^oazzē “from goats”), which, in his view, “*can be only a popular etymology*”. Kogan explained Ar. mir^oizz- ~ mir^oizzā “poil fin, duvet sous le poil plus gros (chez les chèvres)” [BK I 881] as a possible Aramaism.

NB2: Note that N. Skinner has divided the Bade word as mázà-rèn contra Lukas: mázàr-ən.

NB3: Following O. V. Stolbova (1996, 115), A. Militarev (SED l.c.) equated the Chadic forms with the isogloss of ECh.: Bdy. máḡay “gazelle ourebi” [AJ 1989, 96] || SCU.: Dhl. má^oade “female topi” [Ehret 1980, 156, #24 with false comparanda] = má^oade “female kudu” [EEN 1989, 36], which seems phonologically problematic (Bdy. -d- < *Hd- < *-Hḡ- and Dhl. -d- < *-ḡ- not proven), cf. also WCh.: Jimi maado “goat” [Gowers/JI], Zaar màad “goat” [Smz. 1975, 29] || ECh.: EDng. màḡiyá & WDng. màḡiyá (f) “la gazelle, le Cob de Buffon (plus petite que bòḡlā)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 192], Bdy. máḡay (f) “gazelle ourébi” [AJ 1989, 96] | Mkl. mòḡó (f) “Ziege”, mòḡú (m) “Ziegenbock” [Lks. 1977, 225] = mòḡú (m), mòḡó (f) “bouc, chèvre” [Jng. 1990, 140] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 166–7), which can be better explained from PCh. *m-d “goat” [JI 1994 I 80] < AA *m-^o-d “1. gazelle, 2. goat” [GT]. Note that CCh.: Masa mē-da “goat” [Mch.] derives from Ch. *m- [JI l.c.].

NB4: A. Militarev (SED II 200–1, #148) affiliated also NOm. *mǝz- “cow” (see above) with the reflexes of his AA *ma^o(n)ḡ- “kind of ungulate” (denoting “goat” and “antelope”).

NB5: SCU.: Dhl. mòḡo “eland, greater kudu” [EEN 1989, 38] = mòḡo (mòḡo) “sp. large antelope” [MSSL 1993, 40, #102] cannot belong here, being a late loan-word from SNil. (as suggested by EEN l.c.).

- 4. GT: Akk. (mA) ma^oišu “eine Schafrasse (?)” [AHW 586] = “(a breed of sheep)” [CAD m1, 116] or MSA: Jbl. mšy: mošét “livestock” [Jns. 1981, 175] are probably out of question.

mjz.t “Leber” (PT, Wb II 44, 11) = “liver” (FD 105; cf. AEO II 245*–249*, §598) = “Leber (Mensch, Tier)” (GHWb 326; ÄWb I 513–5).

NB: The word occurs in great number of instances in the OK offering lists, mostly written the alphabetical signs m + z, where no -r- (!) was written (ÄWb I 513–5).

We also know that the hrgl. mj (W19) had already lost its old mr value (Kahl 1994, 801, W19: value mj already in the archaic period, cf. also FÄW 176–177) by that time when they began to write mjz.t “liver” occasionally with W19 too, let alone the common and well-attested erosion of old r > j in the OK (AÄG 56, §128). G. Roquet (1979, 442–3, 437–8) brings two exx., in which the -r- was written alphabetically, namely late OK (Dyn. V offering list) mrz.t and CT I 289c (T1C) mrz.t, which are hardly sufficient for setting up an etymon *mrz.t (accepted also in NBÄ 695, n. 793; AL 79.1164; Peust 1999, 140), since even if there was formerly an -r- in our word, it must have certainly been long lost by the late OK and MK, and henceforth these two pseudohistorical forms hardly reflect the actual spelling of the word, which was written without the r sign everywhere else during the OK (numerous exx. listed in ÄWb l.c.). In spite of CT I 289c (T1C) mrz.t, a number of recent standard works (DCT 162 & 174; Kahl 1992, 111) stick to assuming OK mjz.t. Similarly rightly assumes W. Westendorf (1962, 32–33) the OK wtg. mz.t to be a defective form of mjz.t. P. Kaplony (1974, 224) finds only mjz.t in Abusir. The problem of *mrz.t strikingly resembles the phenomenon observed, e.g., with the OEg. root bnj, where usually a process of old bnr > later bnj is accepted. As shown, however, by W. Vycichl (1951, 71; 1978, 73; 1983, 29), W. Schenkel (1965, 114–115), and H. Satzinger (1999, 144, fn. 8), the original root might have been bnj (OK when -r does not appear in most cases), which was replaced then by a false bnr in the later times (MK) due to a “pseudohistorization” (Vycichl 1951) or “archaizing orthography (*graphie archaisante*)” (Vycichl 1983) or “hypercorrection” (Satzinger). By analogies (where the historic process of erosion of r > j indeed took place), the scribes of the MK might have felt bnj too as a development from an earlier *bnr (which actually never existed from an etymological viewpoint).

- Hence: Dem. mws “Leber” (DG 157) → OCpt. $\mu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\epsilon \sim \mu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\iota$ “an internal organ: (?) liver” (CED 95; AEO II 245*; exx. apud Richter 1998, 138) = “ein inneres Organ, wohl: Leber” (KHW 107) = “(prob.) foie” (DELIC 127) = “ein Organ in der Bauchhöhle: Leber (?)” (Spg. KHW 68: cf. Griffith, ZÄS 38, 1900, 92).
NB1: For the correction of (O) $\mu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (m) “liver” (cited in Wb l.c.; Lefébvre 1952, 33–34, §38; NBÄ 695, n. 793) to $\mu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\epsilon$, cf. Vergote 1950, 291.
NB2: Cf. also the gloss $\mu\omicron\varsigma\epsilon$ “Leber” in a mag. Dem. pap. (Richter 1998, 137–9).
NB3: W. C. Till (1955, 331, §43) confirms the loss of the native Eg. word for “liver” by Coptic times, when it was replaced by Gk. $\eta\pi\alpha\rho$ in medical texts.
NB4: J. Osing derived the Dem.-OCpt. form from *mējz.t (NBÄ 695, n. 793) leaving the anomaly of “the unexplained change of -j- > -w-” (AEO II 245*).
- There can be hardly any doubt that it is identical with NOM. *mayz- “liver” [Blz.] = *māyz- [Ehret]: NWomt. *māyz- [Bnd.]: Male māyzi [Bnd.] = maizi [Sbr. 1994–95, 9] = mayz [Flm./Blz.], Bsk. māyız [Bnd.] = mayz [Flm.] = māyız [Mlt.], Doko mayz [Flm.] (NWomt.: Bnd. 2000 MS, 58, #81) | SEomt. *mayy- [reg. from *mayz-]: Haruro (Kcm.) māy-ē [CR 1936, 655] = may-e [Bnd.] = mayy-e [Flm.] = māy-e [LS] = maṣ-e [Sbr.], Kyr. mayy-e [Flm. 1990, 28] = māy-e [Bnd.] = māyy-ē [Sbr.], Gdc. māyy-e [Bnd.], Gnj. may-e [Blz. < ?], Zrg. ma’y-e [Bnd.] = mā-e [Sbr.], Zys. ma’y-e [Bnd.] = ma-ē [Sbr.] = māy-a [LS] | Chara mayy-a [Flm.] | Benesho may (“heart”) [Flm.], She mai [Bnd.] (NOM.: Bnd. 1971, 254–6, 261;

Bnd.-Flm. 1976, 50; Mkr. 1981, 203, #20; Blz. 1989 MS Om., 21, #72; Sbr. 1994, 17; Dlg. 1998, 59, #69) < AA *mayʒ- “liver” [Dlg]. Note that LECu.: Bussa máyē “liver” [Wdk.-Tanaba-Cheru 1994, 12, #47] may be a NOM. borrowing.

AP: H. G. Mukarovsky (1981, 203) compared the NOM. word with Nilo-Saharan: Teda maasen “liver”. M. L. Bender (1975, 172) combined Eg. mjz.t with Niger-Kordofanian: Igbo imežn “liver”.

DP: A. Ju. Militarev (1991, 76) linked OEg. mjz.t to IE: Hitt. mazeri- ~ maze- “Teil der Orakelleber” [Friedrich 1952, 139] as well as to NCAuc.: Avar-Andi *mVçV “liver”, (?) PTsezi *bōçə “spleen” > i.a. Bezhti baço “liver” (NCAuc.: NCED 1040). A. Dolgopolsky (1994, 267, #1; 1994 MS, 3; 1998, 59, #69) affiliated AA *mayʒ- with Ur. *maksə “liver” < Nst. *magiʒa.

LIT.: the Eg.-NOM. etymology was first observed by Ch. Rabin (1977, 338) and (independently) also by Blz. 1989 MS Om., 21, #72 (Eg.-NOM.). See also Mlt. 1991, 76 (Eg.-Hitt.-NCAuc.); Dlg. 1994, 267, #1 & 1994 MS, 3 & 1998, 59, #69 (Eg.-NOM.); Ehret 1997, 214, #1834 (Eg.-NOM.); Takács 1998, 158–9, #2; 2005, 22–23, §1.7 & fn. 16 (Eg.-NOM.-Igbo-NCAuc.); Mlt. 2005, 344, 367 (Eg.-NOM.).

NB1: For the reason of historical phonology, the isogloss of Eg. mjz.t and NOM. *mayz- can hardly related to WCh.: SBCh. *mbaş >/< *maš (?) “liver” [GT] = *mb-s, [JS 1981, 168]: Mbaaruu maasi [Smz.], Grnt. màasi [Smz.] = màasi [Csp.], Jimi bàaso [Csp.], Tala bàsi [Csp.], Zungur basi [Csp.], Boolu & Pelu mbaši [Smz.], Zangwal mbaši [Smz.], Sho mbasi [Smz.], Geji mbaži [Smz.], Zaranda mbaši [Smz.], Buli & Polchi & Zodi (Dwot) mbaš [Smz.], Langas mbâš [Smz.], Tule & Chaari mbažə [Smz.], Zakshi bāžə? [Smz.], Boot mbažə [Smz.], Zaar (Saya) mb*oš [Smz.] (SBCh.: Smz. 1978, 26, 49–50, #24; Csp. 1994, 24). The position of ECh.: Karbo messo “liver” [el-Minai n.d. MS] is uncertain. First, (1) the irregular Eg.-Om. *-z (< AA *ʒ) vs. SBAuchi *-š should be explained. Moreover, (2) SBCh. *mbaş is presumably cognate with NAgaw: Qwara hebšā “Bauch, Leber” [Rn. 1885, 75] = hibša (i.e. hōbša) “liver” [Apl. 1991 MS, 8] = hebša “liver” vs. hebša “stomach” [Flad apud Rn.], Falasha hebša “liver” [Apl. 1996, 16] (from an etymon *hVbš- with the AA prefix of anatomical terms?). The Sem. etymology apud L. Reinisch (l.c.) is dubious, while most recently D. Appleyard (2006, 94) offers no etymology for it at all.

NB2: Ch. Rabin (1977, 338) was inclined to identify the common Eg.-NOM. stem with ES: Geez māʔēs “skin” [Rabin] = māʔs ~ māʔs “skin, hide, leather, headcover” [Lsl. 1987, 324] referring to the analogous parallelism of WCh.: Hausa hanta ~ anta “liver” and Geez anadā “skin” (rare). Phonologically dubious (AA *-Z > Eg.-NOM. *-z ≠ Geez -s). Besides, Geez māʔs “skin” might be related with Eg. *ms.t (q.v.).

NB3: Surprisingly, M. Lamberti & R. Sottile (1997, 476) equated NOM. *mayz- with NOM.: Wlt. miyyiy-a “rib” = HECu.: Kmb. mizāz-u “rib” & LECu.: Afar masan-gale “rib, side of the body” & Bed. biye “rib” & even Dhl. makk-o “liver” (sic).

NB4: Since the function of liver could have hardly been known in the PAA period, an eventual connection of AA *mayʒ- “liver” [Dlg] to the etymon of Ar. myz II “séparer, distinguer de” [Fagnan 1923, 167] = I “séparer l’un d’avec l’autre”, II & IV “séparer, disjoindre l’un d’avec l’autre” [BK II 1172] is rather unlikely.

NB5: The Eg.-NOM. etymology was queried by J. Osing (2001, 576 & fn. 106) uncritically adopting the reading of Eg. mjz.t as mrz.t suggested by G. Roquet (1979, 437–8, 442–3). His objection was disproved by G. Takács (2005, 22–23, §1.7).

- All other etymologies offered for OEg. mjz.t are unconvincing:

- **1.** H. Brugsch (quoted by Horrack 1894, 143–4) assumed a connection to Eg. *jmsj* “einer der vier Horussöhne, Schutzgott der Eingeweide” (OK, Wb I 88) based on the old (false) rendering of *mjz.t* as “great intestine” (Chabas) = “(perhaps act. some) internal organ of the animals body, perhaps the stomach” (Horrack).

NB: In the Canopic jars, *mjz.t* “liver” (with few exceptions) was indeed identified with *Imsety* (presiding over the embalmed viscera), but hardly because of a real etymological connection, “since paranomasia has here played an unmistakable part” (AEO II 247*; Ghalioungui 1981, 15).

- **2.** H. Grapow (1914, 23), P. Lacau (1970 phon., 39, §19; 1970, 150, #406), and W. Vycichl (1983, 127) supposed an *m-* prefix in Eg. *mjz.t*, but they were unable to identify the root (**jz* ~ **wjz* or sim.), which *mjz.t* might have originated in.

NB: Lacau (1970 phon., 39, §19), suggesting a value *ml-/mn-* (sic) for the hrgl. *mj* < *mr* (W19), assumed an “unknown triradical root” (i.e., **lʔz/*nʔz*). Unfounded.

- **3.** GT: assuming an orig. OEg. *mrz.t* (suggested by Roquet and others, quoted above), one might ponder comparing it with Ch. **m-*[]-*d* “liver” [JS 1981, 167]: CCh.: BM **m-d* “liver” [GT] > Chibak *miḍæ*, Ngwahyi *miḍà*, WMargi *miḍà*, *miḍəgə* (CCh.: Krf. 1981, #70) || ECh.: Sokoro *meıld-um* “deine Leber” [Lks. 1937, 36]. But the correspondence of Ch. **-d* vs. OEg. *-z* is irregular.

NB: The position of ECh.: Sarwa *ngál-màndà*, Gadang *müyò* “liver” (both derived in JI 1990 MS, 6, #113 from Ch. **m-l-d*) is uncertain. It has not been researched whether Gadang *-y-* can be < **-yy-* < **-yz-* (as in the case of NOm. **mayz-* above).

mjz.wt (or **mjzw.t?**) “Name der weißen Krone, auch als Göttin” (PT, NK, GR, Wb II 44, 15–16) = “la couronne haute à la tête du roi du Sud” (Lefébvre 1893, 114) = “Southern Crown” (Blackman (1916, 69) = “couronne blanche” (Jéquier 1921, 12) = “Name der oberägyptischen Königskrone” (PT 724b, 753b, ÜKAPT VI 130) = “un des noms de la couronne blanche” (Lacau 1970, 38) = “(klärllich) eine Krone als Ganzes (trotz abweichender Determinierung)” (Otto ÄMÖR II 134) = “white crown” (PL 412).

NB: The segmentation is disputed. Mostly treated as *mjzw.t*. K. Sethe (ÜKAPT III 343) suggests an original form *mjz.t*.

- Etymology obscure.
- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 23) saw in it an *m-* prefix form, but failed to identify the underlying root.
- **2.** A. M. Blackman (1916, 69): since *mjzw.t* “*produces assonance with*” Eg. *nsw* “king” in PT 724a–b, it “*is likewise a derivative of*” Eg. *sw.t* “eine Pflanze: Art Binse” (MK, Wb IV 58), “*mj-* being a prefix”.

Similarly, P. Wilson (PL 412): “a connection with either swt or nswt seems possible”. False.

NB: As rightly noted by A. H. Gardiner (quoted by Blackman 1916, 69, fn. 3, cf. RT 33, 75), mjzw.t cannot be a derivative of sw.t, as the hrgl. W19 is only used in m- formations when either the 1st radical is j- or when the 1st radical becomes j-.

- **3.** P. Lacau (1970, 38 & fn. 2) suggested a “*prototype*” *m-nzw.t originating in OEg. nzw “roi du Haute Égypte” (see nsw) with a prefix m-, which later shifted to m-jzw.t with the rare change of Eg. n > j. In his view, mjzw.t is “à comparer sans doute avec métathèse le nom de couronne nws” (Lacau, RT 31, 1909, 30, l. 2 & 7).
- **4.** D. Meeks (AL 77.1658): lit. “la pointue” originating in Eg. mjz.(t) “la tige, la pointe arrière de la couronne rouge” (discussed above).

mjs.wt (pl.? or **mjsw.t** as in Wb?) “eine Pflanze aus dem Wadi Natrûn” (Lit. MK: Peasant R 22, Wb II 45, 1).

NB: Mathieu (1996, 107, n. 355) found a further occurrence (written mjsj < *mjs.t) in Ostr. DeM 1266 + CGC 25218, 15.

- Meaning and origin unknown. GT: cf. perhaps Akk. mēsu or mēšu “a native tree and its wood” [CAD m2, 33] || NHbr. of TTM mayiṣ “1. Zürgelbaum (Celtis australis), 2. die Frucht dieses Baumes” [Dalman 1922, 235] = “ein Baum der Eicheln und Galläpfel trägt” [Levy 1924 III 100] = “a tall tree with fruits like myrtle-berries” [Löw apud Jastrow] = “name of a tree, Celtis” [Jastrow 1950, 772] | Ar. mays- “1. sorte d’arbre du bois duquel on fait des selles, 2. coll. selles” [BK II 1173]?

NB: Levy (l.c.) compared a certain Cpt. ⲙⲏⲥ (unspecified).

mjk.t (with vars.) “Göttin des Gebiets des 1. Katarakt, eng mit Chnum verbunden” (MK-XXII., Helck, LÄ IV 125).

NB: For listing its exx. cf. also Habachi (in MDAIK 24, 1969, 177f.), Wenig (1970, 141), and Handoussa (1987, 102, fn. 1).

- Meaning and origin unknown.
- **1.** S. Wenig (1970, 141) suspects in the name, which occurs in or south of Elephantine, “eine einheimische Gottheit”, which “von der ansässigen Bevölkerung verehrt wurde, aber auch... Eingang in ägyptische Tempel mit lokaler Bedeutung fand”. Henceforth, he identified mjk.t “mit Vorbehalt” with Meroitic mkdj “Göttin” (“aus mk ‘Gott’ und kdj ‘Frau’ kontaminiert”), which was later personified. Accepting this theory, Handoussa (1987, 101–5) saw in this “egyptianized” name (perhaps mjktj?) a “vivid example” of a local divinity, which “the theologians of Egyptianized Nubia tried to interrelate... with the Egyptian pantheon”.

- **2.** O. D. Berlev (1978, 58–59 quoted apud AL 78.1668 leaving Wenig l.c. unmentioned): the lit. meaning of the name was conceived as *mj-k.t “semblable à l’autre (main du dieu)” (cf. Habachi, MDAIK 24, 1969, 169f.).

mjk3.t “eine offizinell verwendete Frucht” (Med., Wb II 45, 2) = “(Einzeldroge in einem Verband, unbekannt)” (WÄDN 225) = “ein Mineral” (GHWb 326) = “(Frucht/Mineral?)” (HAM 582).

- Meaning and origin obscure.

NB: V. Loret (1894, 94–95, §xiii) identified it with a certain Cpt. $\epsilon\mu\kappa\eta\eta$, $\bar{\pi}\kappa\eta$ “Anis, Pimpinella Anisum L.” (Peyron after Tattam, not attested in CD, KHW, DELC etc.), a plant introduced to Egypt at the beginning of Dyn. XVIII.

mjtr “als Titel” (OK, CT, MK, XXVI., Wb II 45, 4–5) = “Arbeiter am kgl. Hofe, der zu Beginn der 5. Dyn. beseitigt wird” (Helck 1954, 102: since II./III.) = “a kind of worker in the royal court” (MK, Ward 1982, 94, §790) = “Palastarbeiter” (GHWb 326) = “a palace type of servants (a rather frequent title of unknown signification)” (WD III 50: cf. JNES 18, 1959, 263f.; SAK 10, 1983, 274, n. 5; SAK 23, 1996, 88, n. 22).

NB1: Not translated in Kahl et al. 1995, 13D & 242 index as well as in Jones 2000, 424, §1571 (with further lit.).

NB2: W. Helck (1954, 102) read only mtr (sic). G. Roquet (1977, 125, fn. 10; 1979, 447, fn. 2) proposed to read mrtr < m*lt (sic).

- Fem. pair: mjtr.t “als Frauentitel” (OK, Wb II 45, 6) = “mjtr.t-Arbeiterin” (Speidel 1990, 193) = “Palastarbeiter” (GHWb 326) = “lady, concubine” (Jones 2000, 424–5, §1572).
- Reading, meaning, and origin obscure. W. Helck (1954, 102) explained mjtr from *mjtr-r-t3 and affiliated it with the expression (j)r(j)-t3 (Helck: “jubelndes Volk im Sedfestritual?”).

mjd3 “ein eßbarer Körperteil des Rindes (vom Bein?)” (PT 1546c, offering lists, Wb II 45, 7) = “une partie des jambes (?)” (Lacau 1970 phon., 39, §19) = “chair” (Speelers, p.c. by H. Satzinger on 18 Sept. 1996) = “ein Körperteil vom Rind (als Speise)” (GHWb 326; ÄWb I 516).

NB: Occurs in PT among the following parallels: “upper foreleg” (hpš hrj), “lower foreleg” (hpš hrj), “haunches” (jw^c.w), mjd3, “thighs” (sw.t), “shanks” (hnd), “back” (psd). R. O. Faulkner (in AEPT 235) left mjd3 untranslated.

- Obscure. Perhaps OEg. mjd3 from *mydr or *mydl. Only guesses are possible:

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 23) and P. Lacau (1970 phon., 39, §19; 1970, 149, #406) surmized in mjd3 a form enlarged by m- prefix, although they gave no evidence for it.
NB: Lacau (l.c.), in addition, assumed *mld3 or *mnd3 (!) < *ld3 or *nd3 (!).
- **2.** K. Sethe (ÜKAPT V 499 ad PT 1546c), following the (otherwise unpublished) idea of A. Ember, equated mjd3 (< old *mrd3) with Ar. ma-rday-at- “partie charnue du corps située entre la tête du bras et le sternum” [BK II 847]. Phonologically untenable (Eg.-3 ≠ Ar -γ).
NB: Moreover, Sethe (see also KHW 104, fn. 5) considered OĒg. mjd3 to be the etymon of Cpt.: (SLB) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\tau$ “3. Hals, Nacken, Schulter” assuming a contamination with $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\tau$ “1. Sehne, 2. Gefäß” (< Eg. mt?).
- **3.** GT: no evident parallels in AA. Still, the following data are noteworthy:
 - (1) ES: Geez maṭarā ~ maṭārā “shoulder(blade)”, cf. Tigre maṭerär “spine” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 373; cf. Rn. 1887, 278) || WBrb.: Zng a-mardī ~ a-mardī, pl. a-mardī-un “dos (de l’homme)” [Ncl. 1953, 214]?
NB1: The correspondence of ES *-ṭ- vs. Zng. -d- is irreg.
 - (2) NAgaw: Hamir mīdāl-a “elbow” [BSW 1995, 4] || ECu.: Tsamay madal-akko (m) “arm muscle” [Sava 2005, 245]?
 - (3) Akk. (Oakk.) mudulum “(meat-meal)” [Gelb 1973, 169] = (Oakk., YB) muddulu ~ mundulu “eine Art Fleisch (mit Füllung?)” [AHW 666] = muddulu “pickled meat” [CAD], which W. von Soden derived from (jB) muddulu D “etwa: füllen (??)” < madālu “in Salz einlegen” [AHW 1572] = madālu “to salt, pickle meat” vs. muddulu D “to preserve in oil or salt” [CAD m1, 10] = muddulu “konservieren” [Butz, JESHO 27, 1984, 272–316]. Cf. also Akk. midlu “Pökelfleisch” [Deller, Assur 3/4, 1983, 33–39] = “pickled meat” [Watson]?
NB: Cf. also Ug. mdl “a strip of tanned leather (i.e. animal hide or skin treated with oil or salt)” [Watson 1986, 75] = “part of the harness (?)” [DUL 527]? W. G. E. Watson (1986, 73–75), having declined the rendering “guide rope” (< ṽdll) suggested by R. M. Good (1984, 77–81), proposed a comparison of Ug. mdl with Akk. mdl. On the other hand, Akk. madālu (as denom. verb) has been derived inversely from muddulu “eine Art Fleisch” of Sum. origin (OL 2003, 207, fn. 23).
 - (4) LECu.: Saho malad-ā ~ maḷd-ā “Lende, Weiche” [Rn. 1890, 265, 267].
NB: L. Reinisch (l.c.) linked it to Ar. lṭy: laṭā “affixus fuit”.
 - (5) For semantical reasons, NBrb.: Shilh a-madl “joue” [Mntsr. 1999, 164] || SBrb.: Hgr. ā-mâdel, pl. i-mâdl-iw-en “1. mâchoire, 2. p.ext.: mâchoire inférieure (entière), demi-mâchoire (de droite ou de gauche)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1161] = ā-madəl, pl. i-madl-iw-ān “1. demi-mâchoire inférieure, 2. p.ext.: mâchoire” [PAM 1998, 209], Ghat a-madel “mâchoire” [Nhl. 1909, 175] are less promising.

NB: Following D. J. Wölfel (1955, 43, #14), H. G. Mukarovsky (1969, 34, #3.6 & 40, #20.2) affiliated the Brb. word with Bsq. *matel(a)* ~ *mathela* “carrillo, joue, Backe” and *mataria* ~ *matraila* “Kinnbacken”.

(6) EBrb.: Gdm. *u-madir*, pl. *midar* “1. omoplate” [Lnf.] is certainly out of question.

NB: It is cognate with NBrb.: Shilh *a-madir* “Jäthacke” [Stumme] = “1. Haue, Hacke, 2. Stangengebiß des Pferdes” [Vcl.], Wargla *a-mdir*, pl. *i-midar* “1. sorte de houé, de sape, 2. par ext. omoplate” [Dlh. 1987, 185], Qbl. *a-mder*, pl. *i-medran* “1. rebord d’une porte (seuil), d’une fenêtre, d’un bassin, 2. bois de charpentrie, poutre” [Dlt. 1982, 487] || EBrb.: Gdm. *u-madir*, pl. *midar* “1. omoplate, 2. houé large à manche court qui forme avec le plan de l’outil un angle très fermé” [Lanfry 1973, 206, #978] = *o-madir*, pl. *midar* “1. breite Hacke mit kurzem Stiel, 2. Schulterblatt (wegen der Hakenform)” [Vcl.] || WBrb.: Zng. *a-mdār* ~ *e-mdār*, pl. *ə-mdurūn* “vers, du côté de...” [Ncl. 1953, 207]. Following Stumme (1912, 125), W. Vycichl (2005, 4) explained the Brb. word from an unattested Phn. *m^odr “Haue, Hacke” via Punic, cf. also Hbr. *ma^odēr* “plough” [KB 609] = “1. (Jät)Hacke, 2. Pflugschar” [Vcl.].

m^o “1. in der Hand von ..., im Besitze von ..., 2. durch die Hand jemd. → durch jem., wegen etwas, 3. vor jem. (retten, schützen), 4. von jem. (empfangen), 5. von jem. (erbitten), 6. von jem. (s. entfernen)” (OK, Wb II 45–46) = “1. in the hand, possession, charge of, 2. together with, 3. from” (FD 105).

● Etymology disputed:

- **1.** Traditionally (e.g. Wb II 45; EG 1957, 132, §178) explained as a compound prep. consisting of Eg. *m* “in” + ^o “hand”, which is widely accepted in Egyptian philology.
- **2.** I. Eitan (1928, 48; 1929, 47, 49), followed by P. Lacau (1913, 219, §451; 1970, 17), compared it with Ar. *ma^o* ~ *ma^oa* “avec”, cf. also *ma^oā* “ensemble”, *ma^oiyy-at-* “1. propriété conjonctive de la copulative, 2. compagnie, juxtaposition” [BK II 1125], both projecting to Ar. the same compound as in Eg. *m-^o*. Ar. *ma^oa* is cognate with Ug. *m^o* II (adv. “as one, together” [DUL 519] (cf. Renfroe 1992, 128) and distantly probably also with NBrb.: Mzg. *√m*: *a-mu* [-Ø < *^o-reg.] “1. participer à, s’associer à, prendre part à, 2. se joindre à” [Taifi 1991, 399] || SCu.: *Ma’a -mu’i* [-ʔ- < *^o-reg.] “to copulate” [Ehret] < AA **m-^o* “(to be) together” [GT].

NB1: Eitan did not even exclude that the isolated Ar. prep. “*may have come over directly from Egypt*”. But contrary to Eitan, such an Eg.-Ar. comparison would exclude the inner Eg. etymology of Eg. *m^o*.

NB2: Similarly to Eitan, V. Blažek (2004, 12, §9) assumes in Ar. *ma^oa* (“a formal parallel”, in his view, to Ar. *ladā* ~ *laday* “chez, auprès” [BK II 984] derived in DELC 145 from *li-* “to” + *yad-* “hand”) the same construction as in Eg. *m^o* (above) and *mdj* (*m* “in” + **d* “hand”, lit. “at hand”) as well as IE **me-gh(s)ri-* “near”, lit. “at hand”, P. Lacau (1913, 219, §451; 1970, 17), in turn, derived Eg. *m^o*, Ar. *ma^oa*, and Hbr. *‘im* “with” from a common Eg.-Sem. *^o “orientation, direction”.

NB3: The connection of Hbr. ^oam and Ar. ma^oa (supported also in GB 594; MM 1983, 180; KB 839) is dubious. On the other hand, J. Aistleitner (WUS 233–4, #2041) affiliated NWSem. *^oVm “mit, bei” with Ar. ^oan “von, für, mit, zu”. Note that Ar. ma^oa has also a var. ^oam (via met.?) in the dial. of Maroccan Huwara (GB 594). NB4: Ma’a -mu^oi was wrongly affiliated by Ch. Ehret (1980, 159, #52) with Brg. mu^oud- “to pommel” and Dhl. mu^ou^o-u^od- “to masturbate” (rendered by Tosco 1991, 143 more correctly as “to pull down the foreskin”) and explained from his SCu. *mu^o(ut)- “to handle lightly (esp. in a sexual sense)”.

- **3.** The representatives of the Rösslerian trend (“*neuere Komparatistik*”) identify Eg. m-^o with LEg. m-dj “with” (q.v.) < m “in” + ^o(j) var. *dj “hand” in the frames of the hypothetic shift of Eg. ^o (~ late var. d?) < AA *d. Disputed in EDE I 356 and Takács 2006, 113.
LIT.: Zeidler 1992, 208; Schenkel 1993, 140; Kammerzell 1998, 35, fig. 14; Satzinger 1999, 146. Etc.
- **4.** L. Homburger’s (1930, 283) equation of Eg. m^o ~ Peul (Ful) ngam “à cause” is unacceptable.

m^o “Badewanne für die Füße” (OK, Wb II 46, 5) = Fußwanne” (GHWb 326; ÄWb I 516).

- AÄG 109, §254: nomen instr. (or loci) of OEg. j^oj “to wash” (OK, Wb I 39).

NB: The etymology of this root is still obscure:

(1) GT: probably cognate with Sem. *hy^o (extension *h-) “to flow out” [GT]: ESA (Sab.) hy^o “to flow, run (of water)”, hy^o “flow of water, libation” [SD 57], Ar. hy^o I “2. fondre, être en confusion, 3. couler et se répandre (un liquide répandu), 10. vomir”, VI “1. couler, se répandre” [BK II 1467–8] = I “to fuse (lead), flow, be spread, vomit” [Dlg.] (Sem.: DRS 404) ||| ECu. *ya^o-/*yā^o- “to flow away” [Sasse 1982, 192] ||| SCu. *wa^o- [^o older *ya^o-?] “to spill out, flow” [Ehret]: Irq. wa^o-am- “to flow, trickle”, Alg. wa^o-amu “river”, Brg. wa^o-amu “well” | Ma’a -wa “to urinate”, also WRift *wa^o- “to vomit” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 313) < AA *y-^o ~ *w-^o “to flow” [GT]. For ECu.-Sem. see Dlg. 1988, 631, #17. Sem. *h- may be a secondary root complement, while in SCu. we may assume an interchange of AA *y- ~ *w-. For the semantic shift “to wash” vs. “to flow”, cf. e.g. PIE *pleu- “rinnen, fließen” > i.a. Gk. πλύνω “wasche”, OHGerm. flouwen ~ flewen “waschen, spülen”, Lith. caus. pláuju “wasche, spüle” (IEW 835–6).

(2) O. Rössler (1971, 293) and R. Voigt (1992, 42) equated Eg. j^oj with Ar. waḏu^oa “sauber werden”, nom. instr. mīḏa^o-at- “Badewanne” (the only attractive example of the supposed correspondence of Eg. ^o vs. Sem. *ḏ suggested by the Rösslerian theory and disproved in EDE I 363–6).

m^o “Art Schiff” (MK, NE, GR, Wb II 46, 6) = “type of boat” (Jones 1988, 137, §33) = “1. (M.R.) kleiner Fahrzeug, das als Transportboot eingesetzt wurde, 2. (Ptol.) eine Barke des Horus” (Düring 1995, 148, 152) = “1. (MK) type of boat (not stated what it was used for), 2. (Edfu) a general term for the barque of the sun god either in the morning or at night” (PL 417).

NB: D. Meeks (1999, 581) corrected the reading of two Edfu exx. (IV 261:4–5, VII 175:9–10) of PL to *m^cr.t, albeit “*in bateau de ce nom ne semble pas connu ailleurs*”. For the MK attestation cf. Griffith 1898, 56, pl. xxii, l. 13.

- **Origin obscure.** GT: perhaps lit. “vessel”, a nomen instr. < j^c?
NB: For the semantic shift cf. e.g. IE *pleu- “rinnen, fließen” > *plowó-s “Schiff”: Gk. πλέω “schiffe, schwimme”, πλοῖον “Fahrzeug”, πλύνω “wasche”, πλυνός “Waschgrube” etc. (IEW 835–6).
- **m^c** (GW) “poteau, bille de bois” (NE, AL 77.1661 after Vernus, RdE 29, 1977, 180, n. 7) = “die Bordränder, oberer Abschluß der Bordwand (bilden in der Aufsicht eines Schiffskörpers die Form eines Mundes, ein Lippenpaar)” (Düring) = “*Holzstangen” (GHWb 326–7).
- N. Düring (1995, 62) explained it ultimately from Eg. m^{3c}.w “ein hölzerner Teil der Barke” (CT, Wb II 25, 14, see above).

m^c “to slay, kill” (GR hapax: Edfu III 4:2, PL 413)

NB: Written m^{3c}. P. Wilson (PL): “*most likely a corruption of sm³ slay*”, declined by D. Meeks (1999, 581) who, in view of its reduplication, rightly assumed an original stem *m^c.

- Reduplicated: m^cm^c “to kill” (GR, PL 415: 5 exx.) = “töten” (Budde & Kurth 1994, 12, §47).
NB: Budde and Kurth (l.c.) read m^{3c}m^{3c}.
- Etymology disputable:
- **1.** GT: perhaps continues older *m^{3c}, cf. dj-m^{3c} “schlachten” (late NK, Wb II 22, 12), which ultimately derives from Eg. m^{3c} “richtig” (Wb, discussed above, q.v.)?
- **2.** GT: if D. Meeks (l.c.) is right in assuming a distinct Eg. root *m^c “to kill” (or sim.), cf. perhaps AA *m-^c “1. to hit, 2. cut” [GT].
NB1: Attested in Ar. ma^cma^ca “3. lutter, être aux prises les uns avec les autres”, ma^cma^c-at- “cris, tumulte des guerriers ou des hommes engagés dans une rixe” [BK II 1130] || LECu.: Saho ma^c “spalten, zerteilen, öffnen, öffnen” [Rn. 1890, 254] || SCu.: WRift *mu^c- “to beat” [KM 2004, 209] | Ma’a ma “to beat, hit” [Tucker-Bryan 1974, 205] || CCh.: PBata *√m “couper (avec un couteau, une faucille)” [Br.-Jng.]: Bcm. má “couper (avec un couteau)” [Skn. apud Br.-Jng. 1990, 92, 143] = máá “to cut (with knife)” [Pweddon 2000, 52], Gude ma “couper de l’herbe, faucher” [Br.-Jng. 1990, 143].
NB2: Note that Saho ma^c was combined by L. Reinisch (1890, 254) with a certain LEg. m^{3c} (knife det.).

***m^c3.t** (?) > Cpt.: (B) માઈ, માહ, (L) માૅઈ “size, age, kind” (CD 156a) = “1. Ausmaß, Größe, 2. Alter, 3. Gestalt, Art” (NBÄ) = “Art, Gestalt, Alter” (KHW 88) = “grandeur” (DELC 109).

NB: Cf. also (S) သာဓို “Art”, (L) သာသာ(၈) (f) “Substanz, Gestalt” (KHW 517).

- Etymology strongly debated. G. Fecht (1960, fn. 373), J. Osing (NBÄ 322), and W. Vycichl (DELC 109) assumed an etymon *m^cʒ^cé(y). ʔ (Osing) derived by m- prefix from Eg. ʕʒj “to be great,” although, as Vycichl (l.c.) admits, “*il est difficile de classer cette formation parmi les dérivations connues*”. NB1: Strangely, the hypothetic Eg. *m^cʒ^c.t [< *m^c.r.t or *m^c.l.t] coincides with LECu.: Saho ma^cal “1. groß, alt werden, 2. angesehen, einflußreich, erhwürdig sein, 3. wichtig sein (eine Sache)” [Rn. 1890, 256], which must be pure chance. NB2: The Cpt. forms were explained very diversely in the lit.: (1) J. Černý (CED 77), correctly, identifies (B) ⲥⲓ-ⲛⲁⲓⲛ “to grow in size, increase” (CD) = “wachsen” (KHW) with Dem. (Anksheshonqı 6:9) tʒj-ʒmj.t “adult age” (CED 77), cf. Dem. ʒmj.t “Seele, Charakter” (DG 5:1) of dubious origin and presumed by Černý to be present also in Cpt. (S) ⲛⲁⲪⲧⲉⲓⲛⲉ, ⲛⲁⲪⲧⲓⲛⲉ “obdurate, presumptuous, imprudent” (CD 78b) < Dem. ⲛⲓⲧ-ʒmj.(t) “hard of character” (CED 115). (2) B. H. Stricker (OMRO NR 39, 1958, 61, n. 36), in turn, explained Cpt. from bjʒ.t “Charakter” (Wb I 441), while (3) A. Volten (1942, 109; 1962, 98) preferred a derivation from Dem. mj.t “Weg, Art” (DG 152).

m^cj.t “Öse (für Vorhänge)” (GR, Wb II 46, 8) = “boucle d’attache” (Alliot 1949 I, 327–9) = “anneau (de rideau)” (GR, AL 78.1670) = “1. loop (on curtain, on the small shrine), 2. (Edfu VI 125:1) perhaps some kind of loop on the harpoon through which the rope passed” (PL 413–4). Occurs also in the Tebtunis onomasticon: m^cj “Öse” (2nd cent AD, Osing 1998, 227 & n. d).

NB: Beside the reading m^cj.t (preferred in Wb, AL, PL), several GR exx. have no third -j and the fem. -t.

- No certain etymology.
- 1. GT: if its basic sense was “(sg.) round”, presumably cognate with Sem.: OHbr. *mā^cā “Körnchen (des Sandes), Steinchen” [GB 443] = “grain (of sand)” [KB 609], NHbr. of TTM mā^cā (f) “Grundbed.: etwas Rundes: 1. Kern, 2. kleine Münze, Korn, Maah” [Levy 1924 III 183–4] = “1. Körnchen, 2. eine bestimmte Münze” [Dalman 1922, 245] = “(orig. grain of sand) 1. a weight, 2. a (small) coin” [Jastrow 1950, 813] ||| WCh.: Goemai mai “a ring of iron put around the shaft of a spear (is also put around walking sticks and clubs)” [Srl. 1937, 134]. From AA *m^c “round” [GT]? NB: NHbr. mē^ce(h) “1. die ganze Bauchhöhle des animalischen Körpers, 2. das Kerngehäuse einer Frucht” (explained in Levy l.c. from “eig. etwas Rundes”) hardly belong here. Cf. Sem. *ma^cay/w-(at)- “intestines, entrails” [SED I 168, #185].
- 2. GT: less probably, cf. NOm.: Mocha mi^ʔ-o “handle” [Lsl. 1959, 39]? NB: Ch. Ehret (1995, 314, #607) combined Mocha mi^ʔ-o “handle” with Sem. *m^c “to rub” [Ehret] ||| SCu. *mu^c-ut- “to handle lightly” (“durative” *t) < AA *mī^c-/*mū^c- “to handle”. Semantically unconvincing.

m^cʒ^c.wj “die beiden Stangen der Leiter” (PT 468, Wb II 46, 8, so also Hornung 1980, 236) = “ein Teil der Leiter, die Sproßen oder die Holmen der Leiter” (Spg. 1895, 99) = “the uprights of the lad-

der” (AEPT 93) = “die beiden Holme der Leiter” (Kessler, LÄ III 1002 & 1004, n. 8) = “die beiden Holmen (die beiden Stangen der Leiter)” (ÄWb I 516).

- Perhaps from the same root derive also:

(1) MK m^o3^o “Planke oder ein anderer Schiffsteil” (Hornung 1980, 236 after James 1962, 62/31)?

NB: Or belongs rather to m³o.w “ein hölzerner Teil der Barke” (CT, Wb, q.v.) and its kindred?

(2) Dram. Pap. Ramesseum B, ll. 117, 119 (late MK): m^om^o3.wj (abbreviated form m^ow) “die beiden Leiterholmen” vs. m^o3 “Holm” (Sethe 1928, 223, 225, 257) = “part of a celestial ladder erected” (Borghouts quoting Junker 1942, 52–52) = “the clubs” (Borghouts 1971, 202) = “Wurfholz” (Hornung 1980, 236)? Cf. Altenmüller (JEOL 18, 1964, 273f.).

NB1: K. Sethe (l.c.) regarded the fuller var. m^om^o3.wj as “eine alte dualische Schreibung” for m^o3.wj.

NB2: The rendering by Borghouts and Hornung suggests, however, an identification with PT m^oj3.t “throw-stick” (q.v.).

(3) For a possible NK ex. cf. also Janssen (BiOr 25, 1968, 39).

- Origin uncertain.

■ 1. H. Grapow (1914, 23) saw in it an m- prefix form, but the underlying root was not identified.

■ 2. E. Hornung (1980, 236) assume that “*lexikalisch besteht wohl ein Zusammenhang*” between PT m^o3^o.wj and m^oj3.wt “Wurfholz als Götterwaffe” (PT 908e, ÜKAPT IV 184) > ʕm^o3.w “throw-stick-throwers” (CT V 186a, D. Müller, JEA 58, 1972, 121f.), ʕm^o3 “Netz oder Wurfholz zum Vogelfang” (NK, Pfortenbuch). Dubious.

■ 3. GT: m^o3^o < *m^oʕ^o, perhaps any connection to HECu.: Kmb. muluʔla (?) [-ʔ- reg. < *-ʕ-] “ensete tree trunk” [Hds. 1989, 58]?

NB: Or cf. HECu. *merʔe-ta (?) “ensete leaf stem” [Hds. 1989, 58]?

m^oj3.t “Wurfholz (?), Keule (?)” (PT 908e, Wb II 46, 10; also GHWb 327; ÄWb I 516) = “bâton de berger” (Montet 1928, 8) = “Hölzer (?), Wurfhölzer (?)” (PT, ÜKAPT IV 184, VI 130) = “clubs” (Borghouts 1971, 201) = “Wurfholz als Götterwaffe” (Hornung 1980, 236) = “Wurfholz (zum Vogelfang)” (Osing 1986, 208).

- From the same root (?) via met.:

(1) OK ʕm^o3 ~ ʕ3m ~ ʕm^o “das Wurfholz werfen” (Wb I 186, 1; GHWb 140; ÄWb I 271) = “to throw” (EG 1927, 498).

NB: R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 213–4, spell 553, n. 9, cf. AECT III 158, spell 1102, n. 2) read PT 1362b mm.t as prep. m “with” + m.t “throw-stick” assumed to be a corruption of ʕm^o3.t “throw-stick” (Grapow, ZÄS 47, 133). Rejected by K. Sethe (ÜKAPT V 224) and E. Edel (1970, 23–24).

(2) CT $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$ (with numerous vars.) “das Wurfholz zur Vogeljagd” (Wb I 186, 2; GHwB 140) = “clubs” (Borghouts 1971, 201) = “Wurfholz zum Vogelfang (gegen das sich der Verstorbene in CT V 252 zur Wehr setzt; in CT VI 316 werden feindliche Schlangen damit geköpft)” (Hornung 1980, 236) = “throw-stick” (DCT 72, 162).

NB: R. van der Molen (DCT 72) and J. Osing (1986, 208 & fn. 11) surveyed the following CT vars.: $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$ (I 269h, V 252a) ~ $\text{jmj}^{\text{o}}.\text{t}$ (II 153f) ~ $\text{mj}^{\text{o}}.\text{w}$ (II 161f) ~ $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{mj}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$ (II 161f) ~ $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{w}$ (V 186a, D. Müller, JEA 58, 1972, 121f.: “throw-stick-throwers”) ~ $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{w}$ (V 186a) ~ $\text{j}^{\text{o}}\text{m}^{\text{o}}.\text{wt}$ (V 252a) ~ $\text{mj}^{\text{o}}.\text{wt}$ (V 252a, VI 316g, VII 342b) ~ $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{wt}$ (VI 316e, VII 342b) ~ $\text{m}^{\text{o}}.\text{t}$ (VII 424b) ~ $\text{mj}^{\text{o}}.\text{t}$ (II 161f, VII 96s) ~ $\text{m}^{\text{o}}.\text{t}$ (VII 342b, cf. Lesko 1972, 81) ~ $\text{m}^{\text{o}}.\text{wt}$ (VII 520b). The hrgl. depicting a throw-stick (EG 1927, 498, T14) occurring in the wtg. of $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ “Asiatic” from the OK onwards suggests an original $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$ “throw-stick”.

(3) NK $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ “eig. das Wurfholz zum Vogelfang (wird aber bei Ramses VI. deutlich als Netz mit Gitter-Struktur gestaltet)” (Pfortenbuch, scenes 64 & 66, Hornung 1980, 236), discussed below.

(4) GR $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ “Wurfholz” (Tebtunis onomasticon, 2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998, 117 & 119, n. y).

• Etymology debated.

■ 1. H. Grapow (1914, 23): enlarged by the prefix m-, but he named no simplex.

■ 2. P. Montet (1928, 8) regarded PT $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$ as “*sûrement nom d’action*” of a certain $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{w}$ > Eg. $\text{m}^{\text{o}}.\text{wt}$ “Art Szepter” (Wb I 170, 6) = “sorte de sceptre, bâton de berger” (Montet) which he affiliated with $\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{c}$ “un terme d’élevage” (Montet) = “(Verbum, Behandlung von Kälbern)” (OK, Wb I 27, 16)

■ 3. E. Hornung (1980, 236), followed by H. Altenmüller (LÄ III 45, n. 34), surmized that “*lexikalisch besteht wohl ein Zusammenhang*” between $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{wt}$ “Wurfholz” (PT 908e) > $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{w}$ “Wurfholz” (CT V 186a) > $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ “Wurfholz oder Netz” (NK) vs. $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{wj}$ “die beiden Stangen der Leiter” (PT 468) > $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{c}$ “Planke (oder ein anderer Schiffsteil)” (early MK). Dubious.

■ 4. R. M. Voigt (1992, 41) and W. Schenkel (1993, 142) combined Eg. $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ with Sem.: Akk. *gamlu* “Wurfholz, Krummholz, Bumerang” [AHW 279] || Ug. *gml* “sickle (?)” [Gordon 1955, 251, #451] = “Sichel” [WUS #661]. In addition, Schenkel (l.c.) supposed an etymological connection between Eg. $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ and Eg. $\text{qm}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ “Wurfholz” (NK, Wb V 33, 7).

NB1: The correspondence of Eg. c - vs. Sem. g - is irreg. R. Voigt (l.c.) postulates P $\text{Sem. m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$ (sic). The interchange Eg. of $\text{c} \sim \text{q}$ is not justified either by convincing examples.

NB2: H. Holma (1919, 46) identified Eg. $\text{qm}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ “werfen” (OK, Wb V 33) with Ar. *qamara* “mit einem Würfel spielen” [Holma] = “jouer à un jeu de hasard avec qqm.” [BK II 810]. G. Takács (2000, 96), in turn, affiliated Eg. $\text{qm}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}$ [< either $\text{m}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$ or $\text{qm}^{\text{o}}\text{j}^{\text{3}}.\text{t}$] with WCh.: Bokkos *kamloŋ* “Jadgwurfstock” [Jng. 1970, 143].

- **5.** C. T. Hodge (1992, 212) explained Eg. ʿ3m as well as ʿm^o3.t “throw-stick” eventually from his LL (IE-AA) *l-b > *(hH)-l-Nb in frames of his “consonant ablaut” theory (Hodge 1986).
- **6.** GT: was PT m^oj3.t a nomen instr. of an unattested Eg. *ʿj3 “to hunt (?)” (or sim.), perhaps identical with Ar. ʿyl “chercher une proie (se dit d’une bête féroce)” [BK II 422]?
NB: If, however, PT m^oj3.t was connected to OK ʿm^o3 “das Wurfholz werfen”, this possibility should be excluded.
- **7.** GT: alternatively, the hypothetic Eg. *m^o3 “to throw a throw-stick” (hence partial redupl. *ʿm^ol?) could be identified with AA *m-l (var. *m-ʿ-l?) “to throw” [GT].
NB: Attested in NAgaw *mal “to throw (down)” [Apl.] = *māl “um-, niederwerfen” [GT]: Xmr. māl [Rn.] = mal [Apl.], Qmt. māl [CR] = mal- [Apl.], Bln. māl [Rn.] = mal [Apl.], Dembea māl [Rn.], Kailinya mal- [Apl.], Xmtg. mal- [Apl.], Qwr. māl [Rn.] = mal- [Apl.], Falasha māl- [Apl.] (Agaw: Rn. 1884, 392; 1885, 98; 1887, 269; CR 1912, 228; Apl. 1984, 39; 1989 MS, 16; 1996, 18; 2005 MS, 117) ||| WCh.: Bole mall- “1. zu Boden scheudern, 2. flach auf den Boden fallen” [Lks. 1971, 137] || CCh.: Mofu-Gudur -ʿmāl- “2. lancer (le fuseau)” [Br. 1988, 174], Mkt. mùléy “to shoot” & mǎlá “1. to shoot, 2. throw spear” [Rsg. 1978, 324, #635 & 346, #742. a] | Puss mili “2. mettre une vêtement, 3. semer” [Trn. 1991, 106], (?) Mbara māl “laisser” [TSL 1986, 270] || ECh.: Ngam māl “déchanger, (dé)poser, mettre” & Mobu male “déposer (par terre), mettre” [Lenssen 1982, 109; 1984, 69].

m^ojrt (GW) “Art Frucht (neben Bohnen u.ä.)” (late NK hapax: Pap. Anastasi IV rt. 15:10, Wb II 46, 11) = “unknown word” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 212: perhaps only Pap. Anastasi IV) = “eine Frucht” (Helck 1971, 513, #85) = “sort of fruit” (DLE I 206) = “(a food in a list of foodstuffs after pigeons, honey, goose fat, cream and milk, and before...beans, lentils, and peas; it seems to belong to the latter group of grains and legumes)” (Hoch 1994, 126, #160) = “(in Lebensmittelliste nach Tauben, Honig, Gänsefett, Sahne und Milch, vor Körnern und Gemüsen)” (Snd. 1996, 176, #160).

- Apparently a foreign word. Origin obscure.
- **1.** J. Hoch (1994, 126, #160) abstained from identifying it either with Ar. mīr-at- “provisions” or Talmudic Aram. millat “acorns (used in tanning)”, correctly.
- **2.** Th. Schneider (1996, 176, #160): borrowed from some Anatolian lg., cf. Hitt. milit, Luvi mallit, Palaic malit “honey”. False, since -ʿ- remains unexplained, and the list already has “honey” before our word (signified by a native term).

m^o (bodily efflux det.) “etwas vor dem man sich hüten soll” (XVIII. Mag. hapax: Mutter und Kind 4:1, Wb II 46, 12) = “etwas vor dem man sich hüten muß (in Zshg. mit Lippen)” (GHWb 327).

- Meaning and etymology obscure. With respect to its det. (Aa2) and the connection to lips, Sem.: Akk. māʾu (a/jB) “(Galle) erbrechen” [AHW 637] = māʾu “to vomit (bile)” [CAD m1, 437] || Ug. √my^c: Gt t-mt^c “to soak in water” [Tropper 2000, 521–2; Watson 2003, 93] | JNAram. my^c [from *my^c] “to quiver like a fluid, churn, be unstable”, miyāna “moist, liquidy, soft” [Sabar 2002, 216] | Ar. my^c: mā^ca “couler doucement en se répandant à la surface du sol” [BK II 1173] = my^c “mollifier, rendre mou et fluide, enduire de mortier mêlé de paille hachée”, may^c-at- “la résine du storax”, mayā^c-at- “fluidité, liquidité” [Dozy II 629] = my^c: mī^cān- “fluidité”, mā^ci^c- “humide (?)”, ʾal-mā^ci^cāt-u “les corps liquides, fluides” [Fagnan 1923, 167] || Geez (from Ar.) mi^cā ~ me^cā “oil of myrrh, stacte” [Lsl. 1987, 325] || SCu.: Qwd. maʾa-tuko [-ʾ- reg. < *-^c-] “phlegm” [Ehret 1980 MS, 4] | Maʾa mamià “mucus” [Ehret 1974 MS, 45] || SOM.: Hamer máámâ “to spit out seeds” [Flm. 1990 MS, 6] || WCh.: Hausa míyáú “saliva” [Abr. 1962, 676–7] | Grnt. mì “saliva” [Jgr. 1989, 187] = mì “saliva, spittle” [Haruna 1992 MS, 24] | perhaps NBch. *-mi “ulcer” [GT after Skn. 1977, 47] || CCh.: Zime-Dari miç? “salive” [Cooper 1984, 17] || ECh.: Jegu mi “Rotz” [Jng. 1961, 115] are worth being considered as possible cognates. From AA *m-y-^c “(to emit bodily) fluid” [GT]?

NB1: The -āʾ- of Akk. māʾu “erbrechen” [AHW 637] < *-ayā^c- (instead of *-êʾ- < *-eyē^c-) is irregular. In any case, it has hardly anything to do with Akk. (aA) lā muāʾum “nicht wollen” [AHW 665] as supposed by W. von Soden.

NB2: PBHbr. of TTM nī^c “der Schleim, der durch Räuspern, Schütteln, aus der Brust herauskommt” [Levy 1924 III, 389] = “1. the effort made to remove phlegm, hawking; 2. the phlegm discharged by hawking” [Jastrow 1950, 906] = “Schleim” [Dalman 1922, 270] is hardly related, being usually explained from nw^c “to shake”.

NB3: From the same biconsonantal root might derive Ar. ma^ca “fondre, être fondu, liquéfié” [BK II 1125] || (?) Geez ma^cawa “to be humid, wet, moist, supple” [Lsl. 1987, 328]. The origin of Akk. māʾu “excrement” [CAD m1, 435, 437] is uncertain. Cf. also WCh.: Tangale-Waja mwęę “to squeeze” [Kwh. 1990, 238].

m^cm³ ~ m^cm^c3 ~ ^cm^cm³ “(Substantiv)” (NK: Pfortenbuch, scene 64, Wb II 46, 13) = “(Kraftfeld) der Netze, in denen sich die wirkende Zauberenergie befindet” (Hornung 1980, 236) = “*Wurfnetz” (GHWb 327). Cf. m^cm^c3.wj “die beiden Prügel(schwingen)” (MK: Dram. Pap. Ramesseum, Sethe 1928, 223; Altenmüller 1964, 273).

- Etymology uncertain.

- 1. E. Hornung (l.c.) surmizes a transformation from an older sense “Wurfholz zum Vogelfang (bei Ramses VI. deutlich als Netz mit Gitterstruktur gestaltet)”. Moreover, in his view, “lexikalisch besteht wohl ein Zusammenhang” between m^cj3.wt “Wurfholz” (PT 908e, so also Altenmüller 1964, 274) > ^cm^c3.w “Wurfholz” (CT V 186a) > ^cm^c3

“Wurfholz oder Netz” (NK) vs. m^o3^o.wj “die beiden Stangen der Leiter” (PT 468b, so also Sethe 1928, 223) > m^o3^o “Planke (oder ein anderer Schiffsteil)” (early MK). Dubious.

- 2. GT: the coincidence with ECh.: Kera ámàayà “Fischernetz” [Ebert 1976, 26] may be accidental.

m^ow^h (OK) > **mjw^h** (MK) “das Ruder” (old texts, Wb II 46, 14) = “paddle” (Birch apud Ceugney) = “rame” (Ceugney 1880, 6 after Brugsch) = “Ruderstange” (Müller 1894, 34) = “une sorte de bâton” (Jéquier 1921, 162, fn. 1) = “oar” (CT, AECT III 203 index; DCT 161) = “Riemen (rowing-oars)” (Düring 1995, 82) = “Paddel, Riemen” (VI.: 4x, ÄWb I 516).

NB: In Amduat, both m^ow^h.w vs. mjw^h.w are attested (Hornung 1963 II, 157, n. 4). For further evidence of the shift ʿ...h > j...h see Vycichl 1990, 254.

- Apparently a nomen instr. with a prefix m-. Etymology highly debated.
- 1. C. Ceugney (1880, 6) erroneously considered the late orthography mj(w)h and sought the etymon in a certain Eg. jh.w “javelines” (Pierret). False. H. Grapow (1914, 23) correctly registered the shift of m^ow^h (OK) > mjw^h (MK) and abstained from Ceugney’s derivation.
- 2. W. M. Müller (1894, 34) explained the OK vars. m^ow^h ~ m^ohw ~ m^oh from an Eg. *Urförm* *h^o attested as the hypothetic *wh^o “Art Schiff: wohl Fischerboot (nur als Schriftzeichen belegt)” (Wb I 348, 2), cf. wh^o “Fischer” (PT, Wb I 350, 1) ~ hw^o “altes Wort für Schiff (wohl wh^o zu lesen)” (OK, XXVI., Wb III 52, 1) ~ h^o.w “die Flotte” (MK, Wb III 39, 14), which he affiliated (with a remark “*ganz unverständlich*”) also with ʿh “Seil, Strick (der Fähre und am Netz)” (PT, BD, Wb I 213, 15–16). Rather unlikely.
- 3. G. Jéquier (1921, 162, fn. 1) affiliated it with a certain Eg. mh^h.w “bâtons, fourchus, recourbés du haut, dont plusieurs ont une fourche dans le bas” (Jéquier) = “Krummstab” (Kaplony, LÄ VI 1387: cf. IÄF 996 suppl.), which he derived (as nomen instr.) from Eg. hhj “chercher” assuming for mh^h.w an original lit. sense “instruments destinés à sonder le terrain, à chercher la route”, which, however, as Jéquier himself rightly admitted, “*ne peut évidemment pas s’appliquer à*” m^ow^h (OK). False.
- 4. E. Hornung (1963 II, 166, n. 2) identified its supposed etymon *w^oh with the Eg. hapax hrw jhj (Amduat, 10th hour) “ob vom Gesang der Ruderer?” (Wb I 122, 13) = “Taktruf” (Schott) = “Klang des

Ruderns (der Göttermannschaft) oder eher das Geräusch, das die Ruder (mjwḥw) fortgesetzt (vgl. Redupl.) beim Eintauchen machen” (Hornung), which he eventually derived from Eg. jwḥ (Nebenform jwḥ^o) “benetzen, befeuchten, begießen, bewässern, überfluten, befeuchten, sprengen” (since MK, Wb I 57, 1–8) < unattested OK *^owḥ. J. Zeidler (1999 II, 325, fn. 2) approved the derivation from MK jwḥ “benetzen usw.”, albeit only if the group m^o- of OK (!) m^owḥ stands for m- (as from MK on), i.e., our old word was mwḥ ~ mjwḥ (*m^owḥ^o). Improbable.

m^ob3 “Art Speer” (PT, Wb II 47, 1–3, cf. also RdE 15, 1963, 60, n. 1) = “harpoon” (FD 105) = “lance, spear, also harpoon” (Camino 1972, 219, cf. WD I 85) = “Harpune, (Fisch)Speer” (GHWb 327; ÄWb I 516). NB: Goodwin (1867, 95) explained Cpt. (B) $\text{H}\beta\lambda\text{I}$, (S) $\text{H}\beta\lambda\text{I}$ “a distaff or spindle” (CD 177b: “spindle”) from OK m^ob3 “javelin”, which is usually derived from Eg. nb3 (CED 86).

- Identical with Ar. mi^obal-at- “1. fer de flèche long et large, 2. flèche au fer long et large” [BK II 159] = “a broad and long arrow-head or an iron (iron-head) made broad, an arrow having a broad head” [Lane 1942] = “arrowhead” [Lsl.] = mi^obal-at- “arrow with a thick head” [Alb. 1919, 179, #11] = mi^obal-at- “a kind of arrow” [Ember after Nöldeke 1910, 55] = mi^obal-at- “large arrow point” vs. mi^obal- “cutting tool” [Frz. 1977, 164] = mi^obal-at- “arrow” [Vcl. 1983, 108] || Geez mā^oəbal ~ mā^oəbalt “1. tool, instrument, fittings, 2. arrow, weapon, spear” [Lsl. 1987, 54] = ma^obal “sharp instrument, arrow” [Ember] = mab^oal ~ mâ^o(^o)bal “instrument, utensil, weapon” [Alb. 1919, 179, #11] = ma^obal ~ mab^oal “trait, javelot” [Chn.] = mā^obal “telum, jaculum” [Vcl.] = ma^obäl “arrow” [Frz. 1977, 164]. The Eg.-Sem. stem *mV-^obVl- is apparently nomen instr. (cf. Grapow 1914, 23), but the basic meaning of the underlying Eg.-Sem. *^obl is disputed. Most suggestive is Ar. ʿabala “to be(come) large, big, bulky, thick” or ʿabala “to cut (off) to extirpate it” [Lane 1941].

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1926, 5, #1; 1930, #3.c.3, #5.a.19; Vcl. 1934, 55; 1958, 372; 1983, 108; Clc. 1936, #623; Chn. 1947, #57; HSED #1768.

NB1: Cf. Ar. mi^owal- “barre de fer pointue avec laquelle on brise les pierres” [BK II 412] = mi^owal- “a pickaxe or stone-cutter’s pick, the iron implement, a large faʿs-, with which are pecked or hollowed out rocks or great masses of stones” [Lane 2201] = “Spitzhaue” [Clc.] = “pic” [Chn.] with a shift of -b- > -w-?

NB2: W. F. Albright (1919, 179, #11), followed later by W. Leslau (1987, 84), combined the Geez and Ar. noun with Akk. (nA, jB) bēlu “etwa: Waffe” [AHW 120], which is uncertain. Following Dillmann, Albright derived Ar. mi^obal-at- “arrow with a thick head” from ʿabila “to be thick”.

NB3: Already Th. Nöldeke (1910, 55) separated Geez mā^oəbal “arrow” from Geez mab^oal “instrument”. Following him, A. Ember (1926, 5, #1) treated Ar. mi^obal-at- “a kind of arrow” as a borrowing from Geez mā^oəbal “arrow”.

nb4: P. Fronzaroli (1977, 160–4), in turn, saw the source of Geez ma⁶bāl “arrow” and Ar. mi⁶bal- “cutting tool”, mi⁶bal-at- “large arrow point” in Sem. *⁶bl > Ar. ⁶abala “to cut”, ⁶ablā- “white rock, narrow strip in the blackness of the earth, the stones of which are white”, ⁶a⁶bal- “white stone or mountain of which the stones are white” [Frz.], Dathina ⁶ibāl (pl.) “heaps of corn” [Frz.] | Sgt. pl. ⁶ēbhalēten “sharp stones”, cf. má⁶bher “rock” [Lsl. 1938, 293, 296], Mhr. ⁶aybēl [Frz.] = ⁶áybāl “flint(stone)” [Jns. 1987, 10] | Geez ⁶ubāl “hill” [Lsl. 1987, 54]. Fronzaroli set up two PSem. etymons, namely *⁶abl-at- “a white stone” vs. *⁶ibal- “white stones” (supposed source of the name of Ebla), both carrying the basic meaning “a rock of clear, shining appearance similar to flint but coarse-grained, prob. a variety of granite”. In Fronzaroli’s view, the occasional use of this rock as flintstone explains the Mhr. and Sgt. data, while the Ar. reflexes suggest the stone *⁶abl- was used for making baldes and points.

nb5: The authors of SISAJA I, #96 considered Geez ma⁶bal to be the met. of Geez mab⁶al (lit. “working tool”) explained from Sem. *p⁶l ~ *b⁶l “make, do”.

nb6: W. Leslau (1987, 54, 84) assumed in Geez the following scenarios: (1) Geez mā⁶əbal(t) derives directly from Geez ⁶bl II ⁶abbala “to make, do” (which Leslau linked to Sem. *⁶ml “to work”). (2) Geez mā⁶əbal(t) is met. of Geez mab⁶al ~ mab⁶al “iron tool, axe”, cognate with Ug. b⁶l “to make, manufacture, work” [DUL 203] || ESA b⁶l “to work, excavate bedrock (travailler, creuser le soubassement rocheux)” [SD 26].

nb7: V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1768) combined Ar. mi⁶bal-at- and Eg. m⁶b3 with WCh.: Bole ⁶umḅul “wegschleudern” [Lks. 1971, 133] < AA *mi⁶Vbal- “arrow, spear”, which is untenable. Elsewhere, more convincingly Orel and Stolbova (1990, 80, #51) compared Bole ⁶umḅul with Ar. nabala “jeter, lancer des traits, des dards”, nabl-at- “une flèche” [BK II 1187–8]. For Bole ⁶umḅul cf. also WCh.: Klr. ḅil “werfen (Stock usw.), bewerfen” [Jng. 1970, 351] = “to throw” [Nwm. 1977, 186] | Tng. bal “spear with a long blade” [Jng. 1991, 70], Kupto büléléy “werfen, schleudern” [Leger 1992, 18], Grm. bëel-áalā “to throw” [Schuh 1978, 118] || CCh.: Glavda bal “to throw, cast” [RB 1968, 13] | Zelgwa mbāl “to throw an arrow” [Brt. 1995, 202], Mada bāl “to shoot” [Rsg. 1978, 324, #635] | Puss bili “lancer, jeter (une seule chose)” [Trn. 1991, 79], perhaps Mbhara vlā [vl- < *bl-?] “jeter” & vül “lancer, jeter” [TSL 1986, 280] | Masa bil “couteau de jet” [Ctc. 1983, 38]. Note that these Ch. cognates are to be distinguished from Ch. *ḅal- “(to shoot an) arrow” [Stl.] (discussed below), which Stolbova (2005, 35) erroneously equated with Ar. nabala.

nb8: Assuming that Geez mā⁶əbal “arrow etc.” [Lsl.] and Eg. m⁶b3 are unrelated to any of the above listed forms, the two diverse basic meanings of Geez mā⁶əbal ~ mā⁶əbalt “1. tool” vs. “2. arrow” being due to contamination, we cannot exclude a derivation from AA *⁶b-l “to shoot” (or sim.) [GT], cf. WCh.: Hausa ḅillā “to throw” [Stl. 1996, 27] | Ron *ḅol “schießen” [GT]: Fyer ḅol, Bks. ḅol, DB ḅol (Ron: Jng. 1968, 12, #143; 1970, 392) || CCh.: Daba ḅāl “to throw (an arrow)” [Brt. 1995, 225] || ECh.: Sarwa ḅālāw, Gadang ḅālū “lance (de guerre)” (Somray gr.: JI 1993 MS, 8, #144). Note that Ch. *ḅ is reg. < *⁶/⁶h/*⁶/⁶h + *b. O. V. Stolbova (1996, 27) prefers equating this Ch. root with Ch. *^mb-l “to throw” [GT] (presented above), although the initial labials (*⁶b- vs. *b-) are different.

• Other etymologies cannot be accepted.

nb1: L. Homburger (1929, 168) compared Eg. m⁶b3 with Bantu (sic) u-goba “crotchet”, while in another paper (1930, 283) she equated Eg. m⁶b3 with Ful (Peul) gawal “lance”. Absolutely baseless.

nb2: H. Satzinger (1999, 376) considered GR m⁶b3 as a *Graphie* of *m⁶b and affiliated it with Eg. ⁶bb.t > ⁶bb “Speer” (MK, NK, GR, Wb I 178, 13) as well as ndb “verwunden” (BD), which he derived from AA *dVp “ausstoßen, werfen”.

m^ob3 “30” (OK, Wb II 46, 15), vocalized *má^oba3 (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 32) → Cpt.: (O) $\mu\text{O}\Pi$ in $\mu\text{O}\Pi\text{-}\tau\text{I}\epsilon$ “35” (Černý & Kahle & Parker 1957, 94) > (S) $\mu\lambda\lambda\text{B}$, (A) $\mu\lambda\lambda\text{B}\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\lambda\text{I}$ etc. “30” (KHW 87).

• Origin not clear. One of the “hard words”. Presumably enlarged by a prefix m- (as speculatively assumed in Grapow 1914, 23; Černý 1937, 57; DELC 108 without identifying the etymon).

■ **1.** W. F. Albright (1918, 92) & A. Ember (1926, 5, #2; 1930, #5.a.20): Eg. m^ob3 < *^obr identified with PB Hbr. m^oubbār “passage” [Albright] = “intercalated” [Ember].

NB1: Cp. also OHbr. *ma^oābār, st. cstr. ma^oabār “1. das Einfahren, Vorübergehen, 2. Ort des Übergangs”, ma^oābbārā “Furt”, JAram. ma^oābbārā “Furt, Fähre”, NHbr. mē^oābār “pass(age), crossing”, m^oubberet “pregnant”, šānā m^oubberet “leap year (in the Hebrew calendar consisting of 13 lunar months)” (Hbr.: GB 442; Šapiro 1963, 354).

NB2: This comparison leads us to Sem. *^obr “to transgress” [GT], which is semantically difficult to explain, cf. Akk. ebēru “überschreiten”, ebertu “jenseitiges Ufer” [AHW 182] || Hbr. ^obr “vorübergehen, überschreiten”, ^oēber “das Jenseitige eines Ufers, Tales, Meeres” [GB 558, 442, 560] || ESA: Sab. ^obr “to transgress, pass a boundary”, ^obr-n “other side (?)” [SD 11], Qtb. ^obr “side” [Ricks 1982, 170]. Albright guessed whether “*can it refer originally to the number of days in a lunar revolution or passage?*”, while Ember surmized that Eg. m^ob3 “*perhaps denoted primarily a month consisting of thirty days... Eg. m^ob3 has very early lost its original astronomical connotation, and survives only as ‘thirty’*”.

■ **2.** A. Loprieno (1986, 1309): the original meaning of Eg. m^ob3 might have been *^o“Komplettheit”, which he derived from Eg. ^ob3 “to present, provide” (OK, FD 41) = “ausgestattet sein” (Wb I 177, 5; GHWb 135). Semantically very weak.

■ **3.** GT: the primary meaning of Eg. m^ob3 presumed by A. Ember (1926, 5, #2) as *^o“lunar month of thirty days” finds typological support in NBrb.: Nefusa u-yēr “30” coming from u-yēr “lune” [Vcl.] = u-yér “luna nuova” [Bgn. 1942, 240] “à cause des 30 jours de mois” (DELC 108, cf. Wlf. 1954, 31). In the light of these parallels, the coincidence of Eg. m^ob3 < *^obr ~ *^orb (?) with Cu.-Om. *HarP- “moon” [GT] is highly noteworthy.

NB1: Attested in Agaw *^oarb- > *^oarf- “moon” [Apl.]: Bilin arb-ā [Mnh.] = ^oorbā “moon” [Apl.], Hamir arb-ā “moon” [Mnh.], Hamta arb-a “moon” [Apl.], Qwara & Dembea arf-ā “moon” [Apl.], Qmt. arf-a “month” [Apl.] | Awngi árf-á “moon” [Apl.] (Agaw: Mnh. 1912, 236; Apl. 1989 MS, 2; 1991, 8) || HECu.: Sid. (Agaw loan?) arb-ā ~ arf-ā “moon, month” [Flm.] || NOM.: PGmr. *yarf “moon” [GT]: She erf, Benesho i^oyērp || SOM. *^oarP- “moon, month” [GT]: Ari ^oarfi, Hamer arfi, arpi, Dime errop, erpo, erfō, irbo, irpo (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 154; SOM.-Cu.: Flm. 1974, 90, #16; 1976, 320).

NB2: H. C. Fleming (1974, 90, #16) compared the Cu.-Om. root with Sem.: Ug. ^orp-t “cloud” [WUS 243, #2102]. Cp. still Akk. urpatu “cloud” [AHW 1432], Hbr. ^oarāpel “dark clouds” [GB 621] || Bed. afra “cloud” [Rn. 1895, 9]. For Ug.-Bed. see Ehret (1995, 353, #694). If Bed.-Sem. *^or-p “cloud” is related to Cu.-Om. *H-r-P “moon”, we have probably to give up combining the latter with Eg. m^ob3 “30” (Eg. -b- ≠ Sem. *-p-).

m^on “verschönern (von Stöcken) (?)” (late NK Pap. Anastasi IV, rt. 17:3, Wb II 47, 5) = “to embellish” (Camino 1954 LEM, 216) = “embellished” (DLE I 213) = “verschönern” (GHWb 327).

NB: For a different interpretation cf. Junge 2003, 259, n. 528.

- As pointed out by H. Grapow (1914, 23) and R. Camino (l.c.), it derives from Eg. ^on “schön (sein)” (MK, Wb I 190), whose origin is disputed.

NB: The etymologies offered so far are: (1) A. Ember (1913, 115, #52) suggested an etymological connection with the lost PEG. *^o(j)n “eye” quoting parallels like Germ. schön ~ schauen or Hbr. rā’ū “proper, worthy” < Sem. *r’y “to see”. (2) C. Brockelmann (1932, 102, #14): ~ Ar. pl. ʔa-^oyān- “die Notabeln”. (3) O. Rössler (1971, 291): Eg. ^ojn (sic) equated with Ar. zyn “verschönern, schmücken”, but there is no convincing evidence for Eg. ^o ~ Sem. *z (cf. EDE I 357–361). (4) GT: perhaps ~ HECu. *el- “to be better” [Hds. 1989, 409]? HECu. *el- < *^oal-? (5) GT: of extra-AA origin? Cf. PCKhoisan *!an “good” [Baucom 1972, 20]?

m^on “(Hände und Füße) schlagen, Bastonade geben” (XX., Pap. Mayer A, Wb II 47, 6) = “Fesselung” (Grapow 1914, 23) = “twisting of limbs” (Peet 1930, 21) = “a torture applied to witnesses, suspects, and culprits” (Smith 1978, 362) = “to be twisted” (DLE I 216) = “drehen, schrauben” (Helck, LÄ II 279 after Peet) = “(denotes a corporal punishment affecting a criminal’s arms and feet)” (Willems 1990, 34, fn. 29) = “verdrehen (bei der Folter)” (GHWb 327) = “etw. winden, (ver)drehen” (Junge 1999, 351) = “schlagen” (WD I 85 after Willems l.c.). R. Camino (1958, 123, §192) found the same word in the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon: [m]^on “to beat, bastinado or perhaps twist (as a form of punishment)”.

NB: The -^o- was apparently to be read as certain GW forms (in Pap. Mayer A 3–4 passim, 3:6) betray, therefore mn (proposed in DLE or by Willems) or mnn (Helck, LÄ II 279) can hardly be correct, albeit not to be excluded either.

- Reading and meaning debated. Origin obscure.

NB: As R. Camino (l.c., fn. 1) rightly states: “*the exact meaning of mn or m^on remains to be determined, at all events, the verb denotes the infliction of some form of physical punishment*”.

- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 23): enlarged by prefix m- < Eg. ^onn “umwinden (?)” (PT 425, Wb II 192, 9), which is certainly valid for Eg. m^onn (cf. the following entry).

NB: H. Smith (1978, 362), W. Helck (l.c.), and R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) suggest (reading -nn) a direct identification with Eg. m^onn (q.v.).

- 2. H. Willems (1990, 34 & fn. 29) read mn and supposed to have found its older etymon in MK mn “to sever (neck as capital punishment)” (stela no. 9 of Sirenput I in the Heqaib sanctuary). Improbable.

NB: The other instance of MK mn occurring in CT VI 162k has been rendered diversely. AECT II 169: a spelling of mnj “to die”; AL 78.1703 and Willems: “être séparé”; Barguet (1986, 343): spelling of mn “to suffer”.

- 3. GT: if, however, the rendering “to beat” is correct, the following AA parallels should be noted:

(1) Ch. *m-n “to beat” [GT] > WCh.: Ngz. mənú “to knock down with a blow, hit sg.” [Schuh 1981, 105] || CCh.: Guley mamunde “schlagen” [Lks. 1937, 95] | (?) Mada ámmara [-r- reg. < *n-] “être couvert d’ecchymoses, de traces de coups, être roué de coups” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 192].

(2) Ar. ma‘ala VIII “porter à qqn. des coups de lance, ou percer coup sur coup avec un instrument pointu” [BK II 1129] || NAgaw: Kemant millō “coup donné sur la joue gonflé” [CR 1912, 229], cf. Amh. millō “petit coup appliqué par le vainqueur sur la jouedu vaincu au jeu de l’akāndurā” [CR] || LECu.: Afar málāy (m) “managing to kill sb. who has mortally wounded one, beating mercilessly with all on’s strength, scoring a bull’s eye”, malāye “to beat mercilessly, have a good aim, hit a target” [PH 1985, 162] || WCh.: Tangale malī “to beat” [Jng. 1991, 118] = mál- “to beat”, mālō “beating” [Kidda 1985, 208, #268 & 217, #61] || ECh.: Mkl. (t)imlā “2. gifler” [Jng. 1990, 112].

m^onn (or **mnn**?) “gewunden sein” (XX., Wb II 81, 25) = “gewunden sein (von den geschraubten Hörnern der älteren Widderart)” (Hornung 1963 II, 164, #696) = “gewunden sein (Hörner auf Krone)” (GHWb 327) = “curved (of the downward curving type of horns), basic mng.: twist(ed)” (Hovestreydt 1997, 110, n. o) → Ptol. m^onn (or mnn?) “περιλαμβάνω, circulare” (Ceugney 1880, 7 after Pierret) = “herumgewunden sein” (Wb II 47, 7) = “to be wound round” (CED 85) = “tordre, tresser, torsader” (AL 77.1665) = “to be bound” (Smith 1978, 362). NB: The exx. of Dyn. XX lack -^o-, while the GR one has it combined with m- (EG 1927, 460, G20: phon. value only m-). In the Wb Belegstellen a reading mnn is preferred.

- From the same root: (1) m^onn “das aus zwei Stricken zusammengewundene Seil” (NK: Pfortenbuch II 14, 61f., 158 etc., Wb II 47, 9) = “das gewundene Seil” (Hornung 1963 II, 164, #696) = “twisted rope” (CED) = “Art Strick” (Osing, LÄ III 948) = “der Doppeltgewundene” (Hornung 1980, 158; Zeidler 1999 II, 167, fn. 2) = “Schlangenseil, aus dessen Windungen die Stunden entstehen” (Pfortenbuch, Kákosy, LÄ VI 1363) = “Seil (aus zwei Stricken zusammengewunden)” (GHWb 327); (2) mnn.wj (written with no -^o-) “die beiden Verschlungenen (von zwei Schlangen)” (NK: Amduat II 19, 164, Wb II 47, 8; GHWb 327) = “die beiden Gewundenen (Schlangen)” (Ceugney 1880, 7) = “Doppeltgewundener (eine Gottheit)” (Hornung 1963 II, 164, #696) = “eine verschränkte Doppelschlange” (Hornung 1980, 159); (3) mnn (GW: m^onjn) “instrument de torture” (AL 77.1666) = “ein Werkzeug zum Verdrehen der Hände und Füße (?)” (Helck, LÄ II 279) = “screw” (DLE II 218) = “Handgelenkschraube (als Instrument der Tortur)” (Junge 1999, 351) = “Schraube (als Folterbezeichnungin Grabräuberprozessen)” (Zeidler 1999 II, 167, fn. 2); (4) mnn “torsion, twisting” (late 3rd cent. BC, CED 85, cf. Lefévyre 1923–4 II, 23, no. 50:4; Belegst. to Wb II 47, 7) = “tordre (le lin)” (AL 77.1665).

NB1: The traditional reading m^cnn (Wb, GHWb) is doubtful. It is perhaps influenced by the hypothetical derivation from Eg. ^cnn (below). Both NEg. mnn (GW) “gewunden sein” (Wb) and mnn.wj “die beiden Verschlungenen” (Wb) were written without -^c-, in which W. Westendorf (1989, 109) supposes a loss (*Schwund*, sic!) of -^c-. However, both J. Černý (CED 85) and W. Vycichl (DELIC 116) transcribed consistently all reflexes of the root as mnn.

NB2: Vocalized in NBÄ 209, 682, n. 766 as *m^cni^c/un^c(y) in the pattern *m^csdim^w of nomina agentis and instr., hence XX. *ma(?)nīnā (Zeidler 1999 II, 167, fn. 2). W. Vycichl (DELIC 116), however, assumed a pass. part. *mannūn.aw

NB3: Pfortenbuch m^c “Schlangenseil, aus dessen Windungen die Stunden entstehen” (Kákosy, LÄ VI 1363) has hardly anything to do with ^cm.w “Verschlinger” (Hornung 1980 II, 194–5), but may be rather a strongly abbreviated var. of m^cnn, which W. Westendorf (1989, 109) explained with an (unjustified) *Lautübergang* n > 3 > ^c.

- Hence: Cpt.: (S) μαμιν, μαλλιν, μαλια “band, cord” (CD 176a) = “Band, Schnur” (NBÄ 682, n. 766) = “Biegung, Windung” (KHW 95) derived by H. Smith (1978, 362) directly from NK m^cn (XX., above). This etymology is absent in CED.

NB1: The dissimilation of -n- > -l- was influenced by m- (Osing, LÄ III 948). Or *vice versa* (*m-l-l > m-n-n due to m-)?

NB2: The 2nd sense of Cpt. (B) μῶμμεν “1. bewegen, 2. flechten, drehen” (KHW 95, 519) = “1. to (be) shake(n), twisted” (CD 176a) = “1. mouvoir, ébranler, 2. tressé (στρεπτός)” (DELIC 116) may be due to a late contamination of two distinct roots (cf. also Eg. mmmn “to move”, below).

- Etymology highly disputable.

- 1. C. Ceugney (1880, 7) derived mnn from nn (sic), cf. Eg. nn.t “replis (?)” (CT, AL 78.2131) = “coils (?)” (DCT 232), which he considered to be related with nnwḥ (sic) as its “*forme élargi*” (!).
- 2. W. Vycichl (1933, 178, #8), J. Osing (NBÄ 209), and J. Zeidler (1999 II, 167, fn. 2) assumed a root m^cnn originating from Eg. ^cnn (rope det.). “umwinden (?)” (PT 425b, Wb II 192, 9; GHWb 144; ÄWb I 271–2) = “1. sich winden, wenden, 2. umwinden” (NBÄ 209) = “to bound up, wind round, surround, coil up” (CT, DCT 73), cf. hence ^cnn.w “coil, ribbon” (CT II 115c, DCT 73) and ^cnn.wj “Bez. zweier Schlangen, die umwinden” (NK, Wb I 192, 10). The latter occurs in Amduat II 19 in connection with mnn.wj (written without -^c-). This derivation was apparently abandoned by J. Černý (CED 85) and W. Vycichl (DELIC 116) who assume a root mnn.

NB1: Was the similarity of PT-CT ^cnn vs. NK m^cnn pure chance? Was the occasional -^c- of NK-GR m^cnn ~ mnn perhaps due to a secondary contamination, a false *Völksetymologie*?

NB2: Vycichl (l.c.) equated Eg. ^cnn mistakenly with SBrb.: Hgr. e-qqen, caus. sūyen, habit. sūyūn “umwinden, (ver)binden”. Phonologically incorrect (Brb. *q- ≠ Eg. ^c-). Moreover, the Brb. root is cognate with Eg. qn “weben (?)” (GR, Wb V 50, 5), qnj. w “weaver” (Edfu, PL 1063, cf. Meeks in RdE 24, 1972, 117, n. 4) ||| WCh.: (?) Angas gyin “to tie (of animals, leather apron, leaves)” [Flk. 1915] | Tsagu ʔun- “to tie” [Skn. 1977, 44] | Boghom kan “to tie” [Nwm.], Buli kənnu “to tie” [Nwm.] || CCh.: Tera gəni “to tie” [Nwm. 1964, 49, #536], Pidlimdi gīna “to tie” [Krf.], Hwona kinəʔ “to tie” [Krf.], Gaʼanda kinənci “to tie” [Krf.], Gabin kinənci “to tie” [Krf.], Boka kinà-ḏa “to tie” [Krf.] | Daba kən “to tie” [Nwm.] = kīr [Krf.] |

Lame kənwa & Misme kan “to tie” [Nwm.] || ECh.: Tumak koḡ “tordre, courber” [Cpr. 1975, 77], Mokilko kiní “tresser (nattes, cheveux)” [Jng. 1990, 122] (Ch.: Nwm. 1977, 33, #133; Kraft 1981, #422). See Zhl. 1934, 112 (Eg-SBrb.); Bynon 1984, 279–280, #45 (Ch.-Brb.); HSED #1546 (Eg-Brb.-Ch.).

NB3: Eg. ^cnn is cognate with Ar. ^canna IV “3. tourner qqn. de tel ou tel côté” [BK II 377] = “sich abwenden von (^can), begegnen” (cf. ^can “away from”) [Vcl.], which are presumably ultimately related to Eg. ^cn “umwenden” (MK, Wb I 188–189) = “to turn back, return” (FD 43) || Sem.: Akk. enū “umwenden, ändern” [AHW 220] || Hbr. ^cny “to answer, reply”, cf. ^cny nifal “1. to bend, 2. be(come) bowed” [KB 851–3]. For Eg-Sem. see Erman 1892, 108; Albright 1918, 229; 1927, #61; Ember 1926, 302, fn. 10; Clc. 1936, #135; Vcl. 1958, 381; Ward 1961, 37, #19; AHW 220; Hodge 1991, 173. In any case, OEg. ^cnn has nothing to do with Brb. *^c-qqəl (from *^cvwkl?) “revenir” [Dst. 1925, 267] as proposed by W. Vycichl (1933, 178, #7).

- **3.** GT: following J. Černý (CED 85) and W. Vycichl (DELIC 116) in assuming an original root mnn, we find an alternative etymology represented by Ch. *m-n “to twist” (or sim.) [GT], cf. WCh.: Grnt. mənni “to turn round”, manni “to squeeze” [Jgr. 1989, 188] = móní “to turn (round)” [Haruna 1992 MS, 24] || CCh.: Htk. (Hide) mānda “tordre, serrer” [Eguchi 1971, 219] | Mafa mín- “filer du coton” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 227].

- **4.** GT: or, Eg. mnn < *mll could be a perfect match of LECu.: Orm. mēl-aḏḏa (intr.) “1. to sprain, 2. strain (joints)”, mēll-ō “foot or tooth turned in wrong direction”, mēll-annā “turning in wrong direction” [Gragg 1982, 283] || WCh.: Tng. malle “to intertwine (two: rope, thread, cotton, etc.), cf. malme “1. to put a thread, rope, etc., around an object, 2. embrace, coil (snake)” [Jng. 1991, 119] || ECh.: EDng. māliyē “wickeln” [Ebobisse 1979, 141; 1987, 100], also māmīlē “sich um etwas oder jmdn. drehen” [Ebs. 1979, 149; 1987, 79] < AA *m-l-l “to twist” [GT].

NB: The Cpt. evidence does not evidently (contra NBÄ 209) reveal whether the root had *-l or *-n.

m^cnḥ.t “(in dem Ausruck: ḥrj-tp m^cnḥ.t n.t m3^c.t als Beiwort des Horus)” (PT 815a, Wb II 47, 14) = “Art Stütze worauf ein Vogel ruhen kann (?)” (Grapow 1914, 23) = “le longue bâton fourchu (≈ ^cb.t ailleurs) sur lequel avaient coutume de s’appuyer les vieillards” (sic) (Jéquier 1921, 147–8) = “Gebiet (!), Waffe, Stab” (ÜKAPT VI 130) = “gegabelter Stock” (Osing 1980, 221, 223–4) = “a staff” (AEPT 147, utt. 440, n. 2; Fischer 1978, 159; PT & CT; DCT 162: CT) = “eine Gabel (?)” (Snk. 1999, 88) = “ein Szepter” (PT, GHWb 328; ÄWb I 517) = “ein Stab” (WD I 85: cf. JEA 64, 1978, 159).

NB1: Occurs in a pun with ^cnḥ (Sander-Hansen 1948, 11).

NB2: Rendered by G. Jéquier (1921, 66, fn. 7) in PT 815 as “contrepoids (comme le nom du collier)” (similarly E. Staehelin 1966, 122: “Gegengewicht”), which was firmly disproved by H. G. Fischer (l.c.).

NB3: G. Jéquier (1921, 147–8) considered its peculiar det. with a forked ending as due to a confusion with the det. of Eg. mn^h.t “cloth” (q.v.) depicting a “horizontal strip of cloth with two strands of a fringe” (EG 1927, 494).

- Hence: mn^h.t “Art Stab” (MK, Wb II 88, 5) = “ein Gabelstab” (GHWb 341).

NB: Via *mjnh.t < m^onh.t (for the shift of OK ^o > MK j under the influence of h cf. Osing 1980; Vcl. 1990, 255)?

- Derives from the Eg. root ^onh with prefix m-, though its basic mng. is disputed.

NB: (1) J. Osing (1980, 221, fn. 36 & pp. 223–4): < Eg. ^onh “leben” with no explanation for the semantic shift, while (2) W. Schenkel (1999, 88) assumed a lit. sense “zusammengebundenes (?)” < Eg. ^onh “lier” postulated already by P. Montet (1928, 6). (3) G. Jéquier (1921, 147–8; 1921, 167 & fn. 5) erroneously combined it with Eg. m^hn “Art Stock oder Szepter” (PT, MK, Wb, q.v.) rendered as “un bâton pour se reposer (au course d’une marche)” < Eg. hnj “se (re)poser” (sic).

m^onh.t > MK vars. ^onh.t ~ mjnh.t “Art Troddel als Halsschmuck” (MK, Wb II 47, 11) = “houppes pour les colliers” (Ceugney 1880, 5 after Brugsch) = “le pendant, contrepoids comme le nom du collier” (Jéquier 1921, 66 & fn. 7) = “une amulette de protection” (Jéquier 1921, 145–6) = “un ornament” (Montet 1928, 6) = “Gegengewicht (nicht nur Gebrauchs- und Schmuckgegenstand, sondern auch Auszeichnung und Kraftträger)” (Stahelin 1966, 122 & fn. 9 after Jéquier) = “back-tassel, counterpoise (of necklace)” (Smith 1979, 161) = “Troddel, Quaste” (VI., Osing 1980, 221–3) = “pendentif” (Vcl. 1990, 255) = “counterpoise (acting as a protector of the body of the king and making his limbs healthy and live)” (PL 416).

NB: For later vars. mjnh.t ~ m³h.t cf. Fecht 1974, 197 (with further lit.).

- Derives from the Eg. root ^onh with prefix m- (Grapow 1914, 23), though its basic mng. is disputed.

NB: (1) Usually explained from Eg. ^onh “to live”. Thus, e.g., C. Ceugney (1880, 5): lit. “amulette préservatrice pour l’autre vie”; G. Jéquier (1921, 66; 1921, 145–6): act. “ornament pour vivre, pour la vie (terme qui convient à une amulette de protection)” (falsely rendering the prep. m as “for”); H. Smith (1979, 161): lit. “that by which one is kept alive”, followed by P. Wilson (PL 416). So also E. Stahelin (l.c.) and J. Osing (l.c., esp. p. 221, fn. 36) failing to explain the semantic shift. (2) P. Montet (1928, 6), in turn, derived it from a hypothetic Eg. *^onh “lier” based on ^onh “bouquet, bandeau” and ^onh “serment, jurer (en effet un lien)”. Cf. also Schenkel 1999, 88.

m^ond.t “das Schiff der Sonne am Morgen und am Tage” (PT, Wb II 48, 1–8) = “day-bark of sun-god” (FD 105) = “evening boat” (PL 415) = “Tagesbarke, Morgenbarke (des Sonnengottes Re)” (ÄWb I 517).

NB: Cf. m^odn (sic) “boat” in CT VII 488f, which Lesko (1972, 34, 145) supposes to stand for m^ond.t.

- Nom. loci of ^ond, although it is disputable which Eg. root ^ond in fact underlies.

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 23) etc.: < ʿnd.w “Sonnenglanz” (OK, Wb I 207, 13) = “dawn” (FD 45).

NB: The origin of this root is not clear. Most recently falsely compared with CCh.: Falī unṣu “sun” [Str. 1910, 460] | Buduma āṣī “sun” [Lks. 1939, 90] = àṣī [Cyffler] | Mbara nṣā: “day” [TSL 1986, 292] || ECh.: Kera ṣè “Tag verbringen” [Ebert 1976, 59] | Kabalay ṣe “day” [Cpr.] | Tumak nṣā “day” [Cpr. 1975, 88], Ndam ṣów “sun” [Jng.], Gadang & Sarwa ṣa “sun” [Jng.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 313). See Blz. 1996, 135 (Eg.-ECh.); OS 1992, 189 and HSED #1141 (Eg.-Mbara-ECh.); Sts. etc. 1995, 27 (Eg.-CCh.-Tumak). Phonologically unconvincing (OEg. d ≠ ECh. *ṣ probably < *d).

- **2.** W. F. Albright (1917, 34) and P. Wilson (PL 415) derived m^cnd.t from Eg. ʿd “wohlbehalten sein” (MK, Wb I 237–8) = “to be safe, become whole” (FD 51), based on the parallelism with Eg. msk.t.t “night-bark of the sun-god” < skj “to perish” (cf. Akk. šalām šamši “sun-set”, lit. “death of the sun”). Less probable, since an orig. Eg. *ʿnd cannot be proven.

NB: The etymology of OEg. ʿd (or *ʿnd?) is debated. **(1)** Traditionally explained from Eg. *ʿnd < *ʿld equated with Ar. ʿlḡ I: ʿaliḡa “kräftig, gesund sein”, III: ʿālaḡa “to cure, treat (medically), restore”, Geez ʿālgat “Kraft, Sieg” [Clc.] = “trophy of a battle (e.g. genitalia), triumph” [Lsl. 1987, 60]. For Eg.-Sem.: Alb. 1918, 238; Ember 1930, #5.a.14; Clc. 1936, #137; Vrg. 1945, 135, #9.b.2, 146 #24.a.1. **(2)** GT: Eg. *ʿd < PAA *γ-ĉ “to be flourishing, be fresh” [GT], cf. Sem. *γdd: Ar. yaḏda I “être plein de vigueur, de sève, de jeunesse (se dit d’un homme, d’une plante)”, II “être dans le bien-être, prospérer”, yaḏd- “1. frais, tendre, nouveau, 2. plein de vigueur et de santé (homme)” [BK II 473–4] = yaḏd- “fresh, lush” [Hodge] ||| Bed. yaḏa? “feucht, nass, grün, unreif sein” [Rn. 1895, 241] || LECu.: PSam *ʿaydi “unripe” [Heine 1978, 77] || SCu. *ʿEĉ- [*-ĉ- reg < *-ĉ-] “unripe, raw” [GT]: Irq. & Alg. ʿeĉ | Ma’a iṣé (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 277) ||| WCh.: Diri yaḏa “unripe, wet” [Skn. 1977, 47]. LIT.: Hodge 1968, 27 (Ar.-Eg.-Hausa); Dlg. 1987, 209, #104 (SCu.-LECu.). **(3)** W. A. Ward (1962, 412, fn. 3; 1968, 69): Eg. ʿd ~ Sem. *ʿzz “to be strong, powerful”. Untenable (Eg. d ≠ Sem. *z). **(4)** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 176): Eg. ʿd equated with ECu. *ʿēg- “to watch, look out” [Sasse 1982, 67]. Unconvincing both phonologically (Eg. ʿ- ≠ ECu. *ʿ-) and semantically. Besides, ECu. *ʿēg- is related to SBrb.: Hgr. agg “bewachen” as suggested by O. Rössler (1964, 207).

- m^cr** “ausgezeichnet, fehlerlos o.ä.: 1. glücklich (vom Menschen), 2. glücklich gelingen, erfolgreich sein (von Handlungen, Absichten), 3. (vom Tempel, der mit etwas) fehlerlos versehen (ist)” (OK, Wb II 48–49) = “fortunate, successful, flourishing” (FD 105) = “fortunate (conveying the implication of material perfection rather than of spiritual bliss)” (Gdk. 1970, 116).

NB1: The late (from XIX.) form m^crd (hence also m^cd, cf. Brusch 1882, 64; Osing 1998, 93, n. ae & fn. 422) “without defects, happy, successful, fortunate” (DLE I 229) = “prospérer” (Ceugney) = “glücklich, eig. gedeihend (?)” (Erman), which was erroneously derived in some early works from Eg. rd “to grow” (Ceugney 1880, 7; Erman 1896, 35), is probably just a miswritten form due to a contamination of m^cr vs. rd “wachsen” (PT, Wb II 462) motivated by their common det. (M31–32) as supposed by Gardiner (1904, 76) and Langlois (1919, 158, fn. 2). It has therefore hardly any connection with Sem.: Syr. mārīd “munitus, tutus” [Brk.] | Ar. mrd “7. être audacieux, hardi” [BK II 1088] = “beständig sein” [Rsl.] (Rsl. 1971, 286; Sem. *mrd ~ Eg. m3^c < *mrd, cf. above).

NB2: Apparently there was no Cpt. reflex. (SB) $\mu\text{IO}=\text{}$, (F) $\mu\text{IA}=\text{}$ “hail! thanks!” (CD 158b) = “se bien porter, aller bien” (Mallon, RT 27, 155–6) = “heil sei...! danke!” (KHW 88) = “être en bonne santé (en général employé comme optatif et formule de remerciement)” (DELIC) was traced back by W. Spiegelberg (1906, 210, §xxxii; Spg. KHW 56) to OK m^cr (which he falsely read mjr/*mjór= with G10 for mj-): $\mu\text{IO}=\text{K}$ (mjr=k) “du bist glücklich”, $\mu\text{IO}=\text{T}\mu$ (mjr=t μ) “ihr seid glücklich”, but this etymology is not commonly accepted as there are a number of alternative proposals. Thus, Černý (CED 78–79) saw in it a contraction from an earlier $\mu\text{HIO}=\text{}$, where explained $\text{-IO}=\text{}$ from j3wj “old age” (rejected in DELIC 109). Osing (NBA 510): < *mj j3w=, act. “nimm deinen Lobpreis”? Westendorf (KHW 88 & fn. 1): < jmj ʕ3j=k “mögest du geehrt, groß sein” or < m3ʕ=k. The ideas of Westendorf and Spiegelberg were declined by Osing because of the missing trace of -e- in the Vortonsilbe (whereby it should have been * $\mu\text{HIO}=\text{}$).

- **1.** GT: probably related to Sem.: perhaps MSA *m^cr: Jbl. $\delta\text{c}^{\text{ar}}$ “to tell so. not to do sg. which is causing difficulty”, $\text{ə}m\text{te}^{\text{c}}\text{ér}$ “to do so. a favour because he is seen to be in difficulty” [Jns. 1981, 168] (GT: orig. meaning “to be good to so.”?) ||| NOm.: Jnj. (Yemsa) maʔar “good” [Bnd. 1971, 258, #33] = maʔar “good, kind” [Wdk. 1990, 13] = māʔār “good” [Aklilu n.d.; Aklilu & Sbr. 1993, 21] ||| WCh.: Hausa móórè “to feel enjoyment” [Abr. 1962, 678]. From AA *m^c-r “good” (or sim.) [GT], which is probably related to AA *m^c-r-y/w “good” [GT] (originally a var. root?).

NB1: Attested in EBrb.: Augila (m) mṛī, pl. mṛīy-en, (f) mṛīy-et, pl. mṛīy-īt “bello” [Prd. 1960, 161] ||| WCh.: Tng. marmara “successful(ly) (of a spear thrust)” [Jng. 1991, 119] | Jimbin mur “good, beautiful” [Skn. 1977, 23] || CCh.: perhaps Chibak mār-ti [unless -r- < * -n-] “1. verbessern, 2. reinigen” [Hfm. 1955, 135] | Glavda máraw(à) “good” [RB 1968, 63] = marawà “good” [Kraft 1981, #293] | Puss mariya “mieux vaut... , plutôt” [Trn. 1991, 103] || ECh.: Kera marya (adv.) “besser” [Ebert 1976, 80] | (?) WDng. mèèrám “bon, bien” [Fédry 1971, 124] = “good, beautiful” [Skn. 1977, 23]. Jimbin mur has hardly anything to do with NBCh. *mb-n as N. Skinner (l.c.) suggests. Glavda máraw(à) [RB] is to be separated from PCh. *mbar- [cf. JS 1981, 122A].

NB2: Cf. perhaps also Geez maʔārʔara “to become sweet like honey” < maʔār ~ maʔar “honey” [Lsl. 1987, 327].

- Other proposals cannot be accepted:
- **2.** L. Homburger (1928, 333) suggested a false comparison with WCh.: Hausa múrnà “gladness, pleasure” [Abr. 1962, 686] and a number of unconvincing Afr. parallels: Ful (Peul) male-de “être heureux”, mettì “agréable au goût” (sic), Dinka amyed-puóu “heureux”, amíd “doux”.

NB: Hausa múrnà “gladness, rejoicing” [Abr. 1962, 686] derives as nomen actionis from a root *r-n, cf. Hbr. rnn “to jubilate, give a cry of joy” | Ar. ranā “to rejoice” (Sem.: Zbr. 1971, §203) ||| Eg. rnn “jubeln” (MK, Wb II 435, 9–10). Cf. Brk. 1932, 109, §42; Greenberg 1950, 180; Castellino 1984, 16.

- **3.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 308, #592), ignoring Eg. m^cr, derived its late var. mrd (sic) “without defects” < AA *määr- (sic) “to be happy, fortunate, healthy”.

NB1: Based on the semantically debatable equation with Ar. maraḥa “to be merry and boisterous”, maraḥa “jest, sport” ||| PCu. *marc̣- “to be without care, be merry”

||| NOM. *mār- “to get well” > Jnj. (Yemsa) mār-àm- “to be healed” | Mocha mār- “to get over having roundworms”.

- **4.** More recently, Ehret (1997, 217, #1845) identified both Eg. m^cr and m³c.t “ideal state of things” (q.v.) with ECu. *mē^c- “to be good, well off, right”. False.
- **5.** GT: its coincidence with TTM Aram. mə^calləyā “vorzüglich”, mə^calləyūtā “Vorzüglichkeit, Verbesserung” [Dalman 1922, 246] = mə^callī, mə^calləyā “gut, vorzüglich”, mə^calləyūtā “Güte, Vorzüglichkeit” [Levy 1924 II 193] = ma^calyā “good, perfect, valid”, ma^calyūtā “perfection, excellence, improvement” [Jastrow 1950, 817] is striking, but probably only accidental.

NB: This sense of the underlying root (Sem. *^cly) is not reflected in Eg. j^cr, whence m^cr might be in principle derived.

- **6.** GT: a connection with Ar. mari^ca “in Fülle und Fruchtbarkeit leben” [Růžička] = “abonder en pâturages (se dit d’un lieu, d’un vallée)” [BK II 1093] is also to be excluded.

NB: Following BK etc., Růžička explained it via Ar. marī^c- “qui abonde en pâturages et en denrées” [BK] from ry^c “in guten, blühenden Verhältnissen sein, gelingen” [Růžička]. Nevertheless, similarly striking is the (equally accidental) coincidence of Ar. mara^ca “2. oindre abondamment d’huile (la tête, les cheveux)” [BK II 1093] with Eg. (CT VI 5a) m^cr “anointed one (of wig)” (DCT 163 contra AECT II 108, where it is rendered simply “fortunate”).

m^cr (GR **m^cr.t**) “Art Kleid der Götter” (NK & GR, Wb II 59, 2; GHWb 328) = “chaînes, vêtements” (Ceugney 1880, 5 after Brugsch) = “clothes of god” (Edfu, PL 416).

NB1: M. Görg (1975, 18) sees in it the source of OT Hbr. mō^cīl “sleeveless, cloak-like outer garment (either non-sacral or formal vestment of the high-priest)” [KB 612] in spite of its Sem. etymology.

NB2: C. Ceugney’s (l.c.) derivation of ΗΑΙΡΕ “fasciculus alligatus” < m^cr.t is false (cf. CED 88; KHW 99; DELC 119).

- P. Wilson (PL l.c.) explained it from Eg. m^cr “to be good” (sic) suggesting a lit. mng. “a very good quality cloth (exact nature unknown)”. NB: C. Ceugney’s (l.c.) derivation of m^cr.t from a certain Eg. ^cr is baseless.

m^cr “probably grain from a plant *m^cr” (late NK hapax: Pap. Golénischeff, AEO II 228*, #507) = “eine Pflanze” (GHWb 388).

NB: A. H. Gardiner (AEO l.c.) identified the plant in question with that (unattested in texts) depicted in the hrgl. serving as phon. det. of the root m^cr (in the OK similar to M1, later to V29 as a corruption of the former; cf. EG 1927, 468, 510).

- Etymology obscure. GT: any connection to ES: Tigre ma^cro and Tna. mā^car-k^wak^w “a shrub” [Lsl. 1982, 50] ||| SCu.: Irq. mā^cārā “peas” [Mgw. 1989, 115] = ma^cārā (f) “legume stalk like beans, runner bean, peas” [MQK 2002, 68]?

NB: Langlois (1919, 158) derived m^cr from an older mwr (sic) ~ mr “Bündel” (CT) < mr “binden” (Med., Wb II 105), which he eventually affiliated even with Ar. mawz- “1. bananier, 2. banane (fruit)” [BK II 1167], which is simply absurd.

m^oḥ3 “(den Ellenbogen mh) aufstützen o.ä.” (PT 449 & 574, Grapow 1914, 24) = “(m^oḥ3-^o) mit wehrhaftem Unterarm” (ÜKAPT II 241) = “(m^o3-^o) (lit.) fighter with the arm, i.e., The Ready Fighter” (AEPT 91, utt. 301, n. 7: PT 449 & 113, utt. 335, n. 2: PT 574).

NB: For its MK var. mj3 (Lebensmüder 150), displaying the interchange of -^o- > -j- in the proximity of -h-, cf. also jḥ3 “Kämpfer” (MK, Wb I 121).

- Derives (via prefix m-, cf. Grapow, Gdk. l.c.) from Eg. ḥ3 “kämpfen” (OK, Wb I 215–6).

NB: The AA etymology of this Eg. root has been strongly debated. (1) Ember 1930, §5.f.5; Vrg. 1945, 130, 133; Mlt. 1984, 17; Djk. et al. 1986, 69, n. 17: ~ Ar. rhl “to strike with a sword” [Ember] = “mit dem Schwert schlagen” [Vrg.], although the shift of Eg. ^o- < *-r- is problematic (attested only *vice versa*). (2) Vycichl (1933, 175, §3) combined it with SBrb.: Tamasheq √g-h-r: ɛ-gḥer “feindlich sein”, but Eg. ^o- ≠ Brb. *g-. (3) Schneider (1997, 196, §21), in turn, identified it with Ar. ḏyr “angreifen, überfallen” in the frames of the Rösslerian consonant correspondences. (4) Takács (EDE I 330) assumed a dissim. from pre-Eg. *^o3 ~ ECu. *^ool- „war” [Sasse 1979, 21].

m^oḥ^o.t (NK **mjh^o.t**) “1. (selten) Kultstätte eines Gottes, 2. Grab” (MK, Wb II 49, 7–14) = “tombe, monument funéraire” (Boreux 1931, 45–46) = “ausgebautes Grab” (Helck, MWNR 1198) = “tomb, cenotaph” (FD 105) = “Kenotaph, Stelen- bzw. Opferkapelle” (LÄ VII 464 index) = “Bezeichnung des gesamten Grabkomplexes (in Pap. Anastasi I 3:3)” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 41, n. v) = “Grab (Felsgrab), (aufgemauerter) Grabbau, Grabmal, Kenotaph” (GHWb 328).

NB1: For the oldest attestation see SAK 25 (1998), 243. For its wtg. cf. SAK 13 (1986), 30. Cf. also Winlock, JEA 10, 1924, 256 & n. 2 for further remarks.

NB2: For the frequently occurring var. ḥ^o.t, H. Grapow (1950, 73) assumed a “mobile” m- prefix.

NB3: E. Edel (1986, 30, §1) assumed an original *m-ḥ^o.wt written “*immer defektiv*” without the *-w- retained solely by the supposed Dem.-Cpt. reflex (below) which the reconstruction of its vocalized forms relies upon: *m^oḥ^ow.ṯ < *m^oḥ^ow.ṯ (Fecht 1960, 180, §373) = *maḥ^ow.at (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 156) = *m^oḥ^ow.ṯ (Edel 1975, 16, §27) = *m^oḥ^o(w).ṯ (NBÄ 209) > later *mḥ^ow.ṯ (Steindorff 1904, 65) = *mḥa^o(t) (Lacau 1970, 128–9, §13) = *m^oḥ^o(w).ṯ (sic) > *m^oḥ^ow.ṯ (NBÄ 746, n. 906) = *m^oḥ^ow.ṯ (Edel 1986, 30, §1) = *majh^o.at > *mēh^o.at (Vcl. 1990, 235). Note that the shift of -j- < -^o- in m^oḥ^o.t > NK mjh^o.t was influenced by -h- (Lacau l.c., Edel l.c.).

- Whether it survives in Dem. mḥw ~ mhw (with the shift of -h- < -) “das Grab” (DG 171, 174:6) > Cpt. (S) ḥ2AA(O)Y, ḥ2AAAYE, Eḥ2AOY, (A) ḥ2W (L) ḥ2EAY, (F) Eḥ2EOY, (B) (E)ḥ2AY “tomb, cavern” (CD 212b) = “Grab, Höhle, Gedenkstätte” (KHW 112) is a strongly debated question.

NB1: Most of the leading figures of Eg. linguistics belong to the proponents of the continuity between MK m^oḥ^o.t vs. Dem.-Cpt. mḥw, e.g. G. Steindorff (1889, 108), G. Fecht (1960, 180, §373), P. Lacau (1970, 126, 128), J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 156), E. Edel (1975, 16, §27), J. Osing (NBÄ 209), W. Westendorf (KHW 112), H. Smith (1978, 361), W. Vycichl (DELC 132; 1990, 234). Others, however, such

as W. Erichsen (DG) and J. Černý (CED 100), carefully avoided the mention of m^h°t in the entry for the Dem.-Cpt. term “*perhaps on phonetic grounds*” as Smith (l.c.) surmised, who missed it in CED as a “*probable*” etymology (with met. of -°). A fundamental difficulty is the gender difference of MK fem. vs. Dem.-Cpt. masc. forms (cf. Möller 1913, 138, fn. 2; Graefe & Wassef 1979, 117, fn. 33) and that “*weder in m^h°(w).t noch in °h°(w).t scheint das durch das Koptische gesicherte w jemals ausgeschrieben zu sein*” (Fecht 1960, 180, §373, fn. 504). Moreover, Dem. °h°j3.t ~ m^h°j.t are attested, which are clearly distinct from Dem. mh/hw (Graefe & Wassef 1979, 117, fn. 34). Therefore, as W. Vycichl (1990, 235) remarked, m^h°t “*ne peut pas passer directement à ηΔΔΥ (S)*”. For these reasons, E. Graefe and M. Wassef (1979, 115–7, also 109, n. j) sharply rejected this equation and combined Dem.-Cpt. mh^w (pace Möller 1913, 138) with Eg. mhj “Grabkammer (?)” (hapax, Ramses III, Wb, q.v.), see below for further details.

NB2: KHW 523: (O) ηΔΔΟΥ(ε) “*ist zu streichen*”, being identical with mhwt “*Familie*” (q.v.).

- May be a nomen loci (prefix m-) as suggested by H. Grapow (1914, 7, 17, 24). Apparently, m^h°t signified the place of °h°(w), but the exact definition of the underlying etymon is ambiguous:

(1) Eg. °h°w “Denkstein, Grabstein” (XVIII., Wb I 221) = “stela” (FD 47)?

NB: This solution was preferred by G. Fecht (1960, 180, §373), J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 156), H. Satzinger (p.c., 17 April 1999), and others: “*proprement: le lieu où se trouve la stèle °h°w*” (Boreux 1931, 45–46) = “*Stelle des Grabsteins*” (Osing) = “*where the stela is standing*” (Stz.). Eg. m^h°t denoted the Abydos cenotaphs too in contrast to Eg. jz “tomb” (PT, FD 29) = “*das Grab*” (PT, Wb I 126). Rejected by Osing (NBÄ 747).

(2) Eg. °h° “Haufen” (OK, Wb I 220) = “heap” (FD 47)?

(3) Eg. °h° “to stand (up), erect, rise up” (OK, FD 47)?

NB1: Preferred by Smith (1978, 161), Osing (NBÄ 209), Lacau (1970 phon., 128–9, §13), and Peust (1997, 269). Lit. “*un tombeau développé en hauteur (par opposition à la tombe souterraine jz)*” (Lacau) = “*eig. ‘Stehendes’, urspr. wohl als Bezeichnung für mastaba-artige Gräber*” (NBÄ 747).

NB2: V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 193; HSED #1781) connected, perfectly falsely, Eg. m^h°t “tomb” with ECu.: Gwd. may- “to bury” [AMS] ||| CCh.: Musgu mou “to bury” (sic) [OS! not found in Müller 1886; Lks. 1941; Trn. 1991] | Lame muʔu “to bury” (sic) [OS contra Scn. 1982, 320]. Rightly rejected by C. Peust (1997, 269).

m^q “Art Spiess oder ähnliches Gerät zum Braten” (XVIII., Wb II 50, 1) = “Grillspieß (bei dem Aufstellen des Feuerbeckens)” (Junker 1941, 117) = “Bratspieß” (OK, Pusch 1974, 20; so also Junge, LÄ III 833, n. 32) = “Bratspieß, Braten” (Guglielmi, LÄ VI 1290) = “Grillspieß” (Verhoeven 1984, 28; Fischer-Elfert 1986, 76) = “Grill(spieß, auch als Kultgerät)” (GHWb 328; ÄWb I 517) = “roasts on a spit, kebabs, orig.: a spit” (Edfu, PL 416–7).

NB1: Attested already in the OK, from Dyn. V (cf. Junker: Giza V 96; Pusch 1974, 20; Quack 1996, 510, #227; Meeks 1997, 43, #227; ÄWb I 517).

NB2: Should be carefully distinguished from the (sometimes deceitful) writing mg/
m^cg3 (Wb II 164, 4) of the Sem. loan-word mq^r “Ofen des Bäckers und seine
Glut” (late NK, Wb II 158, 15; Helck 1971, 515, #124) > (L) $\mu\epsilon\kappa\rho\epsilon$ “lodern (?)”
(KHW 90), cf. also Verhoeven 1984, 50, fn. 1.

- From the same root: m^cq “braten” (NK, GR, Wb II 50, 2–4) = “to grill” (Zandee 1960, 145, B.4.e) = “braten (als Bestrafung durch Feuer und Schwert)” (Amduat, Hornung 1963 II, 122, n. 8) = “(die spezifische Zubereitungsart) am Spieß braten” (Junge, LÄ III 833, n. 32 after Klebs) = “den Spieß benutzen, am Spieß grillen” (Verhoeven 1984, 52) = “grillen (mit Spieß)” (GHWb 328) = “griller sur une brochette” (Meeks 1997, 43, #227) = “to roast” (PL 417).

NB1: Does it derive as a late denominative verb from OK m^cq?

NB2: For the problem of a NK var. *m^cg cf. Fecht 1965, 89, fn. 49; Verhoeven 1984, 80.

- Origin disputed.
- 1. D. Meeks (1997, 43, #227) and P. Wilson (PL 417) derived it (via m- prefix of nomina instr.) from Eg. ϵ q “to enter, penetrate”, which would imply that the OK noun m^cq was primary “*reflecting the use of the spit as sg. which enters/skewers meat portions so that they can be roasted*” (PL).

NB: Dubious. The writing of m^cq significantly differs from that of ϵ q.

- 2. J. Hoch (1994, 170–171, #227) treated several late NK examples of m^cq “grillen” as var. forms of late NK mgr “to boil, grill” (q.v.). Hoch overlooked the OK attestation of m^cq. Rightly rejected by J. F. Quack (1996, 510, #227) and D. Meeks (1997, 43, #227).
- 3. GT: provided the verb was primary, it represents both phonologically and semantically a perfect match of SBrb.: EWlm. ϵ -my ϵ γ “griller (des grains de céréales) dans leur épi encore vert, 2. être grillé”, hence \grave{a} -mayoy, pl. i-mäyoy-än “grains grillés encore verts (de céréales)” [PAM 1998, 230; 2003, 569], Tadghaq & Tudalt a-mäyay “grilled grains (eaten only when the first millet heads are harvested)” [Sudlow 2001, 286]. Note that Brb. *y < * ϵ is reg. (cf. Vcl. 1992).

NB1: Noteworthy is AA *m-w-k “to burn (or sim.)” [GT] (var. root to the hypothetic AA *m- ϵ -k?): ES *mwq “to be warm, hot” [GT] vs. Geez maqaqa “to burn, sting (e.g. a medicine), burn the throat, cauterize”, Tna. māqmāq bālā “to burn (pepper)”, Gafat moqā “to heat” (ES: Lsl. 1945, 163; 1956, 216; 1963, 109; 1979 III, 414; 1982, 52; 1987, 355, 375; Chn. 1961, 70, #111; Apl. 1977, 37/78; cf. also Lsl. 1959, 264; Mkr. 1981, 217) ||| NOm.: SEOmt. *muḵ-o “ashes” [Bnd. 2003, 82, #3 followed by GT]: Gnj. muḵ-o [Sbr.], Gatsama (Haruro) muḵ-o [Sbr.] = mug-o [CR 1937, 653] = muḵ-a/ṣ [Brz.], Gnj. muḵ-a/ṣ [Brz.], Kyr. muḵ-o [Flm. 1990, 27] = uḵ-ṣ (sic) [Sbr.] = muḵ-a/ṣ [Brz.], Zys. muḵ-o [Sbr.] = muḵ-a/ṣ [Brz.], Zrg. muḵ-o [Sbr.] (SEOmt.: Sbr. 1994, 11; Brz. 1995, 27, §2) ||| CCh.: Musikum \grave{a} -mūḵ [prefix a-] “cendre” [Trn. 1977, 19]. The underlying AA root might have contained medial *w- instead of ayin. The NOm.-CCh. isogloss *muḵ- “ashes” [GT] also displays no trace of *- ϵ -.

nb2: Conti Rossini (l.c.) compared the SEOmt. forms also with NOM.: Haruro mēgg-ē “luogo ove l'erba è stata bruciata”, which is perhaps related rather with ECh.: Mobu me:ge “(se) dessécher” & Ngam miyèke “dessécher” [Lenssen 1984, 69].

nb3: A further var. root, namely AA *m-k [GT] appears in ES: Tigre māk bela, Tna. moḵ bālā, Amh. mōkk alā, mōkkākā “to boil roughly” (ES: Lsl. 1982, 51) ||| SBrb.: Tadghaq & Tudalt ta-māk-at “charcoal” [Sudlow 2001, 308] ||| Bed. muk^a “to burn clay to make pots” [Hds. 1996 MS, 92].

nb4: Cf. also AA *m-k “to give light” [GT]: SBrb.: EWlm. ta-mēqq-it “étincelle” [Ncl. 1957, 570] ||| WCh.: NBch. *muk^v-/*muk^w- “sun” [Stl.] = *m-k [JS 1981, 256C]: Miya múkū, Mburku múkū, Jimbin mùkwá (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 42; Stl. 1987, 259; JI 1994 II, 312). Note that J.D. Wölfel (1955, 147, §5) directly combined Eg. sm^vq “rösten, braten” (NK, Wb IV 131, 11), apparently ignoring that it is just the caus. of Eg. m^vq, with SBrb.: Hgr. semeqq-et “briller (être brillant: soleil, lune, étoile, éclair, feu, flamme etc.)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1231], EWlm. & Ayr. sēmāqq-ət “miroiter, briller (p.ex. chose/arme bien astiquée)” [PAM 2003, 724]. The segmentation of the SBrb. root is not evident in the lit. (Fcd.: listed under √mqq PAM: under √smq), but K.-G. Prasse (p.c., 25 August 2006) confirms that “*semeqqet* is not a causative, as this would require gemination of the m: *semmeqqet*. This is so also in the Hoggar dialect. So root: SMGh (Gh = voiced spirant wular: ghayn). If it is an original causative, this must be a prehistorical derivative”.

- **4.** GT: or, assuming a shift of m^vq from an incompatible *m^ck, we might compare Hbr. m^ck qal “1. to squeeze (breast), 2. squash (testicles), 3. thrust into (a spear into the ground)” [KB 612].

nb1: The basic sense of the Sem. root was slightly different, cf. MHbr. & JAram. m^ck “to crush” [KB], NHbr. (TTM) m^ck “(z)erdrücken” [Dalman 1922, 245] = “zerdrücken, zerquetschen” [Levy 1924 III 190] | Ar. ma^caka “to rub on the ground, struggle” [KB].

nb2: Hence derive also Hbr. ma^cāqā “stupid (as PN)” [KB 612] | Ar. ma^c(i)k- “sot, imbécile” [BK II 1129], for which cf. Eg. m3q (fire det.) “der... (als spottender? Beiname)” (late NK, Wb II 33, 8), presumably a var. of m^vq. For the problem of this form see the entry for m3q above.

m^cd (or **md** or perhaps **m^cf**?) “(mng. unknown, perhaps) anvil (?)” (CT, AECT I 124, spell 146, n. 16) = “un instrument de torture (?)” (AL 78.1680) = “ein Folterinstrument (*Schlachblock)” (GHWb 329) = “Hackklotz” (Snk. 1999, 88 & fn. 11 with CT exx.) = “slaughtering-block” (DCT 163, 193).

nb1: R. van der Molen (DCT) assumes a reading without -^c: md (sic) (CT II 205a) suggesting even a fem. form md.t (CT IV 19d), which, however, is rather to be read nm.t “execution-blocks” (AECT I 208).

nb2: The reading of its final consonant is uncertain, several works give m^cf “Block zur Köpfung” (CT, Wb II 47, 4) = m^cf “Richtblock” (Vcl. 1933, 173, #2) = m^cf “headsman’s block (FD 105) = m^cf “Hinrichtungsblock (zum Köpfen)” (GHWb 327). The Berlin Wörterbuch project has both readings (Hafemann, p.c. on 19 May 2000). Similarly, R. Hannig (GHWb) listed both m^cf and m^cd.

- Origin debated:

- **1.** W. Vycichl (1933, 173, #2) read its Wb ex. equally as m^cf considering it as nomen loci from an unattested Eg. *^cf “head” (*“Ort, an den der Deliquent seinen Kopf hinlegt”), which he identified with

Brb. *ṭ-γef “head” [Vcl.]. The comparison of Eg. ^c vs. Brb. *γ is problematic.

NB1: Cf. NBrb.: Shilh i-ḥf [Vcl.] | Shawya i-γf [Bst.] = yi-ḥf [Zhl.] | Qbl. ē-γaf ~ i-γf [Vcl.] | Nfs. i-γf, pl. i-γf-aun [Lst.] || EBrb.: Siwa a-ḥfi [Vcl.] = a-ḥfi, pl. ʾ-ḥf-āw-en [Lst.], Gdm. i-γaf, i-γf-aun [Lst.], Sokna i-γóf, pl. ye-γf-āwən [Lst.] (EBrb.: Lst. 1931, 301) || WBrb.: Zng. i-f [Bst.] = ṭf [< *i-γf], pl. āʔf-un [Ncl. 1953, 187] || SBrb.: Hgr. i-γef [Bst.], Mshq. ē-γef [Vcl.] etc. (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 313, 342; 1885, 195; 1887, 463; Vcl. 1933, 173; 1955, 306; Zhl. 1942–1943, 83; IS 1971, #195; Mlt. 1991, 264, #40.1).

NB2: For semantical reasons, it is equally dubious whether the Brb. word is cognate with AA *k-P “back of the head” [GT] = *kapay- “occiput” [Mlt.] as often proposed in the lit., cf. Sem. *kapy- “occiput, back of the head” [SED]: BAram. qarqapā [*qap-qap-?] “head” [Rsl.], Syr. qāp(ə)yā ~ qāpāyā ~ qapāyā “postica pars cervicis” [Brk. 1928, 683] = qōpyō (sic) “Hinterkopf” [Rsl.] || Ar. qafā-/qafa “1. derrière du cou, nuque, 2. derrière de la tête, occiput” [BK II 792] = “Hinterkopf, Nacken” [Rsl.] | MSA: Hrs. ʔefē “back” [Jns. 1977, 74] || ES: perhaps Geez kup [irreg. k-] “head”, kop “top of skull” [Lsl. 1987, 289] (Sem.: Mlt. 1999 MS, 6, #165; SED I 148–9, #164) || WCh.: Hausa kàfóó, pl. kàhòòní “horn (for blowing)” [Abr. 1962, 448] (GT: orig. “top of head”?) || ECh.: Bdy. kúpi prep. “behind” [Jng. 1989, 93], WDng. kòpò “nuque” [Fédry 1971, 295], Mgm. kúpó, pl. kòppippá “nuque” [JA 1992, 102] | Jegu kofo, pl. kofo “Hinterkopf, Gehirn” [Jng. 1961, 114]. Cf. also ES: Geez qāf “shoulder blade”, Grg.: Selti & Wln. & Zway qafāt “forehead”, Har. qafāt “forehead” (ES: Lsl. 1979 III, 473; 1987, 423, 289). AP: PKoman *kup “head” [Bnd. 1983, 270, #38]. Some authors compared also IE *kap-ut- “Kopf” [IEW 529–530]. A.Ju. Militarev (l.c.) presumed a semantic development in “back of the head” → “back” vs. “head” → “forehead” (Gurage, Harari). Lit.: Rsl. 1952, 139 (Aram.-Brb.); IS 1965, 366 (PAA-PIE); Brunner 1969, 24, #56 (Ar.-Qbl.-PIE); IS 1971, #195 > Blz. 1994, 428 (Sem.-Brb.-Jegu-IE); Müller 1975, 64 (Ar.-Brb.-Jegu); Bnd. 1975, 168 (PIE-Kwama); Mlt. 1991, 264, #40.1 (Brb.-Jegu-Sem.-Koman); HSED #1548 (Brb.-ECh.-Sem.); Mlt. 1999, 6, #165 (Sem.-Brb.-ECh.-PIE).

NB3: There exist some untenable views on the affiliation of the Brb. root and its AA etymon. (1) E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 98) reconstructed PBrb. *e-γrif (sic, with *-r-) “head” ~ Eg. ḥrp “leiten”. (2) C. T. Hodge (1978, 3, #67): Hgr. e-γáf “head” and PIE *kap-ut- ~ PCh. *ka “head” (!) and Sem. *kapp- “dish, head” (sic). (3) V. É. Orel (1995, 105, #82): Brb. “head” ~ Sem. *qab- (sic) [Orel] > Hbr. qab “a measure of capacity (acc. to the Talmud, approximately two litres)” [KB 1060] and Eg. qbj “Krug” (MK, Wb IV 25). (4) C. Peust (2006) reinterpreted the phon. value of the hrgl. tp “head” (D1) as dp in which he saw a regular reflex of Brb. *γ-f < AA *k-p in the frames of the Rössler theory.

- 2. GT: the rendering “slaughtering-block” suggests a nomen loci of a hypothetic unattested OEg. *^cd “to slaughter” present in ^cd “zerstückeln (Feinde)” (GR, Wb I 238, 21), ^cd.t “Gemetzeln” (MK, Wb I 239, 1) = “slaughter, massacre” (FD 51), whose etymology is disputed. Already W. Schenkel (1999, 88) supposed in m^cd a prefix m- (but leaving the simplex unidentified).

NB: (1) Most probably a secondary sense deriving from Eg. ^cd “(zer)hacken” (OK, Wb I 238) = “to hack up, to destroy” (FD 51). For the AA etymology of this root see EDE I 96. (2) C. T. Hodge (1966, 44; 1968, 27): MEg. ^cd.t equated with Ar. γudd-at- “lessening, shortcoming” [Hodge] || WCh.: Hausa gácá ~ gààcáá “to bite off”, gúcúré ~ gúcúráá “to break piece off” [Abr. 1962, 311, 347]. Later, Hodge (1969, 110, #24) compared MEg. ^cd.t with Ar. γdd ~ γyd “to diminish”, γyz “to

distress, enrage”, ʿazā- “harm”, ʿzz “to fell to the ground”, and even ʿdd “to bite, torment” [Hodge] and WCh.: Hausa gáúdá ~ gáúḍà “to give a severe blow” [Abr. 1962, 311]. (3) A. B. Dolgopolsky (1989, 96, #44) equated it with Sem. *ʿšw “to cut asunder, divide” [Dlg.] and SCu. *haç- “to be separated, divided up”. (4) Th. Schneider (1997, 197, #24) linked it to Ar. zq “to skin, flay, schinden”. Unacceptable, since Eg. ʿ ≠ Sem. *z (see EDE I 357–361). (5) GT: perhaps MEg. ʿd < *ʿnd [from *ʿlg]? Cf. ES: Gees ʿallaga “to castrate, defeat, vanquish”, Tigre ʿallāga “to kill in close combat” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 60).

- 3. GT: or perhaps m^cd < *m^cg ~ AA *m-g-(ʿ) “head” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. md3 “Haube”, NK, GHWb, infra)?
- 4. L. Reinisch (1887, 263) compared a certain Eg. m^cd (sic) with Sem. *mḥṣ “to hit”, Bed. māḍ “auf den Kopf schlagen, den Kopf blutig schlagen jmdm.”, etc., which is a baseless confusion of diverse roots.

m^cd.t “corn-measure” (CT V 185ad: B7C, omitted in B9C and B10C, AECT II 48, 51, spell 404, n. 14; DCT 163) = “une mesure de capacité” (AL 78.1681) = “ein Handmaß für Korn, welche man beim Abmessen von Ölsamen u.ä. statt der Artabe verwenden kann, mit einem eigenen, unbekanntem Wert” (Helck, LÄ III 1210) = “Ziegel (als ein Maß für Feigen, Datteln)” (GHWb 329).

NB: Perhaps occurs already in the OK: following D. Mueller (1972, 301–2), P. Posener-Krieger (1976, 325) resolved the logographic phon. value of the hrgl. U9 (EG 1927, 502: “corn-measure with grain pouring out”) in the Abusir papyrus as m^cd.t (cf. AL 77.1674).

- Presumably from the same root: NK m^cd3 (or md3) “Art Maß für Datteln” (XX., Wb II 186, 15; Lange 1925, 78) = “properly the sort of basket used for the date- conserve (called ʿaḡw-at- Arabic, may have been of standard size), a mass of dates pressed and preserved in baskets (a container of wicker-work) used as measure” (Grd. 1940, 157–8) = “baskets of date-cake (?)” (AEO I 66*, #151 & II 286 index) = “Ziegel für getrocknete bzw. gepreßte Datteln (wie sie auch jetzt in den Handel kommen)” (Helck, MWNR 760) = “the block into which dates were pressed” (Janssen 1975, 474) = “Dattelnzubereitung” (KHW 113, fn. 4) = “measure: basket” (DLE I 258) = “*Ziegel (für Feigen)” (GHWb 329) = “measure, récipient servant de mesure de capacité, à l’origine une façon de présenter des dattes réduites en pâte et pressées” (Meeks 1997, 43–44, §239 after Helck MWNR V 760–1; Cauville, RdE 32, 1980, 47–64; Smith, Enchoria 15, 1987, 83) > Dem. md3.t “measure of capacity” (Parker, JEA 26, 1940, 99) = md3.t “Art Maß” (DG 194) = md3 “ein Raummaß” (Lüddeckens 1960, 187, n. 39 & 363) > Cpt. (S) μαααε, μααε, μαατσε, ματτ (f) “en Maß für Korn und anderes” (Lange 1925, 78) = “a measure

of grain, fruit etc. (its capacity: 12 to the πτοβ)” (CD 213a) = “a capacity measure of one-twelfth of an artaba that was used for grain, fruit, etc.” (Grd. 1940, 157–8; AEO II 225*, #505: especially for dates) = “ein Maß (für Früchte und Getreide)” (KHW 113, 523) = “nom d’unemesure (fruits, blé)” (DELIC 132). The Dem. word passed into Gk. as μῶπιον “measure de capacité” (Fournet 1989, 70, §10 & fn. 49 with occurrences).

NB1: The continuity between CT m^cd.t vs. the NK-Cpt. word was proposed D. Mueller (1972, 301–2): “despite the different spelling and gender, CT m^cd.t is in all likelihood the MEg. form of this NK/LEg. word”, whose idea was followed by W. Westendorf (KHW 523; 1989, 47 “gewiß identisch”), D. Meeks (AL 77.1674), P. Wilson (PL 417). But W. Helck (LÄ III 1204, 1210) carefully avoided to mention this equation.

NB2: The Ramesside word has also a pre-Amarna record: jm^cd3 (Urk. IV 1992:3), cf. Meeks 1997, 44.

NB3: A. H. Gardiner (1940, 157; AEO I 66* & II 286 index), followed by Westendorf (KHW 113, fn. 4), Schenkel (1978, 31, fn. 116), R. Hannig (GHWb 329), D. Meeks (1997, 43–44), firmly sided with a full reading of the NK lexeme with -^c- as m^cd3 (partly because of Cpt. -~~aa~~- reflecting -^c-) against md3 (suggested by Wb; Janssen 1975, 474; Helck in MWNR 760 & LÄ III 1204; Vycichl in DELIC 132; Westendorf 1989, 47). Strangely, Westendorf even tried to project the reading md3.t to CT m^cd.t. L.H. Lesko’s (DLE I 258) md.t (sic) is clearly false. Or, should we assume a LEg. GW for *m^cd as masc. counterpart to CT m^cd.t (GT)?

NB4: A. H. Gardiner (1940, 157) and E. Lüddeckens (1960, 187, n. 39) assumed a figurative sense of the same word in m^cd3 “gain, profit” (Adoption Pap., rt. 5–6, time of Ramses XI, Grd. 1940, 158) = “Profit, Nutzen, Gewinn” (Lüddeckens 1960, 187, n. 39) = “Zugewinn in Ehe” (GHWb 329) = “produit, profit, revenu” (Meeks 1997, 43–44, §239 with further lit. on this lexeme) reflected also in Saite m^cd3 (-^c- in GW!) “profit” (2x, Grd.). Gardiner surmised a metaphor “basket for dates” > “profit” like “fruit of labour” (καρπός, fructus) since “dates were valuable annual produce of *Eg. agriculture*”. In Gardiner’s (1940, 157, fn. 15) view, this word was “obviously related” with md^c (2x) “vom Ackerbau als Dienstpflicht” (Wb II 189, 3: XXII.) = “to grow, cultivate” (Hoch 1994, 178, #240: XIX.), which J. Hoch (1994, 177–8, #239) was inclined to treat it separately from the md3-measure for dates (Pap. Harris I 37a:5) as a variation of md^c (GW) “produce, crops” (XX., Pap. BM 10052, 10:15), which, besides, he explained as a borrowing from NWSem. *šmh (or *šmh) “to grow”. Denying this, D. Meeks (1997, 43–44, §239) firmly maintained Gardiner’s position.

NB5: W. Spiegelberg (KHW 71) read the Dem. word (in Dem. Pap. Heidelberg 738) m^cd.t (sic).

NB6: P. Wilson’s (PL 417) rendering “a capacity measure of half an artaba...” (sic) for Cpt. is erroneous.

NB7: As pointed out by A. H. Gardiner (1940, 157–8), the NK term is identical with m^cd3 n bnj in GR offering rituals: “m. von Datteln (eine Opfergabe)” (Wb II 186, 16–17) = “an offering in the shape of a shrine surmounted by a pyramidion” (Grd.) = “the exact amount required for the dates (connected with the ability to give life and rejuvenate the body)” (PL 417; cf. also Cauville 1980).

NB8: Several works (Wb, Helck in LÄ III 1204 & MWNR 760, GHWb, DELIC 132) suggest a connection of NK-GR md3 or m^cd3 with nd3 “ein Maß für Kuchen und Datteln” (NK, Wb II 377, 9–10) = “Ziegel für getrocknete bzw. gepreßte Datteln” (MWNR 760) = “measure for loaves and dates” (XVIII., FD 144) = “Datteln in Ziegeln gepreßt” (Guglielmi, LÄ III 684) = “Ziegel, Maß für Datteln, Natron, Salz,

3h” (Helck, LÄ III 1204) = “Ziegel (ein Maß)” (GHWb 448) as an earlier variation of Ramesside md3. In the view of A. H. Gardiner (1940, 158, fn. 1), however, the m^cd3-basket can have nothing in common with nd3 (with the brick-like det. suggesting “sweetmeats” made of ground-up dates).

● Etymology debated:

- **1.** D. Mueller (1972, 301–2), followed by W. Westendorf (1989, 47), found it tempting to take CT m^cd.t as nomen instr. from Eg. d3 “mit Korn versorgen o.ä.” (XI., Wb V 516, 1) = “to provide (with food)” (FD 318: cf. JEA 16, 1930, 196, n. 6) connected with measuring, but since its obj. was not the grain, Mueller (pace FD) was disposed to treat it as metaphorical use of d3j “to extend”, and remained sceptical: “for the same reason, the suggested etymology of m^(c)d.t remains exceedingly doubtful”. Declined by P. Wilson (PL 417): “origin not clear”.
- **2.** GT: lit. perhaps “block (as unit of measurement)” (as ingeniously suggested already by Janssen 1975, 474 for NK m^cd3: “the block into which dates were pressed”) and thus eventually related with CT m^cd apparently carrying the same basic sense: “Block zur Köpfung” (Wb) = “Richtblock” (Vcl.) = “headsman’s block (FD) = “Hinrichtungsblock (zum Köpfen)” (GHWb) = “slaughtering-block” (DCT 163, 193)?
- **3.** GT: or any connection with Eg. m^cd.t “*Köcher” (1st IMP, WD I 85; GHWb 329; cf. JEA 61, 1975, 50) = “*Lanzen- oder Pfeilköcher” (ÄWb I 518a) from a common basic sense “container”?

***mw.t** “1. Geier, nur aus der Schrift zu belegen”, hence: “2. die Geiergöttin Mouθ von Theben” (Wb II 53, 15–16) = “divinité vautour (Gypsfulvus)” to be distinguished from *3 “Neophron percnopterus” (Keimer 1935, 186, fn. 4).

NB1: P. Lacau’s (1954, 110) rdg. m3wt (sic) for “la déesse Maout” is false.

NB2: Survives also in (S) ΠΕΤΕΜΟΥΤ “a village near Thebes”, now El-Me/idāmūd < p3-dj-mw.t “whom (goddess) Mut has given” (CED 350) = *p³-dj-[~]?-máw.˘t (Snk. 2002, 21–22).

- GT: cognate with Cu.-Om. *moyy- ~ *mōy- “bird/beast of prey” [GT]: Bed. mōy-ta [-ta < ?] “eine Spezies Adler” [Rn. 1895, 176] || HECu. *mōy-ča “beast of prey” [Hds. 1989, 25]: i.a., Burji mō-čča, pl. mō-yya “beast of prey” [Ss. 1982, 147] || NOM.: Bsk. moyy-a “hawk-like bird with white chest (eats chickens)” [Flm. apud Blz.] (Cu.-Bsk. etymology: Blz. 2000 MS Bed. Fauna, 21; 2003, 267) || ECh.: WDng. mááwà “oiseau de proie (se nourrit de proies vivantes, noir, sauf blanc sur la tête et le ventre, pattes jaunes): faucon chiquera (?), autour gabar (?)” [Fédry 1971, 109], EDng. màawā “oiseau de proie, sort d’aigle” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 199]. Ultimately < AA *m-w-y “bird of prey (orig. beast of prey in gen.?)” [GT].

NB1: Any connection to NAgaw: Xmtg. ábw-a [< *amw-?] “bird of prey” [Apl. 1987, 499] ||| CCh.: Mada mámba [partial redupl. from *ma-m“a?] “oiseau rapace sp., buse” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 186]?

NB2: There is hardly any connection between Eg. *mw.t and Bed. bit “vulture, Geier” [Rn. 1895, 53] as proposed by E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168). Eg. m- ≠ Bed. b-, and Bed. -t is part of the root, while the final -t in Eg. *mw.t is the fem. marker.

mw.t (or **mjw.t**?) “mother” (OK, Wb II 54, 1–10) > Cpt. (O) $\text{M}\Delta\text{O}\Upsilon, \text{M}\Theta\text{O}\Upsilon$, (S) $\text{M}\Delta\Delta(\text{O})\Upsilon, \text{M}\Delta\Upsilon, \text{M}\Theta\Theta\Upsilon$, (A) MO , (L) $\text{M}\Theta(\Theta)\Upsilon, \text{M}\text{O}, \text{M}\text{W}$, (F) $\text{M}\Theta(\Theta)\Upsilon, \text{M}\Theta\text{O}\Upsilon, \text{M}\text{H}\text{O}\Upsilon$, (B) $\text{M}\Delta\Upsilon$ “Mutter” (KHW 106) = “mère” (DELIC 126). NB1: After W. Spiegelberg (1917, 104, §7; 1928), an undefined 2nd weak consonant has been reconstructed in its root on the basis of the Cpt. evidence (S - $\Delta\Delta$ -, LF - $\Theta\Theta$ -): *mjw.t (Spg.) = *m“w.t (Zeidler 1992, 197, fn. 33: m“w.t), vocalized *má“w.t (Spg.) = *mí“w.at (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 45) = *mé“w.č.t (NBÁ 427) = *mí“w.č.t (Edel 1980, 18) = *ma3wi(y).at (Vycichl). Spiegelberg (1917, 105) quoted for the rdg. mjw.t MK and Amarna exx. of the word written as mj.t. But P. Lacau’s (1954, 110) and W. Westendorf’s (KHW 106) rdg. m3w.t (sic) is far-fetched at the moment. W. Vycichl (DELIC 126; 1990, 197, §11) assumed a tricons. root * $\sqrt{\text{m-w-y}}$: *mawwi(y).t, whence the cluster *-3w- arose secondarily from *-ww-. Its st.pron. *mwēte=f is preserved in $\text{K}\alpha\mu\eta\phi\tau\varsigma$ < DN k3-mw.t=f “taureau de sa mère” (Vcl.). NB2: Eg. mw.t n.t gjw “sicherlich etwas mütterliches, hervorbringendes: evt. eine Art Knolle oder Wurzelstock” (Germer 1979, 206, 3.9; HAM 838) may represent its figurative sense.

- *Kinderwort* or *Lallwort*, just like its AA parallels, which are not necessarily genetically cognate: Sem. * ?imm- [Hnrg. 2000, 2062] = var. * ?umm- [Dlg., GT] (Sem.: GB 45; WUS #275; Cohen 1961, 70, #86; DRS 22–23) ||| Brb. *-mma “mother” [GT] = * $\text{y}\alpha\text{mma}$ [Zvd. 1967, 22] = * $\text{yi-mm}\bar{a}$ (“my mother”) [Dlg.]: NBrb.: Shilh i-mma [Bst.] = ma [Jordan 1934, 91], Sus yēmmi ~ yimmi [Dst. 1938, 185: “my mother”] | Mzg. i-mma ~ mma ~ ma [Taifi 1991, 400], Zayan & Sgugu ta-ma (“parents et proches d’un individu”), i-mma (“ma mère”) [Lbg. 1924, 564], Mgild mai- (st.pron.) [Harries 1974, 239], Izdeg mma [Mrc. 1937, 165] | Zenet gr.: Sgrs. i-mma (“ma mère”) [Pellat 1955, 103], Snus mma [Bst.], Shawya i-mma [Msq., Bst., Prv.], Bugi i-mma [Prv.], Mnsr. i-mma [Bst.], Izn. & Rif & Snh. i-mma [Rns. 1932, 382], Ikebdanen & Temsaman & Btw. & Bqy. i(?)mma [Biarnay 1917, 86], Mzab mamma ~ a-mma ~ mma [Dlh. 1984, 114], Sened & Djerba ie-mma, pl. i-mmä-t [Prv.] | Nfs. e-mm [Prv.] = e-mmî [Bgn. 1942, 288] = ə-mm [Lst.] | Zwawa i-mma [Lst.], Bugi i-mma [Bst., Prv.] || EBrb.: Siwa o-mma [Prv.] = u-mma [Lst. 1931, 259], Gdm. ie-mma [Bst.] = ma vs. i-mma (“ma mère”) [Mtl. 1904, 135] = mā ~ ma [Lnf. 1973, 190, #950] = ma-is (“sa mère”) [PAM], Audjila mmâ [Prd. 1960, 168], Fogaha é-mmi ~ ó-mmi [Prd. 1961, 297] || WBrb.: Zng. iumma, pl. iumnon [Msq. 1879, 520] = i-umma [Bst. 1909, 245] = iu-mm“i (“marâtre”) [Ncl. 1953, 202] || SBrb.: EWlm. ma, pl. maw ~ mätt & Ayr ma, pl. mätt ~

maw [PAM 1998, 207; 2003, 517], Ghat e-mma-k (“ta mère”) [Nhl. 1909, 178] || Guanche: Gran Canaria mai- [Wlf.] (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 297, 312; 1885, 176; 1890, 318; Prv. 1911, 123) || HECu. *ama [Hds. 1989, 102, 404]: i.a. Burji ãm (“mother, adult woman”) [Ss. 1982, 25] etc. || SCu.: Irq. & Grw. áma (“1. old woman, 2. grandmother”) [Flm.] | Asa amama & amo (“1. mother (reference), 2. grandmother [address]”) [Flm.] | Ma’a mame (“mother, addressed by daughter”) [Ehret 1974 MS, 44] (SCu.-HECu.: Flm. 1969, 12, #19) || NOm.: Sns. mī [CR] | Nao (Nayi) mēy [CR] = moi [Flm. apud Bnd. 1996 MS, #475] (NOm.: CR 1925, 615) || Ch. *m- [JS 1981, 185A] > WCh.: Hausa maama [Pls.] (dial. umma, Arabism) | NBch. *ma[ɣ]- [GT] = *maX- [Skn.] = *ma[h]a [Stl.]: Warji maɣ-ai [Skn.], Kry. māhə [Skn.] = mah [Stl.], Pa’a ama-ti [Skn.], Miya māhə [Skn.], Siri mā [Skn.] = maɣ [Stl.] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 32; Stl. 1987, 259) | Bade m-én [Lks. 1968, 223], WBade mé-n [Schuh: -Vn ending], Ngz. mai [Pls.] = mài [Schuh 1981, 109], Teshena II mi-n [Schuh] (BN: Schuh 2001, 432; WCh.: Pls. 1960, #5; Schuh 1982, 13) || CCh.: Burji maya [Hfm. in RK 1973, 91], Margi mó [Hfm. in RK 1973, 123] | Higi māmá [Str.], HBaza maa [Lks. 1937, 114], Kps. mă [Str.], FJilbu mī-k [Krf.], FMuchella mă [Krf.], FGili mù [Krf.], FBwagira māmā [Krf.], Fali-Wuba mma [Meek/Lks. 1937, 114] (Higi gr.: Krf. 1972 MS) | Nzangi āmá [Str.] = ómme ~ mo [Mch.], Zumu (Jimo) mo [Meek 1931 I, 81, #25] | Htk. ma, mama [Egc. 1971, 216] | Mnd. mu [Mch.], Mnd.-Mora uum [Egc. 1969, 140], Pdk. ma [Mch., also Lks. 1937, 128], Malgwa ma ~ mama [Löhr 2002, 301] | Mada mma [Mch.], Mtk. maṃ [Mch.], Gsg. mā [Str.] = ma- & (Midjivin dial.) maha [Lks. 1970, 127] = mumuŋ vs. maha (“my mother”) [Gerstmann 1979, 23, #359], Mtrw. mähă [Str.], Balda ma [Str.], Mofu mai [Str.] = maɣ [Mch.], Mofu-Mboku mía, múŋa [Mch.], Mtk. momá ~ māmá [Str.], Hurzo máṃa [Mch.], Uld. mǎŋ [Mch.], Zulgo máṃa [Mch.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 184) | Hina mai [Str.], Daba (Musgoy) mai ~ moi [Str.] = may ~ muŋ [Mch. 1950 l.c.] = may (“my mother”) [Mch. 1966, 135] = māy (“my mother”) [LG 1974, 14a, #359.a], Gawar māmá [Str.] | Gidar mookóo [Str.] = ómma [Mch.] | Ktk. gr.: Lgn. máá-, pl. miyéé ~ máyee [Nct. in Lks. 1936, 106] = ma [Mch.], Bdm. mā- [Lks. 1939, 118] | Musgu am [Mch.], Muzgum mu-gú (2nd pers. sg. suffix -gu) [Lks. 1937, 143], Mulwi á-mí: [Trn. 1978, 206: prefix a-], Mogrum á-mú-kú (“ta mère”) [Trn. 1977, 24] | Masa-Gizey mày [Ajl.], Lame-Peve màmmâŋ vs. mày/máyâw [Schubert 1971 MS, 10, #195], Ham & Musey mbày < *may [Ajl.] (Masa gr.: Ajello 2001,

54) (CCh.: Str. 1910, 455; 1922–23, 119; Mch. 1950, 50). All forms denote “mother” if otherwise not indicated.

AP: Th. Obenga (1993, 293, #21) compares numerous African parallels, which are equally *Kinderwörter*.

DP: H. Möller (1911, 155) combined the Eg.-Sem. root \sqrt{m} with IE $\sqrt{mā-tér}$ (conceived as *nomen agentis*). A. Dolgopolsky (2005, 33, §46) extended this AA-IE equation to Ur. $\sqrt{emā}$ “mother, female”.

LIT.: Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30 (Eg.-Sem.); Erman 1892, 111 (Eg.-Sem.); Ember 1930, #10.a.14 (Eg.-Sem.); Clc. 1931, 35 (Eg.-PBrb.); 1936, #48 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); Zhl. 1932–33, 93 (Eg.-Brb.); Chn. 1947, #36 (PSem.-Eg.-Brb.-HECu.-Hausa); Wlf. 1955, 38 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); Djk. 1965, 40; 1967, 187 (PSem.-Eg.-Brb.-Hausa); 1970, 457, fn. 14 (PSem.-Brb.-PCh.); Zvd. 1967, 22 (PBrb.-Eg.); Mkr. 1969, 34 (Brb.-Ar.); Hodge 1976, 11 (Eg.-PSem.); Dlg. 1984, 72; 1996 MS, 8–9 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.-HECu.-Ch.); OS 1989, 132; 1992, 184 (PWCh.-PCCh.-Eg.); Zeidler 1992, 197, fn. 33 (PSem.-PBrb.-Eg.); Blz. 2002, 111–2, §6.1 (Sem.-Eg.-Cu.-Ch.); PAM 2003, 517 (Brb.-Sem.-Eg.-Sid.). NB1: Cf. also HECu.: Sid. *moë* “women’s placenta” [Gsp. 1983, 236].

NB2: W. Vycichl (DELIC 126) sees in Eg. $\sqrt{maww.it}$ > $\sqrt{ma3w.it}$ an original participle from \sqrt{mwj} present in Eg. *mwj* “feucht sein (von einer Wundöffnung)” (Med., Wb II 53, 5) on the alleged analogy of the IE *nomina actoris* $\sqrt{mā-tér}$ –“Mutter” [IEW 700], i.e., Eg. *mw.t* (orig. $\sqrt{māwiy.at}$) “la mère” signified lit. “celle qui allaite (wet nurse)”. Improbable. NB3: A. B. Dolgopolsky (1984, 72; 1988, 215, #11; 1996 MS, 8–9; 2005, 33, §46) supposes a genetic connection between the AA word for “mother” and \sqrt{m} (2nd pers. sg. fem. pron., on which most recently cf. Gensler 1999 MS), present e.g. in PAA $\sqrt{kV-m}$ “thou (fem.)”: Eg. *tm.t* (indep.), *tm* (dep.) (PT, Wb V 367, 370) ||| Brb. \sqrt{kam} [Prs. 1972, 173] = \sqrt{kamm} “thou” (f) [Dlg.] ||| Ch. \sqrt{kVm} [Dlg.]: e.g. WCh.: Ngz. & Duwai *kəm*, Bade *gəm* || CCh.: Buduma -*gəm* (Ch.: Dlg. ll.c.). Surprisingly, Dolgopolsky (1988, 215, #11) compared the Sem. word for “mother” with Eg. *jm3.t* “female of an animal”, which is mistaken.

NB4: N. Skimmer (1995, 33) erroneously affiliated Eg. *mw.t* with a number of unrelated terms derived from an AA $\sqrt{m-n}$ “person” (!), e.g. Sem. $\sqrt{mann-}$ “who?”, Ar. *marʔ-* “human being”, Eg. *mn* “so-and-so” (q.v.), PCu. $\sqrt{m-n}$ “person, man” vs. $\sqrt{m-n-t}$ “woman”, BT \sqrt{mVndV} “woman”, Ch. $\sqrt{m-t}$ “woman”, etc.

mw “water” (OK, Wb II 50–53) → Cpt. (OFL) $\mu\alpha\omicron\Upsilon$, (S) $\mu\omicron\omicron\Upsilon$, (ALF) $\mu\alpha\Upsilon$, (B) $\mu\omega\omicron\Upsilon$ “water” (CD 197b) = “Wasser, Gewässer, Überschwemmung, Regen, Harn” (KHW 106–7).

NB1: Frozen (fossilized) pl. *tante* (i.e. *m.w* < act. $\sqrt{mj.w}$?), where *-w* was not part of the original root (as correctly suggested by A. Erman apud Nöldeke 1910, 166–9 and by W. Spiegelberg 1917, 104, fn. 3). The external parallels (derivable only from AA $\sqrt{maʔ-}$) indicate that the actual Eg. root might have been either \sqrt{m} or \sqrt{mj} , which is corroborated by the supposed phon. value *mjw* of the hrgl. “three ripples” (N35a) in MK *nmjw* “dwarf” (Gunn 1920–21, 102, fn. 2). The Eg. primary noun can hardly be derived from a root \sqrt{mwj} as suggested by P. Lacau (1972, 300, §11) and W. Vycichl (1991, 120). J. Černý (CED 95) left the question of \sqrt{nmjw} or \sqrt{mwj} undecided.

NB2: Vocalized $\sqrt{māw}$ (NBĀ) = \sqrt{maw} (Lpr. 1995, 44).

NB3: K. Sethe (1912, 92) assumed the hrgl. “ripple” (N35) to have signified both *n* vs. *m* in the early times. Similarly, following Sethe, P. Lacau (1913, 64) attributed an early rdg. *mw* (!) to N35 whose pl. was in fact the word written with the “three ripples”. G. R. Driver derived the Phn. letter *mēm* from the Eg. hrgl. “ripple” (N35, cf. *n.t* “water”), which, however, Cassirer (1949, 113) disposed to explain rather from the GW phon. value *m* of “three ripples”.

NB4: To *mw* “water” in Ptahhotep 458 and Admonitions 3:13, Z. Žába (1956, 156) attributes a metaphoric sense “nécessité (?), besoin impératif, pressant (?)”, water being an indispensable thing in Egypt.

- Hence:

(1) mwj “1. der Harn, 2. das Harnen” (Lit. MK, Wb II 53, 2–3).

(2) mwj.t “Harn” (Med., Wb II 52, 7–9) = “urine” (FD 105) → Cpt. (SBF) MH, (SB) MU, (F) MЄMH (f) “urine” (CD 158a) = “Harn, Ausscheidung” (KHW 86) = “excrément” (Dévaud) > Pi-Solsel mī “Harn” (Vcl. 1936, 172).

NB1: E. Dévaud (1921, 166–8) explained the Cpt. word from a certain MK mrj ~ mj “excrément” (orig. *mr, voc. *mēr > *mēi), which is not accepted in the standard lexicons.

NB2: The etymological position of the LP hapax mwj “Same (bildlich für Sohn)” (Wb II 53, 4) etc. is dubious. For a detailed discussion see the entry of Eg. m3j “die Samenflüssigkeit” (Amarna, Wb, q.v.).

(3) mwj (tr.) “to water” (CT VII 375a, Lesko 1972, 145) = “to swamp (lit. water) the fire” (AECT III 152 & n. 3) = “näßen” (NBÄ 206) = “to water, swamp” (DCT 164: CT hapax).

(4) mwj (intr.) “feucht sein (von einer Wundöffnung)” (Med., Wb II 53, 5) = “to be watery” (FD 105) = “feucht sein, näßen” (WMT 360) = “Wasser absondern” (NBÄ 206).

- Cognate with Sem. *māy- “water” [Frz. 1965, 146] = *maʔ-/*māʔ- [Djk. 1965, 42] = *mVw [Dlg. 1970, 620, #4] = *m-w-y [Rsl. 1971, 314; Vcl. 1991, 120] = *mw[ʔ]/*mwy [Dlg. 1973, 182] = *maw/y- [Bmh. 1984, 272] = *maʔ(y)- [OS 1988, 75] = *maʔ- [Fox 1998, 14] = *māʔ/y- [Hnrg. 2000, 2065] = *māʔ- ~ *māy- [GT]: Akk. mû < OAkk. & OAss. māʔū [AHW 664] = OAkk. maʔū [Gelb 1973, 166], Ebl. /māy/ or /may/, pl. /māwū/ [Krebernik 1983, 23, §616 & 24, §619] = /māwū/ [Frz. 1984, 129, 145] || Ug. my [WUS #1502], Hbr. may, pl. mayim [GB 418], NHbr. of TTM mōy [Dalman 1922, 227] | Syr. mayyō (pl.) [Frz.], JAram. mayyā (pl. mayyīn) [Levy 1924 III 98] || OSA: Sab. √mwy: mw(m,n) (“1. water, 2. natural artificial source of water” [Biella 1982, 268], Madhabi mwy [Arbach 1993, 72], Ar. māʔ-, pl. miyāh- & ʔamwāh- “eau” [BK II 1169], Hdrm. muwayh [Biella] | MSA: Hrs. ha-mu [Lsl. 1947, 195] = ḥe-myōh ~ -mōh [Jns.], Jbl. ḥe-myōh ~ -mōh [Jns.], Mhr. ḥa-mu [Vcl. 1936, 109; 1939, 142] = ha-mû [Lsl. 1962, 67] = ḥə-mōh ~ -mōh [Jns.] (MSA: Jns. 1977, 92; 1981, 92; 1987, 274) || Geez māy “water, liquid”, Tigre & Tna. & Grg. may “water”, Harari mī ~ mīy “water” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 376) etc. (Sem.: GB 418; WUS #1559; Frz. 1965, 146, #3.21; Rabin 1975, 89, #95; Lsl. 1987, 376; Fox 1998, 14) || probably common Brb. *aman (act. pl. *a-m-anʔ) “water” [Mkr. 1966, 104, #232]: NBrb.: Shilh aman [Aplg. 1958, 46] | Mzg. aman (“1. eaux, 2. euph.: sperme, 3. molettes, tare de cheval”) [Taifi 1991, 401], Mgild aman [Harries 1974, 223], Izdeg aman [Mrc. 1937, 91], Zayan & Sgugu aṃan [Lbg. 1924, 565] | Sgrs. aman [Pellat

1955, 103], Izn. & Snh. amän [Rns. 1932, 382], Rif *aman [Biarnay 1917, 86] = *amän [Rns.], Mzab aman [Dlh. 1984, 114], Wargla aman (“1. eau, 2. par ext.: sève, jus, suc, humeur”) [Dlh. 1987, 182], Sened amän [Priv. 1911, 112] | Nefusa aman [Bst.] = amen [Möller] = amān ~ amēn [Bgn. 1931, 259; 1942, 215, 272] | Qbl. aman [Dlt. 1982, 479], Zwawa & Bugi aman [Bst.] || EBrb.: Gdm. aman [Bst.], Siwa aman [Lst. 1931, 228, so also Bricchetti-Robecchi, Minutoli, Müller, Koenig, cf. Bst. 1890, 52] = amanne [Cailliaud apud Bst.], Audjila imin [Bst., Priv.] = imîn [Möller] = imîn [Prd. 1960, 159], Sokna amân [Srn. 1924–25, 11] || WBrb.: Zng. aman [Bst.] = aman ~ amân [Ncl. 1953, 202] || SBrb.: Hgr. âman [Fcd. 1951–2, 1139], EWlm. & Ayr aṣan [PAM 1998, 207; 2003, 518] etc. || Guanche *a-hem-on [GT] = *a-hamV-n [Mlt.] = *a-am-an [Wlf.] = *am^w-an or *amau-n [Mkr.]: Ferro (Hierro) aemon ~ ahe-mon, Gomera aemon, Tenerife aemon, Lanzerote ahemon ~ aemon (Guanche: Wlf. 1965, 513, #232; Mlt. 1991, 165; Brb.: Bst. 1890, 52) ||| Bed. oʻmu “Nässe, Feuchtigkeit”, cf. meija “feucht werden” [Munzinger] = muʻ “feucht sein”, cf. mei (?) “feucht werden” [Almkvist 1885, 46, 48] = mūʻ, pl. miʻ “Feuchtigkeit, Nässe”, miʻ “feucht, naß, flüssig sein” [Rn. 1895, 161] = miʻ “to be(come) damp”, miʻa “damp” [Rpr. 1928, 213] = muʻ “to be wet, moist” [Hds. 1996, 89] || LECu.: Afar mēma “falling rain, shower”, mēme “to drop rain, shower” [PH 1985, 167], Som. máyay “ein zwei bis drei Tage lang andauernder leichter Regen” [Rn. 1902, 308] = máyay “rain in the early part of the day” [Abr. 1964, 177] || SCu. *maʻa “water” [Ehret]: PRift *maʻay “water” [GT]: WRift *maʻay [KM]: Irg. maʻái [Dempwolff 1916–17, 311, #123] = mâʻai [Wtl. 1953; 1958, 91] = maʻay [TB 1957, 87; Ehr. 1980; MQK 2002, 68; KM], Grw. mâʻay [Wtl.] = maʻay [KM], Brg. máʻai [Mnh. 1906, 332] = máʻai [Claus 1910, 495] = maʻay [Dempwolff, Wtl., TB, Ehr.; KM], Alg. maʻay [Wtl., Ehr., KM] (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 26, #114; KM 2004, 197) | Qwd. maʻaya [Ehr.], Asa (Ngomwia) mája [Claus 1910, 493] = maʻa [Ehret] = maya [Flm.] | Maʻa mahi “water” [Mnh. 1906, 313] = maʻí [Ehr. 1974 MS, 45] = mā-ʻí (sic) [TB] | Dhl. maʻa “Wasser” [Dammann 1949–50, 232; TB 1957, 89] = màʻa “water, rain”, maʻw- “to drink”, máʻʻàǰǰe [-ǰ- < *-y-] “wet” [Elderkin 1973 MS, 6, #398 & 7, #438, #451 & 9, #599] = màʻa “water”, maʻaw “to drink”, maʻʻaǰǰe “wet” [Ehr.] = maʻa “water”, máʻʻaǰǰe “wet”, maʻaw- “to drink” [EEN 1989, 36] = maʻa “water”, maʻaw- “to drink”, maʻamēm-it- “to continuously drink” [Tosco 1991, 142] = maʻuna “to drink” [MSSL 1993, 50, #343] (SCu.: Tucker & Bryan

1974, 196 & fn. 36; Ehret 1980, 156; Cu.: Blz. 1997, 180) ||| WCh.: Dera māy- “benetzen” [Jng. 1966 MS, 10] = (?) māyè “1. to take a bath, 2. bathe (a person)” [Nwm. 1974, 129] | SBch. *mā “water” [GT]: Zeem maà [Smz.], Polchi maà’ [Smz.], Grnt. ma [Gowers] = maà [Smz.] = maà [Jgr. 1989, 187] = mà [Haruna 1992 MS, 22] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 33, #53; JI 1994 II, 340; Hs.-Grnt.: Skn. 1992, 353) || CCh.: FMcl. mà’i [Krf.], FBwg. mà’yin [Krf.], perhaps FKiria mètà “river” [Krf.] (Higi gr.: Krf. 1972 MS) | Gude (Cheke) pl. ma’in [Krf.], cf. Gude mya’a “drinking completely”, also “to twist, squeeze, wring out” [Hsk. 1983, 246] | Gsg. miyámò “wet” [Rsg. 1978, 358, #798a] | Ktk.: Sao meä “See” [Duisburg 1914, 42; quoted apud Slk. 1967, 191, #28 as Ngala] | Musgu-Pus maiyau “Wellen” [MB 1972, 10], perhaps Muskum màwà “saison des pluies” [Trn. 1977, 28] (CCh.: Krf. 1981, #104). All forms denote “water” if otherwise not indicated. From AA *ma’- “water” [GT]. Note that NAgaw: Bilin māy [Rn. 1887, 278] || LECu.: Afar māy “wasser”, only in: māy wà’rdi “das Bier” [Rn. 1886, 885] < ES.

AP: NS *ma(:) “to produce water” [Ehret] > CSud. *ma “to rain”, Saharan: Zaghawa & Bertī ma “well”, PDaju & Surmic *ma “water” (NS: Ehret 2001, 277, #97). Ful māyo “river, great water” [Mkr. 1957, 138, fn. 28], cf. Ful -am “marker of the class of liquids” [Jušmanov 1998, 180]. Niger-Congo ma “affix (often suffix) marking the class of liquids” [Mkr. 1981, 516; cf. Old. 1949, 161; Mkr. 1957, 138, fn. 28]. PBantu *mi, *-me “dew” [Skn.]. E. Dammann (1949–50, 232) compared Dhl. ma’a with the Bantu prefix *ma- (sic). Th. Obenga (1993, 291–293, #20) compares i.a. the following African words for “water”: Mbochi ma, Lingala may, Tiv mà, Tula mōye, Burak mēe. Some unconvincing African parallels were also proposed. L. Homburger (1929, 157; 1930, 283) compared Eg. mw “water” to Peul (Ful) mayo, pl. madye “river”, Bantu (sic) nyi “water”, Bambara maya “liquide”. At the same time (1929, 186), she equated Eg. mj.t (sic) “urine” with Bantu dial. (sic) nya, Agni mye “urine” etc. Irreal. Similarly, A. M. Lam (1993, 379) compared Eg. mwj.t “urine” to Pulaar bawle “id.” (which is in fact a borrowing of Ar. bawl-) and at the same time Eg. mwj.t-r3 “saliva” to Pulaar muuyre “salivation”, which was rightly rejected by H. Tourneux (2000, 93).

DP: J. D. Wölfel (1955, 87, #22) and H. G. Mukarovskiy (1963–66, 181, §75) compared Bsq. mama “eau ou autre liquide potable”. H. Möller (1911, 155, 168–9) and A. R. Bomhard (1981, 448) combined the Sem.-Eg.-Brb. root with IE *meu- “to flow, be wet, damp, moist”. Möller extended this to a number of triconsonantal roots both in Ar. and IE.

LIT.: Rn. 1873, 122, fn. 2 (Eg.-Sem.); Bst. 1883, 336 (Brb.-Sem.-Eg.); Hommel 1883, 98 (Eg.-PSem.); Erman 1892, 111 (Eg.-Sem.); Prv. 1911, 112 (Brb.-Sem.); Möller 1911, 155 (Sem.-Brb.); Bates 1914, 82 (Eg.-Brb.-Sem.); GB 418 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.); Farina 1924, 324 (Eg.-Sem.); Möller 1924, 42 (Eg.-Brb.); Farina 1926, 23, #39 (Eg.-Sem.); Clc. 1931, 28; 1936, #47 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); Chn. 1947, #485 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Som.); Lacau 1954, 291–292 (Eg.-Sem.); Wlf. 1955, 87, #22 (Brb.-ONub.-Eg.-Bsq.); Vcl. 1958, 376; 1983, 126–127 (Eg.-Sem.); Djk. 1965, 42; 1967, 187 (Sem.-Brb.-Eg.-Som.); 1970, 457, fn. 14 (Eg.-Brb.-Som.); 1974, 742 (PSem.-Eg.-Brb.); Flm. 1969, 23 (SCu.-Eg.-Sem.); Mkr. 1969, 34 (Sem.-Brb.); 1963–66, 181, §75 (Brb.-Ar.); 1966, 104, #232 (Brb.-Eg.); 1981, 109, #6 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Irq.); Dlg. 1964, 61; 1970, 620, #4 (Eg.-Sem.); 1973, 182 (Xmr.-Bed.-Som.-SCu.-Sem.-Eg.); Zvd. 1967, 22; 1980, 141 (Brb.-Eg.-Sem.); Rsl. 1971, 314 (Sem.-Eg.); Lacau 1972, 300, §11 (Eg.-Sem.); Bnd.

1975, 195, §92.1 (Sem.-Brb.-Eg.Irq.); IS 1976, #298 (Sem.-Eg.-Bed.-Som.-SCu.-Angas-CCh.-Jegu); NBĀ 704, n. 808 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); KHW 107 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); Nwm. 1980, 20 (Irg.-Eg.-Hbr.); Behrens 1981, 24–25 (Eg.-Brb.); Hodge 1981, 410; 1988, 273 (PSem.-Eg.-PCu.-Tamazight); Bmh. 1984, 272; 1990, 385 (Eg.-Sem.); DjK. etc. 1986, 64 = DjK. 1992, 33 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Bed.-Som.-SCu.-Geji); Ehret 1987, 103 (Bed.-SCu.); OS 1988, 75 (Sem.-WCh.-Gude-Smr.); Zbr. 1989, 589, #91 (Bed.-Som.-SCu.-PSem.-Eg.); Blz. 1990, 209 (SCu.-SBch.); Sasse 1991, 271, #1.2 (Sem.-Irg.-Eg.); OS 1992, 173 (Bed.-Agaw-LECū.-Eg.-PWCh.-PCCh.); Obenga 1993, 291–293, #20 (Eg.-AP-Polchi); JI 1994 I 176 (Ch.-Brb.-Eg.-Sem.); Ehret 1995, 300, #569 (Sem.-Eg.); Orel 1995, 107, #105 (PSem.-PBrb.-Eg.-Ch.-Bed.-SCu.); HSED #1699 (Sem.-Brb.-Eg.-WCh.-CCh.-Bed.-SCu.); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 32 (PSem.-Eg.-Bed.-Xmr.-SCu.-Ch.); Skn. 1997, 77–78, #7 (AP-Sem.-Cu.-Eg.-WCh.); Sd. 1997, 81, #1.1 (Ch.-Sem.-Eg.-PBrb.-SCu.-Bed.); Vernus 2000, 175 & fn. 44 (Eg.-Sem.-Irg.); Takács 2000, 99, #29.3 (SCu.-Eg.-Sem.).

NB1: The second root consonant in PSem. may be either *-ʔ or *-y. The reconstruction of PSem. word (above) is disputed. In any case, J. Osing's (NBĀ 704, n. 808) PSem. *maw (sic) is baseless. Considering Ar. māʔ- to be “*of course secondary*”, L. Kogan (2000, 723–4) thinks that J. Tropper's (2000, 164) reconstruction of *-ʔ- in the PSem. stem “*is against the evidence*” presented in Lsl. 1987, 376 and KB 576–7, although he too admits that “some AA cognates” (EDE I 120) have -ʔ-.

NB2: Ch. Ehret (1995, 507, #604) derived a number of unrelated Ar. roots from the bicons. PSem. *mʔ- “to be wet, produce fluid”: mʔd “to become juicy and begin to grow”, mʔr “to break open again (wound)”, mʔʒ “to wash the ground”. Similarly, H. Möller (1911, 168–9) identified Sem. *m- (sic) “water” with the hypothetical biconsonantal *mw- falsely deduced from Ar. mwh “aquam multam habuit (putens)”, mwʔ “to moisten (a thing) in water”, mawǧ- “unda”.

NB3: The etymological analysis of common Brb. *aman “water” [Mkr.] is highly disputed:

(1) Most widespread is the theory that PBrb. *aman derives from a monoradical root *m (as usually stated also in the Brb. lexicons), i.e. *aman was a fossilized masc. pl. form: *a-m-an (Bates: coll. < *mā), identical with the Eg.-Sem. root (Bst. 1883, 336; Brk. 1908, 332; Prv. 1911, 112; Möller 1911, 155; Bates 1914, 82; Möller 1924, 42; Clc. 1931, 28; 1936, #47; Chn. 1947, #485; Nicolas 1953, 202; Vcl. 1961, 289; DjK. 1965, 42; 1967, 187; 1970, 457, fn. 14; 1974, 742; Zvd. 1967, 22; 1980, 141; Mkr. 1969, 34; Osing 1976, 704, fn. 808; Behrens 1981, 24–25; DjK. etc. 1986, 64; Hodge 1988, 273; Sasse 1991, 271, #1.2; DjK. 1992, 33; HSED #1699; Sd. 1997, 81, #1.1). This Eg.-Brb. comparison was firmly rejected by W. Vycichl (DELIC 126–127). Following E. Laoust, J. Bynon (1984, 278–9, #42) did not exclude even a borrowing of the Brb. word from Punic (?). Improbable.

(2) G. Möller (1921, 193–5), P.-H. Zunke (1923/1997, 39), W. Vycichl (1933, 177; 1934, 46), and W. Helck (in Haussig ed. 1965, 331), in turn, combined PBrb. *aman “water” with a hypothetical LEg. *jmn “Meer (?), Teich (?)” (Möller) = *aman (sic!) “Wasser” (Vcl.) deduced from the phon. value late hrgl. used (from XXII.) for writing Eg. jmn “Amon” (Wb I 84, 17). This would, however, imply that the Brb. word should be analyzed as *a-man (i.e., with -n as part of the root), which J. Osing (NBĀ 704, n. 808) already rightly rejected (although his reconstructions are gravely mistaken: Brb. *mā, Sem. *maw, sic!). Möller thinks to have found the same Brb. word also in LEg. ʕmn (GW) attested as the hieratic gloss for Dem. brgt “Teich” in the bilingual (hieratic LEg. vs. Dem.) “bigger” Theban Pap. Rhind rt. 6:7. The hrgl. jmn, however, can be better explained on Eg. grounds, namely from *jw-m-nw “Insel mit Wasser” as suggested by K. Sethe (Vcl. 1934, 46, fn. 1).

(3) With special regard to the Guanche data (from *a-hem-on [GT] = *a-ham-V-n [Mlt.]), other scholars (e.g. Wlf. 1955, 87, #22; 1965, 513, #232; Vcl. 1955, 314; 1960, 263; 1983, 126–127; Dlg. 1964, 62; Prs. 1974, 146, 410; Rsl. 1979, 22–23; Behrens 1981, 24–25; Bynon 1984, 278–279, #42; Mlt. 1984, 22; 1991, 256, fn. 9; Skn. 1995, 34; Takács 1996, 49, #19; Blz. 2000, 38, #19; PAM 2003, 518) prefer

to analyze PBrb. *aman “water” as *a-am-an [Wlf.] = *i-imē-in [Vcl. 1955] = *i-yimiyu-n → *ēmēn → *aman [DELC] = *hamāh-an [Prs.] = *am-an [Skn.] = *Ham-Vn [Mlt. 1984] = *ama-n [Mlt. 1991] = *hāmāh-ān [PAM], i.e. as the pl. of a hypothetical stem *-am-, which was reconstructed various ways by various authors: e.g. PBrb. *yemi [Vcl. 1960], = *y-m [Rsl. 1979] = *em ~ *am [Wlf.]. The supporters of this etymology identified PBrb. *aman with Sem. *yamm- “sea” [Djk. 1965, 42] ||| Bed. yam (pl. tante) “water” [Vcl.] ||| CCh. *y-m “water” [GT]. G. Takács (1996, 49, #19) demonstrated that Brb. *a-ham-an may be akin to Ar. hmw ~ hmy “couler (une larme qui s’échappe de l’œil)” [BK II 1450] ||| Ch. *am [Nwm.] = *ham- “water” [GT] ||| Eg. hmlh “Speichel” (NK, Wb II 490, 8).

(4) E. Zyhlarz (1950, 436) explained Guanche: Ferro ahemon as a borrowing from Canaanite: Pun. ʔgmn “Wassertümpel” < ʔgm “Sumpf” suspecting a “*Mißverständnis bei der Aufnahme des Vokabels für ‘Wasser’, wahrscheinlich unter Hinweis auf eine Tümpel*”. False.

nb4: The Brb. word passed into Nubian, cf. ONub. & Mahasi aman “water” (Zhl. 1934–35, 185; Wlf. 1955, 87, #22; Behrens 1981, 24–25), but the time of borrowing is debated: P. Behrens (1981, 37) suggested a Nubian wandering during the NK into their present area ousting a Berber population, while I. Hofmann (1983, 39, 41) preferred a late date (2nd half of the 10th cent. AD) when a sudden Berber migration occurred eastwards under the Fatimides (for further discussion cf. Bechhaus-Gerst 1996, 145f.). A. Zaborski (1989, 176, n. 1), in turn, has rejected this Brb. > Nub. borrowing: “*I am not convinced that such a basic word may be borrowed. Perhaps this is only a pure coincidence*”.

nb5: L. Reinisch (1895, 161) and W. Leslau (1988, 96) equated Bed. mūʔ with Sem. *mhw, cf. Ar. mahuwa “être clair et aqueux” [BK II 1164] = “to be liquid, waterish” [Zbr. 1971, #139] || ES *mhw “to (be) melt(ed)” [Lsl.], which, however, represent a distinct AA root (probably *m-h-w), cf. Eg. mhwy “etwas Flüssiges” (Med., Wb II 114, 1–3) ||| LECu.: perhaps Som. mäh- [or secondary -h-?] “1. hervorquellen, fließen, 2. frisches, fließendes Wasser” [Rn. 1902, 289] = “eau courante, faire couler l’eau après avoir creusé la terre” [Chn.]. NAgaw: Hamir maw “fließig werden” [Rn. 1884, 397] = “liquidum, humidum esse” [Rn. 1895, 161] (may be an ES loan) ||| WCh.: Angas-Sura *m^a₂ (orig. *m^a₂) “1. (milky) sap, juice, 2. tear” [GT 2004, 256] may also belong here. Note that W. G. E. Watson (2002, 798, §6) derived Ug. mhy-t (3x) “rain” from Ug. my “water” (contra Badre et al., Syria 53, 1976, 121–2 who saw in the former a part. < √hyh expressing “l’idée de la chute de la neige... ou de la pluie... ‘averse’”).

nb6: M. Lamberti (1993, 362), in turn, equated Bed. mūʔ with HECu.: Kmb. & Alb. muṭ-a “naß” derived from his OCu.-Om. *maydy- “to wash”.

nb7: It is not yet clear whether AA *m-ʔ “water” [GT] has anything to do with either of the following Ch. roots: (1) WCh.: Hausa mīyà “soup or gravy (made from meat and leaves etc.)” [Abr. 1962, 676–7]; (2) Ch. *m-y “saliva” [GT] (discussed in the entry for Eg. m^c, q.v.); (3) WCh.: Tsagu moʔoyi “dew” [Skn.] || CCh.: Ktk.: Afd. mo “Tau” [Stz. in Slk. 1967, 191], Lgn. mū “Tau, dew” [Nct. in Lks. 1936, 111] = māv “dew” [Bouny 1975 MS, 15, #215].

nb8: Several authors (Cohen 1947, #485; D’jakonov 1965, 42; 1967, 207, fn. 73; Newman 1980, 20; Mukarovsky 1969, 34; 1981, 109, #6; 1981, 516; Bender 1975, 195, §92.1; Kaye 1985, 890; Jungraithmayr & Ibrizsimow 1994 I, 176; Ehret 1995, 300, #569; Stolbova 1997, 81–82; Vernus 2000, 175 & fn. 44; Prasse in PAM 2003, 518) are inclined to see an etymological connection between the Ch. reflexes of common AA *m-ʔ “water” [GT] vs. AA *y-m “water” [GT] vs. AA *h-m “water” [GT]. O.V. Stolbova (1997, 81–82, #1.2) supposes in PCh. *ʔamma “water” [Stl.] an assim. of *ʔamwa, which she considered an old broken pl. of AA *maʔ/y/w- “water” [Stl.] following the pattern *ʔaprās- just like Ar. ʔamwāh- or WCh.: Bokkos re, pl. ʔarya “man” (which is the only known Chadic example of this type of broken pl. acc. to Stolbova). H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibrizsimow (1994 I 176), in turn, explained almost all Ch. forms from their PCh. *y-m-n “water”. This great

variety of diverse etymons is problematic, and we should carefully distinguish the following Ch. roots from AA *m-? “water” [GT]:

(1) Ch. *h-m “water” [GT]: WCh. *hama [Std.]: AS *ham (Gmy. *hām) [GT 2004, 153] = *am [Std. 1977] = *ham [Dlg.] = *ham [Std. 1987]: Gerka ram [ɣam, reg. < *ham] [Ftp. 1911, 221] = ɣàm “Wasser” [Jng. 1965, 174], Angas am “1. water, 2. rain” [Ormsby 1914, 314–315] = am “water (to drink or wash with)” [Flk. 1915, 143] = [ʔàm] “water” [Brq. 1971, 30, 33], Sura àm “Wasser, Flüssigkeit” [Jng. 1963, 58], Mpn. àm [Frj. 1991, 3], Kfy. am [Ntg. 1967, 1], Chip òm [Krf.], Tal hām [Jng./JI], Mnt. hām “Wasser” [Jng. 1965, 171], Gmy. ham “water” [Ftp. 1911, 221] = haam “a drink of any kind, also water” [Srl. 1937, 72, 75] = hàam “Flüßigkeit” [Jng. 1962 MS, 2] = haam “1. water, 2. (usually) to drink” [Hfm.] = haam [Hlw. 2000 MS, 12] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 25, #241; Std. 1977, 152, #4; 1987, 229, #775) | Ron *ham [GT]: Fyer & Bks. & DB & Sha ham, Klr. ʔaam (Ron: Jng. 1970, 390) | BT *hama [Std.] = *am- [Schuh], Bole ʔame [Schuh] = aməi [Schuh] = àmmá [Schuh], Tng. am [Jng.], Krkr. àmù [Schuh], Ngamo hùm [Schuh], Kirfi pl. àmmá [Schuh] = amma [Gowers], Glm. pl. àmá [Schuh], Gera pl. hámá [Schuh], Pero àm [Schuh] = àm [Frj. 1985, 18] (BT: Schuh 1984, 214) | Ngz. am [Nwm.] = àm [IL] = àm [Schuh 1981, 8], Bade amun [IL] (WCh.: Std. 1977, 64; 1987, 229) || CCh.: Ktk. *am [Phr.]: Lgn. am [Mch.] = àm (pl.) [Lks.] = ʔàm [Bouny] = ʔàm [Bouny 1975 MS, 5, #58], Bdm. amaii “water”, amai “rain” [Talbot 1911, 252] = ammay “eau, pluie” [Gaudiche 1938, 23] = àmái ~ àmei [Nct. in Lks. 1939, 90] = aamai [Cyffer], Afd. àmeh [ame(:)] [Stz.] = hāmē [Barth] = amē [Lbf.], Mkr. amē [Barth] = amē [Lbf.], Glf. am [GD & Röder] = àm [AF], Shoe ame [Lks.] (Ktk.: Slk. 1967, 190, #28; Phr. l.c.) || ECh.: KK *ka-am [prefix kV-] [GT]: Kwang kàam [Jng.], Kera kan [Ebert] | PLY *ka-ama (?) [GT]: Lele kāmá [Gowers], Kabalay ka:mə [Cpr.] | Mgm. àmmi [JA 1992, 65], WDng. amay [Fédry] | Mubi àam, pl. àámé [Lks. 1937, 180] = ʔam [Jng. 1990 MS], Birgit ʔami [Jng. 1973 MS] (Ch.: Str. 1922–23, 127; NM 1966, 240; Lks. 1970, 33; Jng. 1970, 420; Phr. 1972, 15, #4.1; Wolff 1974, 14–15; Nwm. 1977, 34; Mkr. 1987, 395; Zima 1990, 52–53; JI 1994 II, 340–341). All forms denote “water” if otherwise not indicated. From AA *h-m “water” (or sim.) [GT], cf. Sem.: Ar. hmw ~ hmy “couler (une larme qui s’échappe de l’œil)” [BK II 1450] ||| Eg. hmh “Speichel” (NK, Wb II 490, 8) ||| SCu.: Irq. hame “sweat” [Ehret] = hamē “sweat” [Mgw. 1989, 102] | DhI. himm-a “dirt of the body” [Ehret] = him-ā “sweat, dirt of body” [EEN 1989, 15] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 305) ||| NOM.: Kaffa amiy-ō ~ amih-o, Mocha ʔamiy-o ~ amih-o “rain” (Gonga: Mkr. 1981, 109). See Std. 1987, 229 (Ch.-Ar.); Zima 1990, 52–53 (Ch.-Ar.); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 32 (Ch.-Ar.); HSED #1156 (Ch.-Ar.); Takács 1996, 49, #19 (Ar.-Eg.-Ch.). Note that JI (1994 I 176) derived Fyer h- from *y-; Kirfi pl. àmmá [Schuh] < *yamna; Mgm. àmmi [JA] < *yamni; Bdm. aamai [Cyffer] < *yaman, which is dubious.

(2) CCh. *y-m “water” [GT] = *y-m-n [JI 1994 I, 176]: Tera ʔyim [Nwm.], Ga’anda yèma [Zima], Gabin yème [Zima] | Margi ʔimí [IL] = ʔyimi ~ ʔimi [Krf.], WMargi yimi [Krf.], Ngwahyi yimì [Krf.], Bura yimi [Krf.], Cbk. yimi [Krf.] | HNkafa yimi [Krf.], HBaza yèmi [Krf.], HKamale yèmwí [Krf.], HFutu yèmi [Krf.], FGilí -yam [Krf.], FKiria -yàm(v) [Krf.], FJilbu yimù [Krf.] | Lamang (Hítkala) imi [Meek] = ìmi [Lks.: from *i-ym-i?] = imí [Wolff 1971, 65] | Mtk. iyâm ~ yàm [Schubert], Mofu yám [Brt.], Gsg. (Dogba) yam [Lks.] | Musgoy yim [Mch.], Daba yim [Lienhardt], Kola yim [Schubert] | Musgu yim [Mch.] | Sukur yiam [Grb.] = iyam [Nwm.] = yàm [IL] etc. (Ch.: Str. 1922–1923, 127; NM 1966, 240; Lks. 1970, 33; Jng. 1970, 420; Phr. 1972, 15, #4.1; Wolff 1974, 14–15; Nwm. 1977, 34; Mkr. 1987, 395; Zima 1990, 52–53; JI 1994 II, 340–341). From AA *y-m [GT], cf. Sem. *yamm- “sea” (Sem.: GB 302; WUS #1172) ||| Bed. yam (pl.) “water” [Rn. 1895, 242]. Note that NEg. jm “Meer” (XVIII, Wb I 78, 11) is not a cognate, but a late loan from Sem. *yamm-. For the Sem.-Bed.-Ch. cf. also Grb. 1963, 63; Phr. 1972, 76, #48.2; PDP 1972, 65.

(3) Ch. *mb- or *mb-y “water” [GT]: WCh.: NBch. *ambi [Stl. 1987, 249]: Kry. ábi ~ áábi [Skn.], Miya abi [Skn.], Pa’a ambi [Gowers, IL] = ámbi [MSkn.], Siri ibi [Gowers, IL] = íbí [Skn.], Mburku bi [Skn.], Jmb. ìmbí [Skn.] || CCh.: Nzangi mbii [Meek] = bíí [Mch.] = bíí [Str.], Bata mbgy ~ mbgooy [Mch.], Bata-Demsa böyé [Str.] | Zime-Batna bí [Jng.], Ham mbèé [Ajl.], Musey mbòó [Ajl.], Lew mbò [Ajl.], Marba mbiyó ~ mbi ~ mbò [Ajl.] (Masa gr.: Ajello 2001, 21) | ECh.: Sokoro mbo [AF] = úmbo [Barth] “Wasser, Durst” [Lks. 1937, 36] = úumbo [Saxon] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 340–1): explained by JI l.c. as *m- “hardened to a prenasalized stop”. Hardly. Only PMasa *mb- might, in principle, derive from *m- in the testimony of the etymological evidence. Instead, cp. SBrb.: Hgr. ti-biy (coll.) “gros nuages noirs et près de terre échelonnés les uns derrière les autres”, cf. ta-bay-ôt “pluie fine et pénétrante sans vent (suffisante pour pénétrer la terre et faire germer les plantes, insuffisante pour faire couler les ruisseaux)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 41] = ta-bäy-ot “drizzle (rain)” [Prs. 1990, 164] || LECu.: Som. biy-o ~ biy-á “water” [Rn. 1904, 55] | SOrm. (Reshiat dial.) biy-e “water” [Dlg. 1966, 54] || WCh.: (?) Hausa bái “watering horses” [Abr. 1962, 59].

nb9: The Russian linguists (A. B. Dolgopol’skij 1973, 182; V. M. Illič-Svityč 1976, #298; I. M. D’jakonov etc. 1986, 64; 1992, 33) prefer to derive LECu.: Som. máyad “die Gezeiten, Ebbe und Flut des Meeres” [Rn. 1902, 307] from AA *m-? “water”, although -d was part of the root which L. Reinisch (l.c.) compared with Ar. mayyād- “motus, agitatus”.

nb10: H. G. Mukarovskij (1987, 237) identified Eg.-Sem. *m-? “water” with HECu. *waʔa “water” and LECu.: Som. biyʔ- (sic), which is phonologically untenable.

nb9: Ch. Ehret (1995, 300, #569), in turn, derived NOM. *mas- “to wash” (!) and Ch. *mb- “water” from AA *m- “water”.

nb10: N. Skinner (1997, 73) considered the root *m “water” to be the building element in a number of unrelated AA roots: (1) Ch. *kədəm “crocodile”, Skn.: < *kər-/ *ada “dog” + *m “water”; (2) Ch. *kəzəm “thirst” combined by N. Skinner with SBrb.: Tgr.: Hgr. e-ǧzi “mourir de faim” [Fcd.], Ayr ə-gzu “avoir un désir intense de, désirer ardemment” [PAM 1998, 106]; (3) Ch. *ami “honey (bee)” [Skn.] || EBrb.: Gdm. ta-məm-t “honey”; (4) Ch. *d-()m “blood” [Skn.] || PCu. *di/um- “red” [Ehret] || Sem. *dam- “blood” [Frz.]; (5) WCh.: Gwnd. amiši “swimming” || ES *hms “to swim” (combined with Ar. ʕam “to swim”, sic!); (6) Sem. *tuhām-at- “sea” [Frz.] || Eg. thm “bewässern” (GR, Wb V 322, 7); (7) PCu. *ʕam- “saliva, mucus, sap, to spit” [Ehr.]; (8) Skn. 1997, 77–78, #7: ~ ECh.: Tumak muləl “larme” || Bed. mile ~ melo “tear” < mi “wet” + lili “eye” ~ PCu. *ʕil- “eye” (!). Far-fetched and baseless.

nb11: Cf. also LECu.: Saho mūmu-te “to wash, rinse one’s mouth” [Vergari 2003, 138] || WCh.: Gerka mi “to wash” [Ftp. 1911, 221; GT 2004, 248: isolated in AS]?

mw.w “Art Leute, die beim Leichenbegängnis tanzen” (MK, Wb II 53, 14; WD II 60 & III 51: cf. RdE 5, 1946, 256f.; SAK 2, 1975, 1f.; 15, 1988, 10f.) = “class of ritual dancers” (FD 106) = “Muu-Tänzer (im alten butischen Ritual)” (GHWb 330).

nb: The old renderings of mw.w (A. Moret 1927, 258: “rois bouffons”; G. van der Leeuw quoted by Brunner-Traut: “bekrönte Narren”; Jéquier 1925–7, 144–151: “Wasser-geister”) were rejected by E. Brunner-Traut (1992, 57–59), who saw in the mw.w “die Vertreter einer Nekropolengottheit, die dem Jenseits entstiegen, um (den Toten) in ihre Welt zu holen”. H. Junker (MDAIK 9, 1940, 1f., 26, 28), in turn, identified them with “die Seelen von Buto als die verstorbenen Könige von Buto, Seelen der Könige, die aus ihren Gräbern dem Trauerzug entgegenzogen”. Emphasizing the parallelism of CT I 281c (“*Es schütteln für dich die beiden Herrinnen von Buto/Dpw ihre Locken*”) vs. the Eg. burial ritual (cf. Junker, MDAIK 9, 1940, 8f., 24, 26; Fakhry, ASAE 42, 1943, t. 52 etc., where “*ähnlich schütteln die Mtww bzw. die Seelen von Buto... vor dem Toten ihr vorüberfallendes Haar*”), P. Kaplony (KBIÄF 181, n. 261 & 186, n. 272), in turn,

surmised in mw.w “die unterägyptische Ahnenkönige oder die Urgötter der Flut... als Trauergefolge des Toten (Osiris)”. After a thorough discussion of the mw.w, H. Altenmüller (1975, 2–36) suggests (o.c., pp. 36–37) that “die Tracht der Muu deutet ihre Funktion als Fährleute und Grenzwächter an. Wie die Bewohner der Sumpflandschaften sind sie mit den Kränzen aus Papyrusstauden geschmückt”. The mw.w “... als Fährleute haben die Aufgabe, den Transport der Mumie einzuleiten und dessen Durchführung zu überwachen. Sie werden als Grenzwächter an den Gewässern des Osthimmels mythologisiert und sind zugleich die Fährleute, die für die Überfahrt des Toten zum Osthorizont... sorgen”. They are – in Altenmüller’s formulation – “Wesen, die einst selbst sterblich waren, aber durch ihren Tod in den Stand von ‘Geistern’ (3hw) ja von ‘Göttern’ (ntrw) erhoben worden sind”. So also H. Altenmüller (LÄ IV 271–2): “... wahrscheinlich, daß aufgrund ihrer Tracht in den Muu Fährleute oder Grenzwächter zu erkennen sind. Sie sollten im Ritual die Rolle der... mythischen Fährleute übernehmen, die... für den Himmelsaufstieg des Toten sorgen”. In the view of D. Meeks (2001, 357–8) too, their dance was performed when the procession reached the tomb differed in the “less sophisticated scenes” from the that of others only by their special head-dress (woven of papyrus-stalks) is identifying them as marsh dwellers, more precisely, as ferry-men, their role being to ferry the dead across the waters leading to the netherworld.

● Etymology obscure.

- 1. G. Jéquier (1925–27, 147–8) explained it from Eg. mw “water”, lit. “celui des eaux... , créatures... que les Égyptiens se figuraient résider au sein du grand abîme”. Similarly, P. Kaplony (KBIÄF 181, n. 261) considered mw(j).w as an old nisbe, lit. “Wasserleute”, hence: “unterägyptische Ahnenkönige“. This etymology was adopted also by H. Altenmüller (1975, 36–37), even if with hesitation (“von unklarer Etymologie”) and from a different standpoint: he maintains that mw.w literally meant “die zum Wasser gehörenden Männer”, which “möglicherweise hängt mit den Wasserwegen zusammen, an deren Ufer die ‘Muu’ Dienst tun (mit der ursprünglichen Aufgabe, als Fährleute, ... die für die Überfahrt des Toten... sorgen)”. NB: Jéquier falsely included in this equation also nmjw “dwarf” (MK) misread by him as mw (sic).

- 2. GT: or inherited from AA? In this case, the association with the Delta might have been secondary, while its true cognate appears presumably in ECh. *m-y (?) “Totentanz” [GT]: Kera máayáwná “Totentanz und -gesang der Männer” [Ebert 1976, 79] | Mkl. máàyé “cérémonie commémorative en l’honneur d’un ancien (environ tous les sept ans)” [Jng. 1990, 135], WDng. móymò “danse guerrière pour la mort” [Fédry 1971, 136].

NB: Any connection to AA *m-y ~ *m-w “to bury” [GT]: ECu.: Dullay *māy- “begraben” [GT]: Harso & Dbs. māy- “begraben” [AMS], Glg. may- “begraben” [AMS], Tsamay may “to bury”, mayo “tomb” [Sava 2005 MS, 249] (Dullay: AMS 1980, 173, 213, 232) ||| Ch. *m-w(?) “to bury” [GT]: CCh.: Lame móʔ(ó) “1. enterrer, 2. planter, mettre en terre” [Scn. 1982, 320], Zime-Dari móʔ “1. enterrer, 2. semer” [Cpr. 1984, 17], Mesme màʔa “planted (e.g. tomatoes)” [Jng. 1978, 17] = (?) [mū] “l’enterrement” [Ksk. 1990, 92] || ECh.: Smr. mwə “enterrer” [Brt.-Jng. 1990, 115] = mù “enterrer” [Jng. 1993 MS, 45] | Sarwa mô & Gadang mô: “enterrer” [Jng.-Ibr. 1993 MS, 5, #90]? Note that V. È. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 193; HSED #1781) equated the Dly.-CCh. root mistakenly with Eg. mḥʕ.t “tomb”.

- 3. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 213, #1831): Eg. mw.w “dance” (sic), lit. “turning about” (sic), equated with Sem. *mwr “to turn, change” |||

LECu.: Som. mayḏān “exchange” < AA *-may/w- “to turn, change”. Unacceptable. Eg. mw.w did not denote dancers in general.

mw^od “Versammlung” (Wenamom 2:71, Helck 1971, 513) = “assembly” (DLE I 214 after JNES 4, 245) = “council” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 6).

NB: GW: mú-^od-(ut) (Helck) = mú-^od-(t) [*mô^oVd] (Cochavi-Rainey) = mu₃-^oid [*mô^oid] (Hoch). L.H. Lesko’s (DLE l.c.) rdg. mw-^od (sic) is false.

- Borrowed from NWSem., cf. Hbr. mō^oēd “1. place for meeting, assembly point, 2. meeting, assembly” [KB 557–8], Ug. m^od “convention, assembly” [DUL 520] < Can. *y^od < Sem. *w^od, cf. Ar. maw^oid- “(lieu de) rendez-vous” [BK II 1566].

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Helck 1971, 513, §90; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 6, §1.1.1.2 & 35; Hoch 1994, 126, §161.

mwmw (in: wnm...mwmw) “in rohem Zustand (?) (verzehren)” (PT, Wb II 55, 6; Czermak 1931, 25) = “entirely raw” (Faulkner 1924, 100 after Ember) = “(to devour) piecemeal (?)” (AEPT 82, 89) = “(to devour) piece-meal (?)” (CT, AECT II 202–3, spell 619, n. 24 & 204–5, spell 622, n. 7; DCT 165) = “cru (adv.)” (Cannuyer 1989, 9: PT & CT exx.) = “*in rohem Zustand (verzehren)” (GHWb 331; ÄWb I 525b).

- Meaning disputed, etymology obscure.
- **1.** A. Ember (1913, 116, #55; 1930, #10.c.1 quoted also in Faulkner 1924, 100; Clc. 1936, #624) interpreted Eg. mw-mw as *elativus* “entirely raw” of *mw “raw” equated with Sem. *ny? “to be raw” [GT]. Hardly tenable, since Eg. m- ≠ Sem. *n-.
- **2.** GT: perhaps identical with LECu.: Afar mūmo (f) “eating without teeth”, mūmuy-ise “to suck” [PH 1985, 172]?
- **3.** GT: if, in turn, PT mwmw described the way of eating itself, one should eventually account for NOm. *mā “manger” [Crl.] = *m- “to eat” [Bnd.; Flm. 1983, 453–4] = *mV̄- [GT] (NOm.: Crl. 1937–40, 34; 1938 III, 79, 205; 1951, 466–467; Mkr. 1981, 217–218, #59.a; Bnd. 1988, 145; LS 1997, 449) ||| Ch. *m-(y) “to eat” [GT]: WCh.: Waja m̄j- “to swallow” [Kwh. 1990, 239] || CCh.: Bata mwà “to eat together”, mwàa-tō “eating together, sharing cooked food” [Pweddou 2000, 58] | Lamang may-a “weiden, füttern” [Wolff 1972, 198] || ECh.: Kwang mé “manger (viande)” [Jng. in Brt.-Jng. 1990, 113], Kwang-Mobu mé “manger (viande)” [Jng. in Lenssen 1982, 109; 1984, 69]. From AA *may?- “to eat” [Mlt. 2005, 360, #23] = *m-y (?) [GT].

AP: NS *māy or *māy “to chew up” [Ehret 2001, 280, #110].

NB1: Cf. also NAgaw: Hamir mī “bread” [Lmb.] (orig. **“food”*) || CCh.: Glavda miya “(a kind of) food” [RB 1968, 66]?

NB2: To be separated from LECu.: Saho maw ~ mǎw “das Mittagmahl, Mahlzeit” [Rn. 1890, 277] = maw ~ mowo “lunch” [Vergari 2003, 134], Afar mā^ow-ó (f) “das Mittagessen, die Hauptmalzeit des Tages” [Rn. 1886, 878] = mayo “dinner, lunch, midday meal, having drunk milk or water, being satisfied with m. or w.” [PH 1985, 166] = mā^o-o “food” (sic) [Lmb.]?

NB3: NOm. **mV̄-* and its Chadic parallels might be alternatively related via met. (**mV̄-* < **V̄m* < **ᶜVm*) with AA **ᶜ-m* “to eat (or sim.)” [GT] (discussed by Takács 2003, 73, #3.8) as suggested e.g. by H. C. Fleming (1983, 453–4) and A. Militarev (2005, 360, #23). AP: PBaz **am* “to eat”. PKalenjin **λm* “to eat” [HRV 1979, 77, 86].

- **4.** GT: a semantically attractive parallel is found in WCh.: AS **mē₂n* “raw” [GT 2004, 246]. Dissim. in AS (**mē₂n* < **mē₂m* < **may-may?*) or assim. in OEg. (*mwmw* < **mwnw*)?

NB: Attested in Angas miin “1. unripe, raw (of meat), 2. undeveloped, gibberish, or the efforts of a beginner in a language” [Flk. 1915, 245] = miin (K) ~ min (Kd & K) “uncooked, fresh, raw (meat)” [Jng. 1962 MS, 26], Mpn. méen “(to be) raw, uncooked” [Frj. 1991, 37], Msr. me’en (so, -e’e-) “raw” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 181, 276], Gmy. mèn [-ē-] “rawness” [Srl. 1937, 138] = meen “to be raw, fresh” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 22].

mwnf (MK) > **mnf** (NK, LP) “Beistand, Helfer jmds., auch: Beschützer eines Ortes” (MK, Wb II 55, 7–9) = “serviteur” (Ceugney) = “protector” (Grd. 1911, 9*, fn. 13) = “protection” (Barguet 1952, 15, fn. 4) = “1. garrison (XVIII.), 2. (palace) guard (MK), 3. protector (of poor) (MK)” (FD 106) = “garrison or protector (of a place)?” (Gdk. 1977, 93) = “1. Helfer, Beistand, Beschützer (der Armen), 2. Palastwache, 3. Schutztruppe, Garnison” (GHWb 331; ÄWb I 525: lx in 1st IMP) = “protector” (Edfu, PL 429).

NB: For the late wtg. mnf cf. RdE 9, 1952, 15, n. 4; WD II 60. The omission of -n- (*mwf*) in Pap. Anastasi I 5:6 may be due to m- (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 54). Its wtg. mnf3 in Pap. Anastasi I 9:1 looks like a reinterpretation **m-nf3* “durch (o.ä.) jene” (o.c., p. 75, cf. p. 255).

- Etymology still obscure.

- **1.** Already H. Grapow (1914, 24) surmised in it the participial m- prefix, but he did not explain the meaning of **wnf*. W. Vycichl (1934, 102; 1959, 37) and H. Smith (1979, 161), in turn, suggested a nomen agentis m- form derived from Eg. *wnf* “sich freuen” (MK, Wb I 319) = “to be joyful” (FD 61). A direct derivation from this Eg. root is semantically baseless, albeit a remote connection is not fully unjustified.
- **2.** GT: Eg. *mwnf* denoting a confidential status, the underlying root (**wnf* < **wlf?*) is perhaps related to Sem. **wlp* “to be intimate, friendly” [GT]: JAram. *ylp* “1. gewohnt sein, sich gewöhnen, pflegen, 2. lernen” [Levy 1924 II, 242–3], Mnd. *ylp* ~ *ʔlp* ~ *ʕlp* *peal* “to learn, practice, train os.” [DM 21, 192] | Ar. *wlf*: III “être dans la

familiarité de qqn., être son compagnon intime, être uni, s'associer à qqn." [BK II 1605] = II "to be friendly, favour", III "to be friends, trust" [Zbr.], Omani Ar. wəlīf "companion" [Jns.] | MSA: Hrs. weléf "companion" [Jns. 1977, 2], Mhr. wlf: ətwəlīf "to become close friends", wəlayf "companion" [Jns. 1987, 428] || Tigre tə-wal-lafa "to get accustomed, wish" [Zbr.] (Sem.: Zbr. 1971, 74, #132) || NBrb. (from Ar.?): Qbl. wellef "1. durer, rester (par accoutumance), 2. s'habituer", walef "être habitué, accoutumé" [Dlt. 1982, 864].

NB1: A. Zaborski (l.c.) set up a biconsonantal Sem. *lp "to get accustomed", cf. Ar. lwf: lafa "to join friendship with" [Zbr.], Ar. 'alifa "1. s'habituer (à un lieu, une demeure), 2. devenir doux, apprivoisé" [BK I 46] = "vertraut sein, sich dauernd aufhalten" [GB], Hbr. 'lp qal "etwa: vertraut werden" [GB 44] = "to learn (accustom o'self to)" [KB 59]. GB l.c., however, suggests a connection with Sem. *lp "sich verbinden" (a *Volksetymologie?*).

NB2: Eventually, a remote etymological connection of Sem. *wlp "to be friendly" vs. Eg. wnf "sich freuen" is not excluded, although the -n- of Cpt. (SB) ΟΥΝΟϚ "to rejoice" (CD 485) seems to speak against this connection (but cf. Takács 2005, 77–82), cf., e.g., IE *prāi- "gern haben" > i.a. OIndic pṛiṇāti "erfreut", med. "ist vergnügt über etwas", pṛīyate "liebt", pṛī- (f) "Freude, Befriedigung", Germanic *frij-ō- "freundlich behandeln, umwerben", hence *frij-ond- (part.) "Freund, Verwandter": Gothic frijōnds "friend" etc. (IEW 844; Kluge 1999, 285–6). Note that E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 89, §10; 1934, 117) and V. Blažek (1992, 141, §11) equated Eg. wnf with SBrb. *w-n-f: Hgr. unnaf "etwas gern haben, vorziehen", wenif-et "etwas zu sehen wünschen" [Zhl.].

- Other etymologies cannot be accepted:
- **3.** C. Ceugney (1880, 6) derived its late var. mwf (sic) via prefix m- from Eg. w^of "dompter, châtier" (Ceugney) = "gekrümmt, eingebogen sein, niederbeugen" (MK, Wb I 285) = "to bend down, subdue, be bent, curled up" (FD 57).
NB: To be declined both semantically and phonologically (MEg. mwnf can hardly derive from MEg. w^of).
- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 284) equated it with Ful ballowo, pl. walluḅe "a help". Baseless.
- **5.** H. Goedicke (1977, 155, n. 190) supposed a "probable" connection to Eg. mnf³.t "Art Soldaten" (MK, Wb, q.v.), which can be safely excluded, the underlying roots (*wnf vs. *nf³) being clearly distinct.

mflhj "Getreide sieben" (OK, Wb II 55, 13) = "to pass (grain) through sieve" (Grd. 1909, 115) = "setacciare (≈ nqr)" (Curto 1959, 238, fn. 1) = "tamiser (du grain)" (AL 77. 1683, 78.1689) = "passare i cereali al vaglio" (Conti 1978, 158) = "(durch)sieben (Getreide)" (GHWb 332; ÄWb I 526) = "sieben" (Altenmüller 1998, 122, 281).

NB: Regarding its fem. inf. mflh.t, most probably IVae inf. mflhj, which is confirmed also by its supposed denom. origin (suggested already by P. J. Watson 1979, 106, n. 25).

- Already W. Czermak (1931, 28, fn. 1) correctly surmised the m- prefix in Eg. mḥ on the basis of the incompatibility laws: “*altes m- Präfix, sonst m + f unmöglich im unzertrennlichen Wortstamme*”. The identification of the underlying root is, however, debated:
- **1.** P. J. Watson (1979, 106, n. 25), Ch. Reintges (1994, 226), and P. Wilson (PL 420) tried to explain it as an m- prefix form of Eg. ḥ “(ab)lösen” (OK, Wb I 578) with diverse semantical derivations.
NB: Watson rendered the unattested *mḥ “looser”, while Reintges used an erroneous rendering “to sift” for Eg. ḥ. Wilson, in turn, saw a remote connection to Eg. mḥ “sledge” derived by P. Kaplony (KBIÁF 157. n. 197) equally from Eg. ḥ (assuming a lit. sense “der entfernbare Untersatz”).
- **2.** G. Conti (1978, 93–94, 97, 147, 158), followed by W. G. E. Watson (2000, 570, §22), affiliated it with Sem. *nḥ “souffler (avec la bouche)” [Cohen] = “soffiare” [Conti] = “to blow” [GT], which would imply either a prefix *n- in Sem. or assuming an assim. of Eg. mḥ from *nḥ, which can hardly be correct, since Eg. n + f were not incompatible. Semantically also rather improbable.
NB1: Cf. Akk. napāḥu Ebl. /napāḥum/ “to blow”, /mappaḥum/ “bellows” [Frz. 1984, 128, 147 contra Krebernik 1983, 38f., n. 142] || Ug. nḥ “blasen”, mḥ-m (dual?) “Blasebalg” [Ast. 1948, 212, #19; WUS #1815] = mḥ “bellows” [Watson 2000, 570, §22], Hbr. nḥ qal “1. to blow, breathe, 2. set aflame, 3. gasp, plant” [KB 708] || Ar. nafāḥa “souffler avec la bouche, p.ex. pour enfler, gonfler qqch.” [BK II 1306] | ES: Geez nafḥa “to blow (upon), breathe on, inflate” [Lsl.], Tna. nāfḥe etc. “to inflate” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1959, 267; 1987, 388; Sem.: GB 511; Cohen 1961, 69, #65; WUS #1815; Aro 1964, 154; Conti 1980, 93–94; Lsl. 1987, 388).
NB2: The etymological analysis of Sem. *nḥ is somewhat uncertain. W. von Soden (1968, 176) assumed (probably correctly) a prefixation by n-: “puḥ/h machen”. G. Conti (1978, 95–97), in turn, supposed a bicons. *np-, whence he derived a number of semantically unconvincing *comparanda*: Sem. *npd “to penetrate, separate” (sic), *npd “to shake, sieve”, *npg “to smell”, *npy ~ *npp “to sieve”, *nps “to breathe” || Eg. mḥ, nḥ, fnd, nf, nfj.t. Most of these roots are unrelated. Cf. also (via met.) AA *n-g-f [GT] > Ar. naḥafa “1. faire sortir l’air par le nez, comme si l’on éternuait, ou comme si l’on voulait jeter les glaires, 2. aspirer l’air par le nez” [BK II 1222] || NBrb.: Mzg. ngef > nyef “perdre halaine, être essoufflé, haleter” [Taifi 1991, 475].
NB3: Following von Soden’s analysis, we may derive Sem. *nḥ from AA *f-Q (probably *fuq-) “1. to blow” [GT], cf. SCu. *fUk- [GT] = *fōk- “1. to catch one’s breath, 2. rest” [Ehret]: Asa fuʔ-it- [-ʔ- < *-k- reg.] “1. to catch one’s breath, 2. rest” [Ehret] | DhI. fōk- “to rest” [EEN 1989, 23; Tosco 1991, 133] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 151, #21) || WCh.: Angas-Sura *fuk “1. to blow, 2. use bellows” [GT 2004, 110]; Angas fūk “bellows” [Flk. 1915, 178] = fuk (K) “Blasebalg” [Jng. 1962 MS] = fuk “bellows” [ALC 1978, 18], Kfy. fuk “1. to blow, 2. operate bellows” [Ntg. 1967, 13], probably Msr. puk (so, p-) “(describing sound of breathing)” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 256], Gmy. fuk “1. to inflate, swell, 2. breathe” [Srl. 1937, 52] = fuk “to pump, inflate” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 10].
- **3.** GT: mḥj is presumably a denominal verb of an unattested *mḥ “sieve”, which must be a nomen instr. of a hypothetical Eg. *ḥ (or *wḥ) “to sieve”. This assumption seems to be corroborated (in spite of the anomalous initial labials) by AA *p-Q (perhaps *puḥ-ʔ) “to winnow,

sieve grain” [GT]: EBrb.: Audjila ě-ffok ~ ffok “versare, colare” [Prd. 1960, 177] || SBrb.: Hgr. fukk-et “purifier (en faisant tomber la bale, ou le son, ou tous les 2, par battage dans un mortier, des grains de céréales)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 312], EWlm. fǎkk-ăt “purifier (des grains de céréales, en faisant tomber le son par battage dans un mortier)” [PAM 1998, 60] || PCh. *PuQ- “to sieve grain, winnow” [GT]: WCh.: Tng. puke (pl.) “to winnow (in calabash)”, cf. puge (sg.) “to fan, wave” [Jng. 1991, 134] || CCh.: Bura puha [h < *ĥ poss., p- reg. < *p-] “to winnow grain” [BED 1953, 175] | Masa pùk-ađ “tamiser” [Ctc. 1983, 127]. For Hgr.-Tng. cf. also HSED #2008.

NB1: Comparing SCu.: Ma’a mfuḡgate “sieben” [Mnh.] is probably out of question, being presumably an extra-AA loan, cf. Bondei mfuḡgate “sieben” (see Mnh. 1906, 313).

NB2: Caiucoli (l.c.) derived Masa from pùk “accoucher, mettre bas” (?)

NB3: The eventual relationship of AA *puḡ- “to sieve grain, winnow” [GT] and AA *fuḡ- “to blow” [GT] (above) is more than dubious. Although the sematic development “to sieve grain, winnow” < “to blow” would not be strange, cf. e.g. NOm.: Haruro pumm-āys “1. soffiare, 2. vagliare, stracciare” [CR 1937, 657], nevertheless, Brb. *k (i.a. < AA *q) and Dhl. k̄ (i.a. < AA *ġ) clearly contradict.

mfl̥ ~ fl̥ “1. das schlittenartige Gestell, auf dem man die ĥnw-Barke des Soker zieht, 2. (GR) auch für die Barke selbst” (XIX., Wb II 55, 11–12) = “Gestell der Sokarisbarke” (Grapow 1914, 8, 24) = “le traîneau” (Alliot 1954 II, 690) = “Untersatz der Zkr-Barke” (Kaplony, KBIĀF 157, n. 197) = “bark (?) of Soker” (GR, Jones 1988, 246, §44) = “Untersatz (der Sokerbarke)” (GHWb 332) = “sledge under the ĥnw-barque of Soker” (CT, Edfu, PL 420) = “sledge” (DCT 165).

NB: Th. Schneider’s (1998, 93–94) surprising allegation that mfl̥ “erst seit seit der 19. Dyn. belegt ist” (sic) ist erroneous, since it occurs already in CT IV 95p (as pointed out by 1998 a.o. in KBIĀF, PL, DCT l.c.). For further CT exx. cf. Schenkel 1999, 89, fn. 12.

● Origin debated:

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 24), followed by W. Schenkel (1999, 89), derived it by m- prefix without identifying the underlying root. C. Ceugney (1880, 6), followed by P. Kaplony (KBIĀF 157, n. 197) and P. Wilson (PL 420), explained it from Eg. fl̥ “(ab)lösen” (OK, Wb I 578) = “to loosen, remove” (PL) assuming a lit. sense “action de décharger un vaisseau, d’en descendre” (sic, Ceugney after Brugsch) = “der entfernbare Untersatz” (Kaplony).
- **2.** GT: perhaps rather a nomen instr. of an unattested Eg. *fl̥ (or *fj̥h?) “to carry load” (or sim., hardly identical with Eg. fl̥ “lösen”) cognate with Bed. feyāk “sich auflasten, tragen” [Rn. 1895, 85] = fiyak “to carry (away), remove” [Rpr. 1928, 182]?

NB: Any connection to WCh.: Zaar ḥagi “to carry (load)” [Smz.]? H. Jungrauthmayr & K. Shimizu (1981, 61E) set up Ch. *ḥ-k “to carry (load)” based on Zaar and CCh.: Daba bàw [Lienhardt], Kola...ḥi... [Schubert] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 62–63), which is phonologically doubtful.

mfk3.t ~ var. (PT) **fk3.t** ~ (MK) **f3k.t** “der grüne Halbedelstein der Ägypter, den sie besonders vom Sinai bezogen (von uns gewohnheitsgemäß mit ‘Malachit’ oder ‘Türkis’ übersetzt) und dessen Nachahmungen in Glasfluß” (PT, Wb II 56) = “Türkis, ein himmelblauer Edelstein, der auf der Sinai Halbinsel in dem Wadi Maghara und in Sarabit-el-Khadem gefunden wird” (Brugsch Wb 603) = “Malachit” (Breasted 1906 I, §266 & §342; Erman 1907, 7; Grapow 1914, 8, 24; Petrie apud Bevan 1927, 12, n. 1; Iversen 1984, 511–2; cf. Westendorf 1989, 121 ad LÄ VII 1167) = “turquoise (Türkis)” (Loret 1928, 99–114; Newberry 1932, 320, fn. 5; Clère 1938, 125–6; Rowe 1938, 685; ÜKAPT VI 131; Iversen 1955, 18; FD 106; Gdk., MDAIK 18, 1962, 14; Aufrère 1991, 492–3; GHWb 332; Pantalacci 1996, 88; Snk. 1999, 89) = “only turquoise or its imitations in faience or glass beyond doubt” (Harris 1961, 109) = “colourless stone” (Harris, ALUOS 5, 1963–65, 50f. quoted in KB 709) = “(green or blue) turquoise” (Muchiki 1999, 251) > Dem. mfkj “Malachit” (DG 157). Mfk3.t “Name des Wadi Maghara auf der Sinaihalbinsel (als Fundstelle des ‘Malachits’)” (PT, Wb II 57, 4; cf. RdE 20, 1968, 92, n. 40) is first attested under Sanakht (III., FÄW 179).

NB1: Following H. Brugsch (cited above), V. Loret (1928, 99–114) has founded the sense “turquoise” (henceforth generally accepted, replacing the old rendering “malachite”) on both philological and archaeological arguments, which were reaffirmed by J. R. Harris (1961, 106–110).

NB2: Vocalized as OK *mfak3et > MK *mfa3ket > NK *mfāk(°) > *mfak (Erman 1907, 13) = *mēfūkā3.ät > *mfūkā(3)ki > *ḥfūkē > *ḥfūkē > LP *ḥfēkē (Alb. apud Lambdin) = LP *ḥfēkē < MK *ḥfūkā(3) < OK *mfūkā3.ät (Lambdin 1953, 152) = OK *mḥfēk3.ṯ < *mḥfēk3.ṯt > LP *ḥfēki (Fecht 1960, 229, Nachtrag to §373) = OK *mafik3.at (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 156) = OK *mḥfēk3.ṯt (NBÄ 256) = OK *mḥfē/ūk3.ṯt (Snk. 1999, 100). The loss of -3 is first attested in the CT, cf. mfg-jb (VII 260c) and mfgt “Sinai” (VI 213e, DCT 165). The supposed sonant nasal might explain the “mobile” m- in the OK and MK vars. (cf. Müller 1907, 513, fn. 1 contra Erman 1907, 11, fn. 1). G. Sauneron (1961, 241–2, §13) presented orthographical evidence from GR Esna for a very late form nfk (or better jnfk) of our word reflected also in NAss. (u)n-pi-ki [- (u)npī/ēki] (KMAV 32; DNG II 118; NBÄ 829–830, n. 111), which is due to a dissim. of labials in direct contact with -f- (i.e., *ḥf- < *ḥmf-).

NB3: Hbr. (OT) nopek “Granat” [Riehm] = “ein roter Stein: ob Rubin, Karfunkel, Granat (?)” [Müller 1899, 39–41] = “ein Edelstein” [GB] = “a precious stone” [Lambdin] = “green coloured a semi-precious stone, found in Sinai” [KB 709] = “turquoise” [Vcl.] > Samar. Aram. nēpək “small coin, precious stone (?)” [KB] = “a gem” [Tal 2000, 537] was presumably borrowed from LEg. mfk ~ nfk (cf. GB 512; Ast. 1948, 7; Lambdin 1953, 152; DELC 117; Muchiki 1999, 251).

NB4: Whether the same pertains to OT Hbr. pūk “stibium, eyepaint” explained by Lambdin equally from Eg. (m)fk3.t, more precisely a LEg. var. *fūk(è) < MK *fúkā(3) < OK *fúkā3.āt (borrowed without the m- *mobile* and before the change of *ú > *-é- taking place between the Ramesside era and the 8th cent. BC), is not clear.

- Hence (?): mfk “1. malachitartig, prächtig, 2. erfreulich (der Anblick)” (LP-GR, Wb II 57–58) = “to be shining, gleaming” (Smith) > mfk “1. sich freuen, 2. erfreuen” (GR, Wb II 58) = “to be glad, rejoice” (PL 420) = “to be joyful” (Smith) = “joie-céléste” (Auffrère 1982–83, 11) = “to be glad, rejoice (apparently the emotion associated with the turquoise colour)” (PL 420).

NB: The back-formation from old mfk3.t “turquoise” (maintained e.g. by Wb, Chassinat quoted in Auffrère, PL l.c., WD II 60) has been queried by H. Smith (1979, 162), who rather derived these late forms (via m- prefix) from Eg. fk(3) “to be bald” (Wb I 579–580) with regard to the use of jnm “skin” of the surface of turquoise in the MK stela of Harwerre from Sinai (Lesestücke 86:9–13).

- No certain etymology. With regard to the incompatibility of m + f in the same root as well as to its quadrilateral stem, mfk3.t contains presumably an m- prefix as suggested by H. Grapow (1914, 24), A. M. Blackman (1916, 69), W. Czermak (1931, 28), E. Edel (AÄG lxiii), G. Fecht (1960, 229, Nachtrag to §373), J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 156), and W. Schenkel (1999, 89) without naming the underlying root. Most promising seems solution #3.

- **1.** W. M. Müller (1894, 27) and A. Ember (quoted in Alb. 1918, 230, fn. 1; Clc. 1936, #409) combined Eg. mfk3.t ~ fk3.t (rendered by Müller “Malstein”) with OT Hbr. pūk “Stibium, Augenschminke” [GB 636] = “eye make-up (the composition of which is disputed: either black make-up, stibium, kohl or a red pigment, φῦκος obtained from lichens)” [KB 918] explained by Müller from a hypothetical *pwk “1. malen, 2. bes. (später) schminken”. False.

NB: Müller (followed by KB 918) meant an old Sem. loan-word in Eg. (!). The origin of the Hebrew word is disputed. (1) Usually (GB 636; Albright 1918, 230, fn. 1; KB 918), the root of Hbr. pūk is identified with Syr. pkk “to crush” [KB] || Ar. fkk “1. dégager, défaire, briser, 2. séparer, disjoindre deux objets, 3. ouvrir, etc.” [BK II 623] < Sem. *pkk “zerbrechen, pulverisieren” [GB] = “powder” (sic) [KB]. (2) Th. O. Lambdin (1953, 152), J. Aistleitner (1948, 7), and W. Vycichl (DELIC 117), in turn, suggests a borrowing from LEg. mfk ~ fk.t (malachite having been used in the preparation of green stibium).

- **2.** Later, W. M. Müller (1899, 39–41) suggested that the Eg. term should be derived from OT nopek “ein grüner Edelstein” supposing “eine uralte Entlehnung aus dem Semitischen” (!). Similarly, W. Helck (1971, 505) treated LEg. mfk.t (!) as an “*altes Fremdwort*” from Hbr. nopek (!). False.

NB1: Such an early borrowing of an OK word (attested already in Dyn. III) from an isolated Sem. word (the common Sem. nature of which is not at all clear) seems almost an anachronism.

NB2: Assuming an interchange of n- ~ l-, Müller (1899, 41) combined Hbr. nopek with a certain Amarna Akk. lupakku (not listed in Ebeling 1915; AHW; CAD), which he equally rendered as “ein grüner Edelstein” and included in his dubious comparison of Hbr. pük vs. Eg. mfk3.t in a rather obscure way (o.c., p. 40): “*meine Vermutung, dass es mit [hbr.] pwk zusammenhängt, lasse ich dahingestellt*”.

- 3. W. F. Albright (1918, 230; quoted also by Ember 1930, 55; Clc. 1936, #409), assumed an irregular correspondence of Eg. f vs. Sem. *t and compared Eg. mfk3.t < *fk3 < *fkl with Sem. *ʔitkāl- “cluster of grapes” [Gray] = *tkl “grape” [Shalunov]. Difficult to accept.

NB1: Attested in Ebl. /ʔi/atkālum/ [Krebernik 1983, 26] || Ug. ʔtkl “bunch, cluster” [DUL 125] vs. ūškl [Virolleaud 1954–57, 22, §4], OT Hbr. ʔeškōl (1x) ~ ʔeškōl (4x) “1. properly the stalk on which the bunch of grapes is to grow, then also the bunch of grapes, 2. esp. the berry on the henna bush” [KB 95], JAram. ʔitkālā ~ ʔetkālā “eig. der Kamm, woran die Trauben hängen” [Levy 1924 I 184] = “bunch of grapes” [Jastrow 1950, 61] || Ar. ʔitkāl- ~ ʔutkūl- ~ ʕitkāl- ~ ʕutkūl- (prefix ʔ/ʕ-) “the fruit-stalk upon which are the ripening dates” [Lane 345] = “grappe de raisin ou de dattes” [BK II 171] = “Traube” [Hommel 1915, 21] = “bough laden with clusters of fruits” [Shalunov] || Geez ʔaskāl, pl. ʔaskālāt ~ sakʔalāt “grape(s), cluster (of grapes, dates), bunch (of fruit)” [Lsl.], sakala “to bear grapes” [Lsl.] (Sem.: GB 71; Gray 1934, 45; Lsl. 1987, 42–43; Shalunov 1994 MS, 1, §5). In KB l.c., a borrowing of the NWSem. exx. from Akk. (a/jB, nA) is/šḫunnatu [irreg. -s-] “Weintraube” [AHW 387] = “cluster of grapes” [CAD I 190] is pondered. H. Bauer (ZS 10, 1935, 168) assumes the same *Wanderwort* to be present also in JAram. sǝgōl ~ sǝgūlā [irreg. -s-] “Traube, racemus, der Kamm, woran Beeren oder Blüten traubenförmig wachsen” [Levy 1924 III 475].

NB2: Although Eg. f normally ≠ Sem. *t, it is not fully impossible (cf. the old comparison of Eg. fq3 vs. Sem. *tql).

NB3: Albright considered this Eg.-Sem. comparison to be justified by the fact that “*malachite frequently occurs in botryoidal formation*”. However, a different semantical justification would be perhaps more appropriate. Some Chadic data point to an orig. meaning “blue” (AA *č-k-l?), from which Sem. *tkl may eventually also derive, cf. CCh.: MM *č-k-l-t “blue” [GT]: Muyang čok(e)lete, Hurzo čákùlét (MM: Rsg. 1978, 214, #77).

NB4: Later, Albright (1921, 83) spoke of “*the identity of Assyr. sâmtu with Eg. mfk3.t*” that “*may be regarded as absolutely certain*” (cf. JEA 6, 1920, 90, n. 7), which can hardly be maintained, cf. Akk. sâmtu “Röte” [AHW 1019].

- 4. GT: Eg. *fk3 < *fkl, perhaps from AA *f-k-l (with diverse vars. via met.) “a (dark) colour: blue (?)” [GT]? Cognate with Ar. kalifa I “3. tirer sur le noir (se dit d’une couleur rouge sale)”, XI “contracter une couleur rouge foncé et sale (p.ex., d’une jarre à vin)”, kalf- “rouge sale tirant sur le noir, couleur brune”, kulf-at- “couleur rouge sale, brun” [BK II 924–5] || WCh.: Angas kǎ-fǎlǎk “a colour name” ≈ Hausa gunya “cream-coloured” (i.e., Hs. gúnýáá “1. cream-dun horse, 3. yellow sandals, 4. saddle-cloth with yellow embroidery”, Abr. 1962, 343) [Flk. 1915, 205] | Pero pákálàw (adj.) “yellow, pale, blue” [Frj. 1985, 44] = paɣalawì “yellow” [Krf. 1981, #276] || CCh.: (?) Boka pûkin [-n < *l?] “blue” [Krf. 1981, #277] | Daba ma-pùlòḣ [met. of *p-ḣ-l < *p-k-l?] “yellow” [Krf. 1981, #276].

NB1: Note that Eg. -f- vs. Angas -f-, Pero p- < Ch. *f- are regular.

NB2: A common origin of Eg. *fkl and Eg. tfir [from *kfl] “to be blue” (GR, Wb V 300, 4; GHWb 953), tfir.t ~ tfr.t “das Land, aus dem der Lapislasuli kommt” (MK, Wb V 300, 1) is not excluded, cf. Takács 2005, 73 & fn. 227.

mfd “(ein Land) durchlaufen” (GR, Wb II 58, 6) = “traverser, parcourir en sautant” (Ceugney) = “durcheilen (ein Land)” (Grapow) = “to travel through” (Smith) = “to run through” (PL 421).

NB: The alternative rdg. m3fd proposed by C. Ceugney and H. Smith has no etymological support.

- As suggested in Wb and by C. Ceugney (1880, 7), H. Grapow (1914, 24), H. Smith (1979, 162–3) and P. Wilson (PL), it derives from Eg. jfd “1. davonrennen (wie Wild), 2. (einen Ort) durcheilen” (XVIII., Wb I 72, 1–2) = “sauter, bondir” (Ceugney) = “to flee” (FD 17) = “to hasten through” (Smith) = “fliehen, laufen, schnell marschieren, durcheilen (Ort)” (GHWb 46).

NB: The etymology of Eg. jfd is debated. (1) Most probably, this is cognate with Ar. ʔafida “se dépêcher” [BK I 39] = “eilen” [Vrg.] = “to hurry” [Hodge], cf. also Sem. *pdd “to flee” [GT]: Syr. pdd “evanuit, discessit, deficit de siiti” [Brk.] || Ar. fdd “3. courir (se dit d’un homme)”, fdfd “courir en se sauvant devant l’ennemi ou devant une bête féroce” [BK II 554, 556] (Sem.: Dlg. 1967, 306). Lit. for Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1930, #4.a.15; Vrg. 1945, 144, #23.a.1; Hodge 1968, 22; Blv. 1987, 279; 1991, 88, #1; 1993, 53. (2) A few authors (Hannig in GHWb l.c.; Wilson in PL l.c.) derive it apparently from Eg. fd “4” via “fliehen wie Wild mit vier Beinen” (GHWb) = “to go on four legs (i.e., fast, implying speed and directness)” (PL). (3) Th. Schneider (1997, 195, #10) compared it in the frames of the Rösslerian cons. correspondences with Ar. ʔabiša “être agile et rapide à la course” [BK I 4].

mm (orig. *mjmj? vars.: XVIII. **mmj**, XIX./XX. **mjmj**) “Art Früchte von rotbrauner Farbe” (OK, Wb II 58, 7) = “die äthiopische Pflanze Am(m)i: äthiopisches Cuminum, eine Kümmelsorte” (Brugsch 1891, 25–28, §1, esp. p. 27) = “Ethiopian cumin, Ammi amjus L., ‘Bullwort’ or A. visnaga Lam., ‘Spanish toothpick’ (resembles cumin, an umbelliferous plant, scentless, almost tasteless, but the seeds are aromatic like those of cumin etc.)” (Barns 1935, 37–38, §21) = “seed-corn of emmer (?)” (Grd. 1948 II, 113–4; Caminos 1954 LEM, 166, 382; Janssen 1961, 83, 90; FD 104) = “seed-corn of emmer (put with water and left all night in the dew to be applied to the eyes of the patient early in the morning)” (Barns 1956, 19, n. 25) = “eine bestimmte und besondere Körnerfrucht, die besonders gern auf den Feldern des kgl. Harim angebaut wurde: Durra” (Helck, MWNR 803, 1198 index after Lefébvre) = “sicher eine Körnerfrucht, wohl der Emmer, speziell das Samenkorn des Emmers” (WÄDN 222) = “Dumnuß” (Wallert 1962, 53: rejected by Brugsch) = “Körnername: Samenkorn

des Emmers” (Edel 1970, 23–24, §11) = “sicher eine Getreideart (deren Körner geröstet werden)” (Bidoli 1976, 55 & fn. 5) = “1. graine, céréale, 2. (pour désigner une partie du filet de pêche) grain servant d’appât” (AL 78.1693, 79.1184) = “seed corn of emmer (?), lilies (?)” (DLE I 212) = “Durrha (?)” (Helck, LÄ I 1268, 1270, n. 22 with lit.) = “1. *Durra, Sorghum, Sorgho, 2. *Samenkorn des Emmers (auch als Lockspeise für die Schar der Vögel)” (GHWb 325; ÄWb I 512) = “Körnerfrucht (Durrha?)” (HAM 500, 838) = “qqch. que l’on peut semer et cultiver dans les champs, mais aussi qqch. dont on peut tirer un jus: plutôt qu’à une céréale, on pensera à une légumineuse à graines cultivées” (Meeks 2005, 245).

NB1: A. H. Gardiner’s (l.c.) rendering “seed-corn of emmer” (widely accepted in the lit.) was rejected by W. Helck (MWNr 803), R. Germer (1979, 279 excluding “Sorghum” as “*nicht feststellbar*”), Charpentier (1981, §506), and D. Meeks (2005, 245 equally rejecting “Durra, Sorghum”). Helck considered it “*überraschend, wenn es Synonym von bd.t wäre*”, which is, however, just the case in Pap. Lansing 3:6 (Caminos LEM 382: “*synonym of bd.t with special reference to the grain itself*” disproved by Germer l.c.).

NB2: An early (VI.) fem. form mm.t “a form of grain” (Qubbet el-Hawa) has been suggested by Spaul (1969, 222, §3).

NB3: The rendering of mm in CT VI 4g as “grain servant d’appât” by D. Bidoli (1976, 55) = “mjmj-Körner als Lockspeise” (Verhoeven 1984, 77–78) = “emmer-corn” (by R. van der Molen, DCT 161) is debated (AECT II 110, spell 473, n. 10: “mng. unknown, but apparently a part of the net”; AL 78.1693: “une partie du filet de pêche”).

- Etymology uncertain due to the disputable mng. and root (*mjmj or mm?).
- **1.** Following H. Brugsch (l.c.: “*äth. Ursprungs*”), W. R. Dawson (l.c.) identified it with Gk. ἄμμι “Ethiopian or royal cumin (more efficacious than Egyptian cumin)” (Dioskurides), which he explained as “*manifestly a foreign word*” from a Nubian *mami by met. False. Rejected already by L. Keimer (1967, 149) and R. Germer (1979, 2)
- **2.** E. Edel (1970, 23–24, §11), followed by P. Wilson (PL 411), compared it to a number of terms of dubious relationship: **(1)** late OK (Qubbet el-Hawa) mm.t “eine Pflanze” (VI., GHWb 333; ÄWb I 527) = “a form of grain” (Spaul 1969, 222, §3) vs. PT 1362b mm.t (rendered in ÜKAPT “Wurtholz”!) > CT mm.t “une plante comestible” (CT VII 424d, AL 78.1695); **(2)** Med. mjm.t “eine officinell verwendete Pflanze, deren Blätter Saft enthalten” (Edel, q.v.); **(3)** LP mm-ntr vs. mm.t-ntr “das mm(t) des Gottes in kultischer Verwendung (vgl. Fest der mmt-Pflanze)” (Edel) = “citron” (Daressy 1916, 232, 239).

NB: The CT mm.t was combined by Lesko (1972, 145), followed by Meeks (AL l.c.) and Edel (l.c.) with PT 1362b mm.t (“throw-stick” det., T15, Wb II 58, 16), whose reading and rendering is, however, disputed (q.v.).

- **3.** Ch. Ehret & G. Takács: OK mm act. *mjmj, i.e. redupl. of AA *m-y ~ *m-w? Cp. NOm.: Gmr. mu “grain (grano)” [CR 1925, 621] | Mocha mā^w-o “cereals” [Lsl. 1959, 43] ||| WCh.: (?) Diri míyá “seed” [Skn. in JI 1994 II, 286] | Boghom mway “millet” [Csp. 1994, 58] || CCh.: Bdm. míau ~ míō “Sorghum, Durra” [Nct. in Lks. 1939, 119] || ECh.: Smr. mai “Sorghum” [Lks. 1937, 80], Tumak máy “mil (nom générique)” [Cpr. 1975, 83] | EDng. màawà “mil berbéré, très blanc” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 199].
LIT.: Ehret 1997 MS, 192, #1757 (Eg.-ECh.-Mocha); EEWc (Eg.-AA).
NB1: Ehret gives ECh. *m-y “sorghum” (not referring to Somray), and extended the comparison to Sem. *my (sic) “grain, seed grain, whole grains” and Cu. *māy “grain, hard particle” (based on the semantically dubious comparison of Bed. mē ~ mī “hail, hailstone” and SCu.: Irq. mewe “storage bin” | Ma’a imi’á “storage loft”, cf. Ehret 1980, 157; 1987, #431).
NB2: The Cushito-Omotists (G. Conti Rossini 1925, 621; W. Leslau 1959, 43) prefer to derive the NOm. forms from NOm. *mV- “to eat” [GT].
- **4.** GT: if OK mm was the orig. root, noteworthy is Cu. *mam- (?), cf. LECu.: (???) Som. man, pl. manan “(Blüten)Knospe” [Rn. 1902, 296] = mán, pl. mánán “bud” [Abr. 1964, 173] || SCu.: Iraqw mamu “ear of grain” [Ehret] = māmā, pl. mamu? “offspring” [Mgw. 1989, 115] = māma (f) “fruit of a tree, offspring” [MQK 2002, 70] (Irq.-Som.: Ehret 1980, 323) ||| CCh.: (?) Mulwi à-míñ [prefix a-, -ñ < *m#?] “noyau du furoncle” [Trn. 1978, 206].
NB: Som. man < *mam, Som. -n# < *m# being regular (cf. Sasse 1979, 24). But in this case, the pl. form indicates an original *-n.
- **5.** GT: if Eg. *mjmj < *mlml, cp. NOm.: Mocha mull-o “grains boiled in water” [Lsl. 1959, 41] ||| ECh. *mal-/*māl- [GT]: Tumak màl “mil (petit)” [Cpr. 1975, 82] | Bdy. màalò “sorgho (berbéré)” [AJ 1989, 96], WDng. màalò “sorgho tardif” [Fédry 1971, 123], EDng. málaló “le mil berbéré (gros mil blanc)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 194].
- **6.** GT: if Eg. *mjmj < *mrmr, cp. Ch. *m-r “sort of grain” (?) [GT].
NB: Attested in WCh.: Angas-Sura *mā_r “grain sort: millet” [GT 2004, 242] = *mar “millet” [Dlg.] = *mar (so) “1. millet (просо), 2. grain food (зерновая пища)” [Stl. 1987]: Angas moorb (so, -b, error?) “millet” [Ormsby 1914, 313] = moor “food grain (Hs. gero)” [Flk. 1915, 246] = mor [mo:r] “Hirseart, *Pennisetum typhoideum*” (≈ Hs. géeróó “bulrush-millet, *Pennisetum typhoideum*”, Abr. 1962, 315) [Jng. 1962 MS, 26] = moor “millet” [Hfm.], Kfy. máar “early millet (gero)” [Ntg. 1967, 26] = maar “millet” [Hfm.], Chip màr “millet” [Krf.], Gmy. maar “millet” [Srl. 1937, 132] = maar “millet” [Hfm.] = maar “millet” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 21] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 18, #45; Stl. 1987, 234, #808) || CCh.: Tera méré “millet (Hs. gero)” [Nwm. 1964, 43, #277] | Mada màrà-màrà ~ màrmàrà “sorte de mil qui s’égraine facilement” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 192] || ECh.: WDng. mériyá “sorgho” [Fédry 1971, 128], EDng. mèriyá “mil sorgho rouge” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 202].

mm “ein Tier (als Ortsname)” (OK, Wb II 58, 15) = “ein noch nicht identifiziertes Tier, das sich durch eine spitze Schnauze auszeichnet” (Zibelius 1978, 89–90 with further lit.) = “un canidé (?) de nature inconnue” (AL 78.1694; Meeks 2005, 245, #527a with further OK ex.) = “Art Canide (nur in Ortsnamen belegt)” (GHWb 332; ÄWb I 527a).

NB: Occurs as TN. Its det. resembles a fox or hyena or the like.

- **1.** GT: most tempting seems an equation with WCh.: PGoemai *mām “marten sp.” [GT 2004, 240]: Gmy. maam “a marten” [Srl. 1937, 132] = maam “wild cat” (Hs. kyaŋwar daaži “bush cat”, after Abr. 1962) [Hlw. 2000 MS, 21].

NB: Any connection to SCu.: Burunge mbaimö, pl. mbau “Hyäne” [Mnh. 1906, 332]?

- **2.** GT: or, if OK mm < *mj̄m or *m̄3m < *m̄rm/*m̄lm or *mm̄j < *mm̄r/*m̄ml, it could be cognate with WCh.: Ron *murum “hyena” [GT]: Daffo-Butura mùrùm, Bökkos mùrùm, Sha & Mangar mùrùm, Monguna & Kārfa murùm (Ron: Jng. 1970, 145, 219, 287; Seibert 2000 MS, A031) | SBch. *m-m-l “hyaena” [GT]: Buli mùmàli [Krf.], Zul mamal [Gowers], Bara mamal [Gowers], Boghom mulli [*mumli?] [Gowers] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 204).
- **3.** GT: or, less probably, if Eg. mm < *mn (via assim. of nasals?), cp. Bed. máno ~ máne “Wolfshund, Canis anthus” [Rn. 1895, 170] = “wolf-dog” [Ehret] || SCu.: Irq. mâna “a hyena into which the corpse of a man is turned, who has been killed by sorcery” [Wtl. 1953] = mane “hyena which carries spirit of dead person” [Ehret] (Bed.-Irq.: Ehret 1987, #424).

mm.t “als Beischrift zu einem Flötenbläser ‘zur Flöte blasen’” (OK, Wb II 59, 1) = “the double clarinet (consists of two parallel tubes attached to each other by pieces of cloth and resin, each tube has a mouth-piece with a single reed)” (Manniche 1975, 18–20) = ≈ Ar. zummār-at- (Fischer 1988, 105–6, fig. 3) = “Klarinette” (Altenmüller 1998, 158, 281) = “Klarinette, Doppelklarinette, Summarah” (ÄWb I 527ab).

- As rightly noted in Wb (l.c.), “*nicht identisch mit m3.t ‘Flöte’*”. Onomatopoetic word?

mm.t (or **mt**?) “Wurfholz” (PT 1362b hapax, ÜKAPT V 283).

NB1: Its context (m3-n=s jt=k wsjr hrw pw n ḥb mm.t or m m.t? ÜKAPT V 283: “nachdem sie deinen Vater Osiris gesehen hat an jenem Tage des Fanges mit dem Wurfholz”; AEPT 213: “for they saw your father Osiris on that day of fowling with a throw-stick”) is

parallel to PT 1297a–b (jrj n=f nw jrj.n=k n sn=f wsjr hrw pw n hb=k tm=tj m mw, ÜKAPT V 211: “*tu ihm das, was du seinem Bruder Osiris gethan hast an jenem Tage deines vollständigen Auffischens aus dem Wasser*”; AEPT 205: “*do for him this which you did for his brother Osiris on that day of your complete fishing out of the water*”, l.c., n. 3: i.e., of the corpse of Osiris) and PT 2009d (m3–n=sn sn=sn m hb tm, Faulkner is here inconsequent, cf. AEPT 289: “*when they see their brother in the Festival of Atum*”).

NB2: Reading and rendering highly debated:

(1) No translation in Wb II 58,16: “*ob identisch mit*” OK mm.t “Flöte” (Wb, q.v.)? In light of the context, improbable.

(2) With regard to q3 following mm.t in the Wdbtn version (copy of Maspero!), K. Sethe (ÜKAPT V 224) read the word in question as *mqm3.t, nomen instr. < qm3 “Wurfholz werfen”. Rejected by Edel (1970, 23), since the det. of in the version of N.1308 + 32 “*nach Wurfholz sieht... gar nicht aus, sondern eher nach einem Pflanzenstengel mit zwei kleinen Trieben am oberen Ende*”.

(3) R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 213–214, spell 553, n. 9, cf. AECT III 158, spell 1102, n. 2), in turn, read it as prep. m “with” + m.t “throw-stick” assumed to be a corruption of *m^c3.t “throw-stick” (Grapow, ZÄS 47, 133). Rejected already by Sethe (l.c.).

(4) Strangely, in the same work, K. Sethe (ÜKAPT V 292, VI 131) suggested, in a rather obscure way, a connection with CT VII 424d mm.t “ein eßbarer Stoff” (q.v.), which was then followed by E. Edel (1970, 23–24, §11), L. H. Lesko (1972, 145), and D. Meeks (AL 78.1695). This equation was extended by Edel, with a poor argumentation, also to late OK mm.t-plant (Qubbet el-Hawa, q.v.) as well as LP mm(.t)-ntr (Daressy in ASAE 16, 1916, 223, 227), OK mm (NK mmj, mjmj, Wb II 58, 7, q.v.), Med. mjm.t “Pflanze, deren Blätter Saft (mw) enthalten” (Pap. Ebers 93:1–3, q.v.).

- Existence dubious. Ghost-word? If not, purely hypothetically, we might assume (pace Faulkner) a hapax *mt (but masc., cf. PT 1362b^N *mt q3 “long stab with hook” ???), which might be derived from AA *m-t “pointed object” [GT]?

NB1: Cf. LECu.: Orm. mut-ā “awl (used as needle in basketry, for unbraiding wome’s hair, for pulling out thorns, etc.)” [Gragg 1982, 295] | HECu. *mut-a “awl for basketwork” [Hds. 1989, 22, 418] || ERift: (?) Asa mat “arrow, bow” [Flm. 1969, 13] = “arrow” [Ehret 1980, 342, #8 with diff. etymology] || WCh.: Gwnd. mātā? “arrow(head)” [Mts. 1972, 79] || CCh.: Fali metu “Messer” [Str. 1910, 465] || ECh.: Bidiya mēta (f) “javelot, hampe de lance” [AJ 1989, 98].

NB2: Of deverbal origin? Cf. LECu. *mut- “to stab” [GT]: LECu.: Saho & Afar mūt- “stechen” [Rn.] = mud- [Sasse], Assaorta mud “colpire, ferire, pungere” [CR 1913, 70], Oromo mut- “stechen” [Rn.] = muṭa [CR], Somali mud- “stechen” [Rn.] = “to prick, stab” [Ss.] (LECu.: Rn. 1902, 285; Sasse 1979, 37–38) || SCu.: WRift *mut- “to pierce” [Ehr.]: Iraqw mut- [Ehr.] = mūt- [Wtl. 1953; Mgw. 1989, 115], Burunge mut- [Ehr.], Alagwa mut- [Ehr.] (WRift: Ehret 1980, 158) || CCh.: Bura mimetu “sharp-pointed” [BED 1953, 138].

NB3: Some of these comparanda were falsely combined with Eg. mt3: HSED #1763 (Eg.-Bdy.); Takács 1996, 52, #58 (Eg.-Cu.); 1996, 127, #58; 1996, 136, #31 (HECu.-SCu.-Bdy.-Eg.).

NB4: Cp. also as var. root with an original *-d NBrb.: Mzab ta-mōdda “gros crochet (de fer) en forme d’hameçon de boucher” [Dlh. 1984, 115] || WBrb.: Zng. vmd: ta-mmūd, pl. t-māmid “age de la charrue, flèche d’attelage” [Ncl. 1953, 207] as well as AA *m-ṭ [GT] > HECu.: Sid. amāṭṭ-ō “specie di lancia” [Crl. 1938 II, 189] = amāṭṭ-o “arrow” [Hds. 1989, 350] vs. Sid. māṭe (f) “needle for sewing” [Gsp. 1983, 227] || NOm.: Chara meytā “lancia” [Crl.] = mēta “spear” [Bnd. 1974, 17], Gimirra-She māyṭ “lancia” [CR 1925, 622; Crl. 1938 III, 173]?

mm.t “eine Pflanze” (late OK, Qubbet el-Hawa, GHWb 333; ÄWb I 527: cf. Edel 1975 II/1, 17, t. 79) > possibly CT mm.t “memet-plant” (CT VII 424d, Lesko 1972, 145) = “ein eßbarer Stoff” (ÜKAPT V 292 after Lacau 1904 I, 214; ÜKAPT VI 131: falsely attached to PT 1362b) = “une plante comestible” (AL 78.1695).

NB: With regard to the identical det. (harpoon-head, T19), the comparison of CT mm.t with Qubbet el-Hawa mm.t proposed by Edel (1970, 23–24, §11) seems probable. Sethe (ÜKAPT l.c.), followed by Lesko (l.c.), Meeks (AL l.c.), and Edel (l.c.), combined CT mm.t with PT 1362b mm.t (Wb II 58, 16, “throw-stick” T15 det.), whose reading and rendering is, however, extremely disputed (q.v.).

- Meaning and origin obscure.
 - **1.** E. Edel (1970, 23–24, §11), followed by P. Wilson (PL 411), extended the comparison of OK-CT mm.t also to a number of terms of dubious relationship: **(1)** OK mm (OK) ~ mmj (XVIII.) ~ mjmj (Pap. Ch. Beatty XV 5:8) “seed-corn of emmer” (Grd. 1948 II 113–4) = “Samenkorn des Emmers” (Edel), q.v.; **(2)** LP mm-ntr vs. mm.t-ntr “das mm(t) des Gottes in kultischer Verwendung (vgl. Fest der mmt-Pflanze)” (Edel) = “citron” (Daressy 1916, 232, 239), q.v.; **(3)** mjm.t “eine officinell verwendete Pflanze” (Med., Wb, cf. above).
 - **2.** GT: the possibilities of external etymology are equally limited:
 - (1)** Perhaps SBrb.: Hgr. ummum, pl. ummûm-en “nom d’une plante non persistante (Caylusea canescens L.)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1204]?
 - (2)** SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ta-ṛṛṛṛṛṛ-t, pl. ta-ṛṛṛṛṛṛ-en “1. fruit mûr de tādant (juteux), 2. jus de ce fruit (très sucré, sorte de miel végétal), 3. sucre végétal en gén.” [PAM 2003, 541–2]?
- NB: Explained by K.-G. Prasse (PAM l.c.) from Brb. *t-hämmīm-t “miel”. Any connection to Ug. mm (?) “an oil-yielding substance”, zt-mm “oil of mm” [Gordon 1955, 289, #1121]?
- (3)** NBrb.: Uled Sellem ta-mmimāi-t “tamarix” [Joly 1912, 82], Mzg. ta-mimay-t, pl. ti-mamay-in “tamaris (de rivière)” [Taifi 1991, 446], Zayan & Sgugu ta-mimai-t, pl. ti-mimai-n “sorte de bois d’eau” [Lbg. 1924, 564], Zwawa a-mammai “tamarix” [Joly] || EBrb.: Audjila temmî-t, pl. t-menyî-n “tamerice” [Prd. 1960, 175], Foqaha tä-mmâi-t “tamerice” [Prd. 1961, 302]?

mm “to transport (cattle)” (1st IMP, FD 106: cf. JEA 16, 1940, 195, pl. 29, l. 7) = “*transportieren (Vieh über Fluß)” (GHWb 333; ÄWb I 527).

NB: Existence debated (cf. Fischer, Kush 9, 1961, 51; Schenkel 1965, 60, n. a; Meeks 2005, 245, #527a).

- Etymology uncertain.

- **1.** GT: perhaps lit. “to lead (cattle)”, cognate with OSA: Sab. ʔmm III: yʔtmmw “to be led” [SD 6] = “to be led out” [Ricks], Qtb. ʔmm “to lead, be at the head” [Ricks 1982 MS, 14–15], Ar. ʔmm “1. se diriger, tendre vers un lieu, 4. marcher en tête, ouvrir la marche et donner l’exemple que d’autres auront à suivre” [BK I 50] = “to lead” [Hnrg.] = “to march at the front, be at the head of” [Ricks]?
NB: J. Huehnergard (2000, 2062) assumes in Ar. ʔmm a denom. verb from ʔumm- “mother”.

- **2.** GT: or redupl. of AA *m-y ~ *m-w (?) “to carry” [GT]?
NB: Reflexes discussed under GR mj “apporter” (Dendera VIII 65:4, AL, q.v.).

mm.t “Quelle” (Ramses III, NBÄ 744, n. 901; CED 82) = “source, fontaine” (AL 77.1688, 79.1186) = “spring” (CED 82) = “Quelle” (GHWb 333).

NB: R. Hannig reconstructs OK mm.t “Memet, ‘Hervorquellendes Wasser’ (e. Personifikation)” (ÄWb I 1593), although R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 38, utt. 205, n. 4) read this divine name (more convincingly) as mw.t rendered by him “Mowet: Semen personified as goddess?”.

- From the same root: mm.wj (or mm.wʔ), cf. prj m mm.wj “her- vorquellen (vom Wasser)” (GR, Wb II 59, 3) = “Quelloch” (NBÄ 206) = “source, fontaine” (AL 77.1688) = “spring” (CED 82) = “canal” (PL 421) > Dem. mm “fountain” (Griffith in CED 82) = “Quelle” (KHW 518).

NB: Vocalized *māmˁw (NBÄ 206; Snk. 1983, 223) = *mam(w)ay > *māmay (DELIC 112).

- Hence: Cpt. (S) ΜΟΥΝΕ, (B) ΜΥΜΙ, (A) ΜΟΥΝΜΕ (f) “spring, fountain” (CD 198b) = “Quelle” (KHW 92) = “source” (DELIC 112).

NB: J. Černý (CED 82) & W. Vycichl (DELIC 112): the -N- of (A) ΜΟΥΝΜΕ is due to a *Volksetymologie*, a reinterpretation as *ΜΟΥ-N-ΜΕ “water of truth”, i.e. “true water (wahres Wasser)”.

- Etymology disputable. Most probable seems #2.

- **1.** J. Osing (NBÄ 206, 744–5, n. 901) derived it as a deverbal form (via m- prefix) from the rare Eg. mwj “näßen, Wasser absondern” (CT VII 375a, Med., s.v. mw “water”), which would lit. mean “das, was Wasser absondert”. Far-fetched. More attractive is the hypothesis by W. Vycichl (DELIC 112, followed also by P. Wilson, PL 421–2) on an m- prefix nomen loci of Eg. mw (√mwj) “water” (q.v.).

NB: Both etymologies are weakened also by the fact that the orthography mm.t was fully different from that of mw.

- **2.** GT: perhaps identical with HECu.: Darasa (Gedeo) mumme “spring of water” [Hds. 1989, 141] ||| NOM.: Sezo mú:mmè mǎnʃi “well (of water)” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 18] ||| CCh.: Mofu míyám “spring” [Rsg. 1978, 333, #682]. Reduplication of a monoradicalroot pres-

ent in SBrb.: Ghat a-mu “puits” & Wlmd. a-mu “puits profond” [Bst. 1883, 327] ||| LECu.: Som. maʔwi “well full of water” [Luling 1987, 364]?

NB1: Any connection to LECu.: Orm. mumm-ē “glen (esp. where two mountains or mountain ridges meet, frequently forested)” [Gragg 1982, 295]? Note that Sem.: NHbr. & Syr. ʔammā “canal, aqueduct” [DRS 23] has probably a different etymology.

NB2: R. Kießling & M. Mous (2004, 197) compared Som. maʔwi with WRift *maʔay “water” (cf. the entry for Eg. mw).

- **3.** GT: if, in turn, Eg. mm.t < *mjmj.t or *mjm.t < *mlm(l).t (less probable), cp. ECh. *m-l “well, source” [GT]: Tmk. mùl “trou (petit)” [Cpr. 1975, 85], Skr. mūlā “tiefer Brunnen” [Lks. 1937, 36] | Bdy. maala, pl. malāl “puits” [AJ 1989, 96] | Mubi mēlá, pl. málè “Brunnen” [Lks. 1937, 184] = mílá, pl. màlè “puits” [Jng. 1990, 34].
- **4.** E. Hornung (1963 II, 38, n. 50) affiliated Ptol. mm.t “Personifikation des hervorquellenden Wassers” (cf. Leibovitch, JNES 12, 1953, 94, figs. 18 & 107, n. 36) with Eg. mm ~ jmjm “stark, siegesbewußt sein” (PT 113a, 249b, 614c, 782b, ÜKAPT VI 94) = “to be strong, achieve power” (AEPT 36, 58, 119, 142) = “zu sich selbst kommen” (Spiegel 1971, 219, 483) = “unwiderstehlich” (Hornung l.c.). False. NB: J. Spiegel (1971, 219, fn. 2), in turn, saw in PT jmjm “eine durch Reduplikation gebildete Ableitung von der die Identität bezeichnenden Präp. m”. Equally false. The prep. m could have hardly yielded any of the senses proposed for PT jmjm, for which cp. rather mm replacing in CT VI 49 (var. S1C^a) ptpt “to conquer” (or sim., AECT II 127, spell 482, n. 10).

mm.tj “als schmähende Bez. des Apophis” (LP hapax, Wb II 59, 2).

● Meaning and etymology obscure.

- **1.** GT: cf. perhaps AA *m-m (prob. *mum-) “2. to be imbecile” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in ECu. *mūm- “dumb” [GT]: HECu.: Burji mōm- “to be ignorant” [Ss.] | LECu.: Gdl. mūm-ett- “dumb person” [Ss.] | Dullay: Glg. mum- “to be dumb (stumm sein)” [AMS 1980, 213] (ÉCu.: Sasse 1982, 147) ||| WCh.: Glm. mumā “blind” [Schuh 1978, 86], Tng. mùm te “deaf man” [Mkr., not found in Jng. 1991] | (?) NBch. *mam- [unless < *m-h] “to forget” [GT]: Siri mama, Jimbin mama, Mburku mamw- (NBch.: HSED #1720) || CCh.: Zime-Dari mōmá “fait d’être en transes” [Cooper 1984, 16] || ECh.: Smr. mùm “surdité” [Jng. 1993 MS, 45]. AP: PMande *mumu “mute, deaf-mute” [Mkr. 1987, 267; Mande-Tng.]. PNil. *muj “deaf, dumb” [Dimmendaal 1988, 37, #45].

NB2: Eventually < AA *m-m (prob. *mum-) “to have some deficiency (?)” [GT] (above)?

- **2.** GT: if the abusing name of Apophis referring to the external appearance, cp. perhaps AA *m-m “1. to have some deficiency (?)” [GT].

NB: Attested in Sem.: Hbr. *mūm* “spot, blemish, injury (physical, moral)” [KB 556], JPArAm. *mūm* “ritual defect” [Sokoloff 1990, 295], Samar. Aram. *mūm* “blemish, defect, wicked” [Tal 2000, 456], Mnd. *muma* “fault, defect, injury, infirmity, spot, blemish” [DM 261] | cf. Ar. (< Can.?) *mūm-* “1. petite vérole, 2. pleurésie” [BK II 1168] ||| NBrb.: Mzg. *a-mum* “1. maigrir, être maigre, chétif, anémié, dépérir, 2. s’amenuiser, s’étiooler” [Taifi 1991, 399], Zayan & Sgugu *a-mum* “maigrir, s’affaiblir, dépérir” [Lbg. 1924, 565] || SBrb.: EWlm. *u-mṣam*, Ayr *i-mam* “2. être nain (membre du corps)” [PAM 1998, 217] ||| ECh.: Dormo *mám* “schwach” [Lks. 1937, 91].

***mm.t** (?) > Cpt. (L) **MO(O)ME** “Ader” (KHW 92).

● Origin highly disputed:

■ **1.** W. Westendorf (KHW 92) pondered a possible connection with (S) **MOHE** “Wundfrass”. False.

NB: The full form of the latter lexeme is (S) **OYAMHE**, **AMHE**, (L) **OYAMME** (f) “gangrène (la destruction plus ou moins étendue et profonde de la peau et des tissus)” (Chassinat 1921, 106–8) = “eig. ‘Schlamm-Fresser’, 1. Bezeichnung eines im Schlamm wühlenden Tieres, 2. übertragen als Name einer Krankheitserscheinung: Wundfrass, Wundbrand” (KHW 271), a compound of **OYAM-**, part. conj. of (SALBF) **OYOM** “to eat” (pace Chassinat l.c.) + (S) **OME**, (SA) **AME** “Schlamm”.

■ **2.** J. Osing (NBÄ 321, 866, n. 1381; KHW 518) explained it from **máʔm̃* < **mátm̃(j)* < **mámt̃(j)* via met. (cf. Fecht 1960, §206), in which he saw a prefix **ma-* form of Eg. *mtj* (**mát̃j*) > (S) **MOYT** “Ader, Band, Sehne”. Improbable.

■ **3.** GT: cognate with SBrb.: Ayr *e-mām*, pl. *e-māmṣ-ān* “épaisseur de corde etc.” vs. EWlm. *a-məm* “ligoter, être ligoté” [PAM 2003, 541]?

■ **4.** GT: or cf. perhaps Sem.: NHbr. & Syr. *ʔammā* “canal, aqueduc” [DRS 23]? Eventually related to NK *mm.t* & GR *mm.w(j)* “canal” (PL 421)?

NB: DRS offers for the Sem. root a different etymology.

mm (MK) ~ **mmj** (Urk. IV 948) “Giraffe” (Lit. MK, XVIII., GR, Wb II 58, 14) = “giraffe” (FD 106) = “nom primitif de la girafe” (Cannuyer 1989, 8–9).

NB: Its traces can be detected already in CT VI 180j and VII 96i in the giraffe det. of *mwmw* “piece-meal (?)” (Cannuyer 1989, 8–9; DCT 165).

● No certain etymology.

■ **1.** I. Hofman, H. Tomandl, and M. Zach (1984, 20) affiliated Eg. *mmj* with Nub.: Meidob dial. of Darfur *ti-mmit* “Giraffe” [MacMichael 1912, 337]. W. Vycichl (1991, 119) too sought its source in the African substratum but he named no lexical evidence for it.

■ **2.** GT: perhaps lit. “spotted one”, akin to Hbr. *mūm* “i.a. spot” [KB 556], NHbr. of TTM *mūm* & JPArAm. *mūmā* “Makel” [Dalman 1922, 227] = “blemish” [Jastrow 1950, 743], Samar. Aram. *mūm*

“i.a. blemish” [Tal 2000, 456], Mnd. muma “i.a. spot, blemish” [DM 261]?

NB1: An interesting typological parallel is found in LECu.: Arbore mehet “giraffe” [Hayward 1984, 384], which Ch. Ehret (1987, 103, #432) identified with SCu. *meh- “spotted” [Ehret] based on Irq. meḥna “spotted cow”, meḥamo “(spotted) cattle tick” | Dhl. máḥawa “spotted” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 157, #36). Of course, Arb. mehet can hardly be related with Eg. mn in view of the serious phonological difficulty, i.e., Arb. -h- = SCu. *h ≠ Eg. -Ø-. P. Black (1974, 282) gave LECu. *ḥ > Arbore h ~ Ø, while the question as to the reflex of LECu. *h in Arbore was left open.

NB2: SBrb.: Ghat e-ṁāṁ, pl. i-ṁāṁ-ān “hippopotame” [PAM 2003, 541] is equally unrelated.

mn (?) “1. (GR) in Empfang nehmen, 2. (gewöhnlich seit Pyr. in Ritualformeln) nimm in Empfang!” (PT, Wb II 60, 1–4) = “prendre” (AL 79.1188 with KRI exx.).

- Hence (?): Cpt. (B) ΔMONI “to be strong, possess” (CD 8a) = “ergreifen, verpflichten” (KHW 6) = “saisir” (DELIC 9) reflecting the NK j.mn impv. form (XVIII-XIX.) with the prothetic j-?

NB: W. Vycichl (DELIC) assumed a fem. inf. *mnj.t. The etymology of the Cpt. word is debated. K. Sethe (1912, 103) explained it via *ḡermōnwet > *ḡejmōnwet from Eg. rmnj/w “tragen” (Wb II 419), followed by J. Černý (CED 6). Queried by W. Spiegelberg (KHW 5), Wb (l.c.), and KHW 486, fn. 2 (“entspricht nicht der Struktur der IV. inf. Verben”). Albeit first W. Westendorf (KHW 6) hesitatingly accepted the derivation from NK j.mn, later he assumed in (B) ΔMONI merely a “besondere Verwendung” of (B) (Δ)MONI “eig. anpflocken: 1. weiden (Vieh), 2. landen” (KHW 486).

- Etymology uncertain.
- 1. Wb (II 36, 60) and EG (1927, 496, T1): act. a fossilized contraction of Eg. m “nimm!” (q.v.) + dat. n=?
- 2. GT: if the root mn was not secondary, cp. ECh.: Sokoro múne “stehlen” [Lks. 1937, 36]. Or perhaps ECh.: Toram min- “possessor, owner” [AJ 1988 MS, 15]?

NB: Eventually related (on a biconsonantal basis) to AA *m-n-ḡ “to take” [GT] (discussed s.v. mnḡt “Besitz”, below)?

***mn**: phon. value of the hrgl. depicting a “draught-board, set with men (the board is plan, divided into three rows of ten squares each; the draughtsmen appearing on the edge, in elevation, are of two sorts; their number varies in different exx.)” (Griffith 1898, 56) = “Brettspiel mit den quadratischen Feldern” (Ranke 1920, 3) = “damier égyptien” (Pillet 1925–27, 172) = “draught-board” (Grd., EG 1927, 518, Y5) = “un rettangolo scompartito a scacchiera e sormontato da elementi simili a pinnacoli” (Curto 1967, 20–22, §C) = “a gameboard” (Fischer 1996, 225) = “Spielbrett mit Spielsteinen” (Snk. 1997, 58, Y5).

NB1: Since the Eg. name of the game was zn.t (B. J. Peterson, LÄ I 853), the reason of the phon. value mn is not clear. Ranke (l.c., fn. 3): “woher sein Zeichen zu dem Lautwert mn kam, ist m. W. nicht bekannt”; EG l.c.: “for unknown reason...”. Whether the

same word is preserved in the supposed fem. *mn.t “(das Wort, von dem das Zeichen seinen Lautwert mn hat) das Brettspiel, viell. enthalten in dem Götterbeinamen ḥntj-mn.wt=f” (PT, Wb II 60, 5; the Belegstellen to l.c. refer to the name ḥntj-mnj.t=f in PT 285a, 655c) = “draught-board” (Grd. 1915, 67) = “board-game” (Needler 1953, 63, fn. 4) = “table à jeu, échiquier” (AL 77.1692 with exx. from the *Sonnenlitanei*) is highly uncertain.

NB2: After having examined 26 representations of Y5, Pillet (1925–27, 157–172, 175; also ASAE 52, 1954, 579f.) assumed a bivalent nature of the hrgl. y5: “*l’image simplifiée de deux objets complètement différents, damier et palissade (a wattle and a daub fence with ends projecting at the top)*”, sometimes “*un damier, dans la plupart des cases... une palissade en clayonnage, une ‘séria’ ou une barrière dont les pieux verticaux solidement enfoncés en terre sont réunis par un travail de vannerie ou de barres*”. Reaffirmed by S. Curto (1967, 20–22, §C) who saw in the hrgl. “1. figura di scacchiera, 2. di palizzata o di muro” quoting evidence from a Giza mastaba where it “*raffigura chiaramente un muro con paraste che salgono oltre il bordo superiore della parete, alternatamente più o meno alte*”, while in the temple of Darius at El-Khargeh it represents “*sicuramente un muro di mattoni coronato di una palizzata*” (cf. ASAE 40, 1940, 367, n. 140). The interpretation by Pillet was secondary and divergent from the original representation as pointed out by Fischer (l.c.), who cited evidence from Dyn. XI for the legs of the gameboard sloping inward.

● Existence of the word dubious. Etymology obscure.

■ 1. Pillet (1925–27, 174) speculated about a derivation from Eg. mn “*établi solidement*”. Improbable.

NB: Pillet’s argumentation is rather weak: “*Il paraît... bien difficile d’assimiler un objet... qu’un damier posé sur une table à l’idée de fermeté et de stabilité. Il faudrait... supposer plutôt qu’une combinaison du jeu donnait à certaines pièces une position inattaquable, ferme, stable, ou encore que le coup final rendait le vainqueur ‘ferme’, ‘stable’, et qu’il l’annonçait à haute voix...*”.

■ 2. GT: cp. perhaps WCh.: Gmy. m’men “a children’s game” [Srl. 1937, 142; GT 2004, 245: isolated in AS] | Fyer mwên “Spiel” [Jng. 1970, 88] = mwen “play” [Blench 2000 MS, 8, #Q027].

NB: Akk. (a/jB, nA) mēlulu “spielen”, (jB) mummellu “(Schau?)Spieler” [AHW 644, 671] is out of question, being cognate with Hbr. māḥōl, māḥōlā “Spiel” [GB], cf. Eg. mḥn (below).

mn.t “Schwalbe” (OK, Wb II 68, 2; GHWb 335; WD II 62: cf. RdE 38, 1987, 68) = “swallow” (AEO II 257*; FD 107) = “hirondelle” (Meeks 1990, 44–46) > Dem. bnj (f) “Schwalbe” (DG 117) → Cpt.: (S) BHNE ~ BHNE (KHW), BENE (Vcl.), BNE (CED), (BF) BHNI, (B) BENI, BPI (f, rarely m) “swallow” (CD 40a; CED 24) = “Schwalbe” (KHW 24) = “hirondelle” (Vcl. 1983, 28).

NB1: Should be distinguished from Eg. mnw.t “dove” (OK, below) as rightly emphasized by A. H. Gardiner (AEO II 257*). Contra: DLE I 216.

NB2: For the shift of -n- > -r- in (B) BPI, cf. also Peust 1999, 168.

● Etymology disputable. For the time being, #1 or #2 is the most attractive solution.

■ 1. GT: perhaps Eg. mn.t < *m3n.t ~ ECh.: Tumat mārāḥ [-ñ] (m) “hirondelle” [Cpr. 1975, 84]?

- **2.** GT: or akin to WCh.: Tng. ṅaḷeṅaḷe [ŋ- < *m-?] “swallow” [Jng. 1991, 113]?
NB: Cp. perhaps also EBrb.: Gdm. ta-mulla “traquet, petit oiseau noir à turban blanc (qui siffle comme le merle)” [Lanfry 1973, 211, #99] || SBrb.: Hgr. mûla-mûla “nom d’une espèce de motteux (ar. bu-beššîr): un petit oiseau à corps noire, à queue noire et blanche, à dessus de la tête blanc” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1194] || CCh.: Ktk. mällá “francolin (bush-fowl), perdrix” [Bouny 1975, 22, #344]? Ch. de Foucauld and J. Lanfry (ll.c.) derive these terms from Brb. *m-l-l “white”.
- **3.** L. Homburger (1929, 158) equated mn.t (and wr) with Ful bilibili “hirondelle”. Difficult to judge. The same word is found in some Chadic lgs. (presumably as loans with respect to their irreg. labial correspondences): WCh.: Hausa bíbílóó ~ búlbúlóó (m) “swallow (*Hirundo aethiopica*)” [Abr. 1962, 100, 117] | Dera ḥilḥili “swallow” [Nwm. 1974, 122] || ECh.: WDng. peltya (f) “hirondelle” [Fédry 1971, 60], EDng. pélpilā (f), pl. pèlpilāl “hirondelle” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 241].
NB: In principle, a development of Eg. mn.t < *bn.t < *bl-t should not be ruled out even in spite of Cpt. -h (Takács 2005, 77–82, §VII), but this hypothetical pre-OEg. change has nothing to do with the b- of late Dem.-Cpt. reflexes.
- **4.** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (OS 1992, 181; Orel 1993, 40; HSED #1793) related Eg. mn.t with WCh.: Warji munw-ai [Skn.], Kry. múúnú “bird” [Skn.] (NBch.: Mkr. 1987, 95; JI 1994 II, 22) || ECh.: Bdy. minīniyo “poule des rochers” [AJ 1989, 99]. Semantically improbable.

mn “krank sein, leiden” (OK, Wb II 66–67) = “1. to be ill, suffer (Med.), 2. be troubled about (Lit. MK)” (FD 107).

- Hence: mn.t (MK, Wb II 67, 6–18) = “1. malady (MK, Med.), 2. what is harmful (Lit. MK), 3. suffering (Lit. MK)” (FD 107).

NB: J. Osing (1998, 71, 73, n. av) assumed *mēn(w).t or *m̃n.ēt on the basis of the gloss with -ē- in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD).

- **1.** GT: most probably, provided mn < *ml, cognate with AA *m-l-l “to suffer, be weak” (or sim.) [GT]: Sem. *mll “to wear away” [Bmh.]: (?) Hbr. mll qal “to wilt, wither” [KB 593] = “to languish” [Gray], JNAram. (< Ar.) mallul “sorrowful, painful” [Sabar 2002, 219] | Ar. mll “gebeugt sein, sich hinschleppen” [GB] = mll I “s’ennuyer de la conduite”, V “être harcelé” [Fagnan 1923, 165] = II “ennuyer, fatiguer, rebuter, dégoûter, désenchanter, désenivrer” [Beaussier] = “to be ill with fever, ill-tempered” [KB] = “to be weary, faint” [Alb.] (contamination of two diverse roots?) || MSA *mll “to be tired” [GT]: Jbl. mell “to be fed up, despair of finishing sg. with so.”, emlé “to tire, make so. fed up”, mílé “sickening person” [Jns. 1981, 171],

Mhr. *māl* “to be fed up of sg./so.”, *mālēl* “sickening person (poet.), sickness (poet.)” [Jns. 1987, 265] || NBrb.: *Izdeg a-mlelli* “vertige” [Mrc. 1937, 262] | Qbl. *mmel* “2. faire très mal (point douloureux), 3. souffrir de” [Dlt. 1982, 496], cf. *Zwawa mal* “être dégoûté” [Blf. 1910, 219] || ECu.: *Dullay: Tsamay malal* “to be sick, tired” [Sava 2005 MS, 247], *Harso & Dbs. & Glg. malāl-* “1. schwach werden, 2. zusammenbrechen (Mensch), 3. nicht können”, *malāl-a* “schwach (von Menschen)” [AMS 1980, 174, 212] || CCh.: (?) *Musgu millik* “Schmerz” [Rohlf’s in Lks. 1941, 67] || ECh.: *Skr. môle* “ermüden” [Lks. 1937, 36].

AP: A. R. Bomhard (1981, 446) combined Sem. **mll* with IE **mel-* “to wear away”.

NB: Cf. also Hbr. *ʔml qal* “to be hot with fever” [KB 63] = “to languish” [Gray] as suggested by Gray (1934, 35) and KB l.c. *Guillaume* (1965 I, 6), in turn, compared Hbr. *ʔml* with Ar. *wabula* “to be unwholesome” (unconvincing).

- **2.** GT: or cp. Sem. **mnn* “to be weak” [GT]: Ug. *mnn* D stem “abmüden, anstrengen” [WUS] = “to be weakened” [Gordon, Dahood] = “to be weakened or to lower” [Renfroe], (?) Hbr. *mānōn* “weakling” [Reider, VT 4, 1954, 285f.] = “arrogant, insolent, rebellious (?)” [KB 600 with a different etymology] || Ar. *mnn* I “1. fatiguer, éreinter qqn.”, IV–V “affaiblir qqn.” [BK II 1155] = IV: *ʔamma* “ermüden” [WUS] = “to weaken” [Gordon] = “to be tired, jaded, diminished” [Pope] = “to be weak, tired, feeble, dwindle, diminish, abate” [Renfroe] = *manīn-* “machtlos” [GB 436] || Geez *manana* “to be insignificant, incomplete, deficient in, lack, dwindle” etc. [Lsl. 1987, 351] (Sem.: Gordon 1955, 290, #1131; WUS #1604; Dahood 1965, 64, #1505; Renfroe 1992, 128–130) || LECu.: *Orm.* (< ES?) *mannā* “to be worse” [Gragg 1982, 277; Hds. 1989, 170].

NB1: For the problems of Ug. *mnn* vs. Ar. *mnn* cf. Renfroe 1992, 128–130. W.F. Albright (quoted by Renfroe 1992, 130 as “questionable”) suggested a root variation (via dissim.) *mll* ~ *mnn* in Ar. and Sem. Cf. also Ar. *māhīn-* “faible, débile” [BK II 1164] with infix *-h-*.

NB2: The Sem. root is apparently isolated in AA. Cf. perhaps Afar *mina* “1. (f) fainting, 2. (m) being jumpy (être nerveux)” [PH 1985, 169]? A. *Militarev* (2005, 98) combined Ar. *mhn* and ES **mnn* with the reflexes of AA **m-n* “small” [GT].

NB3: The Chadic correspondences are uncertain. Any connection to WCh.: *Karekare māngwəy* “sickness” [Kraft 1981 I, 63] || ECh.: *Somray mòm* “maladie” [Jng. 1993 MS, 45]? Comparing CCh.: *Masa moina* “sickness” [Kraft 1981 III, 169] is out of question, since its *-na* is a masc. suffix (p.c. by H. *Tourneux* on 11 June 1997), cf. *Masa moy* > *möy(ò)* “sick” [Ctc. 1983, 107].

- Other solutions are either weaker or false.
- **3.** A. *Trombetti* (1923, 136, #239): Eg. *mn* compared with NS: ESud.: *Bari myen* “to be painful, feel pain (*dolore*, *sentir dolore*)” and *Bsq. min* “*dolore*”. Hardly areal parallels or loans.

- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 252): Eg. mn related to Nub.: Fadidja & Mahasi orot, -d “maladie” (sic). Absurd.
- **5.** F. Calice (1936, #381), followed by W. Westendorf (1962, 29, §46.5) saw in Eg. mn a “doublet” of Eg. mr “krank sein” (PT, below). Not to be ruled out.
NB: The replacement of mn.t by mr.t “Krankheit, Leiden” is attested already in CT VII 521 (Lesko 1972, 85).
- **6.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 206, #1805) proposed a comparison with NOm.: Jnj. (Yemsa) màngū “bad”.
NB: Semantically doubtful. No match for Janjero -gū in Eg. mn.

mn “bleiben, fest an einer Stelle sein” (OK, Wb II 60–62) = “to remain, be firm, established, enduring, fixed, stick fast in (m), attached to (m)” (FD 106) > Cpt. (SALBF) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta$, (OS) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\iota$ “bleiben, warten, beharren” (KHW 95).

NB1: For the vocalization and cuneiform reflexes cf. Steindorff 1890, 334, §2; KMAV 51; Alb. 1946, 14–15, §22 & 16, §29–30; Lambdin 1958, 187 & fn. 49; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 89; NBÄ 83, 127, 603, n. 572.

NB2: Spiegelberg (KHW 60), Garnot (1958, 139), and Vergote (CdE 51, 1976, 273) falsely assumed a root *mjn with a med. -j-: *mó(ï)ën, cf. Cpt. (SL) $\mu\lambda\epsilon\iota\eta$ (m) “Zeichen” usually explained from Eg. mnw (mjnw?) “Denkmal (eigtl. Bleibendes?)” (OK, Wb, q.v.). Rightly declined by Osing (1978, 73, n. 16). For the late weak Auslaut root cons. appearing in Dem. and Cpt. (OS) var. $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\epsilon$, $\mu\eta\eta\epsilon^+$, (B) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\iota$ see Schweitzer 2003, 237, 240, fn. 30.

● Hence (i.a.):

(1) mn.wt “festes Opfer (für Alle Tage)” (OK, Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 132, n. 20: Urk. I 247:10, 13 & 293–5) vs. jmn.wt (OK) > jmn.jt (since MK) “dauerndes Opfer, ständige Opferstiftung” (OK-XXVI., Wb I 83, 9) = “dauerndes, tägliches Opfer” (NBÄ 470) > mn ~ mn.t “id.” (LP-GR, Wb II 66, 1).

NB: Vocalized: OK *j̄mē/inw.ṯt > MK *j̄mē/inw.ṯt (NBÄ 470: lit. “Dauerndes”).

(2) mn “als Ausdruck in Rechnungen und Listen: bleibt, der Restbetrag ist...” (late NK, Wb II 63, 11) = “balance” (Grd., JEA 27, 1941, 49, n. 2; Grd. 1948 II, 183f., 188; Caminos 1954 LEM, 359; Wentz 1967, 29, n. o) = “remaining” (Janssen 1961, 52).

(3) mn.t “heaven” (lit. “that which endures or is firm”, PL 438).

NB: A. H. Gardiner (1916, 182) proposed a number of improbable noun derivatives of mn “to be firm, established”: mn.t “kind, nature”, mn.t “wine-measure”, mn “such-a-one”, mn.t “such-and-such a thing”. See the respective entries.

● Cognate with a large family of roots in AA. Eventually, the very same AA root developed its diverse secondary senses as follows:

(1) AA *m-n “1. firm, 2. strong” [GT] > Ar. munn-at- “force”, mamnūn- “2. fort, robuste” [BK II 1155–6] ||| NOm. *min- “hard”

[Bnd.]: NWOmt. *min- “to be strong” [GT]: Omt. min- “esser duro, saldo, forte, durare, essere ardito osare”, min-o “forte, potente, duro” [Mrn. 1938, 152], Wlt. min-uw- “to be strong”, min-uw-a “1. strong, 2. hard” [Lmb.], Gofa min- “to be strong”, min-o “strong” [Lmb.] = min-ō [CR], Gamu min-ó “1. strong, 2. hard” [Lmb. 1985 MS, 12, #772 & #775; Sottile 1999, 432], Doko miññ-irē “forza (fu forte?)” [CR 1937, 249] | Chara mín-a “hard” [Bnd. 2003, 142, #41] | Haruro (Kcm.) mõn-o “forte” [CR 1937, 654] = mon-o “strong” [Lmb.] (NOM.: LS 1997, 462, 464) || ECh.: Mkl. m̃any “solide” [Jng. 1990, 137].

NB1: The same root is present in WSem. *ʔmn “1. to be firm, stable, confirmed, 2. reliable, faithful, have faith, believe” [Hnrg. 2000, 1062]: Hbr. ʔmn nifal “1. fest, sicher, 2. dauerhaft, beständig, 3. zuverlässig, treu sein, 4. wahr befunden werden, etc.” [GB], Syr. ʔamīn “fest, bleibend” [GB] || OSA: Sab. ʔmn “to be secure, do sg. with impunity” [SD 6], Qtb. š-ʔmn (caus.) “to make secure, provide security” [Ricks 1982, 6], Ar. ʔmn I: ʔamina “to be safe, secure, faithful” [Lsl.], IV: ʔamana “to believe (glauben)” [GB-Lsl.] = “to assure” [Ricks] (Lsl.: stem IV < Aram. or Geez) || Geez ʔamna “to believe, trust” [Lsl.] (Sem.: GB 48; DRS 23; Marrassini 1971, 80–82; Lsl. 1987, 24).

NB2: H. Möller (1911, 165) assumed a var. with *ʔ- in Ar. ʔamina ~ ʔamana “to remain, stay, dwell, abide (in a place)”.

(2) AA *m-n “to join, attach firmly” [GT]: NBrb. *m-n “se réunir” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mnj) ||| NOM.: Wlt. min-t- “to glue” [Lmb.], Dache min-is- “to glue” [Lmb.] ||| Ch. *m-n “to stick firmly, stick to sg.” [GT]: WCh.: Hausa mánnà “to gum on to, affix to”, mánné ~ mánnè “to stick to” [Abr. 1962, 654–5] || CCh.: Mafa mán- “to attach” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 226], Mtk. maṇa “attacher” [Mch. 1953, 157, 179], (?) Hurzo ṇan [< *man?] “attacher” [Mch.: < *√men] || ECh.: Smr. mēn “coller” [Jng. 1993 MS, 44], perhaps Tumak mìn “appuyer” [Cpr. 1975, 84] | WDng. m̃inë “attacher solidement” [Fédry 1971, 130].

NB: For etymological parallels of the semantic shift “attacher” ~ “fort” see Masson 1991.

(3) AA *m-n “to remain in a place (or sim., act.: to be stuck to a place), hence: 1. sit, 2. wait” [GT]: WCh. *m-n “to sit (down)” [JS 1981, 230G; JI 1994 I, 151]: Ron *mun “to sit” [GT]: DB mun “sich setzen, wohnen, leben, bleiben”, Bks. té-mun “sich setzen”, Monguna man mumun “to sit (down)”, Mangar zan munzân “to sit (down)” (Ron: Jng. 1970, 219, 146, 287, 354; JI 1994 II, 294; Seibert 2000 MS, f005) | Ngz. m̃nú “to wait” [Schuh 1981, 105], Bade ñnú “to wait” [Schuh] (Bade-Ngz.: Schuh 1978, 264; 1981, 105) || CCh.: Musgu mine “sich befinden” [Krause in Lks. 1941,

67]. Hence: ECu.: Dullay: Tsamay man-o “spot, place” [Sava 2005 MS, 266] ||| WCh.: Ron *mun “place” [GT]: Sha mun “Platz”, Klr. mun “Ort, Platz” (Ron: Jng. l.c.).

AP: Nub.: Mahasi mene, mine “to stay, dwell, be” [Trb.]. ESud.: Bari mōn “to remain” [Trb.]. Th. Obenga (1993, 340, #100) compared Mbochi māna “qui est fixé à jamais, solidement établi, ferme, stable, éternel, infini”, Kikongo mēna “être ferme, éternel, infini”, Bambara méné “demener, conserver”, Nkoya (Kaounde-Lunda) imana “rester stable, ferme, debout”. L. Homburger (1930, 285) compared Ful muño “patience”.

DP: Already H. Möller (1911, 165) compared Sem. *ʔmn with IE *men- “manere”. W. A. Ward (1961, 36) too assumed the Eg. root to be Nostratic comparing Gk. μένω. Similarly, A. R. Bomhard (1981, 447; 1984, 271–2, #276) and P. Vernus (2000, 196) combined Eg. mn with IE *mā/an- “to stay, remain” > Lat. maneo. L. Homburger (1957, 30) equated Eg. mn with Drv.: Tamil man.

LIT.: Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30 (Eg.-Sem.); Müller 1905, 418, fn. 1 (Eg.-Sem.); GB 48 (Sem.-Eg.); Albright 1918, 232 (Eg.-Sem.); Trb. 1923, 136 (Nub.-Eg.-Bari-Ar.); Farina 1926, 21, #35 (Eg.-Sem.); Clc. 1936, #198 (Eg.-Sem.); Chn. 1947, #38 (Eg.-Sem.); IS 1976, #287 (Sem.-Eg.-Gofa-Musgu; quoted also in Bengtson-Ruhlen 1988, 21, #16; Blz. 1990, 262); OS 1992, 201 & Orel 1995, 108, #115 & HSED #1795 (Daffo-Butura-Musgu-Eg.); JI 1994 I, 151 (Ron-Eg.); Skn. 1996, 196 (Hs.-Dng.-Eg.).

NB1: A. Erman (1892, 113) declined the old comparison of Sem. *ʔmn vs. Eg. mn (going back to H. Brugsch) purely because of the “unexplained” Sem. *ʔ-, and identified the Sem. root with Eg. rnm “tragen” and rnm “Arm” (!), which is unacceptable both semantically and phonologically.

NB2: W. F. Albright (1918, 232) and A. Ember (1930, #10.a.16) identified Sem. *ʔmn with Eg. mn.t (OK) ~ mnj.t (MK) “mooring-post” (OK, below). Not excluded.

NB3: F. Behnk (1927, 81, #12) combined Sem. *ʔmn with Eg. m3^c.t “truth”. Untenable.

NB4: M. Lamberti & R. Sottile (1997, 462, 464) derived the Omt. forms from OCu. *amal- (sic) “to be strong”, although the shift *-l- > -n- is not proven.

NB5: Ignoring its derivation from Eg. mn, V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 201) combined Eg. smnj “stehen bleiben” (XVIII., Wb IV 134) with a certain CCh. *saman- “to sit” (with *s- as a root cons.!). False.

- All other etymologies are either less convincing or false:
- **1.** W. M. Müller (1905, 418, fn. 1) affiliated Eg. mn and Sem. *ʔmn with Sem.-Eg. *ymn “rechts” as well as Eg. wnmj “rechte Seite” (as “*Nebenform*”). False.

NB: Three perfectly distinct roots. For the etymology of Eg. wnmj see Vcl. 1959, 71; 1972, 178; Takács 1997, 114, #2522 (contra OS 1992, 201; HSED #2522; Orel 1995, 127, #53).

- **2.** F. Behnk (1927, 81, #12), A. Ember (1930, #10.b.15; quoted by Albright 1918, 232, fn. 1), followed by A. A. H. Youssef (1999): Eg. mn ~ Ar. bnn “stetit constitutive in loco” [Freytag] = “stehen, stehen bleiben” [Behnk] = “faire halte, se fixer (dans un lieu)” [DRS 72: no Sem. cognates] = “to occupy, reside, dwell, settle > perche” [Youssef]. Noteworthy.

NB: In principle, a nasal assim. (OEg. mn < *bn) would be possible, although it would evidently contradict the widely accepted comparison of OEg. mn = Sem. *ʔmn etc.

- **3.** W. A. Ward (1961, 36, #15) equated Eg. *mn* with Sem.: Ug. *mn-t*, which, acc. to Ward, is used once parallel with Ug. *šir* “remnant, remains” [WUS #2570] in the Baal-Anat epic (49 II 35–37): *šir-h l-t-ikl ʿšr-m mn-t-h l-t-kly npr* “the birds verily eat his remains, the fowl verily eat his *mn-t*”, which could also be translated “the birds do not eat..., the fowl do not eat...”.
NB: Ward’s etymology is far-fetched, because the Ug. term in question is identical with Ug. *mn-t* “Teil, Glied, Portion” [WUS] < Sem. **mnw* ~ **mny* (?) “to count” (Sem.: WUS #1600), which Eg. *mn* “to remain” has nothing to with.
- **4.** A. R. Bomhard (1981, 447; 1984, 271–2, #276) affiliated Eg. *mn* with Sem. **mn^c* “to hold back, stop”. Out of question. For the etymology of the latter cf. Eg. *mn^t* “Besitz” (NE, Wb, q.v.).
- **5.** M. Lamberti (1988, 89, #219) equated Eg. *mn* and Sem. **mn* with Cu. **min-* “to build”. Similarly, W. Westendorf (KHW 519) mistakenly compared Cpt. (B) *MIN* “Tierlager” (NBÄ 83: from **mīn.~w* “Dauer, Aufenthalt”) with (using the symbol “<”) Som. *min* “Wohnung” (lit. “building”). Also A. R. Bomhard (1981, 447; 1984, 271–2, #276) equated Eg. *mn* with ECu. **ma/in-* “house” [Ss.]. False.
- **6.** N. Skinner (1996, 196) connected the Eg.-Ch. root mistakenly to Ar. *manna* “to bestow (favour) upon”. Semantically unconvincing.
- **7.** Th. Schneider (1997, 198, #33): *mn* < **ml* compared with NBrb.: Qbl. *mel* “passieren, auftreten” [Dlt. 1982, 495] || SBrb.: Hgr. *e-mel* “(in einem Ort) sein” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1887]. False.
NB: For Brb. cf. rather WCh.: Pa’a *maalàà* “to remain, be left over” [MSkn. 1979, 193].
- **8.** A. Zaborski (1999, 46) explained Eg. *mn* from a basic mng. **to be* and equated it with the hypothetical etymon **-mn-* of LECu.: SA *-mm-* (prefix of pass.).

mn “der und der” (since PT 147a, Wb II 64, 65) = “such-a-one”, fem. “such-and-such a thing” (Grd. 1916, 182) = “so-and-so, someone” (FD 107) = “ein bestimmter, der und der” (NBÄ) = “so and so, certain” (DLE I 216) = “(Herr) Sowieso, ein gewisser Mann (als Ersatz des Namens), einer” (ÄWb I 528) > Cpt. (B) *-MAN* “ein gewisser” (KHW 94) = “une certaine personne/chose” (DELIC 114).

NB1: Vocalized **mēn* (NBÄ 604, n. 572).

NB2: Ph. Derchain (1966, 31–36, esp. 32; WD II 60) explained the name of Menes as “le roi quelqu’un” from Eg. *mn*. Similarly, O’Mara (2001, 99): *mnj* in the Royal Torino Canon stands for the abstract “King N.N.” (“König irgendwer”). For alternative etymologies of the name cf. Brunner, LÄ IV 47.

- **1.** Most probably cognate with the AA (interrog., rel., indef.) pronoun base **m-n* [GT] present in Sem.: Akk. (not in aAK, nA) *manman* (aB), hence assim.: *mamman* ~ *mamma* ~ *mammu* (n/

spB) “(irgend)jemand, wer auch immer”, manāma, ass. mannāma ~ manamma “irgendjemand, wer auch immer”, (nA) memēni ~ mimī/ēni ~ menimeni “jemand(en), (irgend)etwas, irgendein”, (nA, n/spB) mamman(n)u “irgendjemand von”, mimma [from *mīn(u)-ma] “irgendetwas, alles” [AHW 600–602, 644, 653] || Ug. mn(m) “who/whatever”, mn-k “person” < *mannu + *kā “whoever thou art” [Gordon 1955, 289, #1129a–1130] = mm [*mnm(n)] “irgendjemand” [WUS #1586] = mnm “any(thing), all (that)”, mnmn “anyone, someone”, mn-k “whoever, anyone” (enclitic -k) [DUL 563], JArām. of TM ma(?)n “1. irgend jemand, wer, aliquis” [Levy 1924 III, 5] || OSA: Qtb. mn “he who, whoever” [Ricks], Sab. mn “whosoever” [SD 86], Ar. man “1. celui qui, tel qui” [BK II 1154] || ES: Grg.: Muher & Ggt. & Soddo & Selti & Zway mannəm, Enm. maniyā etc. “any(one), whatever”, followed by “man” it means “whoever, either” (Grg.: Lsl. 1979 III, 407) || NBrb.: Mzab mənaw (m), mənaw (f) “quelques, plusieurs” [Dlh. 1984, 120] || WBrb.: Zng. mēn (pl. of min) “jemand, unbestimmte Leute” [Zhl. 1942–43, 101, #1] || EBrb.: Gdm. mennaw (m), mennaw-et (f) “quelques, un petit nombre, un petit groupe” [Lanfry 1973, 214, #1016] || SBrb.: (?) Hgr. mendam “un tel: tel homme” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1208] || CCh.: Mada mana “untel (xy), nom que l’on se donne à soi-même (quand on rapporte les propos de qqn. qui mentionne notre nom)” [Br̄t.-Brunet 2000, 187] | Sao mena “was, irgendwas” [Duisburg 1914, 44] || ECh.: Kera ká-mán (pron.) “jemand, etwas” [Ebert 1976, 68] | Smr. màni “chose (coll.)” [Jng. 1978, 205]: orig. **“something”* (?).

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Holma 1919, 38; Ehret 1995, 300; Skn. 1995, 33.

NB1: These AA forms derive from AA *man- “who?” [GT]: Sem. *man < *m-(a)n “who?” [OL 1998, 59] = *man “who?” [Stz.], cp. Akk. mannu (OAkk., NAss. also man, NAss. also maʔu) “wer?” [AHW 603] || JArām. of TM ma(?)n “2. wer? quis? quae?” [Levy 1924 III, 5], BA man “who, whoever” [KB] || OSA: Sab. mn “who” [SD 86] = mn “who, what?” [Lsl.], Ar. man “2. (av. interrogation) qui?”, maniy- “de qui? appartenant à qui?” [BK II 1154, 1159] || Sqt. mon “qu(o)i?” [Lsl.] || Geez mannu “who?” [Lsl.] = “qui?” [Dillmann], Te. mán “qui?” [LH, Munzinger, Lsl.], Tna. man “who?” [de Vito, Bassano, Coulbeaux], Amh. ma(n) [Guidi], Gafat man ~ mano “who?” [Lsl. 1945, 162], Arg. man “who?” [Cohen, Lsl.], Harari mʔan “who?” [Crl., Lsl.], Chaha man “who?” [Lsl.] etc. (ES: Lsl. 1961, 67, §4; Sem.: WUS #1592; Ricks 1982, 142; Lsl. 1987, 348) || NBrb.: Shilh man “who, what?” [Aplg. 1958, 61]. Note that N. Skinner (1995, 33) erroneously derived ES *mannu “who” from AA *m-n “person” [GT].

NB2: Do eventually MSA: Jbl. mny: mōnyét “likeness”, cf. ʔəl ʕōd mōnyét lʔ “there is nobody like him” [Jns. 1981, 172] || EBrb.: Audjila i-mán “stesso” [Prd. 1960, 175] || Bed. mána (adv.) “so, in such and such a way” [Rpr. 1928, 217] also belong here? Cf. also Eg. mn.t “Art” (Wb, q.v.).

- 2. GT: or Eg. mn “someone” developed from AA *m-n “one” [GT]?

NB1: Cp. EBrb.: Audjila i-mân “same, stesso” [Prd. 1960, 175] || Ch. *m-n “1”: WCh.: Tal mènè [IL] = ménè [Smz.] | Grm. mon [Gowers] || ECh.: Kwang mîn ~ mín [Jng.], Mobu món [Jng.], Kera mènà [Ebert] | PSmr. *mVn [GT]: Smr. mon [Nct.] = man [Barth] = men [AF] = mun [Dcr.] = món [Jng.], Ndam man [Barth] = mán [Jng.] = minei [Dcr.], Tumak mon [Dcr.] = man [Barth], Gulei miin [Hfm.], Miltu man [Hfm.], Sarwa muni [Hfm.] (Smr. gr.: Hfm. 1971, 9; Ch.: JI 1994 II, 262–263).

NB2: For the semantic development in Eg. mn, cf. e.g. Eng. one “1” ~ “someone (in general)”.

NB3: A similar (but not the same) idea was proposed by A. Dolgopolsky (2005, 25–26, #35), who explained Eg. mn, along with IE *monwo-/*menu- (?) “alone”, eventually from Nst. *me[y]kU “oneself, one’s own, body” (see below).

- **3.** A. H. Gardiner (1916, 182) derived it (along with mn.t “nature”, mn.t “wine-measure”, q.v.) from Eg. mn “to be firm, established”. Unconvincing.
- **4.** J. Osing (NBÄ 604, n. 572) affiliated it with Eg. mn.t (*mîn. ʔ) “Art und Weise”, which is in fact certainly a distinct root.
- **5.** V. Blažek (1992, 139–140; 1999, 61, #23), in turn, identified Eg. mn with the reflexes of AA *man- “man” [1992] = *manw-/*many- “man” [1999] (preserved in Brb.-ECu.-NOM.-Ch.). Similarly, L. Homburger (1960–63, 56) equated Eg. mn with Sid. mann-a “men, people” [Hds.]. Possible only if we assume an eventual cognacy of AA *m-n “who” vs. AA *m-n “man” [GT].

NB1: For the semantic development, cf. e.g. (as typological parallel) PIE *manu- “man” → i.a. German Mann & man (IEW 700).

NB2: For a detailed discussion of the derivatives of AA *man- “man” see the entry for Eg. mnw “Min” (below). Note that Blažek (1999 l.c.) mistakenly compares here NOM.: Wlt. min-ō “warrior” and Haruro (Kachama) mon-o “strong”.

- **6.** A. Dolgopolsky (2005, 25–26, #35) combined it with Brb. *-mān “soul, person” [Dlg.] || HECu.: Sid. mann-imma “body” [Hds. 1989, 29] || SCu.: Dhl. móni “self” [Dlg.] = maní “reflexive” [EEN 1989, 37], whereby he explained Brb. *m- (prefix of the reciprocal-refl.-pass. stīrp) || Cu. *m- (prefix of pass.-refl.) too, along with some Alt., Drv. parallels, eventually from Nst. *me[y]kU “oneself, one’s own, body” [Dlg.]. Some of these *comparanda* are hardly tenable.

NB: (1) The Brb. reflexes are usually listed under the monoradical root \sqrt{m} (with a fossilized pl. circumfix), which is clearly confirmed by the AA evidence, cf. LECu.: Das. má “person, man” [Tosco 2001, 516] || SCu. *mī “people” [Ehret 1980, 160, #55] || NOM.: Sezo may & Hozo mo “man (vir)” [Bnd. 1990, 610, #148] || WCh.: PGmy. *may “man” [GT 2004, 243–4] | BT *mu/*mi “person” [Schuh 1984, 211] = *mī ~ *mū [GT after Schuh 1978, 150] etc. (2) Sid. mann-imma is rather cognate with Kmb. mann-ōmat “body” [Hds.], which may derive from HECu. *man-a, pl. *mann-a “man” [Hds. 1989, 96]. For the semantic shift cf. HECu. *naf-a “body” [Hds. 1989, 29] || WCh.: Fyer & Monguna náaf, Klr. naafú, Mangar náaf “man (vir)” (Ron: JI 1994 II, 230; Seibert 2000 MS, a001) || CCh.: Ga’anda náf-čá “person” [Nwm. 1977, 123]. (3) As indicated in EEN 1989, 37, Dhl. maní has no SCu. cognates. (4) The Brb.-Cu. pass.-refl. marker *m- is of common AA nature and has no *-n.

mn.t (OK) > **mn.tj.t** (LP) “eine löwengestaltige Göttin” (OK, Wb II 68, 5) = “Löwengöttin (alt in Ritualen belegt, in der Spätzeit mit Mehit, Pachet, Sachmet und Tefnut verbunden)” (Helck, LÄ IV 48) = “Menet, Mentit” (ÄWb I 1593b).

- Etymology ambiguous due to the -n (< *-n or *-l?).
- 1. GT: perhaps identical with WCh.: Bade m̄in-án “lion” [Lks. 1968, 223; 1974–1975, 103] = m̄in-án “lion” [Krf. 1981, #159]? Apparently isolated within Chadic.
- 2. GT: or mn.t < *m3n.t < *mln.t? Cp. ECh.: Kbl. mlàḡə “lion” [Cpr.], Lele mlá [Gowers] = mláng “lion” [Simons] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 227).
NB: Perhaps related to PCh. *m-l “leopard” [JS 1981, 163] (discussed s.v. Eg. m3j).

mn.t “Schenkel, Oberschenkel” (PT, Wb II 68, 8–15) = “cuisse (fémur)” (Beauregard 1892, 182; Lefébvre 1952, 47, §54) = “Beine” (Erman 1893, 123, §28) = “the two loins” (Pap. E. Smith 21:2, Breasted 1930, 490) = “hind-leg” (Blackman & Fairman, JEA 29, 1943, 17, fn. c) = “hind leg (of ox), leg, thigh (in men)” (AEO I 17) = “Oberschenkel” (Grapow 1954, 92) = “1. thigh (of man), 2. haunch (of ox)” (FD 107) = “thighs” (Borghouts 1971, 94, n. 161 with lit.) = “(dual) le giron (de Nout) (KRI II 854:7)” (AL 79.1201) = “1. Oberschenkel (Mensch, auch als Stelle der Geburt und als Schoß), 2. Oberschenkel des Hinterbeins (Tier)” (GHWb 335) = “1. hindleg (including buttock), 2. thigh” (Walker 1996, 269) = “1. thigh (of man), buttock (CT VI 392c), 2. haunch, feet (CT VI 261e), 3. lap (CT VI 61g, VII 174a)” (DCT 167).

NB: In CT V 92g (and also in Urk. V 156:10, 162:1), mn.tj denotes “an unidentified part of boat (lit. haunches): plausibly mast-step” (AECT II 30, spell 397, n. 29 & III 203, index after Spaul) = “mast-step (?) (lit. haunches) as ship part” (Jones 1988, 168, #68) = “die Benennung für die Fassungen der beiden Schenkel des Bipod-Mastes: Mastschuh, -spur” (Düring 1995, 70, 214).

- From the same root: old *mn.wj (dual.) → mnj “die beiden Oberschenkel” (Med., Wb II 76, 15) = mnj “the upper part of the hindleg” (AEO II 244*) = mnj “thighs” (FD 108) = mnj “cuisse” (Iversen, JEA 65, 1979, 82, n. 4; WD I 88) = mnj “hips (?)” (DLE I 218).
- Hence: Dem. mn(j).t “thigh” (Vos 1993, 351, #250) > Cpt.: (S) **𐎎𐎏𐎐** “thighs & hips, rump, anus (?)” (CD 38b) = (S) **𐎎𐎏𐎐** (f) “Hüfte, Schenkel” (KHW 24) = (SB) **𐎎𐎏𐎐** “thigh, hip” (Bishai 1964, 41) = (S) **𐎎𐎏𐎐** (f) (sic) “cuisse” (Vcl. 1983, 28).

NB1: G. Fecht (1960, 230, §428) explained the fem. dual form *bl.tj < *bn.tj < mn.tj with the reg. change of n-t > l-t in Eg. > Cpt. Should we reconstruct perhaps OEG. *m̄l.ṽt < *m̄ll.ṽt?

NB2: Acc. to W.B. Bishai (1964, 41), the Cpt. word passed into Eg. Ar. as falt “buttocks” (Sobhy).

- Origin highly disputable.
- **1.** Ch. Ehret (1995, #588): Eg. mn.t is cognate with NOm.: Koyra mínl-e “thigh” [Hayward 1982, 219] ||| LECu.: Saho mīla “limb: arm/leg” [Vergari 2003, 136], Orm. mill-a “foot” [TB 1957, 85] = mīll-a “leg, foot” [Gragg 1982, 286, 428; Ali-Zbr. 1990, 141] = mīl-a “leg” [Strm. 1987, 367; also Bnd.; Ehret] < PAA *mīl- “thigh” [Ehr.]. GT: cf. perhaps also ES: Amh. mūlā “parte superiore del femore” [Guidi] ||| Ongota mēla, mēla “leg” [Flm. 1992, 191, 212] ||| WCh.: Fyer mwilē “Gesäß” [Jng. 1970, 88] || ECh.: Tmk. māḷəṇ (pl.) “fesses” [Cpr. 1975, 82] | Mubi mūlmúli (m) “mollet” [Jng. 1990, MS]. At the present, it is the most probable solution.
 AP: Bīrale (Ethiopia, Unseth 1990, 14: unclassified) mela “foot, leg” [Bnd.]. Orm. mīla has probably nothing to do with Kunama mīndata “foot” as suggested by H. G. Mukarovsky (1987, 194, §30).
 LIT.: Ehret 1995, #588 (Eg.-Orm.-Kyr.); Bnd. 1983, 340 (Bīrale-Orm.).
 NB1: Ch. Ehret (l.c.) analyzed Koyra mínl-e as *mīl-n-, extended by a suffix -n- (whose function was left unexplained). Instead, a dissim. (mīnl-e < *mīll-e) is better to be suspected, which is supported by the Oromo parallel.
 NB2: The ES etymology proposed for Amh. mūlā by Wajnberg (1935, 56) is phonologically unacceptable.
 NB3: SCu.: Ma’a (Mbugu) mūḷo, pl. ma-muḷu “knee” [Mnh. 1906, 315] probably does not belong here.
- **2.** GT: with respect to the Cpt. reflex, we should not rule out a connection to Ch. *b-l ~ *ḃ-l “thigh” [GT]: CCh.: Tera bol [Nwm. 1964, 38, #94], Pidlimdi bōli [Krf.] | Musgu à-ḃul [Trn.], Pus ḃal ~ ḃalak [Trn. 1991, 79], Mogrūm à-ḃul [Trn. 1977, 20], Mulwi (Vulum) à-ḃul [Trn. 1978, 204], Muskum ḃilīt [Trn. 1977, 20] | Masa ḃalano [Krf.] = ḃal “cuisse” [Ctc. 1983, 42], Banana ḃālā [Krf.], Museye ḃalano [Krf.] (CCh.: Kraft 1981, #56) || ECh.: Kwang tō:-ḃól “thigh” [Jng.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 325).
 NB1: Only a similarity due to chance? Or should we assume the following chain of sound changes: AA (i.e., Eg.-Ch.) *b-l “thigh” → PEg. *bl-t ~ *bn-t → OEg. mn.t ~ *ml.t → LEg. *bl.t ~ *bn.t → Cpt.: (S) BIAṬE again?
 NB2: V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (HSED #190) equated the CCh. forms with NBrb.: Zayan a-ḃaḃil “camel’s leg”, which is unacceptable both semantically and phonologically. Similarly, Ch. *b-l “thigh” should be carefully distinguished from CCh.: Bana balu-ugu “mein (?) Bein” [Lks.] | Musgu blá “Bein” [Lks.] | Kulung ábala-n “mein Bein” [Lks.] (CCh.: Lks. 1937, 129, 137, 141).
 NB3: Difficult to decide whether Ch. *b-l “thigh” is remotely related to AA *p-(y)-l “thigh” [GT]: NOM.: Mao: Bambeshi pólè “thigh” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1993, 21] ||| WCh.: PAngas *p’ál “thigh” [GT 2004, 296]: Angas pyaal “the thigh (generally used of cattle)” [Flk. 1915, 270] = pyaal “Arschbacke” (the meaning “thigh” was rejected by Jng. in his MS) [Jng. 1962 MS, 34] | Tng. pīla “thigh” [Jng. 1991, 131] = pīla “thigh” [Kidida 1985, 210, #325], Waja pīl-a “thigh” [Kwh. 1990, 100] || CCh.: (?) Hurzo vóláy [v- and -y obscure] “thigh” [Rsg. 1978, 344, #730]. In any case, the isogloss of Akk. paḃallu “Oberschenkel” [AHW 810] ||| CCh.: PDaba *pah’al “thigh” [GT]: Hina pōḃāl “Bein, Oberschenkel” [Str.], Daba pōḃól “Bein” [Str.] =

pawal “cuisse” [Mch. 1966, 146] = pòhəl [Lienhardt], Kola páwəl “thigh” [Schubert] (CCh.: Str. 1922–23, 117; Ch.: JI 1994 II, 324–5) should be separated (for Daba-Akk. cf. SED II 185).

- **3.** GT: its connection to LECu.: Saho mayn “Fußfläche, Ferse” [Rn. 1890, 278] | Orm. mañ-e “ankle, лодыжка” [Dlg. 1973, 309] = mañ[?]-ē “lower part of leg (human, animal)”, cf. munn-ē “anus” [Gragg 1982, 277, 295, 428] = (Borana) manyē “lower (part of the) leg, hoof” [Strm. 1995, 207] seems improbable.
- **4.** GT: the similarity to PBantu *-nàmà “thigh, leg” [Gtr. 1971, 134] might be purely accidental.
- All further proposals are unconvincing.
- **5.** H. Holma (1919, 38) combined Eg. mn.t mistakenly with Sem.: Akk. imittu [*imintu] “urspr.: rechte Keule, dann: Schenkel, Keule (überhaupt)” [Holma] = “right side” [AHW 377].
NB: Rejected already by F. von Calice (1936, #624.a). The Akk. form derives from Sem. *yamin- “dexter”.
- **6.** G. Fecht (1960, 230, §428) affiliated it with (“*gewiß ursprünglich identisch mit*”) Eg. bn.tj “die beiden Brustwarzen” (Med., Wb I 457, 11–14) and bn.tj “weibl. Geschlechtsteil (?)” (Med., Wb I 458, 1). Semantically unacceptable. Similarly, W. Westendorf (KHW 148) derived Cpt. (B) ΠΟΥΠΙ “After” (!) < Eg. bn.tj (Wb I 458, 1) < Eg. mn.tj. False.
- **7.** J. H. Greenberg (1965, 90, #6) identified Eg. mn.t with WCh.: Angas bwiin “1. the small of the back, 2. the hips” [Flk. 1915, 154] || CCh.: Musgu bul “hip”. In principle, a connection to either of these forms is not excluded (Angas bwīn and Musgu bul are distinct roots).
NB: The development of Eg. m- < PAA *mb- suggested by Greenberg is problematic, and Cpt. b- may be an inner Eg. innovation too (due to a dissim. of nasals: OEg. mn.t → *bn.t → *bl.t?). Moreover, these Ch. terms for “hip” find a much safer parallel in OEg. bnw “waist, buttocks” (PT, above).
- **8.** P. Lacau (1970, 128, §338; 1972, 49, §15) derived Eg. mn.t from wnj “eilen” (PT, Wb I 313). Semantically very weak.

mn.t “das West-Schiff” (V. hapax, Altenmüller & Moussa 1977, 86, n. a) = “barque” (AL 77.1713) = “kind of boat” (Jones 1988, 138, §35) = “Reiseschiff (‘Westschiff?’)” (Düring 1995, 142, 217 index) = “ein Boot (*‘Westschiff’)” (ÄWb I 528).

- From the same root (?): mn.w “Art Schiff” (LEth.: Urk. III 145:7–8, Wb II 72, 10) = “une type d’embarcation” (AL 77.1712) = “kind of boat” (Jones 1988, 138, §34) = “ein Boot” (XIX/XX.–XXV., Düring 1995, 148).

- H. Altenmüller (l.c.), followed by R. Hannig (ÄWb l.c.), considered OK mn.t (read *mn.tj) as “die verkürzte Bezeichnung” of jmn.tj “das Schiff der rituellen Westreise”. Whether LEth. mn.w has any connection to this, is obscure.

mn.t “content (of receptacle)” (XVIII.: Pap. Louvre E 3226, 29:2, FD 107) = “capacité, contenu, équivalence” (AL 77.1698) = “amount, capacity (of the workhouse given to the ordinary clients)” (XIII.: Pap. Boulaq 18, Spalinger 1985, 189) = “1. (V./VI.) Inhalt, Äquivalent, Rauminhalt, 2. (1st IMP: Urk. I 294:10) Betrag” (ÄWb I 528) = “Menge” (WD III 52).

- Etymology disputable.
- 1. R. O. Faulkner (FD 107), followed by J. Osing (NBÄ 605, n. 576), affiliated it with Eg. mn.t “Art” (Wb, q.v.), which Osing attached to mn “der und der”.
- 2. GT: or perhaps cp. Sem. *mny “to count”?

mn “être séparé, individualisé (?)” (CT VI 162k, AL 78.1603) = “to separate, sever” (MK 2x, Willems 1990, 34) = “trennen” (WD I 86).

NB: The CT hapax was conceived by R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 169) as an irreg. spelling of mnj “to die”, while by P. Barget (1986, 343) as that of mn “to suffer”, but the right sense was surmised already by D. Meeks (AL l.c.). In addition, H. Willems (1990, 34 & fn. 29) pointed out the same lexeme in the MK stela no. 9 in the Heqaib sanctuary (Elephantine island) of Sirenput I: mn-tw tz=f “his neck will be severed”. Alternatively, Willems supposed MK mn to be the old form of NK m^{cn} (corporal punishment affecting a criminal’s arms and feet, Peet: “twisting of limbs”, see above), which is less probable.

- Provided it existed as a separate root, the following alternatives are to be accounted for:
- 1. GT: most probably cognate with Sem. *mny “to divide, portion out, count” [Bmh.]: Ug. mn-t “Teil, Glied, Portion” [WUS] = “portion” [Segert 1984, 192] = “1. portion, ration, 2. piece, member” [DUL 564], Hbr. mny “zuteilen, zählen”, mānā “(An)Teil” [GB 436] = mny “(orig.) to divide into parts > count”, mānā “share, portion (of meat or food offered as sacrifice)” [KB 599], NHbr. mny “to divide, distribute”, mənāt “portion, share” [Jastrow 1950, 799], Offic. Aram. & Palm. mnh (f) “share, portion, instalment” [DNWSI 657] || Ar. mny: manā I “3. départir qqch. à qqn., lui assigner une certaine quantité de . . . , 4. ê assigné à qqn. comme un part”, VI “se partager qqch. en séparant avec les doigts” [BK II 1158] = “zumesen” [WUS] (Sem.: WUS #1600) || CCh.: perhaps Zelgwa míné “to pull up (peanuts)” [Brt. 1995, 202] | Mesme mán “trier, choisir”

[Ksk. 1990, 41], Gizey & Musey & Lew & Marba mán “choisir” [Ajello 2001, 14].

NB1: W. Leslau’s (1958, 31) ES cognates (Geez bānt “tribute” or Tigre mäna “to create”) are unlikely. A. R. Bomhard (1981, 447) affiliated Sem. *mny with IE *men- “to think, reflect, remember”, which would require to assume a basic sense “to count” in Sem. If, in turn, the original sense of Sem. *mny was “to divide, separate (parts to be reckoned)” (or sim.), it might be eventually related with AA *m-n “to break (into pieces)” [GT], cf. Ar. manna “3. couper ou casser ou raccourir (une corde, etc.)” [BK II 1155] ||| HECu.: Burji mōn?- “to break (intr.)” [Sasse 1982, 147: isolated in HECu.] ||| NOm.: Wlt. men-t- (tr.) “1. to break, 2. smash” [Lmb.] = myen-t “rompere” [Crl. 1929, 33], Dawro men-t- ~ men-c- [-ts-] “to break (tr.)” [Crl.], Gamu & Dache & Zys. men-c- [-ts-] “to break (tr.)” [Crl.] (Omt.: Crl. 1939, 654; LS 1997, 462) ||| CCh.: perhaps Bura mara [r < *n] “to carve” [BED 1953, 129] || ECh.: Sarwa mónyā “briser”, mónyā “écraser” [Jng. 1990 MS, 2, #30 & 5, #86].

NB2: L. Reinisch (1887, 80) combined Ar. mnn and Sem. *mny with Eg. mnj “aus-, zuteilen, beschenken” (sic) = “beschenken” (Lit. MK, XVIII., q.v.), which, however is a fig. sense of mnj “landen lassen” (Wb). See below.

- **2.** GT: or, if Eg. mn < *ml, cp. AA *m-l “to divide into parts” [GT]: NAgaw: Qmt. mälāmäl “choisir entre plusieurs, choisir le plus beau” [CR 1912, 229] || LECu.: Afar moll-aye ~ mull-aye ~ moll-ē “to be weaned (être sevré)” [PH 1985, 170], Saho mil- “aus-, verteilen” [Rn. 1890, 265 with false cognates], Rnd. mīl “1. a share (by right), 2. a part of the body” [PG 1999, 224], Baiso mūlame “to dissolve (intr.)” [Hyw. 1979, 123] | Gedeo (Drs.) mell- “to choose” [Hds. 1989, 40], Kmb. & Alb. malallo “he separated” [Crass], Tmb. malalle? “he separated” [Crass], Qbn. malallo? “he separated” [Crass] (HECu.: Crass 2001, 31) || SCu.: Qwd. mal- “to apportion, divide up” [Ehret 1980 MS, 4] ||| ECh.: WDng. milà “partage de boisson ou de nourriture” [Fédry 1971, 132].

NB1: Cf. also Akk. malāʾu “to take out (?)” [CAD m1, 162], mng. based in CAD on its possible connection to Akk. malāḫu G “to remove”, D “to tear apart (?), flicker (?)”. Any connection to HECu.: Gedeo (Drs.) mal-aʾ- (intr.) “to burst (of boil, cyst)” [Hds. 1989, 34]?

NB2: V. É. Orel (1995, 108, #121): Sem. *mVI- “to tear, break” (sic) < Nst. *moLV “раздроблять” ~ ST *mial “id.”.

- **3.** GT: or, if Eg. mn < *bn, cf. NAgaw: Bln. bän “teilen: 1. ver-, aus-, zuteilen, 2. zahlen (Steuer, Abgabe)”, Qwara bän “teilen”, Hamir bin “teilen” (NAgaw: Rn. 1887, 80)?

NB: L. Reinisch (1887, 80) combined the Agaw root with Ar. mnn and Sem. *mny as well as Eg. mnj “aus-, zuteilen, beschenken” (sic), for which see the note above.

mn.t “Art und Weise” (MK, Wb II 65, 6) = “1. lit.: such a thing, the like, 2. hence: sort, kind, nature, pattern” (Gardiner 1916, 181; 1956, 20) = “1. Art und Weise, 2. Arbeit, Tätigkeit, Geschäft” (Sethe 1928, 152) = “équivalence” (Megally apud NBÄ) = “manière, sorte, façon”

(Žaba 1956, 160) = “the like, fashion” (FD 107) = “manière” (Černý 1978, 8, n. q) = “kind, fashion, the like” (DLE I 217) = “1. Art und Weise, 2. Beispiel, Muster, 3. eine beliebige Sache” (GHWb 334) = “the like” (CT VI 245r, DCT 166) = “Art und Weise, etwa auch: Stil, Prägung, Manier, Methode, Modell” (Junge 2003, 256, n. 496).

NB: Gardiner (1916, 181; 1956, 20) pointed out an early (Ramesside) ex. of mn.t (hieratic potsherd published by M.R. Weill, RT 36, 1914, 89–90, pl. V, misunderstood by Sottas 1919, 29) carrying the abstract mng. “sort, kind” (< “such a thing, the like”) in the construction m t3j mn.t “of this kind” (Grd.) = “von dieser Art” (Wb II 65, 8) > Cpt. (S) ꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖ “in this manner” (CD 173a). Cf. also the NK idiom jrj mn.t jm=f “to take him as a pattern” (Grd.) = “sich nehmen ein Beispiel an ihm” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 19, n. k).

- Hence: Dem. mn.t “Art und Weise” (DG 161) > Cpt. (SAL) ꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖ, (SA) ꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖ, (BF) ꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖꞖ (f) “sort, quality, manner” (CD 172a; CED 83) = “Art, Weise” (KHW 94) = “manière, façon” (DELIC 115).

NB: Vocalized *mīn.ṯ (NBÄ; Snk. 1983, 223).

- Origin very much disputable.

- **1.** A. H. Gardiner (1916, 182; 1956, 20) and J. Osing (NBÄ 605, n. 576) rendered the orig. sense of mn.t as “such a thing” (Grd.) = “die und die, so etwas” (NBÄ) and derived it from Eg. mn “such and such (a person)”, fem. “such and such a thing”. Plausible.

NB: Eventually connected with MSA: Jbl. mny: mānyét “likeness”, ʔəl ʔəd mānyét lʔ “there is nobody like him” [Jns. 1981, 172] ||| EBrb.: Audjila i-mân “stesso” [Prd. 1960, 175] ||| Bed. mána (adv.) “so, in such and such a way” [Rpr. 1928, 217]?

- **2.** Usually equated with Sem.: Hbr. *mīn, st.cstr. mīn- “Art” [GB 420] = “type, kind (in natural science), species” [KB 577], cognate with Ug. mn “species (of animal)” [DUL 560; cf. Dahood 1976, 351 with lit.] = “Gestalt, Art” [Dietrich & Loretz, UF 10, 1978, 62], NHbr. & JAram. mīn “Art” [GB] = “Gattung, Art” [Dalman 1922, 234; Levy 1924 III 103] = “kind, genus, species” [Jastrow 1950, 776], Palm. myn “tribe, clan” [DNWSI 621], Samar. Aram. myn “species, kind” [Tal 2000, 465], JPArAm. mīn “1. species, 2. type, kind” [Sokoloff 1990, 305], Syr. mīnā “genus, famiglia” [Brk. 1928, 384].

LIT. for Eg.-Hbr.: Erman 1892, 111; Clc. 1936, #625; Vcl. 1958, 376; 1983, 115; 1990, 55; Vrg. 1965, 86; KHW 94.

NB: There is no convincing Sem. etymology for the quite isolated NWSem. word. (1) GB l.c.: derived from Sem. *myn ~ *mwn, cf. Ar. myn “furchen, spalten” & “erdichten, lügen”. Also KB l.c.: ~ Ar. myn “to invent, fabricate”. (2) L. Kogan (SED I 303, #41), in turn, explained it from a primary mng. “seed, sperm” < Sem. *mny “to have sexual desire, discharge sperm, exude vaginal secretion”. (3) To be distinguished from Ar. manan “4. certaine manière, façon déterminée” < mny: mānā “3. départir qqch. à qqn., lui assigner une certaine quantité de...” [BK II 1159]. (4) Guillaume (1965, IV, 9) combined Hbr. mīn with Ar. fann- “kind, species”, but Hbr. m- vs. Ar. f- cannot be accepted. (5) Hbr. *mīn was perhaps just a borrowing from LEg. *mīnṾ (not its cognate) as suggested by M. Görg (1984). Surprisingly, KB l.c. explained Eg. mn.t, *vice versa*, as a loan-word from Hbr. (!), which is an untenable anachronism.

- **3.** GT: perhaps < AA *m-n (prob. *man-) “1. vessel, 2. means, 3. thing” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mnj “sort of vessel”, q.v.)?
NB1: Semantically not impossible, cf. Hung. szer “instrument, thing, manner, etc.”.
NB2: The wider Sem. etymology of the NWSem. word is dubious (some scholars derive it from Sem. *ny).
- Other solutions are less probable:
- **4.** A. H. Gardiner (1916, 182), followed by J. Osing (NBĀ 127) and W. Schenkel (1983, 223), derived Eg. mn.t (Osing: lit. “Bleibendes”, sic) ultimately from Eg. mn “bleiben” (Wb) = “to be firm, established” (Grd.). Unconvincing.
NB2: Thence they explained also a number of nominal forms of dubious cognacy (see the respective entries) like Eg. mn.t “wine-measure” (Grd.), mn.t “Feuerbecken” (Snk.). Ignored by W. Vycichl (DELIC 115).
- **5.** GT: with regard to the -n- of (S) MINĒ, it is dubious whether Eg. mn.t can be related to LECu.: Som. mal-a “means” [Lsl.] | Orm. māl-a “means” [Lsl.] = mal-a “method, way, strategy” [Gragg 1982, 409; Ali-Zbr. 1990, 140] ||| ECh.: Bdy. melya, pl. melèy ~ meléeliye “mot, histoire, querelle, affaire, problème” [AJ 1989, 98]. Semantically the most appropriate etymology for MĒg. mn.t.
NB: The LECu. term was borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Harari māla “ways and means”, Tigre mela “skill, opinion”, Tna. mela “capacity”, Grg. (most dials.) māla “occasion, by chance” (ES-LECu.: Lsl. 1963, 107). The (secondary) meaning of the Tigrinya word is interestingly identical with that of Eg. mn.t “content (of receptacle)” (Pap. Louvre 3226, 29, 2, FD 107) = “1. Inhalt, Äquivalent, Rauminhalt, 2. (auch im Rubrum) Betrag” (GHWb 334).
- **6.** GT: Eg. mn (via nasal assim.) < *bn ~ LECu.: Saho bēn-ó, pl. bēnūn (f) “Art, Gattung” [Rn. 1890, 84: no Cu. etymology]?
- **7.** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (OS 1992, 174; HSED #1721) connected Eg. mn.t etymologically to LECu.: Som. mǎn-, pl. mǎnán “mind” [Abr. 1964, 172] ||| WCh. *man- “to know” [GT].
NB1: Deriving Eg. mn.t from AA *m-n “to know” is semantically possible, cf. e.g. PIE *weid- “1. to see (aor.), 2. to know (pf.)” → German Weise ~ wissen ~ weisen (IEW 1125–7).
NB2: For details on AA *m-n “know” see the entry for Eg. mnw “monument” (below).
- **8.** L. Homburger (1930, 285): Eg. mn.t compared to Ful du [Hmb.: d < *n] “suff. de noms de manière”! Baseless.

mn.w (pl.) “1. die Bäume, 2. Baumgarten, 3. (GR) auch für die Pflanzen (allgemein)” (MK, Wb II 71, 13–16) = “trees, plantation” (XVIII., FD 108) = “(sg.) Baum” (Barta 1969, 83, 138) = “(tree)” (sic) (DLE I 219) = “arbres, la végétation arborescente et arbustive” (Baum 1988, 31, fn. 71 & 351) = “Bäume, Baumgarten, Pflanzung, Anpflanzung” (GHWb 336).

- GT: presumably related to WCh.: BT *mala “bush, forest” [GT]: Bole mala “forest” [Stl. apud Blz., not so in Krf. 1981, #146] = màalà “bush, close to a settlement which may be changed into kòòrì farm(ing land)” [Ibr.-Gimba 1994, 133], Gera màalà “bush” [Schuh 1978, 118], Kwami máalá “Busch, Wildnis” [Leger 1992, 27; 1993, 172], Kupto màalà “Busch, Wildnis” [Leger 1992, 20] || CCh.: Moloko mélé “tree” [Rsg. 1978, 350, #758], Uld. (Udlam) mlāmili “brousse” [Mch. 1953, 152] || ECh.: perhaps Kera maalau [unless extended by ma- prefix] “Baumwolle” [Lks. 1937, 100–1] = (a)màaləwà “Baumwolle” [Ebert 1974, 14; 1976, 26].
 LIT.: Blz. 1990, 208 (Mmt.-WCh.); 1999, 66, #66 (BT-Snh.); Takács 1996, 119, #16; 1996, 135, #27 (Eg.-WCh.-NBrb.).
 NB1: Whether NBrb.: Senhazha a-mālu & Ait Ahmed a-māiu [*-l-] “forêt ou lieu où poussent chênes verts” [Rns. 1932, 387], Metmata mālu “forest” [Dst. apud Blz.] etc. belong here is dubious, since these forms are usually derived from Brb. *√l > *ti-li “ombre” [GT].
 NB2: Alternatively, cf. WCh.: Gwnd. miṅya “forest” [Mts. 1972, 81] || ECh.: Tmk. mām “forêt” [Cpr. 1975, 82]?
 NB3: L. Homburger (1957, 30) compared Eg. mn.w to Drv.: Kannada mara, Telugu mānu, mranu “arbre” (sic).

mn “ein Produkt aus Syrien von schwarzer Farbe” (XVIII–XIX., Wb II 68, 1) = “a mineral or resin of dark colour (in a mass of lumps in basket in its depiction): 1. either a semi-precious stone or a resin, 2. perhaps a form of red ochre” (Harris 1961, 171–2) = “a product of black colour” (Niwiński).

- Identification not sure. Wb l.c.: ~ Eg. mnw “schwarzer Stein” (q.v.), declined by J. R. Harris (l.c.), who pondered an equation either with Eg. mnj.t “resinous material occasionally employed in the manner of precious stones” (XIX–XX., q.v.) or mnj “resin or ruddle (?)” (NK, q.v.). A. Niwiński (1992, 468), in turn, affiliated it with Eg. mnnn “a kind of resin (not bitumen)” (q.v.) and derived both from Eg. mn “to be firm, established, remain”. He regarded it “*imaginable that the black substance mn or mnnn used in the mummification process was intended to make the mummy like a monument (mnw) as firm (mn) as a fortress (mnw)*”.

mn.t, occurring in: m mn.t “täglich, alle Tage, pro Tag” (Amarna, Wb II 65, 9–10; GHWb 334) = “daily” (FD 107; DLE I 217) ~ var. m jmn.jt “dauernd, täglich” (NK, Wb II 83, 8).

NB1: Vocalized *mīni.t > *mēne.t ~ *minya.t (DELIC 115).

NB2: Baillet (1907, 7, §18) and Takács (1998, 129, #5) suggested an ultimate relationship with Eg. mjn “heute” (PT, Wb II 43, 1–9) and its AA relatives, which is mistaken and was declined already by A. Erman (1896, 57, fn. 1).

- Hence: Dem. (n) mn “täglich” (DG 160:4) > Cpt. (SALM) (M)HNE, (SA) (M)MHNE, (BF) (M)MHNI, (F) (M)HNEI “daily, every day” (CD 172a; CED 83) = “täglich” (KHW 94) = “tous les jours, chaque jour” (DELC 115) > Pi-Solsel māni (Vcl. 1936, 172).
NB: In the Tebtunis onomasticon, m-mn.t is glossed with Dem. mnj (Osing 1998, 74).
- Origin debated:
 - 1. J. Osing (NBÄ 470) and W. Westendorf (KHW 94) derived it from an older (!) jmn.jt (attested in fact first in the NK), which they identified with OK jmn.wt (*j̃mĕ/inw.ʔt) > MK jmn.jt (*j̃mĕ/inj.ʔt) “dauerndes, tägliches Opfer” < Eg. mn “dauern” (q.v). Supported by W. Vycichl (DELC 115).
NB: Westendorf falsely attached Eg. mjn.t “ein Getränk” (Lit. MK, Wb, q.v.) too to this root.
 - 2. G. Takács (1998, 129, #5) suggested its cognacy with the reflexes of AA *m-n “day” [GT].
NB1: Attested in LECu.: Som. mān “day” [Rn. 1902, 296], Jbr. mān “1. day, 2. time” [Rn. 1904, 78], Rnd. mān, pl. mānán “(heller) Tag” [Schlee 1978, 139, #748], PSam *mān-tā “today (act. this day)” [Heine]: Rnd. mān-ta, Som. mān-ta ~ man-ta, PBonī *mānə [Heine 1982, 133]: Bonī mān? ~ mān-ta (Sam: Heine 1976, 222; 1977, 188; 1978, 90) || WCh.: Mnt. mene “day” [OS] || CCh.: Mkt. māhənáy “day” [Rsg.] = mən [Mch.], Mofu mənáy “day” [Rsg.] = mani [Mch.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 153; Rsg. 1978, 234, #181) || ECh.: WDng. ménà (pl.) “journées de 24 heures (jours comptables, comprenant les nuits)” [Fédry 1971, 127], EDng. mēnāw (f) “journée, durée de 24 heures, le jour” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 201], Mgm. mēcènè, pl. mēcēni “jour (24 heures)” [JA 1992, 106]. Cp. perhaps also Ar. ʔal-muminnāni (dual) “le jour et la nuit” [BK II 1156].
NB2: V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (HSED #105) combined the Ch. (Montol-Dangla-Migama) word for “day” (*m-n) with Eg. jmn “Sun-God” (sic), which might be a misquotation of jmn.j “Beiname des Sonnengottes (mit Stierkopf)” (NK, Wb II 85, 10). This Eg. word has hardly anything to do with “day”.
NB3: Any connection to NAgaw: Bln. e/imān-ā “time, past” [Rn.] || LECu.: Saho amān-a “time” [Rn.] | Som. imin ~ amin “time” [Rn.] (Cu.: Dlg. 1973, 132) || ECh.: Tumak mán “time, moment, duration” [Cpr. 1975, 82]? Note that V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1992, 174) connected the Cu. forms mistakenly with Eg. mjn “today”.
NB4: G. Takács (1998, 129, #5) pondered alternatively a less probable relationship with LECu.: PSam *mālim “day” [Heine] = *mālam [Lmb.]. False.
 - 3. GT: or cp. perhaps LECu.: Som. mín (adv.) “in each case, respectively” [Abr. 1964, 180]?
- mn** “es ist nicht, es gibt nicht” (late NK, Wb II 59; WD II 60: cf. RdE 36, 1985, 155 & 38, 1987, 73, n. 50) = “there is no . . . , non-existent . . .” (DLE I 215) = “es ist nicht, es gibt nicht, es gibt kein” (GHWb 333).
NB: Was it present in the Volkssprache already in the OK? Cf. the det. “arms in the gesture of negation” (D35) of OK jmn “verborgen” (ÄWb I 141–2).
- Hence: Dem. mn “nicht ist, nicht gibt” (DG 158) > Cpt.: (B) ḡMON, (SALF) (M)Mḡ- etc. “not to be” (CD 166b; CED 82).

- Origin a bit uncertain.

- **1.** In Egyptian linguistics, usually explained from MEg. n wn ~ nn wn “es existiert nicht, es gibt nicht” (Wb I 308, 8–9), which was left unmentioned in EG §108 and Lefébyre 1955, §314–6.

LIT.: Sethe 1899 I, §203; Clc. 1906, 149; Spg. KHW 59 & fn. 9; Erman 1928, §516; Czermak 1934 II, 196; Edel 1955, §979.A; Fecht 1960, 54, fn. 163 & p. 195, §402, fn. 547; Lacau 1970, 48–49, §2 & §9–11; CED 82; KHW 93; Vcl. 1983, 112–3; Peust 1999, 163.

NB1: Most of the listed authors accept the common view that m- was due to a contraction (assimilation) of Auslaut -n# + w-, i.e., *nn-wón → *nm-món → *mmón (Lacau l.c.) = orig. *n n-wán lit. “es gibt nicht einen Existierenden (etwas Existierendes)” (Fecht l.c.) = n-wn/*n[V]-wán (Peust l.c.). The latter scenario is less probable, since the assimilation n-w > m is supposed to have taken place in direct contact of -n# vs. Anlaut w-. K. Sethe (l.c.) assumed a “change” (Wechsel) of m ~ w: *ʔěmmón < *ʔěn-món. W. Spiegelberg (l.c.), in turn, did not exclude a shift nn > mn via dissimilation.

NB2: Strangely, J. Černý (CED 82) suggested that it was “*etymologically the same word as*” Cpt. (S) ἸἸἸἸἸἸ “verily, for” (CD 169a), although “*the reason for the passage of meaning is obscure*”.

- **2.** GT: the apparent *communis opinio* on LEG. mn < MEg. nn-wn is somewhat disturbed by the fact that (1) traces of mn in the OK can be detected (above), although there is no convincing evidence for an early shift nw > m. In addition, (2) there existed an AA negation morpheme *m-n [GT].

NB1: Cf. SBrb.: Hgr. min “sans” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1207] ||| LECu.: Das. mán “1. not, 2. there is not” [Tosco 2001, 516], Rnd. menye ~ minye “nicht, außer, abgesehen von (nachgestellt)” [Schlee 1978, 140, #771] = ményá ~ mínyá “(is it) not so?”, ménye ~ minye “is not (as usual), is not (just) as normal (but...)” (appears to negate the normal, expected interpretation of a situation) [PG 1999, 223] ||| WCh.: Angas-Sura *man-(t)a(ŋ) “do not!” [GT 2004, 240–1]: Angas man ~ man-tak (so, -k) “1. do not, don’t, 2. lest” [Ormsby 1914, 208, 313] = man ~ man-ta “the negative imperative: don’t, let not” [Flk. 1915, 241] = man ~ man-áj ~ man-táj “einleitende Partikel im negativen Subjunktiv der 2. Personen mit der Postposition kát” [Jng. 1962 MS, 24] = man-taj ~ man-te “don’t” [ALC 1978, 35], Kfy. mán “never” [Ntg. 1967, 26], Gmy. man (with negative is used in giving orders) [Srl. 1937, 134] = man “do not” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 21].

NB: Extra-AA parallels: Gumuz: Sai mmēn “there is not”, Sese mén “no” (Gumuz: Bnd. 1979, 63). The affiliation of Gumuz (in Ethiopia) is debated. In some works it is classified within NS (Bnd. & Flm. 1976, 57; Bnd. 1983, 1–3; 1983, 260). Elsewhere (Bnd. 1979, 63), it is supposed to be an isolated group of languages.

- Other etymologies cannot be accepted:

- **3.** C. T. Hodge (1990, 171) derived Eg. mn from LL **Nb-Nl, a var. of LL **Nb-l (negation): (F) mpel (neg. imprv.) ||| Geez ʔenbala “without”, ultimately from LL **b-l (negation). Unacceptable.
- **4.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 307, #589) explained LEG. mn “loss” (*hapax*, DLE I 215) = “Verlust” (GHWb 333), a nominalized secondary development from mn “there is no”, from a certain AA *-mān- “to lose, lack, be without”. Unacceptable.

NB: Ehret's PAA form is built on Ar. *mn*^c “to refuse, hinder, prevent, repel” ||| NOM. **ma/ān*- “person of outcaste status, casted worker, tanner”: Mocha *mān-n-ó* ||| Ch. **m-n-(t)* “to forget”, which are even mutually unrelated.

***mn** “to see” (?), cf. the eye det. of *mn* “es ist nicht” (NK, Wb II 59) > (???) Dem. *mn* “to see” (Smith 1984).

NB1: We have several examples of Dem. *mn* “to see”, including Dem. Pap. BM 10507, Pap. Harkness, and 2 examples in the Hor ostraca, which J. Ray (1976) did not recognize (kind p.c. by J. Johnson, 15 May 2007). It has been discussed by M. Smith (1984, 193–210) and F. de Cenival (RdE 29, 1977, 21–37).

NB2: GR *mntj* “eyes” (Edfu III 4:7, VI 284:14) is hardly a dual of **mn.t*, but a development of GR *mnd* “das Auge” < BD *mnd.t* “Teil des Gesichts am Auge” (Wb II 93, 11–12; PL 440). Thus, it has to be regarded as unrelated.

● Existence as a distinct lexeme dubious. Etymology uncertain.

■ **1.** H. Brugsch (1882, 68) derived both GR *mntj* and *mr.tj* from a common etymon with **l-*. False.

NB: As to GR *mntj* cf. BD *mnd.t* (discussed above).

■ **2.** J. D. Ray (1992, 134, n. 15) combined it with Luvian *mana-* “to see” (sic). Absurd.

NB: The meaning of the Luvian word is debated (cf. HEG l-m, 117).

■ **3.** GT (contra Takács 1995, 95, #4): the **n-* of Cpt. (SALF) (M)MĪ- etc. “not to be” (CD 166b) hardly allows any connection to Eg. *m33* ~ *m3n* [< **mll*] “to see” (above), although the interchange 3 ~ n does not *a priori* suggest **l* (Watson 1980, 47–54). Besides, the var. *m3n* is restricted only to certain cases (subjunctive, inf.).

NB: Cf. the CT divine name *m3-ḥ3-f* ~ *mn-ḥ3-f*, act. **“der hinter sich schaut”* (Satzinger 1994, 200), where the var. form **mn* may underly.

mn.t “happy state of being” (late NK, DLE I 217) = “erfreulicher Zustand” (GHWb 334).

● Origin not clear.

■ **1.** R. Hannig (GHWb 334) explains it from *mn.t* “Art und Weise”. Semantically dubious.

■ **2.** GT: perhaps cognate with the reflexes of AA **m-n* ~ **m-y-n* “good (or sim.)” [GT]: WSem. **mnn* “to be kind, show favour, patronize, disdain” [Hnrg. 2000, 2065]: esp. OSA: Sab. √*mnn*: *mn* “to benefit” [SD 86], Ar. *mnn* VIII “2. être bienveillant pour qqn. . .”, *minn-at-* “grâce, bonté, faveur (de Dieu)”, *mannān-* “bienveillant, bon” [BK II 1155] ||| HECu.: perhaps Sid. *manà* (intercalary part.) “well” [Gsp. 1983, 222] ||| WCh.: Suroid **men* “nice” [GT 2004, 245]: Sura *mèn* “schön” [Jng. 1963, 74], Mpn. *mén*, pl. *ménmén* “beautiful (used only with respect to women)” [Frj. 1991, 37] | Dwot (Zodì) *màni*, *màni* “good” [Mkr.] = *món* “to be good, beautiful”, *moní* “beautiful”

[Caron 2002, 210] || CCh.: prob. BM *m(ə)na-(gu) “good” [GT]: Margi mánəgù [Hfm. in RK 1973, 126: “well”] = minagù, mánagù [Krf.], WMargi mna [Skn. 1977, 23: “good, beautiful”] = m̄na [Krf.], Kilba mīnàkú [Krf.], Wamdiu minahù [Krf.], Hildi minagù [Krf.] (Ch.: Kraft 1981, #293) || ECh.: Kera móyán “Fröhlichkeit” [Ebert 1976, 81] | Mkl. máanà (f) “entente, générosité” [Jng. 1990, 135] (Margi-Dwot: Mkr. 1987, 197). We would need more data for justifying this etymology.

NB: Ar. ʔāman- “meilleure partie, la partie la plus sûre pour la qualité” [Lsl. 1938, 65] is probably unrelated, cf. Sem. *ʔmn “to be firm”? Any connection to ECh.: Mgm. màanī (adv.) “beaucoup” [JA 1992, 105]? Similarly irrelevant is Yemeni Ar. munā “pleasant things” < mny II “to wish” [Piamenta 1990, 472].

- **3.** GT: or, if Eg. mn.t < *ml.t, to be compared with AA *m-l “good” [GT]: ES: Tigre mǎlmǎla “to be beautiful” [LH 108] || NBrb.: Mzg. a-mellay “bon” [NZ] | Mzab ta-mella “charme, harmonie, galbe, belle apparence” [NZ] | Qbl. √m-l: a-mellay “bon, miséricordieux, compatissant, clément”, ta-mella-(t) “bonté, miséricordieuse, pitié, compatission, grâce” [NZ] || SBrb.: Hgr. ta-mella, pl. ti-mell-iw-în “bonté, miséricordieuse, bonté tendre et compatissante...” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1191], Ayr & EWlm. i-mal “forme unique”, mol-ān “good”, tǎ-mmul-t “good quality” [Alojaly 1980, 127] = Ayr i-mal “être bon”, tǎ-mmol-t, pl. tǎ-mmol-ən “bonté, bon qualité, beauté”, tǎ-mol-t, pl. tǎ-mol-en “jour faste (jour heureux, de triomphe)” [PAM 1998, 215–6; 2003, 536] (Brb.: NZ 1998, 143–4, §139) || NAgaw: Bln. milmil-ī (f) “schön, graziös (nur auf Mädchen und Frauen angewendet)” [Rn. 1887, 270] || CCh.: Ktk. mǎlǎ “sweet, pleasant” [Bouny 1975, 27, #446]?

AR: Mer. mlē [Chn.; Hintze 1955, 359] = mlo [Vcl. 1958, 76] = *ml(e/o) “bon” [Meeks 1973, 12] = mle ~ mlo (*mlē) [Bnd. 1981, 21] = ml(e/o) < *malo (?) [Mlt.], which was combined by M. Cohen (1947, 191) and A.Ju. Militarev (1984, 158, #9) with Sem. *mlh “to be good” and Eg. mnḥ (q.v.), which is probably false.

NB1: The etymology of the Tigre root has been disputed. (1) LH l.c.: ~ Ar. malīh- “beautiful”, while (2) Lsl. 1982, 51: ~ Tna. mǎlmǎla “to choose” > mǎlmul “preferred, of beautiful appearance”.

NB2: K. Nait-Zerrad (l.c.) erroneously compared also Hgr. a-mel “louer, faire d’éloge de” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1180], which certainly reflects a distinct root, cf. EBrb.: Gdm. ū-māl “vanter” [Lanfry 1973, 209, #997] || HECu.: Sid. mǎlala “to admire, be surprised”, mǎlale “(obj. of) admiration”, mǎla(?)lo “1. wonderful thing, miracle, 2. astonishment” [Hds. 1989, 220–1].

NB3: For AA *m-l cf. alternatively Eg. jm3 [Blv.: reg. < *mj] “angenehm (sein), freundlich” (OK, Wb I 79) = “(to be) pleasing, kind, gentle” (FD 20).

mn “to remove, displace” (late NK 1x, DLE I 216) = “déplacer” (AL 77.1704) = “versetzen, beseitigen” (GHWb 335).

● Etymology debated.

■ **1.** D. Meeks (AL l.c.) & R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) derive it (as a “simple form”) from Eg. mnmn “to move” (q.v.). Not to be excluded, although Eg. mnmn does not occur in the same usage.

NB: Cf. Eg. mnmn “(tr.) bes. einen Namen, einen Erlass tilgen, entfernen” (Wb II 81, 12).

■ **2.** GT: cognate with ES *mnn “to reject” [GT]: Geez mannana “to despise, disdain, reject, repudiate, renounce, repel, cast aside, hold in contempt”, Amh. männänä “to retire from the world”, Tigre mnn “to decline, reject”, Tna. mnn “to reject, abstain”, cf. mänawä “to be disgusted, reject” (ES: Lsl. 1969, 54; 1987, 350) ||| CCh.: Margi mnyä “to rebuke, reproach, scold” [Hfm. apud RK 1973, 126] | Lele māny “nier, contredire”, mānyē “nier, contradiction” [WP 1982, 61]?

NB1: As suggested in Dillmann 1865, 189 and KB l.c., ES *mnn may be related to Sem. *mʾn: Hbr. mʾn piel “sich weigern” [GB] = “to refuse (to do sg.)” [KB 540], NHbr. of TTM mʾn piel “to deny, refuse” [Jastrow 1950, 723], Aram. of TM mʾn “sich weigern, insbes. oft von einem unmündigen, durch des Vaters Tod verwaisten Mädchen, die von ihrer Mutter oder ihren Brüdern, ja selbst von ihrem Vater verheiratet wurde, der hierzu aber keine Berechtigung hatte” [Levy 1924 III 5], Samar. Aram. mʾn “refusal” [Tal 2000, 448], Syr. mʾn “to be abhorrent to sʾone” [KB] || OSA: Sab. mʾn “sich weigern” [GB] (Sem.: GB 393; Müller 1963, 311). GB (l.c.) compared Sem. *mʾn to a certain Eg.-Cpt. mʾn “wegtreiben, abstoßen” (sic), while Guillaume (1965, I, 10) combined Hbr. mʾn with Ar. manaʾa “macérer la peau avant de la tanner” [BK II 1156], which is semantically unacceptable.

NB2: On a bicons. basis, Sem. *mnʿ may be also related, cf. Aram. mnʿ “отказывать, удерживать, лишать” [SAN 4, 199] = “to deny, withhold” [DNWSI 661] | Ar. manaʿa “1. refuser, 2. repousser, éloigner, 3. défendre, protéger” [BK II 1157]. Not clear whether ECh.: Bdy. moon [-ʾ] < *nH reg.] “effrayer les oiseaux en frappant sur les arbres” [AJ 1989, 100] belongs here.

■ **3.** GT: or cp. ECh: Mgm. mèelò “refuser” [JA 1992, 106]?

NB: No connection to ES: Geez malaya “to separate, divide, distinguish, pull away, tear out, liquefy, melt”, Amh. mälläyya ~ mälläyyo “distinguishing feature, attribute” < läyyä “to separate, distinguish” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 346).

■ **4.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 206, #1807): ~ Ar. mnn “to cut/tear off” (sic, contra Lane 3024; BK II 1155) ||| SCu. *mānʿ- “cleared and enclosed ground” [Ehr. 1980, 154, #16].

NB: The source of the Ar. mng. is not clear. The SCu. comparanda are semantically unconvincing.

mn.tj “porter” (XX. hapax, CED 86 after Peet 1930, 173, n. 1) = “portier” (AL 77.1751) = “doorkeeper” (DLE I 217) = “Nachtwächter (auch im Tempel; *der auch einen anderen Beruf ausübt)” (GHWb 343) = “Türhüter” (Schenkel 2002, 22).

NB1: Vocalized *^emnüt < *^ewnüty (AEO) = *m̃nát̃j, fem. pl. *m̃nát̃j.ṭ (NBÄ 776, n. 958) = *m̃n.át̃i < *m̃n.át̃i (Snk.).

NB2: Because of its A7 det. (“man sinking to ground from fatigue”), its usual rendering was declined by W. Vycichl (DELIC) who thinks that “*ce mot doit signifier ‘malade et non portier’*”. R. Hannig (GHWb), in turn, assumed the det. A7 to be the carrier of the nuance “Nachtwächter”. Interestingly, Vycichl (l.c.) claims Černý not to have translated NK mn.tj, although CED (l.c.) gives the mng. “porter”.

- Hence: Dem. mn̄t “Türhüter” (DG 165:3; Spg. KHW 62; Thissen 1984, 76) = “porter” (CED) > Cpt. (SLBF) მნოუტ, (BF) εμνοუτ “porter, doorkeeper” (CD 176b) = “Türhüter” (KHW 96) = “portier, gardier de la porte” (DELIC 117).

NB2: The Cpt. word survives in Eg. Ar. ʔamnüt “sexton” (Vcl. apud Worrell 1942, 331 quoted by Bishai 1964, 40; Ishaq 1991, 115, §viii.2) = “Küster” (Vittmann apud Snk.) vs. Upper Eg. Ar. emnüt “portier (d’une église, d’un monastère)” (DELIC 117).

- Apparently nomen agentis (-tj) from *mn, whose basic meaning and etymology is disputed:

- 1. Following F. L. Griffith, A. H. Gardiner (AEO I*62), quoted also by J. Vergote (1950, 294) and W. Westendorf (KHW 96 contra 519) derived it (act. *mnw.tj) from Eg. wnw.tj “Stundenbeobachter” (MK, NK, Wb I 317, 9) = “hour-man” (AEO) = “hour-watcher, astronomer” (FD 60) with the shift of w- > m- (*^ewnüty > *^emnüt), where “*the suspicion arises that jmj-wnw.t is only a late writing of wnw.tj, naturally conveying a false etymology ‘he who is in the hour’...*” (Grd.). Trying to explain the significant semantic shift, Gardiner views that “*it is not unlikely that the hour-watchers when off duty served as temple watchmen, warders or doorkeepers*”. Dubious. Declined by W. Vycichl (DELIC).

NB1: The change w- > m- worked in a direct contact with the preceding Auslaut -n#, i.e., there was a merger of -nw- > -m- which otherwise did not apply (Lacau 1970, 48–49, §2 & §9–11; Peust 1999, 163–4).

NB2: Ignoring NK mn.tj (not in Wb), F. L. Griffith (1909, 222, n. 4 & 238, n. 2) and W. Westendorf (KHW 96) were disposed to explain the Cpt. word directly from Dem. jmj-wnw.t “the warders (who were guarding)” (AEO) < jmj-wnw.t “der Stundenbeobachter” (since the end of NK, Wb I 316, 1). Declined by Westendorf (in the “*Nachträge und Berichtigungen*” of his KHW 519) as well as W. Vycichl (DELIC).

- 2. R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) surmised a connection with Eg. mnj.tj “ein Ackersmann” (q.v.) and also eventually mnj “Arbeitsdienstler” (q.v.). Not too likely.

- 3. W. Schenkel (2002, 22, fn. 64) suggests an etymon *m̃n.át̃i derived (as a nomen actoris) from Eg. m(j)nj “anbinden” (sic) > “hüten”. Attractive, although not supported by the orthography.

mn.t ~ mnj.t (flame det.) “Schmelzfeuer” (LP, Wb II 68, 16) = “cop-smith’s melting fire” (CED 24) = “Schmelztiigel, Feuerbecken”

(Osing 1976, 595, fn. 538: cf. Faulkner, JEA 23, 1937, 171) = “feu pour la fonte de métaux” (DELC 28).

NB: Vocalized *mín.ʔt (NBÄ 122; Snk. 1983, 223).

- Hence: Cpt. (B) ʀINI “crucible” (CD 40a; CED 24) = “Schmelztiiegel” (Fecht 1960, 230, §428; Osing 1976, 122; KHW 24) = “creuset” (Vcl. 1983, 28).

- From the same root (?): mn.w m d^cb.t “ein Kohlenfeuer” (GR, Wb II 69, 1).

NB: Unless it denotes in fact “what remained” and derives (as pf. part.) from mn “to remain”. In any case, an eventual derivation of mn.w m d^cb.t “ein Kohlenfeuer” < mn is justifiable, cf. e.g. Pokomo kā “to remain, bleiben” → kaa “coal” [Mnh. 1905, 209].

- 1. J. Osing (1976, 122, 595, fn. 538) and W. Schenkel (1983, 223) explained the lit. sense of LEg. mn.t as “dauerhaftes, festes Gefäß” derived from Eg. mn “von Dauer sein” (above). Dubious. Rejected by Takács (2004, 208).

NB1: Osing’s translation is based on (B) ʀINI “Schmelztiiegel” and on rejecting the rendering of LEg. mn.t in Wb etc. He apparently ignored LEg. mn.w “ein Kohlenfeuer”.

NB2: Osing failed to explain the anomaly of the initial consonants in (B) ʀINI “Schmelztiiegel” vs. HOYH “bleiben”.

- 2. V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova and G. Takács compared LEg. mn.t “Schmelzfeuer” with WCh.: SBch. *muruŋ > *ŋuruŋ ~ *muyuŋ “ashes” [GT] = *muyun- (sic) [OS]: Boghom müyūuŋ [IL in JI 1994 II, 4] = muyúŋ “ashes” [Smz. 1975, 27; 1978, 20, #2] = muyúŋ [Csp.], Jum mùrúŋ [Csp.], Mangas mwúrùn [Csp.], Kir mwurìŋ [Csp.], Kir ħúrəŋ [Smz.], Laar ŋġoro [Smz.], Mangas ħúruŋ [Smz.] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 20, §2; Csp. 1994, 40) < Ch. *ŋ-r-ŋ “ashes” [JS 1981, 31D]. Unlikely because of SBch. *-r- (ignored both by OS & GT).

LIT.: OS 1992, 186; HSED #1797 (Boghom-Eg.); Takács 1995, 105, #1; 2004, 208 (Ron-Boghom-Eg.).

- 3. G. Takács (2004, 208): alternatively cp. WCh.: PRon *m^w-n “fire” [JS 1981, 106C] = *m^wan [GT]: Fyer-Tambas maan, Bokkos man, Daffo-Butura mwán, Monguna & Mangar & Sha mwan (Ron: Jng. 1968, 9, #82; 1970, 390, 420; Magwa etc. 1985, 8; Mkr. 1987, 172; Ibr. 1990, 85; Brt.-Jng. 1993, 128; JI 1994 II, 138; Seibert 2000 MS, F001) || CCh.: (?) Mbara mòŋ “fondre du métal” [TSL 1986, 272] | (?) Gidar mōŋlo “cendre” [Mch. 1950, 44] || ECh.: EDng. mémènē & WDng. mènènènè (m) “le gratin amer qui rest au fond de la marmite” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 201].

NB: The APs (SWMande *ŋəŋ, Songhay-Jerma nuŋe) to Ron *m^wan adduced by Bonvini (1995, 104, §93) are unconvincing.

- **4.** G. Takács (1995, 93, #1; 1995, 105, #1; 2004, 208): with respect to (B) BINI, it is more difficult to identify Eg. mn.t with the reflexes of AA *m-l-l “(to bake in) hot ashes, coal” [GT] (reflected in Sem., Brb., LECu., discussed s.v. CT mrr, q.v.). Perhaps (B) BINI < LEg. mn.t < PEg. *ml.t?

NB1: For Ar. mll “to put (bread, flesh-meat) into ashes (to bake or roast)”, mall-at- “hot ashes, ashes and earth, in which fire is kindled” [Lane 3022–3], a certain Eg. mn “vom backenden Brot” (OK, Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza XI 162, not glossed as a distinct lexeme in ÄWb I) is irrelevant, since its context clearly indicates, as suggested by Junker, jrj.t (s)mn.t šd.t “das Prüfen des Brotes”, i.e., it was in fact an abbreviated wtg. of smn “prüfen” (kind p.c. by O. Witthuhn, 7 Sept. 2006).

NB2: Or, if LEg. mn.t < PEg. *bn.t ~ *bl.t, cp. AA *b-l (var. to *m-l-l?) “ashes” [GT]: HECu.: Gedeo bulul-o, Sid. bulul-o “ashes” (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 22) ||| WCh.: Jimbin bùulí “ashes” [Skn. in JI 1994 II, 4] || ECh.: Mkl. ?ùbàlí (pl.) “braise” [Jng. 1990, 189].

- **5.** GT: or, if (B) BINI < LEg. mn.t < PEg. *bn-t, cp. perhaps AA *b-n “ashes” [GT]: SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr e-ben, pl. i-ben-än “1. fourneau de pipe, 2. pipe, 3. cigarette” [PAM 1998, 11] ||| LECu.: Rnd. ben “Asche” [Mkr.] ||| NOm.: She ben “ashes” [Bnd. in Mkr.] | Mocha bún-o “embers” [Lsl. 1959, 22] (Rnd.-She: Mkr. 1981, 206, #25) ||| CCh.: Vulum (Mogrum) bònó “cendre” [Trn. 1977, 19].

NB1: The NOm. forms are prob. distinct from NOm. *bVdn- “ashes” [GT].

NB2: This AA root should be carefully distinguished from WCh.: Pa’a àvùn “charcoal” [MSkn. 1979, 166] = avuñ “charcoal” [NSkn.] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 15) | Ngz. avan “embers” [Skn.], Bade vanyi “ashes” [IL in JI 1994 II, 4] = vany-in “Kohle” [Lks. 1968, 223] || CCh.: Bura vina “charcoal” [BED 1953, 216], Margi vunyi “charcoal” [Skn.] | (?) Gsg.-Dogba viver [*-n?] “Kohle” [Lks. 1970, 137] | Htk. (Hide) voni “charbon” [Eguchi 1971, 233] | Musgu eñeñ “Kohle, Asche” [Krause in Mlr. 1886, 394; Lks. 1941, 52] = aveñ “cendre” [Mch. 1950, 40], Pus eveñ “charbon” [Trn. 1991, 86], Vlm. (Mulwi, Mogrum) àvèñ ~ àqvèñ “charbon de bois” [Trn. 1977, 19; 1978, 207] | Glf. faj “Holzkohle” [Lks. 1937, 150] | Masa vèñ “charbon” [Ctc. 1983, 140], Zime-Dari vön “charbon de bois” [Cooper 1984, 29], Lame-Peve von? “charcoal” [Venberg 1975, 36]. It is, however, not excluded that the underlying Ch. root was remotely related to AA *b-n.

mn.w (stone det.) “mountain range (of the land bordering the Nile)” (NK hapax: Pap. Leiden I 348, rt. 2:3, Borghouts 1971, 46, n. 28; DLE I 219) = “Gebirgszug” (GHWb 338).

NB: First identified with GR mn.tj “die beiden Berge” (Wb) by J. F. Borghouts (1971, 46, n. 28).

- From the same root:

(1) mn.tj (dual of sg. *mn.t) “die beiden Berge: die beiden Bergzüge östlich und westlich des Niltales” (GR, Wb II 69, 3) = “the ranges east and west of the Nile, esp. the place of origin of precious metals” (Lucas & Rowe 1938, 145, fn. 5) = “falaise” (Drioton 1940, 409, §5) = “les deux plateaux désertiques qui bordent le Nil” (AL 79.1202) = sg. “chaîne montagne, région minière”, dual “les deux plateaux, fal-

aises” (Aufrère 1990, 20, 25, 66) = “mountains, mountain ranges of Egypt (they produce minerals, precious stones, metals)” (PL 438–9) = “die beiden Ufergebirge” (Osing 1998, 108, n. c & n. h with a late form mn.dj).

NB1: No sg. mn.t attested in Wb, but as Fairman (ASAE 43, 1945, 308, n. 7) rightly noted, “*it is a reasonable assumption... that there must have been a singular form mn.t from which the dual was derived*”. Borghouts (l.c.) found this sg. form in Philae I (Große Pylon) 269:5, 269:13, 271:6.

NB2: Vocalization reconstructed by J. Osing (1998, 108, n. h) as *m[˜]ná(?)ti > *m[˜]ná(j).tj.

(2) mn “Steinbruch (?)” (Tebtunis onomasticon, 2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998, 108, n. c).

NB1: Considered by Osing to be a rare sg. *Nebenform* of GR mn.tj.

NB2: Already Beauregard (1892, 182) and Gabelentz (1894, 112–3) mention a certain masc. mn “montagne”.

- Etymology debated. Most probable seems #2.
- 1. P. Wilson (PL l.c.): “*origin... is not clear: it may have been confused with mnṯjw or may have been invented from mn ‘be firm’ as a variant word to stress the enduring presence of mountain ranges*”. Dubious.
- 2. G. Takács (1996, 175, #132): perhaps related to NOm.: Zys. & Zrg. mel-o “stone” [Bnd.] = mál-o [Sbr.] (SEOmt.: Bnd. 1971; Mkr. 1981, 212, #43.c; Sbr. 1994, 20; Blz. 1990, 208) ||| ECh.: Kwang dialects.: Gaya mOlo, Alowa & Mindera & Tchagine Golo & Ngam & Kawalke mOlḏo, Mobu moro “pierre” (Kwang: Coates 1991 MS, 2, 5) < Nst. *mAIV “mountain” [IS 1976, §286; Dlg. 1991 MS, #976 with IE & Drv. exx.].
AP: H. G. Mukarovskiy (l.c.) compared the NOm. forms with Saharan: Daza mele “pierre à surface noire brillante”.
NB: LECu.: Orm.-Orma milimā “mountain” [Strm. 1987, 367] and SCu.: Dhl. málīma “mountain” [Elderkin 1973 MS, 7, #445] are out of question, since these were borrowed from Swahili mlīma.
- 3. G. Takács (2004, 208, #976) compared it alternatively with Sem.: PBHbr. √mly or √mwł: mōlī “Erdhöhung, Hügel” & JAram. mōlyā “Erhöhung, hüglige Stelle” [Levy 1924 III 49] | Ar. mīl- “4. grand monticule de sable, 5. pierre milliaire”, māyil-at- “4. bosse du chameau, 5. grand monticule de sable” [BK II 1175] ||| SCu.: Dhl. málōl-a, pl. málōlēma “cow’s hump” [EEN 1989, 37] ||| WCh.: Gmy. mel “to rise very high” [Srl. 1937, 137] (GT 2004, 245: isolated in AS) ||| ECh.: Kera móólé “stapeln” [Ebert 1976, 82], which is perhaps semantically far too risky but not impossible.
NB: Cf. German Höcker “Buckel” vs. Hocke “Haufen” vs. Hügel, both akin to Lith. kiúgis “großer Heuhaufen von mehreren Fudern” (Kluge 1999, 378).
- Other suggestions cannot be accepted:
- 4. G. von Gabelentz (1894, 112–3) combined it with NBrb.: Qbl. amaday “Wildniss” and Bsq. mendi “Berg”, which is unacceptable.

- **5.** T. V. Gamkrelidze & V. V. Ivanov (1984, 666, fn. 1) and A. R. Bomhard (1984, 274, #286) connected Eg. mn.tj with PIE *m(e)n-t- “mountain” (!). This suggestion can hardly be justified.
NB: Bomhard’s surprising idea on the underlying AA etymon *mā/an- “to project, jut out” (unattested) seems fully baseless.
- **6.** G. Takács (1996, 175, #132; 2004, 207, #976) compared it with NBrb. *a-malu “mountain slope protected from sunshine” [GT]: Shilh a-malu, pl. i-mula “versant ombreux” [Dst. 1938, 292] | Mzg. a-malu “ombre, versant le moins ensoleillé” [Taifi 1991, 417] | Rif *a-malu “slope” [GT]: Izn. a-mälu, Bqy. & Ammart & Tuzin maṛu, Snh. a-nmalu etc. “versant d’une montagne abrité du soleil” (Rif-Snh.: Rns. 1932, 387) | Qbl. a-malu, pl. i-mula “versant le moins ensoleillé, le côté de l’ombre où la neige reste le plus longtemps (l’ubac)” [Dlt. 1982, 498]. Improbable.
NB: Dubious, since these forms are usually derived from Brb. *√l > *ū-li “ombre” [GT].
- **7.** GT: or cp. CCh.: Fali-Muchella m̄un ~ m̄ul (so, -l) “mountain” [Krf. 1972 MS] = m̄un ~ m̄u [Krf. 1981, #140]? Seems isolated in Ch.
NB: A comparison with Eg. √mn seems to be excluded in the light of CCh. *m-w “mountain” [GT]: Wamdiu m̄aw, Hildi maw, Margi ṛwu, Kilba m̄a? | Higi-Nkafa mwè | Bcm. mwey, Gudu mómò (CCh.: Krf. 1981, #140).

mn.w ~ mn ~ mn.t “1. Gewässer mit Wasserpflanzen, 2. auch als Bez. eines Kanals im Gau von Hermopolis” (GR, Wb II 72, 1–2) = “mnw-Wasser” (Helck, MWNR 402–3) = “waterway with plants (must be Delta waterways with plants and birds)” (Edfu, PL 425).

● Etymology uncertain:

- **1.** P. Wilson (PL l.c.): “*the term may derive from mn ‘pot’ or more generally ‘container’ and mean nothing more than a container for something, in this case a waterway which contains both water and vegetation*”. Plausible.
- **2.** GT: any connection to WCh.: SBch. *māl- “water” [GT]?
NB1: Attested in Jimi màalo [Csp.] = malo [Gowers], Tala maal [Csp.] = ma:l [Smz.], Zungur maal [Csp.], Buli mal [Gowers] = màl [IL] = mal [Smz.], Soor (Zangwal) & Sho (Ju) & Baram & Dir maal [Smz.], Zaranda mààli [Smz.], Zul mààlè [Smz.], Langas & Lundur màal [Smz.] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 33, #53; Csp. 1994, 38; JI 1994 II, 340).
NB2: H. Jungraithmayr & K. Shimizu (1981, 283A₁) affiliated SBch. *māl- to PCh. *^mb- “water”. Later, however, H. Jungraithmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I 176) explained it as a late borrowing from NC *mel-(aŋ) [Williamson 1973, 388].
- **3.** L. Homburger (1931, 253) falsely equated it with Nub. aman “water”, which was in fact borrowed from Brb. *aman “water” [GT], which is, however, usually analyzed as *a-m-an (pl. tante) < PAA *m-(?) “water” (cf. Eg. mw).

NB: G. Möller (1921, 193–195), W. Vycichl (1933, 177; 1934, 46), and W. Helck (1962, 331) combined Brb. *a-man with the hypothetical Eg. *jmn “water”, which they reconstructed on the basis of the late (not before NK) hrgl. representing an island with the water sign (n) in it. This combination of hrgls. is to be read jmn in the name of jmn “Amon” (Wb I 84, 17). This theory would imply dividing the Brb. word into *a- (article) and root *man (with *-n as part of the root). Both Müller and Vycichl declined the explanation for the phonetic value of the sign on the basis of cryptography, offered by K. Sethe (jmn < *jw-m-nw “island with water”). J. Osing (1976, 703–704, fn. 808) rejected Helck’s etymology.

mnj (orig. ***mjnj**?) “(eigtl.) anpflocken: A intr. 1. landen, 2. sterben, B tr. 3. landen lassen, ans Land bringen, 4. (LP, GR) sterben lassen, 5. (ein Land u.ä.) gut lenken” (OK, Wb II 73–74) = “1. to moor (ship, tr.), 2. die, 3. (XVIII.) attach (m) to cult-service” (FD 107) = “1. landen, andocken, anpflocken, 2. (euph.) sterben” (GHWb 336) = “1. to moor, land, 2. die” (DCT 167).

NB1: Although -j- after m- does not appear in wtg., it is commonly accepted to assume an original root *mjnj (*m̄inj) (proposed by K. Sethe 1899 I, §111; ÜKAPT VI 129; cf. also Müller 1894, 28, fn. 1; 1905, 419, fn. 1; Czermak 1934 II, 235; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 146; DELC 115; Allen 1984, 581) on the basis of the double vowel of the Cpt. reflexes, which, however, is not attested acc. to CD. W. M. Müller (l.c.): m̄in (sic), false. A. H. Gardiner (1905, 120–1) held the theory of Sethe “*absolutely certain*” and defined the root as m̄nw. J. Vergote (l.c.): pre-Cpt. *má?na < *máynay. However, the old rdg. mnj is still maintained in in some standard works (FD, DCT, PL).

NB2: The basic mng. of the underlying root has also been diversely understood: “to attach to a peg” (Grd.) = “to be made fast” (Vrg.) = “anpflocken” (ÜKAPT, Wb, KHW, etc.) = “accoster” < “attacher à un poteau” (DELC 115). The latter sense would imply a denom. verb root, which is questionable. Its tr. use was mistranslated by W. M. Müller (1894, 27–28) as “stoßen, treiben”, later as “vor sich hertreiben, (an)stoßen” (Müller 1905, 419, fn. 1).

NB3: A. H. Gardiner (1905, 120, fn. 5) considered the frequent metaphorical usage “to die” (not determined with ship until the NK) to be of unclear origin: perhaps it derived not directly from the sense “to land”, but perhaps its original mng. was the restraint which is implied both in the stage of being tied and in that of death. Kuhlmann (1992, 193), in turn, explained the shift of mng. from a conception where “*offenbar das Bild der Totenbarke im Vordergrund der Assoziation stand, zur Bestattung gehört... mit der Barke bei Osiris am ‘Hohen Land’ bzw. Ufer, t3 wr, im Westen anzulanden*”.

- Hence: Dem. mn “landen” (DG 160:2) > Cpt. (SLBF) ΔΜΟΝΙ, (B) ΜΕΝΕ-, ΜΑΝΕ-, ΜΑΝΟΥ- “to be made fast, come to land, into port (of ship)” (CD 173).

NB: W. Westendorf, J. Černý, and W. Vycichl, in turn, gave (S) ΜΟ(Ο)ΜΕ, (A) ΜΔ(Δ)ΜΕ, (F) ΜΔΔΗ(Ε)Ι (KHW 94) = (S) ΜΟΟΜΕ, (B) ΔΜΟΝΙ (CED 84) = (S) ΜΟΟΜΕ, (B) (Δ)ΜΟΝΙ for both (1) “landen”/“to be made fast” and (2) “weiden”/“to pasture, feed” (sic), although these forms with the *Doppelvokal* are attributed in CD solely for “to pasture”.

- From the same root:

(1) mnj.t “Pflock an dem das Schiff am Land festgemacht wird, 2. als Werkzeug zum ‘pfählen’ (als Strafe), 3. als Pfahl an welchen der zu Strafende gebunden wird” (OK, Wb II 72–73) = “gewiß... ein

Marterinstrument, an welchesder Deliquent gedrückt wird, wohl nur ein eingerammter Pfahl, an den der Deliquent gebunden oder gehalten wird, um Zappeln mit Armen und Füßen zu verhindern” (Pap. Abbott 6:12–13; Spg. in OLZ 2, 1899, 245; cf. OLZ 2/11, 1899, 365) = “le piquet d’amarrage” (Jéquier 1911, 77, §46; 1921, 74) = “1. mooring-post, 2. whipping-post” (FD 107; AECT III 203; DCT 168) = “pieu” (Aufrière 1990, 433) = “1. Landepflock (an dem das Schiff festgemacht wird), 2. Pfahl (zum Pfählen als Strafe), 3. Marterpfahl (an den Sünder gebunden werden)” (GHWb 336; ÄWb I 530) = “Landepflock zum Festmachen des Schiffes, eingeschlagen” (Düring 1995, 85) = “Marterpfahl (hinter, selten vor dem Gemarterten)” (WD I 87: cf. JEA 58, 1972, 215).

nb: Difficult to decide whether mnj.t was a deverbal noun from mnj or *vice versa*.

(2) mnj + prep. m “1. jemd. mit etwas beschenken, 2. jemd. mit einer Frau verheiraten” (Lit. MK, NK, Wb II 74, 15–16) = “1. to attach to (cult-service), endow with, 2. marry to” (FD 107) = “7. *belohnen (m: mit Äckern)” (GHWb 337).

nb1: Wb II 74 discussed Eg. mnj “beschenken” in a separate entry. But as pointed out by R. O. Faulkner (FD 107) and R. Hannig (GHWb 336–7), this sense is a secondary development from “to moor”. Therefore, a connection to AA *m-n “to give” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mn) is to be excluded.

nb2: As H. Goedicke (1984–85, cf. AEB 85.324) demonstrated, the term mnj m implies in Sinuhe B 78 that Sinuhe married the girl without having to pay anything.

(3) Dem. mne “to fulfil, accomplish successfully (lit. moor)” (Smith 1987, 169).

● Origin debatable. No unambiguous etymology.

■ 1. GT: most probably, related to NBrb. *mun “se réunir” [GT].

nb1: Attested in Shilh mun “accompagner” [Jst. 1914, 143] = mun “se réunir” [Dst.] = mun “to accompany” [Aplg. 1958, 61] = mun “accompagner qqn., aller avec, se réunir” [Mnts. 1999, 176], Tazerwalt mun “begleiten, mitgehen mit, übereinstimmen in, zusammenkommen” [Stumme 1899, 210] | Mzg. mun “1. accompagner, escorter, faire escorte, aller de compagnie avec, 2. fréquenter, côtoyer, 3. s’accorder, se rassembler, se réunir, se grouper” [Taifi 1991, 419], Mgild mun “to go together, accompany” [Harries 1974, 240], Zayan & Sgugu mun “aller de la compagnie avec qqn.”, ʔa-mmun “compagnie, réunion, société” [Lbg. 1924, 569], Izdeg mun “accompagner” [Mrc. 1937, 12] | Rif mun “s’unir” [Tlm. 1998, 110], Botiwa ʔm-n “se réunir” [Bst. 1890, 318] = Botiwa & Iqrayen mun “se réunir” [Brn. 1917, 93], Temsaman ʔa-mún-t “compagnie, société” [Brn.], Izn. mun “se réunir”, ʔa-immun-t “réunion, constellation” [Rns. 1932, 384] | Qbl. ta-yemmun-t “constellation” [NZ] (NBrb.: NZ 1998, 144, §140) || ECh.: Lele māné “aller avec une femme”, māñ “aller avec une femme, avec un homme” [WP 1982, 60]. From AA *m-n “to join so., accompany” [GT]?

nb2: This Brb.-Ch. root presumably derives from AA *m-n “to attach firmly” [GT], cf. NOm.: Wlt. min-t- “to glue” [Lmb.], Dache min-is- “to glue” [Lmb.] || Ch. *m-n “to stick firmly to sg.” [GT]: WCh.: Hausa mánnà “to gum on to, affix to”, mánnè ~ mánnè “to stick to” [Abr. 1962, 654–5] || CCh.: Mafa mán- “to attach” [Brt.-Bléis

1990, 226], Mtk. *manā* “attacher” [Mch. 1953, 157] || ECh.: Smr. *mēn* “1. toucher, 2. collar” [Jng. 1993 MS, 44], perhaps Tmk. *min* “appuyer” [Cpr. 1975, 84] (lit. “to stick to”?) | WDng. *miñè* “attacher solidement” [Fédry 1971, 130]. This equation implies that Eg. *mnj* (**mjnj*) derives probably ultimately from the same root as Eg. *mn* “to remain” (above) as surmised also by P. Wilson (PL 422).

NB3: Ch. **m-n* “full” [GT] may be perhaps also related (via “to join, unite” > “to make complete”), cf. WCh.: Bole *man-* “genügen, genug sein” [Lks. 1937, 137] || ECh.: Sokoro *ménna* “voll” [Lks. 1937, 36] | EDng. *miné* “(r)emplir, combler, saturer” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 205] = *füllen* [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 83], Mahwa *mùnúnj* “füllen” [Jng. 1978, 38], Ubi *munnà* “plein” [Alio 2004, 273, #228] | Jegu *mín-ân* “voll” [Jng. 1961, 115], Mubi *mín-* “ensemble, totalité” [Jng. 1990 MS], Kofa *míinàn* “full” [Jng. 1977, 18, #468]. From this standpoint esp. noteworthy is the *Nebensinn* of Eg. *mnj* in CT V 188i: “to saturate (with)” (DCT 167) = “to affix” (AECT II 49).

- 2. GT: if, in turn, Eg. *mnj* was a denom. verb (as usually supposed, cf. Wb, ÜKAPT, KHW, etc.) from *mnj.t*, the underlying etymon (**mnr.t*) might be perhaps equated with NBrb.: Shenwa *a-mnar*, pl. *i-mnar-en* “montant vertical de la porte” [Lst. 1912, 147] || WCh.: PAngas **manēr* “pillar” [GT 2004, 267]: Angas *maneer* “a prop, pillar (of a house)” [Flk. 1915, 242] = *màneer* (K) “pillar of house” [Jng. 1962 MS, 25] = *maner* “pillar” [ALC 1978, 35].

NB: A prefix **ma-* form from AS **nā₂r* identical with AS **nā₂r* “top” (q.v.)? Cf. esp. Angas *màneer* (prefix *ma-*) (K) “top”, *ka mèneer* “on the top” (*ka* “on”) [Jng. 1962 MS].

- All further proposals are out of question.

- 3. W. M. Müller (1905, 419, fn. 1) combined it with Hbr. *mʔn* “urspr.: weg/abstoßen”. Semantically unconvincing.

NB1: The basic sense of Sem. **mʔn* was different, cf. Hbr. *mʔn piel* “sich weigern” [GB] = “to refuse (to do sg.)” [KB 540], Syr. *mʔn* “to be abhorrent to sʔone” [KB] || OSA: Sab. *mʔn* “sich weigern” [GB] (Sem.: GB 393; Müller 1963, 311).

NB2: Müller assumed an early borrowing (!) from Sem.: “*man könnte... behaupten, das semit. mʔn sei eben als myn in Aegyptische aufgenommen und nur zufällig dann durch inner-ägyptischen Wandel der semit. Form wieder angeglichen worden...*”.

- 4. W. F. Albright (1918, 231, #49) related Eg. *mnj* (with the secondary meaning “to die”!) with Ar. *manan* [**manay-*] “1. mort, trépas, 2. destin(ée)” [BK] = “death” [Alb.], both derived from a common Eg.-Sem. **mny* “to stretch, make firm” (sic), whence he explained also Ar. *manna*, Hbr. *ʔmn*, Eg. *jmn* “to conceal” and *mn* “to remain”. Perfectly wrong.

NB: The basic meanings of Eg. *mnj* vs. Ar. **manay-* (act. “fate”) are fully different, cf. Sem. **mny* “to share out” [GT]: Ug. *mn-t* “Teil, Glied, Portion” [GT] || Ar. *mny* “départir qqch. à qqn.” [BK II 1158–9] = “zumessen” [WUS] (Sem.: WUS #1600). Eg. *mn* (q.v.) is ultimately cognate with Ar. *mnn* and Hbr. *ʔmn*, but these have nothing to do with Eg.-Sem. **mny*.

- 5. G. Jéquier (1921, 74) combined Eg. *mnj.t* “piquet” with Eg. *mnj.t* “collier”, although the reason for identifying the two terms is not clear.

- **6.** M. Lubetsky (1978–79, cf. AEB 33, 1979, 49–50, #79.225) assumed a change of Eg. *m(j)nj* < **mnl*, which he affiliated with NHbr. of TTM *līmīn* ~ *līmīn(ā)* “Hafen, Bucht” [Levy 1924 II, 501] = *līmēn* “Hafen” [Dalman 1922, 218] = also *lāmēn* “haven, bay” [Jastrow 1950, 712] as well as Gk. *λιμὴν* “port” [Boisacq]. He assumed a common Eg.-Sem. root **lmn*, whereby the Gk. term derived either via Hbr. or Eg. Absurd.
NB: The NHbr. word cannot be a cognate of Eg. *mnj*, since it is merely late borrowing of the Gk. term, which, in turn, comes from the IE heritage, cf. Gk. *λειμών* “tout lieu humide, prairie, pelouse”, *λίμην* “eau stagnante, marais, étang, lac” < IE **slei-* (Boisacq 1916, 565).
- **7.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 307, #590) derived Eg. *mnj* “moor” from AA **ma/un/η/ɲ-* “to tie up” based on the false equation of MSA **mnʿ* “to take, catch, hold” ||| Eg. *mnḥ* “to string” ||| Cu. **ma/unĉ-* “to twist (e.g. in making rope)”. Impossible
NB: Ehret derived the secondary meaning of *mnj* (“to die”) from a distinct AA root, namely **mān-* “to lose, lack, be without” > Ar. *mnʿ* “to refuse, hinder, prevent” ||| Eg. *mn* “there is not” ||| NOm. **mo(:)nn-* “person of outcaste status” ||| Ch. **m-n-(t)* “to forget” (!).
- **8.** N. Skinner (1995, 30) derived Eg. *mnj* “to die” from his AA **m-w/y-* “death, hunger” (sic). False.
- **9.** GT: the similarity to Ar. *mīn-at-* ~ *mīnāʿ-* “rade, port” [BK II 1175] > NAram. (Baḥ^oa) *mīna* “Hafen” [Correll 1969, 171] is misleading, being due to pure chance.
NB: The Ar. term is traditionally (BK) derived from Ar. *wny* “abandonner” [BK II 1612]. Note that M. Lubetsky (1978–79, cf. AEB 33, 1979, 49–50, #79.225) explained Ar. ʿal-*mīnāʿ* via Cpt. (!) ultimately from Eg. *mnj* (!), which is baseless.
- **10.** GT: because of Cpt. *-n-*, a comparison with Brb. **ə-məl* “arriver à” [Ksm.] is out of question.
NB: In addition, it derives from Brb. **ä-mVl* “se diriger vers” [Ksm.], which may be cognate with Eg. *m3ʿ* (q.v.).
- **11.** GT: the same pertains to CCh.: Mulwi *à-ḥīl* [prefix *a-*, < **-mil?*] “piquet où l’on attache les vaches la nuit” [Trn. 1978, 206].

mnj (or ****mjnj***) “als Hirt weiden” (NK, Wb II 75, 11–13) = “to act as herdsman” (PT 936c, FD 108) = “to pasture, guard” (CED 84) = “to serve as herdsman” (PT 936c, AEPT 161) = “1. weiden, 2. fig. hüten” (GHWb 337) = “(be)hüten (Ägypten)” (PT 936c, ÄWb I 531) > Dem. *mn* ~ *jmn* “weiden” (DG 31, 160) > Cpt. (S) *MOONE*, *MEHE-*, (S^aA) *MAANE*, *MAHE*, (B) (*Δ*)*MOHI*, (F) *MAANI* “1. (intr.) to pasture, feed (flocks or herdsman as subj.), 2. (tr.) feed, tend cattle, feed on, devour” (CD 173a) = (S) *MO(O)HE*, (A) *MA(Δ)HE*, (F) *MAAN(Ε)I* “weiden” (KHW 94).

NB: The original root was *mġnj (*mġni) (proposed by K. Sethe 1899 I, §111; ÜKAPT VI 129; cf. also Müller 1894, 28, fn. 1; 1905, 419, fn. 1; Czermak 1934 II, 235; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 146; DELC 115; Allen 1984, 581) on the basis of the double vowel of the Cpt. reflexes.

● Hence:

(1) mġj.w (mġnj.w) “(Vieh)hirt” (OK, Wb II 74–75) = “herdsman” (FD 108) = “Viehhirt, Hirt(e) (bes. von heiligem Vieh, Vieh eines Gottes)” (GHWb 337) > Cpt. (SAF) מַאֲנֵ, (B) מַאֲנִי “herdsman, pastor” (CD 173b) = “Hirt” (KHW 94).

NB1: Whether the verb mġj is denom. from mġj.w or *vice versa* “*can hardly be determined*” (Grd. 1905, 120). Nevertheless, more probable seems that mġj.w was a part. of the verb mġj.

NB2: Vocalized as *majnġ (Vrg. 1971, 52) = *m(a)jġ(ġ)w, pl. *m(a)jn(ġ)jġw (Snk. 1983, 214). Reflected also in cuneiform, cf. the Amarna PN ma-ni-e [manē], name of the envoy of Amenhotep III, lit. “shepherd” (Steindorff 1890, 331, fn. *; Albright 1946, 15, §23; Vergote 1973 Ib, 88).

NB3: For identifying Menes with mġj.w cf. Winckler in ZÄS 27, 1912, 49 and PSBA 50, 560; Steindorff 1890, 331, fn. *.

NB4: Whether mġj.w-htr.w “one who raises horses” underlies for Μῶνϵθῶς (as suggested e.g. by Černý 1950; Vergote 1971, 52; Thissen 1987, cf. AEB 87.276) is disputed. D. B. Redford (1986; AEB 86.271) assumed its etymon to be a dial. form of a LEg. *mrj-ntṛ-ʿ3. H.-J. Thissen (l.c.) proposed alternatively *mġj.w-t3-ḥ.wt “shepherd of the temple”.

NB5: Its det. represents a “man with stick and bundle or mat on shoulder” (EG 1927, 438, A33) = “peut-être une image de l’homme portant sur un bâton la natte de jous qui sert à la protection du berger (?)” (Lacau 1972, 47, #11).

(2) presumably mġj.w (mġnj.w) “Art Räumlichkeit (Schrein o.ä., urspr. viell. Hirtenzelt, insbesondere die Thronhalle?)” (PT, Wb II 75, 15–16) = “Schrein oder Gegenstand im Schrein (Bez. des Grabes)” (ÜKAPT III 383, IV 14f., VI 130, declined by Gdk. l.c.) = “throne-room (?)” (Gdk., RdE 11, 1957, 67) = “Weideland” (Gdk. 1966, 35) = “baldachin” (AEPT 138, 144, 271: PT 744a, 793c, 1867b, resp.) = “shrine” (DCT 168) = “ein Schrein (des Anubis, viell. urspr. Hirtenzelt)” (V–VI., ÄWb I 531).

NB: For a different etymology see Goedicke, RdE 11, 1957, 67.

● No unambiguous etymology.

- 1. A. H. Gardiner (1905, 120–1 & fn. 2) explained it from an earlier sense “to attach to a peg” (the stake or post used for this purpose being usually found as det. of the root), whence the mng. “to herd cattle” arose from “*the herdsmen’s habit of tying their cattle to a post*”, the “*custom of tethering the cattle while they graze*” being “*usual in Egypt also in the present day*” (Grd.). Similarly, W. Westendorf (KHW 94) and W. Vycichl (DELC 115) derived both Eg. mġnj “landen” (lit. “Schiff anpflocken”) and “weiden” (lit. “Vieh anpflocken”) from a common root denoting “attacher à un poteau” (Vcl.). Rejected by W. M. Müller (1894, 28, fn. 1).

- **2.** GT: or to be compared with Ar. *maʔana* “4. avoir grand soin de qqn., 5. s’arranger, s’ajuster, faire ce qu’on doit faire pour paraître bien, avoir soin de sa personne” [BK II 1054] ||| SAgaw: (?) Awngi *man-d-iŋ* [unless < *mal-d-] “to take care of, look after”, *man-iŋ* “to guard” [Hetzron apud Apl. 1994 MS, 14] || HECu.: Sid. *mânâwa* ~ *mânaʔwa* “1. to keep guard, preserve (money), 2. economize”, cf. *mâna* (f) “wise behaviour, economizing, the knowing of a thing” [Gsp. 1983, 222] ||| CCh.: prob. Mafa *man-* “2. élever un animal domestique” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 226] || ECh.: Tobanga *māŋē* [-ñ-] “sauver, secourir” [Cpr. 1978, 165]?

LT.: the Eg-Awngi comparison was first suggested by Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 205, #1804).

NB1: Whether Awngi *man-d-* belongs rather to NAgaw *mEl-t- [GT] (below) is uncertain.

NB2: Ch.A. Diop combined Eg. *mnj* with Wolof *min* “domestiquer”, but as pointed out by H. Tourneux (2000, 89), it is in fact *miin* “être habitué à, familier à, avoir l’habitude de voir”.
- **3.** GT: or cp. NBrb. **mun* “se réunir, accompagner” [GT], which derives ultimately from AA **m-n* “to attach firmly” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. *mnj* “landen”)?

NB: This comparison would ultimately imply a derivation from the AA root Eg. *mn* “bleiben” (q.v.) also originated from.
- Other etymologies are either improbable or false:
- **4.** GT: since Eg. *mnj* < **mly* is rather unlikely, a comparison with Cu.-Om. **m[a]l-* “to watch cattle” [GT] is probably out of question. Moreover, the underlying AA root is eventually related to AA **m-l* “to watch” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. *m33*).

NB1: Attested in NWA_{gaw} **mEl-t-* or **mäl-äy/t-* “to guard, tend flocks” [GT]: Qemant *mäl-* “garder” [CR 1912, 228] = *mäl-t-* ~ *mel-t-* “to tend flocks” [Apl. 1996] = *mel-na* “to drive cattle” [Apl. 1991 MS, 4], Kailiña *mil-d-* “to tend flocks” [Apl.], Qwara *mäl-* “spähen, beobachten, herumschauen” [Rn. 1885, 98] = *mäl-t-* “to tend flocks”, *mäl-t-äntä* “guardian” [Apl.], Falasha *mäläy-änta* “guardian” [Apl.] (NA_{gaw}: Apl. 1994, 248; 1996, 18) ||| Orm. *mil-* “guardare” [Crl. 1951, 471] || HECu.: Burji *maläl-* ~ *mallal-* “to herd” [Sasse 1982, 140] = “to watch cattle” [Hds. 1989, 164, 211] ||| N_{Om.}: Haruro (Kachama) *mälänäy* “pastore” [CR 1937, 654].

NB2: Burji *mallal-* is isolated in HECu., while the other HECu. lgs. have **alläl-* (!). Therefore, H.-J. Sasse (1982, 140) has supposed an *m-* prefix pointing to an original prefix verb (cf. Afar *-olöl-* “to graze”, intr.).

NB3: Any connection to CCh.: Masa *möl-là* [GT: < **mol-na*] “regrouper (boeufs)” [Ctc. 1978, 70] = *möl* “regrouper (les animaux)” [Ctc. 1983, 115], Mesme *mól* “rassembler” [Ksk. 1990, 31]?
- **5.** W. M. Müller (1894, 28, fn. 1) affiliated Eg. *mnw* (sic) “Hirt” with Eg. *mnj.tj* “Erdhacker” (Müller) = “Art Ackersmann” (Lit. MK, Wb, q.v.), which he identified with either Ar. *mʔn* or Hbr. *mnʔ* (sic, mng. not specified).
- **6.** F. L. Griffith (1898, 104) rendered its orig. sense as “hireling (for the day)” and affiliated it with MK *mnj* “possibly (1) ordinary labourers

(subject to the corvée) or (2) professional shaiyālīn, i.e. strong porters (?)” (Illahun, Griffith) = “(daily) corvée labourers (lit. day labourers)” (Maspero) as well as Eg. mnj (sic) “harbour”, which he derived from Eg. *mn “daily” (sic). False.

- **7.** H. F. Lutz (1928–29, 186) and D. J. Wölfel (1955, 66, §56) assumed an etymological connection between Eg. mnj.w vs. mnmn.t, which was rejected already by H. P. Blok (1930).
NB: This is conceivable only if Eg. mnj.w was originally a nisba (*mn.j.w “who belongs to the herd”) of an unattested Eg. *mn “herd”, which, in turn, might have been, in theory, the unreduplicated etymon of MEg. mnmn.t “cattle” (MK, FD, below).
- **8.** H. F. Lutz (1928–29, 186) explained OEg. mnj.w as a loan from a hypothetical Sum. *munu (!), regarded by him as a dialectal var. of Sum. ùnu (ÁB-KU), read also as utul (Borger) = udul (Labat) “Hirte, Herdenaufseher” (see Labat 1976, 191, #420; Borger 1978, 167, #420). Deriving OEg. mnj.w < Sum. *munu was approved by H. P. Blok (1930, 23–24) with reservations. Baseless.
- **9.** D. J. Wölfel (1955, 66, §56) combined it also with Guanche: Tenerife armenime ~ armegnime ~ arbenime “l’endroit de la bergerie” [Wlf. 1955] = “Viehürde” [Wlf. 1965, 499, §199], for which no Brb. etymology has been suggested. Unconvincing.
- **10.** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (OS 1990, 85; 1992, 169): Eg. mnj.w < PAA *man- “man”. Not to be ruled out definitely.
NB: For the suggested semantic shift “man” → “herdsman”, cf. Eg. bt (OK, above).
- **11.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 205, #1804) equated it with SAgaw: Awngi mand- “to look after” ||| SOm.: Ari mang- “to hunt” < AA *-maŋ- “to look for”. The Ari parallel is highly dubious.
NB: The Eg.-Awngi etymology is especially attractive (cf. above).

mnj.t ~ mn.t “(Substantiv)” (1st IMP 2x: Urk. I 294, 296, Wb II 76, 8) = “*Amtsinsignien, *Schal, Band (des Min)” (ÄWb I 531).

- May be identical with Eg. mn.(w)t “shroud (?)” (CT VI 190d, AECT II 180–1, spell 575, n. 15) = “bandelettes, linceul (?)” (AL 78.1723) = “*Leichentuch, Bandagen” (GHWb 337–8) = “?” (DCT 168).
- Origin uncertain. GT: cp. perhaps EBrb.: Gdm. tə-məll-iw-īn (pl.) “bandes d’étoffe étroites et longues (dans l’aménagement de l’alcôve nuptiale, elkubbet, ces bandes constituent un parement horizontal qui fait jointure entre la couverture de l’alcôve et les tentures qui violent l’alcôve sur les côtes)” [Lanfry 1973, 210, #999]?

mnj (OK, XVIII.) ~ **mn** (MK, NK) ~ **mn.t** (NK) “Art Krug für Wein, Bier, Öl, Früchte, Weihrauch u.ä., auch wie ein Maß” (MK, Wb II

66, 6–11; already in OK, cf. Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza II 162) = “(mn) Krug” (Helck, MWNR 1198) = “Amphore, Maß von Inhalt von 20 Hin” (Helck, LÄ III 1203) = “1. jar, 2. as measure of capacity” (FD 107) = “big jar with two handles” (Ahituv 1972, 302) = “vase” (AL 77.1700) = “jarre” (AL 78.1708: cf. Posener-Kriéger, JEA 64, 1978, 87, n. m, pl. xiv, rt. 10) = “jar” (DLE I 216) = “1. Meni-Amphore (Höhe 50–70 cm, für Wein, Bier, Öl, Früchte, Weihrauch), 2. ein Maß (20/30 Hin)” (OK 1x, GHWb 336; ÄWb I 530a: cf. ASAE 16, 1916, 200).

NB1: For the estimated quantity of the mnj-measure cf. Ahituv 1972, 302; also EG 1957, 199, §266.1. For mn cf. also JEA 58, 1972, 302 (WD I 86); RdE 37, 1986, 26 (WD II 60).

NB2: J. Osing (NBÄ 194, 724, n. 853; cf. AL 77.1700; PL 426) derived hence Cpt. (B) (𐎠)MIN (m) “dish of soapstone” (CD 7b) = “irdener Topf” (KHW 486) = “Art Krug” (Snk.), vocalized by W. Schenkel (1983, 223) as *jamīm̄j. For a supposed different Cpt. reflex of Eg. mnj, namely (B) NHHI “honeycomb” (CD 227b), cf. CED 109; KHW 486, fn. 1.

- From the same root (or merely as late variations of the very same OK term mnj?):

(1) NK mn.t “wine-measure” (Grd. 1916, 182) = “Amphore” (Helck, MWNR 1198) = “jug, the normal container for wine (whether it indicates a fixed measure is not clear)” (Janssen 1961, 25) = “a measure for capacity” (PL).

NB: P. Wilson (PL 426) combined it with Cpt. (S) $\overline{\text{HNT}}$, (B) MENT (m) “a measure of grain (less thab PTOB)” (CD 176a; Kemp, JEA 65, 1979, 183), which is false, since it requires an old etymon *mnd/*mnd (m) or sim. A derivation from NK mn.tj is semantically unlikely. The correct etymon (as pointed by J. Osing 1978, 189) may be Eg. mnd “une mesure pour le grain” (Urk. IV 1342:5, AL 78.1759).

(2) NK mn.tj “Napf” (XVIII–XIX., Wb II 66, 12–14; WD II 62: for attestation cf. RdE 43, 1992, 114) = “Napf (für Wein, Bier, Wasser)” (GHWb 334).

(3) GR mn.w “vase” (Ptol., Chassinat 1935, 107f.) = “jar, probably fairly large drop-shaped pottery vessel with wide mouth” (Edfu, PL 426).

(4) GR mnmn.t “vessel” (hapax, Edfu IV 46:11, PL 430).

NB: PL l.c.: “possibly an invented word derived from mnw ‘vessel’ and used as a pun on mnmn.t ‘herd’”.

- 1. Probably identical with Sem. *mall-at- [GT]: Akk. (a/spB) maltu “ein Napf, flache Schale”, (spB) mallatu “ein Gefäß” [AHW 596] = mallatu “a plate or bowl”, cf. OAkk. & OAb. maltum “a bowl made of stone or frit, metal, wood”, NBab. malītu “a small bowl made of clay or precious metal”, malalu “(drink) container” [CAD m2, 160–1, 165, 169, 172] || Ar. (Oman) mallah “bowl, basin” [Jns.], Dathina melle, pl. mlāl “Schüssel”, mella “Schale, Schüssel” [GD

2712] | MSA *mall-et [GT]: Hrs. malléh “bowl, basin”, Jbl. mällét “pot”, Mhr. mällēt “large bowl” (MSA: Jns. 1977, 88; 1981, 171; 1987, 265) ||| CCh.: Gsg. malalaw “small storage pot (gen.)” [Gerstman 1979 MS, 10, #123.a]. From AA *m-l-l “pot” [GT].

Lrr. for Eg.-Akk.: Holma 1919, 38; Clc. 1936, #410; Vrg. 1945, 135, #9.b.9.

NB1: W. G. E. Watson (1982, 9) saw in Ug. mll (in a context of eating and drinking) a reflex of Akk. malalu.

NB2: Difficult to decide whether Sem. *mall-at- is genetically related to AA *m-w-l “(vessel used as) scoop, ladle” [GT], cf. SBrb.: Hgr. ā-mūla, pl. i-mūlā-t-en “biberon: petit vase, en matière quelconque, muni d’un bec formant tétine, pour l’allaitement artificiel des enfants et des jeunes animaux”, tā-mūl-at, pl. ti-mūl-āt-īn “poche: grande cuiller demi-sphérique, à long manche, en matière quelconque, de la contenance d’un quart ou d’un tiers de litre environ” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1198], EWlm. a-mmōla, dimin. tā-mmōl-et ~ -at “une louche en Calebasse” [Gouffé] = Ayr & EWlm. ā-mōla, pl. i-mōla-n “grande cuiller à long manche, louche, poche, fait en Calebasse ou bois de *tabārakkat* ou métal (utilisé pour puiser et pour remuer pendant la cuisson)” [Alj. 1980, 128; PAM 1998, 216; 2003, 537], Ghat a-mūla, pl. i-mūla-t-en “cuiller (grande cuiller à pot)” [Nhl. 1909, 147] (SBrb.: Gouffé 1974, 374) ||| Bed. amūl (m) “milk-bowl made of closely woven palm leaf”, (f) “similar bowl with foot like a wine glass” [Rpr. 1928, 149] || NAḡaw: Bln. mūl-ā, pl. mūl “Schöpfgefäß um Wasser aus der Cisterne zu schöpfen zum Tränken des Viehes” [Rn. 1887, 269].

- **2.** GT: or cp. EBrb.: Audjila tā-mnī-t “giarra” [Prd. 1960, 167] ||| ECh.: Bdy. muuno “petit pot décoré” [AJ 1989, 102]?

NB1: ECu.: Tṣamay man-o (m) “container” [Sava 2005 MS, 266] lit. means “spot, place”, and is thus unrelated.

NB2: From the same AA root may derive the fig. sense “vessel > thing”, cf. WCh.: Karekare mén “Sache, Ding” [Lks. 1966, 203] || ECh.: Jegu man “Sache” [Jng. 1961, 115].

NB3: Note that Ug. mn “Gerät, Möbel” [WUS], Phn. mn “vessel, precious object” [Harris 1936, 120], BAram. *mān, st.cstr. pl. mānē- & EAram. mʔn “Gerät, Gefäß, Zeug (v. Sachen v. Kupfer, Eisen u. Holz)” [GB], JAram. of TTM mānā(?) “1. Gerät, 2. Gefäß” [Dalman 1922, 240] = mā(?)n ~ mā(?)nā(?) “Gefäß, Geschirr, Gerät” [Levy 1924 III, 4, 147] = maʔn ~ mā(?)n ~ mā(?)nā(?) “1. vessel, utensil, 2. garment, dress” [Jst. 1950, 723], Syr. mānā “Gerät, Gefäß, Zeug” [WUS], Samar. Aram. mʔn “1. vessel, instrument, 2. garment” [Tal 2000, 448], JPAram. mʔn ~ mn “1. utensil, vessel, 2. instrument” [Sokoloff 1990, 288], Mnd. mana “vessel, garment, utensil, instrument, implement” [DM 246] (Sem.: GB 912; WUS #1594) are usually explained via *ma- prefix from Sem. *ʔVnāy- (Kogan 2005, 528, §5).

- Other etymologies cannot be accepted:

- **3.** A. H. Gardiner (1916, 182) affiliated NK mn.t with Eg. mn.t “kind, nature”, mn “such-and-such”, mn.t “such-and-such a thing”, which he derived ultimately from Eg. mn “to be firm, established”. Similarly, W. Schenkel (1983, 223) compared it with Eg. mnj.t “root” (!). Certainly false in view of OK mnj as well as the obvious semantical difficulties.
- **4.** M. Ellenbogen (1962, 104) saw in Eg. mnj a loan-word, which “at an early period” had been borrowed from a Mesopotamian source,

cf. Akk. *manû* “Mine (ca. 480 g)” > Sum. *mana* [AHW 604]. False both semantically and because of the OK attestation.

NB: He treated Eg. *mnj* (instead of Akk.) as the source of Gk. *μνᾶ* ~ Ionic *μνέα* (f) “mine, poids et monnaie de cent drachmes” > Lat. *mina* [Boisacq], which is equally false. Besides, as M. Mayrhofer stressed, OInd. *maná* “Benennung eines goldenen Schmuckes” [KEWA II 574] = “un poids d’or” [Boisacq] is unrelated to these *Wänderwörter*.

- 5. W. Schenkel (1983, 223) combined Eg. **jamín̄j* “Art Krug”, the supposed etymon of Cpt. (B) (ⲁ)MIN (above), with Eg. *mnj.t* (**mán̄.t*) “Wurzel” (!) and derived both from Eg. *mn* “bleiben. False.
- 6. P. Wilson (PL 426) derived it from OK *mnw* “(a type of) quartz” (Harris 1961, 110–1; GHWb; ÄWb I, q.v.): “*this word for stone for a jar, may have become the jar itself and then a general word for a type of jar*”.

mnj.t “die Halskette und ihr Schlußstück” (MK, Wb II 75, 18) = “le nom des cymbales égyptiennes” (Loret apud Montet) = “collier” (Jéquier 1921, 74–77) = “instrument de musique: paire de cymbales” (Montet 1928, 13–15) = “necklace (sacred to Hathor)” (FD 108) = “Zimbeln” (Gdk. 1967, KDAR 169) = “Art Brustschmuck” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza X 135) = “kettentartiger Schmuck der Hathor” (Altenmüller 1975, 349) = “ein Gerät, das aus mehreren an ihren Enden zusammengefaßten Perlenketten und einem länglichen, zunächst offenbar paarigen Abschlußstück besteht, welches später die Gestalt eines Rechtecks oder Trapezes annimmt und in einer Scheibe endigt (dieser Teil fungiert als Gegengewicht, wenn das Menit um den Hals gelegt wird); oft in der Hand getragen (es läßt sich mit ihm dann dank der Perlen durch Schütteln ein klapperndes Geräusch erzeugen)” (Stahelin, LÄ IV 52) = “collier” (AL 77.1719) = “counterpoise of necklace” (DLE I 217) = “in einem Gegenwicht endende Perlenkette, als Halsschmuck, Rasselinstrument und Symbol der Göttin Hathor” (GHWb 337) = “necklace” (Fischer 1996, 237, 257) = “Zimbeln (?)/Stoff (?)” (WD I 87: cf. JEA 56, 1970, 204) = “necklase (sic) sacred to Ḥathor” (DCT 168).

NB1: The function and nature of this “symbol of mysterious origins” (Springborg 1990, 112) is debated. For discussion and lit. see Barguet in BIFAO 52, 1953, 103–111; Westendorf 1967, 145; LÄ IV 52–53; Griffiths 1994, 237–9.

NB2: Cf. also Eg. *mnj.t* “als Material zu kleinen Figuren” (late NK, Wb, below).

- Origin obscure.
- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 4) speculated about a possible m- prefix in it. Baseless.
- 2. G. Jéquier (1921, 74–77) maintained that its representation in the MK freezes is “*en tout point identique à celui du piquet d’amarrage des*

bateaux, ... il y a là évidemment une indication relative au sens symbolique... de l'objet... , qui doit avoir trait à l'hereuse arrivée du mort dans l'autre monde", whereby it might have been "*une sorte de 'sauv-conduit' pour le moment de l'abordage de la barque des morts*". Alternatively (von Bissing apud Jéquier 1921, 74, fn. 7), it was a "*collier d'animal*", lit. "*l'attacheur, le fixeur*". In either cases, Jéquier suggested an etymological connection with Eg. mnj.t "piquet" (above).

- **3.** W. Westendorf (ZÄS 94, 1967, 145), followed by L. Troy (1986, 100–2), surmised it to have originally represented the female vulva, while the handle of the sistrum, with which it often appears together (Nagy 1977, 204 & fn. 49–50), originally figured the phallus (i.e., that "*der 'Pfeiler' bzw. Handgriff des Hathorsymbols ursprünglich ein phallusartiger Tampon war*"), whereby Westendorf suggested a connection ("*wenigstens im Wortspiel*") with Eg. mn.t "thigh, womb" (sic). Far-fetched.

NB1: The basic sense of Eg. mn.t had nothing to do with "vulva", for which other words were used. Moreover, the -j does not appear in the wtg. of mn.t "thigh".

NB2: J. Quaegebeur (BSFE 98, 1983, 17–39), followed by P. Springborg (1990, 112f., 135f.), in turn, saw in mnj.t a symbol of regeneration (Nagy 1977, 205 & fn. 51 with further lit.) consisting of a pair of testicles (in spite of noted studies on the subject, cf. LÄ IV 53), which was doubted by J. G. Griffiths (1994, 238): "*why should a goddess of sexuality symbolically sling a pair of testicles around her neck?*". Nevertheless, he too, assumed the sacred necklace of Hathor to consist of testicles, namely those of Seth with regard to some Ptol. texts suggesting that the mnj.t "*was given to the goddess to secure her aid in the destruction of Seth*".

- **4.** GT: a comparison with Akk. (Amarna, Qatna, Alalakh) maninnu "ein Halsschmuck" [AHW 603] = "a necklace" [CAD m1, 211] is equally to be excluded.

NB1: As suggested by H. Kronasser (WZKM 53, 184f.) and M. Mayrhofer (Die Sprache 5, 1969, 88; Orientalia NS 34, 1965, 31; KEWA II 556) as well as in CAD (l.c.), the Akk. word may be of Indo-Aryan origin (with Hurrian as mediator lg., cf. its ending -nnu), cf. Hurr. mani-nnu "mehnteiliger Halsschmuck" [Kronasser], OInd. mañi- "am Halse getragener Schmuck, Perle, Edelstein, Juwel" [KEWA] = "necklace" [CAD] (supposed connection with Lat. monile "Halsband" rejected in LEW II 108). The IE origin of the Hurr. term (denoting also "Zierrat am Griff eines Gefäßes") was queried by I. M. Diakonoff (1972, 114): "*eine rein hurritische Herkunft ist wohl wenigstens ebenso wahrscheinlich wie eine arische*".

NB2: For its reflection in Ug. and Emar see Watson 1995, 224–5.

- **5.** GT: if Eg. mnj.t < *mlj.t, cf. LECu.: Orm. (Orma) māl-tē "a string of beads worn around the waist by baby girl", (Borana) melmēl-a "a type of necklace (common among Borāna, Gabra, and Saknye women)" [Strm. 1987, 361, 366].
- **6.** GT: Eg. mnj.t < *mnr.t? Cf. ECu.: Yaaku múnyúrí, pl. múnyúr "chain" [Heine 1975, 122]?

NB: For further parallels see the entry of Eg. mnj.t "Perlen" (below).

mnj.t “essbarer Körperteil des Rindes (hinter ḥpš ‘Schenkel’ und ‘Herz’ genannt)” (MK hapax, Wb II 77, 8).

NB: Its det. resembles (or identical with) a rib.

- Meaning and origin obscure. Only guesses are possible.
- **1.** A. Erman & H. Grapow (Wb) supposed a connection to Eg. mn.t “Bein” (sic). The det. and the -j, however, contradict this solution.
- **2.** GT: if, in turn, it was distinct from Eg. mn.t “thigh”, cp. either of the following AA roots:

(1) AA *m-n “intestines (or sim.)” [GT]: Cu. *man- “intestine” [Ehret]: Bed. eʿ-mana “die Eingeweide” [Munzinger] = é-maná “Gedärme” [Seetzen] = mána “Darm, Gedärme, Eingeweide” [Almkvist 1885, 45; Rn. 1895, 170] = mána “viscera, bowels, intestines” [Rpr. 1928, 217] || LECu.: PSom. *man- (in words for lower alimentary organs) [Ehret] || SCu.: Dhl. mani “Magen” [Dammann 1949–50, 232] = máni “large intestine” [Ehret 1980, 153; EEN 1989, 36] (Cu.: Flm. 1969, 23; Ehret 1987, #423) || CCh.: (?) Mada màrara [r < *n?] “abats (intestins, poumons)” [Brт.-Brunet 2000, 192] || ECh.: Bdy. móono (f), pl. monon “pancréas” [AJ 1989, 100].

(2) AA *m-n “liver, heart” [GT]: SCu. *muna “heart” [Ehret]: Irq. mûna, pl. mûne [Wtl. 1953; 1958, 92] = mona [Flm.] = mōna [Bnd. 1971, 278, #74] = muna [Ehr.] = mūna, pl. mūnāwē ~ munē [Mgw. 1989, 115] = mūná ~ mūnā [MQK 2002, 75], Grw. & Alg. mona [Flm.], Brg. mōna “Geist, Hauch, Herz (?)” [Mnh. 1906, 332; also Claus l.c.] = mona [Flm.] = muna [Ehr.] | Qwd. muna-ko/u [Ehr. 1980 MS, 4], Asa (Ngomwia) muna-ko, pl. múnano [Claus 1910, 492] = mono-k [Ehr.] | Dhl. mūna [Ehr.] = muna [EEN 1989, 39; MSSL 1993, 38, #30] (SCu.: Flm. 1969, 11, 23; Ehret 1980, 159) || CCh. *min-ḏ- “liver” [Stl.] = *m-n [GT]: Boka mwànáʔtə [Krf.], Gbn. mènàʔəta [Krf.], Gaʿanda mènəttə [Krf.], Pidlimdi minamina [Krf.] | Bura mir [r < *n] “liver” [BED 1953, 138] = mirà [Krf.] | Higi mḥí “heart”, mḥḗ “liver” [Mohrlang 1972, 99], HFutu mīni [Krf.], FGili mīni [Krf.], HKamale mūnè [Krf.], HNkafa mnè [Krf.], Kps. mūnè [Krf.] | Mtk. mónáḏ [Krf.] (CCh.: Krf. 1981, #70; Stl. 1996, 137).

LIT.: HSED #1794 (SCu.-CCh.).

(3) AA *m-n “chest” [GT]: SCu.: Brg. mūna, pl. mūnaʔi “chest (physic.)” [Wtl. 1958, 22, #16] = munaʔi “chest” [Ehret 1980, 159] || CCh.: Tera mémónà “chest” [Nwm. 1964, 38, #67].

(4) AA *m-l “liver, heart” [GT]: (?) HECu. *mule “kidney” [Hds. 1989, 86] || NOM. *mVl- [Bnd.]: Kaffa múll-ō “Herz” [Rn. 1888, 317] = mull-ō “1. cuore, 2. comprendonio, intelligenza, 3. intenzione”

[Crl. 1951, 471] = mūll-o “heart” [Bnd. 1971, 259, #39; 1975, 169, §39.6 with false Irq. cognate] | EMao: Bambeshi mēle “liver” [Bnd. 1971, 206] = (NMao) mēle [Bnd. 1971, 275, #46] = mel-e ~ mēl-e “liver” [Flm. 1988, 39] = mele [Mkr.] = māl-e [Blz.] = mēle [Bnd. 1990, 602, #47] ||| Ch. *m-l “heart” [JS 1981, 134D] > WCh.: Bks. mulùt (f) “heart” [Jng. 1968, 7, #52; 1970, 144; Magwa et al. 1985, 10] | Boghom mal “liver, heart” [Smz. 1975, 30] = mal “heart” [Jng. 1965, 177] = māl “liver” [Krf. 1981, #70], Kir māl “heart” [Smz.], Laar & Mangas mal “heart” [Smz.] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 26, 49, #24) || CCh.: Baldamu mémél “foie” [Trn. 1987, 55] || ECh.: Kwang-Mobu málwá (f) “coeur” [Jng. 1973, 44; Ebert 1977 MS, 9].

LIT.: Mkr. 1987, 33 & 1989 MS, 5 (NOM.-Boghom); Blz. 1989 MS Om., 19, #65 (NOM.-WCh.).

(5) AA *m-l “belly” [GT]: NOM.: Doko mill-ē “ventre” [CR 1927, 249] | Haruro mīll-ē “fianco” [CR 1937, 654] | Mao: Hozo ómali “guts”, Sezo mállè “guts” (Mao: Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 13) ||| ECh.: Sokoro mel-dum “dein Bauch” [AF] = mēl “Leib” [Lks. 1937, 36] = mēl(ú) “belly (external)” [Saxon 1977 MS, 3, #22] = mēl(lú) “belly” [Saxon in JI 1994 II, 21].

mnj “Art Arbeiter (beim Steineschleppen u.ä.)” (MK: Pap. Berlin 10073 of Illahun 14:5, 19:64, 22:45, 22:49, Wb II 77, 1) = “corvée labourers” (Maspero) = “ordinary labourers subject to the corvée (?) or professional shaiyâlîn, i.e. strong porters (?), possibly dock labourers, who load and unload boats” (Griffith 1898, 39, 104) = “travailleurs traînant la pierre et cantonnés dans leur quartier: travailleurs soumis à une corvée (?) ou... porteurs, haleurs de pierre professionnels (?), piocheurs (?), journaliers (?)” (Baillet 1907, 6–7, §18 & p. 25) = “Arbeiter, die Steine zu schleppen haben, einem Speicher (?) zugeteilt sind” (Scharff 1924, 36, §3) = “corvée” (FD 108) = “les simples travailleurs (?)” (AL 77.1721) = “a class of workmen” (Ward 1982, 95, #797) = “Fronarbeiter” (Helck 1970 I, 42, n. a) = “Arbeitsdienstler, Zwangsarbeiter (besonders *Verbrecher im Arbeitseinsatz)” (GHWb 338).

NB: In Pap. Anastasi I 1:8 (cf. also Pap. Sallier II 4:9 and LÄ II, 333–4, n. 4), mnj “Landarbeiter” (Helck 1970 I, 42, n. a) = “Feldhacker” (Seibert apud Fischer-Elfert) = “Ackersmann” (Brunner 1944, 58) = “Ackerer” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 21 & n. x: “Bedeutung nicht einwandfrei klar”) may be a var. of NK mnj.tj (q.v.).

● Origin unknown.

■ 1. G. Maspero (quoted by Griffith and Scharff) regarded Eg. mnj as lit. “day labourers” or “hirelings for the day” (Griffith) = “Tagelöhner im Frohndienst” (Scharff) derived from Eg. m-mn.t “daily” (q.v.).

Not excluded by Baillet (1907, l.c.). Rejected already by A. Scharff (1924, l.c.) as “*gewagt*”.

- **2.** F. L. Griffith (1898, 104): “*possibly connected with mny (sic) ‘harbour’...*” as well as Eg. mnj.w “herdsman”.
- **3.** Baillet (1907, l.c.) and W. Helck (1970 I, 42, n. a) supposed a connection NK mnj.tj “Lanarbeiter” (Helck) = “fendre la terre” (sic) (Brugsch), although the sense of MK mnj “haleur de pierre” does not accord with it. Unlikely.
NB: In addition, Seibert (1967, 116, n. d; cf. Fischer-Elfert 1986, 21) assumed an eventual derivation from Eg. mrj.t “als Name der Hieroglyphe: die hölzerne Hacke” (LP, Wb II 98, 11). False, since the *-r- (not *-l-) in this root is doubtless.
- **4.** Alternatively, Baillet (1907, l.c.) speculated about a derivation from Eg. mntj.w “captifs étrangers, Arabes: gens de la montagne ou des sables (?)”. False.
- **5.** GT: the det. (man carrying a burden) also suggests that a relationship to WCh.: AS *maŋ [provided < *m-n-?] “to pick up, take, carry” [GT 2004, 241] is not to be excluded.
NB: For details on this AS root cf. Eg. mn^c.t (q.v.).

mnj.t ~ var. **mnw.t** ~ **mn.t** “Wurzel” (Med., Wb II 77, 2–4; WÄDN 239–240; GHWb 338; WD III 51: cf. SAK 20, 1993, 114, n. 27) = “root” (FD 108).

- Hence (?): late NK nn.wt (pl.) “Wurzel” (NBÄ 617, n. 620) ~ nn.w (Mathieu 1996, 91, n. 304) > Dem. nn.t “Wurzel” (DG 220:6) = var. nnj ~ nwn (Erichsen 1954, 371) = var. nn “root (?)” (Tait 1991, 89) → Cpt. (SALM) $\text{noyn}\epsilon$, (BF) noyni “root” (CD 227b; CED 109) = “Wurzel” (Spg. KHW 89; KHW 124).

NB: This derivation (accepted in CED, KHW, NBÄ etc.) is only possible provided we accept a shift of Ramess.-LP *nán.˘(t) (GT) < early NK *mán.˘t (NBÄ 139; Snk. 1983, 223) < OEg. *mān(j).˘t (GT) via assim. of the nasals. Declined in Wb II 77; Vergote 1950, 291; DELC 143 because of the unexplained change of m- > n-.

- Origin debated:

- **1.** GT: most probably, Eg. mnj.t < *mlj.t, cognate with CCh.: Pdk. mīlil “racine d’arbre”, cf. mīlilya “artère, veine” [Mch. 1950, 21, 30] = mīlil “root” [Brт.-Jng. 1993, 133] | Htk. (Hide) mala “1. veine, 3. muscle” [Eguchi 1971, 217] | Mafa-Mada *m-l-m-l “vein” [GT]: Mada mīlmél “vein” [Rsg.] = melmel i miž “artère, veine” [Mch.] = melmel “veine, nerf, tendon” [Brт.-Brunet 2000, 184], Muyang mīmīlé “vein” [Rsg.], Uldeme (Udlam) amel “artère, veine” [Mch.], Zelgwa mīlē mambaz “artère, veine” [Mch.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 165; Rsg. 1978, 354, #777).

NB: It is not yet clear whether the m- in Paduko, Hitkala, and Mafa-Mada derives from *mb- (cf. #2).

- **2.** J. H. Greenberg (1965, 89, #2) identified Eg. mnj.t with CCh.: Lgn. mbelle “root” (sic apud Grb.), treating the correspondence of Eg. m- = Logone mb- as a proof for PCh. or PAA *^mb-. The Lgn.-Eg. etymology is dubious, although, judging by the other problematic correspondences of Eg. mn, not excluded.

NB1: Only tentatively, we could assume the following process: PEg. *bly-t → OEg. *bny.t ~ *mnj.t → NEg. mnj.t (nasal assim.). Otherwise, equating Eg. m- with PCh. *^mb- (as suggested by Greenberg) is unconvincing.

NB2: The Logone word for “root” is recorded as mbéllē, pl. mbéllēn [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 108] = mból [Brt.] = mbéli [Mch. 1950, 21] = ?əmbə̀l [Bouny] = mból, pl. mbə̀llè [Trn. p.c.]. According to H. Tourneux (p.c., 11 June 1997), the m- of Logone mból, pl. mbə̀llè is a frequent prefix, which is confirmed by the further Chadic and Afro-Asiatic cognates indicating that the underlying PCh. root might have been *b-l “root” [GT] = *^mb-l [JS 1981, 215C], cf. WBrb.: Zng. tā-béll-it “fibre du Titārək, fibres végétales” [Ncl. 1953, 179] || WCh.: (?) Bgm. báy [-y < *-l?] “root” [Smz.] || CCh.: Higi mbilíi “Volksstamm” [Str.], Kps. mbilíi “Volksstamm” [Str.] (Higi: Str. 1922–23, 120) | Gidar bə̀ltə̀ na wúlā̀ŋa “racine d’arbre” [Mch. 1950, 21] | Bdm. pū̀l wā̀nē “Wurzel des Baumes” [Lks. 1939, 125], Afd. bílszaszih [bilsasi(?) “root” [Stz.] = mgbə̀l “root” [Brt.] (Ktk.: Slk. 1967, 209, #117; Brt.-Jng. 1993, 133) | Mada bilngé ~ bə̀lŋgé “root” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 68] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 276–7).

NB3: The same root exists in WCh.: (?) Goemai vél “nerve, vein” [Srl. 1937, 260] = veel “vein, sinew” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 39] || CCh. *b-l “nerve, vein” [GT] = *^mb-l “vein” [JS 1981, 280]: Dghwede hlá [unexplained b-] “vein” [Frick] = hula [Std.] | Lgn. bílle “Adern” [Nct. in Lks. 1936, 87] = ?əmbə̀l “vein” [Bouny], Bdm. bálei ~ pálei “Nerv, Sehne” [Nct. in Lks. 1939, 91] = faley “veine” [Gaudiche], Afd. mbill “Bogensehne”, ébombill “Aderlaß” (cf. nbill “Puls”) [Stz.] (Ktk.: Slk. 1967, 264, #329) | Gidar belet na mbéli “artère, veine” [Mch. 1950, 30] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 336–7). O. V. Stolbova (1996, 23) reconstructed PCh. *^abul- > *^buʔal- “1. tendon, 2. vein” on the basis of Ktk.-Dghwede and a number of phonologically dubious parallels.

- **3.** GT: or perhaps cp. Sem.: Akk. (jB) manānu (pl.t.) “Nerven (?)” [AHW 602] = “Sehnen (?)” [Holma 1911, 6] = “sinews” [CAD m1, 208] || Hbr. *^mmēn, pl. minnīm ~ minnī “Saiten(instrumente)” [GB 433], Syr. mentā “1. crinis, 2. nervus, 3. chorda, 4. tonus” [Brk.] = mennā “1. Haar, 2. Saite” [GB] = “nervus, chorda” [Holma] = mennē “1. Haare, 2. Nerven, Sehnen” [AHW] || perhaps Ar. maʔn-at- “toute la partie du ventre qui entoure le nombril” [BK II 1054] (Kogan: orig. prob. *^rectus abdominis, a straight muscle of the abdomen”) || Tna. mənāt “muscolo del braccio” [Bst.] (Sem.: Mlt.-Kogan 2000 MS, 197–8, #182) || NOM.: Haruro mānān-o “varietà di liana” [CR 1937, 654] || ECh.: EDng. māyīnē “ficelle autour des riens pour tenir le cache des filles” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 200]. From AA *^m-n (perhaps *^man- ~ *^min-) “fibre” [GT]?

● Other etymologies are less probable:

- **4.** J. Osing (NBÄ 139), followed by W. Schenkel (1983, 223) and W. Vycichl (DELIC 143), derived it from Eg. mn “bleiben, fest an

einer Stelle sein” (!), i.e., *māniy.at (part.) > *many.at ~ *māni.t lit. “ce qui reste (dans la terre)” (Vcl.). Unconvincing.

- **5.** L. Homburger (1957, 30): Eg. mn.t “root” equated with Drv.: Tamil mûl (meaning?). Should be examined in Nst. frameworks, out of the range of EDE.
- **6.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 214, #1832): mnj.t identified with Eg. mnw “thread” (q.v.) = Cu. *mayn- “tapeworm” < AA *mayn- “thread, thin fiber”. Semantically less convincing (than #1 and #2 or #3).
- **7.** GT: or should we assume an assimilation of Eg. mnj.t < *bnj.t? Cp. AA *b-n “1. tendon, nerve (Akk.-LECu.-ECh.), 2. hair (Aram.-NBrb.-NOM.-ECh.)” [GT]?
NB: For further details on this AA root, cf. Eg. bn.t “harp” (EDE II q.v.).

mnj “(offizinell verw.)” (Med.: Pap. Ebers 54:19, 68:10, Wb II 76, 13) = “eines der aromatischen Harze” (Ebers, Lüring apud Harris l.c.) = “unbekannt, viell. ein Harz” (Ebers, WÄDN 239) = “ruddle (?)” (Pap. Chester Beatty I rt. 17:3, Grd. 1935 I, 37, n. 2; Caminos 1956, 34; Wentz 1967, 169; DLE I 218: or “hips?”) = “perhaps ruddle, a form, preparation of red ochre (used not as pigment), a species of red ochre used for marking the hides of sheep and cattle” (Harris 1961, 172–3) = “Harz oder Rötöl oder Halbedelstein” (Helck, MWNR 1198) = “piece of jewellery, could be ‘ruddle’, a preparation of red ochre or a metal object, possibly some item of jewellery (?)” (Ostr. DeM 579, 16 under Ramses III/IV, Janssen 1975, 309–310, §85 & fn. 71) = “matière inconnue” (Pap. DeM I 10:8, 25:7, Černý 1978, 8, n. q) = “un produit” (AL 78.1724 after Černý) = “(als Inhalationsmittel, ganz unbekannt, kein Beweis dafür, daß es ein Harz war)” (Germer 1979, 177) = “un bijou (?)” (AL 79.1212 after Frandsen 1979, 288, 294) = “pissasphalte” (Charpentier 1981, 332, n. 520) = “Rötölstift” (Hannig & Fuchs, LÄ IV 550–1, n. 9) = “résine” (Aufrère 1990, 657) = “*Rötöl, Schmuckstück” (GHWb 338) = “eine pflanzliche Substanz, ein Produkt für die Vorbereitung eines Salbes” (Koura 1999, 171 & fn. 189) = “Mineral oder Harz” (HAM 839 index).

NB: Chassinat, Lüring, and Ebbell (quoted apud Harris 1961, 172, fn. 7) saw in the Ebers exx. Eg. mnnn “bitumen” (q.v.).

- From the same root (?): mnj.t “1. in der Verbindung mnj.t-wd als Material zu kleinen Figuren, 2. bei der Ölbereitung” (XIX–XX., Wb II 76, 9–10) = “a semi-precious stone or resin: a species of resinous material occasionally employed in the manner of precious stones” (XIX–XX., Harris 1961, 172) = “ein Material: *Harzkügelchen, *Perlen” (GHWb 338).

NB1: The comparison or identification of mnj and mnj.t was suggested by J. R. Harris (1961, 171) and B. Koura (1999, 171), which Harris extended also to Eg. mn “ein Produkt aus Syrien von schwarzer Farbe” (XVIII–XIX., Wb, q.v.) = “either a semi-precious stone or even a resin or a form of red ochre” (Harris).

NB2: Alternatively, however, XIX–XX. mnj.t should be affiliated with Eg. mnj.t “necklace” (MK, above).

- Meaning and etymology uncertain.
- 1. B. Koura (1999, 171, fn. 189): lit. “das Bleibende” (sic, which provided the “*magische Wirkung des Namens*”) < Eg. mn “erhalten, bleiben, dauern”. Dubious.
- 2. GT: if the rendering “ruddle” (or sim.) is correct, cp. either of the following AA roots:
 - (1) Sem.: Akk. (j/spB) amānu, cf. t̄ābat amāni “ein rötliches Salz (Amanus-Salz?)” [AHW 40] = “red salt” [CAD] (DRS 23: no Sem. etym.) ||| NAgaw: Qmt. imān-ā “givre rouge” [CR 1912, 164: no Cu. etym.].
 - (2) If Eg. mnj < *mly, cp. SBrb.: Hgr. he-melmel “être rouge et brillant comme un tison: être rouge et étincelant (feu, métal en fusion ou chauffé au rouge, un brasier, objet embrasé, soleil levant ou couchant...)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1197] ||| CCh.: (?) PMasa *mbal [Masa *mb- reg. < *m-] “to rust” [GT]: Zime-Dari mbàl “1. (se) rouiller, 2. teindre, colorer (en rouge)” [Cooper 1984, 17], Lame mbàl “1. se rouiller, 2. teindre, colorer” [Scn. 1982, 309].
 - (3) If Eg. mnj was an assimilation < *bnj, cp. WCh.: Daffo-Butura bòn “Kupfer” [Jng. 1970, 212], which might eventually derive from AA *b-n “dark red (or sim.)” [GT].

NB: Attested in NOm. *būna ~ *bunna “brown” [GT]: Gamu būna [Alm.], Dorze būna-male [Alm.], Dawro-Kullo bunnama [Alm.] | Jnj. (Yemsa): Fofā dial. būnnāmā [Akl.-Sbr. 1993, 19] | Sns. būna-maleç [Alm.] (NOm.: Alm. 1993, 8) ||| WCh.: NBch. *b-n “red” [GT] = *(m)bin- “red” [Skn.]: Wřj. & Kry. mbīna, Miya bīni, Pa’a bihan, Tsagu bunan (noun) (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 36) | Kir bāñān “red”, Balar & Mangas bāñān “red” (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 44, #98) || CCh.: Bcm. biñ-biñ “red” [Crm. 1975, 465].

mnj.tj (det.: man with hoe) “Art Ackersmann” (NK, Wb II 77, 6–7) = “agriculturist or handicraftsman” (Goodwin 1867, 85–86) = “travail-lant aux champs” (Baillet 1907, 6 contra p. 25 with false mngs.) = “cultivator” (Grd. 1911, 6*; DLE I 218) = “Erdhacker” (Vcl. 1953, 373) = “Feldhacker” (Seibert 1967, 116, n. d.) = “ein Ackersmann (auch im Stall tätig)” (GHWb 338).

- Origin debated, but the solution #1 is most likely.
- 1. GT: most probably a nomen actoris (.tj) from a hypothetical *mnj “fendre la terre” (Brugsch) = “piocher” (Baillet) = “die Erde

aufhacken” (Erman) = “to hoe the ground” (Goodwin), which may be identical with Sem.: Ar. myn: māna “2. labourer la terre”, mǎn- “soc de la charrue” [BK II 1175] = myn “furchen, spalten” [GB 420] = myn “to cleave, plough” [Honeyman apud KB 577] = myn “pflügen” [Erman] = mwn (!) “pflügen”, mǎn- “Pflugschar” [Vcl.], Yemeni Ar. mwn I: mǎn (impf. yimūn) “to take care by watering and ploughing (of land)” [Piamenta 1990, 474] ||| WBrb.: Zng. a-man “lame”, a-man ta-zūz “fil, lame, (de la) hache” [Ncl. 1953, 202] ||| SCu.: Ma’a -mǎnye “to prepare soil or ground for planting” [Ehret 1974 MS, 44; 1980, 154, #16] ||| CCh.: Bura mura [r < *n] “a native hoe” [BED 1953, 145].

LIT. for Eg.-Ar.: Erman 1892, 111; Clc. 1936, #199; Vcl. 1953, 373–4; 1958, 376.

NB1: The semantic development coincides with the history of Ar. fallāh- “fellah” < Ar. flh “to split, cultivate field” ~ Hbr. plh qal “to furrow”, piel “to split”, Syr. plh “to dig, cultivate field” (Sem.: GB 642).

NB2: Ar. myn has been affiliated in KB l.c. with Ar. myn “to invent, fabricate”. A var. root occurs in Ar. myl II (vulg.) “préparer la terre, donner un labour préparatoire, une première façon à la terre”, miyāl- “labourer préparatoire, première façon donnée à la terre” [Dozy II 630].

NB3: The similarity with Aram. of TTM mānā? “4. Pflug” is misleading (basic mng. “Gerät” < *√ny).

- Other solutions are unlikely:
- **2.** W. M. Müller (1894, 28, fn. 1) was disposed to relate it either with Ar. maʔn- “bois de la charrue sur lequel on adapte le soc” [BK II 1054] or Hbr. mnʔ (sic, mng. not indicated).
- **3.** C. W. Goodwin (1867, 85–86) combined it with Eg. *mr “hoe” (with a false var. *mn) as well as a number of untenable parallels. Similarly, Seibert (1967, 116, n. d) ruled out a connection to Eg. mnj.t “(Lande)Pflöck” and pondered an eventual derivation from Eg. mrj.t “als Name der Hieroglyphe: die hölzerne Hacke” (LP, Wb II 98, 11) with reservations (as to whether it is “lautgeschichtlich” correct). False, since -n- ≠ -r-.
- **4.** An etymological connection with Eg. mnj “Zwangsarbeiter” (q.v.) assumed by Baillet (1907, 6, §18 with doubts) and R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) is unlikely.

NB1: Eg. mnj might have denoted a quite different type of work (discussed above).
 NB2: Equally unconvincing are the alternative Eg. etymologies offered by Baillet (1907, 6, 21): (1) mnt.w “captifs étrangers, Arabes (!), gens de la montagne ou des sables (?)” or (2) m-mn.t > (S) 𐎎𐎎𐎎𐎎 “quotidie” → mnj.tj lit. “journaliers” or (3) mjn “today” (mistranslated “journée”).
- **5.** N. Skinner (1996, 209) assumed a met. from *nmj identifiable with WCh.: Hausa nóómáá “farming”, nóómà “to till, work (farm)”, nóómè “to till, weed all of” [Abr. 1962, 706], Gwnd. noma [met. of *mona?] “to do farm-work with large hoe”, nõmu “to be cultivated”

[Mts. 1972, 90] ~ AA *l-m [GT] > SBrb.: Hgr. e-llem “creuser (sous une chose pour l’extraire)” [Fcd. 1950–1, 1074] ||| CCh.: BM *lam “to dig” [GT] || ECh.: Mkl. límè “désheber” [Jng. 1990, 133].
Improbable.

NB: Skinner proposed also a number of untenable parallels, e.g. ES: Grg.: Chaha anämä, Ezha annämä “to weed”, which eventually originates from Sem. *ħrm (Lsl. 1979 III, 89).

mnj.t (particles det.) “als Material zu kleinen Figuren” (XIX–XX., Wb II 76, 9) = “a semi-precious stone or resin: a species of resinous material occasionally employed in the manner of precious stones” (Harris 1961, 172) = “ein Material: *Menitperlen, Harzkügelchen” (GHWb 338) = “ein Produkt für die Vorbereitung eines Salbmittels” (Koura 1999, 171 & fn. 189).

NB: Of its three exx. (Pap. Harris I 40b:15: “perhaps a semi-precious stone”; Berlin stela 45: “as the label beside a necklet, although this may be the name of the object rather than its material”; Amon-hymn of Leiden 1:8: “a species of resin”), Harris (l.c.) considers the third one as a distinct word, although resin was used for beads and other small objects (Lucas 1948, 444).

- Etymology debated.
- **1.** J. R. Harris (1961, 171) and B. Koura (1999, 171) affiliated it with Eg. mnj “ruddle (?)” (Grd., discussed above), which Koura ultimately explained from the lit. mng. “das Bleibende” derived from Eg. mn “bleiben”. Dubious.
NB: This comparison was extended by Harris also to NK mn “ein Produkt aus Syrien von schwarzer Farbe” (XVIII–XIX., Wb, q.v.) = “either a semi-precious stone or even a resin or a form of red ochre” (Harris).
- **2.** GT: if, in turn, the mng. “bead” and its identification with MK mnj.t “necklace” is correct, it may derive perhaps from *mnr.t, cf. LECu.: Sam: Boni munyúur “Perle” [Heine 1977, 290] = Boni (Bireeri dial.) munyùur “beads” [Heine 1982, 93] | Yaaku múnyúrí, pl. múnyúr “chain” [Heine 1975, 122].

mnj.t (wood det.) “cornice (?)” (late NK 1x, DLE I 218) = “*Gesims” (GHWb 338).

- Origin obscure. GT: the following alternatives are to be accounted for:
 - (1) Perhaps Eg. mnj.t < *mnr.t ~ NBrb.: Qbl. a-mnar “1. seuil, 2. linteau”, ta-mnar-t “petite marche” [Dlt. 1982, 506]?
 - (2) Or WCh.: Angas (Kabwir dial.) màneer “top” [Jng. 1962 MS]?
 NB: The Angas word means also “pillar” and seems to be a ma- prefigation (for details cf. Eg. mnj.t “mooring-post” above).
 - (3) Or CCh.: Gsg. moŋ “Oberseite” [Lks. 1970, 130]?

mnj3 “Körperteil einer Frau” (MK: Med. Pap. Illahun 3:19, 3:25, Wb II 77, 9) = “shoulder” (Müller 1909, 186) = “(not yet identified)” (Lefébvre 1952, 57, §64) = “scorpion’s pair of claws (the sting in the tail is the only likely alternative)” (CT V 168d–e, 169b, AECT II 44, spell 400, n. 5) = “1. (MK Med.) la main (poignet compris), 2. (CT) aussi les pinces (du scorpion)” (AL 78.1725) = “1. (MK Med.) *Arm (mit Hand), 2. (CT) Schere (des Skorpions)” (GHWb 338) = “unidentified part of the arm” (Walker 1996, 269) = “Pulsstelle” am Unterarm, vielleicht die Stelle des Pulses zwischen Unterarm und Hand” (MK Med., HAM 172, 434, 436) = “claw (?)” (DCT 168).

• Etymology not yet clear.

■ **1.** W. M. Müller (1909, 186) erroneously linked it to Eg. *rmn* “shoulder”, which he explained from **jmn* (!) > Cpt.: (S) Δ MONI “to seize, possess, detain” (CD 8a), treating *r-* as a “false archaism”.

■ **2.** J. H. Walker (1996, 269): “*a formation in m-*” of Eg. *nj3* ~ *nj* “underside of forearm” (Med., Walker) = “Körperteil, in einer Schwangerschaftsuntersuchung parallel zu den Fingern des Arztes genannt” (WMT 446) = “avant-bras dont la main a la paume retournée” (Keimer 1957, 97–99 after Lefébvre 1955, 349: D41). Approved by D. Meeks (p.c., 18 May 2004).

■ **3.** GT: perhaps a nomen instr. from Eg. **nj3* > *nj* “abweisen, zurückweisen (Böses)” (Lit. MK, BD, Wb II 201, 4–6), which, interestingly, appears as *nj3* in the Med. texts (Westendorf 1962, 22, §34.4) and CT VII 369b (Lesko 1972, 145). Semantically, however, not fully evident.

NB1: For the rdg. of Eg. *nj3* “abweisen” cf. also Gunn 1924, 90; Feichtner 1932, 222; Thausing 1941, 12 & fn. 3.

NB2: D. Meeks (p.c., 18 May 2004) considers the verb to be of denom. origin and not *vice versa*: “*plutôt un dérivé de la partie du corps que le contraire. Il s’agit de ’repousser’ (de la main); cf. le geste que décrit le déterminatif*”.

mn^c.t “Amme” (PT, Wb II 78, 1–9) > hence Cpt. (S) μ (O)ONE, (A) μ ANNE, (F) μ ANNI, (B) MONI etc. (f) “Amme” (KHW 95).

NB1: Vocalized **māni^c*.at lit. “suckling woman” > **mān^c*a > **mā^c*na (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 132) = **mān^c*.ṭ (Snk. 1983, 223).

NB2: V. Loret (1889, 126 & fn. 3) explained it from an earlier (rare) *mn^c.t* “sein” (after Maspero), which is, however, not listed in the standard lexicons.

• From the same root: **(1)** *mn^c.t* “Milchkühe” (PT, Wb II 78, 10) = “milch-cow” (FD 108). **(2)** *mn^c* “1. säugen (von einer Göttin), 2. aufziehen (vom Vater)” (XVIII., Wb II 77, 10–11) = “allaier” (PT, Lacau 1913, 35) = “to nurse” (FD 108), denom. verb?

• Etymology highly debatable:

- **1.** E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168) and M. Cohen (1947, #37) identified it with Bed. *amna* “Kindbetterin, Wöchnerin, Amme” [Rn. 1895, 19] = “woman in child-bed” [Rpr. 1928, 149].
NB1: A. B. Dolgopolskij (1973, 65) rejected this Eg-Bed. comparison. He emphasized that the meaning of Bed. *amna* was not “nurse”, but rather “woman in childbed”, act. *woman having given birth not long ago (недавно родившая женщина). Following L. Reinisch (1895, 19), Dolgopolskij equated Bed. *amna* with Agaw *k-b-n → *k-m-n [assim.] “to give birth”, which is phonologically unacceptable (Bed. Ø-/’- ≠ Agaw *k-).
- NB2: M. Cohen (1947, #37) combined the Bed. and Eg. forms with Sem.: Hbr. *ʔomēn* “attendant”, *ʔomenet* “nurse” [KB 64] = *ʔōmen* (sic) “tutor, educator”, fem. “nourrice” [Chn.], cf. NHbr. *ʔōmenet* “governess, preceptress, nurse” [Šapiro 1963], which can be only an alternative etymology for Bed. *amna*. W. F. Albright (BASOR 94, 18, fn. 28), in turn, explained the Hbr. word as a back-formation from *ʔomnīm (pl.) < *ʔummānīm ~ Akk. *ummānu* “Menschenmenge” [AHW 1413].
- **2.** A. Ember (1926, 302, fn. 10; quoted also by F. von Calice 1936, #626) equated Eg. *mn^c* with Ar. *mayīla* “allaiteur un enfant étant enceinte d’un autre” [BK II 1133] = “to suckle” [Alb.] = “to be pregnant” [Clc.]. Unlikely due to both met. and Ar. -l- ≠ Eg. *-n-.
NB: It may be related (via met.) with Hrs. *layām* “to suck from the breast (animals), give food to (livestock), feed” [Jns. 1977, 83], EJbl. *layām* & CJbl. *layām* “(goats) to (let) suck”, *elyām* ~ *elóyūm* “to give (kids) milk, allow to suck” [Jns. 1981, 161], Mhr. *layām* “(animals) to suck from the breast, let (animals) suck” [Jns. 1987, 252].
- **3.** GT: or cp. Ar. *malaʿa* “2. têter sa mère (se dit d’un petit chameau)”, var. *malaqa* “4. têter sa mère (se dit d’un petit)” [BK II 1149–50] ||| LECu.: Saho *mulūʿ*- “saugen, lecken” [Rn. 1890, 265]? Semantically possible, phonologically dubious (cf. Cpt. -N-).
- **4.** GT: Eg. *mn^c.t* “nurse” originally *suckling woman”, derived < *jn^c “to suckle” (“participial” m- prefix), which, according to Belova’s law (EDE I, chapter VIII), Eg. *jn^c could be a reflex of AA *n-y-ʿ “breast” [GT].
NB1: Attested in Sem. *nVʿay-at- ~ *nayaʿ- “breast (of an animal)” [SED]: JArām. of TTM *nāʿā* “Brust” [Dalman 1922, 273] = *nīʿā* ~ *nayāʿā* ~ *nāʿā* “Brust (vom Tiere)” [Levy 1924 III, 389] = *nīʿā* ~ *nayāʿā* “breast of an animal” [Jastrow 1950, 906], Samar. Arām. *nʿy* “breast of an animal”, *nyʿ* “breast” [Tal 2000, 535], JPArām. *nyʿ* “breast of an animal” [Sokoloff 1990, 350], Syr. *nāʿā* “pectus” [Brk. 1928, 434] || MSA: Hrs. *neʿēt* “udder, teat” [Jns. 1977, 93], Mhr. *naīt* “pis” [Lsl. 1938] = *nāʿīt* “dug” [Lsl. 1945] = *noʿīt* “udder” [Jns. 1987, 278], Jbl. *nāʿīt* [Jahn] = (e)nʿēt “Euter” [Bittner 1917, 53] = “dug” [Lsl.] = CJbl. *naʿēt* & EJbl. *nʿēt* “udder” [Jns. 1981, 179], Sqt. *nīʿih* (sic, -h) “pis” [Lsl. 1938] = “dug” [Lsl. 1945] = *nóʿəh* “udder” [Jns.] = *nóʿəʿ* [Jns. MS apud SSL] = *√nʿ* “mamelle (ne s’applique pas aux êtres humains)” [SSL] (MSA: Lsl. 1938, 254; SSL 1992, 99–100; Sem.: Lsl. 1945, 241; SED I 174, #193) ||| Bed. *nāy* [Rn.: < *neʿay] “melken” [Rn. 1895, 187, 179] = *nāi(y)* “to milk” [Rpr. 1928, 226] = *naiy* “to milk” [Hds. 1996, 101] ||| WCh. *nyī “breast” [GT] = *nVy/wV “breast, udder, milk” [Stl.]: Waja *nyii* “breast” [Jng. 1968–9, 183] = *nyii-mā* “milk” [Kwh. 1990, 98] | SBch. *nyī “(female) breast” [GT]: Zangwal & Ju *nyi*: [Smz.], Geji *ni*: [Smz.] = *nī* ~ *nī* [IL], Bolu & Zaranda *ni*: [Smz.], Zul & Tule *nyī:ni*: [Smz.], Buli *nyiin* [Mkr.] = *nyen* [IL/JI], Zem *ni:ni* [Smz.], Wangday *nyin* [Smz., IL], Dwtot *ngin*

[< *nyin] [Smz.], Boot ni:nə [Smz.], Luri nyiin [Caron 2004, 198] (SBCh.: Smz. 1978, 22, #8) | Ngz. ànyì “1. breast, teat, 2. milk” [Schuh 1981, 11] = anji “breast” [Meek] = anyi [IL] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 46) || CCh.: Hurzo & Vame èné “breast, milk” [Rsg. 1978, 217, #91 & 291, #467] | PKtk. *ēni [< *^c-y-n?] “milk” [GT]: Lgn. ééni “milk” [Lks. 1936, 90], Mkr. ?èeni “breast” [Mkr.] = ?èni “milk” [Trn., p.c., 11 June 1997] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 257) || ECh.: Smr. náē “Euter”, nae ~ niī “Milch” [AF apud Lks. 1937, 80] = ñayi (coll.) “lait” [Jng. 1993 MS, 47]. AP: SMande *nʔō “(fem.) breast” [GT]: Boko nyo, Nwa nyon, Mwa nyo (Prost 1953, 148). Cf. also PNil. *ɲawa “udder” [Dimmendaal 1988, 61, #190] > PLOTUKO-Masai *ɲawa [Vossen 1982, 455]. Here may belong LECu. *^cān- “milk” [Black 1974, 219], which may form a special isogloss with the CCh. forms. The underlying AA *^c-y-n ~ *^c-n-y “milk” [GT] may in principle be related (via met.) with AA *n-y-^c “breast” [GT] discussed above. See also Müller 1975, 68, #53 (Sem.-Smr.); Skn. 1996, 209–210 (Bed.-Smr.-WCh.); Stl. 2005, 106, #365 (Ch.-Sem.). O.V. Stolbova (l.c.) falsely added also Ar. nḥy “agiter le lait pour en faire du beurre” [BK II 1218]. W. W. Müller (1975, 68, #53) equated the Sem.-Smr. parallel with Eg. mnd “breast” (OK, below). N. Skinner (1996, 209–210) erroneously combined the Bed.-Ch. parallel with ECU. *nūg- “to suck” [Ss.], Eg.-Sem. *ynk “to suck” [GT], ES: Grg: Endegeny annāwā “to milk” (reflex of Sem. *ḥlb, Lsl. 1979 III, 77), and the reflexes of AA *n-w-n [GT] (discussed below).

NB2: AA *n-y-^c [GT] should be probably distinguished (esp. in the SBCh. gr.) from the reflexes of AA *n-w-n “breast” < *n-w-? ~ *w-n “to suck” [GT], cf. HECu. *anūn-a “breast” [Hds. 1989, 31] vs. HECu. *unūn- “to suck, nurse (intr.)” [GT]: Burji unūn- ~ unun- & Gedeo unun- ~ unu?n- [Hds. 1989, 106] || SCu. *(nu)nu?- “to suck breast” [Ehret]: Irq. nunu?- “to suck breast” [Ehr.] = nuni?- “to suckle (the breast), drink through a straw” [MQK 2002, 79] | Ma’a-nūnu “to suck in air, gasp, pant”, inunú “nipple, teat” [Ehr. 1974 MS, 48] | Dh. no?- “to suck breast” [Eld. 1973 MS, 6, #374; EEN 1989, 40] = no?- “to suck”, no?-odid- “to milk” [Tosco 1991, 144] = nó?-ona “to suck” [MSSL 1993, 52, #408] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 186) || Ch. *n-n “breast” [JS 1981, 53C]: WCh. *nōn- “breast” [GT]: Hausa nóónò “1. sour milk, 2. breast, udder” [Abr. 1962, 706], Gwnd. nóno “1. breast of woman, 2. (esp. fermented) milk” [Mts. 1972, 90] | SBCh. *nōn “breast” [GT]: Boghom noòn [Jng. 1965, 177] = noòn [Smz. 1975, 27] = nuon [IL], Kir & Balaar noòn [Smz.], Mangas nwòn “breast” [Smz.] (SBCh.: Smz. 1978) || ECh.: (?) Sarwa nà:ndì “sein” [Jng. 1990 MS, 13, #235]. See also Mkr. 1987, 109, 257 (WCh.-Hdy.); JI 1994 I 20 (Ch.-HECu.). Note that P. Behrens (1984–5, 188) falsely equated WCh. *nōn- [GT] with LECu. *^cān- “milk” [Black]. H. G. Mukarovsky (l.c.) mistakenly equated the WCh.-Hdy. parallel with CCh. Ktk. *ēni [GT] (cf. above). Equally false is the comparison of Dh. no?- with ECU. *nūg- ~ *lūg- “to suck” [Ss.] by H. C. Fleming (1983, 434). There can be hardly any cognacy between WCh.: Hausa nóónò vs. BT *nVnV “mother” (a distinct AA root) as suggested by N. Pilszczikowa (1958, 79, §19). Ch. Ehret (1995, 322, #625 & p. 508) combined SCu. *nú(nu)- “to suck” with Sem. bicons. *n?- “to suck in” and Eg. n3w “breeze” (false).

- 5. GT: less probably, cp. SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ta-mān-āt, pl. ta-mān-āt-en “lait remonté d’une vache ou d’une chamelle qu’on n’a pas traire pendant plus de 24 heures (peut-être toxique et cause l’anāyn)” [PAM 1998, 219; 2003, 544].

NB1: Cf. also CCh.: Musgu ánem [Krs.-Ovw.] = anum [Barth-Ovw.] “1. milk (Krs.-Ovw.-Barth), 2. breast, udder (Krs.)” [Lks. 1941, 45] = ànim “breast” [Trn. in JI 1994 II, 47]. Musgu from *^c-n-m < *n-m^c (or sim.) [GT] via met.?

NB2: The reconstruction of PKtk. *n-m “1. to milk, 2. dug (СОСОК, ВЫМЯ)” [Prh.] is misleading, the primary meaning not being connected with milk or breast, cf. Lgn. num “1. drehen, flechten, 2. melken” [Lks. 1936, 113], Bdm. num ~ num “1. drehen,

2. melken” [Lks. 1939, 121], Afd. nimm “Strick” [Slk. 1967] = nimm “1. to milk, 2. dug” (!) [Prh., not found in Slk. 1967], Ngala nim ~ nem “Strick” [Duisburg], Glf. lem (Kotoko: Slk. 1967, 319, #573; Prh. 1972, 13, #2.1). Note that H. Tourneux (p.c. on 11 June 1997) recorded Afade ʔéʔwí “breast” and ʔéí “milk”.

- All further proposals are evidently out of question.
- **6.** L. Reinisch (1873, 246) equated Eg. mn^c “säugen” and bn^c.t “female breast” (sic) with Teda tongwa “female breast”. Absurd.
- **7.** W. M. Müller (1907, 303), F. Hommel (1915, 16, fn. 3), W. Westendorf (1962, 20, #31.b.9), and Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 204, #1800) related √mn^c to Eg. mnd “breast” (below) with regard to the rare correspondence of Eg. d vs. Sem. *ʕ. Can be safely excluded.
NB: In light of the AA data, it is certain that Eg. mnd does not reflect an earlier *mn^c. On the other hand, the irreg. (?) correspondence of Eg. d and Sem. *ʕ should not (and cannot) be projected on the inner Eg. evidence (contra Goedicke 1955; Vycichl 1957; Knudson 1962).
- **8.** L. Homburger (1930, 285): Eg. mn^c.t & mn^c ~ Ful (Peul) mar-ude “élever” and at the same time (!) to ina ~ nene “mother”. Absurd.
- **9.** W. Westendorf (1962, 20), with regard to the alleged alternation of Eg. ʕ ~ q, compared Eg. mn^c.t with Hbr. mēneqet “Amme” [GB 438] = “(wet-)nurse” [KB 577], NHbr. mēneqet “Säugeamme” [Dalman 1922, 234]. Unacceptable.
NB: It derives from Sem. *ynk “to suck” ~ Eg. caus. snq [< *s-jnq] “to suckle”.
- **10.** A. M. Lam (1993, 397) equated Eg. mn^c with Ful (Pulaar) muynu- “têter”. Requires to be checked.
- **11.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 204, #1800), in turn, compared Sem. *ml (sic) “to suck” ||| LECu.: Afar muluk- “to be satisfied with milk”. False. Eg. ʕ ≠ ECu. *k.

mn^c “eine Kampfhandlung (durch 2 Männer dargestellt, die Stöcke miteinander kreuzen bzw. die sich bei den Händen fassen, wobei beide Arme einer jeden Person zur Deckung gelangen)” (NK hapax, Sethe 1928, 252, 166, scene 18, l. 56–57) = “Kampf” (Vcl. 1933, 178) = “eine Kampfsportart” (GHWb 338).

NB: Occurs in the Dram. Pap. Ramesseum: hpr-n mn^c hrw pw ʕḥ3-f ḥn^c stḥ “there began a mn^c: Horus fought against Seth” (after Sethe 1928 II, scene 18, line 56). Sethe (l.c.) has not drawn too concrete conclusions from the peculiar det.: “*es ist aber doch wohl nur ein ganz allgemeines Schriftzeichen für Kampf*”.

- From the same root (via met.?): ʕmn.t “Beischrift zu einer Prügelszene” (XVIII., Wb I 187, 1) = “(in den Darstellungen der Kampfspiele zur Feier des Königsjubiläums)” (Sethe 1928, 166, l. 56–57, scene 18 after Brugsch) = “Boxen” (Westendorf 1989, 13) = “(Inf.?) *boxen, *verteidigen (im Boxkampf)” (GHWb 141) as suggested already by K. Sethe (l.c.).

- Obscure word. Etymology uncertain.
- **1.** W. Vycichl (1933, 178, #9) and E. Zyhlarz (1934, 114, fn. 1) identified it with NBrb.: Shilh: Tazerwalt mmay [*< *m-nay*] “to fight” [Feichtner] | Izdeg i-menyi “bataille, combat” [Mrc. 1937, 32, 55] | Qbl. e-mney “kämpfen” [Vcl.] = e-mney “aufeinander loshauen, kämpfen” [Zhl.] = e-mmeny “s’entretuer, se battre” [Dlt. 1982, 567], which derive via *m-* prefix from Brb. **n-γ* “to kill” [GT]. Unacceptable.

NB1: The Brb. prefix *m-* of reciprocity (Feichtner 1932, 218: “*m- der Reziprozität, Sozietät*”) cannot be projected to Eg. mn^c, since there is no convincing evidence for an Eg. prefix *m-* with a reciprocal meaning.

NB2: The Brb.-Eg. etymology is phonologically also problematic, PBrb. **n-γ* being incompatible with Eg. **n^c* (note that Eg. ^o ~ Brb. *Ø*, while Brb. **γ* ~ usually Eg. *h* and *q*), cf. e.g. NBrb.: Izn. & Rif. & Snh. e-ny “tuer, assassiner” [Rns. 1932, 394] etc. (NBrb.: Bst. 1883, 318; 1885, 196; 1887, 406; Mlt. 1991, 204) || EBrb.: Siwa e-ny “to kill” [Lst. 1931, 306] || WBrb.: Zng. e-ny “to kill” [Bst. 1909, 248] || SBrb.: Ghat e-ny “to kill” [Nhl. 1909, 212], Ayr e-ny & EWlm. ä-nyu “1. tuer, 2. mettre à bout de forces, harceler, traquer, 3. punir, battre, rosser” [Alj. 1980, 143].

NB3: The AA etymology of Brb. **n-γ* is highly disputed. **(1)** GT: most probably akin to Ar. naḥa^a “2. égorger un animal en portant le couteau au haut du cou, presque au haut de la colonne vertébrale, 3. (en gén.) tuer, mettre à mort, anéantir” ~ var. naqa^a “7. tuer qqn., 12. égorger un chameau pour ses hôtes, 13. éclater contre qqn. en injuriant” [BK II 1222, 1329] < Sem. **nk^c* “to split” [GT]: Hbr. nq^c qal “sich abtrennen” [GB 521] = “to split” [Lsl.] || Ar. naqa^a “6. déchirer (p.ex. chemize)” [BK II 1329] || MSA: Sqt. **√nq^c*: nāqaḥ “partir (fusil), se décharger, craquer” [Lsl. 1938, 274] || Geez nāq^a “to be split” [Lsl.] etc. (Sem.: Lsl. 1969, 60; 1987, 399), which J. Vergote (1945, 133, #3.c.8) connected with with Eg. nq^c “schneiden” (WMT 485) = “to tingle, prick” (late NK, DLE II 36) = “(das Herz) ausreißen, beißen, prickeln” (WD I 114; II 80). For different etymologies of Eg. nq^c see Alb. 1918, 245; DELC 95; Shore 1990, 165; Stz. 1994, 198. **(2)** Bmh. 1984, 277, #294; 1986, 254; Blz. 1990, 265; Mlt. 1991, 153, fn. 5: ~ Sem. **nky* “to wound, hurt” [GT] || Eg. nkn “to injure, hurt” (PT, Wb II 346, 8), which cannot be accepted for phonological reasons (Brb. **γ* ≠ AA **k*). **(3)** Wlf. 1955, 121, §1: ~ Eg. ng³ “töten” (PT, Wb II 348, 16–17). Unacceptable, the underlying root being < **ngr* or **ngl*.
- **2.** W. Westendorf (1989, 13) assumed an etymological connection between Eg. ^omn.t and ^own.t “Art Stock, Art Keule (mit Metallbeschlag am Ende als Waffe)” (MK, NK, Wb I 73, 4–5). Uncertain, esp. since ^omn.t is not attested with the sense “stick”.
- **3.** GT: perhaps related to AA **m-n-^c* “1. to hold, 3. ward off, hold back” [GT]?

NB: Attested in Sem.: Hbr. mn^c qal “zurückhalten, hemmen” [GB], NHbr. & JA mn^c “zurückhalten” [GB], NAram. of Baḥ^a mn^c “1. Einhalt gebieten, 2. jmdn. ab-, zurückhalten von” [Correll 1969, 168–9] | OSA: Sab. mn^c “zurückhalten” [GB] = “to prevent, ward off, prohibit (?)”, t-mn^c “to fight off (enemy)” [SD 86], Ar. mana^a VIII “se sauvegarder, se mettre en lieu sûr”, manī^c ~ mannā^c “qui repousse les attaques” [Fagnan 1923, 166] || MSA: Mhr. mūna “ab-, zurückhalten, hindern” [Jahn in Jns. 1987, 267] (Sem.: GB 438) || WCh.: AS **maḡ* “to stop raining (or sim.)” [GT 2004, 241]: Angas maḡ “to stop (raining)” [ALC 1978, 36], perhaps

Msr. lukun-mang “harmattan period (signifying the disappearance of rain fall)” (lukun “dry season”) [Dkl. 1997 MS], Goemai mang “to stop” [Srl. 1937, 135]?

- **4. GT:** with regard to the sense of Eg. ^cmn.t, the etymology of the Eg. root might be NBrb.: Qbl. l-b·unya “poing”, a-b·unyw, pl. i-b·unyw-en “1. boxeur, 2. bagarreur, 3. fort” [Dlt. 1982, 30].

NB1: In this case we should suppose Eg. mn^c ~ *^cmn < *bn^c ~ *^cbn = Qbl. b-n-y < *b-n-^c.

NB2: The Qabyle root occurs in Maghrebi Arabic too (Qbl. l-b·unya contains the Ar. def. article), but it is difficult to suppose an Arabic origin, since the Maghrebi Ar. root has no Sem. background (cf. DRŠ 71). On the other hand, K. Naït-Zerrad (DRB I 80–81) does not discuss the etymology of the Qbl. root either. The connection to Fr. poing seems also to be excluded. The origin of this Qbl. root is obscure.

- **mn^c.t (GW)** “Besitzung” (XIX. hapax: Doomed Prince 8:7, Wb II 79, 2; Helck 1971, 513, #88; GHWb 338) = “property, possession, estate” (DLE I 219) = “property, estate” (Hoch 1994, 127).

NB: GW: ma-n-^cá-tá (Helck) = ma-n-^ca-ta [*ma^canta/*man^cata?] (Hoch).

- Origin debated.

- **1. J. C. Hoch (1994, 127, §163)** *a priori* assumed it to be a loanword from Sem. and suggested three alternative etymologies: **(1)** Sem. *^cwn “to dwell” > BHbr. məʿonā “dwelling place”, MHbr. māʿōn “residence”, Phn. m^cwn “temple”; **(2)** Sem. *mn^c “to hold back” > Ar. manā^c-at “to be strongly fortified, impregnable”; **(3)** “less likely” Sem. *nwh “to rest” > BHbr. mənūhā “resting place”, neither of which is convincing (either semantically, geographically or phonologically).

NB: The assumption of the Sem. origin was uncritically adopted by J. Osing (2001, 572: “*deutlich wie ein nicht-äg. Wort geschrieben*”) and J. F. Quack (2002, 173), who, however, did not detail which one of the three false etymologies they prefer. Disproved by G. Takács (2005, 67–68, #5.3).

- **2. G. Takács (EDE I 96–97; 2005, 67–68, #5.3 & fn. 202):** in spite of its GW, perhaps it represents a native word, which goes back to AA *m-n-^c “1. to (take) hold (of), 2. possess (or sim.)” [GT]?

NB1: Cf. Sem.: MSA *mn^c “to take hold of” [GT]: Hrs. mōna “to take, catch, hold” [Jns.], Jbl. mená^c “packen, bewahren, abwehren” [Bittner 1917, 52] = mīna^c “to (take) hold (of)” [Jns.], Mhr. mūna “to catch, get, take” [Jns.] (MSA: Jns. 1977, 89; 1981, 172; 1987, 267) ||| WCh.: AS *maṇ “1. to pick up, take, 2. carry” [GT 2004, 241] = *maṇ “to take (one)” [Dlg.]: cf. esp. Gerka mang “to lift, take” [Ftp. 1911, 218, 220], Angas mang “to take up, carry, lift” [Flk. 1915, 242] = māṇ (hill) “aufheben, tragen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 25] = maṇ “to take” [Hfm.] = (Pang, Garam, hill) mang “to take, pick up” [Gcl. 1994, 35, 72], Sura māṇ “1. aufnehmen, übernehmen, 2. in Besitz nehmen, 3. haben, 4. tragen” [Jng. 1963, 73], Mpn. māṇ “to pick up, carry” [Frj. 1991, 35], Kfy. máng (sg.), kok (repeated action) “to take, grasp, lift, choose” [Ntg. 1967, 26] = maṇ “to take” [Hfm.], Msr. mang “1. to take, carry, lift, 2. select, choose, take out, pick, extract” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 179, 390] = màṅ “taking, to take” [Jng. 1999 MS, 11], Mnt. mung (so, -u-, error for *-ə-?) “to lift, take” [Ftp. 1911, 218, 220] = māṇ “1. tragen, 2. aufheben” [Jng. 1965, 178, 180],

Gmy. mang “to take” [Ftp. 1911, 218, 220] = màŋ “nehmen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 8] = maŋ “to take, carry, lift up” (AS: Hfm. 1975, 18, #42; Stl. 1972, 186; 1977, 155, #128) || ECh.: (?) Toram min- [irreg. -n- < *-n^o-?] “possessor, owner” [Alio-Jng. 1988, 15]. See also HSED #1725 (MSA-AS).

NB2: For the semantic development in Egyptian, cf. e.g. IE *g^hab^h- “fassen, nehmen”: Lat. habeo “I possess”, Gothic gobei “Reichtum” (IEW 408).

NB3: Angas-Sura *-ŋ is a regular reflex of an earlier *-nH (i.e., *-n^o in our case). The -n and the root vowel of the Toram word are not clear.

mnw.t, vars.: **mnj.t** ~ **mnw** ~ **mn.t** “Taube” (OK, Wb II 79, 3–4) = “pigeon” (AEO II 257*; FD 108) = “pigeon du type *Streptopelia turtur* *Isabellina* (fréquent dans le Fayoum et à Giza au moment de la preproduction, plus rare en Haut Égypte)” (since V., PK 1976, 248 & fn. 2) = “Taube, Turteltaube (*Streptopelia turtur* *Isabellina*)” (GHWb 338).

NB: For its distinction from (and occasional confusion with) Eg. mn.t “swallow” cf. AEO II 257*, nr. C3, l. 3.

● Origin uncertain:

- 1. J. H. Greenberg (1963, 55; 1965, 90, #5), followed by V. M. Illič-Svityč (1966, 19, #1.31) and M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998, 122, #5) affiliated it with AA *(m)b-l “dove” [GT]. Possible provided it is a dissimilation via < *bnwt ~ *blwt.

NB1: Attested in Sem.: ES (< ECu.?): Amh. bullal ~ bulal, Gft. bulal “pigeon”, Grg.: Msq. & Ggt. & Soddo & Whn. bullal, Muher bulle “pigeon” (ES: Lsl. 1945, 148; 1979 III, 141) || Bed. belbel “wilde Taube” [Rn. 1895, 47] || LECu.: Orm. bulul-a “dove” [Rn. 1895, 47, not in Gragg 1982, 457–458] | HECu.: Sid. lemböl-a “dove” [Hds. 1989, 383] || PCh. *b-l ~ *mb-l “dove” [GT] = *Nb-l- [Skn.]: Hausa bolo ~ EHs. bóólóó [Skn., not in Abr. 1962] | AS *bu,l → *vu,l “pigeon, dove” [GT] = *mbu,l [Stl. 1977] = *bəl “dove, pigeon” [Dlg.] = *mbul [Stl. 1987]: Angas bül “the dove” [Flk. 1915, 151] = buul “dove” [Grb.] = mbul “Taube” [Jng. 1962 MS, 24] = bul “dove, pigeon” [Hfm.] = [m^bU] “dove” [Brq. 1971, 41] = mbul ~ mbul-kum “pigeon” [ALC 1978, 38] = mbul “dove” [Krf.], Sura ŋbuul “dove” [Grb.] = mbul “Taube” [Jng. 1963, 74] = mbul “Taube” [Jng. 1963, 74] = mbul “dove, pigeon” [Hfm.] = mbul “dove” [Krf.], Mpn. mbúl ~ nà-mbúl “dove” [Frj. 1991, 37, 41], Kfy. vul [irreg. v-?] “dove” [Ntg. 1967, 41] = bel ~ vul “dove, pigeon” [Hfm.] = bel “dove” [Hfm., not found in Ntg. 1967], NKfy. vul “dove” [Hfm.], Chip búl “dove” [Grb.] = bul “dove” [Krf.], Msr. nbul “bird sp.: pigeon of the wild type”, mbuul tul “pigeon” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 172], Gmy. bel “dove” [Ftp. 1911, 216] = bel “dove, pigeon” [Srl. 1937, 13] = bel “dove, pigeon” [Srl. 1937, 13] = bəl “dove” [Grb.] = bel “Taube” [Jng. 1962 MS, 1] = bel “dove, pigeon” [Hfm.] = bel “dove” [Krf.] = bel “dove” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 1] (AS: Grb. 1958, 301; Hfm. 1975, 17, #16; Stl. 1972, 184; 1977, 155, #130; 1987, 156, #104) | Bole bole [Krf.] = mböle [IS] = mbölè [Grb.] = mbólé [Schuh 1984] = moley [Schuh 1982, 19] = mbolo [Stl.], Tng. mbole ~ lambole “turtle-dove” [Jng. 1991, 75] = lambul [Stl.], Pero málbì [Frj. 1985, 41], Krkr. beławi [Krf.] = beławí [Schuh], Ngamo əmɔlei “dove” [Alio 1988 MS] (BT: Schuh 1984, 208) | Jmb. milwa [Skn. 1977, 18] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 156) || CCh.: Tera mböla [NM] = mbólá [Nwm. 1964, 42, #252] = mbólè ~ mbólá [SISAJa], Pidlimdi mbòledi [Krf.] | (?) BM *mbuš [Skn.]: Margi (h)ambiša [Krf.], WMargi əmša ~ əmša [Krf.], Wamdiu būša [Krf.], Hildi mbušā [Krf.], Kilba mbišā [Krf.] | Bdm. ŋgígī bōla “turtle-dove” [Lks. 1939, 122] | Mada óblò “pigeon sauvage sp.” [Brit.-Brunet 2000, 68] | Masa maale [Lks.

1937, 99] || ECh.: Gabri belu [Lks. 1937, 88] | Kwang búlàogó [CWC in Mkr.] = balóki [OS] | Bdy. bályà “tourterelle” [AJ 1989, 56] (Ch.: Grb. 1963, 55; NM 1966, 234, #22; IS 1966, 17; Kraft 1981, #201). Areal parallel: IE *b^hol- “dove” (Iranian-Baltic) [Blz.].

nb2: The equation of Ch. *mbul-/AA *b-l “dove” with Eg. mnw.t (Grb. 1958, 301; 1963, 55; IS 1966, 17) seems to go with the phonological difficulties accompanying Eg. mnj.t “root” (above), whereby the only reasonable explanation is an assim. of PEg. *blw.t > *bnw.t > OK mnw.t. Eg. m- vs. AA *b- are otherwise irregular. J. H. Greenberg’s PAA *mb- is provable only for Chadic. It is difficult to suppose that Eg. mnw.t together with WCh.: Bole molely [Schuh], Pero málbì < *malwi [Frj.], Ngamo mǎlei [Alio] | Jmb. milwa [Skn.] || CCh.: Masa mále [Lks.] represent a distinct isogloss, AA *m-l-w “dove” (or sim.) [GT], although it should not be ruled out either.

nb3: There are apparently no Sem. cognates (ES being presumably borrowed < ECu.). W. Leslau (1944, 55) combined the Eth.-Sem. word for “dove” with Akk. bulili ~ bulilu “kind of bird”, which von Soden (AHW 137), following Muss-Arnoldt, linked to Ar. bulu^llu^l- “langhalsiger Wasservogel” [AHW].

nb4: AA *b-l has apparently no reflexes in Berber either. For the problem of Brb. *ta-mVIIv “turtle-dove” [GT] see below.

nb5: G. Takács (1999, 81; 1999, 366) sought the true Eg. reflex of AA *b-l in OK ^lb3 ~ ^lb “a pigeon or dove” (AECT l.c. after Edel 1961, 227, 229, 246) = “Turteltaube (Streptopelia turtur)” (V. GHWb 135 after Edel) = “ein Vogel” (ÁWb I 264), which could, in principle, derive from *^lbl (prefix ^l-?). The reading of -3 in this word is dubious. R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 229, spell 657, n. 3; III 87, spell 953, n.1) connected OK ^lb3 with CT ^lbw “name of a bird” (CT VI 278k, VII 168h) = “a bird” (DCT 69), for which D. Meeks (AL 78.0686) quoted GR ^lbb (Edfu VI 77:10; Drioton 1948, 43).

nb6: The Russian scholars (SISAJa I, 98, #119; HCVA 2, #134) related the reflexes of AA *b-l “dove” to Eg. *b3 “(jabiru) stork (?)” (above). Semantically unacceptable. Lrr.: Grb. 1963, 55; 1965, 90, #5 (WCh.-Eg.-Orm.-NBrb.); IS 1966, 17, 19, #1.31 (WCh.-Eg.-Qbl.); SISAJa I, 98, #119 (Sem.-WCh.-Tera); Mlt. 1987, 102 (IE-Bed.-Orm.-ES-WCh.); Mkr. 1987, 146 (Sem.-WCh.-CCh.-Kwang); HCVA 2, #134 (Sem.-WCh.-Tera-ECh.-Orm.); HSED #330 (Ch.-Orm.-Sem.); Skn. 1995, 33 (Jmb.-Bura-Margi-Eg.); 1996, 18 (Ch.-Sem.-Bed.-Sid.); BG 1998, 122, #5 (Eg.-NBrb.-Bed.-WCh.); Blz. 2000 MS, 11–12, #61 (Sem.-Bed.-Orm.-NBrb.-WCh.-IE). This Eg.-AA comparison was queried by G. Takács (1999, 80; 1999, 366) and V. Blažek (2000 MS, 12, #61).

- Further etymological suggestions are unacceptable:
- 2. Others (Rn. 1879, 116; Zhl. 1934–35, 172; Bhr. 1981, 28; Skn. 1995, 33) affiliated it with Nub.: Kunuzi & Dongola & Mahasi míne ~ mínne “dove” [Rn.] = minnē [Zhl.]. But it seems more likely that Eg. mnw.t passed into Nubian as a borrowing. nb: W. Vycichl (1991, 119) too assumed in it a word coming from the “E.g. African substratum”.
- 3. L. Homburger (1930, 285) affiliated Eg. mnw.t with Ful (Peul) mara-ndu “pigeon domestique”.
- 4. J. H. Greenberg (1963, 55; 1965, 90, #5), followed by V. M. Illič-Svityč (1966, 19, #1.31), M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998, 122, #5), and V. Blažek (2000 MS, 12, #61), connected Eg. mnw.t and/or WCh. *mb-l (above) with the reflexes of Brb. *ta-mVIIv “turtle-dove” [GT]. Improbable. Brb. *m- can by no means be derived from AA *b-.

nB1: Attested in NBrb.: Shilh ta-milla [Bynon] | Mzg. ti-milla “tourterelle, colombe” [Taifi 1991, 417], Izdeg ti-milla, pl. ti-milla-t-in ~ ti-mall-w-in “tourterelle” [Mrc. 1937, 252], Ndhir ta-malla [Taifi] | Shenwa t-mälla [Vcl.] = malla [Bynon], Izn. t-mälla [Grb.], Wargla t-malla “tourterelle sédentaire non migratrice” [Dlh. 1987, 188] | Qbl. ta-milla [Dlt. 1982, 498] = ta-mella ~ ta-melli [Bynon], Zwawa ta-milla “colombe” [Bst. 1890, 318] = ti-milla [Vcl.] | Nfs. t-malla [Lst.] etc. || EBrb.: Gdm. ta-mälla [Lst.], Siwa t-mälla [Lst.] (EBrb.: Lst. 1931, 304) || WBrb.: Zng. t-melli-t “colombe” [Bst. 1890, 318] = taâ-melli-t “colombe” [Bst. 1909, 245] = ta-ʔmällaʔ-d [Bynon] (Brb.: Bst. 1885, 196; 1887, 428; Vcl. 1955, 322; Bynon 1984, 253, #10).

nB2: The Berber term seems to be a late innovation. As proposed by most Berberologists, it might derive from Brb. *m-l-l “(to be) white”. Rejecting this common view (going back to the works by R. Basset, J. Bynon (1984, 253, #10), in turn, regarded this term onomatopoeic. He argued that “*wild doves and pigeons were never called ‘white’ but were on the contrary invariably referred to as ‘dark, grey’...*”.

- 5. V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 181; Orel 1993, 40; HSED #1793), followed by V. Blažek (2000 MS, 12, #61), equated it with WCh.: Kry. múúnú “bird” [Skn. in JI 1994 II 22] and ECh.: Bdy. miniiniyo “poule des rochers” [AJ 1989, 99], which is clearly untenable for semantic reasons.

mnw (or **mn.w**) “Min (er verkörpert Fruchtbarkeit, ithyphallisch, mit erhobenem rechten Arm, seine linke Hand umfaßt rundplastisch erkennbar den Phallus, im Flachbild linker Arm ‘verdeckt’)” (OK, Wb II 72, 11; Gundlach in LÄ IV 136–7).

nB1: Full wtg. in PT 424 (T). Vocalized *mīn(ēw) (Zunke 1923/1997, 61) = *mīn.ēw (Lacau 1972, 72, §51) > Gk. Miv.

nB2: H. Goedicke (2002, 247–255) considers Min’s representation as a depiction of circumcision, whereby the Min-symbol was originally the instrument of circumcision (contra Gardiner, EG 1927, 490, R22: “two fossil belemnites?”; Wainwright, JEA 17, 1931, 185f.: “Donnerkeil”, rejected by R. Gundlach, LÄ IV 136: “doppelte Pfeilspitzen”). In his view, “*this practice was originally particular to people serving as fighters and might have been of foreign origin*”, hence “*Min displays specifics typical for professional fighters among which circumcised phallos was of particular significance*”.

- Origin uncertain.

- 1. If Min symbolized primarily *“(lust, sexual desire)”, cp. AA *m-n “to desire, like” [GT].

nB1: Attested in Sem. *mny “to have sexual desire” [SED]: Oakk. manājum “to love”, menjum “love” [Gelb 1973, 179] = Akk. menû ~ manû “lieben”, minûtu “Liebesverlangen” [AHW 645, 657] = menû ~ manû “to have (enjoy) sexual intercourse with a woman” [Alb.] || Ar. mny V “désirer, vouloir, souhaiter” [BK II 1158] || Geez mny: ta-mannaya, tä-männäyā “to desire, wish, be eager for” [Lsl.], Tigre tamanna “to wish” [LH 129], Tna. tämännäyā “desiderare, volere, ardentemente” [Bassano], Grg.: Enm. & Gyeto tä-mēñä etc. “to wish” [Lsl.] etc. (ES: Lsl. 1960, 214; 1969, 20; 1979 III, 414; 1982, 52) || MSA *mny: Hrs. emtōni “to wish” [Jns. 1977, 89], Jbl. mūtni “to wish, want” [Jns. 1981, 172], Mhr. mátni “to wish” [Jns. 1987, 268] (Sem.: Alb. 1918, 231; Lsl. 1987, 352–353; SED I 302, #41) || NBrb.: Qbl. menni “to wish, desire” [Dlt. 1982, 503; < Ar.] || Bed. menī-m (refl.) “sich wünschen, ein Verlangen tragen” [Rn. 1895, 170] = minni (m) “wish, desire”, minnī-m “to wish” [Rpr. 1928, 217] || LECu.: Saho mūn “Liebesdienst,

Gefälligkeit, Gunst, Gnade” [Rn. 1890, 296] || WCh.: Ron *mun- “to like” [GT]: Fyer munî “lieben”, mwân “Freund” [Jng.] = muni, pl. mwin “desire, love” [Blench 2000 MS, 1, #a033 & 3, #f042], Sha mun “1. lieben, 2. zustimmen, akzeptieren, 3. helfen” [Jng.], Daffô mwí(n) “Freund” [Jng.] (Ron: Jng. 1968, 10; 1970, 88, 219, 287, 392) | Pero ménô “to like” [Frj. 1985, 41] || CCh.: Bata mô [-ô < *-on] “vouloir” [Mch.] | Masa míñ-nā “aimer” [Jng. 1973 MS] = min “vouloir” [Mch.] = min “1. (tr.) désirer, vouloir, 2. (en particulier) désirer sexuellement, aimer” [Ctc. 1983, 106] = mín “vouloir, aimer, désirer” [Ajl.], Lame mún “le/la plus aimé(e), préféré(e) (femme ou enfant)” [Scn. 1982, 317], Gizey & Ham & Musey & Lew & Marba mín “vouloir, aimer, désirer” [Ajl. 2001, 20, 58] (CCh.: Mch. 1950, 56) || ECh.: Bdy. moonòw “préférer” [AJ 1989, 100].

NB2: MM 1983, 244, §23 assumed an etymological connection between Sem. *mny and *mʔn “to reject” on the basis of semantic opposition. Improbable.

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Alb. 1918, 90; 1918, 231; Ember 1917, 21; Clc. 1936, #200; IS 1976, #292; Bmh. 1986, 248; 1990, 407. For Sem.-Masa vs. Sem.-WCh.-Lame: HSED 384, #1772 vs. 389, #1796, resp.

AP: Kuliak: Ik mîn-es “to love” ~ ENil.: Teso a-min “to love” ~ Surma: Majang men “friend” (Flm. 1983, 453).

- 2. GT: if Eg. mnw as the masculine deity of fertility (depicted usually with phallus in erection) was originally a personification of sexual activity, performance (or sim.), then we may compare it with Sem. *mny: Ar. mny I “5. laisser couler le sperme (dans la copulation ou autrement)”, minā ~ mina “sperme, liqueur de la femelle qui se mêle au sperme et contribue à la génération”, maniyy- “sperme (du mâle), liqueur utérine de la femelle” [BK II 1158–9] = mny I “verser, répandre”, X “provoquer l’éjaculation, se masturber” [Fagnan 1923, 166], MLAr. mny X “to masturbate, perform onanism”, ʕimnā?- “ejaculation”, manīy- ~ mina [$<$ *minay-un] “sperm, seed” [Baranov 1976, 770] || Sqt.: dial. of Qalansiya village ($<$ Ar.?) ṽmny: méni “sperme, sécrétion vaginale” [SSL 1992, 89] || perhaps Grg. *mny “to have sexual intercourse” [GT]: Enm. & Gyeto tā-mēñā etc. “be covered (cattle), be coupled, conceive (cattle)” [Lsl. 1979, 414] || CCh.: Mafa man- “to multiply, have numerous descendants” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 226] || ECh.: Lele mán “to cohabit, faire l’amour (cuer, foquer)” [Simons 1981, 29, #501].

AP: PNil. *(t-)maṣ “to have sexual intercourse”: Turkana maṣ “to have sexual intercourse”, Kipsikiis imeṣ “to unsheathe penis” (Dimmendaal 1988, 45, #94).

NB: A. R. Bomhard (1986, 248) and L. Kogan (SED l.c.) suggest that Ar. mny I “to ejaculate” vs. mny V “to desire” are etymologically related. The latter author traced back Sem. *mny “to desire, wish, want” via “to have sexual desire” to a primary sense “to discharge sperm, exude vaginal secretion” purely on the basis of the Ar. mng. This semantic connection (or contamination?) is especially apparent in Gurage *mny where both senses (“to wish” vs. “to have sexual intercourse”) are attested (Lsl. 1979 III, 414). The semantic connection of “to wish” ~ “to copulate” is indeed plausible, cf. e.g. Sem. *ptw “to desire, love”: Ug pty “to tup” [Gordon 1955, 314, #1602] = “to copulate” [Ullendorff] = “to weaken” [WUS #2289], Hbr. pty piel “to seduce” [GB 666] || Geez fatawa, fatwa, fātawā “to desire, wish, love, covet, lust for” (Sem.: Ullendorff 1956, 193; Lsl. 1987, 171).

- **3.** GT: if Min was a personification of the male organ, cp. NAgaw: Bilin mām [assim. < *mān?] “penis, pudendum viri” [Rn. 1887, 270] || LECu.: Baiso man-to “penis” [Flm. 1964, 53; Hyw. 1979, 128] vs. Baiso fem. man-tīti “vagina” [Ss.].
NB: H.-J. Sasse (1982, 149) combined Baiso man- with HECu.: Burji mīnn-ā “vagina”. Cf. also CCh.: Musgu muḡ “testicles” [Lks. 1941, 69?]
- **4.** V. M. Illič-Svityč (1976, #292): if mnw signified originally **“male”* or the like, cp. AA *man- “man, male” [GT].
NB1: Attested in WBrb.: Zng min ~ man “homme” [Msq. 1879, 515] = man ~ u-man (pl.) “hommes” [Bst. 1890, 318] = min, pl. ei-manen ~ manen “homme, pl. gens” [Bst. 1909, 245] = (i-)mān, pl. mān-en “Leute” [Zhl. 1942–43, 101] = mīn, pl. mān ~ man ~ ei-mān-ən “homme, individu” [Ncl. 1953, 114, 205] || LECu.: Som.-Hawiya mun “maschio (di animali)” [Crl.] | cf. Orm. man-gudd-ō “anziano, notabile”, act. **“big man”?* (gudd-ō “grande”) [Crl.] | HECu. *mann-a “man, person” [Hds. 1989, 96, 112, 418] = *mann-a “man” [GT after Lsl. 1988, 195] vs. Burji mēn-a “people” [Zbr. 1985, 90] || NOM.: (?) Wlt. min-ō “warrior (guerriero)” [Crl.] (act. **“young man”?*) | Jnj. (Yemsa) mon-ō “gente” [Crl.] (NOM.-ECu.: Crl. 1929, 33; 1938 II, 214; 1938 III, 80, 172, 205; Dlg. 1973, 180; Lmb. 1987, 540, #48.b) || Ch. *m-n “1. person, man (homo), 2. male, husband” [JS 1981, 147A₃, 202A₂]: WCh. *mani “человек, мужчина” [Std. 1987, 232, #801] = *man- “1. man, 2. husband” [GT]: Gerka man ~ maan “husband” [Blz. < ?] | Kkrk. (pl.) mún “Menschen, Leute” [Lks. 1966, 203], (?) Kirfi mīni [unless < *mii-] “person” [Schuh], Grm. mùni määná “person” [Schuh], Dera minya pl. “people” (BT: Schuh 1978, 150) | SBch. *m^wan- “man, male” [GT]: Bgm. mään “Ehemann” [Jng. 1965, 177], Geji mááni [Csp.] = má-ni [IL] = ma:ni [Smz.], Zaranda mwáni [Smz.], Zul móoni [Csp.] = mooni “man” vs. mun- “person” [Smz.], Zeem & Barang moni [Smz.], Langas maní [Smz.], Buli manne [Gowers] = maní [Smz.] = mánò [IL] = mánò [Csp.], Tule ma-nè [Smz.], Chari mwan [Smz.], Dokshi -mān [Smz.], Dikshi -man [Smz.], Bandas min “person” [Smz.], Wangday mánè [IL] = máni “man” vs. min “person” [Smz.], Zaar (Saya) māmwan [IL] = ḡa mán [Smz.] = g^t-ma:n “husband” [Smz./JI] = mumwán “man, male” [Csp.], Dwot (Zodi) maní [Smz.] = máni “man, male”, mín “person” [Csp.] = mán(i) “male” vs. min “human beings” [Caron 2002, 208, 210], Polchi maní [Smz.] = máni [Csp.], Barawa maní [Smz.], Grnt. mandau “man” [Gowers] = mandàw [Smz.], Guus & Sigidi maan “man, male” [Caron 2001, 27] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 26, #26 & 29, #39; Csp. 1999, §1 & §3; WCh.: Std. 1987, 232–233) || CCh.: Bata mano “Mann” [Barth 1852, 413], Nzangi minde “person” [Meek] = mōndē bari [Mch.] | Lgn. meeni “man” [Lks. 1936, 108] = méni [Mch.] = mééni [Mkr.] | Zime-Dari mānyii “person” [Str.] || ECh.: Sarwa ḡun [ḡ- < *m-?] “person” [Jng. 1977, 14, #349; 1990, 11, #194: < Ch. *g-nl] | Ma(h)wa min “Person” [Jng. 1978, 37] | Ubi mūn- “mari” [Alio 2004, 273, #227] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 200, 230–1, 266–7).
NB2: AA *m-n “man” is probably to be separated (contra Blz. 1999, 61, #23) from NBrb.: Mzab i-m-an “âme, esprit, soi” [Dlh. 1984, 114], Izn. i-m-än “1. âme, 2. vie, 3. personne” [Rns. 1932, 390] | Qbl. i-m-an “la personne elle-même (moi-même, toi-même)” [Dlt. 1982, 503] | Nefusa i-m-an “âme” [Lst.] || EBrb.: Gdm. i-m-an “personne” [Lanfrý 1973, 212, #1007], Siwa i-m-an “âme” [Lst. 1931, 194] || SBrb.: Hgr. i-m-än “1. âme(s), 2. p.ext. personne (individualité)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1138], EWlm.-Ayr i-m-an “1. âme(s), 2. esprit, prince de vie, 3. personne” [PAM 1998, 207] (Brb.: Bst. 1890, 318; Brn. 1917, 93). The interpretation of the Berber forms is controversial: several authors (Ch. de Foucauld, J. Delheure, K.-G. Prasse) see in them the pl. tantum of *√m (GT: cf. AA *m-y “person”), while others (R. Basset, A. Renisio, F. Nicolas, J. Lanfrý, J. M. Dallet) maintain a bicons. Brb. *√m-n.

nb3: JI (1994 I, 115, 135) took the Ch. forms from Ch. *m-t-m with compensatoric length at the loss of R,, which hardly agrees with the AA data above. Interestingly, JS (1981, 147A₃, 202, A₂) and R. M. Voigt (1998, 612) assume a connection between Ch. *m-t-(m/N) vs. *m-z ~ *m-r-(n) vs. *m-m “man” and the reflexes of *m-n “man” [GT], all derived from a monoradical *m-.

nb4: N. Skinner (1977, 33) suggested a number of impossible reflexes of AA *m-n “person”, such as, e.g., Eg. mw.t “mother”, mn “such and such a man”, Sem. *mannu (sic) “who?”, Ar. mar? “human being”, Ch. *m-t “woman”. False.

LT.: CrI. 1938 II, 214; 1938 III, 80, 172, 205 (ECu.-NOM.); DjK. 1965, 50 (HECu.-PCh.); Dlg. 1973, 180 (ECu.-NOM.); IS 1976, #292 (Eg.-Zng.-NOM.-WCh.-CCh.); Lmb. 1987, 540, #48.b (ECu.-NOM.); Mkr. 1987, 5, 254–255 (ECu.-WCh.-Lgn.-Mubi); Blz. 1990, 208–209 (Brb.-Brj.-PWCh.); 1990, 262 (ECu.-Zng.-Jnj.-Gerka.-Lgn.); 1992, 139–140 (ECu.-NOM.-Ch.); 1999, 61, #23 (ECu.-Wlt.-Zng.-WCh.-Lgn.); 2002, 105, §1.5 (Zng.-Ch.-ECu.); HSED #1722 (Zng.-Ch.-ECu.-Jnj.).

- Other solutions are less credible or false:
- 5. G. Ebers (1868, 71–72) spoke of a Phn. origin (!) and considered the name to signify “*mit Bezug auf den Phallus... der Aufgerichtete*”. Baseless.
- 6. A. Roccati (1970, 35, n. b): Eg. mnj.w (or mjn.w) “pastore” (with god-det.) “...è certamente in relazione con Min”. This derivation was supported by H. Goedicke (1999). Rather unlikely.
NB: Alternatively, Roccati (1970, 34, n. e) quoted a pun on Min in CT VII 168c: jr mnmn=j mnmn=j m mnw “*se mi scuoto, mi scuoto come Min*”. Goedicke (l.c.) sees e.g. in the epithet of Horus “Hirte der Herde seines Vaters” a justification of this theory.
- 7. H. Goedicke (1999, 96) suggested alternatively (as a “*recht spekulative anmutende Erklärung*”) a derivation from Eg. mn “bleiben” (i.e., a primary sense *mn.w “Bleibender”). He found both this derivation and the former etymology (mnj.w that eventually also he preferred) as “*potentiell ansprechend, wenngleich eine Entscheidung noch umfassender Forschung bedarf*”.

mnw “Denkmal” (OK, Wb II 69–71; GHWb 335) = “monument” (FD 108) = “Stiftung” (1st IMP, Gdk., KDAR 217, n. 11) = “fondation” (Meeks 1979, 230, n. 2 with lit.: ASAE 26, 132, n. 2; JNES 22, 189, n. 12, etc.) = “fondation, dedication, donation (≈ Ar. waqf-)” (Tawfiq 1985, cf. AEB 85.356) = “monument (need not to imply a physical structure)” (WD I 87 after JEA 75, 1989, 44) → Cpt. (SL) **𓄠𓄡𓄢**, (S) **𓄠𓄡𓄢**, **𓄠𓄡𓄢**, (A) **𓄠𓄡𓄢**, (B) **𓄠𓄡𓄢** (m) “1. Zeichen, Signal, 2. Wunder” (KHW 89) = “1. signe, marque, 2. miracle” (DELC 109).

NB: Orig. mjn.w (Edel 1955: AÄG 22, §50; Lacau 1972, 256, §72; Zeidler 1981, 88, fn. 18), vocalized *majnu (sic) “monument” (Grd. 1915, 66) = *miyanu > *miynu (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 45) = *mīn.ṽ vs. *mē/inw.ṽ > *mē/iynṽ (NBÄ 548) = *mījnṽ (not *mījnṽ) (Edel 1980, 47) = *minyaw (Vcl., DELC 109).

- Hence: LEg. mnw “Statue, Götterbild” (XIX., Wb II 71, 3) → Dem. mn “Götterbild” (DG 158).
NB: A fig. sense is mnw “son” (GR, Wb II 71, 6).
- Basic meaning and origin disputed.
- **1.** In Egyptian philology (e.g., Grd. 1915, 66; DELC 109), usually explained from Eg. mn “to remain”, lit. **“Bleibendes”* (Wb) = *“Aufenthalt (sic), *Dauer, Dauerhaftes”* > *“(seit MR) (sic) Denkmal”* (Osing, NBÄ 548).
NB: If the common rendering of Eg. mnw as “monument” is correct, this etymology seems much more convincing than any other proposal. Nevertheless, if the basic meaning was “sign” (as preserved by Coptic), solution #2 should be preferred.
- **2.** A. Ju. Militarev (Sts. etc. 1995, 18): mnw “monument” could be related to AA *m-n “to know”. In principle possible. Semantically justifiable (“to know” → “sign” & “image”).
NB1: AA *m-n “to know” [GT]: SBrb.: EWlm. te-men-t, pl. ši-men-en “esprit, intelligence” [PAM 1998, 218; 2003, 543], Ghat i-mun “connu (célèbre)” [Nhl. 1909, 144] || LECu.: Som. mǎn, pl. mǎnán “mind” [Abr. 1964, 172], Orm. mānā “reason, meaning” [Strm. 1987, 361: < Swahili?] || Ch. *m-n(-) “to know” [JI 1994 I 107; Hfm.]: WCh. *man- “to know” [GT]: AS *man “to know” [GT 2004, 240]: Angas *man “to know” [GT] = *man [Stl. 1977] = *man [Dlg.] = *[mp]An “to know” [Stl. 1987]: Angas man “to know, be able” [Ormsby 1914, 207, 210] = man “to know, understand, be able” [Flk. 1915, 242] = man [mǎn] “to know” [Brq. 1971, 51; Hfm.; ALC 1978, 35; Krf.] = mǎn “to know” [Gcl. 1994, 38], Sura man “wissen, (er)kennen” [Jng. 1963, 73] = man “to know” [Hfm.] = mǎn “to know” [Krf.], Mpn. mǎn “to know, be able to” [Frj. 1991, 35], Kfy. man “to know” [Ntg. 1967, 26] = man [Hfm.], Msr. man ~ maan (false vowel length?) “to know, understand, knowledge” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 181, 187, 389] = man “to know” [Jng. 1999 MS, 11], Chip man gwe “to know” [Krf.], Tal ǎman “to know” [IL/JI], Mnt. man “to know” [Ftp. 1911, 218], Gmy. man “to know” [Ftp. 1911, 218; Srl. 1937, 65, 134; Hfm.] = ni mǎn [-ǎ- < *-a- or error?] “to know” [Krf.] = man “to know, recognize”, mman “knowledge” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 21–2] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 18, #41; Stl. 1977, 155, #127; 1987, 153, #84) | Bole mon- [Lks.] = mǎnǐ [IL], Ngamo mǎntǎ “to know” [Alio 1988 MS] = mant- “to know” [Ibr. 2003 MS, 6], Krkr. ment- “wissen” [Lks. 1966, 203], Maha monayo “to know” [OS!] (BT: Hfm. 1970, 8–9) | SBch. *man- ~ *mam- [assim.]: Kir & Tala & Mangas & Ju mam, Zaranda & Buu -mǎni, Buli man, Zul & Baram momǐ (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 36, §66; WCh.: JI 1994 II, 216) || CCh.: Lame mǎn “to observe, analyze”, mún “1. entendre, 2. comprendre” [Scn. 1982, 317; 1978, 197], Zime-Batna mún “to hear” [Jng.], Zime-Dari mún “entendre, comprendre, éconter” [Cooper 1984, 17] = mún “to hear” [Jng. 1978, 25; 1979, 144] || ECh.: Kera mínǐ “sagen, bekanntgeben” [Ebert 1976, 81] | WDng. minē & EDng. minē “avertir, prévenir, faire savoir, informer, mettre au courant, communiquer, signaler, mettre en garde” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 206] = “warnen, benachrichtigen” [Ebs. 1979, 125; 1987, 77, 99], Bdy. min “avertir, informer” [AJ 1989, 99] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 204, 341). AP: PWNigr. *man “to know” [Smz. 1981, 19, #184; JI 1994 I 107 after Mkr. 1976, 267, 273–4]. PBantu *mǎn- etc. “to know” vs. *món- “to see” [Gtr. 1971, 133] = *manya “to know” [Mnh. apud Hfm. 1970, 8–9]. Lit.: OS 1992, 174; HSED #1721 (WCh.-Lame-Som.-Eg).
NB2: The hypothesis of Militarev on explaining Eg. mnw < AA *m-n “to know” is semantically possible, cf. e.g. PIE *weid-“1. to see (aor.), 2. know (pf.)”: OInd. vid-“to know” ~ Lith. pavidulis “Ebenbild” (IEW 1125–1127). Or cf. Russian знамя “sign” < знать “to know”. There are many further examples.

NB3: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1721) derived Sem. *mnw “to count (contare)” [Frz.] (Sem.: GB 436; Frz. 1965, 266, #4.32; AHW 604) from the same AA root, which is semantically questionable (“to know” ≠ “to count”). Similarly, A.R. Bomhard (1984, 271, #275) equated IE *m_ə/an- “to think, reflect” with Sem. *mny “to count, reckon”. It may be indeed supposed that the underlying root was AA *m-n “1. to count, 2. think, 3. know” [GT]. For the shift of meaning in Sem. *mnw, cf. e.g. Eg. ḥsb “to count” ~ Sem. *ḥšb “to think”. Deriving Eg. mnw “monument” from AA *m-n “to think” seems also defensible, cf. e.g. German Denkmal vs. denken.

NB4: Cf. also SCu.: Dhl. mam-ṯ- “to think” [Ehret 1980, 157; EEN 1989, 37 with different etymology] = mam-ṯ- [Tosco 1991, 142] with an assimilation of nasals?

● Other etymologies are out of question:

- 3. A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1966, 66), in turn, identified OEg. mnw with ECu. *man-/*min- “house”, which seems semantically less convincing.

NB: For details on this AA root, see the entry for Eg. mnn.w “fortress” (below).

- 4. A. R. Bomhard (1984, 274, #286) derived both (!) Eg. mnw “monument” and mn(j) “mountain” (sic) from AA *m_ə/an- “to project, jut out” ~ IE *m_ə/an- “to project, stand/jut out” (sic) > Lat. mōns.
- 5. V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1989, 132) proposed erroneously a connection between LEg. mnw “(fig.) son (act. *image)” (GR) and ECh.: Kwang main “son-in-law” | Smr. mwân “son-in-law”, Ndam men “son”, which have nothing to do with the sense “monument”.

mnw “Art kostbarer Stein (allein oder mit ḥḍ, km, bes. als Material zu Steingefäßen)” (OK, Wb II 72, 4) = “wohl der Alabaster” (Anthes 1928, 77, Graffito 49, l. 3) = “Granit (?)” (Balcz 1932, 68–70, §4 & 111) = “black and white granite (?)” (Caminos 1956, 30, fn. 4) = “1. (ḥḍ) sans doute: le crystal de roche, 2. (km) obsidian” (Barguet 1953, 24, n. 10 after Lacau) = “a semi-precious-stone of two distinct colours, light and dark, generally accepted as quartz: 1. mnw ḥḍ both its transparent variety (rock crystal) and the translucent and opaque varieties (milky or cloudy quartz) vs. 2. mnw km: not only the brown and black species of smoky quartz, but also obsidian, which was probably confused with them, but extremely improbable that it was also amethystine quartz (with a somewhat distinctive colouring)” (Harris 1961, 110 after Wendel and Bissing) = “kind of stone” (FD 108; DCT 168) = “Quarz”, mnw ḥḍ “Bergkristall”, mnw km “Rauchquarz” (Kaplony 1972, 210 after Helck MWNr 418, 712, 948, 1000, 1011, 1198) = “Gesteinsart” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza II 161) = “Quarz, Obsidian” (LÄ IV 549, cf. V 50) = “cristal de roche” (Aufrière 1990, 179) = “Quarz: 1. (ḥḍ) weißer Menu-Stein, *Bergkristall, 2. (km) schwarzer, dunkler Menu-Stein (für Gefäße, *Rauchquarz, *Obsidian)” (GHWb 336; ÄWb I 529).

NB: The rendering “bases, piédestaux” (Sottas 1919, 29 after Budge) is false.

- Origin uncertain. Neither of solutions is convincing:
- **1.** GT: perhaps unrelated to NOm.: Zys. mel-o, Zrg. mel-o “stone” (SEOmt.: Bnd. 1971; Mkr. 1981, 212, #43.c; cf. Blz. 1990, 208) ||| ECh.: Kwang dials.: Gaya mOlo, Alowa & Mindera & Tchagine Golo & Ngam & Kawalke mOl̩o, Mobu moro “pierre” (Kwang: Coates 1991 MS, 2, 5).
AP: H. G. Mukarovsky (l.c.) compared the NOm. forms with Saharan: Daza mele “pierre à surface noire brillante”.
- **2.** GT: assim. via *mlw < *mrw? Cf. Ar. marw- “silex”, murw-at- “un silex, une pierre très dure” [BK II 1097], Dathina marw-at- “silex, Feuerstein, Quarzit” [GD 2690], Yemeni Ar. máruw, marwa “Marmor (sehr weiß)” [Behnstedt 1993, 195], Ṣa^odah (Yemen) marwah (nomen unit.), marwin (coll.) “Feuerstein” [Behnstedt 1987, 302].
- **3.** A. bey Kamal (1912, 241) compared a certain Eg. mnw (stone det.) with Ar. mall-at- “cendres chaudes ou braise”, ḥubzu mallatin “pain cuit dans les cendres chaudes” [BK II 1141], which is certainly false.
NB: Cf. rather Eg. mnw “ein Kohlenfeuer” (GR, Wb, q.v.).
- **4.** J. R. Harris (1961, 171) rightly declined its equation with Eg. mn “ein Produkt aus Syrien von schwarzer Farbe” (XVIII–XIX., Wb, q.v.) as “unlikely”.

mnw “die Keule (belegt in den Listen der Sargbeigaben)” (MK, LP, Wb II 72, 3) = “genre de massue conique” (Jéquier 1921, 201–3) = “prehistoric mace with dish-shaped head” (MK coffins, EG 1927, 496, T1 & n. 3) = “die alte Tellerkeule (als Kriegswaffe begegnet sie schon zu Beginn der geschichtlichen Zeit nicht mehr, hat sich aber als Ritualgegenstand bis ins MR gehalten)” (Otto, ÄMÖR II 130) = “Tellerkeule” (GHWb 336).

- **1.** G. Jéquier (l.c.) connected it with Eg. mn “prendre” (q.v.).
- **2.** GT: or ~ Eg. mnj-vessel (q.v.)?

mnw “Faden” (MK, Wb II 72, 8; GHWb 334; WD I 87: cf. ZĀS 110, 1983, 167, fn. 183) = “thread” (FD 108).

NB: Questionable whether -w was a masc. noun ending (as suggested in GHWb) or part of the root (as in most of the standard lexicons).

- Etymology disputable.
- **1.** GT: perhaps cognate with Sem.: (?) Ug. mn “string” [Guillaume, not in WUS and DUL] ||| SBrb.: Ayr a-ssā-ṣṣmo, pl. ə-ssə-ṣṣna “corde d’attache (de jeune animal; sert à attacher celui-ci à un arbre, piquet

pour l'empêcher de suivre sa mère)" [PAM 2003, 545] ||| LECu.: Orm. minn-a "bandage" [Bitima 2000, 198] ||| NOm.: Haruro mānān-o "varietà di liana" [CR 1937, 654] ||| ECh.: EDng. māyīnē "ficelle autour des riens pour tenir le cache des filles" [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 200]. From AA *m-n "fibre" [GT]?

NB1: Guillaume (1965 IV, 9) combined Ug. mn (above) with Ar. manīn- "a weak rope", which is, however, nothing else but a secondary noun from Ar. manīn- "faible, affaibli" [BK II 1155].

NB2: Here might eventually belong Sem. *ma(?)n-(at)- "1. tendon, sinew, 2. muscle" [SED]: Akk. (jB) manānu (pl.t.) "Nerven (?)" [AHW 602] = "Sehnen (?)" [Holma 1911, 6] = "sinews" [CAD m1, 208] || Hbr. *mēn, pl. minnīm ~ minnī "Saiten(instrumente)" [GB 433] = "string, pl. stringed instrument" [KB 597], Syr. menā "1. crinis, 2. nervus, 3. chorda, 4. tonus" [Brk.] = "1. Haar, 2. Saite" [GB] = "nervus, chorda" [Holma] = mennōtā, pl. mennē "hair, nerves" [KB] = "1. Haare, 2. Nerven, Sehnen" [AHW] || Tna. mānat "muscolo del braccio" [Bassano] (Sem.: Mlt.-Kogan 2000 MS, 197-8, #182; SED I 166, #183). Whether Ar. maʔn-at- "toute la partie du ventre qui entoure le nombril" [BK II 1054] is also related as L. Kogan suggests (orig. *"rectus abdominis, a straight muscle of the abdomen") is not clear.

NB3: Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 214, #1832) equated both Eg. mnw and mnj.t "root" with PCu. *mayn- (sic) "tapeworm". Indeed, an etymological connection to Sem.: Akk. (jA, nA) mūnu "Larve, Raupe (speziell der Knoblauch)" [AHW 673 after Landsberger 1934, 57, 128] ||| LECu.: Orm. minn-i "tapeworm" [Foot apud Ehret] = minn-ī [Ss.], Arb. mīnn-e "tapeworm" [Hyw. 1984, 385] | HECu. (from Orm.?): Burji minn-i (m), mīnn-ē (f) "tapeworm" [Ss.], Drs. minn-e "tapeworm" [Lsl.] (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 145; Lsl. 1988, 195; Hds. 1989, 149) || SCu.: Asa menan-a "tapeworm" [Ehret 1980, 324, #36] is not excluded. Note that A. B. Dolgopolskij (1973, 250) and V. M. Illič-Svityč (1976, 77, #312) derived Orm. minn-i "tapeworm" < *mid-n-i ~ Som. miḍ "Würmchen in Wasserpflützen" [Rn. 1902, 287], which was rejected by V. Blažek (1990, 210).

NB4: Was AA *m-n "fibre" [GT] connected with WCh.: Grnt. mānni "to turn round", manni "to squeeze" [Jgr. 1989, 188] || CCh.: Mafa mín- "to interwine, spin cotton, filer du coton" [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 227; Brt. 1995, 205-6], Mtk. mne "to spin (thread)" [Schubert 1971-2 MS, 7] | Htk. (Hide) mānda "tordre, serrer" [Eguchi 1971, 219]?

- 2. GT: if mnw = *ml-w, cp. alternatively Sem.: (?) Emar Akk. māltu (ma-a-al-tu₄) "lien" [Nougayrol quoted by Sjöberg 1998, 278, §81. n] = "bolt" [Hnrg.], JNAram. mulla "string" [Sabar 2002, 218] ||| LECu.: Saho maml-ā "Strick, Seil, Tau" [Rn. 1890, 268] ||| WCh.: Tng. malle "to intertwine (two: rope, thread, cotton, etc.), cf. malmē "1. to put a thread, rope, etc., around an object, 2. embrace, coil (snake)" [Jng. 1991, 119] || ECh.: EDng. māliyē "wickeln" [Ebobisse 1979, 141; 1987, 100].

NB1: Was the same root is preserved perhaps in CCh.: Pdk. mīlil "racine d'arbre", cf. mīlilya "artère, veine" [Mch. 1950, 21, 30] = mīlil "root" [Brt.-Jng. 1993, 133] | Htk. (Hide) mala "1. veine, 3. muscle" [Eguchi 1971, 217] | Mafa-Mada *m-l-m-l "vein" [GT]: Mada milmél "vein" [Rsg.] = melmel i miḍ "artère, veine" [Mch.] = melmel "veine, nerf, tendon" [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 184], Muyang mimilé "vein" [Rsg.], Uldeme (Udlam) amel "artère, veine" [Mch.], Zelgwa miḷ mambaz "artère, veine" [Mch.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 165; Rsg. 1978, 354, #777)? Cf. Eg. mnj.t "root" (q.v.).

nb2: Or cp. LECu.: Orm. *mēl-aḏḏa* (intr.) “1. to sprain, 2. strain (joints)”, *mēll-ō* “foot or tooth turned in wrong direction”, *mēll-annā* “turning in wrong direction” [Gragg 1982, 283]?

- 3. GT: or Eg. *mnw* < **m-lw* (prefix the *m-*) to be analyzed the same way as Ar. *ma-lwīy-* “zusammengedreht” < pass. part. **ma-lwūy-* [Vcl.]? For the participial *m-* prefix in Eg. (analogous to Ar. *ma-* of pass. part.) see Grapow 1914, 17. The ultimate source in this case would be AA **l-w* (or **l-w-y*) “to tie around, twist around” [GT].

nb1: Cf. Sem. **lwy* “winden (flectere, volvere)” [Holma] = **lwī* “umwinden” [AHW]: Akk. *lawū* > *lamū* “umgeben, belagern” [AHW 541] = “umschließen, umringen” [Aro] || Hbr. *liwā* “Kranz” [GB 380] = “cirlet” [Alb.] || Ar. *lwy*: *lawā* “to twist a rope” [Lsl.] = *lwy* “to encircle, wind” [Alb.] = *lwy* “winden” [Aro] = *lwy* “tordre une corde etc. en la tressant” [Vcl.], cf. Ar. *talawwā* [**ta-lawway-*] “coil of serpent” [Ar.] || Geez *lawaya* ~ *lawawa* “to twist, wind, wrap around” → *mālwāy* “turban” [Lsl.], Tigre *lāwla* “to wind around” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Holma 1914, 156–8, #5; Alb. 1919, 184, #23; Aro 1964, 181; Lsl. 1987, 321–322) || Eg. *nwt* [**lw-t*] “Garn, Faden, Schnur, Seil” (MK, Wb II 217, 3–6) = “yarn (for weaving), thread” (FD 127) → Cpt.: (S) *λOOY(ε)* ~ *λΔΔY*, (SB) *λWOY* “Locke, Franse, Saum, Bündel, Büschel, Ring” (KHW 81) || Bed. *luwi* “zusammenwickeln, -drehen, flechten” [Rn. 1895, 160] || LECu.: Saho *law-* “to bind” [Dlğ. 1987, 196]. For the etymology of Eg. *nwt* see Lsl. 1962, 46, #16 (Eg.-Sem.); Vcl. 1972, 275–279 (Brb.-Ar.-Eg.-Cpt.); 1983, 100 (Eg.-Ar.). Eventually, LEg. *nw* “bekleiden, verhüllen” (LP, Wb II 220, 15) might be also related. A different etymology was proposed by V. Ě. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 194; HSED #1661): LEg. *nw* ~ WCh.: Sura *lēe* “to dress” [Kraft 1981, #382] || ECh.: Tumak *lōw* “mettre un vêtement” [Cpr. 1975, 80], which is to be justified by further Ch. and AA data.

nb2: W. Vycichl (1972, 275–9; 1989, 12–15; DELC 100) analyzed Brb. **ti-nelli* “Faden oder Schnur” [Vcl.] too as an old pass. part. with prefix *ma-*, i.e., **ta-ma-lwūy-t*, hence **ta-malwī-t* → **ta-nalwī-t* “zusammengedrehte Schnur” [Vcl.] > NBrb.: Shilh *ti-nelli* “fil” [Vcl.] | Mzab *ti-nēlli*, pl. *ti-nelli-w-in* “fil, ficelle” [Vcl.], Wed Righ *i-nelli* “fil” [Vcl.], Djerba *ti-lelli*, pl. *ti-lelli-w-in* [**nelli-*] “fil” [Vcl.] | Qbl. *ti-nelli*, pl. *ti-nelwa* “1. ficelle, 2. bout de fil, 3. fil de trame, duite” [Dlt. 1982, 564] | Nfs. *t-nelli*, pl. *t-nelli-w-in* “fillo” [Bgn. 1942, 315] || EBrb.: Sokna *ti-nelli*, pl. *t-nilwa* “fil” [Vcl.] || SBrb.: Hgr. *té-nellé*, pl. *ti-nelwa* “fil (à coudre)” [Fcd. 1951–2], EWlm. & Ayr *te-nälle*, pl. *ši-*, *ti-nəlwa* “fil (à coudre)” [PAM 1998, 251–2] (Brb.: Vcl. 1972, 275–9; 1989, 12–13). The dissim. of the prefix **m-* due to the labial in the root (Brb. **m-...-w* > **n-...-w*) was thoroughly demonstrated by Vycichl (1989, 14), for which cf. also e.g. Akk. *narkabtu* [< **ma-rkab-t-u*] “Wagen” [AHW 747] < Sem. **rkb*. Or Eg. *nb3.t* [< **mbl-t*] “Tragstange” (Westcar, Wb II 243, 5–9), nomen instr. from AA **w-b-l* > Sem. **wbl* “to bring, carry” (Eg.-Sem.: Ward 1978, 55–57; Hodge 1981, 374, #41).

nb3: A. B. Dolgopolsky (1987, 196) compared Saho *law-* “to bind” mistakenly with SCu. **lāw-* “to pick up, pluck”.

- mnw** (in: *mnw-ḥd*) “eine wohlriechende Pflanze” (GR, Wb II 71, 17) = “white manna, definitely vegetable substance (in the Laboratorium of Edfu among sundry drugs, thoroughly similar to the grains of *ʿntjw*)” (Pilter 1917, 157–8 after Ebers) = “(aromate)” (Baum 1988, 372 index) = “plant (smells of *ʿntjw*)” (PL 425).

nb: An identification with Eg. *mnw-ḥd* (a semi-precious stone, q.v.) may be ruled out (Hafemann, p.c. on 19 May 2000).

- Etymology uncertain.
- **1.** G. Ebers (quoted by Pilter 1917, 157–9 and GB 432), followed by G. Charpentier (1981, §523), equated it (as a Sem. borrowing) with Hbr. mān “Manna, die wunderbare Nahrung der Israeliten in der Wüste “manna: a species of tamarisk found in Sinai and North Arabia, *Tamarix mannifera* (distinguished by yellow-white globules; earlier explained as a secretion of the tamarisk after damage from the shield louse, but now known as originating from the insect itself, a glutinous protection protection for the egg sacs of the shield lice)” [KB 596] = “wohl das noch vorkommende Manna (mann bei den Beduinen der Sinaihalbinsel) d.i. der aus den Zweigen der *Tamarix gallica mannifera* (Ehrenberg; Boissier...)...Ende Mai und im Juni quellende süße, klebrige, honigartige..., in schweren Tropfen zu Boden fallende Saft” [GB 432] = “*Tamarix gallica mannifera*, Ehrenberg (from the tender twigs of the tamarisk... issues a sweet, sticky, honey-like substance which falls to the ground in hard drops,... gathered by the Beduin, put into leather bottles, and partly consumed as spice with their bread-cakes...; falls in the night, melts in the sunshine, its balls are similar to white coriander seed, its taste is like bread-cake and honey” [Pilter 1917, 156], Ar. mann- “3. manne, substance visqueuse” [BK II 1155]. It was declined by Baum (1988, 202, fn. 1182) as “*une hypothèse qui est loin d’être étayée*”.
NB1: In Pilter’s view, the grains of ‘ntjw “are resinous substances which are obtained from the Arabic Neha trees... brought to Egypt in the form of grains. Exactly the same holds good for the drops of manna which issue from the tarfa shrubs...”. Both plants are described as bright, white.
NB2: I. Löw (1924 III, 403) regarded Hbr. mān as “*ungezwungen erklärbar*” from Ar. minn- (sic) “Wachsreif auf den Palmblättern, pruina, auch für Blattläuse gebraucht”.
- **2.** P. Wilson (PL 425) wondered whether it was related to MK mn.w “tree” (sic) = “die Bäume, der Baumgarten” (Wb, q.v.).
- **3.** GT: any connection to NBrb.: Temsaman & Ibeqqoyen te-mānn-ät “liseron sauvage” [Brn. 1917, 93]?

mnwj (cord det.) “Art Maß für Kleiderstoffe” (late NK, Wb II 66, 17) = “das einzelne Stück beim Zählen von Geweben” (Erman 1892, 111) = “*unité d’étoffe*” (PK 1976, 377) = “(?)” (DLE I 220) = “Maß für Kleider” (Helck, LÄ II 1203, 1207, n. 79) = “*ein Maß (für Kleiderstoffe)” (GHWb 334).

NB: W. Helck (LÄ l.c.), uncritically adopting Caminos 1954 LEM, 287, falsely attributed this word solely to Pap. Anastasi VI 23 as a hapax, although it is first attested in the OK: mnw “mesure de fil, prob. la manière dont se présente le fil ou une mesure de fil” (V, PK 1976, 377, 673 index) = “*unité de mesure pour le*

fil” (V., AL 77.1701) = mnwj “*ein Maß (für Kleiderstoffe)” (V.: 2x, 1^a IMP: 1x, GHWb 334; AWb I 528b).

- Proper meaning obscure. Etymology uncertain.
- 1. A. Erman (1892, 111) and W. F. Albright (1966, 41) explained it from Sem.: Hbr. mānā “Teil, Portion”, mny “zählen” and Ar. mann- “don, faveur” [BK II 1155] = “Teil, Zahl” (sic) [Erman]. False.
- 2. P. Posener-Krieger (1976, 377) and R. Hannig (GHWb 334) suggested a connection to Eg. mnw “fil” (q.v.).
- 3. GT: did this measure signify act. *’roll’? Cp. Ch. *m-n with the same basic mng.
NB: Attested in WCh.: Grnt. māni “to turn round” [Jgr. 1989, 188] || CCh.: Mafa mīn- “to intertwine, filer du coton” [Br.-Bléis 1990, 227; Brt. 1995, 205–6], Mtk. mine “to spin (thread)” [Schubert 1971–2 MS, 7] | Htk. (Hide) mānda “tordre, serer” [Eguchi 1971, 219].

mnwh “eine Pflanze, deren Same šn-t3 heißt” (Med., Wb II 79, 10) = “Trigonella foenum graecum (Brockshornklee)” (Dawson 1926, 240f. rejected by Germer 1979, 202) = “*Cyperus esculentus*” (Loret 1938, 867 declined by Edel l.c. as “*sehr zweifelhaft*”) = “Rhizomknöllchen” (Edel 1970, 22, §7).

- Origin unknown. Equated by V. Loret (1938, 867) and W. Westendorf (HAM 500) with Eg. mnḥ “*Cyperus papyrus*” (q.v.), which was declined by E. Edel (l.c.) and R. Germer (1979, 201).
NB: Germer argued that *Cyperus papyrus* vs. *Cyperus esculentus* were two distinct species, which “*nicht verwechselt werden*”. In addition, *Cyperus esculentus* has no seed.

mnbj.t “Thron oder Ruhebett der Götter und des Königs, auch personifiziert als Göttin” (GR, Wb II 63, 4–5) = “lit” (Jéquier 1921, 244, fn. 1 after Brugsch) = “royal couch, also: throne, bed (of the gods and king)” (Amenope onomasticon, AEO I 36*) = “1. birth couch (associated with the lion bed in GR), 2. (used in Edfu as) throne, as symbol of strong kingship, upon which the gods or king sit” (since XVIII., PL 427).

- Etymology debated.
- 1. A. H. Gardiner (AEO l.c.) assumed a compound to be read *mn.t-bj.t, which P. Wilson (PL 428) rendered as *mnj.t-bj.t “nurse of Lower Egypt” (sic) “*referring to the life giving qualities of the bed*”.
- 2. K. P. Kuhlmann (quoted in PL 427) explained it from older Eg. mnm(w).t “bed”, a nomen loci (with prefix m-) deriving from Eg. nm “to sleep”. Declined by Wilson (PL 428), since “*the earliest spellings do not suggest this and nor does the nature of the bed*”.

mnpḥ.t “1. Brust (late NK), 2. Euter der Kuh (GR)” (Wb II 79, 14–15) = “Euter, Unterleib” (Westendorf 1966, 143).

- As pointed out by P. Montet (1911, 224, §3), H. Grapow (1914, 24), G. Fecht (1960, 181, fn. 507), W. Westendorf (1962, 27, §43.6.dd; 1966, 143), and H. Smith (1979, 162), it consists of a prefix m- + Eg. nph.(w) “Teil des menschlichen Unterleibes (in der Gegend der Genitalien): ob Leistengegend?” (Med., Wb II 249) = “Hüften, Lenden” (Stern) = “pis” (Montet) = “les aînes, inguina” (Loret 1896, 176–9, §1) = “vermutlich: Kreuzbeingegend” (Ebbell 1937, 305–7) = “vorn unten am Leibe zu lokalisieren: Leistengegend, Euter der Kuh” (Grapow 1954, 83–84) = “iliac region” (FD 130) = “Beckenraum, Leistengegend, Unterleibsregion, Euter” (Westendorf 1966, 143) = “Beckenraum” (GHWb 407) = “rear parts, udder” (Smith l.c.) = “inguinal lymph nodes, region, groin” (Walker 1996, 251–6) = “groin” (PL 512).

NB: Akin to Ar. ʔinfah(h)-at- ~ ʔinfih-at- ~ m/binfah-at- “the rennet or rennet-bag, of a kid or lamb [Lane 2821] = ʔinfah-at- ~ ʔinfihh-at- “ventricule d’un agneau ou d’un chevreau” [BK II 1306]. For further parallels cf. Takács 2004, 59, #349.4.

mnpḥ “Art Kleid” (GR, Wb II 79, 13) = “the hide of an oryx or antelope, may have been highly prized as an item of clothing because of its softness and smoothness, offered to god(desse)s as protective clothing (the skin may have been protective and offered regeneration for a corpse wrapped in it)” (Edfu, PL 428) = “Götterkleid” (Tebtunis onomasticon, 2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998, 249, n. e).

NB: Cf. also Ryhiner 1995, 9, n. 34 & 22, n. 81.

- Ph. Derchain (1962, 31–36) saw in this name of garment an m- prefix + nph.w “iliac region” (FD 130) indicating an apron or belt to cover the lower part of the body (ph.w).

mnf.t “neben Salz als Medikamente” (late NK Mag., Wb II 80, 9) = “*e. Mineral” (GHWb 339).

NB: Hapax (Pap. Leiden I 343 + 345, rt. 26:12), mentioned before “northern salt” and hz3-mash. A. Massart (1954, 94–95, n. 17), H. Deines & H. Grapow (WÄDN 1959, 247), and R. Hannig (GHWb 339) supposed it to be an error for Eg. mnš.t “ein mineralischer Stoff” (Med., Wb, below) = “yellow ochre (?)” (Massart l.c.; FD 110) = “yellow/red ochre” (DLE II 223) = “mineral pigment” (PL 437) = “red ochre (?)” (Leitz 1999, 99). W. Westendorf (1962, 25, §40.c), in turn, alternatively assumed an error for Eg. šnf.t “offizinell verwendet (zwischen Früchten und Pflanzen genannt)” (Med., NK, GR, Wb IV 514, 13) = “(Korn)Frucht” (GHWb 830), which was declined by J. R. Harris (1961, 147), who did not exclude an independent status of mnf.t either.

- Meaning and existence dubious. If it is not a ghost-word, cp.:

- **1.** W. Westendorf (1962, 25, §40.c) pondered a connection with Eg. m3f.t (plant or tree) and m3f (q.v.), which would suggest an orig. *mlf.t.
- **2.** V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 191), ignoring the philological problems around Eg. mnf.t, identified it with a certain CCh. *nVf- “medicine” (sic). Clearly false.
NB: Unacceptable even if Eg. mnf.t existed, since it surely did not mean “medicine (in general).”
- **3.** GT: perhaps ~ WCh.: Angas (Kabwir) melp “a grey earth for colouring houses” [Jng. 1962 MS]?
NB: Angas -p < AA *-f is regular. Cf. WCh.: Suroid *melep → *mølep “a dark colour” [GT 2004, 245]?

mnf3.t “(allgemein) die Soldaten, die Truppen” (MK, Wb II 80, 1; WD II 61: for LP mng. cf. RdE 38, 1987, 96, n. e) = “infantry” (Goodwin 1867, 86; AEO I 25*, #88 & 113*, #236) = “shock-troops, infantry, soldiery” (JEA 39, 1953, 38 & 40, 1954, 43f.) = “trained soldiers, assault troops, infantry, soldiery (in general)” (FD 108) = “Führungsschicht: la couche sociale dans laquelle se recrute le personnel d’élite” (Vandersleyen 1971, 181; CdE 48, 1973, 347, 349, rejected by Spalinger and Fischer-Elfert l.c.) = “Soldaten” (Stadelmann, MDAIK 32, 1976, 210, n. 12) = “l’ost, la garde” (AL 77.1728) = “soldiers, infantry, troops” (DLE I 220) = “zu zivilen Arbeitsleitungen herangezogene Truppen, Soldaten” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 119–120, n. c) = “1. Infanterie, Fußtruppen, 2. Sturmtruppen, Elitetruppe (*Führungsschicht der Armee), 3. (allg.) Armee” (GHWb 339) = “infantry soldiers of the army (rather than chariotry), in Edfu, in general soldiers of Horus, whose main function is to protect him” (PL 430).

- Etymology debated. Most convincing is #1:
- **1.** Sh. Yeivin (1933, 108; 1936, 70, #15) analyzed mnf3.t as *m-nfr.t (m- prefix), cognate with Ar. nafar- “a band of armed men” [Yeivin] = nafar- “1. homme, individu, personne, 2. simple soldat”, cf. nafir- “5. petite troupe d’hommes, 6. homme, individu, personne” and nafir-at- “troupe d’hommes, fuyards” [BK II 1308] = naf(a)r- “individu, simple soldat, troupe de gens qui portent pour la guerre, les compagnons de celui qui fait une expédition, caravane(s), patrouille”, cf. nafir- “troupe de gens qui portent pour la guerre” [Dozy II 699] = nafar- “groupe d’individus, quel que soit leur nombre” [Fagnan 1923, 174].

NB1: The Ar. term was borrowed into Sem.: JNAram. nafar “person” [Sabar 2002, 234] | Šaʿdah (Yemen) nafar “Person” [Behnstedt 1987, 307] || Tigre nāfār “some people” [LH 346; Lsl. 1982, 55].

NB: May be cognate to WCh.: DB naáfara & Klr. máfařeyaw ~ fařeh “man (vir)” [Jng.] = máfařeyaw, pl. fařè [Seibert]. Of biconsonantal origin? Cf. WCh.: Ron *náf- “man (vir)” [GT]: Fyer náaf [Jng.], Sha náf [Seibert], Klr. naafú [Jng.], Daffo ná:f [Jng. 1981, 431] = naáf [Seibert], Butura naaf “person”, naf “people” [Magwa et al. 1985, 15], Monguna naáf [Seibert], Mangar náaf [Seibert] (Ron: Jng. apud JI 1994 II 230; Seibert 2000 MS, #a001–2) || CCh.: Ga’anda náf-čá “person” [R.M.Nwm. 1977, 123]. For Ron-Ar. see HSED 395, #1829.

- **2.** A. H. Gardiner (AEO I 113*, #236): “*possibly a formative in m from nf ‘wrongdoing’...*”, whereby its etymological mng. might be “aggressors, attackers”. Semantically very weak. False also since the old etymon was mnf3.t.
- **3.** GT: is the root *nf3 < *nfr identical with Eg. nfr.w (pl.) “Jünglinge, bes. die Rekruten” (MK, Wb II 258, 1–2) = “young men (of army), recruits” (FD 132) = “young people, elite troops” (DLE II 19)?
NB: Or does this word originate in nfr “good, nice”? I regard the first solution to be the more probable.

mnfr.t (OK, CT, MK, XVIII.) > **mnfj** (XXV.) > **mnf.tj** (GR) “Art Schmuckband für Arme und Knöchel, Armband” (MK, Wb II 80, 8, 10–12) = “les bracelets et quelquefois aussi les périscélides” (Jéquier 1921, 146; 1921, 99) = “bracelet, ruban (pour les bras et les chevilles)” (Barguet 1952, 10, fn. 3) = “band for arm or ankle” (FD 109) = “périscelides” (AL 79.1220) = “das lange Halsband oder einfach ein längliches, schmales, vielleicht besonders ein aus Perlen gefertigtes Band (Beni Hasan: zwei lange schmale Bänder oder Stricke, viel zu lang für Fuß- oder Armspangen, in Sargfriesen: Bänder für die Arme und die Fußgelenke)” (Stahelin 1987, 112–3) = “terme générique pour ‘bracelet’ ou ‘périscélide’” (Cristophe 1987, 28) = “1. Schmuckreifen an Armen und Fußknöcheln, 2. (bezeichnet im Grabe Senenmuts) das Tönnchenarmband (der sonst andere Armbänder bezeichnet)” (Edel 1987, 46–47 & fn. 9) = “Armband, Fußband” (VI., GHWb 339; ÄWb I 534–5) = “bracelet, usually for the arm or ankle, can also refer to the clasps on the ends of collars or amulets” (PL 429) = “band for arm or ankle” (CT VI 214a, VII 136g, DCT 168).

NB: In the tomb of Senenmut at Sheikh Abd-el-Gournah (Urk. IV 399), it adopted the det. of Eg. msktw “Armring (am Unterarm)” (XVIII., Wb, q.v.), cf. Cristophe 1987, 28, fn. 3.

- Etymology uncertain:
- **1.** Usually (Grapow 1914, 16; Jéquier 1921, 146; Fecht 1960, 180, §373; Smith 1979, 162; Stahelin 1987, 113, fn. 1; PL 429) explained from Eg. nfr “nice”, i.e., lit. “Verschönerin” (Edel 1987, 47, fn. 9; WD III 51) = “to make beautiful” (sic) (PL) = “pour être beau, pour embellir” (sic) (Jéquier falsely rendering m as “pour”!).

NB: The OK vars. m3fr.t (act. *mlfr.t?) ~ mfj.t (ÄWb I 526, 534) ~ mfj.wt (AL I.c.) seem to exclude this solution.

- **2.** L. Homburger (1930, 285) identified mnfj.t with Ful (Peul) feggere, pl. pegge “bracelet”. Absurd.
- **3.** GT: perhaps it derives from *nfr “to tie (?)” sharing the same root with Eg. nfr.t “Art Tau zum Ziehen des Schiffes” (NK, Wb II 262, 8) and nfrj.t “Strick mit dem man das Steuerruder lenkt” (MK, Wb II 262, 9).

NB: No reliable external parallels. L. Reinisch (1895, 187) and W. Vycichl (1960, 260–261) equated the Eg. root with Bed. nawar “Seil, Strick” [Rn.] = “rope, string” [Vcl.]. But Eg. -f- ≠ Bed. -w- < *w-/*b-. This irreg. Eg.-Bed. correspondence could be justified only if we assume an alternation of OEg. *-f- ~ *-b-.

nmn.t “Bett” (PT, Wb II 80, 14) = “Ruhebett” (ÜKAPT VI 131).

NB: Vocalized as *ma-n(a)wam.at (DELIC 139) = *manām.at > NK *nanām.at (Vcl. 1990, 234).

- Hence later (via assim.): nmn.t “Bahre” (NK, Wb II 276, 16) = “als Liege des Verstorbenen” (BD, Köpstein 1989, 8, §2) → nmj.t ~ nmj “Bahre für den Toten” (LP, Wb II 266, 3–5) = “lieu de repos” (Baillet) = “the name of funerary couches” (Habachi, MDAIK 22, 1967, 42f.; Janssen 1975, 240, fn. 169).

NB: Assim. of nasals: OK nmn.t > NK nmn.t > LP nmj.t (cf. Vcl. 1990, 234).

- As pointed out by K. Sethe (ÜKAPT VI 131) and H.S. Smith (1979, 162), it is a nomen loci of an unattested OEg. *nmj (Vcl.) = *nm “to sleep” (GT), whence Eg. nm (GW nm^o) “1. schlafen, 2. im Todesschlaf liegen” (Amarna, Wb II 266, 7–8; Schlichting, LÄ V 642) = “reposer, sommeiller, être étendu” (Baillet 1881–83, 35, fn. 1 after Pierret) = “to go to sleep” (FD 133) = “to lie, sleep” (Smith) = “to go to sleep, lie down, drowse, lie on one’s back” (DLE II 19–20) = “1. schlafen, liegen, 2. darniederliegen” (GHWb 412) also originates. From the same root derives Eg. nmm.w “Schlafzustand” (XIX., Wb II 268, 1; Schlichting, LÄ V 642; GHWb 413). The underlying Eg. root is cognate with Sem. *nwm “to sleep” [SED] = *nawim- “addormentato leggermente”, *nawm-(at)- “sonno leggero” [Frz.]: Akk. (OBab.) nāmum “schlummern” [AHW 729] > munattu ~ munāmatu “Schlummer, auch frühe Morgenstunde”, cf. OAb. PN na^omu “Schlummerer (der viel schläft?)” [Soden 1955, 389–390, §78] || Ug. nhm-mt [Kogan: inserted -h-] “sleep of death” [Gordon 1965, 422], Hbr. nwm qal “schlummern (bes. aus Trägheit, Untätigkeit)” [GB 492] = “to fall asleep, slumber” [KB 680], JNAram. nnum “to slumber, have a light sleep (sitting)” [Sabar 2002, 233], Syr. nwm “schlummern (v. Halbschlaf)” [GB] = “dormitavit” [Brk. 1928, 420] | Ar. nāma [Frz.: < *nawima] “dormir”, hence: ma-nām-at- “dortoir,

lieu où l'on dort, où l'on a dormi" [BK II 1372–3] || Geez noma "to sleep" [Lsl. 1987, 409] (Sem.: Frz. 1964, II, 263, §2.11.a–b; SED I 312, §52) || CCh.: Gvoko lomě [dissim. < *nom-?] "schlafen" [Str. 1922–23, 120].

Lrr. for Eg.-Sem.: Erman 1892, 112; Farina 1926, 14, #15; Ember 1930, #10.a.23; Clc. 1936, #217; Chn. 1947, #75; Vcl. 1958, 376; 1983, 139; 1987, 118; 1990, 55; 1990, 234; Bnd. 1975, 185, §73.2; Rabin 1982, 28, #32; Castellino 1984, 16; Hoch 1994, 185–6, §249; Mlt. 2005, 367, §47. Eg.-AA: EEWC.

nb1: Eg. nm is usually listed as nm^c in the standard dictionaries (so also apud Osing 1998, 81, n. v). With respect to PT mnm.t, XIX. mnm.w, (B) -NIM "to sleep" (below), and Sem. *nwm, however, the Amarna form must have been evidently a GW for nm (with the combination of m & ^c for m so frequent in MK-NK orthography) as pointed out already by W. Vycichl (1990, 234; DELC 139) and J. Hoch (1994, 185–6, §249): "*le groupe m^c signifie tout simplement m et l'absence de formes à voyelle brisée en copte montre clairement qu'il n'y avait pas de ^cayin dans le mot égyptien*" (Vcl.). "*The ^cayin was probably erroneously inserted by confusion with either nm^c 'to be partial' or the verb 'to cover, spread'...*". The origin of Amarna nm (GW nm^c) has been strongly debated. E.g., (1) A. Baillet (1881–83, 35, fn. 1) affiliated it with nm^c "Mauern mit feinem Stein bekleiden" (late NK, Wb II 266) = "maçonner" (Baillet) = "to build" (Caminos 1954 LEM, 351) = "to line with stone, build" (Badawy 1956–57, 71) = "to set out, lay down walls" (DLE II 19) = "to cover, spread" (Hoch 1994, 186), which is hardly tenable for semantical reasons. (2) J. E. Hoch (1994, 185–186, #249–250) treated it as a Sem. loan-word, which was rightly rejected by (3) J. F. Quack (1996, 510), who, in turn, traced it back to a basic meaning *"sich auf die Seite legen" with respect to Eg. nm^c "parteiisch sein (bes. beim Richten)" (MK, NK, Wb II 267, 1) = "to be one-sided, partial" (FD 133; DLE II 20) = "voreingenommen, partiell sein (bes. beim Richten)" (GHWb 413). This explanation is by no means convincing, because NK nm "to sleep" goes back to an unattested OEg. *nm [< *nwm], whose existence is corroborated by the PT nomen loci mnm.t and Sem. *nwm.

nb2: Cpt. (SALF) -NHB, (B) -NIM in compound with HI- (Vcl.: < h_{wj} "battre?") "1. dormir, 2. (m) sommeil" (DELC 139) has been explained either from Amarna nm (Vcl. 1983, 139; 1990, 234) or as a loan-word from Sem. *nwm (Lambdin 1987, 186, fn. 43). Vycichl (l.c.): *nībaw ~ *nīmaw < *niybaw < *nim/byaw < *^vn_{mj}. Lambdin (l.c.): < *nēm < *nūm.

nb3: There are some untenable proposals as to the etymology of Sem. *nwm. H. Möller (1911, 175) explained it from a biconsonantal *nw- > Sem. *nwp "sich hin- und herbewegen", *nwγ "(sch)wanken", Ar. nwḍ: nāḍa "movit (ramum)", nwt: nāta "to move from side to side in walking". MM 1983, 246, §II.8: ~ Ar. nīm- "внушающий доверие" vs. mayn- "ложь".

nb4: Further var. roots are attested in Ch., cf. Ch. *n-w-n [GT] > WCh.: Dera 'nòn "to sleep" [Nwm. 1974, 130] || ECh.: PSmr: *nun "to sleep" [GT]: Smr. nūnī "sleep", Ndam ʔǝǝ nūn, Tmk. nūn "sleep, sommeil" [Cpr. 1975, 86]. Ch. *m-w-n [GT] > CCh.: Mtk. maṇ "se coucher" [Mch.] = man- "2. passer la nuit, se coucher" [Brt. 1988, 226], Mofu mēn "se coucher" [Mch.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 166) | Lame monú "schlafen" [Lks. 1937, 139] || ECh.: Mkl. mòoné "(to) sleep (v./n.)" [Lks. 1977, 207, 223] = mòoné "sommeil" [Jng. 1990, 141] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 299). The Chadic reflexes are to be explained via assim. (Dera and Smr. gr. from *n-w-m) and met., resp. (Mokilko from *nōm-?).

nb5: Sha munu-munyà "Schlafplatz, Bett" [Jng. 1970, 287] is unrelated, originating (as nomen loci) from PRon *n^a(h) "to sleep" [GT] (Ron: JI 1994 II, 298), which is clearly incompatible with Sem. *nwm (in spite of the suggestion by Ch. Rabin 1982, 28, #32). JI 1994 I 154 considered the Ron root as a borrowing from NC *na "to sleep". Cf. perhaps also ECh.: Ngam pà:je: [< *n-y-H?] "coucher avec femme, foquer" [Lns. 1982, 110].

- mnmn** “1. (intr.) sich bewegen, sich rühren, 2. (tr.) etw. fortbewegen, fortnehmen” (MK, Wb II 80–81) = “to quake, move (about)” (Badawy 1956–57, 73; DCT 168–9) = “1. to move quickly (of person), move about (of army) (XVIII.), 2. quake (of earth) (Lit. MK), 3. be shifted (of boundary) (XVIII.)” (FD 109) = “to move slowly” (Habachi 1972, 43) = “to move, (be) displace(d)” (DLE I 220) = “1. sich bewegen (*langsam, *gemütlich), sich rühren, 2. sich fortbewegen nach hin (r), 2. beben, schwanken (Schiffsmast, Mauer, Erde), 4. fortbewegen, fortnehmen von (m), verschieben (Grenze, Grenzstein), 5. abändern (Beschlossenes), 6. tilgen, entfernen (Namen, Erlaß)” (GHWb 339) = “to move quickly” (PL 430).
- Hence: Dem. mnmn “bewegen, beben” (DG 162:11) = “to move, tremble” (CED) = “to be(come) displaced” (Smith 1987, 169) > Cpt.: (B) **MONMEN** “bewegen, erschüttern, beben” (KHW 95) = “to (be) shake(n)” (CD 176a; CD 85).
 - Etymology debatable.
 - **1.** W. Westendorf (1981, 30), followed by J. Osing (1998, 81, n. v, fn. 373: first CT VI 177c): “*Verdacht besteht*” that it was a met. of OK mnmn “sich bewegen, sich regen, beben” (PT 393b, Wb II 267), which is plausible, but does not offer an AA etymology.
 - **2.** P. Wilson (PL 430), in turn, declining a derivation from Eg. mn (referring to sg. static and stable), preferred to explain it (via a change of b > m) from Eg. bn “to come” (sic) = “entrinnen, entkommen” (CT, Wb I 456, 13) > bnn “überquellen” (XVIII., Wb II 460) vs. bnbn “fließen lassen, ausfließen” (GR, Wb I 459) and bnbn “to impregnate” (PL) = “als eine sexuelle Betätigung” (LP, Wb I 459). Semantically unconvincing.
 - **3.** GT: most probably related with SBrb.: EWlm. mənən-ət “flotter (drapeau)” [PAM 2003, 547].
AP: NS *mān “to oscillate, move back and forth or up and down” [Ehret 2001, 278, §102].
 - **4.** V. Orel and Ch. Ehret affiliated it with WCh.: Angas-Sura *m^wāc₂n “to move” [GT 2004, 258] = *m^wān “to go, walk” [Dlg.] | SBch. *man “to come” [GT]. Semantically somewhat uncertain. Rejected by G. Takács (2005, 218–9, #306).
DP: IE *men- “to step” ~ Ur. *mene- “to go” < Nst. *mene (?) “to step” (IS 1976, 61).
LIT. for the AS-Eg. etymology: OS 1992, 197; HSED #1782; Orel 1995, 123, #33. For SBch.-Eg.: Ehret 1997 MS, 206, #1806.
NB1: Attested in Angas-Sura: Angas mwen “journey” [Ormsby 1914, 210] = mwen “to go” [Flk. 1915, 244, 250] = mwen [m^wēn] “to travel” [Brq. 1971, 42, 51] = mwēn “to go, walk” [Hfm.] = mwen “to travel” [ALC 1978, 40] = (usual) mwèn

~ (hill) mèn “to trek, walk” [Gcl. 1994, 34, 71], Sura mwaan “reisen” [Jng. 1963, 76] = mwaan “to travel” [Hfm.], Mpn. mùan [mwàn] “to walk” [Frj. 1991, 38], Kfy. mwán “to go” [Ntg. 1967, 28] = mwaan “to go, walk” [Hfm.], Msr. mwan (so, short -a-) “1. to walk, go, 2. journey” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 183, 383] = mwaan “to walk, travel” [Jng. 1999 MS, 12], Mnt. moin [< *m^wən?] “journey” [Ftp. 1911, 218], Gmy. moin [mūən?] “to go” [Ftp. 1911, 217] = muaan, pl. muen “to go” [Srl. 1937, 145] = maw^γaan [maw^γ-reg < *m^w-], pl. maw^γen [reg < *m^wen] “gehen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 8] = muaan [müān] “to go, walk” [Hfm.] = ni migàn (so, -g-) [reg < *m^wan] “to go” [Krf.] = maaan (sg), muen (pl.) “to go” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 23] | SBch.: Zakshi & Boot & Zari & Sigidi man [Smz.], Saya mán [Csp. 1994, 45], Zaar-Lusa mân [Smz.] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 34, #58) || CCh.: Bura mwari [r < *n] “to go” [BED 1953, 146] = mumar “weggehen” < mwár ~ m^wari ~ m^wam^wari “gehen” [Hfm. 1955, 136, §65], Chibak mwár “gehen”, mumar “weggehen” [Hfm.] | Bcm. munó “to go away” [Crn. 1975, 463, §43].

NB2: Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 206, #1806) compared also NOm.: Zayse mang- “to begin”, which is semantically false. V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (ÖS 1992, 197; Orel 1995, 123, #33; HSED #1782), in turn, suggested the following semantically unconvincing parallels: NBrb.: Zayan mun “to accompany” || WCh.: Ngamo man “to return” || CCh. “to return”: Fjilbu mún, FMcl. min | Bcm. mūná, Mwulyen úmíná.

- 5. G. Takács (2005, 219, #306) compared it alternatively with the reflexes of AA *m-l “to move” [GT]. Less probable because of Cpt. -N-.

NB: Attested in Ar. malmala II “s’agiter dans son lit ne pouvant pas dormir, se tourner et retourner sur tous les côtés”, malmal-at- “rapidité des mouvements, célérité”, mulāmil- “agile, rapide, vélocé” [BK II 1153] || NBrb.: Mzg. melmel “bouger, remuer, se mouvoir” [Taifi 1991, 417] | Qbl. mbwiwel “1. remouer, bouger, 2. être déplacé, ébraulé” [DRB 1, 139: *b-w-l] || HECu.: Sid. milli yâ “to move (intr.), be shaken”, mill-isa “to move (intr.), be animated”, mill-o “movement, capability to move o’self” [Gsp. 1983, 232] = milli ass- “to shake (tr.)”, milli y- “to shake (intr.)” [Hds. 1989, 386] || NOm.: Gamu mūll- “to shake” [Lmb. 1985 MS, 12, #303] || WCh.: (?) Pero máalò “to wander about” [Frj. 1985, 41].

mnmn.t (MK, Wb II 81, 17–22) = “herd, cattle” (FD 109).

- Origin highly disputed:

- 1. W. Spiegelberg (1904, 46, §LXIII.B) pondered a connection to Eg. mnj (the hypothetical etymon of Mvñ(ε)υις instead of mr-wr). Unconvincing.

- 2. H. F. Lutz (1928–29, 185) and D. J. Wölfel (1955, 66, §56) were inclined to relate it with Eg. mnj “weiden”, mnj.w “herdsman” (above). Rejected already by H. P. Blok (1930, 24).

NB: In this case, Eg. mnmn.t should be regarded as a redupl. of the unattested Eg. *mn “cattle”, while Eg. mnj.w a nisba thereof (lit. *mn.j.w “that of the cattle”), which is rather improbable (cf. the entry for mnj).

- 3. H. P. Blok (1930, 24), P. Kaplony (1969, 37, fn. 33), and P. Wilson (PL 430) derived it from Eg. mnmn “to move” (q.v.), which would suggest a literal meaning **“etwas, das sich bewegt, die wogende Menge der Herdentiere”* (Blok). Not too convincing.

NB: Similarly, P. Kaplony (ibid.) took Eg. *hzt* “flock of sheep” (OK, Wb III 154) from Eg. *hzj* “to turn back, turn away” (MK, FD 177; cf. Wb III 159, 4), which is semantically even worse.

- **4.** GT: a reduplication of an unattested *mn “bull” (with coll. mng.) to be compared with AA *m-n “bull, buffalo” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in Agaw: Qemant *miyän* “young cow” [HSED #1773!] || LECu.: Saho-Irob *móynoy* “bull” [PW 1953, 385] || NOm. *mēn- “buffalo” [Bnd.]: Ometo *mēn(t)* “buffalo” [Bnd.]: Wlm. *mien-tā* “buffalo” [Crl. 1929, 33], Male *méni* “buffalo” [Sbr. 1994–95, 7, #171] | Zayse *meno* “buffalo” [Sbr.], Zrg *mms* “buffalo” [Sbr.], Haruro (Kcm.) *mēno* “buffalo” [Sbr.], Ganjule *mēno* “buffalo” [Sbr.] (SEOMt.: Sbr. 1994, 12) | Gimirra *men* “buffalo” [Bnd.] | (?) Kaffa *mēn-ō* “meat” [Crl.] | Dizi *mīn* “buffalo” [Bnd.] = *mieṅ* “buffalo” [Flm. apud Bnd. 1996 MS, #22], Sheko *mī:n* “buffalo” [Flm. 1972 MS, 7] = *mēn* “buffalo” [Akilu apud Bnd. 1984 MS, §22] | Hozo *mEyandi* “buffalo” [Bnd.] = *miāndi* [Sbr.-Wdk.], Sezo *meande* “buffalo” [Sbr.-Wdk.], Mao of Bambeshi *mēnē* “buffalo” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1993, 55] (Mao: Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 11, #171; NOm.: Bnd. 1988, 151) || WCh.: Boghom *mwòṅ* “ram, sheep” [Jng. 1965, 177] || CCh.: Matakam gr.: Udlam (Uldeme) *maṅ-ša* “cow, bull” [Skn. 1977, 184] | Musgu *mwuṅ* “buffalo” [Lks. 1941, 70; JI 1994 II, 51]. Cf. perhaps also WCh.: NBch. *nim “bull” [Skn. 1977, 14] with met.? AP: ENil.: Ongamo-Maa: Ongamo pl. *o-mónyí* “bull”, Maasai pl. *il-mónjí* “oxen” (Heine & VoBen 1976, 103).

NB2: From the same root (?): Eg. *mnw.tj* (Esna II 190:3,6) ~ *mnwjt* (Dendera VIII 150:19) “vache d’Hathor” (AL 78.1730).

- **5.** GT: in principle, Eg. *mnmn.t* (if < *mlml.t) could be also cognate with Sem. *mwl: Ar. *māl-* “1. bien, fortune, aboir, richesses, 2. troupeau de chameaux”, *mwl I* “être riche, surtout en troupeaux”, *IV* “donner à qqn. des troupeaux” [BK II 1168] || *Jbl. mol* “livestock” [Jns. 1981, 176], *Hrs. mōl* “flocks, livestock, bride-price” [Jns. 1977, 92], *Mhr. mōl* “livestock, capital” [Jns. 1987, 275] || SBrb.: *Ayr mǎllul* “un être vivant, animal” [PAM 1998, 217] || Cu.-Om. (< Ar.?) **māl-* “cattle (Rindvieh)” [Lmb.] > Agaw: *Bilin mal* “livestock, cattle” [Lmb.] || LECu.: Saho & Afar *māl* “money, richness” [Lmb.], Som. *mǎl* “livestock” [Abr. 1964, 172] | HECu. **māl-a* “meat” [Sasse 1982, 137; Hds. 1989, 98] (HECu.: cf. also CR 1913, 420; HL 1988, 129) || NOm.: *Koyra (Badditu) māli, māli, mālē* “cow” [Crl. 1951, 472] = *mālē* “cow” [Lmb.] || ECh.: *Mokilko mǎal* “herd” [Lks. 1977, 220], *WDng. máálá* & *EDng. mǎllē* (coll.) “1. troupeau, les bêtes, les animaux, 2. richesse, dot” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 193].

LIT.: Crl. 1938 II, 213; 1951, 472 (HECu.-Baditu); OS 1992, 182 (Eg.-Mokilko); Lmb. 1993, 106 (Koyra-Bilin).

NB1: Some of the AA forms listed here may represent late loan-words from Ar. *māl-*, which N. V. Jušmanov (1998, 164) explained from a fossilized compound **mā li-* “ro, что y... (what is with...)”.

NB2: M. Lambert (1993, 106; 1993, 355; LS 1997, 473–4) compared the Cu.-Om. data with NOm.: *Shinasha mīnz-a* “cattle”, *Anfillo minc-o (-ts-)* “cow, cattle”, *Sheko mīnṣ-o* “cow, cattle”, cf. also *Chara manc-ā* “buffalo” [Crl. 1938 III, 172], in which he assumed a “formative suffix” *-tV attached to Cu.-Om. **māl-* with the basic sense “to milk” (sic). Hardly so, cf. the discussion s.v. Eg. *mjz.t* (q.v.).

- 6. D. J. Wölfel (1955, 66, §56) affiliated it with Guance arm/benime “l’endroit de la bergerie”. False.
- 7. A. M. Lam (1993, 397) equated it Pulaar (Ful) mēm̄mēntu- “bêler de façon discordante (ce qui est la caractéristique de tout troupeau)”. False.

mnmn “(von Min, der seine Mutter ‘begattet’)” (XIX.-GR, Wb II 81, 16).

- 1. GT: met. of *nmnm, cf. Eg. mnmj “der Begatter” (NK Mag., Wb II 267, 15)?
- 2. Wb l.c.: ~ √bn, cf. Eg. bnbñ “als eine sexuelle Betätigung” (LP, Wb I 459)?
- 3. GT: cf. CCh.: Mafa man- “se multiplier, avoir de nombreux descendants” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 226]?

mnn.w (since XVIII.) < **mn.w** (OK) “1. die Festung (als militärische Anlage), 2. Festung (für sein Heer, vom König), 3. (GR) Umfassungsmauer des Tempels” (PT, Wb II 82, 2–7) = “fortress” (FD 109).

NB: J. Osing (NBÄ 299) considers NK mnn.w as a “Nebenform diminutiver Bed.” of OK mn.w.

● Etymology debated:

- 1. GT: most attractive would be to derive it from Eg. mn “to be firm” (above), for which cf. esp. ECh.: WDng. mà̀nìnà̀w & EDng. mǎ̀nìnǎ̀w (f) “la force, la puissance” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 195].
- 2. H. Goedicke (1966, 34) affiliated its OK form with Eg. mnj “to herd”. Unconvincing.
- 3. R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 125, utterance 377, n. 1, cf. 329) assumed an etymological connection with the Eg. hapax mnnj “to (be) shut up, imprison(ed) (?)”, which occurs in PT 662 in a pun on mnn.w: “*may you be shut up (?) in your name of ‘Fortress’...*”.

NB: K. Sethe (ÜKAPT III 218) rendered this alleged PT hapax differently (“*du sollst landen*”), regarding mnnj as a geminated form of mnj “to moor”, which, however, does not occur elsewhere in Faulkner’s view.

- 4. G. Takács (1995, 105–106, #3; 1996, 135, #28) explained it from the basic meaning *,building” (hence “fortress” due to a contamination with Eg. mn “firm”) comparing AA *m-(y)-n “1. to create, 2. build” > AA *min- “house” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Sem.: Tigre mäna “to create”, Argobba mäna “to make”, Gurage-Selti mäne “to build”, Gurage-Chaha mäna, Gurage-Ezha mäna “to be done” (Eth.-Sem.: Lsl. 1960, 214; 1979, 406) ||| Eg. jmn “bilden, schaffen” (PT, XVIII., 2x, Wb I 83, 4) = “to create” (FD 21) ||| Sem.: perhaps Ar. myn “to invent, fabricate” [KB 577] ||| Bed. mine “(er)schaffen” [Rn. 1895, 170–1] || ECu.: Kambatta min- “to build” [Hds. 1989, 33], Sidamo min- “costruire (una capanna)” [Crl. 1938 II, 214]

= min- “costruire” [Mrn. 1940, 230] = min- ~ miʔn- “to build (a house)” [Hds. 1989, 386] ||| WCh.: Tsagu mun- [assim. < *min-ʔ] “to build” [Skn. 1977, 14] || CCh.: Zime-Mesme min (pf.) “to mould (pots)” [Jng. 1978, 17]. The AA noun *min- “house” [GT] is attested in Agaw *ɲən [*ɲ- < *m-] “house” [Apl. 1984, 45; 1989, 6; 1991, 23] || ECu. *min- ~ *man- “house” [Sasse 1979, 24; 1982, 145; cf. also Lsl. 1988, 195; CR 1913, 420; Moreno 1937, 238; Zbr. 1985, 90]: LECu.: PSam *min “house” [Heine 1976, 216; 1977, 288; 1978, 91] | HECu. *min-e “house” [Hds. 1989, 418] || SCu. *min- “house” [Ehret 1980, 158] ||| WCh.: Bole-Tangale *mina “hut, house” [Stl. 1987, 247]. Lit.: Grb. 1955, 59; 1963, 58 (Dera-Sid.-Agaw); IS 1966, 17, 19 (Dera-ECu.-Agaw); Dlg. 1967, 10, #8 (ECu.-Agaw-Dera); Mlt.-OS 1989, 153 (WCh.-ECu.-SCu.); Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 8, #48 (Cu.-BT); HSED #1723 (Ch.-Cu.). For Cu.: also Ehret 1987, 104 (PCu. *min- “house” vs. “to build”). For Agaw-ECu.: also CrI. 1938 II, 214; Chn. 1947, #38; Bnd.-Flm. 1976, 41; Apl. 1989, 6; 1991, 20. For Eg. jmn < AA *m-n see Takács 1998, 116, #2; 1999, 356.

NB2: Alternatively, Eth.-Sem. *mny may derive from PSem. *bny (assim.?). Or borrowed from Cu.?

NB3: The comparison of Cu.-WCh. *m-n “to build” with Sem. *bny etc. is frequent (e.g. Lsl. 1949, 314, #38; Grb. 1955, 59; 1963, 58; IS 1966, 17; Dlg. 1967, 10, #8).

NB4: V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1989, 88; 1989, 133; 1992, 174) equated the Cu. and WCh. data with the first component of Eg. mnqḥ “kühler Raum im Hause zum Schlafen” (MK, Wb II 90, 15, below). Moreover, in HSED #1723 they quoted a non-existing Eg. mn “room” (sic). Rejected already by Takács 1995, 106, #3.

NB5: M. Cohen (1947, #38) suggested a direct comparison of Cu. *m[i]n- “house” with OEg. mn “to remain etc.” ~ Sem. *ʔmn (details above), which was rightly rejected by W. Leslau (1949, 314, #38).

mnn “annales” (late NK, AL 79.1224) = mnn.w “Annalen” (GHWb 339).

- GT: presumably from the same root as Eg. mn.w “Denkmal” (q.v.). NB: Hardly any connection with Ar. ml III “écrire qqch. sous la dictée de qqn.” [BK II 1141] and/or SBrb.: Ayr mālāl “agir, parler à tour de rôle” [PAM 2003, 539].

mnn (GW mnwjnjw) “die Mine (als Goldgewicht)” (XIX/XX., Wb II 82, 1) = “Mine (Gewicht)” (Helck 1971) = “Mine (Wertangabe)” (Helck 1989).

NB: Syllabic spelling min-nuⁿⁱ (Helck, Cochavi-Rainey & Sivan: the significance of doubled -nn- in the Eg. spelling is not clear) = *man-nu₂: [*manū] (Hoch).

- Borrowed from Sem., cf. Akk. manû “Mine (ca. 480 g)” > Sum. mana [AHW 604] || Ug. mn “mina (unit of weight of 470 gm.)” [DUL 561], Hbr. māne(h) “mina (measuring unit for precious metals)” [KB 599], etc. > Gk. μνᾶ ~ Ionic μνέα (f) “mine, poids et monnaie de cent drachmes” > Lat. mina [Boisacq].

LIT.: Helck 1971, 513, #87; 1989, 140, §12; Cochavi-Rainey & Sivan 1992, 7, §1.1.2; Hoch 1994, 127, §162.

mnn.t (GW, fem.) “Teil eines Grabes an seinem Granitverschluß (?)” (XX., Wb II 82, 8) = “either a part of granite sarcophagus (perhaps

lid) or part of, a location within the tomb (the burial chamber)” (Hoch 1994, 129, §167) = “*Grabverschluss” (GHWb 339).

NB: GW man-nu₂-ta: [*manuta] (?) (Hoch).

● Origin debated:

- 1. R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 125, utterance 377, n. 1, cf. p. 329) suggested a rare Eg. mnnj “to shut up, imprison” (PT 662). GT: this might be the fitting source whence “Grabverschluss” can be explained.

NB1: Is this akin to ECu.: Yaaku (Mogogodo) imni “cover or lid” [Grb. 1963, 32, §44] = imni, pl. imno[?] (f) “lid for closing beehive” [Heine 1975, 129]?

NB2: For a different interpretation of PT 662 mnnj (< mnnj “landen”) see ÜKAPT III 218.

- 2. J. Hoch (l.c.), ignoring, Faulkner’s idea, *a priori* assumed a Sem. borrowing, although he himself admitted that “*no convincing etymology can be proposed*”.
- 3. W. A. Ward (1996, 28, §167), too, saw in it a “*native Eg. lexeme*”, which “*must be a colloquial term derived from mnnj ‘moor (a boat)’; in its common derived sense ‘to die; death’, hence the place of death, an appropriate term for either a sarcophagus or burial chamber*”. Far-fetched, since there are many other parts of a tomb that might be explained this way.

mnnn (or **mnn**) ~ var. **mnr** (LP) “der Asphalt (zur Balsamierung und als Bestandteil einer Salbe)” (late NK-GR, Wb II 82, 9–14; WD II 61: cf. RdE 37, 1986, 28 with lit.) = “eines der aromatischen Harze” (Lüring quoted by Harris) = “bitume ayant servie à la momification (en rituel de l’embaumement)” (Loret 1894, 158–162) = “(prob.) une huile ou une autre substance grasse, une graisse, matière qui n’est... ni liquide ni solide, huile (?)” (Jéquier 1921, 147 & fn. 3 & p. 148) = “der schwarze Stoff der früheren Mumien aus pflanzlicher Basis” (Lucas apud Koura 1999, 228) = “hardly bitumen, rather a resin, probably wood tar or wood pitch or coniferous oil or resin” (Harris 1961, 173) = “(may after all refer to) bitumen or a mixture containing bitumen (there is still some evidence for the use of bitumen in embalming before the GR), though identification as wood tar or wood pitch seems more probable” (Harris 1961, 234) = “Bitumen” (KHW) = “wood tar” (Janssen apud Koura 1999, 228) = “resin (?) (not ‘manna’)” (Kitchen, LÄ IV 1199–1200, n. 29) = “Teer, Pech” (Fuchs, LÄ VI 290) = “l’asphalte natif” (Aufrère 1982–3, 16; 1984, 1f.) = “résine noire, asphalte (?)” (Aufrère 1990, 41, 137–8) = “(it is not sure whether it designated bitumen, more probably) a kind of resin” (Niwiński 1992, 468) = “*Bitumen, *Naturasphalt, *Harzöl” (GHWb 339) = “pistaccia resin (extensively imported into Egypt

from the NK, used in mummification)” (Serpico apud PL) = “resin, pitch, asphalt” (PL 430–1).

NB1: Mostly read as mnnn (Wb, Harris, CED, KHW, Fuchs, GHWb, PL, Koura, WD, etc.), while Aufrière (1990 l.c.) suggested mnn, which seems preferable in the light of the Cpt. reflex.

NB2: Lucas (1948, 384f.) hold the sense “bitumen” (part of the embalming procedure only from the GR times) to be unlikely

- Hence: Cpt. (B) ΜΙΟΛΩΝ ~ ΜΙΟΛΟΝ ~ ΜΗΟΛΟΝ “bitumen (extracted from embalmed corpses)” (CD 165a; CED 81) = “Bitumen, Pech” (KHW 89) = “bitume” (DELIC 109).

NB: E. Chassinat (1921, 65; 1922, 463) doubted the identity of Eg. mnnn with the Cpt. word.

- 1. Its traditional comparison with its synonym (in the Cpt. *scalae*), Ar. mūmiyā- “sorte de bitume auquel on attribue des vertus vulnéraraires extraordinaires” [Vcl.] = “Mumie” [KHW] > Mand. mumi(i)a “piss-asphalt, a kind of bitumen used as ointment and preservative” [DM 262], maintained by V. Loret (1894, 161), W. Westendorf (KHW 89), and W. Vycichl (DELIC 109 with further lit.), has serious (phonological) drawbacks and can in no way be accepted.

NB: This etymology does not account for the presence of *-l- in the Eg. word, and ignores that Eg. -n- ≠ Ar. -m-. Moreover, Ar. mūm- “wax” was borrowed from Pers. mūm “Erdpech oder Bitumen” (so also Hannig 2006, 15).

- 2. A. Niwiński (1992, 468) derived it (and mn denoting a product of black colour) from Eg. mn “to be firm, established, remain”. He regarded it “*imaginable that the black substance mn or mnnn used in the mummification process was intended to make the mummy like a monument (mnw) as firm (mn) as a fortress (mnw)*”.

- 3. GT: with regard to LEg. mnr and Cpt. -λ-, it may be supposed that Eg. mnnn reflects *mll ~ *mnl (or the like) > PCpt. *ΜΙΟΛΟΛ. As noted by W. Vycichl (DELIC 109), the final syllable in Cpt. (orig. *ΜΙΟΛΟΛ?) may have been influenced by the Gk. nom. sg. neutr. ending -ov. Eg. mnnn has highly promising parallels in NBrb.: Qabyle ti-mul-in “suei” [Dit. 1982, 497] ||| LECu.: Boni mulūl? “black”, mulūl? ~ malūl “(char)coal” [Heine 1977, 289, 292; 1982, 95, 98] ||| CCh.: Daba memlij “noir” [Giger & Lienhard 1975, 100] || ECh.: Lele mīlī “noir (chevaux)”, múmlī “noir et déforme (ongle, mycose)” [WP 1982, 63] | Bdy. mòl “noircir les marmites avec de la bouse de vache” [AJ 1989, 100] < AA *m-l-l) “black” [GT].

NB1: J.-M. Dallet (l.c.) explained the Qbl. word as “euphémisme par antiphrase” < √m-l-l “to be white”.

NB2: Here might belong also LECu.: Som. mā-éyyo “1. black sap, 2. black blood mixed with impurities which issue from a wound” [Abr. 1964, 172]. V. Blažek (1992, 255) equated a certain Somali maleyo “tar, pitch” (sic) [Blz.; absent in Rn. 1902, 296; Bell 1969, 175] with Ar. mall-at- “heiße Asche, glühende Kohle”, for which cf. Czech smůla “pitch” < IE *smel- “langsam und rauchend verbrennen” (for which cf. Eg. mn.t “Schmelzfeuer”, Wb, q.v.).

mnrws (***mlws**) “Nistplatz” (XX. hapax: Ostr. Gardiner 339, l. 10; Helck 1971, 513, #89; GHWb 339) = “nesting place” (DLE I 222) = “nest” (Hoch 1994, 127–8) = “nid” (Mathieu 1996, 123, n. 420).

NB: Written in GW: ma-r₂-wa-śu (Helck) = ma-n-r-wa-su₂, i.e., *marwasu (?) (Hoch).

- Etymology obscure. Seems to be a loan-word borrowed from a Sem. *m- prefix nomen loci form, but the underlying root is not clear.
- **1.** W. Helck (1971, 513, #89): probably < Hbr. rwš “besetzen” (sic). Error.

NB1: Does not exist. There is only Hbr. rwš qal “to be poor” [KB 1029], which can have hardly been the right root for Eg. *mlws “nest”. J. Hoch (1994, 128, fn. 4) surmises Helck to have had Hbr. yrš “1. to take possession of, 2. be heir to s’one” [KB 443] < Sem. *wrt “to inherit” in mind, although here too, the mng. is not very suitable.

NB2: B. Mathieu (l.c.) misquoted even Helck’s false suggestion as a derivation from a non-attested Hbr. mls (sic)!

- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 127–8, #164) found Helck’s rendering “*a little too broad*” and his etymology as impossible (rightly). Instead, he rather preferred a pass. part. derived from Sem. *ryš > Ar. rāša “to provide with feathers, feather a nest” [Hoch] = ryš “garnir (la flèche) de plumes”, cf. marš- “garni de plumes (flèche, etc.)” [BK I 962]. Unconvincing because of the Eg. *-l-.

mnh.t “Art Krug (für Milch?)” (NK, Wb II 82, 16) = “Milchkrug” (GHWb 339).

- May be a metathetic var. of NK mhn(j) (NK) < MK mhr “Milchkrug” (Wb, below).

mnhj.w (stone block det.) “a monumental stone (no identification)” (NK hapax in a list of statues and their materials, Harris 1961, 86, cf. ZÄS 37, 96) = “nom d’un pierre” (AC 1977, 8) = “peut-être un minéral de couleur bleue” (AL 77.1735) = “a stone” (DLE I 220) = “ein Stein” (GHWb 339).

- D. Meeks (AL l.c.) surmises an etymological connection to CT II 14d–e mnh.w (stone block det.) ~ var. mnhj.t (circle det.) “Himmelsbezirk” (Altenmüller 1975, 323) = “(désigne) le ciel” (AL l.c.) = “?” (DCT 169), both deriving from a hypothetical basic sense “blue”.

mnhp “der Morgen” (GR, Wb II 83, 1) = “morning” (PL 432).

- As noted by H. Grapow (1914, 25) and H. Smith (1979, 162), derives from Eg. nhp.w “früher Morgen” (PT, Wb II 284, 9–10) vs. Eg. nhp “früh auf etwas sein” (XVIII., Wb II 284, 5–6) = “to rise early in the morning” (FD 135).

NB: The etymology of this root is debated. (1) M.-Th. Derchain-Urtel (1973, 43) saw in it a fig. sense deriving from Eg. nhp “entspringen” (i.e., lit. “das Aufspringen der Menschen und Tiere vom Nachtlager”)? (2) Eg. nhp has been usually equated with Ar. nabaha “s’éveiller, se réveiller (du sommeil)” ~ nabihā “3. faire attention à qqch.” [BK II 1189] = “to awaken from sleep” [Alb]. Lit.: Albright 1927, 222; Ember 1926, 302, fn. 10, 309, fn. 5; 1930, #8.b.2; GÄSW 66, #220; Vrg. 1945, 134, #6.b.2. This comparison is somewhat weak: Eg. -p ≠ Ar. -b-. The same root may have been retained in LECu.: Rnd. nebáy “2. wakefulness” [PG 1999, 232], Arb. neybeh-aḏ- “to wake up (intr.)” [Hyw. 1984, 387]. (3) M. Cohen (1947, #459) compared Eg. nhp with NBrb.: Beni Snus tu-fu-t “matin” ||| SBrb.: Tuareg (sic) u-fu “commencer à faire clair pour”, which is out of question. Brb. *ta-faw-t “sunshine” [Mt. 1991, 259] is cognate with Sem. *wp^o ~ LEg. p^op^o (GR, EDE II, q.v.). (4) P. Lacau (1972, 58, §26.7): ~ Hbr. n?p, which is semantically out of question.

mnhp “der Begatter” (GR, Wb II 82, 17) = “procreator (of the ram of Mendes)” (Smith) = “Begetter” (PL 431).

- From the same root: (1) mnhp “phallus et dos réunis” (Yoyotte, BIFAO 61, 141; AC 1978, 14) = “appareil génital” (AL 78.1738) = “Phallus” (WD II 61); (2) mnhp “ein Aphrodisiacum” (GR, Wb II 82, 18) = “aphrodisiac plant” (PL 431) = “‘Mittel zum Begatten’-Pflanze (nicht feststellbar, welche Name ist)” (Germer 2002, 126).

- It derives (by prefix m-), as pointed out by H. Grapow (1914, 24), H. Smith (1979, 162), and P. Wilson (PL), from Eg. nhp “bespringen (vom Stier), begatten (vom Menschen)” (OK, Wb II 284, 3–4) = “to copulate” (FD 135) = “to procreate” (Smith).

NB: The etymology of this root has been disputed: (1) K. Sethe (ÜKAPT ad PT 582b) and M.-Th. Derchain-Urtel (1973, 43): the meaning of Eg. nhp was secondary (euphemistic) < Eg. nhp “to spring” (XVIII., Wb II 283–284) = “to pulsate” (FD 135). (2) Others, however, prefer equating it with Hbr. n?p “to commit adultery, ehebrechen” [GB 477], which is questionable due to the irregular Eg. -h- vs. Hbr. -?-. (cf. EDE I 294–5). Lit. for Eg.-Hbr.: Erman 1892, 113; Ember 1911, 89; 1930, #8.a.3, #11.a.27, #13.b; GB 477; Trb. 1923, 137, #247; GÄSW 164, #663; Chn. 1947, #446; Vcl. 1960, 175; DELC 151. (3) M. Cohen (1947, #446) extended the Eg.-Hbr. etymology to a certain Brb. *√n-b-y “coïter (en parlant de l’homme)”, which is out of question, since – to the best of my knowledge – it exists only in SBrb.: Ahaggar e-nbi “monter (une femme), accomplir l’acte sexuel” [Foucauld 1951–52 III, 1288], while in almost all other Brb. lgs. it denotes “to taste” (eventually PBrb. *mḏi, cf. Ksm. 1999, 191, #560), which may be the primary sense the metaphoric and euphemistic Hgr. mng. might have derived from.

mnhz “Wächter (von Göttern)” (PT 816a, XVIII., Wb II 83, 2) = “Wachender” (Grapow 1914, 25) = “Bewachender” (AÄG 110, §256) = “watcher” (Smith 1979, 161; PL 432) = “Wächter (von Göttern), Bewachender” (ÄWb I 535).

- Derives (via participial m- prefix) from Eg. nhzj “er-, aufwachen aus dem Schlaf” (OK, Wb II 287), cf. Grapow 1914, 25; Ol’derogge 1956, 7; Smith 1979, 161; PL 432.

NB: The etymology of this root is obscure. GT: cf. either (1) Sem. *nhz (?): Mand. \sqrt{nhz} “to move noisily, cause disturbance, clatter about, bluster about, reel about, move boisterously, violently, shake about, struggle violently” [DM 291], Syr. \sqrt{nhz} “to arouse commotion, excite” [DM] | Ar. nahaza “6. lever la tête en se mettant en marche (se dit d’une bête)” [BK II 1355]; (2) or, as irreg. match (or a root var. to Sem. *nhz?), PClass. Yemeni Ar. nkz I: nukuz “to be frightened from a sudden noise, wake up (intr.)”, II “to wake up, disturb” [Pianta 1990, 497]?

mnhd “das Schreibgerät” (PT, XVIII., Wb II 83, 3) = “a writing outfit” (Grd. 1915, 65) = “écritoire” (Lacau 1954, 88, fn. 2) = “scribe’s palette” (FD 109) = “das Schreibzeug, das alte aus Steinpalette, Farbbeutel und Binsenkapsel zusammengesetzte Gerät (noch im A.R. durch eine neuartige Palette gsj ersetzt)” (Schott 1968, 46) = “das Schreibgerät, die Palette, Schreibpalette (älteren Typs)” (ÄWb I 535).

NB: H. Grapow (l.c.) and A. H. Gardiner (l.c.) both read it erroneously mnhd (sic, -h-).

- Apparently a nomen instr. (as already suggested by H. Grapow 1914, 25) derived (via m- prefix) from an unattested Eg. *nhd, which is difficult to identify.

NB: Perhaps lit. *‘‘tool of drawing (lines)’’? Cf. Ar. nahāḡa “1. tracer, frayer un chemin, 2. être bien tracé, frayé, distinct (se dit d’une grand’route), 3. suivre un chemin” [BK II 1352], which, however, derives from Sem. *nhg “to drive” [GT], cf. Lsl. 1987, 393.

mnh (orig. **mnhj?**) “Papyrus oder eine ähnliche Sumpfpflanze” (MK, Wb II 83, 8; Germer 1988, 249) = “papyrus-plant” (FD 109; DCT 169) = “Cyperus papyrus L.” (Germer 1979, 138–9 with detailed discussion) = “reeds, plants” (DLE I 221) = “(*junger) Papyrus (Cyperus papyrus *antiquorum): *Jüngling” (GHWb 340; ÄWb I 535) = “a less usual term for papyrus, the symbolic plant of Lower Egypt (may have denoted a certain type of papyrus, or perhaps specifically the tuber or stem of the papyrus plant, or the papyrus at a certain stage of maturity)” (PL 432) = “Zypergras, Papyrusstaude” (Germer 2002, 81).

NB1: First attested in the OK with a final -j: mnhj (AL 77.1737; GHWb l.c.).

NB2: Supposed to be preserved also by Gk. $\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$ “name of papyrus” (Theophrastus), cf. Thompson 1932, 249; Roquet 1994, 307–310 (suggesting a correspondence of Eg. -h- > Gk. -σ- on the analogy of Eg. wḥ3.t “oasis” > Gk. ὄασις and discussing on pp. 310–4 the late alternation of Gk. intervocalic *-σ- > *-h-/-Ø- ~ -σ-).

- Fem.: mnḥ.t “Papyrusstengel” (NK, Fischer-Elfert 1986, 54).

NB: The name of the goddess mnh(j).t “she of the papyrus-plant (whose milk is sweet: bnj-jrt.t)” (CT VII 205k, AECT III 101–2, spell 993, n. 6; DCT 169; cf. Jéquier 1921, 14) is regarded by R. O. Faulkner (AECT l.c.) as the origin of mnhj.t (Wb II 84, 3–8) applied to a number of goddesses often depicted as bearing a papyrus-stem staff. Note that H. Smith (1979, 162), in turn, derived this name (as “doubtless”) from Eg. mnḥ “to slaughter”.

- Origin obscure:
- **1.** H. Brugsch (1882, 68), A. Erman (1892, 111), and F. von Calice (GÄSW #628) suggested that it was an early loan from NWSem., cf. Hbr. mallū^aḥ “Melde (Gk. ὄλιμος), atriplex halimus Linn., ein salatähnliches Gewächs, dessen junge Blätter roh und gekocht eine Speise armer Leute abgaben” [GB 426] = “Mesembrianthemum Forskali” [Löw] = “oarche, Atriplex Halimus (eaten as food by the poor), mal-low, saltwort” [Hölscher] = “salt-weed” [KB 587] = “a salt-marsh plant” [Hnrg.], PBHbr. mallū^aḥ “Melde, ein salatähnliches Gewächs, dessen junge Blätter den Armen als Speise dienten” [Levy 1924 III 127]. Improbable both semantically and because of Gk. -v-.
NB: Hbr. mallū^aḥ, along with Akk. ma/ullaḥtu “ein salziges Gras” [AHW 596] and Ar. mullayḥ- “sorte de plante (reaumuria vermiculata)” [BK 1145], derives from Sem. *milḥ- “salt” [Hnrg. 2000, 2065].
- **2.** R. Hannig (GHWb & AWb l.c.) suggested an etymological connection with Eg. mnḥ “Jüngling, Bursche” (NK, Wb, below).
NB: In Edfu VII 173:9–10 (also Edfu III 193:3), the verb mnḥ “to make young” is used in a pun on mnḥ “papyrus” to parallel w3ḏ “papyrus” vs. “child” ~ w3ḏ “green or young” (PL 432).
- **3.** GT: or any connection with LECu.: Saho malāḥ (m) “eine Pflanzensorte (Bilin takanā), als Futterkraut sehr geschätzt” [Rn. 1890, 266]? Doubtful because of Gk. -v-.
NB: Difficult to decide whether the similarity with LECu.: Orm.-Borana mell-ā “a papyrus-like reed, found in swampy areas” [Strm. 1995, 209] is only accidental (no trace of *-ḥ- in Orm.), cf. rather Eg. m3.t [*<**ml.t] “das Rohr des Schilfs” (OK, Wb, q.v.). In principle, Orm. mell- < *melḥ- is plausible.

mnḥ.w “Schaum (auf den Lippen einer wütenden Göttin)” (XVIII., Wb II 84, 10; GHWb 340) = “froth on lips” (FD 109).

- G. Takács (lit. infra): presumably, it reflects AA *m-l-ḥ “to exude bodily efflux (orig. of abscess?)” [GT].
NB1: Attested in Sem.: Ar. malaḥ- “tumeur au jarret du cheval” [BK II 1144] = “tumor in suffragine equi” [Freytag apud Dlg.] (Dlg.: orig. *’abscess?’) ||| SBrb.: perhaps Hgr. tā-mellemel-t “humeur vitrée qui remplit le fond du globe de l’oeil” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1194] (unless < √m-l-l “white”) ||| PCu. *malḥ- “to ooze out (of body), pus” [Ehr. 1987, #422] > ECu. *malḥ- “pus” [Sasse] = “Eiter” [AMS]: LECu. *mal(a)ḥ- [Black]: Saho malāḥ “der Eiter” [Rn. 1890, 266] = malaḥ “pus” [Vergari 2003, 130], Afar malaḥ “der Eiter” [Rn.] = malaḥ “pus”, malaḥ-e “to exude pus” [PH 1985, 162; Hyw. 1974, 392], Somali mālah “der Eiter” [Rn. 1902, 295] = malaḥ “pus” [Abr. 1964, 172], Jābāri mūluḥ “der Eiter” [Rn. 1904, 78], PBoni *mālāḥ “pus” [Heine 1982, 123], Arbore meleḥ “pus”, meleḥ- “to suppurate” [Hyw. 1984, 384], Oromo malā “pus”, malaʔa “to burst (pus from wound)” [Gragg 1982, 275] = malaʔā “pus, vesicorpuscle”, malaʔū “to be discharged (pus)”, malā “pus, abscess, suppuration” [Btm. 2000, 187], Konso mal- “to let pus out” [Black] (LECu.: Black 1974, 200, 202; Sasse 1973, 269; Zbr. 1975, 328) | HECu. *mal-a “pus” [Hds. 1989, 417]: e.g. Sid. malā “to burst and discharge pus (sore, wound)”, malāwa “to have a sour, wound” [Gsp. 1983, 220–1], Burji māl-ā “pus”, mal-iy-

“to suppurate” [Ss.] (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 195; Hds. 1989, 119) | Gollango malāh-ko “Eiter, Geschwür” [AMS 1980, 212] | Yaaku mlleh “pus” [Ehr.] (ECu.: Rn. 1886, 882; Ehret 1974, 87; Sasse 1979, 5, 21, 35–36; 1982, 139–140; AMS 1980, 64) || SCu. *malih- “pus” ~ *malah- “to expel viscous body fluid” [Ehret]: Iraqw malhari “pus”, malah- “to bring up phlegm, loosen phlegm” [Ehr.] = malāh- “to loosen (of a cough), give pus (of a pimple or wound)”, malh-ari “pus” [MQK 2002, 69–70] | Dahalo malīhaʔa “pus” [Nurse 1986, 30; EEN 1989, 37] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 154, 323; Cu.: Ehret 1987, #422) || CCh.: perhaps Masa mila “ulcer” [Krf.] = ml̄ “abcès, plaie” [Ctc. 1983, 106], Banana mbil-na [mb- < *m- reg.] “ulcer” [Krf. 1981, #256]. SCu.: Iraqw malah- “to bring up phlegm” is esp. close to the meaning of Eg. mn̄h.w [*ml̄h.wʔ]. Note that Akk. malū “Beutel, Geschwulst” [Holma 1913, 11–15] has not been confirmed in AHW and CAD.

NB2: The semantical connection of Eg. “froth on lips” vs. Cu. “pus” is justifiable, cf. NEg. rj.t [< *r.l.t ~ r.r.t] “Eiter” (Med., Wb II 399) ~ Hbr. ryr qal “fließen” → *r̄r “ausfließender Speichel, Geifer, Schleim” [GB 759] | Ar. rayr- “bave qui coule de la bouche d’un enfant” vs. rāʔul “bave, écume qui sort de la bouche du cheval”, ruʔal- “bave, écume que jette le cheval” [BK I 961, 795].

NB3: G. Takács (1998, 136) wonders whether the isogloss of Bed. melo “tears” [Rn. 1895, 168] || ECh.: Tumak m̄l̄l̄ “tear” [Cpr. 1975, 85] was distinct (met. of AA *l-m “tears”?). Note that CCh.: Buduma himālo “tears” [Lks. 1939, 104] cannot be related (borrowed from Kanuri šimalò).

NB4: Naturally, ECu. *malh- has nothing to do with Ar. maḡl- as suggested by L. Reinisch (1902, 295).

LIT.: Dlg. 1987, 200, #37 (ECu.-SCu.-Ar.); Takács 1996, 135–6, #29; 1997, 228, #; 1997, 260–1, #7.2; 1998, 136; 2000, 98–99, #29.2; 2004, 58, #348 (Eg.-Cu.-?Ar.).

mn̄h “das Wachs (der Biene)” (XVIII., Wb II 83, 4) = “beeswax” (Goodwin 1867, 86; Janssen 1975, 353, §110) = “wax” (FD 109) = “Bienenwachs” (Koura 1999, 198–9 with discussion and lit.) → Cpt. (SAB) $\mu\omicron\gamma\lambda\bar{\omega}$ “1. Wachs, 2. Kerze, 3. Honigwabe” (KHW 91) = “wax, candle, honeycomb” (CED 82).

NB: C. Peust (1999, 166) explained Cpt. - λ - as being due to a secondary assim. * n - > * l - in the proximity of m -.

● No evident cognates.

■ 1. V. Blažek (1991, 49), followed by G. Takács (1998, 153) assumed an ultimate derivation from AA * m -l “honey” [GT], whereby the final - h would have to be considered as a root extension just like * b in ECu. *malab- “honey” [Sasse 1979, 14].

NB1: Attested in NBrb.: perhaps Shilh a-mlu “mélange de pâte d’amandes avec l’huile d’arganier et du miel” [Mntsr. 1999, 164] || LECu.: Arbore m̄l̄ “liquid part of raw honey” [Hyw. 1984, 386] | HECu.: Sidamo malʔ- ~ mal- “essere sapido, saporito, dolce” [Mrn. 1940, 228] || SCu.: Dahalo móla “(honey) mead” [EEN 1989, 38] = móla, pl. mólalle “mead” [Tosco 1991, 143] | Ma’a (Mbugu) māla [Mnh. 1906, 313] = mála “beer (generic)” [Ehret] (GT: orig. *mead?) (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 154) || NOm.: Wlt. maʔl- “to taste well”, Gofa malʔ- “to have a good taste”, Gamu & Dache malʔ- “to taste good”, malʔ-o “sweet” | Haruro (Kachama) malʔ- “to have a good taste” (NOm.: LS 1997, 450–1) || ECh.: (?) Bidiya mole “boisson (terme générique)” [Alio-Jng. 1989, 100] = “alcoholic drink” [Blz.] (orig. *mead?).

NB2: V. M. Illič-Svityč (1976, 38, #276) derived ECu. *malab- “honey” [Sasse 1979,

14; HECu.: Hds. 1989, 417; cf. CrI. 1938 II, 214] from a bicon. *mal-, preserved in HECu.: Sidamo mal- “honey”. SCU. *mala “mead” is not necessarily due a delition of the final *-b, i.e. *mala- < *malab- (as suggested in Ehret 1980, 15).

NB3: H. C. Fleming (1969, 9, #13) suggests that ECu.: Yaaku meren gen. “beehive” [Heine 1975, 120] || SCU.: Asa meringo, Gorowa meringi “honey barrels (in trees)” (SCu.: Flm.) may be related too.

NB4: M. Lambert & R. Sottile (1997, 450–451) treat the NOm. data as reflexes of OCu. *me^c- “to be tasty, taste good” plus suffix *-l- (function unexplained).

AP: PDateoga *mal “honey” [HRV 1979, 77] ~ ENil.: Masai melok, pl. ta-melono “to be sweet, tasty”.

DP: PIE *mel-it- “sweet, honey” & PIE *mel-n- > Lat. mel, gen. sg. mellis “honey” [GI 1984, 603].

LIT.: Goodwin 1867, 86 (Eg.-IE); Flm. 1969, 9, #13 (ECu.-SCu.); IS 1976, 38, #276; (IE.-Cu.); Bmh. 1984, 275, #288 (ECu.-SCu.-IE); Blz. 1990, 207, #276 (Arbore-SCu.); 1991, 49, #26 (ECu.-Eg.-SCu.-Ch.); Takács 1998, 153, #11 (Eg.-Cu.-Ch.-IE).

- 2. Ch. Ehret (1995, 306, #587) equated it with Cu. *malḥ- “to ooze out, pus”, which he affiliated with a number of impossible parallels. Unacceptable.

NB: Such as Ar. ml “to drop excrement”, LECu.: PSom. *mallay “fish”, Om. *mol- “fish”, WCh. *m-l “water” < AA *mal- “to flow” (sic).

- 3. GT: or cf. perhaps Ar. malāḥa II “être sufisamment gras...” [BK II 1144].

- Other proposals cannot be accepted:

- 4. A. Peyron (quoted by Spg.) combined its Cpt. reflex with Cpt. (SL) ΜΟΥΛᾶ, (B) ΜΟΛᾶ, (F) ΜΑΛᾶ “zusammenfügen”, which was rightly rejected by W. Spiegelberg (1919–20, 25–26, §17), who correctly derived these from Eg. mnḥ “aufziehen” (q.v.).

- 5. The connection with Eg. mrḥ.t “Salböl” (OK, Wb, q.v.) maintained by Goodwin (1867, 86), Brugsch (1882, 68), and Reinisch (1890, 266) is out of question.

NB: Goodwin suggested further unacceptable cognates: Sem. *milḥ- “salt”, Sem. *mrḥ “to rub with oil”, Eg. mrḥ “bitumen”, Hbr. mān “manna”, Gk. μύρρα “myrrha”.

- 6. As rightly noted by A. Erman (1892, 112), it has surely no connection with Sem. *milḥ- “salt” (contra Goodwin 1867, 86; Rn. 1890, 266).

- 7. L. Homburger (1957, 30) compared it with Drv.: Tamil meḷuku, Kui mena.

mnḥ “Jüngling, Bursche (zwischen Kind und Mann), bes. als Bez. von Arbeitern und Sklaven” (late NK, Wb II 83, 13–17; WD II 61: cf. RdE 34, 1982, 80, n. c) = “junger Bursche” (Brugsch, ZÄS 14, 1876, 71) = “stripling” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 553 index) = “Halbwüchsiger (als Arbeiter im Nekropolis)” (Arnold, LÄ II 848) = “jeune (d’un animal)” (AL 78.1743 after Borghouts 1978, 1, #2) = “youth, stripling”

(DLE I 221) = “1. Jüngling, Bürschchen, Bursche, 2. Jungarbeiter, Lehrling, Gehilfe, 3. Jungtier” (GHWb 340) = “youth, young one” (PL 432) = “junger Mann im heiratsfähigen Alter, spezifisch: Lehrling (der Handwerker von Deir el-Medina)” (Junge 1999, 351).

NB: Hence GR mnḥ “taurillon (?)” (Ūrk. VIII 104f., AL l.c.) > [m]nh.w (pl.) “Jungtiere”, glossed with OCpt. mnḥēi with a pl. ending -hī (Tebtunis onomasticon, 2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998, 121–2, n. b).

- From the same root: GR (Edfu) mnḥ “verjüngen, jung werden” (Kurth 1994, 12, §51) = “to make young” (PL 432). Denom. verb?

- 1. V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova, followed by G. Takács, related it with certain reflexes of AA *m-n-ʕ (vars. *m-n-y ~ *m-y-n?) “little child” [GT]. Plausible, albeit somewhat uncertain because, with respect to Dahalo mána^{ʕe}, we have to posit an original AA *^ʕ in the *Auslaut* (irreg. alternation of *^ʕ ~ *-h?).

NB1: Attested in NBrb.: Mzg. (Ait Ayyash) a-myan, pl. i-myaun “bouc (animal)” [Tf. 1991, 446] | Bottiwa a-mian, pl. i-mian-en “jeune bouc”, fem. ta-mian-t, pl. ū-mian-in “chevrette, jeune chèvre” [Biarnay 1911, 185] || WBrb.: Zng a-meini, fem. ta-meini-t “petit d’animal” [Bst. 1909, 246] = a-méini, fem. ta-méini-t “petit d’animal” [Ncl. 1953, 220] = a-meyni “junges Tier” [Vcl.] || SBrb.: Hgr. a-maynu “Jungesel” [Vcl. 2005, 65], EWlm. & Ayr a-māyno, pl. Ayr i-māyna & EWlm. i-mina “jeune homme, fille” [PAM 1998, 230; 2003, 570] || SCu. *mana^ʕ- [Ehr.] = *m^wana^ʕ- [GT]: Ma’a (Mbugu) mwana “child” [Mnh. 1906, 315] | Dahalo mána^{ʕe} “baby” [EEN 1989, 37] = “(new-born) baby” [Tosco 1991, 142] || WCh.: Polchi miimáni “boy, child” [Csp.], Wangday min “child” [Smz./JI], Boghom man “son” [Csp. 1994, 66], Saya ŋaa-mwán “boy, child” [Csp.], Zul nyé-móone “boy, child” [Csp.] (SBch.: Csp. 1999, §4) | BN *mānyim “boy” [GT] > Ngz. máayim “boy, young man” [Schuh 1981, 113], Bade máanyim-ón “Junge” [Lks. 1968, 223], WBade máanyimân “boy” [Schuh], Bade-Mazgarwa máanyim “boy” [Schuh], Duwai máanyim “boy” [Schuh] (BN: Schuh 1972, 53) || CCh.: (?) Gisiga maŋgal [< *man-gal?] “child” [Lks. 1970, 128] || ECh. *māny ~ *mayn “baby” [GT]: Kwang máany “bébé” [Jng. 1973 MS, 43], Kwang-Mobu māŋ “bébé, porte-bébé” [Ebert 1977 MS, 1], Kwang-Ngam ki-mayn-ke & -Mobu kê-mân “enfant” [Coates 1991 MS, 4], Kwang-Gaya & Mindera kê-mân-ke “enfant” [Coates 1991 MS, 1] | Lele mányò “être petit, petite” [WP 1982, 61] | Somray māny “bébé” [Jng. 1993 MS, 43], Tumak mōŋŋ “enfant” [Cpr. 1975, 84], perhaps Ndam-Gulei men “Sohn” [Lks. 1937, 95] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 74). Cf. also Ch. *m-n “small” (Chibak, Lele, Tumak) [JS 1981, 240M], cf. ECh.: Tumak mōnŋ (m), pl. mōŋŋŋ “petit” [Cpr. 1975, 83]. The sources of WCh.: Boghom mwan “slave” [OS] || ECh.: Kwang main “son-in-law” [OS] | Smr. mwán “son-in-law” [OS] is not clear.

NB2: Ch. Ehret (1980, 153, #6) combined Dh. mána^{ʕe} with Irq. na^{ʕay} “baby” and Brg. naw “baby boy”, which, however, represent a distinct AA root. V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1722), in turn, derived the Dh. word from AA *ma(ya)n-“man”, which is certainly out of question.

NB3: V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1989, 132; 1992, 185) compared their ECh. *mwani- (sic) “son(-in-law)” mistakenly with LEg. mn.w “son” < NK mn.w “statue, image” (XIX., q.v., cf. Wb II 71, 3–8).

Lrr.: OS 1989, 132; 1992, 185 (Boghom-Eg); HSED #1783 (Boghom-Eg); Takács 1996, 127, #5 (Eg.-WCh.-Ma’a).

- 2. GT: an irreg. cognate to ECu.: Dullay: Dobase múnk-e (f) “Säugling” [AMS 1980, 176]?

NB: For the irreg. correspondence of Eg. ~ AA *k̄ see EDE I 302–4.

- **3.** GT: if Eg. mnḥ represented *mlḥ, cp. perhaps NAgaw: Hamir miluw-á, pl. melû “small child, kleines Kind” [Rn. 1884, 393] = miluwá [CR], Hamta malwá, malò “ragazzo, piccolo, giovane” [CR 1905, 222], Hmtg. málwa “small (age)” [Apl. 1987, 504] || SCu.: Ma’a milo [*-ḥ- > -Ø- poss.] “Kind”, ya-milò (pl. of iṇi) “Kinder” [Mnh. 1906, 314, 318] = mílo “child”, míli “heifer” [Ehret] ||| NOM.: Ganza mamali “small” [James 1965 MS].

NB: Ch. Ehret (1980, 157, #35) equated the Ma’a word with Brg. mela “house of unmarried young man” < SCu. *mēl- “older child, adolescent”, which would, however, exclude a comparison with Eg. mnḥ.

- **4.** H. Brugsch (1876, 73) assumed a connection with Ar. malīḥ- “3. beau (de visage), 4. beau jeune homme, bel homme” [BK II 1145] = “gut, schön, vollkommen” [Brugsch] on the analogy of the alleged derivation of Eg. nfr.w “junge Mannschaft” < nfr; cf. Ar. maluḥa “2. être beau (de visage), 3. (en gén.) être beau ou bon (se dit de toute chose)” [BK II 1144]. Improbable as rightly noted already by F. von Calice (GÄSW #627).

NB: The basic sense of Ar. malīḥ- is “1. salé, qui a un goût salé (eau, etc.), ou dont l’eau est salée (puits)” < Sem. *milḥ- “salt”, which excludes a comparison with Eg. mnḥ.

mnḥ.t “Huldigungsgeschenk” (XIX.: 2x in Pap. Sallier I rt. 4:1–2, Wb II 84, 11) = “Geschenk (an Naturallieferungen): ob ein schonender Name für ’Abgabe’ (?)” (Spg. 1899, 52–53, §XLVI) = “gift (uncertain whether a voluntary gift or a compulsory tribute is meant)” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 305) = “Abgabe” (Helck 1971, 513, #91) = “gift, tribute, offering” (DLE I 221; Hoch 1994, 128) = “*Huldigungsgeschenk, *Königsabgabe” (GHWb 340).

NB: Written in GW: min-ḥi-tá (Helck, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = man-ḥ-ta: *manḥata (Hoch).

- Borrowed from some NWSem. reflex of Sem. *mnḥ “beschenken” [GT].

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Spg. 1899, 52–53, §XLVI; GB l.c. (after Spg. 1899, 53); Wb l.c.; Caminos 1954 LEM, 305; Helck 1971, 513, #91; 1989, 140, §12; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 16; Hoch 1994, 128, #165.

NB1: Attested in Ug. mnḥ “an offering” [Gordon] = “Geschenk, Tribut” [WUS; Dietrich & Loretz & Sanmartín 1973, 111, §41] = “delivery, contribution, tribute” [DUL 562], Hbr. minḥa “1. Geschenk an einen Mächtigen um ihn günstig zu stimmen, 2. Geschen an eine Gottheit” [GB 437] = “A: gift, present (non-sacral): 1. veneration, 2. thanksgiving, 3. homage, 4. alliance, 5. tribute; B: offering (food)” [KB 601], Hatra mnḥ “gift, offering” [DNWSI 658], Phn. & Punic mnḥ-t “offering” [Harris 1936, 120] = “offering made to the gods (said of a stele, of a meal-offering)” [DNWSI 659], Samar. Aram. mnḥḥ “offering (cereal)” [Tal 2000, 476] | Ar. manḥa “1. donner, offrir qqch. à qqn.” [BK II 1156] = “beschenken” [GB], Dathina mnḥ

“accorder une faveur”, minḥ-at “don, faveur” [GD 2720] || MSA: Sq. mnḥ “offrir, donner” [Lsl. 1938, 246] || (?) Gees maḥana ~ maḥna “to pay homage, make a gift, bow down to greet”, treated as denom. of maḥanā etc. “present, gift, tribute, offering, sacrifice” [Lsl. 1987, 336], Tigre (< Ar.) mannaḥa “to present an offer (a cow as a loan)” [LH/KB] = “to give a cow to a poor person (the cow belongs to the owner and the milk is used by the poor person)” [Lsl. 1968, 358, §1500] = mānnaḥa “to give a cow as present” [Lsl. 1982, 52], (Sem.: WUS #1597; Gordon 1955, 289, #1127). On Akk. mānaḥātu “installations, equipment” [CAD M1, 206] see Hnrg. 1986, 453.

NB2: C. H. Gordon (l.c.) affiliated Sem. *mnḥ with Ar. mana^a “to give” (sic), approved also by W. Leslau (1968, 358) quoting Ar. mny (sic). J. Levy (1924 III 153) assumed in Sem. *mnḥ a bicons. root *mn- based on the equation with (1) Sem. *mnn vs. (2) Sem. *mny “schenken, zuteilen”, cf. esp. (1) Ug. mny G/D “1. to award, 2. decide fate (?)” [DUL 565] | OSA: Mdb. mnw “attribuer” [Arbach 1993, 70] vs. (2) OSA: Sab. mn “bénifice” [Arbach 1993, 70], Ar. manna I “donner, faire une grâce à qqn.”, minn-at- “bienfait, grâce” [Dozy II 616], Dathina mn “accorder une faveur” [GD 2720].

NB3: Although this latter etymology is semantically rather uncertain, the supposed bicons. origin is supported by the AA evidence, cf. HECu.: perhaps Sid. mine (f) “the dowry that the boy’s father gives to the girl’s father in view of the marriage” [Gsp. 1983, 232–3] || WCh.: Hausa mānna “to give a trifle, small present” [Abr. 1962, 654] | Pero múnú “to give” [Frj. 1985, 42] | (?) Boghom num [met. of *mun?] “to give” [Gowers] || CCh.: Chibak mari [-r- reg. < *-n-] “to give” [IL] | MG -mən- “rembourser” [Brt. 1988, 177] || ECh.: Smr. mēn “2. donner qqch. à qqn. rapidement et maladroitement” [Jng. 1993 MS, 44] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 158). From AA *m-n “to give” [GT]? For Sem.-Pero see HSED #1798.

NB4: Bura-Margi *-r- derives regularly from PCh. *-n- (see NM 1966, 227; Nwm. 1977, 17, #3.14; JI 1994 I, XXII). Nevertheless, V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (1992, 194) equated Chibak mari “to give” with Eg. m3^c “to make an offering” (q.v.), which is evidently false.

NB5: Orel & Stolbova (HSED #1798) identified WCh.: Pero múnú “to give” directly with Sem. *mnḥ. Although the development of pharyngeals in Chadic is still little studied, in the case of Sem. *-nḥ one would expect Ch. *-ṅ.

NB6: G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 272–3) affiliated Bsq. ema/on “geben” (!) with a certain Eg. mena (sic) “zuteilen”, i.e., mnj “1. beschenken, 2. mit einer Frau verheiraten” (MK, Wb II 74, 15–16) = “1. to attach to (cult-service), endow with (m) sg., 2. marry to (m) so. (tr.)” (FD 107) = “7. *belohnen (m: mit Äckern)” (GHWb 337), which is, however, clearly unrelated, being a fig. sense of Eg. mnj (orig. *mjnj?) “(eigtl.) anpflocken” (Wb, above).

NB7: W.F. Albright (quoted by Hoch l.c.) derived the root *mnḥ from Sem. *nḥy “to lead, head for (a destination)”.

***mnḥ** occurring in: **k3-mnḥ** “als Bez. für die Schildkröte (als Symbol des Böses)” (GR, Wb V 96, 9) = “lit. taureau immolé” (Walle 1953, 185) = “mâle de l’espèce animale mnḥ, désignant l’espèce tortue en général” (Sauneron 1966, 1–2, §36) = “Stier von Wachs” (Osing 1998, 139 & fn. 644).

NB: Its interpretation is highly disputed. B. van de Walle (l.c.) identified the second component with Eg. mnḥ “to slaughter” (q.v.). Moreover, in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD), in turn, k3-mnḥ was written as a compound denoting “wax bull” (Osing 1998, 140, n. a) with the 2nd component glossed by Dem. mnḥ “wax”. But in the index, J. Osing (1998, 304) lists Eg. mnḥ^c (sic) “Schildkröte”. S. Sauneron

(l.c.) provided convincing indirect evidence for the existence of *mnĥ “tortue” (cf. the tortoise det. of mnĥ “papyrus plant” in Esna texts).

- If the supposed LEg. *mnĥ “tortoise” existed, we may account for either of the following solutions:

- **1.** GT: cp. perhaps NBrb.: Shenwa malla [< *t-malla], pl. t̄i-mall-win “черепаха” [Ajh. 1986, 11]?

NB: Brb. -Ø is reg. < *-ʕ. But a derivation from Brb. *m-l-l “to be white” cannot be ruled out.

- **2.** G. Takács (1996, 51, #53; 1996, 148, #53) equated it with the reflexes of AA *mulʕ- “lizard” [Blz. 1992, 158] = *muluʕ- “ящерица” [Orel] = *mulʕ- ~ *mulĥ- (?) “lizard” [GT].

NB: Attested in NBrb. *mulab “lizard” [GT]: Izn. & Mnsr. mulab “lézard” [Bst.] | Qbl. (of Jurjura) i-mulab “lézard d’Algérie (Tropidosaura algira etc.)” [Bst.], Qbl. (of Ait Mangellat) a-mulab “lézard vert” [Dlt.] (NBrb.: Bst. 1885, 174) ||| LECu.: Saho mulʕu ~ muluʕ “type of lizard” [Vergari 2003, 137], Afar mulluʕit “eine Eidechsenart” [Rn. 1886, 881], PSam *mulʕ “lizard” [Heine 1978, 69] > Som. múlaʕ (cf. mállāu) “eine Eidechsenart, der Skink (er gilt als heiliges Tier und darf nicht verletzt werden)” [Rn. 1902, 295–6] = múlaʕ (cf. also málow) “type of lizard” [Abr. 1964, 172, 182] = muluʕa [Blz.], Rnd. mul’úĥ [Heine 1976, 217] ||| WCh.: (?) Hausa múlwā “a short, thick snake” [Brg. 1934, 800] | Bokkos mulú-sūs “graue Eidechse” [Jng. 1970, 144] || CCh.: Kobocho málwā “Chamäleon” [Str.] = malwāʕ (sic) [Blz.], Nzangi maalāwā “Chamäleon” [Str.], Holma málwé “Chamäleon” [Str.] (Bata gr.: Str. 1922–23, 135) | (?) Musgu-Girvidik mùlbùĥ (compound?) “Kröte” [MB 1972 MS, 6]. AP: NMande *muluk “lizard” [GT after Mkr.] ~ Songhay nsey mollo “Eidechse” (nsey “Blindschleiche” [Mkr.]). DP: V. Blažek (2000 MS, 13, #68) compared the Gmc. word for “salamander”: OSaxon & OHGrm. mol, Grm. Molch.

NB1: V. Blažek (l.c.) analyzed NBrb. ext. *-b as identical with the AA suffix of animal names (cf. Djk. 1965, 28, fn. 40 & 52, fn. 2; 1967, 210; 1970, 461, fn. 23; 1975, 140; 1986, 47; 1988, 57; Frz. 1969, 307, fn. 113; IS 1971, 192–3 etc.).

NB2: L. Reinisch (Rn. 1902, 295–6) affiliated the Som. word with Ar. mlʕ “properavit agilis levisque in incessu”.

LIT.: Mkr. 1987, 245; 1989 MS, 19, §9 (Bks.-LECu.-NMande); Blz. 1989, 212; 1992, 137; Blz. 2000 MS, 13, #68 adopted by OS 1992, 208; Orel 1993, 39; HSED #1792 (LECu.-Bks.-CCh.-NBrb.).

mnĥj (IVae inf., cf. Edel 1956, 17) “schlachten” (GR, Wb II 84, 2) = “to slaughter” (CT, DCT 169).

- From the same root:

(1) j.mnĥ ~ mnĥj “Schlächter” (NK, Amduat, Wb I 87, 16; Hornung 1963 II, 151, n. 614) = “Schlächter, Henker, Scharfrichter” (GHWb 340) = “butcher, executioner” (DLE I 221) = “slayer, butcher” (CT, DCT 169). Attested as mnĥwj “butcher, sacrificer” in GR Edfu (Blackman & Fairman 1943, 21–22, n. 6).

(2) mnĥ “abattoir, billot” (CT III 285a, AL 78.1744) = “Schlachtplatz” (GHWb 340).

NB: This is rendered by R. van der Molen as the verb “to slaughter” (DCT 169).

- Etymology dubious.

- **1.** A. Ember (1917, 86, #123; 1930, #10.b.16, #14.a.5) and Youssef (1983, 259) connected it with Ar. *banaha* “couper en morceaux (la viande)” [BK I 166] = “to cut meat into slices” [Ember]. Not to be excluded. Queried by F. Calice (1936, #629).
NB: Was Eg. *mnḥ* a result of a partial assim. from **bnḥ* (due to the -n-)?
- **2.** GT: or cf. Hbr. *mlḥ nifal* “sich auflösen, zerrissen werden (vom Himmel)” [GB 427] = “to be torn into pieces, scatter” [KB 588]?
NB: Phonologically dubious, since Hbr. *mlḥ* is usually explained from Sem. **mlḥ*, cf. Akk. *malāḥu* “(her)ausreißen” [AHW 593] || Ar. *mlḥ* “zergliedern, zerlegen, verrenken” [GB] = “to dismember” [KB], which, however, seem to be of bicons. origin, cf. Sem. **mlš* vs. **mlg* with the same basic sense (cf. AHW 594, 596; Lsl. 1987, 343).
- **3.** GT: a comparison with CCh.: MG *məneh məneh* “casser facilement (corde), s’effiloche” [Brt. 1988, 178] would be equally dubious due to the lack of further Ch./AA cognates corroborating its derivation from AA **m-n-ḥ*.
- **4.** H. Smith (1979, 162) saw in it falsely an m- prefix form of Eg. *nḥ3* “to be wild, dangerous”, which is out of question both semantically and because of the -3.

mnḥ “der Meißel (Holzgriff mit eingelassener Metallklinge) des Zimmermanns” (OK, Wb II 84, 12) = “chisel, consisting of a tongue-shaped metal blade set in a stout wooden handle, to be driven by a mallet, distinct from the awl (the handle of the awl being more slender)” (Griffith 1898, 49) = “maillet, (fem.) le nom ordinaire du ciseau” (Jéquier 1921, 167, fn. 3 & 279) = “le ciseau, bédane du menuisier, du charpentier et du serrurier moderne (un manche cylindrique en bois, dans lequel était fixée une tige de fer plate et quadrangulaire, taillée en biseau à sa extrémité, en certains examplaires, la lame était retenue au manche au moyen de lanières, prob. en cuir, ou un fil de cuivre)” (Lallemand 1923, 85) = “chisel” (FD 109; DCT 169; Šliwa 1975, 29–30, §4 with lit. & disc.) = “Meißel” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza IV 72, VII 58, 60; KBIÄF 13–14; Drenkhahn 1976, 117) = “reamer used by the carpenter and sculptor (not much different from *md3.t*)” (Janssen 1975, 312–3 & fn. 10 & p. 318) = “ciseau à bois” (AL 77.1740) = “chisel used with a mallet” (Fischer 1983, 44, U22) = “Lochbeitel” (GHWb 340; ÄWb I 535).

NB1: Vocalized as **m̄nāḥ* (NBÄ 186) = **m̄nāḥuw* (Snk. 1983, 187).

NB2: R. Drenkhahn (1976, 120 & fn. 73) ruled out the existence of an alleged OK *mnḥ* “Zimmermann” postulated by E. Graefe (MDAIK 27, 1971, 149f.) = “menuisier, charpentier, mortaiser, p.ext.: ouvrier en bois” (Lallemand 1923, 87–89).

NB3: J. Osing (NBÄ 186, 581, n. 483 & 711, n. 825) derived hence Cpt. (B) *ḿḥ3* “Meißel, Beitel, Spitzhammer”, which was convincingly disproved by W. Westendorf (KHW 111, 522), who, however, affiliated it rather with Dem. *mḥl* “Gießform des

Töpfers” (DG 153:8) < (?) Eg. m_hn “Art Stock” (PT, Wb, q.v.), which is semantically equally uncertain.

- From the same root: mnĥ “mit dem Meißel arbeiten (wohl immer vom Bearbeiten von Holz)” (OK, MK, Wb II 84, 13) = “façonner, former” (Jéquier 1921, 279) = “travail d’orfèvre, celui de menuisier ou du charpentier: se servir du bédane, percer un trou “ (Lallemand 1923, 84–89) = “ciseler (l’or)” (Montet 1928, 11) = “Löcher bohren (?)” (Seibert 1967, 120) = “meißeln (Löcher mit Hammer und Meißel schlagen)” (Drenkhahn 1976, 106) = “to chisel (in a more destructive way)” (GR Edfu, PL 435) = “mit dem Lochbeitel arbeiten (bes. Holzverarbeitung); vielleicht bes. mit einem Lochbeitel Löcher schlagen für die Bespannung” (ÄWb I 535). Denom. verb (as suggested in PL 435 contra Jéquier 1921, 279)?
NB: Questionable whether Dem. mnkj “formen” (DG 164:5) = “to prepare” (Osing) > Cpt. (S) מוּיִנֵּר “formare, effingere, construere” (Brugsch) = “to make, form” (CD 174b) derive from the same root as suggested i.a. by H. Brugsch (1882, 57), J. Černý (CED 85), and C. Peust (1999, 118). Brugsch and Černý distinguished this word from (S) מוּיִנֵּר “to cease” (CD 175a) = “to finish, accomplish” (Osing) < Eg. mnq “to finish” (q.v.). The usual combination of the former root with Eg. mnĥ was, however, rejected by Lallemand (1923, 96–97) and Osing (1978, 187) because of Eg. -ĥ ≠ Cpt. -K, who derived the Cpt. verb from Eg. mnq (q.v.).
- Origin obscure. The lack of AA cognates with m- indicates probably a nomen instr. with m-.
- 1. W. Westendorf (1973, 138) assumed an Eg. etymon *mnĥ whence he explained both mnĥ “mit dem Meißel arbeiten” (lit. “treffen”) & mnĥ “Meißel” (lit. “trefflich”, sic) and mnĥ “fähig, tüchtig, trefflich” on the analogy of German trefflich < treffen ~ OEng. drepan “schlagen, stoßen” as well as German tauglich, tüchtig (derived from the basic sense “herrichten, herstellen”). Dubious.
NB: Westendorf derived Eg. mnĥ “Bez. für große Haufen” (XXII., Wb II 87, 5), lit. “*Stöße”, too from the same etymon (but cf. WD III 52 after SAK 22, 1995, 176: “als separater Eintrag unnötig”).
- 2. GT: if the derivation Cpt. (B) מַלְחָא < Eg. *mĥl ~ *mlĥ is correct, cf. rather ECu.: Dullay magal [met. < *malg], pl. malge (m) “hammer of rifle” [Savà 2005 MS, 256], which looks like an m- prefix nomina instr. of AA *l-ĥ ~ *ĥ-l, cf. Eg. nĥj “hacher, trancher (?)” (AL 77.2170) = “*zerhacken, *abschneiden” (GHWb 425).
- 3. GT: alternatively, provided the verbal mng. was primary, cp. perhaps CCh.: Bura mārghyū [-r- < *n- reg.] “to pinch” [Hfm. apud RK 1973, 126] < AA *m-n-ĥ?

mnĥ “(einen Halskragen, Perlen auf einen Faden) aufziehen, (ein Amulett an den Hals) hängen” (OK, Wb II 87, 8–11; cf. Krah, LÄ IV 940) = “faire un assemblage solide par tenous et mortaises,

assembler solidement, monter” (Lallemand 1923, 98) = “to string (beads)” (FD 109) = “urspr.: Löcher bohren in den Perlen” (Seibert 1967, 120) = “bereits vorgefertigte Schmuckelemente auf einen Faden aufreihen bzw. mit einem Faden verknüpfen” (Drenkhahn 1976, 44) = “to thread (beads), hang up” (CED 82) = “auffädeln” (Satzinger 1994, 198) = “1. knüpfen (Halskragen), 2. aufziehen (Perlen auf Faden), 3. hängen (Amulett an Hals)” (GHWb 341; ÄWb I 536) = “1. to string beads, 2. bore the holes in beads so that they can be strung” (PL 435).

- Hence (?): Cpt. (SL) $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\lambda\text{z}$, (B) $\text{m}\text{o}\lambda\text{z}$ < $^*\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\lambda\text{z}$, (F) $\text{m}\lambda\lambda\lambda\text{z}$ “1. (intr.) to be hooked into, twisted into, attached to, 2. (tr.) involve, enmesh”, (B) $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\lambda\text{z}(\text{T})$ “joint” (CD 166a; CED 82) = (SL) $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\lambda\text{z}$ etc. “zusammenfügen, verbinden, befestigen, einhüllen”, (B) $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\lambda\text{z}(\text{T})$ “Verbindung” (Spg. 1919–20, 25–26, §17; KHW 91; cf. also Lallemand 1923, 98, fn. 1; NBÄ 596, n. 544) = (SL) $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\lambda\text{z}$ etc. “fixer, joindre, être fixé, maintenu” (DELIC 112).

NB: The Eg. etymology of this Cpt. verb is somewhat uncertain. (1) Its derivation from Eg. mnh (Spg. l.c.) was apparently declined in the Wb l.c., cf. also Vrg. 1950, 291. (2) Its comparison with (SB) $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\lambda\text{z}$ “wax” (Peyron) was correctly rejected already by W. Spiegelberg (1919–20, 25, §17). (3) The connection with Cpt. (P) mehel mentioned in KHW 522 is improbable. (4) GT: cf. perhaps AA $^*\text{m-l-h}$ “to bind (?)” [GT] > (?) Eg. $\text{m}3\text{h}$ “Korngarbe” (OK, Wb, q.v.)?

- Basic sense and etymology disputed:
 - 1. W. Spiegelberg (1919–20, 25–26, §17 & fn. 26) assumed a basic sense “anordnen” (sic), whence he explained also LEg. mnh “etwas gut herstellen” (Spg.) = “trefflich herstellen” (XXII., Wb II 86, 12) < OK “trefflich” (Wb, q.v.) maintaining that “*beide Bedeutungen passen zu der des... vermuteten koptischen Derivates*”.
 - 2. H. Lallemand (1923, 87–98) explained it from a lit. mng. “solide” preserving the alleged idea of “assemblage, fixation, monter (en joaillerie)” of Eg. mnh “menuisier”. Improbable.
 - 3. Similarly, Seibert (1967, 120) derived it from the basic sense “Löcher bohren” (attested in Pap. Sallier II 5:1), which he also affiliated with Eg. mnh “percer des trous à l’aide d’un ciseau, mortaiser” (AL) = “(mit dem) Meißel (arbeiten)”, lit. “Bez. der Bohrlöcher in den Perlen” (Seibert). So also in AL 77.1741; PL 435. Plausible.
 - 4. D. Meeks (AL 77.1741) and W. Vycichl (DELIC 112) assumed a relationship with Eg. mnq “vollenden” (MK, Wb, q.v.) > (SB) $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\text{n}\bar{\text{r}}$ “former” with an alternation of -n- ~ -l- and -h ~ -q. Improbable.
 - 5. GT: if its primary sense was “aufziehen”, it presumably derives from AA $^*\text{m-l-Q}$ “1. to draw (out), 2. stretch (out), 3. strip (off)” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Sem. *mlĥ “to pull out” [GT]: Akk. malāḫu “(her)ausreißen” [AHW 593] = “to remove” [CAD m1, 152] || Aram. mlġ “herausreißen” [AHW] = “to pluck” [Lsl.] | Ar. malaḥa I “4. tirer qqch. avec force à soi en saisissant avec les dents ou avec les mains” [BK II 1145–6] = “1. to pull, draw (out, forth, away, off) e.g. grasping with the hand, 2. (a beast) stretch forth (one’s arms), etc.” [Lane 2734] = “arracher, disloquer, déboîter, démettre les os” [Dozy II 611] = “herausreißen, -ziehen” [Wehr 1952, 820] = “to pull out, strip the meat from the bone” [Guillaume 1965 IV, 9] = “to pull out” [Lsl.] || Hrs. melōḥ “to pull down” [Jns. 1977, 89] || Geez malḥa “arracher (la racine)” [Strelcyn 1948–1951, 44] = mälḥa “to extract, extirpate” [Lsl. 1969, 20 with a diff. Sem. etym.] = malḥa ~ malḥa “to tear out, pluck out, pull out, eradicate, draw (sword), drag forth etc.” [Lsl. 1987; 1988, 78] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 343; Frolova 2003, 86, §I.4.1) || Bed. mehal [met. < *m-l-h] “(heraus)ziehen, ausbreiten” [Rn. 1895, 166] || LECu.: Saho (borrowed from ES) *malah “(heraus)ziehen, entblößen” [Rn. 1890, 266] = muluh “to pull out” [Lsl. 1988, 78] || (?) WCh. *m-l-k “to stretch” [GT]: Gwnd. minka [irreg. -nk- < *-lk-?] “to stretch” [Mts. 1972, 81] | Tng. meluuk ~ meluk-meluk “state of lying stretched out (e.g., rope, snake)” [Jng. 1991, 119].

NB2: A. Zaborski (1991, 1677) derived Sem. *mlĥ from bicons. *lĥ based on its comparison with Syr. tĥ < *tlĥ and Ar. slĥ.

NB3: Further var. roots are attested in (1) Sem. *mlġ: PBHbr. mlġ “abrupfen” [Dalman 1922, 237] = “to pluck, strip (of hair, feathers etc.)” [Jastrow 1950, 787], JPAram. mlġ “to pluck” [Sokoloff 1990, 308] vs. (2) Sem. *mlĥ > Samar. Aram. mlġ “to unsheath” [Tal 2000, 474] | Ar. mlġ VIII “2. tirer, extraire qqch.” [BK II 1150] || HECu.: Sid. mulĥ- “1. to strip, take off (e.g. clothes), 2. take property away, 3. skin, flay (carcass of animal)” [Hds. 1989, 136, 148, 387: isolated in HECu.].

- **6.** GT: alternatively, provided it is unrelated to (SL) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\lambda\zeta$ etc., cf. NOm.: Kafa manṣ [–ṣ < *-g?] “stringere, far stretto” [Crl. 1951, 472 with a diff. etym.] || CCh.: Mbara mĩngĩ “lier, attacher” [TSL 1986, 272] < AA *m-n-g “to string” [GT]?
- **7.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 307, #590) explained it from a certain AA *-ma/un/ŋ/j- “to tie up” based on the false comparison of unrelated roots: MSA *mnʿ “to take, catch, hold” Eg. mnj “to moor” Cu. *ma/unĉ- “to twist (e.g. in making a rope)”.

mnĥ “1. sich freuen an etwas, 2. staunen über (m) etwas” (PT 1533a, Wb II 87, 7) = “erstaunen über (m)” (ÜKAPT VI 132; ÄWb I 537) = “sich entsetzen, erstaunen über” (Sethe 1928, 73, n. c) = “1. eine Geschichte erfinden, witzeln, 2. *erstaunen über (m)” (GHWb 341).

● Basic sense uncertain, hence etymology disputable:

- **1.** W. Westendorf (1973, 139) regarded it as a secondary figurative sense (lit. “betroffen sein”) of his hypothetical Eg. *mnĥ “treffen”, whence he explained Eg. mnĥ “(mit dem) Meißel (arbeiten)” (OK, Wb, q.v.). Uncertain.

NB: As parallel for this semantic shift, Westendorf (l.c.) quoted Cpt. (S) $\tau\omega\mu\eta\eta\tau$, (B) $\tau\omega\mu\eta\eta\tau$ “betroffen sein, verblüfft sein, staunen, 2. verwirren, täuschen” (KHW 234) < Dem. tmt “1. vereinigen, 2. verwirren” (DG 634) < Eg. dmd [met. < *dm̄d < AA

*čmd] “zusammenfügen, vereinigen” (Wb V 457), which he falsely affiliated with Eg. mdd “treffen” (q.v.) representing probably an entirely distinct AA root.

- **2.** GT: perhaps cognate with Ar. malaḥa I “3. être entièrement livré, p.ex. aux plaisirs de ce monde, 8. être gai et jouer (se dit d’un cheval)”, III “1. jouer, plaisanter avec qqn., 2. flatter, cajoler qqn.” [BK II 1145–6] ||| LECu.: (?) Orm. milk-ī “luck, fortune” [Gragg 1982, 287] ||| CCh.: MG -mámólk- “être heureux, être joyeux” [Br. 1988, 176]?

NB: Cf. also (as root vars.) Ar. malīqa I “1. flatter, aduler qqn.”, III & V “flatter, caresser, cajoler qqn.” as well as mly III: mālaya “amuser qqn. par des propos obscènes”, VI “se moquer de qqn., le railler” [BK II 1150], which passed into Brb., cf. NBrb.: Mzg. melley “1. railler, se moquer de, 2. plaisanter, taquiner, blaguer” [Tf. 1991, 418], Izdeg melley “railler” [Mrc. 1937, 213] | Zenet: Izn. & Snh. & Rif mellay “plaisanter” [Rns. 1932, 388]. Note that the relationship of Ar. mly with Geez mal‘ā “one who is inclined to fornication” (known only from a late lexicographic source) [Lsl. 1987, 342] has been declined by S. Weninger (2002, 292) and L. Kogan (2005, 199, §29) as “not fully reliable”.

- **3.** GT: alternatively and purely hypothetically, we might assume an etymon AA *m-l-g (hence Eg. mnḥ would be reg.) parallel to *m-r-g attested in ECU. *murg- “to be surprised” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. m3ḥ, q.v.).

mnḥ (orig. **mnḥj**) “unklarer Grundbedeutung: so wie etwas sein muß, richtig, trefflich, untadelig” (OK, Wb II 84–86; GHWb 340) = “solidement assemblé, solide, durable, fidèle, constant, loyal” (Lallemand 1923, 98) = “potent (of king etc.), trusty (of officials), efficacious (of commands, counsel etc.), 2. to go well with (n), well-disposed, devoted to (n), splendid (of buildings, workmanship), costly (material), lavish (of workship), excellent (of occasions), well-famed, well-established (of endowment), skilful, right, etc.” (FD 109) = “tüchtig” (NBÄ 162) = “to be excellent, efficient, potent, well-established, beneficent, well-disposed, efficacious” (DLE I 221) = “to become functional, efficacious” (Allen 1984, 557).

NB1: Vocalized as *m^hēj “vortrefflich” (NBÄ 162; Snk. 1983, 223) based on Gk. -μενχης in the PN Πμενχης < p3-mnḥ(j) (Ranke PN I 105:8) vs. Μερχης ~ Μενχης ~ Μιρχης < mnḥ(j) (Ranke PN I 153:3) vs. Περεμενχης(ς) < p3-dj-mnḥ(j) (Ranke PN I 123:19). But J. Osing (NBÄ 101) set up *m^hē(y) based on its highly dubious equation with Cpt. (P) meḥēl, which is not supported by the Greek forms, which, along with Eg. Aram. mnḥh “ehrende Bez. des Verstorbenen” < Eg. mnḥ “trefflich” (Vittmann 1993, 240; Muchiki 1999, 168), indicate either an orig. Eg. *-n- or a late shift of OK *-l- > LP -n-.

NB2: J. Osing (NBÄ 101, 581, n. 483, cf. KHW 522) explained Cpt. (P) meḥēl “Heilung bringen” (NBÄ) = “heilen” (KHW) from Eg. mnḥ “vortrefflich herstellen” (Wb II 86, 12) with met. and change of n > l. False. Cf. Eg. *mḥl (below).

- Etymology very much disputed.

- **1.** H. Lallemand (1923, 87–98) saw in it a metaphoric usage (lit. “solide”) of Eg. mnĥ the basic idea of which he figured as “assemblage, fixation, monter (en joaillerie)” on the basis of its supposed connection with Eg. mnĥ “menuisier” (q.v.) → “former un ouvrage à l’aide d’instruments” → “bien travailler” → “bien, faire de bonnes oeuvres, être bienfaisant, généreux” (sic).
- **2.** W. Westendorf (1973, 139) suggested a different scenario: he regarded “trefflich, fähig, tüchtig” as a secondary figurative sense (lit.) of his hypothetic Eg. *mnĥ “treffen”, whence he explained also Eg. mnĥ “(mit dem) Meißel (arbeiten)” (OK, Wb, q.v.). Uncertain.
NB: As parallels for the semantic shift Westendorf quoted the alleged connection of **(1)** Eg. ħmw “Steingefäße ausbohren” ~ ħmw.w “kunstfertig, geschickt” ~ ħm “Keule (mit dem man auf den mnĥ-Meißel schlägt)”; **(2)** German trefflich < treffen ~ OEng. drepan “schlagen, stoßen”; **(3)** German tauglich, tüchtig derived by him falsely from the basic sense “herrichten, herstellen” (contra Kluge 1999, 818).
- **3.** Similarly, J. Osing (NBĀ 101, 581, n. 483) equated Eg. mnĥ “Meißel” > (B) מאבֿוֹגל “Meißel” vs. Eg. mnĥ “vortrefflich herstellen” > Cpt. (P) meĥel “Heilung bringen, heilen” (q.v.), but he failed to suggest a satisfactory explanation for the semantic problems. Moreover, both Cpt. forms probably belong to two distinct etymons.
- **4.** Traditionally equated with Sem. *mlĥ: Ug. mlĥ “good (?)” [Gordon 1955, 288, #1117; 1965, 443, adopted by Ward 1963, 427, fn. 2; Frz. 1971, 621; Vcl. 1988, 485] = “salted” [Ullendorff, JSS 7, 1962, 345] = “good (?), pleasant (?)” [Segert 1984, 192] = “drawn, sharp” [KB 588] = “hermosura (?)” [DLU 274] = “beauty (?)” [DUL 548] | Thamudi PN mlĥ “schön, hübsch” [Shatnawi], Ar. malīḥ- “3. beau (de visage), 4. beau jeune homme, bel homme, 5. amant, galant, 6. bon” [BK II 1145] = “schön, hübsch” [Brk., Shatnawi] = “pleasant” [Lsl.], cf. Ar. maluḥa “2. être beau de visage, 3. en gén.: être beau ou bon” [BK II 1144] = “schön sein” [Shatnawi], EAr. dial.: (Syria) mnīḥ “nicely, nice” [Durand], (Lebanese) mləḥ ~ mnəḥ “good” [Mlt.] vs. WAr. dial. (Tunisia-Algeria) mlīḥ [Durand 1995, 150], cf. Malt. mielah “good, beautiful, gracious” (preserved in the title Il-Madonna l-Mielha “Our gracious Lady”) [Saydon 1965, 78] || MSA: Mehri menaḥ “nice” [Zbr., not in Jns. 1987], Sq. ménaḥ “beau” [Lsl. 1938, 246] (Sem.: cf. also Lsl. 1987, 343; Shatnawi 2002, 744). Unacceptable.
LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1911, 90; Brk. 1932, 106, #32; IS 1976, #278; Chn. 1947, 191; Mlt. 1984, 158, #9; Bmh. 1986, 253; Zbr. 1991, 1689; HSED #1816; Mlt. 2006 MS, 24, #34.6 (“less tenable”).
NB1: This false Eg.-Sem. comparison breaks down on several points, since **(1)** Eg. -ḥ ≠ Sem. *-ḥ; **(2)** Eg. *-n- vs. Sem. *-l-; **(3)** moreover, the original meaning of Sem.

*mlḥ was not “good, nice” but “salty”, the eventual source being Sem. *milḥ- “salt” [Frz. 1971, 634, #7.46] as usually assumed in the lit. (recently cf., e.g., Gordon 1955, 288, #1117; Ward 1963, 427, fn. 2; Vcl. 1988, 485; 1989, 34; Durand 1995, 150; Mlt. 2006 MS, 24, #34.6). This derivation is most evident in Ar. malīḥ- “1. salé, qui a un goût salé (eau, etc.), ou dont l’eau est salée (puits), 2. salé (poisson), 3. beau de visage etc.”, which is a pass. part. of maluḥa “1. être salé (eau de mer), 2. être beau de visage etc.” [BK II 1144–5]. Or cf. Akk. ṭabtu “Salz” < ṭyb “schön, gut sein” [AHW 1377].

NB2: The semantic connection of “salty” ~ “nice” was declined by W. Leslau (1968, 358, #1482) arguing that Ar. maluḥa means primarily “to be beautiful, nice”. Similarly, M. Dahood (1965, 64, #1482) rejected the equation of Ug. mlḥ “good” with Ar. malīḥ- and preferred to derive the former from Sem. *lḥ “to be fresh, succulent”. A. Zaborski (1991, 1689) considers the Eg.-Sem. etymology to be valid. Zaborski regarded √mnh of EAr. dials. mnīḥ and Mehri menāḥ to be the original root (!), which later underwent a secondarily dissimilation into √mlḥ due to the influence of Sem. *milḥ- “salt”. This theory cannot explain the irreg. Eg. -ḥ vs. Sem. *-ḥ, nor Ug. mlḥ.

NB3: W. Leslau (1987, 343) rendered Geez malḥa ~ malləḥa “to do, work”, mālḥ “work” as orig. “to do good work” (salt being the symbol of good deeds). Alternatively, he assumed that it should be corrected to *malḥa and refers in general to all the activities expressed by Geez malḥa “to pluck out”.

NB4: V. Blažek (1990, 207) and A.Ju. Militarev (2006 MS, 24, #34.6) related the hypothetical Sem. *mlḥ “to be good, nice” with SBrb.: Ayr & EWlm. i-mal “forme unique”, mol-ān “good”, tā-mmul-t “good quality” [Alojaly 1980, 127], which is more than questionable. In principle, Ayr zero < *ḥ is possible, but Ayr -Ø ≠ Eg. *-ḥ. Moreover, the SBrb. root derives from AA *m-l “good” [GT], which seems to be related with Eg. jm3 [Blv.: reg. < *mj] “angenehm (sein), freundlich” (OK, Wb I 79) = “(to be) pleasing, kind, gentle” (FD 20)? For further details cf. Eg. mn.t “happy state of being” (NE, DLE, q.v.).

NB5: The Sem.-Eg. parallel was combined by M. Cohen (1947, 191) and A.Ju. Militarev (1984, 158, #9) with Mer. mle ~ mlo “good” [Meeks 1973, 12]. Its genetic connection with Eg. mnḥ is excluded, while a borrowing from Eg. is also impossible due to Eg. -ḥ vs. Mer. -Ø as well as Eg. -n- vs. Mer. -l-, and also because of the meaning.

NB6: A.R. Bomhard (1984, 275, #289) affiliated Sem. *mlḥ “to be good” with IE *m̥al- > Hitt. malai- “to approve”, Lat. melior “better”.

■ **5.** GT: or was Eg. mnḥ a met. of *mḥn deriving from AA *m-g-n > SBrb. *m-g^y-n “to fit” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in Hgr. mugⁿ-et “1. être comme il faut, 2. être poli, bien élevé et distingué de manières” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1170], EWlm. & Ayr māgn-āt “2. être comme il faut (en tous points), 3. être civilisé, poli, 4. (Ayr) être en bon point, bien venu, 5. être agréable, 6. être bon, convenable”, tā-magne “1. bonne conduite, bon sens, bonnes manières civilisées, 3. procédure, manière de procéder” [PAM 2003, 527].

NB2: Highly dubious whether the SBrb. root is related to CCh.: BM *m(ə)na(gu) “good” [GT]: Margi mónágu [Hfm. in RK 1973, 126: “well”] = minágu, mónágu [Krf.], WMargi mna [Skn. 1977, 23: “good, beautiful”] = m̥na [Krf.], Kilba mīnákú [Krf.], Wamdiu mináḥú [Krf.], Hildi minágu [Krf.] (Ch.: Kraft 1981, #293), where *-gu was not part of the original root. N. Skinner (1977, 23) derived WMargi mna from Ch. *m̥b-n- (!). But a derivation from PCh. *m-n “good” [GT] < AA *m-n ~ *m-y-n “good (or sim.)” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mn.t “happy state of being”, NK, DLE, q.v.) seems more probable.

■ **6.** GT: the supposed basic mng. of Eg. mnḥ “efficient” seems quite close to that of Geez malaga “to be able, endure, can”, malgu “who

is able, who endures” [Lsl. 1987, 342: no Sem. etymology], though the irreg. correspondences of Eg. -ĥ vs. Geez -g and Geez -l- are problematic.

- **7.** GT: in theory, if the ultimate Eg. root was still *mlĥ, it could be an m- prefix form (“participial” m-, cf. Grapow 1914, 17) deriving from a hypothetical PEg. *(w/y)lĥ, which could be derived from AA *l-ĥ “good” [GT].

NB: Attested in Eg. 3ĥ [reg. < *lĥ] “trefflich, herrlich, nützlich sein” (OK, Wb I 13–14) = “to be splendid, glorious, beneficial, useful” (FD 4) ||| PBrb. *l-γ “to be good” [GT] > NBrb.: Qabyle e-lhu “être bon, beau” [Dlt. 1982, 448–9] = ə-lhu “to be good, of good quality” [Mlt.] || SBrb.: Ghat ulay “to be good”, yulay-en “good” [Nehilil 1909, 135], Ahaggar a-ley “1. être bon, 2. p.ext. être vertueux, bon moralement, 3. avoir de la bonté d’âme” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1100], EWlm. & Ayr a-ləy “to be good” [Alojaly 1980, 111] (Brb.: Mlt. 1991, 262, #35.1 and #35.6) ||| NOm. *loq- “good” [GT]: Wolamo & Gamu & Zaysse loʔ-o [Hyw.] | Mao (sic) nəkə-de [*l-] [Flm.], Mao of Bambeshi & Diddesa noka “good” [Bnd. 1990, 608, #34], Bambeshi nók[fi]tè “good” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1993, 56/16] || SOm. *laq- [GT]: Ari laq-mi “good”, laq-am- “to become good”, Bako lay-mi “good”, cf. Dime liŋg [< *liŋq < *liqʔ] “good” (SOm.: Bnd. 1994, 151; Om.: Flm. 1976, 318; Hayward 1994 MS, 4). AP: Komuz: Kwama nōko “good” [Bnd.]. See Snd. 1997, 194, #3 (Eg.-SBrb.); Takács 1996, 52–53, #28; 1999, 137, #3.12; 1999, 204–5, #3.12 (Eg.-Brb.-Om.). Takács (l.c.) compared also Eg. w3ĥĥ “sich freuen über einen Ort” (PT, Wb I 259, 14–15). Eventually, did both Eg. 3ĥ and Eg. mnĥ originate in the same AA root?

- **8.** L. Homburger (1930, 285) affiliated it with Ful (Peul) ĥur-de “exceller”. Absurd.

mnĥ.t “Kleid, Gewand: eigtl. von den Kleidern der Götterbilder, von den Gewändern die dem Toten dargebracht werden” (OK, Wb II 87–88; WD I 88: cf. JEA 60, 1974, 194) = “cloth(ing)” (FD 110) = “allgemeiner Ausdruck für Stoff” (IÄF 328) = “tissu, une étoffe servant normalement à revêtir les images divines, vêtement divin (partie de l’offrande pr.t-ĥrw)” (PK 1976, 367, n. 9 & p. 183, B25) = “Kleid, Gewand (für Götterbilder, den Verstorbenen), eine Stoffart” (ÄWb I 536–7).

NB1: The hrgl. (S27) used either as its det. or ideogramm depicts a “horizontal strip of cloth with two strands of a fringe” (EG 1927, 494) = “a rolled piece of cloth terminated by units of fringe” (Smith 1935, 148 after Jéquier 1921, 31f.) = “Zweifransenstoff” (IÄF 328: “unklar wie der... zum Lautwert mnĥ.t kommt”).

NB2: Preserved also in Eg. Aram. tmnĥʔ < Eg. t3 mnĥ.t “Gewand” (Vittmann 1993, 240–1, cf. fn. 41–42).

- Nomen instr. deriving (with prefix m-) from of Eg. wnĥ “1. sich kleiden, gekleidet werden, 2. (tr.) (ein Kleid) anziehen, 3. (mit einem Gewand) bekleiden” (OK, Wb I 323–4) = “to clothe” (FD 63) = “act. to unfasten (not clothe)” (Graefe, SAK 7, 1979, 53–63; AEB 33, 48).

LIT.: Wb II l.c.; Grapow 1914, 4, 16, 25; AÄG 109, §253; Ol’derogge 1956, 7.

NB: The etymology of this root has been disputed: (1) Traditionally, Eg. wnĥ has

been equated with Akk. \sqrt{ylh} : D $ullu\dot{h}u$ “(ver)zieren (mit Wolle, Kleidern etc.)” [AHW 197]. Lit. for Eg.-Akk.: Alb. 1918, 227; Ember 1930, #11.b.4; Vrg. 1945, 135, #9.b.6; Chn. 1947, #168. The Semitic background of the Akk. root is obscure. **(1.1)** The root of the D-stem ($ullu\dot{h}u$) of Akk. \sqrt{ylh} has probably nothing to do with the root of the G stem $el\dot{e}hu$ “streuen, bestreuen” [AHW 197]. **(1.2)** Akk. ylh has been usually combined with Geez $laḥaya$ “to be pretty, beautiful, shiny”, $talahaaya$ “to resplendent, adorn oneself, attire oneself” and even Ar. lwh “to appear, become visible, shine, be bright” (Albright 1918, 227; Brk. 1932, 100). **(1.3)** Others (cf. Leslau 1987, 312 with further lit.), in turn, treat Geez lhy as a met. of Sem. * hly : Hbr. $h\dot{a}l\dot{a}'im$ pl. “ornaments” [Lsl.], “Halsgeschmeide” [GB 233] | Ar. hly : $hal\dot{a}$ “to adorn” [Lsl.], which clearly contradicts the suggested Eg.-Akk. comparison (Eg. $-h \neq$ Sem. * $-h$). **(2)** M. Cohen (1947, #168) combined Akk. \sqrt{ylh} and Eg. wnh with Agaw: Bilin $w\dot{a}leka$ “leather apron (tablier de cuir)” || LECu.: Afar $w\dot{a}laho$ “leather (for cloth, bed)”. No doubt, these Cu. data are unrelated with Akk. ylh & Eg. wnh . **(3)** The most convincing etymology for Eg. wnh was found by E. Zyhlarz (1934, 113; cf. Hintze 1951, 79, #168), cf. SBrb.: Ahaggar $e-nney$ [reg. < * $\sqrt{w-n-}\gamma$] “orner de dessins” [Fcd. 1951–52, 1404] = “ornieren, dekorieren, schmücken” [Zhl.]. SBrb. * $-γ$ vs. OĒg. $-h$ are reg.

***mlh** (or ***mlh**?) > Dem. mlh “Streit, Kampf” (DG 170:8) > Cpt. (SL) $\bar{\eta}\lambda\alpha\delta$, (B) $\bar{\eta}\lambda\alpha\delta$, (F) $\eta\lambda\epsilon\delta$, (A) $\eta\lambda\alpha\delta\upsilon$ “Kampf, Krieg, Schlacht(reihe)” vs. (B) $(\epsilon)\eta\lambda\alpha\delta$, (F) $\eta\lambda\epsilon\delta$ “streiten, kämpfen” (KHW 91).

NB: Probably to be distinguished (as e.g. in DG) from Dem. mlh “der Planet Mars” (DG 170:7) > (B) $\eta\omicron\lambda\omicron\chi$ “planet Mars” (CD 165a), usually explained from Gk. $\acute{M}\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\chi$ (name of the Ammonite god Molek), cf. CED 81. The coincidence of the Dem. spelling with $-h$ may have been influenced by Dem. mlh “to fight, battle” as suggested by M. Smith (1978, 360). Nevertheless, W. Spiegelberg (KHW 58), followed by W. Westendorf (KHW 91), explained Dem. mlh > (B) $\eta\omicron\lambda\omicron\chi$ “planet Mars” from the lit. mng. “Krieger (?)” (Spg.). Moreover, W. Vycichl (DELIC 111) surmised in the (B) orthography with $-X$ an influence of Gk. $\acute{M}\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\chi$, while he too derived the expected (B) * $\eta\delta\alpha\lambda\omega\delta$ < * $m\dot{a}ll\dot{a}h$ “guerrier” from Dem. mlh “Streit, Kampf”.

- Origin debated. Most convincing is solution no. 2.
- **1.** GB 383 and W. Spiegelberg (KHW 58) treated it as a borrowing from Hbr. $mlh\dot{a}m\dot{a}$ “Kampf” [GB], which originates from Hbr. lhm (below).
- **2.** G. Fecht (quoted in KHW 518) explained the Cpt. word as the 2nd inf. of Cpt. (SL) $\eta\omicron\upsilon\gamma\lambda\delta$ “zusammenfügen” via a hypothetical secondary sense *”anbinden (mit jmdm.)” on the analogy of (S) $\eta\omicron\upsilon\gamma\pi$ $m\bar{\eta}$ - “mit jmdm. anbinden, streiten” (KHW 99).
- **3.** W. Vycichl (DELIC 111) and J. Černý (CED 81), in turn, equated Dem. mlh directly with Hbr. lhm qal “kämpfen” [GB] = “to fight” [KB 474] with met., cf. also Ar. $laḥama$ I “7. $tuer$ qqn .” [BK II 977] = III “combattre avec”, V “subir la dilaniation, être haché (par le bourreau) à coups de sabre”, VIII & X “hacher à coups de sabre (bourreau)” [Dozy II 521] = VI “to fight” [KB, not in BK II 977!] = VI “handgemein werden (to come to blows)”, VIII “angezettelt werden, sich entzünden (vom Krieg, Streit usw.)” [WKAS II 345–6],

which is only possible on the basis of genetic relationship (not via borrowing). The origin of this Sem. root is highly debated.

NB1: Traditionally (cf. GB 383, KB 526; WKAS II 345), it has been explained from Sem. *lhm “to join” via the basic mng. “to be pressed together” > “to come to blows”.

NB2: W. Vycichl (DELIC 111) compared also Ar. laḥama “1. couper, 2. frapper qqn. sur le visage” [BK II 981], which, in the light of Ar. lhm, is out of question.

NB3: Instead of assuming in it a fig. sense of another Sem. root, it might be identified with the AA cognates appearing in NAgaw: Bilin lāmlām “feindlich zusammenwachsen, kämpfen, ringen, raufen miteinander” [Rn.] ||| CCh. *IVmV “1. war, 2. to fight” [Stl.] > Hide lmo “disputer, faire la guerre, lutter” [Egc. 1971, 213], Htk. & Lmg. lōmò “Streit, Krieg” [Lks. 1964, 107] | Daba līm “war” [LG 1974 MS, 10, #229] = lām [Krf.] = lām [Lnh./Stl.]. Lit.: Rn. 1887, 256–7 (Bilin-Sem.); HSED #1702 & Stl. 2005, 88, §285 (CCh.-Sem.). L. Reinisch (l.c.) derived the Bilin word from an unattested basic mng. **“in einander verschlungen, verwickelt sein”* comparing also Bilin lām-r “in Empfang nehmen”, laham “zusammenkleben, -leimen”. Improbable.

- **4.** GT: hypothetically, we might alternatively derive it from AA *m-l-ḥ “war” [GT] to be deduced on the basis of its comparison with WCh.: GIm. màalá “war” [Alio 1988 MS] | (?) Bubure méré [-r- < *-l-?] “war” [Haruna 1992 MS, #B030]. Here too, a palatalization of *-ḥ > LÉg. -ḥ would have to be assumed.

mnz.tj (or **mns.tj**?) dual “die Beine” (LP, Wb II 88, 7) = “jambe” (Lacau 1970, 150, #406).

- Etymology uncertain:

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 13) and Lacau 1970, 150, #406) assumed in LÉg. *mns.t an m- prefix form deriving from Eg. jns.t “unterer Teil des Beines: Unterschenkel samt Fuß” (OK, Wb I 99, 18–20) = shin, shank, calf of leg” (FD 24).

NB1: As pointed out by G. Takács (1999, 53), Eg. jns.t is presumably cognate with NBrb.: Tuat ti-ns-it, Gurara ti-ns-it, Mzab ti-mša [< *ti-nsa] n i-dar-en “calf of leg (mollet)” (NBrb.: Bst. 1887, 420) ||| CCh.: Sukur na:s “leg” [Meek] = nās “leg” [IL in JI 1994 II, 221].

NB2: Eg. jns.t cannot be related with Ar. nis^o-at- “wrist” as suggested by A.G. Belova (1989, 11), which derives from Ar. nis^o-at- “girth, strap, belt”. Besides, Eg. j- vs. Ar. -^o are irregular.

- **2.** A.B. Dolgopol’skij (1973, 309) and V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 170) equated it mistakenly with LECu.: Somali maḣin-ti (sg.), pl. máḣin-o ~ mánḣ-o “Fuß von Tieren” [Rn. 1902, 289, 444], Oromo manḣí “Fuß” [Rn.] = “лодыжка (ankle)” [Dlg.] | Yaaku míḣí, pl. míḣnén “leg” [Heine 1975, 129]. Rejected by G. Takács (1999, 53). NB: These Cu. forms historically go back to ECu. *magin-/*migín- “foot” [Sasse 1979, 54], therefore the PCu. etymon *mAnḣ-(An)- “foot” suggested by Dolgopol’skij (l.c.) has no bases.
- **3.** GT: or perhaps LÉg. sg. *mns.t < *m_s.t via met. < *m_s.t, which might be akin to Brb. *√m-s-l “thigh” [GT].

NB: Cf. NBrb.: Shill a-msel, pl. i-m(e)sl-an “fesse, cuisseau, cuissot, rable” [Jordan 1934, 33] | Mzg. i-mesli, pl. i-mesl-an “1. fesse, 2. flanc, 3. arrière-train d’un animal” [Tf. 1991, 438] | Izn. ta-msäl-t, pl. ti-mesl-in, Bqy. & Tuzin a-mseř, pl. i-mesř-awen [-ř- reg. < *-l-] “cuisse, arrière-train d’un animal” (Zenet: Rns. 1932, 386) || WBrb.: Zng. mäsl-än (pl.) “lombes, hanches”, cf. sg. a-mâšč, pl. a-m^wašč-ən [-šč- < *-šč- reg. < *-sl-] “hanche” [Ncl. 1953, 219] || SBrb.: Hgr. a-msel, pl. i-msäl “flanc (partie du côté comprise entre l’aisselle et la hanche chez les personnes et les quadrupèdes)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1255], EWlm. a-msəl & Ayr e-msəl (m) “1. flanc, 2. p.ext. croupe (du cheval)” [PAM 1998, 225] || ECh.: perhaps EDangla lalmóosó [met. < *√m-l-s?] “fémur, os de la cuisse (homme et animaux)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 185]?

mnz (or **mns**?) “eine Pflanze” (LP, Wb II 88, 6).

- Meaning and origin uncertain. GT: cf. perhaps NBrb. *√m-l-z: Shenwa a-melzi “genévrier”, malaz “la bruyère” [Lst. 1912, 147], Temsaman a-m’rzi “thuya” [Brn. 1917, 92].

mnz3 (OK var. **mnz**) “Krug für Wasser” (OK, Wb II 88, 8; 110) = “Art Krug” (Grapow 1914, 25) = “Flasche (ausgußlos als auch mit Schnabel in der Speisenliste, vielleicht die typische Form dieser Flasche)” (Balcz 1934, 71, §XIX.A) = “a jar (looks exactly like ḥz-jars, frequently used for milk-offerings, but they are also water-jars, in TT 88 wine, beer, and milk are offered in this deep concave-sided bowl)” (Lichtheim 1947, 173 & fn. 36-37) = “jar (for liquids)” (FD 110; DCT 170) = Krug mit Wasser für die Reinigung” (Helck 1967, 41) = “Opferkrug” (Spiegel 1971, 483) = “Wasserflasche” (Kaplony 1972, 212) = “bouteille, flacon” (AL 77.1745) = “ein Krug für Bier (in rituellen Texten auch für Milch und Wasser)” (GHWb 342).

NB1: Occurs also in a pun with bz3.t in PT 32b (Sander-Hansen 1948, 7–8).

NB2: Cf. also NK mns.t “Krug” (under Ramses II, Helck MWNR 735).

- Apparently an m- prefix nomen instr. form (Grapow 1914, 25). Its origin is still uncertain.
- **1.** A. Ember (1913, 120, #94; 1930, #11.a.16) and F. Calice (1936 GÄSW, #411) compared the underlying Eg. *nz3 with Sem. *ndy, cf. Akk. nzy “verspritzen” [AHW 784] || Hbr. nzy “sprengen, spritzen” [GB 494], Aram. ndy “emporspritzen” [GB] (Sem.: Zbr. 1971, #166). Phonologically unconvincing (OEg. -3 ≠ Sem. *-y).
NB1: L. H. Gray (1933, 128, #56) and A. Zaborski (1971, #166) equated Hbr.-Akk. *nzy alternatively with Ar. nzz “to leak, flow out” [Zbr.] = “avoir des sources d’eau jaillissantes à sa surface (sol)” [Gray], cf. also Geez nazza ~ nazaza “to come out of one’s nose (food while one is asleep)” [Lsl. 1987, 412], cf. also Ar. nḏd “to urinate”. But Aram. -d- points to Sem. *-d-.
NB2: Calice (l.c.) explained Eg. mnz3 (OK!) as a borrowing from NWSem., which is unacceptable.
- **2.** GT: it is a perfect match of Akk. (a/jB) mazzālu [< *manzāl-] “eine Gießkanne (?)” [AHW 637] = mazzalu “vessel for pouring out

oil or water” [CAD m1, 440], whereby the hypothetical Eg. *nz3 [*nzl ~ *nzt] “to pour out water (or sim.)” may be identified with Sem. *nzt “to flow down (or sim.)” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Akk. nazālu “entleeren”, nizlu “eine überdachte Tränke (?)” [AHW 771, 799] = nazālu “to pour out, drain”, manzaltu ~ mazzaltu “1. drainage, 2. flow of excrement” [CAD n2, 134, 230] || Ug. nzl “perhaps a libation ceremony” [Alb. in BASOR 63, 1936, 28, n. 24] = “reichlich, im Überfluß” [Mustafa, Acta Or. Hung. 29, 1975, 101] = “to pour out (i.e., provide) food” [Watson quoted in DUL] = “offering” [DUL 655], Hbr. nzl “rinnen, fließen, etwas in Menge herabströmen (aktivisch)” [GB 494–5] = qal “to trickle, flow”, hifil “to make water flow (from a rock)” [KB 683], PBHbr. & Jewish Aram. nōzal “fließen” [Levy 1924 III 364] = “to run, melt, be distilled” [Jastrow 1950, 892] | Ar. nzl: cf. esp. IV “7. avoir une éjaculation du sperme (se dit d’un mâle)”, V “2. donner du lait (se dit d’une chamelle)”, nuzl- “4. sperme que le mâle laisse échapper”, nazal- “2. pluie” [BK II 1240] || Geez nazala ~ nazzala “to go down, flow, spill over, seep (water), become damp (from seepage)” [Lsl. 1987, 411].

NB2: From the same AA root *n-ṣ-l “to flow, pour (?)” [GT] might derive SCu.: Qwadza manṣal-em-o (-dz-) “dew” [Ehret 1980 MS, 4] || WCh. *nzVI- “to pour” [Stl.]: BT *nzalu “to pour” [Schuh] > Krkr. nzālú- “to pour” [Schuh] = ñzàrè “to drip, leak” [Alio 1991 MS, #f117–8], Bole nzólú- “to pour” [Schuh], Ngamo nzal “to pour” [Schuh] = “to pour in” [Stl.] (BT: Schuh 1984, 217) | Kry. zal “to pour” [Skn./Stl.]. See also Stl. 2005, 134, #505 (WCh.-Sem.).

NB3: Its eventual etymological kinship with Eg. mns3 (old mnz3?) “Erektion” (Wb, q.v.) has been surmised already by H. Kees (1922, 111, §26) as “eine passende *Etymologie*”, although he did not rule out an identical “*Schreibung wegen falscher Etymologie*” either.

mns.t (det. depicting a flat object) “eine Örtlichkeit in oder bei Heliopolis” (OK, Wb II 88, 11–12; cf. Osing 1974, 97; Zibelius 1978, 29; WD II 62; cf. Vandier 1965, 152–165, §e) = “Name eines Heiligtums bei Heliopolis” (AAG 16, §34; GHWb 341) = “sanctuaire héliopolitain” (AL 79.1239). Cf. also Vandier 1965, 152–6, §e.

- Basic mng. and etymology obscure. GT: only guesses are possible. NB: Cf. perhaps (1) SBrb.: Hgr. ā-mennas “1. bassin en métal, 2. p.ext. vaste désert plat et stérile sans eau ni pâturage”, tā-mennas-t “plat creux en métal” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1216], EWlm. ā-mannas “plat creux en métal” [PAM 1998, 220] or (2) ECh.: Mkl. mènèsè (f) “margāi de Boubou”, cf. bùubú “maladie envoyée par cette margāi à une famille” [Jng. 1990, 139]?

mns.t “(ob richtig?)” (MK, Wb II 88, 14) = “lack (?)” (FD 110) = “*Mangel” (GHWb 342).

- GT: perhaps < old *mnz.t, related to NOm.: WMao *mānz- “small, thin” [GT]: Sezo mānzèwì “few”, mānzì “small”, mānzì “thin”, Hozo manza “small”, mānza “few”, mānzet “narrow” (Mao: Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 12, 14, 16, 18) || ECh.: Nancere menžé “dünn” [Lks. 1937, 89] < AA *m-n-ṣ (?) [GT].

mns (or **mnws**?) (GW) “ob ein Amt (?)” (XIX. hapax: Pap. Anastasi IV rt. 13:6, Wb II 88, 15) = “type of scribe” (DLE I 222; cf. Caminos 1954 LEM, 197: uninstanced elsewhere) = “type of scribe skilled in drawing up loan documents: loan clerk (?)” (Hoch 1994, 128–9).
NB: Written in GW as man-nu-sa [*manusa] (Hoch).

- Basic mng. and etymology obscure.
- **1. J. Hoch** (1994, #166) affiliated it (as a loan-word) with Hbr. maššā? “claim on a debt”, maššā?ā “secured loan” and Ar. našī?-at- “sale on credit”. This Sem. etymology was excluded by Woodhouse (2003, 279, #166).
- **2. J. F. Quack’s** (1996, 509) dubious suggestion (“*könnte mit der geographischen Bezeichnung mnws für Kreta zusammenhängen*”, i.e., zš mns “*wäre dann ein Schreiber, der Kretisch kann*”) was rightly declined by Woodhouse (l.c.): “*Quack’s interpretation... is as good as anything offered by Hoch*”.

mns3 (orig. **mnz3**?) “Erektion des Phallus” (Med., Wb II 88, 16) = “emissio seminis, involuntary emission” (Breasted 1930, 425, 330, 535) = “Erguß” (Westendorf 1962 GMT, 11, §22.c.3) = “Ejakulation, Samenerguß, Orgasmus” (GHWb 342) = “Samenerguß” (Med., HAM 731) = “to emit, ejaculate” (CT VI 220s, DCT 170).

NB: According to H. Kees (1922, 111), the same word is attested also in the following vars.: mns3.w displaying a met. of mn-/nm- (MK sarcophage, Gautier & Jéquier 1902, pl. xxiii, l. 2f.) ~ mnz3 (old hymn from Deir e-Bahari, XVIII.) ~ mnms3.w (LP fragment from Horbeit, cf. Naville in ASAE 10, pl. II). In addition, the CT (VI 220c) & Med. (Pap. E. Smith 10:16, 10:19, 10:20–21) exx. mns3 have both equally -s-.

- A definite etymology is impossible at the moment because of the uncertain origin of the NK sibilant (-s-/z-) and also because of the ambiguous basic meaning of the underlying verbal root. Probably extended by an m- prefix. For the root *nz3/*ns3 the following solutions have to be considered:
- **1. H. Kees** (1922, 111) and **P. Lacau** (1972, 42, §12.15) combined its 2nd component -s3 with Eg. s3j “satt werden, sein” (PT, Wb IV 14–15) = “to be(come) sat(isfi)ed” (FD 208), which they affiliated with the component s3.w of the Eg. term in PT 1248a “Ausdruck des Selbstbegatters” (Kees) = “self-pollution, onanism” (Kees 1922, 110 as quoted apud Breasted) = “who masturbated” (AEPT) = “qui se satisfait” (Lacau) of dubious reading (jws3.w or ms3.w or s3w?). C. T. Hodge (p.c. on 4 September 1994) had a similar comment on Eg. mns3: “*The mn- of mns3 I would analyze as two prefixes, m- and n-, as in mnqb, etc...*”

- **2.** Alternatively, H. Kees (1922, 111) assumed an eventual etymological connection with OK mnz3 “Krugname” (PT32b, above), which “*eine passende Etymologie bildet*” provided the XVIII ex. mnz3 preserves the oldest spelling, although “*möglich ist aber eine falsche Etymologie in dieser Schreibung*” (i.e., in that of mnz3 at Deir el-Bahari). In this case, the hypothetic Eg. *nz3 “to ejaculate” would be the perfect match of Ar. nzl: cf. esp. IV “7. avoir une éjaculation du sperme (se dit d’un mâle)”, V “2. donner du lait (se dit d’une chamelle)”, nuzl- “4. sperme que le mâle laisse échapper”, nazal- “2. pluie” [BK II 1240] = nzl IV “éjaculer” [Fagnan 1923, 171], which would imply an ultimate relationship with Eg. mnz3 “Krug” (OK, Wb, above) < *nz3 “to pour out” ~ Sem. *nzl “to flow down” [GT] (Sem.: GB 494; Lsl. 1987, 411) < AA *n-ʒ-l “to flow, pour (?)” [GT].
- **3.** J. Breasted (1930, 330) rightly ruled out an etymological relevance of the idiom jw=f mn z3.w “it remains stationary” explaining mns3 in Pap. E. Smith 10:20–21: “*It would seem highly improbable that... mn ‘remain’ and sʔw ‘protect’... should have any etymological connection with mnsʔ ‘emissio’. The commentator has either been misled by the simple paranomasia, or found it too attractive to be resisted*”.
- **4.** W. Westendorf (1962 GMT, 11, §22.c.3) supposed in Med. mns3 vs. nms.w “Erguß” the very same word with met. Very dubious. Anyhow, mns3 cannot be derived from *mns.
- **5.** C. T. Hodge (kind p.c. on 4 September 1994) was disposed to analyze “*the mn- of mns3... as two prefixes, m- and n-, as in mnqb, etc.... Due to its specialized nature, mns3 is not easily etymologized. In looking for possible cognates, I came upon Ar. wsl V ‘to curry favor’. Not a certainty but to be kept in mind*”.
- **6.** GT: if the underlying Eg. root was *ns3, cf. alternatively Ar. nasala IV “1. engendrer ou enfanter, donner naissance à un foetus”, VI “se multiplier par une génération successive (se dit des hommes, des animaux)” [BK II 1252].
NB: It originates from Sem. *nsl attested in Hbr. nsl qal tr. “1. (tr.) ausziehen, ab-, hinauswerfen, vertreiben, 2. (intr.) Abfallen der Oliven, herausfallen, herausfahren” [GB 527] = “lösen” [Voigt], JAram. nsl “abfallen, ausfallen”, piel “abwerfen, abfallen lassen” [Levy 1924 III 451] | OSA: Sab. nsl-m “offspring of animals” [Biella 1984, 307] = ns,l [nasl] “Nachkommenschaft (von Tieren)” [Voigt] = “Nachwuchs (?)” [Sima 2001, 253, §5: hapax], Ar. nasala I “5. couler, tomber, glisser de dessus le corps, 6. pousser, germer, naître, paraître”, nasal- “1. lait qui coule spontanément des pis sans qu’on traie la femelle, 2. lait, suc blanc d’une figure encore verte” [BK II 1252] = nsl “ausfallen, abfallen (z.B. Haare, Federn)” [GB] (Sem.: Voigt 1998, 177).
- **7.** GT: if, in turn, the basic sense of the hypothetic Eg. *ns3 was “to have erection”, cf. perhaps Ar. nšr I “faire naître, produire”, VIII

“être en érection (homme)” [Fagnan 1923, 172]. Improbable because of the irreg. Eg. -s- vs. Ar. -š-.

- **8.** GT: it would be tempting to combine XVIII. mnz3 [$< *mnzr?$], which was treated by R. Hannig (GHWb 342) separately and rendered as “geschlechtlich mißbrauchen”, with Eth.-Sem. $*mnzr$ “to commit fornication” [Lsl.].

NB1: Attested in Geez mnzr: $ʔamanzara$ “to commit adultery, be licentious”, manzir ~ manzər ~ mənzər “bastard, dissolute, who slanders”, Tna. $ʔamānzārā$ & Amh. $mānāzzārā$ “to become dissolute”, $amānāzzārā$ “to fornicate, commit adultery” (ES: Lsl. 1958, 31; 1969, 54; 1987, 353), which was borrowed into NAḡaw: Qwara $mānazar$ “huren” [Rn. 1885, 100], Hamir minzer “huren” [Rn. 1884, 393].

NB2: Following C.F.A. Dillmann (1865, 191), F. Praetorius (1879, 59), and Th. Nöldeke (1910, 45), W. Leslau (l.c.) connected with Hbr. $mamzēr$ “Israelite half-breed” [KB 595] = “bastard” [Lsl.], MHbr. & JAram. $mamzērā$ “child of a prohibited mixed marriage” [KB] usually explained from Sem. $*mḏr$ “to decay, rot” [KB 566], which makes the Eg.-ES etymology improbable. Alternatively, however, Leslau explained the ES root in question from ES $*mnzr$ “to waste money, be spendthrift”, which semantically also rules out the Eg.-Sem. etymology.

mnsr (flame & snake det.) “als Name der heiligen Schlange im Gau von Aphroditopolis” (GR Edfu, Wb II 89, 1) = “Name einer Gottheit” (Grapow 1914, 25) = “name of the sacred snake of the region of Aphroditopolis” (Smith 1979, 162).

- Derives from Eg. $nṣr$ “brennen” (PT, Wb II 335) = “to flame, burn” (FD 140) as pointed out by H. Grapow (1914, 25) and H. Smith (1979, 162).

NB1: A contamination with Eg. $nzr:t$ “royal serpent (goddess)” (PT, FD 139; Wb II 320, 2–5) is not excluded.

NB2: The etymology of Eg. $nṣr$ is of dubious.

(1) GT: cf. perhaps NBrb.: Wrg. $ti-nṣər-t$, pl. $ti-nṣar$ “sorte de brasero en terre cuite qui sert de brûle-parfums ou de chauffeferre, de réchaud” [Dlh. 1984, 226] | Qbl. $a-nazir$ “1. brasier avec flamme, 2. grosse chaleur, 3. fièvre” [Dlt. 1982, 593] || EBrb.: Gdm. $ta-naser-t$ “brûle-parfum en terre cuite” [Lnf. 1973, 248, #1171].

(2) W. W. Müller (1961, 202, #12) identified it (via met. $< *rsn?$) with ES $*rsn$: Geez $rāsna$ “entzünden, verbrennen” [Müller] = $rasna$ “to glow, be red-hot, be heated, be inflamed” [Lsl.]. Add Ar. (Dathina) $rašin$ “to burn”, Tigrinya $rāsānā$ “to be very hot”, Tigre $rāsna$ “to glow” (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 474).

(3) GT: it may be of biconsonantal origin ($*\sqrt{sr} \sim *\sqrt{sl}$), cf. Eg. $nṣjsj$ ~ $nṣrsr$ “als Name einer Insel als Geburtsort der Sonne” (PT, Wb II 336, 8) displaying the structure $nC_1C_2C_1C_2$ (Ward 1972, 155–156; Conti 1980). For the hypothetical $*\sqrt{sr}$ cp. Sem.: (?) Ar. $saʿara$ (root complement -ʿ-?) “1. allumer et attiser le feu, 2. brûler, causer une douleur cuisante” [BK I 1091] || ECu. $*sār-$ [GT]: Burji $sār-$ (intr.) “to boil”, $sār-i$ “steam”, Hadiyya $sar-$ “to cook, bake” | Yaaku $-sar-$ “to burn” (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 161) || SCu. $*sār-$: cf. Qwadza $sil-im-$ “to roast” [Qwadza-Yaaku: Ehret 1980, 181] || WCh. $*s-w-r$ “to fry” [GT]: Hausa $sóoyà$ “to fry” [Abr. 1962, 821] | Angas-Sura $*sūr$ “to fry” [GT 2004, 324]: Angas $suur$ “to fry” [Flk. 1915, 285] = sur “to fry” [ALC 1978, 61] = sur “to fry” [Krf.], Mpn. $sūr$ “to fry” [Frj. 1991, 57] | Bole-Tangale $*suru$ “to fry” [Schuh 1984, 216] | Burma $sūr$ “to burn” [Stl.] || CCh.: Margi $sāl$ [l reg. $< *r$] “to fry” [NM 1966, 235] | Paduko $sula$ [l $< *r?$] “to fry” [Nwm. 1977, 26] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 179; NM 1966, 235; Nwm. 1977, 26).

H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) analyzed the ECu. stem as a fossilized caus. *-s-ʿār- “to cause to steam”. If this is correct, the ECu. data are unrelated.

(4) GT: or cp. NBrb.: perhaps Wargla a-slu, Snus & Iznasen i-selu-ān “suie” (NBrb.: Bst. 1925, 15) ||| HECu.: Burji sal- “to cook”, Hadiyya saʿl- “to bake” | LECu.: Saho & Somali sol- “to grill, roast” (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 163) ||| WCh.: Hausa súlálá ~ súlàlálá “to warm up, cook by steaming” [Abr. 1962, 825].

mnš.t “ein mineralischer Stoff (besonders in offizineller Verwendung), auch als (gelber) Farbstoff zum Schreiben und Ausmalen von Inschriften” (Med., Wb II 89, 12–13) = “eine Art von Erde, deren man sich als Farbstoff beim Malen und Schreiben bediente” (Brugsch Wb II 665) = “Mennige, Rötel” (Spg. 1906, 158 after Brugsch Wb Erg. 610) = “most probably yellow ochre, a soft argillaceous earth impregnated with ferric oxyde (used as a yellow pigment for colouring sculptured reliefs)” (Dawson 1934, 188, §20; Barns 1956, 33) = “l’ocre jaune” (Jonckheere 1947, 22, §3) = “yellow ochre (?)” (Mag. Pap. Leiden I 343 + 345, rt. 26:10, Massart 1954, 94–95, n. 13) = “red ochre” (WÄDN 246–7; Borghouts 1971, 43–44, n. 21) = “some sort of clay (in constant connection with ztj ‘yellow ochre’): red ochre (μίλτος)” (Iversen 1955, 19–21, 28–34: no evidence for yellow ochre, adopted by PL 445) = “an ochreous earth used as pigment (but its colour is not definitely identified), probably red” (Harris 1961, 146–7) = “yellow (?) ochre” (Med., FD 110) = “yellow/red ochre” (DLE I 223) = “ocre rouge” (Aufrière 1990, 652–3, 659, 742, 765) = “Ocker (viell. roter)” (GHWb 342) = “mineral pigment: probably red ochre” (PL 437) = “red ochre (?)” (Leitz 1999, 99).

NB1: Its variety was mnš.t w3d.t “grüne Farberde” (Brugsch) = “frische Mennige” (Wreszinski) = “natural ochre (used directly as found)” (Iversen).

NB2: Attested also as mnš (Pap. Ch. Beatty VI, rt. 5:8–12, cf. Brugsch 1882, 68; Spg. 1906, 158; Dawson in JEA 20, 1934, 185f., §20; Dawson 1935, 39, §23; Jonckheere 1947, 22, §3; PL 437, 445). For the form mnf.t cf. Westendorf 1962, 25, §40.c.

NB3: Vocalized as *mēnš.ʿt (Snk. 1963, 145).

NB4: For the apotropaic power of red mnš.t see Borghouts 1971, 43–44, n. 21.

- Origin debated. Most probable is #2.
- 1. H. Brugsch (1882, 68), W. Vycichl (DELIC 121), and S. Aufrière (l.c.) assumed an Eg. root *√mlš on the basis of its supposed connection with LEg. mrš “lichtrot” (GR, Wb II 113, 1, q.v.) > (S) ἠρω “devenir rouge, jaune” (DELIC). Doubted by J. R. Harris (1961, 147). It may be that the primary root was *√mnš, whereby GR mrš arose secondarily via a late shift of -n- > -r- under the influence of m- (nasal dissim.) as suggested by C. Peust (1999, 166). Thus, the very etymology of Eg. *√mnš remains open.

LIT. for combining Eg. mnš.t vs. mrš: Rn. 1873, 90; Brugsch 1882, 68; Iversen 1955, 28f.; Snk. 1963, 145; KHW 100; DELIC 121; PL 445; Peust 1999, 166.

- **2.** GT: perhaps identical with WCh.: EHausa *mànžú* “red dye, mostly prepared from the red leaf-sheats of a variety of millet” > (?) Bole *mònžú* “type of grass for colouring *pìimó*” [M. Broß quoted by Ibn. & Gimba 1994, 134] || CCh.: Bura-Margi **ma[N]za* (?) “red” [GT]: WMargi *muŋzà* [Krf.], Cibak *məgzà* [Krf.], Bura *mamzà* [Krf.] = *mamsa* [Hfm. in RK 1973, 92], Ngwahyi *məməzà* [Krf.] (CCh.: Kraft 1981, #274)? The reconstruction of the C₂ nasal (Ch. **-m-* or **-n-*?) and the C₃ sibilant (perhaps Ch. **-ʒ-* = Eg. *-š-*?) is uncertain.

NB1: A partial reduplication (< **m-S*) seems improbable in light of the WCh. data. Cf. also CCh.: Bata *mis-* “to redden” [Pweddton 2000, 56], Bcm. *miso-miso* “red” [Crn. 1975, 465, #85]?

NB2: N. Skinner (1997, 79) compared the BM root with the reflexes of CCh. **m-m-S* “blood” [GT], cf. BM **mamši* [GT]: Margi *ʔmámčí* (-tsh-) [IL], Gwara *mámší* [Wolff], Bura *mamši* [Hfm. apud RK 1973, 92] = *mámčí* [Wolff], Bura-Pela & Kilba *mamši* [Meek] = *màši* [Grieve 1976 MS, 2, #15] (BM: Wolff 1974–75, 190, 202) | Fali-Jilbu *mamzi* “blood” [Krf. 1972 MS] | Gudu *māmši* [IL] | MM **maNbez* [Rsg. 1978, 213, #75] | Sukur *mumbus* [Meek] = *múmbùz* [IL] (CCh.: Mch. 1953, 172; JI 1994 II 30–31). Here may belong HECu. **munz-* “to bleed” [GT]: Sid. *munda* “to bleed”, *mundē* “blood” [Gsp. 1983, 241; CrI. 1938 II, 214], Gedeo (Darasa) *mundaʔ-* “to bleed”, *mundé* “blood” [Hds.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 28). Note that HECu. (Sid.-Drs.) *d* < ECU. **z* is possible and regular (Sasse 1979, 19–20, also 56).

- **3.** L. Reinisch (1873, 90) set up a root **mš* (!) compared with Teda *mado*, *wada* “rot”. Absurd.

mnš “der sogenannte Königsring, der den Königsnamen umschließt” (NK, Wb II 89, 2) = “Königsring (Kartusche)” (Spg. 1906, 158) = “cartouche” (FD 110) = “ein Siegelring mit dem Königsring auf dem Siegelbild” (Kaplony, LÄ III 618, n. 13).

- Hence (denom.): *mnš(j)* “mit dem Königsring stempeln” (NK, Wb II 89, 5; Spg. 1906, 158).
- **1.** H. Schäfer (1896, 167) and W. Barta (1970, 5) derived it (via *m-* prefix and *met.*) from Eg. *šnj* “umkreisen, umringen” (Schäfer, cf. Wb IV 489), cf. *šn* (NK) ~ *šnw* (XXI). “Königsring” (Barta).
- **2.** W. Spiegelberg (1906, 158) and P. Wilson (PL 436–7) assumed a connection to Eg. *mnš.t* “Mennige, Rötel” (Spg., q.v.) = “red coloured” (PL), because “*die ägyptischen Farbnapfe oft die Form des Königringes haben*”.
- **3.** GT: *m-* prefix form of a hypothetical Eg. **wnš* “to encircle”, akin to NBrb. **ta-winis-t* “boucle d’oreille” [GT]: Snus *ta-unis-t* | Zayan *ti-winəs-t* | Zwawa *ta-unis-t* | Nfs. *t-uinəs-t* (NBrb.: Lst. 1931, 205) || SBrb. **tā-wiynis-t*, pl. **tū-wuynās* (or **tā-wihnis-t*, pl. **tū-wihnās*) “circle, ring” [Prs. 1974, 53, 133]: Hgr. *tā-wīnəs-t*, pl. *tī-wīnās*, Ayr *ta-wəynəs-t* (SBrb.: Blz. 1998, 163; 1999, 50, 73).

mnš “Art Schiff auf dem Nil und auf dem Meere, zu Handelsfahrten und als Kriegsschiff” (XIX., Wb II 89, 7–10) = “1. ship for freight, 2. a warship” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 553) = “ship, vessel sailing under hire for the Pharaoh, apparently a liner with a fixed route sailing under pharaonic privilege” (Wenamun, Goedicke 1975, 68, 169) = “barque de transport” (AL 78.1754) = “Art Seeschiff” (E. Martin-Pardey, LÄ V 605, 609, n. 51) = “ship, freighter, barge, riverboat, galley, vessel, warship” (DLE I 222) = “barge, riverboat, galley, warship” (Jones 1988, 138, §36 with lit.) = “barge” (Aufrière 1990, 74, 659) = “Schiff, Frachter, Barke, Flußboot, Galeere, Kriegsschiff” (GHWb 342) = “1. ein See- (Handelsfahrer) und Kriegsschiff (der Äg. Flotte), 2. auch ein seegängiges Lastschiff (das auch bei der Flußschiffahrt eingesetzt wurde), 3. auch bei Transporten in der Binnen- und Seeschiffahrt verwandt, 4. ein mit Löwenbug, Mastkorb und Verschanzung ausgerüstetes Fahrzeug (als erstes ägyptisches Kriegsschiff ist fraglich), 5. eine nur in den Aufbauten gering veränderte Abart des zeitgenössischen Schiffstyps (ein Schiffskörper mit hohem Bord, bogenförmig nach innen gezogenem Heck und einem Bugteil, das mehr Kastell oder Verzierung als Ramme ist)” (Düring 1995, 144–6 with further disc.).

- Basic mng. and origin uncertain.
- 1. E. Iversen (1955, 34, fn. 1) observed its “*curious coincidence*” with Eg. mnš.t “red ochre” (Med., above), which he regarded as “*undoubtedly closely related*” on the analogy of Gk. μιλτεῖον (a special type of boats or vessels) < μίλτος (red ochre). Henceforth, he explained this type of boats as “*originally intended for the transport of the ochre*”, although these “*retained their name also when used for other purposes*”. This idea was followed by J. R. Harris (1961, 146–7).
- 2. H. Goedicke (1975, 25) assumed its basic mng. not to be of nautical origin, but to derive from Eg. mnš “royal cartouche” vs. “to stamp with the royal cartouche”. Thus, in his view, it may have in fact denoted “ships sailing under royal charter to conduct business, without being actual royal property”.

mnq “zu Ende bringen, vollenden, auch: etwas durchmachen (?)” (MK, Wb II 89, 16–19) = “to complete, give effect to” (Pap. Turin 1882, 4:4, Grd. 1956, 18) = “to come to an end” (FD 110) = “to finish, complete, come to an end, end, restore, heal” (DLE I 223) = “1. vollenden (Arbeit, Bau), zu Ende bringen (Fest), fertigstellen, zu Ende kommen, 2. vergelten, gewähren” (GHWb 342).

- Hence: Cpt. (B) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\bar{\kappa}$, (S) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\kappa$, (F) $\mu\omicron\omicron\Upsilon\kappa$ “1. (intr.) to cease, be lacking, perish, 2. (tr.) cause to cease, destroy” (CD 175) = “consumere” (Brugsch) = “aufhören, vollenden, beseitigen, verzehren, vergehen” (KHW 95). Ultimately related pair (mostly intr.): (SLBF) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\bar{\kappa}$ “verzehren, aufhören” (Spg. KHW 61) = “to (make to) cease” (CED 85) = “vollenden” (KHW 95) = “to finish, accomplish” (Osing). Cf. Pap. BM 10808 $men\bar{h}$ - (st.nom.) “zu Ende bringen, vollenden” (Osing 1976, 96).

NB: Questionable if Dem. $mnkj$ “formen” (DG 164:5) = “to prepare” (Osing) > Cpt. (O) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\Gamma$, (SLBF) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\bar{\kappa}$, (F) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\kappa$ “to make, form” (CD 174b) = “construere, sculpere” (Goodwin 1867, 86 with false etym.) = “formare” (Brugsch) = “bilden, formen, herstellen” (KHW 95) represent the same root. W. Westendorf (KHW 95) assumed two plausible etymons: Eg. $mn\bar{h}$ “mit dem Meißel arbeiten” (OK, Wb, q.v.) and mnq “ein Gerät” (NK, Wb, below), while by H. Brugsch (1882, 57), J. Černý (CED 85), and C. Peust (1999, 118) derived the Dem.-Cpt. root from Eg. $mn\bar{h}$ “mit dem Meißel arbeiten” (OK, Wb, above), which they distinguished from (S) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\eta\bar{\kappa}$ “to cease” (CD 175a) < Eg. mnq “to finish”. The usual combination of the former root with Eg. $mn\bar{h}$ was, however, rejected by Spiegelberg (1919–20, 26, §17), Lallemand (1923, 96–97), and Osing (1978, 187) since Eg. $-h \neq$ Cpt. $-\kappa$ and also because Eg. $mn\bar{h}$ > (B) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\lambda\bar{\kappa}$ “ein-, zusammenfügen”. Therefore, Spiegelberg (KHW 61) and Osing (l.c.) assumed both Cpt. verbs to be “ultimately identical”.

- Etymology highly debatable, but #3 seems fairly probable.
- 1. W. F. Albright (1927, 217) identified Eg. mnq with Sem. $*bl\bar{k}$: Hbr. blq “to lay waste (th land)” [KB 135], Ar. $balaqa$ “ouvrir brusquement la porte, ou l’ouvrir tout entière” [BK I 163] etc. He explained Eg. mnq from the basic sense $*\text{“to cut off”}$. Rightly declined by F. von Calice (1936, #630) for semantic considerations.

NB: Eg. $m-$ ~ Sem. $*b-$ are irregular, although, a partial assim. ($mnq < *bnq < *blq$) is (in principle) possible.

- 2. GT: following Albright’s idea on the basic meaning of Eg. mnq , an equation of Eg. mnq [$< *mlq?$] with Sem. $*ml\bar{k}$ “to tear off (or sim.)” [GT] should also be accounted for. This assumption seems to be corroborated by LECu.: Orm. $mulq\bar{u}$ “to finish completely” [Btm. 2000, 203], cf. also Orm. $mulu\check{c}$ $\check{z}e\check{d}a$ [$-\check{c}$ - reg. < $*-k-$] “to completely over with, destroyed” [Gragg 1982, 294] ||| CCh.: (?) Gude $milhi$ [$-h$ - reg. < $*-k-$] “to close eye” [Hsk. 1983, 243], although Cpt. $-N-$ seems to contradict this comparison.

NB: Attested in Hbr. $mlq\ qal$ “to pinch off (the head of a bird with one’s fingernails)” [KB 594] = “to nip off” [Lsl.], Syr. mlq “to tear loose” [KB] = “to pluck off, peel” [Lsl.] | Ar. mlq VIII “to pull, tear out” [KB] = VII $\text{?}im\bar{t}alaqa$ “to extract, draw out” [Lsl.] || Geez $malaqa$ “to cut sever, pluck, break off, snap off” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 345)

- 3. GT: on the other hand, it seems to display a similar semantic diversity as HECu.: Sidamo $munku$ “complete, whole, all” [Crl. 1938 II, 215] ||| NOm. $*man\bar{k}$ - “to finish, prepare (?)” [GT]: Chara

mank-it- “fare” [Crl. 1938 III, 172] | Dizi mamk “to prepare” [Toselli quoted by Bnd. 1996 MS, 2, #488] || SOM.: Ari máq- ~ maḵ- [**mank-?*] “to finish” [Bnd. 1994, 150], which apparently derive from AA **m-n-k* with the basic sense “full, complete” [GT].

NB1: Unrelated to NBrb.: Qabyile neqqi “1. nettoyer, curer, 2. finir, achever complètement (un travail)”, i-mneqqi (adj.) “parfait” [Dlt. 1982, 571], which is a loan from Ar. nqy II “to clean”.

NB2: G. Takács (2004, 208, #995) did not exclude an eventual connection to Nst. **manʿa* “to stop, delay” [Dlg.] (on a bicons. basis), which is semantically uncertain, cf. Sem. **mnʿ* “to hinder (or sim.)” [GT].

- **4.** GT: alternatively, cp. perhaps ES: Tna. ʔamengewe [irreg. -g-] “interrompere, lasciare à metà un lavoro incominciato, incastrare, immettere un legno in una fessura” [Bassano] = te-mānāgʷeye “s’interrompit, s’arrêta soudain” [Coulbeaux] (ES: cf. Wajnberg 1935, 67) ||| WCh.: Bubure múḡkò “to cease” [Haruna 1992 MS, #f196]?
- **5.** GT: in principle, a cognateship with NBrb.: Qbl. $\sqrt{m-l-\gamma}$: a-melyiy ~ a-menyiy “1. sommet de la tête, 2. os du crâne” [Dlt. 1982, 500] (on the analogy of, e.g., Hung. be-fej-ez “finishes” < fej “head”) is not to be excluded.
- Other suggestions cannot be accepted:
- **6.** C. W. Goodwin (1867, 86): Cpt. (B) MONK “construere, sculpere” < Eg. **mr* ~ **mn* (sic) “1. hoe used for tilling the ground, 2. chisel or hatchet for cutting wood and stone” (sic). Absurd.
- **7.** L. Reinisch (1873, 247) equated it with Teda daḡ (!) “ruhen”. Absurd.
- **8.** L. Homburger (1929, 165) affiliated it with Bantu (sic) mana ~ mala (mng. not indicated).
- **9.** Later, Homburger (1957, 30) compared Drv.: Kannada mugi, Tamil muki.
- **10.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 203, #1799) combined it with LECu.: Afar muluy “end” < AA **-mul-* “to end (intr.)”. Baseless.
NB: For the Afar word cf. Eg. m3.tj (dual) “two ends (?)” (Grd., above).

mnq “ein Baum (als Nutzholz und offizinell verwendet)” (Med., Wb II 90, 7–8; WD III 52: for lit. & early exx. cf. SAK 12, 1985, 35f.) = “*Styrax officinale*” (Loret 1892, 140, adopted by Charpentier 1981, §531, rejected by Germer 1985, 147, cf. HAM 500) = (Holz)” (Helck MWNr 120) = “(the nature of mnḵ-wood is unknown)” (Janssen 1966, 53) = “ein unbekannter Baum, dessen Holz und Blüten offizinell verwendet werden” (WÄDN 248–9) = “an unknown kind of wood” (Janssen 1975, 208, fn. 40) = “Holz, fast ausschließlich für den ḡḡb.t-Stab = verwendet” (Hassan 1976, 49 & fn. 63) = “(wood)” (DLE

I 223) = “Baum von besonders hohem Wuchs, (nach Texten des NR) entweder Nutzholz oder officinell verwendet (botanische Bestimmung bisher noch nicht sicher)” (already V.: reign of Izezi, Grimm 1985, 35–36 & fn. 32, 34 with exx. and lit.) = “ein Baum” (GHWb 342) = “styrax” (HAM 500) = “un arbrisseau (le bois servait à fabriquer des pièces de mobilier et autres ustensiles, généralement bon marché, en DeM toujours pour désigner un bois d’oeuvre: cela ne peut certainement pas en faire un aboulifer)” (Ghica 2006, 79).

NB: V. Loret (l.c.) and E. Chassinat (1921, 185) as well as G. Charpentier (1981, 26–27, 338–9) saw its trace in Dem. $\zeta\mu\omega\nu\eta\kappa$ “styrax” (Dem. Pap. London & Leiden 14:23, Griffith) and Cpt. (scalae) $\Delta\text{M}\text{H}\text{H}\text{A}\text{K}\text{O}\text{Y}$ “styrax” (after Kircher) = “Styrax arbor et liquor inde manans” (Peyron 1835, 6). Since the Dem. and Cpt. terms derive from Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\omega\nu\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$, their connection with Eg. $m\eta q$ was rightly declined by R. Germer (1985, 147) “*als ungesichert*” as well as by A. Grimm (1985, 36 with abundant lit.) and by V. Ghica (2006, 78–79 & fn. 32 with a hint on the “*problèmes phonétiques: l’apparition dans la forme démotique de deux consonnes non étymologiques, /ʔ/ et /ʕ/, et une étrange re-vocalisation du vocable lors du passage du démotique au copte*”).

- Mng. and origin obscure. GT: a connection with SCu.: DhI. $m\eta\lambda\eta\kappa\epsilon$ “sp. tree from which poison is made” [EEN 1989, 39] is improbable.

$m\eta q$ (chisel & wood det.) “ein hölzernes Hausgerät” (XX. hapax, Wb II 90, 6) = “ein unbekanntes Holzgerät” (Helck MWNR 914 with further ex.) = “ein Holzgerät” (GHWb 342).

- Perhaps a variation of Eg. $m\eta\eta$ “Meißel” (OK, Wb, above) with a shift of $-\eta > -q$, whereby the $-k$ of Cpt. (S) $\text{M}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{N}\bar{\text{K}}$ “to make, form” (CD 174b) might be explained.
LIT.: Brugsch 1882, 57; Wb l.c.; Vrg. 1950, 290–1; CED 85; KHW 95. Contra: Lallemand 1923, 97; Osing 1978, 187.

$m\eta q.t$ “ein Gefäß (?)” (XVIII.: Urk. IV 1848:15, Wb II 90, 11) = “aromate (qui ne peut guère être que) la résine odorante du Styrax officinale” (Loret 1892, 63, §99 & p. 140, rejected in the lit.) = “jar (?)” (FD 110) = “Bierkrug” (M.V. Fox apud Guglielmi 1995, 114, cf. also Herbin 1999, 196, ii:8) = “vessel” (PL 437).

- Hence: $m\eta q.t$ “eine Göttin, (GR) besonders als die Göttin des Biers” (BD, LP, often GR, Wb II 90, 9–10; WD II 62: cf. RdE 50, 1999, 196) = “Menqet, personifizierter Krug, Göttin des Bieres und des \underline{d} sr. t-Getränkes, das sie in späten Tempelinschriften braut” (Helck, LÄ IV 55) = “Biergöttin” (Guglielmi 1995, 113f.) = “nom de la déesse de la bière” (Mathieu 1996, 107, n. 357) = “beer goddess (personified beer jug)” (PL 437).

NB: W. Guglielmi (o.c., p. 115) discusses a.o. “ihre häufige... Erwähnung bei dem ‘Darreichen des Bieres’, bei der möglicherweise der homoioteleutonartige Gleichklang (oder ‘Reim’) zwischen ḥnq.t ‘Bier’ und Mnq.t eine Rolle spielte”

- Etymology disputed:
- **1.** V. Loret (l.c.) affiliated it with Eg. mnq “a wood” (Med., above) and Cpt. (scalae) ἈΜΙΝΑΚΟΥ “styrax” (after Kircher). False.
- **2.** Others suggest a derivation from Eg. mnq “vollenden” (MK, Wb, q.v.) in diverse ways. Thus, W. Helck (1971, 86) derived the word for “beer” from the sense “das Ausgegorene (Getränk)”. J. Baines (1985, 197), in turn, rendered the mnq.t-jar as lit. “manufactured item” (cf. Cpt. “to prepare”), while W. Guglielmi (1994, 113) explained the name of the jar as “die Vollendete” or “die Vollenderin”
- **3.** B. Mathieu (l.c.) derived the underlying root *mnq from a contraction of Eg. *m (prefix) + (ḥ)nq.t “beer”. Unacceptable. Eg. ḥ- does not disappear after the m- prefix.
- **4.** GT: since the basic word for “beer” in Eg. was ḥnq.t, we may suppose Eg. mnq.t to have signified primarily a sort of jar (having only a secondary association with beer), which may be perhaps related with NAgaw: Bilin māṅḳ-a “pot of clay”, māṅḳək “pot of clay” [LT 1997, 510].
- **5.** GT: a connection with Ar. mlq V “couler (eau qui s’écoule ou stagne sur un sol uni)”, malaq-at- “bourbier, fonds marécageux et non-cultivés” [Fagnan 1923, 165] seems less probable.

mnq “jem. belohnen mit (m) etwas” (XIX.-LP, Wb II 90, 3) = “3. belohnen mit” (GHWb 342).

NB: Cf. also mnq “(mit Obj. und n der Person) jemandem etwas vergelten, etwas gewähren” (XIX.-LP, Wb II 90, 1–2) usually (Wb, DELC 116, GHWb) explained from mnq “vollenden” (q.v.).

- GT: cognate with ES: Geez manqaqa “to distribute, hand out, give out” [Lsl. 1987, 351], which stands isolated in Sem.

mnq (vessel det.) “als Bez. für Milch” (GR, Wb II 90, 12) = “Milch” (Vcl. 1988, 489) = “Bez. der Milch” (Guglielmi 1994, 127, n. 10 with lit.) = “milk” (PL 437).

- Etymology disputed. Most promising seems #2.
- **1.** G. Fecht (1955, 295) derived it from Eg. nq.wt “Feuchtigkeit” (Med. hapax: Pap. E. Smith 21:18, Wb II 343, 17) = “moisture” (Breasted 1930, 497), which he eventually affiliated with Eg. snq “to suckle” and Sem. *ynḳ “to suck”. Untenable.

NB: Fecht confused two distinct AA roots: (**1**) Eg. nq.wt is akin to GR nqq “water” (Osing 1998, 91), which may be cognate either with ECu.: Yaaku nḳqi “river”

[Heine 1975, 132] ||| NOm.: Mao of Bambeshi nāṅkè “dew” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1993, 55] || SOm. *nōk- “water” [Bnd. 2003, 219, #145] ||| ECh.: EDng. nyóké “pleuvoir”, nyāknyāké “pleuvoir, pleuvoir légèrement, bruiner, pleuvasser” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 221] (for Yaaku-SOm.: Grb. 1963, 36, #142; Eg.-NOm.: HSED #1881), or (via prefix n-) with SBrb.: Nslm. qaw-ən “water” [Mlt. 1991, 247] ||| LECu. *koyy- “wet” [Black 1974, 198; Sasse 1979, 49] ||| Om. *ka- “wet” [Bnd. 1994, 1157, #94] as suggested by A. Dolgopolsky (1983, 136), while (2) Eg. snq derives from AA *n-k “to suck” [GT] (cf. the following item).

- 2. W. Vycichl (1985, 67; 1988, 489), followed by C. Peust (2000, 251), analyzed LEg. mnq as a pass. part. *ma-ynūq “das Gesaugte”, derived from an unattested Eg. *jnq “to suck”.

NB: This root was preserved by Sem. *ynk “to suck” [Frz. 1971, 630, #7.15] ||| Eg. snq (caus. prefix s-) (PT; Wb IV 174) = “to suck(le)” (FD 234) ||| (?) NBrb.: Sus ta-naṣu-t “pis” [Lst.] | Mzg. ṭi-nṣi “pis, mamelle” [Taifi 1991, 479], Zayan & Sgugu ṭi-nṣi “3. pis” [Lbg. 1924, 575] | Izn. ṭa-nṣi “pis” [Lst.] = ṭi-nṣi “pis, tétin (de vache, brebis, etc.)” [Rns.], Rif *ṭa-nṣa “pis, tétin (de vache, brebis, etc.)” [Rns.] > e.g. Bqy. ṭa-nṣa “mamelles” [Lst.; Brn.], Wrg. ṭi-mṣi (so, -m-) “glande mammaire” [Lst.; Brn.] (NBrb.: Brn. 1917, 99; Lst. 1931, 278; Rns. 1932, 394) ||| SCu.: Dahalo nūk- “to suck beer through a straw” [EEN 1989, 40].

AP: NS *nākw “to suck” [Ehret 2001, 313, #252]. PKuliak *nakw “to suck” [Ehret 1981, 94] ~ PNil. *nāk “to suck”, *i-nāk “to suckle, give breast” [Dimmendaal 1988, 58, #167] → PENil. *n_oak- “to suck” [Vossen 1982, 455] → PLOTuko-Maa *nak- “to suck” [Vossen 1983, 194].

LIT. for this AA root: Erman 1892, 118 (Eg.-Sem.); Müller 1903, 79; 1907, 304, fn. 3 (Eg.-Sem.); Ember 1930, #11.a.51, #20.a.18 (Eg.-Sem.); Clc. 1936, #812 (Eg.-Sem.); Vcl. 1958, 377; 1959, 39 (Eg.-Sem.); Zbr. 1971, #159 (Eg.-Sem.); Dj. etc. 1986, 65 (Sem.-Eg.-WCh.); Vcl. 1988, 483–484 (Zayan-Sem.); Ehret 1995, 320, #620 (PSem.-Eg.-PCu.).

NB1: Sem. *ynk may be explained on the basis of a bicons. Sem. *nk preserved also in Ar. nqy: naqā “tirer, extraire la moelle d’un os” [BK II 1335] = nqw (impf. ya-nqwu-u) [Gray] (cf. Gray 1933, 127, #37; 1934, 36), Ar. naqata & naqata & naqaḥa “vider un os en en tirant la moelle” [BK II 1320] (for further reflexes cf. Ehret 1995, 508, #620). Ar. nāq-at- “Kamelstute” was derived by F. Hommel (1879, 402) from PSem. *nawak-at- ~ *yanak-at- “female dromedary”, while W. Vycichl (1985, 67; 1988, 489) took it from a pass. part. *yanāk-at- * “die Gemolkene”.

NB2: P. Lacau (1970, §268–9) equated Eg. snq mistakenly with Ar. saniqa “to suffer indigestion from milk”, which was rightly declined by W. A. Ward (1972, 22) and G. Conti (1978, 27, fn. 2).

NB3: W.A. Ward (1972, 22) identified the simplex of the caus. Eg. snq incorrectly with Eg. jnq “to embrace, collect, unite” (OK, FD 24; Wb I 100–1).

NB4: E. Laoust (l.c.) explained the NBrb. root *ṣn-ḡ from the monocons. one attested e.g. in Sus a-ḡu “lait”, which would exclude the inclusion of the Brb. data in this AA etymology.

NB5: Sem. *ynk and Eg. snq have been often (incorrectly) compared with LECu. *nūg- “to suck” [GT] and its further Cu. cognates (see Müller 1903, 79; 1907, 304, fn. 3; Behnk 1928, 138; Dj. 1965, 43; 1967, 188; Dlg. 1973, 175–176; Dj. et al. 1986, 65). For the correct etymology of the Somali etc. root see the entry for Eg. mnd “breast” (below).

NB6: V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (1992, 196; HSED #1872) combined the Sem.-Eg. isogloss with WCh.: NBauchi: Warji nək, Kariya nəkə “lick” (NBauchi: Skn. 1977, 29) || CCh.: Mbara nik “to lick” [TSL 1986, 274], which, however, represent a distinct AA root.

- **3.** P. Wilson (PL 437): “origin unclear”, although she was disposed to affiliate it with Eg. *mnq.t* “a vessel” (XVIII.) and *mnq.t* “beer goddess (personified beer jug)” (which she reinterpreted here as the “personification of milk jug”).
- **4.** GT: or cp. perhaps Ar. *malaqa* I “4. têter sa mère (se dit d’un petit)” [BK II 1150]?

***mlq** (?) > (S) ΜΟΥΛΔ, (B) ΜΟΥΛΧ (m) “branch” (CD 166b) = “Zweig, Schößling” (KHW 92).

- GT: alternatively, an Eg. etymon **mlg* or **mlḥ* is equally plausible. Cp. perhaps CCh.: (?) Mada *malgwa* “fourche en bois pour ramasser les épines” [Br. – Brunet 2000, 184]?

mnqḅ “Schirm, Wedel zum Kühlen” (PT, Wb II 90, 13–14) = “fan” (FD 110) = “a simple fan” (WD III 52: cf. JEA 77, 1991, 86).

- From the same root: *mnqḅ* “1. kühler Raum (im Hause zum Schlafen), 2. Raum im Tempel, 3. als Bez. des Königspalastes” (MK, Wb II 90, 15–19) = “un lieu frais, un endroit où l’on peut se rafraîchir” (Jéquier) = “1. cool place, 2. chapel” (FD 110).

NB1: Jansen-Winkeln (1985, 60, n. 77) doubted the meaning “eine poetische Bez. des Gefängnisses” (Wb II 90, 21) as “improbable”.

NB2: Cf. also *mnq* (error for *mnqḅ*?) “Raum im Palast” (XX., Wb II 90, 5) = “Lager, Magazin” (GHWb 342).

- Derives from Eg. *qbb* “kühl sein” (PT, Wb V 22–23) = “to be cool, cold” (FD 277). Eg. *mnqḅ* “fan” seems to be a *nomen instr.*, while Eg. *mnqḅ* “cool place” a *nomen loci*.

LIT.: Grapow 1914, 25; Jéquier 1921, 54; Thausing 1932, 293; Takács 2004, 59, #349.2.

NB1: There is little in the lit. on the function of -n- following the prefix m- that occurs also in the element mn- of Eg. *mnr.t*, *mndr*, *mnt3.t* (below), cf. Takács 1995, 106, #3. G. Jéquier (1921, 149) explained the inserted -n- “*sans doute*” with “*une raison euphonique*”.

NB2: Eg. *qbb* is cognate with Agaw **kāmb-* [irreg. *k- < *k-] “to be cold” [Apl.]: Bilin *kanb-* ~ *kamb-* [Rn.] = *kamb-* [Apl.], Xmr. *kib-* [Rn.] = *kəb-* [Apl.], Qmt. *kāmb-* ~ *kamb-* [Apl.], Qwara *kab-* ~ *kanb-* ~ *kamb-* [Rn.], Dembea *kimb* [Rn.] (NAgaw: Rn. 1884, 375; 1885, 84; 1887, 223; Apl. 1989 MS, 6; 1991, 19, 23) || ECu. **qab(b)-* “cold” [Sasse]: LECu.: PSam **qab-ō* “cold” [Heine 1978, 71], Arb. *keb-eta* “to become cool” [Ss.], Orm. *qab-an-* “to become cool” [Ss.] | HECu.: Burji *kabb-* “to become cold or cool” [Ss.] (ECu.: Sasse 1979, 49; 1982, 112; Lsl. 1988, 193) ||| CCh.: (?) Banana-Museye *hebe* [unless < **henbe*] “cold” [Krf. #307]. LIT.: Rn. 1885, 84; 1887, 223 followed by Chn. 1947, #231 (Eg.-Agaw-LECu.); Rsl. 1950, 491 (Eg.-Somali); Bnd. 1975, 157 (Eg.-Oromo); Dlg. 1983, 135 (ECu.-Eg.); Mkr. 1987, 130 (Agaw-ECu.-Musey); Apl. 1994 MS, 4 & 1996, 198 (Eg.-Agaw-ECu.); HSED #1527 (Eg.-LECu.).

NB3: The etymology of Banana-Museye *hebe* is ambiguous, cf. CCh.: Matakam *hembé* “wind” [Str. 1922–23, 126] ||| HECu.: Burji *hombobal-itte*, Hadiyya *hom-*

bu'l-ama, Sidamo hombobol-atte, hobombul-te “storm” (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 191) ||| LEg. hnb̄b “wind” (GR, Wb III 113, 14). For the 2nd element of the HECu. term cf. HECu. *bobire (?) “wind” [Hds. 1989, 168].

mnqbj.t “Art Halsschmuck (unter Anderem in Gestalt eines Schlangenkopfes)” (MK, Wb II 91, 1–2) = “petit bijou de cornaline” (Jéquier 1912, 124) = “pendentif, collier supportant un pendentif à tête de serpent” (Jéquier 1921, 54–55) = “une amulette en cornaline représentant une tête de serpent coudée à angle droit sur un tronçon de corps” (Jéquier 1921, 148–9).

- Contains an m- prefix as pointed out by H. Grapow (1914, 25).
- 1. G. Jéquier (1921, 54–55; 1921, 148–9) saw in it “un objet pour rafraîchir (le serpent figuré par ces petits objets est... une couleuvre... qui nage... qui donne le plus d’impression de froid au toucher... qui vit de préférence dans les endroits humides et même dans l’eau), un talisman garantissant au mort la protection contre les chaleurs torrides de l’autre monde et la jouissance de la fraîcheur pour l’éternité, amulette pour assurer au mort un peu de fraîcheur dans les déserts torrides de l’autre monde)” originating from Eg. qbb “kühl sein” (PT, Wb V 22–23) via prefix m- (falsely rendered by him “pour”).
- 2. F. von Calice (1936, #380) and J. Vergote (1945, 136, #9.c.4) supposed in it an m- prefix form of unattested an Eg. *nqb compared with Ar. ruqb-at- ~ raqab-at- “Hals”, denom. raqaba i.a. “am Halse befestigen”. Unconvincing (Eg. -n- ≠ Ar. r-).

mnqrj.t “1. Beischrift zu einer Flasche (ob richtig?), 2. Schlangenkopf als Halsschmuck” (MK, Wb II 91, 4–5) = “Art Schmuck” (Grapow) = “petit bijou de cornaline (≈ mnqbj.t)” (Jéquier 1912, 124) = “pendentif (tête de serpent)” (Jéquier 1921, 54) = “(pour désigner) 1. l’amulette à tête de couleuvre (à la place de mnqbj.t), 2. vase à eau fraîche du type ordinaire” (Jéquier 1921, 149–150).

NB: Hence may derive (with the loss of -n-) mqrt “1. (GR) Name einer heiligen Schlange, 2. (LP: XXVI.) auch als Name eines Schlangenkopfes als Halsschmuck” (Wb II 159, 6–7) = “amulette à tête de serpent” (Capart) as suggested already by J. Capart (1908, 15).

- Contains a prefix m- as pointed out by H. Grapow (1914, 25), although the source is obscure.
- 1. G. Jéquier (1921, 54 & fn. 7; 1921, 149–150) analyzed it as a compound of prefix m- + euphonic -n- + qrt “(désignant d’une façon générale) une grotte, une caverne (situé dans la catatracte),

la source du Nil (origine de toute fraîcheur) et le plus spécialement les deux autres”. Thus, mnqrj.t lit. signified “(celle qui est) dans la source” or “(celle qui est, sort) de la source”.

- **2.** GT: should we assume (on the analogy of Eg. mnqbj.t) a derivation from an unattested Eg. *qrr “cool” ~ Sem. *krr > Hbr. qrr II hifil “to keep cool”, qar “cold, cool” [KB 1127, 1149] | Ar. qarra I “5. être frais (se dit d’une journée fraîche), 6. être rafraîchi, ou éprouver une fraîcheur (en parlant des yeux) etc.” [BK II 698]?

mnkr.t “der Schwanz am Königsschurz” (MK, Wb II 91, 6) = “la queue postiche des Pharaons (en réalité, à l’origine, une queue de taureau)” (Jéquier 1921, 150) = “Menkeret (bisher nur aus dem Bereich der Jenseitsvorstellungen des Totenkultes bekannt; Funktion: im Bestattungsritual für den König die Auferstehung zu gewährleisten)” (Abitz, LÄ IV 54) = “(ikonographisch) weibliche (sekundär: männliche) Gestalt, die auf ihrem Kopf eine (mitunter in Mumienbinden gehüllte) Königsgestalt trägt (belegt im Bestattungsritual der Könige der 18. und 19. Dynastie), Löwin, die dem toten König zur Auferstehung verhilft” (Wst. 1985, 109–110) = “nom spécifique de la queue d’animal suspendue derrière le dos du roi” (Bardinet 1990, 4) = “bull’s tail (worn by king)” (FD 110) = “ein Tierschwanz (am Königsschurz)” (GHWb 343).

- Hence:

(1) mnkr.t “Name einer löwenköpfigen Göttin (neben Sachmet)” (MK, NK, GR, Wb II 91, 7) = eine löwenköpfige Göttin, ursprünglich wohl Personifikation des Löwenschwanzes am Königsschurz” (Amduat, Hornung 1963 II, 165, n. 702) = “Personifikation des Schwanzes des Königsschurzes” (CT VI 117, Snk. 1999, 89 & fn. 16) = “a goddess” (DCT 170).

NB1: Note that W. Schenkel (l.c.) erroneously gave CT VI 111a (sic).

NB2: W. Westendorf (1966, 53–54, fn. 7) assumed a “*wahrscheinlichen Zusammenhang zwischen*” Eg. 3kr “der Erdgott” (Wb I 22, 6) and ntr (< *nkr) “god”, whereby he explained mnkr.t as an “*m-Bildung*” with the primary sense “die Verwandlerin, die Vergöttlicherin (?)”.

(2) perhaps mkr “als Name eines Schriftzeichens” (LP: Tanis sign pap. 13, Wb II 163, 1) = “nom de signe, qui serait une désignation de la dent du crocodile” (Griffith 1889, 30 quoted after Bardinet) = “extrémité corporelle (ce signe est placé à la fin de la série des parties du corps, cité avec les ailes et autres extrémités corporelles; il ne s’agit probablement pas d’une dent)” (Bardinet 1990, 4).

NB: Identified with old mnkr.t by Th. Bardinet (1990, 4).

- Extended by a prefix *m-* as pointed out by H. Grapow (1914, 25), P. Lacau (1970, 150, §406), and W. Schenkel (1999, 89), although the identification of the underlying root (**nkr* or **kr*) is debated.
- 1. G. Jéquier (1921, 110; 1921, 150) rendered it lit. “*pour battre, pour frapper autour de soi*” (sic, translating *m-* falsely as “pour”) and affiliated *-kr* with a certain Eg. *krkr* “battre, frapper autour de soi” (NK, Jéquier, not in Wb, DLE, GHWb) arguing that the bulls, “*quand ils sont en fureur, ils se battent les flancs de la queue, soit pour s’exciter eux-mêmes, soit pour terrifier leur adversaire*”. False.
- 2. W. Westendorf (1985, 13/109 & fn. 39) saw in it an older (UEg.?) “*Dialektform*” for an unattested **mntr.t* and regarded both forms as *m-* prefix derivatives of the root **nkr* > **ntr*, which he (Wst. 1985, 12/108 & fn. 33) ultimately compared (pace Vcl. 1958, 394–5) with Sem. **nkr* “*unkenntlich machen, maskieren, verkleiden, sich zur unkenntlichkeit wandeln*” [Wst.] > i.a. Ar. *munkar-* “11. Monkar, nom de l’un des deux anges qui font subir aux morts un interrogatoire dans le tombeau” [BK II 1341], arguing that, Eg. *mnkr.t* should denote “sg. divine” or “sg. belonging to the dead king” in general. His hypothesis was followed by W. Helck (1992, 150, fn. 21): “*Dabei muß man sich daran erinnern, daß ntr ursprünglich den toten König bezeichnet hat*”. Unconvincing.
- 3. G. Takács (2004, 59, #349): Eg. *mnkr.t* compound of the element *mn-* (found in *mnqb*, *mnt3.t*, *mndr* too) + a hypothetical Eg. **kr* “tail (or sim.)” < AA **K-r* “tail” [GT].

NB1: Attested in LECu. (unexpected *g-* < **k-*): Saho *gārā* “Schwanz” [Rn.] = *gērā* “tail (coda)” [Vergari 2003, 91], Afar *gārā* “1. Schweif, Schwanz, 2. Rück-, Hinterteil, 3. hinter/n, hernach”, *garí tágör* “Schwanzbüschel” [Rn. 1886, 852; 1887, 116] = *gēra* “tail (of animal)”, *gērale* “base of the spine, coccyx, area near the tail” [PH 1985, 112] || NOM.: Kaffa *kerrò* “coda” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 304, not in Crl. 1951] (Afar-Kaffa: Rn. l.c.; Mkr. 1966, 16, #35) || (?) SOM.: Dime *gōlan* & Ari *goli* [Bnd.-Flm. 1976, 49] || PCh. **k-r* (probably **kir-*) “tail” [GT]: WCh.: SBauchi **kyir-* “tail” [GT]: Dwot *čir* [Smz.], *Kir kār* [Smz.] = *kir* [Csp.], Mangas *kār* [Smz.] = *kir* [Csp.], Grnt. *kīrau* [Smz.] = *kāru* [Jgr. 1989, 188] = *kārūu* [Csp.], Zaranda *kil* [Smz.], Tule *kyeerō* [Smz.], Dokshi *kyeer* [Smz.], Zaar (Saya) *kiir* [IL, Smz., Csp.], Boghom *kʰai* [IL] = *kay* [Smz.] = *kái* [Csp.], Geji *čil* [< **kil*] [Smz.] = *čil* [IL], Polchi *car* [Smz.], Wangday *čir* [IL] = *čir* [Smz.], Jum *kir* [Csp.] etc. (SBauchi: Smz. 1978, 32, #49; Csp. 1994, 35, 68) || CCh.: Mandara **ḥV-kila* “tail” [GT]: Glavda *ḥùkilà* [Mkr.], Guduf *ḥikyela* [Mkr.] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 361; Jng. 1988, 71; JI 1994 II 316–7). AP (borrowed from CCh.?) : PWNigr. **kila* “tail” ~ PBantu **kila* “tail” (Ch.-AP: JI 1994 I, 163).

NB2: If the suggested NOM.-Ch.-Eg. comparison proves correct, the Chadic data listed above should be separated from PCh. **k-t-r/n* “tail” [JS 1981, 260A] = **k-ts-r* [Jng. 1988, 71] = **k-t-r* < **k-š-r* [JI 1994 I, 163] = **n-katuri* > **kutari* “tail” [Stl. 1996, 64–65], whose reconstruction is, however, correct beyond doubt. It seems that there were rather two etymologically distinct PCh. roots (**k-r* and **k-t-r*). Note that WCh.: Dera *kōrat* [Stl., not so in Nwm. 1974, 137], Pero *kérēt* “tail” [Frj.

1985, 36] derive from BT *katər “tail” [Schuh 1984, 213] with the shift of -r- < *-t- vs. -t < *-r (Stl. l.c.).

NB3: It is questionable whether Cp. NOm.: Kafa kéra “Rücken” [Rn. 1895, 203] || PCh. *k-r “back” [JI 1994 I, 3] > WCh.: Gmy. kââr [kɔ̃r] “the last bone at the base of the spine” [Srl. 1937, 88] | NBauchi *kyar- “back” [Skn. 1977, 11] | Zaar ka:r [Smz.] || CCh.: Gudu h̄ul [Meek], Gudu-Waga ūhul [Meek] | Lamang h̄ul [Meek] || ECh.: Mubi h̄âr [Lks.] = h̄âr [Jng.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 6–7) are also related. An alternative etymology is Sem. *ʔah(a)r “behind, after” [Sem.: DRS 15; GB 26].

- **4.** GT: the formal coincidence with WCh.: Angas mùnkàar (K) “hip” [Jng. 1962 MS, 26] might be due to pure chance.

NB: Obscure compound. For mun- cf. perhaps Kofyar m̄ŋ- in: moéng-koè̄m [m̄ŋ-k̄m] “buttocks” (-koè̄m obscure) [Ntg. 1967, 27], while Angas-kàar [Flk.] is related to Gmy. kââr [kɔ̃r] “the last bone at the base of the spine” [Srl. 1937, 88].

mnt.t “eine Steinart: schwarzer Granit, als Material zu Statuen und Gefäßen” (OK, Wb II 91, 11–12) = “granit noir avec taches rouges” (Legrain 1906, 3) = “eine Abart des Diorites (in den unternubischen Steinbrüchen abgebaut)” (Sethe 1933, 49–51, §7) = “(the old name for) diorite, which was also applied to a dark granite with prominent spots of red feldspar (might well have been confused with diorite)” (Rowe 1938, 395, 682) = “1. diorite-gneiss or even anorthosite-gneiss from Tushkah (its rock has a gneissic structure), and 2. the coarse-grained black and white speckled variety (used in early dynastic times)” (Harris 1961, 87–88) = “Diorit (für Statuen und Gefäße), Dioritgneis” (GHWb 343; ÄWb I 537c; cf. Meeks 2005, 245, #537c).

- Its origin is fully obscure.
- **1.** Rowe (1938, 682) apparently considered the name to be of foreign origin (cf. his remark: “*locally called in Lower Nubia*”).
- **2.** H. Balcz (1932, 68) regarded it as a variation of Eg. mnw (q.v.) mis-translated by him as “schwarzer und schwarzweiß geflecter Granit (?)”. False.
- **3.** GT: highly dubious whether Eg. mnt.t (provided < *ml̄t.t) is anyhow related with AA *m-l-t “(to smear with) clay” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Sem. *ml̄t: Hbr. melet “Mörtel, Cement” [GB 428] = “clay floor (?)” [KB 590] | Ar. malaṭa “1. enduire de boue une muraille, en construisant une maison”, milāt- “1. boue avec la quelle on enduit les murailles, 2. ciment que l’on met entre les pierres de construction” [BK II 1148–9] = malaṭa “to make smooth, cover wall with lime or cement”, milāt- “mud used as cement, cement covering” [CED] = milāt- “Mörtel” [KHW] ||| WCh.: Bole müldá “type of clay (easily obtainable from the surrounding hills)” [Bross-Ibr. 1993, 78, 93] = “clay for making pots” [Ibr.-Gimba 1994, 134], Ngamo müldá “clay” [Alio 1988 MS].

NB2: Cpt.: (SALB) ηελωτ “ceiling, canopy” (CD 165a) = “Zimmerdecke, Dach, Baldachin” (KHW) is usually explained as borrowing from Sem. *ml̄t (CED 81; KHW 91; Mlt.-OS 1989, 153), which has been rightly doubted by B. H. Stricker (1937, 19), W. Vycichl (1983, 111), and J.F. Quack (2005, 313). Besides, the comparison with Dem. mjlt “ein Stoff” (DG 153:2) = “eine Textilbezeichnung, wohl: milesische Wolle” (Quack) suggested in CED 81; KHW 518 has been rejected by J. F. Quack (2005, 313).

NB3: M. L. Mayer (1960, 90) derived Gk. μάλθα ~ μάλθη “mixture of wax and pitch for caulking ships and laying over writing tablets” [CED] = “impasto di cera e pece per le navi” [Mayer] via *malt- (sic) “specie di cemento” ultimately from Hbr. melet.

NB4: H. Möller (1911, 164) combined Sem. *mlt̄ with IE *m-l-dh- (sic) “wich (sein/werden)”.

mnt3 (or rather **mnt?**) “der heilige Hain des sogenannten Abaton auf der Insel Bigge bei Phylae” (GR, Wb I 91, 13–14).

NB: Reflected presumably by Gk. *μηθίς, gen. μηθίδος of problematic rdg. (hapax, Plutarch: De Iside et Osiride 359B, cf. Fournet 1989, 66, §2).

● Etymology obscure.

- 1. J.-L. Fournet (1989, 66, §2) assumed a secondary -n- in GR mnt3 on the analogy of (S) MNT̄ (in an unstressed syllable) < *m-t. Improbable.
- 2. GT: written as if it were a compound mn + t3. Pseudo-etymology?
- 3. GT: if, in turn, it derives from *mnd, cp. perhaps Akk. mindu “eine Pflanze” [AHW 655] = “a plant” [CAD m2, 85] ||| SCu.: Irq. mundí “1. Pennisetum clandestinum Chiov., Kikuyu grass, 2. open space with grass within the compound, place to winnow, courtyard, edge with grass aside the house” [MQK 2002, 75] | Asa mondeya “kind of bush or shrub” [Flm. 1969, 12, §12]?

mntd (GW) “etwas aus Leder (aus Syrien)” (late NK, Wb II 91, 16): discussed s.v. mt̄dj (GW) infra.

mnt “(Korn) sieben (?)” (OK, Wb II 91, 17) = “(Weizen) sieben (?)” (Wreszinski 1926, 3) = “reinigen” (Helck 1971, 26) = “(Korn) durchsieben” (Pusch 1974, 20; Junker: Giza XI 161) = “worfeln” (Helck, LÄ I 790) = “*(durch)sieben (Korn), schwingen (Getreide)” (GHWb 343; ÄWb I 537c).

● Origin obscure.

- 1. E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 246 & fn. 1) combined it with ONub. MINAI “Körnchen”, MINAI-MINAI-ΛO “detailliert”. Improbable.
NB: Even if connected, the ONub. word could only have been a loan-word from Eg. mnt, which, however, seems not to have survived after the MK.
- 2. GT: cp. perhaps SCu.: Qwd. meneko, pl. menekawa “winnowing basket” [Ehret 1980 MS, 4]?
NB: No (S)Cu. parallels available. Suffix -ko in Qwadza? If so, cannot be related.
- 3. GT: if its basic mng. was “to move to and fro”, cp. Ar. malaka I “7. pétrir comme il faut la farine, la pâte, et lui donner de la mollesse”, II & IV “3. pétrir bien et amollir une pâte” [BK II 1151] ||| ECh.: Jegu malk- “umrühren (Brei, Brotteig)” [Jng. 1961, 115].

mnt.w (later **mnt.jw**) “uralte Bezeichnung der im Nordosten Ägyptens wohnenden Stämme” (OK: from V, Wb II 92, 4) = “captifs étrangers, Monitiou, Arabes: gens de la montagne ou des sables” (Baillet) = “Beduin” (FD 110) = “one of the Nine Bows (it can refer to people of the Libyan desert, the Semitic nomads of the Sinai peninsula)” (PL 439) = “Beduinenstämme” (ÄWb I 537–8).

- **1.** Baillet (1907, 6, §18), ignoring the third radical, erroneously affiliated it with Eg. mnj “haleurs de pierre (?)” (sic) and mnj.tj “Ackersmann” (q.v.). False.
- **2.** Sh. Yeivin (1965, 204–6) suggested a nisba derivation from Eg. mnt “to winnow” (q.v.), which lit. “winnowers”, i.e., a “descriptive appellation of an agricultural people (group of people in Sinai, probably in the Oasis of Wadi Feyran, where agriculture was practised from the earliest times”.
- **3.** GT: perhaps lit. “stranger”? Cf. Ch. *m-l-k “stranger” [GT]? NB: Cf. WCh.: Nbauchi *m-l/r-ky- “stranger” [Skn.] = *mulky- (?) [GT]: Warji mālki-zahə-na, Diri murkyu (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 42) || CCh.: Sukur malak “stranger” [Stl.] | PMafa-Mada *malak- “guest” [Rsg.] = *mal“ak- ~ *m“alak- “stranger” [GT]: Mafa mbúrúkw “étranger, inconnu” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 247], Mada málwāk [Mch.] = málwāk [Rsg.] = málwāk “1. voyage(ur), 2. hôte, étranger au clan” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 185], Mofu mblāk [Rsg.], Mofu-Gudur mōlak “étranger, visiteur” [Brt. 1988, 174] = mblāk [Mch.], Zulgo mblok [Mch.], Mboku mbúlko [Mch.], Udlam (Uldeme) málwāk [Mch.] = málwāk “l’étranger, le nouveau quand il arrive” [Cfm. 1997, 190], Gisiga mulak “stranger” [Lks. 1970, 131] = mōlāk [Rsg.], Mkt. mōlākudzā [Rsg.], Hurzo mbark [Mch.] (MM: Rsg. 1978, 265, #337) | PMusgu *mVrkVý [*rk- < *lk-] “stranger” [GT] > Musgu markoi “Fremder” [Krause apud Lks. 1941, 66; Müller 1886, 400], Pus morkay “1. hôte, étranger, visiteur, non-autochtone” [Trn. 1991, 107], Girvidik morkoy “Fremder”, cf. morkoy “Reise” [MB 1972–73, 70], Mbara mbürkóy & Vulum (Mulwi) mòrkáy “hôte, invité” [TSL 1986, 199] | Daba mùlluk “guest” [Krf. #96] | Gidar malaka ~ málaka [Mch.] (CCh.: Mch. 1950, 51; 1953, 86; NBch.-CCh.: Skn. 1977, 42). See Skn. 1996, 14 (NBch.-CCh.-Tuareg).

mnt.w “Month” (MK, Wb II 92, 2).

NB1: Vocalized as *móntěw (Lacau 1972, 71, §49.6) = *mántw (Skn. 1968, 539) = *māntaw > *mōntə (Zeidler 1994, 47, fn. 35). Reflected also in: (1) NAss. cuneiform ma-an-ti-me-[an]-hi-e (*mantimehē) PN vs. Gk. Μοντομης < Eg. mnt.w-m-ḥ3.t (KMAV 30; Steindorff 1890, 354–6, §19; Zeidler l.c.). (2) Ar. Armant < (SB) ΕΡΜΟΝΤ, (S) ΡΗΜΟΝΤ, (B) ΕΡΗΜΟΝΤ vs. Gk. Ἐρμῶνθις < Eg. jwn.w-mnt.w (CED 351; KHW 476). For a different etymology see Snk. 2002, 23, 26. (3) NAss. cuneiform ḥar-ri-mun-na-tú, ḥu-ru-mu-un-na-tú, ḥu-ur-un-na-tú vs. Gk. Ἀρμῶνθις < Eg. ḥr.w-mnt.w “Horus-Month” (Edel 1980, 40f.).

NB2: Also written without -t (cf. JEA 58, 1972, 45, n. 1; WD I 88).

- Origin uncertain.

- **1.** K. Kuhlmann (LÄ II 701, 705, n. 30) considered it as a *Partizipi- albildung* (via prefix m-) from an unattested Eg. *nt > ntt “fesseln” (OK, Wb II 367), which yielded a literal meaning *“(die Fende)

Fesselnde” (!), “*was zum Charakter des Month als Kriegsgott nicht schlecht paßte*”. Unconvincing.

- **2.** A. Ember (1917, 21) assumed Eg. *mnt.w* < **mlk.w*, eventually connected with Sem. **mal(i)k-* “king” [GT] > Akk. *mal(i)ku* [AHW 595] || Hbr. *melek* [GB 428–9] | Ar. *malik-* [BK II 1151] (Sem.: WUS #1577; Lsl. 1987, 343–4). Uncertain. The etymology of Sem. **mal(i)k-* is disputed.

NB1: An inner Sem. origin seems most probable, cf. Akk.-Aram. **mlk* “to advise, give an advice” (for more details on this problem see the entry for Eg. *m3t* above). Ar.-ES **mlk* “to possess, dominate” is evidently denominative.

NB2: V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1791) equated Sem. **malk-* with Ch. **m-l-k* “stranger” [GT] (discussed above s.v. *mnt.w* “beduin”), which is highly dubious, although there are parallels for this semantic shift, cf. e.g. OInd. *arí-* “stranger” → *aryá-* ~ *ariyá-* (lit. “belonging to the strangers”) “lord, master” [Monier-Williams 1899, 93] (< ?) PIE **alyo-* “other” (see IEW 24–25; KEWA I 49; GI 1984, 755).

- **3.** GT: perhaps derives from **√mlk*, a var. to AA **m-r-k* “1. to compete with, 2. be hostile” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in LECu.: Orm. *morka* “to compete, dispute”, *mork-īs-a* “to make quarrel” [Gragg 1982, 291], Baiso *morke* “enemy” [Hyw. 1979, 123] | HECu.: Sid. *morka* “to be in a competition”, *mork-ama* “to oppose, compete with, be obstinate” [Gsp. 1983, 237] || NŌm.: Zala *markā* “nemico” [Crl. 1929, 44], Gamu *morké* “enemy” [Lmb. 1985 MS, 15, #229; Sottile 1999, 432] || ECh.: Bdy. *meyèk* [-y- < **-l-/*-r-?*] “être hostile envers qqn.” [AJ 1989, 98].

NB2: Whether SBrb.: Ayr *ə-mällegu* & EWlm. *ä-mällagu*, pl. *i-mälluga* “1. member of a foreign raiding party (membre d’un rezzou étranger), 2. enemy” [Alojaly 1980, 128; PAM 1998, 216; 2003, 538] || Ch. **m-l-k* “stranger” [GT] (discussed s.v. *mnt.w* “beduin”) are also related is questionable. Given the apparent etymological link to “road” in certain Ch. daughter lgs., a distinct status and a primary mng. “voyager” is not excluded.

mnt (GW) “to fasten” (NK hapax, DLE I 224) = “befestigen” (GHWb 343).

- Origin uncertain.

- **1.** GT: if not borrowed, it might derive perhaps from an unattested old Eg. **mnt* < **mlk* ~ MSA: Sqt. *melik* “être ferme”, š-*melik* “tenir fortement”, cf. (hence?) *mèlok* “particule d’affirmation” (≈ Ar. *yaqīn*), *molk* “sûrement” [Lsl. 1938, 244–5].

NB: The Sqt. mng. is apparently isolated in Sem. M. Bitner (1918, 60, §9) rendered it “ratsam” in the light of Akk.-Aram. **mlk*, while W. Leslau (l.c.) identified it with Ar.-ES **mlk* “prendre possession”.

- **2.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 308, #590) derived it from his AA **ma/un/ŋ/j-* “to tie up” based on the of forms which are even mutually unrelated. False.

NB: He affiliated it with MSA **mn^o* “to take, hold”, Eg. *mnj* “to moor” (!) & *mnḥ* “to string beads” (!), Cu. **ma/unĉ-* “to twist (e.g. in making ropes)”.

mnt3.t “Schale für Wasser” (MK, Wb II 92, 7; GHWb 343) = “pottery vessel” (CT II 314b & 318b, FD 110; DCT 170, cf. JEA 16, 1930, 21).

- Derives from Eg. t3.t [reg. < *kl.t] “Art Gefäß” (OK, Wb V 343, 3) with the inetymological element mn- (on the analogy of Eg. mnqb, mnkr.t, mndr.t, cf. Takács 1995, 106, #3; 2004, 59, #349.3). Eg. t3.t stems from AA *k^(w)-l “vessel” [GT].

nb1: Attested in Sem.: (?) Akk. kallu “1. bowl (made of clay or wood), 2. crown of the human skull, shell of the turtle”, cf. kalkallū “a small bowl-shaped vessel, possibly with a lid” [CAD k 77, 83] || Üg. kl II “belonging(s), equipment(s), gear” [DUL 438], Hbr. kālī “1. Gerät, 2. Kahn” [GB 348] = “1. vessel, receptacle, 2. piece of equipment, 3. implement, instrument, 4. ornament, weapons, 5. ship, boat” [KB 478–9] | Ar. (Omani dial.) kelāw “jugs” [KB after Vollers, ZDMG 49, 514] = “посуда” [IS] = “кувшин” [Mlt.] || Tigre kalē “pot” [LH 389b] || HECu.: Kambatta kalōl-uta “small jar” [Lsl.] → (borrowed) ES: Gurage: Masqan & Goggot & Soddo k^wālāl-it “small jar used for cooking” [Lsl. 1979 III 342] | LECu.: Rendille kúl, pl. kulál “calabash (of wood)” [Heine 1976, 213] = kúl “long-necked container (made of wood in the shape of a calabash, normally used in homes and at shoat camps to carry milk)” [PG 1999, 206–7], Oromo killa “small bowl” [Gragg 1982, 441] || NOm.: Shinasha kōl-ō “vessel” [CR 1913, 409] || Ch. *k-l “горшок” [IS] > WCh. *kul- “calabash” [Schuh 1982, 16] = *k^wal- ~ *k^wal- “calabash” [OS]: prob. Angas *čāl [if *č- < *k^w-] “large pot for oil” [GT 2004, 46]: Angas čaal “the largest sized water-pot” (≈ Hs. rāndáá “large water-pot”, Abr. 1962, 722) [Flk. 1915, 155] = čàal (P) “großer Öltopf” [Jng. 1962 MS] = čal “a kind of big pot for processing olive oil” [Gcl. 1994, 27] | Bole kula “calabash” [Krf.], Tng. kwali “calabash” [Krf.] = kwaalī “calabash” [Jng. 1991, 107], Pero kwáali “calabash” [Frj. 1985, 39], Dera kile “pot” [Grb.] = kile “cooking pot”, kiliwet “small pot” [Krf.] = kile [NM 1966, 242] = kōle [IS], Ngamo kyelle “small pot” [Krf.], Krkr. kālī “small pot” [Krf.] | SBch. *kāl- < *k^wal- (?) “calabash” [GT] > Boghom kaal, Mangas káal, Kir káal, Saya kwálat (SBch.: Csp. 1994, 44) | Bade kula “calabash” [Schuh 1982, 16; Haruna 1995, 153] || CCh.: Higi-Ghye kuli “small pot” [Krf.] | Gvoko kwəla “calabash, pot” [OS] | Buduma káloē “1. Gefäß, 2. Ware” [Nct. in Lks. 1939, 108] | Musgu kele “Kochtopf” [Décorse in Lks. 1941, 61] || ECh.: Sokoro kogólo [AF] = kóókolo “Kochtopf” [Nct.] = “cooking pot” [Grb.] = “pot” [OS 1989, 134] | Bidiya kólle, pl. kólól “marmite” [AJ 1989, 91] = “jug” [OS], Migama kòlò-ngàné “marmite en poterie” [JA 1992, 100] | Mubi kóólí, pl. kóólál “Kochtopf” [Lks. 1937, 183] = koolo “cooking pot” [Grb.] (Ch.: IS 1971, #154; Kraft 1981, #240–3; cf. Grb. 1963, 61).

nb2: Whether also Akk. kálītu “ein Gerät” [AHW 425] = “(mng. uncert.: 1. as part of a chariot, 2. a small object used as decoration)” [CAD k 76–77] = “род соуда (sort of vessel)” [Mlt.] belongs here (as often suggested in the etym. lit.) is fully uncertain. But WCh.: Hausa kwàlà “1. double-spouted ewer, 2. soldier’s metal water-bottle or bandolier” [Abr. 1962, 578] is certainly unrelated (contra HSED), being a modern loan-word from Eng. cooler.

nb3: A special (semi-)reduplication of the same (?) root may be attested in Akk. kakkullu “Früchten-, Abfallkorb” [AHW 422] = “vessel for making beer, for storing liquids, 2. wooden box (with cover)” [CAD k 59] || (?) Ug. kkl [AHW, not listed in WUS, DUL], MHbr. kalkāla “Korb zu Früchten, bes. Feigen” [Levy 1924 II 337] | (?) Ar. kalkal- “poitrine” [BK II 925] = “Brustkorb” [AHW] || SCu.: Qwadza kakuletto “half-calabash” [Ehr. apud OS] || CCh. *kVklV- ~ *kulVkl- “basket” [OS]: (?) Musgu kekele “basket” [Sdl., not so in Lks. 1941] | Glavda *kul-k “basket” [Sdl.].

LIT.: IS 1971, #154 (Sem.-Ch.); MM 1983, 231 and Mlt. 1984, 15 (Eg.-Sem.); 1986, 69 (Kmb.-Ch. with a diff. reconstr.); Stl. 1994 MS, 1 (Akk.-CCh.-Qwadza); HSED #1417 & #1423 & #1473 (Eg.-Ch.-LECu.); Takács 1999, 169, #3.1 (Eg.-WCh.-Musgu-Rnd.-Sns.-Sem.).

mnth.t (GW) “exile, abandoned woman” (XX. 2x, Hoch).

NB: Written in GW: ma-n-tu-ḥa-ta: *manuṣṣaḥata (Hoch).

- Apparently a borrowing. J. Hoch (1994, 130–1, §169): “*almost certainly*” a D-stem fem. sg. pass. part., although “*the root is less certain*”: (1) Sem. *nšḥ > Akk. nasāḥu “to expel, deport”, OHbr. & Iaram. nšḥ “to uproot (people)”, Taram. nšḥ D “to exile”, Ar. nasaḥa “to replace” (Eg. from Can., since although Eg. ≠ Sem. *ḥ), (2) Sem. *nsʕ, whence also Eg. ntʕ (GW) “to desert” (q.v.) derives, (3) Hbr. nzḥ “to abandon, reject”.

mnd “une mesure pour le grain” (XVIII. hapax: Urk. IV 1342:5, AL 78.1759).

- Hence (?) Cpt. (S) mñT, (B) MENT (m) > Gk. μέντ “measure of grain, less than πτοβ” (CD 176a) = “ein Maß (kleiner als πτοβ)” (KHW 96).
- Etymology uncertain.
- 1. J. Osing (1978, 189) derived it from OK mndm “basket” (q.v.) with the loss of -m.
NB: It was considered as a miswriting (“lies mndm”) already in Urk. IV 1342, fn. a.
- 2. GT: or should we assume a connection with SAgaw: Awngi mand-á, pl. mand-ó-ká “bowl”, mand “bowl (made of clay and straw)” [Hetzron 1978, 131] = mand “bowl” [Apl. 1994 MS, 14]?

mndf.tj (dual) “als Urheber der Überschwemmung genannt” (PT 1039a, hapax, Wb II 92, 9) = “ein Gott” (Grapow 1914, 25) = “die beiden Quellöcher des Nils” (ÜKAPT VI 132) = “twin reservoir” (Ward 1968, 70) = “the two sources” (AEPT 173) = “*zwei Quellen” (ÄWb I 538).

- As pointed out by H. Grapow (l.c.) and W. A. Ward (l.c.), it is a nomen loci (Ward: lit. “place of overflowing”) deriving from Eg. *(n)df, related to Eg. ndfdf “tränen (vom Auge)” (PT, Wb II 368, 13; Feichtner 1932, 205) = “pleurer” (Montet 1911, 213–4, §17) = “triefen” (Ptol., Spg. 1919–20, 18–19, §11) = “to drip (intr.)” (Allen 1984, 587) = “tomber goutte à goutte” (Vernus 2000, 189). As for LEg. ndf “befeuchten, benetzen” (Spg. l.c. after Brugsch), it cannot be decided whether its etymon was ntf or ndf (CED 34).

nb1: Akin to Sem. *ntp “tropfen” [Brk.]: Hbr. ntp qal “tropfen, träufeln” [GB 501] = “to drip, pour forth” [Zbr.], Syr. ntp “to drip, melt, flow in drops” [Zbr.] | Ar. naṭafa “1. s’écouler, suinter, couler doucement (se dit d’un liquide, d’un venin), 2. verser, répandre l’eau” etc. [BK II 1284–5] = “to flow, pour, drop, drip, float, ooze out” [Zbr.], OSA (Sab.) nṭf “to cause blood to flow (?)” [Biella 1984, 303], cf. OSA mntf-t ~ mṭf-t “Wasserbehälter” [GB] = “cistern, reservoir” [Zbr.] || Sgt. nṭf “dégoutter, ruisseler”, inṭef “gouttes” [Lsl. 1938, 266], Mhr. naṭāwf “to drip” [Jns. 1987, 304] || Geez naṭafa “colare” [Rundgren] (Sem.: Rundgren 1961, 368) etc. Ignoring the rules of PSem., J. Osing (2000, 172) quoted the PSem. root as *nṭf (sic, with -f!).

nb2: C. Brockelmann (1927, 26), followed by A. R. Bomhard (1984, 276–7, #293), derived this Sem. root from a bicons. *nṭ-, which can hardly be accepted in the light of the Eg.-Sem. equation.

nb3: J. Vergote (1950, 291) views that Eg. ndfd has hardly anything to do with (B) ελτοϋ “ausspeien” (contra Spg. 1919–20, 18–19, §1; CED 34; Stz. 1994, 198).

nb4: The Eg.-Sem. root clearly originates from an onomatopoeic biconsonantal AA *ṭ-f, cf. Eg. ddfd “to drip” (PT 133, AEPT 40, FD 312), ddfd.t “Tropfen” (XX., Wb V 448, 6). Eg. *df is akin to Sem. biconsonantal *tp “to drop, leak” [Zbr.], which has been retained with diverse root extensions: (1) Sem. *ṭtp: PBHbr. ṭṭṭṭp “tröpfeln, tropfenweise fallen” [Levy 1924 II 178] = “to drip, drop” [Zbr.] || Tigre ṭāṭāfa “alternative de pluie et de beau temps” [Lsl. 1987, 587] = ṭṭṭṭf “light rain” [Zbr.]. (2) Sem. *ṭpp: PBHbr. ṭṭp “das Maß vollmachen (eine volle Schale)” [Levy 1924 II 182] = “to float, drip” [Zbr.] | Ar. ṭf IV “4. remplir entièrement (un vase, la mesure)” [BK II 87] = ṭf “to raise”, cf. ṭaff-ān- “filled to brim” [Zbr.]. (3) Sem. *ṭwp: PBHbr. ṭwp “1. strömen, fließen, 2. überschwemmt werden, 3. aufsteigen, in die höhe kommen” [Levy 1924 II 147] = “to float” [Zbr.], Syr. ṭwp “to float, overflow, flood, swim” [Zbr.] | Ar. ṭwf “to overflow”, ṭūf-ān- “flood, deluge” [Zbr.]. (4) Sem. *ṭpw: Ar. ṭfw “1. surnager à la surface de l’eau” [BK II 90] = “to float on water” [Zbr.]. (5) Sem. *ṭp: Hbr. ṣṭp qal “1. to flood over, 2. gush, pour down”, nifal “1. to be rinsed, 2. be overwhelmed, flooded away” [KB 1475] = “to wash off, leak, overflow” [Zbr.], JAram (Targum) ṣṭp “sich ergießen, insbes. überströmen, fort-, abspülen” [Levy 1924 IV 542] = “to overflow” [Zbr.] | Ar. ṣṭf “to rinse off” [KB] = “споласкивать” [Blv.], cf. also Ar. ṣṭf “to wash” [Freytag] = “rincer, laver” [Dozy I 759b] = “to rinse (out, off)” [KB]. For the Sem. bicons. comparison cf. Dlg. 1966, 85, #8.12; Ward 1968, 70–72; Zbr. 1971, #268; Blv. 1989, 12; 1993, 33, #8.

nb5: Since Sem. *ṭ regularly corresponds to both Eg. t and d, Sem. *nṭp and *ṣṭp are equally comparable with Eg. nṭf “begießen, benetzen” (OK, Wb II 356, 6–8) and ṣṭf “vom sorgsamem Abgießen einer Flüssigkeit (bei der Arzneibereitung)” (Med., Wb IV 342, 5), respectively

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Brk. 1932, 108, #37; GÄSW 168, #680; Chn. 1947, #456; Dlg. 1966, 85, #8.12; Ward 1968, 70–72; Conti 1978, 66–68; Bmh. 1984, 276–7, #293; Blv. 1989, 12; 2002, 30, #1; Stz. 1994, 198; Osing 2000, 172; Vernus 2000, 189.

mndm “Korb für Früchte o.ä., auch bildlich gebraucht” (Lit. MK, NK, Wb II 93, 16–17) = “Art Korb oder Schale” (V: Abusir 3x, Kaplony 1972, 212) = “basket for fruit (its lid was nqr)” (Lit. MK, XVIII., Janssen 1975, 147, §17) = “corbeille” (PK 1976, 369, 371–4) = “tamis (à farine), corbeille” (CT VI 283s, AL 77.1758) = “basket” (DCT 170) = “un tamis ou une corbeille à farine” (Aufrière 2003, 25) = “ein Korb” (ÄWb I 538).

NB1: Its oldest form is *mndm* (with -d-) as revealed by the Abusir papyri (in lists of vessels). Therefore, the later (MK, NK) wtg. *mndm* is apparently based on a pseudo-etymology.

NB2: Written as *mn(j)* in Ostr. Torino 57068 vs. 2 & 57088 rt. 1:3 (AL 78.1763). The connection with Eg. *mnd* “une mesure pour le grain” (XVIII. hapax, AL 78.1759) > (?) Cpt. (S) *mn̄t̄*, (B) *m̄nt̄* (m) “measure of grain” (CD 176a), suggested by J. Osing (1978, 189), is uncertain.

- Apparently an m- prefix nomen instr. as suggested by H. Grapow (1914, 25), but the root **ndm* has not been identified.

NB: With regard to the Abusir evidence for original -d-, one cannot agree with H. Goedicke (1998, 120) who suggests that *mndm* “*might be better understood as a descriptive mn-ndm ‘the sweet (good) shall remain’, denoting a separating sieve.*”

mndt (GW) “Kostbarkeiten o.ä. (eines Libyerfürsten)” (XIX. Wb II 92, 10) = “equipment, ornament” (DLE II 224) = “Ausrüstung” (KRI IV 6:9, Helck l.c.; GHWb 343) = “equipment” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 90 index) = “tax, gifts, tribute (?)” (Hoch 1994, 131, §170).

NB: Written in GW: *ma-n-da-tā* (Helck, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = *ma₄-n-da-ta*: **mandatta* (Hoch).

- Borrowed from Sem., but the source is disputed:
 - 1. W. Helck (1962, 560, #93; 1971, 513, #93), followed by J. Hoch (1994, 131, §170), explained it from Akk. *mad(d)attu* ~ *mandattu* “Abgabe” [AHW 572] > Hbr. **middā* “tribute, tax, payment” [KB 548].
 - 2. D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 16–17, §1.2.2.1) alternatively affiliated it with Sem. **mdd* > Hbr. **mad* “gown, robe” and *middā* “1. measured length, 2. measure(ment)” [KB 546–7].

mnd “Brust” (OK, Wb II 92–93) = “breast” (FD 110) = “breast, nipple” (Walker 1996, 269) > Dem. *mn̄t̄* “breasts” (CED 86, not in DG) > Cpt. (B) *mn̄ot̄*, dual *mn̄ot̄*, *mn̄ot̄* “breast” (CD 176) = “Brust(warze)” (Sethe & Grd. 1910, 43; Till 1955, 330, §34; KHW 96).

NB: The var. *bnd.t* may be due to a contamination with *bn.tj* “die beiden weiblichen Brustwarzen, Brüste” (Med., Wb I 457), cf. Piehl 1890, 47; Grd. 1904, 135. Surprisingly, L. Keimer (1984, 40, n. 9) assumed a shift *bnd.t* > (!) *mnd.t* (on the analogy of PT *n̄hb.t* > XIX.-GR *n̄hm.t* “Knospe des Lotus”), which is impossible.

- Hence (?): (1) *mnd* “altar (of Re)” (CT VI 354c, AECT II 275; DCT 170). (2) *mndj* “la panse (d’un récipient)” (AL 77.1755) = “Bauch eines Gefäßes” (GHWb 344).

NB1: The latter occurs in fact in the epithet of the brazier *wr-mndj* (< **mnd.wj*?) “great-breasted” (CT VI 9a, AECT II 108) = “mit großen Brüsten (vom Feuerbecken)” (Bidoli 1976, 79, n. f) explained by D. Bidoli (l.c.) with the coincidence of the form of the brazier and breast: “*Das charakteristische Profil des Backens... , wie es als Deutzeichen zu ḫ in Pyr. 558a angegeben ist, rechtfertigt das Beiwort ‘groß an Brüsten’, das wir am besten mit ‘dickbäuchig’ im Deutschen übertragen würden. Die ‘Brüste’ im Dual... gehen*”

auf die zwei...niedrigen Füße zurück, die sich mit den Zitzen der Brüste vergleichen ließen". Since the epithet of brazier occurs already in PT 1961a as wr-mnd=f "the great-breasted one" (AEPT 284) = "Groß-ist-seine-Brust (die vergöttliche Personifikation des Feuerbeckens)" (Bidoli l.c.), Meeks' CT mndj (sic, with -j) "panse" as such has to be considered a ghot-word.

NB2: D. Meeks (1977, 81, fn. 1; AL l.c.) derived CT mndj from OK mnd.t "point de fusion du métal" (q.v.), which, however, hardly represents the same root.

● Etymology disputable.

- 1. Usually equated with Ar. malaḡa (impf. ya-mluḡ-u) I "saisir avec le bout des lèvres le sein de sa mère (se dit d'un enfant qui se met à téter)", malīḡa I "1. id., 2. sucer et ensuite mâcher une datte sauvage, 3. perdre son lait, ne plus en avoir (se dit d'une chamelle)", IV "allaiter (enfant)", VIII "sucer (le lait), tirer tout le lait à force de sucer" [BK II 1143] = malaḡa "to suck (at) the breast of his mother (child)" [Möller; Ember] = "lutschen" [Clc.] = "se mettre à téter" [Chn.], which is akin to PBHbr. & JAram. mlg "eig. melken, dem Tiere die Milch entziehen" [Levy 1924 III 123] || Amh. mällägä "to suck(le) (baby)", mällaggägä "to suck dry, suckle vigorously", cf. also moläggägä "to lick the hands clean with one's tongue" [Kane 1990, 161–2] = mlg D "to suck strongly" [MM] (Sem.: MM 1983, 247) ||| LECu.: Afar muluke ~ mulke [irreg. -k-] "to be satisfied with milk", caus. muluk-use [PH 1985, 171], cf. perhaps Orm.-Orma mırğa [-rg- < *-lg-?] "to yield milk, produce milk in abundance" [Strm. 1987, 368; 1995, 209; 2001, 56]. The Ar.-Eg. comparison was rightly queried by I. M. Diakonoff and L. E. Kogan (1995 MS, #1815; 1996, 34–35, #1815) as "not so evident" with regard to Cpt. (B) -N-, although they did not exclude "some assimilation processes".

DR: IE *melḡ- "Milch geben" suggested by H. Möller (1911, 163–4).

LIT. for Eg.-Ar.: Ember 1911, 90; 1919, 32; 1930, #10.a.17, #11.b.6, #24.a.5; Alb. 1918, 90, 92, #4; Brk. 1932, 803; Clc. 1936, #201; Vrg. 1945, 135, #9.b.10; Chn. 1947, #483; Dlg. 1968, 102; 1970, 620, #11; 1998, 28, §19; Ward 1972, 20, #178; IS 1976, #291; Mlt.-Sts. 1994, 2; Orel 1995, 108, #120; 1995, 151, §6; HSED #1815; Vernus 2000, 187. For Afar-Eg.-Sem.: Ehret 1997 MS, 204, #1800.

NB1: W. F. Albright (1918, 92, fn. 4) affiliated Eg.-Ar. *mlg with Akk. mulūgu rendered as "nursing fee". Cf. Akk. mulūgu ~ mulīgu "eine Art Mitgift", mulūgūtu "Grundstück" [AHW 671], Ug. mlg (vars. mlk ~ mlk-t ~ mly) "dowry, gift" [Watson 1995, 538], PBHbr. mälūḡ "(eig. das Melken), nur übertragen: Nutznießung, insbes. Güter, welche die Frau in die Ehe mitbringt, und die als ihr Eigentum verbleiben sollen" [Levy 1924 III 123]. Note that W. G. E. Watson (1995, 538) assumed in these forms a Wanderword of Hurr. origin.

NB2: A var. root to Ar. mlḡ is present in Ar. malaḡa I "4. téter sa mère (un petit)" [BK II 1150] (cf. also MM 1983, 162). C. Brockelmann (1907 I, 268–9), followed by A. Zaborski (1991, 1687) treated Ar. lamaḡa I "manger qqch. avec le bout des lèvres", V "2. goûter, déguster légèrement un mets ou une boisson" [BK II 1023] = "an der Brust saugen" (sic) [Brk.] as a metathetic variation of √mlḡ. Uncertain. H. Möller (1911, 163–4) assumed Ar. mlḡ to be eventually cognate with Ar. malaḡa "to suckle, give suck for (of woman)", mry: marā "ubera strinxit", marada "to mumble the breast", maraṭa "to suck (breast)", maraṣa "pressit digitis", which

is phonologically excluded. S. S. Majzel' & A. Ju. Militarev (1983, 247), in turn, combined Ar. mlġ with Hbr. gml qal "to wean" [KB 197], which is semantically unconvincing. Note that Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 204, #1800) derived Ar. mlġ from PSem. *ml- (sic) "to suck". G. Takács (1998, 143, #6) did not exclude a bicons. origin of AA *m-l-g.

NB3: A. B. Dolgopolsky (1968, 102; 1998, 28, §19; Blz. 1990, 208, #291) erroneously compared Ar. mlġ with LECu.: PSam *māl- "to milk". Rejected already by D. Appleyard (1999, 308–9, §19) and G. Takács (1999, 48).

- 2. Already H. Grapow (1914, 4) and P. Lacau (1970, 71, #178) has ingeniously surmised (without any extra-Eg. evidence) that Eg. mnd may be a nomen loci or instrumenti (prefix m-) of an unattested Eg. *wnd "to suckle (allaiter)". As pointed out by G. Takács (1997, 232, #22; 1998, 143, #6; 1999, 48; 2004, 60, #350), whose suggestion is supported by D. Appleyard (1999, 308–9, §19), the hypothetic Eg. *wnd (< *wng) is hypothetically derivable from AA *nug (according to Belova' law) and finds its perfect match in Cu. *ng^w-/*nAg^w- "сосок груди" [Dlg.] = *nag^w-/*nūg^w- "to suck" [Lmb. 1986, 42; HL 1988, 133–4] = *nug^w- ~ *nūg^w- "to suck the breast" [GT] > Bed. (Bisharin dial.?) o[?]-nug, pl. e[?]-nug "die Mutterbrust" [Munzinger apud Almkvist] = o-nūk (sic, -k) "Zitzen, Weiberbrust" [Stz./Almkvist] = nūg, pl. nūg "(weibliche) Brust, mamelle" [Almkvist 1885, 52] = ū-nūg "Brustwarze" [Rn. 1884, 335] = nūg ~ nūg^we, pl. nūg "Zitze, die weibliche Brust" [Rn. 1895, 181] = nug^w, pl. nūg^wa "teat, nipple of breast or udder" [Rpr. 1928, 223] = nig "female breast" [Thelwall 1970, 1, §11] = nūkw "breast, udder" [Hds. 1996 MS, 101], Ammar'ar (ʔō)nīg^w, pl. (ʔē)ng^wa "сосок груди (nipple, teat)" [Dlg.], Halenga nóg^we, pl. nóg^wā "Brustwarze" [Rn. 1887, 35] || ECu. *nūg^w- "to suck (saugen)" [Sasse 1979, 24; 1981, 155] = "to suckle" [Apl.]: LECu. *nūg^w- [Black]: PSam *nūg "to suck from breast", *nūg^w-i "to suckle" [Heine 1976, 221; 1977, 291; 1978, 70; 1982, 130–1]: Somali nūg "saugen, spez. die Mutterbrust" [Rn. 1902, 311] = nūg-ayya "to suck" [Abr. 1964, 190] = "to suck" [Black], PBonī *nūg^w- "to suck", nūg-šīy- "to suckle" [Heine 1982, 148] > Bonī nūg [Heine], Rendille a-nuga "ich sauge" [Schlee 1978, 143, #830] = nūga "to suck" [PG 1999, 235], Arb. indiy-nug-e "to suck" [Black] = nuge [Flm.] = nūg^w- "to suck", nūg^w-is- "to suckle" [Hyw. 1984, 388], Elm. ínūka "saugen" [Heine 1973, 281] = i-nūk-a "to suck" [Black] = nūk "to suck", nūk-is "to suckle" [Heine 1980, 208], POromoid *lūg- [Black; GT]: Orm. lūgū "to suck" [Btm. 2000, 183], Oromo-Wellega lūg- "to squirt milk from cow's udder into mouth" [Black], Orm.-Borana of Isiolo lūga "to milk outside the settlement (done illegally by herdsmen)" [Strm. 1987, 360; 1995, 205], PKonsoid *lūg- "to suck" [Black] > Konso & Gidole & Dirayta

lūk- “to suck” [Lmb.] (LECu.: Black 1974, 140, 182, 222) | HECu.: Hdy. nug- “saugen” [Lmb.] | Yaaku -nūk- [-k- < *-g-] (tr.) “to suck” [Heine 1975, 135].

Eventually etymologically related (either extended with prefix *ʔa- or via met. < *nag^w-?) may be PCu. *ʔa/ung^w- “breast” [Ehret 1987, 109, #463] = *ʔang^w- “breast” [Bnd. 1994, 1162, #11]: Agaw *ʔəng^w- “breast” [Apl.; Ehr.]: NAgaw: Bilin unḡú, pl. unḡú-í ~ rarely unḡú-í “Brustwarze, Zitze” [Rn. 1886, 812; 1887, 35] = ʔing^wí, pl. ʔing^wik^w [Palmer/Dlg.] = ʔəng^wí [Sasse; LT 1997, 502] = ʔəng^wí/ī ~ ʔing^wí [Apl.] = ʔāng^wí [SLLÉ apud Wdk. 1994, 10, #28], Hamir oq, pl. oq^w-tān “Brustwarze” [Rn. 1884, 335] = əq^w [Apl.], Hamta eròq^w (sic, -r-) [CR; Dlg.: act. *əyoq^w?], Hmtg. ik^w “breast” [Apl.], Qwara engū “Brustwarzen, Busen” [Rn. 1885, 26 after Levébvre] = ʔeng^wá [Rn. 1886, 35] = eng^wā [CR], Qemant angū, pl. angwâ-t “sein, mammelle” [CR 1912, 166] = ĩngu /əng^wə/ [Bnd.] = /əng^w/ [Sasse] = əngu [Bnd./Dlg.] = angu [Flm.] = əng^w(ə) ~ ing^wí [Apl.] = /ing^wí/ [Ss. 1972 MS, §11] = ang^wo-t (pl.) [Dlg.] | SAgaw *ʔang^w- [Apl.]: Awngi (Awiya) ang^wī [CR 1912, 166] = ang^w “breast” [Bnd. 1971, 238, #91; Hetzron 1978, 137] = ang^w(ī) [Apl.], Damot angu [CR], Kunfāl angu-k^h “breast” [Birru-Adal 1971, 101, #11] (Agaw: Sasse 1973, 121, §11& 126, §11; Apl. 1984, 46; 1989, 6; 1991 MS, 3; 1991, 21; 1996, 188) || LECu. *ʔang- “breast” [Ehr.]: Saho angú, pl. ángūg “Brustwarze, weibliche Brust” [Rn. 1890, 38] = angu, pl. angug “female breast” [Welmers] = angu, pl. angug “breast” [Vergari 2003, 45], Afar angú ~ āngú, pl. ángūg “Brustwarze” [Rn. 1886, 812] = āngu “breast” [Bnd.] = angu, pl. angūga “1. breast, 2. breast milk (lait maternel)” [PH 1985, 43], Som.-Jiddu ʔenek “breast” [Ehr. & Nuuh Ali 1984, 244] = ʔeneg [Ehr. 1987 l.c.] = ennek-kə “female breast, udder” [Lmb.] (isolated among the Som. dialects.), perhaps Baiso enneg- “to swallow” [Lmb.] ||| CCh.: PKotoko *eng^w- “Weiberbrüste” [GT]: Sao emgpie (sic) [-mgp- < *ngw-?] “seins” [GD], Makeri énkwe “female breast” [Barth], Gulfei emgwe “seins” [GD], Kuseri embwi [-mbw- < *-ngw-] “seins” [GD] (Kotoko: Sölken 1967, 260).

AP: PBaz *nug “to suck” [HRV 1979, 77].

LIT.: Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 29 (Cu.-Kotoko). For the common Cu. comparison see Rn. 1887, 35; Dlg. 1973, 175; Flm. 1983, 434; Dj. etc. 1986, 65; Lmb. 1988, 61; Apl. 1996, 188; Zbr. 1989, 579; Apl. 1989 MS, 6–7; Sasse 1991, 272, #1.6; Blz. 1997, 177.

NB1: Uncertain whether ES: Grg.: Muher lagä, Chaha & Ezha nagä, Ennemor & Endegeny & Gyeto nāgä “to suck too much (child, animal), Amh. lagä “to suck, milk the cow directly into one’s mouth (considered to be of bad manners)” (ES: Lsl. 1979 III, 375) ||| SAgaw: Awngi lang-īn “to plane, drink from udder” [Hetzron 1969, 101] || Bed. ligag “to sip milk for another (it is taboo for a man to drink what he

has milked himself until another person has first sipped” [Rpr. 1928, 211] are also related. W. Leslau (1979 III, 375; 1987, 307) affiliated these with Geez *laga* ‘‘the milk secreted a few days before and after childbirth’’, Tna. *läga* ~ *laga* ‘‘colostrum’’, Mhr. *lega* ‘‘to suck (teats)’’, which, if correct, excludes a connection to AA **n-w-g* ‘‘to suck the breast’’ [GT]. Cf. perhaps also the isogloss **l-g-w* > SBrb.: WY *ə-lgəw* ‘‘1. nourrir autrement qu’avec la lait de sa mère, 2. élever (animal), 3. être nourri’’ [PAM 2003, 459] ||| CCh.: MG *-ləgw-* ‘‘2. manger le premier’’ [Brt. 1988, 155]? NB2: The reflexes of Cu. **nūg-* have been often falsely equated with Sem. **nyk* ‘‘to suck’’ & Eg. *snq* ‘‘to suck[le]’’, cf., e.g., Rn. 1887, 35; Müller 1903, 79; 1907, 303–304, fn. 3; Behnk 1928, 138; DjK. 1965, 43; 1967, 188; Dlg. 1973, 175–176; DjK. et al. 1986, 65; Zbr. 1989, 579; Skn. 1996, 209 (with further unrelated comparanda). It is unconvincing, since the correspondence of Eg. *-q* ~ Sem. **-k* vs. PCu. **g* is irregular. Cf. also PKuliak **naḳ* ‘‘saugen’’ [Sasse 1981, 155; Flm. 1983, 434]? Similarly false is the direct equation of ECu. **nūg-* ‘‘to suck’’ vs. SCu. **nūḳ-* ‘‘to sip, savor’’ [Ehr.] > DhI. *nūk-* ‘‘to suck beer through straw’’ (let alone Xmr. *noḥnaḥ* ‘‘so. who speaks through his nose’’) apud Ehret 1987, 93, #395.

NB3: Indirectly, already W. M. Müller (1907, 303–304, fn. 3) had referred to the eventual connection of ‘‘Hamitic’’ (sic) (i.e., presumably Somali) **nūg, nwg* (sic) with Eg. *mnd*, although it is true that he erroneously supposed both Eg. *mnd* and *mn* (!) to derive from a root **n*. NB4: A.B. Dolgopolsky (1987, 201, #46) compared POromoid **lūg-* with Sem.: Sqt. *šgg*: pf. 3rd sg. masc. *wi-n-šegig* ‘‘to flow, couler’’ [Lsl. 1938, 425] and SCu. **šik-* ‘‘to sop up, slop, slurp’’ [Ehret 1980, 212]. Improbable both phonologically and semantically (there is significant difference between SCu. **k* ≠ POromoid **g*, and SCu. **i-* ≠ POromoid **ū-*). POromoid **lūg-* can be better explained from ECu. **nūg-*. For Sqt. *šgg*, in turn, cf. rather Ar. (Hadramaut) *saḡa* ‘‘couler’’ [Lsl.]. NB5: W. M. Müller (1903, 79) and M. Lamberti (1988, 61 etc.) combined the Cu. root with NAgaw: Bilin *nāb-* ‘‘to suck’’ with the labialization of **g*, but this shift is not proven for Bilin. M. Lamberti (1993, 365–7; LS 1997, 481–2) suggested further unconvincing parallels, e.g. Sns. *nibbā* ‘‘heart’’ (along with other reflexes of Cu.-Om. **l-b* ~ **n-b* ‘‘breast, heart’’), Saho *naḥar* ‘‘die ganze Brust’’, NOM. **na?* ‘‘child’’, LECu. **nāg-* vs. **mi/e?* ‘‘child’’. Similarly, one can hardly agree with the equation of Cu. **nag*/**nūg-* ‘‘to suck’’ vs. Som.-Baiso **na?*as- ‘‘female breast’’ proposed in HL 1988, 133–4.

NB6: Whether Afar *nak-* ‘‘to drink milk’’ [Black] = *nake* ‘‘to drink milk’’ [PH 1985, 174] is ultimately related with LECu. **nūg-* ‘‘suck’’ is dubious.

NB7: O. V. Stolbova (2005, 60, #2.2) combined LECu. **nūg-* ~ **lūg-* ‘‘to suck’’ with Ch. **lig-* ‘‘to lap, lick’’, which, however, certainly represents a distinct AA root, namely **l-k* ~ **l-ḳ* ‘‘to lick’’ [GT].

NB8: Ch. Ehret (1995, 317, #613) erroneously equated Cu. **ʔa/ung* ‘‘breast’’ with PSem. **ng-* (sic) ‘‘to seep, ooze’’ and Eg. *ngsgs* ‘‘to overflow’’ (although the underlying root was **gs*, cf. Conti 1980, 65) < AA **nug* ‘‘to seep’’.

- Other proposals are out of question:
- 3. L. Homburger (1930, 286): ~ Ful (Peul) *endu* ‘‘sein’’. Absurd.
- 4. E. Zyhlarz (1936, 444 & fn. 1) identified it with Brb. (sic) *mnīd-ak* ‘‘vor Dir’’ < **emnid-a-ka* ‘‘in Bezug auf Deine Vorderseite’’ < **mnid* ‘‘nach vorne schauen’’ (sic), which he ultimately connected with Eg. *mnd* ‘‘breast’’ (q.v.) and even Nub.: Kunuzi *missi*, Mahassi *mañi* ‘‘oeil’’ (sic). Absurd.

- **5.** W. M. Müller (1907, 303) and F. Hommel (1915, 16, fn. 3) proposed an etymological connection with Eg. *mn^o* “to suckle” (above). False, since Eg. *mn^o* represents a distinct AA root.
- **6.** D. Meeks (1977, 81), pace E. Zyhlarz (l.c., fn. 1), assumed a relationship with Eg. *mnd.t* “Teil des Gesichtst am Auge” (BD, Wb, below) = “vordere Augenpartie” (Zhl.) = “globe oculaire” (Meeks) < Eg. **mnd* “to be round”. Baseless.
- **7.** V. Blažek (1982, 246, #16) compared it with PCu. **mVn-* “entrails” [Dlg. 1973, 182]. Rejected by G. Takács (1999, 48).
- **8.** A. R. Bomhard (1984, 274, #287) derived from a certain AA **mə/ant^y-* “breast” (sic, otherwise unattested) ~ IE **mə/ant^y-* “breast, to suckle” (cf. IEW 729; WP II 232). Similarly, F. Kammerzell (1999, 250, table 15), in an astonishing manner, affiliated Eg. *mnd-* (sic, -d-!) “säugen” (sic!) with IE **me/ond-* “säugen”. Absurd.
- **9.** G. Takács (1999, 49): The similarity of Eg. *mnd* [< **mng?*] to PWNigr. **mung-* “to suck” [Smz. 1981, 19, #183] may be accidental.

mnd.t “1. (Med., XVIII.) Teil des Gesichts zwischen Nase und Jochbein längst dem Auge, 2. (BD-GR) Teil des Gesichtst am Auge (dann auch für das Auge selbts, gern im Dual)” (Wb II 93, 10–12) = “cheeks” (Dawson 1927, 20–21, §1) = “between the nose and nostrils on the one hand, and the temporal region and ear on the other: the cheek, the maxilla(ry bone) and the adjoining portion of the zygoma as far back as the temporal bone” (Breasted 1930, 243) = “Auge(npartie)” (Zhl. 1934–35, 173) = “a part of the face” (AEO I 18) = “1. la joue, 2. paupière (peut-être la partie inférieure)” (Lefévre 1952, 14, §14 vs. 17, §18) = “Wangenpartie: (die rechts und links der Nase anschließende) Wangen” (Grapow 1954, 31, 37–39) = “cheek” (FD 110) = “1. les joues, 2. le globe oculaire, les yeux” (Meeks 1977, 81, fn. 1; AL 77.1756–7; so also Koemoeth 1993, 115 & fn. 33) = “Wange, Nasenlöcher” (Scheel 1985, 161 & fn. 113–4) = “Wange, Backe” (GHWb 343) = “1. cheek, 2. eyeball (?), eyelid (?)” (Walker 1996, 269) = “eyes” (PL 440) = “part of the face” (DCT 170).

NB: The original form was *mnd.t* developed to NK *mnd.t* (Wb l.c.) → GR *mnd.(tj)* ~ *mntj* (PL l.c.).

- A metaphorical sense of the same word may be represented by OK *mnd.t* (usually pl.) “vermutlich Teil des Schmelzofens” (Wb II 93, 9) = “Nasenlöcher” (Erman 1918, 41) = “cheek” (Dawson 1927, 23) = “‘Wange’ im Metallhandwerk: eine Bezeichnung für das dem Arbeiter

zugewandte Ausgußloch bzw. Tiegelwand” (Drenkhahn 1976, 32, rejected by Scheel) = “point de fusion du métal, mais pourrait être ‘la panse, la paroi’ du creuset” (AL 77.1755) = “im Metallhandwerk eine Metapher: sicherlich die Wange des (Schmelz)Tiegels bzw. die Tiegelwabdung” (Scheel 1985, 162–163) = “*Melztiegelwand (‘Wange’), *Ausgußloch, *Seite der Gußform, *Schmelzbrei” (GHWb 344; ÄWb I 344) = “Ausflußloch, Tiegelwand des Schmelzofens” (WD III 52 pace Scheel).

NB: It is attested also in mnd.w “Kontrolleur beim Gußvorgang” (WD III 52: cf. SAK 9, 1981, 153).

- Basic sense dubious. Etymology disputed.
- 1. D. Meeks (1977, 81, fn. 1, cf. AL l.c.) explained it from a certain Eg. *mnd meaning “sg. round”, whence he derived also Eg. mnd “breast” (q.v.), mndj “la panse (?)” (which presumably stems from the preceding). Following him, P. Wilson (PL 440) also maintains that Eg. *√mnd “seems to refer to sg. spherical in shape and thus to parts of the body such as the breasts, cheeks, eyeball”. Improbable.
NB: The rendering “globe oculaire” is somewhat dubious in the light of Eg. br “ball of eye” (NK, CED 22; DLE I 156) < OK b33 (cf. EDE II 232). Eg. mndj, in turn, may be rather identical with Eg. mnd “breast” (q.v. above, cf. also DCT 170), which certainly represents a distinct AA root.
- 2. G. Takács (1997, 229, #11; 2004, 61, #351): perhaps < *mng.t, related with the Ethiopian *Wanderwort* *mangāg- “jaw, chin” [GT]? NB1: Attested in Eth.-Sem. (< Cu.?): Tna. māngaga ~ mōngaga [Lsl.], Amh. & Argobba māngaga “Kiefer, Kinnlade, Kinnbacken” [Rn.] = “jaw-bone, molar tooth” [Gragg] = “molar tooth” [Lsl. 1949, 47], Harari māngaga “jaw” [Lsl.], Gurage-Zway māngāga “jaw” [Lsl.] ||| LECu.: Saho & Afar mingāgā, pl. mingōg “Kiefer, Kinnladen, Kinnbacken, Wange” [Rn. 1890, 269] = mingāga “jaw, chin” [Lmb.], Oromo mangagā “jaw” [Rn.] = mangāgā “jaw” [Gragg 1982, 277] = māgāga ~ mangāga “jaw” [Lsl.] = mangāga? [Lmb.], Dirayta mankākō-t^a “jaw” [Lmb.] | HECu.: Burji mangāg-ā “lower jaw” [Sasse], Alaba gangā^ama [met. < *magang-?] “jaw” [Lmb.], Hadiyya mangāgga “jaw” [Lmb.], Kambatta mangaga [Lsl.] = mangāga [Lmb.] = māngaga “jaw” [Zbr.] ||| NOM. (< ECu.?): Wolamo mangāga “jaw” [Lmb.], Gamu mangāgille “jaw” [Lmb.] | Mocha mangāgo [Lmb.] | Sheko mangāgo “jaw” [Lmb.] (ECu.-NOM.-ES: Rn. 1886, 882; Lsl. 1963, 108; 1979 III, 409; Sasse 1982, 140; Zbr. 1985, 90; Lmb. 1987, 533; LS 1997, 461).
NB2: The definite etymology of these forms is obscure. As H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) remarked: “the ultimate source... is hard to determine”. The derivation from Sem. *ḥanak- “palate” (Praetorius 1879, 70) was rightly declined by W. Leslau (1979 III, 409). Sasse (l.c.) thought of a borrowing either from ES or Oromo, while G. Hudson (1989, 85) pondered a connection with HECu. *gānge “molars” [Hds.]. However, *mangāg- resembles an m- prefix formation like *ma-ngag- < *√ngg, for cf. SCu.: Dahalo nḷaḷe “jaw” [EEN 1989, 46]? If so, we have to give up the comparison with Eg. mnd.t.
NB3: M. Lambertini (1987, 533) compared also LECu.: Baiso munḷe “mouth, lip” [Lmb.], which is improbable. Later, he (LS 1997, 461) combined the ECu. root with Cu. *marg- > Wlt. morgiy-a “shoulder, hump”, which is impossible (cf. the entry for Eg. m3wd).

- **3.** GT: alternatively, we might assume a root *mn- extended with an affix (?) -ḍ occurring as C₃ in a number of Eg. anatomical terms (psḍ, fnḍ, nḥḍ.t, ḥnḍ), cf. AA *ma/in- “forehead” [Blz.] = *m-n “front of head” [GT].

NB: Attested in ECu. *m̄n- [GT]: Saho & Afar min̄n “die Augenbrauen” [Rn. 1886, 882; 1890, 269] = min̄n “(part of the face around the) eyebrow” [Lmb.] | Rnd. m̄n “forehead” [PG 1999, 224] | PKonsoid *m̄n-da [Black] > Konso & Turo & Gato m̄n-ta “forehead, face” [Black], Konso m̄n-tá & Mossiya m̄n-ta “forehead, face” [Lmb.], Dirayta m̄n-ta “forehead” [Lmb.], Gdl. & Mashile & Bussa m̄n-t “forehead, face” [Black] (Konsoid: Black 1974, 255) | HECu.: Hdy. m̄ne “forehead” [Lmb.], Kmb. m̄ne “forehead, face” [Lmb.], Alb. m̄ne [Lmb.] = m̄nita “face” [Crass], Qbn. m̄nit “face” [Korhonen etc.] = m̄ni-ta [Crass] (HECu.: Crass 2001, 47, #69) | Dullay *m̄n-te “forehead, face” [Lmb.]: Harso m̄n-čé “Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite” [AMS], Gwd. m̄n-te “Stirn, Vorderseite, Gesicht” [AMS] = “forehead” [Black], Dbs. (Gobeze) m̄n-te “forehead, face” [Black] = m̄n-čé “Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite” [AMS], Glg. m̄n-té “Stirn, Gesicht, Vorderseite” [AMS], Tsamay m̄n-te “face” [Blz. < ?] (Dullay: AMS 1980, 175, 213; Cu.: Black 1975, 296; Lmb. 1987, 533; 2005, 233, §38) ||| NOm.: (?) Yemsa maṅà [-ŋ- < ?] “eyebrow” [Lmb. 1993, 365] ||| WCh.: Butura maan “forehead” [Magwa 1985, 15] = DB maán “forehead” [Blench 2001 MS, 5] || CCh.: Hina maněno “Stirn” [Str. 1922–23, 113]. See also Blz. 2000 MS, 2–3, §7; 2000, 182–3, §7 (ECu.-Hina).

DP: V. Blažek (l.c.) compared the AA root with IE *mein- “face” [Blz.] (IE: Jucquois, Orbis 16, 1967, 177–9; Tischler HEG 1990, 197) ~ Drv. *mun- “front” [DED #5020a].

- Other suggestions cannot be accepted:
- **4.** L. Homburger (1931, 252) and E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 173) combined it with Nub.: Kunuzi missi, Mahassi mañi “oeil”. Absurd.
NB: In addition, Zyhlarz (1936, 444, fn. 1) ultimately connected this false parallel with Brb. (sic) mn̄id-ak “vor Dir” < *em̄n̄id-a-ka “in Bezug auf Deine Vorderseite” < *mn̄id “nach vorne schauen” (sic).
- **5.** A. M. Lam (1993, 379) combined it with Ful (Pulaar) maṣnata “qui fait sourciller”.
NB: Rightly rejected by H. Tourneux (2000, 92–93) pointing out that it is fact a conjugated form (maṣ- + factitive -n- + suffix -ata) without subject (not a participle) meaning “[ça] fait sourciller”.

mnd3 ~/> (?) **mnd** “Beischrift zu einem Gegenstand” (MK, Wb II 92, 8) = “instrument servant à l’ouverture de la bouche” (Jéquier 1921, 324) = “un surnom de pésech (instrument d’ouverture de la bouche)” (AL 79.1251) = “*ein Mundöffnungsgerät (dem Peseschkaf ähnlich)” (GHWb 343).

- Proper root uncertain. Origin unknown.
- **1.** G. Jéquier (1921, 324) saw in it an m- prefix nomen instr. of Eg. nḍ “broyer” surmising in it an “*allusion au bout de l’instrument, introduit de force entre les lèvres*”. False, because if mnd3 was the primary form, this etymology does not explain -3.
- **2.** GT: perhaps a nomen instr. of Eg. *nḍ3 [< *nḍr] “to split open (?)”, which is presumably akin to AA *n-ç-r ~ *n-ĉ-r “to split open” [GT].

nb1: Cf. Sem. *nšr ~ *nšr [GT]: Sqt. nšr: nōṭiṣar “être déchiré, se fendre” [Lsl. 1938, 272] = “to be torn” [Lsl. 1987] || Geez naḏara ~ naṣara “to rip off, tear off, rend, separate, split” [Lsl. 1987, 387] = “briser” [Lsl. 1938], Tigre nāṣra “to tear asunder” [Lsl.] || SBrb.: Ayr a-nḏar [-ḏ- reg. < AA *-ḏ-] “déchirure, fente, blessure” [PAM 2003, 591] || NAgaw: Bilin (< ES?) naṣar “zerreißen, zerfleischen” [Rn. 1887, 283].

nb2: The same root is apparently attested also in Eg. nd3 “Splitter (von Holz und Stein)” (MK, XIX/XX., Wb II 377, 8).

- **3.** GT: if, in turn, the var. mnd represents the older form (less probable), only guesses can be made.

nb: Cf. (1) WBrb.: Zng. ə-mṣad [-ṣ- reg. < *-l-] “pointe, résurgence, fait de resoudre”, cf. ə-mṣad-ən (pl.) “le première eau qui sourd quand on creuse un puits” [Ncl. 1953, 219] or (2) perhaps NOm.: Haruro mald-ā “stagno, metallo” [CR 1937, 654]. For the semantic shift in the latter case cf. the possible connection of Eg. sb3 ~ sb [< *sbl?] “(in der Opferliste als ein Gerät aus bj3-Mineral)” (MK 1x, XVIII-XXVI., Wb IV 81, 14) = “Seba (ein Mundöffnungsgerät)” (GHWb 685) vs. Ar. sabal- “faisceau de lances” [BK I 1047], from Ar. derives EBrb.: Gdm. ə-ssabūl-ət “long poignard, à fourreau de métal” [Lnf. 1973, 330, #1421] || (?) NBrb. *ti-subla “aiguille” [GT after Dst. 1925, 260, §2] || LECu. *sibl- [GT]: Orm. sibīl-a, Gdl. silp, Konso siplá - all “metal” (LECu.: Black 1974, 52) | HECu. *sibila “iron” [Hds. 1989, 84] | Dullay sipil-ho “metal” [Ss. 1979, 33] || SOM. *sibil- “iron” [GT after Bnd. 1994, 153] || (?) WCh. (AS-BT) *s-w-l “iron” [GT]. See also Mlt. 1985 MS, 2, §6 (Ar.-Gdm.-ECu.-WCh.).

mndj (in: dšr.w nw mndj) “als ofizinell verwendetes” (Med. hapax: Pap. Ebers, case 193, Wb II 93, 15) = “unbekannt (in einem Einnehmemittel)” (WÄDN 249) = “ein Mineral oder eine Körnerfrucht” (GHWb 344) = “eine Pflanze (?)” (HAM 580).

- Meaning and etymology obscure. GT: only guesses can be made:

nb: Cf. perhaps (1) Sem. *mang- [OS]: Akk. (j/nB) mangu (var. mannagu “Phaseolus (Bohne) Mungo” [AHW 602] = “(an alkaline plant)” [CAD m1, 211] || Syr. maggā [AHW] | Ar. maḡḡ- “sorte de lentilles” [BK II 1063]. The Sem. word has hardly anything to do with HECu.: Burji manḡ-o/ō “millet, sorghum” [Hds. 1989, 211] | Dullay: Tsamay mānḡ-o “sorghum” [Sava 2005 MS, 265] as suggested in HSED 374, #1724. (2) SCu.: Brg. munga “natural salt” [Wtl. 1958, 25, #89]? (3) Or < *mlg ~ Ar. mulḡ- “datte sauvage”, ʔumlūḡ- “1. datte sauvage, 2. sorte d’arbrisseau semblable au cyprès, et qui croît dans le désert” [BK II 1143] || SBrb.: Hgr. ā-malagʾa “fruits frais de l’arbre (appelé en tamahaq absey)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1199], EWlm. & Ayr a-mālāga “fruit (frais) d’afāḡag (acacia), 2. (p.ext.) fruit (en gén.)” [PAM 1998, 216]?

mndr “ein Eingeweide des Menschen und der Säugetiere” (Med., Wb II 94, 1-2; Grapow 1914, 26) = “mentioned among viscera (both of men and animals) gall-bladder (?)” (Dawson, JEA 18, 1932, 15; AEO I 18, #299) = “Gallenblase” (Grapow 1954, 79; E. Feucht, LÄ I 1206; Quack 1997, 331; HAM 501 after Dawson) = “vésicule biliaire” (Lefébvre 1952, 34, §38; Massart 1959, 233, §33) = “Magen” (Hornung 1976 II 88, 143, n. 478; GHWb 344; HAM 501) = “estomac (?)” (AL 77.1759 after Hornung) = “an organ receiving sg. into the

body and/or connected with the passage of sg. through it: probably either the pancreas or diaphragm or gastro-intestinal tract or at least part of it, particularly the stomach (gall-bladder appears less tenable than stomach)” (Walker 1996, 213–9, 269 contra Nunn 1999, 258: “not stomach”) = “stomach” (WD III 52).

NB: The mng. “brain” (suggested by Chassinat 1921, 212–5; Ebbell 1937, #766; Iversen, JEA 33, 1947, 47; Lefébvre 1956, 72, n. 1, cf. Ghalioungui 1981, 16) is improbable (for this mng. cf. Eg. 3js, ʿmm). For similar considerations, “gall-bladder” proposed by W. R. Dawson (JEA 18, 1932, 15) is equally hardly the right sense (for whic cf. Eg. bnf, wdd).

- Its meaning is disputed. Mentioned among viscera of man and animals, usually together with liver, heart, spleen, lung, intestines.
- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 26) supposed in it a prefix m- (however, without naming the underlying root). Similarly, A. H. Gardiner (AEO l.c.), followed by E. Hornung (1976 II 143, n. 478) and J. H. Walker (1996, 214), surmised it to be an m- prefix derivative of Eg. ndrj/w “to grasp, hold fast, catch hold of, secure, take possession of”.

NB: Trying to justify this strange derivation, Walker assumed that “*theoretically*, mndr should be the place where sg. is held fast, perhaps a type of receptacle (both gall-bladder which receives bile from the liver and holds it, and the stomach which receives ingested food and holds it... Both organs are compatible with this etymology”.

- 2. GT: perhaps from AA *m-n-ç-r, being a rare and irregular quadriconsonantal match of LECu.: POmo-Tana *mindīʿar “intestines” [Hyw. 1979, 76] = *mindīqar [Hyw. 1979, 88, n. 6] > PSam *mindīqar “intestines” [Heine]: Baiso menʿēr “intestines” [Hyw. 1979, 76] = meṇēr [Hyw. 1979, 125], Som. mindīʿir “1. (sg.) der Mastdarm, 2. (pl.) der Bauch, die Eingeweide, Gedärme” [Rn. 1902, 297] = mīndīʿir “the large intestine” [Abr. 1964, 180] = mindīqir ~ mindīʿir “intestines” [Heine] = mindīq/ʿir “Darm” [Lmb.], Rnd. mindāḥár “intestines” [Heine 1976, 217; 1978] = mindāḥár (sic, with plain -d-) “intestine” [PG 1999, 225], PBoni *mānəḡér “guts” [Heine 1982, 147] > Boni mineʿer (f) “Teilstück der Eingeweide” [Heine 1977, 286] = minīʿir “part of intestines” [Heine 1978] (Sam: Heine 1978, 69/91; LECu.: Hyw. 1979, 88, n. 6; Lamberti 1993, 348–9). NB1: This Eg.-LECu. is only possible if we treat LECu. *ʿ/k- as an additional inetymological extension to the root *m-n-ç-r. Note that such an epenthetic *ʿ- is attested in other ECU. anatomical terms too. Eventually, to be connected with Sem. *mṣr: Ar. maṣīr-, pl. ʿamṣīr-at- etc. “intestins où s’élabore le chyle” [BK II 1116], Dathina ʿimṣār, pl. ʿamāṣīr- “intestin, boyau” [GD 2699], Hadramaut ʿamṣūr “intestin, boyau” [Landberg 1901, 716] via assimilation of *mn- > *m-? NB2: M. Lamberti (1993, 105; 1993, 348–9; 1994, 115) and R. Sottile (1997, 213) analyzed the LECu. form as a compound (lit. “Kopf der Innereien”/“head of offals”, sic), but the suggested proto-form *mand- is baseless, and its supposed connection with Cu.-Om. *marḏ- “Innereien” [Lmb.] = *marač(č)- [GT] vs. Gonga *māč- [GT] is not convincing.

- **3.** G. Takács (1996, 153–154, #68; 2004, 59, #349.1 & 61, #352) analyzed it as *mn- + *dr̥ on the analogy of Eg. mnqb, mnkr̥t, mnt̥3.t (q.v., for the element mn- cf. also Takács 1995, 106, #3), where he identified the component -dr̥ [< *gr̥ ~ *gl̥?] with AA *g-r “stomach” [GT].

nb1: Attested in Ar. ġirriyy-at- “the stomach, or triple stomach, or the crop, or craw of a bird” [Lane 476] ||| Bed. gʷārār “colon, large intestine” [Rpr. 1928, 189] || NĀgaw: perhaps Bilin gir (var. ġir) “Darm”, pl. “Gedärme, Eingeweide, Magen” [Rn. 1887, 158] || ECu. *gar^ʕ- “Bauch” [Sasse 1973, 275]: Oromo garā “stomach, heart, mind” [Gragg 1982, 167], Oromo-Maccha garā “желудок, живот (stomach, belly)” [Dlg.], Konso kari-ta “belly” [Flm.], Gato kara “belly” [Flm.], Dirayta gere “belly” [Flm.] | Elmolo gere “belly” [Heine 1973, 279], Geleba (Dasenech) gere “belly” [Dlg.] = gēre “belly” [Sasse], Arbore gēre “belly” [Sasse, Dlg.] = geré? “belly” [Zbr.] | Dullay *kar^ʕ- “Bauch” [GT after AMS 1980, 232] || SCu.: WRift *gura^ʔ- “stomach, belly” [GT]: Iraqw gūra, pl. gūr^ʔe, Gorowa gūra, pl. gūr^ʔi, Alagwa gura^ʔa, Burunge gura^ʔa (SCu.: Wtl. 1958, 25; Dlg. 1972, 202; 1973, 205; Ehret 1980, 239) ||| NŌm.: Haruro (dial. of South Lake Margharita) gara “body” [Flm.] = gārā [Dlg.] (orig. *‘belly’?) ||| ECh.: Lele gúrmú “stomach” [WP 1982, 32] | Migama gūr-múđú “stomach” [JA 1992, 89]. Lit.: Chn. 1947, #211 (Ar.-Agaw); Flm. 1969, 23 (SCu.-ECu.-Haruro); Dlg. 1972, 202; 1973, 205 (Agaw-ECu.-NŌm.-SCu.-Ar.); Ehret 1980, 389 (Irq.-?Orm.); Zbr. 1989, 578 (Cu.-Ar.); Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 17 (Bed.-SCu.); HSED #995 (Ar.-Cu.).

nb2: H.-J. Sasse’s (1973, 275) evidence for setting up ECu. *gar^ʕ- with *^ʕ is insufficient. The underlying AA stem has been most recently (Mlt.-Sts. 1994, 2) reconstructed as *garyV “belly” (on the basis of Sem., CCh., ECu., SCu., Om. data).

nb3: It is hard to separate Bilin gir from Agaw *ġir- “intestines, guts” [Apl.]: Bilin ġir, Hamta zīla, Qwara ġir, Qemant ġar, ġir, Awngi zir (Agaw: Apl. 1991 MS, 7).

nb4: The element -dr̥ is certainly distinct from Eg. dr̥w̥w “side, flank (anat.)” (MK, AEO II 254*; FD 324). Cf. perhaps Eg. dr̥j̥t “Körperteil des Rindes: wohl am Bauch” (MK, Wb V 600, 14)?

nb5: The AA parallels might be (alternatively?) equated with Eg. ng3j (unless ngj) “ventre” (late NK, AL 77.2237) = “belly” (CED 119) = “Bauch” (KHW 527) > (S) n̄h̄ḥ̄ḥ̄, (B) n̄ḥ̄ḥ̄ḥ̄ (KHW 136, 138) < *ngr̥ (prefix n-?).

- **4.** GT: Eg. *dr̥ might be alternatively equated with Akk. ṣurru “Inneres, Herz” [AHW 1114].

mr̥ (or **jm̄j-r̄**?) “Vorgesetzter, Vorsteher, oberster Verwalter” (OK, Wb II 94, 5–13; WD I 89 with lit.) = “Seher, Aufseher, Aufpasser” (Helck 1954) = “overseer” (FD 18; Jones 2000, 51, §255 with lit.) = “Vorsteher, Superintendent, auch Minister” (GHWb 50) = “der Vertreter (nicht ein Vorsteher) einer Personengruppe, deren ‘Sprecher’ er ist (der an sich keine administrative Befehlsgewalt besitzt, sondern... die Stellung eher auf der Basis von Respekt ausgeübt wurde; der Titel bezeichnet keinen Rang, sondern vielmehr eine relative soziale ‘Stellung’)” (Gdk. 1998, 101, 106).

nb1: The traditional rdg. jm̄j-r̄ (FD, GHWb, Ward 1982, §28; Jones) = mj-r3 (sic) (Spg. KHW 48) vocalized as *j̄mej-lá3 (Fecht 1960, §70, fn. 126 & §259, fn. 399) = *j̄m̄j-rá’ (Fischer-Elfert 1992, 40 after Fecht 1960, 38, §70) = *iám.î-rá3 or *iám.î-rá3 > *(î.m.ê)-rá3 (Buchberger 1993, 629) = *iám.î-rá’ (Kahl 1994, 91).

NB2: From the Saite period, a LEg. var. r also occurs (Piehl, ZÄS 21, 1883, 128, fn. 1; 1890, 106, fn. †; Griffith 1899, 271; Grd. 1902–3, 143; Franke 1984, 118–9, §518a & §540) reflecting act. *la ~ *lo (Franke 1984, 118–9), where the jmj- “had fallen away” (Grd. 1902–3, 143). This scenario was rejected by H. G. Fischer (1985, 44–45): “improbable that early MK imy-r was universally reduced to *lo/*la by the middle of Dyn. XIF”.

- The reduced LEg. form r has been preserved in OCpt. $\lambda\sigma$ - (Spg., RT 24, 188; Fecht 1960, 134, §259; KHW 74; DELC 93; Vcl. 1990, 248) and in Cpt. * $\lambda\lambda$ - ~ * $\lambda\epsilon$ - ~ * $\epsilon\lambda\sigma$ - (prefix in st.nom.) “Vorsteher” (Spg. KHW 48 & fn. 8; KHW 74) as first pointed out by F. L. Griffith (1899, 271) in the following compounds:

(1) (S) $\epsilon\lambda\sigma$ - $\iota\epsilon$ “shepherd” (CD Add., xvib & 55b) = “(Rinder-)Hirte” (KHW 34; Stz. 1994, 196) = “chef de boeufs” (Vcl. 1990, 248, #4) < Dem. mr-jh “Rindervorsteher” (DG 166:2) < Eg. mr-jh.w “Vorsteher der Rinder(herden)” (Fecht, KHW, cf. Wb I 119, 21) = “overseer of cattle” (Peust), i.e., *j m j-rá3-j h w > *j m j-rá-j h w (Fecht 1960, 38, §70) = *m[V]rá-juhV (Peust 1999, 145). Cf. Dem. PN p3-mr-jhw > Gk. Πελαίας (CED 34).

(2) (S) $\lambda\epsilon$ - $\eta\eta\eta\omega\epsilon$, (L) $\lambda\epsilon$ - $\eta\eta\omega\epsilon$ ~ -C- “Hauptmann, Krieger, Held” (KHW 79) = “commandement de troupe” (Vcl. 1990, 247, #4) = “Krieger” (Stz. 1994) < Dem. mr-mš^c “1. militärischer Titel, 2. Priestertitel” (DG 166:5) < Eg. mr-mš^c “General” (Wb II 155, 16) > Gk. λεμείσα, vars. λέμυσος, λεμύση “titre de prêtre égyptien” (Fournet 1989, 70, §7 & fn. 46) ~ Mer. plmos (Griffith, JEA 3, 1916, 121–2) = /pelmoš/, probably *pelamoša “der Offizier” (Stz. 1980, 83) = *pelamusa (Peust 1992, 118, #c).

(3) (SL) $\lambda\lambda$ - $\omega\lambda\eta\epsilon$ “village magistrate or official” (CD 148a) = “ein Beamter: Dorfschulze, auch allgemein: Machthaber, Herrscher” (KHW 81 & fn. 4) = “Schulze” (Stz.) < Dem. mr-šn “Oberpriester, Lesonis” (DG 166:9) < Eg. mr-šn.t “Beamter mit richterlicher Befugnis” (MK, XVIII., Wb IV 498) > Gk. λεσώνις ~ λεσώνιος ~ λασώνι “chef administrateur d’un temple (≈ ἀρχιερέυς)” (Fournet 1989, 70, §8 & fn. 47), Mer. plsn (Griffith, JEA 3, 1916, 114, 121).

LIT.: see also Griffith 1899, 271–2; Roquet 1972, 113; DELC 93.

NB1: A.H. Gardiner (1902–3, 143) and W. Vycichl (DELC 93) supposed a Cpt. st.abs. * $\lambda\omega$ < *l3w (sic, Vcl.), which is baseless lacking any lexical evidence.

NB2: For the loss of nasal in OK mr > LEg. r cf. Sethe 1911, 29, fn. 1. G. Burkard’s (1977, 34) parallel (Eg. rh > Cpt. $\epsilon\omega$) for Eg. mr > Cpt. * $\lambda\epsilon$ - is misleading: these are not the same pattern.

- Etymology very much disputed:
- 1. In Egyptian philology, traditionally explained as a frozen nisba compound jmj-r literally meaning “celui qui est dans la bouche (des individus qui lui sont subordonnés)” (Piehl) = “im Munde Befindliches” (Behnk) = “was im Munde ist, der welcher etw. zu befehlen hat” (Wb) = “im Munde von, Mundinhalt (sic)” (Sethe) = “he who is in the mouth (i.e., of his subordinates)” (Grd.) = “das, was im Munde ist” (Helck) = “in dessem Mund (die Befehlsgewalt liegt)” (Lange) = “der, in dem/welchem der Ausspruch (r) ist” (Fecht) = “darin befindlich ist der Ausspruch” (Westendorf) = “1. der im Munde ist (seiner Untertanen), or 2. der, in dem der Spruch ist bzw. der, den Spruch hat” (Allam) = “he in whom speech is” (Fischer) = “der sich im Mund befindet” or “der, in dem sich der Spruch befindet”

(Buchberger) = “einer, der der Mund ist” (Gdk.) in view of **(1)** the writing *jmj-r* (Wb I 74, 13) attested from the beginning of Dyn. VI (Edel 1956, 8, §8, perhaps already Dyn. II, cf. Allam 1987, 1 & fn. 2 after IÄF III, t. 126, fig. 755 & IÄF II 849, n. 961), which was, however, ignored by H.-G. Fischer (1985, 44–45) who dated this wtg. from the early MK; **(2)** the fem. form *jmj.t-r* (3x OK, 1x MK, Grd. 1955, 122), and **(3)** its pl. *jmj.w-r* (1x, early MK stela, Kairo 20465, Lange 1905, 142), as well as **(4)** the abbreviation with the “tongue” hrgl. (from the MK) suggesting a pun “what is in the mouth”, i.e., “tongue”. This etymology is presumably false due to the anomaly of Cpt. (S) ***λΔ**-, ***λΕ**-, ***ΕΛΟ**- vs. (S) **PO** “mouth”.

LIT.: Pehl, RT 1, 1870, 133, n. 3 (later, in PSBA 14, 487, he abandoned this hypothesis); Grd. in ZÄS 40, 1902–3, 142–4 (cf. also ZÄS 70, 1954, 76f.); Lange in ZÄS 42, 1905, 142; Sethe 1911, 29, fn. 1; 1923, 191, fn. 2; EG §79; Fischer 1985, 44–45, §28; Allam 1987, 1 & fn. 3 with lit.; Fischer-Elfert 1992, 40–43, §III; Buchberger 1993, 628; Gdk. 1998, 101–2.

NB1: W. Vycichl (DELC 93–94) correctly maintained that “*l’expression n’a pas de rapport avec le mot r3 ‘bouche’ = PO (SB)*”, although he also accepted that “*il s’agit certainement de jmj-l3 (sic) ‘qui est dans le...’*”, in which “*le sens de l3w n’est pas connu, mais on peut supposer qu’il sagissait primitivement d’un bâtiment particulier où le chef exerçait ses fonctions*”. Baseless. W. Westendorf (1989, 110–1): “*die Übersetzung ‘der im Munde ist’... beweist nichts hinsichtlich der Bedeutung...*”. Also H. Goedicke (1998, 102) found this rendering to be “*eine Einstellung... für die kein Nachweis erstellt werden kann*”.

NB2: For rendering *jmj-r* as the inverted use of nisba see Erman 1928, §231b; ZÄS 52, 1915, 107f.; Griffiths, JEA 28, 1942, 66f.; Fecht 1960, §70, fn. 126 & §259, fn. 399; 1979, 106f. & fn. 1; NBÄ 309; Westendorf, NAWG 1981, 85 & MIO 7, 1960, 320–2; Stz. 1984, 127–8; Allam 1987, 1, fn. 4; Fischer-Elfert 1992, 40, fn. 3; Goedicke 1998, 101–2. G. Fecht (1960, 134–5, fn. 399) took the apparent *Endbetonung* of *(jmej)-lā3 > OCpt. **ΛΟ** as a proof for an *umgekehrte Nisbe*, i.e., *Nominalsatzkompositum* meaning “*der, auf den zutrifft: das Innere ist der Ausspruch*” > “*der, in dem der Ausspruch ist*” (instead of an *älteres Kompositum* *jmej-lā3 “*der in r3 Befindliche*”). The rendering of *jmj-r* as inverted nisbe has been firmly disproved by K. Jansen-Winkel (1993, 9–10), cf. also Schenkel, CdE 41 (1966), 55–57.

NB3: The anomaly of Cpt. (S) **λ**- vs. **Π**- has not been satisfactorily explained. F. L. Griffith (PSBA 21, 1899, 272) pondered an assimilation of Cpt. (S) ***λΔ**- to the homophonous form of the part.conj. prefix (SLB) **λΔ**- “*possessing, endowed with*” (CD 135a) = “*Zugehörig*” (KHW 74) “*due to false analogy*”. A. H. Gardiner (1902–3, 144), in turn: “*From ΠΩ to ΛΩ is no difficult step: perhaps the change from r to l is due to the influence of the lost element jmj...*”. But as W. Helck (1954, 76–77) rightly stressed, for the wtg. with the tongue hrgl. “*vielleicht hat eine Rolle gespielt, daß λΔC auch *l- hatte wie mr > λΕ-ΠΩNE, während bei jmj-r3 müßte man *r- (PO) voraussetzen*”.

NB4: H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1992, 40–43, §III) thinks to have found the clue for the reading and rendering of *jmj-r* in *jmj.t-r* “*als Name von Geräten*” (CT, Wb I 74, 14) = “*eine bestimmte Art von Stab oder Stock*” (Fischer-Elfert after K. J. Seyfried 1977, 65–70), which he understood as a inverted nisba, lit. “*das, in dem sich der Ausspruch befindet (als eine materielle Manifestation des ‘Wortes’)*”. He regarded both *jmj.t-r* and *mdw* as “*Würdezeichen des Beamten: Mund, Wort, Ausspruch*”, which signify the “*Potenz des Wortes, des befehlenden, autoritätsheißenden Ausspruches*” as evidenced i.a. by the Sign Pap. of Tanis, where *mdw* “*Stab*” is explained with “*eine aufschlußreiche Glosse*” ns n *mdww* “*sprechende Zunge*” (cf. Griffith 1889, 20, pl. VI, II.A.3, l. 4). Note that A. Hassan (cf. Fischer-Elfert 1992, 41, fn. 37) and E. Edel (AÄG §347.1) render *jmj.t-r* as “*Stab, der sich im Tore befindet*”.

- **2.** W. Helck (1954, 76–77) rightly queried the correctness of this *Volksetymologie*. He considered the wtg. with “tongue” hrgl. as a result of secondary re-interpretation of mr as (j)m(j)-r “what is in the mouth” (i.e., “tongue”) due to homophony taking place by the MK (acc. to Edel 1956, 8, §8 by the late OK) on the analogy of titles like jmj-ḥnt and jmj-jz. He proposed an etymological connection of mr with a hypothetic OK *mr.tj “two eyes” (attested from BD, below) and eventually with Eg. m33 (act. *mll or *mrr?) “to see” (above) as suggested by W. Vycichl (1951, 72). E. Edel (1956, 9, fn. 1) did not rule out an ultimate etymological connection to Cpt. (S) βαλ “eye” either (incorrect, cf. EDE II 256). Rejected by A. H. Gardiner (1955, 121–2: “questionable, ... mere groundless speculation”) as well as by H. G. Fischer (1985, 44–45).

nb: Helck found Dyn. III evidence (on the block from Akhti-Aa’s tomb, Berlin 15302/3) for mr being the original consonant sequence: in the title mr k3.t nb.t nsw “Vorsteher aller Arbeiten des Königs”, it was written with m + two eyes. A. H. Gardiner (1955, 121) queried this “not unpalatable suggestion”, since “the assumed evaporation of the fem. dual ending presents an insuperable obstacle”, whence he considered the ex. from Dyn. III a “sportively written equivalent” for mr, to be read jmj-jr.tj (read jmj-jr.tj also by P. Kaplony, IÄF I 658 & III, fig. 755 as). E. Edel (1956, 9, §8, fn. 2) regarded “die erwähnte bizarre Schreibung aus der 3. Dyn. ... eher als kryptographische Spielerei ... (Anspielung auf den Titel jmj-jr.tj. ...?)”, while M. Z. Allam (1987, cf. AEB 87.0228) read it as m3(w) “overseer (Beaufichtiger)” (he assumed the underlying Eg. m33 “beaufsichtigen” to have survived in Eg. Ar. māʔa “etwas anstarren, scharf beobachten”). In the view of H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1992, 40 & fn. 28), in turn, in this early ex. “geht es um einen eigenständigen Titel”, which he (pace Allam) read m3w.

- **3.** Already F. Behnk (1927, 80) has observed (with reservations) the closeness of Eg. mr to Sem. *ʔmr “1. to see, 2. show, say, 3. order” [GT], which is eventually cognate with Eg. m33 “to see” (q.v.). A cognacy with Eg. mr is improbable in view of Cpt. (S) λ-.

nb1: Cf. Akk. (LBab.) amertu “Inspektion, Musterung”, ammāru “Aufseher” [AHW 42–44], Ebl. /ʔamir-um/ “guide” [Frz. 1984, 128, 135] || Hbr. ʔmr qal “1. sprechen, sagen, 2. denken, 3. befehlen” [GB 50] = “1. say, 3. mention, praise, call, assure, 4. think (say to o’self), 5. intend, 6. give orders” [KB 66], BAram. ʔmr “sprechen, sagen”, *mēmār “Wort, Befehl” [GB 912] | OSA: Qtb. ʔmr “1. to proclaim, command, 2. command (of a god), oracle” [Ricks 1982 MS, 16], Sab. ʔmr “1. to proclaim, 2. oracle, command of aged” [Ricks], Ar. ʔmr “ordonner, commander” [BK I 53] = ʔmr “befehlen”, ʔamīr- “Befehlshaber” [GB] = ʔamāra “to command, order”, ʔamīr- “commander, prince” [Hnrg.] || Jbl. ʔmr: ʔōr “to order”, ʔēmṛ “matter, order” [Jns. 1981, 3] = ʔōʔr “to command, order” [Nkn.], Mhr. ʔāmār “matter, order” [Jns. 1987, 6] = hamōr “to command, order” [Nkn.] (MSA: Nakano 1986, 70, #539) || ES (< Ar.): Tigre ʔamr & Tna. ʔamri “order, will” [Lsl. 1982, 6] || SBrb. (from Ar.): EWlm. a-mār & Ayr a-mār “ordonner à (qqn.)” [PAM 2003, 550], Tadghaq & Tudalt a-mār “to order, command” [Sudlow 2001, 144].

nb2: The sense “to order” originates from the primary sense of Sem. *ʔmr “1. to see, 2. (make) know(n), say” [Hnrg. 2000, 2062], cf. Akk. ʔmr “sehen” [AHW 40] || Ug. ʔmr Qt “sichtbar sein, sehen” [WUS #283] || Geez ʔammara “zeigen” [WUS] (Sem.: also DRS 24). J. Barth (1902, 5f.) and P. Haupt (ZDMG 63, 518) assumed an older basic meaning “hoch sein” to be retained by Hbr. ʔmr hitpaʔ “sich erheben, stolz sein” and Ar. ʔmr “groß, viel sein”, cf. Mhr. ʔēmār “hugē” [Jns. 1987, 6].

nb3: H. Möller (1911, 166) equated Sem. *ʔmr with IE *m-r- “verkündigen” (sic).

- **4.** GT: on the other hand, an eventual connection of Eg, mr (*ml?) with Ch. *m-l “chief (Häuptling)” [GT] is not to be excluded.

nb1: Attested in CCh.: Zulgo mala kute [Lks. 1973, 248–9], Hurzo maḥmaḥ hū “chef de village” [Mch.] | Mbara mlí “chef” [TSl 1986, 272, 286] | Gidar mul “chef de village” [Mch.] = múlya [Mch./JI; Skn.] | Masa (“Bana”) múl “Häuptling” [Lks. 1937, 129; Ajl.] = mul “chef de village” [Mch.] = múl-la < *mul-na [Mch./JI] = mùl-là, pl. múlyá-nā “chief” [Jng. 1973 MS] = múl-la “chef” [Ctc. 1983, 108], Gizey & Ham & Musey múl “chef” [Ajl.], Marba ʔàmúl “chef” [Ajl.] (Masa gr.: Ajello 2001, 14; CCh.: Mch. 1953, 185) || ECh.: Kwang mólá “chef” [Jng. 1973 MS, 48] = mùlà-tē “chief” [Jng./JI], Kwang-Mobu mólá-dé [Jng.], (? Kera kú-mná [< *ku-mla?] “chief” [Ebert] | Kabalay kù-màlò [Cpr.], Lele kùr-mbàlò [Gowers], Gabri kà-lmà [met. < *mla] “chef” [Cpr. 1972 MS] | Bdy. mìlo, pl. mele “propriétaire, créateur”, e.g. miloo-čo ʔùlay “chef de terre” [AJ 1989, 99] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 73).

nb2: H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibrizimow (1994 I, 34) set up PCh. *m-l-b “chief” on the basis of NBCh. *malv- “king” [Skn. 1977, 28] = “chief” [JI]. Earlier, H. Jungraithmayr and K. Shimizu (1981, 67A) assumed a bicons. Ch. *m-l- “chief” based on NBCh. *m-l-v vs. C-ECh. *(k)-m-l-(t) vs. WCh. & Jegu *l-m.

nb3: Is the Ch. word related to NBrb.: Shilh ml “to conduct, direct, show” [Aplg. 1958, 61]?

- **5.** GT: alternatively, in spite of Cpt. (S) λ-, cp. perhaps Sem. *marʔ- “1. son, 2. lord, man” [Fox 1998, 18] = *marʔ- & *māriʔ- “1. man, 2. master, lord” [Hnrg. 2000, 2065] = *marʔ- “1. son, 2. man, 3. lord” [Djk.-Kogan 2001, 148, #5] = *marʔ- “man, male” [Kogan 2005, 532, §10].

nb1: Attested in Sem.: PSin. mrʔ (*maruʔ-) “groom” [Alb. 1966, 41], Ug. mrù “to command” [Gordon 1955, 291, #1161] = “Offizier” [WUS #1664] = mrù “Ausübler eines gewissen Berufs, Offizier” [WUS #1661] = mrù, syll. [murʔu] “commander” < (!) ʔmrʔ “to command” [Hnrg. 1987, 148–9] | PArām. *māriʔ- (morphological innovation) [Kogan 2005, 532, §10] > BArām. māreʔ (st.cstr. “Herr” [GB 914] = “lord” [KB 1921], Arām. (inscr.) mr ~ mrʔ “господин, владелец, начальник” [SAN IV 201–2] = (Nabat.) mrʔ “lord, master” [Jobling 1995, 50] = mrʔ “lord, master”, (Official) mr-wt “rule, kingship” [DNWSI 682–9, 691], Samar. Arām. mrʔ “masterdom”, mār “Lord (said about God)” [Tal 2000, 484], JArām. (TTM) māraʔ “Herr” [Dalman 1922, 251] = mār, cstr. māre- “Herr, Besitzer”, mōraʔ or mōrī “herrisch sein, befehlen”, mārōn “Mann, Herr” [Levy 1924 III 233–4, 245] = mar “1. man, lord, master, 2. somebody”, mārūt “authority, dominion” [Jastrow 1950, 834, 840], JPAram. māre “master, owner”, cf. mrw “dominion, control” [Sokoloff 1990, 328–9], JNAram. māra “owner” [Sabar 2002, 210], Syr. mār(ʔ)ā “lord” [Brk. 1928, 401], Mnd. mara ~ maria “Lord, master, owner, possessor”, mariut(a) “lordship, dominion, mastery” [DM 251, 254], Maʔlula ʔmwr: mōra “Herr, Besitzer” [Bergsträsser 1921, 58] (Aram.: Kogan 2005, 532, §10) | OSA: Sab. mrʔ “man, (over)lord, suzerain, social superior, divine lord, male” [SD 87] = “1. man, person, 2. lord (divine or human)” [Biella 1984, 283], Mdb. mrʔ “seigneur” [Arbach 1993, 70], Ar. marʔ- “Mann” [GB] = marʔ- ~ mirʔ- ~ murʔ- “man (vir)”, muruw-w-at- ~ muru/ūʔ-at- “manhood, power, strength, humanity” [Eitan] (Sem.: Frz. 1964, 267, #2.36; AHW 615; Lsl. 1969, 20; Djk. 1970, 472, fn. 86) || NAgaw (< Sem.): Qwara māri “Führer” [Rn. 1885, 100]. The Akk. reflex means “son” (cf. Eg. m3j).

nb2: A. F. Rainey (JNES 24, 18) falsely associated Ug. mrʔ with Akk. (w)arū(m) “to lead”, while M. Dietrich & O. Loretz (OLZ 62, 543) connected it with OAkk. & Mari merḫu ~ Geez marḫa “to lead”. Both etymologies were correctly rejected by J. L. Boyd and J. Huehnergard (1987, 148–9). Others affiliated Sem. *marʔ- with

Sem. *mrʔ “to be fat, strong” (Hoch 1994, 134, §173). A. R. Bomhard (1981, 447): ~ IE *mer-yo- “young man”.

NB3: For the etymology of OT Hbr. ʔimrō “oppressor, violent man” (Job 20:29) see Eitan 1924, 53–56, §xxxv.

NB4: For Sem. *marʔ- cf. also Eg. m.r.t “Hörige” (Wb, below).

NB5: LECu.: Saho & Afar méri “Herrschaft, Steuer an Ägypten” [Rn. 1886, 884; 1890, 271] and Som. mīri “monatlicher Sold an einige Somalischefs von Seite der Regierung ausbezahlt” [Rn. 1902, 300] stem from vulg. Ar. mīriyy “1. appartenant à l’émir, au prince, au gouvernement, 2. fisc” [BK II 1172].

NB6: Any connection to WCh.: Guus (Sigīdi) mur “possessor, owner” [Caron 2001, 29] || CCh.: Ktk. mārə “propriétaire” [Bouny 1978, 109] || ECh.: Nāncere māri “Sultan” [Lks. 1937, 90] (< Ar.ʔ?)

- **6.** GT: or perhaps connected with SBrb.: EWlm. maṛāw “autoriser, donner la permission à, etc.” [PAM 2003, 554] ||| HECu.: Sid. murr-isa “to order, command”, murr-ičča (m) “lit.: one who gives orders: a member of the clan (sēra) who has the task of giving order on the occasion of wiʔla, or when a house has to be built, or for a sēra work” [Gsp. 1983, 242–3] = murr-is- “to order” [Hds. 1989, 108, 387: isolated in HECu.] ||| NOm.: Dorze & Sns. mura “chief” [Alm. 1993, 6]?
- **7.** H. Brugsch (Wb I 668, 1867) compared it with Sem. *mlʔ assuming a far-fetched semantic shift from “voll, angefüllt sein wovon” to “Besitzer von etwas sein” > “Besitzer, Verfüger, Vorsteher, Anführer von etwas”. Rightly rejected by H. Goedicke (1998, 102) pace A. H. Gardiner (1902-3, 142-4).
- **8.** A. M. Lam (1993, 401) equated it with Ful (Pulaar) maro “le gardien”, yamir- “donner l’ordre”, which is, however, as pointed out by H. Tourneux (2000, 93), an Arabism (cf. Ar. ʔamara misquoted with ʕ-).

mr (GW) “Adverb, vielleicht der Zeit: früher (?), im Gegensatz zu jetzt (?)” (late NK: Pap. Bibl. Nat. 197/8, Wb II 108, 12) = “earlier, formerly” (DLE I 225) = “früher, *drüben, jenseits” (GHWb 347).

NB: W. Spiegelberg’s (KHW 63) derivation of Dem. r-mr < (S) ʕ-MHP “jenseits” from mr was rejected in Wb (cf. Vrg. 1950, 291).

● Origin disputed:

- **1.** A. Erman (Wb l.c.) and W. Helck (1962, 560, #94; 1971, 513, #94): borrowed from Hbr. ʔe/itmōl, which they suggestively divided as ʔet-mōl pretending that Eg. *ml represented an innovative back-formation.

NB1: Sem. *tml (with *t- as a root radical) is attested in Akk. timāli/u “gestern”, hence itimāli < ina timāli [AHW 1359] || Hbr. ʔe/itmōl “1. gestern, 2. schon, früher, längst” tāmō/ol “yesterday (gestern)” [GB 78, 881; KB 103, 1746], Amarna tumāl [Knudtzen 1915, 1532], Syr. tāmāl vs. ʔetmāli “yesterday” [KB], Mnd. ʕtmal “yesterday” [DM 1963, 358b] || Geez tāmālōm “yesterday, eve” [Lsl.] = tēmālēm [KB], Tigre tāmale ~ mali “yesterday” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 575–6).

NB2: A. Caquot (1954–57, 97) affiliated Sem. *tml with Hbr. mūl (prep.) “in front of” (discussed below), which is not generally accepted in Sem. linguistics.

- **2.** GT: borrowed from a source close to or identical with OHbr. mūl (prep.) “vor, gegenüber von, unterhalb (einer Gegend)” [GB 405] = “1. front (n.), 2. (prep.) opposite” [KB 556]?

NB: The origin of this prep. is highly debated: (1) P. Haupt (AJSL 22, 1905–6, 150, 253, Caquot l.c.; cf. also GB 405): < *mā-ʔōl from Hbr. √ʔwl “vorne sein”; (2) P. Lacau (1970, 88, §228): ~ Hbr. mwl qal “to circumcise” [KB 555]; (3) Ar. myl “to bow down”, mayl- “inclination towards”; (4) GT: perhaps a distinct root from the AA heritage, cf. SCu.: Asa mile-k “the day before yesterday, after tomorrow” [Flm.] (Cu.: Dlg. 1973, 194) || SOM.: Ari mā̄l, Dime mel-o “outside” (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 155).

- **3.** WBrb.: Zng. √m-r: mār “débuter dans une action (verbe aux.)” [Ncl. 1953, 211] ||| CCh.: Musgu-Puss marai “früher, ehemals” [MB 1972 MS, 3].

mr (GW) “Art Nutzholz” (hapax under Thotmes III: Pap. BM 10056, Wb II 108, 13) = “a Syrian timber out of which the specially large ḫst.t planks were made, clearly the name of a particularly good, and therefore foreign wood” (Glanville 1932, 13, §19).

- Origin obscure. Seems to be a loan-word.

NB: As rightly stressed by S. R. K. Glanville (l.c.), it is to be distinguished from Eg. mrw “ein Nadelholz” (OK, Wb, q.v.) = “morus (?)” (Glanville). A. R. Bomhard (1984, 274, #285) and V. Blažek (1990, 208, #282) affiliated it with IE *mar- “black/mulberry” < Nst. *marya “berry (ягода)” [IS 1976, §282], which is perfectly baseless. GT: equally dubious is any connection to LECu.: Som. maráy-o (var. muráyo, murayo) “ein Baum, welcher Harz und eßbare Früchte gibt” [Rn. 1902, 303].

***mr** (hardly *mḥr) word deduced from the phon. value mr of the hrgl. U23 depicting a “pointed instrument with wooden handle of peculiar shape (showing that it is to be worked by hand) of rushes (?) bound together: apparently a chisel or borer to be worked by hand, connected with drilling or piercing (not struck with the hammer)” (Griffith 1898, 49) = “chisel (?)” (Ember 1917, 21; EG 1927, 503) = “Werkzeug (die älteste Form): zweifellos ein Meißel, bestehend aus dem Handgriff in Gestalt eines Kegelstumpfes und einer verschieden breiten, zugespitzten, angebundenen oder eingelassenen Klinge; hieraus die Form des AR & MR: ein gut in der Hand liegender Griff in der Form eines umgekehrten Kelches, der sich nach der Klinge hin so verbreitert, daß die Hand nicht abgleiten kann; am freien Ende ist eine Scheibe als Schlagfläche so aufgesetzt, daß die Hand unter ihr geschützt liegt; ... die Klinge, lang, mit geschweiften Rändern, endet in eine rhombische Spitze oder in eine breite Schneide, sie ist in den Griff eingelassen” (Wreszinski 1932, 133–4 after Petrie) = “hand chisel (in the OK with a projection at the front of the handle provided to

keep the thumb from slipping, in the 18th Dyn. in a slightly different form with a narrow cap at the top)” (Fischer 1983, 45, #U23) = “Grabstichel, Meißel” (Westendorf 1989, 75).

NB1: As stressed by W. Wreszinski (l.c.), it is to be distinguished from the hrgl. U23 with the phon. value 3b (the two were confused already in the OK), which originally depicted “a pin for holding a lock of hair (perhaps the loop was intended for holding the end of a strand of hair which was to be wound around it)” (Weigall 1911–12, 176, §13) = “eine Haarnadel (aus Elfenbein)” (Wreszinski).

NB2: Not clear if the MK hapax mr.t “mortier” (Jéquier 1921, 298) = “*Mörser” (GHWb 347: “*Existenz des Wortes nicht gesichert*”) represents the same word.

NB3: Often identified with the second element of the PN n^r-mr rendered very diversely (and rather unconvincingly in most of the cases): (1) “Cleaving Catfish” based on Eg. mr “chisel” (Goldwasser 1992, 68); (2) “wütender Wels (angry catfish)” (Kaplony, *Orientalia* 34, 1965, 132f.) = “schlimmer Wels (malapterus electricus)” (Beckerath apud Gdk.), cf. Eg. mr “krank > schlimm” (q.v.); (3) “Der Befehlshaber unter der mr.w-Mannschaft” < Eg. n^r “Tätigkeit: gackern” (sic!) ~ Eg. Ar. na^rar “Schrei des Viehes, Gebrüll” (MK, cf. Wb II 209, 7) + Eg. mr.w “mercenaire” < mr “Hacke” etc. (Moftah 1987, 128), perfectly false; (4) “excellent warrior (of Horus)” (sic), where mr is read mnḥ (Goedicke 1995, 82–83); (5) “Dappled One” based on reading -mr as s3b (Ray 2003).

NB4: J. F. Quack (2003, 113–6) argued for a phon. value mḥr of U23 based on 3 dubious exx.: (1) Eg. mr “pyramid” > Ar. haram- (not clear how this uncertain etymology might be suggesting to read in fact *mḥr); (2) Eg. mr “krank” reflected by Dem. mhl (Tebtunis onomasticon) ~ mhr (Pap. Carlsberg 304, 3:5) as well as CT V 113b (T1C) hm.r.t (usually considered an error for mr.t, cf. AECT II 32, spell 397, n. 91: “ḥ in T1C is surely a misreading of original mr...”), although its rendering “Pain” (AECT) is not at all certain (cf. T1Be mrḥ.tj pointing to a distinct lexeme); (3) Eg. smr “friend” written shmr in the Onomasticon of Amenope (Pap. Golenischeff 1:14, cf. AEO I 20*, fn. a: -ḥ- is “intrusive and meaningless”), explained with the Dem. gloss smḥ3 in the Tebtunis onomasticon (Osing 1998 I, 172, 178, n. s) as well as in Dem. Pap. Wien 6319, 1:16.

● Etymology uncertain.

- 1. W. Westendorf (1989, 75) derived it from an unattested Eg. *mr “stechen” assuming a connection to Eg. mr “krank” (!) on the analogy of Eg. nq^r.wt “stechende Schmerzen” < nq^r “ritzen, schneiden”. Far-fetched, since the we are not dealing here with the very same semantic shift.
- 2. F. L. Griffith (1898, 49): “*being constructed by binding the tool may have received its name*” from Eg. mr “to bind”.
- 3. A. Ember (1917, 21) and W. F. Albright (1918, 98, fn. 1) equated it with Sem.: Amh. märo “chisel” [Lsl.] = márō “chisel” [Ember, Alb.], which is to be identified with ES: Gurage: Chaha & Ezha & Masqan m^warä, Ennemor & Endegeny & Gyeto & Selti & Wolane märo, Goggot & Soddo märä “chisel” (ES: Lsl. 1979 III, 418). Cognateship uncertain.

NB: As pointed out by W. Leslau (1979 III, 418; 1987, 265), the Amh. word comes from an ancient var. mähro ~ mähro [Dillmann 1865, 588], while the Gurage words too are supposed to derive from a nomen instr. *mā-hra/āw [Praetorius 1879, 157] of *√hrw, cf. Geez ḥarāwä “to pierce, perforate, make a hole, engrave, carve, chisel,

make a sketch, dig (out)” [Lsl.]. This analysis proves that the similarity of Eg. *mr and ES “chisel” is purely accidental. Note that Geez marawa “to perforate, drill a hole” [Lsl. 1987, 361] is treated by W. Leslau as a denom. verb deriving from Amh. māro “chisel”.

- **4.** GT: cp. perhaps SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr mǎrmǎr “graver (dessin, en bois, metal, pierre), être gravé”, EWlm. a-sǎ-mmarmǎr & Ayr ə-sə-mmǎrmǎr “1. outil servant à graver, burin, ciseau, 2. fer de gaufrage, gaufroir (pour métal, cuir)” [PAM 1998, 222; 2003, 553] || ECu. *mur- “to cut” [GT] (discussed s.v. m3) vs. HECu.: Hdy. omār- “to pierce” [Hds. 1989, 112] || SCu.: (?) Asa marama-ok “awl” [Ehr.] || CCh.: Ktk. *m-r (?) “axe” [GT]: Gulfei mio ~ mir, Kuseri moröo, mörəyo (Ktk.: Prh. 1972, 11, #1.5 & 57, #31.10)?

NB1: Ch. Ehret (1980, 159, #47) derived the Asa word from SCu. *mūr- based on the false equation of Brg. murta “quiver of arrows” and Ma’a lumurá “needle” (borrowed ultimately from Ar!).

NB2: VJa. Porhomovskij (l.c.) falsely explained the CCh. forms from his PKtk. *mšVn,(V) “топор”.

- **5.** GT: or cf. perhaps Ar. √myl: mīl- “1. aiguille avec laquelle on applique le collyre sur le bord des paupières, 2. poinçon, 3. burin” [BK II 1174–5]?

- **6.** GT: less probable is a relationship with Sem. *mll “to scrape” [GT].

NB: Attested in Ug. mll G “to caress, pinch, rub (?)”, mll “waste, scraps (?)” [DUL 558], Hbr. mll qal “(mit den Füßen) scharren” [GB 431] = “to scrape” [KB 594], NHbr. mll “zerreiben” [GB] = “to rub away between the fingers” [KB] = mll qal “1. (zer)reiben, zerbröckeln”, hence: memel “Preßstein, Preßbalken (eig. Zerreibendes, Zermalmendes), insbes. Bestandteil der Kelter, vermittelt dessen die Oliven zermalmten und gepreßt wurden” [Levy 1924 III 133, 141] = mll qal “to crush, squeeze, esp. rub ears for husking the grain”, memel “crushing tool, press-beam (or stone) for olives, mill” [Jastrow 1950, 792] || Geez malala “to plane (a board), smooth with a plane” [Lsl. 1987, 344], Amh. mlml “to hew, trim, prune (a tree)” [Lsl.], cf. Tigre melal ~ miläl “painting stick” [Lsl. 1982, 51].

- **7.** R. Mofteh (1987, 139, fn. 22) equated mr “Meißel, Sichel” (sic) with Eg. mr “Hacke” (rendered also “Pflug”) and even Brb. (sic) e-mir-an “Sichel” & Ar. mar?- “man” (sic). Absurd.

mr “1. körperlich krank sein, leiden, 2. schmerzhaft, schlimm” (PT, Wb II 95) = “1. sick, ill, diseased, 2. painful” (FD 110) = “1. schmerzen, krank sein, Schmerzen haben, 2. schmerzen, schmerzhaft sein, 3. krank sein, 4. seelisch, schlimm sein, 6. *schwierig, mühsam sein” (GHWb 344) = “schlimm, schmerzhaft” (FÄW 184) > Dem. mr “to be anxious, grieve” (Smith & Hughes 1980, 142, n. p pace Glanville) = “betrübt sein” (Thissen 1984, 76, cf. Vittmann, Enchoria 10, 1980, 136; Smith, Serapis 6, 142) > OCpt. (Pap. BM 10808) ⲙⲟⲩⲣ “krank, schmerzhaft, schlimm” (Osing 1976, 109; NBÄ 188) = “krank sein” (KHW 520).

NB1: J. F. Quack (2003, 114, §2) tried to rewrite the phon. value of the hrgl. U23 as mhr. One of his arguments was Eg. mr “krank”: (1) glossed with Dem. mhl ~ mhl in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998, 71, 73, n. ao & 218: “*der Grund der Entstehung des zusätzlichen h bzw. h ist unklar*”); (2) cf. ibidem mr-nsr “Name des 8. Tores der Unterwelt: Die mit schmerzhafter Feuersglut” glossed with Dem. mhl-nslj (Osing 1998, 201–3); (3) reflected by [mh]r in Pap. Carlsberg 304, 3:5; (4) attested in CT V 113b (T1C) as hm̄r.t usually considered an error for mr̄.t (cf. AECT II 32, spell 397, n. 91: “*h in T1C is surely a misreading of original mr...*”), whose rendering as “Pain” (AECT) is, however, not at all certain (cf. T1Be mrh̄. tj pointing to a distinct lexeme). Quack’s GR exx. for a rare interchange of mr- ~ mh- in epithets are even less convincing.

NB2: W. A. Ward (1961, 36, §16) assumed a primary sense “to be strong” appearing in Sinuhe B132–4 (jb nb mr.w n=j “every heart was strong for me”) and Wenamon 2:67–68 (n3 md.t j.dd.w n=f jw=w mr “the things that were said to him were strong”), but D. Pardee (1978, 255) rightly rendered these and further exx. as occurrences of a metaphorical use “compassion, distress” deriving from the basic mng. “sick, displeasing, disagreeable”. P. Kaplony (1965, 142) rendered n̄r-mr as “der wütende Wels” suggesting an early shift of mng. of √mr, which requires further evidence.

- Hence: mr.t “1. Krankheit, 2. Böses, Schlimmes” (PT, Wb II 96, 6–12) > OCpt. (Pap. BM 10808) mre^o “Schlimmes” (Osing 1976, 66; NBÄ 142; KHW 519). Cf. Dem. mr.w (pl.) “das Unglück (?)” (Spg.) = “malheurs, catastrophes, maux” (Pap. Leiden I 384 rt., Cenival 1984, 224, L1).

NB1: The fem. form was vocalized as *m̄ r.ēt “Böses” (Osing l.c.).

NB2: W. A. Ward (1980, 357–360, cf. AEB 34, #80.222) erroneously assumed a number of further derivatives, e.g. hr̄j-mrj.t “crocodile” (!), mr(j) “fighting bull”, mr-wr “Mnevis” (cf. the resp. entries).

- Probably cognate with NBrb.: Shilh: Tazerwalt ta-märr-it “pain, agony” [Stumme 1899, 230] | Wrg. i-mur-ən (pl. tante) “contraintes, douleurs de femme enceinte” [Dlh. 1987, 194] | Qbl. √m-r: u-mr-an (pl. tante) “chagrins, peines”, a-mur, pl. i-mur-en “colique, mal de ventre”, a-mrir “1. embarras, 2. grandes difficultés” [Dlt. 1982, 513] ||| LECu.: Oromo marar “rattristarsi” [Crl.] = “to be sick” [Lsl.], Baiso marni “to be sad” [HL 1988, 129] | HECu.: Sidamo marar-s- “addolorare” [Crl. 1938 II, 215] = marar-s “to be sick” [Lsl.] = marar- “to have pity, be sad” [Hds. 1989, 385] ||| NOM.: Yemsa mer-o “illness” [Wdk. 1990, 131] = mer-ò “1. Krankheit, 2. Schmerz” [Lmb. 1993, 366].

AP: Surma: Longarim & Murle k-omor, am̄r “sick” (Flm. 1983, 462).

NB1: J. Delheure (1987, 194) explained NBrb.: Wrg. i-mur-ən (pl.) from ta-mara “force subie, contrainte, nécessité”, which, however, represents a distinct root, although here too, the semantic shift “force” ~ “suffering” is attested, cf. NBrb.: Sgrs. ta-mara “peine, difficulté” [Pellat 1955, 105], Rif ta-mara “souffrance” [Tilmatine 1998, 62] | Mzg. ta-mara “1. force, 3. peine physique, 4. misère, 5. pauvreté, gêne, 6. adversité, difficulté” [Tf. 1991, 427], Izdeg ta-mara “affliction” [Mrc. 1937, 14]. Elsewhere, *ta-mara denotes “force”.

NB2: Cf. also NBrb.: Rif a-meruq (extension -q?) “больной (ill)” [IS].

NB3: Obscure whether Qbl. meṛṛeṛ “1. importuner, 2. frustrer, léser” [Dlt. 1982, 511] is related.

NB4: The ECu. root has been explained by E. Cerulli (l.c.) from ES *mrr “amarum esse”.

NB5: M. Bechhaus-Gerst (l.c.) equated the Eg-Shilh parallel also with LECu.: Arb. bīra “ache” [Hyw. 1984, 348] | HECu. *bōr- “to be impure” [Hds. 1989, 406], which is false.

NB6: Interesting to observe the parallelism of AA *m-r “sick” [GT] vs. AA *m-y (?) “sick” [GT] > LECu.: Rnd. máy “mild illness, slight sickness” [PG 1999, 222] || CCh.: Masa mòy “maladie” [Ctc. 1983, 107] || ECh.: Gadang mòyò “sickness” [Jng. 1977, 10, #222] | Sokoro móyo, moi “krank (?)” [Lks. 1937, 36]. AP: PKuliak *may “sick” [Flm. 1983, 462].

- The following isoglosses may eventually be akin to the underlying AA root *m-r (above) on a biconsonantal basis:

(1) Brb. *m-r-y “to be difficult, painful” [GT]: NBrb.: Mzg mray “être difficile, pénible, 2. être dur, ardu, 3. être incommode” [Tf. 1991, 433] | Iznasen √m-m-r: e-mmra “être difficile, pénible”, ta-mmara “moment difficile, passe pénible” [Rns. 1932, 390] | Qbl. √m-r-y: e-mri “1. être tourmenté, troublé, 2. tourmenter”, cf. a-mray “être difficile, lourd, grave” [Dlt. 1982, 518] || EBrb.: Ghadames ə-mray “1. être douloureux, 2. faire souffrir, être pénible” [Lanfry 1973, 217, #1027] || SBrb.: Ghat e-mri “être difficile” [Nhl. 1909, 151].

(2) Sem. *mʔr: Hbr. mʔr hifil part. mamʔir, fem. mamʔeret “bösertig (vom Aussatze)” [GB 394] = “painful, malignant” [KB 541] | Ar. maʔir- “difficile”, cf. maʔira “2. se rouvrir, être en recrudescence (une plaie)” [BK II 1052] = maʔira “to open (a wound)” [KB].

NB: Whether SCU.: Asa maʔara “weak” [Ehret 1980, 343, #13] || ECh.: Bidiya meer [-ee- < -VʔV-?] “s’émousser” [AJ 1989, 98] = “to become weak” [Stl.] are also cognate is highly dubious. Ch. Ehret (l.c.) equated the Asa word with Irq. morq-ot- “to be dull”, which is equally uncertain.

(3) LECu.: Orm. mārē “kind of smallpox (attacks cattle and humans)” [Gragg 1982, 271] | HECu.: Hdy. māriyye & Sid. māriyye (f) “smallpox” [Hds. 1989, 137] || ECh.: EDng. mārārā (f) “la maladie des poules” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 196].

Lrr.: Lsl. 1949, 315, #481 (Eg-ECu.); IS 1976, #293 (Eg-ʔRif); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 3 (Eg-Ghadames); HSED (Eg-Bdy.-Asa-Orm.); BG 1998, 121, §2 (Eg-Shilh).

- Other etymologies cannot be taken into account:

- 1. Eg. mr has been usually combined with Common Sem. *mrđ (*mrš) “to be sick, ill” [SED] = *marid- “malato, penoso” [Frz.] (Sem.: GB 463; WUS #1683; Frz. 1964, 163, #2.12; Lsl. 1968, 359, #1555; Meparišvili 1987, 18, §3; Voigt 1992, 38; SED II 303–4, #42).

Lrr. for Eg-Sem.: Ember 1911, 93, #10, fn. 3; 1917, 86, #120; Holma 1919, 38; Clc. 1936, #50; Vrg. 1945, 136, #9.c.3; Chn. 1947, #481; Vcl. 1966, 247; 1990, 106; IS 1976, #293; Bmh. 1981, 447; 1984, 273; Bmh. 1990, 391; Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 3.

NB1: There is no match for Sem. *-đ in Eg. mr; therefore there can be no talk of a direct identification of Sem. *mrđ vs. Eg. mr. Nevertheless, it may not be excluded that the 3rd cons. of Sem. *mrđ was a root complement, the underlying bicons. root deriving from AA *m-r “ill” [GT] (discussed above).

nb2: Note, however, that there is no convincing inner Sem. evidence for a bicons. origin of Sem. *mrđ. It has hardly anything to do with Sem. *mrr “bitter” or Ar. mrh (below) as suggested in Philippi 1875, 87–88; Ember 1911, 93 & fn. 3; Holma 1919, 38; GÄSW #50; Vrg. 1945, 136, #9.c.3; Cohen 1947, #481; IS 1976, #293. Similarly false is the idea of H. Möller (1911, 165) who affiliated Sem. *mrđ on a bicons. basis e.g. with Ar. mrrm “to become smooth”, mrr “to go (away), pass (away, on)”, mrd & mrt “to macerate (a thing in water)”, mrrn “to be(come) smooth with a degree of hardness”.

nb3: A. Drexel (1925, 14) erroneously equated Hbr. mrš “krank sein” with WCh.: Hausa mārwaá “2. a serious quarrel, angry disputing and arguing, 3. any sudden dazedness or giddiness” [Brg.] = “2. bickering” [Abr.] misquoted by him as mārwaá “Pein, Angst” (sic), although its basic meaning is quite different: “1. serious tangling of two or more well-ropes let down simultaneously” [Brg. 1934, 776] = “1. tangling of several well-ropes” [Abr. 1962, 660].

nb4: H. Möller (1911, 165) combined Sem. bicons. *mr- with IE *m-r- (sic) “zerreiben, weich sein” (ext. *-k, *-H, *-d, *-ġ, *-g, *-s) > “sterben” (!). False. A.R. Bomhard (l.c.) equated Eg. mr and Sem. *mrđ with IE *mer- “to die”.

- 2. Eg. mr has been compared (often together with Sem. *mrđ or Ar. mrh) also with Sem. *mrr “to be bitter” [Frz. 1964, 267, #2.39], cf. e.g. Hbr. mrr qal “1. to be bitter, 2. desperate, bewildered”, hifil “to cause bitterness, grief, embitter etc.” [KB 638] || Gafat (at)mirrärä “irriter, mettre en colère” [Lsl. 1956, 217] (Sem.: Frz. 1964, 267, #2.39; Crl. 1938 II, 215; Lsl. 1969, 20). But the semantic connection of “ill” and “bitter” is not evident as rightly noted by C. T. Hodge (1976, 20, fn. 43). Rejected by Th. Schneider (1993, 81).

Lr. for Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1911, 93, fn. 3; 1917, 86, #120; Holma 1919, 38; Clc. 1936, #50; Chn. 1947, #481; Lsl. 1949, 315, #481; Vrg. 1945, 136, #9.c.3; Ward 1961, 36, #16; 1980, 357–360; Pardee 1978, 256 (with reservations); Vernus 2000, 187.

nb1: Sem. *mrr has fully different AA cognates: Eg. ʿm3 [ʿmrr] “vom sauer werden des Biers” (PT, Wb I 185, 1) = “to grow sour (of beer)” (CT I 284d, DCT 71) || NBrb. *m-r-γ [GT: compl. *-γ?]: Mzg. m-r-γ: i-mriy “1. être amer (par excès de sel), 2. être saumâtre, trop salé” [Taiñ 1991, 430–1] | Qbl. i-mriy “1. être amer (par excès de sel), 2. être saumâtre” [Dlt. 1982, 516–7] || WCh.: PAngas *mer > *mer “sour” [GT 2004, 246]: Angas meer “acid, sour, vinegar” [Flk. 1915, 244] = méér ~ mér (K) “sauer, sour”, mér-mér “very sour”, cf. mér-wér “tiny flying insects which are attracted by sour food, beer, etc.” [Jng. 1962 MS, 25] = mer “bitter” (so!) [Grb. 1962, 85] = [mér] “sour” [Brq. 1971, 30] = mer “sour” [ALC 1978, 38] = mer [mér] “sourness” [Krf.] || CCh.: Bura-Margi *m“a-m“al- [-l- reg. < Ch. *-r-] “sourness” [GT]: Wamdiu momolu, Hildi mwömwálu, Kilba mwömwólú | Fali-Bwagira marin “bitterness” (Ch.: Kraft 1981, #289 & #290) < AA *m-r “sour, bitter” [GT]. See OS 1990, 82, #2 (Angas-Sem.); OS 1992, 201 (Angas-Eg.); HSED #1734 (Eg.-Angas-Sem.).

nb2: F. W. M. Philippi (1875, 88–87) falsely derived Sem. *mrr “bitter sein”, Ar. mrrm “rinnen, fließen”, Ar. mrr “1. vorübergehen, 2. binden, fesseln”, Hbr. mr? “stark, fest, fett, gesund, kräftig sein”, Ar. mrh “krank sein”, Hbr. mrh “widerspenstig sein”, Sem. *mrđ “krank sein” etc. from a common bicons. PSem. *mar “streich/fen, straff/mm sein” (sic). For Sem. *mrr ~ Ar. mrh cf. also Lsl. 1949, 315, #481.

nb3: W. A. Ward (1961, 36, #16; 1980, 357–360) explained both Sem. *mrr “to be bitter” and Eg. mr “krank sein” from a primary sense “harsh, violent strength” based on 2 Eg. exx. (above) and Job 13:26 (mārōrōt “string things”), respectively. P. Vernus (2000, 187) also defined the mng. of the Eg. root as “être piquant, amer, douloureux” (sic), which is far-fetched. As correctly pointed out by D. Pardee (1978, 256), “there is no trace in Egyptian of a sense ‘strengthen’...”, while, in his view, the seman-

tic development “bitter” → “strong” in the Sem. exx. (below) was restricted just to certain idioms (Pardee 1978, 274–6). B. Margalit (1983, 70), however, defended the etymologically distinct status of Sem. *mrr “bitter” vs. Sem. *mrr “strong”. L. Kutler (1984, 111–8) too maintained the shift from “bitter” to “strong” (or *vice versa!*) in all the levels of OT Hbr. as well as in Sem. The etymological connection of Sem. *mrr “bitter” vs. “strong” has been frequently maintained in Sem. lexicography (Gordon 1955, 291–2, #1170; Ward l.c.; Dietrich & Loretz & Sanmartín 1973, 119–122; Pardee 1978, 249–288; Masson 1991, 92; KB 638; DUL 577). Note that the basic sense of the Sem. root was etymologized in BK II 1084 from Ar. mrr X “3. être tordu avec force, recevoir quelques tours de plus pour être solide (se dit d’une corde), de là: être ferme, constant” (representing a distinct AA root, cf. Eg. mr “binden”, q.v.), which É. Masson (1991, 92) extended even to Sem. *mrr “to be bitter”. Dubious.

NB4: Sem. *mrr “to be strong”, however, seems to represent a distinct AA root, cf. Akk. marāru “i.a. to prevail, be strong” [Kutler 1984, 117 after AHW 613–4; CAD m1, 267–8] > (LBab.) marmar(r)u “stark” [AHW 612] = marmāru (LL) “strong person” [CAD m1, 284], Mari Akk. marru “strong (weapons)” [Kutler 1984, 117] || Ug. mr “to strengthen, bless, commend” [Gordon 1955, 291–2, #1170; Segert 1984, 193; Kutler 1984, 117] = “Stärke verleihen, segnen” [WUS #1659] = “to strengthen” [DUL 577], cf. Hbr. mārārī (PN) “strong” [KB 639] | Ar. mrr X “3. être ferme, constant, 4. durer, continuer”, mirr-at- “3. force d’intelligence, 4. fermeté, constance”, marīr- “1. forte, robuste, solide (homme), 2. ferme, constant, persévérant”, ʔamarru “plus solide, plus ferme”, mirar- ~ ʔamrār- ~ marīr- “force, vigueur du corps” [BK II 1084–5], Thamudi PN mrr “Stärke” [Shatnawī 2002, 740], ʕaʕdah marrah “sehr” [Behnstedt 1987, 302] || Hrs. merrēt “strength” [Jns. 1977, 89], cf. Mhr. amrīr “to give so. courage, embolden” [Jns. 1987, 268] (Sem.: Shatnawī 2002, 740) || NBrb.: Mzg. ta-mara “1. force, 2. obligation, contrainte, 3. peine physique, misère, 4. pauvreté, gêne, 5. adversité, difficulté” [Tf. 1991, 427] | Wrg. ta-mara “force subie, contrainte, nécessité” [Dlh. 1987, 194] | Qbl. marī “2. se forcer”, ta-mara “obligation, nécessité” [Dlt. 1982, 512], Bugi ʔe-mara “violence” [Bst. 1890, 313] || SBrb.: Hgr. tā-māra, pl. ti-mār-iw-in “force, puissance d’action” [Fed. 1951–2, 1221], EWlm. & Ayr tā-māra “1. force, puissance d’action, 2. personne notable” [PAM 1998, 221; 2003, 549], Tudalt & Tadghaʕ tā-māra “eminent, powerful” [Sudlow 2001, 267] || Guanche: Canar. ta-mor-an “tierra de valientes” [Wlf. 1955, 122, §5] || LECu.: (?) Afār maʕar ~ -l (-ʕ- obscure) “strength, force” [PH 1985, 168] || SCu.: Maʕa muḷu (muru) “können (?)” [Mnh. 1906, 315] = -mūru “to be able, have power to” [Ehret 1980, 159, #49 with false etym.] || NŌm.: perhaps Yemsa mer- “1. besiegen, 2. schlagen (in einem Kampf), 3. gewinnen” [Lmb. 1993, 366] || WCh.: (?) Hausa määre “to recover (from illness, disgrace, fright, indigence, etc.)” [Abr. 1962, 658] || CCh.: Mafa maray “tout être de grosse taille” [Br̄t.-Bléis 1990, 231] | Musgu miria “kräftig” [Lks. 1937, 142]. For this AA etymology see HSED #1737 (Sem.-Hausa); Blz. 1999, 66, #70 (Sem.-Eg.).

- **3. H. Holma’s comparison of Eg. mr with Ar. mariha “krank sein (vom Auge)”, marih- “krank (überhaupt)” [Holma] (frequently echoed in the lit.) is also false.**

LIT. for Eg.-Ar.: Holma 1919, 38; Clc. 1936, #50; Vrg. 1945, 136, #9.c.3; Chn. 1947, #481; Lsl. 1949, 315, #481; IS 1976, #293; HSED #1736.

NB1: The basic sense of the Sem. root was quite different: Ar. mariha “être terne, sans éclat (se dit des yeux), marih- “faible, abattu”, murh-at- “blanc pur, couleur blanche sans aucun mélange” [BK II 1096–7]. Besides, Sem. -h vs. Eg. -Ø do not correspond unless Ar. -h is a secondary root extension.

NB2: For the (false) bicons. comparison of Ar. mrd and mrh cf. already Philippi 1875, 88; Holma 1919, 38. For Sem. *mrr ~ Ar. mrh cf. Lsl. 1949, 315, #481.

NB3: Mnd. mahra “maladie” is also unrelated, deriving from $\sqrt{hr} > \text{JAram.}$ (Targum) ʔahārē “exciter, irriter” (DRS 446)

- **4.** J. Vergote (1945, 136, #9.c.3) and W. Westendorf (1962, 29, §46. c.5) equated Eg. mr with Eg. mn (above) assuming an interchange of $r \sim n$.
- **5.** W. Westendorf (1989, 75) affiliated it with Eg. mr “Meißel” (q.v.) deriving both from the *Grundbedeutung* “stechen”.
- **6.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 200) equated Eg. mr mistakenly with reflexes of Ch. *m-(w)-t “to die” [JI 1994 I, 47] where the shift *-t > -r had taken place.
NB: Cf. e.g. WCh.: Dera mūr- [Jng.] || CCh.: Bcm. mbúrò [Skn.] | Musgu mára [Krause] = miri [Décorse] = m-r- [Trn.] || ECh.: Somray mār [Jng.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 102–3).
- **7.** Th. Schneider (1993, 81; 1997, 198, #34) equated Eg. mr with Hbr. ʔml qal “sich schlaff senken (von den Pflanzen), verwelken”, pulal “verwelken (von Pflanzen), vertrocknen” [GB 48, 430] = “fiebrig sein” [Snd.] | Ar. mll “gebeugt sein, sich hinschleppen” [GB] = mll “verdrossen, müde sein”, mulāl- “krankhafte Unruhe, Fieberhitze” [Wehr] “heat of fever”. Similarly, Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 202, #1792) combined Eg. mr with ECu.: Dullay: Harso & Dbs. & Glg. malāl- “1. schwach werden, 2. zusammenbrechen (Mensch), 3. nicht können” [AMS 1980, 174, 212]. Both etymologies are dubious semantically and also because of OCpt. -p.
NB: Ehret (l.c.) compared also Ar. mald- “tendre, délicat (de corps)” [BK II 1146] = “soft and delicate” [Ehr].

mr “Pyramide” (OK, Wb II 94, 14–16).

NB1: Part of the hrgl. O24 represents “le rectangle, une base comme représentation du mur qui enlôt le tombeau (?)” $\approx \text{τεμένοϛ}$ (Gilbert 1935, 155–6).

NB2: J. F. Quack (2003, 113–4, §1) reconstructed the phon. value of the hrgl. U23 (chisel, above) partly on the basis of mr “pyramid” which he erroneously read as mhr purely because of its supposed (albeit disputable) connection with Ar. haram- (below). Unconvincing, since there is no inner Eg. evidence for -h- in *this* lexeme.

NB3: Whether Gk. πυραμίς contains the same word is not certain. The old Greek popular etymology ($\pi\upsilon\rho$ “fire” or $\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ “wheat”) is evidently false. The derivation from Cpt. $\Pi\text{-}$ + Ar. ḥarama “to be sacred” (de Sacy) or Cpt. $\Pi\text{-}$ or $\pi\upsilon\rho$ “fire” + Gk. ʕūr-ʕamūd “fire-column” (Hager) is equally improbable. K. Lang (1923–24, 551–3) and W. Schenkel (1997, 328, fn. 8) assumed a compound reflecting Cpt. $\Pi\text{-}$ (“strong” form of the def. article $\Pi\text{-}$), i.e., * pi-mar > via met. * pi-ram (Lange) = * p-3-mār (Snk.), where Gk. $\pi\upsilon\text{-}$ < * pi- may have been influenced by a Greek Volksetymologie ($\pi\upsilon\rho$ or $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$). J. F. Quack (2003, 114, fn. 6) explained Gk. πυραμίς via * p3-hrm < * p3-mhr .

NB4: The same uncertainty pertains to the origin of Ar. haram-, pl. ʔahrām- \sim hirām- “pyramide de l’Égypte” [BK II 1415], which is explained in the traditional popular etymology from Ar. harim- “1. très-vieux, décrépît” [BK]. Instead, D. H. Müller (1876) supposed Ar. haram- to have originally denoted a “tall building” deriving from Sem. * rwm (cf. the town Haram in Yemen with a famous building

erected by the Himyarite kings). K. Lang (l.c.), in turn, saw in it the Hbr. article *ha-* + Eg. *mr*, which is rather anachronistic. Its connection to Hermes, Hermonthis, Cheremon proposed by S. Fodor & L. Fóti (1976, 166 *pace de Sacy*) was rightly declined by J. F. Quack (2003, 114, fn. 6), who, in turn, derived Ar. *haram-* directly (!) from Eg. **mhr* (!). W. Schenkel (1997, 328, fn. 8): Ar. *hāram-* < (B) **ḥi-rām* (**p^hi-rām*) reinterpreted as non-Bohairic **ḥi-rām* with epenthesis of **-h-* of the (B) article. Far-fetched.

- One of the most enigmatic words from an etymological viewpoint. Etymology still unsettled in spite of the abundance of suggestions:
- 1. W. F. Albright (1919, 189; 1927, 218), F. von Calice (1936, #631) identified Eg. *mr* with Ar. *ʿamar-at-* (pl. *ʿamar-*) “1. petite pierre qui indique la route, 2. tertre” [BK I 54] = *ʿamar-at-* “холм” [Kokovcov] = *ʿamar-at-* & *ʿamār-at-* “pyramidal heap of stones” [Alb.] = “Steinsäule, Denkmal” [Clc.] = *ʿamār-at-* “signe, indice, repère” [DRS], which has further cognates in Akk. (Bab.) *amartu* (also *amaru*) “Seitenwand”, *amaru* “Ziegelhaufen” [AHW 40] = *amartu* “1. dividing wall, party wall, 2. sideboard” vs. *amaru* “pile of bricks (often of standard dimensions)” [CAD a2, 3–4], Hbr. *ʿāmīr* “Wipfel des Baumes, 2. Gipfel des Berges” [GB 48] = “somet d’arbre ou montagne” [DRS] = “top of a tree” [Guillaume].
NB1: As noted in GB 48; Alb. 1919, 189; Clc. 1936, #631; Chn. 1947, #9; DRS 24, these Sem. forms go back ultimately to Sem. **mr*, but the underlying basic sense is ambiguous: (1) “to see, show”, hence “(apparent) sign”, cf. Hbr. *ʿmr qal* “sprechen, sagen” [GB] || Geez *ʿammara* “montrer, indiquer”, *təʿmārt* “signe” [DRS], Tigre *tāmārt* “signe, marque, science” [DRS]; or cf. (2) Akk. *emēru* “aufreiben” [AHW 214] = “soulever (?)” [DRS 23: < Sem. **hmr* or **ḥmr*] || Hbr. *hitpael* “sich erheben, stolz auftreten” [GB] || Ar. *ʿamira* “être nombreux, se trouver en grande quantité”, *ʿimr-at-* “2. accroissement des biens” [BK I 53–54] = *ʿimr-at-* “изобилие, умножение”, *ʿammara* “возвысить” [Kokovcov] = *ʿmr* “groß, viel sein” [Barth arud GB] = “être abondant, croître” [DRS] || Ejb. *ʿémār* “huge” [Jns.], Mhr. *ʿmār*: *ʿēmār* “huge” [Jns. 1987, 6]. Does Hbr. **tīmārā* “Rauchsäulen” [GB 877] = “colonne pilier [DRS] also belong here?
NB2: A. Guillaume (1965 IV, 2) equated Hbr. *ʿāmīr* with Ar. *ḥāmūr* “top of a mast”, but Hbr. *ʿ* ≠ Ar. *ḥ*.
- 2. K. Lang (1923–24, 553 after Christian), A. Ember (1930, 39, #6.a.15), W. Vycichl (1958, 149–152; 1958, 393; 1959, 29; 1959, 69–70, #19; 1959, 73; 1990, 222), and G. Conti (1976, 268), in turn, supposed Eg. *mr* to be a met. of **rm* (indeed not unparalleled), which they equated with Ar. *raym-* “1. Überfluß, Aufhäufung, Zugabe, Draufgabe, Hinzufügung, was man über den Rücken eines Lasttieres über zwei seitlich verteilte Lastkörbe oder Ballen aufhäuft, 2. Hügel, Anhöhe, 3. Grab, Grabhügel, 4. Stufe, Treppenstufe”, *rīm-* “Grabhügel, Grab (tombeau, sépulcre)” [Vcl.] = *raym-* “eccessa, collinetta” [Conti], which derive from Sem. **rwm* ~ **rym* “to be high” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Ug. rm “hoch, oben sein”, mrym “die Höhen” [WUS #2514] = mrm “1. height, 2. excellency” [DUL 576], Pun. mrm “height or elevated part, story, floor” [DNWSI 694], Hbr. rwm qal “sich erheben, erhaben sein, hoch werden oder sein (im räumlichen Sinne), sich überlegen zeigen”, rāmā “Anhöhe (als Kultusort)” [GB 750, 761] = rāmā “Höhe, erhöhter Ort” [Lang] || OSA: Sab. “(?) to be over, overlook, (?) heighten a wall”, rym-m “(in) height, upwards”, mrym “(?) roof-terrace” [SD 120] = rym “essere alto, altezza” [Conti], Ar. rym II: rayyama “3. être superflu, redondant, être en surplus” [BK I 964] = “to exceed” [Lsl.] || Sqt. rym “essere lungo” [Conti after Lsl. 1938, 399] || Geez rayama “to be high, long, raised” [Lsl.], Tigre rēma “essere ampio, lungo” [Conti] (Sem.: Zbr. 1971, #202; Lsl. 1987, 478) || SCu. *rūm- [Ehr.] > Dhl. rúmate “long, tall” [Ehret 1980, 222] || WCh.: perhaps Hausa rímíú “2. (b) to stand on hind legs, (c) rise to one’s feet in one’s anger, (d) stand on the hands” [Brg. 1934, 857] = “1. to rise to one’s feet in anger or excitement, 2. stand on one’s hands, 3. rear up (horse)” [Abr. 1962, 736] | (?) DB rām “Berg” [Jng 1970, 220] | Ngz. rāmáú “1. to outstrip, surpass, 2. precede, go ahead, 3. be greater than, stronger than” > mārām “big, large” [Schuh 1981, 111, 134]. For the bicons. etymology of common AA *r-m “high (or sim.)” [GT] cf. Rabin 1982, 27, §23 (Daffo-Sem.); HSED #2120 (Sem.-Hausa).

NB2: W. Vycichl quoted twice a certain Class. (sic!) Ar. mayr- (sic) “heap, hill, tomb” [Vcl. 1959, 29] = mayr- “Haufen, Hügel, Grab, Grabhügel” [Vcl. 1959, 73] = mayr- > mēr “1. surplus, surcroît, addition, supplément, 2. colline, tertre, 3. tombeau, sépulture, 4. degré, marche (d’un escalier)” [Vcl. 1959, 69–70], which is not listed in BK and Lane.

NB3: Sem. *rym stems from a bicons. root being presumably cognate with (1) Sem. *ʔrm > Ar. ʔiram- ~ ʔarim- “1. grosse pierre, borne destinée à indiquer le chemin dans le désert, 2. sommet de la tête, 3. crêtes ou pics des montagnes”, pl. ʔurūm- “2. pierres sépulcrales des Adites (Arabes de la tribu de ʕād), 3. hauteur, pics, sommets”, ʔur(r)am- “2. extrémités des doigts, 3. cailloux” [BK I 26]; (2) Sem. *wrm: (?) Akk. erim(m)u “Beule, Aussatz” [Torczyner 1912, 769] = “ein Hautmal” [AHW 241] || Syr. ʔawrem “fare alto, esaltare” [Conti] | Ar. warima “être enflé, grand” [BK I 1525] = “essere alto, crescere” [Conti] || Eg. wrm “hochragende Figur” (GR, Wb I 333, 1), wrm “Bez. der Überschwemmung” (GR, Wb I 332, 19) || CCh.: Musgoy urūm “Berg” [Str. 1910, 462]. See Alb. 1927, 209 (Sem.-Eg.); Ember 1930, 39, #6.a.15 (Eg.-Sem.). From the same root may stem Eg. wrm.t “Laube, Dach(bekrönung eines Gebäudes)” (PT, Wb I 333, 2–3) = “roofing (originally awnings)” (FD 64) || WCh.: Ron *mawar- [GT]: Daffo-Butura mawár & Sha mawár “Dach” [Jng 1970, 218, 287] = “roof” [Mlt.-OS 1989, 154] | Tangale wurme “to cover, thatch (plate, house, barn, pot)” [Jng 1991, 164] = wurum (sic) [Stl.]. See OS 1989, 133 (Eg.-Tng.); 1992, 191 (Eg.-Ron); Mlt.-OS 1989, 158 (Eg.-Tng.); HSED #2550 (Eg.-Tng.).

- 3. GT: or cf. AA *m-r (?) “heap of stones (?)” [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh i-miri “tas de pierre et muraille en pierres sèches”, tizi n imiri “col du tas de pierres”, a-mra “contrefort en pierres des champs cultivés en terrasse” [Lst. 1942, 40, §77, §79] | Mzg. i-mr-an (pl.) “grosses pierres enfoncées à moitié dans la terre, qui servent de bornes délimitant une propriété” [Tf. 1991, 428] || CCh.: MG mémeré “murette en pierres des terrasses” [Brt. 1988, 176]?

NB1: É. Laoust and M. Taifi (l.c.) compared also NBrb.: Shilh ta-mra “grosses pierres rouges” [Lst.] | Mzg. ta-mra “bord, penté” [Tf.] | Ait Warain ta-mri “pierre” [Lst.] | Qbl. ti-mri “rocher” [Lst.].

NB2: Any connection to EBrb.: Sokna a-mérru, pl. i-mérr-ân “montagna” [Sarnelli 1924–25, 21]?

- **4.** GT: or related to OSA: Qtb. \sqrt{mwr} : mwrtn “tower” ?mwr-š “its border, confines” [Ricks 1982 MS, 139], Ar. mwr: māra I “6. venir, aller, entrer dans un pays haut, dans un plateau”, IV “soulever, exciter des tourbillons de poussière” [BK II 1167]?
NB: S. D. Ricks (l.c.) affiliated the Qtb. root with Ar. mwr “to go around” and Dathina māra “border”.
- **5.** GT: akin to PBHbr. \sqrt{mly} or \sqrt{mwl} : mōlī “Erdhöhung, Hügel” & JAram. mōlyā “Erhöhung, hügelige Stelle” [Levy 1924 III 49] | Ar. mīl- “4. grand monticule de sable, 5. pierre milliaire”, māyil-at- “4. bosse du chameau, 5. grand monticule de sable” [BK II 1175] || SCu.: Dhl. mālōl-a, pl. mālōlēma “cow’s hump” [EEN 1989, 37] || WCh.: Gmy. mel “to rise very high” [Srl. 1937, 137] (GT 2004, 245: isolated in AS) || ECh.: Kera moolé “stapeln” [Ebert 1976, 82]?
- Other proposals cannot be accepted.
- **6.** A.Ju. Militarev, V. Orel, and O. V. Stolbova identified Eg. mr with the reflexes of AA *m-r “house” [GT] (attested in ECu., Rift, NOm., CCh., discussed s.v. Eg. mj3.t). Semantically weak.
Lrr.: Flm. 1969, 9 (SCu.-Saho-Male); Ehret 1987, #426 (Saho-Agaw-SCu.); Mlt.-OS 1989, 154 (Eg.-Bilin-SCu.-Nakaci); OS 1989, 133 and 1992, 190 (Eg.-Nakaci); HSED #1732 (Eg.-Bilin-SCu.-Nakaci). Cf. also Takács 1996, 15, §6.2.1 (where Militarev’s etymology was mistakenly adopted).
- **7.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 20, #1794) affiliated it with NWomt. *mel-o “stone” || Ch. *mal “point” (sic) vs. WCh. *m-l-m “horn” ~ ECh. *mal “spear” < AA *mel- “point, peak”.
- **8.** V. Blažek (2000 MS, 18, #97) combined it with NBrb.: Qbl. te-meri “isolated rock, crag (?)” [Nwm. 1887] and Nst. parallels like Drv. *mēruvay “pyramid, high top” [DED #5094] and Ur. *mōrV “mit Sträuchern (wald)bewachsener Hügel, Bergrücken” [UEW 291–2].

mr “eigentlich: Wassergraben, Kanal, künstlich angelegter Teich (beim Tempel, beim Gartenhaus), auch als natürliches Gewässer” (OK, Wb II 97, 3–8; for PT 1728a cf. Meeks 2005, 246, #546c) = “lac, bassin, canal” (Langlois 1919, 150, 155–7) = “Bewässerungskanal” (Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 72, n. 30 ad Urk. I 209–213) = “canal, channel, river-arm” (NK, Grd. 1948 II 30) = “1. canal, 2. artificial lake” (FD 111) = “Kanal, See” (OK, Pusch 1974, 20) = “1. Kanal, 2. Garten (vor einem Tempel angelegt)” (Helck, LÄ II 378) = “basin and the surrounding land, garden area, esp. garden in front of the temple, an area directly connected with the quay and under cultivation, internalized within the temple compound area, retained the aspect of garden” (Darnell 1994, 35–36 in accordance with Geßler-Löhr

1983, 20–27, 118–125) = “1. Kanal, Schiffahrts-, Wassergraben, Wasserarm, Wasserstraße, 2. Teich, Wasserweg, 3. Hafen, 4. Becken, Gefäß, 5. Trog, 6. Verdauungskanal, 8. *Tempelsee” (GHWb 345; ÄWb I 539) = “waterway, lake” (CT VII 294a, DCT 173) > Dem. m3 “Kanal o.ä.” (DG 147:7; Osing 1998, 127–8, n.d).

NB1: W. Spiegelberg (1908, 88–89) interpreted the hrgl. N36 (phon. value mr) “channel filled with water” (EG 1927, 479) = “Kanal” (Wb II 96, 13) solely as “ein Webinstrument, das Rietblatt, durch welches Kettenfäden laufen” (Wb II 96, 14) = “une navette, entrave” (Baillet 1907, 23).

NB2: Μοίριος (Herodot) = Μοίριδος (Strabo) < mr-wr “der Moërissee des Fayum” (NK, Wb II 97, 13; cf. Montet GEA II 214) = “(name of a town, probably) Kōm Medīnet Ghurāb (Gurob)” (Grd. & Bell 1943) = “le grand canal/lac” (Vrg.) has nothing to do with the throne name of Amenemhat III, n(j)-m3^c.t-r^c (cf. Vergote 1962, 66, 73). The derivation of Aram. m[?]r/d < Eg. mr-wr is unlikely (Muchiki 1999, 161).

NB3: From the same root have been explained: (1) mr.w “von Geräten: Becken o.ä. aus Metall” (LP, Wb II 97, 3–8) = “basins or receptacles of some sort” (Caminos 1958, 103, §157, n. f), cf. also Urk. IV 630 with a label to a relief showing an “Opfertafel in Teichform” (Sethe) = “3. libation trough” (FD 111) = “a vessel in a T shape (like so many Eg. garden ponds) made of gold” (Caminos l.c.) as well as mr.w n.w jr.t “ponds of milk” (XVIII., Schott, ZÄS 73, 1f.). (2) mr.t “der Palast- und Totentempelgarten” (OK) & mr.w “Garten vor einem Tempel” (NK) > m3r.w “Anlage” (Amarna, LP, Helck, LÄ II 378; Görg 1976, 29), which is rather dubious (q.v.). (3) Usually mr.t n.t m3nw “als poet. Bez. der Stätte des Tempels von Medinet Habu” (XX. hapax, Wb II 98, 7) = “name of the site/location of the mortuary temple of Ramses III” (Darnell), cf. e.g. Gebler-Löhr 1983, 27, n. 94: “*Vielleicht wurde der Begriff von dem zu führenden Kanal (mr) zunächst auf den gesamten Vorbereich des Tempelbezirks ausgedehnt und konnte im Laufe der weiteren Entwicklung auch ganz allgemein für ‘Gebiet’ stehen.*” Darnell (1994, 37 & 38, fn. 18), however, suggests a rdg. sp3.t n.t m3nw, which is unconvincing in the light of Dem. m3-wr (DG 147).

- Origin disputed. Most acceptable seems #3.
- 1. K. Sethe (1929, 4), followed by I. M. D’jakonov (1982, 25; 1985, 132, #22) and V. Blažek (1990, 209) derived it from Eg. (*)mr “graben” (GHWb 345) = “to hoe, dig a ditch” (Djk.), which seems a denom. verb.

NB: That is, in this case, we should (1) either maintain its ultimate connection with Eg. *mr “die hölzerne Hacke” (Wb, below), or, (2) as external cognates, cp. Akk. (OBab.) marāru “durchgraben (?)” [AHW 608] = “to break a field for cultivation” [CAD m1, 268] || ES: Amh. mārāmmārā “to dig” & Gurage: Selti mirāmārā “to plow a field for the third time” [Lsl.] || (?) SCu.: PRift *mara?- “den, burrow, cave” [Ehret]: Burunge mara[?]iya, Asa mara[?]ok (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 342). Are these denom. verbs from Sem. *marr- “hoe” [GT]? W. Leslau (1979 III, 422) explained the ES forms from ES *mrmr “to examine, investigate”.
- 2. H. Abel (1933–34, 304) and E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 172, 174 and 1934–35, 256) equated Eg. mr with PNum. *marti “Bewässerungsgraben, -kanal”, also Mahassi merē “Teich, Tümpel”, which, cannot be cognate with Eg. mr only borrowed from it. Cf. also Takács 1998, 156, #15.

- **3.** Eg. *mr* has been recently equated with diverse reflexes of AA **m-r* “river (?)” [GT], cf. Sem.: ESA: Sab. (hapax) *mr* “part of irrigation system: perhaps channel (?)” [Biella] ||| LECu.: Orm.-Borana *mērī* “1. watering trough, 2. a hedge around a watering pond preventing cattle to enter into the water” [Strm. 1995, 208] | Dullay: Tsamay *mīre* (f) “pond” [Sava 2005 MS, 262] ||| SOm. **mir-* “river” [Bnd. 2003, 255, #A74]: Ari *miri* “river, stream” [Ehret] = *miri* [Bnd.], Dime *mīre* “river” [Sbr.] = *míró* [Flm. apud Bnd. 1996 MS, 1, #74] (SOm.: Bnd. 2003, 350, #74) ||| CCh.: Fali-Mubi *mirê* “river (peka)” [IS] | Muskum *mirà* “marigot, oxbow lake” [Trn. 1977, 24]. Whether and how LECu.: Orm. *murra* “a deep and wide ditch (usually for defence)” [Btm. 2000, 204] and/or CCh.: Musgu *amrai* “pool, puddle” [Decorse] can also belong here is obscure.

NB1: J. C. Biella (1984, 282–3) supposes a derivation of OSA *mr* from \sqrt{rwy} “to irrigate, transmit water”.

NB2: V. M. Illič-Svityč (l.c.) explained Eg. *mr* eventually from Nst. **mār’ā* “moist(ure), humid” suggesting a number of semantically unconvincing cognates (q.v.), which was rightly declined by V. Blažek (1990, 209). Cp. AA **m-r* “1. to flow, 2. pour” [GT] > Sem. **mwr*: PBHbr. *mōr*, *mōrā* “Zerfließendes, Herabfließendes, Zerfallendes” [Levy 1924 III 56] | Ar. *mwr* (impf. *ya-mūr-*) “fließen”, *mawr-* “Flut, Woge” [Vcl. 1958, 397] || ECh.: (?) Sokoro *maaro* “feuchte Erde” [Lks. 1937, 36] vs. AA **m-r* “(to?) rain” [GT] > Ar. *marmara* “lâcher l’eau, les eaux d’une fontaine, et les laisser couler sur la surface du sol, p.ex. pour l’arroser”, *marmar-at-* “pluie abondante” [BK II 1095] ||| LECu.: (?) Somali *mar-* “to pour” [Hodge 1968, 23; not so in Rn. 1902, 297] || (?) SCu. **mar/d-* “rain” [GT]: Burunge *mađiñ* “rainy season” | Ma’a (Mbugu) *máre* [unless < **mad-*] “rain” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 153) ||| CCh.: MM [-r- < **d-?*]: Uld. *mār-ō* “rosée” [Clm. 1986, 134], Muyang *mārō* & Mkt. *mālāh* & Mlk. *māmārā* “dew” [Rsg. 1978, 236, #193] || ECh.: Kwang-Mobu *móró* (f) “Regen” [Ebert 1977 MS, 3] = *ka-mír* “pluie” [Coates], Kwang of Tchagine Golo *kê-mêy* & Kawalke *kê-mêr* “pluie” [Coates 1991 MS, 5] | Somray *maari* (-aa- not clear) “rain” [Stl., not in Lks. 1937, 80]. Note that Ar. *mwr* “fließen” was equated by W. Vycíhl (l.c.) with Eg. *rmj* “weinen”, which was rightly declined by P. Behrens (1987, 242, #5: ~ ECU. **ʔilm-* “weinen”). The comparison with NBrb.: Qabyle *ə-mmir* “to pour” (sic) with the Somray word in HSED #1733 is false, since Qbl. *e-mmir* means “être vidé, versé, vide” [Dlt. 1982, 511]. Ch. Ehret (l.c.) falsely combined Eg. *mr* and the Ari cognate with SCu. **mur-* “to flow” (its reflexes in Ehret 1980, 159, #48 are unconvincing, whence the reconstruction is baseless) and Ch. **m-r-s* “to vomit” (semantically untenable).

Lrr.: IS 1976, #294 (Eg-Ma’a-CCh.-Sokoro); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 32 (ESA-Eg-CCh.); HSED #1774 (Eg-CCh.); Ehret 1995, 310, #595 (Eg-Ari); Takács 1998, 155, #15 (Eg-ESA-?SCu.-Ari-Ch.-IE-Nub.).

- Other suggestions are either improbable or out of question:
- **4.** W. F. Albright (1918, 93, fn. 1) assumed Eg. *mr* to have originally signified perhaps **“inundation”* and thus to be combined with Sem. **mīl’* “füllen” > Akk. *mīlu* “flood”. Improbable.

- **5.** H. Holma (1919, 39, quoted also in GD 2683, fn. 1) pondered an etymological connection with Eg. mrr.t “street” (q.v.) as well as Ar. mrr IV “tordre fortement”, ma-marr- “passage”. False.
- **6.** P. Langlois (1919, 150, 155–7): < Eg. mr “to bind” ~ t3–mrj rendered by him “le territoire de l’inondation captée” (affiliated with Sem. *miṣr- “Egypt”, sic!) ~ mrj.t “Uferdamm” (MK, Wb, q.v.) and even mtr.w “Flut, Wasser” (NK, Wb, q.v.)! False.
- **7.** L. Homburger (1929, 158) connected it with Ful (Peul) wendu, pl. beli (sic). Absurd.
- **8.** W. Vycichl (1959, 73; 1990, 222) saw in Eg. mr a met. of *rm, which he combined with Ar. rām-at- “Teich” [Vcl.], while A.Ju. Militarev (in Sts. 1995, 32) combined Eg. mr with MSA: Ejjibbali rrmr “sea” (sic) [Mlt., not in Jns. 1981].
- **9.** A. R. Bomhard (1981, 449; 1984, 273–4, #283) equated it (with no further AA cognates) with IE *ma/or-i- “any body of water: lake, sea”.
- **10.** V. V. Ivanov assumed Eg. mr to have passed separately into various IE lgs.: Hitt. amiyar(a)- “Kanal” [Friedrich 1952, 20], Gk. (Homer) ἀμάρη “tranchée, rigole, fossé, conduite d’eau” [Boisacq] = “ditch, canal” [Djk.], (?) Alb. âmë [-Ø < *-r?] “river bed (pycлo peки)” [GI]. Dubious.
LIT.: GI 1972, 19; 1984, 886; Ivanov 1977, 20–23; IS 1976, #294; Takács 1998, 155, #15.
NB1: Rejected by I.M. D’jakonov (1982, 25; 1985, 132, #22), who summed in Hitt.-Gk. a pre-IE substratum word stemming from Asia Minor (giving, however, no linguistic data).
NB2: Gk. ἀμάρη has been traditionally (e.g. Boisacq 1916, 49) equated with the reflexes of IE *mōri “Meer” [IEW 748].
- **11.** M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998, 120–1, §1) affiliated it with Cpt. mpo “port, embarcadire” (i.e., Eg. mrj.t) and a number of unconvincing parallels.
NB: Such as LECu.: Afar bōru “port” [PH 1985, 73] | HECu.: Sdm. bale “ditch, pit” [Gsp. 1983, 28] ||| NOm.: Mocha boro “small ditch” [Lsl. 1959, 23] etc.
- **12.** A. B. Dolgopolsky (1998, 26, §14): ~ Dem. mr “haven, land on the seashore” < Eg. mrj.t “haven” (q.v.) ||| CCh.: Fali-Bwagira murìn “river” [Krf.] = mirìn “river” [quoted by Dlg. falsely as Nzangì]. Dubious. The connection of Eg. mrj.t vs. Fali murìn [Krf.] is excluded.
NB: For the CCh. word cf. rather AA *m-r-n “wet substance, water” [GT]: (?) Ar. marana “rendre mou, imbiber” [Dozy II 585] ||| (?) Eg. mjn.t [< *mrn.t?] “Art Gewässer” (PT 857a, Wb II 43, 13, q.v.) ||| ECh.: Gadang mōràn “1. pluie, 2. dieu” [JI 1990 MS, 4, #76]. Alternatively, cf. the Ch. reflexes of AA *m-r “river” [GT] (listed in #3 above).

mr “Weberei” (MK, Wb II 96–97; Pusch 1974, 20) = “Weber(ei)” (Spg. 1908, 88) = “tissage” (Barguet 1952, 13, fn. 3) = “weavers” (FD 111).

NB: Cf. the hrgl. V36 carrying the phon. value *mr* that has been “supposed with some plausibility to depict” (Grd.) “ein Webinstrument, das Rietblatt, durch welches die Kettenfäden laufen” (Wb II 96, 14) = “weaving reeds” (Spg. 1908, 88) = “une navette, entrave” (Baillet 1907, 23) = “weaver’s reed” (Grd., EG 1927, 479), although this rendering has been doubted by A. H. Gardiner (l.c.).

- From the same root: *mr.t* “weavers” (late NK: Pap. Anastasi IV rt. 3:11 etc., Caminos 1954 LEM, 142, 284, 311) = “tisseur” (Barguet 1952, 13, fn. 3).
- **1.** W. Spiegelberg (1908, 88–89): perhaps related to Eg. *mr* “binden”. Most probable.
- **2.** J. Baillet (1905, 214–5; 1906, 21) pondered (with reservation) a connection of Eg. *mr.tj.w* “tisseurs” and *mrjw* “tisser” (sic) to Eg. *mr.t* “Untertanen, Diener, Leute”, which was rightly declined already by Spiegelberg (l.c.).
- **3.** A. M. Lam (1993, 384) combined Eg. *mr.t* “tisserands” with Ful (Pulaar) *mōrde* “tresser, tisser”, *mōrōḃe* “tressenses”.

mr “Viehweide” (OK: from III., Wb II 97, 14–15; Kahl & Kloth & Zimmermann 1995 I3D, 249) = “Viehweide, *Garten” (GHWb 345; ÄWb I 539). Fem.: *mr.t* “Weide (?)” (MK, Wb II 98, 1).

● Etymology uncertain:

- **1.** GT: perhaps a fig. sense of Eg. *mr* “künstlich angelegter Teich (beim Tempel, beim Gartenhaus)” (Wb, q.v.)?
- **2.** The Russian linguists (V. Orel, O. Stolbova, A. Ju. Militarev) presumed it to be cognate with the reflexes of AA **m-r* “field” [GT]. NB1: Attested in OSA: (?) Sab. *mrw* “fertile field” [Biella 1984, 307] ||| Brb. **ta-mūr-t* “pays, terre cultivée” [Chn.] = **ta-mur-t* (sic) “terrains propres à la culture” [Lst. 1920, 258] = **t-mur-t* “Erde” [Clc., Vrg.] = **ta-m(m)ur-t* “earth, country (земля, страна, почва)” [Mtl.] = **ta-mur-t* “Land” [Zbr.]: e.g. NBrb.: Shilh *ta-mur-t*, pl. *ti-murra* [Bst.] | Mzg. *ta-mur-t*, pl. *ti-mura* “terre, pays” [Tf. 1991, 428] | Seghrushen & Warain & Zemmur *ta-mur-t* [Wlf.], Shawya *a-mor-t* [Msq., Bst.] = *ta-mur-t* [Prv.], Uled Sellem *ta-mur-t* “pays, terre, pièce de terre” [Joly 1912, 80], Mzab *ta-mor-t* [Msq., Bst.] = *ta-mur-t* “1. terre, sol, champ, 2. contrée, région, pays” [Dlh. 1984, 121], Wargla *ta-mūr-t*, pl. *ti-mūra* [Lst., Grb.] = *ta-mur-t* “terre, sol, glèbe, pays, région, continent” [Dlh. 1987, 194], Menaser *ta-mur-t* [Bst.], Sened *ta-mūr-t* [Prv., Lst.], Rif *ta-mmur-t* [Bst.] = **ta-mmur-t* “pays, terre” [Brn. 1917, 94], Shenwa *ha-mur-t*, pl. *hi-mura* “terre, pays, contrée” [Lst. 1912, 147], Halima *ta-mur-t* “pays” [Bst. 1895, 103], Iznasen *ta-mmor-t* [Bst.] = *ta-mur-t* [Grb.], Nefusa *ta-mur-t* [Mtl.] = *ta-mura* [Lst.] = *ta-mūr-t* ~ *-t* “terra, territorio”, *t-murā* ~ *-r-* “paese” [Bgn. 1942, 312] | Qbl. *ta-mur-t*, pl. *ti-mura* “1. terre, terrain, 2. pays” [Dlt. 1982, 512], Zwawa & Bugi *ta-mur-t* [Bst., Prv.], Ait Khalfun *ta-mur-t* [Bst.] || EBrb.: Ghadames *ta-mūr-t* [Mtl., Lst.] = *ta-mmur-t*, pl. *t(ə)-m(m)urū* “terre,

sol” [Lnf. 1973, 215, #1020], Sokna ta-mūr-t, pl. t-mûra “paese (abitato)”, ta-mōr-t “città” [Srn. 1924–25, 22, 41] = t-mura (pl.) [Lst.], Siwa ta-mor-t [Bst. 1883, 299; Mtl.] = ta-mar-t [Bricchetti-Robecchi apud Bst. 1890, 91] = ta-mār-t [Laoust] = ta-mūr-t [Mlt.], Djerba ta-mor-t [Bst., Prv.], Audjila tā-mūr-t “terra” [Prd. 1960, 175], Fogaha ta/ā-mūr-t, pl. t-mūr-ān “terra, suolo, pavimento” [Prd. 1961, 298, 301] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr tə-mur-t “1. peuple, nation, pays, état, 2. du monde, gens” [PAM 1998, 221; 2003, 550] (Brb.: Msq. 1879, 523; Bst. 1883, 299, 313; 1885, 185; 1887, 423; 1895, 111; Mtl. 1904, 145, 164; Prv. 1911, 130, 141; Laoust 1931, 274; Wlf. 1955, 69; IS 1971, #22) || NAgaw *mayr- ~ *mawr- [GT]: Bilin maūrā ~ mōrā & Hamir mūrā [< *mayr-] “Rinderlager, Lagerplatz, wo das Vieh bei Nacht sich aufhält” [Rn. 1887, 278] || LECu.: Som. mir “Weide des Viehes zur Nachtzeit”, caus. mir-ī “auf die Weide treiben bei Nacht” [Rn. 1902, 300] = mūr-ayya “to graze flocks by night” [Abr. 1964, 180] || Ch. *m-r “fields (farm)” [JS 1981, 103A] > WCh. *māra “поле” [Stl. 1987, 233, #804]: PAngas-Sura *mar “field, farm” [Stl. 1977, 155] = *mār “farm” [GT 2004, 242]: Gerka ma (so, no -r) [-Ø < *r#?] “farm” [Ftp. 1911, 216], Angas mar “farm” [Ormsby 1914, 209, 313] = maar “1. a farm, 2. to farm” [Flk. 1915, 243] = mār “Feld” [Jng. 1962 MS, 23, 25], Sura mār “Farm, Feld” [Jng. 1963, 73], Mpn. mār “farm, field” [Frj. 1991, 35, 43], Chip mār “Feld” [Jng. 1965, 166] = mar “farm” [Krf.], Kfy. mar “farm” [Hfm.], Msr. maar “farm” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 179, 189] = mār “farm” [Jng. 1999 MS, 10], Mnt. mai [-i < *r reg.] “farm” [Ftp. 1911, 216] = máí “Feld” [Jng. 1965, 168, 171], Gmy. maar “farm” [Srl. 1937, 133] = maar “Feld, Bauernhof” [Jng. 1962 MS, 3] = mār “farm” [Krf.] = maar “cultivated land, referring to ‘soft soil’” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 21, 30] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 18, #44; Stl. 1972, 183; 1977, 155, #129; 1987, 233, #804) | Bole-Tangale *mara “farm” [Schuh]: Bole & Gera màalà [Schuh], Ngamo marra [Schuh], Galambu màrà [Schuh 1978, 86], Dera (Kanakuru) mōrā (“farming”) [Schuh], Bubure màalāa (“field(s), farm, cultivated ground (field)”) [Haruna 1992 MS, #D002–3, D005] (BT: Schuh 1984, 208) || ECh.: (?) Sokoro maaro “wet earth” [Lks. 1937, 36] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 134–5).

nb2: A.Ju. Militarev (1991 & 2006 l.c.) combined the Brb. root with OSA mrt-m “limestone (?)” [SD 86 > Lsl.] || Eth.-Sem. *maray-t (sic) “earth” [Mlt. 1991] = *mar-(V)t- (sic) [Mlt. 2006]: Geez maret “earth, soil, dust of the ground, dirt, clay, plaster, dung” [Lsl. 1987, 361], Tigre & Tna. & Amh. & Arg. mǎret “earth, ground” [Lsl.] = “earth, (main)land” [Mlt.], although the *t- was part of the Sem. root.

nb3: Many scholars (Clc. 1936, #52; Vrg. 1945, 135, #8.b.1; Chn. 1947, #398; Grb. 1965, 91, #17; Zbr. 1989, 587; Hodge 1991, 99) equate Brb. *ta-mur-t with Eg. mrw “desert” (below) and even Cu. *bVr(r)- “desert etc.” [GT] (cf. Eg. b3.t in EDE II 33). Similarly, V. M. Illič-Svityč (1971, #22) derived incorrectly Brb. *ta-mur-t from an earlier *m-bw-. The three comparanda are, however, to be separated.

nb4: A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 104, fn. 31) connected the Brb. and WCh. forms “land, field” (above) etymologically with PAA *marr- “hoe” [Mlt.] (attested in Sem., Eg., ECu., Ch.), which is still open for further research. This similarity is especially apparent in WCh., where the stem for “farm, field” is difficult to separate from that for “to cultivate land” (cf. esp. Mlt. l.c.; Stl. 1987, 233).

LIT.: Mlt. 1991, 257, #23 (Brb.-WCh.-Sem.); 2006, 17, §22.3 (Sem.-Brb.-Eg.); HSED #1735 (Eg.-WCh.-Sokoro).

- 3. GT: alternatively cf. perhaps OSA: Sab. √mʔl: mʔyl-t-n “gardens, or meadows” [Biella 1984, 266], Ar. maʔl-at- “luxuriant garden, or meadow” [Jamme apud Biella], Yemeni Ar. māl (√mʔl), pl. amwāl “field, cultivated land, real estate” [Behnstedt 1990, 474] = māl (√mw!l) “Feld”, māl ʿala l-yeyl “Feld, das durch einen Bach bewässert wird” [Behnstedt 1993, 199], Ṣaʿdah (Yemen) √mw!l: mālin “Feld, Acker” [Behnstedt 1987, 305].

NB: P. Behnstedt (l.c.) identified the Yemeni Ar. word with Ar. māl- “goods, cattle”, which would probably exclude the comparison with Eg. mr.

- 4. A. Anselin (2000, 80, fn. 6) combined both (!) Eg. mr.t and mrw “bande désertique, marge, frange, lisière” with a number of semantically unconvincing Ar. parallels: mrt “conduire hors de”, mart- “désert sans eau”, mrğ “envoyer un animal pâturer”, mrr “passer” (cf. Ehret 1989, 14).

***mr** “als Schriftzeichen: die hölzerne Hacke (nur in der Spätzeit belegt als Name der Hieroglyphe)” (Wb II 98, 11) = “wooden hand-hoe, made of a long bent blade held in place by a cord attached to the handle” (Griffith 1898, 48) = “une fourche d’arbre naturelle (on aurait perfectionné cet util en le composant de deux pièces assemblées, liées fortement)” (Langlois 1919, 160–1, §1) = “hoe” (EG 1927, 502, U6–7) = “una zappa fatta di due pezzi tenuti fermi da una legatura” (Conti 1978, 55, fn. 2) = “hoe (in the OK with either one or two crosspieces)” (Fischer 1983, 43, U6) = “Hacke (die sich zum Pflug entwickelt hat)” (Moftah 1987, 128, 139, n. 22).

NB: The view that it was a foundation symbol (Nibbi, ASAE 63, 1979, 148f.; GM 29, 1978, 89f.; Odgon 1981, 63; Wildung 1981, 39f.) has been declined by W. Barta (1982, 11–16).

- Hence (?): Cpt. (SAL) $\epsilon\mu\epsilon$, (B) $\lambda\mu\epsilon$, $\lambda\mu\eta$ (f) “hoe (for digging)” (CD 55b; cf. Crum, JEA 8, 1922, 117) = “aratrum, manica aratri” (Langlois 1919, 160–1, §1) = “Hacke, Pflug” (KHW35) = “houe” (Dévaud 1921, 156–8; Muséon 36, 1923, 87, §16) > (?) Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta$ “faucille, fauchet” (Boisacq) = “a shovel or mattock” (Crum).

NB1: The etymology of the Cpt. word is disputed. E. Dévaud (1921, 156–8) explained its supposed etymon *jmj.t not from a masc. *mr, but LEg./GR mrj.t (f) (Tanis Sign Pap. 18:4, cf. Griffith & Petrie 1889, pl. 4, p. 18, for its dating for the Roman period cf. Iversen 1958, 4–6; Meltzer 1970, 193, fn. 1), where he assumed a prothetic j- occurring also in (SF) $\epsilon\mu\omicron\Upsilon$ < Eg. mj.t (f) “cat”, (SB) $\epsilon\omega\omega$ < Eg. š3 “pig”, (B) $\lambda\eta\lambda\omega$ < Eg. n^c.j.t “piquet d’amarrage”. E. M. Meltzer (1970, 193), however, surmised in the GR hapax a later loan-word (source not specified). Similarly, J. Vergote (1950, 294) regarded (B) $\lambda\mu\epsilon$, $\lambda\mu\eta$ to be “peut-être un emprunt au grec $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta$ ”, which, besides, has an IE background (Boisacq 1916, 53).

NB2: The etymology offered by Langlois (1919, 160–1, §1) for the Cpt. word (derived from Eg. 3mm.t “fist, poing, la poignée” suggesting a basic sense “mancheron”) is certainly false.

- From the same root (denom. verb): jmr “houer” (V. hapax, Dévaud 1921, 156–8 after Steindorff) = “piocher” (Baillet 1905, 214 & fn. 14; 1907, 21). Cf. also the hypothetic *mr “hacken” (XVIII., Sethe 1929, 4) = “creuser” (AL 77.1765) = “graben (Kunstwort)” (GHWb 345). NB1: K. Sethe (l.c.) derived Eg. t3-mrj “Ägypten” (lit. < **das behackte Land, Kulturland*) as well as mr “Graben, Kanal” from the same root. Uncertain. R. Moftah (1987, 128, 139, n. 22) suggested even more improbable Eg. derivatives, e.g., mr.w “Sklaven” (q.v.).

NB2: Hence may perhaps derive Dem. mr “tombe” in Dem. Pap. Leiden I 384, 18:10 (rejected by Spiegelberg, registered in DG under mḥw), for which cf. Malinine in RdE 14 (1962), 39, n. A4 and Cenival 1984, 224.

- The word is widespread also outside AA as an agricultural *Wanderwort*, whose ultimate source is difficult to determine. Within the AA family, Eg. *mr finds its closest parallels in several branches, but here too we are probably dealing rather with areal words than cognates (independent interbranch borrowings?): Sem. *mar(r)- “hoe, marre” [Chn.] = *marr- “мотыга” [Djk.]: Akk. marru “Schaufel, Spaten” [AHW 612] = marru “shovel, spade” [CAD m1, 287], Emar marru “shovel” [Sjöberg 1998, 265, #438] || JAram. mārā “Hacke, Grabcheit” [Perles 1905, 382] = “Hacke, Grabscheit” [Levy 1924 III 235] = mār ~ mārā “hoe, rake” [Jastrow 1950, 834], JNAram. marra “spade, hoe” [Sabar 2002, 224], Syr. marā [Seidel 1988, 167] = marrā “hoe, spade with an iron blade” [Mlt.] | Ar. marr- “3. pelle en fer, 4. manche d’une pelle en fer” [BK II 1083] = “bêche” [Dozy II 576] = “Spaten, Erdhacke” [Clc.], Ar. (dial. of Syria & Palestina) marr “vanga il cui ferro è triangolare e il manico provvisto di bastoncino trasversale” [Conti], Hadramaut marr “vanga” [Conti], Dathina marr “pelle, marre” [GD 2684] || LECu.: Hadiyya morāra “Haken des Pfluges” [Lsl. 1979 III, 423]: borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Gurage: Soddo mārār “the piece of wood that joins the yoke with the handle of the plough” [Lsl.], cf. Tigrinya & Amh. mōran “part of the plough” [Lsl.] || NOm.: Kaffā mārō “asta di legno (o di metallo) con la quale si trappa dell’ensete la parte farinosa, separendola della fibra” [Crl. 1951, 443] || (?) WCh. *māra “обрабатывать землю” [Stl. 1987, 233, #804] = *mar- (denom.?) “to hoe” [GT]: AS *mār “to hoe” [GT]: Angas maar “2. to farm” [Flk. 1915, 243] = mār ~ maar “Feld bestellen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 23, 25] = mār “to farm” [ALC 1978, 33, 36], Msr. maar “to cultivate” [Jng. 1999 MS, 10], Gmy. maar “to cultivate on soft soil” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 21, 30] | BT *mara “to hoe, till” [GT] > Bole mar- “den Boden bearbeiten, pflügen” [Lks. 1971, 137], Dera mārā “gemeinschaftliche Feldarbeit” [Jng. 1966 MS, 11] = mātè [-t- < *-r-] “to farm” [Nwm. 1974, 130] = mārè “to cultivate, till (soil), hoe” [Kidida 1991 MS, 13], Ngamo mārā “to cultivate, till”, mārā dèrè “to hoe, till soil”, ?āmāāarā “peasant” [Alio 1988 MS] = mar- “to hoe, farm” [Ibr. 2003 MS, 7], Maha mārā “to hoe, till soil” [Alio 1988 MS], Bubure mārā “cultiver, labourer, houer, sarcler” [Haruna 1992 MS, #D019–20] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 233) || CCh.: Mboku mer “cultiver” [Mch. 1953, 155] = mer “to till” [Blz. & Boisson 1992, 20, #2] || ECh.: Somray (Sibine) mirí ~

midí (f), pl. mîr-bi “houe” [Jng. 1978, 181; 1993 MS, 45] = mârô [Mlt.] = mārā [OS].

DP: Outside AA, the following parallels have been compared: **(1)** Sum. ^(gîš/urudu)mar “houe, marre” [Labat 1976, 141, #307] = “Spaten” [Borger 1978, 125, #307] is usually treated (e.g. AHW 612) as source for Akk. marru and hence for the further Sem. reflexes. **(2)** Lat. marra “Hacke zum Ausjäten des Unkrauts” [LEW II 43] = “sorte de houe à large tête” [DÉLL 388], borrowed into LGk. μάρρον, μάρρα ≈ ἐργαλείον σιδηροῦν [Hesykhios], hence It. marra, Fr. (region of Orléans) la marre. Their ultimate source was probably Akk. with the mediation of Aram. (cf. Lewy 1931, 33, fn. 1). **(3)** Drv. *mēr-i- (only SDrv., CDrv.) “plough(-tail, -handle)” [DED #5097]. **(4)** Sino-Tibetan *mra “to plough” [Shafer quoted by Blažek & Boisson 1992, 20].

NB1: The source of Eg. *mr is very much debated. W. M. Müller (1909, 107) thought Eg. *mr to have been borrowed from PSem. *marr-. B. Hrozný (1938, 371; 1938, 437) and E. S. Meltzer (1970, 193–194) supposed in Eg. *mr the proof for a stronger Sum. influence on predynastic Egypt. D. G. Reeder (1962, 167–168) rejected the primary meaning “hoe” of Eg. *mr and its being a Sum. loan. W. A. Ward (1978, 54) Eg. *mr was borrowed indirectly from Sum. mar through Sem. On the other hand, the Russian linguists (Stl. 1977, 65; 1987, 233; Djk. 1981, 50; Mlt. 1983, 104, fn. 31; 1984, 60, #12; 1985, 1, #1; 1989, 129; 1990, 33; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 74; Kvl.-Mlt. 1993, 27, #2; 1994, 2, #2.2; OS 1988, 75; 1989, 135; 1992, 174; HSED #1738–1739) treat Eg. mr as genetically cognate with the AA parallels.

NB2: The etymological position of the Sum. and Sem. forms is equally disputed. Most probable seems a borrowing via Sum. > Akk. > Aram. & Ar. etc. (as suggested e.g. in CAD m1, 287; AHW 612). F. Perles (1905, 382) maintained that the Aram. and Ar. forms were not borrowed from Lat. or Greek, but represented a “Semitic word” stemming eventually from Akk. (since Hbr. lacks it). W. M. Müller (1909, 107) saw in Late Sum. mar a loan-word borrowed from Akk., while M. Cohen (1947, 191, #478) derived the Sum. term from Sum. eri “cuivre” (sic), which would exclude a genetic cognacy of the Eg. and Sem. terms. Recently, the Russian scholars (Djk. 1981, 50; Mlt. 1983, 104, fn. 31; 1984, 60, #12; 1985, 1, #1; 1989, 129; 1990, 33; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 74; Kvl.-Mlt. 1993, 27, #2; 1994, 2, #2.2) are, in turn, inclined to interpret Sum. mar itself too as “a substratum loan” from an unspecified (but not Sem.) AA substratum supposed to have existed in the Ancient Near East (cf. also Takács 1998). I. M. Diakonoff (1998, 213, fn. 9) too derived Sum. mar “hoe” from PSem. *marr- because he considered its AA cognates as genetic. Or *vice versa*?

NB3: It is also difficult to judge whether Akk. (OBab.) marāru “durchgraben (?)” [AHW 608] = “to break a field for cultivation”, Dt “to be split (?)”, N “to be broken” [CAD m1, 268] || Amh. mārāmmārā “to dig” & Gurage: Selti mirāmārā “to plow a field for the third time” [Lsl.] can belong here in any form as denom. verbs from *marr- “hoe”. W. Leslau (1979 III, 422) explained the ES forms from ES *mrrm “to examine, investigate”. I. M. Diakonoff (1998, 213, fn. 9) declined the reconstruction of AA *mar- “to hoe, work in the field” (in HSED #1739) on the basis of Akk. marāru “to hoe, dig up”, which is in fact a denom. verb of marru “hoe”. Similarly, WCh.*mar- “to hoe” [GT] might be a secondary denom. verb, whose source (Ch. *mar “cultivated field” [Ehr. 1997 MS, 207, #1808]), if correct, indicates a distinct origin.

NB4: In I. M. Diakonoff’s (1998, 212, fn. 6) view, the comparison of Hbr. mar II “Tropfen” [GB 457] = “speck” [KB] with ECh.: Smr. maari “rain” (apud HSED) is false, since the misquoted Hbr. hapax (Isa. 40:15) was in fact a deverbal noun from Hbr. *mrr “to dig” (sic).

NB5: A.Ju. Militarev (1987 MS, 1) suggested also NBrb.: Qabyle (dial.) a-mriri [root?] “tillage, ploughing” [Mlt.] as cognate, but (as kindly confirmed by K.-G. Prasse, p.c. on 30 Oct. 2006) the basic meaning of it is reciprocal, i.e. “joint agricultural labour” and especially “contract for agricultural labour by mutual exchange” (m- is a

reciprocal prefix). The rest is based on a root $\sqrt{r-r}$. Qbl. a-m-riri is a verbal noun, but the verb itself does no longer exist in Kabyle. It does however exist in Mzg. mrara “1. to exchange (words); 2. group together (tribes)”. The simple verb also exists: Mzg. rar (pf. irura) “to give back, restore”, which is an iterative verb (which has lost its iterative meaning), and must be considered to be derived from the simple verb represented by Tuareg ärr, Qbl. and Mzg. ärr “to give back, restore” (pf. yërra). NB6: Forms like Bed. malaw “hache” [Chn.] || NAgaw: Hamir baruw “Erde hacken” [Clc.] = “piocher” [Chn.] || LECu.: Saho ma-barō “Erdhacke” [Clc.] = “houe” [Chn.] < ECu. *b-r “to cultivate” [Lmb.] cannot be related as suggested in Clc. 1936, #51; Chn. 1947, 191, #478; Lmb. 1988, 28. Rejected by G. Takács (2006, 149–150). Cf. rather Eg. b3 above.

NB7: The same seems to pertain to the comparison of PBrb. *ta-mur-t “land” [GT] suggested by A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 104, fn. 31; 1985, 1, #1).

NB8: Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 207, #1808) combined the Eg.-Sem. word with SCu. *mara?- “den, burrow (of burrowing animal), cave” [Ehret 1980, 342] as well as Ch. *mar- “cultivated field” [Ehr.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 134–5).

LIT.: GD 2684 (Sem.-IE-Eg.); Müller 1909, 107 (Sem.-Sum.-Eg.); Hrozný 1910, 8–9; 1938, 437; 1938, 371 (Eg.-Sem.-Sum.-IE); Kamal 1912, 103; 1914, 60 (Eg.-Ar.); Lewy 1931, 33, fn. 1 (IE-Sem.-Sum.); Brk. 1932, 117, #76 (Eg.-Sem.-Sum.); Clc. 1936, #51 (Eg.-Ar.); Vcl. 1938, 133 (Eg.-Akk.); Chn. 1947, 191, #478 (Sem.-Eg.-Sum.-IE); LEW II 43 (IE-Sem.-Sum.); Aro 1964, 475, fn. 2 (Eg.-Sem.-Sum.); Djik. 1965, 49 (Eg.-Sem.); Meltzer 1970, 193–4 (Sum.-Akk.-Eg.-IE); Vcl. 1972, 219 (Eg.-Akk.-Sum.-IE); Stl. 1977, 65 (WCh.-Eg.-PSem.); 1987, 233 (WCh.-Eg.); Conti 1978, 55–56, 146, §2.1, 148 (Eg.-Sem.-Sum.-IE); Djik. 1981, 50 (Eg.-Akk.-Sum.-PCh.); Mlt. 1983, 104, fn. 31; 1984, 60, #12; 1985, 1, #1; 1989, 129; 1990, 33 (Sem.-WCh.-Somray-Hadiyya-Eg.-Sum.); Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 74 (Sem.-Hadiyya-WCh.-Somray-Eg.); Blz. 1992, 163 (PDrav.-PAA); Blz.-Boisson 1992, 19–20 (Sem.-Eg.-Ch.-Hadiyya-Kaffa-Drav.-ST-Sum.-IE); Kvl.-Mlt. 1993, 27, #2; 1994, 2, #2.2 (Sem.-WCh.-Somray-Eg.-IE-Sum.); Lmb. 1988, 28 (Eg.-Sem.); Seidel 1988, 167 (Sem.-Sum.-Eg.-IE); OS 1988, 75 (Sem.-WCh.-Somray); 1989, 135 (Eg.-PWCh.-Somray-Sibine); 1992, 174 (Sidamo-Eg.-PECh.); Obenga 1993, 325–6, #78 (Eg.-Mboku); Redford 1994, 209, §8 (Eg.-Sum.-Akk.); HSED #1738–9 (Sem.-Eg.-ECh.-Hdy.-WCh.); Ehr. 1997 MS, 207, #1808 (Sem.-Eg.-SCu.-Ch.); Vernus 2000, 193 (Eg.-Sum.-Akk.).

• Any other etymology for Eg. *mr is false.

NB: (1) C. W. Goodwin (1867, 86) affiliated it with Eg. mn.tj “agriculturists or handicraftsmen” (q.v.), referring to an alleged var. mrw.tj (Pap. Leiden I 347, 4:14) with the interchange of r ~ n, as well as (B) MONK “construere, sculpere” (!), from which he erroneously deduced Eg. *mr ~ *mn (sic) “1. hoe used for tilling the ground, 2. chisel or hatchet for cutting wood and stone” (sic). (2) J. Baillet (1905, 214 & fn. 14; 1907, 21) affiliated it with Eg. mrt “Hörige” (OK, Wb, q.v.) falsely rendered by him lit. “les piocheurs”. (3) Following F.L. Griffith (1898, 49), P. Langlois (1919, 160–1, §1), followed by D. G. Reder (1962, 167–168) and G. Conti (1978, 55, fn. 2), suggested a basic sense close to that of Lat. ligo “hoyau” and an etymological connection to Eg. mr “to bind” and even mrj “to like” on the analogy of Lat. ligo vs. ligare vs. diligere, since the blade and the wooden stock of the Eg. hoe were held together by a rope (Griffith: “apparently owed its common... value mr to being made of two pieces bound together”). (4) F. Behnk (1928, 139, #30): ~ Ful remer-go “Hacke”. (5) R. Mofitah (1987, 139, fn. 22): Eg. mr “Hacke” (rendered also “Pflug”) and even mr “Meißel, Sichel” (sic) ~ Brb. (sic) e-mir-an “Sichel” ~ Ar. mar?- “man” (sic). Absurd.

mr.t (coll.) “Hörige, Untertanen” (OK, Wb II 106, 11–20) = “Untertanen, Diener, Leute” (Spiegelberg 1908, 89) = “weitgehend für die Feldarbeit eingesetzt; konnten auf Verwaltungsbefehl versetzt,

Tempeln oder Privatleuten zugewiesen worden; auch arbeiteten sie in den Produktionsanlagen der Güter und Institutionen (ihre Stellung ist mit der von Hörigen des europäischen Mittelalters zu vergleichen, nicht aber mit der von römischen Sklaven; aus den mr.t konnten Totentempelarbeiter und Totenpriester von Privatleuten ausgehoben werden, die dadurch aus dem Verband der Hörigen des gegenwärtigen Königs ausscheiden und nicht mehr versetzbar sind; das gilt bald auch für mr.t an Tempelt von Lokalgöttern)” (Helck, LÄ II 1235–6) = “not serfs, but rather applied to Egyptians assigned to the periodically compulsory work ordered by the state (the scope of their activities focused on agricultural labour, they were involved in the foundation of new domains on unproductive land, they usually came from peasant communities and the lower class)” (Moreno García, JEA 84, 1998, 71–83) = “1. Hörige (die zu staatlichen Arbeiten herangezogen werden können), Landarbeiter (auf Staatsdomänen), Haushaltsangehörige, 2. dann: Pöbel, einfaches Volk, Anhänger, Parteigänger” (Junge 2003, 227, n. 223) = “1. die Hörigen, Landarbeiter auf Staats- und Tempeldomänen, die Klasse der Hörigen, die Unterschicht, die Untertanen” (ÄWb I 540).

NB: For further lit. see WD II 65 (cf. RdE 26, 1974, 53, fn. 6); WD III 54.

- From the same root: **(1)** mr “Angehörige (jemds.), (seine) Anhänger, (seine) Parteigänger, Dienerschaft” (MK, Wb II 98, 2) = “mercenaire” (Moftah 1987, 128) = “Höriger” (OK 1x: Urk. I 137:8, ÄWb I 540). Cf. also **(2)** mr.w (pl.) “als Bez. von Personen” (OK, Wb II 107, 1) = “die Hörigen (die auf Verwaltungsbefehl zu staatlichen Arbeiten eingezogen werden können; zunächst das einfache Volk, später hauptsächlich Kriegsgefangene), Landarbeiter (auf Staatsdomänen)” (ÄWb I 540). Cf. also Guglielmi 1991, 9, fn. 45 with further lit.
- The inner Eg. etymology seems here to be weaker than the comparison with the AA cognates (listed either #3 or #4):
- **1.** J. Baillet (1905, 211–7, §8; 1906, 21): orig. “les piocheurs, laboureurs ou colons”, derived from a certain Eg. j.mrr (sic) “piocher”. Similarly, W. Spiegelberg (1908, 89) rendered its basic sense as “Landarbeiter, Leute der Hackarbeit, d.h. Landleute, nicht nur die eigentliche Landarbeit besorgend, sondern auch in dem ganzen witen Gebiet der ägyptischen Landwirtschaft tätig”, which he explained from Eg. *mr “mit der Hacke arbeiten”. R. Moftah (1987, 139, fn. 22) too affiliated it with Eg. mr “Hacke” (rendered also “Pflug”) and even mr “Meißel, Sichel” (sic) ~ Brb. (sic) e-mir-an “Sichel” (absurd).
- **2.** Alternatively, J. Baillet (1905, 214–5; 1906, 21) assumed a primary sense “liés, attachés (soit à la glèbe, soit à un maître)” (sic) derived

from Eg. *mr* “*lier*”. So argued also W. Guglielmi (1991, 9, fn. 45 with further lit.) suggesting a primary signification “*Zusammengehörende*” deriving from *mr* “*binden, sich anschließen*” (q.v.).

- **3.** GT: semantically, the closest cognates appear in WBrb.: Zng. *u-mūr-ä(y)n* “*travailleurs*”, *tyā-mūr-əT* ~ *ta-mūr-əT*, pl. *tyā-mūr-äyn* ~ *t-mūr-äyn* “*travailleuse*” [TC 2002, 436–8] || LECu.: Rnd. *mír* “*task-force, (small) group of people pledged to carry out a particular task (applied to a group of warriors on a raid etc.)*” [PG 1999, 226] || PCh. **m-r* (var. **m-H-r*?) “*slave*” [GT] = **m-(k)-r* “*slave*” [JS 1981, 236, A.] > WCh.: **mar[i]* “*slave (paḅ)*” [Stl.]: Hausa *múríimà* “*слуга, сопровождающий всадника*” [Stl.] | Ron **m-H-r* “*slave*” [GT]: DB *moór* “*Sklave*”, *móré* “*Sklavin*” [Jng.] = *mōór*, pl. *mwāār* [Jng. 1992–93, 123], Kulere *mahór*, pl. *mahwaār* “*Sklave, Sklavin*” [Jng.], Sha *moh* [Jng. 1966, 172: -*h* reg. < **-r*] “*Sklave*” [Jng.] (Ron: Jng. 1970, 218–9, 287, 353) | NBauchi **mar-* “*slave*” [Skn.]: Mburku *mar*, Siri *marə-čək*, Jimbin *mar-žū* (NBauchi: Skn. 1977, 40; WCh.: Stl. 1987, 233, #805) || CCh.: Fali-Kiria *mərə* “*slave*” [Krf. 1981, #92] | MM **mər* “*travail(ler)*” [Mch.] > Mofu *mbrā*, Mboku *mér s way*, Zulgo *mər* (MM: Mch. 1953, 182).

NB: The origin of the (additional?) **H-* reflected by the Ron data (but unattested elsewhere) is not clear.

- **4.** Following H. Brugsch, a number of authors connected it to the (mostly Sem.) reflexes of AA **m-r* “*man*” [GT]. Not impossible provided we assume that the coll. Eg. *mr.t* may have actually signified **“people, men (of someone)”*.

NB1: Attested in Sem. **mar*?- “1. son, 2. man, 3. lord” [Fox 1998, 18; Djk.-Kogan 2001, 148, #5] = **mar*?- (Aram. var. **māri*?-) “1. man, 2. master, lord” [Hng. 2000, 2065] = **mar*?- “man, male” [Kogan 2005, 532, §10] > i.a. OSA: Sab. *mr*? “man, (over)lord, suzerain, social superior, divine lord, male”, *mr*?-*t* “woman” [SD 87] = “1. man, person, 2. lord (divine or human)” [Biella 1984, 283], Qtb. *mr*? “man, person, lord” [Ricks 1982, 144–5], OAr. dial. vars. *mar*?- ~ *marr-* “man” [Zbr. 1991, 1684] > Ar. *mar*?- “Mann” [GB] = *mar*?- ~ *mir*?- ~ *mur*?- “man (vir)”, *muruw-w-at* ~ *murū-ū*?-*at*- “manhood, power, strength, humanity” [Eitan] (Sem.: WUS #1661; Frz. 1964, 267, #2.36; AHW 615; Lsl. 1969, 20; Djk. 1970, 472, fn. 86) || EBrb.: Fogaha *a-mār*, pl. *a-mār-en* ~ *a-mār-ā* “uomo” [Prd. 1961, 297, 302], Sokna *mar* ~ *mār*, pl. *i-marr-iw-en* “uomo” [Sarnelli 1924–25, 27, 45] || PCh. **m-r* “man, vir, male, husband, person” [JS 1981, 174: A., 202: A.] > WCh.: DB *māra* “männlich” [Jng.] = *māra* [Seibert], Fyer *marā* “männlich” [Jng., Seibert] = *mara* “male” [Blench 2000 MS, #a006], Bokkos *mārēy* “male” [Seibert], (?) Monguna *nārī* [Seibert] (Ron: Jng. 1970, 87, 219; Seibert 2000 MS, #a006) | SBCh. **mar* ~ **mur* “person” [GT]: Grnt. *mar diri* [Smz.], *Bandas & Wangday mar* [Smz.], *Zakshi mar-* [Smz.], *Wangday mar* [Smz.], Grnt. *mar* “man, person” [Jgr. 1989, 186–7], *Zaar mur* ~ *mor* [Smz. 1975, 31], *Booluu māl* [Smz.], *Boot mur-* [Smz.], *Buu mul* [Smz.], *Tule mur* [Smz.], *Dokshi mār* [Smz.], *Zaari mār-* [Smz.] (SBCh.: Smz. 1978, 29, §39) || CCh.: Higi-Baza *mure* “man (not woman)” [Meek 1931 I, 111], Fali-Jilbu *mwuli* “man” [Krf.], Fali-Muchella *muŋu* “man” [Krf.], Fali-Bwagira *mūrīn* “man” [Krf.] (Fali: Krf. 1972 MS) | Bata **mur-* “Mann, Mensch” [Ibr.]:

Bata mūrē [Str.] = mūre [IS] = nyō-mūrē [Garrigues] = mùrīn [Stl.] = mure “man (not woman)” [Boyd 2002, 56], Bata-Demsa mūrē [Str.] = murē [Mch.], Zumu (Jimo) muro “man (not woman)” [Meek 1931 I, 81, #21], Bachama mure “man (not woman)” [Meek 1931 I, 49] = mùrèy [Stl.] = mùrè [Skn./JI], Gudu mir [IS] = mīr [IL] = mār [Stl.], Kobochi mūrū [Str.], Nzangi mùre [Meek/JI] = murē [Mch.], Holma mülē [Str.] | Laamang mara-kwa “man” [Ibr.] | Matakam mūōl “man” [Str.] | Gawar mül [Str.], Daba & Musgoy mewūl “Mann, Mensch” [Str.], Daba muwul “homme, personne” [Ibr.] (CCh.: Str. 1910, 454; 1922–23, 118; Ibr. 1991, 48–49; JI 1994 II, 231) || ECh.: Dangla ùmirnè “person” [Fédry] | Mawa mār “clan, famille” [Roberts 1994, 7] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 266–7).

nb2: The reflexes of Sem. *mar[?]- cover a wide semantical spectrum: “1. son, 2. man, 3. lord”. These might derive from an ultimate meaning “young man”, which can be projected to a deeper diachronic level, cf. AA *m-r “child” (or sim.) [GT] > Oakk. mar[?]um ~ mer[?]um “son, boy”, ma/erānum “young animal, whelp” > Akk. māru “Sohn, Junge” [AHW 615], Ebl. /mār-/ ≈ Sum. dumu [Sjöberg 1998, 253, §138] || PSin. mr[?]-rb^c “le garçon du chef” [Loundine 1991, 110–1], Ug. mr “son” [DUL 570: borrowed from Akk.] | OSA: Sab. mr[?] “male child” [SD 87], Qtb. mr[?] “male child” [Ricks 1989, 99] || MSA: Mhr. √mrw (sic) ḥa-mrō “children” [Jns. 1987, 271] (Sem.: Kogan & Dj. 2001, 148, §5) || LECu.: Das. (Galab) mār-ti (f) “girl” [Sasse 1974, 417], Rnd. mār, pl. mārō “calf” [Heine 1976, 213] = mār, pl. mārro “Kalb (vom Rind)” [Schlee 1978, 140, #762] = mār (m), mār-e (f) “calf” [Oomen 1981, 64] = mār “male/female calf (of cattle)” [PG 1999, 216], Arb. mār “calves (collectively)”, mār (f) “female calf” [Hyw. 1984, 383] | HECu.: Sid. mur-e “child (under 6 months)” [Hds. 1989, 40] || NOm.: Wlt. mārā “vitello” [Crl. 1929, 33] = (listed as Omt., act. Wlt.?) mārā “giovine d’animale” [Mrn. 1938, 151] = mara “1. offspring of sheep or goat, 2. maggot” [LS], Gamu marā “calf” [Lmb. 1985 MS, 17, #557; Sottile 1999, 440], Dorze mar “calf (bovine)” [Blz.] etc. < “OCu.” (Cu.-Om.) *mar- “kid” [LS 1997, 465] | Mao *meri ~ *mari “boy, child, son” [GT] = *me/al- [Bnd.]: Hozo mer, mēri, mēri [Bnd. & Atieb] = mera [Gr.] = mēri [Sbr.-Wdk.], Sezo 1 māli & 2 mēri [Sbr.-Wdk.] (Mao: Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 11; Bnd. 2003, 269, #17) || Ch. *m-r “child, son” [JS 1981, 69, C₁; JI 1994 I 35] > WCh. *m-r “son” [GT]: Daffo-Butura mār ~ mār “Kind” [Jng. 1970, 218, 388] = Butura mar “child” [Magwa etc. 1985, 10] | Sbauchi *mVr “child” [GT]: Zaar miiri (pl. “children”) [Smz. 1975, 28], Tule mur [Smz.], Wangday mar [Smz.], Sigidi mir [Gowers] = (Guus) miméer (pl. “children”) [Caron 2001, 28], Luri mimír (pl. “children”) [Caron 2004, 198] (Sbauchi: JI 1994 II, 74) || ECh.: Kera kó-már (coll. “Kinder”) [Ebert 1976, 68; 1978, 43, #1; Pearce 1998–99, 67] | Somray mwłré (f) “fille” [Jng. 1993, 47] | Kofa máriyò, pl. máriyè “youth, jeune homme” [Jng. 1977 MS, 15, #362], Kajakse mār, pl. mare “baby” [Doornbos 1981 MS, 2, #105] = mār “enfant, garçon”, maare “fille” [Alio 2004, 245, #234 & #239], Ubi maryà “jeune homme” [Alio 2004, 272, #204] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 74–75). AP: Cf. Ongota mārā “baby” [Flm. 1992, 192]. NS *mār “1. child, boy, 2. man or person” [Bnd. 1997, 88, #63]. For the AA etymology see also Rabin 1982, 27, §22 (Sem.-Ron-Maa); Mlt. 1996, 20, #5 (Cu.-Om.: with false AA comparanda); Kogan & Dj. 2001, 148, §5 (Sem.-WCh.). DP: A. R. Bomhard (1981, 447) combined Sem. *mr[?] “to be manly, virile” with IE *mer-yo- “young man”.

nb3: The primary sense of the underlying Sem./AA root is disputable. Thus, (1) F. W. M. Philippi (1875, 87–88) explained the original sense of Ar. mar[?]- “Mann” as “eig. der Kräftige” from a certain Sem. *mar “streich/fen, straff/mm sein” (sic). Similarly, W. F. Albright (1918, 235, #61) and P. Fronzaroli (1964, 267, #2.36) derived Sem. *mar[?]- from Sem. *mari[?]- “grasso”, while V. Blažek (2002, 104, §1.2) combined the reflexes of our AA root with SBrb.: Hgr. ta-māra, pl. ti-māri-win “1. force, 2. personne considérable” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1221]. (2) GT: is the primary mng. preserved in LECu.: Saho mārā (pl.) “die Seienden, Lebenden, Leute” < mār “sein

(esse), leben, bleiben, wohnen” [Rn. 1890, 270] = mara (m) “1. living, 2. people”, mare “kinship, relationship, family” < mare “to live, exist, be, live at” [Vergari 2003, 132], Afar m̄ara “people, living”, mare (f) “family relationship” [PH 1985, 163–4]? (3) GT: less probable is an eventual connection with SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr t̄a-mur-t “1. people, nation, pays, état, gens” [PAM 2003, 550] < Brb. *ta-mur-t “land” [GT].

NB4: Although Akk. māru is generally connected with JAram. mār “Herr, Besitzer” [Levy 1924 III 233] || Ar. ma/i/ur?- “homme” [BK II 1085] etc. instead of Aram. *bar, R. C. Steiner (1982, 195/15, fn. 6) was inclined to consider it “*entirely possible*” that Akk. māru has “*two sets of cognates*” (sic), i.e., a contamination of two distinct Sem. roots in Akk., the one being *mar?- , the other one Aram. *bar “son”. Similarly, T. M. Johnstone (1987, 271) derived Mhr. ḥə-mrō from √br? “to create” via prefix m-, which L. Kogan & I. M. D’jakonov (2001, 148, §5) accepted (“*a situation which is in fact widespread in MSA*”, cf. Mhr. ḥə-mbərāwtōn “boys, male children”).

NB5: The AA cognates adduced by M. Cohen (1947, #47) for Ar. mar?- are untenable. The same applies to V. Blažek (2002, 104, §1.2) who compared WBrb.: Zng. ə-ma?r^h “elder brother” [Ncl. 1953, 101].

NB6: H. Jungrauthmayr and K. Shimizu (1981, 174: A₂, 202: A₁) assumed a connection of Ch. *m-r to Ch. *m-t, *m-z, *m-n, *m-m, deriving all these from a monoconsonantal root *m-. Similarly, N. Skinner (1995, 33) explained Ar. mar?- and Dangla umirne (above) as well as Ch. *m-t “woman” (!) from AA *m-n “person”! Dubious for phonological reasons.

LIT.: Erman 1892, 112 after Brugsch (Eg.-Sem.); Ember 1913, 118, #74 (Eg.-Sem.); Brk. 1932, 105, #27 (Eg.-Sem.); IS 1976, #227 (Sem.-Eg.-CCh.); Moftah 1987, 139, fn. 22 (Eg.-Ar.); OS 1989, 132 (Bata-Eg.) and (Eg.-WCh.-Fali); 1992, 184–185 (Eg.-WCh.-CCh.); Blz. 1990, 207 (WCh.-Fogaha); 2002, 104, §1.2 (Brb.-WCh.-Eg.-Sem.); Ibr. 1991, 48–49 (CCh.-PSem.); HSED #1727, #1740, #1803 (Sem.-Eg.-Sidamo-Ch.); Takács 1999, 97 (Eg.-Ch.).

- 5. GT: a connection to NOm.: Haruro & Baditu mālā “schiavo” [Crl. 1929, 62; 1937, 654] is unlikely, the latter being probably an ethnic name of a tribe.
- 6. A. Erman (1892, 112) related Eg. mr.t with Ar. mala?- “Menge, Haufe”, which, however, derives from Sem. *ml? “to fill”. This, of course, can have nothing to do with Eg. mr.t.

mr.t (OK) > **mrj.t** (NK) “Brett o.ä.” (OK, NK, Wb II 108, 2; WD III 54) = “Holzrelief (?)” (Helck MWNR V 914 doubted by Janssen) = “board: 1. probably the footboard of the bed, 2. the back of a seat, 3. also wooden board for some article of furniture (board of a coffin?)” (Janssen 1975, 184, 189, 388, §140) = “planche, cadre (?) d’un lit” (AL 79.1269: cf. Frandsen 1979, 294, where no new mng. is proposed) = “board” (DLE I 227) = “wooden plank” (Ward 1985, 333, §4) = “1. Bez. für das Fußbrett des Bettes, senkrecht stehendes Brett, beim 3t.t- und ḥ^ʿtj-Bett: Fußbrett, 2. die Lehne, ein senkrecht stehendes Holzteil (1x NK: Ostr. Grd. 44, 2:3–4)” (Köpfstein 1989, 13, §1 & 26, §1) = “Brett, *Fußbrett (auch am Bett), *Rückenlehne (am Stuhl)” (V., GHWb 347; ÄWb I 546; cf. Meeks 2005, 246, #546b with further lit.).

NB1: R. Caminos (1958, 98, §148) surmised the same word in the Chronicle of Osorkon B13: ʕh^c-n dj=f s(w) r mr lit. “then he placed himself on shipboard”, whence he explained Dem. r-mr “an Bord” (DG 168:1).

NB2: J. J. Janssen (1975, 184, fn. 17) did not rule out a semantical influence of Eg. mrj.t “river bank”.

- Etymology uncertain. GT: cf. either **(1)** Akk. amartu “1. sideboard (of a bed, chair, or wooden chest)” [CAD m2, 3] = “1. (jB) Seitenwand des Bettes, 2. (spB) Trennwand zwischen Häusern” [AHW 40] **(2)** or perhaps ECh.: WDng. málè “porter soutien (un frère en général) la la bataille ou la discussion”, málò (f) “soutien” [Fédry 1971, 122], EDng. màlè “soutenir, aider, appuyer, épauler” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 193]?

mr “(zusammen)binden, fesseln” (Med., Wb II 105, 1–8) = “to bind” (FD 111) = “(zusammen-, an)binden, 2. gebunden, verkrampft sein” (GHWb 347; ÄWb I 546) > Dem. mr “binden” (DG 166:2) = “to gird” (JEA 26, 1940, 105) > Cpt. (SALBF) MOYP “to bind, gird, tie” (CD 180a; CED 88) = “binden, sich gürten, (sich) verpflichten” (KHW 99) = “binden, umklammern” (NBÄ 710, n. 820).

NB1: P. Lacau (1954, 102, fn. 2), E. Edel (BiOr 21, 1964, 162), J. Vergote (CdE 51, 1975, 275), W. Westendorf (KHW 99), and J. Osing (1978, 73, n. 16) reconstructed the root as *mjr because of (S) $\text{M}\Delta\text{EIP}\text{E}$.

NB2: W. Erichsen (1954, 374) surmised in Dem. ml “binden” (Dem. Pap. Berlin 13602, l. 26) a variation reflecting (F) - λ , although (F) has also MOYP . In the Tebtunis onomasticon too, Eg. mr was glossed by Dem. mwl “binden” (Osing 1998, 216).

- From the same root:

NB: P. Langlois (1919, 150–161) explained from mr a number of diverse (mostly absurd) derivatives, i.a., Eg. *mr “hoe”, mrj “to like”, mrj.t “port”, mr.t “la berge divisée (déesses protectrices)” (sic), t3-mrj “Egypt”, mr “canal”, which represent distinct AA roots (cf. the respective entries). Semantically equally unacceptable is the derivation of Eg. mrw (*múraw) “Ufer (sic), Wüste”, mrj.t (< *muráw.ṯ) “Uferdamm, Hafen” etc. as suggested by W. Schenkel (1983, 223–4).

(1) mr.t “Kleiderbündel (?) (in einem Dorfnamen)” (OK, Wb II 105, 16; Pusch 1974, 20) = “sac, ballot de tissus (?)” (AL 77.1777) = “Kleiderbündel (?) (nur in Ortsnamen belegt)” (GHWb; ÄWb I 546) > Cpt. (S) $\text{M}\Delta(\text{E})\text{IP}\text{E}$, MHPE , MEPE , $\text{M}\Delta\text{APE}$, (B) MHIP (f) “bundle of cloths” (CED 182a; CED 88; Černý 1955, 37) = “Bündel” (KHW 99) = “paquet, botte” (DELC 120) vs. (SAL) MPPE , (F) MELAI “chain, bond, joint” (CD 182a) = “Band, Kette, Glied” (NBÄ 194) = “Band, Fessel” (KHW 99).

NB1: Vocalized as *máry.et (Černý 1955, 37) = *mú’ra < *múy.ra’t “bundle” (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 139) = *mē/ir(j).ṯ “Band, Bündel” (NBÄ 194, 248) = *mír(w).ṯ “Bündel” vs. *mēr(w).ṯ “Band” (Snk. 1983, 223–4) = *miry.at (MEPE) vs. *miy.at ($\text{M}\Delta\text{EIP}\text{E}$) vs. *mirr.at (MPPE) vs. *mír.at (MHPE) (DELC 120).

NB2: J. Osing (NBĀ 724, n. 854) explained (B) **ΜΔΠΙ** (f) “part of loaf (?) or loaf of certain form (?)” (CD 182a) = “Stück, Happen (vom Brot)” (NBĀ) from **mě/ir(j).ʔ* t “Glied” via the primary sense **“Band, Kette”*.

NB3: E. Dévaud (1916, 206) explained the Cpt. word from *mrrj.t* “paquets (?) (d’encens sacré)” (MK, q.v.) with a hint on vulg. Cpt. (S) **ΟΥΜΑΙΡΕ ΝΤΕΧΤΑΚΝΗ** “fasciculus myrrhae” (MMIFAO 6, 198). An eventual connection of MK *mrrj.t* with the AA root underlying Eg. *mr* is indeed not impossible, although a direct inner Eg. derivation of *mrrj.t* < *mr* is semantically rather unlikely.

NB4: P. V. Ernštedt (1953, 51–53) derived Gk. *μέρις* “*πορς*” (sic) = “fil” (Boisacq) = “Faden” (IEW) from (SA) **ΗΡΡΕ** comparing even (S) **ΜΑΡΟΥΟΣΕ, ΜΕΡΟΥ(Ο)ΔΕ** “a thing girt about the middle (?), belt” (sic) = “Kinnbacken” (KHW 100: act. “Kinnbacken-Band” < Eg. *mr* + *wgj.t*), although É. Boisacq (1916, 628) pointed out the connection of the former with Gk. **σμήρινθος** “fil”, which excludes an Eg. origin. Similarly, A. R. Bomhard (1981, 449; 1984, 274, #284) affiliated Gk. *μέρις* “cord, string, rope” with Icelandic *merð* “fish-trap (Fischreuse)” etc. < IE **mer-* “flechten, binden” (pace IEW 733), which, however, he regarded as a “long-range” (Nst.) cognate of Eg. *mr*.

(2) *mr.w* ~ *mr* “Binde, Zeugstreifen, Bündel, Bund” (MK, Wb II 105, 9–14; GHWb; ÄWb I 546) = “paquets de vêtements, ballots d’étoffes” (Jéquier 1921, 32, 350) = “strip of cloth, bundle of clothes” (FD 111) = “1. cloth strips (what kind of strips is less clear), 2. bundle (e.g. of vegetables always measured in this, exact mng. obscure, no indication of its quantity)” (Janssen 1975, 286–7, §67 & 360, fn. 4) = “un paquet d’étoffes ou de bandelettes” (V. Abusir, PK 1976, 183: B26 & 367) = “sac, ballot” (Abusir: V, AL 77.1776) = “bundle (most common measure of vegetable)” (Johnson 1996, 77f. after Janssen) > (S) **ΜΗΡ, ΜΔ(Δ)Ρ, ΜΕΡ** (m) “bundle” (CD 182a; CED 88) = “Bündel, Bund” (KHW 99; NBĀ) = “paquet” (DELIC).

NB1: Vocalized as **mě/ir(j).w* vs. met. **mě/i(j)r.ʔw* > **mēr.ʔw* (NBĀ 243, 813–4, n. 1060) = **mír(w).ʔ(w)* vs. **mě/ir(j).ʔw* (Snk. 1983, 223). W. Vycichl (DELIC 119) assumed three distinct pre-Cpt. etymons: (1) **miryaw* > (S) **ΜΕΡ** vs. (2) **míraw* > (S) **ΜΗΡ** vs. (3) **mirraw* > (S) **ΜΔ(Δ)Ρ**.

NB2: Cf. also Cpt. (SB) **ΜΟΥΡ** “band, girth, strap, bandage, bundle, clutch” (CD 181b) = “Band, Fessel, Gürtel, Bündel” (KHW 99), which J. Osing (NBĀ 186, 710, n. 820) and W. Schenkel (1983, 223) vocalized as **már.w* “Binde, Zeugstreife” (from a nomen instr. *mr.w*) and regarded as distinct from the substantivized inf. (SALBF) **ΜΟΥΡ**.

- Its primary mng. may have been “to tie around”. Represents part of a widespread AA root family with the basic sense denoting a circular movement. The following isoglosses can be separated:

(1) AA **m-r* “to encircle” (or sim.) [GT] > PCu. **mar-* “1. to be round, 2. turn, twirl, 3. wrapped” [Lmb.] = **mar-* “to wring” [Ehr. 1995, 309]: NAgaw: *Qemant mār y* “faire un bond” [CR 1912, 230], Hamta *mēr* “anello” [CR 1905, 222] || ECu. **mar-* “to wrap around, roll up” [GT]: esp. Afār *marmāru* “circle”, *marmar-ite* “to go round”, *mar-o* “circle”, *marommällo* “being round”, *marrōwe* “to encircle

(intr.)”, m̀arrow “encirclement” [PH 1985, 164], Baiso maramure “round” [Black, Flm.], PSam *mar “rund sein” [Heine 1977, 285] > Som. mar- “to gird, pass, cross” [Lmb.] = mar-s-ad “to put on cloths (said of woman)” [Black], PBoni *mar “to be round”, *mar-sī- “to encircle a group of animals”, *m̀arò “to tie dress by rolling” [Heine 1982, 103–4] > Boni mar-sī- (caus.) “eine Gruppe Tiere umzingeln und von allen Seiten hineinschließen” [Sasse 1980, 99], Rnd. m̀ar “to be round” [Heine 1976, 220] = mar- “to be round” [Lmb.] = mara “to go round, circle, revolve” [PG 1999, 219], Arb. mar- “to be wrapped, wound around” [Hyw. 1984, 383], Oromo mar- “to bind, roll up” [Black] = mara “to wrap”, marma “to be wrapped around, embrace”, marmāra “to visit, go round, back and forth” [Gragg 1982, 278, 281] = mar- “to gird, move in circles” [Lmb.] = mara “1. package, bundle, 2. to roll, twist”, marmarū “1. to roll up, 2. wrap around, 3. fold up, 4. curl”, marmū “1. to embrace, twine, 2. coil” [Btm. 2000, 192], Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata dials.) mara “to go round, turn, spin a thread, wrap” [Strm. 1987, 364; 1995, 207], Konso & Gdl. mar- “to gird” [Lmb.], Konso mar- “to roll up, meander” [Black], Gdl. mar- “to coil, roll up” [Black] (LECu.: Black 1974, 156) | HECu.: Sid. marmara “to wind, roll up” [Gsp. 1983, 225] | Dullay *mar- “to roll up” [GT]: Harso & Dobase mar- “aufwickeln, einrollen” [AMS], Gawwada & Dobase mar- “to gird” [Lmb.], Gollango mar- “auf-, herumwickeln” [AMS], Tsamay mir “to wring clothes” [Sava 2005 MS, 270] (Dullay: AMS 1980, 175, 212) | Yaaku -mir(i)mir-s- (tr.) “to twist” [Heine 1975, 136] (ECu.: Flm. 1964, 64; Heine 1978, 68; Sasse 1979, 24; 1982, 141) || SCu. *mār- “to wring” [Ehr. 1980, 323, #34] = *mar- [GT]: Rift *mar- “to wring” [Ehr. 1980, 342, #4]: PIraqw *marmār- “to twist, wring, fold” [KM 2004, 198] > Iraqw -marmar-īṅw- “to wring” [Wtl. 1958, 92] = mar- ~ marmar- “to wring” [Ehr.] = marmār “to twist” [Mgw. 1989, 115] = mār “to fold, wrap up, wring”, marmār “to wring, twist” [MQK 2002, 71], Grw. marmār- “to twist, wring, fold” [KM] | Qwd. mal- [-l- < *-r-] “to wring” [Ehr. 1980 MS, 4] | Dhl. mar- “to go round”, mar-aḏiḏ- “to make go around” [EEN 1989, 37] (PECu.-Dhl.: Blz. 1990, 210) ||| NOM.: Benesho mar “to plait hair” [Wdk. 1990, 107] | Yemsa mar- “to gird” [LH] = mar- “einen Verband anlegen” [Lmb. 1993, 366] || SOm.: Ari mār- “to twirl” (intr.) [Lmb.] (Cu.-Om.: HL 1988, 129) ||| WCh.: Gwnd. m̀irīṅya “to twist”, m̀irīṅyà “1. to turn in bed, 2. wriggle (as snake)”

[Mts. 1972, 81] | AS *mer > *mər “to turn (in)to” [GT 2004, 246]: Sura *mér, cf. *táa mér* “1. sich zur Seite wenden, abzweigen, 2. hindurchgehen, hineingehen, eintreten” [Jng. 1963, 74, 84], Mpn. *máər* (so, long -əə-) ~ (Jipaari) *mér* (short -e-) “to turn” [Frj. 1991, 41, 37], perhaps Msr. *mer* “to branch at someone’s house before reaching your house” (sic, act. “to turn away”?) [Dkl. 1997 MS, 383] | Pero *méro* “to turn” [Frj. 1985, 42] | Tangale *marì* “to twist, wring, screw”, *mure* “to twist, screw” [Jng. 1991, 119, 122], Pero *méréméro* “whirl (n.)” [Frj. 1985, 41].

NB1: Cf. still LECu.: Saho *mór-ō* (m) “Leibbinde, Gurt” [Rn. 1890, 271], Afar (Aussa dial.) *mar-tó* “skirt” [Black] | Som. *máro* “Toga, Leibtuch, Kleid” [Rn. 1904, 78] = *máro* “cloth (material), body-cloth” [Abr. 1964, 175] = *máro* “toga, dress” [Flm. 1964, 55] = *már-o* “cloth” [Black], PBoní **mâri* (f) “dress” [Heine 1982, 103] > Boní *marí*? “Kleidung” [Heine 1977, 289], Orm. (Waata dial.) *mar-ata* “cloth wound around head or waist” [Black], Das. (Galab) *mor-oč*, pl. *mor-is* “a kind of garment” [Sasse 1974, 418], which are derivable as deverbal nouns (lit. “sg. twisted around”) from LECu. **mar-* “to roll up, wrap around” [GT]. H.C. Fleming (l.c.) equated Som. *máro* with Baiso *māre* “human skin” [Flm.] = *mār* “human skin” [Brenzinger 1995, 22], which, however, represents a certainly fully distinct AA root, namely **m-r* “skin” [GT], cf. WBrb.: Zng *i-mur* “sachet” [Bst. 1909, 240] || NAgaw **mar* “leather bag, satchel” [GT]: Bilin *mār* “Ledersack, gegerbte Ziegenhaut als Schlauch oder Sack verwendet” [Rn. 1887, 273] = *mar* “leather bag” [Apl.], Qwara *may* “leather bag” [Apl.] = *māy* “Ledersack, Schlauch” [Rn. 1885, 103], Hamir *mār* “Schlauch, Sack, aus gegerbter Ziegen- oder Schafthaut verfertigt” [Rn. 1884, 394], Hamta *mār* “(piccolo) otre” [CR 1905, 222], Qemant *māy* “petit sac de peau, outre” [CR 1912, 234] = *may* “leather bag” [Apl.], Dembea *māy* [Rn.] (Agaw: Rn. l.c.; 1890, 257 with false comparanda; CR l.c.; Apl. 1991 MS, 3; 1994 MS, 1) || LECu.: Som. *méra* (m) “Kamelhaut” [Rn. 1902, 300], Orm.-Borana *marr-ā* “leather bags used for carrying tobacco or coffee” [Strm. 1995, 208] || CCh.: Musgu *a-mər* (prefix *a-*) “skin” [Mch.], Mogrum (Mulwi) dial. *à-mìr* “peau” [Trn. 1977, 26] = *à-mìr* “peau” [Trn. 1978, 206], Girvidik *à-mùr* “Haut, Leder” [MB 1972 MS, 4, 6], Pus *a-mor* [MB], Kaykay (Munjuk) *à-mùr* “peau” [Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 24] (CCh.: JI 1994 II, 297).

NB2: R. Kießling & M. Mous (2004, 198) erroneously derived PIrq. **marmār* (as a distributive stem) from WRift **mād* (sic) “set into revolving motion” based on the semantically false equation with Brg. *mād* “to drive, set into motion”.

NB3: P. Vernus (2001, 179) falsely rendered the PCu. root **mar-* as “lier”.

(2) AA **m-r* “rope” [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh *mur* “rope” [Aplg.] || WCh.: Hausa *mári* ~ *màri* “shackle, fetter” [Abr. 1962, 658; Abubakar 1995, 327] (Hausa-Angas: Stl. 1987, 234) | Galambu *múr* “rope (plaited from grass)” [Schuh 1978, 86, 152] || CCh.: presumably Mofu *mâr* “vein” [Brt./JI 1994 II 337], Mafa *már* “nerf, tendon” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 230] || ECh.: (?) Bdy. *marno*, pl. *maràn* (unless nomen instr. < * $\sqrt{r-n}$) “corde” [AJ 1989, 97].

NB: M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998, 121, §3) combined the Eg.-Shilh parallel with untenable Cu.-Om. cognates containing an initial **b-*.

(3) AA **m-r-r* “1. to twist a rope, 2. tie (a rope)” [GT] > Sem. **mrrr*: Ar. *marra* “5. serrer et attacher avec une corde un chameau, etc.”,

IV “8. tordre fortement une corde”, mirr-at- “tortis, tresse dont se compose une corde”, marīr-at- “1. tresse, tortis dont se compose une corde, 2. ficelle ou corde longue, mince et solide” [BK II 1083–4] = mrr “binden, fesseln” [Philippi 1875, 87] = marīr-at- “corde” [Dozy II 577] = mrr “serrer (avec) une corde”, marīr-at- “corde” [Masson 1991, 92], Dathina mrr “binden”, murr-iy-y-at- “collier de perles” [GD 2683, 2686] || NBrb.: Ait Said $\sqrt{m-r-r}$: ta-mri-^āt “sorte de corde” [Allati 1986, 15] | Qbl. a-mrrar, pl. i-mrrar-en ~ i-murar “1. corde, 2. câble (autrefois grosse corde de laine et poils de chèvre à quatre, six ou huit torons)”, ta-mrrar-t “ficelle” [Dlt. 1982, 513] || SBrb.: EWlm. ə-mrər “attacher solidement”, EWlm. & Ayr a-mrrar “1. bride de chameleon (pour le dressage), 2. corde de tirage (mise autour de la tête d’un chameau)” [PAM 2003, 553; 1998, 222] || Bed. marār, pl. mārār “1. vein, 2. streak of colour esp. in the sky at dawn and sunset” [Rpr. 1928, 218] = marrar “vein, artery” [Hds. 1996 MS, 95] || LECu.: Saho marōr-iše (tr.) vs. marōr-ite (intr.) “to twist” [Vergari 2003, 132], Afar amrāray “going round and round”, emrēreye “to go round and round searching exhaustively for sg.” [PH 1985, 41], Som. mārōr “Drehung”, caus. maror-ī “eine Drehung machen, drehen, winden” [Rn. 1902, 303] = marōr-ayya “to become crooked, twisted” [Abr. 1964, 176], Rnd. merereḥi “to wring” [Heine 1976, 223] vs. murēr “circle, dot, sphere” [PG 1999, 228] | HECu.: Sid. merrero “round” [Flm.] vs. Sid. merāra (m) “the rope that is used to tie the plough to the yoke” vs. mirāra (m) “the rope or strap that is used to attach the yoke to the plough” [Gsp. 1983, 229, 233] | Harso marari “round” [Flm.].

NB: F. W. M. Philippi (1875, 87) Ar. mrr with Hbr. mr? “stark, fest, fett, gesund, kräftig sein” and Ar. mar?- “Mann (eig. der Kräftige)” etc. Similarly, O. Masson (1991, 92) Ar. mrr with murr- & ^ʔamarr- “amer”, mirr-at- “fiel, bile”.

(4) Brb. *m-r-w/y “to turn round” [GT] > NBrb.: Sgrs. $\sqrt{m-r-y}$: ə-mri “tourner une bouillie” [Pellat 1955, 106] | Qbl. e-mru “2. (re)tourner” [Dlt. 1982, 512].

(5) Sem. *mwr “1. to encircle, 2. make circular movement” [GT]: Hbr. mwr hifil “1. vertauschen, 2. wechseln, 3. schwanken (Erde)”, nifal “verändert werden” [GB 408] = nifal “to (ex)change” [KB 560] | OSA: Sab. mwr “to enclose, shut in” [Biella 1982, 269], Qtb. ^ʔmwr “border, confines” [Ricks 1982, 139], Ar. mwr: māra “1. s’agiter, aller çà et là, 3. être agité comme par une mouvement de tangage” etc. [BK II 1166] = “schwanken, wallen” [GB] = “to run about, go around” [Biella], Yemeni Ar. mār “chain, necklace” [Piamenta 1990, 458], Dathina mwr: māra “circuler, tourner, couler,

sich hin und herbewegen” [GD 2724] vs. Dathina māra “border” [Ricks] || ES: (?) Tigre mawāra “to tie together” [Lsl. 1987, 361 with a diff. etym.].

(6) AA *m-y-r “to twist around” (or sim.) [GT] > LECu.: Som. mēr “Rundung, Kreislauf” & “die Runde machen, kreisen, rund sein”, mēr-ī ~ mērmēr-ī ~ mēr-sī “abrunden, drehen, rund, im Kreise bewegen” [Rn. 1902, 299] = mēr-ayya “1. to roam, avoid (a topic), be on his rounds” [Abr. 1964, 178], Boni mére “(etwas) aufdrehen, einkreisen” [Heine 1977, 285–6] || WCh.: AS *m^yaγ^war (?) > *m^waγ^rar (Sura) ~ *m^yār (Angas) ~ *m^ya₃γa₃r (Mpn.-Gmy.) “to twist” [GT 2004, 261] = *mVHVr < *m-r-H [Stl. 1987]: Angas myaar [reg. < *m^yaγ^rar] “to twist a strand of string (especially used of the strip of skin to be made into a bowstring, so as to get it into a state of torsion” [Flk. 1915, 251] = myaar ~ myar “Lederschnur drehen, Seil drehen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] = myar “to twist” [ALC 1978, 41] = myer “to twist” [Krf.] = mīar “to twist” [Gcl. 1994, 62], Sura muyer (so, -uye-) [mu- < *m^we- < *m^{wy}aγ- ~ *m^yaγ^w-?] “to twist” [Krf.], Mpn. myōr [-o- reg. < *-a₃-] “to twist” [Frj. 1991, 39], Gmy. miââr [myō̄r, reg. from *m^ya₃γa₃r < *m^yaγ^war?] “to twist” [Srl. 1937, 149] = ni miyòr “to twist” [Krf.] = myoor “to twist, squeeze, wring out” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 24] (AS: Stl. 1987, 234, #809) | (?) Saya mīrāt “to twist” [Csp. 1994, 70].

(7) Here belongs also WCh. *marṭ- “to plait (плетти)” [Stl.] > Bole-Tangale *murḍ [Stl.] with a C₃ root extension.

NB1: Cf. Hausa mūrḍa “to wring out, twist” [Abr. 1962, 685] = “to plait” [Jng.] | Bole murḍ “to plait” [Stl.], Krkr. murḍ “to plait” [Stl.] = mōrḍu “to twist” [Alio 1991 MS, #f130], Ngamo marḍit “to plait” [Stl.] = mārḍi “to twist (tordre)” [Alio 1988 MS] = marḍ- “to wring (wash in order to dry), squeeze” [Ibr. 2003 MS, 6] (BT: Stl. l.c.) | Mīya murḍ- [Stl.] | SBch.: Saya mūrḍi [Stl.], Mangas murḍēe “to twist” [Csp. 1994, 70] | Bade mōrḍ- [Stl.] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 234) || CCh.: Zelgwa mūrḍ “strangle” [Brt. 1995, 202]. Perhaps cf. also Krkr. malḍ “sich umwenden” [Lks. 1966, 203] = mālḍā “to turn (round)” [Alio l.c.].

NB2: The WCh. C₃ root extension *-ḍ has been recognized already by H. Jungraitmayr (1971, 287), who isolated in Hausa the “etymological root” *muR- conveying the idea of “twisting and rubbing”. Similarly, Ch. Ehret (1995, 309, #594) derived WCh.: Ngz. mārḡḡḍú “to wring out”, mārṭákú “to twist” [Schuh 1981, 106] from *mār- based on the comparison of Ngz. mārṁṁs- “to rub lightly”, mārṭāk- “to twist” ~ PSem. *mr- “to brush with the fingers” < AA *-mi/ar- “to take in the fingers”, which is semantically far-fetched.

LIT.: Rn. 1902, 299 (Som.-Ar); Ember 1913, 118, #77; 1930, #10.a.18, #12.a.12 (Eg.-Ar.); Clc. 1936, #202 (Eg.-Ar.); Vcl. 1958, 393 (Eg.-Ar.); Grb. 1963, 54, §17 (Orm.-Sem. with false AA comparanda); IS 1976, #309 (Eg.-ECu.-Angas); Bmh. 1986, 247; 1990, 397 (Eg.-ECu.); OS 1990, 89, #39; 1992, 191 (Galambu-Eg.); HSED #1730 (Eg.-Tangale-ECu.-Iraqw); Ehret 1995, 308, #591 (Eg.-PCu.-Bns.) & 309, #594 (PCu.-Ngz.); BG 1998, 121, §3 (Eg.-Shilh); Vernus 2001, 179 (Eg.-PCu. after Ehret l.c.).

- Other etymologies are either improbable or evidently out of question:
- **1.** Often compared with Common Nub. *mōr “binden”, *mur-ti “Knoten” [Abel].
Lit. for Eg.-Nub.: Abel 1933–34; Zhl. 1934–35, 174–5, 180; BiOr 21, 1964, 309; Vcl. 1983, 119.
NB: Possible only as a late borrowing of Nub. from Eg. Cognacy is excluded, Nub. not being part of the AA family.
- **2.** GT: a relationship with LECu.: Afar māmūl “string (ficelle)”, malmāle “to wrap, bandage, curl, puff, wring” [PH 1985, 158, 162] ||| CCh.: Bata mālē “rope (archaic)” [Pweddōn 2000, 53] is unlikely because of Cpt. -p.
- **3.** L. Homburger (1930, 285): ~ Ful (Peul) mōr-ude “coiffer”. Out of question.
- **4.** C. T. Hodge (1976, 11, #25, 18, fn. 25) affiliated Eg. mr “binden” with Sem. *ḥimār- “donkey” [SED II 137–9, #98], the basic sense of which he arbitrarily interpreted as *“(one bound (with a load) (?))”. Absurd.

mr “sich anschließen an” (PT, Wb II 105, 19; GHWb 347) = “sich gewöhnen an” (ÜKAPT VI 132) = “jemandem verbunden bleiben, sich zu jemandem halten” (Guglielmi 1991, 9, fn. 45) = “sich an etwas halten” (OK, Altenmüller 1998, 108, 281) = “1. (zusammen, an)binden, 2. (jmdm., r) folgen” (ÄWb I 546a).

● Origin uncertain:

- **1.** W. Guglielmi (l.c. supra) and GT: eventually derives from Eg. mr “binden” (Wb, q.v.)? If so, among the external cognates of the latter, cf. esp. SBrb.: EWlm. ə-ṃrər “attacher solidement” [PAM 2003, 553; 1998, 222] ||| Bed. (a)marrarai (marārai?) “to assemble (intr.)” [Rpr. 1928, 218].
- **2.** GT: eventually from the basic sense “to close”? Cf. WBrb.: Zng. √m-r: ie-mmar “être fermé”, i-mir “bouchage”, ie-mmar “fermeture” [Bst. 1909, 241].
- **3.** GT: or related to EWlm. & Ayr ə-ṃṃər “1. passer par (près de, à, auprès de, chez), 2. fréquenter, visiter, 3. voir au passage (qqn.), aborder (qqn.), 4. atteindre, toucher (qqn. + endroit), 5. se diriger vers, 6. concerner (qqch. + qqn.), 7. sur-, advenir à (qqn.), arriver à” [PAM 2003, 550] ||| HECu.: Sid. mara “to go towards a destination” [Gsp. 1983, 224]?
- **4.** GT: or to be derived from the primary sense “to join”? Cf. NBrb.: Qbl. mlil “1. rencontrer, 2. se rencontrer, se rejoindre”, a-mlili

“rencontre” [Dlt. 1982, 496–7; Chaker 1987, 163] ||| ECh.: Tumak mā:l “accompagner” [Cpr. 1975, 82], Sarwa malà “accompagner” [JI 1990 MS, 1, #3], cf. Gadang má:r [-r < *-l?] “accompagner” [JI 1990] | Sokoro mólewē “to follow” [Lks.] (JI 1994 II, 151: isolated in Ch.).

mr.t “Benennung der vier mit Binden umschnürten Behälter (für die vier verschiedenfarbigen Kleiderstoffe), die vor den Gott gezogen oder ihm geweiht werden” (OK, Wb II 108, 3–5) = “Kleiderkasten” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza III 50; Osing 1992, 65, 82) = “coffre” (AL 77.1783) = “mr.t-chests which contain coloured clothing” (Egberts 1983, 29–30) = “Meret-Behälter, Kleidertruhe (vier Truhen mit jeweils einem anderen Kleiderstoff, im Kult)” (GHWb 347).

NB: For the rites relating to the four mr.wt cf. Egberts l.c.

- As noted by E. Pusch (after Junker: Giza I 226, note), it may be derived from Eg. mr “binden” (q.v.).

mr.t “in den Bez. gewisser, nach Königen des Alten Reiches benannter Tempel” (OK, Wb II 108, 9) = “Kultstätte (?) der Hathor” (Anthes 1928, 21) = “Taltempel dem Kult der Hathor und dem Andenken des Stifters geweiht” (Helck in PWR XXIII 2208) = “Heiligtum, eng mit Hathor verbunden, vielleicht eine Kapelle der Hathor innerhalb des r3-š, innerhalb des Rahmens des Pyramidenkomplexes” (Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 70, n. 29) = “Königsresidenz (auf jene Fälle beschränkt . . ., wo der König nicht in der traditionellen Residenz Hof hielt, sondern freiwillig . . . eine persönliche Residenz errichtete)” (Goedicke 1967, 6, n. o) = “Gebäude (seine Funktion als Kultort der Hathor ist klar; seine Lokalisierung in allen Fällen ist unsicher; die Gleichsetzung mit Taltempel ist unrichtig; mr.t und Sonnenheiligtum sind nicht identisch – sie kommen in denselben Texten getrennt vor –, aber sie sind in ihrem Wesen verwandt)” (Wildung 1969, 137–8 & fn. 7–10) = “Heiligtum” (Pusch 1974, 20) = “der Palast- und Totentempelgarten” (Görg 1976, 29) = “der Vorläufer der späteren Geburtshäuser der Spätzeit” (Kaplony 1977, 315, 320) = “vielleicht eine Kapelle innerhalb des r3-š, Kultort der Hathor, Art Gebäude” (Zibelius 1978, 41, 102) = “Haus mit eigenem Kult der Hathor und des Horus” (Helck, LÄ II 378) = “Haus, nicht für den Geburt eines Götterkindes, sondern für den des königlichen Thronfolgers Gebäude als Teil des königlichen Palastes; könnte . . . die Zeremonialbühne für die wohl alljährlich gefeierte kultische Vereinigung des regierenden Königs mit der in Gestalt der Göttin Hathor agierenden Königin

gebildet haben; Kultort für die heilige Hochzeit... als Ort für die Zeremonien von Zeugung und Empfängnis” (Barta 1983, 102–4) = “mr.t-Gebäude als Lusthaus (?)” (Moftah 1987, 139, n. 26; ZÄS 92, 46 & n. 13) = “*Sanktuar, *Aufweg” (GHWb 347) = “Art Tempel” (WD II 66, cf. also Eichler 1991, 144 & fn. 5–7 with lit.) = “Taltempel mit Verehrung der Hathor und des Königs” (ÄWb I 546).

NB: The rendering “Taltempel” (Helck) was declined by H. Goedicke (1967, 6, n. o) on the basis of an OK letter (Pap. Boulaq 8, l. 10): “*eine derartige kultische Erklärung gibt aber im vorliegenden Fall keinen Sinn, da offensichtlich ein sekulärer Verwaltungsbegriff vorliegt*”.

● Rendering and origin disputed:

- 1. W. Helck (quoted apud Zibelius l.c.) affiliated it with Eg. mrj.t “Landeplatz” (q.v.).
- 2. H. Goedicke (1967, 6, n. o & fn. 7) assumed a connection to MK mrr.t “Residenz, Quartier” (Gdk.) = “(vom Palast)” (Wb II 110, 11).
NB: This, in his view, does not contradict Hathor’s cult, which belongs basically to the residence.
- 3. P. Kaplony (1977, 315, 320) saw in it the OK variety of LEg. pr-mr.wt “Geburtshaus” (lit. “Haus der Liebe”). Although this equation was doubted by W. Barta (1983, 102–4), both scholars agreed on the etymological connection of OK mr.t to Eg. mrj “lieben” and mr.wt “Liebe” (q.v.).
- 4. K. Zibelius (1978, 102) identified it with Amarna m3rw (q.v.).
- 5. M. Görg (1976, 29) and W. Helck (LÄ II 378) too, assumed its etymological connection to both NK mr.w “Gärten vor einem Tempel” and Amarna m3r.w (q.v.).
- 6. GT: any connection to Eg. mr “Art Gebäude” (late NK, Wb II 106, 1–2)?

NB: Cf. also mr “Gebäude (?)” (Pap. Berlin 23040a, frag. b, l. x+9, Burkard 1994, 102).

mr.t “Sängerin (?)”, Name zweier Göttinnen, besonders als Musikan-tinnen, auch als Göttinnen, die das Götterkind aufziehen” (OK, Wb II 107, 2–3) = “le rivage, le berge divinisée sous la forme des déesses protectrices de l’une et l’autre rive” (Langlois 1919, 156) = “goddesses and priestesses depicted playing the harp and sistrum on temple walls” (Gardiner 1936, 196) = “chanteuse” (Hickmann 1958, 127) = “musician-goddess” (FD 111) = “Sängerin” (Pusch 1974, 20 after Junker: Giza VII 37) = “a pair of goddesses characterized as mr.t-šm^cw and mr.t-mḥw, likely that they were singers from the out-set” (Brovarski 1987, 43–44, §23, esp. p. 44, fn. 2) = “Sängerschaft, Sängerguppe” (Guglielmi 1991, 9) = “songstress, singer” (PL 445).

Attested also as coll.: mr.wt (coll.) “Sängerschaft” (III., Kahl & Kloth & Zimmermann 1995, 13D, 249).

NB1: Its det. (D41: forearm with palm of hand downwards) is identical with what follows Eg. ḥs “to sing” indicating “*the pantomimic gesticulation or hand movements in chironomy*” (Brovarski after Hickmann l.c.).

NB2: Glossed in the Tebtunis onomasticon with the apparently homophonous Dem. ml3 “Art Schiff” (DG 168, cf. Osing 1998, 155, n. d, 166, 168, n. e).

NB3: It is this word that A. H. Gardiner (l.c.) explained the OT PN Miriam (sister of Moses and Aaron) from with special regard to the “*distinctive character of her own... as a prophetess and as musician*”.

● Etymology uncertain:

■ 1. P. Langlois (1919, 156) saw in it a personification of mrj.t (ḥrpw) “port” (!), which he ultimately derived from Eg. mr (ḥoyp) “lier”. Recently, W. Guglielmi (1991, 9–10) has regarded it as an original coll. fem. and assumed (besides, ignoring Langlois’ paper) a similar etymological connection: “*Zwar lassen sich über seine verbale Wurzel nur Vermutungen anstellen, mir scheint eine Ableitung von mr ‘binden’, ‘sich anschließen’ am wahrscheinlichsten, aber er ist... eindeutig mit ‘Sängerschaft’, d.h. wohl, ‘die (durch Gesang) verbundene Gruppe’, wiederzugeben*”.

■ 2. A. H. Gardiner (1936, 196) rendered its basic sense “the beloved”, which would derive “*in all probability*” from Eg. mrj “to love”. This etymology was in fact the one maintained by the Eg. priests as early as the MK. Rightly declined by W. Guglielmi (1991, 15 with further lit.) as a *Volksetymologie* (although more exact would be to use here “priestly etymology”).

NB1: Equally rightly has Guglielmi (1991, 15–16) rejected another old etymology: “*Ebensowenig sind die Deutungen älterer Autoren wie R. V. Lanzone, J. Dümichen und G. Maspero als ‘Uferland’ und ‘Überschwemmung’ zu halten... Sie sind deutlich von dem den ‘Nilen’ und Mr.t-Göttinnen gemeinsamen Lotus- und Papyrus-Kopfschmuck inspiriert*”.

NB2: Much deeper Eg. roots has the conception explaining the mr.t “*als Augen des Himmelsgottes, eine Metaphorik, die auch anderen Göttinnen zugeschrieben wird*” (discussed in detail by Guglielmi (1991, 16–18 with further lit.). Of course, this approach has to be also kept away from modern etymological analyses.

■ 3. GT: or to be identified with WCh.: Hausa múryà (f) “voice, tone, melody, musical tone (pitch) in speech” [Abr. 1962, 687] || ECh.: Kera muróy “Musik der Gurna” [Ebert 1976, 82] | Toram màriye “chanteuse” [Alio 2004, 259, #301]?

■ 4. GT: if the root had *-l- (cf. the Dem. gloss ml3), cp. perhaps rather ECh.: WDng. mìliyà (f) “chanteuse” [Fédry 1971, 133], Bdy. milay “1. louer, chanter, 2. être sage”, milay (f) “chanson, louage, manière”, milaayà (f) “chanteuse, femme qui pousse le you-you”, milaayò (m) “personne qui joue du tamtam, un artiste” [AJ 1989, 99].

mr “Kampfstier, Bulle” (MK, Wb II 106, 8; Guglielmi 1973, 111 with MK exx.; ÄWb I 546: Abusir, V. 1x) = mrj “fighting bull” vs.

mr.w “bulls” (MK, FD 111–2; Caminos 1956, 23, 28, 39) = mr “Art Rind” (V.: Kaplony 1972, 224) = mr “bovidé, boeuf” (V., PK 1976, 252, 322, 673: det. doubtful) = mr ~ mrj “Kampfstier, Bulle” (GHWb 347).

NB: Vocalized as *m^ˈrjēj (Fecht 1960, 10, §14).

- From the same root:

(1) probably mr-wr “Name des heiligen schwarzen Stiers von Heliopolis: Mnevis” (XVIII.: Amarna, Wb II 106, 4–5; WD III 54: cf. SAK 10, 1983, 259f.) = “der Name des heiligen Stieres von Heliopolis” (Sethe 1929, 12) = “Mnevis-bull” (FD 112) > Dem. mr-wr (DG168) > Gk. Μνηύις ~ Μνεύης ~ Μνεύις and OCpt. ΕΗΝΕΥΙ “Mnevis-Stier” (KHW 498 after Stz., WZKM 68, 1976, 186; AL 77.1778). Cf. also Mourski 1983.

NB1: Its first component was found as “*zweifellos identisch*” with MK mr ~ mrj by G. Fecht (1960, 9, §12).

NB2: Old mr-wr > LEg./pre-Cpt. *mn-wj is regular according to P. Lacau’s *Lautgesetz* on the *Lautübergang* r + m > tonloses *nēm/*mēn (Lacau 1922, 722; Sethe 1929, 12). G. Fecht (1960, 9, §13, fn. 25 & 10, §16) modelled the hypothetical shift of *mnēwi < *m^ˈnrēwi < *m^ˈrrēwi < *m^ˈrjēw^ˈ < *merjēj-wur^ˈr (compound of *m^ˈrj^ˈj “Kampfstier” + wr) on the analogy of Eg. mhr > mhn “Milchkrug” and (B) ΜΕΝΡΕ-, ΜΕΝΡΙΤ= etc. < *m^ˈnr- (under the influence of m-) < *m^ˈrr- < *m^ˈrj- or (as *Fernassimilation*) npr “Getreide” > npn.t “Getreidekorn” (Wb) > (S) ΝΑΠΡΕ ~ ΝΑΠΝΕ.

NB3: H. Schäfer (quoted in Sethe 1899, §221) read the name as nm-wr with regard to the phon. value nmj of the hrgl. O5 rightly declined by W. Spiegelberg (1904, 45–46), who, however, excluded the relationship of Eg. mr-wr and Gk. Μνηύις as “*lautlich undenkbar*” (falsely arguing that Eg. wr > only Gk. -ορη-). Instead, he traced the Gk. form back to Eg. mnj “als Name des Mnevisstiers” (Lepsius) not ruling out an etymological connection with Eg. mmmn.t “Herde” (q.v.). Although the latter idea is out of question, a var. mnj to mr-(wr) is indeed not excluded. G. Fecht (1960, 7, §10 & fn. 20), following H. Kees, pointed out a deviant var. form of Mnevis written as mnj-wr (sic) in CT V 205k (M1C, Meir) as well as nm-wr in three parallel texts of CT V 191b from Bershe (B5C, B9C, B10C). Nevertheless, Fecht regarded the 12th Dyn. CT vars. nm-/mnj- as sporadic “*Hörfehler*” (Kees: “*Hörvariante*”) and as isolated “*private Erzeugnisse fern vom Kulturzentrum des Stieres entstanden*”, while the original form mr- was paradoxically (but logically) preserved in the Amarna stelae representing “*hochoffizielle Königstexte mit der ursprünglichen heliopolitanischen Auffassung*”. Fecht assumed Bershe nm- (written with phonetic signs) to be due to a false resolution of the hrgl. O5 “*da in der zeitgenössischen Aussprache das alte mr- bereits ein -n hinter dem m- entwickelt hatte*”. Also M. Moursi (1983, 260) regarded mr-wr as the original var., “*auch wenn dort (i.e., CT) noch öfters Mn/Nm-wr erwähnt wird*”.

(2) perhaps mr.t “schwarze Kuh” (GR, Wb II 106, 10).

NB: Dubious whether it belongs here. Following B. Bruyère (1927, 66), J. J. Clère (1952, 637) assumed a lit. meaning “l’aimée (?)”.

- Cognate with Sem. *mir(Vʔ)- “bull” [SED]: perhaps Akk. (aB) mīrtum “Zuchtkuh”, (a/jB) mīru ~ mēru “Zuchtstier” [AHW 658] = mīru “young bull”, mīrtu “cow” [CAD m2, 109] || Hbr. mārī? “fatted steer, esp. oxen (buffalo, bubalus buffalus acc. to Aharoni)” [KB 635] (Sem.: SED II 205–6, #153) ||| HECu.: Hdy. mor-a “bull” [Flm.]

= mōr-â “bull” [Dlg. 1973a, 80] = mōr-a “ox (for breeding)” [Hds. 1989, 109] || SCu.: Ma’a (Mbugu) kí-mōlē’, pl. vi-mōle [-l- < *-r-] “Ochse” [Mnh. 1906, 311] = ki-more ~ ki-mole “ox, bull” [Flm.] = ki-móro “ox, steer” [Ehret 1974, 93; 1974 MS, 46] || NOm.: Wlt. mārā “jeune taureau” [Dlg. 1967] || Jnj. omoru “toro” [Crl. 1938 III, 67] = omora “bull” [Flm.: Hdy. loan?] = omoru “bull” [Ehret 1974, 94] || CCh.: Mtk. (Mafa) maray “1. fête rituelle du taureau, 2. taureau de case sacrifié lors de la fête” [Brt.-Brunet 1990, 231] = mari “Stier” (sic) [Krf. 1981 III 147, #189; Blz. 1992, 18, fn. 25] = maray “bull (for sacrifice)” [Mlt.], Mofu-Gudur maray “taureau engraisé à l’étable” [Brt. 1988, 183], Mtk. mari “bull” [Kraft 1981, 147, #189]. Cf. also ECu.: Dullay *mār- “heifer” [GT] > Harso & Dbs. mār-akkó (m) “Färse” [AMS 1980, 173], Tsamay märe “heifer” [Sava 2005 MS, 256] || SCu.: Ma’a mmèrà “bluish-grey cow”, mer-emére “barren cow/woman” [Ehret 1974 MS, 45] as fem. of the same root?

AP: NS *māwr “ox” [Ehret 2001, 279, #107].

NB1: The Sem. forms have been usually derived from Sem. *mr? “to be fat”, cf. Akk. mīru “Mästung” [AHW] || Ug. mrû/i/â [Gordon 1965, 1544; WUS 1663], which was convincingly doubted by L. Kogan (SED l.c.), since (1) √mr? is virtually unattested in OT Hbr., and (2) no OT passage suggests that Hbr. mārī? was a fat(ened) animal, while (3) Akk. mīru is not derived from marû “to be fat” either in AHW and CAD. M. Franci (2005, 58) equated CSem. *mari?- “fat” (as “generally a synonym of power and virility”) directly with Eg. mr ~ mrj “(fighting) bull”.

NB2: Ma’a -moro “steer” is hardly a loan borrowed from SNil. *mōi < *mōri “calf” as suggested by Ch. Ehret (1974, 93).

NB3: Quite widespread is in the lit. combing the words for “bull” with reflexes of AA *m-r “ram, sheep, lamb, calf” [Mlt.] = AA *mar(ay) “ram” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. *m3j, q.v.) etc. (see Blz. 1990, 207; 1992, 28, n. 25; OS 1992, 168; HSED #1728; Mlt. 1995, 119, #8; Mlt. 1996, 20, §5; Blz. 2000 MS, 9, #52; SED II 205–6, #153).

NB4: A. B. Dolgopolskij (1967, 8, #5) combined NOm.: Wlt. mār-ā “jeune taureau” & Eg. mr and mr.t with Sem. *bu?r- “jeune taureau”. Unconvincing, for further comments see Takács 1999, 39.

LIT.: Dlg. 1967, 8, #5 (Eg.-Wlt.-Sem.); Flm. 1969, 29 (Ma’a-Hdy.-Jnj.); Behrens 1984–85, 166, §4.1 (Eg.-Ma’a-Jnj.-Akk.-Mtk.); OS 1992, 182 (PCCh.-Eg.); HSED #1728 (Eg.-Mafa); Mlt. 1995, 119, #8 (Eg.-CCh.); Mlt. 1996, 20, §5 (Eg.-Mtk.); Blz. 2000 MS, 9, #52 (Hdy.-Eg.-Mtk.); SED II 205–6, #153 (Sem.-Eg.-Mafa with untenable comparanda).

● Other etymologies are less likely:

- 1. P. Newberry (E.B. I 28) rendered Eg. mr(j) as “favourite (of the cows)” < mrj “to like”, which was declined by W. Guglielmi (1973, 111).
- 2. G. Fecht (1960, 10, §14): perhaps a nisba (*mr.j) of Eg. mr “Viehweide” (q.v.), hence literally “der von der Viehweide”.
NB: Fecht argued that “*Es könnte eine tabuistische Umschreibung für die eigentliche Bezeichnung des gefährlichen Kampfstiers vorliegen*”.
- 3. W. A. Ward (1980, 357f.; AEB 34, #80.222) derived Eg. mr-wr and mr(j) from his hypothetical Eg.-Sem. *mrr “1. harsh, violent strength,

2. pain, 3. illness, 4. bitter” (sic) along with other untenable derivatives, such as e.g. Eg. *hr-mrj.t* “crocodile” (!).

- **4.** F. Kammerzell (1999, 250, table 15): Eg. *ml-* (sic) ~ IE **mel-* “black”. Absurd.

mr.w (food det.) “provisions” (CT I 351b, DCT 173 after AECT I 73).

NB: R. *ban der Molen* (DCT) compared also CT IV 144a *mr.w* (in a context similar to that of CT I 351b) rendered by R.O. Faulkner (AECT I 248) as a rel. form “what (your name) desires (?)”.

- From the same root (?): *mrr* “als Bez. für Speisen” (GR, Wb II 110, 13) = “(among pastry)” (AEO II 231*) = “provisions” (GR: Edfu, PL 443).

NB: However, if A. H. Gardiner’s (AEO II 231*) and P. Wilson’s (PL l.c.) supposition is right that this late word “*may... specifically denote a type of bread and be connected with*” Eg. *mrr* (GW, listed among cakes in the Golénischeff onomasticon 7:1, cf. AEO l.c.) = “ein Gebäck” (Wb II 110, 12) = “Opferbrot” (Helck MWNR 672, #27) = “a baked good” (Hoch 1994, 138, §178), regarded by Wilson to be “*possibly a loan word*” and by Hoch as a borrowing from Sem. **ml*, any comparison of it with CT *mr.w* has to be refuted.

- Origin uncertain.

- **1.** GT: may be related to OSA: Sab. *myr* “grain (crop, harvest)” [Biella 1984, 274], Ar. *myr*: *māra* I “1. procurer, fournisseur des denrées, des vivres, approvisionner qqn., surtout les siens en vivres”, *mīr-at-* “approvisionnement en grains, en denrées” [BK II 1171] = *myr* “to supply with grain”, *mīr-at-* “provisions, grain stores” [Biella] = *myr* “to supply, make provision for” [KB], Dathina *myr* “approvisionner”, *mīr-* “approvisionnement” [GD 2727].

NB: The Ar. root is ventually akin to NBab. *māru* “kaufen” [AWH 616b] = “to buy” [Hnrg.] (< NWSem./Aram., cf. Soden, Or. 35, 18; 46, 190) || Hbr. *mwr nīfal* “to change o’self” [KB], Syr. *mwr* “to supply” [Hnrg.] = “to import grain” [KB] (Sem.: KB 560; Hnrg. 1986, 170 & fn. 4).

- **2.** GT: or perhaps related to Sem. **ml*: Akk. *malālu* G “to eat (one’s fill), consume, eat clean”, D “to provide with food” [CAD m1, 160–1 contra AHW] || (?) Ug. *ml* (hapax in context of eating and drinking) [Watson 1982, 9]?

mr.t “Art Schiff” (MK, Wb II 108, 7) = “kind of boat” (FD 111; Jones 1988, 139, §38 with lit.) = “Fahrzeuge (dieses Typs bilden die Flottile der Bestattungsfahrt)” (Düring 1995, 150) > Dem. *mr.t* “Art Schiff” (DG 168:3).

NB1: Cf. Dem. *r/hr mr.t* “an Bord” (DG 168:1) = “to/on shipboard” (Smith). As correctly stressed by M. Smith (1978, 360), this lexeme is to be separated from Dem. *r-mr* “quer über, andere Seite” > Cpt. **MHP** (CD 180a) as well as from Eg. *mrj.t* (q.v.).

NB2: Cf. also Dem. *ml3* “Art Schiff” (DG 170:4) = *mlw3.t* ~ *ml^c3.t* “a ship” (Smith),

whose identification with Gk. *μηλωτή* “sheepskin” (proposed by Thissen) was declined by Chauveau (CdE 71, 66) and Smith (2000, 180, ad IV:17) suggesting in these forms a var. wtg. of Dem. *mr.t*.

- From the same root: (1) *mr.wt* ~ *mr.jt* “Schiffahrt”, in the title ʕ3 n *mr.wt* (LP, Wb II 108, 8), (2) perhaps also *jh3j.t mr* “Art Schiff von Vieh”, act. “schwimmender Stall (?)” (Ramses IV: Pap. Harris I 12b:11, 69:13, Wb II 109, 4) = “type of boat for conveying cattle” (Jones 1988, 139, §37) = “*eine Rinderfähre” (GHWb 348) = “ein speziell zum Transport von Tieren dienender Schiffstyp” (Dürning 1995, 140).
- Etymology obscure.
- 1. J. D. Wölfel (1955, 102, §4) linked it (as a Mediterranean *Wanderwort*) to a number of untenable parallels, i.a., Lat. *remus* & Irish rame “Ruder”. False.
- 2. J. Settgast (1963, 75, fn. 1) and N. Dürning (1995, 150) affiliated it with Eg. *mj.t* “Art Schiff” (MK, Wb, q.v.). Not to be excluded.
NB: Dürning compared (semantically unconvincingly) also Eg. *m3.t* “proue (d’un navire)” (AL 77.1572; Meeks 1994, 258, discussed above), since “*die Gleichsetzung des mj.t mit m3.t mit der... Lesung mr.t bereitet keine Schwierigkeiten*” (cf. AÄG §30).

mr.t “Auge (einer Gottheit)”, dual *mr.tj* “die beiden Augen” (BD 1x, GR frequently, Wb II 107, 10–15) = “l’œil (du dieu)”, dual “les deux yeux” (Lefébvre 1952, 16, §17; El-Sayed 1987, 64) = “Auge des Königs” (Edfu, Kurth 1994, 13, §52).

NB1: Occurs esp. in the epithet of Horus of Pharbaithos *hr-mr.tj* and the TN *pr-hr-mr.tj* (lit. “Haus des Horus der beiden Augen”) > Cpt. (B) *ΦΑΡΒΑΙΤ* > Ar. *Horbeit* ~ *Horbet* (KHW 479; PL 446). G. Roeder (ZÄS 61, 1926, 58) was sceptical about this derivation (esp. as for LEg. *h-* > Ar. *h-* and Gk. *-βαθ-* < Eg. *mr.tj*), but K. Sethe (1928, 99) collected evidence for Eg. *h-* > Ar. *h-* and LEg. *m* > Gk. *β*.

NB2: Cf. also *mr.tj* (snake det.) “zwei dem Toten feindliche Schlangen” (BD, Wb II 107, 16), which may be alternatively conceived as a reference to the two *mr.t*-goddesses (Barguet quoted by Ward 1978, 144–145, §287).

NB3: W. Helck (1954, 76–77), followed by A. Volten (1959, 27), demonstrated the early existence of the word attested by an unusual wtg. of the title *mr* “Vorsteher” (Wb, q.v.) from Dyn. III written with *m* + two eyes.

NB4: H. Brugsch (1882, 68) affiliated it with GR *mn̄tj* “eyes” on the basis of the interchange of *n* ~ *r* < **l*, but this late form may have an entirely distinct etymon, being a var. of GR *mnd* “eye” < BD *mnd.t* “part of face” (q.v.).

- Origin highly debated. Most probable is #1.
- 1. W. Vycichl (1951, 72) and G. Takács (1995, 159): ultimately cognate with Eg. *m33* “to see” (with an interchange of 3 ~ *r*).
NB: Cf. also LEg. *m3.tj* dual. “die Augen (Sonne und Mond als Augen des Himmels)” (LP, Wb II 11).
- 2. P. Lacau (1970, 150, §406) derived it via *m-* prefix from Eg. *jr.t* “eye”. Followed by W. A. Ward (1978, 144–6, §287): “*attractive suggestion and would strengthen the idea of a late dialectal variant*” (specific for the Ptol. lexicon). Unconvincing. None of the functions of *m-* seems to fit here.

- **3.** W. Westendorf (KHW 22) and Guglielmi (1991, 16 & fn. 92 with lit.) suggested a connection between Eg. mr.t ~ OEg. b33 > LEg. bnr > GR br.wj (dual) “eye(ball)”, which was rightly declined by W. A. Ward (1978, 144–145, §287). There was probably no etymological relationship to Eg. *bl (cf. EDE II s.v. br).
- **4.** A. M. Lam (1993, 379) identified Eg. mr.t with Pulaar mērtu- “ouvrir les yeux”. Absurd.

mr.t “ein Tier (zwischen Fischen genannt)” (XVIII. Mag., Wb II 105, 17).

NB: G. Takács (1997, 53–54, #1; 1998, 134, #1.2) suggested a connection to the 2nd component of PN n^r-mr. Was the n^r sign (depicting a catfish) just the ideogram of a hypothetic *mr catfish? Cf. esp. WCh.: Grnt. mólāj “eel, fish, catfish, mudfish” [Haruna 1992 MS, 24] || CCh.: Mofu málálāj “catfish” [Rsg.] (for further cognates see below).

- Existence, meaning, and etymology uncertain. Only guesses are possible:

- **1.** GT: perhaps < AA *m^wal-/*malw- (?) “fish” [GT] = *mal(w)- [Blz.]? NB1: Attested in LECu.: Mossiya mōle “fish” [Lmb.], Bussa mole [mólē] “fish” [Wdk.-Tanaba-Cheru 1994, 9] | Baiso mōle “fish” [Lmb.], PSam *mal(a)lāy “fish” [GT] > Som. málāj “fish” [Abr. 1964, 172, not listed in Rn. 1902], Som.-Digil malalay [Crl.], Som.-Hawiya mallay [Crl.], Som.-May mallállay [Lmb.], Som.-Jabartū malláy [Rn. 1904, 78], PBonī *málólāi “fish” [Heine 1982, 147] > Boni melelé’i [Heine 1977, 287], Bireeri maleléi [Heine], Safare malalāi [Heine], Jara & Kijee & Kilii málāi [Heine] (Boni dials.: Heine 1982, 106) | HECu. (from NOM.): Sid. mwoliyā “fish” [Chn., Lmb.] || P Om. *mol- “fish” [Lmb., Philippson, Bnd.]: NWomt. *mol-o [Bnd.] > Wolamo muoliyā [Crl.] = mole [Bnd.] = moliya [Alm., Lmb.], Zala muoliyā [Crl., Lmb.], Dawro (Kullo) mōl’ā [Bnd.] = molya [Lmb.] = woliya (so, w-) [Alm.], Gofa molā [Crl.] = molā/o [Lmb.] = molo [Alm.], Male mollo [Bnd.] = molo [Lmb.], Bsk. mōla [Bnd.], Gamu & Dache mole [Bnd., Alm., Lmb.], Dorze mol’lé [Bnd.] = mole [Alm., Lmb.], Oyda mōllo [Bnd.] | SEOmt. *mol-e/o [Bnd.] > Koyra (Badittu) malalā [Crl., Lmb.], Zayse mo’le [Bnd.] = mole [Lmb.] = mole [Sbr.], Zrg. mo’le [Bnd.] = mole [Sbr.], Gdc. mollo [Bnd.], Kcm. (Haruro) molo [CR, Bnd., Lmb., Sbr.], Gnj. molo [Sbr.] | Chara mulā [Crl., Bnd., Lmb.] = mula [Mkr.] | Sns. mole [Alm.] (NOM.: Crl. 1929, 44, 50, 62; CR 1937, 654; Bnd. 1971, 252–7 & 279, #28; 2003, 116, §51; Alm. 1993 MS, 7; Sbr. 1994, 14; Bnd. 2000 MS, 56, #51) || SOm. *mol- “fish” [GT]: Ubamer & Galila mol-ta [Mkr.], Ari mola [Bnd. 1994, 150] (NOM.-SOM.: Mkr. 1981, 208, #32; Cu.-Om.: Crl. 1929, 32; Crl. 1951, 172; Lmb. 1993, 363; Lmb. 1994, 115; LS 1997, 461) || WCh.: Glm. málā “eel” [Alio 1988 MS] | SBAuchi *m^wal(l)aj [partial redupl. < *m^walam?] “fish” [GT]: Guruntum mwerrang “fish” [Gowers] = mollaṅ [Smz.] = m^walaṅ “fish” [Jaggar 1989, 184] = mólāj “eel, fish, catfish, mudfish” [Haruna 1992 MS, 24] = moləṅ “fish” [Csp. 1994, 17], Mbaaru mollaṅ “fish” [Smz.] (SBAuchi: Smz. 1978, 24, #17; JI 1994 II, 140) || CCh.: Mofu málálāj “catfish” [Rsg. 1978, 222, §118] | Ktk. mulni ~ -e “poisson: Gymnarchus niloticus C.” [Lbf. 1976, 20, §13] | Musgu-Puss malaw “poisson: Porcus Bayad Bayad” [Trn. 1991, 103] | Lame mbāl [mb- reg. < *m-] “poisson sp.” [Scn. 1982, 309] || ECh.: Smr. mwālā (m) “carpe” [Jng. 1993 MS, 46].

NB2: M. Cohen (1947, #466) equated the ECU. forms with Eg. rm “Fisch” (OK, Wb II 416, 12). Uncertain because of the met. as well as the Cpt. reflex (S) PΔ(Δ)MΘ, PΔMH “ein Fisch: Tilapia” (KHW 163). For the etymological problem of Eg. rm, cf. recently Takács 1995, 159–164; 1996, 89–93.

nb3: In the view of M. Lamberti (p.c., 6 January 1997), the ECu. word for “fish” was probably borrowed from NOM. (cf. the suffix *-iya* in Sidamo typical of Ometo).

nb4: Ch. Ehret (1995, #587) affiliated NOM. *mol- “fish” with WCh. *m-l “water”. In theory possible, cf. e.g. Sem. *nūn- “fish” [AHW 803] (attested in Akk.-Aram.-?Ar.) ||| Eg. nw.t ~ nwj.t “Wasser” (MK, Wb II 221), nnw “Urwasser” (OK, Wb II 214–215), or IE *mad- “naß” > i.a. OInd. mátsya- [< *mad-(e)s-yo-?] “fish” (act. *Nasser?) [KEWA II 567; IEW 694].

nb5: G. Philippson (2003 MS, 3) assumed in the NOM. word a prefix *m-, although his analysis was based purely on the phonologically unacceptable comparison with NOM.: Bns. örú, Dime ʔorɔq (!). Note that Omt. *-l- = Bns. -l-.

nb6: G. Takács (1997, 53–54, #1; 1998, 134, #1.2) did not exclude an ultimate relationship between AA *m-l “fish” and AA *m-l-ʔ/h “lizard” (discussed s.v. Eg. mnḥ, q.v.).

dp: V. Blažek (2000 MS, 13, #68) compared the AA root with Drv. *malaŋku “eel” [DED #4737].

lit.: Takács 1997, 53, #1; 1997, 93, #155 adopted in Blz. 2000 MS, 13, #68 (ECu.-Om.-Sbauchi-?Eg.).

- **2.** GT: or cf. perhaps SBrb.: Ewlm. & Ayr mälul, pl. mälul-än “1. serpent, 2. reptile” [PAM 1998, 217; 2003, 539] ||| WCh.: Hausa mülwà “a short, thick snake” [Brg. 1934, 800] | Dera málmal “burrowing viper” [Nwm. 1974, 130] = “viper” [Kidda 1991 MS, 2].
nb: G. Takács (1997, 54, #2) and V. Blažek (2000 MS, 13, #68) compared the Hausa word with AA *mulʕ/h- “lizard” [GT].
- **3.** GT: or cp. perhaps WCh.: Hausa mààrí (m) “type of fish” [Abr. 1962, 658] || CCh.: Masa mérmér & Gizey mèmìrèŋ “poisson: Siluranodon auritus” [Ajl. 2001, 45].
- **4.** GT: or eventually related with AA *m-r “sort of snake” [GT]?
nb1: Attested in Agaw *mər[V]w- “snake” [Apl.] = *məw(V)r- [Ehret] = *mi/ur- [Orel]: NAgaw *məraw- [Ehret] > Bilin meráwā [Rn.] = mərəwā [Apl.; TS 1997, 519], Qemant mārāwā, pl. mārā-k [CR] = merewa /mərəwā/ [Bnd./Ss. 1973] = /mirewā/ [Ss. 1972 MS, 9, #76] = [mórōwā] [Ss. 1973, 124, #76] = mərəg/awā ~ mərə/āwā [Apl.] = mərəwā [Mkr.], Falasha merowa [Apl.], Qwara marāwā [Rn.] = mārā/owā [CR], Kaylo (Kailinya) mərəwā [Apl.], Dembea merwā [Rn.] | SAgaw *məwr- [Ehret] > Awngi muérí [CR] = muri [Bnd. 1971, 238, #76] = mūr-i, pl. mūr-ka [Hetzron 1978, 129, 140; Apl.] = (sic, -a-) mari [Bnd. 1975, 187] = mūrí [Wdk. 1995, 16 after SLLE], Damot murí [CR] (Agaw: Rn. 1885, 101; 1887, 275; CR 1905, 168; 1912, 232; Hhn. 1975, 96; Apl. 1984, 39; 1991 MS, 11; 1996, 17; 2005 MS, 105) || ECu.: (?) Arb. martú (m) “intestinal worm, Taenia/Ascaris” [Hyw. 1984, 384] & Rnd. maráy “ringworm (fungal skin disease)” [PG 1999, 219], (?) Orm. marʔatā “kind of dark blue snake” [Gragg 1982, 278] | (?) Yaaku (Mogogodo) murhot “snake” [Grb. & Bnd. 1971, 281, #76] = mərḥo “snake” [Ehret] (Yaaku-Bilin: Grb. 1963, 36, §155) ||| WCh.: PAngas-Sura *mʔir(im) > *mʔirəm (partial redupl.) “python” [GT 2004, 262] = *mʔir[m] [Stl. 1977] = *myir [Stl. 1987]: Angas myírm “the python (Hs. mesa)” [Flk. 1915, 251] = mirəm “Pythonschlange” [Jng. 1962 MS, 26] = myírm “python” [ALC 1978, 41] = myírm “python” [Krf.], Sura mir “Pythonschlange” [Jng. 1963, 74] = miyir (so, -iyi-) “snake” [Krf.], Mpn. mēr (so, -e-) ~ mūr “python” [Frj. 1991, 37–8], Chip mir “python” [Krf.], Gmy. mir “boa” [Srl. 1937, 140] = mir “Pythonschlange” [Jng. 1962 MS, 4] = mir “python” [Krf.] = mir “python” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 23] (AS: Sd. 1972, 185; 1977, 155, #132; 1987, 234, #810) | Fyer mírím “Pythonschlange” [Jng. 1970, 88; Seibert 2000 MS, #A034; Blench 2000 MS, 5, #A34] | Grnt. miiri “python” [Jaggar 1989, 187] || CCh.: Hwona mimira “snake” [Mkr.] | Bdm.

muri “python” [Gaudiche 1938, 19] = múri [Souley 1993 MS, 99]. AP: Suk murot “snake” [Grb.], Songhay mir “Python” [Mkr.].

NB2: M. L. Bender (1994, 1163, #76) set up a certain PCu. *moḥ^hr- “snake”.

LIT.: Ehret 1987, 74, #308 (Agaw-Yaaku); Mkr. 1987, 345; 1989 MS, 18, §5 (WCh.-Agaw-Yaaku-Hwona); Orel 1993, 39 and HSED #1808 (Agaw-WCh.).

mr, occurs in m mr=s “in ihrer (einer Göttin) Nähe” (LP, Wb II 106, 3).

● Origin uncertain.

■ **1.** D. Meeks (p.c., 13 April 2000) surmises that the det. (O5) suggests a relationship with MK mrr.t “Straße, Gaße” (Wb, q.v.).

■ **2.** Perhaps to be compared with HECu.: (?) Sid. merêro “the middle, among”, merêra “to attain the middle (e.g., of the night)” [Gsp. 1983, 229] ||| WCh.: (?) Pero mùr-míná “neighbour”, cf. mínà “house” [Frj. 1985, 42] || ECh. *mir-/myar- “near, close” [OS]: Lele mîrà “near” [Simons 1981, 27, #458] = mîrā “être proche, près, proximité” [WP 1982, 63], Nancere méra “nahe” [Lks.], Kabalay mrā “nahe” [Lks.], Kulong merá “nahe” [Lks.] (Lay gr.: Lks. 1937, 90, 93, 137).

LIT.: OS 1992, 200; HSED #1759 (Eg.-ECh.).

NB1: Doubtful by D. Meeks (p.c.) on the basis of the otherwise usually correct argument “*Tout le problème du comparatisme... est que l'on compare entre eux des mots et non des radicaux comme on devrait*”. Following this principle, we might ponder if LEg. mr is ultimately akin to Eg. mr “sich anschließen an” (PT, Wb, q.v.), which, however, would not necessarily rule out the suggested equation with the reflexes of AA *m-r “close” [GT].

NB2: The Sidamo parallel is uncertain, since it may alternatively derive from HECu. *marêro “1. middle, center, 2. ensete trunk core” [Hds. 1989, 58, 99].

■ **3.** GT: or if LEg. mr < *ml, connected to HECu.: Sid. molē “vicino”, cf. mulē (prep.) “sotto, a danno di...” [Crl. 1938 II, 214] = mulé “presso, vicino” [Mrn. 1940, 231] = mulé (m) “near, soon (in space, time)” [Gsp. 1983, 240] = mule ~ mulé (adv.) “near”, cf. mule “next to (the bed)” [Hds. 1989, 104–5, 387: isolated in HECu.] ||| WCh.: Saya mel “near” [Csp. 1994, 59]?

AP: ONub. mol “zu, in die Nähe von” [BG 1996, 208], Nuba -mōlla “nahe bei” [BG] = mōl “nahe” [Hohenwart-Gerlachstein 1979, 281].

NB1: Any connection to NBrb.: Shilh-Tazerwalt i-mäl “im nächsten Jahre” [Stumme 1899, 189] | Mzq. i-mal “l’an(née) prochain(e)” [Tf. 1991, 417] | Rif i-mar “année prochaine” [Tlm. 1998, 64], Mzab i-mal “l’an prochain” [Dlh. 1984, 117], Wrg. i-mal ~ (parfois) i-man “prochain(e) fois, une autre fois, à venir (se dit surtout pour l’an prochain)” [Dlh. 1987, 189]?

NB2: Cf. Sid. milā “companion(s), fellow(s)”, milimma “vicinity” [Gsp. 1983, 231] = milimma “vicinity” [Hds. 1989, 386]?

mr “als Synonym für m3^o.t” (GR, Wb II 106, 10).

● The use of the artificial word mr (bull sign + phallus det.) as a synonym for m3^o.t is due to the interchangeability of mr “bull” vs. m3^o.t by H. W. Fairman (ASAE 43, 1943, 255f. following A. M. Blackman),

which has been explained by G. Fecht (1960, 9, §12) with the identical pronunciation of both $m3^c.t$ and mr “bull” in the Ptol. era, cf. (S) $M\text{E}$ “Wahrheit” < $m3^c.t$ vs. (S) $M\text{E}$ “lieben” < $*m\acute{e}rj\acute{i}.t$.

NB: V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 201; HSED #1742) erroneously compared Eg. mr directly (!) with CCh.: Zeghwana maṛā “correct” [Krf. 1981, #287], which is baseless, albeit may fit well indirectly Eg. $m3^c$ (q.v.).

mr.t “Kehle o.ä. eines Gottes (von der $m3^c.t$ ‘Wahrheit’ gebraucht, die ihm gereicht wird)” (GR, Wb II 107, 7) = “gorge” (Lefébvre 1952, 22) = “gorge, gosier” (Berlandini, LÄ IV 85; AL II 167, #1786; cf. Blackman, JEA 22, 1936, 105; Fairman, ZÄS 91, 1964, 8, vii) = “throat, voicebox, larynx” (Walker 1996, 269) = “throat, gullet (associated with Hathor and Maat regarded as the throat of god by which air and food were given to him)” (PL 445).

NB: No trace of the word from earlier than the GR. D. Meeks (2000, 239, n. 1) observed a certain $mr.t$ (?) (flesh det.) in Ostr. Petrie 36 = Ostr. DeM 1696, rt. 1 “désignant une pièce de boucherie ou une partie du corps (humain ou animal)” (not listed in the standard lexicons, cf. also Grandet 1999, 15, n. 68), although he regarded “*un rapprochement avec $mr.t$ ‘gorge’...*” as “*très hasardeux*” in spite of “*des graphies de ce mot*” (listed in Guglielmi 1991, 113) that are “*assez proches de celles de nos ostraca*”.

- Meaning to be treated with reservations due to the very late attestation. Etymology problematic:

- **1.** G. Lefébvre (1952, 22 & fn. 9), J. Berlandini (LÄ IV 85), W. Guglielmi (1991, 14), and P. Wilson (PL 445) identified it with OK $mr.t$ “songstress” (PL) as an “incarnation de la chanteuse-chironome antique, officiante...” (Berlandini) = “organ over which the songstress had particular authority” (Wilson), although Wilson seems to be undetermined whether the association of both lexemes with Eg. $m3^c.t$ was because “*the three concepts make a potent pun*” being interchangeable as they “*may have sounded the same in sounding*” in the GR era.

NB: The same way has been explained the interchangeability of Eg. mr “bull” vs. $m3^c.t$ in the GR by A. M. Blackman and H. W. Fairman (ASAE 43, 1943, 255f.) as well as by G. Fecht (1960, 9, §12) who pointed out the identical pronunciation of both roots in the Ptol. era, cf. (S) $M\text{E}$ “Wahrheit” < $m3^c.t$ vs. (S) $M\text{E}$ “lieben” < $*m\acute{e}rj\acute{i}.t$.

- **2.** GT: both LEg. $mr.t$ “throat” and OK “songstress” are perhaps connected with WCh.: Hausa $m\acute{u}r\acute{y}\acute{a}$ “1. voice, 5. throat extracted from chicken” [Abr. 1962, 687], Gwandara $m\acute{u}r\acute{y}\acute{a}$ “voice” [Skn. 1992, 356], which would not exclude the first etymological option (above).

NB: To be borne in mind that, in theory, there “*could*” be an etymological connection between Hausa $m\acute{u}r\acute{y}\acute{a}$ ‘voice’ and $w\acute{u}y\acute{a}$ ‘neck’ [Abr. 1962, 937] as confirmed to me by P. Newman (p.c., 13 Nov. 2006), although he has “*never been able to find good internal or comparative evidence to show that this is so. Semantically, there is no problem. Phonologically, however, the connection is problematic. Murya comes from *muri (the ya being*

a feminine suffix and not part of the stem) whereas wuya (where the /y/ is part of the stem) comes from *wura (or some such), the *r to y change being well documented. Initial /m/ in Chadic is generally quite stable, and so it would be hard to explain an *m to /w/ change that would be required if wuya went back to the same proto-form. And then, contrary to common practice among certain Chadicists, one cannot simply ignore vowels, i.e., the final -i in one case, final -a in the other". Cf. WCh. *[h^w]-yara "neck" [Stl. 1987, 239, #860] < PCh. *ḥa-wuyar "neck" [Stl. 1996, 90–91].

- **3. G. Takács** (1996, 136, #30; 1997, 226, #3 2004, 61–62, #353) combined alternatively Eg. mr.t with ECu. *marmar- "neck" [Sasse]: Orm. mórm-ā "Hals" [Rn.] = morm-a "neck" [Gragg 1982, 291] = (Borana, Orma, Waata dials.) morm-a "neck, throat" [Strm. 1987, 370], Somali mármar "der lange Hals und Nacken des Kamels" [Rn. 1902, 302] = mármar "nape of the neck" [Abr. 1964, 175] = marmar "neck of the camel" [Lsl.] | Burji mARMARI "(whole) neck" [Flm.] = marmár-i "neck, nape of neck" [Ss.] (ECu.: Sasse 1979, 24; 1982, 141).

AP: Takács (1996, 136, #30) compared also AP: NS *mor- (??) "neck" [Bnd. 1994, 1161, #56] > PKuliak *morok "throat" [Ehret 1981, 92; Flm. 1983, 470], cf. Nyangi mōrōk "throat" vs. murut "neck, nape, back of neck" [Flm.] ~ ESud. *mur(u)t "neck" [GT]: Nile Nub. gu-mur, Shilluk muto, Nandi ki-mut, Bari murut, Masai en-murtu (ESud.: Flm.) ~ ENil. *-murut- "neck" [Vossen 1982, 455; cf. also Heine-Vossen 1976, 99; Grb. 1963, 103]. Cf. also Bnd. 1975, 177, §56.12 (Orm.-Masai); Flm. 1983, 456 (NS-SOM.).

NB1: Any connection to Ar. ʔamriʔ-at- "oesophage" < maraʔa "2. manger qqch." [BK II 1086] = mariʔ- "oesophage, conduit alimentaire" [Dozy II 577], Yemeni Ar. marīn "gullet" < mrʔ II "to whet an appetite" [Piamenta 1990, 463] ||| WBrb.: Zng a-marti "nuque" [Bst. 1909, 242] ||| SOM.: Galila murut "neck" [Flm. 1983, 456: prob. < Nil.] ||| ECh.: Sokoro mórol-dūm "dein Schlund" [Lks. 1937, 36]? NB2: H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) derived ECu. *marmar- "neck" from ECu. *mar- "round, to roll up" via the mediator meaning *ʔto turn around". Cf. PIE *k^wol-so- "Hals" > Lat. collum "Hals, Bergjoch", Germ. Hals < PIE *k^wel- "drehen" [IEW 639–640].

NB3: ECu. *marmar- was borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Harari märmär "shoulder", Gurage *märmär [Lsl.]: Chaha & Ennemor & Gyeto mämär etc. "nape of neck", Zway marmara "hump of the neck" (ES: Lsl. 1963, 111; 1979 III, 406; 1988, 195).

NB4: H. Fleming (1964, 53; 1983, 470) compared also LECu.: Baiso margi "(whole) neck" and NOm.: Dorze morg-e | Maji mork-n' || SOM.: Dime mork-u "throat", which may have been borrowed from NS (Kuliak, cf. above).

NB5: V. Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 27) combined ECu. *marmar- with WCh.: Pa'a marni, Siri mirk'a, Miya amarno, Mburku marin "rib" (NBauchi: Skn. 1977, 36), which is unlikely both semantically and because of NBch. *-n-.

- **4. GT: AA *m-(^ʕ)-l** "part of neck (?)" [GT].

NB1: Attested in SBrb.: EWlm. tā-mala, pl. šī-mal-iw-en & Ayr. tā-nala "appendice charnu mobile (voile du apalis?) qui se trouve dans la bouche du chameau entier et qui se gonfle et sort au moment du rugissement (indice de rut ou colère)" [PAM 2003, 537] ||| LECu. *ma^ʕal- [ext. *^ʕ- of anatomical terms?] "dewlap" [GT]: Orm. māla "Kropf, dicker Hals usw." [Rn.] = malla (sic, -ll-) [Ehret 1974, 89] = (Borana, Orma, Waata dials.) māla (f) "dewlap" [Strm. 1987, 361; 1995, 206], Som. má^ʕal [Ibrahim] ~ māl [Rn.] "1. Wamme, Wampe, Koderlappen unter dem Kinn des Schafes und Rindes, 2. Kropf, dicker Hals und Struma" [Rn. 1902, 282, 294] = má^ʕál "dewlap of sheep" [Abr. 1964, 168],

Arb. meʔel (f) “dewlap” [Hyw. 1984, 384] || WCh.: Hausa mààlòlòlò “1. goitre, wen on throat, 2. fatness on throat of young animals, 3. bird’s crop” [Abr. 1962, 652] || CCh.: Uld. mòmàlò “gorge” [Mch. 1953, 168] = mòmàlò “gorge” [Clm. 1997, 199]. Note that Ongota ma^calte “dewlap” [Flm. 1992, 192] and PMasai *-māl- “cow’s dewlap” [Ehr.] was borrowed from ECu. (Ehret 1974, 89).

NB2: L. Reinisch (l.c.) affiliated the LECu. word with Ar. mā^cin- “abdomen”. False.

mr “Topf für Milch” (PT, MK, Wb II 105, 18) = “milk-vase” (Griffith 1898, 40) = “(als) Milchtopf (besaß den gleichen Namen wie in ältester Zeit gebräuchliche kugelige Milchnapf; in der ersten Zeit des AR tritt an seine Stelle eine spitz nach unten laufende Form ohne Hals, die dann im Laufe der 5. Dyn. durch eine solche mit Hals abgelöst wurde)” (Balcz 1934, 64, §2) = “bassin, vase pour le lait” (Langlois 1919, 161, §3) = “milk-jug (a probably obsolete word)” (EG 1927, 514) = “un vase à lait” (Lacau 1954, 93 with PT exx.) = “Behälter, Krug für Milch” (VI., Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 82, n. 3) = “libation trough, milk-jar” (Hodge 1968, 23) = “Milchtopf” (II–III., PT, VI., GHWb 347; FÄW 188; ÄWb I 546).

NB: Cf. the hrgl. W19 with the phon. value mr > mj presumed to depict a “Milchtopf mit der Tragschlinge” (Wb) = “globular vase-shaped object suspended from a loop (the vase is surrounded at its widest part by a broad band of net-work)” (Griffith 1898, 40) = “milk-jug as carried in a net” (EG 1927, 514). Its rendering as “Milchtopf mit der Tragnetz” was declined by D. Faltings (1998, 20) who denied its use as det. in Eg. mhr “Milchtopf” (MK, Wb, q.v.) and reinterpreted the sign as “Jochgefäß” (following P. Montet 1925, 259) deriving it from Eg. mr > mj “gleich(er)” via the “Grundidee, daß an einem Joch wegen des Gleichgewichts immer zwei gleiche Gefäße getragen werden müssen”. Besides, Faltings misquoted A. H. Gardiner (EG l.c.) as if he derived or somehow affiliated Eg. mhr from/with the “obsolete” PT mr. Cf. also mr “(title, attached to a man supervising milking)” (Fischer 2002, 22, #542.a: cf. Harpur, JEA 71, 1985, 39, fig. 8 and LD II 106a)?

● No evident cognates:

- 1. C. T. Hodge (1968, 23) compared Eg. mr with Ar. mry: marā “1. presser avec les doigts les pis de la chamelle pour en tirer du lait, 2. tirer, extraire qqch., 4. exprimer l’eau d’un nuage”, II “presser avec la bouche les pis de la chamelle en les suçant”, IV “1. laisser couler un ruisseau abondant de lait (se dit d’une chamelle), 2. faire couler un ruisseau abondant de lait en serrant les pis d’une femelle”, VIII “2. tirer, extraire, 3. gagner, acquérir des biens, de la fortune”, mariyy- “qui donne un filet abondant de lait”, miry-at- “lait qui sort en filet abondant du pis de la femelle” [BK II 1097–8] = marā I “ubera strinxit (camelae) mulgendi ergo”, IV “lac radiatim emisit (camela)”, mury-at- “lac radiatim emissum” [Möller]. Cp. still Sem. *mry: Dhofar mrâ “1. Milch, welche die Frau bringt (Ali), 2. oder milchreiche Kamelin (Mhammed)” [Rdk. 1911, 56: “beides unsicher”] || Jbl. mry: méré “to fondle a camel’s teats to encourage it to give milk” [Jns. 1981, 174], Mhr. mry: mərū əmruh “to play with a

camel's teats till milk comes", mərəy "camel with milk but no young" [Jns. 1987, 271] ||| NBrb.: perhaps Wargla ta-mmar-t, pl. ti-mmar-in "outré à battre le lait" [Brn. 1908, 343] ||| SCu.: PRift *mar- "to wring" [Ehret 1980, 323].

NB1: C. Brockelmann (1932, 811) explained Ar. mry from the original sense "streichen" ("stringere"). H. Möller (1911, 164) and Ch. Ehret (1989, 182, §53), in turn, assumed a bicons. Ar. *mr- "to brush with the fingers" [Ehr.].

NB2: Hodge (l.c.) compared also LECu.: Som. mar "to pour". Unconvincing.

NB3: Hard to decide whether AA *m-r "1. to wring, 2. milk" [GT] may be related with AA *m-r "milk" [GT] on the analogy of IE *mēlg- "abstreifen" vs. "melken" [IEW 722], cf. LECu.: Saho múrr-ā "die frisch gemolkene, kuhwarme Milch" [Rn. 1890, 272] = murr-a (m) "fresh milk" [Vergari 2003, 137], Afar múrr-ā "die frisch gemolkene Milch" [Rn. 1886, 884] = mùrr-a "fresh milk" [PH 1985, 172], Gidole (Dirayta) mórra (pl.) "curds", mōr (m) "curds" [Hyw. 1981, 134] || SCu.: PRift *mar- "to wring" [Ehret 1980, 323] ||| CCh.: Bata māree "butter" [Barth 1852, 413] | Masa (Banana) miira "milk" [Mch. 1950, 26] vs. míra "breast" [Mch. apud JI 1994 II 47] = mírā "lait" [Jng. 1973 MS] = mír "lait" [Ctc. 1983, 107] = mír "lait" [Ajl.], Gizey mír "lait" [Ajl.], Lame mbir [mb- reg. < *m-] "lait d'un animal" [Scn. 1982, 308], Zime-Dari mbīr "lait (animal)" [Cooper 1984, 17], (?) Musey mbū [-Ø < *r?] "lait" [Ajl.], Ham mbū "lait" [Ajl.], Lew & Marba ʔāmbir "lait" [Ajl.] (Masa gr.: Ajello 2001, 33).

- **2.** C. T. Hodge (1968, 23), on the other hand, compared Eg. mr with WCh.: Hausa máaráá "fragment of calabash for dipping out túwóó from cooking-pot" [Abr. 1962, 655]. Unconvincing.

NB: Cf. rather LECu.: Gidole (Dirayta) murr-át "bowl-shaped calabash" [Hyw. 1981, 143]?

- **3.** GT: alternatively, cf. perhaps LECu.: PSam *māl "to milk" [Heine 1978, 68; 1976, 218; 1982, 117]: Somali māl "melken" [Rn. 1902, 293] = māl-ayya "to milk", māl, pl. málál "milk" [Abr. 1964, 172], Rendille mál [Heine] = a-mála "ich melke" [Schlee 1978, 139, #735], PBonī *māl- "to milk" [Heine 1982, 147] | (?) Tsamay mēlo "fresh (milk)" [Sava 2005 MS, 254]?

NB: The AA etymology of PSam. *māl has been strongly debated. In any case, it can have nothing to do either with (1) Ar. mahana "mulsit" (suggested by L. Reinisch l.c.) or with (2) Ar. mlġ "to suck at the breast" (as proposed by A. B. Dolgopolskiĭ 1968, 102 and V. Blažek 1990, 208, #291) or with (3) PRift *mar- "to wring" (as suggested by Ch. Ehret 1980, 323) or with (4) NAgaw: Bilin mal "livestock, cattle, richness" [Lmb.] (Arabism?) || HECu. *māl-a "meat" [Hds. 1989, 417] ||| NOM.: Koyra mālē "cow" [Lmb.] etc. (as proposed by M. Lamberti 1986, 444; 1993, 106; 1993, 106; LS 1997, 473-4, 477).

mr, hence (OK) **mj** "1. (Präposition) gleichwie, wie, 2. (Konjunktion) vor Verbum finitum usw.) wenn..., so lange als" (OK, Wb II 36-38).

NB1: Alternatively written with the hrgl. U6 (mr) in PT 1090e (AAG 56, §128) and in CT I 22, B3Bo, B2Bo (AECT I 4, spell 7, n. 12: "even as") & CT III 84a, B3BO (AECT I 154, spell 184, n. 13; AL 78.1656). The prep. was written mjr "like(wise)" in CT VII 39p & VII 510g (DCT 161).

NB2: Vocalized as *mār(-) > *māj- (Fecht 1960, §72, fn. 129 & 96, fn. 292). Eg. mj jrj=(f sdm) "if (he has heard)" (Crum 1930) has been retained in Cpt. as (SF) MΔ-, MΔ=, (F) MƎ= "Präfix des Bedingungssatzes: wenn" (KHW 84) = "préfixe verbal du conditionnel: si" (DELIC 105).

NB3: Occurs also in Eg. mj-n3 “hierher” (late NK, Wb II 44, 1) vocalized *ma[?]/j-né3 (NBÄ 403) > Cpt. (B) **MMΔI** “here, hence, hither” vs. **HNH** “there, thither” (cf. CD 174a) > Eg. Ar. minnāy “(from) here” vs. minnāw “(from) there” (Ishaq 1991, 115, §VI.6.5–6) with the diphthong -āw was influenced by (SB) **MMΔY** “there”.

- Hence: mrj > mj “ebenso” (OK, Wb II 38, 13), mjw “gleich sein” (CT IV 286/7, Junge, LÄ II 886), mj.tj “ein Gleicher wie” (PT, Wb II 39, 2–9).

NB: L. Lesko (1972, 46, n. h) interpreted the name of the god mj in CT 292b (B1L, B2L, B1C, B2P, hapax, DCT 160: not translated) as “Mummy-wrapper” (or alternatively “Equalizer”), although R. O. Faulkner (AECT III 134, sp. 1041) sees in it a var. of 3j < 3r “Oppressor” (CT *ibid.*: vars. B13C, B4L, B2Bo).

- Etymology not unambiguous:

- **1.** GT: most probably derives from AA *m-r “as, when, if” [GT] > NBrb.: Mzg. mer ~ mur “si (conj., sert à l’expression de l’hypothèse irréelle ou à l’hypothétique douteux)” [Tf. 1991, 426] | Sgrs. mr “si” [Bentolila 1981, 435] || SBrb.: EWlm. a-mər & Ayr a-mär “quand, lorsque, pendant que, alors que” [PAM 2003, 549] || HECu.: Sid. marò (prep.) “when” [Gsp. 1983, 225], Burji marru(na) “if” [Hds. 1989, 83: isolated in HECu.] || NOm.: Yemsa mar[?]ò (interrog. pron.) “wie” [Lmb. 1993, 367] || WCh.: Pero márù “while” [Frj. 1985, 41].

NB1: M. Taifi (l.c.) explained the Mzg. conj. from the negation ur ~ mr. Improbable.
NB2: NBrb.: Qbl. i-mir “après, ensuite” [Dlt. 1982, 510] is presumably unrelated, cf. rather SBrb.: Hgr. e-mir “moment” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1225].

- **2.** W. F. Albright (1927, 202) and F. Behnk (1927, 82, #13) equated it with Akk. mala, mali, mal, malla/u “entsprechend (wie), gemäß”, cf. mal(a)mališ ~ mammališ “entsprechend” [AHW 591, 596] = mala “im Vergleich zu” [Brk.] = mala “as much as, as many as, everything that, everybody who” [CAD m1, 143f.]. Here may belong still NBrb.: Mzab məlmi ~ bəlmi “quand, lorsque” [Dlh. 1984, 118] || LECu.: Orm. (Orma & Waata dials.) mala “2. as, when, while (cf. 1. time moment)” [Strm. 1987, 363] || NOm.: Wlm. melā “come, a simiglianza di...” [Crl. 1929, 32] || CCh.: Daba mala “comme” [Mch. 1966, 136] | Mofu méléy “to be equal” [Rossing 1978, 245, #240].

AP: Tarok māl “gleich sein” [Šibomana 1981, 266].

NB: C. Brockelmann (1932, 800) erroneously combined the Eg.-Akk. parallel with NBrb.: Warsenis ammi, Shawiya em “comme”. W. von Soden (AHW l.c.) and CAD (l.c.), in turn, identified the Akk. conj. as the st. cstr. of Akk. malû “Fülle”, which would exclude its comparison with Eg. mr etc.

- **3.** GT: alternatively, one may consider also an eventual cognateship of Eg. mr with HECu.: Hadiyya mulle-ka “other” [Hds. 1989, 108] = mūla [Blz.] || SCu.: PRift *mele “again” [Ehret]: WRift: Iraqw male, male[?]ale “again” | ERift: (?) Asa mile-k “1. day after tomorrow, 2. day before yesterday” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 343) || NOm.: POMETO *mEl “other” [Bnd. 1988, 147] > NWOMt. *mell-a “other”

[Bnd. 2000, 60, §99] (Omt.: Bnd. 1971, 254–5, #62). From AA *m-l “similar” [GT]?

NB1: Ch. Ehret (1987, 103, #433) and V. Blažek (1987 MS, 11; 1990, 37) etymologically related Hdj. múla and SCu. *mel- with Bed. malō-b “2” [Rn.], Bisharin málo [Blz. < ?], Beni Amer málo [Rn.], Ammar’ar málō-b (m) & málō-t (f) [Dlg.], Arteiga mhalō “2” [Hds.] (Bed.: Rn. 1894, 8–9; Zbr. 1987, 328; 1989, 589; Blz. 1987 MS, 11) || LECu.: Saho-Irob malhan “7” [PB], Afar malhe’na “7” [Bliese] (Dlg. & Blz.: act. “5+2”?) || CCh. *m-[š] “2” [GT]: BM *mišu [Blz.]: Margi mišù [Krf.] = məšù [Hfm.], Wamdiu mišu [Krf.], Kilba mészù [Krf.], Hyildi mišù [Krf.] | Guduf míts^b [IL], Dghwede mícè [Frick] = mící [IL] || ECh.: Sokoro *mordu “2” [Blz.] (Ch.: Kraft 1981 II; JI 1994 II, 332–3). The Chadic data, however, cannot be traced back to *m-l. Nevertheless, the cognacy of the Cu. comparanda is plausible. For the semantic dispersion cf. e.g. Sem. *kil?- “both, two” [Mlt. 1984, 160, §26] (Sem.: Rabin 1975, 89, #92) || Eg. kj [< *kl] “anderer” (OK, Wb V 110–4) || LECu.: Som. kalé “anderer, alius” [Rn. 1902, 239] = kalé “altro” [Roccati after Bantij] || SCu.: Brg. kalel- “to be similar” [Ehret 1980, 366] || CCh.: Mafa-Mada *kal “to be equal” [Rsg. 1978, 245, §240]. See Ember 1926, 308, n. 2; 1930, #4.f.10; Alb. 1927, 202; Behnk 1927, 83, §34; Bnd. 1970, 180 (Eg.-Sem.); Roccati 1994, 183 (Eg.-Sem.-Som.); Hodge 1994, 533 (Eg.-MM).

NB2: Ch. Ehret (1980, 324, #37) falsely combined PRift *mel- with LECu.: Som. mar “time, occasion”.

NB3: M. Lamberti (LS 1997, 483) equated Bed. mal(l)o “2” with Cu.-Om. *lam- “2” < OCu. *lakk^w- “two, both” (sic).

Lrr.: Ehret 1987, 103, #433 (Bed.-PRift); Blz. 1987 MS, 11; 1990, 37 (CCh.-Bed.-ECu.-SCu.).

- Other suggestions are unacceptable:
- 4. W. M. Müller (1909, 191) assumed in Eg. mr a false “archaizing” -r (for -j) and proposed equating it with Sem. *mā “like” (sic), orig. *“(that what is)” (sic).
- 5. L. Homburger (1930, 284): ~ Ful so “si” (sic). Absurd.
- 6. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168, quoted also in KHW 84) identified Eg. mr with Bed. mar (m) & ma(r)t (f) “such a (one), French un tel” [Rpr. 1928, 217] = “solch, derart” [Rn.]. Semantically dubious. Rejected by W. Vycichl (DELIC 105).
- 7. V. Blažek (1994 MS Elam, 14, #75) compared Eg. mj with Sem. *ʔam/*ʔim “if” [Blz.] || SBrb.: Hgr. am “comme” [Prasse 1972, 230] || NAgaw: Bilin emmá ~ immá “nun denn, also” [Rn.].

mr or **mj** (?) “als aufmunternder Zuruf an Vieh” (V., MK, Wb II 41, 8) = “ein besonderer Zuruf (mit dem man das Vieh anfeuert auf den Bildern des A.R. und M.R. die den Ackerbau darstellen)” (Erman, ZÄS 48, 1910, 42–43, §viii) = “ein Ruf (an den Esel) mit dem man Tiere antreibt: ‘geh!’” (Erman 1918, 21, fn. 3) = “ein oft gebrauchter Treiberruf”, mr/j wr “läuft schnell (eigtl. sehr!)” (Guglielmi 1973, 14, cf. also LÄ V 194) = “auf, hüh! (Treibruf an Vieh)”, mr jj wr “hüh, lauf schnell!” (GHWb 344; ÄWb I 538).

NB: Reading debated: mj (Erman, Wb) = mr/mj (Guglielmi) = mr (GHWb). Not clear whether in the sole ex., where r was written following W19 + D54 (in the from the Zawyet el-Mayitin tomb, cf. LD II 106b, not listed in AWb l.c.), -r after the det. (!) represents part of the root (cf. the remarks by S. Grunert, GM 168, 1999, 40; D. Meeks 2005, 245, #538c). Note that the ex. from the tomb of Ti (V, quoted in AWb l.c.) may be alternatively rendered mrj “to like” (Meeks l.c.).

- Etymology highly disputable:
- **1.** W. Guglielmi (1973, 14) assumed that it “*dürfte schon im A.R. mit mj ‘komm’ verwechselt oder gar von ihm abgeleitet worden sein*” (cf. the wtg. of Meir ex., Blackman 1914–53 V, pl. 30) not ruling out that there “*fand die Verwechslung schon im A.R. statt*”. The phon. value mr ~ mj of the hrgl. W19 led Guglielmi to presuming “*daß es leicht lautlich mit mj ‘komm’ zusammenfallen konnte*”. A. Erman (1910, 42–43, §viii) admitted the interchange of OK mr with mj “come!” (q.v.) only in the NK (cf. RT 8, 98), “*mit dem er nichts zu tun hat*”. Even if Erman’s first point cannot be confirmed, the OK use of W19 (still mr) excludes an etymological relationship with OK mj “come!”.
- **2.** W. Guglielmi (l.c.) saw in its OK wtgs. (with W19) an evidence (!) speaking rather for a connection to Eg. mr “binden” rendering our word as “*etwa: bleibe (mir) verbunden*” or “*halte dich (an mich)!*”. False (mr “to bind” is written with U7).
NB: This rendering would eventually lead to Eg. mr “sich anschließen an” (PT, Wb, q.v.).
- **3.** Alternatively, Guglielmi (l.c.) did not exclude an interjection: “*doch zweifelhaft, ob der Ruf mr/mj überhaupt von einem Verb ableitbar ist und nicht nur den Klang der Leute wiedergibt*”.
- **4.** GT: if the rendering of our word as a fossilized imperative (lit. “hurry! come on!” or sim.) proves correct, cp. AA *m-y-r ~ *m-r-y (?) “to haste, gallop (animal)” [GT].
NB: Attested in (?) Ar. mry: marā I “3. faire courir sa monture le plus vite possible (avec acc. de la monture, en tirer, pour ainsi dire, toute la vitesse à l’aide du fouet, etc.)” [BK II 1097] (provided ≠ mry I “1. presser avec les doigts”) ||| NBrb.: Mzg. √m-r: a-mmer [reg. < *√m-y-r] “se dépêcher, se hâter, faire vite, accélérer, faire qqch. sans s’arrêter” [Tf. 1991, 427] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr mærumør “aller vite” [PAM 2003, 553] ||| Bed. marā “to trot (camel) at fastest possible pace short of galloping” [Rpr. 1928, 217] = marai “to trot fast (camel)” [Hds. 1996 MS, 94] ||| WCh.: PAngas *m’ār > younger *m’ar “to leap” [GT 2004, 261]: Angas myaar “to leap, ricochet” [Flk. 1915, 251] = myaar ~ myar “springen” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] = myār “to jump” [ALC 1978, 41] = mīar ~ myar “to jump” [Gcl. 1994, 62, 70].
- **5.** GT: or, provided OK mj < mr < *ml, cp. Ar. malla I & VIII “se dépêcher en marchant”, II “1. presser, activer”, V “1. se dépêcher, marcher vite” [BK II 1140–1].

mrj “lieben” (OK, Wb II 98–100) > (S) mε, (B) mεi, (AL) mεiε, (L) mαεiε, (SL) mαiε, (BF) mhi, (F) hi, st.nom. (SL) mεpε-, (ALS)

MPPE-, (P) MENEPE-, (F) MEPI-, MEΛΛI- etc. “lieben, wünschen, wollen” (KHW 85-86).

NB1: Sometimes denotes also “vorziehen, sich erwählen” (Otto 1969, 98–100).

NB2: For the vocalisation of its diverse nominal derivatives see KMAV 51; Ranke 1937, 93; Alb. 1937, 191–2 & fn. 3; 1946, 15, §25 & 16, §27 & 16, §31; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 45, 89; NBÄ 238, 243, 319, 809; Edel 1989, 29–30; Vcl. 1990, 61.

NB3: A. H. Gardiner (1936, 195–6) explained the OT PN miryām ultimately from Eg. mrj “the beloved”, while L. Kutler (1984, 117) preferred a derivation from Hbr. mrr “to be strong”.

- Hence: i.a., mr(j) “Freund” (LP, GR, Wb II 98, 9; WD III 54; cf. JEA 81, 1995, 144 for XXII–XXIII. exx.).

- Despite the extensive literature on its etymology, its origin cannot be regarded as satisfactorily clarified:

- 1. A. Ember proposed its most widespread traditional equation with Sem. *rʔm: Akk. rāmu, raʔāmu, ramāmu “lieben” [AHW 951], Ebl. ra-a-mu-um [*raʔām-um] “to love” [Frz. 1984, 148] || Ar. rʔm: raʔima “aimer qqch.” [BK I 795]. Cf. also Ar. rwm: rāma “désirer ardemment, rechercher” [BK I 957] = rāma “(heftig) begehren, wünschen, lieben”, ma-rām- “Wunsch” [Vcl.] || NBrb.: Qbl. √r-m: ssi-rem “1. désirer, 2. se proposer, 3. préférer” [Dlt. 1982, 725].

LIT. of Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1912, 89; 1930, #6.a.15, #10.a.19; Alb. 1918, 84; Holma 1919, 38; Chn. 1947, #413; Vcl. 1953, 374, #6; 1958, 150; 1958, 393; 1959, 29; 1959, 69, #18; 1959, 73; 1983, 106; 1990, 222.

NB1: F. von Calice (1936, #633) and Th. Schneider (1993, 81) considered this Eg.-Sem. comparison unsatisfactory, although the metathesis in roots containing m is indeed not uncommon in Eg. as pointed out by W. Vycichl (l.c.).

NB2: In theory, Sem. *rʔm could be alternatively compared also with Eg. jm3 [< *ʔmrʔ?] “angenehm, freundlich sein zu” (PT, Wb I 79, 10–13), jm3.t “Freundlichkeit, Liebeswürdigkeit” (OK, Wb I 80, 1).

NB3: O. V. Stolbova (2005, 226–7, §36) equated Sem. *rʔm with WCh.: Gerkalum “to love” [Ftp.], for which cf. rather ECh.: Sarwa lamā “aimer” [JI 1990 MS, 1, §6].

- 3. D. Ol’derogge (1954, 145; 1956, 13; 1960, 800), I. M. D’jakonov (1965, 50), and N. Skinner (1996, 197/9) combined Eg. mrj alternatively with WCh.: Hausa mármárí (m) “desire”, mármártóo ~ màrmártà “to long to get” [Abr. 1962, 659], for which cf. perhaps also LECu.: Rnd. marma “to demand (sg.), insist (on sg.)” [PG 1999, 220]. AP: PNil. *mar “to desire”: Teso maria “to rush for, scramble”, Pokot mar “to seek, desire”, Acholi maro “to love, like” [Dimmendaal 1988, 38, #47].

NB: Ug. âm “Wunsch” [WUS 1963, 25, #284] (alternatively rendered “Rede (?)”, not so in DLU I 35) can hardly be related. It may be connected with Sem. *ʔmr “to say”.

- 4. GT: or cp. LECu.: Afar mār (m) “attachment (of love)” [PH 1985, 158] | Orm. marara “to be dear, loved, pleasing” [Gragg 1982, 280].

NB1: G. Gragg (l.c.) affiliated Oromo marara with Oromo māra “to have mercy on a person” [Gragg 1982, 271, 436] | HECu. *marar- “to pity” [Hds. 1989, 418], which may derive rather from ES, cf. Amh. marä “to have pity” [Gragg] (and

eventually from Eth.-Sem. *mrr “to be bitter, sad”). See also Skn. 1996, 9 (Eg.-ECu.). Less likely is a link to NBrb.: Rif *Vm-r-w: Tuzin maw-et [from *marw-et?] “faveur, générosité” [Rns. 1932, 387].

NB2: There may be perhaps an AA var. root *m-y [GT]. Cf. CCh. *m-y (?) “to love” [GT]: Bcm. m̄ “être d’accord, aimer” [Br.-Jng. 1990, 93] | Daba may “vouloir, aimer” [Mch. 1966, 135] = māy “to like, want (desire)” [LG 1974, 22, #591–2] | Lame-Peve...mây... “to like, want (desire)” [Schubert 1971, 16, #329–330]. Is ECu.: Harso & Dbs. & Gwd. may- “to kiss” [AMS 1980, 254; Black 1976, 229] ultimately related?

- **5.** M. Cohen (1947, #413) equated Eg. mrj also with Eth.-Sem.: Harari mariñ “friend” [Chn.] = mārīñ “companion” [Lsl.: “with an enigmatic suffix -ñ”]. Cf. also Gurage dials. mārī “friend (boy), companion” [Lsl.], Argobba meri “companion (boy), friend” [Lsl.], the ultimate origin of which is still unclear.

NB1: E. Littmann (ZS 1, 66) took these from Oromo mārī “guide”, while W. Leslau (1979, 417) preferred a derivation from Oromo mārī “best man”. Afar-

NB2: There are further AA terms for “friend”, but their connection either with Eg. mrj or the ES forms (above) is obscure: thus, (1) N. Skinner (1996, 9) compared the Eg. & Eth.-Sem. forms also with LECu.: Saho mārēytā “Verwandter, Freund, Geliebter”, mārēytīñó “Verwandschaft, Freundschaft, Liebesverhältnis” [Rn. 1890, 270, 273], Afar mārēytā “Freund, Geliebter” [Rn. 1886, 884] = mārēy-tā “close friend for whom one would die (made so at a big feast)” [PH 1985, 164]. L. Reinisch (l.c.) assumed in SA an etymon *mārē-y-tā lit. “von der Verwandtschaft, vom gleichen Wohnort seiend” < SA mār “die Zeit zubringen, leben, bleiben, wohnen, sein” [Rn.], cf. Afar mare (f) “family relationship” [PH], which excludes any cognacy with Eg. mrj. (2) Cf. perhaps Rnd. marmīr “Freund, Beischläfer, Konkubine” [Schlee 1978, 140, #759] and/or (3) CCh.: Musgu marmāi [Krause] = marmaya [Barth] = mirmé [Ovw.] “Freund” [Müller 1886, 400; Lks. 1941, 66], Puss marmay “1. (m) ami, 2. (f) amie, fiancée, 3. amitié” [Trn. 1991, 103], Vulum (Mogrum) marmāy “ami” [Trn. 1977, 17], Girvidik marmay “Freund(schaft)” [MB 1972–73, 70]? As confirmed to me by H. Tourneux (p.c., 17 Nov. 2006), the connection of the 2nd component *-may to Puss may “ami, voisin, camarade” [Trn. 1991, 104] etc. is fully uncertain: the latter word signifies in fact “quelqu’un ou quelque chose comme” (somebody or something like), “et ce mot est toujours accompagné d’un pronom complément (something like it, somebody like her, etc.). Je vois une ressemblance formelle avec marmay, mais je ne vois pas de lien étymologique entre may et marmay. Il y en a peut-être un cependant”.

- **6.** Th. Schneider (1993, 81; 1997, 198, §35) combines Eg. mrj with Ar. myl “6. aimer qqn.” [BK II 1174] = “être incliné vers, avoir de la sympathie pour, aimer bien” [Snd.] = “1. geneigt sein, 2. Sympathie empfinden für, 3. gern haben” [Wehr 1238] = “avoir une prédilection” < “se tourner contre qqn., s’incliner vers qqn.” [Dozy II 630] = IV “to favour” [KB]. Improbable because of Cpt. -PP-.

NB: The basic sense of Sem. *myl was, however, different from that of Eg. mrj, cf. Ma^llula maila “Seite” [Bergstr. 1921, 57] | Ar. myl: māla “1. se pencher, s’incliner, être penché, incliné vers le bas, vers la terre” [BK II 1174] | MSA *myl “to turn aside” [GT]. In KB 556, Ar. myl is combined with Hbr. mwl hifil “to fend off”. For further discussion see Eg. m3 “sickle (?)” (q.v.). Noteworthy are WCh.: Hausa mēèlú & Kts. dial. mēèlí “to feel inclined” [Abr. 1962, 673].

- **7.** GT: remarkable is AA *m-l “to desire, like” [GT], although unlikely because of Cpt. -PP-.

nb: Attested in Ar. mala²- “6. désir ardent, concupiscence” [BK II 1142] || SBrb.: EWlm. te-mōllī “baiser” [Ncl. 1957, 572] = EWlm. & Ayr mäll-āt “1. (donner un) baiser (à), 2. choyer (enfant)”, sə-mməll-ət “2. aimer beaucoup, chérir”, Ayr a-sā-mmälla “grand amour, amour sincère, tendre” [PAM 1998, 216; 2003, 537], Ghat ta-mella “compassion, pitié”, ta-mull-it “baiser”, mull-et “baiser” [Nhl. 1909, 132, 143, 190] || ECu.: Yaaku -māl- “to like, agree” [Heine 1975, 119, 129] || WCh.: Mundat mumúli “desire” [Seibert 2000 MS, #a033] || CCh.: (?) Ktk. mēlù “friend” [Bouny 1975, 24, §386] || ECh.: (?) Tumak mālà “ami” [Cpr. 1975, 83: “*emprunt possible*”].

- Other suggestions are evidently false:
- **8.** G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 249) combined Cpt. MĒI with Bsq. maitatu “lieben”.
- **9.** P. Langlois (1919, 161) assumed Eg. mrj “diligere” to represent a secondary derivative of the basic sense of Eg. mr “ligare, lier” (with the most absurd reflexes).
- **10.** L. Homburger (1930, 285) Ful muy-de “avoir envie de”, yiḍ-ude “aimer”.
- **11.** E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 94; 1934, 109; 1936, 435–6, quoted also in KHW 86) compared Eg. mrj with NBrb.: Zayan meru “Wunsch”, merw-et “Phantasie(begehren)”, e-meri “Freund, Liebhaber”, mer-zīzwa “Melissenkraut” (lit. “geliebt von Bienen”, cf. zīzwi, pl. zīzwa “Biene”) and SBrb.: Tuareg (sic) merhí “wollen, lieben”, Lamta merw “Wunsch, Verlangen”, which represent the “*Reziprozität-Bildung*” (Feichtner) = “*Sozialstamm*” (Rsl.) = “*sozial erweiterte Form*” (Zhl.) = “*erstarrte m-Bildung von Sozial-Verba*” (Rsl.) = “*reciprocal form with m-*” (Zbr.), namely *me-ri “einander wollen, lieben, begehren” [Zhl.] deriving from the root *ri. Zyhlarz tried to project this analysis also to Eg. mrj, which was strangely adopted by some authorities (Feichtner 1932, 221; Vycichl 1933, 180; Rössler 1950, 488; Schenkel 1983, 12; Zaborski 1997, 56), who supposed both in Eg. mrj and msdĵ “to hate” (q.v.) a similar prefix m- derivation (of the “*Sozialstamm*”) from an unattested root *rj and *sdĵ, resp., which “*in prähistorischer Zeit in ein m- Präfix... zerlegbar gewesen sein mögen...*” (Snk.). Reviewing his position on the question fifty years later, W. Vycichl (1983, 106) firmly (and correctly) rejected this theory.

nb1: This Eg.-Brb. comparison is probably false, the etymology of the common Brb. root being fully different, cf. NBrb.: Shilh iri “aimer”, ta-iri “amour, amitié, désir, volonté” [Wlf.], Sous îri “aimer” [Dst. 1938, 11] | Demnat ri “aimer” [Wlf.] || EBrb.: Ghadames e-fri ~ i-fri [met. < *-rb] “vouloir” [Mtl.] = ə-br “1. vouloir, désirer, tenter, essayer de, 2. aimer, 3. avoir l’intention de” [Lnf. 1973, 24–25, #96] = ä-br [Mlt.] || SBrb. *erh [Ksm.]: NTuareg: Ghat er “aimer, chérir, désirer, vouloir” [Nhl. 1909, 125], Wlm. ə-rhu ~ ə-ru [Prs.], EWlm. iru “aimer, vouloir, désirer, avoir besoin de” [PAM 2003, 643], Ayr ər(u) “désirer etc.” [Prasse] = är [Mlt.], Hgr. er “aimer, vouloir” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1547] = ər [Prs.] = ərhi [DELCL 106] = är [Mlt.] | STuareg: Tamasheq erhi “wollen” [Vcl.], Adagh yārha “il aime”

[Prs.] = ärh [PAM], Taneslemt erh [Bst., Msq.] = orh “désirer etc.” [Prs.] = ärh [PAM] (Brb.: Wlf. 1955, 116; Prasse 1969, 86, #588; Mlt. 1988, 200, #3.4.1; Blz. 1992, 138; Ksm. 1999, 66, #34 & 78, #119). The PBrb. root is disputed: $\sqrt{r-h_3-h_1}$ [Prasse 1969, 27] = $\sqrt{*r-b-?}$ “wünschen, wollen, lieben” [Rsl. 1971, 316] = $*i-r\text{Hih}$ [Prs./Mlt.] = $*i-h^{\text{ar}}$, met. $*i-rah^{\text{w}}$ [Mlt. 1988, 200]. Most probable seems PBrb. $*r-b$ [GT] (with the regular shift of $*b > NBrb. \emptyset \sim SBrb. *h$), which has been convincingly identified with Eg. 3bj [if $< *rby$] “wünschen” (MK, Wb I 6–7) ||| LECu.: Somali rāb- “wünschen, wollen” [Rn. 1902, 317] = rab- “to want” [Abr. 1964, 207] ||| CCh.: MG má-róba (exclam.) “souhait, vœux; à tes souhaits!” [Brt. 1988, 183]. Lit.: Chn. 1947, #79 (Sem.-Som.); Rsl. 1964, 213 (Eg.-Brb.-Som.); 1966, 227 (Eg.-Som.); 1971, 316 (Eg.-Brb.-Som.); Hodge 1968, 23 (Eg.-Som.-Sura); Prasse 1969, 27 (SBrb.-Eg.-Som.); Dlg. 1973, 170 (Som.-Sem.). Cp. also the special isogloss of Sem. $*ryb$ “to want (to eat)” [Blz.]: Hbr. r^{cb} qal “to be hungry” [KB 1257] | Ar. rayība “1. vouloir, désirer, rechercher, avoir du penchant, de l’inclination pour, 2. prier, supplier Dieu humblement et avec ferveur” [BK I 887] || Geez rāḥba ~ rāḥba “to be hungry, hunger (for)”, desire to eat” [Lsl. 1987, 468] ||| Eg. 3ḥf [$*rḥf$ irreg. $< *ryb$] “Eblust (?)” (MK, Wb I 19, 4) = “fever of appetite (?)” (FD 5) = “Eblust, der große Hunger; *Völlerei” (GHWb 13) with a secondary $*-γ$ (Sem.-Eg.: Rsl. 1964, 213; 1971, 296).

NB2: V. Blažek (1992, 136–138) combined PBrb. $*r-h_3-h_1$ [Prs. 1969, 27, 86] rather with Bed. aray “den Vorzug geben, (aus)wählen, lieben, wollen, begehren”, arāy ~ arē “Wahl, Vorzug, Zuneigung, Liebe”, arāw ~ arāu “Freund(in)” [Rn. 1895, 30] = aray “to want, wish, like”, árau “companion, friend” [Rpr. 1928, 153–4], which he derived from his Nst. $*[?]a/erHi$. Note that Bed. -w can go back to $*-b$. Thus, a connection of Bed. aray $< *araw < *arab$ (?) [GT] with Som.-Brb.-Eg. $*r-b$ “to desire” [GT] (above) should not be ruled out.

- **12.** R. Moftah (1987, 139) affiliated Eg. mrt “Geliebte, Konkubine” with mr.w “Sklaven”, mr “Hacke” and even Ar. ʔimraʔ-at- “Frau”. Absurd.
- **13.** Th. Obenga (1993, 325–6, §78): ~ Acoolī mārò “aimer”, mār “amour”, Lwo mer “agrée, être d’accord, gentillesse”, Nuer mār “ami”, Wolof mār “aimer à la folie” etc.

mrj.t “1. Uferdamm (am Fluß, am Meere), 2. insbesondere als die Stelle am Ufer, wo Schiffe landen können, Hafen” (MK, Wb II 109–110) = “1. (mostly) river bank, 2. harbour (doubtful in several cases with very small villages)” (Janssen 1961, 68 & fn. 2, cf. Grd., JEA 27, 1941, 37f.) = “bank, shore, sandbank (?), quay, height of triangle, coast” (FD 112) = “river-bank (with certainty established) as the place of mooring or washing (e.g., also the place where the uncared-for dead are disposed of, but not the place of succumbing)” (Gdk. 1970, 128) = “built harbor” (Gdk. 1975, 127) = “digue construite au bord de l’eau” (DELIC 119) = “harbour or simply riverbank where boats could moor” (Jones 1988, 205, §8) = “rivage, désert” (Aufrière 1990, 16, 722) = “riverbank (some workmen certainly had huts and chapels on the mrj.t)” (McDowell, JEA 78, 1992, 202) = “1. (natürlicher) Uferdamm (am Meer, Fluß; oft als Weg ausgebaut), 2. Damm (als Felderbegrenzung), 3. Kai, Hafen” (since XI., GHWb 348; ÄWb I

546) = “(usually) riverbank, port probably consisting of houses and an administrative facility situated on the banks of the Nile” (Davies & Toivari 1997, 75, n. g with further lit.) = “Marktplatz am Ufer oder Hafen” (Allam, SAK 26, 1998, 3, fn. 2) = “(generally rendered as) shore, coast (except in the cases where the river has cut a deep bed, its shore is not very distinct and certainly not in the form of a ‘dam’), (applies specifically to) the stretch of land along the river (which can be tilled during the low-water season)” (Gdk. 1998, 120 & fn. 89) = “Uferdamm, Anlegestelle, Hafen” (Osing 1998, 155, n. d) = “coast, river-bank” (DCT 173). Cf. also WD II 65; III 54.

NB1: The MK form *mrw.t* (quoted in NBÄ 265, 839, n. 1130; Snk. 1983, 224 as the original etymon) is attested in CT V 46e (B1Bo). But an older form **mrw.t* can hardly be based on one occurrence. P. Lacau (1972, 89, §77.3) analyzed the word as *mr.jt* (sic) with a suffix *-jt* of “*noms géographiques*”, but elsewhere (o.c., p. 97, §91.4) he assumed a root **mrj*.

NB2: Vocalized as **m(e/u)rāw.ṭ* (NBÄ 265, 337, 839, n. 1130) = **murāw.ṭ* (Snk. 1983, 224) > **marāy.at* (Vrg. 1971, 51) = **m̄rāy.ṭ* (Osing 1998, 155, n. d) > **mrōj.ēt* (Lacau 1972, 97, §91.4). Survives also in Eg. Ar. TN *Damrū*? < Cpt. **TEMPΩ** < **t̄3-m̄rāy.ṭ* “der Uferdamm” (Snk. 2002, 20)

NB3: Denotes in Ostr. Grd. 44 an “accessory of palanquin (qnj)” (AEO I 68).

- Hence: Dem. *mr.(t) ~ mrj.t* (f) “Hafen, Uferland” (DG 168:2, 169:3) = “harbour” (CED l.c.; Tait 1991, 43) = “Uferdamm, Mole” (Thissen 1984, 77) > Cpt. (SL) **ḿpΩ**, (S) **εμπpΩ**, (B) **εμ(ε)pΩ** “harbour, landing stage” (CD 183a; CED 88) = “place at a port where ships are moored” (Vrg. 1971, 51) = “Hafen, Kai, Anlegestelle” (NBÄ 265; KHW 98) = “embarcadère, port” (DELC 119). Cf. also Dem. *mre* “dock-side (?)” (Ankhsheshonqi 10:3, Thissen l.c.).

NB1: For (B) *ḿbr-* ~ (S) *ḿr-* cf. Hintze 1949, 48.

NB2: Glossed in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) by Dem. ml3 “Art Schiff” falsely assumed by J. Osing (1998, 154–5, n. d) to be homophone (!) in spite of Cpt. *-P-*.

NB3: (L) **MPΔYT** “Hafen, Kai” treated by W. Westendorf (KHW 100) as a pl. of (S) **ḿpΩ** has been derived by J. Osing from an etymon extended by an affix *-tj*: **m̄rāw.ṭ* (NBÄ 337), while W. Vycichl saw in it a nisbe **mr.w.t.j* “port”, lit. **“endroit de la rive”* (DELC 120). Cf. also Gk. TN **Τεμραῦθις**. Vycichl (l.c.) compared also Dem. *mrj.t* “quartier en Assiut” (DG 169) and Dem. *mrwṭ* “Fruchtland” (DG 169). The latter comparandum is unlikely.

- From the same root (?):

(1) *mrj* “vom flottmachen des festgefahrenen Schiffes” (XVIII., Wb II 109, 11) = “to ground” (Grd., JEA 9, 1923, 17, n. 10) = “to strand” (Grd. 1925, 69, l. 18: “*clearly connected with mrj.t ‘shore’, whence the meaning ‘strand’ is fairly obvious*”) = “to run aground (of boat, ship), stranding” (FD 112 & Jones 1988, 215, §34 after Grd.) = “auflaufen, auf Land geraten, stranden” (NBÄ 196, 728–9, n. 871 after ZÄS 60, 1925, 69, l. 18) = “stranden” (KHW 498, 637) = “auf Grund laufen, auflaufen, stranden” (GHWb 348).

NB1: Correctly affiliated with Eg. mrj.t “bank” already by A. H. Gardiner (l.c.). The connection can only be a denominational derivation from the latter.

NB2: Behind the NK wtg. mrj (inf.), a root *mr > mj was proposed in NBÄ l.c.

NB3: J. Osing (NBÄ l.c.) saw in it the ultimate source of (SL) (T-)ϵMHPE, (B) (T-)ϵMHPI (f) “Überschwemmung” (for which, however, different etymologies have also been proposed, cf. CED 35; KHW 498).

(2) mrw “(Substaktiv)” (MK 1x, Wb II 109, 3, cf. Griffith 1889, Siut tomb 19, l. 55) = “harbours (?)” (FD 112) = “(désigne) une terre” (DELC 119) = “plage, port” (Aufrière 1990, 17) = “Hafen, Kai” (GHWb 348) > perhaps Dem. (r/hr)-mr “quer über, andere Seite”, cf. p3-š^c-mr (Gk. Ψαμήρις) PN “die Sandbank” (DG 168:5–6) = “(anderes) Ufer, (andere) Seite” (NBÄ 838–9, n. 1127 after Pestman, CdE 41, 1966, 316, n. 1) = “across the river, the other side” (CED 87) > Cpt. (O) MEP, (SB) MHP (m) “Ufer, Gegenseite, Jenseits” (ϵMHP “hinüber”, ρMHP “jenseits”) (KHW 99) = “shore (of river), esp. opposite shore” (CED 87) = “rive (opposée), l’autre côté” (DELC 119) > LCpt. mīr (Peust 1999, 120 after Worrell & Vycichl).

NB1: Vocalized as *mē/ūr(a)w (NBÄ 265) = *mīr^w (Peust 1999, 120 & fn. 21).

NB2: MK mrw strikingly resembles the var. wtg. of mrj.t as mrw in the late NK, e.g., in Pap. Anastasi I 21:2, IV 1b:4, 10:5, Wenamon 1:x+8, 1:x+24, 1:13, 1:22, 2:74 (cf. Belegstellen ad Wb II 109, 13, 15 & 110, 1–2; Jones 1988, 205, §8). Does MK mrw perhaps represent an early ex. of the masc. var. form of mrj.t (late NK)? Note that R. Caminos (1954 LEM, 129) identified hr-mrw of Pap. Anastasi IV rt. 1b:4 (treated in Wb as a mere var. of mrj.t) with Cpt. (S) ρI-MHP “on, at other side” (CD 180a), which implies its separation from mrj.t. This distinction was extended by J. Černý (CED 87) and D. Meeks (1979, 248, §54) also to other exx. of late NK mrw treated in Wb as masc. vars. of mrj.t, “d’où il convient d’éliminer les exemples du masculin mrw ‘rive (opposée)’...” (Meeks). Cf. also Vergote (1950, 291).

NB3: Several authors (DG 168; NBÄ 838–9, n. 1127 & 839, n. 1130; KHW 99; DELC 119) have already assumed a remote etymological connection of the underlying etymons of Cpt. (S) M̄PΩ vs. MHP tracing back the latter to MK mrw (Wb II 109, 3). Their distinction was, however, maintained by J. Černý (l.c.).

NB4: J. Černý (CED 87) and J. Osing (NBÄ 265; 1998, 107–8, n. d) derived the Dem.-Cpt. word directly from Eg. mrw “desert” (q.v.), cf. esp. mrw snb.w “the coast (lit. the desert) is clear” (FD 112 after JEA 28, 1942, 11, n. gg).

- Etymology disputable. Most promising seems #5.
- 1. J. Osing (NBÄ 265, 838–9, n. 1127 & 1130) derived both Eg. fem. mrj.t < mrw.t (*me/uráw.ṯ) and masc. mrw (*mē/ūr(a)w) “Ufer” as well as mrw “Wüste” (lit. *“(Seite, Rand)”) from Eg. mr (sic) “stranden, auflaufen”. Mistaken, since their connection is only plausible *vice versa* (assuming in mrj “stranden” a denom. verb).
- 2. W. Vycichl (DELC 119): Eg. mrj.t was “certainement” a fem. nisbe originating from Eg. mr “canal, étang” (q.v.). Unlikely.
NB: Written in CT I 234b indeed like a nisbe (DCT 173).
- 3. W. Schenkel (1983, 223–4) tried to explain both Eg. mrj.t < mrw.t and mrw “Wüste” (!) from Eg. mr “binden”, whence he derived also Eg. *jamīr(w).ṯ “Überschwemmung (eigtl. das, was über die Ufer

tritt) > (SL) (Τ-)ΕΜΗΡΕ, (B) (†-)ΔΜΗΡΙ “inundation, high water” (CD 56a).

- **4.** W. F. Albright (1918, 93) and F. von Calice (1936, #634) combined the root *mrj with Sem. *ml? “to fill”. Semantically plausible, but note Cpt. (S) -p-.

NB1: Attested in Akk. malû (Oakk., O-MAss. malāʾum) “voll sein, werden, sich füllen” [AHW 596–7] || Hbr. ml? qal “1. voll sein, werden, 2. füllen” [GB 423] | Ar. malaʾa “(r)emplir qqch.” [BK II 1141] || Geez malʾa “to fill (up), complete, multiply, be full, filled, overflow, be completed, be abundant, come to an end” [Lsl. 1987, 342] etc. (Sem.: Cohen 1961, 70, §110; Rabin 1975, 87, §32).

NB2: Especially noteworthy are the nominal derivatives (semantically strikingly close to Eg. mrj.t) like Akk. mûlû “Höhe (von Mauern usw.), Anhöhe, Aufstieg” [AHW 671] || Hbr. millō? “terraced structure (used for different purposes), the retaining walls and infill of the terraces surrounding the Herodian temple, ‘fill’ etc.” [KB 587], Hatra ml? “artificial terrace” [Steiner, BASOR 276, 15ff] = “ditch” [Aggoula, Syria 64, 93] = “store” [Segal, JSS 31, 73] (cf. DNWSI 628), Aram. mālītā “Aufschüttung” [Clc.], JAram. malyatā? “landfill, earthwork, rampart” [KB], Mand. mulia “(Erd)aufschüttung, Terasse, Sockel” [Dietrich 1967, 299].

NB3: Sem. *ml? may be cognate to SBrb.: Ayr mällu “être (rempli) entièrement, pleinement, être concentré”, EWlm. & Ayr mələməl “être complètement rempli” [PAM 2003, 537, 540] || SCu.: (?) Irq. milalāʿ [ext. -ʿ?] “to fill to the brim” [MQK 2002, 73] || NOM.: Wlt. mūliya (mng. obscure) “(perhaps) totality, wholeness”, cf. ʕamma mūliya “the whole night” [LS 1997, 461 with improbable cognates] || WCh.: Hausa máláálà “to flow into, onto, over, pervade”, málàlà “abundantly”, málàáléé “1. to flow out, leak out, 2. flow into, onto, over, pervade entirely” [Abr. 1962, 650] || CCh.: Mada mōla-kiya “full moon” (cf. MM *kiya “moon”) [Rsg. 1978, 293, #476]

NB4: A. Drexel (1925, 14) combined Hbr. ml? with Hausa mààlóló “1. goitre, wen on throat, 2. fatness on throat of young animals denoting good health, 3. bird’s crop” and even mááláá “type of satchel” [Abr. 1962, 649, 652] = mààlóló “Geschwulst” (sic) vs. mááláá “große Ledertasche der Blinden, in der sie die Gaben aufbewahren” [Drexel]. Semantically weak.

NB5: H. Möller (1911, 162) combined Sem. *ml? with Gk. μάλα, Lat. multus. A. R. Bomhard (1981, 448; 1984, 273, #282) compared it with IE *m̥a/a/el- “to be full, much, many” and a certain Eg. mr3.t (sic) “fullness”. S. A. Starostin (2003, 471) linked the Sem. root to Alt. *miltʰe “full”.

- **5.** GT: remarkable is Bed. mar “Seite” [Rn. 1895, 171] = mari “side, direction” [Rpr. 1928, 218], which has apparently no reliable Cu. cognates.

NB: V. Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 27) tentatively equated Bed. mari with WCh.: Nbauchi *-mVr- “rib” [GT] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 36) and ECu. *marmar- “neck” [Sasse 1979, 24; 1982, 141], but this is semantically uncertain.

- Other suggestions cannot be accepted:

- **6.** P. Langlois (1919, 150, 156) derived Eg. mrj.t “portus” from Eg. mr “liet, assembler” (q.v.), whence he took also Eg. t3-mrj (q.v.), mr.w (Pap. Anastasi IV 10:5) and mr “bassin, lac, canal” (q.v.). This did not hinder Langlois in comparing Eg. -mrj with Sem. *mišr- “Egypt” (!) and Eg. mtr.w “Flut” (Amarna, Wb, q.v.) as well (including further absurd *comparanda*).

- **7.** W. Westendorf (l.c.) combined Eg. mrw (and mrj.t) with Bed. būr “1. Erde, Erdreich, Boden, 2. Gebiet, Land” [Rn. 1895, 50] (after Zyhlarz 1932–3, 59). Excluded.
- **8.** Ch. Ehret (1997, 207, #1809) compared SCu. *mār/d- “rock”.
- **9.** M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998, 120, §1) affiliated Eg. mrj.t and Eg. mr “canal, water ditch” with LECu.: Afar bōru “canal” [PH 1985, 73] etc.
- **10.** A. B. Dolgopolsky (1998, 26, §14): ~ Eg. mr “pool” (q.v.) ~ CCh.: Nzangi mirim “river”.

mrj, in t3-mrj (XIX-XX. var. t3-n-mrj) “Name für Ägypten” (XI., Wb V 223) = “Delta, flood-waters of the Nile” (Czapkiewicz) = “1. (till NK) patrie, pays du bien-être, 2. (Ptol.) terre d’héritage” (Derchain-Urtel 1992, 55–61, esp. 55, fn. 2 after Schad, so also Goebis 1995, 173: “Ermland”) = “Tameri, Ägypten (besonders das ägyptische Kernland), Nilland” (GHWb 913).

NB: Preserved in the Eg. Ar. TN Dumayra < (B) †ΔΜΗΡΙ (Czapkiewicz 1971, 70, §176; Amélineau 1893, 116–9). Since the LP fem. (Wb l.c.), thus hardly identical with Gk. πτῦρις “Bez. für das Delta” as suggested by K. Sethe (1906, 145)

● Etymology uncertain.

- **1.** P. Langlois (1919, 150, 155–7) explained it from the sense “le territoire de l’inondation captée, lit. endiguée” derived from Eg. mr “lier, assembler” (q.v.), which was correctly rejected by W. Guglielmi (1991, 9, fn. 45) as “*unwahrscheinlich*”. Equally surprisingly, from the same root took Langlois also Eg. mrj.t “portus” and mr “bassin, lac, canal” (q.v.), which is similarly unconvincing. All this did not hinder Langlois in comparing Eg. -mrj also with Sem. *mišr- “Egypt” (!) and Eg. mtr.w “Flut” (Amarna, Wb, q.v.) as well (including further absurd comparanda).

NB: The form mr.w quoted by him from Pap. Anastasi IV 10:5 represents in fact Eg. mrj.t (Wb II 109, 15).

- **2.** K. Sethe (1929, 4) and R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 255, utt. 611, n. 7) interpreted it as “das behackte Land (als Kulturland)” (Sethe) = “The Hoed Land” (Faulkner) regarded as akin to Eg. mr “Graben, Kanal” (its pl. mr.w was rendered by Faulkner in PT 1728 “the hoed lands”), which they traced back to Eg. *mr “hacken (to hoe)”.
- **3.** J. Černý (CED 35) affiliated Eg. t3-mrj with Cpt. (SL) (τ-)ΕΜΗΡΕ, (B) (†-)ΔΜΗΡΙ (f), (SL) ΕΜΗΡ (m) “inundation, high water” (CD 56a) = “Überschwemmung” (Snk.), LCpt. (Pi-Solsel) amīri “Flut” (Vcl. 1936, 171) reflected also by Eg. Ar. (Snk.: “*Verbreitung nicht spezifiziert*”) damīra “Zeit der Nilüberschwemmung” (NBÄ 728–9, n. 871 after Spg., ZS 4, 1926, 61f.) = damīra “inundation” (Ishaq 1991, 113,

#I.A.1) = *dimī/ēra* “time of (Nile) flood” (Vittmann 1991, 209) = *dimī/ēra* “Zeit der Flut” (Snk.), in which Černý assumed a back-formation from (S) **TḒ-ḤHPḒ* vs. (B) **Ṭ-ḤHPḒ*, i.e., *t3* was taken for the fem. article, and the compound was treated as fem.: (S) **TḒ-ḤHPḒ* became **T-ḤHPḒ*.

NB1: The etymology of the Cpt. word is disputed (cf. NBÄ 196, 728–9, n. 871: **jamīry.ṭ* → **jamīry.ṭ* → **jamēyr.ṭ* < Eg. *mr* ~ *mj* “stranden”; KHW 498: < Eg. *mr* “Gewässer”; Schenkel 1983, 224: **jamīr(w).ṭ* lit. “das, was über die Ufer tritt” < *mrj.t* “Uferdamm” ~ *mrw* “Wüste” derived ultimately from Eg. *mr* “binden”). Strangely, his own suggestion was apparently ignored or declined by W. Schenkel (2002, 20) stating of (SL) (T-)ḤHPḒ, (B) (Ṭ-)ḤHPḒ that the “*Etymologie des auf den Artikel folgenden Substantivs*” is “*unbekannt*”.

NB2: In any case, the hypothetical Eg. **mrj* might be in principle linked to Ar. *maʿara* “l. remplir (une outre)” [BK II 1052].

mrj “sounding-pole” (MK, FD 112) = “Lotstange (zur Bestimmung der Wassertiefe)” (GHWb 348).

- 1. GT: perhaps lit. the instrument “running aground” the bottom of river, thus related to Eg. *mrj* “to strand” (cf. s.v. Eg. *mrj.t* “bank”)?
- 2. C. T. Hodge (1990, 173) falsely combined it with Ch. **mari* “to give” [JS 1981, 116], IE **mər-* “hand” [IEW 740] < LL **Nb-lH*, which he ultimately derived from his LL **b-l* “to carry” based on the most absurd comparanda (cf. Eg. *m* “take!”).
- 3. GT: or cp. Akk. (jB) *murru D* “hineinstecken (z.B. Hände)” [AHW 671]?

NB: Root uncertain: √*mūr* or √*wūr*?

mrj.t “(in *hr mrj.t* als Bezeichnung der Krokodile)” (Lit. MK hapax: Pap. Berlin 3024, 75 & 97, Wb II 110, 4) = “a coll. term for crocodiles” (FD 112; Faulkner 1956, 37, n. 81) = “crocodile” (DLE I 227).

NB: Occurs only twice in the *Lebensmüder*, in both passages apparently as a coll. fem. noun as surmised by Faulkner: (74)...*tp š šn m* (75) *grḥ hr mrj.t* “(74)...*on a lake infested by (75) night with crocodiles*”; (96)...*mk bḥ rn=j mk r st mzh.w* (97) *r ḥms.t hr ḥd.w (?) hr mr(rj).t* “(96)...*Behold my name is detested. Behold, more than the smell of crocodiles, (97) more than sitting by sandbanks (?) full of crocodiles*” (Faulkner 1956, 28). The same approach was followed by A. Erman (1896, 54) “...*als zu sitzen unter den... mit den (?) Krokodilen*”.

- Etymology highly debated:
- 1. Usually either identified with or derived from Eg. *mrj.t* “river-bank” (q.v.), namely either (1) as a frozen compound *hr(j)-mrj.t* “die am Ufer” (as suggested in Wb l.c.); (2) or as a coll. fem. form used metaphorically, lit. “bank-lurkers” (as thought by Faulkner 1956, 37, n. 81). H. Goedicke (1970, 136) assumes that “*it might equally be a euphemism used to avert potential danger*”.

- **2.** W. A. Ward (1980, 357–360, cf. AEB 34, #80.222) affiliated it with Eg. *mr(j)* “fighting-bull” and *mr-wr* “Mnevis” (q.v.), etc., which he explained from Eg.-Sem. **mr* “harsh, violent strength” (hence: “pain, illness” in Eg. and “bitter” in Sem., resp.). Unconvincing.
- **3.** GT: is the coincidence with Ch **m-r* “crocodile” [GT] > CCh.: (?) Ktk. *mur(u)ḡe* “crocodile” [Lbf. 1942, 165] | *Lame (bà) - mǎ(ḡ)-mírī* “crocodile sp.” [Scn. 1982, 322] || ECh. **m-r* “crocodile” [JS 1981, 80C]: *Tumak màrà* “crocodile” [Cpr. 1975, 82], *Mawer màrà* “crocodile” [Cpr. 1971, 50] | *Karbo (Dng.) móómáàrá* “crocodile” [el-Minai MS n.d.], *WDng. máàrá ~ máárá* “crocodile” [Fédry 1971, 115], *EDng. màrrē* “crocodile” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 196] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 95) purely accidental?
NB1: In L. Homburger’s view (quoted by Lebeuf, l.c., fn. 1), Ktk. *mur(u)-* “*serait un préfixe*”.
NB2: J.-P. Caprile (l.c.) assumed the *Tumak* word to have been borrowed from *Barma màrà* “crocodile” (Goundi, Bouso) vs. *màr* (Njamena). Similarly, J. Fédry (l.c.) supposed in *Dangla* a loan.

mrj (GW) “ausrutschen (?)” (XIX. hapax: Pap. Anastasi I 25:9, Fischer-Elfert 1986, 225, n. c; GHWb 348) = “fright, fear” or “(straight) shot” (Hoch 1994, 134–5, §174).
NB: Written in GW as *ma₂-ru₂-?a*: **môra?a* (?) (Hoch l.c.)

- Apparently a Sem. loan, but the source is debated:
- **1.** W. Helck (1962, 560, #95; 1971, 513, #95) affiliated it with (the root underlying) Eg. *mrj* (GW) “Pferdeknecht” (q.v.). Rejected by A. H. Gardiner (1911, 27, n. 18) and H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1986, 225, n. c).
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994 l.c.) explained it as an *m-* prefix derivative of Sem. **yry* (sic, instead of **wrw*) “to shoot”. Alternatively, he derived it from Sem. **yr?* “to be afraid” (cf. hence Hbr. *mōrā?* “fear, terror”) assuming the “leg” + “walking legs” dets. of Eg. *mrj* to indicate “the result of panic”.

mrj (GW) “Pferdeknecht” (late NK, Wb II 110, 5; Helck 1971, 513, #95) = “palefrenier, cocher” (Ceugney 1880, 7 after Pierret) = “groom” (Grd. 1911, 6*, n. 16 & p. 37, fn. 4; AEO I 93*, #203 after Burchardt) = “le groom, valet de cheveux, un terme désignant les soldats, apparemment d’infanterie” (Sauneron 1964, 24, §32) = “Stallknecht” (Störk, LÄ IV 1011) = “groom, fatterer of cattle” (DLE II 226) = “groom, squire” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 80 index) = “a military position involving horses: froom (?), squire (?)” (Hoch 1994, 132).

NB1: Written in GW: ma-rú-ʔe (Helck l.c.; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey l.c.) = ma-ru-ʔu (Hoch l.c.) = ma-ru-ʔu (DLU 571).

NB2: It is this word that G. Sauneron (1964, 24, §32) explained Ptol. *mr* “un soldat” (Dendera) from.

- Apparently borrowed from Sem., but the ultimate source is debated:

- 1. C. Ceugney (l.c.) misread the word with -ʕ- (not to be read in GW) and derived it (with prefix *m-*) from Sem. *rʕy > Hbr. rʕy “to shepherd”.

- 2. J. Hoch (1994, 132–4, §173) ultimately explained the title from Sem. *mrʔ “to be fat” (cf, e.g., Akk. *marû Š* “to fatten”) with a hint on a Mari letter (after Wintermute) containing allegedly a nominal reflex of *mrʔ* describing “the occupation of one who feeds sheep and fowl: groom”.

NB: Hoch supported the traditional affiliation of the diverse Sem. *mrʔ representing the semantic fields “to be fat, healthy, strong” vs. “to be manly, masterly”, cf. Ug. *mrû* “members of the officers’ guild, commanders” [Gordon 1965, #1543] = “a military officer” [Hoch], BA *mārē* “lord” [GB] | OSA (Sab.) *mrʔ* “man, lord” [SD], Ar. *marʔ-*, *mirʔ-*, *murʔ-* “homme” [BK II 1085] etc. For this problem cf. Eg. *mr* “overseer” (above).

- 3. D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 38, §2.1.4.2) and W. G. E. Watson (1995, 538) identified it with Ug. *mrû* “eine Art ‘Stallmeister’” [Sanmartín 1989, 346–7 & fn. 92] = “equerry” [Watson] = “member of a group or class: chief groom (?)” [DLU 571].

NB1: The etymology of Ug. *mrû* is disputed. W. Helck, J. Sanmartín, and W. G. E. Watson (l.c.) mention an alleged Hurr. origin but failed to quote the Hurr. etymon. W. Thiel (UF 12, 1980, 354, fn. 35) explained the Ug. title from Eg. (!), which was rightly rejected by W. G. E. Watson (1995, 546).

NB2: Hence may derive Akk. *murʔu* “(etwa) Offizier (?)” [AHW 677: from Ug.] = “(an official)” [CAD m2, 228] too as a late borrowing, although its etymology is equally uncertain. CAD l.c.: “foreign word”. D. Rainey (JNES 24, 1965, 18) derived it from Akk. *warûm* “to command” [AHW 1471f.], while E. Lipiński (WdO 20–21, 1989–90, 302) combined it with Aram. *mrʔ* “to command”.

mrjn “Bez. syrischer Vornehmer (vom Gefolge, von Kriegern)” (XVIII., Wb II 110, 6) = “Syrian warriors” (Grd. 1911, 25*, fn. 1) = “asiatischer Ritter, Adliger” (GB 914) = “1. charriot-warrior, knight; 2. Syrian noble” (Alb. 1930, 217–221) = “lords” (AEO I 145*, 190*) = “the upper military class of the Syrian states” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 46 after O’Callaghan) = “a military aristocrat” (Ward 1961, 39, §24) = “Syrian warrior” (FD 112) = “Ritter” (Helck 1971, 513, #96) = “a high warrior class in Asia Minor” (MacDonald, cf. AEB 34, 1980, #80.211 and also Schulman, JSSEA 11, 1981, 7–19) = “(warrior, knight)” (DLE I 228) = “Wagenkämpfer(-Truppe)” (Kaplony, LÄ V 270) = “chariot warrior” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 80 index) = “knight” (Hoch 1994, 135–137, #175).

NB1: Written in GW: ma-rā-ja-na (Helck) = ma-r-ya-na (Sivan & Cochavi & Rainey) = *maryana (Hoch).

NB2: D. Meeks (1997, 41, §175) assumes in the exx. of KRI VII 125:6 & Urk. IV 1305:2 recorded without the final -n (mrj) a sg. form (based on a false etymology by McDowell, see below).

- Borrowed from some Mesopotamian source (Akk., Ug. or directly from Hurr.?). The ultimate origin of this term has been disputed. Identical with Akk. ^{LÜ.MES}mar(i)jannu “eine Kriegerkaste” [AHW 611] = “junger ritterlicher Streitwagen-Kriegeradel” [Hauschild] = “führende Kriegerkaste” [Smolian] = “member of the charioteer-aristocracy” [Harmatta] = “Adelstand” [Oettinger] = “type of personnel: charioteers (?)” [Izre’el 1998, 426 with lit.] (cf. also Raulwing & Schmitt 1998, 677–8 and DUL 580 with abundant lit.) and Ug. mryn (syllabic mar-ya-nu) [maryannu] “Adeliger, Wagenkämpfer” [WUS #676] = “warrior” [Segert 1984, 193] = “charioteer” [Hnrg. 1987, 149] = “member of a special group, titular of a war chariot” [DUL 580], which are supposed to go back to Hurr. mariyanni [*maryannə] (with the Hurrian suffix article *-annə) interpreted various ways: “der Kriegeradel und der grundbesitzende Landadel” (Gustavs 1929, 58, fn. 1) = “noble” [Gelb 1944, 68] = “noble chariot-warrior” [Gordon 1955, 292, #1166 after O’Callaghan] = “Wagenlenker” [Djk. 1972, 114, #c.5 rejecting “Adeliger”] = “officiers mittanniens, commandant les escadrons de chars de guerre” [Laroche 1980, 168] = “название особой касты” [GI 1984, 727] = “колесничий (charioteer)” [Hačikjan 1985, 47] (for Ug. < Hurr. cf. also Thiel, UF 12, 1980, 353, n. 33; Watson 1995, 538).

NB1: Traditionally, the Hurr. and, hence, also the Sem. and Eg. terms have been explained from Indo-Aryan *marya- > Ved. márya- (m) “young man, lover”, lit. “mortal man” [Monier-Williams 1899, 791]. In Iranian, cf. Avest. mairya- (m) “etwa Jungmann, Junker, Mitglied eines Männerbundes”, as a “daëvic” word: “Bube” [KEWA II, 596–597]. Perhaps the first one to notice the parallel of Akk. marjannu and Ved. márya- was H. Winckler (OLZ 13, 1910, 291–300), cf. Grd. 1911, *25, fn. 1. This view has been since then maintained by several authors: Albright (1930, 217–221); Gordon (1955, 292, #1166); Mayrhofer (KEWA II, 596–597); Mayer (1960, 86); Ward (1961, 39, #24, fn. 103); Kammenhuber (1968); Helck (1971, 513, #96); Laroche (1980, 168); Segert (1984, 193); Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1984, 727); Huehnergard (1987, 149); Hoch (1994, 135–7, §175); Watson (1995, 547; 1999, 130, §4.9.5). W. G. E. Watson 1995, 131 does not exclude that “...some [Ug.] words may even have been borrowed back from the language which initially borrowed them”. There are different scenarios as to the proper way of borrowing of Indo-Aryan *marya-. W. F. Albright (1930), for example, insisted that the Indo-Iranians (whose words for “horse” and “chariot” passed into Eg.) themselves took part in the Hyksos invasion and that the final -n in Eg. mrjn reflects instead of the Hurr. ending an acc. pl. ending of OInd. máryān. This latter assumption is surely wrong. Following D. Rainey, W. von Soden (AHW 611) derived Akk. mar(i)jannu directly from Indo-Iranian (OInd. marya-, Avest. mairya- “junger Mann”). Noteworthy that the Indo-Aryan word is supposed to have passed as a borrowing also into FÜ, cf. Chereemis mari(j) “Mann, Mensch, Tscheremisse” [KEWA].

nb2: Note that H. Winckler (OLZ 13, 1910, 300) erroneously affiliated Eg. mrjn with Aram. *māri?- “lord”. Even worse is the suggestion by A. G. MacDowell (quoted by Meeks 1997, 41, §175) on comparing the Eg. var. mrj (KRI VII 125:6 & Urk. IV 1305:2) without the final -n with Ug. mr^o (sic) “commandant” (pace Chabas), which was rightly rejected already by A. H. Gardiner (1911, 25*, fn. 1) together with the false rendering of Eg. mrjn as “lords” and its alternative equation with Hbr. mry “to be contentious, rebellious”. The derivation of Akk. mariannu from Aryan *marya- was doubted already by A. Gustavs (1929, 58, fn. 1), since among the listed PNs of the bearers of this title “*kein einziger Arier’ ist*”.

nb3: Others derive the Near Eastern term from (or, at least, via) Hurrian instead of Indo-Iranian. J. Huehnergard (1987, 149) and D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 40): Eg. ~/< Ug. < Hurr. < IE. But more reasonable seems the following way: Eg. < Sem. (Akk./Ug.) < Hurr. < (?). Already A. Gustavs (1929, 58, fn. 1) tried to render the title as a native Hurr. term deriving from the stem mari- “besitzen” + ending -anni of participles (!) and thus denoting “Besitzer” (cf. also ZA NF 2, 301). I. M. Diakonoff (1963, 89; 1972, 114, #c.5, 115, fn. 93; DjK-Sts. 1986, 21, #18; 1988, 173, #18) and M. L. Hačikjan (1985, 47) related the Hurr. expression with Urart. ^{LU}mari/e [*marə] “знатный” [Djk. 1963; Melikišvili 1971, 286] = “Bezeichnung einer der höheren Gruppen der königlichen Angestellten” [Djk. 1972] = “a rather highly placed group of people of the palace personnel” [Djk.-Sts. 1986; 1988] = “category of warriors” [Djk. 1995, 122], from which Diakonoff reconstructed a common Hurro-Urartean *mari-.

nb4: Most recently, some Russian specialists assumed the Hurro-Urartean word to represent the heritage of the supposed common East Caucasian proto-language, which implies that the ultimate Indo-Aryan origin of the ancient Near Eastern term has to be declined. This theory was defended by M. L. Hačikjan (1985, 141, #54.3) mentioning a common NCauc. root mari- (sic) “husband”. Later, I. M. Diakonoff and S. A. Starostin (1986, 21, #18; 1988, 173, #18; cf. NCED 830–1; DjK. 1995, 122, #7) proposed the genetic comparison of PHurro-Urartean *mari- with PECauc. *m[ā]rǰV/*mōrǰV “male” (attested in Archi meč-le, Kryz mig/γ-il, Dargwa marga “male”, Tabasaran murgu-ž’i “brave man, hero”, PNakh *märe > Bacbi & Ingush mar “husband”, Chechen mayra “husband, brave man, brave”), where HU *-r- < PECauc. *-ǰ- was regular and the inlaut PECauc. *-r- was dropped in the cluster. V. V. Ivanov (1979, 101–112) tried to combine both hypotheses supposing that the PECauc. term itself was an early borrowing from some IE (Indo-Iranian?) dialect, which was rejected by Diakonoff arguing that at the diachronic depth of the Proto-Hurro-Urartean level, it would be hard to point out any Indo-Iranian influence.

mrjn.t (GW) “a vessel” (hapax: Pap. BM 10795, fragm. C II 11, late NK or thereafter, CED 88) = “ein Gefäß” (KHW 520, 637) = “reservoir (?)” (AL 77.1788) = “*Reservoir, *Tank” (GHWb 348).

nb: Vocalized as ma-ru₂-ya-ni-ta: *maluyanita (Hoch).

- Hence: Cpt. (B) ΜΕΡΑΝ, ΜΗΡΑΝ (via *ΜΕΡΑΝΤ?) “trough, tank” (CD 183a) = “Wasserbehälter” (KHW 100, 520) = “bassin, auge” (DELIC 120).

nb: This derivation suggested by J. Černý (CED 88) and W. Vycichl (DELIC) was declined by J. Hoch (1994, 137, fn. 44) as “rather dubious”.

- Apparently a late borrowing, although its source is uncertain.

nb: J. Hoch (1994, 137, §176) proposed two weak options, neither convincing: (1) lit. *“(that which is filled)” < Sem. *ml? “to fill” (but Eg. -nt remains obscure); (2) m- prefix derivative of Sem. *rwy, cf. Hbr. rwy “to drink one’s fill” (but it has no m- prefix forms).

mrw (MK) ~ **mr** (OK) ~ **mrj** (XVIII.) “ein Nadelholz aus Syrien (von roter Farbe), als Nutzholz (für Schiffe, Stöcke, Möbel, Säрге u.a.)” (OK, Wb II 108–109; Hassan 1976, 48) = “sycamore” (Jéquier 1921, 237) = “morus (?), a Syrian timber” (Glanville 1932, 13, §19) = “ein aus Syrien stammender Nadelbaum, von dem das Sägemehl offizinell verwendet wird” (WÄDN 250) = “possibly red wood of a tree of foreign origin: either the cedar or cypress” (Janssen 1975, 205) = “cedar” (Śliwa 1975, 14, fn. 30 after Wenzel 1939, 35) = “willow (?), cedar (?)” (DLE I 227) = “rötliches, syrisches Nutzholz für Schiffe, Stöcke, Möbel und Säрге, wahrscheinlich Zedernholz” (Germer 1985, 6) = “cèdre” (Meeks 1993, 77) = “an unidentified kind of wood (cedar?)” (Vos 1993, 352, #256) = “*Libanonzeder (Cedrus libani Lond.?)” (GHWb 348) = “tree and type of wood, believed to be a type of fir tree from Lebanon, perhaps even cedar from Lebanon (Cedrus Libani or Abies cilicica Carr)” (PL 442 pace LÄ II 1264–5, VI 1357–8) = “ein Nadelholz aus Syrien” (I., FÄW 189) = “ein aus Syrien stammender Nadelbaum, -holz: Zeder (?)” (Koura 1999, 228–9 & fn. 379).

nb1: For its red colour and problematic identification cf. Loret 1916, 34, 38, 45; Caminos 1954 LEM, 122 (with lit.).

nb2: To be separated from NK mr (GW) “a foreign timber” (as suggested by Glanville 1932, 13, §19)?

- No certain etymology. It has been (or might be) compared with various tree names (though their common origin is doubtful):
- **1.** H. Holma (1919, 39), F. von Calice (1936, #412), and V. M. Illič-Svityč (1976, #283) combined it with Ar. marw- “2. sorte d’arbre (macrua)” [BK II 1097] = “pierre ponce” [Dozy II 585] = “nomen arboris” [Holma] = “Holzart” [Clc.] (apparently isolated in Sem.).
nb1: OK mr(w) can hardly be a loan-word from Ar. as supposed by Calice and Illič-Svityč.
nb2: Illič-Svityč ultimately derived the Ar.-Eg. parallel from Nst. *marV “дерево (tree)”.
- **2.** GT: connected to AA *m-r “acacia” [GT]?
nb1: Attested in WBrb.: Zenaga a-marari “acacia” [Bst. 1909, 242] ||| LECu.: Somali marā “Acacia Arabica W.” [Rn. 1802, 299] = mārā “1. Acacia Arabica, 2. Acacia Nilotica” [Abr. 1964, 174] ||| ECh.: Mgm. miirú “acacia sp. (ar. garat)” [JA 1992, 107]. See also Blz. 1990, 208 (Zng.-Som.-WCh.).
nb2: V. Blažek (l.c.) compared also WCh.: Ron: Daffo-Butura méèr ~ méér “Baum” [Jng. 1970, 218]. Not clear whether WCh.: Bokkos maráy (m) “Baumart: locust bean tree” [Jng. 1970, 144] and/or ECh.: Mgm. mōoriyò (f) “arbr sp.” [JA 1992, 107] can be also related.
- **3.** GT: in spite of their semantical closeness, it has hardly anything to do with Akk. (jB) *amalu (hapax) “eine Fichte” [AHW 40] = *amālu ≈ ašūhu “fir tree” [CAD a2, 1].

NB2: May be a ghost-word created on the basis of one single (misunderstood?) place by the Akk. commentator (p.c. by E. Reiner and D. Testen, 7 Feb. 2000).

- 4. A. M. Lam (1993, 412) affiliated it with Ful (Pulaar) meri “variété d’arbre utilisé pour la fabrication d’objets utilitaires”.

mrw “Wüste, bes. als Ort der Wüstentiere und als Herkunftsort kostbarer Gesteine” (XVIII., Wb II 109, 5) = “desert” (FD 112) = “desert edge” (CED) = “Ufer (sic), Wüste” (Schenkel 1983, 223) = “désert, lisière, bande, plateau désertique” (Aufrière 1990, 12, 16, 44, 721–2, 746).

NB: It is from this word that J. Černý (CED 87) explained Dem. mr “the other side” (cf. DG 168:1) and Cpt. (S) MHP “shore of river (esp. the opposite one)” assuming a basic sense “edge”, which is probably mistaken. Vocalized by W. Schenkel (1983, 223) as *mūraw, which hardly accords with Dem. mjl “Wüste(nrand)” attested as a gloss to Eg. mrw in the Tebtunis onomasticon (Osing 1998, 107–8 & n. d, 309 index).

● Its proposed equivalents are disputable:

- 1. C. Brockelmann (1932, 105, #27) and F. von Calice (1936, #52) related Eg. mrw with Sem. *barr- “freies Feld” [Brk.] and Ar. barra “gut, fromm, gehorsam sein” [Brk.]. Impossible both phonologically (Eg. m- ≠ Sem. *b-) and semantically (the Sem. root means “open, free”).
- 2. E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 245) affiliated it with Nile Nub. bur “kahl, unbesät”. False.
- 3. L. Reinisch (1887, 83), F. von Calice (1936, #52), J. Vergote (1945, 135, #8.b.1), M. Cohen (1947, #398), J. H. Greenberg (1965, 91, #17), A. Zaborski (1989, 587), and C. T. Hodge (1991, 99) compared Eg. mrw “desert” with common Brb. *ta-mūr-t “pays, terre cultivée” [Chn.] and even Cu. *bVr(r)- “desert (or sim.)” [GT].
NB: Brb. *ta-mur-t has a more convincing cognate in Eg. mr “Viehweide” (OK, above). Comparing Eg. mrw with Cu. *bVr- should be definitely abandoned (cf. Eg. b3.t in EDE II 33).
- 4. O. Rössler (1971, 313) equated Eg. mrw with Ar. malā (√mlw) “désert” [BK II 1153] = “Wüste” [Rsl.], although Ar. √mlw primarily means “marcher d’un pas vigoureux et rapide, et se mettre à courir de toutes ses forces” [BK].
- 5. J. Osing (NBÄ 838–9, n. 1127), followed by S. Aufrière (1990 l.c.), explained Eg. mrw from a basic sense “Seite, Rand” and affiliated it with Eg. mrj.t (q.v.) rendered by Aufrière “rivage, désert” > Cpt. (S) MPW (f) “harbour”, which was rightly declined by H. S. Smith (1978, 360).
- 6. W. Schenkel (1983, 223), in turn, derived it from Eg. mr “binden” (q.v.). Semantically very weak.

- **7.** A. M. Lam (1993, 395) connected it with Ful (Pulaar) *mēre* “le vide”, *mēru* “vide (en parlant p.ex. d’une chambre)”, which is incorrect, since (1) a genetic cognacy is excluded, while (2) in the case of borrowing, such a semantic shift would be difficult to explain.
NB: Nevertheless, cf. NBrb.: Qbl. *e-mmīr* “être vidé, versé, vide” [Dlt. 1982, 511].
- **8.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 202, #1795) compared it with Omt. **mel-* “1. dry, 2. empty” [Ehr.], which represents a plausible cognate.
- **9.** GT: whether it is connected with Ar. \sqrt{mrw} : *marwar-āt-* “désert” [BK II 1097] or Ar. *marīr-* “5. désert” [BK II 1084] cannot be decided.
NB: Ar. *mūr-* “poussière soulevée par le vent” [BK II 1167] = “dust” [KB], incorrectly combined with Hbr. *mar* “speck” [KB 629], is certainly out of question, the underlying root being Ar. *mwr* “s’agiter et aller çà et là” [BK].
- **10.** GT: or cp. Bed. *malāl*, pl. *malāl* (m) “Wüste, Steppe” [Rn. 1895, 169] = *malāl*, pl. *malāl* “khor, country on either side of banks or khor, town” [Rpr. 1928, 217] = *malal* “1. wilderness, 2. desert, 3. khor and surroundings” [Hds. 1996 MS, 93], Bisharin *u-malāl*, pl. *i-malel* “das Wādī und seine Umgebung, Wādī-Gelände” [Hess 1918–19, 215] ||| (?) SOM.: *Dime māl-o* & *Galila māl* “the outside” (close to American “front yard”) [Flm. 1988, 173]? This is the most attractive solution.
NB: J.-J. Hess (l.c.) combined the Bed. word with ES: *Tna. ma/ōrōr* “brousse, terrain en friche garenne, essart” [Coulbeaux & Schreiber].
- **11.** GT: alternatively, it might be perhaps compared to Ar. $\sqrt{amīl}$ - “montagne sablonneuse, large d’un mille et longue d’une journée de marche” [BK I 56] = “dunes de sable” [DRS 22] ||| EBrb.: *Gdm. ta-mellil-it* “sabbia” [Prd.], *Audjila mlāl* “polvere, sabbia” [Prd. 1960, 172], *Fogaha u-mlāl* “sabbia, polvere” [Prd. 1961, 301], *Sokna u-mlāl* “sabbia, terra” [Prd.].

mrwrj.t (MK tomb) ~ / < **mrwrw.t** ~ **mr(w).tj** (CT) “ein Vogel” (Wb II 109, 10) = “black stork (*Ciconia nigra*?)” (Davies 1949, 16, table 2, nr. 7; AECT II 20–21, spell 395, n. 9; DCT 173) = “un oiseau, compagnes de Rê qui s’attaquent au mort” (AL 78.1790) = “Schwarzstorch” (Störk, LÄ VI 10 & n. 6) = “(in dual it seems to represent) a divine complex including both the double uraeus and the pair of zoomorphic goddesses Isis and Nephthys” (Bianchi 1987, 206–7) = “*Abdim-Storch (*Ciconia abdimii*) oder schwarzer Storch, einschließlich Schwarzstorch (*Ciconia nigra*)” (V. 1x, GHWb 348; ÄWb I 546) = “Schwarzstorch (?), (in den Sargtexten) als Name von zwei weiblichen mythologischen Wesen” (Osing 1998, 128, fn. 588 with lit.) = “Jenseitswesen” (WD I 92 pace Bianchi).

NB: Appears as *mrrw*[...] “Schwarzstorch (?)” in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD), where it is provided with a Dem. gloss (kj-dd) *mlrm*[...], analyzed by J. Osing (1998, 128) as **ml-r* or **ml rm*[...] “bindend” (sic).

- Etymology obscure:
- **1.** D. Meeks (AL l.c.): “*leur identité avec les mr.tj ‘chanteuses’ est très hypothétique*”.
- **2.** GT: ~ Akk. *marratu* “ein Vogel (eig. das Bittere)” [AHW 612] = “a wild bird” [CAD m1, 285]?
- **3.** GT: or cf. ECu.: Tsamay *morall-e* (f) “bird sp.” [Sava 2005 MS, 248]?

mrm (GW) “heights” (Thotmes III, Hoch 1994, 138).

- From the same root (?) might eventually derive Cpt. (SB) *mrw*m, (S) *oyr/aw*m, (B) *emr*wm, *mr*om (m) (hence Gk. *ἐμβρίμιον*, Lat. *embrium*) “1. pillow, 2. dummy” (CD 183a) = “1. Kissen, Polster, 2. Stoffpuppe, Strohmännchen” (KHW 100) = “1. coussin, 2. mannequin” (DELC 120) < **m̃rām* (GT).

NB1: For semantic shift cf., e.g., Avest. *barəziš-* “Polster, Kissen” < *barəz-* ~ *bərəz-* “hoch, erhaben” [Bartholomae 1904, 949–950] = *barəziš-* “stuffed seat, cushion” < *barəz-* ~ *bərəz-* “high, exalted, loud (sound)” [Reichelt 1911, 243] < IE **b^hereǵ^h*- “hoch, erhaben” [IEW 140]. Or cf. Eg. *bd3* “Polster (aus Leinen zum Verbinden)” (Med., Wb I 488, 13) = “Polster, Kissen”, *bd3.w n ḥbs.w* “Stoffpolster (dient als Schiene bei Brücken)” (GHWb 267) < Eg. **bd3* [< **bgr*] “high” (GT) < AA **b-g-r* “to grow high” [GT] (contra NBĀ 790, discussed in EDE II 368), cf. also Eg. *bd3* “Mastspitze” (BD & Med., Wb I 488, 12) = “mast-head” (FD 86) = “le sommet, la pointe du mâte” (CT, AL 78.1398).

NB2: W. Westendorf (KHW 100) derived the Cpt. term, with hesitation, from LEg. *wrm* “hochragende Figur” (GR, Wb I 333, 1), whose root (Eg. **wrm* “to rise, be elevated” or sim.) may indeed be eventually (albeit not directly) related. The connection to Ar. *ramrūm-* “navis alta” (suggested in CD, KHW) is dubious.

- Apparently a late borrowing. J. Hoch (1994, 137–9, §177) assumed a pattern **marô/êma* (?), which he explained from Sem. **rw*m “to be high” (cf. Ug. *mrym* “heights”, Hbr. *mārōm* “height”, Phn. *mrm* “elevated”, etc.), which is ultimately akin to Eg. **wrm* (cf. above).

mrr (fire det.) “flame (?)” (CT V 168g, 169b, AECT II 43–44, spell 400, n. 8; DCT 173) = “flamme (?)” (AL 168, #78.1794; El-Sayed 1987, 64) = “Flamme (?)” (GHWb 348).

- GT: related to AA **m-l-l* “1. (to bake in) hot ashes, 2. coal” [GT]. NB1: Attested in Sem. **ml*: JAram. (TTM) *malāla?* “Glühkohle” [Dalman 1922, 238] = (PBHbr. *melel* &) *malāla?* “das Glimmen, Summen der Kohle” [Levy 1924 III, 134] = *mi/īlāla?* “embers” [Jastrow 1950, 792] | Ar. *ml* I “2. mettre qqch. sous les cendres chaudes ou sur la braise pour griller, 3. passer au feu le bois de l’arc ou de la flèche pour le redresser”, VIII “3. braiser, griller, rôtir sous les cendres chaudes ou sur la braise”, *mall-* “2. braise”, *malal-* “marque imprimée avec un fer chaud sur l’os saillant sous l’oreille”, *mall-at-* “2. cendres chaudes ou braise, 3. creux que l’on fait dans les cendres chaudes pour y rôtir qqch.” [BK II 1140–1]

= mll “to put (bread, flesh-meat) into ashes (to bake or roast)”, mall-at- “hot ashes, ashes and earth, in which fire is kindled” [Lane 3022–3] = mall-at- “proprement: la fosse dans laquelle on allume du feu, afin de cuire le pain sur des charbons et de cendres chaudes” [Dozy II 608] = mall-at- “1. cendres chaudes, 2. creux, fosse où l’on met les cendres chaudes destinées à cuire le pain” [Fagnan 1923, 165] = mall-at- “hot ashes, glowing coal” [Baranov 1976, 763], Dathina mll VII: ?inmalla “être fourré dans les cendres chaudes”, mall-at [mällah] “cendre ou terre chauffée sous le charbon incandescent, le foyer (où se trouvent les cendres), pain”, malil “cuit sous la centre”, malläl “Feuersglut” [GD 2712] ||| NBrb.: Zwara a-mmäl “cucina forno” [Prd. 1961, 298] || SBrb.: Hgr. ě-memmel, pl. i-memmel-en “tison (morceau de bois à demi-enflammé)”, dimin. té-memmel-t, pl. ti-memmel-in “1. petit tison, 2. p.ext. petite braise ardente: petit fragment de bois réduit en charbon et ardent” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1198], EWlm. e- ~ a-mämmäl, pl. i-mämmäl-än “1. tison, 2. flambeau”, EWlm. & Ayr mämmäl-ət “être ardent, brûler sans flammes (tison, feu, surface de qqch.)” [PAM 1998, 218; 2003, 542] ||| LECu.: Som. mül-ayya “(he is) melting (this)” [Abr. 1964, 180] ||| ECh.: Bdy. mallē (f) “cautère” [AJ 1989, 97], Mkl. mällä “1. chaleur” [Jng. 1990, 136].

nb2: In Hebrew lexicography, PBHbr. melel & Aram. of TTM ma/il(ə)lä “das Glimmen, Summen der Kohle” [Levy] are usually treated as a figurative sense developed from “das Wort, der Ausspruch” [Levy] = “word speech” [Jastrow]. Mistaken *Volksetymologie*?

nb3: The AA etymology of the Ar. root has also been disputed. (1) A. Bey Kamal (1912–13, 241) compared Ar. ḥubzu mallati “pain cuit dans les cendres chaudes” and mullā “pain ou gâteau bien cuit” [BK II 1141] with a certain Eg. mnw (sic, stone det., no mng. provided). (2) V. Blažek (1992, 255), in turn, equated Ar. mall-at- with a certain LECu.: Som. maleyo “tar, pitch” [Blz.; absent in Rn. 1902, 296; Bell 1969, 175], where, in principle, the supposed semantic development can be justified, cf. e.g. PIE *smel- “langsam und rauchen verbrennen” → Czech smůla “pitch”, or cf. PIE *d^heg^h- “brennen” → Lith. degūtas “tar” ~ degū, dėgti “to burn”. (3) Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 203, #1798) identified Ar. mll with LECu.: Orm. mullū “boiled grain”, mull-ēs- “to boil grains” ||| NOm.: Mocha ’mull-o “grains boiled in water” [< ECU.?.] (4) G. Takács (1995, 105, #1) equated Ar. mll alternatively with LĒg. mn.t ~ mnj.t (flame det.) “Schmelzfeuer” (LP, Wb, above), cf. also LĒg. mn.w m d^b.t “ein Kohlenfeuer” (GR, Wb II 69, 1).

nb4: It would be tempting to compare also LECu.: Boni mulūl’ “coal”, mulūl’ “black” [Heine 1977, 289, 292; 1982, 147] = *mālūl “charcoal” [Heine 1982, 147], for which cf. perhaps rather AA *m-l-l) “black” [GT] discussed s.v. Eg. mnnn ~ mnn “Asphalt” (NK, Wb, above).

nb5: Sem. *mll may go back to a basic meaning “hot”, cf. Hbr. ?ml qal “to be hot with fever” [KB 63] || Ar. mll V “3. être couvert d’une sueur fébrile (chaude ou froide)”, mall-at- “4. sueur fébrile” [BK II 1141] = malla “to be ill with fever, ill-tempered” [KB] = malla “to have fever” [Zbr.]. A. Zaborski (1971, 75, #142) suggested a bicons. Sem. *ml “to have fever” mentioning a certain Hbr. ?amūlā “fever” (sic). Cf. alternatively Eg. mr “krank” (OK, Wb, q.v.)?

NB6: Is AA *m-l “dry” [GT] eventually related? Cf. Hbr. ?ml pulal “vertrocknen (von Öl, einem Lande, einer Stadt, einer kinderlosen Weibe, Menschen)” [GB 48] = ?ml (with a by-form mll) qal “to wilt, wither, dry up”, pulal “1. to wither, dry out”, hitpoal “to dry up” [KB 593] ||| HECu.: Kmb. mōl- “to dry (intr.)”, mōl-a “dry” [Hds.], Sid. mōl-ā “1. secco, arido, 2. stagione asciutta” [Crl. 1938 II, 214] = mol- “seccare” [Mrn. 1940, 230] = mōla “1. to be dry, dry up (intr.), 2. be barren (woman)” & “dry, barren” [Gsp. 1983, 237] = mōl- “to dry (intr.)”, mōl-a “dry”, mōll-e “drought”, mōll-o “dryness” [Hds.], Hdy. omal- “to dry (intr., of wound)” [Hds.], Alb. mōl-a “dry” [Lmb.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 53–54) ||| NOm.: Omt. *mel- “seccare” [Mrn. 1938, 152] > NWOmt. *mel- “dry” [Bnd. 2000 MS,

55, §38] (NWomt.: Alm. 1993, 9) | Zayse & Zrg. mela [Sbr.], Kcm. mela [Sbr.], Koyra mela “dry” [Flm. 1990, 27] = melleše [Sbr.] (SEomt.: Sbr. 1994, 13; HECu.-Omt.: LS 1997, 459) || CCh.: Mkt. mīlmilē “dry season” [Rsg. 1978, 320, #611], perhaps Gsg. muʔul “vertrocknen” [Lks. 1970, 130] || ECh.: EDng. mūlē “sécher, désécher, flétrir, s’étéoler, se putréfier, fermenter, pourrir...” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 211] = “trocknen” [Ebs. 1979, 125; 1987, 96].

mrr.t (NK var. **mrt**) “Straße einer Ortschaft, Häuserviertel, Gaße” (MK, Wb II 110, 8–10) = “rue, voie publique” (Volten 1959, 27) = “street, avenue (of statues)” (FD 112) = “1. Straße, Gaße (in Ortschaft, Palast), 2. Häuserviertel, Allee (mit Statuen gesäumt)” (1st IMP: 2x, GHWb 348; ÄWb I 546) = “street, part of a town” (PL 443: “*sometimes wrongly written mrt*”).

NB: It could hardly have been the etymon of NK br.w ~ bnr > (SB) BOΛ “Außenseite” as suggested by A. Volten (1959, 27) and then by W. A. Ward (1972, 19) because of too many anomalies at a time: (1) m- > b-, (2) change of gender, (3) semantic shift. Rightly declined by J. Osing (NBÄ 834, n. 1117).

- Related with Ar. ma-marr- “passage, endroit où l’on passe” [BK II 1084] = ma-marr- “corridor”, pl. ma-marr-āt- “rue” [Dozy II 577] = ma-marr- “Passage, Paß usw.” [Vcl.], Ar. (dial. of Libya) merīra “sentier de traverse (Pfad)” [Vcl.], Ar. (dial. of Mauritania) mrrirè, pl. mrrair “piste”, mrrirā, pl. mrrair “trajet, direction, route, passage, sentier” [Pierret 1948, 142, 410, 469, 499] || NBrb.: Zayaan & Sgugu √m-r-r: ṭa-mllr-ṭ “sentier” [Lbg. 1924, 566] || ECh.: Kera kə-məmār “Ziehpfad, Spur (von Rindern)” [Ebert 1976, 68], which ultimately derive from AA m-r “to go, pass by” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Sem. *mrr: Akk. (Amarna) marāru G & N “fliehen”, Š “verjagen” [Ebeling 1915, 1463] = G “etwa: fortgehen” [AHW 609: < Ug.] = G “to leave, go away”, Š “to expel” [CAD m1, 268: < WSem.] || Ug. mr III “to drive out” [Gordon 1955, 291, #1159] = mr “weggehen, weichen” [WUS #1658] = √mrr G “1. to go away, leave, travel through, 2. walk” [DUL 577] | OSA (Sab.) *mrr “arriver, survenir” [SD 87], Ar. marra “passer (en parlant d’un homme qui passe à côté ou du temps qui s’écoule, etc.), s’en aller, s’éloigner, passer à côté de qqn./ qqch.”, murūr- “passage, cours” [BK II 1082–4] = mrr “vorübergehen” [Brk.] = IV “passer, faire mouvoir” [Dozy II 577] = mrr “vorbeigehen, herumgehen” [Vcl.], Maltese mar “he went” [Saydon 1966, 118] || MSA: Hrs. mer “to continue, go” [Jns. 1977, 89], Jbl. mirr “to pass” [Jns. 1981, 173], Mhr. mār “to pass” [Jns. 1987, 268] || Tigre mārra “to walk, run”, Tna. marārā “to leave”, Amh. mārr alā “to jump, leap” (ES: Lsl. 1982, 53) || EBrb.: Ghadames: dial. a-mrrir “petit chemin” [Vcl.: from Ar.?] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-mmer “passer par, à” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1218], EWlm. & Ayr ə-mṣmər “1. passer par, près de, à, auprès de, chez, 2. aborder, 3. prendre en passant et emmener avec soi, 5. advenir, survenir à, arriver à, 6. atteindre, toucher (endroit), 7. se diriger vers (désir), etc.”, EWlm. ə-sa-mər & Ayr ə-ssa-mər “1. lieu de passage, 2. moyen de passage, moyen/possibilité de passer” [PAM 1998, 221; 2003, 550] || LECu.: Orm. mar “volgere, muovere a cerchio, passare”, mar-ī “guidare” [Crl.] = mar- “to go” [Hyw. p.c. apud Ss.], Som. mar “vorübergehen, vorbeigehen, passieren, durchziehen, -wandern, gehen”, mārīn “Pfad, schmaler, enger Weg” [Rn. 1902, 297, 302] = “passare” [Crl.] = mār-ayya “1. to pass by, 2. travel, 3. go via,

4. skirt (e.g. town), 5. pass through, forwards, 6. traverse, take a route, 7. pass through (an ordeal) [Abr. 1964, 174] || HECu. *mar- “andare, camminare” [Moreno 1937, 237; 1940, 229] = *mar- “to go (around)” [Sasse 1982, 140–1] = *mar- “to go” [Hds. 1989, 418, 71] (ECu.: CrI. 1938 II, 215; 1951, 473) || WCh.: (?) Miya mir- & Mburku mur- “to run” [Skn. 1977, 38] | Buli marri “to go” [Gowers in JI 1994 II, 162] || CCh.: Mafa māráy “en chemin, en course de route” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 231] | Masa mār “1. venir auprès, (tr.) faire venir, apporter” [Ctc. 1983, 110] || ECh.: EDng. mòrē “(dé)passer (temps et lieu)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 209] = “1. vorbeigehen, 2. vergehen” [Ebs. 1979, 125; 1987, 99].

NB2: Hbr. mar “speck” has been explained in KB 638 from Sem. *mrr.

NB3: H. L. Fleischer (quoted by C. Brockelmann 1932, 811) erroneously explained Ar. mrr from the basic sense “streichen” based on its false comparison with Ar. mry: marā “melken” and Akk. & Syr. mrq “(zer)reiben”. Similarly, H. Möller (1911, 165) affiliated Ar. marra with IE *mr- (sic) “zerreiben, weich werden”.

NB4: E. Cerulli (l.c.) erroneously explained Kafa mar “guidare” as an intr. counterpart to HECu. *mar- “andare” [GT], which, however, represents a fully distinct AA root (cf. Eg. m3^c, q.v.). H.-J. Sasse (1982, 140–1) explained the HECu. verb from HECu. *mar- “1. round, 2. to twist” [Ss.].

NB5: L. Homburger (1930, 285) equated Ful (Peul) bolol, pl. boli “chemin”.

LIT.: Holma 1919, 39 quoted also in GD 2683, fn. 1 (Eg.-Ar.); Clc. 1936, #413 (Eg.-?Ar.); Vcl. 1958, 393 (Eg.-Ar.-Ghadames); 1960, 174, #3 (Eg.-Ar.); Bnd. 1990, 32, #3 (Sem.-HECu.); HSED #1731 (Ar.-Ayr-NBch.-HECu.); Orel 1995, 123, #32 (Ar.-Ayr-Buli-Bura-HECu.); Ehret 1995, #593 (Ar.-Eg.-PCu.).

mrr (GW) “ein Gebäck (in Verbindung mit anderen Broten und Speisen)” (XX./XXI. hapax: Golénischeff onomasticon 7:1, Wb II 110, 12 & Belegstellen) = (listed among cakes, pastry in the, AEO II 231*, 287) = “Opferbrot” (Helck MWNR 672, #27) = “a baked good” (Hoch 1994, 138, §178).

NB: Written in GW: m()-rú-rú (Helck) = ma-ru₂-ru₂, vocalized as *malulu (?) (Hoch).

NB: Cf. also mrr.t “Opferbrot der Form von R7” (1x in Medinet Habu, Helck MWNR 672, #27).

- Apparently a borrowing from Sem., but the underlying root is disputable.
- 1. J. Hoch (l.c.) explained it from NWSem. *mll “to rub”, cf. Ug. mll “to rub”, OTHbr. mll “to rub, scrape”, mālīlā “ear (of wheat)”, MHbr. mll “to rub, scrape (ears of grain), prepare mush (of flour and vinegar)”. Cf. also Watson 2004, 72 (with a possible Ug. parallel).
- 2. GT: in spite of Hoch’s reluctance (“*any resemblance to Ar. mullā... is gratuitous*”), should we rather assume a Can. source close to Ar. mullā “pain ou gâteau bien cuit”, malīl- “1. cuit sous les cendres chaudes (pain, etc.), 2. braisé, grillé sur la braise (viande)”, mall-at- “2. cendres chaudes ou braise, 3. creux que l’on fait dans les cendres chaudes pour y rôtir qqch.” [BK II 1140–1]?

mrr “als Bez. für Speisen” (GR, Wb II 110, 13) = “(among pastry)” (AEO II 231*) = “provisions” (GR: Edfu, PL 443).

● Etymology uncertain:

- **1.** GT: from the older mr.w (food det.) “provisions” (CT I 351b, DCT after AECT, q.v.)?
- **2.** A. H. Gardiner (AEO II 231*) and P. Wilson (PL l.c.), however, assumed that this late word “*may... specifically denote a type of bread and be connected with*” Eg. mrr (GW, q.v.) regarded by Wilson to be “*possibly a loan word*”, which excludes any comparison with CT mr.w.

mrrj.t “Klumpen o.ä. (von Weihrauch)” (Lit. MK, Wb II 110, 14; GHWb 349) = “paquet (?) (d’encens sacré)” (Dévaud 1916, 206) = “lumps (?) (of incense)” (FD 112).

- **1.** E. Dévaud (l.c.) affiliated it with Cpt. (S) $\text{M}\Delta(\text{E})\text{IP}\text{E}$, etc., (B) MHIP (f) “bundle of cloths” (CED 182a). Although the latter originates in OK mr.t “bundle” < mr “to bind” (q.v.), they may be derived from one common root akin to PCu. *mar- “to be round” [Lmb.] < AA “to encircle” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mr, above).

- **2.** GT: or cp. perhaps WCh.: Hausa múlmùláá “to knead between the fingers”, múlmùlè (m) “kneaded-ball, ball (of fùráá)” [Abr. 1962, 683] || ECh.: Lele mòmlí “faire une boule” [WP 1982, 64].

NB1: These parallels might eventually derive from AA “to be round” (or sim.) [GT] > LECu.: Afar mīlā (var. bīlā) “Fuß- oder Arming” [Rn. 1886, 881], Orm. mulul-ēssū “to make round, roll”, mulull-ē “sphere, globe”, mulull-ōma “sphericity”, mulul-ū “round, spherical, globular” [Btm. 2000, 203] || SOM. *mul- “round” [GT] > Ari mull-a, Dime mil-u, mul-ū (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 157) || WCh.: Hausa mílílí “small and round (re fruit)” [Abr. 1962, 675] || CCh.: Mafa mél-mélle’e “sphérique, lisse (pour une tête)” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 225] || ECh.: EDng. mǎliyē “(en)rouler, bander (une plaie)”, cf. mǎmilē “1. tourner autour, 2. faire la cour (animaux)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 193]. H. G. Mukarovsky (1981, 215, §54.B) affiliated the SOM. root with Saharan: Kanuri mud-gátá “rund”. A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 591, §69), in turn, combined it with Ongota mul’o “round”, although he also admitted that the “*cognition [is] not quite reliable*”.

NB2: Whether SBrb.: Hgr. meelli “être retourné” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1200–1], EWlm. & Ayr mǎlǎllǎy “être retourné, mis dans un autre sens, à l’envers, avoir sa position changée” [PAM 1998, 217], Tadghaq & Tudalt mǎlǎllǎy “to be turned over, turn around, over” [Sudlow 2001, 196] || WBrb.: Zng. $\sqrt{\text{m-l}}$: um’èlli “qui retourne” [Ncl. 1953, 210] are related to our AA root is rather dubious. As confirmed by K.-G. Prasse (kind p.c., 27 Nov. 2006), this verb was listed in the Brb. lexicons “*under the root MLLY as there is no way of proving by means of Tuareg that it is a derived verb. As all verbs of this type it may, however, be an assimilation of mǎlǎllǎy. It is further probable that the M is a reflexive prefix. Fortunately, Tamazaight (Central Moroccan) can help us to solve the problem as it has both a verb èllèy ‘turn round; vibrate; be/feel dizzy’ (WLY) and a noun timlǎllay (pl.) ‘dizziness’. This dialect also has mlullǎy ‘change one’s/its position etc.’*” [Taifi 1991, 388].

- **3.** GT: its resemblance to OHbr. mār-dārōr “lumps of myrrh”, cf. mor (6x) ~ mōr (4x) “myrrh (from resin Commiphora abessinica, tastes bitter, smells strong)” [KB 629–630] = mār-dārōr “von selbst ausgeflossene Myrrhe” [GB 167] may be accidental.

mrḥ.t “1. Salböl, 2. Fett von Tieren, 3. Öl eines Baumes (selten)” (OK, Wb II 111, 1–10) = “1. some kind of vegetable oil in general (exact mng. difficult to establish), a particular kind of oil for anointing, castor oil made from dgm ricinus plant and used as a laxative (in the late NK price lists), 2. also: fat from birds in particular” (Janssen 1975, 333–4, §102) = “1. das zum Salben verwendete Öl, 2. polysemantische Bez. allgemein für Öle, Fette, Salbe und Salbmittel” (II., Koura 1999, 114–123; 1998, 72).

NB1: Vocalized as *m̃ rě/ř(w).ṭ (NBĀ 209).

NB2: B. Koura (1999, 114 & fn. 25) erroneously assumed in it the old etymon of (S) ΔΜΡΗΖΕ, (B) ΔΜΡΕΖΙ (m) “asphalt”, although she quoted W. Vycichl (DELIC 11) too correctly pointing out the latter to be cognate with Ar. ḥmr (see below).

- Hence (as secondary denominative verb?) mrḥ “1. salben, 2. auch vom Versehen einer Tonfigur mit Glasfluß” (LP, Wb II 111, 11–12) = “salben, beschmieren” (Grapow).

NB1: H. Grapow (1914, 26) derived this late verb directly from wrḥ. Similarly, H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1986, 32, n. 3:3) points out mrḥ vs. wrḥ to be in Pap. Anastasi I 3:3 “*orthographische Varianten eines Wortes: ‘Salben’...*” assuming an interchange of w- ~ m- (Westendorf 1962, §34.3.aa).

NB2: Hence may derive perhaps also mrḥ.w “ein Gott in Stiergestalt” (OK, Wb 112, 5; ÄWb I 1594) = “dieu taureau d’Athribis” (AL 78.1797) = “bull god, an aspect of the king from very ancient times, as anthropomorphic god the bull of Xoïs or Athribis” (PL 443), which, acc. to P. Wilson (PL), “*refers to one of the bulls anointed by the queen at the Sed festival*” being connected with mrḥ “to anoint”.

NB3: Cf. also mrḥ “Art Holzbearbeitung” (late NK, Wb II 112, 1) = “*Firnissen, Lackieren” (GHWb 349). For its use in Dendara V 105 & 119:3 and its supposed eventual connection to mrḥ “bitumen” cf. Guglielmi 1994, 126, n. a.

- *Prima vista*, it seems logical and natural to accept its traditional etymology (#1) spread in Egyptian philology. But since the origin of Eg. wrḥ is obscure, while Eg. mrḥ.t has convincing AA etymology (cf. #2), one is tempted to suppose in Eg. wrḥ a back-formation created when the use of m- as nomen instr. prefix was still active in Eg.

- **1.** The traditional view that Eg. mrḥ.t is a deverbal m- prefix nomen instrumenti derived from wrḥ “salben” (OK, Wb I 334–5) has been expressed by a number of authors.

LT.: Grapow (1914, 26); Vycichl (1933, 180; 1934, 102); Calice (1936, #566); Albright (1944, 24); Edel (AĀG 109, §253); Osing (NBĀ 209); Smith (1978, 361; 1979, 161); Wilson (PL 444); Koura (1999, 114); Militarev (2005, 360–1, §26) etc.

NB1: Ch. Reintges (1994, 226) explained it from a simplex rḥ (sic, with no *) “to salve, anoint”.

NB2: There is no convincing suggestion for the origin of Eg. wrḥ. It was equated by A. G. Belova (1991, 88, #13; 1993, 53, #13) with Ar. rwḥ II “4. parfumer, imprégné de parfum” [BK II 946], cf. also Hbr. rwḥ B hifil “to smell (a fragrance)” [KB 1196], but the basic sense of the underlying Sem. root is so significantly different that it cannot fit Eg. wrḥ, cp. Sem. *rḥ- “odore” vs. *rūḥ- “vento” [Frz. 1965, 145, #3.14] vs. *rwḥ “to blow, of wind (дуть, о ветре)” [Dlg. after WUS #2494] ||| (?) Eg. jḥ [< *ryḥ?] “angenehm (vom Geruch)” (GR, Wb I 120, 14) ||| LECu. *ruḥ- “breath” [Dlg. 1973, 319].

NB3: Cf., however, Ug. mrḥ (hapax of disputed mng. in a text relating generally about objects for cosmetic use by women) “vessels for perfumes (?)” [Heltzer] explained by M. Heltzer (1978, 27, 58, n. 136) from √wrḥ “to flavor” and combined by W. G. E. Watson (2002, 924, fn. 35) with Eg. mrḥ.t “*though this is only a surmise*”. Note that a Eg. mrḥ.t “oil-jar (?)” (hapax in CT VII 447a) was deduced by R. O. Faulkner (1981, 173) from the cryptic hrgl. written with the ideogram of a (standing vs. squatting) man pouring fluid from a jar on his head which in B1L-B3L is det.-ed with an ointment-jar.

- 2. The identification of Eg. mrḥ with Sem. *mrḥ ~ *mrḥ “to anoint, rub with fat or oil” [Bomhard 1981, 448–9], which has also been maintained by numerous authors, represents a plausible etymology. Interestingly, both A. Ember (1911, 90) and A. G. Belova (1991, 88, #13; 1993, 53, #13) tried to affiliate Hbr. & Ar. mrḥ with both Eg. wrḥ and mrḥ.t pretending that the Sem. root may also contain a secondary m- extension, which is, however, excluded.

LIT.: Goodwin 1867, 87; Rn. 1873, 255; Erman 1892, 112 (after Brugsch); Ember 1911, 90; Clc. 1936, #566; Hohenberger 1958, 396; Müller 1975, #70; Bmh. 1981, 448–9; 1984, 275–6, #291; 1990, 404; Blv. 1991, 88, #13; 1993, 53, #13; KB 634; Blz. 1999, 70, #104.

NB1: There must have been two diverse var. roots (with *-ḥ vs. *-ḥ, resp.). Cf. Akk. marāḥu [AHW 608b] || Ug. mrḥ Ṣ “to overlay (with meal)” [Gaster 1944, 20–21 contra Alb. 1943, 41] = “überziehen” [Ast. 1948, 212, §7; WUS #1673], OT Hbr. (hapax) mrḥ qal “(ein Geschwür) mit einem Heilmittel bestreichen” [GB 461] = “to rub” [Ember] = “to spread on (ointment)” [KB 634], PBHbr. mrḥ piel “1. to strike a plaster, rub a salve”, 2. pass (the hand) over a viscid mass, wipe off, rub off” [Jastrow 1950, 840–1], Aram. mrḥ “glätten” [WUS] | Ar. mariḥa II; marraḥa “1. frotter d’huile, oindre (le corps, sa peau)” [BK II 1087] = marraḥa “to anoint” [Ember] = “ab-, einreiben, streichen” [Drexel] = maraḥa “salben, einreiben” [Ast. 1948, 21, §7] = maraḥa “1. to oil, anoint, rub with ointments, 2. coat slightly with mud” [Ehret] vs. Ar. maraḥa I & II “2. frotter d’huile, oindre” [BK II 1088] = “to rub in, anoint” [KB] = “seinen Körper mit Öl bestreichen, einreiben, erweichen” [Philippi] = “to impregnate with fat or oil” [Ember], Dathina mrḥ “enduire, oindre” [GD 2685] || MSA: Jbl. mīrāḥ “to smear (paint, etc., on sg.) with one’s hands, throw sg. sticky on sg.” [Jns. 1981, 174].

NB2: With respect to the generally accepted inner Eg. etymology of mrḥ.t < wrḥ, F. von Calice (1936, #566) and W. F. Albright (1944, 24, #1) explained Sem. *mrḥ as an early borrowing from Eg., whereby Calice considered Ar. mrḥ a result of contamination with marḥ- “Holz, durch dessen Reibung man Feuer macht” (cf. Eg. m3ḥ, q.v.). Albright (approved by Lambdin 1953, 152 contra Calice), in turn, semantically separated Hbr.-Aram.-Ar. mrḥ (with a basic sense “to smear”) vs. Ar. mrḥ (basic sense “to soften”). Gaster (1944, 20–21) traced back Hbr. mrḥ to Sem. *mrḥ with regard to Ug.-Ar. mrḥ. Thus, Hbr. mrḥ cannot have been a loan from Eg. mrḥ.t. Strangely, Muchiki (1999, 249–250) surmised in either Hbr. mrḥ “to rub” or Eg. mrḥ.t “to rub” (sic) a loan stressing even that “*it is very difficult to discriminate between cognate and loanword in this case*”. Surprisingly, Muchiki was ready to assume two alternative scenarios (neither correct): (1) if the cognacy of Hbr. mrḥ with Ar. mrḥ is valid, it “*is a Semito-Egyptian loanword*” (sic), or, (2) if not, the Hbr. verbal root was a “*likely*” loan-word (!) from Eg.

NB3: Whether Sem. *mrḥ or *mrḥ was the original root is debatable. Eg. mrḥ.t and the comparison with Brb. *m-r-y [reg. < *m-r-ḥ/ᶜ] “to rub” [GT] (suggested by A. R. Bomhard 1984, 276) speak for the AA origin of Sem. *mrḥ. Cp. NBrb.: Mzg. mroy e-mrey, intens. merrey “to rub” [Frj. 1979, 8] = mrey “1. (se) frotter,

2. frictionner, 3. masser, 4. travailler la pâte, 5. râper, 6. tourner une bouillie” [Tf. 1991, 434], Ndir mrəy “to rub” [Penchoen 1973, 104], Izdeg mri “râper”, ta-mer-ray-t “râpe” [Mrc. 1937, 214] | Qbl. e-mri “frotter en appuyant” [Dlt. 1982, 518] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-mri “frotter (avec qqch. de dur)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1226], EWlm. & Ayr ə-mrəy “1. frotter (avec qqch. de dur), 2. effacer en frottant, 3. écorcher” [PAM 1998, 223; 2003, 555]. Note that Brb. *-y can continue i.a. PAA *-ḥ but not *-ḥ (cf. Mlt. 1991, 245–6; Vcl. 1992). However, Brb. *m-r-y < AA *m-r-y should also be accounted for, cf. LECu.: Som. mári “reiben, streifen” & “Bestreichung, Reibung” [Rn. 1902, 299], which might be an evidence for a bicons. AA *m-r “to rub (over), anoint” [Bmh. 1984, 275–6].

NB4: The third root consonant in Sem. *mrḥ etc. can be analyzed as a C₃ root extension (complement) as pointed out by several authors (Reinisch 1887, 274; Drexel 1925, 9; MM 1983, 166 comparing Ar. mrḥ, mry, mrḥ; Bomhard 1984, 275–6, #291; Bomhard 1990, 404 comparing Sem. *mrḥ, *mr^c, *mrḵ, *mrṯ), cp. (1) Ar. mara^a I “2. oindre abondamment d’huile (la tête, les cheveux), 3. peigner les cheveux” [BK II 1093] = mara^a “kämmen, salben, auch: voll (gestrichen) sein” [Philippi] = mara^a I & II “reichlich mit Öl salben, kämmen”, mur^c-at- & mir^a- “Fett” [Růžička] = mara^a “to anoint abundantly” [Ehret] < Sem. *mr^c “to rub, anoint” [Bmh. 1981, 448–9]; (2) Ar. marāya “oindre abondamment d’huile et en imbiber un corps” [BK II 1093] = “to anoint with oil” [Ehret]; (3) Sem. *mrḵ “to scour, rub clean, polish” [Bmh. 1984, 275–6; 1990, 404] > Akk. marāqu “ab-, zerreiben” [AHW 608] || Hbr. mrq qal “polieren”, hifil “reinigen” [GB 463] = qal “to polish”, pual “be rubbed out”, hifil “to clean” [KB 638] || Ar. marāqa “to scrape off the wool” [Ehret] (Sem.: Aro 1964, 154); (4) MSA *mrḵh: Hrs. amárkaḥ “to tidy up” [Jns. 1977, 90], Jbl. êrkaḥ “to clear, wipe up, tidy” [Jns. 1981, 173], Mhr. amárkəḥ “to clear, wipe, tidy up” [Jns. 1987, 270]; (5) ES *mrg “to smear, plaster” [Lsl.]: Tigre maraga “to cover with clay” [LH 116b; KB 638] = marrāga “to smear with clay” [Lsl. 1982, 53], Amh. marega “mit klebrigem Stoffe bestreichen” [Rn.] || NAgaw: Bilin marg “mit Lehm, Ton verstreichen, verschmieren” [Rn. 1887, 274] || LECu. (from ES): Orm. mārāga “to plaster, whitewash, smear (mud on house)” [Gragg 1982, 279], which W. Leslau (1969, 20) equated with Sem. *mrḵ. (6) Ar. marasa I “essuyer, p.ex. la main avec qqch.”, IV “3. essuyer (p.ex. sa main avec une serviette)”, V & VIII “se frotter contre qqch.” [BK II 1090]; (7) Ar. marata “lisser, glacer, rendre lisse, poli” [BK II 1086]; (8) Sem. *mrṯ “to rub, polish, clean, scour” [Bmh. 1984, 275–6] = “1. to rub, scratch, 2. make sooth by plucking out” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. m3d, q.v.). Ch. Ehret (1989, 181–2, §53) established the bicons. Ar. *mr- “to brush with the fingers” i.a. on Ar. mr^c, mrḥ, mry, mrq, mrt (above), but also on a number of semantically uncertain *comparanda*: mrṯ “to crush with the fingers”, mrz “to press slightly with the fingertips”, mrs “to macerate and crush with the hand”, mrš “to scratch with the nails”, mry “to strike the udder of the camel for milking”.

NB5: This biconsonantal analysis can be projected also to the AA cognates. Thus, W. Drexel (1925, 9) correctly combined Sem. *mr- (deduced from Hbr. mrḥ vs. mrṯ) with WCh.: Hausa múrzà “to rub sg. between one’s palms” [Abr. 1962, 687] = “reiben” [Drexel].

NB6: This is why unacceptable is the suggestion by R. Růžička (1911, 131) to take Ar. mrḥ and mr^c etc. from a common biconsonantal Ar. *rḡ ~ *rḥ ~ *rḡ “von dicken, fetten Körperteilen” (sic).

NB7: F. W. M. Philippi (1875, 87–88) affiliated Ar. mrḥ “mit Öl bestreichen” and mr^c “salben (gestrichen voll sein)” with Hbr. mr[?] “stark, fest, gesund, kräftig sein” and a number of unacceptable *comparanda* like Hbr. mry “widerspenstig sein”, Ar. mry “uber stringere mulgendi causa, schlagen, peitschen”, marra “vorübergehen, binden, fesseln”, marmara “rinnen, fließen” (explained from **dahinstreichen*), marra “bitter sein (von stringendem Geschmack)”, mrḥ “krank sein” etc., which he

derived from a common Sem. bicons. *mr- “streich/fen, straff/mm sein”. Similarly, V. Blažek (1999, 70, #104) combined the Eg.-Ar. root mrḥ with the ECu. & WCh. reflexes of AA *m-r “fat” [GT] (below).

NB8: A number of extra-AA parallels have also been suggested. Most convincing is the comparison of Sem. *mrḥ vs. *mr^c and Eg. mrḥ with IE *(s)mer- “to smear, anoint, rub with fat or oil” by A. R. Bomhard (1981, 448–9) as well as the equation with MElam. mirri- “to smear” [HK 1987, 923, 935] ~ Drv. *mer- “to smear, rub” [DED #4709] or *meṛuk- “1. to smear, plaster; 2. wax” [DED] by V. Blažek (1999, 70, #104). H. Möller (1911, 168) erroneously combined Ar. maraḥa with IE *mVrk- (sic) “eingeweicht sein”. L. Reinisch (1873, 255), in turn, affiliated Eg. mrḥ.t and Amh. mrg with a number of absurd parallels. The same pertains to the equation of Eg. mrḥ.t with Bsq. bilgor ~ milgor “Talḡ” apud G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 197).

- **3.** On the other hand, equally widespread is the alternative comparison of Eg. mrḥ.t with the reflexes of common AA *m-r (with diverse C₂ vs. C₃ extensions) “fat (noun/adj.)” [GT] = *maw/yr- [Blz. 1990, 209] = *mar- “fat” [Mlt. 2005, 360–1; 2005, 580]. Attested in Sem. *mr[?] “stark, fest, fett, gesund, kräftig sein” [Philippi 1875, 87]; Akk. marû (Oakk.-OAss. marāʾum) “mästen, langsam machen”, marû (Ass. marʾu) “gemästet, fett” [AHW 616–7] = (Oakk.) marāʾum “to fatten (?)” [Gelb 1973, 182] || Ug. ṽmr[?] “fett werden” [WUS] = ṽmr[?] “to be fat” [Dahood 1965, 65, #1544] = ṽmr[?] G “to fatten”, mrḥ “1. fattened, 2. fatling” [DUL 570–1], Hbr. mrʾ hifil “mästen”, mārīʾ “Mastvieh (vielleicht besonders Mastkälber)” [GB 458, 461] vs. qal “to feed on the fat (of the land), graze” [KB 630] | OSA: Sab. mrʾm “Mastvieh” [GB], Ar. mariʾa “trouver un aliment sain, bon, et le digérer facilement” [BK II 1085] = “wohl bekömmlich sein (Nahrung)” [GB] || Amh. mora “fat of meat” [Bnd.], Gurage dialects. mora etc. “animal fat that is not eaten” [Lsl. 1979, 418] (Sem.: WUS #1663; Lsl. 1968, 359, #1544) || SAgaw: Awngī morī “fat (n.), grease” [Hetzron 1978, 137–8; Apl. 1994 MS, 14] || ECu. *mōr- “fat” [GT]: LECu. *mōr- [^c*mawr-?] “fat, sealing-wax” [Blz.]: Oromo morā “Fett, Talḡ” [Müller 1975, 69, #70] = mōra “жир, сало” [IS 1976, #296] = mōra “sealing-wax” [Sasse] = mōra “(cattle) fat” [Gragg 1982, 291] = mōra “grease, suet tallow” [Btm. 2000, 200], Gidole (Dirayta) mōr “sealing-wax” [Sasse] = mōra “dried fat” [LS], Konso mōra “fat” [LS], Baiso mōro “suet” [Hyw. 1979, 130], Som. mōr “seal(ing-wax)” [Abr. 1964, 181], Rnd. mōr “fat around the intestines and stomach” [PG 1999, 227], Arb. mōra “fat (n.)” [Kusian & Sbr.] | HECu.: Kmb. mōra/e “Fett” [LS], Alb. mōra “Fett” [LS], Sidamo mōra “pulp of the flesh of an animal” [Ss.], Gedeo mōroʾo “Fett” [LS], Burji mōri “abdominal or kidney fat” [Sasse 1982, 147] = fat, butter” [LS] | Gwd. mōr- “to become fat” [LS], Tsamay mōru “fat (n.)” [Kusian-Sbr.] = mōro (m) “hard internal part of animal fat” [Sava 2005 MS, 256] (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 147; Lsl. 1988, 195; Kusian-Sbr. 1994, 6) || NOM. (< ES): Wlt. mōriya “1. fat (n.), 2. bodyfat” [LS] | Zayse & Yemsa mōra “1. fat (n.), 2. bodyfat” [LS] (Cu.-Om.: LS 1997, 468), cf. also Ongota mōra “pot belly, fat of meat” [Flm. 1992, 191] = mōra “fat” [Bnd. 1994, 1160] = mōra “fat (n.)” [Kusian-Sbr. 1994, 6] || SCu.: perhaps Maʾa mweré “cream, butterfat” (unless prefixed by m-, cf. Asa ʾoreʾ-ek “oil, fat” < SCu. *ore- “cream, butterfat”) [Ehret 1980, 298] || NOM.: (?) Male mōr-esi “fat, grease” [Sbr. 1994–95, 8, #77] || SOM. *mōrr- (?) “Fett” [GT]: Banna mōrr [Mkr.], Hamer mōrr [Mkr.] = mōr [Bnd. 1994, 149] (Om.: Bnd. 1975, 162; Mkr. 1981, 208) || Ch. *m-r ~ *mb-r “fat, oil” [JS 1981, 99B, 196] = *mVHVr- “жир” [OS 1989, 135] = *ma/iwrV “fat, butter” [Blz. 1990, 209] = *moH[a]r- “oil” [Stl. 1996, 83] > WCh. *mawra/*miwra “жир, масло” [Stl. 1987, 233, §803] = *m-w-r “Fett, Öl” [GT]: Hausa máí [Stl.: < *mawr-] “oil, fat, grease” [Abr. 1962, 638], Gwandara máy “oil” [Mts. 1972, 80] | PAngas-Sura: (I) *mʾūr (> *mūr) var. *muḡur “fat” [GT 2004, 260] = *m[u]ḡur “fat” [Dlg.] = *mwAr [Stl. 1987] (AS:

Stl. 1972, 185; 1987, 233, #803; Hfm. 1975, 18, #52) vs. (2) *m^wōr ~ *m^wē₂r (var. *m^war?) “oil” [GT 2004, 261] (AS: Stl. 1972, 185; 1987, 233, #803; Hfm. 1975, 18, #52) vs. (3) *m^wār > var. *m^wāl “fat” (both adj. and noun) [GT 2004, 261] | Ron *m^vŪr “oil” [GT]: Fyer mēē “Fett” vs. moo “Öl” [Jng.] = moo vs. mēē, resp. [Seibert], Sha maḥ [-h < *-r] “Öl” [Jng. 1966, 172], Kulere màär “oil” [Jng.] = màr [IL], Bokkos mbaar “oil” [Jng.] = mbar [Seibert], Daffo-Butura mbaar “oil” [Jng.] = mbar “oil” [Seibert], Monguna mar “oil” [Seibert], Mangar màw “oil” [Seibert], Mundat & Karfa màr “oil” [Seibert], Richa màà “oil” [Seibert] (Ron: Jng. 1970, 390; Seibert 2000 MS, #F207 & F209) | PBole-Tangale *mōr “oil” [Schuh] = *murw- [Stl.]: Karekare marù [Jng. 1966, 172] = mārù “oil” [Krf. #223] = meru (sic) [Stl.] = màrù “oil” [Schuh; Alio 1991 MS, #F207], Bole mōr [Meek; Jng. 1991-92] = moñ “oil” [Krf. #223] = mor [Schuh 1982, 5], Ngamo mōr “oil” [Krf. #223] = mòr [Schuh] = mòr “oil” [Alio 1988 MS], Maha mor [Nwm. 1965, 58] = mòr “(palm) oil” [Alio 1988 MS], Bele mùrù [Shuh], Kirfi mùrù [Shuh], Dera mot [-t < *-r] “oil” [Meek; Nwm. 1970, 44], but cf. also Dera mori me “this oil” [Nwm. 1970, 44], Galambu màr [Shuh], Gera mori “oil” [Krf. #223] = mòòri [Shuh], Geruma mòòri [Shuh], Pero mór “pomade, lotion, oil” [Frj. 1985, 42], Kwami móri “Fett, Öl” [Leger 1992, 28] (BT: Schuh 1978, 30, 150; 1984, 211) | Diri miri “oil” [Krf. #223] vs. NBauchi (borrowed from Hausa): Tsagu máyī, Warji máyī, Siri mài, Mburku màyī (NBch.: Skn. apud JI) | SBauchi: Bgm. maayi [Jng.] = mà: [IL] = maayi “Öl” [Jng. 1965, 177, 179] = maay “oil” [Smz. 1975, 31] = may [Schuh], Kir màär [Smz.], Tala miir [Smz.], Laar & Mangas maar [Smz.], Sho (Ju) miir & -myir [Smz.], Booluu (Migang) müli [Smz.], Zaranda müli [Smz.], Zul & Barang (Baram) müiri [JI], Zaar (Sayanchi) miir “oil” [Smz. 1975, 31] = mur “oil” [Krf. #223], Polchi müiri [Stl. < ?], Barawa miyir [Stl. < ?], Geji mài (from Hs.) “oil” [Smz.] vs. míli [Stl.: -l < *-r-] “oil” [IL] = míli “oil” [Krf. #223], Buli mir [IL] = mier [Smz.] = mir “oil” [Krf. #223], Dokshi mier [Smz.], Zangwal & Langas miir [Smz.], Zeem may [Smz.], Bandas mài [Smz.], Bodli (Zumbul) miyir [Smz.], Zakshi maaya [Smz.], Burma mar “oil” [Krf. #223], Chaari & Boot maayi [Smz.] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 29, #36) | Bade mùlan “oil” [Krf. #223], WBade màl-áan “oil” [Schuh], Gashua-Bade màlák (-k not part of the root) “oil” [Schuh 1975, 111], Ngizim mirak “oil” [Meek] = mirák “oil” [Krf. #223] = màràk “oil” [Schuh 1981, 105] = màrək [Stl.], Teshena murin “oil” [Schuh] (BN: Schuh 2001, 432; WCh.: Jng. 1966, 172; 1991-92, 24; Stl. 1987, 233, #803) || CCh. *mar “oil” [GT]: Tera mor [Nwm. 1977] = mar [Nwm. 1964, 42; JI], Pidlimdi mōr [Krf.] | BM *mal [reg. < *mar] “oil” [GT] > Margi màl “oil, fat”, màlmàl “fat” [Hfm. apud RK 1973, 125] = mal [Nwm.] = maèl “fat” [Hfm.] = màl “oil” [Krf. #223], WMargi màl ~ màl “oil” [Krf. #223], Bura mal “fat, oil” [BED 1953, 127] = màl “oil” [Krf. #223], Bura-Pela mal-kum “fat” [Meek], Chibak màl “oil” [Krf. #223], Wamdiu mal “oil” [Krf. #223], Kilba mal “fat” [Meek] = màl “oil” [Krf. #223], Ngwahyi màl “oil” [Krf. #223], Hildi màlu “oil” [Krf. #223] | Fali-Jilbu malí “oil” [Krf. #223], Fali-Muchella màru “oil” [Krf. #223], Fali-Bwagira màrín “oil” [Krf.] (Fali: Krf. 1972 MS) | Gude mara “oil” [Meek; Nwm.; Krf.] = máará “oil” [Hsk. 1983, 233] = maṛa “oil” [Krf. #223], Gudu mar [Nwm.] = maṛ “oil” [Krf. #223] = maṛey [Carnochan 1975, 465] = marəy “oil” [Krf. #223] = mà:rè [Skn./JI], Bata maré “Fett” [Str. 1910, 461] = maṛəṛ “huile” [Mch.] = mááré “oil” [Pweddton 2000, 53], Bata-Zumu (Jimo) maro “fat, oil” [Meek 1931 I 81-82], Bata-Garwa & Bata-Demsa maaré “Fett” [Str. 1922-23, 127], Nzangi mare “oil” [Meek; Krf. #223] = màre “oil” [Krf. #223] | PMnd. *wala [reg. < *mara] “oil” [GT]: Pdk. mal “huile” [Mch.], Mnd. wəje [Meek] = wəyɛ [Mch.] = wəyɛ [Krf. #223], Glavda wala [RB] = ?uwàlà [Krf. #223], Guduf wala [IL], Dghwede (Zeghwana) wilé “oil” [Frick] = wílí? [IL] = wile [Krf. #223], Gava wala “oil” [Krf. #223], Nakatsa wula [Krf. #223], Ngweshe wálá [IL] | Sukur mir “oil” [Meek] = mír [IL], Sakun mir “graisse,

huile” [Brt. MS n.d., 4, #69] | MM *m(b)ar > *mal “huile” [Mch.] = *amal “oil” [Rsg.] > Mafa (Mtk.) mbār “huile” [Mch.] = mbař [Krf. #223] = mbār [Schubert], Mada mař “huile” [Mch.] = amal “huile” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 184], Muyang àmál [Rsg.], Muktele àmál [Rsg.], Hurzo àmbār “huile” [Mch.], Hurzo & Vame àmbār [Rsg.], Moloko àmár [Rsg.], Uldeme amál “huile” [Mch.], Mofu-Gudur mál “huile” [Brt. 1988, 174], Gisiga mal “huile” [Mch.] = mál [Rsg.], Muturwa & Mijivin mal “huile, graisse animale” [Jaouen 1973 MS, #55], Zelgwa & Mofu mař “huile” [Mch.] = mál [Rsg.], Mboku àmař “huile” [Mch.] (MM: Rsg. 1978, 299, #506) | Gidar mele “huile” [Mch.] = meḷeḷe [Mch./JI] | PMusgu *mal ~ *mel [Trn.: reg. from *mar] “oil” [GT] > Muskuum miltuw “huile, beurre” [Trn. 1977, 23], Musgu emél “Fett/Öl” [Krause apud Müller 1886, 395] = amél [Barth, Rohlfš] = amel [Ovw.] “flüssige Butter” [Lks. 1941, 52] = mel “huile” [Mch.] = (Munjuk) àmél [Trn.], Musgu-Girvidik àmél “Butter, Fett, Öl” [MB 1972 MS, 2], Musgu-Puss emel “Butter, Fett, Öl” [MB] = emel ~ amel (m) vs. amaliy “1. huile, 2. liquide sirupeux, visqueux ou gras” [Trn. 1991, 86], Mulwi àmél (prefix a-) “graisse, beurre, huile” [Trn. 1978, 206], Mbara mál “huile, beurre liquide” [TSL 1986, 271; Trn. 1990, 254], Mogrum àmél “huile, beurre” [Trn. 1977, 23] | Masa mul “huile” [Mch.] = mül “1. huile, 2. graisse, 3. beurre, 4. pétrole” [Ctc. 1983, 108] = mül cù:ná “fat” [Jng./JI] = mül-lá “huile” [Jng. 1973 MS] = mula [Krf. #223] = mül “grasse, huile” [Ajl.], Banana bulš [Krf. #223], Banana-Museye mbul-na [Krf. #223], Gizey mùl “grasse, huile” [Ajl.], Ham & Gizey & Marba mbùl “grasse, huile” [Ajl.], Zime-Batna mbūr “fat” [Scn.] = mbūr [Jng. 1991–92, 24], Zime-Dari bur “Fett” [Str.] = mbūr “huile, graisse” [Cooper 1984, 18], Lame mbář “oil” [Krf. #223] = mbūr “huile, grasse” [Scn. 1982, 310], Lame-Peve mar “oil” [Krf. #223] (Masa gr.: Ajl. 2001, 28; CCh.: Mch. 1953, 177; WCh.-CCh.: NM 1966, 238) || ECh.: (?) WDangla móórò “1. épiderme (≠ derme) de l’homme, 2. petits morceaux de viande (déchets) restés après le rasage intérieur d’une peau de boeuf” [Fédry 1971, 134] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 132–3, 260–1).

AP: (?) PNil. *mā-(R) “fat, oil, grease” > Turkana a-kimyet “grease, fat” (contraction < *a-ki-mey-et), PKalenjin *mwa(a)R “oil”, PLwoo *mOū “oil”, Surma gr.: Murlé more (Nil.: Dimmendaal 1988, 40, #63).

Lrr.: Grb. 1963, 60 (WCh.-CCh.-Eg.); Dlg. 1966, 66 (Sem.-Eg.); Hodge 1968, 26 (Eg.-Hausa); Müller 1975, 69, #70 (Oromo-WCh.-CCh.-Eg.); Bnd. 1975, 162 (NOM.-Hamer-Awngi); IS 1976, #296 (Sem.-Eg.-Oromo-Ch.); Nwm. 1977, 30 (PCh. *mar “oil”); OS 1989, 135; 1992, 190 (WCh.-CCh.-Eg.); Bmh. 1990, 404 (Eg.-PCh.); Blz. 1990, 209 (Eg.-PECu.-PWCh.-PSem.); JI 1994 II, 132–133, 260–261 (WCh.-CCh.); Orel 1995, 107, #112; 1995, 148 (Sem.-Eg.-Ch.-Orm.); Skn. 1996, 192–193 (Hs.-WDng.-Bdm.-ECu.-Sem.-Eg.); Std. 1996, 83 (Ch.-Eg.-Ar.); Blz. 1999, 70, #104 (Eg.-WCh.); Militarev 2005, 360–1, §26; 2005, 580, §26 (Ch.-Ongota-Hamer-Male-ECu.-Awngi-Sem.).

NB1: The cognacy of Eg. mrḥ.t with the common Ch. term for “fat, oil” and Sem. *mr? has been rejected by G. Takács (1999, 105) and A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 360–1, §26) because of Eg. mrḥ.t < wrḥ. Although Illič-Svityč (1976, #296) too categorically refuted any relationship between Sem. *mr? & Ar. mrḥ and Eg. mrḥ.t < wrḥ, he did not exclude the common origin of LECu. *mōr- (!) and Ch. the root for “fat, oil” with Eg. mrḥ.t. He derived both the LECu. and Ch. word from *m- prefix + *w-r-H on the analogy of Eg. mrḥ.t < *m-wrḥ.t.

NB2: F. W. M. Philippi (1875, 87–88) explained both Hbr. mr? and Ar. mrḥ “mit Öl bestreichen” from a common Sem. bicons. *mr- “streich/fen, straff/mm sein”. Similarly, numerous authors (Müller 1975, #70; Std. 1987, 233; Bmh. 1984, 275–6, #291; 1990, 404; Blz. 1999, 70, #104; cf. HSED #1784 & #1804) also compared Sem. *mrḥ/h “to rub, smear” with common Ch. *m-r “fat, oil”. In any case, this would imply a kinship between Sem. *mrḥ vs. *mr? (declined for semantical reasons by Diakonoff & Kogan 1995, #1804; Kaye 1997 MS, 2; Takács 1999, 105), which is

only plausible if we assume for Sem. *mr- (with diverse extensions) a primary mng. *^cto rub, smear with fat”, cf. especially Ar. mara^ca I “2. oindre abondamment d’huile (la tête, les cheveux)”, mur^c-at- & mirā^c- “graisse” [BK II 1093] = mr^c “salben, kämmen, auch: (gestrichen) voll sein” [Philippi] = mara^ca I & II “reichlich mit Öl salben, kämmen”, mur^c-at- & mirā^c- “Fett” [Rüzička].

NB3: W. Leslau (1988, 195) explained the ECu. forms as loans from Eth.-Sem., cf. Amh. mora “animal fat” [Gragg], but L. Bender (2003, 16, §46) assumed just the opposite direction borrowing.

NB4: H. Jungraithmayr (1989, 256) derived some of the WCh. (Hausa, Sura, and Kulere) reflexes from a common WCh. *m-k-l (!).

NB5: E. Wolff & L. Gerhardt (1977, 1538–9) combined the Ch. root for “oil, fat” with BC: Mbla & Mama muru, Wurunk muruḡ, Nagumi murū. In the view of H. Jungraithmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I 63), the Ch. root for “fat” “cannot be reconstructed, since they stem from different NC languages” (!). As to the Ch. words for “oil”, here too, they (JI 1994 I, 130) suggested a derivation from some NC source: “its reflexes undoubtedly stem from NC languages...”, which is rather unlikely as they also admit that the eventual cognacy with the Sem. parallels “deserves further consideration in a wider African-Asian context”.

- 4. GT: alternatively, cp. Ar. malaḡa II “être suffisamment gras et beau et bon à être égorgé (se dit d’un chameau)”, IV “2. mettre de la graisse dans la marmite, la graisser”, V “être gras”, miḡ- “gras” [BK II 1144] = miḡ III “Fett zusetzen”, V “fett sein”, miḡ- “fett” [Rüzička]. NB: This may be eventually related (via met.) to AA *m-H-l, i.e., *m-[h]-l [GT] > NOm.: Male māli “Fett” [Mkr.] = mali [Lewis] = māli “fat, grease” [Sbr. 1994–95, 8, #77] = mA:li [Bnd. 2000 MS, 55, #46], Koyra malla “Fett” [Flm.] | Mao: Hozo māli “fat of meat, guts” [Flm.], EMao (sic) mala ~ male māli “fat of meat, guts” [Flm.], Diddesa māle “fat” [Flm.], Bambeshi moela “Fett” [Mkr.] (Mao: Flm. 1988, 39; 1990, 27) ||| WCh.: AS *m^waḡal [*-ḡ- seems reg. < *-ḡ-] “1. fat (adj.), 2. muscular, strong” [GT 2004, 256] = *m^waḡal “fat, greasy (жирный)” [Sd.]: Angas mwaal (≈ myaar in hill Angas) “fat” [Flk. 1915, 249] = mwaal (K) “fat (living obj.)” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] = mwal “to be fat, becoming fat” [ALC 1978, 40] = mual-mual “fat, plumpy” [Gcl. 1994, 61], Sura mwaḡal “gemästet, fett, schlachtreif” [Jng. 1963, 76] = moḡal [mo- weakened < *m^wa-] “fatness” [Krf.], Mpn. mōl “full of body (used to describe a healthy, fat person)”, múl múl “very muscular”, mōl ~ múl múl “1. fat, 2. thick, 3. muscular” [Frj. 1991, 38–9], Kfy. mwāḡal “fat” [Ntg. 1967, 27], Gmy. maal [ma- reg. < *m^wa-] “resistance, vigour, hardness” [Srl. 1937, 132] (AS: Sd. 1972, 184; 1977, 156, #140). Note that this NOm.-AS isogloss might be alternatively akin to Ar. muhl- “3. huile ou marc d’huile” [BK II 1163] = “Öl” [Rn. 1873, 255].

NB1: Rüzička (1911, 131) affiliated Ar. malaḡa with maraḡa & mara^ca I & II “reichlich mit Öl salben” (above) and derived from Ar. bicons. *ḡ ~ *rḡ ~ *rḡ “(von dicken, fetten Körperteilen)” (sic).

NB2: Ug. mlḡ-t (f) (hapax) “feast or ceremony (of an Eg. celebration): an act of anointing (?)” has been explained (in DLU 274; DUL 548 and Watson 2000, 570, §21) as borrowing from Eg. mrḡ.t, which would imply an original *-l-.

NB3: H. G. Mukarovsky (1981, 208) and M. L. Bender (2000 MS, 55, §46) derived the Male reflex from NWOmt *moḡl- “fat, grease” (for which cf. also Eg. md.t below).

NB4: Strangely, A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 360–1, §26) explained also Kilba mal and Margi maél from AA *mal- ignoring that BM *l < Ch. *r is regular.

- 5. C. W. Goodwin (1867, 87), H. Brugsch (1882, 68), F. Hommel (1883, 440, fn. 30), and L. Reinisch (1887, 274; 1890, 266) assumed

“a numerous family of words... signifying various kinds of natural products (both mineral and vegetable)”, in which they equated Eg. mrḥ.t (with original *-l-) as “etymologically identical” (Goodwin) with Eg. mnḥ [*mlḥ] “wax” (q.v.), mrḥ “bitumen” (Goodwin) = “Asphalt” (Wb, q.v.), Sem. *milḥ- “salt” [Frz.] = “Salz, Fett” (!) [Hommel] > Cpt. (SABF) מוֹיָאֵז “salzen, salzig sein” (KHW 91), Hbr. ḥēmār “asphalt, bitumen” [KB 331], Hbr. man “manna” etc. Goodwin even included Ar. mrḥ “to rub with oil”. This absurd comparison is evidently wrong.

NB: These words stem from unrelated AA roots: (1) for Eg. mnḥ “wax” cf. above; (2) for Eg. mrḥ “bitumen” see below; (3) Sem. *milḥ- may be cognate rather with Eg. ḥm3.t [*ḥml.t from *mlḥ.t via met.] “Salz” (MK, Wb III 93–94) as suggested by F. Behnk (1927, 82, #25) and W. Vycichl (1988, 485; 1990, 39).

mrḥ “Asphalt” (Lit. MK, Wb II 111, 13) = “a species of bitumen (or a mixture containing bitumen used in embalming) or (liquid) asphalt or possibly petroleum”, mrḥ n ḥt “wood tar, wood pitch or resin” (Harris 1961, 173–4, 234) = “Holzteer oder Art Asphalt” (NBÄ 747, n. 909) = “Teer oder Pech (?) (u.a. auf die Mumie gegeben)”, mrḥ-ḥ3s.t “Pissasphalt (?)” (Fuchs, LÄ VI 290 & 292, n. 13 after Janssen 1975, 215, fn. 64).

NB1: P. Lacau (1903, 155), J. Garnot (1958, 141), J. Osing (NBÄ 209, 747, n. 909), and A. Loprieno (1995, 48) explained it from a fem. etymon suggesting a connection to mrḥ.t “oil” (q.v.), which is far from certain.

NB2: Vocalized as *marēhe (Fecht 1960, 180, fn. 505) = *marūḥu (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 156) = *m̄rē/ḥ(w).ṯ > *m̄rēḥ̄ > *mrēḥ̄ (NBÄ l.c.) = *mVrḥj.at (sic) (Loprieno 1995, 48).

- Hence: Dem. mrḥ(j) (m) “Asphalt” (DG 169:11) > Cpt. (S) ΔΜΡΕΖΕ, (SA) ΔΜΡΗΖΕ, (B) (Ε)ΜΡΕΖΙ, (Ἰ)ΒΡΕΖΙ, ΕΡΠΡΕΖΙ, (F) ΔΜΡΕΖΙ (m!) “bitumen, asphalt” (CD 9a) = “l’asphalte ou bitume de Judée (ἄσφαλτος, στέαρ, asphaltus, adeps)” (Loret 1894, 157–8) = “Asphalt” (KHW 6).

NB: For the shift in (B) ḿḥp- (*mvr-) ~ (S) ḿp- (*mr-) see Hintze 1949, 48.

- 1. Most probably related to Hbr. ḥēmār “bitumen, asphalt” [KB 331] = “Asphalt, Erdpech” [GB 242], JAram. ḥēmārā [KB] | OSA (Mina) ḥmr [ZAW 75, 309], Ar. (Lsl.: < Aram.) ḥumar- “asphalte” [BK I 489] = ḥumar- “asphaltum or Jews’ pitch, bitumen Judaicum” [Lane 640] = ḥamīr- (sic) [KB] || Sqt. ḥamóra “bitume” [Lsl. 1938, 181]. LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Goodwin 1867, 87; GB 242; Dévaud 1921, 170, fn. 6; Clc. 1936, #414; Vrg. 1945, 138, #12.a.5; Vcl. 1958, 376; 1990, 222; KHW 6; KB 331.

NB1: The met. in Eg. (mrḥ < *ḥmr) is plausible and esp. typical in the proximity of m, cf. e.g., Eg. mrḥ < *rmlḥ “spear”, mzḥ < ḥmz “crocodile”, ḥms < *mzḥ “ear (of grain)” etc.

NB2: F. von Calice (l.c.) considered Eg. mrḥ an early loan from Sem. instead of a genetic relationship. Possible, especially if we accept the derivation from the Sem. root ḥmr “red” (proposed in some Sem. lexicons).

NB3: É. Dévaud (l.c.) rightly stressed the distinction of Eg. mrḥ from mrḥ.t (contra Loret 1894, 158), which J. R. Harris (1961, 173–4) accepted too (“*the distinction is right*”), although he did not rule out that eventually both “*may well be the same word*”, which is hardly correct provided we accept the Sem. etymology.

NB4: The inner Sem. etymology of the term is obscure. R.M. Voigt (p.c., 8 Dec. 2006) sees no reason for “*Zweifel an der traditionellen Sicht, dieses Wort von der Wurzel für ‘rot’ abzuleiten*” since “*Asphalt ist zwar eher schwarz, aber vielleicht leuchtet er rot bei der Erhitzung*”. M. Bulakh (Moscow, p.c., 15 Dec. 2006) views, however, “*что оно никак не связано с ḥmr ‘красный’ (мне непонятно, почему асфальт должен ассоциироваться с красным цветом)*”.

- 2. Others, i.a., Loret (1894, 157–8), Chassinat (1922, 463), Harris (1961, 173–4), Černý (CED 7), Osing (NBÄ 209, 747, n. 909), and Westendorf (KHW 6), however, treated it as etymologically identical with Eg. mrḥ.t < wrḥ. H. Grapow (1914, 26) too assumed an m- prefix form, but carefully avoided the mention of wrḥ as well as mrḥ.t. Rejecting a direct m- prefix derivation, G. Fecht (1960, 180, fn. 505), in turn, explained it from LEg. mrḥ “salben” (Wb, q.v.). J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 156) too saw in its supposed etymon *marūḥu a pass. part. (“celui qu’on étale”) of LEg. mrḥ “oindre”.

NB: C. W. Goodwin (1867, 87) assumed “*a numerous family of words... signifying various kinds of natural products (both mineral and vegetable)*”, in which he erroneously equated Eg. mrḥ (with original *-l-) as “*etymologically identical*” with Eg. mnḥ [*mlḥ] “wax” (q.v.), mrḥ.t “oil” (q.v.), Sem. *milḥ- “salt”, Hbr. man “manna” etc. Goodwin even included Ar. mrḥ “to rub with oil”. Absurd.

mrḥ “verderben, vergehen (Seele, Leichnam, Platz)” (XVIII., Wb II 111, 14–20) = “to go to ruin” (Badawy 1956–57, 73) = “to decay (of buidings)” (FD 112) = “deterioration” (Ward) = “to decay, pass away” (PL 443).

- GT: most probably, (an irregular?) cognate of Akk. (a/jB) marāḥu “to allow to become spoiled (?)”, cf. mirḥu “ergot” [CAD m1, 265 & m2, 106] || JAram. (TTM) mərəḥ nifal “to be crushed into a viscid mass”, cf. pael “to strike off the pile, finish” [Jastrow 1950, 841], Samar. Aram. mrḥ “spoiling”, mrwḥ (qāṭol adj.) “spoiled” [Tal 2000, 485] | OSA mrḥ “to destroy (разрушить)” [IS 1976, §310 < ?].

NB1: The identification of the Akk.-Aram. root is due to A. Tal (l.c.). Usually, Akk. ḥ points to Sem. *ḥ, but L. Kogan (1995) demonstrated the lexical evidence for occasional shift of Akk. ḥ < Sem. *ḥ, which is confirmed in our case by OSA mrḥ. It was V. M. Illič-Svityč (l.c.) to affiliate the OSA root with PBHbr. mrḥ “(ab)reiben, bestreichen” [Levy 1924 III 248] = “ab-, zerreiben, glätten” [GB] = “растирать” [IS] < OTHbr. mrḥ qal “mit einem Heilmittel bestreichen” [GB 461], which would imply a remote cognacy with Eg. mrḥ.t “oil” (q.v.). W. von Soden (AHW 608) too, suggested a relationship of Akk. marāḥu ~ Sem. *mrḥ “einreiben”.

NB2: Presumably no connection to NŌm.: Gamu mōr- “1. to make a mistake, 2. spoil, destroy” [Sottile 1999, 429] whose basic sense might have been different.

- Any other etymology is either doubtful or false:

- **1.** L. Homburger (1929, 158): ~ Ful mbor-di “pus”, Bantu bola “pourrir”. Absurd.
- **2.** W. A. Ward (1963, 423, #7) derived (!) the basic idea of Eg. mrḥ “deterioration” (as a borrowing!) from Sem. *brḥ > Hbr. bāraḥ “to run away, flee”, Ar. baraḥa “to go away, cease”, bāriḥ- “past time”. Unlikely.
NB: Unclear why would have such a meaning been borrowed. The change m < *b- is also unjustified in this case.
- **3.** C. T. Hodge (1992, 17, #4.c) connected it with Eg. mr “to be sick”. False.
NB: No explanation for the final -ḥ in this case.
- **4.** P. Wilson (PL 443), reluctantly though (“*origin not clear*”), explained it directly from Eg. mrḥ “*oil for embalming, which has exactly the opposite effect for it ‘preserves’ and ‘prevents decay’*”, whereby “*the two may be antonyms*”. Semantically very weak.
- **5.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 207, #1811) combined it with Ar. mrd “to blacken one’s character” and Sem. *mrḳ “to be ill” ECu.: Glg. mor- “verletzen”. Phonologically unacceptable (anomalous C₃s).
- **6.** GT: a connection to MSA: Sqt. mlḥ “fatiguer” [Lsl. 1938, 244] is equally improbable. Cf. also Ar. marḥān- “faiblesse” [BK II 1087]?
NB: T. M. Johnstone (1977, 89) combined the Sqt. root with Hrs. melōḥ “to seize, pull down”.

mrḥ (GW) “Lanze” (late NK, Wb II 112, 14) = “lance” (Grd. 1911, 37, fn. 13) = “the javelin (of the equipment of the war-chariot)” (Janssen 1975, 325, fn. 75) = “spear, lance” (Hoch 1994, 139, 179).

NB: Written in GW as ma-r-ḥà ~ mi- (Helck 1971, 513, #98; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 80) = ma-r-ḥa, vocalized as *murḥa (Hoch l.c.).

- Hence: Cpt. (SB) 𐩢𐩣𐩥𐩢, (S) 𐩢𐩣𐩢, (A) 𐩢𐩣𐩢𐩣 (m) “spear, javelin” (CED 184a; so also Goodwin 1867, 86) = “Lanze, Speer” (KHW 101).
NB: Peyron’s (B) 𐩢𐩣𐩣𐩢 (leading A. H. Gardiner l.c. to doubt its derivation from LEg. mrḥ) has not been confirmed in the recent lexicons.
- Borrowed from Sem. *rumḥ- [GT], cf. Ug. mrḥ “a spear” [Gordon 1947, 247, #1225; 1965, #1547] = “Lanze” [WUS #1671] = (fem.!) “lance, spear” [Tawil 1998, 340; DUL 574] = “lancet” [Stieglitz, JCS 33, 1984, 52], Hbr. romaḥ “Lanze, Speer” [GB], JAram. rō/ūmhā “spear” [Jastrow 1950, 1461], Syr. rumḥā [Brk.] | Ar. rumḥ- “lance”, ramaḥa I “1. frapper, percer qqn. avec une lance, 4. lancer tout à coup son cheval au galop” [BK I 921] || Geez ramḥ ~ rəmḥ “spear”, ramḥa “to pierce or wound with a spear” [Lsl. 1987, 470].

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Burchardt 1909–10, #477; GB 762; Clc. 1928, 142; Stricker 1937, 17; Hintze 1951, 84; Vcl. 1958, 393; 1959, 70; 1983, 121; 1990, 101; Helck 1971, 513, #98; Černý in CED 90; Westendorf in KHW 101–2; Roquet 1983, 329–331, §2; Youssef 1983, 260; Helck 1989, 134, §4; Vcl. 1990, 222, §b.4; Hoch 1994, 139, #179; Peust 1999, 307.

LIT. for Eg. < Ug.: Gordon 1955, 291, #1164; Ast. in WUS #1671; Rsl. 1971, 314; 1987, 384; Behrens 1987, 239–240, #2; Voigt 1989, 91–92, #2; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 27, #1.2.9 & 12, 1.2.1.1; Hoch 1994, 138–9, §179; Watson 2000, 570, §23 & fn. 25 with lit.; DUL 574.

AR: perhaps ESud. *mER- ~ *bEr- “spear” [Bnd. 2005, 29, §52].

NB1: W. M. Müller (1893), W. Vycichl (1958; 1990) and others (above) insisted that the source was Sem. *rmḥ and the met. of Eg. mrḥ < *rmḥ had been completed in Eg. Strangely, W. Helck (1989, 134, §4) left the dilemma, whether LEg. mrḥ (GW!) was borrowed from a common Sem. root or *vice versa*, open! C. H. Gordon, G. Roquet, and others (above), in turn, explained Eg. mrḥ to have been borrowed from the metathetic Ug. reflex (or from a dialect close to it), where the stem *murḥ developed from the common Sem. *rumḥ-. P. Behrens (1987) has quoted further convincing cases of an Eg. < Ug. borrowing. It is, however, risky to agree with R. M. Voigt (1989, 91–92, #2) and D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, l.c.) in that the original form was preserved by Ug. mrḥ and all the other Sem. cognates suffered an early met., all the more because its rendering is far from unambiguous (cf. Heltzer 1978, 27; Watson 2002, 924 & fn. 35).

NB2: As pointed out by M. Cohen (1947, #425) and W. Vycichl (1990, 101), the same word (with the same metathesis as in Ug. mrḥ) survives also in NBrb.: Shilh ta-mur-t “lance, canne ferrée, épieu” [Jordan apud Vcl.], Sus ta-mūr-t “lance, épieu” [Chn.], which may be derived from an etymon *ta-murḥ-at [Vcl.]. A borrowing (Brb. < NWSem. via Punic) seems fairly possible (for Punic influence on Brb. cf. Vcl. 1952). Surprisingly, W. G. E. Watson (2000, 570, §23) assumed Ug. mrḥ to have come from Brb. (!), although, as rightly stressed by Vycichl (l.c.), “...*le berbère connaît pas le son ḥ – sauf dans les mots arabes...*”.

NB3: There may be a further (genetic, not borrowed) cognate to the Eg.-Ug. isogloss: Bed. malkā (fem.!) “spear” [Hds. 1996 MS, 93]. Bed. -l- < Cu. *-r- is irreg. But Bed. -k# < AA *-ḥ seems plausible, cf. Bed. mīlak “salt” ~ Sem. *milḥ- “salt”.

NB4: Sem. *rmḥ may be eventually akin to WCh.: Bade rūum-ḥn “Kriegslanze” [Lks. 1968, 223] (from Ar.?) || ECh.: Ngam rām “jeter, lancer (pierre), tiring (fusil)” & Mobu rame “lancer” [Lanssen 1984, 72].

NB5: V. É. Orel (1986, 62) observed the traces of Sem. *rumḥ- “Lanze” borrowed into the ancient Balcanic languages, cf., e.g., Thracian ρομφία “lance”, perhaps also “arrow” (and hence “lightning” in Bulgarian and Albanian), usually compared with OInd. rambhā- (m) “a prop, staff, support” or with Lat. rumpō “to tear, break” ~ OInd. lup- (impf. lumpati) “to break, take away etc.” (rejected by Orel for phonological reasons).

● Other etymologies cannot be accepted.

NB: The Eg. etymology in Goodwin 1867, 86 is absurd. L. Reinisch (1873, 213, fn. 3) combined Eg. mrḥ with Tigre balḥ as well as numerous phonologically absurd African *comparanda*. Later, he (Rn. 1887, 78) equated it with Bilin balāḥ and SA mahāḷō (-d-) “Spieß, kurze Lanze”.

mrḥm (GW) “Salzarbeiter” (XIX.hapax, Helck) = “salt workers” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey, Hoch).

NB: Written in GW: mu-la-ḥ (!) (Helck, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = mu₂-ra-ḥ-mu₄ reflecting *mōliḥimū (?) (Hoch).

- Borrowed from Sem. *milḥ- “salt” with a Can. pl. ending -m.
LIT.: Helck 1971, 513, #99; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 12, §1.2.1.1 & 27, §1.2.10; Hoch 1994, 140, §181.
NB: D. Meeks (AL 77.1793) found the Eg. pl. form without the Can. pl. ending in late NK mrḥ.w “sauniers” (KRI III 139:2). Following W. Helck, J. Hoch (1994, 139–140, §180) identified the borrowed trace of the underlying Sem. noun with Eg. mrḥ (GW, XVIII. hapax) > Cpt. (SB) MḘλ2 “salt”.

mrḥnn (GW, wood det.) “?” (mid XVIII.: Pap. Berlin 10463 rt. 4, DLE II 228 after Caminos, JEA 49, 1963, 33, pl. 6A) = “(subst.)” (AC 1977, 8; AL 77.1794: attested also in Ostr. DeM no. 589, 8–9) = “Kleinholz” (Görg 1980, 160) = “a type of wood: matchwood” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 12, §1.2.1.1 & p. 80 index) = “Splitterholz” (GHWb 350).

NB: Written as ma-rḥ-há-n-na (Helck) = ma-r-há-n-na (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey).

- R. Caminos (1963, 33) saw in it an “*unknown word of Semitic appearance*”. W. Helck explained it from Akk. (YBab.) marḥanû “ein Baum (?)” [AHW 611] = marḥanu “ein Holz” [Görg], which is, however, itself too of dubious origin and reading.

LIT. for Eg.-Akk.: Helck 1971, 513, #99a; Görg, JEA 66, 1980, 160–1, cf. AEB 80.196.

NB: M. Görg accepted the Akk. etymology with reservations, since (1) the Akk. form is a hapax and (2) there is no proof for the double -nn- in Akk. (3) Moreover, the mng. of the Akk. word is dubious. But D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (l.c.) firmly rejected the idea of Helck, since the Chicago Ass. Dictionary identified the Akk. hapax with the Akk. word to be read arḥanû “designation of a certain stage of growth of the date palm” [CAD m1, 279] < arāḥu. Nevertheless, the same Eg. pap. (rt. 4) contains Eg. hrm (a plant), which is supposed to be related to YBab. ḥu/ar-mu “eine Pflanze” [AHW 359a]. In addition, “the Eg. form may still reflect a gemination in place of vowel lengthening often found in cuneiform spellings of 2nd mill. BC, especially related to the suffix -ānu” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 28, §1.2.11).

mrḥ.t “1. astronomisches Gerät zur Beobachtung der Gestirne und Feststellung der Stunden, 2. Ort der Beobachtung mit vorstehenden Gerät (?)” (XVIII., GR, Wb II 112, 13–14; for further lit. v. Vittmann, LÄ 608, n. 6) = “(nicht eine Uhr/Stundenzeiger, sondern) Instrument für die Richtungsbestimmung (das bei der Bestimmung der Richtung der Tempelaxe und bei der Festlegung der Ecken eine Rolle spielt): ein Lot(stab) mit horizontalem Griff (der es ermöglichte, die Lotschnur so zu halten, daß der haltende Arm nirgends die Sichtbarkeit des Fadens beeinträchtigte)” (Borchardt 1899, 10–17, esp. 12–14, 17 with detailed description of the underlying object; 1910, 9) = “Merker, Zeiger” (Spg. 1917, 114) = “heure” (sic) (Gauthier 1922, 107) = “Visierinstrument” (Vcl. 1938, 134) = “a water clock or clepsydra” (Žaba, ArOr suppl. 2, 1953, 62–64) = “un instrument de visée astronomique” (AL

77.1795) = “instrument and place for observation of stars or place of learning” (Smith) = “Wasseruhr” (Drenkhahn, LÄ IV 466) = “Gerät als Hilfe der astronomischen Orientierung” (Arnold, LÄ V 2–3 & n. 19 with lit.) = “Querbalken (wohl eine der sogenannten Weiheellen)” (Graefe, LÄ V 1106) = “Lotinstrument: ὀρολόγιον” (Osing, LÄ VI 100) = “horloge solaire (Sonnenuhr)” (Devauchelle, LÄ VI 1156 & n. 4 with lit.) = “1. astronomical, sighting instrument used to align the temple axis by looking at the stars, 2. (in the Osireion at Abydos) the upright indicator of the st3.t-instrument, used to measure the shadow of the sun” (PL 444).

NB1: For the semantic shift cf. LECu.: Afar maḷágā “Sterndeuter” < ḍag “(er)kennen, wissen” [Rn. 1886, 882].

NB2: P. Wilson (PL 444) is mistaken dating its first ex. to the 18th Dyn., since Eg. mrḥ. is presumably first attested in the 5th Dyn., cf. PK 1976, 32. From the same root may stem, besides, Eg. mrḥ.t “Denkstein” (1x in 1st IMP, ÄWb I 548).

- The Cpt. reflexes (if any) are debatable.

NB1: D. Devauchelle (LÄ VI 1156, n. 5) derived Cpt. (S) ἠρωϋε “1. a vessel of clay, 2. (hapax) water clock (?)” (CD 184a) = “un modèle de clepsydre” (Devauchelle) = “ein Gefäß” (KHW 100) = “nom d’un récipient” (DELIC 121) from old mrḥ.t, which may have been indeed employed also as name of clepsydre. D. Meeke (AL 77.1795) carefully avoided this comparison. W. Vycichl (DELIC 121), in turn, considered it as “*moins probable*”. Moreover, J. Černý (CED 89), W. Westendorf (KHW), and W. Vycichl (DELIC) were disposed to identify the Cpt. word rather with Eg. mrḥ.t (Wb II 112, 11) > Dem. mrḥ (f) “ein Gerät (ob Sieb?)” (DG 169:12) = “a metal tool” (CED 89) > (S) (ε)ἠρωϋε (f) “vessel, prob. of metal” (CD 184a) = “ein Gefäß” (KHW 101) = “nom d’un récipient dans une liste d’objets métalliques” (DELIC 121).

NB2: G. Fecht (cf. KHW 520) explained (S) ἠρωϋε “umhersehen” (KHW 100) = “regarder autour” (Vcl. 1990, 231: < *mrḥ) as a denom. reflex of old mrḥ.t.

NB3: W. Westendorf (KHW 170), in turn, saw in (B) ρωϋ “messen” either a similar denom. verb or a direct reflex of Eg. rh.

- Nomen instr./loci of Eg. rh “kennen, wissen” (OK, Wb II 442–5) as noted by L. Borchardt (1899, 12: “*wörtlich* ‘Instrument, wodurch man erkennt’, etwa ‘Zeiger’”), W. Vycichl (1934, 46; 1938, 134), H. Smith (1979, 161–2), and P. Wilson (PL 444: lit. “instrument of knowing”), which has preserved the basic meaning “erkennen” (Wb).

NB: There is no agreement in the lit. concerning the etymology of the underlying Eg. root: (B) at the present, most probable seems the cognacy with Bed. erh- “sehen, schauen, erblicken” [Rn. 1895, 29] = erh, irh, reh, rih “to see” [Rpr. 1928, 153], Ammar’ar reh- ~ rh- “to see (видеть)” [Dlg.], Bisharin rēh- ~ rh- “to see” [Almkvist] (Bed.: Dlg. 1973, 170) || Agaw *ʔarq- “to know” [Apl. 1989, 6; 1991, 23] || ECu. *ʔarg- “to see” [Sasse 1982, 26] > SLECu. *ark- “to see” [Black 1974, 195] > i.a. Som. araq- [Rn.] = ark- [Black] = arag (imp.) [Heine] || WCu.: (?) Hausa (Sokoto dial.) réégà “to peep into” [Abr. 1962, 729] = “hineinsehen, hineingucken” [Mnh.]. The Eg.-Bed. comparison has long been known, cf. Hommel 1894, 357; Rn. 1895, 29; Zhl. 1932–33, 169; Vcl. 1934, 46, 77; 1938, 134; Dlg. 1973, 170; OS 1992, 176. See Mnh. 1912, 238 (Hausa-Cu.); Chn. 1947, #46 (Eg.-Cu.); Zbr. 1989, 587 (Bed.-ECu.); Takács 2005, 210; 2006, 118, fn. 60 & 125–6 (Bed.-Agaw-Eg.). Because of the lack of *C-, the Agaw-LECu. isogloss can hardly be compared with Eg. ṛq “1. klug, verständig sein, 2. verstehen, kennen” (MK, Wb I 212, 10–15) as often proposed (Rn. 1884, 341; Vrg. 1945, 137, #10.b.6; Chn. 1947, #45; OS 1992, 178;

Orel 1995, 104, #62; HSED #1074). (2) In principle, Eg. rḥ (if < AA *l-ḥ) might be alternatively combined with HECu. *laḥ- [Hds.] > Drs. laḥ- “to hear, know”, Hdy. laʔ- “to know”, Sid. laʔ- “to see, know” (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 87), which seems unlikely due to Cpt. -p-. (3) Its comparison with Sem. *rʔy “to see” (suggested in Erman 1892, 114; Chn. 1947, #415) is out of question (Eg. -ḥ ≠ Sem. *ʔ-). (4) The same pertains to the equation with Sem. *rwḥ “to smell” (Ember 1926, 304, #1) due to both phonological and semantical difficulties. (5) F. Behnk (1927, 82, #23) and O. Rössler (1966, 228) equated Eg. rḥ with Sem. *ydc “to know” although Eg. r- vs. Sem. *d- and Eg. -ḥ vs. Sem. *ʔ, resp., are not regular. W.F. Albright (1927, 203) rightly called this comparison “dangerous”. (6) E. Zyhlarz (1934, 113): Eg. rḥ ~ NBrb.: Zayan ʔi “können”. Improbable (Zayan can hardly derive from *ryi < *r-ḥ-y). (7) Th. Schneider’s (1997, 200, #54) surprising equation with Hbr. lʔc “stammeln, irre reden”, Ar. lʔw “to chat, talk nonsense”, Tigre lʔc “to speak in an animated way” (!) is semantically absurd and certainly false. In addition, this Sem. root has long been correctly identified with Eg. 3ʔc [reg. < *lyʔ] “1. to gibber, 2. speak a foreign language” (late NK, DLE I 2), for Eg.-Sem. see Calice 1931, 36; 1936, #1; Vergote 1945, 130; Hodge 1981, 374, #34.

mrḥ.t (var. **mrḥ**) “ein geflochtenes Hausgerät” (late NK, Wb II 112, 10) etc.: discussed s.v. mtrḥ.t ~ mtrḥ infra.

mrs.w “Art des Weins (neben šdh): Most (?)” (late NK, Wb II 112, 15) = “new wine, must” (AEO II 235; Ward 1961, 40, #27; Janssen 1975, 428–9, §163; DLE I 229; Hoch 1994, 140; WD III 54) = “Most, neuer Wein” (GHWb 350) > Dem. mjsl “Most” (DG 158) > Cpt. (S) ḥḥḥḥ, (B) ḥḥḥḥ “new wine, must” (CD 183a; CED 89; Ishaq 1991, 115, §xi.6) = “moût” (Dévaud 1921, 168–170; 1923, 9–11) = “Most” (Vrg. 1950, 293).

NB1: Vocalized *emrīšw (Dévaud 1921, 170) = *merītu (sic) (Hoch) = *mrīš.~ < *m rīš.w (GT).

NB2: For the epenthetic (B) -r- in (B) ḥḥḥḥ- (*ḥḥḥḥ-) vs. (S) ḥḥḥḥ- (*ḥḥḥḥ-) cf. Dévaud 1921, 170; Hintze 1949, 48.

- Hence: mrs.w “vessel in which mrs was carried” (late NK, XX., Ward) = “name of a container in which mrsw is kept or served, quite a small vessel, prob. a cup rather than a container for must” (Janssen 1975, 428–9) = “nom d’un pot de cuivre” (AC 1978, 14 with lit.) = “pot (dans lequel on conservait le moût)” (AL 78.1798, 79.1281) = “cup” (DLE I 229) = “(in a list of metal vessels)” (Hoch 1994, 141, §184) = “(kleines) Gefäß (offenbar für Weinmost)” (GHWb 350) = “Art Kupfertopf” (WD II 65).

NB: Vocalized *marītu (Hoch). Surprisingly, J. J. Janssen (1975, 428–9, §163), followed by J. Hoch (1994, 141, §184), was disposed to trace back (B) ḥḥḥḥ, ḥḥḥḥ, ḥḥḥḥ (fem.!) “jug, jar” (CD 183a) = “vessel” (Janssen) = “Krug, Gefäß” (KHW 100) = “(water) jug” (Hoch) to NK mrs.w (ignoring the former’s derivation from Gk. μάρτις “measure for liquids of 6 cotylae” suggested, e.g., in KHW 100; CED 89).

- Borrowed from Sem. The proper source has been disputed:

- **1.** W. F. Albright (1918, 250–1, #107), F. von Calice (1936, #415), J. Hoch (1994, 140–1, #183), and C. Peust (1999, 307) assume Eg. mrs.w to have been borrowed from Old Canaanite (Alb.: “*Sem. *mēriš*”), cf. (?) Akk. mērisu ~ mērištu “must” [Alb. after Luckenbill, *AJSL* 23, 293, not in AHW] || Ug. mrt̄ “perhaps a wine product” [Gordon 1955, 292, #1171] = “new wine” [Hoch 1994, 141, fn. 59 after Gibson] = “must” [DUL 579; Watson 1996, 548 with lit.] = “vin nouveau (?)” [DRS] (not so in WUS!), J.Aram. (TTM) mēri/at “Most, ungegorener Wein” [Levy 1924 III, 107] = (Targum) mēyrat ~ mēriṯ “fresh unfermented grape juice” [Rabin 1963, 137–8] = (Talmud) mērat ~ mārēt “must, juice” [Hoch], Syr. meritō [Brk.] = m^critā “new wine” [Dahood] = meritā “must” [Hoch]. The Cpt.-Sem. parallel had been identified much earlier than the Sem.-Eg. one (cf. Dévaud 1921, 168, fn. 6). Seems to be the most convincing solution both semantically and phonologically.

NB1: Ug. mrt̄ has been alternatively rendered “legacy, i.e., inherited farm or estate” < *wrt̄ “to inherit” (Dijkstra, UF 19, 1987, 47–48; cf. Watson 1999, 789, §27, fn. 29).

NB2: The origin of the NWSem. word is disputed. **(1)** Formerly, it was usually derived from the hypothetic Sem. *wrt̄ “to press out, deprive” [Alb.] = “auspressen” [Clc.] based on Ebl. /warītu(m)/ [Conti] || Hbr. yrš II qal “keltern, auspressen” [Loretz 1977, 353–4, with further lit., after Haupt, *AJSL* 26, 1909–10, 215, 223; Köhler, *ZAW* 46, 1928, 218–220] = “to tread (down), press (wine)” [KB 442, 1727] = “presser (?) (ou aussi: fouler aux pieds)” [DRS 638–9] | Ar. wart- “what is fresh, juicy, or moist (of things)” [Lane 2934] = “ce qui est frais, juteux, humide” [DRS] as well as the supposed etymological connection to the alleged *t- prefix derivatives of the same root, cf. Ug. tr̄t̄ “wine” [Gordon 1955, 334, #1979; Dahood 1965, 65, #1558; Rabin 1963, 137] (not listed in WUS 329!), Phn. trš “must” [Hoch], Hbr. t̄rōš (mainly as poetic parallel to yayin) “Most, ungegorener Wein” [GB 877] = “sweet wine, must” [KB 1728] = “wine” (sic) [Rabin 1963, 137 & fn. 3 with further lit.] = “moût de raisin non fermenté” [DRS] = “must, new wine” [Watson] (supported by GB 877; Gordon 1955, 292, #1171; 1978, 52; Dahood 1965, 65, §1558; DL in UF 10, 1978, 426; Hoch 1994, 140–1, §183; Watson 1999, 789, §27; DRS 638–9; DUL 579). M. Görg (l.c.) even tried to link Sem. *wrt̄ II “to press” to *wrt̄ “to inherit” assuming a semantic shift “to take into one’s possession by force” > “to drive out” > “to press out”, which is very weak. The existence of Hbr. *yrš (and Ug.*yrt̄) has been queried by several authors (Loretz 1977, 353–4; KB 1727). **(2)** Recently, however, the mutual connection (and even the Sem. origin) of the forms with initial *m- vs. *t- has been queried (cf. KB 1727). Thus, Ug. mrt̄ has been alternatively affiliated (as a tricons. root with m- as part of it) with Ar. mrt̄ (var. to mrd̄, mrs) discussed below (see Köhler, *ZAW* 46, 1928, 219f.; Rabin 1963, 137–8; Loretz 1977, 353–4; DRS 639; KB 442). W. A. Ward (1961, 40, #27) compared Ug. mrt̄ with Akk. mrs. Note that Akk. s does not regularly correspond to Ug. t̄ < PSem. *t̄ (yielding Akk. š). Therefore, Ug. mrt̄ and Akk. mrs cannot be directly etymologically related. On the other hand, some authors have identified the NWSem. *t- prefix forms with Hrgl. Luwian tuwarsa- “grape wine” and Gk. θύρσοϛ “wreathed staff of Bacchantes” as Old Mediterranean *Kulturwörter* (Rabin in Or. NS 32, 1963, 137, §20; Brown 1969, 168–170; Görg 1979, 7–10; Watson 1999, 789, §27; 2000 MS, 4, §38; KB 1727; DUL 579), but there is no agreement on the way of borrowing. Thus, e.g., Ch. Rabin (followed by J. P. Brown, M. Görg, and

KB) suggested Ug. < Hitt. (vigorously declining the inner Sem. derivation of the former), while W. G. E. Watson (1999, 792, fn. 46) vacillated between Ug. > Hitt. (labelled by him as “*not impossible*” with regard to Ug. *mrt* < **wrt*) and a reverse direction of borrowing with hesitation.

NB3: C. H. Gordon (1978, 52) explained both Syr. *mērit* and Hbr. *taršiš* “sea” (which literally designates a colour; cf. the Gk. epithet of sea οἶνον ~ οἶνώψ “wine-dark”) from NWSem. **yrt*, which he erroneously ultimately affiliated with Cpt. (S) *ἄρωπεω* “rot sein, werden” (KHW 245), the underlying Eg. root being *dšr*. Note that W. F. Albright (BASOR 83, 1941, 21) saw in Hbr. *taršiš* a taqṭl of *√ršš* (lit. “smelting plant, furnace”).

- 2. O. Rössler (1971, 314) and W. Vycichl (1983, 120), in turn, identified Eg. *mrs.w* with Eg. Ar. *marīs-a(t)* “espèce de bière” [Dozy II 581] = “Dattelwein” [Rsl.] = “Sudanese beer, zythum” [Elias quoted by Vcl.] = “date-wine, barley-wine, zythum” [Ishaq 1991, 115, §xi.6] = “barley wine, a type of beer” [Hoch], cf. also Palest. Ar. *merīse* “cake made from sour milk thickened by heat and dissolved in water” [Rabin 1963, 137–8 after Denizeau], Dathina *marīs-at* “bière” [GD 2687]. These are treated by them seemingly as cognates. From Sudan Ar. *marīs-a(t)* [Rn.] = “kind of beer” [Ishaq] were probably borrowed Bed. *merīsa* (f) “Bier” [Rn.] = *merissa* “fermented drink made from durra” [Hds. 1996 MS, 95] as well as Nub. *mersā* ~ *-ē* [Rn.] (sic). E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 245) equated Eg. *mrs.w* directly with Nile Nub. *merīsa* “Dattelwein, Durrabier” [Zhl.] = “bière faite de doura ou de doura et de dattes” [Massenbach quoted by Vcl.] = *merīsa* “must, beer” [Peust 1999, 307]. The Eg.-Ar. etymology has been firmly rejected by J. Hoch (1994, 141).

NB1: The Ar. word derives eventually from Sem. **mrs*, cf. Akk. *marāsu* “durchrühren” [AHW 609] = *marāsu* “1. (SBab.) to stir into a liquid, 2. (NAss. < Aram.) squash”, (LL) *maršu* “mixed (said of malt steeped for beer)”, (OBab.) *mirsu* (*mersu*, *mirisu*) “a confection made of dates, oil, butter, etc. [CAD m1, 108, 269, 290] = *marāsu* “zu Mus verkochen”, *maršu* “Mus, Süßes” [Ward] = *marāsu* “to stir with a liquid” [Lsl.] || PBHbr. *mrs piel* “to stir with a liquid” [Rabin, Lsl.], JAram. & Syr. *māras* “to steep, make soft by steeping” [Lsl.], Mnd. *mrs* “to squash, bruise” [Lsl.] | Ar. *marasa* “1. macérer dans du lait et pétrir avec la main les dattes”, var. *marāša* “1. macérer et pétrir des dattes dans de l’eau ou dans du lait”, *marīs-* “dattes macérés dans le lait” [BK II 1090–1] = *marasa* “aufweichen, abwischen” & *marāša* “id., reiben” [Philippi] = *marasa* “to steep (food) in water” [Lsl.] || Mehri *mirōs* “to dissolve” [Lsl.] || Geez *marasa* “to moisten, steep, putrefy, spoil” [Lsl.], Tigre *mārsa* “to boil” [Lsl.], Amh. *marrāsa* “to become soft (soil, by having manure dumped on it)” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 360).

NB2: A var. root is represented by Sem. **mrt* > Ug. *mrt* “benetzen, wässern” [WUS] = “to moisten” [Lsl.], Syr. *mērit* “wässern” [WUS] | Ar. *marāta* “aufweichen, sanft, milde sein, firmus et constans fuit in litigando”, II “allmählich zerreiben” [Philippi] = *marāta* “to macerate (a thing in water), soak (bread in water), steep (dates) in water and mash them”, *marīta* “to be mild and forbearing or clement”, II “to crumble with one’s fingers” [Möller] = “erweichen, in Wasser auflösen, einweichen” [WUS] = “to steep fruit in water” [Rabin] = “zerreiben” [Loretz] = “macérer, mouiller, humecter” [DRS] = II “to crush” [KB] = “to steep (food) in water” [Lsl.] (Sem.: WUS #1684; Lsl. 1987, 360).

NB3: As mentioned above, several authors maintain the eventual etymological connection of Sem. *mrs & *mrt̄ to Ug. mrt̄. That is, Eg. Ar. marīs-a(t) vs. Ug. mrt̄ etc., might ultimately be related.

NB4: R. Dozy (l.c.) sought the source of Ar. marīs-at- in Eg. (!) with a false etymology: “*elle semble tirer son nom de la province dont il sera question dans l'article suivant, cf. marīs-iy- (les Coptes appellent la Haute Égypte ΜΑΡΗΣ, ce qui est au midi)*”. Naturally, (SBF) ΜΑΡΗΣ “Südbezirk” (KHW 166) < Eg. m3^c-rsj ≠ (S) ΜΡΙC < Eg. mrs.w.

NB5: M. W. F. Philippi (1875, 88) derived Ar. mrs, mrš, mrt̄ from bicons. Sem. *mar- (sic) “streich/fen, straff/mm sein”. H. Möller (1911, 165) explained Ar. mrt̄ from *mr- based on false Sem. *comparanda* as well as IE *m-r- (sic) “zerreiben, weich werden”.

mrš “lichtrot (von der Farbe einer Art ‘Myrrhen’)” (GR, Wb II 113, 1) = “hellrot” (Ebbell 1938, 98) = “(être) rouge, roux” (AL 77.1797 after BIFAO 75, 1975, 381) = “rötlich” (NBÄ 641, n. 668 with further lit.; Snk. 1983, 224) = “light red” (PL 445).

NB: Preserved also in Gk. PN Μερσις ~ Πμερσις (cf. Vrg. in BIFAO 61, 1962, 75). Vocalized as *mūršu (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 46) = *mērš̄(t) (sic) (Snk. 1963, 145) = *mūrš̄ or *mērš̄ > *mērš̄(w) (NBÄ 149, 641, n. 668; Snk. 1983, 224).

● Hence: Dem. mlš “lichtrot” (DG 170:9; NBÄ 887) (?) > (S) ἄρω, ἄραω, ἄρωρ⁺, (A) ἄρωρ⁺ “to be red or yellow” (CD 183b; CED 89) = “rot, gelb, blond sein” (KHW 100) = “devenir rouge, jaune” (DELC). As adj.: (SBF) ἄρωρ, (SF) ἄρωρ, (SA) ἄρω “rot, rötlich” (KHW) = “red, ruddy person” (Vrg. 1971, 49) = “homme roux” (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 46): substantivized adj.

■ **1.** Usually explained from Eg. mnš.t “red ochre” (Med., Iversen, q.v.). Doubted by J. R. Harris (1961, 147). H. Brugsch (1882, 68) supposed behind the alternation -n- ~ -r- an original *-l-. C. Peust (1999, 166), in turn, assumed a shift of n > r in the neighborhood of m, which seems more probable.

LIT.: Rn. 1873, 90; Brugsch 1882, 68; Iversen 1955, 28f.; Snk. 1963, 145; KHW 100; DELC 121; PL 445.

■ **2.** H. Brugsch (Wb II 665) combined it also with Cpt. (SA) πηρῶ (m) “Mennige, Rötel” (KHW) < Dem. prš (DG 136) = “minium, red lead (≈ μίλτος)” (Griffith) = “red ochre” (Iversen l.c.) < Eg. prš “minium, red oxide of lead (Mennige, ein Bleioxyd)” (Med., Dawson 1934, 188, §20, cf. also JEA 21, 1935, 39; FD 92) = “red earth or red lead” (Griffith-Thompson quoted in WÄDN 203) = “red ochre” (CED 128; AL 77.1455) = “*Rötel (Eisenoxyd), *Mennige, Bleioxyd (Pb₃O₄)” (GHWb 287), cf. also Harris 145. Declined by J. Černý and J. R. Harris (1961, 147) as “impossible”, since the shift m- > p- is unparalleled. Iversen (l.c.) too considered this equation “as uncertain and obscure”, although Eg. pnš (occasional var. of prš) occurs in a list of pigments at the expected place of mnš. Therefore, Iversen was disposed to state that “...in spite of the linguistic difficulties which cannot be

solved at the present there is quite a lot of circumstantial evidence which would make an etymological connection between these words probable".

NB: J. R. Harris (1961, 147) identified the rare pnš (in Ostr. Strassburg H.41) as an error for mnš.t.

- **3.** J. Osing (NBÄ 149) and W. Schenkel (1983, 224) explained it via met. from an unattested Eg. *mšr (sic). Baseless.
- **4.** W. Vycichl (DELIC 121) pondered a comparison with Ar. wars- "plante tinctoriale appelée Memecylon tinctorium, pour teindre en jaune, bonne pour faire disparaître les taches de rousseur", warš- "teint en jaune" [BK II 1519].
- **5.** GT: a relationship to ES: Geez malasa "to gleam, shine, glitter, flash, sparkle, be polished etc." [Lsl. 1987, 345] should not be ruled out either.
NB: However, the underlying Sem. root (attested in Ar., ES) signified "to be smooth".
- **7.** L. Reinisch (1873, 90) set up a root *mš (!) compared with Teda mado, wada "rot". Absurd.

mrqh.t (GW) "?" (late NK, Wb II 113, 2) = "flight (?)" (MDAIK 16, 110, n. 12) = "Beute" (Helck 1962, 560, #100) = "to melt away (?)" (DLE I 229) = "to yield" (AEL II 65) = "booty" (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 80) = "to flee, flight, retreat" (Hoch 1994, 142–3, §185) = "*wagschmelzen (in der Flucht)" (GHWb 350).

- Apparently a Sem. loan-word, but its source is uncertain.
- **1.** Traditionally affiliated with Hbr. malqōʿh "Beute" < Sem. *lkḥ, which, in J. Hoch's (l.c.) view, "should be dismissed", since the dets. of Eg. mrqh.t show a motion and its context requires a mng. like "to flee".
LIT.: the Eg.-Hbr. etymology was suggested L. Burchardt (1909–10, #480) followed by W. F. Albright (cf. Hoch l.c.), W. Helck (1962, 560, #100; 1971, 513, #100), and D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 12, #1.2.1.1 & p. 17, #1.2.2.2).
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 142–3, §185) preferred an equation with an m-prefix reflex of Sem. *rḥk "to be far" (with met.), cf. esp. Syr. rəḥiq "to depart", Geez rəḥqa "to be far off, depart, withdraw, recoil".
NB: As a "less likely" alternative, Hoch (l.c.) compared Ar. mulāḥaqa "to pursue, chase" < laḥiqa "to catch up, overtake".

mrqdn (GW) "?" (middle of XX., Ostr. DeM 434, 2:7, Janssen 1975, 325, §95) = "un outil" (AC 1978, 14; AL 78.1799; 79.1283) = "a metal tool" (DLE I 229; Hoch 1994, 143).

NB1: Written as ma-r-qi₂-di₄-na vocalized as *mar/lqizina (?) (Hoch).

NB2: J. J. Janssen (l.c., fn. 72) excluded a miswriting for qrdn, and compared also mdrn in the Libyan war inscription of Merneptah (l. 61, i.e., KRI IV 9:9).

- As rightly stated by J. J. Janssen (l.c.), it is apparently a Sem. borrowing (extended with m- prefix of nomina instr.), but the underlying root is

uncertain. J. Hoch (1994, 143, §186) suggested two possible sources, namely (1) Sem. *gʒr “to cut” (hence: Hbr. *magzērā “axe”, JAram. migzērā “cutting tool, pruning knife” ~ (met.) margəzayyā pl. “meat choppers, mincing knives”) vs. (2) Sem. *zlg > Hbr. mazlēg “(three-pronged) meat-fork”, MHbr. mazlēg ~ (met.) malgēz “fork (used in cooking)”, cf. Akk. mazlagu “fork (in list before spoon)”.

mrk “Geschenk” (XX–XXI., Wb II 113, 3) = “cadeau, présent” (RT 21, 1899, 86) = “Königsgeschenk” (W. M. Müller) = “Königsgabe” (Erman, Ranke, Hintze) = “tribute” (Breasted) = “royal gift” (Wilson) = “coronation gifts” (Gdk.) = “cadeau, offrande” (AL 78.1801 after Couroyer, RB 85, 1978, 584, n. 54) = “gift” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 80) = “gifts” (Hoch).

NB1: Attested acc. to Wb in Wenamun 2:11–12 and Pap. Chester Beatty I vs. B31. The ex. in Pap. Wilbour A35:23 suggested by A. H. Gardiner (1948–52 III 37 & IV 75) and W. Helck (1962, 560) is in fact a TN and was henceforth declined M. Görg (1974, 13) and H. Goedicke (1975, 137, n. 101). B. Couroyer (1963, 173) excluded even the Pap. Chester Beatty ex., representing in his view “*sans doute*” just a variation of brk. J. Hoch (1994, 104) added two further exx. expanding the time limits of the attestation: KRI II 246:13 (XIX.) and Pap. Berlin 23252 vs. 2:8 (XXII.).

NB2: Written in GW as ma-l-kú (Helck, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey).

- From the same root: mrk “offrir, présenter” (AL 78.1800 after Couroyer l.c. and Alliot 1954 II, 796, n. 4) = “opfern” (GR Edfu, Kurth 1994, 13, §53).
- Apparently a loan, but the source of borrowing is highly debated (cf. also Galán 1997, 43, fn. 48).
- 1. A. H. Gardiner (1931, 42, n. 1), J. H. Breasted (ARE 1927 IV 282, §577, n. a), B. Couroyer (1963, 170, 173, 176–7, also in RB 66, 1959, 591–4), G. Vittmann (1975), and J. Hoch (1994, 104–6, §129 & p. 145, §188) considered it merely as a var. of NK brk (GW) “Geschenk, Gabe” (Wb I 466, 10; cf. Galán 1997, 41–43) < Hbr. bərākā with the “strange” (Grd.) interchange of m- ~ b-. Rejected by M. Görg (1974, 14), since Sem. *brk was reflected as Eg. brk.
- 2. Many other authors, in turn, explained it eventually from Can. *malk- “king”, cf. Hbr. melek “1. König, 2. Königsgabe” (sic) [Helck]. LIT.: W. M. Müller (OLZ 3, 1900, 208; MVAG 5, 1900, 20, n. 2), A. Erman (1923, 231, n. 2, also ZÄS 38, 1900, 8), M. Burchardt (1910 II, 26, #481 with reservation: “unklares Wort”), H. Ranke (in Gressmann 1926, 73, n. g), F. Hintze (1950–52, 242), W.F. Albright (JAOS 71, 1951, 261), J. Wilson (in ANET¹ 1950, 27, n. 20), W. Helck (1971, 514, #101), H. Goedicke (1975, 79, 137 & fn. 99–100 with lit.). NB: Albright assumed a false Can. (sic) etymon *mulku (sic) “royalty, dominion”.
- 3. M. Görg (1974, 18), rejecting the derivation from both NWSem. *brk and *mlk, explained it from Akk. mulūgu “eine Art von Mitgift” [AHW 671], Ug. mlg “dowry” [Gordon 1965, 433, #1480, not listed in WUS]. Rejected by G. Vittmann (1975).

- 4. G. Vittmann (1975, 45) pondered whether its source was a Can. form close to Punic *mlk* “Darbringung, Opfer” [Donner & Röllig] representing the “*Verbalnomen zum Jiphil von hlk*”. But ultimately he also agreed with the old view that Eg. *mrk* was purely a var. to *brk*.

mrkb.t (GW) “Streitwagen” (late NK, Wb II 113, 4) = “chariot” (Janssen 1975, 329, §100; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) > Cpt. (S) $\text{BR}\rho\text{OOY}\text{T}$, $\text{BEP}\epsilon\text{E}\delta\text{WOY}\text{T}$, (B) $\text{BEP}\epsilon\text{E}\delta\text{WOY}\text{T}\text{C}$ (f) “Wagen” (KHW 27) = “char voiture” (DELC 31).

NB1: Its earliest ex. dates back to Dyn. XVIII (Karnak stela of Amenhotep II, Urk. IV 1311:12), cf. Helck 1971, 514, #102; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 35, §2.1.3.2.2.

NB2: Consistently written in the GW with the syllabic group -bu-. Vocalized as *markābata, pl. *markabāta (Hoch).

NB3: The shift of m- > Cpt. *b- may be due to the proximity of r ~ l in the root (Peust 1999, 167).

- Borrowed from the Can. reflex of Sem. *ma-rkab-(a)t- (nomen instr.) < Sem. *rkb “to ride” [SED I 317], cf. Hbr. merkābā “Wagen, bes.: 1. Kriegswagen, 2. Sonnwagen (im Kultus), 3. Cherubwagen” [GB], JArām. markabtā [GB].

LIT.: GB 462; Burchardt 1910 II, #482; Caminos 1954 LEM, 468; Helck 1971, 514, #102; DELC 31; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 9, §1.1.4.1 & pp. 45–46, §2.2.2.4; Hoch 1994, 145–7, §189.

NB: The proper Can. source of Eg. *mrkb.t* has been conceived diversely: *markabtu (sic) [Vcl.] vs. *markabōta (pl.) reflected by the Eg. syllabic group -bu- [Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey].

mrt “Kinn” (LP hapax: Pap. Boulaq III 8:14, Wb II 113, 6; Grapow 1954, 44) = “barbe” (Sauneron 1952, 12, l. 13 & p. 51) = “barbe, menton” (AL 77.1800) = “Kinn(bart)” (Behrens 1984–85, 160, §2.3) > Dem. *mrt* “Bart” (DG 169) > Cpt. (SB) $\text{MOP}\bar{\text{T}}$, (F) $\text{M}\Delta\lambda\bar{\text{T}}$ “Bart” (Till 1955, 328, §25; KHW 100).

- Generally accepted that Eg. *mrt* was borrowed from Common Brb. *tā-mar-t “menton, barte” [Chn.] = *ta-mar-t “Bart” [Zhl.] = “подбородок, борода” [Djk.] and then deprived of the Brb. fem. definite article prefix *ta- (which the Eg. *Volksetymologie* falsely identified with the Eg. fem. definite article t3) but not of the Brb. postfix *-t. As rightly stated by P. Behrens (1984–85, 163), “*das kopt. -T zeigt eindeutig ein Lehnwort (bei geerbtem Wort wäre es altäg. *mrt > späḡ. *mr gewesen)*”.

LIT. for Eg. < Brb.: Stern 1883, 26, fn. 2; Bates 1914, 84, fn. 1; Möller 1924, 54; Zhl. 1932–33, 84; Chn. 1947, #480; Hintze 1951, 86; Till 1955, 328, §25; Wölfel 1955, 42–43; Vcl. 1972, 181; CED 89; KHW 100; Vcl. 1983, 120; 1990, 79; Behrens 1984–85, 160, §2.3; Peust 1999, 131.

NB1: Cp. NBrb.: Shilh ta-mar-t “Bart” [Vcl.] | Mzg. ta-mar-t, pl. ti-mira “barbe” [Tf. 1991, 428], Zayan & Sgugu ta-mmar-t “barbe” [Lbg. 1924, 566], Izdeg ta-mmar-t, pl. ti-mmira ~ ti-mmar-iwin “barbe” vs. ta-mar-t, pl. ti-mira “menton”

[Mrc. 1937, 32, 165] | Sgrs. t(a)-mar-t, pl. ti-mira “barbe” [Pellat 1955, 105], Rif te-mar-t [Bst.], Iqrayen & Bettiwa & Uriaghel t̄-mar-t, pl. ti-mira “barbe” [Biarnay], Shawya t-mer-t [Bst.], Uled Sellem ta-mar-t “barbe” [Joly 1912, 80], Sened t-mar-t, pl. ti-mira [Lst.], Izn. t-mār-t [Rns.], Tuat & Gurara te-maḥ-t [*-r-t] “barbe” [Bst. 1887, 402], Menacer t-mer-t [Bst.], Shenwa t-mèr-t “barbe” [Msq.] = ha-mar-t, pl. hi-mira “barbe, menton” [Lst. 1912, 146] = t-mar-t “Bart” [Vcl.], Harawa te-mar-t “menton” [Bst.], Wrs. t-mar-t “barbe” vs. t-mar-t “menton” [Bst.], Halima ta-mar-t [Bst.], Mzab te-mār-t [Msq., Bst.] = t-mar-t, pl. ti-mira “1. barbe, 2. (pl.) fins rouleaux de laine cardée” [Dlh. 1984, 121], Wargla t-mar-t “beard” [Bates] = t-mar-t, pl. ti-mira “1. barbe, 2. p.ext. menton” [Dlh. 1987, 194], Wed Righ te-mer-t [Bst.] = t-mar-t [Bates] | Nefusa tu-mər-t [Laoust] = tu-mer-t [Mtl.] = tu-mər-t ~ t-mər-t, pl. t-mār “barba” [Bgn. 1942, 316] = tu-mar-t [Vcl.] | Qbl. ta-mar-t, pl. ti-mira “barbe, menton” [Dlt. 1982, 512], Khalfun ta-mar-t, pl. ti-mira [Bst.], Zwawa & Bugi ta-mar-t [Bst.] (NBrb.: Bst. 1895, 78, 97; 1991, 7; Bates 1914, 84, fn. 1; Biarnay 1917, 87; Rns. 1932, 386; Vcl. 1955, 322) || EBrb.: Ghadames tu-mar-t, pl. te-mīra “barbe” [Bst., Mtl., Lst.] = tū-mer-t, pl. tu-mar-īn “barbe” [Lnf. 1973, 215, #1021], Sokna t-mar-t, pl. t-mīra “barba” [Srn. 1924–25, 13, 39 & Lst.], Siwa te-meur-t [Bst.] = ta-mar-t [Bricchetti-Robecchi apud Bst., Mtl.] = te-meur-te [Cailliaud apud Bst.] = it-mer-t “Bart” [Hornemann apud Stumme 1914, 92] = ti-mar-t [Stumme 1914, 97; Laoust] = t-mèr-t “beard” [Quibell 1918, 98] = t̄-mār-t [Lst.], Audjila ta-mar-t “barbe” [Bst.] = ta-mīr-t, pl. ti-mīra “barba” [Prd. 1960, 160] || WBrb.: Zenaga ta-mmeur-t “barbe” [Msq., Bst.] = ta-mer-t “barbe” [Bst. 1909, 241] = taʔ-mər-t, pl. tuʔ-mər-ən ~ tuʔ-mmər-ən “barbe, menton” [Ncl. 1953, 212] || SBrb. *ta-mar-t “menton, barbe” [Ncl.]: Hgr. tā-mar-t, pl. ti-marr-īn “1. menton, 2. barbe du menton, 3. p.ext. barbe (tout entière, du menton et des joues)” [Fcd. 1950–1, 1224], Ghat ta-mar-t, pl. či-mīr “barbe, menton” [Nhl. 1909, 132, 178], EWlm. tā-mar-t “1. menton, 2. barbe” [Ncl. 1957, 574], EWlm. & Ayr tā-mar-t “1. menton, 2. barbe” [PAM 1998, 221; 2003, 550], Tamasheq tā-mar-t [Stern], Tadghaq & Tudalt tā-mar-t, pl. ti-marr-en “beard, chin” [Sudlow 2001, 277], Tagdalt & Tabarog ta-mar [Ncl.], Tadaksahak ta-mar-t ~ tā-mar-t [Ncl.], WTuareg ta-mar-t (Tuareg: Nicolai 1990, 153–154; Brb.: Msq. 1879, 491; Bst. 1883, 290; 1887, 152; 1890, 34; Mtl. 1904, 104; Laoust 1931, 200; Behrens 1984–85, 160, §2.3). All forms denote “beard” unless otherwise indicated. Brb. *ta-mar-t is a fem. diminutive form of Brb. *a-mar “Vollbart, Zottelbart” [Zhl. 1932–33, 84], cf. NBrb.: Shilh a-mar “menton” [Jordan 1934, 30], Sus a-mar “barbe et menton” [Wlf. 1955, 42–43] || SBrb.: Hgr. ā-mar, pl. i-marr-en “grosse barbe” [Fcd. 1950–1, 1224], EWlm. & Ayr ā-mar, pl. i-mārr-ān “1. gros menton, 2. menton” [PAM 1998, 221; 2003, 549]. The root *mar occurs also in NBrb.: Shilh ta-qšmar-t “mâchoire” [Vcl.], which is a compound of *q-s + *mar-t “der Knochen des Kinns”.

nb2: M. Taifi (1991, 428) affiliated the common Brb. word for “beard” with Mzg. a-mur “part”, which cannot be accepted.

nb3: M. Cohen (1947, #480) erroneously meant the Eg.-Brb. parallel as genetic (inherited) cognates.

nb4: Brb. *ta-mar-t is related with NOm.: Gimirra merç “mento” [Montandon apud CR 1925, 621] || SOm.: Ari murča “chin” [Bnd. 1994, 147] || WCh. *mar-(ut)- “beard” [Stl.] = *m-r “beard” [JS 1981, 35E; JI 1994 I 6] = *m[a]r- [GT]: (?) Hausa maroro “1. double chin or a swelling under the chin; 2. crop of bird” [Pls.] | NBauchi *m-r/1 “beard” [Skn.] = *marA [Stl. 1987, 259]; Warji maara [Skn.] = mārā [Skn./JI], Siri murū [Skn.] = mūrī [Skn./JI], Dirī muldu [Stl.: < *murdu?] [Skn.], Kariya mar [Skn./JI] | Bade-Ngizim *mari [GT]: Gashua-Bade m̄lī [Schuh], WBade m̄r-ān [Lukas 1968, 222; Schuh 1975, 112], Ngizim mārī [Schuh 1981, 111] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 259; JI 1994 II, 12) || CCh.: (?) Uldeme māmáy [if -y < *-r] “barbe” [Clm. 1997, 191] | Mbara mādmāráy (f) “barbe” [TSL 1986, 270]. Lit.: Pls. 1960, 123, #123 (Eg.-Brb.-Hausa); DjK. 1965, 50 (Eg.-Brb.); Skn.

1977, 12 (WCh.-Gsg.-Tuareg); JS 1981, 35E (PWCh.-PBrb.); OS 1990, 89 (Eg.-WCh.); OS 1992, 185; HSED #1805 (Eg.-WCh.); Orel 1995, 146, #2 (Eg.-Diri); Voigt 1998, 607, fn. 1 (WCh.-Brb.-Cpt.).

NB5: J. D. Wölfel (1955, 42–43) compared the Eg.-Brb. isogloss with Bsq. mutur “menton” vs. bizar “Bart”, reflexes of NCauc. *mēçuri “beard, long hair” [NCED 800] as well as those of IE *b^hard^h- “beard” [Kluge 1999, 83], but neither of his parallels is convincing.

NB6: L. Homburger (1930, 284) combined Eg. mrt with Ful wahre, pl. bahe “menton”. Untenable.

***mrd** “without defects, happy, successful, fortunate” (late NK, DLE I 229).

NB: Represents a ghost-word erroneously handled in DLE as a new gloss. It is, in fact, a distorted form of m^r “fehlerlos” (q.v., cf. also Wb II 48), -d being due to a false association to Eg. rd because of the same det. in both words.

● Such a root did not exist. Any etymology built on it is vain.

NB1: Misled by DLE, Ch. Ehret (1995, 308, #592) mistakenly combined it with Ar. maraḥa “to be merry and boisterous”, maraḥa “to jest, sport”, Cu. *març- “to be without care, be merry” etc.

NB2: For the same reasons, it can have nothing in common with Ar. malida “être gai”, malad- “2. éclat et vivacité de la jeunesse” [BK II 1146].

mh.t “unidentified insect” (CT VI 302f, AECT II 244, spell 674, n. 1) = “un insecte” (AL 78.1803) = “ein Insekt” (GHWb 350) = “ein Käfer als göttliches Wesen” (Snk., p.c. by Hafemann, 19 May 2000) = “insect” (DCT 174).

NB: R. O. Faulkner (AECT l.c.) suggested an alternative rdg. m + ht. D. Meeks (AL l.c.) was disposed to identify the same word in mh.wt of CT VI 337b, which R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 266, spell 705, n. 3) rendered as an m- formative of hwt “to burn” (cf. CT II 73a, 244d, 247a), lit. “Burnt One (?)”.

● Meaning and origin obscure. GT: perhaps an irregular cognate of LECu.: Orm. mimmi[?]-ō [-mm- via assim. < *ḥm-[?] -[?]- reg. < *-^r/[?]-] “insect in grass which causes itching in foot” [Gragg 1982, 287] || SCu.: Irq. mēḥm-ō, pl. mēḥ-a “tick” [Mgw. 1989, 115] = mēḥam-o, pl. mēḥ-a (f) “tick” [Mous 1999, 271]?

NB: Cf. perhaps also SBrb.: EWlm. tə-mk̄ā-t, pl. tə-mk̄ā-t-en (m!) “esp. d’insecte, charançon (rouge, vit dans le mil stocké)” [PAM 1998, 215] ? The C₂ correspondences are everywhere irregular (Eg. -h- ≠ Orm. -[?]- ≠ Irq. -ḥ- ≠ Brb. *-ḵ-).

mh.wt (or **mhwt**?) “Familie, die Angehörigen, bes. auch Stamm (der Beduinen, der Feinde), auch Sippe (der Bösen, des Apophis)” (MK, Wb II 114, 7–8) = “family” (FD 113) = “la famille au sens large (les ‘consanguins’ en général)” (Meeks 1974, 65, fn. 3 with lit.) = “family, tribe, people, warriors, relatives” (DLE I 230) = “Sippe, als Bez. von Gruppen ausländischer Völker” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 14, 168, n. ai; also Quack 1994, 107, fn. 76 with further lit.) = “Sippe, Clan (aus mehreren Familien bestehend), Sippschaft” (ÄWb I 548a).

NB1: Written in the NK also as mh3.w (cf. Wb), which might be due to an influence of h3w “Verwandte, Angehörige” (MK, Wb II 479, 1).

NB2: D. Meeks (1974, 65, fn. 3) is mistaken claiming mh.w.t to be “*ne pas connu qu’à partir de la fin du Moyen Empire*” (cf. JEA 35, 1949, 39, n. 5), since the first ex. dates back to the 1st IMP (cf. AWb l.c.).

NB3: Vocalized as *mhōww.ēt (pl.) < *mhōw.ēt (Černý, cf. Lacau in RT 31, 1909, 76) = *m^hhā3^w.t (sg., not pl.!) > *m^hhā3w.t > *m^hhāww (Fecht) = *mihā3w.at (Vrg.) = *m^hhā3w.t or *m^hhē3w.t (NBÄ 322).

- Hence: Dem. mh.w.t (f) “Familie” (DG 171:2) > OCpt. $\mu\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$ “relative” (Černý 1955, 30–31, §1, in a horoscope published by F. L. Griffith, ZÄS 38, 1900, 71f.; JEA 43, 1957, 94) = “clan, famille” (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 156; CED 100; DELC 131) = “Familie, Verwandtschaft, Sippe” (NBÄ 322; KHW 112) vs. $\mu\eta\epsilon(\omicron)\gamma$ (pl. tante, m?) “Familie, Geschlecht, Volksstamm” ≈ Gk. $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$, (B) $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\omega\tau$ (Gabra 1994, 194, §3).

NB: W. E. Crum (CD 212b) identified it with (S) $\mu\eta\lambda\alpha\gamma$ “tomb”, which J. Černý (l.c.) found unfitting for the context.

- Origin problematic.

- 1. The *communis opinio* in Egyptian philology (Grapow 1914, 26; Wb l.c.; Fecht 1960, 229, Nachtrag to §373; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 156; NBÄ 322, 868, n. 1387; KHW 112) derives MK mh.w.t from MK h3.w “Verwandte, Angehörige” (MK, Wb) which seems originate in the same root as h3.w “Angelegenheit, Besitz” (MK, Wb II 478, 14–18), namely OK h3.w (NBÄ: *ha3úwaw) “Nachbarschaft, Nähe” (Wb II 477). Hardly possible because of the consistent wtg. of MK mh.wt vs. h3.w without vs. with -3-, resp. This false etymology was carefully (and rightly) abandoned by W. Vycichl (DELC 131) who also assumed a m- prefix in mh.w.t as “probable” but avoided to reconstruct more than *mhwX.t/*mhXw.t.

NB: The etymology of Eg. h3.w has not yet been convincingly settled: (1) Djik. et al. 1986, 61; OS 1992, 178: ~ Sem. *hwy “to be(come)” ||| SBrb.: Ahaggar i-hā, Ayr i-ha “to be, stay (in)” ||| SCu.: Iraqw, Alagwa ho-t- “to live, dwell”, Asa hu-t- “to stand still” etc. But Eg. 3 ≠ Sem. *w/*y not regular. (2) Hodge 1995, 640: Eg. h3w “neighborhood” ~ Ug. hlm “hierher”, Hbr. halōm “(to) here”, Ar. halumma “hither” (Sem.: WUS #834) and PCu. *hal-/*hil- “other” [Ehret 1987, 126], while Hodge 1985, 18: Eg. h3w “period of time” ~ Ar. mahala “to take one’s time”. (3) GT: perhaps ~ Tuareg: Tamasheq ē-hari, pl. i-hari-w-en “Herde” [Vcl. 1933, 177] ||| CCh.: Gisiga hirwi “Dorf” [Lks. 1970, 124].

- 2. GT: < AA *m-h “relation” [GT]?

NB1: Seems to be attested only in Ar. ʔamaha “s’engager envers qqn. par un pacte ou une alliance” [BK I 58] = “s’en remettre (to rely on), s’en rapporter à qqn. (to put one’s faith in so.)” [Blachère I 238; DRS 22] ||| WCh.: AS *mī [reg. < *mih] “1. relative (also in wider sense), 2. relation” [GT 2004, 248]: Gerka mi “relation” [Ftp. 1911, 219], Angas mii “a brother (used as a term of endearment)”, gwō-mii “relationship” (gwō- “person”) [Flk. 1915, 195, 244] = ǧō-mi “family” (ǧō “person”) ≈ Hs. dengi (sic, i.e., Hs. dāngi “relative”, Abr. 1962, 187) [Jng. 1962 MS] = ngo-mi “relative” (ngo- “person”) [ALC 1978, 46], Sura mii “Verwandter (im weiten

Sinne” [Jng. 1963, 74], Kfy. mi “relative” [Ntg. 1967, 26], Mnt. mi “relation” [Ftp. 1911, 219], Gmy. mi “relation” [Ftp. 1911, 219] = mi, pl. mia “1. relation, relative, 2. to be related”, goe-mi “a relative” [Srl. 1937, 65, 139] = mi “relations”, gə-mi “relative”, mə mya (pl.) “relatives” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 22–23]. Cf. alternatively MSA: Hrs. myḥ: mēyeh “village” [Jns. 1977, 92].

nb2: Cf. perhaps also NBrb.: Mzg. ta-ma (sg. coll.) “parents et proches d’un individu, parenté (ensemble des parents et des alliés)” [Tf. 1991, 399] || ECh.: Mkl. mâwʔwí ~ mâwḥí ~ màawí “parents” [Jng. 1990, 138]. Note that M. Taifi (1991, 400) assumed a connection with Mzg. i-mma “mother”.

nb3: Does Akk. mātu (fem.) “1. (eigenes) Land, Gebiet, 2. flaches Land, 3. Fremdland, 4. Landesbewohner” [AHW 633], which was borrowed into Sam. Aram. mt “place, town” [Tal 2000, 492], and ECh.: Toram maawā “village” [Alio 2004, 259, #290] eventually stem from the same AA root? Note that of Akk. mātu no good Sem. etymology is known as confirmed by E. Reiner (p.c. on 8 Feb. 2000), D. Testen (p.c. 8 Feb. 2000), and L. Kogan (p.c., 15 Dec. 2006), which, however, does not rule out assuming a pre-Akk. etymon *mah-t- (or sim.).

nb4: Perhaps LECu. *mEh- “property” [GT]: Orm. miʔ-a “goods, possessions, things” [Gragg 1982, 284], Arb. méh (m) “goods, property, chattels” [Hyw. 1984, 384] might be also related.

nb5: Remarkable is the closeness of AA *m-h and/or *m-(y) “person” [GT] > Brb. *i-m-an “soul(s)” (pl. affixes *i-...-an attached to the orig. root *m) [GT]: NBrb.: Mzab iman “âme, esprit, soi” [Dlh. 1984, 114], Wargla iman “âme, personne” [Dlh. 1987, 182], Izn. imän “âme, vie, personne” [Rns. 1932, 390], Qbl. iman [Dlt. 1982, 503] || EBrb.: Siwa & Gdm. & Nfs. iman “âme” [Lst. 1931, 194] || SBrb.: Hgr. iman [Fcd. 1951–2, 1138], EWlm. & Ayr. iman “1. âme(s), 2. princepe de vie, 3. personne” [PAM 1998, 207; 2003, 517] (Brb.: NZ 1998, 140–1, §128) || ECu.: Arb. mōh ~ mó (m) “person, man”, mó ~ mohá deyya (m) “woman” [Hyw. 1984, 385], Dasenech (Galab) mú “homo”, má “vir” [Sasse 1974, 422] = má “person, man”, mí ~ mú “man, person” [Tosco 2001, 516] || SCu. *mi “people” [Ehret] = *mV, orig. perhaps *mu [GT]: WRift: Irq. & Grw. mu (pl.) “people (persons)” [Wtl. 1958, 24], Qwd. meʔ-iko “people” [Ehr. 1980 MS, 4] | Maʔa m-mú “person”, va-mú “people” [TB 1974, 193; Ehr. 1974 MS, 46; Mous 1996, 207: < Irq.] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 160, #55) || NOm.: Wolayta moy-tilliya & Gamu & Zayse moy-tille “ghost” [Lmb.] | Yemsa (Janjero) mé “vielleicht Menschen, Frauen” [Lmb. 1993, 362] | Shinasha mēyá “Geist” [Lmb.] | Sezo may “man (vir)” [Bnd.] = m̄: “man” [Sbr.-Wdk.], Hozo mōó “uomo” [Gr. 1940, 356] = mo “man (vir)” [Bnd. 1990] = “person” [Bnd. 1994, 1159, #62] = m̄: “man” [Sbr.-Wdk.] (Mao: Bnd. 1990, 610, #148; Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 14; NOm.: Lmb. 1993, 364) || WCh. *m[a]y- “person” [GT]: PGmy. *may (with prefix *kə- sg. vs. *m̄- pl.) “man” [GT 2004, 243–4]: Gmy. goe-mai “an inhabitant of the Ankwe land” [Srl. 1937, 64] = mó-mai (pl.) “Mann, Mensch” [Jng. 1962 MS, 2] = gə-mai “Goemai”, mə-mai (pl.) “people” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 11, 22] | BT *mu/*mi “person”, pl. *miya “people” [Schuh] = *m-m “man (vir), male, person” [JS 1981, 174: A₃/2] = *mUy- ~ *miy- (sg.) “person” & *mī-mī ~ *miya (pl.) “people” [GT]: Bole méémù (sg.), míʔyá (pl.) [Schuh] = me: mu “vir, person” [IL] = memu “person” [Meek], Tangale miye (pl.) “Menschen” [Jng. 1957, 149] = muu ~ mu “Mann, Person” [Jng. 1991, 122], Bele móyyò (sg.), mīmò (pl.) [Schuh], Maha mòò “people” [Alio 1988 MS], Kirfi míimí (sg.), mīmí (pl.) “person” [Schuh], Galambu mü (sg.) [Schuh] = mü “person(al spirit)” [Alio 1988 MS], Geruma míimi (sg.), mùnú (pl.) “person” [Schuh], Dera mu “homme” [Pls. 1958, 78] = mú, pl. miyá [Schuh] = mami “Mann”, mùú “Mann, Mensch, Person”, miya “Leute, Volk” [Jng. 1966 MS, 10–11] = máámí “husband, male” [Nwm. 1974, 129] = mùú “person (homo), man”, pl. miyá “clan” [Kidda 1991 MS, 1, 26], Kwami múu, pl. miyá “Mensch, Person” [Leger 1992, 28; 1993, 172] = “human being, person” [Jng.-Leger], Krkr. món (pl.) [Schuh], Kupto múu, pl.

míyá “Mensch, Person” [Leger 1992, 21], Kushi mèmé (pl.) “human being, person” [Jng-Leger], Piya míyá (sg.) “person” [Jng-Leger] (BT: Schuh 1978, 150; 1984, 211; Jng-Leger 1993, 167) | Guruntum mu “man, person” [Jgr. 1989, 186–7], Jimi ma “Mann” [Gowers], Bubure múmó “person (homo)”, mimmĩñé “people” [Haruna 1992 MS, #a001–2], Dokshi mii “person” [Smz. 1978, 29, #39] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 230) || CCh.: Bata meye “personne” [Mch.] = m(y)á “person, s’one” [Pweddton 2000, 52] = ma “(male) person” [Boyd 2002, 56] | Logone mee ~ meea (in gen. cstr.: mi ~ mii ~ miia ~ miie) “Leute” [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 108–9], Buduma mwey “homme” [Gaudiche 1938, 20], Gulfei mejiwe (pl.) “Männer” [Lks. 1937, 150], Ngala moi “people” [Mgd. 1922, 236] (W-CCh.: JI 1994 II, 266–7) || ECh.: Gabri kà-mā “personne” [Cpr. 1972 MS]. For the AA etymology see also Mkr. 1981, 210, #38.A (SCu.-Mao); 1987, 253 (BT-Mao); Orel 1995, 108, #119 (PWCh.-POM.-PRift). Note that A. B. Dolgopolsky (2005, 26) reconstructs PBrb. *mān “soul, person” ~ Eg. mn “a such-and-such” < Nst. *me[y]ñU “o’self, one’s own, body”. Improbable. JI (1994 I, 115) explained the Ch. forms from PCh. *m-t-m, while R. M. Voigt (1998, 612) erroneously assumed a derivation of the them either (!) from PCh. *m-t or *m-n “Mann”.

- **3.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1801) erroneously combined it with Akk. (OAss.) maḥāʾum “etwa Onkel (?)” [AHW 582] etc. Impossible (Eg. -h- ≠ Akk. -ḫ-). Cf. Eg. mḥ (below).

mh.wt (or **mhwt**?) “?” ≈ md.t “Rede” (XIX., Wb II 114, 15) = “paroles (?), opinions (?), expressions (?)” (Clère 1949, 42) = “propos, langage” (Clère 1951, 112–3) = “speech” (FD 113) = “mots, discours” (AL 77.1804) = “words, speech” (Ward 1977, 283–4, §7) = “mots” (Posener 1986, 95) = “expression” (Baines 1992, 245, n. g: XIX. ≈ md.wt “speech”) = “Rede” (GHWb 351) = “escient” (WD II 159). NB: Attested only in the expression dns-mhw.t “als gute Eigenschaft (≈ beredt, verschwiegen)” (XII., XVIII., XXX., Ptol., Wb II 114, 14–15) = “prudent dans ses paroles (?), n’exprimant ses opinions (?), mesurant ses expressions (?)” ≈ ḥ3p-ḫ.t & ḫtm-r “discret” (Clère 1949, 38f., esp. 42) = “n’exprimant ses opinions (?) qu’à bon escient” (Clère 1951, 140, n. E) = “réservé dans (ses) propos (signification en relation avec la politesse ou même la ‘diplomatie’ du langage, quelque chose comme ‘...garder en soi les propos qui pourraient offusquer ou fâcher autrui’ ou ‘ne se laissant pas aller à dire des mots choquants ou blessants’ – vers la notion de discrétion, de réserve dans le langage” (Clère 1951, 112–3) = “guarded of speech” (FD 113) = “prudent of words” (Ward 1977, 283–4, §7) = “pesant ses mots” (Posener 1986, 95 & fn. 23 with lit.) = “réservé de propos” (Meulenaere 1991, 246, cf. 248, n. b with lit.) = “reserved of expression” (Baines 1992, 245, n. g with lit.) = “wohlüberlegt in der Rede” (GHWb 351) = “à bon escient” (WD II 159) with lit.

- Etymology debatable.

- **1.** W. A. Ward (1969, 265; 1977, 283–4, §7) rendered Eg. mhwt “speech, words” as an m- prefix form deriving from a hypothetical common Eg.-Sem. *hwy “to speak” [Ward] attested – in his view – in Akk. awû(m) “sprechen” (AHW: denom!), awātu [*hawy-at-?] “1. Wort, 2. Angelegenheit” [AHW 89, 91] = awû(m) “plaider”, awātu “1. mot, message, nouvelle, 2. ordre, décision, 3. procès, 4. chose, affaire” [DRS], Mari ʾà-wa-tum /hawatum/ [Gelb] || Ug. hw-t (fem.)

“word” [Gordon 1955, 258, #548] = “Äußerung” [WUS #820] = “exhaled breath” [Margalit, RB 91, 1984, 113f.; ZAW 99, 1987, 394] = “mot” [DRS] = “1. word, statement, 2. matter, assignment (?)” [DUL 349] (Sem.: DRS 386; DUL 349) as well as in an obscure OT form.

NB1: The commonly accepted rendering and etymology of OT Hbr. hawwōt (fem. pl.) “words” (sic) [Ward] used by Ward in his comparison is fully different. In the view of R. M. Voigt (p.c., 19 Dec. 2006), here “*könnte vielleicht hawwōt in der Bedeutung ‘Drohungen’, gebraucht mit dem Verb dabber in Ps. 38:13, gemeint sein*”, but “*die Grundbedeutung von hawwōt ist ‘Verderben’ (von der Wurzel für ‘fallen’)*”. Thus, Sem. *hwy “to speak” is probably baseless.

NB2: It is, however, impossible to agree with Ward in relating this hopeful Eg-Sem. isogloss with several further Eg-Sem. roots, which are clearly distinct: (1) Eg. hwt “jammern, klagen, schreien (?)” (BD, Wb II 485, 2–3; GHwB 490), in which -t is part of the root and which occurs already in CT IV 160a–b, rendered as “to shout” (Ward 1969) = “to speak” (Ward 1977), has been rightly connected by Ward (1969, 265, fn. 4) with Sem. *hwt, cf. Hbr. hwt “anfahen, einstürmen auf” [GB 178] = “to attack” [KB 243] | Ar. hawwata (Damascus) “anschreien, drohen” [GB] = “anschreien” [WUS] = “to shout at” [KB]. Cf. also Sem. *htt: Hbr. htt “to overwhelm with reproofs” [KB 257] = “to shout” [Ward] | Ar. hatta “to damage s’one’s reputation” [KB] = hatta l-kalāma “to speak continuously”, hattāt- “one who speaks continuously or eloquently” [Ward]. The erroneous comparison of Sem. *hwy with Ar. hwt has been proposed also in WUS #820. For the same reasons, Ug. hw-t and Akk. awātu are similarly unrelated to Eg. hwt (contra F. Calice quoted in Albright 1937–39, 71). (2) Hbr. nhh qal “to lament” [KB 675] || Eg. hh “klagen, jammern” (GR: old text, Wb II 502, 9), cf. Ward 1969, 267 for a new Dyn. XXI occurrence. (3) Ward is mistaken also in affiliating Eg-Sem. *hwy, *hwt, *(n)hh with Eg. hhj “to deafen” (late NK, DLE I 88) and (4) Sem. *hwy “to desire” (contra WUS l.c.).

NB3: Note that Akk. amū < awū “sprechen” [AHW] cannot have anything in common with Geez hamāyā “to speak ill of” etc. as W. Leslau (1944, 55–56) falsely conjectured. As for Eth.-Sem. *hmy, cp. rather ECu. *ḥam-/ḥum- “bad” [Sasse 1979, 38; Heine 1978, 64] || (?) Eg. ḥm.t “Unglück, Übel” (GR, Wb III 80, 12).

- 2. G. Takács (1999, 144): if Eg. mh.wt displays the same semantic development as Eg. r “mouth” > “speech, utterance” (OK, FD 145) does, it is unavoidable to remark the parallelism with NBrb.: Wargla i-mi “dire” [Prv.], Wed Righ i-mi “dire” [Bst./Wlf.], Sened e-mma (iu-mma) “dire” [Wlf.] || SBrb.: Ghat i-mi “dire” [Prv.], whose (denominal) derivation from the Brb. root for “mouth” was correctly noted by D. J. Wölfel (1955, 44, #19). AP: Nama mí, CKhoisan *mi “to say” (Bnd. 1975, 183, #68.12). This rare verbal root *m-h might thus eventually derive from AA *m-h “mouth” [GT] = *ma-/mi- [HSED].

NB1: Attested in Sem.: perhaps Akk. maʾu ~ maʾtu “tongue or a part of the tongue” [CAD m1, 414, 435] || Brb. *imi “1. bouche, 2. entrée, ouverture” [Bst. 1890, 37; 1890, 312; Bst. 1929, 33–34] = *imi, pl. *im-awn “bouche” [Durand 1993, 243] = *a-mwi (sic) “mouth” [Blz.] = *mV- (sic) [HSED] = *im(mi) [Stl. 2002, 273, #23] = *ē-mīhīh ~ *ē-māhīh (?) [PAM] = *ʔimi/*yVmi, *ʔimaw-on (Anlaut *-i-stable) [Mlt. 2005, 370, §56] = *i-miH [GT]: NBrb.: Shilh i-mi “bouche, porte”

[Jst. 1914, 133], Tazerwalt i-mi, pl. i-māu-n “1. Mund, 2. Eingang, Tür, 3. Rede, Geschwätz” [Stumme 1899, 189] | Demnat i-mmi “bouche, entrée” [Brn.], Mzg. i-mi, pl. i-maw-n “1. bouche, 2. ouverture, 3. entrée, seuil, 4. lisière, bord extérieur”, ti-mi-tt, pl. ti-maw-in “petite bouche, petite ouverture, bouche d’enfant” [Taifi 1991, 400–1], Izdeg i-mi, pl. i-ma-w-en ~ i-mau-n “orifice, ouverture” [Mrc. 1937, 37, 181–2], Zayan & Sgugu i-mi, pl. i-maw-en “1. ouverture, 2. bouche” [Lbg. 1924, 564] | Sgrs. i-mi “bouche, porte, entrée” [Pellat 1955, 103], Rif i-mi, pl. i-ma-un “bouche” [Rns. 1932, 383], Tuat & Gurara i-mi, pl. i-ma-w-en “bouche, entrée, ouverture” [Bst.], Snus i-mi, pl. imawen “bouche” [Wlf.], Shenwa i-mi, pl. imawen “bouche, entrée, ouverture” [Lst. 1912, 146; Brn. 1917, 86], Mnsr. & Halima i-mi “bouche” [Bst. 1885, 153], Mzab i-mi, pl. i-ma-w-ən “1. bouche, 2. ouverture d’entrée, orifice, issue, 3. bouchée, plaine bouche” [Dlh. 1984, 114], Wargla i-m, pl. i-ma-w-en “bouche” [Bst., Prv.] = i-mi, pl. i-ma-w-ən “1. bouche, 2. orifice, entrée, issue, ce que peut contenir la bouche, bouchée” [Dlh. 1987, 182], Sened i-mi, pl. i-ma-imawen “bouche” [Prv.] | Nfs. i-m, pl. i-ma-w-en “bouche” [Bst.] = i-mi “bouche” [Prv.] = i-mî, pl. i-mâw-en “bocca, entrata, accesso” [Bgn. 1931, 285] | Qbl. i-mi, pl. i-ma-w-en “1. bouche, 2. embouchure” [Dlt. 1982, 479], Zwawa & Bugi i-mi “bouche, entrée, ouverture” [Bst.] || EBrb.: Ghadames a-mi, pl. i-ma-w-en “bouche” [Mtl.] = a-mî, pl. mî-w-en “1. bouche, 2. entrée, ouverture, 3. bouchée” [Lnf. 1973, 190, #952] = a-me, pl. me-w-än [PAM], Sokna ē-mi [Lyon] = i-mî, pl. i-mâ-w-en “bocca” [Srn. 1924–25, 13, 39], Audjila a-m “bouche” [Bst., Mtl.] = ā-m, pl. miwân ~ miwēn “bocca” [Prd. 1960, 161], Siwa a-mmbu (sic, -mm-) “bouche” [Bricchetti-Robecchi apud Bst.] = a-mbû, pl. mba-w-ən [< *a-m“u] “bouche” [Lst. 1931, 204], Fogaha i-mî “bocca” [Prd. 1961, 297], Djerba i-mi “bouche” [Bst., Prv.] (EBrb.: Mtl. 1904, 107) || WBrb.: Zenaga i-mi “bouche, entrée, ouverture” [Bst. 1890, 312] = i-mmi, pl. a-mm-un “bouche” [Bst. 1890, 37] = i/e-mmi, pl. a-mmu-n “bouche” [Bst. 1909, 240] = ə-mmi, pl. ā-mm-ūn “1. bouche, 2. ouverture, porte etc.” [Ncl. 1953, 201] || SBrb.: Ahaggar i-mi “bouche” [Bst.] = ě-mi, pl. i-ma-w-en “bouche” [Fcd. 1950–1, 1137], Wlmd. ê-m “bouche” [Barth] = i-mi [Bst.], WWlm. i-mi “bouche” [Nicolai], EWlm. & Ayr i-mi, pl. i-ma-w-än “1. bouche, 2. entrée, orifice, ouverture, porte, 3. bord (en gén.), 4. bout tranchant (de couteau etc.), début, première partie” [PAM 1998, 207; 2003, 517], Ghat i-mi, pl. i-ma-w-wn “orifice, ouverture, bouche” [Nhl. 1909, 135, 184] = e-mi “bouche” [Prv.], Kel Ui e-mi “bouche” [Bst.], Tadghaq & Nslm. e-mi, pl. i-ma-w-än “bouche” [PAM], Tasawaq mè ~ mé ~ mey “bouche” [Nicolai], Tagdalt & Tabaroq mè “bouche” [Nicolai], Tadaksahak ‘miya “bouche” [Nicolai] (SBrb.: Nicolai 1990, 153, §4; Brb.: Bst. 1883, 309, 320, 334; 1887, 403, 449; 1890, 37; 1890, 312; Prv. 1911, 103, 111; Vcl. 1957, 144) || NAgaw *mä-k- “mouth” [Ehret 1987, #438; Apl. 1989 MS, 16] (extended with *-k- to be found in some other AA anatomical terms): Qwara makēya [Flad/Rn.] = makya [Beke/Rn.] = makiyā ~ makyā “Mund, Lippe” [Rn. 1885, 98] = māk(ə)ya ~ makiyā “mouth” [Apl.], Falasha makēya “mouth”, mäke “face” [Apl.], Dembea makiyā ~ mekyā [Rn.], Hamir mīkā, pl. mik “Mund und Lippe” [Rn. 1884, 392], Hmtg mika [Rn.] = mīḷa “mouth” [Apl. 1987, 503] = mǝḷa [Apl. 1996], Kemant maḳay “bouche, langue” [CR 1912, 228] = mekey ~ mikey [Bnd. 1973 MS, 7, #55] = mākäy ~ mǝkəy [Apl.], Kailinya māki “mouth” [Apl.] (NAgaw: Apl. 1989 MS, 16; 1991 MS, 48; 1994, 248; 1996, 16) || ECu.: Yaaku mēʔ, pl. mēʔe (m) “mouth” [Heine 1975, 130] || SCu.: (?) Ma’a muǝ ~ muho, pl. miǝ “Mund” [Mnh. 1906, 315] = muʔo “mouth” [Ehret 1980, 387] || PCh. *m-(k) “mouth” [JS 1981, 187B] = *m-y “mouth” [JI 1994 I 122] = *maw/y/?- [Std. 2002, 273, #23] > WCh.: Ngizim miyá “1. mouth, 2. language, speech, 3. any opening, 4. point of spear” [Schuh 1981, 115] = miya [IL], Bade miyá “mouth” [Schuh 1978, 264], WBade mnyáa-n [Schuh], Teshena miya-n [Schuh] (BN: Schuh 2001, 432) || CCh. *ma/i- “mouth” [HSED] = *m-y [GT]: Tera me “mouth” [Nwm. 1964, 38, #60], Hwona me [Brt.-Jng.] | Bura mya “1. mouth,

2. language, 3. opening, entrance, 4. edge" [BED 1953, 147] = mya "Mund, Rand, Sprache" [Hfm. in RK 1973, 91], Margi mnyà "mouth, opening, edge" [Hfm. in RK 1973, 126] | Higi-Baza myoe [Skn.], Higi-Bana mí [Br.-Jng.], Fali-Jilbu mà-n [Krf.] = ma-n [Skn.], Fali-Kiria mí [Krf.], Fali-Mucella mà [Krf.], Fali-Gili ìmí [Krf.], Fali-Bwagira mà-n [Krf.] (Higi gr.: Krf. 1972 MS) | Bachama kwè-mé [Skn.], Bata màe "Mund" [Str.], Bata-Demsa më [Str.] = ma [Mch.], Gude ma [Str., IL] = mà "mouth, edge, rim" [Hsk. 1983, 232], Nzangi bwà-ma [Mch.], Kobochi mà "Mund" [Str.] | Lmg. éwé [-w- < *-m-] [Lks.] | PMnd. *muwe > *wuwe [Stl.] = *we < *may [-w- reg. < *-m-] "mouth" [GT]: Mandara wé [Egc.] = uwè-bwè [Mch.] = wé [Jng.], Dghwede wúwè [Frick] = úwè [IL], Ngweshe we [IL] | MM *may "1. mouth, 2. beak, 3. language" [Rsg.] > Matakam (Mafa) mà "Mund" [Str.] = mà "1. bouche, 2. parole, 3. bord d'une rivière, d'un champ" [Br.-Bléis 1990, 218] = mà [Schubert] = mèmà "beak" [Rsg.], Hurzo mé "beak, mouth, word" [Rsg.], Mada mamma [Skn.] = mämmā [Jng.] = māmā "mouth" [Rsg.], Gisiga mí ~ mee "Mund" [Str.] = me "1. Mund, 2. Wort, Sprache" [Lks. 1970, 128] = mí "mouth, beak, language" [Rsg.], Balda me "Mund" [Str., Sgn.-Trn.], Mlk. mà "mouth", mà "language, word" [Rsg.], Vame mé "mouth, language" [Rsg.], Mofu maa "Mund" [Str.] = mé "mouth" vs. mí "beak" [Rsg.] = mëy [Br./JI], Mofu-Gudur méy "1. bouche, lèvres, 2. gueule, bec, 3. bord, bout, extrémité, entrée, 4. devant, début, avant, 5. parole, langage, langue, 6. affaires, palabre" [Br. 1988, 192], Muturwa mí "Mund" [Str.], Uld. mà "1. bouche, museau, 2. entrée, porte, idiome, parole" [Cim. 1986, 133; 1997, 188] (MM: Rsg. 1978, 207, §49 & p. 279, §409 & p. 295, §486 & p. 362, §816) | Hina mà ~ maa "Mund" [Str.], Gawar mà "Mund" [Str.], Daba ma "Mund" [Str.] = mà "1. mouth, 2. language, word" [LG 1974, 10, #237, #239] = mà "bouche, langage" [Mch. 1966, 133], Kola mà [Schubert], Musgoy ma [Mch.] | Gidar mo-kó "Mund" [Str.] = mō [Mch.] | Musg/kum mà-gu "Mund" [Lks. 1937, 143] = mù-t "bouche" [Trn. 1977, 18], Musgu ma [Barth, Rohlf] = mà [Rdr., Lks.] = m [Rohlf] = mañ [Décorse] = mī [Krause] "Mund" [Lks. 1941, 65; 1937, 142] = mu [Mch.] vs. mëméé "Mund, Lippen" [Müller 1886, 400] = mëméé "Lippe (?), Mund (?)" [Lks. 1941, 67], Puss mí (m) [MB 1972 MS, 7] = miy "1. bouche, bec, gueule, 2. ouverture, 3. extrémité, pointe" vs. meme "1. bouche, 2. langue, langage, dialecte, idiome", mi- "bouche de" [Trn. 1991, 104-6], Musgu-Girvidik mé (m) [MB 1972 MS, 7], Munjuk mëmé "mouth" [Br.-Jng.] = maa [Mkr.] = ma [Rsl.] = ma-L [Skn.], Kaykay mëé "bouche" [Sgn.-Trn.], Mogrum më-ŋ "bouche" [Trn. 1977, 18], Mbara máy "1. bouche, 2. langage, idiome" [TSL 1986, 271, 292] | Peve mà "mouth", má "word" [Schubert 1971 MS, 2, #6 & 8, #142] (CCh.: Str. 1910, 451; 1922-23, 114; Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 24; Ch.: Skn. 1977, 59-60; Brt. 1987, 61, §1.1; Brt.-Jng. 1993, 130; JI 1994 II 244-5; Stl. 2002, 273, #23). All forms quoted above denote "mouth" unless otherwise indicated.

NB2: Cf. perhaps also SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr e-mäy, pl. i-mäyy-än "conte (merveilleux), légende" [PAM 1998, 229; 2003, 569] and EWlm. tä-maya "voix (humaine)" [PAM 1998, 229; 2003, 569].

NB3: The comparison of the common Brb.-Ch. root with Sem. *p- "mouth" and Cu. *ʔaf- (suggested in Murtonen 1989, 334-5; Durand 1993, 243; JI 1994 I 122; PAM 2003, 517) is phonologically unacceptable. Equally false is the equation of Brb. *imi with Sem. *ʔmw (sic) suggested by O. Durand (1993, 243).

NB4: Ch. Ehret (1987, #438) falsely equated NAgaw *mäk- "mouth" with Bed. möka "neck".

DP: D. J. Wölfel (1955, 44, §19) affiliated the Brb. word with Sum. eme (var. me) "Zunge, Sprache" and Bsq. mí ~ mī ~ mihi ~ mīn "lengua".

LIT.: Mkr. 1966, 17, #42 (Brb.-Musgu); IS 1971, 245, #105 (Brb.-CCh.); Skn. 1977, 59-60 (Ngizim-CCh.-SBrb.); Rsl. 1979, 23, #7 (Brb.-Ch.); JS 1981, 187B (PBrb.-PCh.); JI 1994 I 122 (PBrb.-PCh.); Blz. 1994, 428 (Brb.-CCh.); HSED

#1698 (Brb.-CCh.); Stl. 2002, 273, #23 (Akk.-Ch.-PBrb.); Mlt. 2005, 370, §56 (Brb.-Yaaku-Maa).

- **3.** GT: a remarkable parallel is represented by Cu.-Om. *moh- “1. word, 2. matter, case” [GT] = (“OCu.”) *moʔ- “lawsuit, process” [Lmb.]. Ultimately related to the preceding item?

NB1: Attested in Bed. mohi- “to accuse” [LS] || HECu.: (?) Burji miyāna ~ miyani “case, matter” [LS] ||l NOm.: Wlt. mō-t- “anklagen” [Lmb.], Gamu mō-t- “anklagen” [Lmb.], Dache & Zayse mō-t-o “lawsuit, process” [LS] | Kafa moy-ō “1. parola, 2. lite, questione, 3. cosa, 4. motivo, ragione” [Crl. 1951, 476] = moy/ʔ-o “Wort, Streit, Sache, Grund” [Lmb.] = “word, quarrel, case” [LS], Sns. mōyy-à “1. Gerichtsverhandlung, 2. Prozeß” [Lmb.] = mōyy-a “lawsuit” [LS] | Sheko moʔ-o “Sache” [Lmb.] = “case” [LS] (Cu.-Om.: Lmb. 1993, 364; LS 1997, 470–1).

NB2: Any connection to WRift *māh- “to ask (question)” [GT]: Alg. māh-am-īs- & Brg. mā-s- [Wtl. 1958, 55, #4]?

- **4.** GT: if Eg. dns-mh.wt literally signified “heavy (i.e., important) of speech” (or sim.), a quite attractive cognate emerges, cf. SBrb. *√n-h-w [Prs.] = *a-nhiw “proverbs” [GT] > Hgr. a-nhi, pl. i-nhi-wən “proverbe” [Prs. 1969, 83, #551], EWlm. a-nhi, pl. i-nhi-t-än & Ayr e-ni ~ ä-yeni “proverbe, diction, adage (traditionel), mot d’esprit, bon-mot (faisant rire)” [PAM 2003, 606].

NB: The Brb. cluster *-nh- might presumably be explained from *-mh-.

- **5.** GT: or a remotely related (irregular) cognate of Cu.-Om. *maQ- (perhaps *-ḳ-ʔ) “to tell” [GT] = (OCu.) *māk- “to tell, speak” [HL] (discussed also s.v. Dem. mkmk ~ mqmq, q.v.)? For an irregular Eg. h ~ AA *ḳ cf. EDE I 295.

NB: Do LECu.: Orm. magmāg-ā [Rn.] = makmāk-a “tale” [HL] = mammāka “to tell proverb, recount history” [Hds.], Baiso māmā (m) “proverb, story” [Hyw. 1979, 128, 130], Som. mahmāh “Sprichwort” [Rn. 1902, 289] = mähmāh, pl. mähmāhó “proverb” [Abr. 1964, 171], Rnd. mammāh “proverb, traditional wise saying” [PG 1999, 219] | HECu. *mammāk- [Hds.]: Sid. mammāh- “to tell story”, mämmāha “to quote proverbs and sayings, tell stories”, cf. mätto “story” [Gsp. 1983, 222] = mämmāh- “to tell a story” vs. mammak- “to tell proverb” [Hds.], Gedeo (Drs.) mammāk- “to recount history”, mammāssa “history” [Hds.] = mammassà “proverb” [Lsl. 1988, 195], Burji mammāh- “to recount history”, mommāho (f) “history” ~ mommākō (f) “story” [Hds. 1980] = mommāk- “to narrate a story”, mammāh-ō ~ mammāk-ō “oral tradition, story” [Ss. 1982, 140, 146] = mämmāh- ~ mommāk- “to tell a story” [Hds. 1989] (HECu.: Hds. 1980, 80, 121, 144; 1989, 150) (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 140, 146; Cu.-Om.: HL 1988, 128) represent a distinct root?

mh (GW) “a type of container” (late NK hapax²: Pap. Turin B vs. 1:10, Caminos 1954 LEM, 469) = “container, jug” (DLE I 230) = “ein Gefäß” (GHWb 351) = “nom de récipient” (Meeks).

NB: D. Meeks (2000, 246, n. aw) supposes a further ex. of the same term in Ostr. Petrie 36, vs. 8 (only -h- legible, traces of GW m-ʕ- & -3 reconstructed), which he regarded as a rare but distinct lexeme.

- Origin uncertain:

- **1.** R. Hannig (GHWb) surmized (“*vielleicht*”) in it a late form of Eg. mhr “Milchkrug” (q.v.).
NB: Both R. Caminos (l.c.) and D. Meeks (l.c.), however, hesitated to identify mh either with Eg. mhn < mhr “pot du lait” or mhwj “le produit liquide” (q.v.).
- **2.** GT: perhaps akin to ES: Geez māhəw ~ māḥəw “utensil of glass, glass cup, bottle, crystal, glass”, Tigre məho “goblet”, Amh. məho ~ (ə)mo ~ mahəw (the latter var. < Geez) “goblet, cup of glass”, Grg.-Zway māwa “goblet” (ES: Lsl. 1982, 50; 1987, 334; 1988, 71) ||| NAgaw (< ES): Qemant mo “glass, cup” [Lsl.] ||| SOm.: Dime maye [Flm.] = māyɛ [Sbr.] “pot” [Bnd. 1996 MS, 1, #68]?
NB: The Sem. etymology of the ES word is uncertain. **(1)** F. Praetorius (1879, 54) affiliated it with Amh. wəha “water”. **(2)** Th. Nöldeke (1910, 170 after Gesenius), in turn, combined it with Ar. mahā-t- “crystal” (which, in turn, eventual comes from the word for “water”). **(3)** This was received rather reluctantly by W. Leslau (l.c.), who (Lsl. 1963, 106) assumed instead a connection with Harari māḥawa “object, goods, utensil”.

***mh.w** (?) > OCpt. Ḥ2ΔΥ (m) “Hitze, Fieber” (KHW 523).

- Explained by J. Osing (1976, 76; NBÄ 107) from Eg. hm “heiß sein” (XVIII. Mag, Wb II 489, 15) via metathesis.

mhj.t “Milchkuh” (hapax: PT 550a, Wb II 113, 16; ÄWb I 548).

NB: The -r of the rare GR mhr “Milchkuh” (Esna hapax, Wb II 115, 17) may be due to the influence (via contamination) of mhr “melken, Milch saugen oder geben, säugen” (GR, Wb II 115, 9–16) and can thus hardly be a serious argument for reconstructing an old etymon *mhr.t. Parallel to the well known -r > -j process, there was a tendency of a “false archaisation” already in the MK, where etymologically correct final -j was hypercorrected into -r which in fact never existed in the root (as pointed out by Müller 1909; Schenkel 1965; Vycichl 1983, 29). There is no convincing evidence for assuming in PT mhj.t a development from an early OK *mhr.t.

● Etymology debated:

- **1.** F. von Calice (GÄSW #636) assumed an etymological connection with LEg. mhr “melken” (GR, Wb, q.v.) < mhr “Milchkrug” (MK, Wb II 115, 5). Unlikely for the reasons outlined above.
- **2.** A. Ember (1913, 110, #3; 1930, §10.a.20, §13.a.5; quoted also in GÄSW #636) affiliated it with Ar. mahā-t- [< *mahaw-t-], pl. mahaw-āt- ~ mahay-āt- “vache sauvage ou antilope” [BK II 1164] = “(semble être) une espèce de buffle” [Daumas: Sahara apud Dozy] = “une antilope du genre appelé *meha*” [Daumas: Ghadamès in Dozy II 622] = “wild cow” [Ember], cf. also Dathina mahā “vache sauvage, antilope” [GD 2727], which represent a plausible cognate.

NB: The Ar. term is formally listed under Ar. mhw: mahā “être d’un beau et brillant pelage blanc (se dit d’une vache sauvage, d’une antilope)” [BK] in the lexicon, but this is hardly a convincing etymology (denominal verb?).

mhj “vergesslich sein (vom Herzen), vergessen (hr)” (MK, Wb II 113, 7–10; ÄWb I 548: 1x in the 1st IMP) = “to be forgetful, neglectful of (hr)” (FD 112; DCT 174: CT exx.).

NB: The root has been assumed in DCT to be IIIae w ($\sqrt{\text{mhw}}$) in the light of the CT evidence.

- Most probably akin to Ar. ʔamiha “oublier”, ʔamuha “avoir l’esprit troublé”, II “jeter qqn. dans le trouble, lui troubler l’esprit”, ʔamah-“oubli” [BK I 58] = ʔamiha “to forget” [Lane 103] = ʔamiha “1. to be inattentive, be absent-minded (être distrait, avoir l’esprit absent), 2. to forget, omit sg. (oublier, omettre qqch.), 3. divert, take so.’s attention (off sg.) (distraindre qqn., troubler son attention)”, $\text{ʔam(a)h-“forgetting (oubli, omission)”}$ [Blachère I 239; DRS 22] ||| NAgaw *məḥi- (with an irreg. *ḥ-) [Apl. 1989] = *miḥi-T- (with pass./refl. ext.) “to forget” [Apl. 1991] = *məḥ-iR- < *Vt- [Apl. 2005]: Bilin mēḥ-r ~ (rarely) māḥ-r “vergessen” [Rn.] = megi (sic) “vergessen” [Clc.] = məḥi-r- ~ miḥi-r- [Apl.], Hamir mī-t ~ mi-t [Rn.] = mi/ə-t [Apl.], Hmtg. mi-r- [Apl.], Qemant māy ~ miy “oublier, ne faire pas attention” [CR] = məy-y- ~ mə-y- ~ mi-y-(is)- [Apl.], Qwara me-y- [Rn.] = mi/ə-y- [App.], Dembea me-y- [Rn.] (NAgaw: Rn. 1884, 390; 1885, 103; 1887, 264; CR 1912, 234; Apl. 1984, 39; 1986, 11–12; 1989 MS, 16; 1991 MS, 6) ||| WCh.: Grnt. mʔa-wi ~ mʔau-mi “to forget” [Jaggat 1989, 184] = myáuwá “to forget” [Haruna 1992 MS, 25] = myoowí “to forget” [Csp. 1994, 18] || CCh.: Bura mwi “ignoramus” [BED 1953, 146] | Banana mawa “to forget” [Kraft 1981 III, 181], which may be eventually related also to ECu.: Yaaku -mεʔε “to get lost (of animals)” [Heine 1975, 129] ||| WCh.: NBch. *ma- “to be lost” [Skn.] > Jmb. & Miya & Kry. *ma- [Skn.], Tsagu maa- [Skn.], Pa’a mumá “to get lost”, mùmei “to lose sg.” [MSkn. 1977, 194], Siri mama [Skn.], Mburku man- [Skn.] | Grnt. mai “to become lost, lose” [Jaggat 1989, 184, 186] = máya “to lose (sg.)”, máya “to lose one’s way” [Haruna 1992 MS, 22].

LIT.: Rn. 1887, 264 (Agaw-Eg.); Clc. 1936, #635 (Eg.-Bilin); Chn. 1947, #468 (Eg.-Agaw); OS 1992, 194 (PWCh.-PCCh.-Eg.); HSED #1711 (Eg.-Banana-Agaw); Apl. 2005 MS, 51 (Agaw-Yaaku-Eg. after EDE I 122).

NB1: The further Sem. parallels (if any) are dubious. (1) W.G. Watson compared Eg. mhj to Ug. mhy “(perhaps) oblivion” [Watson 1999, 789, fn. 28], which would lead in the light of Ar. ʔmh to Sem. bicons. *mh- “to forget (?)” [GT]. But Ug. mhy has been rendered variously as demonstrated in Watson (1999, 789, fn. 28) and DUL 537, which hinders the Eg.-Ug. etymology, cf. (1) “abyss” [Hvidberg 1962, 28, fn. 3] vs. “lowland” [De Moor 1987, 217; De Moor & Spronk 1987, 149], (2) “meadow, i.e., irrigated, fertile land” [DUL with further lit.], (3) “white emmer” [lit. apud Watson], (4) “waters” [Margalit, Herdner apud DUL] vs. “riverains” [Szyner/DLU], (5) or even “Wesen, (unverfälschte, unverdorbene) Natur” [Aartun, UF 16, 1984, 15f.], (6) “calamity” [Cassuto 1973–75 II, 163]. (2) Yemeni Ar. mwh II “1.

to be absent-minded, 2. hesitate, tarry” [Piamenta 1990, 474] is also uncertain, the basic mng. of Ar. *ʾmwh* being different, cf. Ar. *mwh* II “4. colorier, enjoliver (une gravure), 5. embellir un récit et l’altérer par des additions, 6. mettre à qqn. dans la tête telle ou telle opinion” [BK II 1169] = II “1. to silver or gild, wash over with gold or silver (a thing of brass or copper or iron), 2. varnish or embellish falsehood (so as to give it the appearance of truth), falsify (information), involve in confusion or doubt, practice concealment or disguise, deceive, delude, beguile, circumvent, outwit” [Lane 3026a] < *mwh* I “i.a. 3. mêler, mélanger” [BK]. (3) Akk. *makû* G “vergessen (?)”, Gt “nachlässig sein (?)” [Ebeling 1915, 1461] is out of question (Eg. -h- ≠ Sem. *-k-), cf. Eg. *mkḥ3*. (4) Sem. **mhh* is far too remote semantically, cf. Hbr. *mhh* or *mhmh* hitpalpel “zögern, zaudern” [GB 402] = *mhh* “to hesitate, tarry, delay” [KB 552] = “weigern, verneinen” [Drexel 1925, 21] | Ar. *mahah* “Verzug, Langsamkeit des Ganges” [GB] = “slow, ambling pace” [KB]. A. Drexel (l.c.) considered Hbr. *mah* (sic) to be of onomatopoeitic origin. (5) A connection with MSA: Hrs. *mhn*: *máthen* “not to know” [Jns. 1977, 88] is also unlikely because of the *C*₃ with no match in Eg. and Agaw.

NB2: No convincing cognates in Brb. either. SBrb.: Hgr. *mihi*, pl. *mihi-t-en* “1. doute (incertitude), 2. p.ext. risque, péril” [Fcd. 1950–51, 1173] is certainly unrelated, cf. Nslm. *miši* < SBrb. **ʾm-z-h*₁ [Prs. 1969, 79, #514].

NB3: L. Reinisch (l.c.), followed by F. von Calice (l.c.), erroneously combined the Eg.-Agaw root also with Ar. *fahiha* “1. être faible, débile, 2. oublier” [BK II 640] || LECu.: Saho *biya-š-it* “vergessen” [Rn.], Somali *mōg* “Trägheit, Faulheit, Nachlässigkeit” [Rn. 1902, 288] = *mōg* “ignoramus”, *mōg-aysan-ayya* “to act absent-mindedly” [Abr. 1964, 181], neither of which, however, can belong here. Somali *mōg* is a frozen compound of Som. *má* (negation) + *og*, cf. *og-ān-ayya* “to know” as pointed out by R. C. Abraham (l.c.), while Ar. *f-* vs. LECu. **b-* ≠ Eg. & Agaw **m-*.

NB4: The cognacy of WCh.: Ron: DB *nyây* ?*à-màh* “vergessen” (cf. *nyây* “verändern”) [Jng. 1970, 219] is also uncertain. The same pertains to WCh.: NBch. **mam-* “to forget” [Skn.] = **man-* (?) [GT] > Siri & Jmb. *mama*, *Miya man-*, *Mburku mamw-*, *Pa’a mbambur-* (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 22), which are to be derived rather from PCh. **m-n()*- “to forget” [NM].

NB5: A remote connection to the Ch. root (perhaps **m-w-h*?) for “drunken, intoxicated” (lit. **“confused”*) is not to be ruled out, cf. WCh.: Hausa *mààyéé* “intoxication” [Abr. 1962, 670] || CCh.: Mofu *mōwaha* & Mboku *māhay i vān* “(s’en)ivre(r)” [Mch. 1953, 177] || ECh.: Bdy. *miyaw* “s’enivrer” [AJ 1989, 99], Mgm. *mòwòwò* “s’enivrer” [JA 1992, 107] | Jegu *miw-* (*miwa*, *miyaw*) “betrunken sein” [Jng. 1961, 115].

● Other etymologies cannot be accepted.

■ 1. In Egyptian philology (Ceugney 1880, 7; Grapow 1914, 26; Feichtner 1932, 220; Vycichl 1933, 179), it was traditionally derived from Eg. *whj* “entgehen, verfehlen” (Wb) with an *m-* prefix, which Feichtner identified with the AA prefix **m-* of reciprocity (*Gegenseitigkeit*) presuming Eg. **m-whj* to originate from a literal signification “*der Gedanke*’ und *der Denkende*’ verfehlen einander”, in which “*die zwei Subjektsbegriffe*, *Vergessender*’ und *Vergessenes*’ in Wechselbeziehung stehen” (sic).

■ 2. A. Ember (1913, 117, #65; 1930, #10.c.2, #13.c) and H. Holma (1919, 39) risked to combine Eg. *mhj* with Akk. *mašû* (Ass. *mašāʾum*) D “vergessen” [AHW 631] || WSem. **nšy* “to forget” [GT], but Eg. -h- ≠ Sem. *-š-. This idea was correctly declined by F. Calice (1936, #635). NB1: Cp. Hbr. *nšy qal* “vergessen” [GB 526], OAram. *nšy itpael* “to be forgotten” [DNWSI 764] | Ar. *nasiya* “oublier” [BK II 1254] || MSA **nhy* from **nšy* [GT]:

Hrs. anhō “to forget” [Jns. 1977, 95], Mehri inf. nehīyōn “to forget” [Ember], Sq̄t. niši [Jns.] || Geez nahsäyā, Tigre näsa “to forget” (ES: Lsl. 1969, 20).

NB2: As H. Holma (l.c.) confessed, the correspondence of Eg. h ~ Sem. *š “*ist bis jetzt allerdings nicht belegt*”. Ember saw justification of the supposed shift of Eg. *msj > mhj in Mehri nhy. But Eg. -h- has nothing to do with Mehri -h-, which is a secondary inner Sem. innovation.

- **3.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 304, #581) affiliated it with Ar. mħk “to enervate (by sexual intercourse)” and SCu. *māh- “to be sterile” < AA *māh- “not to be able (to do)”. Semantically untenable.

mhwj ~ mhw.t (pl. **mhwj.w?**) “etwas Flüssiges, ob: Zerlassenes, Geschmolzenes (Fett) (?): 1. als Bestandteil zus.gesetzter Medikamente, 2. als etwas, das in die Ohren geträufelt wird” (Med., Wb II 114, 1–4) = “se fondre” (Maspero quoted by Ceugney 1880, 7) = “1. milk (not the usual word for it), 2. possibly also cream of milk, 3. an ingredient produced by or made of fat or ointment or grease (in mhwj n mrħ.t), 4. perhaps also a verb (in Med. Pap. Illahun 3:4)” (Breasted 1930, 287) = “(en somme) une drogue à effet laxatif” (Jonckheere 1947, 16, fn. 2) = “crème” (Lefébvre in WÄDN 280) = “Stoff aus ranzigem Milchfett (?)” (GHWb 351) = “un nom de fluide” (Meeks 1999, 581) = “ein Teil der Milch, vielleicht der Rahm” (Koura 1999, 199).

NB1: Cf. also mhw.t ~ mhwj (grain det.) “etwas Körniges (offizinell verwendet)” (Med., Wb II 114, 5), which is treated in WÄDN 279 as one and the same word. The same may hold true of mhj.wt (grain det.) “Art Frucht (zwischen Weihrauch und Asphalt bzw. zwischen Feigen und Kräutern)” (XX. hapax: only Pap. Harris 64c:11 & 19a:8, Wb II 114, 6; Helck MWNR 759).

NB2: P. Wilson assumed in mh3j “a liquid (in a palette offering)” (GR Edfu IV 299:10, PL 448) a late trace of the same word, which D. Meeks (1999, 581) received with scepticism (“*me paraît des plus hasardeux*”) being disposed to suppose that it “*pourrait désigner soit l'eau du godet soit le godet lui-même*”).

- Exact mng. obscure. But what we have learnt about it seems to (be) corroborate(d by) the suggestion by W. W. Müller (1961, 202, #8) who identified Eg. mhwj with the reflexes of Sem. *mhw “to (be) melt(ed)” [GT]. Especially the Ar. root is remarkable from a semantic viewpoint.

NB1: Attested in Syr. mēhā “to be cooked” [Lsl. after Brk. 1928, 376] | Ar. mahuwa “être clair et aqueux (se dit du lait, etc.)”, II “étendre, délayer en ajoutant de l'eau, allonger, p.ex. une sauce, rendre clair, aqueux”, muhā-t- “sperme, liqueur fécondante du mâle”, mahw- “2. clair, fin, qui n'est pas épais, 3. lait clair, aqueux, délayé d'eau, 4. beurre qui contient beaucoup de parties aqueuses, 6. petites pierres minces, brillantes et transparentes, 7. perles, 8. (coll.) dattes fraîches et molles” [BK II 1164] = “to be liquid, waterish” [Zbr.] = “to be watery (milk)” [Lsl.], Yemeni Ar. mhy: miħī “to become soft, be softened, mollified, dissolve, melt” [Piamenta 1990, 473] = miħi (sic) “to be soft” [Müller, Lsl.] || Geez mhw: mehewa “se dissoudre” [CR] = mähwā “schmelzen, verflüssigen” [Müller] = mähwa ~ mahawa ~ mahāwa “to melt (intr.), be liquefied, dissolved, dwindle”, mähw “melted fluid” [Lsl.], Tigre māha “to (be) melt(ed)” [Lsl. after LH 106], Harari mōħa “to (be) melt(ed)” [Lsl.], Amh.

māwā ~ muāmuā “se dissoudre” [CR] = m^wa alā ~ m^wamm^wa “to (be) melt(ed)” [Lsl.], Grg.-Zway māmū “to be melted (butter, honey)” [Lsl.] etc. (Sem.: Lsl. 1963, 105; 1982, 50; 1987, 334–5; 1988, 96).

NB2: The ES root was borrowed into Cu., cf. NAgaw: Qemant maw ~ mag “se dissoudre” [CR 1912, 234], Hamir maw “se dissoudre” [CR] = maw-^{au} “Schmalz”, maw “flüssig werden” [Hhnb. 1978, 45 with false cognates] | SAgaw: Awngi mom-^{ij} “to be dissolved” [Htz. 1969, 102] = maw- (sic) “to dissolve” [Skn.] || LECu.: Orm. māma^wa “to dissolve” [Gragg 1982, 270] = “to (be) melt(ed)” [Lsl.] = mām-^{awa} (sic) [Hds. 1989, 51]. The comparison with Bed. mū[?], pl. mi[?] “Feuchtigkeit, Nässe”, mi[?] “feucht, naß, flüssig sein” [Rn. 1895, 161] (suggested often by W. Leslau l.c.) cannot be accepted (Bed. -[?] ≠ Sem. *-h-). Any connection to HECu.: Gedeo mi[?]e ~ me[?]e “fresh/warm milk” [Hds. 1989, 99]? N. Skinner’s (1995, 30) proposal, in turn, on the derivation of the Bed. & Awngi forms from AA *m-w/y- “hunger, death” (!) is absurd.

NB3: Sem. *mhw may be akin to LECu.: Somali māh- “hervorquellen, fließen”, māh “frisches, fließendes Wasser” [Rn. 1902, 289] || WCh.: AS *m^wa₂ [orig. *m^wā₂ < *m^wa₂h[?]] “(milky) sap, juice” [GT 2004, 256]: Angas mwēe (so, long -ee, false[?]) “sap, milky juice” [Flk. 1915, 250] = mwe (Ks) “juice, sap” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27], perhaps Mpn. mwà gór “pimple” (cf. perhaps gór “bachelor, spinster”) [Frj. 1991, 39], Kfy. mwà “mothers milk” [Ntg. 1967, 27], Gmy. mua “a liquid substance”, mua toeng “the sap of a tree” (toeng “tree”), mua nšii “honey (i.e. liquid of bees)” (nšii “bee”), mua yer “milk” (yer “breast”) [Srl. 1937, 145] = mua (or mûa) [mûa reg. < *m^wa] “sap of a tree” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 23] || CCh.: perhaps Hurzo mòháy “alcoholic beverage (also beer)” [Rsg. 1978, 199, §8].

NB4: Th. Nöldeke (1910, 170) saw in Sem. *mhw a denom. derivative from the common Sem. *may (sic) “water”. Similarly, A. Zaborski (1971, #139) treated both Ar. mhw and mwh: māha “avoir beaucoup d’eau (se dit d’un puits)” [BK II 1169] = “aquam multam habere (putens)” [Möller] = “to be abundant in water” [Zbr.] as denom. verbs from Ar. mā[?]-, pl. ?amwāh-. Accepting this for the case of Ar., W. Leslau, however, suggested a different etymology for Geez (where, in his view, “the enlargement through -h- does not occur” and thus “this procedure does not apply”), cf. Ar. mahha “traiter avec douceur, avec humanité (ses bestiaux, etc.)”, mahiha “être doux” [BK II 1159]. H. Möller (1911, 169) erroneously treated Sem. *-h as a C₃ root ext.

NB4: The cognacy of Ug. mhy-t is unlikely. It has been rendered and etymologized very diversely (cf. Watson 2002, 798, §6): “rain” < √hyh expressing “l’idée de la chute de la neige... ou de la pluie” [Badre et al., Syria 53, 1976, 121–2] = “meadow, watered place, fertile land” < my “water” (!) [DLU 267].

NB5: Remotely related may be also Sem. *mhl, which seems to have a C₃ root ext. *-l, cf. Hbr. māhūl “(vinum) castratum, verfälscht, schwach” [GB 403] = “watered down, diluted (with the addition of water)” [KB 552], PB Hbr. māhal “langsam fließen” > mōhal “1. Saft, das Flüßige, Ausgeschwitzte” [Levy 1924 III, 37] = mōhal “broth with oil” [Lów/KB], JAram. mhl “to dilute wine with water” [KB], JPAram. mhl “to dilute” [Sokoloff 1990, 294] | Ar. mahala “être lent, doux” > muhl- “2. cuire fondu, 3. huile ou marc d’huile, 4. goudron, pox liquide, 5. sanie d’un cadavre” [BK II 1163] = muhul- “Fruchtsaft” [Barth/GB 403 & Nöldeke, ZDMG 40, 741] = muhl- “fruit-juice”, mahl- “liquid asphalt” [KB].

- Other etymologies cannot be accepted:
- 1. C. Ceugney (1880, 7) saw in it an m- prefix derivative of Eg. hh “flamme” (!).

- **2.** F. Jonckheere (1947, 16, fn. 2) separated its var. mh3wt (in Pap. Ch. Beatty VI rt. 1:1–7) which he explained from Eg. h3j “descendre” with a prefix m- (lit. “ce qui fait descendre”).
- **3.** W. Westendorf (1962, 35, §51.8) assumed in its var. mhn (Med. XIX., Wb II 115, 4) “*eine mögliche Wiedergabe von*” *mhl (contra Wb l.c.: “*anscheinend irrig für mhwj*”), on the basis of which he surmised an etymological connection to Eg. mhr ~ mhn ~ mhj “Milch(gefäß)” vs. “melken” (sic, q.v.) with an interchange of n ~ j ~ w ~ 3 (sic). P. Wilson (PL 448) had apparently a similar idea. False.

mhn “Art Kiste aus Holz” (late NK, Wb II 115, 1) = “Truhe” (Edel) = “chest, coffer” (AEO I 68, II 212*, #440) = “Kästchen, auch als Ausfuhr” (Helck MWNR 304) = “chest (made of wood)” (Wente 1967, 73, n. 1) = “(may have been) a rather rough, though not too small chest (used for i.a. grain)” (Janssen 1975, 207–8, §45) = “Kiste, Kasten” (NBÄ 322, 867–8, n. 1385) = “coffin” (Smith 1979, 161) = “wooden chest” (DLE I 230).

nb1: Appears also in an Amarna cuneiform list of gifts (EA 14, 4:20–22 & 4:34) as ma-ḥa-an “Gefäß aus ušū-Holz (hinter Gefäßen aus Elfenbein erwähnt)” [Ranke] = “an ebony or, at least, wooden object: a type of wooden chest” [Lambdin 1953, 366, §17] = “Kasten, Truhe (aus Ebenholz)” [Edel 1988, 106–109, #5] = “a type of wooden chest” [CAD m2, 50; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1997, 99–100], which had earlier been mistakenly explained by H. Ranke (KMAV 23) from NK mhn “ein Gefäß” (Ranke) = “rare name of a vessel” (Lambdin) < mhr “Milchkrug” (Wb, q.v.).

nb2: Vocalized as *māhan (NBÄ).

nb3: Attestation before NK problematic. Cf. perhaps CT V 190a mhnn.w (and CT V 205h mhj?) (both wood det.) “(mng. unknown)” (AECT II 49, III 203 index; DCT 174) = “partie du navire” (AL 78.1806) = “1. (190a) (mng. unknown), 2. (205h) (mentioned in connection with mast and fittings)” (Jones 1988, 168, §69 & §70, resp.) = “1. (190a) les cordages, 2. (205h) (son) coffre (?)” (Barguet 1986, 360, spell 404 vs. p. 363, spell 405, resp.) = “Kasten für Taue” (GHWb 351) = “als Holzteile des Schiffes im Zshg. mit den Teilen des Mastes” (Dürring 1995, 88)?

- Clearly (cf. Wb l.c.; NBÄ 322; Smith 1979, 161) an m- prefix form derived from Eg. hn ~ var. hn.w “Kasten” (OK, Wb II 491–492) = “box, coffer, chest” (Smith 1987, 127–8), whose etymology is still unclear.

nb: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1713) compared Eg. mhn with Akk. maḥḥalu “ein Korb oder Kasten (?)”, cf. maḥḥaltu “Sieb” [AHW 582], which is a grave error for several reasons: i.a., **(1)** this is a nomen instr. (*ma-nḥal-) of Akk. naḥālu “(durch)sieben” [AHW] (for which cf. rather Eg. nqr “to sieve”), **(2)** only the first consonants correspond (Eg. -h- ≠ Akk. -ḥ- and Eg. -n proven by the Amarna evidence ≠ Akk. -l either). Rejected by G. Takács (1997, 113, #1713; 1999, 112). For further discussion of the Akk. word see Eg. mhjr (below).

mhn.t (GW) “l’altération de la peau, peut-être un effet de venin sur la peau: ulcération (?)” (XXX. or Ptol.: Pap. Brooklyn 47.218.48, Sauneron 1989, 84–85, §60, n. 1 & p. 235 index).

- S. Sauneron (l.c.) hesitated to explain it via prefix m- from an Eg. simplex like hnj.t “une partie de la coloquinthe d3r.t” (Pap. Ebers 109:10) = “Art Schröpfkopf” (WMT II 567), which “*ne fournit pas guère de sens*”. Instead, he was pondering whether it was a late NWSem. loan e.g. from Hbr. mōhālā “maladie, infirmité”, whose sense is, however, too general.

mhr > var. (XVIII.) **mhj** ~ (XIX.) **mhn** “Milchkrug, 1. auch als Maß gebraucht, 2. auch aus Metall als Tempelgerät” (MK, Wb II 115, 5; GHWb 351) = “jarre, quantité, mesure d’un vase contenant du lait. du vin” (Ceugney 1880, 7 after Brugsch) = “récipient pour le lait (les plus anciens vases de ce genre, à anse mobile, ont le fond plat ou rond; ce n’est qu’à partir de la XXII^e dynastie que ce généralisa l’usage de les orner dans le bas d’un bouton, ce qui, à l’époque grecque, fit dire que les vases à lait avaient la forme du sein)” (Daressy 1917, 83) = “bassin, vase pour le lait” (Langlois 1919, 161 & fn. 3) = “1. (the common word for) milk vessel, 2. also a type of situla” (Lichtheim, JNES 6, 1947, 173 & fn. 33 pace Daressy; Evrard-Derriks & Quaegebeur, CdE 54, 1979, 49, fn. 4; WD III 54, rejected by P. Wilson in PL 448) = “milk-jug” (AEO I 66*, #153; Caminos 1954 LEM, 469; PL 448) = “milk-jar” (FD 113) = “Bottich, Maß für Milch” (Helck, LÄ III 1203) = “Melkkrug (pot à traire)” (DELIC 307).

nb1: Not this word is reflected in the Amarna letter EA 14, 4:20–22 & 4:34 (as falsely suggested by H. Ranke, KMAV 23), cf. Edel 1988, 106, §5.

nb2: Attested once already in Dyn. VI (Cairo 43371 stela, cf. ASAE 17, 1917, 163 & Urk. I 254) and once in the 1st IMP (MDAIK 50, 1994, 73, pl. 9), cf. ÄwB I 548.

nb3: Determinated in the GR with the hrgl. W19 (phon. value mr > mj) rendered “Milchtopf mit der Tragschlinge/Tragnetz” (Wb) = “milk-jug as carried in a net” (EG 1927, 514) = “Jochgefäß” (Faltings 1998, 20 following P. Montet 1925, 259). As pointed out by D. Faltings (l.c.), the det. of the MK ex. of mhr (from Meir) was, however, not identical with the hrgl. W19 (as suggested by A. H. Gardiner in EG 1927, 514) but depicted in fact “*ein typischer, länglicher Milchtopf des AR, allerdings ohne Grasbüschelverschluss*”. M. Lichtheim (1947, 173 & fn. 33–34) admitted that mhr could have occasionally denoted a situla (namely “a certain type of situla, the broad-shouldered, narrow-necked shape” that “*is primarily a milk vessel because of its regular appearance in the milk-sprinkling ceremony*”), although the “*support for this is not evident*” (cf. inscriptions of Thotmes III in Urk. IV 172:12, 743:15 contra Urk. III 123, “*where milk vessels of silver are listed twice, and in both cases the det. for mhn are not situlae*”).

nb4: For a very late ex. of mhn (hieratic wooden tablet Varille, 2nd year of Alexander the Great) cf. Jasnow 1994, 107, n. v (with further lit.). The shift of NK mhn < MK

mhr has been explained by G. Fecht (1960, 9, fn. 25 & 26) with the “*assimilatorische Einwirkung von m- auf -rr-*” (!), cf. Eg. *mr-wr* > *mn-wr* “Mnevis”, and also before *n*, cf. *npr.t* “Getreidekorn” ~ *npr* “Getreide”.

- From the same root:

(1) mhr “Melker” (late NK, Grapow 1914, 26; GHWb 351) = “milkman” (Grd. 1911, 20*, fn. 7; AEO I 64*).

NB: Cf. also *mh3* (GW) “eine Personenbez.” (late NK, Wb II 44, 9) = “ein Beruf: *Melker” (GHWb 326).

(2) mhr (denom.?) “1. melken, 2. Milch saugen, 3. Milch geben (Kuh), 4. säugen, ein Kind stillen (mit Milch, mit den Brüsten)” (GR, Wb II 115, 9–16; WD II 66: cf. RdE 7, 1950, 69, n. 9) = “to provide with milk” (Grd. 1911, 20*, fn. 7; cf. Piehl in Sphinx 4, 12–14) = “to suckle, milk” (PL 448).

- Etymology disputable.

- 1. In Egyptian philology, traditionally derived as an *m-* prefix form from the rare Eg. *hr* “melken” (late NK Mag. hapax, Wb II 498, 3; GHWb 495), whose existence has been doubted by P. Wilson (PL 448: “*not attested*”). Dubious also for NK *mhn* can hardly agree with Cpt. *-p-*.

LIT.: Grapow (1914, 139 emphasizing his reservations); Gardiner (AEO I 64*); Smith (1979, 161); Vycichl (DELC 307); Faltings (1998, 20, fn. 78).

NB: J. Černý (CED 291) reaffirmed the rendering of LEg. *hr* “to milk” with a further late NK occurrence: Horus & Seth 10:7 (“*the meaning is certain*”). R. Hannig (AWb I 751), in addition, has two OK exx. from Dyn. V. This is supported also by Cpt. (SB) *ḳwḫ* “to squeeze out milk, milk” (CD 697b) = “melken” (KHW 385) = “traire” (DELC 307). This Eg. root has only a semantically weak Sem. etymology (offered by Albright 1918, 222, #1; Ember 1930, #12.a.30, 13.a.9), cf. Ar. *hrr* “to flow” and *nhr* (prefix *n-*?) “to flow”.

- 2. P. Langlois (1919, 161–2) assumed in NK *mhr* an “*orthographie nouvelle*” of OEg. *mr* “Topf für Milch” (PT, Wb, above). This derivation of MK *mhr* from the “obsolete” PT *mr* (late OK *mj*, cf. AÄG §30 & §128) was firmly rejected by D. Faltings (1998, 20) as “*zweifelhaft*” wondering “*wie sollte ein Lautwandel von mj (auch wenn es aus mr entstanden ist) zu mhr aussehen?*”.

- 3. V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 198; HSED #1709) supposed Eg. *mhr* to be cognate with WCh. **m^war-* (sic) “to suck” [Stl.] based solely on Angas moor “to suck” [Flk.]. Uncertain especially because LEg. *mhr* “säugen” (Wb) seems a denom. verb, but not to be ruled out fully.

NB1: The underlying AS root was in fact **moyor* (var. **muḫur* in Msr.?) [GT 2004, 250]: its basic sense presumably refers to the (stirring?) movement of the jaw when chewing and sucking. This original meaning “to stir (?)” has been preserved in Msr. *kam mukur* [< **muḫur*] “stirring stick”, cf. *ka tung ngwom ku kam mukur* “you stir the food with a stirring stick” (*kam* “stick”) [Dkl. 1997 MS]. Elsewhere, it is attested with the sense (1) “to suck”, cf. Angas moor “to suck” [Flk. 1915, 246]

= mor “to eat” (so!) (\approx Hs. šáá “to drink”, Abr.) [ALC 1978, 39], Kfy. mogór “to suck” [Ntg. 1967, 27], perhaps Msr. mukur (so, -u-) “soaking something like sweat” (lit. “sucking in, absorbing of ...”) [Dkl. 1997 MS, 185], Gmy. mââl [mool reg. < *ma₃ya₃l or *moyol, irreg. -l < *-r] “2. to suck” [Srl. 1937, 132] vs. (2) “to chew”, cf. Sura mòyòr “etwas im Mund bewegen” [Jng. 1963, 75], Gmy. mââl [mool reg. < *ma₃ya₃l or *moyol, irreg. -l < *-r] “1. to chew” [Srl. 1937, 132].

NB2: If the hypothetical basic sense of the AS root is correct, it might be alternatively compared with Ar. mwr “s’agiter et aller çà et là (se dit de l’eau dont les vagues sont en mouvement)” [BK II 1166], which excludes the Eg-AS etymology.

- **4.** GT: cp. perhaps CCh.: PMasa *mīra [*-ī- < *-ih-?] “milk” [GT] (Ch. reflexes discussed s.v. Eg. mr “Topf für Milch”, PT, Wb, q.v.)? NB: We find promising extra-Ch. (Ar., LECu., Rift) parallels also, which, however, show no trace of *-h- and seem to be in better phonological agreement with Eg. mr.
- **5.** GT: or cp. LECu.: PSam *māl “to milk” [Heine 1978, 68; 1976, 218] (reflexes discussed s.v. Eg. mr “Topf für Milch”, PT, Wb, q.v.)? NB: The long *-ā- of PSam *māl might be explained from an earlier (pre-PECu.) *mahl- via compensatoric lengthening due to a lost medial laryngeal (cf. Takács 2000, 197f), while its final *-l would justify the late interchange of Eg. mhr ~ mhn ~ mh3 (reflecting *mhl?).
- **6.** GT: irreg. (*mhl ~ *myl?) cognate of Ar. maḃila I & IV “allaïter un enfant étant enceinte d’un autre”, maḃl- ~ maḃal- “lait d’une femelle ou d’une femme grosse d’un nouveau foetus” [BK II 1133]?
- Other etymologies are evidently out of question:
- **7.** C. Ceugney (1880, 7) saw in its NK (XIX.) var. mhn (!) an m-prefix form of Eg. hn.w “mesure”. Incorrect as the alternance of Eg. -r ~ -n is late and secondary.
- **8.** F. Behnk (1928, 139) compared its var. mhn with LECu.: Saho-Irob han, pl. hanun “milk”. To be declined for the same reason.
- **9.** L. Homburger (1930, 284): ~ Ful ḥir-de “traire”. Absurd.
- **10.** F. Kammerzell (1999, 250, t. 15) affiliated Eg. mhl- (sic) “Milch” (sic) with Sem. *ḥlb ~ *ḥlm. Absurd. Eg. -h- \neq Sem. *ḥ-.

mhr “Säugling”, cf. mhr ḥn.t “Zögling der Anat (vom König als Krieger)” (XIX., GR, Wb II 116, 1) = “suckling” (Grd. 1911, 20*, fn. 7; RT 18, 162) = “Säugling, Junges”, cf. mhr ḥn.t “Kind der Anat” (GHWb 351) = “suckling, child” (PL 448).

- Origin not evident.
- **1.** Usually (Grd. 1911, 20*, fn. 7; Grapow 1914, 26; PL 448) derived from Eg. mhr “melken” (GR, Wb, q.v.). Dubious, since the verb has no certain attestation before the Ptol.
- **2.** GT: its contamination with a part. of Eg. mhr as well as its eventual cognacy with Sem. *muhr- “animale giovane” [Frz. 1968

V, 292, #5.45] = “жеребенок” [Mlt. in MM 1983, 246, §2.12] cannot be ruled out.

NB1: Attested in Akk. *mūru* “Eselfohlen, Jungtier”, hence *mī/ērānu* (late var. *mūrānu*) “junger Hund, Welp, Junges von Löwe oder Hyäne” [AHW 658, 677] = “Tierjunges” [Möller] = (OAkk.) *mūrum* “a young animal” [Gelb 1973, 167] | Syr. *muhrō* “puledro” [Frz.] || OSA (Sab.) *mhr-t* “filly” [SD 84], Ar. *mhr-* “1. poulain, 2. (en gén.) petit (en parlant de tout animal)” [BK II 1161] = “the first male offspring of a mare or other animal” [Möller] = “Füllen” [AHW] = “puledro” [Frz.] = “poulain, premier petit d’une bête” [Gelb] (Sem.: Frz. l.c.).

NB2: H. Möller (1911, 167) erroneously equated the Sem. word with Akk. *māru* “son”, which represents a distinct Sem. root (*mar²-), cf. Eg. *m3j* (q.v.). A.Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 246, §2.12), in turn, assumed an eventual kinship with Sem. **mhr* “to be skilled, quick” [Djk.-Kogan 1995, #1710] = **mahir-* “svelto” [Frz. l.c.] (for which cf. the following entry).

mhr (GW) “Bez. eines jungen Helden oder seiner Betätigung” (late NK, Wb II 116, 3; WD III 54 with lit.) = some kind of officer, possibly what we should call a military engineer” (Goodwin 1858, 267) = “velox, celer, promptus” (Chabas 1866, 81–82) = “äg. Titel des Reisenden” (Lauth 1871, 634, §130) = “(must be the technical name given to) an emissary in Syria” (Grd. 1911, 20*, fn. 7) = “der ägyptische Offizier, der in Syrien umherzieht” (Erman 1923, 286) = “Egyptian courier to foreign lands” (Wilson, ANET 477, n. 27) = “young hero” (Gordon 1955, 287, #1075) = “Bote” (Helck 1962, 561) = “Eilbote” (Brunner, declined by Fischer-Elfert 1986, 161, 244–5, cf. also LÄ IV 677) = “not a type of soldier: 1. (in military context it describes) the swiftness of soldiers, 2. (in non-military contexts simply a verb/adv.)” (Couroyer 1964, 443–453) = “soldier, charioteer (a virtual synonym of *maryannu*)” (Rainey in JNES 24, 1965, 24 and JNES 26, 1967, 58f.) = “(refers to) the chariotry personnel, possibly used as the counterpart of the Eg. designation ‘runner’, intelligence and reconnaissance officer (Streitwagenkämpfer, Truppenführer und Aufklärer)” (Schulman 1966, 127–9; MÄS 6, 1964, 48) = “Krieger” (Helck 1971, 514) = “warrior (?), messenger, reconnaissance officer, soldier scribe” (DLE I 230) = “Streitwagenfahrer, Aufklärer, vorgeschobener Beobachter mit Aufklärungsaufgaben” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 245, 300 index) = “(acted as a) scribe, information gatherer and warrior” (Zorn 1991, 133) = “warrior” (Cochavi-Rainey & Sivan 1992, 81) = “military officer commanding troops and handling logistics” (Hoch 1994, 147–9, §190; cf. also Vittmann 1997, 283 with further lit.) = “*Späher (der Armée, der das Land kennt), *Feldvermesser, Agrimensor (führen Armee im Ausland)” (GHWb 351).

NB1: Its duties and characteristics were summed up by Zorn (1991, 133) as follows (cf. also Fischer-Elfert 1986, 144–6): (1) trained as a scribe, (2) able to give reports on

his travels, (3) a soldier equipped with a bow (*the* weapon of the chariotry), quiver, and a knife, (4) could also lead troops, (5) equated with the maryannu or chariot-warriors, (6) expected to possess a broad geographical knowledge (major towns, roads, passes, fords from the Eg. border to Hatti, the distances involved and the dangers on the way. Rainey (1967, 58–60) discussed arguments against rendering Eg. *zš mhr* (Pap. Anastasi I 18:4) as OT Hbr. *sōper māhīr* “expert (swift) scribe”, which he regards as an “all-too-simple equation” (suggesting that Can. *mahr “was some type of soldier, perhaps the Sem. counterpart of maryannu”).

NB2: For a detailed list of the exx. of Eg. mhr with sources see Zorn (1991, 133–4, fn. 35–48) and Hoch (1994, 147, §190).

NB3: Its child det. was borrowed from mhr “Säugling” (XIX., Wb, q.v.), cf. RT 18, 162; Grd. 1911, 20*, fn. 7. But both mhr terms may be etymologically distinct. B. Couroyer (1964, 443f.) rightly rejected the derivation of Eg. mhr of *this* entry from hr “to milk”.

NB4: The forms written in GW were vocalized by W. Helck (1971, 514, #103) as *mahar and by J. Hoch (l.c.) as *mahīra, which A. F. Rainey (1998, 441–3, §190) regarded as “baseless”. Similarly, G. Vittmann (l.c.) reconstructed Eg. *mahir. Instead, Rainey (1967, 59; Israel Exploration Journal 19, 1969, 107) proposed (following W. F. Albright) an original vocalisation *mahr > *mahar (with the added anaptyctic vowel) reflecting the pattern of Hbr. *hākām* “wise” or *yāšār* “righteous”. Z. Cochavi-Rainey & D. Sivan (1992, 81) reconstructed LEg. *mahar. H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1986, 244) too assumed a NWSem. etymon *mahr (sic). This might be in principle corroborated by Amarna ^hpa-ma-ḥa-a (EA 162, 74), for which various interpretations have been proposed (e.g., Albright 1937, 200, n. 4: < p3 mḥ-jb “the commissioner”, for further details cf. Eg. mḥ.j.t), and which was recently identified by J. Zorn (1991, 131–8) as an Egyptianized form of NWSem. *mahar (pronounced in the 14th cent. BC as */maha/) + p3 (definite article), lit. “the soldier”. Zorn’s (1991, 133) assumption that the -r in Eg. “at the end was no longer pronounced” and its writing was purely due to a “frozen spelling in the traditional writing” is, however, not satisfactory (even when one can easily agree with Z. Cochavi-Rainey 1997, 105–6 in that “the absence of the final -r is easier to accept than the supposed absence of the final -b in Albright’s suggestion”), since it could have been the case only when the NWSem. had been present in the Eg. vocabulary for long centuries before the end of the 14th cent. BC (as supposed by Zorn), which would be an anachronism, and if Eg. mhr had thus undergone the same erosion process of OK -r > MK -j > late NK -Ø as the native Eg. words. Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1997, 105–6) sees the proof of the final -j in question in the wtg. of the LEg. PN mhrj (XX., cf. Ranke PN II 292:1), which, however, may be rather a reflection of OT PN mahray (one of David’s mighty men).

NB5: Attested also as mhrn (KRI III 370:4), cf. Meeks 1997, 41, §190.

NB6: LEg. mhr is supposed to have survived until the Ptol. and Roman times, when it appeared in Edfu (I 180, I 203, IV 234) as mhr.w (pl.) “Bez. der Genossen des Seth” (Wb II 116, 5) = “Seth and his associates” (PL 448) and in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as mhr.w (pl.) “die Feinde (in der Liste von verderbenbringenden Wesen, neben ḥp-Feinden usw.), als Bez. für die Genossen des Seth (≈ ḥftj.w)” (Osing 1998, 100, n. d & fn. 458, p. 286–7, n. o & fn. 1354). As pointed out by P. Wilson (PL), this shift of meaning of Eg. mhr applied to the allies of Seth may have occurred “either because of its military and fighting associations or because it represents a foreign soldier”.

- A NWSem. loan, cf. esp. Ug. mhr “serviceman, soldier” [Gordon] = “Dienstmann, Junker, Soldat” [WUS] = “soldier, young hero (?)” [Segert 1984, 191] = “hero’s vigor or courage” [Zorn 1991, 135–6], cf. Ug. mhr st “drunken soldier” [Ginsberg] = “ready in battle” [Driver] = “Sutean warrior” [Margalit] = “warrior of the Lady”

[Gibson] = “champion of (the Eg. god) St” (sic) [Grdseloff] (for Ug. cf. Zorn 1991, 136; Watson 1993, 217 with further lit.) as well as Punic mhr “warrior” [Hoch] | OSA t-mhr-t “contingent of Bedouin mercenaries” [Lsl.] = “elite troops” [Hoch]. Ug. mhr may have properly meant “skilled, trained” (or the like), being cognate with Sem. *mhr “gewandt, erfahren” [WUS] = “to be skilled” [Ullendorff].

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Goodwin 1858, 267; Chabas 1866, 81–82; Grd. 1911, 20*, fn. 7; Erman 1923, 286; Gordon 1955, 287, #1075; Ward 1961, 39, #24; Helck 1962, 561; Couroyer 1964, 443–453; Zorn 1991, 131–8; Hoch 1994, 147–149, #190.

NB1: For the wider Sem. relationship of the NWSem. term, cf., e.g., Hbr. mähir “gewandt, geschickt” [GB] = “quick, skilled, expert, practised” [Ullendorff, VT 6, 1965, 195], Imp. Aram. mhyr “capable, skillful” [Lsl.], Syr. mähira “geschickt” [GB] = “skill, knowledge” [Ullendorff] = “trained, skillful” [Lsl.] | OSA mhr (part of PNs) “(perhaps) skill, expertness” [Ullendorff] = “Handwerker (?)” [Müller 1963, 311], Ar. mahara “être habile dans qqch., savoir faire qqch. avec habileté” [BK II 1160–1] = “begabt, tüchtig sein” [GB] = “to be skilled” [Lsl.] || Eth.-Sem. *mhr “to teach” [Lsl.] > i.a. Geez mahara ~ mähra “üben, lehren” [GB] = “to teach, instruct, educate, train, discipline” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Gordon 1955, 287, #1075; Ullendorff 1956, 195; WUS #1532; Lsl. 1987, 334; Hoch l.c.).

NB2: F. Chabas (quoted by Lauth l.c. and Gardiner l.c.: “*very uncertain, but has not been bettered*”) and W. Helck (1971, 514, #103) explained Eg. mhr directly from Hbr. mhr piel “1. eilen, 2. schnell bringen, schnell fertig machen”, mähira “Eile, Schnelligkeit” [GB 403], although it is treated in GB as a distinct root akin to Ar. mhl II & V “voransehen”, mahal- “Vorangehen” [GB]. Still, in the light of the pun between Eg. 3s “schnell” vs. mhr in Pap. Anastasi I 27:9 “wegen der Synonimität beider Wörter” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 234–5), there must have been an etymological connection to Hbr. mhr piel “eilen”, which (along with rendering Eg. mhr as “courier”/“Eilbote”), in spite of the pun, was firmly denied by H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1986, 244–5).

NB3: Ignoring the Sem. cognates of Ug. mhr “serviceman, soldier”, V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1710) erroneously connected it with WCh.: Ron: Kulere mahor, Daffö-Butura moor “slave” || CCh.: Lame muhor “immigrant”. This false Ug.-Ch. comparison has been rightly rejected by I. M. D’jakonoff & L. Kogan (1995 MS, #1710). Besides, for Ron “slave” see Eg. mrrt above.

mhr (GW) “Kaufpreis” (XIX.: Pap. Anastasi I, Fischer-Elfert 1986, 213, 219–220) = “Brautpreis” (Quack 1996, 512).

- Explained by H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (l.c.) from Hbr. mohar “der Kaufpreis, den der Bräutigam an den Vater der Braut zahlte” [GB 403] = “bride-money, an indemnity for the bride’s family” [KB 554], cf. also Ar. mahr- “dot qu’on assure à la femme qu’on épouse” [BK II 1161] = “Morgengabe” [GVGSS I 194, §74]. His rendering was doubted by J.-F. Quack (l.c.): “*im Kontext nicht zweifelsfrei*”.

mhrn (GW) “praise” (XX. hapax: Ostr. DeM 429, 3, Hoch 1994, 149).

NB: Read by W. Helck (1962, 565, #158) as hrn (ha-ri-na), which, however, “*makes little sense*” in Hoch’s view, who assumed *mahalāla.

- J. Hoch (l.c.) explained it from Hbr. *mahālāl “praise, recognition by others, reputation” [KB 552] = “praise (of a person), what others think (of a person)” [Hoch] < Sem. *hll “to praise”.

***mhl** (?) > Dem. mhl “kahl” (hapax: Pap. Bibl. Nat. 218, Spg. KHW 70; DG 171) = “bald in front” ≈ Gk. ἀναφάλαντος (CED) = “chauve” (DELIC) > Cpt. (A) ΜΕΖΗΛ “bald place (on head)” (CD 211b; CED 99) = “Glatze” (Spg. l.c. after Lemm) = “kahle Stelle (am Kopf)” (Till 1937, 138) = “kahle Stelle (des Kopfes), Glatze” (KHW 111) = “calvitie” (DELIC 132).

- Etymology debatable:

- **1.** E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 53, 162), followed by W. Westendorf (KHW 111) saw in it a late loan from Bed. melhái “Kahlköpfigkeit” [Zhl.] = melhāy “calvitie” [Vcl.] = melhai (m) “1. scar due to abrasion, 2. baldness due to injury” [Hds. 1996 MS, 93] < lehi “abschälen, abrinden”, leh “kahl, abgerindet sein” [Rn. 1895, 156] = lehe “to be(come) bald (usually on top of head only)”, ləhei (f) “baldness” & “bald, tonsured” [Rpr. 1928, 211] = lehi “abschälen” [Zhl.] = lehi “peler” [Vcl.] = lehai “partially bald” [Hds. 1996 MS, 85]. Rightly rejected by W. Vycichl (DELIC).

NB: The Bed. root was √l-h-y, which stemmed from Ar. lh̄y: lahā “1. enlever l'écorce intérieure d'un arbre, d'un bois” [BK II 979] as a recent borrowing at a much later date than that when a possible Bed. > Eg. borrowing could have at all taken place. M. Vanhove (p.c., 18 Dec. 2006) confirms that “it seems highly unlikely that any borrowing from pre-classical Arabic could have taken place as early as 3rd cent. BC. There is no mention I know of that refers to any particular (intense or loose) contact between the small bedouin tribes of the Arabic peninsula and the forefathers of the Bejas”.

- **2.** GT: a genetic equation with LECu.: Orm. mol-ū “bald”, mōl-āwa ~ mōl-aḏḏa “to be(come) bald” [Gragg 1982, 290; Hds.], Orm.-Borana mol-ū “bald person” [Sasse], EOrm. mol-ičča “bald person”, mol-āw- “to become bald” [Sasse], Konso mōl-ata “baldness” [Sasse], Arb. mol-ó (f) “bald person” [Hyw. 1984, 385] | HECu.: Sid. mull-a “empty, naked, vain”, mull-isa (caus.) “to strip, bare” [Gsp. 1983, 240] = mull-iččo “naked” [Yri apud Hds. 1989, 56, 103], Burji (< Orm.) mól-ō (f) “bald person” [Sasse] = molan-ga “bald” vs. mōla ih- ~ mōl-āw- “to be(come) bald” [Hds.], Darasa (Gedeo) mol-ičča “bald” [Lsl. 1988, 195] = molam-o ~ mol-o “bald” vs. molo?- “to be(come) bald” [Hds.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 24; ECu.: Sasse 1982, 146) || SCu.: Dhl. (borrowed < LECu.?) *molo “bald head” [EEN 1989, 38] is equally uncertain at least for two reasons.

NB: (1) The ECu. forms display no trace of medial *-h-. (2) H.-J. Sasse (l.c.), in addition, affiliated these with LECu.: Afar mōl- “to shave” [Sasse] = mōle “to shave (se raser)” [PH 1985, 170] (semantically plausible), which agrees much better with

Hbr. ml II qal & mwl qal “beschneiden”, mūlā(h) “Beschneidung” [GB 404, 430–1] = mwl & ml qal “to circumcise” [KB 555, 594], although there is also a cognate with an infix -h-, cf. Hbr. *mhl “recidere” [Msc.] → mähül qal pass. ptc. “(vom Weine: vinum) castratum” [GB 403; cf. Msc. 1947, 127].

mhs (?) (GW) “ein libyscher Stammesname” (XXII.: Cairo statue 42218 stemming from Karnak, reign of Osorkon II/Takelot II, Spg. 1917, 114, #16) = “Stammesname” (JW 1985, 115, n. 6) = “libyscher Stamm, Μασσούλιοι” (GHWb 351).

NB: It was long misread because of its debated 7th hrgl. G. Legrain’s (1914, 42) spelling mhsw (“mahasaou”) was rejected by W. Spiegelberg (l.c.), who saw in the hrgl. in question the sign E34 (hare) and thus read mhsw. However, K. Jansen-Winkeln (1985, 112 & 115, n. 6), followed by W. Westendorf (1989, 122), pointed out a 2nd ex. of the ethnonym (cf. JEA 53, 1967, pl. xi) confirming that the 7th hrgl. is in fact a Seth det. (E21) appearing here due to an association to nhs “Bez. des Seth als Tier” (Wb II 287, 14–16).

● Etymology obscure.

NB: (1) Legrain (l.c.) identified it with the Beduin stem name Awlad Ma^cāzeh, “*was aber, abgesehen von historischen wie geographischen Schwierigkeiten, lautlich nicht angeht*” as rightly stated by (2) Spiegelberg (1917 l.c.), who, in turn, surmised in it *mhswl reflecting *ΜαΗσούλιοι “Massylier” (from *mahsūl-?). This hypothesis has been correctly disproved by Jansen-Winkeln (1985, 115, n. 6: “*durch die neue Lesung ist Spiegelbergs Gleichsetzung mit den Μασσούλιοι nicht haltbar*”) as well as by Westendorf (l.c.: “*entfällt auch die ohnehin fragliche Gleichsetzung mit Μασσούλιοι*”). (3) Jansen-Winkeln (l.c.) viewed that alternatively “*einen Zusammenhang mit dem libyschen Stamm der hs.w (Wb II 502, 14. . .) läßt sich wohl nicht herstellen*” either.

mhd (GW, flame det.) “Krach”, f3j mhd (late NK hapax: Ostr. DeM 44, rt. 19, Helck 1971, 514, #104) = f3j mhd “élever une protestation (?)” (AL 79.1293 after Janssen, Oriens Antiquus 18, 307, n. 22) = “quarrel” (DLE I 231; Cochavi-Rainey & Sivan 1992, 81) = “Streit, Krach”, f3j mhd “*Streit austragen wegen (n)” (GHWb 351).

NB: Syllabic: ma-hā-di (Helck) = ma-ha-di (Cochavi-Rainey & Sivan).

● Etymology uncertain:

- 1. W. Helck (l.c.) and Z. Cochavi-Rainey & D. Sivan (1992, 34, §2.1.3.2.1) rendered it as a loan-word borrowed from some Sem. source where an m- prefix participial form of Ar. hadda II 1. intimidier, épouvanter qqn., 2. menacer qqn., proférer des menaces contre qqn.” [BK II 1397] = “krachen” [Helck] was reflected.
- 2. GT: irregular (genetic) cognate to Ar. maḥata I & IV “mettre qqn. en colère”, maḥuta “être brûlant (se dit d’un jour de chaleur?)” [BK II 1066] (NB: Eg. -h- ≠ Ar. -ḥ-, and Eg. -d ≠ Ar. -t)?
- 3. GT: or eventually cognate with NBrb.: Mzab mmud [< *√m-h-d?] “cuisiner, faire cuire, préparer le manger” [Dlh. 1984, 115], Wargla mmud “cuisiner” [Dlh. 1987, 184]?

***mḥ** “le fouet fouet du berger” (Vandier 1978, 49; AL 78.1807) = “(nearly identical with) the formidable whip of twisted thongs (in OK scenes of driving rams over the ground to break it up)” (Griffith 1898, 62) = “whip” (EG 1927, 509, V22–23; Fischer 1983, 48, V22–23) = “(das Urbild stellt) eine Knallpeitsche (dar), die aus dicken Bündeln des harten ägyptischen Halfgrases zusammengeflochten ist und in einem (aus dem Bast der Dattelpalme gefertigten) Strick endigt” (Keimer 1927, 82) = “(das Urbild dessen ist) die Peitsche, die aus geflochtenen Lederriemen besteht” (Decker, LÄ IV 922).

NB1: “*L’existence de ce mot ne peut être déduite que de l’hiéroglyphe mḥ*” (Vandier) depicting the object whose most detailed form has been described as “ganz deutlich eine aus mehreren Strähnen zusammengedrehte Peitsche..., wie solche zum Antreiben der Esel und Widder beim Ausdreschen des Getreides in Gebrauch waren” (III. ex., Borchardt 1897, 106) = “eine Peitsche... der Art, wie sie nach den Reliefs des A.R. zum Antreiben von Eseln und Widdern gebräuchlich war” (Keimer 1927, 77), which L. Keimer (1927, 77–82) identified in several aspects with the description of the whip from recent Egypt published by Schweinfurth (*Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 36, 1904, 517–9, fig. a): “3 m lange Knallpeitsche” used “in der Umgegend von Theben während der Sommermonate” with “Verwendung zum Verscheuchen der... das Land heimsuchenden Vögel”, made “aus dicken Bündeln einer harten Grasart, der *Eragrostis cynosaroides*... zusammengedreht und läuft in einen Strick von braunem Dattelbast aus. Nur mit knapper Not umspannt die kleine Hand des Ägypters den Griff...”, while “beim Hin- und Herschwingen... wird ein Knall hervorgebracht”. If one compares “die von Schweinfurth beschriebene Knallpeitsche und deren Handhaltung mit dem Gegenstand... auf den Reliefs des Alten Reiches... so ist es klar, daß es sich in beiden Fällen um dieselbe Peitsche handelt” (Keimer).

NB2: Any connection to LEg. mḥ(°) (sic) “Riemen o.ä. (aus Leder)” (not in Wb) attested also as mhw msk3 (?) “Leder-Riemen (?)” (Tebtnunis onomaasticon, 2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998, 117–8, n. m)?

● Origin obscure:

- 1. F. L. Griffith (1898, 62, quoted also in EG 1927 l.c., fn. 3) saw in it an m- prefix derivative of Eg. ḥwj “to strike”. Alternatively, he derived it from mḥ (sic, originally mḥ^o) “flax” or mḥ.t “diadem” (sic, act. “feather”). False.
- 2. GT: perhaps akin to SCu. *maḥ- “to hit” [Ehret] > Brg. maḥ-as- “to beat (person)” | Ma’a -ma “to hit” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 156, #28). Assuming a variation of *-h-/*-h-, cf. also Ar. mhw: mahā “porter à qqn. un coup violent” [BK II 1164].

mḥ “füllen, voll machen” (OK, Wb II 116–118).

- Hence: Cpt. (SALF) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\zeta$, (B) $\mu\omicron\zeta$ “to fill, fulfil, complete, amount to, reach (with numerals), pay” (CD 208; CED 98) = “füllen, voll sein, erfüllen, vervollständigen, zunehmen, anschwellen, (Wasser) schöpfen, (Zahlungen) vollständig leisten” (KHW 110).

NB1: P. V. Ernstedt (1953, 102–5) saw in the Eg. root the source of Gk. $\mu\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ “plein, rempli”, $\mu\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\nu$ “remplir”, whose IE etymology is uncertain (cf. Boisacq

1916, 629; Chantraine in DELG 689: “*Était peut-être à l’origine un terme expressif. En tout cas, pas d’étymologie*”). J. Puhvel (p.c., 21 Dec. 2006) still prefers a connection with IE *med- (Gk. μεστός < *med-to-s) with the specific proto-meaning ‘measure by bulk or weight’, as seen in Gothic mitan ‘measure’, Latin modius ‘bushel’, Greek (Hesychius) μέσμα-μέστωμα ‘full measure’. Cf. also HED VI 167–8.

NB2: Dem. mjh ‘ein Maß für Futter’ (DG 153) > Cpt. (S) ΗΘΕΙΩ, ΗΘΙΑΩ, ΗΘΙΕΩ, (F) ΗΘΕΙΑΩ, ΗΘΙΑΩ ‘measure for fodder’ (CD 208a; CED 98) = “a measure” (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 132) = “ein Maß für Futtermittel” (KHW 89) = “nom d’une mesure (paille, blé, etc.)” (DELG 109) has been derived from an Eg. etymon *májhu < *māyihu lit. “filling one” (Vrg.) = *mayhaw “qui remplit” (Vcl.) and used as evidence for the original Hae j root *mjh.

- Most probably cognate with Sem.: (?) Phn./Punic mh-t < mhy “2. to (make) overflow”, hence “to pay or weigh to the full weight” [DNWSI 616] ||| Bed. muh “genügen” [Almkvist 1885, 48] = muh ~ mehū “genügen, hinlänglich, genug sein” [Rn. 1895, 165] = muha “genügend, genug” [Zhl.] = meh- “to suffice, be enough” [Roper 1928, 215] = mehu ~ mūh “to be sufficient” [Behrens] || Dullay: Dbs. muh- “beenden”, muh-e (f) “Ende” [AMS 1980, 176, 232] ||| NOm.: Yemsa mūma “full, levelled” [Wdk. 1990, 131] = mūmā “full” [Aklilu MS n.d.] ||| CCh.: Lame mbúmbú’ú [mb- < *m- reg.] “bien plain, rebondi, sans creux” [Scn. 1982, 316] || ECh.: Kera me’i (adv.) “genug” [Ebert 1976, 80] | (?) Tobanga máw “plein, rempli, bourré à ras bord (pour des graines, de la farine, des étoffes, pas pour un liquide)” [Cpr. 1978, 165].

LIT.: Zyhlarz 1932–33, 168 (Eg.-Bed.); Behrens MS (Bed.-Dullay-Eg.); Takács 1999, 40 (Eg.-Bed.-Dullay).

NB1: Any connection to LECu.: Afar miye “to fill completely” [PH 1985, 169] | Orm.-Orma miy-ū “full” [Strm. 2001, 56] and/or ECh.: Mkl. má’iwé (m) “gros-sesse” [Jng. 1990, 135]? Note that Afar -y- is not the regular match of Eg. ḥ-.

NB2: W. Vycichl (1983, 130) was surprisingly sceptical as to the Eg.-Bed. etymology with respect to his own (semantically much weaker) Sem. etymology (below).

- Other etymologies are either unconvincing or false:
 - 1. Often compared with LECu.: Somali bûḥ- “Fülle”, búḥ “voll sein” [Rn. 1902, 77]. Rejected by G. Takács (1999, 40).
LIT. for Som.-Eg.: Rn. 1886, 880; 1890, 258 (quoted in Behrens 1984–85, 169); Chn. 1947, #139; Dlg. 1967, 9–10, #7; Stz. 1972, 254; KHW 522.
NB1: A. Ember (quoted by Albright 1918, 93, fn. 1) also mentioned the comparison of Eg. mh with “Hamitic bûḥ ‘to fill’” (sic) probably referring to Somali bûḥ-.
NB2: For Som. bûḥ- see rather Eg. b^oḥj (EDE II).
 - 2. Its frequent equation with LECu.: Saho & Afar mag- “anfüllen, voll machen” [Rn.], Som. mug “Fülle, Vollheit” [Rn. 1902, 288] = “plénitude” [Chn.] = múg “fullness” [Abr. 1964, 182] ||| NOm.: Kaffa mag-o “pesante” [Cecchi/Rn. 1888, 315] = magg-o “schwer” [Lmb. 1993, 353], Mocha magg-o “heavy” [Lsl. 1959, 40] is also false (Eg. ḥ- ≠ Cu. *-g). Rejected by G. Takács (1999, 40).
LIT. for LECu.-NOm.-Eg.: Rn. 1886, 880; 1890, 258 (quoted in Behrens 1984–85, 169); Chn. 1947, #139; Dlg. 1967, 9–10, #7

NB: For ECu.-NOM. *m-g see rather Eg. mḏ “10” (below).

- **3.** F. Hommel (1904, 110, fn. 1) compared it with Akk. maḥāḫu “aufquellen lassen, in Flüssigkeit auflösen” [AHW 577]. False both semantically and phonologically (as a rule, Eg. ḥ vs. Akk. ḫ do not correspond). NB: The Akk. root is perhaps connected with Syr. ṽmḥḥ: ʔetməḥaḥ “zerstäubt werden” [AHW].
- **4.** A. Ember (1930, #10.b.9; quoted also by Albright 1918, 93, fn. 1) equated it with Ar. bāḥ-at-, pl. būḥ- “grande masse d’eau, abîme des eaux, de la mer” [BK I 177] = “flood, mass of water” [Ember], although the underlying root has a significantly different basic sense.
- **5.** M. Cohen (1947, #139) equated it also with Ar. muḥḥ- “1. le coeur même, la partie la plus pure (d’une chose), 2. jaune d’oeuf, 3. tout l’intérieur d’un oeuf, jaune et blanc d’oeuf pris ensemble” [BK II 1066], though it is not too convincing semantically.
- **6.** W. Vycichl (1983, 130) maintained its cognacy with Ar. myḥ. Semantically uncertain.
NB: Cf. Ar. māḥa (impf. yaḥīḥu, v.n. mayḥ-) “1. descendre dans le puits où il y a un peu d’eau pour remplir son seau, 2. tirer, prendre, puiser de l’eau, 7. se remplir la bouche de salive” [BK II 1170–1], cf. also Ar. myḥ X “épuiser, finir de chercher” [Fagnan 1923, 167], Dathina myḥ “tirer l’outre à eau en haut”, myḥ “descendre dans le puits pour y remplir le seau, lorsqu’il y a peu d’eau” < “puiser l’eau avec le mayḥ [mēḥ] ≈ ḥab!” [GD 2674, 2726].
- **7.** A. R. Bomhard (1990, 376): ~ Geez mḥs “to cause to grow, rear”. Incorrect. Semantically dubious. The Geez final -s has no match in Eg.
- **8.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 199, #1781) derived Eg. mḥ “auslegen (mit Steinen, Glasflüssen usw.), eigtl.: füllen” (late MK, Wb II 119) = “to inlay” (FD 113) from AA *ma/eḥ- “to stick into” based on untenable comparanda: Ar. mḥz “to lie with” and NOM.: Zayse meh-et-s (-et- durative, -s- caus.) “to copulate”.
- **9.** GT: the idea (expressed e.g. in GM 114, 1990, 92) of its kinship with Sem. *ml? “to be full” has to be discarded.
NB: The evident phonological disagreement between Eg. -ḥ vs. Sem. *-l? has to be admitted in spite of the suspiciously similar (and unsolved) dilemma of comparative Eg.-Sem. phonology represented by the apparent cognacy of Eg. smḥj “left (side, hand)” (late NK, Wb IV 140; DLE III 53) with Sem. *smʔl ~ *sʔml “left (hand)” [WUS #2622] = *šaʔmal- [Frz. 1965, 265, #4.27] (Eg.-Sem. suggested by Erman 1892, 119; Holma 1911, X; Ember 1926, 312, #7; contra: Ward 1961, 38, #21).

mḥ “Arm (gern neben ʕ)” (PT, Wb II 120, 1) = “forearm” (FD 113) = “foeearm including hand” (Walker 1996, 269) > (B) מוֹטֵט “arm” (CD 133b s.v. מוֹטֵט; CED 98) = “Ellenbogen” (KHW 89).

- From the same root: mḥ “Elle (auch der Ellenstab)” (PT, Wb II 120, 2) = “1. Elle, 2. Elle als Maß, 3. ein Flächenmaß” (GHWb 353;

ÄWb I 552) = “cubit” (FD 113) > Dem. mh “Elle” (DG 173:1) > Cpt. (SAL) MAḂḂ, (BF) MAḂḂ, (M) MEḂḂ, (F) MEḂḂ (m) “ell, cubit” (CD 210b; CED 99) = “Elle, Unterarm” (KHW 110) = “avant-bras, coudée” (DELIC 129).

NB: The Cpt. evidence speaks in both cases for a quadricons. word in Eg: *mhj.w or *mh^o.w (!) (KHW 89, 110 & fn. 3) = *m^ohC₃C₄ (Vcl.) = perhaps *mh^o3.w (GHWb; ÄWb).

- Origin obscure. GT: perhaps akin to WCh.: Ngamo mà “arm”, màa “wing” [Alio 1988 MS] || CCh.: Bata word meḥ “bras” [Mch. 1950, 31] | Sao (Sso) mwa “Arm” [Duisburg 1914, 41].

NB1: Without further Chadic and extra-Chadic data, it is hard to determine the second root cons.

NB2: Is the supposed Eg.-Ch. isogloss ultimately related ES: Harari mihi “vicinity, near, beside”, an mihiye-be “at my side” Grg.: Chaha & Gyeto & Masqan me^oä “rib”, Wolane miyamo “side of ribs” || MSA: Sqt. mi^oeh [irreg. -^o] “side” (Leslau 1963, 105)?

- Other suggestions are unconvincing:

- 1. P. Lacau (1970, 107, #281) considered Eg. mh to be an m- prefix form related to Akk. aḥu “arm, side”. This is not well founded. W. A. Ward (1972, 22, §279–282) rightly declined Lacau’s idea.

NB: Eg. h does not regularly correspond to Akk. ḥ (but cf. Kogan 1995). In addition, the function of m- in this case has not been explained.

- 2. W. A. Ward (1972, 22, §279–282) derived Eg. mh “forearm” from mh “to seize, hold” (below). Improbable.

NB: A semantic connection between “fist” and “to grasp, seize” is understandable, but this is not the case here.

- 3. L. Reinisch (1873, 246–7) combined it with Teda t̄ ~ t̄hi “Ellbogen”, tumma ~ tunḡa “Hand” (!), which is absurd.

mh “fassen, packen” (NK, Wb II 119; ÄWb I 550: attested 1x already in VI.) = “to hold, seize, lay hold of (m), grasp, capture” (FD 113) > Dem. mh ~ (3)mht̄ (DG 5:4, 172:2) > Cpt. (S) MAḂḂḂ, (A) MAḂḂḂ, (B) MAḂḂḂ, (F) MEḂḂḂ “to prevail, grasp” (CD 9a; CED 7).

NB: Dem. mht̄ may reflect originally an imperative (with a prefix j-) form followed by an old refl. (obj.) pronoun tw, which was used *quasi* inf. already in LEg. (Doomed Prince 6:12; Urk. VI 121:6, cf. Spg. in RT 28, 1906, 205, §xxii; Grd. 1956, 18; CED 9; Ray 1999, 190–1.

- Origin disputable:

- 1. A. Erman (1928, 5; cf. Wb II 119), J. Černý (CED 7), and P. Wilson (PL 451) regarded it as “*semantically linked with*” (PL) Eg. mh “füllen” (above). Rightly rejected by W. Vycichl (1983, 130) separating the two verbal roots.

NB: As correctly noted in DELIC 11, “*les formes coptes suggèrent l’existence d’une 3^e consonne*” in Eg. mh “to seize”.

- **2.** Ch. Ehret (1995, #582) equated it with PCu. *mă/iḥ- “to attack, assail” (sic, Cu. reflexes not mentioned). Similarly, G. Takács (2000, 99, §29.4), with hesitation, combined it with SCu. *maḥ- “to hit” [Ehret 1987, #420] > Brg. maḥ-as- “to beat (person)” [Ehr.] | Ma’a -ma “to hit” [Green] = ma “schlagen” [Mnh. 1906, 312] = ma “to beat, hit” [TB 1974, 205] = -má & -máʔ-iša “to hit” [Ehret 1974 MS, 44–45] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 156). Semantically highly dubious but apparently not impossible.

NB1: For the semantic shift cf. SCu.: Dahalo muk-ēd- “to take by force” [Ehret] = “to plunder” [EEN 1989, 38] = mukān-ad- “to take by force” [Tosco 1991, 143] vs. Rift: Iraqw muḥ- “to fight” [Ehret] | Asa muk- “to beat” [Ehret] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 159) || WCh.: Hausa määkáá “1. to beat, 2. hit down”, mááká “to beat (with a stick)” [Abr. 1962, 641], cf. also Hausa múúká “to hit” [Abr. 1962, 682] = “to strike hard with stick, clod, brick” [Mlt.-Stl.] || ECh.: Migama múkkiyò “battre” [JA 1992, 108]. Lit. for this AA root: Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 71; HSED #1802.

NB2: Ehret (l.c.) compared also Ar. mḥz “to strike the chest with fist” and mḥn “to beat” (Ehret: root extensions -z, -n).

- **3.** GT: the etymological connection to HECu.: (?) Sidamo moh “to seize” [Lsl. 1944, 56] || CCh.: Bata mō “accepter” [Mch.], Gude muʔu “to clench fist, close hand around sg.” [Hsk. 1983, 245] | Musgu ma “accepter”, imã “saisir” [Lks./Mch.] | Musgoy may “accepter” [Mch.] (CCh.: Mch. 1950, 50, 54) would be semantically right, but the second root cons. in Ch. is obscure.

NB: In addition, the Sid. mng. was given only by W. Leslau (l.c.) referring to Cerulli (1938 II, 213), who, however, glossed this word as “regnare” (which certainly represents a distinct root surely unrelated with Eg. mḥ).

- **4.** GT: Sem. *mḥw “verschwinden, verlöschen, vertilgen” [Tropper] = “to efface” [GT] seems a plausible cognate to Eg. mḥ.

NB1: Attested in (?) Akk. maʔû “wegstossen (?)”, D muʔû “etwa: hinwerfen (?)” [AHW 637] = D “niederwerfen” [Soden 1955, 388; Aro 1964, 182] || Ug. mḥ (√mḥw) “verwischen” [Ast. 1948, 210, #14] = mḥy N “verwischt werden” [WUS], Phn. mḥy “to efface” [Lsl.], Hbr. mḥy qal “1. abwischen (die Tränen), 2. tilgen (die Sünde), 3. den Namen, das Andenken vertilgen, 4. ausröten, vernichten” [GB 413] = “essuyer, effacer” [Gray 1933, 128, §53], JAram. mḥʔ pael “verwehren, verhindern” [Dalman 1922, 230] | Ar. mḥw “verwischen, abwischen” [GB] = “to erase, cancel” [Lsl.] || ES: cf. Geez maḥawa “to uproot, pluck out, pull out, tear away, tear out, carry away, rub” [Lsl.], Tigrinya māhawā “to uproot” [Lsl.] (Sem.: WUS #1540; Aro 1964, 182; Lsl. 1969, 20; 1987, 337) || CCh.: Zime-Dari māʔ “nettoyer (qqch. de pâteux ou de collant)” [Cooper 1984, 16] || ECh.: Tobanga móo “récolter” [Cpr. apud Brt.-Jng. 1990, 117]. The comparison of WSem. *mḥw with Akk. maḥû “rasen” [AHW 586] = “vertilgen” [GB] = “in Trance verfallen” [Tropper] (suggested e.g. by J. Tropper 1995, 64 listing exx. for Akk. ḥ < Sem. *ḥ) is semantically doubtful.

NB2: For the semantic connection cp. e.g.: (1) Eg. ḥmʕ “seize, grasp” vs. “to drive off (evil)” (PT, FD 191). (2) WCh.: Sha tək & Daffo-Butura tyək “nehmen, aufheben” (Ron: Jng. 1970, 222, 289) || CCh.: Musgu taka [Decorse] = tega [Barth] “nehmen” [Lks. 1941, 77] || Eg. tkk “angreifen” (MK, Wb V 331, 336, 2–10) vs. Ar. takka “3. couper, retrancher, 4. briser qqch. en le foulant aux pieds, en marchant dessus” [BK I 202] = “zerdrücken” [Vrg.] || WCh.: Hausa tááká “1. to tread on, 2. follow

example, 3. provoke, insult, 4. disobey, break (the law), 5. measure by pacing, etc.” [Abr. 1962, 840] = “push” [Stl.] | Bokkos & Daffo-Butura tuk “stoßen” [Jng. 1970, 222]. Lit.: Vrg. 1945, 143, #21.a.21 (Ar.-Eg.); OS 1990, 80, #40 (Ar.-WCh.); Orel 1994, 9 (Eg.-WCh.-Musgu).

- **5.** GT: the seeming similarity with ECh.: Somray mî [Lks.] = myə “to steal” [Jng. in JI 1994 II, 309] is probably due to chance.
NB: Not clear whether the Somray form can be derived from the root *m-r with the erosion of *-r. The underlying Ch. root has been reconstructed as *m-g-r [JI 1994 I, 159] (for its problem cf. Eg. m3r above).

mĥ.w “Unterägypten” (OK, Wb II 123–4) > Dem. mĥ.w/j “Unterägypten” (DG 174). Hence: mĥ.w.j ~ mĥ.j “unterägyptisch” (OK, Wb II 124; ÄWb I 552).

NB1: Vocalized as *maĥ.e/iw < *māĥ.iw (NBÄ 261, 312, 837, n. 1123; Osing 1998, 118, n. b) = *maĥ.ew (Snk. 1983, 225) = *māĥ.iw (Stz. 2001, 426).

NB2: R. Müller-Wollermann (1987; AEB 87.0262) etymologically explained (jt) šm^o and mĥ (usually rendered as “ober- bzw. unterägyptische Gerste”) from Eg. šm^o “schmal” and mĥ “gefüllt, voll”, resp., which thus signified “*Gerstensorten unterschiedlicher Ähren dicke*”: šm^o “vierzeilige Gerste” vs. mĥ “sechszellige Gerste”. This theory would also imply that mĥ.(w)=s “unterägyptisches Getreide” (GR, Wb II 125, 3) does not in fact represent an extended form of mĥ.w “Lower Egypt”. The trace of the former was, besides, found by M. Görg (1983; AEB 83.292) in OHbr. dg mĥwsp (Ex. 16:14), explained from dq.w mĥ.w=s ps “flour of cooked Lower Egyptian flour”.

- From the same root:

(1) mĥ.t “das Sumpfland von Unterägypten, die Deltamarsch” (OK, Wb II 125, 4) = “Delta, marais bordé de papyrus (n’est pas un nom de contrée)” (Montet 1928, 8) = “(refers to) the papyrus marshes of the delta (rather than Lower Egypt)” (PL 454) = “Sumpfland von Unterägypten, die Deltamarschen, Deltagewässer” (ÄWb I 552).

NB: Vocalized as *m(a)ĥ.it vs. *māĥ.it (NBÄ 261 vs. 312, resp.) = *maĥ.et (Snk. 1983, 225).

(2) mĥ.wt (OK) > mĥ.jt (MK) “der Nordwind (als kühlender, erquickender Wind)” (OK, Wb II 125, 6) = “norther accompanied by much cloud and heavy rain” (Faulkner 1956, 35) = “la septentrionale” (Vrg.) > Dem. mĥ.t.t “Nordwind” (DG 175:4) > Cpt. (L) ⲙⲁⲩⲏ (f) “Atem” (Polotsky, JEA 25, 1939, 113; Edel 1954, 32, fn. 11; KHW 110) = “brise fraîche (du nord)” (Kasser 1964, 33) = “souffle, haleine” (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 91; Vcl. 1983, 130; 1990, 93) = “breath” (CED 99) = “Wehen, Hauch” (Osing) = “Nordwind” (Edel, Stz. l.c.).

NB1: Reflected also in the MBab. (EA 162, 77) transcription (ni/é-e/im-ma-ĥe-e) of the PN nb-mĥ.jt (*nib-maĥē) “Herr des Nordwindes” (Edel after Ranke, PN I 185:7) = “seigneur de la brise” (Vcl. 1990, 93, §3). Vocalized as (OK) *maĥēw.t > (NK) *maĥē with short *-a- in the *Vortonsilbe* (Edel, AÄG 67, §152 & 68, §154) = (OK) *maĥé/íw.t > (MK) *maĥé/íj.t (NBÄ 837, n. 1123) = *maĥiyat (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 80, §63) = (MK) *maĥéj.t > (NK) *maĥé(j) (Edel 1980, 15; 1988, 34) = (OK) *maĥiw.ij.at > *maĥíwVt > *maĥíwVt (Stz. 2001, 426) = *mVĥíwVt (Roccati) =

(MK) *mahjVt > (NK) *mahé? (sic, *-ə-!) (Lpr. 1995, 39) = (pre-Cpt.) *mhē < *mhējet (Černý) = *mhēj.t < *mhj.t (Spg.). The Cpt. reflex has been brilliantly envisaged as *Ḥ2H < older *Ḥ2t by W. Spiegelberg (1930, 131) still before it had been identified by H. J. Polotsky (JEA 25, 1939, 113). Lit.: Albright 1946, 17, §37 & JNES 8, 1949, 186–190; Edel 1954, 32, 38, 40; AĀG 66, §151; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 91; NBĀ 837, n. 1123; Edel 1980, 15 & fn. 14; 1988, 34–35 & fn. 15; DELC 130; Roccati 1988, 121–2; Vcl. 1990, 93, §3; Peust 1992, 118.

NB2: For the problem of its supposed cryptographic occurrence (in the shape of a mast with the sail hrgl.) used for writing m-ḥ3.t cf. Spg. 1930, 131 (pro); Polotsky, JEA 25, 1939, 113 (pro); Smither 1939, 168, fn. 1 (pro); Drioton 1943, 177–180 & AIPHO 3, 1935, 133–140 (contra); Černý 1951, 442–3, §7 (pro); DELC 130 (pro).

(3) mhj.t “der Papyrus” (Med., GR, Wb II 124, 8; Germer 1988, 249) = “Papyrusstengel (ohne nähere Angabe)” (Germer 1979, 139) = “Cyperus papyrus L., Papyrus” (Germer 1979, 138; Manniche 1999, 99f.) = “Papyrusstaude, Zypergras” (Germer 2002, 81) = “Papyrus(stengel), -dickicht” (ÄWb I 552).

NB: P. Lacau (1970 phon., 10, §20) erroneously derived it directly from a false etymon *mh3jt < prefix m- (denominal) + ḥ3 “papyrus” instead of mh.w “Lower Egypt” vs. mh.t “Delta”, which he (o.c. 11, fn. 1) separated from mhj.t “papyrus” as “*un autre mot (en apparence homophone)*”.

(4) mh.t.j “Nord; nördlich” (PT, Wb II 125–6) > Dem. mhṯ “1. nördlich, 2. (m) Norden” (DG 175:3) > Cpt. (OSAL) Ḥ2IT, (A) M2EIT, (ALF) M2IT, (SBF) E2IT, (F) M2IT “north” (CD 212a; CED 100; KHW 112) = “nördlich (!), Norden” (Spg.).

NB1: Vocalized as *mhējtej > *m-ḥitj > *mhīt (Sethe/NBĀ n. 1328) = *mhēitj (Lacau) = *mhj.tj (Spg. 1930, 131) = *mhītej (Černý) = *m-ḥētj < *m-ḥitj < *m-ḥitj < *m-ḥitj < *m-ḥitj < *m-ḥitj < *m-ḥitj (NBĀ 837, n. 1125 & p. 857–8, n. 1328).

NB2: Reflected also in Cpt. (S) Ḥ2ATE, (B) M2AT (TN, location unknown, perhaps somewhere in the Herakleopolite nome, presumably a settlement of people coming from the Delta) < *n3-mhj.w “The Northerners”, where *M2ATE is the otherwise lost Cpt. pl. (*mhājew) of (S) Ḥ2IT adhering to the pl. pattern *C₁C₂ájew of the sg. *C₁C₂itey (Černý 1955, 31, §2; CED 100).

● Original mng. and etymology debated:

- 1. Most probable seems an inner Eg. derivation of mh.t.j “northern” (Osing: lit. “zum Sumpfland von Unterägypten gehörig”) < mh.t “the Delta-marshes” (Osing: lit. “Überschwemmungsgebiet”) ultimately from mhj “im Wasser sein” (PT, Wb, below) = “to inundate (land)” (FD). Cf. the *Wortspiel* with mh.w vs. mhj in PT 766d (ÜKAPT VI 133). In this case, the meaning “north” etc. would be an innovation.

LIT.: Montet 1928, 8–9; Osing in NBĀ 261, 857–8, n. 1328; Snk. 1983, 225.

- 2. K. Sethe (1899 I, §97.a & p. 34; ZĀS 44, 1907, 3, 13–14), in turn, followed by P. Wilson (PL 454), supposed an opposite way of derivation assuming Eg. mh.t.j “nördlich” to be a secondary (orig. *mhw.tj, lit. “zum Nordwind gehörig”) form coming from Eg. mhw.t “Nordwind”, which would have to be regarded as a primary noun.

Although this scenario was *a priori* declined by J. Osing (NBÄ 857–8, n. 1328) as “hardly explainable”, W. Vycichl (DELC 130) ingeniously pointed out the striking identity of Eg. mḥ.w.t “north-wind” with Ar. maḥw-at- “1. vent du nord, 2. pluie” [BK II 1071], which may, of course, be due to pure chance as well as well due to cognacy.

NB: I. D’jakonov & L. Kogan (1995, #1714) affiliated the Ar. word with Akk. meḥû “Sturm” [AHW 642] and derived both from Sem. *mḥw “effacer, anéantir” [Kogan], cf., e.g., Ar. mḥw: maḥā “effacer” [BK], which – as we have seen above – may probably be eventually akin to Eg. mḥ “to seize” (q.v.).

- **3.** GT: taking into view that north in Egypt was in fact conceived as “*ce qui est derrière*”, which “*d’après le système d’orientation des anciens Égyptiens est derrière lui, le Sud en face*” (Lacau 1970, 11, fn. 1; 1913, 219, §453), the closeness of Eg. √mḥ to AA *m-[ḥ] “1. back, 2. bottom” [GT] is also noteworthy.

NB1: Attested in Sem.: (?) Akk. maʔû “wegstossen (?)”, D muʔû “etwa: hinwerfen (?)” [AHW 637] = D “niederwerfen” [Soden 1955, 388; Aro 1964, 182] || ES (from Orm.): Grg.-Zway moʔo “buttocks, anus” [Lsl. 1979 III, 386; Bedecha 1994, 2] || LECu.: Orm. moʔ-ō “loins, back” [Lsl.] = (Borana) mō “back of cattle, tailbone of cattle” [Lsl. 1995, 210], Baiso mō “back” [HL 1988, 126], (?) Som. moḥog [-g < ?] “(a part of the) back” [HL] || HECu.: Sid. mähê-ssa (m), mähê-tte (f) “that is in the rear, and comes after the others (cattle)”, mahôʔ-ma “1. to follow the others, 2. be behind the others (animals)”, mahôʔ-mino manni “the crowd that came behind” [Gsp. 1983, 219] || CCh.: FMuchella mú(n) “buttocks” [Krf. 1972 MS] | Mnd. mâḥa “en bas” [Mch.] | Gsg. miyew “Bodenerde, Erde” [Lks. 1970, 130] | Musgu as-mái (adv.) “unten” [Müller 1886, 393] = mày “en bas” [Lks. 1937/Mch.] = as-mái “unten” [Lks. 1941, 46] (CCh.: Mch. 1950, 56) || ECh.: Mkl. ʔimméy (m) “là-bas” [Jng. 1990, 112]. AP: WSud. *-mâ- “back” [Wolff-Gerhardt 1977, 1536 with false Ch. parallel].

NB2: Note that Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata) màyē “after, behind” [Strm. 1987, 362; 2001, 53] may represent a distinct root.

- **4.** GT: a cognacy with SCu.: Maʔa ki-mayē “Wald” [Mnh. 1906, 311] = ki-maʔé, maʔéza [-ʔ- < *-ḥ- reg.] “bushland, scrub wilderness (as opposed to forest)” [Ehret 1980, 156, #27] seems less likely.

NB: Ch. Ehret (l.c.) combined the Maʔa word with Irq. maʔaye “kind of medicine” (explained from a certain SCu. *māʔa- “bush, shrub, plant”), which is semantically unconvincing.

- Other suggestions are either irreal or unlikely:

- **5.** W. Spiegelberg (1902, 180) explained the Eg. name of Delta (lit. “Flachland”) from Eg. mḥj (sic) “Flachs”. False, since the oldest form of the latter was mḥ^ç (q.v.).

- **6.** Following A. Erman (1928 ÄG⁴, §128) and G. Lefébvre (1955 GEC, §160), P. Lacau (1913, 219, §453; 1970, 11, fn. 1) assumed in both Eg. mḥ.t “north” (derived by him from a false etymon *mḥ3.tj) and mḥ3 “Hinterkopf” (PT, Wb, q.v.) = “la nuque” (Lacau) “*un dérivé en m- préfixe formé sur un tout autre radical, à savoir*” Eg. ḥ3, which he erroneously affiliated with Sem. *ḥr “la nuque” (sic), i.e., “*la partie derrière de la tête*”.

- **7.** L. Homburger (1930, 253) affiliated it with Nub. kalo “Nord” (!). Absurd.
- **8.** G. R. Castellino (1984, 17–18) proposed a connection with Sum. ^{im}MER (misquoted as ^{im}MER) ≈ Akk. ištānu > iltānu “north(-wind)” [Labat 1976, 159, #347]. Evidently wrong. Naturally, Sum. MER and Eg. mḥ.w have nothing in common either semantically or phonologically.
NB: The original meaning of Sum. MER is totally different being translated by Akk. agāgu “ère en colère” and ezzu “furieux” [Labat], while IM (TU₁₅) signifies “wind”. Sum. ^{tu15/im}MER thus means actually “vent furieux”.
- **9.** A. M. Lam (1993, 395) combined Eg. mḥ.w vs. t3-mḥ.w “Lower Egypt” with Ful (Pulaar) ḥakke “boue” vs. to-ḥakke “le pays de la boue” (sic) and also to-muḥi “le pays couvert de boue” (sic). Absurd.
NB: The quotation of the Ful(fulde) data is, besides, inexact (kind p.c. by H. Tourneux, 22 Dec. 2006): to- may in no case be a Ful formative. It may be a conjunction meaning “if”. Anyhow, it is not clear what to ḥakke could be, neither to-muḥi.

mḥ.t (vars. **mḥ** ~ **mḥ.w** ~ **mḥj** ~ **mḥ.t.t**) “Schale, Napf (auch aus Silber) zu Flüssigkeiten, Fleisch, Süßigkeiten, auch zum Beschreiben mit Zaubertexten” (XVIII., Wb II 126, 11–15; GHWb 355) = “a container for all kinds of food” (Janssen 1961, 20) = “bottle” (FD 113; Ward 1961, 40, fn. 126: attested already in the 1st IMP) = “dish for writing a spell on it” (Borgouts 1971, 132, n. 304) = “1. a dish of unknown capacity” (late NK, Janssen 1975, 474) = “2. a bowl” (GR: Edfu, PL 456; WD III 55) = “Napf, Schale” (OK: 1x, 1st IMP: 1x, ÄWb I 553).

NB1: P. Wilson’s (PL) both GR exx. (Edfu I 558:17, III 49:13) were rejected by D. Meeks (1999, 581) as not convincing (with false rdg.).

NB2: Vocalized as *māḥy.ṯ (Osing in NBÄ 214; Snk. 1983, 224) based on its supposed identity (!) with Dem. mjḥ (m) “ein Maß für Futter” (DG 153:5) > Cpt. (S) ḤOḤIṬ, ḤOIAṬ, ḤAIḤIṬ, (F) ḤOḤIAṬ, ḤAIAṬ (masc.!) “1. a measure for fodder etc., reeds, or grain, 2. a vessel (?)” (CD 208a; CED 98) = “ein Maß für Futtermittel” (KHW 89), which is improbable not so much because of the gender change (projected by Osing for Dem., although the masc. var. occurs already in the NK), but much rather due to the apparently different basic senses: (1) Dem.-Cpt. *mjḥ “a measure” vs. (2) NK mḥ.t (sort of vessel). Note that the mng. “2. ein Maß für Kraut” attributed to Eg. mḥ.t.t (used for sm.w only in Pap. Leiden I 350, vs. 1:x + 17) by J. Osing (NBÄ 214) and W. Schenkel (1983, 224) clearly originates from “1. Schale”.

● Etymology debated:

- **1.** J. Osing (NBÄ 214, 762, n. 924, cf. also p. 235 & 802, n. 1021), followed by W. Schenkel (1983, 224), saw in it a pass. part. of Eg. mḥ “to fill” with the basic mng. “das zu Füllende”, and affiliated it with Eg. mḥ [*māḥ(w)ṯ(w)] “Nest” (late NK, Wb, below) explained from an orig. mng. * “Schale” (lit. “das, was gefüllt wird”). Uncertain.

NB: Following G. Mattha, J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 132), W. Westendorf (KHW 89), and W. Vycichl (DELIC 109–110) too explained Dem.-Cpt. *mjḥ “a measure” eventually from Eg. mḥ “to fill”.

- **2.** W. A. Ward (1961, 40, #33) saw in its supposed metathetic form *ḥm > Cpt. (S) ʔOME (f) “cup” (CD 676a) = “Schale, Tasse” (KHW 371) a cognate of Ug. ḥm (sic) “bottle (for wine)” [Gordon 1955, 263, #637]. Hardly correct. Both comparanda are etymologically problematic.

NB1: J. Osing (NBÄ 186, 710, n. 822) convincingly derived the Cpt. word from Eg. ḥnw.t “Becher, Napf” (OK, Wb III 106) via *ḥānw.ṯ > *ḥām.ṯ(t), although in the light of his own syllable rules, C. Peust (1999, 163–4, §3.16.3) denies here the effect of the assimilation or merger process of -nw- > -m-, which is supposed to have worked only in direct contact of -nw-.

NB2: The Ug. form is enigmatic, not listed as such in any of the standard lexicons except for that of Gordon, who distorted in fact Ug. ḥm-t “Lederschlauch” [WUS 105, #945] = ḥm-t “wineskin” [DUL 365], which hardly suits either Eg. mḥ.t or (S) ʔOME < Eg. ḥnw.t.

- **3.** GT: perhaps akin to ES: Harari māḥawa “object, goods, instrument, baggage, utensil, things” [Lsl. 1963, 106]?
NB: The etymology of the Harari word is uncertain. W. Leslau (l.c.) assumed this to be connected with Geez mahəw “utensil of glass, bottle” and its ES cognates, which are usually derived eventually from Ar. mahā-t- “crystal” (discussed s.v. Eg. mh, q.v.).

mḥ “eine Tätigkeit beim Spinnen” (MK, Wb II 121, 8; GHWb 354; OK ex.: Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza V 42:44).

- Hence: (1) mḥ “Gewebe” (OK, Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza V 15:42), (2) mḥ.w “Leinenfaden” (XVIII. Mag, Wb II 121, 9; GHWb 354). Cp. perhaps also (3) mḥ “umwinden” (GR, Wb, q.v.)?
NB: The etymology of the latter is rather debated (below).

- Etymology obscure.

- **1.** GT: perhaps akin to PClass. Yemeni Ar. mayḥ, pl. amyāḥ ~ miyāḥ ~ muyūḥ “rope” [Piamenta 1990, 475; GD 2727] and eventually AA *m-(y)-ḥ “to bend, twist” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mḥ “sich verneigen”, Wb, q.v.)?

- **2.** GT: an eventual connection with ECh.: Somray (Sibine) mā “nouer” [Brt.-Jng. 1990, 114] is not excluded either.

NB: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 199; HSED #1712) equated the Somray word with Eg. mḥ3 (below). This isolated form, however, being of a rather unclear history, has to underlie further study.

- **3.** GT: its striking resemblance to Common Aram. mḥʔ “to weave” is hardly due to cognacy, the underlying Sem. root being *mḥ/ḥṣ (Aram. ʔ < old *ḥ being a reg. reflex of Sem. *ṣ).

NB1: Attested in Akk. maḥāšu [irreg. -ḥ- < *-ḥ-ʔ] “weben” [AHW 580] = “to weave” [CAD m1, 78] (cf. Landsberger; WZKM 26, 130) || PBHbr. (< Aram.) mḥʔ “to interlace, weave”, itpeal “to be interwoven, fastened” [Jastrow 1950, 760], JAram.

məḥāʔ “weben” [Dalman 1922, 230] = məḥāʔ “3. spinnen, weben”, hence məḥītā “Gewebe” [Levy 1924 III, 68, 74], Samar. Aram. mḥy “weaving”, qal “to weave” [Tal 2000, 461], JPAram. mḥy “to weave” [Sokoloff 1990, 300] || MSA: Sqt. méḥad [-ḥ- poss. < both *-ḥ-/*-ḥ-] “tisser” [Lsl. 1938, 240].

NB2: Traditionally, the Aram. root has been explained from the homophonous root meaning “to hit” (e.g., J. Levy l.c.: “*eig wohl: die Fäden übereinander schlagen oder mit dem Webeschiffchen anschlagen*”, L. Kogan, p.c. on 26 Dec. 2006: “... must be somehow connected with the basic meaning ‘to strike’ even if the semantic shifts implied are not yet properly understood”), which is ultimately to be derived from Sem. *mḥš “to hit” (via Aram. *mḥʕ). Sqt. -ḥ- does not decide the question either as Sqt. -ḥ- < *-ḥ- is also possible (SED I lxix).

- 4. G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 190–1): Eg. maʔḥe (sic) “Strick” ~ Bsq. muku “Dacht”. Absurd.

mḥ.t “1. Vogelfeder, 2. Federschmuck (Feder am Kopf der Libyer), 3. Wedel aus Federn” (XVIII., Wb II 123, 6–10) = “Feder, Gefieder” (NBĀ) > Dem. mḥj (m) “Feder” (DG 174:3) > Cpt. (S) מḥזע, (B) מועזי (m) “feather” (CD 211a; CED 99) = “plume” (DELIC 130).
NB: Vocalized as *mḥw.ṯ > *mḥ/īḥ(w).ṯ > *mḥ/īḥ(y).ṯ > *mḥ/ī(y)ḥ.ṯ > *mḥ.ṯ (Osing) = pre-(B) *māhi (DELIC).

- Hence: mḥ.wt “von der Mähne des Pavians” (late NK, Wb II 123, 11).
NB: Cf. also the late mḥ.w “Figur mit Mähngesicht” (Tebtunis onomasticon, 2nd cent. BC, Osing 1998, 295, n. b with a different etymology & p. 304 index).
- Origin uncertain. J. Osing (NBĀ 256, 830, n. 1112, quoted also in Westendorf 1989, 22) thinks it to be explainable “*nur (!) als m-Bildung*” (of pass. mng.) from Eg. ḥwj “(Flügel, Federn) schlagen”. Thus, *mV-ḥw.ṯ would have originally meant “instrument of striking”. Weak.

mḥ “1. Nest, Vogelnest, 2. (fig.) Stützpunkt (der Armee, eines Landes)” (late NK, Wb II 121, 10; GHWb 354) > Dem. mḥ “Nest” (DG 173:5) > Cpt. (S) מנז, (S^f) מנזז(t), (A) מנזע, (B) מנז “nest, brood of young” (CD 208a; CED 98) = “Nest, Brut” (KHW 110) = “nid, couvée d’oiseaux” (DELIC 129).

NB: Vocalized as *māḥ(j)ṯ(j) (NBĀ 235) = *mā/īḥ(w).ṯ(w) (sic) > *mḥ.ṯ(w) “Nest” (sic) (Snk. 1983, 224).

- Etymology obscure.
- 1. J. Osing (NBĀ 235, 801–2, n. 1021), followed by W. Schenkel (1983, 224), identified it with Eg. mḥ.t ~ mḥ “Schale” (explained from *māḥj.ṯ), deriving both eventually from Eg. mḥ “to fill” (q.v.) as pass. participial forms (lit. “das, was gefüllt wird”). Weak.
- 2. GT: perhaps from a basic sense “settlement”? Any connection to MSA: Hrs. mēyeh “village” [Jns. 1977, 92]?
NB: For the semantic shift cf. IE *ni-zd-o-s/m [*-zd- assim. < *-sd-] “Nest” < IE *ni- “nieder” + *sed- “sitzen”, lit. “Ort zum Niedersitzen” (IEW 887).

mḥ “umwinden: 1. von der Schlange, die den Kopf (die Stirn) schmückt, 2. die Stirn mit dem Diadem schmücken” (GR, Wb II 123, 2–4) = “enserrer le front, couronner” (AL 77.1818) = “to go around” (PL 451).

● Etymology debated.

NB: (1) In D. Meeks’ (AL l.c.) view, probably to be read m3h. (2) P. Wilson (PL l.c.), in turn, surmised in its Edfu ex. a corruption of mḥn (q.v.), “from which the **n** has been lost”, although she quoted Dendera exx. suggesting a distinct “word in its own right”. (3) GT: eventually, any connection to OK mḥ “Tätigkeit beim Spinnen” (Wb, q.v.)?

mḥ “sich verneigen (ob richtig?)” (GR hapax: Edfu I 142, Wb II 121, 3).

- Existence uncertain. GT: if the gloss is correct, may be cognate with SCu.: Irg. māḥ-āt “to bend down because of wind, walk while bent down, tiptoe” [MQK 2002, 69, not in Wtl. 1958 & Mgw. 1989] | Ma’a -mama [-Ø < *-ḥ reg.] “to fold” [Ehret 1980, 156, #25] ||| CCh.: Gude myaʔa “to twist, squeeze, ring out” [Hsk. 1983, 246]. NB1: Cf. also Ar. myḥ: māḥa V “être agité çà et là (ce dit d’un rameau agité par le vent)” [BK II 1170] (from a basic sense *‘to bend, twist’?)? NB2: Ch. Ehret (l.c.) derived Ma’a from his SCu. *māʔ/ʕ- “to bend, fold”.

mḥ “die Säbelantilope (als Symbol des Seth), die Horus jagt, auf deren Rücken er hockt; auch in dem Namen des Gaus von Beni Hasan (XVI von Ob.äg.)” (GR, Wb II 121, 11) = “oryx” (PL 450).

● Most probable seems etymology #1.

■ 1. In Eg. philology (cf., e.g., Sethe 1923, 191, fn. 2; Wb l.c.; Grapow 1950, 75; Fecht 1960, 105, §199; PL l.c.), usually treated as the late form of old Eg. m3-ḥd merged (Wb: “verkürzt”, Grapow: “verschmolzen”) from *mḥt < *m(3)ḥd < m3-ḥd.

■ 2. GT: because of etymology #1, presumably unrelated to AA *m-w-(?) “gazelle, antelope” [GT].

NB1: Attested in NAgaw: Qmt. mēwā “petite gazelle” [CR 1912, 234] ||| CCh.: Bura mwi “roan antelope” [BED 1953, 146] = mwi “Blaubock, Schlimmelantilope” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 92], Margi mwàʔyù “roan antelope” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 127] = mwaʔyu “roan antelope” [Skn. 1984, 23] | Hurzo miyáh & Zulgo miyák “antelope (general)” [Rsg. 1978, 201, #18], Uldeme miyák “gazelle à front roux, Gazella ruffrons” [CIm. 1997, 205] | Lame & Peve & Zime miyeo “antelope” [Std.].

NB2: Cf. perhaps also AA *m-H “goat” [GT] > HECu.: Sid. meʔ-ō “capra” [Crl.] = meʔ-é/iččo “capra” [Mrn. 1940, 230] = meʔ-iččo, pl. meʔe “goat” [Gsp. 1983, 228; Hds. 1989, 385: isolated in HECu.], Kmb. mie-iččo-ā “capra” [Crl. 1938 II, 213] ||| WCh.: PAngas *mā, younger *ma “sheep” [GT 2004, 239] | Tangale mēè “goat” [Jng./JI 1994 II 166] (WCh.: Std. 1987, 234) || ECh.: Kwang-Ngam tó-méè “goat” [Jng. 1973 MS; JI 1994 II 167]. AP: NS *mi-a ~ *ʔi-a “goat, sheep, lamb” [Bnd. 2005, 123, #272]. Kuliak: Ik may-a, Nyangi ma “hartebeest” ~ ENil.: Don-

gotono mayu “hartebeest” ~ ESud.: Gaam mau-eg (pl.) “herd of antelope” (Flm. 1983, 447). PKoman *mei “goat” [Bnd. 1983, 276, #129].

NB3: The AA root described above is probably unrelated to CCh.: Zime-Dari mbã [mb- reg. *m-] “Antilope-cheval” [Cooper 1984, 17], Lame mbã ~ mbàŋ “hippotrague, Hippotragus equinus” [Scn. 1982, 307], which reflect a root *m-ŋ.

NB4: H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibrizimow (l.c.) derived the Tng. and Kwang forms from Ch. *m-d “Antelope”.

NB5: V. E. Orel and O. V. Stolbova related the Qemant and some of the Ch. forms to Eg. m3 (q.v.). Cf. OS 1992, 181 (PCCh.-Margi-Eg); Orel 1993, 42 & HSED #1765 (Eg.-CCh.-Qmt.).

mh “Kind: vom König als ‘Kind’ eines Gottes, als Bez. des neugeborenen Kindes” (GR, Wb II 120, 10) = “das (neugeborene) Kind” (Erman).

NB: P. Wilson’s (PL 448) one single ex. (Edfu VI 73:4–5) was rejected by D. Meeks (1999, 581) as a misreading of nmh.w “Waise(nkind)” (MK, Wb II 268, 8).

- Being a word of late attestation only, to be handled carefully. Etymology highly dubious:

- **1.** Traditionally (Wb II 120, 11–12; Erman 1928, 5; Grapow 1950, 74) rendered as a figurative use (Erman: lit. “ellenlang”) of Eg. mh “cubit” (q.v.), which is supposed to have been regarded in Egypt as the size for a baby.

NB: The new-born (future royal) children are in Westcar 10:10 one cubit in length, cf. hrd n mh w^c “Kind von einer Elle” (Wb l.c.).

- **2.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 184) equated it with ECh. *may- “child” [OS], cf. Kwang (dials. of Alowa, Tchagine Golo) kê-may “enfant” [Coates 1991 MS, 1] | Tumak màì “child” [JI 1994 II, 75]. Not clear whether the ECh. forms can be derived from AA *m-ḥ (or sim.).

***mh** (?) > Dem. mh “sehen” (BM 10507, 1:9, TLA, kind p.c. by H. Satzinger, 28 Dec. 2006) → Cpt. (SL) MOY₂, (A) MOY₂, (B) MO₂ “(intr.) to look”, (B) “appearance” (CD 210b) = “sehen, blicken”, (B) “Anblick, Erscheinung” (KHW 111).

NB: In the light of (B) -O-, an original *ḥ is to be preferred to *-h (cf. Lacau 1965, 9–11; Peust 1999, 237, §5.6.2.2), which is confirmed by the Dem. ex. But (A) -ḡ is quite unexpected with regard to (B) -2.

- No evident pre-Cpt. etymon is attested (CED, KHW, DELC). GT: eventually an irregular cognate of ECu. *mV^c- “to see, look at” [GT]

||| WCh. *m-y “to see” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. m “behold!”, q.v.)?

NB: Ch. -y-/-Ø- may in principle be derived from AA *ḥ-, but ECu. *-^c ≠ Eg. -ḥ-. Note, however, that the common AA affix *ḥ (nominal class marker of anatomical terms) > Eg. ḥ appears in ECu. as *^c.

mḥ3 “Hinterkopf” (PT, Wb II 128, 1; GHWb 356) = “nuque” (Marsart 1959, 233, §34) = “back of the head” (FD 114).

NB: J. Breasted (1930, 113) surmised in mḥ3 a scribal error for mkḥ3 (q.v.), although it occurs a few times.

- Derives (via prefix m-) from Eg. ḥ3 “Hinterkopf” (PT, Wb III 8, 5–11) = “occiput, back of ear” (FD 161). GT: the same prefix mV- (for which cf. MIt. 2005, 87) may occur in Ar. ma-ḥāl-(at)- “milieu du dos, vertèbre” < ḥāl- “8. paquet, hardes qu’on porte sur son dos, 9. dos du cheval, surtout cette partie que l’on couvre d’un drap, sou la selle” [BK I 518, 520].

LIT.: Lacau 1913, 219, §453; Grapow 1914, 26; 1954, 25, fn. 3; NBÄ 321 & 866, n. 1378 (ad Grapow); Smith 1979, 161.

NB1: The etymology of Eg. ḥ3 has been disputed. (1) Most probably akin to Ar. ḥalāʔ-at- “milieu, surtout du derrière de la tête”, cf. ʔahlā- & ḥalawān, pl. ḥulāwīn “milieu du derrière de la tête” [BK 484] = ḥu/alāw-at-u ʔl-qafā “the middle of the back of the neck” [Lane 634] = ḥalāʔ-at- “the middle part of the back of the head” [Ember] = ḥalʔ-at- “Hinterkopf” [Vrg.] < Sem. *ḥa/ul(l)- “spinal column with thigh bones” [SED I #114]. For Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1917, 88, #138; 1930, #3.c.6, #14.a.9; Vrg. 1945, 130, #1.d.16. (2) The equation with Sem. *ʔḥr “dernier” (sic) suggested by P. Lacau (1970, 37–39) is false (Eg. ḥ ≠ Sem. ḥ). (3) Eg. ḥ3 can have nothing to do with WCh. *ḥama “head” either (as proposed in OS 1992, 186; HSED #1208).

NB2: Eg. mḥ3 has nothing to do with Eg. mḥ.tj “northern” (as suggested by P. Lacau 1913, 219, §453).

mḥ3 “eine Krankheit” (NK Med./Mag, WMT 386, cf. Borghouts 1971, 111, n. 225) = “an illness” (Osing 1978, 189) = “enflures (?)” (AL 78.1826) = “eine Krankheit: *Geschwulst” (GHWb 356) = “Hautausschlag” (HAM 839).

NB: Regarded by J. Osing (l.c.) as the etymon of Cpt. (S) ḥḥ2ḗ (f) “tumour, abscess” (CD 211a) = “Abszeß” (KHW 110), which is highly dubious, since the fem. Cpt. form suggests an etymon *mē/ūḥ.t (with final fem. -t rather than -3), which W. Westendorf (KHW), in addition, explained from Eg. mḥ “full”.

- Etymology obscure. W. Westendorf (1957, 298; WMT l.c.) assumed in it an m- prefix derivative of the *Grundstamm* *ḥ3 based by him on the erroneous comparison of clearly unrelated words like ḥ3.t-jb “Kummer, Leid”, wḥ3.w “Hautausschlag oder ähnliche krankhafte Erscheinung der Körperoberfläche (wahrsch. Trachom)”, nḥ3 “Bez. einer unebenen (welligen, zerfurchten oder körnigen) Oberfläche”, nḥ3.t “Augenkrankheit, eig. Unebenheit (Follikelbildung?)” originating in distinct roots. A derivation from *wḥ3 is not excluded.

mḥj “1. im Wasser sein, schwimmen, im Wasser ertrinken, jem. ertränken, ins Wasser werfen, zu Wasser gebracht werden (vom Schiff), geflüßt werden (von Holz), 2. voll Wasser sein: überschwemmt sein,

reichlich fluten usw.” (OK, Wb II 121–2) = “être immergé, être dans l’eau” (Montet 1928, 8–9) = “1. ertrinken, im Wasser sterben, 2. zu Wasser bringen, ins Wasser werfen, 3. schwimmen, geschwemmt werden” (ÜKAPT VI 133) = “1. nager, 2. mettre à l’eau (?)” (Posener 1950, 296) = “1. to (be) drown(ed), 2. overflow (of Nile), inundate (land), 3. swim, 4. to launch (a vessel, boat)” (FD 114; AECT III 201) > OCpt. $\text{m}\epsilon\text{z}\text{i}\alpha$ = “versinken” (Osing 1976, 54; KHW 522).

- Hence: **(1)** $\text{m}\text{h}\text{j.t}$ “Flut”, occurs mostly in $\text{m}\text{h.t-wr}\text{t}$ > Gk. $\text{M}\epsilon\theta\upsilon\epsilon\rho$ (PT, Wb II 122), **(2)** $\text{m}\text{h.w}$ “als Bez. für die Krokodile” (LP, Wb II 122, 20) = “crocodile (lit. ’immersed’)” (Leitz 1999, 99), **(3)** $\text{m}\text{h}\text{j.t}$ (coll.) “die Fische” (OK, Wb II 127, 10) = “Bez. der Fische im allgemeinen ohne Spezifizierung der Art (ebenso alt wie rmw , nur als Kollekt.)”, lit. “die Wasserbewohner” (GW 1970, 19), etc.
NB1: For further possible derivatives of this root cf. Erman 1928, 5; Montet 1928, 8–9. However, Eg. $\text{m}\text{h.t}$ “das Sumpfland von Unterägypten” (q.v.) does not necessarily belong here, cf. Eg. $\text{m}\text{h.w}$ “Unterägypten” (q.v.).
NB2: There are some false etymologies proposed for the coll. Eg. $\text{m}\text{h}\text{j.t}$ (mistakenly separated from the underlying root). Thus, L. Homburger’s (1930, 254) comparison of it with Nub. kare “poisson” is absurd. The same applies to its equation with Class. Ar. $\text{h}\text{üt-}$ “fish” apud A. Ju. Militarev (2006, 21, §29.3).
- Origin disputable. A couple of attractive solutions have been offered so far, by neither of these is entirely convincing. It is uncertain if these *comparanda* are ultimately related.
- **1.** W. Vycichl (1953, 373) equated it with Ar. $\text{m}\text{y}\text{h}:$ $\text{m}\text{ā}\text{ḥ}\text{a}$ I “1. descendre dans le puits où il y a peu d’eau pour remplir son seau, 2. tirer, prendre, puiser l’eau, 7. se remplir la bouche de salive”, VIII “1. puiser, tirer de l’eau, 4. faire suer abondamment, p.ex. la partie convexe de la tête du chameau (se dit du soleil qui agit sur cette partie de la tête)” [BK II 1170] = “waten” and “Wasser schöpfen” [Vcl.].
NB: Semantically, Ar. “waten” would fit Eg. mhj “im Wasser sein, schwimmen”.
- **2.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 198; HSED #1756): Eg. mhj “to swim” ~ WCh.: SBauch: Boghom myau “to swim”. GT: add perhaps also NBrb.: Mgild â-um “to bathe, swim” [Harries 1974, 227] || LECu.: Somali $\text{m}\text{ā}\text{ḥ-ayya}$ “to cross (the ocean), ford, thread one’s way (through the people)” [Abr. 1964, 171]?
NB: In theory possible, though one single isolated Ch. word cannot be of serious use in AA etymologies.
- **3.** GT: the cognacy with WCh.: Dera $\text{m}\text{āy-}$ “benetzen” [Jng. 1966 MS, 10] = (?) $\text{m}\text{āy}\acute{\epsilon}$ “1. to take a bath, 2. bathe (a person)” [Nwm. 1974, 129] = $\text{m}\text{āy-}$ “to pour, wet” (sic) [Stl.] | Bubure $\text{ḥaa}^?a$ [ḥ- < * m- ?] “wet” [Haruna 1992 MS, #c026] || CCh.: Mbara mò & Vulum

mī “verser” [TSL 1986, 199] is equally uncertain, since these *comparanda* might be equated – at the present level of our knowledge of Ch. historical phonology – also with the reflexes of AA *m-ʔ “water” [GT] > Eg. mw (q.v.).

NB1: Surprisingly, V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED 375, #1726) explained the Eg. root (combined with Dera) via an absurd shift of L.Eg. -h- < old *-h- (sic), whereby the set up AA *maq- (sic) “to pour”.

NB2: Whether Ar. maḥw-at- “2. pluie” (listed under √mḥw: maḥā “effacer”) [BK II 1071] belongs here is also dubious.

- Other suggestions are certainly false:
- **4.** W. F. Albright (1918, 93), A. Ember (1930, §10.b.9, §14.a.6), F. von Calice (1936, #637): ~ Ar. bāḥ-at- “flood, mass of water”. Phonologically incorrect (Eg. b- ≠ Sem. *m-).
- **5.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 305, #583): ~ PCu. *māḥ- “to get wet” < AA *māḥ- “to get wet”.
NB: The PCu. form was based by Ch. Ehret (1987, #416) on the false equation of LECu.: Som. māḥo (sic, -ḥ-) “to leak, seep” [Ehret] || Agaw *maw- “to dissolve” [Ehret]. Nevertheless, the Som. word has been recorded with -h-: māḥ- “herivorquellen, fließen” > māḥi “frisches, fließendes Wasser” [Rn. 1902, 289], which corresponds to Sem. *mhw (cf. Eg. mhwj).
- **6.** N. Skinner (1997, 77–78, §7) derived both Eg. mw “water” and mhj “to swim” from AA *m “water”, which is absurd.
- **7.** Th. Schneider (1997, 198, #36): ~ Brb. *m-γ “feucht, naß, durchnäßt sein” > *m-γ-y “wachsen (von Pflanzen)”. Phonologically false (Eg. -ḥ- ≠ Brb. *γ).

mhj.t “die Löwengöttin von This und von Sebennytos” (OK, Wb II 127, 7–8).

NB: Vocalized form reconstructed as (OK) *mahūj.at > (NK) *mahú > (LP) *mahé ~ *meḥé (Edel) = (NK) *mahūja (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 80, §62) = (OK) *mahú(w).t (NBÄ 201; Snk. 1983, 224) = *mahūj.Vt > (NK) *māḥūʔ (sic, *-ə-) (Lpr.) with the regular shift of NK *-ū- > LP *-ē- on the basis of its reflection in cuneiform (Amarna, EA 7, 76) ^{m/hi}pa-ma-ḥu-[u] and Gk. Πα-μχη-ς < Eg. PN p3-n-mhj.t “Der der (Göttin) Mhj.t” (Rank: PN I 108:15). Cf. Edel 1948, 24; 1954, 39–40; NBÄ 730–1, n. 879; Lpr. 1995, 39. Note that EA 7, 76 ^{m/hi}pa-ma-ḥu-[u/ú] should be separated from EA 162, 74 ^mpa-ma-ḥa-a (Edel 1948, 24 contra Albright, JEA 23, 1937, 200–1, n. 4), whose rendering is debated (cf. Zorn 1991, 131–8). An indirect reflection of the presumed LP (7th cent. BC) vocalization *mahé ~ *meḥé of Eg. mhj.t has been pointed out by E. Edel (1988, 34–35) in the cryptogram composed by a falcon (Month) + lioness (mhj.t) rendered by J. Leclant (BdE 35, 1961, 247) and L. Habachi (ASAE 51, 1951, 458f.) as the secret form of PN mnt.w-m-ḥ3.t vocalized at that time (7th cent. BC) presumably as *mantū-ma-ḥé, cf. (NAss.) ma-an-ti-me-<am>-ḥe-e and Gk. Μοντουῆς.

- Etymology highly debated:
- **1.** Usually derived from Eg. mḥ “full” (q.v.), whereby its literal sense has been rendered as “die Volle” or “das (wieder) Vollgemachte (Himmelsauge)”. This connection, in L. Kákosy’s (l.c. infra) opinion,

“*spiegelt die Weiterentwicklung des Wesens der Göttin*”, which was rightly treated by J. Osing (NBÄ 731) as a popular etymology (“*Der Deutungsversuch bei Sethe... ist sicher erst sekundär*”).

Lrr.: K. Sethe (1912, 27; 1930, §23), H. Junker (1917, 131), H. Kees (1941, 10), L. Kákósy (LÄ IV 5 & n. 2–3).

- **2.** Following H. Junker (1917, 131), J. Osing (NBÄ 201, 731) and W. Schenkel (1983, 224) explained its original meaning from Eg. *mḥ* “to hold” (q.v.) as “die Packende (Löwin)”.
- **3.** GT: remarkable are NOM. *mahy- [*-h- < AA *-ḥ- reg.] “leopard” [GT] ||| WCh.: Hausa *mààgée* [Stl. 1987, 89: Hs. -g- reg. < AA *-ḥ-] “cat” [Abr. 1962, 635] corresponding both phonologically and semantically.

NB1: Attested in Omt. *mahe ~ *mahya [Mrn. 1938, 151] > NWOmt.: Wolamo *máya* [Rn.] = *mahē* [Crl.] = *māhiya* [LS, Alm.], Dorze *māhe* [Alm.], Zala *mahiya* [Crl.] = *mahiya* [LS], Kullo (Dawro) *mahia* & *máya* [CR] = *mahi(ya)* [LS], Basketo *mahi* [Crl.], Malo & Dache & Gamu *māhe* [LS], Gamu *māhé* (“1. leopard, 2. tiger”) [Lmb. 1985 MS, 14, #438] = *mahe* [Alm.], Gofa *mahe* [LS] = *māhe* [Alm.] | SEOmt.: Zayse *māhe* [LS] = *mahe* [Sbr. 1994, 17], Zrg. *mahe* [Sbr.] | Chara *mahā* [Crl.] = *maha* [LS] | Janjero (Yemsa) *meʔo* [Crl.] = *mewu* [Wdk. 1990, 131] = *mewù* [Lmb.] = *mēwū* [Akl.-Sbr. 1993, 39; Aklilu MS n.d.] | Kaffa *māhō* [CR] = *māhō* [Crl.] = *māho* [LS], Mocha *māho* [Lsl. 1959, 41], Anfillo *māhō* [Crl.] = *māho* [LS], Shinasha (Gonga, Bworo) *māho* [Bekes/CR, Grt.] = *māhā* [d’Abbadie/Grt., CR] = *maho* [Crl. 1929, 1938] = *mahā* [Crl. 1951] = *māhe* [Alm.] = *māhā* [Lmb.] | Sheko *māho* [LS] | Mao (so) *māhō* [Grt.], Ganza *mahi* (“lion”) [James 1965 MS; Bnd. 2003, 356, §56: isolated in Mao] etc. (NOM.: Rn. 1888, 317; CR 1913, 408; Crl. 1929, 32, 44; 1938 III, 79, 115, 171; 1951, 470; Grt. 1940, 356; Alm. 1993, 7; Lmb. 1993, 350; 1993, 368; LS 1997, 457).

NB2: M. Lambertini (l.c.; LS l.c.) reconstructed NOM. *māk- “leopard”, but neither its *-k- is well founded nor its comparison with LECu. *keb- (!) “leopard” (via met.) is convincing.

NB3: Is the primary sense of the underlying AA root retained by SCu. *mēḥ- “spotted” [Ehret]: Irq. *mēḥ’na* “a black and white spotted cow” [Wtl. 1958, 92] = *mēḥna* “spotted cow” [Ehret] vs. *mēḥ* “spotted black and white” [MQK 2002, 72] | Dahalo *māḥawa* “spotted (animal)” [Ehret-Elderkin-Nurse 1989, 36] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 157, #36)?

mḥj “sich Sorge machen um, bekümmert sein wegen (ḥr)” (MK, Wb II 120, 13) = “to be concerned for, take thought for, ponder on (ḥr)” (FD 113) = “sorgen für, sorgend bemüht sein um, sich Sorge machen um, bekümmert sein wegen (ḥr)” (VI.: 1x, 1st IMP: 1x, GHWb 353; ÄWb I 550) = “sich sorgen, sich kümmern” (Osing l.c.).

NB: There is no agreement as to the original root, which was correctly (1) defined in FD and GHWb as IIIae inf. contra (2) Wb (no weak consonant, i.e., mḥ). (3) Strangely, J. Osing (1998, 295, n. b) prefers mḥ^c treating the arm det. (probably due to the influence of mḥ “arm, cubit”) as the 3rd root consonant -^c.

- Hence: (1) mḥ “Sorge, Kummer” (MK, Wb II 120, 17; GHWb 353) = “care” (FD 113), (2) mḥj “1. der Fürsorger, 2. der um den man Sorge hegt” (MK, Wb II 121, 1–2) = “Beistand, Helfer” (Osing l.c.).

- Etymology disputed. Most attractive seems #4.
- **1.** P. Wilson (PL 449) saw in it an “*extension of*” Eg. mḥ “to fill” carrying “*in this case an emotional ‘filling’ (!)*”. Very weak.
- **2.** E. Zyhlarz (1934, 114) compared it with SBrb.: Hgr. mihi, pl. mihî-t-ən “doute, risque” [Prs.] = məhi “zweifelhafte Lage, bedenkliche Situation” [Zhl.]. False, since Hgr. -h- < SBrb. *-z- in this case, cf. Nsl. miši [Msq. apud Prs.] < SBrb. *m-z-h₁ [Prs. 1969, 79, #514].
- **3.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 198, #1777) affiliated it and Eg. mḥ.w “hunter” with Ar. mḥmḥ “aimer qqn. d’un amour pur, sincère, désintéressé” [BK II 1070] as well as HECu.: Burji mahāl-s- “to listen to”.
NB: The Burji parallel is out of question (cf. instead Cu. *m-ḡ-l “to hear” [GT]), but the Eg.-Ar. etymology is noteworthy, although the suggested AA *maḥ- “to pay close attention, watch with care” might underly much better the parallel outlined in the next item.
- **4.** GT: it is semantically quite close to ECh.: DM *moy- “to think” [GT], although the development of AA *-ḥ- in ECh. is not yet clear. O. V. Stolbova (1996, 131, t. 26) admits PCh. *-ḥ- > ECh. *-ʔ-, *-w-, *-y-, although she failed to quote DM exx.
NB1: Cf. WDng. mōyè “méditer, avoir la nostalgie de, regretter, penser à, songer, être triste” [Fédry 1971, 136], EDng. mōyé “se rappeler, se souvenir, se remémorer, se ressouvenir, penser, songer, méditer, réfléchir, rêver, rêvasser, être préoccupé, être triste, ressasser, se soucier, se faire des soucis, être en soucis” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 210] = “sich erinnern, sich Sorgen machen” [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 81, 93], Bidiya moy “penser, réfléchir, se souvenir” [AJ 1989, 100].
NB2: For DM. *moy-, cf. alternatively Eg. m “behold!” (q.v.).
- **5.** GT: or cp. perhaps Ar. myḥ: māḥa “6. intercéder, s’employer en faveur de qqn. auprès de qqn.” [BK II 1070]?

mḥj “flichen nach (r)” (late NK, Wb II 126, 16–17; GHWb 355; ÄWb I 553: 5x in VI. PT) = “to flee” (DLE I 233),

- Hence: mḥ.w “der Flüchtling” (XX., Wb II 126, 19) = “fugitive” (DLE I 233–4).

NB: Vocalized as (NK) *maḥā < old *maḥā(j.u)w supposed to be reflected in Amarna cuneiform (EA 162, 74) ^mpa-ma-ḥa-a < p3-mḥ.w “als Bez. eines landesflüchtlingen Ägypters” (Helck 1971, 433; NBÄ 185, 705–6, n. 815; Snk. 1979, 371; 1983, 225; Zorn 1991, 131 with alternative interpretations).

- Origin obscure.

- **1.** E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168) compared it with Bed. mih- “erschrecken (vor etwas)” [Zhl.]. Not impossible.

NB1: For the shift of meaning cf. ECu. *baḡ- “to be afraid” and “to run away” [Sasse 1982, 32 contra Lsl. 1988, 183] ||| Ar. ʔbq “to run away, fly” [Zbr. 1971, 56, #17] etc.

NB2: For a different etymology of Bed. mih- cp. Eg. m3ḥ (above).

- 2. GT: perhaps akin to Akk. (OBab.) mâtum [$\sqrt{m\dot{u}h}$, -h < *-h?] “eilen (??)” [AHW 586] ||| CCh. *m-y-(?) [GT]: Mofu-Gudur mīyāv mīyāv ~ mīyēw mīyēw “rapidement, vite” [Br. 1988, 194] | Lame mīyā[?](ā) “vite” [Scn. 1982, 321], although the C₃ correspondences are not clear.

NB1: For the regular correspondence of Eg. C₁C₃j ~ AA *C₁-y-C₃ see Vycichl 1953, 373–7.

NB2: Semantically, a connection to Yemeni Ar. myh: māh I “to pass by (‘alā), V “to go and come, prowl around” [Piamenta 1990, 460], Dathina myh “passer par, devant ou chez”, mayyaḥa “passer”, ta-mayyaḥa “aller et venir, rôder autour” [GD 2727] seems unlikely.

- mhj** “Grabkammer o.ä.” (Ramses III, hapax: Pap. Berlin 10496/6, vs. 13, Wb II 127, 2) = “Grab” (Erman, SPAW 1910, 335) = “building (?)” (Blackman 1926, 179, 181) = “1. (unterirdische) Kammer (allgemein), 2. Grabkammer, Magazin, Keller o.ä.” (Graefe & Wassef 1979, 115–7) = “caveau, tombeau” (AL 79.1316 with lit.) = “*Grabkammer” (GHWb 355).

NB1: E. Graefe & M. Wassef (1979, 109, n. j) assumed the same word in mh “die Bez. für einen Gebäudeteil o.ä. (zwischen ‘Kapelle’ und ‘Tür’ erwähnt): Kammer” (stela from the 21st year of Taharqa, 670 BC).

NB2: The word *mḥ.t “chapelle (?)” (AL) occurring in *mḥ.t-ntr “Tempel” (LP, Wb II 126, 6) is a false rdg. and should be eliminated (Graefe & Wassef 1979, 115, 118; AL 79.1311).

- Probably hence: Dem. mḥw ~ mhw(e) [with the shift of -h- < -h-] “das Grab” (DG 171, 174:6; Lacau 1970, 126, §9) vs. early Dem. mh(3)jw “eine Art nicht-funeräres Gebäude bzw. ein solcher Gebäudeteil (der wohl in eine Siedlung gehört)” (Graefe & Wassef 1979, 116, fn. 21) > Cpt. (S) ḤḤḤ(Ḳ)Ḳ, ḤḤḤḲ, ḤḤḤḲ, (A) ḤḤ (L) ḤḤḤḲ, (F) ḤḤḤḲ, (B) (Ḥ)ḤḤḲ “tomb, cavern” (CD 212b; CED 100) = “Grab, Höhle, Gedenkstätte” (Spg. KHW 71; Wst. KHW 112).

NB1: This LEg./Dem. > Cpt. etymology has been maintained by G. Möller (1913, 138), W. Spiegelberg (KHW 71), J. Černý (CED 100), E. Graefe & M. Wassef (1979, 117), who either demonstratively ignored or firmly and probably rightly declined the usual derivation of the Cpt. word from Eg. m^ht (q.v.). J. Osing figured a development *m^ht > *m^ht (sic) > (?) *m^ht (NBÄ 209, 746, n. 906), but his arguments are weak or even contradictory: (1) the fact that the Dem. forms have -w instead of -^h can only prove the identity of the Dem. and Cpt. word; (2) the fact that the diverse Cpt. reflexes of Eg. $\sqrt{m^h t}$ indicate no trace of -^h does not make it necessary the derivation from m^ht; (3) the Cpt. double vowel is not necessarily an evidence merely for -^h but also for -j- (act. *-?-), cf. e.g. (S) ḤḤḤ “bad” < bjn (Peust 1999, 206 with lit.) or (S) ḤḤḤḲ (pl.) “crocodiles” < mzh.jw (BD 130 of Budge) via met. with the epenthesis of -j- in the root (Lacau 1903, 157; Spg. 1927, 656; Edel 1954, 36; Vcl. 1990, 186, §3). In addition, no -w- is attested in Eg. m^ht as forced by Osing (Fecht 1960, 180, §373, fn. 504). Moreover, Dem. Ḥ^h3.t ~ m^hj.t are attested (Graefe & Wassef 1979, 117, fn. 34). For further details cf. Eg. m^ht (q.v.).

NB2: For the merger of -h- vs. -ḥ- in Roman Dem. cf. Vrg. 1945, 99–100; Lacau 1970, 126, §9; Peust 1999, 99, §3.5.3.

NB3: The rdg. of mḥ- in the DG ex. of mḥw is dubious, perhaps rather mr- (Graefe & Wassef l.c.).

- Origin obscure. E. Graefe & M. Wassef (1979, 117) assumed an old etymon *mḥw. GT: no certain external (AA) cognates, only ECh.: Toram mohe “grave (tomb)” [Alio-Jng. 1988, 22; Alio 2004, 260, #328], whose Ch. background has to be investigated.

NB: Any connection to HECu.: Burji mḥ-ē “two stones placed on grave of deceased person who leaves children” presumed to have been borrowed from NOM.: Koyra mḥ-e “id.” [Sasse 1982, 148–9]?

mḥ^ʕ ~ mḥ^ʕw ~ mḥ^ʕj “Flachs” (OK, Wb II 121, 4; WD II 66 with lit.) = “lin, Linum humile Mill.” (Loret 1892/1975, 140, 107, §177) = “flax” (FD 114; Janssen 1975, 364–5, §116 with disc.; DCT 177) = “Flachs, Kulturlein (Linum usitatissimum)” (Germer 1979, 57–60; GHWb 353; ÄWb I 551) = “Lein, Leinpflanze” (Germer 1985, 101; 2002, 154) = “Linum usitatissimum, linseed” (Manniche 1999, 116) > Dem. mḥ(j) “Flachs” (DG 173:3) > Cpt. (S) ḥḏḔ, (B) ḥḏḔ (m) “flax” (CD 211a; CED 99) = “Flachs, Leinen” (Spg. KHW 70; Wst. KHW 110).

NB1: The old rdg. of the OK root as mḥj (e.g., Loret l.c.; Wb l.c.; Pusch 1974, 21; Germer l.c.; Manniche l.c.) is incorrect and it is to be read mḥ^ʕ (cf. Lacau 1903, 160; ASAE 15, 1915, 228; AÄG 40, §93 & p. 64, §146 & p. 105, §244; James 1962, 112f.; Edel 1963, 167f.; Guglielmi 1973, 52, fn. 11 & p. 59 with lit.; Janssen l.c.; Bidoli 1976, 63; DELC 129; DCT 177). Edel (l.c.) assumed a quadrilit. mḥ^ʕw (OK) > mḥ^ʕj (MK). Later, mḥ^ʕw may have indeed shifted into *mḥ^ʕj, where -j- was in fact -ʔ- (Peust 1999, 103). The OK forms m^ʕḥ (Badawy 1952–54, 140) and ḥm^ʕ (Spg., Lacau) may represent in fact a “*simple disposition calligraphique*” (Lacau) rather than a real metathesis.

NB2: Vocalized as *mḥ^ʕw (Edel, AÄG 105, §244) = *mḥ^ʕij (Roquet 1978, 489) = *mḥ^ʕaj (Vcl. in DELC).

- Origin obscure.
- 1. W. Spiegelberg (1902, 180) affiliated it with Eg. mḥ.w “Delta” (rendered lit. as “Flachsland”) on the analogy of ḏ.t “papyrus” vs. “Delta”. But the roots (mḥ^ʕ vs. mḥ) hardly accord.
- 2. W. Vycichl (1991, 119) assumed in it the trace of an African substrate, but was unable to quote any lexical evidence for it. GT: no AA parallels that could be equated with Eg. mḥ^ʕ.

NB: (1) Sem. PBHbr. (TM) mōk “Werg, gehechelte Wolle, oder Flachs” [Levy 1924 III 45] = “a soft, spongy substance, hackled wool, rag, lint etc.” [Jastrow 1950, 741] is out of question (Eg. -ḥ^ʕ ≠ Hbr. -k). (2) A comparison with NOM.: Janjero (Yemsa) moḏaḏo ~/> morarō “lino” [Crl.], Kaffa muto “lino” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 321] = muṭṭō “lino” [Crl. 1951, 475], Mocha mútto “flax” [Lsl. 1959, 42] would be only plausible if we assume Eg. -ḥ^ʕ < *-ḥ^ʕ corresponding (in principle) to Sem. *-ḏḏ (*-ṣṣ) acc. to the Rössler theory (cf. EDE I 336). L. Reinisch (l.c.) affiliated the Kaffa word with NOM.: Wolayta puto “cotton” and even Hbr. būs “Byssus”, which is certainly false.

- mḥwn** “der Geflügelhof” (late NK: reign of Sethi II, Wb II 128, 2; cf. Chevrier, ASAE 36, 1936, 140, t. II, l. 8; LÄ II 506) = “Geflügelstall” (Ricke 1937, 126) = “fowl-yard” (Camino 1954 LEM, 416; DLE I 235) = “un tour à pigeons” (Meeks 1976, 95) = “volière” (AL 77.1829; 79.1318) = “basse-cour” (DELIC 129) = “volière, pigeonnier” (Bickel & Mathieu 1993, 40–41) > Dem. mḥwl “Taubenschlag, Geflügelhof” (DG 175:1) > Cpt. (S) $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{2}\text{OY}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{a}$, $\text{m}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{2}\text{OY}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{a}$, $\text{m}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{2}\text{OY}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}$, $\text{m}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{n}\text{OY}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{a}$, (L) $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{2}\text{OY}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{a}$, (B) $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{2}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{a}$ “nest, dovecot” (CD 208a; CED 98) = “Nest, Taubenschlag” (KHW 110; Vrg. 1950, 293) = “nid, pigeonnier” (DELIC 129) > (?) Eg. Ar. (Fayyum, Upper Egypt, sporadically in Delta) maḥwal “Futtertrog, Hasen-, Hühnerstall, Verschlag aus Lehm zur Aufbewahrung von Getreide” (Behnstedt 1981, 90, §38). NB: The Eg. Ar. word may be alternatively either derived from Class. Ar. ḥawal- “Besitz an Vieh” > ma-ḥwāl- “food storage-room, crop storing-room” [Dostal apud Snk.] or explained as a contamination of the two etymons (Snk. 2002, 51).
- Origin uncertain. The genuine sense of may have become obscure by the late NK. Presumably this is why the word was written unetymologically (mḥ “to fill” + wn “to open”):
 - **1.** Usually rendered as a compound, where the first component was identified with Cpt. (S) $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{2}$ “nest”, but the etymology of the second one is not evident. J. Černý (1973) derived (S) * $\text{oY}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{a}$ from LEg. w3nr “Hof (?)” (cf. Bojowald 2003, 17 & fn. 16). Later, Černý (CED) and others identified it with the LEg. hapax w3r (*w3l) “young bird (which can neither walk nor fly), fledgling” (Ostr. Grd. 25, vs. 3, CED 98 after Posener, RdE 16, 1964, 40, followed by Bickel & Mathieu, BIFAO 93, 1993, 40–41 & fn. 64: “oisillon”; Guglielmi, ZÄS 112, 1985, 140, n. c: “Vogeljunges”). Rejected by S. Bojowald (2003, 17). D. Meeks (AL), in turn, assumed an Eg. etymon *mḥ-wn (sic) “le nid des petits oiseaux”, but he failed to clarify *-wn. LIT.: CD 208, 477; Černý, BdE 50, 1973, 348, n. 10; CED 98; Meeks 1976, 95; KHW 110, 269; Smith 1978, 361; Guglielmi, ZÄS 112, 1985, 140; Schenkel 2002, 51 & fn. 157. NB: The hapax w3r hardly suits as the second element of mḥwn. J.F. Borghouts (1981, 272) maintains that it “is not a new word, but wr ‘swallow’ in group-writing” like bwn3 for bnw “heron” in Ostr. DeM 1436, x+4. W. Guglielmi (l.c.), however, rightly rejected its equation with Eg. wr “swallow”. But as S. Bojowald (2003, 16) points out, the rendering of w3r is against the context. Moreover, he (o.c., p. 18) explained it as a late borrowing from Akk. wāru “(heran)gehen” [AHW 1471] = “gehen, laufen” [Bojowald].
 - **2.** Already W. Vycichl (DELIC 129) surmised it to be rather an m-prefix form (*m-ḥwl), although he was unable to identify * $\sqrt{\text{hwl}}$ (cf. Ricke 1937). GT: if we assume a nomen loci *m-ḥwl with the basic meaning “encircled area (yard)”, a striking cognate appears in PBHbr. māḥōl “1. Umkreisung, Umzäunung, 2. (übertr.) kreisförmiger Sitz”

[Levy 1924 III, 71] = “1. untilled ground surrounding the vineyard (between the vines and the fence), 2. chorus of singers and dancers” [Jastrow 1950, 758].

NB: For Sem. * \sqrt{hwl} “to encircle” cf., e.g., PBHbr. $\dot{h}ul$ “sich im Kreise drehen, tanzen” [Levy 1924 II, 23] < OTHbr. $\dot{h}wl$ qal “1. to go round, 2. turn upon, 3. dance round dances, whirl with” [KB 297] | OSA: Sab. $m\dot{h}wl$ “Rundsäule” [GB 217–8], Ar. $\dot{h}wl$: $\dot{h}āla$ I i.a. “13. être de travers, louche, avoir le strabisme (des yeux)” [BK I 517] etc. (for further details cf. Eg. $m\dot{h}n$).

mĥbš (GW) “ein Gegenstand aus Elfenbein” (late NK hapax: Pap. Petersburg 1116 B, 70, Wb II 128, 5) = “Zierrat am Schiff” (Helck) = “ornament of a ship (?)” (DLE I 235; Jones 1988, 168, §71) = “ornamentation (on a boat)” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = “Bänder” (Snd. 1996, 175).

NB: Written syllabically as $m\dot{a}-\dot{h}\dot{a}-b\dot{i}-\dot{s}\dot{a}-j\dot{a}$ (Helck) = $ma-\dot{h}\dot{a}-b\dot{i}-\dot{s}\dot{a}-j\dot{a}$ (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey).

- Borrowed from NWSem., cf. Hbr. $m\dot{a}habb\dot{e}\dot{s}$, piel part. of $\dot{h}b\dot{s}$ qal “1. (um)binden, 2. satteln”, piel “1. (eine Wunde) verbinden, 2. hemmen, unterbinden” [GB 212–3].

LIT.: Helck 1971, 514, #105; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 34, §2.1.3.2.1 & p. 37, §2.1.4.1 & p. 62, §2.4.2.

mĥn “Verbum: 1. von der Schlange, die sich auf (ĥr) dem Kopf ringelt, den Kopf umringelt, 2. den Kopf mit dem Uraeus u.ä. umgeben” (XVIII., Wb II 128, 7–10; GHWb 356) = “(Grundbedeutung des Stammes) sich ringeln, umkreisen, im Kreise umgeben” (Ranke 1920, 20 & fn. 2) = “to coil (of serpents)” (FD 114).

- From the same root (for further details see Ranke 1920, 14–23):

(1) $m\dot{h}n$ “Spielbrett in Form einer zusammengeringelten Schlange” (PT, Wb II 128, 14) = “un jeu (?) rond” (Lacau 1903, 150, §10) = “Schlangenkopf-Brettspiel” (Sethe, ÜKAPT) = “a board-game” (FD 115) = “the ‘coiled-serpent’ game” (AEPT 107, utt. 332, n. 2) = “a kind of primitive trap comprising a sort of cup and a flat part corresponding to a circuit rolled upon itself” (Leclant quoted by Ritner with due criticism: “*the true nature of the sign determining $m\dot{h}n$ was... a schematic depiction of the round game board with a stand, not a pit*”) = “the coiled serpent-game” (Ritner 1991, 211) = “Schlangenspiel (mit Spielbrett in Form einer zusammengeringelten Schlange)” (GHWb 356).

NB: H. Ranke (1920, 3–4) dealt with the description of this “Brettspiel, Schlangenspiel” in detail. Its early OK form “*zeigt ein Brett in Gestalt einer kreisrunden Scheibe mit trapezförmigen griffartigen Ansatz. Die Scheibe selbst trägt eine Innenzeichnung, die eine in linksläufigen Spiralwindungen siebenfach zusammengeringelte schwarz und gelb gefleckte Schlange darstellt; neben dem Kopf der Schlange ist in der Mitte der Scheibe ein kleiner Kreis freigelassen*”.

(2) mĥn “die große Schlange beim Sonnengott auf seiner Fahrt durch die Unterwelt” (MK, Wb II 128, 12; WD III 55 with recent lit.) = “the coiled serpent” (PT 541, AEPT 107, utt. 332, n. 2).

(3) mĥn-t3 “Erdumringler (als Name einer grossen Schlange)” (NK, Wb II 128, 11).

(4) mĥn.jt “die Stirnschlange des Sonnengottes und anderer, Uraeuschlange des Königs” (NK, Wb II 129, 3–5) < mĥn.wt “Stirnschlange, Uraeus” (I., FÄW 196).

- Etymology uncertain. As rightly stated by H. Ranke (1920, 20, fn. 1), there is no Sem. root *mĥn “mit ähnlicher Bedeutung”.
- 1. E. Littmann (p.c. quoted in Ranke 1920, 20, fn. 1) surmised a connection to Ar. ĥny: ĥanā I “1. (re)courber, plier, cambrer (un bois), 2. pencher la tête pour boire, 3. se tordre les mains” [BK I 506] = “biegen, krümmen” [Littmann], “wovon mĥn eventuell eine denominative Bildung sein könnte”, cf. esp. ma-ĥnā-t- ~ ma-ĥnuw-at- “détour et sinuosité (d’une vallée)” [BK]. Seems convincing.
- 2. F. von Calice (1936, #203) and J. Vergote (1945, 135, #9.b.11), in turn, analyzed Eg. mĥn as an m- prefix participial form from *ĥn (*ĥl), which they identified with Hbr. and Ar. reflexes of Sem. *ĥwl “to encircle” [GT].

nb1: Among the diverse m- prefix derivatives especially noteworthy are Akk. mēlulu “spielen” [AHW 644] = mēlulu “to play”, mēlelu “play”, mēlultu “play, game” [CAD m2, 12, 15–16] || Hbr. māḥōl and *māḥōlā, str. cstr. māḥolat- “Reigentanz” [GB 413–4] = māḥōl and māḥōlā “dance in a ring” [KB 568–9], PBHbr. māḥōl “1. Kreis, 2. Reigen” [Dalman 1922, 230] = “1. Umkreisung, Umzäunung, 2. (übertr.) kreisförmiger Sitz” [Levy 1924 III, 71] = “1. untilled ground surrounding the vineyard (between the vines and the fence), 2. chorus of singers and dancers” [Jastrow 1950, 758] | OSA: Sab. mĥwl “Rundsäule” [GB].

nb2: Sem. *ĥwl is attested, e.g., in OTHbr. ĥwl qal “tanzen (sich drehen), Reigentänze aufführen”, hitpalel part. mīḥūlēl “ringelnd (vom Sturme)” [GB 217–8] = qal “1. to go round, 2. turn upon, 3. dance round dances, whirl with” [KB 297], PBHbr. ĥūl “sich im Kreise drehen, tanzen” [Levy 1924 II, 23] | OSA ĥwl “autour” [Lsl.], Ar. ĥwl: ḥāla I i.a. “13. être de travers, louche, avoir le strabisme (des yeux)” [BK I 517] = I & VI “sich kreisförmig bewegen, drehen” [GB] = ĥwl “to turn, change, shift, become altered from straightness to crookedness, become crooked” [Lane 673] = ĥwl “sich im Kreise drehen” [Clc., Vrg.] || MSA: Hrs. & Mhr. ĥewōli “around, about” [Jns. 1977, 63], Sqt. ĥwl: ĥel “faire un tour, aller autour”, ḥāuwelhel (ḥāulhel) “anneau, bague” (< **“tourner”*), ḥaylhil “1. durée, 2. alentours” [Lsl. 1938, 167] etc.

nb3: A. Ember (1917, 88, #139; 1930, #3.c.10) preferred to equate Ar. ḥawla (prep.) “around” with Eg. ḥ3 “hinter, herum um” (PT, Wb III 8–9), which seems to exclude the equation with Eg. mĥn “around”, cf. also Eg. ḥ3 “Hinterkopf” (PT, Wb III 8, 5–11) ~ Ar. √ḥwl > ma-ḥāl-(at)- “milieu du dos, vertèbre” < ḥāl- “8. paquet, hardes qu’on porte sur son dos, 9. dos du cheval, surtout cette partie que l’on couvre d’un drap, sou la selle” [BK I 518, 520]. In this case (too), the prep. may be of denominative origin.

- Other etymologies are unconvincing.

NB: (1) K. Sethe (quoted in Ranke 1920, 20, fn. 1) derived it from Eg. *mḥ.w* “Unterägypten”, which is evidently out of question. (2) G. Fecht (SDAIK 18, 1985, 93) affiliated it with Cpt. (S) *ḡḏmḥp* “arms, embrace” (CD 679a; CED 284) = “Arme, Umarmung” (KHW 373) < Dem. *ḥml* “armful (of grass)” (CED after Klasens, BiOr 13, 1956, 223) = *mḥwl* (KHW), although W. Vycichl (DELIC 301) found a more fitting Eg. etymon in Ptol. *ḥmr* “Thron” (Wb III 96), which K. Kuhlmann (LÄ VI 524) affiliated with Sem. **ḥml* “tragen”. The semantic change “umfassen” ~ “tragen” was approved also by W. Westendorf (1987, 459). (3) Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 199, #1780) equated it with NOm.: Mocha *māhi* “small ball of wood” [Lsl. 1959, 40], but there is no match in NOm. for Eg. -n. (4) W. G. E. Watson (1999, 789, fn. 28) combined Eg. *mḥn* “to encircle” (misquoted as *mḥn*) with Ug. TN *mḥnm* “(eine Ortsangabe)” [WUS #1545] = “?” [DUL 539] and even Hbr. TN *maḥānayim* (see next entry), which is somewhat incomprehensible.

mḥnm (GW) “encampment” (XXII., Hoch 1994, 149).

NB: Vocalized as **maḥan(e)mā* (GB) = **maḥanēma* (Hoch).

- Borrowed from NWSem., cf. Hbr. TN *maḥānayim* (dual) “(n.pr.) einer Stadt der Gaditen jenseit des Jordans” [GB 415] = lit. “double camp” (?) [KB 570–1].

LIT. for Eg. < Sem.: GB 415; Hoch 1994, 149, §192.

mḥnk “(eigtl.) Beschenker: Vertrauter eines Höherstehenden” (OK, Wb II 129, 7–8) = “trusted man” (JNES 6, 1947, 238; WD III 55) = “partner (?)” (FD 115) = “confidant, intimate, ‘body-servant’ (?)” (Jones 2000, 449, #1680 with lit.).

- Derives from Eg. *ḥnk* “beschenken” (PT, Wb III 117–8) with the prefix *m-* of participles.

LIT.: Grapow 1914, 26; AÄG 110, §256.

NB: The origin of Eg. *ḥnk* is unknown. GT: cp. perhaps Agaw **naḡ-* < **nāk(k)-* “to give (here, to the speaker)” [Apl.]: Bilin *nak-/naḡ-*, Hmtg. *näy-*, Hamir *naq-* (imper. *nāk*), (?) Qemant *läy-* [Apl.: **läq-* < **näq-?*] “to bring, give” | Awngi *naḡ-* “to bring, give” (Agaw: Apl. 1984, 36; 2006, 74), although these forms show no trace of the first syllable **ḥV-*, while Eg. -*k* vs. Agaw **-q* would be irregular.

mḥshs (excrement det.) “als Schimpfwort (Substantiv)” (PT, Wb II 129, 10) = “ein Schimpfname” (AÄG 110, §256) = “Bekackter (Kot)” (Störk, LÄ V 635) = “(Schimpfwort) Scheißkerl, Bekackter, Waschlappen” (V., GHWb 356; ÄWb I 555).

- From the same root: *mḥs* “impuissant, stérile” (AL 77.1835) = “zeugungsunfähig” (Brunner, LÄ II 338 & 343, n. 2: cf. Daressy, RT 20, 1898, 74f.) = “impotent, zeugungsunfähig sein” (GHWb 356).

NB: It has been identified with *mḥs* “eine äußerliche Krankheit” (Med., Wb II 129, 9) = “eine Krankheit (*am Kopf)” (GHWb 356) = “Mumps” (HAM 143) by I. Hafemann (p.c., 19 May 2000), while R. Hannig (GHWb) separated the two lexemes.

- Derived by participial m- from Eg. *ḥs “koten” (Altenmüller) < ḥs “Kot, Exkrement” (PT, Wb III 164, 4–10), cf. also jḥs “Schimpfwort” (Ptahhotep, CT V 30a–b).

LIT.: AÄG 110, §256; Altenmüller 1989, 6.

NB1: Eg. ḥs may be cognate with Bed. hūš [irreg. -š] “liquid faecal matter” [Rpr. 1928, 200] = “dünner Kot” [Zhl.] || LECu.: Afar ḥays-ū “Urin, Harn” [Rn. 1886, 862], Saho haš(š)-ū “Harn” [Rn. 1890, 196] ||| NOm.: Kachama oyšā, Ganjule ʔāša “dung of livestock” (NOm.: Blz. l.c.) ||| (?) Ch. *H-s [if from *ḥ-s] “faeces” [GT]: WCh.: AS *g^y₁es (Suroid) ~ *g^y₂es (Gmy). “excrement” [GT 2004, 146] | Krkr. ʔiṣē [Krf.] | Boghom yi:s [Smz.], Geji ʔiṣi [Krf.], Buli ʔiṣ [Krf.], Zaar (Saya) yi:s [Smz.] (WCh.: Sd. 1987, 230) || ECh.: Kera k-usi [Ebert] | Sokoro issī “faeces” [Jng.] | Mokilko ʔiizi [Jng.] | Jegu ʔiṣ [Jng. 1961, 113] | Mubi ʔāsē (pl.) [Jng.] (Ch. data: JI 1994 II, 128–129; Nwm. 1977, 25). Note that the correspondence of Eg. -s vs. Bed. -š is irregular. AP: E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 173) combined Eg. ḥs with Nub.: Kunuzi oṣi “Dünger” [Zhl.], Lit.: Zhl. 1932–33, 170 (Eg.-Bed.); OS 1990, #45.a; 1992, 185; HSED #1275 (Ch.-Eg.); Blz. 1989 MS Om., 10, #27 (NOm.-Ch.); Skn. 1992, 348 (Eg.-Ch.); Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 20 (Bed.-LECu.-Eg.); Skn. 1995, 34 (Ch.-Eg.). The initial PCh. laryngeal has been alternatively reconstructed as *ʔ-, cf. ECU. *ʔus- “contents of stomach” [Sasse 1982, 185] (Nwm. 1977, 25; PCh. *isi; Blz. 1989 MS Om., 10, #27: PAA *ʔi/usV). For the problem cf. also Takács 1996, 126, #1. The etymology of WCh.: Hausa káší ~ káášíi [*ka-asi] “excrement” [Abr. 1962, 498], Gwandara kwaṣi [Mts. 1972, 75] is dubious.

NB2: Sh. Yeivin (1936, 80, #41) compared Eg. ḥs with Hbr. & Aram. səḥīta “dirt, unclean things”, Ar. ṣḥy “to scrape off, clear away” via met., which seems less probable.

mhdr.t (GW) “Fischteich” (late NK, Wb II 129, 11) = “pond” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 343; DLE I 236) = “fish dike, fish net” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = “fish pond or enclosure(s) made with small dykes” (Hoch 1994, 150).

NB: Written syllabically as ma-ḥə-ṣá-r-tá ~ maḥ-ṣa-r-ta (Helck) = ma-ḥà-ṣi-r-tá ~ ma-ḥà-ṣa-r-tá ~ maḥ-ṣa-r-tá (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey). Vocalized as *maḥṣarta (?) (sg.) vs. *maḥṣarāta (pl.) (Hoch).

- Apparently a nomen loci/instr. borrowed from Sem., although the underlying root is disputed:
 - 1. W. Helck (1971, 514, #106) explained it from the basic sense “wasserreich” < “grün” in the light of the assumed connection with Sem. *ḥṣr > Hbr. ḥāṣīr “grass” [KB 344] | Ar. ḥaḍīra “to be green” [KB]. Declined by J. Hoch (1994, 150) as “*virtually impossible*”, the suggested primary sense being “*inappropriate*”.
 - 2. D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 35, §2.1.3.2.2 & p. 62, §2.4.2), followed by J. Hoch (1994, 150), compared it with Sem. *ḥṣr > Ug. ḥṣr “mansion, cuartel, measure of length” [DUL 382], Hbr. ḥāṣēr “yard without walls, court(yard), enclosure (around building)” [KB 345] | Ar. ḥaḍāra “to make inaccessible, confine cattle in fence”,

ḥaẓīr-at- “enclosure, corral, pen” [KB, Hoch]. Cf. also Ar. ḥaṣāra “to encircle, enclose”, ḥaṣr- “enclosure” [Hoch].

NB: No m- prefix reflexes attested in Ug. and Hbr., but cf. Ar. ma-ḥzūr-at- “chose sacrée, dont l'accès est défendu” < ma-ḥzūr- “1. tenu, enfermé dans une cloison, 2. (fig.) inaccessible, inabordable, autour duquel on élève une muraille” [BK I 454], which, however, hardly suits LEg. mḥdr.t.

- 3. Alternatively, J. Hoch (1994, 150, §193) affiliated it with Sem. *ḥṣr > Hbr. ḥāṣērīm (pl.) “1. permanent settlements” [KB 345] | Ar. ḥaḍāra “to be present, settle”, ḥaḍar- “place of residence, Bedouin camp” [KB] with hesitation (“not very likely on semantic grounds”).

mḥ “jemanden ehren” (MK, Wb II 129, 12; GHWb 357) = “to respect (so.)” (FD 115) > Dem. mjḥ “Ehre”, mḥj “ehren” (DG 153, 176).

- Hence: mḥ “the honoured one (?)” (CT VII 482, AECT III 174, spell 1137, n. 3).

NB1: For its doubtful and unlikely occurrence in the Eg. Aram. epithet ḥstḥmḥ (on a stela from Saqqara, 482 BC) rendered via Eg. ḥzj.tj “Günstling” + Dem. mḥj “ehren” (Grelot) see Vittmann 1993, 240.

NB2: Whether this root has anything to do with Eg. mḥ.t in Pap. Leiden I 348, rt. 10:4 (alternatively m-ḥ.t, rendered by J. F. Borgouts 1971, 111, n. 227 as “means”) and/or in Pap. Chester Beatty VII, rt.3:3 (tzj r mḥ.t “rise to the...”) is not clear.

- GT: it could be eventually cognate with Geez ʔamməḥa “salutavit”, ʔammeḥā “osculum, salutatio, munus, donum, munera (venerationis causa oblata)” [Vcl.] = ʔamməḥa ~ ʔamməḥa “to kiss, embrace, greet, salute, worship, revere, pay respect to, offer a gift out of respect”, ʔamməḥā “kiss, salute/-ation, greetings, gift offered out of respect, present”, ʔamməḥe “greeting, salutation” [Lsl. 1987, 23: isolated in Sem.] = ʔamḥa “baiser, donner des signes de plaisir et de vénération à qqn.” [DRS 22: isolated in Sem.] ||| WBrb.: Zng. emg-ek (1st sg. aor.) “louer, célébrer” [Bst. 1909, 244] ||| NAgaw: Hamir mīkek “verherrlichen, preisen, Ehrenbezeugungen erweisen (einem Mächtigen, Grossen)”, mikk-eš “mächtig sein” < *ʔgeehrt werden” [Rn. 1884, 392] < AA *m-q (?) “to respect” [GT].

NB1: The etymology of the Geez root has been strongly debated. E.g., F. Praetorius (1890, 30) explained Geez ʔamməḥa < *ʔamʔaḥa as a denom. verb stemming from māʔəḥa “brotherhood, friendship” literally denoting “to treat so. as a brother”. C. Conti Rossini (1905, 205) and C. Brockelmann (1950, 15), in turn, assumed a borrowing from the NAgaw verb “to kiss”, cf. Qemant yəmaγ [Rn., Apl.], Qwara imaγ [Rn.] = yəmaγ- [Apl.], Hamir (i)emqʔ [Rn.] = əmqʔ- [Apl.], Hamta amūḥ [CR, Apl.], Damot amaq [Rn.]. Both suggestions were (rightly) rejected by W. Leslau (l.c.). D. Appleyard (2006, 89) suggested just the opposite direction of borrowing (NAgaw < ES/Geez). Besides, L. Reinisch (1895, 24) combined the Agaw root for “to kiss” with Ar. wmq “lieben” as well as Eg. jm3ḥj “verehren, lieben” (sic) (Rn.) = “(tr.) jem. ehren” (XXII, Wb II 81, 15) < (intr.) “würdig, geehrt sein” (MK, Wb I 13–15) < jm3ḥ “1. Würde, Würdigkeit; 2. Ehrung” (OK, Wb II 81, 16–17). W. Vycichl (1958, 404) too combined Geez √ʔmḥ with Eg. jm3ḥ. This comparison is

hardly correct due to the semantic and phonological (Eg. -3- ≠ Geez -Ø-) difficulties. In addition, L. Reinisch (1895, 97) equated the Geez root with NAgaw: Qwara *mag̃a > mag̃ā-š (caus.) “sing” [Rn.] = mago-šow “to sing” [Flad].

NB2: There may be further Sem. cognates. Cf. PBHbr. mhy hifil “3. to recognize as an authority, (in gen.) authorize, appoint” [Jastrow 1950, 759], which M. Jastrow treated as a denom. verb from mūmḥe(h) “tried, skilled, expert, practical”. Or cf. Ar. myḥ: māḥa “avoir une démarche fière, se donner des airs en marchant” [BK II 1171]?

NB3: The Eg.-ES-WBrb.-NAgaw isogloss may be eventually connected with SCu.: Ma’a -māka “to wonder, be astonished” [Ehret] ||| WCh.: Hausa mààmáàkì “being surprised”, àbím mààmáàkì “wonder, marvel” [Abr. 1962, 652] < AA *m-q (unless *m-k) “to wonder” [GT]. For the semantic shift cf. Hung. csodál “to admire, respect” ~ csodálkozík “to wonder” < csoda “miracle”. Note that Ch. Ehret (1980, 155, #21) explained the Ma’a word from his SCu. *māk- “to be happy”, which is semantically unlikely.

NB4: Eg. mḥ and its AA cognates above might be (alternatively) affiliated with AA *m-Q (*-[g])? “elder relative” [GT]: Sem. *mḥ[?] > Akk. (OAss.) maḥā’um “uncle (?)” [AHW 582] = maḥā’um or maḥḥā’um “(mng. uncertain, seems to indicate a relationship) possibly elder brother or sister (in a family or in a commercial partnership)” [CAD m1, 85] ||| CCh.: Higi-Kamale muḥa “old men” [Mkr. 1987, 253] || ECh. *m-K “grandparent” [GT]: Kwang-Mobu mùg-dúm “grand-père” [Ebert 1977 MS, 8] | Bdy. migi “grand-père” [AJ 1989, 99], Mkl. mūgiyē (m) “grand-père”, mògá (f) “grand-mère” [Jng. 1990, 140, 142], Mokilko mògá “grand-mère” & mùgiyē “grand-père” [Jng. 1990, 140, 142], WDng. mígò (mìgò?) “parent par alliance: beau-père, gendre (terme réciproque)” [Fédry 1971, 131], EDng. mìgò “beau-père, gendre” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 204] | Birgit mòkòo-tù “mon grand-père” [Jng. 1973 MS], Toram mogot “grandfather” [AJ 1988 MS, 20], Kofa mògótá “grandfather” [Jng. 1977, 15, #34]. The etymology of the OAss. term is disputed: the authors of CAD surmised a connection to Sum. maḥ. W. von Soden (AHW 582, 586) assumed a cognacy with Akk. maḥḥû “Ekstatiker, Prophet” < maḥû “rasen” (unconvincing). O.V. Stolbova (1994 MS, 1; HSED #1801), in turn, connected the Akk. word to the Ch. term for “chief”, which is eventually possible (discussed below within this entry), but there can be no connection to Eg. mh.wt “relatives etc.” (q.v.) as suggested in HSED #1801, since Eg. h ≠ AA *Q. This Akk.-Ch. isogloss may be related also with CCh.: Higi muḥa, Fali-Muchella muḥa-ruku “old” || ECh.: (?) Sokoro mù’iyá [-? < *-ḥ-?] “old” (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 279).

NB5: The same applies to its eventual kinship with AA *m-[g] “chief” [GT]. Cf. NOM.: Haruro māgā “capo della comunità del villaggio” [CR 1937, 653] ||| Ch. *muḥa[V?] “chief” [Stl. 1996, 130] = *m-k-m “chief” [JI 1994 I 34C] = *m-[ḥ]-y [GT] > WCh.: Jimbin mùgà’á “chief” [Skn.] || CCh. *muḥa “king” [Stl.]: Higi mḥyē “chief” [Krf.], Higi-Nkafa mbage “chief” [Meek], Higi-Kamale ḡḡo “chief” [Meek] Fali-Kiria ḡḡyù “king” [Stl.: *mḡy < *mḡyV], Kapsiki mḡḡo “chief” [Stl.] | Dghwede màgàmá “chief” [Frick] = màḥámá [IL] = mùḡàma “king” [Stl.] | Lamang mbagam [Meek] = àmghàm ~ ómghàm [Lks.], Hide (Hitkala) mḡàm “chef, roi” [Eguchi 1971, 219] | PKotoko *mḡai “chief” [GT] = *mVHV “вождь, царь” [Prh. 1972, #1.6]: Logone mḡái “König, Herr” [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 109] = myāḡe [Mch.] = míanyé [Lks./JI] = mánḡe ~ mḡai [Mkr.] = mḡai “chief” [Stl.] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 124; JI 1994 II, 72–73; Stl. 1996, 130). Note that the Chadic terms listed above should be separated from the misleadingly similar *Wandervoort* ultimately borrowed from Kanuri mǎi “king”, cf. WCh.: Hausa mǎi “he/she who owns, chief of...” [Abr. 1962, 637] | Gerka mǎi “König, Häuptling” [Jng. 1965, 174] | Tangale maḡ “king, chief, head, leader, owner” [Jng. 1991, 118], Kirfi me [Gowers], Bole mǎe (sic, -e) [Meek] = moi [Ibr.] | Ngizim mǎi “Mai, i.e. a chief who descends from the line of the Mais of Birni Ngazargamo” [Schuh 1981, 109] ||

CCh.: Ngala mai “king, chief” [Meek/Slk.], Buduma mei ~ mai “König, Häuptling” [Nct./Lks. 1939, 118], Makeri & Affade mê (act. mee) “king, chief” [Barth/Slk.] = meç “chef” [Lbf./Slk.], Sao me “chef” [Gaudefroy-Demombynes/Slk.], Gulfei me “chef” [Gaudefroy-Demombynes/Slk.] = me “Häuptling” [Lks. 1937] = meç “chef” [Lbf./Slk.], Kuseri me ~ men “chef” [Gaudefroy-Demombynes/Slk.] = meç “chef” [Lbf./Slk.] (Ktk.: Slk. 1967, 273, §363; Prh. 1972, #1.6). The etymology of WCh.: Bokkos màkàà, pl. kayà “king” [Jng. 1968, 10, #108] = “König, Häuptling” [Jng. 1970, 144] is obscure, but in any case it may be a ma- prefix form. N. Skinner (1977, 28) falsely derived Jimbin mùgàʔá from NBch. *malv-.

NB6: The semantic connection of “respect” vs. “chief” vs. “old” seems to have existed in AA, cp., e.g., NAgaw: Bilin bähär, bahar “vieux, respectable, grand, notable” || LECu.: Somali boqor, boyor “chief, king” (Cu.: Dlg. 1967, 7, #3) or PBrb. *m-ḳ-r > *m-ḳ-r “être vieux, notable, grand” [GT] (Brb.: Dlg. 1967, 7, #3; Mlt. 1991, 252, #5.1).

● Other suggestions cannot be accepted:

- 1. C. H. Gordon (1955, 287, #1085), followed by K. Aartun (1979, 1), affiliated it with Sem.: Ug. mḥ “indeclinable interjection” (attested a few times in the Aqht-poem in: hw/hy mḥ interpreted as “may he/she prosper!”) [Gordon] = “ein Ausdruck des Ausrufs” [Aartun] and even Ar. mḥḥ: ʔamaḥḥa “to be fat”. False. These comparanda can hardly belong to the same root.

NB1: J. Aistleitner (WUS #1543) glossed the Ug. form s.v. mḥ “beruhigt, betrost” combined with Ar. mwḥ “ruhig, besänftigt sein, sich beruhigen”.

NB2: Ar. ʔamaḥḥa is in fact just a denom. verb < muḥḥ- “1. moelle, 2. cervelle, 3. graisse, 4. matière adipeuse de l’oeil” [BK II 1071] deriving ultimately from common Sem. *muḥḥ- “brain” [SED I 169–170, §187], which has hardly anything to do either with the Ug. word in question or with Eg. mḥ.

- 2. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 196, #1772) equated Eg. mḥ with LECu.: Afar maʕan (misquoted as *magan) “sg. that is taboo” [PH 1985, 160].

mḥ (or better **mḥj**?) “Verbum von einer Krankheit: sich ausbreiten o.ä.” (Med., Wb II 129, 13: hapax) = “s’étendre” (Lefébvre 1956, 24) = “bändiggen, einstellen” (WMT I 388) = “juguler” (AL 78.1832) = “im Keime ersticken” (GHWb 357) = “einstellen (schädliche Tätigkeit)” (HAM 578) = “eindämmen” (Hafemann after WMT, p.c. on 19 May 2000).

NB: Obscure word attested with three exx. It has apparently a fem. inf. (1) The reading of the supposed ex. in CT IV 328a is highly debated. R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 271, spell 336, n. 11) left it untranslated surmising a connection to ḥw.t.t (flame det.) “als Name eines der Tore des Jenseits” (BD, Wb III 247, 6), while R. van der Molen (DCT 178) read the whole expression as one word (mḥʕ.wt “flame?”). But D. Meeks (AL l.c.) maintained the rdg. as a compound: mḥ.w sd.t “celui qui jugule la flamme”. (2) The context of Pap. Ebers 36:14 deals with a disease of the stomach and liver of a patient whose condition is apparently on the way to bettering, when the physician has to state: ḥ3j.t pw hr mḥ.t wnm-s “c’est que la maladie s’étend et qu’elle dévore” (Lefébvre 1956, 24, rejected in WMT) = “it shows that the disease mḥ.t, it is consumed (i.e. decreases?)” (Ebbell 1937, 47) = this is a disease during

mḥ.t (inf.) of its consuming” (GT). The translation “to extend” has been rejected by W. Westendorf (in WMT I 388), who corrected its reading to mḥr rendering it as a *Nebenform* of mḥ3 “fesseln”, which led him to translating the passage as “die Krankheit bändigt (oder stellt ein) ihr Fressen” (WMT) = “es ist (der Fall, daß) die Krankheitserscheinung dabei ist, ihre schädliche Tätigkeit (wörtlich: Fressen) einzustellen” (HAM l.c.), which can hardly be projected to the other two occurrences. This suggestion has been rightly rejected by D. Meeks (AL l.c.: “*cette correction n’emporte pas l’adhésion*”), who found the third occurrence of Eg. mḥ (3) in Edfu VII 112:15–16, where the mng. “*juguler’ conviendrait tout à fait*”.

- Any etymology would be premature.
- **1.** GT: most attractive seems a derivation from AA *m-q (hardly *m-k because of Sem. *ḥ-) “to reject” [GT].
NB1: Attested in Ar. mḥy: II maḥḥā “emmener qqn. pour qu’il soit loin de qqch.”, V “2. se contenir et s’abstenir de qqch.” [BK II 1075] = “abstinuit” [Levy] ||| HECu.: Sid. makk-i’r- “to refuse” [Gsp./Hds. 1989, 122, 384], Hdy. makk-at- “to defend” [Hds. 1989, 293].
NB2: Whether Can. *mḥ/ḥy “eliminate by force (?)” [GT] > OHbr. mḥy qal “to annihilate (names)” [KB 567], BAram. mḥ? pael “hindern, wehren” [GB 913], PBHbr. & JAram. mḥy “2. verbieten, wehren” [Levy 1924 III, 72–73] = i.a. “2. to wear out, destroy”, piel i.a. “2. to forewarn, interfere, try to prevent” [Jastrow 1950, 759] represents the same Sem. bicons. root is highly doubtful (a secondary contamination with Can. *mḥy “to wipe off” is plausible).
- **2.** GT: a connection to SBrb.: Tudalt & Tadghaq māḵ-āt “to be extinguished” [Sudlow 2001, 180] is hardly possible.
NB: Cf. SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr māḵ-āt “être réduit à l’état de braises ardentes, 2. se consumer, s’éteindre par manque de bois (feu)” derived from Ewlm. a-ku “être allumé” [PAM 2003, 351–2], Hgr. mek-et “1. être réduit, se réduire à l’état de braises ardentes sans flamme, 2. (par ext.) être achevé, tué, recevoir le coup de grâce, s’achever” < u-ku “être allumé (avec ou sans flamme)” [Fed. 1951–2, 720–1].
- **3.** GT: presumably unrelated also to WCh.: PAngas *muk “to squeeze, throttle” [GT 2004, 254].
NB: Attested in Angas muk “to press, squeeze” [Flk. 1915, 247] = mùk “würgen” (≈ Hs. šáákè “1. to strangle, 2. fill chock-full, be brimful”, Abr. 1962, 643, 799), mùk ḡwàṅ-ḡwàṅ “to throttle” (ḡwàṅ-ḡwàṅ “Adam’s apple”) [Jng. 1962 MS, 26].
- **4.** GT: does it represent a tr. reflex of AA *m-ḵ “(to be) waste, empty” [GT]?
NB: Cf. Sem.: Yemeni Ar. maḥḥ “freilassen, befreien” [Behnstedt 1993, 193] ||| HECu.: Sud. muquq-ânčo “empty, vacant” [Gsp. 1983, 241] ||| NOm.: Kafa māk “ausgehen, -fallen (Haare, Zähne), glatt, kahl werden” [Rn. 1888, 317] = makok-at “cogliere” [Cecci apud Rn.].
- **5.** GT: since the mng. “sich ausbreiten” (Wb) in Pap. Ebers 36:14 has been firmly disproved, a comparison with Ar. √mḥḥ > mu-miḥḥ- “long, qui se prolonge (affaire)” [BK II 1072] is excluded.
NB: The same pertains to an alternative comparison with Akk. maḥāḥu “aufquellen lassen, in Flüssigkeit auflösen” > G also “(durch Reiben?) verschwellen lassen (Augen)” [AHW 577].

mḥ3.t “Wage, besonders die große Standwage” (OK, Wb II 130, 8) > Dem. mḥj.t “Wage” (DG 176:1) > Cpt. (SL) ḥḏḡḡ, (S) ḥḏḏḡḡ, (B)

μαυι, (A) μαρι, (F²) μευι (f) “balance” (CD 201a; CED 96; DELC 128) = “Waage” (KHW 107) > (?) Eg. Ar. (dial. of Khargeh) mēša “ein Gefäß zum Abmessen, Abwiegen” (Behnstedt 1981, 90, §39). NB: Vocalized as *māh3.t (Zunke 1923/1997, 63; Snk. 1999, 96) < *māh3.t (Fecht).

- Hence denom.: mh3 “1. (tr.) in Gleichewicht bringen, (den Mund an die Knochen) anpassen (bei der Mundöffnung), eben machen, (sich mit jem.) messen, 2. (intr.) jemandem gleich sein, ausbalanciert sein” (OK, Wb II 130–1) = “(einander) anpassen, (gegeneinander aus)balancieren” (Grapow 1914, 27; Feichtner 1932, 220) = “adjustment (of balance)” (Ptol., Faulkner 1958, 31) = “to adjust” (PT, Allen 1984, 557) > Dem. mhj “gleichen” (Lüddeckens 1960, 222, n. 682 & p. 363; Cenival 1988, 80).

NB: The alleged reflection of mh3 “(sich mit jem.) messen” (Lit. MK, Wb II 131, 1) in Cpt. (SL) μιυε, (B) μιυι “kämpfen, schlagen” (KHW 108) < Dem. mhj “schlagen, kämpfen” (DG 176) < Eg. mh(3)j “durchstossen (vom Speer)” (GR, Wb, q.v.) is quite doubtful. This semantically far-fetched *Ableitung* suggested by K. Sethe (Spg. KHW 68, n. 13), G. Fecht (1955, 291, §3), W. Westendorf (1966, 153, fn. 4), J. Černý (CED 96), and J. Osing (NBA 50) may be due to a late contamination and has probably to be rejected. For further details cf. Eg. mhj (q.v.).

- Nomen instr. of Eg. h3j “messen, wägen” (OK, Wb III 223).

LIT.: Ceugney 1880, 7; Grapow 1914, 27; AAG 109, §254; Ol’derogge 1956, 7; Fecht 1960, 180, §373; Smith 1979, 161; DELC 128.

NB1: M. K. Feichtner (l.c.) erroneously identified the first cons. of the denom. verb mh3 with the AA prefix *m- expressing *Gegenseitigkeit*.

NB2: Following P. Kaplony (ZÄS 88, 1962, 11, n. 2), H. Goedicke (1966, 20 & fn. 3–4) doubted the derivation of Eg. mh3.t < h3j (arguing that the latter denoted “das Messen mit dem Scheffel, also einen völlig anderen Vorgang”) and suggested instead a rather unlikely connection to Eg. h3.t (OK) > h3w.t (MK) “Platte mit Untersatz (einbeiniger Tisch) zum Darbringen von Speisen” (PT, Wb III 226) = “(Tisch)Platte” (Gdk.) as well as mh3.wt “Landesteg” (MK, Gdk., below, plausible) and even mh3 “verbinden” (Lit. MK, q.v.), which has little in common with measuring and certainly represents a distinct root.

NB3: The etymology of Eg. h3j is not fully certain: (1) C.T. Hodge (1990, 371) identified it with Ar. hl̄l: V taḥallala “to be or come between”, cf. hl̄l̄l- “interval, middle”, ḥalal- “interval, gap, split” [Hodge]. Semantically weak. (2) GT: it might be perhaps an irreg. (Eg. ḥ ≠ Sem. *k) cognate to Sem. *kyl > Ar. kyl: kāla “to measure” || MSA: Jbl. ṽkyl: miḥol “measure” (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 339). For the reg. correspondence of Eg. IIIae-j roots with Sem. hollow roots see Vcl. 1953, 373–7. (3) GT: if, in turn, Eg. h3j < *h3rj, cp. alternatively WCh.: perhaps Sura kár “Kräfte messen, in Wettstreit treten” [Jng. 1963, 69] | Bole kor- “abmessen” [Lks. 1971, 136] || CCh.: MM *g^war ~ *gur “to measure” [GT] > Mada g^wár, Muyang g^wár, Hurzo g^wáriká “to measure” (MM: Rsg. 1978, 290, #458).

mh3.wt “Zollstationen (?) auf dem Fluß” (MK: Urk. VII 48:6, Wb II 131, 7) = “Wagestellen oder Zollstellen” (Sethe apud Gdk.) = “custom-houses” (Glanville 1932, 17) = “Stapelplatz” (Helck 1954, 79f.) = “Landesteg” (Gdk. 1966, 20) = “custom-station, control-point

on river” (Jones 1988, 205–6, §9, cf. Glanville in ZÄS 68, 1932, 17, n. 36).

NB: S. R. K. Glanville (l.c.) found a further ex. in Pap. BM 10056: mh3.jt “magazine (?) (or sim.)” ≈ mstjr “place of administration”.

- **Nomen loci.** The underlying root is debated.

NB: (1) The traditional derivation of MK mh3.wt from Eg. ḥ3j “to measure” (OK) has been rejected by H. Goedicke (l.c.) as “*unmöglich*”, who affiliated it rather with (2) Eg. ḥ3.w “Schiffsbalken” (Wb III 224, 3) and a number of further unconvincing *comparanda* (discussed s.v. Eg. mh3.t “balance”, q.v.). (3) GT: perhaps originates from Eg. wh3 “suchen” (OK, AWb I 370), whose OK exx. were rendered in Wb I 354, 9 as “(Waren) besorgen”. Cf. esp. wh3.wt “Suchkommando” (1st IMP, AWb l.c.).

mh3 “fesseln, (gefangene Vögel) binden” (Lit. MK: Adm. 13:11, Wb II 130, 1–2; GHWb 357) = “to bind” (Grd. 1909, 115) = “to hold, bind together” (JEA 29, 1943, 14, n. c) = “to fetter, chain” (Camino 1954 LEM, 206) = “to make fast, bind” (FD 115) = “verbinden” (Gdk. 1966, 20, fn. 4) > (?) Dem. mhj “enwickeln” (Dem. Pap. Leiden I 384, 5:35, Spg.) = “s’entortiller” (Cenival 1984, 230) = “enrouler” (Cenival 1988, 85).

NB: The occurrence in CT I 269e (suggested in Wb Bel. ad II 130, 2 and by H. Goedicke l.c.) has been rendered by R. O. Faulkner (AEPT I 58), followed by R. van der Molen (DCT 371), fully differently: m ḥ3.w “in thousands”. W. Helck (1971, 504, #107) rendered the ex. in Ostr. Edinburgh 14:6 as “ein Wagenteil” borrowed from Sem., cf. Hbr. mh? “schlagen”.

- Hence: (1) mh3 “1. Fessel, 2. auch als etwas am Streitwagen: Schlaufe, Schlinge” (late NK, Wb II 130, 3) = “cordes” (Ceugney 1880, 7 after Maspero) = “string (which figs are arranged in)” (Camino 1954 LEM, 206) = “fetter, band (Fessel, Band)” (Janssen 1975, 289, §70 with disc.; KHW 486) = “rope, fetter” (CED 7) = “lien, corde” (AL 77.1838) = “string, line, ropes, noose, fetters, bonds” (DLE I 236) = “1. Fessel, Schlinge (um den Hals), 2. *Schlaufe, Schlinge (am Streitwagen)” (GHWb 357), vocalized *^cmh3 (CED) > Cpt. (B) ⲁⲙⲱⲓ (f!) “rope” (CD Add. xv; CED 7) = “Seil, Schnur, Docht” (KHW 486), (2) mh3 “Kranz o.ä. von Feigen (wie ein Maß gebraucht)” (late NK, Wb II 130, 5) = “espèce de mesure” (Ceugney 1880, 7 after Maspero) = “*Kranz, Strang (von Feigen, als Maß).
- GT: most probably, Eg. mh3 < *mḥr reflecting AA *m-ḳ-r “1. to bind, 2. twist” [GT] > HECu.: Sid. meqêrra “to plait, twist (thread)”, meqêrra “what is twisted, twined, plaited together, as thread” [Gsp. 1983, 229] = meḳêrr- “to plait (thread, rope)” [Hds. 1989, 385: isolated in HECu.], Gedeo (Drs.) mirḳ- [met. < *mirḳ-] “to bundle”, mirḳ-es-anḣo “bundle” [Hds. 1989, 33] || SCu.: DhI. mukḳur- “to tie” [Eld. 1973 MS, 6, #375; EEN 1989, 39] = “to bind” [Ehret

1980, 159; Tosco 1991, 143] ||| NOm.: Haruro mirq- [met. < *miqr-] “torcere” [CR 1937, 655] ||| CCh.: Tera mekóri “to twist” [Nwm. 1964, 48, #479] | perhaps Mafa mœk^wer “cordelette en lamelles de tiges de mil tressées, passée autour de la main d’un tireur à l’arc et tenue par un noeud coulant” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 224].

NB1: Ch. Ehret (1980, 159) derived the Dh. word from his SCu. *muḡur-/muruḡ- “to gain mastery, overcome, overpower” (sic) based on the semantically false equation with Ma’a -múru “to be able, have power to”.

NB2: An AA var. root *m-[g/g]-r “to tie (or sim.)” [GT] has been also preserved (discussed in the entry for Eg. md3 infra).

NB3: The AA root discussed above seems to have biconsonantal background, cf. the following family of roots:

(1) AA *m-[g/g] “thread (?)” [GT] > ES: (?) Geez mag(a)we “bunch, handful, small bundle” [Lsl. 1987, 333: isolated in Sem.] ||| NBrb.: (?) Mzab t-miḡza [ž < *g reg.] “fils tenant les boucles de la lisse sur la sur la tringle derrière le tissage” [Dlh. 1984, 127] || SBrb.: Hgr. ā-miḡ, pl. i-māḡy-an “artère (vaisseau qui porte le sang du coeur aux extrémités), veine (canal qui ramène le sang des extrémités au coeur)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1169; PAM 1998, 211; 2003, 526], Ghat a-meḡ, pl. i-māḡ-an “artère” [Nhl. 1909, 129] ||| NAgaw: Qwara magg-na “thread” [Flad/Rn.] | LECu.: Orm. māḡ-ā “ascaris, roundworm” [Gragg 1982, 270] | HECu.: Gedeo (Drs.) māḡa “roundworm” [Hds. 1989, 126]. Cf. also LECu.: Orm. magi “weft” [Lsl.] ||| NOm.: Mocha māḡo “weft” [Lsl. 1959, 40]?

(2) AA *m-[k/q] “to bind” [GT] > NAgaw: Qemant mak “filer”, mak^wa “fil” [CR], Qwara makow “to spin” [Flad/Rn.] = mak “spinnen” [Rn.], Dembea mek^wa “Faden” [Halévy/Rn.] = mak “filer” [CR] (NAgaw: Rn. 1895, 97; CR 1912, 227) || HECu.: (?) Hdy. mačč-o [č < *k?] “breiter Ledergürtel der Männer” [Ehret 1991, 252, §179] ||| CCh.: Mbara mikí “lier, attacher” [TSL 1986, 272]. Note that LECu.: Afar maḡuy- “tying action” [PH 1985, 160] cannot belong here (as erroneously suggested by Ch. Ehret l.c. who mistranscribed it as maḡuy-).

(3) AA *m-[k/ḡ] “to tie” [GT] > LECu.: Som. miḡ “spinnen” vs. “Spinnerei, Faden, Filum zum Nähen” [Rn. 1902, 291] = miḡ “a length of thread (as for inserting in a needle)”, miḡ-ayya “to spin” [Abr. 1964, 180] | Dullay: Dbs. maqq-is- “anbinden (ein Tier)” [AMS 1980, 175].

NB4: In the light of the semantic shift of Dem. mhj “enwickeln” (Spg.) = “s’entortiller, enrouler” (Cenival), the root family of AA *m-K (vars. *m-k/ḡ ~ *m-k/q) “to turn (around), make circular motion” [GT] might be eventually also related, cf. LECu.: Saho make “to twist”, mak-iše “1. to cause to twist, 2. (tr) turn”, mak-ite “1. to twist o’self, 2. turn (intr.)” [Vergari 2003, 130], Afar mak-o (f) “bend, curve, twist”, makōka (f) “zigzag, sharp bend”, makk-ōwe (intr.) “to bend, twist (se courber, s’enrouler), make bend, distort, twist” [PH 1985, 161, 170] | perhaps Tsamay maḡ “to change direction, readdress” [Sava 2005 MS, 250] (orig. *to turn?) || SCu.: Irq. mukuku[?]-ūs “to twist, throw with a sling, swing”, hence māmuk-ūs “wave”, cf. māḡ-ūm “to circle in the air (of bird of prey), roaming (people)” [MQK 2002, 69–70, 74] ||| WCh.: Bubure mâakó “to wrap, envelop” [Haruna 1992 MS, #f137]. Noteworthy is AA *m-K (vars. *m-g ~ *m-k) “to change, mix” (orig. *to make a circular motion?) [GT] > Ar. myḡ: māḡa “être mêlé, mélangé”, cf. also maḡmaḡ-at- “mélange, confusion” [BK II 1065, 1170] | Orm. maka “to mix, add, dilute” [Gragg 1982, 274] = makū “1. to add, mix, blend, 2. involve”, maktō “fusion”, makā “1. mixture, 2. compound, 3. combination” [Btm. 2000, 186–187] | HECu.: Gedeo (Drs.) mak- “to mix” [Hds. 1989, 100: isolated in HECu.] || CCh.: (?) Bdm. mugu “masser” [Gaudiche 1938, 29] = moge ~ gome “durchkneten” [Lks. 1939, 119] || ECh.: WDng. mákè & EDng. màḡē “(é)changer” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 192]

= “umtauschen” [Ebs. 1979, 125; 1987, 97] | Birgit màgí “changer”, màgàyi “échanger” [Jng. 2004, 356].

NB5: The etymology of LECu.: Konso makük-a “weaving shuttle” [Sasse] | HECu.: Burji mukük-ā > muhúh-ā “weaving shuttle” [Sasse 1982, 149] is not clear. Nomina instr. with the prefix *ma-?

- Other suggestions are either unlikely or cannot be accepted:
- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 7) derived Eg. mh3 “cordes” from Eg. h3j “to measure” (q.v.).
- **2.** H. Goedicke (1955, 33) and E. E. Knudsen (1962, 35, §7), in turn, combined Eg. mh3 with Eg. mđ.t “Art Klammer oder Fessel” (PT, Wb II 184–5, below) on the basis of the supposed interchange of Eg. h ~ d.
NB: The presence vs. absence of -3 is disturbing. Moreover, there are but very few truly convincing examples for the alleged alternance of Eg. h ~ d among the examples gathered by Goedicke (1955), Vycichl (1957, 71–73), Knudsen (1962, 33–36).
- **3.** W. W. Müller (1961, 202, #9) affiliated it with Sem.: Geez ḥam(m)aya ~ ḥammaya “to chain, tie, bind, shackle” [Lsl. 1987, 262–3] = ḥamäyā “fesseln, mit Ketten binden (vinculis constringere, ligare, vincire)” [Müller] via met. But Eg. -3 vs. Geez -y are irregular.
NB: For Geez ḥmy, a different etymology has been suggested by W. F. Albright and A. Ember, cf. Akk. ḥamû “lähmen” [AHW 319] = “to immobilize, paralyze, stun” [CAD h 72] = “to hold, seize” (!) [Alb.], to which W. Leslau (l.c.) added also Ar. ḥmy: ḥamā “défendre, protéger, empêcher, 2. interdire” [BK II 497] via the semantic shift “to restrain” > “to tie, bind”. The suggested connection of Akk.-Geez parallel to Eg. ḥm^o “fassen, packen” (PT, Wb III 281–2) is rather unlikely. The latter root may be akin rather to SCu.: PRift *kom- “to hold, have” [GT] | Dahalo kam- “to hold” [Ehr.] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 241, #1) ||| SOM.: (?) Hamer ḥam- [if h- < AA *q-] “to hold, keep” [Bnd. 1994, 152] ||| WCh. *kaHam- “to seize” [GT] = *qam- (sic) “ловить” [OS 1988, 67, #6]: Hausa káámà “to seize hold of, capture, arrest, take, etc.” [Abr. 1962, 463] | AS *kaγam [*-γ- < *-ʕ-?] “to seize” [GT 2004, 161] etc. Lit.: Alb. 1919, 182; 1927, #66 (Eg.-Sem.); Ember 1926, 309, #3; 1930, 36, §5.h.1 (Eg.-Sem.); IS 1984, #376 (Geez-Eg.-WCh.); HSED #2033 (Hausa-SCu.).
- **4.** Later, H. Goedicke (1966, 20, fn. 4) seems to have changed his view and affiliated this root with Eg. mh3.wt “Landesteg” (MK, Urk. VII 48:6) and mh3.t “Wage” (OK, Wb, q.v.) derived from Eg. h3.t (OK) > h3.wt (MK) “Platte mit Untersatz (einbeiniger Tisch) zum Darbringen von Speisen” (PT, Wb III 226) = “(Tisch)Platte” (Gdk.). Semantically rather doubtful whether all these forms derive from the same root.
- **5.** R. Caminos (1977, 28), followed by L. Lesko (DLE I 258) and R. Hannig (GHWb 357), saw in it a var. of Eg. mđ3 “eingesperrt sein” (late NK, Wb, q.v.) = “einsperren” (Lange) = “to tie up, fetter” (Caminos) = “fesseln” (GHWb) with the interchange of Eg. h ~ d.

NB: Plausible, provided Eg. *mḏ3* < AA **m-g-r/l* (and not < AA **m-ç/ĕ/ĉ-r/l*, which is not to be ruled out either), but this does not ultimately contradict the etymology suggested above. Moreover, it adds nothing to the very etymology of Eg. *mḥ3*.

- **6.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 199; HSED #1712) combined Eg. *mḥ3* with ECh.: Somray (Sibine) *mā* “nouer” [Br̄t.-Jng. 1990, 114] = “to tie” [OS].

NB: Due to the lack of further Ch. lexical evidence, it is difficult to judge the etymology of the Somray word (cf. also Eg. *mḥ* “to spin or sim.”, above).

- **7.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 197, #1775) affiliated it with LECu. **māg-* (sic) “to collect together”.

NB: His proto-form was based on Afar *māgoy-ise* “to collect together” [PH 1985, 157] and Som. *māgēr* “enclosure” [Ehr.] that are even mutually unrelated.

mḥ3.w (skin det.) “ein Tier (dessen Haut zu einem ledernen Arming verarbeitet ist/wird)” (XVIII. hapax: Urk. IV 671:14, Wb II 131, 11; GHwB 358).

NB1: The second ex. (suggested in Wb Belegstellen), namely *m(-)ḥ3.w* in CT I 269e, has been rendered by H. Goedicke 1966 (after Belegstellen Wb ad II 130, 2) as *mḥ3* “verbinden” (q.v.), while R. O. Faulkner (AEPT I 58) and R. van der Molen (DCT 371) rendered it as *m ḥ3.w* “in thousands”.

NB2: D. Meeks (p.c., 15 March 2000) doubts that it denotes the name of an animal surmising in it rather a word for “skin”. But the context suggests the former solution, cf. *mḥ3.w* “arming of skin of *mḥ3.w*”.

- Meaning dubious. Etymology uncertain. Since it is listed among the tributes of Syria and Palestina, we may not exclude a foreign origin.

- **1.** D. Meeks (p.c., 15 March 2000) supposes that it may be a prefix *m-* extension of Eg. *ḥ3.w* “Haut und sonstiger Abfall von Kleinvieh” (OK, Wb III 225, 8).

NB: This is akin to P.Om. **kur*-(N)- “bark” [Bnd. 1988, 149; 1994, 1156, #3] || WCh.: perhaps Pero *kpilò* [reg. < **k^wilo*] “to peel, break from the shell” [Frj. 1985, 38] | Pa’a kurri “skin” [Gowers] | S.Bauchi **k^war* ~ **kūr* “skin” [GT]: Bghom kwaii [IL] = *kway* [Smz.] = *kwa-miess* [Gowers], Kir kwaar [Smz.], Tala kuur [Smz.], Geji kullzi [IL] = *kuul* [Smz.], Buli kūr [IL] = *kuur* [Smz.], Wangday kūr [IL] = *kur* [Smz.] || ECh.: Somray *gàré*, *gà:ré* “skin” [Jng.], Ndam *gōré* “skin” [Jng.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 296–297). Cp. perhaps also CCh.: Gisiga *garak* “skin, Haut” [Lks. 1970, 122] || ECh.: Kera *gòlgò* “skin of animal, Fell” [Ebert 1976, 52].

- **2.** GT: following D. Meeks’ rendering, perhaps it might be alternatively affiliated with LECu.: Baiso *marka* [met. < **makr-a*] “skin (human)” [Flm.], PSam **maqār* “skin (of person)” [Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984, 223] = OSomali **maḳār-* “Fell, Haut” [Lmb. 1986, 444].

NB: Attested in Somali *maqār* ~ *maḡār* “ausgestopftes Kalb oder Kamelfellen welches dazu benützt wird, dem Muttertier die Milch abzulocken” [Rn. 1902, 293] = *maqār*, pl. *māqārro* “1. skin of dead camel-foal put near its mother to deceive her into giving milk, 2. hide for sleeping on” [Abr. 1964, 173], Som.-Benadir *makar* ~ *magar* “skin (human)” [Flm.], Rnd. *maḥel* (sic, -l) “skin” [Flm.] = *maḥēr* [-kh-] “abgezogene Haut eines Tieres” [Schlee 1978, 139, #734] = *maḥēr* (-x-) “prepared

camel skin” [Oomen 1981, 72] = magār (!) “skin (of person)” [Ehret] = mākḥér “prepared camel skin” [PG 1999, 214] (Sam: Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984, 237–241; LECu.: Flm. 1964, 55, 70). Cp. perhaps also ECh.: Smr. mǎgólà (m) “sac en peau” [Jng. 1993 MS, 43]?

- **3.** GT: if, in turn, Eg. mh3.w was the name of an animal, cf. perhaps CCh. *m-k-r “a small animal (lizard?) sp.” [GT]. CCh. *k ~ Eg. ḥ reg. < AA *q.

NB1: Attested in MM *mak^wal ~ *maklaw “lizard sp.” [GT]: Mafa mokwal “petit lézard sp.” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 224], Mada máháláw “chameleon” [Rsg.] = mahlaw (-hl- ≠ -h/s- in this case) “caméléon” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 181], Muktele mākūlóló “chameleon” [Rsg.], (?) Mofu mǎklà-zàráw “lizard” [Rsg. 1978, 285, §433.b], Mofu-Gudur ‘makwál “petit lézard sp.” [Brt. 1988, 173] (MM: Rsg. 1978, 222, §120) | Logone mágaran “Eidechse” [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 106]. Note that D. Barreteau (l.c.) explained the MG word from -kwál- “sécher”.

NB2: The etymology of CCh.: Bura mikir ~ mukur [-r < *-n] “a small animal”, mikura ~ mukira “a very large bush rat”, mukira “a small animal like a groundhog” [BED 1953, 138, 143] is obscure.

mh3 (house det.) “Art Magazin für Holz” (late NK, Wb II 130, 6) = “a shed or magazine for wood” (Caminos 1956, 17) = “shed” (FD 115) = “Schuppen (Gebäude)” (GHWb 357).

- Etymology uncertain.

NB: (1) Nomen loci? The underlying root is not clear. Perhaps from the same root as Eg. mh3.wt “Zollstationen (?) auf dem Fluß” (MK, Wb, above), i.e., < Eg. ḥ3j “to measure”? (2) Or to be associated with Eg. mḥr “Kornspeicher” (OK, Wb, q.v.)?

mh3j (or rather GW for **mhj**?) “etwas verbrennen (von der Vernichtung der Feinde, ihrer Länder u.ä. durch den König)” (XX., Wb II 130, 7) = “action de brûler” (Ceugney 1880, 7) = “to burn up” (DLE I 236) = “verbrennen” (GHWb 357).

- Etymology uncertain.

- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 7) regarded it as the “*forme complète*” of Eg. m3ḥ “verbrennen”, which he derived from an Eg. ḥ^hw. Absurd.

- **2.** GT: act. GW for mhj? If so, cp. SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr mǎmmǎg-ət “1. avoir la surface entièrement brûlée, 2. brûler, être brûlé” [PAM 1998, 218; 2003, 542].

- **3.** GT: or, less probably, perhaps an m- prefix form of an Eg. *√ḥ3 [< *ḥr?], for which cp. Eg. ḥrt “Flamme” (NK, Wb III 323, 20) ||| LECu.: PSam *huri “to kindle” [Heine 1977, 292; 1978, 63]?

mhj (better than **mh3** or **mh3j**) “durchstoßen (vom Speer, der die Beute oder ihre Glieder durchstößt; auch von einem tauchenden Vogel, der das Wasser nach Fischen durchstößt)” (GR, Wb II 131, 8–10) = “frapper, percer (avec une lance, un harpon)” (AL 77.1840) = “transpercer” (DELC 128) = “to skewer” (PL 456).

NB: The root is “in seinem Konsonantenbestand nicht eindeutig” (Fecht 1955, 291, §3). The Ptol. Edfu vars. mhj ~ mh ~ mš (PL 456) as well as the Cpt. reflexes suggest a IIIae -j root in spite of the common view that its inf. (correctly vocalized) contained a 3rd alef, cf. *mīh̄3 (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 147) = *mīh̄3, st. pron. *mē/īh̄3 = > (B) MΛΩ = (NBÄ 401) = *mīhi3 (Zeidler 1999, 285, fn. 9), which is greatly motivated by the (popular?) etymology (discussed under #1 below) based on the rather dubious ultimate derivation of the sense “schlagen” from “gleich machen” (sic). Instead of this controversial theory, which fails to answer also why the typical pattern of the IIIae -3 verbal roots did not result in Cpt. (S) *ḥiωλi in this case, more appropriate seems to assume an Eg. √mhj (*mīh̄j) regularly yielding (S) MΛΩ.

- Hence: Dem. mhj ~ mjh “schlagen, kämpfen” (DG 176, 153) = mjh(e) ~ mjš “to hit” (Johnson 1976, 129) > Cpt. (SL) MΛΩ, (S) MΛΩ, (A) MΛΩ, M(ε)IΩ, M(ε)IΩ, M(ε)IΩ, (BF) MΛΩ “1. (intr.) to fight, 2. (tr.) strike” (CD 202–3) = “schlagen, durchbohren, kämpfen mit, überwinden” (Spg. KHW 68) = “schlagen, kämpfen” (KHW 108; Wst. 1966, 153, fn. 4) = “to attack” (Peust 1999, 247).

- Etymology uncertain.

- 1. In Eg. philology, it is usually treated as a late reflection of Eg. mh3 “(sich mit jem.) messen” (Lit. MK: Sin. B49, Wb II 131, 1) = “to measure (one’s strength with)” (Černý), which is a rare *Nebensinn* of mh3 “in Gleichgewicht bringen” (PT, Wb, q.v.) = “gleichmachen” (Fecht). Semantically weak. Moreover, the Cpt. reflexes suggest an inf. following the pattern *C₁iC₂~C₃ where -C₃ was -j.

LIT.: Sethe (quoted in Spg. KHW 68, n. 13), Fecht (1955, 291, §3), Westendorf (1966, 153, fn. 4), Černý (CED 96), Osing (NBÄ 50), Zeidler (1999, 285, fn. 9)

- 2. P. Wilson (PL 456), in turn, assumed an etymological connection to Eg. mh3 “to bind” arguing that “by skewering sg. on a skewer separate pieces can be held together” (!), allotting that it “may be also (!) connected with” Eg. mšw “blade, weapon” and mšʕ “army”. The latter idea is absurd.

NB: In the light of its GR context as well as the sense of its Cpt. reflexes, LEg. mh3 has little in common with the suggested connotation of a skewer. In addition, Eg. mšw and mšʕ may not even mutually be connected.

- 3. It has long been identified with the diverse supposed reflexes of AA *mVq̄- “to beat, fight” [Mlt.-Stl.] = *muq̄Vʔ- “to strike” [HSED] = *m-ḳ̄ ~ *m-ḥ [GT], cf. Sem. *mḥʔ (?) “to strike” [GT]: Akk. māḥītu “Peitsche” [AHW 584] = maḥītu ~ mi- “whip” [CAD m1, 103: first attested in OBab.] || (?) Can. *mḥʔ “to strike” [GT] || NBrb.: Wargla məqq-ət “frapper, donner un coup sur la bouche pour faire taire, faire taire en donnant un coup sur la bouche” [Dlh. 1987, 194] | Qbl. √m-γ: e-mmey “se précipiter sur, mettre la main à ou sur” [Dlt. 1982, 507] || SCu. *muḥ- “to fight” [Ehret] = “to beat” [GT]: Iraqw -mūḥ- “to fight” [Wtl. 1958, 92] = muḥ- “to fight, beat”

[Ehr.] = mūḥ “to beat, spank”, muḥ-tā “beating, spanking” [Mgw. 1989, 115] = mūḥ- “to fight, beat, spank” [MQK 2002, 75] | Asa muk- “to beat” [Ehret] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 159) || Ch. *muḥ/k- “to strike, beat” [Stl. 1996, 130] > WCh.: Hausa múùkà ~ mùùkàá “to hit”, múùkè “to hit with a stick”, cf. mààkàá ~ máákà “1. to beat, 2. hit down (fruit or leaves from tree)”, [Abr. 1962, 641, 682] = múùkà “to strike hard with stick, clod, brick” [Stl.] | Boghom mak “to kill” [Smz. 1975, 34; 1978, 36, #65] = mak(ta) “to hit”, mak “to kill” [Csp.] = mák^h “to kill” [IL/JI 1994 II 212], Jum maùk (sic) “to hit”, cf. máyk (sic) “to kill” [Csp.] (SBCh.: Csp. 1994, 54, 56) || CCh.: Hide mwah [h < *k?] “hitting, cutting into sg.” [Hsk. 1983, 245] | (?) Masa mòk “préparer une attaque (guerre, chasse)” [Ctc. 1983, 111] || ECh.: Modgel mog-túm “schlagen” [Lks. 1937, 97] | Migama múkkiyò “battre” [JA 1992, 108].

LIT.: Erman 1892, 112 after Brugsch (Eg.-Aram.); GB 412 (Eg.-Sem.); Fecht 1955, 291, §3 & fn. 4 (Hbr.-Eg.); DELC 128 (Eg.-Hbr.); Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 71 adopted in HSED #1802; Stl. 1996, 130 (Sem.-Irq.-Hs.-Mgm.-Eg.); Ehret 1995, 304, #580 (SCu.-Yms.); Takács 2000, 99–100, #29.7 (PRift-Eg.-Ch.-Sem.).

NB1: This etymology also suggests an original Eg. ṽmhj. In order to a priori leave the inner Eg. derivation from mh3 (above) untouched, G. Fecht (1955, 291–2, esp. fn. 5) tried to render the Eg.-Can. match as a late borrowing. In his view, “*an einfache Entlehnung des äg. Wortes aus dem Semitischen ist gewiss nicht zu denken*”, since the late verbal loans from Sem. were in Eg. were vocalized acc. to the *C₁āC₂C₃ pattern (besides, for a possible late Eg. loan from Can. *mh[?] cf. Helck 1971, 514, #107). Instead, as he argued, “*vielleicht hat... das semitische Wort ein älteres ägyptisches mh3 ‘sich messen’ = ‘kämpfen’ in seiner Bedeutung dahingehend beeinflusst, daß dieses nun auch den Begriff ‘schlagen’ (und ‘durchstossen’) in sich aufnahm (Bedeutungsentlehnung)*”. Although Fecht (l.c.) regarded “*diese freilich... hypothetische Lösung*” as “*wohl die nach dem Stand unserer Kenntnis wahrscheinlichste*”, this far-fetched hypothesis also fails to resolve the controversy of Eg. √C₁C₂j (*C₁īC₂j) > (S) C₁C₂e ≠ Eg. √C₁C₂3 yielding typically (S) *C₁C₂ḏt. Even more unlikely is the suggestion by W. Vycichl (DELC 128) to assume an opposite route of borrowing (Hbr. mh[?] from Eg. mh3!).

NB2: W. von Soden (Or. 35, 16) and M. Dietrich (1967, 299) considered the Akk. noun as an Aram. loan-word, but the O Bab. attestation supports a derivation from a hypothetic *maḥû as pointed out by B. Landsberger (quoted in CAD l.c.).

NB3: Whether the Canaanite root belongs here is highly doubtful. It is attested in Hbr. mh[?] qal “schlagen” & mh(h) qal “auf etwas stoßen” [GB 412–3] = mh(h) “to encounter, meet” > mōḥī “thrust of the battering ram against the walls” [Waschow/KB 568], PBHbr. mōḥā? “schlagen” [Dalman 1922, 230; Levy 1924 III, 68], O Aram. & Off. Aram. mh[?] “1. to beat, 2. strike, 3. force a siege upon” [DNWSI 610] = “ударять, бить” [SAN IV 192], V Aram. mh[?] peal “schlagen” [GB 913], Eg. Aram. mh[?]h “Schlag” [GB], J Aram. mh[?] “1. to strike, beat, wound, 2. sting, bite”, mh[?]h “stroke, blow, plague, wound” [Sokoloff 1990, 299], Samar. Aram. mh[?] qal “1. to blow, strike, 2. protest, refuse, 3. kill, 4. crush”, mh?y (adj.) “goring”, mh[?]h “beating”, mh[?]w “beating, striking” [Tal 2000, 549–460], J N Aram. mh[?] “to beat, strike, play (musical instr.), mark” [Sabar 2002, 218], Syr. mh[?]: mōḥā(?) “schlagen” [Ast.] = “to beat, whip, fight” [Mlt.], Ma[?]lula mh[?] “schlagen” [Bergsträsser 1921, 56], N Aram. of Bah[?]a mh[?] “1. schlagen, trommeln an, 2. töten, umbringen”, mehya “Prügel, Schläge” [Correll 1969, 167], Mnd. ṽmḥa “1. to strike (at), hit (at), smite,

beat, attack, butt (head), 2. (of musical instr.) play, strike, clash, beat, 3. touch, 4. strike out, destroy, annul”, mhita “blow, wound, beating, castigation, mischance, attack upon, etc.” [DM 258, 260], Syr. m’ḥā “verberavit, cecidit” [Möller 1911, 156]. These forms have been generally recognized by most of the Semiticists as reflexes of Sem. *mḥš “to strike” via dissim. from *mḥʿ (see, e.g., Nöldeke, ZDMG 32, 1878, 409; GVGSS I 242; GB 913; Ast. 1948, 217; Held 1959, 171 & fn. 38 with further lit.; DM 258; Dietrich 1967, 299), cf. Akk. maḥāšu “schlagen” [AHW 580] = “zerschlagen, verwunden” [GB] || Ug. mḥš “zerschmettern” [Ast.], Hbr. mḥš qal “zerschlagen, zerschmettern” [GB 415] | Sab. mḥd “to smite, defeat” [SD 84], Ar. mḥd “stoßen, schüttern” [GB] = “heftig schüttern” [Ast.] etc. In this case, we should assume that the OTHbr. mḥ(h) was borrowed from Aram. However, this theory was received in GB 415 with some hesitation (“wahrsch.”). A.Ju. Militarev (Mlt.-Stl. l.c.), in turn, firmly denied the derivation of Aram. *mḥʿ from Sem. *mḥš/ʿ via *mḥʿ maintaining the distinct status of the two roots.

nb4: In principle, common Brb. *ḳ-ny “to kill” [GT] might be explained via *ḳ-my from AA *m-Q “to hit” [GT], but this is unlikely because of its possible connection with Ar. naqaʿa “7. tuer qqn., 12. égorgier un chameau pour ses hôtes” [BK II 1329] || HECu. *naḳ- “to hit” [Hds. 1989, 80] (further cognates are discussed s.v. Eg. nqʿ) < AA *n-ḳ-ʿ [GT].

nb5: Any remote connection to WCh.: Dera múkè “to throw” [Nwm. 1974, 130] = múkè “to throw (stone)” [Kidda 1991 MS, 8] and SBrb.: Hgr. meggé, pl. meggí-t-en “javelot à tige de fer d’une espèce particulière” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1169] || Guanche Brb.: Canarian moca(s) “varas tostadas” [Wlf. 1955, 122, §11] || SCu.: Qwd. muko-tiyeto, pl. mukokuko “spear” [Ehret] || CCh.: Higi-Kamale mùyà “spear” [Krf. 1981, #230] || ECh.: Modgel mugtó “Speer” [Lks. 1937, 97]? Note that SBrb.: Ayr te-mək-it, pl. ti-mək-it-en (f) “1. épée de Bornou (très tranchante, de qualité supérieure), 2. p.ext. couteau très tranchant” literally signifies “femme des Iməkítān” [PAM 2003, 533] and cannot belong here.

nb6: Ch. Ehret (1980 l.c.) compared also Dh. muk-ēd- “to take by force, plunder” [Ehret] = muk-(ēd)- “to plunder” [EEN 1989, 38] = mukkān-ad- “to take by force” [Tosco 1991, 143], for which cp. rather CCh.: Masa mək “saisir en pinçant (avec la pointe des doigts)” [Ctc. 1983, 110].

nb7: NOm.: Gamu meḳḳ- “to break (intr.)” [Sottile 1999, 439] does not belong here either. Cp. rather AA *m-ḳ “to break” [GT] > Ar. maqqa “fendre la spathe du palmier femelle pour y introduire la fleur du palmier mâle” [BK II 1134] || NOm. *meḳ- “to break (intr.)” [Lmb.]: Wolayta meʿʿ- [-ʿʿ- < *-ḳḳ-], Gamu & Dache meḳḳ-, Zayse & Koyra meʿʿ- etc. (NOm.: LS 1997, 449).

nb8: The same pertains to NOm.: Yemsa muko “to thresh” [Wdk. 1990, 131] = mùk- “to thresh” [Ehret], which originates rather from AA *m-k “to pound (or sim.)” [GT] > Sem. *mʿk (root ext. -ʿ-) “to squash” [GT] || LECu.: Afar mokkotta (f) “mortar”, maku-tta “pestle” [PH 1985, 162, 170] || WCh.: (?) Bole múkkó “wiederkäuen” [Lks. 1971, 137], Pero múgú “to chew” [Fj. 1985, 42] || CCh.: Sao moki (mėki) “Mehl” [Duisburg 1914, 41] || ECh.: WDng. màkè “to pound (in mortar)” [Fédry in JI 1994 II 269], EDng. mákè “piler au mortier” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 192] = “stampfen” [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 94].

nb9: For WCh.: Boghom mak “to beat drum” [Smz. 1975, 34; JI 1994 II 16] = màḳi “drumming” [Csp. 1994, 47] cf. rather Eg. mqmq (q.v.).

nb10: Ch. Ehret (1995, 304, #580) erroneously combined the SCu.-Yms. parallel with Ar. mḥt “to beat lightly” (all derived from an AA *muyʿ-), to which he added Eg. mḥt “whip” (q.v.), which is, however, in fact a late borrowing from Sem., cf. Akk. māḥitu “Peitsche” [AHW 584].

- 3. L. Reinisch (1873, 247) suggested for the Cpt. reflex absurd *com-paranda* (q.v.).

mḥjr “a receptacle: a basket (in a list of objects)” (XX., Černý 1958, 206–7, §3 & p. 213; CED 97) = “Korb” (Helck 1971, 514, #109) = “panier” (AL 77.1843) = “corbeille” (DELIC 129) = “basket” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 12, §1.2.1.1) = “basket used as a sieve (twice listed among words connected to sieve)” (Rowińska 1992, 43–44) = “basket, box (in lists of household items)” (Hoch 1994, 151, #195).

NB1: Written syllabically as ma-ḥi-rú (Helck) = ma-ḥi-ru (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey).

NB2: J. Hoch (l.c.) treated mḥj (HO 28/2, rt. 10) as the same word (with the met. of -r) as mḥjr (q.v.), for which he quoted (*sine* mḥj) four further exx.: (1–2) two in HO 61/3, rt. 2 & 13 (rendered both by D. Meeks 1997, 42 and E. Rowińska l.c. as a sort of sieve); (3) HO 85/1 (Ostr. BM 5639a), vs. 6; (4) HO 63/1, vs. 2, out of which D. Meeks (1997, 41–42) accepted only the first two exx. (“*doit être retenue*”), while he eliminated the third ex. (being act. part of the name of the p3-n-mḥjr festival as pointed out in Černý 1943, 174) and the fourth one (“*plus que douteuse*”, a metal object, perhaps to be corrected).

NB3: For its occurrence in the festival name p3-n-mḥjr (late NK, cf. Wb II 131, 13–14), which resulted in the name of the 6th Cpt. month: (SLB) ⲙⲞⲓⲠ, (SB) ⲈⲙⲞⲓⲠ, (S) ⲙⲈⲞⲓⲠ, ⲙⲒⲞⲓⲠ, (F) ⲙⲞⲓⲠⲣ (hence Eg. Ar. ʔamšir) ~ Gk. Μεχείρ (from the pre-Bohairic Delta dialect, where the palatalization shift -ḥ- > -š- did not take place), see Černý 1943, 174; 1958, l.c.; KHW 109; DELIC 129. Note that (SB) ⲙⲈⲞⲓⲠ, (F) ⲙⲈⲞⲓⲠ were re-borrowed from Gk. Note that Černý (1958 l.c.) associated the month name alternatively with Hbr. mḥir “price”.

NB4: For a fem. mḥrt “pânière” (Ostr. DeM 1657, l. 2) see Mathieu 1993, 344 & fn. 44.

- Hence (?) or from the same root (?): Cpt. (BL) ⲙⲞⲓⲠ, (B) ⲈⲙⲞⲓⲠ (P) “object of metal: pot, box for incense, censer (among church utensils)” (CD 206a; CED 97; Černý 1958, l.c.; Hoch l.c.) = “(ce terme est donc) synonyme d’encensoir” (Lefébvre, paper read in the Académie des Inscriptions, session of 16 Nov. 1945, cf. CRAIBL 1945, 565) = “Gefäß, Behälter” (KHW 109) = “encensoir” (DELIC 129) = “basket” (sic) (Zeidler 1993, 581).

NB: A direct derivation of the Cpt. term (denoting a metal vessel) from Eg. mḥjr “a basket” (first proposed by M. Burchardt and then defended in CED 97) was rightly doubted by J. Černý (1958, 213), who, however, presumed both words to have originated separately from the same month name. Later, he (CED 97) did not exclude this to have happened *vice versa*, namely that the eponymous festival was named after the object. This Eg.-Cpt. etymology was declined by D. Meeks (1997, 41–42, §195). Similarly, J. Zeidler (1993, 581) assumed in Cpt. (S) ⲙ(Ⲉ)ⲞⲓⲠ vs. ⲙⲞⲓⲠ purely homophones.

- Etymology debated:
- 1. J. Černý (1958, 206–7, §3 & p. 213) rendered the “prototype” of Eg. mḥjr in the name of the LEg. festival p-n-mḥjr (and month Μεχείρ) as a term originally signifying a building, assuming that the festival and month gave the name to the receptacle, which, in his view, was presumably “a prominent object used at the festival” (just as the vessel named after the LEg. festival/month k3-ḥr-k3 served for measuring incense).

- **2.** W. Helck (1962, 561), D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 12, §1.2.1.1), and J. Hoch (1994, 151, #195) presumed Eg. *mḥjr* to have been borrowed from Sem. **mḥr* “to receive” (although this root is not attested in OTHbr. with this mng., cf. Akk. *mḥr* “to receive”, hence *namḥāru* “bowl, jug”, ESA *mḥr* “to receive”), whereby they rendered Eg. **māḥiru* as a G stem part., literally “receptical” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = “that which receives” → “receptacle” (Hoch). Rejected by D. Meeks (1997, 41–42, §195) as not “*valable*”.
- **3.** E. Rowińska (1992, 43–44), rejecting the idea of Helck, explained Eg. *mḥjr* as a borrowing from Akk. *maḥḥalu* “ein Korb oder Kasten (?)” [AHW 582] = “a basket” [CAD m1, 89] = “a basket used as a sieve” (≈ Sum. *gi.gur.sè.sè.ga* “a basket of throwing/shaking” & *gi.gur.še.nu.tuk* “a basket that does not hold flour”) [Rowińska after Salonen 1965–66 I, 68, 222], cf. also Akk. *maḥḥaltu* “Sieb” [AHW 582] = *maḥḥaltu* “a type of sieve” [CAD m2, 89], which are *nomina instr.* of the Akk. verbal root *√nhl* “(durch)sieben” (following the pattern *ma-pras-*, i.e., **ma-nḥal-* > **ma-ḥḥal-*, cf. GAG 64, #56.a-c). Cf. also Mnd. *m(u)hulta* “sieve” [DM 260], Ar. *munḥul-* ~ *munḥal-* “tamis” [BK II 1223]. This would confirm the translation of Eg. *mḥjr* as “a basket used a sieve” (Rowińska). J. Hoch (l.c.) and D. Meeks (l.c.) failed to consider Rowińska’s (1992) paper.
NB1: As pointed out by C. Brockelmann (1932, 107, #36) and H. Györy (1990, 4, #8), PSem. **nḥl* “Getreide sieben” [Aro 1964, 476; Tyloch 1975, 58, #26] has also a genetic reflection in Eg. *nqr* “(durch)sieben” (OK, Wb II 344, 7–10) in spite of the irregular correspondence of Eg. -q- vs. Sem. **-ḥ-* (for other etymologies of Eg. *nqr* cf. Hodge 1966, 45, #36; Rössler 1966, 228).
NB2: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1713) falsely compared Akk. *maḥḥalu* with Eg. *mhn* “box” (!) deriving both from an unreal PAA **maḥal-* “box, basket” (sic!) based purely on these two unrelated words. They ignored that Akk. *maḥḥalu* < **ma-nḥal-* < *√nhl*, while Eg. *mhn* “Art Kasten aus Holz” (NK, Wb, q.v.) < *hn* “Kasten” (OK, Wb, q.v.) via *m-* prefix. Besides, Eg. -h- ≠ Akk. -ḥ-. See Takács 1997, 113a, #1713; 1999, 112.
- **4.** D. Meeks (l.c.) admitted only Eg. *mḥjr* (in HO 61/3, rt. 2 & 13) as the name of the instrument, which he identified (via met.) with Eg. *mrḥ* “tamis, passoire” (XX., HO 28/2, rt. 10) regarding the latter as the original form (q.v.).

mḥmh.wt (pl.) “Art Blumen” (late NK hapax: Pap. Harris 500, 7:3, Wb II 131, 15) = “pourpiers, *Portulaca oleracea* L.” (Loret 1892 vs. 1975, 140 & §124; Mathieu 1996, 78, n. 245) = “Blumenneme: *Portulak*” (Guglielmi 1984, 497) = “Art Blumen, Gemüse: **Portulak*, *Sauburzel*, *Portulaca oleracea* L.” (Germer 1985, 29 with doubts; GHWb 358) = “purslane, *Portulaca oleracea* L.” (Manniche 1999, 137).

NB: Vocalized as *maḥmāḥ.at (DELIC 131; Vrg. 1986, 582), which W. Vycichl (DELIC) rendered as a *nomen agentis*.

- Hence: (S) $\text{ME}\mathcal{Z}\text{MOY}\mathcal{Z}\text{E}$, (B) $\text{ME}\mathcal{Z}\text{MOY}\mathcal{Z}\text{I}$ (- \mathcal{Z} -!) (f) “purslane” (CD 211b; CED 99) = “Portulak” (KHW 112) = “pourpier” \approx Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta$, Ar. riḡl-at “Portulaca oleracea L.” (Loret 1892 vs. 1975, 73, §124; Chassinat 1921, 233, 306, 341; DELIC 131).

NB: W. Vycichl (DELIC) explained the unexpected (B) - \mathcal{Z} - with a (S) influence.

- Origin unknown, on which only guesses can be made.
- 1. J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 125) assumed in it a foreign loan-word purely because of its GW, although he was unable to name the source. No Sem. parallels are available.
- 2. GT: in spite of the species difference, might be perhaps connected to NAgaw: Bilin maqmaq-ó “Rumex abessinicus (die Wurzel zum Gelbfärben der Butter verwendet)” [Rn. 1887, 268] || LECu.: Saho maqmaq-ó “eine Pflanzensorte, Rumex abessinicus” [Rn. 1890, 265] | Som. maqmaq-o “Rumex abessinicus H. oder Chenopodium murale L., als purgativ verwendet” [Rn. 1902, 292] || NOm.: Kafa maqmaq-ō “eine Pflanzensorte, und zwar Rumex abessinicus” [Rn. 1888, 317].

NB1: Phonologically more dubious (Eg. ḥ \neq Sem. *ḡ) is the comparison with Sem.: (?) Akk. memī/ētu “eine Pflanze” [AHW 644] = “(a plant)” [CAD m2, 18] || Ug. mǧmǧ “a medicinal plant” [DUL 532 contra Gordon 1955, 290, #1143].

NB2: There are further noteworthy data, which are etymologically equally obscure: (1) NBrb.: Mzab ti-mǧǧw-ət ~ ti-mgu-t “sorte de camomille du désert” [Dlh. 1984, 116], Wargla ti-mǧǧ-ət “plante du désert, sorte de camomille, cotule (ar. garṭufa)” [Dlh. 1987, 186] || SBrb.: EWlm. e-mǧ, pl. e-mǧ-ān & Ayr e-mǧ, pl. e-mǧǧ-ān ~ i-mǧǧ-ān “esp. de buisson (dont les feuilles donnent un purgatif, ressemble à la taḍrōnt, fleurs différentes, Pulicaria crispa)”, cf. Ayr te-māk, pl. ti-mǧǧ-en “esp. de plante: belle-de-jour (ressemble à l’emǧ)” [PAM 1998, 211; 2003, 525–6]; (2) LECu.: Som. mayǧǧ ~ mēǧǧ “Maerua crassifolia” [Rn. 1902, 288, 307] = mēǧǧ “1. Boscia Minimifolia, 2. Terminalia parvula” [Abr. 1964, 177]; (3) CCh.: Hide (Htk.) mukoy ~ mukwi ~ ḡkwī “chien-dent, Cyperus esculentus” [Egc. 1971, 220].

mhnt “Antlitz: eigtl. Vorderseite (?)” (PT, Wb II 132, 5) = “Gesicht, Stirn” (GHWb 358).

- Derives from Eg. ḥnt “Gesicht, Vorderseite des Kopfes” (PT, Wb III 302, 1–5) with prefix m-.

LIT.: Grapow 1914, 27; 1954, 30.

NB1: As pointed out by G. Takács (2004, 193f.), Eg. ḥnt is akin to Sem.: MSA *ḥnt: “to be in front (?)” [GT]: Hrs. ḥenṭī “one of the fore-teats of a camel” [Jns. 1977, 141], Jbl. ḥanṭī “front, front part of anything”, ḥunṭ “outside”, aḥnīṭ “to take, put out, go out in spring, etc.” [Jns. 1981, 303], Mhr. ḥanṭáy “front udder of a camel” [Jns. 1987, 445] (apparently isolated in Sem.). As a remote var. root cp. perhaps also SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ə-nkōd “1. aller au devant de, 2. prévenir (par des mesures préventives)” [PAM 2003, 609].

nb2: Formerly, the etymology of Eg. ḥnt was very much disputed, but neither of the suggested solutions was satisfactory: (1) Holma (1911, X; 1919, 42) treated it falsely as a fem. *ḥn.t (!) in order to equate it (via met.) with Akk. naḥnaḥātu “Nasenscheidewand” [AHW 715] = naḥnaḥūti ša appi “die Nasenknorpel” [Holma], for which cp. rather Syr. naḥnaḥtā “die Mandeln im Halse”, Ar. nuḥnuḥ- “Rachenmandel” (Sem.: AHW l.c.). (2) Ember 1918, 31; 1921, 177; 1926, 310, #6.2; 1930, #11.d.2, #15. a.16, #25.b.8; Albright 1918, 90; 1918, 239, #74; Behnk 1928, 140, #38; HSED #1340: Eg. ḥnt < *ḥmt via partial assim. of the labial *-m- to dental -t and the met. of *ḥtm ~ Akk. ḥuṭṭimmu “snout” [AHW 362], PBHbr. ḥōṭām “the distinctive feature of the face, nose, nostril” [Jastrow 1950, 431], Ar. ḥaṭm- “bec, museau” [BK I 596] = “snout, muzzle” [Alb.]. (3) There is a long tradition of comparing Eg. ḥnt with WCh.: Hausa hāncī, pl. hāntū-nā “nose” [Abr. 1962, 369] (Eg.-Hs. supported by Behnk 1928, 140, #38; Vcl. 1934, 71; Old. 1952, 38; 1956, 12; 1960, 800; IS 1966, 336, #8.4; Hodge 1968, 20; 1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A; 1991, 160, §18). False, because (as pointed out in JI 1994 I, 129) the Hausa form can be divided into the ha- prefix of body parts + Ch. *-ntin/r “nose”. This Eg.-Hausa comparison was rightly rejected already by N. Pilszczikowa (1958, 99), who identified in Hausa hāncī the well-known Hausa prefix ha- occurring in Ch. names of body parts (Takács 1997, 255–260). (4) Hodge (1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A; 1991, 160, §18) combined the alleged Eg.-Hausa parallel with Ar. ḥnn “to speak nasally”, which contains no match for the Eg. C₃. In addition, the basic sense of Eg. ḥnt is “front”, not “nose”. (5) Hodge (1985, 18; 1990, 646, #13A): Eg. & Hausa ~ SCu. *ntse “in front” [Ehret]. (6) Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 19): ~ Bed. *hanat “before” [Blz.] attested in hānat-ʔāwi “forenoon”, cf. ʔāwi “noon”. (7) Its long-range (Nst.) comparison (often with the inclusion of Hausa hantū) with PIE *Hant- “Vorderseite, Stirn”, loc. *Hanti “im Angesicht, Gegenüber” [IEW 48–49] has been maintained by several scholars (Forrer 1930, 243, #3; Ivanov 1965, 15–16; 1966, 106–107, fn. 9; IS 1966, 336, #8.4; Hodge 1968, 20; 1981, 373, #30; 1983, 37; 1991, 160, §18; Bmh. 1988, 446; Shevoroshkin 1988, 541; Ray 1992, 134, n. 15). It is not possible in the framework of this dictionary to judge this proposal pointing far beyond the limits of AA. (8) Zyhlarz (1934–5, 253) combined it with ONub. KQANT(t) Vorfahr”. Genetic cognacy excluded. The rest of the etymologies for Eg. ḥnt are clearly absurd. (9) Homburger (1930, 283): Eg. mḥnt (!) ~ Ful ḥari “visage”. (10) Lacau (1970, 49): Eg. ḥnt < *ḥnr ~ *ḥnj (!) ~ Ar. naḥara “ronfler, renifler”, maḥar- “narine” mentioned as “*pure hypothèse*”. (11) Hodge (1991, 160, §18): ~ Brb. *himmīw (?) “forehead” [Prs.: MGT II 171].

mḥr “Kornspeicher” (OK, Wb II 132, 9) > mḥr “Speicher für Korn” (MK, Wb II 134, 6) = “a bin to hold corn, granary” (Birch 1868, 9) = “magazine (for corn and the like)” (AEO II 212*, #437; cf. JEA 27, 1941, 24, n. 2) = “a domed storage bin” (Fischer, MIO 7, 1960, 308, fn. 18; Kush 9, 1961, 49, n. a) = “granary, storehouse” (Brovarski 1981, 19, n. dd) = “(clairement) une partie de l’ensemble appelé šnw.t (utilisation comme magasin, pas nécessairement empli de céréales)” (Vernus 1986, 143, n. n) = “barn for grain, magazine for corn” (PL 457) = “Scheune, Speicher” (Altenmüller 1998, 281) = “Speicher” (since III., WD II 67, cf. RdE 33, 1981, 56) = “(tieferliegender) Speicher, Scheuer (für Korn)” (ÄWb I 556).

nb1: For mḥr > mḥr see AĀG lix, §121.

nb2: For a fem. var. mḥrt (since MK) cf. WD III 56 < SAK 26, 1998, 116.

NB3: W. Erichsen (DG 153:8) explained Dem. mjhl “Gießform des Töpfers” from Eg. mhr. Semantically highly doubtful. Cf. also Eg. mnḥ “Meißel” (Wb, q.v.).

- Origin highly disputed. GT: nevertheless, it is difficult to ignore its risky albeit semantically perfect comparison with OHbr. mägūrā(h) “Vorratskammer”, cf. *mamgurā(h), pl. mamgurōt “Vorratshaus, Kornspeicher” [GB 397] = mägūrā(h) “grain pit, storage room” [KB 544], MHbr. mägūrā(h) “1. Vorratshaus, Speicher, Magazin, 2. Behältniss, Fach, bes. Wasserbehälter” [Levy 1924 III, 14] = mägūrā(h) “1. store-room, bin for wheat, figs, etc., 2. reservoir, 3. pericarp of nuts, almonds etc., 4. drupe” [Jastrow 1950, 727] = mägū/ōrā(h) “grain pit, storage room” [KB], JPArām. mgr “to store” [Sokoloff 1990, 291], whose Sem. background is uncertain.

NB: There have been proposed the most diverse Sem. etymologies for the Hbr. word. (1) Perhaps the most realistic opinion has been formulated in GB l.c.: “*ein auch im nhebr. vorkommendes Wort unklarer Wz.: viell. mgr?*”. (2) Jastrow (l.c.) explained it from Hbr. grr qal “to drag away” [KB 204] associated with Hbr. gören “threshing-floor” [KB 203] and PBHbr. & JAram. gūrā(h) “gathering of rain water, reservoir” [Jastrow 1950, 227], which is rather unlikely. (3) Sokoloff (l.c.) treated JPArām. mgr as a secondary root stemming from Hbr. √gr “to bring in (the harvest)” [KB 11]. (4) KB l.c.: fem. form of Hbr. *mägōr “1. Aufenthalt, 2. Wohnung” [GB 397] = “grain pit, storage room” [KB 544], which, in turn, has been derived in KB l.c. from an unattested Hbr. *gwr IV [KB 185] ~ OSA gwr “name of a grave” [Müller], Ar. ġwr II: ġawwara “to hollow out” > Ar. muġawwar- & ġūr-at- “drain, pit” [KB]. This would replace the old derivation of Hbr. *mägōr from √gwr I qal “sich als Gast und Schützling irgendwo niederlassen, dann allg.: wohnen” [GB 134] (suggested, e.g., in GB 397).

NB2: The derivation of LEg. mgrt “Gruben” (q.v., suggested in GB l.c.) from the Can. word is doubtful.

- Other etymologies are either less attractive or clearly false:
 - 1. H. Grapow (1914, 15), followed by P. Wilson (PL 457) and R. Hannig (ÄWb I 556) derived it from Eg. hr “unter” via a prefix m- of the nomina loci, lit. “place which contains” (PL). On the other hand, F. von Calice (1936, #638) assumed a derivation from Eg. hrj.t “Bedarf”. Both suggestions are false.

NB: OK mhr has not too much in common with OK hr “under”, which is revealed by their fully different orthographies. Although the development of OEg. mhr > MEg. mhr may have indeed been influenced by a contamination with hr “under”, it could have only been secondary with no bearing on the ultimate origin of OK mhr.

- 2. S. Birch (1868, 9) noted its resemblance to the Numidian *magalia* huts or cottages, cf. Lat. māgālia “runde (fahrbare) Hütten nomadisierender Berberstämme” [LEW II 9].

NB: This word (of Punic origin) was associated in the LEW (l.c.) with diverse alternative Sem. etymologies: (1) Hbr. maʿgāl “Geleise, Weg (eig. wo man fährt)” [Lewy] = “waggon track, firm path” [KB 609] after Lewy (KZ 59, 189); (2) Servius suggested a dubious derivation from Punic magar (sic) “villa” [Servius cited in LEW] = mager (sic) [Placidus apud Goetz quoted by Harris], for which cf. Lat. Māgāria “Vorstadt Karthagos”, which Z. S. Harris (1936, 92) identified with Phn.

*mgr “country house, farm” [Harris] derived $\sqrt{g(w)r} > \text{Phn. gr}$ “temple dweller” [Harris] ~ Ar. ġār- “voisin” [BK I 352]; (3) P. Schroeder (1869, 104) combined it with Hbr. mōʿārā(h) “cave” [KB 615]. The Hbr. word was quoted in LEW with the false comment that this “*stammt aus*” (sic) a certain Ar. maʿarr-at- (sic), for which cf. instead Ar. maʿarr-at- “1. caverne, 2. gîte (de gazelle)” [KB II 517].

- **3.** W. F. Albright (1918, 232, #50, quoted also in GÄSW #638) and A. Ember (1930, #10.a.21) equated it with Hbr. ḥomer “Haufe” [GB 242] = “heap” [KB 330], JAram. ḥmr “aufhäufen” [GB], and even with Akk. bīt ḥamri ša Adad “heiliger Bezirk des Adad” [AHW 318] = “sacred precinct (of Adad)” [CAD ḥ, 70] = “treasure house of Adad” [Alb.], Ar. ḥmr “couvrir, envelopper, cacher, etc.” [BK I 630]. False.

NB: Although, in theory, the Eg. met. *ḥmr > *mḥr would be possible, Ar. ḥmr is unrelated to Sem. *ḥmr, for which cf. better Ar. ḥamara IV “2. ramasser, réunir de tous côtés” [BK I 489]. In addition, Sem. *ḥ ≠ Eg. ḥ.

- **4.** G. Conti (1978, 98–99, 147, 157) explained MEg. mḥr as a “forbidden or restricted area” and compared it with Sem. *ḥrm “coprire” [Conti] (quoted also by P. Vernus 1986, 143, n. n with doubts). False. Rightly rejected already by A. Ju. Militarev (1983, 98, fn. 5).

NB1: Attested in Hbr. ḥērem “(what is) ban(ned)” [KB 354], Phn. ḥrm “to devote, consecrate” [Harris 1936, 104], Ar. ḥarama “éloigner, repousser, défendre, prohiber, déclarer illicite”, ḥaram- “chose illicite, défendue, chose sacrée etc.” [BK I 1413–4] etc. Note that Akk. (OAss./OBab.) ḥarāmu > (LBab.) arāmu ~ erēmu “bedecken” [AHW 323] cannot belong here as Conti claimed. For Sem. *ḥrm cp. rather Akk. (LBab.) ḥarāmu “absondern” [AHW 323].

NB2: With regard to OEg. -ḥ-, the suggested correspondance of Eg. mḥr and Sem. *ḥrm is not acceptable.

- **5.** A. Ju. Militarev (1989, 129, #3; 1990, 34, #3; MIt.-Stl. 1990, 74) assumed a common origin of Eg. mḥr with Brb. *m-g-r “to reap” [MIt.], which he affiliated with clearly unrelated roots such as Ar. maḥara “3. introduire de l’eau dans un morceau de terre en y pratiquant des rigoles, des sillons” [BK II 1072] = “to till the land” [MIt.], and others (discussed below), whereby he reconstructed PAA *mi-ḥaru “to reap, pick up (corn)”. Only the Brb.-Eg. comparison is plausible.

NB1: The Brb. root is attested in NBrb.: Shilh mger “moissonner, faucher” [Jst. 1914, 144] = i-mgr “sickle” [Galand 1970, 251], Sml. ċ-mger “moissonner” [Dst.] = ə-mgər “to reap” [MIt.], Ntifa ċ-mgēr “moissonner” [Dst.] | Ait Mgild ċ-mgēr “moissonner” [Dst.] = mgr “to harvest”, a-mgʷr pl. “harvester” [Harries 1974, 224, 239] | Rif ċ-mžar “moissonner” [Dst.], Bqy. & Amr. e-mžar “moissonner” [Rns.], Snh. a-mgʷar “moissonner, faucher les épis”, a-mgʷar “faucille” [Rns.], Mzab ə-mžər “moissonner, couper à la faucille”, a-mžər “faucille, serpe mozabite” [Dlh. 1984, 127], Wargla e-mžar “moissonner” [Rns.] = ə-mžər “couper à la faucille l’herbe, le blé, etc., faucher, moissonner”, a-mžər “faucille ouarglie, serpe dentée” [Dlh. 1987, 205], Izn. ċ-mžer, mžer “moissonner” [Dst.] = mžər “moissonner”, ta-mžər-t “aire” [Lst.] = a-mžer “faucille” [Rns.], Sened ə-mžər “moissonner” [Lst.] | Qbl. e-mger “1. moissonner, 2. récolter”, a-mger, pl. i-mger-an “faucille à lame strivée

pour couper l'herbe" [Dlt. 1982, 489] | Nfs. é-mger ~ ámgär etc. "mietere", cf. mēžer ~ mžer ~ mžär, pl. i-mēžer-en "falcetto" [Bgn. 1942, 288, 305] = ə-mgar "moissonner", tə-məgra "moisson" [Lst.] (NBrb.: Dst. 1925, 258, §2; Rns. 1932, 388) || EBrb.: Siwa miđer "moissonner", a-mğār ~ a-mžār "moisson", ti-məğran-t ~ ti-məžran-t "aire", a-mžir, pl. i-məžr-än "faucille (à lame droite, taillée en dents de scie de 0^m, 25^{cm}, emmanchée dans un manche long et droit, 0^m, 60^{cm}, terminée en pointe)" [Lst. 1931, 192, 236, 261], Gdm. ə-mğər "moissonner" [Lst.] = e-mžar "moissonner", a-mžir, pl. məžr-an "faucille" [Lanfry 1973, 208, #991–2], Audjila í-mger "sickle" [Prd. 1960, 165].

NB2: The Ar. root, in turn, primarily means "1. fendre, sillonner l'eau, 2. fendre les vagues, sillonner l'onde avec bruit" [BK], which excludes its comparison with Eg. mḥr.

- **6.** A.Ju. Militarev (l.c.) affiliated it also with WCh.: AS *k₂ūr "to gather, heap" [GT 2004, 209] = *k₂ur [Stl. 1972, 182] = *g₁ur "to gather (intr.) (собираться)" [Stl. 1977] = *g₁ur "собираться" [Stl. 1987, 243, #45] | Vole gar "to collect harvest" [Mlt.].

NB1: The AS root is attested in Angas gur "1. to collect in great numbers, 2. a great gathering or assembly" [Flk. 1915, 191] = ġūr (K) "assembly" [Jng. 1962 MS], Sura kùur "Versammlung, Zusammenkunft, Menge, Masse", kuur "sich versammeln" [Jng. 1963, 71], Mpn. kùur "gathering, congregation" [Frj. 1991, 29], Gmy. kur "to heap up, form a heap" [Srl. 1937, 108] = kur "1. heap, 2. to (make a) heap" [Hlw. 2000 MS, 17] (AS: Stl. 1972, 182; 1987, 225, #740 & 243, #45).

NB2: The WCh. root is akin to Sem.: Hbr. ʔgr qal "in Vorrat legen, für die Zukunft sammeln" [GB 8] = "to bring in (the harvest)" [KB 11] = "to gather (food), gather in" [Kogan] || ECu. *gūr- "to pick up, collect" [Sasse 1982, 86] as suggested by L. Kogan & O. Stolbova (1994 MS, 2, #14).

NB3: It would be tempting to combine the Hbr.-ECu.-WCh. isogloss (leading to AA *g-r "to collect" [GT]) with a hypothetical Eg. *ḥr "to gather" (with an irregular correspondence of Eg. ḥ vs. AA *g), whereby Eg. mḥr could be regarded a *nomen loci* (*"place where corn is heaped up"?).

- **7.** A.Ju. Militarev (1989, 129, §3), on the other hand, combined it also with WCh.: Angas *g₂ā₂r < AS *d₁ā₂r "granary, storehouse" [GT 2004, 99]. Unlikely, since Angas *g₂- < AS *d₁- < AA *ṭ- and perhaps also *ç/ç/ĉ- (cf. Takács 2003, 116).

NB: Attested in Angas gyeer ~ yeer "a store house, but especially used of a woman's grain store" [Flk. 1915, 197, 307] = 'géer ~ (KS) 'gyéer "Speicher" [Jng. 1962 MS] = d₁yer ~ d₁er ḥut "granary" [ALC 1978, 15] = g₁yer "barn, granary" [Gcl. 1994, 27], Mpn. dāar [< *d₁ār] "outdoor granary (this granary requires a ladder to get in from the outside, it used to be accessible only to the head [man] of the household, now women can take grain from this granary as well)" [Frj. 1991, 17], Msr. dyaar "granary made of mud or corn-bin", dyaar kaham "granary built together with a house" [Dkl. 1997 MS, 380].

- **8.** GT: the connection to NBrb.: Izn. & Wrg. a-nḡur "1. (only Izn.) cour, 2. enclos fait de branchages épineux, servant de parc à troupeaux" [Rns.], Amr. & Bq. a-nḡur "partie surélevée du sol de la chambre rifaine où sont parqués les ovins et caprins, qui y montent par des marches" [Rns. 1932, 395] is also uncertain, since we should assume Brb. *-nḡVr < *-mḡVr.

NB1: Alternatively, the Brb. root might be compared (via met.) with LECu.: Orm. *gōran-ō/a* “small granary” [Gragg 1982, 181] = *gōran-ō* “granary, grain store” [Hds. 1989, 72] ||| ES: Amh. *goranno* “place for animals in house” [Gragg]?

NB2: The etymological relationship with SBrb.: Hgr. *i-nḡer* “ravin (affluent ou sous-affluent d’un ‘vallée’, en montagne)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1409], EWlm. *a-nḡer* “1. région basse, plus ou moins mouvementée, 2. embouchure de ravin (normalement avec une élévation du terrain ou un cône de pierres ou de roches au milieu), 3. p.ext. creux (en gén., p.ex. creux laissé après la perte d’un oeil)” [PAM 2003, 606] is also unlikely.

- 9. A. M. Lam (1993, 403) linked it with Ful (Pulaar) *mar-* “garder, conserver”. Irreal.

mĥr.w (OK) > **mĥr.w** (MK) “Bedürfnisse jemds. oder einer Sache, Fürsorge für..., Versorgung von..., (LP) auch wie ein Wort für Speisen” (MK, Wb II 134, 12–15) = “1. dealings, business, 2. ordinances, arrangement (of building), 3. provisions, offerings, food (LP)” (Grd. 1909, 115; FD 116; PL 457) = “Bedürfnisse, Geschäfte” (OK: 2x, ÄWb I 556).

NB: Usually listed as *mĥr.w* in the standard lexicons. Attested already in the OK, but with an original *-ḡ-* (Edel 1981, 83–84; ÄWb I 556).

- Origin uncertain. Usually derived (via prefix *m-*) from Eg. *ḥr* “under” (cf. Grd. 1909, 102–3: lit. “that which appertains to”; Grapow 1914, 28; Fecht 1960, 134, §258; NBÄ 868, n. 1389; PL 457), although the OK *-ḡ-* indicates that it may well be just a pseudo-etymology. GT: perhaps eventually related to Eg. *mĥr* “Kornspeicher” (OK, Wb, above)?

mĥr (GW) “?” (XX./XXI. hapax: Pap. Golenischeff 3:12, i.e., onomastic of Amenope 211, Wb II 132, 10) = “Kaufpreis” (Burchardt) = “buyer (occurs among occupations)” (AEO I 95*; Hoch 1994, 150) = “price (Preis)” (Helck 1971, 514; DLE I 237; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = “Käufer, Kunde” (GHWb 358).

NB1: Written syllabically as *ma-ḡar* (Helck) = *ma-ḡ(r)/ma-ḡar* (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = *ma-ḡ-r* (Hoch). Vocalized as **māḡir* or **maḡḡār* (Hoch).

NB2: Its house det. may have been due to an association to either *ḥr* “tomb” or *ḡr* “street” (Černý 1958, 206–7).

NB3: J. Černý (1958 l.c.) pondered if there was an etymological connection with the month name *Mekhir*. Hardly. Cf. rather *mĥjr* (GW) above.

- Borrowed from Sem., cf. Akk. *maḡiru* “price” vs. *māḡirānu* “buyer”, Hbr. *māḡīr* “price”

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Burchardt 1909–10, 493; AEO I 95*, §211; Černý 1958, 206–7, §3; Helck 1971, 514, #108; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 12, §1.2.1.1; Hoch 1994, 150–1, §194.

mĥr.t (GW, fem.) “bag” (XIX./XX. hapax: Ostr. DeM 1657, 2, Hoch 1994, 151).

NB: Written syllabically as ma₂-ḥi-ra-ta, vocalized as *maḥirata (Hoch).

- Borrowed from Sem.? Explained by J. Hoch (1994, 152, §196) from Akk. maḥāru “to receive”, which is doubtful.

***mhl** (?) > Cpt. (P) meḥēl ≈ ἰᾶσθαι “heilen” (dial. of the Book of Proverbs of Pap. Bodmer VI, KHW 112) = “Heilung bringen” (NBÄ 101) = “guérir” (DELIC 132).

- Although its origin has been highly debated in Eg. philology, most convincing is the ingenious observation by W. Vycichl (DELIC 132) on its kinship with Bed. oʾmeḥél “die Medizin” [Munzinger] = emhelána “Artz” [Seetzen] = m(e)hēl “1. (einen Kranken) pflegen, 2. (m) Arznei” [Almkvist 1885, 46] = meḥél ~ emhél “Arzenei, Heilmittel”, emhēl “heilen, einen Kranken pflegen” [Rn. 1895, 166] = meḥēl “to dose, treat medically, tend sick”, məhēl (m) “medicine, medical treatment” [Rpr. 1928, 215].

NB1: A late borrowing (Cpt. < Bed.) is not improbable, although Eg. *-ḥ- < Bed. -h- could not be sufficiently explained in this case. On the other hand, Eg. -ḥ- vs. Bed. -h- in genetic cognates is plausible.

NB2: The AA etymology of Bed. ṽm-h-l is not yet clear (the various Ar. parallels suggested by L. Reinisch l.c. are all weak and unconvincing). Note that SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr māḡāl “1. être soigné au moyen de médicaments, 2. p.ext. être guéri par des médicaments”, a-māḡāl “1. remède, médicament, 2. (EWlm.) condiment, épice”, EWlm. a-māḡāl “traitement médical, soins réguliers” [PAM 2003, 526] cannot be related, being a late borrowing from WCh.: Hausa mááḡàní “a remedy, medicine, prophylactic, a prevention” [Br. 1934, 743].

- Other solutions are unconvincing.
- **1.** J. Osing (NBÄ 101, 581, n. 483) derived it from LEg. (XXII.) mnḥ “trefflich machen, vortrefflich herstellen” (cf. Wb II 86, 12) via met. of *m̃nēḥ̃(y) > *m̃h̃éñ(y), which W. Westendorf (KHW 522) affiliated also with Cpt. (S) ἡΟΥΛ2 “verbinden”. Both suggestions are far-fetched.

NB: Osing (NBÄ 581) compared even Cpt. (B) ἡΔΟΥΛ “Meißel, Beitel, Spitzhammer”, which was convincingly disproved by Westendorf (KHW 111, 522).

- **2.** W. Westendorf’s (KHW 112) ideas on this matter are even more surprising, since he surmised an etymological (!) connection to Cpt. (SLB) ὠωλ “fließen, rinnen, (durch)gießen, spülen, (auf)lösen, lockern” or (S) ὠωλἡ “ziehen, zücken, herausnehmen”.

mhsf “spindle” (BD 153, Griffith 1898, 67) = “Spindel” (Bidoli 1976, 15 & fn. 5).

- Derives from the rarely attested Eg. ḥsf “spinnen (eig. zwirnen)” (MK, Bidoli l.c. pace Wb III 335, 5) = “to spin (yarn)” (FD 197), cf. ḥsf “die Spindel (nur im Schriftzeichen belegt)” (Wb III 335, 5).

mḥsf “Pflock zum Spannen des Netzes für Vogel- und Fischfang” (BD, Wb II 132, 14) = “Haltepflock des Vogelnetzes” (Grapow 1914, 27) = “peg” (Allen) = “an unidentified part of a boat (substitutes for ḥsw)” (CT VI 39, AECT II 124, spell 479, n. 19) = “der Spannpflock am hinteren Ende” (Bidoli 1976, 15) = “partie du navire” (AL 78.1833) = “pivot stake” (Piccione, 1981–2, 83) = “(mng. unknown)” (Jones 1988, 168–9, #73) = “peg, used to tense a fishing-net” (DCT 179).

NB: Cf. also CT V 74 ḥsf “(unidentified)” (AECT II 22, 24, spell 396, n. 22).

- As pointed out by H. Grapow and D. Bidoli, this is an m- prefix form of Eg. ḥsf “1. abwehren, abweisen, 2. strafen” (PT, Wb III 335–7) = “hindern” (Grapow) = “1. to drive away, ward off, oppose, 2. repress, redress (wrong), reprove (words), 3. drive (cattle), divert (water), 4. avoid, prevent” (FD 197) = “abwehren, Widerstand leisten” (Bidoli). NB: The etymology of this root is disputed. Alb. 1918, 240: ~ Ar. fsh “to disjoint, separate, abrogate”. Semantically weak. Later, Albright (1919, 174, fn. 1) extended this comparison also to Akk. sapāḥu “to scatter” (so also Ember 1930, §9.a.13, §15. a.18, §18.a.13). GT: in the light of the rare older var. ḥsb (PT) we may not rule out a derivation from *ʕsb (incompatible in Eg., cf. EDE I 326), cf. Ar. ʕasaba IV “s’enfuir (se dit du loup)”, X “2. avoir de l’antipathie pour” [BK II 249].

mḥt (GW) “Teil des Streitwagens” (late NK: Pap. Anastasi I 26:7 & IV 16:12, Wb II 132, 15; Fischer-Elfert 1986, 229, n. f) = “Teil eines Wagens, der in mehr als 6 Stücke zerrissen wird” (Lauth 1871, 634, §132) = “a part of a chariot adorned with metal, mng. unknown” (Grd. 1911, 28*, fn. 14) = “(mng. unknown)” (Camino 1954 LEM, 215) = “ein Streitwagenteil” (Helck 1971, 514, #110) = “ein schmückender Beschlag am Wagen (?)” (Görg in BN 5, 1978, 11, cf. AL 79.1328) = “whip” (DLE I 237) = “parts of the yoke or draught-pole assembly, perhaps pieces of metal plating, nails, or fittings to the knob of the yoke saddle” (Schulman apud Hoch) = “part of wagon” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = “unknown parts of chariot” (Hoch 1994, 152) = “Art schmückende Wagenteile” (GHWb 358).

NB1: Written syllabically as ma-ḥi-tá (Helck l.c.; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = ma-ḥi-ta (Hoch) and vocalized as *maḥīta < *maḥīya (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 42, §2.2.1) = *maḥīta (Hoch).

NB2: H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (l.c.) treated the third consonant as a fem. marker, which is by no means certain.

- Rendering and etymology uncertain.
- 1. J. Lauth (1871, 634, §132) affiliated it with Hbr. maṭṭe(h) “Stab, Rute” derived by him from nṭy “ausstrecken”. False. There is no correspondence for LEg. -ḥ-.
- 2. The rendering “whip” (suggested in DLE l.c.) would be corroborated by Akk. māḥītu “Peitsche” [AHW 584] ~ Aram. *mḥ? “to strike” [GT] (for further details cf. also LEg. mḥj, q.v.).

NB: Ignoring the borrowed status of Eg. *mḥt*, Ch. Ehret (1995, 304, #580) erroneously derived it from AA **-muγ*- “to hit”.

- **3.** Following A. R. Schulman (JSSEA 16, 41), J. Hoch (1994, 152, §197) pondered (merely “*as a wild guess*”) whether it reflects an m-preformative noun of Sem. **ḥwt* “to sew”, cf. MHbr. *maḥaṭ* “sewing needle, (hair) pin”, JAram. (Talmud) *maḥāṭā* “needle, pin”, Ar. *mīḥyat*- “needle”.

NB: Hoch’s statement that before him “*no one has hazarded an etymology*” is false.

mḥtb.t “Art Schmuckstück aus Gold” (XVIII., Wb II 133, 1) = “an ornament of gold” (FD 115) = “un bracelet pour le poignet gauche ayant la forme d’un anneau large et plat que des lignes verticales divisent en rectangles” (Vrg. quoted by Edel) = “mugget” (DLE I 237) = “nom de bracelet” ≈ *mnfr.t* (Cristophe 1987, 27–28) = “(nicht einfach eine Art Schmuckstück, sondern—aufgrund des Determinativs und von Abbildungen) ein breiter flacher Ring um das linke Handgelenk (während sein Gegenstück am rechten Handgelenk tönnchenförmig ist und die Bezeichnung *mḥktw*... trägt), Handreifen (der als sehr breit bezeichnet wird und nicht paarweise auftritt, sondern einzeln getragen wird)” (Edel 1987, 45) = “Armreif (auch als Orden für Tapferkeit)” (GHWb 358) = “name of the wide armband worn on the left arm” (Cochavi-Rainey 1997, 100).

NB: Vocalized as **maḥtāb.ṯ* (Edel). Following M. Görg (BN 5, 1978, 7–11, esp. 9), E. Edel (1987, 43–47, cf. AEB 87.243) supposed a cuneiform reflection of Eg. *mḥtb.t* in the Amarna (EA 14, 1:77) gloss *ma-aḥ-da/ta* “bracelet” [Lambdin 1953, 67] = “very wide hand-bracelets that are strung with stones” [CAD m1, 89], which Edel emended to *ma-aḥ-tab-tú* (instead of *ma-aḥ-tá-<ba>*), since DA may also be read as *tab-tú* (cf. also Cochavi-Rainey 1997, 100).

- From the same root: *mḥtbtb* “plate or golden amulet” (Ptol. hapax: “famine stela” of Sehel 15, not in Wb, Sethe 1928, 187; ZÄS 48, 143) = “ingot of gold” (Ransom Williams quoted by Harris) = “(le) nom d’une amulette de couleur verte” (Barguet 1953, 23) = “protective or amuletic golden stone” ≈ *χρυσόλιθος* (Harris 1961, 88) = “pierre d’or” (AC 1977, 8) = “un bijou: pépite d’or (?)” (AL 77.1846; 79.1329 with lit.) = “Goldklumpen” (WD II 67; III 55).

- Etymology uncertain.

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 27) assumed in it an m- prefix, but was unable to identify the underlying root. P. Barguet (1953, 23) and J. R. Harris (1961, 88), followed by E. Edel (1987, 44), derived it from Eg. *ḥ3tb* “schonen” (PT, Wb III 236, 9) assuming a general sense “protective or amuletic stone” (Harris). Arguing for its inner Eg. origin, Edel (l.c.) found Eg. *mḥtbtb* to be a “*Weiterbildung...die doch wohl nur von einer genuin ägyptischen Wurzel...gebildet worden sein könnte*”, while he

regarded the sole instance of writing mĥtb.t as mĥ3tjb.t (Urk. IV 41:1) as “archaisierend (?)”.

- 2. M. Görg (BN 5, 1978, 9) compared its supposed root (*ĥtb) with Sem. *ĥṭb “schmücken”. Phonologically dubious (Eg. ĥ ≠ Sem. *ĥ). In addition, as noted by E. Edel (1987, 43), no m- prefix derivative of this Sem. root is attested.

mĥtm “Truhe” (OK, Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza IV 72) = “box” (Fischer 1996, 226, n. 403 & p. 257).

NB: Identified by R. Hannig (ÄWb I 555) with MK mĥtm.t (fem.) “ein verschließbarer oder versiegelbarer Behälter”.

- From the same root: mĥtm.t “?” (MK, Wb II 133, 3) = “a closed or sealed receptacle” (FD 115, cf. Grd., JEA 41, 1955, 13, col. 35) = “ein verschließbarer oder versiegelbarer Behälter” (GHWb 358), the same word as mĥtm.t “Viehhürde” (GR, Wb II 133, 2) = “cattle stable” (Smith 1978, 361) = “stall for cattle” (Smith 1979, 162) = “cattle byre” (PL 457)?

- Derives from Eg. ḥtm “siegeln, verschließen” (PT, Wb III 350–2) with prefix m-, cf. ḥtm “Siegel” (OK, Wb III 350).

LIT.: Grapow 1914, 27; Smith 1978, 361; 1979, 162; PL 457.

NB1: Eg. ḥtm is related to Sem. *ĥtm: Hbr. ḥtm qal “1. to seal (up), 2. confirm”, ḥōtām “seal, signet-ring” [KB 364], Phn. ḥtm “signet-officer” [Harris 1936, 105] = “seal” [Muchiki 1994, 126, #1] | Ar. ḥtm “1. sceller, cacheter, munir d’un sceau, d’un cachet etc., 4. clore, achever, terminer qqch., 7. clore, finir, faire telle ou telle fin”, ḥatam- “(anneau servant de) cachet” [BK I 539–540] = “versiegeln, schließen, stempeln” [Hommel] || MSA: Hrs. ḥōtem “ring” [Jns. 1977, 143], Jbl. ḥtum “to finish, cover, stop up”, ḥōtām “(ear-)ring” [Jns. 1981, 308], Sqt. ḥātem “sceau” [Lsl. 1938, 197] ||| Bed. ḥāta/im “der Siegelring” [Rn. 1895, 130] || NAGaw: Bilin kaṭam “2. (ver)siegeln” [Rn. 1887, 231], Qemant kaṭam “couvrir” [CR 1912, 218] || LECu.: Saho *kaṭam “umschließen”, kāṭim, pl. kāṭimá “Siegelring” [Rn. 1890, 226], Som. kāṭun [*-m > -n], pl. kāṭúmo “Siegelring” [Rn. 1902, 248] ||| WCh.: (?) Bokkos šitām [ši- < *ki-?] “Ring” [Jng. 1970, 146] | (?) NBch. *kaṭVn “ring” [Skn.]: cf. esp. Miya kaṭam “ring” [Skn. 1977, 37]. Lit.: Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30 (Eg.-Sem.); Müller 1903, 77, fn. 2 (Eg.-Som.); Yeivin 1933, 110 (Eg.-Sem.); Mlt. 1984, 16 (Eg.-Sem.); HSED #2035 (Sem.-Eg.-Miya).

NB2: Although the Sem., LECu., and WCh. nominal parallels are mostly treated as loans, not cognates, it is difficult to explain all verbal *comparanda* as denom. verbs (this is probably the case with Qemant and Saho). With respect to the widespread Sem. attestation, Th.O. Lambdin (1953, 151) has supposed a very early (2nd mill. B.C.) borrowing from Eg, while Y. Muchiki (1994, 126, #1) considered Phn. ḥtm a much later (9/8th cent. B.C.) borrowing from Eg. distinct (!) from the rest of Sem. The routes of the Eg. > Sem. borrowing are uncertain.

NB3: The proper genetic cognate of Eg. ḥtm may hardly be Sem. *ĥtm: Akk. ḥtm “verstopfen” [AHW 336] | Hbr. ḥtm “to restrain o’self” [KB 307] | Ar. ḥtm “zum Schweigen bringen” [AHW] = “to put on a bridle or muzzle” [KB] (Akk.-Eg. suggested in HSED #1393), since these *comparanda* are in fact denom. verbs from Sem. *ḥuṭm- “nose, snout, muzzle, beak” [SED I 125, §139].

mh (Dem.) “to (be) unite(d)” (Pap. BM 10507, 5:18, Smith 1987, 169).

- Most probably a met. of Dem. *hm* (cf. Pap. Rhind 2, IXd5), which is, in turn, a wtg. of Dem.-Eg. *hnm* “to unite” as pointed out by M. Smith (1987, 88, n. a, ad l. 18). This view has been accepted also in the Chicago Dem. Dictionary (forthcoming) by J. Johnson (p.c., 9 Jan. 2007).

NB: This is why its resemblance (as an irregular cognate) to AA *m-K “to mix, unite” [GT] > Ar. *myġ* “être mêlé, mélangé”, perhaps *maġmaġ-at* “mélange, confusion, désordre” [BK II 1170, 1065] ||| LECu.: Orm. *maka* “to mix, add, dilute”, *itti-makamtū* “member (of organization)” [Gragg 1982, 274] = *makū* “1. to add, mix, blend, 2. involve”, *maktō* “fusion”, *makā* “1. mixture, 2. compound, 3. combination” [Btm. 2000, 186–7] is illusive.

mh3 “Art Schiff” (MK, Wb II 133, 6; WD III 55: cf. SAK 26, 1998, 234, n. 20) = “a boat” (FD 115) = “kind of boat” (Jones 1988, 139, §40) = “ein Boot (auch mit über Rudern/Riemen)” (GHWb 358; *ÄWb* I 555: 2x in 1st IMP) = “ein Bootstyp, als Transportboot und Fähre belegt (u.a. mit einer Länge von 26 Ellen belegt)” (Düring 1995, 148) = “Lastschiff (mit 46 Rudern)” (Müller-Wollermann 1998, 234–5 & fn. 38).

- Origin obscure. GT: eventually an irregular cognate of Akk. *magīlu* “eine Barke” [AHW 576] = *magillu* “a type of boat” [CAD m1, 44] ||| CCh.: Bdm. *māġərà* “pirogue” [Souley 1993 MS, 98]? Note that Akk. -g- = Eg. -g-.

NB: Ch. Ehret (1995, 312, #601) erroneously affiliated it with a certain Sem. *mḥ- “to produce water, fluid” and even SCu. *maḥ- “hippopotamus” < AA *maḥ- “to move water about”, which is out of question.

mh3 “(die Herzen der Untertanen dem neuen König) geneigt machen” (XVIII. < “old text”, Wb II 133, 5; GHWb 358) = “to incline (one’s heart) to (n)” (FD 115).

NB: Due to semantic reasons, it can hardly be connected to *mh3* of PT 1004c & 1973a rendered as “vom Mitleid erfaßt werden, zusetzen sein” (*ÜKAPT* VI 133) = “to be full of sorrow” (AEPT 169, 285) = “to become sorrowful, sorrow” (Allen 1984, 557) = “*voll Trauer sein” (*ÄWb* I 555) as suggested in Wb II 133, 4 unless we assume for both verbs a common basic sense “to feel passion for so.”, whence the PT ex. may have derived via a semantic shift from “to feel compassion on so.”.

- Etymology dubious.

■ **1.** GT: semantically, its closest parallel appears in Akk. $\sqrt{m}gr$, although the correspondence of Akk. -g- vs. Eg. -h- is irregular.

NB1: Cf. Akk. *magāru* “1. to comply with a request, consent, give permission, 2. grant a person sg., agree to a demand, 3. follow an order, obey, 4. find acceptance, favor” [CAD m1, 34] = *magāru* “einwilligen, zustimmen”, *māġiru* “willfährig, gefällig”, *magru* “willig, freundlich”, *migru* “Einwilligung, Zustimmung”, *mitgurtu* “Vereinbarung, Einverständnis” [AHW 575–7, 651, 661] = *magāru* “willfahren,

gehörchen” [GB] = magāru G “genehmigen”, D “Gunst erweisen” [Ebeling 1915, 1459] = magāru “Gunst erweisen, gültig aufnehmen” [Brk.] = migru “favorite” [Gellb 1973, 170], Emar ma-ga-rù “to comply, consent”, stative magir (m) vs. magrat (f) “is willing, favorably inclined” [Sjöberg 1998, 261, §316 & 269, §511 & 277, §731]. NB2: The Sem. background of Akk. $\sqrt{\text{mgr}}$ has been disputed. P. Haupt (AJSL 24, 106) combined it with Hbr. mgr piel “stürzen, hinwerfen” & Syr. mgr “fallen” [GB 397], which is semantically doubtful. F. Buhl (GB l.c.), in turn, affiliated it rather with Hbr. mgn piel “1. überliefern, 2. hingeben, 3. beschenken” [GB] = “übergeben” [Brk.], where the change of -r- < *-n- was, in C. Brockelmann’s (1927, 35–36) view, influenced by Akk. maḥāru “gnädig empfangen”.

- **2.** GT: equally noteworthy are certain reflexes of Sem. *mḥr, especially Akk. (YBab.) maḥḥiru “gern empfangend”, miḥāru “einander entsprechend”, miḥurtu “Zusammentreffen, Harmonie” [AHW 582, 662].

NB1: Cf. Akk. maḥāru “gegenübertreten, angehen, empfangen”: G “1. entgegentreten, 2. sich wenden an, jmd. angehen, 3. empfangen, annehmen, 4. auf sich nehmen” [AHW 577] = “entgegen, vorne sein” [GB], Hbr. māḥār “morgender Tag” [GB 416] | OSA: Sab. mḥr “to face, run, extend towards (boundary)” [SD 84] = “to stand facing sg.” [Lsl. 1969, 19]

NB2: This Sem. root may be eventually akin to NBrb.: Shilh $\sqrt{\text{m-k-r}} \sim \sqrt{\text{m-g-r}}$: makar ~ magr “to meet” [Aplg. 1958, 61] = mnaggar “se rencontrer” [Jst. 1914, 144] | Qbl. $\sqrt{\text{m-g-r}}$: mmag^rer “1. rencontrer, 2. se rencontrer avec, 3. aller à la rencontre de” [Dlt. 1982, 490] = mmager “rencontrer, aller à la rencontre de” [Chaker 1987, 163], Zwawa mager “rencontrer” [Blf. 1910, 219] || SBrb.: Hgr. meg^rur-et “recevoir l’hospitalité (de la nourriture)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1171].

- **3.** GT: if we stick to the literal sense “geneigt machen”, we may compare it with LECu.: Afar makr-a (f) “turning the eyes inwards, sideways” [PH 1985, 161] | Sid. marq-a “to bend (a bow)” [Gsp. 1983, 225] ||| NOM.: Haruro mirq- “torcere” [CR 1937, 655] ||| WCh.: Hausa (Katsina) márgàyáá “to tilt, hitch forward” [Abr. 1962, 658]. From AA *m-r-Q ~ *m-Q-r “to bend” [GT].

NB: Ch. Ehret (1995, 313, #602) explained Eg. mḥ3 on a bicons. basis from AA *môḥ^v- “to bend” > PCu. *môḥ^v- “to bend”. Cp. LECu.: Afar make “to bend, distort, twist” [PH 1985, 161], Orm. maqa “to change direction, turn aside, shift from right to wrong (sin)” [Gragg 1982, 278].

mh^cq.t ~ var. (Med.) **mš^cq.t** “1. Rasiermesser, 2. bildliche Bez. des Schulterblattes (scapula)” (Med., Wb II 133, 8).

NB: For the semantic shift cf. NBrb.: Shilh a-madir “Jäthacke” [Stumme] = “1. Haue, Hacke, 2. Stangengebiß des Pferdes” [Vcl.] | Wargla a-mdir, pl. i-midar “1. sorte de houe, de sape, 2. par ext. omoplate” [Dlh. 1987, 185] | Qbl. a-mder, pl. i-medr-an “1. rebord d’une porte (seuil), d’une fenêtre, d’un bassin, 2. bois de charpente, poutre” [Dlt. 1982, 487] || EBrb.: Gdm. u-madir, pl. midar “1. omoplate, 2. houe large à manche court qui forme avec le plan de l’outil un angle très fermé” [Lanfry 1973, 206, #978] = o-madir, pl. midar “1. breite Hacke mit kurzem Stiel, 2. Schulterblatt (wegen der Hakenform)” [Vcl.] || WBrb.: Zng. a-mdār ~ e-mdār, pl. ə-mdurūn “vers, du côté de...” [Ncl. 1953, 207]. Following H. Stumme (1912, 125), W. Vycichl (2005, 4) explained the Brb. word from an unattested Phn. *m^cdr “Haue, Hacke” via Punic, cf. also Hbr. ma^cdēr “plough” [KB 609] = “1. Jät/Hacke, 2. Pflugschar” [Vcl.].

- An m- prefix nomen instr. formation of Eg. h^cq “rasieren” (PT, Wb III 365, 1).

NB: Its etymology is disputed and obscure. (1) Erman (1892, 115): ~ Hbr. qrh “scheren” (for which we should assume an improbable chain of shifts: Eg. h^cq < *h₃q < *q₃h). (2) Traditionally, Eg. h^cq has been explained from *h₃q ~ Sem.: Hbr. hlq “glatt sein”, Ar. ḥalaqa “rasieren (Kopf), scheren”, ḥaluqa “glatt sein”. Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1911, 89; 1926, 301, #2; 1930, #5.g.4, #16.b.2, #21.b; Albright 1918, 95; Behnk 1928, 139, #17; Clc. 1936, #272; Vrg. 1945, 134, #3.d; Vcl. 1958, 372; 1963, 150; 1985, 177; 1990, 42; Ward 1968, 70; Lacau 1970, 95–96. Cf. also WCh.: Tangale (from Ar.?) ḥalak-ḥalak “smooth”, ḥalaak “plain, flat” [Jng. 1991, 88]. For Hbr.-Tangale v. HSED #1229. (3) A connection to Ch. *sVkV “to shave” [Nwm. 1977, 31] is also unlikely (there is no trace of *-^c-, not even as compensatory vowel length), cf., e.g. WCh.: Angas-Sura *sak [GT 2004, 325] | Ngizim sākū [Schuh 1981, 140] || CCh.: Mandara səḥə “to shave” [Nwm.].

mh²bl or **m²bl** (?) “Netz (?) oder Käfig (?)” (Dem.: Dem. Pap. Leiden I 384 rt. 18:22, 18:24, Spg. 1917, 156, cf. also Spg. KHW #376) = “ob: Netz (?)” (DG 150:13, 189:7) = “cage” (Cenival 1988, 57, 106) = “Netz” (Brunner-Traut 1989, 170) = “(seems to be) a net or a cage” (PL 475) = “Käfig” (F. Hoffmann 2000, 214) = “ein Netz spezieller Art: Käfig-Netz (das Netz bildet einen käfigartigen Raum)” (Kurth 2003, 247f.).

NB1: Written in fact as m3h₃b3l (m3t₃b3l) with -3- standing for a vowel. Formerly read as m3teb3l (Spg.) = m₃t₃bl or m₃t₃b3l (DG, Cenival, et al.). After having discussed (almost) all pros and cons around the Dem. form, D. Kurth (2003, 252) suggests a new rdg. of the word, where the second consonant (-h-) is written with the ḥr sign (DG 386) used here as a phonogram for h (DG 346:3, 349:5, 373, 390:6, 391:5, cf. Kurth 2003, 252, fn. 45). But his explanation for why the prep. ḥr is written in a form throughout the text conceivably different from that used in our word (“dem kann ich vorerst nur die Möglichkeit entgegenhalten, daß der Schreiber dieses seltenen Wortes entweder die beiden ähnlichen Zeichen aufgrund einer indistinkten Vorlage verwechselt hat oder bloß er bewußt differenzieren wollte, wofür sich Beispiele anführen lassen”) is not fully convincing and satisfactory and this poses the most serious obstacle in the way of accepting Kurth’s etymology (below).

NB2: Kurth’s (2003, 247, fn. 7) statement, that “das Wort findet sich auch nicht bei... P. Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexikon...”, is incorrect (cf. PL 475).

NB3: G. Sauneron (l.c.), J. Černý (CED 182–3), and P. Wilson (PL 475) have combined Dem. m₃t₃bl with Cpt. (S) ἘΒΗΛ, (B) ἘΒΗΛ, (?) ἘΒΔΛ “fold (?) for sheep” (CD 400b) = “1. Hürde, Stall (für Schafe), 2. Gitter, Gatter, 3. Geflecht, Weidenkorb, Schutzdach” (KHW 222, 545) = “enclos (de brebis)” (DELIC 211: “*mot apparemment isolé*”), which, if correct, would make us maintain the old rdg. Dem. m₃t₃bl after Spiegelberg. Besides, J. Osing (NBÄ 202, 735–7, n. 890), W. Westendorf (KHW l.c.), and W. Vycichl (DELIC l.c.) eventually explained the Cpt. form from Eg. √dbn (act. *√dbl), cf. esp. Eg. dbn “runder Kasten” (Wb V 437, 16).

- Reading of C₂ and origin disputed. In spite of the lengthy (albeit not perfectly convincing) analysis devoted to this lexeme by D. Kurth (2003), one is disposed to agree rather with F. de Cenival (1988, 106) on that “*le mot n’est pour l’instant pas élucidé*”.
- 1. W. Spiegelberg (l.c.), with right hesitation, assumed it to represent an m- prefix *nomen instr.* of Ass. tabālu “wegnehmen, wegtragen, an sich reißen, entführen” [AHW 1297].

- **2.** G. Sauneron (RdE 15, 1963, 51f.), J. Černý (CED 182–3), and P. Wilson (PL 475) compared the Dem. word (with -ṯ-) as well as Cpt. (S) $\tau\beta\eta\lambda$ (above) with Eg. mtbr “champ de bataille” (GR: Edfu III 136:5, Sauneron l.c.) and even with Cpt. (SA) $\tau\beta\eta\pi$, (B) $\theta\pi\eta\beta$ (sic) (m) “blow with foot, kick” (CD 401a) ignoring the anomalous third root consonants and the significantly differing meanings, which has been rightly abandoned by W. Vycichl (l.c.) and correctly rejected by D. Kurth (2003, 247, fn. 7: “paßt hinsichtlich der Semantik keineswegs”).
- **3.** D. Kurth (2003, 247, 251, 253–4) explained it as a late borrowing from Hbr. mikmār “Netz für das Einfangen von Landtieren (eig. Mittel, womit man überwältigt; gewöhnlich Netz, aber besser: Gehege mit Gruben, in denen die Gazellen gefangen werden)”, which can be semantically clearly opposed to fem. mikmeret “Netz für den Fischfang”. This theory is not fully certain on all points (above).
NB1: Kurth (2003, 253) preferred to explain Dem. -ḥ- as a reflection of the contemporary spirantized -k- („begadkefat”) instead of assuming here the late (GR) interchange of Eg. k ~ ḥ. Nevertheless, the fem. Can. term appears already in LEg. as mkmrt (GW) with -k- (hapax: Amenemope 7:6, below). He explained this anomaly with the more than 800 years time gap between the Dem. form vs. LEg. mkmrt (GW, discussed below), which “aus einer Zeit stammt, in welcher der betreffende Laut vielleicht noch wie ein Verschlusslaut gesprochen wurde” (Kurth 2003, 254, cf. also fn. 62: “für wahrscheinlicher halte ich jedoch eine späte Wiederentlehnung mit innersemitisch geänderter Aussprache, nachdem das Wort zwischenzeitlich in Ägypten außer Gebrauch gekommen wäre”).
NB2: For Eg. the interchange of Eg. m ~ b, Kurth (2003, 254, fn. 63) provided us with an abundant lit., but he failed to satisfactorily explain the anomaly of Dem. -l vs. Can. -r.

mhn “Art Stock oder Szepter” (PT, Wb II 133, 11; GHWb 359; ÄWb I 555) = “un bâton de voyage du type ordinaire” (Jéquier 1921, 342) = “sorte de canne” (Jéquier 1921, 167 & fn. 5) = “un bâton” (AL 77.1850).

NB1: W. Westendorf (KHW 111, 522, cf. AL 77.1850) affiliated it with Cpt. (B) $\mu\alpha\beta\omicron\gamma\lambda$ “Meißel, Beitel, Spitzhammer” and eventually even with Dem. mjhl “Gießform des Töpfers” (explained in DG 153:8 from Eg. mhr), while J. Osing (NBÄ 186, 581, n. 483 & 711, n. 825) saw the etymon of the Cpt. word rather in Eg. mnḥ “Meißel” (OK, Wb, q.v.), which is semantically equally uncertain.

NB2: G. Jéquier (1921, 167 & fn. 5) identified it with MK mnḥ.t (< OK m^cnḥ.t “gegabelter Stock”, q.v.), which was rightly declined by J. Osing (1980, 224, fn. 66) with regard to -ḥ- ≠ -ḥ- and the gender difference.

- Etymology unknown.
- **1.** G. Jéquier (1921, 167 & fn. 5; 1921, 147) derived it (via the prefix m- of nomina instr.) from Eg. ḥn “s’arrêter, se reposer”, whence he rendered its lit. mng. as “un objet servant à se reposer”. False because of OK -ḥ- ≠ -ḥ-.
- **2.** GT: perhaps to be connected with Geez mḥn ~ maḥn “shuttle, length of the warp, weaver’s reed”, Amh. māhan ~ mḥn ~ mān “weaver’s reed” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 336)?

- **3.** GT: if, in turn, Eg. *mhn* < **mhl*, cp. NBrb.: Mzab ta-mčul-t, pl. ti-mčal [č < *k reg.] “cylindre de roseau, de métal, etc., étui cylindriques, d’où: flûte, tube, motif de dessin de tissage, de ceinture de femme” [Dlh. 1984, 115] ||| LECu.: Orm. mukulkula “piece of wood, whose edge is on fire (like torch), brand” [Gragg 1982, 293] || SCu.: (?) Irq. magwál ~ mugúl [irreg. -g-] “1. stick with hook on one side and two ends on the other (used for pulling and pushing thorny branches for a hedge or the like), 2. collar bone” [MQK 2002, 69, 74].

mhn.t “Fähre, Fährschiff (zum Übersetzen über ein Gewässer), bes. auch im Jenseits” (OK, Wb II 133, 12–13) = “ein Schiff” (Lauth 1871, 634, §131) = “Ruderboot” (AÄG 109, §225) = “bac” (PK 1976, 461, fn. 3) = “bac, bateau de passage” (AL 77.1851; 78.1835: CT V 170e, 174a) = “ferry-boat” (Smith 1978, 361; Jones 1988, 139–140, §41) = “1. Fähre, mit der der Tote über die Gewässer der Unterwelt fährt, 2. (im profanen Bereich) Fährschiff, 3. (in der Flotte des Pianchi) Truppentransporter (beim Sturm auf den Hafen)” (Düring 1995, 142).

NB: W. Schenkel (1999, 87f., esp. 92) based its vocalization **múhn.ṭ* on the wtg. of the *Ṭonokalsilbe* with the three ripples hrgl. (N35) in the CT (exx. q.v.).

- Derives with prefix *m-* of nomina instr./loci from Eg. *hnj* “rudern, fahren” (PT, Wb III 374–5).

LT.: Grapow 1914, 28; AÄG 109, §225; Old. 1956, 7; Smith 1978, 361.

NB1: Its origin is still obscure. V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 198) identified it with ECh. **ʔan-* [OS] = **ʔany-* “to swim” [GT] > Jegu *ʔany-* “schwimmen” [Jng. 1961, 110], Mubi *ʔáñà* “schwimmen” [Lks. 1937, 180].

NB2: Ignoring Eg. *hnj*, J. Lauth (1871, 634, §131) explained Eg. *mhn.t* erroneously from a certain Hbr. *makone(h)* “vase, navire” (sic!) [Harkavy].

mhn “schlammige Stelle o.ä.” (late NK: onomasticon of Pap. Golenischeff 6:4, Pap. Lansing rt. 4:5, Wb II 134, 1) = “bog” (Blackman & Peet 1925, 288 & fn. 5) = “ledge of the canal or river-bank” (AEO II 217*–8*) = “mire (?)” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 385: only “*a guess*”; DLE I 237) = “*Morast, schlammige Stelle” (GHwB 359).

NB1: In A. H. Gardiner’s (AEO II 217*–8*, §466) view, the exact mng. of *mhn* is unknown, the sense “schlammige Stelle” (Wb) being “*certainly not definitive enough to suit*” the context of Pap. Lansing 4:5, where it is said of a potter whose hands and feet are full of clay and “he is like who is in the *mhn*”, whence he conjectured to a mng. “ledge of the canal or river-bank” not claiming it “*to be the sole possibility*”.

NB2: Whether *mhn(w).t* (f) “ein Gewässer” (late NK hapax, Wb II 134, 2) represents the same word is doubtful.

NB3: For Dem. *m3hn.t* cf. Klasens, BiOr 13, 222; Cenival 1988, 84.

- Origin obscure.

- **1.** GT: derives from Eg. ḥnw “Gewässer: Fluß (Nil), Bach, Wüstenbunnen” (XVIII., Wb III 373, 5–7)? Extended with prefix m- (whose signification is, however, in this case obscure)?
NB: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 187) compared Eg. ḥnw with ECh. *kʷan- “river”. Cf. also Bed. kʷan (m) “Fluß, Gieß-, Regenbach” [Rn. 1895, 143] = “river, spate of water” [Witczak]. For Bed.-ECh. see IS 1971, #177; Witczak 1992, 41. In principle, Bed. & ECh. *k- vs. Eg. ḥ & ḥ can correspond.
- **2.** A. H. Gardiner (l.c.) associated it with Eg. mḥnm.t “basin” (below).
NB: If so, mḥn should be regarded either as misread or miswritten, which is unlikely.
- **3.** GT: its striking resemblance to ES: Geez mǝʿno ~ māʿəno ~ mǝʿno ~ māʿəno “mud, mire, dung, marsh(land)” < mǝʿna “to be muddy, marshy, slimy, to rot” [Lsl. 1987, 326: isolated in Sem.] seems to be accidental. Note that Eg. -ḥ- ≠ Sem. *-ʿ-.

mḥnm.t ~ mḥnm “basin” (late NK, Pap. Wilbour: 3x, DLE I 237) = “Bassin, Becken” (GHWb 359).

NB: A. H. Gardiner (AEO II 217*-8*, §466) concluded his obscure hint on the surmised connection of mḥn (above) to Pap. Wilbour mḥnm (m) vs. mḥnm.t (f) equivocally: “*nothing shows whether these are identical*”.

- **Origin uncertain.** GT: perhaps derived from or connected with Eg. ḥnm.t “Brunnen” (MK, Wb III 382, 10–15) = “well, cistern” (FD 202)?
NB: The etymology of Eg. ḥnm.t ~ *ḥlm.t (?) > Cpt. (S) ʒOHRE, (B) ʒOHRE, (L) ʒAAMḐ “spring, fountain” (CED 280; CD 670, 691) = “Quelle, Brunnen” (KHW 367, 379) has been highly disputed. (1) J. Osing (NBÄ 598, n. 556) explained it “*als Ableitung von*” the sense “umfassen” of Eg. ḥnm “vereinigen” arbitrarily rendering ḥnm.t as “ursprünglich ein Wasser *einschließendes* Becken” (sic!). (2) V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1990, 85, #3; HSED #1160), in turn, mistakenly compared Eg. ḥnm.t with WCh.: Kulere haram “Fluß” [Jng. 1970, 352], which is equally false (Eg. n ≠ WCh. *r). The “modern” Volksetymologie suggested by Osing was disproved by (3) G. Takács (2005, 79–80, #7.6), who affiliated it rather with CCh.: Bachama kálmá “well” [Mkr. < ?] | Logone ʕüllem “Loch, Grube, Graben” [Lks. 1936, 96] = gúlum (sic) “well” [Mkr. < ?], Buduma ólum “Grube, Loch” [Lks. 1939, 113] | Musgu kaláḡ “Brunnen” [Müller 1886, 398; Lks. 1941, 61], Musgu-Puss kálanḡ “pit” [Trn. 1991, 97] || ECh.: Lele külmá “trou”, külmá kama “pit” (lit. “hole of water”) [WP 1982, 52] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 401).

mḥr “tief gelegenes Land, Weidegrund” (MK, Wb II 134, 9).

NB: Identical with old mḥr “Weideland” (OK, Wb II 132, 8; FÄW 196: archaic period) = “Weidegrund, tiefgelegenes Land” (1st IMP 1x: Urk. I 77:11, ÄWb I 556)?

- From the same root: (1) mḥr.w “der Bodensatz (eines nicht durchgesehenen Getränks)” (Med., Wb II 134, 10); (2) mḥr.w “?”, in: rdj tp [r] mḥr.w “den Kopf nach unten senken (?)” (Wb II 134, 11) = “Tiefe (?)” (Erman 1896, 63) = “tiefliegender Ort (?)”, rdj tp r mḥr.w “den Kopf hängen lassen” (Pap. Westcar, GHWb 359).
- Derived with m- prefix from Eg. ḥr “unter” (OK, Wb III 386–8), cf. Grapow 1914, 28; NBÄ 868, n. 1389. But the anomaly of OK mḥr has not been satisfactorily explained.

nb1: Derives from AA *g-r ~ *q-r “under, down” [GT] reflected in SCu. *giri “under, below, down” [Ehret]: Irq. gir-is- “to release, let fall” | Qwd. gil-ando [-l-reg. < *-r-] “area of lower ground” | Dhl. giri “under, below, down” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 238, #31) ||| SOM. *g^oEr- (?) “under” [GT]: Ari gire, goir, Hamer gwear, Dime goR-o (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 161) ||| WCh.: Dera gorò “under” [Krf.] || ECh.: Jegu koraye, pl. korai “Gesäb” [Jng. 1961, 114], Mubi kòr “Unterseite”, à kòr gi kóólí “unter dem Topf” (kóólí “Topf”) [Lks. 1937, 183].

nb2: The underlying common AA preposition occurs both with *-l and *-r (as pointed out in EDE I 175), cf. AA *g-l ~ *q-l “under, down” [GT] > MSA *hly [GT]: Jbl. nḥel “sous” [Lsl.], Hrs. ʔḥáli ~ ʔḥóli “under(neath)” [Jns.], Mehri nḥáli “unter” [Jahn] = ḥáli “sous” [Lsl.] = ʔḥáli “under(neath)” [Jns. 1987, 308], Sgt. héle [h- < *h-] “profond”, di-hále “sous”, ḥly “jeter en bas” (denom.?) [Lsl.] (MSA: Lsl. 1938, 175; Blz. 1988, 43) ||| LECu. *gal- “lower part” [GT]: Saho gál-e ~ (rare) gáll-e “Tiefe, der untere Teil eines Gegenstandes” [Rn. 1890, 151-2] | POromo *gel- [Black]: Oromo gial-a (so, gi-) “il disotto, la parte inferiore, il fondo”, giála “(di)sotto, inferiore” [da Thiene 1939, 162] = žále “under” [Black] = žala “under” [Gragg 1982, 232], Konso kéla [k- reg. < *g-] “under” [Black], Gidole kél “under” [Black] (LECu.: Dig. 1972, 208, #1.23; Black 1974, 183) | HECu. *kol- “down, descent” [GT]: Kambatta kola, Hadiyya kolo^o (LECu.: Lsl. 1979 III 341) ||| CCh.: PBura-Margi *kil- “under” [GT]: Bura akira [< *-kil- via *-kin-?] “unter” [Hfm.] = àkirà “under” [Krf.], Chibak *-kil “down”, attested in si-kil “herabsteigen” (s? “to come”) [Hfm.] = a ḡilow kwirà “under” [Krf.] (Bura-Margi: Hfm. 1955, 136; Krf. 1981, #327). Cf. Takács 1999, 42. L. Homburger (1928, 341) compared diverse African parallels, cf. Kunama kula, Malinke koro, Dahome glo “under (sous, dessous)”. Because of Cpt. (S) ʔAP̄O=, (A) ʔAP̄A=, (B) ʔAP̄O= “under” (KHW 347), Eg. ḥr probably derives from AA *g-r ~ *q-r.

nb3: F. Hommel (1907, 383) compared Eg. ḥr with Ar. ḡawr- “Senkung, Depression”. Unacceptable (Eg. ḥ- = Ar. h-/ḥ-).

mhr.w “Bedürfnisse” (MK, Wb): discussed s.v. **mhr.w** (OK, supra).

mhrr (Dem.) “Skarabäus” (DG 177:6) ~ vars. mḥll (Volten 1942, 110) ~ mwḥrr (Cenival 1988, 85) > Cpt. (O) MOYḶPHP, (S) AMḶPHPE “Skarabäus, Mistkäfer” (KHW 7, 112, 522) = “scarab” (CED 7).

nb1: Ignoring the Dem. evidence, W.E. Crum explained the Cpt. word as an innovation, a compound (S) *OYAM-ḶPHPE “flower-eater” (CD 704a), which was rightly rejected by J. Černý (CED 7), H.S. Smith (1978, 361), and F. de Cenival (1987, 6), since (S) ḶPHPE < Eg. ḥrrt, whereby Dem. -ḥ- & (O) -ḡ- ≠ Eg. h- and also because “... it is hard to believe that the Egyptians evolved late in their history a new word for a creature so deeply involved in their solar symbolism” (Smith). With an obscure hint on Vycichl, W. Westendorf (KHW 7, fn. 1) suggested alternatively an etymon *ḡm-ḥrrt, which is naturally equally false. The same applies to Crum’s (JEA 28, 1942, 30; KHW 112, fn. 1) alternative explanation of (O) MOYḶPHP via (S) *OYAM-ḶOPE “dung-eater”, since Cpt. (S) ʔO(Ḗ)PE “Kot” < Dem. ḥrt ~ ḥ^ojr.t < LEg. ḥrj.(t) (KHW 359). Rejected by W. Vycichl (DELIC 131).

nb2: J. Osing (1976, 94) declined the rendering of OCpt. (Pap. BM 10808) MOYḶPHP as “scarab” (cf. KHW 486, 522) as being “gegen dem Kontext”. Instead, he analyzed it as [MO]YḶ-ḶPHP < a compound of Eg. m3ḥ(w) “das Brennen” (inf.) + GR rr “Kind warten, aufziehen” (pseudopart. 3rd p. sg. masc.) or r3r “binden” > (S) POP=.

● Etymology obscure and very much debated:

■ 1. W. Westendorf (KHW 7, 366) and F. de Cenival (1987, 6) supposed (S) AMḶPHPE to be cognate with (A) ʔALLI (rdg. dubious, cannot be checked) “beetle (?)” (CD 669a) = “Käfer, Mistkäfer, Skarab”

(KHW) = “scarabée” (DELC 297) < Eg. ḥrr.t (NK) ~ ḥrr (GR) “1. eine Schlange in der Unterwelt, 2. (GR) alles Gewürm” (NK, GR, Wb III 150, 2–3). False.

- **2.** H. S. Smith (1978, 361) surmised in it a met. of Eg. ḥpr̄r, but failed in satisfactorily explaining the shift of old -p- > Dem. m-.
- **3.** F. de Cenival (1987, 3–8, esp. 6), followed by J. G. Manning (1991, 156), saw in it a compound of prefix m- + ḥr.j “ce qui est en dessous” related to Eg. mḥr “tief gelegenes Land” (MK, Wb, q.v.), mḥr.w “der Bodensatz (eines nicht durchgesehenen Getränks)” (Med., Wb, q.v.), whereby they rendered mḥrr literally as “ce qui vient du dessous (le scarabée est qui sort des profondeurs du fond du sol)” (Cenival) = “that which goes underground” (Manniche).

mḥt.w (pl.?) “Eingeweide, auch die Gedärme” (OK, Wb II 135, 5–6) = “intestines, tripe” (AEO II 287 index) = “entrailles” (Massart 1959, 233, §36) = “intestines, gastro-intestinal tract or at least the largest part of this tract (excluding the most proximal parts, namely the oesophagus and stomach), probably encompassing the terminal sections of the tract in the pelvis, namely the sigmoid colon and rectum”, cf. mḥt ʕ3 “large intestine, colon”, mḥt šm “small (lit. perhaps journeying or meandering) intestine” (Walker 1996, 113–4, 269, 270) > Dem. mḥt (m) “Eingeweide” (DG 177:9) > Cpt. (S) MḌḂṬ, (L) MḂḂṬ, (SLF) MḂḂṬ, (B) MḌḂṬ (m) “bowels, intestines” (CD 211b; CED 99) = “intestina, viscera” (Brugsch) = “Darm, Eingeweiden” (Till 1955, 330, §40; Vrg. 1950, 291) = “Eingeweide, Gedärm, Nabelschnur” (KHW 112) = “1. entrailles, 2. (S) cordon ombilical” (DELC 132).

NB: Vocalized as *māḥt̄w < *māḥt̄w (Fecht 1960, 180, §373) = *mēḥt̄w (NBÄ 323).

- Its origin has not yet been satisfactorily explained:
- **1.** Generally accepted in Egyptian philology as an m- prefix derivative of Eg. ḥ.t “belly”, which has usually been distinguished from Eg. jmj-ḥ.t “Eingeweide, Embryo” (PT, Wb I 75, 7–8) = “die im Leibe befindlichen, die Eingeweide” (Steindorff) = “ce qui est dans le ventre” (Vcl.) = “the part belonging to the torso” (Walker). It has, however, not yet been satisfactorily evidenced what the signification of the prefix m- here was and how the fem. ending -t became part of the root in the masc. mḥt.w.

LIT.: Brugsch 1882, 63 (< jmj-ḥ.t!); Ceugney 1880, 8; Steindorff 1890, 594, fn. † (< jmj-ḥ.t!); Grapow 1914, 15, 28; 1954, 80; Sethe 1923, 191 (< jmj-ḥ.t!); Wb II 135; AEO II 252–3; Massart 1959, 233, §36; Fecht 1960, 134, §258 & 180, §373; Ward 1972, 19; Smith 1978, 361; DELC 132; Vcl. 1990, 229, §6 (< jmj-ḥ.t!) vs. 247, #3 (after Fecht, v. infra); Walker 1996, 113–4, 122; PL 458 (after Grd., AEO l.c.).

NB1: As for the direct derivation of *mht.w* < *jmj-h.t*, G. Fecht (1960, 134, §258) rightly states that “*diese Etymologie ist nach unseren Ergebnissen unmöglich*”, since – acc. to Fecht – it should have yielded **j* *měj-he3.t* or **j* *měj-h.et* > *(*ŋ*)*HH2E* (cf. also l.c., fn. 397). Instead, Fecht regarded *mht.w* as “*eine m-Bildung zu h.t ‘Leib’ mit Antritt einer Endung -w*”.

NB2: Considering it as “*kaum möglich, mhtw als denom. Erweiterung unmittelbar von h.t ‘Leib’ zu verstehen*” (because of **mé-* ≠ prefix **ma-*), J. Osing (NBÄ 322–3) tried to explain it as a nisbe (lit. “das zum Leib gehörige”) with the supposed old ending *-(*i*)*w* deriving from an unattested fem. **mht*.t conceived by Osing as the “*erweiterte Form*” (quasi var.!) of *h.t*.

NB3: For a possible late interchange or even contamination of Eg. *mht.w* vs. *jmj.w-h.t* cf. Faulkner 1938, 49; AEO I 64, #140 & II 252*, #602; Lefébvre 1952, 35, §41.

- **2.** J. Hohenberger (1958, 393) and P. Lacau (1970, #406) saw in Eg. *mht.w* a cognate of Sem.: Hbr. *mēʿim* “bowels”, Ar. *maʿy-* “intestines” Tigre *ameʿid* “Gedärm, viscera” (Sem.: Cohen 1961, 69, #55). This is phonologically impossible, rightly declined by W. A. Ward (1972, 19).

NB: Lacau, at the same time, was admitting also the popular derivation from Eg. *jmj-h.t*. Besides, the *m-* of Sem. **maʿy-* is not at all a prefix.

- **3.** A. B. Dolgopolsky (1992 MS, 316, §30) affiliated Eg. **ht* with Sem. **hyt* “to sew” and its “long-range” cognates: IE **Hēter* “Eingeweide (Ader usw.)” [Dlg. after IEW 344], Turkic **e/ät-* “to sew, tie” < Nst. **qe/ätV* “to tie, thread”.
- **4.** N. Skinner (1995, 31) derived it from AA **and-* “intestines”. False.
- **5.** GT: is it perhaps an irregular cognate of Ar. *miʿd-at-* ~ *maʿid-at-* “estomac”, cf. *maʿad-* “1. côté, flanc, 2. ventre, 3. chair sous les omoplates, 4. veine dans la partie du corps appelée minsag- chez le cheval” [BK II 1126] = *miʿd-at-* ~ *maʿid-at-* “1. estomac, 2. caillette, quatrième estomac des animaux ruminants, 3. gros boudin fait avec des oeufs” [Dozy II 602] ||| LECu.: Afar *maḥd-a* (f), pl. *maḥdōdi* “entrails, internal organs, innards, viscera” [PH 1985, 161] ||| SOm.: Dime *moydu* “brain” [Bnd. 1994, 146]? Note that AA **mʿd* > Eg. **mhd* would be reg. (cf. EDE I 326–7), whereby Eg. *√mht* might be conceived as a root var.
- NB1: The Ar. word was affiliated in HSED 371, #1708 with ECh.: *Jegu medet* “belly” (sic, not so in Jng. 1961, 115) and even CCh.: BM **miḏ-* “liver” [GT] = **mVhid-* [OS] (all derived from AA **maʿid-* “stomach”), which seems rather unlikely. This set of dubious comparanda was combined by V. A. Dybo (2000, 53) with Saharan *(*kə*)-*matkun* “liver”. Irreal.
- NB2: Hardly any connection to Akk. *mātu* “u.a. 5. ein bestimmter Teil der Oberfläche von Eingeweiden” [AHW 634].
- **6.** GT: cp. alternatively Ar. *maḥaṭa* “2. tirer, extraire tout à fait, 3. tirer à soi et détendre”, *māḥiṭ-* “qui traverse un corps de part en part” [BK II 1074]?
- **7.** G. Takács (2005, 216–8, #304): prefix *m-* + AA **Q-t* [**h-* or **g-*] “body, belly” [GT]?

mz ~/< mz3 “herbeibringen, -tragen, -führen, -schleppen, (Hand) hinstrecken” (OK, Wb II 135, 7; Erman 1910, 36–38, §iv) = “to bring with, carry” (Badawy 1956–57, 67) = “to bring, present to (n), bring away booty, extend hand, take aim” (FD 116) = “1. to bring, present, offer, 2. launch (a vessel)” (DLE I 238; Jones 1988, 215, §36) = “herbeibringen, -tragen, -schaffen, entgegenstrecken und rasseln, hinstrecken” (GHWb 360).

NB1: Its rare older (?) var. *mz3* (PT 85) may reflect the full root (cf. Wb II 136, 3; FD; GHWb l.c.).

NB2: The wtg. (since NK) as *mzb* ~ *mzbj* ~ even *mzbbj* (sic) represents “*nur eine orthographische Verdrehung*” (Erman 1910, 47), which “*nach Analogie von zbj ‘bringen’ gebildet ist*” (Sethé 1912, 81 & fn. 2), as it has been surmised already by P. Renouf (1868, 48): “*I cannot believe that in mzbj the b is otherwise than ideographic (sic) of the sound mas*”. The view of G. Thausing (1941, 25), that these exx. in fact represent either a root extended with -b or a verbum conjunctum (< *mz* + *zbj*), is erroneous.

NB3: OCpt. M&C- (part. conj.) “bringen, schaffen, hervorrufen” may reflect the part. of either Eg. *mz(3)* or *msj* (KHW 520).

NB4: The derivation of LEg. *tmz* (or *tms*) “(das Gesicht) zuwenden jemandem (r/n)” (XVIII., GR, Wb V 308, 14–15) from *mz* suggested by Ch. Cannuyer (1983, 28) is dubious.

- Hence (?): *mz* “Blumenstrauß (zumeist die eigentümlichen sog. Stabsträuße)” (XIX., Wb II 136, 1; Kaplony 1972, 223: first attested in Abusir; WD III 56 with lit.) = “elaborate garlands made of white flowers, or woven of separate petals” (Griffith 1898, 27) = “bouquet” (XVIII., FD 117) = “bouquet monté, offrande florale” (OK: Abusir, PK 1976, 414, n. d; AL 77.1856; 79.1337) = “1. Strauß, 2. Maß für frisches Grün, Papyrus, Lotos” (Helck, LÄ III 1203) = “1. Stabstrauß, Bouquet, 2. Blumenopfer” (GHWb 360) = “floral offerings” (PL 459).

NB1: Rendered literally as “das Dargebrachte” (Erman) = “das Herbeigebrachte” (Grapow). For its supposed derivation from Eg. *mz(3)* see Erman 1910, 39; PL 459; Koemoth 1997, 153 & fn. 29. Note that H. Grapow (1914, 28) derived it directly (!) from **zwj* (sic) “Verb des Gehens” (via prefix *m-*), which is certainly incorrect. The same pertains to the far-fetched idea of FL. Griffith (1898, 27) to derive *mz* (rendered lit. “artificial”) from *msj* “to produce children” (supported also by P. Wilson in PL 459) and (!) even late *mzb* (sic) < *zbj* “to bring, offer”.

NB2: The form described as “Stabstrauß” suggests to assume alternatively a connection to Eg. *mz.t* “Art Stab des Osiris” (NK, Wb, q.v.).

- Etymology disputable.
- **1.** Most convincing seems the comparison with the reflexes of WSem. **msr* “1. to remove, 2. deliver, hand over” [Hnrg, 2000, 2065] suggested by Th. Schneider (1993, 168; 1997, 198, §37).

NB1: Attested in Hbr. *msr qal* “to become the occasion for apostasy (?)”, *nifal* “to be selected, picked out” [KB 608 contra GB 441] = “to deliver up, offer” [Guillaume] = *nifal* “ausgewählt werden” [Voigt], PBHbr. & JAram. *msr* “übergeben, überliefern” [GB] = “1. einen Gegenstand übergeben, aushändigen, 2. (Worte) überliefern, mündlich mitteilen, 3. ausliefern, preisgeben, freigeben” [Levy 1924 III, 176–7] = “1. to seize, 2. hand over, deliver, transmit” [Jastrow 1950, 810], JAram. *msr* “to hand over, deliver, transmit” [Sokoloff 1990, 321], Samar. Aram. *msr qal* “1. to hand over, 2. appoint, entrust, 3. recall”, ʔtṣṣʕl “1. to be handed

over, 2. devote o'self, 3. be appointed, 4. be retained" [Tal 2000, 480], Mnd. msr "to deliver, yield, give up, surrender, give order, hand on, transmit (particularly the marginal and notes of the Mesorah)" [DM 1963, 276a] = "übergeben, überliefern" [Snd.], Syr. msr "to hand on, transmit, teach" [KB] = "to hand over, surrender" [Bravmann] = msr "überliefern" [Voigt] | OSA: Sab. ms_{1,r} "to clear away silt" & "silt behind dam (?)", ms_{3,r} "to remove (inscription, monument)" [SD 88] = ms_{3,r} (hapax) "entfernen, wegnehmen" [Sima 2001, 253, §4] = msr (sic) "wegschaffen, entfernen" [Snd.], Min. msr ~ mšr "wegschaffen" [GB after Hommel, ZDMG 46, 530] = ms_{3,r} "entfernen, wegnehmen" [Sima 2001, 253, fn. 6], Mdb. ms_{1,r} ~ ms_{3,r} "enlever une inscription, un monument" [Arbach 1993 MS, 71] (Sem.: Voigt 1998, 174, 177). The OSA evidence (ms_{1,r}) reflects a P_{Sem.} var. *mšr [GT].

NB2: W_{Sem.} *msr has no evident reflex in E_{Sem.} The connection with Akk. muššuru D "wegschicken, aufgeben" [Haupt] (suggested in GB 441) is out of question, this being a var. to wuššuru < wšr. R.M. Voigt (1998, 177) compared Akk. mšr "(auf dem Boden) schleifen" [AHW 624] = "1. to teasel cloth, 2. drag (over the ground), 3. make an impression of the hem on clay, 4. drive around" [CAD m1, 359], which is semantically weak.

NB3: A. Guillaume (1965 I, 11) affiliated Hbr. msr with Ar. slm IV: ?aslama "to deliver up", which is far-fetched (met. + -r vs. -l- unlikely). M. Bravmann (1977, 513f.), in turn, assumed N_{Sem.} *msr to have originally been a denom. verb from a *ma-prefix derivative of Sem. *√sr "to bind, tie", i.e., the underlying basis was a noun attested in JAram. mēsārā ~ mēsartā "truss (of herbs)" [Levy 1924 II, 179b], Syr. mēsārtā (Nestorian tradition: mēsārtā) ~ mēsār "truss (of herbs), shackle (vinculum)" [Brk.], Geez ma'sa/ar ~ ma'sart "shackle (vinculum)" [Bravmann]. Semantically far-fetched. In addition, the OSA cognates also disprove this theory.

- **2.** GT: or should we assume a met. < *m3z/*mlz ~ Ar. malaza I "empporter qqch., partir en emportant qqch.", II "délivrer qqn. de qqch.", IV "s'en aller en emportant qqch." [BK II 1147]?

NB: Derived by Ch. Ehret (1989, 182, §55) from a hypothetical bicons. Ar. *ml- "to remove".

- **3.** Other (phonologically equally plausible) alternatives are semantically less likely.

NB: Such as (1) Hbr. m3r qal "to spread (a net)" [KB 566], JAram. m3r "to stretch o'self out" [KB], Ar. m3r "3. détendre et faire gonfler (p.ex. une outre en la remplissant d'eau, etc.)" [BK II 1099] = "to stretch out, inflate (skin)" [KB], cf. Ar. mdr II "dispenser, disséminer", IV "être dispersé, disséminé de tous les côtés" [BK II 1080]; (2) OSA (Sab.) mdr-m "routing (?), putting to flight (?)" [SD 83]; (3) if Eg. mz was the primary root, cp. NA_{gaw}: Hamir mizez "(heraus)ziehen (Schwert usw.), zerren" [Rn. 1884, 396].

- Other etymologies are not acceptable.

- **4.** An etymological connection (maintained by some egyptologists) with Eg. *zj "gehen?" (Wb III 424, 13) = zwj (sic) "Verb des Gehens" (Grapow) = z (sic) "to bring, come" (sic, Reintges) > j.zj "gehe!" (OK, Wb I 126, 8) can be safely excluded because of the meaning.

LIT.: Ceugney 1880, 8; Grapow 1914, 28; Thausing 1941, 25; Reintges 1994, 226.

- **5.** It is obscure why I. M. Diakonoff (1981, 43, fn. 52) related Eg. mz3 "to bring" with such Afro-Asiatic forms as Akk. mzy "to press", (D) "to force, insult, debase, rape", Ar. mzz "to overcome, keep one's own (in contest)" ||| Bed. mayk^{wa} [< *mazik^{wa}?] "dexter" || E_{Cu}. *mizg- "dexter".

- **6.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 305, #584): Eg. *mz3* ~ Ar. *mḏl* “to make known a secret” ||| ECu. **mi/u/ač-* “to stick out, come forth” ||| NOM.: Gonga **mōčč-* “young grain” < AA **-mu/aš-* “to come forth, emerge, stick out”. These comparanda are even mutually unrelated.

NB1: At the same time, Ehret (1995, 303, #577) affiliated LEg. *ms* “to launch” with Ar. *mzh* “to set out on a journey” and Cu. **mač-* “to get up” < AA **-mač-* “to start”. NB2: Later, Ehret (1997 MS, 214, #1836) combined it with Afar *mād-* “reach, arrive at” < AA **-māz-*.

mz.t “Art Gans” (OK, Wb II 136, 4) = “eine Gans” (GHWb 362).

NB: The rdg. *mz3.t* (Wb) is based on the supposed connection with *z.t* (Wb: **z3.t*). In fact, the **-3* does not appear.

- Etymology dubious.
- **1.** Derives from Eg. *z.t* [Wb: < **z3.t*] “Art Gans oder Ente” (PT, Wb III 407, 16–17) via prefix *m-*?
NB: Eg. *z.t* has been usually equated with Sem. **wazz-* “goose” [Mlt.] = *(*?a/i*)-*waz(z)*- [SED]: Ug. *ūz* [WUŠ #125], Hbr. **ʔayyāz* [< **?a-wwaz*] (sic) [Ember], PBHbr. *ʔāwāz* [Jastrow 1950, 23], Syr. *wazzā* [Brk. 1928, 184] | Ar. *wazz-* & *?i-wazz-* [BK II 1527] || (?) Geez *zəy* & Amh. *zəyy(i/e)* [Lsl. 1987, 646] (Sem.: DRS 12; SED II 32, #22), cf. also Sum. *uz* “oie (sauvage?)” [Labat 1976, 171, #372] (Sum. from PSem. or vice versa?). For Eg.-Sem.: Ember 1913, 111, #13; 1930, #17.a.10; Chn. 1947, #506; Mlt. 1985, 8, #32; 1995, 120, #13; Kvl.-Mlt. 1993, 27, #5; 1994 MS, 2, #1.15; SED II 33. This comparison is, however, hindered by the supposed Eg. **-3*.
- **2.** GT: or related to AA **m-c* “goose” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. *msj.t*, q.v.)? Did late NK *msj.t* continue the old word *mz.t*?
NB: No connection to SCu.: Dh. *miṣe* “Egyptian goose” [EEN 1989, 38: no SCu. cognates]. Note that Dh. *š* < **y!*

mz.t “Art Stab des Osiris” (NK, BD, Wb II 136, 2; GHWb 360) = “a staff” (FD 116) = “Stab, ein Krummstab” (Hornung 1963 II, 27–28, §81 & 87, §305) = “eine Bez. des Krummstabes” (Kaplony, LÄ VI 1386, n. 71: already CT V 90f.).

NB1: Its occurrence in CT V 90f (suggested by P. Kaplony l.c.) was rendered by R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 29, spell 397, n. 25) as a corruption of *mstw* “offspring”.

NB2: The supposed connection to Eg. *mz* “Blumenstrauß (zumeist die eigentümlichen sogen. Stabsträuße)” (first attested in OK, Wb, above) suggests an original -*z*.

- Origin obscure. GT: perhaps related to AA **m-s* “sort of stick” [GT]?
NB1: Cf. EBrb.: Siwa *ta-məš-t* “battoir: une pièce de bois dont on se sert pour bourrer la pâte d’olive dans les scroustins et qu’on place sur la pile des scroustins au moment de la presse” [Lst. 1931, 201] ||| NAgaw: Bilin *mássa*, pl. *másses* “Holz der Lanze, Schaft” [Rn. 1887, 275] || SCu.: WRift **mays-* “pestle” [Ehret]: Irq. *músa*, Grw. *músu*, Alg. & Brg. *maysu* (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 25, §81) ||| NOM.: Kachama (Gatsama) *mīci* [-ts-] “stick” [Sbr. 1994, 20].
NB2: Later, Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 214, #1835) combined the Eg.-WRift parallel also with SOm.: Ari *mīs-a* “grass”, which is semantically unconvincing.

mzw.t > mzj.t ~ mz.t “Art Speise aus Weizen” (PT, Wb II 136, 5; Pusch 1974, 21; cf. Cagiola 1987) = “Weizenspeise” (AÄG lix, §145

& 109, §253) = “Weizen in einem besonderen Zustand” (Helck, LÄ I 1267) = “Weizen” (Helck, LÄ II 587) = “Weizengericht” (Edel 1980, 14).

NB: Eg. msj.t (var. msj) “Schale, Schüssel (aus Gold, Silber)” (LP, NBÄ 815 after MacAdam 1949, inscr. iii 13, 19) = “Gefäßname” (Edel) has been explained by M. F. L. MacAdam (1949, 11, n. 44) as a vessel named after the food (Eg. mzw.t) it contained (cf. Edel 1980, 14, fn. 8). For the problem of its alleged cuneiform reflection in Amarna ma-[š]u-ia (EA 14, 1:14) suggested by J. Osing (NBÄ 815) and rejected by E. Edel (1980, 14) see Eg. ms.t and msj3.t.

- **1.** Most probably derives from Eg. zw.t “Weizen” (PT, Wb III 426, 12–17) = “Weizen (*Triticum durum*), *Dinkel” (GHWb 674) with prefix m- as usually suggested in Eg. philology.

LIT.: e.g. Grapow 1914, 15, 28; Wb l.c.; Edel in AÄG 109, §253 & 1980, 14, fn. 8; Wst. 1989, 18; Snk. 1999, 89.

NB: As suggested by A.Ju. Militarev (1995, 118, #4) and G. Takács (2002, 173), Eg. zw.t may be compared with WCh.: Nbauchi *z/zu “guinea-corn, sorghum” [Skn.] = *zuw [Std.]: Warji zū-na, Miya, Kariya zu, Mburku zū, Tsagu zu-n (Nbauchi: Skn. 1977, 24; Std. 1987, 254). Areal parallel: Ubangi group: PMundu-Ndogo *zú “flour” [Saxon 1982, 77]. I.M. D’jakonov (1981, 46) combined Eg. zw.t with Hbr. ziw “altkanaan. Name des zweiten Monats, etwa der Mai entsprechend” [GB 194] = “the month of Ziw” [KB 266] = “name of month when wheat ripened” [Djk.]. But the Hbr. has been explained in KB l.c. as a loan-word of entirely different basic sense connected with Akk. zīm/wu (for further discussion see also AHW 1528). A.Ju. Militarev (1995, 118, #4), in turn, affiliated the Eg.-PNbauchi isogloss with Guanche Brb.: Fuerteventura te-zzez-es “barley/wheat” [Mlt.] < *ti-zziz- + Spanish pl. ending -s. Alternatively, Militarev related the Guanche form with NBrb.: Qabyle ti-zzi-t “oсть ячменного колоса” [Mlt.].

- **2.** GT: the similarity between Eg. mzw.t vs. AA *m-š “sort of corn (?)” [GT] may be pure chance.

NB1: Cf. NOm.: Chara mey-ā [from *meyz-] “farina di ensete” [Crl.] | Yemsa (Janjero) meš-ò “1. hirseähnliches Getreide, 2. Amaranthus Caudatus” [Lmb. 1993, 364] | Kafa mäh-ò “cereals” [Crl.], Shinasha maš-o “cereals” [Crl.] = “grain” [Lsl.], Mocha māw-o “cereals” [Lsl. 1959, 43] (NOm.: Crl. 1938 III, 173; 1951, 470) || WCh.: Bade fem. mùuš-in “Guineakorn” [Lks. 1968, 222] || ECh.: Somray mášja “Negerhirse” [Lks. 1937, 80] | (?) Mokilko múudú [-d- < *Z-?] “Hirse” [Lks. 1977, 221] = múdú (coll.) “mil (nom générique), céréale” [Jng. 1990, 142]. Note that E. Ceruli (1951, 470) derived the Kafa word from the common NOm. root *m- “to eat” [GT] on the analogy of Amh. əhəl “cereals” < Sem. *ʔkl.

NB2: G. Takács (1999, 133; 1999, 199, #1.1.1.) compared the NOm.-Bade-Mokilko isogloss with Ar. mazḥ- “épi” [BK II 1099] = “Kornähre” [Vcl.] || Eg. ḥmz [met. of *mzh < *mzh] “Kornähre” (BD, Wb III 367, 5), which is uncertain. For Eg.-Ar.: Vcl. 1958, 388; 1959, 146, #4; 1990, 52.

NB3: The reflexes of AA *m-š (above) are presumably to be separated from Brb. *m-z “orge” [Rns. 1932, 386] = *tíméz-in (sic, -z-) “Gerste” [Zhl. 1950, 412] = *tī-muzz-āt-in (sic, -zz-) “barley” [Djk. 1981, 43] = *tV-miz/zi-n [Mlt.-Sts. 1984, 39] = *tV-m[V]zi-n [Mlt. 1991, 169] > NBrb.: Shilh te-mz-in [Bst.] = ti-mzz-in [Vcl.] | Mzg. ti-mz-in (fem. coll. pl.) “(les) orge(s)”, ti-mez-t, pl. ti-mz-in “un grain d’orge” [Tf. 1991, 451], Izdeg ti-mez-t, pl. ti-mz-in “orge” [Mrc. 1937, 181], Zayan & Sgugu tu-mez-t ~ ti-mez-t ~ ti-meš-t “orge” [Lbg. 1924, 567] | Sgrs. ti-mz-in (pl.) “orge” [Pellat 1955, 107] = ti-miz-in [Wlf.], Tuat ti-mezz-in [Bst.], Shenwa hi-mz-in “orge” [Lst. 1912, 146], Wargla ti-mz-in [Bst., Prv.] = ti-mz-in “orge” [Dlh. 1987, 203], Mzab tɔ-mz-in [Bst.] = ti-mz-in “orge” [Dlh. 1984, 126], Halima & Harawa

ti-mz-in “orge” [Bst. 1895, 102], Uriaghel & Bqy. ti-muyaz “orge grillée” [Rns. 1932, 384], Uled Sellem ti-mz-in “orge” [Joly 1912, 80], Shawya ti-mz-in “orge” [Wlf.], Sened ti-mz-in (pl.) “orge” [Prv.], Nfs. ta-mz-in (sic, t-) “orge” [Mtl., Prv.] = ta-mz-in ~ tâ-mz-in “orzo” [Bgn. 1931, 260; 1942, 312] etc. | Qbl. ti-mz-in (coll. fem. pl.) “(les) orge(s)” [Dlt. 1982, 529] || EBrb.: Ghadames ti-mz-in [Mtl. 1904, 143] = ti-mez-in [Prv.] = t̄-mz-īt, pl. t̄-mz-īn “orge” [Lanfry 1973, 222, #1056] = ti-mz-in [Mlt.], Sokna ti-mz-in “orzo” [Srn. 1924–25, 22], Audjila ti-mz-in [Prd. 1960, 171], Siwa ta-mtz-ein “orge” [Bricchetti-Robecchi apud Bst.] = ta/u-mz-en [Bst.] = ta-mz-en [Prv.] = te-mz-en [Cailliaud apud Bst.] = teu-mz-en [Koenig, F. Müller apud Bst. 1890, 76] = ta-mz-in [Mtl.] = tu-mz-èn “barley” [Quibell 1918, 98] = to-mz-in “orge”, cf. ta-məzzūa “mais (Lst.), millet (Minutoli)” [Lst. 1931, 255, 270] = tu-məz-an [Djk.] = ta-mz-in [Mlt.], Fodjaha t̄-mz-in “orco” [Prd. 1961, 299] || SBrb.: Ahaggar ti-mz-in “orge” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1270], Ghat č̄-mz-in “orge” [Nhl. 1909, 184], EWlm. te-mz-en (pl.f.) “orge (Hordeum vulgare)” [PAM 2003, 574] = ta-mzen-t (so, -n-t) “blé” [Wlf.] || Guanche: Lanzerote & Fuertaventura ta-moz-en [Bst.] = te-moss-en [Zhl. 1950, 412] = ta/e-mos-en “cebada” [Wlf. 1955, 76, §6] = ta-mosen, ta-moz-en, ta-moc-en [Mlt.] (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 298; 1885, 183; 1887, 423, 459; Prv. 1911, 128; Wlf. 1955, 76, §6; Djk. 1981, 43, fn. 52; Mlt. 1991, 152, fn. 4; 1991, 169) || WCh.: Dera módò “bulrush-millet” [Nwm. 1974, 130], Pero módò “millet” [Frj. 1985, 42], W. Vycichl (1955, 315, fn. 15) supposed the Brb. word to have had the primary meaning “die Haarige, Grannige”, but his comparison with NBrb.: Shilh coll. i-mzad “Haar” (on the analogy of Ar. šaʿīr-) is false (-d being part of the root).

NB4: For AA *m-ǰ (above) cf. also (as var. root with a voiceless sibilant) Sem.: Yemeni Ar. ṽmys: meysāni “burr-sort”, maysāni “eine Weizenart” [Behnstedt 1983, 200] || ECh.: Lele misé “early millet, bulrush-millet” [Simons 1981 MS, 6, #77] = “sorgho (gén.)” [WP 1982, 63] | Sarwa māsā “millet” [Jng. 1977 MS, 5, #76] = “petit mil” [Jng. 1990 MS, 9, #163] < AA *m-s “sort of corn” [GT]?

mzwr “Stelle wo man trinken kann, Trinkplatz” (PT, Wb II 136, 6) = “1. (NK) Trinkstätte (geschrieben als ob eine Trinschale wäre, aber eher ein Gebäude ist gemeint), 2. (PT 930) offenbar ein Teich” (Sethe 1929, 2) = “drinking-bowl” (FD 117) = “drinking place” (Smith 1979, 161) = “Trinkstelle” (PT, ÄWb I 563).

NB: P. Wilson supposes that maybe GR mswr (old *mzwr?) “ein Gewässer im Ombos, auch als Name des Sobek” (Wb II 143, 9–10) = “canal” (Edfu, PL 464) also belongs here.

- Nomen loci (or instr.) of Eg. zwr “trinken” (OK, Wb III 428; ÄWb I 563–4). LIT.: Grapow 1914, 28; Old. 1956, 7; Smith 1979, 161; PL 464.

NB: The etymology of Eg. zwr is still unsolved (for a detailed discussion see Jung-raithmayr & Takács 2000):

(1) The most widespread view is that Eg. zwr is cognate with common Berbero-Chadic *s-w-[-?] “to drink” [GT], whose reflexes, however, indicate no trace of *-r, cf. Brb. *š-w-y “to drink” [Rsl. 1964, 208] = *s-w-i [Rsl. 1987, 385] = *s-w-y [Vcl. 1990, 225] = *s-w-H [Dlg. 1990, 215]: e.g. NBrb.: Qbl. i-swa, Shilh su ~ ssu, Snus sū || EBrb.: Siwa su, Ghadames e-swu || WBrb.: Zenaga i-šba [from *s-wa] || SBrb.: Tuareg ā-sw (for Brb.: Bst. 1883, 309, 320; 1887, 403, 448; Mlt. 1991, 256, #19.1) || Ch. *s- “to drink” [NM 1966, 234, #23] = *sa [Nwm. 1977, 25] = *s₂-w-[?]/h [JS 1981, 88; Dlg. 1990, 215, 219] = *s₂-w-[?] [Jng. 1982, 8] = *s₂-w- [JI 1994 I, 51] = *s-w-(y) [Jng. 1994, 230] (Ch. data: JI II 110–1; Jng. 1983, 141–2; Jng. 1995, 217; Prh. 1972, 52, #29.1). Lit. for the equation of Eg. zwr with the Brb.-Ch. root: Trombetti 1902, 193; Müller 1909, 185 & fn. 2; Bates 1914, 82; Zyhlarz 1931–32, 5,

fn. 1; 1932–33, 49; 1934, 117; Mercier 1933, 319, fn. 1; Cohen 1947, #296; Greenberg 1963, 55, #25; Rössler 1964, 207–8; 1979, 26; 1987, 385; D'jakonov 1965, 44; Dolgopolsky 1970, 622, #8.44; Bender 1975, 159; Vycichl 1990, 225; Jng, 1994, 104–105; 1994, 230; 1994, 444–6. All these scholars overlooked or ignored that Eg. voiced *z*- (as pointed out already by F. Hommel 1882, 10) does not regularly correspond to the initial voiceless sibilants in Brb. and Ch., and, more importantly, that there is no match of Eg. -r. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, l.c.) tried to justify the reconstruction of Brb. **-r* by a comparison to the isolated Snus agricultural term *e-sšūr* (sic) “tränken”, which must be in fact an error for *a-sured*, verbal noun of *sured* “to bring to the watering place, to water”, causative of *ured* < Arabic *warada* “to arrive (at a watering place or wurd)” (kind p.c. by K.-G. Prasse, 24 Jan. 2007). The similarity of Eg. *zwr* to CCh.: Tera (connecting stem) *za-rá < vza* “to drink” [Nwm. 1964, 47] < PCh. **sw-* is also misleading. W. M. Müller (1909, 185), in turn, tried to justify the Eg.-Brb. comparison by explaining Eg. -r as a false archaization of the orthography, but it can hardly be accepted in this case because of the *hrgl. wr* (G36) in the word. This etymology of Eg. *zwr* has been already rightly doubted by F. Hintze (1951, 81: “*unwahrscheinlich*”), C.T. Hodge (1976, 23, #127), and even W. Vycichl (1990, 227: “*il semble difficile de comparer l'ég. zwr avec le berbère su et le haoussa sâ...*”). Moreover, O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1300; Stl. 1996, 58) has recently convincingly identified the Brb.-Ch. isogloss **s-w-y/H* with Ar. *ḥsw* “boire en humant (l'eau), absorber par petites gorgées, humer la soupe” [BK I 429] = “to sup, sip, drink by little and little” [Lane 572] = “to drink by small gulps” [Stl.], cf. also Mehri *ḥsw*: *ḥəsū* “to dig for water, make a water-hole”, Jibbali *ḥsy*: EJibbali *ḥsē* & CJibbali *ḥasē* “to dig for water” (MSA: Johnstone 1981, 116; 1987, 189). Thus the Brb.-Ch. root may be traced back to AA **s-w-ḥ* ~ **ḥ-s-w* “to drink” [GT], which definitely rules out the problematic equation of Brb.-Ch. **s-w-H* with Eg. *zwr* > *zwj*. This is confirmed also by the long-range parallels of the Ar.-Brb.-Ch. root, to which add NOm.: Gimirra *sō* “Wasser” [Cohen 1947, #296], cf. IE **sew-/sū-* “1. moist(ure), 2. to gulp, suck” [IEW 912], Kart. **s-w-* “to drink” (suggested by A. Dolgopol'skij 1970, 622; 1990, 219). W. M. Müller (1975, 69, #68) and Th. Obenga (1993, 320–322, #69) related the Chadic root to NOm. **uš-* “to drink” [GT] (with met.), although the SOm. evidence indicates that the sibilant was deglottalized in NOm., cf. Ari *woč-*, Hamer *wəč-a*, Dime *wuč-* “to drink” (Bender 1994, 148, #20).

(2) A. Erman (1892, 117, with hesitation) and M. Cohen (1947, #296) compared Eg. *zwr* with Sem.: Hbr. *sb?* “trinken, zechen”, though none of the root consonants corresponds. Besides, Hbr. *sb?* is cognate with Ch. **s-b* [**-ḥ* < **-b?*] “to suck, drink” [Nwm. 1977, 32]. See SISAJa III, 20, #32; HSED #403 (Sem.-Ch.). R. M. Voigt (1998, 610) did not exclude the *Urverwandtschaft* of Hbr. *sb?* & Ch. **s₂-b*/**s₂-b₂* “saugen” [JI] with Brb.-Ch. **s-w-* “to drink”.

(3) A. Ember (1911, 90; 1926, 302, fn. 10, 305, #3.1; 1930, #6.d.3), in turn, combined Eg. *zwr* with Sem. **šrb* ~ **šrp*: PBHbr. (Talmud) *šrp* “to sip”, Syr. *srp* “to suck in, absorb”, Ar. *šariba* “to drink, suck out”, Geez *šrb* “imbibere, bibere, sorbere” (Sem.: Dlg. 1972, 169, #6; Rabin 1975, 90, 87, #19; Mt. 1976, 24, #13). Rightly rejected by C. T. Hodge (1976, 23, #127). Evidently unreal: Eg. *z-* never corresponds to Sem. **š-*, while Eg. *-w-* vs. Sem. **-b* are also irregular. Rejected already by C. T. Hodge (1976, 23, #127). Sem. **šrb* is supposed to be cognate with Eg. *š3b.w* [perhaps **šrb-w*] “food, meals” (MK, FD 261) ||| WCh.: Hausa *šarḥáá* “to noisily drink soup” [Abr. 1962, 802]. For Eg.-Sem.-Hs.: Ember 1930, #3.b.34; Hodge 1966, 46, #60; 1990, 647, #17.a.

(4) H. Jungraithmayr (1977, 52–53) combined Eg. *zwr* and Brb. **s-w-* with Ch. **s/š-b-r/h* (?) > WCh.: Sigidi *šiabur* (hl-), Polchi *šir* (hlir) “trinken” < **šib-r* (sic). Phonologically equally unlikely.

(5) G. Takács (1995, 101, #3) traced it back to a bicons. Eg. **z3* ~ **zr* “to flow” based on Eg. *z3b* “fließen” (PT, Wb III 420, 3–4) and *z3t* “Wasser sprengen” (PT, Wb

III 422, 11). Far-fetched, although there are external parallels, cf. PCh. *z-1 “to pour” [JS 1981, 206] > e.g. WCh.: BT *(n)zalu “to pour” [Schuh 1984, 217].

(6) GT: its kinship to the isolated Nbauchi *š-w-r “Wasser” [JS 1981, 283; JI 1994 I, 176] = *[c/ç]uwar- [GT]: Warji suwara [Gowers] = ts’ùwárá (çùwárá) [IL] = sùwará [Skn.], Diri tsuwaru [Skn.] = sùwàrù [IL] is phonologically also unlikely (NBch. *š- < AA *ç- ≠ Eg. z-).

(7) GT: in view of GR mswr “canal” (GR, PL), noteworthy is Sem. *šwr (hardly *šwr) > OSA m-s₃wr-t “irrigation channel” [Lsl.] = “Bewässerungskanal” [Voigt] | Geez mašwar(t) [irreg. š-?] “funnel, container (for oil)” [Lsl.] = “Trichter” [Voigt] (Sem.: Müller 1983, 283; Lsl. 1987, 539; Voigt 1994, 113) – albeit the correspondence of the first radicals is irreg. and the basic sense of the underlying Psem. root is uncertain.

mzmz “Verbum (von der Sonne)” (PT hapax, Wb II 136, 9; GHWb 363) = “sich umgürten” (ÜKAPT VI 133) = “to gird” (AEPT 180) = “(mng. unknown, simplex mz?)” (Allen 1984, 571) = “gegürtet sein” (ÄWb I 564).

NB: Occurs only in PT 1088a: mzmz=f m pšr.t “he is girt with his kilt” (AEPT) = “he is... in the girdle” (Allen). The lack of det. indicates that the word was no longer fully understood. Even the interpretation of pšr.t (hapax of PT 1088a) is equally questionable. It is usually rendered as “ein Schurz” (ÄWb I 474), but the oldest var. (P) has a road det. (N31), which may suggest – in principle – assuming *phr.t “route” (or sim.) < phr “go around”. This would lead to a different understanding of the passage: “he is... during the route (?)”. Perhaps *mzmz “to shine or burn (???)” (or sim.). But further research is needed.

- Meaning and origin obscure. We be confined only to speculations.
- 1. GT: should the basic mng. “to roll (up in)” (or sim.) be valid, Eg. mzmz might be linked to Sem.: Dathina mzz “spremere” [Rossi] = “to squeeze, wring (the clothes)” [Stace] = “(res)serrer, tendre” [GD 2691], Yemeni Ar. mzz I “to squeeze, press hard, wring (clothes), VIII “to recoil, contract (fingers)” [Piamenta 1990, 464] ||| NBrb.: (?) Qbl. m-z-y: e-mzi “être rond” [Dlt. 1982, 531].

NB: NOm.: Wlt. mayz “indossare, vestire” [Crl. 1929, 33] cannot be related, the underlying NOm. root being just *may- (cf. LS 1997, 477).

- 2. GT: if, in turn, its basic meaning has anything to do with “shining” or “burning” (or sim.), cp. perhaps NOm. *mič- (< *miš-?) “to burn” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Wolayta mičč- “to taste hot” [Hyw.], Zayse mičč- “to roast” [Hyw.], Koyra mičč-e “heiß” [Lmb.], Baditu mičč-ē “caldo” [Crl. 1929, 62], Haruro meč-āys “scaldare, bruciare”, mičč-ē “caldo” [CR 1937, 653] | Gimirra-Benesho mič- “to roast” [Hyw.] | Chara miča “to burn” [Bnd. 1974, 29] | Kaffa miš- “heiß sein, brennen”, miš-ō “Hitze” [Rn. 1888, 316] = mič “1. accendersi, 2. arrostirsi” [Crl. 1951, 468] = mičč- “Feuer fangen, gebraten werden, verbrennen (intr.)” [Lmb.], Mocha mičči(yé) “to burn (intr.)”, mičči(yé) “to burn, fry, kindle” [Lsl. 1959, 39–40] = mičč- “to roast” [Hyw.], Sns.-Bworo mičc- (-tts-) “1. (an)brennen (tr), 2. verbrennen (tr), 3. frittieren” [Lmb.] | Sheko mičč- “1. anzünden, 2. verbrennen (tr), 3. frittieren”, mičč-o “heiß” [Lmb.] (NOm.: Hyw. 1988, 283; Lmb. 1993, 361). L. Reinisch (l.c.) erroneously connected the Kaffa root with Eth.-Sem. *mwq “to be warm”, although the medial -r- and the final -š speak against it. M. Lamberti (l.c.), in turn, derived the NOm. root from a hypothetical OCu. (PCu.-Om.) *bud-, which is phonologically also unlikely.

nb2: Cp. also Mer. hmz “le dieu Soleil” [Meeks 1973, 13] = mz “sungod (?)” [Bnd.] = MŠ [maš] [Zavadovskij-Kacnel’son 1980, 66]? Note that L. Bender (1981, 25, #24) tentatively combined the Mer. word with NS: Undu (Berta) mʷndzu “sun”, ESud.: (?) Kelo (Tornasi) máaʒùwá, Dinik (Afitti) midí “star”, and Kordofanian: Kadugli-madagek “star”. A.Ju. Militarev (1984, 158, #10), in turn, compared Mer. mz “sungod” with the reflexes of PNile Nub. *maša “Sonne” [BG 1984–85, 78], cf. Mahasi & Fadidja maža, Dongola & Kunuzi masil, Christ. Nub. mašal “sun”. Any connection to CCh.: Bata mōčē (-tsh-) “Sonne, Tag” [Barth 1852, 413]? Cf. also Nst. *mV[ž]V “light, sun” [IS 1976, 77, §313; Dlg. 1989, 98, §61; Blz. 1990, 210 with further details?]

mzn.t (or **msn.t?**) “foundation trench” (1st IMP, Fischer 1968, 149, fn. 656) = “*Gründungsgrube” (GHWb 363).

nb: Fischer (l.c.) suggested that the det. of mzn.t “*is probably connected with*” the sign N37 (distorted from X4) “*and does not represent a stone or brick*”.

● Etymology uncertain.

- 1. H.G. Fischer (l.c.) identified it with GR msntj (late Dendera temple scenes), although he rightly pointed out that if the GR form really derives from sntj, “*the Dendera word cannot be involved*” (1st IMP mzn.t < old *msntj hardly possible). In this latter case, Fischer assumed that “*perhaps it contains the root*” zn “to open”.
- 2. GT: or, if 1st IMP mzn.t stands for old *msn.t, cp. perhaps LECu.: Som. másn-o “Wasserrinne, Wassergraben” [Rn. 1902, 305]?

mzh “Krokodil” (OK, Wb II 136, 10–14) > Dem. msh (DG 179:6) > Cpt. (SB) mca2, (B) emca2, (F) mece2, pl. nemcoo2 “crocodile” (CD 187b; CED 92; KHW 103).

nb1: Vocalized as (old) *m˘zāh, pl. *m˘zāh˘w (Snk. 1983, 224; 2002, 48) = *mazāh (Vcl. 1990, 130). P. Lacau (1903, 157, 159, fn. 6) reconstructed an additional *-3- in LEg. *msōh3, fem. *mēšō3et > *hēsō3t, pl. *msōh3ēw > *msōh3jēw assuming a primary form mzh3/j (?). This was rightly declined by E. Edel (1954, 36–37), who pointed out (SAL) -oo- in pl. forms (for which cf. Spg. 1927, 656) < old -j-, cf. Eg. pl. msh.jw (BD Budge 130), i.e., *m˘sāh˘w contra (B) pl. *mca2, (F) *mce2 reflecting *m˘sāh˘w.

nb2: It was borrowed into diverse foreign lgs. in the following forms (for a survey cf. also Spg. KHW 65; Lambdin 1953, 284–5; Wst. KHW 103; DELC 123; Ishaq 1991, 114, §iii.2).

(1) Akk. (MBab., Qatna, 14th cent. B.C.) nem-ša-ḥu “crocodile” [AHW 729] = nim-ša-ḥu “(a decoration)” [CAD n2, 235] reflecting Eg. pl. n3 msh.w (with def. article). Vycichl (1990, 186, §3): < pl. stem *-msa3h- (so, with *-3-). Cf. also Vrg. 1973 Ib, 63, §55, 91–92.

(2) Akk. (MAss. 13 or 11th cent. B.C.) nam-su-ḥa (acc. sg. of *namsuḥu) “crocodile” [AHW 729; CAD n1, 245]. Lambdin (l.c.): < LEg. *nēmsāuhē or *nēmsāhē. E. Edel (1954, 35–37; 1975, 12) suggested an etymon from an Upper Eg. source (*m˘sāh˘w) close to Cpt. (S) pl. nemcoo2 (in his view, a Lower Eg. source like *m˘sāh˘w would have resulted in *namsaḥu). W. Vycichl (1990, 186, §4): < *nē-msu3h-u (sic). Cf. also Vrg. 1973 Ib, 63, §55, 90.

(3) Ass. *tamšahu and *tumsuḥu “crocodile” (proposed by H. Holma 1914, 154) do not exist. The former is to be read pir-ša-ḥu “Floh” [AHW 855] as pointed out by E. Landsberger (1934, 121) and Th.O. Lambdin (1953, 285, fn. 17), who also excluded the reading of H. Hunger’s (MVG 14, 1909, 282–3) Akk. nim-sa-ḥu “crocodile”.

(4) The Gk. hapax *χάμψαι* “the Eg. name for crocodile” (Herodotos II 69) is usually explained from Eg. *hmz* (discussed below) with met. (Sethe 1899 I, §253; Lacau 1903, 156–9, §3; Spg. KHW 65; Grapow SBAW 1938, 348; Grdseloff 1944, 285, fn. 1; Volten 1959, 365; Vcl. 1959, 146, §4; Fournet 1989, 68, §7). P. Lacau (1903, 158–9) saw in *χάμψαι* a LEg. fem. etymon **hāmse*. A. Wiedemann (quoted by Piehl 1891, 47, fn. †) firmly denied the connection of *χάμψαι* to *mzh*. Th.O. Lambdin (l.c.) assumed either a scribal error or Herodot’s mishearing as “*strongly possible*”. J. Černý (1943, 347, §4), in turn, supposed Herodot to have heard and recorded a LEg. **hn-msh* with the pl. indef. article **han-*, although LEg. *h* > Gk. *χ*- is “*sans précédent*” (Fournet). Černý thought to have overcome this “*real difficulty*” by assuming the frequent interchange of old *h*- ~ *h*- in Roman times to have worked in this case also, since LEg. *h* > Gk. *χ* is plausible, cf. Eg. *smjh* “left” > Gk. ἄσμοχ, Eg. *dd-hr* > Gk. Ταχως, Eg. *jʿh-ms* > (?) Gk. -χμασ- (in Περχμασσισνητ). For the exx. indicating a shift of the LEg. cluster *m/n* + voiceless cons. > (SB) *μη* + voiceless cons. (cf. already Gk. Ῥάμψης ~ Ῥάμψεσης) see Hintze 1949, 49–50; Roquet 1995, 367f. P. Lacau (1903, 159, fn. 6) was disposed to identify the second component of TN Ταχομψώ too with **hēmsō3t* (without adducing any evidence), i.e., LEg. **t3-(n?)-hms.t*.

(5) Gk. PN Πεμσάις ~ Πεμσάις (Černý 1943, 347) vs. Πομσαις (Vergote 1962, 74) < LEg. *p3-msh*. Th.O. Lambdin (l.c.): Gk. PN Θεμσαις, Θομσαιεις, Τομσαιεις etc. < LEg. *t3-msh.t*.

(6) Ar. *timsāh-*, pl. *tamāsīhu* (m) “crocodile” [BK I 208, II 1104] and hence Bed. *tímsa* (m) “das Krokodil” [Rn.] = *timsah* [Müller] are also connected to Cpt. (SB) *HCΔ2* (cf. Rn. 1895, 230; Müller 1896, 205; Karlberg 1912, 26; Spg. KHW 65; Bishai 1964, 46; Ward 1986, 152; Powels 1992, 196 etc.). The Ar./Bed. word has been usually explained from a Cpt. reflex with the definite fem. article (e.g., Spg. l.c.; Lambdin l.c.; Bishai l.c.; Westendorf in KHW l.c.; Vycichl in DELC l.c.; Ward l.c.), although both the Cpt. and the Ar. words are masc., so it is not clear why it would have borrowed with a fem. article. S. Powels (1992, 196 & fn. 54), in turn, assumed in *ti-* a Sem. *Präformativ* attested, in her view, in Hbr. *tūkiyyīm* (pl.) < MEg. *kj* (a rather disputed etymology, cf. KB 1731). Probably P. Behnstedt (p.c. quoted by W. Schenkel 2002, 48 & fn. 148) is right in deriving Ar. *timsāh-* from Cpt. (B) *ΠHHCΔ2* (m) via *Analogiebildung* with Ar. *tī-* (not from the Cpt. fem. article) following the pattern of Eg. Ar. *tiʿbān* (Class. *tuʿbān-*) “Schlange”, *tīrsa* “Nilschildkröte”, *tinnīn* “große Schlange, Drache”. Note that V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #2430; Orel 1993, 39) erroneously explained Ar. *timsāh-* (and ECh.: Mubi *tumsa*, which is, in fact, a late loan from Ar.) with “*haplology and metathesis*” (!) from their absurd AA **tūm-meḥas* (sic) along with Eg. *tšmm* “crocodile” (GR), which was rightly rejected by a number of authors like C. Peust (1997, 270), G. Takács (1997, 114; 1999, 113), I. M. Diakonoff (1998, 211, fn. 6: “*a quite fantastic mental construct*”, “*a spurious word-compound*”), and A. Zaborski (2000, 151: “*horrendous mistakes*”).

NB3: The “*alte Schreibung*” (Wb) *hmz* “Krokodil” (OK, Wb III 96, 11) is attested from the 1st Dyn. (Qaa, cf. Czermak 1931, 27; FÄW 197) throughout in the OK-MK (cf. Lacau 1903, 156, §3), especially frequently in the CT (cf. DCT 83). K. Sethe (1899 I, §253), P. Lacau (1903, 158–9 & fn. 6), and W. Vycichl (1990, 130) assumed a *real* metathesis, which they projected also to LEg. fem. **hāmse* (Sethe) = **hāmsē* < **māshē* (sic) (Lacau: instead of ***hemsō* < ***mshō*), which they based on Gk. (hapax) *χάμψαι* “the Eg. name for crocodile” (Herodotos II 69). The assumption, that this met. occurred only in the OK and then again 5th cent. BC, was strongly opposed by J. Černý (1943, 346, §4), who stressed that P. Lacau (1903, 157) had already shown “*beyond all doubt*” that the OK form *hmz.t* was “*nothing more*” than a “*métathèse apparente due à un groupement*”, i.e., “*due to a mere graphic grouping of the signs*” (pace AĀG 40, §93, where *-h* as *C₃* is maintained), and thus “*nothing allows to assume*” an OK **hmz*. H. Ranke (1925, 79) also insisted on reading the OK-MK exx. in question as *mzh*. J.-L. Fournet (1989, 68, §7), in turn, emphasized that P. Lacau

(1903, 158) in fact accepted for LEg. fem. msh.t a real met. *ħms(t), at least “à un certain moment”, via “un changement de structure phonétique du mot, dû à la présence de l'article féminin”. Even further went A. Loprieno (LÄ V 1212, 1214, n. 40) accepting a reverse (!) met. also for OK masc. ħmz > later mzh (adducing no evidence), which he attributed to a *Sprachtabu*.

- Its origin still fully hides in obscurity. W. Vycichl (1991, 119) postulated an African substratum in it (without any etymological evidence).

- **1.** GT: its equation with the isolated SOM.: Ari māḍa “Krokodil” [Lmb.] ||| CCh.: Logone mídegē, pl. mídgyē “Krokodil” [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 109] = mádge “crocodile” [Mch. 1950, 22], Kuseri mur(u)ge [Lbf. apud Slk. 1967, 231, #221] is hindered by phonological difficulties.

NB1: The correspondences of Eg. -z- vs. Ari -ḍ- and Ktk. -g vs. Eg. -ḥ have not been evidenced.

NB2: M. Lamberti (l.c.) combined the Ari ex. with NOm.: Sns.-Bworo muçcà (-tts'-) “Fisch” [Lmb.] and even HECu. *nāčča “crocodile” [Hds. 1989, 45, 419], although the latter is just a late borrowing from LECu.: Oromo. L. Homburger (quoted in Lbf. l.c.) assumed in Ktk. a prefix muru- attached to *√ig-.

- **2.** GT: in the Ethiopian language groups, we find an areal word for “crocodile”, whose common etymon could be reconstructed as *[h]azz-. This may have been the source of Eth.-Sem. *[h]azzo. Purely hypothetically, if Eth. *ħazz- was due to an assimilation of a former **ħamz-, it could be a plausible equivalent of Eg. ħmz (OK). This theory has, however, serious drawbacks: (1) it is dubious if OK ħmz was the original form, (2) the ultimate origin of the Eth.

Wanderwort seems to be unknown.

NB1: Cf. Eth.-Sem.: OAmh. hazzo > Amh. azzo [Apl.], Common Gurage azzo [Lsl.: Ø- < old *h/h- plausible] ||| NAgaw: Qemant azo [CR] | SAgaw: Awngi azzū [CR] = azzu [Crl., Apl.] = azza [Lsl.] ||| NOm.: Kaffa ay-ō [Crl.] = ay-o [Lmb. 1993, 100: from *az-o] (ES-Cu./Om.: CR 1912, 173; Crl. 1951, 408; Lsl. 1963, 87; 1979 III, 119; Apl. 1977, 42).

NB2: The etymology of these data is uncertain. Anyhow, their common Sem. background being entirely obscure, an Eth.-Sem. borrowing from Cu. (not *vice versa*) seems more probable just as E. Cerulli (l.c.) and D. Appleyard (l.c.) suggested. W. Leslau (1963) affiliated our Eth. word also with LECu.: Somali žāḥas ~ yāḥas (southern dial.) “das Krokodil” [Rn. 1902, 187] = žāḥās “crocodile” [Abr. 1964, 137] > ES: Harari ḥās “1. crocodile, hence: 2. gluttonous” [Lsl. 1963, 87], which is also uncertain, since (1) the anomaly of Harari -ā- and (2) Som./Harari -s as well as (3) Som. ža- > ya- vs. Eth. Ø- is unexplained. In addition, (4) L. Reinisch (l.c.) and W. Leslau (1987) combined the Som. word Geez ḥagaṣ “lizard” (also translated “crocodile”) [Lsl.].

- **3.** GT: its connection to Brb. *a-mzaH “ogre” [GT] is also unlikely. This Eg.-Brb. comparison would suggest the semantic shift “(man-eating) giant” → “crocodile”.

NB1: Cf. NBrb.: Mzg. ta-mza “ogresse (évoquée, dans des contes berbères, sous la forme d'une femme aux cheveux longs, et avec des seins pendants qu'elle jette sur les épaules), anthropophage et s'attaque à l'homme par ruse” [Tf. 1991, 451] | Sgrs. ta-mza “ogresse” [Pellat 1955, 107], Beni Snus a-mza “ogre” [Lst.], Beni Menaser a-mez “ogre” [Bst.] = a-mza “ogre” [Lst.], Qsurs a-mez, pl. i-mziw-an

“ogre” [Bst. 1885, 181], Ikebdanen ta-mza “ogresse” [Brn.], Igrayen a-mza “ogre” [Brn.], Urg a-mza “ogre” [Brn.] = a-mziu [Rns.], Izn. & Tuzin a-mziu, pl. a-mziwen “ogre” [Rns. 1932, 386], Ait Said √m-z-w: a-mziw “l’ogre” [Allati 1986, 14], Shenwa a-mziw “ogre”, ha-mziu-t ~ ha-mza “ogresse” [Lst. 1912, 146], Wargla a-mza “ogre” [Bst. 1909, 242] = a-mza, fem. ta-mza “ogre(ss)” [Dlh. 1987, 203], Nfs. a-mziu, pl. i-mziw-en “orco” [Bgn. 1931, 260; 1942, 272] || EBrb.: Gdm. ta-mza “1. hyène, 2. aussi tous les fauves de grande taille” [Lst.] = a-mziw, pl. a-mziw-en, fem. ta-mza, pl. te-mzi-w:n “ogre” [Lanfry 1973, 222, #1059], Siwa ə-mzā, pl. ə-mzā-wən “ogre”, ə-mza “revenant” [Lst.], Audjila á-mzā, pl. a-mzi-wen, fem. ta-mzā “1. ocro, 2. anche persona furba, forte, 3. leone” [Prd. 1960, 170] (EBrb.: Lst. 1931, 247, 268).

NB2: Traditionally (cf. Bates 1914, 82; Laoust l.c.; Tf. l.c.), the Brb. word has been derived from common Brb. *√m-z, cf. NBrb.: Mzg. a-mz “attraper” [Tf.] | Dubdu a-meza “to seize, take away” [Bates] || EBrb.: Siwa a-məz “prendre, saisir” [Lst.]. E. Laoust (l.c.) recorded different sibilant (-z vs. -z)

NB3: The loss of PAA *-h is regular almost in all Brb. lgs. (Mlt. 1991, 245). But Brb. *z < AA *ç ≠ Eg. z. The change of AA *-z-H > Brb. *-z (on the analogy of the compensatory glottalization in Ch. after the loss of *H) has not been evidenced.

- **4.** GT: cp. perhaps Ar. ʔamḏaḥu “2. puant, fétide” [BK II 1080]?
NB: Cf. Lebensmüder 95–97: “Behold, my name is detested, behold, more than the smell of crocodiles, more than sitting by sandbanks (?) full of crocodiles” (Faulkner 1956, 28) = “Siehe, mein Name ist stinkender als der Gestank von Krokodil, als ein ganzer Wohnplatz von Krokodil” (Brunner-Traut, LÄ III 795 after Hornung).
- **5.** GT: if we assume a real met. in OK-MK ḥmz, the comparison with Ar. ḥamaza I “1. piquer, picoter (la langue), 2. aiguiser, affiler, 3. saisir, captiver”, ḥamuza “être dur au toucher”, ḥamūz- “qui saisit et tient fortement”, ḥamīz- “dur, sévère” [BK I 491] & ḥamz- “pungency, acidity” [Lsl.] || Geez ḥəmz “poison, venom, bitterness, rage, furor, wrath, scorpion” [Lsl. 1987, 235] appears semantically especially tempting.
- **6.** GT: or cp. perhaps CCh.: Mada mzèh “long (queue, perche)” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 197]?
 - Other suggestions are certainly out of question:
- **7.** C. Ceugney (1880, 8): “doit se décomposer en” prefix m- + caus. s- + wḥ3 “détruire”, i.e., its lit. mng. was “le saccageant, le destructeur”. Absurd.
- **8.** A. Moret (1895, 87, fn. 2) analyzed it as a compound of prefix m- + Eg. √sh (sic) ~ (met.!) ḥz3 “fascination matérielle exercée par certains animaux” (sic) explained from ḥz3 “fluide, flux qui coule” (sic) on the alleged analogy of Eg. m3j-ḥz3 “lion qui influe ou fascine par l’oeil”. Absurd.
- **9.** G. Karlberg (1912, 26) explained it from the prep. (!) m + Eg. shw (sic) “egg”, lit. “das, was aus dem Ei hervorgekommen ist”. This absurd etymology (apparently formulated long before 1912) had rightly been declined already by K. Pichl (1891, 47, fn. †) as “nicht berechtigt”.

- **10.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1757; Orel 1993, 39) erroneously equated Eg. *mzḥ* with WCh.: Hausa *méésà* “python” [Abr. 1962, 673] ||| LECu. **maš-* “Schlange” [Sasse 1976, 127] | HECu. **hamas-o* “snake” [Hds. 1989, 412].
NB: Eg. *-z-* is not in agreement with AA **-s-*. In addition, Eg. *-ḥ* is not reflected either. This false comparison was correctly rejected already by A.Ju. Militarev (1995, 120, fn. 73). I. M. Diakonoff (1998, 211, fn. 6) also declined these parallels “none of which can be derived... from **meḥas*”.
- **11.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 304, #579) derived it (with an alleged iterative suffix **-ḥ*) from his AA **-mōṣ-* “to become wet” based on dubious parallels.
NB: Such as PSem. **md-* “to wet”, Eg. *sms* “to splash” (!), Afar *mōyat* “waves”, NOM. **mōṣ-* “to become wet” > Bns. *moš-t* “to swim”, Zys. *mōž-* “to feel cool”, and even WCh. **m-z-(t)* “soil” (!).

mzš (MK) > **mšš** (Ebers) “(Verbum zur Bezeichnung eines Drogenzustandes)” (Med., WMT I 392) = “(Verbum der Drogenbereitung)” (Westendorf) = “(Verbum in Zusammenhang mit Dattelsaft)” (GHWb 364) = “ablösen (vom Dattelnkern), entkernen (vom Dattelsirup gesagt)” (HAM 682, 839).

NB1: For the assimilation of *zš* > *šš* cf. Westendorf 1962, 41, §64.1.

NB2: Its MK var. *mzš* was incorrectly read in Wb III 485, 7 as *zš* (cf. HAM 682, fn. 210).

NB3: Occurs only in *bnj* *mz/šš* “...Dattelsaft” (Med., Wb II 158, 5) = “(bis jetzt nicht identifiziert, undeutbar, wohl ein Bearbeitungszustand der Dattel)” (Germer 1979, 156, 160). D. Meeks (kind p.c., 15 March 2000, 21 May 2004) had no idea of its sense either, but he regarded the rendering “*mélanger*” or “*broyer, presser*” as unlikely, there being other verbs for these meanings. Its det. (two sticks crossed, Z9) is typical of verbs signifying separation, mixing of diverse entities etc. (EG 1927, 522).

NB4: Not clear whether it is related to *mzš* (rdg. dubious) “?” (DCT 184) or *mžš* “?” (1st IMP, Snk. MHT 227, n. b).

- Meaning and etymology uncertain. Only guesses can be made.
- **1.** The rendering suggested by W. Westendorf (HAM l.c.) suggests a connection to Eg. (hapax) *zšw* “sich ablösen (Kopf und Knochen vom Skelett)” (PT 739a-b, Wb III 485, 6; ÄWb I 1234), cf. also *zš* “to cut” (CT, DCT 548). But the function of *m-* would be here unexplained.
- **2.** GT: cp. perhaps Ar. *mazza* I “se distinguer des autres, surpasser les autres en...”, III “séparer les uns d’avec les autres, éloigner les uns des autres”, *myz* I “séparer l’un d’avec l’autre”, II “séparer, disjointre l’un d’avec l’autre” [BK II 1098, 1172]?
NB: The correspondence of Eg. *-zš* ~ Ar. *-zz* should be subject to further research. For the AA background of Eg. *zš* cf. Stl. (1994, 89) who suggested its derivation from AA **ĉ*, i.e., its correspondence with Ar. *š* (which supports rather the following etymology suggested below).

- **3.** GT: its comparison to Ar. mšš I “4. tremper qqch. dans l’eau pour rendre liquide, pour délayer”, mšmš I “1. macérer dans l’eau (un médicament)” [BK II 1108, 1112] = mšš “to dissolve in water” [KB 606] would fit well both its suggested meaning and the rule of Eg. zš ~ Ar. š set up by O.V. Stolbova (l.c.). Semiticists (Magnanini 1974, 407; Renfroe 1992, 133; KB 606; DUL 583) used to affiliate Ar. mšš with the reflexes of the more widespread WSem. bicons. *√ms “to dissolve” [Zbr. 1971, 76, #145; 1991, 1682].
- nb1: Attested in Ug. mss G “to liquefy, dissolve”, mss “sap, juice” [DUL 583–4], Hbr. mss nifal “1. zerschmelzen, zerfließen, sich auflösen und abfallen (von Ketten), 2. vergehn (u.a. vor Angst), verzagt werden”, msy hifil “machen, daß etwas fließt, schmelzen, auflösen, zergehn lassen, zerfließen machen, in große Furcht setzen” [GB 439–441] = mss nifal “1. to melt, become fluid, 2. become weak”, hifil “to cause to melt”, msy “1. to cause to melt, 2. flood (with tears)” [KB 604, 606] = mss nifal “to dissolve, melt”, msw (sic) “to dissolve” [Zbr.] = mss “diluire, liquefare” [Magnanini], PBHbr. (TTM) msy qal “zerfließen”, nifal “vergehen”, mss qal “1. zerfließen, 2. verzagen” [Dalman 1922, 242–3] = mss qal “zerfließen, schwinden”, pilpel “1. zerfließen machen, zerdrücken, 2. besänftigen”, var. mzz pilpel “erweichen” [Levy 1924 III, 66, 171, 173] = mss qal “to melt, dissolve”, nifal “1. to be melt, liquefied, 2. fall away, 3. faint”, pilpel “to melt, dissolve”, mas “1. juice, 2. melting, fainting”, mzz pilpel “to soften” [Jst. 1950, 756, 803, 808], JAram. (TTM) mss “flüssig sein, werden, zerfließen” [Levy 1924 III, 167, 173], Syr. m(ə)šā “schmelzen” [Aro] = “to condense” [Zbr.] = “to putrefy, melt, dissolve (used specifically of earth in the sense ‘slimy mire’)” [Renfroe], Mnd. √msy “1. to condense, curdle, congeal, assume material shape, take shape, consolidate, solidify, materialize, 2. dissolve, melt, flow away, fall from, be removed” [DM 275] || Ar. mss “to make wet” [Guillaume 1965 II, 22], cf. perhaps also Ar. msw III “faire fondre ou déchoir”, VI “fondre” [Dozy II 593] > masw-at- “rennet: curdled milk” [KB] || MSA *msy: Jbl. músi “to melt, dissolve (as sugar with water in it)”, Mehri mássi “to be dissolved, melted (as, e.g., sugar in water)”, Sqt. mēsə ~ mīsə “to crumble” (MSA: Jns. 1981, 175; 1987, 272) || Geez masawa “auflösen” [Aro] = mas(a)wa “1. to melt, liquefy, dilute, dissolve, 2. make faint, make pine away” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Aro 1964, 183; Zbr. 1971, 76, §145; Lsl. 1987, 368; Renfroe 1992, 133, fn. 27).
- nb2: An AA var. root *m-č [GT] is reflected by OSA: Sab. myt “wine (?) or pressed dates (?)” [SD 89], Ar. myt I “dissoudre qqch. dans l’eau, et macérer une drogue dans l’eau”, V “1. être amolli pour avoir été bien trempé d’eau (se dit du sol), être délayé, macéré dans l’eau”, VIII “boire qqch. après avoir délayé d’eau” [BK II 1170]. W. Leslau (1988, 92), R. M. Voigt (1994, 107), and A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 114) affiliated the OSA-Ar. root (√mw/yt) with ES: Geez mesa “to serve mead at a banquet”, mes “drink made from fermented honey, mead” [Lsl. 1987, 377] = mes “Honigwein” [Voigt], which is in fact an Ethiopian *Wanderwort*, cf. common Neth. *m-s/z “mead, alcoholic drink made from fermente honey” [LS 1997, 472] > Agaw *miz “mead” (Agaw: Apl. 1991 MS, 8) || LECu.: Saho mēz “Honigwein, Hydromel” [Rn. 1890, 273] = mes [Lmb. 1993, 363], Irob mesé “Hinigwein” [PW 1953, 383], Afar mēs “Honigwein, Hydromel” [Rn. 1886, 884] (Cu.: CR 1905, 169) || WCh.: AS *m^wos (var. *m^wes in Mpn.-Gmy.) → *m^wəs “native beer” [GT 2004, 260] = *m^w₂,₃s (mistranslated as “butter, масло!”) [Stl. 1977] = *m^w[ə]s “beer” [Dlg.] = *m^was “1. ferment, leaven (закваска), 2. beer (пиво)” [Stl. 1987]: Angas mos “a fermented liquor made from grain (Hs. gia), and nearly equal with our beer” [Flk. 1915, 246–247] = mōs ~ mwōs (K) “general name for beer” [Jng. 1962 MS, 26–27] = mos “beer” [Hfm.; ALC 1978, 39], Sura mwōs “Hirse-Bier” [Jng. 1963, 76], Mpn. mwés “alcoholic drink (generic name)” [Frj. 1991, 39], Kfy. mwōs “beer” [Hfm.], Mnt. muus (so, -uu-) “beer” [Ftp. 1911, 214, 216], Gmy. muoes

[m^wəs] “native beer (generally made of millet, guinea corn may be used too)” [Srl. 1937, 147] = mūes [mūes < *m^wes] “beer” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 23] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 19, #55; Stl. 1972, 184; 1977, 156, #141; 1987, 243, #48) || CCh.: Musgu maza “Bier” [Ovw./Lks. 1941, 66], Pus maža “bière de mil épaisse” [Trn. 1991, 104], Girvidik maza “Bier (aus Hirse)” [MB 1972 MS, 1]. Note that the etymological position of Dullay: Tsamay mičo (-ts[’]) “sorghum beer” [Sava 2005, 265] and NŌm.: Sns. mās^ʔa “Honigwein” [PW] is not clear. A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 114) erroneously compared also Akk. mīzu ~ miz^ʔu “ein Süßtrank” [AHW 664] = me/iz^ʔu ~ mīzu “(a type of beer and wine)” [CAD m2, 148], but this derives from Akk. mazû “auspressen” [AHW 637] = mazû “to press out” [CAD].

NB3: The etymology of HECu.: Burji mūšiy- ~ mūšē- “to melt, dissolve” [Sasse 1982, 150; Hds. 1989, 214: isolated in HECu.] is still obscure.

- **4.** GT: its etymological connection to Ar. myš “mêler, mélanger” [BK II 1173] = “to mix, blend, garble” [Guillaume 1965 II, 133] is semantically less likely (for Eg. -zš ~ Ar. -š see above). Besides, the Ar. root may represent a rare variation eventually related to the more widespread AA *m-s “to mix” [GT].

NB: The latter is attested in Ar. msms “être embrouillé et en confusion (se dit d’une affaire)” [BK II 1107] || EBrb.: Gdm. e-msak “mélanger (surtout des choses mouillées qui, une fois mêlées, ne se séparent plus)” [Lnf. 1973, 218, #1037] = ā-mšēk “mélanger” [Ksm.] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-msi “mélanger (du lait frais etc.)”, cf. ū-msei “lait frais mélangé de lait aigre (ou de lait caillé, lait dont on a extrait le beurre)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1249–1250], ĒWlm. & Ayr. ə-ṁsəy “mélanger, être mélangé” [PAM 1998, 225; 2003, 560] = ē-msēy [Ksm.], Tudalt & Tadghaq ə-ṁsəy “to mix” [Sudlow 2001, 133] (Brb.: Ksm. 1999, 188, §539) || WCh.: Angas mwés “to mix (esp. with water, to make fura)” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] || CCh.: Bura msitsa “to mix a little mud for building” [BED 1953, 142] || ECh.: Mgm. ʔāmsō “mélanger” [JA 1992, 65], WDng. āmsē “touiller quelque chose de liquide, bière de mil, pour bien mélanger les ingrédients” [Fédry 1971, 4], EDng. āmsē “mélanger, mettre en désordre, brasser, préparer, touiller” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 14] = “mischen” [Ebs. 1979, 135; 1987, 88]. NB: An AA var. root *m-č [GT] is reflected in Ar. mwṭ “mêler, mélanger, brouiller, 2. délayer, dissoudre et macérer qqch. dans l’eau” [BK II 1166].

- **5.** GT: or cp. perhaps Sem.: PBHbr. mss II pilpel “1. to press, squeeze, 2. press, urge”, pass. part. māmūsmās “mashed, shapeless” [Jst. 1950, 808] || EBrb.: Gdm. e-mšəš “être contusionné, meurtri” [Lnf. 1973, 192, #960] || ECh.: Mkl. mássí “mondre, écraser, broyer” [Jng. 1990, 138]?

***ms**: phon. value of the hrgl. depicting a “caractère composé de trois chacals suspendus ou mordant à une attache ronde” (Daressy 1903, 122–3; 1919–20, 176) = “ursprünglich ein Wedel aus drei oben zusammengehaltenen Fuchsfellen” (Borchardt 1907, 75–76, §1; Erman 1909, 92) = “combinaison de trois chacals ou de trois renards liés en paquet et retombant parallèlement l’un à l’autre” (Maspero 1908, 175) = “1. un devanteau primitif formé de trois peaux de renards suspendues par le museau, 2. (plus tard) flagellum...” (Jéquier 1921, 93–94, 189 & fn. 4 with lit.) = “three foxes’ skin tied together” (CT, Grd. 1927, 457, F31) = “chasse-mouche formé de trois peaux

de fenek (petits renards)” (Lacau 1954, 45–46, §21) = “(propriamente) flagello sacrale, ma anche scacciamosche di forma simile” (Curto 1959, 249, fn. 1) = “eig. ein Gebilde aus drei zusammengesetzten Fuchsfellen” (Stachelin 1966, 165) = “drei zusammengebundene Felle kleiner Füchse, Symbol der Fruchtbarkeit” (Edel 1980, 14) = “Dreierbündel von Fuchsfellen” (Westendorf 1987, 461, fn. 16) = “an object (flywhisk?) made of three skins of small fenek foxes, tied together” (Goldwasser 1992, 77 & fn. 42).

NB1: G. Daressy (1903, 123) found a late (Saite) form of the hrgl. neatly elaborated on a relief and representing “trois chacals allongés, vus de haut, semblent mordre une disque au-dessus duquel se dressent trois tiges” (Daressy) = “drei an den Köpfen zusammen befestigte vollständige Felle kleiner Füchse – nach den langen Ohren zu urteilen, vielleicht von Feneks” (Borchardt). The same sign is depicted twice on the obelisk of Antonius (2nd cent. AD) appearing “*als trügen drei tierische Wesen den Korb (V32)*” (Erman 1909, 92). For the rare (unique?) GR phon. value ms of the hrgl. “drei ganze Schakale” (on a Ptol. stela) that “*beruht auf einer echt ptolemäischen... Spielerei des Schreibers oder Steinmetzen, der an Stelle der drei Schakalfelle drei ganze Schakale hinzeichnete*” cf. Ranke 1909, 92 (after Brugsch).

NB2: F.L. Griffith (1898, 27) misunderstood the object originally underlying hrgl. suggesting that it depicts “three curiously shaped bonds, apparently garlands, strings or chains of white flowers, tied together at the top” erroneously affiliating it with mz “garlands made of white flowers” (above) ~ mzb (!) that he eventually derived from zbj “to bring”. Its definition as “flywhisk” (developing into “flagellum”) by L. Borchardt (l.c.) and A. C. Mace & H. E. Winlock (1916, 94f.), adopted also in Wb (l.c.), was firmly rejected by H. G. Fischer (LÄ II 85, n. 22 with further lit.). Strangely, the index of LÄ (VII 467) still has ms.t “Wedel”. Sometimes confused with the hanging part of the flagellum nh3h3 (Daressy 1903, 122), but their identity with the flywhisk was declined by G. Jéquier (1921, 189) stressing that the use of ms as flagellum was due to an “*adaptation secondaire*”. E. Stachelin (1966, 165 & 164, fn. 8 with further lit.) presented some evidence of the hrgl. ms representing a “Fliegenwedel”. In addition, she (o.c., p. 165, fn. 2) also maintained the old view that “*die ‘Geißel’ als bekanntes Herrschaftszeichen... ist nicht anderes als ein Fliegenwedel*”.

- Hence: ms.t “Wedel aus einem Schakalfell oder aus drei solcher Felle (der Gegenstand, den die Hieroglyphe ms darstellt)” (MK, NK, Wb II 137, 2–3) = “Fuchschwanz oder meist drei Fuchschwänze als Wedel (manchmal ohne Griff, häufiger mit einem Stiele)” (Borchardt 1907, 75–76, §1, esp. p. 76, fn. 3 with exx.) = “le groupe de trois peaux de renards qui, suspendu à un bâton (modèle primitif de flagellum)” (Jéquier 1921, 94) = “apron of fox-skins” (Grd. 1927, l.c.; FD 116) = “chasse-mouche (parmi les objets offerts au mort) fait de peaux de ms (le fenek?)” (Lacau 1954, 45, §21, fn. 2; 1970, 64, §10, fn. 2) = “1. (in ältester Zeit hat als) Schurz für Männer (gedient), 2. Amulett in der Form der Hieroglyphe ms” (Edel 1980, 14) = “Schurz aus Fuchsfellen” (GHWb 360). Cf. also Jasnow 1994, 107, n. cc.

NB: Vocalized as *mäsuj.a(t) > *mäsja by E. Edel (1980, 14) on the basis of the much disputed Amarna cuneiform gloss (EA 14, 1:14) ma-šu-ja rendered “unbekannter Gegenstand aus Gold” [KMAV 23] = “an object, implement” [Lambdin] = “ein

Gegäßbname (aus Gold) [Osing] = “ein leichter, am Hals zu tragender Gegenstand, eine Art Amulett” [Edel], which is supposed to reflect either (1) Eg. ms.t (defective wtg. of *msj.t) “Amulett als Symbol der Fruchtbarkeit” (Edel l.c.) or (2) the pass. pf. part. of Eg. msj (tr.) “to form, fashion”, viz. *masúj.a(t) (Lambdin 1953, 367, §19 with an obscure a hint on Eg. msj.t “Füllen”, XVIII, Wb II 140, 15) or (3) or Eg. msj.t (var. msj) “Schale, Schüssel (aus Gold, Silber)” (LP, NBÄ 815) or (4) Eg. msj3.t “Rangabzeichen” (q.v.) suggested by E. Edel (l.c.) and J. Zeidler (1998, 24–25, §2; 1999, 286). Quoting only the solution offered by Th.O. Lambdin (l.c.), D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 100) view that for the Amarna gloss “*no final conclusion can be made*”.

- Etymology rather debated. Most likely seems solution #1.
- **1.** The old view, that it may be somehow connected with Eg. msj “to give birth”, still holds.

NB: G. Jéquier (1921, 93–94) saw in the object the hrgl. ms originated in “*un devantreau primitif formé de trois peaux de renards... tombé hors d’usage à une époque très ancienne... un objet destiné à couvrir les parties sexuelles de l’homme, donc à protéger les organes de la reproduction*”, which symbolically could “*servir à exprimer la fonction même de ces organes et être employé pour désigner le mystère de la naissance*”, and it is only hence that it became later “*le flagellum... l’insigne particulier de certains dieux qui, comme Min et Osiris, ... qui personnifient la renaissance régulière et perpétuelle... un emblème de renaissance et du pouvoir vicatrice*”. L. Störk (LÄ II 348 & n. 6 with lit.) believes that “*die Fuchsfelle der Hieroglyphe ms zeigt auch für Ägypten den weitverbreiteten Zusammenhang zwischen Fuchs, Erotik und Fruchtbarkeit*”. Similarly, V. Wessetzky (1989, 426) supposed the object depicted by the hieroglyph ms to have probably been conceived in Egypt as a protective symbol at child-birth (“*günstiges Sinnbild bei der Geburt*”) arguing that “*das Zeichen msj wurde der Überlieferung nach gegebenenfalls an die Tür des Zimmers der Kriechenden oder über die Wiege gehängt. Dieser Brauch war in Nubien auch in jüngster Vergangenheit noch lebendig*”. Note that nh3h3 “flagellum” (rarely confused with the hrgl. ms, cf. above) has been also explained “*as an emblem of birth*” (Fischer, LÄ II 516 & 517, n. 8).
- **2.** G. Daressy (1903, 122–3) maintained its derivation from Eg. mz “Blumenstrauß” (OK, Wb, q.v.), although even he found it “*not entirely satisfactory*”. False both philologically and phonologically (old *ms ≠ mz). NB: Daressy (l.c.) eventually regarded the formerly generally accepted view, that ms was “*pris pour une triple guirlande de fleurs*” (Lepsius: “végétaux” and Griffith: “three curiously-shaped bands, apparently garlands, strings or chans of white flowers tied together at the top”), as still valid. Since he failed to understand “*le rapport... entre le groupe de trois chacals bizarrement placés et le mot mes... former, façonner*”, he regarded it merely as “*fantaisie d’artiste*” (Daressy) = “*die mißfällige Spielerei eines Künstlers*” (Burchardt) of the Saite ex. (above) and listed the hrgl. ms further on among flowers. But as G. Maspero (1908, 176) rightly pointed out, the late model depicting the ms hrgl. as a “*combinaison de trois chacals ou renards*” was “*une des formes les plus anciennes du signe*”, which L. Borchardt (1907, 76) considered as the real form of the hrgl. “*in allen Zeiten*” as attested from the OK (cf. e.g. Urk. I 11:16).
- **3.** G. Maspero (1908, 176–7) affiliated it with a great variety of Eg.-Cpt. words, which are deriving from distinct roots.

NB1: Such as Eg. mss “*cuirasse formée d’un cuir sur lequel les écailles de métal étaient cousues*” (q.v.), Cpt. (S) HOYC , (B) $\text{HOY}\text{C}\text{EP}$ “lorum, corium pour les sandales” (v. s.v. Eg. mss), and even Eg. msq “peau” (q.v.).

NB2: The common origin of these forms is highly dubious: (1) Eg. mss “tunic” (NK, FD 118) has been usually treated as a foreign word (Janssen 1975, 260; Watson 1999, 789–790, §28; 2000, 570, §24; Lipiński 2001, 209; DUL 606 etc.). (2) The Cpt.

form has been explained as an “m-Bildung von srj *Haar, Strähne*” (NBÄ 322; KHW 520) contra Harris (Or. 30, 1961, 370). (3) Eg. msq (from NK) < OK msk3.

- **4.** P. Lacau (1954, 45, §21; 1970, 64, fn. 2) derived it from a hypothetical Eg. *ms or *msj “fenek (petit renard)”.

NB: Unattested. To be distinguished from Eg. m3s (q.v.), which clearly represents a separate root (with -3-).

- **5.** W. Westendorf (1987, 461, fn. 16) explained it (via m- prefix) from Eg. *w3s “heben, tragen, erhöhen” based on the most dubious *comparanda* like msj “gebären” < * “tragen, hervorbringen” (q.v.), m3s “ein Tier, dessen Fell”, Eg. m3s.t “Knie” (q.v., Wst.: orig. “Oberschenkel” < * “Schütze, Träger”), 3s.t “Sitz” ~ m3s.t “Sandbank” (q.v.). Uncritically adopting this, Ch. Leitz (2000, 275) too spoke of a “*möglicher Zusammenhang*” between the hrgl. ms, Eg. m3s.t “(in der Schurzlisten des A.R.)”, and m3s.(t) “Tier, wahrsch. Fuchs”. Unlikely.

NB: (1) Eg. *w3s “heben” is simply unattested. (2) Which animal hides behind Eg. m3s is also uncertain: the specimen is highly debated and the rendering “fox” does not fit all contexts (it went in teams in the NK, cf. Caminos 1956, 32). (3) The Ch. cognates of Eg. m3s.t indicate that m- was part of the underlying AA (Ch.-Eg) root (*m-l-s). (4) Even the supposed cognacy of Eg. 3s.t (rdg. rather uncertain) vs. m3st is ill-founded, since the reconstruction of 3- in the former is dubious and by far not commonly accepted (cf., e.g., FD 206; DCT 431; ÄWb I 1033), moreover, it is disproved also by the external data (cf. Vrg. 1945, 141, §16.b.13; Hodge 1968, 26, §82; Takács 1999, 397), while (5) the latter word (m3s.t “shoal”) has been derived from Eg. m3s.t “knee” (Caminos 1954, 129; GHWb 321).

- **6.** GT: it cannot be excluded that the association of foxes’ skin to the archaic rituals around child-birth was only secondary (based on *Wortspiel* due to homophony?). In this case, cp. ES *maʔs- (?) “skin” [GT], whose reflexes may perhaps be related with Eg. *ms.

NB1: Cf. Eth.-Sem.: Geez māʔs ~ māʔs “skin, hide, leather, headcover” [Lsl.], Tigre maʔas “hide, skin” [LH 131] = māʔas “skin, leather” [Lsl.], Tna. maʔsi “skin, leather” [Lsl.], Gurage: Soddo & Aymellel mas & Zway māš “tanned hide used to lie down on” [Lsl.], Harari māš “tanned hide” [Lsl.] ||| ECu.: Oromo māsi “tanned hide” [Lsl.], Somali mās “leather” [Abr. 1964, 176] = mās-ka “leather” [Bell 1969, 174] (ES-Cu.: Lsl. 1963, 112; 1979, 426; 1988, 69).

NB2: The ECu. and Eth.-Sem. data may be due to various distinct mutual borrowings (e.g. Gurage from Oromo according to Leslau l.c.), while their ultimate origin is unclear. The Sem. background of the ES root is obscure. (1) J. Barth (1893, 62) affiliated it with Ar. māʔiz- “goat(skin)”, which W. Leslau (l.c.) rejected as “unlikely”. (2) With regard to the distinction of -ʔ- vs. -ʕ- in Tigre, L. Kogan (2005, 192, §13) has probably correctly denied the relationship of Geez māʔ/ʕs etc. to ES: Tigre māʕasä “to put hides into a mixture of acacia foliage for tanning” [LH 136] ~ LECu.: Saho maʕas- “gerben die Haut” [Rn. 1890, 257] = “to tan hide” [Lsl.], which he linked rather with Ar. myt “plonger, submerger qqn. dans l’eau” [BK II 1131] = “to steep, soak, macerate (a thing in water) and rub with the fingers, mash with the hand (medicine in water)” [Lane 2725] making (an obscure) hint on Ar. maʕasa “frotter la peau” [BK II 1053] = “to rub leather vigorously” [Lsl.] vs. maʕasa “frotter avec force le cuir” [BK II 1127] vs. maʕaša “frotter doucement” [BK II 1127]. Note that L. Reinisch (1890 l.c.) combined Saho maʕas- with a number of impossible Eg. parallels (mr, md3, mtđj).

nb3: Eventually (at the PAA level), Sem. *ma/išk- “skin” [SED I 172, §190] may be also related on a biconsonantal basis as surmised already by L. Bender (1975, 185, §72.1), who combined Geez maʾis and Akk. mašk- “skin” with CCh.: Margi ámči “skin (of man)” [Hfm. apud RK 1973, 101 & JI] = ínšī? [IL/JI 1994 II, 296]. The origin of the Margi word has been disputed. JI (1994 I, 153) saw in it a met. of Ch. *z-m, but Margi -č- < Ch. *-z/ʒ- is unlikely.

nb4: There are many other forms that seem to be *prima vista* similar, but their cognacy is either unlikely or certainly to be ruled out. (1) Bed. míswa (f) “Ledersack, Schlauch” [Rn. 1895, 174] = miswád (m) “leather bag made of whole skin esp. of ox” [Rpr. 1928, 219] = misuwud “leather sack made of more than one skin” [Hds. 1996 MS, 96]: apparently an m- prefix form with a C₃ -d, which excludes a connection with ES *mʾs. (2) Yaaku misaʾ, pl. mih-nin [mih- < *mis-] “rope, made of skin” [Heine 1975, 132]: cf. rather ECu. *ma/is- “cord” [Ehret 1991, 218] = *maš- [Sasse 1976]. (3) SCu.: Irq. mâyšot, pl. mâyšu “cow skin sack” [Wtl. 1953] = mašót (f) “big leather bag for use on donkey”, mayšót (f) “leather bag” [MQK 2002, 71–72] was borrowed from Datooga. (4) Akk. mazāʾu “ein Ledergegenstand” [AHW 637] = “a leather object” [CAD m1, 438]. (5) NOm.: Kaffa naš-o “cuoio” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 325] = nāšō “pelle tannata” [Crl. 1951, 481] was combined by H. C. Fleming (1964, 46) rather with LECu.: Baiso nezi “bark of tree”. (6) Whether SBrb. *√m-z-h₁ [Prasse] = *ta-mzī-t “leather bag” [Mlt.]: Ahaggar ta-mhi-t, pl. ti-mhī-t-m “sac en peau de dimension moyenne (formée d’une seule peau tannée de chèvre, mouton, jeune mouflon etc.)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1173] = “middle-size bag made of a whole goat or sheepskin” [Mlt.], Tadghaq & Nslm. ta-mši-t “leather bag (sac en peau)” [Bst. quoted by Prs. and Mlt.], Tadghaq & Tudalt ta-mši-t “sack (millet was stored and transported in leather sacks until recently)” [Sudlow 2001, 293] (SBrb.: Prs. 1969, 79, §515) || Guanche: Lanzarote & Fuertaventura maho “Fellschuh” [Wlf. 1955] = “calzado”, maho-s (-s Spanish pl. ending!) “calzados de los cueros de las cabras, el pelo afuera, unos como zapatos” [Wlf. 1965] = “a shoe” [Mlt.] etc. (Brb.: Wlf. 1955, 100, §11; Mlt. 1988, 197, #3.2.2.5, fn. 8) are related is rather uncertain. A.Ju. Militarev (l.c.) explained Tuareg *ta-mzī-t from *ta-m-zay-a derived from *a-zayha “leather thing”, while D. J. Wölfel (l.c.) identified the underlying verbal with Hgr. ah “écorder de sa peau” [Fcd.].

ms “enklitische Konjunktion: doch o.ä.” (MK Lit., Wb II 142, 4; GHWb 359) = “surely, indeed” (EG 1957, §251; FD 117).

nb: Cf. var. mjs in CT III 232b (M.C. 105) and VI 240r (T1Ca) “surely” (DCT 161).

- GT: cp. perhaps CCh.: Hide (Htk., Lmg.) mača [-č- < *-s/š-?] “certain, sûr” [Egc. 1971, 216] | (?) Musgu massi “aufrichtig” [Rohlf s apud Lks. 1941, 66]?

nb: It would be tempting to compare also Akk. (YBab.) amašša “sicherlich” [AHW 42: “Ableitung unklar”, cf. GAG §113.c & §121.d], but the rdg. of this particle has been corrected in CAD for abarša “truly, surely (?)”.

ms “als Zins eingegangenes Getreide (neben: Korn der eigenen Ernte)” (XIX., Wb II 142, 2) = “Zins (auch als Getreide eingegangen)” (GHWb 362) (?) > Dem. ms.t (masc.!) “Zinsen” (DG 178) ~ ms “interest” (Ostr. Toronto D 55:3 etc., Caminos) ~ ms “to bear interest (intr.)” (Hermupolis Legal Code 4:23, 5:6, Mattha 1975, 136) = “porter intérêt” (Vcl.) > Cpt. (SAM) mHCε, (B) mHCi, (F) mHC

(f) “usury, interest” (CD 186a) = “Zinsen, Wucher” (KHW 101) = “intérêts d’un prêt” (DELC 122).

NB1: The etymon of Cpt. (S) †ϠMHCE “to give at an interest” has been identified by R. Caminos (1954 LEM, 238) with Eg. dj r msj “to give at an interest” (Pap. Anastasi V, rt. 11:3).

NB2: Vocalized as *músy.at > *mús.at (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 139) = old *més.w̄t > later *més.j̄t > *més.̄t (NBĀ).

NB3: W. Helck (MWNR 576) found the alternative rendering “Korn” of ms in certain contexts “*schwer abzusetzen, da die vom Wb vorgenommene Erklärung als Zinskorn wegen MHCE sich wenigstens aus unserer Stelle... nicht ergibt*”. This doubt, accompanied by the shift of gender (not discussed in CED, NBĀ, KHW, and DELC), somewhat queries the equation of the Wb gloss with msj “interest” (Pap. Anastasi V, rt. 11:3) > Dem.-Cpt.

- Ultimately originates in Eg. msj “to give birth” > “to produce etc.” as usually proposed in the lit. Its literal or primary sense might have actually been “offspring of money” (CD 186a; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 139) = “Geburt, Nachkommenschaft” (NBĀ) = “Vermehrung (des Geldes)” (KHW). Semantically plausible, cf. Gk. τόκος “interest” (rendered in Dem. just by ms/ms.t) < τίκτω.

LIT.: Vrg. 1950, 291; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 139; NBĀ 471; CED 90; KHW 101; DELC 122; Quack 1994, 101, fn. 53 etc.

NB1: Its derivation directly from Dem. ms “Kind” (SAK 19, 1992, 9; WD III 56) is rather doubtful.

NB2: In the light of the inner Eg. etymology, other suggestions are out of question.

(1) GT: this must apply to the *prima vista* tempting affiliation of Eg. ms with Hbr. mas “Fronddienst” [GB 439], Off. Aram. ms “forced labour, corvée”, mss “to pay tax (?)” [Dupont-Sommer, DNWSI 662–3, 665] = ms “tax (?)” [Segal] ||| LECu.: PBonī *mās (f) “debt” [Heine 1982, 101] > Bonī mās (f) “Schuld” [Heine 1977, 292] ||| NOm.: Kaffā meš-ō “debito” [Crl. 1951, 476]. (2) Comparing Eg. ms(j) with CCh.: Logone msoaa “millet” (OS 1992, 184; HSED #1817) is evidently false. (3) Similarly, the combination with the Ch. reflexes of AA *m-[c] “to trade” [GT] (Takács 1998, 157, #17) is also incorrect.

ms “Ehrfurcht bezeugen vor (n)...”, also: ms t3 n (XXII., Wb II 142, 7–8).

NB1: D. Meeks (kind p.c., 13 April 2000) views that “*il n’est pas sûr que ‘to be afraid’ soit sémantiquement satisfaisant*” and surmises rather a connection to 3ms-jb (var. jms-jb, also ms-jb) “Verbum, von der Freude der Kuh am saugenden Kälbchen” (MK, Wb I 11, 7) = “se réjouir, montrer l’intérêt pour” (AL 77.0054). But its supposed very late occurrence (ms n hr[j=f (?)] “[seinem (?)] Vorgesetzten Ehrfurcht bezeugen”) in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998, 213, 214, n. af & fn. 1042 with further evidence) speaks for a separate gloss ms as in Wb.

NB: Related to mss “schlottern (vor Angst)” (XVIII., Wb, below)?

- Its meaning and the underlying root are uncertain. GT: if the sense suggested in Wb is correct, it might be affiliated with LECu.: SA *mays- “to fear” [GT] (with a possible Hbr. reflex).

NB1: Attested in LECu.: Saho mayšī ~ mayží ~ māšī ~ mēšī ~ māží “Furcht” [Rn. 1890, 276] = maššī (f) “fear, fright, scare”, mašš-īše “to frighten, scare”, mašš-īte “to fear, be afraid” [Vergari 2003, 134], Saho-Assaorta maš “paura, pauroso” [CR 1913, 72], Afar maysī, pl. māysis (f) “Furcht” [Rn. 1886, 885] = mays/z-it- [Colizza] =

meys-it- “to fear”, meysi [meyst ~ meyšt] “fear” [Hyw. 1974, 390, 394] = meysi (f) “fear, cowardliness, uncertainty”, meys-ite “to fear, be afraid, be uncertain” [PH 1985, 168] | HECu.: Sid. mas- “meravigliarsi”, mass-ir- (refl.) “lodare, ringraziare” [Crl. 1938 II, 215] = masa “to fear, be afraid, scared”, mas-isa “to frighten, terrify” [Gsp. 1983, 225] = mas- “to be afraid, surprised”, mas-is- “to surprise, startle”, mas-is- “to frighten” [Hds. 1989, 146, 385].

NB2: The origin of Hbr. msy hifil “in große Furcht setzen” [GB 439] is uncertain. Perhaps just a fig. sense of Hbr. msy hifil “1. to cause to melt, 2. cause to disappear (heart, loveliness), 3. flood (with tears)” [KB 604].

NB3: The etymology of Akk. mēsu II (pl.tantum) “Kulte” [AHW 647: u.H.] = mēšū ~ māšū “cultic rites, rituals” [CAD m2, 35] is obscure. In principle, the semantic shift “to fear” > “to respect” is plausible.

ms “Fürst der Libyer” (XXII., Wb II 142, 9) = “Libyan prince” (AEO I 120*) = “titre de chef” (Yoyotte) = “chef libyen” (AL 77.1866) = “Titel ‘libyscher’ Fürsten” (Behrens).

- A word of Berber origin, cp. SBrb.: Tuareg *m-s “Herr, Fürst” [Hölscher] = *mæss “lord” [Mlt.]: Ghat mas [Bst.] = mess “maître” [Nhl. 1909, 175], Hgr. mess, pl. messaw “maître, propriétaire” [Bst.; Fcd. 1951–2, 1245] = mæss [Mlt.], Ayr mæšš [Mlt.], EWlm. & Ayr mæšš “maître, seigneur, propriétaire” [PAM 1998, 224; 2003, 557], Niger Trg. (sic) messi “Herr, Gott” [Bhr.] (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 325, 335; Mlt. 1988, 202, fn. 23 etc.).

LIT. for Eg-Brb.: Bates 1914, 83; Zhl. 1931–32, 10; 1932–33, 26, 29 (fn. 2), 85; Grd. 1933, 23 (after Eрман); Hölscher, AF 4, 1937, 67, fn. 1; Blackman 1941, 87; Hölscher 1955, 67 & fn. 1; Yoyotte, GLECS 8, 1957–60, 23; BIFAO 58, 1958, 86–87; Vcl. 1966, 272; Junge, LÄ II 326; Behrens 1981, 36; 1984–85, 160, §2.2; Mlt. 1989, 249; 1991, 151.

NB1: M. Kossmann (1999, 17) views that LEg. ms “*n’est pas non plus preuve de l’appartenance à la branche berbère: des termes comme ‘roi’ ou ‘chef’ sont facilement empruntés*”.

NB2: The filiative element *mas “lord (ХОЗЯИН)” [Mlt.] occurs in several Brb. personal names (like Amastan, Massinissa, Masuna, Masgivin, Massulet, Mastigas, Mastiman etc.), cf. Bates 1914, 80; Mlt. 1991, 151.

NB3: The Brb. word seems to stem from the common AA heritage being cognate with NOm.: Chara mēsā (subst.) “grande” [Crl. 1938 III, 172] || Ch. *m-S “chief” [GT]: WCh.: Hausa māsūú (pl. of mār) “(s)he who owns, chief” [Abr. 1962, 637] = “maître de, propriétaire de” [Gouffé 1974, 369] || CCh.: BM *m-š [secondary *š < *s] “master” [Hfm. 1987, 459] > Margi mša ~ mše “chief, king” [Mkr.], Margi-Putai mša ~ mšā “chief” [Hfm. 1987, 471, §21] | PHigi *maz- “chief, king” [GT]: Fali-Gili maz, Kapsiki maze, Higi-Bana maz-ca (Higi gr.: Mkr. after Krf.) | Mboku masay “Oberhaupt” [Lks.], Mofu masay “Oberhaupt” [Lks.] = māšay “chef de famille” [Mch. 1953, 178] (CCh.: Lks. 1973, table between pp. 248–9).

NB4: With regard to its pl. māsūú, C. Gouffé (1974, 369) declined (“*semble devoir être écarté*”) the traditional derivation of Hausa mār (sg) from Kanuri máy “king” (Pls. 1958, 79, fn. 17).

NB5: The equation of CCh. *m-S [GT] with ECh.: Mokilko mózigù “chief, king” [Mkr.] = mózigò “chef (roi)” [Jng. 1990, 142] (suggested by H. G. Mukarovsky 1987, 124) is dubious. For the problem cf. Eg. mšwš (q.v.).

NB6: No convincing Sem. cognates. The etymology of PSinaitic mṯ “lord” [Alb.] = mṯ “Herr” [Donner] = mš (sic) “don” [Loundine] is uncertain. W. F. Albright (1966, 41–42) combined it with a certain Ug. mṯ “lord” vs. mṯ-t “lady”, which are

rendered recently rather as “infant, baby boy (title of Baal’s son)” vs. “damsel, young lady (royal title in epic, chief wife of Keret and Danel)” [DUL 604, 606]. In addition, Albright assumed PSin. *mṭ* to have “*clipped by dissimulation*” from Sem. **mṭl* “to be like (to), represent” [Alb.], cf. Hbr. *mšl qal* “herrschen, Herr sein” [GB 470] = “representieren, herrschen” [Donner], Off. Aram. *mšl* “*властвовать, иметь власть*” [SAN IV 204]. H. Donner (1967, 279), in turn, affiliated the PSin. form with Eg. *ms*, Sum. *mes*, Ar. *mayyit-* (sic, no details). The view of A. van den Branden (quoted by Loundine 1991, 111) that the PSin. word was borrowed into (!) Eg. (as *ms!*), is unacceptable.

NB7: There can be no connection to OAss. *massuʔum*, OAkk. & OAb. *massum* “Anführer” [AHW 619] < Sum. *maš.zu* (cf. Watson 1996, 708) either.

NB8: Eventually, the ES-Ch. isogloss represented e.g. by Common Guraige *məs* “male” [Lsl.] ||| Ch. **m-S* “husband, male” [GT] might be related. Note that W. Leslau (1987, 83) rejected the usual comparison of the Grg. root with Ar. *baʔusa* “to be strong, intrepid”, Geez *bəʔasi* “man, male” (Praetorius 1879, 50).

ms3.w (?) “der Onanierer” (PT 1248, ÜKAPT V 148) = “who masturbated” (AEPT 198, n. 2).

- Rdg. and etymology disputed. Discussed s.v. Eg. *jws3.w*.

ms3q.t, in: *ms3q.t-jb* “als Beiname der Sachmet” (XVIII., Wb II 142, 10) = “(Epit. der Sachmet)” (GHWb 363).

NB: Act. “the self-possessed one”?

- Perhaps a participial *m-* prefix form derived from Eg. *s3q* “zusammenfügen, zusammenraffen” (PT, Wb IV 25–26), cp. esp. *s3q-jb* “sich selbst beherrschend” (MK, Wb IV 26, 1–2).

NB: The etymology of Eg. *s3q* is debated: (1) A. Ember (1930, #3.c.30) incorrectly equated Eg. *s3q* with Ar. *salaka* “to march along, wind off (thread)”. Impossible both phonologically (Eg. *-q* ≠ Ar. *-k*) and semantically. (2) E. Zyhlarz (1934, 118) identified it with SBrb.: Tuareg *á-səy* “verbinden”. (3) M. Cohen (1947, 139, §283) and G. Conti (1978, 28, fn. 1) affiliated it with Akk. *s/šaqqu* “Sack, Traergewand” [AHW 1027] || Hbr. *šaq* “sack” [KB 1349–50] and the Agaw reflexes of AA **s-ḳ* “to weave” [GT]. Unlikely. Eg. *-3-* vs. Sem. **-Ø-* is problematic. (4) C.T. Hodge (1966, 46, #56) combined Eg. *s3q* with WCh.: Hausa *sárkà* “to interlace, -wine, -weave”, *sárkèè* “1. to become tangled, interlaced, intertwined, interwoven, 2. pull the door to and fasten the chain on it, fasten its hasp on its staple” [Brg. 1934, 908]. Possible both phonologically and semantically. (5) V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #380) assumed Eg. *s3q* < **slq* ~ Ar. *slq* “to gather” [OS! not listed in BK] ||| CCh.: Matakam (Mafa) *cakal* & Mofu *čakal* “to gather, collect” [OS].

ms3d.tj (PT) > **ms3d.tj** ~ **msd3.tj** (CT) > **msd.tj** (MK-GR) (dual) “die Nasenmuscheln, auch die Nasenlöcher (durch die man riecht)” (Med., Wb II 153, 5–6; Grapow 1954, 37; GHWb 363, 366; WD II 67: cf. RdE 26, 1974, 144) = “Nasenlöcher oder Nasenflügel” (Edel 1954, 88–89) = “les fosses nasales” (Lefébvre 1952, 19) = “two nostrils” (Breasted 1930, 242, 536; FD 117; PL 468; DCT 182) = “nasal cavities” (Ward 1972, 19) = “narines” (AL 79.1367) = “pair of nose-wings” (DLE I 244) = “sides of the nose, nostrils” (Walker 1996, 270).

NB1: For the PT evidence of the oldest form (ms3d.tj) see Edel 1954, 88–89, §4; 1955, 110, §256; Roquet 1984, 372. The ex. in CT II 36a (msd3.tj < ms3d.tj < ms3d.tj) displays a metathesis and the regular shift of OK -d- > -d-.

NB2: Although no vocalized form is known, its syllabic structure was reconstructed by G. Fecht (1960, 180, §373) as *m̃s̃d̃t̃j > *m̃s̃3̃d̃t̃j.

- E. Edel (1954, 88–89, §4; 1955, 110, §256), followed by G. Fecht (1960, 180, §373), W. A. Ward (1972, 19), and P. Wilson (PL 468), saw in it an m- prefix nomen instr. derived from Eg. s3d “frisch machen” (PT 565c), which is the caus. (*s-w3d) of w3d “grün, frisch sein”. Henceforth, the proper meaning of ms3d.t has been rendered as *‘‘Frischmacher’’ (Edel) = *‘‘die beiden frisch Erhaltenden’’ (Fecht) = *‘‘those which make fresh’’ (Wilson).
- Other etymologies (mostly ignoring PT ms3d.t) cannot be accepted:
- 1. P. Lacau (1970, 50), although he accepted PT ms3d.t ‘‘narine’’, considered its source (*s3d) only as hypothetical and unknown (!). Instead, he assumed an etymological connection to Eg. msdj ‘‘to hate’’ (below) on the analogy of Eg. fnd ‘‘nose’’ > fnd ‘‘zürnen’’. Rightly rejected by W. A. Ward (1972, 19).
- 2. H. Smith (1979, 163) explained it from Eg. sd ‘‘to break, open’’, since the ‘‘*embalmers ‘broke’ into the body through the nostrils*’’. False. Rejected by D. Meeks (AL 79.1367)
- 3. The Russian linguists erroneously analyzed Med. msd.t as nomen instr. of an unattested Eg. *sd ultimately derived from PAA *čVt ‘‘to smell’’ [Mlt.].
LIT.: MM 1983, 218 (Ar.-Eg.); Djk. et al. 1986, 34 (Ar.-Brg.-Eg.-Angas); Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 56 (Sem.-Angas-Eg.); Djk. 1992, 17 (Ar.-Brg.-Eg.-AS).
NB: Based on Ar. lʔt ‘‘sentir mauvais’’ [BK I 215] = ‘‘to have a bad smell’’ [Mlt.] || NOm.: *šid/t- ‘‘nose’’ [GT] || SOM.: Ari dial. sūdi ‘‘nose’’ [Flm.] (Om.: CR 1913, 407; Dlg. 1973, 110; Flm. 1974, 90, #18) || WCh.: Bade ʔə-st-án ‘‘nose’’ [Lukas 1968, 223] and some other forms that are certainly unrelated. Thus, e.g., SCu.: Burunge čuʔ-ud ‘‘to smell’’ derives from SCu. *cuʔ- [*ts-] ‘‘to smell (intr.)’’ [GT after Ehret 1980, 199–200], while the quotation of WCh.: Angas čet, Sura čēt ‘‘to smell’’ (sic) is due to a mere translation error of O. Stolbova who misunderstood ‘‘to smelt’’, the correct mng. of Angas čet (cf. Flk. 1915, 157). In addition, H. C. Fleming (1974, 90) and A. B. Dolgopolskij (1973, 110) analyzed of the Om. data as *sin-tV.
- 4. A. M. Lam (1993, 379) linked it to Ful čerđi ‘‘fosses nasales’’. Absurd.

msj ‘‘1. gebären → 2. bilden’’ (OK, Wb II 137–138) > Cpt. (SAL) MICE, (BF) MICI, (A) MEICE ‘‘gebären, hervorbringen, schaffen, erzeugen’’ (KHW 101).

NB1: Its vocalized forms: (1) inf. *mīs̃t (Edel 1954, 41) = *mīs̃it (Zeidler 1999, 296) = *misVj-at > *mīs̃Vt > *mīs̃Vt > (S) MICE, st.pron. *misVj-at = > *mīs̃Vt = > *mīs̃t = > (S) MACT = (Stz. 2001, 426, 429), (2) subjunctive *masjā = (Zeidler), (3) part. perf. act. *mesje (sic) (Clc.) = *māse (Grd. 1936, 192) = *mase (Edel 1948, 16, §ix) = *māsij vs. *masij (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 96–97; 1986, 583) = *mase/ij (NBÁ 129) = old *māsij > NK *masē (Vcl. 1990, 163, §5) = *mas(ij) as etymon of part. conj.

(Zeidler l.c.) vs. fem. *mē/īsj.ṭ “Frau, die geboren hat” > Cpt. (S) מְחַצֵּה, (B) מְחַצֵּה (f) “one with child” (CD 185b) = “Wöchnerin, WocheNBett” (KHW 101; NBÄ 471), (4) part. perf. pass. late NK j.msĵ/*(j)amˀsjē(j) (NBÄ 238) > OCpt. מְחַצֵּה, מְחַצֵּה, מְחַצֵּה(ע) “so. whom (so.) bore” (CD 185b) = “der, den (irgendeiner) geboren hat” (KHW 102), which is hardly in accordance with *masūjat based by Th.O. Lambdin (1953, 367, §19) on a disputed Amarna gloss (EA 14, 1:14) of dubious rendering (for alternative etymologies cf. NBÄ 815 & Edel 1980, 14 and also below), (5) pseudopart. (3rd p.m.sg.) *māsĵˀw > *māsĵ (Edel 1948, 17–18, §xii) = *māsĵw > *māsi (Edel 1954, 40; 1980, 12) = māsĵw (Zeidler l.c.) = pseudopart. (*masVĵaj > *māsVĵaj > *māsĵaw/j > (S) מוֹצֵה (Stz. l.c.).

NB2: For the supposed cuneiform reflections of its (1) pseudopart. see KMAV 51; Zunke 1923/1997, 14; Alb. 1946, 16, §33; Edel 1948, 17–18, §xii; 1954, 38, 40; 1980, 12; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 97, 99; (2) part. perf. act. (esp. in MBab. rijamašša < PN r^c-msj-sw) see Clc. 1909, 111 (after Sethe); Friedrich, OLZ 27, 1924, col. 705; Grd. 1936, 192 (dubious); Edel 1948, 16, §ix; Fecht §225–7; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 96–97; NBÄ 129, 608, n. 597; Vrg. 1986, 583; Vcl. 1990, 163, §5; (3) part. perf. pass. see Lambdin 1953, 367, §19 contra NBÄ 815 (< Eg. msĵ.t “Schale, Schüssel”, cf. mzw. t above) and contra Edel 1980, 14 (< Eg. msĵ3.t, above) and Cochavi-Rainey 1997, 100 (“no final conclusion can be drawn”).

NB3: The name of Moses has been usually derived from Eg. msĵ (either from its pseudopart. 3rd p.m.sg. or from Eg. ms “child”), which is due to K. R. Lepsius (followed by F. J. Lauth and G. M. Ebers and many others listed by Gardiner 1936, 192 and Vergote 1980, 89f.), see also Spg., ZDMG 53, 1899, 633f.; Grd. 1911, 20, fn. 3; 1936, 192–4 & 195–6, fn. 28; Karlberg 1912, 44–45; Černý 1941, 352; Griffiths 1953, 228 (with further lit.); KB 642. This etymology is hindered in the view of J. Vergote (1980, l.c.) by two anomalies: (1) the vowel of the 1st syllable was in short Eg. but long in Hbr. (explained by J.W. Griffiths l.c. with the influence of Gk. Μωϋσῆς ~ Μωυσῆς), while (2) Eg. -s- vs. Hbr. -š- also differ. Other etymologies for the Hbr. PN have also been proposed: Griffith ZÄS 46, 1907, 132–4 (Eg.); Haupt OLZ 12, 1909, 164 (Hbr.); Grd. 1936, 194 (Hbr.); Černý 1941, 349–353 (Hbr., Eg.); Vrg. 1980, 89–95 (Eg.).

- Hence derive, i.a.:

(1) ms “das Kind” (PT, Wb II 139) > Cpt. (SB) מְחַצֵּה, (A) מְחַצֵּה “young (mostly of animal or bird)” (CD 185b; CED 90) = “Kind, Junges” (NBÄ).

NB1: Vocalized as *mīs(yu) < *mīsayu (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 136) = *mēs (NBÄ 228; Snk. 1983, 225).

NB2: Y. Muchiki (1994, 127, §2) explained Phn. (5th cent. BC) PN ʿnḥ-pms from Eg. *ʿnḥ-p3-ms “(may) the child live(s)”.

(2) ms “Kalb” (MK, Wb II 140, 8–9) > Cpt. (S) מְחַצֵּה, (S^A) מְחַצֵּה, (BF) מְחַצֵּה “young animal, especially calf, bull” (CD 186a; CED 90) = “Junges, Kalb” (NBÄ).

NB: Vocalized as *mēs(jĵ) (NBÄ 243) = *mēs(j/w)ˀ(w) (Snk. 1983, 225).

(3) ms.wt (OK) > msĵ.t (NK) “1. das Gebären (als Vorgang), 2. das Geboren werden, die Geburt jemandes, 3. Gestalt o.ä. (eines Gottes)” (OK, Wb II 140–1) = “manifestation (?), primarily of deities, an aspect of mode of being, probably as a refinement of characterization” (Baines, AEB 86.238) > Cpt. (L) מְחַצֵּה, (B) מְחַצֵּה “Geburt, Wochenbett” (KHW 101).

NB: Vocalized *mē/īsw.ṭ > *mē/īsj.ṭ (NBÄ 471) = *mīsw.at (Snk. 1983, 225).

- From AA *m-č “1. (intr.) to be born, 2. (tr.) to bear child” [GT], cf. Brb. *√m-s “to stem from” [GT] = “sein, existieren, stammen aus” [Snd.] > NBrb.: Mzg. mes “être (originaire de), 2. avoir les liens de parenté, 3. être parent proche de”, a-mas “lien de parenté, identité, ethnique” [Taifi 1991, 435], Ait Mgild √m-s “to be (ethnically)” [Harries 1974, 240], Zayan mes “être originaire de...” [Rns. 1932, 385], Zayan & Sgugu mes “être originaire de” [Lbg. 1924, 567] | Sgrs. ə-ms “être” [Pellat 1955, 106], Wargla e-mus “devenir” [Priv.], Sened e-ms “devenir” [Priv.] || WBrb.: Zenaga √m-s “être fait, exister”, ĩamũšša (aor. of 3rd p.sg.m.) “être fait, créé” [Ncl. 1953, 217] || SBrb.: Hgr. √m-s: umas “être” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1239] = “sein” [Vcl.], Udalan u-ṃas “être (verbe d’identification)” [Prs. & Dicko 2002, 29], EWlm. u-ṃas & Ayr i-ṃas “être, devenir” > EWlm. & Ayr tə-ṃus-t, pl. tə-ṃus-en “nature, essence, identité (ethnique)” [PAM 1998, 223–4; 2003, 556], Ghat e-mus “devenir” [Nhl. 1909, 151] (Brb.: Priv. 1911, 110) || presumably LECu.: Saho mas-o “dimension, size” [Vergari 2003, 133], Afar missos “form, shape” [PH 1985, 169] | HECu.: (?) Hdy. miš- “to ripen, be ripe” [Hds. 1989, 294] = “Frucht bringen” & “Frucht” [Ehret] || Ch. *m^wasay (?) “1. to beget, 2. bear child, 3. make” [GT] > WCh.: Ron *masay “to make (do)” [GT]: DB masay, Bks. masî, Sha masây, Mundat msây, Karfa má:sàn (Ron: Seibert 2000 MS, #f189) || CCh.: Bata gr. *m^wasa “to give birth” [GT]: Mwulyen ku-mwàšá (ku- verbal prefix) “donner naissance” [Br̄t.-Jng. 1990, 151], Bata mwàzà (nǝi) “enfanter” [Mch. 1950, 48] = mwàsá [Mlt.: -s- < AA *-č-?] “to beget, give birth”, cf. perhaps mòs- “to be fertile” [Pweddton 2000, 57–58] = mwàsá “to give birth to”, mwààsa-to “family, lineage” [Boyd 2002, 57], Bachama mwàsá “to give birth” [Skn.] | Kola mómbúàzà [< *m^wasa] “to give birth” [Schubert] (CCh.: JI 1994 II, 161).

From the same root derives AA *m-č “child” [GT] = *mič- “son, child” [HSED, Mlt.] > Sem.: (???) Ebl. ma/áš “son, child, one born” [Gordon] || Ug. m̄t “Sohn”, fem. m̄t-t “Tochter, Dame” only as PN [WUS #1717] = m̄t “twin-brother” [de Moor] = m̄t “lad” vs. m̄t-t “lady, lass” [Segert 1984, 193] = m̄t “boy”, m̄t-t “lady” [Watson] = m̄t “baby boy (infante, niño peqeño)” vs. m̄t-t “damsel, young lady (damisela, joven dama)” [DLU 308–9; DUL 604, 606] || NBrb.: Zayan *mes “Sohn”, cf. mes-uryāz “Sohn eines Menschen” [Zhl.] || NOm.: Mocha mōsso “baby” [Lsl. 1959, 42] || CCh.: Gidar mōséa [Str. 1910, 455] = mōséa “child” [JI 1994 II, 75] || ECh. *mič- (so, *-i-) “son” [Stl. 1996, 116]: Somray māsái “junger Bursche” [Lks. 1937, 80] = māsé, pl. mwλsλ “garçon, jeune homme, mâle” [Jng.

1993, 44] | DM *mič- “child” [Mlt.]: Dng. (Karbo) mičo “boy”, miči kopok “(small) child” [el-Minai n.d. MS], Bidiya mičo (m), miča (f), pl. miče “enfant” [AJ 1989, 98], Migama mûčà (m), mičà (f), pl. mičí [č < AA *č/*s poss.] “1. enfant (fils, fille), 2. fruit”, miččúwéé (m) “enfantillage, enfance” [JA 1992, 106–7].

LIT.: Zhl. 1932–33, 94 (Eg.-Brb.); Ast. 1948, 222; Gordon 1955, 293, #1185 & #1579 (Ug.-Eg.); Hodge 1961, 36 (Eg.-Mocha); WUS #1717 (Ug.-Eg.); Vcl. 1964, 228 (Eg.-Tuareg); OS 1989, 132; 1992, 185 (Eg.-Somray); 1992, 195 (Eg.-Bata gr.); Gordon 1991, 554–5, §6 (Ebl.-Ug.-Eg.); Rowe, AuOr 11 (1993), 251 (Ug.-Eg.); JI 1994 I 77 (Eg.-CCh.); Blz. 1994, 432 (Eg.-Ebl.-Zayan-Somray); HSED #1769 (Eg.-Ug.-Dangla) and #1786 (Eg.-Bata); Ehret 1995, #599 (Eg.-Afar-Mocha); Watson 1995, 546 & 1996, 101 & 1996, 707 (Ug.-Eg. with further lit.); Stl. 1996, 116 (Ug.-Eg.-ECh.); KB 642 (Eg.-Ug.); Lipinski 1997, 85, #8.18 (Eg.-Gafat-Gurage); Snd. 1997, 198, §37 (Eg.-Brb.); Blažek 2002, 118, §8.6 (Eg.-Brb.-Ch.-Ug.-Ebl.); DLU 308–9 & DUL 604 (Ug.-Eg.); Mlt. 2006, 36, §51.10 (Ug.-Eg.-Bata-DM).

NB1: C. H. Gordon (1991, 554–5), uncritically approved by V. Blažek (1994, 432), maintained a common AA heritage in Eg. ms and Ebl. máš, which seems rather doubtful in the light of Sum. máš. A.Ju. Militarev (2006, 36, §51.10) surmises a cognate (!) even in Akk. māšu ~ maššu ~ mašû “twin” [CAD m1, 401], which, however, is treated in AHW 631 as a borrowing from Sum. máš.

NB2: For an Ug. var. mš-t (PN) cf. Watson 2003, 246. Ug. mṯ has been traditionally equated with Ar. mayyit- “mou, tendre” [BK II 1170] = “soft, gentle” [Gordon], which was rightly rejected by J. Aistleitner (WUS #1717) and C. H. Gordon (1955, 293, #1185), while both of them supposed in Ug. mṯ a foreign word borrowed from Eg. ms.

NB3: The Ar. parallels (if any) are doubtful, cf. msw: mašā “1. introduire la main dans le vagin de la chamelle pour en tirer le sperme de l'étalon qui vient de la couvrir, quant on ne peut pas qu'elle retienne de ce mâle” [BK II 1107] and msy “to clean the uterus of camel (an action performed by inserting the hand in the animal's uterus and drawing out the offending matter)” [Guillaume] = “to clear the uterus of a camel from sperm, wipe with the hand” [Ehr.], although both were derived by Ch. Ehret (1989, 182, §54) from Ar. bicons. *ms- “to touch”, while Guillaume (1965 II, 23) maintains a basic sense “to draw” and cognacy with Hbr. mšy “to draw”. Moreover, Ar. -s- ≠ Sem. *-t-. The same applies to the C₃ of Ar. mašy: mašā “avoir beaucoup d'enfants ou de petits (se dit des femmes ou des femelles)”, VIII “avoir une nombreuse postérité” [BK II 1113], massa I “cohabiter” [Fagnan 1923, 163], and nu/a/is? “enceinte d'un enfant” [Dozy II 664]. In the latter case, in addition, we should assume an interchange m- ~ n-. For the reasons mentioned above, neither of these comparanda suits fully.

NB4: The Eth.-Sem. parallels are equally uncertain: (1) Harari mūs “to be pregnant” is out of question, cf. ES *√ms: Tigre ʿamsä(t) “to be pregnant” [Lsl. 1963, 112]. (2) The origin of ES: Gafat mossay “young child (enfant)” [Lsl.] = mosiet “infant, child” [Beke apud Lsl.], Amh. massa “young child” [Lsl.], Gurage: Chaha & Gyeto mʿāsa & Muher & Gogot mʿāssa & Soddo (Aymelle) massa etc. “veau” [Lsl.] (Eth.-Sem.: Lsl. 1956, 217; 1979, 425) is disputed. F. Praetorius (1879, 73) equated the Gafat word with Argobba mans explained from *mānʿas < √nʿs “to be little”, while W. Leslau (l.c.) maintained the cognacy of all these ES data, which A. Faber (1984, 200, §1) derived from Sem. *ʿnS₁ “weak, small”. For the pattern of Gafat mosiet < *√msy cf. Gafat məsiet “evening, night” ~ Eg. mswt. (3) A.Ju. Militarev (2006, 36, §51.10) compared Ug. mṯ and the related AA words also with ES: Grg.: Soddo maš “man”, Arg. mis & Harari miš “fellow”, which can hardly belong here (cf. Eg. mšʿ).

NB5: L. Reinisch (1873, 19, fn. 2) combined Eg. ms with a certain Brb. i-mis (sic) “Kind, Sohn”, while A.Ju. Zavadovskij (1967, 22) equated Eg. ms “child” with a certain Brb. maʒuʒi (sic, -ʒ-) “детеньши” [Zvd.]. Both comparanda are obscure.

NB6: V. Blažek (2002, 118, §8.6) explained NBrb. *məm̄mi “fils” as a compound of Brb. *√m-s “être originaire de” + *√m “mother”. Unlikely, cf. Takács 1996, 127.

NB7: Ch. Ehret (1991, 235) reconstructed ECu. *mi/u/ač(č)- “to stick out, emerge out of” based on the comparison of Had. miš- (above) with HECu.: Burji mus-ā or mūs-ā, var. miss-a “penis” [Sasse 1982, 145, 150] = mis-a ~ miss-a ~ mus-ā [Hds. 1989, 213].

NB8: LECu.: Som. mi^ɕis, pl. mi^ɕisó “newborn animal” [Abr. 1964, 180] seems also unrelated because of the -^ɕ- unreflected in Eg. msj.

NB9: Ch. Ehret (1995, #59) combined Eg. ms etc. also with LECu.: Afar mò-ta, pl. mōy “kid (male baby goat)” [PH 1985, 170] erroneously equating Afar -y < *-c (!) with Eg. -s-.

NB10: ECu.: Yaaku -emus- [tr. “to have sexual intercourse” [Heine 1975, 128] || SCu.: Dhl. ʔmuš- “to give birth”, ʔumuš-ikuó- “to be born” [Eld. 1973 MS, 2, §79–80] = ʔumuš- “to give birth”, ʔumuš-ikuó- “to be born” [Ehret 1980, 295] are also unrelated. V. Blažek & M. Tosco (1994 MS, 4) traeted the Yaaku verb as originally caus. *em-us- compared with LECu.: Dasenech (Geleba) ʔum-u [Tosco] = úmm-o [Hhn. 1966, 96], Arbore umm-ó (pl.) “children” [Tosco] < ECu. *ʔüm- “to create” [Tosco]. Ch. Ehret (1980, 295) seems to decline the analysis of Dahalo -uš- as a caus. ending.

NB11: W. Leslau (1959, l.c.) explained the Mocha ex. as a loan from Orm. mučā “child” [Gragg 1982, 292], which cannot belong here (Orm. č ≠ Eg. s).

NB12: SCu.: Asa msumbe-tog, pl. msumbe “son (in address)”, Iraqw masómbáʔ-ima “a youth” (SCu.: Flm. 1969, 10) are probably also to be left out of consideration.

NB13: D. Barreteau & H. Jungraithmayr (1990, 151) derived Mwulyen √m^w-š from their Ch. *mb^w-(s), which is baseless. Ch. *√m^w-s-y seems more likely (above).

NB14: J. Greenberg (1965, 91, #15), V. Blažek (1989, 216–217), and M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998, 121) erroneously compared Eg. msj with forms preserving an original AA *b-s [GT], which must be a distinct root, cf. NAgaw: Qemant bās “engender, devenir père” [CR 1912, 181] || LECu.: Saho & Afar bus “matrice” [Crl.] || NOM.: Kaffa buš-ō “son, boy” [Lsl. 1951, 416], Mocha buš(o) “child, son” [Lsl. 1959, 23], Shinasha (Bworo) bušō “son” [Lsl. 1956, 191] etc. This comparison was elaborated in the framework of J.H. Greenberg’s (1958; 1965) theory on the special AA proto-phoneme *mb-, which was rightly rejected by V. M. Illič-Svityč (1966).

NB15: Similarly unconvincing is the remark on ECh.: Dng. m^w-s by JI (1994 I 77) that it “resembles” Tubu bus “gebären”.

NB16: Because of the anomalous sibilant of ECh. *mič- “child” [Mlt.] (above), ECh.: Kera & Tupuri mesew & Kwang miséw “adultère de la femme” [Ebert 1977 MS, 7] = Kera mēsēw & Tupuri mēsēw “adultère de femme” [Ruelland 1978, 167] cannot be related.

NB17: Is perhaps AA *m-s (?) “seed” [GT] > SBrb.: EWlm. ā-masa, pl. i-masa-n “1. semence, 2. origine” [PAM 2003, 557] || SOM.: Ari māša & Hamer maš- & Dime mišit “seed” [Bnd. 1994, 157] eventually related?

● Other etymologies are false.

NB: (1) G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 161) equated a certain Eg. mese, wese (sic) with NBrb.: Qbl. a-bbuš and Bsq. pitcho “Penis”. (2) O. Bates (1914, 81) and M. Bechhaus-Gerst (1998, 121) combined it with WBrb.: Zng. a-možž “accoucher, mettre bas”, možžei “enfants”, t-mužžeg “accoucher”, ta-mužžeg “accouchement” [Bst. 1909, 243] = a-maž “to bear, give birth to”, mežž “to be alive” [Bates] = o-mužžih “enfant, accoucher” [Ncl. 1953, 220], which is excluded (Zng. ž < Brb. *j). (3) O. Bates (l.c.) extended this erroneous comparison to OBrb. mes- “filiative prefix” (for which cf. also Eg. ms above). Hmb. 1930, 284: ~ Ful mah-de “façonner” and (!) ɸes-do “femme qui vient d’enfanter” [Hmb.] = ɸes-ɸo vs. ɸōsa “petit d’un chat ou d’un chien” [Lam]. The latter comparison was suggested also by A. M. Lam (1993, 413). Absurd. (4) L. Homburger (1929, 166): ~ Bantu byala (sic). (5) Z. S. Harris (1936, 122), in turn, combined Eg. ms with Ph. mš “statue” and Sem. *nš?. (6) W. Westendorf (1987, 460–1 & fn. 16–17) assumed a primary root *m3s (unattested), which he explained ultimately from a hypothetical Eg. *w3s “tragen, heben, erhöhen”,

whence he derived (with m- prefix) also Eg. m3s.t “Knie, Oberschenkel” (act. “Stütze, Träger”), m3s Tier dessen Fell”, *ms “Fuchsfelle”. He made even a hint on IE *ĝneu-/*ĝneu- “Knie” vs. IE *ĝen(H)- ~ *ĝnē/ō- “erzeugen” [IEW 373, 381], which – as he rightly remarked – “zur Vorsicht bei etymologischen Vergleichen gemahnt”.

msj.t “Art Wasservögel” (MK, Wb II 143, 3; cf. also Helck MWNR 505, 1199) = “eine Sorte eßbaren Geflügels, wohl irgendeine Gänseart” (Erman 1896, 53) = “an edible bird, presumably aquatic” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 348) = “waterfowl” (FD 117) = “Wasservogel” (Barta 1969, 16, 139) = “gibier de l’eau” (AL 78.1848) = “marsh bird, breeding fowl: geese (?)” (DLE I 241) = “Geflügel (coll.), *Hühner” (GHWb 362) = “type of waterbird, an edible waterfowl” (PL 461). NB: R. Caminos (LEM 343) supposed in msrt-bird of Pap. Sallier IV vs. 2:4 (cf. DLE I 242) either a defective wrg. of msj.t or a haplographic compound *ms-sr.t “young/offspring of the sr.t-goose”.

- Etymology uncertain. Most likely seem solutions #1 and #2.
- **1.** D. Meeks (AL l.c.) found “*difficult to distinguish*” it from OK mz.t ~ mz3.t (q.v.).
- **2.** G. Takács (1996, 45, #6): cognate with CCh.: PKotoko *mā[c]V “goose” [GT]: Logone mmáásə [Lks.] ~ máási [Nct.] “größere Art von Wasserente, Gans” [Lks. 1936, 110] = mmásə [Prh.] = (?) maši “oie de Gambie: Plectropterus gambensis” [Lbf. 1976, 24, #2], Affade mátsi “a fowl” [Barth] = mâtzi [ma:tsi/māci] “Gans” [Seetzen], Ngala māsee “a fowl” [Barth], Makari maasa “a fowl” [Barth], cf. Mara māsə “canard de la brousse” [Bouny 1977, 72] (Kotoko: Slk. 1967, 226, §188; Prh. 1972, 11, #1.4; 65, #40.1). NB1: Takács (l.c.) connected the Eg.-Kotoko isogloss to doubtful Brb. parallels, for which cf. perhaps Eg. mš^c (below). NB2: The Eg.-Kotoko etymology does not necessarily exclude the identification with old Eg. mz.t, cf. the rare (irregular?) correspondence of Eg. z vs. AA *c (EDE I 311). Alternatively, cf. Eg. mš.t “Pfeifente” (OK, GHWb, infra).
- **3.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 302, #574) derived it from AA *-māč- “to immerse, flow over” based on false comparanda (below). Absurd. NB: Ehret’s Sem. *mṯ- “to leak, run out”, Som. māš- “to spread over (rain, flood, prosperity), drown (tr.)”, and NOm.: Bns. maš “sediment” have nothing in common with Eg. msj.t.

msj3.t “Kennzeichen” (PT, Wb II 143, 7) = “Kennzeichen einer gewissen Würde, angesehener Stellung, das ’Abzeichen’ eines Ranges, Rangabzeichen, Würdenabzeichen (wohl als eine Art Amulett oder Schmuck um den Hals gehängt)” (ÜKAPT III 370; Edel 1980, 15) = “Kennzeichen, Rangabzeichen” < lit. “das Erkannte oder Erkennbare” (Zeidler 1999, 286).

NB: Vocalized as OK *masúj3.at > NK *masúj.a(t) (Edel 1980, 15) = OK *masúj3.ṯ > Amarna *masújə (Zeidler 1999, 286) on the basis of its much disputed reflection in the Amarna (EA 14, 1:14, broken tablet) cuneiform gloss ma-[š]u-ja (KMAV:

-sú-?), which has been rendered diversely: “unbekannter Gegenstand aus Gold” [KMAV 23] = “an object, implement” [Lambdin] = “ein Gegäßname (aus Gold)” [Osing] = “ein leichter, am Hals zu tragender Gegenstand, eine Art Amulett” [Edel] = “Geschenkebezeichnung” [Zeidler], which is supposed to reflect either **(1)** Eg. ms.t (defective wtg. of *msj.t) “Amulett als Symbol der Fruchtbarkeit”, vocalized by E. Edel (1980, 14) as *masuj.a(t) > *mása, or **(2)** the pass. pf. part. of Eg. msj (tr.) “to form, fashion”, viz. *masūj.a(t) (Lambdin 1953, 367, §19 with an obscure hint on Eg. msj.t “Füllen”, XVIII., Wb II 140, 15) or **(3)** or Eg. msj.t (var. msj) “Schale, Schüssel (aus Gold, Silber)” (LP, NBÄ 815) or **(4)** Eg. msj3.t “Rangabzeichen” (q.v.) suggested by E. Edel (1980, 13–15, §2) and J. Zeidler (1998, 24–25, §2; 1999, 286). Quoting only the solution offered by Th.O. Lambdin (l.c.), D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 100) view that for the Amarna gloss “no final conclusion can be made”.

- An m- prefix nomen instr. form of Eg. sġ3 “erkennen” (PT, Wb IV 30), cf. also sġ3 “Kennzeichen, Erkennungsmittel” (Med., Wb IV 31, 6). Cf. Grapow 1914, 29.

NB: Eg. sġ3 [₂ *sġl/r] is most probably akin to pan-Brb. *s-l “to hear” [Bynon]: NBrb.: Shilh sella “entendre” [Rsl.] | Mzab & Wargla sōll “entendre, ouïr, écouter (avec régime indirect)” [Dlh. 1984, 187; 1987, 295] = sel [Bst.], Rif aor. i-sera “entendre” [Bst.], Shawya aor. i-sela “entendre” [Bst.] | Qabyle sel “entendre” [Dlt. 1982, 771], Zwawa aor. i-sela “entendre” [Bst.] || EBrb.: Ghadames e-sl “entendre” [Lnf. 1973, 335, #1450], Siwa sōl “entendre” [Lst. 1931, 231], Audġila eśēl ~ āsel “sentire” [Prd. 1960, 174] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-sel “entendre” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1819], EWlm. ā-slu & Ayr ā-slu ~ ə-slu “entendre, écouter, apprendre” [PAM 2003, 713] (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 294; 1887, 410; Rsl. 1979, 29, #23) || PCh. *s₃-l “to hear” [JS] > WCh. *s-l [JI] = *s-y-l ~ *s-l-y “hören” [GT]: Ron: Sha sālāy [Jng.], Kulere syel ~ sel [Jng.] = sēl [IL] (Ron: Jng. 1968, 7, §58; 1970, 392) | Maha solī “to hear” [Nwm. apud Mkr. and JI 1994 II, 184]. This root is eventually of common origin with AA *S-r “to hear” [GT] > Agaw: Waag dial. šər “to hear” [Blz.] || SOM.: Ari (?)ésər- “to hear, listen” [Bnd. 1994, 152], Bako eser “to hear” [Mkr.], Ubamer eser “to hear” [Mkr.], Galila eser “to hear” [Mkr.] || CCh.: Zeghwana carāka “entendre” [Blz.] || ECh.: Jegu ser- “sehen” [Jng. 1961, 117]. In the etymological lit., the reflexes of the two AA roots have often been confused, cf. Rsl. 1979, 29, #23 (Brb.-WCh.); Bynon 1984, 280, #47 (Brb.-Ron); Mkr. 1987, 233, §38 (Maha-SOM.); 1989 MS, 2 (SOM.-Ron); Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 5, #10 & 1999, 59, §10 (Eg.-Waag-Zeghwana); JI 1994 I, 90 (WCh.-Tuareg). Note that HECu.: Burji sēr-is- (caus.) “to learn” can hardly belong here, since H.-J. Sasse (1982, 164, cf. also Lsl. 1988, 199) derived HECu. *sēr-a “law” [Hds. 1989, 420] from Oromo sēr-a “traditional law”. Other suggestions for the origin of Eg. sġ3 are either less convincing or evidently false: **(1)** A. Erman (1892, 117): ~ Hbr. š^cy “umherschauen”. **(2)** E. Zyhlarz (1934, 115, 118, fn. 3) equated Eg. sġ3 with Brb. *z-r-y “sehen, wahrnehmen” [GT] (Brb.: e.g. Bst. 1883, 302, 314; 1885, 198; 1887, 430). In principle, PBrb. *z- can derive from PAA *c- (Mlt. 1991, 242) yielding Eg. s-. **(3)** C. T. Hodge (1961, 36) compared it with NOm.: Mocha šāwwi(yé) “to not know” [Lsl.]. Absurd. **(4)** G. R. Castellino (1984, 18): ~ Sum. si ≈ Akk. nūru “Licht”, nwr “leuchten, hell sein”. Fully unreal. **(5)** Th. Schneider (1993, 180; 1997, 205, §90) affiliated it with Sem. *š^cr (Hbr. š^cr “wissen von”, OSA s^cr “sich einer Sache bewußt sein”, Ar. šā^cara “erkennen, wissen, verstehen”) admitting that “dessen ägypt. Äquivalent aber auch šġ3 sein kann”.

msjn.t “ein Körperteil am Unterleib” (Med. hapax: Pap. Ebers 106:16, Wb II 143, 8; GHWb 363) = “navel (?)” (Ebell) = “Harnblase oder Schließenmuskel” (Vycichl 1938, 157) = “(not yet identified)” (Lefébvre 1952, 57, §64) = “spermatic cord (?)” (Walker 1996, 270) = “Bauchfell” (HAM 839).

NB: The word occurs in connection with the “water” in the lower trunk of the body, related specifically with the urine.

- Meaning debated. Etymology uncertain. H. Grapow (1914, 28) saw in it an m- prefix formation, but was unable to identify the underlying root. W. Vycichl (l.c.) too explained Eg. msjn.t from an unattested *√sjn which he compared with Sem. *-tyin- “urinare” vs. *tayn-(at)- “urina” [Frz.] = *-tīn- “to urinate” [Dlg.] > i.a. Ar. ma-tān-at- [~~*ma-tyan-at-~~] “1. vessie, 2. utérus” [BK II 1062] = “Harnblase” [Vcl.] = “vescica” [Frz.] = “bladder” [Dlg.] and Gees maśyant “bladder” [Lsl.].

NB1: Attested in Akk. *šīānum > šānu “urinieren, pissen” [AHW 1225] || Ug. tn-t “urine” [DUL 924], Hbr. šayin “urine” [KB 1479], Syr. tīnō ~ tūnō [~~*tayn-at-~~] “urina” [Frz.] = tīnā “urine” [Dlg.] || Gees šēna “to urinate” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Frz. 1964, 264, #2.15; Lsl. 1987, Blv. 1993, 41, #155; Voigt 1994, 105).

NB2: A. B. Dolgopolsky (1983, 136, #9.1) equated Sem. *tyn with ECu. *siṅḍ- [Sasse] = *siṅḍ- [Dlg.]: LECu. *siṅḍ- “urine” [GT]: Oromo fiñḥ-āni [f- reg. < *s-], Konso & Gidole siṅḍ-ā, Arbore iy-siṅḍ-aye, Dasenech (Geleba) sinn-a | HECu.: Burji sin-au “to urinate” (ECu.: Black 1974, 216; Sasse 1979, 24, 26).

NB3: Does ECh.: Smr. mósiny ~ misiny (m) “rein” [Jng. 1993, 45] also represent an m- prefix form of AA *č-y-n?

msw.t (OK) > **msj.t** (MK) “Abendbrot, auch allgemein: Mahlzeit, Speise” (PT, Wb II 142, 11–16) = “Abendmahl” (Grapow 1942, 77) = “supper” (FD 117) = “1. Abendbrot, Mahlzeit, 2. Tag (Nacht) des Abendbrots” (GHWb 362).

NB: W. A. Ward (1981, 364–5, §16) supposes to have pointed out the original masc. noun mswj in a late NK Deir el-Medineh ostrakon with the primary mng. “evening” (Ward) = “Abend” (GHWb 362; WD III 56), whence he explained the secondary sense “supper” attested in the more widespread msw.t.

- Akin to Sem. *mušy- [Frz.] = *√ms,y “evening” [Faber] = *mVšy- [Mlt.]: Oakk. mušjum “night” [Gelb 1973, 184] > Akk. mūšu & mušitu “Nacht” [AHW 683, 687] vs. mašû “to spend the night” [CAD m1, 401], Ebl. mušum [*mūšum] ~ var. mesu [*mīšu(m)] “night” [Krebernik 1983, 32, §817; Frz. 1984, 129, 147] || NAram. (< Ar.?): Ma^llūla √msy “sich verspäten (b-) mit”, msō(ya), pl. msayō “Abend” [Brgstr. 1921, 59], Baḥ^la √msy: msō “Abend” [Correll 1969, 170] || Ar. msw: masā “3. venir le soir, au soir, 4. se trouver au soir”, IV “1. se trouver au soir, entrer dans l’heure du soir”, masā?- “1. soir(ée)”, musy- “soir”, musayy- “soirée” [BK II 1107–8] || ES *māset “evening”, *msy “to become evening” [Lsl.] > Gees māset ~ māsyat “evening, twilight”, denom. masya (māsyä) “to become evening” [Lsl.], Amh. māšet “evening”, māššä “to become evening”, amāššä “to spend the evening” [Lsl.], Gafat māsiet ~ māštä “evening, night” [Lsl.], Harari māša “to be evening”, māšet “evening” [Lsl.], Grg.:

Chaha & Ennemor & Gyeto mäšä “to be evening” etc. [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1969, 57; 1979 III, 432; Sem.: Faber 1984, 203, §13; Lsl. 1987, 368; Mlt. 2005, 93) ||| Brb. *əns “passer la nuit” > *mə-nsu “souper, prendre le repas du soir” [Lst.] = *√n-s-y (via partial assim. from **√m-s-y?) [Vcl.] = *əns vs. *i-nsa “to spend the night” [Ajh. 1987, 52] = *√n-s-w < **√m-s-w “to spend the night” [Dlg.] > *ma-nsaw “evening meal” [Djk.] = *ǎ-nsīh “passer la nuit” [PAM]: NBrb.: Shilh ns “dormir, passer la nuit, s’êteindre, héberger, éteindre” [Jst. 1914, 145] = i-mənsi “repas du soir” [Lst.] = əns “passer la nuit, être éteint” [Jordan 1934, 97], Sus əns “passer la nuit, être éteint” [Lst. 1921, 290], Tazerwalt əns “passer la nuit” [Bst.] = ʿns “nächtigen, übernachten, zur Ruhe gehen, auslöschen (intr.)” [Stumme 1899, 213] | Mzg. nes “1. passer la nuit, se produire, se dérouler toute la nuit, 2. être de la veille (pain, repas)” [Tf. 1991, 476] > i-mənsi “repas du soir” [Lst.], Zayan & Sgugu ɛs ~ ɛns “passer la nuit” [Lbg. 1924, 573], Izdeg əns “passer la nuit” [Mrc. 1937, 177] | Sgrs. əns “passer la nuit” [Pellat 1955, 121] = ns “to spend the night” [AM 1971, 405], Rif nes “passer la nuit” [Tlm. 1998, 113], Iqrayen & Bettiwa & Temsaman & Tuzin & Bqy. ʔns ~ e-ʔns “passer la nuit, avoir passé la nuit” [Brn. 1917, 96] = əns [Bst.], Bettiwa əns “passer la nuit”, a-mənsi “dîner” [Brn. 1911, 186], Izn. & Snh. əns “passer la nuit”, Izn. munsu “dîner”, a-mənsi “le dîner” [Rns. 1932, 392], Shenwa əns “passer la nuit”, munsu “souper”, a-mənsi “repas du soir” [Lst. 1912, 148], Tuat & Gurara əns “passer la nuit” [Bst. 1887, 422], Halima i-mənsi “souper” [Bst.], Mzab mənsiw “souper” [Bst.] = əns “1. passer la nuit, 2. être éteint, 3. n’être pas frais (pain, etc.)”, mmsu “prendre le repas du soir, souper” [Dlh. 1984, 139], Wargla əns “passer la nuit” [Bst.] = a-mənsi “repas du soir” [Lst.] = əns “1. passer la nuit, 2. par ext. être rassis (pain)” [Dlh. 1987, 224], Nefusa mənsi “souper” [Bst.] = insū “er hat übernachtet” = əns “passer la nuit”, tə-mə-nsi-ut “gîte de nuit” [Lst. 1931, 268] = əns “trattenersi di sera o di notte”, pernottare” [Bgn. 1931, 275] | Qabyle əns “1. passer la nuit, 2. être éteint, s’êteindre, 3. désenfler”, i-mənsi “souper” [Dlt. 1982, 575–6], Zwawa əns “passer la nuit”, i-mənsi “repas du soir, souper” [Bst.; Blf. 1910, 214], Bugi əns “passer la nuit” [Bst.] (NBrb.: Bst. 1890, 322) || EBrb.: Ghadames a-misi [loss of *-n-] “repas du soir (cena)” [Lst. & Prd. after Mtl. 1904, 159] = a-misi “repas du soir”, i-mənsi “souper”, mənsaw “souper (vb.)” [Lnf. 1973, 213, §1015] = a-mīsī [< *-minsV with compensatory length], pl. misiwən “souper, repas du soir” [Lnf. 1973, 217, #1030],

Sokna íns “pernottare” [Srn. 1924–25, 23], Audjila iš [< *ins] “dormire” > a-mišiú “cena” [Prd. 1960, 162] || WBrb.: Zenaga enš “passer la nuit”, ienšē “il a passé la nuit”, menši “souper” [Bst.] = menši [Zhl. 1942–43, 88] = $\sqrt{n-s/\text{š}}$ “passer la nuit, se coucher, être couché”, mənši “repas du soir, souper”, i-munša^h “repas” [Ncl. 1953, 205, 237] = enši “passer la nuit” [Chn. & TC 2000, 285] || SBrb.: Ahaggar ens “to spend the night”, a-mensi [Fcd. 1951–2, 1411, 1414] = a-mənsu “repas du soir” [Lst.], EWlm. ăṅsu & Ayr əṅsu “1. passer la nuit (à un lieu), 2. se coucher, 3. dormir, 4. se trouver (dans un lieu)”, EWlm. mǎṅsǎw “prendre comme repas du soir” [PAM 1998, 220, 255; 2003, 624], Tudalt & Tadghaq ǎns “1. to pass the night (in), 2. lie down, 3. sleep, 4. be in a place, 5. be put aside” [Sudlow 2001, 152] (Brb.: Bst. 1890, 60; 1909, 248; Lst. 1931, 297) || NAgaw (< ES): Bilin miz-ē, pl. amzúy [unexpected -z-] “Abend” [Rn. 1887, 275] = mize, pl. amzuy “evening” [Flm.] || CCh.: Gudu məšü “shadow” [Krf. 1981, #261] | Lgn. méése “Nachmittag” [Lks. 1936, 109] || ECh.: (?) EDng. nèse “abends aufbleiben (und sich dabei unterhalten)” [Ebs. 1979, 126; 1987, 75]. From AA *m-s “night” [GT] = *m̄s/*m̄əs “night, late evening” [Djk., cf. Voigt 2002, 276] = *-mas- “to become evening” [Ehret]. AP: Barea meséte “Nacht” [Rn.], Tubu mašá “Abendmahlzeit” [Lks. 1941, 183].

The same biconsonantal root (extended with *ʔ-) may be found in the reflexes of AA *ʔ-m-s [GT] = *ʔamsV̄y- [Mlt.] > Sem. *ʔamš- [GT] = *ʔamši(l/n)- (sic) [Mlt.]: Akk. amšali/a > anšala “gestern” (-li influenced by timāli) [AHW 45] || Hbr. ʔemeš “1. die verwichene Nacht, 2. acc.: letzte Nacht, gestern Abend” [GB] = “last night, yesterday” [KB 68] || Ar. ʔams- “yesterday (noun), the day before the present day by one night”, ʔamsi “yesterday (adv.)” [Lane 99] = ʔams- “dies hesternus, heri” [Rn.] vs. ʔamsi “Nachmittag, gestern abend” [GB] || MSA (from Ar.): Hrs. yemšī “yesterday” [Jns.], Jbl. ʔəmšín “yesterday” [Jns. 1981, 3] = ʔəmšín “hier” [SS], Mhr. yimšī “hier” (yi-influenced by yimo “aujourd’hui”) [Jahn, Lsl.] = yəmšē “yesterday” [Jns.] = yemšī ~ yemšē “yesterday” [SS], Sqt. ʔimšín “hier” [Lsl.] = ʔəmšín [Jns., SS], Hobyot ʔmši “hier” [SS] (MSA: SS 1997, 394; Sem.: GB 52; Lsl. 1938, 65; 1945, 164; 1949, 49; 1956, 218; 1962, 1; 1969, 21; 1979 III, 432; Caquot 1954–57, 97; Frz. 1965, 147, #3.27; Apl. 1977, 37; Mlt. 2005, 93) || Bed. (Lsl.: < Ar.) ʔamas “heute Abend”, ʔamse “heute” [Almkvist] = amás “der späte Abend, die Dunkelheit, Finsternis, Nacht”, amsé ~ amsí “heute” [Rn. 1895, 19] =

ámse “today, one day”, mäs (m.pl.) “late evening, night” [Rpr. 1928, 218] = amass “time from sunset to sunrise” [Huber] = ámse “oggi” [Cifoletti], Ammar’ar ?amáš “by night” [Lsl. 1979 III, 432; 1988, 96] || SCu.: WRift *amasi “night” [Ehret]: Iraqw imsi [Flm./Dlg.] = âmsi “middle of night” [Flm.] = amsi “wee hours of the night”, ame-šemu “noon” [Ehret], Gorowa amsi “night” [Wtl.], Alagwa & Burunge amasi “night” [Wtl., Ehret] (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 24, #76) | ERift: Qwadza amasiya “tomorrow” [Ehret] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 297, #104).

LRr.: Rn. 1873, 258 (Eg.-Ar. with a false Teda parallel); 1874, 143 (Barea-Eg.-Tigre); Erman 1892, 112 after Brugsch (Eg.-Sem.); GB 52 (Eg.-Sem.); Kuentz, BIFAO 30 (1930), 855 (Eg.-Sem.); Brk. 1932, 800 (Eg.-Sem.-Brb.); Clc. 1936, #416 (Eg.-Sem.); Vrg. 1945, 141, #16.b.4 (Eg.-Sem.); Chn. 1947, #472 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Bilin-Bed.); Vcl. 1951, 70 (Nefusa-Eg.-Ar.); 1958, 376 (Eg.-Ar.); Djk. 1965, 42 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Bed.); 1975, 124 (PCu.-PSem.); Flm. 1969, 22 (SCu.-Bed.-Bilin-Sem.-Eg.); Lacau 1970, 39, #80 (Eg.-Sem.); Dlg. 1973, 142 (Bed.-SCu.-Sem.-Eg.-Brb.); 1990, 213 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Bed.); Ward 1981, 364–365, #16 (Eg.-Sem.); Faber 1984, 203, §13 (Sem.-SCu.-Eg.); Mlt. 1984, 158, #10; 1991, 259, #28.1 (Sem.-Eg.-CCh.); Behrens 1984–5, 194–5, §5.4 (Brb.-Cu.-Sem.-Eg.-Kefoid); Djk. et al. 1986, 63; Djk. 1992, 33 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Bed.-SCu.-Mocha); Lsl. 1987, 368 (Sem.-Bed.); Blv. 1989, 11 (Eg.-Sem.); Sasse 1991, 271, #1.4 (Sem.-Bed.-SCu.); HSED (Sem.-Gudu-Bed.-SCu.); Ehret 1995, 310, #596 (Sem.-Eg.-Rift-Yemsa); PAM 2003, 624 (Brb.-Sem.); Mlt. 2005, 93 (Sem.-Eg.-Gudu); 2005, 371, §60 (Akk.-Irq.); Blz. 2006, 370 (Bed.-SCu.-Zys.-Brb.-Eg.-Sem.). NB1: Although the common origin of Sem. *mušy- and *ʔamš- is commonly accepted in the lit. (e.g. GB, Lsl., Caquot, Djk., Dlg., Mlt. above), A. Faber (1984, 203, §13) regarded it as “unclear”.

NB2: ES: Grg.: Chaha & Ezha məsarä, Ennemor & Gyeto məsaʔarä “night” also derive – as stated by W. Leslau (1979 III, 430) – “probably from the root msy ‘be evening’... with an enigmatic suffix -rā” (cf. also Mlt. 2005, 113). The same pertains to Grg.: End. masakkä “night” [Lsl.], in which – to quote again W. Leslau (1979 III, 427) – “one recognizes the element massa for ‘evening, night’, but the ending -kkä is enigmatic” (cf. Mlt. 2005, 122).

NB3: Note that Bed. mehäs “das Mittagsmahl” [Rn. 1895, 166] || NAgaw: Bilin medä, Hamir mesä, Qwara mezyä “das Mittagessen gegen 11 Uhr vormittags” (NAgaw: Rn. 1887, 263 with false Eg. parallel) || LECu.: Orm. mizí “das Mittagessen” [Rn.] = misi “Mahlzeit” [Foot 1913, 44] = misí “meal, lunch” [Gragg 1982, 288] || NOm.: Kefoid (< Amh.) *miš-ō “midday meal” (orig. *“(evening meal)”) [GT]: Kaffä məš-ō “das Mittagessen, Hauptmahlzeit des Tages, Mahlzeit” [Rn. 1888, 320] = miš-ō “convito, banchetto” [Crl. 1951, 474] = “midday meal” [Lsl.], Mocha mišo “midday meal” [Lsl. 1959, 42], Sns. míso [Rn.] do not belong here (as mistakenly suggested in Behrens 1984–85, 194–5 and Djk. et al. 1986, 63), since these were eventually borrowed from Eth.-Sem., cf. Amh. məsa “midday meal”, Geez & Tigre & Tna. məsaḥ “meal” < ES *msh “to smear, anoint” (Apl. 1977, 29/71; Lsl. 1979 III 426).

NB4: As pointed out by M. Cohen (1947, #472) and A. B. Dolgopolsky (1990, 213), PBrb. *-ns- is due to an assimilation of an earlier **-ms-. But Dolgopolsky (l.c.) mistakenly explained EBrb.: Gdm. a-mīsī from an irrela Brb. *mīsī (sic).

NB5: A.Ju. Militarev (1991, 259, §28.1) assumed a kinship of our AA root to that present in Brb. *ti-mVsi “fire”. Dubious.

NB6: A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1973, 142) reconstructed PCu. *^cAm(A)S- based on the unconvincing comparison of Bed. √^ʔ-m-s with LECu.: Som. ^cašo [Rn.] | HECu.: Sid.

& Drs. hāša [Bnd.] | Yaaku ačei [Hobley, Grb.] and NOm. *hačč- [GT after Dlg]. NB7: W. Leslau (1979 III, 432) assumed both the Bed. and SCu. forms to have been borrowed from Ar.

NB8: Ch. Ehret (1980 l.c.) falsely analyzed SCu. *ʔamasV (rendered lit. “at night”) as **āma- (unattested) extended “with *-Vs- probably of the locative”.

NB9: For WRift: Asa eramesa “night” [Ehret 1980, 387] cf. rather Eg. mšrw, which, besides, was erroneously identified in PAM 2003, 624 with the Brb. & Sem. reflexes of AA *m-s.

NB10: Should we assume in CCh.: MM *n-š “dormir” [Mch. 1953, 167] a process (*nš- < *mS-?) supposed in Brb. *-ns?

NB11: J. Lippert (1906, 342, §27) affiliated WCh.: Hausa sansani “Lager” [Lippert] = sànsàní “1. war camp, 2. the camp of an emir when travelling, 3. a halo round the moon or sun” [Brg. 1934, 901] with Brb. (sic) sens (caus.) < ens “die Nacht zubringen”.

NB12: Is AA *m-s “night” [GT] remotely connected with NBrb.: Shilh-Sus a-mušša “noir”, i-mšiu “être noir” [Dst. 1925, 273] = i-mušša “il est noir”, i-mšiu “être noir”, a-mušša “noir” [Lst. 1942, 123, §250] | Ntifa muššu “noir” [Lst.] ||| CCh.: Paduko musa “schwarz” [Lks. 1937, 128] | Mafa madz- “noircir” [Brt.-Brunet 1990, 221]? Note the anomaly with PBrb. **√[m]-s-y. E. Laoust (l.c.) was disposed to affiliate the Brb. word with Brb. *a-mušš “cat”.

NB13: A.Ju. Militarev (1984, 158; 1991, 259) combined the Sem.-Eg.-Brb. word for “night” with the names of astral bodies, cf. NOM.: Yemsa màsk-ō “morning star, Venus” [Ehr.] ||| CCh.: Bata mošē “sun” [Mlt.] | Musgu mešēḡ (-θ-) “star” [Müller 1886, 400; Lks. 1941, 67], Pus meežek (m), maažakiy (f), pl. mežežer “étoile” [Trn. 1991, 104–5], Mbara mižer “étoile” [TSL 1986, 272] | Sukur mašin “morning” [Mlt.] | Masa mišek “étoile” [Ctc. 1983, 106]. Semantically uncertain, but cf. Ar. masy-ān- “bright star” < *evening star” [Mlt.]. A.B. Dolgopol’skij (1964, 54, fn. 5), in turn, related CCh.: Bata mošē “sun” with Sem. *šams- “sun”.

msbb “1. sich zuwenden zu (ḥr), 2. (GR) allgemein: gelangen, kommen nach (r/m)” (MK, Wb II 143, 14; WD III 56: cf. SAK 22, 1995, 299f., n. 36) = “to turn to (ḥr), serve s’one with (ḥr), deal (?) with (ḥn^o)” (FD 117) = “to turn (head) toards, reach” (Smith 1979, 162) = “to have dealings with” (DLE I 241) = “to turn towards” (PL 461).

NB1: Cf. msbb “*verhandeln mit (ḥn^o)” (1st IMP, ÄWb I 564 after JEA 16, 1940, 195, l. 10, t. 29).

NB2: For ms[b]b “zugetan sein” in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) see Osing 1998, 77, n. k.

● Origin disputed.

- 1. F. von Calice (1936, 277, #203.a) and A.G. Belova (1987, 277; 1989, 11, #3.3.3) derived Eg. msbb (via m- prefix) from a hypothetical *sbb equated with Sem. *sbb “to turn (a)round”.

NB: Cf. (?) Akk. sibbu “Gürteltuch” [WUS] = “Gürtel(Schlange)” [AHW 1226] || Ug. sbb “um etwas herumgehen” [WUS #1883] = G “1. to turn round, go round and round, go through, 2. turn (towards), 3. turn into”, N “to be changed into”, Š “to cause to rotate, spin/turn” [DUL 752], Hbr. sbb qal “1. sich wenden, drehen (v. einer Türe), 2. verwandelt werden, 3. herumgehen, kreisen, umherwandeln, 4. sich ringsum aufstellen, 5. umwandeln, umgeben, umspannen, umfließen, feindlich umringen”, hifil: hissīb “(lēb: die Gunst) zuwenden” [GB 533–4] = qal “to turn oneself around, reverse, go around, perform a ceremonial circuit, surround, buzz

around (bees), move around, encircle, flow around, go around (avoiding), turn towards, slip through, wander about” [KB 739] | Ar. sabab- “1. corde, 2. lien, attache”, sibb- “turban” [BK I 1038].

- **2.** H. Smith (l.c.), followed by P. Wilson (PL 461), erroneously derived it from Eg. zbj “to lead” (Wb IV 82, 1–2), which is not supported by the orthography, let alone the obscure function of m-.

msbb “1. (stela Wien 5857, 3rd cent. BC) loben, 2. (XVIII.) freundlich sein zu (ḥr)” (XVIII., Wb II 143, 12–13).

- Origin obscure.
- **1.** Presumably related to Eg. msbb “sich zuwenden zu” (Wb, above) as supposed in Wb II 143 and by F. von Calice (1936, 277, #203.a) as well as by G. Vittmann (1995, 299–300, n. 36) who assumed a lit. sense “sich jemandem freundlich zuwenden” (Clc.) = “das sich Zuwenden” (Vittmann).
- **2.** The Russian linguists derived it as an m- prefix from the antonymous AA *sVb “1. хула, 2. хвала” based on the comparison of evidently unrelated roots that can hardly be cognate.

LIT.: SISAJa III, 11, #14 (Sem.-Bed.-ECu.-WCh.-Eg.-Ayr); Blv. 1987, 277; 1989, 11, #2.1 (Eg.-Sem.).

NB1: These can be grouped as follows: **(1)** Sem.: Ar. sbb “3. injurier qqn., lui dire des injures, gronder qqn., faire des reproches à qqn.”, ma-sabb-at- ~ mi-sabb- “qui dit des injures ou gronde souvent, médisant” [BK I 1039], Mehri sbb: səb “to insult, miscall, abuse, curse” [Jns. 1987, 338], Soqotri √sbb “calomnier” [Lsl. 1938, 280] ||| Bed. sebib “tadeln, strafen” [Rn. 1895, 194]. **(2)** AA *S-b “to deceive” [GT] > ECu. *sab- “to deceive” [Sasse 1982, 164–5] > esp. Somali sásab- “überreden, beschwatzen, durch Schmeichelei und Künste jemanden zu etwas bewegen, durch erdichtete Gründe beruhigen” [Rn. 1902, 351] ||| WCh.: Pero cábà “to lie” [Frj. 1985, 23] = səhá [Stl.], Bole sówtà [< *sob-ta] “Lüge” [Mkr. 1987, 239]. **(3)** AA *S-b “to be angry” [GT] > Akk. s/šabāsu ~ šabāšu “sich zornig abwenden, zürnen” [AHW 1118] ||| WCh.: (?) Hausa māsàbàččí “a quarrelsome person” [Brg. 1934, 776] | Warji šib- & Diri šubu “to be angry” [Skn. 1977, 10]. **(4)** WCh.: Hausa sààbóó “any heinous sin against God” [Brg. 1934, 877] | Tangale sábyo “sinfulness, wrongfulness, moral misbehaviour” [Jng. 1991, 139] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 175). **(5)** SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr a-šəb “être enchanté, ravi de, enthousiasmé pour” [PAM 2003, 699] has nothing in common with the roots listed above, being a late loan from Ar. ʿašaba.

NB2: A. G. Belova (1987, 277; 1989, 11, #2.1) postulated in Eg. msbb a semantic opposition on the analogy of Russian хвалить “to praise” ~ хулить “to abuse, revile, belittle”. Interestingly, a similar opposition is attested in Somali sásab- [Rn.] < ECu. *sab- [Sasse] (above).

mssp.wj (wood det.) “wohl der Riegel, das mit einem vertikalen Griff verbundene Ringelpaar, das beim Schließen vor die Tür gezogen wird, sich also der Tür ‘zuwendet’” (V. 2x, Kaplony 1972, 203).

- Affiliated by P. Kaplony (l.c.) with Eg. msbb “sich zuwenden zu (ḥr)” (MK, Wb, q.v.).

mspr.t (?) > **msr.t** “die Spanten o.ä. des Schiffes” (CT V 135a–b, cf. Urk. V 184:8,11–12 & 188:5,8–10, Wb II 164, 14; GHwB 364) = “une partie des couples d’un bateau, probablement les nervures d’un des bords du bâtiment” (Jéquier 1911, 63–64, §21) = “Schiffspanten” (1st IMP-MK, Fecht 1960, 109, §206, II.b.1 & 180, §373; Schenkel 1999, 90) = “(mng. unknown)” (AECT II 38, 34, spell 398, n. 31, III 203 index; DCT 183) = “une partie du navire” (AL 78.1856) = “membrures” (Barguet 1986, 353, spell 398) = “ribs (?), frames (?)” (Jones 1988, 169, §74–75 with further disc. and lit.).

NB1: As pointed out by G. Jéquier (l.c.), its det. (e.g., on Cairo coffin 28127, MK) indicates “*bien clairement*” the “*pièces de bois recourbées et assujetties au moyen de chevilles*”. The rendering is confirmed also by the commentary to this word (spr.w js.t wsjr “les côtes d’Isis et d’Osiris”). Jéquier surmised the uncertain wtg. to testify to an old word no longer employed in the MK, which was replaced from the NK by m3s.tj “pièce de bois unique sur laquelle sont fixées d’autres pièces, également en bois... et qui ne peut évidemment pas avoir le même sens de ‘couples’...”.

NB2: The overwhelming majority of its varieties are attested without -p- (msr.t, cf. Urk. V 184:12 & 188:10), which is regarded by most of the authors (Wb, Jones, GHwB) as an error for (*m)spr.t (occurring only in CT V 135b, M5C, Cairo coffin 42826), although a miswriting in nearly all instances is rather unlikely. Instead, G. Fecht (1960, 109, §206, II.b.1 & 180, §373) surmises an erosive shift of the cluster *pr- > *-3r- (*m’s p̄r̄.t > *m̄s̄ p̄r̄.t > *m̄s̄ 3r̄.t) which he compared with that seen in Amarna cuneiform (14th cent.) -ḥu[?]ru- < Eg. ḥpr.w (KMAV 14, 58, 89; Ranke, ZÄS 56, 1920, 74, fn. 3; Edel 1948, 14f.). The question is whether this change can be projected to the MK.

- G. Fecht (1960 l.c.) explained it as the m- prefix form of Eg. spr “Rippe”, which seems to be commonly accepted (Wb l.c., Jones l.c., GHwB l.c.).

mspr.t “Zufluchtsort (für Schiffe)” (MK, Wb II 144, 7) = “Ankunft” (Amduat, Hornung 1963 II, 15, n. 36; Meeks 1994, 258) = “haven, landing-place” (Petrie 1900, 48; Fischer 1968, 140; cf. Jones 1988, 206, §10) = “der Ankunftsort” (Edfu, Budde & Kurth 1994, 13, §55). NB: Jones (1988, 169, §74) rendered some of its exx. as mspr.t “ribs (?)” (q.v.).

- Nomen loci of Eg. spr “kommen zu, gelangen nach, erreichen” (PT, Wb IV 102–3), lit. “a place which enables arrival” (Jones).

LIT.: Grapow 1914, 28; Hornung 1963 II, 15, n. 36; Jones 1988, 206, §10.

NB1: H. Grapow (l.c.) and H. Smith (1979, 161) mentioned further possible m- derivatives of the same root, e.g., mspr “Name des dritten und sechzehnten (mspr sn-nw) Tages des Mondmonats” (GR, Wb II 144, 3; Grapow), msprj.t “name of the 6th hour of the night and its goddess” (Smith), mspr “ein Heiligtum” (GR, Wb II 144, 6), mspr.tj.w “Art Arbeiter oder Handwerker” (GR, Wb II 144, 6), which, however, should be subject to further study. Cf. also OK mspr “?” (in einem Dorfnamen)” (Wb II 144, 5; GHwB 363), mspr (CT IV 8, AECT I 205, spell 270, n. 3 with a hint on Wb II 144, 5–6), and the equally enigmatic mspr in CT VI 286 (AECT II 234, spell 660, n. 50: “of the three mspr words of Wb II 144, 3–6, none fit here”).

nb2: The etymology of Eg. spr is not evident: (1) Usually identified with Sem.: Akk. špr “to send” [CAD š1, 430] || Ar. safara I “11. se mettre en route”, II “2. envoyer, expédier”, safr- “voyageur” [BK I 1098] || Geez safara “to camp” [Lsl. 1987, 489] || Jibbali sfōr “to travel” [Jns. 1981, 224], Soqotri sfōr “voyager” [Lsl. 1938, 289]. For Sem.-Eg.: Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; Alb. 1927, #74; MM 1983, 226; Castellino 1984, 16. The Sem.-Eg. parallel was equated in SISAJa III, 8, 38 i.a. also with CCh.: Fali-Gili sūvūri “ausgehen” [Krf.] and falsely even with WCh.: Ngizim saāfār “3. bringing water from a long distance” [Schuh 1981, 142], which is but an Ar. loan via Kanuri. (2) Albright 1918, 244, #91; Ember 1926, 311, #9.2; 1930, #8.a.6; Vrg. 1945, 142, #16.c.2; Conti 1978, 27: Eg. spr ~ Sem.: JAram. sōpār “(an der) Grenze (gelegener Ort)” [Levy 1924 III 574] | Ar. šafara “arriver au bord, à l’extrémité de qqch., effleurer”, šafir- “bord, extrémité, crête (de toute chose), lisière d’une vallée” [BK I 1247]. Although this comparison is hindered by the irregular Eg. s- vs. Ar. š- (for which, however, cf. Eg. sp.t ~ Sem. *šap-at- “lip”), it is semantically justifiable, cf. Fr. arriver < Lat. ad “to” + rīpa “river-bank”, Akk. kišādu “Ufer” < kašādu “erreichen”.

msm.w (pl.) “eine Landbezeichnung (neben Städten und Gauen)” (PT 993b hapax, Wb II 144, 9; GHWb 363; ÄWb I 564) = “Gau(?)” (ÜKAPT VI 134) = “(lands, mng. unknown)” (AEPT 168, utt. 480, n. 2).

- Mng. and etymology obscure. GT: only guesses can be made.

nb1: Cf. perhaps either (1) ES: Geez mas^c “rural area” [Lsl. 1987, 362; no Sem. etym.] (ext. -^c?) or (2) NOM.: Mocha māšo “highland”, māša(yé) “to be highland” [Lsl. 1959, 42] (3) or WCh.: Bokkos māšwà “Stadt” [Jng. 1970, 144].

nb2: Any connection to EBrb.: Nfs. ta-mésna “fuori” [Prd.] || Gdm. ta-mésna “deserto” [Prd.] = ta-ma/cсна, pl. ti-masni-wīn “le désert (hors de l’oasis)” [Lanfry 1973, 219, #1040], Audjila ta-mésna “fuori” [Prd.] || SBrb.: EWlm. māsnu “être dénué, désertique (région)” [PAM 2003, 559] (Brb.: Prd. 1960, 166; 1961, 301, fn. 2)? Ext. *-n?

msn.w “Harpunierer (besonders von Nilpferden), Harpunenjäger” (CT, Wb II 145, 4; Sethe 1922, 137–8; FÄW 199: archaic period) = “harpooner (of hippopotamus)” (EG 1927, 510, V32; AEO II 90*, §190A; FD 117) = “ceux qui participent à la chasse à l’hippopotame” (Vernus, LÄ IV 108).

nb: K. Sethe (ZÄS 54, 1918, 50f.) correctly rejected deriving Cpt. (SB) ВЄСННТ “Schmied” (KHW 28) from Eg. msn.w (cf. Spg. 1919–20, 42–43, §33, fn. 8).

- From the same (?) root:

(1) Perhaps msn “Name des Schriftzeichens: der korbformige Schwimmer an der Harpunenleine” (LP, Wb II 145, 1) = “wickerwork frail (possibly also used as a float by hippopotamus-hunters)” (EG 1927, 510, V32) = “name of the sign representing a reed basket for transport of dates” (CED 91) = “une bourriche tressée, et, sans doute, le flotteur attaché à la corde du harpon” (Vernus, LÄ IV 108–9, fn. 1) = “a woven basket and also the float attached to the harpoon” (PL

462) > (?) Cpt. (S) **ΜΟCÑ, ΜΟCÑЄ** (m) “Korb, Gefäß” (Spg. KHW 65; Wst. KHW 102) = “a vessel or dry measure” (CD 186b; CED 91) = “nom d’un récipient” (DELIC 122).

NB: As A. H. Gardiner (EG I.c., n. 3) confessed, the alleged connection of the sign to harpoon(ers) is merely “a guess based partly on the use of the sign to determine msnw ‘hippopotamus-hunter’, partly on the occurrence of a very late word bb... mentioned among the equipment (spears, ropes, etc.) of the msnw... But possibly the sign is really the det. of msn ‘weave’, ‘plait’, though not so actually found, in which case it would only be phon. det. in msnw ‘hippopotamus-hunter’”.

(2) msn “das Harpunieren (?)” (I., Wb II 145, 9). Existence dubious. NB: For the supposed verb *msn cf. Godron, ASAE 54, 1957, 195–198 (demonstrating the non-existence of this gloss, the m- and the alleged msn hrgl. in its sole ex. being due to a misreading of hrw and jb, resp.); Vergote, CdE 51, 1976, 276 (deriving -εμσυνις of Gk. Ἀρεμσυνις from *massānu “le harpeneur”).

(3) msn (OK) > msn.t (GR) “Name einer Kultstätte des Horus von Edfu” (OK, Wb II 145, 2) = “Harpunierstätte” (Barta, LÄ III 34) and hence msn.j “der von msn (als Beiwort des Horus)” (OK, Wb II 145, 3).

NB1: H. Kees (1956, 213, n. 1, 419, 426) rejected its interpretation as a toponym, which has been disproved by K. Zibelius (1978, 102–5), who localized it primarily in the middle of the Delta in the region of Sais and Buto.

NB2: Eg. hr.w msn.j “Horus of msn” is presumably reflected in Gk. Ὠρεμσυνις (Osing 1978, 69).

● Etymology disputed.

- 1. K. Sethe (ZÄS 54, 1918, 50–54) regarded Eg. *msn as a denominative m- form deriving from Eg. *sn, a word reconstructed on the basis of the hrgl. T22 (phon. value sn) depicting a “Zweizack” (Wb II 148, 4) = “two-barbed spear-head” (EG 1927, 500) = “Speer mit zwei Wiederhaken” (Hintze 1951, 87) = “arrow-head” (Hodge 1976, 12) = “harpoon-point” (Hodge 1981, 410) = “double pronged spear (most often depicted at Edfu in hippopotamus hunting)” (PL 462). Similarly, J. Osing (1978, 69, §9) viewed that Eg. msn.w “*kann solange nicht als deverbale Ableitung angesehen werden, wie kein Verbum msn ‘harpunieren’ nachgewiesen und eine etymologische Verbindung (m-Bildung) zu sn ‘Zweizack’ noch möglich ist*”. Plausible.

NB1: Eg. *sn is akin to Sem.: Ar. sanna “2. aiguiser, repasser (un couteau), 3. munir de fer le bois de la lance, 6. percer d’un coup de lance, 7. mordre qqn.”, sinān- “1. fer d’une lance, d’un javelot, 2. pierre à aiguiser, queueux” [BK I 1146–47] = sinān- “point of lance, spear-head”, sanna “to sharpen” [Ember] = sinān- “Lanzenspitze” [Vrg.] || NBrb.: Shilh a-sēnnān “épine” [Dst. 1938, 115] = a-sānnan “thorn” [Vrg.]. See Ember 1918, 31 (Eg.-Ar.); Alb. 1918, 89 (Eg.-Ar.); Vrg. 1945, 141, #16.b.17 (Eg.-Ar.-Shilh).

NB2: Eg. *sn and Ar. sinān- have been usually affiliated with the common AA word for “tooth”, cf. Sem. *šim- “tooth” [SED I 219, #249; Lsl. 1945, 236; Rabin 1975, 89–90] || Brb. *i-sīm [GT: < *siHn, i.e. *siḥn-?] “(incisive) tooth” [Dlg.] || SCu.: WRift *siḥin- “tooth” [GT] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 180, #21 with false etymology) || PCh. *s-n “tooth” [NM] = *šan [Nwm.] = *s_n-n [Jng. 1994, 230] (Ch.: Str. 1922–23, 114; NM 1966, 240; Lks. 1970, 33; Prh. 1972, 55, #31.3; Wolff 1971, 65; 1974,

16; Nwm. 1977, 33; Mkr. 1987, 377–378; Sd. 1987, 261; Trn. 1990, 251; JI 1994 II, 330–1]. For the secondary infix *-h- occurring in the AA names of body parts cf. Takács 1997. For the comparison of Eg. *sn with AA “tooth”: Ember 1918, 31; 1926, 7, fn. 1 (Eg.-Sem.); Chn. 1947, #262 (Sem.-Brb.-Eg.); Grb. 1963, 63 (Sem.-Ch.-Brb.); Djk. 1965, 41 and 1974, 742 (Sem.-Eg.-Brb.-Ch.); 1970, 457, fn. 14 (Sem.-Brb.); Zvd. 1967, 22 (Brb.-Eg.); Hodge 1976, 12 (Sem.-Eg.); 1981, 410 (Eg.-Sem.-Ch.-Brb.); Dlg. 1994, 9, #8 (Sem.-Brb.-Ch.-Eg.-?SCu.). For AA see also Wlf. 1955, 43 (Sem.-Brb.); Vcl. 1954, 220; 1972, 182; 1974, 63 (Brb.-Ar.); OS 1988, 79 (Sem.-WCh.); Dlg. 1964, 60 (Ch.-Sem.); 1973, 91 (SCu.-CCh.-ECh.-Brb.); 1990, 213, 216 (Sem.-SCu.-Brb.-Ch.); Bynon 1984, 271, #31 (Brb.-Ch.-Ar.); Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 4, #9 (Sem.-SCu.-Brb.-Ch.).

nb3: For the semantic background of Eg. *sn, cf. Sem.: Akk. šēlu “to sharpen”, Sqt. šaʿal “tooth”, Geez šhl “to sharpen” (Sem.: Lsl. 1945, 244); Eg. nḥd.t [**nḥç-t*] “tooth” (OK, Wb II 304, 5–8) identified by A. Ember (1921, 177; 1926, 302, fn. 10; 1930, #24.b.3) with Ar. naḥīd- “sharp, pointed”, naḥaḍa “to sharpen (a lance), loosen flesh from bone”.

nb4: Traditionally (cf. e.g. Hintze 1951, 87), Eg. *sn has been associated with Eg. sn “2” on the analogy of Eg. *wʿ “die einzackige Harpune” ~ wʿ “1” (Wb I 273), which was firmly declined by A. Ember (1926, 7, fn. 1).

- **2.** M. Alliot (1954 II, 702, n. 1) and P. Vernus (LÄ IV 108), in turn, assumed an etymological connection with Eg. msn “Ausdruck für spinnen” (MK, Wb, q.v.) = “tresser, filer” (Vernus). P. Wilson (PL 462) argues that Eg. msn.w signified the person involved in the hunt for the hippopotamus with the instrument depicted by the hrġl. V32, namely the float attached to the harpoon. Rather dubious.

- **3.** GT: the noteworthy resemblance of Eg. msn to the HECu.-Kotoko isogloss *m-s-n “axe” [GT] is probably due to pure chance. Is *m- in this term to be separated as a nomen instr. prefix?

nb1: Attested in HECu. *mēsāna “axe” [Hds.]: Sid. mēsane, pl. mēsanna [Hds.], Qbn. misanit “axe” [Korhonen] = misānita [Crass], Alb. misānita [Korhonen], Gedeo mēsano [Hds.], Hdy. mēsāna hēda “hatchet” [Hds.], Kmb. misāni-ta [Hds.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 23, 385; Crass 2001, 45, §9) ||| CCh.: PKotoko *mṣVn(V) “Axt” [Prh.]: Kotoko māsār, pl. māsārē “axe (hâche)” [Bouny 1975, 10, §131; 1978, 60], Logone mṣənni ~ mṣənni, pl. mṣəšan “Axt” [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 111] = mṣənni “hache” [Mch. 1950, 54], Buduma han ~ hən [h- < *s- reg.] “Beil” [Nct. apud Lks. 1939], Ngala mošene “Axt” [Duisburg], Sao (Sso) mošene “Axt” [Duisburg 1914, 43], Afade msirir [msir(ɾ)] “Beil” [Stz.] etc. (Kotoko: Slk. 1967, 325, §609; Prh. 1972, 11, #1.5, 57, #31.10).

nb2: The connection with Sem.: Šaʿdah (Yemen) ṣmsr: missārīn “Beil” [Behnstedt 1987, 302] ||| LECu.: (?) Boni misirān “Axt” [Heine 1977, 285] is obscure.

nb3: The etymology of Akk. mašānu > mašānu “Feuerhaken” [AHW 626] = maššānu “tongs (for picking up coals)” [CAD m1, 387] is uncertain, but it can hardly belong here, cf. rather Akk. našū.

- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 284–5): ~ Ful bañowo, pl. wanyuḅe “chasseur de gros gibier”. Absurd.

msn “1. Ausdruck für Spinnen, 2. (Kleider, Amulettsschnur, Netz) durch spinnen herstellen” (MK, Wb II 144, 12–15) = “to spin (?), plait (?)” (FD 117; AECT II 110, spell 473, n. 16) = “zwirnen (entweder mit der

Hand oder mit der Hilfe einer Spindel verrichtet)” (Bidoli 1976, 66) = “mit den Fingern zu langen Fäden drehen” (Strauß-Seeber, LÄ V 1156) = “1. *spinnen, *zwirnen, *zusammendrehen (der Faser aus dem Katzenkopf bzw. Knokken zu Fäden), 2. durch Zwirnen herstellen” (GHWb 363) = “to spin, plait, the action of twisting long threads and winding them up into a ball” (PL 461).

- Hence: msn.t “tissage, tissu” (CT VI 5d, VI 221n, AL 78.1853) = “plaiting” (DCT 183).
 - NB1: Cf. also msn.w (det. damaged) “(pourrait désigner) une natte (dans une liste de produits retirés d’une institution)” (Pap. Illahun VI 10, vs. 10, Meeks 1977, 86 & fn. 4).
 - NB2: For an alleged reflection in Amarna cuneiform cf. Lambdin 1953, 367, §21.
 - NB3: Whether msnj “Art der Herstellung von Statuen” (LEth.: 3x in Urk. III 122, Wb II 146, 1) = “the name of (some kind of) gold treated in a particular way: (might refer to) gold filigree” (Harris) is also related (as suggested by J. R. Harris 1961, 41), is not clear. Cf. perhaps rather Eg. msn.w “drillers (of stone)” (MK, Ward, below)?
- No clear AA equivalents. Therefore, this may be perhaps a *terminus technicus* to be explained on Eg. grounds. Only speculation is possible.
- **1.** A. Ember (1930, #18.b.7) and A. G. Belova (1989, 17, #12.2.3) identified the first consonant as a prefix m- (leaving its function here undefined) attached to *sn which they affiliated with Ar. tny “plier, ployer, (re)courber, tourner (à droite ou à gauche), plier en deux” [BK I 238], which is just a denom. verb originating from the common Sem. numeral “2”. This approach has already been doubted by F. von Calice (1936, #639).
- **2.** GT: equally unlikely is a derivation < *wsn ~ Sem. *wtl: Akk. ušultu “Blutader” [Holma 1911, 7] || Ar. waṭal- “Strick”, waṭīl- “Faser, Seil” [Torczyner 1912, 769].
- **3.** GT: a comparison with Sem. *mṭl is semantically also very doubtful.
 - NB: Attested in Akk. mašālu “gleichen”, mašlu “halb”, mišla “1. halb und halb, 2. je zu Hälfte” [AHW 623, 628, 661] || Hbr. mšl nifal “ähnlich sein, gleichen”, māšāl “Spruch, der wegen seiner typischen Form oder als Anspielung auf einen prägnanten Fall weite Verbreitung gefunden hat: 1. Sprichwort, 2. Gleichnis, Parabel” [GB 469–470] | Ar. mṭl “1. ressembler à un autre, 2. comparer l’un à l’autre, 3. faire un exemple de qqn.”, esp. III “3. reproduire (par l’impression, par la lithographie) plusieurs exemplaires d’un ouvrage, 4. faire une image, une statue”, miṭāl- “2. modèle, 3. exemple, 4. image, effigie, ressemblance, toute figure peinte ou figurée, statue” [BK II 1060] || MSA: Jbl. miṭāl “to be like so.” [Jns. 1981, 176], Mhr. mətūl ~ miṭāl “to be like”, mətīlāh “likeness” [Jns. 1987, 274] || Brb. (from Ar.): NBrb.: Qbl. e-mseḷ “1. façonner, 2. modeler de la poterie (sans tour)” [Dlt. 1982, 522] || EBrb.: Gdm. e-mṣāl “tourner au tour de potier” [Lnf. 1973, 219, #1039].
- Other suggestions are evidently out of question:
- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 284): ~ Ful moil-āde “tortiller le fil”. Absurd.
- **5.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 303, #576): < AA *-mōoč/c- (sic) “to turn (tr.)” based on unrelated parallels.

NB: Such as Ar. *mtmt* “to confuse”, Eg. *msnh* “to rotate”, SCu. **môodoḵ*- “to bend (joint of body)”, WCh.: Ngz. *məst*- “to turn, tilt, change into”.

msn.w (pl.) “drillers (of stone)” (MK, Ward 1982, 96, #802) = “Steinbohrer” (GHWb 363).

NB: Cf. perhaps *msnj* “Art der Herstellung von Statuen” (LEth.: 3x in Urk. III 122, Wb II 146, 1) = “the name of (some kind of) gold treated in a particular way: (might refer to) gold filigree” (Harris 1961, 41)?

- Etymology uncertain. GT: presumably unrelated to Eg. *msn.w* “Harpunierer” (Wb, above). Perhaps a derivative of an unattested Eg. **sl* < AA **[s]-l* “to bore a hole” [GT] extended with the prefix *m-* of participles?

NB1: Attested in LECu. **sull-/sill-* “to bore a hole” [GT]: Orm. *fulla(w)-* [f- reg. < **s-*] “durchbohrt sein” [Sasse] = *full-aʔa* “to break through, pierce through” [Gragg 1982, 149], Konso *sill-a* “kleines Loch” [Sasse] = “small hole” [Ehret] (LECu.: Sasse 1975, 245, §18) ||| WCh. **sul* “to bore” [GT]: Suroid **sul* ~ **sʷul* “to make a hole” [GT 2004, 323]: Sura *sùl* (sg.) “graben” [Jng. 1963, 82] = *sùl* “to pierce” [Krf.], Mpn. *sùl* “to pierce, make a hole” [Frj. 1991, 57], Kfy. *sùl* (sg.) “to make a hole” [Ntg. 1967, 37], Chip *səl* (sg.) [-ə- < **-u-*] “durchbohren, erstechen” [Jng. 1965, 167] = *sil gwe* [sùl] “to pierce” [Krf.], Msr. *šwul* ~ *šuwul* [š- < **sʷ-*] “to dig, excavate”, šuwul *tukuun* “to dig a grave” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 197] | Sha *čul* [č- < **s-ʔ*] “durchbohren, erstechen” [Jng. 1970, 284]. Note that the correspondence of ECu. **s-* ~ Sem. **t-* < AA **č-* set up by A. B. Dolgopolsky (1983) does not seem to work here, since AA **č-* > AS **č-* (Takács 2001, 83–85).

NB2: A var. root (with voiced C, -) is represented by SCu. **š₁al-* [GT]: WRift **cil-* [GT] > Irq. *tsil-* “to sting” | ERift **š₁al-* [GT] > Qwd. *tsal-* “to stab”, *tsel-et-* “to drill” & Asa *šal-as-* “to bite, sting” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 193, #4). Cf. Takács 2001, 68.

NB3: The unconvincing parallels suggested by A. B. Dolgopolsky (1987, 197, #15) are irrelevant to the AA root discussed above: Akk. *šilu* “Vertiefung” [AHW 1237] = “cave” [Dlg.] ||| SBrb.: Hgr. *tə-sāli-t* “grotte servant à suspendre des objets” [Dlg., not so in Fcd. 1951–2] ||| SCu. **sila* (?) [Ehret] > Qwd. *sili-mbayo* “cave” [Ehret 1980, 326, #61]. Cf. rather (1) Akk. *s/šalû* “eintauchen (intr.)” [AHW 1152] vs. (2) Hgr. *té-sali-t* “colline isolée en roche lisse” < *é-sali* “roche lisse” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1822], respectively.

msnj “Messer”, cf. *dj msnj=f m* “sein Messer stossen in (den Feind)” (GR, Wb II 146, 2) = “scharfe Waffe” (Grapow 1914, 28) = “knife” (PL 462).

- A rare late word, which is to be handled carefully. H. Grapow (l.c.) assumed in it a late writing of an old **mzn*.(t[?]), which he explained as the *m-* prefix nomen instr. of Eg. *zn* [< **zl*?] “abschneiden, zerschneiden, töten” (PT, Wb III 457, 17–21).

NB: The etymology of Eg. *zn* is still uncertain. (1) W. Schenkel (1993, 145) noted the variation with Eg. *dn*, which does not exclude a (2) comparison (GT) with NBrb.: Shilh **√z-l-w*: *ə-zlu* “töten” [Rsl. 1964, 207] ||| LECu.: Som. *dil-* “töten” [Rsl.] ||| WCh.: Kulere *zyèl* “töten” [Jng. 1970, 356] | (?) NBauchi: Siri *zìlù* “zerschneiden, zerhacken” [Skn. in JI 1994 II, 98]. (3) The etymology offered by C. T. Hodge (1968, 25) is unreal.

msnh > (NK hapax) **bsnh** “1. umwenden (das Gesicht des Feindes), umdrehen (bildlich von Ägypten), abwenden (den Bösen), 2. sich (um)wenden (besonders Pflanze zur Sonne hin)” (MK, Wb II 146, 3–8; Lange 1925, 65, 68 with discussion) = “to turn (a)round” (Grd. 1909, 115) = “1. to turn backwards or away, 2. neglect, 3. be out of order (months)” (Caminos 1954, 514, n. 13) = “1. to rotate, 2. turn backwards, 3. turn away” (FD 117) = “to turn” (Peterson 1966, 126, col. II, 6) = “to turn back, round, be reversed (never ‘to spin’), i.e., to reverse the direction of a movement” (Federn 1966, 55, fn. 4) = “contourner, se retourner” (AL 79.1347) = “se révolter” (Koenig 1981, 135) = “to avert, turn away, turn (back)” (DLE I 242) = “1. se retourner, 2. (s’emploie, entre autres, pour décrire) un mouvement de tête destiné à mieux contempler un objet vénéré” (Mathieu 1996, 236, n. 802) = “1. to turn around, 2. turn away, be reversed, drive away” (PL 463).

NB: Cf. also “OCpt.” (of Pap. BM 10808) *msne[h]t tw* (impv.) “wende dich um!” (Osing 1976, 90).

● Origin disputed.

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 29) and W. Federn (1966, 55, fn. 4) assumed it to be the m- prefix form of Eg. *snh* “verkehrt sein (von den in Unordnung gerateten Monaten)” (late NK, Wb IV 169, 3) = “verwirrt, verkehrt, verdreht sein” (Feichtner) = “durcheinandergeraten sein” (GHWb 721), which is, however, a ghost-word. M. K. Feichtner (1932, 220) and Federn (l.c.) postulated here an m- “*Ver-balpräfix der Reziprozität*”, which “*selektiert hier... aus einem ‘Wirrwarr vieler Richtungen’ eine Reziprozität zweier Richtungen*” (Feichtner) = “a reciprocity of two directions” (Federn).

NB: As pointed out i.a. by R. Caminos (1954 LEM, 172 & 514, n. 13) and Federn (l.c.), in the only source of *snh* (Pap. Anastasi IV, 10:2), the authors of Wb ignored the b- of *bsnh* (cf. also DLE l.c.), which should be in fact emended to *msnh* (with a shift of m- > b-). The Wb Belegstellen (ad Wb IV 169, 3) suggested a further possible ex. of *snh* making a hint on Urk. II 178:4, which is, however, not valid either. Here, *msnh* occurs (Caminos after Sethe: due to “*a certain corruption*”).

- **2.** W. F. Albright (1927, 218), F. von Calice (1936, #204), and A. G. Belova (1987, 277) have also supposed a prefix m- in it, but avoided Eg. *snh* of Wb IV 169, 3. Instead, they compared the purely hypothetical Eg. **snh* with Ar. \sqrt{snh} .

NB: Cf. Ar. *sanaḥa* I “1. se présenter, 4. venir sur qqn., approcher (se dit de la proie), 6. détourner qqn. d’un projet, d’une entreprise”, V “1. tourner le dos à qqn.” [BK I 1149] = I “1. to show, present its side, present itself, occur, 2. turn away or back” [Lane 1441] = I “to turn”, V “to turn around” [Alb.] = I “1. einfallen, kommen (Gedanke), 2. sich (dar)biegen, 3. abwenden, abbringen” [Wehr 1952, 395–6] = I (ʿan) “отклонить, отвести, отворачиваться” [Blv.].

- **3.** W. Federn (1966, 55, fn. 4) analyzed it as prefix m- + a hypothetical **snh* regarded by him either as a cognate of Ar. *sanaḥa* (pace

Albright l.c. supra) or “as a shortened caus.” of Eg. nḥ3 “to vibrate” (rather than Wb’s “contrary”), “in which again the n- might be detached as a prefix from the stem ḥ3” (that he – following Ember 1917, 88 – affiliated “by shortening” with Sem. *ḥwl “to circle”). P. Wilson (PL 463), in turn, saw in it an m- prefix + Eg. snḥ “to bind” (semantically doubtful), which, in addition, she falsely regarded as the caus. form of Eg. nḥ3 (!) “to be contrary”. This idea is erroneous on several points and thus can hardly be followed.

msnšd (act. **ms.w-nšd**) “Bearbeiter von kostbaren Steinen” (OK, Wb II 146, 11) = “Juwelier” (Grapow 1914, 29) = “stonemason, jeweller or gem-cutter” (Harris 1961, 23) = “Schmuck(stein-Be)arbeiter” (Seibert 1967, 119, n. a; Schlee 1985, 173, fn. 180; WD III 56) = “Bearbeiter von Schmuck, Juweliers” (Edel apud Jones) = “un homme occupé à percer une cornaline” (PK 1976, 206, fn. 2) = “Perlenhersteller (Berufsbezeichnung für Handwerker, die Schmuck aus Stein anfertigen)” (Drenkhahn 1976, 49) = “maker of jewellery” (Fischer 1976, 13) = “Perlenmacher” (Krah, LÄ IV 941) = “jeweller, worker in precious stones” (Jones 2000, 451, #1689) = “Schmuckhandwerker” (ÄWb I 559, cf. also Meeks 2005, 246, #559.a): discussed s.v. nšd (q.v.).

***msnt > msntj** “die Baugrube für das Fundament” (GR, Wb II 146, 12) = “foundation trench” (Smith 1979, 163) = “tranchée de fondation” (AL 79.1349) = “*Gründungsgrube” (GHWb 363) = “an area of land prepared for foundations” (PL 463).

NB: The origin of mzn.t (or msnt < *msnt?) “foundation trench” (1st IMP, Fischer 1968, 149, fn. 656) = “*Gründungsgrube” (GHWb 363) is dubious (cf. above).

- The GR word may be an m- prefix nomen loci which derives from Eg. sntj “gründen, schaffen” (PT, Wb IV 177–178) as suggested in Wb (l.c.), by H. Smith (l.c.), and P. Wilson (PL 463). Cf. also snt “Fundament, Grundriß” (MK, Wb IV 178–9).

NB1: H. Grapow (1914, 29) and K. Sethe (ÜKAPT l.c.) assumed a prefix m- also in Eg. msnt.t “als Beiwort der Nut” (PT 786a hapax, Wb II 146, 13) = “Kornspeicher” (ÜKAPT VI 134) = “granary (?)” (AEPT 143) = “*Gründungsgrube” (ÄWb I 564), but they left the underlying root unidentified.

NB2: Eg. sntj probably originates (via met. < *sntj < *sknj) from AA *s-k-n “1. to set(tle), 2. sit” [GT] = *sVkvN “to be stable, settle” [Mlt.] > Sem. *škn “to lay, settle” [GT]: Akk. šakānu “(hin)stellen, (ein)setzen, anlegen, versehen mit” [AHW 1134–9] || Ug. škn “1. legen, hinsetzen; 2. besetzen” [WUS #2606], Hbr. škn qal “1. sich (zeitweilig) niederlassen; 2. bleiben, sich ruhig verhalten (die Füße eines Weibes im Hause); 3. wohnen” [GB 827–828], Aram. škn “sich niederlassen, wohnen” [WUS] | Ar. sakana “1. être en repos, 3. se retirer dans un lieu pour s’y reposer; 6. habiter (un maison)” [BK I 1115] = “ruhen, ruhig sein, wohnen” [GB-WUS] || Jbl. skun “to dwell, settle (down), become calm (after shaking)” [Jns. 1981, 227] ||

SBrb.: Ahaggar e-sken “se tenir debout sur les pieds de derrière (un quadrupède)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1814] = “to squat on hind legs” [Mlt.] ||| SCu.: Irq. sukunu[?]-at- “to squat” [Ehret 1980, 351] = sak[?]nene[?]-it- “to squat (on the haunches)” [Eld.-Mgw. 1992, 61] ||| (?) WCh. *[s]V[k]Vn [Stl. 1986, 108] > SBch.: Mbaru sigine/sigine “to rest” [Stl.]. See Alb. 1918, 245, #94 (Sem.-Eg.); Ember 1930, #11.a.52 (Sem.-Eg.); Djik. et al. 1986, 44 and Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 52, #12 (Sem.-Hgr.-Irq.-WCh.); Stl. 1986, 108 (WCh.-Ar.). M. Cohen (1947, #255) affiliated the Sem. root with NA^gaw: Bilin saṅ “demeurer, attendre” [Chn.], but Agaw *ḥ usually stems from Cu./AA *m (cf. Ehret 1987, 104–6).

NB3: Other etymologies suggested for Eg. sntj are less convincing. (1) E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 99; 1934, 110, #5) compared it mistakenly with SBrb.: Tuareg a-senti “Grundlage, Fundament”, caus. of ent “festgegründet sein, seinen Ursprung haben” [Zhl.]. But Eg. ṯ [from *k] ≠ Tuareg t. (2) C. T. Hodge (1961, 36) combined Eg. sntj with NOM.: Mocha šūna(yé) “to make, work” [Lsl.], which displays no match for Eg. -t- < *k-.

msh “gehen” (LEth., Wb II 147, 1) = “marschieren” (Peust).

• Origin uncertain.

■ 1. C. Peust (1999 phon., 105; 1999 Napat., 230) regarded it as “eine Variante” of old Eg. mš^ʕ “to march” (discussed below).

NB: He supposed here “einen Stimmtonverlust des /^ʕ/, der auch von anderen koptischen Wörtern her bekannt ist, ohne dass sich dafür bisher eine exakte Regel hat finden lassen...”, although he confessed that “ich kann nicht erklären, warum im Napatatischen die Schreibungen mš^ʕ ~ m^ʕs und msh koexistieren”.

■ 2. A. G. Belova (1987, 277; 1989, 11) identified it with Ar. msh I “8. mesurer (la terre, les champs...), 9. traverser, parcourir, arpenter la terre, 10. marcher toute la journée (se dit des chameaux)” [BK II 1102] = “измерять поверхность, площадь (земли), межевать, шагать взад и вперед” [Blv.].

NB: This Eg.-Sem. etymology is rather unlikely due to the significantly different basic sense (“to measure”) of the Sem. root, cf. Eg. msh below.

■ 3. GT: or perhaps related the Brb.-Hs. isogloss *m-c-(?) “to move” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mss)? Improbable because of the late and rare attestation of the Eg. root.

msh.t “(als Name für) das Salben- und Öl-Maßgefäß” (late V. hapax: provision-jar BM 57322 from the reign of Izezi/Asosis, Balcz 1934, 85, cf. also LD II 76). Presumably the same word is preserved by **msh** (GW) “Gefäß für Öl und Wein (auch wie ein Maß gebraucht)” vs. **msh.t** (GW) “Gefäß oder Maß für Öl” (late NK, Wb II 147, 2–3 vs. 4) = “a not very common container, jar (measuring 46 hin)” (Jansen 1961, 72, 83, 88 with lit.) = “(vessel, jug)” (DLE I 242 after Janssen 1975, 330, fn. 1) = “a measure or container of liquid (used widely in Ramesside times)” (Gdk. 1975, 29, 121) = “1. ein Gefäß (für Wein und Öl), 2. ein Maß (ca. 46 Hin)” (Helck, LÄ III 1203; GHWb 364) = “a vessel” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = msh

(sg.) vs. msh.t (pl.?) “amphora, a large vessel (for wine and sesame oil)” (Hoch, 1994, 152–3).

NB1: The OK instance occurs in a marketing scene “*where its meaning seems quite obvious*” according to H. Goedicke (1957, 69, §1 & fn. 5), who – pace H. Balcz (l.c.) – identified it with the LEg. forms (cf. also WD II 67).

NB2: The LEg. word is written syllabically as ma-sá-ḥi vs. ma-sá-ḥi-tá (Helck, also Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = ma-sa-ḥi (Hoch). Hence, its vocalisation has been reconstructed as *masaḥta (Helck) = *mašīḥa vs. *mašīḥāta (Hoch).

- Etymology debated. Usually regarded as a late borrowing from Sem., but its alleged OK occurrence (RdE 11, 1957, 69; WD II 67) – if correct – speaks for a native word. GT: perhaps akin to OAkk. mašḥum “(a container)” [Gelb 1973, 185] = “ein Bierbecher” [AHW 625] = “(a vessel used for beer)” [CAD m1, 365]? Note that J. Hoch (1994, 152–3, #198) mentioned (probably erroneously) this etymology as a late Sem. borrowing in LEg.).
- Other etymologies are out of question:
 - **1.** L. Reinisch (1887, 263) combined Eg. msh (mistranslated as “epulari”, sic) with Eth.-Sem.: Amh. mṣa “midday meal”, Geez & Tigre & Tna. mṣaḥ “meal” (Apl. 1977, 29/71; Lsl. 1979 III 426). False.
 - **2.** Later, Reinisch (1890, 276) affiliated Eg. msh (erroneously rendered “unguere”, sic) with LECu.: Saho mišḥó “(zerlassene) Butter” (borrowed from ES *msh “to smear, anoint”). Similarly, W. Helck (1971, 514, #111) explained it from Hbr. mšḥ “salben” [GB]. False both semantically and phonologically. Rejected by J. Hoch (l.c.) as “*impossible*” because of Eg. ḥ ≠ Sem. *ḥ.
 - **3.** Following GB 467 (after OLZ 3, 208), J. Hoch (1994, 152–3, §198–9) explained it from Akk. (N/LBab.) mašḥu, pl. mašḥātu “ein Hohlmaß von etwa 1 pān (30–48 qa)” [AHW 626] = “measure, measuring container (of standardized size, 30 to 54 silas; contents: barley, other cereals, dates, linseed, beer; material: mainly made of wood, clay)” [CAD m1, 366]. Rejected by A. F. Rainey (1998, 443) as “*hardly convincing*”.

NB1: Although R. Woodhouse (2003, 279, #198) excluded the N/LBab. parallel as the proper source of Eg. msh (as it “*does not tally with*” the supposed Eg. vocalism), he too found the semantics of this equation to be “*impeccable, even to the cubit capacity*”. Henceforth, he assumed the Eg. word to represent an otherwise unattested Akk. cstr. state *mašahḥi “measuring vessel, measure of” (cf. perhaps OObab. *mašahḥu, pl. mašahḥātu “?”, CAD m1, 353a, bottom?), which he regarded – with a rather strange and unconvincing etymological argumentation – as a “morpho-semantic” parallel of Akk. eleppu “ship” < elēpu “to sprout” (cf. “*the ship’s mast ‘sprouting’ from the sea!*”) or agammum “marsh” < agāmu “to rage” (“*perhaps due to fiery reflections of sun on the surface of the water!*”). Both of these derivations seem to be false (kind p.c. by J. Huehnergard, 2 Feb. 2007).

NB2: The Akk. term ultimately derives from Sem. *mšḥ “messen” [GB 467] = *mšḥ (so, with false *-ḥ!) “to measure” [Hoch] (with an irreg. -ḥ < *-ḥ), cf. Akk. mašāḥu “(aus)messen (Grundstücke, Gebäude, Gegenstände)” [AHW 623] = “1. to measure,

2. compute” [CAD m1, 352] || Hbr. *mišhā & māšhā “der den Priestern zufallende Teil der Opfer” [GB 467] = *mišhā “share, allotment”, māšhā “portion” [KB 644], Eg. Aram. mšh-t (st.cstr.) “Maß” [GB] | Ar. msh I “8. mesurer (la terre, les champs pour en connaître la superficie)” [BK II 1102] = “измерять площадь земли, поля” [Blv.] (Sem.: Blv. 1993, 45, #254). W. von Soden (AHW 623) affiliated Akk. mašāhu with Ar. masaḥa “umformen”, which is semantically weak.

- **4.** D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 37, §2.1.4.1) and A. F. Rainey (1998, 443, #198–9), in turn, view that the Eg. word originates in a certain root *shj which, however, they failed to identify.

msh3 (vars. **msh** ~ **msh**) “1. sich (über etwas) freuen; 2. (das Herz jemandes) erfreuen” (GR, Wb II 147, 6–13) = “to rejoice (perhaps in the sense ‘to celebrate’)” (Smith 1979, 163; PL 464–5).

NB: Its orthographic varieties disclose very little about how its primary root should be reconstructed (GR -h3 may stand also for -h and vice versa, GR -h < -h3).

- Origin disputed (most convincing seem #2 and #3).
- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 18, 29) surmised in it an m- prefix, but left the underlying root unidentified. H. Smith (1979, 163) and P. Wilson (PL 465) explained it from Eg. sh3 “to remember”. Semantically very weak.
- **2.** A. G. Belova (1987, 277) has probably found the correct equivalent of Eg. *sh3 in Ar. shr.

NB1: Cf. Ar. saḥira “se moquer, rire de qqn., le railler”, ma-šhar-at- “1. risée, moquerie, 2. objet de la risée, figure ridicule, qui prête à rire” [BK I 1065] = saḥira “to mock at, scoff at, laugh at, deride, ridicule”, ma-šhar-at- “1. an occasion or cause of mockery, derision, ridicule, 2. one who mocks at, scoffs at, laughs at, derides or ridicules others” [Lane 1324] = saḥira “1. spotten, sich lustig machen, 2. verspotten, verhöhnen, verlachen, bspötteln”, ma-šhar-at- “1. Gegenstand des Spotts, 2. lächerlich, drollig, 3. Maskerade”, mašhara “lächerlich machen, verspotten, verlachen” [Wehr 1952, 365, 809] = shr & mshr “высмеивать, вышучивать”, ma-šhar-at- “предмет насмешки, шутки” [Blv.]. Ar. mshr may be denom. from mašhar-at-.

NB2: W. Eilers (1987–88, 44) mistakenly considered the -r of Ar. mašhar-at- as a root extension (!) on the basis of its false equation with Ar. mašh- “transformed or metamorphosed into a worse or more foul or more ugly shape” [Lane 2715] = “Mißgeburt, Cretin” [Eilers].

- **3.** GT: alternatively, if Eg. msh3 < *mShl, cf. SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr māžgāl “1. être joli, 2. p.ext. être sympathique, honnête (personne)”, a-māžgol “1. homme joli, 2. chose parfaitement confectionnée, jolie, 3. beauté, belle femme, 4. homme sympathique” [PAM 1998, 232; 2003, 576]. NB: The Tuareg verb derives from *√z-g-l (with the prefix m- of the reflexive stem).
- **4.** GT: provided the old Eg. root was *mzh ~ *mzh, cp. perhaps Ar. mazaḥa “plaisanter, badiner” [BK II 1099] || Geez mazḥa ~ mazḥa “to laugh (at), jeer at, dally (with women), be pampered”, cf. manzāḥa “to live comfortably” [Lsl. 1987, 378, 353].
- **5.** GT: or cp. Akk. mašāhu II “(etwa) aufleuchten (Stern, Meteor)” [AHW 623]?

NB: The semantic shift is common in Sem., cf. e.g. Hbr. *blg hifil* “1. aufglänzen lassen, 2. heiter, fröhlich werden” [GB 99] | Ar. *balāḡa* “briller, luire (se dit de l’aurore)” ~ *balīḡa* “être gai, avoir l’air ouvert et riant” [BK I 157].

- 6. L. Reinisch (1873, 351–2, fn. 1) suggested a number of absurd Ar. parallels (*blḡ* and *frḡ* “sich freuen”, *mrḡ* “vergnügt sein”, *mrḡ* “scherzen”).
- 7. G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 251): ~ Bsq. *p/boztu* “sich freuen”. Equally false.

msh₃ “sich verbeugen vor (n)” (GR, Wb II 147, 14).

- As pointed out by H. Grapow (1914, 29), it derives (via prefix *m-*) from Eg. *sh₃* “sich verbeugen vor (n)” (GR, Wb III 235, 3), the caus. of *ḥ₃* “sich beugen” (GR, Wb III 223, 1). M. K. Feichtner (1932, 221) identified *m-* as the “*Verbalprefix der Reziprozität*”, while O. Rössler (1950, 487) defined *m-* as prefix of the “*Sozialstamm (selten, erstarzt)*”. Both authors assumed a primary sense “sich voreinander verbeugen”.

NB: A. G. Belova (1987, 277) affiliated Eg. *m-s-ḥ₃* with Ar. *ḥrr* “to fall down”, but this is akin to Eg. *ḥr* “to fall”. G. Takács (2000, 93, #23.4), in turn, equated Eg. *ḥ₃* [*< *ḥ[?]*] with SCu. **ḥo[?]-* “to bend (around, intr.)” [Ehret]: Irq. *ḥu[?]-us-* “to turn one’s back on” | (?) Qwd. *ḥu[?]u-mbayo* [root **ḥu[?]-*] “leather wrapping securing bowstring to bow” | Dhl. *ko[?]-ēd-* “to fold” (Ehret 1980, 259) ||| WCh.: Bokkos *ḡi[?]* “falten” [Jng. 1970, 142].

msh_{33.t} “Landerweiserin” (PT 1481 hapax, Wb II 147, 17).

NB: R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 228–9, utterance 573, n. 3) assumed Eg. *msh_{33.t}* “name of a sacred beetle” (MK hapax: Cairo 20328, Faulkner) to be also related. Cf. also *msh_{33.t-k₃w}* “als Name eines göttlichen Wesens” (PT 150c, Wb II 147, 16)?

- An *m-* prefix form of an unattested (?) Eg. **sh₃*, which has been analyzed in Wb (l.c.) as the caus. of *wḥ₃* “einen Platz anweisen” (PT, Wb I 353, 10; GHWb 213; ÄWb I 370). Here, *m-* ultimately goes back to the AA prefix of participles.

NB: H. Grapow (1914, 30) suggested a slightly different etymology: Eg. *msh₃* lit. “die suchen Lassende (d.h. daß sie den Toten seinen Sitz sich suchen lassen soll)” < *m-* prefix participle of an unattested caus. **s-wḥ₃* “suchen lassen” < *wḥ₃* “suchen” (OK, Wb I 353–4).

msh^c “das Erglänzen einer Gottheit” (GR, Wb II 147, 18) = “splendeur, manifestation brillante, sortie brillante” (Piehl 1892, 32) = “Glanz, Erscheinung” (Grapow 1914, 30) = “brightness, splendour, effulgence (of a god)” (Smith 1979, 163; PL 465) = “éclat, luminosité” (El-Sayed 1987, 64).

- Derives (via prefix *m-*) from Eg. *sh^c_j* “erscheinen (lassen)” (PT, Wb IV 236–7) = “glänzen machen” (Grapow), the caus. of *ḥ^c_j* “aufgehen,

erscheinen” (PT, Wb III 239–241) = “to rise (of sun), appear in glory (of god, king)” (FD 185).

LIT.: Grapow 1914, 30; NBĀ 119; Smith 1979, 163; PL 465.

NB1: The etymology of Eg. ḥ^ʕj is disputed: **(1)** GT: most probably, Eg. ḥ^ʕj is identical with Agaw *g^wə- [irreg. *g^w- < *k^w-?] “to get up, rise” [Apl. 1989 MS, 12] || ECu. *ka^c- “1. to get up, 2. wake up” [Sasse 1979, 11]: e.g. PSam *ka^c- “to stand up” [Lmb. 1986, 443] || SCu. *ka^c- [GT]: Ma’a -ká “to get up, stand up, awake”, -káʔa “to raise, waken” [Ehret 1980, 331] || WCh.: Angas-Sura *kā₂ (orig. *kay?) “to mount” [GT 2004, 160]. AP: PCKhoisan *lkḥ^ʕua “to rise (of the sun)” [Baucom 1972, 25]. **(2)** H. Holma (1919, 42) and A. Ember (1926, 303, #10): Eg. ḥ^ʕj < *ḥ₃j (sic!) ~ Sem.: Akk. ḥelû “hell, heiter sein” [AHW 339]. False. **(3)** Th. Schneider (1997, 204, #77) equated it with Sem.: OSA ^ʕwd “to return, turn back”, Ar. ^ʕwd “to return, come back”. Even if we accept the Rösslerian rule of Eg. ^ʕ ~ Sem. *d, it still remains semantically unconvincing.

NB2: K. Piehl (1892, 32–33, §68) assumed in it instead a compound of two diverse roots (perhaps msj “bilden” + ḥ^ʕj?), which is improbable.

msĥn “Aufenthaltort, Ruheplatz” (PT, Wb II 148), msĥn.t lit. “Ort wo man sich niederläßt”, hence: “1. Aufenthaltort, Ruheplatz eines Gottes, 2. als Bez. der Nekropole, 3. zumeist mit Bezug auf die Geburt: Geburtsstätte” (PT, Wb II 148).

- A nomen loci (prefix m-) of Eg. ṣḥnj “1. (tr., fem. inf.) setzen, 2. (intr. masc. inf.) sich niederlassen an einer Stelle, an einem Ort” (OK, Wb IV 253–254), cf. ṣḥn “Ruhestätte (für den Schatten des Toten)” (MK, Wb IV 254, 7) < ḥnj “niederschweben, sich niederlassen (auf etwas)” (PT, Wb III 287–8), cf. ḥn.w “Ruheplatz” (XVIII., Wb III 288, 12–15).

NB: Although the etymology of Eg. ḥnj has disputed, **(1)** its safest cognates appear in Brb. *√g-n “to lie down” [GT] || PCh. *ḥ^wən- “to lie down” [Nwm.] = *k-n “to sleep” [JS 1981, 237] > i.a. WCh.: Hausa kwanta “to lie down” [Abr. 1962, 587] | AS *gan “to lie down” [GT 2004, 122] | DB kon “sich niederlassen, legen” [Jng. 1970, 217] | Bole gand- “sich niederlegen” [Lks. 1971, 135] || CCh. *ḥ^w-n “to lie down” [GT] || ECh.: Mkl. kóonè “1. (s’)asseoir, 2. s’absenter” [Jng. 1990, 126] (Ch.: Nwm. 1977, 29, #82; Mkr. 1987, 336). Lit.: Mkr. 1966, 19, #67 (WCh.-Bdm.-Brb.); Djk. et al. 1986, 54 & Mlt. 1990, 82 (Brb.-Eg.); OS 1992, 196 (PCCh.-Eg.). **(2)** C.T. Hodge (1976, 13, 22, #103), in turn, assumed in Eg. ḥnj met. of Sem. *nwḥ “to rest”. **(3)** E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 98) combined Eg. ḥnj with NBrb.: Qabyle ḡeli “niedergehen, fallen, untergehen (auch vom Gestirn)”, for which cf. rather Eg. ḥr “under”. **(4)** G. R. Castellino (1984, 16) affiliated Eg. ḥnj with Sem.: Hbr. ḥny “zeltten: mettre la tenda”, which has been related (in Alb. 1927, 226, #68; Vrg. 1945, 140, #14.b.3; Vcl. 1958, 375, 390; 1990, 52; Mlt. 1990, 80–81) rather with Eg. ḥn “Zelt” (PT, Wb III 368, 1). **(5)** W. F. Albright (1918, 232–233, #51): Eg. ṣḥnj and msĥn.t ~ Sem.: Akk. ḥrš & Ar. ḥrs i.a. “to be in travail, give birth”. Evidently false (s- not part of the root in Eg. ṣḥnj). Rejected already by F. Calice (1936, #640).

msĥtjw “Art Haken mit dem der Mund des Toten geöffnet wird” (OK, Wb II 149, 2) = “herminette, forme usuelle du manche sans lame, à double courbure et crochet terminal” (Jéquier 1921, 325) =

“a large metal adze used in wood-working (depicted as such on the reliefs in the causeway of the Unis pyramid)” (Ward 1961, 37) = “adze (used in ‘Opening the Mouth’)” (FD 118) = “Dechsel und Meißel, ein sehr altertümliche Bezeichnung, die in klassischer Zeit nur noch als Sternbild (Großer Bär) erscheint und als Schenkel des Seth mythologisiert wurde” (Helck 1967, 33) = “herminette” (Lacau 1972, 54, §20.3) = “Dechsel” (Drenkhahn 1976, 119) = “ein Haken, Dächsel”, dm mšhtjw (V.) “den Dächsel scharfen” (GHWb 364).

- The same word appears in **(1)** mšhtjw “das Sternbild des großen Bären (alt als Haken, später als Vorderschenkel angesehen)” (OK, Wb II 149, 3–4) = “name for the constellation of the Great Bear” (Faulkner 1937, 184) = “(from the earliest times) the name of the constellation of the Great Bear (originally conceived as an adze, from the early MK on depicted as the foreleg of a bull, later as the bull itself)” (AEO I 4*) = “constellation of the Plough” (FD 118) = “polestar” (DLE I 242) = “Großer Wagen, Großer Bär (Sternbild)” (GHWb 364) and **(2)** mšht “der Arm” (GR, Wb II 149, 5) = “cuisse, angle” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “foreleg” (AEO I 4*).

NB: For *Ursus Maior* interpreted either as an adze or as a foreleg of an ox cf. also Wainwright, JEA 18, 1932, 11 & 163; Roth 1993, 70–71.

- Original root and etymology uncertain. The etymological analysis in #1 seems convincing.

NB: P. Lacau (1972, 54, §20.3) regarded -w as the suffix of “*noms d’outils, d’armes et de sceptres*”.

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 30) suurmised in it a prefix m-, but left the root it may have derived from unidentified. W. A. Ward (1961, 37, #20) rendered Eg. mšhtjw as the *nomen instr.* of an unattested *šht he equated with Ug. mšht “Schlachtbeil” [WUS] = “a weapon (of Baal to attempt to slay the messengers sent Yam in the Baal and Anath epic), a large weapon possibly of metal for crushing (not stabbing)” [Ward] = “a kind of axe or cleaver” [DUL 590–1], cf. also Ebl. /mašḥaṭum/ [DUL], which are also *nomina instr.*, cf. Sem. *šḥt ~ *šḥt “to slaughter” [TG].

NB1: Attested in Akk. šaḥātu “1. entblößen, 2. (Gewand) weg-, ab-, herunterreißen, ausziehen, 3. (Fell, Haut) abziehen, 5. abstoßen, 6. ab-, wegreißen, 8. (Finsternis) abreißen, beenden, 9. antblößen (?)” [AHW 1131] = “to tear off (skin) violently” [Ward] || Ug. *šḥt “to slaughter” [Gordon] = “schlachten” [WUS] = “to butcher, slaughter” [DUL 813], Hbr. šḥt qal “1. schlachten (ein Tier), 2. töten, morden (Menschen), 3. hämmern, treiben (Gold)” [GB 818] | Ar. saḥaṭa “1. égorger, tuer promptement, d’un seul coup, 2. suffoquer qqn.” [BK I 1060] = “schlachten” [GB] (Sem.: Gordon 1955, 327, #1819; WUS #2594). Note the unexpected Ar. -ḥ- contra Akk.-Ug. -ḥ-.

NB2: The Eg.-Sem. root may be eventually cognate with WCh.: NBauchi: Warji & Jimbin & Mburku & Kariya čəkət- “to cut, slaughter” [Skn. 1977, 17; JI 1994 II, 96].

- **2.** GT: alternatively, if the Eg. root was *msh (extended by -tj nomen agentis suffix + ending -w of masc. nouns), cp. perhaps NBrb.: Qbl. e-mšek · “enfiler, piquer, transpercer”, lemšekk “aiguille grosse et longue munie d’un chas pour enfiler sur un lieu souple des morceaux de viande...” [Dlt. 1982, 483].
- **3.** GT: since its signification as a body part was only secondary, its resemblance to the reflexes of AA *m-s-K “part of leg (?)” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. msd.t infra) may be due to pure chance.

mss “schlottern (vor Angst)” (XVIII.: Urk. IV 614:3, Wb II 149, 6) = “to totter” (FD 118) = “*taumeln, schwanken” (GHWb 364).

NB: For its supposed attestation of mss “vor Angst schlottern (?)” in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) cf. Osing 1998, 216–7, n. a.

● Origin uncertain.

- **1.** GT: ~ Brb.-Hs. *m-c(?) “to move, tremble” [GT]?

NB1: Cf. NBrb.: Shilh mussu “bouger, remuer” [Jst. 1914, 144] vs. musā “to move, tremble” [Aplg. 1958, 61] vs. s-muss(u) (caus.) “agiter, secourir” [Gouffé] || SBrb.: Tuareg: Hgr. mussu “1. être remué, (se) remuer, 2. p.ext. être agité, s’agiter” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1243] || WCh.: Hausa móócà (-ts-) “1. to move, 2. set out on journey” [Abr. 1962, 678] = móócàà “remuer (tr./intr.)” [Gouffé] (for Hausa-Brb. see Gouffé 1974, 368).

NB2: H. G. Mukarovsky (1982, 262) regarded the Hausa verb as a late loan deriving from Lat. mōtus “Bewegung”.

NB3: A var. root (with *-z) is attested in Ar. mazmaza I “agiter, remuer (dans tous les sens)”, II “1. être agité, remué (en tous sens), 2. ébranler, se mettre en mouvement pour se lever, 3. se disperser (sous l’influence de la frayeur)” [BK II 1100].

- **2.** GT: or cp. Ar. masmasa “être embrouillé et en confusion (se dit d’une affaire, des affaires)” [BK II 1107] ||| SBrb.: Hgr. √m-s-m-s: hemesmes “être surrexcité, être excité au delà des limites ordinaires et au point que cela paraît au dehors” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1244], EWlm. & Ayr mašuməš “être embarrassé, indécis” [PAM 2003, 562]?
- **3.** GT: related to Eg. ms “Ehrfurcht bezeugen vor (n)...” (XXII., Wb, above)?
- **4.** Ch. Ehret (1995, 301, #573) erroneously derived it from an AA *-mâč- “to walk swaying, move about disjointly” based on clearly unrelated parallels.

NB: Such as Ar. mṭʿ “to walk in a vulgar fashion”, Som. mašaḡo “turbamento”, ECu. *mačč- “to be drunk”, NOm.: Gongga: Mocha maš- “to be drunk”.

mss ~ mss.t “ein Kleidungsstück: Hemd”, mss n ʿh3 “Panzerhemd” (NK, Wb II 149, 7–8) = “cuirasse formée d’un cuir sur lequel des écailles de métal étaient cousues” (Maspero 1908, 176) = “a garment, mng. unknown (the usual translation ‘shirt’ is to be proved), perhaps the normal apron of the Eg. man” (Janssen 1961, 74, 92f.) = “garment (in general), clothes” (Rabin l.c. infra) = “apron” (Wente

LRL 1967, 73–74) = “tunic”, mss n ʿḥ3 “mail-shirt” (FD 118; Janssen 1975, 259–264, §60 with disc.) = “bag-tunic” (Hall 1981, 29) = “apron, kilt, tunic” (DLE I 242) = “Hemd, Tunika (in der Regel sackförmig zugeschnitten und sehr weit)” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 213 with lit.) = “Tunika, Ghalabiya” (GHWb 364) = “tunique, aussi chemise, peut-être de lin fin (un nom de vêtement qu’on porte quotidiennement où fait partie du matériel funéraire)” (Ryhiner 1995, 72, n. 68; Mathieu 1996, 39–40, n. 63 with lit. & 104, §340) = “tunic worn by both sexes (could be made of cloth, metal or leather), may be the ancient Eg. galabiyeh” (PL 466) = “garment, a simple, loose, bay shaped garment”, mss n ʿḥ3 “mail-shirt (made either of leather scales or from metal scales)” (Johnstone 2002, 595). Cf. also msj “Art Kleid” (late NK, Wb II 143, 4).

NB: R. M. Hall (1981, 29–34) discussed in detail the form of the piece of clothing supposed to be signified by Eg. mss: “one of the simplest of all garments, purely an inverted bag of linen-sheeting formed by a long rectangle folded over and stitched up..., with a slit being left at the top of each side for the arms, and for sleeves which could be attached if required. A keyhole-shaped cut, placed at or near the fold for the head to pass through... Such tunics, varying in length from knee to ankle, had to be made sufficiently wide to be easily put-on and taken-off...” (cf. also Hall, GM 40, 1980, 29–38, pl. 1). J. M. Johnstone (2002, 595–601) too analyzed its style and motifs. She distinguished a short version of Eg. mss which appeared in the MK “worn either belted or loose, with(out) short kilt and apron”, while the long version spread only in the NK as “a linen cloth of Syrian style”. In the Amarna correspondence, Akk. naḥlaptu “Gewand, Mantel” [AHW 715] = “1. wrap, outer garment (worn by soldiers and as festive apparel), 2. facing, coating, 3. leather or metal armor” [CAD n1, 138] “entspricht sicherlich dem” Eg. mss (Edel 1974, 118).

- Origin obscure.
- 1. G. Maspero (1908, 176) assumed an etymological connection with Eg. *ms (phon. value of the hrgl. depicting “la combinaison de peau de trois chacals ou renards”, q.v.), msk3 > msq “peau” (below) as well as Cpt. (S) ΜΟΥC, (B) ΜΟΥCΕ/HP “lorum, corium pour les sandales”, whereby he apparently deduced for Eg. a biconsonantal root *ms “leather”. This, however, hardly accords with the commonly accepted rendering of Eg. mss as “tunic”.
- 2. Usually affiliated with Ug. mtyn (Hurr. article -nni-) “a garment: shawl (un châle), sash (?)” [Watson, DUL] vs. cuneiform maššijannu “eine Schärpe (?)” [AHW 629] = “a garment” [CAD m1, 389], Hbr. mešī (≈ LXX τριχαπτον, Vulgate polymitus) “Seid, seidenes Zeug (LXX: haarfeine Fäden)” [GB 468] = “sheer veil” [Rabin] = “costly material, silk” [Guillaume] = “feines Gewand, Damast, vielfädig gewirkt, buntgewirkt (Vulgate)” [Habel] = “a kind of costly material for garments, a garment of fine linen, purple robes, fringes (LXX: plaited or woven of hair, fine veil of hair)” [Ellenbogen] = “fine cloth (for garments), woven from hair (LXX)” [KB 645a after

Hönig] = “a costly material for garments” [Mck.] = “silken gauze” [Lipiński], Hitt. ^{TÜG}maššiya- “ein Kleidungsstück, eine Art Gürtel oder Schal (?)” [Goetze] = “Tuchgürtel (?), Schal (?)” [Friedrich 1957, 13] = “shawl” [Rabin] = “ein Gürtel (?)” [AHW].

LIT.: Ellenbogen 1962, 109; Rabin 1963, 129–130, §13 & 129, fn. 4; de Moor, JNES 24 (1965), 361; Janssen 1975, 260; van Soldt, UF 22 (1990), 336, fn. 111; HEG II 160; KB 645; Watson 1995, 543 & fn. 50; 1999, 130, §4.9.2; 1999, 789, §28 & 790, fn. 30; 2000, 570, §24; 2000 MS, 3, §28; Cochavi-Rainey, UF 29 (1997), 100; Muchiki 1999, 250; Lipiński 2001, 209; DUL 606.

NB: Whether the very same Near Eastern *Wandervort* is represented by these terms is not at all evident. Their ultimate origin is not clear either. The speculations on this question have been usually formulated from the standpoint of Hbr. *meš*, which has no Sem. cognate. In both OT passages (Ezek. 16:10, 16:13) it occurs in, it is preceded by Hbr. *šēš* “(Egyptian) linen” [KB 1663], which was borrowed from Eg. *šs*. The following scenarios have been proposed in the lit. Ellenbogen assumed the Hbr. term to have been borrowed from Eg. Rabin (followed by de Moor): Hbr. and Eg. < Hitt. Alternatively, Rabin derived the Hitt., Hbr., and Eg. terms from an undefined common source. KB: Hbr. < Eg. or Hitt.? DUL: Ug. and Hbr. < Hitt. ~ (?) Eg. Muchiki rightly stressed the semantic and phonological (Eg. *s* ≠ Hbr. *š*) difficulties of the Eg.-Hbr. etymology, which he regarded as “*open to the choice*” as follows: (1) Hbr. < Eg., (2) Hbr. < Hitt., (3) cognates (!). The latter choice is certainly excluded. Lipiński preferred Hbr. < Eg. and hold Hbr. < Hitt. or Ar. to be less likely. Hbr. *meš* has been explained by Ben-Yehuda (quoted by Rabin) directly from Chinese *ssu* “silk” (!) with a “prefix” *me-*, while Guillaume 1965 IV, 9 (quoted also by KB, Muchiki, Lipiński) connected the Hbr. word rather with Ar. *wašy-* “1. couleur et dessin d’une étoffe à dessin colorié, 3. éclat ondoyant d’une lame damasquinée, 5. étoffe de soie à figures ou à ramage” [BK II 1545–6] = “a kind of variegated or figured cloth, garment” [Lane 3054] = “silk brocade” [Guillaume, KB] = “embroidery” [Lipiński]. Watson: Ug. < Hitt. via Hurr. (cf. Ug. cuneiform -*nnu*). Von Soden connected the Ug.-Hitt. term with Akk. *aššijanni* “wohl ein Kleiderstoff” [AHW 84] = “a decoration sewn on garments” [CAD a2, 465] (whose ending -*nni* indicates a borrowing from or via Hurr.). Tischler (HEG l.c.), in turn, did not exclude the derivation of Hitt. *maššiya-* from IE **mes-* “stricken, knüpfen” (attested only in Germanic and Balto-Slavonic).

- **3.** GT: or any connection to Akk. (OBab.) *massum* (or -*šš-*/*-zz-*?) “ein Gewand” [AHW 621] = “a garment” [CAD m1, 344] and/or SBrb. **√m-s-s* [GT] > Ayr *tā-mšāš*, pl. *ta-mšāš-en* “1. sorte de voile pour femme, mante (noir, enveloppe le corps entier), 2. voile de tête” [PAM 2003, 562]?

NB: Has the underlying verbal root been retained perhaps in CCh.: Hide *msa* “rouler, couvrir” [Egc. 1971, 219]?

mss or **msms** (GW) “strap, band, belt, girdle” (LP hapax, Harris, *Orientalia* NS 30, 1961, 366–370 contra Caminos 1958, 129, §201; cf. Wentz LRL 1967, 73–74 referring also to Pap. Geneva D 191, 60:2) = “Riemen, Gürtel” (KHW 102 pace Harris) = “Art Ring oder Fassung” (NBÄ 867 pace Harris but rejecting his etymology, cf. below) = “bandeau, ceinture (?)” (AL 77.1873).

NB1: Rdg. uncertain. Not clear if the signs of repetition “zp-sn” (for which cf. also Wessetzky 1945) pertains to -s (i.e., we should read mss) or to ms as a whole (i.e., msms²).

NB2: Whether Cpt. (SAF) HOYC , (B) $\text{HOY}\text{C}\text{E}/\text{HP}$ (m) “lorum, corium pour les sandales” (Maspero 1908, 176) = “strap (in harness), band, belt, girdle (soldier’s), thong” (CD 184) = “Lederstreifen, Riemen” (NBÄ 322) = “Riemen, Gürtel” (KHW 102) is related (as suggested by J. R. Harris, *Orientalia* NS 30, 1961, 366–370) is somewhat uncertain because of (B) -p, whereby J. Osing (NBÄ 322, 867, n. 1384) has reconstructed the underlying etymon as *mās-r treated as an “m-Bildung” of Eg. sr “Haar (einer Frau, eines Tieres)” (Lit. MK, Wb IV 191, 3–4) > Cpt. (S) CIP “hair, line, stripe” (CD 353b; CED 160) = “Haar, Streifen, Strähne”. The use of the hrgl. F27 (hide of leopard?) or V7 (loop of cord) in Dem. msr attested as a gloss to Eg. ms “Ehrfurcht bezeugen” in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) also led Osing (1998, 215, n. af) in the light of (B) $\text{HOY}\text{C}\text{EHP}$ to assuming that the notion “leather belt (or sim.)” was “vielleicht vom Glossator mit äg. *ms < *msr in Verbindung gebracht”. This theory, however, fails in explaining the anomaly of (S) -Ø vs. (B) -HP, the unusual retention of old (MK) -r# in (B) -P as well as the traceless loss of the whole 2nd syllable in (S) HOYC instead of * $\text{HOY}\text{C}\text{E}$.

- Existence of word and etymology very uncertain.
- 1. The rendering “apron” given by E. F. Wente (1967, 73, n. aa) seems to suggest an equation with Eg. mss (above). Similarly, G. Maspero (1908, 176) combined Cpt. (SAF) HOYC etc. with Eg. mss “cuirasse” (above).
- 2. GT: if its suggested rendering is correct, LEg. msms “girdle (or sim.)” (in spite of its GW) could be a perfect nominal derivative of the equally hypothetic PT mzmz “to girdle (or sim.)” (q.v.).
- 3. O. Bates (1914, 83) combined it with Brb. * $\sqrt{\text{b-š-š}}$: Wed Righ a-bešši “belt, girdle”, Wargla bešš (aor. i-bešši) “to gird o’self (with a belt)”, but Eg. m- vs. Brb. *b- are irreg.
- 4. GT: or perhaps akin to PCu. *mās- “strip, strand” [Ehret] = *mVs- “rope” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in SAgaw: Awngi mas “stubble” [Ehret] || ECu. *ma/is- “cord” [Ehret 1991, 218] > LECu.: POMO-Tana *mas- “cord” [Ehret]: e.g., Dsn. (Galab) mas “rope” [Sasse 1974, 416] = más-a “rope” [Tosco 2001, 516] | Yaaku misa?, pl. mih-nin [-h- < *-s-] (m) “thong” [Heine 1975, 135] = mis (sic) [Ehret] || SCu.: Ma’a lu-msu or lu-mušu “Strick” [Mnh. 1906, 312] = la-mušu “fiber rope” [Ehret 1974, 46] (Cu.: Ehret 1987, 99, #417) || NOM.: Kaffa mašō “stoffa in seta di cui si fanno mantelli di cerimonia” [Crl. 1951, 474], Mocha mašo “red thread” [Lsl. 1959, 42] || CCh.: (?) Bata-Garwa masé “Ader” [Str. 1922–23, 115] || ECh.: Mkl. mēšuwé (m) “corde à trois brins en rônier” [Jng. 1990, 139].

NB2: The etymology of ECu.: Sid. mačc-o “breiter Ledergürtel der Männer” [Ehret] is obscure. Ch. Ehret (1991, 252, §179) combined it with LECu.: Afar maḍuy “tying action” (where ma- is, in fact, a noun prefix!) erroneously derived from an ECu. *maḣ- “to tie up”.

mss (inf.) “Tätigkeit (vom Zimmerplatz)” (XXII., Wb II 149, 9) = “(unbekannt)” (JW 1996, 98, §156).

- Mng. and origin unknown. Only speculation is possible.

NB: GT: cf. perhaps (1) N.Om.: Omt. mas- “piallare, lavorare il legno, scavare” [Mrn. 1938, 151], Gamu mass- “to carve” [Sottile 1999, 437], Koyra mas- “to carve” [Hyw. 1982, 237]? (2) Or Akk. mšš N “to be wiped, polished” [CAD m1, 360] and/or (3) Ar. mss “frapper, atteindre qqn. (en parlant d’un événement, surtout malheureux)” < mss “toucher” [BK II 1101] ||| CCh.: (?) Mada ámc̣a [-č- < ?] “frapper, battre, donner des coups” [Br.-Brunet 2000, 175]?

mssb.t or **msb.t** (GW) “a metal tool” (Ostr. Gardiner 146, line 4, hapax, CED 91, not listed in DLE) = “ein Metall-Gerät (?)” (KHW 520) = “aiguille” (AL 77.1874) = “hache” (!) (Aufrère 1990, 106) = “große Nadel” (GHWb 364) > Cpt. (S) *MCΩBE, EMCΩBE, MCΩΠE, (B) EMCΩBI, MECTΩBI, (F) MECTΩBI (f) “large needle” (CD 186b) = “Nadel” (KHW 102) = “aiguille” (DELIC 122).

NB: W. Vycichl (DELIC 122) prefers to read msb.t in spite of two diverse syllabic groups for -s-.

- 1. J. Osing (NBÄ 206, 744, n. 900; cf. KHW 520), in the light of (B) MECTΩBI, reconstructed *ṃtbās.̣t (sic, with *-tb-), which he explained (via met.) as an “m-Bildung” of Eg. tbs “stechen (vom Dorn)” (GR, Wb V 262, 10) = “to prick, pierce” (PL 1133) > Cpt. (SA) TΩBC “anstacheln, antreiben, stechen, stoßen” (KHW 223).

This etymology was (probably rightly) ignored by W. Vycichl (l.c.).

NB: A. H. Gardiner (HPBM III 17, nn. 2–3) identified the etymon of GR tbs with late NK dbs “to prick” (DLE IV 130; PL 1134), which speaks against Osing’s *ṃssāḅ < *ṃssāḅ < *ṃtsāḅ.̣(t) < *ṃtbās.̣t. Moreover, (B) -TC- is not an absolute proof for old *-ts- > *-ss-, cf. (S) MECTΩΠΩHE, MECTΩΠΩHE, (A) MECTΩΠΩHE, (B) MECTΩΠΩHE < old ṃspn.t (discussed below), where an etymon *ṃtspn.t or sim. can be certainly excluded.

- 2. GT: alternatively, perhaps an m- prefix *nomen instr.* of an unattested Eg. *sb or *zb (?) “to sew” < AA *S-P “to sew” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in WSem. *špw/y “to sew”: Ar. šfy: ?išfā “alène” [BK I 1252] = “awl” [Lsl.] | MSA *šfw: Jbl. šfe “to stitch a leather bag, sew leather”, mōšfē? “nail, sharpened to sew leather” [Jns. 1981, 247], Mhr. šōfū “to sew (leather, with an awl)”, mōšfīw “nail sharpened for sewing leather bags” [Jns. 1987, 374] = mišfiu “Bohrer” [Jahn] || ES *šfy “to sew” [Lsl.] > i.a. Gees safaya “to sew, stitch, mend, patch”, masfe “awl, large needle” [Lsl.], Tna. māsfe “awl” [Lsl.], Tigre māsfe “big needle” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 490) ||| N.Om. *sip- “to sew” [Bnd. 1988, 150]: P.Omt. *sip- [Bnd.] = *sipp- “to sew” [Lsl. 1988, 268] > e.g. Koyra sip- “to sew” [Hyw. 1982, 237] | Gimirra sip “to sew” [Lsl.] | Kaffā šip “1. cucire, 2. tessere tappeti” [Crl. 1951, 500], Mocha šippi-ye “to sew” [Lsl.] | PMao *šib “to sew” [Flm.]: Hozo šib-/šiw-i, Sezo šiw-e, EMao šif (Mao: Flm. 1988, 38) ||| CCh. *z-b “to sew” [JI 1994 I, 147] = *z-b [GT]: Mandara ẓb-ə (dz-) [Mirt], Glavda ẓib- (dz-) “to sew” [RB 1968, 35] | Logone ṣbā [Mch.] = ṣba “nähen” [Nct. apud Lks. 1936, 117] | Kola... hízib... [Schubert] (CCh.: JI 1994 II 289). The sibilant and labial correspondences of Sem. vs. Ch. are irregular. The supposed Eg. reflex (*sb/*zb) seems to be closer to Ch. *z-b.

NB2: Akk. šapū ~ šabū “einbinden, einnesteln” [AHW 1177] is probably hardly related directly to the AA root described above (contra AHW; Dlg. 1983, 137; Lsl. 1987, 490). Cp. rather Ar. šff I & IV “tresser les feuilles de palmier pour en faire des

paniers, etc.” [BK I 1096] ||| Eg. sp “(ein Schiff) zusammenbinden (aus Papyrus)” (OK, Wb IV 96, 13) ||| ECu.: Dullay *šap(p)- “binden” [Ss. after AMS 1980, 234]. For the supposed ultimate origin of both AA roots see Dlg. 1973, 236; Ss. 1981, 146; Dlg. 1983, 137; OS 1989, 89; Blz. 1989, 206.

msq (GW) “Art Bearbeitung von Metallwaffen” (XIX. hapax: Pap. Koller 1:7, Wb II 150, 1) = “aus-, wegziehen, -putzen” (Rn. 1887, 265–6) = “zerkleinern” (Thausing 1941, 22, fn. 1) = “(mng. unknown, old pf. qualifying the ‘facings’)” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 434) = “ziseliiert” (Helck, MWNr II 197) = “Tatigkeit der Metallwaffenbearbeitung” (Helck 1971, 514, #112) = “schärfen” (KHW 520) = “frapper, battre (le métal)” (AL 77.1876, 78.1866) = “activity of a metal worker” (DLE I 243) = “metal working, a metallurgical activity pertaining to the making of weapons” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 24, 81) = “a metalworking activity: to emboss, hammer (?), hammered work (?)” (Hoch 1994, 153, §200 & 173, §229) = “(Metall) schmieden, schlagen” (GHWb 365).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-šá-qa (Hoch) = ma-ša-qa (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey).

NB2: J. Hoch (1994, 172–3, §229) treated msq as the met. of mgs (GW) “Verbum von der Arbeit am Schurz einer Statue” (XX., Wb II 164, 15) = “a metal working activity: to emboss, hammer (?)” (Hoch). D. Meeks (1997, 43, §229), however, demonstrated that of the two exx. of mgs suggested by Hoch, only that attested in Pap. Turin (P + R) 32:5 (KRI VI 335:9) might fit msq of Pap. Koller 1:7, while mgs of Pap. Turin (P + R) 32:7 (KRI VI 335:12) is merely a wtg. of mks “sceptre” (as correctly indicated in Wb II 164 and Hoverstreydt 1997, 110, n. g, rendered in Woodhouse 2003, 280, §229 alternatively as “document case”), which has thus nothing to do with the former two exx. For mgs in Pap. Chester Beatty V see HPBM III, vol. I, 49, n. 9. D. Meeks (l.c.) has regarded it also as dubious whether msq (Pap. Koller 1:7) and mgs (Pap. Turin P + R 32:5) represent the same word.

NB3: Is msq (knife det.) “ob Waffe (?)” (BD, Wb II 149, 18) = “(Subst.)” (GHWb 366) connected?

- Hence: Cpt. (SMF) **MOYCK**, (B) **MOCK**⁺ “1. to strike, rub (?), 2. be sharpened be whetting (?)” (CD 186b) = “1. schlagen, 2. reiben, schärfen” (KHW 102).

NB: Its derivation from msq of Pap. Koller 1:7 was suggested by G. Fecht (KHW 520) and by J. Osing (1978, 189).

- Etymology highly debated.
- 1. L. Reinisch (1887, 265–6) suggested semantically untenable Sem. cognates.

NB: Such as Hbr. mšq qal “ziehen” [GB 468], Ar. mšq I “5. déchirer (une robe), 6. abîmer (la jambe), froisser par sa rudesse (se dit d’un vêtement neuf qui n’est pas encore assoupli)”, IV “fouetter”, V “1. être déchiré, lacéré”, VIII “2. couper, retrancher une partie de la chose” [BK II 1111–2], Ar. msk I “mettre la main sur...” [BK II 1105].

- 2. O. Bates (1914, 82) equated Eg. msq “to pluck off, snatch” (sic) with Brb. *m-z (sic, correctly *m-z) “to seize, take away”. False.

- **3.** G. Thausing (1941, 22, fn. 1) and D. Meeks (1997, 43, §229) regarded it as the m- prefix form of Eg. sqr > (OK) sqj “schlagen” (PT, Wb IV 306). Unconvincing, since the function of m- here has not been cleared.
NB: Thausing extended this etymology also to Eg. ḥsq “abschneiden, abhauen” and jsq (sic).
- **4.** R. Caminos (1954 LEM, 161) surmised a connection with Eg. nqs (Pap. Anastasi IV, rt. 7:11–8:1) ~ nsq (Pap. Anastasi I, 18:3) “bildlich von boshafte(n) Reden (?)” (Wb II 336, 16). Similarly, D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 16, §1.2.2.1 & 24, §1.2.6) assumed Eg. *mattaqa to derive “*evidently*” from *mantaqa (cf. also Vittmann 1997, 283), which they regarded as an m- prefix noun connected with Sem. *nṯ reflected by Ug. nṯq “a weapon: missiles, projectile, dart (?)” [DUL 654], Hbr. nēšeq ~ nešeq “Waffen, Rüstung” [GB 528] = “equipment, weapons” < nšq II qal “to take one’s place in rank, acquiesce, 2. be armed (with a bow)”, hifil “to touch one another (flapping wings?)” [KB 731] and eventually “*probably*” also Eg. nsq (GW) “sharp sayings”. Semantically dubious.
- **5.** W. Helck (1971, 514, #112) remained neutral: “*Ableitung unsicher*”.
- **6.** J. Hoch (1994, 173, §229) affiliated Eg. *maqaša (sic) with “(hammered/embossed) metal-work” with Hbr. miqšā “gedrehte, gedrechselte Arbeit”, miqše “gedrehte Arbeit (von künstlich geflochtenen Haaren)” [GB 457]. Semantically weak.
NB: In Hoch’s view, the underlying Hbr. root (√qšy) is only known as a m- preformative noun, but cf. Hbr. qšy qal “hart, schwer sein (Grundbedeutung fest drehn?)” [GB 732].
- **7.** GT: or perhaps related to Geez masaqa ~ mašaqa “to carve, hew” [Lsl. 1987, 366]?
NB: W. Leslau (l.c.) quotes a Geez var. form n- considered to be original.
- **8.** GT: semantically, most attractive seems its genetic cognacy with WCh.: Ngz. mąsú “to flatten out, squash, smooth with rubbing motion” [Schuh 1981, 109], which would imply that Eg. mgs displays the original root.

msk3 (OK-NK) > **msq** (from XVIII.) “Haut, Fell eines Tiers, Leder” (PT, Wb II 150, 3–5 & II 149, 10–14) = “leather” (FD 118; WD III 56) = “oxhide” (DLE I 243) = “Haut von Tieren (Stier, Nilpferd, Schlange), Fell” (GHWb 365) = “leather, hide, skin of an animal” (PL 466).

NB: F. W. von Bissing (1955–56, 334) suggested an uncertain OK attestation of the late var. msq (V, Abusir), which has not been confirmed in AWb I. Drenkhahn (1976, 12) supposes that the form msk3, which is “*nur bis zum N.R. belegt*”, was “*danach*

vermutlich durch das seitdem M. R. belegte dh̄r abgelöst”, although J. J. Janssen (1975, 398, fn. 1) stressed the semantical distinction of MK msk3 “hide” vs. dh̄r “leather”.

- Etymology uncertain. Already H. Grapow (1914, 30) surmised a prefix m- in it, but was unable to identify the underlying root.

- **1.** Most of the authors treat it as a probable cognate of Sem. *mašk- “pelle (tolta dal corpo)” [Frz.] = *ma/išk- “skin” [SED], but the anomaly of Eg. -3 vs. Sem. *-Ø is a serious hindrance.

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Rn. 1873, 272, fn. 3; 1887, 362; Bondi 1897, 5; Holma 1911, X, 3; Ember 1913, 115, #43, 116, #59; GB 468; Wb II 150; Clc. 1936, #205; Vrg. 1945, 141, #16.b.5; Mlt. 1984, 15; Faber 1984, 203, §14.

NB1: Attested in Oakk. maškum “skin” [Gelb 1973, 185] > Akk. mašku “Haut, Fell” [AHW 627] = “skin, leather” [CAD m1, 376] || (?) Ug. msg “1. (animal) skin, 2. leather of a certain kind (to cover chariots)” [DUL 581], Hbr. mešek “skin bag” [Rabin] = “borsa di pelle” [Frz.] = “leather pouch” [KB 646], OAram. mšk “шкура” [SAN IV 204] = “skin, hide” [DNWSI 700], JAram. (TTM) maškā(?) “1. Haut, 2. Fell” [Dalman 1922, 257], JPAram. & Samar. Aram. mšk “skin, leather” [Sokoloff 1990, 334; Tal 2000, 490], JNAram. maška “sheepskin used as milk container” [Sabar 2002, 226], Mand. miška ~ (sporadically) maška “skin”, cf. perhaps masik “fresh peel, or bark of a tree” [DM 270, 249, 255] = meškā “skin” [KB], Syr. meškā “cutis” [Brk. 1928, 407] | Ar. mask-, pl. mustik- “peau ôtée récemment d’un agneau ou d’un chevreau” [BK II 1106] = “sac en cuir, une grande outre en peau de boeuf, carrée, pour porter l’eau à dos de chameau ou de mulet” [Dozy II 592] = “freshly-flayed skin” [Rabin] = “removed skin” [KB], Dathina mask, pl. mustik “peau récemment ôtée” [GD 2695; prob. < Akk., sic] etc. (Sem.: e.g. Frz. 1964, 266, #2.30; 1971, 634, #7.44; Rabin 1975, 89, #76; KB 645; SED I 172, §190) || Bed. mesik, pl. miska “Haut, Fell” [Rn. 1895, 173] (Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 28: < Ar.) || LECu.: Somali (< Ar.) másag (m) “Lederschlauch, Wasserschlauch” [Rn. 1902, 304] = “outre” [Chn.] = “water skin” [Boisson]. L. Kogan (SED L.c.) compared also ES: Harari miskät “buttocks” [Lsl.] “with specific meaning shifts”, but this is hardly convincing, cf. rather AA *m-s-K “part of leg” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. msd.t infra, cf. also Eg. ms̄htjw supra).

NB2: The Sem. term is probably of deverbal origin (lit. “das Abgezogene” as usually suggested in the lit. after L. Koehler, cf. GB 468; Frz. 1964, 266, #2.30; Lsl. 1969, 20; Faber 1984, 203, §14; KB 645; abandoned or ignored in SED L.c.), cp. Sem. *-mšuk- “scuoiare” [Frz.] = *ms,k “to pull” [Faber] (discussed s.v. Eg. mst.t).

NB3: Accepting the equation of Eg. msk3 ~ Sem. *mašk-, P. Lacau (1970, 150, #406) considered Eg. msk3 to be an ancient m- prefix form of an unattested Eg. *sk3 (“la correspondance avec héb. mšk indiquerait qu’il s’agit d’une formation ancienne en m-préfixe... remontant au fonds commun”), which, however, certainly excludes the connection with Sem. *mašk-, in which *m- was not at all a prefix.

NB4: The Sem. term was borrowed (via Akk. or Aram.) into a number of non-AA lgs.: Gk. (Hesychios, Nikandros) μέσκος (≈ κώδιον, δέρμα) “pelle” [Mayer] = “skin, leather” [KB] (Reinisch 1873, 272, fn. 3; Mayer 1960, 90), OPers. maškā- “inflated skin” > NPers. mask (Kent 1953, 203), OIndic maśāka- (m) “leather bag” [MW 1899, 793] (Rn. l.c.), and (via some Iranian source) Burushaski mašk “skin bag for carrying water” [Boisson] = “skin for water” [KB] (Boisson 1989, 10).

NB5: L. Reinisch (1887, 362) and M. Cohen (1947, #471) erroneously affiliated the Sem.-Eg. isogloss with NAgaw: Bilin wāšaḳā “gegerbte Kuhhaut, welche man aufbreitet um darauf zu schlafen” [Rn.] = wašaqa “peau, cuir (servant de couche)” [Rn.], which derives in fact from NAgaw *wVčäy-a “leather for sleeping on it” [Apl. 2006, 83].

NB6: Some authors opinion that either Eg. msk3 (OK) may be a very early loan from Sem. (Conti 1978, 84, fn. 4; HSED #1744) or NK msq was a late borrowing

from Can. (Helck 1962, 506, #4; 1971, 506, fn. 4), but both scenarios are false. Neither OK -3 can be explained from Sem. *-Ø nor NK msq can be separated from OK-NK msk3.

NB7: L. Bender (1975, 185, §72.1) connected Akk. mašku “skin” with ES: Geez maʾis “skin” and CCh.: Margi šmči “skin (of man)” [Hfm. apud RK 1973, 101 & JI] = inši? [IL/JI 1994 II, 296] on a biconsonantal basis. But the origins of the Geez and Margi words are uncertain (for further discussion cf. Eg. *ms above).

- **2.** G. Maspero (1908, 176) derived it from a biconsonantal root which he affiliated with Eg. *ms “peau de chacal”, mss “cuirasse formé d’un cuir”, Cpt. (S) ΜΟΥC “lorum, corium pour les sandales”. False. The origin of Eg. -k3 would remain unexplained.
- **3.** E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 172) combined it with Nub.: Kunuzi & Dongola busug “Ledersack”, which is equally unconvincing.
- **4.** C. T. Hodge (1991, 641) equated Eg. msk3 [< *mskl] with Hbr. maškil (≈ LXX συνέσεως, Vulgate intellectus), whose rendering is debated. Certainly excluded for a number of reasons.

NB: The Hbr. term has been translated as “Bezeichnung einer Psalmenart, (gewöhnlich übersetzt als) Lehrgedicht, vielleicht eher Huldigungslied” [GB 465] = “Meditation, Nachdenken” [Delitzsch] = “cult song” [Kittel] = “memory passage” [Maag] = “wisdom song performed to music” [Mowinckel] = “a parchment document” [Hodge] (cf. KB 641), which hardly accords with Eg. msk3. In addition, the underlying root is Hbr. škl hifil “Acht geben, einsichtsvoll betrachten, verständnisvoll sein usw.” [GB 785–6] = “to understand, comprehend, have insight” [KB 1328], which has hardly anything to do with the notion of “skin”. Besides, Eg. -s- vs. Hbr. -š- would be also irregular.

- **5.** C. Boisson (1989, 10) related it with Sem.: Akk. maškaru “Schwimmschlauch” [AHW 627] = “waterskin (used for floating and wine)” [CAD m1, 374] || Ug. mškr-t “skin (?)” [DUL 591]. Unlikely.

NB: This is apparently a *ma-pras- nomen instr. stem, which was derived by W. von Soden (AHW l.c.) from Akk. šakāru “betrunken werden” [AHW 1139], which does not fit Eg. msk3.

- **6.** GT: the hypothetic Eg. simplex *sk3 might perhaps represent an older variety (prior to the first Eg. palatalization) of Eg. st3 [< *sk?] “ziehen” (PT, Wb IV 351–353).

NB1: For the supposed parallels of Eg. st3 in Bed., Yaaku, SBch., Tobanga see Takács 1999, 111, #57; 1999, 351.

NB2: For the semantic shift cf. e.g. Sem. *mašk- < *mšk (above), Norwegian tinder (f) & ODanish tan “Zwerchfell” < IE *ten- “dehnen, ziehen, spannen” (IEW 1065–6), or Gk. δέμμα < δέπω.

mskj “Gerücht, Klatsch” (Lit. MK, Wb II 150, 7; GHWb 365) = mskj n md.t “slander (?)” (FD 118) = “rumeur, médisance” (AL 77.1878).

NB: Attested also in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as msk “Vorwurf (?)” with an OCpt. gloss ΜΟΥCΚ (Osing 1998, 77, n. h), which speaks against the proposal by W. Westendorf (KHW 559) to explain Eg. mskj as the etymon of Dem. šmšk

“zischen” (DG 512:1) = “to hiss” (CED) > Cpt. (SL) $\varpi\eta\varpi\eta\delta\epsilon$, (B) $\varpi\eta\varpi\eta\chi\iota$ “to whisper” (CD 568a) = “zischeln, wispern, spotten” (KHW 315). Because of Dem.-k, equally unlikely is the proposal by J. Černý (CED 245) to project the etymon of the Cpt. verb as *šem^osēded, the compound of Eg. šm^o > (S) $\varpi\eta\alpha$ “to be(come) s) light” + Eg. sdd > (S) $\varpi\lambda\chi\epsilon$ “talking”, lit. “lightness of talk”.

- **1.** J. Osing (1998, 77, n. h) suggests that it is “*wohl eine m-Ableitung zu*” Eg. sk “Beschwerde gegen jem., Beschuldigung jemds.” (MK, Wb IV 313, 11–12), which seems convincing.
NB: Eg. sk has been usually equated with Ar. škw: šakā I “1. se plaindre de qqch. à qqn., 2. souffrir de quelque mal, 3. affecter, faire souffrir qqn., lui causer de la douleur”, šakā[?]-, šikāy-at-, šakw-at-, šakwā “plainte” [BK I 1261] || Geez sākāyā “klagen, beschuldigen, anklagen” [Müller] = sakaya “to lay an accusation, accuse, complain of, charge with a crime, claim” [Lsl. 1987, 498]. For Eg.-Sem.: Müller 1961, 203, §18; Lsl. 1962, 46, §12; Conti 1978, 28, fn. 2. Note the irreg š- in Ar. (≠ s- of Geez and Eg.).
- **2.** GT: because of Eg. -j, much less likely seems a relationship to Akk. masāku (var. -š-) “schlecht sein, werden” [AHW 618] = masāku (var. -š-) G “to be ugly, bad”, Š “to give a bad name”, N “to become bad, receive blame”, mas/šiktu “bad reputation, bad feelings, wrongdoing” [CAD m1, 322–3].

msktw (var. **msktwj**) “Armring (am Unterarm) aus Gold oder Leder” (XVIII., Wb II 150, 8–9) = “armlet” (FD 118) = “breite, gewölbte, über dem Handgelenk sitzende Armreife mit flachen Rändern” (Stachelin, LÄ I 442) = “Unterarmreifen (gelegentlich tönncchenförmig, meist am rechten, ab und zu an beiden Handgelenken getragen)” (Feucht, LÄ II 731) = “Gegenstück für mhbt.t (breiter flacher Ring um das linke Handgelenk) am rechten Handgelenk (tönncchenförmig)” (Edel 1987, 45) = “Unterarmreif (aus Gold oder Leder)” (GHWb 365).

NB1: For its form cf. its det. in Urk. IV 38:16, 40:16 and Schäfer, ZÄS 70, 1934, 12, fig. 13, fn. 3.

NB2: The rdg. msk.wt (suggested by Edel l.c.) is improbable due to the standard wtg. of its Auslaut as -tw.

- Etymology uncertain. Neither of the proposals explain the ending -tw.
- **1.** A. G. Belova (1989, 11) affiliated it with Hbr. moškōt “bracelet, fetter” [KB 646] | Ar. masak-at- (sg.) vs. masak- (pl.) “bracelet de jambes ou de bras fait d’écaille ou d’ivoire” [BK II 1106] = “bracelets made of tortoise-shell or ivory, bracelets and anklets made of horn” [Lane 3020] = “браслет из рога или слоновой кости” [Blv.] = “restraint, armband” [KB], Yemeni Ar. miskah ~ miskih, pl. misak “bracelet” [Piamenta 1990, 466]. She did not exclude a borrowing from Can.

NB1: These forms are usually explained from Sem. *mšk “to pull” > Ar. msk “to take, hold, restrain”, cf. also Hbr. *mešek, cstr. mešek- rendered diversely, i.a. as “Armband” [GB 469: Yahuda, JQR 15, 704].

NB2: Akk. mesukku “2. Teil von Schmuckringen usw.” [AHW 648: u.H.] does not exist. In fact, the word primarily denotes “a bird of prey (possibly the falcon)” including also the “representations (probably of a falcon) in jewelry, i.a., bracelet” [CAD m2, 36] (kind p.c. by E. Reiner & D. Testen, 7 and 8 Feb. 2000, resp.).

- **2.** J. Lauth (1871, 635, §138) combined it with Hbr. massēkā II “Decke” [GB 440] = “covering” [KB 605] = “fusio metalli” [Lauth], ma- prefix form of nsk II “flechten, weben” [GB 508] = “to plait, braid” [KB]. Semantically unlikely.
- **3.** L. Reinisch (1873, 280, fn. 2) linked it to Aram. pešak “palma manus” and Kanuri and Teda-Kanem musko “Hand”. Both suggestions are out of question.
- **4.** H. Grapow (1914, 30) supposed (with hesitation) in Eg. msktw a prefix m- without identifying the underlying root (*skt?).

mst.w “Art Beutel” (MK hapax: Cairo coffin 28027, Wb II 152, 1) = “Art Säckchen” (Grapow 1914, 31) = “ballot d’ètoffes” (Jéquier 1921, 350).

NB: In the same work, G. Jéquier (1921, 32) rendered it “le pagne ordinaire”.

- Etymology uncertain.
- **1.** H. Grapow (l.c.) assumed a prefix m- in it (leaving the underlying root unidentified).
- **2.** Not clear whether it is distinct from Eg. mstr.t (q.v., cf. Jéquier 1921, 18, 32, fn. 5).
NB: G. Jéquier (1921, 148) clearly maintained the identity of Eg. mstr.t vs. mst.w, “d’après laquelle on constate que la sonnante finale -r n’est pas...un élément indispensable du radical” (sic).
- **3.** I. Grumach-Shirun (LÄ III 741, n. 10) affiliated it with Eg. msd.t “Kleidungsstück” (PT 416) and msd.t ~ mstj “(nicht Korb, sondern) auf Seilbasis geflochtene Tasche” (NK, below) used parallel with h3r “Sack” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 408).

mst3 ~ vars. **mstj** ~ **mst3nj** ~ **mstnj** ~ **mstnw** “eine bestimmte Flüßigkeit” (MK Med., Wb II 151, 1–4; GHWb 365) = “(it might mean) spring-water, well” (Griffith 1898, 10) = “paste, paste-water” (Ebbell 1937; Massart 1954, 108–9, n. 24) = “liquide particulier” (Jonckheere 1947, 19, fn. 6) = “eine unbekannte Droge, vielleicht eine dickliche Flüßigkeit” (WÄDN 285–287).

NB1: As noted by H. Deines & H. Grapow (WÄDN l.c.), B. Ebbell’s translation “deutet nur die mehr breiige Beschaffenheit an, während die Determinative des Wassers und des Topfes mehr auf eine Flüßigkeit hinzuweisen scheinen”.

NB2: W. Westendorf (1962, 12, §22.c.5.cc) assumed the group -3nj to reflect either an *-l or “den Übergang (sic) 3 > n”, but it resembles rather the morpheme -nj “grammatisches Element (als verstärkender Zusatz?)” (Wb II 201, 1), whose function

is debated (cf. Naville 1905, 160; Sethe 1907, 84–85; Erman 1909, 104–6; Grd. 1918, 5–7; Breasted 1930, 160–1, 188, 275; Edel 1944, 85; perhaps also ÜKAPT VI 137).

- Interpretation and etymology obscure. Presumably an m- prefix derivation, but the underlying root has not yet been convincingly identified.
- **1.** GT: does the hypothetical *st3 represent the caus. form of the root attested in Eg. t3 (water + vessel det.) “(?)” (Med., Wb V 231, 5–6; GHWb 915) = “Lauge (des Wäschers) (?)” (Ebbell quoted in WÄDN 543)?
- **2.** GT: or should we assume Eg. *st3? This could be a regular match of either Ar. $\sqrt{\text{stl}}$ or $\sqrt{\text{stl}}$.
 NB1: Cf. either **(1)** Ar. *saṭala* “sortir à la suite l’un de l’autre (se dit, p.ex., des gouttes d’eau, de sueur ou de sang qui paraissent ou coulent l’une après l’autre”, *sutāl-at* “reste, résidu, tout ce qu’on laisse comme étant de qualité inférieure, après avoir pris le meilleure partie” [BK I 1050–1] or **(2)** less probably Ar. *saṭala* VII–VIII “s’enivrer, s’étourdir de la boisson préparée avec une herbe” [BK I 1089] = *saṭala* I “to intoxicate (said of a medicine, a vulgar word)”, VII–VIII “to be in a state of intoxication produced by the herb ḥašš- or perhaps species of herb” [Lane 1359] = *saṭala* VII “se prendre de vin, s’achever de peindre, achever de s’enivrer, être ravi en extase, s’extasier” [Dozy I 653].
 NB2: Ar. *saṭl-* “1. petit vase à une anse avec lequel on puise l’eau dans les bains pour la verser sur le corps, 2. bénitier” [BK] = “small vessel having a loop-shaped handle” [Lane] is not a Persian loan-word (as pointed out by R. Dozy l.c.).
- **3.** A.G. Belova (1987, 277) compared Eg. *st3 with Sem. *šty “to drink” [GT], which is not at all convincing there being no correspondence between Eg. -3 vs. Sem. *-y.

mstj.wt “Galeeren” (Thotmes III, hapax: Pap. BM 10056, rt. 8:13, Helck MWNR 877, 887, after Glanville). The same word is attested in **mstj** (f) “Art Schiff” (late XIX., hapax: Pap. Anastasi IV 10:4, Wb II 151, 9) = “an unidentified type of vessel, many-oared boat with a fairly small craft: naval cutters (?)” (Glanville 1932, 16–17, §32) = “a many-oared boat” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 173) = “boat” (DLE I 243) = “kind of boat” (Jones 1988, 140, §42) = “small galley propelled by oars (must be a vessel of fairly large bank of oars, which were relatively small, and dependent upon larger war ships)” (Hoch 1994, 153) = “mit vielen Ruderern bemanntes Boot” (Düring 1995, 148 after LEM).

NB: The (fully) manned mstj-boat is compared in Pap. Anastasi IV 10:4 with a vulture’s wing (LEM 173).

- Origin disputed.
- **1.** H. Brugsch (Wb Suppl. 644) combined it with Eg. m3s.tj (q.v.), which – as rightly noted by S. R. K. Glanville (l.c.) – “cannot be right, since m3stj is only part of a ship, but it is possible that there is a connection, or even that mstj derives from m3stj”.

- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 153–4, §201) set up *mašōṭa (fem.!) and regarded it “*quite possible*” that it was a Can. loan reflecting Hbr. māšōṭ “oar”, JAram. mēšōṭā “oar, a light ship”, Ar. miswaṭ- “stirring stick” < (via *mV- of nomina instr.) Sem. *šwṭ “to beat, stir, row”.
- **3.** GT: or perhaps < Eg. *mst “to transport (or sim.)” (cf. Eg. mst.t below) with -tj < old *-tʔ

mstr.t ~ mztr.t ~ mstr “Art Gewebe und der aus ihm gefertigte Schurz” (PT, MK, Wb II 152, 3) = “ein Gewebe” (Grapow 1914, 31) = “nom d’étoffe” (Jéquier 1921, 33, §24) = “pagne ordinaire pour désigner de simples étoffes, parfois aussi... étoffes pliées en bal-lots” (Jéquier 1921, 18, 32, 36; 1921, 148) = “kilt” (AEPT 12, utt. 57L) = “pagne, cache-sexe” (Meeks 1977, 83 & fn. 5; AL 77.1883, 79.1363) = “1. ein Gewebe, 2. Schurz (aus dem Gewebe)” (GHWb 365; ÄWb I 565).

nb: The oldest var. (Dyn. VI) has -t- (PT 40 + 12, spell 57K-L, cf. AEPT Suppl. 2).

- Origin uncertain, but most convincing seems etymology #1. H. Grapow (1914, 31) has already surmised the prefix m- in it (although left the underlying root unidentified).
- **1.** F. Buhl (GB 553; KB 771) and V.M. Illič-Svityč (1966, 322, #2.24) regarded it as the nomen instr. of an Eg. (*str ~ Sem. *str “по/скрывать” [IS]: Hbr. str nifal “sich verbergen, verborgen sein”, sitrā “Schirm, Schutz”, sēter “1. Versteck, 2. Hülle, 3. Schirm, Schutz” [GB 553–4], Ar. satara I “(re)couvrir avec un voile, cacher” [BK I 1049] = “schützen, decken, verhüllen” [GB] etc. Possible both semantically and phonologically.

nb1: The supposed Eg. str is probably unattested, cf. the etymology suggested by D. Meeks (#3).

nb2: GB compared also also Akk. šataru (hapax var. to šūtūru, OAkk. tutūrum) “Kleidername” [GB] = “ein Prachtgewand” [AHW 1294] (which is in fact a Sum. borrowing) and OSA h-štr “beschützen” [GB] = “to protect” [KB after Müller, ZAW 75, 1963, 312].

nb3: Sem. *str has been usually identified with Eg. šṭ3 [< *štr] “geheim” (PT, Wb IV 551–3), cf. Holma 1919, 45; Rsl. 1971, 304; Castellino 1984, 16; Dlg. 1987, 203, #62.

- **2.** G. Jéquier (1921, 148; 1921, 18, fn. 2) explained it as the m- prefix (or rather prepositional) form (rendered as “en matière filée”, sic) of Eg. st (sic) “tordre, filer”, which is in fact a late wtg. of st3 “spinnen” (PT, Wb IV 355). False.

nb: Jéquier supposed Eg. mst.w “Art Beutel” (MK hapax: Cairo coffin 28027, Wb, cf. above) to reflect a var. without -r, “d’après laquelle on constate que la sonnante finale -n’est pas... un élément indispensable du radical” (sic).

- **3.** D. Meeks (1977, 79–83, esp. 83) derived it from Eg. str ~ ztr “emmailloter, enrouler dans des bandelettes” (CT I 278g) = “(die

Mumie) mit Binden umhüllen” (LP, Wb IV 344, 7) = “*einwickeln (in Binden)” (GHWb 786) and str.t “paupière” (XVIII. BD, Meeks) = “*oberes Augenlid” (GHWb 786), which he treated as originally caus. of a hypothetic Eg. *tr “(re)couvrir, faire couvercle” (Meeks) reconstructed from tr.wt “le couvert boisé (?)” = “(als Dorfname)” (Wb V 387, 1) and tr.t “Weide” (PT, Wb V 385–6) = “saule” (BIFAO 31, 177–226). The derivation from Eg. str is probably right, albeit the reconstruction of Eg. *str is problematic.

- 4. J. Osing (1979, 13 & fn. 1; 2001, 577, fn. 118), being apparently unfamiliar with the paper by D. Meeks (1977), derived it from Eg. stj “knüpfen” (OK, Wb IV 330, 2–4), which he explained “*nach der späten (!) Form str¹¹⁸, wohl stj < str*” (Osing 2001, 577, fn. 118: “*Wb IV 344, 5–7. Vgl. auch mstr.t Art Gewebe und der aus ihm gefertigte Schurz*”), cf. str “Halskragen, Schmuck herstellen” (LP-GR, Wb IV 344, 5–6). This is probably mistaken as demonstrated by G. Takács (2005, 25–26, §1.13).

NB: First, the OK occurrences of the verb stj were never written with an additional -r (Wb l.c.). So also the OK nominal reflex: stj “Halsbandknüpfer” (OK frequent, AWb I 1253). The hapax str.w “*Halskragenmacher” (1x, Meir, reign of Pepi II, AWb I 1259) can hardly be used for proving the alleged old *str, since this sole occurrence from the late VIth Dyn. may well be the case of a pseudohistorization. In addition, its interpretation is dubious. Secondly, LEg. str “(die Mumie mit) Binden umhüllen” has a significantly differing sense from that of OK stj, which, besides, has been identified by V. Blažek (1991, 365) with Sem. *šty “to kni/ot” [GT] > Akk. šatû “(Fäden) knüpfen” [AHW] || Hbr. šty “weben” [GB], PBHbr. šotî “der Aufzug des Gewebes, die aufgezogenen Fäden, welche die Länge des Gewebes bilden” [Levy 1924 IV 617] || Ar. satan [< *satay-un] “woof, pattern in a garment, (a part of) a garment” [Lane 1306b] (Sem.: GB 866; KB 1667, 1669; AHW 1203).

- mstr** (GW) “Büro” (XVIII. 2x: Pap. Petersburg/Leningrad 1116B, vs. 60, 70, 75, 78 & Pap. BM 10056, 10:2, Helck 1971, 514 after Glanville 1931, 105f.) = “perhaps the name of a large compound enclosing a number of šmm.wt, or perhaps a foreign word for such a place or for ‘customs house’” (Glanville 1931, 108) = “bureau des écrits” (AC 1978, 14; AL 77.1882) = “office” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = “office, chancellery” (Hoch 1994, 154) = “ein Gebäudekomplex, der Speicher umfaßt und Holz liefern kann, vielleicht Sägewerk” (Quack 1996, 510) = “Kanzlei” (WD II 67).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: maš-tá-r (Helck) = más-tá-r (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = mas-ti₃-ra (Hoch).

NB2: The rendering “bureau” is purely based on its traditional comparison with Sem. *štr “to write” (below).

- Rendering and etymology disputed.
- 1. W. Helck (1971, 514, #113) and J. Hoch (1994, 154–5, §202) assumed Eg. *mašṭira (Hoch) to reflect a borrowed *nomen loci* of Sem.

*štr “to write”, which is hindered by a number of obstacles. Thus, as rightly noted by E. A. Knauf (1982, 38) and J. F. Quack (1996, 510), one would have to admit two irreg. correspondences at a time (Eg. -s- < Can. *-š- vs. Eg. -t- < Can. *-t-). In addition, Hoch failed to specify which Can. m- prefix nomen loci he prefers as the proper source denoting the “place of writing or where documents were kept” (which apparently cannot even be pointed out for OCan.). This etymology was excluded also by R. Woodhouse (2003, 279, #202) arguing that Quack and Rainey (below) presented “*equally good*” etymologies.

NB1: On the basis of the available reflexes in Akk., Ug., and Hbr., it is difficult to project such a term for ESem. or Can. and it is even more risky to presume such a term to have been borrowed prior to the 15th cent. BC from OHbr. by the Egyptians (and not *vice versa*), cf. Akk. maštaru “inscription, text” [CAD m1, 396] || Hbr. *mištar “Herrschaft, Amt (des Himmels über die Erde), die sternengesäte Firmament” [GB 468] = “Amtsgewalt” [Knauf] = “writing in the heavens”, meaning the stars in the sky” [KB 645], Punic mštr “(subst. indicating) a military function, military officer (?) whose function is administrative”, mštrh “(subst. probably meaning) military administration” [DNWSI 700]. No Ug. reflex with prefix m-.

NB2: The borrowing from OHbr. was declined by Knauf (l.c.) also because there “*die Wurzel ursprünglich fremd gewesen zu sein scheint*”, Hbr. šoṭer “Beamter” and *mištar “Amtsgewalt” (sic) being “*beides Lehnwörter in der Verwaltungssprache*”.

- **2.** E. A. Knauf (1982, 38, n. 26): “*vielleicht*” a nomen loci related to Syr. šaddar “schicken, senden (e.g. Schriftstücke, Briefe)” (no arguments provided). Baseless.
- **3.** A. F. Rainey (1998, 443, #202), considering “*a theoretical *mašdir is as possible as *maštir*” in Eg., combined it with Hbr. šadērā “an architectural feature of the Jerusalem temple”. This is also a pure guess with no evidence for an m- prefix reflex that could be regarded as the source of Eg. mstjr. D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 22, §1.2.5.3 & 26, §1.2.8.1) vacillated between this vs. Helck’s etymology.
- **4.** J. F. Quack (1996, 510, #202), confessing that “*die korrekte Etymologie bleibt zu suchen*”, viewed that if it was really a Sem. loan-word, then “*wäre eine Verbindung mit der Wurzel štr ‘zerreißen’ phonetisch am naheliegendsten*”. Unconvincing, since Quack failed in demonstrating any Sem. m-nomen loci of this root which might be identified with Eg. mstjr.
NB: Cf. Hbr. štr nifal “to be burst open” [KB 1363–4] = nifal “(vielleicht) gespalten werden, hervorbrechen” [GB 795] | OSA s₃tr “to destroy” [SD 135], Ar. šatara “1. couper, disséquer, 2. blesser, offenser qqn., lui faire de la peine, etc.” [BK I 1189] = “to tear, s(p)lit” [Lsl.] || Geez šatara “to rend, tear to pieces, lacerate, scourge” [Lsl. 1987, 537] = “to shred, tear apart” [KB].

mstĥ (GW) “Subst., etwas (scharfes?) mit dem die Krallen verglichen wird” (XX., Wb II 152, 4) = “Falle” (Helck 1962, 562; 1971, 514; GHwB 365) = “pitfall, trap” (DLE I 243).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-šš-tá-ḥà (Helck) = ma-sa₄-ta-ḥa (Hoch).

NB2: Occurs in a pun with sdḥ (erroneously written sdbḥ) “senken, nieder-/untersinken lassen” (MK, Wb IV 371, 6–7) = “to bring down” (Hoch).

● Origin uncertain.

- 1. W. Helck (1962, 562, #114; 1971, 514, #114) saw in it the (borrowed) hitpael part. of Hbr. šwḥ qal “hinabsinken”, cf. šḥā(h) “Grube” [GB 813; Helck] = šwḥ qal “to sink, subside, collapse” [KB 1439], which is unlikely in view of the phonological difficulty (below) noted by J. Hoch (l.c.) who considered it semantically too as improbable.

NB: Hbr. šwḥ is cognate with Ar. swḥ “1. tomber dans un bourbier et y rester embourbé, 2. aller au fond de l'eau et s'y arrêter, 3. engloutir” [BK I 1160] = “tief einsinken” [GB] < Sem. *šwḥ, which – at least in Hoch's (l.c.) view – makes Helck's etymology “impossible”.

- 2. J. Hoch (1994, 155–6, §203) reconstructed *mašḥīta with met. assuming that it “almost certainly” reflects Hbr. mašḥīt “1. der Verderber (militär. Terminus als coll.), 2. Verderben, 3. Falle” [GB 467] = “1. spoiler (military, demonic), 2. destruction, 3. snare for birds, 4. vexation (?)” [KB 644] = “trap, bird-trap” [Hoch] < Sem. *šḥt “to go to ruin” [Hoch], which was approved by R. Woodhouse (2003, 279, #203) with enthusiasm: “an ingenious piece of reconstruction... despite the emotional comment by” A. F. Rainey (1998, 443, #203) who regarded this etymology as “hardly obvious” in the light of the Eg. vs. Hbr. contexts.

mstt ~ **msttf** “Name eines Skorpions” (GR, Wb II 152, 5–6) = “scorpion” (AL 79.1364).

NB: For the extension -f (typical of LEg. and Cpt.) cf. NBÄ 326–9.

- Derived by H. Smith (1979, 163) with hesitation from Eg. stj “to shoot (forth, of venom or flame)” (Wb IV 326–7).

mst.w “Träger” (from III., Helck, LÄ VI 744) = mst-nbw “der das Gold trägt” (Badawy, ASAE 40, 1940, 495f.; KBIÄF 58 & n. 227–8) = mst-nbw “der die Goldstangen transportiert” (Badawi 1941, 498–9) = mst-nbw “gold-worker” (PM III G126; Jones 2000, 451, #1691) = mst-nbw “l'orfèvre (?)” (Ziegler 1990, 94–95, n. 13) = “Lastenträger, Transportarbeiter” (FÄW 201–2; Kahl & Kloth & Zimmermann 1995, 13D, 250) = mst-nbw “Goldträger, *Goldtransporteur” (ÄWb I 565).

- From the same root: mst.t ~ mst̄ ~ smt̄ ~ s(m)t̄.t “?” (from III., Wb IV 146, 4) = “Lastung (?) (auch in Verbindung mit Ackerland)” (Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 132, n. 16) = “Arbeit (?)” (Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza VII 216) = “*Transportarbeit(erschafft), *Lasten,

Verpflichtungen” (GHWb 366; ÄWb I 565) = “la corvée de transport” (Garcia 1998, 77, fn. 20) = “Transport” (WD III 56: pace Garcia l.c.). NB: Rdg. disputed: smt ~ mst.t ~ st.t (Wb) = mst.t (Pusch) = mst.tj (FÄW) = *mstj.w, fem. *smt.tj.w (GHWb 366) = mst (WD). Whether smt displays a real met. is uncertain (cf., e.g., the problem of Eg. mzh above). The rdg. mst3 proposed by (Badawi 1941, 499) – apparently guided by the wish to explain it from st3 “to pull” – cannot be accepted.

- We may assume an underlying Eg. *mst “to carry a burden on” [GT], for which both etymologies suggested below seem to be nearly equipotential.
- 1. GT: if the basic sense of Eg. *mst [via met. < *stm < *skm?] “to carry on one’s shoulders (or sim.)”, cf. Sem. *tkm “to carry on shoulders” [GT] = “to travel carrying things (?)” [Faber] > Ug. tkm “auf den Schultern tragen” [WUS] = “to carry on the shoulders” [Lsl.] = tkm-t “she who carries on her shoulders, who shoulders” [DUL 903], Hbr. škm hifil “1. aufladen, auf den Rücken der Lasttiere (was bei den Nomaden am frühen Morgen geschieht), 2. davon: sich früh aufmachen, früh tätig sein” [GB] = “to get an early start” [Faber] | (?) Ar. takama “s’occupper constamment de qqch.” [BK I 231] = “to be diligently occupied with sg.” [Faber] || OSA tkm-t (coll.) “Träger” [GB, WUS] = “subjects” [Biella 1982, 544] || Geez sakama “auf den Schultern tragen” [GB, Voigt] = sakama “carry on the shoulders, carry a burden”, sakm “load”, tasakama ~ tasakma “to take upon one’s shoulders”, ?askama “to place on one’s shoulders” [Lsl.] = säkämä “to carry on the shoulders” [Faber], Amh. täšäkkämä “to carry, bear” [Kane 1990, 650], Tna. täs/šäkämä “portare, mettersi sulle spalle” [Bassano 365], Tigre šäkma & tašäkkämä & Gafat täsikkämä “to carry a load” [Lsl.], Tigre šäkəm “fardeau” [LH 222], Arg. (əš)šekkämä “to carry on the back” [Lsl.]. NB1: For the supposed mng. “*Lasten, Verpflichtungen” (GHWb) of Eg. mst.t, especially noteworthy is OSA (Sab.) tkm-t “subjects” [Biella] as well as tkm-t “first (?) or last (?) year of office as eponym” [SD 150] = “first year of eponymous office” [Biella], whose comparison with Sem. *tVkm- “shoulder”, although L. Kogan (SED l.c.) found her “*argumentation not quite convincing*”, was based by J. C. Biella (1984, 544) on assuming semantic shifts that can be better understood in the light of the Eg. evidence: “subjects”/“carrier” < lit. *(those under) the yoke” < “shoulder” vs. “...year of eponymous office” < “shouldering the burden of office”. For the latter case, Biella suggested alternatively a primary sense “(year of) succession (to the office)” (cf. Ar. takama “to follow s’one’s tracks”). For the semantic dispersion outlined here cf. Eg. m3wd (above). NB2: This denom. verb derives from the primary noun Sem. *tVkm- “neck and shoulders” [SED]: Ug. tkm “1. Nacken mit Schulter, 2. oberer Teil eines Gebäudes” [WUS] = “shoulder” [DUL 903], Hbr. šäkem “der Nacken mit den Schulterblättern, bes. als Körperteil, auf dem man eine Last trägt, der Teil des Körpers (Rücken), auf den man jem. schlägt, 2. Landstrich, eigtl. Rücken des Landes” [GB] = “1. the (nape of the) back or neck of a person, 2. shoulder (as a part of the body on which

to carry a heavy load), the shoulder joint (as a part of the carcass of a sacrificial animal)” [KB] || Ar. takm- “shoulder (of road)” [Faber] (Sem.: GB 826–7; WUS 334, #2866; Faber 1984, 210, #50; Lsl. 1987, 496; Voigt 1994, 107; KB 1492–3; SED I 251, §281) || PCu. *sVnk^w. “1. затылок, спина, плечо, 2. то место, на котором носят грузы” [Dlg.] = *sVkm- → *sVmk- “shoulder” [GT]: Bed. sánk^wa ~ (häufiger) sánk^wa ~ súnka [met. of *sikm-?] “Nacken, Schulter, Rücken, die Stelle, auf welcher beim Tragen die Lasten ruhen” [Rn. 1895, 203], Hadendowa súnk^wi “id.” [Rn.], Ammar’ar ʔu sink^wa “плечо (shoulder)” [Dlg.] || LECu.: Saho sunku [*sumk- < *sukm- via met.] “shoulder joint” [Welmers apud Dlg. and Sasse 1976, 128] = súnkú “Achsel, Schulter(blatt)” [Rn. 1890, 328], Afar súnkú “Achsel, Schulter(blatt)” [Rn. 1886, 901] | Somali ságan [-n < *-m# reg, -g- < *-VkV-], pl. ságamo “Nacken, Genick” [Rn. 1902, 338] (Cu.: Rn. l.c.; Dlg. 1973, 91). From AA *č-k-m “shoulder” [GT]. Cf. also Dlg. 1983, 136, #9.2 (Sem.-Bed.-LECu.).

NB3: A remotely related var. root (with a voiced initial affricate) has been preserved in Sem.: (?) Ar. (Yemen) mā-zgām “manche” [DRS 784] || SCu. *ʒoga[m]- [GT]: Ma’a ʔki-zōgā “shoulder” [Mnh. 1906, 311] = ki-zōga ~ ki-zōga ~ ki-zōka [-Ø# < *-m reg.] “shoulder” [Ehr. 1974 MS, 74; 1980, 190] || CCh.: Mafa-Mada *Zug^wam (var. *Zag^wom?) “shoulder (épaule)” [GT]: Mofu mo-ʒugom [Mch.] = ma-ʒag^wóm [Rsg.], Mboku ʒug^wóm [Mch.], Zelgwa ʒogom [Mch.] = ʒaʒá (sic) [Rsg.], Mlk. ʒágom [Rsg.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 167; Rsg. 1978, 325, #637). From AA *ʒ-g-m (perhaps *ʒugam) “shoulder” [GT]. See also Blz. 1989 MS Om., 5, #4 (Ma’a-CCh.); Takás 2001, 64; 2005, 70 (Ar.-Ma’a-CCh.).

NB4: A. Faber (l.c.) erroneously affiliated the Sem. root with ECu. *lukm- (sic) “neck” (where, besides *-k- is incorrect, cf. Black 1974, 261; Sasse 1979, 21, 49; 1982, 132; Lamberti 1987, 535).

- 2. GT: alternatively, provided Eg. *mst originally denoted “to drag (a burden)”, cf. Sem. *-mšuk- “scuoiare” [Frz.] = *ms₁k “to pull” [Faber], whence especially remarkable is Tigre māška “to saddle, harness” [Lsl.]. NB1: Attested in Ug. msk “to draw” [Dahood] vs. (?) mtk (irreg. -t-) “to stretch out one’s hand” [KB after WUS #1720] = “fassen, ergreifen” [Tropper], Hbr. mšq qal “ziehen” [GB 468] = “1. to seize, carry off, 2. pull, drag, pull out, 3. stretch, draw out to full length, 4. (intr.) pull, go” [KB] = “to draw, drag” [Guillaume, Lsl.] = “to pull, hold firmly” [Faber], JAram. mšq “to draw, carry along” [O’Connor 1986, 217, fn. 20], JPArām. mšq “to pull, draw” [Sokoloff 1990, 334] | OSA mš₁k “to seize” [KB after Conti] = ms₁k “to take” [Faber], Thamudi msk PN (lit. “einer, der ergreift, festhält”) [Shatnawi], Ar. msk: I masaka “to take hold of”, masuka “to be tenacious”, IV ʔamsaka “to withhold, keep back” [Guillaume 1965 II, 23–24] = “to grab, grasp” [Lsl.] = msk I “ergreifen, festhalten”, IV “zurückhalten, hindern” [Shatnawi], Hdr̄m. ʔamsak “serrer, prendre” [Landberg 1901, 715] || Geez masaka ~ massaka “(den Bogen) spannen” [GB] = “to drag, draw, bend (a bow), distend, render tight or taut by pulling, straighten up, bring near” [Lsl.], Amh. mäsākā “to pull, tug” [Lsl.], Grg.: Selti & Wolane & Zway mäsākā “to *drag, pull” > “to lead a horse” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Dahood 1965, 6465, #1509 & #1582; Leslau 1969, 20; 1979 III, 427; 1987, 364; Faber 1984, 203, §104; KB 645; Tropper 1994, 38; Shatnawi 2002, 740). Note that Akk. mašku “Zug, Weg” (sic) [GB] does not exist. NB2: S. Moscati (1947, 128) assumed in Hbr. mšq a root det. *-k + bicons. *mš- attested in Hbr. mšy qal “herausziehen” [GB 466]. Ch. Ehret (1989, 182, #54), in turn, derived Ar. msk “to seize and hold” from a bicons. Ar. *ms- (based on semantically dubious parallels).

mst.w (PT) > **mstj.w** (from MK) “1. (PT) Verwandtschaftsbezeichnung (neben Vater, Bruder und Schwester), 2. (from MK) Bez. für den ʔAbkömmlingʔ eines Gottes (immer mit Gen. oder Suffix des

Vaters), neben Sohn, Erbe u.ä. als Abbild des Vaters (?)” (Wb II 151, 10 & 152, 7; WS III 56 with lit.) = “(fem.) mütterliche Verwandte” (ÜKAPT VI 135) = “Sprößling” (Otto 1951, 58, fn. 3) = “offspring” (Faulkner 1936, 134; FD 118) = “true image/shape, re-embodiment, reincarnation (of a god) (more likely than ‘Abkömmling’)” (AEO I 52, fn. 2 & II 287 index; Caminos 1958, 46, §62) = “parent” (Lacau 1972, 79, §59.4) = “frère ou soeur utérin(e)” (Meeks 1974, 65, fn. 4; WD II 67) = “1. Sproß, Nachkomme, 2. Reinkarnation, Wiedergeburt, neue Körper, wahre Gestalt” (GHwB 365; ÄwB I 565).

NB: G. Fecht (l.c.) found a late trace of fem. mstw.t in the PN Ταρμεσωτης (explained from *t3-dj-mstw.t), whereby he has postulated Cpt. *ḥ̄cote vs. *ḥ̄coote < *m̄saw̄(t), which he conceived as a type of *m-Bildung* not mentioned in NBÄ but possible to be deduced from the type *sādām “*der Substantive passivischer Grundbedeutung, ... bei dem -j von stj III inf. durch -(a)w ersetzt ist*”.

- As rightly noted by A. H. Gardiner (AEO l.c.), “*it has nothing to do with*” Eg. msj “to bear” (q.v.). Probably derives, as pointed out by K. Sethe (ÜKAPT), E. Otto (1951, 58, fn. 3), and G. Fecht (1974, 193: “*nicht zweifelhaft*”), with prefix m- (m-st-w) from Eg. stj [< *skj] “Samen ergießen, begatten, erzeugen” (MK, Wb IV 347–348), stj.t “Same (?)” (MK, Wb IV 348, 2) = “seed, posterity” (FD 253) provided it is etymologically identical with the homophonous Eg. stj “säen” (PT, Wb IV 346–7) as suggested in Wb IV 346 (“*jüngere Schreibung für den übertragenen Gebrauch des vorstehenden*”). Fecht (l.c.), suggesting a lit. mng. “Erzeugter” (and thus explaining fem. mstw.t as “*bedeutungsgleich*” with z3.t “daughter”, where the former “*doch einen feierlicheren Klang hatte und auf die Welt der Götter und des Königs beschränkt war*”), found “*Sethes Ansicht, daß das Wort ‘eher aktivische als passivische Bedeutung haben werde*” to be “*fragwürdig*”.

NB1: The semantically closest cognates of Eg. stj [< *skj] “to beget” may be found in Sem. *ʔisk-(at)- “testicle” [Frz. 1964, 272, #2.77] = *ʔi/ušk- “(primarily) genitalia of man and woman (?)” [SED I 13, §11]: e.g. Akk. išku “testicle” [AHW 396; CAD i 250] || Ug. ušk “testicle” [DLU 56], Hbr. ʔešek [< *ʔašk-] “testicle” [KB 95] || Ar. ʔisk-at- “lèvre du vagin de la femme” [BK I 33] || Geez ʔəskit “testicle, genitalia of man and woman” [Lsl. 1987, 43], Amh. əskit “penis, testis” [Kane 1990, 1176] || WCh.: Ron *šuk (?) “Hoden(sack)” [GT] > Fyer tóšók (if *tó-šók) “Skrotum, Hoden”, Sha ʔa-šukūt, pl. ʔašukutāt “Hoden und Hodensack (Skrotum)” (Ron: Jng. 1970, 90, 282; JI 1994 II, 322) || CCh.: Gvoko sok “männliche Glied” [Str. 1922–23, 118]. Is Guanche suka “son”, sukaha “daughter” [Wlf. 1955, 39] perhaps also related? For the semantic connection of Sem. “testicle” vs. Eg. “to beget” cf., e.g. IE: Hitt. ark- “future, besteigen, bespringen” > denominal arki(ya)- “testicle” ~ Av. ərazi- (m) “Hodensack”, ərazi (dual) “testicles”, Gk. ὄρχις “testicle”, Arm. orji-k’ (pl.) “testicles” < PIE *orgʰi- (m) “testicle” (Tischler 1977, 59–60; GI 1984, 817; IEW 782).

NB2: On the other hand, Eg. stj [< *skj] “to sow” derives from AA *suk- “to sow” [Blz.] (which does not necessarily exclude the AA etymology outlined above), being evidently cognate with HECu.: Gedeo (Drs.) soʔ- [Lmb.: -ʔ- < *-kʔ-] “to sow, mill” [Lmb.] || POM. *šok- “seed” [Bnd. 1994, 1157, #70]: e.g. Yemsa (Janjero) sik- “(sich) zerstreuen” [Lmb.] | Kaffa šok “seminare” [Crl. 1951, 496] = šök-o “seed, fruit”

[Beke apud Flm.] = šok “to sow seeds” [Flm.], Mocha šò kki(yé) “to seed” [Lsl. 1959, 50], Wombera šoka “to plant seed” [Flm.], Bworo šòka “(to) seed” [Flm.], Shinasha šòká “seed” [Lmb.] = (Dangur) šòka “seed” [Flm. 1990, 28] (Kefoid/Gonga: Flm. 1987, 151, §2; Cu.-Om.: Lmb. 1993, 374–5) ||l| WCh.: Hausa šúúká “to sow” [Abr. 1962, 815] = šyuka [Behnk] = “to place seed in ground and cover with soil” [Skn. 1996, 246] || CCh.: BM *č-k [reg. < *s-k] “to sow” [GT]: Margi č(á)ká (tl-) “to sow, plant”, čká (tl-) “to sow, plant (single seeds)” [Hfm. apud RK 1973, 142], Bura čika (thlika) and Chibak sǎgáti “sāen” [Hfm.] (BM: Hfm. 1955, 135) | (?) MM *žigay “to sow” [Rsg. 1978, 332, #674] | Musgu sukí, soká, sokó “(faire le trou avant de) semer” [Trn. 1991, 60], Mbara čók “faire le trou avant de semer” [TSL 1986, 197], Vulum súkí “faire le trou avant de semer” [TSL 1986, 197]. Lit. for the AA etymology: Behnk 1928, 140, #50 (Eg.-Hausa), Mit. 1983, 101; 1989, 130; 1990, 77 followed by Blz. & Boisson 1992, 26, #8; OS 1992, 176; 1992, 198; Blz. 2000 MS, 22, #118 (Hausa-Mbara-NOm.-Eg). AP: IE (Latin, Celtic) *seg- “to sow” [IEW 887], Drv. *cāk- “to sow” [DED #2431].

NB3: The “modern” popular etymology of Egyptian philology (cf. e.g. Westendorf, ZÁS 94, 1967, 142–3; Wessetzky 1985, 78; Gaboda 1990, 87–88 with further lit. on p. 88, fn. 17) has sometimes erroneously related Eg. stj “to beget” and “to sow” with Eg. stj “(eine Flüssigkeit) ausgießen” (PT, Wb IV 328–9) and/or stj “schießen” (OK, Wb IV 326–7), which, in spite of their seemingly related significations (for the problem in general, cf. Takács 2005, 623f.), both have an original (OK) -t- (and not -t-). Phonologically, OK t [< *t or *t] and t [< *k] are always to be carefully distinguished. Similarly, W. Vycichl (1953, 374) has incorrectly combined Eg. stj (misspelled by him as st!) “to pour out” with Hbr. swk “(Salbe) ausgießen, 2. salben” [GB 538].

mstp.t “1. Art Kasten, 2. besonders Sargkasten und sein Schlitten” (MK, Wb II 152, 9–10) = “(ne désigne pas ni un traîneau funéraire ni un corbillard, mais bien) un sarcophage en bois, le grand sarcophage extérieur” (Jéquier 1920, 17) = “portable shrine” (FD 118) = “Bezeichnung für den größeren Kasten” (Drenkhahn 1976, 106) = “Sargschlitten (mit Sarg)” (Altenmüller, LÄ I 756; Gundlach, LÄ V 657) = “outer sarcophagus” (DLE I 243) = “1. tragbarer Schrein, 2. Sargschlitten, Sargschleppe” (VI. 1x, GHWb 366; ÄWb I 565).

NB: A. Eissa (2002, 123–4) supposed LEg. *mstp.(t) to survive in Ar. maṣtab-at- ~ maṣtab-at- “1. long banc en pierre devant une maison, dans le jardin, etc., pour se reposer, 2. cabaret de marchand de vin” [BK I 1337] = (also miṣtab-at-) “a place where people assemble like a kind of wide bench of stone or brick etc., generally built against wall, for the purpose of sitting upon it, a square flat-topped pile of earth, raised for the purpose of passing the night upon it” [Lane 1686] = miṣtab-at- “1. une estrade à hauteur d’homme, à larges degrés et couverte de drap d’or et de coussins, sur laquelle s’assied le sultan, 2. un édifice magnifique où s’assemblent les soldats, 3. dans un jardin, planche, couche près d’un mur” [Dozy I 831] = “Sitzbank” [Eissa], which is usually explained from an unattested Ar. *šaṭaba in the Ar. lexicons. Eissa’s foremost argument, that both objects had “*rechteckige Form*”, is, however, insufficient.

- Origin obscure. May be an m- prefix (nomen loci?) as suggested by H. Grapow (1914, 31), who, however, did not identify the underlying root. A. Eissa (2002, 123–4) rendered its primary sense as “ein gezimmerter Holzkasten” and derived it from Eg. stp “mit dem stp-Dächsel arbeiten, auch: etwas zimmern” (OK, Wb IV 336, 1–2) >

“(Fleischstücke) auslösen, (Tiere) zerlegen” (PT, Wb IV 336), which would point to an original *-t- in MK *mstp.t*, but the earliest ex. (Dyn. VI) proves *mstp.t* (cf. ÄWb l.c.). Thus, the connection with OK *stp* has to be ruled out.

msd.t “Kleidung” (PT 416b hapax, Wb II 152, 12) = “Gewand” (ÜKAPT VI 134) = “a garment (in the nature of a cloak)” (AEPT 84, utt. 275, n. 5) = “un vêtement” (AL 78.1869: cf. Borghouts 1978, 69, n. 93) = “ein Kleidungsstück” (GHWb 366; ÄWb I 565).

- From the same root: *msd* (?) “bekleiden” (GR, Wb II 152, 13) = “to clothe” (Smith).
- Derives from Eg. *sd* “gekleidet sein” (PT, Wb IV 365, 1–6; GHWb 788) = “to clothe” (FD 256) = “to be clothed” (Smith).
LIT.: ÜKAPT VI 134 (“vielleicht *m-Bildung*”); AEPT l.c.; Smith 1979, 163.
 NB1: Eg. *sd* is akin to WCh.: AS: Mpn. *sét* [-t < *-d# reg.] “to wrap, cover oneself” [Frj. 1991, 54].
 NB2: K. Sethe (ÜKAPT II 178) explained it alternatively from Eg. *sd* “tail”.

msd.tj “die Nasenmuscheln” (Med., Wb II 153, 5–6): discussed s.v. *ms3d.t* (supra).

msd.t “Körperteil des Menschen und der Säugetiere vielleicht am Hinterschenkel” (BD, Wb II 153, 2–3; WD II 67 with lit.) = “haunch” (Blackman, JEA 29, 1943, 15; AEO II 242–3*; FD 118) = “1. la cuisse, 2. p.ext. la jambe” (Lefébyre 1952, 55, §62) = “Keule” (Helck MWNr 842) = “part of of an animal or the human body (found also in lists of meat): haunch (rather than thigh)” (Janssen 1961, 20) = “cuisse, cuissot” (AL 78.1870, 79.1366) = “part of the body of man and mammal, haunches” (Brovarski 1987, 49) = “*Schenkel, Keule (des Rindes)” (GHWb 366) = “hanche” (Mathieu 1996, 66, n. 155) = “thigh, haunch” (Walker 1996, 270) = “hind-quarters, haunches (of human or animal, as cuts of meat in lists), leg” (PL 468–9) = “Lende, Hüfte” (Osing 1998, 245, n. k).

NB1: E. Brovarski (1987, 49) surmises an old occurrence of the word in the toponym in 2nd col. of an OK writing board (found by Lythgoe in 1905–6 in the street to the east of the great anonymous mastaba G2000/LG23 of the Giza cemetery), whose former rdg. as *ḥwt-m3=f* (Jacquet-Gordon) he corrected to *ḥwt-m3sd*, which he connected with *msd.t* and *m3sd* “ein Körperteil (?)” (old rel. text from XXVI., Wb II 33, 5). B. Mathieu (1996, 66, n. 155) suggested for the NK form an original rdg. *msd.t* (with no arguments).

NB2: Attested also in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as *msd^c* “Lende” (Osing 1998, 245, n. k: “*ganz ungewöhnlich geschrieben... , als ob es enthielte das Kompositum st-^c ‘Tätigkeit, Einwirkung’... Diese Schreibung beruht vielleicht auf einem partiellen Gleichklang (späte Lautung von msd.t: *msete?)...”).*

- Etymology not fully evident. Most likely seems solution #3.

- **1.** R. Hannig (GHWb 366) suggested a connection with Eg. m3s.t “knee” (supra), but with regard to NK -d and the proposed translation, there could hardly be any but an occasional late contamination (cf. AEO l.c. for GR) of originally two distinct lexemes.
- **2.** A. G. Belova (1989, 11) derived it via prefix m- (function not specified) from *(j)sd.t which she compared with Ar. ʔasaṭtu “haut de jambes” [BK I 1087] = “upper part of leg (верхняя часть ноги)” [Blv.] and Ar. sṭw: saṭā “marcher d’un pas large, à grandes enjambées” [BK I 1089] = “идти широким шагом, поднимая на ходу хвост (о лошади)” [Blv.]. Semantically unconvincing.
- **3.** GT: a relationship with Brb. *√m-s-d (> *√m-š-d with glottal assim.) “thigh, haunch” [GT] seems very probable both semantically and phonologically.

NB1: Attested in NBrb.: Demnat i-mešdh-an (pl.) “cuisse, jambe” [Biarnay], Mzg. √m-s-d: ta-mšaṭṭ ~ ta-messaṭṭ, pl. ti-mšaḍ “cuisse, fesse” [Taifi 1991, 437] | Rif ta-mešṣaṭ “cuisse” [Tlm. 1998, 54], Izn. & Urg. & Tuzin a-mešṣaḍ ~ ta-mešṣaṭṭ, pl. ti-mešṣaḍ-in “cuisse” [Rns. 1932, 386], Temsaman & Bqy. a-m’ššāḍ, pl. i-m’ššāḍ-an “cuisse”, dimin. ta-mšṣaṭ, pl. ti-m’ššāḍ-in (sic, -d-, misprint for -d-?) “cuisse d’enfant” [Biarnay 1917, 89], Tuat & Gurara ta-messaṭ and Harawa ta-messe/at (sic, -t) “cuisse” [Bst. 1887, 408; 1895, 84], (?) Mzab ti-mša n i-dar-en “mollet” [Bst.], Swy. a-msaṭ “cuisse”, messaṭ “hanche” [Msq.], Uled Sellem ti-meššaš-et (sic, -š-) “fesse” [Joly 1912, 81], Sened a-msaṭ (sic, -t) “cuisse”, ti-mest-in (sic, -t-) “fesses” [Prv. 1911, 108, 115] | Qbl. √m-š-d: a-mešṣaḍ, pl. i-mešṣaḍ-en “cuisse”, ta-mešṣaṭ, pl. ti-mešṣaḍ-in “1. cuisse d’enfant, 2. cuisse de poulet, de lapin” [Dlt. 1982, 524], Zwawa ta-meššaš-et (sic, -š-) “fesse” [Joly 1912, 81], Bugi a-messaṭ (sic, -t), dimin. ta-messaṭ-et “cuisse” [Prv. 1911, 108] || EBrb.: Gdm. √m-š-d: ta-messaṭ “hanche” [Mtl. 1904, 125] = ta-mšāṭ, pl. tā-mšāṭ/d “3. devant du pied (pied sans talon)” [Lnf. 1973, 193, #962] || WBrb.: Zng. a-mochth “hanche” [Msq.] (Brb.: Msq. 1879, 503, 515). The Brb. term passed into Maghrebi Ar. messaṭa “os coxal, hanche” [Dlt.]. NB2: Since Brb. *√m-s-d can derive from both AA *-t- and AA *-č/č/č-, the correspondence of Brb. *√m-s-d to both OEg. *msd.t and *msḍ.t would be regular.

NB3: No parallels found outside Brb. A connection with Ar. masaṭa I “3. introduire la main dans le vagin de la chamelle qui a été couverte par un étalon, pour en extraire le sperme, quand on ne veut pas qu’elle retienne de ce mâle”, mašī- “étalon dont on a extrait le sperme du vagin de la femelle qu’il avait couverte” [BK II 1105] is very unlikely.

- **4.** GT: if its OK etymon was *msḍ.t, in principle, a hypothetical var. *mst.t < *msk.t ~ *msq.t might be derived from AA *m-s-k ~ *m-s-ḵ “part of leg (?)” [GT].

NB1: Attested in ES (from NŌm. or *vice versa*?): Harari miskāt “buttocks” [Lsl.], Grg.: Selti & Wolane & Zway məskāt “1. back of body, 2. clitoris, female genital organs” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1963, 112; 1979 III, 428) || WBrb.: Zng. a-məsk “haut de la cuisse, aussi cul” [Ncl. 1953, 219] || LECu.: Som. mísíg, pl. mísko “Hüften, Lenden” [Rsn. 1902, 304] = mísíg, pl. mískó “hip, head of femur” [Abr. 1964, 181] = misíg “meat of the hip” [Ehret] || SCu.: PRift *muš/čok(ʷ)- “biceps, large limb muscle” [Ehret]: Brg. mičoko “calf of leg” | (?) Qwd. muṣaʔ-ikuto [-ʔ- < *-ḵ-??] “arm” (Rift: Ehret 1980, 324, #41 & 343, #15) || NŌm. (from ES or *vice versa*?): Gamu & Dorze miskata “buttocks” [Alm. 1993, 4, #33] || CCh.: Logone máskə “jambe”, mskə “pied” [Mch. 1950, 34, 36] = “leg” [JI 1994 II 221], Kuseri máśake “Bein”, mšeke “Fuß” [Lks. 1937, 145].

NB2: L. Kogan (SED I 172, §190) compared the ES parallels with Sem. *mašk- “skin” (cf. Eg. msk3, supra) “with specific meaning shifts” (adducing no parallel evidence), but this is hardly convincing.

(*)**msd.t** “breast” (NK, DLE I 243).

NB: This rendering is not supported by any other standard lexicon (Wb, FD, GHWb). Both exx. quoted in DLE (Pap. Harris 500, rt. 1:2 and Pap. Leiden I 350, vs. 1: x+20) are translated by J.J. Janssen (1961, 20) as “haunch” (v. supra).

- Most probably a ghost-word. If, nevertheless, there was a distinct lexeme with this mng., we might assume, purely in principle, two alternative etymologies.
- **1.** E. Dévaud (apud Spg. KHW) and T. E. Peet (apud Janssen l.c.), followed by W. Westendorf (KHW 103) and W. Vycichl (DELIC 123), affiliated it with Cpt. *MЄCT- attested in (SL) MЄC-ӨHT “breast” (CD 187b) = “Brust” (KHW 103).

NB: This, however, represents a LEg. compound *msd.t-(n)-ḥ3tj, lit. “basket of the heart” (CED 92; Smith 1987, 127, n. c) = “Korb des Herzens” → “Brustkorb” (KHW 520; Grumach-Shirun, LÄ III 741, n. 9). Is LEg. *msd.t “breast” perhaps a secondary metaphoric sense of msd.t ~/> mstj “basket” (infra)?

- **2.** G. Takács (2002, 170) derived it from a hypothetical old etymon *msd.t, it might be theoretically explained as a reflex of AA *m-s ~ *m-ç “breast” [GT], where Eg. *-d > -d could be analyzed as the extension occurring in Eg. anatomical terms (for further such exx. cf. EDE II 577).

NB: Cp. Akk. (YBab.) muššu “weibliche Brust” [Holma 1911, 47; 1913, 16; OLZ 1910, 491; AHW 685] ||| WCh.: NBch. *m-š/ç “chest” [Skn. 1977, 15] = *m[u]çV [GT]: Siri maši & Jmb. muçu & Mburku muušu [Skn.], Pa’a mûtsi (m) “chest” [MSkn. 1979, 194] | SBch.: Grnt. māasi “1. chest, 2. heart” [Jgr. 1989, 183]. Is the AA var. with *-ç present also in Ar. mušāy-at- “gésier” [BK II 1118]?

msd.t “Korb für Früchte” (late NK, Wb II 152, 14) ~ **mstj** (also written **mst3**) “Art Korb für Früchte, Kraut, Fische (auch wie Mass gebraucht)” (late NK, Wb II 151, 5–7) = “1. (at least in 5 instances) sack (made of leather), 2. (more frequently) basket (made of wicker-work, once of grass), 3. (sometimes) a leather sack or bag (used parallel with ḥ3r ‘sack’, cf. Caminos 1954 LEM, 408)” (Černý 1973, 19, fn. 3; Janssen 1975, 403–6, §151, esp. p. 403–404, fn. 30–32) = “basket, leather bucket” (DLE I 243) = “Ledersack” (Arnold, LÄ II 849) = “wohl nicht Korb, sondern die auf Seilbasis geflochtene Tasche” (Grumach-Shirun, LÄ III 741) = “panier” (Aufrère 1990, 21) = “1. Korb, 2. auch Ledereimer (auch zum Wegräumen des Abraums), 3. Sack, 4. Traglast (eines Eimers)” (GHWb 365).

NB1: In J.J. Janssen’s (l.c.) view, “possibly mstj indicated only a particular shape, independent of its material, which was sometimes reed or rushes”. E. Chassinat (1930, 138, §138) rendered mstj n nbj “une sorte de civière (de roseaux), de claie faite de roseaux sur laquelle on transportait la victime afin d’éviter qu’elle se souillât en allant de l’étable à l’abattoir”.

NB2: Y. Muchiki (1999, 168) surmised its trace in Aram. *msty*.

NB3: LEg. *msd.t-(n)-h3tj, lit. “basket of the heart” (CED 92; Smith 1987, 127, n. c after Blackman & Fairman) = “Korb des Herzens” > “Brustkorb” (KHW 520) is reflected in Cpt. (SL) $\text{H}\epsilon\text{C}\text{-}\theta\text{HT}$, (S) $\text{H}\epsilon\text{CTH}\eta\text{HT}$, (B) $\text{H}\epsilon\text{CT}\epsilon\text{H}\eta\text{HT}$ “1. $\sigma\theta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$, pectus, 2. $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu$, tergum” (Loret 1893, 117, fn. 1) = “breast” (CD 187b) = “Brust” (KHW 103). Already W. C. Till (1955, 329, §33) surmised the presence of (S) ηHT “heart” in this compound, but was still unable to identify the first component, which V. Loret (l.c.) erroneously combined with *jmstj* (for which cf. rather Sethe 1934, 14).

- No certain AA cognates, which indicates an inner Eg. derivation.
- 1. I. Grumach-Shirun (LÄ III 741, n. 10) affiliated it with Eg. *msd.t* “Kleidungsstück” (PT 416, v. supra) and *mst.w* “Stoffpaket” (MK, above). Unlikely.

NB: PT *msd.t* (m- prefix form of *sd* “gekleidet sein”, PT, Wb IV 365) semantically does not fit, while MK *mst.w* is a hapax (CG coffin 28027) of disputed etymology. In addition, Grumach-Shirun failed to demonstrate the shift of MK -t- > NK -d-.

- 2. GT: due to phonological difficulties, its derivation from OK *mst.t* “Lastung” (Gdk., see above) = “Transportarbeit” (GHWb) is also improbable, unless the primary NK form was *mstj* (reg. < **mst.t*), whereby *msd.t* split off it as a secondary var. (with the late NK interchange of *t* ~ *d*?).

- 3. GT: difficult to compare it with the reflexes of Om. *m-S (?) “basket” [GT], which show no reflex of Eg. -d.

NB: Cp. NOm.: Yemsa masa “basket” [Wdk. 1990, 130] = masà “Korb” [Lmb. 1993, 367] = mäsà “basket” [Aklilu & Siebert 1993, 19; Aklilu n.d. MS] || SOM.: Ari meça (i.e., meča) “basket” [Bnd. 1994, 145]. Note that M. Lamberti (l.c.) combined the Yemsa term with Amh. mäsob “Korb aus Stroh, auf den Speisen gelegt werden”.

msdj “Art Gefäß aus Metall” (LEth. 2x, Wb II 153, 7).

- Origin obscure. GT: is the resemblance to NBrb.: Mzg. $\sqrt{m}\text{-š}\text{-d}$ > *ta-meššatt* [< **ta-meššad-t*], pl. *ti-meššad-in* “pot à beurre” [Tf. 1991, 40] due to chance?

msdm.t “ein mineralischer schwarzer Farbstoff: meistens die schwarze Augenschminke” (OK, Wb II 153) = “collyre pour les yeux” (Ceugney after Pierret) = “antimony sulphide” (Lüring 1888, 86 apud Harris) = “eine ganze Reihe ähnlicher Substanzen, die schwarze Farbe, die schwarze Farbe besaßen und als Schminke dienen konnten” (Wiedemann 1889, 25f. quoted apud Harris) = “Antimon” (Brugsch 1891, 30–31, §3) = “wohl: Schwefelantimon” (Ebers 1895, 3) = “fard noir” (Lacau 1903, 151, §5) = “black antimony as eye-paint” (Breasted 1930, 489) = “galena” (Jonckheere 1952 quoted apud Harris) = “1. originally the most general word for eye-paint (including also the green and black paint), 2. (by the PT it became) a more specific

term for the black eye-paint (made of a number of somewhat similar substances, but normally galena as its most common component)”

(Harris 1961, 174–6) = “black stone, eye paint” (DLE I 244).

NB1: The assumption (sometimes erroneously suggested in the lit.), that Cpt. (SB) CTHM , (B) ЄCΘHH (m) (\approx Ar. *kuhl*-) “une préparation de diverses substances, terme général pour collyre noir” (Jéquier 1921, 154–5) = “stibium, antimony, kohl” (CD 364b; CED 166) = “Augenschminke (Kohl)” (KHW 201) represents the very same lexeme, is to be excluded. P. Lacau (1903, 152) derived (S) CTHM from * msdēmēt supposing the loss of m- before a cluster. J. H. Breasted (1930, 489) also supposed *msdm.t* to have been “*corrupted into CTMH*” (apparently so also in CED 166, where both *sdm* and *msdm.t* are mentioned as *etyma*). Similarly, H. Grapow (1950, 73–74) explained the Cpt. form either via a “mobile” m- prefix or with an erosion of * mēsd-mēt > * ēsd-mēt > * ēsd-m . G. Fecht (1960, 180–1, fn. 505) has disputed these views and rightly derived the Cpt. word from Eg. *sdm.(w)* “Schminke (für die Augen)” (OK, Wb IV 370, 9), where he explained (B) $-\Theta-$ στίμη with the influence of the posttonic -d- of * $\text{m}^{\text{h}}\text{s}^{\text{h}}\text{d}^{\text{h}}\text{m}^{\text{h}}\text{t}$ > * $\text{m}^{\text{h}}\text{s}^{\text{h}}\text{dm}^{\text{h}}\text{t}$.

NB2: Eg. *sdm* passed into Gk. $\text{στίμμυς} \sim \text{στίμμι} \sim \text{στίμη} \sim \text{στίβι}$ “eye-paint made of antimony” [Grd.] = “noire d’antimoine pour se teindre les cils, les sourcils” [Vcl.] > Lat. *stimmī* ~ *stibi* ~ *stibium* “Spießglas, schwarze Schminke” [LEW] = “antimony” (Brugsch 1891, 30–31, §3; Boisacq 1916, 912; Jéquier 1921, 154; Breasted 1930, 489; LEW II 591; WÄDN 289; KHW 201; DELC 199 etc.). (S) $\text{CTMHKBT} \approx$ “ στίμμι κοπτικόν ”, in the view of A.-A. Saleh (1972, 146), “*probably refers to the region through which it passed in transport*”. S. Aufrère (1984, 13) too saw in it the “*souvenir du fait que la galène transitait par Coptos*”. W. G. E. Watson (1998, 755, §10) surmised the trace of Eg. *sdm* in Ug. *sdm* “Kohl” (hapax, restored from: *thgrn* [s]dm “they (i.e. her eyes) are surrounded by eye-shadow”), which is, however, not confirmed in either of the standard lexicons of Ug. (Gordon 1955, 300; WUS 218; DLU I 398; DUL 753).

NB3: As noted i.a. by J. R. Harris (1961, 174), the “*nature of this black eye-paint has been widely misunderstood, owing to the fact that στίμμι and stibium refer principally to antimony compounds, stibnite etc.*”. But already A. Wiedemann (l.c.), V. Loret (quoted apud Harris 1961, 174, fn. 19), and A. H. Gardiner (1917, 37) declined its equation with (the eye-paint made of) antimony. The rendering of *msdm.t* by A. Wiedmann (l.c.) as a compound of substances, most importantly among them lead sulphide (galena), was supported by a number of scholars, e.g. Hofmann and Loret quoted by J. R. Harris (1961, 174, fn. 18–19), who convincingly reaffirmed and established the validity of this suggestion. Besides, the Cpt. term for antimony was (B) BACOPY (CD 44b; KHW 28). A further argument used by A. H. Gardiner (1917, 37) against antimony was the late NK hapax (jnr n) *msd.t* “als Material für die Sockel (?) der Flaggenmasten” (RT 8, 1886, 9, pl. 4, Wb II 152, 15) = “stone for making of flag-staffs” (Grd.: Pap. Harris 41a:8, 53a:13) = “the material of two flagpoles of a model temple or perhaps their bases” (Harris) = “*eine Steinsorte” (GHWb 366) explained by him as an “abbreviation” of *msdm.t*, which is more than doubtful. Although he hold a corruption of *msdm.t* “*not impossible*”, J. R. Harris (1961, 83–84) was rightly disturbed that no parallel ex. of *jnr n *msdm.t* can be found and henceforth he was disposed to regard it rather as a hapax “*the meaning of which cannot be determined*”.

- Nomen instr. (prefix m-) of Eg. *sdm* “schminken” (PT, Wb IV 370, 3–8) = *sdmj* (Grapow; Lacau after Sethe 1899 I, §305).

LIT.: Ceugney 1880, 8; Grapow 1914, 31; Jéquier 1921, 154; AÄG 109, §255; Fecht 1960, 181, fn. 505.

NB: The etymology of Eg. *sdm* is disputed.

(1) Its connection with Ar. ʔuṭmud- ~ ʔiṭmid- “antimoine dont on fait le collyre” [BK I 235] = ʔiṭmid- “an ore of antimony or antimony itself, stibium or stimmī,

collyrium-stone, which is black inclining to red, the mines whereof are in Işphahán, whence the best is obtained, and in the West, whence the hardest is obtained, a certain stone used as a collyrium, a certain stone from which collyrium is prepared or collyrium itself or a substance resembling it (said to be an arabicized word)" [Lane 352] = ʔitmid- ~ ʔatmid- (sic) "Antimon, zur Herstellung von Augenschminke" [Vcl.] = ʔitmid- ~ ʔatmid- (sic) "сурьма, из которой приготавливают наружное глазное средство, капли" [Blv.] has long been well known (Eg.-Ar.: Vollers 1896, 655; Müller 1905, 415–6; Albright 1918, 230, fn. 1; Vcl. 1958, 393; 1960, 174, #2; 1985, 171, #11; Saleh 1972, 145; DELC 199; Blv. 1987, 276). But it is not clear if we should assume a met. in Eg. (sdm < *smd) or in Ar. (tmd from *tdm). It cannot be decided either if the Ar. word (isolated in Sem.) is a loan-word from Eg. Some authors, however, suggested a reverse way of borrowing. W. M. Müller (l.c.): "*Herkunft schwer zu entscheiden, obwohl ich schließlich auch es eher als nichtägyptisch ansehen möchte*". A.-A. Saleh (l.c.) treated this alleged Eg. < Sem. borrowing as a "linguistic evidence" of that the eye cosmetic occurred in Arabia or it was "imported from other country to the African coast", since the genuine Ar. ʔitmid "was not available in Egypt, but in Arabia, also Asia Minor and Persia" (the only valuable item of the imports, brought by Ibsa, chief of the Aamu, to Khnumhotep, monarch of the Oryx nome under Sesostri II, was msdm.t), while materials of other eye-paints (malachite, galena) were Eg. products (Lucas 1962, 83, 196). Note that Ar. ʔitmid- strikingly resembles the Gk. stem στῖμ(μ)ιδ-, cf. gen. στῖμ(μ)ιδος. R. M. Voigt (kind p.c., 13 Feb. 2007) too finds it plausible, "*daß das arabische ʔitmid- nicht direkt aus dem Ägyptisch-Koptischen gekommen sein kann. Wegen des auslautenden -d muß das Griechische als Vermittler angenommen werden*". If the Ar. term comes from Gk., it makes its direct comparison with Eg. sdm baseless.

(2) Others supposed Eg. sdm to be a frozen caus. of *dm equated with Ar. dmm I "1. enduire de qqch., 10. teindre (une étoffe)", II "enduire (l'oeil de collyre, d'onguent) [BK I 728] = I "to smear, daub, overlay" [Gaster] = II dammama "to anoint eye with collyrium" [Ember] = II "das Auge mit Kollyr behandeln" [Clc.] ||| WCh.: Hausa dāmóó-dāmòò "stickiness, dirtiness, messiness etc. of fingers from touching meat, honey, soap, blood, excrement" [Brg. 1934, 207] = "messy" [Abr. 1962, 182] = "липкая грязь (sticky dirt)" [SISA]Ja II 76–77, §154]. For Eg.-Ar.: Alb. 1918, 230, fn. 1; 1919, 188, fn. 1; Ember 1930, #26.a.29; Clc. 1936, #417; Blv. 1987, 276; 1989, 12. For Sem.-Eg.-Hausa: SISA]Ja II, 76–77, #154. T. H. Gaster (1944, 21) compared Ar. dmm with a certain Ug. dm "coating" (hapax, in: šmrḥt b-dm ḥrš "overlay with a coating of gold") [Gaster] (not confirmed in the Ug. lexicons: Gordon 1955, 255; WUS 78; DUL 273). J. Vergote (1945, #23.a.10) has, in turn, combined Eg. sdm with Ar. dammaḥara "das Auge mit Kollyr behandeln". This second solution, however, does not explain the mng. of the hypothetic Eg. simplex.

(3) GT: semantically, more fitting would be to assume a caus. Eg. sdm (lit. *'to darken, blacken') deriving from AA *d-m "dark" [GT] > Sem.: Ar. dhm (secondary root ext. -h-?) II "noircir (se dit du feu qui noircit le bas de la marmite)", IX "être tout noir", XI "être noir", duhm-at- "(de couleur) noir", ʔa-dham-u "noir" [BK I 744] ||| Agaw *dämm-ən- "cloud" [Apl. 1989, 5; 1994, 4] ||| ECu. *dum- "to become dark" [Sasse 1982, 58; Bmh. 1986, 238, #9] > add Sidamo dimma "darkness" [Hds. 1989, 47] (ECu.-Agaw: Apl. l.c.) ||| NOM.: Koyra dūma "cloud" [Sasse] ||| WCh.: Dera dāmuni "darkness" [Mkr.] | Buli dum "darkness" [Mkr.] vs. dūmā "black" [IL], Kir dùḡḡn [Smz.], Tule dōḡḡḡ [Smz.], Zaar nì-duḡḡ "black" [Smz.] ||| CCh.: Nzangi dum "black" [Mch.], Bcm. dōmbún "black" [Mch.] | Mnd. dàḡḡwè "black" [Egc.] ||| ECh.: Kabalai dāmā "night" [Cpr.], Gabri damā "darkness" [St.] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 139; JI 1994 II, 28–29, 257). Cf. also HSED #738 (Ar.-ECh.-LECu.). AP: PWNigr. *dim "darkness" [Shm. 1981, 15]. For a different AA etymology of the Agaw root cf. SISA]Ja II 72, §144.

(4) There exists a var. root with an initial AA *t-, cf. AA *t-m "dark" [IS] > Sem.: (?) Ar. ʔtm IV (ʔaʔtama) "devenir sombre, se couvrir de ténèbres (se dit de la nuit)"

[BK I 39] ||| Cu.-Om. *ḍum- “oscuro, buio” [Crl.] > HECu.: Had. ṭum-o “darkness” [Dlg. 1973, 53], Sid. ḍiʾm- “to become dark” [Hds. 1989, 47] etc. ||| Om. *ṭum “night, cloud, dark” [Bnd. p.c.] > NOm. *ṭum- “to be dark” [GT]: Male ḍūmi “darkness” [Mkr.] | Chara ḍum “evening, darkness” [Bnd.] | Gimirra (Bns., She) ṭum “night” [Bnd.], Bns. dum-as-e “notte” [Crl.] | Kefoid (Gonga) *ṭum-a “night, darkness” [GT]: Kaffa tum (sic, t-) “finster, dunkel, Abend sein”, túm-ō “Finsternis, Abend, Nacht” [Rn. 1888, 338] = ṭum- “diventar, essere oscuro, farsi notte”, túm-ō “tenebra, buio, notte” [Crl. 1938 II, 22; 1951, 510] = ḍum ~ ṭum “evening, darkness” [Flm.], NKafa ḍumi “darkness, night” [Flm.], Mocha ṭuma(yé) “to be evening”, túmo “night” [Lsl. 1959, 55], Bworo & Wombera ṭuw-a “darkness, night” [Flm.], Naga ṭum-a “darkness, night” [Flm.] = tum [Beke] (Kefoid: Flm. 1987, 147, §5) || SOM.: Dime ṭum “dark” [Flm., Mkr.], Ari ḍūmi [Mkr.] etc. (Om.: Bnd. 1988, 149; SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 148) ||| WCh.: Pero ḍumḍum “darkness” [Frj. 1985, 30] || ECh.: Mubi ḍèḍem “night” [Lks., Jng.]. Etc. Lit. for the AA etymology: IS 1966, 319 (Kaffa-Mnd.); Flm. 1976, 317 (SOM.-NOm.); Mkr. 1987, 139 (Pero-Om.); 1989, 6 (Om.-Mubi); Bnd. 1988, 149 (NOm.-SOM.); Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 14, #74 (Had.-Ar.).

msdj “1. hassen, auch im Sinne von: unzufrieden sein mit jem., jem. schelten, 2. verabscheuen, 3. nicht wollen” (OK, Wb II 154) > Dem. mst “hassen” (DG 180:2) > Cpt. (S) **НОСТЕ**, (ALS) **НАСТЕ**, (L) **НЕСТЕ**, (B) **НОС†**, (F) **НАС†** “to hate” (CD 187a; CED 91) = “hassen” (KHW 102).

NB: Sometimes denoted “benachteiligen” (Otto 1969, 98–100).

- It belongs to the most difficult Eg. roots to understand from the standpoint of etymology. Although there are various suggestions and possibilities, none of these can be regarded as satisfactory.
- **1.** M. K. Feichtner (1932, 221), O. Rössler (1950, 488), and W. Schenkel (1983, 12) analyzed the first consonant in both antonyms, namely Eg. msdj and mrj “to like” (supra), as a fossilized m- prefix representing “Reziprozität” (Feichtner) = “Sozial-Verba, Sozialstamm” (Rsl.) = “an old (prehistoric) prefix” (sic) (Snk.). Baseless.
NB: Neither of the presumed Eg. simplexes (viz. *sdj and *rj, resp.) can be justified etymologically (on the contrary, the m- of mrj was certainly part of the original AA root), although, in any case, an m- prefix, at least in the case of msdj, cannot be ruled out definitely.
- **2.** A. Ember (1930, #24.a.15), F. von Calice (1936, #206), and J. Vergote (1945, 146, #24.a.7), in turn, equated Eg. msdj with Ar. samuḡa I “être vilain, hideux, affreux à voir”, X “trouver vilain, hideux, affreux” [BK I 1135] = “to be hideous, ugly”, samīḡ- “repulsive” [Ember] = samuḡa “gemein, häßlich sein”, samīḡ- “gemein, häßlich” [Clc.]. Met. (msdj < *msgj < *smgj) in Eg.?
- **3.** P. Lacau (1970, 50) derived it from Eg. ms3ḍ.t “fosses nasales, narine” (supra) on the analogy of Eg. fnd “nose” > fnd “zürnen” (XXII., Wb) or Sem. *ʾanp- “nose” > Hbr. denom. ʾnp “être en colère”, cf. Ar. denom. ʾanifa “s’abstenir par pudeur, par honte”. False.

NB: Lacau mistakenly treated -3- of PT ms3d.t as purely “*orthographical*”. W. A. Ward (1972, 19, #113) correctly rejected his theory (ms3d.t < s3d, caus. of w3d, cf. Edel 1954, 88; 1955, §256). Besides, the proper meaning of ms3d.t was not “nose” in general.

- **4.** GT: highly interesting are Akk. masāku (mašāku) “schlecht sein, werden” [AHW 618] = masāku (var. -š-) G “to be ugly, bad”, Š “to give a bad name”, N “to become bad, receive blame”, mas/šiktu “bad reputation, bad feelings, wrongdoing” [CAD m1, 322–3] ||| CCh.: Lgn. msakwa “zornig sein” [Lks. 1936, 111], although Eg. -d- < *-g- vs. Akk. & Lgn. -k would be irregular.
- **5.** GT: its comparison with Ar. mazaġa ʿalā “exciter, irriter qqn. contre un autre” [BK II 1098] = “to incite against” [Lsl.] || Geez mazaga “to cause to speak angrily or arrogantly, cause to be envious or jealous” [Lsl. 1987, 378] might be justified by the incompatibility of OEG. z + d (cf. Peust 1999, 299; EDE I 323).
- **6.** GT: or cp. Akk. *masāḫu D (mussaḫu) “verächtlich, geringschätzig behandeln” [AHW 618] = “1. to treat with contempt, 2. (in the stative) to be of bad quality” [CAD m2, 236]?

NB: Should we assume eventually an Eg. primary var. *msḫj ~ *msgj? For the interchange of Eg. ḫ ~ d see Vcl. 1957, 71–73; Knudsen 1962.

msdr “Ohr” (PT, Wb II 154, 13–16) > Dem. msdr ~ msd(j) ~ msd^o “Ohr” (DG 180:4; DELC 132) > (S) $\text{M}\Delta\Delta\chi\epsilon$, (S^a) $\text{M}\epsilon\omega\tau$, (AF) $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\chi\epsilon$, (P) $\text{M}\Delta\omega\tau\alpha$, (L) $\text{M}\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon$, (MF) $\text{M}\epsilon\chi\epsilon$, (F) $\text{M}\text{H}\chi\text{I}$, (B) $\text{M}\Delta\omega\chi$ “ear” (CD 212b; CED 100; KHW 523).

NB1: Vocalisation reconstructed as *misd̥er (Zunke 1923/1997, 63) = *misd̥er > *misd̥e^o ~ *misd̥e^o > *misd̥e3 ~ *mest̥e3 > *meste3 (Polotsky 1931, 76; Wst. 1978, 156) = *misd̥r (Edel, AAG 109) = *mēs̥d̥r > *mēs̥d̥r (Fecht 1960, 180; NBÁ 119) = *misd̥ar reflected in (1) (B) $\text{M}\Delta\omega\chi$ and developing into further varieties: (2) *misd̥a^o > *misd̥a^o > (P) $\text{M}\Delta\omega\tau\alpha$, (L) $\text{M}\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon$ vs. (3) *midda^o (assim.) > *mi^oda (via met.) reflected in the (SAF) *Doppelvokal* (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 45, 156) = *misd̥ir > *middi^o > *mi3di^o (Vcl. 1990, 197, §7).

NB2: The LEg. etymon mšt (from *mšd < *msd) of the Cpt. (PL) reflex is supposed by W. Westendorf (1978, 154–7, §3) to have been preserved in Eg. mšt(j)-pnw (GW) “Pflanzenart, die zu Kränzen verwendet wird” (late NK school texts 3x, Wb I 136, 4: mistakenly read as jšt-pnw) = “(nicht unser ‘Vergißmeinnicht’, sondern) ein zu derselben Familie gehörendes Bor(r)etschgewächs, das als Küchen- und Gewürzpflanze diente” (Wst. 1978, 156) = “Vergißmeinnicht” (GHWb 369), cf. also AL 78.1873, 1884; Lauth 1871, 635, §141 (with a false etymology). Westendorf (1978, 156) located the dialect used in the school texts in question “*in einem Gebiet... des späteren Subachmimischen*” or where later “*vom Achmimischen beeinflusstes Sahidisch...*” dominated. A slightly modified var. of this botanical term is attested in Cpt. (S) $\text{M}\Delta\Delta\chi\epsilon\text{F}\text{I}\text{P}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$ (from *msdr n p3 pnw) “mouse’s ear, myosotis” (CD 213a, 263a) = “Vergißmeinnicht (wörtlich: ‘Mäuse-Ohr’)” (KHW 147).

NB3: K. Sethe (1899 I, §271) explained the loss of -š- < -s- in Cpt. (SAF) as assimilation (i.e., -sd- > *šd- > *-dd- > -d-), which is doubtful because it hardly accords with the etymological evidence. P. Lacau (1910, 79), followed by W. C. Till (1928, §17.b),

in turn, supposed -s- to have become -ʔ- (on the analogy of -t/-r- in similar cons. cluster position), which was rightly doubted by H. J. Polotsky (l.c.), who suggested that “die... Gruppe -ϣϣ- (= -ϣTϣ-) ist in den anderen Dialekten in der Weise vereinfacht worden, daß eins ihrer beiden š dissimilatorischen Schwund verfiel”, i.e., in (L) the second -š- (i.e., that of -X- conceived as *-Tϣ-), while in (SAF) the first -š- had been lost.

NB4: It has long been observed that most of the Cpt. reflexes cannot be directly explained from old msdr, which would yield rather, e.g., (B) *HΔϣX1, (F) *HЄЄX1 etc. The archetype *msd^ϕ required by the Cpt. evidence has been identified H. J. Polotsky (1931, 76) with Dem. msd^ϕ (ear det., hapax in Setna 4:30), whose earlier form was found by J. Černý (1950, 39, #5) in LEg. msd^ϕ (written msdr^ϕ3.t, ear det., XXI./XXII., hieratic list of body parts protected by a god, Pap. Berlin 10462, rt. 76:4). Cf. also Fecht 1960, 197 (with lit.); CED 100; Vcl. 1990, 197, §7; Osing 2000, 167. Although Polotsky did not know of parallels of the shift of r > ^ϕ elsewhere, one might compare perhaps the reverse process (OK ^ϕ > MK r) attested presumably in 3 exx. (Peust 1999, 106, §3.6.4.4), one of which, namely the Eg. name of Nile, was however, regarded by J. Kahl (1992, 102 & fn. 16) as an instance of old r > MK ^ϕ. He saw in PT (292d^{WT}, 564a^T, 2047c^N) hp the defective wtg. of hrp (attested in the MK), whence “könnte... ein Wandel hrpi > h^ϕpi angesetzt werden und nicht – wie Kurt Sethe [1910, 164] annahm – ein Wandel h^ϕpi > hrpi”. At the same time, beside LEg. mšt(j) yielding (P) HΔϣTΔ and (L) HЄϣTЄ, the LEg. var. *mšd(r) must have also survived to yield (B) HΔϣX. É. Drioton (1941, 124–5) analyzed a cryptographic pun for Eg. msdr (GR, Pap. Salt 825 = BM 10051, rt. 9:4) as a compound of ms (hrgl. of the “vache qui vèle”) + dr (hrgl. of leaf, cf. Eg. drd “feuillage”). E. Edel (AĀG 109, §253) derived (B) HΔϣX ultimately from an old msd attested in his view already in PT 1673b^{MN} (which he apparently did not consider to be just a defective wtg. contra Kahl 1992). Strangely, J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 45, 156) took (B) HΔϣX directly (!) from *mšdar.

- The validity of its inner Eg. derivation (no. 1) is beyond doubt. Or, at least, that the *Sprachgefühl* in ancient Egypt explained the word this way, can hardly be questioned. On the other hand, in the light of all presently available linguistic data, we may not fully exclude a more complicated scenario, where OK msdr came into being as a secondary form due to the contamination (re-etymologization) of an inherited *msd “ear” (from an ancient AA *nomen instr.* literally signifying the “organ of hearing”) and the *Neubildung* msdr “refined” from this inherited word (no longer felt to be native?) and sdr “to lie (on)” and accordingly extended by an additional -r in the prehistoric or archaic period when some other old anatomical terms (e.g., *^ϕjn “eye”, *jd “hand”, *jdn “ear”) were replaced by innovative names and when the prefix m- was still in active use.
- **1.** Its derivation as the m- prefix *nomen loci* form of Eg. sdr “die Nacht zubringen, schlafen, liegen” (PT, Wb IV 390–2) is widely accepted. The original sense of Eg. msdr has been rendered as “la partie de la tête sur laquelle on s’appuie pour dormir” (Lacau) = “endroit où l’on dort” (Vcl.: “it is on the ear that one sleeps”) = “место, на котором спят” (Old.) = “l’endroit sur lequel on dort” (Vrg.) = “Stelle bzw. Vorrichtung zum Schlafen” > “Schläfe” (Osing) = “thing lain upon” (Smith) = “Schlafort” > “Schläfe” (Till: cf. Germ. leg dich aufs Ohr!

≈ schlaf!) = “Schlafstelle” (Snk.). This view has been expressed by most of the authors in the field of Eg. linguistics.

LIT.: Müller 1909, 194, fn. 4 (with doubts); Grapow 1914, 31; 1954, 31; Chn. 1947, #82; Lacau 1954, 91; 1970, 37; 1970, 52, #119; 1972, 311, §31.A (but cf. also below); AÄG 109, §253; Till 1955, 327, §18; Old. 1956, 7; Fecht 1960, 180, §373; Kaplony 1966, 91; Djk. 1967, 208; Rsl. 1966, 228 (but cf. also below); Vrg. 1973 Ib, 156; NBÄ 119, 588, n. 517; Smith 1979, 161; Vcl. 1983, 132; 1991, 122; Snk. 1999, 90.

NB: The etymology of Eg. *sdr* is highly uncertain: (1) Hommel 1904, 110, fn. 1; Ember 1911, 94; 1930, §12.b.15; Albright 1927, §234; caus. (!) of an unattested Eg. **dr* (hypothetic mng. not specified) ~ Akk. *šll* G “sich hinlegen, liegen, schlafen” [AHW 1075] = “sich niederlegen” [GB] = “to sink to rest, lie motionless” [Driver apud Lsl.] || Hbr. *šll* II qal “sinken” [GB 684] || Geez *šalala* “to float upon, come to the surface, swim” [Lsl. 1987, 555]. (2) O. Rössler (1966, 228; 1971, 306), in turn, equated it – in the frames of his new system of cons. correspondences (Eg. *d* ~ Sem. **ḏ*, Eg. *r* ~ Sem. **d*) – with Hbr. *sʿd* qal “stützen, befestigen, unterstützen, helfen” [GB 548] = “to support, sustain, strengthen, help” [KB 761] (Rössler’s “ausruhen” is unattested) || Tigre *sʿd* “Arm, Ellbogen, Nacken” [Rsl.], which is semantically less likely. (3) Later, O. Rössler (1987, 384) combined it with Hbr. *šqʿ* qal “(ver-, zurück-, nieder)sinken” [GB 861], which is even more difficult to follow. (4) V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 201) compared it with a certain CCh. **vḡur-* (sic) “to sit” [OS] probably “based” on Lamang *tšur-* “to sit” [Lks.] | Glavda *čəḡwar-* ~ *čḡur-* “to sit” [Rapp] | Muktele *šəhāl* “to sleep” [Rsg.] (CCh.: JI 1994, 295, 299).

- 2. The alternative comparison of Eg. *msdr* with common Brb. **√m-z-g* “ear” [GT] is almost as old (first established by Rochemonteix) as its derivation from Eg. *sdr* and has been maintained also by many specialists. Accepting the Brb. parallel of Eg. *msdr*, Ch. Rabin assumed the Eg. final *-r* to be an additional element that “occurs occasionally in HS as a suffix, cf. Hbr. *-l*”. Rejected by A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 359, #21) for the sake of an evidently false etymology (below). If the underlying PBrb. root contained **-g* (as supposed by Cohen, Brockelmann, Lacau, and Militarev, cf. below), the equation of the hypothetic pre-OEg. **msd* (above) might be in principle explained with the shift of AA **ḥ/ḥ̣/ḥ̣-* + **g* > Eg. *s-* + *g* > *s-* + *d* via loss of glottalization due to incompatibility (EDE I 327–9). Does the Eg.-Brb. isogloss represent the *nomen instr.* of AA **ḥug-* “to hear” [Mlt.] = **ḥ-g* [GT]?

LIT. for Eg.-Brb.: Stern 1883, 26, fn. 2; Hommel 1893, 112; Bates 1914, 82; Lacau 1954, 300; 1970, 52, #120; 1972, 311, §31.A, fn. 4; Bnd. 1975, 160; KHW 113; Rabin 1977, 336, fn. 33; Rsl. 1987, 384; Mlt. in Sts. et al. 1995, 6).

NB1: The PBrb. root and noun stem have been reconstructed in various forms, e.g., as **√m-z-γ* [Prv. 1911, 128; Rns. 1932, 386] = **√m-z-g* > dialectal vars. **√m-z-γ* ~ **√m-z-k* [Chn. 1947, #82] = **√m-z-γ* ~ **√m-z-γ* [Rsl. 1987, 384] vs. **a-mezzug* > **a-mezzuγ* [Brk. 1932, 812] = **a-məzzuγ*, pl. **i-məzz* (sic) [Bst. 1929, 43–44 quoted also by Lacau 1970, 52, #120] = **a-mezzug* [Lacau 1954, 300] = *[t]a-məzzug > **məzzuγ* ~ **məzzuk* and pl. **i/a-məzgi* > **məzḡ-i* ~ **m[əḡ]ḡ-i* ~ **m[əḡ]ḡ-i* [Mlt. 1991, 256] = **a-mazzuγ* > vars. with **-zz-* (influenced by **-γ*) [Blz. 1994, 434] = **məzzūg* [Mlt. in Sts. et al. 1995 MS, 6] = **ta-mV-zug-(t)* [Mlt. 2005, 359, #21].

NB2: The Brb. word is overall attested in the whole branch, cf. NBrb.: OShilh (“*pré-moderne*”) ta-mḍgu-t [van den Boogert apud Ksm.] > Shilh a-mzeg [Bst.] = a-mzzuy, pl. i-mezz-an “oreille” [Jst. 1914, 120] = a-məzzuy, pl. i-mezzay [Jordan 1934, 35] = i-məzzay (pl.) [Lst.] = a-mzzuy, pl. i-mzzay ~ i-mzg-an [Mntsr. 1999, 165] = məzzuy, pl. i-mzg-an [Ksm.], Tazerwalt a-mezzuy [Bst.] = a-mzuy ~ a-mzzuy [Stumme 1899, 165] | Mzg. a-məzzuy = a-mezzuy, pl. i-mežž-an ~ i-mezzuy-n (très peu usité) [Tf. 1991, 412, 448], Zayan a-mezzuy, pl. i-məžž-an [Bst.; Lst. 1918, 9] = a-məzzuy [Mlt.], Zayan & Sgugu a-mezzuy, pl. i-mežž-an [Lbg. 1924, 567], Izdeg a-məzzuy [Mlt.], Ndir a-məzzuy [Penchoen 1973, 103] | Seghrushen *a-mzzuy, pl. i-mžž-an [AM 1971, 387] = a-mzzuy [Mlt.], Iznasen a-mezzuy [Rns.] = ti-mežž-et, pl. i-mežž-ən ~ ti-mežž-iwin [Rns.] = ti-mežž-ət, pl. ti-məžž-it-in [Mlt.] = ti-mežž-en, pl. ti-mežž-in [Ksm.], Semlal a-məzzuy ~ (rarely) i-məžž [Mlt.], Ntifa a-məzzuy [Mlt.] = a-məzzuy [Blz.], Djerid ta-mež-it [Bst.], Rif & Harawa a-mezzuy [Bst.] = a-mezuy [Bates], Rif a-mežž-un, pl. i-mežž-an [Tlm. 1998, 53], Guelaya a-mežž-un, pl. i-mežž-an [Ksm.], Bettiwa, Temsaman a-mzuy [Bst.], Bettiwa a-mezzuy [Biarnay 1911, 184], Ikebdanen, Bettiwa, Temsaman, Urg, Bqy. a-m'zuy “oreille”, dimin. ta-m'zzuḥ-t “petite oreille” [Biarnay 1917, 88], Iqrayen a-m'zuy ~ a-m'žžun [Biarnay], Tuzin a-mezzuy [Rns.], Ait Said a-məžžōy [Allati 1986, 14], Warsenis, Menaser a-mezzuy [Bst.], Shenwa a-mezzuy [Bst.] = a-məzzuy [Mlt.], Bel Halima a-mezzuy, pl. i-mezzay [Bst.], Senhazha a-məzzuy [Blz. < ?], Taghzut i-mezz-ən (pl.) [Rns.], Snus ti-mž-ət, pl. ti-mž-in [Mlt.], Shawyia ti-mž-ət [Msq.] = i-məžži, pl. i-məžž-an [Mlt.], Ufed Sellem i-mežž-an (pl.) [Joly 1912, 80], Mzab ti-mezur-t (r for γ) [Msq.] = ta-mzuy-t [Bst.] = ta-məzzuḥ-t ~ ta-mzuḥ-t, pl. ti-məzγ-in “oreille” [Dlh. 1984, 126] = ta-məzuy-t [Mlt.], Wargla ta-mž-it ~ te-mež-it, pl. tu-mežž-in [Prv.] = ta-mž-it [Lst.] = ta-məžž-it, pl. ti-mežž-in [Dlh. 1987, 204], Sened ta-mež-it, pl. te/i-mež-in [Prv.] = ta-məž-it [Lst.] = ta-məž-it (sic, -ž) [Mlt.], Nefusa te-mež-it [Prv.] = tə-məž-it [Lst.] = t-mežž-it, pl. t-mežž-in [Bgn. 1942, 315] = ta-məž-it, pl. tə-məž-in (-dj) [Lst. > Mlt.] | Qabyle mezu^c (sic) [Rn.] = a-mezzuy (fem. ta-mezzuy-t), pl. i-mezzuy-en “oreille”, s-muzγ-et “écouter attentivement et réfléchissant” [Dlt. 1982, 529–530] = a-mezzuy, pl. i-mezzuy^c-en [Bgc. 1998, 324], Irzhen a-məzzuy [Mlt.], Zwawa a-mezzuy “oreille”, s-muzeg-ut “entendre”, s-muzegut “entendre” [Bst.] = i-mežž-an (pl.) [Joly 1912, 80] = a-məzzuy [Mlt.], Bugi a-mezzuy & also i-mež(ž) [Bst.] || EBrb.: Sokna ta-mazookh [Lyon apud Srn. 1924–25, 43] = ta-mezzuḥ-t, pl. t-məzzuḥ-in [Srn. 1924–25, 22] = ta-məzzuḥ-t, pl. t-məzz-in (sic) [Lst. > Mlt.], Siwa te-mmesoch-t [Hornemann apud Stumme 1914, 92] = te-mmesak [Scholz apud Stumme 1914, 94] = ta-mazuy-t, pl. ta-mazuy-ən [Quibell 1918, 100] = ta-mtzah-t (so, -tz-) ~ ta-mezakh-t [Bricchetti-Robecchi apud Bst.] = ta-mezzok-t [Cailliaud] = ta-mzuḥ-t ~ ta-mzoq-t [Bst.] = mesuḥ [Rn.] = ta-məzzuḥ-t, pl. ti-məzzuy-in [Lst., Mlt.], Fodjaha t-muzzūy-t ~ t-mežž-ut “orecchio” [Prd. 1961, 297] || WBrb.: Zenaga ta-mazgudh [Msq.] = ta-me/azg-ud/d, pl. ti-mezg-én ~ te-mezg-en [Bst.] = ta-mazgūd ~ ta-mazgūt, pl. tə-məzg-ən ~ tə-məzgūd-ən “oreille”, i-məsgī^h, pl. məzg-ən “ouïe” [Ncl. 1953, 220] = ta-mazgūd ~ tə-məzgud^h, pl. tə-məzg-ən^h [Mlt.] = tyā-mazg-ud ~ ta-mazg-ud [TC 2002, 436] || SBrb. (Tuareg) *ta-mzūk [Mlt. 2005, 359, #21]: Ghat ta-mezzuk, pl. či-mezzuž-in [Nhl. 1909, 184; so also Prv.], Ahaggar tā-mezzuk, pl. ti-mezzuy-în “oreille”, ā-mezzuy^g, pl. ā-mezzuy^g “grosse oreille” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1274] = ta-məzzuk [Mlt.], Wlmd. te-másug [Bst.] = másug [Rn. 1895, 174] = tə-məzzūq, pl. tə-məzzūg-in [Mlt.] = ta-məžžuk, pl. ši-mežžug-én [Ksm.], EWlm. & Ayr ta-məžžuk, pl. ši-məžžug-en [PAM 1998, 232; 2003, 575], Tamashq (sic) te-másug [Stern], Tudalt & Tadghaq ta-məžžuk, pl. ti-məžžug-en [Sudlow 2001, 277] etc. (Brb.: Msq. 1879, 522; Bst. 1883, 298; 1885, 182; 1887, 422, 459; 1890, 75–76; 1890, 314–5; 1891, 14; 1895, 102, 152; 1909, 243; Prv. 1911, 128; Bst. 1929, 45; Lst. 1931, 270; Rns. 1932, 386; Mlt. 1991, 256, #21.1; Ksm. 1999, 143–4, §325). All forms denote “ear” unless otherwise indicated.

NB3: The etymological position of Brb. word for “ear” is very much disputed. The inner Brb. etymologies are rather unlikely. R. Basset (1890, 314–5) and A. Basset

(1929, 45) compared it with NBrb.: Zwawa & Bugi â-zzug “sourd” < Brb. *√m-z-g (sic) “être sourd”, for which cp. rather Eg. zlj “taub sein, taub machen” (MK, Wb III 473–4). F. Nicolas (1953, 220) affiliated it with SBrb.: Taitoq səgəd “dresser l’oreille, écouter”. Surprisingly enough, V. Blažek (1994, 434) analyzed Brb. *mazzuy as an m- prefix derivative of PAA *g^w-h [Blz.] (falsely deriving PBrb. *-zz- from the palatalization of PAA *g^w, for which he presented no evidence) and identified it with Sem.: Sqt. ṽhgy: mṣḥzə-d-ʔidehən “lobe of ear” [SSL 1991, 1478]. But the formal coincidence is misleading. There is great confusion in the lit. (listed at the end of this NB) around a number of other external parallels suggested for Brb. *√m-z-g (and sometimes also for Eg. msdr), which are also rather dubious (mostly on phonological grounds) and can hardly have anything to do with Eg. msdr. This linguistic material can be grouped as follows:

(1) Often (lit. below) equated with Bed. māsuw ~ māsu [Rn.: < *mesu^h, *mesu^h] “hören, vernehmen, aufmerksam sein” [Rn. 1895, 174; Rpr. 1928, 218] = māsu “to hear” [Jean 1913, 84] = māsu ~ māsi(w) “to hear” [Rpr. 1928, 218] = masūw “to hear” [Hds. 1996, 96]. But Brb. *-z/z- ≠ Bed. -s-. In principle, the hypothetic Bed. *-h might correspond to Brb. *γ. It is, however, dubious whether Bed. -w could derive from *g^w. M. Cohen (1947, #82) connected Brb. *√m-z-g “ear” and Bed. √m-s-w with Eg. sdm “to hear” (apparently assuming development of Eg. sdm < *msd < *msg), although Eg. sdm has been convincingly etymologized from *sm^o < *sm^o ~ Sem. *šm^o “to hear” (see EDE I 262).

(2) O. Rössler (1987, 384), followed by V. Blažek (1994 MS Bed., 28), connected the Eg.-Brb. parallel with Bed. mišāk^wi ~ mišāk^wáni (f) “Schläfe” [Rn. 1895] = mišāk^wi ~ šimāk^wi ~ šimāk^wani “temple” [Rpr. 1928]. But L. Reinisch (1895, 175, 215) related the Bed. word with Eth.-Sem. *√mšk^w “to chew the cud, ruminant” [Blz.].

(3) Bed. √m-s-w has often been compared in Cu. studies (cf. e.g. Jean 1913, 84; Dlg. 1973, 301; Zbr. 1989, 583, #38) with the reflexes of Agaw *was- “to hear” [Apl., Dlg.] ||| NOm. *wayz- “ear” [Blz.] = *wayš- [Dlg.] (although no author succeeded in explaining the function of Bed. m- as a prefix in this case), which are, however, most probably akin rather to Sem. *ʔudn- “ear” [WUS 8, #89] ||| Eg. *jdn [irreg. from *ʔjn] “ear” (based on the phon. det. value jdn of the ear hrgl. contra Lacau 1954, 300, fn. 1; Zeidler 1984, 43–44, §3.2 and its possible trace in CT VII 30k, cf. Gilula 1975, 251; Vcl. 1985, 172, §1) as commonly accepted in the comparative AA lit. (for details see EDE I 248).

(4) The Bed. and Agaw roots have been often (lit. below) combined with HECu. *manč-a “ear” (cf. denom. *mačč-is- “to hear”) [Hds.] = *mačč-a “ear” [GT]; Hadiyya (Gudella) máčč-a ~ mačč-e [Mrn., PB] = mačč-ie [Crl.] = meč-e [Bnd.] = mačč-e [Hds., Zbr.], Sidamo mačč-a [Mrn.; Hds.; Gsp. 1983, 217] = mačč-ē [Crl.] = mačč-e/o [Mrn.; Zbr.] = mečč-a [Bnd.], Kambatta mačč-ēā [Crl.] = mačč-āta ~ mäčč-āta [Lsl.] = meč- [Bnd.] = mačč-a [Hds.], Alaba mačč-a [CR] = mačč-a [Mrn.] = mečēt [Bnd.] = mačč-at^a [Lmb.], Darasa (Gedeo) manša-(te) (secondary nasal?) [Mrn.] = meṅša [Bnd.] = manš-a [Hds.] etc. “ear” (HECu.: Mrn. 1937, 237; Crl. 1938 II, 213; Lsl. 1956, 992; Dlg. 1973, 183; Lmb. 1987, 534, #16.b; Hds. 1989, 55), which is also false. Bed. and Agaw *-s- ≠ HECu. *čč-. The Cu./Om. etymology of HECu. *mačč- is not settled. Following M. M. Moreno (1937, 237), A. B. Dolgopolskij (1973, 183) erroneously derived the HECu. word from a PCu. *m-k^wVI- “ear”. Similarly, M. Lambertini (1987, 534, #16.b) saw in HECu. čč- the palatalization of *k^w-. G. Hudson (1989, 417–418) set up HECu. *manč-a “ear” > *mačč-is- (denom.) “to hear”, but the *-nč- is not justified sufficiently (based on Darasa only). The Eg.-HECu. comparison was rejected by A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 359, #21). Although the comparison of the HECu. word with Agaw *was- and Bed. √m-s-w is evidently out of question on phonological grounds, its connection with the hypothetic Eg.-Brb. *√m-č-g is not necessarily to be ruled out *a priori* (HECu. *mačč- assimilated < earlier *mačč-g-?).

(5) Ar. šimāḥ- “1. cavité de l’oreille, canal de l’ouïe, 2. oreille” [BK I 1369] = “1. the (inner) ear-hole (that penetrates to the interior of the head), 2. ear itself”

[Lane 1726] = “Ohr” [Rn.] has been compared with Brb. *√m-z-g by L. Reinisch (1895, 174) and C. Brockelmann (1932, 812).

LIT.: Rn. 1895, 174 (Brb.-Bed.-Agaw-Ar.); Jean 1913, 84 (Bed.-Agaw-Gonga); Brk. 1932, 812 (Brb.-Bed.-Agaw-Eg.-Ar.); Chn. 1947, #82 (Brb.-Bed.); Bnd. 1975, 160 (Mzg.-Eg.-Sid.); Bnd. 1975, 168, §40.18 (Bed.-HECu.); Rabin 1977, 336, fn. 33 (Sid.-Brb.-Eg.); DjK. 1981, 27, fn. 9 (Bed.-Agaw-NOM.-Sem.-Eg.); Rsl. 1987, 384 (Brb.-Bed.); Zbr. 1989, 583, #38 (Bed.-Brb.); Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 28 (Eg.-Brb.-Bed.); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 6 (Eg.-Brb.-Bed.-HECu.).

NB4: P. Lacau (1970, 52, #120) assumed in both Eg. msdr and Brb. *√m-z-g an m- prefix form. This analysis in itself seems correct, although he failed to identify the Brb. simplex. A. Ju. Militarev (in Sts. et al. 1995 MS, 6) referred to the eventual common origin of Eg. msdr, Brb. *√m-z-g, HECu. *mačč-a (amd mistakenly also Bed. m-s-w) with ECh. *Seg- “to hear” [Mlt.] based on the isolated ECh.: Kwang sēgi “to hear” [Jng], Kera óski “to hear” [Ebert] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 185), which, however, display no trace of AA *č- (JI 1994 I, 90 treat this ECh. root carefully separated from PCh. *d-g^w “to hear”). Cf. also Takács (1999, 160, #2.3). Later, A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 359, #21) equated the hypothetical Brb. root **√-z-g with ECu. *de/og- “to hear” [Sasse 1979, 17] < AA *čug- [Mlt.], which seems phonologically more convincing (AA *č > Brb. *z has been demonstrated by G. Takács 2006, 59–61 contra Mlt. 1991, 242).

- **3.** C. J. Ball (1892, 49) and F. Hommel (1893, 112) affiliated it with Neo-Sum. muš-d/tug < OSum. giš-dug “ear”. Absurd.
- **4.** A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 359, #21), rejecting the Eg.-Brb. etymology (above), considered it “likely” that Eg. msdr can be analyzed as *m-s-gVI- (sic) in the light of Med. grj.t (or gnj.t) “Teil des Ohres” (Med., Wb V 181, 7), whereby he assumed a baseless *√gly. False.

mš.t “une espèce de canard” (OK, AL 79.1371) = “Pfeifente, Anas Penelope” (GHWb 367; ÄWb I 569–570).

- Origin obscure.

NB: (1) R. Hannig (GHWb) suggests that the proper rdg. is *mrš.t. (2) GT: or cf. perhaps PKotoko *mä[c]V “goose” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mz.t and esp. msj.t above)?

mš (GW) “(Fische) aufschneiden o.ä.” (late NK, Wb II 154, 18) = “ausweiden” (Helck 1971, 514, #115) = “(used for cutting up fish)” (Janssen 1975, 230) = “to eviscerate” (DLE I 244 after Helck) = “*pökeln (Fisch), *ausweiden, abschuppen, *aufschlitzen” (GHWb 367) = “fendre, entailler (en parlant du nettoyage des poissons)” (Meeks 2000, 241, n. y with further exx. of the word).

- Etymology disputed (most likely seems #2).

- **1.** W. Helck (l.c.) explained it as a borrowing from Can. comparing it with Hbr. mwš ~ myš qal “1. weichen, 2. (den Hals aus etwas) ziehen”, hifil “entfernen” [GB 409] = qal “1. to withdraw from a place (people, things), 2. cease from”, hifil “to remove” [KB 561]

= “wegschaffen” (sic) [Helck], which is semantically dubious (cf. the knife det. of Eg. mš).

- **2.** GT: a native word of the *Völkssprache* inherited from AA *m-ĉ “to split, tear apart” [GT]?

NB1: Cf. Sem.: (?) Akk. mišu “(a cut of meat?)” [CAD m2, 130] || (?) Ar. mš (root ext. -h-?): mahaša “2. déchirer avec les ongles” [BK II 1161] || SBrb.: Ghat √m-z [z reg. < *ĉ] > ĉi-maza-t, pl. ĉi-maza-in [ĉi- reg. < *ti-] “échancrurer” [Nhl. 1909, 153] || Bed. mešaʔ “zerreißen, spalten, teilen, zersägen”, mešʔa (f) “Spalt, Riß” [Rn. 1895, 175] = mišʔ(a) “to split (tr.)”, mišʔe (f) “split, crack, groove, space between two parallel object” [Rpr. 1928, 219] || NOm.: Kaffa *mišo: mišciē-gogo-sciētiē [miše-gogo-šettie] “scorticare”, mescē-goro [meše-] “corteccia” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 320] || CCh.: (?) Mafa mušuc- (musluts-) (root ext. -c-?) “arracher, (dé)couper (une corde)” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 233].

NB2: L. Reinisch (l.c.) combined the Bed. root with a number of phonologically untenable Sem. parallels (Ar. mšq, mżq, fđb, Hbr. pšʕ).

- **3.** GT: if – in spite of the GW – the Eg. root was mš3 (as suggested e.g. by J. J. Janssen l.c.), cf. Ar. mašara II “2. diviser, séparer et disperser qqch.” [BK II 1109].

mš (GW) “(Subst.)” (late NK, rare word, Wb II 154, 19) = “a place where fish is ‘struck, hit’ (perhaps designates) the place where the newly caught fishes were cleaned, dressed, and cured, commonly done ashore” (Caminos 1956, 18–19 ad pl. 6, l. 10) = “pond” (DLE I 244 after Lichtheim, AEL II 193) = “*Fischbearbeitungsstelle” (GHWb 367) = “bassin” (Mathieu 1996, 106, n. 352).

- Origin uncertain.

- **1.** The hypothetical rendering suggested by R. Caminos (l.c.) and adopted by R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) would implicate an etymological connection with LEg. mš (GW) “to eviscerate (fish)” (DLE, above).
- **2.** GT: or, is there any connection with AA *m-S (perhaps *m-š?) “river” [GT]?

NB1: Attested in NBrb.: Mzg. a-mzaz “1. rapide (cours d’eau), 2. courant (mouvement de l’eau), 3. partie la plus profonde d’un fleuve”, ta-mzaz-t “tourbillon de l’eau” [Tf. 1991, 447], Zayan a-mzaz “flot” [Lst. 1918, 8] || WBrb.: Zng. mozz-an (pl.) “puits, canaux d’irrigation”, cf. a-muž [-ž < AA *š] “canal d’irrigation”, a-muš “puits, courant d’eau”, o-meš “rivière” [Bst. 1909, 242–3] = mozz-ān (pl.) “Kanäle”, cf. a-mūž “Bewässerungskanal” [Zhl. 1942–43, 88–89] || Ch. *maži “river, water” [Stl.] > WCh.: NBch. *m-z/š “river, watering place” [Skn. 1977, 37] = *mazi “water(ing place)” [Stl.] = *maži (*-dz-) “river” [Skn. 1997, 74]: Warji mazə-na, Kry. mazə, Pa’a & Siri məži, Miya māzə-n (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 37, quoted by Stl. l.c. with some misprints) || CCh.: Tera-Pidlimdi mižima “lake” [Krf.] | Gsg. muzaw “Fluß, (Sturz)bach” [Lks. 1970, 132] = mázaw “river” [Rsg. 1978, 315, #586], NGsg. muzaw “fleuve” [Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 25], Balda mašawa (-sl-) “fleuve” [Sgn.-Trn.], Muturwa msau “Bach, Fluss” [Str.] | Daba (Musgoy) māmāsā “Bach, Fluss” [Str.], Kola maz “rivière” [Wdk. 1975, 100], Musgoy māza-maza “river” [Krf.] | Peve mázá “river” [Schubert 1978 MS, 6, #111] || ECh.: Mkl. mízzi “1. pluie, 2. tonnerre” [Jng. 1990, 140] (Ch.: Stl. 1996, 114–5; CCh.: Str. 1910, 461)?

NB2: The Ch.-Eg. sibilant correspondences are apparently irregular (Ch. *-ʒ- vs. Eg. -š-) unless we assume a hypothetic AA *-ʒ-, whose existence and reconstruction has not yet been satisfactorily demonstrated (for preliminary results cf. Dlg. 1989, 99–103). A similar problem seems to appear in the case of Eg. mš^ʕ (below). But Brb. *z ~ Eg. š is well attested.

NB3: N. Skinner (1997 l.c.) mistakenly analyzed the NBch. word as a compound of *ma (considered to be an “affix” signifying “water”) + *ʒi (mng. not specified).

mš.t ~ vars. **mš3.t** ~ **mš3** (GW for **mš.t**?) “?” (Jonckheere 1947, 22, fn. 2) = “Körperteil (neben pḥ.wj.t ‘After’ und šptj.t ‘Blase’ genannt), wahrscheinlich ebenfalls in der Unterleibsgegend zu lokalisieren: Ort wo der Kot ist (?)” (WMT 397) = “ein Körperteil (vielleicht zusammengesetzter Begriff: s^ʕq-mš.t)” (GHWb 367) = “?” (Walker 1996, 270) = “Kot-Ort (?), Darm/After (?), ob den Ort bezeichnet, an dem sich der Kot befindet?” , s^ʕq-mš.t “eine Bez. für das Darm-Endgestück (‘Eintritt zum Darm/After’) (?)” (HAM 839, 208, fn. 237) = “(il s’agit, chez l’être humain, des) parties charnues du bas du dos, les fesses”, mš.t n.(t) j3d.t (for j3.t “dos, vertèbes, comme pièce de boucherie: échine”) “(en boucherie) la partie charnue de la région lombaire de l’animal, soit l’aloyau (en celui-ci couvre les parties allant de l’avant-dernière côté à la partie antérieure du bassin; on en tire les filets et le rump-steack)” (Meeks 2000, 241, n. y with further exx. of the word).

NB: D. Meeks (l.c.) prefers a GW for mš.t. Or to be read mš3.t as suggested in WMT, GHWb, and HAM?

- Rdg., mng., and etymology dubious.
- **1.** W. Westendorf (WMT & HAM l.c.) supposes it to be an m- prefix *nomen loci* of Eg. š3.w “Kot”, which is rather unconvincing.

NB1: There are a few fundamental obstacles: (1) Westendorf failed to demonstrate any etymological evidence for a denom. *nomina loci* with m-. (2) Not clear why just š3 (and not the more popular ḥs) would have been used for such a form. (3) The rendering “Kot-Ort” is not at all generally accepted.

NB2: The formal coincidence with NBrb. *√m-z-r [GT: reg. < AA *m-ĉ-r]: Shilh a-mazir, pl. i-mzr-an “fumier”, a-mezur, pl. i-mzur-en “crottin, fumier”, mizer “être fumé (avec du fumier)” [Jordan 1934, 30, 34, 92] | Mzg. (Izdeg) √m-z-r: a-mezzur, pl. i-mezzr-an “crottin, fumier (d’âne, de cheval)” [Tf. 1991, 449] might be pure chance.
- **2.** D. Meeks (l.c.), in turn, supposes that it “probably” originates from Eg. mš3 “fendre, entailler (en parlant du nettoyage des poissons)” (above), which seems more attractive.

mš3b (GW) “Schöpfrinne” (XX–XXI., Wb II 155, 1; Helck) = “place for drawing water” (Grd. in AEO) = “canal, channel” (DLE I 245) = “scoop” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81) = “watering place” (Hoch).

NB: Syllabic spelling: ma-šá-ʔab (Helck) = ma-šaʔab-u ~ ma-šə/á-ʔab (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = ma-ša-ʔaba ~ ma-ša-ʔaba₃-ya reflecting *mašʔaba (Hoch).

- Borrowed from Can., cf. Hbr. *maš(ə)ʔāb, pl. maš(ə)ʔabbīm “Tränkrinne an der Quelle” [GB 466] = “trough, drinking pipe” [KB 642] = “watering place” [Hoch], *nomen loci* of Hbr. šʔb qal “schöpfen” [GB 796] = “to draw water” [KB 1367].

LIT. for Eg. < Hbr.: Burchardt 1909, 506; Wb l.c.; AEO I 9*, #42 (“*somewhat doubtful*”); Helck 1962, 562, #117; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 20, §1.2.4.3 & 21, §1.2.5.3; Hoch 1994, 156, #205.

mšj (GW) “lederner Teil des Streitwagens” (late NK, Wb II 154, 20) = “leather coverings” (Grd. 1911, 28* & fn. 9; DLE I 244) = “unknown leather object” (Camino 1954 LEM, 435) = “ein Wagenteil aus Leder” (Helck 1962, 562, #116; 1971, 514, #116) = “irgendwelche ledernen Verschnürungen, mit deren Hilfe die Deichsel bzw. deren ‘hintere’ dr.t (ein Teil der Deichsel, der an die Achse stößt, vielleicht ein Teil, das die Deichsel unterhalb des Kastens mit der Achse verband und dort zur zusätzlichen Halterung mit Lederriemen verschnürt wurde) an der Achse befestigt wird” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 228, n).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-šá-ja (Helck).

NB2: R. Camino (l.c.) surmised that it is “possibly” related to Dem. mšj “a container” (Dem. Pap. Wien 27, rt. 5:4, 5:30, not in DG), while W. Spiegelberg (1920, 22, 24) rendered it “Schalen”. Accepting this sense, H. W. Fischer-Elfert (l.c.) excluded a connection LEg. mšj with Dem. mšj, which was translated by R. L. Vos (1993, 353) as “a vessel”.

- Origin obscure. As stated by W. Helck (l.c.), no Sem. parallel can be found. GT: perhaps a native word inherited from AA? Cp. SBrb. *ta-mzī-t [*-z- reg. < AA *-ĉ-] “leather bag” [Mlt.] (discussed s.v. Eg. *ms)?

mšʕ “Heer, Truppen” (OK, Wb II 155, 2–19) = “1. Truppe, Heer, 2. Armee, Fußvolk, Infanterie, 3. Arbeitertruppe, Expeditionstruppe” (ÄWb I 570) > Dem. mšʕ “Volk, Menge, Heer” (DG 181) > Cpt. (SLF) מַחֲמַעַ, (ALSMF) מַחֲמַעַ, (A) מַחֲמַעַ, מַחֲמַעַ, (F) מַחֲמַעַ, מַחֲמַעַ, (B) מַחֲמַעַ “multitude, crowd, troop, populus” (Griffith 1898, 299; CD 202a; CED 96) = “Menge, Haufe, Schar, Volk, Truppe, Heer” (KHW 108) = “1. multitude, 2. foule, 3. troupe” (DELC 128).

NB1: Usually written with the logogram, which “*einen Soldaten mit einer vom Stirnband gehaltenen Straußfeder zeigt*” (Behrens, LÄ VI 78). In H. Goedicke’s (1998, 107) view, the general translation “Heer” is “*nur unter bestimmten Bedingungen berechtigt*”.

NB2: Vocalized as *māšʕ3 (!) (Farina) = *múšʕu (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 31) = *mī/éšīʕ or *múšīʕ (NBÁ) = *múšʕ (Satzinger) = *múšʕ/iʕ (Zeidler). As for the reconstruction

of the *Tonvokal*, J. Osing (NBÄ 455) was not able to decide between *ú vs. *í/é. Amarna miši (below) speaks for *í-, while H. Satzinger (1980, 83) and J. Zeidler (1998, 25–26, §3) prefer *ú- in the light of Mer. pelmoš (below), although the shift of old *ú- > late *é- must have completed somewhere between the Ramesside period and the Libyan era, well before the time of a possible Eg. > Mer. borrowing.

NB3: Reflected in Amarna cuneiform miši [Ebeling 1915, 1470] = “an Eg. naval detachment” [Smith] = “army, troops” [CAD m2, 122] = “naval expedition” [Cochavi-Rainey] as supposed already by Th.O. Lambdin (JCS 7, 75–77). Cf. also Lambdin 1958, 180 (with a hint on a certain cuneiform *miš vs. *māš). D. Cochavi-Rainey (1997, 107) discussed and rejected the former rdg. of the Amarna gloss as mi-lim (still maintained by Säve-Södeberg in 1946).

- Hence: mr-mš^o “General” (Wb II 155, 16) > Dem. mr-mš^o “1. militärischer Titel, 2. Priestertitel” (DG 166:5) > Cpt. (S) λϵ-μΗΗΩϵ, (L) λϵ-μΗΩϵ ~ λϵ-μΗΩϵ “Hauptmann, Krieger, Held” (KHW 79) = “commandement de troupe” (Vcl. 1990, 247, #4) = “der Stratege” (Zeidler).

NB1: The semantic shift attested in Cpt. (SF) μΗΗΩϵ “in der Spätzeit führt auch dazu, daß mr-mš^o neben den militärischen auch eine zivile Stellung bezeichnet: eine Art Administrator der Kultvereine” (Satzinger 1980, 83, fn. 5).

NB2: Gk. λειψία ~ λειψος ~ λειψος (m) “titre de prêtre égyptien” presumably originates from Dem. mr-mš^o (Fournet 1989, 70, §7 & fn. 46).

NB3: Eg. p3 mr-mš^o (with the definite article) is reflected by Mer. pelmoš /pel(a)moš(a)/ “ein Tiel” [Stz.] = pelmoš /pelamus/ [Peust] = pelmoš /-musa or -musə/ [Zeidler]. Cf. Satzinger 1980, 83, fn. 5; Peust 1992, 118, n. c; Zeidler 1998, 25–26, §3; Muchiki 1999, 299. For Mer. pelmoš atolis ≈ Eg. p3 mr-mš^o n p3 mw cf. Hofmann 1976 and 1990.

- From the same root:

(1) mš^o “Kriegsschiff” (OK, Wb II 156, 2) = “ein schmales Flußschiff mit einer aus Soldaten bestehenden Rudermannschaft, auch Truppentransporter, ein mit Truppen besetztes Frachtschiff” (Düring 1995, 145).

(2) mš^o “Feldzug, Expedition” (OK, Wb II 156, 3) = “(Grundbedeutung) Marsch, Bewegung” (Zeidler 1998, 25–26).

- Origin debated.

- 1. Traditionally explained as a deverbal adj. (nomen agentis) deriving from Eg. mš^oj “marschieren, reisen” (late NK, Wb, below). Its literal sense has been rendered “la troupe en marche” > “le corps expéditionnaire” (Vcl.) = “Marschierendes” > “Expeditionstruppe, Heer” (Zeidler). Dubious. A reverse (denominal) way of derivation of Eg. mš^oj seems more likely (provided there was an etymological connection at all). This comparison is hindered also by the unexplained anomaly of the Cpt. (S^aAL) reflexes of Eg. mš^o “troop” (-ω-) vs. mš^oj “to march” (-2-) > Dem. μῆ^o “gehen” (DG 170:1), which led J. Černý (CED 96) to assuming an original *μῆ^oj in the latter case. LIT.: Cf. e.g. DELC 128–9 (“certainly”); Zeidler 1998, 25–26, §3.

NB1: Some of the adherents of the Rössler theory (*neuere Komparatistik*) derived the underlying root from pre-Eg. *mšd preserved in Dem. mšd “durchwandern” (which, acc. to J. Zeidler, “nicht mehr aufgrund einer phonetischen Variation aus... mš^ɕj abgeleitet werden konnte”) treated as the *Wurzeldublette* of mš^ɕj (for further details and lit. see Zeidler 1992, 208; 1998, 26, fn. 30; Loprieno 1995, 45). Although mš^ɕj (as verb) is attested from the NK only, this hypothesis would imply that mš^ɕj existed “*schon in der Zeit, als der ʕ/t-Wechsel möglich war*” (Zeidler). However, both J. Osing (1997, 229) and H. Satzinger (1999, 147) rightly viewed that this theory “*semantically cannot be accepted*”, since NK mš^ɕj derives from OK mš^ɕ “army” (as suggested also by H. Goedicke 1998, 108).

NB2: There is, nevertheless, a weak external support for Eg. mš^ɕ ~ mš^ɕj in the frames of the “old school” of Eg-Sem. cons. correspondences. In principle (pace Takács 2006, 113), we might regard Ar. mal^ɕ- “troupe, bande, partie” vs. mala^ɕa “marcher avec rapidité, d’un pas léger et rapide (se dit d’une chamelle)” [BK II 1149] as a parallel displaying an interchange of the PSem. laterals (*-l- ~ *-š- > Ar. -l- ~ -š-), cf. Ar. maša^ɕa “3. marcher doucement” [BK II 1111].

- **2.** H. Goedicke (1998, 109–110), in turn, noted some early (Dyn. IV and early Dyn. V) instances of mr-mš^ɕ written phonetically as mr-š^ɕ (for lit. cf. l.c., fn. 38–40), whence he assumed that the root “š^ɕ oder mš^ɕ zu lesen ist, wobei die Varianz darauf hindeutet, daß mš^ɕ eine erweiterte Form ist” (although he noted that “*ob diese als m- Präfix oder als *imj zu verstehen ist, läßt sich nicht entscheiden*”). Goedicke offered various (often far-fetched) derivations from diverse Eg. roots √š^ɕ(j), neither of which can, however, be regarded as convincing. Thus, one can agree with his own statement that “*die etymologische Ableitung von m š^ɕ nicht mit Sicherheit geklärt werden kann*”.

NB: First, Goedicke considered “*eine Verbindung mit š^ɕ ‘Sand’*” that “*könnte in Form einer Nisbe-Bildung (š^ɕj) oder als *imj-š^ɕ erfolgen, wobei ersteres als ‘der zum Sand gehörige’, letzteres als ‘der im Sand befindliche’ übertragen werden müßte*”, but confessed “*weder das eine noch das andere führt zu einer sinnvollen Bedeutung als Personenbezeichnung*”. Alternatively, he suggested that “*es scheint besser š^ɕ mit dem Verbum š^ɕ (sic) ‘abschneiden’... zu verbinden*”, whereby he admitted “*verschiedene Deutungen*”: (1) lit. “Abschneider”, which – as Goedicke confessed – “*macht wenig Sinn (wenn man an Bogenschützen denkt)*”; (2) “*als nominal gebrauchtes passives Partizip wäre die Übersetzung ‘Abgeschnittener’ angebracht, was räumlich und persönlich verstanden werden kann. Im ersten Fall wäre es ein Verweis auf die Trennung vom angestammten Wohnort, im anderen ein Einschnitt am Körper des Bezeichneten. Es gibt keinerlei Unterstützung für die erste Möglichkeit. ... Die Möglichkeit des körperlichen ‘Einschnitts’ scheint auf einen Punkt beschränkt, nämlich die Beschneidung derer, die im ägyptischen Militärdienst standen, wobei dies auch auf Personen nichtig. Herkunft zutrifft*”, whence Goedicke concluded that eventually, “*wären die als *š^ɕ, bzw. mš^ɕ bezeichneten Bogenkämpfer als ‘Beschnittene’ zu sehen*”.

- **3.** GT: hypothetically, interpreting Eg. mš^ɕ as a coll. noun “men, people (of war)” deriving from an original sg. meaning “man (vir)”, a comparison with AA *m-S-(?) “male person (vir)” [GT] might be taken into account, although the nature of the underlying sibilant and the reconstruction of its C₃ (if there was any) is fully uncertain. Thus, this weak alternative has to be laid aside for further research.

NB1: Cf. Sem.: (?) ES: Argobba miche “mari” [Seetzen] = mis “husband” [Lsl., Apl.], Harari miš “mâle” [Lsl. 1949] = “fellow” [Lsl. 1963; 1979; Apl. 1977],

Gurage dialects: Chaha, Ennemor, Gyeto, Muher məs, Ezha, Masqan, Gogot, Soddo məss, Endegeeny mus, Wolane məs ~ miš, Selti məs ~ miš, Zway miši “husband, male” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1949, 50; 1963, 114; 1979 III, 426) ||| WBrb.: Zng. √m-s: ɔ-massən, pl. ɔ-massən-ən “mâle (animal, plante)” [Ncl. 1953, 218] ||| NOm.: Sezo məž “man” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 14] ||| Ch. *m-z “man (vir), male, husband, person (homo)” [JS 1981, 147A₁, 202A₁] = *m-z (JI: perhaps < orig. *m-y-z) “man (vir), husband, person” [JI 1994 I 114, 135] = *mi/aži, pl. *maž- “husband, man” [Stl. 1996, 114; 2003, 300] > WCh. *məz- “male, husband” [Schuh 1982, 15] = *mʋži “мужчина” [Stl. 1987] = *miži [Stl. 1996]: Hausa miži (sg), mázáá (pl.) “1. males, 2. husbands”, cf. nāmíži “male” [Abr. 1962, 671, 697], Gwnd. miži, pl. maža “male”, miži “husband” [Mts. 1972, 77, 81] | AS *miš (preserved only in Sura) → *mis (elsewhere) > *məs “1. male, 2. husband” [GT] = *miš “man, male person (мужчина)” [Stl. 1977] = *mis “husband” [Dlg.] = *miš [Stl. 1987]: Angas mus (so, -u) [act. məs:] “male, husband” [Ormsby 1914, 208, 210, 313–4] = miš ~ müs [< *məs] “husband, or mate”, gwō-miš “lit. a man, a male, a man, (but especially) a brave man, a warrior” [Flk. 1915, 196, 246, 248] = mis ~ gwo-mis “husband” [Flk./Mgd. 1911, 383] = məs “Ehemann, Mann” [Jng. 1962 MS, 25] = [gɔ-miš] “male” [Brq. 1971, 44] = mis “husband” [Hfm.] = məs “husband” [ALC 1978, 15, 39], Sura miš “1. Mann, 2. männlich” [Jng. 1963, 75] = miš “husband” [Hfm.], Mrn. miš “man, husband” [Frj. 1991, 37–8], Kf. miš “husband” [Ntg. 1967, 27] = mis “husband” [Hfm.], Chip mis “man” [Krf.], Gmy. miš “husband, male” [Ftp. 1911, 217–8] = mis “man, husband” [Srl. 1937, 140] = mis “Mann” [Jng. 1962 MS, 4] = mis “husband” [Hfm.] = miš “man” [Krf.] = mis (pl. das) “man, male” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 23] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 18, #49; Stl. 1972, 186; 1977, 155, #133; 1987, 232, #799; GT 2004, 249) | Ron: Karfa misí “people” [Seibert 2000 MS, #a002] | Bole-Tangale *mizi “husband” [Schuh] = “man, male human” [Schuh 1978] = *miži “мужчина” [Stl. 1987]: Bole moži “male, husband” [Schuh 1982] = mòzi “husband” [Schuh 1984], Karekare mèzi “(Ehe)Mann” [Lks. 1966, 203] = “husband” [Schuh], Ngamo mizi “man” [Nwm. 1965, 58], Maha bo-moži “man” [Nwm. 1965, 58], Bele mihì [h < *s, *z] “man, male human” [Schuh], Kirfi mižži “man, husband” [Schuh], Galambu mi mùši “husband” [Schuh], Gera mizi “husband” [Schuh], Geruma miži ~ mizi “husband” [Schuh] = miži “man” [Gowers apud JI], Bubure midže [-ž-] “man (opposed to woman)” [Haruna 1992 MS, #a003] (BT: Schuh 1978, 148; 1984, 210) | Boghom mees “Mensch, Mann” [Jng. 1965, 177, 179] = myès “person” [Smz. 1978, 29] = myès “person” [IL], Grnt. məši (pl.) “men” [Jgr. 1989, 186] = miši “person (homo)” [Smz.] | Bade ʔmš-ən ~ gə-mš-ən “Mann (männl. Individuum)” [Lks. 1968, 223] = ga-msik “man (vir)” [IL], WBade mšón “husband” [Schuh], Ngizim mšòk “husband” [Schuh 1981, 106] = nɪn gɪ-msik “man (vir)” [Meek apud JI], Teshena I asigumsin “husband” [Schuh] (BN: Schuh 2001, 431; WCh.: Zbr. 1984, 211, #43; Stl. 1984, 91; 1987, 232, #799) || CCh.: Gisiga-Dogba (Gsg) mužay (mudlay) (pl.) “Menschen, Leute” [Lks. 1970, 131], Muayang miš “person, male” [Rsg.], Moloko mižé “person, male, man” [Rsg.], Balda məža (-dl-) “gens, Leute” [Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 25] (MM: Rsg. 1978, 288, #449a & 303, #527) | Musgu mašakái ~ mašagái ~ mazakái ~ mazagái ~ masagái (pl.) “Mann, männlich” [Krause apud Müller 1886, 400; Lsk. 1941, 66], Musgu-Pus mažagay (pl.) “mâle” [Trn. 1991, 125] | Kotoko-Logone mäsö “husband” [Bouny 1975, 23, #352, quoted also apud JI 1994 II 201], “Mandage of Mara” mà:sö “mari” [Bouny 1977, 72] | Zime-Batna hù-màžè “man (vir)” [Jng./JI] = hō-màndzì [Scn.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 230–1; JI 1994 II, 266–7; Stl. 1996, 114; 2003, 300).

NB2: The Ch.-Eg. sibilant correspondences (Stolbova’s Ch. *-ž- vs. Eg. -š-) look strange according to our present working hypothesis (based on SISAJa, HCVA, Takács 2001). Should we assume a hypothetical AA *-ž-? For preliminary results in the reconstruction of this PAA phoneme cf. Dlg. 1989, 99–103. A similar problem seems to appear in the case of Eg. mš (above).

nb3: The etymology of the Eth.-Sem. root is disputed. F. Praetorius (1879, 509), followed by W. Leslau (1963, 114; 1979, 426) and D. Appleyard (1977, 10/52), postulated in Eth.-Sem. a development mās < *bās < *bāʔās based on Geez bāʔ(ə)si “man”, Tigre bāʔās “husband”. C.F.A. Dillmann (1865, 519) explained Geez bāʔəsi “man” from the basic meaning “to be strong” (cf. Ar. baʔusa, Appleyard: Sem. *bʔs “to be bad” > “strong”). In M. Cohen’s (1939, 421) view, Eth.-Sem. *m- < *b- was due to an interference influenced by Geez mət “husband”. In this case, Eth.-Sem. “husband” cannot be related with WCh. “vir” and Eg. “Heer”. On the other hand, A. Ju. Militatev (2006 MS, 36, #51.10) combined the ES word rather with Ug. m̄t “infante” [DLU 309], which is semantically unconvincing.

nb4: JS (1981, 147A, 202A) erroneously affiliated Ch. *m-z with a number of synonymous Ch. roots (*m-t-(N), *m-n, *m-m, *m-r) on a monoradical basis (PCh. *m-).

nb5: Does Angas gwō-mīs “lit. a man, a male, a man, (but especially) a brave man, a warrior” [Flk.] reflect the same shift of meaning as supposed in Eg.? For this semantic dispersion, cf. (1) Sem.: Syr. ʔnmʔ “trupe des soldats” [DRS] ~ Ar. ʔa/ānām- “créatures, hommes” [DRS 25]; (2) Akk. ummānu “Menschenmenge, Heer, Arbeitstruppe” [AHW 1413] || Hbr. ʕam “2. (paternal) relationship, clan, kin” [KB 837] | Ar. ʕamam- “1. foule immense, multitude, 2. people, populace, 3. masse, grand volume” [BK II 359]; (3) IE *koryo- (n) “Heer” > OPers. kāra- “Kriegsvolk, Heer”, Gk. κοίρανος “Heerführer, Herr”, MĪrish cuire “Schar, Menge”, German Heer, Lith. k̄aras “Krieg” (IE: Kluge 1999, 362-3.); (4) perhaps IE *laHwo- (?) > Hitt. laḫḫa- “Feldzug, Reise”, ^(LU)laḫḫiyala- “Kriegsmann, Kriegsheld”, Luvian laḫḫiya- “reisen”, laḫḫiya- “Reise, Zug” ~ Gk. (Homer) λαΐός, (Attican) λεός “Leute, Volk(smene), Kriegsvolk” (IE: Sturtevant 1951, §53, 73-74; Friedrich 1952, 124; Wentris & Chadwick 1956, 407; GI 1984, 740; Molčanov & Neroznak & Šarypkin 1988, 151; rejected by J. Tischler, HEG II 9); (5) perhaps IE *teut-ā “Volk” > Hitt. tuzzi- “Heer, Truppenmacht; Heerlager” ~ Oscan touto “Bürgerschaft”, OIrish túath “people, tribe”, OHGerm. diot “people”, Lith. tautà “people” (IE: Friedrich 1952, 232; GI 1984, 749; handled with some doubt by J. Tischler, HEG III 501f).

- Other etymologies cannot be accepted:
- 4. C. Ceugney (1880, 8) derived it from an unattested Eg. š^c (sic) “aller”.
- 5. G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 101) combined the Cpt. reflex with Bsq. maiz (sic).
- 6. G. Farina (1924, 323) explained the Cpt. reflexes from a false Eg. *m^cš3 equated with Ar. maʕšar- “1. réunion, assemblée d’hommes, de personnes ou de démons, 2. famille, femme et enfants” < √^cšr [BK II 262].

nb: Eg. mš^c was never written as *m^cš3 with final -3.

mš^c ~ mš^c.w “ein Vogel, dessen ḫ3.tj-Herz offizinell verwendet wird” (Med., Wb II 156, 17) = “a kind of bird” (Barns 1956, 28) = “ein Vogel” (GHWb 368).

- Mng. uncertain. Etymology obscure. Only guesses can be risked.
- nb: (1) N. Skinner (1996, 204) erroneously equated it with WCh.: Hausa múúḣiyáá “any owl, but esp. the African or white-breasted barn-owl (Typto alba) and the West African eagle-owl (Bubo africanus cinerascens)” [Brg. 1934, 798] for an absurd reason (namely because the Eg. word “begins with owl symbol”, sic!). (2) GT:

any connection to NBrb.: Mzg. ta-miss-it, pl. ti-missa “bergeronette (oiseau)” [Taifi 1991, 436] | Mzab u-msisi “bergeronette (oiseau)” [Dlh. 1984, 123], Wargla msisi “oiseau genre bergeronnette”, t(ə-m)musisi “sorte de petit oiseau” [Dlh. 1987, 197] || CCh.: Muskum míšit (-t ending) “oiseau sp.” [Trn. 1977, 25]? Note that Brb. -s- < AA *š- seems regular. The etymology of SBrb.: Taneslemt i-mənsiw-ən (pl.) (secondary -n-?) “birds” [Mlt.] || Guanche: Gomera ta-masmas “bird” [Mlt.] (Brb.: Mlt. 1991, 252, #6.4) is not clear. Their relationship to Eg. msj.t “waterfowl” (MK, FD, supra) supposed by G. Takács (1996, 45, #6) is very unlikely.

mš^Ɔ.t “offerings” (CT V 38a, AECT II 34, 38, spell 398, n. 37) = “une denrée” (AL 78.1876) = “eine Nahrungsmittel” (GHWb 368) = “a cake” (DCT 186).

- Supposed by R. O. Faulkner (AECT l.c.) and R. van der Molen (DCT l.c.) to represent an m- prefix var. to Eg. š^Ɔ.t “a cake” (DCT 605), cf. also š^Ɔw.t “Kuchen (im Gegs. zum gewöhnlichen Brot) aus Spelt, Fett und Honig” (PT, Wb IV 421, 3), š^Ɔ.t “Art Brot” (XX., Wb IV 420, 2), š^Ɔ.t.t “Art Brot” (Med., BD, Wb IV 420, 3).
NB: Cf., however, the flesh det. of mš^Ɔ.t in CT V 38a (M21C, M4C), which Faulkner failed to explain.

mš^Ɔ or **mš^Ɔ.w** “commissions” (2nd IMP hapax: writing board, Ashmolean Museum 1964.489ab, text A, l. 3, Barns 1968, 74; AC 1977, 8; AL 77.1890) = “Besorgungen” (GHWb 368) = “Kommission” (WD II 68).

NB: J. W. B. Barns (l.c.) knows “of no examples of a word mš^Ɔ so determined, or with a meaning exactly appropriate to the present context”.

- Origin uncertain. Barns (l.c.) surmises that it means in fact perhaps sg. like “errands” being related to mš^Ɔ.w “envoys” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 445) < mš^Ɔ “Expeditionstruppe” (above). Other solutions are less credible. GT: m- prefix form? Cf. perhaps Eg. š^Ɔj “trennen von (r) (im alten Opferritual)” (since PT, Wb IV 417, 13; GHWb 806)? But Barns (l.c.) rightly admits that “I cannot extract a satisfactory sense from a division m-š^Ɔw”.

NB: The similarity to Ar. maša^{ʿa} I “2. gagner, acquérir, se procurer qqch., 9. se présenter, s’offrir à qqn. pour être pris” [BK II 1111] may be pure chance.

mš^Ɔ or **mš^Ɔ-jb** (with vars. **mš^Ɔ-r-3w** ~ **mš^Ɔ-m-r-ḫ.t**) “Name für bestimmte Art Myrrhe” (GR, Wb II 156, 16) = “ein ʿntjw des Asiatlandes, ein Balsam (seine Farbe ist rot, es ist weich durch seine Flüßigkeit und sein Duft ist sehr angenehm)” (Dümichen apud Ebbell) = “Terpentin” (Ebbell 1938, 102–3, §viii) = “l’oliban aggloméré (concrété; présente la coloration et...l’apparence de l’écume du brassin de bière)” (Chermette & Goyon 1996, 61–62, fn. 34 with lit.) = “a

kind of myrrh used in the temple (from Asia, is dry and red, very sweet scented)” (PL 469).

NB: M. Chermette & J.-C. Goyon (l.c.) have disproved the rdg. mšć-jb (proposed, i.a., in Charpentier 1981, 360-1, #565).

- Etymology obscure.
- **1.** P. Wilson (PL l.c.) explained the first component from Eg. mšćj “to go, proceed” suggesting that the whole phrase meant “the heart/mouth goes” (sic) “*showing the effect of the smell of the substance on the senses*”. This reasoning, if valid at all, might be only regarded as a GR popular etymology.
- **2.** B. Ebbell (1938, 109) compared the element mšć- with Hbr. & Aram. mšḥ “to smear, anoint” [KB 643] with a “*Wechsel von ʕ ~ ḥ im Semitischen*” (sic). False.
- **3.** GT: both of the preceding suggestions can hardly be accepted, cf. Eg. šć-jb “(im Zus.hang mit Myrrhe genannt)” (XVIII., Wb IV 418, 7; GHWb 806), which suggests rather a prefix m-

mšćj “1. marschieren (von den Soldaten), reisen, 2. (sich) bewegen (Füße, Überschwemmungswasser), 3. Reise, Marsch” (NK, Wb II 156, 4–12; WD III 57) = “1. zu Fuß gehen, 2. (übertragen) wandeln” (Till 1955, 334, §56) = “to march” (FD 119) = “1. to march, journey, travel, depart, 2. journey, march” (DLE I 245) > Dem. mšć ~ mḥć “gehen” (DG 170:1, 181:1) vs. mšć “movement” (Smith 1987, 169: Pap. Harkness 2:25) > Cpt. (S) ḥṳṳṳṣ, ḥṳṳṣ, ḥṳṣṣ, (AL) ḥṳṳṣ (so, -2-), (S^a) ḥṳṣ, (S^aA) ḥṳṣ, (F) ḥṳṳṣ, ḥṳṣ, (B) ḥṳṣ “to go, walk (on land or water)” (CD 203b; CED 96) = “gehen” (KHW 108) = “1. marcher, 2. s'en aller, 3. mourir” (DELC 128–9).

NB1: W. Westendorf (KHW) surmised behind the Cpt. reflexes a late root *mšćj or *mšć < mšćj. His supposition has been confirmed by H.W. Fischer-Elfert (1986, 174), who found a “*hybride Graphie*” in Pap. Anastasi I 22:1 showing the met. mšćj < old mšćj. Nevertheless, Westendorf’s *mšć can hardly be maintained.

NB2: J. Černý (CED 96) assumed the Cpt. (S^aAL) reflexes with -2- to “*point to*” an original *-ḥ- in the original root, but this is false. The correspondence of (SFB) -ṳ- vs. (L) -2- clearly indicates Eg. -ḥ-, since (SFB) -ṳ- can only represent the regular reflex of old -š-/-ḥ- (cf. Peust 1999, 115, §3.8.1). In addition, as rightly noted by W. Vycichl (DELC), the strange (A) reflex with -2- is certainly irregular, since old -ḥ-/ḥ- yield (A) -2-. W. C. Till (1955, 334, §56) quoted Cpt. (AL) ḥṳṳṣ (sic, with -2-!), while J. Osing (1978, 187) too gave a certain (A) ḥṳṣ (so, -2-), but these forms have not been listed in the standard lexicons. The controversy could be resolved, at least, to a certain degree, by assuming a (L) influence in the (A) reflex, although in this case we should stick to an old *mḥć (as in Dem.), which should be explained as the var. of the unattested old *mḥćj. Alternatively, (SBF) -ṳ- might be perhaps due to an early (pre-Cpt.) influence of Cpt. (SALMB) ṣṣ, (F) ṣṣ “gehen” (KHW 301).

- Etymology highly disputable.

- **1.** Usually connected with Eg. mš' "Heer" (OK, Wb), cf. above.
NB: Plausible, cf. Ar. mal' - "troupe, bande, partie" vs. mala'a "marcher avec rapidité, d'un pas léger et rapide (se dit d'une chamelle)" [BK II 1149], which, besides, might be even genetically related to Eg. mš' if we assume an interchange of the PSem. laterals (*-l- ~ *-š- > Ar. -l- ~ -š-), cf. Ar. maša'a "3. marcher, doucement" [BK II 1111].
- **2.** C. Ceugney (1880, 8) derived both NK mš'j and OK mš' "army" from Eg. š' "aller" (sic). False.
- **3.** Sh. Yeivin (1933, 108; 1936, 70–71, #16) and W. E. Crum (CD 203) identified Eg. mš' (and its Cpt. reflex) with Ar. mšy/w: maša I "1. marcher, 2. aller, se diriger vers" [BK II 1113] = I "1. zu Fuß gehen, 2. gehen, 3. einhergehen, -schreiten, 4. marschieren" [Wehr 811] = I "gehen", II "überbringen (den Auftrag), melden" [WUS]. Rightly rejected by W. Vycichl (DELC). There is no correspondence between Eg. -' vs. Ar. -y.
NB1: Although Yeivin too accepted that NK mš'j "may be of course denom.", he surprisingly viewed that "this fact would not affect the suggested connection between" Eg. mš' and Ar. mšy.
NB2: The Sem. etymology of Ar. mšy is uncertain. J. Aistleitner (WUS #1610) equated it with Ug. msw D "überbringen, melden" (not listed in DUL). M. Cohen (1947, #473), in turn combined Ar. mšy with Eg. šm "to go" with met., which seems more convincing. GT: cf. also WCh.: Tangale meṣe [-s- < *-š-?] "journey, travel, walking" [Jng 1991, 120].
- **4.** Some of the adherents of the Rössler theory (*neuere Komparatistik*), e.g., J. Zeidler (1992, 208; 1998, 26 & fn. 30 with further lit.) and A. Loprieno (1994, 127; 1995, 45), rejecting the derivation of LEg. mš'j from OK mš' as denominal verb (suggesting instead a *nomen agentis* in old mš' "army"), derived it from proto-Eg. *mšd preserved in Dem. mšd "durchwandern" (not in DG, cf. below) treated as the etymological doublet (*Wurzeldoublette*) of LEg. mš'j, i.e., as the *Nebentwcklung* < PEg. *mšt, which "nicht mehr aufgrund einer phonetischen Variation aus... mš'j abgeleitet werden konnte" (Zeidler). Although the verb mš'j is attested from the NK only, this hypothesis would imply that it existed "schon in der Zeit, als der ' / t-Wechsel möglich war" (Zeidler). Moreover, as rightly pointed out both by J. Osing (1997, 229) and H. Satzinger (1999, 147), the comparison with Dem. mšd "semantically cannot be accepted".
NB: Besides, Dem. mšt seems to be a denom. verb from Eg. mšd.t "die Furt (des Orontes)" (XVIII., Wb, below), which is, in turn, a *nomen loci* of PEg. *šd identified by A. G. Belova (1989, 15) with Sem.: Hbr. štt "to wander, roam", Ar. šaṭṭ-/šaṭ' - "shore, coast, river-bank".
- **5.** G. Takács (2006, 113): perhaps akin to Ar. maša'a "3. marcher doucement" [BK II 1111]? This would not exclude a connection with Eg. mš' "army" (above), since, in principle, Ar. maša'a might be conceived as a parallel displaying an interchange of the PSem.

laterals (*-l- ~ *-š- > Ar. -l- ~ -š-), cf. Ar. mal^c- “troupe, bande, partie” vs. mala^a “marcher avec rapidité, d’un pas léger et rapide (se dit d’une chamelle)” [BK II 1149].

- **6.** GT: hardly an irregular cognate of Sem. *ns^c “to move (?)” [GT] (whose reconstruction is rather dubious). Eg. -š- ≠ Sem. *-s-, although the interchange of n- ~ m- rarely occurs in Eg.-Sem. etymologies. NB: Attested in (?) Akk. nesû “1. to step back, withdraw, depart, move back, away, recede, regress, go away, 2. (tr.) remove” [CAD n2, 185–6] || Ug. ns^c “to travel, remove” [Gordon 1955, #1663] (with different rendering in DUL), OHbr. ns^c qal “2. to journey further on” (explained via “1. to tear out” > “to pull out tent pegs” > “to break camp” > “to move off”) [KB], PBHbr. ns^c “fortziehen”, hitpaal “1. ziehen lassen, entfernen, fortnehmen” [Levy 1924 III, 408] = ns^c “to move, march”, *nesa^c “march” [Jastrow 1950, 918] || Ar. nasa^a “to travel” [Guillaume 1965 I, 28] = “s’enfoncer dans l’intérieur des terres, du pays” [BK II 1249] (Sem.: Lsl. 1968, 359, #1663; KB 704). W. von Soden (AHW 781) excluded Akk. nesû (rendered as “fern sein, sich entfernen”) from this etymology.

mš^c “abschneiden (?)” (XIX–XX., Wb II 156, 15).

NB: The GR exx. might belong rather to LEg. mḥ(3)j (q.v.).

- Etymology disputed.

- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 18) and M. K. Feichtner (1932, 220) saw in it an m- prefix form deriving from Eg. š^c “schneiden” (PT, Wb IV 415–416), cf. š^c “trennen von etwas” (PT, Wb IV 417, 3).

NB1: The etymology of Eg. š^c is debated. (1) GT: most probably, it may be akin to HECu.: Burji šo? “to separate”, Hadiyya šo?-ákko “to be loose” (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 199) || SCu. *še?-/*še^c- “to slice, slit” [Ehret 1980, 211] || PCh. *ša “to cut” [Nwm.] > WCh.: Suroid *sā ~ *sē “to cut in pieces” [GT 2004, 314]: Sura saa “schneiden, beschneiden, abschneiden, fällen” [Jng. 1963, 61], Mpn. sãa “to chop” [Frj. 1991, 53], Gmy. sê [sē] “to split” [Srl. 1937, 200] | Tng. seē “to cut (wood, tree, with hoe or big knife), chop, slay (with sword), hew, fell” [Jng. 1991, 142] | Sayanchi (Zaar) ša “to cut, chop” [Smz., Nwm.], Burma šuwe “to cut” [Krf. > Stl.], Buli šo “to cut” [Krf. > Stl.] | Bade sãa “to cut” [Stl. < ?] || CCh.: Tera ḥla (ša?) “to cut” [Nwm.] = ḍa [Krf.], Hwona še-ŋ (ending -ŋ) “to cut” [Krf.], Gabin še-nči “to cut” [Krf.] | Margi ša “to cut” [Krf. > Stl.] = šia “to cut open” [Skn. 1977, 17], WMargi ša-mdà, šà “to cut” [Krf.], Hildi šà-nà “to cut” [Krf.], Chibak šày “to cut” [Krf.] = šà-ntà [Hfm.], Bura ša (thla) “schneiden” [Hfm. 1955, 134–5] | PHigi *ša- “to cut” [GT]: Fali-Gili ša-mtú [Krf.], Fali-Jilbu ḍà-bi (ending -bi) [Krf.], Fali-Muchella ḍa-bi [Krf.], Higi-Ghye ša-ve [Krf.], Higi-Nkafa ša-nte [Krf.], Higi-Kamale ša-mte [Krf.], Higi-Futu ša-ntu [Krf.] (all forms denote “to cut”) | Mandara ča “to cut” [Mch.] = yč-a [Mirt] | Matakam ḍi?a “to cut” [Krf.] = ži?a [Stl.] | Daba žù “to cut” [Krf.], Musgoy za “to cut” [Mch.] | Lamang dl- (ž-) “to cut, chop” [Lks.] | Balda šuw “knife” [Stl.] || ECh.: Tumak sà “couper (un fois)”, sà “couteau de jet” [Cpr. 1975, 92], Smr. sãw “to cut” [Jng.] | Mokilko sũwwo “couteau” [Jng. 1990, 179] (Ch.: Nwm. 1977, 24; Stl. 1991 MS, 2; 1995, 59; JI 1994 II, 96–99). From AA *š-^c “to separate” [GT]. Lit.: OS 1992, 194 (PCh.-Eg.); HSED #525 & #567 (WCh.-CCh.-Mkl.-Eg.). O. V. Stolbova (1991 MS, 9; 1994 MS, 1; 1995, 59) compared the Ch. root with Eg. zšw “sich ablösen (von Kopf und Knochen des Skeletts)” (PT, Wb III 485, 6). Note that phonologically, an alternative comparison with WCh.: AS *l̥₂ “to cut grass” [GT 2004, 226–7] seems also plausible, since AS *-l- < AA *š- is regular, cf. Angas lī “to cut (as of grass with a sickle)” [Flk. 1915, 237] = lii “to cut grass” [Jng.

1962 MS, 23] = li “to cut grass etc.” [ALC 1978, 33], Sura lèe “to cut” [Krf.], Mpn. lèe “to cut by taking off slices, harvest” [Frj. 1991, 33], Kfy. lè “to gather or cut” [Ntg. 1967, 23], Msr. leeh “to harvest” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 142]. (2) W. F. Albright (1927, #79), F. von Calice (1936, #842), and G. Conti (1978, 87) combined it with Ar. ša[◌]a, šā[◌]a, ša[◌]ā “to scatter, spread” and Geez ša[◌]aya “to scatter, winnow”, which is semantically unconvincing. (3) The same pertains to Th. Schneider’s (1997, 206, #97) far-fetched comparison of Eg. š[◌] with Sem. *ḥdd “sharp” [GT].

NB2: Feichtner assumed in Eg. m- the “*Verbalpräfix der Reziprozität*”, whereby he rendered the primary sense of Eg. mš[◌] as “von einem (großen) Stück ein anderes (kleineres) abtrennen” maintaining that “*hier sind also zwei durch Reziprozität bedingte Objektvorstellungen auseinanderzuhalten*”. Baseless.

- 2. P. Wilson (PL 456), in turn, erroneously affiliated it with Eg. mšw “blade weapon” (below) and mḥ3 “to skewer” (above) < mḥ3 “to bind, tie” (!).

mš[◌]f (GW) “(von Fischen, die auf dem Trocknen sterben)” (late NK hapax: Pap. BM 10474, i.e., Amenemope, rt. 7:4, Wb II 157, 1) = “schnappen (von toten Fischen gesagt)” (Helck) = “to snap” (DLE I 246) = “snatched, caught” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81).

NB: Syllabic spelling: ma-š[◌]a-fi (Helck, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey). L. Lesko (DLE I 246) preferred to ignore -[◌]- in its spelling (mšfj).

- Usually explained as an m- prefix part. borrowed from Can., cf. Hbr. š[◌]p qal “nach Luft schnappen, lechzen” [GB 798] = qal “to gasp for air, pant for the shade, be a nuisance, pester, strive, press on (?el)” [KB 1375]. Uncertain, since the assumption, that in Eg. “*the shift ? > [◌] must have occurred*” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey), has not been convincingly demonstrated.

LIT. for Eg.-Hbr.: Lange 1925, 47; Helck 1962, 562, #120; 1971, 515, #120; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 15, §1.2.1.6 & 19, §1.2.4.2.

mšw (GW) “eine Waffe: Dolch (?)” (XVIII. hapax²: Urk. IV 894:9, Wb II 157, 2) = “sword” (FD 119).

- Reading and etymology uncertain.
- 1. R. Hannig’s (GHWb 368) alternative reading *mš[◌].w (although, if not GW, it is to be spelled in fact *m[◌]šw with a reverse order of -[◌]š-) suggests a nomen instr. (with prefix m-) deriving from Eg. š[◌] “to cut”. Unlikely.
- 2. GT: the traditional reading mš.w (Wb, FD) can be justified by the AA parallels proposed by N. Skinner (1996, 198), although their ultimate origin is hard to determine.

NB1: Cf. NAgaw: (?) Bilin máss-ā “Lanzenschaft” [Rn. 1887, 275] || ECu.: Afar muss-a “small knife” and/or cf. perhaps mās (m) “metal, print, gimlet, awl” [PH 1985, 158, 172] | Oromo maš-i “forca con tre o quattro denti per voltare le pannocchie della dura” [da Thiene 1939, 239] = “knife” [Lsl.], Baiso mač-a “knife”

[Flm.] = maš-á (f) “knife” [Hyw. 1979, 126] = mač-a ~ maš-a “knife” [HL] = maš-á “knife” [Brenzinger 1995, 16, #247], Boni miši? (f) “Messer” [Heine 1977, 290] | Hdy. mašša?-a “knife” [HL], Alb. mašša-ta “knife” [HL], Kambatta mašša-a “knife” [HL] = mašš-ata “knife” [Hds. 1989, 87] = maš- “knife with wooden handle” [Skn.] || SCu.: Asa mušú-g “heavy throwing spear” [Flm. 1969, 14, #32] = mušu-k, pl. muši-ka “spear” [Ehr. 1980, 158, #44 with false etym.] || NOM.: Wolamo māš-ā “coltello” [Crl. 1929, 33] = “pugnale” [Crl. 1938 III, 173] = maš- “knife with wooden handle” [Skn.] = mašš-a “swordlike knife” [LS], Dorze mašš-a “knife” [Alm.], Dawro maš-a ~ mas-a “knife” [LS], Doko mas?yē “coltello” [CR] = mas?ye “knife” [Flm.], Gofa mass-ā “ferro” (!) [Crl. 1929, 50] = maš-ā “coltello” [CR] = mašš-a “knife” [Alm.], Malo maš-ā “coltello” [CR] = mašš-a “knife” [LS], Dache mašš-a “knife” [HL], Gamu mašš-a “knife” [HL, Alm.] = “(swordlike) knife” [Sottile & Lmb. 1985 MS, #337; Sottile 1999, 437] | Zayse mašš-a “knife” [HL] = maš-a [Sbr.], Zrg. mašš-a “knife” [Sbr.], Kachama (Haruro) māšš-ā “coltello” [CR 1937, 655] = mašš-a “knife” [Lsl., Flm., LS] = maš- “knife with wooden handle” [Skn.] = maš-a “knife” [Sbr.], Ganjule maš-a “knife” [Sbr.] | Chara māš-ā “pugnale” [Crl.] = mašš-a “(house) knife” [Bnd. 1974 MS, 14] | Sns. mašš-a “knife” [Alm.] (NOM.: CR 1927, 249; 1937, 655; Crl. 1938 III, 173; Alm. 1993 MS, 8; Sbr. 1994, 16; ECu.-NOM.: Flm. 1964, 51; HL 1988, 130; LS 1997, 470) || SOM.: Ari mass, mašš- “knife”, Dime mašš-i “knife” (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 153) || PCh. *m-s “spear” [JS 1981, 246A₁/2] > WCh.: Hausa mááši “spear” [Abr. 1962, 663; Wolff 1992, 419], Gwandara mášu “spear” [Mts. 1972, 79] | Tala (from Hs.) maaši “spear” [Cooper 1994, 33] || CCh.: Tera mesi “sharp (like a knife blade)” [Nwm. 1964, 46, #381] | WBura gr. *mw-s- & EBura gr. masu “spear” [Skn.] > Bura mwasu “a spear or lance” [BED 1953, 146] = mwəsù “spear” [Krf.], Chibak mōši “große Lanze” [Hfm. 1955, 123] = mwaši “spear” [Krf.], Margi masu “spear” [Krf.], WMargi mwəsi “spear” [Krf.], Ngwahyi mwasù “spear” [Krf.], Kilba másu “spear” [Krf.], Wamdiu másu “spear” [Krf.], Hyildi másu “spear” [Krf.] (BM: Krf. 1981, #230) | Daba masa “fer” [Mch. 1966, 135] = mōsa “iron” [Krf.], Musgoy maša “fer” [Mch. 1950, 17] || ECh.: Mubi másiyò, pl. màsè “Eisen” [Lks. 1937, 184]. For the AA etymology see HSED #1785 (Asa-Hausa-CCh.-Mubi); Skn. 1996, 198 (WCh.-CCh.-Dangla-ECu.-NOM.-Asa-Eg.).

nb2: Whether Oakk. maššatum “eine Waffe (?) (auch mit Gold- und Silberbeschlag)” [AHW 629] = “(a weapon)” [CAD m1, 389] can belong here is highly dubious. I. Gelb (1973, 184) read it maššadum “a weapon” (from $\sqrt{\text{mšd}}$). In the view of M. Aivil (kind p.c. by E. Reiner, 7 Feb. 2000), Oakk. maššatum is in fact identical with Akk. (M/LBab.) mašaddu “pole” [CAD m1, 350] = “Deichsel” [AHW 622] < Akk. $\sqrt{\text{šdd}}$ (Oakk. $\sqrt{\text{šdd}}$) “ziehen” [AHW 1121]. D. Testen (p.c., 8 Feb. 2000), in turn, refers to a certain Akk. maššatugum “(a weapon)”.

nb3: W. Leslau (1963, 114; 1979 III, 433) explained ES: Harari māšah “knife”, Grg.: Wolane māššā & Selti & Zway mašša “knife with a wooden handle” (no Sem. etymology) from (!) Cushitic, although he failed to explain Harari -h (no Cu. reflex).

nb4: Note that MSA: Sqt. mos, dual mósi, pl. muwás “couteau” (!) [Lsl.], Mhr. maus ~ mauz [Bittner 1915, 24] = maws “razor” [Jns. 1987, 275], Jbl. mus “razor” [Jns.] (MSA: Lsl. 1938, 239) and also LECu.: Saho mōs-ū & Afar mōs-ā “das Rasiermesser” [Rn. 1886, 884] cannot belong here, since these derive from Ar. mūsā “rasoir” [BK II 1167], whose etymology is disputed (for a survey see Pennacchietti 2005, 231–7).

nb5: Ch. Ehret (1991, 235, §91) affiliated LECu.: Afar muss-a and Baiso maš-a with HECu.: Hdy. miš- “Frucht bringen” and even Burji mus-ā ~ miss-a “penis”. Semantically untenable.

nb6: Cf. perhaps also NBrb.: Mzg. i-mass-en (pl.t.) “charrue” [Abès 1916, 123], Zayan & Sgugu i-mass-ən (pl.t.) “charrue” [Lbg. 1924, 567] || Bed. miša (f) “Pflugschar” [Rn. 1895, 175]?

nb7: For the semantic shift “iron/metal” vs. “knife, lance” (in the Ch. examples discussed above), cp. Ar. *sabal-* “faisceau de lances” [BK I 1047] = “a number of spears (few or many)” [Lane 1302 with a poss. Ar. *Volksetym.*] ||| Eg. sb3 [reg. < *sbl] “ein Mundöffnungsgerät in der Opferliste als ein Gerät aus bj3-Mineral” (MK, from XVIII. often, Wb IV 81, 14; GHWb 685) ||| EBrb.: Ghadames (from Ar.?) ə-ssəbül-ət “long poignard, à fourreau de métal” [Lnf. 1973, 330, #1421] = “long dagger with a metal sheath” [Mlt.] ||| LECu. *sibl- > *silb- “iron” [Black 1974, 52] ||| WCh.: Bole sōwəl [-w- < *-b-?] “iron” [Mlt. < ?]. See also Mlt. 1985 MS, 2, #6 (Ar.-LECu.- Gdm.-WCh.).

- **3.** P. Wilson (PL 456) erroneously affiliated it with Eg. mš^c “abschneiden (?)” (XIX., Wb, above) and mḥ3 “to skewer” < mḥ3 “to bind, tie” (!).
- **4.** A. M. Lam (1993, 385): ~ Ful mačča “grande hache à large tranchant”.

mšwš ~ mšw ~ mš ~ m (GW) “Name eines libyschen Stammes” (XIX., Wb II 157, 3) = “one form of the generic Berber appellation” (Bates 1914, 47) = “a mixed tribe of Libu-like tribesmen with their native chiefs (who... by the time of Sethos [I] and certainly by the time of Ramesses III had become subject to a family of Tjehnu origin)” (Wainwright 1962, 92).

nb1: For a detailed discussion of the mšwš cf. Wainwright 1962, 89–99 (stating on p. 92, i.a., that “*the main body of the tribe only differed from the Libu in not being tattooed... and in their fashion of wearing the phallus-sheath instead of the kilt which is the dress of the Libu*”) and Zibelius 1972, 130–2.

nb2: The var. mšw is attested under Ramses III (LD III 218c). In G. A. Wainwright’s (1961, 72 & fn. 5; 1962, 99) view, the final -š (GW) “*of the full name was not an integral part of the name but only a termination as in the names of the Sea Peoples*” like Qereqeš, Eqweš, Tereš, Šekeleš. K. Zibelius (1972, 130) too was of the speculative opinion that “*der frühe Abfall des -š könnte zeigen, daß es nicht zur Wurzel gehörte*”.

nb3: The supposed first occurrence of mšw in Thotmes’ III list of northern peoples (Urk. IV 792, no. 282) is problematic. It was considered by W. Hölscher (1955, 60) as “*perhaps the original and more correct form*”, which both W. C. Hayes (JNES 10, 1951, 91, fn. 119) and K. Zibelius (1972, 131) rejected (cf. already AEO I 119*, #240). Also for G. A. Wainwright (1962, 99, fn. 5), it was “*hard to see in it more than a coincidence in view of time and place*” but he “*cannot have been derived from the Asiatic tribes*”, because the form mšwš was in use already in the 34th year of Amenhotep III (15 jars labelled containing “fat of mšwš bulls”).

nb4: For its abbreviation as m (GW, first attested XXI.), first identified as such by de Rougé (Mélanges d’Archéologie 1, 87 quoted by Grd. l.c.), see DNG III 19; Grd. 1933, 23; Blackman 1941, 87; AEO I 120*; Grd. 1955, 3.

- Etymology uncertain. A number of scholars suggest that Eg. mšwš might reflect the PBrb. ethnonym *a-maziḡ “Berber man”, pl. *i-maziḡ-ən “Berber people”, *ta-maziḡ-t “Berber language” [Mlt.], which is supposed to have been preserved also in Gk. Μάζυες (Herodot) ~ Μαζικες (Ptolemy) ~ Μάζυες (Hecataeus) and Lat. Mazices (Aethicus, Euagrius, Nicephorus Callistus, Philostorgius, Ammianus Marcellinus) ~ Mazaces and Mazages (Claudian, Lucan,

perhaps Suetonius) ~ Maxytani (Justin), which have been connected with Eg. mšwš already by H. Brugsch and G. Maspero (cf. Hölscher 1955, 60; Sarnelli 1957, 131; Strobel 1976, 21–22). In principle, as rightly stated by A. Ju. Militarev (1991 and 1991 l.c.), Brb. *-maziγ could originate from an older *-maših, while Eg. mšwš might perhaps stem from *mšwḥ via assim. But in fact, no convincing Brb. etymological evidence has been adduced for this theory in this case. K.-G. Prasse (1959, 200) *ex cathedra* declined equating Brb. *-maziγ with Eg. mšwš (without further comment). There is good reason to agree with him. Lrr. for Eg.-Brb.: Bates (1914, 42, 47), Möller (1924, 50), Eilers (OLZ 38, 1935, 202, n. 1), Sarnelli (1957, 131), Wainwright (1962, 99); Poplinskij (1978, 160–169), Militarev (1991, 139; 1991, 151; 1994, 247–248).

NB1: The Brb. ethnonym is attested almost in all Brb. lgs. (except for Qbl. and some EBrb. dialects like Siwa etc.), cf. NBrb. *a-māziγ [Prasse] vs. pl. *i-māziγ-en “berberi puri, bianchi, nobili, liberi” [Sarnelli]: e.g. Shilh a-maziγ, pl. i-maziγ-en “homme blanc, homme libre” [Jordan 1934, 30] = a-maziγ “Berber man”, ta-maziḥ-t “Berber language” [Mlt.], Zrw. a-maziγ “weiß” [Stumme 1899, 164] | Mzg. a-maziγ, pl. i-maziγ-en “1. berbère, 2. berbère du Maroc Central” [Tf. 1991, 447], Izdeg a-maziγ, pl. i-maziγ-en “berbère”, ta-maziγ-t “langue berbère” [Mrc. 1937, 34] | Izn. & Tuzin maziγ, pl. i-maziγ-en “Berbère”, ta-maziḥ-t “femme berbère et langue berbère” [Rns. 1932, 386], Bettiwa a-maziγ, pl. i-maziγ-en “homme du Rif”, ta-maziγ-t “1. femme du Rif, 2. la langue rifaine” [Brn. 1911, 183], Bettiwa & Tamsan & Izn. a-maziγ “homme d’origine berbère, rifain”, ta-maziḥ-t “femme berbère, langue, dialecte du Rif” [Brn. 1917, 88], Nefusa maziγ, pl. i-maziγ-en “berbère” [Laoust 1931, 202] = māzōγ (var. of Jefren dial. māzīγ), pl. i-māziγ-en “berbero” [Bgn. 1931, 289; 1942, 304] || EBrb.: Gdm. a-māzəγ, pl. i-mūzəγ ~ rarely a-māziγ, pl. i-māziγ-ən “Berber” [Prs.] = i-maziγ-en “manière touaregüe de désigner le quartier et les habitants de Ghadamès, qui se nomment eux-mêmes imaziγ-ən” [Lnf. 1973, 222, #1058] || SBrb.: Wlm. a-māzəγ, pl. i-māzəγ-ən “Tuareg noble” [Prs.], EWlm. a-māzəγ ~ ə-māzəγ & Ayr ə-māzəγ, pl. i-māzəγ-an “Tuareg noble (membre de la classe des nobles), 2. p.ext. Touareg (gén.), 3. homme/animal brave, courageux”, denom. vb. mužəγ “1. être Touareg noble ou Touareg en gén., 2. se tenir fièrement, 3. être brave, courageux” [PAM 1998, 232–3; 2003, 576], Ayr a-maz/zəγ, i-māzəγ-ən “Tuareg noble” [Prs.] = i-māziγ-en (-ǧ-) [Duveyrier apud Bates], Hgr. a-mahay [Laoust] = ā-māhay, pl. i-mūhay [Prasse], Tadghaq (Ifogha) a-māšəγ, pl. i-mūšay “Tuareg noble”, ta-māšəq “1. Tuareg language, 2. Tuareg woman” [Mlt.] = ta-mešəγ-t [Bissuel apud Bates] (Brb.: Prasse 1969, 80; Mlt. 1988, 196, #3.2; 1989, 246–7). Fem. -q < *-γ-t (Prasse).

NB2: The origin of PBrb. *-maziγ is disputed:

(1) F. Nicolas (quoted by Prasse 1972, 9, fn. 4 and Militarev 1994, 248, fn. 16) saw in it a deverbal *ma- prefix form derived from the root attested in SBrb.: EWlm. ə-žžəγ “marcher d’un pas altier, marcher comme un noble” [Prasse] = “to walk in a proud, haughty manner” [Mlt.].

(2) T. Sarnelli (1957, 132–4) and A.Ju. Militarev (1988, 197, #3.2.1.3; 1991, 139; 1991, 151; 1994, 248) preferred to render it as an m- prefix form of PBrb. *√z-w-γ “rosso” [Sarnelli] = *i-zway “to be red” [Mlt.], i.e., *a-ma-ziy < *a-me-zwe/ay [Sarnelli] = *a-ma-zwiγ [Mlt.]. This etymology, however, certainly excludes any comparison with Eg. mšwš, which would be plausible only if Brb. *-z- < AA *-š-. But this is not the case, since Brb. *z-w-γ is cognate with NOm. *zoḳ- “red” [Bnd.] (as pointed out by Takács 2000, 268–9). Surprisingly, Sarnelli assumed a reverse chain of phonological shifts: *m-z-w-γ < *m-z-g-γ < (!) PBrb. *√z-g-γ (!) “red” with *-g- > *-w- > -Ø-.

(3) K.-G. Prasse (1959, 197–200) disapproved this argumentation on morphological grounds. He treated PBrb. *a-māziy as a nomen agentis (with prefix *ma-) of a tr. verb with an initial weak consonant, which he (following Foucauld 1951–2, 665–674) was inclined to identify with SBrb.: Hgr. a-hey “razzier” [Fcd.] and to derive it from an earlier *azey. Thus, acc. to Prasse, Hgr. a-māhay could have act. meant “qui razie” > “un (beau) guerrier” and thence (since only free men could participate in war) “un homme libre” > “un noble”. This is certainly mistaken. Later, Prasse (1969, 80, #520; 1972, 9, fn. 4) himself declined this idea. As later Prasse (1972, 9, fn. 4) also admitted and confirmed, the h- of Hgr. a-hey “razzier” is original (i.e., not from *z-), cf. NBrb.: Shilh ay “prendre, atteindre” [Jordan 1934, 21] | Qabyle ay “prendre” [Dlt. 1982, 597], Ait Khalfun ay [Bst.] || WBrb.: Zenaga yokka (aor. [Bst.] etc. (Brb.: Bst. 1885, 190) || NAgaw: Hamir hīq “stehlen, entwenden” [Rn. 1884, 370]. Note that E. Zyhlarz (1934, 118) and P. Behrens (n.d. MS) combined SBrb.: Hgr. a-hey vs. Hamir hīq, resp., with Eg. h3q “erbeuten, erobern” (MK, Wb III 32–33), which has a fully different etymology (see Ember 1911, 88; 1917, 88, fn. 2; 1926, 302, fn. 10; 1930, #3.c.4; Holma 1919, 40; Lexa 1938, 217; Vrg. 1945, 130, #1.d.19; Chn. 1947, #442).

(4) Strangely, K. Zibelius (1972, 131) explained the Brb. word from Gk. and Lat. (and not *vice versa*).

(5) It may well be that Brb. *māziy cannot be explained purely on Brb. grounds. Already O. Bates (1914, 42) surmised that this term “*radically once was a common ethnic name of Western Hamites*”, which O. Rössler (1964, 205) suspected to represent an ethnonym going back to the common AA heritage shared with LECu.: Somali mudug [-d- reg. < ECu. *-z-] “Selbstbezeichnung eines Teiles der Somali” and CCh.: Logone muzugu “Volk in Kamerun”.

mšpn.t “eine Krankheit” (Med.: Pap. Hearst 160/11:3 etc., Wb II 157, 6) = “Hautausschlag” (KHW 114) = “herpes” (DLE I 246; Borghouts 1999, 175 with XXII. ex. from Pap. Turin 1983) = “Hautflechte” (NBĀ 206; Snk. 1983, 69, 96) = “lichen” (Aufrière 1986, 8) = “une maladie ‘papuleuse’ de type lichen (λιχίν, mentagra)” (Bardinet 1988, 21–22) = “*Hautflechte, *Herpes” (GHWb 368) > Cpt. (S) ΜΕΧΠΩ(Ω)ΝΕ, ΜΕΩΠΩΝΕ, (A) ΜΔΩΠΩΝΕ, (B) ΜΕ(Τ)ΩΦΩΝΙ (f/m) (≈LXX λειχίν, OTHbr. yallepet, Ar. qūb-/quwab-at- of the Cpt. scalae “ulcer, eruption” (CD 213b; CED 101) = “lichen (maladie de la peau)”, (S) ΜΕΧΠΩΝΕ ΕCΩ ἸCΔΩ “lichen ulcéré (probablement l’eczéma impétigineux)” (Chassinat 1921, 274, 279, 298, 307–8, 314, 341) = “Ekzem” (Till 1951, 31) = “ein Hautleiden, Bezeichnung für Trichophytie, Rauheit der Hautoberfläche mit viel Jucken, Hautaffektion (ausschließlich mit äußerlichen Mitteln behandelt)” (Ebbell 1967, 96–97) = “Hautflechte, Ausschlag, Schorf, Geschwür” (KHW 114) = “gale” (DELIC 129) = “les vergetures ou une sorte d’acué” (Cannuyer 1986, 98–99 & fn. 58 with lit.) = “gale, dartre, eczéma” (Bardinet 1988, 21–22).

nb1: Vocalized as *mašpān.ṭ (NBĀ 206; Snk. 1983, 69, 96).

nb2: The Cpt. word was first derived from Eg. mšpn.t by B. Ebbell (who has been followed by most authors, J. Černý, J. Osing, W. Westendorf, Cannuyer l.c. et al.).

- An m- prefix form (as surmised already by H. Grapow 1914, 31) derived by J. Osing (NBĀ 743, n. 899), W. Vycichl (DELC 129), Ch. Cannuyer (1986, 98–99), and Th. Bardinete (1988, 23) from Eg. *špn attested in špn “eine Krankheit” (Med. hapax: Pap. Hearst 171–2, Wb IV 444, 15) = “Gonorrhoe” (Ebbell 1938, 49) = “eine Krankheit: eine schmerzhaft Harnerkränkung” (WMT 845 contra Ebbell) = “Aufreibung, Stauung” (NBĀ 744, n. 899) = “un engraissement inhabituel, accompagné de rétention” (Cannuyer after Osing) = “maladie: blennorragie” (Bardinete l.c.).

nb1: J. Osing (NBĀ 206, 742–4, n. 899) eventually explained Eg. *špn “ausgebaucht, aufgetrieben sein” as a var. to Eg. ḥpn ~ (later) ḥpn “fett, gemästet” (Wb III 366, 12–14) = “wohlgenährt sein, werden” (Osing) = “feist, stramm, kraftstrotzend, stark” (KHW) > Dem. ḥpn ~ ḥpn “fett” (DG 354:9, 380:4) vs. špn.w “graisse, huile, suif” (Cannuyer) > (?) Cpt. (L) 𓂏𓂏𓂏 “1. to thrive, prosper, 2. feed” (CED 290, not in CD) = “sicher sein (?)” or rather “fett, fruchtbar” (KHW 382, 567) = “gras. engraisé, gavé” (Cannuyer) with an old interchange of ḥ ~ š (Sethe 1899 I, §260–2; AĀG §120; ÜKAPT V 295), which is dubious with regard to the anomalous Cpt. reflexes: (A) 𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏 etc. (clearly pointing to an old -š-) vs. (L) 𓂏𓂏𓂏 (indicating old ḥ-).

nb2: Ch. Cannuyer (l.c.) extended this comparison with Eg. špn.t “gute Eigenschaft einer Frau” (Lit. MK: Ptahhotep 500, 503, Wb IV 444, 16) = “eine Wohlgenährte” (Erman 1923, 95, n. 37) = “une femme atteinte de maladie (vénérienne?)” (Lexa). The connection with Eg. ḥpn was rightly rejected by Z. Žába (1956, 160, n. 499 following F. Lexa), at least, in the case of špn in Ptahhotep l.c. (“špn des papyrus médicaux n’a rien de commun... avec notre mot”).

mšr.w “1. (alt vielleicht) die Zeit zwischen Mittag und Abend, 2. (seit M.R.) Abend (im Gegs. zum Morgen und zum Mittag), 3. (XXI., Gr. vereinzelt) die Nacht (Gegs. der Tag) als Zeit des Mondscheins” (PT, Wb II 157, 9–17) = “vesper” (Scharff apud Gdk.) = “midday meal” (de Buck apud Gdk.) = “Abendimbiss” (Jacobson apud Gdk.) = “late afternoon, evening” (Grd. 1948 II, 32) = “Tageszeit, die noch nicht völlig dunkel ist: Abenddämmerung, Zeit der Sonnenuntergangs” (Hornung 1961, 110) = “evening” (FD 119) = “1. (eig.) die zweite Tageshälfte, der Abend (im Gegensatz zum Morgen), 2. auch (später vereinzelt, z.B., Stela Louvre C.256, 13) die Nacht (als Zeit des Mondscheins im Gegensatz zum Tag)” (Beckerath 1968, 21, n. 13h) = “the meal (with a roast as its pièce de résistance) between noon and evening” (Gdk. 1970, 140 pace Weill and Wilson) = “crépuscule, obscurité” (El-Sayed 1987, 64) = “Abend, Abenddämmerung (helle Zeit des Sonnenuntergangs), Abendrot” (GHWb 368) = “evening, time of day when the sun...sets and vanishes from the sky” (PL 469–470) = “die Nacht als die Zeit des Mondscheins” (WD II 68 pace RdE 20, 1968, 21, l. 13h).

NB1: As stated by E. Hornung (1961, 109–111, §3), the PT det. of sunrays (replaced from MK by that of the darkness) “*weist daraufhin, daß mšrw ursprünglich eine Tageszeit war, die noch nicht völlig dunkel ist, in der vielmehr die Sonne selbst oder zumindest das Abendrot noch ‘strahlt’. Mehrfach erscheint mšrw... eindeutig als Zeit der Sonnenuntergangs*”. P. Wilson (PL 470) too viewed that the OK det. of sunrays of mšrw “*implies that it is the time when the light has not quite gone, but perhaps the sky is red with ‘fire’...*”.

NB2: P. Lacau (1972, 58, §26.6) surmised in its final -w a noun suffix “*de noms de divisions du temps*” (!).

- Hence: **(1)** mšr.wt “Essen zur mšr.w-Zeit” (PT, Wb II 158, 1) = “evening-meal” (FD 119) = “main meal (≈ dinner), which is served either at midday or in the evening, the roast-meal” (Gdk. 1970, 140, 201, n. 176) = “Mahlzeit am frühen Nachmittag” (Helck, LÄ III 1164), **(2)** denom. mšr “am Abend sein” (GR, Wb II 158, 3) > **(3)** caus. smšr “den Abend zubringen” (XXVI, Wb IV 144, 1).
NB: The rendering of mšr in PT 1048d is disputed. R.O. Faulkner (AEPT 174, utt. 488) apparently took it to be the denom. of mšrw (lit. “to be in the evening”), while E. Hornung (1961, 110) and P. Wilson (PL 470) identified it with mšr “verglühen (Natron)” (1st IMP hapax, Hornung 1961, 110; GHWb 368; ÄWb I 570) = “to be burnt, dry by fire” (PL). Whether the latter is indeed also a denom. verb from mšr. w is, however, rather uncertain. If mšr “verglühen” represents a distinct root, cf. perhaps alternatively Ar. mašira I “2. être vif, ardent”, V “2. être vert vif (feuillage), 2. avoir toute l’apparence d’aisance” [BK II 1109]?
- There have been suggested several tempting etymologies. Most attractive seem solutions #2 and #4 (eventually, perhaps from the same AA root with met.?).
- **1. H. Grapow** (1914, 31) assumed in Eg. mšrw an m- prefix form (without naming its simplex). This derivation has become common in Eg. philology, albeit in diverse (sometimes controversial) forms. There is no agreement even in the basic sense of the underlying root. Semantically, neither of the proposed inner Eg. etymologies can be regarded as satisfactory.
NB1: G. Fecht (ZÄS 85, 1960, 105, fn. 1) derived it from a hypothetical Eg. *šr “1. gelbrot, flammenfarben, 2. heiß, dörrend” based on the unconvincing comparison of 3šr “braten”, wšr and ššr (caus.) “trocknen”, šrt “Kleid”, šrḥ “Name einer Art Holz (von roter Farbe)”, dšr “rot” (quoted after Wb), which seem to display at least four etymologically distinct roots (although a remote connection of Eg. 3šr and wšr has been surmised also by A. Ember 1930, §19.a.11 and A. G. Belova 1989, 15): **(1)** for Eg. 3šr see Hodge 1990, 647, #17.B; OS 1992, 197; HSED #573; Orel 1995, 102, #35. **(2)** For Eg. wšr cf. Ember 1930, §19.a.12; Dlg. 1970, 622, #8.46; 1989, 96, #33; OS 1992, 200; HSED #564. **(3)** For Eg. šrt cf. perhaps OS 1989, 88; 1992, 174; HSED #2331. **(4)** Eg. šrḥ (GR) seems to be a foreign word, **(5)** The origin of Eg. dšr is obscure as no convincing etymology has been proposed as yet. In any case, it can hardly be related either with Sem. *šrk “to be red” (contra Alb. 1918, 234, 235; Ember 1930, §19.a.9) or Sem. *šḥr “rötlich sein” (as in Snd. 1997, 208, #113). Note that Eg. d- agrees neither with Sem. *k nor with *š-. The idea of L. Bender (1975, 181) on an eventual connection with CCh. *d-z “red” has to be subject to further research.
NB2: E. Hornung (1961, 109–111, §3), maintaining that mšrw “*ist... die Zeit, in welcher die Sonne ‘verglüht’ (untergeht)*”, explained it from Eg. mšr “verglühen (Sonne,

Natron” and ultimately from 3šr “braten (Fleisch), rösten (Feigen), backen (Brot)” (PT, Wb I 21, 4–6). A similar position has been taken by P. Wilson (PL 470) who derived mšr.w from *šr “to be dry, roast” concluding that it was “*time of day when the sun is ‘burnt up’...*”. Hornung found E. Otto’s (1954, 50) biconsonantal Eg. *šr “trocken” as erroneous. Instead, Hornung (1961, 110, fn. 1) falsely assumed an eventual connection with the *Grundbedeutung* “verringern (was beim Trocknen, Rösten usw. eintritt)” (sic!) with a hint to Eg. šrr ~ šrj “klein sein” (OK, Wb IV 524), which represents in fact a distinct AA root, cf. Ember 1912, 90; 1930, #12.a.40; Holma 1919, 45; Alb. 1927, #64; Chn. 1947, #293; Gordon 1955, 339, #2080; Zvd. 1967, 22; MM 1983, 230; Bynon 1984, 274–275, #36; EDE I 140.

NB3: H. Goedicke (1970, 140), ignoring its clearly secondary derivation from Eg. mšr.w, explained mšr.wt “Bezeichnung der Mahlzeit” directly (!) from Eg. 3šr (above) concluding that it was “*die Hauptmahlzeit des Tages, die sich durch ‘a roast as its pièce de résistance’ auszeichne*” (Verhoeven 1984, 16), which was rightly doubted by W. Helck (LÄ III 1165, n. 3).

- **2.** F. Behnk (1927, 82, #14), F. von Calice (1936, #418), and W. Vycichl (1990, 222) equated it with Sem.: JAram. rəmaš ~ ramšā ~ ru/ūmšā “Abend” [Dalman 1922, 405; Levy 1924 IV, 456] = “evening” [Jastrow 1950, 1483], Syr. ramšā (sg.), ramše ~ ramšawātā (pl.) “vesper” [Brk. 1928, 735b-736a] with met., although Aram. -š- does not regularly correspond to Eg. -š- (while Eg. -š- = Aram. -s- < Sem. *š-). This etymology was rejected already by W. F. Albright (1927, 202) because of the Aram. sibilant.

NB: The Aram. word has no evident Sem. cognates (this fact has been confirmed by M. Moriggi, p.c., 20 Feb. 2007). C. Brockelmann (l.c.) supposed a connection with Ar. √rms: ʔar-rāwāmisu “1. ceux qui (se) cachent, 2. vents qui en dispersant la poussière couvrent et effacent les traces des pas ou d’un campement, 3. oiseaux nocturnes, ou, en gén., bêtes qui ne sortent que pendant la nuit” [BK II 924] = “animalia noctu prodeuntia” [Brk.]. J. Levy’s (l.c.) analysis (root ext. r- + √mšš, lit. “weichen, von der Sonne, die sich entfernt hat”) is, in turn, very unlikely. Perhaps SCu.: Asa eramesa “night” [Ehret 1980, 387] is related, but cp. SCu.: PRift *amas- “night” [Ehret] (discussed in detail s.v. Eg. msw.t, above).

- **3.** W. F. Albright (1927, 202) compared Eg. mšr.w with Ar. samara “1. passer la nuit à causer, deviser pendant la nuit, 2. veiller”, samira ~ samura “être brun, foncé, de couleur fauve foncée”, samar- “1. entretien, causerie de nuit, 2. nuit, 3. ténèbres, 4. endroit où il y a de l’ombre par un clair de lune, 5. temps, 6. endroit où l’on cause pendant la nuit” [BK II 1135–6] = samara “to be awake, not to sleep, occupy oneself during the night, pasture animals by night” [Lane 1424] = samar- “evening vigil, night, night darkness”, samura “to be dark, brown” [Alb.], although Ar. s- is just as an irregular match of Eg. -š- as Aram. -š-. In addition, the primary sense of the underlying Sem. root is quite different.

NB: Cf. Hbr. šmr “1. to keep, watch over; 2. take care of, preserve, protect” [KB 1581–2], Phn. & Punic šmr “to guard, watch over” [Donner-Röllig] | OSA dmr “to protect” [Conti, SD 39] etc.

- **4.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 173) supposed Eg. mšr.w to be cognate with NOm.: Wolayta cluster *omarsa-a “night, evening” [Bnd.]. NB1: Attested in Wlt. omarsa “evening” [LS] = ?omársa [Alm., Azeb], Dorze (Gerese?) & Gofa omarsa “evening, night” [Bnd.], Gofa ?umarsa “night” [Alm.], Dawro omarsa “evening” [Lmb.], Gamu omarsí “evening, night” [Lmb. 1985 MS, 22, #704] = omarsa [Bnd.] = ?omarse “night” [Alm.] = ?omarsa-wode ~ homarsa-wode “evening” [Sottile 1999, 435], Malo ?omars- “night” [Lmb.] = ?omars [Alm.] = omátsə (-ts- < *-rs-?) [Siebert & Caudwell], Bsk. ?umats (-ts- < *-rs-?) [Alm.], Dache o’mars “night” [Bnd. 1971, 253, #58 quoted also apud Dlg.] = omarsi “night” [Lmb.] (NOm.: Alm. 1993 MS, 8, #237; Bnd. 1999, 20, #95; 2000 MS, 60, #95). NB2: The Cu.-Om. etymology of this stem has been disputed, albeit no convincing parallels have been proposed. A. B. Dolgopól’skij (1973, 142) derived the Dache form from his PCu. *^oVm(V)S- “1. evening, 2. darkness, 3. night etc.” (based on exx. with no trace of *-r- reflecting evidently diverse etyma), while M. Lamberti and R. Sottile (1997, 287) postulated POM. *?om-ar- (with *-s- explained as “sibilant derivational suffix”, sic) derived from a certain OCu. (PCu.-Om.) *k^wab-(ar)- (!) “time of darkness, night” (with a shift *k^w- > *?- and *-b- > -m-). Both suggestions are baseless. NB3: Does the hypothetic Aram.-Eg.-Wlt. isogloss eventually originate from AA *m-S-r ~ *m-r-S (its sibilant C₃ cannot be exactly defined) “black” [GT] > NAgaw *ḡǝčir- [*ḡ reg. < *m] “black” [Apl.] > Bilin nəširab^w [Apl.], Hamir ḡǝčor [Apl.], Hamta nəčír [CR], Kailinya nəčor [Apl.], Qwara nišer “Dunkelheit” [Rn.] ||| CCh.: Mafa-Mada *m-r-S “black” [GT] > Mkt. māršigá, Huro mēržén, Vame miržé “black” (MM: Rsg. 1978, 212, #71)?
- Other suggestions are evidently out of question:
- **5.** L. Reinisch (1887, 275): ~ NAgaw: Bilin mizé “Abend” (for which cf. Eg. msw.t above).
- **6.** O. Bates (1914, 83): ~ Brb. *√m-d-r > NBrb.: Mnsr. ta-madir-t “evening”, but Eg. -š- ≠ Brb. *-d-.
- **7.** E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 173, 180) assumed in it a prefix m- and compared Eg. *š with Nub. *šare “Abend” [BG 1984–85, 53]. NB: P^Nub. *šare “Abend” cannot be anyhow cognate. It might be, however, noteworthy as a plausible AP to the AA root preserved by Eg. šs3.t [reg. < *šsr.t] “Nacht” (PT, Wb IV 545, 2) ||| SCu.: Iraqw širé’í “midday” | Asa širaho-g “forenoon, 10 AM” (SCu.: Flm. 1969, 11, #9). For different etymology of Eg. šs3.t cf. OS 1992, 200; HSED #2261.
- **8.** K.-G. Prasse (PAM 2003, 624) erroneously combined it with Sem. *msw/y (sic!) and PBrb. *ǎ-nsīh “passer la nuit”, which are, in fact, akin to Eg. msw.t (above).
- **9.** GT: the connection with Yemeni Ar. našar “am Spätnachmittag gehen” [Deboo 1989, 197] = “to depart, go, set off, leave” [Pimenta 1990, 485] (with an alternation of m- ~ n-) is improbable. NB: The basic sense of this Ar. root is significantly different, cf. Ar. nšr “déployer (les voiles), ouvrir et étaler, disperser, disséminer, divulguer, publier, répandre (des connaissances), enseigner” [BK II 1258; Dozy II 671].

mšr.w (GW) “some damp or waterlogged place (?)” (late NK, Grd. 1948 II, 32) = “?” (AC 1977, 9 after Grd.) = “une catégorie de terres (?)” (AL 77.1894; 78.1879) = “une désignation de pièce d’eau” (Kruchten

1978, 24) = “kind of land” (Borghouts 1981, 273) = “(land)” (DLE I 246) = “plain, wetland (refers to a place with productive agricultural soil, in administrative texts with reference to grain)” (Hoch) = “eine Landbezeichnung” (GHWb 368) = “category of land” (PL 470).

NB: D. Meeks (AL l.c.) supposed to have found a GR instance in *mrš* (with met.) of Edfu V 56:6 that J. F. Borghouts (l.c.) surmised to have signified “the realm of a crocodile (?)” suggesting two further instances of *mrš* in Pap. Leiden I 350, rt.2:7 (hymn) and Pap. Jumilhac 21:10 (“both in a most aquatic context”).

- Mng. and etymology obscure.
- 1. A. H. Gardiner (1948 II, 32) found its occasional det. of night/darkness (occurring in Pap. Wilbour B17:8.28) to resemble Eg. *mšr.w* “afternoon, early evening” remarking that “*that possible etymology (!) provides no apparent clue to the meaning*”. Of course, there can be no etymological connection (which, besides, Gardiner missed to specify).
- 2. J.-M. Kruchten (1978, 25), followed by D. Meeks (AL l.c.; 1997, 42, #207): “*pourrait bien... n’être qu’une variante de ce même mot*”, i.e., Eg. *jšr.w* “Tempel und heiliger See der Göttin Mut bei Karnak” (XVIII.-GR, Wb II 135, 6) = “un étang résiduel en demi-lune, voisin du désert, formé soit par les pluies d’orage à la base du cône de déjection d’un oued, soit par un méandre du fleuve en voie d’assèchement” (Kruchten 1978, 25 after Sauneron 1964 and Yoyotte 1962) = “désignation du lac des déesses lionnes” (Meeks) = “1. name of a canal in the 18th LEg. nome, 2. also the name of the lake of Mut, the lioness goddess” (PL 113) “*constituée au moyen de la particule préformante «m» qui... sert à construire notamment des noms d’instruments et des noms de lieux*”. Kruchten assumed that both Eg. *jšr.w* and *mšr.w* “*pourraient... être... synonymes et correspondaient peut-être... à des variantes dialectales*”. Although this idea was accepted by P. Wilson (PL 470) and R. Woodhouse (2003, 279, #207), it appears to be rather poorly argued.

NB: More far-fetched and unlikely is Kruchten’s (1978, 27–28) further theory that Eg. *mšr.w* “crépuscule” (above) might “*fort bien d’ailleurs avoir la même origine: après désigné simplement une variété de pièce d’eau, le même mot se serait appliqué au moment particulier de la journée où ce lieu prenait une importance exceptionnelle aux yeux des Égyptiens préhistoriques, à l’heure où, le soleil juste couché, cet endroit désert aux heures chaudes, s’animait pour devenir le siège d’une vie animale intense*”.

- 3. J. Hoch (1994, 158–9, §207) assumed it to have “possibly” derived from an *m*- prefix reflex of Sem. **wtr* (sic!) ~ **yšr* “to be level” [Hoch] like JAram. *mēšār* ~ *mēšārā* “1. Ebene, Fläche, 2. Beet” [Dalman 1922, 235] = “Plan, Ebene” [Levy 1924 III 290] = (m) “straight line, horizontal level (dividing, e.g., a field)” vs. (f) “1. bed, 2. plain, valley” [Jastrow 1950, 779] = “garden bed, plain” [Hoch]. Cf. perhaps also Akk. *mūšaru* ~ *muš/sar(r)û* “Beet” [AHW 681: < *ešru?*] = *m/ūšarū* (pl.t.) “(a technical term for planting a

field)” [CAD m2, 262]. Rejected by D. Meeks (1997, 42, #207) and R. Woodhouse (2003, 279, #207).

NB1: Hoch’s P_{Sem}. *wṭr (sic!) “to be level” is a grave error, since the Aram. and Ar. reflexes clearly indicate Sem. *yšr “(to be) straight” (cf. GB 326; Dlg. 1983, 137, #10.2; 1990, 213). His comparison with OSA (Sab.) ʔwṭr “low ground (?), terre basse (?)” [SD 166] = “plains, lowlands” [Hoch] is baseless.

NB2: Alternatively, Hoch combined Eg. mšr.w with Sem. *trw “to be moist” (OHbr. *mišrā, st.cstr. mišrat- “liquid”, MHbr. mišrā “pond”, T_{Aram}. mitrūtā “juice”, Ar. taran “moist earth, ground, soil”), but since the Can. evidence “points to extreme wetness, not appropriate for land producing cereal crops”, Hoch regarded this connection as “somewhat questionable”.

- **4.** GT: a relationship with Brb. *ta-mazi/ar-t “sort of field, land” [GT] seems not to be excluded on both semantical and phonological grounds (Eg. -š- ~ Brb. *-z- < AA *-š-).

NB1: Attested in NBrb.: Shilh ta-mazir-t (n ti-fir-t) “pays (de la dalle)” [Lst. 1942, 68, §180] | Mzg. ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizar “pays, région”, cf. a-mazir, pl. i-mizar “lieu de campement” [Abès 1916, 110, 136] = ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizar “1. pays, 2. pays naturel, 3. région, centrée, 4. terroir, 5. terre, champs, propriété”, cf. a-mazir “terrain (sur lequel se fixent les tentes d’un d’douar), champ (où se pose une tente et ses parcs en vue de le ’fumer)” [Tf. 1991, 448], Zayan & Sgugu a-mazil, pl. i-mizar “ancien campement de douar”, ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizar “pays, contrée, région, royaume” [Lbg. 1924, 567], Izdeg ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizar “pays, région” [Mrc. 1937, 188, 218] | Sgrs. a-mazir “lieu, endroit” [Pellat 1955, 107], Ait Ayash & Sgrs. ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizar “country” [AM 1971, 412], Snhz. ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizar “sol, pays, contrée, terre” [Rns.], Izn. ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizār “emplacement d’un campement” [Rns. 1932, 386] | Qbl. ta-mazir-t, pl. ti-mizar “champ ou jardin situé en bordure de village, fréquent en top” [Dlt. 1982, 530; Chaker 1987, 168] || SBrb.: Hgr. tā-mahar-t, pl. ti-mihār “place abandonnée d’un ancien campement” [Fcd. 1951–2, 638], EWlm. ta-mazar-t ~ ta-mižir-t, pl. ti-mizar ~ i-mižār [Prs. pace Ncl.], Ayr a-možir [Bst. apud Prs.].

NB2: The inner Brb. etymology of the Brb. word has been subject to strong debates. (1) V. Loubignac (l.c.) derived it from a certain Brb. *a-zr (unattested). (2) E. Laoust (1942, 82, §248), assuming that “c’est le nom donné à un ‘ancien campement’ encombré de débris, puis celui du ‘fumier’ qui s’y trouve accumulé”, linked it to Shilh a-mazir “fumier” [Lst.], cf. Mzg. a-mazir, pl. i-mizar “lieu de campement, tas de fumier” [Abès 1916, 110]. (3) Ch. de Foucauld (l.c.), in turn, listed it s.v. Hgr. a-her “mettre en association (être associé pour), avoir en commun” [o.c., p. 634], which was rightly rejected by (4) K.-G. Prasse (1969, 80, #522), who supposed that our word might perhaps originate from Brb./Tuareg *i-zar “précéder”.

- **5.** GT: or, with regard to the occasional plant det. of Eg. mšr.w, cf. perhaps OSA: Qtb. mšr “plants, sprouts” [Ricks 1982 MS, 145–6], Ar. mašara I “produire ou avoir des feuilles appelées maš-at-”, IV “2. produire des plantes, des herbes, se couvrir de végétation (se dit du sol)”, maš-at- “1. feuille d’une plante ou d’un arbre dès qu’elle commence à s’ouvrir et quand elle est encore de forme oblongue et pontue, 2. rameau tendre et verte”, cf. māšir-at- “champ gai dont les récoltes luxuriantes se balancent au vent” [BK II 1109–1110] = maš-at- “sprouts, vegetables” [Ricks]?

mšr (GW) “ein Holzstück” (NK, Helck 1962, 562, #118; 1971, 515, #118) = “an article of furniture (occurs only in price ostraca among furniture): might be an object of plain surface, may have been used for a table” (Janssen 1975, 194–6, §37 with a list of exx. and detailed disc.) = “une meuble: la table (?)” (AC 1978, 14; AL 78.1880, 79.1376: cf. Frandsen 1979, 288, 295) = “piece of wood, table (?)” (DLE I 246) = “(in Möbellisten, Material sicherlich Holz, die Bedeutung läßt sich nicht beweisen)” (Köpfstein 1989, 31, §4) = “piece of wood, table” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81, 47, §2.2.3.1) = “piece of furniture, perhaps table” (Hoch 1994, 157) = “Tisch (?)” (WD II 68; III 57: cf. JEA 80, 1994, 130, n. 4).
NB: Syllabic spelling: má-šá-r (Helck) = má-ša-r (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey).

- Etymology uncertain. Apparently a loan-word, but neither of the suggested Sem. etyma can be regarded as fitting.
- **1.** W. Helck (l.c.) explained it (“*wohl*”) from Hbr. *šrr “winden” (sic) [Helck] = “be strong, linked (?)” [Hoch], but this is unattested and has no m- prefix derivative in the OT (cf. GB 864; KB 1658). J. J. Janssen (l.c.) rightly expressed his doubt (“*I fail to see to what kind of furniture this could point*”). Declined by J. Hoch (l.c.) as “*unfounded*”.
- **2.** J. J. Janssen (1975, 195) too supposed a borrowing from Can., cf. Hbr. mšōr “level place, plateau, plain” < yšr “straight, smooth”. But this is similarly baseless. As J. Hoch (l.c.) has emphasized, there is “*no evidence in Sem. for a word designating an item of furniture*” from this root.
- **3.** J. Hoch (1994, 157–8, §206) identified it with the Sem. word for “table” having an anomalous *p- (Akk. paššuru, IAram. ptwr?, JAram. pātōr(t)ā, Ar. fātūr-), which is phonologically unconvincing.
NB: W. von Soden (AHW 845b) derived the Sem. word from Sum., but in Hoch’s view, *t suggests a Sem. origin.

mšrr (GW) “polished (?)” (XIX.: Pap. Koller 2:1–2, Pap. Anastasi IV 16:12, Grd. 1911, 38* & fn. 11; Caminos 1954 LEM, 215: “*just a guess*”; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81, 63, §2.4.2) = “eine Herrichtung von Teilen des Wagens” (Wb II 158, 4) = “to polish” (DLE I 246) = “Herrichten von Wagenteilen” (Helck 1971, 515, #119) = “to attach, affix (the draught poles to the chariot body)” (Hoch 1994, 159) = “polieren” (GHWb 369). Cf. also Erman, ZÁS 14, 41, fn. 3.
NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-ša-ra-r<a> (Helck) = ma-šá-ra-ra (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = ma-ša-ra-ra (Hoch).
NB2: Its mistranslation as an inf. (which may have never existed) can hardly be correct. As pointed out by J. Hoch (l.c.), it was used in both passages as an old perfective. the

- Mng. debated. Etymology uncertain. Already A. H. Gardiner (l.c.) surmised that it “looks like a Sem. *pass. part.* *mašrūr”, although the Sem. “word” it might have originated from was for him “unknown”.
- 1. J. Lauth (1871, 635, §140) mistranslated it as “ein Wagenteil, der eingeölt werden mußte: Axe (?)” and assumed a connection either with Hbr. mīšōr “Geradheit” or māsillā “Bahn”.
- 2. W. Helck (l.c.) tried to explain it from Hbr. šrr “winden” (sic), but failed to demonstrate this comparison.
- 3. J. Hoch (1994, 159–160, §208), followed by G. del Olmo Lete & J. Sanmartín (DUL 594), set up a vocalized form *mašarrira stating that “it seems almost certain that there is a connection with” Sem. *šrr “to be firm”, whereby it “is no doubt a *D-stem participle*” like Ug. mšrr-m (pl.) “stabilizers, carats (small weights used to balance the scales)” [Dijkstra & de Moor, UF 7, 1975, 205] = “pointer (of the balance), pivot” [DUL with further lit.].

mšš.wt “eine Krankheit” (Med.: Pap. Hearst 11:9, Wb II 158, 6; WD II 68 with lit.) = “Krankheit am Kopf (Lokalisation am Kopf ist aus der Verwendung des Applikationsverb wrḥ ‘salben’ sowie aus dem Determinativ von Kopf-/Barthaar erschloßen)” (WMT I 399) = “(disease)” (DLE I 246; also in HPBM IV, L1, vs. 41 & T2, rt. 106–7) = “pelade, alopecie, teigne” (Bardinet 1988, 23) = “eine Hautkrankheit (*am Kopf)” (GHWb 369) = “Krankheit (untern Haar- und Hautkrankheiten genannt): als Erkrankung der Kopfhare zu vermuten” (HAM 143).

NB: Th. Bardinet (l.c.) and R. Hannig (GHWb) identified it with LEg. mšt (GW) “*Krätze, *Haarausfall” (GHWb, below), which seems rather unlikely as correctly remarked already by W. Westendorf (HAM 143, fn. 78: “...wohl kaum mit dem maskulinen mšt...vergleichbar”). In the case of fem. mšš.wt, the root must have been *mšš or *mšj, while the same can hardly be true of the masc. LEg. term (√mšt or *√mšd?).

- GT: perhaps related to Akk. muššu (≈ liptu) “ein (ansteckender) Ausatz” [Holma 1911, 47; 1913, 11, 16] || Ar. mašaš- “1. excroissance qui se forme chez une bête de somme à la partie du pied appelé waḏīf-, 2. tache blache qui se forme sur l’oeil d’un chameau”, mašiša “avoir l’excroissance, le durillon appelé mašaš- (se dit d’une bête de somme)” [BK II 1108] || NBrb.: Sus ti-məss-it, pl. ti-məssa “abcès” [Lst.] | Mzg. ta-messi “1. éruption de la peau, 2. anthrax, 3. petits boutons qui couvrent le corps d’un enfant” [Tf. 1991, 436] | Beni Mīr ti-məssi “éruption de petits boutons” [Lst.] | Zwawa ti-mis-t, pl. ti-smās “furoncle” [Lst.] (NBrb.: Lst. 1931, 189) || EBrb.: Audjila

te-mās-ût, pl. te-mās-ût-în “foruncolo” [Prd.], Gdm. ta-miss-it, pl. ti-mess-at-in “abcès” [Mtl. 1904, 97; Prd.] (EBrb.: Prd. 1960, 166) ||| HECu.: (???) Sid. mâs-a (m) “disease of animals, affecting jaw-bones and teeth” [Gsp. 1983, 225]?

NB: The ultimate common origin of these *comparanda* is disputable. In theory, Brb. *-s- ~ Sem. *-š- < AA *-š- is plausible. H. Holma (1913, 11) explained the Akk. term from Akk. mašāšu “berühren”, while E. Laoust (l.c.) assumed an etymological connection to the common Brb. word for “fire”, cf. Trg. (sic) té-msé, pl. ti-mās “1. feu, 2. abcès” [Lst.].

mšš (GW) “part of a boat (?)” (LEg. hapax: BM 10056, frag. A, rt. 3:12, Glanville 1932, 34) = “unklare Bezeichnung eines bei der Ausschmückung gebrauchten Holzstücks” (Helck, MWNR 889) = “ein Bootsteil (?)” (Helck 1971, 515, #121) = “nom d’une partie de bateau (?)” (AC 1978, 14) = “(part of a boat)” (DLE I 246) = “partie du navire” (AL 78.1881) = “part of boat (mng. unknown)” (Jones 1988, 169, #76) = “ein Holzteil des Boots” (GHWb 369) = “Bootsteil (?)” (WD II 68).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-ša-š (Helck MWNR l.c.) = ma-šá-šá (Helck 1971 l.c.).

NB2: Any connection with mšš “ein Holz” (MK, GHWb 369; AWb II 1145)?

- Mng. and etymology obscure. W. Helck’s (l.c.) speculative assumption (“*ob mit hbr. mšš ‘betasten’ zusammengehörig?*”), which he later himself abandoned (Helck 1971, 151, #121: “*ohne Ableitung!*”), cannot be proven.

mškb, pl. **mškbj.w** (GW) “1. eine Berufsbezeichnung, auch als Amt beim König, 2. Aufseher, Vogt (über Rudermannschaft, Hönigsucher u.ä.)” (LEg., Wb II 158, 7–10) = “tax-official” (Breasted, ARE IV §266) = “Aufseher” (Burchardt 1910 II, #513; Helck 1971, 515, #122; WD III 57; cf. Spg., RT 15, 1893, 142f.) = “eine Klasse von Dienstleuten der Pharaonen”, their service was “in der Hauptsache der Transport der für die Pharaonen oder auch für die Götter bestimmten Massengüter (Vieh, Naturalangaben, Steinmaterial usw.) auf dem Nil” (Alt 1939, 16–20) = “transport officer (?), in most cases related to ships” (AEO I 92*, queried by R.O. Faulkner, JEA 39, 1953, 47 who offered no alternative and listed it among soldiers) = “1. foreigner from Syria (but not a Syrian class of population), 2. (seems to be) the man who tows the ship, man who is working on ships, probably in connection with the towing” (Janssen 1961, 34–35) = “(refers to) a chariot personnel, surely the title of an officer whose primary function was connected with intelligence and reconnaissance”

(Schulman 1966, 127–132) = “sea-people (?)” (Allam 1973, 22, n. 6) = “tax officials, caretaker” (DLE I 246–7) = “Polizist, Treidler” (LÄ VII 467) = “transport officer (exact role uncertain)” (Jones 1988, 76, §114) = “overseer” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81 after Helck l.c.) = “a state official, probably tax official or custom officer (in connection with ships, taxes): collector of tax (?)” (Hoch 1994, 160–1) = “officer (?)” (Thomson 1997, 220). Cf. also Sauneron & Yoyotte 1950, 11, fn. 5 (with lit).

NB: A. Alt (1939, 16, fn. 2) rejected the “*verbreitete falsche Annahme, daß den mškb auch die Erhebung der Abgaben oblag*”, but his view has not been confirmed by the later research.

- Although “*the form suggests Semitic origin*” (as rightly noted by A. H. Gardiner, AEO l.c.), there is no agreement on the Sem. root that might underly.
- **1.** Usually explained as a Can. borrowing reflecting Hbr. hofal part. muškāb, pl. muškābīm “gelegt, gebettet” [GB 825] < Sem. *škb “to lie down”, which was correctly doubted by a number of authors, e.g., by J. J. Janssen (1961, 34, fn. 6) pointing to that the derivation from Hbr. škb “*gives no clue to the meaning of mškbw*”. D. Sivan & |Z. Cochavi-Rainey compared Eg. mškb rather with Phn. mškb-m (pl.) “(probably designation of the conquered indigenous population of Samʿal” [Lidzbarski et al. quoted in DNWSI 701] = “agricultural labourers” [Joüon] (supposed piel part. of škb “to lay out for irrigation”), which was rejected by J. Hoch (l.c., esp. p. 162, fn. 170): “*apparently unrelated (since it denotes the lower social class of Yaudi)*”. The same position has been taken by A. H. Gardiner (AEO l.c.) as to A. Alt’s etymology: “*identification with an OArām. word for a particular caste or class of population seems very improbable*”.
LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Burchardt (1910 II, #513); Alt (1939, 16); Helck (1971, 515, #122); Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 63, §2.4.2).
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 163, §209) explained the hypothetic LEg. *maškaba (?), pl. *maškabaya/u as the Š-stem part. of Sem. *gby/*gbb “to collect” (with *-g- devoiced under the influence of the sibilant), albeit “*an exact Semitic parallel is not found*”. His alternative etymology (Akk. miksu “tax” > mākišu “tax collector”, Hbr. mekes “taxes due to the temple”, TArām. miksā “tax, toll”, Ar. makasa “to collect taxes”) is phonologically even weaker (Eg. -š- ≠ Sem. *-s, Eg. -b ≠ Sem. *-m, the latter identified by Hoch as mimation!).
- **3.** GT: an eventual connection with Ar. šakb- “don, récompense, rémunération” (no verbal root), cf. šakama I “2. rétribuer, rémunérer qqn., récompenser, donner (lui son salaire), 3. gagner qqn. (p.ex., un jüge) par un cadeau”, šukm- “1. rétribution, 2. cadeau fait en

retour d'un autre cadeau" [BK I 1257, 1261] via the theoretical Can. reflex (hifil part. *maškb, lit. *"the one who makes s'one pay"?) of a hypothetic Sem. *škb ~ *škm has not yet been suggested and should be subject to further research.

NB: Esp. noteworthy are OSA (Mdb.) *s₂km > ms₂km "catégorie des ouvriers" [Arbach 1993, 99], Sab. ms₂kym-m "qqn. de classe inférieure" [Arbach 1993, 100] < Sem. *škm.

mškt (GW) "dwelling place" (XX. hapax, Hoch).

NB: Syllabic spelling: ma₄-ša-ka-ta (Hoch).

- Explained J. Hoch (1994, 163–4, §210) as *maškatta reflecting a Can. fem. st.cstr. of the nomen loci of Sem. *škn (Akk. maškattu "deposit", maškanu "building, site, place", Ug. mškn-t and Hbr. miškān "dwelling place").

mšt (GW) "une maladie: gale, pelade (?)" (late NK 2x, AL 77.1896) = "(malady)" (DLE I 247: HPM IV, text 1, vs. 28 & text 3, rt. 28) = "nom d'une maladie" (AC 1977, 9) = "eine Krankheit: *Krätze, *Haarausfall" (GHWb 369) = "eine Krankheit" (WD II 68).

NB: Var. bšt (GW) "?" (DLE I 163) = "eine Krankheit" (GHWb 262).

- Of disputed origin.
- **1.** Th. Bardinet (l.c.) derived it from the Eg. verbal root supposed by him to have been preserved in the GR hapax mšt "tondre" (Sauneron: Esna V 345, AC 1977, 9; Bardinet 1988, 23) = "tondre, couper" (AL 77.1895) = "abscheren" (WD II 68). Semantically doubtful (LEg. mšt may have referred to loss of hair due to a malady). In addition, Bardinet and R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) suggested a connection with Eg. mšš.wt "eine Krankheit" (Med., Wb, above), which was rightly declined by W. Westendorf (HAM 143, fn. 78).
- **2.** GT: instead, cp. perhaps Akk. (a/jB) maštu "eine juckende Hautkrankheit" [AHW 630] = "bump, welt" [CAD m1, 394] = "irgendwelche Mißbildung des Körpers, eine Krankheitserscheinung der Haut" [Holma 1913, 24–25, 101]?
NB: Its connection with Akk. (j/spB) mišittu "Schlag(anfall) (als Krankheit), Herzinfarkt" [AHW 660–1] < mašādu "schlagen, walken (?)" [AHW 623] can be certainly excluded.

mšt(j)-pnw (GW) "Pflanzenart, die zu Kränzen verwendet wird" (late NK, Wb I 136, 4) = "(nicht unser 'Vergißmeinnicht', sondern) ein zu derselben Familie gehörendes Bor(r)etschgewächs, das als Küchen- und Gewürzpflanze diente" (Wst. 1978, 156, cf. AL 78.1873, 78.1884) = "Vergißmeinnicht" (GHWb 369).

NB: In Wb l.c. mistakenly read as jšt-pnw.

- **1.** W. Westendorf (1978, 154–7, §3) rendered it literally “ear of mouse” assuming in the first component the LEg. etymon (mšt from *mšd < *msd < *msdr) of the Cpt. (S^a) ΜΕΩΤ, (P) ΜΑΩΤΑ, (L) ΜΕΩΤΕ “Ohr” (KHW 113). For further discussion cf. Eg. msdr (above).
NB: A slightly modified var. of this botanical term is attested in Cpt. (S) ΜΑΑΧΕ ΠΠΠΠ (from *msdr n p3 pnw “mouse’s ear, myosotis” (CD 213a, 263a) = “Ver-gißmeinnicht (wörtlich: ‘Mäuseohr’)” (KHW 113, 147).
- **2.** J. Lauth (1871, 635, §141) erroneously combined it with Cpt. ΜΕΩΦΩΝΕ (sic, with -Φ- and -Ε!) “impetigo, Stechraute” (for which cf. Eg. mšpn.t above) and even Hbr. šāpān “der Klippdachs (hyrax syriacus)” [GB 859] = “rock badger, hyrax, dassie (Procavia syriaca)” [KB 1633]. Perfectly false.

mšt “Art Schmuckstück (Troddel o.ä.)” (MK, Wb II 158, 11) = “ein typisches Göttergewand” (I., IÄF 328; KBIÄF 29 with further lit.: Jéquier 1921, 39; Balcz, AÄA 1, 1938, 48f.) = “*schmückendes Kopfband (der Privatpersonen, mit langen flatternden Bändern)” (GHWb 369; ÄWb I 570: already VI. 2x) = “ein (Götter)Gewand” (I., FÄW 203).

NB: An old word (Junker: Giza IX 235; PT 1285c), cf. also OK PN mšt (Ranke PN I 166:8 & II 186). P. Kaplony (IÄF l.c.) read the exx. from the archaic period alternatively as št.

- Derives from Eg. št “schmücken, bekleiden” (PT, Wb IV 558) = “1. kreuzweise übereinanderlegen, 2. bedecken, bekleiden, schmücken” (Osing 1998, 818, n. 1077), cf. št “Art Kleid (eigtl. gekreuzte Bänder?)” (PT, Wb IV 558) = “un ornament” (AL 77.1897) = “garment: crossed bands (often worn by Libyans)” (Darnell 1995, 70 & fn. 124) = “gekreuzte Bänder (als Bekleidung und Brustschmuck)” (ÄWb I 1322).

NB1: Its resemblance to NAgaw: Hamir mišqā “Band” [Rn. 1884, 396], Qemant maškaḥ “cordon, ceinture des pantalons” [CR 1912, 233] ||| CCh.: Mafa mašaka “habit, vêtement, tissu” [Brt. & Bléis 1990, 232] | Daba mašaga “bande de gabac” [Mch. 1966, 133] is misleading and may be purely accidental (unless these forms too represent m- derivatives of a root akin to Eg. št < *šk).

NB2: The AA etymology of Eg. št is uncertain. (1) A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 102, §7, fn. 26; 1985 MS, 6, §26) derived it from AA *šak “(крупное или рубое) плетение” [Mlt. 1984, 38] based on its comparison with Ar. šakik- “corbeille à fruits”, cf. šakka “se collar, s’attacher” [BK I 1256], Dathina škk “zusammennähen (infilare)” [Rossi] = “enfiler” [GD 2071] etc. (2) GT: or related to Hbr. škl II piel (hapax) “kreuzweise legen” [GB 786] = “to lay over cross-wise, exchange, cross” [KB 1329] = “to lay crosswise” [Tawil 1998, 216f.], which has been affiliated with Akk. šakkilu “eine Kopfbinde” [AHW 1140] (false, since CAD S 23 suggested a new rdg. sagdullu “a type of headgear” < Sum.) || Ar. šikāl- “a cord or rope, with which a camel’s fore shank and arm are bound together, a bond that is attached upon the fore and hind foot of a horse and of a camel” [Lane 1587] = “Strick, womit die Beine eines

Tieres zusammengebunden werden” [GB] = “the cord with which a horse’s legs are hobbled” [KB]. Root ext. -l in Sem.?

mšd “végétal” (V. Abusir hapax, PK 1976, plate 61, p. 674) = “eine Pflanze (oder Synonym zu mz ‘Blumenstrauß?’)” (Kaplony 1972, 223) = “une plante” (AL 77.1898: cf. also Junker: Giza X 42) = “eine Pflanze” (GHWb 369; ÄWb I 570).

NB: Acc. to the new *Berliner Wörterbuch* (in preparation, kind p.c. by I. Hafemann, 19 May 2000) this may be the same word as mšd “(Subst., in einer Aufzählung von Opfern) (NK, Wb II 158, 13) from a common basic sense “pflanzliche Opfern”.

- In the view of P. Kaplony (l.c.), it was “*abgeleitet wohl*” from Eg. šdj “nehmen” on the analogy of OK mz (also in Abusir) < mz “bringen”.

mšd “être enterré” (CT VI 100c, hapax, AL 78.1883) = “to die (?)” (DCT 187 pace AECT II 145, spell 513, n. 8) = “*‘abkleben’, abbinden (Stellen vor dem Firnissen bei der Sargherstellung)” (ÄWb II 1145).

- Mng. uncertain, etymology obscure. R. O. Faulkner (AECT l.c.): “*unintelligible*”. Only speculative guesses have been made.

NB: (1) D. Meeks (AL l.c.) seems to have pondered a derivation from Eg. šdj “graben” (OK, Wb IV 563, 1), while the rendering by (2) R. Hannig (ÄWb l.c.) apparently suggests a link with Eg. šd.w “Art Taue (des Schiffes)” (CT, GHWb 842; ÄWb II 2494), although the neither the dets. (šd.w with VI “coil of rope”, mšd in var. B1P^a with D40 “forearm with hand holding stick”) nor the context of mšd in CT VI 100c (≈ mt “to die” in B9C and B1BO) really support this. (3) GT: is this the MK etymon of Dem. mšd “durchwandern” (Zeidler 1992, 208; 1998, 26, fn. 30; Lpr. 1994, 127) with a semantic shift analogous with that attested in Eg. ḥpj “to travel” > “to die”?

mšd.t “die Furt (des Orontes)” (XVIII., Wb II 158, 14) = “canal navigable” (Ceugney) = “Durchgang” (Zeidler) > Dem. mšd.t ~ mštj “Furt” (DG 158:14, 182:6; NBÄ 830–1, n. 1113) > Cpt. (S) MHWTϵ, MW[TE] (f) “ford, ferry” (CD 207a) = “Furt, Fähre” (KHW 109) = “gué, passage” (DELIC 129).

NB: Vocalized as *mēšd.t (Osing).

- Whether Dem. mšt “untersuchen, inspizieren” (DG 182:4) = “to examine, inspect” (CED) vs. mšde (Spg. KHW 69) vs. Dem. mšd “to inspect” (Pap. Rylands IX, 6:9 and elsewhere, Griffith) > Cpt. (SALBF) MOYWT “1. to examine, search out, 2. visit” (CD 206; CED 97) = “(unter-, be)suchen, umhergehen” (NBÄ 261) = “1. durchwandern, 2. besuchen, erforschen, erwägen” (KHW 109) = “1. parcourir, visiter, explorer, 2. réfléchir” (DELIC 129) are etymologically related (as usually suggested, cf. e.g. CED, KHW, Smith,

Zeidler, DELC l.c.) is dubious. A contamination of diverse (i.e., etymologically distinct) roots is not to be ruled out.

NB1: Note that Dem. mšd “durchwandern” (Zeidler 1992, 208; 1998, 26, fn. 30) = “to wander” (Lpr. 1994, 127; 1995, 45) is not listed in DG and its existence has been doubted by H. Satzinger (1999, 147–8). The Dem./Cpt. verb has been explained from the *Grundbedeutung* “to pass through” (Černý in CED; Smith 1978, 361) = “den Flußübergang auskundschaften, den Fluß bedachtsam überqueren” (Wst. in KHW).

NB2: Strangely, J. Černý (CED 97) derived NK mšd.t from an unattested verbal root *mšd preserved in Dem.-Cpt. Note that a connection with mšd “to interrogate” (XIX. hapax, KRI II 108:6, Kitchen in RITA II 15, n. 28 ad 108:1) = “renvoyer (?) qqn.” (AL 78.1380) = “zurückkehren” (GHWb 369), which is replaced by wšd “to address, question” in the parallel version, is surely excluded as correctly stated by H. Satzinger (1999, 147–8), who declined also the mng. “send away” and assumed a denom. origin (< *mšd “investigation” < wšd via m- prefix).

NB3: J. Osing (NBĀ 261) assumed Cpt. (S) ḤO(O)ṬṬE (CD 207a) = “Gegend, Nachbarschaft” (KHW) to derive (via pre-Cpt. *māšt.~y/t) from (the same root as) (S) ḤOṬṬ.

- Etymology highly disputed. Most likely seems #2.
- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 8 following E. de Rougé and G. Maspero) explained it as the m- *nomen loci* of a false Eg. šd “couper, trancher” (sic), which is certainly mistaken. H. Grapow (1914, 31) too surmised in it a prefix m- but carefully abandoned Ceugney’s idea.
- **2.** W. Westendorf (KHW 109, fn. 2), in turn, assumed it to represent the “m-Bildung des Ortes” of Eg. šdj.t “1. Art Landbezeichnung, 2. Art Gewässer” (Wb IV 567, 11–14) = “Gesamtheit der Äcker (eines Verwaltungsbezirks), 2. Wassergraben” (GHWb 845), while J. Osing (NBĀ 256) derived Eg. mšd.t directly from the underlying verbal root, Eg. šdj “graben” (OK, Wb IV 563, 1).
- **3.** H. Smith (1978, 361) regarded it as a deverbal noun of Eg. šdj “to draw forth”, i.e. *“(the place) which draws (one) forth (from the water)”, which he affiliated with Ar. šadda, which is probably to be excluded the basic senses of the latter being “1. to make an assault or attack upon, 2. be quick (in running), hasten, 3. make or render hard, firm, compact, sound, 4. hence: bind, tie firmly, fast or strongly” [Lane 1517]. Semantically rather weak.
- **4.** A.G. Belova (1989, 15), followed by G. Takács (2006, 114), treated it as of *nomen loci* derived from an unattested Eg. *šd ~ Sem. *štt, which should be subject to further research.

NB1: Cf. Ar. štt “1. être éloigné, 2. éloigner”, šatt- “bord, rivage d’un fleuve, grand fleuve”, cf. št? “longer, suivre le rivage, le bord d’un fleuve, d’une vallée”, šat?- “3. extrémité, 4. (pl. šutū?-) bord, rivage d’un fleuve” [BK II 1228–9] = štt “zu weit gehen, das Maß überschreiten”, šatt- “Ufer, Küste, Gestade, Strand”, muštt- “übermäßig” [Wehr 1952, 428] = šatt- “Seite”, cf. šati?- “Ufer” [GB 782] = šatt- ~ šat?- “побережье, берег реки” [Blv.] || MSA: Hrs. štt: šet “to come from afar to see (so.)” [Jns. 1977, 122], Jbl. štt: šett “to come from afar to see (so.)”, eštēt “to go a long way, make so. go a long way”, šttēt “long path in an awkward position” [Jns.

1981, 257], Mhr. štt: šett “schwierig zu besteigen (Berg)”, pl. šaṭōwet “schwieriger Bergpfad” [Jahn] = šəṭ “to come from afar, come over hill and dale to see so.”, šəṭāyt “long path in an awkward place” [Jns. 1987, 387]. Note that Belova’s Hbr. štt “бродить” (sic) is unattested (GB, KB).

NB2: As for the shift of meaning in Eg, cf. e.g. Russ. брод “ford” vs. бродить “to wander, roam”.

- **5.** J. Zeidler (1992, 208; 1998, 26, fn. 30) and A. Loprieno (1995, 45), in turn, derived Eg. mšd.t as a deverbal noun from the alleged old etymon of Dem. mšd “durchwandern” (which, acc. to J. Zeidler, “*nicht mehr aufgrund einer phonetischen Variation aus... mšʕj abgeleitet werden konnte*”) treated by them as the etymological *Wurzeldublette* (*mšṭ) of pre-Eg. *mšd preserved in Eg. mšʕj “marschieren” (NK, Wb, cf. above), which implies in J. Zeidler’s view that this *Wort/Wurzelspaltung* occurred “*schon in der Zeit, als der ʕ/ṭ-Wechsel möglich war*”. J. Osing (1997, 229) and H. Satzinger (1999, 147) rightly rejected this theory as it “*semantically cannot be accepted*”.

NB: The fact, that in Cpt. “*auch sonst Überschneidungen zwischen ἰσοπέδ and ἰσοπέτ ‘wandern’ auftreten*” (Westendorf, KHW 109, fn. 1), does not necessarily indicate a etymological relationship.

- **6.** GT: its connection with Akk. mašdu > maldu “(etwa) Rand (?) 1. von Bett, 2. von Fluß (Erde)” [AHW 625] = “edge (?), side (?)” [CAD m1, 363] seems also unlikely.

mšd (GW) “Art Holzbearbeitung von Särgen” (XX., Wb II 158, 2) = “Aushöhlung” (Grapow 1914, 31; NBÄ 589, n. 518) = “to hollow (a coffin)” (JESHO 11, 1968, 154, n. k; Janssen 1975, 221 & fn. 77; DLE I 247) = “Art der Holzbearbeitung” (Helck 1971, 515, #123) = “(exact meaning unknown, but seems to have to do with carpentry in the Giornale and with the preparation of a coffin in O.Petrie 16)” (Zonhoven, JEA 65, 1979, 96–97) = “to (be) hollow(ed) out (?)” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 81, 37, §1.2.4.1) = “aushöhlen (bei der Sargherstellung)” (GHWb 369).

NB: J. Hoch (1994, 212, §164) identified its occurrence attested in the Turin Necropolis Journal (year 17, vs. 8, 10, 16) with mšdd.t “comb” (below), which has not been supported by other authors.

- Origin uncertain (Helck l.c.: “*ohne Ableitung*”). No convincing etymology has been suggested.
- **1.** H. Grapow (l.c.) derived it from Eg. š3d “graben (von der Arbeit am Tempel von Redesieh, der zur Hälfte in den Fels gehöhlt ist)” (Grapow: LD III 140b).
- **2.** W. Spiegelberg (quoted by Vergote 1950, 292) explained it from the alleged verbal root of Cpt. (S) ṣṭṣ (m) “Nest, Horst” (KHW 328 with a fully different etym.).

- **3.** D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 37, §1.2.4.1) maintained the rendering “to hollow out” with a remark “*unless the root is *šdy*” (not detailed).
- **4.** L. Zonhoven (JEA 65, 1979, 96-97) assumed an etymological relationship with Eg. mšdd.t “comb” (below).
- **5.** GT: cp. perhaps Akk. mašādu G “1. walken (Stoff, Seite), 2. etwa massieren, 3. (mit Krankheit) schlagen, 4. etwa eindrücken (?) (Foetus)”, D “massieren (?)”, Š “hämmern (?) (Tiara)” [AHW 623] = G “to strike with palsy”, D “to rub” [CAD m1, 351]?

mšdd.t “Wagendeichsel” (XII. hapax, GHWb 369; ÄWb II 1145) = “Wagenteile” (WD III 57).

NB: Occurs in the great Memphis inscription of Amenemhet II, col. 18 (RdE 32, 1980, 77, col. 18; SAK 18, 1991, 14, pl., col. 18; JEA 78, 1992, 14, col. 18). H. Altenmüller and A. Moussa (SAK l.c.) rendered it as part of a chariot (lit. “Kamm”, but here “*sind... Wagenteile gemeint*”) “*en dépit de la date du texte*” as rightly noted by D. Meeks (1997, 42, §212), who, together with J. F. Quack (1996, 510), saw in it the MK etymon of LEg. mšdd.t “comb” (below).

- As suggested by H. Altenmüller and A. Moussa (SAK 18, 1991, 14, fn. 8), it might be identified with Akk. (M/LBab.) mašaddu ~ mešeddu (Nuzi mašandu) “Deichsel” [AHW 622] = “1. pole (in gen.), 2. referring to the pole of the Wagon constellation” [CAD m1, 350–1], cf. OAkk. mašaddum “1. a weapon, 2. shaft of a wagon or a part of it” [Gelb 1973, 184].

NB1: The Akk. term for “pole” (nomen instr.) has been derived from Akk. šadādu “ziehen” [AHW 1121] = “1. to pull taut, stretch, draw, pull (off), 2. pull a cart, tow a boat, bear a yoke, chair, haul, drag objects, transport, convey, drag down, carry away, 3. remove, transfer, take along, bring along, 4. measure (out), survey (a field), draw a line, 5. extend, stretch (intr.), etc.” [CAD š1, 20–21; Gelb 1973, 265]. W. von Soden (AHW l.c.) equated this root with Hbr. šdd qal “gewalttätig sein, 2. verheeren, verwüsten” [GB 808] = “to devastate, despoil, deal violently with” [KB 1419], which is semantically very weak.

NB2: That this special mng. would have evolved independently in both Akk. and Eg. is unlikely. A borrowing from Akk. seems, however, also dubious because of the *Genuswechsel*.

mšdd.t (GW) “comb” (XX.: Ostr. Wien Äg 1, CED 97; Zonhoven, JEA 65, 1979, 90, 96–97, §1.8; DLE I 247; Ward 1989, 76) = “peigne” (AL 77.1900; 79.1381) = “(Web)Kamm” (GHWb 369; WD I 96) > Cpt. (S) $\mu\omega\tau\omega\tau\epsilon$, $\mu\omega\tau\omega\tau\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\lambda\omega\theta\omega\tau\iota$ (f) “weaver’s comb” (CD 207b; CED 97; Osing 1978, 186) = “Kamm” (KHW 109, 522) = “peigne” (DELIC 129).

NB1: Vocalized by J. Hoch (l.c.) as *mušāta (sic, *-t- vs. *-t-!) (?), which is certainly erroneous. Perhaps *mšdād.~(t).

NB2: W. E. Crum (CD l.c.) derived the Cpt. reflex from (S) $\mu\omicron\gamma\omega\tau$ “to examine, search out” (CD 206b) = “durchwandern” (KHW), which was approved also by

explained (influenced by a *Volksetymologie* < √šdj “1. ab-/fortnehmen, 2. fortschaffen, 3. einziehen, 4. herausnehmen, 5. abliefern, 6. entnehmen”, *ÄWb* II 2494–6?).

NB3: M. Dietrich, O. Lorentz, and J. Sanmartín (1975, 164, §51) affiliated Akk. mušātu (above) with Ug. mtṭ (an object that “zur Ausrüstung eines Mannes gehört”), but the latter has been recently (DUL 606) rendered “oar” in comparison with Hbr. māšōt “rudder” [KB 643], although its alleged relationship (suggested in KB l.c.) with Ar. mi-swa/āt- “a thing with which one mixes a thing and stirs it about, i.e., a stick or the like used for that purpose” < swṭ “to mix one part with another, stir about and beat it until it become mixed” [Lane 1466–7] indicates P^{Sem}. *š- (and not *t-). Strangely, Hbr. šwt qal “1. to rove about, roam, 2. row” [KB 1440] has been combined in KB l.c. with Ar. šwt II “to make a long journey, become long (a journey), voyage (with ship)” [Lane 1619], which is an entirely distinct root.

NB4: Hoch (l.c.) affiliated the LEg. word also with Akk. mašādu G “(Stoff) walken (?), etwa massieren”, “(mit Krankheit) schlagen (v. Schlagenfall)”, D “massieren”, Š “hämmern (?)” [AHW 623] = mašādu “to comb out hair, card, comb wool”, *mašdu, pl. mašdātu “dressed or combed hair” [CAD m1, 351–2, 363] and even Hbr. šdd qal “to harrow” [KB], which is certainly false. As for Akk. √mšd (combined in AHW with Ar. msd D “massieren”), its basic sense seems also to be different.

NB5: Zonhoven (JEA 65, 1979, 96–97) surmised a connection with Eg. mšd whose “exact meaning is unknown, but seems to do with carpentry in the *Giornale* and with the preparation of a coffin in *O.Petrie* 16”. Alternatively, he erroneously analyzed mšd.t as a compound of an “instrumental” prefix m- + *šdd (unattested and baseless) > Dem. štt “Saum” (DG 530, 7) = “border (of garment)” (CED) > Cpt. (B) ⲱⲧⲁⲧ “edge, border” (CD 598b) = “Rand, Kante, Saum (ob eig. Webkante?)” (KHW) and (S) ⲱⲧⲧ “weaver” (CD 598b) = “1. Weber, 2. Kette (am Webstuhl)” (KHW), which, however, ultimately derive from Eg. šht “to weave” (CED 256; NBĀ 297; KHW 333).

(*)mq3 “to arrive” (late NK 2x: KRI II 51:15–16, DLE I 247) = “kommen” (GHWb 369).

NB: J. F. Quack (1997, 331) denied the existence of this lexeme and rendered both occurrences as m-^rq3.

- May be just a ghost-word, whence any etymology may be vain.
- 1. GT: the coincidence with EBrb.: Siwa ə-mraq “arriver” [Lst. 1931, 197] may be accidental.
- 2. Ch. Ehret (1995, 306, #586) compared it with Om. *māk-“to return” (no reflexes provided) < AA *-māk^(w)-“to come back, return”. This would be only plausible if Eg. mq3 represented the GW of *mq, which seems impossible at the moment.

NB1: Cf. HECu.: Burji maḳ-“to come from”, maḳ-aḳ-“to leave, depart” [Sasse 1982, 139; Hds. 1989, 90, 211] ||| NOM.: Male ma?- “to return” [Hyw.], Zala & Gamu māḳ(k)- ~ (dial.) mā?- “to return” [Hyw.] | Zayse māḳ- “to return” [Hyw. 1988, 277], Koyra māḳ(k)- “to return” [Hyw.] (NOM.: Hyw. 1994 MS, 3; 1996, 173).

NB2: A different root may be preserved by NOM.: Male mūkk- “to come” [Azab/Bnd.] = muk- [Donham/Bnd.] = mok-ēni “it comes” [Sbr. 1994–5, 8] (Male: Bnd. 2000, 54, #27).

mq^r ~ mqr (GW) “Ofen des Bäckers und seine Glut” (late NK, Wb II 158, 15) = “Höhe” (Helck 1971, 515, #124) = “oven(s bottom)”

(DLE I 247) = “1. oven’s bottom, 2. height” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 82, 63, §2.4.2) = “1. (mq^rr) bottom of the oven, firebox, 2. (mqr) hearth oven” (Hoch 1994, 165–166) = “Ofen (des Bäckers), Ofenboden, Glut, Feuerstelle (eines Ofens)” (GHWb 369–370).

NB1: J. Hoch (1994, §214 vs. §216) glossed mq^rr (Pap. Sallier I 7:9) and mg (Pap. Anastasi II 8:4) vs. mqr (Med. Habu 83:50) in two diverse (etymologically distinct) lexical entries (doubtful), while the Wb treated them as one lexeme (except for the Anastasi ex.). J. Hoch (1994, §227) separated all these exx. also from LEg. mgr (below), although he regarded them as ultimately related (cf. also Takács 1999, 95). U. Verhoeven (1984, 50, fn. 1) and D. Meeks (1997, 43, §227) correctly distinguished these words from the LEg. reflexes of OK m^rq.

NB2: G. Fecht (quoted in KHW 518) supposed a Cpt. reflex in (L) $\mu\epsilon\kappa\rho\epsilon$ “lodern (?)” (KHW), for which semantically more fitting would be a derivation from late NK mgr “to bake” (DLE) = “to broil, grill” (Hoch) if such a lexeme really existed (cf. below).

- Apparently borrowed from Sem., but the underlying root is disputed.
- **1.** Usually explained as an m- “preformative” form (*maq^rara) of Sem. *k^rr “to be deep, hollowed out” [Hoch] (Hbr. qə^rārā “dish”, NHbr. qa^rar “bottom”, Ar. qa^rr- “bottom, depth” cited after Hoch).
Lrr. for Eg.-Sem.: Burchardt (1909, #517); Caminos (1954 LEM, 56); Helck (1971, 515, #124); Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 63, §2.4.2); J. Hoch (1994, 165, §214).
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 166, §216) singled out LEg. mqr (Med. Habu 83:50), which he did not treat as just a defective wtg. of mq^rr and vocalized as *maqlû, to explain it as a nomen *loci/instr.* of Sem. *kly “to roast” [Hoch] (Akk. qalû “to burn, roast, refine” [CAD q 69], Hbr. qly “to roast” [KB 1101], Syr. qālā “to roast” [KB], Ar. qly “frire dans une poêle à frire” [BK II 808] = qlw ~ qly “to fry, roast” [Lane 2993], Geez qalawa “to roast, parch” [Lsl. 1987, 431] etc.), cf. Akk. maqlû “1. oven, grate, 2. burning, combustion” [CAD ml, 251], MHbr. maq(ə)le(h) & NHbr. miqle(h) “hearth” [Hoch] = “roasting place, roast” [Jastrow 831], JAram. miqlā “hearth” [Jastrow], Ar. miqlan “poêle à frire” [BK] = “frying-pan” [Lane].
NB: The Sem. word passed also into Cu. (via Ar.), cf. Bed. enkalīw [Lsl. 1987, 431: *em-kaliw < *me-kaliw] “Pfanne oder Topf aus Ton zum Kochen” [Rn. 1895, 25] || NAgaw: Bilin maqló-rā “Eisenplatte zum Brotbacken” [Rn. 1887, 268] || LECu.: Afar mogla “frying pan” [PH 1985, 169].

mqmq “ruhen, schlafen” (GR, Wb II 159, 1) = “dormir” (AL 77.1902) = “ruhen, schlafen (definiert wohl den) Ruhezustand vor dem Schlaf)” (Schlichting, LÄ V 642) = “to sleep” (PL 470).

- Etymology disputed. Most likely is solution #3.

- **1.** J. Černý (CED 80) suggested that Eg. mqmq derived from a reduplication of the old etymon (mkj) of Cpt. (S) $\mu\kappa\epsilon$ “to rest”, which is certainly false. These roots should be carefully distinguished. There may have been only perhaps a late contamination.
NB: Deriving Dem. mkmk “nachdenken” (DG 183) and Cpt. (S) $\mu\kappa\mu\epsilon\kappa$ “to think, ponder” (CD, below) from Eg. mqmq (suggested in CED 80) would be plausible only through a mediator sense “to dream, indulge in day-dreams”.
- **2.** V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 201) equated Eg. mqmq with WCh. *myak/ḳ- (so!) “to sleep” (no reflexes mentioned), which was apparently based solely on WCh.: Boghom miyo “to sleep” [Gowers] = $\mu\gamma\text{:}q^h$ [IL/JI 1994 II, 298] = pí myok “to sleep” [Smz. 1975, 32; 1978, 37, #71].
NB: The origin of the Boghom form is obscure, cf. also SBauchi: Boghom míyùk, Jum múyùk, Kiri mīrīkòy “to sleep” (SBch.: Csp. 1994, 66). GT: if the SBch. root was *m-r-k, cf. perhaps SCu. *maḳāla ~ *malāḳa “dream” [Ehret]: Ma’a maḳāla “Traum” [Mnh. 1906, 313] | Dhl. milāk-it- “to dream”, milāk-áni “dream” [EEN 1989, 38] = milāk-it- “to dream” [Tosco 1991, 143] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 154, #9).
- **3.** GT: remarkable cognates appear in LECu.: Orm. muga “to sleep a little, slumber” [Gragg 1982, 293] = “to be sleepy, nap” [Hds.], Konso -mug- “to sleep” [Bnd. 1971, 247, #73] | HECu. (from Orm.?): Burji mug- “to be sleepy, nap” [Hds.], Sid. muga “to doze”, mugânčo “sleepy, drowsy” [Gsp. 1983, 240] (ECu.: Hds. 1989, 136) ||| CCh.: Fali mekó-te (ending -te) “schlafen” [Lks. 1937, 111].
NB: Cf. perhaps also Akk. muqqu “feeble”, muqqu “to be slowly, delay” [CAD m2, 214]?
- **4.** G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 247) erroneously combined it with Bsq. ametstu “träumen”.

***mqmq** (or ***mkmk?**) > Dem. mkmk “nachdenken” (DG 183:6) = as noun “report, memorandum (in legal use)” (Smith 1978, 360) > Cpt. (SB) $\mu\kappa\mu\epsilon\kappa$, (A) $\mu\alpha\kappa\mu\kappa$, (LF) $\mu\alpha\kappa\mu\epsilon\kappa$ “1. (intr.) to think, ponder, 2. (tr.) meditate, intend, 3. (refl., oftenest) consider” (CD 162a; CED 80; Smith l.c.) = “1. denken, 2. (refl.) sich etwas überlegen” (KHW 90) = “considérer, réfléchir” (DELIC 110).

NB: Supposed to have been preserved also by Eg. Ar. makmak “to hesitate, be reluctant” (Ishaq 1991, 117, §xxii.40).

- Etymology disputed.
- **1.** J. Černý (CED 80) explained it from GR mqmq “ruhen, schlafen” (Wb, above), in which he saw a reduplication of Eg. mkj “to protect” (!) > (S) $\mu\kappa\epsilon$ “to rest” (CD 161b) = “ruhen” (KHW), which was approved by W. Westendorf (KHW 518). This is certainly false as Eg. mkj vs. mqmq represent two distinct roots (cf. the preceding entry). In addition, R. Schlichting, (LÄ V 643, n. 8) misquoted (SB)

МОРМЕК “1. ruhen, schlafen, 2. denken” (sic!). W. Vycichl (DELIC 110) too admitted that Dem.-Cpt. mkmk “*visiblement*” represents the reduplication of Eg. mkj, although he was more cautious about GR mqm̄q maintaining that “*il n’est pas sûr s’il y a un rapport avec*” Dem.-Cpt. mkmk.

- 2. G. Takács (2006, 678, #388): cf. perhaps LECu.: Afar makk-it- “to figure out, reason” [Hyw. apud Sasse] | HECu.: Burji makk- “to measure” [Sasse 1982, 139], Gedeo (Drs.) mikká “to measure” [Wdk. 1976–79, 169].

NB1: Cf. also Cu.-Om. *maQ- (perhaps *-q̄-?) “to tell” [GT] = (OCu.) *māk- “to tell, speak” [HL] attested in HECu.: Qbn. māku-ta “story” [Crass 2001, 53, #236], Alb. māku-tā “tale” [HL], Kmb. māʔ- “to tell a story”, māʔu-ta “story” [Hds.], Had. moq-ō “colloquio” [Crl.] | Tsamay māk-k-e “tale” [Sava 2005 MS, 267] || NOM.: Zala māq-et (refl. “consigliarsi” [Crl. 1929, 44] | Janjero (Yemsa) maq ~ maq̄ “parlare, dire” [Crl. 1938 III, 80] = mak- “to tell” [HL] = “to speak” [Lmb. 1996, 333] | Benesho mak “1. to say, 2. mean, think” [Wdk. 1990, 107] | Sheko mak “say!”, as makʌk “he said” [Flm. 1972, 3], Nao maho “to say” [Bnd. 1971, 262, #68]. For the semantic shift “to speak” ~ “to think” cf. e.g. Eg. mdw (below).

NB2: Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 196, #1773) erroneously combined NOM.: Benesho mak with LECu. *mag^c- “name” and Ar. myy “to speak (vividly and distinctly)”.

NB3: WCh.: Ngz. màakú “1. to look for, 2. seek out and find, 3. seek to do, try to do” [Schuh 1981, 109] seems unrelated.

- mqr** (GW) “Stab” (XX.: Pap. Harris I 34b:3, Wb II 159, 3; GHWb 370) = “staff” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = “staff, stick, rod” (Hoch).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: má-q̄-la (Helck) = má-qa-la (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 82). NB2: P. Seibert (l.c.) and J. Hoch (l.c.) assumed mqn.t (GW) “Waschbleuel” (XIX./XX. hapax, Ostr. BM 29550, 4, Seibert after Maspero, BdE 5, xxxiv) = “Wäscherkeule” (Burkard 1977, 275) = “planche du blanchisseur” (AL 77.1903) = “Wäscherkeule, Bleuel” (GHWb 370) to represent the very same word along with its vars. mgw.t late XIX., Pap. Anastasi VII 3:8) ~ mgj.t (XIX./XX., Ostr. Ramesseum 94, 5) ~ mg.t (late XIX., Pap. Sallier II 8:5). D. Meeks (AL 77.1915) surmised the same lexeme also in mg3.t “ein Gerät” (LEth. hapax, Wb II 164, 11) = “un ustensile (que, sur la foi du dét., l’on aimerait rapprocher de mg3.t ‘planche de blanchisseur’: un plateau, plaque” (Meeks).

- Usually explained as a borrowing from Can., cf. Hbr. maqq̄l “Zweig, Rute, Treibstecken, Reitgerte, Stab” [GB 456] = “rod, staff, branch” [KB 627], Samar. Aram. mql “rod” [Tal 2000, 484]. Hoch’s vocalized Eg. *maq̄q̄lā was doubted by Rainey as “*uncertain*”.

LIT.: GB l.c. (pace Müller); Burchardt 1909, #518; Wb l.c.; Czermak 1934, 196; Seibert 1967, 186, n. h; Helck 1971, 515, #125; KB l.c.; Hoch 1994, 165, §215; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 28, §1.2.11; Rainey 1998, 444, §217.

NB1: Hoch explained the Eg. fem. -t as the reflection of the occasional fem. gender of the OHbr. word (attested once in the OT, Gen. 30:37) and/or its regular fem. pl. maqlōt.

NB2: The etymology of the Hbr. term (not known in Sem. outside Hbr.) is disputed and is even today “*trotz mannigfacher Vorschläge noch zweifelhaft*” (Kopf 1976 l.c.) and “*uncertain*” (Rainey 1998 l.c.). (1) Schwally (ZAW 11, 170f.): nomen instr.

of Hbr. qll “schütteln”. (2) Barth (ZDMG 41, 616): lit. “Treibholz”, nomen instr. < *qly ~ Ar. qly/w “treiben”. (3) Fraenkel (ZA 3, 52): ~ Akk. baqlu “Schößling”, Geez baqalt (bäqält) “Stamm”. The latter proposal was rightly rejected by (4) Leslau (1958, 31), who assumed a nomen instr. *mä-nqäl (sic), lit. “an instr. serving or used when one sets out” < nql “to pull out, set out” ~ Syr. naqal “to drive out”, Ar. naqala “to transport”, Tigre näqälä “to set out”, which was declined by (5) Rundgren (1961, 368) viewing that Leslau’s *mä-nqäl “*kann nie*” be the etymon of Hbr maqqēl. Instead of *ma-nqil, Rundgren suggested *ma-qill, lit. “(etwa) was aufgehoben wird”, which he related to Ar. qll “geringfügig sein”, IV ʔaqalla “tragen können”, Geez ʔaqallala “sublevare” regarding Ar. naqala as “*eine spätere Transitivity eines uralten Reflexiv-Bildung *n-qll leicht sein, sich bewegen*”. (6) Kopf (1976, 158, §43), in turn, surmised Hbr. maqqēl to have originally signified “Treibstecken” being perhaps akin to Ar. nql “fortbewegen, befördern”. (7) GT: any connection to Akk. mak/qilu (aAk, jB) “eine Waffe” [AHW 589: u.H.] = makilu (“a weapon”) [CAD m1, 129]? GT: the coincidence with HECu.: Sidamo muḡullo “ensete tree trunk” [Gsp./Hds. 1989, 58: isolated in HECu.] or EBrb.: Sokna ta-mëkkül-t “bastoncino portacollirio” [Srn. 1924–5, 13: < Ar.?] may be due to pure chance.

mqr.t “un récipient (PT: déterminé par le pot à lait), une situle” (OK 1x: PT 2286 & MK 1x: Pap. Ramesseum VI 62, Meeks 1997, 43, #218; AL 79.1382 pace Evrard-Derriks & Quaegebeur, CdE 54, 1979, 49, fn. 2) = “e. Situla” (GHWb 370; ÄWb I 570, II 1145).

NB: The existence of this fem. lexeme for “situla” is highly debated. The occurrence in PT 2286 has been rendered by R.O. Faulkner as “razor-case” (AEPT 318, utt. 756, n. 1) = “étui à rasoir” (Jéquier 1921, 127 with a dubious rdg.). A. H. Gardiner (1957, 50, fn. 2), in turn, translated MK mqr.t as “socket (?) (of the eye)” (Pap. Ramesseum VI, 62) = “(Augen)Höhle” (Osing apud JW 1997, 112–3, n. 3) claiming that “*it is unknown elsewhere, but both the determinative and the context point to its equivalence with*” qrr.t “als Stelle des Grabes, wo beim Begraben dem Toten (seiner Statue) geopfert wird (wohl auf dem Dach der Mastaba über dem Schacht)” (OK, Wb IV 61, 14) and qrr.t “Höhlung, Loch” (MK, Wb IV 62, 1). Nevertheless, D. Meeks (AL 79.1382; 1997, 43, #218) has maintained that PT 2286 mqr.t “*fournit un parallèle presque exact au P.Ramesseum VI, 62*” and that both forms are connected with LEg. mqr (below) as its fem. counterpart just as C. Evrard-Derriks & J. Quaegebeur (1979, 49, fn. 2) supposed.

- From the same root (?): mqr (GW) ~ var. mkr (1x: Pap. BM 10209, 2:12, cf. CdE 54, 1979, 47 & fn. 4 and 6, for q ~ k see Görg 1977, 178–180) “Gefäß (?), das ein Affe (?) trägt (mit Artikel p3)” (XX–XXI. 2x: Ritual of the Festival of the Valley 2:12 and Ani 9:4, Wb II 159, 4) = “vessels for carrying water” (Houghton 1889, 84) = “a vessel” (CED 80) = “une situle” (AL 79.1383; Meeks 1997 l.c. pace CdE 54, 1979, 46–49) = “a vessel, goblet (?)” (Hoch 1994, 167, §218) = “*Situla” (GHWb 370; WD II 68) = “a milk jar (which can be a situla)” (Darnell 1995, 83, fn. 188, cf. WD III 57).

NB: J. Černý (CED 80) supposed this LEg. form to be reflected by Cpt. (B) MAKPO (m) “trough, mortar” (CD 162b) = “Mörser, Trug” (KHW), which has survived also in Eg. Ar. (Bagūr) makro “mortar” (Ishaq 1991, 117, §xxi.3). C. Evrard-Derriks & J. Quaegebeur (1979, 48) saw in LEg. mqr3 a var. corroborating the connection with (B) MAKPO. This evidence hardly accords with Hoch’s (l.c.) hypothetic LEg. *maqūrū. However, A. Volten (quoted in KHW 518 & fn. 1 and AL 77.1916) explained the Cpt. word from Eg. mgrg “Art Krug” (CT, Wb, below). S. Cauville (1982–83, 137,

s.v. mqr, fn. 5 pace Monnet & Saleh) rejected the equation of LEg. mqr with situla. J. Hoch (1994, 167, §218) doubted even the identity of the two LEg. occurrences of mqr and their relationship to (B) מִקְרֹו.

- Mng. and origin disputed. No convincing etymology has been suggested.
- **1.** J. Quaegebeur & C. Evrard-Derriks (CdE 54, 1979, 48–49) and (apparently independently) J. Hoch (l.c., cf. also DUL 568) compared it (Hoch only the ex. of Ani l.c., while the former authors also PT-MK fem. mqr.t) with Akk. (LBab.) maqartu “ein Gefäß” [AHW 605] = “a vessel” [CAD m1, 240] || Ug. mqr-t “an ornamental beverage vessel” [Gordon 1955, 291, #1156; 1965, #1538] = “Schüssel” [WUS #2455] = “a container or pot” [DUL 568]. Hoch meant a borrowing from Sem., but as rightly remarked by D. Meeks (1997, 43, #218), the PT/MK attestation hardly allows this. In addition, Quaegebeur and Evrard-Derriks (o.c., p. 49 & fn. 1) themselves doubted the Sem. etymology: “*toutefois, le rapprochement se heurte à certaines difficultés*” (first of all, according to G. Roquet, the case of Cpt. -κ- < Eg. -k/q- ~ Sem. *-k-). NB: The common origin and the etymologies of the Sem. comparanda are disputed. W. von Soden (AHW l.c., followed by CAD l.c.) explained the Akk. term as a late borrowing from Aram., cf. JAram. m̄qartā “Kühlung”. J. Hoch affiliated the Ug.-Akk. parallel with Ar. miqrā-t- “1. grand réservoir d’eau, 2. grande écuelle dans laquelle on sert à manger à plusieurs hôtes à la fois” [BK II 730–1] = “a large bowl” [Hoch] = “Schüssel” [WUS], which is unlikely the underlying Ar. root being qry “recevoir qqn. comme hôte” [BK]. G. del Olmo Lete & J. Sanmartín (DUL l.c. pace Hava), in turn, compared the Ug.-Akk. word with Ar. maqarr-at- “petite cruche” < qrr “5. être frais, 8. verser un peu d’eau fraîche sur ce qui bouît, 9. rafraîchir qqn. en jetant sur lui de l’eau fraîche, 10. couler, glisser, souffler secrètement qqch. dans l’oreille de qqn.” [BK II 701] with an obscure hint on Ar. qwr “to become wide, cut a round hole in the middle of” [Lane 2574].
- **2.** J. F. Quack (1994, 123, fn. 142), who was even referring to CdE 54, 1979, 46–48 (where the MK attestation is also mentioned), suggested that LEg. mqr “*könnte von hebr. māqōr ‘Quell’ (sic) entlehnt sein*”. Absurd.
NB: Cf. Hbr. māqōr “1. source, spring, 2. fountain” [KB 627].
- **3.** GT: a connection with EBrb.: Siwa maqli “vase pour boire” [Lst. 1931, 287] is probably also excluded, this being presumably a var. of common NBrb. *buqal “cruche” [Lst.].

mqrp.wt “spade, hoe (?)” (XVIII. hapax, Hoch).

- J. Hoch (1994, 167, §219) rendered it as a borrowing from Can. reflecting Hbr. magrəpot “spades”, JAram. magrōpītā “spade, hoe”, Ar. miğraf-at- “spade, mattock”.

(*)**mqh** “to grieve” (LP, Jasnow, below) > Dem. mqh ~ mkh “betrübzt sein” & “Trauer” (DG 183:1) > Cpt. (OSALB) Ἰῤῥῶ, (B) ΕἸῤῥῶ, (F) ΕἸῤῥῶ, (MF) Ἰῤῥῶ, (S) Ἰῤῥῶ (intr.) “betrübzt sein, trauern, schwierig

(zu tun)” vs. (SAF) $\mu\text{OYK}\mathfrak{Z}$, (S) $\mu\text{OYX}\mathfrak{Z}$, (A) μOYX (tr.) “betrüben, bedrängen, quälen” (KHW 90).

NB: R. Jasnow (1992, 161) found two possible occurrences of LP $\mu\text{q}\mathfrak{h}$ in Pap. Brooklyn 47.218.135 that might be regarded as the ancestor form of the Dem.-Cpt. verb. He rendered one of these (p. 64, rt. 3:2) as “to grieve” (> Dem. $\mu\text{q}\mathfrak{h}$), while the other one (p. 67, rt. 3:10) “to grieve or neglect” (< $\text{mk}\mathfrak{h}3?$).

- Etymology uncertain.
- 1. G. Maspero (1903, 176) and W. Vycichl (DELIC 111) supposed that it eventually originated from Eg. $\text{mk}\mathfrak{h}3$ “vernachlässigen” (XVIII., Wb, below), cf. $\mu\text{q}\mathfrak{h}$ “beseitigen” (late NK, Wb II 159, 9). Semantically very weak.
- 2. GT: or related to Sem. $^*\text{mh}\mathfrak{k}$ with met.?
NB: Cf. (?) Hbr. $\text{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{q}$ qal “zerschlagen” [GB 415] | Ar. $\text{ma}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ “1. effacer et faire disparaître jusqu’aux traces, 2. de là: rendre malheureux, ne pas faire prospérer qqn. ou qqch. (se dit de Dieu qui refuse sa bénédiction, sa faveur à qqch.)” [BK II 1068] = “1. auslöschen, 2. ausrotten, vernichten” [Wehr 1952, 797] || MSA $^*\text{mh}\mathfrak{k}$ > Hrs. $\text{me}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{k}$ “to pester, bother”, $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{k}$ “to lose one’s patience, be bothered” [Jns. 1977, 88], Jbl. $\text{ma}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{k}$ “(children) to annoy, anger so.”, $\text{m}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{k}$ “to become annoyed, lose patience”, $\text{mi}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{k}$ “(person) tiresome, annoying” [Jns. 1981, 170], Mhr. $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{k}$ “(children) to annoy so., pester” [Jns. 1987, 263]. Note that H. Zimmern (quoted in GB l.c.) saw in Hbr. $\text{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{q}$ (influenced by OArām.?) a dial. *Nebenform* to $\text{m}\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{s}$ ($^*\text{mh}\mathfrak{c}$).

mqs (knife det.) “zerkleinern” (GR, Wb II 159, 10), cf. mqs.t “Subst. zum vorstehenden Verbum” (GR, Wb II 159, 11).

- 1. G. Thausing (1941, 22, fn. 1) derived it from a bicons. Eg. $^*\text{sq} \sim \text{qs}$, cf. jqs “abschneiden” (NK, Wb I 138, 19).
NB1: Doing so, Thausing erroneously affiliated it with Eg. msq (GW) “Art Bearbeitung von Metallwaffen” (late NK, Wb, above), $\mathfrak{h}\text{sq}$ “abschneiden, abhauen” (PT, Wb III 168–9), and even $\text{sqr} > \text{sqj}$ “schlagen” (OK, Wb IV 306–7), which certainly represent etymologically distinct roots.
NB2: Eg. jqs may be compared with Sem. $^*\text{k}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}$ “to cut (off), (ab)schneiden” [GB 722; Lsl. 1987, 451] (further Sem. var. roots discussed in MacDonald 1963–65, 67–68) || ECu. $^*\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}$ - [$^*\text{-d}$ < AA $^*\text{-c}$ -] “to cut” [Dlg.] || SCu. $^*\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}$ - “to divide” [Ehret 1980, 250] > Iraqw qas - “to divide, distribute” [MQK 2002, 85] || WCh.: (?) Hausa $\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}$ e [dissim. < $^*\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}$ -?] “to interrupt” [Brg. 1934, 586] | Tangale $\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}$ (pl.) “to fell, cut” [Jng. 1991, 94], Pero $\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{o}$ “to divide into pieces” [Frj. 1985, 34] | NBch. $^*\text{K-c}/\mathfrak{c}$ “to cut, chop” [Skn. 1977, 17]. See Clc. 1936, #10 (Eg.-Sem.); Dlg. 1983, 135, #8.4 (Sem.-ECu.). The SCu. and the Pero forms may represent the same dissim. of glotalisation $^*\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}$ - < $^*\text{k}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}$ - as Eg. jqs (cf. EDE I 329). A. G. Belova’s (1991, 86, #4; 1993, 50, #4) comparison of Eg. jqs with Ar. qys “to measure” can semantically hardly be accepted.
- 2. GT: perhaps akin to Ar. $\text{ma}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a}$ “casser, briser” [BK II 1135] || Geez $\text{maq}^{\text{a}}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a} \sim \text{mo}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a} \sim \text{ma}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a} \sim \text{ma}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a} \sim \text{mo}\mathfrak{q}^{\text{a}}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a}$ “to cut off/up, deform, remove, take away, mutilate, destroy, separate, make small, diminish”, Tna. $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a}$ & Tigre $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a}$ (Lsl.: augmented by -n-) “to tear out” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 355).
NB: As stated by W. Leslau (l.c.), Amh. $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{a}$ “to cut with scissors, trim hair” is unrelated being a denom. verb of $\text{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}$ “scissors” (from Ar. $\text{mi}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}$ - “scissors”

< qss “to cut”), but it is not the case with Geez \sqrt{mq} ’s (as suggested in Dillmann 1865, 182 and Armbruster 1920, 157).

mqq (GW) “Art Ackerland” (XVIII.–XXII., Wb II 159, 12) = “berieselte Felder oder Wiesengründe” (Lauth 1871, 635, §136) = “terre fertile” (Pierret apud Ceugney 1880, 9) = “clods of earth (??)” (Grd. 1911, 39* & fn. 15) = “moist, damp, muddy soil (of the river-bank along which the apprentice tows)” (Camino 1954 LEM, 76, 135) = “feuchter Boden” (Helck) = “damp-soil” (DLE I 247; WD III 57: cf. SAK 5, 1977, 280, n. 73) = “soft, moist soil” (Hoch 1994, 168) = “feuchter Boden (auch am Ufer)” (GHWb 370).

● Solution #1 seems almost certain with certain reservations.

■ **1.** It has been usually derived from Sem. *mḳḳ “to melt” as a Can. loan-word, cf. Hbr. *mqq nifal* “1. zerfließen, eiern (von Wunden), 2. sich auflösen, hinschwinden” [GB 457] = *nifal* “to rot, fester (wounds), decay (eyes and tongue), 2. (metaph.) melt, dissolve (hills, people)” [KB 628–9] = “liquere” [Lauth] = “to putrefy” [Camino, Hoch] (Helck’s wrong mng. “to melt dissolve” has been corrected by J. Hoch 1994, 168, fn. 196), JAram. *ʔitmaqmeq* “to melt away” [Jastrow 1950, 832] | Ar. *maqqa V* “boire petit à petit, buvotte du vin” [BK II 1134] || Geez *maqqa* “to melt (intr.), dissolve, be spoiled” [Lsl.], Tigre *mäqqa* “to melt” [Lsl.], Tna. *mākākā* (irreg. -k-) “to melt” [Lsl.], Amh. *mā/aqqäqä* “to become rotten, spoiled” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 355). This etymology was abandoned by J. Hoch (l.c.) regarding the Hbr. mng. as “*not particularly applicable to moist soil*”. But the Brb. cognates suggest the same basic sense as LEg. *mqq* may have had, cf. NBrb.: Mzg. *mmeḡ* “se mouiller, être mouillé, trempé, humecté, imbibé” [Tf. 1991, 407], Zayan & Sgugu e-*mmeḡ* “feucht, naß, durchnäßt sein” [Lbg./Snd.], Ait Ndir *mməḡ* “moist, damp” [Pnc. 1973, 106], Izdeg *mmeḡ* “être humide” [Mercier 1937, 139] || EBrb.: Gdm. e-*mməḡ* “1. plonger, 2. nettoyer une séguia souterraine” [Lanfry 1973, 214, #1017] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr e-*mməḡ* “être trempé, imprégné” [PAM 1998, 212; 2003, 528] || WCh.: Bole *mokut-* “naß machen” [Lks. 1971, 137], Ngamo *mòktù* “to be wet” [Alio 1988 MS] || ECh.: Mahwa *mòdògò-ŋ* (-ŋ ending of verbal nouns) “einweichen” [Jng. 1978, 38].

Lrr. for Eg-Sem.: Lauth 1871, 635, §136 (pace Chabas); Camino 1954 LEM, 76 (pace Chabas); Helck 1962, 562, #126; 1971, 515, #126.

NB1: A var. root (mḥh) was preserved in Akk. *maḥāhu G* “1. aufquellen lassen, 2. in Flüssigkeit auflösen (Erde, Lehm, Schlamm, Kot, Asche, Erden, Alaun, Tonfiguren in Urin, Pflanzen in Bier, Wein), 3. (durch Reiben?) verschwellen lassen (Augen)” [AHW 577] = G “1. to soak (soil, weeds), soften in a liquid, 2. suffuse (?) (with tears or blood)”, Štn “to mingle (?)”, N “to be soaked, softened” [CAD m1],

which, however, J. Huehnergard (2003, 106, fn. 6) combined rather with Ar. mḥḥ “to become worn (of clothes)” (semantically less likely).

NB2: In a rather unconvincing manner (using no phonological correspondences), J. HoheNberger (1978, 45) affiliated Hbr. mqq with NAgaw: Hamir maw-au “Schmalz”, Qwara boy^w-ut “fließen” || LECu.: Afar mak-a “zerfließen”.

NB3: Th. Schneider (1997, 198, #36) linked Brb. *m-γ (sic) with Eg. mḥ (sic) “überschwemmt sein” (above). False.

- Other suggestions are less convincing.
- 2. C. Ceugney (1880, 9) saw in it an m- prefix form of Eg. q3j “élever”.
- 3. J. Hoch (1994 l.c.) explained LEg. *maqīqu from a Can. root reflected by or akin to Hbr. mwg qal “to melt”, piel “to soften”, MHbr. mgg “to soften (by soaking)”, Ar. mwǧ I “to swell, surge”, VI “to flood, flow”.

NB: For further possible parallels cf. Lsl. 1938, 239 and Frolova 2005, 450, §56.

- 4. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 200, #1786): ~ Ar. mql “to immerge entirely”, HECu.: Sid. māḳḳe “jar for milking”, NOm.: Benesho maḳ “to become clean”.

***mqd** or ***mgd** (?) > Cpt. (S) ΜΑΚΟΤ, ΜΑΚΩΤ, ΜΑΓΑΤ, ΜΑΓΑΔ, (SA) ΜΑΚΑΤ (m/f) “javelin, dirk, lancea” (CD 162b) = “Lanze, Wurfspieß, Dolch” (KHW 90).

NB1: The pre-Cpt. consonants cannot be exactly reconstructed. If it stems from a native Eg. root, it might have only been from *mqd (all other combinations of -k/q/g- vs. -ṭ/d/ḏ are incompatible). If, however, we are dealing with a late borrowing, even the incompatible solutions (listed above) become plausible.

NB2: There is an obscure Dem. word mgt (?) from Pap. Köln (Cologne) 1859, 9, which H.-J. Thissen (et al. 1980, 64) did not render: “*Eine andere Lesung ist wohl nicht möglich; statt des m ein š zu lesen, ist... ausgeschlossen. Trotzdem bleibt die Frage nach der Bedeutung*”, for which Thissen suggested two alternative etymologies: (1) ~ Dem. mgt (read by J. Johnson as mge.t, cf. Ray 1976, nr. 19, vs. 8:21, rt. 18) which J. Ray (1976, 76, n. h) combined with Cpt. (B) ΜΟΚΙ “Gefäß” (CD 161b) or Dem. mgwt.t “Sänfte Bahre”; (2) ~ (S) ΜΑΚΟΤ, ΜΑΓΑΤ “Dolch, Lanze”. Thissen identified the det. of Dem. mgt as a “*nachlässig ausgeführte Schreibung des Messers oder des schlagenden Armes*”, which “*spräche für die zweite der angeführten Möglichkeiten. Der Sinn der beiden Zeilen bleibt dennoch unklar*”. J. Johnson (kind p.c., 17 April and 14 May 2007) too suggests that it might be related either to Dem. mge.t “vessel, jar” or to Cpt. (S) ΜΑΚΟΤ (for discussion see also Vittmann, Enchoria 11, 1982, 123).

- Etymology obscure. D. J. Wölfel (1955, 122, §6, cf. §8) saw in it an old Mediterranean *Wanderwort* related to NBrb.: Snus a-megdi “marteau à tailler la pierre” || Guanche: Canarian mági/odo “Schlagkeule, Holzschwert”, cf. a-modaga “Holzschwert” ||| WCh.: Hausa makata “hooked staff” and Bsq. maket “porra, palo muy grueso”.

mk.t “Stelle, Platz (zumeist im Sinne von: richtige Stelle), Synonym von s.t: 1. (gewöhnlich) die richtige Stelle, auf der ein Körperteil sich befinden muß, 2. für Körperteil: dort wo die Götter stehen (oder schlafen), 3. (NK) die man im Leben einnehmen muß” (PT,

Wb II 161, 8–12; GHwB 371) = “siège, thrône, fauteuil de divinité” (Piehl 1902, 34–35) = “the proper place or resting place for a thing, particularly for parts of the body (esp. the heart)” (Breasted 1930, 150–1) = “1. richtige Stelle, 2. Rumpf” (ÜKAPT VI 135) = “correct position (of limbs etc.), proper station for standing” (FD 119; Walker 1996, 197; DCT 187) = “proper place” (DLE I 249).

NB: Cf. perhaps also mk.t “Richtplatz” (LP, Wb II 161, 13).

● Origin uncertain.

■ 1. Neither its hypothetical derivation from Eg. mkj “schützen” (OK, Wb, below) nor the connection with Eg. mk3.t “stützender Unterbau” (OK, Wb, below) suggested in some works (e.g., in Wb II 161–2; Breasted 1930, 150; Walker 1996, 155, 197) are commonly accepted.

■ 2. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 94) identified it with SBrb.: Hgr. e-mmek signifying a.o. “1. indication (fait d’indiquer), 2. conduite (fait de guider), 4. moyen, 6. (se dit des) indications, conduites, moyens, qui sont l’oeuvre de Dieu” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1180] = “1. Weisung, Bedeutung; 2. richtiger Sinn” [Zhl.].

NB1: It is not clear whether this is cognate with SBrb.: EWlm. ə-mmək & Ayr ə-ṁṁək “1. manière d’être, façon, caractère, nature, état, forme, 2. manière d’agir, comportement, procédé, méthode, moyen, 3. manière réelle, vraie, propre, originale etc.” [PAM 2003, 533], which, in turn, seems to be related to EBrb.: Audjila e-mmóg [-g < *-k?] “divenire, essere, trasformarsi” [Prd. 1960, 165] ||| LECu.: (?) Saho makk-o “meaning, concept” [Vergari 2003, 130] ||| NOM.: Omt. (sic) mak-“prepare, apprestare” [Mrn. 1938, 151] | Magi mamk “prepare” [Toselli 1939, 38] ||| CCh.: Mandara mag-a “1. sich ereignen, 2. machen, tun” [Mirt 1970–71, 67], Malgwa mága “1. machen, tun, 2. sich ereignen” [Löhr 2002, 301]. From AA *m-k (var. *m-g?) “1. to be(come), 2. (tr.) make” [GT]? For the semantic shift cf., e.g., (1) SBrb.: Hgr. e-mel “être dans un lieu” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1187], Ayr & EWlm. ə-məl “être dans un lieu”, e-mel “existence, occurrence (dans un lieu)”, EWlm. a-sə-məl, pl. i-sə-mal “1. lieu, emplacement, place, 2. lieu de résidence, domicile” [Alj. 1980, 127; PAM 1998, 215; 2003, 535–536], (2) Eg. s.t “(Wohn)Sitz, Platz, Stelle” (OK, Wb IV 1–6) < AA *s-(w/y) “1. to put, 2. make” [GT] (cf. EDE I 189).

NB2: For the Hgr. root cf. perhaps also Oakk. (Elam) mekûm (or mēkûm?) “Anweisung (?)” [AHW 642] = mekûm “orders, provisions (?)” [CAD m2, 8], which would semantically fit well, albeit it is of an obscure Sem. background.

NB3: Note that Hgr. e-mmek “3. garde (fait de prendre soin), fait de faire le nécessaire pour qqn., fait de donner sa sauvegarde à, 5. sauvegarde” [Fcd.] may represent a distinct Brb. root, cf. Eg. mkj “schützen” (OK, Wb, below).

■ 3. L. Homburger (1930, 283): ~ Ful nokure “lieu”, which is out of question

mk “1. (Amarna VI 21:12) Art Schiff, 2. (GR) auch Götterbarke im Tempel” (Amarna, GR, Wb II 161, 14–15) = “bateau de transport des grains” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “barque sacrée d’Edfou” (Chassinat, RT 16, 1894, 117) = “boat” (FD 119) = “ship” (2nd stela of Kamose, Habachi 1972, 34) = “bateau” (DELIC 110) = “freighter,

warship, sacred bark” (Jones 1988, 140, §43) = “Bezeichnung für ein Transport” (Düring 1995, 140) = “1. (Amarna) sacred boat, 2. (Karnak) grain carrier, (GR) type of ship” (PL 470) = “ein Schiff” (ÄWb II 1150).

NB: Cf. mk “fahren” (GR, Wb II 161, 16). Denom. verb?

- **1.** W. Vycichl (DELC 110, followed by Jones l.c.) supposed an etymological connection with Eg. mk “vessel” > Cpt. (B) MOKI (below). Dubious, since mk denoted a certain sort of boat and not a ship in general.
- **2.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 200, #1785) too combined it with Cpt. (B) MOKI “container” with regard to its “*presumed original application to vessel hollowed out of log*”, whereby he extended the comparison to Cu. *mūka “stem, trunk”. Semantically uncertain.
- **3.** GT: a connection with PBHbr. mākūtā “a certain type of boat (low boat?)” [Jastrow 1950, 782] = “Mastbaum (die Erklärung nach sḥpīnā ‘Schiff’ nicht zutreffend)” [Levy 1924 III, 112], Mand. makuta “raft, punt, (flat-bottomed) boat” [DM 242] is out of question, since these eventually derive from Akk. makkūtu “a boat (lit. short boat)” (borrowed from Sum. ^{gis}má.gud₄.da) [CAD m1, 137] = “Kurzschiff” [AHW 590; Dietrich], cf. Akk. makittu (makkītu) “(tow)boat, barge” (Sum. ^{gis}má.gíd.da) [CAD m1, 130] = “ein (getreideltes) Prozessions-schiff” [Dietrich] as pointed out by M. Dietrich (1967, 299).
NB: Akk. makua (Fraenkel, ZA 3, 53) mentioned in DM l.c. does not exist. For a Syr. parallel cf. Brk., ZA 17, 254f.
- **4.** GT: its resemblance to Ar. makkiyy-at- “espèce de navire (peut-être était-il destiné au transport des pèlerins à la Mecque)” [Dozy II 606] is equally misleading.

mk “a vessel” (Pap. BM 10795, frag. C, II, 13, CED 80) = “ein Gefäß” (KHW 517) = “un vase” (AL 77.1907) = “nom d’un récipient” (DELC 110) > Cpt. (B) MOKI (m) “jar, vessel, quiver, container generally” (CD 161b; CED 80, approved by Osing 1978, 186) = “Gefäß, Behälter, Köcher” (KHW 90, 517) = “1. vase, cruche, récipient, 2. carquois (quiver)” (DELC 110).

- GT: perhaps akin to SBrb.: Hgr. ě-meké, pl. i-mekê-t-en “grande cruche en terre”, dimin. té-meké-t, pl. ti-mekê-t-în “petite cruche en terre” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1183], Ayr e-māke, pl. i-māke-t-ān “sorte de cruche (en terre)” [PAM 2003, 533] ||| NOm.: Koyra mōkko [mɔ:k:^hv ~ mɔ:k:^h] “old water-pot” [Hyw. 1982, 218] ||| CCh.: Muturwa māgaía “Topf” [Str. 1910, 464] | Mbara mīkàw (m) “jarre à eau (water-jar)” [TSL 1986, 272, 291]. From AA *m-k-w (?) “sort of vessel” [GT]? An old (PAA) *nomen instr.*?

NB: The etymologies of HECu.: Sid. *mâqqe* (f), pl. *mâqquwa* “a small vessel (for butter etc.)” [Gsp. 1983, 224] = *mâkqe* “small vessel” [Hds. 1989, 85] and SCu.: Dhl. *mīgāwa* “ladle” vs. *mīko* “spoon” [EEN 1989, 38] = *mīgau* ~ *mīko* “kind of spoon” [MSSL 1993, 43, #174–5] are obscure. In any case, these can hardly be related either with Eg. *mk* or the AA parallels above.

mk “*zuteilen” (late NK, GHWb 371).

- GT: related to Eg. *mk* “Unterhalt” (late NK, below)? Or cp. perhaps Ar. *makkūk-* “mesure de substances sèches contenant un demi *šāʿ*-, ou un demi *wayb-at-*, ou trois *kayl-at-*” [BK II 1137] ||| HECu.: Burji *makk-* “to measure” [Sasse 1982, 139]?

NB1: H.-J. Sasse (l.c.) equated the Burji word with LECu.: *Afar makk-it-* “to figure out, reason” [Hyw.], for which cf. also the discussion of Eg. **mqmq* (supra).

NB2: Any connection to OAkk. (Elam) *mekûm* (or *mēkûm?*) “Anweisung (?)” [AHW 642] = *mekûm* “orders, provisions (?)” [CAD m2, 8]?

mk (or **mk.w/mkj.w**) “Unterhalt, Nahrung” (late NK, Wb II 162, 5) = “aliment” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “food” (Grd. 1911, 20*; Janssen 1961, 90) = “food (victuals)” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 99, 203, 218) = “rewards” (Černý in CAH² II, chapter 35:21) = “the extra provisions” (Janssen 1975, 489) = “food, victuals, reward” (DLE I 249) = “Extrazuteilung, Unterhalt” (GHWb 371).

- Basic sense and etymology uncertain.
- 1. Despite the suggestive translation “Unterhalt” (Wb, GHWb), it may well be etymologically distinct from both Eg. *mkj* “schützen” (OK, Wb, above) and *mk3.t* “stützender Unterbau” (OK, Wb, below).
- 2. GT: most attractive seems its comparison with OAkk. (Elam) *mekûm* (or *mēkûm?*) “Anweisung (?)” [AHW 642] = *mekûm* “orders, provisions (?)” [CAD m2, 8], which has no apparent parallel in Sem. Cf. also the uncertain Eg. hapax *mk* “zuteilen” (late NK, GHWb, above).
- 3. GT: assuming that its primary sense was “food, victuals” (Caminos), one might postulate the same semantic development as, e.g., in Lat. *victualia*, which would suggest that Eg. *mk* originated in a hypothetic AA root **m-k* “to live” (or sim.) [GT], which, albeit unattested with this meaning, is presumably present in Cu.-Om.
NB1: Its traces have been preserved in SCu. **māk-* “game animal” [Ehret]: WRift **makay* (pl.) “animal” [Ksl., GT]: Iraqw *māka* “animals” [Wtl. 1953] = *makitōʿa*, pl. *mākay* “animal” [Wtl., Zbr.] = *makitōʿo*, pl. *makay* “wild animal” [Ehret] = *makitōʿo*, pl. *mākāy* “beast” [Mgw. 1989, 115], Gorowa *māka*, pl. *mākay* “animal” [Wtl., Zbr.], Alagwa *maka*, pl. *makay* “animal” [Wtl., Zbr.], Burunge *makiyamo*, pl. *makay* “animal” [Wtl., Zbr.] (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 22, #1; Zbr. 1973–74, 30) | Asa *magat* “game” [Ehret] | Maʿa *mayerú* “game” [Ehret] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 155) ||| NOm.: Wtl. *māhyā* “bestiame” [Crl. 1929, 32] = *meh-iyā* “animal” [Alm.], Zala

meʔā ~ mehi “denaro” [Crl.], Zayse mehe “animal” [Sbr. 1994, 11], Gofa mēhe “animal” [Alm.], Gamu meʔe “animal” [Alm.], Dorze mehe “animal” [Alm.] | Sns. mehe “animal” [Alm.] (NOM.: Alm. 1993 MS, 6). Note that R. Kießling (2001, 232) explained WRift *makay (pl.) as a borrowing from Bantu: Rangi maka “beast”, which is hardly correct with regard to the SCu. and NOM. attestation. ECh.: Smr. mwàgə̀nā, pl. mwàgə̀né “animal” [Jng. 1978, 206; 1993 MS, 46] seems to stem from a distinct root.

NB2: For the mng of Eg. mk cf. the history of some roots with synonymous significations: (1) Eg. ḥw [*< *ḥjw or *ḥjw.w?*] “Nahrung, Speise” (PT, Wb III 44, 11) which may be cognate with Sem. *ḥyw ~ *ḥwy “to live” (e.g. Ug. & Phn. ḥwy, Hbr. ḥyy, ESA ḥyw, Ar. ḥyy, Geez ḥyw) as pointed out a number of authors, e.g. A. Ember (1916, 72–73; 1917, 89, #145; 1930, #14.a.14), M. Cohen (1947, #128), V. M. Illič-Svityč (1971, #101), A. B. Dolgopolsky (1973, 156). Especially noteworthy are, e.g. Ug. ḥw-t “Tier” [WUS #911], OTHbr. ḥayyim “life (used also in the sense ‘subsistence, maintenance, food’)” [Ember] vs. ḥayyā “1. (all kinds of) animals, 2. wild animals, beasts of prey, 3. beast-like creatures” [KB 310], Syr. ḥayūtō “animal” [Brk.]. Related are probably also Bed. ḥay “1. leben, frisch, gesund, lebendig, 2. sich aufhalten, wohnen” [Rn. 1895, 132–3] || LECu.: Saho & Afar hay “leben, das Leben fristen, (besonders durch Nahrung oder Heilmittel) die geschwächten Kräfte wieder ersetzen, satt, gesund werden” [Rn. 1886, 861] | HECu. *ḥē-ḍ- “to live” [Hds. 1989, 412] || SCu.: Asa haiu-g [h- < *ḥ- reg.] “food” [Flm. 1969, 11] || CCh.: (?) Mandara ḥiwa “animal” [Stl.] | Buduma aiyu “to live” [Talbot 1911, 253] vs. yááwa “lebendig” [Nct./Lks. 1939, 130] || ECh.: Somray haye & Ndam a:y “food” [Stl.] | Bidiya ʔāwyō “animal sauvage” [AJ 1989, 55] | Jegu ʔaiwo “Tier” [Jng. 1961, 109] < AA *ḥ-y-w ~ *ḥ-w-y “to live” [GT]. For the AA comparison see Chn. 1947, 103, #128 (Sem.-Eg.-Bed.-ECu.); IS 1971, #101 (Sem.-Eg.-ECu.-Bed.-Bdm.-Jegu); Dlg. 1973, 156 adopted in Djk. et al. 1986, 57 (Bed.-ECu.-Eg.-Sem.-Bdm.); HSED #1252/#1257 (Sem.-Eg.-Mnd.-ECh.-Asa).

(2) PIE *gʷey- “to live” > i.a. Gk. βίος [via *gʷiw-o-] “1. life, 2. food” vs. ζῷον [via *dy- from *gʷy-] “animal”, Lat. victus “food, sustenance” (hence Eng. victuals), OIrish biad “Nahrung, Speise”, NBreton boed “Nahrung” etc., ORuss. животь “animal” (lit. “living one”). For IE cf. IEW 467–469; GI 1984, 465.

(3) There are many further parallels for the semantic shift “food” < “life” (for which see Ember 1916), cf. Eg. ʕnh (coll., food det.) “Lebensunterhalt” (XVIII., Wb I 205, 8) < ʕnh “leben” (OK, Wb I 193–198); Ar. ʕayš- “1. vie, manière de vivre, 2. pain” [BK II 420]; Hung. élelem “1. (1644) Auskommen, Lebensunterhalt, Erwerb, Einkommen, 2. (1755) Lebensmittel, Kost, Nahrung, 3. (1766) Ernährung” ≈ eleség “(1266) Lebensmittel, Nahrung, Speise, Kost” < él “to live” [MNYTESz I 742–4].

- 4. Ch. Ehret (1995, 306, #585) erroneously derived it from an unattested AA *-muk- “to eat”.

NB1: Based on the false equation of unrelated roots such as Ar. makka I “1. sucer et extraire tout le contenu à force de sucer, 2. réduire, 3. consumer, consommer, dévorer”, II “donner un petit morceau de qqch. à qqn., autant qu’il suffirait tout juste à l’oiseau makkāʔ-” [BK II 1137] || Cu. *m-k- “gullet” [Ehret] || NOM.: Yemsa makt- “to be hungry” [Ehret].

NB2: A remote connection (via *k- ~ *k-) with AA *m-k “to feed, nourish” [GT] is equally unlikely, cf. Ar. maqqa II “1. abecquer ses petits (se dit d’un oiseau), 2. nourrir mal, chichement, les gens de sa maison”, V “1. boire petit à petit, buvotter du vin etc.”, cf. mqw: maqā “1. téter avec violence (sa mère)” [BK II 1134, 1136] || HECu.: Sid. maqa “to feed (men in bed, sitting; animals in the stable)” [Gsp. 1983, 223] = maḵ- “to feed, eat (of animals in stable)” [Hds. 1989, 55, 62, 384] = maḵal- “to eat (of animal)” [Yri] || ECh.: (?) Bdy. mägaw [-g- < *k- not clear] “élever du bétail”, mägə̀, pl. mägáawə̀ “éleveur de bétail” [AJ 1989, 96].

mk (GW) “Art Stoff zu Kleidern” (NK, Wb II 162, 4) = “lin, toile” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “als ein Stoff genannt, wohl eine Art feines Leinen” (Lange 1925, 90) = “mk-cloth” (Camino 1954 LEM, 287) = “mk-Stoff” (Helck, MWNR 1200 index) = “Kleid, Stoff” (WMT I 399) = “material (not a specific garment), esp. perhaps bed-clothes (?) or fly and mosquito nets (?)” (Černý (1965, 8, 17) = “1. eine bestimmte Stoffqualität: (mit dem Schlafszimmer verknüpft) Schutz(stoff), Bettschutz, Fliegenschutz, 2. (sehr selten) ein Gewand” (Edel 1974, 145–6, fn. 36; WD III 57) = “(cloth) linen” (DLE I 248) = “1. quality of linen called ‘tissue de fête’ (after Edel), 2. particular garment (after Černý)” (Grandet 1999 II, 67, n. 241) = “1. Verarbeitungsart, 2. Gewand” (GHWb 371) = “(il faudrait distinguer entre deux homographes mk:) 1. (l’un désignant) une qualité d’étoffe: ‘tissu de fête’, 2. (l’autre) un vêtement” (Grandet 1999 II 67) = “type of cloth, quality linen (in list of various garments, a quality between the best sort: šsr-nsw ‘royal linen’ vs. third category: šm^ḥ-nfr ‘good thin linen’): a special type of weaving of royal/fine linen, tapestry weaving, ie., woven cloth in which extra threads are inserted to create ornamentation” (Janssen & Janssen 2000, 177, 181–2).

nb1: J. Černý (1965, 8) saw in it a “material and not a specific garment”, although E. Edel (1974, 145, fn. 3) found that at least in two instances of the material examined by Černý “*scheint es allerdings ein Gewand zu bezeichnen*”, whence he has concluded that “*das sind Widersprüchlichkeiten, denen zuliebe man zunächst ein mk I ‘eine bestimmte Stoffqualität und ein sehr seltenes mk II ‘ein Gewand’ unterscheiden möchte*”. J. J. Janssen & R. M. Janssen (2000, 179) doubted the two diverse significations suggested by E. Edel (l.c.), P. Grandet (l.c.), and R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.) as unfounded because they see no convincing evidence for mk as an item of clothing.

nb2: Presumably reflected also in cuneiform, cf. Amarna Akk. (Boghazköy) miku “(a quality of textiles)” [CAD m2, 66: “Eg. word”], which, however, can hardly reflect an Eg. *mík^w (that would have presumably yielded Amarna *mika), but perhaps better *mík^w as rightly noted by E. Edel (1974, 144).

nb3: Perhaps the same word has been preserved by the supposed first component of Hbr. *miknās (dual st.cstr. miknisē-) “Unterbeinkleider (der Priester)” [GB 422] = (st. cstr. miknāsē) “the leggings of the priests (Noth, Hönig), a loin-cloth in two pieces (Galling), hip-sheath (Elliger)” [KB 581] = “Teil des hohenpriestlichen Ornats (urspr. Ausstattung des Königs)” [Görg 1975, 18], PBHbr. miknāsayim & JArām. miknāsā (sg.), mi/aknāsīm (pl.) “Beinkleider der Priester” [Dalman 1922, 236] = “bes. Kleidungsstück, das den Leib und die Füße aufnimmt, daher: Beinkleider” [Levy 1924 III 113] = “clothes of retirement, undergarment, drawers” [Jastrow 1950, 783] < basic form *maknas [KB], which has been traditionally (in Hbr. lexicography) derived from Hbr. √kns “to sit”, but already N. L. Tidwell (VT 24, 1974, 507) has regarded the underlying root as “uncertain”, while M. Görg (1975, 17–18) explained the OT word as a borrowing of Eg. *mk-nsw “königliches Schutzgewand (o.ä.)”, although the vocalization of Eg. nsw as *nās in the “UEg. dial.” (Fecht 1960, §31, §34, §37–38, §102; Helck 1976, 122; 1984, 256; Snk. 1968, 539; Kahl 1994,

65–66; Osing 1998, 179, n. v) has been declined by J. Vergote (1961, 210) and W. Schenkel (1986, 68).

- **1.** J. Černý (1965, 17), followed by M. Görg (l.c.) and Grandet (l.c.), derived it from Eg. mkj “schützen” (OK, Wb, below). Černý’s theory was adopted by E. Edel (1974, 144–5) with reservations (“*Leider fehlt eine sichere Etymologie dieses *míkṽw*”) and restricting this etymology only to mk II, while for mk I, “*amehesten denkbar erscheint... eine Verbindung mit dem... erst in pto. Zeit belegten mk ‘Fest; festlich sein’ (Wb II 162, 7–10)*”, whereby in the case of mk I “*es läge dann ein ‘festlicher’ Stoff vor*”, i.e., a “*festliche Stoffqualität*”. Alternatively, “*falls beide Worte gleich sind*”, Edel did not rule out a rendering of mk I as “*eine magische Schutz(stoff)*”.
- **2.** GT: a connection with Sem.: Ebl. mu-gú /mukk-u(m)/ “an inferior quality of wool” [Frz. 1984, 146] or NAgaw: Qwara māḵ- “a kind of clothing” [LS 1997, 476] and HECu.: Sid. māge (f) “wool” [Gsp. 1983, 219] seems unlikely.
NB: M. Lamberti (LS l.c.) combined the Qwara word with NOm. *may?- “to dress” [GT], which he erroneously derived from an OCu. *māḵ- (cf. also L Eg. mj “MumieNBinde” above).

mk “überzogen sein mit Gold u.ä. (von Gegenständen aller Art)” (LP, GR, Wb II 162, 1–2) = “couvrir, envelopper” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “(re)couvrir” (Loret 1894, 94) = “recouvrir, plaquer (d’un métal)” (2nd IMP: 1x, Cairo stela 38917, AL 79.1388: cf. El-Sayed, BIFAO 79, 1979, 168–170, esp. 173, t. 47, l. 4) = “überziehen” (ÄWb II 1152 with further lit.).

- Hence: mk “Überzug, Beschlag (aus Gold) eines Tores” (LP, Wb II 162, 3).
- **1.** The Wb (l.c.) explained it as a late form of old b3k “etwas ‘belegen’ mit einem feineren Stoff, ihn damit überarbeiten, (mit Gold) überziehen, vergolden, (mit Erz) beschlagen, (mit Lapislazuli) auslegen” (Wb I 427, 6–9), cf. also Keimer 1984, 40, n. 9 (with parallels for the shift of old b > m). The attestation from the 2nd IMP, however, seems to speak for a distinct root.
- **2.** O. Beauregard (1892, 182) and P. Wilson (PL l.c.), in turn, suggested a derivation from (or, at least, a connection with) Eg. mkj “to protect”, which was in Wilson’s opinion “*extended in use for overlaying sg. with gold*”, since this “*is the same as protecting it*”.
AP: Of interest might be (as AP) PNil. *muk “to cover” [Dimmendaal 1988, 36, #36]. For the semantic change “to protect” < “to cover” cf. e.g. IE *wer- V “1. verschließen, bedecken, 2. schützen, retten, abwehren” [IEW 1160].

mk3.t “stützender Unterbau” (OK, Wb II 162, 13) = “supporting, resting place, support (designed esp. to maintain in an upright posture a patient having a serious wound in the skull)” (Breasted 1930, 151, 236) = “Unterlage, Stütze” (WMT 399) = “1. support, pedestal, 2. trunk” (FD 119) = “1. socle, estrade, 2. lit funéraire” (AL 77.1908; 78.1890) = “als Bezeichnung der Mumienbahre” (Pfortenbuch, Hornung 1980, 169) = “1. supporting substructure, a structural support (horizontal beneath an object), a base, a platform, a pedestal or socle, a stela base, funerary bier etc., sometimes also a vertical, upright support such as a brick pillar (possibly also the supporting pillar behind statues) or column, 2. anatomical pillar (in human anatomy denotes vertical structures), probably not the entire trunk but only the spinal column within it, specifically the thoracic spine (behind the heart and mediastinum or the breast-bone in front of them) to which the cervical spine (wsr.t) is attached (or upon which the heart resides), 3. also the sternum (breast-bone, as support of the collar-bones)”, cf. mk3.t-jb/h3tj “a horizontal platform under the heart (perhaps a diaphragm?) or could be a vertical pillar supporting it (perhaps the sternum or spine?)” (Walker 1996, 155–6, 197, 199–202) = “1. stützender Unterbau (z.B. zwei Ziegel), Sockel, Podium, 2. Totenbahre” (GHWb 371; ÄWb I 573: V. 1x; ÄWb II 1152: CT VII 15k, VI 278o).

NB1: J. H. Walker (l.c.) maintains that the rendering “base (of the heart)” or “trunk (torso)” and also “frame (i.e., the support surrounding the object) of the chest, i.e. ribcage” (pace Borghouts 1978, 57) is “*probably erroneous*” in anatomical contexts, where the basic sense “pillar (most often thoracic spine)” fits well in every such context. NB2: To be distinguished from mk.t “Stelle, Platz (richtige Stelle)” (PT, Wb, above) in spite of Wb l.c.; Breasted 1930, 150–1; Walker 1996, 155, 197. But a contamination of the two lexemes (in the view of Walker 1996, 199, already in the PT) is quite possible.

- Hence: mk3.tj “Art Gott” (NK, Wb II 162, 14) = “celui qui est couché sur son lit de mort” (AL 77.1909) = “he of the pillar” (Walker 1996, 199 after Hornung). For LP mk3tj (?) (Wb II 162, 15) cf. also Faulkner 1936, 140. From the same root: **(1)** mk3 “base (?) (the det. looks like a stela standing on a foundation slab)” (CT VI 176f, AECT II 174–5, spell 572, n. 10) = “socle, estrade” (AL 78.1890) = “pedestal, base” (DCT 187: also CT VI 237v, VI 278o), perhaps cf. also **(2)** mk3 “Vertiefung (wie sie durch einen Tritt hervorgerufen wird)” (Med., Wb II 162, 12) = “(perhaps a noun designating) some injury or disfigurement of the nose (whereby the lower, fleshy and cartilaginous portions of nose might abruptly project, suggesting a support or notch or depression – this is only a hazardous guess)”

(Breasted 1930, 234, 236) = “einebnen, planieren” (WMT 399; GHWb 371).

- Origin disputed. Most convincing seems solution #2.
- **1.** W. Westendorf (1980, 101) and J.H. Walker (1996, 198) see in it an m- prefix derivative of a hypothetical Eg. *k3(j) “heben, tragen” (Wst.) = *k3j “to carry, lift into being, produce, create by physical labour” (Walker), i.e., *m-k3.t, lit. “die Stelle, die etwas zu tragen in der Lage ist” (Wst.) having “*strong connection with lifting sg into being, with the erection and construction of buildings (reflected by the determinatives stairway, stela on pedestal, brick, house, pillar?)*” (Walker). Dubious.

NB1: The underlying verbal root is unattested. It cannot have been identical with Eg. k3wt “tragen, hochheben” (GR, Wb V 103), which is a denom. verb of k3.t “Arbeit, Tätigkeit” (OK Wb V 98) just like Eg. k3w:tj “Art Arbeiter” (MK, Wb V 102) = “a porter, a builder’s labourer” (FD). W. Westendorf erroneously affiliated these words also with Eg. k3 “Geist als Teil der menschlichen Persönlichkeit, Kraft, Eigenschaft” (OK, Wb V 86–89) = “Ka: Hebekraft” (Wst.), *k (Wst.: *k3j/w!) “Art Korb” (Wb V 83, 1) = “Trage(korb)” (Wst.), sk3 “Erhöhung als Bezeichnung des Thrones” (Wb IV 316, 14), sk3 “(den Acker) pflügen bzw. bestellen, (Getreide) aNBauen (Wb IV 315–6) explained by Westendorf from a primary sense “zum Tragen bringen, (Ertrag) liefern lassen” (sic). Walker derived even Eg. mkj “to protect” (OK, below) from *k3j, which is equally unconvincing. For a critical appraisal of Westendorf’s etymologies cf. Takács 2005, 331–2, §iii, fn. 21–23.

NB2: Nevertheless, a remote connection of Eg. k3.t with Sem. *krr “to lay” [GT]: Akk. karāru “setzen, stellen, legen” [AHW 447] || Tigre kārāra “to lie” [Lsl. 1964, 117] (Akk.-Tigre: Lsl. l.c.) || SOM.: Hamer (Galila) kari “place” [Bnd. 1994, 156] || Ch. *karə “to carry” [Nwm. 1977, 24, #24] = *k-r- “to load” [NM 1966, 237] cannot be excluded. C. T. Hodge (1978 MS, 2, #24; 1981, 234; 1981, 371) already related Akk. krr and Ch. *k-r- [NM] to Eg. k3.t “work” (PT, Wb V 98–101) and even to LECu.: Somali kār-ayya ~ karāynayya “is able to do” [Abr. 1964, 148], although the latter is semantically dubious. AP: PCKhoisan *kuru “to do, make” [Baucom 1972, 21]. Although a direct (inner Eg.) connection of Eg. k3.t vs. mk3.t is rather unlikely (on semantic grounds), but an ultimate common origin (from AA *k-r “to lay” or sim. [GT]) is plausible. In this case, Eg. mk3.t (*mkr.t) might be indeed regarded as an m- prefix form and its basic sense could be rendered *“(on) what (sg.) is put down”.
- **2.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 199, #1783) equated it with LECu.: Afar makara (f) “foundation”, makare ~ makre “to prepare a base, foundation” [PH 1985, 161] < AA *makr- “to make a base or foundation”, which fits well the mng. “Unterbau” (Wb).

NB: GT: cp. perhaps also Agaw *ʔənkʷər- [if *-nkʷ- < *-mkʷ-] “to put, place” [Apl.: Hamir əqʷər-, Hamta əgʷər ~ iqwir-, Qwara ənhʷər-, Falasha onhər-, Qemant ənhʷər-, Kailinya əqʷər- | Awngi ənkʷ-r- (Agaw: Apl. 1989 MS, 4, fn. 10; 1991 MS, 10; 1994 MS, 3; 1996, 16). D. Appleyard (1989 MS, 4) combined the Agaw root with ECU. *gūr- “to pick up, collect” (via prefixed *mV-gur- > Agaw *ʔənkʷər-), which is semantically unlikely.
- **3.** GT: if, in turn, the mng. underlying root was just the opposite, cf. perhaps Sem.: JNAram. mukra “heap (of stones)” [Sabar 2002, 213: < ?].

NB: From AA *m-k-r “to raise” [GT]? In principle, Common Brb. *nker “se lever” [NZ] = *√n-k-r (*-nk- from *-mk-?) “to r(a)ise” [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh nkr “to stand up” [Aplg. 1958, 62] || WBrb.: Zng. e-nker “se lever” [Bst. 1909, 249] = √n-k-r ~ √n-g-r “(se) lever” [Ncl. 1953, 234] || SBrb.: Ghat e-nker “(s)éveiller, se lever, se dresser” [Nhl. 1909, 158, 173] etc. (Brb.: NZ 1998, 155, §171) might be also related, although an alternative etymology is also available, cf. Eg. ng3g3 [< *ngrgr?] “se lever (en parlant du vent)” (CT II 1171, AL 78.2266), which was rendered by R. O. Faulkner “to lack, be destitute” (AECT I 104, spell 106, n. 9).

- **4.** GT: or cp. Ar. √mkl: mukūliyy- “vil, bas”, makila “contenir de la vase au fond (se dit d’un puits)”, mumākil- “qui ramasse et conserve tout ce qu’il trouve par terre” [BK II 1138]?

mk3 (or **mk?**) “tapfer, kühn (vom Herzen)” (Lit. MK, Wb II 50, 6) = “brave” (FD 105) = “standhaft, tapfer” (Wst. 1989, 88) = “(m^ok3-jb) tapfer, kühn, draufgängerisch (wie Löwen)” (GHWb 329).

NB: The root cannot have been m^ok3 (as in Wb, FD, and GHWb), since *^ok do not occur in native Eg. roots (cf. Peust 1999, 298; EDE I 323). For this reason, -^o- can only be considered as purely orthographical. Whether the same is true about the final -3 (i.e., only mk is to be read), remains open.

- Etymology highly disputable.
- **1.** W. Westendorf (1989, 88) explained it from Eg. mk.t “die richtige Stelle auf der ein Körperteil sich befinden muß (zumeist vom Herzen)” (Wb II 161, 9) and mk3.t “stützender Unterbau” (Wb II 162, 13) rendering the primary meaning of mk3-jb as “Herz auf dem (rechten) Fleck”. Unconvincing.
- **2.** R. Hannig (GHWb 329), in turn, referred to Eg. mk3 “aufmerken” (q.v.) apparently suggesting an alternative rendering of *mk3-jb as “aufmerksam”. Possible.
- **3.** GT: a cognacy with the isolated CCh.: Kotoko mǎgǎrá “courageux” [Bouny 1978, 109] = mǎgǎrà “courage” [Bouny & Jouannet 1978, 185] is rather uncertain.

NB: The Ch. origin of the Kotoko word is obscure. In principle, a hypothetical AA *m-k-r “brave” [GT] might be supposed, whose *-r might be a root extension provided we assume a connection with AA *m-[k] “brave” [GT] (below).

- **4.** G. Takács (2006, 677–8, #387) assumed a GW for √mk which he combined it with SBrb.: Ayr ə-muḵ, pl. i-muḵ-ān (m) “homme de coeur, valeur” [PAM 2003, 533] ||| SCu.: WRift *magi “braveness” [KM] > Irg. migi “braveness, courage, daring” [MQK 2002, 73], Brg. magūmā “diligence” [KM] (WRift: KM 2004, 198) ||| ECh.: Mgm. mákká (adj.) “1. brave, 2. fort (pour les boissons alcoolisées, le tabac, le piment etc.)”, mákkúwé “courage, intrépidité” [JA 1992, 105] < AA *m-[k] “brave” [GT].

NB1: Note that R. Kiefling and M. Mous (l.c.) equated the WRift word with LECu.: Som. miziga “braveness”, which is both semantically (basic mng. “right side”, cf.

Lmb. 1986, 261) and phonologically (Som. -z- ≠ WRift -Ø-) unacceptable.

NB2: Probably no connection with Sem.: Geez maʔaka ~ maʕaka ~ maʕka “to get angry, take offense, be frightened” and Ar. māʕik- “quarreler” (Sem.: Lsl. 1987, 324) either.

mk3 (or GW for **mk**?) “(Verbum, mit sdm ‘hören’ verbunden)” (NK, Wb II 162, 11) = (?) “considérer, examiner” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “to hearken (?)” (Pap. BM 10188, rt. 13:18, 4th cent. BC, Faulkner 1936, 139) = “to (give, pay) heed” (Caminos 1958, 107, §164 with LP exx.) = “aufmerken”, cf. mk3.tw hft sdm.tw “möge man aufmerken, wenn man hört” (GHWb 371) = “hören auf (n)” (LP, JW 1996, 174, §271.A.i).

NB1: The -3 has been quite consistently written almost in all exx.

NB2: For a further occurrence in Pap. Chester Beatty XII cf. Borghouts 1971, 152, n. 364.

- Its proper root is somewhat uncertain. Origin unknown. GT: its resemblance (suggesting a GW for mk) to CCh.: Mada mekeke “attention” [Br.-Brunet 2000, 182] may be only accidental. Perhaps it may represent an irregular (via interchange of *mkl ~ *mql) cognate to the reflexes of the hypothetical AA *m-ḳ/ḳ-l ~ *ḳ/ḳ-l-m (met.) “to sense: 1. hear, 2. see (?)” [GT].

NB1: Attested in (?) Ar. maqala “1. regarder, fixer qqn. des yeux, 2. voir, apercevoir qqch. (se dit de l’oeil)” [BK II 1136] ||| Cu. *mak^wVl “ear” [IS] = *mk^wVl- ~ *mVkk^wVl- “ear” [Dlg.] > Bed. ángwíl, pl. ángwíl ~ áng^wel ~ áng^wla “Ohr” [Rn. 1895, 24] = angwíl (m) “ear” [Rpr. 1928, 151], Bisharin ónquil “Ohr” [Kremer/Blz.] = ank^wíl “ear” [Almkvist/Dlg.] || SLECu. *maq^w- “to hear” [Black] = *maq(a)- [Blz.]: PSam. *maqal “to hear” [Heine 1978, 68/90; Lmb. 1986, 252] > Som. máqal “Gehör, Gehorsamkeit”, as verb “hören, gehorchen” [Rn. 1902, 291] = máq^w-ayya “to hear” [Abr. 1964, 173], Boni m’áʔal “to hear” [Heine] = maʔal [Lmb.], Dasenech (Geleba) māle “to hear” [Mrn.] = mā^w- [Black] = male [Zbr.] (LECu.: Dlg. 1967, 5; 1973, 183; Black 1974, 261, 265; Zbr. 1989, 580, §21) ||| WCh.: AS *ḳələŋ ~ *ḳəliŋ [AS *-ŋ < pre-Ch. *-m seems reg.], perhaps < *ḳiliŋ (Suroid) ~ *ḳu₂lu₂ŋ (hence Gmy. *ḳelen) “to hear” [GT] = *ḳ[ə]l[ə]ŋ “to hear” [Dlg.] = *ḳ[ə]l-mAk [Stl. 1987]: Angas kaliŋ (hill) “to hear, understand” [Flk. 1915, 207] = kəliŋ ~ kələŋ ~ kəliŋ (VN) [Dlg.], Sura kəliŋ ~ kələŋ “1. hören, 2. fühlen, verspüren, 3. riechen” [Jng. 1963, 70] = kəliŋ ~ kələŋ “to hear” [Hfm.] = kiliŋ [kūliŋ] “to hear” [Krf.], Mpn. kələŋ “to hear”, kləŋ “to hear, feel” [Frj. 1991, 31], Kfy. koeloeng [kələŋ] “to hear, understand” [Ntg. 1967, 19] = kələŋ “to hear” [Hfm.], Chip kələŋ “kören” [Jng. 1965, 166] = kiliŋ gwe “to hear” [Krf.], Gmy. kellung (so, -ll-) “to hear” [Ftp. 1911, 217] = ḳeleng “to hear, understand” [Srl. 1937, 97] = ḳeləŋ “hören” [Jng. 1962 MS, 8] = ḳelen “to hear” [Hfm.] = ni kiliŋ “to hear” [Krf.] = kələŋ “to hear” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 16] (AS: Stl. 1972, 186; 1987, 213, #639; Hfm. 1975, 24, #202; JI 1994 II, 184; GT 2004, 205). The comparison of Ar. and Som. √m-q-l was first suggested by L. Reinisch (1902, 291), who found a typological parallel for the semantic shift in vulg. Ar. nẓr “hinhorchen” < “sehen”, which, however, in our case may have only taken place in a reverse way.

NB2: The LECu.-AS isogloss has been usually (Dlg. 1967, 5; 1973, 183; Mkr. 1987, 152; OS 1988, 73, §57; Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 5) explained from a biconsonantal root (*sine* *m- treated as a nomen instr. prefix of the primary noun “ear” attested in

Bed.) in comparison with WCh. *k^wal- “слышать” [Stl. 1986, 92; 1987, 213, §639] < AA *k^w-l “слышать” [IS] < Nst. *qewlE > *qüyE “(to h)ear” [Dlg. 1991 MS, #1281], whose Eg. reflex G. Takács (2004, 210, #1281) surmises in GR wḥr “jem. erhören” (Wb I 355, 7). This etymology indirectly indicates, however, a primary *-q̣- (and not *-k-) in AA *m-q̣/k-l, which would exclude the comparison with Ar. mql or Eg. mk3.

mkj “(be)schützen, Schutz sein für (n), (Pferdezucht) *hegen, *pflegen” (OK, Wb II 160; GHWb 370) = “protéger, défendre” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “schützen, ehren, respektvoll behandeln, achten” (ÜKAPT VI 135) = “1. to guard, protect” (FD 119; AEPT 62, utt. 252, n. 1; DLE I 248; Allen 1984, 570) = “schützen, begnaden” (Spiegel 1971, 484) > Dem. mkj “1. schützen, 2. verzärteln” (DG 183; Thissen 1984, 79) = “1. to protect, 2. pamper (one’s limbs)” (Smith 1958, 122; CED 80) > Cpt. (S) ΜΙΚΕ, (F) ΜΙΚΙ “1. to rest (intr.), remain unaffected (?), 2. rest o’self (tr. refl.)”, as noun (m) “rest, fallowness” (CD 161b; CED 80) = “ruhen, (sich) schonen”, (S) as noun (m) “Ruhe, Erholung” (KHW 89).

nb1: Its special NK use in connection with horses (Sphinx stela, Urk. IV 1282, Pap. Anastasi III 6:10) has been rendered “to occupy o’self (with the horses), be careful about” (Hassan, ASAE 37, 1937, 134) = “to take care of” (Pritchard, ANET 244) = “2. look after (horse)” (FD 119) = “pflegen (ein *terminus technicus*, der allgemein das Ausbilden untrainierter Pferde umschreibt)” (Hofmann, GM 56, 1982, 53–56 pace Helck, cf. AEB 36, 1982, #82,281) = “(für einen Pferd) sorgen” (Decker).

nb2: H. S. Smith (l.c.) and J. Černý (CED 80) demonstrated the derivation of the Cpt. reflex from old mkj “(Körperteile) schützen” (NK, Wb II 160, 15) = “to protect (limbs)” (CED), whose tr. mng. “became obsolete during the last centuries of BC”, while “a specialized reflexive use was retained” (Smith), which became in Cpt. intr.

nb3: J. Černý’s (l.c.) comparison with LEg. mqmq “to rest, sleep” and (S) ΜΟΚΗΕΚ (above) is, however, unconvincing. These forms must certainly preserve a distinct root.

- Hence: mk.t “Schutz, bes. Zauberschutz” (OK, Wb II 160–1; GHWb 370) = “amulette” (Beauregard 1892, 182) = “protection, defense” (FD 119; DLE I 248) = “Charisma, die durch göttlichen Beistand bewirkte übernatürliche Begabung eines Menschen” (PT 407d, Spiegel 1971, 453, 484, fn. 75).
- Comes from the AA heritage, cognate to Sem.: Geez māk^wäyā “beschützen, hüten” [Müller] = makk^waya (with different meanings, i.a.) “3. to guard, protect” [Lsl. 1987, 341] ||| NBrb.: perhaps Mzg. mekkēk “être économe, économiser” [Tf. 1991, 415] (via * “to preserve”?) || SBrb.: Hgr. emmek, pl. emmek-en (i.a.) “garde, sauvegarde, fait de prendre soin de, donner sa sauvegarde” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1180] = (i.a.) “nötige Obsorge, Schutzgeleite, Schutz” [Zhl.], EWlm. ə-mmək & Ayr ə-ṁṁək “3. garde, sauvegarde (de Dieu)” [PAM 2003, 533] ||| Bed. mok “shelter”, mokwa (f) “place of shelter”, mauk ~ mok ~

mok^w “to take shelter” [Rpr. 1928, 215] = mok/gwə (f) “shelter from rain” [Hds. 1996, 92] = mok^wa (f) “die gekrümmte Zeltstange” (!) [Munzinger apud Rn. 1895, 167] || LECu.: (?) Afar makko (f) “3. reliability (sureté)”, also “1. the will of God, 2. betrothal” [PH 1985, 161] || NOm.: Haruro *mok-, cf. mōkk-ēs “andare dinanzi a q.u., parare” [CR 1937, 654] | (?) Mocha ma·kko “guarantor of the newly married” [Lsl. 1959, 41] || ECh.: EDng. mòogē “secourir, aller au secours, porter secours, donner la main venir en aide, prêter main forte” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 208] = mòògē “zu Hilfe kommen” [Ebs. 1979, 131; 1987, 86], Bdy. máakāw “porter secours, secourir, sauver”, maakāwò (m), máákiwa (f) “le fait de porter secours”, màkááwò (m, f, pl.) “sauveteur” [AJ 1989, 96].

Already C. F. A. Dillmann (1865, 202) combined Geez mk^wy with Ar. mqw/y, which represents a remotely related AA var. root *m-ḵ “to guard” [GT], cf. Ar. maqā I “garder qqch., veiller sur qqch.”, maqw- ~ maqw-at- ~ muqāw-at- ~ maqy-at- “garde, soins qu’on prend pour conserver qqch.” [BK II 1136–7] = “to watch, guard” [Lsl.] || NAgaw: Bilin mǎy^wǎy^w (γ stands for ḥ) “1. hüten, (be)schützen, 2. sich der Wohlfahrt einer Person warm annehmen, wohlmeinende Vorstellungen machen, Ratschläge erteilen, auf Fehler aufmerksam machen, verweisen, tadeln” [Rn. 1887, 265] = (?) mǎḵ-ǎʔr- “aufpassen, hüten, weiden lassen” [Lmb.] || NOm.: Wlt. mǎč- [-č- < *-ḵ-] “züchten” [Lmb. 1993, 348]. Hence may derive also NAgaw *mǎq[aq]- “herdsman, shepherd” [Apl.]: Bilin meqǎqǎ ~ meqǎqǎ, pl. meqǎq “Hirt” [Rn. 1887, 268] = mǎḥaḥa/miḥáḥa [Apl.], Hamta miqā [Rn.] = meqǎ, pl. meqǎt “pastore” [CR 1905, 222] = mēqǎ [CR/Apl.] = mǎqa/míqa, pl. míq “shepherd” [Apl. 1987, 501], Hamir míqā, pl. míqqe ~ míq “Hirt (bes. über das Hornvieh)” [Rn. 1884, 392] = míqā [CR] (Agaw: Apl. 1991 MS, 7; 2005, 83) || ECh.: Mgm. mággú (m), mággá (f), pl. mággée “berger” [JA 1992, 105].

LIT.: Rn. 1887, 265, 268 (Bilin-Eg.-Ar.); Zhl. 1932–33, 94 (Eg.-Brb.); Müller 1961, 202, #10 (Eg.-Geez); KHW 89 (Eg.-Brb. dubious); Conti 1984, 171–2 (Ebl.-Mari-Geez-Eg.-Brb.); Ehret 1997 MS, 199, #1782 (Eg.-Mocha).

NB1: G. Conti (l.c.) extended the comparison Ebl. ma-gu, ma-[gú] /makū/ and Mari Akk. makū “per designare persone che vengono inviate dagli Yaminitù” [Conti], which seems unlikely and has not been confirmed by other authors.

NB2: W. Vycichl (1983, 110) rejected the Eg.-SBrb. isogloss arguing that the primary meaning of Hgr. e-mmek [Vcl.: < *e-wmek] was “indication, conduite, moyen, sens, signification”, which, however, seems to represent a distinct root (cf. Eg. mk.t “proper place”, above).

NB3: Cf. perhaps also ES *mkt: Tigre & Tna. & Amh. mákkätä “parry with the shield” [Lsl. 1982, 51] > HECu.: Hdy. makkat- “to defend” [Hds. 1989, 48]. Root ext. *-tʔ

NB4: L. Homburger (1930, 283, 303) combined Eg. mkj with Ful maʔ-de “protéger” (sic), while A. M. Lam (1993, 389) with Ful moggu- “protéger, cacher”.

mkj (\approx jtn n h) “(als etwas offizinell Verwendetes)” (Med.: Pap. Ebers 25:16, 26:4, Wb II 162, 6) = “poussière, saleté (de poutre ou de plafond)” (Loret 1894, 94) = “eine Droge” (KHW 89, n. 1) = “Erd-boden, Oberfläche (?) (des Hofes)” (HAM 564)

NB: V. Loret (1894, 93–95, §xiii) declined identifying it with a certain $\text{Cpt. } \Theta\text{HKH, } \bar{\text{FKH}}$ “Anis (Pimpinella Anisum L.)”. Instead, Loret (l.c.; 1904, 230), followed by J. R. Harris (1961, 217), (S) $\text{MH}\Theta\text{EIK}$ (f) \approx Gk. $\kappa\acute{o}\pi\rho\varsigma$ “stercus, fimus” (Loret, Harris) = “Kot, Dung” (KHW 89) (1961, 217) rejected (“wohl kaum”) (KHW 89, fn. 1)

NB2: For its further possible occurrence cf. Frandsen 1979, 295 and AL 79.1930 (ad Janssen 1975, 150).

- Mng. uncertain. Etymology obscure.
- 1. V. Loret (l.c.) derived it from Eg. mk “(re)couvrir”, whereby the lit. sense of mkj “*pourrait être l’enduit qui... recouvre une paroi*”.
- 2. GT: a connection with Akk. mekû “(a medicinal plant)” [CAD m2, 8] is excluded, since Eg. mkj “*ne peut désigner un végétal*” (Loret), the det. of which is suggesting some material (such as sand, mineral, etc., cf. EG 1927, 478, N33).

mkmrt (GW) “(Subst.)” (XXI.² hapax: Pap. BM 10474, i.e., Amenemope, rt. 7:6, Wb II 162, 16) = “Fischernetz” (Spg, OLZ 27, 1929, 185 pace Lange 1925, 47; Quack 1997, 331) = “?” (Helck 1971, 515, #127) = “fishing-nets” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 9, 82; Hoch 1994, 168–9) = “ein Kleidungsstück” (GHWb 371).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-k-ma-rú-tá (Helck, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = mak-ma-rú₂-ta reflecting pl. *makmarōta (Hoch).

NB2: The mng. suggested in GHWb was rejected by J. F. Quack (l.c.), who erroneously maintained Spiegelberg to have first proposed the rendering “fishing-nets” (in fact, this was Lange l.c.).

- Usually explained as a Can. borrowing, cf. Hbr. *mikmeret ~ mikmoret “Netz, Fischergarn (fishing net)”, cf. mikmār ~ *mikmor “eig. Mittel, womit man überwältigt: Netz, aber besser: Gehege mit Gruben, in denen die Gazellen gefangen werden (fishing net, keep-net, used as a snare metaph.)” [GB 422; KB 580] < OHbr. *kmr attested in MHbr. kmr hif. (usually treated as denom.) “Netze ausbreiten” [Levy 1924 II, 346], related to Akk. (jB) kamāru “Fanggarn (des Jägers)” [AHW 430] = “a trap with a snare” [CAD k, 111]. Apparently declined (or perhaps ignored?) by W. Helck (1971, 515, #127: “ohne Ableitung”!).

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Lange 1925, 47; Spg, OLZ 27, 1929, 185; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 9, §1.1.4.1 & 45, §2.2.2.4; Hoch 1994, 168–9, §222; KB 580.

mkr (GW) “eine Pflanze (in Handvoll gemessen)” (NE, GHWb 372).

- Mng. and origin obscure.

NB: Cf. perhaps ES: Geez ʔamekalā “thorn, thistle”, Tna. ʔamekälā “bramble”, Amh. amekälā “bramble” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 24)?

mkr “Art Schiff” (XXII. ritual, Wb II 163, 2) = “kind of boat” (Jones 1988, 140, §44).

- Origin unknown.

NB: R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 24, utt. 396, n. 21), followed by D. Meeks (AL 78.1891) and D. Jones (1988, 169, §77), suggested a connection with CT V 74t mkr.t (or mrk.t?) “(mng. unknown)” (Faulkner, AECT III 203 index) = “partie du navire” (Meeks) = “ein Schiffsteil” (GHWb 371). V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1716), in turn, affiliated it with Akk. magīlu “barque, boat” [OS] = magīlu “eine Barke” [AHW 576] = magillu “a type of boat” [CAD m1, 44] < AA *makil-, which has no real bases.

mkr “als Name eines Schriftzeichens” (LP hapax: Tanis sign pap. 13, Wb II 163, 1) = “nom de signe, qui serait une désignation de la ‘dent du crocodile’” (Griffith 1889, 30 as quoted by Bardinnet) = “extrémité corporelle (ce signe est placé à la fin de la série des parties du corps, cité avec les ailes et autres extrémités corporelles; il ne s’agit probablement pas d’une dent)” (Bardinnet 1990, 4).

NB: The form of the sign resembles to A. H. Gardiner’s (EG 1927, 456 vs. 476) F33 (“tail”) and N21 (“tongue of land”), but neither really fits.

- Th. Bardinnet (1990, 4) assumed LP mkr to be a late form of MK mnkr.t (or *mnkr, q.v.).

NB: Or any connection to ES: Geez ʔamekalā “thorn, thistle” [Lsl.]?

mkrj (GW) “Kaufmann” (XX./XXI. hapax: Onomasticon Golénischeff 3:12, Wb II 163, 3; Helck 1971, 515; WD II 68) = “seller” (Grd. in AEO) = “merchant” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 82; Hoch 1994, 169).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: mak-rú-ʔu (Helck, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey, Hoch). Vocalized by J. Hoch as *mäkiruyu.

NB2: K. Jansen-Winkel (1997, 112–3, n. 3) maintains that the late (XXX.) mqr.t (not GW, house det.) “Magazin (dem Determinativ zufolge eine Gebäude- oder Ortsbezeichnung, ein Verkaufsstand, eine Lagerhalle oder etwas ähnliches)” can be “nur eine Ableitung von dem im NR belegten semitischen Fremdwort mkr ‘Kaufmann’... sein” (rightly rejecting J. Osing’s suggestion to identify it with mqr.t “Augenhöhle” of disputed rendering, cf. Grd. 1957, 50, fn. 2 and the entry for Eg. mqr.t “situla” above), which is unacceptable for several reasons: (1) it is hardly credible that a hapax Sem. loan-word reappears seven centuries (!) later (2) in a fully different new mng. (derivation of a new word is not at all typical with loan-words in Eg.). (3) The late hapax mqr.t can be better explained from late NK mgr.t (GW) “Höhle” (Wb, q.v.), whose spelling mqr.t is also known from the reign of Thotmes III (cf. Hoch 1994, 172, #228).

- Borrowed from Sem., cf. esp. Akk. makāru “im Handel einsetzen”, makkārum (OAss.) ~ mäkiru (YBab.) “Händler” [AHW 588] || Ug. mkr N “to be sold”, mkr-m (pl.) “merchants, commercial agents,

runners” [DUL 543–4], Pun. mkr qal “to sell”, mkr “sale of land > the land sold” [DNWSI 625–6], Hbr. mkr qal “to sell” > (?) *makkār “merchant” [KB 581–2], JAram. mkr “eintauschen” [Levy 1924 III, 115] = “kaufen” (!) [Lsl.] | OSA (Sab.) mkr (coll.) “traders” [SD 85] = “merchants” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1969, 19; WUS #1567).

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Wb l.c.; AEO I 95*, §212; Gordon 1955, 288, #1112; Helck 1971, 515, #128; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 38, §2.1.4.2; Hoch 1994, 169, §223; DUL 544.

NB1: J. Hoch’s OT Hbr. mōkēr “vendor” is not attested in the standard lexicons.

NB2: For an eventual (genetic) cognacy between Sem. *mkr and Eg. mt3 see below.

mkrr “zwischen schwarz und weiß als Farbenbezeichnung einer Holzart genannt” (GR, Wb II 163, 5; WD III 57: but cf. SAK 23, 1996, 69, fn. 56) = “eine Farbenbezeichnung” (Goodwin, ZÄS 10, 1872, 107–8) = “brun” (Loret 1893, 127) = “possibly a red colour” (Harris 1961, 227) = “(marque de la succession des tous intermédiaires) entre le noir et le blanc” (Chassinat quoted by Chermette & Goyon) = “(en fait, il s’agit du) bois comme de l’écorce de l’aliboufier, noirs foncées (n’est pas le ‘brun’ de V. Loret)” (Chermette & Goyon 1996, 69, fn. 56).

NB: C. W. Goodwin’s (l.c.) suggestion to derive Cpt. ⲙⲱⲣ from Eg. mkrr was rejected by M. Chermette & J.-C. Goyon (l.c.).

- Presumably derives from AA *m-k-r “red” [GT], cf. Sem. *mkr “to be red” [Mlt. 2005, 88]: Akk. (aA, jB) makrû “rot” [AHW 590] = “red” [CAD m1, 138] | Syr. mkārā, mkārētā “rubrica sinopica, minium” [Brk. 1928, 386] = mkr “schwarz sein” (sic) [Clc.] || Ar. makira I “être rouge”, makara I “4. teindre”, makr-, pl. makūr- “terre rouge avec laquelle on marque en rouge”, mamkūr- “1. marqué de terre rouge, 2. teint du sang de sa proie (lion)”, mumtakir- “marqué de terre rouge” [BK II 1138] = makira I “to be red”, IX “to be red”, makr- “red (noun), red chalk” [Ember] (Sem.: Bulakh 2003, 10–11, §2.1) || SBrb.: perhaps EWlm. & Ayr ta-ṁrək ~ ta-ṁərək “1. marque de propriété faite au fer rouge, 2. fer à marquer, fer rouge” [PAM 1998, 222] || LECu.: (?) Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata dials.) magartū [irreg. -g-] “yellow, green” [Strm. 1987, 362].

A remotely related AA var. root *m-g-l ~ *m-k-l “red, brown” [GT] can also be reconstructed, cf. LECu.: Orm. magāla “copper coloured” (cf. Amh. māgala “dark coloured, of horse”) [Gragg 1982, 273] = maggala [Lsl.], Borana magala “bruno (specie di colore della pelle degli animali)” [Venturino 1973, 102] = magāla “1. greyish-brown, 2. brown (referring to animals)” [Strm. 1995, 206], Borana dial. of Isolo magāla “greyish-brown” [Strm. 1987, 362] | HECu. (from

Orm.?): Sid. magāla “brown, having the colour of coffee, black with white spots” [Gsp. 1983, 218], Burji maggāl-o “brown color” [Sasse 1982, 139], Drs. (Gedeo) magāl-à [Lsl.] (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 195) ||| CCh.: PMusgu *m-k-l “red” [GT]: Musgu mékelē (m), makalái (f) “rot, braun” [Krause apud Müller 1886, 400 & Lks. 1941] = mekelé “rot” [Lks. 1937, 142] = mekele “weiß” [Decorse apud Lks. 1941, 67] = mekele “rouge” [Mch. 1950, 37] = mékélée “rot” [Mukarovsky 1969, 344], Girvidik mékélé (m), mákáláy (f) “rot” [MB 1972 MS, 8], Kaykay mékélé “rot” [Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 26], Puss mekele (m), makalay (f), pl. makalakay “rouge” [Trn. 1991, 104], Mogrum mékélé “rouge” [Trn. 1977, 27] | (?) Masa bakāl [irreg. b- < *m- via *b-?] “rot” [Lks. 1937, 99].

NB1: V. É. Orel & O. V. Stolbova (HSED #1717) were the first to combine Sem. *mkr with LEg. mkr.

NB2: As confirmed to me by K.-G. Prasse (p.c., 6 August 2006), the Tuareg form is not a French loan (not indicated as such in PAM l.c. either) but rather “it should be a genuine Tuareg word, although it seems to be an isolated word with no other words akin to it of the same root”. Cf. alternatively perhaps SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr mākāra, pl. mākāra-t-ān “ocre jaune (sous forme de pierre tendre), poudre de mākāra (sert de fard aux femmes, de remède pour les blessures)” [PAM 1998, 215; 2003, 535]?

NB3: H. Stroemer (1987, 362) combined Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata) magartū with Wellega Orm. marga “grass”, but the Borana word for “grass” is marra.

NB4: H. G. Mukarovsky (1969, 344), in turn, derived Musgu ṽm-k-l from *-KÉLÉ (sic), which he equated with NOM.: Mocha čéll-o “red”. Untenable.

NB5: For AA *m-k-r ~ *m-k-l see also Eg. m3t above.

NB6: A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 88) assumed a prefix *mV- in both Sem. *mkr and Eg. mkr, which he eventually affiliated with Ar. karik- “rouge” [BK II 888] and Eg. tr [reg. < *kr] “das Rote” (OK, Wb V 386).

NB7: There are also some outdated and false etymologies for Eg. mkr. L. Reinisch (1873, 245): ~ Teda taheh “schwarz”, Eg. t3-mri < *mereg (sic!) “Ägypten”, Cpt. HCP. Absurd. G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 209) too compared it with Cpt. HCP and NBRB.: Qbl. berrih “schwarz” and even Bsq. bel(t)z ~ belch ~ baltz “schwarz”.

mkĥ3 “Hinterkopf” (MK, Wb II 163, 6) = “occiput” (Ceugney 1880, 9) = “Nacken” (Sethe 1923, 191) = “back of the head” (FD 119; DLE I 249; PL 472 but cf. Meeks 1999, 581) = “nuque” (Massart 1959, 234, §38; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 161) = “Hinterkopf, Genick” (GHWb 372) = back of the head and neck (i.e. occiput and nape)” (Walker 1996, 270) > mqĥ.t (with art. p3, act. mqĥ) “Teil des Kopfes” (Lit. LP, Wb II 159, 8) > Dem. mqĥ “Nacken” (DG 183:2) > Cpt. (S) MAK2, (A) MEK2 (m) “neck (of man, beast)” (CD 162b; CED 80) = “Hals, Nacken” (Till 1955, 328, §26) = “nuque, cou” (DELIC 110).

NB1: Vocalized as *mēkĥe? (Sethe) = *mikĥ3 (Fecht) = *mikĥ3 (Vrg.) = *mikĥi3/*mikĥu3 (Vcl.).

NB2: The var. mqĥ3 is attested as early as CT VI 124e (M35C, M36C), cf. AECT II 154, spell 531, n. 8 (where it is treated as an “abnormal spelling”); DCT 187. So also in Pap. Boulaq 3, 4, 15 (Caminos 1954 LEM, 325).

- Origin highly debated.
- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 9) erroneously saw in it the m- prefix form of LEg. qḥ (head det.), which is in fact a fully distinct lexeme (cf. Wb V 66, 12–13) whose head det. is due to a mere association to the phon. value ḥ3. H. Smith (1979, 161) explained both mkḥ3 and mḥ3 as m- prefix derivatives of Eg. ḥ3 “back of head” (Wb III 8, 5–11). Also W. Vycichl (DELIC 110) assumed a prefix m- but left the simplex unmentioned.
- **2.** K. Sethe (followed by a number of authors) analyzed it as a compound of Eg. mkj “to protect” + ḥ3 “occiput”, literally “Schützer des Hinterkopfes” (Sethe) = “protecteur de l’occiput” (Vrg.) = “protecteur de l’arrière (de la tête)” or “protection de l’occiput” (Vcl.). G. Fecht rendered the first part *mīk- > (S) MΔK- as a participle, which would, however, require an impf. *mkk in the MK.
Lrr.: Sethe 1923, 191; Thausing 1941, 13; Fecht 1960, §261; Westendorf 1962, 43, fn. 2; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 161; Vcl. 1990, 230, §11; 1990, 247, nr. (6).
- **3.** W. Westendorf (1962, 43, §68) surmised in it an extended var. of Eg. mḥ3 with “Zusatz von k (?)” (!) wondering “*ob es sich um einen Übergangslaut handelt, der nicht als b oder p, sondern wegen des folgenden... ḥ als palatater Verschlusslaut realisiert wurde*”, although he was only disturbed by the “*Schwierigkeit... , daß die betr. Konsonanten nicht aneinander stoßen, sondern durch den Tonvokal getrennt sind*”.
- **4.** Others assumed a compound of two juxtaposed synonymous terms, where ḥ3 denotes “occiput”, while the first component might be compared with Bed. mōk ~ máge (f) “Hals” [Almkvist 1885, 48 apud Rn. 1895, 164] = mōk ~ máka, pl. mōka “Hals, Nacken” [Rn. 1895, 167] = mok, pl. moka (f) “front external part of neck”, m’áge (m) “neck, nape of neck” [Rpr. 1928, 214–5] = m’aggi (m) “neck”, mōk (f) “front part of the neck” [Hds. 1996 MS, 90, 92], cf. Bed. toʔ-mok “der Nackenpreis der Frau” [Munzinger], Bisharin mā̄k, pl. máge “neck” [Zbr. 1976, 20/130] (Bed.: Rn. 1895, 167; Zbr. 1978, 371), which is probably cognate also with EBrb.: Siwa ta-migâ “neck” [Quibell 1918, 103] = ta-məḡa “cou” [Lst. 1931, 218]. The Bed.-Siwa isogloss may have further AA equivalents denoting some back and/or lower part of the trunk of body, cf. Ar. makw-at- “cul, derrière” [BK II 1140] ||| Bed. mīk^wa (m) “femur, humerus, tibia (anat.)” [Rpr. 1928, 216] || NAgaw: Bilin māk^wá, pl. mākuk “Steiß, Podex” [Rn. 1887, 267] = mək^wa, pl. mək^wək^w “buttocks” [Lmb. 1988, 93, §115; LT 1997, 510] = māk^wa “backside, anus” [Apl.] || ECu.: Afar makuḥ ~ mukoh ~ mukuh “spine, spinal cord” [PH 1985,

162], Boni-Bireeri múkkə (f) “anus” [Heine], Boni-Badde mukka “buttocks” [Heine], and Boni-Jara múkkə (f) “buttocks” [Heine 1982, 91], (?) Rnd. mókkolo “1. (bones of) the lower spine, 2. small of the back” [PG 1999, 227] | Yaaku muk “lower side or part of body” [Ehret/Blz.] (Cu.: Apl. 1995 MS, 7).

LT.: Rn. 1895, 167 (Eg.-Bed.); Behnk 1928, 139, #32 (Eg.-Bed.); Zh. 1932–33, 168 (Eg.-Bed.); Blažek 1987, 159 (Eg.-Bed.); 1994 MS Bed., 26; 2000, 185–6, §21; 2000 MS, 5, §21 (Bed.-Agaw-ECu.-Eg.).

AR: V. Blažek (1987, 159; 2000, 185–6, §21; 2000 MS, 5, §21) affiliated the underlying AA *muk- “1. neck, 2. back” with remote Nst. parallels like Drv. *mak(k)- “neck” [DED #4622], Ur. *muka “back” [Sammallahti], Alt.: Korean mok “neck, throat”, and Pamir Iranian: Shugni & Wakhi māk, Sarikoli mok & Ishkashim mak “back of the neck, nape” [Morgenstierne].

NB1: M. Lamberti (1988, 93, §115) combined the Bilin word with LECu.: Som.-Jiddu gōmā “vagina” (via met.), which is rather unconvincing because of the significant semantic change and the met. at a time.

NB2: The origin of SAgaw: Awngi māqí “spalla, schiena” [CR 1905, 168] = māck (so, -ck) “spalla” [Waldmyer/CR] = maq “shoulder” [Hetzron 1978, 140] is not yet clear.

NB3: W. Vycichl (1983, 110) *ex cathedra* rejected the Eg.-Bed. comparison arguing that the morpheme boundary in Eg. was m-kĥ3 (although he failed to mention any evidence in favour of *kĥ3), while he arbitrarily derived Bed. mōk from a trilateral *mākeC₃, pl. mak < *makC₃ew (although he failed to list parallels for this pattern). Therefore, the objection of Vycichl can hardly be accepted. The Eg.-Cu. comparison may still be correct and one may explain Eg. -ĥ3 two ways: (1) either identical with Eg. ĥ3 “Hinterkopf” (PT, Wb III 8) = “occiput, back of ear” (FD 161) and thus the proper Eg. correspondence of the Cu. cognates would be only mk-. (2) In Afar makuĥ ~ mukoh ~ mukuh, the final -ĥ probably represents the common AA nominal class marker occurring in anatomical terms (Takács 1997). If Afar -ĥ is identical with the -ĥ- of Eg. mkĥ3, we have to suppose an original Eg. *mkĥ, which was only later extended to mkĥ3 due to a popular etymology influenced by Eg. ĥ3 as supposed already by W. Westendorf (1962, 43, fn. 2).

- 5. L. Reinisch (1873, 245) linked it to Eg. mĥ^oq (!) and bgz “Hals” (!) and even Teda taī, dubu “Nacken, Hals”, which is absurd.
- 6. G. von der Gabelentz (1894, 158–9) compared it with Bsq. gibel “Rücken”. Equally false.

mkĥ3 “vernachlässigen, sich nicht kümmern um” (XVIII., Wb II 163, 7–12) = “to disregard” (Grd. 1910, 94, n. i) = “to turn the head” (Alb.) = “être négligent” (Posener 1950, 297) = “to ignore, eschew (evil), be neglectful of (hr)” (FD 119) = “se détourner, négliger” (AL 77.1911: cf. Zivie 1976, 85, n. hhh ad l. 21) = “verabscheuen, sich enthalten, vermeiden” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 30, 38) = “1. vernachlässigen, sich nicht kümmern um, sich abwenden von (hr, n, r), meiden, 2. verabscheuen” (GHWb 372; ÄWb I 573: 1x in 1st IMP, ÄWb II 1152: 1x XII./XIII.). Cf. also mqĥ “beseitigen” (late NK: Pap. Sallier I rt. 8:10, Wb II 159, 9) = “to neglect, forsake” (Camino 1954 LEM, 325).

NB1: A. H. Gardiner (1955, 2) found the rendering “vernachlässigen” (Wb) as “*surely not strong enough*”.

NB2: It has nothing in common with Cpt. (S) $\text{H}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{K}\text{2}$ “affligere” (in fact, < Dem. mqh , above) as suggested by G. Maspero (1903, 176).

- **1.** Usually conceived as a denom. verb of Eg. $\text{mkh}\text{3}$ “back of the head” (Grd., above), lit. “(eigtl.) den Hinterkopf zuwenden” (Wb) = “to turn the back upon/to” (Grd., FD, DLE).
LIT.: Grd. 1910, 94, n. i; Wb l.c.; Caminos 1954 LEM, 325; Grd. 1955, 2; FD l.c.; Fischer-Elfert 1986, 38.
- **2.** W. F. Albright (1927, 218) and F. von Calice (1936, #641) equated it with Ar. $\text{kama}\text{ḥa}$ “tírer à soi avec la bride (la tête du cheval)” & $\text{kama}\text{ḥa}$ “1. id., 2. dresser le nez, le porter au vent” [BK II 928–9] = “to raise a horse’s head with the bridle” [Alb.] = “den Kopf des Pferdes mit dem Zügel hochziehen” [Clc.], Geez (ta) $\text{makk}\text{əḥa}$ “to praise o’self, glorify o’self, boast, brag, puff up, be honored” [Lsl.], Tigre (tə) $\text{mäkk}\text{əḥa}$ “to brag” [LH 132] etc. (ES: Lsl. 1982, 51; 1987, 339), which Albright explained from the basic sense *”to have one’s head turned”. Semantically unconvincing. In addition, Eg. $-\text{ḥ}- \neq$ Ar. $-\text{ḥ}-$. Rightly rejected by W. Vycichl (DELIC 110), although merely because he supposed a prefix $m-$ in Eg. $\text{mkh}\text{3}$ (\neq Sem. $*\text{kmh}$).
NB: Calice even supposed Eg. $\text{mkh}\text{3}$ to represent “*vielleicht... ein Lehnwort (!)*” that “*durch Volksetymologie an äg.: ḥ3 ‘Hinterkopf’ angeglichen worden [ist]*”. A borrowing (Eg. < Sem.) can be here safely excluded.
- **3.** GT: if the Eg. root was $*\text{mkh}$ (whose wtg. was influenced by $\text{mkh}\text{3}$ “back of the head” as supposed by Calice), a noteworthy parallel emerges in Akk. (O/YBab.) $\text{mek}\text{û} \sim \text{mak}\text{û}$ “vernachlässigen, nachlässig sein”, (OBab.) $\text{mēk}\text{ûm}$ “inaktiver Mann”, (OBab.) $\text{temk}\text{ûm}$ “Vernachlässigung”, (Y/LBab.) $\text{mik}\text{ītu}$ “Versäumnis (?)” [AHW 643, 651, 1346] = $\text{mek}\text{û} \sim \text{mak}\text{û}$ “to be negligent, neglect a task, disregard sg.” [CAD m2, 8].

mks “1. Art Szepter, auch als Beigabe für den Toten, 2. als Symbol der Königsherrschaft” (PT, Wb II 163, 13; Spg, ZÄS 53, 1917, 101; WD II 68 & III 57 with lit.) = “Schutzhülle (das Futteral) mit der Bestallungsurkunde (welche Horus als Erben des Geb zu seinem Nachfolger auf Erden machte), Testament, aber genau genommen der Behälter, in dem das Schriftstück aufbewahrt ist, Futteral des Testaments, demnach Symbol des göttlichen Königtums” (Spg. 1917, 101–4) = “un genre de sceptre spécial, sorte de bâton long coupé en son milieu par une pièce en forme de cône tronqué, une insigne exclusivement royal, instrument cultuel” (Jéquier 1921, 150–1) = “Teil des nḥb.t -Szepters, neben $\text{ḥb}\text{3}$ ” (ÜKAPT VI 135) = “(urspr.)

eine besonderer, breitblättriger Speer, speerähnliche Waffe” (Helck 1954, 983) = “1. a sceptre, 2. container for documents” (FD 120) = “das kleine Szepter (früher nms genannt), wird vor allem vom König mit der ‘Geißel’ zusammen beim Hebsed-Lauf verwendet” (Stachelin 1966, 162, §d & fn. 3 with lit.) = “ein Stab, den allein der König trägt (keine Entsprechung bei Götterdarstellungen)” (Hassan 1976, 178) = “ein kurzer, walzenförmiger Gegenstand mit schwalbenschwanzartigen Enden, mit Binden umwickelt, deren Farbe als gelb mit roter Zeichnung angegeben wird (darf nicht mit einem mks genannten Zeppter verwechselt werden), in enger Verbindung mit dem Königskult, darf ganz allgemein als heiliger Gegenstand gelten, ein Herrschaftselement, sicher seit Spätzeit, wahrscheinlich aber schon früher eine Art Futteral für ein Dokument verstanden worden, das dem König die Herrschaftsberechtigung über Ägypten bestätigt” (Barta, LÄ IV 20–21) = “Zeppter des Königs (seit Dewen und Adjib), ein langer, oben spitzer Stock zum Erstechen der Feinde... (beim Halten ruht die Faust des Königs über einer napfförmigen Verdickung in der Mitte; beim Kampf mit dem mks packt er es mit beiden Händen vor der Verdickung)” (Kaplony, LÄ VI 1375) = “2. eine Hülle für ein Dokument das die legitime Herrschaftsübernahme des Königs anerkennt und so zum Herrschaftssymbol wird” (Goebs 1995, 156) = “1. mks-Szepter, 2. mks-Symbol (kurzer walzenförmiger Gegenstand, später eine Art Futteral für Dokument)” (GHWb 372) = “2. document holder, symbol of kingship, an object, possibly circular in section, made of some soft material (known from Djoser’s time), thought to be a container in which the titulary or a list of the possessions of the king was kept written on a papyrus or leather roll” (PL 473) > Dem. m(w)ks “ein Behälter oder Futteral, in dem das Protokoll (nḥb.t) erhalten ist, also etwa ein Papyrusblatt, auf dem die Herrschaftstitel, das Königsprotokoll, verzeichnet waren (also ein Herrschaftssymbol in der Hand der Götter)” (Spg. 1917, 101).

NB1: Following H. Kees, W. Spiegelberg (1917, 102 & 103, fn. 3) maintains that the mng. “Behälter” in fact “mit dem ‘Schattenstab’ der Statuen nichts zu tun hat”, i.e., “von unserem m(j)ks-Futteral ist... das Zeppter mks... zu trennen”.

NB2: Its combination with Cpt. (scalae) *ḥꜣḥꜣ* “Muscheln” (suggested by H. Brugsch in his Wb VI 574) was doubted by W. Spiegelberg (1917, 101, §6 & 103), since it has “*gewiß keine zureichende Begründung*” and so this “*läßt man besser ganz beiseite, da es nur durch Kircher belegt ist... Sollte es wirklich existieren, so würde sich die die Perle umschließende Muschel gut mit dem Begriff des schützenden Futterals zusammenstellen lassen*”.

- Etymology debated. Most attractive seems the 2nd possibility.
- 1. C. Ceugney (1880, 9) and G. Jéquier (1921, 150–1; 1921, 176) explained it from Eg. *kz* “se coucher” (Ceugney) = “courber,

s'incliner" (Jéquier), since "*un sceptre est un objet devant lequel doivent s'incliner ou même se prosterner les sujets du Pharaon*" Jéquier prep. (not prefix!) m lit. "pour courber (les têtes, devant lequel les hommes s'inclinent avec respect" (sic)

- **2.** W. Spiegelberg (1917, 103), K. Sethe (1928, 130; ÜKAPT I 2), J. Osing (NBÄ 872), and W. Barta (LÄ IV 20–21) as well as K. Goebis (1995, 156) and P. Wilson (PL 473) saw in Eg. mks a derivation extended by the *Ableitungssuffix* -s occurring in the names of other royal insignia (on the analogy of Eg. 3m-s, j3q-s, šm^c-s, mh^w-s, mth^s-s, hr-s, hq3-s, ht-s, on which cf. also Sethe quoted in Spg. 1917, 103, fn. 2 and Fecht, SAK 1, 1974, 179f.). Barta and Osing identified the root with Eg. mkj "to protect" (above), which could be compared with Geez makk^waya (var. mak^wasa) "3. to guard, protect one another" [Lsl. 1987, 341]. Eg. mks might have thus literally denoted "Schutzhülle (für den Papyrus), die zu einem Abzeichen königlicher Würde geworden ist" (Spg., Barta).
- **3.** GT: a connection (via met.) with Ar. masaka I "1. mettre la main sur, saisir, 2. tenir beaucoup, avoir de la capacité (se dit d'une outre, etc.)", masika "se contenir, se maîtriser" [BK II 1105] = I "prendre (une chose avec soi), arrêter, emprisonner, se maintenir" [Dozy II 591] = IV "1. garder son mari, 2. (pass.) être empêché de", V & VI "garder en sa possession, rester détenteur de" [Fagnan 1923, 164] (via met.) is less likely.

mktr ~ mgdr ~ mkdr (GW) "Befestigungsturm" (since XVIII., Wb II 164, 2) = "fortress" (Grd., AEO) = "Befestigung" (Helck, Knauf) = "tour, forteresse" (Vcl.) = "tower, lookout, stronghold, fort" (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 83) = "tower" (Hoch) > Dem. mktr "Turm" (DG 183:9; Vittmann 1996, 439 with exx. & lit.) = "fortification tower" (CED) > Cpt. (S) ΜΕΓΤΩΛ, ΜΕΓΤΟΛ, ΜΕΧΤΩΛ, ΜΙΚΤΩΛ, (B) ΜΙΧΤΟΛ, ΜΙΧΤΩΛ, ΜΕΨΤΩΛ, (F) ΜΙΚΤΑΛΛ, ΜΙΧΤΟΛ (m) "tower" (CD 214b; CED 102) = "Turm, Burg" (KHW 114) = "1. tour, 2. forteresse" (DELC 132),

NB: Vocalized as *magdāla (Hoch). Reflected in Amarna cuneiform ^{um}ma-ag-da-li (i-na mi-iš-ri) (EA 185:34, 185:29). J. Hoch (1994, 170, fn. 207) quotes a certain Akk. ^{um}mad-gal-te (supposed to display met.). The LEg. word appears also in Gk. μάγδαλος (Herodot II 159) "tour de guet" [Fournet 1989, 70, §9] = "Name einer Stadt in Ägypten" [Vcl. 2005, 4–5].

- Borrowed from Can., cf. Ug. mgdl "tower" [Gordon 1955, 250, #392] = "Turm" [WUS #632] = "tower, watchtower" [DUL 530], Hbr. migdāl "1. Turm, von Festungstürmen, Kastellen, 2. hölzernes Gerüst,

Rednerbühne” [GB 396] = “1. tower, 2. wooden-framed tower” [KB 543–4] = “tour de forteresse, estrade en bois, armoire, tour de garde d’un vignoble” [Fournet], cf. Hbr. *migdol* “n.pr. einer oder mehrerer äg. Städte” [GB 396] = “one or more places in Egypt” [KB 544] = “ägyptischer Ort auf der Sinaihalbinsel (Ezechiel 29:10), Station beim Auszug aus Ägypten (Exodus 14:2)” [Vcl. 2005, 5], Phn. *mgdl* “tower” [Harris 1936, 93], OSA (Mdb.) *mgdl*-(nhn) “tour” [Arbach 1993, 40: not attested in other OSA lgs.], Ar. *mīgdal*- “château” [BK I 266] = “a palace or pavilion strongly constructed” [Lane 392] = “tour (sur une hauteur), tour à feu, signal, château fort” [Blachère 1367].

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Burchardt 1910 II, #528; Spg. KHW 72; AEO II 214*, §450; Caminos 1954 LEM, 258; Helck 1971, 515, #129; Lpr. 1977, 133; KHW 114; Knauf 1982, 34; DELC 132; Vcl. 1990, 84, §11; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 14, §1.2.1.4 & 34, §2.1.3.2.1; Hoch 1994, 169–170, §224.

NB1: The Hbr. form with -āl reflects a more recent Hbr. layer, while that with -ol stands closer to an old Can. stage (Bauer & Leander 1922, 18; DELC 132). The Ar. parallel with *mi-* (normally only in *nomina instr.*) is supposed to have been borrowed from Can. The Can. word has been traditionally explained from Can. **gd*l “big, etc.” (GB 396; Harris 1936, 93; Gordon 1955, 250, #392; WUS #632; KB 543 etc.), but D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 14) suggest a derivation from a hypothetic Sem. **dgl* “to watch” (with met.), which is rather unlikely.

NB2: W. Vycichl (2005, 4–5) supposed the corresponding Punic word (**magdōl*) to have passed into Berber (**a-magdūl*), cf. TN Amegdul “eine Festungsrueine auf einem Felsen des Götzen-Plateaus im Gebiet von Ghadames”.

mk̄t.t (GW) “*eine Kleidungsstück” (XX. hapax: RAD 20:8, GHWb 372) = “garment, covering” (Hoch) = “eine Gewandbezeichnung” (Quack).

- J. Hoch (1994, 341, §505) discussed it s.v. *kt̄t* (GW) not considering *m-* as part of the word, whose root he identified with Sem. **ksw*. J. F. Quack (1996, 512) singled out the RAD 20:8 ex. from the group of LEg. *kt̄t* forms “wegen des *m-* Präfixes”.

mg3 (Lit. MK) ~ later **mgj** (LP) “traurig” (Lit. MK, Wb II 164, 17) = “Niedergeschlagenheit” (Wst. in LÄ VI 744, cf. VII 468 index).

NB: P. Seibert (1967, 186, n. h & p. 196) and D. Meeks (AL 77.1914) firmly disproved the existence of this gloss. In the Nile hymn VIIa (Pap. Sallier II 13:1), they regard *mg3*.(t) as a corruption of *m g3w* “in Mangel” (Seibert) = “à l’état de manque, nécessaires” (Meeks). Also J. Assmann (LÄ IV 495, n. 42) rendered **mg3*.t “traurig” as *lectio faciliōr* for *m-g3w* “in Not”. The form *mgj* in the stela of famine (l. 3), in the view of D. Meeks, “en dépit de la graphie, pourrait être compris exactement de la même façon”, although P. Seibert saw in it rather “eine abwegige Schreibung von *b3gj*”, while P. Barguet (BdE 24, 15) accepted Wb’s *mg3* “traurig”. In Pap. Anastasi VII rt. 3:8, in turn, D. Meeks (AL 77.1914–5) assumes *mg3*.t to represent “*sûrement un subst., ‘planche du blanchisseur’...*”.

- Supposed to be merely a ghost-word. Therefore, it can have hardly any connection with AA *m-r-g “confused, sad” [GT] (via met.).
NB1: Attested in Sem.: (?) Ar. mariġa “3. être en désarroi, se déranger, se désorganiser (se dit des affaires politiques d’une communauté ou de sa religion qui se corrompt)” [BK II 1087] = “turbatus et confusus fuit” [Rn.] ||| NBrb.: Mzg. a-mareg, pl. i-murag “douleur, mal d’amour” [Abès 1916, 110] = a-marg/y, pl. i-murag/y “1. amour, 2. chagrin d’amour, 3. mélancolie, 4. tristesse, 5. nostalgie, désir de voir ses parents” [Tf. 1991, 430] ||| LECu.: Som. múrug “Verwirrung, Bestürzung, Trauer”, caus. murg-ī ~ murug-ay “in Verwirrung, Bestürzung, Trauer versetzen” [Rn. 1902, 301] = murug-on-ayya “to become sad” [Abr. 1964, 183] = murug “resentment (Ärger)” [Farah & Heck 1993, 251].
NB2: The resemblance of Eg. mgj (Stela of Famine, < old b3gj) to CCh.: Masa māgīyā “fatigue” [Jng. 1973 MS] = mak “(se) fatiguer” [Ctc. 1983, 105] may be accidental.

mg3 or **mg** (fire det.) “eine offizinelle Pflanze” (Med. hapax: Pap. Hearst 11:14–15, Wb II 164, 5) = “eine unbekannte Pflanze” (WÄDN 292) = “eine Pflanze” (GHWb 372).

NB: Its fire det. might be perhaps due to an association with L Eg. mq^or “oven” (Hafemann p.c., 19 May 2000)

- Mng. uncertain. Any etymology would be premature. Not clear whether any of the following data might be relevant.
- **1.** GT: Eg. mg3 < *mgl? Cf. SCu. *mag^wale “sorghum” [Ehret]: Iraqw mangwarē “red sorghum” | Ma’a magalé “maize” (SCu.: Ehret 1974, 64; 1980, 155) ||| CCh.: Mada mágálá “plante à fleurs mauves pour haie, à tiges creuses (vertes en saison sèche)” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 179].
- **2.** GT: if Eg. mg3 was from *mgr, cf. perhaps ES (from Cu./Orm.): Harari migir “kind of grass serving to make baskets” [Lsl. 1963, 104] ||| LECu.: Orm. migira “kind of tough grass”, cf. marga “grass” [Gragg 1982, 280, 285], Borana mogorrē “grass with small thorns” [Strm. 1995, 210] | HECu.: Hdy. migira “grass for basket-work” [Hds. 1989, 294]
NB: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED 383, #1767) equated ECu. *migir- with SCu.: PWRift *mi/a-gir-mo “firewood” [GT pace Wtl. 1958, 23, #41], which is probably incorrect, cf. ECu. *gīr- “fire” [Sasse 1982, 110] = *gir- “1. fire, 2. to burn” [Dlg.] etc. (Cu.: Dlg. 1973, 202–3; 1983, 131). The highly interesting fire det. of Eg. mg3 is presumably irrelevant.
- **3.** GT: alternatively, if it was a GW for *mg, cf. perhaps Emar maggu (Sum. ú-teme) vs. Akk. mangu [< *maggu?] “alkaline plant (probably dry stalks which are lying on its side)” [Sjöberg 1998, 257, §244 & fn. 37] ||| NBrb.: Wrg. ti-məgg-ət “plante du désert, sorte de camomille, cotule” (≈ Ar. garṭufa) [Dlh. 1987, 186] ||| LECu.: Saho-Assaorta mogōg “ricino, sp. dia pianta” [CR 1913, 70]?

mg3 or **mg** (child det.) “junger Krieger” (XVIII., Wb II 164, 6) = “palefrenier ou vétéran” (!) (Pierret quoted by Ceugney 1880, 8) = “skirmisher (or the like)” (Caminos 1954, LEM 53; FD 120; DLE I 250) = “Melder (?)” (Brunner, LÄ I 444) = “Bez. für junge nubische Krieger” (Helck, LÄ III 1133, n. 2) = “wohl (Teil der) Polizei (erscheinen einmal als nubische Krieger)” (LÄ IV 134, n. 38) = “ritterlicher Einzelkämpfer nubischen Ursprungs” (Kaplony, LÄ V 271) = “Zweikämpfer” (LÄ VII 468 index) = “eine bestimmte Form von Kriegerern (oft im Zusammenhang mit nubischen Kriegerern): Kriegermann als Bezeichnung insbesondere fremder Soldaten” (Kottsieper 1988, 130, 133 & fn. 34 with exx.) = “*Kämpfer (im Gefecht, nubischer Krieger, auch als Melder)” (GHWb 372) = “a Nubian soldier or skirmisher” (PL 473) = “junger Krieger, Kämpfer” (Junge 1999, 352).

NB: Proper root uncertain: mg or mg3 (Wb) = mg3 or mg or mgi (GHWb).

- Etymology disputed. Most attractive appears #5 (while #6 is not to be ruled out either).
- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 8) derived Eg. mg3 “palefrenier” vs. (!) “vétéran” from two diverse (and false) etymons, namely Eg. gw “taureau” vs. (!) g3 “fléchir”. Absurd.
- **2.** L. Reinisch (1887, 268) arbitrarily rendered it “Hirt” and compared with NAgaw: Bilin meqáqā “Hirt”. False.
- **3.** A number of authors (Gunn & Gardiner, JEA 5, 1918, 50, fn. 6; Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 143–4; Caminos 1954 LEM, 53; Vandersleyen 1971, 28, 80 & n. 5; Kaplony, LÄ V 271) surmised in it a Nubian word (cf. Urk. IV 6:5, 1593:4, 1660:13), albeit they were unable to identify it in the lexical stock of the Nubian languages.
- **4.** W. Helck (LÄ III 1133, n. 2) and P. Wilson (PL 473) assumed an etymological connection with Eg. “Bez. für ein Krokodil (als Sohn des Seth oder Seth selbst)” (NK, Wb, below).
- **5.** I. Kottsieper (1988, 125–133), followed by J. F. Quack (1996, 512), treated it as a Sem. loan borrowed from a certain Can. *m_{gg} “Krieg führen, kämpfen, belagern, angreifen” [Kottsieper], cf. Amarna Akk. māga (or magga) (EA 362) combined by Kottsieper with Akk. muggu “ein militärischer Terminus technicus: Kampftruppe, stehendes Heer, Garnison” [Kottsieper] occurring in NAss. & SBab. rab mu(n)gi “ein hoher Beamter” [AHW 667b] = “a high military official” [CAD m2, 171a] = “Garnisonschef” [Kottsieper] = “title for officials and officers” [KB] > Hbr. rab-māg “title of a high Babylonian officer” [KB 543], cf. also Off. Aram. mg “garrison” [DNWSI 592: rdg. highly uncertain] = rb-mg ≈ Gk. στρατηγός [KB]. Trying to localize the

common source of these terms, Kottsieper regarded the “*südsyrische-libanesischer Raum als Herkunftsgebiet dieses Begriffes*”.

- **6.** GT (cf. also Takács 2004, 207, #962): on the other hand, if it comes from the original sense “young man” (especially emphasized by its child det. as well as in Pap. Anastasi II 7:4 & V 10:6), we might assume a (phonologically irregular?) relationship with AA *mak^w/g- “young man” [Blz. 1992, 156, #43].

NB1: Reconstructed by V. Blažek (l.c.) from Ārb. and WCh., cf. also NAgaw: Qwara māḳ^wat & Dembea mekut “Jüngling” [Rn.] ||| SOm.: Hamer māku “young or sg. to do with animal birth (inferred from ‘cow bore calf’)” [Flm. 1990 MS, 9].

NB2: Cf. also (as remotely related root var.?) AA *m-k “small” [GT] > NBrb.: Mzg. i-miq “peu, un peu de (indique surtout la quantité)” [Tf. 1991, 425] ||| LECu.: Orm. muč-ā [-č- reg. < *-k-/*-d₁-] (m) “child” [Gragg 1982, 292] ||| NOm.: Shinasha muḳa “small” [Bnd. 1971, 259, #74] = muḳḳā “klein”, muḳḳā “wenige”, muḳ-iš- “1. vermindern, 2. verkleinern” [Lmb. 1993, 351], Shinasha-Dangur muḳa “small” [Flm. 1990, 28].

NB3: V. Blažek (1992, 156, #43; 2000 MS, 7–8, §42) affiliated AA *mak^w/g- “young man (woman)” [Blz.] with Drv. *maka “child” [DED #4616], IE *megh- “young (wo)man” [Blz.] vs. Celtic *mak(k)- “son” [IEW 696], Ur.: Mansi moki ~ mokh “child, descendant” [Munkácsi quoted by Blz.]. Cf. also Nst. *mahk/ga “child” vs. *maḳU “baby, child” [Dlğ. 1991 MS, #962a vs. #969].

mg3 (or **mg?**) “Bez. für ein Krokodil (als Sohn des Seth oder Seth selbst)” (NK, Wb II 164, 8–9; WD II 68 & III 57 with new lit.) = “1. le crocodile, 2. le mal” (Ceugney) = “1. eig. Das Böse, 2. (dann) das Krokodil als Symbol des Bösen” (Karlberg 1912, 25) = “démon crocodile, identifié à Seth” (AL 78.1894 with lit.) = “Bezeichnung des Krokodils als Sohn des Seth (unter diesem Namen erscheint Seth als Krokodil besonders in den Darstellungen des Speerens des Krokodils durch den König in Edfu)” (Helck, LÄ III 1133) = “Seth as dreaded crocodile” (Borghouts 1980, 36, fn. 19 with lit.) = “e. Krokodil (als Sohn des Seth oder Seth selbst)” (GHWb 372) = “1. (NK) a term for the crocodile as the son of Seth, 2. (LP) (applied to) Seth (as crocodile), 3. (GR) a general word for Seth (used for magic effectiveness referring to him as a crocodile, hippopotamus or ‘foe’ in general)” (PL 472–3) = “crocodile Mag (Moga), the son of Seth” (Kákósy & Moussa 1998, 157, n. F).

NB: Proper root disputed: mg3 (Wb, Ceugney, Helck, GHWb, WD) vs. mg (Karlberg, PL).

- No certain etymology.
- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 8) derived it (with m- prefix) from Eg. g3w “(be)eng(t) sein” (OK, Wb V 151). Semantically unconvincing.
- **2.** W. Helck (LÄ III 1133, n. 2) and P. Wilson (PL 473) affiliated it with Eg. mg3 (XVIII., Wb II 164, 7–8, above) = “a Nubian soldier or skirmisher” (PL) regarded by R. Caminos (1954 LEM, 53) and

others to be a Nubian word (although they failed to identify it in the Nub. lexicon).

■ **3.** GT: its relationship with the isolated CCh.: Muktele múg-lāwàriyáw “crocodile” [Rsg. 1978, 231, #167: isolated in MM] = máglā-wàriyáù [JI 1994 II, 95] is very unlikely.

■ **4.** GT: if it was GW for old *mg, cp. perhaps AA *m-w-g ~ *m-g-w “плохой” [IS] = *m-g “bad” [GT].

nb1: Attested in Sem.: (?) Ar. maʔg- “trouble, agitation” [BK II 1052] ||| Bed. *mig (rad. inus.) “schlecht, böse sein”, māg “schlecht, böse werden”, a-māg “schlecht” [Rn. 1895, 18, 163; Zbr. 1974, 81] = ámāg “bad”, māg “evil, bad blood, fend, war”, mig “to do evil”, mag (refl.) “to become bad, evil” [Rpr. 1928, 149, 214] = mag “to become bad”, mig “to be at enmity”, mōga “anger” [Hds. 1996, 90] || ECU.: Oromo mag^w ~ māg “schlecht sein” [Rn.], cf. Borana (of Isiolo) māga “to regret (i.a. a previous experience)” [Strm. 1987, 361; 1995, 205] | Dullay: Harso, Dobase, Gollango, Gawwada-Dalpena māk-a “schlecht”, mak- “schlecht sein, werden” (Dullay: AMS 1980, 174, 212, 266; Hyw. 1989, 26) ||| NOm.: (?) Yemsa māngū “bad” [Akl.-Sbr. 1993, 35; Akl. MS n.d., #257] = māngū “schlecht, häßlich” [Lmb. 1993, 365] ||| WCh.: Hausa múúgú “bad, evil” [Abr. 1962, 680; Old. 1954, 146], Gwnd. múgu “1. bad, 2. dangerous” [Mts. 1972, 83] || ECh.: (?) EDng. mòyǵùmē “être en deuil, porter le deuil (cheveux défaits)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 211] < Nst. *magu “плохой” [IS] = “bad” [Dlg. 1991 MS, #960]. See Mnh. 1912, 238 (Hs.-Bed.-ECu.-Bilin); IS 1966, 334, #6.23 (Bed.-Orm.-Hs.); 1976, #275 (Bed.-Bilin-Orm.-Hs.); HSED #1705 (Hs.-Bed.-Orm.).

nb2: Note that the comparison with NAgaw: Bilin muqlá “Vergehen, Verbrechen”, adj. “schlecht, unbrauchbar, verdorben” [Rn. 1887, 268] = muhlá [Mnh.] = məh̄lā “bad” [IS] is unconvincing. This may represent a distinct root.

nb3: M. Lamberti (l.c.) combined the Yemsa word with NOm.: Sns. mang-a “schwer”, Kaffa & Sheko magg-o “schwer”. Later, M. Lamberti & R. Sottile (1997, 459) compared it also with NOm.: Wlt. mākuwa “poor”, Gofa manko “poor”, Dawro manko “poor”, which is both semantically and phonologically unconvincing.

mgr (?) (GW) “to bake (?)” (late NK/XIX.–XX. hapax, 2x: Pap. Anastasi IV rt. 14:5 and Pap. Chester Beatty IV vs. 9:5, Caminos 1954 LEM, 206: “a guess”; DLE I 250) = “to broil, grill, roaster or even roast (meat) (?)” (Hoch 1994, 171, #227).

nb1: Its rdg. is disputable. Wb V 181, 3 reads it as divided into m (prep.) + root gr. Only the two exx. (quoted above) that occur in the phrase ṭrp mgr “broiled goose” (Hoch) may represent the same lexeme. The rest of J. Hoch’s (l.c.) further exx. (all in GW), namely m^q (XX., Pap. Turin P+R 88:2), mq (XIX., Pap. Anastasi I 9:5), and m^q (lit. Ostr. DeM 1623, 8) can hardly belong here. As correctly pointed out by J. F. Quack (1996, 510, #227) and D. Meeks (1997, 43, §227), these forms have to be distinguished from LEg. mgr and be identified rather as the LEg. reflexes of old m^q “1. Grillspieß, 2. grillen” (OK, Wb, above) = “1. la brochette, 2. griller sur une brochette” (Meeks). Cf. also Verhoeven (1984, 50, fn. 1).

nb2: G. Fecht (quoted in KHW 518) derived Cpt. (L) ΜΕΡΡΕ “lodern (?)” (KHW) from LEg. mq^r ~ mqr “oven” (DLE, above), but for semantic considerations, its derivaton from LEg. mgr seems more likely.

nb3: Following the p.c. by D.B. Redford, J. Hoch (1994, 171 & fn. 210) was disposed to assume that Gk. μαγειρεύω “to cook (meat)” and μάγειρος “a cook (of meat and fish)”, whose “etymology is unknown” (!) in his view, eventually “may be a Kulturwort”

originating from LEg. mgr. He erroneously ignored that É. Boisacq (1916, 597) had long demonstrated the IE background of the Gk. word (and hence, of Lat. *magīra* “art du cuisinier”, cf. Ernout & Meillet 1959, 377), which literally signified “qui pétrit, qui prépare le manger”, cf. Gk. *μαγίς*, gen. *μαγίδος* “pâte pétrie, pain” < IE **mag-* “frotter en pressant, pétrir” [Boisacq] = “kneten, drücken, streichen” [IEW 696]. In the light of these facts, an Eg. origin can hardly be maintained.

- Rdg. and origin debated.
- **1.** Eg. mgr was treated in Wb V 181, 3 as prep. m + gr. This analysis was declined in DLE I 250 and Hoch 1994, 171, #227.
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 171, #227) reconstructed **maqala*, which related with Sem. **klw* “to burn, roast”, although he admitted that “*the m- is problematic*” (since this Sem. root was used only in G-stem). He assumed this to be due to a confusion with (or a back-formation from) LEg. mqr ~ mqʿr “hearth” (cf. above), since “*the Egyptians must have assumed the root was *mq̄l and not qly*”, for which Hoch (1994, 171, fn. 213) thinks to have found an analogous LEg. m- root “*which... apparently resulted from mistaking the mem-preformative as the first root consonant*”. Since Hoch’s LEg. vars. with -q are probably to be separated from the -g-forms, a comparison with Sem. **klw* is phonologically hardly possible.
- **3.** GT (cf. also Takács 1999, 95): probably to be distinguished from LEg. mqʿr ~ mqr “oven” (DLE, above). The rdg. mgr seems to be corroborated also by the fire det. of mgʒ “eine unbekannte Pflanze” (Med., Wb, above). Whether we assume m + gr or a distinct lexeme mgr, it would be hard to separate our word from AA **gər* “fire” [Dlg.] = **gur-* “ash” vs. **gir-* “fire” [OS] = **g-r* “to burn” [GT].
NB1: Attested in Sem. **gir(r)-* “fire” [Dlg.]; Akk. (a/jB) *gīru* ~ *girru* “Feuer(gott)” [AHW 291] vs. (jB) *g/kurāru* “glühende Asche” [AHW 510] || Eg. *dr* [from **gr*] “Feuer” (GR, Wb V 595, 14) || SBrb.: Hgr. *ta-žzer-t* < *ta-s-gʷer-t* (nomen instr.) “1. substance servant d’amadou (substance quelconque capable de prendre feu aux étincelles d’un briquet et de servir à allumer le feu), 2. se dit p.ex. d’amadou, de coton imprégné de poudre à fusil” [Fcd. 1951-2, 472], Ghat *ta-žer-t* [< **ta-s-ger-t*] “amadou” [Nhl. 1909, 126] || Cu. **gVr-* “1. огонь, 2. жечь, зажигать” [Dlg. 1973] = **gir-* (!) “fire” [Djk.] > Bed. *gʷar-* “to boil, roast” || ECu. **gīr-* “fire” [Sasse] = **gir-* “to burn”, hence **gir-a* “fire” [Dlg. 1983] (ECu.: CR 1913, 421; Sasse 1982, 110; HECu.: Hds. 1989, 410) || SCu.: WRift **ma-gir-mo* (nomen instr.) “firewood” [GT]; Iraqw *mīgīrmo*, pl. *mīgīr* [Wtl.] = *migirmo* “firewood”, *migir-* “to collect firewood” [Ehr.] = *mīgīrmō*, pl. *mīgīr* “firewood”, cf. *mīgīr*, pl. *mīgīrān* “to collect firewood” [Mgw. 1989, 115], Burunge *māgīnō* “ein Stück Feuerholz”, pl. *māgīdū* “Feuerholz” [Mnh. 1906, 332], Gorowa *magīrmo*, pl. *māgīr* “firewood” [Wtl., Ehr.], Alagwa *maginimo* [assim. < **ma-gir-im-*?], pl. *magīru* “firewood”, *magim-* “to collect firewood” [Wtl., Ehr.] (WRift: Wtl. 1958, 23, #41; Ehret 1980, 155, #17 with false etym.) || NOM.: cf. (?) Janjero (Yamma) *geʷ-aa* “fire” [Dlg. < **gičč-* < **girč-* with -č- of individualis, -ʷ- reg. < **čč-*] “fire” [Crl./Dlg.] (Cu.-Om.: Dlg. 1972, 207; 1973, 202-3) || Ch. **gʷVr* [Dlg.] = **gur-* “charcoal, ash” [Stl.] > WCh. **gur-* “жечь” [Stl.]; Hausa *gūūrā* “to cause fire to blaze up” [Brg. 1934, 411; Abr. 1962, 343] | (?) AS **kuyur* → **kūr* [**k-* < **g-*?] “1. to burn (tr), 2. charcoal” [GT 2004, 207] = **kuyur* “charcoal” [Dlg.] | Bokkos ʷaḡoor “verbrannt

Reste in einem Topf” [Jng. 1970, 139] | Tangale kuro [k- < *g- reg.] “charcoal” [Jng. 1991, 106], Galambu ngürná “charcoal” [Schuh 1978, 141] (WCh.: Stl. 1986, 91; 1987, 219) || CCh. *n-gur-sV “charcoal” [GT]: Bura ʔaŋ-gwulà-sim [Stl.] | Mwulyen ŋgólí “Holzkohle” [Mkr.] | (?) Gude gúra “hearth (for warming room, rather than cooking)” [Hsk. 1983, 194] | Logone gúrwakee “Kohlen” [Lks. 1936, 94] etc. || ECh.: Ndam-Dik gürē “Holzkohle (charcoal)” [Jng. quoted by Mkr. & Stl.] | Barein gáruí “Feuerholz” [Lks. 1937, 50] = “дрова для растопки” [IS] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 120; Stl. 1996, 67). Lit. for the AA etymology: IS 1971, #95 (Eg.-Bed.-ECu.-Janjero-WCh.-Logone-Barein); Dlg. 1972, 207 (ECu.-Jnj.-Bed.-WCh.-Lgn.); 1973, 202–3 (ECu.-SCu.-Jnj.-Eg.-Akk.); 1983, 131 (Akk.-Eg.-ECu.); Djk. 1975, 123 (Akk.-PCu.); 1981, 64 (Akk.-ECu.-Irb.-Jnj.-Eg.); Zbr. 1985, 89 (ECu.-Eg.); Djk. et al. 1986, 48 (Akk.-SBrb.-ECu.-Jnj.-WCh.); Blz. 1989, 95 (Akk.-PWCh.-PECu.); HSED #930 & #986 (Akk.-Eg.-ECu.-SCu.-WCh.-Ndam); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 11 (Eg.-Akk.-WCh.-ECu.); Takács 1999, 95 (Eg.-Sem.-Cu.-?Jnj.-Ch.). NB2: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #931) compared also WCh.: Bole-Tangale *girgir “hot” [Stl.]: Dera gərgət [Nwm.: -t < *-r], Maha girgir (BT: Stl. 1987, 246) || CCh.: Tera gərgər “hot” [Nwm. 1964, 46: loan?] (Ch.: Nwm. 1970, 44).

mgr.t (GW, pl.) “die Höhle” (late NK 2x: KRI I 22:5–6 & II 158:16, Wb II 164, 14; Lauth l.c. pace Brugsch, RT 1, 45; GHWb 372; WD II 68: cf. RdE 11, 1957, 50, n. 2) = “Getreideboden, Magazin” (Karlberg) = “Gruben (der Füchse)” (GB) = “caves” (AEO II 219; DLE I 250; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 82) = “cave (hiding place, dens of jackals)” (Hoch 1994, 172, #228 quoting also 2 exx. from the reign of Thotmes III).

NB1: G. Karlberg (1912, 89) erroneously suggested an OHbr. loan borrowed from (!) Eg. mgr.t.

NB2: A late instance of this word may perhaps be mqr.t (not GW, house det.) “(dem Determinativ zufolge eine Gebäude- oder Ortsbezeichnung) Magazin, Verkaufsstand (!), Lagerhalle oder etwas ähnliches” (XXX.), which K. Jansen-Winkeln (1997, 112–3, n. 3) treated (presumably mistakenly) as “eine Ableitung von dem im NR belegten semitischen Fremdwort mkr ‘Kaufmann’” (q.v.), while he rightly declined J. Osing’s suggestion to explain it from mqr.t “socket” (XIII. hapax: Pap. Ramesseum VI, 62, Grd. 1957, 50, fn. 2: unknown elsewhere, prob. < qrr.t of Wb IV 61, 14 & 62, 1) = “eine (Augen)Höhle” (Osing) or mqr “ein Gefäß” (Evrard-Derriks & Quaegebeur, CdE 54, 1979, 46–49) maintaining that in the case of mqr.t (XXX.), “so etwas wie Ausgehöhltens bedeutend, scheint...weniger wahrscheinlich”.

- Borrowed from Can., cf. Ug. mṣr-t “Bergwerk (?)” [WUS #1630] = “cave” (TN) [Watson 2001, 118; DUL 532–3], Hbr. məʿārā “Höhle” [GB 447–8] = “Grotte” [Lauth] = “cave” [KB 615], BAram. məʿārtā [GB], Imp. Aram. mʿrtʔ [Hoch], Palm. & Off. mʿrh (f) “cave” [DNWSI 672], JAram. məʿārā “1. Höhle, 2. Kammer eines Felsengrabes” [Dalman 1922, 246], JPArAm. mʿrh “cave” [Sokoloff 1990, 323], məʿartā [KB] | Ar. maṣār-at- “Höhle, Grube” [WUS] = “1. caverne, 2. gîte (de gazelle)” [BK II 517] = “a cave(rn)” [Lane 2307]. Lit. for Eg.-Can.: Lauth 1871, 634; Wb l.c.; AEO II 219, §470; Helck 1962, 515, #131; 1971, 563, #130; 1989, 137; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 13, §1.2.1.3; Hoch 1994, 172; KB 615.

NB1: The underlying Sem. root has been long debated. Th. Nöldeke (ZDMG 32, 404), whose idea has been adopted in a number of lexicographical works, derived the Can. word from Hbr. רר קל “to strip oneself” [KB 889] (which, however, does not explain the mng.). L. Kopf (1976, 160, §46, following Cassuto) found it better to assume an unattested Hbr. *רר related Ar. رر I “1. descendre dans un terrain encaissé, 2. pénétrer dans la terre, 3. entrer trop, être très-enfoncé, 4. se coucher, descendre” [BK II 515] = “tief eindringen, einsinken, tief liegen”. Correct. D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 13), in turn, explained it from Sem. *רר (sic).
NB2: GB 397 affiliated Eg. mgrt with Hbr. מגורה “Vorratskammer” (for which cf. Eg. mḥr above).

mrg “Art Krug” (MK, Wb II 164, 12) = “grand vase à une purification spéciale destinée à donner la vie éternelle au mort” (Jéquier 1921, 151) = “une verseuse en pierre, vase à purifications” (Jéquier 1921, 314) > **mngrg** “Krug für Öl” (late NK, Wb II 91, 9).

- Its m- prefix has been surmised already by H. Grapow (1914, 32), although he was unable to find its simplex, which G. Jéquier (l.c.) identified either with Eg. grg “1. équiper, fonder” or Eg. grg “2. mensonge”, but neither of his far-fetched and morphologically erroneous suggestions for its primary mng. are really convincing (either “pour la vie éternelle” or “un vase pour le mensonge, i.e., un ustensile destiné à purifier, à laver l’homme de cette faute, pour le péché” reflecting “l’idée de l’eau lustrale qui lave les péchés et par là même donne la vie”).

mrg “der Lügner (als Bez. des Seth)” (GR, Wb II 164, 13).

- Derived (with “participial” m-) from Eg. grg “Lüge” (end of OK, Wb V 189–190), cf. Grapow 1914, 32; Smith 1979, 163.

NB: The AA etymologies suggested for Eg. grg (probably *glg) > Cpt. (S) ḡol “Lüge” (KHW 449) so far are accompanied by serious phonological obstacles. (1) Albright (1918, 251, #113; cf. Ember 1930, #12.a.46, #23.b.3) equated Eg. grg with Ar. qrq “tromper qqn., en imposer à qqn.” [BK II 722]. But Eg. g vs. Ar. q are not regular. (2) Behnk’s (1928, 141, #60) comparison of Eg. grg vs. Masai leḣ “betrügen” is out of question. (3) Reinisch (1887, 162) and Cohen (1947, #236) combined Eg. grg with Bed. gūhar “betrügen, (be)stehlen” [Rn. 1895, 93] || NAgaw: $\text{Bilin g}^{\text{w}}\text{āreh}$ “jmdn. unter listigen Vorspiegelungen ausbeuten, hintergehen, betrügen” [Rn.] = “tromper” [Chn.] || LECu.: Saho-Afar $\text{g}^{\text{w}}\text{āreh-it}$ (refl.) “aussinnen eine List”, $\text{g}^{\text{w}}\text{ārhé}$ “Tücke, Betrug, Hinterlist”, $\text{g}^{\text{w}}\text{ārāh}$ “Hinterlist, Tücke, Verschlagenheit” [Rn. 1890, 164]. But Cu. *ḥ is incompatible with Eg. -g . Cp. also CCh.: Musgu argūḥ “Lügner, lügenhaft” [Rohlf’s apud Lks. 1941, 45]. (4) Hintze (1951, 80) extended this Eg.-Cu. comparison to NBrb.: Sus s-kīrāks “mentir”, n.vb. ti-kārkis-t , pl. ti-kēr-kās [Dst. 1938, 184], Ntifa s-kirkās “lügen” [Hintze]. Cf. also Tamazight s-karks “to tell lies” [Skn. 1971, 305]. But there is hardly any phonological agreement between the Cu. and Brb. *comparanda*. There is not even one single common root consonant shared by both Brb. *krks and Eg. *glg . (5) Mukarovsky (1987, 239) mentioned noteworthy Ch. forms for “lie (Lüge)” in comparison with NMande: Soninke gāre “Lüge”, cf. WCh.: Hausa kāryāá “1. a lie, 2. (occasionally used for) a mistake, unintentional lie” [Brg. 1934, 574] | Pa’á kwalí “lie”, ndar kwalí “to tell lie” [MSkn. 1979, 189]

|| ECh.: Kwang kèlaŋ “Lüge” [Mkr.] | Ndam ʔə ma kórən “Lüge” [Mkr.]. But here too, it is difficult to see regular consonant correspondences. For Hs. cf. also WCh.: AS *kār “to tamper with (a woman, another man’s fiancée)” [GT 2004, 202]: Angas kaar “1. to tamper with (esp. of another man’s fiancée), 2. deceive” [Flk. 1915, 209] = káar “to talk to a girl not to marry her fiancé but oneself” [Jng. 1962 MS, 16], Gmy. kaar mat “to bring a young wife into her husband’s room on the third day after their marriage” (mat “wife”) [Srl. 1937, 88]. Skinner (1971, 305) erroneously related the Ch. forms to Brb. *√k-r-k-s (above). (6) Vycichl (1990, 106) linked Eg. grg to Ar. ḡalaṭa “se tromper, commettre une erreur, une faute (en parlant, en écrivant, dans le calcul), manquer” [BK II 492] = “lügen” (sic) [Vcl.], which is equally unacceptable (there is just one single corresponding phoneme, namely -l-). (7) Takács (2000, 88, #18.12) equated Eg. *glg (as partial redupl. of *gl) with ERift *gil- [GT]: Asa gil- “to deceive”, gil-at “lie” (noun) [Ehret 1980, 364]. Cf. perhaps also JAram. glg “plaudern”, galgā “Geschwätz” [Dalman 1922, 78]?

mgs (GW) “Verbum von der Arbeit am Schurz einer Statue” (XX., Wb II 164, 15) = “ziseliert” (Helck, MWNr II 197) = “a metal working activity: to emboss, hammer (?)” (Hoch 1994, 153, §200).

- D. Meeks (1997, 43, §229) demonstrated that of the two exx. of mgs suggested by Hoch that attested in Pap. Turin (P + R) 32:7 (= KRI VI 335: 12) is merely a wtg. of mks “sceptre” (cf. Wb II 164 and Hoverstreydt 1997, 110, n. g; Woodhouse 2003, 280, §229: “document case”). Whether mgs of Pap. Turin (P + R) 32:5 (= KRI VI 335:9) represent the same word as msq of Pap. Koller 1:7 (for details cf. above) is dubious.

mgsp (GW, pl.) “crates made of palm-sticks” (XIX. hapax: Pap. Chester Beatty V vs. 1:11, Blackman 1936, 104, cf. HPBM III, 49, n. 9) = “cageot” (AC 1978, 14; AL 78.1896) = “crate” (DLE I 250) = “create, basket” (Hoch) = “*Kisten” (GHWb 373) = “Lattenkiste” (WD II 68).

NB: Syllabic spelling: ma-ga-sa-pa (Hoch).

- Origin uncertain. Looks to be a Semitic loan-word with an m- prefix, but the source has not yet been satisfactorily identified.
- 1. A. M. Blackman (1930, 104) suggested that it “perhaps” might be related (with met.) to Ar. qafaṣa “to tie the legs (of a gazelle), put things together”, qafṣ- “lattice-work”, qafaṣ- “(the ordinary word for) crate made of palm-sticks in modern Egypt”, which in Blackman’s view “denoted exactly the same kind of crate used in Egypt” not only in the Ramesside period, but from “immemorial times”. But as rightly pointed out by J. Hoch (l.c.), this comparison is doubtful phonologically. There is no agreement between Can. *-ṣ- and Eg. -s- (Blackman would have expected Eg. -ṭ-!), and the same is valid for Ar. q vs. Eg. g (contra Ember 1930, 106 referred to by Blackman).

- 2. J. Hoch (1994, 173–4, §230) reconstructed LEg. *magatapa (?) assuming that it is perhaps akin to MHbr. kōpeš “basket (for olives)”, kəpīšā “a vessel with a bottom compartment”, cf. also kpt “to twist, tie”, kəpātā “travelling implements tied up, bundle” (with Aram. -t- < *-t-). Unconvincing.

mgg (GW?) or **mg3g3** (?) “(Verbum)” (GR hapax, Wb II 164, 16: Edfu Mammisi, cf. Chassinat 1939, 115) = “ululation (?)” (Smith 1979, 163) = “hurlement, lamentation” (AL 79.1397) = “cri, hululement” (Cauville 1987, 184).

- H. Smith (1979, 163) explained it as an prefix m- derivative of Eg. g3g3 “to cackle (of goose)” (Pap. Westcar 8:23) = “schnattern (der Gans)” (Wb V 157, 2).

NB: S. Cauville (1987, 184) extended this etymology to a number of Eg. onomatopoeic forms: pgg “grenouille” (Cauville) = “ein Tier, dessen ^omm offizinell verwendet wird” (Med., Wb I 563, 8), pngg “petit animal: grenouille (?)” (Cauville), ngg “crier, tinter” (Cauville) = “1. schreien (Falken), 2. klirren (Sistrum), 3. erschallen lassen (?) (Stimme)” (PT, Wb II 350, 9–12). Doubtful. Eg. pgg^t can hardly belong here, cf. EDE II 528. For Eg. ngg there is good AA etymology, which indicates that *n- was part of the root.

mt “sterben” (OK, Wb II 165–6) > Dem. mwt “sterben” (DG 157) > Cpt. (OSALBF) מוּי “sterben” (KHW 87).

NB1: Although written regularly as mt (and listed so in dictionaries), the root was originally probably *mwt. E. Edel (AÄG 64, §145) reaffirmed the exceptional early Dyn. VI exx. of writing med. -w- (PT 676b¹) and -j- (PT 657e¹) quoted already in Wb II 165. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33), followed by G. Lefébvre (CdE 11, 1936, 279), W. Vycichl (1938, 148), and Ch. Cannuyer (1983, 28), supposed Cpt. מוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּ to represent a piel (pi^oēl) stem (quasi *sddm), i.e., *mVwwVt (Vycichl: with -t “durch Systemzwang geblieben”), which was rightly queried by W. C. Till (1937, 133), who argued that we are dealing here rather perhaps with the two (intr./tr.) types of the Cpt. inf. following the pattern of (S) מְרַאֵךְ “sich kränken” vs. מוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּ “quälen” (pointing out GR exx. with a secondary tr. mng. “to kill”). For the problem cf. also Quack 2003 and Peust 2005, 266–7.

NB2: For an alleged var. mz cf. Kaplony, LÄ VI 650.

- Common AA root, cf. Sem. *mwt “to die”, hence *mawt- “death”, *mawit- “dead” [Frz.] = *-mūt- [Dlg. 1999, 53–54, §177] (Sem.: e. g. Lsl. 1962, 66; WUS #1703; Aro 1964, 177; Frz. 1964, 263, #2.09; Rabin 1975, 87, #17) ||| Brb. *√m-w-t “to die” [Mkr.] = *e-mwet (pf.) [Zyhlarz and Vycichl] = *√m-w (!) [Hintze] = *ə-mmət (aor.), *i-mmut (impf.) [Mlt.]: NBrb.: Atlas gr.: Shilh e-mmut (aor. ie-mmet) [Bst.] = e-mmet [Rsl.], Semlal ə-mmət [Mlt.], Zrwl. é-mmēt [Stumme 1899, 177], Sus ě-mmet [Dst. 1938, 193] | Tamazight e-mmet ~ (dial.) e-mmet [Mkr.] = mmet “mourir, décéder, trépasser” [Tf. 1991, 442–3], Izdeg mmet “mourir, décéder” [Mrc. 1937, 73, 171] = mmət

[Mlt.], Zayan ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.] etc. | Zenet gr.: Sgrs. ə-mmət̄ [Pellat 1955, 104] = mmt̄ [Mlt.], Btw. e-mmūt̄ [Brn. 1911, 185], Tamsaman & Bqy. & Ikebdanen & Iqrayen & Tuzin & Urg. eʔ-mméʔt̄ (aor. i-mmút̄) [Brn.], Mzab e-mmet̄ (aor. i-mmet̄ ~ i-mmūt̄) [Bst.] = ə-mmət̄ [Dlh. 1984, 124], Wargla ə-mmət̄ [Dlh. 1987, 200], Mnsr. e-mmūt̄ ~ e-mmūt̄ [Bst.], Iznasen e-mmūt̄ [Bst.] = ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.], Snus & Shenwa ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.], Tuat e-mmūt̄ ~ e-mmi [Bst.], Tamentit e-mm [Bst.], Harawa e-mmūt̄ [Bst.], Harakta e-mmet̄ ~ e-mmūt̄ [Bst.], Djerba e-mmūt̄ [Bst.], Nefusa e-mmet̄ [Bst.] = i-mmet̄ [Mtl. 1904, 139] = é-mmet̄ [Bgn. 1931, 274] = ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.] etc. (Zenet gr.: Bst. 1887, 420) | Qabyle e-mmet̄ [Rsl.; Dlt. 1982, 524], Irzhen ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.], Bugi e-mmet̄ ~ e-mmūt̄ (aor. i-mmūt̄) [Bst.], Zwawa i-mmūt̄ (aor.) [Bst.] = ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.] || WBrb.: Zenaga e-mmūt̄ ~ e-mmi (aor. iu-mmi) [Bst. 1890; 1909, 245] = è-mmʷi ~ è-mmi (loss of *-t treated as affix?), impf. iu-mmi [Ncl. 1953, 202] || EBrb.: Ghadames mmet̄ [Rsl.] = i-mmūt̄ [Mtl. 1904, 139] = ə-mmət̄ [Lnf. 1973, 192, #959], Siwa i-mmūt̄ (impf.) “il est mort” [Lst. 1931, 263] || SBrb.: Hgr. i-mmūt̄ (aor.) [Bst.] = e-mmet̄ [Fcd. 1951–2, 1131; Vcl. 1987, 118] = ə-mmät̄ [Rsl. 1964, 207] = ə-mmət̄ [Gouffé 1974, 362], Ghat ie-mmūt̄ (aor.) [Bst.] = e-mmet̄ “décéder, mourir” [Nhl. 1909, 148, 180] = ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.], Udalan ä-ṛṛmät̄ [Prs. & Dicko 2002, 29], EWlm. & Ayr ä-ṛṛmät̄ [PAM 2003, 563], Kel Ui ie-mmat̄ (aor.) [Bst.] = ə-mmət̄ [Mlt.] etc. (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 297, 325, 339; 1885, 178; 1890, 312–3; Brn. 1917, 92–93; Mlt. 1991, 255, #17.1; PAM 2003, 563) || ECu. *-mūt- “sterben” [Sasse 1980, 172] = *-mūt “to die” [Dlg.] = *mut- [OS]: LECu.: PSam *amut “to die” [Heine]: Rendille a-mut “die!” [Flm. 1964, 67] = impf. -amut-, pf. -umut-, omót “death” [Heine 1976, 214; 1978, 35, 52] = ämūt̄ (praes.) [Schlee 1978, 108, #29], (?) Boni üd/uäd [Heine: < *amut] “to die” [Heine 1978, 52], Gidole mūt- “to become very weak and close to death” [Sasse] = “totkrank” [Dlg.] (ECu.: Heine 1978, 35, 52; Schlee 1978, 17; Sasse 1980, 165–167; Sasse 1982, 148; Dlg. 1983, 130) || PCh. *m-t- “to die” [NM] = *mVtV [Prh.] = *mət̄ [Nwm.] = *m-w-t [Jng. in JS 1981, 84A; JI 1994 I 47] = *mut- [Dlg., OS 1992] = *mawut- [OS in HSED] = *mu(wa)t- [Stl.] > WCh. *mètú “to die” [Schuh 1977, 163] = *mawt- > *mūt- “to die” [Stl.]: Hausa mútù, máçè [Abr. 1962, 627, 689] = mútu “sterben, ausgehen (v. Licht, Feuer)” [Drexel], Gwnd. mútù “1. to die, 2. go out (as fire), 3. be damaged” [Mts. 1972, 84] | AS *mūt “to die” [Stl.]: Gerka muud (so, -d) [Ftp. 1911, 216] = mwət̄^h [IL/JI], Angas muut [Ormsby

1914, 208] = muut [Flk. 1915, 248] = mùt [Jng. 1962 MS, 26] = muut [Grb. 1962, 85] = [mùt] [Brq. 1971, 30] = mùt [Gochal 1994, 69], Sura mùt [Jng. 1963, 75], Mpn. mùt [Frj. 1991, 3], Chip mùt [Jng. 1965, 166], Tal mūu:t [IL/JI], Mnt. muud (so, -d) [Ftp. 1911, 216] = mùt [Jng. 1965, 171], Msr. muut [Dkl. 1997 MS, 183] = mút [Jng. 1999 MS, 12], Gmy. muud (so, -d) [Ftp. 1911, 216] = muut [Srl. 1937, 149] = muut [Jng. 1962 MS, 8] = muut [Hlw. 2000 MS, 24] (AS: Stl. 1977, 156, #139; 1987, 232, #797; JI 1994 II 102; GT 2004, 255) | Ron *mot “to die” [Rabin]: Fyer mot “to die” [Seibert, Blench], Bokkos mot [Blench] = mô̄t “death” [Seibert], Kulere mot [Seibert], Sha mô̄t “1. to die, 2. death” [Seibert, Blench], Mundat mot “to die”, mamô̄t “death” [Seibert; Blench], Karfâ mât “death” [Seibert] = mət [Blench], Daffo-Butura mot [Jng. 1970; Blench] = mō̄t [Jng. 1990] = mot “to die”, mamô̄t “death” [Seibert], Richa mot [Blench], Monguna mot [Blench] = mô̄t “to die”, môtôt “death” [Seibert], Mangar mô̄t “1. to die, 2. death” [Seibert] (Ron gr.: Jng. 1970, 393; Seibert 2000 MS, #a029, #f002; Blench 2001 MS, 6) | Bole-Tangale *ma/utu [Schuh]: Bole motuo [Pls.] = máló (!) [IL] = mot- “sterben, erlöschen” [Lks. 1970; 1971, 137] = mótú- [Schuh] = mutuʔo [Krf.] = máló (!) [IL/Jng. 1990] = mot- [Ibr.-Gimba 1994, 134], Karekare meet “sterben”, mēetó “Tod” [Lks. 1966, 203] = metaw [IL] = mēetú- [Schuh] = mē [Krf.] = mēetáw “death” [Alio 1991 MS, #R031] = meet- [Jng./JI], Dera múr “Leiche”, muṛ- “sterben”, múrù “Tod” [Jng. 1966 MS, 11] = múrì (pl. mútè) “to die” [Nwm. 1970, 44; 1974, 130] = mùròni [Krf.] = múrù [-r- reg. < *-t-] “1. death, 2. corpse”, múrì “to die” [Kidda 1991 MS, 9, 31], Tangale tòḷè mutùgò [Krf.] = mūdè [Jng. 1991, 121], Ngamo mato [Nwm. 1965, 58, #64] = mātú- [Schuh 1977] = mātun [Krf.] = mātì “to die”, mātò “death” [Alio 1988 MS], Kirfi mutto [Gowers] = mút- (sic, -t-) [Schuh 1977] = múk-kò < *mut-ko (cf. vb.n. mùtó) [Schuh 1978], Maha muto [Nwm. 1965, 58, #64] = mùtó “death”, mùtò “to die” [Alio 1988 MS], Pero mútó “death”, mútù “to die” [Frj. 1985, 43] = muṛuḡò [Krf.], Bele mótú-kò [Schuh], Galambu máz-àalá [Schuh], Gera mudu-mì [Krf.] = múdù-mí [Schuh], Geruma mut-alla [IL] = mút-álà [Schuh], Kwami mùd-àn [Leger 1993, 172] (Bole-Tangale: Schuh 1978, 142; 1984, 215) | NBch. *miy- “to die” [Skn. 1977, 18; 1995, 30]: Warji miy- [Skn.] = mì- [Jng.] = míyāʔ [IL], Mburku miy- [Skn.], Miya miy- [Skn.] = a mìtə [Krf.], Pa’a miyà “to die”, míyàù (m) “death” [MSkn. 1979, 194] = miyà [Jng.] = miʔa [IL], Kariya míyà [Skn.], Diri mótú [IL]

= matu [Skn.] = yà mùšì [Krf.], Tsagu mōōs-èn [Skn.], Mburku miy- [Skn.], Jimbin mul- (?) [Skn.], Siri miya [Skn. 1977] = mīyū [Skn./JI] = míyù [IL, Stl.] = miwa [Gowers, Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995] (NBauchì: Skn. 1977, 18) | Sbauchi: Boghom (Burma) maz-ong [Gowers] = mās:s [IL] = mas [Smz. 1975, 35; Jng. 1990] = misè [Krf.] = mās [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Kiir muse (imper. mās!) [Smz.], Laar & Tala & Mangas mās- [Smz.], Zangwal & Sho (Jimi) mās- [Smz.], Mbaarù mās- (imper.) [Smz.], Grnt. masse [Gowers] = mās- [Smz.] = mósí “to die”, mósà “to extinguish”, mú(u)sí “death” [Haruna 1992 MS, 24], Bubure mùtó “death”, mùtó “to die” [Haruna 1992 MS, #a029, #f002], Booluu (Pelu) & Chaari & Dokshi (Lushi) mās [Smz.], Geji meškin [Gowers] = mósúwí [IL] = mās [Smz.] = mùšì [Krf.] = musu [Stl.] = miš [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Zaranda máč [Smz.], Bandas (Dur) & Dikshi (Baraza) mās [Smz.], Zul muš [Smz.], Baram (Barang) meš (-tl) [Smz.], Langas & Lundur mùs [Smz.], Polchi mās ~ maš [Smz.] = mišì [Krf.] = māsə [Jng. 1983] = mišì [Stl.], Tule māsì [Smz.], Zumbul mas [Smz.], Wangday mās [IL, Smz.], Dwot māsə [Smz.] = mus [Krf.], Zakshi & Boot mās [Smz.], Burma māsə [Jng. 1983] = misè [Stl.], Jimi mačə [Gowers], Buli mósū [IL] = mušù (mišì “death”) [Krf.] = mās ~ miš [Smz.] = mušì [Stl.] = mašši [Gowers, Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Zaar (Seya) mišì [IL] = mās [Smz. 1975, 35] = mās [Smz. 1978] = mišì [Krf.], Zaar of Kal mās [Smz.], Zaar of Gambar Leere miš [Smz.], Zaar of Lusa mās [Smz.] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 34, #59) | Bade mət-án (f) “Tod” [Lks. 1968, 224] = mət [Lks. 1970] = mt- [Lks. 1974–75, 103] = mùtú [Schuh 1977] = mətən [Krf.] = mútú [IL] = mətən [Jng. 1990], WBade mùtú [Schuh 2001], Ngizim mutu [Pls., NM, IL, Jng. 1990] = mətə [Nwm.] = mùtu [Krf.] = mətú [Schuh 1981, 106], Teshena II mot- [Schuh 2001], Duwai mtó [Schuh 1977] (BN: Schuh 2001, 434; WCh.: also Schuh 1977, 163; Stl. 1987, 232) || CCh. *mut- “to die” [OS] = *mVtV [PDP 1972, 65]: Tera məḍə “to die”, məḍi “1. death, 2. corpse, 3. to die” [Nwm. 1964, 44, #313–4 & 49, #517] = mitá [Dlg. 1973] = məḍi (vb.n. mətə) [Krf./Jng. 1990], Pidlimdi mɪdi [Krf.], Ga’anda ìmèri [Krf.], Gabin m̀iri [Krf.], Boka m̀eri [Krf.], Hwona mùř [Krf.] = mùr [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995] | PBura-Margi *√m-t “to die” [Hfm.] = *NtV [Pnv. 1977, 59]: Bura mta(i) “sterben”, (i)mta “1. sterben, 2. Tod” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 92] = mtì [Krf./Brt.-Jng.] = mta [Hfm. 1987], Ngwahyi nti [Krf., Hfm. 1987, Brt.-JI], Margi mt̩ [Hfm. 1987] = mti [NM] = mt̩ “1. to die, 2. dying, death” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 126 and Wolff 1974–75,

191] = mtə [Nwm. 1977, 24] = mtu [Krf., Hfm.] = mt-o^u [Rsl.] = m̄t^hò^u [IL] = m̄t^ho^u [Krf./Jng.] = mtò [Jng. 1990], WMargi mtæ/mta [Krf.] = mtè [Brt.-Jng.], NMargi mtu [Krf./Brt.-Jng.], Margi-Gwara ómtò [Wolff 1974–75, 191], Margi-Putai mtä ~ mta [Hfm. 1987], Kilba átū (*wt- < *m̄t-) [Krf.] = átū [Jng. 1990; Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Chibak (Kyibaku) ntì [Hfm. 1955, 133, #55; Kraft 1981; Brt.-Jng. 1990; Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995] = nti [IL] = ntä [Hfm. 1987] = nta [Hfm., Jng. 1990], Heba ta [< *mta], Hyildi təw [Krf.; Hfm. 1987], Wamdiu təw [Krf., Hfm. 1987, Brt.-JI], Wuba tau [Hfm. 1987] (Bura-Margi gr.: Hfm. 1987, 470, #2 reviewed by Kaye & Daniels 1992, 442) | Higi amte [NM] = m̄t̄é [Mohrlang 1972, 99], Higi-Nkafa & Higi-Kamale mte & Higi-Ghye [Krf., Brt.-Jng.], Higi-Baza wtə [Krf., Brt.-JI], Higi-Futu mto [Krf.], Fali-Jilbu m̄ci [Krf.], Fali-Gili & Bwagira mti [Krf.], Fali-Mucella mkyì [Krf.], Fali-Kiria w̄ki [Krf.], Fali-Bwagira mti [Krf.] (secondary velarization via *-çi < *-ti?), Kapsiki mtə “mourir” [Clm.] = mte [Krf./Brt.-Jng.] (Higi gr.: Krf. 1972 MS) | Gude (Cheke) ntó [Brt.-JI], Bachama (Bata) mbut “mort” [Mch.] = mbúró [Carnochan 1975, 463: reg. < *m-t] = mburò [Krf.] = m̄búró [Skn., Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Mwulyen ùmbútò [Krf.], Nzangi mbut “mort” [Mch.] = mute [Krf.] = mbútò [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], (?) Gudu ru [IL] = rù [Jng. 1990] (*mru < *mtu?) | Lamang (Hitkala) mt- [Lks. 1964, 108; 1970] = mət-a [mta] [Wolff 1972, 198] | Mandara mc-a (-ts-) “sterben” [Mirt 1970–71, 67] = m̄ca-mca (-ts-) [NM] = umcámca (-ts-) [Egc.] = mcəmca (-ts-) [Krf.] = mts- [Jng. 1990], Ngweshe çàwè (*ts’-) [IL/Jng. 1990], Dghwede (Zeghvana) m̄čà [Frick 1976 MS, 2, #45] = m̄tsayà [Krf.] = mtsáyà [IL], Glavda mts “to die, be dead, be quenched (fire)” [RB 1968; Lks. 1970] = m̄ca m̄cùgà (-ts-) [Krf.], Guduf mts?(ə)gànà [IL], Gava m̄cigànà [Krf.], Paduko mc (-ts) “mort” [Mch.], Nakatsa amshaya [Krf.], Gvoko mca [Wolff] = m̄óčà(wé) [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995] | Mafa-Mada *√m-c (-ts) “mort/mourir” [Mch.] = *mac (*-ts) “to die”, *ma-mac (*-ts) “death”, *m̄ət- “to extinguish” [Rsg.] > Gisiga múc (-c) “1. to die, 2. death”, mùčá “to extinguish” [Rsg.], NGsg. (Dogba) moc (-ts) [Lks., Sgn.-Trn.], Gsg-Midjivin muču [Jaouen 1973 MS, #23], Gsg-Balda muč [Sgn.-Trn.], Mtrw. muč [Jaouen 1973 MS, #23], Hurzo muckà (-ts-) (-ts) “mort/mourir” [Mch.] = mickà (-ts-) “death”, mudzeka “to extinguish” [Rsg.] = m̄ac (-ts-) “mourir” [Clm.], Uld. mut (-ts) “mort/mourir” [Mch.] = mət [Clm.] = -mót- [Clm. 1987, 87; 1997, 201], Vame (Mbreme) mcákà (-ts-) “death” [Rsg.] = m̄ac (-ts-) “mourir” [Clm.], Zulgo (Zelgwa) m̄tə ~ mda (-ts) “mort/

mourir” [Mch.] = mómətá “death” [Rsg.] = mat “mourir” [Clm.], Matakam (Mafa) muc (-ts) “mort/mourir” [Mch.] = mit-eŋ “to extinguish” [Rsg.] = amtsayi (sic) [Krf.] = məc (-ts-) “mourir” [Clm.] = məca (-ts-) [Schubert/JI; Brt.-Bléis 1990, 235; Jng. 1990], Magumaz & Sulede məc (-ts-) “mourir” [Clm.], Mkt. məc- (-ts-) “to die”, māməcáy (-ts-) “death”, məcíŋalá “to extinguish” [Rsg.] = məcə (-ts-) “mourir” [Clm.], Muyang -mt- “to die”, məté “to extinguish” [Rsg.] = məta “mourir” [Clm.], Mada mta [Hfm. 1971] = mát [Rsg.] = mat [Clm.], Mora məca (-ts-) [Clm.], Paduko mc (-ts) (-ts) “mort/mourir” [Mch.] = məc (-ts-) [Clm.] = məcá (-ts-) [Brt. 1995, 199], Moloko mát [Rsg.], Mboku misinde, mčə “mort/mourir” [Mch.], Mofu mčə “mort/mourir” [Mch.] = məcə “to die”, mèmčé “death”, məcàdá (-ts-) “to extinguish” [Rsg.] = məc (-c-) “mourir” [Clm.] = mčëy [Hfm. 1971], Mofu-Gudur -məc- [Brt. 1978, 116] = ‘məc- [Brt. 1988, 163; Jng. 1990], SMofu ‘məc` [Brt.] = məc [Sgn.-Trn.], Mefele məc (-ts-) “mourir” [Clm.], Gwendele məca (-ts-) “mourir” [Clm.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 169; Rsg. 1978, 235, §183 & 237, §194 & 246, §244; Clm. 1982, 107; Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 27) | Musgoy muc (-ts) [NM], Daba muc (-ts) [Mch. 1966, 139] = mïc (-tš) [LG 1974, 190, §507; 1975, 100] = ti mùč [Krf.], Hina miči (-ts) “mort/mourir” [Mch.] = midi [Grb.], Gawar míči [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Kola məc (-ts) ~ məc [Wdk. 1975, 93–94] = múty [Schubert] | Gidar mta “mort” [Mch., NM] | PKotoko *mVtV “to die” [Prh.]: Buduma máte “sterben”, mátte “auslöschen” [Nct./Lks. 1939, 119] = na-mati [Gaufrey-Demombynes] = mətó [Cyffer] = matə [Jng. 1990], Logone mti(ì) [Nct./Lks. 1936, 111] = mti “mort” [Mch.] = amtia [Gaufrey-Demombynes] = (“Kotoko”) mârî (f) “mort” [Bouny 1978, 109] = mârə [Bouny/JI], Afade ámadéh [amadě] (1st p. sg.) [Stz.] = médì [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Ngala na-mate aas “er ist gestorben” [Duisburg], Gulfei madə [Lks. 1937, 150] = madə [Dlg. 1964, 62] = na-madi [Gaufrey-Demombynes], Shoe amadi “töten” [Lks. 1937, 155], Soe mdi [Lks.], Kuseri amatu [Gaufrey-Demombynes] (Kotoko gr.: Slk. 1967, 345–6, §706; Prh. 1972, 11, #1.3; 1977, 110) | Musgu mára [Krause apud Müller 1886, 400 and Lks. 1941, 66; Jng. 1970; Rsl. 1979] = miri [Décorse/Lks., Grb.] = mre [Rohlf/Lks. 1941, 66] = m(ì)ri [Mkr. 1966] = mra [NM] = mirí [Trn. 1991, 106], Musgu-Pus miri [Trn. 1991, 106], Muzuk mra “mort” [Mch.], Muskum mìnna “mort” [Trn. 1977, 25], Vulum (Mogrum) mìrí “mourir”, mèmréŋ “mort” [Trn. 1977, 25; 1978, 304], Mbara miđiŋ [TSL 1986, 272], Kaykay mìrí [Sgn.-Trn. 1984,

27] | Masa (Banana) mit “mort” [Mch.] = māt-ná “tuer”, mít-ná “1. mourir, 2. mort” [Jng. 1973 MS] = pf. midá, impf. midà [Jng. 1977, 80] = mita (vs. Banana mitùwà, mida) [Krf.] = mìt (mìt-na) [Ctc. 1983, 107; Jng. 1990] = mít [Ajl.], Zime-Dari māt “to die” [Jng. 1978, 25; Jng. 1979, 144] = māt “1. mourir, 2. mort, 3. cadavre” [Cooper 1984, 16], Zime-Batna mat [Jng. 1978, 6, 25] = māt “to die” [Jng. 1979, 144] = māt (pf.), māt (impf.) [Jng. 1980], Marba pf. mádá, impf. midá = māt [Ajl.], Lame mǎř(ší) ~ món(ší) [Krf.] = māt(á) “mourir”, māt(ā) “mort, cadavre” [Scn. 1982, 319], Lame-Peve mat “to die” [Krf.] = mat “death” [Venberg 1975, 37], Mesme (Zime-Misme) māt “died” [Jng. 1978, 16] = mat [Krf.] = más ~ māt “mourir”, māt “mort, cadavre”, māt “la mort” [Ksk. 1990, 40–41, 163], Gizey & Ham & Musey & Lew mít [Ajl.] (Masa gr.: Ajl. 2001, 38; CCh.: also Mch. 1950, 35; Hfm. 1971, 225; Wolff 1974, 15; Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 27) || ECh. *mat- “to die” [OS]: Kwang mǎyé “mourir”, mǎtii (f) “mort” [Jng. 1973 MS, 46], Kwang-Ngam mǎyé [Ebert 1973, 52] = mayé “mourir, ‘partir’, dépasser” [Lns.] = mayE [Coates], Kwang-Mobu máyé [Ebert 1977 MS, 2] = maye “mourir”, mǎye “dépasser” [Lns.] = maye [Coates], Kwang-Gaya & Alowa maye [Coates], Míndera mayE [Coates], Tchagine Golo & Kawalke maye [Coates], Modgel máte “töten” [Lks. 1937, 97], Kera mè [Ebert 1973, 52] = mé [Ebert 1976, 80; 1977 MS, 2] (KK: Lns. 1982, 109; Coates 1991 MS, 2, 5) | Kabalai ma [Jng. 1977, 80] = muwə [Jng. 1990] = muwá [Cpr., Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Lele mā (impf. mǎrā) “to die” [Simons 1981, 29, #507] = mā “mourir”, mǎrwē ~ mǎrwī (freq.) [WP 1982, 59, 61], Nancere má [Hfm. 1971, 10: *-t was sometimes lost in Nancere], Tobanga mǎrē [Brt.-Jng.] = mā ~ mǎrā [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Gabri mǎré (m) “mort”, mǎrē “mourir” [Cpr. 1972 MS] | Somrai (Sibine) máree “sterben”, mar “sterben (?)” in dóóa-mar “Sonnenuntergang”, mádee “Tod” [Lks. 1937, 80] = mǎdē (f) “1. mort, 2. cadavre”, mǎr “mourir” [Jng. 1993 MS, 43; 1978, 205], Tumak mā “mourir”, mā:d “mort” [Cpr. 1975, 81] = má (pf.), mā (impf.) [Jng. 1980], Ndam míyá [Jng. 1990], Sarwa māt “death (mort)” [Jng. 1977, 10, #218] = mǎrā “mourir” [Jng. 1990, 9], Gadang mà:r “mort”, mé:r “mourir” [Jng. 1990] (Somrai gr.: JI 1990 MS, 9, #167, #169) | Sokoro míta “sterben”, múútaa “Tod” [Lks. 1937, 36] = mita [Nwm.] = miita [Grb.] = míté [Jng. 1977, 80; 1990] = mítē [Saxon/JI, Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995] | EDng. mǎté “mourir, être achevé, cesser de vivre”, múútú (f) “mort, décès, trépas, la fin, l’extinction”, mútú (m) “la plaie,

blesure, bobo” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 198, 212] = *mát-é* “mourir” [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 77, 94], WDangla *màtè* (impf.), *mata* (pf.) “mourir”, *mùùtù* (f) “mort” [Fédry 1971, 110], Migama impf. *mátáá* [Jng. 1977, 87] = *múútú* [Fédry] = *maate* (pf.) [Jng. 1983] = *máató*, cf. *múútú* “mort” [JA 1992, 105; Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Mokilko *ʔùntó* “Tod, Toter” [Lks. 1977, 224] = *máàtè* (impf.) [Jng. 1977, 87] = (t)indá “mourir”, *ʔùntó* (f) “la mort” [Jng. 1990, 112, 190] = *ʔind-* [Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Mawa *mídín* (-ŋ ending of vb.n.) “sterben”, mit “stirb!”, *mut* (m) “Tod” [Jng. 1978, 37–38] = *miidè* [Jng. 1990], Bidiya *māātèŋ* “mourir” [Fédry] = *maat* “mourir”, *muutò* (f) “mort, décès” [AJ 1989, 96, 101] = *mūti* (pf.), *mūt-* (impf.) [Jng. 1983] = *māāt* [Jng. 1990] (DM: Fédry 1977, 105) | Jegu *maat* “sterben, zugrunde gehen, zerbrochen werden”, *moot* “Toter, Leiche” [Jng. 1961, 115], Birgit *màatí* “mourir”, *mùutì* (f) “mort” [Jng. 1973 MS; 2004, 356–7], Mubi *maat* (pf.) [Lsk. 1937, 184] = *mat* [Rsl. 1979; Jng. 1990; 1992] = *mààdé* [Jng. 1978, 314; 1990 MS, 32; Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995], Kajakse *màatà* (vb.n.) [Alio 2004, 245, #235], Toram *mùt* [Alio 2004, 260] (common Ch.: also NM 1966, 233, #20; Lks. 1970, 34; Nwm. 1977, 24; Jng. 1970, 421; 1977, 80–81; 1980, 74; 1983, 141–142; 1990, 235–242; 1992, 384; Krf. 1981, #410; JI 1994 II, 102–3; Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995, 229–239; Std. 1996, 106; Brt.-Jng. 1990, 73–75, 80, 82, 117, 171). All forms denote “to die” if no meaning is indicated.

LIT. for the AA comparison: Hommel 1883, 98; Erman 1892, 111; Lippert 1906, 343; Bates 1914, 82; GB 409; Möller 1924, 42; Drexel 1925, 14; Zhl. 1932–33, 93; Vcl. 1934, 76; 1957, 354; 1978, 64; 1983, 107; 1987, 118; 1990, 55; 1990, 223; 1994, 250; Clc. 1936, #32; Virg. 1945, 142, #21.a.4; Chn. 1947, 192, #488; Rsl. 1952, 135; 1964, 207; 1979, 26–27; Hintze 1953, 36–37; Lefebvre 1955, 2, #3.a.3; Pls. 1958, 82, fn. 26; Mkr. 1957, 138–139; 1959, 15, #23; 1966, 30, #61; Grb. 1955, 57; 1963, 55, #23; Korostovcev 1963, 14; Dlg. 1964, 62; 1967, 281; 1973, 246; 1983, 130; Djk. 1965, 44; 1967, 187; 1974, 742; Slk. 1967, 345–6, §706; Djk. et al. 1986, 64; Gouffé 1974, 362; Prh. 1972, 11, #1.3; 1977, 110; Bnd. 1975, 158; Hodge 1976, 12, #61; 1978, 3, #34; 1981, 410; KHW 87; Sasse 1980, 172; Jng. 1982, 8; Rabin 1982, 25, §5; Bynon 1984, 252–253; Jng. 1987, 26; OS 1992, 175; 1992, 200; Jng. 1983, 141–142; 1990, 235–238; 1994, 230; Mlt. 1991, 255, #17.1; HSED #1751; Brt.-Ibr.-Jng. 1995, 229–239; HSED #1751; Std. 1996, 106; Dlg. 1999, 53–54, §177; Vernus 2000, 175.

AP: With special regard to Eg. *mt* “sterben”, hence “zu Grunde gehen: vom untergehenden Schiff” (MK, Wb II 166, 7) = “to perish (of boat), sink” (Jones 1988, 215, #37), Mukarovskij (1957, 138–9; 1959, 15, #23; 1994, 152) related AA **m-w-t* (Eg. *mt*) with Ful *mūt-de* “sinken, untergehen (von der Sonne oder einem Boot)”, mutual “Untergang”, WAtl.: Bolante *mota* “auslöschen”, Temne *mota* “sinken (Schiff, Stein), tauchen, untergehen (Sonne)”. Elderkin (1982, 79), in turn, combined Ch. **m-t* “to die” with Hadza *misi* “to die”.

DP: A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1967, 281) explained the AA root from Nst. **mutə* “закончиться” based on Tungus-Mandju **muda* “закончиться”, Drv. **mūt-/*muṭə*

“кончатся”. S. A. Starostin et al. (1995, 4) affiliated the AA root with Alt. *mūtei “complete”, Drv. *mut- “to end, be completed”, and ST *met “to perish”.

NB1: N. Skinner (1995, 30) erroneously reconstructed a certain AA *m-w/y- “1. to die, 2. hunger” based on the mostly false comparison of a number of unrelated *comparanda* like Ch. *m-y “hunger” vs. *k-m “corpse”, WCh.: NBch. *miy- “to die” vs. *m(w)ay- “hunger”, Eg. mnj “to die” (original mng. “to moor”!), Bed. misis “to die natural death (animal)”, miti “to dissolve, melt” and a number of further absurd parallels.

NB2: Brb. *-mm- < *-mw- was regular, cf. Brb. *ə-ssən “to know” ~ Eg. swn as rightly pointed out by E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 93) and F. Hintze (1953, 36–37 & fn. 48). The latter author was, however, of the view that “*möglicherweise ist -t im Berberischen eine Stammerweiterung*”, while in Sem. and Eg. it was not (cf. contra Zyhlarz 1932–33, 94 and Cohen 1947, 192, #488: “*toutefois dans certains dialectes -t est traité comme suffixe*”). Uncritically following Ch. Ehret (1995, 312), P. Vernus (2000, 175 & fn. 48) made an obscure statement that “*en couchitique, le t n’est pas intégré à la racine*”. N. Skinner (1977, 18, fn. 54) too assumed that *t was a suffix in NBch.

NB3: Not too many evident traces of AA *m-w-t in Cu. Note that LECu.: Somali mōd- and Somali-Isaq mot- “death” were borrowed from Ar. (Dlg. 1973, 246). Following R. Hayward (p.c.), H.-J. Sasse (1982, 148) related AA *ʃm-w-t to HECu.: Burji mot-ā “lame”, mot-um- “to be paralyzed, dislocated” and Orm. a-mut-ā “mourning”. Ch. Rabin (1982, 30, fn. 4), in turn, was disposed to compare also the homophonous Cu. root for “to pierce”/“to eat”.

NB4: No evident cognates in Om. either. Cf. perhaps NOM.: Gamu met-ó “1. lack, 2. trouble”, meto-t- “to lack” [Lmb. 1985 MS, #521–2] | Yemsa (Jnj.) mett- “to be sick” [Lmb. 1996, 334]

(*)**mt**: an old word which may be reconstructed from the phon. value of the hrgl. depicting a “phallus” (EG 1927, 448, D52) = “le phallus ou le mâle” (Lacau 1912, 72, §6) = “pénis (un mot, qui a très vraisemblablement existé, mais il a disparu)” (Lacau 1952, 9, §7 & fn. 3) = “Hieroglyphenbild des erigierten Phallus” (Grapow 1954, 21) = “eine alte, wohl etikettierende Bezeichnung des Phallus (nur als Phonogramm belegt)” (Behrens, LÄ IV 1019, n. 5) > Dem. mt “phallus” (DG 184).

NB1: This may be considered – pace P. Lacau (l.c.) – a word “*qui appartenait au vieux fond de la langue*”. I. M. D’jakonov (1965, 42) treated it as an attested lexeme, although W. W. Müller (1968, 365) also warned that “*mt ‘Phallus’ ist im Ägyptischen als Wort unbekannt, nur als Schriftzeichen (belegt)*”. Nevertheless, P. Lacau (1970, 81) maintains to have identified the word in PT 601: jʃj hr n N jn ntr.w m... (three phallus hrgls. + -w) m hm.wt “le visage de N. est lavé par les dieux et comme mâles et comme femelles” (Lacau) = “my face is washed by the gods, male and female” (AEPT 116). But here, the phallus hrgl. has to be read rather as tʃj. A. H. Gardiner (1957, 52, fn. 2), followed by W. A. Ward (1972, 21, #209), in turn, thought to have found a “unique” MK occurrence of mt “phallus” (“*perhaps the otherwise unrecorded word from which the sign takes its phonetic value*”) in Pap. Ramesseum VI 71(?), 96 (cf. WD II 69). But R. Hannig (ÄWb II 1153) lists a significant number of its further MK (mostly CT) occurrences as a *Kunstwort*.

NB2: Whether mt.wt “1. männliche Same, 2. (bildlich) Sohn” (PT, Wb II 169, 1–3) originated from the same root is uncertain. J. Zeidler (1984, 47) seems to have preferred deriving Eg. *mt “phallus” from mt.wt “sperm” (not *vice versa*). This does not necessarily contradict to the etymology of Eg. *mt suggested below (Sem.

*mut- “man” etc.). Note that H. Grapow (1954, 86) maintained an etymological connection between Eg. *mt.wt* “semen” and *mt.wt* “poison” (supposing that Egyptians conceived sperm as poisonous).

- **1.** Most probably cognate with Cu.-Om. *mut- “penis” [GT]: HECu.: Hadiyya muta “penis” [Lmb.], Sidamo mutā “membro virile” [Crl. 1938 II, 215] = mutá “membro virile” [Mrn. 1940, 231] = mutá [Hintze] = muta “penis (unpolite word)” [Gsp. 1983, 243; Hds. 1989, 387] = mut-ā “male genitalia” [Lsl.] ||l| NOM.: Zala & Dache mut-e “1. penis, 2. (hence) vagina” [Lmb. 1988, 69, §179; HL 1988, 129], Zayse mut-ē “ano” [Crl. 1938 III, 206]. Several authors (e.g., Lsl. 1949, 315; Hintze 1951, 86; Blz. 1990, 265; Takács 1997, 372, #a) suggested an etymological connection of Eg. *mt “phallus” (and its Cu.-Om. parallels) with the reflexes of AA *mät “man, husband” [Djk.] = *mut- “man, male” [GT]. Thus, Eg. *mt has been usually equated (also) with Sem. *mut- “man, warrior” [Hnrg. 1995, 2128; 2000, 2065] = *mut- “man, husband” [Fox 1998, 15; Djk.-Kogan 2001, 151, §2.1]: Akk. mutu “(Ehe)Mann” [AHW 690] < Oakk. mutum “mate, husband” [Gelb 1973, 186] (misquoted in HSED #1806, cf. Kogan 2002, 195) || Ug. mt “(Ehe)mann, Gatte” [WUS] = mt “1. man, individual, member, 2. man, husband, 3. hero” [DUL 598] = mt “1. Mann, Ehemenn, 2. Krieger, Heros” [DL 1990, 59–65], Hbr. *mot (st.cstr. *mätū-), pl. mätim (st.cstr. mätē-) “1. men, 2. people” [KB 653], Samar. Aram. mt “man” [Tal 2000, 492] || Geez mät “husband” [Lsl.], Tigre mit “husband” [Nöldeke 1910, 146, §2] (Sem.: Lsl. 1944, 57; 1968, 359, #1569; 1987, 371; WUS #1705; cf. Djk. 1970, 465, fn. 40; Rabin 1975, 88, #52) ||l| Ch. *mätu “person” [Nwm. 1977, 30] = *m-t-m (or *-k) vs. *m-t-N “1. man, person (homo), 2. husband” [JS 1981, 147A₂, 202A₁; JI 1994 I 98] = *mutum (!) “man” [Rabin] > WCh.: Hausa mùtum ~ mùtuŋ “1. man, male, 2. person, human being” [Abr. 1962, 690] = mùtùm “person, man in general”, pl. mùt-àànéé “gens” [Lks. 1968, 104], Gwnd. n̄cé [< *nte < *mte], pl. ñtànì “person, man” [Mts. 1972, 87] || ECh.: Sokoro mätii “Gatte, Mann, junger bärtiger Mann” [Lks. 1937, 36] = mätí, pl. mòdoŋ “homme” [Saxon 1977 MS, 23, #351] = “man (Mann)” [JI] | WDng. mítà ~ mítì-kò “mari”, míyò “enfant” [Fédry 1971, 129], EDng. mètà “homme, personne de sexe masculin, adulte, mâle, mari, fiancé”, mītyāw “enfance, jeunesse”, mìyò (m) “enfant” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 203, 207], Mawa m̄l̄t̄à “Mensch, Mann” [Jng. 1978, 37] | Toram m̄c̄t̄it̄ (m) “male” [Alio 1988, 20] = miito “homme” [Alio 2004, 260, #319], Ubi mòotá “homme” [Alio 2004,

273, #216], Karbo mitiko “man” [e-Minai MS n.d., 3], Jegu mitó, pl. mit “Mann” [Jng. 1961, 115], Kofa mètó, pl. miḍén “homme” [Jng. 1977, 14, #351] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 201, 231). Whether SBrb.: Tuareg ta-mätte “gent, nation (ensemble de population très considérable)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 603 with different etym.], EWlm. & Ayr te-mätte “1. population, 2. (EWlm.) gens, nation, 3. famille, les gens” [PAM 2003, 563] ||| LECu.: Oromo māṭī “children” [Sasse 1982, 138] = māṭī “family, household” [Gragg 1982, 272] = māṭī? “Ehefrau mit den Kindern, d.h. Familie” [Lmb.], Dirayta mēt [me:ti] & Bussa mēča [mé:ʃa] “child” [Wdk.-Tanaba-Cheru 1994, 8, #119] | HECu. (borrowed from Orm.): Burji māt-é “family” [Sasse] = mātē ~ mātē [Hds.], Sid. mātē “Familie” [Yri/Hds., Lmb.], Hdy. mātē?e “Familie” [Lmb.] (ECu.: Hds. 1989, 60; Lmb. 1993, 361), cf. Amh. (from ECu.) mati “large number of children of the same family” [Gragg] ||| ECh.: (?) EDng. mityò (m) “un petit garçon”, mityā (f) “une petite fille” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 203] are eventually also related, is dubious. The etymology of LECu.: Arb. matóm (m) “group of young men” [Hyw. 1984, 384] is not clear.

AP: E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 168) combined ONub. mete “Generation” [Zhl.] with Eg. mt.wt “Same, Sohn”. M. Lambertini (1988, 69, §179), in turn, compared HECu.-NOM. *mut- with Kuliak: So, Tepesh mečut, pl. metot “penis” [Flm. 1983, 457]. Cf. also Digo mthu and Nika mutu (Taylor: muṭu) “Mensch” [Mnh. 1905, 179, 188]. M. L. Bender (1975, 174, §49.5) combined the Hausa word with Ful neɗ-, PBantu *-ntò, and even IE *ner- (!) “man (person)”. H. Jungraithmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I 135) too, surmised here an “*ancient pan-African root*” present also in PBantu *-ntù “person” [Gtr. 1971, 139, #1798], cf. e.g. Swahili mtu, Luganda omuntu (Bantu: cf. also Gluhak 1979, 223), although the proper root in Bantu seems to be just *-tu [Gtr.].

DP: D. J. Wölfel (1955, 37) and V. Blažek (1990, 265) affiliated the underlying AA root with IE *mut- > Lat. mütō “das männliche Glied”, Mrel. moth (or math) “das männliche Glied” (IE: LEW II 138). F. Kammerzell (1999, 250) combined Eg. *mt with IE *mōit-/*mit- “Phallus”.

LRR.: Erman 1892, 112 (Eg.-Hbr.); Vcl. 1934, 46; 1938, 133; 1983, 125 (Eg.-Hausa-Sem.); Yeivin 1936, 71, #17 (Eg.-Sem.); Chn. 1947, 190, #476 (Sem.-Eg.-Hausa); Lsl. 1949, 315, #476 (Sem.-Eg.-Sidamo); Hintze 1951, 86 (Akk.-Eg.-Sidamo); Lacau 1954, 295; 1970, 81–82; 1972, 305, §20 (Eg.-Sem.); Gordon 1955, 293, #117 (Sem.-Eg.); Wlf. 1955, 37 (Hausa-Eg.-Akk.); AHW 690 (Sem.-Eg.); Djk. 1965, 40; 1967, 187 (Sem.-Eg.-Hausa, cf. Ibr. 1991, 52); 1970, 457, fn. 14 (Sem.-Hausa); 1974, 742 (Sem.-Eg.-Jegu); Brunner 1965, 93, fn. 2 (Eg.-Sem., cf. Zeidler 1984, 47); Pls. 1960, 123, #122 (Sem.-Eg.-Hausa); Lacau 1970, 81 (Eg.-Sem.); Rsl. 1971, 284 (Eg.-Sem.); Gouffé 1974, 366 (Hausa-Tuareg); Rabin 1982, 11 & fn. 4 (PCh.-Sem.-ECu.-Eg.); Behrens, LÄ IV 1019, n. 5 (Eg.-Hs.-Sem.); Djk. et al. 1986, 64 (Sem.-Eg.-Hausa-ECh.); Lsl. 1987, 271 (Sem.-Sid.); Murtonen 1989, 268 (Sem.-Hs.); Blz. 1990, 265 (Sem.-Eg.-?PBrb.-PCh.-Sidamo); Bmh. 1990, 401 (Sem.-Eg.-Sidamo-Ch.); Djk. et al. 1992, 33 (Sem.-Eg.-Hs.-ECh.); Lmb. 1993, 105 (HECu.-NOM.); JI 1994 I 135 (Ch.-Trg.-Hbr.); Redford 1994, 209 (Eg.-Sem.); HSED #1806 (Sem.-Hausa-ECh.); Skn. 1996, 206 (WCh.-CCh.-ECh.-Sem.-Eg.); KB 653 (Sem.-Eg.); Takács 1997, 235, #26.2; 2005, 52, #4.22 (Eg.-Sem.-ECu.-PCh.-PBrb.); Voigt 1998, 612–3 (Ch.-Sem.-

- Eg.); Vernus 2000, 189 & fn. 205 with lit. (Eg.-Sem.); Diakonoff & Kogan 2001, 151, §2.1 (Sem.-Eg.-PCh.); Blz. 2002, 130–1, #24.1 (HECu.-NOM.-Eg.).
- NB1: The etymology of Sem. *mut- has been debated. L. Reinisch (1887, 252) and I. M. Diakonoff & L. Kogan (2001, 151, §2.1) affiliated Geez *mat* with Ar. *matta* “extendit” [Rn.] = *matta* I “1. étendre qqch., 3. rechercher une alliance avec qqn., chercher à s’allier dans la famille de qqn.”, *matāt*- “lien par lequel on tient à la famille de qqn.”, *mätt-at*- “lien d’alliance ou de parenté” [BK II 1055]. But already L. H. Gray (1934, 41) reconstructed the primary sense of PSEM. *mut- as “mortal, man”, evidently referring to Sem. *mwt “to die”. V. Blažek (1990, 265–266) and V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1806) too, have suggested a relationship of PAA *m-w-t “to die” vs. PAA *mut- “man” with special regard to the typological parallel found in PIE *mer- “to die” > i.a. Indo-Iranian-Gk.-Arm. isogloss *mor-to- “man”.
- NB2: In Berber, cf. alternatively PBrb. *a-utəm “man” [Lst.] = *√w-t-m “male” [Blz.] > NBrb.: Shilh (Tiznit) a-wtəm “mâle” [LR], Shilh of Anezi a-wsəm “mâle” [LR] | Ait Sadden a-wtəm “mâle” [LR] | Rif: Tamsaman & Ait Tuzin & Uriaghel a-wtəm “mâle” [LR], Figig a-wtəm “mâle” [Ksm.], Swy. a-wtəm “mâle” [LR] || EBrb.: Gdm. ôtəm “mâle” [Lanfrj], Siwa utəm “mâle” [Lst. 1931, 256] (Brb.: LR 1999, 289, 291; Blz. 2002, 130–1, #24.1), which V. Blažek (1990, 265; 2002, 130–1) explained as a metathesis from an earlier **a-wmət.
- NB3: H. C. Fleming (1964, 57) equated HECu.: Sid. *muta* with Bed. mid “penis” (below) and LECu.: Bys. *manteti* (-ti fem. suffix) & Orm. Borana *mutē* “vagina”. M. Lamberti (1988, 69, §179; 1993, 105; 1993, 288; HL 1988, 129) derived HECu.-NOM. *mut- “penis” from his “OCu.” (PCu.-Om.) *buḍ-/ *muḍ- “to sprout, spring” based on the phonologically dubious comparison of this root with Bed. mid “penis” (below) || LECu.: Saho-Afar *buḍde* “penis”, Orm. *biṭto?* “penis”, Gdl. mi²-no “penis” and (!) *beṭere* “vagina”, Baiso *man-to* “penis” | HECu.: Burji *misa* ~ *musa* “penis”, Kmb. *muturo* “vagina” || NOM.: Zayse & Dache *mute* “vagina”, Yemsa *bur’a* “penis”, and NOM.: Sns. *bēca* (-ts-) “penis”.
- NB4: M. Lamberti (1993, 361) erroneously assumed a connection of the ECu. word for “family” (above) with NOM. *māčč- “Frau” [GT], which he explained from OCu. *may- “weiblich(es Wesen)” [Lsl.].
- NB5: The relatedness of SCu.: WRift *ḡm-et (!) [Dlg.] = *Vmet “people” [GT] > Iraqw *emēt* “Leute” [Dempwolff] = *emet* [Dlg.], Burunge *imēt* [Dempwolff] = *imet* “people” [Dlg.] (WRift: Dempwolff 1916–17, 310, #56; Dlg. 1973, 176) is also rather unlikely, while LECu.: Afar *ummat* (f) “inhabitants, populace, people” [PH 1985, 204] is evidently a borrowing from Ar. *ʿumm-at*- “1. assemblée, foule, multitude, 2. famille, 3. peuple, nation” [BK I 52].
- NB6: The etymology of the Ch. forms has been disputed. Lukas 1968, 104: Hausa *mùtùm* < Ch. *√m-t-n! N. Pilszczikowa (1958, 78, §16 & fn. 12), rejecting M. Cohen’s (l.c.) equation of Hs. *mutum* with Sem. *mut- and Eg. *mt (which she erroneously combined with Hs. *miḡi* “homme, mari”), compared the Hs. word rather with WCh.: Dera mu and Bole *memu*, which she supposed to originate from “*une jonction de mu et tun*” identified by her with a certain “Nilo-Hamitic” (sic) *nyetuñunan*, while Hs. *mu-* “*serait un préfixe d’une ancienne classe humaine*” comparable with Hs. -*tun* of the same mng. (acc. to Delafosse). Similarly, H. Jungrauthmayr & K. Shimizu (1981, 147A₂ and 202A₁₋₂) explained PCh. *m-z, *m-n, *m-m, *m-r “man (vir), male, husband, person” from PCh. *m-. Later, however, H. Jungrauthmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I, 98, 114–115, 134–135) set up an original PCh. *m-t-m “husband, man, person” remarking that the third radical *m is reflected only in Hausa, elsewhere a root *m-t is attested with C₃ “*apocopated*” (whence they took also WCh.: Tng. *muu* and Jimi *ma* as well as the ÉCh.: Sokoro and Dangla *comparanda* listed above, in which C₃ “*has been clipped*”). JI (1994 I, 135) did not exclude that “*originally R₁ and R₃ of our root [i.e., PCh. *m-t-m] would have been class markers in an ambifixal class language system m- + -t- + -m*”. This hypothesis has not been satisfactorily demonstrated. Already

R. M. Voigt (1998, 612) correctly separated Ch. *m-t from Ch. *m-n. The same applies to Ch. *m-z vs. *m-r vs. *m-, which represent diverse unrelated AA roots.
 NB7: R. M. Voigt (1998, 612–3) affiliated Ch. *m-t-m “Mann” (attested in fact only in Hausa) with Ar. *matuna* “stark sein”, which he separated from bicons. Ch. *m-t (Sokoro) ~ Sem. *mut- and Eg. *mt “phallus” (explained by him eventually from the AA root reflected by Eg. *wmt* “dick sein”).

- 2. The roots for “male” and “penis” with AA *-t- listed above have not been always carefully distinguished from those having an original *-d- with a similar semantic spectrum.

LIT.: Chn. 1947, #476 (Eg.-Tuareg); Bynon 1984, 276, #39 (Eg.-Tuareg); Mlt. 1984, 158 (Bed.-Tuareg-LECu.-CCh.); Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 26 (Bed.-ECu.); Takács 1997, 235, #26.3; 1997, 372, #b (Cu.-Brb.-?Ch.). Already A. Ju. Militarev (l.c.) related the Bed.-LECu. isogloss for “penis” with the Tuareg-CCh. one for “man”.

NB1: Cf. AA *m-d “1. penis, 2. groin (?)” [GT] attested in Bed. *mid* “männliches Glied” [Almkvist 1885, 48] = oʾmid [Munzinger] = *mīd* (m) “das männliche Schamglied” [Rn. 1895, 162] = *mīd* “penis” [Rpr. 1928, 213] = *mīd* (-d-) [Dlg. 1972, 229] = *mid* “penis” [Hds. 1996, 89] || LECu.: Orm. *mund-ō* “penis (relatively polite term)” [Gragg 1982, 295] || ECh.: Kwang-Mobu *tà-dá* (f), pl. *kà-dá* (?) [**-mda?*] “penis” [Jng. 1973 MS].

NB2: Cf. perhaps also AA *m-d (perhaps *mud-/mʷad-?) “groin” [GT] > LECu.: Oromo *mudāmuddī* “groin” [Gragg 1982, 292–3] | HECu.: Hadiyya *muday-iččo*, Kambatta & Qabenna *možožži-ta* & Tambaro *možož-iččo* “groin” [Lsl.], hence Eth.-Sem.: Gurage **məzəmza* “groin” [Lsl.] vs. Wolane *mudamudo* “groin” (Eth.-Sem.: Lsl. 1980, 125; 1986, 378) || WCh.: AS *mʷat [-t < *d# reg.] (prefixed by *po-) “groin” [GT 2004, 259]; Angas *po-mwat* “groin” [Gochal 1994, app.], Mpn. *mwát* “private parts (male or female, not an obscene word)” [Frj. 1991, 39], Msr. *po-mwat* “cervix”, sorop *ku po-mwat* “women have cervix” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 250].

NB3: On the other hand, cf. AA *m-d “man” [GT] > Brb. *mīdīd-ān [PAM 2003, 521] > NBrb.: Shilh *medd-en* “les gens” [Bst.; Jst. 1914, 144] = *mid-n* “people” [Aplg. 1958, 61] = (Tiznit and Anezi dial.) *mōdd-ən* “gens” [LR] = *mōdd-ən* [PAM 2003] | Mzg. *mīdd-en* (pl.t.) “les gens, les humains, personnes” [Tf. 1991, 404; falsely √mdn], Izdeg *medd-en* “gens” [Mrc. 1937, 128] | Zenet gr.: Iznasen & Menaser *mīdd-en* “gens” [Bst.], Mzab *mīdd-en* “gens” [Bst.] = *mīdd-ən* (m.pl.) “les gens, autrui” [Dlh. 1984, 115], Wargla *mīdd-ən* (pl.m.) “(le) gens, le public, le monde, autrui” [Dlh. 1987, 184], Djerba *medd-en* “gens” [Bst.], Sened *mīdd-en* (pl.) “gens” [Priv. 1911, 117] | Qabyle *medd-en* (pl.s.sg.) “1. les gens, 2. les étrangers, les autres qui ne sont pas de la famille directe et proche” [Dlt. 1982, 487] = *mōdd-ən* [PAM 2003], Zwawa & Bugi *medd-en* “gens” [Bst.], Ait Khalfun *i-mīd-an* “gens” [Bst.] (NBrb.: cf. also Bst. 1883, 338; Bst. 1885, 169) || EBrb.: Gdm. *medd-in* “gente” [Prd. 1961, 297] = *medd-īn* “des gens” [Lanfry 1973, 204, #971] = *mādd-ən* [PAM 2003], Audjila *a-mēd-ən* “uomo”, pl. *mīdd-e/ən* “gente, persone” [Prd. 1960, 166, 176] = *mīdd-ān* [PAM 2003], Fogaha *i-mīdd-en* ~ *i-mīdd-ā* “gente” [Prd. 1961, 297] = *i-mēdd-ən* ~ *i-mīdd-ən* [PAM 2003] || SBrb.: Ahaggar *medd-ān* “enfants” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1159], EWlm. *mādda* “1. (les) enfants, 2. fils”, *mādd-an* “1. fils (de), enfants (de), 2. (p.ext.) petits d’un animal” vs. EWlm. *medd-ān* & Ayr *medd-ən* (pl.) “hommes” [PAM 1998, 209; 2003, 521], Ghat *mīdd-en* (pl.) “hommes” [Nhl. 1909, 168], Kel Ui *mīdd-ən* (pl.) “люди (men), мужнины (husbands)” [Mlt.] (Brb.: Bst. 1883, 311; LR 1999, 287; PAM 2003, 521) || LECu.: Dasenech (Geleba) *mādet* “man” [Bnd. 1971, 251, #49], Arbore modo “man” [Bnd. 1971, 251, #49] = *módo* “man” [Kusian & Sbr. 1994, 8] (Dasenech-Arbore: also Mlt. 1984, 158; Mkr. 1989 MS, 5) || WCh.: Bade *mīdī* “person” [LL/JI] = ʾmīd-ən “man, person” [Lks. 1968, 104, 223] = *mīd-ən* ~ *mīdan* “Mensch” [Lks. 1974–75, 103], WBade *mīd-ən* “person” [Schuh], Ngizim *ndīwā* ~ *ndāwā* [nd- from *md-] “people” [Schuh 1981, 212],

Teshena I mudʔai & II mudin “person” [Schuh] (Bade-Ngizim gr.: Schuh 1982, 13; 2001, 432) || CCh.: Tera ndú-kù “person” [Nwm. 1964, 39, #112] | Bura-Margi *m-d “person” [Hfm. 1987, 457] > Bura mda “man” [BED 1953, 135] = mda “Mensch, jemand”, madi “irgendein, jeder” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 91–92], Margi *√m-d “person” [Hfm.]: EBura *mdu vs. WBura *mda [Skn. 1996, 206], Margi mdù (pl. m̄ʒi) “1. man, person, 2. some-, anybody” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 124] = mdò “man” [Nwm.] = mdù [Wolff] = ṁdò “person” [IL/JI], Margi-Gwara ámdò “Mensch” [Wolff 1974–75, 191], Ngwahyi nda “person” [Krf.], Chibak (Kyibaku) nde ~ ndó ~ ndà “Mensch” [Hfm. 1955, 125], Putai mda “person” [Krf.], Heba “person” [Krf.], Hyildi ndu “person” [Krf.], Wamdiu ndaw “person” [Krf.], Wuba ndau “person” [Krf.] (Bura-Margi: Hfm. 1987, 470, #3 after Krf. 1981, #83) | Higi m̄di “person” [Mohrlang 1972, 98], Higi-Nkafa mdi “person” [Meek], Higi-Kamale mde “person” [Meek], Fali-Kiria mde “homo” [JI] = (w)mdu “person” [Krf.], Fali-Jilbu m̄di “person” [Krf.], Fali-Muchella mundu “person” [Krf.], Fali-Gili ndu “person” [Krf.], Fali-Bwagira m̄ndin “person” [Krf.] (Higi gr.: Krf. 1972 MS) | PBata *(mu)ndu [GT] > Gude nda “person” [Meek] = undəron [IL], Nzangi m̄nde “person” [Meek] = m̄nde bari “person” [Mch.], Gudu m̄ndu “person” [Skn.], Mwulyen ndoh “person” [Skn.], Gude nda “person” [Skn.] | Lamang (Hitkala) mudu ~ mdu ~ mundu “homme” [Egc. 1971, 219] = wundu “person” [Meek] = ùmdù “person” [Lks.] = úndú “Mensch” [Wolff], Lamang-Turu mundu “Mensch” [Wolff], Wemgo (Vizik, Woga) wundu “Mensch” [Wolff], Alataghwa unda “Mensch” [Wolff] (Lamang: Wolff 1971, 65, §31) | Mnd. mde “gens” [Mch.], Glavda úúð-à < *u-md-a “man, person” [Lks.; RB], Dghwede w̄de “person” [Frick], Malgwa nda “Leute, Menschen” [Löhr 2002, 304] | Sukur mdu “person” [Meek] | Matakam (Mafa) ndo “homme” [Mch.] = ndu [Lks. 1970] = ndwà “person” [Schubert 1971–72 MS, 6] = ndó “homme, personne” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 282], Paduko m̄nda “gens” [Mch.], Mofu ndu “homme” [Mch.] = ndòw “homo” [Brt./JI], SMofu ndaw “Mensch” [Sgn.-Trn. 1984, 25], Mofu-Gudur ndaw [Lks. 1968] = ndaw, pl. ndəh(w)ay “homme, être humain, gens” [Brt. 1988, 205], Mboku du ~ do “homme” [Mch.], Hurzo duu “homme” [Mch.] (MM: Mch. 1953, 184) | Logone madá “Leute” [Lks. 1936, 106] (CCh.: Mch. 1950, 49) || ECh.: Lele induwa [from *md-] “humain” [Skn.] | Migama mīdi (m) “homme (mâle)” [JA 1992, 107] = mi:di “man (vir)” [Jng. in JI] = mīido [Skn.], Bdy. mīdò “homme”, pl. mīdaw “mari”, cf. mītte (m), pl. mīdaw “époux, mari” [AJ 1989, 99], Birgit mīdiwò (m), pl. mīdi “homme” [Jng. 1973 MS; 2004, 357], Mkl. mádi “camarade! (terme d’adresse à un homme)” [Jng. 1991, 136] (ECh.: also JI 1994 II, 231; Ch.: also Lks. 1970, 32; JI 1994 II, 230–1, 266–7).

nb4: The etymology of Bed. m̄id has been debated. L. Reinisch (l.c.) compared it with LECu.: Afar buddé “das männliche Schamglied” and even māl “coire”, while E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168) connected it rather with Eg. mt3 “penis” (below). A.B. Dolgopolskij (1967, 8, #4) too, combined Bed. m̄id (sic) with HECu.: Sidamo mutá “membrum virile” and Eg. mt (sic) “penis”. But the etymology of Eg. mt3 is disputed (see below). E. Haberland and M. Lamberti (1988, 129) too, derived Bed. m̄id “penis” from an OCu. *muð/t- “sexual organ” erroneously based on LECu.: SA buddé “penis”, Orm. biṭṭo? “penis”, Gdl. miʔ-no “penis” and (!) beṭere “vagina”, Baiso manto “penis” | HECu.: Burji misa “penis”, Sid. & Had. muta “penis”, Kmb. muturo “vagina” || NOM.: Zala & Dache mute “vagina”, Yemsa bur’a “penis”.

nb5: The etymology of Brb. *midd-ən “gens” is also dubious. Its direct comparison with WCh.: Hausa mutum ||| Eg. *mt ||| Sem. *mut- (above) is doubtful (phonologically also), although it has been frequent in the lit., cf. Halévy (quoted by Prv. 1911, 117); Bst. 1885, 169; Lippert 1906, 341, §20; Wf. 1955, 37; Lacau 1970, #213; Gouffé 1974, 366; Behrens, LÄ IV 1019, n. 5; Rabin 1982, 11; Vcl. 1983, 125; Bynon 1984, 276; JI 1994 I 135 (with hesitation); PAM 2003, 521. This comparison was rejected already by Provotelle (1911, 117), who saw in the Berber word

a pl. form “*dérivée avec la terminaison du pluriel d’une*” Brb. *√d or *√d > NBrb.: Swy. iud-an ~ iud-an, Sened uđ-un, Djerba & Nfs. iud-an ~ ida “les gens”. Similarly, V. Blažek (2002, 129, #23.2) analyzed Brb. *√m-ʔ-d (sic) “man” as a compound of *√d + prefix *m-.

NB6: It is just as well improbable that LECu.: Dasenech & Arbore *mVd- “man” would be directly related with PCh. *m-t “man” [GT] (as proposed by H. G. Mukarovsky 1989 MS, 5). The derivation of the Chadic forms for “man, person” with *-d- from PCh. *m-t (with *-t-) seems to be commonly accepted in comparative Chadic linguistics (cf., e.g., JI 1994 I 98, 115: Ch. *m-t-m > Birgit midiwó [Jng] via *mitimo etc.; Lukas 1968, 104, 223: Bade ʔm̀dón < *m̀tún). But both the inner Chadic and the AA evidence speaks for two distinct root vars. (*m-t vs. *m-d).

NB7: The equation of WCh.: Hausa miʒi (sg), mázáá (pl). “1. male, 2. husband” [Abr. 1962, 671, 697] etc. with Sem. *mut- ||| Eg. *mt etc. (suggested by N. Pilszczikowa 1960, 123, #122 and I. M. D’jakonov 1974, 742) is phonologically incorrect. In this case, one can hardly derive Hs. -ʒi from *-di. The etymological interpretation of this Ch. word is dubious (for details and the problem cf. Eg. mšʕ “Heer” above).

- Other etymologies for Eg. *mt are either less convincing or evidently false:

- **3.** H. Grapow (1954, 21) assumed that the “*Hieroglyphenbild des erigierten Phallus... , der ja zugleich ein längliches Hohlgefäß ist...*” was primarily “*ein elastischer Strang...*”, since “*vielleicht hat der Ägypter sich die mt-Gefäße usw. ähnlich gebaut vorgestellt*”. This hypothesis maintaining the ultimate link of Eg. *mt “phallus” to mt “Gefäß des menschlichen Körpers” (Med., Wb, below) was uncritically adopted by J. Osing (2001, 578–9) and rejected by G. Takács (2005, 52, #4.22; 2005, 643–4, #20).

- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 285) compared it with Ful -di ~ -ri “suffixe de noms de mâle”. Absurd.

- **5.** E. Zyhlarz (1934, 110, #5) combined Eg. *mt “phallus” with Common Brb. *ta-mətt-ut “woman”.

NB1: This Berber word has been affiliated also with the reflexes of AA *m-t “to copulate with a woman” [GT], which is equally dubious (cf. the following item of this entry).

NB2: Brb. *ta-mətt-ut “woman” has nothing to do with Brb. *midd-ən (above) as proposed by J. Bynon (1984, 276, #39).

- **6.** M. Cohen (1947, #476) affiliated Eg. *mt (also) with NBrb.: Qabyle mta “conjoint”, which is to be separated from the rest of his *comparanda*.

NB1: Cf. AA *m-t “1. to copulate with a woman, 2. conceive a child (?)” [GT], cf. Ar. maʔaʔa ~ maʔā (-w) “cohabiter avec une femme” [BK II 1121, 1124] ||| NBrb.: Izdeg ti-mitt, pl. ti-matt-in “placenta” [Mrc. 1937, 193], Zayan & Sgugu ti-matt-in (pl.s.sg) [irreg. -tt-] “placenta, enveloppant le foetus” [Lbg. 1924, 565] || SBrb.: Ahaggar té-miṭ “matrice (utérus, viscère où a lieu la conception), 2. (p.ext.) parenté (lien de consanguinité ou d’alliance qui unit ensemble des personnes ou des animaux)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1164], EWlm. te-met, pl. EWlm. & Ayr ši-/ti-meḍ-en “1. (sg) gras foetal (qui recouvre le corps du nouveau-né au moment que sa mère le met au monde), 2. (pl.) placenta, délivre, arrière-faix (tissu auquel est attaché le cordon ombilical et qui naît après l’enfant), 3. (pl.) matrice (utérus, viscère où a lieu la conception), 4. (pl.) (liens de) parenté (maternelle ou paternelle)” [PAM 2003, 524, 563] ||| LECu.: Saho & Afar mā [*-d] “beschlafen, coire” [Rn. 1890, 267],

Afar maḍ- “to copulate” [Sasse] = maḍaḍ “uterus, womb”, maḍe “to copulate (of male)”, maḍo “copulation, sexual intercourse” [PH 1985, 160], Dirayta meḍḍ-aw- (inchoativesuffix -aw-) “schwanger sein” [Lmb. 1993, 348] | HECu.: Burji maḍ-iss- (caus.) “to marry (of man)” [Sasse] (Afar-Burji: Sasse 1982, 139; Hyw. 1997, 110) ||| NOm.: Sns. maḍ- “schwanger sein” [Lmb. 1993, 348]. Lit.: Hintze 1951, 85–86 (Qabyle-Ahaggar); Mlt. 1984, 158 (ECu.-Ahaggar); Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 3 (Afar-Ahaggar).

NB2: Cf. perhaps also LECu.: Afar muḍi, pl. muḍ “testicle” [Dlg. 1972, 229; PH 1985, 171], Orm. muḍ-ā “child” [Gragg apud Hds. 1989, 40] = muḍ-a [-ḍ- < *-ḍ-?] “1. (Waata) vagina, 2. (Borana) boy, child”, muḍ-ē “vagina” [Strm. 1987, 370–1] = muḍ-a? “Säugling” [Lmb.] ||| NOm.: Zayse & Dache mute “vagina” [Lmb.] | Yemsa (Jnj.) muḍ-ā “männlicher Säugling”, muḍ-à “weiblicher Säugling” [Lmb. 1993, 363] ||| ECh.: (?) EDng. miḍyī (coll.) “les enfants, les petits, les grosses, les marmots, les mioches, les bambins, les bébés, les marmailles” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 203]. An extended form of the same term can be found in LECu.: Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata) muttura “vagina” [Strm. 1987, 371] | HECu.: (?) Kmb. muturo “vagina” [Lmb.].

NB3: Ar. mṭ? & mṭw “cohabiter avec une femme” [BK] is not necessarily related with Brb. *ta-məṭṭ-ut “woman” as supposed by W. Yýicichl (1990, 80–81).

NB4: Despite the suggestion by a number of authors (Hintze 1951, 85–86; Militarev 1984, 158; Blažek 1991, 362), it is not clear whether SBrb.: Ahaggar té-miṭ and HECu.: Som. miḍ-o can be related with Brb. *ta-məṭṭ-ut “woman”. Note that the Som. word derives from ECU. *miḍ- “fruit, seed” [Sasse 1979, 29; Heine 1978, 69] < PCu. *mAt- “1. плод (fruit), 2. семя (seed)” [Dlg. 1973, 250], for which cf. Eg. mt.wt “der männliche Same” (PT, Wb, below) = “seed” (FD).

- **7.** A. M. Lam (1993, 379): ~ Ful ḥotte “testicules, sexe”. Absurd.
- **8.** GT: an alternative comparison to Ug. mṭ “1. Stab, 2. virga virilis” [WUS #1551] (for lit. on the 2nd mng. v. DL 2003, 166, fn. 129) is impossible for a number of reasons.

NB: The Ug. term, which has recently been rendered as “rod, staff, riding crop” [DUL 602], is to be compared to Hbr. maṭṭeh that is usually explained from *vntḥw, which, however, cannot be related to Eg. *mt (for further details cf. Eg. mdw below). In addition, the alleged sense “phallus, penis” of Ug. mṭ has been most recently disproved by M. Dietrich & O. Loretz (2003, 166–9).

mt (or rather **mtj/w**) “Gefäß des menschlichen Körpers, insbesondere:

1. von Adern, 2. von Gefäßen die Schleim, Luft u.ä. führen sollen,
3. Band, Muskel, Sehne (z.B. am Kiefergelenk, am Nacken u.ä.),” cf. jṭh mt “die Sehne (eines Gottes) ziehen (bildlich für das Lösen des Siegels an der Kapelentür)” (Med., Wb II 167, 10–14; Osing 1992, 473–4 & n. d: early MK ex. in Pap. Torino 54003) = “muscles, vaisseau” (Lefébvre 1952, 8–9, §7) = “ein Gefäß des Körpers, das Blut, Tränen, Schleim, Wasser, Luft führt: Hohlgefäß, Ader” (Grapow 1954, 20) = “vessel, duct, muscle” (FD 120) = “vein” (CED 93) = “(perhaps coll. for) the whole vascular system” (CT VII 160, AECT III 83–84, spell 945, n. 3) = “muscle, vein, blood vessel, artery” (DLE I 251) = “Hohlgefäß im Körper, Ader; Strang im Körper (Muskel,

Sehne, Flechse, Band)” (GHWb 373; ÄWb II 1153b) = “anatomical conduit, generic term for any bodily conduit, vessel, hence (it can refer to) rectum, ureter, blood vessel, windpipe, etc.” (Walker 1996, 236–240, 270) > Dem. mt ~ mwt “Gefäß, Muskel” (DG 157, 184) = “vein, muscle” (CED) > Cpt. (SLB) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\tau$, pl. (rarely sg.) (S) $\mu\omicron\tau\epsilon$, $\mu\omicron\tau\omicron\Upsilon$, (M) $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\omicron\tau$, (F) $\mu\alpha\tau$ (m) “1. sinew, nerve, 2. bonds, joint, 3. neck, throat, back, shoulders” (CD 189a; CED 93) = “1. Band, Sehne, Nerv, Gelenk; 2. Gefäß; 3. Hals, Kehle, Nacken, Schulter, Rücken” (Till 1955, 328; KHW 104) = “1. tendon, nerf, 2. articulation, 3. cou” (DELC 124).

NB1: The preservation of Cpt. - τ indicates a lost second syllable and a final (C₂) consonant not written in hrgl. (*-j or *-w), cf. XIX. pl. mtj.w (quoted in Wb II 167). W. Westendorf (l.c.) assumed an old *mtj or *mtw and found a further proof confirming the *Auslautvokal* of LEg. *mát(C₃) in the Tale of Woe 1:12 (Caminos 1977, 11) where mt is written as md.t.

NB2: Vocalized as *mān (sic) (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 131) = *mát̃j (NBĀ 321) = *mātej (Wst. 1984, 74) = *mātej/w, pl. *matj/w-ū (DELC 124).

NB3: Although numerous senses of it are known, its basic mng. is perhaps best expressed a.o. in Pap. E.Smith 3:18 mt.w mr p̄h.wj wg.t(j)=f̄j mj dd w3.t ḥ.t m zš “the ligaments which bind the end of his jaw as one says, ‘the cord’ of a thing in/as a splint” (Breasted 1930, 189).

NB4: The pl. of the same lexeme is reflected by Cpt. (S) $\mu\omicron\tau\epsilon$, (F) $\mu\alpha\tau$, (M) $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\omicron\tau$ (m) “1. neck, shoulders, joint, 2. sinew, bowstring” (CD 189a) = “Hals, Nacken, Schulter, Gelenk” (Till 1955, 328; KHW 103), which K. Sethe & A. H. Gardiner (1910, 43) explained from *mótwej. Although W.C. Till (1955, 328, §26 pace CD 189a) maintained both (S) $\mu\omicron\Upsilon\tau$ vs. $\mu\omicron\tau\epsilon$ to be “*miteinander verwandt*”, he admitted that “*seine Herkunft ist unbekannt*” (!).

NB5: For the etymological connection of the forms meaning “sinew” vs. “neck” speak a number of facts: (1) the occurrence of Eg. mt in the expression “Band am Nacken” (Wb II 167, 13); (2) CT VII 43: mt n ḥḥ=f “duct (?) in his neck” rendered by R. O. Faulkner with hesitation (“*what it means in this context is not clear*”) as a term referring to “a blood-vessel to be cut after the stunning or the windpipe which is to be strangled” (AECT III 27–28, spell 839, n. 13); (3) typological parallels like ECu. *murḳ- “gristle” [Ss.] > Orm. morg-aya “tendon, nerve”, Arb. morgi “tendon, sinew”, Som. muruq “muscle (Rn.: die sehnigen Bestandteile am Oberarm oder an den Waden, Muskeln)”, Yaaku morḣ-i? “sinew of neck” (ECu.: Sasse 1982, 148; HL 1988, 129; Lmb. 1988, 88, #130; LS 1997, 466). Nevertheless, pre-Cpt. *mát “neck” might be alternatively combined with ECh.: Barein maato “Hals” [Lks. 1937, 51], whose wider Ch. etymology is still obscure (cf. Takács 2005, 52, fn. 136).

NB6: J. Osing (NBĀ 321, 866, n. 1381) explained Cpt. (L) $\mu\omicron\omicron\mu\epsilon$ (m) “Ader” from *mám̃t̃(j) (via *máʔm̃), which he regarded as the partial reduplication of mtj (cf. Fecht 1960, §206f). Cf. also Eg. *mm.t (?) above.

- Belongs to a widespread AA root family with the basic sense “to stretch”, where the following varieties can be distinguished (according to their C₂, which was either *-t, *-ṭ or *-d):
- 1. GT (cf. also Takács 2005, 52, #4.22): the biconsonantal AA *m-t “to pull, stretch” [GT] has been preserved in a great number of diverse extended roots:

(1) Ar. mtt I “1. étendre qqch. en long (p.ex. une corde)”, matāt- “lien par lequel on tient à la famille de qqn.”, māt-at- “lieu d’alliance ou de parenté” [BK II 1055] = mtt I “1. to extend, stretch out (a rope etc.), 2. draw (water), draw up (a bucket) without a pulley”, māt-at- “bond, tie” [Lane 2687–8] = mtt I “ausbreiten, ausdehnen” [Shatnawi] ||| CCh.: MM *mVt- > Mafa mit “to pull” [Schubert 1971–72 MS, 10] = mit- “tirer (une corde, un animal)” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 233], Uld. √-mVt- > -mātóη- (ending -Vη) “éteindre” [CIm. 1997, 193].

(2) OSA (Thamudi) mty PN “ausgedehnt” [Shatnawi 2002, 738], Ar. mtw: I matā “étendre en long (une corde, etc.)”, V “s’étendre, s’allonger, sxe pencher en avant, de manière à allonger la croupe en tirant de l’arc”, VIII “tirer de l’arc en tendant le corps en avant” [BK II 1059] = mty: matā “ausbreiten, ausdehnen” [Shatnawi].

(3) Ar. mtʔ I “(é)tendre en long (une corde)” [BK II 1056] = “to extend, stretch out (a rope)” (dial. form of mtw) [Lane 2688].

(4) Ar. mataha I “tirer, retirer la seau à l’aide d’une corde”, VI “être à une grande distance l’un de l’autre” [BK II 1059].

(5) Sem. *mth “to pull, stretch” [GT]: Ug. mth “a stretch, distance” [Gordon] = “ein Längenmaß” [WUS #1707] = “a measure of length (?)” [DUL 599], Hbr. mth qal “ausdehnen” [GB] = “to spread, stretch out” [KB], PBHbr. & JAram. mth “ausdehnen” [GB] = “ausspannen” [AHW], Syr. mētaḥ “spannen” [WUS], Samar. Aram. mth “spreading out, movement” [Tal 2000, 492] | Ar. mth I “4. oter, écarter”, VIII “oter, tirer, arracher”, mattāḥ- “long et flexible (bâton, morceau de bois)” [BK] = mth “1. to draw up water by means of the pulley and its appertenances, draw out the bucket, pull the rope of the bucket, 2. become prolonged, be (pro)long(ed)” [Lane 2688] = mth “hoch-, fortziehen” [AHW] (Sem.: GB 474; Gordon 1955, 293, #1179; KB 654).

NB: W. von Soden (AHW, adopted in KB l.c.) compared WSem. *mth with Akk. (M/NAAss.) matāḥu [irreg. -ḥ- < *-ḥ-?] “aufheben” [AHW 632a] = “1. to carry, 2. pick up, lift, put on (garment), stand high (in stative, said of the moon), 3. remove” [CAD m1, 403] (provided < *to pull up”).

(6) AA *m-t-ʕ “to pull, draw (up, away)” [GT] preserved in Ug. mtʕ “forttragen” [WUS #1714] = “to remove, shed (said of clothing?)” [DUL 599] | Ar. mataʕa “9. allonger, étendre en long, 10. jouir de qqch., tirer parti, utilité de...”, matuʕa “1. être long” [BK II 1057] ||| SCu.: Dhl. mutʕ-ud- “to pull down the foreskin” [Tosco 1991, 143] = muṭuʕ-uḏ- “to masturbate” [Ehret].

NB: The rendering of the Dhl. verb by Ch. Ehret (1980, 159, #52) is incorrect (Mauro

Tosco, p.c.), and the same pertains to his suggestion to derive it (with met.!) from SCu. *mu^c(ut)- “to handle lightly (esp. in a sexual sense)” based on Brg. mu^c-ud- “to pommel” and Ma’a -mu^ʔ “to copulate”. The real Dhl. term for “to masturbate” is, besides, in fact žagw^c-ið- [Ehret 1980, 223; EEN 1989, 30]. Therefore, the sexual connotation in both Dhl. and Ar. mut^c-at- “enjoyment”, matā^c- “a woman’s pudendum, the penis” [Lane 3017] = mut^c-at- “jouissance, l’action de jouir d’une femme, commerce charnel”, matā^c- “membre viril” < mata^ca V “jourir (d’une femme), cohabiter avec une femme” [Dozy II 567] may be purely accidental.

(7) Sem. *matn- “tendine” [Frz. 1964, 268, #2.40] = *matn- “sinew, tendon” [SED], in which N. V. Jušmanov (1998, 177) analyzed the third root consonant as a secondary extension to be rendered as a class marker of body parts present in a number of Sem. anatomical terms with *-n.

nb1: Attested in Akk. matnu “1. (O/LBab.) Bogensehne, 2. (LBab.) Sehne des Körpers (?) (nicht mit Sicherheit)” [Holma 1911, 6, fn. 3] = “1. Sehne, 2. Bogensehne” [AHW 633], Ebl. ma-da-nu /matn-u(m)/ “tendon” [Frz. 1984, 144] || Ug. mtn “nerve” [Cauquot apud Lsl.] = “Sehne (von Stierhufen)” [DL 2003, 170–1, #2.16] = “tendon” [DUL 600] vs. mdn “die Sehne spannen” [WUS] | Ar. matn- “nerf” [BK II 1059] = “the erector spinae muscle, which consists of the sacro-lumbalis and the longissimus dorsi and spinalis dorsi” [Lane 3017] vs. mtn “4. tendre, étendre et allonger qqch., 5. châtrer un bélier par extraction des testicules”, III “3. s’éloigner à une grande distance” [BK II 1058–9] = “to stretch” [Tritton], cf. also Ar. tū-mān- ~ ta-mūn- “the threads or strings of tents” [Lane 3017] || Geez mātən “sinew, nerve” [Lsl. 1958] = “(Hüft)Sehne” [Holma l.c.] = ʔa-mtan-t (pl.) “Nerven, Fleschen” [WUS] = matn “tëndine” [Frz.] = mātñ “sinew, nerve” [Lsl. 1969] = matn ~ mātñ “sinew, nerve, muscle”, pl. ʔamtənt “strings of musical instrument” [Lsl. 1987], Tna. mātñi “nerve, sinew” [Lsl.], Amh. (Lsl.: from Geez) mātən “sinew” [Lsl.] (Sem.: WUS #1524; Lsl. 1958, 32; 1969, 20; 1987, 372). Ultimately related are perhaps also Jaram. mitnā ~ mutnā [irreg. -i/u/ō-] “Strick” [Dalman 1922, 259] = mi/itnā ~ mötnā “cord, strap” [Jastrow 1950, 863] | Ar. (Post-Class. Yemeni) mutūn (pl.) “string, cord, thick thread” [Pimenta 1990–91, 459].

nb2: The primary meaning of the PSem. word has been disputed. It has been almost generally accepted in Sematology (e.g. Holma 1911, 6, fn. 3; Lsl. 1945, 236; 1958, 32; 1987, 372; Frz. 1964, 268, #2.40; AHW 633) that Akk. matnu and its ES cognates are etymologically identical with WSem. *matn- “Hüfte” [AHW] > Ug. mtn-m “die Hüften” [WUS], Hbr. mātnayim (dual) “die Hüften, genauer das Kreuz, ὀσφύς” [GB 475] = motnayim “hips, lumbar region” [Lsl. 1958], Aram. matnayyō “Hüften” [WUS] = mātnayyā “hip” [Lsl. 1987], Syr. matnātā “loin” [Lsl. 1945, 1987] = matmōtō “lato del dorso” [Frz.] | Ar. matn- “back, two portions of firmly-bound flesh between which is the back-bone (or that confine the back-bone, rendered firm by being tied by/with sinews)” [Lane 3017] = “partie du dos de chaque côté de l’épine dorsale” [BK II 1059; Lsl. 1938] = “middle of back, loins” [Alb. 1927, 218] = “partie du dos de chaque côté de l’épine dorsale” [Lsl. 1945, 236] = “das Kreuz” [WUS #1712] = “lato del dorso” [Frz.] = “half or side of the back” [Lsl. 1987], Hdrm. matn “partie postérieure des épaules, omoplate” [Lsl.] || Hrs. mōten “flesh, small of back” [Jns. 1977, 91], Mhr. mōtən “flesh of back” [Jns. 1987, 273], Jbl. mūtun “flesh of the back” [Jns. 1981, 176], Sq. mōten “haunch” [Lsl. 1938, 254] = mōtən, dual mātni “haunch” [Jns.]. It is tempting to agree with H. Holma (1911, 6, fn. 3) in setting up a common PSem. basic mng. “Hüftsehne”. Accordingly, the PSem. term has been reconstructed as *matan- “1. hip, haunch, 2. tendon, nerve” [Blv. etc. 1994, #68] = *ma/utn- “1. partie de dos; 2. loins” [Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995, 3]. But already J. Aistleitner (WUS #1524 vs. #1712) and

W. Leslau (1969, 20) seem to have made a fine distinction between the two basic senses of Sem. *matn-. L. Kogan and A. Militarev (SED I 173, §191), in turn, assumed two different and etymologically unrelated PSem. anatomical terms, namely *matn- “1. sinew, tendon, 2. nerve” vs. *matn- “hip, loin”, which they also found “*semantically difficult to compare*” assuming that “*a semantic contamination with metathetic *mV(?)n-(at)- ‘tendon, sinew; muscle’... is possible*” (unlikely). The basic sense may be closer Aram. mitnā ~ mutnā “Strich” [WUS].

NB3: Already A. S. Tritton (1933–35, 597) surmised (rightly) the Sem. biconsonantal root *mt- comparing Ar. mtw vs. mtn.

- **2.** GT: on the other hand, Eg. mt may be eventually connected (or identical?) with Eg. mtj “Strick” (OK, Wb, below) as suggested in Wb II 169, 13; Hornung 1980, 139, n. 3; and Osing 1992, 474 & fn. 6. In this case, it may be related to AA *m-ṭ “cord” [GT] (for which cf. the entry for Eg. mtj below), which might ultimately derives from AA *m-ṭ “to stretch out, draw, lengthen” [GT] > Sem.: Ma^olula mṭmṭ (pf. maṭmaṭaṭ) “sich ausstrecken” [Brgstr. 1921, 60] | Ar. mṭṭ I “tendre, et allonger une chose en tirant avec force, allonger, étendre la main comme l’on fait en voulant parler à parler à qqn.” [BK II 1121] = “to draw, pull, strain, extend by drawing or pulling, stretch, extend, lengthen” [Lane 2721] vs. Ar. mṭw I “3. tirer, traîner, 4. allonger le chemin à qqn., 11. étendre les bras en baïllant” [BK II 1124] = mṭy I “to draw, pull (a thing, for instance, a well-rope)”, V “to stretch (in a neuter sense)” [Lane 3021] vs. Ar. m^oṭ I “1. étendre, allonger, 3. tirer la sabre du fourreau” [BK II 1128], Yemeni Ar. mṭṭ: VIII ʔamtatṭ “to grow (hair), rise (dough)” (intr.) [Piamenta 1990, 468] || MSA *mṭṭ: Hrs. meṭ “to stretch (tr.)” [Jns. 1977, 91], Jbl. miṭṭ “to stretch (like elastic)” (tr.) [Jns. 1981, 176], Mhr. məṭ “to stretch (like elastic)” (intr.) [Jns. 1987, 273] || ES: Tna. māṭāṭā “to lengthen, stretch” [Lsl. 1982, 54], Tigre māṭṭa “to drag the ear of a refractory animal”, redupl. māṭmāṭa “to draw, span” [Lsl. pace LH 143–4] || LECu.: Orm. (Waata) mīṭa ~ mīṭ-ita “to draw a bow” [Strm. 1987, 367] | HECu.: Burji maṭēṭ-aḍ- ~ miṭēṭ-aḍ- (med.) “to stretch o’self” [Sasse 1982, 142; Hds. 1989, 145] || WCh.: Geruma méḍé “long” [Schuh 1978, 137, 148], Bubure méḍḍè “long (of stick), high” [Haruna 1992 MS, #c013, #c016] || CCh.: Mofu-Gudur -mámáḍ- “1. allonger (le cou), 2. amincir une pâte en la faisant tourner sur la cuisse avec la main” [Brt. 1988, 175] | Vulum mīḍí “s’étirer, redresser qqch. qui est tordu” [Trn. 1978, 304] | PMasa *mEḍ- “allonger, étendre” [GT]: Gizey mīḍ, Masa méʔ [-ʔ < *-ḍ], Ham mét, Musey & Lew & Marba mát (Masa gr.: Ajl. 2001, 2) || ECh.: (?) Mkl. ʔónḍè [-nḍ- < *-mḍ-ʔ] “(s’)allonger (sur un lit), 2. dresser, 3. (s’)étirer” [Jng. 1990, 154]. For Ch.-Sem. see Takács 2002, 155.

NB1: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED 385, #1776) combined Sem. *mṭṭ with CCh.: Mtk. mit, which, however, seems to derive rather from AA *m-t (above).

NB2: J. Blau (IOS 2, 1972, 68, n. 3) compared Ar. mṭw with Geez maṭṭawa “to hand over, deliver, give over etc.” [Lsl.]. But the etymology of the Geez verb is disputed. Th. Nöldeke (ZDMG 40, 1886, 736, fn. 5) explained it as an assim. from an earlier *ʔamṭā, cognate to Ar. ʔanṭā “to give” (in which Landberg 1942, 2786 saw a contamination of Ar. ʔaʕṭā vs. ʔandā “to bring”). W. Leslau (1987, 374), in turn, combined it rather with Aram. məṭā peal “to attain, reach”, pael “to bring” Sqt. mṭy “to attain” etc.

NB3: A. R. Bomhard (1981, 448) affiliated Ar. mṭṭ (above) and mṭl “to expand, draw out, lengthen, stretch” with IE *med- “to measure”, for which (in the frames of the Nst. hypothesis) Sem. *mdd (below) would fit much better.

NB4: Mkl. ʔónḏè may be alternatively compared to Ar. nṭy, which has been connected in GB 913 (pace Nöldeke, ZDMG 40, 736) to BA mṭʔ peal “1. wohin reichen, sich erstrecken, 2. wohin gelangen, 3. (an)kommen”, for which, cf. Eg. *mṭj below.

- **3.** GT: in addition, there was also a var. root with *-d, cf. AA *m-d “to stretch” [GT] (whose reflexes are discussed s.v. Eg. mdd infra).

mt.wt “1. der männliche Same, 2. (bildlich für) Sohn” (PT, Wb II 169, 1–3) = “1. seed (CT, Med.), 2. (fig.) seed, progeny (PT, Urk. IV)” (FD 121).

NB: The existence and rdg. of mt.w(t)-k3 “als Synonym von m3ʕ.t (‘Wahrheit’)” (GR: lx in Philae, Wb II 169, 4) has been confirmed by D. Kurth (1984, 273f.) with further exx. from GR temples and a discussion of the aspects of this expression.

- Etymology disputed.
 - **1.** K. Sethe (ÜKAPT II 207) explained it from an unattested Eg. *mt “männlich” (“von dem” the phallus hrgl. “den Lautwert mt haben muß”). Similarly, Sh. Yeivin (1936, 71, §17) connected it with Eg. *mt “phallus” and Sem. *mūt- “husband” (sic, discussed above), which was (rightly) doubted by W. Vycichl (DELC 125) and P. Lacau (1912, 76) viewing that its writing with the phallus (mt) hrgl. “c’est une pure coincidence”. For E. A. Knauf (1984, 18) “weniger glücklich scheint... der Versuch, den Zusammenhang zwischen äg. mt.wt Same vs. akkad. mutum, äth. mēt Ehemann zu bestreiten”.
 - **2.** H. Grapow (1954, 86), in turn, maintained an etymological connection with Eg. mt.wt “Gift” (below), supposing Egyptians to have considered sperm poisonous. This is, however, only possible if we assume that the primary sense was “seed”.
 - **3.** GT: perhaps related to ECu. *mAṭ- “1. плод (fruit), 2. семя (seed)” [Dlg. 1973, 250] = *miḏ- “fruit, seed” [Sasse 1979, 29; Heine 1978, 69] = *miḏ- “1. to sow (seed), 2. bring fruit” [GT].
- NB1: Attested in SLECu. *miḏ- [Black]: Orm. miḏ-ā, miḏan [Rn.] = miḏ-āni “grain” [Black] = miḏ-ān “grain (growing, harvested, or food)” [Gragg 1982, 285] = (Borana, Orma, Waata) miḏāni “1. seeds, grains, cereals, 2. food” [Strm. 1987, 367; 1995, 209], Konso miḏ-ā & Gdl. miḏ-ā “edible leaves” [Black], Som. miḏ-o “Frucht,

Feld- oder Baumfrucht” [Rn. 1902, 287] = miḏó “fruit” [Abr. 1964, 179] = “плод чрева (fruit of womb)” (sic) [Dlg.], Som.-Isaq miḏ “frutto, seme” [Crl.] = miḏ-ó [Abr./Dlg.], Som.-Darod mir-o [-r- < *-ḏ-] “frutto, seme” [Crl.] (LECu.: Black 1974, 218; Zbr. 1975, 325) | HECu.: Sid. miḏ- ~ wiḏ- [m- > w-] “seminare” [Crl.], Hdy. & Kmb. wiḏ- [m- > w-] “seminare” [Crl.], Gedeo (Drs.) miḏ-a ~ miʔr-a [-ḏ- > -r-] “grain, cereal, crop” [Hds. 1989, 72] (ECu.: Crl. 1938 II, 215; Dlg. 1973, 250). NB2: The Eg.-ECu. isogloss might be eventually akin to AA *m-T (perhaps *muT-?) “(to) sprout” [GT], whose C₂ cannot be determined due to its reflection in diverse var. root displaying an irreg. alternation of AA *-t- ~ *-ḏ- ~ *-ḏ-: **(1)** AA *m-t “to sprout” [GT] > NBrb.: Wargla ṽm-t-y: t-muti-t, pl. ti-muti-y-in “rejeton d’arbre, surtout de palmier-dattier” [Dlh. 1987, 201] ||| ECu. *mut- “to sprout” [GT] > LECu.: Orm. mutaya “germination”, mutū “to germinate, sprout” [Btm. 2000, 204] | HECu. *mut(i)-ʔr- “to sprout” [Hds.]: Hdy. mut- “to sprout” [Hds.], Kmb. mut-á “shoot of tree”, múččo “to germinate” [Lsl. 1956, 987] = mut- “to sprout”, muta “sprout” [Hds.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 141) ||| WCh.: (?) Suroid *mat “3. to grow” [GT]: Msr. mat “to grow” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 179, 181, 385, 390] = máṭ “to grow” [Jng. 1999 MS, 11]. **(2)** NBrb. *ṽm-d [GT] > Shilh a-mud “semence” [Jst. 1914, 121] | Izdeg a-mud, pl. i-madd-en “(graine de) semence” [Mrc. 1937, 130, 233], which can only be explained from AA *m-d [GT]. **(3)** ECu. *muḏ- “to sprout” [GT] > LECu.: Orm. muḏ-a “sprout, blade (crop)” [Gragg 1982, 295] = muḏ-ē “sprout” [Hds.] | Sid. muḏ-ē “sprout” [Yri apud Hds.] = mur-a “sprout”, muʔr- “to sprout” [Gsp. apud Hds.] ||| ECh.: (?) DM *m[ā]ḏ- “to grow” [GT] > WDng. mááḏé “grandir” [Fédry 1971, 111], EDng. mààḏē “grandir, croître, pousser, s’élever” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 191] = “wachsen” [Ebs. 1979, 131], Mgm. màaḏò “grandir, croître, pousser” [JA 1992, 105], Birgit mòodí [irreg. -ḏ-] “croître” [Jng. 2004, 357]. From AA *m-t?

- **4.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 210, #1819) affiliated it with Ar. mṭḥ “to drop excrement”, Eg. mtr.t “flood”, and Cu. *math- “to vomit”. Unconvincing.

mt.wt “Gift (besonders das der Schlangen und Skorpione)” (PT, Wb II 169, 5–8) = “1. poison, 2. ill-will (?)” (FD 121) = “1. Gift (von Krankheitsdämon, Schlange, Skorpion), 2. (fig.) Böswilligkeit, Mißgunst, Gift” (GHWb 374) > Dem. mt.wt “Gift” (DG 189) > Cpt. (S) ματοϋ, ματε, ματοϋε, (B) μαθοϋι, (ALF) μετοϋ, (F) μετρι (f) “poison” (CD 196a; CED 94; DELC 125) = “Gift” (KHW 104).

- Origin disputable.

- **1.** H. Grapow (1954, 86) maintained an etymological connection with Eg. mt.wt “seed” assuming sperm to have been considered in ancient Egypt as poisonous. Also W. Westendorf (1970, 145) speaks of “poison” and “seed” as diverse senses of the very same word: “*es scheint also eine Vorstellung eines zauberkräftigen Wirkstoffes zu bestehen, dessen positive oder negative Wirkung sich im Einzelfall als Leben oder Tod schaffend erweisen kann*” (WD I 98: mt.wt “giftiger Same”). W. Vycichl (DELC 125) explained it from the primary sense “*la matière secrétée (1) par l’homme vs. (2) par les serpents et les scorpions*”, of which he regarded the

first one as original merely because of the fact that the hrgl. with the phon. value *mt* depicted a *phallus*.

NB: For Vycichl's primary mng. cf. perhaps NBrb.: Wargla $\sqrt{m-t-m}$: *i-mətm* "1. humeur corporelle, suppuration, 2. (au fig) désir, goût" [Dlh. 1987, 201].

- **2.** GT: probably not related to ECh.: Mkl. ʔündümú , pl. ʔindá [-nd- reg. < *-md-] "médicament, poison" < "arbre" (?) [Jng. 1990, 190] because of the different basic sense and the irreg. -d-.
- **3.** GT: or cf. perhaps WBrb.: Zng. a- ʔmòḍ (imper.) "mordre", tu-mmḍ ~ -z "morsure" [Ncl. 1953, 219] (provided Zng. -ḍ < Brb. *-ḍ < AA *-t)?
- **4.** GT: or any connection with AA **m-t* "tears" [GT]?

NB1: Attested in NBrb.: Shilh a-mṭṭa "larme" [Jst. 1914, 121] | Mzg. i-metṭi "pleur, larme" [Taifi 1991, 445], Izdeg i-metṭi "larme" [Mrc. 1937, 153], Zayan & Sgugu i-mṭi ~ i-metṭi "larme" [Lbg. 1924, 568], Ait Ndir a-mṭṭa "tear (n.)" [Pnc. 1973, 107] | Izn. & Rif a-mṭṭa, pl. i-metṭ-awen "larme, pleur" [Rns. 1932, 385], Nfs. i-mṭṭ-aun (pl. of a-mṭṭa) "pleurs" [Lst.] etc. | Qbl. i-metṭi "larme" [Dlt. 1982, 527], Zwawa & Bugi i-metṭi, pl. i-mṭṭa-un "larme" [Bst. 1890, 316] (NBrb.: Bst. 1890, 62–63; Biarnay 1917, 90) || EBrb.: Siwa i-mṭṭ-āw-ən (pl.) "larmes" [Lst. 1931, 252], Sokna i-mt-āw-ən "pleurs" [Lst.], Gdm. $\sqrt{m-t}$: a-mṭṭa, pl. mṭṭa-w-en "larme" [Lnf. 1973, 220, #1049] || WBrb.: Zenaga $\sqrt{n-d-w}$ (sic): ē-nḍaw-ən (coll. pl.s.sg) "larmes" [Ncl. 1953, 227] || SBrb.: Hgr. ā-miṭ, pl. i-metṭ-aw-en "larme" [Fcd. 1951–2, 1163], EWlm. a-mṭṭ & Ayr ə-mṭṭ "larme" [PAM 1998, 228], Tadghaq & Tudalt a-mṭṭ "tears" [Sudlow 2001, 281] ||| NOm.: PMAoid * ʔamt- (?) "tears" [GT] > Hozo āmt-i & Sezo hamiç(i) "tear of eye" [Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 17, #25] ||| WCh.: Pero múḍḍi "tear (lacrima)" [Frj. 1985, 42].

NB2: For the semantic shift cf. e.g. LECu.: Som. mīlil "Schlangengift, Gift vom Biß der Schlange" [Rn. 1902, 295–6] vs. AA **m-l* "to weep" [GT].

NB3: With regard the usual derivation of the Brb. word for "tears" from Brb. **tiṭṭ* "eye" (e.g. Renisio, Taifi l.c.) may be merely a *Volksetymologie*.

NB4: The etymology of HECu. **indidd-o* "tears of eyes" [Hds. 1989, 149] is uncertain. Perhaps from an earlier **imd-* with an irregular alternation of ECu. *-d- ~ *-ḍ-?

NB5: SBrb.: EWlm. ā-maḍun, EWlm. & Ayr ə-/i-muḍan (orig. pl.?) "pus (produit par une inflammation)" [PAM 1998, 210] seems to be unrelated.

mt.t "Mitte", occurs in: **(1)** *mt.t* "middle" (PT 285b, AEPT 64) = "Mitte" (GHWb 376 pace ÜKAPT II 325; ÄWb I 574: PT 285b & X. 1x contra Snk. 1965, 78; cf. ÄWb II 1158 with an obscure ex. from XIII.) vs. **(2)** *m mt.t* (n.t) *jb* "aus vollem Herzen (?)" (XVIII., Wb II 168, 3–6) = *mt.t* (n.t) *jb* "affection (?)" (FD 120) = *m mt.t n.t jb* "(a confirming expression after verbs like 'love, create, serve)" (Gdk. 1970, 167) = *m mt.t* (n.t) *jb* "gladly", lit. "from (the) middle of (the) heart" (CED 93) = "*aus vollem Herzen, in Innigkeit" (XI. 1x, ÄWb II 1155) vs. **(3)** <*m*> *t3 mt n* "(in) the middle of" (late NK, CED 93 pace Caminos 1954 LEM, 436; Wenté 1967 LRL, 25, n. b) = "midst" (DLE I 251) > Dem. *mtj* (written

also mtr) “Mitte” (DG 191:1) = mtj “centre” (CED 93) = mt(r)j.
t (f) “Mitte” (NBÄ 650, n. 673) > Cpt. (SAL) MHTE, (S) MHTE,
(B) MH† (f) “medium” (Brugsch 1882, 64) = “middle, midst” (CD
190b; CED 93) = “Mitte” (Spg. KHW 66; Wst. KHW 104) > Pi-
Solsel mādi “Mitte” (Vcl. 1936, 172).

NB1: Vocalized as *múʔta < *mútʔa < *mútr.at (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 139) = *mé/út.ʔt
(Osing). Several authors (e.g. Caminos 1954 LEM, 436; Vrg. 1973 Ib, 139; GHWb
376; AWb I 574) suggest an original spelling *mtr.t (for the problem cf. below).

NB2: The PT 285b instance was translated in Wb II 168, 2 as “Eignung” < mtj
“richtig” (q.v.). J. Osing (NBÄ 650, n. 673), in turn, has rendered Eg. mt.t in Pap.
Rhind 64:2–3 and Pap. E. Smith 2:2 as *‘das Richtige, Richtiges, Eigentliche’
(literally) > “der Kern, Mitte” (contra WMT 412 suggesting for the Pap. Smith
place a fem. adj. mtj.t “richtig”).

NB3: It is tempting to combine it with K. Sethe’s mt (sic) “Eingeweide, Inneres” (PT
1367b, ÜKAPT VI 135), which seems, however, to be a ghost-word, now read as
ḥrmt *‘Aufweg’ (GHWb 643), which occurs also in PT 2015b (AEPT 214, n. 14
ad PT 1367 & p. 290, utt. 676, n. 11 ad PT 2015).

● Origin debated.

- **1.** In Eg. linguistics, it has been usually explained as a defective wtg.
of *mtr.t (or a late orthography reflecting the loss of *-r-), which
has been etymologically connected with Eg. mtr.t (Vrg.: *mútr.at →
*múʔra) “Mittag” (Wb, below) = midday (FD) > (S) HEEPE etc. (lit.
*‘the middle’) and ultimately derived from the Eg. root traditionally
conceived as mtr (sic, -r) “gerade in der Mitte sein” (Sethe) = mtr
“(adj. of) accuracy of the stand-balance” (Smith). But this latter root
has recently been (correctly) reconstructed as mtj “richtig, gerade,
genau” (Osing, cf. also Grd. 1917, 85; 1955, 195; NBÄ 643, n. 672;
Snk. 1983, 225; Junge 2003, 225, n. 199). Moreover, the relationship
of mtj “correct” vs. mt.t “middle” is semantically also doubtful.

LIT.: Brugsch 1882, 64; Sethe 1914, 114; 1923, 198; Wb l.c.; Caminos 1954 LEM, 436;
Vrg. 1973 Ib, 139; NBÄ 150, 649–650, n. 673; Smith 1978, 360; GHWb & AWb l.c.

NB: That the word was written in Dem. also as mtr.t proves hardly anything about
the original spelling of the underlying root just like Dem. mtr (!) ~ mtj “Tiefe,
Länge” (DG 191) < Eg. md.wt “Tiefe” (MK, Wb, below). J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 36
& 139) eventually explained both Eg. mtr.t “midday” vs. mt.t “middle” from an old
Eg. etymon *mútr.at resulting in (apparently via *Wortspaltung*) *múʔra(t) “midday”
vs. *mútʔ.a(t) > (via met.) *múʔt.a(t) “middle”, whose the cluster *-tr- > *-tʔ-
would be reflected by (S) -HHT-. J. Osing (NBÄ 649), in turn, regarded the derivation of
Eg. mt.t & Dem. mtj “Mitte” from an old Eg. fem. adj. mt(j).t (*mé/út.ʔt) “richtig,
gerade, genau” as “sicher”, whence the word was “neugebildet” (!) in or before Dyn.
XVIII as mtr.t (*mé/út.ʔt) > “Mittag” (lit. “richtig, genau”). H. S. Smith (1978,
360) conceived the basic sense of Eg. √mtr as an “adj. of accuracy of the stand-
balance”, whence he took (S) MHTE (no mention of mt.t).

- **2.** GT: instead, perhaps cognate to Cu.-Om. *māṭ- “intestines”
[GT] > HECu.: Gedeo (Drs.) maḏuma “intestines” [Hds. 1989,
84] = maḏduma “Magen, Bauch” [Lmb.] ||| NOm.: Sns. maḥ-ō
“1. pancia, ventre, 2. interno, parte interiore di una cosa” [Crl.] =

māč-à “Bauch, Magen, Innenseite” [Lmb.], Anf. mač-ō “1. pancia, ventre, 2. interno, parte inferiore di una cosa” [Crl.] = mač-o “Bauch, Innenseite” [Lmb.], Kaffā mač-ō “1. pancia, ventre, 2. interno, parte inferiore di una cosa” [Crl.] = mač-o “Bauch, Innenseite” [Lmb.], Mocha māč-o “belly, stomach”, māč-(i) “inside” [Lsl. 1959, 39], Sheko māč-o “Magen, Bauch” [Lmb.] (NOM./Kefoid: Crl. 1951, 468; Lmb. 1993, 348–9).

NB: M. Lamberti (l.c.) derived these parallels from *maṇḍ- explained as a var. of OCu. *marḍ- with the interchange of *-r/n-. Doubtful. Cf. perhaps rather Brb. *ta-miḍ-t “placenta” [GT] ||| LECu.: Afar maḍaḍ “uterus, womb” [PH 1985, 160]?

- Other etymologies are out of question.
- **3.** H. Möller (1911, 66) derived it (and Eg. mtr.t “Mittag”) from Eg. jm “in(ter)” (!) compared with Sem. *matn- “Hüfte” (erroneously explained from an orig. mng. “Mitte”) as well as with IE *(e)m-t (sic) “mit”, IE *ent-r (sic) “inner” (from *émter) and even IE *méd^h-jō-s “medius” (!). Clearly absurd. Similarly, A. R. Bomhard (1981, 446; 1984, 271, #273) combined Eg. mt.t (and mtw “with”, sic) with IE *mət-/*met- “middle, i the midst of, with, among”. Both proposals ignore basic facts of the Eg. morphological analysis.
- **4.** L. Homburger (1930, 289): Eg. mtr (sic) “milieu” ~ Ful nder “dedans”. False.
- **5.** A. M. Lam (1993, 391): Eg. mt.t “affection” (sic) ~ Ful mette “affection morale”. Absurd.

mt “Zäpfchen o.ä. als Form in welcher zusammengesetzte Medikamente in After und Vulva eingeführt werden” (Med., Wb II 167, 15–16) = “Darmzäpfchen” (Grapow 1936, 39, §9) = “le suppositoire, un moyen utilisé dans le but de provoquer une simple exonération intestinale réflexe, à la manière de nos suppositoires laxatifs?” (Jonckheere 1947, 65) = “bolus” (FD 120) = “Zäpfchen (für After, für Vagina)” (GHWb 373).

- GT: perhaps an extended sense of the extinct Eg. *mt “phallus” (above)?

NB: Especially noteworthy are the NOM. reflexes of HECu. *mut- “penis” [GT] (corresponding to Eg. *mt), in which the basic mng. shifted to designate the feminine counterpart of penis, cf. Zala & Dache mut-e “1. penis, 2. (hence) vagina” [Lmb. 1988, 69, §179; HL 1988, 129], Zayse mut-ē “ano” [Crl. 1938 III, 206] (from *vagina”).

mt, attested in: mt jfd “ein viereckiges Stück Leinen” (Wb II 168, 9: XVIII.; GHWb 373; ÄWb II 1153: already XII.) = “strip (?) of cloth”, mt jfd “a rectangular strip (?) of cloth” (FD 120).

- Etymology uncertain. No convincing suggestion has been made.
NB: (1) A. M. Lam (1993, 385) rendered it as “dépouiller (?)” (!) to combine it with Ful motto “le filage du coton”. (2) Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 211, #1822) compared it with NOm. *māt- “elongated leaf” > Mocha mātō “enset leaf” (and Omt. & Bns. “leaf”) explained by him from an AA *-māat- “strip” (sic). False. (3) GT: cf. perhaps NBrb.: Izdeg a-mata, pl. i-muta “bande d’étoffe” [Mrc. 1937, 32] || WBrb.: Zng. e-mmat (aor. i-mmat) “s’enveloppeur” [Bst. 1890, 312]? Dubious.

- ***mt.t/*md.t** (?) or ***mtj/*mtr** (?) > Cpt. (S) *MΔTЄ, (F) *MΔ† attested in (S) ЄMΔTЄ, MMΔTЄ, (F) (Є)MΔ† (1x), (S^a) ΔMΔTЄ (adv.) “greatly, very” (CD 190a; CED 93) = “sehr, viel” (KHW 36) = “très, beaucoup” (DELIC 43).
NB: Vocalized as *mity.at (Vcl.) = *midw.at (Ray).
- Etymology highly disputed. Most likely seems #2.
- **1.** E. Dévaud (Muséon 36, 1923, 95, §83) projected an anachronistic Cpt. etymon *M-ΔTO (sic, M- and -O) as its etymon (lit. “in multitude”), consisting of Eg. m (prep.) “in” + (SL) ΔTO, (SF) ΔTΔ, (B) ΘO, (L) TO, (SF) ΔTЄ- “Menge” (KHW 13). Absurd.
- **2.** J. Černý (CED 93; KHW 499) sought its ancestor in Eg. r-mtr (adv.) “richtig, genau” (GR, Wb II 174, 1) = r-mtr (sic, -r) “correctly, accurately (lit. according to correctness)” (Černý) = “avec justesse, exactitude” (AL 77.1923), which seems to be the only semantically suitable etymology that could be offered on Eg. grounds, although the semantic shift from “correctly” to “greatly” has not been demonstrated by him with parallels. In addition, the underlying Eg. root was mtj (not mtr, cf. below).
- **3.** Its derivation from “*some form of*” (Ray) Eg. m3^o.(t) that J. Černý (l.c. supra) and J. D. Ray (l.c. infra) also referred to is “*phonetically difficult to accept*” (Ray) and is clearly a contamination (DG 149, 190).
- **4.** W. Vycichl (DELIC 43) maintained that it reflects “*certainment un composé*” of Cpt. (S) Є- “à” + MΔTЄ “atteindre, jouir”, (m) “succès” < Eg. *mtj which he ultimately explained (with hesitation) from Eg. mtr “être présent” (via an unattested sense “rendre présent”!). Semantically unconvincing.
- **5.** J. D. Ray (1999, 193, n. c), in turn, surmised that Dem. n-md.t (sic, -d-) “in any way” in Pap. Leiden I 382, rt. 5 (from Eg. mdw “to speak”) represents “*perhaps the ancestor*” of the Cpt. expression, and regarded it as possible that “*two or more different etymologies merged in Coptic*”.
- **6.** GT: if, however, the inner Eg. etymology (#2) proves incorrect, the resemblance of the hypothetical pre-Cpt. *mt.t or *md.t “multitude (?)” to AA *m-t ~ *m-d “many” [GT] may be perhaps not fully illusory.

NB1: Attested in Sem. *maʔd- “many” [Djk.]: Oakk. maʔādum “to be plentiful” [Gelb 1973, 100] > Akk. maʔādu ~ miādu ~ mādu “viel, zahlreich werden/sein”, maʔdu, later mādu ~ mandu ~ maddu “viel, zahlreich” [AHW 573, 650], Emar ma-ʔ-du “nombreux”, ma-ʔa-du ~ [m]a-a-du₄ /mādu/ “much” [Sjöberg 1998, 259, #275 & 274, #651] || Ug. māḏ D “vervielfältigen”, māḏ “bedeutend an Zahl”, miḏ “1. viel, 2. sehr” [WUS #276] = miḏ /maʔd-/ “1. (adj.) plenty (?), 2. (adv.) much”, māḏ /maʔād-/ “plenty” [Segert 1984, 191] | OSA (Madhabi) mʔd “ajouter” [Arbach 1993, 67], (?) Ar. maʔada “commencer à être en sève et grandir (plantes)” [BK II 1052] = “anfangen zu wachsen” [WUS] || NBrb.: Mzg. ṽm-d: mimud “1. être plein de ..., grouiller, pululler, 2. être en grand nombre, en grande quantité” [Tf. 1991, 402] || NOm.: Kafa méto “cumulo, mucchio”, mèto “abbondanza” [Cecchi/Rn.] = mèto “Menge, Fülle” [Rn. 1888, 321] = mèto “folla, grande numero” [Crl. 1951, 475] = mèto “abundance” [Lsl.], Mocha mètti(yé) “to be numerous, abundant”, mètto “abundant, much” [Lsl. 1959, 42] = mètto “many” [Bnd. 1971, 260, #50] = mèto “viel” [Mkr.] | Dizi mad “very” [Toselli apud Bnd. 1996 MS, 2, #292] || SOM.: Ari (Bako) maʔat “many, much” [Bnd., Mkr.], Galila māṭ [Flm.] (Aroid: Bnd. 1994, 154; Om.: Mkr. 1981, 200) || NOm.: Haruro miḏ-āys “essere di più, sovrabbondare”, modʔido “grosso” [Crl. 1937, 653] || Ch. *m-d-(m) “big, many, long, high” [JS 1981, 40A.] > WCh.: Gmy. muoet (the oe is long here) [mʔɔt] (adv.) “very, much” [Srl. 1937, 148] || CCh.: MM *mad- (?) “big” [GT]: Mlk. māḏigá “big” [Rsg.], Gsg. māḏiḏá “big” [Rsg.] = madaḏaḏ “groß” [Lks. 1970, 127] (MM: Rsg. 1978, 211) | Daba māḏāy “big, tall, large, great (grand)” [LG 1974, 17, #435; 1975, 99] || ECh.: Kera mèèḏi ~ míti (m), mútu ~ mtu (f), pl. kò-mt-íḏ “grand, large” [Jng. 1973, 47, 52] = mòtò (f), pl. kò-mt-ḥḏ “groß (big)” [Ebert 1974, 18; 1976, 33; 1978, 43, §24], Fianga modo “groß” [Lks. 1937, 102] | Mkl. mèèḏá (f) “groß (Frau)” [Lks. 1977, 220] | Kajakse emadi “many” [DoorNBos 1981 MS, #50], (?) Birgit mòodi [unless -d- < *d-] “croître” [Jng. 2004, 357]. H.G. Mukarovsky (1981, 200, §10.A) Om. word with Saharan: Teda munto, Daza monto, Tubu múntu “viele”.

NB2: A number of false etymologies have been proposed for the Sem. root. A. Drexel (1925, 13) combined Akk. mādu with WCh.: Hausa máḏḏaa “Ungezügelmkeit, Habsucht” [Drexel] = máḏḏá ~ máḏḏáá “slowness in starting and carrying out a job of work” [Brg. 1934, 739] = máḏḏá “dilatoriness” [Abr. 1962, 630], which is semantically very weak. M. L. Bender (1975, 174, §50.1) equated Akk. mʔd with ECh.: Mubi nāmát “many” [Lks. 1937, 184], but its -t was an adj. ending (attached to ṽn-m). H. Möller’s (1911, 156) equation of Sem. *mʔd with IE *māk- “groß” (!) is simply absurd.

NB2: L. Reinisch (l.c.) combined the Kafa word with Hbr. mēʔā and Ar. miʔ-at- “hundred”, although he admitted that “*die Herkunft dieses Wortes ist dunkel*”. W. Leslau (l.c.), in turn, suggested a connection with HECu. *bataʔ- with the “*change of labials*”.

NB3: AA *m-t ~ *m-d (above) seems to belong to a widespread root family being remotely akin to the following AA roots with related primary significations:

(1) AA *m-d “to collect” [GT] > SBrb.: Hgr. a-med “1. cueillir, détacher avec la main de la tige, 2. fig. recueillir (des nouvelles)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1153], EWlm. & Ayr a-məd “cueillir (produits végétaux comestibles, sel), ramasser (bois de chauffage)” [PAM 2003, 520], Tudalt (Udalan) & Tadghaq a-məd “to gather (in the bush)” [Sudlow 2001, 144] || LECu.: Afar madode “to be collected together in the afternoon for driving home (cattle)”, modod-ise (caus.) “to collect...”, modod (m) “collecting together in the afternoon...” [PH 1985, 169] || ECh.: (?) Smr. māḏḏḏ [ḏ- < *d-?] “grouper, réunir, rassembler” [Jng. 1993 MS, 43] | EDng. āmḏiyē “se grouper, se réunir nombreux” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 12] = “eine Gruppe bilden” [Ebs. 1987, 78]. AP: cf. NS *mád “to join together, assemble (intr.)” [Ehret 2001, 278, §100?]

(2) Ch. *m-d-(C₃) “to exceed” [GT] > WCh.: AS *met “2. to surpass” [GT 2004, 247]: Sura mēḏ (so, -d) “to surpass” [Krf.] = mēt “überspringen” [Jng. 1963, 74],

Mpn. mét “2. to perform, surpass, overcome” [Frj. 1991, 37], Kfy. mét “to exceed” [Ntg. 1967, 26], Msr. met “1. to surpass, be superior, bigger” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 179, 181, 385, 390] = mét “to surpass” [Jng. 1999 MS, 11], Chip met ni gwe “to surpass” [Krf.] || CCh. *m/n-d-(y) “dépasser” [Br.-Jng. 1990, 148] > e.g. Margi mdā “to surpass, excel” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 124]. E. Wolff & L. Gerhardt (1977, 1540) suggested a false AP (in BC) for the Sura verb.

(3) AA *m-d-(C₃) ~ *(C₁)-m-d (var. *m-d-h in Brb. and CCh.?) “to (be) complete, all” [GT] > Sem. *ʔmd “to finish” [GT]: Ug. ʔmd D “vernichten” [WUS #276] | Ar. ʔamada “être terminé, fini” [BK I 53] = “être achevé” [DRS] | OSA: Sqt. ʔmd “remplir” [Lsl.] || Tigre ʔamdā “parfaire, révéler” [DRS] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 63; DRS 22) || PBrb. impf. *ʔa-mduh, pf. *ʔu-mdah [Prasse 1975, 227] = *ʔ-mdu < *ʔm-d-[h] “to complete” [GT]: e.g. NBrb.: Shilh a-se-mdi “parfait, accompli” [Bst. 1909, 242] | Mzab ʔ-mda “être complet, compléter” [Dlh. 1984, 115], Wargla ʔ-mda “être complet, entier, accompli, fini, parfait, en toute sa forme, accomplir, parfaire, finir” [Dlh. 1987, 184] | Qbl. med^c “1. parvenir à un certain développement, 2. grandir, grossir, 3. être suffisant (quantité), suffire, être capable de” [Dlt. 1982, 484] || EBrb.: Gdm. ʔ-mdu “achever, compléter” [Lanfry 1973, 197, #966] = i-mdu [Prs.] || WBrb.: Zng. ʔm-d “être fini, finir” > ʔumdan “vielli”, ʔumda^b “expérimenté (se dit d’un homme)” [Ncl. 1953, 206] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-mdu “finir (achever)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1154] = i-mdu [Prs.], Ayr ʔ-mdu ~ ʔ-mdu “1. être complet, entier, 2. être fini, achevé, 3. être parfait, 4. devenir adulte, majeur, atteindre l’âge de la majorité, 5. être ample (vêtement)” [PAM 1998, 208; 2003, 520], Tudalt (Udalan) ʔ-mdu “être complet” [Prs. & Dicko 2002, 29] || LECu.: Afar mīde “to be full” [PH 1985, 168] | HECu.: Drs. (Gedeo) madadi-nke “all” [Hds. 1989, 19], cf. Drs. (Gedeo) mud- “to be finished, be accomplished” [Hds. 1989, 18, 64] || SOM.: Ari mūd- “all” [Bnd. 1971, 263, #1] = mudda ~ mūda [Bnd. 1994, 144] = mūda “all” [Bnd. 1994, 1158, #1] || CCh.: Mafa ndəh- “remplir”, cf. nd- “boucher” [Bléis 1987, 111] || ECh.: Kwang-Mobu ándé “être plein, remplir” [Lns. 1982 MS, 102]. S. Chaker (1973–79, 300, §15) connected the Brb. root with NBrb.: Qbl. ta-mdi-t “le soir”, which is unconvincing, the m- of the latter not being part of the root (p.c. by K.-G. Prasse, 12 April 2007). M. Cohen (1947, 180, #423) erroneously combined the Hgr. root with Sem. *rbb and Eg. nb (!) supposing “un passage de nb à md”. K.-G. Prasse (PAM 2003 l.c.), in turn, affiliated Brb. *ʔa-mduh (via met.) with Ar. tmm and Eg. tmm “être complet”, which is equally unlikely.

(4) AA *m-[t] “to be(come) much, great” [GT] > NBrb.: NBrb.: Wrg. medmeḏ “être nombreux (gens, foule, animaux)” [Brn. 1908, 342] || EBrb.: presumably Gdm. miməḏ “fourmiller (de monde, de parasites)” [Lanfry 1973, 206, #979] || LECu.: Afar mùḏḏ-i ~ -o “greater, more”, mùḏḏ-uta “to abound, be too much”, mùḏḏ-use “to increase” [PH 1985, 171], Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata) miṯē ~ /> miṯē “plenty, abundant” [Strm. 1987, 366; 1995, 209–210] || CCh.: Lame mbùḏ “grandir, être grand” [Scn. 1982, 310], Zime-Dari mbùḏ [mb- < *m- reg.] “grandir, être grand” [Cooper 1984, 18] || ECh.: (?) DM *m[ā]d- “to grow” [GT] > WDng. mááḏé “grandir” [Fédry 1971, 111], EDng. màáḏē “grandir, croître, pousser, s’élever” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 191] = “wachsen” [Ebs. 1979, 131], Mgm. màáḏò “grandir, croître, pousser” [JA 1992, 105], (?) Birgit mòóḏí [irreg. -d- < *-d-?] “croître” [Jng. 2004, 357] | Kajakse màḏi ~ mèéḏi “beaucoup” [Alio 2004, 245, #236].

(5) AA *m-[č] (var. to **m-ṯ?) “(to become) complete, finish(ed)” [GT] > Ar. mḏy: maḏā I & IV “mener qqch. à bonne fin, exécuter, accomplir”, māḏin < *māḏi?-un “mort, dépassé”, mamḏuww- “affaire menée à bonne fin” [BK II 1120–1] || NBrb.: (?) Izn. e-mḏa [or -d- < *-d-?] “être passé, terminé” [Rns. 1932, 385] | (?) Qbl. s-mḏy “arriver à maturité” [Chaker 1973–79, 300, §15] || WBrb.: Zenaga ʔm-d (sic: i-š-medh (3rd p.sg.m., caus.) “accomplir” [Bst.] = i-š-medh (3rd p.sg.m.aor.) “accomplir” [Bst. 1909, 241] = ʔm-d “finir, terminer”: i-maḏ “c’est (il est) fini” [Ncl. 1953, 206] || SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ʔ-məḏ “être complet, en entier (tous/t)” (to be distinguished

from ə-məḏ “être épais, gras”?) [PAM 1998, 210; 2003, 523–4] ||| CCh.: Mafa (Mtk.) mēḏ “fin, mort, dernière heure” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 222], MG -məḏ- “terminer, finir” [Brt. 1978, 139]. Cf. perhaps also NBrb.: (?) Qbl. maḏi “pas du tout, absolument pas, jamais (en phrase nég.)” [Dlt. 1982, 488] (borrowed from Ar., kind p.c. by M. Kossmann, 19 April 2007) ||| NOm.: Omt.: Gofa meḏa-meḏa “sempre, éternamente” [Mrn. 1938, 152]. S. Chaker (1973–79, 300, §15) derived both Brb. *m-d- (above) and *m-ḏ- from a common basic mng. expressing “l'idée de terme, accomplissement”.

mt3 “(Subst.)” (PT 235a hapax, Wb II 170, 4) = “(vielleicht) Sitz, Stelle, Ort” (ÜKAPT VI 135) = “trône (qui, d’après son déterminatif, désignait précisément le siège représenté)” (Drioton 1956, 40) = “?” (Faulkner and ÄWb I 574) = “Stab” (Leitz).

NB: E. Drioton (l.c.) regarded the Q1 hrgl. (following mt3) as the det. of our word (pace K. Sethe, ÜKAPT l.c.) and derived the cryptographic phon. value m of the seat (throne) hrgl. (Q1) attested in the tomb of Ramses VI and on scarabs from this rare and old word. R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 55), however, presupposed a compound mt3-s.t in which the hrgl. Q1 was the second component.

- Rendering and etymology doubtful.
- 1. Ch. Leitz (1996, 404) identified it as the OK instance of NK mt3. w ~ mt3j.t “Art Spieß” (Wb, below).
- 2. GT: may the coincidence with NBrb.: Tazerwalt a-mtul “Ort, Fleck” [Stumme 1899, 165] be purely accidental?

mt3.w ~ var. **mt3j.t** “Art Spieß” (BD, Wb II 170, 1–2) = “bâton, crochet” (Jéquier 1911, 61, §18 & fn. 2 correctly rejecting Page-Renouf’s “chaîne”) = mt3.w ~ mt3j.t “bâton courbé et fourchu” (Jéquier 1921, 162) = mt3.w “Gabelstöcke (auch als Waffe des Seth gegen Apophis)” (Hornung 1980, 154: cf. Cherf, ZÄS 109, 1982, 86–97; Zandee, ZÄS 10, 1963, 152) = mt3.w (pl.) “Art Spieße (*Gabelstöcke)” vs. mt3j.t “ein Spieß” (GHWb 374) = “Gabelstockträger”, also “Waffe (des Seth) gegen Apophis” (Zeidler 1999 II, 159, fn. 1).

NB: Its vocalized form *mät3.aw vs. *mat3äw.t > *mat3äj.t (Zeidler l.c. pace NBÄ 166–175) has to remain purely theoretic due to the lack of cuneiform or Coptic evidence.

- Hence (?) as denominative verb (or *vice versa*?): mt3 “mit dem mt3j. t-Spieß erstechen” (LP, Wb II 170, 3) = “transpercer d’une lance” (late NK: KRI II 318:13, AL 79.1407) = “aufspießen, speeren” (GHWb 374) = “erstechen” (Zeidler l.c.).
- Origin disputable.
- 1. J. Zeidler (1999 l.c.) saw in mt3.w and mt3j.t *nomina agentis* to LEg. mt3 “erstechen”. GT: if this reverse way of derivation is valid, the Eg. verbal root has to be equated with Ar. matara I “1. couper, retrancher en coupant, abattre” [BK II 1056] || ES: Geez matara

“to cut (off, up, asunder), break up, interrupt, shut off etc.” [Lsl. 1987, 372].

- **2.** GT: alternatively, cf. perhaps Hbr. mṭl: *māṭīl, st.cstr. māṭīl- (barzel) “geschmiedeter Stab” [GB 417] = “(iron) rod” [KB 574] = “lamina” [Jerome] = “bar (of iron)” [Rabin] = “graveness (or iron)” (!) [Saadiyah] = “strength of iron” [Ibn Ezra], JAram. maṭlā “Stange” [GB; Dalman 1922, 232] = maṭāl “geschmiedete Stange” vs. maṭlānā “eiserne Stange” [Levy 1924 III 88, 90] = maṭāl “javelin for thrusting” [Jastrow 1950, 767] = (Targum) maṭl(ān)ā “javelin (of iron)” [Rabin].

NB: The etymology of the Hbr.-Aram. word is so very much disputed that it cannot be surveyed and evaluated here in full. H. Lewy (1895, 131f.) saw in it a borrowing from Gk. μέταλλον. L. Koehler (KB) affiliated it with Ar. maṭala “forger, étendre, aplatir à coups de marteau (le fer, etc. pour faire un casque, etc.)” [BK II 1123] = maṭala “to beat iron into sheats”, maṭīl-at- “tin” [Rabin]. C. H. Gordon (1965, §19, #1037), J. Aistleitner (WUS #1118), and G. R. Driver (1956, 151a), in turn, equated it with Ug. ṭl “to fall” or alternatively with Ug. mdl “lightning” (Gordon 1965, §19, #1430; WUS #744a; Driver 1956, 161a; de Moor, ZAW 78, 69f.). Ch. Rabin (1963, 131, §15 & fn. 2–3), admitting that it “looks like” a derivative of Can. *nṭl > Samar. Aram. nṭʿlh “pole, bar” (≈ HBr. moṭ), JAram. (Targum) ʿaṭel ~ ʿaṭel “to throw”, surmised “an ellipsis of two different roots”, i.e., a contamination with a supposed correspondence of Akk. mutallu “noble, proud” (cf. Landsberger, JCS 8, 1954, 131–3 against Soden, Or. 22, 1953, 200f.) and Ar. rumḥ mitall “a strong spear” (normally derived from Ar. talla, i.e., “a spear thrown on the ground”), which he eventually explained from Hitt. & Luwian & HH muwat(t)alli- “strong (esp. of weapons)” (cf. also Güterbock, ArOr 18/1–2, 216). Note that JAram. maṭlānā has been rendered entirely differently by Dalman and Jastrow l.c.

- **3.** GT: or cf. perhaps AA *m-t-l “to cast” [GT]?

NB1: Reconstruction highly uncertain as the common origin of its supposed derivatives seems rather doubtful, cf. NBrb.: Izn. √m-t-l: mettel “jeter un sort” [Rns.], Uriaghel a-mettel “jettature” [Rns. 1932, 384] ||| (?) SAgaw: “Awiya” metālī & “Damot” metāl “fionda” [CR 1905, 169] ||| CCh.: (?) Mada mātēlā “throwing knife” [Rsg. 1978, 278] = máatla (-tl- not for -š-) “genre de couteau de jet (à deux courbes)” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 194] (or nomen instr.?) || ECh.: (???) Mkl. ʿōndilā [-nd- < *-mt-?] “1. placer, mettre dans, 2. pondre, 3. laisser tomber, 4. jeter” [Jng. 1990, 154].

NB2: As D. Appleyard (p.c. on 24 March 2007) confirmed, C. Conti Rossini’s “Awiya” and “Damot” forms “look blatantly like the Amharic verbal noun (infinitive, nomen actionis) māṭal from the verb ṭalā ‘throw, throw away, drop’. However, māṭal is simply the verbal noun ‘to throw’ in Amharic, and the Amharic word for ‘sling’ (= It. fionda) is from an entirely different root: wānčif. The Amharic nomen instrumentalis from ṭalā is māṭaya and this means ‘a place where you throw things, a dump, rubbish tip!’”.

NB3: Akk. mudulu “eine Stange” [AHW 667] seems to be of Sum. origin (cf. OL 2003, 207, fn. 23).

- **4.** GT: if, in turn, it ultimately comes from an AA *m-ṭ-r [GT], it might be akin to ECh.: Mkl. miḏyiré (m) “couteau de jet” [Jng. 1990, 139] ||| Brb. *√m-ḏ-r > *√n-ḏ-r “to throw” [GT].

NB: The Brb. root is attested in NBrb.: Rif (sic) nder “jeter” [Tlm. 1998, 110], Urg. & Bqy. & Amr. e-nḏer “jeter” [Rns.], Bitw. nḏar “jeter” [Brn. 1911, 186], Izn.

ə-mɔ̄ɔ̄r “jeter” [Lst.] = e-mɔ̄ɔ̄r “jeter” [Rns.], Mnsr. e-mder “jeter” [Bst. 1890, 313], Metmata & Beni Salah ə-mɔ̄ɔ̄r [Lst.], Halima meter “jeter” [Bst.], Nfs. ə-nɔ̄ɔ̄r “jeter” [Lst.] = é-nɔ̄ɔ̄r ~ â-nɔ̄ɔ̄r “gettare” [Bgn. 1931, 275; 1942, 289] || EBrb.: Gdm. ə-nɔ̄ɔ̄r “jeter” [Lst.] = e-nɔ̄ɔ̄r “1. abattre, faire tomber, 2. mettre à couvrir” [Lanfray 1973, 235, #1100] (Brb.: Bst. 1895, 452; Lst. 1931, 249; Rns. 1932, 384).

- **5.** GT: if it is a *nomen instr.* of a hypothetical Eg. *(w)t3 “to throw (a weapon like spear, e.g.)” (or sim.), cp. Ar. talla I “1. jeter (à terre)” > mitall- “1. tout objet avec lequel on renverse ou jette à terre, 2. lance” [BK I 203] = talla I “1. to prostrate, throw down” > mitall- “a thing with which one prostrates, and hence: a spear and (as an epithet applied to a spear) even and erect” [Lane 311].
- **6.** GT: alternatively, cp. LECu.: PSam *tūr “to throw” [Heine]: PSom. *tūr “to throw” [Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984, 221] > Somali tūr “to throw” [Heine], Boni tūr “werfen (auf einen Haufen)” [Heine 1977, 294] = “to throw on a heap” [Heine 1978, 75] | HECu.: Kmb. torr- “to throw” [Hds. 1989, 154: isolated in HECu.].
AP: H. C. Fleming (1983, 458) compared Som. tūr with Kuliak: Ik itur “to throw away” ~ ENil.: Masai a-iturrā “to throw away”.
NB: Whether the same AA root might be present in LECu.: Somali tēr-i [Rn.: < *ta(w)iri → *tayri?] “schwere, lange und breite Lanze zum Stoßen, Stoßlanze im Handgefecht” [Rn. 1902, 368] = tēr-i “type of heavy spear” [Abr. 1964, 237] | Yaaku tōr “spear” [Grb.] = tōr; pl. tōrōri (m) “spear” [Heine 1975, 134] || SCu.: Maa tōr-o (sic) “spear” [Grb.] = i-toró ~ i-to “spear” [Ehret 1974 MS, 65] (Cu.: Grb. 1963, 36, #157) || NOm.: NWomt. *tōr-a “spear” [GT]: Wlt. tora, Gofā & Gamu & Dorze & Dawro/Kullo tōra (NWomt.: Alm. 1993, 8; for Gamu: Lmb. 1985 MS, 15, #230) | SEomt. *tōr-a “spear” [GT]: Zayse & Zrg. & Gnj. & Kcm. tora, Koyra tōra (SEomt.: Sbr. 1994, 20) | Sns. tora “spear” [Alm.] is rather doubtful. Most of these forms look like borrowings ultimately originating from ES: Amh. tōr “spear” [Apl.], which D. Appleyard (1977, 55/97) explained either from ES *šwr > Geez šorā “to carry”, šor “burden, load” or Gafāt šāwwārā “strong, rigid”, although neither of these etymologies may be regarded as semantically satisfactory. D. Appleyard (p.c., 24 March 2007) found a parallel for the semantic shift for Geez šor “burden, load” > Amh. tōr in Tigrinya šor “burden, load”, pl. šorat ~ var. ?aşwar “arms, soldier’s equipment”.
- Other suggestions are unacceptable.
- **7.** G. Jéquier (1911, 61, §18) treated it as the NK form of MK md3.t “(pl.) les bois autour desquels on arrimait les cordages, crochets, bittes ou taquets” (below). Excluded (MK -d- can hardly yield NK -t-). Later, however, Jéquier (1921 l.c.) regarded its origin to be unknown.
- **8.** A. A.-H. Youssef (1983, 259) combined Eg. mt3j.t with Ar. muddyat- “couteau” [BK II 1079], which is excluded both as a genetic parallel (Eg. -t- vs. Ar. -d- irreg., while Eg. -3- ≠ Ar. -y) and as an Eg. > Ar. (via Cpt.) borrowing.
- **9.** G. Takács (1996, 52, #58; 1996, 127, #58; 1996, 136, #31) preferred to affiliate Eg. mt3.w on a biconsonantal basis with Eg. mtpn.t “Dolchscheide” (MK, Wb, q.v.), mtf.t “Art Dolch” (MK, Wb, q.v.),

and even *mtnj.t* “Art Beil” (MK, Wb, q.v.). Unconvincing in each case, since all of these *comparanda* presumably represent m- prefix *nomina instr.*

mtj (n z3) “Vorsteher (einer Priestergilde, bei Handwerkerphylen)” (OK, Wb II 168, 10–14; GHWb 374) = “Leiter (einer Phyle)” (Junker: Giza VI 21) = “chef (d’un collègue)” (Pirenne apud Jones) = “Phylenobmann” (Kees 1948, 81–90 with discussion) = “controller (of a priestly phyle)” (FD 121; Ward 1982, 96, #803) = “regulator (of a phyle)” (Fischer 1996, 8, n. 5 & 227, 251; Jones 2000, 452, #1694) = “Phylenobmann, Regulator, Leiter (einer Priesterphyle, auch bei Handwerkerphylen)” (ÄWb I 573).

NB1: also in “Regulator der Verwaltung” (VI. 1x: Cairo 1403, ÄWb I 573). Hintze NB2: Was Mer. *mete “Phylarch” [Zhl. 1956, 26] = mte “ein Titel” [Hintze 1951, 359] borrowed from Eg. *mtj*?

NB3: It is not clear what evidence Brb. *mete (sic) “Libyertitel”, lit. “Erster, Fürst” [Zhl. 1950, 421, fn. 5] has been based on (considered by E. Zyhlarz to be “*altbekannt*”), but it can hardly anything to do with Eg. *mtj*.

- There are more possible ways of its etymologization:
- **1. J. Osing** (NBÄ 647, n. 672.3) eventually explained this title from Eg. *mtj* “richtig, rechtmäßig, ordentlich, genau” (MK, Wb, below). GT: perhaps a substantivized participle deriving from a verbal use of *mtj* with the sense “to direct” attested also in CT VII 14k *mtr* (for **mtj*) “to steer (the bark) straight for (?) (the land)” (AECT III 7, spell 815, n. 4) and LEg. (hapax) *mt* “führen, leiten” (WD II 68 pace Gdk. in RdE 38, 1987, 73, n. 49; absent in Wb)? Uncertain. NB1: Although the etymologically correct reading of the underlying root seems to have been *mtj*, the wtg. *mtr* occurs at least twice in the late Dyn. XII (Kairo 1478 and 20536, Belegstellen ad Wb II 168, 11; the latter ex. was quoted by Osing l.c. as Kairo 20526), which can only be explained as the influence of Eg. *mtj* (written also *mtr*) “richtig”. However, it is noteworthy that the det. of accuracy (two fingers, EG 1927, 447, D50) regularly accompanying Eg. *mtj* “richtig” is typically missing in all exx. of Eg. *mtj* (as title) listed by Wb, which makes the etymological connection suggested by Osing at least suspicious. NB2: The semantic shift would be plausible, cf. e.g. PIE **rēg-* “(gerade) richten etc.” (i.a. OInd. *rjú-* and Av. *ərəzu-* “gerade recht”) vs. IE **rēg-s* “König” (OInd. *rājan-* & *rājan-*, Lat. *rēx*, OIrish *rī*), cf. IEW 854–7.
- **2.** GT: on the other hand, in principle, an AA etymology should be also accounted for, cp. perhaps Bed. *mityáy*, pl. *mítyay* (m) “Befehl, Gebot”, *mityay* “befehlen” [Rn. 1895, 176 with a phonologically unconvincing Sem. etymology] = *mityā* “to describe” [Rpr. 1928, 219] ||| ECh.: Kwang-Modgel *metí* “Häuptling” [Lks. 1937, 97]. NB1: The origin of NAgaw: Bilin *mād* [irreg. -d] “1. Aufsicht, Oberbefehl über jemanden, 2. Aufseher” [Rn. 1887, 263] = *mād* “responsibility” and “someone who watches over other people’s work” [Kiffemariam Hamdél] is not clear. L. Reinisch

(l.c.) compared it with ES: Tigre māz (not in LH) and Geez maʿadā, var. maʿdā “to counsel, warn, exhort, admonish”, which D. Appleyard (p.c., 26 March 2007) is disposed to rule out. W. Leslau (1987, 325) compared this ES root with Soqotri maʿad “to intend” and other Semitic terms from the root *wʿd. Appleyard assumes that if Tigre māz is a genuine form then Bilin -d comes from earlier *-z (a common sound change in this language), and Tigre could have borrowed it from Bilin before the z > d change.

NB2: LECu.: Orm. mot-iččā (m), mot-itti (f) [Mrn.] = mōti “lord, king” [Hyw.] | HECu.: Sid. mōt-iččō (m), mōt-iččā (f) “signore” [Crl. 1938 II, 215] = mot-ičča (m), mot-itte (f) “signore/a, padrone/a” [Mrn. 1940, 231] = mōte “chief”, mōt-ičča (m) “lord, master”, mōtōʿma “to become chief” [Gsp. 1983, 238] = mōte, pl. mōtolla/e “chief, (clan) leader”, mōt-ičča, pl. mōte “lord, master” [Hds. 1989, 97, 386: isolated in HECu.] cannot be related. For R. Hayward (1997, 108), the Sid. term “looks like an Oromo loan-word”, while the Oromo one may be explained from the root *mōh- (Dirayta mōh- “God, title of respect”) + Orm. nominal formative -t-.

NB3: The origins of CCh.: Gude mēetā “older child with responsibility of looking after younger child” [Hsk. 1983, 243] || ECh.: Mkl. mōʿitā (f) [-ʿ- obscure] “dirigeante, responsable d’une groupe” [Jng. 1990, 140] are obscure.

- 3. G. Takács (1996, 126, #57; 1996, 136–7, #32) supposed Eg. mtj to represent a fossilized nisba *mt.j (with the primary sense “one being in front” or sim.) of an extinct Eg. reflex of AA *matw- “head” [Blz.] = *mat- “1. (top of the) head, 2. front part of head” [GT]. NB1: Attested in Akk. muttu “Vorderseite”, hence muttatu “Stirnhaar, Stirnlocke” [Holma 1911, 35–36; AHW 690] = muttu “front”, muttiš “in front, before” [CAD m2, 313], cf. also Oakk. muttum “(head covering)” vs. mudum “(a garment)” [Gelb 1973, 169] || PCu.-Om. *mVt(t)Vh- “голова” [Dlg.] > Bed. mat “Scheitel” [Rn. 1895, 175] = mud ~ “top of head” [Hds. 1996, 89] || (?) PAḡaw *ḡat-a “head” [Apl. 2005 MS, 16] (reconstruction of *-t- dubious) || ECU. *mat-ḥ- “head” [Sasse] (with an AA nominal class marker *-ḥ in anatomical terms, cf. Blz. 1989, 213; Takács 1997, 234, #24.14; 254, #5.2): cf., i.a., LECu. *math- “head” [Black 1974, 185] > PSam *mataḥ [Heine 1976, 216; 1977, 289; 1978, 69; 1982, 111; Lmb. 1986, 445]: cf. esp. Orm. matā “1. head, 2. chief, leader” [Ali-Zbr. 1990, 141] = “1. head, 2. mind, sense, brains, 3. leader” [Btm. 2000, 193], Som. mádaḥ “head” > mádáḥ “leader(s), chief” [Abr. 1964, 169] (ECu.: Flm. 1964, 51; Bnd. 1971, 195, 241–251; Hhn. 1975, 89; Sasse 1973, 268, 271–2, 275; 1979, 36; Lmb. 1987, 532, #2; HL 1988, 131) || Om. *mat- “head” [Blz.] > NOm.: Dizoid *mot “head” [Bnd. 1987, 33] > Nao moṭi “testa” [CR 1925, 615] = mot “head” [Grb.; Bnd.] = mōt “head” [Akl. apud Bnd. 1996 MS, #38], Shako mōtu ~ mütu “head” [Flm. apud Bnd. 1996 MS, #38] || SOM. (Aroid) *mat “head” [Bnd. 1987, 33] = *mata “head” [GT]: Ari mata [Grb./Dlg., Lmb., Zbr.] = māta [Bnd. 1971; Ehret 1976, 93] = met-a [Flm.] = matá [Bnd. 1994], Banna mēte [Bnd. 1971] = mete [Zbr.] = mēte [Blz.], Bako mata ~ mōta [Mkr.], Ubamer mātá [Blz.] = metá [Mkr.], Galila mat-a [Flm.] = mαta [Bnd. 1994] = matá [Blz.] = mōta [Mkr.], Hamer mata [Flm./Bnd.] = met- [Lydall/Bnd.] = met-e [Flm.] = mät- [Blz.] = mīte ~ mīti “head” [Flm. 1990 MS, 1], Karo meti [Bnd. 1971] = meti [Flm.] = meti [Zbr.], Dime mat-e ~ met-o [Flm.] = méto [Bnd. 1971] = mōto [Blz.] = mōte [Flm./Bnd. 1996 MS, #38; Mkr.] = mōt- [Flm./Bnd. 1994] = met- [Bnd. 1994] = matʿe [Sbr.] (SOM.: esp. Bnd. 1971, 262–4, #37; Dlg. 1973, 182; Flm. 1988, 167; Mkr. 1989 MS, 4; Blz. 1989 MS, 18, #60; Bnd. 1994, 152) || WCh.: perhaps Fyer met “beginnen” [Jng. 1970, 391] = “to begin, start” [Blench 2000 MS, 4, #f194] (for the semantic development “head” > “to begin” cf. below) || CCh.: (?) Paduko muḏara “tête” [Mch. 1950, 38] = muḏara [Clm. 1995, 234] = muḏara (sic, -ḏ-) “head” [Blz.] | Musgu máda “Kopf” [Müller 1886, 399] = madu-gú (-gu poss. pron. suffix) “Kopf” [Lks.

1937, 141] = maidi ~ máda ~ mídi “Kopf, Oberseite” [Krause apud Lks. 1941, 65, 67] = mada ~ midi “head” [Mkr.], Pus midi- “Kopf” [MB 1972 MS, 5] = mædiy (m) “tête (head)”, st.cstr. midi- “1. tête de (head of), 2. sur (on)” [Trn. 1991, 105–6], Mulwi mātō “head” [Jng. 1971 MS, 3, #1], Mbara mbòt “head” [TSL 1986, 199], Vulum māt “head” [TSL] || ECh.: (?) Sarwa ndī [if < *mti] “tête” [JI 1990 MS, 14, #255]. AP (from ECu.): PBaz *metəḥ and PKalenjin/PKuliak *met “head” [HRV 1979, 77–78, 86]. SNil.: Omotik matéta “head” [Heine 1974, 48]. lit. for the AA comparison: Dlg. 1973, 182 (Bed.-ECu.-Om.); Blz. 1989 MS Om., 18, #60; 1994 MS Bed., 28 (Om.-ECu.-Bed.-CCh.-Akk.); Mkr. 1989, 4 (ECu.-Om.-Musgu); Zbr. 1989, 582–583 (Bed.-ECu.-SOM.-Nao); Takács 1996, 52, #57; 1996, 126, #57; 1996, 137, #32; 1997, 211, #1 (Eg.-Cu.-Om.-Ch.).

nb2: The Om. parallels are supposed to have been borrowed from ECu. (Ehret 1976, 93; Flm. 1987, 33; Lmb. 1987, 532; Blz. 1989 MS, 18, #60).

nb3: H.-J. Sasse (1990, 167) rightly rejected M. Lamberti’s (1988, #63) unconvincing comparison of ECu. *mataḥ- “Kopf” with Som. tim-o “Kopffhaar” (etc.).

nb4: L. Reinisch (1888, 276) combined Orm. matá with NOM.: Kafa batbat “primo, principio, precedente” [Cecchi] = batbát-ō “Anfang” [Rn.], which is certainly false, the underlying Amh. etymon (batā “to begin, said of month”) having a fully different etymology (cf. Leslau 1969, 35; 1988, 184; Takács 2005, 277, #7 ad Eg. 3bd).

nb5: E. Wolff & L. Gerhardt (1977, 1536) affiliated WCh.: Fyer met with BC: Kaningkom & Ndem mat “to begin” explained by them from PBantu *-bad- “to begin”.

nb6: The semantic change “head” > “chief” is universal, cf. e.g. (1) ECu. *mat-ḥ- “head” [Sasse] > LECu.: Oromo matā “head”, whence matā “chief, leader” [Ali-Zbr. 1990, 141]. (2) Eg. tp “head”, hence tp “headman, chief” (OK, FD 296) || HECu.: Burji tip-ō “skull” [Sasse 1982, 177] (orig. *?head?) || WCh. *tVp- “to begin” [Std.] ~ AP: PKoman *tVpa “chief” > Twampa tap^ha & Anej itiba [Bnd. 1983, 280, #226a], cf. Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 5, #13 (Burji-Eg.); OS 1992, 192 (Eg.-PWCh.); Takács 1997, 211–2, #1 (Eg.-Burji-WCh.-Koman). For a different etymology of Eg. tp (act. dp?) cf. Peust 2006, 7–8. (3) LECu.: Saho-Afar amú ~ amó “Kopf, Scheitel” [Rn. 1886, 810; 1890, 34], Afar ma-o “head, summit, top, intelligence, hair” [PH 1985, 40] || Sem.: OSA ʔmm “être à la tête de”, Ar. ʔmm “marcher en tête, être à la tête de” || Tigre ʔammāmā “aller dans une direction, résoudre”, Amh. əmm “le prêtre qui règle le service à l’église” (Sem.: DRS 23). (4) PKart. *t^haw- “head” > Georg. t^hav-i “head”, whence t^hav-ad-i “chief, prince” vs. ga-t^hav-eba “to finish” [Cherkesi 1950, 87; Penrihi & Saržvelaže 1990, 142]. (5) IE: Russ. глава “chief” vs. голова “head”. (6) PUr. *pāje “Kopf, Haupt” > Hung. fej “head” > fejedelem “ruler”, fő “head” > főnök “chief” ~ (?) Yurak p’a- “anfangen, beginnen” (MNyTESz I 862; UEW 365) etc. G. Roquet (1972, 104–5, §15) examined further parallels for “head” → “chief”, e.g. (7) Ar. raʔis- “chef”, lit. “celui de la tête” or (8) Lat. caput > Fr. chef.

- 4. G. Takács (1996, 136–7, #32; 1997, 211, #1) regarded it just as well plausible that Eg. mtj may have originally denoted “the first one” (on the analogy of Eg. tp “head” > tp.j “first”, Wb V 277–9), which suggests an ultimate connection with AA *m-T (*m-t ~ *m-ṭ?) “one” [GT].

nb1: Attested in PCu.-Om. *mat “1” [Crl.] > ECu. *ma/it- “1” [Sasse]; HECu. *mitto “1” [Hds. 1989, 107, 418] (ECu.: CR 1913, 410; Sasse 1982, 143; PB 1963, 468; CR 1913, 410; Crl. 1936, 263; 1938 III, 171; 1951, 475; Zbr. 1987, 331–5) || NOM.: Chara mičč-ā “solo” [Crl.], Gimirra matti “1” [Toselli/Zbr.] = mət “allein” [Mkr.], She mat [CR/Zbr.] = māṭ “1” [Crl.] = maṭ “allein” [Mkr.], Benesho māṭ “1” [Crl.] = māṭ [Bnd./Zbr.] | Kaffa mittō “solo” [Crl. 1951, 475] (NOM.: Zbr. 1983, 385) || Ch. *m-d “1” [JI 1994 I 131] > WCh.: BT *mōdī “1” [Schuh 1984]

> Bole mođi [IL] = móođi [Schuh], Bele móođi [Schuh], Ngamo mòođi [Schuh], Kirfi modi [Gowers] = móođi [Schuh 1978] = móodi (so, -d-) [Schuh 1984], Glm. múuryī [Schuh], Grm. móoyī [Schuh 1984] = móoyì [Schuh 1984], (?) Dera dùmói (met.?) [Schuh], Nyam mǒdǒ [Leger in JI 1994 I, 131] (BT: Schuh 1978, 150; 1984, 211; JI 1994 II, 262) || CCh.: Mefehe mətá “1” [CIm.]. AP: Gumuz: Sai metam, Sese metá, Gojjam metā(m), mítal, Kokit meta “1” (Gumuz: Bnd. 1979, 57) ~ Niger-Congo: Themne mǒth-à “one, first” [Blz.] ~ PBantu *-mòtj ~ *-mòtj “1” (but cf. also PBantu *-mú etc. “1”) [Gr. 1971, 133] > PWNigr. *-mot- “one, first” [Mkr. 1976, 413 quoted by Blz. 1987 MS, #1.6]. Lit.: CrI. 1938 III, 171; 1951, 475 (NOm.-ECu.); Mkr. 1987, 29 (WCh.-ECu.-NOm.); Blz. 1987 MS, 3–4, #1.6; 1990, 35; 1993, #1.3 (ECu.-NOm.-WCh.-Mefehe-Gumuz-WNigr.-Bantu-Themne); Takács 1996, 136–137, #32; 1997, 211–2, #1; (Eg.-Cu.-Om.-Ch.).

nb2: H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibrizimow (1994 I, 131) put forward the hypothesis that Ch. *m-ǰ “1” [JI] are eventually related with Ch. *m-n “1” [JI] and even WCh.: AS *mē (var. *mī?) “one” [GT 2004, 244] (leading them to assuming an original triradical *m-n-ǰ!), which is phonologically uncertain.

nb3: An ultimate etymological connection of AA *mat- “head” [GT] (quoted above) and AA *m-T “one” [GT] (act. * “the top number”?) cannot be excluded (cf. Takács 1996, 136–7, #32; 1997, 211–2, #1).

mtj (rope det.) “Strick” (labelled as an “old word”, Wb II 169, 13; Hornung 1980, 249–250, n. 17: Pfortenbuch, scene 69) = “Schutzknoten” (PT 666b, ÜKAPT VI 135) = “mtj-cord” (AEPT 125) = (CT I 251c: B10C^c, AECT I 55, spell 60, n. 6) = “corde” (AL 78.1907) = “*Band” (GHWb 374; ÄWb I 574; ÄWb II 1157: also CT VII 43d & 45b).

nb: E. Hornung (1980, 138–9, n. 3) affiliated Eg. mt.wj “Doppelstrick (Name für eine mit der Hieroglyphe für ‘Lebenszeit’ bestückte Schlange, die gelb bemalt ist), die auf eine Vorstellung der Zeit als eines unendlich gewundenen Seiles deutet” (PforteNBuch, scene 31, absent in Wb) with mt “Ader, Sehne” (above) and mtj “Strick”. Cf. also Barguet, RdE 9, 1952, 5, 12.

- May be related to Eg. mt “Sehne” (Wb, above) as suggested in Wb II 169, 13; Hornung 1980, 139, n. 3; and Osing 1992, 474 & fn. 6. This connection eventually suggests an derivation from AA *m-ṭ “to stretch (originally a cord?)” [GT] (for details cf. Eg. mt supra). This AA root may be eventually connected with AA *m-ṭ “1. cord made of plant fibers, 2. (hence denom.?) to tie” [GT], cf. LECu.: Orm.-Borana muđī “strong rope” [Strm. 1987, 370] = muđđī [Strm. 1995, 211] | HECu.: Sid. miṭe (f) “belt, girdle, esp. used by children” [Gsp. 1983, 235] || SCu.: Dahalo mēṭe “palm-fiber cord” [Ehret 1987, 143] = mēṭe, pl. mēṭīma “date palm fiber” [EEN 1989, 37] = “wild date palm fibers used in weaving mats” [Ehret 1997, 214, #1833] || Ch. *m-ǰ “to tie (rope)” [JS 1982, 269D₁] > WCh.: Hausa mḕdǐ́ (m) “fibre from root of dum, locust-bean used for mending broken calabashes and for making the fish-net *ásùùtáá*” [Abr. 1962, 672] | Ngz. mǎđú “to tie in a bundle, tie up load” [Schuh 1981, 105] ||

CCh.: Bata muḍe “rope plant” [Boyd 2002, 56] || ECh.: (?) Sarwa maʔyâ [reg. < *m-dʷ] “attacher” [JI 1993 MS, 1] | Bdy. múḍe, pl. muḍàḍ “bande de cotonnade” [AJ 1989, 100].

LIT.: the Eg.-Dhl. etymology was first suggested by G. Takács (1996, 137, #33; 1997, 98, #39).

NB1: Ch. Ehret (1987, 143) derived Dhl. mēte from a certain PCu. *-mç- “to bind” [Ehret] based on the comparison with PAgaw *ʔəncāw- “to tie” and ECu.: Yaaku -inç-am- “to catch, seize”, which D. Appleyard (2005 MS, 117–8) has rightly considered as “speculative”, since it leaves Agaw *-āw unexplained, while

NB2: Any connection to HECu.: Gedeo (Drs.) mēṭe “palm tree” [Wdk. 1976–79, 170] | Dullay *máyt- “1. palm, 2. palm fiber mat” [Ehret], cf. Hrs. & Dbs. máyt-e “1. Palme, 2. Matte (aus Palmfasern)” [AMS 1980, 175] & Glg. mayt-a “Palme” [AMS 1980, 213] || SOm.: Ari mēç-a “palm tree” [Bnd. 1994, 156]? *Pars pro toto?* Already Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 214, #1833) combined the Ar.-Dahalo isogloss (above) with Dullay *máyt- (assuming a basic mng. “rope made of palm fiber”).

NB3: On the analogy of Ar. maṭw- (above) < maṭā “3. tirer, traîner” [BK II 1124], the remotely related root vars. carrying the basic sense “to stretch” have also produced substantival derivatives with the mng. “cord”, cf. Ar. matāt- “lien par lequel on tient à la famille de qqn.” < mtt “1. étendre qqch. en long (p.ex. une corde)”, V “1. s’appuyer fortement sur un bout de la corde, voulant la casser” [BK II 1055], Ar. madmad- “corde” ~ mdy: madā I “étendre en long” ~ mdd I “1. allonger en tirant, tirer pour allonger, 2. étendre comme un tapis, 3. prolonger etc.” [BK II 1075, 1078–79] || ECu.: Tsamay midd-akko (m) “rope” [Savā 2005 MS, 263].

NB4: Presumably AA *m-d (vars. *m-t ~ *m-tʔ) “navel-string” [GT] may be eventually also related, cf. Brb. *tV-mid-t (?) > *tV-miḍ-t “nombriil” [GT] > i.a. NBrb.: Izdeg ti-miṭ-t [assim. < *-d-tʔ] “cordon ombilical” [Mrc. 1937, 63] | Wargla t-miḍ-t “nombriil et cordon ombilical” [Dlh. 1987, 185] (Brb.: cf. esp. Lst. 1931, 267; Lanfry 1973, 204, #970a; Taifi 1991, 405) || HECu.: Sid. mud-ukkō “ombelico” [Crl. 1938 II, 213] = mud-ukko (m) “navel” [Gsp. 1983, 239], Kmb. mudug-ičču “navel” [Hds. 1989, 104] || SCu.: WRift **mudungu > *murungu [-r- < *-d- reg. in WRift] “navel” [GT after Wtl. 1958, 24, #75] || NOm.: Mocha māčo “Nabel” [Rn. 1888, 316] || WCh.: Ron *mut- “navel” [GT]: Daffō matô(h), Bokkos mùto, Sha & Klr. mučuk [via *mutuk] “Nabel” (Ron: Jng. 1970, 387; JI 1994 II, 250) || CCh.: Hina memát “Nabelschnur” [Str. 1922–23, 119].

mtj “1. genau, rechtmäßig, richtig, 2. zuverlässig, 3. regelmäßig, traditionell, üblich” (MK, Wb II 173; GHWb 373; Junge 2003, 225, n. 199 & 239, n. 344; ÄWb I 573: 1x already in 1st IMP) = “normal, regular, middle” (Grd. 1955, 2–3) = “straightforward, precise, correct, exact (e.g., of name), regular, usual, customary” (FD 120; DCT 189–190) = (also) “straight on (used of the movement of a boat)” (CT I 251c) vs. (as denom. verb) “to steer straight for (?) (the land)” (AECT III 7, spell 815, n. 4; DCT 190) = “adj. of accuracy of the stand-balance” (Smith 1978, 360) = (also) “de bonne qualité (de la peau ou du cuir)” (RdE 33, 1981, 56, n. av; WD II 69) > Dem. mtj ~ mtr (≈ m3ʳ) “wahr” (DG 149, 192) > Cpt. (O & ^{archaic}S) мнт “true, real (in magic)” (CD 158a; CD 78) = “richtig, rechtmäßig,

genau" (Fecht 1958, 116, fn. 1) = "wahr, wirklich, echt", cf. (O) P- $\mu\eta\tau$ "richtig werden" (KHW 104, 521).

$\nu\beta 1$: Its distinction from mtr "bezeugen" (Wb, *infra*) and that the correct reading of the root seems to be mtj have been pointed out or indicated in a number of works (Grd. 1917, 85; 1927, 447, D50, fn. 2; 1955, 2–3; Fecht 1958, 116, fn. 1; FD 120; NBĀ 150, 643–7, n. 672; AL 77.1922; AECT III 7, spell 815, n. 4; Snk. 1983, 225; GHWb 373 and 375; Junge 2003, 225, n. 199). It does not read mtr as erroneously indicated (or sometimes even suggested) in a few older and more recent works (Wb II 173; Sethe 1923, 198; Alb. 1927, 218; Clc. 1936, #642; Clère 1938, 242; CED 78; Smith 1978, 360; Snk. 1983, 225 rather delusively; DELC 119; Mlt. 1984, 22; Junge 1999, 353; DCT 189; WD II 69, III 58). The occasional wtg. of -r (CT VI 337j, VI 404e, VII 14k, cf. DCT 189–190 & ĀWb II 1154; the NK exx. are quoted in the Belegstellen ad Wb l.c.; WMT 412; Pap. Ramesseum III D 3:2?) may be due to the influence of Eg. mtr.t "middy" (OK, Wb, below). J. Osing (NBĀ 643, n. 672) assumed even "*gelegentliche Kontamination mit*" Eg. mtr "Zeuge", which is perhaps a bit far-fetched. Although the original idea of separating Eg. mtj "exact" from mtr "to be present" (hence mtr.w "witness") stemmed from A. H. Gardiner (l.c. *supra*), later he (Grd. 1955, 2–3) seems to have become somewhat irresolute in this matter because of Eg. mtr.t "middy" (preserving its -r- both in hrgl. and Cpt.), which he maintained to be also related. This brought him to confess that "*this idea of mine may well be a mistake*" (i.e., that on Eg. mtj) and that "*the question requires the closest investigation*". The etymology of Eg. mtr.t "middy", whose etymology is by far not obvious, is discussed below in a separate entry.

$\nu\beta 2$: The derivation of Cpt. (OS) $\mu\eta\tau$ from Eg. $m3^c.tj$ "tugendhaft, wahrhaftig, unschuldig befunden, gerecht" (suggested in Wb II 21; Spg. KHW 66 pace Sethe; Erman 1933, §232; CD 185a; AĀG §211) was and firmly rejected (as what "*semantisch gar nicht übereinstimmt*") by G. Fecht (1958, 116, fn. 1), who convincingly demonstrated that the "sportive" wtg. of the final component (-mdw) of the late PN ns-p3-mdw "zum (göttlichen) Stab gehörig" (Ranke PN I 175:1) > Gk. Ἐσπιμηθις (2nd cent. BC) vs. Eg. *ns-mdw > Gk. Ἐσμητις, Ζμητις as -mtr (for mtj) is proving the vocalized form *mūt̄j or *mēt̄j of the latter. The arguments of Fecht for explaining Cpt. (OS) $\mu\eta\tau$ from Eg. mtj (not mtr) "richtig" have been almost generally accepted (CED 78; NBĀ 643–650; KHW 104, 521; Schenkel 1983, 225). Note, however, that the contamination of Eg. mtj vs. $m3^c.tj$ seems to have begun already in Dem. (DG 149, 192) - presumably, due to their similar (identical?) vocalizations.

$\nu\beta 3$: Most authors, e.g., W. Spiegelberg (KHW 66), W. Erichsen (DG 190), J. Černý (CED 93), W. Westendorf (KHW 103), and J. Osing (1998, 93, n. ae & 165, n. 1) agree in explaining Dem. mtr (mtj) "1. passen, stimmen, richtig sein, 2. zustimmen, zufrieden sein, übereinkommen, 3. erfassen, 4. unterweisen", tj mtr (mtr) $h3.t$ "das Herz zufriedenstellen (in der Formel der Kaufverträge usw.)" (DG 190; NBĀ 648) = "to agree (clause of sale)" (Reymond 1973, 161) = "to fit, be content, agree" (CED) and Cpt. (S) $\dagger\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$ etc. "1. consent, agree, 2. (m) assent, good pleasure" (CD 189b–190a) = "1. übereinkommen mit, sich freuen über (EXEN-, 2 \bar{n} -, $\mu\bar{n}$ -), 2. (m) Zustimmung, Zufall" (Spg. KHW 66; Wst. KHW 103) ultimately from Eg. mtj "richtig", the secondary sense of which has already been attested in LEg. texts from Dyn. XXII/XXIII (cf. HPBM IV text, 49, n. 25): mtj "to be pleased, agree upon" (Caminos, JEA 38, 1952, 46–51) = "zufrieden sein, zustimmen (vom Herzen)" (NBĀ 648; GHWb 376) = "einverstanden, zufrieden sein" occurring only in mtj $h3.tj$ "das Herz zufriedenstellen" (Jansen-Winkeln 1989, 237–8 rendering Caminos' mtj from the stela of Shoshenq I at Gebel es-Silsila, l. 35 & 38, as a wtg. of mtn "belohnen", q.v.). This (somewhat odd) late semantic shift can only be understood by assuming LEg. mtj to have primarily signified in fact "to accord exactly with, be in exact (perfect) accordance". More difficult is to explain the primary mng. of

Cpt. (S) $\mu\lambda(\lambda)\tau\epsilon$, (SAL) $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, (AL) $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, (F) $\mu\epsilon\tau$, (B) $\mu\lambda\tau$ “1. to reach, obtain, enjoy, benefit by, 2. (intr.) be successful, hit the mark” (CD 189b) = “1. erlangen, besitzen, genießen, 2. erfolgreich sein, teilhaben an” (KHW), which is usually treated as etymologically identical with Cpt. (S) $\tau\text{-}\mu\lambda\tau\epsilon$ (above) and Dem. mtj (mtr) “passen” (DG), which, in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD, Osing 1998 l.c.), is used as a gloss attached to Eg. m^r “glücklich gelingen, erfolgreich sein” (Wb, supra). Nevertheless, until the suspect, that we are dealing s.v. (S) $\mu\lambda\tau\epsilon$ with the contamination of two distinct Eg. roots, is disproved and the derivation of Cpt. (S) $\mu\lambda(\lambda)\tau\epsilon$ “to reach” etc. < Eg. mtj “richtig” (Wb) is convincingly demonstrated in all details, it seems wiser at the moment to treat the latter Cpt. word apart in a distinct entry (below).

- Hence: (1) mt.t “Eignung, Geeignetheit” (PT 285b, MK, Wb II 168, 2; GHWb 373), mtj (written also mtr) “1. Richtigkeit, Genauigkeit, Geeignetheit, 2. Eignung, Art” (MK, Wb II 173–4; GHWb 373; Junge 2003, 239, n. 344) = “exactitude, exactness” (FD 120), mtj.t (Osing: < old *mtw.t) “Geradheit des Charakters” (XVIII., Wb I 169, 12; NBÄ 645–6, n. 672.2; GHWb 373) = “rectitude” (FD 120) = “exactitude, adéquation” (AL 77.1924) etc.

NB1: W. Westendorf’s (KHW 104) derivation of Cpt. (S) $\mu\mu\tau\epsilon$ “Mitte” (v. supra) from Eg. mt.t is to be preferred to that from Eg. mtj.t (cf. NBÄ 650, n. 673; AL 77.1924).

NB2: The PT 285b instance of mt.t has been alternatively rendered as “middle” (AEPT 64) = “Mitte” (ÄWb I 574).

NB3: From Eg. mtj a number of further words have been eventually explained, although their derivation is doubtful or, at least, not perfectly evident. Cf. Eg. mtj “Vorsteher” (OK, Wb, above). K. Sethe (1923, 198) reconstructed our OEg. root as mtr (!) “gerade in der Mitte sein”, whence he deduced both Eg. mt.t “Mitte” (PT 1x, 1st IMP 1x, ÄWb I 574, discussed above) = “?” (MK, Wb II 168, 3–6) > (S) $\mu\mu\tau\epsilon$ “Mitte” (KHW 104) and Eg. mtr.t “Mittag” (Lit. MK, Wb, below) > (S) $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ “Mittag, Tag” (KHW 99). Similarly, H.S. Smith (1978, 360): Eg. mtr > (S) $\mu\mu\tau\epsilon$ (no mention of mt.t). The latter has been conceived by W. Schenkel (1983, 225) as a var. (*mũtr.ṯ) akin to Eg. *mũt.ṯ “Mitte” displaying the semantic shift “Richtiges” → “Mitte” → “Mittag” (!). Cf. perhaps also n-mt-n “(als Eigenschaftswort guter Bedeutung) wegen der...des” (OK, Wb II 168, 1) = “wegen der Präzision von” (VI. 1x: Cairo 1435 = Urk. I 102:11, ÄWb I 573).

- Its etymology is still obscure.
- 1. GT: a relationship to ES *mtr “to cut” [Lsl.] > i.a. Geez mätura “precisely, certainly, absolutely, decisively” < matara “to cut (off, up, asunder), break up, interrupt, shut off, depose, remove (from office), exterminate, decree, decide, determine” → mätur “cut (off), amputated (piece), deposed, removed, also: decided, decisive, decreed, absolute, strict (commandment), stern (judgement), severe” [Lsl. 1987, 372] ||| HECu.: Hdy. mutur- “to be sharp”, matura “sharp (of knife)” [Hds. 1989, 132] seems fair likely whether we stick to the traditional reading mtr (accepted in Wb etc.) or the new spelling mtj, since Eg. -j < AA *-r is plausible, albeit scarcely attested (cf. EDE I 91–92), just like Eg. -j < AA *-l (with more evidence, EDE I 90).
- 2. GT: alternatively, a derivation from AA *m-ṯ (var. *m-t?) “1. good, 2. right, correct (?)” [GT] cannot be excluded either.

нв1: Attested so far only in NОm., and CCh.-ECh., therefore the *-C₂- cannot be exactly reconstructed (in principle, an AA glottal affricate is also plausible, which would certainly rule out any comparison with Eg. -t), cf. NОm.: Koyra (Badditu) moḍē “buono” [Crl. 1929, 62] = moḍē “buono” [Crl. 1938 III, 79] = mód “good” [Hyw. 1982, 228] = moḍe “good” [Flm. 1990, 27] = moḍe “good” [Sbr. 1994, 15], Haruro moḍē “buono”, moḍ-us-āna “rendrere buono” [CR 1937, 653] = moḍe “good” [Mkr.] | Hozo maṭṭi “good” [Mkr.] = maṭi “good” [Sbr.-Wdk.], Sezo maṭṭi “good” [Mkr.] = Sezo I māt[ī]-mātá “good” vs. Sezo II mātá “good”, mātṭi kúwì “straight” [Sbr.-Wdk.] (Mao gr.: Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 13, 16; NОm.: Mkr. 1987, 194) || ECh.: Mubi mḍé “schön, gut” [Lks. 1937, 184] = miḍé “bon (adj.)” [Jng. 1990 MS]. AP: H.G. Mukarovsky (l.c.) affiliated the NОm. root with Kunama maidā “bene, buono” [Volpi] = máyda “gut” [Rn.] = máyda “good” [Bnd.].

нв2: E. Cerulli’s (l.c.) comparison of the NОm. root with LECu.: Orm. miḍag “buono” [Crl.] = miḍaga “to be beautiful” [Gragg 1982, 285] is uncertain because of the Orm. -C₃ having no match in NОm.

нв3: The AA root var. *m-t seems to have been preserved in CCh.: Fali-Jilbu miḍāy “good” [Krf. 1972 MS] | Mnd. mta “bon, bien, bon à goût” [Mch. 1950, 40, 55] | Hurzo muday “bon à goût” [Mch. 1953, 175] || ECh.: Mkl. mātíkí [root ext. -k-?] “1. assez, moyen, 2. vrai, juste, 3. mieux” [Jng. 1990, 138]. Note that SBrb.: Ayr mətətu, pl. mətətu-t-ān “précision, exactitude” [PAM 2003, 566] certainly represents a distinct root (*√t-C₂-t-C₂ where *C₂ might have been either a laryngeal or “weak” cons.).

- Other suggestions cannot be accepted.
- 3. W. F. Albright (1927, 218) combined both Eg. mtr (!) “to be right, just” and mtr “to bear witness” with Ar. mtr “to stretch”, which is semantically by far not convincing.
- 4. A. Ju. Militarev (1984, 22) equated Eg. mtr (!) “richtig” (Wb) with NBrb.: Izdeg ta-matar-t “знак” || SBrb.: Hgr. ta-matar-t “пароль, условный знак удостоверяющий подлинность письма”, which is semantically just as well erroneous. For the Brb. root cf. also Eg. mtr “to testify” below.
- 5. A. M. Lam (1993, 409), ignoring the basic mng. of Eg. mtj, combined Eg. mt.t “exact moment” (FD 120) with Ful mot- and Wolof mat- “être temps”. False.

mtj or **mt(w)tj** (?) “? (in einem Zaubertext)” (PT 236a^w & LP: Mag. Pap. London 190, 13–14 passim, Wb II 169, 9) = “Giftschlange” (Leitz 1996, 405) = “(serpent?) venimeux (ou qqch. d’approchant)” (Meeks, p.c., 15 March 2000; so also Meeks 2005, 246, #573a) = “Zauberwort” (ÄWb I 573a: PT 236a).

нв1: The three varieties of the word occurring in PT 236a (mtj vs. mjtj in two different orthographies) are all without det. The LP forms have either a worm/snake or spitting mouth det.

нв2: Since PT 236a (utterance 232) is “*all utterly obscure*” (Faulkner, AEPT 55, utt. 232, n. 1), nothing really supports the rendering of mtj (?) but the mere fact that this spell is placed among others spells against snakes and scorpions. K. Sethe (ÜKAPT II 207, VI 135) conceived PT 236a mtj simply as an instance of mt.wt “Gift” in spite of the clearly different orthographies.

нв3: Rdg. also debated: mtj (Wb, ÄWb) vs. mtjt < *mt.wtj (Leitz l.c.).

- Obscure word. Rdg. and mng. uncertain. Any etymology is premature.
- **1.** C. Wilke (1931, 127) suggested a quite different rendering: “*das aus unbekanntem Gründen in drei verschiedenen Schreibungen auftretende Wort mj.tj (sic) ... sieht wie eine Pseudopartizip 2. Sg (!) aus. ... Es mag mit mwj.t ‘Harn’ (HH) zusammenhängen*”.
- **2.** Following K. Sethe (ÜKAPT II 207), Ch. Leitz (l.c.) and D. Meeks (l.c.) rendered it as a (substantivized) nisbe of Eg. mt.wt “poison” (above), which seems to be corroborated by the det. of spitting mouth in the LP exx. (the LP-GR wtg. of mt.wt having the same det.). This theory can, however, hardly explain either the PT var. mjtj (or *mjt-wtj if we stick to Leitz’s idea?) with mj- or the significantly differing PT orthographies of mtj vs. mt.wt (443a, 2255a, the supposed ex. in 128b being uncertain). Therefore, this etymology has to remain a purely hypothetical idea.
- **3.** G. Takács (1996, 137, #33; 1997, 94, #156.2; 1997, 98–99, #39; 1998, 141, #3.3.3; 2004, 208, #1028), followed by V. Blažek (2003, 265), surmised in it (with hesitation) a reflex of AA *m-t “1. worm, 2. snake” [GT]. This suggestion is also unprovable and, henceforth, unlikely.

NB1: Attested in PCu. *mVt- “червячок (Würmchen)” [Dlg. 1973, 250] > LECu.: Orm. mūta “earth-worm” [Strm. 1987, 371; 1995, 211], Somali mid [IS 1976, #312: < earlier * m-t] “Würmchen in Wasserpflütz(ch)en” [Rn. 1902, 287] | HECu.: (?) Sid. maṭall-o [root ex. -l?] “tapeworm” [Gsp. 1983, 226; Hds. 1989, 385: isolated in HECu.] ||| PCh. *məḏə “python” [Nwm., Schuh] > WCh.: Hausa (Sokoto) múḏùwáá “a python” [Brg. 1934, 790, 797, absent in Abr. 1962, 680] | Bole miḏi [Nwm.] = miḏi [Schuh], Ngamo miḏiwi “python” [Nwm.] | Nbauchi (from Hs.) *muḏ-w/h- “python” [Skn.]: Kariya muḏo [Skn.], Pa’a muḏaha [Skn.], Mburku muḏuwa [Skn.], Miya muḏu [Skn.] = muḏuu [Schuh], Tsagu muḏuwe [Skn.], Siri muḏuwi [Skn.] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 35; WCh.: Skn. 1977, 35; Schuh 1982, 19; Stl. 1987, 234 with a false WCh. proto-form) || CCh.: Fali-Jilbu miḏi, Fali-Muchella miḏi, Fali-Bwagira miḏin “python” (Higi gr.: Krf. 1972 MS) | Bachama miḏu-tə “python” [Skn.], Gude miḏónə “python” [Hsk. 1983, 243] | Gidar myəḏən “python” [Nwm.] | Kotoko muḏə “python” [Nwm.] | Mada émméd “serpent vert non venimeux qui frappe avec sa queue” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 178] | Musgu gr. (borrowed from Hs.): Musgu múdua (f) “Schlange” [Krause apud Müller 1886, 401; Lks. 1941, 68], Pus muḏuwa (m) “python” [Trn. 1991, 107], Mbara muḏùwà (m) “python (‘boa’)” [TSL 1986, 273] | PMasa (from Hs.) *muḏu “python” [GT] > Masa muḏuu “serpent sp., prob. le python” [Ctc. 1983, 108 with a false etym.], Gizey & Masa & Ham & Musey muḏù “Pyton regius” [Ajl.], Lew muḏù “Pyton regius” [Ajl.], Marba múḏú “Pyton regius” [Ajl.] (Masa gr.: Ajl. 2001, 51) || ECh.: Mubi miḏyāw (f) “python (boa)” [Jng. 1990 MS, 33] (Ch.: Nwm. 1977, 30; Haruna 1995, 150, #2).

NB2: Cf. perhaps also CCh.: Mada mèdè “chenille sp. (au ventre noir)” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 178] | Vulum miḏi “onduler (serpent)” [Trn. 1978, 304] (has it preserved the original verbal sense of the underlying AA root?)

NB3: WCh.: Hausa múúḏí “type of harmless snake” [Abr. 1962, 680] and Gwnd. moč [< *motj] “snake” [Mts. 1972, 82] evidently represent a distinct word.

NB4: Some authors compared the reflexes of AA *m-t “worm” [GT] also with diverse AA terms for “ant, termite” that can be grouped at least in three different (remotely related?) isoglosses: (1) Brb. *√m-H₃-d/*√m-d-H₃ [Prs. 1969, 78, #506]

= *məh₃d/*mədh₃ [Blz. after Prs.] = *ta-midi “termite, ant” [GT] (Brb.: Lst. 1931, 241, 309; Wlf. 1955, 40) || (?) Bed. mala-mída (m) “Ameisenbär” [Rn.] (rendered by V. Blažek 2003, 265 as a compound) || LECu.: Boni *màdàqúg (f) “big ant sp.” [Heine 1982, 90] vs. (2) LECu.: Orm. miř “tiny black ant” [Gragg 1982, 289] = “little ant” [Hds.] | HECu.: Sid. miřa “a kind of middle size red ant” [Gsp. 1983, 235] = “kind of little red ant” [Hds.], Gedeo (Drs.) miřa “big red ant” [Hds.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 20, 150) || CCh.: Gude mǎdǎadǎwǎ “type of ant (dark brown, lives near water)” [Hsk. 1983, 229] vs. (3) SCu.: Dhl. muřa “small ant” [EEN 1989, 38]. Lit. for these AA etymologies: Blz. 1990, 210 (ECu.-PBrb.); 2003, 265 (Bed.-Orm.-?Dhl.-?Eg.-PTrg.); HSED #1775 (Tera-ECu.-Dhl.); Orel 1995, 108, #116 (CCh.-ECu.); Takács 1996, 137, #33; 1997, 94, #156.2; 1997, 98–99, #39; 1998, 141, #3.3.3 (Som.-Ch.-Eg. ~ Orm.-Dhl.-Brb.). V. Orel (1995, 108, #116) reconstructed AA *mit- “insect (насекомое)”, which, however, does not explain and cover all the parallels listed above. This AA word has been usually treated as a reflex of the hypothetical Nst. *mVřV “worm” [IS 1965, 372; 1976, 77, §312; Blz. 1990, 210; Dlg. 1991 MS, #1028] > Krt. *mař- “worm” [Klimov 1964, 124] ~ IE *ma/ot^h- “(in Worten für) nagendes, beißendes Gewürm oder Ungeziefer (??)” [IEW 700] = “biting insect, worm” [GI] (IE-Krt. compared by IS l.c. and GI 1984, 20).

***mtj** (?) > Dem. jr mtj (mtr) “jemanden treffen” (DG 190) > Cpt. (S) μα(α)τε, (SAL) μετε, (AL) μεετε, (M) μηετε, ητοογ⁺, (F) με† (Lacau: also μα†, μαατε, not listed in other sources), (B) μα† “1. (tr.) to reach, obtain, enjoy, benefit by, 2. (intr.) be successful, hit the mark” (CD 189b) = “atteindre, obtenir” (Lacau 1972, 233) = “erreichen, erlangen, teilhaben, treffen, Erfolg haben” (NBĀ 647, n. 672) = “1. erlangen, besitzen, genießen, 2. erfolgreich sein, teilhaben an” (Spg. KHW 66; Wst. KHW 103) = “obtenir, jouir” (DELIC 124).

NB: Its inf. was vocalized as *mé/řj.t (Osing). As for its -C₂-, an old Eg. etymon *mdj or *mđj cannot be certainly excluded.

- Etymology debated. Difficult to prove whether the Cpt. mng. represents an innovation or an old word not attested earlier.
- **1.** Usually derived from Eg. mtj “richtig, rechtmäßig, genau” (MK, Wb, above) = “correct, accurate” (CED), the significant semantic shift of which, however, has not been satisfactorily demonstrated in either of the relevant works (quoted below).
LIT.: Lacau 1972, 233, §25; CED 93; NBĀ 485, 643–650, esp. 647–8, n. 672; KHW 103, 521; Osing 1998, 93, n. ae.
- **2.** J. Černý (CED 93), although he also accepted the derivation of the Cpt. verb from Eg. mtj, preferred to explain Cpt. (S) ματε “attainment, success” (CD 189b) separately from Dem. m³c.t “success”.
- **3.** W. Vycichl (DELIC 124), in turn, tried to deduce it from Eg. mtr “être présent” via the unattested sense * “rendre présent” (vocalized as *matar, sic!).
- **4.** GT: if the old Eg. etymon was *mdj, cf. NBrb.: Shilh mdi “to reach, catch” [Aplg. 1958, 61] | (?) Mzab √m-d-y: ə-mdi “tendre (un piège)” [Dlh. 1984, 116] ||| LECu.: Saho māde “to reach, arrive

at destination” [Vergari 2003, 127], Afar māḍ “hin-, ankommen, anlangen, das Ziel erreichen” [Rn. 1886, 879] = māde “to reach, arrive at destination” [PH 1985, 157].

NB: The etymology of the SA root is still uncertain. L. Reinisch (1890, 253) erroneously took the SA verb from a hypothetical LECu. *maw. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 214, #1836) combined the Afar verb with Eg. mʒ3 “to betake os. to, bring present (to) etc.” (q.v.). G. Banti (in Burtea et al. 2005, 13–15) and M. Vergari (p.c., 5 April 2007) rightly separated SA māḍ- (suffix-conjugated) from Afar emēte (prefix-conjugated) “to come” < ECu. *-mVt- as there is no alternation of SA -t- vs. -d-. Vergari excluded a direct borrowing of Saho-Afar suffix-conjugated māḍ- from Ethiosemitic (as “not likely”), because “*borrowed Semitic verbs are usually integrated as prefix-conjugated verbs in this East Cushitic subgroup*” (as shown by Hayward and Orwin in African Languages and Cultures 4, 1991, 157–176). Vergari does not know of phonologically possible ES source that might have been borrowed into Saho-Afar with -d-.

- 5. GT: or, if the underlying old Eg. -C₂- was *d-, it might be eventually derived from AA *m-ç ~ *m-č ~ *m-ĉ “to reach” [GT].

NB1: The Sem. correspondence with *-š- (< AA *-ç-) is attested in Ug. mšā “to reach to (-)” [Gordon 1955, 290, #1145] = D “gelangen machen” [WUS] = mšʔ/mšʔ (sic) “kommen” [Voigt], Phn. mšʔ “to find” [DNWSI 675], Hbr. māšāʔ qal “1. to reach, 2. meet accidentally, 3. find what was sought, 4. obtain” [KB 619–620] = “gelangen zu, treffen, finden” [WUS, DL], PBHbr. māšāʔ “eig.: auf etwas stoßen, zu etwas gelangen > antreffen, finden” [Levy 1924 III 205], Epigr. Aram. mšʔ, mšy “добывать, доставать, приобретать” [SAN IV 201], JAram. mətāʔ “vermögen, können” [Dalman 1922, 248] = “finden, antreffen, vermögen” [Levy 1924 III 205], Samar. Aram. mšy “finding”, qal “to find” [Tal 2000, 483], JPAram. mšy “to be able” [Sokoloff 1990, 325], JNAram. mšy “to be able” [Sabar 2002, 223], Syr. mēšā “etwas können, finden”, afel “finden lassen” [WUS] = “to find, reach, be in a position to do sg.” [KB], Mnd. mša I “to be a match for, be equal in force, be able, 2. attain to, arrive at, reach, achieve” [DM 1963, 276b] (Sem.: Ast. 1948, 216; WUS #1634). Y. Sabar (2002, 223) explained all Aram. forms with -š- as Akkadisms.

NB2: A var. root is represented by Sem. *mṯy ~ *mṯʔ (AA *-ĉ-) “to reach” [Dlg.] > Akk. mašû “hingelangen, finden” [Ast. 1948, WUS] = “entsprechen, genügen, ausreichen” [AHW 621] || Ug. mṯy [-y- reg. < *-ĉ-] “to reach, come” [Gordon 1955, 290, #1142] = “1. an etwas reichen, 2. kommen, wohin erlangen” [WUS] = mṯy “gehen, kommen” [Bauer apud Rsl. 1961, 160, 169] = mṯy “kommen, erreichen, wohin erlangen” [Ast. 1948, 215] = mṯy “to reach, arrive, come to” [Ricks; Segert 1984, 192] = mṯy “ankommen, eintreffen” [Tropper] = mṯy G “1. to come, arrive, 2. reach, head for, approach, 3. go, walk” [DUL 533, 608] vs. Ug. mʒʔ “jem. treffen” [Dietrich] = mʒʔ G “to meet, run into” [DUL], Off. Aram. & Palm. mṯʔ qal “to reach, arrive” [DNWSI 617] = mṯʔ “достигать, доходить, прибывать, доставаться, приходится обязательным” [SAN IV 193], JAram. mətāʔ “1. gelangen, ankommen, 2. reichen, treffen, 3. eintreffen” [Dalman 1922, 232] = mətī ~ mətāʔ ~ mətā(h) “1. to reach, stretch, 2. arrive at, 3. obtain, 4. happen to” [Jastrow 1950, 767] = mētāʔ “to reach, arrive at” [Lsl.], Samar. Aram. mṯy “reaching, arrival”, qal “to reach, arrive at”, mṯw “reach, ability”, mṯyʔ ʕd (prep.) “as far as” [Tal 2000, 462–3], JPAram. mṯy “to arrive, reach, overtake, befall” [Sokoloff 1990, 302], JNAram. mṯy “to reach an end, arrive, be overcome, be overtaken (with fear)” [Sabar 2002, 215], Syr. mṯā “parvenir” [Lsl. 1938] = mətā “to attain, reach”, pael “to bring” [Lsl. 1987] = mṯā “hin-, ankommen” [Tropper pace Brk. 1928, 381f.], Mnd. mṯa “to come, arrive, reach, happen (to), attain (to)” [DM 1963, 264], Maʕlula mṯy “gelangen, gehen zu, hinkommen” [Brgstr. 1921, 60] | OSA: Qrb. mʒʔ “to enter, go through” [Ricks] = “entrer, pénétrer, replacer”, yš₁mʒʔwn “excúter” [Arbach], Sab. mʒʔ “kommen” [Brk./WUS] = mʒʔ “to reach, arrive, come to” [SD] = mʒʔ “to reach, arrive, come to” [Biella 1984, 273] = mʒʔ “aller, s’avancer, marcher, atteindre un endroit” [Arbach] = mṯʔ “kommen” [Voigt], Mdb. mʒʔ “se trouver

à un endroit”, s_1 -t-mʔ? “arriver” [Arbach] (OSA: Arbach 1993, 73) || MSA: Jbl. mđy: mđi “to reach” [Jns. 1981, 169], Sq̄t. mʔy “venir, arriver, atteindre”, cf. mʔt “devenir mûr” (on the analogy of Ar. balaya “atteindre, parvenir” ~ baliy- “parvenir à la majorité”) [Lsl.] || ES: Geez mäsʔa “to come” [Lsl.] = maşʔa [Dillmann] = mašeʔa “hingelangen” [Ast. 1948], Amh. mäṭṭa “to come” [Lsl.] = mṭṭa [Guidi], Arg. maṭṭa “venir” [Cohen, Lsl.], Tigre mäsʔa “to come” [LH 145], Tna. mäsʔe “to come” [de Vito & Bassano apud Lsl.], Gurage: Selti maṭa & Zway maṭ-ānu “to come” [Bedecha 1994, 3], Wolane mäṭä “to come” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1956–57, 271; 1959, 266; 1982, 54; Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 241; 1969, 57; 1987, 374; Cohen 1961, 69, #79; Brk. quoted in WUS #1627; DL 1967, 306; Dietrich 1967, 299; Ricks 1982 MS, 140–1; Voigt 1994, 108; Tropper 1994, 24; 2000, 95; Dlg. 1999, 25–26, §47; Kogan 2000, 718 with corrigenda ad Tropper l.c.; DUL 533). L. Kogan (2005, 195, §20) doubted the common origin of Ug. mʔ? vs. mʔy. The authors of KB (and a few other standard works) confused the reflexes Sem. *mʔsʔ vs. *mʔtʔ. Any connection to CCh.: Bura mži “1. to suffice, 2. reach, arrive” [BED 1953, 147]?

NB3: The var. with Sem. *ḍ/ṣ- (AA *ḥ-) has been preserved in OSA mđʔ “to reach, arrive at” [Biella 1984, 282], Ar. maḍā “1. passer, avoir eu lieu, 2. pénétrer dans le corps (se dit de toute arme ou instrument piquant ou tranchant), 3. mener qqch. à bonne fin, accomplir” [BK II 1120] = “vorüber-, weggehen, eindringen” [Wahrmund apud Tropper] = “to go away” [Ricks], Yemeni Ar. mđy I “to die, come to (ʿalā), consume food to the last crum”, II “to cease, stop, end” [Piamenta 1990, 468]. Their direct equation with the Sem. reflexes having *-ṣ- or *-ṭ- (as suggested by Bauer in Rsl. 1961, 160; Brockelmann in WUS #1627; Aistleitner 1948, 215, 219; Gordon 1955, #1142; Dietrich 1967, 299; Ricks 1982 MS, 141; Segert 1984, 192; Biella 1984, 273; DUL 533) is, however, phonologically incorrect.

NB4: O. Rössler (1961, 161, 169) equated Ug. mʔy with Ar. mʔy: maṭā “mit weit-entwickelter Bedeutung” (!) (BK II 1134: I “prononcer un mot”, V “mettre qqch. sur le dos de qqn., lui attribuer une chose qui n’est pas vrai”!), which is certainly false. J. Tropper (1994, 24) identified Ug. mʔy directly with Ar. mđy.

NB5: W. Leslau (l.c.) combined the quoted ES reflexes also with Geez maṭṭawa “to hand over, deliver etc.”, pass. ta-maṭṭawa “to receive, accept, partake (of), take (hold of)” [Lsl.], which was rejected by both M. Dietrich (1967, 299) and J. Blau (IOS 2, 1972, 68, n. 3). The latter compared Geez mʔw with OSA (Sab.) mʔw “to walk, march” [Blau] = “to make an expedition” [SD 88] and Ar. mʔw “to stretch, draw, walk” [Blau].

NB6: M. Cohen (1947, 190, §474) affiliated the Sem. var. roots with Brb. (sic) məḍ “arriver” (quoted after Bronzi), although he suspected that this word “*ne paraît pas exister*”, which is not the case, cf. NBrb.: Mnsr. ṽm-ḍ: meḍ “pénétrer, arriver” [Bst. 1890, 315]. For Brb. *ḍ < AA *ḥ cf. Takács 2006, 57–59, 62. The Chadic etymology of WCh.: Fyer moot “to arrive, reach” [Blench 2000 MS, 4, #f221–2] is still obscure.

NB7: H. Möller (1911, 157) connected the Sem. root with IE: Gothic ga-mōṭjan “begegnen etc.”.

mtw “Tempuspräfix, dem kopt. Konjunktiv entsprechend” (LEg, Wb II 165) = “prefix of Conjunctive” (CED 111) > Dem. mtw “Konjunktiv (Präfix)” (DG 185:8) > Cpt. (OSLMBF) ⲛⲧⲉ- “Präfix des Konjunktivs vor nominalem Subjekt” (KHW 126).

- The pattern mtw=f sḍm has been – since the fundamental study by A.H. Gardiner from 1928 – usually explained from Eg. “split” inf. (Grd.) construction ḥnᶜ ntf sḍm (late XVIII., early XIX.) with the loss of the prep. ḥnᶜ, although its ultimate origin is disputed: *ḥnᶜ sdm ntf (Grd., Junge) vs. *ḥnᶜ ntf ḥr sḍm (sic, Vcl.). The 1st person forms (mtw=j, mtw=n) of the conjunctive must represent a secondary innovation.

LIT.: Grd. JEA 14, 1928, 91–96; Černý, JEA 35, 1949, 25–30; cf. also CED 111; DELC 144–5; Satzinger 1998–99, 79–80; Junge 1999, 109–111, §2.3.3.(3) (with further lit.).

NB: This generally accepted derivation discards other etymologies of LEg. mtw (Volten quoted in KHW 126, fn. 4: mtw=f < jr.t=f; Mattha, BIFAO 45, 1945, 43–55: < *hⁿc nt.t jw=f hr sdm).

mtbr (from an earlier **mdbr**?) “champ de bataille” (GR: Edfu III 136:5, Sauneron, RdE 15, 1963, 51–54; AL 77.1928; DELC 211) = “Schlachtfeld” (KHW 223) = “battlefield” (CED 183) = “field of battle (arena)” (PL 475) = “Kampfplatz” (WD II 69; Kurth 2003, 247, fn. 7). Occurs also in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as **mdbr** (-d-!) “Kampfplatz” (Osing 1998, 105–6 & n. a).

NB: G. Sauneron (1963, 53), followed by J. Černý (CED 182–3) and P. Wilson (PL 475), supposed Dem. mṭbl “Nomen: ob Netz (?)” (DG 189:7) = “Netz” (Spg. quoted by Sauneron 1963, 54) = m3teb3l (sic) “(évoque l'idée d')une cage ou d'un filet” (Sauneron 1963, 53) = mṭbl “(seems to be) a net or a cage” (PL) and Cpt. (S) ṭḫḫḏ, (B) ḫḫḏ, (?) ḫḫḏḏ “fold (?) for sheep” (CD 400b) = “1. Hürde, Stall (für Schafe), 2. Gitter, Gatter, 3. Geflecht, Weidenkorb, Schutzdach” (KHW 222, 545) to represent “*prob(ably) the same word as*” GR **mtbr** and even (SA) ṭḫḫḏ (!) (in spite of the anomalous C3 as well as the significantly differing meaning), which was rightly abandoned by W. Vycichl (DELC 211: “*mot apparemment isolé*”) and correctly rejected by D. Kurth (2003, 247, fn. 7: “*paßt hinsichtlich der Semantik keineswegs*”). Besides, the 2nd cons. (-t-) of the Dem. word has been recently read by D. Kurth (2003, 252) as -h- (cf. mh³bl below). In addition, J. Osing (NBÄ 202, 735–7, n. 890), W. Westendorf (KHW l.c.), and W. Vycichl (DELC l.c.) eventually explained the Cpt. (S) ṭḫḫḏ etc. from Eg. ṽdbn (act. *ṽdbl), cf. esp. Eg. dbn “runder Kasten” (Wb V 437, 16).

- Etymology uncertain.
- 1. W. Spiegelberg (quoted by Sauneron 1963, 54) saw in it a *nomen instr.* (Sauneron: lit. “le lieu où l’on capture, le lieu où l’on garde une capture”) of an unattested *tbl that he identified with Akk. tabalû “an sich reißen, entführen”.
- 2. G. Sauneron (RdE 15, 1963, 54) and J. Černý (CED 183) have suggested a connection with Cpt. (SA) ṭḫḫḏ, (B) ḫḫḏ (sic) (m) “blow with foot, kick” (CD 401a) = “donner un coup de pied, chasser du pied, ruer” (Sauneron) = “Fußtritt” (KHW 223) = “coup de pied” (DELC 211). Sauneron surmised in GR **mtbr** an “*academic invention*”, while Černý assumed it to represent a borrowing from Sem. with a link to Ar. mūbāl-at- (sic!) “m- being the Semitic prefix forming words of places”. This latter statement is no argument for a Sem. origin, since the same prefix m- of nomina loci existed in Eg. also. Moreover, Černý’s Ar. parallel is phonologically unacceptable. More realistic is P. Wilson’s theory that the Cpt. noun preserved an otherwise not attested Eg. verbal root *tbr “(sg. like) to thump or stemp with a foot” (Sauneron: “un mot du langage populaire”), whence GR **mtbr**

was derived with an m- prefix of *nomina loci* to signify lit. the “place of thumping of feet” (CED) = “place of stamping the foot” (PL), which might indeed suit as name for “an arena for fighting or place for keeping animals” (PL). But, as confessed by Sauneron himself, “*cette étymologie est, naturellement, incertaine*”.

NB: W. Spiegelberg (1919, 58; Spg. KHW 142) and J. Vergote (1950, 293) erroneously derived (SA) TBHP from Eg. $\text{t3-w}^{\text{c}}\text{r.t}$ “das Bein” (Wb I 287), which W. Westendorf (KHW 223, fn. 2) considered to be “*noch unwahrscheinlicher*” after W. E. Crum (JEA 8, 1922, 187) had disproved the existence of Cpt. (S) * $\text{OYHP\text{E}}$ “Bein”.

- **3.** GT: alternatively, its eventual connection (as a late loan) with Akk. *ma/udbaru* “Steppe, Wüste” [AHW 572] = “steppe, desert” [CAD m1, 11–12] (from Can., cf. von Soden, Or. NS 35, 15 & 46, 189) || Ug. *mdbr* “desert, grazing land” [Gordon 1955, 254, #458] = “Einöde” [WUS 75, #724] = “desert” [DUL 525], Hbr. *midbār* “(eig. wasserlose) Wüste, Steppe” [GB 398] = “pasture, steppe, wilderness, desert” [KB 547], Off./Imp. Aram. *mdbr*? “desert, steppe” [DNWSI 595], JPAr. *madbar* “desert” [Sokoloff 1990, 291] | pre-Class. Ar. (Safaitic) *mdbr* “terrain de pacage, steppe, désert” [DRS] (Sem.: DRS 213) has to be also accounted for (LEg. **mdbr* lit. “field of battle”?), although this comparison requires further research.

NB: This m- prefix *nomen loci* has been affiliated in Sem. linguistics (GB, WUS, KB, Lsl.) with the following isoglosses the ultimate common origin of which has, however, not been satisfactorily elucidated (their separation within the same entry in DRS 212 also indicates this uncertainty): (1) Ug. *dbr* “Trift, Weideland” [WUS], Hbr. **dober* (attested in st.cstr.) “Trift” [GB 155] = “pasture” [KB 212], JPAr. *dabrā* “pasture, field” [Jastrow 1950, 279], Syr. *dabrā* “Feld, Wüste” [WUS] = “field” [Lsl.], Mnd. *dibra* “outlying country, wilderness, desert, field” [DM 1963, 106] | Ar. *dabr-* “3. montagne (from ES?), 8. champ, pré”, (?) *dibār-* “certaine étendue de terrain” vs. *dabr-at-* “champ cultivé” [BK I 665] = *dabr-* “the location or quarter that is behind a thing, a portion of ground separated from the adjacent parts, for sowing or planting, being surrounded by dams or by ridges of earth, land that is sown or for sowing, a piece of rugged ground, like an island, a mountain”, *dabr-at-* “cultivated field” [Lane 845] || Geez *dabr* “mountain region” [Lsl. 1987, 121]; (2) Ug. *dbr* “(etwa) folgen” [WUS], Hbr. *dbr piel* “1. to turn one’s back, turn aside, 2. drive away, 3. pursue”, *hifil* “to subdue” [KB 210]; (3) Ug. *dbr* “death (?)” [KB 212 with lit.] = “plague, pestilence” [DUL 264] and Ar. *dabara I* “i.a. 9. dépasser le but et tomber par terre au delà du but (se dit d’une flèche)”, III “2. mourir”, *dabr-* “mort”, *dabār-* “perte, ruine, perdition”, *dabr-at-* “2. fuite, dérouté (dans le combat), 3. malheur, adversité, infortune, 4. fin” [BK I 663–6].

- mtpn.t** (from OK **mtpn.t?**) “Dolchscheide” (XII., Wb II 170, 6; GHWb 374; ÄWb II 1157) = “étui pour le poignard (toujours figuré dans sa gaine ou l’arme et sa gaine sont représentées placées l’une à côté de l’autre) ou le fourreau (plutôt que une sorte de poignards dans son étui)” ≈ *mtfj.t* (Jéquier 1921, 200 & fn. 9; 1921, 152) = “dagger” (Grd., EG 1927, 497, T8 after Lacau).

NB: Whether mtpn.(t) of PT 40 + 17 (preceded by m3gs.w “dagger”) represents the very same word is debated. R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 13, utterance 57Q, n. 1) rendered it “dagger” (!), but recently R. Hannig (ÄWb I 574c) translated it more cautiously as “Amulett” (suggesting a link rather to MK mtpn.t, see below), while D. Meeks (2005, 246, #574c) supposed that perhaps it might be “*un ex. ancien de mtpn.t fourreau*”.

- Etymology obscure. Already H. Grapow (1914, 32) surmised a prefix m- in it, although he was unable to identify the simplex in the Eg. lexicon. Most attractive seems #1, but it may be also if the PT attestation of our word (with -t-) proves valid.
- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 32) assumed a common origin of MK mtpn.t “Art Schurz” (Wb, *infra*, Grapow: in fact *”Tasche für den Phallus”?) vs. MK mtpn.t “Dolchscheide” (Grapow: actually *”Tasche für den Dolch”?) in spite of the consequent difference in the orthographies of the -C₂-.
- **2.** G. Jéquier (1921, 152; 1921, 200), followed by A. H. Gardiner (1927, 497, T8), P. Lacau (1954, 86, 1970 phon., 33–34, §10), and P. Kaplony (KBIÄF 184, n. 268) explained it as the m- prefix form of an unattested Eg. *tpn regarded to be the older var. of *tpj “(l’ancien nom du) poignard” (Jéquier) = “dagger” (Grd. l.c.: “*the existence of a lost word tp ‘dagger’ is also suggested by the late name mtpn.t... ‘dagger’;... probably a derivative therefrom*”) = “le nom primitif du poignard” (Lacau). Thus, mtpn.t (as a *nomen loci*) might have in fact denoted “place of the dagger”. Jéquier (1921, 152) accounted for a very early disappearance of Eg. *-n in the word (“*le n, étant une consonne faible, a pu disparaître au cours de l’époque thinite ne laissant au signe hiéroglyphique que la valeur des deux consonnes fortes t et p*”). Lacau (1970, 29–41) listed further exx. for the shift of Eg. -n > -j, while Kaplony (l.c.) postulated Eg. *tpl “Dolch” (as var. *mtpl.t), which would better explain the shift.
NB1: Note that Jéquier’s understanding the lit. sense of mtpn.t as “pour (!) le poignard” (with an m- prep. of dat.!) is false.
NB2: G. Fecht (1979, 108, fn. 1) and K. Jansen-Winkel (1993, 10) rendered Eg. *tpj “Dolch” as a nisbe (-j) of tp “head”, lit. “der zu dem eine Spitze gehört”, which would rule out the suggested derivation of mtpn.t < *tpn.
- **3.** GT: the comparison of the hypothetic Eg. *tpn with WCh. *p-n-d “quiver (Köcher)” [JS 1981, 209B] seems – in the light of PT mtpn.t – also unlikely.
- **4.** G. Takács (1996, 52, #58) erroneously traced it back to a biconsonantal Eg. *mt- based on the unconvincing comparison with Eg. mt3j.t ~ mt3.w “Art Spieß” (Wb, *supra*), mtf.t “Art Dolch” (Wb, *infra*), mtmj.t “Art Beil” (Wb, *infra*).

- mtf.t** “Art Dolch” (MK, Wb II 170, 7) = “1. le fourreau de poignard, étui pour le poignard, 2. poignard (!)” (Jéquier 1921, 200, 350 index) = “*Scheide (von Dolch, von *Säge)” (GHWb 374; ÄWb II 1157).
- Etymology obscure. In any case, it seems to be an m- prefix *nomen instr./loci*.
 - **1.** G. Jéquier (1921, 200, fn. 9) analyzed it as a compound of a certain Eg. prep. m “pour” (!) (not prefix!) + tf “scie”. The first assumption is certainly false. Besides, the latter root contained also a third -3 (Wb V 298: tf3 “Säge”). Nevertheless, R. Hannig (ÄWb l.c.) also seems to assume Eg. mtf.t to be a *nomen loci* of tf(3).
 - **2.** GT: or cf. WCh.: Angas pat (hill) “sheath of a knife” [Flk. 1915, 261], (?) Kfy. fet [irreg. f < *p-] “penis sheath” [Ntg. 1967, 12] | Tng. padam “sheath” [Jng. 1991, 128] with metathesis? Irreg. WCh. *p- vs. Eg. -f-.
 - **3.** GT: if it denoted the dagger itself, it might be eventually a *nomen instr.* of *tf < AA *t-f (?) [GT] > SBrb.: NTuareg: Ahaggar tâ-ḏef-t “hache” [Fcd. 1951–2, 260] = ta-ḏef-t “axe” [SISAJa] ||| LECu.: Somali ḏif-an-ayya “1. to hit, 2. tug at, 3. snatch” [Abr. 1964, 59]. NB1: Cp. also SISAJa II, 32, #66, where these AA forms are derived from AA *t-p is reconstructed on the basis of Sem.: Syr. ṯartāpā “древко (копья, дрютика)” ||| WCh.: Angas tap ~ tep Sura tap, “to break” | Nbauchi: Tsagu ṯurake “рубец, шрам”.
 - **4.** G. Takács (1996, 52, #58; 1996, 136, #31) erroneously affiliated it with Eg. mt3j.t & mt3.w “Art Spieß” (Wb, supra), mtpn.t “Dolchscheide” (Wb, supra), mtmj.t “Art Beil” (Wb, infra).

mtmt “1. hin- und herreden, 2. (Plan) erörten, diskutieren” (XVIII., Wb II 170, 8–9; GHWb 374) = “s’enquérir” (Posener 1957, 132 & fn. 6) = “to discuss” (FD 121). Hence: mtmt “Klatsch” (late NK, Wb II 170, 10) = “discussion” (FD 121) = “*Diskussion” (GHWb 374). NB1: Rendering disputed. Rejecting the LEg. hapax mtmt “Klatsch” (“*ist zu streichen*”), J. F. Quack (1994, 103, fn. 68) found that mtmt of Wb II 170, 8–9 “nach pLeiden I 32, 2:28 eher als ‘lauschen’ zu verstehen (Stricker, OMRO 31, 1950, 58 & 62) scheint nicht sinnvoll” and “näherliegend” is mtmt in Urk. VI 105:8, for which he supposed the sense “aufwiegeln” (unless to be read as smtj “verhören”). NB2: E. M. Ishaq (1991, 116, §xix.2) deduced Eg. Ar. matmat “to argue”, matmata “speech, prattle, argument” either from Cpt. (SAL) ΜΟΥΤΕ (< Eg. mdw, below) or Eg. mtmt.

- Etymology uncertain.
- **1.** G. Posener (1957, 132 & fn. 6) views that mtmt “*est apparenté au caus. (!)*” smt “(ver)hören, erlauschen, auskundschaften” (PT, Wb IV 144, 5–8), cf. also smtmt “Lauschen, Herumhorchen (als Sünde)” (BD, Wb IV 145, 1), which is rather uncertain semantically (Posener’s translation for √mtmt has not been supported in the standard lexicons). In addition, Eg. smt is not necessarily a caus.

- **2.** G. Takács (2002, 157): if the mng. suggested in FD and GHWb is still correct, it is cognate with HECu.: Sid. mātto (f) “(hi)story”, mātto māt-is- “to tell a story” [Gsp. apud Hds. 1989, 144, 384] || SCu.: Qwd. mit- “to speak” [Ehret 1980 MS, 4] ||| WCh.: (?) BT *māt- [GT] > Krkr. màatú “to speak” [Schuh], Kupto màatú (f) “Rede, Erzählung” [Leger 1992, 21] || ECh.: Mkl. ʔùnté [prefixed ʔV-, -nt- reg. < *-mt-] “dire, déclarer, (se) prononcer”, hence ʔùntú (m) “chose, truc” [Jng. 1990, 190–1] < AA *m-t “to tell, speak” [GT].
NB1: An AA root var. to that preserved by Eg. mdw (q.v.)?
NB2: R. Schuh (1984, 218) postulated BT *mbAtu “to speak” on the basis of Bole mbòsà “speaking”, Kirfi bàatì “speaking”, Glm. mbàsá “speaking”.
- **3.** GT: or cp. perhaps NOM.: Zala mut-et “discutere una lite” [Crl. 1929, 44] | Kafa mič, mičihe [-č- < *-t-?] “chiacchierire”, mičë metaho “piacevolezza, buffoneria” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 316: isolated in NOM.] vs. močëčëčō (adj.) “litigioso, puntiglioso” [Crl. 1951, 468] ||| WCh.: Hausa mító “1. constantly raking up a thing, unwilling to let it alone, 2. making a fuss about trifles, 3. muttering, when reprimanded” [Brg. 1934, 794] = “grousing, grumbling” [Abr. 1962, 676] < AA *m-t “to dispute, quarrel (?)” [GT].
NB1: E. Cerulli (l.c.) derived the Kafa word from moyō “parola”, which, however, certainly represents a distinct root.
NB2: A var. with a voiced -C₂- is attested in NBrb.: Mzab mmədməd “grogner, murmurer” [Dlh. 1984, 115].
- Other suggestions that have been made for the etymology of Eg. mtmt cannot be accepted.
NB: (1) Eg. mtmt can hardly have anything to do with Nub.: Kunuzi, Dongola múmut “stumm” as L. Reinisch (1879, 119) insisted. (2) L. Homburger (1930, 289): ~ Ful mal-de (sic). (3) V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 198; HSED #1762) equated Eg. mtmt with ECh.: Sokoro mete-méteŋ “schreien” [Lks. 1937, 36], which is semantically rather weak. (4) Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 211, #1823) affiliated it with Ar. mtn “to swear”, Eg. mtr “to testify”, and NOM.: Mocha mító “testimony”. Semantically unacceptable.

mtn “beschenken” (XVIII., Wb) etc.: discussed s.v. **mtn** infra.

mtn (LP also **mdn**) “1. mit einer Aufschrift versehen, (in eine Liste) eintragen, (den Namen) schreiben (auf etwas), (etwas mit jemandes Namen) beschreiben (mtn m-dd: folgendermaßen beschriftet), 2. bildlich: gekennzeichnet als (m)” (late NK, Wb II 170–1; GHWb 375) = “(ein)gravieren, mit Inschrift versehen, einführen, eintragen (jemanden in eine Liste)” (Lange 1925, 28, 87) = “to inscribe, adorn (pace Breasted)” (Blackman, JEA 13, 1927, 191) = “beschriften,

gravieren” (Amduat, Hornung 1963 II, 110, n. 10: cf. JEA 13, 1927, 191) = “graver (le grand nom)” (Bonhême 1978, 362) = “inscrire” (AL 78.1908) = “to inscribe, carve” (DLE I 252) = “ornen, rehausser” (Meeks 1991, 200) = “to mark, inscribe” (PL 475) = “to draw” (Leitz 1999, 99).

NB1: Occurs also in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as mdn (so, -d-, glossed with OCpt. $\mu\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\eta\eta$) “beschriften” (Osing 1998, 89).

NB2: Perhaps a hypothetic LEg. var. *mtj (with the late shift of -n > -j, cf. its defective form mṯ in Amduat) may have been borrowed into Bed. as mityā “to describe” [Rpr. 1928, 219], which has been attested also as mityāy, pl. mityay (m) “Befehl, Gebot”, mityay “befehlen” [Rn. 1895, 176] (with a phonologically unconvincing Sem. etymology).

- Hence: mtn “Steuerliste, der Kataster” (late NK, Wb II 171, 5; GHWb 375) = “Liste” (Lange 1925, 28).
- P. Wilson (PL 476) assumed a connection with NK mtn “to reward” (conceived by her as an act of providing “the reward officially confirmed by the a written receipt or document”). An etymological connection between PT mṯn “to assign (places)” (AEPT 292) vs. NK mtn “to mark” (PL, lit. *”to sign”) seems in fact semantically plausible.

mnt “evil renown (?)” (late NK, DLE I 253).

- GT: its coincidence with NBrb.: Mzg a-muttel, pl. i-muttīl-n “châtiment divin, punition, malédiction (divine)” [Tf. 1991, 443] may be due to pure chance.

mntj.t “Art Beil” (CT, Wb) etc.: discussed s.v. **mnt.wt** infra.

mtr “(Verbum vielfältiger Bedeutung:) 2. jem. (etwas) bezeugen, Zeuge sein für, Zeugnis ablegen für oder gegen (cf. also RdE 30, 1978, 129, n. 83), 3. etwas zeigen (einem Andern), (ein Grundstück) anweisen, 4. jem. (an)erkennen, anmelden, prüfen, 5. (late NK) unterrichten über (r), raten, lehren, unterrichten, 6. jemandem etwas (hr) auftragen, 7. bekannt sein” (MK, Wb II 171, 10–20; GHWb 375; AWb I 574: PT; AWb II 1157) = “1. (jemds. Identität) bezeugen, 2. anmelden” (PT, ÜKAPT VI 135) = “1. to testify concerning (tr), 2. exhibit virtues, 3. charge tasks to (hr), instruct s’one about (r) sg. (pace Grd. 1911, 22*, fn. 17), 4. (intr.) be famous, renowned” (FD 121) = “to bear witness, testify, advise, attest, inform, tell, assist, examine, teach, instruct, educate, recognize” (DLE I 253) = “1. to witness, 2. instruct, 3. assign” (PL 476) = “1. to testify, (bear) witness, 2. instruct” (DCT 190).

NB1: To be distinguished from Eg. mtj “genau” (Wb, supra) in spite of both ancient and modern contamination (lit. see above s.v. Eg. mtj). W. Spiegelberg (1917, 115 &

fn. 1) erroneously explained the “*vieldeutig*” Eg. $\sqrt{\text{mtr}}$ from the *Grundbedeutung* “gerade sein” (of $\sqrt{\text{mtj}}$), whereby he rendered mtr (r) “unterrichten (über)” (late NK, Wb II 171, 19) = “(über etwas) belehren” (Spg.) as a piel form lit. signifying “gerade machen, erziehen (oder vielleicht auf den rechten Weg bringen)”, cf. sb3j.t mtr.t “Erziehungslehre” (Spg. contra Erman, ZÄS 32, 1894, 127 suggesting “mündliche (?) Lehre”) = “enseignement éducatif (lit. enseignement et instruction)” (Bickel & Mathieu 1993, 32). A. H. Gardiner’s view (1955, 2–3) is correct that “*two stems are involved*” here, namely (1) mtr “to witness” (as for its generally accepted identity with mtr “to be present” cf. below) vs. (2) mtj “normal, regular, middle”. But that Eg. mtr.t “midday” had -r also in Cpt. made Gardiner hesitate (admitting that “*the idea may be a mistake*”). Most recently, F. Junge (2003, 225, n. 199) has correctly reaffirmed the separation of mtj “richtig” vs. mtr/j “bezeugen”.

NB2: One can hardly agree with setting up a separate verbal (basic!) sense of mtr as “1. zugegen sein, präsent sein” (Wb II 171, 9; GHWb 375) based (acc. to the Belegstellen ad Wb l.c.) solely on mtr(t) of Pap. Anastasi I 7:7 (rendered in DLE I 253 “to assist”!). This verbal sense is attested neither in the OK (ÄWb I 574b) nor in the MK (ÄWb II 1157b–c; DCT 190). For the problem of Eg. mtr (or mtj) “Gegenwart” (NK-GR, Wb) occurring in the compound preps. see below.

NB3: W. F. Albright (1918, 87) explained Gk. μάρτυρος “witness” as a borrowing from LEg. mtr.w (Boisacq 1916, 612: < IE *smr- “to remember”!). Considering this proposal as “*не безусловно удачен*”, P. V. Ernstedt (1953, 49–50) suggested a LEg. etymon *ar-metré (cf. jr mtr.t “Zeugnis ablegen für jem.”, late NK, Wb II 172, 12) with hesitation (“*остаётся шаткой*”), whence he took the Gk. term (with met.) adding also Lat. arbiter [*ar-miter] “Augenzeuge, Schiedsrichter, Gebieter”, arbitrari “beobachten, meinen”, whose IE etymology is obscure (cf. LEW I 62; Ernout & Meillet 1959, 42–43). J. Katz (kind p.c., 3 April 2007) thinks “*it would be hard to relate the two words... in morpho-phonological terms*”. Also J. Puhvel (kind p.c., 5 April 2007) sees “*no way to relate martus and arbiter to each other*”. He derives the Gk. term from IE *smr̥tu- > Skt. smṛti- ‘memory, record, history’, thus an abstract “witness” (as in “to bear witness”), marked with the suffix *-ro-. He also finds Thieme’s game try *mrt-tur- ‘grasping death’ (cf. Lat. mort- vs. Lith. tver-/tur- “to hold”) hardly likely. On the other hand, Puhvel regarded the etymology of Lat. arbiter is fairly hopeless: “*it has been considered a loanword from Umbrian, which allows ar- < *ad-, but suggestions for the remainder are not worth repeating. Even the Umbrian origin (rather than vice versa) is doubtful, since it occurs already in the Twelve Tables*”. Cf. also H. Rix in Indogermanische Forschungen 95 (1990) 281–283.

NB4: Eg. mtr may have been borrowed into ONub. (where the final -r was preserved). E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 183) combined Eg. mtr with ONub. matar-ki “Symbolum” (and Mer. mtr “Wahrzeichen o.ä.”), while W. Vycichl (1934, 58) compared it with ONub. matar-aḡ “als Zeuge fungieren”.

- Hence:

(1) mtr.w “Zeuge” (MK, Wb II 172; GHWb 375; ÄWb I 574: 3x already in V-VI.) = “witness” (FD 121) > Cpt. (SAL) $\text{m}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{T}\text{P}\ddot{\text{E}}$, $\text{M}\ddot{\text{E}}\text{T}\text{P}\ddot{\text{E}}$, (FS) $\text{M}\ddot{\text{E}}\text{T}\text{P}\text{H}$, (B) $\text{M}\ddot{\text{E}}\text{P}\ddot{\text{E}}$ “witness, testimony” (CD 177a; CED 86) = “Zeuge” (KHW 105).

NB: Its OK vocalization has been reconstructed as *m̥tréw (NBÄ 176; Snk. 1983, 225 pace NBÄ).

(2) mtr “1. (schriftliches) Zeugnis, 2. Bekanntheit” (Lit. MK, late NK, Wb II 172, 17–18; ÄWb II 1158b: already MK) = “fame, renown” (FD 121) = “witness document” (Ward 1981, 365–7, §17) = “1. testimony, 2. advice, teaching, instruction, precept” (DLE I 253).

(3) mtr.t “1. Zeugnis, 2. Unterricht, Ermahnung” (late NK, Wb II 172, 11–16; GHWb 375; ÄWb I 574: PT 2288c; ÄWb II 1158: CT VI 360a) = “testimony” (FD 121 pace Clère, JEA 24, 1938, 242; DCT 190) = “1. testimony, 2. advice, teaching, instruction (Gdk. 1975, 113 pace Clère l.c.), precept” (DLE I 253–4).

- One of the most Eg. (over)complicated roots from the viewpoint of etymological research.
- **1.** Traditionally derived from Eg. *mtr “zugegen sein, präsent sein” (OK, Wb II 171, 9, existence dubious, discussed above) and etymologically identified with mtr “Gegenwart, Nähe” (Wb, below), for which an irregular cognate may be found in WBrb.: Zng. ndar [< *mdar?] “être imminent” [Bst. 1909, 247] (GT).
LIT.: Sethe 1900, 145, §1; Zhl. 1932–33, 95; Clc. 1936, #642; Černý CED 86; Osing 1976, 91; AL 78.1910; Junge 1999, 353; Junge 2003, 225, n. 199 etc.
NB: W. Schenkel (1983, 225) combined Eg. *m̄tr.éw “Zeuge” directly with Eg. *m̄tr.at “Mittag” (below) explained by him from the lit./basic mng. “Richtiges” (!), which results from the confusion of three distinct Eg. roots that can hardly be approved (cf. Eg. mt.t “Mitte” and mtj “richtig”, supra).
- **2.** E. Zyhlarz and W. Vycichl (lit. infra) have convincingly compared Eg. mtr with certain (mostly NBrb.) reflexes of Brb. *ta-matár-t “Zeichen” [Zhl.], cf. NBrb.: Mzg. ta-matar-t (no pl.) “1. signe, indice, 2. point de repère, 3. signe de reconnaissance, mot de passe, 4. signe précurseur, avant-coureur” [Tf. 1991, 444], Zayan & Sgugu ta-maṭar-t “signe de reconnaissance” [Lbg. 1924, 570], Izdeg ta-matar-t, pl. ti-matar-in “signal, signe” [Mrc. 1937, 235] | Mzab ta-mtar-t, pl. ti-mitar “1. marque distinctive, signalement, 2. (p.ext.) distinction, cadeau fait comme marque d’affection, de bon souvenir, etc.” [Dlh. 1984, 125], Wargla ta-mtar-et, pl. ti-mtar-in ~ ti-mitar “marque distinctive, signalement” [Brn. 1908, 341] = ta-mtar-t, pl. ti-mitar ~ ti-mtar-in [Dlh. 1987, 201] || SBrb.: NTuareg: Ahaggar meter “être conseillé, recevoir un conceil, des conceils”, tă-matar-t, pl. ti-mitâr “signe de reconnaissance (paroles, fait, signe, objet connus de 2 pers., ou paroles, signe ou objet convenus d’avance entr’elles, au moyen desquels celle qui reçoit de l’autre une lettre ou un message vérifie leur authenticité)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1263–4] = ta-matar-t “Wahrzeichen, Signatur” [Zhl.], EWlm. & Ayr e-măṭer “1. (EWlm.) conseil (recommandation) en gén., 2. (EWlm.) testament, 3. (EWlm.-Ayr) aumône de funéraires, 4. don d’usufruit de qqch.”, ta-məṭir-t “1. signe de reconnaissance, 2. indice, preuve, 3. souvenirs possédés en commun, 4. secret possédé en commun”, EWlm. măṭâr “être conseillé, recevoir un conseil”, a-măṭer, pl. i-măṭer-ăn “testament (acte de la dernière volonté)” [PAM 1998, 228; 2003, 566] | STuareg: Tadghaq & Tudalt

ta-mătar-t, pl. ti-mătr-en “miracle (sign)”, te-măter-t, pl. ti-măter-en “commandment (in law)” [Sudlow 2001, 309, 311], Tamasheq (sic) ta-matar-t “Wahrzeichen”, meter “Rat empfangen” [Vcl.] (Izdeg-Ahaggar: Mlt. 1984, 22).

AP: ONub. matar-ki “symbolum” [Zhl. 1934–35, 168: Eg.-ONub.].

LIT. for Eg.-Brb.: Zhl. 1932–33, 36, 95; 1936, 442; Vcl. 1934, 58; Clc. 1936, #642; KHW 96.

NB1: Although both Zyhlarz and Vycichl quoted both meanings of Eg. mtr (“1. zugegen sein” vs. “2. bezeugen, Zeuge sein für”) in their etymologies, this Eg.-Brb. comparison reaffirms just the likelihood of the Eg. basic meaning being closer rather to “3. zeigen, 4. (an)erkennen, anmelden”.

NB2: The common Brb. root *√m-t-r has apparently no further AA parallels (in Sem., Cu.-Om. or Ch.). K.-G. Prasse (PAM 332) affiliated the EWlm.-Ayr forms with EWlm. aṭṭar “1. demander à Dieu dans la prière, 2. prier, 3. avancer, proposer un prix pour”, which is semantically unconvincing. Equally unlikely seems a connection with NBrb.: Ksur muter “trouver, estimer” || WBrb.: Zng. mader “chercher, s’étonner” (Brb.: Bst. 1890, 312). Cf. perhaps NOm.: Haruro muṭur-o “voto” [Crl. 1937, 655] and/or ECh.: Mkl. máddará (f) “trace, cause, motif, raison” [Jng. 1990, 136]?

- Other etymologies cannot be accepted.
 - **3.** L. Reinisch (1890, 274): ~ Sem. *mṭl “gleich, ähnlich sein”. Excluded both phonologically and semantically.
 - **4.** W. F. Albright (1927, 218; quoted also in Clc. 1936, #642) erroneously assumed the following chain of semantic changes: Eg. mtr (sic, -r!) “to be right, just” → mtr “to bear witness” → “middle”. His *comparanda* are also false: Ar. mtr “to stretch”, Sem. *matn- “hip” > Ar. matn- “1. middle of back, loins, 2. middle of the road”, Sem. *wtr “to stretch”.
 - **5.** C. T. Hodge (1961, 36) suggested a connection with NOM.: Gimirra mite “testimonio” [CR 1925, 622 pace Montandon] | Kaffa mit- “testimoniare”, mitō “testimianza” [Crl. 1951, 475], Mocha mīto ~ mīto “evidence, witness, proof”, mīṭa-yé “to testify” [Lsl. 1959, 42–43]. This striking parallel (which yields no match for Eg. -r) may be purely accidental.
- NB1: In this case, the writing of OK -r and Cpt. -p- do not allow to suppose that the original spelling of the Eg. word was *mtj, although already in the MK there was a tendency of “false archaisation” (during the -r > -j process, cf. Müller 1909; Schenkel 1965; Vycichl 1983, 29).
- NB2: Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 211, #1823) extended the false Eg.-Mocha etymology to Ar. mtn “to swear, take an oath”, Eg. mtmt “to discuss” < AA *-mī(ī)t- “to testify to”.
- NB3: Eg. mtr “to testify” can have equally nothing in common with LECu.: Baiso amat- “to swear” [HL 1988, 68] ||| CCh.: Mada ámmaḍa “faire le serment, jurer (le faux serment entraîne la mort)” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 178].

mtr.t “Mittag” (Lit. MK, Wb II 174, 6–7; GHWb) = “midday” (XVIII., FD 121) = “midi” (Lacau 1970, 70) = “midi (ce qui est au milieu)”

(Vrg. 1973 Ib, 36) = “midday, noon” (DLE I 254) = “noon” (Vcl. 1991, 123) > Dem. mtr “Mittag” (DG 192:2) vs. mtlj “Mittag, tags” (Hoffmann 1996, 197) > Cpt. (O) $\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, (SA) $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, (F) $\mu\eta\eta\rho\epsilon \sim \mu\eta\lambda$, (M) $\mu\eta\rho\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota$ “midday” (CD 182b; CD 88) = “Mittag, Tag” (KHW 99) = “midi” (DELIC 119).

NB1: Its MK instance (quoted by Clère, JEA 24, 1938, 242 and Fecht 1960, 108, §206.I.a.4) has not been confirmed in AWb II 1158. Occurs also in the Tebtunis onomasticon (fragment K 3:8, 2nd cent. AD) with the Dem. gloss mtrlj (Osing 1998, 112).

NB2: Vocalized as *metr.et (Steindorff 1904, §45 followed also by Sethe 1914, 114; Lacau 1970, 70, fn. 1) = *métr.t > *mé3tē (Fecht 1960, 108, §206.I.a.4) = *métr.ēt → *méʔr.ēt (Lacau 1970, 70, 84) = *mútr.at → *múʔra (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 36) = *mé/útr.at → *mé/úʔr.at (NBÄ 149, 649) = *mútr.at (Snk. after NBÄ) = *mirr.at → *mirr.at → *mi3r.at (DELIC 119; Vcl. 1991, 123). F. L. Griffith (1901, 76), G. Maspero (1903, 161, 163), and P. Lacau (1970, 69–70) provided further exx. for the shift of Eg. *-tr- > *-ʔr- (if preceded by a *Tonvokal*) that may be opposed to those with *-tr- unchanged (if preceding a *Tonvokal*) like, e.g., Eg. mtr.w “witness” (Lacau: *metr.ēj) > (SA) $\mu\eta\tau\rho\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\epsilon\theta\rho\epsilon$, (F) $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\eta$.

● Origin uncertain.

- 1. Usually explained from a hypothetical Eg. adj. root *mtr “middle” (unattested with this mng.) based on its frequent equation with Eg. mt.t “midst” (DLE I 251) = “Mitte” (GHWb 376) > Dem. mtr, mtj “Mitte” (DG 191) > Cpt. (SALK) $\mu\eta\tau\epsilon$, (S) $\mu\eta\eta\tau\epsilon$ “Mitte” (KHW 104). Dubious.

NB: Over the past century, the most diverse scenarios have been put forward to justify the relationship of both terms as well as their supposed derivation either from Eg. mtj “correct” or mtr “to testify” (or even both!). In the view of K. Sethe (1914, 114), mt.t (*mēt.et) originates directly from métr.et (lit. “Mitte”) “*sehr früh nach Ausfall von r*”, while mtr.t “Mittag” retained the original stem with -r-. He (Sethe 1923, 198) postulated the basic sense of *mtr to have been “gerade in der Mitte sein” (maintaining the connection with Eg. mtj “richtig usw.”, above). W. F. Albright (1927, 218; quoted also in Clc. 1936, #642) erroneously assumed the following chain of semantic changes: Eg. mtr (sic, -r!) “to be right, just” → mtr “to bear witness” → “middle”. His comparanda are equally false (Ar. mtr “to stretch”, Sem. *matn- “hip” > Ar. matn- “1. middle of back, loins, 2. middle of the road”, Sem. *wtr “to stretch”!). Besides, H. Möller (1911, 66, 158, 170) combined Eg. mtr.t “Mittag” and mt.t “Mitte” (above) and Ar. matn- “the middle part (of a bow, a spear, a sword, a road)” also with IE *médh-i-o-s “medius”. A. H. Gardiner (1955, 2–3) correctly suggested a distinction between Eg. mtr “to be present” vs. mtj “normal, regular”, although he derived the basic sense “middle” of mtr.t “midday” from the latter (!). The fact that its -r was preserved also by Cpt. -p made Gardiner hesitate: “*this idea of mine may well be a mistake. The question requires the closest investigation*”. J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 36 & 139) eventually explained both mtr.t “midday” and mt.t “middle” from an old *mútr.at, whereby he assumed a *Wortspaltung* resulting in *múʔr.a(t) “midday” vs. *mútʔ.a(t) > (via met.) *múʔt.a(t) “middle”. J. Osing (NBÄ 149, 649), in turn, regarded the derivation of Eg. mt.t and Dem. mtj “Mitte” from the old fem. adj. mtj.t > mt.t (*mé/út.ṯ) “richtig, gerade, genau” as “*sicher*”, which was - according to him - “*neugebildet*” (!) in (or before) Dyn. XVIII as mtr.t (*mé/út.ṯ) “Mittag” (lit. “richtig, genau”!), but he failed to resolve the contradiction how and why this additional -r was attached to the old root mtj. Even more far-fetched is

the position occupied by W. Vycichl (DELG 119), who pondered whether mtr.t “midi” is related to both mtr “être présent” and mtr (sic, -r!) “exact”. W. Schenkel (1983, 225) derived both mt.t “Mitte” and mtr.t “Mittag” from the literary mng. “Richtiges” (!) related to Eg. mtr.w “Zeuge”, although he discussed these forms separately from Eg. mtj “richtig”!

- **2.** GT: its relationship (via var. *mdr.t) to the Brb. word for “evening” is not only semantically doubtful, but certainly excluded.

NB1: Cf. NBrb.: Rif. Tuzin, Iznasen ʔa-meddi-t “soir (après le coucher du soleil)” [Rns. 1932, 385], Mnsr. ʔa-mdir-t (var. ʔa-meddi-t) “soir” [Bst.] = ʔa-madir-t “evening” [Bates], Halima ʔa-meddi-t “soir” [Bst.] || EBrb.: Gdm. ʔm-d: ta-meddi-t, pl. tə-məddi-t-īn “soir” [Lanfry 1973, 204, #969]. These parallels cannot derive from *ʔm-d-r. K.-G. Prasse (kind p.c., 12 April 2007) believes tamdir.t is an error for tamdeht. Moreover, as he pointed out, there are several words for “afternoon” derived from the common Brb. verbal root *ʔd-w-h “to depart or arrive in the afternoon”, cf. Tuareg tadwat, tadwit, tadəggat, Shilh & Mzg. tadggwat [-ggw- < *ww-], Mzg. tamddit, Qbl. & Izn. taməddit, Menacer tamdeht [prob. < *tamdeyt], taməddeht [< taməddeyt]?

NB2: O. Bates (1914, 83) erroneously combined the Brb. term with Eg. mšr.w (q.v.), which is phonologically certainly excluded (Eg. -š- ≠ Brb. *-d-). For the Brb. root cf. alternatively perhaps Ar. wamida “être d’une chaleur étouffante et humide (se dit d’une nuit)” [BK II 1610] = “schwül sein (von der Nacht)” [Müller] (for which Müller 1961, 201, #4 suggested a false Eg. etymology).

- **3.** GT: if we assume an OEg. etymon *mtr.t < *mkl.t (for discussing the anomaly of old *-l- vs. Cpt. -p- in an etymological context v. Takács 2005, 82–83, #7.12–19), a striking parallel appears in the common Brb. term for “midday meal”.

NB1: Cf. NBrb.: Shilh: Tazerwalt i-mkēli “Mittagsbrot, Mittagszeit” [Stumme 1899, 189] | Mzg. mekla “déjeuner, prendre le repas de la mi-journée”, i-mekli “déjeuner, repas de la mi-journée” [Taifi 1991, 330, 415] | Qbl. i-mekli, pl. i-mekla-wen “1. repas dans la journée, 2. repas de midi”, mmeklu ~ mmeklew “être mangé au repas du milieu du jour” [Dlt. 1982, 494] | Sened a-mekli, pl. i-mekli-wen “déjeuner” [Prv.], Nfs. mekli “déjeuner” [Prv.] = məkli, pl. i-mekli-un “déjeuner” [Lst. 1931, 223] = mekli, pl. i-mekli-wen “pranzo” [Bgn. 1942, 305] || EBrb.: Gdm. a-mekli “déjeuner” [Prv.] = a-məkli, pl. məkliwen “repas du milieu du jour”, meklaw “prendre le repas du milieu du jour” [Lanfry 1973, 149–150, 208, #995] = a-məkli “déjeuner” [Lst.], Audjila a-mekliw “pranzo” [Prd. 1960, 172], Fodjaha mekli “pranzo” [Prd. 1961, 299] || WBrb.: Zng. məgʒi, pl. məgʒiḍ-ən [ʒ < *l reg.], hence ā-mugʒ-og ~ a-mmugḍ-ək “j’ai déjeuné (au milieu du jour)” [Ncl. 1953, 216] || SBrb.: EWlm. a-məkli & Ayr e-məkli “repas de midi”, EWlm. & Ayr a-məklū “repas de midi, dîner (pris vers 11 heures, normalement bouillie et lait)”, tə-melkew-t “repas” [PAM 1998, 216; 2003, 371] = Ayr emekli & Wlmd. amekli “repas” [Ksm., p.c. on 3 April 2007] (Brb.: Prv. 1911, 109; LR 1999, 291).

NB2: This hypothetical Eg.-Brb. equation rises, however, the fundamental question of why the simplex is not attested in Eg. (one might expect OEg. *tr or *trj > MK *tr or *trj, resp., “to spend the midday” or sim.; a relationship with Eg. tr is of course excluded). The Brb. forms are extended by a prefix m-, although there is no agreement in determining the primary root (*k-l-y or *k-l-w?). In any case, most likely seems a derivation from common Brb. *k-l “passer le milieu du jour” reconstructed by Aghali-Zakara (2002, 44f.), which – in the view of M. Kossmann (kind p.c., 3 April 2007) – represents in this case “the only serious etymology” that is “commonly accepted among Berberologists”. M. Taifi (1991, 330) too, explained Mzg. mekla etc. from the root √k-l: kel “passer la journée”. On the other hand, both Provotelle and Stumme

(l.c.) assumed a late borrowing from Ar. maʔkal- “a place and a time of eating” [Lane 73] or maʔkal-at- “aliment, repas, festin” [Dozy I 31] (< Sem. *ʔkl “to eat”), which would certainly rule out the Eg-Brb. etymology suggested here. But K.-G. Prasse (p.c., 3 April 2007) has firmly excluded any derivation from Arabic. A relationship of Brb. *k-l-y ~ *k-l-w (or sim.) with Sem. *ʔkl “to eat” is also impossible. Lanfry (1973, 149–150, #744), in turn, took Gdm. a-məkli from e-kl “être hôte de passage”, which is rather unconvincing both semantically and phonologically (the root √k-l has no third -w or -y). Prasse (PAM 1998, 216) explained EWlm. & Ayr tə-melkew-t from *l-k-w, but PAM 1998, 193 give only EWlm. & Ayr ə-lkəw “puiser (un liquide) avec un récipient”.

mtr.t > mt(j).t ~ mtj ~ mtr.w “1. (NK) Flut, Wasser, 2. (GR) auch vom Überschwemmungswasser” (Amarna, late NK, Wb II 174, 8 & II 169, 11; GHWb 376) = “flood (i.e., Nile)” (AEO I 7*, §23; FD 121) = “deep waters, flood” (DLE I 254) > Dem. mtr “Flut, Wasser” (DG 192:3 with a different etym.) > (?) Cpt. (S) ⲡⲦⲐ (m) “deep water, depth of sea” (CD 193a; CED 92) = “flot” (Roquet) = “Flut, Meerestiefe” (Spg. KHW 65; Wst. KHW 103; Osing 1976, 217, n. 678).

NB: G. Roquet (1973, 162, fn. 1) reconstructed *imtárrī (sic) → *imtájji (sic) → *imtái (sic) → *əmtó. GT: if the genetic connection with (S) ⲡⲦⲐ is valid, we should assume perhaps rather *m̃tár.˘t/w > *m̃táj.˘(t/w) > *m̃táj(˘). J. Černý (CED 92), W. Westendorf (KHW 103 & fn. 6), and H.S. Smith (1978, 360) correctly distinguished Cpt. (S) ⲡⲦⲐ from (S) ⲡⲦⲱ (f) “depth” < Dem. mtj (mtr) “Tiefe, Länge” (DG 191:2) < Eg. md.t (the two Cpt. forms were still confused in CD l.c.). Gardiner (AEO I 7*, §23) rightly surmised that “perhaps there was contamination of the two words”. J. Osing (1976, 217, n. 678) and W. Westendorf (KHW 104) separated (S) ⲡⲦⲐ < Eg. mtr.(t/w) also from (L) ⲡⲡⲦ treated by J. Černý (l.c.) as a var. of (S) ⲡⲦⲐ, while Roquet (1973, 162, fn. 1) surmised in (S) ⲡⲦⲐ a merger of the reflexes of two diverse etyma, namely (1) that meaning “profondeur” < Eg. md.(w)t vs. (2) that signifying “flot” < Eg. mtr.t, their coincidence being due to “*l’hybridation*” of (S) ⲡⲦⲱ vs. (S) ⲡⲦⲐ.

- Etymology somewhat uncertain due to the lack of OK evidence.
- **1.** Usually treated as a parallel related to (or borrowed from?) Sem. *mṭr, cf. esp. Akk. (m/jB) miṭirtu, miṭru “Wasserlauf” [AHW 663] = miṭirtu “1. a type of field or orchard, characterized by a special irrigation system, 2. a type of canal or ditch”, miṭru “a small canal, ditch” [CAD m2, 144, 147] = “Weide” [Holma 1913, 93] = “watercourse” [Fox], which is akin to Sem. *maṭar- “pioggia” [Frz.] = *maṭar-/ *miṭr- “Regen” [AHW] = *maṭar- “streaming water, rain” [Orel] = *maṭar- “дождь, орошение дождевой водой” [Blv.]: Mari Akk. maṭartum “rain” [Watson] || Ug. mṭr (allophone 1x: mṣr) “(to) rain” [Watson] = mṭr-t ~ mṭr “rain”, mṭr G “to rain” [DUL 603], Hbr. māṭār “Regen”, denom. mṭr nifal “beregnet werden”, hifil “regnen lassen” [GB 417], JAram. miṭrā “Regen” [GB], Samar. Aram. mṭr “1. rain, 2. (tr.) to rain” [Tal 2000, 464], JNAram. mṭr IV “to send rain”,

muṭra “rain” [Sabar 2002, 216], Mnd. miṭra “Wasserlauf” [Dietrich 1967, 299] | OSA: Mdb. mṭr-n & Sab. mṭr, pl. ?mṭr “champ arrosé par la pluie” [Arbach 1993, 72] = “(rain-watered) canal” [Fox], Ar. maṭar- “Regen”, maṭar-at- “Wasserschlauch”, denom. verb ḥamṭara, impf. yu-ḥamṭiru [h- prefix] “den Wasserschlauch füllen” [Vcl. 1934, 43; 1936, 109] (Sem.: WUS #1555; Frz. 1965, 146, #3.18; Rabin 1975, 88, #66; Fox 1998, 24; Watson 2002, 796, §4).

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Rn. 1873, 259 (with numerous false parallels); HSED #1747; Orel 1995, 146, §1; Peust 1997, 256, fn. 14.

NB1: This Eg.-Sem. etymology was handled by V. É. Orel (l.c.) as genetic. But Peust sided with seeing in NK mṭr.t a Sem. borrowing.

NB2: W. G. E. Watson compared also Akk. maḍārum “(convoient en effet des nettes connotations d’humidité qui s’apparentent au suintement)” [Durand, AuOr 17–18, 1999–2000, 194].

NB3: M. L. Bender (1975, 180, #63.2) affiliated Ar. maṭar- with NBrb.: Shilh & Mzg. a-nzar (so, -z- for -z-) “rain”, which is probably mistaken (normally, Ar./AA *ṭ- = Brb. *ḍ- ~ *ṭṭ-, cf. Mlt. 1991, 242).

NB4: N. V. Jušmanov (1998, 180) regarded the C₃ in this root to be identical with his hypothetical Sem. *r noun class “marker of fluid bodies” (supposed to be present, e.g., in Ar. nahr- “river” and Hbr. rīr “saliva”). Similarly, A. R. Bomhard (1984, 275; 1986, 254; 1990, 403) analyzed the third root radical of Sem. *maṭar- as a root complement assuming an original AA biconsonantal *m-ṭ, cf. Eth.-Sem.: Gurage mṭmt “to be soaked through by the rain, be drenched, be rotten, putrid” [Lsl. 1979 III, 438] || HECu.: Kambatta (Qabenna, Tembaro) müčč-o “to be wet”, muṭ-iššo “to wet” [Lsl. 1956, 987] = māto “rainy season” [Dlg. 1973, 182] = maṭo “rainy season (June–August)” vs. muṭa “(to be) wet” [Hds. 1989, 120, 166; Crass 2001, 55, #282] (Eth.-Sem.-HECu.: Lsl. l.c.) || SCu. *ma[d]- “rain” [Ehret]: based on Burunge madiṅ “rainy season” | Ma’a mare “rain” [Ehret 1980, 153] || WCh. *maḍa “poca (dew)” [Stl.]: Mundat mud & Karfa m“atat “to be wet” [Seibert 2000 MS, #D031] | Nbauchi *maḍa[y]- “poca (dew)” [Stl.]: Warji maḍ-ai, Pa’a & Diri maḍa, Siri muḍi, Jimbin amaḍa, Miya amaḍi, Mburku ma-maḍa, Kariya maḍa (Nbauchi: Skn. 1977, 18) | Bade maḍaawaan “dew” [Krf.], Ngz. máḍáawà “dew” [Schuh 1981, 108 with a false inner Ngz. etym.] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 232, #798) || CCh.: Mofu-Gudur -màḍ- “arracher” [Brt. 1978, 139], Uld. miḍà “frais, humide” [Cln. 1997, 204] | Masa maḍíí “rosée” [Ctc. 1983, 105], Zime-Dari [mb- < *m- reg.] mbàḍà “rosée” [Cooper 1984, 17], Lame mbòḍà “rosée”, mbèḍèḍè “mouillée (terre)” [Scn. 1982, 311, 315], Gizey màḍgáy “rosée” [Ajl.], Masa màḍí/éy “rosée” [Ajl.], Ham mbàḍigí “rosée” [Ajl.], Musey mbàḍàgíí “rosée” [Ajl.], Lew & Marba mbàḍí “rosée” [Ajl.] (Masa gr.: Ajl. 2001, 49) || ECh.: EDng. meḍínkó “humide, mouillé, trempé”, cf. meḍyè “le rhume, la grippe, la bronchite, la morve” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 200]. Any connection to AA *m-ṭ “tears” [GT] attested in Common Brb. *a-məṭṭa “tears” [GT] and its NOM. & WCh. cognates (discussed s.v. Eg. mt.wt “poison”)? Cf. perhaps also (as a remotely related root var.) AA *m-t-w/y “light rain” [GT] > Bed. mit“ai (m), pl. mitwei “light spring rains” [Rpr. 1928, 219] || ECh.: WDng. máatyé (f) “longue pluie ininterrompue et fine, en août” [Fédry 1971, 113].

NB5: H. Steintal (1857, 408), followed (apparently independently) by A. G. Belova (1998, 13), proposed just the opposite way of the analysis of Sem. *maṭar- via prefix *m- + bicons. *ṭr, which Belova derived from PAA *ṭVr “to drip, flow, pour (капать, течь, лить)” [HCVA III #235].

- 2. GT: if, however, NK mṭr.t < old *mṭr.t < pre-OK *mkr.t, cf. Akk. makāru ~ mekēru G & D “bewässern, tränken”, makru “bewässert”,

mikru “Bewässerung” [AHW 588, 590, 651] = makāru ~ mekēru G & D “to flood, irrigate, (in a figurative sense) drench”, makāru “the flooding of an entire field” [CAD m1, 125–6] || Ar. makara I “3. arrosier (son champ)” [BK II 1138].

- Other etymologies cannot be accepted.

NB: (1) P. Langlois (1919, 150) combined it with Eg. mr “canal” (q.v.) and even Eg. t3-mrj “Egypt” (q.v.), which he falsely derived from Eg. m(w)r (sic, -w-) “ligare” (cf. s.v. Eg. mr supra). (2) P. Kaplony (LÄ VII 31, n. 75), in turn, rendered Eg. mtr:t as “die zur rechten Zeit in rechter Höhe kommende Überschwemmung” (Kaplony) = “richtige Überschwemmung” (LÄ VII 468 index) evidently deriving it from Wb’s Eg. mtr “richtig” (which is certainly erroneous, the old Eg. root in question being mtj with -j, discussed above). In addition, Kaplony is erroneously referring to AECT I 274, n. 16, where R. O. Faulkner has not discussed this word in fact at all. (3) Ch. Ehret (1997, 210, #1819): ~ Ar. mth “to drop excrement”, Eg. mt.wt “semen”, Cu. *math- “to vomit”. Semantically unconvincing.

mtr (?) “Gegenwart, Nähe” (late NK, GR, Wb II 171–2; GHWb 375; ÄWb II 1158a: 1x already in XII./XIII.) = “présence, proximité” (AL 78.1911) > Dem. mtj ~ mtr “1. zugegen sein, 2. auch: erziehen, Erziehung” (DG 191:3) = “to be present, presence” (CED) > Cpt. (SAL) ἸΤΟ, (S) ἸΠΤΟ, (B) (Ε)ΜΘΟ, (AM) ἸΤΑ, (F) (Ε)ΜΤΑ, ἸΜΤΑ, (S) ΕΜΤΟΟΥ, var. (LM) ΗΗΤ (m) “face, presence” (CD 193a; CED 94) = “Gegenwart o.ä.” (Sethe 1900, 145, §1; Spg. KHW 65; Wst. KHW 103–4)

NB1: The -r of the single MK ex. (ÄWb l.c.) is written, while the NK-GR exx. (quoted in the Belegstellen ad Wb l.c.) all lack it, which may be due to the erosion of old -r > -y > -Ø. But cf. also OCpt. (Pap. BM 10808) ΗΤΟΡ “gegenwärtig, zugegen” (Osing 1976, 91, 218, n. 685; KHW 521) retaining the old -r, which has been explained by Osing (l.c.) from a deverbial adj. *m̄tār̄w (cf. NBÄ 188f.).

NB2: Whether the verbal mng. of mtr “1. zugegen sein, präsent sein” (Wb II 171, 9; GHWb 375) = “gegenwärtig sein” (Spg. KHW 65) is attested at all is highly dubious (for further details cf. Eg. mtr “bezeugen”, above).

NB3: Vocalized as *emtor “zugegen sein” (Sethe 1900, 145, §1) = *mtor “to be present” (CED 86) = *m̄tā? < *m̄tār (Osing 1978, 43–44). As for (LM) ΗΗΤ (cf. Muséon 84, 1971, 398), J. Osing (1978, 43–44) disproved its plurality (contra Kasser 1964, 31; KHW 103–4) with regard to its sg. article Π-, conceiving it as merely a *Nebenform* to (SAL) ΗΤΟ etc. (both *mt? < *mtr) reflecting “*aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach*” either (1) an odd inf. pattern *mūt̄r (which would be a so far “*sonst nie bezeugter Infinitivtyp*”) as var. to the *endbetonter* inf. Π *m̄tā? < *m̄tār or (2) a qual. like (SL) ΚΗΒ+ to (S) ΚΒΟ (inf. “kühl werden”) (KHW) “*in einem späteren infinitivischen Gebrauch*” (cf. Funk, ZÄS 104, 1977, 25f.).

- Origin still obscure. Both #1 and #2 represent plausible etymologies.

- 1. GT: one might perhaps compare it to WBrb.: Zng. ndar [assim. < *mdar?] “être imminent” [Bst. 1890, 321] ||| LECu.: Afar matare ~ matre “to catch up with, meet up with, overtake” [PH 1985, 166]. NB: K.-G. Prasse (kind p.c., 10 April 2007): “Zenaga ndar has no counterpart in other dialects as far as I know”.

- **2.** GT: since the Eg. root was triconsonantal (mtr), and hardly *mtj, its direct derivation from AA *m-t ~ *m-d “to be near” [GT] is probably out of question. But a remote (PAA) connection cannot be ruled out.

NB1: Attested in LECu.: Orm. maddī “2. near, beside, close” [Btm. 2000, 185] = (Borana, Orma, Waata) maddī (var. baddī) “beside, near” [Strm. 1987, 362] | LECu.: Sdm. meddi yâ “to get near to, be halfway (along a road, doing sg.)” [Gsp. 1983, 228] || NOm.: Omt. (sic) mata “vicino (adj., adv.)”, mata-n “presso, vicino”, mata-t- (pass-refl. suffix -t-) “avvicinarsi, accostarsi” [Mrn. 1938, 151], Wlt. matâ “vicino (adj.)” [Crl. 1929, 33] = matâ “come near!”, máta “near”, mátaa “nearness (specific)” [Adams quoted in Bnd. 1999, 12, #8] = mata “1. (adj.) near, 2. (postp.) near” [Lmb.], Gofa & Gamu & Dache mata “near (adj.)” [Lmb.] (for Gamu: Lmb. 1985 MS, 22, #692; Sottile 1999, 431), Dawro mata “near (postp.)” [Lmb.] | Kcm. (Haruro) mata “presso” [CR 1937, 655] = “near (postp.)” [Lmb.] (NOm.: Lmb. in LS 1997, 471) || CCh.: Mada métya “voisin” [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 195], cf. Mafa mæd- “approcher” [Bléis 1987, 106 with a false Mafa etym.] | Logone mádee “gegenwärtig, augenblicklich” [Lks. 1936, 106] || ECh.: WDng. móòtà “proche, près” [Fédry 1971, 135], EDng. máaty “tout près”, cf. móódá “près, tout près, proche” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 199, 207], Bdy. mòot ~ mòotí (adv.) “tout près, presque” [AJ 1989, 100] | Birgit mòotá “près, proche” [Jng. 1973 MS; 204, 357], Mubi múudí “être près, proche” [Jng. 1973 MS], Kajakse mùtà “near” [DrNB. 1981 MS, 3, #150] = moota “près” [Alio 2004, 246, #247], Kofa mòot “near” [Jng. 1977, 18, #458].

NB2: M. Lamberti (LS l.c.) combined the NOm. stem with LECu.: Saho ‘abata “near (adj.)” [Lmb.], which is phonologically unlikely.

- **3.** L. Homburger (1930, 285) combined Eg. mtr “être présent” with Ful ndar-ude “être sur le point de, chercher”.

mtr.t “(mtr.t w^{fb}) etwas Pflanzliches (?)” (late NK: Pap. Koller/Berlin 3043, rt. 2:1, Wb II 174, 10) = “...leather (?)” (Pap. Koller l.c., Grd. 1911, 38*) = “1. (Pap. Koller l.c.) mtr.t w^{fb}: neat webbing (?), 2. among various flax- or hemp-plants (Pap. Harris I 16b:12, XX.), 3. some wickerwork amongst baskets or sim. (Ostr. Grd. 240, XX.), 4. (must be) the string webbing of the bedstead (Pap. DeM III, l. 6)” (Camino 1954 LEM, 435 page Černý) = “1. une partie d’une plante: fibre végétale (?), semble servir à la fabrication d’un lit, probablement les fibres ou les cordes d’une plante qui servaient, soit à lier ensemble les parties en bois du lit, soit à serrer le matelas dans le cadre du lit (Pap. DeM III, l. 6), 2. parmi les paniers ou sim. (Ostr. Grd. 240)” (Černý 1978, 13–14, n. e) = “fibre végétale (?)” (AL 78.1915 page Černý) = “webbing” (DLE I 254) = “cordage (Ostr. Grd. 240: together with baskets, Pap. Harris I 16b:12: among items made of flex and hemp)” (Hoch 1994, 174–5) = “Pflanzenfaser (für das Flechtwerk des Bettes)” (GHWb 376).

NB1: The connection of mtr.t (leather det.) “etwas aus Leder (?)” (XII. hapax: Pap. Kahun VI, 10, vs. 57, Wb II 174, 11) = “a leather” (Camino 1954 LEM, 135) =

“Gurt” (GHWb 376; ÄWb II 1158: “unklar”) with mtr.t of Pap. Koller l.c. etc. has been regarded by A.H. Gardiner (1911, 38* & fn. 4) as “possible”, while J. Hoch (1994 l.c.) voiced his reservations: “connection... is uncertain”. The same pertains to Eg. mtrj.t (wood det.) “a wooden object” (Pap. Anastasi IV 2:11, Caminos 1954 LEM, 135) = “?” (DLE I 254 pace JEA 27, 1941, 148), on which R. Caminos (1954 LEM, 436) noted: “dubious if related” to mtr.t of Wb II 174, 10.

NB2: Occurs also in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as mtr (Dem. gloss mtlj) “Art pflanzliches Flechtwerk” (Osing 1998, 120, n. e). For possible Dem. reflex(es) see Spg. 1920, 2, 9, n. 7; Vos 1993, 354, §274.

- Etymology disputed.
- **1.** J. Černý (1978 I, 14, n. 1) derived it from Eg. mtr.t “middle” (sic, cf. mt.t “middle” vs. mtr.t “midday”, above), which J. Hoch (1994 l.c.) rightly declined as “highly improbable”.
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994 l.c.) sees in it a borrowing from Can., cf. Hbr. *mētār “bow-string, tent-rope/cords” [KB 578–9], PBHbr. mētār “cord, rope” [Jastrow 1950, 780] < Can. *ytr: Hbr. yeter “1. still wet tendon of a slaughtered animal (which contracts and holds when dried), 2. bow-string, 3. tent-cord” [KB 452] = “cord (for tying people), bowstring” [Hoch], JAram. yitrā “1. Strick, Seil, 2. übertr.: Teil des Darmes, der geradgestreckt ist und seilartig aussieht” [Levy 1924 II, 280] = “1. the cord of the bow, 2. rope, 3. the straight side of the stomach” [Jastrow 1950, 605] = “strong cord, bowstring, rope” [Hoch] < Sem. *wtr, cf. Ar. watar- “the string, and the suspensory, the appendage (of a bow), and in like manner, a chord of a lute and the like” [Lane 2918] = “(bow-)string” [KB] || Geez watr “sinew, cord, string (of musical instrument), web (o spider)” [Lsl. 1987, 622]. Hoch’s etymology was rightly queried by G. Vittmann (1997, 283): “es ist auffallend, daß dieses mtr.t nie ‘syllabisch’ geschrieben wird. Handelt es sich wirklich um eine semitische Entlehnung?”. This doubt is corroborated also by the *Genuswechsel* as well as by the suspect that the same Eg. mtr.t occurs already in Pap. Kahun l.c. Nevertheless, this Eg.-Sem. parallel might be alternatively conceived as a genetic one provided we assume that Eg. mtr.t was an m- prefix derivative of an unattested Eg. *wtr ~ Sem. *wtr > Ar. watara I “7. mettre la corde à un arc, le garnir d’une corde”, II “3. tendre l’arc en y adaptant une corde”, V “être tendu et dur (se dit d’une veine, d’un nerf, de la corde de l’arc)” [BK II 1480] || Geez wat(t)ara “to bend, stretch tight, tighten (strings), straighten up (probably a denom. of watr)” [Lsl. 1987, 622].
- **3.** GT: alternatively, cp. perhaps AA *m-t-r “1. to stretch (a cord, tendon), 2. pull (In gen.)” [GT] > JAram. mtr “aufspannen (das Lager), daher: lagern, wohnen” [Levy 1924 III 303] | Ar. matara I

“2. tendre et étendre en long (une corde)”, VI “2. tirer chacun de son côté, tirailler” [BK II 1056] ||| NBrb.: Mzg. nter [nt- < *mt-?] “2. tirer (pour arracher), arracher, extirper” [Tf. 1991, 505] ||| ECh.: Bdy. madira (f), pl. madiri “tendon” [AJ 1989, 96].

- **4.** GT: or related to Ar. $\sqrt{m\dot{t}l}$ > mamṭūl- “corde” [Dozy II 601] and perhaps LECu. $\sqrt{m-t-r}$ > Orm.-Borana māčēr-a [-č- reg. < *-t-] “1. tendon, ligament, 2. meat that is difficult to chew, 3. (verb) to be tough (meat, tendon, wood)”, cf. maṭaria “to spin, weave” [Strm. 1995, 205, 208]?

NB1: All these forms mentioned in #2–3 (whose C_3 may be a root ext.) may eventually originate from the very same AA biconsonantal root family with the basic sense “to stretch”, which has yielded diverse root varieties that can be distinguished according to their C_2 : AA $*m-t \sim *m-\dot{t} \sim *m-d$ (discussed s.v. Eg. mt “vessel” and mtj “cord” supra).

NB2: Alternatively, the Orm. root (if its -č- < ECU. $*-d-$ stems from AA $*-č-$ or sim. and not $*-t-$) may be remotely related to Eg. md3 “to fetter” (late NK, DLE, below).

***mtr/*mdr** (?) > Cpt. (S) MATP, (B) MATEP (\approx Gk. κόλλα) “glue” (CD 196a) = “Leim” (KHW 105) = “colle” (DELIC 125). Discussed s.v. $*mdr$ infra.

mtrḤ “Gegenstand aus Holz (Art Waffe?): 1. (PT: vermutlich mißverstandenen aus mt rḤ.wj), 2. (XXVI.) in dem Beinamen des Osiris: w^c mtrḤ.w m z3w, 3. als Amulett, das Feinde vertreibt” (PT, Wb II 174, 12–14) = “(sens difficile à établir, désigne un objet mal connu en bois qui faisait partie des armes divines au temple de Saïs)” (Alliot 1946, 78, fn. 2) = “?” (AL 77.1935 with lit.).

NB: M. Alliot (l.c.) identified this weapon of Seshat iconographically with that named in BD 153A-B mḥsf and depicted as “une longue canne une longue canne (ou massue) de bois, terminée par un pommeau ovoïde” (“Cette canne sert de piquet d’attache pour le filet”).

- Meaning and origin unknown. H. Grapow (1914, 32) surmised a prefix m- in it, but he was unable to identify the underlying root. H. Ranke (1933, 104, fn. 6), in turn, established the archetype of PT 126–130 (utt. 210), whereby he deduced mtrḤ.wj=f(j) to have eventually been a ghost-word resulting from the misunderstanding of mt + rḤ.wj=f(j) “den Samen seines Genossen (weisen)” in the original version.

mtrḤ.t ~ mtrḤ “ein Hausgerät” (late NK, Wb II 174, 15) = “Matte (?)” (Grapow 1914, 32) = “aus Riedgras geflochtener Gegenstand (nicht zu identifizieren)” (Helck MWNR 918 with Belegstellen) =

“strainer or sieve” (Janssen 1975, 145–6, §16) = “Sieb” (GHWb 376) = “crible” (Aufrère 2003, 25).

- The same word (?) may be represented by:

(1) mrḥ.t (var. mrḥ) “ein geflochtenes Hausgerät” (late NK, Wb II 112, 10; GHWb 350) = “strainer or sieve” (Janssen 1975, 145–6, §16) = “Korb” (Gutgesell, LÄ III 1074) = “crible (désignant toujours un récipient en bronze)” (Aufrère 2003, 25 & fn. 65) vs. mrḥ “das Sieb” (GR, Wb II 112, 12; WD II 65: cf. RdE 28, 1976, 61, n. 6) = “washtub” (Smith 1979, 162) > Dem. mrḥ (f) “ein Gerät (ob Sieb?)” (DG 169:11) = “a metal tool” (CED) > Cpt. (S) ḥṛwꜣꜥ, ɛmpwꜣꜥ (f) “a vessel probably of metal (in list of utensils in bronze or brass), strainer (?) (covering corpse’s face)” vs. ḥṛwꜣꜥ (f) “a vessel of clay (perhaps identical with ḥṛwꜣꜥ ≠ ḥṛwꜣꜥ ‘water-clock’)” (CD 184a; CED 89–90) = “ein Gefäß” (KHW 101).

NB: The sense “sieve” was doubted by W. Helck (LÄ V 924). The derivation of the Cpt. forms from Eg. mrḥ.t first suggested by W. E. Crum (CD l.c.) and has been maintained - in spite of the changes in the material of the vessel - by W. Westendorf (KHW l.c.) and J. J. Janssen (1975, 145–7, §16 & fn. 60–61 with lit.) pointing out that k3.t-m(t)rḥ.t was of metal at least in two contexts (elsewhere made of basketry) signifying perhaps “*the well-known type of metal strainer or sieve, of which several exx. were discovered at Thebes and elsewhere*”.

(2) k3.t-mtrḥ.t (Pap. Ebers 66:19) vs. k3.t-mrḥ.t (late NK) “ein Gefäß aus Bronze” (Wb II 112, 11 vs. II 174, 16 & V 94, 3–4) = “kind of vessel” (CED) = “ein Gefäß” (GHWb 376) = “ein Sieb von Metall” (Pap. Ebers 66:19, HAM 630) = “(dans un contexte médicinal, pourrait désigner) le crible ou la bassine de l’accouchement (désignant toujours un récipient en bronze)” (Aufrère 2003, 25 & fn. 65).

NB1: S. Aufrère (l.c. pace Wb V 94, 3–4) identified the first component of this compound with k3.t “der äußere weibliche Geschlechtsteil” (PT, Wb V 93, 12–14) = “(mot très ancien, désigne) la partie féminine” (Aufrère), in which he saw “*une preuve d’un lien... entre le crible et la naissance*” demonstrated in detail throughout his paper.

NB2: There seems to be a *communis opinio* that, in spite of the additional -t-, both mtrḥ.t and mrḥ.t represent the same word. W. Westendorf (1962, 44–45, §71.2) supposed mrḥ.t to be due to the “*Fortfall des t*”, but in alternatively he (o.c., p. 45, fn. 1) pondered whether a reverse process was the case: “*oder ist mrḥ.t das urspr. Wort, in das t als ‘Übergangslaut’ geschoben ist?*” (cf. Hintze 1949, 46f.). J. J. Janssen (l.c.) too maintained both mtrḥ.t and mrḥ.t to “*indicate one and the same object*”, the compound k3.t-m(t)rḥ.t being the “*definite proof of their identity*” (both words never occur together in the same text). He also supposed that probably mtrḥ.t was the earlier form (only in texts from Dyn. XIX and early Dyn. XX, while some of the exx. of mrḥ.t occur also in the middle of Dyn. XX) and because only the var. mrḥ.t survived into Dem.-Cpt. S. Aufrère (l.c.) passed by this problem only stating that mrḥ “*se lit aussi*” mtrḥ.t, while k3.t-mtrḥ.t “*se retrouve également sous la forme*” k3.t-mrḥ.t.

- Original (OK) spelling unknown. Etymology uncertain. Apparently an m- prefix nomen instr. as surmised already by H. Grapow (1914, 32), although the underlying root is still debated.

- **1.** H. Smith (1979, 162) pondered a possible derivation from Eg. *rḥt* “to wash (clothes)” (Wb II 448, 8). Unlikely, since the latter had -t as part of the root. Should we suppose a met. (**mrḥt.t* > *mtrḥ.t*)?
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 151, §195) and D. Meeks (1997, 42, §195) treated the Dyn. XX var. *mrḥ* “tamis, passoire” (Meeks) = “basket, box” (Hoch) separately (erroneously regarded as a hapax) and assumed it to be a metathetic var. of *mḥjr* ~ *mḥr* (q.v.). Another Dyn. XX ex. of *mrḥ* (wood det.) *n šnd.t* “paniers (de fleurs) d’acacia” has been found by Mathieu (1996, 139, n. 477), who also saw in it a met. of *mḥr* “panier, corbeille” (Černý 1958, 206–8).
- **3.** GT: if *mtrḥ.t* is the older var., in principle, a hypothetic basic verb **trḥ* “to sift or shake” (or sim.) might be set up, which might be equated (via met. and an irreg. but attested correspondence Eg. *t* ~ Sem. **t*) with Can. **ḥtr* (?) “to sift” [GT] > Ug. *ḥtr* “Schaufel oder Sieb (?)” [Ast. 1948, 221] = “Sieb” [WUS #1109] = “instrument for scattering” [Gordon 1955, 269, #755] = “strainer, sieve” [DL & Sanmartín, UF 5, 1973, 89; Stieglitz, JCS 33, 1981, 53; Healey, UF 15, 1983, 51] = “winnowing rake, sieve, a tool” [Watson 1996, 702] = “a tool” [DUL 416], NHbr. *ḥšr* “sieben, ausstreuen” [Dalman 1922, 163] = “streuen, in kleinen Teilen herabfallen lassen, daher auch: sieben” [Levy 1924 II 125] = “to peel, sift, distil drops as if through a sieve” [Jastrow 1950, 511], JAram. *ḥšr* [irreg. -š- influenced by Hbr.?] “sieben, (aus)streuen” [Dalman & Levy & WUS] = “to sift” [Jastrow]. Dubious.
 NB1: For further instances of the rare Eg. *t* ~ Sem. **t* cf. EDE I 316–317; II 349–350.
 NB2: The reconstruction of the Can. root is rather problematic. J. Levy (l.c.) assumed a *Grundwurzel* **šr* (based on the dubious equation with *√nšr* ~ *√nšl*). J. Aistleitner (WUS l.c.), in turn, affiliated Ug. *ḥtr* with Ar. *ḥašara* I “1. trier, nettoyer, monder qqch., en ôter les ordures ou les parties moins bonnes, 2. laisser les parties moins bonnes d’un mets” [BK II 575] = “etwas von den schlechten Teilen befreien” [WUS pace Al-Yasin], which is not generally accepted (Ug. -t- ≠ Ar. -š-). GT: alternatively, cp. perhaps Ar. *ḥašara* I “2. être dans l’agitation, dans le désordre (se dit de l’esprit)” [BK II 541] = “1. to heave, become agitated (soul or stomach) by a tendency to vomit, 2. become disordered” [Lane 704] with var. *ḥatara* (-t!) “to heave, become agitated (soul or stomach) by a tendency to vomit” [Lane 701]. In addition, Ug. *ḥtr* has been recently reinterpreted as “bieldo” [OL] = “a (bladed) weapon (?)” [Watson 1996] = “dagger, knife” [Watson 2000] = “pitchfork” [Watson 1970, 110f. quoted after DLU] = “una herramienta” [DLU I 203], which led W. G. E. Watson (1996, 702–3; 2000 MS, 3, §20) to explain it as a *Wanderwort* borrowed from Hurrian *ḥašeri* “dagger, knife” [Watson] = “Dolch” [Haas & Thiel], albeit he regarded this etymology to be “only (a) very tentative solution”.
- **4.** GT: if, however, Eg. *mrḥ.t* represents the primary form, it might be related to *nomina instr.* like WCh.: Hausa *máréégí* (m), pl. *màrèègáí* “sieve”, *máráárakí* (m) “native sieve” [Abr. 1962, 657–8] || ECh.:

Mubi àmàràk, pl. àmáárik ~ ùmóórùk “Korb” [Lks. 1937, 180].
NB: The underlying root has been preserved by Hausa réégà “to shake (corn, rice etc.) with water to rid it of sand, etc.”, rèègáá “to shake part of” [Abr. 1972, 729].

mṭhn.t “Mädchen” (CT, Wb II 175, 1–2) = “Gattin, Frau” (Grapow) = “concubine (?)” (FD 121; DCT 189) = “female sexual partner” (Smith 1979, 161) = “compagne, épouse” (AL 79.1417) = “Konkubine (?)” (GHWb 376).

● Origin obscure.

- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 32) supposed an m- prefix in it, but left the simplex (*ṭhn?) unidentified. H. Smith (1979, 161) treated it as the *nomen agentis* of Eg. ṭhn “1. (tr.) jemanden treffen, ihm begegnen, etwas anrühren (um es zu beschädigen), 2. (intr.) mit (n, r) jemandem nahe kommen, begegnen, mit (hn^o) zusammenstossen (um zu kämpfen)” (XVIII., Wb V 389–390) = “to meet” (Smith). Dubious.

NB: Eg. ṭhn (which first occurs in the 12th Dyn., cf. ÄWb II 2750a) is regularly written with ṭ- (not t-) ever since the MK, while there is not one single instance of *mṭhn.t in the CT (cf. DCT 190), where only mṭhn.t is attested (with -t).

- 2. G. Takács (1996, 124–125, #26; 1996, 138, #34) analyzed it as a frozen compound *mt-ḥn.t (lit. *”young woman”) resulting from the fossilized contraction of a hypothetical Eg. *mt.(t) < AA *m-ṭ ~ *m-t “woman” [GT] + Eg. ḥwn “sich verjüngen, jung werden” (CT, ÄWb II 1639). Far-fetched.

NB: For the reflexes of AA *m-t ~ *m-ṭ cf. Bst. 1887, 453 (SBrb.-Hausa); Lippert 1906, 341 (Brb.-Hs.); Hintze 1951, 85–86 (Brb.-Om.); Wlf. 1955, 37 (Brb.-Hs.); Mkr. 1966, 14 (WCh.-NOm.-Brb.); 1989, 6 (NOm.-WCh.-CCh.); Dlg. 1973, 181 (NOm.-Dsn.); Gouffé 1974, 363 (Brb.-Hs.); Bnd. 1975, 198 (Mzg.-Hs.-NOm.-Sid.); Mlt. 1984, 158 (Brb.-WCh.-Bcm.); Blz. 1991, 362–363 (Brb.-Kcm.-PWCh.-Bata gr.); Blz. 1994 Elam, 7, #25 (Sid.-Kcm.-Brb.-PWCh.-CCh.); JI 1994 II, 346–7 (Ch.).

- 3. GT: any connection to Eg. *mt “phallus” (v. supra) and/or ḥnn “phallus”, cf. ḥnn.t “copulation (?)” (CT II 18g, DCT 339)?

mtgṭ ~ mtkṭ (Dem.) “1. (f) Armee, Streitmacht, 2. (m) Heerlager (pace Spg. 1932)” (DG 193:6–7) = mtkte ~ mtgte “Heer” (Lidzbarski 1919, 93) = mtgṭ “Heerlager” vs. mtgt.t “Heer” (Spg. 1932, 176, n. 7 & 177) = mtgt “military camp, army” (Černý 1958, 205–6) = mtgṭ “1. (f) army, 2. (m) army camp” (CED) = mtgt(j) “army” (Dem. word, quoted in DLE I 257 as LEg!) = mtgt “Armee” (GHWb 379) > Cpt. (L) ΜΑΤΕΣΤΕ “army” (CED 95, not in CD) = “Armee, Heer(lager)” (KHW 106).

NB1: The rdg. *mdgt suggested in DLE is only hypothetical.

NB2: That Lesko’s references clearly refers to the Demotic word, has been confirmed by J. Johnson (p.c., 18 April 2007) who has no references to actual examples in LEg.

- A late borrowing from Akk. madaktu “Feldlager” [AHW 571] = madaktu “1. military camp, 2. expeditionary force” [CAD m1 9] = “Heerlager” [Lidzbarski] = “army camp” [CED] (*nomen loci* < Akk. \sqrt{dwk} : dāku), which may have “entered Egypt during the brief period of Assyrian wars” as stated by H. Smith (1978, 361) pace Lidzbarski (1919, 93): “wohl während der assyrischen Okkupation direkt von den Assyryern (nicht über das Aramäische) entliehen”.

LIT. for Eg./Dem./Cpt.-Akk.: W.M. Müller, OLZ 4 (1901), 319–320 (erroneously seeking the source in Arm.); Lidzbarski 1919, 93; Spg. 1932, 176, n. 7 & fn. 4; Stricker 1937, 5; Černý 1958, 205–6, §2; CED 95; KHW 106; Smith 1979, 162; DELC 125; Quack 1996, 314; Vittmann 1996, 439.

NB: J. F. Quack (l.c.) pondered what the reasons of the anomalous (L) -é- might have been: (1) either an *Analogiebildung* of (L) where $\text{E} \sim (\text{S}) \text{A}$ or (2) due to “besonders heller Aussprache des Vokals” of its Akk. source.

mtđj (GW) “Peitschenschnur (?)” (XIX. hapax: Pap. Anastasi I 26:8, Wb II 175, 3) = “les lanières du fouet” (Lauth 1871, 635, §142 pace Chabas) = “lanières” (Ceugney 1880, 9 pace Brugsch) = “Schlauch” (Reinisch 1890, 257) = “Peitschenschnur” (Helck 1962, 563, #131; 1971, 515, #131; LÄ VII 468 index) = “lashes, thongs” (DLE I 254) = “Schnur (?) der Peitsche” (Decker, LÄ IV 922) = “Schnur (?)” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 229, n. h pace Decker) = “whip cord” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 16, §1.2.2.1 & 36, §2.1.2.5) = “whip lashes (leather items that were fixed to a whip)” (Hoch 1994, 175, §233) = “*Schnüre, *Peitschenschnüre” (GHWb 376) > Dem. (f) mt^ot̄ (with a purely “orthographic” -^o-) “bridle” (Smith 1975, 197, §1: Dem. Pap. Saqqara 153+357+376, also Kufi 17:18 falsely read by Spg. mtr) = mt^o.t (sic, with fem. -t!) “bride” (DELC) > Cpt. (S) $\bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{T}}\bar{\text{A}}\bar{\text{T}}$ (f) “camus, capistrum, fraenum” (Lauth 1871, 635, §142 pace Brugsch) = “bridle, bit” (CD 196a, not in CED!) = “Zügel” (KHW 105: no etym.) = “bridle, rein” (Smith 1978, 362) = “licon, laisse” (DELC 125).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-tá-šá-^ou (Helck) = ma-tá-ša-^ou (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = ma-ta- d_4 -^ou (Hoch). G. Vittmann (1997, 283) ignored the final -jw in mtđj maintaining that it cannot be [^ou] of GW, since “diese Gruppe steht im Hieratischen gerne am Wortende”.

NB2: Perhaps (B) $\bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{T}}\bar{\text{A}}\bar{\text{T}}\bar{2}$ “(mng. unknown)” (CD) = “Zügel (?)” (KHW) represents the same word (with a secondary, i.e., inetymological, -2).

- The same word is supposed to be preserved by mntđ (GW) “etwas aus Leder (aus Syrien)” (XIX. hapax: Pap. Anastasi IV 17:2–3, Wb II 91, 16) = “(mng. unknown)” (Camino 1954 LEM, 216) = “ein Wagenteil” (Helck 1971, 513, #92) = “part of a wagon” (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 16) = “perhaps whip lashes (in the context

of chariot equipment)” (Hoch 1994, 130, §168, cf. p. 174, §233) = “ein Wagenteil aus Leder: *Kandare” (GHWb 343).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-n-tá-si (Helck) = ma-n-tá-ši (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey) = ma-n-ta-đi (Hoch).

NB2: Misread in Burchardt 1910 II, #458. Hoch 1994, 175: “*probably a by-form*” of mtdj, Hoch 1994, 130: “*almost certainly identical to*” mtdj. The identification of both Eg. forms has been approved by G. Vittmann (1997, 283). D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 16, §1.2.2.1) too assumed in both forms the same word and regarded mntd as the primary var.: *mantaša[ʔu] > *mattaša[ʔu].

- Etymology highly debated. Apparently a foreign word.
- 1. J. Lauth (1871, 635, §142) and C. Ceugney (1880, 9) explained it from Hbr. meteg “Zaum” [GB 474] = “bridle” [KB] = “frenum” [Ceugney], PBHbr. & JAram. mitgā “Zaum” [GB & Levy 1924 III 295], cf. also Tigre mateg “thin neck” [LH 126b], which was apparently ignored by both W. Helck and J. Hoch (below).
- 2. L. Reinisch (1890, 257) affiliated Eg. mntd (misquoted as mndt) with LECu.: Saho maʕas “gerben die Haut”, Agaw *mVr- “Leder-sack”, and even Eg. md3 “Lederschurz”. Absurd.
- 3. W. Helck (1962, 563, #131; 1971, 515, #131) saw in Eg. mtdj the hitpael part. of Hbr. nšy qal “zerstört werden” [GB 516] = qal “to go to ruin”, nifal “to be destroyed, devastated” [KB 715] = “zerzaust werden” [Helck] = “to fall in ruins” [Hoch], which was rejected by J. Hoch (1994, 175). Eg. mntd, in turn, has been derived by Helck (1971, 513, #92) with hesitation (“*wenn überhaupt kan.*”) from Hbr. ntš “1. niederreißen, zerstören, 2. ausschlagen (v.d. Zähnen)” [GB 531] = qal “to tear down, pull down” [KB 736]. This etymology was also rejected by Hoch (1994, 130) on semantic grounds. D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 16, §1.2.2.1 & 36, §2.1.2.5) derived both Eg. forms from Hbr. ntš.
- 4. J. Hoch (1994, 175, §233), in turn, supposed Eg. mtdj to “*possibly*” reflect JAram. maṭraqā “Peitsche” [Dalman 1922, 233] = “Ruthe, Schlägel” [Levy 1924 III 95] = “a goad, whip” [Jastrow 1950, 770], which he (Hoch 1994, 130, §168) extended also to mntd with reservations (“*although quite difficult*”). Phonologically unconvincing. In addition, Hoch ultimately affiliated all these words with O/PBHbr. širʕā (coll.) “Hornissen, Wespen” [GB 695; Levy IV 220] = “hornet, wasp” [KB 1056], BAram. ṭarīqayyā (coll.) “hornets” [Hoch, not listed in GB, KB, Dalman, Levy, Jastrow], which raises several doubts.
NB: First, JAram. maṭraqā corresponds to Ar. miṭraq- “1. baguette avec laquelle on bat la laine ou le coton, 2. battant de dégraisseur, de lavandier, 3. marteau de forgeron, 4. bâton, gourdin de berger” [BK II 78] (< Sem. *ṭrk), which Hoch forgot to quote. Secondly, Hoch (1994, 393–4, #591 & fn. 56) affiliated the Hbr.-

Aram. coll. term for “hornets” with Aram. ṭṛq ~ ʿrʿ ~ ʔrʿ “to sting” > ʿarʿitā and ʔurʿitā “wasp, hornet”, although he failed to explain the irregular correspondences (Aram. ṭ- ~ Hbr. ṣ- are reg. < Sem. *ṭ- ≠ Sem. *t- > Ar. ṭ-, while Hbr. -ʿ ≠ Aram. -q). Moreover, the “wasp” words have been alternatively combined with Hbr. ṣrʿ (Aram. ʿrʿ) “anfallen, überfallen” [Levy] = “schlagen” [GB]. GT: or, instead, cp. perhaps Ar. ɗarʿ- “2. épine du palmier, 3. épine en gén.” [BK II 23] (with reg. Ar. ɗ- ~ Aram. ʿ- < Sem. *ɗ/ṣ-)?

mṭbl (in fact, **m3ṭb3l**) “ob: Netz (?)” (Dem., DG 150, 189): discussed s.v. **mḥbl**.

mṭ.t “Schale für Wasser und Wein” (NK: XVIII. & XX., Wb II 175, 4) = “coupe, aiguière” (AL 77.1936) = “a kind of bowl” (Ward 1985, 333, §5) = “Schale für Wasser und Wein” (GHWb 376).

NB: The word occurs during Dyn. XX in GW: ma-ṭ-tá (Ward).

● Origin obscure.

- **1.** It may be a late defective writing of OK mnt3.t (as suggested by Wb, GHWb, Ward). Strangely, W. A. Ward (1985, 333, fn. 18) regarded both mṭ.t and mnt3.t as “*old Semitic loans which, by Late Egyptian times, had become part of the native vocabulary, their foreign origin having long been forgotten*”, although he failed to present any evidence.
- **2.** GT: if, in turn, Eg. mṭ.t is a distinct (native) word, perhaps it might be derived from a old (pre-OK) etymon *mk.t < AA *m-k-w “sort of vessel” [GT] (discussed above s.v. Eg. mk “a vessel”, CED 80).

mṭ3 “herausfordern (?)” (Lit. MK: Sin. B 109–110 and Pap. Prisse 5:11, Wb II 175, 8) = mṭ3 jb=k r=f (Prisse) “if your heart girds (?) against him” (Gunn 1924, 128) = “to flout, vex”, mṭ3-jb r (Prisse) “to disagree with (?)” (Faulkner 1955, 82, n. e; FD 121) = “to flout (?), insult (?)” (Hayes 1955, 72, 82) = “insulter ou défier ou provoquer qqn.” (Žaba 1956, 114) = “herausfordern(d sein)” (Fecht 1978, 29 & fn. 40 with further exx.; 1981, 149, n. c) = “insulter, défier” (AL 78.1917 pace Fecht) = “herausfordern (auch zum Kampf)”, mṭ3 jb=k r=f (Prisse) “wenn dein Wille/Geist ihn herausfordert” (ÄWb II 1158; GHWb 376).

NB1: The phrase mṭ3 jb r (Pap. Prisse l.c.) was earlier conceived as m (vetitive) + *t3 jb r “anmassend sein gegen jem.” (Wb V 342, 8), which, as pointed out by R. O. Faulkner (l.c.) seems to be a hapax, although Z. Žaba (l.c.) was disposed to connect this *t3 jb with t3j jb “rayir le coeur” (Ani 9:6–7) in spite of the different dets. indicating two different verbs. Žaba surmised that the scribe of Pap. Prisse probably forgot to write *m mṭ3 jb=k (for the omission of m before an initial m- cf. ZAS 56, 1920, 63) due to a confusion of *m mṭ3 jb=k r=f (“*ne t’anime pas contre lui*”) with *m t3j jb=k r=f expressing a similar idea (“*ne saisis/dirige pas ton coeur contre lui*”). Faulkner’s

new interpretation has been followed by G. Fecht (1981 l.c.) and H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1999, 61). F. Junge (2003, 210, n. 63), in turn, hesitated to choose between the two renderings: mt3 (jb r) “herausfordern” or t3-jb r “anmaßend gegen”?

NB2: Whether GR mt3 “Verbum (von dem Namen)” (Myth of Horus: Edfu VI 215:2–3, Wb II 175, 7) = “?” (PL 479: perhaps also Edfu VI 214:12) represents a late (and isolated) occurrence of MK mt3 “(to) challenge” as it has been suggested by J. G. Griffiths (JEA 44, 1958, 78 and LÄ III 57) is disputed. Instead, D. Kurth (1992, 374, fn. 12) was disposed to see in it rather a term of abuse related to mt3 “das männliche Glied” (late NK-GR, Wb II 175, 5).

- Hence: mt3.w “insolent ones” (late MK hapax: Pap. Brooklyn 35.1446, Hayes 1955, 72, 82) = “les insolents” (AC 1977, 9; AL 77.1937 pace Hayes) = “die Unverschämten” (GHWb 376) = “frech” (WD II 69).
- 1. GT: most probably, Eg. mt3 < *mkr. From AA *m-k-r “to put to test, challenge (?)” [GT]? Cf. ES *m^wkr “to try, test” [Lsl.] = *mVkkVr “versuchen, probieren” [Lmb.]: Geez mkr II: makkara “to tempt, try, (put to the) test, examine, choose by testing”, Tna. mäk-kärä & Amh. mōkkärä & Arg. mōkkärä “to attempt, try, test” (ES: Lsl. 1987, 340–1; passed into Cu.-Om., cf. Lmb. 1993, 351) || SBrb.: (?) EWlm. ta-mākōrra, pl. šī-mākōrra-wen “1. défi, 3. stratagème, 4. chose difficile à réaliser, faire, comprendre” [PAM 1998, 215; 2003, 535] || CCh.: (?) Vulum mīkīrī “menacer” [Trn. 1978, 304].
NB1: W. Leslau (l.c.) separated this root from ES *mkr “to advise” (contra Dillmann 1865, 198–9; Nöldeke 1910, 76, fn. 4).
NB2: K.-G. Prasse (p.c., 10 April 2007) surmises that EWlm. ta-mākōrra “is possibly derived by an m- prefix, but I cannot prove it”. Root ṽk-r-r if not ṽm-k-r.
NB3: Bed. ankir ~ e/inker “verschmähen, -achten, haßen” [Rn. 1895, 183] is probably unrelated. For the 3rd sense of the EWlm. parallel cf. also LECu.: Afar makare ~ makre “to be hypocritical”, makreyna “crafty person” [PH 1985, 161–2], which, however, may be a late loan < Ar.
- 2. GT: less, probably, provided we accept its translation “to flout, vex” (FD), a remote etymological connection with Sem.-Brb. *r-g-m “to flout” seems perhaps also plausible (Eg. mt3 < *mkr ~ *rkm via met. and an irreg. Eg. t < *k ~ Sem.-Brb. *g).
NB: Cf. Akk. rgm “schreien, rufen, verklagen”, rigmu “Ruf, Geschrei, Stimme” [Rsl. and AHW 941, 982] || Hbr. rgm qal “steinigen” [GB 745] | Ar. rgm I “lästern, verwünschen” [GB] = I “steinigen, verfluchen”, III “mit Worten streiten” [Rsl.] || Geez rgm “to curse, insult, execrate, excommunicate” [Lsl. 1987, 465] = “verfluchen” [AHW] = “maledixit” [Rsl.] || NBrb.: Shilh & Qbl. e-rgem “injurier” [Rsl.] || WBrb.: Zenaga ti-rēgmi “Fluch” [Vcl.] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-rēm (-g^y) “1. faire un épigramme contre (une pièce de vers satirique contre), 2. p.ext. lancer un mot satirique contre [lancer, dans la conversation, une parole mordante et satirique contre]” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1603] = “verspotten (in einem Gedicht)” [Vcl.]. Lit. for Sem.-Brb.: Rsl. 1952, 140, §61; Vcl. 1952, 201. W. Vycichl (l.c.) suggested that the Brb. root was borrowed from Sem. *rgm via Punic.
- 3. GT: equally unlikely seems a comparison of pre-Eg. *mkr with Akk. (a/jB) magīrtum, migīrtu “(etwa) freche Herausforderung”

[AHW 576] = ma/igirtum “insult, insolence” [CAD m2, 44–45], which is supposed to derive from Akk. (a/jB) giārum “(etwa) herausfordern (?)” [AHW 287] ~ Hbr. gwr qal “angreifen” [GB 135] | Ar. ġwr “sécarter de la ligne droite, être injuste, commettre une injustice, opprimer qqn.” [BK I 352] = “Unrecht tun” [AHW].

- 4. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 213, #1828): ~ Ar. mšd “to be humble, humiliate” and ECu. *mīš̄- “to scorn, be antagonistic toward” < AA *-mīš̄-. Unacceptable both phonologically and semantically.

mt3 “to give, dedicate” (late NK hapax: Nauri Decree of Seti I, l. 78, KRI I 56:1, DLE I 255 after W. F. Edgerton, JNES 6, 1947, 224–5, section II.B.3.b & fn. 47 against Griffith’s rendering as “forfeiting”) = “geben, widmen” (GHWb 376).

- Hence: mt3.t “vom ererbten Landbesitz” (XVIII. hapax: Urk. IV 132:8, Wb II 175, 6) = “land-heritage” (FD 121) = “Widmung” (GHWb 376).
- GT: perhaps Eg. mt3 < *mkr, which seems related with Sem. *mkr “to trade” [Frz. 1960, 139] = “to sell, buy, trade” [Zbr. 1991, 1677] = *mkr “1. to sell, hand over, 2. betray, deceive” [Kvl.-Mlt. 1993; 1994] = *mkr “to sell” [GT], cf. Akk. (LBab.) makāru “im Handel einsetzen” [AHW 588] = “to do business, use (silver, etc.) in business transactions” [CAD m1, 126] || Ug. mkr-m (pl.) “Kaufleute (?)” [WUS] = mkr-m (pl.) “merchnats” [Gordon 1965, #1477] = mkr “verkaufen” [AHW] = G “to trade, sell” [Hnrg. 1987, 146–7: not < Akk.] = mkr N “to be sold”, mkr “merchant, commercial agent, runner” [DUL 543–4], Phn. mkr “to sell”, mkr “merchant, seller” [Harris 1936, 117], Punic mkr “to sell” [DNWSI 625], O/PBHbr. mkr qal “verkaufen” [GB 422] = mkr qal “1. to sell, 2. betray to others”, meker “1. purchase price, 2. saleable items, 3. trade” [KB 581–2] = mkr qal “to sell” [KB 581] = mkr “sale of land, the land sold” [DNWSI], Syr. mkr “emittere (sponsam), despondere, desponsus esse” [Brk.] = “to buy” [Zbr.] = “to sell” [Lsl.] | OSA: Sab. mkr (coll.) “traders” [SD 85] = mkr “merchant, tradesman” [Biella 1984, 274], cf. Ar. mkr II “accaparer des grains pour les vendre au plus haut prix” [BK II 1138] = II “wucherisch Korn aufkaufen” [AHW] (Sem.: WUS #1567; Zaborski 1971, 73, #122; Zbr. 1991, 1677; Kvl.-Mlt. 1993, 28, #1; 1994 MS, 3, #3.1). With respect to the Eg. cognate, we may reconstruct the a primary sense of Sem. *mkr as “to sell, hand over”.

NB1: The relatedness of Ar. makara I “1. tromper qqn., agir avec ruse à l’égard de qqn., séduire, induire en erreur” [BK II 1138] = “to deceive, cheat” [Zbr.] has been suggested by Th. Nöldeke (1910, 76, fn. 4) and recently by A. Zaborski (1991, 1677) and others, while C. Brockelmann (1928, 385) affiliated Can. *mkr “to sell” with Eth.-Sem. *mkr “to advise”.

NB2: H. Zimmern (quoted in GB 422) surmised in Hbr. mkr a loan eventually borrowed from Sum. via Akk. makkuru. Other authors (e.g., GB 422; Möller 1911, 141; Zaborski 1971, 73, #122), however, suggest that Sem. *mkr is an m- prefix extension deriving ultimately from Sem. *kry > Hbr. kry qal “1. to purchase, buy, 2. barter for (‘al)” [KB 497] | Ar. kry III “to employ for hire”, IV “to let on hire”, VI & VIII & X “to hire” [Lane 3000] = III “locavit”, IV “to let on hire”, VI & VIII “conduxit (rem)” [Möller]. Sem. *kry is supposed to have been borrowed into PIE *k^wrey- “to buy, trade” (IS 1964, 6, #18; GI 1984, 875; Dlg. 1989, 7).

mt3 (or GW for **mt**) “das männliche Glied” (late NK, Wb II 175, 5) = “männliches Glied” (Grapow 1954, 57) = “Penis, männliches Glied” (GHWb 376) = “penis” (Walker 1996, 270) = “foreskin” (WD II 69 after Zonhoven) > GR mt “phallus” vs. mt3 (denom.?) “to erect phallus” (Hibis, Cruz-Urbe 1988, 268) = mt3 “phallus” (Edfu, PL 477).

NB1: As to whether mt3 (with linen det., V6) of the Berlin Leather Scroll (Pap. Berlin 3029, 1:9–10) has to be rendered as mt3m “swaddling clothes” (de Buck) or as defective wtg. of t3m (de Wit, ZÄS 99/1, 1972, 42) or *mt3m (Blumenthal) or as mt3 “foreskin” (here by no means “penis”), see Zonhoven, ZÄS 125 (1998), 84, who suggests that the reading as mt3 “has the advantage that no emendation of final m is necessary – assuming that mt3 may also designate the ‘foreskin’...”. In addition, the word occurs in a similar context also in Urk. VII 34:1 (MK) where surely m t3m “from the foreskin” must be read.

NB2: The same word occurs presumably also in Dem. m3d ~ md ~ m^cd “Phallus” (DG 150, 154, 193), which would have still to be proven. For LEg. -t > Dem. -d cf. Dem. hdn “ein Gemüse: Lauch” (DG 373:2) < LEg. htn (GW) “ein Gemüse: Lauch (?)” (Wb III 354), or Dem. gd “eine Frucht” (DG 595:6) < LEg. kt (GW) “eine Pflanze, deren Blüten und pr.t-Früchte als Schmuck verwendet werden” (Wb V 148) = “safflower” (DLE IV 48). Relevance might be perhaps also the interchange of GW -t ~ -d- in LEg. (GW) ktn ~ kdn “charioteer” (Hoch 1994, 341–4, §506). Note, however, that the velar environment is missing in the case of LEg. mt(3).

- Origin highly debatable, albeit is it difficult to *a priori* agree with P. Behrens (LÄ IV 1019, n. 4), who regarded this word as “*nicht etymologisierbar*”.

- **1.** Most authors (Ceugney 1880, 9; Grapow 1914, 15, 32; Spg. 1917, 96; Lacau 1970, 149, #406; Wilson in PL) assume in it an m- prefix form of Eg. t3 (phallus det.) “Mann” (OK, Wb V 344–5).

NB: The etymology of Eg. t3 (from *kl) is more or less evident. **(1)** G. Takács (1999, 39) combined it with SBrb.: NTuareg: Ghat pl. a-kal-en “gens”, Sghat dialects. a-hel < *a-kel [Bst. 1883, 324] ||| WCh.: (?) Sha ka(r)- “Leute von” [Jng. 1970, 286] || ECh.: Kabalai kálly (pl.) “men” [Stl. < ?] | Mokilko kùlè (m), pl. kùulí “Mann” [Lks. 1977, 222] = “man (vir), husband” [JI] (ECh.: OS 1990, 16, #13; JI 1994 II, 201, 231). **(2)** GT: eventually, the same AA root may be represented by WCh.:

Pero kpállè [kp- reg. < *k^w-] “penis” [Frj. 1985, 37] || CCh. *k^walV “penis” [GT]: Bura kwàl, Chibak kwalà, Ngwahyi kwèl, Margi kwal | Higi-Nkafa kwala, Higi-Fali kwàla, Fali-Jilbu kwòlàkū | Nzangi kwèrə, Mwulyen kwáàlò | Kotoko-Makeri kòlì (CCh.: Krf. quoted by Mkr. 1987, 284). For the semantic shift, cf. Eg. *mt “penis” (above). Other etymologies for Eg. t̄3 are not acceptable. (3) Spiegelberg (1917, 96) derived it from a certain Eg. t̄3j “seminare” (sic) treated by him as the etymon of Cpt. (S) ɛo, (B) xɔ “säen” (distinguished by Spiegelberg from the mng. “aus-senden” contra KHW 412), for which, however, cf. rather Dem. t̄j-šm “pflanzen” (DG 506, 605). (4) Homburger’s (1928, 332) comparison of Eg. t̄3 with forms like SCu.: Ma’a (Mbugu) mu-he, pl. wa-he “homme” etc. is just as well unreal. (5) C. T. Hodge (1976, 16, n. 2) conjectured a relationship with Sem. *d̄ikr- “man, male” (!). (6) HSED #1450: Eg. t̄3 ~ ECh.: Gabri k̄e “child” (!).

- 2. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168) connected it with Bed. mīd (m) “das männliche Schamglied” [Rn. 1895, 162] = mīd “penis” [Rpr. 1928, 213] = mīd (-d-) “penis” [Dlg. 1972, 229] = mid “penis” [Hds. 1996, 89]. A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1967, 8, #4) erroneously extended this Eg.-Bed. comparison also to HECu.: Sidamo mutā “membrum virile” [Dlg.] = mutā “membro virile” [Crl. 1938 II, 215] = mutā “membro virile” [Mrn. 1940, 231] = mutā [Hintze] = muta “penis (unpolite word)” [Gsp. 1983, 243; Hds. 1989, 387] = mut-ā “male genitalia” [Lsl.], although a direct genetic connection between the Sid. vs. Bed. words (on Cu. grounds) is impossible. Rejected by G. Takács (1999, 39).

NB1: For the AA background of Bed. mīd and the Sid. term see Eg. *mt “penis” (above). The Bed.-Eg. comparison would be phonologically possible only if we assume a late borrowing (in genetic cognates, Eg. t̄ < *k ≠ Bed. d), for which an attractive parallel is to be found in Eg. f̄jt “verlachen, für nicht achten” (XX., Wb I 576, 4) = “être negligent” (AL 78.1570) = “to assail, deride, despise, be scornful” (DLE I 190) = “verlachen, verhöhnen, verspotten, verachten” (GHWb 305) identified by Zyhlarz (1932–33, 167) with Bed. fā’id ~ fāyd “(aus)lachen, verspotten” [Rn. 1895, 75] = fāyid “to laugh” [Rpr. 1928, 182] = fāyid “lachen” [Zhl.]. This would make us suppose that NK t̄ here represents in fact a dental plosive.

NB2: A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1967, 8, #4) compared Bed. mīd with a number of phonologically unacceptable cognates (Ar. baḍa’ā “coire”, buḍ’- “initus, vulva”, LECu.: Saho-Afar māl- “coire” and even buḍd-ē “penis”, WCh.: Hausa buuraa “penis”, Bole bola “penis”, sic), which has been critically commented in Takács 1999, 39.

- 3. GT: alternatively, GW m̄t might perhaps indicate and represent the survival of a native Eg. word in the *Volkssprache*, namely that of Eg. *mt “penis” (discussed above), for which, nevertheless, a special LEg. “syllabic” orthography had to be invented due to the lack of its use in the orthography of the old *Hochsprache*. Another reason why it was not written with the “phallus” hrgl. may be that its identity with old Eg. *mt was no longer felt because of the anomalous LEg. -C₂-, the odd secondary palatalization (?) of which remains at the moment unexplained.

mt3.t “die Vezierin (als Titel der Isis)” (GR, Wb II 175, 10) = “a title of Isis at Dendera and Aswan” (Smith).

- Its derivation (suggested in Wb l.c. and Grapow 1914, 32) from Eg. t3tj “vizier” (OK, Wb V 343–4) has been queried by H. Smith (1979, 163), who was disposed to see here an m- prefix form of Eg. t3j “male” (Wb V 344–5).

NB: For the etymologies of Eg. t3.tj see Takács 1998, 126–8, #2.

mt3m “Art Kleidungsstück für Mädchen” (MK, Wb II 175, 11) = “veil” (XII./XIII., Grd., JEA 4, 1917, 34 & fn. 2) = “a woman’s garment” (FD 121) = “*Schleier” (GHWb 376; ÄWb II 1158: XI., cf. Snk. 1965, 282–3) = “swaddling clothes” (WD II 69 after Zonhoven, ZÄS 125, 1998, 84 & fn. 47).

NB1: Cf. also Quack 1992, 132, fn. 42 (with a false spelling: mč3m, sic: -č-) for declining the mng. “Windel”.

NB2: A. H. Gardiner (l.c.) emphasized that it “is a single word and not to be split up into m + t3m” as erroneously suggested by E. Dévaud (Sphinx 13, 117).

NB3: The word is supposed to occur once already in Dyn. III (mentioned between tm3.t and šnd.t on a tablet found near the pyramid of Sekhemkhet, cf. Helck, WZKM 54, 1957, 72–76) with the mng. “*Schleier” (ÄWb I 574), but D. Meeks (2005, 246, #574c) prefers to read it as mt̄ or mt̄(3) or m(3)t̄ (cf. Eg. m3t̄.t ~ m3t̄ supra) for which he found a further OK instance in PK 2004, pl. 15 (II vs. D3), where mt̄ (or m3t̄) is preceded by mtm, which Meeks supposes to be a defective form of mt3m.

NB4: Does mt3 “umwickeln” (NK hapax: Pap. Hearst 147, WMT I 413; GHWb 376) = “to wrap” (Zonhoven, ZÄS 125, 1998, 84 & fn. 56) = “to wave (?)” (Reisner 1905, 27 index) represent a defective wtg. of a denom. *mt3m lit. “to cover with mt3m” or a met. of t3m (as suggested in WMT)?

- *Nomen instr.* deriving (with prefix m-) from Eg. t3m “1. verhüllen, bedecken; 2. sich schließen (von einer Wunde)” (MK, Wb V 354, 12–14), which has been admitted in Grd. l.c.

NB1: For the etymology of this root cf. AA k-r-m “to cover, hinder, hide” [GT]: Akk. krm “hin-, zurück-, aufhalten” [Rsl.] = “(zurück)halten” [AHW 446] = “to hinder, slow down” [CAD m1, 200] || perhaps Ar. karām-at- “couverture de la cruche” [BK II 890] || SBrb.: Hgr. te-kurm-ut “prison” [Fcd.], EWlm. ta-kərm-ut “prison” [PAM 2003, 404] || WCh.: (?) AS *karam → *karəm (prefix *ka-?) “mat used for covering entrance or as fence” [GB]: e.g., Angas kārām ~ kārām “a ‘zana’ mat in the process of making, or before it is put to any actual use, made from the grass *miil*” [Flk. 1915, 209–210] = karam “a kind of mat for fencing” [ALC 1978, 24] = karam ~ karm “fencing mat” [Gcl. 1994, 41], Mpn. krēm (so, -e-!) “door mat (mat that is hung at the entrance of the house and serves as a door)” [Frj. 1991, 27], Gmy. karam “a mat” [Srl. 1937, 95] = karəm “mat” [Krf.] = karam “mat”, cf. karam-šin “skin” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 15] etc. (AS: GT 2004, 166) | Ngz. kūfūm “hidden, hidden up” [Schuh 1981, 100]. For the semantic dispersion cf. e.g. the history of IE *wer- V “1. verschließen, bedecken, 2. schützen, retten, abwehren” (IEW 1160). The Akk.-Brb. parallel is due to O. Rössler (1952, 134, #26), who compared also Hgr. e-krem “replier, ourler (une étoffe, une peau), replier sur lui-même le bord d’un vêtement (en faisant au bord du vêtement un ou plusieurs plis irréguliers), retrousser le bord d’un vêtement”, ti-kremrem-t “ride” [Rsl. pace Fcd. 1951–2, 876–7], cf. EWlm. &

Ayr ə-krəm “(re)plier” [PAM 2003, 403], assuming a common Sem.-Brb. *k-r-m “hin-, zurückhalten, zurückstreifen, falten” [Rsl.], which seems less convincing for semantical considerations. The equation of Eg. t3m (*k3m) with Ar. kmy: kamā I “taire, cacher (p.ex. son témoignage)”, kumiya “être tout couvert d’une armure, être armé de pied en cap” [BK II 932] = kamā “verhüllen, bedecken, verbergen” [Clc., Vrg.] suggested by F. von Calice (1931, 37; 1936, #354) and J. Vergote (1945, 144, #22.6) cannot be accepted (Eg. -3- ≠ Sem. *-y).
 NB2: L. Homburger (1930, 300) Eg. m3m (!) with Ful som-āde “s’envelopper”. Absurd.

mtwn (fighting bull det.) “Kampfplatz: eigtl. Kampfplatz der Stiere; auch in einem Dorfnamen des A.R.” (OK, Wb II 175, 12; WD II 69: cf. RdE 15, 1963, 51f.) = “the fighting place of the Bulls” (Rowe 1942, 342) = “lieu de bataille, foncer la tête en avant” (Keimer 1943, 188) = “arena” (FD 121) = “le champ de bataille, l’arène (désigne le lieu où les taureaux se battent)” (Sauneron 1963, 51) = “bull-ring” (Smith 1979, 161) = “Arena (?)” (Behrens, LÄ VI 17) = “Arena, Kampfplatz” (GHWb 376; not listed in ÄWb I 1558). Occurs also in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as [mt]wn(t) (Osing 1998, 105–6 & n. a vs. p. 304 index: mtnw!).

NB: F. L. Griffith (ZÄS 34, 1896, 41) rendered twn.w as “a lassoed ox” suggesting that the det. of OK TN mtwn “is an ox tripped up by a rope or bolas”, which has been disproved by H. Schäfer (1906, 74–76) pointing out that the exx. of the det. from Dyn. V depict in fact “ein Tier..., das vor Erregung den Boden mit dem Hufe scharrt, so daß der Sand ihm in etwas unnatürlich gezeichneter Kurve über den Kopf fliegt” (instead of a bull “der in seiner stürmenden Kraft mit der an den Hörnern hängenden Fangleine dem Jäger durchgegangen ist”). Similarly, L. Keimer (1943, 188) maintained that the fighting bull det. “représente un taureau qui fait jaillir sous son sabot un jet de sable. Ce sable ne peut être perçu au même moment sur toute sa trajectoire telle qu’elle est représentée”. So also S. Sauneron (1963, 51 pace Schäfer): “le taureau de combat, au moment où il frappe le sable ou la poussière de son sabot de devant, et la fait jaillir en l’air avant d’attaquer”.

- *Nomen loci* (with prefix m-) deriving from the unattested OK etymon of Eg. twn.w “Kampfstier” (XVIII., Wb V 359, 13; GHWb 950) = “fighting bull” (Smith 1979, 161) = “taureau de combat” (Cauville 1987, 183), which is first attested in the MK (ÄWb II 2731) and may be related to MK twn (fighting bull det.) “(hinein)stoßen (in: m)” (CT, Wb V 359; ÄWb II 2731) = “mit den Hörnern stoßen” (AÄG 109, §254) = “to gore (with horn), stick into (m), throw (with force)” (FD 304; DCT 752) = “to attack, smite (mng. not clear)” (PL 477). Cf. Černý 1945, 33–34, n. 1; Sauneron 1963, 51.

NB1: H. Grapow (1914, 32) recognized the prefix m- but failed to name the simplex. There is no agreement on whether we are dealing here with a *nomen loci* of the verb or the noun. E. Edel (AÄG 109, §254) and P. Wilson (PL 477) derived mtwn directly from twn “stoßen” (PL: lit. *“(place of) attacking”), while H. Smith (1979, 161) and S. Cauville (1987, 183) were disposed to explain it directly from twn.w “Kampfstier” (GT: lit. *“(place of) the fighting bull”).

NB2: The etymology of Eg. *ṭwn* is uncertain. C. T. Hodge (1968, 24) ignored the OK *t-* of *mṭwn* and proposed false cognates with initial **t-* (derived from a certain AA **tiwn-*), although several form quoted by him evidently originate from **t-m* (with **-m*). G. Takács (1999, 39–40, 80, 104; 1999, 365) affiliated Eg. *ṭwn* (< **kwn*) with Ch. **k-[w]-n* “buffalo” [GT], although in Chadic studies, the *-C₂-* in this well attested common Ch. root has been usually reconstructed as **-b/ḃ-* instead of **-w-*: PCh. **kVbVn* [IS 1966] = **k-b-n* [NM 1966; JI 1994 I, 22] = **kəbən* [Nwm. 1977] = **kəb*“in [Skn. 1984, 24] = **ka-HVpan-* (prefix **ka-*) [Stl. 1996, 61] > WCh. **kəbən* [Schuh 1982, 19] = **kaḃani* [Stl. 1987] > AS **kəbən* ~ (met. of glottalization) **kəḃən* (preserved in Suroid), hence **kəyon* (Gmy.) vs. **kəyon* (Kfy, Mnt.) vs. **kən* (Angas) “buffalo” [GT 2004, 204–5] | Bole-Tangale **kabən* [Schuh 1984]. Takács supposed forms like CCh.: Gisiga *gūwǒng*, Balda *gǒwǒn* | Hina *kəwón*, Daba *kəwúm*, Musgoy *koowóon*, Gawar *kəwón* | Gidar *kəwén* (CCh.: Str. 1910, 466; 1922–23, 132) || ECh.: PSomray **g-w-n* [GT: from **k-w-n*]; Somray *gùnī* [Jng], Ndam *gūn* [Jng], Tumak *gùn* [Cpr.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 50–51) to preserve the original PCh. **-VwV-* (developing into *-VḃV-/VḃV-* in intervocalic position in the majority of the Ch. reflexes, which needs further inner Ch. evidence).

mṭpn.t “Art Schurz (aus Gold)” (MK, Kairo 28092, Wb II 175, 14) = “Art Schurz: Phallustasche (?)” (Grapow 1914, 32) = “(dans les frises, peint en jaune, était en or ou en électrum, la forme d’une vase uni ou couvert de stries alternées et muni d’un cordon du suspension; la indication *r-ḥ.t=f* ‘pour souvenire’ désigne) une sorte de poignards, une amulette” (Jéquier 1921, 94–95, #G) = “une sorte d’amulette qui devait se placer sur le ventre du défunt (*r ḥ.t=f*), qui avait la forme d’un vase ou d’une moitié de disque et était muni de cordons de suspension” (Jéquier 1921, 153) = “*ein Amulett” (GHWb 376; ÄWb II 1158–59 with further MK exx.).

NB: G. Jéquier (1921, 153) and R. Hannig (ÄWb II 1158 vs. 1157) distinguished it from MK *mṭpn.t* “Dolchscheide” (Wb, discussed above) = “fourreau de poignard” (Jéquier). For the obscure PT hapax *mṭpn.t* “ein Amulett” (ÄWb I 574) cf. MK *mṭpn.t* above.

- 1. H. Grapow (1914, 32) maintained a common origin of MK *mṭpn.t* “Art Schurz” (Grapow: act. **Tasche für den Phallus*“?) vs. MK *mṭpn.t* “Dolchscheide” (Grapow: **Tasche für den Dolch*“?) in spite of the consequent difference of the second consonants.
- 2. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 104; 1934, 109) identified Eg. *ṭpn.t* “Art Gewebe” (MK, treated as hapax in Wb V 364, 7, cf. Gauthier & Jéquier 1902, t. 23), which R. Hannig listed (ÄWb II 1159) s.v. MK *mṭpn.t* (as “*unklar*”), with SBrb.: Hgr. *é-tfen* “natte d’afezu (se plaçant verticalement et servant de paravent, mot ancien qui n’est plus us. du tout)” [Fcd. 1951–52, 1885] = *ε-tfən* “Vorhang” [Zhl.], which might be only connected if (1) MK *ṭpn.t* existed and (2) the MK *-t-* in (m)*ṭpn.t* were false archaization for **-t-* in the original **mṭpn.t* (old Eg. *ṭ- ≠* Brb. **t-*). Unlikely.

mtp.r.t (GW, metal det.) “subst. de sens inconnu” (XIX. hapax: KRI II 672:3, AL 79.1420) = “a tool (?): chisel (?)” (Hoch). No mng. in GHWb 377.

NB: Syllabic spelling: ma-ti-pa-r-ta (*mapšilta?) (Hoch).

- Etymology obscure. Apparently a foreign word.
- **1.** D. Meeks (AL l.c.), followed by R. Hannig (GHWb): “à *rapprocher de*” tprt (GW) “Streitwagen der Hethiter” (late NK, Wb V 364, 10) = tprt (sic) “char de guerre” (AL) = tpr “chariot” (DLE IV 109) = “bronze covered chariot” (Hoch 1994, 365, #542: borrowed from Akk.?) = tprt ~ tpr “*Lastkarren, Troßwagen”, n thr ~ “Teher-Krieger der hethitischen Wagentruppe” (GHWb 952), which has also metal det. An Anatolian loan? But Meeks left the mng. of mtp.r.t and the function of m- unexplained.

NB: Searching for a possible Anatolian source of LEG tprt, J. Puhvel (kind p.c., 12 April 2007), purely hypothetically and tentatively, would not exclude that a Hittite fit might be *zupparu-/zuppari-* ‘torch’ (cf. Akk. *ṭiparu* “torch” [not listed in AHW 1392a]?), which would require an *ex hypothesi* second sense “war chariot”. Parallels for the semantic change could be Hitt. *tiyarit-* “wagon” ~ Hurr. *tiyari* “spindle or ‘torch’”, and Engl. ‘torque’ (technical for “rotation”) < Lat. *torques* “twist” and “torch” (hence French *torche*) < Vulgar Latin base vari. **torca*. If the mng. “wheel(s)” could be *pars-pro-toto* metonymy for “c(h)ar(iot)” (cf. Skt. *rātha-* “chariot” ~ Lat. *rota* “wheel”, or Engl. “to get wheels” ≈ “to buy a car”), so perhaps could “torque” or “rotor” (cf. Myc. a-ko-so-ne > Gk. ἄξονες “axles” alternating with a-mo-ta > ἄρματα “chariots” at Knossos).

- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 175–6, §234), in turn, saw in it an m- prefix *nomen instr.* borrowed from Sem. reflecting MHbr. *məpasselet* “plane, sculptor’s chisel”, NHbr. *mapselet* “chisel” < Hbr. *psl* “to hew”.

mtn “Weg, Straße” (OK, Wb II 176, 1–7) = “1. road, way, 2. course” (FD 122) = “cammino” (↔ w3.t “percorso illimitato”) (Roccati 1998, 89) = “Dammweg” (!) (Snk. 1999, 90) = “Weg, Straße (auch Wasserstraße, richtige Lebensführung)” (ÄWb II 1159) > Dem. *mjt* (masc.) “Weg” (DG 153:11) → Cpt. (S) *MOEIT*, (A) *MAEIT*, (ALM) *MAEIT*, (FM) *MAIT*, (B) *MWIT* etc. “1. Weg, 2. Ort, Stätte” (KHW 89) = “road, path” (CD 188a; CED 92). Occurs in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as *mdnw-ḥw* “begangener Weg” (Osing 1998, 105).

NB1: Vocalized as **mōjten* (Sethe 1908, 39) = **mátī(ē)n* > **mátī(ē)* > **mājī* > **mājī* → (B) *MWIT* vs. **mājī* → (S) *MOEIT* (Albright 1937, 192) = **májī* ~ **májī* n, i.e., **májī*/un (Fecht 1960, 86, fn. 5& 180, §373) = **májītan* (Vrg. 1973 Ib, 155) = **májt̃n*. ~w (Osing 1998, 106, n. b & fn. 483 with lit.). K. Sethe (1908, 39, 42), W. Spiegelberg (KHW 66), and W. Vycichl (1990, 65) assumed OEg. *mjtn*, but C. Peust (1999, 233) rightly emphasizes that there may have been no semivocalic element in the OEg. form, although his explanation of -j- of Dem. *mjt* (masc.) and (S) *MOEIT* via some “diphthongization” is also rather vague. The instances of late

NK mt (masc.) < old mtn (see Fischer-Elfert 1986, 76, 89, 189) suggest a shift of $n > j \sim \emptyset$ (i.e., LEg. *mtj ~ *mjt via met.), which is paralleled by Eg. jtn > *ʔāti(ē) (Alb. l.c.) = *jāti < *jāti/un (Fecht 1960, 86, fn. 5) attested in Amarna cuneiform (EA 155) ma-ia-a-ti reflecting Eg. PN mrj.t-jtn (daughter of Ekhnaton); Eg. nnšm (*nājši/un) > Cpt. (S) ἠοϞιω (Fecht 1960, §262). For further exx. of $n > j$ in Eg. see Lacau 1970, 29–41. Recently, J. F. Quack (2003, 170) put a question-mark between Dem.-Cpt. mjt and Eg. mtn, but no arguments were presented.

nb2: G. Burkard (1977, 21) erroneously explained also mj.t (fem.) “Weg, Straße” (late NK, Wb, supra) from old mtn, which, however, may represent two distinct etymons that were probably only confused as correctly surmised already by H. Smith (1978, 360). Note that this distinction was kept until Cpt., cf. Dem. mj.t (fem.) “1. Weg, 2. auch in der Bedeutung: Lehre, Art u.ä.” (DG 152:3) with an orthography significantly different from that of Dem. mjt (masc., above) < LEg. mt < old mtn.

nb3: W. Schenkel’s (l.c. supra) rendering “Dammweg” (no evidence presented) seems rather daring (cf. contra Kuhlmann 1992, 198, fn. 24). H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1986, 177, n. d) pointed out the semantical difference between mtn vs. w3.t and mj.t “Weg” rightly emphasizing that “eine semantische Wortfeld-Untersuchung wäre nötig”.

- Etymology very debated. The fact that L. Bender (1975, 181, #65.6) has no AA no cognates for it seems to support its inner Eg. etymology.
- 1. W. Vycichl (1951, 72), followed by G. Takács (1996, 52, #27), analyzed it on the analogy of Cpt. (B) ΜΑΜΜΟΩΙ “chemin (lit. endroit où l’on marche)” (DELG) as a *nomen loci* deriving from an old verb of motion (via prefix m-), namely OEg. *jtn (or sim., from *jkl?), which may be affiliated with Sem.: perhaps Ar. wkl III “2. marcher lentement, lourdement (se dit d’un cheval lent et paresseux)” [BK II 1599] = “to go with slow steps, with difficulty (of riding animal)” [Mlt.] ||| Eg. tntn (GT: from *kkl, redupl. of *tn < *kl?) “zu Fuß gehen (Gegs. zu Wagen Fahren)” (late NK hapax: Pap. Anastasi I 24:8, Wb V 385, 10; GHWb 958) ||| Brb. *y-k-l “betreten, reisen, gehen” [Vcl.] = *ṽVkvI, *ṽV-klVṽ [Mlt.] = *k-l-y ~ *y-k-l “to go on feet, step” [GT], cf. NBrb.: Shilh s-īkəl (caus.) “reisen” [Vcl.: from *sa-ykal] | Mzg. ukel “marcher sur, piétiner, fouler”, s-kel “marcher à pas de loup, ramper, partir précipitamment, en cachette, sans avertir”, ti-kli “1. marche à pas de loup, 2. marche, 3. allure, manière de marcher, 4. départ (précipité)” [Tf. 1991, 331], Ait Sadden ti-čli [č < *k] “la marche” [LR] | Figig ti-šli [š < *k] “la marche” [Ksm./LR], Rif: Temsaman & Tuzin ti-šri [š < *k] “la marche” [LR], Mzab ti-čli [č < *k] “marche, démarche, conduite” [Dlh. 1984, 22] = “ходьба, переход” [Mlt.], Wargla a-kəl, yu-kəl “suivre, marcher, voyager”, ti-kəl-t “voyage, fois”, ti-kli “(dé)marche, allure, conduite, fois” [Dlh. 1987, 142] | Qabyle ti-kli, pl. (rare) ti-kli-win “marche, allure, conduite” [Dlt. 1982, 402] = ti-čli “la marche” [LR], Zwawa ti-ikli “ходьба, переход” [Mlt.] || EBrb.: Siwa ukəl “marcher”, ti-kli

“marche et pas” [Lst. 1931, 193, 257, 314], Sokna a-kəl “cheminer” [Lst. 1931, 257] || SBrb.: Common Tuareg *təkle “Reise” [Vcl.: *ta-ykle], Hgr. s-ikəl (caus.) “voyager, marcher au pas”, tē-klé “marche au pas (sans courir)”, tē-kkil-t “empreinte de pied”, ā-tū-kla “1. piéton, 2. p.ext. homme” [Fcd. 1951–2, 781–3] = s-ikəl “to go” [Mlt.], EWlm. & Ayr š-ikəl “voyager, aller au pas (cheval, chameau?), aller au pas renforcé (chameau), trotter (à n’importe quelle allure du trot lent)”, te-kle (pl. EWlm. ta-kli-wen, Ayr te-kla-wen) “marche (au pas), manière de marcher, allure”, ta-kkol-t “pas, empreinte de pied” [PAM 1998, 149; 2003, 369] (Brb.: Vcl. and Mlt. quoted below) ||| LECu.: Rnd. kila/kil- “to go” [Flm. 1964, 68, not listed in Schlee 1978 and PG 1999].

LIT.: Vcl. 1951, 72 (Eg.-Brb.); Mlt. 1991, 262, #34.13 (Brb.-Ar.); Takács 1996, 52, #27; 1999, 137; 1999, 204, #3.11 (Brb.-Eg.-Ar.).

NB1: V. Orel (1995, 104, §70; HSED #1418) combined Brb. *kVI- “to go” (sic!) with CCh. *kal- “to run, go quickly” [Orel] derived from AA *kal- “to move, go” (cf. also HSED #1420, #1474), which is semantically dubious. The comparison of the Brb.-Ar. isogloss with late Eg. *tn̄n* is due to G. Takács (1996, 52, #27).

NB2: The Ar. cognate suggested by A. Ju. Militarev (l.c.) is semantically dubious, since its basic sense may be eventually different, cf. Ar. wākil- “lent, paresseux, qui a besoin de l’éperon et du fuet”, wukal-at- “impuissant, faible qui remet tout aux soins des autres” [BK].

- **2.** G. Fecht (1960, 180, §373) and J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 155) derived it directly from the LEg. hapax *jtn* “?” (Wb I 145, 14) = “marcher” (sic!) (Vrg.), which should be subject to further research.

NB1: With respect to its context (*j3h.w jtn.w n r^c*, said of Osiris), it might be perhaps identical rather to the late NK denom. verb *jtn* “(be)leuchten” (Mag. Pap. Harris 4:5, GHWb 112, cf. Wb I 145, 12) with a change of det.

NB2: W. Vycichl (DELIC 109) assumed more carefully just a derivation of Eg. *m̄tn* from a hypothetical OEg. **jtn* “marcher” (without any reference to LEg. *jtn*).

- **3.** P. Kaplony (1966, 80, §166) and K. P. Kuhlmann (1992, 198, fn. 24) saw in it “*eine m-Bildung*” of Eg. *tn̄j* “erheben” (PT, Wb V 374–5, Kaplony: “*wohl ‘vom Boden aufheben’, mit dem erhobenen Wurfholz der Vogeljagd determiniert*”), which – according to Kuhlmann – “*bezeichnet ursprünglich vielleicht den ‘aufgeworfenen Dammweg’, obwohl dies nach der Situation hier*” (i.e., in the story of the Eloquent Peasant) “*kaum der Fall sein wird*”, since “*ein Dammweg erfordert einen Kanal auch jenseits der Straße*” (not to be deduced from the examined passage). Kaplony also reconstructed a primary sense “*erhobener (aufgeschütteter) Dammweg*”. The mng. “Dammweg” and the same etymology (lit. “Erhobener”) was suggested by W. Schenkel (1999, 90 & fn. 37) too, who, in addition, extended the derivation from Eg. *tn̄j* also to *m̄tn* “Führer” (lit. “Herausgehobener”).

- 4. GT: alternatively, Eg. *mṭn* (if < *mk^{wl}) might be, in principle, also an m- prefix cognate to CCh. *k^{wal}- “1. far, 2. way” [GT]: Fali-Kiria kwāl(u) and Fali-Gili kwal “road” [Krf. 1972 MS] | Hurzo kwālālā, Mkt. kàrkár, Gsg. míkiléṅ “far” (MM: Rsg. 1978, 247, §249) on the analogy of Eg. w3.t “Weg” < w3j “fern (sein)” (OK, Wb I 245–6) etc.
- 5. GT: Eg. *mṭn* (< *mkn?) is probably unrelated to NOm.: Gongga ming-o “chemin” [Beke apud Lsl. 1956, 215] > ES: Gafat managi-š “chemin” [Beke].
- 6. The connection with Agaw: Kunfāl maki “road” [Birru-Adal 1971, 102], pondered by G. Takács (1996, 52, #27), cannot be confirmed.

mṭn “der Führer auf dem Wege, bes. der Scheich der Beduinen” (MK, Wb II 176, 9–10) = “Sche(i)ch (?) oder Beduine” (Borchardt 1891, 63) = “sheikh (lit. path-finder?)” (FD 122) = “guide chez les bédouins, khabīr” (DELC 109) = “Wegführer (bes. in der Wüste)” (GHWb 377; ÄWb II 1159).

NB1: For its occurrence in Dyn. III see FÄW 203 (beside Ranke PN 167:19): “Wegführer”; H.G. Fischer, JNES 18 (1959), 262: “(to) guide” (either noun or verb, cf. also WD III 58); Kahl 1994, 730, #2265: “Führer”; Jones 2000, 453, #1696: “?”.

NB2: The title *mṭn* in PT 952a has been rendered diversely, cf. Wb II 176, 11: “ein Türhüter im Himmel (vgl. das vorsteh. Wort)”; ÜKAPT: “Wegewarte”; Fischer 1959, 263, fn. 71: “(designates) a doorkeeper of the netherworld”; AEPT 164 (cf. Jones l.c. suggesting an erroneous rdg. *mṭn*-w3.t): “Keeper of the Way”; ÄWb I 575: “Wegführer”.

NB3: Cf. also LEg. *mṭn* (spelled also as *mt* without -n) “guider, devenir chef” (Černý, BIFAO 41, 1942, 16) = “to guide” (Gdk., RdE 38, 1987, 73, n. 49) supposed to derive from the same root as a denom. verb.

- Its generally accepted rendering “Führer auf dem Wege” (maintained in the standard dictionaries, cf. e.g. Wb, FD, DELC, GHWb, FÄW, ÄWb, cf. esp. the *Beleg* ad Wb II 176, 9) suggests that it may be related with Eg. *mṭn* “Weg” (OK, Wb, above) and eventually also with Eg. *mṭn* “anweisen” (OK, Wb, below).
- Any other etymology is probably out of question.
- 1. K. Sethe (ÜKAPT VI 135) surmised PT 952a *mṭn* to represent an m- prefix *Berufsbezeichnung*. H. G. Fischer (1959, 263, fn. 71), although rightly connected it with *mṭn* “Plätze anweisen”, maintained the strange hypothesis that “*it may be considered whether mṭn* ‘way’ is not a secondary (!) application of *mṭn* ‘guide’ and whether the verb (!) *mṭn* may not contain a preformative m + the verb *ṭnī* ‘raise up, distinguish’...” (hesitating to do so only because this derivation is “not among the examples listed by”

M. K. Feichtner 1932, 218f.). P. Kaplony (1966, 80, §167) too: *tnj* “erheben” > *mtn* “Jäger mit dem erhobenen Wurfholz”. W. Schenkel (1999, 90 & fn. 38) derived *mtn* “Führer” directly (!) from Eg. *tnj* “to raise” (supposing a basic sense “Herausgehobener”), whence, in addition, he explained also Eg. *mtn* “Dammweg” (sic) for which he suggested an original mng. “Erhobener”.

- **2.** GT: the coincidence of Eg. *mtn* < **mkn* with Ar. *makuna* “avoir d’influence, du pouvoir, être homme considérable, jouir d’autorité”, II “établir qqn., surtout dans un poste élevé, donner à qqn. le pouvoir sur qqch.”, IV “1. établir qqn. comme chef et lui donner le pouvoir sur qqch.”, V “être puissant, influent, pouvoir beaucoup, 2. pouvoir faire, être de force à faire telle ou telle chose, 3. se rendre maître de qqch. et avoir en son pouvoir”, *makīn-at-* “3. autorité, pouvoir, influence dont on jouit auprès du prince, etc.” [BK II 1139–40] = *makuna* I “to be strong, powerful” [Zbr.] > ES: Tigre *məkən* “great hero, violent knight” [LH 133; Lsl. 1982, 51] may be purely accidental.
NB: The etymology of the Ar. root is disputed. Fagnan (1923, 165) took Ar. *makuna* II “rendre maître de, donner comme territoire” to be a denom. verb of *makān* (nomen loci < \sqrt{kwn}) “1. place, endroit, lieu, 2. place distinguée, élevée, rang élevé” [BK II 1139]. For different (biconsonantal) inner Sem. etymology of Ar. *mkn* see Zbr. 1971, 72, #119; Grande 1963, 15, 17.
- **3.** GT: the same pertains to LECu.: Afar *makawán*, pl. *makāwōn* “Häuptling, Herrscher” [Rn. 1886, 881] = “chief, king” [Mkr.] erroneously equated by H.G. Mukarovsky (1987, 124) with a certain CCh.: Dghwede *màgàná* “chief, king” [Mkr.]. Both *comparanda* are clearly unrelated.
NB1: The Afar term seems to ultimately originate from ES * \sqrt{kwn} . But it is not listed in Parker & Hayward 1985 unless – as suggested by D. Appleyard (p.c., 10 April 2007) – it is a poor transcription of *makāban* “elder, clan chief”, the plural of which is *makābon* ~ *makābana*, which may be an indigenous Afar term, as there is no ES root it could derive from. Appleyard doubts if it could be a corruption of Ge’ez & Amh. & Tna. *mākwānnen* “nobleman, officer” (< $\sqrt{k^w-n-n}$).
NB2: On the other hand, the validity of the Dghwede form is controversial as Ch. Kraft (1981 III, 112, #91) has Dghwede (Zeghvana) *mùrāma* “king”.
- **4.** GT: that Ar. *malk-* “3. milieu ou le bord du chemin”, *milk-* “milieu du chemin” [BK II 1151] may eventually stem from Ar. *malik-* “king” on the basis of the function of king as guide or leader (A. Măcelaru, p.c. 22 April 2004), may only be relevant as typological parallel but hardly as a genetic one.

mtn “(Plätze) anweisen (PT 2040b, Wb II 175, 15; GHWb 377; ÄWb I 574; ÄWb II 1159: CT III 188a, VII 1521, VII 153g) = “bestimmen” (Sethe 1928, 63 pace Erman: PT 2040b) = “to assign (places)”

(AEPT 292 & AECT I 172, spell 215, n. 13: PT 2040b; AECT III 80, spell 940, n. 3: CT VII 152l: object unexpressed) = “assigner (une place)” (AL 78.1920 pace Fischer, JNES 18, 1959, 263, fn. 71, but cf. mtn “Führer” above) = “anweisen, geben (als Antonym zu nhm)” (PT 2040b, Barta, LÄ IV 388–9, n. 1) = “to usher (indicate direction)” (Allen 1984, 557) = “to be assigned (a place)” (DCT 190: CT III 188a, VII 152l).

NB1: R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 172, spell 215, n. 13) considered the mng. of mtn in CT III 188a as obscure and, henceforth, he regarded its connection with mtn of PT 2040 as “hardly” possible. D. Meeks (AL 78.1921), in turn, rendered it “prendre, saisir (lit. élever dans sa main)” (suggesting a derivation from tnj “to raise”).

NB2: P. Kaplony (LÄ II 1119, 13) rendered mtn in the Theology of Memphis (l. 57) not as “bestimmen” (Sethe 1928, 61–62 pace Erman) but as “erheben” (which he explained from Eg. tnj).

- The same verbal root may be present in *mtn > mtn “1. jem. mit etwas (m) beschenken, belohnen, 2. mit etwas versehen” (XVIII., Wb II 170, 11–12; GHWb 374; JW 1996, 521: LP; WD I 98; ÄWb II 1157: XVII.) = “to reward” (FD 121) = “belohnen, angesehen sein” (!) (NBÄ 90).

- Hence (as deverbal as suggested in Snk. 1983, 225):

(1) mtn.wt ~ mtn.wt > mtnj.t “Belohnung, Entlohnung (für eine Arbeit oder Herstellung eines Objekts)” (CT, Wb II 170, 14; GHWb 374–5; JW 1996, 521: LP) = “reward (used of such high rewards as might, victory, and jubilees bestowed by gods)” (Camino 1954 LEM, 31; FD 121) = “Belohnung, Ansehen” (NBÄ 90) = “Belohnung, Ansehen” (Snk. 1983, 225) = “Abzeichen” (Snk. 1999, 90: CT I 29c, VII 162bf) = “reward, indication, sign” (DCT 189–190) = “1. Belohnung, Entlohnung (für eine Arbeit oder Herstellung eines Objekts), 2. Abzeichen” (ÄWb II 1157).

NB1: Its OK attestation is problematic. J. Osing (NBÄ 90 vs. 563, n. 427) and D. Meeks (2005, 246, #575a) projected the sense “Belohnung” to OK mtn.t “Unterhalt (?)” (Wb II 176, 12 after LD II 103, cf. also Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza V 51) considered to be merely “une graphie ancienne de” NK mtn.wt. K. Sethe, followed by R. O. Faulkner R. van der Molen (DCT 189) rendered PT 161b mtn.t as “Besoldung” (ÜKAPT 135) = “grant (?)” (AEPT 45). Others, however, conceive it as m prep. + tn.t “Unterschied” (ÄWb I 1450: cf. Spiegel 1971, 187).

NB2: It has long been uncertain whether an original -t- or -t̄- is to be read in this word. Most of the standard dictionaries (Wb, FD, most recently even GHWb, ÄWb II) list it with -t- (!) (even despite mentioning the var. mtn.wt beside mtn.wt). In the majority of the CT occurrences, the word is written as mtn.wt (CT I 29c, II 204a, II 151e, VII 162bf) ~ var. mtn.jt (CT I 29c), cf. also the underlying verb mtn (CT VII 152l, VII 153g). In the light of the supposed OK etymon mtn.t and the CT vars. with -t- (above), J. Osing (1976, 90, 563, fn. 427) treated CT mtn.wt as the primary form.

(2) mtn.w “recompense (for making an object; in fact refers to the price, in which the wages of the craftsman and the value of the

material are included)” (late NK, Janssen 1975, 183, 314, 417, 425).
(3) mtn.w “Erzeugnisse (des Landes)” (GR, Wb II 170, 15).

● Etymology disputable.

■ **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 9) assumed in this root an m- prefix extension of Eg. tñj “déterminer”, while H. Grapow (1914, 32) explained it from Eg. tñw “zählen”. Both suggestions are semantically weak. W. Schenkel (1999, 90) too supposed a prefix m- prefix but without naming the underlying root.

NB: Eg. tñj [< *knj] “erheben” (PT, Wb V 374–5) has been identified with Sem. *kwn “to stand firm, be(come)” [Lsl. 1987, 299–300; Zbr. 1971, 72, #119; Mlt. 1986, 72] || NAgaw: Bilin kün “sein, existieren” [Rn. 1887, 222] = kʷən “to be, exist” [Mlt.] || LECu.: Saho & Afar kīn (part.) “seiend” [Rn. 1890, 218]. Lit.: Alb. 1918, 245, #94; Ember 1930, #11.a.57, #22.a.25; Chn. 1947, #196; Vcl. 1953, 43; 1953, 373–4; 1958, 373. Cf. still twn [< *kwn] “to r(a)ise” (MK, FD 295).

■ **2.** GT: Eg. mtn “anweisen” might be perhaps ultimately related to Eg. mtn “Weg” (OK, Wb, supra) as a denom. verb and, henceforth, also to Eg. mtn “der Führer auf dem Wege” (Wb, above).

NB: For the semantic shift cf., e.g., Hung. utal “anweisen” < út “Weg”.

■ **3.** GT: its comparison with Ar. mkn II & IV “établir qqn. comme (chef), donner (à qqn. le pouvoir sur qqch.)” [BK II 1139] = IV “arranger, ordonner” [Dozy II 607] = “in die Hand geben” [Wehr apud Behnstedt], Yemeni Ar. mkn: yemakkan (impf.) “übergeben, übermitteln” [Behnstedt 1993, 197] = mkn II (ʿalā) “to give, hand over” [Pianta 1990, 470] is not to be excluded.

NB: The Ar. root seems, however, to be of denom. origin, cf. Ar. makuna I “avoir de l’influence, du pouvoir” < makān-at- “1. place, 2. état, 3. pouvoir, influence, autorité”, makīn-at- “2. état de ce qui est établi solidement, 3. pouvoir, influence, autorité” [BK II 1139–40]. Therefore, this Eg.-Ar. would ultimately imply having to assume an eventual etymological connection to Ar. kwn: kāna “1. être, 2. avoir lieu” [BK II 945].

■ **4.** GT: alternatively, should we assume in Eg. mtn < *mkn an irregular cognate of Sem. *mgn “to give” [O’Connor]?

NB1: Attested in Akk. (Nuzi) makannu (or -g-) “Geschenk” [AHW 574b] = magannu (or -k-) “gift, present”, magannūtu “transaction involving a gift-(exchange)” [CAD m1, 31–32] || Ug mgn “to request gifts” [Gordon 1965, §19, #1419] = “beschenken” [WUS] = “to beseech (with gifts)” [Lsl.] = “gift” [O’Connor] = “present” [Watson 1999, 789, §26] = “gift, present” [DUL 531], Hbr. miggēn piel “überliefern, hingeben, 3. beschenken” [GB 397] = “to deliver up, give a person a thing” [Lsl.] = “1. to hand over, surrender, 2. give as a gift” [KB 545], JPAr. maggān “(undeserved) gift, grace”, maggān(aʷ) “gratis, in vain” [O’Connor], Phn. mgn “to present, offer” [Jean], Palm. mgn (adv.) “gratis” [O’Connor], Syr. maggān, magganaʷ “gratis”, maggānāya “freely given” [O’Connor] | Ar. (from Aram.) maḡḡān- “ce qui nous vient grātis” [BK II 1066] = “Geschenk” [WUS] = “free, gratuitous” [O’Connor] (Sem.: WUS #1513, AHW 574; Lsl. 1958, 29–30; 1968, 358, #1419; 1969, 19; O’Connor 1989, 26–27, §2 & 27–29, §3). The Ar. term passed into LECu.: Som. magan “favor” [Lsl. pace Chn. 1939, 335].

nb2: The widespread assumption, proposed by H. Kronasser (1958, 127), Laroche (1960, 200, fn. 3), M. Mayrhofer (1960, 143, fn. 58; 1961, 453; KEWA II 545–6), and W. von Soden (1965, cf. KB 545; O'Connor 1989, 29, fn. 28), that the Akk. word eventually originates from OIndic maghá-m (n) “Gabe, Geschenk, Lohn, Reichtum (gift, reward, wealth)” [KEWA] via Hurrian makanni- “Geschenk” [Kronasser] (cf. the Hurr. ending -nnu), has been recently doubted and rejected by several authors. E. Laroche (1980, 164): “*L'origine indo-arienne... n'est pas évidente... Il peut s'agir de la racine sémitique mgn*”. A. Kammenhuber (1968, 222–9) maintained a native Hurrian (not IE) origin of the stem magan- (!) leaving to Semitists to decide if it was eventually Semitic. M. O'Connor (1989, 25, 29–30, §5) insisted that Sem. *mgn is “*relatively rare, but well enough documented across a variety of languages to ensure*” that the Hurrian word came from Sem. (not *vice versa*) and that W. von Soden's hypothesis “*is no more tenable*”. W. G. E. Watson (1995, 547) too, has admitted (pace M. Salvini) that the Sem. root “*is not necessarily a loan from Indo-Aryan*” (Watson 2000 MS, 3, §26 lists further lit. for a Hurr./Vedic/Sem. origin). Whether Hurr. maganna (ma-ka-a-an-na) of the Mitanni letter (Laroche 1980, 164: absolutive sg. of maganni + poss. pron. of 3rd p.sg.: “son présent”, cf. Wilhelm, Or. NS 54, 1985, 487; others: absolutive pl.) is Vedic or Sem., was discussed rather “*inconclusively*” (Watson 1999, 789, §26) by Giorgieri and Röseler (1996, 282–3, esp. fn. 3–4), who conceived the Hurr. stem maganni (Schuler) = magan- (Kammenhuber, Farber, Girbal) = magānni (Giorgieri and Röseler) as an essive “als Geschenk”. W. G. E. Watson (1999, 131) only supposed that Ug. mgn belongs to the group of words that “*may have been borrowed back from the language which initially borrowed them*”.

- 5. GT: on the other hand, its connection with Eg. *tw̄n* “belohnen” (GR, Wb V 360, 2) = “to reward” (PL 1161) vs. *tw̄n* “Zuwendung o.ä., Geschenk” (Wb V 360, 1) = “reward, gift” (PL) seems less likely. Note that LEg. *mtwn* (m) “reward (?)” (Černý, JEA 31, 1945, 33, n. 1; DLE I 252) has been explained by R. Caminos (1954 LEM, 31) directly from MK *m̄tn.wt*, although the derivation from (or contamination with) an old var. **tw̄n* is not to be ruled out either.

nb1: In principle, NK *tw̄n* < OK **tnj* (?) “to reward” cannot be excluded (from which, however, it would be difficult to explain PT *m̄tn* “anweisen”, Wb), cf. Eg. *tw̄n* “Unterschied, Differenz” (Math., Wb V 360, 3) < *tn.t* “Unterschied” (XVIII., Wb V 376, 1; ÄWb I 1450: already PT?). Note that the GR verb *tw̄n* (*tw̄n*) might be alternatively explained as a late wtg. of Eg. *dwn* “ausstrecken” > “jem. beschenken mit (m) etwas” (LP, GR, Wb V 431, 17) = “1. to extend, 2. offer, 3. reward” (PL 1188). Nevertheless, this can hardly be true about NK *tw̄n*.

nb2: For Eg. *tw̄n* (if from **kwn*) cf. perhaps WCh. **kʷ-n* “to give” [GT] attested in Angas-Sura **č̄in* → **šin* (from **kin*?) “to give” [GT 2004, 52]: Sura *č̄in* “geben” [Jng. 1963, 61] = *č̄in* “to give” [Krf.], Mpn. *č̄in* ~ *šin* “to give” [Frj. 1991, 56, 10], Kfy. *šén* “to give” [Ntg. 1967, 35], Chip *šin* “geben” [Jng. 1965, 167] = *šin-ni* gwe “to give” [Krf.], Gmy. *šin-dong* “a present, gift” [Srl. 1937, 217] | (?) Siri *góná*, *gáná* “to give” [Skn.] | Boghom *kyañ* “to give” [Smz.] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 158).

nb3: For WCh. **kʷ-n* “to give” [GT] cp. perhaps also (as the met. of the same AA root?) Sem.: Ar. *nakaga* “payer à qq. ce qu'on lui devait” [BK II 1336] = “to pay s'one his due, give” [Lsl.] || Geez *nakaya* “to pay (back), give, make a gift” [Lsl. 1987, 398?]

- Other etymologies (which erroneously ignore NK -t- < OK -t̄- in our root) cannot be accepted:

- **6.** L. Homburger (1930, 285, 290): ~ Ful teun “donner une dot”, teño “dot”.
- **7.** G. R. Castellino (1984, 15) suggested a connection of Eg. (NK) mtn vs. mtn.wt with Hbr. ntn > mattān & mattānā “Geschenk” [GB 475] = “gift, present” [KB 654]. But in this case Eg. mtn.wt could hardly be the same deverbal m- prefix form (from a not attested Eg. *ntn) as e.g. Hbr. mattān(ā). Similarly, Eg. mtn “beschenken” could hardly be regarded as denom. verb.

NB1: Cf. NWSem. *ntn “to give” [Hnrg. 2000, 2065] attested in Ug. mtn “gift (?)” [DUL 600: < *ytn! false], PSin. mtn (*matti/an-) “gift” [Alb. 1966, 41], Pun mtn & mtnh “gift” [DNWSI], Phn. mtnh “gift” [DNWSI], Hbr. ntn “1. geben, 2. setzen, aufstellen, legen”, inf. tātōn, tāton, tēt [*tin-t-], imp. tēn, tēnāh [GB 529–530], OAram. & Imp.-Aram. ntn “geben” [GB], Off. Aram. mtn “gift” [DNWSI], Epigr. Aram. mtn? “ḏap” [SAN IV 205], Samar. Aram. mtnh “gift” [Tal 2000, 450], Syr. notal “geben” [Eilers: “wohl angeglichen an einen folgenden Dativ mit der Präp. la-”] (Sem.: Eilers 1984–86, 95).

NB2: Sem. *ntn could be derived from the biconsonantal root preserved also by Sem. *wtm “to give” [GT] in Ebl. i-ti, NI-ti /yitin/, /ʔatin/, wa-ti-nu PN “donato” [Conti 1984, 164–5] || Ug. ytn “1. geben, gewähren; 2. veranlassen”, hence mtn “Geschenk, Darbringung” [WUS #1255] = mtn “gift” [DUL 600], cf. also Ug. PN mtn-bʿl “Gift of Baal” [Gordon 1955, 293] = “(unübersetzt, kein Komm.)” [WUS #1711, cf. also Durand, SEL 8, 1991, 81–97 with further lit. & Watson 1995, 225 & fn. 106], Phn. ytn “geben” [GB].

NB3: A. Zaborski (1971, #258) and W. Eilers (1978, 130) set up a biconsonantal Sem. *tn “to give” (Eilers: Sem. *ntn vs. *ndn with n- are “deutlich präfigiert”). C. H. Gordon (1957, 273) went much further assuming a monoconsonantal (Nst.) root. MM 1983, 154: WSem. *ntn ~ ESem. *ndn are vars. G. Conti (1984, 164–5) combined Sem. bicons. *dn ~ *tn “dare” with Eg. wdn “opfern” (Wb I 391). Most recently, A. Ju. Militarev (2005, 89–90; 2006 MS, 23, §33.1) explains Can. *ntn (via prefix n-) from Can. *ytn, from which he separated Akk. ndn derived by him (via prefix n-) from a Sem. root akin to Ar. dyn “prêtre, rétribuer” [BK I 757], Jbl. edyīn “to lend” [Jns. 1981, 44], Mhr. adyēn “to lend (money, supplies), give credit” [Jns. 1987, 78], Sgt. šedyen (caus.-refl.) “s'emprunter” [Lsl. 1938, 127] ~ Eg. wdn (above).

NB4: S. A. Starostin (2003, 471) affiliated Can. *ntn and *ytn with Ur. *anta- (*amta-) “to give”, Alt. *jāt'a (~ *-t-), and NCauc. *=VtV̄.

NB5: For a late Eg. borrowing of Can. *ntn > Hbr. *mattān see Hoch 1994, 176, §235.
- **8.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 210, #1821): ~ PSem. *mt- “to travel toward” ||| SOm.: Ari māṭ “to return”. Semantically also unacceptable.

mtn “prendre, saisir (lit. élever dans sa main)” (CT III 188a, AL 78.1921) = “*nehmen” (GHWb 377).

NB: Its rendering has been debated. R. O. Faulkner (AECT I 172, spell 215, n. 13) considered the mng. of mtn in CT III 188a (“*your mouth gives me my lips that I may mtn them*”, i.e., the bread and the beer) as obscure and regarded its connection with mtn “(Plätze) anweisen” (PT 2040, Wb, above) as “hardly” possible. D. Meeks’ (AL) translation was first adopted by R. Hannig (GHWb), but later (ÄWb II 1159) he preferred “anweisen” (above).

- May be a ghost-word. If, however, the mng. proposed in AL is correct, the following alternatives are to be accounted for:

- **1.** D. Meeks (AL l.c.) suggests a derivation from Eg. ṯnj “to raise”.
- **2.** GT: *mṯl < *mkl ~ Ar. makila X “prendre (une) femme pour épouse” [BK II 1138] ||| WCh.: Gwnd. mākāle “to hold” [Mts. 1972, 78]?
- **3.** GT: or cp. Ar. mkn IV “(proprement) mettre en possession de” [Dozy II 607]?
- **4.** GT: its resemblance to WSem. *mlk “to obtain, possess” [GT] may be due to pure chance.

NB1: Cf. Samar. Aram. mlk qal “3. to seize” (“1. to rule, 2. possess”) [Tal 2000, 471], KNAram. (from Ar.) mlk “to acquire, inherit” [Sabar 2002, 219] | OSA (Sab.) mlk “to cause to possess, place in the possession of (?)”, mlk “property” [Biella 1984, 277–8], Ar. malaka “1. tenir une chose après l’avoir saisie avec la main, 6. épouser une femme”, II “6. prendre une femme pour épouse” [BK II 1150–1] = mlk V “acquérir, se rendre maître de, posséder”, VI “tenir ferme, ne pas lâcher le pied”, VIII “acquérir”, X “s’approprier, capter, gagner” [Dozy II 613].

NB2: WSem. *mlk “1. to rule, dominate, 2. possess, own” has been connected with Sem. *malk- “ruler, king” (Hnrg. 2000, 2065). A. Măcelaru (p.c., 22 April 2004), treats Ar. malaka as secondary denom. verb from Ar. malik- “king” (lit. “the one who guides”) ~ Akk. malku “plan” and Amh. mələkkət “mark(er), sign, trace”.

mtn.wt (CT VII 17v: T3C/Cairo J 47355) ~ **mtn.jt** (MK wood coffin, London 6655; CT VII 20e: T3C) > **mtn.jt** (GR Dendera) “1. (CT) Art Beil, 2. (LP) z.T. als Messer” (CT, LP, GR, Wb II 171, 6–7) = “wax axe or pole axe (represented with a delta shaped blade, colored yellow to show that it was made of bronze, the blade was fixed to the handle with straps of rivets, the handle is colored white to show that it was made of silver)” (Birch 1870, 181) = “la hache de guerre” (Jéquier 1921, 210 & fn. 1; 1921, 152 pace Brugsch) = “Typ von Streitaxt” (Kühnert-Eggebrecht 1969, 3) = “hache” (Lacau 1972, 87, §72.1; AL 79.1411 with further lit.) = mtnj.t “sort of mace or knife” (Smith 1979, 163) = “Axt” (Altenmüller, LÄ III 45, n. 36) = mtnj.t “Kriegsbeil, Knüppelbeil” vs. mtn.w “Klinge (von Beilen)” (GHWb 375) = “knife” (DCT 189.190: CT VII 17v, VII 20e).

NB1: Since the (apparently older) var. with -t- and -wt (instead of younger -jt) is attested merely by one single MK coffin text, and we have no OK occurrence of the word, the dilemma of the original -t-/-t- cannot be definitely decided.

NB2: The word is written “in der Spätzeit mit Messer-Determinativ, weil ursprünglich das Determinativ aus einer Streitaxt mit schmaler langer Klinge bestand, die in der Spätzeit, als solche Streitäxte seit langem nicht mehr in Gebrauch waren, als Messer mißverstanden wurde...” (Kühnert-Eggebrecht l.c.).

- Whether **(1)** mtn “tailler, (dé)couper, mettre en pièces” (GR Aswan hapax, Ptolemy IV, AL 78.1909) represents a denom. verb and **(2)** mtn.w and mdn.w (written for mtn.w?) “Messer” (GR, Wb II 182, 10; Jéquier 1921, 210, fn. 2 pace Brugsch) = “knife, axe” (GR Edfu, PL

476) derives from the same root, is somewhat uncertain (cf. *mdnj.t*). NB1: Ch. F. Nims (1952, 346 & fn. 29–31) surmised (correctly with strong reservations) in GR *mdn.w* a fully distinct root (old *dnj*), cf. Eg. **mdnj.t* (infra).

NB2: On the other hand, it is even less likely that GR *mdn.w* has anything to do with Eg. *mdn-ḥs* “aiguiseur à rasoir” (MK 1x, Jéquier 1921, 127 & fn. 8) = “un aiguiseur en terre cuite” (Jéquier 1921, 153, fn. 2) = “affûtoir de rasoir” (V. 1x, PK 1976 II, 423, n. d; AC 1978, 14) = “aiguiseur de rasoir” (AL 77.1948, 78.1931) = “Schärfinstrument für den Rasierapparat” (WD II 69), for which cf. below.

- Original spelling (-t-/-t-?) and etymology uncertain. In any case, it is probably an m- prefix *nomen instr.*, but the underlying root is not evident. At the moment, most likely seems #3.
- **1.** C. Ceugney (1880, 9) and G. Jéquier (1921, 152) derived MK *mtn.jt* from Eg. *dn* “abschneiden, verstümmeln” (MK, Wb V 463, 7–8) = “couper, tailler, séparer” (Jéquier), cf. also *dndn* “abschneiden” (BD, Wb V 465–6). This cannot be accepted without “*phonological reservations*” as rightly thought by G. Jéquier (l.c.), whose lit. rendering “(arme) pour trancher” (with an m- of dat., sic!) is baseless. The relationship with MK *dn* could only be possible if we assume a rare interchange of CT -t- ~ -d- (albeit ~ -t- would be rather odd, but not excluded).

NB: A number of authors (Grapow 1914, 33; Jéquier 1921, 153; SISAJa II, #158) derived GR *mdn.w* from MK *dn*, which can only hold true if we either accept the MK var. *mtn.jt* (~ **mdn.jt*) as primary and the -t- of *mtn.wt* as purely orthographic (rather improbable) and treat GR *mdn.w* as a distinct lexeme separate from MK *mtn.jt* < *mtn.wt* (unlikely)

- **2.** H. Smith (1979, 163), in turn, speculated whether it was perhaps an m- prefix derivative of Eg. *tnj* “(Substantiv als Bez. des Königs im Kampf)” (XX., Wb V 311, 3) and *tnj* “(refl.) sich messen mit (ḥn^c) jem. (im Kampf)” (XX., Wb V 311, 4) = “to measure o’self with s’body in battle” (Smith), which have, however, probably nothing to do with our word for “knife”. Declined already by P. Wilson (PL 476) as “*unlikely*”.
- **3.** GT: if its root contained originally a -t-, there appear two CT verbs that might be relevant, but their rendering is rather debated and, henceforth, the etymology based on them remains uncertain, cf. CT II 112b *tnj* “to lift up (bonds)” (AECT I 102, spell 105) = “to remove (fettters)” (DCT 760) = “zerschneiden (auch Fleisch in Scheiben); *markieren” (ÄWb II 2744) vs. CT VII 214k *tn* (knife det.) “to sculpt (?) (a shape)” (AECT III 104–5, spell 997, n. 4: not recorded; not translated in DCT 761).

NB: Already W. Schenkel (1999, 90) analyzed CT VII 17v (very suggestively) as *m-tn.wt* with a lit. mng. “Trenner”, but he failed to identify the underlying root.

- **4.** GT: if, however, MK *mtnj.t* originates from an OK **mtn* (with old *-t-), it may reflect ES: Geez *maṭnaya* (instead of *maṭanaya*) “to cut, tear” [Lsl. 1987, 373].
- **5.** GT: if it is an *m-* prefix *nomen instr.* deriving from an unattested Eg. **tn* [*< *t*], the closest parallels are to be found in SBrb.: Hgr. *tū-təla*, pl. *tū-təla-w-in* “Axt (hache)” [Rsl. pace Fcd. 1951–2, 1899] ||| Bed. *tela?* “durchbohren, -stechen, -löchern”, *til?* “durchbohren” [Rn. 1895, 226] = *til?(a)* “to pierce, bore” [Rpr. 1928, 242] || LECu.: Somali *tallal-ayya* “to vaccinate” [Abr. 1964, 235] = *tallāl* [Ehret] || (?) SCu. **ṭel-* “to poke, prod” [Ehret] ||| WCh.: Bokkos *tel* “(z.B. Baum, Holz) schneiden” [Jng. 1970, 146].
NB: The Bed.-Som.-SCu. parallels have been derived in Ehret 1987, #615 from PCu. **Tel-* “to prick”.
AP: O. Rössler (1964, 210) combined the Hgr. term with NS: Lotuko *a-tolu*, Bari *tulu* “Axt”.
- **6.** G. Takács (1996, 52, #58) mistakenly derived it from a bicons. Eg. **mt-*. False.

mṭḥ ~ mṭḥs “?”, in *ḥrj-mṭḥs* “(Titel)” (LP:, Wb II 176, 13) = “eine Königsinsignie” (since MK, Sethe 1928, 130, 132, 248 listing *exx.* from MK to XXV./XXVI.; GHWb 377; ÄWb II 1159: MK 2x).

NB: The additional -s may be identical to the suffix -s typically occurring in the names of royal insignia (*šm^o-s*, *mḥ-s*, *3m-s*, *ḥr-s*, *ḥq3-s* etc., cf. Sethe l.c.).

- The origin of the underlying root (*mṭḥ < *mkḥ*) is obscure.
NB: GT: any connection to ES **mkḥ*: Geez *makkəḥa* ~ *ta-makkəḥa* “to praise, glorify oneself, boast, brag, puff up, be honoured”, *caus.* **makkəḥa* “(also) to embellish, render magnificent”, *makkāḥi* “magnificent, glorious, boastful”, *məḥḥ* “boasting, glorify(ing), praise, object of boasting, pride”, Tigre *təməkkəḥa* & Tna. *təməkkəḥä* “to brag, rely on” etc. (ES: Lsl. 1987, 339)?

mṭk “Mischbecher” (KHW 523) = “boisson mélangée” (AL 77.1939) = “mixed drink” (Smith 1978, 361) > early Dem. *mṭk* (*so, -ṭ-*) “mixed drink” (CED: *Ankhshehsonqi* 4:18, 5:15, not in DG) = *mṭk* “Mischtrank” (KHW 523: *ibid.*) = *mtk* (*so, -t-*) “drink (what kind of a brew it was is unknown)” (Mattha 1975, 84: Dem. Legal Code of Hermupolis West 3:11) = *mṭk* “cratère” (DELC 133) = *mṭk* “Getränk, Mischwein” (Thissen 1984, 81 listing numerous Dem. *exx.*) > Cpt. (SA) *MOYᶜᶜ*, (S) *MOYᶜᶜK*, also *MOYᶜᶜ*, (SALB) *MOYᶜᶜT* “1. (intr.) to be mixed, 2. (tr.) mix, 3. (m) mixture” (CD 214a; CED 101) = “1. mischen, (sich) vereinigen, 2. gemischt sein” (KHW 114) = “se mélanger” (DELC 133).

NB1: The LEg. word has been supposed to occur in the late PN p-s-n-mṭk (Ranke PN I 136:8) rendered literally as “the vendor of mixed drinks” (CED) = “der Mischweinkäufer” (Vittmann). Recently, G. Vittmann (1996, 439) regards this analysis to be purely “*volksetymologisch*”.

NB2: E. Edel (1980, 36–37, §13) assumed a vocalized form *mēṭk (“ohne Sproßvokal” between C₂ vs. C₃) on the basis of its reflection in cuneiform as ^mpi-šá-mi-iš-ši-ku¹ (under Kambyses, KMAV 41) ~ pi-sa-mi-is-ki (under Darius I, KMAV 40) ~ pi-šá-me-el-ki (time of Assurbanipal, KMAV 32) ~ pu-sa-mis-ki (Nabukadnezar II, Edel) and Gk. Ψαμμήτιχος

NB3: Cf. perhaps also Dem. mṭk ~ mṭke (so, -t-) “résonner (de secouer, mélanger?)” (Cénival 1988, 87).

NB4: G. Mattha (1975, 84) suggested a connection to LEg. mdq and mdqt (below). Also W. Vycichl (DELIC 133) affiliated the Cpt. term with Dem. mdg “Gefäß” (DG 195) = “nom d’un récipient, prob. d’un ‘cratère’ (où l’on mélangeait le vin et l’eau à la manière grecque)” (Vcl.) which he (Vcl. 1990, 231) explained ultimately from Eg. *mdg (!). False.

- A late loan borrowed (Smith: during the Assyrian wars) from some reflex of Can. *√msk (from Sem. *msk?) “Wein mischen, würzen” [Loretz] > Ug. msk “mischen” [Ast. 1948, 219, §3; WUS #1611] = msk “to mix (drinks)” msk “mixture of drinks” [Gordon 1955, 290, #1134; 1965, #1509] = msk “to pour, draw” (not “to mix drinks”) [Dahood 1965, 64, §1509 following H. Graetz quoted also in Loretz 1993, 258] = msk G “to mix, combine”, msk “mixture, mixed wine, mixed drink”, msk-t “mixture, emulsion”, mmskn “earthenware bowl” [DUL 582, 559] = mmskn “Mischkrug” [Loretz], Phn. msk “mixer, mixing vessel (?)” [Harris 1936, 120], Pun. msk “mixer, mixing-vessel (?) (mng. unknown)” [Harris 1936, 120 with lit. contra], Hbr. mesek “Mischung, gewürzter Zusatz zum Wein”, mimsāk “Mischwein, Würzwein” [GB 440, 432] = mesek “vinum mixtum, crater”, mimsāk “amphora vinaria” [Zorell/Loretz] = msk qal “to reconstitute (by adding spice, honey)”, mesek “spiced drink”, mimsāk “jug of mixed wine (Mischkrug)” [KB 595, 605], PBHbr. msk “1. (Wein) mischen, 2. (Metall) gießen”, mesek “Mischtrank” [Dalman 1922, 243] = msk “1. gießen, den Wein mischen, 2. ein metallenes Gefäß anfertigen, eig. gießen” [Levy 1924 III 167] = mesek “clarified, mixed drink”, msk “1. to temper, mix wine (denom. of mesek), 2. cast metal (denom. massēkā, unrelated!)” [Jastrow 1950, 807] = msk “1. to mix, 2. also pouring of molten metal” [KB].

LIT. for Eg. < Can.: CED 101; Smith 1978, 361; DELIC 133; Vittmann 1996, 439–440.

NB1: The etymology of the Hbr./Can. root has been controversial in Sem. studies. Levy (l.c.) took (PB)Hbr. msk from an OHbr. *Grundwurzel* *ms- > mss. Jastrow (l.c.), in turn, derived Hbr. mesek from a root attested in PBHbr. skk (or swk) nitpo. “to be enlightened” [Jastrow 1950, 990]. Graetz (quoted by Loretz 1993, 258) considered Hbr. msk (only “gießen”, not “mischen”) secondary from mzg “nach Analogie des griechischen μισγέιν ‘Wein mit Wasser mischen’ gebildet”. A. S. Kaye (1991, 834, fn. 6)

assumed Hbr. msk to be an irregular (instead Hbr. *mšg) reflex of Ar. mašağa “to mix” that was influenced (“*semiotically realigned*”) by Hbr. nsk “to pour”. But most recently, Loretz (1993, 254–6) convincingly demonstrated the validity of OHbr. msk as a primary root inherited a common Ug.-Hbr. *√msk “Wein mischen”. GT: although the AA etymology of Can. *msk is not clear, cp. perhaps LECu.: Afar mosok (m) “becoming soft (adoucissement)”, mosòk-ed^ce “to fall into pieces, decompose, disintegrate”, mosoke ~ musuke “become soft through boiling or much wear” [PH 1985, 170].

NB2: Most of the authors dealing with the Sem. etymology of the Dem.-Cpt. term (e.g., CD l.c., KHW l.c., Smith l.c., Wittmann l.c., most recently Quack 2005, 314) explained at the same time Dem. mtk etc. also from Sem. *mzg (making no distinction from Hbr. msk), which, however, can hardly be accepted on phonological grounds (LP -t- < Can. *s vs. LP -k < Can. *-k). Can. *msk may only be regarded as a distantly related var. to Sem. *mzg, cf. Hbr. mezeg ~ -k “mixed wine, spiced wine (meaning sperm)” [KB 564] = “Mischwein” [Graetz/Loretz] = “punch” [Pope/Loretz], MHbr. & JAram. mzg “mischen”, PBHbr. mezeg “Mischwein” vs. JAram. mizgā “1. Mischwein, 2. Mischbecher” [Dalman 1922, 229] = PBHbr. mzg “mischen, mengen, gießen, insbes. Getränke durch Mischung mit andern Flüssigkeiten zubereiten” vs. JAram. mzg peal “mischen, den Wein (auch Essig) durch Mischung zubereiten”, PBHbr. & Aram. mazīgā “die Mischung des Weines, gemischter Wein” [Levy 1924 III 61] = mzg “to mix wine” [KB], Off. Aram. mzg qal “to mix” [DNWSI 608], Palm. mmzgn (sg. emph.) “mixer, cup-bearer” [DNWSI 646], Samar. Aram. mzg “pouring liquids, mixing”, qal “to mix (?)” [Tal 2000, 459], JPAram. mzg “drink”, mzg “to mix, serve, wine, pour” [Sokoloff 1990, 297], Syr. mazīg “miscuit (vinum)” [Möller], Mand. mzg “to mix, mingle, blend, combine, compound, temper” [DM 1963, 264] | Ar. (KB: < Aram.) mazağa “mêler l’un avec l’autre, l’un à l’autre” [BK II 1098] (Sem.: Möller 1911, 161). The etymology of Sem. *mzg has also been debated. The old comparison of Hbr.-Aram. mzg with Akk. mzq “saugen” [AHW 637] = “to suck” [CAD m1, 437] has been rightly queried by Wagner (BZAW 96, 1966, 73–74, #157, cf. Loretz 1993, 249, fn. 19). GB 410 eventually derived Hbr. mzg from Akk. muzīqu ~ munziqu “Rosine” [AHW 692] = muzīqu “raisin” [CAD m2, 322] = munzi/ūqu [GB], while Drower & Macuch (1963, 264) assumed the following chain of borrowing: Ar. mzg (and also mšg!) < Aram. mzg < Akk. munziqu “mixed wine” deriving from nazāqu ~ mussuku (mng. obscure). Loretz (1993, 248–9) too supposed Hbr. mzg to have been borrowed from Aram. mzg. GT: if, however, Sem. *mzg represents a primary (non-derived) root, cf. CCh.: Buduma madegey [-d- < AA *-ʒ-?] “mélanger” [Gaudiche 1938, 29]. W. Vycichl (2005, 58) saw in WBrb.: Zng. u-mzeg-en (pl.) “les mélangés ou le filtrés pour l’indigestion et les nausées on fait cuire quelques graines du gonakier (Acacia arabica L.) dans les cendres chaudes, puis on les agite dans de l’eau très légèrement salée à laquelle on ajoute du lait” [Ould Hamidun] a form that “looks like” a pass. part. *mazūg “gemischt” borrowed from Punic.

NB3: Further var. roots are attested in Ar. maḏaqa “mêler d’eau (le lait)” [BK II 1081], Ar. mašağa “mêler, mélanger” [BK II 1109]. For the comparison of the Sem. root vars. see also Möller 1911, 161 (with an IE parallel); MM 1983, 157.

***mtk.t** “(gefärbtes) “Kleid” (Osing) > Cpt. (S) μακκε, μιχ(ε)κε, μιχδε, μεκκε (f) “a woman’s garment” (CD 213a) = “Art Kleid” (Osing) = “ein Kleidungsstück (für Frauen)” (KHW 113: no etym.).

NB: Osing (NBÄ 256) assumed a vocalized form *mētk.ṯ.

- Following the suggestion by W.E. Crum (CD l.c. with a question-mark), J. Osing (NBÄ 256, 633, n. 655 & 831, n. 1114) derived it (with prefix m-) from an unattested LEg. *tkj (not *tk3) > Cpt. (S) $\alpha\omega(\omega)\delta\epsilon$, (B) $\delta\omega\alpha$ etc. “to be dyed, stained” (CD 800) = “(sich) färben, beizen”, (m) “Farbe” (KHW 444), cf. also Dem. tk3 (\approx βαφένς) “Färber” (DG 659:4) = “dyer” (CED 324) and Dem. tkj “Bild, Zeichnung (farbig?)” (Osing, not in DG). This theory was apparently either ignored or declined by C. Peust (1992, 122) briefly stating Cpt. (S) $\mu\alpha\alpha\kappa\epsilon$ to be still “*etymologisch unklar*”. GT: perhaps related to Eg. mk(3)t.t “ein Stoff” (late NK, Helck: MWNR 922, 1200) via met.?

mtt or **mtt.t** (GW, wood det.) “ein Wagenteil” (XIX./XX. hapax: Ostr. Torino 57365, 1, Helck 1971, 515, #132, cf. JEA 19, 1933, pl. 19, 2.1) = “part of a chariot” (DLE I 255 pace Helck) = “(mng. unknown, certainly not part of a chariot, could be) a staff or rod” (Hoch 1994, 176, §236) = “(Subst.)” (GHWb 377).

NB: Syllabic spelling: ma-stí-tá-(t) (Helck) = ma-ti₂-ta-{t} (Hoch).

- Origin obscure. W. Helck (l.c.): “*ohne Abl(eitung)*”. Apparently a foreign word (perhaps borrowed from a Sem. *nomen instr./loci*). J. Hoch (l.c.) pondered an eventual connection with Ar. minsa?-at- “stick, staff”

md3 (also written **md3m**, CT V 74: with skin det., V 129: rope det., VI 390: both) “(may be) lacings (?), leather lacing (?) for the hull, gunwale lashings (?)” (CT V 129a, V 74s, VI 39o, AECT II 22, 24, spell 396, n. 20 & II 37, spell 398, n. 18 & II 124, spell 479, n. 18 and 24 & III 203 index, adopted in Jones 1988, 169, §78) = “(prob.) une partie du bordage: deux pièces de bois recourbées qui ont la forme d’accoudoirs de fauteuils, sortes de bras qui servent de support aux bancs de rameurs et de barrière pour empêcher le bétail de tomber à l’eau (cette partie de la barque solaire était l’armature de grandes tentures retombantes)” (Jéquier 1911, 52, §8 & fn. 4, cf. also RT 30, 1908, 66, §8: further exx., cf. Urk. V 185:2, 185:4 with wood det.) = “lanière (?)” (AL 78.1924) = “(wohl) die lederne Einfassung der Bordkanten (wie sie in vielen Bildbelegen zu erkennen ist)” (Düring 1995, 77 & fn. 192) = “*schmaler Riemen (*lederne Einfassung der Bordkante)” (GHWb 377; ÄWb II 1159c) = “lacings (?)” (DCT 190).

NB: The original spelling of the word is debated: md3m (AECT, AL, Düring) = md3 ~ md3m (DCT) = md3m < *md3 (GHWb). Perhaps we are dealing here with a met. of -m reflected by the final additional -m, for which cf. the orthography of Eg. qm3 written in MK-NK also as qm3m (Wb V 33–38).

- GT: perhaps related to Ug. mdl I “to saddle, prepare a mount for a rider” [Gordon 1955, 286, #1068] = “Gespann (yoke, harness)”, denom. mdl “anschirren, satteln” [WUS #744a] = mdl “to tie, attach (?)” [Greenfield 1964, 527f.] = mdl “to attach a guide rope”, mdl “a guide rope (a rope to guide the ridden animals)” [Good, UF 16, 1984, 77–81] = mdl “strap, halter, a strip of tanned leather”, denom. mdl “to strap (or the like), put on or attach a halter (to an ass), tie a lead-rope to a donkey” [Watson 1986, 73–74; 1996, 76, §6; cf. also 1986, 18] = mdl G/D “to bridle”, mdl “part of the harness (?)” [DUL 527: etym. uncertain].

NB1: Although the rendering of Ug. mdl by diverse authors is quite coherent, its Sem. etymology has been highly disputed. Aistleitner (WUS #744a) took the Ug. verb mdl (as denom.) from Ug. mdl (noun) that he treated as *nomen instr.* of Ug. dll D “erniedrigen, verachten”. Greenfield (l.c.), following Goshen-Gottstein (Biblica 41, 1960, 64–66), however, assumed a primary (not denom.) Ug. verbal root mdl akin to Hbr.-Aram. *lmd “to tie, bind, tog” via met. (which has been partly accepted by Margalit l.c.). Good (l.c.) also supposed a denom. verb in Ug. stemming from a *nomen instr.* cognate to Aram. dallel “to lead” and Ar. dalla “to guide an animal”, arguing that that “ridden animals ordinarily were not s a d d l e d in the Late Bronze Age” adding that “the only piece of equipment a Late Bronze Age rider would need was a rope to guide the ridden animals” (Good 1984: 80). Watson (1986, 73), in turn, was disposed to assume rather a primary root mdl in the light of two alternative Akk. parallels: (1) Akk. madālu “to salt, pickle meat” hence Ug. mdl lit. “a strip of tanned leather, i.e., animal hide or skin treated with oil or salt” or (2) Akk. muddulû “elastischer Streifen, Band” [Butz, JESHO 27, 1984, 305, n. 144: “kaum von muddulu abgeleitet”] = “elastic strip” [Watson 1986, 76, n. 13], Ebla ma-da-LUM “(most probably) a bridle or guide-rope of some kind (and certainly not such an expensive item as a saddle, in an “equine” context, list of equipment) [Watson]. Al-Yasin (quoted by Margalit 1984, 133, §xii) compared Ug. mdl with Ar. mdl V: tamaddala “to unwrap” [Al-Yasin] = “to wrap” [Gordon] (not so in BK II 1078: “s’essuyer avec une serviette”), which was endorsed by Olmo Lete (apud Margalit), but Margalit preferred to explain Ar. mdl from Lat. manti/ele (pace Kopf, BiOr 12, 1955, 135). As an alternative solution, Watson (forthcoming, kind p.c., 11 April 2007) suggests that Ug. mdl may be compared with Akk. nadd/ttullu [AHW 703] = nattullu “(part of a harness)” [CAD n2, 120–121] or “reins” [Adler, Görg] and Ebla na-da-lum “oggetti per carri e cavalli” [Conti] = “part of the harness or else reins” [Watson]. For the correspondence of Ug. m- ~ Akk. n-, Watson lists Ug. mišp-t “a container” ~ Akk. nēseptu, Ug. mdrn “a weapon” ~ Akk. namšāru, Ug. mlbš “cape” ~ Akk. nalbašu, Ug. mpḥ “key” ~ Akk. naptû, Ug. mrkbt “chariot” ~ Akk. narkabtu, Ug. mšlm “pay” ~ Akk. našlamtu, Ug. mtm, “gift” ~ Akk. nidin/ttu and nidnu (see also Tropper 2000, 155), but these exx. of a secondary delabialization in Akk. (in the proximity of a labial consonant) can hardly be relevant in our case. GT: for Ar. mdl cp. perhaps rather Brb. *m-d-l “to cover, close” [GT]: NBrb.: Mzab Qjbl. e-mdel “fermer (sans verrou)” [Dlt. 1982, 486] || EBrb.: Gdm. e-mdōl “fermer (les yeux), être fermé (yeux), être caché par les nuages (soleil)” [Lanfry 1973, 205, #975].

NB2: Reinisch (1890, 257) rendered Eg. md3 as “Lederschurz” (!) and combined it with a number of phonologically clearly false and unacceptable *comparanda*.

NB3: Less likely is a connection with NBrb.: Mzg. √m-d-r: ta-madar-t, pl. ti-madar-in “corde (de métier à tisser) qui sert à fixer l’ensouple enrouleuse aux extrémités inférieures des deux montants verticaux” (derived from a-der “appuyer sur”) [Taifi 1991, 404, 71].

mdj “Bez. des Sonnengottes” (PT 1518b, hapax, Wb II 177, 20) = “wohl Bez. des Re^o” (ÜKAPT VI 135) = “Medi (Göttername)” (ÄWb I 1595).

- Mng. and origin obscure.

NB: V. Orel & O. Štolbova (1992, 189) equated it with their CCh. *^oam(V)d- “day” and *mVdiy- “morning” (reconstruction dubious, no reflexes mentioned). GT: for further research cf. perhaps ES: Tigre $\sqrt{\text{mdy}}$: tə-mada “to be kindled”, redupl. mädmäda “to kindle, light” [LH 14, 141; Lsl. 1982, 50].

mdj “mit, bei” (MK, Wb II 176–177; ÄWb I 493: first attested in the 1st IMP; for its possessive mng. cf. Théodoridès 1970, 140–154) > Dem. mtw ~ mtj “bei, von” (DG 188) > Cpt. (SALMBF) $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon-$, (SB) $\bar{\eta}\tau\alpha=$, (ALM) $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon=$, (OF) $\bar{\eta}\tau\eta=$ “bei, in Besitz von, zusammen mit” (KHW 126).

NB1: Vocalized as *mṭi- (Snk.) = *ṃdu- (Kmr.).

NB2: For the late var. ntj (stela Wien 5857, 3rd cent. BC) displaying the same assimilation as in Cpt. cf. Vittmann 1995, 296, n. 13 (referring to Borghouts, SAK 8, 1980, 65f.).

- Etymology disputable and by far not evident (cf. Théodoridès 1970, 139, fn. 1 quoting Erman 1933, §623: “*seine Herkunft ist unklar*”):

- **1.** W. Spiegelberg (1925, 59–61 & fn. 2) identified its second component (in st.pron.) with the finite form of LEg. dj “to give” (with suffix), i.e., *djǎ=f > *dʔǎ=f > *dǎ=f (sic, *ǎ-) > Cpt. (SL) $\tau\alpha\alpha\upsilon$, (S) $\tau\alpha\upsilon$, cf. st.nom. (AF) $\tau\epsilon-$. J. Černý and S. Israelit-Groll (LEG 112) conceived the prep. as composed of m + element dj “*which sometimes takes the form of the inf. of the verb di.t ‘give’*”, but they carefully avoided assuming any etymological connection.

NB: In the light of its inetymological Dem. wtg. mdr (cf. also LEg. m-drt for mdj, Wb V 583, 11), Spiegelberg (1925, §375) alternatively traced back Cpt. (S) * $\tau\epsilon-$ /* $\tau\alpha$ = of LEg. mdj “*vermutungsweise an die tonlose Form * $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon-$ von $\tau\omega\tau\epsilon$ dr.t ‘Hand’*” (rejected already by Sethe 1927, 5), but Edel convincingly demonstrated that *ǎd > st. abs. * $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau$ has st. pron. * $\tau\alpha=$, cf. (S) $\varrho\sigma/\varrho\mu\alpha=$ “face”.

- **2.** W. Vycichl and L. Homburger have alternatively identified Eg. mdj with the reflexes of AA *-dV ~ *-Vd (comitative, dative) [Djk. 1988, 61] = *d[a]y “with” [GT], which, interestingly, appears in Chadic with a prenasalization (trace of an old *m- akin to Eg. m-?). If this suggestion proves to be correct, the analysis of Eg. mdj as some sort of a compound should be abandoned.

LIT.: Homburger 1928, 343 (Eg-Bantu-Hausa); Vcl. 1933, 176 (Tamasheq-Eg.); Bynon 1984, 279, #44 (PCh.-Brb.); Blz. 1994 MS Elam, 14, #76 (Agaw-Angas-Brb.).

NB1: Attested in OLib. prep. d “and (with?)” [Prasse 1972, 158] || NBrb. prep. *yṭd “with” vs. *døy “dans” [Prasse] || SBrb.: NTuareg: Hgr. əd “avec (accompagné de); et” vs. əd “dans” [Prs. 1972, 225–7] | STuareg: Tamasheq i-daw “zusammensein mit jemandem”, a-mi-di [*a-mi-diw], pl. i-mi-daw-en “Freund” (lit. *^oone who is

together with”) [Vcl.] ||l NAgaw: Bilin & Qwara -dī “mit, in Gesellschaft” [Rn. 1887, 93] (for further traces in Agaw numerals v. also Hetzron 1967, 170–1) ||l PCh. *dā “1. with, 2. and” [Nwm.] = *nda < *mday (???) [GT]: WCh.: Hausa dà “1. together with, 2. both...and, 3. by means of, 4. in relation to, etc., 7. from” [Abr. 1962, 153] | Bade da “with/and” [Nwm.] || CCh.: Tera nda “with/and” [Nwm.] | Nzangi nda ~ ndā “avec, ensemble, et” [Mch.] | Htk. dà “mit” [Lks. 1964, 106] = nda “avec” [Egc. 1971, 220] | Gidar dī ~ de ~ den “avec, ensemble” [Mch.] = di [Nwm.] | Zulgo ndā “1. avec (instr.), 2. et” [Mch.] | Zime-Dari ndī “avec” [Cooper 1984, 19] (CCh.: Mch. 1950, 57, 64) || ECh.: Kera dā “mit, und” [Ebert 1976, 39] (Ch.: Nwm. 1977, 34, #148). AP: Bantu dial. ndi “with” [Hmb.].

NB2: I. M. D’jakonov (1988, 61, 82) combined the Agaw-Brb. prep. with the Brb. and Ch. nota genitivi (explained from comitative pre/postp. (or conjunction) “with, and”. O.V. Stolbova (2005, 115, #407) reconstructed CCh. *nV[d]- (sic) “all, together” on the basis of such additional comparanda as CCh.: Gaanda & Gabin nət “all” [Krf. #284] | Misme nda “all” [Krf.] and Ar. nudh-at- “grand nombre” [BK II 1229]. Unconvincing.

NB3: C.T. Hodge (1979, 497, #2.2; 1984, 416; 1990, 647, #23A) supposed an ultimate etymological connection of Sem. *yad- “hand” and Brb. *yīd “with”.

NB4: There must have been a Ch. var. *(n)ta (?) “with” [GT], cf. WCh.: Fyer tà “mit”, Bokkos tá “1. in, 2. mit”, Daffo-Butura tá “1. bei, in, nach, zu, von, 2. dann”, tá “von”, Kulere tu “mit, und (verbindet Nomina)”, Sha tá “mit” (Ron: Jng. 1970, 89, 146, 221, 288, 355) || CCh.: MM *ta “with” [Rsg.] = *nta [GT] > Mtk. & Mkt. àtá “with” [Rsg.], Mofu tã “avec (instr.)” [Mch.] = tá “with” [Rsg.], Mboku tu “avec (instr.)” [Mch.], Hurzo tẽ: “avec (instr.)” [Mch.] = àtè “with” [Rsg.], Uld. at ~ ànta “avec (instr.)” [Mch.] (MM: Rsg. 1978, 361, #811; Mch. 1953, 193) || ECh.: Mokillo tí “avec, de, à, par” [Jng. 1990, 183].

- **3.** E. Edel (followed by numerous authors) assumed that in Eg. m-dj < old *m-jd (lit. “in der Hand...”) “*ein sehr altes Wort bewahrt sei, das schon in historischer Zeit ausgestorben war, nämlich*” Sem. *yad- “hand”. Thus, he conceived the Eg. prep. as a compound of m “in” and *jd “hand” (preserved also in the hrgl. for d), which represents typological parallel to Eg. m-^o “1. in der Hand von..., im Besitze von..., 2. durch die Hand jemds. etc.” (Wb II 45, Edel: lit. “im Arme von”), Cpt. (OSALM) $\bar{n}\bar{t}\bar{n}$ -, (SAL) $\bar{n}\bar{t}\bar{o}\bar{o}\bar{t}$ = etc. “bei, mit, von, durch usw.” (KHW 249 & fn. 9) < *m-dr.t-n.(t) (Edel: lit. “in der Hand von”), Ar. lada(y) “auprès de” < li “à” + yad- (\sqrt{ydy}) [Vcl.], cf. also MSA: Sqt. mid “de, par” < me(n) “de” + ?id “vers” [Lsl. 1938, 238].
LIT.: Edel 1967, 74; DELC 1983, 145; Vcl. 1985, 174–7; Osing 1997, 299. Others are only indirectly referring to Edel’s etymology with an hint on Eg. mdj as a compound prep.: KHW 126 & fn. 7; Junge 1999, 353. Note that Sethe (1912) does not list Eg. mdj among the derivatives of Eg. *jd “Hand”.
NB: For the comparison of Eg. *(j)d with Sem. *yad- “hand”: Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; Sethe 1912; Ember 1918, 30; 1930, #26.a.17; Vrg. 1945, 131, #2.a.3; Chn. 1947, #493; Vcl. 1958, 373; 1959, 39; 1985, 174, #4; Hodge 1976, 12, #47; MM 1983, 219; Hodge 1990, 647, #23A (contra Knauf 1982, whose theory was rejected by Vcl. 1985, 169–179).
- **4.** The supporters of the Rössler theory maintain its genetic connection with Eg. m-^o(w) “bei” assuming an interchange of Eg. d [t] ~ ^o [d] and the identity of Eg. ^o [< *d] “arm” with Sem. *yad- “hand”.

Rejected by J. Osing (1997, 299) in favour of Eg. *m-jd without any specific argument.

LIT.: Zeidler 1992, 208; Schenkel 1993, 140; Satzinger 1997, 31; 1999, 146, §11; Kammerzell 1998, 35.

- 5. A. R. Bomhard (1981, 446; 1984, 271, §273) erroneously combined Dem. mtw with Eg. mt.t “middle” and even IE *me/ə/at- “middle, in the midst of, with, among”. Absurd.

mdj “Bez. des Seth” vs. **mtj** “als Bez. für Seth: das Böse o.ä.” (GR, Wb II 177, 21 vs. II 169, 15) = “Mede, used of Seth in Edfu as a term of abuse with a nationalistic mng.” (Griffiths 1979, 177, cf. also LÄ III 57) = “le Mède (epithète de Seth)” (AL 79.1423 pace Griffiths) = “als Schmähdname des Seth” (Spycher, LÄ IV 357) = “das von Horus für Seth benutzte Schimpfwort: Medjai (!)” (Kurth 1992, 374, fn. 12) = “an abusive term for Seth (often at Edfu): the foreigner, the outsider *par excellence*” (PL 478) = “(vermutlich) Meder (gemeint ist)” (Peust 1999 Nap., 213).

NB1: P. Wilson (PL) listed two supposed exx. of Eg. mdj (in a difficult passage of the Myth of Horus: Edfu VI 214:12 & VI 215:2–3) also s.v. md3j (q.v.), “où ils sont effectivement mieux à leur place” in the opinion of D. Meeks (1999, 581), who, in addition, regarded it not at all certain that GR mdj signifies “the Mede” (cf. Enchoria 17, 161–2; BIFAO 89, 85), since “en fait les graphies tardives de md3j désignant un corps de police ont souvent été comprises comme désignant, à tort, les Mèdes”, although C. Peust (1999, 214) has at the same time arrived just at the opposite conclusion “dass das neuägyptische md3j ‘Polizist’ im späteren Ägyptischen nicht fortlebt”. A.H. Gardiner (AEO I 82*, 88*) too, found it “doubtful if there is any instance of Md3j in the true meaning ‘Nubians’ after Dyn. XVIII” admitting (pace Kees 1930) that “in the Legend of Horus at Edfu, ... Mdj certainly alludes to the Persians”. Following him K. Zibelius (1972, 136–7) also denied the survival of md3j after Dyn. XX claiming that this term “im Koptischen ist überhaupt nicht belegt” (see below).

NB2: Vocalized as *madāj by J. Osing (NBÄ 361–3, n. 39 pace Till 1931, §27).

- Rendering still debated. The identity of all exx. listed in PL 478 is also uncertain.
 - 1. Usually rendered (following H. Kees quoted below) “as ‘Mede’ being an allusion to the recently departed Persian overlords of Egypt” (PL), which “reflects the phase of Persian domination at least in one point of terminology” (Griffiths, LÄ), i.e., it is “an impress of the expulsion of the Hyksos and the Persians” (Griffiths 1979). The direct source may be PBHbr./JAram. māday “Medien”, mādiyyī “der Meder” [Levy 1924 III 29–30] = mādāy (sic) “Meder, Perser” [Osing, NBÄ 361, n. 39]. At the moment, this seems to be the most convincing etymology, albeit not fully certain.
- LIT.: Kees 1930, 346–7; Te Velde 1967, 148; Griffiths 1979, 174, 177; LÄ III 57; Kurth 1992, 374, fn. 12; PL 478.

NB: This theory implies that GR mdj should be regarded as the hrgl. etymon of Dem. mtj “Medien, auch: Meder” (DG 185:2) = “1. Meder, genauer: Perser, 2. (!) Soldat” (Peust 1999, 213, cf. also Zauzich 1990, 162; Vittmann 1997, 268, n. k) = “Persia, Persian, lit. Mede” (CED), whence most authors (e.g., Griffith 1909 III, 319; Sethe 1916, 124–131; 1923, 169; Spg. KHW 66; Kees 1930, 346–7; AEO I 81*; Hofmann 1969, 1121, fn. 65; Zibelius 1972, 137, fn. 122 with lit.; CED 93; NBÄ 361–3, n. 39 with lengthy disc.; KHW 105; Smith 1978, 360–1; DELC 125; Peust 1999 Nap., 213–4; Quack 2005, 314) have derived Cpt. (SB) $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$, (SL) $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\iota$, (F) $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ (m) “soldier” (CD 190b) referring originally, in H.S. Smith’s (l.c.) view, to the class of professional Persian soldiers. Earlier, the Cpt. term was explained from Eg. md3j “policeman etc.” (infra). Trying to resolve the semantic difficulties (caused by the elimination of old md3j as the alternative etymon of the Cpt. term), C. Peust (1999 Nap., 214) has supposed that “*das lautlich klar als solches ausgewiesene Lehnwort mdy / $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ ‘Perser’ hat, vermutlich in der Epoche der persischen Besetzung Ägyptens, eine zweite Bedeutung ‘Soldat’ (!) angenommen*”. The Cpt. forms can hardly be explained from *mādāj as figured by K. Sethe (l.c.). Instead, W. Vycichl (DELC 125 pace Lacau) has assumed *matáj, pl. *mató3j (sic, *3j), although he denied the etymological connection with NK md3j. The etymology of the Cpt. term has not been void of controversies, since it was earlier derived from Eg. md3j (q.v.). As a compromise, some authors surmised that Cpt. (SB) $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ etc. “*ist aus den lautlich zusammengefallenen Begriffen mdj ‘Meder’ und md3j ‘md3j-Nubier’ entstanden*” (Kaplony, LÄ V 271, n. 15 pace DG 195; Hodge 1969, 11–12; KHW 105; DELC 125), i.e., via contamination of both lexemes, cf. Dem. mđw ~ mdj ~ mtj “Soldat, auch: Polizist (später mit mtj ‘Meder’ zusammengefallen)” (DG 195:1). P. Wilson (PL) took (rather equivocally) a position that one can hardly follow: “*the basis of md3i for $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ is clear enough (!) and if md3y is taken as a word for foreigners in general then this may also be the term at the root of mdy... It is possible that in this passage the term already has the meaning $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$* ”. J. Černý’s (CED 93) allegation that Wb II 86, 4 “*confuses mdy with the African people md3y!*” is somewhat misleading, since the relevant Belegstellen have evidently md3j. Moreover, the authors of Wb (l.c.) have clearly denied the connection of the Cpt. word with Eg. md3j: “*vermutlich nicht das Kopt. $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$* ” (Vrg. 1950, 294: “*sans doute à bon droit*”).

- **2.** D. Kurth (1992, 374, fn. 12) rendered mdj of Edfu VI 214:12 as an instance of md3j “Medjai”, while he saw in mdj of Edfu VI 215:2–3 a term of abuse rendered as “Wüstling (?)” but regarded as related (!) to mt3 “das männliche Glied” (late NK-GR, Wb II 175, 5), noting (quite obscurely), however, that “*der annähernde Gleichklang der beiden Schimpfwörter (i.e., mdj vs. mt3) ist sicher kein Zufall*”. Discussing the quoted passage of the Edfu Myth of Horus, P. Wilson (PL 478) too surmised that mdj “*here may be the country md3y which supplied mercenary soldiers to Egypt and her police force*”.
- **3.** GT: the resemblance of GR mtj “der Böse” (Wb) to any AA parallel with a similar mng. may be purely accidental.

NB: Noteworthy are the following isoglosses: **(1)** LECu.: Orm. mudā “blemish, fault” [Gragg 1982, 292] = mudā “1. defect, fault, 2. blemish”, mudō “defect” [Bitima 2000, 202], Orm.-Borana “misfortune, misery, accident”, mudama “(to be in) trouble” [Strm. 1987, 370; 1995, 211] ||| ECh.: Lele mādfā “folie, être fou” [WP 1982, 59] | Mkl. mādà “fou, folle” [Jng. 1990, 135]; **(2)** Ar. ʿamida “être en colère, s’emporter contre qqn.” [BK I 53; DRS 22: no Sem. cognates] ||| CCh.: Mada ámad

“devil” [Rsg. 1978, 236, #192]; (3) NOM.: Wlt. metuwa, Gamu & Dache meto “trouble” (NWomt.: LS 1997, 475) ||| ECh.: Mkl. mètiké (m) “malin” [Jng. 1990, 139]; (4) Akk. maṭû “gering werden/sein”, miṭē/ītu “Minderung” [AHW 636] = maṭû (maṭīu) “bad in quality, low in status, humble” [CAD m1, 428–9] ||| SBrb.: (?) EWlm. & Ayr māṭṭāy “2. être annulé, 3. changer en mal, empirer, s’aggraver, prendre une mauvaise tournure, 4. (EWlm.) être comme métamorphosé, être monstrueux” [PAM 1998, 228; 2003, 567] ||| ECh.: Mgm. miḏḏā “laid, mauvais, mal” [JA 1992, 106], cf. perhaps also ECh.: Mkl. màaḏè “être de courte taille et très âgé”, màaḏè (m), màaḏà (f) “nain” [Jng. 1990, 135]; (5) AA *m-ṭ “to be unjust” [GT] > Ar. myṭ: māṭa “1. être injuste, tyran, opprimer, 2. être rebelle, récalcitrant”, miyāṭ- “1. tiraillements, hostilité réciproque des gens” [BK II 1173] ||| LECu.: Arb. mīd- “to abuse physically or verbally” [Hyw. 1984, 385].

mdw “Stab, Stock (auch als Waffe, als Herrschaftszeichen, Grabbeigabe, zum Prügeln), von heiligen Stäben, Standarten mit dem Götterkopf (oft GR)” (OK, Wb II 178; ÄWb II 1159) = “Keule oder Stock” (Müller 1893, 126) = “(vermutlich bezeichnete mdw) einen kurzen Stock und als solcher auch den Feuerbohrer” (Spg. 1923, 150 & fn. 5) = “walking-stick, staff” (Grd. 1927, 496, S43) = “canne” (Drioton 1940, 425, §159) = “also: a rod for chastising the wrongdoer” (Pap. Torino 1882, 2:2, reign of Ramses IV, Grd. 1956, 13) = “Stab mit verdicktem unteren Ende” (Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza I 148) = “walking-stick, with knobbed end downward” (Fischer 1983, 41, S43) = “1. stick, staff (carried by officials in office as an insignia of the office), 2–3. (Edfu) a term for the staff of Horus which he uses to smite foes and also for his harpoon” (PL 479).

NB1: Although reliefs, paintings, and statuary normally show the larger end of the mdw-staff upward, the orientation of the staff in writing became standard with this end downward presumably reflecting the way the staff was originally held down to Cheops’ reign (Fischer 1977, §45; 1978, 160). For the scenes in MK tomb chapels showing a device in the production of mdw-staves (where these were straightened rather than bent) cf. Fischer 1978, 158.

NB2: W. Spiegelberg (1923, 150–1) tried to demonstrate that Eg. mdw was “*eig. auch die Bezeichnung des Feuerbohrers*” supposing that “*was in den älteren Formen der Hieroglyphe wie ein Knopf am unteren Ende des Stockes aussieht, ist vielleicht ein härteres Stück Holz, das sowohl für den Spazierstock wie den Bohrer zweckmässig war*”. Whether the late evidence of the Edfu Calendar (l. 20: jnj sḏ.t sjn mdw “Bringer der Flamme, der den Bohrer reibt”, cf. Lemm, ZÄS 25, 1887, 114) can be projected to predynastic times, has to be proven. A. Hassan (1976, 20–21) too supposes mdw to have originally signified a stick for making fire.

NB3: Rarely appears as fem. md.t (cf. Hassan 1976, 14, fn. 22).

NB4: In CT V 231k, it denotes “eine Stange zum Loten oder Staken” (Bieß quoted by Jones) = “an unidentified part of boat” (AECT II 61, spell 409, III 203 index) = “partie de la barque nsm.t” (AL 78.1926) = “bâton de la barque” (Barguet 1986, 371, spell 409) = “an unidentified part of boat: belaying pin (?)” (Jones 1988, 170, §79) = “auch: eine zum Loten gebrauchte, am unteren Ende häufig gegabelte Stange” (Düring 1995, 84 pace Bieß) = “Lotstange” (ÄWb II 1161a).

NB5: Vocalized as *mētʿw (Farina) = *mādēw (sic, *-â-!) (Zunke) = old *médʿw > LP *mēt (Fecht) = LEg. *mēd (Osing 1998, 111, n. g), cf. PN ns-p3-mdw “er gehört dem (heiligen) Stabe” (Ranke PN I 175:1) = “zum (göttlichen) Stabe gehörig” (Fecht) =

“celui qui appartient au bâton (sacré)” (Vrg.), i.e., *n̄s-p̄3-m-d̄w (Zunke) reflected by NAss. cuneiform išpimātu and Gk. (2nd cent. BC) Ἐσπιμητις, also Ἐσμητις ~ Ζμητις (cf. Spg., RT 25, 1903, 184–190; OLZ 15, 1912, 9, fn. 2; KMAV 29, 51; Zunke 1923/1997, 34, 63; Wb II 178; Fecht 1958, 116). The equation of the NAss. and Greek forms was declined by J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 87) because of the anomalous NAss. -ā- vs. Gk. -η-. G. Fecht (l.c., fn. 1) presented additional evidence for late *-ē- in mdw revealed by the last component of this late PN written *spielerisch* also as (1) m̄d “10” vocalized in LP as *méd/t̄w > (S) mHT and (2) as mt(r) “richtig” (in Ptol.) > (OldS) mHT “richtig” (derived in CD 158a; Spg. KHW 66; AĀG §211 from m3^c.tj). For GR mdw “staff” written also with the logogram of m̄d “10” (old *mūd̄w > late *méd) cf. Wb II 178. Moreover, in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD), mdw is “glossiert durch das homophone Zahlwort mt ‘10’ > mHT” (Osing 1998, 111, n. g).

NB6: W. M. Müller’s (1893, 126) hypothesis, that the root of Eg. mdw was “*in vorhistorischer Zeit*” *m̄d (cf. also RT 8, 21f.), is baseless.

- Etymology highly debated.
- **1.** H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1992, 41–42 & fn. 38) assumed in it a typological parallel to Eg. jmj.t-r “Stab, Würdezeichen des Beamten” (conceived by him as a reverse nisbe, lit. “das, in dem sich der Ausspruch befindet”), since “*ein Beamter, der einen dieser beiden Stäbe in der Hand führt, verfügt Kraft seines Amtes und dieses Machtattributs auch über die entsprechende Potenz des ‘Wortes’, ... des ‘befehlenden... Ausspruches’*”. The fact that it is sometimes combined in Eg. texts with Eg. mdw “sprechen” (in the Tanis “Sign Pap.”, e.g., mdw “Stab” is glossed by ns n mdw “sprechende Zunge”, cf. Wb II 180, 12), led Fischer-Elfert to stating that “*ein Wortspiel im Sinne einer etymologischen Beziehung zwischen beiden Lexemen anzunehmen scheint unausweichlich*”, which represents in fact a typical instance of adopting an old an Eg. *Volksetymologie* of homophonous roots.
- **2.** Usually compared to Sem.: Hbr. maṭṭeh [-ē/ā] “1. Ast, Rebe, 2. Stab, Stecken, 3. Stamm des israelitischen Volkes” [GB 404] = “Keule” [Clc.] = “rod, staff” [Ward] = “arrows” [Gray, UF 11, 1979, 318] = “1. stick, staff, stem, 2. tribe” [KB 573] = “1. Stab, Stock, 2. Geschoß, Pfeil, 3. (?) Penis (unattested)” [DL 2003, 166–9], cf. PBHbr. maṭṭeh “1. Stab, 2. Stamm” [Dalman 1922, 232] = “staff, tribe” [Jastrow 1950, 765], which has been affiliated with Ebl. ma-du-um [maṭ(t)um] “bastoncino”, ma-da-ti [maṭati] “due verghe” [Brugnatelli 1984, 95 pace, Pettinato], Ug. mṭ “Stab, virga virilis” [WUS #1551] = “staff” [Gordon 1955, 296, #1237; 1965, #1642; Segert 1984, 192] = “Stab, Spazierstock” [Tropper 2000, 198] = “rod, staff, riding crop” [DUL 602], Aram. of Deir ʿAlla mṭh “rod, punishment” [DNWSI 617]. Uncertain.
LIT.: Clc. 1936, #642 (Eg.-Hbr.); Ward 1961, 37, fn. 89; 1968, 68 (Eg.-Hbr.); HSED #1807 (Eg.-Hbr.); Mlt. 2005, 381, §90; 2005, 597, §90 (Eg.-Hbr. with unlikely *comparanda*).

NB1: The etymology of the Hbr. parallel has been strongly debated. (1) Traditionally (GB 417; Gordon l.c.; Djik. & Kogan 1995, 16, #1807; KB 573; Tropper 2000, 198) it (recently along with Ug. mṭ) has been derived from Hbr. nṭy qal “1. ausstrecken (einen Stab, ein Schwert, die Hand, um ein Zeichen zu geben, als Gestus des Drohens usw.), 2. ausspannen (die Meßschnur, ein Zelt, den Himmel usw.), 3. neigen (niederwärts, die Füße jem. zum Fallen, eine Wand, den Himmel usw.), 4. (intr.) rechts oder links abbiegen vom Wege, abweichen” [GB 500] = “1. to reach out (staff, sword, hand etc.), 2. spread out (tent), lay (measuring cord), stretch out (heaven), 3. bow down low, 4. (intr.) stretch out, become long, turn aside, away from, bend, incline, join together with, follow after, support, devote o’self to, be inclined to” [KB 692–3], which, on the other hand, cannot be the root of Eg. mdw. L. Kogan (2000, 726) rightly regarded the derivation from Hbr.-Ug. *nṭw as “not so certain” (although Hbr. maṭṭeh < *nṭw “is clear from its structure”), Hbr. nṭy being semantically “not very suitable to develop into ‘stick, staff’, although both the noun and the verb appear in close connection in Ex. 9:23”. He found a connection with Akk. naṭū ~ -d- ~ -t- “schlagen” [AHW 768] = “to hit, beat” [CAD n2, 132] semantically better, although he admitted that the derivation from a basic verb attested only in another language may be problematic. (2) Alternatively, the Hbr. word was explained (in KB l.c. and Muchiki 1999, 249) as a loan from Eg. mdw, whereby Y. Muchiki regarded Hbr. -eh as a trace of the dropped Eg. -w. (3) As remarked by L. Kogan (l.c.), “the picture is more complicated with” Oakk. miṭṭum “battle-mace” [Gelb 1973, 187] > Akk. miṭṭu ~ miṭu ~ meṭu “eine Götterwaffe” [AHW 664] = miṭṭu “mace” [AHW m2, 147] and Hbr. mōṭ ~ mōṭā “1. Tragstange, Tragesstelle, bestehend aus mehreren dergleichen Stangen, 2. Joch” [GB 404] = mōṭ “1. carrying-frame, 2. pole” vs. mōṭā “1. yoke, 2. carrying-pole” [KB 555], which have also been equated (in DUL 602 and DL 2003, 169) with the Ug.-Hbr. term, although neither can derive from a IIIae -w/y or Iae n- root. A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 597, §90) too both Hbr. maṭṭeh (!) and Akk. miṭṭu from a Sem. *ma/iṭṭ- “branch, rod, stick”. Seeing these controversies (without resolving them), L. Kogan concluded that “I must therefore admit that the criticism against Orel and Stolbova’s comparison of Hebrew maṭṭā and Eg. mdw... expressed in Diakonoff and Kogan 1996:34 was not fully justified...”. This is surprising, since V. Orel, who ignored elementary rules of Hbr. historical morphology and misquoted the Hbr. word as maṭe (sic), derived it from Sem. *maṭ- (sic), which he based, in addition, solely on the Hbr. word. So, Orel’s artificial Sem. *maṭ- and AA *mut- were rightly rejected by I. M. Diakonoff & L. Kogan (1995, 16, #1807; 1996, 34, #1807).

NB2: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED 379–380, #1750), followed by A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 381, §90; 2005, 597, §90), eventually combined the Eg.-Hbr. parallel with AA *maw/yaṭ- “tree” [OS] = *mayṭ- [Mlt.] based on the erroneous equation of ECu. *mayṭ- “palm tree” [Mlt.]: Orm. mēṭ “palm tree” [Gragg 1982, 284] ||| CCh. *mVṭ- “baobab” [OS] || ECh.: Mkl. mòoté (m) “arbre sp., donne des fruits très sucrés” [Jng. 1990, 141], whose resemblance is due to pure chance. Militarev’s (2005, 381, §90) PSem. *mVṭ- (sic) (no reflexes mentioned) seems to be a *creatio ex nihilo*.

- **3.** G. Farina (1924, 324) connected Eg. mdw with Sem. *mawṭ- “bastone” (sic).

NB: Based on Hbr. mōṭ ~ mōṭā “1. Tragstange, Tragesstelle, bestehend aus mehreren dergleichen Stangen, 2. Joch” [GB 404] = mōṭ “1. carrying-frame, 2. pole” vs. mōṭā “1. yoke, 2. carrying-pole” [KB 555], which, however, might have been borrowed from LEg. m3wd < old m3wd (q.v.).

- **4.** W. A. Ward (1968, 68) compared Eg. mdw alternatively with Sem. *mdd “to stretch out, measure” (Sem.: Lsl. 1969, 19; Zbr. 1971, #138). Semantically less probable.
- **5.** A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 381, §90; 2005, 597, §90) compared it (among other parallels that cannot be connected, cf. above) to NOM.

*mV[t(t)]- “деревцо (Baum, Holz)” [Dlg.] = *miḍ- “Baum, Holz” [Lmb.] = *mi(n)ṭ- [Mlt.] = *mitt-, hence *miḥḥ/ḥḥ- [GT].

NB1: Attested in Ometo miṭa ~ miḥa [Mrn.], Wolamo mittā [Crl.] = mitta [Lmb.], Gamu micci (-tts-) [Lmb.], Malo micci (-tts-) [Lmb.], Zala miḥa [Crl.] = mica (-ts-) [Lmb.], Gofa miḥa [CR] = miḥa (-ts-) [Lmb.], Bsk. mic [Bnd.], Male mici [Bnd.], Dawro miḥa [Bnd.] = mica (-ts-) [Lmb.], Dache miḥḥ (-tts-, “Baum”) vs. miḥa (-ts-, “Holz, Brennholz”) [Lmb.] | Koyra miḥē [Crl.] = miḥe [CR] = mice [Bnd.] = mice ~ mici (-ts-) [Lmb.], Gidicho miṣṣi [Bnd.], Haruro (Kcm.) miḥḥa [CR] = miḥa [Lmb.] | Zayse miḥa [Bnd.], Chara miḥa (also mit) [Crl.] = miḥa ~ mit [Bnd.] = mica (-ts-) [Lmb.], Kaffa miḥō [Crl.] = miḥo [Bnd.] = miḥo [Lmb.], Mocha miḥo [Lsl.], Anfillo miḥḥō ~ miḥḥō [Crl.], Bworo mittā [Bnd.] = miṭa [Bnd.] | Sheko miḥo [Lmb.] etc. (NOM.: Dlg. 1973, 250; Lmb. 1993, 360; LS 1997, 472–3).

NB2: A. B. Dolgopolskij (1973, 250) affiliated the NOM. word with Hbr. maṭṭeh (above) and Eg. mdḥ.t “behauenes Holz” (LP, Wb, below), which is certainly false with regard to Sem. *ṭ- ≠ Eg. -d- and, on the other hand, due to the fact that Eg. mdḥ. t < mdḥ “Holz behauen” (Lit. MK, Wb, below). M. Lamberti (1993, 360; LS 1997, 472–3), in turn, derived the NOM. parallels from his OCu. *muḍ- “sprossen, blühen”.

- **6.** GT: or cp. LECu.: Oromo muṭuṭé “Keule, Knüttel, Prügel” [Rn. 1902, 73] | HECu.: Sid. mûṭa (m), pl. mûṭṭa (f) “small stick, small piece of wood” [Gsp. 1983, 243], Gedeo (Drs.) mûṭ-iččo “leaf sheat of enset” [Hds. 2003 MS, 1]?

NB: Any connection to LECu.: Orm. mäčča [Lsl.] borrowed into ES: Gurage: Chaha, Ezha, Muher, Masqan, Goggot m“ača, Soddo mača “thin branch without leaves used as a rod for driving cattle or for beating children, rod” (ES: Lsl. 1979 III, 388)? Cf. also LECu.: Oromo maṭṭa-na “grande cinghia o correggia che serve a fissare il carico di muli e degli asini” [Da Thiene 1939, 240].

- **7.** GT: its connection with Ar. maṭw- “1. toute chose longue, allongée, qui se prolonge, 2. branche de palmier fendue en deux et dont on se sert pour lier qqch. comme avec une corde” [BK II 1124] is more than questionable, since it derives from Ar. mṭw I “3. tirer, traîner” [BK].
- **8.** GT: or cp. perhaps AA *m-d “wood, stick” [GT], whose reconstruction is rather uncertain.

NB1: Cf. (?) Akk. mandû ~ maʾdû ~ mādû “eine Stange” [AHW 602: u.H.] ||| NOM.: Mocha maddō “rail at each side of the threshold in front of the house” [Lsl. 1959, 40] ||| CCh.: (?) MM *a(N)da “stick” [Rsg.] > Myg. ádáy, Mlk. ádàn, Gsg. gándáy (MM: Rsg. 1978, 335, #690) || ECh.: Mkl. ʾündùmú, pl. ʾindá “1. arbre, 2. bois à brûler, bâton, fagot” [Jng. 1990, 190]. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 193, #1762) explained the Eg.-Mocha parallel from AA *mād- “rod, pole”. A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 597, §90), in turn, connected the Mkl. cognate with AA *mi(n)ṭ- “tree” (cf. above, phonologically unacceptable).

NB2: There may be also an AA var. root with *-t-, cf. Akk. (a/jB) muttû ~ mattû “eine Stange” [AHW 690] ||| WCh.: (?) Hausa múčiyáá ~ múčiyáá (f) “1. stick for stirring túsúwóó, 2. pole for stirring dye in dye-pit, 3. canoe-pole, 4. stick for stirring sweets when being boiled” [Abr. 1962, 679] | PAngas *m“at “trunk, stem (of a tree)” [GT 2004, 259]: Angas mwat teuṭ “the trunk of a tree” [Flk. 1915, 250] = mwàt (tón) “(Baum)Stamm” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27]?

- **9.** GT: noteworthy are the AA var. roots with initial *b- that may be eventually related.

NB1: Cf. AA *b-d “branch, reed” [GT] > Hbr. *bad, pl. baddīm “Zweig, Ast” (explained from *bdd “absondern”) [GB 84], PBHbr. & JAram. baddā “Stengel,

Stange" [GB] | Ar. badd-, pl. budūd- "Balken" [GB], Palest. Ar. badd "Balken der Ölprelle" [GB] ||| NBrb.: Shilh ta-buda "variété de roseau", a-buda "jonc" | Mzg. (t)a-buda "massette (plante)" | Nūfa ti-budda "jonc de marais", Rif te-buda "massette (plante)" | Qbl. ta-buda "1. massette, 2. espèce de jonc" (NBrb.: DRB I 18) ||| WCh.: Tng. bādā (-d-, both implosives < plain voiced stops) "stick, stalk" [Kidda 1985 MS, 201, #30] = bada "stalk of grains, straw, sugar cane, pen, reed" [Jng. 1991, 70].

NB2: Cf. AA *b-ṭ [GT] > Ar. būṭ- "massette" [DRB I 18 with false Brb. *comparanda*] ||| NBrb.: Shilh ta-buḏa "jonc des marais" [DRB] | Mzg. a-buḏa "espèce de roseau avec lequel on fait des cabanes et des treillis" [Tf. 1991, 11] | Izn. buḏ, pl. i-baṭṭ-en "pied d'une plante, souche" [Rns. 1932, 291] | Qbl. ta-buḏa "jonc des marais" [DRB] (NBrb.: DRB I 29).

- 10. L. Homburger (1930, 285): ~ Ful weduru, pl. bedi "matraque".

mdw (or **mwdw** or **mdwj**) "1. sprechen, reden, 2. diskutieren über (r), Fürsprache einlegen (hr), 3. streiten mit (hn^o), 4. (mit Objekt, cf. Junge 2003, 228, n. 240) jem. verreden, verleumden (?), anreden (?), (den Namen) aussprechen" (OK, Wb II 179; ÄWb I 576–7; II 1161–4) = "1. to speak, 2. claim" (Allen 1984, 582) = "1. to speak, 2. (tr.) plead one's cause" (DCT 191) > Dem. mt "sprechen, reden" (DG 184:7) > Cpt. (SAL) ḥOYTḐ, (A) ḥOYNTḐ, (BF) ḥOYT "to speak, call" (CD 191b; CED 93) = "1. reden, sprechen, 2. rufen, nennen, 3. besprechen, beschwören (im Zauber)" (KHW 104).

NB1: The spelling of the verbal root is disputed: mdw (Wb l.c.; CED l.c.) = mwdw (Grd. 1927, 216, §285) = mdwj (Allen l.c.: full form attested in PT 1482; so also HAM 113–4; Snk. 2002, 64; ÄWb l.c. etc.).

NB2: Supposed by R. O. Faulkner (1981, 173) to be written in CT II 247c with the ideogram A26 (depicting a "man with one arm raised in invocation", EG 1927, 438). Cf. contra: AECT I 129, spell 149, n. 21 (regarding this as the verb j with a hint on Heerma van Voss, Phoenix 17, 1971, 99).

NB3: E. M. Ishaq (1991, 116, §xix.2) derived Eg. Ar. matmat "to argue", matmata "speech, prattle, argument" either from Cpt. (SAL) ḥOYTḐ (< Eg. mdw) or "rather" from Eg. mtmt (above).

- Hence:

(1) mdw "1. Wort, Rede, 2. Anklage, 3. Vortrag, Auftrag, 4. Zauberwort, 5. Sache, Angelegenheit, 6. Text, geschriebene Worte" (OK, Wb II 180; ÄWb I 577; ÄWb II 1164) = "speech, word, debate, voice" (DCT 191–2), cf. also dd-mdw.w "zur Kenntlichmachung von gesprochenen Worten, der Reden, von Sprüchen (die rezitiert werden sollen)" (Wb II 180, 8–9) > Cpt. (B) ḫE-ḤTAY "wizardry, magic" (CD 196a; CED 94, cf. also Crum 1922, 187; Spg. 1924, 160; Zhl. 1925, 173; Fecht 1960, n. 491) = "Zauberei" (NBÄ 375) = "Zauberworte, einen Zauberspruch rezitieren" (KHW 105) = "charme, incantation" (DELC 125).

NB1: Occurs also in cuneiform (Amarna, 14th cent. BC) nam-du-ú reflecting n3 mdw.w (pl.) "the words" (Smith & Gadd 1925, 234, §2), vocalized by J. Osing as *na3-mḏūw < *mḏūw.w "Wörter" (NBÄ 375).

nb2: Ignoring its clear IE background (Boisacq 1916, 649; IEW 743), P.V. Ernstedt (1953, 55–57) explained Gk. μῦθος vs. μύθηα as late borrowing from Eg. (mdw vs. md.t, resp.). Most recently, Jaan Puhvel (kind p.c., 15 April 2007) thinks “*the best connection seems to be to the interjection μῦ(-μῦ), thus ‘idle chatter’ (cf. English yak-yak)*”.

(2) md.t “1. gesprochene Worte, Rede, 2. geschriebene Worte, Text, Wortlaut (eines Befehls), 3. Sache, Angelegenheit, 4. Tadel, Anklage, Kritik” (OK, Wb II 181–2; ÄWb I 578; II 1166–67; for all nuances cf. also Junge 1984, 261f.) > Dem. mt (f) “1. Rede, Worte, 2. Sache, 3. zur Bildung von Abstrakten” (DG 184:7) > Cpt. (OSAL) ḿḥṭ-, (S) ḿḥṭ-, ḿḥṭ-, (OF) ḿḥṭ-, (F) ḿḥṭ-, (BF) ḿḥṭ-, (B) ḿḥṭ- “Nominalpräfix zur Bildung von fem. Abstrakta” (KHW 96).

- GT: may be cognate with LECu.: OSom. *mōd- “denken” [Lmb. 1986, 445] > Som. mōd- “meinen, vermuten, glauben, dafürhalten”, mōd ~ mūd “Gedanke, Meinung, Glaube” [Rn. 1902, 285] = mōd-ayya “to think” [Abr. 1964, 181] = mōd- “to think, think wrongly, suppose” [Bell 1969, 176] || Ch. *mVd- “to speak” [Stl.] > WCh.: Tng. mad- “to read, count” [Kidda 1985 MS, 217, #60] = maade “1. to count, anumerate, number, 2. read” [Jng. 1991, 118], Kwami màad-áy “sagen, sprechen”, pf. pl. màad-án-gò [Leger 1992, 27; 1993, 172; Jng.-Leger 1993, 168] || CCh.: Mtk. mēdanà “to speak” [Stl.] | Musgu méda [Müller 1886, 400] = méda ~ mēdan [Krause] = múda “sprechen, sagen” [Roeder apud Lks.] = mda “parler, dire” [Mch. 1950, 32] = mèda [Stl.] (Musgu: Lks. 1937, 142; 1941, 66; CCh.: Stl. 1996, 109). From AA *m-d “1. to think, 2. say, speak” [GT]. Ar.: Tubu módi, médi “Wort” [Lks. 1941, 12] = “Rede” [Stl.]. Lr.: IS 1965, 353 (Sem.-Musgu); 1976, #311 (Sem.-Eg.-Som.-CCh.-Jegu); OS 1992, 179 (LECu.-Eg.-PW/C/ECh.); HSED #1788 (Eg.-EWlm.-Hs.-Musgu-ECh.-Som.); Stl. 1996, 109 (CCh.-ECh.-Eg.-Tubu); Takács 1999, 163, #7.1.2 (Eg.-ES-Brb.-Bed.-Som.-Ch.).

nb1: Cf. perhaps also Sem. *ʔmd: PBHbr. & JAram. ʔmd “(ab)schätzen, bemessen, (Aram.) vermögend sein” [Lévy 1924 I 94a] = “juger, évaluer, apprécier” [Lsl., DRS] (influenced by √mdd “to measure”?) || MSA: Sqt. ʔmd: *ʔómed “comprendre, apprécier” [Lsl.] || ES: Harari emädä “говорить (to speak)” [IS] = emäda “dire, informer” [DRS] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 63; IS l.c. infra; DRS 22)? The etymology of Harari √ʔmd has been disputed. E. Littmann (Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 33, 1921, 122) mistakenly compared it with Akk. amātu “word” [< awātu < *hawaytu]. On the other hand, W. Leslau (1944, 54) explained it as a loan from Cu. (source unidentified). The rare Ar. mād-at- “mot, expression (employé comme sigle)” [Fagnan 1923, 162] derives probably from √mdd “to measure” and is thus unrelated. R.M. Voigt (p.c., 17 April 2007) surmises that “*vielleicht steckt dahinter einfach mād-at-*” denoting, i.a., “3. article, paragraphe, alinéa (p.ex., dans un dictionnaire, article consacré chaque mot)” [BK II 1076].

nb2: Cf. also LECu.: Somali mōd- “non-animate belongings” [Ehret] combined by Ch. Ehret (1980, 324) with SCu. *mūd- > Iraqw mura “stuff, things” (with a semantic shift attested in Eg. md.t?).

nb3: For the semantic shift “to think” ~ “to speak”, cf., e.g., Hbr. bdʔ “erdenken, frei erfinden, ersinnen” OSA bdʔ-n “Geschwätz” (Sem.: Müller 1963, 307; 1985,

270); AA *m-l “2. to think” [GT] ~ AA *m-l “3. to show, 4. say” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. m33 “to see” supra); PIE *wekʷ- “to speak” > i.a. OHGerm. giwahanen “erwähnen, gedenken” vs. Arm. gočem “schreie, rufe, lade ein”, Lat. vocō “rufe” (IEW 1135–36); or PIE *men- “to think” vs. Hitt. memmāi [< *memnāi?] “sagt” (IEW 726–728).

NB4: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #1788) related the Eg.-Som.-Musgu parallel with some of the reflexes of AA *m-(h)-d “to ask” [GT], cf. EBrb.: Gdm. ṽm-d: mūd “prier”, a-mūd, pl. mūd-awen “prière (canonique)” [Lanfry 1973, 193–4, #965], Audjila mūd “pregare” [Prd. 1960, 172] || SBrb. *ṽm-h-d “réciter, prier” [Prs.]: Hgr. muhed “réciter en priant”, ā-mud, pl. i-madd-en “prière canonique (musulmane)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1156–57] = muhəd, verbal noun ā-mud, pl. i-madd-ən [Prs.], EWlm. mud (so, -d) [Prs.] = mud “1. prier, 2. participer à une fête religieuse, 3. fêter” [PAM 2003, 519], Ayr mud [Prs.], Ghat muhəd [Prs.] (SBrb.: Prs. 1969, 79, #516) || ECh.: Ndam madidii “to call” [Stl.] | Jega maad- “fragen” [Jng. 1961, 114; Nwm. 1977, 190]. Semantically even more dubious is their comparison with WCh.: Hausa múdà “to reply, answer” [Abr. 1962, 679].

- Further (remotely related) AA var. roots are attested in:

(1) Ch. *ndV[?]/y- “to speak” [Stl. 1996] = *nVd- > *(?V)nd- “to speak, ask” [Stl. 2005] > WCh. *nVd- “to speak, say” [Stl.]: NBau-chi *mu-ndV [partial redupl. *mu-mdV[?]] “to say, speak, tell” [GT]: Pa’a munda “to say”, munde “to tell to” [MSkn. 1979, 194], Siri mundu [Skn.], Diri nda [Skn.], Miya and- [Skn.], Mburku nd- [Skn.] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 38) || CCh. *nVdV_y- (sic) [Stl.] = *ndV < *mdV (?) “to say” [GT]: Margi ndó “to say” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 128] = ndú “to speak” [IS] | Bata ndí “(ra)conter” [Hfm./Brt.-Jng.] | Mandara da [< *nda] “to speak” [Skn.] = ndə-ndà “to say (parler)” [Krf., Whaley, Brt.-Jng.], Malgwa nda “sagen, erzählen, erklären” [Löhr 2002, 304] (CCh.: Brt.-Jng. 1990, 86, 97) (Ch.: Stl. 1996, 84; 2005, 113, #401).

NB1: O. Stolbova (l.c.; HSED 408, #1893) combines these cognates also with Ar. ndw “1. appeler qqn., lui crier de venir, 2. convoquer à une réunion” [BK II 1229] || CCh.: Dghwede (Zeghvana) ndiy[?]a(ya) “to ask” [Krf.] || ECh.: Bdy. ?inàd/?indù “demander, interroger” [AJ 1989, 82], EWDng. indē “fragen” [Ebs. 1987, 82], which may represent a distinct AA root.

NB2: Alternatively, the n- in these Ch. comparanda might be regarded as prothetic. In this case, we are dealing with a distinct AA root, cf. Bed. di “to say, mean”, nomen act. m^oād (so, -^o-) ~ mi(y)ād “talking, saying, expression” [Rpr. 1928, 167, 213] = miād “words, speech” [Hds. 1996 MS, 89] || LECu.: Elm. anádedeya “sprechen” [Heine 1973, 282] || CCh.: Masa de[?]e “to speak” [Krf.], Banana da ~ di “parler, dire” [Mch. 1950, 32] = diyē “to speak” [Krf.] || ECh.: Dangla diyē [d- < *nd-?] “dire” [Fédry 1971, 208] = diyē (sic, d-) “to speak” [Skn.].

(2) AA *m-t “1. to think, 2. say, speak” [GT] > LECu.: Orm. muṭē (adj.) “talkative (esp. of child)” [Gragg 1982, 296] | HECu.: Sid. muṭṭi muṭṭi yā “to be talkative” [Gsp. 1983, 243] || NOm.: SEOmt. *moḍ- “to think” [Bnd. 2003, 110 & 146, §101] > Zergulla moḍi “to think” [Sbr. 1994, 21], Koyra mac- ~ mas- [Flm.] = mas- [Crl.], Zayse moḍuc- (-ts-) “to think” [Bnd.] (SEOmt.: Bnd. 2003, 336,

§101) ||| CCh.: Gude mæəðə (iter.) “to say or tell much” [Hsk. 1983, 228], Gudu máwúḍù: “to speak” [Krf.] | Musgu-Pus miḍi “parler, dire” [Trn. 1991, 106], Musgu-Girvidik muḍ- ~ mæḍ- “sagen” [MB 1972–73, 70], Vulum (Mulwi) miḍi “dire, parler” [Trn. 1978, 304], Mulwi (Vulum) m`d` “parler” [Trn. 1978, 92], Møgrum miḍi “parler” [Trn. 1977, 26].

NB1: Any connection to Ar. mṭw: maṭā I “7. ouvrir les yeux” [BK II 1124] ||| WCh.: Kupto mēḍéy “sehen” [Leger 1992, 21]?

NB2: Cf. also CCh.: MM *b-d “to speak” [GT] > MG mà-bə̀bèḍ-èy “parler” [Brt. 1977, 22], Mada àmbàḍà “parler, dire, raconter” [Brt.-Bléis 2000, 199], Gsg. buboḍ “reden, miteinander reden” [Lks. 1970, 118] with an interchange of *m- ~ *b-.

- Other etymologies for Eg. mdw are out of question:
- 1. H.-W. Fischer-Elfert (1992, 41–43) assumed an etymological connection with Eg. mdw “Stab” (discussed above).
- 2. L. Homburger (1930, 285) regarded Eg. mdw as the ancestor of Ful wolw-ude, bolle, leb-ude (mng. and phonological rules not provided). Absurd.
- 3. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168) compared Eg. mdw with Bed. mīda (Hadendowa, Bisharin) ~ mīdala (Halenga) “Zunge” [Rn. 1895, 162–3] = mīdā-b ~ mīdalā-b “tongue” [Rpr. 1928, 214], although the root here seems to be √m-d-l, let alone the semantic difficulties.
- 4. C. T. Hodge (1981, 376) combined it with Sem. *lmd “to learn” (!) supposing a prefix *l- in Sem. Untenable both semantically and phonologically.
- 5. W. Vycichl (1991, 119) surmised (without mentioning any evidence) that it originated from the “African substrate”.
- 6. A. M. Lam (1993, 414): ~ Ful muddit “débiter des paroles”, mudditōwo “celui qui profère des paroles”.
- 7. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 193, #1761) affiliated it with Sem. *mdh “to praise” and LECu.: Som. madār “to bray, speak foolishness” < AA *-mad- “to speak out”.

***mdn** attested in: mdn-ḥs(f) “aiguiseur à rasoir” (MK coffin, Jéquier 1921, 127 & fn. 8) = “un aiguiseur en terre cuite (à côté des rasoirs, un objet étroit en haut, taillé en biseau à sa partie supérieure et peinte en rouge-brun)” (Jéquier 1921, 153, fn. 2) = “affûtoir de rasoir (ce avec quoi on aigüise le rasoir)” (OK, PK 1976 II, 423, n. d; AC 1978, 14) = “aguiseur de rasoir” (AL 77.1948, 78.1931) = “Schärfinstrument für den Rasierapparat” (WD II 69).

NB1: Composed of mdn + ḥs or ḥsf “le rasoir (mot inusité)” (Jéquier) = ḥs or ḥsf “rasoir” (PK) = ḥsf “Rasiermesser, Schaber” (ÄWb I 979). Jéquier (l.c.) rendered the lit. sense of mdn-ḥs(f) as “(pierre) pour (faire) trancher, couper le rasoir”.

nb2: Unrelated to mdn (act. mtñ) “Messer” (GR: Edfu VI 85:5, Wb II 182, 10), for which cf. which Eg. mtñ.wt above and mdnj.t below.

- Etymology disputable. G. Jéquier (1921, 153) treated it as a *nomen instr.* (m- prefix) derived from Eg. dn “abschneiden, verstümmeln” (MK, Wb V 463, 7–8), cf. dndn “abschneiden” (BD, Wb V 472, 9). Semantically uncertain.

nb1: H. Grapow (1914, 33) and the Diakonoff group (SISAJa II, #158) supposed the same of GR mdn, which may be false, since -d- in this GR word may eventually be traced back to old -t- (or -d-).

nb2: The etymology of Eg. dn is also disputable. A number alternatives have been proposed for its origin: (1) F. Behnk (1928, 141, §62) saw in dn a var. of zn (cf. Snk. 1993, 145 contra Ward 1961, 33, §7). (2) W. A. Ward (1961, 33, §7) has identified it with Sem. *dyn “to judge”. The semantic shift “to cut, separate” > “to judge” is well known in AA, cf., e.g., Eg. wpj “i.a. to separate, part vs. to judge” (OK, FD 59); Eg. wdʿ “to cut vs. to judge” (OK, FD 75); Akk. prs “trennen vs. entscheiden” [AHW 830]. (3) The Russian linguists (see SISAJa II, #158; HSED #762) compared Eg. dn with Eth.-Sem.: Tigre dännä “couper” [DRS 283] = “отрезать (to cut off)” [SISAJa]. (4) C. T. Hodge (1968, 25) equated Eg. dn [$< *dl?$] with LECu.: Som. dil-ayya “to kill, beat” [Abr. 1964, 61], Oromo dilli “battle” [Hodge]. Cp. also HECu. *dul- “to slaughter (cattle)” [Hds. 1989, 408] > Burji dul- “to bore through”, Sid. dul-a “to skin an animal” (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 186; Sasse 1982, 58) ||| WCh. *dala “ρονοπ (axe)” [Stl. 1987, 173]. (5) OS 1992, 196: ~ ECh. *dʿanH- “to kill” (no reflexes mentioned).

mdn “1. ruhig sein, sich ruhig verhalten, 2. die Ruhe” (late NK, Wb II 182, 8–9; GHWb 379) = “être au repos” (Ceugney 1880, 9 after Pierret) = “to be at rest” (Yeivin) = “to be at rest, at ease, fixed, stuck, placed” (Camino 1954 LEM, 198; DLE I 253) = “to be quiet” (CED) > Dem. mtñ (DG 189:10) = “to repose” (CED) > Cpt. (SB) (ε)ΜΤΟΝ, (ALSF) ΠΤΑΝ, (F) ΕΗΤΑΝ “ruhig sein, ruhen, genesen”, (m) “Ruhe, Wohlbefinden, Erleichterung, Linderung, Heilung, Wohltat” (KHW 105) = “to be at rest, at ease, be relieved (of sickness)”, (m) “rest, ease, relief, health (rare in S)” (CD 193–5; CED 94) = “ruhig sein, zustimmen” (Vcl. 1933, 180) = “être tranquille, calme, reposer, guérir” (DELC 125) = (m) “Gesundheit, Lagern” (Snk.) vs. Cpt. (S) ΜΟΤΝΕC ~ ΜΟΤΝΕC, (S^aS^fL^f) ΜΑΤΝΕC, (M) ΜΑΤΗC, (B) ΜΟΘΝΕC (f) “ease, contentment, facility, opportunity, pleasantness, satisfaction, equivalent (of debt), relief” (CD 195) = “Ruhe, Zufriedenheit, Vergnügen” (KHW 105 & fn. 3).

nb1: Vocalized as masc. *mādn(w) vs. fem. *mādnʿt (Snk. 1983, 225–6) = intr. *madin, verbal noun *madān > *madān (DELC 125) = inf. *mʿtān (GT).

nb2: The rdg. and rendering of (hr m) mdn.w (GW) in Pap. Torino 1879 vs. 1:20 (cf. also KRI II 475:6) is debated: “(an der) Versorgung” (Helck MWNR II 197: var. wtg. of mtñ, cf. Wb II 170, 11–14) = “(tomber dans) l’impuissance (?)” (Meeks, AL 79.1429) = “(at) ease” (Hovestreydt 1997, 112, n. oo).

- As pointed out by Sh. Yeivin (1933, 108; 1936, 71–72, #18), it reflects act. *mtn (or represents a var. with -d- akin to it) that may be cognate with Sem. *mtn “to be strong, firm → firmly established, immobile” [Yeivin]: PBHbr. mtn hifil “1. warten, 2. vorsichtig sein” vs. JAram. mtn peal “1. (er)warten, 2. vorsichtig sein” [Dalman 1922, 259] = PBHbr. mtn hifil “abwarten, harren (eig. wohl fest sein)” [Levy 1924 III 297] = PBHbr. mtn qal “to be long, slow, wait esp. to lie over for complete ripening”, hifil “1. to last, remain fresh, 2. keep, let (fruits) lie over, 3. wait, tarry, postpone, 4. be slow, patient” vs. JAram. mtn peal “to cause delay, let wait”, afel “to tarry, remain, wait” [Jastrow 1950, 863], NHbr. mtn “to delay, wait, be slow”, māṭūn “careful, sedate, slow” [Yeivin], Samar. Aram. mtn “tranquility, waiting, rest” [DNWSI 492], JPArām. mtn “to wait” [Sokoloff 1990, 337], Syr. maṭīnā “être indolent, doux” [Lsl.] || Ar. matana “8. s’arrêter dans un lieu”, matuna “être ferme, solide, robuste et résister aux fatigues”, cf. perhaps also madana “1. se fixer, s’établir dans un lieu” [BK II 1058, 1079] = matuna I “fest, stark, solide sein”, matn- ~ maṭīn- “fest, stark, solide” [Wehr 1952, 793] = matina “to be strong, solid, firm” [Yeivin] || (?) Sqt. mīten-hon [perhaps < *mitenhon] “mou” [Lsl. 1938, 242] (Sem.: Kopf 1976, 148 with parallels for “strong” vs. “to wait”).

NB1: In Yeivin’s (l.c.) view, a direct borrowing of Eg. mdn from Can. is not likely, while C. Peust (1999, 308, fn. 415–6), who also considered this Eg.-Sem. etymology “very probable”, attributed the just the opposite to Yeivin (as if he had “hesitatingly taken” this parallel as a LEg. < Sem. loan). GT: in the light of the irreg. Eg. -d- and the lack of GW, a genetic cognacy seems more probable.

NB2: Any other etymology is out of question. (1) C. Ceugney (1880, 9) analyzed it as m- prefix + tnw (no mng. provided). (2) W. Vycichl (1933, 180), in turn, derived LEg. mdn (perhaps *mjdn) from *jdn “hören” (sic), which cannot be justified at all, because the extinct Eg. *jdn may have only meant “ear” (cf. Gilula 1975, 251; Vcl. 1985, 172, §1) and by no means “to be silent”. The ear det. in mdn does not necessarily indicate an etymological connection. It may be purely due rather to the influence of the orthography of the words containing the sequence (j)dn (cf. Wb I 154; V 463, 6 & 466, 3 & 470, 2–3).

mdnj.t (MK, older *mdnj.t?) “Medenit (Name des 22. oberägyptischen Gaus)” (OK, ÄWb, discussed below s.v. *mdnj.t).

mdnb.w (pl., MK, from an older unattested *mdnb.w) “part of the heaven” (MK, Spencer, discussed below s.v. *mdnb.w).

***mdr/*mtr** (?) > Cpt. (S) ματρ, (B) ματερ (≈ Gk. κόλλα) “glue” (CD 196a) = “Leim” (KHW 105) = “colle” (DELIC 125).

NB: No pre-Cpt. evidence is available. In principle, both old *-t- and *-d- are plausible, but the external parallels suggest rather a pre-Cpt. etymon *mī/éd̥r (less likely than, e.g., *mūt̥r). The retention of final -p indicates a lost third syllable and/or late borrowing in a period by that the erosion of old Eg. *-r# had completed, but by that the shift of NK -d- > pre-Cpt. -t- vs. LP *-é- (from NK *-í-) > (SB) -a- had not.

- As suggested by A. Ember (quoted in Spg. KHW; Wst. KHW 105; DELC 125), it may be related to Sem. *midr- “terriccio” [Frz. 1969] = “loam” [Frz. 1975, 48]: PBHbr. meder “Erde, Lehm” [Dalman 1922, 225] = “ordure, a material used for vessels” [Jastrow 1950, 735] = “argilla” [Frz.] = “clod of earth” [Lsl.], JAram. mādār “Erd-scholle, weiche Erde, lutum” [Levy 1924 III 32], Syr. medrā “zolla” [Frz.] = “clod, soil” [Lsl.] | OSA (Sab.) mdr “territory, ground” [SD 83] = “1. earth, soil, 2. (rural) districts” [Biella 1984, 267] = “land” [Lsl. 1969] = “territory, ground” [Lsl. 1987], Ar. madar- “zolle di argilla” [Frz.] = “boue sèche et tenace, sans sable” [BK II 1078] = “Erd-schollen, Lehm(klumpen)” [Wehr 1952, 800] = “aussi: (motte d’)argile” [Vcl.] = “clods of earth, mud” [Lsl.], fem. madar-at- “motte de boue, d’argile, avec laquelle on construit des maisons” [BK] = “fango” [Prd.], hence (as denom. verb) Ar. madara “enduire de boue, d’argile (le sol, l’abreuvoir)” [BK] || MSA: Mehri mdēr “Lehmziegel” [Jahn 1902, 210a quoted by Ember apud KHW, not in Jns. 1987] = medēr “sun-dried brick” [Lsl.] = mder (sic) “brique” [Vcl.] || Geez medr “terra, campo” [Frz.] = medr “Land, Erde” [Lsl. 1969] = mādār “country” [Apl.] = mēdr “terre” [Vcl.] = mōdr “1. earth, ground, bottom (of a pit), soil, 2. field, country, land, territory, district, region” [Lsl. 1987], Amh. mader “Erde” [Rn. 1873, 10, fn. 1] = mādār “earth” [Apl.], Tigre & Amh. & Grg. mādār “soil, earth” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Frz. 1969, 308, #6.05; Lsl. 1969, 20; 1987, 330; Bnd. 1970, 34; Apl. 1977, 37/79). The final Cpt. -p suggests that the LEg./Cpt. word was borrowed from a certain (Aram.?) reflex of the Sem. word. NB1: Whether there is an Akk. parallel is dubious. Several authors, e.g., P. Fronzaroli (l.c.), W. von Soden (AHW 651), W. Leslau (1969, 20), and D. Appleyard (1977, 37/79), have combined the Geez (etc.) reflex(es) with the “enigmatic” (Zadok) OAkk. midrum “eine Art Land (sorta di terra)” (but CAD m2, 48: mng. uncertain). R. Zadok (1991, 117, §26), in addition, compared also Emar Akk. ma-da-ri-ia “field” and even Akk. (OB, SB) madāru II “(mng. uncert.)” [CAD m1, 11b]. NB2: W. Vycichl (DELC 125) supposed that the Eg.-Sem. parallel represents perhaps an m- prefix *nomen instr.* (!), but he failed in presenting any evidence. This is certainly excluded, the PSem. *C₁iC₂C₃- pattern being typical of triconsonantal roots. M. Jastrow (1950, 735) erroneously traced back the Can. word (via met.) to *√mrd, comparing JAram. mirdā “ordure, a material for vessels”. NB3: For the semantic dispersion in Eg. and Sem., cf., e.g., Gmc. *leima- (m) “Leim, Kalk (LEW: eig. Klebstoff aus einer Erdmasse, Kluge: die Wurzel bezeichnet offenbar zunächst einen Stoff zum Verschmieren von Wänden o.ä.)” ~ Lat. lēvis “glatt, blank, schlüpfrig, fließend” ~ Gk. λείος “glatt”, eventually akin to Gmc. *lai-ma/ōn

(m) “Lehm” ~ OPrussian layso “Letten, Ton(erde)”, laydis “Lehm” ~ Lat. *lĭmus* “(Boden)Schlamm, Kot, Schmutz” ~ Alb. *leth, ledhi* “feuchter Ton, Schlamm” < IE **lei-* “schleimig, davon: 1. durch Nässe glitschiger Boden, ausgleiten, worüber hinschleifen oder -streichen, 2. klebrig” [IEW] = “streichen, schmieren” [Kluge] (LEW I 789, 804–5; IEW 662–4; Kluge 1999, 510, 513).

NB4: The AA background of the Sem. term is obscure. L. Reinisch (1873, 10, fn. 1) erroneously compared the Amh. reflex with an odd (probably false) SBrb.: Wlmd. *ta-medur-t* “Landschaft” (not listed in PAM 2003; K.-G. Prasse, p.c., 10 April 2007: *ta-medur-t* “*is unknown to me in Tuareg*”) as well as NBrb.: Mzg. *a-maḍal* “earth”. Also M. Cohen (1947, 191, §477) combined Sem. **mdr* with Tuareg (sic, act. Hgr.) *ā-maḍal* “terre”. The latter forms reflect common Brb. **√m-d-l* “earth” [GT], which is, however, certainly unrelated to Sem. **midr-*. U. Paradisi (1960, 160), in turn, compared the Ar. reflex with EBrb.: *Audjila te-medyā-t* ~ *te-medyā-t* “1. argilla, 2. anche: terra rossa”, but Brb. *-γ-* ≠ Ar. GT: similarly, the connection of Sem. **midr-* with NBrb.: Mzg. *ta-mḍir-t*, pl. *ti-mḍir-in* “*parcelle de terrain délimitée par des sillons qu’on doit labourer en une journée*” [Tf. 1991, 406] seems also unlikely (Brb. **-d-* ≠ Sem. **-d-*). GT: Sem. **midr-* may be eventually akin to LECu.: Baiso *madār-* “to build” [HL 1988, 126] = “bauen” [Lmb.] ||| NOm.: Sns. *māddirā* “1. Wand, 2. Hausmauer” [Lmb.] (Cu.-Om.: Lmb. 1993, 350). For this semantic dispersion cf., e.g., Av. *pairi-daēzayēiti* “mauert ringsum”, Gk. *τεῖχος* “Mauer, Wand”, Lat. *finō* “1. kneten, eine Masse gestalten, bilden, formen (besonders weiche Massen wie Ton, Wachs usw.), 2. erdichten, 3. streichen etwas über hin, streichelnd betasten”, Norwegian *diga* “dicke, weiche Masse” < IE **d^heiǵ^h-* “Lehm kneten und damit mauern oder (Mauer, Wall, Töpferei) bestreichen” (IEW 244–5) = “schmieren, kneten, streichen (Lehm und damit mauern, auch von der Töpfer- und Teigmasse)” (LEW 501–2). Or cf. the history of Gmc. **mak-ō-* “machen” < IE **maǵ-* “kneten, (Hauswände) mit Lehm verschmieren” (IEW 696–7; Kluge 1999, 530).

mds (knife det.) “1. gewalttätig, 2. fest (von der Sohle, mit Bezug auf den Gang des Königs), 3. scharf, schneidend (vom Messer, von den Augen, vom Gesicht)”, as intr. verb “4. gewalttätig sein, 5. (vom Speer, der in dem Bösen) wütet” (OK, Wb II 183, 5–10; WD II 69: cf. RdE 27, 1975, 147aa) = “*ce qui coupe*” (GR, Drioton 1940, 425, §160) = “scharf” (PT 402a–b ÜKAPT VI 136) = “schneidig” (PT, AÄG 189, §428.dd) = “1. (PT 962) sharp (of knife), (BD) acute (of vision), (MK) forceful (of character), (XVIII.) firm-planted (of foot)” (FD 123) = “(CT VII 162h) determined (of heart), (CT VII 452, also Urk. IV 969:1) spiteful (of heart), (Les. 79:7) forceful (of character)” (AECT III 84–85, spell 946, n. 5 & III 164, spell 1119, n. 9) = “mighty, sharp” (Smith 1979, 163) = “to become sharp (edged)” (PT, Allen 1984, 557) = “1. (CT, BD) gewalttätig, aggressiv, 2. (Pap. Anastasi I 1:8) hervorstechend (die aus CT, BD bekannte Konnotation kommt hier nicht in Betracht)” (Fischer-Elfert 1986, 21, n. x) = “to act viciously” (Hibis, Cruz-Urbe 1988, 268) = “to be sharp (of knife), violent, forceful, revengeful, spiteful” (DCT 192–3) = “1. scharf (Messer), 2. energisch, schneidig, 3. gewalttätig”, *mds-jb* “boshaft, gemein” (PT, 1st IMP, CT, ÄWb I 578; ÄWb II 1168) >

- Dem. mts (?) “schneidig” (Anksheshonqi Pap. Louvre 2414, 1:12, Thissen 1984, 81 with discussion: or mtr “unterrichten”?).
- Hence: **(1)** mds “Gewalttät(ig)er, Frevler” (PT, Wb II 183, 14–15; ÄWb I 578; ÄWb II 1168) = “Gewalttätiger < Schneidiger” (Altenmüller 1975, 268) = “Scharfer, Frevler” (CT, Snk. 1999, 90 & fn. 41 with exx.) = “Violent One (attribute of Seth)” (PL 480) = “violent one, slayer, carver” (CT, DCT 192–3), **(2)** pl. mds.w “die Ausgezeichneten” (XIII.: LD III 13b, Wb II 183, 17; ÄWb II 1169: CT VI 230b+e, VI 193e) = “Verbrechen auf Erden” (PT 281a-b, ÜKAPT VI 136) = “the violent ones” (PT 281a–b, AEPT 63) = “the sharp ones (or those of the knives)” (CT VII 355e, VII 502c, VI 193e, Lesko 1972, 91–92 & n. f, 145) = “they of the sharp knives” (CT VI 193e, AEPT II 182) = “Scharfer” (CT VII 355e, Snk. 1999, 90), **(3)** mds used as tr. verb: “6. (die Feinde, die Bösen) niedermetzeln, (ihre Körperteile) zerschneiden (GR, Wb II 183, 11–12) = “tuer avec un instrument tranchant” (GR, Ceugney 1880, 9) = “to cut down (foes)” (Pap. BM 10569: Book of Horus, 3rd cent. BC, Faulkner 1958, 38) = “schlachten” (PT 402a–b ÜKAPT VI 136) = “to cut down (quarry)” (PT 402, FD 123; AEPT 81, 165) = “to cut down” (CT VI 342, AEPT II 269, spell 711, n. 6 & CT VII 420, AEPT III 157, spell 1101, n. 1; DCT 192–3) = “zerschneiden” (Verhoeven 1984, 54) = “to stab, stick, cut” (PL 480) = “abstechen” (ÄWb I 578: PT 402a; ÄWb II 1168: CT VI 319o, VI 266g), **(4)** mds “Messer des Schesmu (CT VI 8c, 32f), des Krokodils (CT VII 492a, cf. CT IV 347d)” (Altenmüller 1975, 346–7) = “knife” (PT 1999c, CT VII 96j, AEPT III 48, 50, spell 885, n. 32; DCT 192–3) = “couteau” (Edfu VIII 27:1, AL 78.1934) = “Messer” (Budde & Kurth 1994, 13, §57: GR; Snk. 1999, 90 & fn. 42 with CT exx.; ÄWb I 578: PT 1999c & 1606b; ÄWb II 1168: CT exx.).
 - Etymology debatable.
 - **1.** Usually treated as an m- prefix form deriving from Eg. ds “Messer” (PT, Wb V 486–487), cf. denom. ds “schneiden” (LP, Wb V 487, 2–3). LIT. “ce qui coupe” (Drioton) = “scharf wie ein Messer” (Bidoli)? Eg. mds is attested also in a pun together with ds in CT III 337g: jnk ds mds jmj ʕ dḥwtj “ich bin der scharfe Messer in der Hand des Thoth” (Bidoli).
LIT.: Ceugney 1880, 9; Feichtner 1932, 218f.; AÄG 189, §428.dd; Bidoli 1976, 79; Smith 1979, 163; Verhoeven 1984, 54, fn. 5; Cauville 1987, 184; PL 480; Stz. 1999, 380; Snk. 1999, 90.
NB1: For the etymology of Eg. ds cf. **(1)** Ar. dws: dāsa I “polir, fourbir (une lame, etc.)”, dūs- “poli, brillant (lame, plaque de métal)”, nomen instr.: midwas- “2. lis-

soir, instrument avec lequel on fourbit” [BK I 750] = dws I “to polish, sharpen (a blade)” [Alb.]. Cf. Alb. 1927, #94 & Ember 1930, #26.a.23 (Eg.-Ar.); Blv. 1989, 15 (Eg.-Ar.). (2) SOM. *dēs- “to kill” [GT]: Ari dēs- ~ dēs-, Hamer dēs-, Dime dēs- (SOM.: Bnd. 1994, 153) || WCh. *dVc- [Stl.]: Hausa dááà “1. to cut off a portion, 2. cut up by repeated chopping blows (e.g. grass), 3. make holes in cloth” [Brg. 1934, 237] | (?) Tangale òyà [< *disa?] “knife” [Jng. 1991, 80] | Dokshi (Lushi, misquoted by Stl. as Zeem) -dùcə- “to kill” [Smz. 1978, 36, #65.21] (Stl. 1987, 170) || CCh.: Kotoko dósə “hauen mit scharfem Werkzeug” [Lks. 1936, 89; JI 1994 II, 17] || ECh.: Kabalay dàsi, Gabri dās-in, Dormo dōsi “knife” (Lay gr.: Stl.) | Sokoro dēsídēsì “cut” [Stl.] = dis “zerschneiden” [Nct./JI 1994 II, 99]. The connection with NBrb.: Mzab tí-mədyaz (pl.) “ciseaux” [Dlh. 1984, 116], Wargla tí-mdyaz (fem. pl.) “ciseaux, cisailles” [Dlh. 1987, 186] is dubious. Lit. for this AA etymology: SISAJa II, 63–64, #125 (NBrb.-Eg.-WCh.); Djk. et al. 1986, 33 (NBrb.-Eg.-WCh.-Sokoro); Blv. 1989, 15 (Eg.-Ar.-WCh.); OS 1989, 135 (Eg.-ECh.); HSED #610–611 (Eg.-Ch.). (3) A.G. Belova (l.c.) compared it also with Ar. *ḍatta* “lancer des projectiles, frapper fort” [BK I 669], which is less probable (Hausa -c- < AA *c- ≠ Ar. -ṭ- < AA *č-). (4) H. Satzinger (1999, 380) connected PT ds “Messer” with MK ^ᶜd.t “Gemetzl” (with the supposed Rösslerian interchange of ^ᶜ ~ d and d ~ ḍ) and ultimately derived both roots from AA *ḍac ~ *ṭac.

NB2: S. Cauville (1987, 184) explained Eg. pds “1. breitrücken, 2. zerstören” (OK, Wb I 566, 18–19) = “détruire” (Cauville) as a p- (!) prefix derivative of Eg. ds, which is semantically unacceptable. In addition, Eg. pds ~ Sem. *ptš (cf. EDE II 542).

- 2. GT: semantically, more likely seems a relationship (via met.) to Brb. *m-s-d “to be sharp” [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh msad “être aiguisé” [Jst. 1914, 144; Jordan 1934, 93] = msad “to be very sharp” [Aplg. 1958, 61], Zrwl. msād “sehr scharf sein” (wohl eine Habitativform) [Stumme 1899, 209], Sus msad “être aiguisé” [Lst. 1921, 295] | Mzg. msed “être aiguisé, affilé” [Tf. 1991, 437], Ait Mgild msid “to be(come) sharp” [Harries 1974, 240], Zayan & Sgugu si-mseḍ “aiguiser” [Lbg. 1924, 568] | Mzab ie-msed “1. pointu, 2. rusé” [Msq. 1879, 524, 528] = ə-msəd “être affilé, tranchant, aigu”, a-msəd “pierre plate et polie finement sur laquelle on repasse le fil d’une lame ou sur laquelle on polit un objet” [Dlh. 1984, 123], Wargla ə-msəd “être affilé, aiguisé” [Dlh. 1987, 197] | Qbl. e-msed (var. e-mṣeḍ) “aiguiser, affiler”, a-msed, pl. i-mesd-en “pierre à aiguiser (grosse pierre calcaire ou grès fin, de rivière), 2. pierre lourde, 3. pierre à polir l’enduit d’un mur intérieur, ou de sol de la maison”, a-msad, pl. i-msad-en “pierre à aiguiser (une faux, une faucille)” [Dlt. 1982, 521, 524] || EBrb.: Gdm. se-msed “aiguiser” [Mtl. 1904, 99] = sə-msəd “aiguiser (une lance, une lame)” [Lanfry 1973, 218, #1036] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-msed “être affilé, être tranchant, être aigu, 2. s’affiler, 3. (fig.) être bien affilé (langue, des paroles), 4. (fig.) être acéré, mordant (langue), 5. être leste, prompt es agile dans ses mouvements, 6. (la vue, les yeux, les regards) être perçant (voir les objets très petits ou très éloignés)”, caus. se-msed “aiguiser” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1247], Ghat

se-mšed (caus.) “aiguiser” [Nhl. 1909, 125], Tadghaq & Tudalt ə-mšəd “to be sharp” [Sudlow 2001, 133].

NB: The inner/external etymology of the common Brb. root has been disputed. (1) V. Loubignac (1924, 568) derived it from a primary root attested in Zayan $\sqrt{m-d}$ -u: mdu “être tranchant, bien aiguisé”, but he failed to explain the function of *-s-. (2) O. Rössler (1952, 136, §37) affiliated Hgr. $\sqrt{m-s-d}$ with Akk. mašādu “drücken” [Rsl.] = G “(mit Krankheit) schlagen, (Stoff) walken, (etwa) massieren”, D “massieren (?)”, Š “hämmern (?)” [AHW 623] and vulg. Ar. massada “massieren, frottieren (die Glieder mit den Händen)” [Rsl.] derived from AA *m-š-d “pressend reiben”. Cf. also Ar. madasa “frotter (du cuir, etc.)” [BK II 1078]. Semantically dubious (common Brb. “sharp” ≠ Sem. “to press” or sim.). Note that H. Bauer (1915–16, 107, §6) and P. Haupt (quoted in GB 841) combined Bab. mašādu (≈ maḥāšu “schlagen” and sapānu “überwältigen”) rather with Hbr. šmd hiḥil “zerstören, vernichten” [GB]. (3) S. Chaker (1973–79, 300, §16) took Brb. * $\sqrt{m-s-d}$ from a biconsonantal Brb. *m-s- based on the false equation with Shilh-Qbl.-Trg. *m-s-l “façonner, modeler”. (4) GT: cp. perhaps CCh.: Mada čād čād ~ čéd čéd ~ eččédá “pointu, aigu, effilé” [Br.-Brunet 2000, 78]?

- 3. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 193, #1763): ~ ECu. *mud- “to pierce, stab”. Unacceptable.

*mdg3 (?) > Cpt. (SAL) $\eta\theta\eta\delta$, (SF) $\epsilon\eta\theta\eta\delta$, (B) $(\epsilon)\eta\theta\eta\chi$, pl. (L) $\eta\theta\epsilon\delta\epsilon$ (m) “plant, herb, weed” (CD 233a) = “Pflanze, Kraut, Unkraut, Gras, Wurzel” (KHW 129).

NB: Vocalized as *mǝdǝ/ǝgǝ3, pl. *mǝdǝgǝ3.ǝw with the shift of *mǝd- > *md- > *nd- via assim. (Osing).

- J. Osing (NBÄ 256, 828, n. 1109): pass. part./noun derived (via m-prefix) from Eg. dg3 “pflanzen” (late NK, Wb V 499, 10) > Cpt. (S) $\tau\omega\delta\epsilon$ etc. “to plant” (CD 465). Cf. also Steindorff 1951, §112a; AÄG xxxix, §256A; KHW 129; Snk. 1983, 214.

mdd (GW) “Maß für Wein” (XX.: Pap. Harris I 64a:5, Wb II 183, 18) = “Gefäß” (Helck) = “vessel for measuring wine” (CED with further exx.) = “vessel” (DLE I 209; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 82) = “a vessel, containing wine and milk, measure (?)” (Hoch).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: má-di-d<i> (Helck) = má-di-di (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey). NB2: J. Černý (CED 94) saw in it the etymon of Cpt. (S) $\eta\theta\omega\tau\epsilon$ “(mng unknown)” (CD 196a) = “a vessel (?)” (CED) = “ein Gegenstand (in einer Liste, vielleicht ein Gefäß)” (KHW 521) comparing the shift of LEg. (GW) -dj dj > (S) - $\tau\omega\tau\epsilon$ to that of LEg. (GW) mšdd.(t) > (S) $\eta\theta\omega\tau\omega\tau\epsilon$ (q.v.).

- Borrowed from some Can. (?) reflex of Sem. *mdd “to stretch out, measure” [Ward].

LIT. for Eg. < Sem.: Leslau 1962, 45, #1; Helck 1962, 563, #133; 1971, 515, #133; Ward 1968, 68 & fn. 34; CED 94; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 25, §1.2.7.1; Hoch 1994, 176, #237 & 177, #238.

NB1: Attested in Akk. maḏādu “(ver)messen”, middatu > mindatu “Maß” [AHW 571, 650] = maḏādu “to measure (using a measure of capacity or length), pay, deliver in a measure of capacity, measure (length), survey”, middatu (mindatu, maddatu, mandatu) “1. measure of capacity, 2. of length, area, and time, 3. measuring rod”

[CAD m1, 5 & m2, 46] = “die Länge messen” [GB] || Ug. *mdd “to measure” > md-m “(designating members of a certain guild, perhaps) surveyors” [Gordon 1955, 286, #1067], Ug. (syll.) ma-ad-da-tù /maddatu/ “measurement” [Hrg. 1999, 139], Phn. mdd “to measure”, md-t “measure, scale” [Harris 1936, 116], Hbr. mdd qal “messen”, piel “sich dehnen, 2. vermessen”, middā “Ausdehnung, Maß” [GB] = qal “to measure”, hitpo. “to stretch oneself out over”, middā “measure” [KB 547], PBHbr. and JAram. (Talmud) mdd “to measure”, middā “dimension, measure, proportion” [Jastrow 1950], Off./Imp. Aram. mddh “conduct” < orig. * “measure” [DNWSI 595] | OSA (Mdb) md “période” [Arbach 1993, 67] vs. (Sab.) md-t “period (of time)” [SD 83], Ar. mdd “1. allonger en tirant, 2. étendre comme un tapis, 3. prolonger”, mudd- “certaine mesure des substances sèches équivalant au quart d’un šāʿ-”, mudd-at- “1. longueur, étendue, 2. espace (i.a., espace de temps)” [BK II 1075–76] = mdd “strecken” [GB] = mdd “vorwärts-, hinaufgehen, ausstrecken” [Aro] = mdd “to draw, pull, strain, stretch (forth), extend by drawing, lengthen, prolong, expand, make sg. much in quantity, increase”, mudd- “a certain measure with which corn is measured, equal to a pint and one third of the standard of Baghdad, i.e., the quarter of a šāʿ-”, mudd-at- “the utmost or extreme extent, term, limit, reach or point of time and of place, a long or any space of time” [Lane 2695–7] || MSA *mdd “to stretch” [GT]: Hrs. med “to stretch out, aim (gun)” [Jns.], CJbl. midd “to stretch (out), push forward, give, extend, point a gun” [Jns.] = miʿd “to stretch” [Nkn.], Mhr. mudd “1. ausstrecken, 2. abgeben, übergeben, bezahlen” [Jahn] = mād “to stretch (out)” [Jns.] = mid(d) “to stretch” [Nkn.], Sqt. med “étendre”, médde “espace de temps” [Lsl.] = med ~ mid [Jns.] = mād “to stretch” [Nkn.] (MSA: Jns. 1977, 87; 1981, 168; 1987, 260–1; Nakano 1986, 83, #611) || Geez madada “to execute, spread, level” [Lsl.], Tigre mdd “to stretch” [LH 141a], cf. also Tigre mdmd “1. to spread, stretch, 2. attack” [Lsl.], Amh. mdmd “to level off, even” [Lsl.], Tna. mdmd “to level, flatten” [Lsl.], Amh. mādāmmādā “to flatten, level, cut down one after another (trees), destroy” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1987, 329; Hbr.-Amh.: Lsl. 1968, 358, #1427; 1969, 52; Sem.: GB 398; Lsl. 1938, 238; Gordon 1955, 286, #1067; Aro 1964, 169; Lsl. 1969, 19; Zbr. 1971, #138). For the basic sense of Sem. *mdd cf. also JNAram. myd “to stretch” [Sabar 2002, 216]. For Ug. md (rendered diversely, e.g., as (1) “cover, lid”, (2) “sheath”, (3) “a measure (as a jeweller’s tool)”, (4) “a garment”), cf. Watson 2002, 923, l. 4.

NB2: H. Möller (1911, 157) equated Sem. *mdd with IE *m-d- “messen” (sic) [Möller] = *med- “(er)messen” [IEW 705–6]. A.R. Bomhard (1984, 273, #281), in turn, saw the regular Nst. correspondence of IE *mā/at- [Bmh.] in Ar. mṭṭ “to expand, stretch, lengthen”, mṭl “to draw out, lengthen, expand, stretch”, mṭy “to stretch”. NB3: W. Vycichl (DELIC 117) derived Cpt. (S) مِطْر, (B) مِطْر (m) “nom d’une mesure de céréales, moins qu’une artabe” of “obscure origin” (via *muddi > *mundi) from a Sem. source close to Ar. mudd- (UEg. midd-) “32,96 litres, 1/6 d’ardabb” ignoring J. Osing’s (1978, 189) more convincing proposal to identify the Cpt. word with Eg. mnd “une mesure pour le grain” (XVIII. hapax: Urk. IV 1342:5, AL 78.1759). W. A. Ward (1969, 68), in turn, saw the genetic cognate of Sem. *mdd in Eg. mdw “staff” (discussed above).

NB4: Sem. *mdd originates from AA *m-d “to stretch” [GT], cf. NBrb.: Shilh mdi “to reach, catch” [Aplg. 1958, 61] | Mzab ṽm-d-y: ə-mdi “tendre (un piège)” [Dlh. 1984, 116] || Bed. midi “to stretch out”, med-im “to stretch (tr.)” [Hds. 1996, 89–90] || HECu.: Hdy. midid- “to stretch (body)” [Hds. 1989, 145], Burji mid- “to uproot” [Ss. 1982, 144], Kmb. moṣṣ-o “to pull” [Lsl.], Qbn. miṣṣ-o “to pluck out” [Lsl.], Tmb. miṣṣ-e “to reap” [Lsl.] (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 195).

NB5: SBrb.: Hgr. mūda, pl. mūdā-t-en “mesure de capacité d’un litre”, ā-mūdhu, pl. i-mūdḥ-ān “mesure de capacité de 30 litres” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1160] (kind p.c. by M. Kossmann, 16 April 2007) || Bed. mud (m) “measure for corn” [Hds. 1996 MS, 89] are recent loans borrowed from Ar. mudd-at- (above).

NB6: The etymology of NBrb.: Mzg. $\sqrt{m-d}$: mad “être de quantité égale, avoir la même contenance, la même capacité” [Tf. 1991, 402] is uncertain. M. Kossmann (kind p.c., 17 April 2007) assumes it could be an m- derivation (not unexpected with these semantics) of a verb ad, which could be derived from something like *abed or *ebed.

NB7: Similarly obscure is ECh.: Mkl. mīḏò [-q- < ?] (f) “mesure (avec une calebasse, une tasse, par ex.)” [Jng. 1990, 139].

md.t (also written **d.t**) “Salbe (zumeist allgemein, aber auch als nestimmte Salbe neben anderen Salbmitteln, besonders im Kultus verwendet, auch beim Balsamieren)” (PT, Wb II 185, 11–19; Koura 1999, 125–7) = “une catégorie d’onguents... employé pour l’Ouverture de la bouche (c’était un mélange de graisse de boeuf fondue et d’aromates; il ne s’agit pas d’une huile)” (Chassinat 1930, 118–9) = “ein gut duftendes Mittel, das gr. Stakte entspricht (\approx stj-ḥb)” (Balcz 1934, 77, fn. 2) = “Stakte (στακτή): ein tropfbar flüßiges Verarbeitungsprodukt des Myrrhenharzes usw.” (Steuer, cf. Meyerhof, OLZ 4, 1935, 214) = “oil” (FD 123; DLE I 258) = “oil, unguent (animal fat mixed with vegetable matter, one of the unguents used in the Opening of the Mouth, it is made fragrant and has as its base possibly cow grease, a manufactured rather than naturally occurring substance)” (PL 484 pace Charpentier 1981, 368–9, #584) = “ointment, oil” (DCT 193) = “Salbe (besonders im Kult)” (ÄWb I 579c; II 1170b).

NB: It occurs “oft ohne m (zumeist nach vorangehender Präposition m)” (presumably due to haplography), but only “seit D.18 auch vereinzelt in anderen Fällen” (Wb l.c.), which testifies to that m- was part of the original root (***md** or sim.).

- Etymology disputable. Most likely seems #3.
- **1.** H. Grapow (1914, 4): perhaps an m- prefix form deriving from a weak root. Later, Grapow (1950, 73) modified this hypothesis of the analysis of m- as a prefix here and only spoke of a “mobile” m- in **md.t** ~ **d.t** (unlikely, see above), leaving the etymology unsolved. B. Koura (1999, 127), although she saw “keine deutliche Ableitung” (on Eg. grounds) either, rendered it in the light of its usual context (where it occurs in connection with **d.t**) as a fossilized compound of the Eg. prep. m + **d.t** “Leib” (Wb V 503) resulting in a basic sense “(etwas, das) aus dem Gottesleib (herauskommt)” or “(das, was) im Leib (sich befindet bzw. sich befand)”. Very weak.
- **2.** H. Brugsch (Wb II 732) affiliated it with Eg. mdd “auspressen”, which in principle might only be possible on a bicons. basis (cf. Hodge’s suggestion below), but this hardly fits semantically (as noted by E. Chassinat 1930, 118: “le procédé de fabrication prescrit dans notre formule... n’opérait pas par pressurage”).

- 3. E. Chassinat (1930, 118-119 & fn. 2), in turn, suggested that it was probably a m⁶- (!) prefix form of dd3 “être gras” signifying originally “ce qui sert à graisser” or “celui qui est graisseux”. Absurd.
- 4. C.T. Hodge (1966, 45) equated it with WCh.: Hausa máacà (-ts-) “1. to squeeze out (juice from the lime-fruit), extract (oil from the ground-nuts), 2. press together, 3. massage, eke out (food)”, mácà “to pinch together, squeeze together” [Abr. 1962, 666]. Cf. also ECh.: WDng. mídyò (m) “pâte pressée pour faire l’huile” < mídyé “presser” [Fédry 1971, 131]. Such an etymology would hardly fit a term connected with animal grease.

NB: For the AA background of the Ch. root cf. Eg. mdd (below).

- 5. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 195, #1768) and GT (EEWC, independently) identified it with NOm. *moḡ-o “Fett, Öl” [Ehret]: NWOmt. *moḡ- “fat, grease” [Bnd.] > macro-Omt. *moḡ- [Bnd.]: Wlt. cluster *moḡ-o “fat, grease” [Bnd. 2003, 16, §46] > Wlt. (Wolamo) moḡa “Fett” [Bnd., Mkr.] = moḡuwa [Alm.] = moḡḡuwa “fat (noun)” [LS], Gofa moddō (sic, -dd-) “grasso” [CR 1927, 249] = moḡḡo [Alm.], Dawro (Kullo) mōḡwa “Fett” [Bnd., Mkr.] = moḡḡ-uwa [Alm.] = modwa (sic, -d-) “fat (n.)” [Lmb.] = moḡua [Bnd.], Konta modwā [Alm.], Gamu moḡḡo [Alm., Lmb.] = mḡḡo [Bnd.], Dache mōḡo “Fett” [Bnd., Mkr.] = moḡe “fat (n.)” [Lmb.], Dorze (Gerese) mōḡo [Bnd.] = moḡo [Mkr.] = moḡḡo [Alm.] = moḡe [LS/Bnd.], Oyda moḡo [Flm., Mkr.] = mō:ḡo [Bnd.], Malo moḡe “Fett” [Flm., Mkr.] = mōté ~ mōde (sic, -t-/ -d-) [Sbr.-Candwell] = mō:ḡo “fat, grease” [Bnd.], Doko modḡu (modḡhu) “grasso” [CR 1927, 249], Bsk. mōḡa [Bnd.-Flm.] (NWOmt.: Bnd. 1999 MS, 16, §46; 2000 MS, 55, §46) | SEOmt. *moḡ- “fat (n.)” [Bnd.]: Zayse & Zergulla moḡo [Bnd., Mkr.] | Sns. moḡḡo “fat (n.)” [Alm.] (NOm.: Bnd. 1971, 252, 254, 257; Mkr. 1981, 208, #30; Alm. 1993, 5, LS 1997, 457; Bnd. 2003, 116, §46).

NB1: GT: the NOm. root may be akin to SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr ə-moḡ “1. être épais (cuir, etc.), 2. être compact, solide, 3. être gras etc.”, cf. perhaps also EWlm. te-meḡ, pl. EWlm. & Ayr ši-/ti-meḡ-en “1. (sg.) gras foetal (qui recouvre le corps du nouveau-né au moment que sa mère le met au monde)” [PAM 2003, 523-4] ||| Bed. mōḡ “to put scent or fat on the hair” [Hds. 1996, 89] ||| HECu.: Sdm. moḡ- “esser grasso, spesso” [Mrn. 1940, 231]. Since AA *ṭ vs. *ḡ/*ḡ/*ḡ had merged in Bed. and NOm., these parallels might be, in principle, derived from a hypothetic AA *m-ṭ too.

NB2: M. Lamberti (1988, 32, §39; LS 1997, 457) combined the NOm. root with LECu.: Dasenech buoḡḡi “fat (n.)” and ECu. *b-r-(^c) “butter”. Phonologically dubious.

NB3: No evident Sem. cognates. Cf., however, Akk. māṣu (*mḡṣ?) “butter” [AHW 621] = “to churn” [CAD m1, 350] || Ug. mṣ “Melker (?)” [AHW] | Yemeni Ar. mwḡ: I māḡ “to milk, make thick milk, churn butter” [Pianta 1990, 474]? For

a Mnd. cognate of the Akk. root cf. Dietrich 1967, 299. The Akk. root has been erroneously combined by M. Held (1959, 171 & fn. 43–44) with Ar. maḥaḍa “to churn milk, shake” (which is discussed s.v. Eg. mdḥ “behauen”, Wb, below).

- **6.** GT: or cp. perhaps AA *m-ḥ “to rub” [GT]?
NB: Attested in Ar. mwṣ: māša “1. frotter qqch. avec la main pour nettoyer, 2. laver” [BK II 1168] = “die Zähne reinigen” [Wajnb.erg] || ES (Wajnb.erg: prob. borrowed from Ar.): Geez mwṣ: moša “to scrub, pick (the teeth), polish by rubbing, wash” [Lsl. 1987, 375], Tna. mewweṣe “forbire, pulire i denti” [Bassano] = meyyeṣe ~ mewweṣe [Coulbeaux], Tigre māyeṣe “puli i denti” [Missionne Catolica apud Wajnb.erg] = māṣ “gratte-dents” [Abbadie apud Dillmann], Amh. mwaččä “to pick or brush the teeth” [Lsl.] = mwāče [Baeteman, Guidi], cf. also Amh. mučča “glue” [Gragg] (ES: Wajnb.erg 1937, 36) || LECu.: Orm. mūča “to be rubbed” [Gragg 1982, 296] || NOm.: Badditu maḍ “ungere” [Crl. 1929, 62] || ECh.: EDng. ámdýe “frotter pour rendre lisse, tanner” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 12].
- **7.** GT: a comparison with JAr. am. mōg “a melting substance, wax (?)” < mwg “to melt” [Jastrow 1950, 738] and/or CCh.: Bdm. maigu “graisse” [Gaudiche 1938, 24] = maigé “Fett” [Nct./Lks. 1939, 118] seems dubious.
NB: Cf. also ECh.: Mkl. (t)òmmitgè “se frotter le corps en se lavant” [Jng. 1990, 153]?
- **8.** GT: with respect to the rare correspondence of Eg. -ḍ- ~ Sem. *-ḥ- (cf. EDE I 261–2), Ar. mīḥ-at- “styrax” (cf. myḥ VII “être en fusion, fondre, se dit de la graisse, etc.”) [BK II 1174] = “oil of myrrh” [Lsl.] > Geez miḥā ~ meḥā ~ miḥ “oil of myrrh, stacte, perfume” [Lsl. 1987, 325] may be perhaps also noteworthy.

md.t (usually in pl. **md.wt**) “Art Klammer oder Fessel (für das Vieh)” (PT 2202, Wb II 184, 15) = “(semle être) un instrument qu’on pique en terre et qui servait à attacher les bestiaux dans les champs” (Lacau 1913, 81) = “hobble for cattle (made of cord with a wooden cross-bar to be hidden below the earth)” (Grd. 1927, 508–9, V19 & n. 1 pace Montet) = “les arceaux plantés en terre par une corde nouée autour de la lèvre inférieure, qui est juste assez longue pour permettre au captif de se lever sur ses quatre pieds (les arceaux étaient plantés à l’intérieur d’un espace clos)” (Montet 1954, 45–46 & fn. 3) = “fetter” (Gdk. 1955, 33) = “bonds” (FD 123; AECT I 64, spell 67, n. 30; CT I 289) = “Fesselklammern, Strickösen (für Vieh im Boden)” (GHWb 380; ÄWb I 579).

NB: The word is preserved by the hrgl. V19 depicting the same object that was coloured in Dyn. 0/I black (Kahl 1997, 54, V20). L. Keimer (1949–50, 97) demonstrated that the hobble signified by Eg. md.t may have been used the same way as (probably) the same implement still in use today in Nubia: the hobble consists of a palm fibre cord and a large loop held by two big stones (cf. also Vcl. 1987, 120, §4).

- Later this meaning was extended *pars pro toto*: md.t “1. Viehhof, Stall → 2. Vieh, Herde” (OK, Wb II 185, 1–4) = “cow-house” (AEO I

90*, #192; II 215*, #457) = “1. byre → 2. stalled cattle” (FD 123) = “Stall (besonders für die Aufzucht und Mästung von Rindern, Wild und Geflügel..., charakterisiert durch Tröge, an die die Tiere gebunden waren)” (Helck, LÄ V 1254) = “Viehhof, Koppel, Pferch, Stall (Rind, Antilope, Geflügel)” (GHWb 380; ÄWb I 579).

- Its origin has been very much disputed. Most likely seems #5 (and perhaps also #7).
- **1.** E. Zyhlarz (1934, 111) saw in Eg. *md.wt* a cognate of SBrb.: Hgr. *ta-mdí-t* “grosse pierre (pièce de bois, bottillon d’herbages) à laquelle est attaché une corde (ou une chaîne), enfoncée, ou destinée à l’être, sous terre près de la surface du sol, l’extrémité de la corde restant hors du sol et pouvant servir à attacher un animal (cheval, âne, vache etc.)” < *e-mdi* “enfoncer sous terre près de la surface du sol” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1161] = “Viehkoppel” [Zhl. 1934] = “Pflock” [Zhl. 1936], Ayr *te-mdəy-t*, pl. *tí-mədday* & EWlm. *ta-ndi-t*, pl. *ši-nədday* “pièce de bois, corde, chaîne, pierre dont une partie est enfoncé sous terre, l’autre extrémité sortant du sol et servant à attacher un animal” [PAM 1998, 209; 2003, 523, 588], Tadghaq & Tudalt *ə-mdəy* “to tie (animal to stick)” [Sudlow 2001, 133]. However attractive it may be from a semantical viewpoint, this Eg.-SBrb. parallel can be by no means valid as SBrb. *-d* vs. Eg. *-d̥* do not correspond.
NB: Later, Zyhlarz (1936, 442) compared the Hgr. word to a certain Eg. *m’dy* (sic) “feststecken” (sic).
- **2.** H. Goedicke (1955, 33) and E. E. Knudsen (1962, 35, §7) assumed in Eg. *md.t* “bond” vs. *mḥ3* “fessel” a case of the supposed interchange of Eg. *ḥ* ~ *d̥*. But the uses of these words are different. In addition, a common origin is improbable in the light of convincing cognates to Eg. *mḥ3* confirming *-3* (not GW) < **-r*.
- **3.** C. T. Hodge (1966, 45, #34) identified Eg. *md.wt* “bonds with WCh.: Hausa *máácè* (*-ts-*) “to firmly wind on (turban)” [Abr. 1962, 668]. Phonologically possible (Hausa *-c-* < AA **-ç-* ~ Eg. *-d̥-*). But cf. Eg. *mdḥ* (below).
- **4.** P. Behrens (1984–85, 190, §4.27; quoted also apud Vcl. 1987, 120–1) erroneously derived Eg. *md.t* “Viehhof, Stall” from the basic sense **“Dorngehege”* or “umzäunter Platz zum Schutz der Tiere während der Nacht” and equated it with NOm.: Gimirra *māg* “sieve” [CR 1925, 621] = *mag* “fence” [Bnd.] | Kefoid **magg-* “fence” [Bnd.] > Kafa *magg-ō* “Hof, Haus mit allen Wirtschaftsgebäuden” [Rn. 1888, 315] = *magg-ō* “recinto per bestiame” [Crl. 1951, 470] = “Viehhof” [Behrens], Mocha *mágg-o* “cattle pen” [Lsl. 1959, 40]

- = “Viehgehege” [Behrens], Sns. mágg-o “cattle pen” [Lsl.] (NOM.: Bnd. 2003, 198, §29). Phonologically possible, but semantically false. Declined already by W. Vycichl (1987, 120–1).
NB: GT: for the NOM. root cf. also ECh.: Tumak mǫg “1. tenir, 2. étreindre, 3. serrer” [Cpr. 1975, 84].
- **5.** W. Vycichl (1987, 120, §4), in turn, explained Eg. mǫ.t “hobble for cattle” from the primary mng. “deep one”, since only the upper part of the hobble cord is visible, the lower parts of the hobble are in the earth. Cf. esp. Om. *mǫg- “to dig, bury” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. mǫ “deep”).
 - **6.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 182; HSED #1809), ignoring its original sense, combined Eg. mǫ.t (coll.) “stalled cattle” (!) with ECh.: Birgit (sic) muuzo “ox”. Perfectly incorrect. Rejected already by G. Takács (1996, 443, #6.1; 1996, 140).
NB: OS misquoted in fact Barein múúzo “Ochse” [Lks. 1937, 51]. Besides, Eg. -ǫ vs. ECh. *-z/*-ǫ seem irregular. Moreover, the ECh. word may be cognate to NOM. *miz- “bue” [Crl.] = “Rind” [Rn.] (NOM.: Rn. 1888, 318; Crl. 1938 III, 80, 115, 173, 206; 1951, 471–473; Lmb. 1993, 100), cf. Eg. mǫz.t “animaux à cornes (?)” (CT I 289c, AL 78.1667).
 - **7.** G. Takács (1996, 443, #6.1), agreeing with W. Vycichl (l.c.), supposed an eventual connection with LECu.: Somali mǫg-a “ein zugespitzter Stock zum Auflockern der Erde” [Rn. 1902, 288] = mǫg, pl. mǫgág “tent peg”, mǫg-ayya “to drive in the pegs (when erecting the tent)”, mǫg-e “two pieces of wood in which a strip of leather is fixed (to soften leather)” [Abr. 1964, 179] = mǫg-ga ~ mǫg-e-ha “peg” [Bell 1969, 176].
 - **8.** A. M. Lam (1993, 397) combined Eg. mǫ3.t (sic!) “bétail d’étable” (!) with Ful maǫǫatā “qui ne se perd pas” (!). Absurd.
 - **9.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 193, #1764) equated Eg. mǫ.wt “bonds” and a few other unacceptable Eg. parallels with Ar. mǫḍ “to wrap up the head” and PCu. *maǫ- “to roll, twist” < AA *-maǫ- “to set apart”.
NB: At the same time, Ehret (1997 MS, 194, #1765) compared Eg. mǫ.t “stalled cattle, byre” with a certain Sem. bicons. *mǫ- “to make go away”, LECu.: Afar mǫḍ- “to choose, select, set apart” < AA *-mǫǫ- “to set apart”.

md “Zahlwort: zehn” (OK, Wb II 184, 1) > Cpt. (SALMB) мнт (m), (SM) мнтε (f) “ten” (CD 187b; CED 92; KHW 104; DELC 124) > dial. of Pi-Solsel māḍ (Vcl. 1936, 171).

NB1: Vocalized as *mōḍu (sic, with *-ō-) (Vcl. 1936, 172) = *mēḍew/t (m/f) (sic, with false *-ē-) (Černý 1937, 57) = (m) *mūḍaw vs. (f) *mūḍḍt (Edel 1955, 166–176) = *mūḍ(a) (NBĀ 650, n. 672) = *mōḍ or sim. (Vcl. 1983, 124) = *mūḍ(a)w/t (m/f) (Loprieno 1986, 1309) = *mōḍ (Vcl. 1991, 121) = *mūḍḍw (GT). The *-ū- (not *-ē-) is confirmed and reflected by MBab. (Amarna, 14th cent. BC) cuneiform (in a list of Eg. words, EA 368) as mu-ṯu (cf. Smith & Gadd 1925, 230–8, esp. 236, §15;

Lambdin 1958, 186; Edel 1975, 11f.; NBĀ 650, n. 672; Edel 1980, 17 & fn. g; Vcl. 1983, 124; 1990, 102, §5; 1991, 121; Peust 1992, 118, #b; Mck. 1999, 299). For the vocalization with *-ū- cf. also Alb. 1926, 189; Vcl. 1956, 42; 1972, 179; Satzinger 1980, 83–84.

NB2: For establishing the final -d̄ see Sethe 1896, 90.

- This Eg. numeral has always been a challenge for Eg./AA linguistics. One of the most difficult words from the viewpoint of etymology. There have been offered several etymologies, but until very recently a fully satisfactory solution has not been found. The etymologies described under #1/2/5/6/7 are out of question for phonological or/and semantical considerations. Some other etymologies also have considerable drawbacks enough to have to be careful about them. #3 may not be fully excluded, while #4/8/9/10 are perhaps possible. However, the solution outlined in #11 seems to be most probable both phonologically and semantically.
- 1. A. Trombetti (1902, 198), C. Brockelmann (1908, 487), W. Worrell (1926, 272), and G.A. Barton (1934, 30) erroneously equated LEg. md, Dem. mt, and Cpt. (S etc.) MHT with Sem. *miʔ-át- “hundred” [Dlg.] (ignoring OEg. m̄d and the fact that the Sem. fem. marker *-at- was not part of the root). This phonologically fully unreal suggestion has rightly been declined already by W. F. Albright (1918, 92, fn. 6), later also by F. A. Dombrowski and B. W. W. Dombrowski (1991, 342), and by V. Blažek (1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10).
- 2. There has been a long tradition of mistakenly comparing Eg. m̄d with the reflexes of PBrb. *m̄raw “10” [Zhl. 1934–35, 185] = *marāw [Prs. 1974, 403, 405] = *mra (m), *mra-ut (f) [Zvd. 1975, 50–51, §14.0] = *mārāw (sic) [Vernus] = *maraw [Mlt., GT]. Correctly rejected by W. Vycichl (1983, 124), followed by G. Takács (1995 MS, 4, #7; 1996, 139, #35; 1996, 442, #2.3), as there is no evidence for Eg. -d̄ ~ Brb. *-r-, while Brb. *-w is part of the root (contrary to Eg. masc. m̄d.w vs. fem. m̄d.t).

LT.: this theory was maintained or supported by a number of scholars, cf., e.g., Gabelentz (1894, 99); Meinhof (1912, 240); Zyhlarz (1931, 137–138, #8; 1932–1933, 104; 1934, 104, 106, 111, fn. 1); Mercier (1933, 314); Wölfel (1954, 58); Lefebvre (1955, 276) and Korostovcev (1963, 14): both misquoting the Brb. root as mzu (sic!); Rössler (1966, 227; 1971, 317); Zavadovskij (1967, 43; 1974, 111–112; 1975, 50–51, §14.0); Loprieno (1986, 1309); Blažek (1989, 215–216; 1990, 41; 1997, 17–18); Dombrowski and Dombrowski (1991, 344); Vernus (2000, 180, 192: Eg. mdw (sic) “*a un cognat possible avec le berbère*”!).

NB1: The Brb. root is reflected, a.o., by NBrb.: Atlas gr.: Shilh merawi [Bst. 1909, 242] = mrau [Jordan 1934, 93], Tazerwalt m̄rāw [Mnh.], Semlal mraw [Mlt. apud Blz.] | Demnat mrau [Wlf.] | Zenet gr.: Mzab meraw [Msq.] = mraw [Dlh. 1987, 196] || EBrb.: Ghadames meraw [Mtl. 1904, 117] = maraw [Lanfry 1973, 216, #1026] || WBrb.: Zenaga m̄reg [Msq.] = m̄rēg and m̄reg [Bst.] = m̄reg ~ meri [Mercier] = m̄reg ~ meri, fem. m̄reg-eṭ [Wlf.] = m̄rəgṭ [Mlt.] || SBrb.:

NTuareg: Ahaggar meraw [Fcd. 1951–2, 1228, so also Msq., Wlf.], Ghat merau [Nhl. 1909, 152], Wlmd. merau [Wlf.], EWlmd. & Ayr māraw [PAM 2003, 554], Kel-Ui maraw [Bst.] || Guanche: Tenerife marago [list of Pseudo-Sosa, Cedeño de Chil, Marin y Cubas, Berthelot], Gran Canaria marava [Niccoloso da Recco] = marava ~ marago [Wlf.] (Guanche: also Mlt. 1991, 166; Brb.: Msq. 1879, 496; Bst. 1883, 308–309, 318; Mercier 1933, 314; Wlf. 1954, 12, 47, 58, 62–64; Mlt. quoted by Blz. 1987 MS, 40–41).

NB2: The Brb. numeral hardly represents an AA word. It has been instead convincingly compared to areal parallels like NS: Kanuri mru, mèru “10” [de Mounio apud Wlf.] vs. megù < *mere-gu [Wlf.], Kanem mère “10” [Wlf.], Tama merr “10” [Wlf.] ~ Tubu mórdem-ge “10” [Lks. 1941, 19] ~ ESud.: Merarit mer “10” [Grb.] ~ Nil.: Bari mere “10” [Grb.], Kordofan Nubian bure “10” [Zhl., Grb.] etc. ~ (?) Basque hamar ~ amar “10” [Wlf.] = (h)amar “10” [Mkr.] (AP: Mnh. 1912, 240; Grb. 1963, 106). Cf. also Gabelentz 1894, 98 (Bsq.-Brb.-Eg.); Zhl. 1931, 138; 1934–35, 185 (NS-Brb.-Eg.); Wlf. 1954, 58 (Brb.-NS-Bsq.); Mkr. 1969, 34, 38, #15.1 (Brb.-Basque); Blz. 1990, 41 (Eg.-Brb.-AP).

NB3: The various authors elaborated diverse (false) theories for justifying the comparison of Eg. md and Brb. *maraw “10”, e.g.: (1) E. Zyhlarz (1931, 138, #8), uncritically followed by D.J. Wölfel (1954, 58), analyzed Brb. *mer-aw as composed of an original root *√m-r + pl. ending *-aw, whereby he equated PBrb. *√m-r directly with Eg. md. But the *Lautensprechung* of Eg. d̄ = Brb. *r (sic) suggested by Zyhlarz never existed. (2) Alternatively, Wölfel (l.c.) argued that alternation of Brb. d ~ r was “not unusual” (sic). I.e., he assumed a false correspondence of Eg. -d̄ ~ Brb. *-d- > *-r-. (3) O. Rössler (1966, 227; 1971, 317), in turn, traced back Eg. md to an earlier *m3d.w/*m3č.w (in Rössler’s transcription), which he equated with the Brb. root reconstructed by him as *√m-r-? (not considering the final *-w as part of the root). Thus, he maintained in fact a correspondence of Eg. -d̄ ~ Brb. *-? that is not justified by any etymological evidence. (4) Ju.N. Zavadovskij (1974, 104, 112; 1975, 44, 50–51) also supported the reconstruction of Eg. *m3d < *mrg that he regarded as a match of Brb. *√m-r-w, although Eg. -d̄ [< *-g] is incompatible with Brb. *-w. Zavadovskij (1975, 50–51, §14.0) eventually derived the Brb.-Eg. root from AA *√m- (!) comparing also Hausa goma “10” (below) and Cu. *tama (sic) “10”. Absurd. (5) Strangely, A. Loprieno (1986, 1309, 1316, n. 32) developed similar ideas considering Eg. md and Brb. *māraw (sic) “eventuell” both related to Bed. tamin “10” and HECu.: Hdy. tomo “10” (!) “durch Metathese” (!). In addition, at the same time (!), he assumed even an ultimate connection with Eg. md “tief” (below). (6) V. Blažek (1987 MS, 40–41; 1989, 215–216; 1990, 41; 1997, 18) has postulated (pace Rössler) a development of Eg. md < *m3d < *mrg, which he identified with the PBrb. root that he preferred to reconstruct as *marāg^w > *maraw with regard to two isolated derivatives (WBrb.: Zenaga mereg and Guanche: Tenerife marago “10”, see above). Although this argumentation seems fairly attractive, only the shift of Brb. *-ww- > -gg- is attested and not vice versa (Prs. 1972, 64). According to the Brb. comparative-historical phonology elaborated recently (Mlt. 1991, 244–246), Zenaga -g and Tenerife -g- represent a secondary development from *-w, and not traces of PBrb. *-g^w (confirmed for me by A.Ju. Militarev, p.c., Moscow, September 1995). Besides, K.-G. Prasse (1974, 403, 405) and A.Ju. Militarev (1991, 166) have both reconstructed the PBrb. -C₃ as *-w. Thus, the Zenaga-Guanche can only reflect PBrb. *marā/aw and not *marāg^w. The coincidence with Ar. maḡr- “5. grande quantité, 6. armée nombreuse” [BK II 1064] = “much, many, numerous” [Ehret] ||| NOM.: Male merge “many” [Sbr. 1994–95, 9] may be due to chance. Besides, the Ar. root was connected by Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 196, #1771) with ECu. *mig- “to be full” (below). (7) Following O. Rössler’s hypothesis on identifying Eg. *m3d with PBrb. *√m-r-?, V. Blažek (1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10) has later alternatively assumed a development *√m-r-? < *√m-r-^o in Brb., cf. the occasional reflection of Sem. *^o by Eg. d̄ (EDE I 261–2).

- **3.** K. Sethe (1916, 17) and A. Loprieno (1986, 1309) supposed the eventual relationship of Eg. *md* “10” with *md* “deep” (see below), which they failed to demonstrate with typological parallels for the odd semantic shift (which, naturally, cannot be ruled out completely). V. Blažek (1997, 17; 1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10) excluded a direct connection between the two Eg. words.
- **4.** F. Behnk (1928, 139, #33) suggested that Eg. *md* [*< *mg*] might represent a met. of the AA word attested in WCh.: Hausa *góómà* “10” [Brg. 1934, 397; Abr. 1962, 332] = *góómàà* [JI]. I.e., should we presume Eg. **mūd.˘w* *<* (via met.) **dūm.˘w* *<* pre-OEg. **gūm.˘w*? Note that roots with the sequence *dm-* were not typical in Eg. This quite realistic etymological approach to the Eg. word was regarded as *possible* also by V. Blažek (1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10). The Eg.-Hausa/Ch. comparison was repeated by Ju.N. Zavadovskij (1974, 104; 1975, 50–51) and Blažek (1989, 215–216; 1997, 17).

NB1: The Hausa numeral for “10” is reflex of PCh. **g^wam-* “10” [Nwm. 1977, 32] = **g^w-m* [JS 1981, 263; JI 1994 I, 165] attested in WCh.: Gerka (Yiwom) [IL] | Dera (Kanakuru) gum [Pls.] = *gūm* [Krf., Jng.], Tangale *gbomō* [*< *g^wom-*] [Jng.] | (?) Tsagu *wúúma* [Skn. 1977, 34: *< PCh. *g-m-*] | Ngizim (*< Hs.?*) *guma* [IL] = *gumō* [Krf.] = *gúumà* [Schuh], Bade (*< Hs.?*) *gūmā* [IL] = *guumà* [Krf.] (WCh.: also Pls. 1958, 85) || CCh.: Tera *gwān* [Nwm. 1964, 36, #10], Tera-Jara *gwom* [Nwm.], Hwona *gumdiđi* ~ *kūm* [Krf.], Boka *kum* [Krf.], Gabin *kūm* [Krf.], Ga’anda *kum* [Krf.] | BM **kum-* [GT] > Margi *kūmú* [Hfm.] = *kumu* [Krf.], WMargi *kuma* ~ *kume* [Krf.], Cbk. *kyme* [IL] = *kuma* [Krf.], Bura *kuma* [Krf.], Wamdiu *kumō* [Krf.], Hildi *kūmō* [Krf.], Kílba *kūmà* [Krf.], Ngwahyi *kuma* [Krf.] | Fali-Kiria *gwum(ù)* [Krf.], Fali-Jilbu *gumú* [Krf.], Fali-Mucella *gum* [Krf.], Fali-Bwagira *po-gumu* [Krf.] | PMandara **g^wamgV* (?) [GT]: Dghwede *gwāngá* [Frick] = *hwāngá* [IL], Ngweshe *úwāngō* [IL], perhaps Paduko *žuma* [Mch.] (if *< *guma*, borrowed from Hs.?) | Sukur *úwān* *< *g^wam* (?) [IL] | Musgoy *gup* [Mch.], Daba *gúh* [Lienhard] | Musgu *gum* [Roeder] | PMasa **g^wuḅ-* *< *g^wum-* (?) [GT]: Lame *gwúhú* [Krf.], Lame-Peve *gwúh* [Krf.], Zime-Batna *gùp* [Jng.] = *gùbù* [Scn.], Misme-Zime *goub* [Krf.] || ECh.: Mokilko *kòómá(t)* [Jng.] (Ch.: Mkr. 1987, 43, 222; Ibr. 1990, 211–212; JI 1994 II 320–321).

NB2: C. Hoffmann (1970, 12–14) and H. Jungrathmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I, 165) considered PCh. **g^w-m* “10” to be an old Niger-Congo loan, cf. Benue-Congo **-kumi* “10”, which would exclude its equation with Eg. *md*. However, a genuine AA etymology of PCh. **g^w-m* is also possible, cf. AA **g-m* “complete (or sim.)” [GT] (discussed under #11 below). V. Blažek (1987, 41), in turn, combined the PCh.-Eg. parallel with SBrb.: Ahaggar *a-g^wim* (*-g-* apud Fcd.) “millier” [Fcd. 1951–2, 444], Ghat *a-žim* (*a-djim* apud Nehlil) [*-ž-* *< *g^w-*] “mille” [Nhl. 1909, 179].
- **5.** Ju.N. Zavadovskij (1974, 112; 1975, 44) and A. Loprieno (1986, 1316, n. 32) have supposed that Eg. *md* could be a met. of Cu. **√t-m-n* “10”. Fully unreal. Eg. *-d* has nothing to do with Cu. **t-*, not to mention the additional Cu. **-n*, which is not reflected in Eg.
- **6.** I. M. D’jakonov (1986, 61; 1988, 67) has combined Eg. *md* with Sem. **maʔd-* “many”, although Eg. *d* does not correspond to Sem. **d*. Declined already by V. Blažek (1989, 215–216; 1997, 17) and

- G. Takács (1994, 217; 1996, 139–140, #35; 1996, 442, #4; 1999, 136; 1999, 203).
- **7.** A. Loprieno (1986, 1309, 1316, n. 33) suspected the ultimate common origin of Eg. *mḏ* “10” and *mḏ* “deep” with such Sem. roots as **mšš* “aufsaugen” (!), **mdd* (!) “lang ziehen, ausdehnen”, **mṯṯ* (!) “lang ziehen, ausdehnen”. Fully unacceptable. None of the Sem. roots can correspond to Eg. *mḏ*. The comparison with Sem. **mšš* is to be excluded on semantical grounds (how should one figure a relationship of “aufsaugen” vs. “ten?”), while that with Sem. **mdd* and **mṯṯ* for phonological reasons (Eg. *ḏ* ≠ Sem. **d* or **t*). Rightly rejected already by V. Blažek (1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10).
 - **8.** V. Blažek (1987 MS, 41; 1990, 41) has compared Eg. *mḏ* to CCh.: Higi gr. **muṇ-* “10” [GT]: Higi *mēngé* [Str.] = *m^wōṇé* [Mrl. 1972, 102] = *mùṇəy* [Brt.-Jng.], Higi-Nkafa *mùṇəy* [Krf.], Higi-Baza *mūnge* [Lks. 1937, 113] = *mùṇə* [Krf.], Higi-Kamale *mùṇe* [Krf.] vs. Kapsiki (= Kamale?) *māng* [Str.] = *məṇ* [WL] = *məṇ(ə)* [Brt.-Jng.], Higi-Ghye *mùṇəy* [Krf.], Higi-Bana *məṇə* [WL] = *məṇ* [Brt.-Jng.], Higi-Futu *mùṇi* [Krf.], Fali-Gili *mùṇ* [Krf. 1972 MS] (Higi gr.: Str. 1922–1923, 123; Wenté-Lukas 1973, 7; Kraft 1981 II, 131, 141, 151, 161, 171, 191, #10; Brt.-Jng. 1993, 131), which can be only be valid provided Eg. **mūḏ.ṽw* < **mūḏ.ṽw* and if the Higi numeral stems from **mung-*. This tempting Eg.-CCh. equation was mentioned also by G. Takács (1994, 217) in the context of further AA parallels (for which see #11 below).

NB1: Interesting to observe that this etymology would be supported also by the vocalization of Eg. **mūḏ.aw*/**mūḏ.ṽt* (Edel 1955, 166–176) = **mūḏ.aw*/**mūḏ.at* (Loprieno 1986, 1309) vs. **mōḏ* (Vcl. 1983, 124) > MBab. cuneiform *mu-tu*.

NB2: The etymology of Higi gr. **muṇ-* “10” is uncertain. Contrary to Blažek (l.c.), D. Ibrizimow (1990, 211–2) excluded a met. from Ch. **gum-/g^wam-* “10” (above). Later, Blažek (1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10) derived Higi gr. **muṇ-* “10” from **mu-mg-*, which might be etymologically identical with Agaw **mang-* “many” [GT] || LECu. **mang-* “many” [GT] ||| NOM.: Shinasha *manga* “heavy” [Lmb.] (discussed below, cf. #11). If this is correct, a remote kinship between Higi gr. **muṇ-* with Eg. *mḏ* is not impossible. Cf. also Takács 1995, 5–6; 1996, 140, #35; 1996, 443, #7 (Eg.-Higi-ECu.-NOM.).
 - **9.** C. T. Hodge (kind p.c. on 4 September 1994) has not excluded that Eg. *mḏ* “10” is akin to PBrb. **tē-mihḏay*, pl. **tī-muhād* “100” [Prasse 1974, 406]. Since PBrb. **ḏ* can go back to PAA **ḥ* (cf. Mlt. 1991, 242; Takács 2006, 57–59, 62), the phonological correspondence of Eg. *ḏ* ~ PBrb. **ḏ* is regular. Hodge’s idea is to be accounted for, although PBrb. **-h-* seems to have no match in Eg. *mḏ*.

NB1: The Brb. numeral is attested, a.o., in NBrb.: Nfs. *te-miṭi* [Mtl.] = *tə-miṭi* [Lst.] = *te-miṭi* [Mrc.] || EBrb.: Sokna *sənnət t-miṭin* “deux cents” [Lst.] || WBrb.: Zng. *ta-māde* (sic, -d-) “100” [Ncl. 1953, 206] || SBrb.: Hgr. *té-médé*, pl. *ti-mad* “centaine” [Fcd. 1951–2, 1165] = *ti-miṭi* [Mtl.] = *tə-miṭi* [Lst.] = *ti-miṭi* [Mrc.], EWlm. *ti-miṭi* [Bst.] = EWlm. & Ayr *te-meḍe* ~ Ayr *ti-miḍa* “1. centaine, 2. cent” [PAM 1998, 210; 2003, 524], Kel Ui *ti-maḍi* [Wlf.], Ghat *či-miṭi* “cent”, *senat či-maḍ* “deux cents” [Nhl. 1909, 138; Mrc.] (Brb.: Lst. 1931, 209; Mrc. 1933, 316; Wlf. 1954, 74).

NB2: The AA etymology of the Brb. numeral is obscure. (1) A. Klingenheben (quoted by Wölfel 1954, 75) and M.G. Mercier (1933, 316) erroneously explained it as a late borrowing from Ar. *miʔ-at-* (!), which has rightly been excluded by Wölfel (l.c.). Surprisingly, this absurd equation of the Brb. numeral with Sem. **miʔ-at-* “1.000” has been recently suggested also by E. Lipinski (1997, 291, §35.20). (2) On the other hand, F. Nicolas (1953, 206) combined the Brb. numeral for “100” with the Brb. root attested in WBrb.: Zng. *√m-d* “finir, être fini”. (3) GT: cf. perhaps ECh.: Mkl. *mèedá* (f) “cent, centaine(s)” [Jng. 1990, 138], although Mkl. -d- vs. Brb. *-d- seem also irregular.

- **10.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 202) identified Eg. *md* with their ECh. **mʷaš-* “10” (no reflexes mentioned), which is certainly a false reconstruction. This asterisk-form is based solely on the isolated ECh.: Somray *moš* “zehn” [Nct. apud Lks. 1937, 80; Hfm. 1971, 9] = *mwàš* “10” [Jng. 1993 MS, 46; JI 1994 II, 321]. False.

NB1: In theory, there could be a little chance that Somrai *mo* derives from an earlier **√m-(w)-g*, cf. perhaps ECh.: Somray *ʔášə* [Jng.] vs. Ndam *yógə* “to cut, chop” [Jng.] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 99). However, this is surely not the case here. There is firm evidence for that Somray *moš* [Nct.] etc. reflects **√m-w-d* attested by its earlier record and its closest cognates listed by J. Lukas (1937, 74, 87) and C. Hoffmann (1971, 9): Somrai *moid* “10” [Adolf Friedrich] = *moet* [Gaufrey-Demombynes], Dormo *moid* [Adolf Friedrich] | Gabri *moid* [Adolf Friedrich] = *mwòšə* [Cpr. 1972 MS], Chire *moodo* “10” [Barth apud Lks.].

NB2: The AA background of the ECh. numeral is disputed. (1) V. Blažek (1997, 18; 1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10) tried to derive it from a hypothetical **mVdV* supposed to correspond phonologically to Eg. *md* and even PBrb. **tē-mihḍay* “100” [Prasse 1974, 406] (above). In principle, Somray *-š* < ECh. **-d* < AA **ç/*č/*ĉ* might perhaps be indeed plausible, cf. ECh. **gaḍ-* “cheek” [GT]: Kabalai *kwašji* [Cpr.] | Somray *gàšé* “cheek” [Jng.] | WDangla *gàḍumò* [Fédry] | Birgit *gàḍáyó* [Jng.] (ECh.: JI 1994 II, 69) || SBrb.: Ahaggar *à-gʷ/ǵaz* (-g- apud Fcd.) “joue” [Fcd. 1951–2, 491] || PCu. **gAc(c)-* “лицо, лоб” [Dlg.] > Bed. *gēdi* “das Gesicht, Antlitz, Auge” vs. *gʷad* ~ *gʷada* ~ *gʷaš* ~ *gaš* “Auge, Gesicht” [Rn. 1895, 89–90] = (also) *gʷaḍ*, pl. *gʷaḍa* “face, eye” [Dlg.] || NAgaw **gäc* “face” [Apl.] = **gäc* (?) [GT]: Bilin *gäš*, Hamir *gaš*, Qwara-Dembea *gaš*, Qemant *gäš* (NAgaw: Apl. 2006, 63) || ECu. **gaḍ-* “jaw” [Apl., KM] || SCu.: WRift **gicē* “forehead” [KM 2004, 117] < AA **g-ç/ĉ* “cheek” [GT] (lit. for the AA root: Chn. 1947, #197; Dlg. 1973, 297; HSED #866 vs. #914). But in this case, there is no sufficient and convincing piece of evidence for reconstructing **-d-* in the ECh. numeral against **-d-*. Consequently, the available records provide hardly any proof for the relatedness of the Eg. and ECh. numerals. (2) G. Takács (1999, 136; 1999, 202–203, #3.2) connected ECh. **√m-(w)-d* with Sem. **magd-* “many” [Djk.] || PBrb. impf. **ya-mduh*, pf. **yu-mdah* [Prasse 1975, 227] = **ə-mdu* < **√m-d-[h]* “to complete” [GT] || SOM.: Ari *mūda* “all” [Bnd. 1994, 1158, #1] (discussed in detail s.v. Eg. **mt.t*). If this Sem.-Brb.-SOM.-ECh. comparison proves to be valid, the ECh. numeral can have nothing in common with Eg. *md*.

- **11.** G. Takács (1994, 217–218; 1995, 5–6, #7; 1996, 140, #35; 1996, 443, #7; 1999, 40, 50–51, 143) presumed Eg. mḍ “10” to derive from the basic sense “full, many” (similarly to many other numerals for 10, 100, 1000 in AA, cf. below). He identified Eg. mḍ [from *mg] with ECu. *mig-/mug- “fullness”, *-mg- (prefix verb) “to fill” [Sasse 1979, 25] = *-meg- “to be full” [HL 1988, 127; Lmb. 1993, 353] = *-mig- “to be full” [Ehret 1997 MS, 196, #1771] = *mVg- “many, full” [GT]: Saho mag “anfüllen, voll machen”, míge “das Anfüllen”, m-mag “angefüllt, voll werden” [Rn. 1890, 258–9] = mag “remplir” [Chn.] = -meg- (prefixed) “to fill” vs. mig-e “fullness” [Sasse] = -emmeg- “to be full” [HL] = emege (imp. amage) “to fill”, mig-e “fullness” [Vergari 2003, 78, 135], Saho-Assaorta mag-, pass. m-mag “essere molto, in molti, essere pieno” [CR 1913, 70] = meg- “to be numerous, full (БЫТЬ МНОГОЧИСЛЕННЫМ, ПОЛНЫМ)” [IS], Afar mag “anfüllen, voll machen”, ang-ō and míge-i “das Anfüllen” [Rn. 1886, 880] = mag- “remplir” [Chn.] = -eng- [< *emg-] “to fill” [Sasse] = -emmeg- “to be full” [HL] = enge “to fill”, migi (f) “fullness”, mamga (f) “fullness, abundance” [PH 1985, 163], Afar-Tadjurah mog-o “many (МНОГО)” [IS] | Orm. mog-a “fullness”, miḣ-ū [-ḣ- < *g-] “full” [Sasse], Orm.-Waata magā-ta “many” [Strm. 1987, 362], Orm.-Bararetta imieke “full” [Flm.], Konso imako-ta “full” [Flm.] = immak- “to be full” [HL], Gidole innako-ta “full” [Flm.] = innak- “to be full” [HL], Mossiya innak- “to be full” [HL], Gato imako-da “full” [Flm.] | OSom. *ammūg- “füllen” [Lmb. 1986, 437] > Som. mug “Fülle, Vollheit” [Rn. 1902, 288] = múg- “fullness” [Abr. 1964, 182] = “multitude, plenty” = “Fassungsvermögen, Fülle” [Lmb. 1993, 353], Som.-Jiddu ammūg- “to full” [HL], PBaiso & Jiddu (sic) *ʔu/img- “full” [Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984, 229], Baiso mig-i “full” [Flm.] = mig-i “to be full”, mig-i “full” [HL] = ʔamoga “many” [Sbr. 1994, 17] | Yaaku -mok [< *mog], pl. -móḣe? “many, much” [Heine 1975, 130] (ECu.: Dlg. 1973, 256–257; Sasse 1979, 25; HL 1988, 127). This Eg.-ECu. equation has been regarded by V. Blažek (1999, 251–3, §10; 1999, 47–49, §10) too as the “most convincing” one of all the etymologies offered so far for Eg. mḍ.

AP: A noteworthy areal parallel is to be found in Mer. *m(g/h)e “abondant” [Meeks 1973, 12] = “abundant, all, big, many” [Bnd. 1981, 16–17; Fleming-MacCall 1994, 28–29].

NB1: In H.-J. Sasse’s (1979, 25) view, the Konso & Gidole parallels (with -n/-k-) “are obviously cognate, but display problematic correspondences”, for which cf. NAgaw: Kemant imkuy “être abondant (le blé)” [CR 1912, 164] || WCh.: Tng. mḣmḣ “somewhat full” [Jng. 1991, 121] || ECh.: EDng. mak “(idéophone d’accomplissement)” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 192]. Do these parallels display traces of an AA root var. *m-k “full” [GT]?

nb2: The relatedness of (1) LECu.: Rendille mig, pl. amíge, mimíge “strong, hard” [Heine 1976, 216, 220] = mīg (f) “Kraft, Macht” [Schlee 1978, 140, #774] = mīg-e “strength” [Oomen 1981, 72] = mīg “strength, stiffness, tightness, heaviness, hardness, difficulty” [PG 1999, 224] and/or (2) NOm. *magg- “1. full (?), 2. (hence) heavy” [GT]: Haruro mǎgg-ǎys “essere contento” (lit. “to be full”?) [CR 1937, 653] | Kefoid *magg- “to be heavy” [GT]: Kaffa mag- [Crl. 1951, 470] = magg- [Dlg.], Mocha mǎggi-yé “to be heavy”, magg-o “heavy” [Lsl. 1959, 40], Sheko maggo “heavy” [Lmb.] (NOm.: LS 1997, 459 with semantically false comparanda) is semantically problematic. For the ECu.-NOm. comparison see Dlg. 1967, 9, #7; 1973, 256–257; IS 1976, 41–42; Lmb. 1993, 111 (Cu.-Om. *mVg- “to be full, heavy”).

nb3: The traditional (Rn. 1886, 880; Chn. 1947, #139; Dlg. 1967, 9, #7) comparison of the reflexes of ECu. *mVg- “to fill” with Eg. mh “to fill” (OK, above) is phonologically unacceptable (Eg. h ≠ Cu. *g).

nb4: The reflexes of ECu. *mig-/mug- [Ss.] and NOm. *magg- [GT] have been often (Rn. 1886, 880; 1890, 259; CR 1913, 71; Lsl. 1945, 163; 1979 III, 408–9; IS 1976, 41–42; Apl. 1977, 26/68; HL 1988, 127; Lmb. 1993, 353; LS 1997, 459 with semantically false comparanda) compared with Cu.-Om. forms containing apparently an additional (?) *-n-, cf. NAgaw: Qemant māngā “foule, quantité, multitude” [CR 1912, 230] = manga “multitude, crowd” [Lsl.] (Apl. p.c. on 20 April 2007: “without any doubt a loan from” Amharic mānga “herd, flock, crowd”, which, in turn, is “obviously a loan from ECush.”) || SAgaw *menči [-či < *ki] “many” [GT]: Awngi ménč “many” [Htz./Bnd. 1971, 238, §50] = mʼenṣi (so!) [Flm./Bnd.] = ménči [Bnd. 1973 MS, 7, #51] = ménč “many” [Apl. 1991, 8], Kunfal menči “many” [Birru & Adal 1971, 102, #50] = mīnči “many” [Bnd. 1970, 3, #50] || LECu. *mang- “numerous” [GT] > Saho mang “viel, zahlreich werden, sich mehren”, mǎngō ~ mangō “Fülle, Überfluß, Menge”, ma/ǎngū-m “viel, sehr, gewaltig, reichlich” [Rn. 1890, 259, 269–270] = mang-o “many” [HL] = mang-o “to be much, many”, mang-a “totality, amount, quality” [Vergari 2003, 131], Saho-Assaorta mangō ~ mangū-m “molto, forte”, m-mang (denom. refl.) “essere abbondante, forte” [CR 1913, 71], Afar mang “angefüllt, voll werden/sein”, mang-ū “viel”, mang-ó “Fülle, Menge”, mangū-m “viel, sehr” [Rn. 1886, 880, 882] = mang-o “crowd” [Lsl.] = mang-o “to be many, much” [PH 1985, 163] = mang-o “many” [HL] || NOm.: (?) Shinasha-Bworo mang-á “heavy (schwer, gewichtig)” [Lmb. 1993, 111; 1993, 353]. The SA stem *mang- has been explained by L. Reinisch (1886, 880 1890, 259) from a pass. m-ang “angefüllt werden”, cf. Saho-Afar caus. s-ang < √mag. C. Conti Rossini (1913, 71) extended this also to NAgaw (Kemant) assuming a common PCu. *mag > *m-mag > *mang > Kemant & SA mang-. G. Banti (p.c., 19 April 2007) sees in the LECu. forms a prefix ma- (“the form is like mabla ‘seeing’” in Saho-Afar). D. Appleyard (p.c., 20 April 2007) shares the same view: “manga is certainly the more ‘archaic’ in so far as it is more transparently the nominal prefix ma- + the verbal root -mg-, i.e. PEC *mig-/mug- etc. ‘be full’... it seems to me quite reasonable to build a new ‘root’ on the basis of a nominal derivation *ma-m[V]g-; partial reduplication of the C₁VC₁VC₂- type seems less likely to me”. The Cu. stem was probably borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Gafat māngā, Amh. mānga, Gurage-Soddo mānga “herd, flock” (ES: Lsl. 1945, 163; 1979 III, 408–9; Apl. 1977, 26/68 with less like alternative Sem. etymologies). For reasons outlined here, the comparison of Cu.-Om. *mang- with CCh.: Higi gr. *muṣ- “10” (above) seems at the moment rather unlikely.

nb5: ECu.-NOm. *mVg- “1. many, 2. full, 3. heavy, 4. strong (?)” [GT] may be eventually related to AA *m-g “1. big, 2. long, high” [GT] > Akk. magāgu (also maqāqu) “(weg)spreizen” [AHW 574] || NOm.: Omt. *mēg- “col” [GT] > Wlt. & Dawro/Kullo meg-uwa, Gofa & Gamu & Dorze mēg-o | Sns. mēg-o (NOm.: Alm. 1993 MS, 8, #202b) || CCh. *m-g- “long (of stick)” [JS 1981, 169B]: Musgu masc. mógwa, fem. muguí, pl. mógwáákai “lang, hoch” [Krause apud Müller 1886, 401] = mógoa [Rohlf] = mogó “lang” [Ovw.] = ana-mogó “it is big” [Rohlf] =

mogó “groß” [Roeder] = mugwi “hoch” [Décorse] = mógo “groß” [Lks.], Musgu-Pus mogo (m), mogwi (f), pl. mogokai “hoch” [MB 1972 MS, 4] = mogo (masc.), muguwiy (fem.) “long” [Trn. 1991, 106], Musgu-Girvidik mógó (m), mógwí (f), pl. mógwáy “hoch” [MB 1972 MS, 4] = mogo(m) “lang” [MB 1972–73, 70] (Musgu: Lks. 1937, 141; 1941, 68) || ECh.: Tumak mägón “nombreux”, cf. mäg “être capable, pouvoir, beaucoup” [Cpr. 1975, 81]. For the AA etymology see IS 1976, 41–42 (ECu.-NOM.-CCh.); HSED #1704 (Tumak-Musgu-ECu.); Mlt. in Sts. etc. 1995 MS, 13 (ECu.-NOM.-Musgu-Tumak). H. Jungraitmayr and K. Shimizu (1981, 169B₁) explained the Ch. cognates via met. from the Ch. root *g-m(N-) “long” (attested in Daba-ECh.). GT: cf. perhaps also Ssem. *mgn (with root ext. *-n?) “very (much)” [GT]: Jbl. mékən “much, many, a lot of” [Jns. 1981, 170], Mhr. maken [-k- < *g-] “beaucoup, très” [Lsl.] = mēken [Jahn] = mēkən “much, many, a lot of” [Jns. 1987, 264] || Amh. magan “très large” [Lsl.] = mägän “1. very large, unusually or strangely large (size), portentous, 3. type of long shield used by a fully-grown man” [Kane 1990, 343] (Sem.: Lsl. 1931–34, 35). The AA (ECu.-NOM.-CCh.) root (erroneously reconstructed by V. M. Illič-Svityč and A. Gluhak as *mV(n)g- “strong, heavy, abundant”) has been affiliated by the adherents of the Nst. theory (see IS 1965, 331; 1976, 41–42; Gluhak 1978, 26–27; 1978, 124; Dlg. 1991 MS, #997) with a number of long-range (Nst.) parallels, e.g. Krt. *mag-ar- “strong (сильный, крепкий)” [IS, not in Klimov 1964 and KEEL 1990] ~ IE *me/ġ^h- “groß” [IEW 708–9] = *meġ^h- “big” [IS] = *meġ- [Gluhak] < Nst. *magV “large” [Dlg. 1991 MS, #959] vs. IE *me/on(e)ġ^h- ~ *mng^h- “reichlich, viel” [IEW 730] = *meng^h- “abundant, numerous” [IS] ~ Alt. *maṅa “hard, strong, firm” [IS] ~ ST *maṅ “much, many” [IS] < Nst. *manga “strong” [IS] = *maṅga “strong” [Dlg. 1991 MS, #997].

nv6: AA *m-g [GT] seems to belong to a wide family of remotely related AA roots with diverse C₂:

(1) AA *m-k “long, wide” [GT] attested in Sem.: Akk. makāku “ausweiten, hiNBreiten” [AHW 587] = “to spread” [CAD m1, 121] ~ var. with -g/q- in Akk. magāgu ~ maqāqu “(weg)spreizen” [AHW 574], cf. also Ar. var. √mhḥ > mu-miḥḥ- “long, qui se prolonge (affaire)” [BK II 1072] || Bed. mikik “to stand with legs wide apart”, mákák “bandy-legged”, mikūkai “astride” (adv.) [Rpr. 1928, 216] || SAgaw: (?) Agaw: Kunfāl maki “road” [Bnd. 1970 MS, 122, #65; Birru-Adal 1971, 102, #65] (lit. “the long one”?) || NOM.: (?) Kafá mako “nervo” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 317] = maqqō “nervo” vs. makkā “arco” [Crl. 1951, 471, 473] || WCh.: Hausa máákéékè “long and broad”, mákáká “big and broad” [Abr. 1962, 646, 642] = √maak- “lang und breit (Raum, Acker)” [Wolff 1990, 527], Gwnd. míkye “to stretch”, mikyeyke “straight” [Mts. 1972, 81] || CCh.: Masa gr. *mbok [reg. < *mok] “écartier” [GT]: Zime-Dari mbók “écart(ement)” [Cooper 1984, 18], Lame mbök “écart(ement)” [Scn. 1982, 310].

(2) AA *m-k (var. *^Cm-k with prefix *^C-) “long, high (?)” [GT] > Ar. ^ʿamiqa “être long, se prolonger, s’étendre loin, être profond”, occurs also without ^ʿ-, cf. maqaq- “longueur du corps (d’un cheval)” [BK II 369, 1134] || SOM.: (?) Galila muk-á “mountain” [Flm. apud Bnd. 1994, 155] || WCh.: Hausa múúkéékè “long and thick”, múíkà “1. to stretch out, 2. (intr.) extend, spread (news), continue one’s way, set out”, múíká(á) “to become protracted, be stretching os.”, múíkí “weaver’s stretching thread in loom for weaving” [Abr. 1962, 682, 673].

(3) AA *m-k (var. *^Cm-k with prefix *^C-) “2. ability, power” [GT]: Sem. *^[ʿ]mġ (?) [GT] > Akk. emūqu, nA also amūqu [< *^ʿmġ?] “Armkraft, Macht, Gewalt” [AHW 216] || HECu. *maḵ- “power, strength” [GT]: Sidamo maq-é “1. forza, 2. autorità, 3. podestà” [Mrn. 1940, 229] = maḵé “strength, power” [Hds.] = maḵè “strength, energy, physical condition, features” [Gsp. 1983, 224], Kmb. maḵ-o “strength, power” [Hds.] (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 144–5, 384) | Dullay: Tsamay

muḳ- “to strengthen” [Hyw. 1989, 29] = mūḳ-um “to be powerful” [Savà 2005 MS, 247] ||| WCh.: AS *mak (var. *muk?) [-k reg. < *g/k] “1. to suffice, be (much) enough, 2. able” [GT 2004, 239–240]: Sura mak “können, vermögen, erreichen, genügen” [Jng. 1963, 73], Mpn. māḳ “to suffice, satisfy” [Frj. 1991, 35], Kfy. mak “enough”, (se) mak àn “enough for me” [Ntg. 1967, 26], Msr. mak ~ muk (so, -u-) ~ mok (so, -o-) “1. sufficient, 2. plenty, much”, mak-čiin “sufficiently, plenty, useful” [Dkl. 1997 MS, 179, 181, 387] = mak “able” [Jng. 1999 MS, 11] ||| CCh.: Tera māḳa “to know (savoir)” [Nwm. 1964, 48, #493] ||| ECh.: Tumak māḳ “1. être capable, 2. pouvoir, 3. (être) beaucoup” [Cpr. 1975, 81]. Cf. IE *magh- “können, vermögen, helfen” [IEW 695]?

(4) Perhaps also AA *m-k “all” [GT] > NOm.: PMao *muḳ (?) [GT]: EMao muḳes ~ meḳeD- ~ meḳet- “all” [Flm. 1988] = (Diddesa) muk “all” [Flm. 1990, 27], Sezo I mökkè “all” [Shr.-Wdk. 1994, 10], Hozo mūḳar-a “all” [Flm.] (Mao: Flm. 1988, 39) ||| ECh.: Mubi ḡammák (adj.) “tout” [Jng. 1990 MS, 2]?

NB7: The semantic shift of Eg. md “10” < AA *m-g “full, many, etc.” [GT] is supported i.a. by the following AA parallels: (1) PCh. *g^wam- “10” [Nwm. 1977, 32] ~ WCh. *[n]-gam “to fill, be full” [Std.] = *gamu(m)- “наполняться” [OS] > AS *gam “to fill” [GT] = *gam [Std. 1977] = *gam “to fill, be(come) full” [Dlg.] = *gam- [Std. 1987] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 24, #215; Std. 1972, 181; 1977, 154, #65; 1987, 217, #676; GT 2004, 121) | BT *ḡgamu “to fill, be full” [Schuh 1984, 216] = *(n)-g^wam [GT]: cf. esp. Bole ḡḡómání “full” [IL apud JI] = ḡom- “sich füllen, steigen (Fluß)” [Lks. 1971, 136] = ḡḡómú- “to fill, be full” [Schuh] | NBCh. *g-m- “to gather, join, meet” [Skn. 1977, 23] (WCh.: Std. 1987, 217–8; JI 1994 II, 156) ||| Sem. *gmm “völlig sein/machen” [GB] > Hbr. gam “zusamt, steigernd” [GB 143] | Ar. ḡamma I “1. être riche, 2. être abondant, se remplir de nouveau d’eau, 3. être comble” etc., ḡamm- “1. abondant, exubérant, 2. complet, 4. (mesure) comble” [BK I 321–2] = ḡamma I “to be full, be overcrowded, overflowing” [MacDonald] (for its further Sem. cognates with various root extensions see Hodge 1971, 42; Zbr. 1971, #58; MacDonald 1963–65, 75; WUS #664; Vcl. 1987, 114) ||| (?) Eg. ngmgm (prefix n-) “sich versammeln” (XVIII., Derchain-Urtel 1973, 39–40 contra Wb II 349, 15) ||| HECu. *gum^ʔa “all” [Hds. 1989, 411] ||| NOm.: Oyda gāma “much, many” [Dlg. 1973, 78]. For Ar.-WCh.: Std. 1987, 218; OS 1990, 80, #55; HSED #888. (2) ECu. *kum- “1.000” [Sasse 1979, 12, 25; 1982, 120; Lsl. 1988, 193; Hds. 1989, 415] ||| SCu. *kuma “1.000” [Ehret 1987, 30] ||| NOm. *kum- “1.000” [GT] (Cu.-NOm.: Dlg. 1973, 78–79) ~ Ar. kamala (root ext. -l) “être entier, parfait” [BK II 930] ~ Eg. km “vollständig machen, vollenden” (MK, Wb V 128–130) ||| EBrb.: Siwa kôm, koma “tout, beaucoup” [Lst. 1931, 304] = “all, whole” [Mlt. 1991, 250] ||| LECu.: Baiso kamogani “much, many” [Ehret] ||| NOm.: Omt. *kum- “to be full” [GT]: Wolamo, Gamu, Dache, Zayse kum- “to be full” | SEOmt. *kum-s- (caus.) “to fill” [GT]: Koyra kun-s, Kcm. kun-ça | Yemsa akama “many” (NOm.: LS 1997, 412). For Ar.-Eg. see Ember 1911, 89; 1912, 88; 1930, #10.a.43; Holma 1919, 46; Vcl. 1990, 106]. Cf. perhaps also LECu.: Somali kôn [-n < *-m#], pl. kómo “Schar, Haufe” [Rn. 1902, 243] = “multitude, a lot of” [Ehret 1987, 30], borrowed from Ar. kûm-at- “1. monticule, 2. tas de décombres, de grains, etc.” < kawima I “avoir une grande bosse (chamelle)”, II “éleve un tertre”, ḡakwamu “haut, élevé”, mumtakām- “accumulé, formant un tas” [BK II 945]. (3) Sem. *^cašar- “10” [Dlg. 1986, 79, #14] ||| WCh.: AS *šār “ten” [GT] = *sar [Std.] = *šar [Dlg.] (AS: Jng. 1965, 182; Hfm. 1975, 20, #93; Std. 1972, 182; 1977, 157, #188; JI 1994 II, 320; GT 2004, 334–5) ||| Eg. ḡš3 [< *^cšr] “viel (sein)” (OK, Wb I 228, 8–26). Lit. for the Eg.-Sem.-(AS) etymology: Trb. 1902, 199; Ember 1917, 88, #135; 1930, #3.b.4; Alb. 1918, 92; 1931, 150; Vrg. 1945, 128, #1.c.8; Chn. 1947, #47; Hodge 1976, 15, #165; OS 1988, 82; Blv. 1989, 15; Mlt.-Std. 1990, 65. (4) NOm.: Kullo (Dawaro) tet-a “100” [CR 1913, 410] ||| Eg. twt “versammeln, versammelt sein”

(PT, Wb V 259–260) || (?) WCh. *tVt- “to gather” [OS]. For Eg.-PWCh. see OS 1992, 195. (5) Sem. *rbb “big” > Ebl. rib(b)a or ribab “10.000” [Brugnatelli 1984, 86–87; Gordon 1988, 261] || Ug. rbt, Hbr. rōbabā, Aram. ribbābtā “10.000” (Can.: Ember 1917, 87; WUS #2481). (6) Eg. db^c “10.000” (I., Wb V 365–366) ~ eventually perhaps NOM.: She geba “many” [Flm.] || SOm.: Hamer & Karo geʿbi [Flm.: error for *geʿbi?] “big” [Flm.] (Om.: Flm. 1976, 317) || ECh.: WDangla góóbé “remplir un récipient (en l’immergent dans l’eau)” [Fédry 1971, 329] = “to fill” [JI 1994 II 157]. As noted by W. Vycichl (1934, 80), the comparison of Eg. db^c with WCh.: Hausa dubu “1.000” (suggested in Skn. 1981, 187–8, #105 after Barth 1862) is excluded. For an alternative etymology of Eg. db^c see Takács 1997, 217, #9. (7) Eg. hfn [< *hff] “100.000” (I., Wb III 74, 1) ~ Ar. ḥafala I “reichlich vorhanden sein”, V “sich in grosser Zahl versammeln”, ḥaff- “Menge”, ḥafil- “zahlreich” [Vrg., Vcl.]. For Eg.-Ar. see Sethe 1916, 13–14; Ember 1917, 87, #135; 1930, #9.a.7; Alb. 1918, 93; Vrg. 1945, 136, #9.b.26; Chn. 1947, #111; Vcl. 1958, 377; Loprieno 1986, 1310. For a different (less convincing) etymology of Eg. hfn see Holma 1919, 41; Hodge 1976, 12, #49; 1990, 370; Loprieno 1986, 1310.

md “1. (Med. and later) tief (sein) (von der Unterwelt, von Gewässern, von einer Wunde u.ä.), 2. (LEth.) versunken sein in (m) (in bildlichem Gebrauch)” (Wb II 184, 4–6) = “deep” (FD 123) > Cpt. (O) ΜΟΥΤ, ΜΤΕ- “einsinken” (Pap. BM 10808, Osing 1976, 52, 250–1; KHW 521). NB: Regarding the -w- of md.wt (below) as part of the root, W. Vycichl (DELIC 124) erroneously postulated a triconsonantal (IIIae inf.) verbal root (*mdj or *mdw), but OCpt. ΜΟΥΤ suggests a derivation from a biconsonantal √md.

● Hence: md.wt “Tiefe” (MK, Wb II 184, 8–14) = “depth” (FD 123) > Dem. mtj (written mtr) “1. Tiefe, Länge, 2. tief” (DG 191:2) > Cpt. (S) ΠΤΩ, ΕΠΤΩ, (?) ΠΤΟ, (B) ΕΠΘω (hapax) “depth (≈ profundum)” (CD 193a; Vrg. 1971, 49, §11; CED 94) = “Meerestiefe, Tiefe” (KHW 103; NBÄ 92) = “profondeur (de la mer)” (DELIC 124).

NB1: Vocalized as *imḏāwa(t) > *imḏā > *imḏā > *imḏā > *imḏā > *imḏā > *imḏā (Roquet 1973, 162, fn. 1) = *me/udāw.t (NBÄ 92) = *mudāw.t (Skn. 1983, 226) = *mad[JJ]āw.at or *madāw.at (DELIC 124). C.J. Eyre (1992, 280 & fn. 5) points out a possible *Wortspiel* in Pap. Westcar 3:15–16, cf. 4:7 (and elsewhere) between Eg. m d3.t “in the Netherworld” (yielding, in principle, Cpt. *ΠΤΗ) and Eg. md.wt “depths” > (S)ΠΤΩ.

NB2: W. Spiegelberg (KHW) erroneously explained (S) ΠΤΩ from Eg. mtr “flood” (supra), which was correctly declined by A.H. Gardiner (AEO I 7*, §23), although he also admitted that (B) Θ- (1x), “if correct, would tend to favour” the derivation from mtr (cf. Peust 1999, 85, §.3.3.5).

NB3: The origin of Cpt. (S) ΠΤΟ (m) “deep water, depth of sea” (CD 193a; CED 92) = “flot” (Roquet) = “Flut, Meerestiefe” (Spg. KHW 65; Wst. KHW 103; Osing 1976, 217, n. 678) has been disputed. Several authors (Černý, CED 92; Westendorf, KHW 103 & fn. 6; Smith 1978, 360) rightly distinguished Cpt. (S) ΠΤΩ (f) “depth” < Dem. mtj (DG 191:2) < Eg. md.t from Cpt. (S) ΠΤΟ (the two Cpt. forms were confused in CD l.c.), which has been correctly derived by Westendorf (KHW 103 & fn. 6) and Osing (1976, 217, n. 678) from NK mtr (q.v.). As it has been surmised already by Gardiner (AEO l.c.), “perhaps there was contamination of the two words”. G. Roquet (1973, 162, fn. 1), in turn, distinguished in (S) ΠΤΟ the contaminated reflexes of two diverse etyma, namely (1) that meaning “profondeur” < Eg. md.(w)t vs. (2) that signifying “flot” < Eg. mtr.t, their coincidence being due to ‘hybridation’ of (S) ΠΤΩ vs. ΠΤΟ.

NB4: Rejecting Volten's (so also CED 92) former derivation of Cpt. (OL) mHT "Tiefe" (KHW 521) = "deep water" (Allberry quoted in DELC) = "profondeur" (DELC 124) from mtr.w "Flut" (Wb, above), Osing explained it rather from Eg. * $\text{méd}.\text{w}$ (Edel 1955, §235; NBĀ 92; Osing 1976, 90, cf. also 217, n. 678) = * $\text{mūd}.\text{aw}$ (Snk. 1983, 226), i.e., from an unattested masc. Eg. etymon * $\text{md}.\text{w}$ that "*ist nicht sicher belegt*" (NBĀ 569–570, n. 447). Osing (1976, 217, n. 678) and Westendorf (KHW 104) etymologically separated (S) HTO also from (OL) mHT , while Černý (CED 92, 94) treated both as a vars. of the same lexeme.

- Etymology uncertain.
- **1.** GT: its equation with LECu.: Somali-Jabarti māg "Ebbe" [Rn. 1904, 77] would be attractive in theory (Somali -g can correspond to Eg. -d), but L. Reinisch explained it as a late borrowing from Ar. mawḡ- "flot, vague, onde, lame" [BK II 1166] = "Flut" [Rn.], which is semantically incompatible with Eg. md .
- **2.** GT: should we assume perhaps a shift of meaning "to sink down" ~ "to go down"? Cp. HECu. * mugg - "to descend" [GT]: Kmb. mugg - "to descend, go down" [Yri apud Hds. 1989, 49, 333: isolated in HECu.], Alaba migg-iyē ? [Lsl.], Qabenna muggi-yo ? [Lsl.] borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Gurage dials. mug ~ mugg * balā "to be bent, bend down, be inclined, bow down" [Lsl. 1979 III, 393].
NB: The HECu. root might represent a var. root with a voiced *-C₂ to Sem.: Ug. mkk G "to fall, flag", mk "depressed and disgusting place" > "large puddle, bog (?), well, refuse tip (?)" [DUL 542–3, cf. Dahood 1976, 351] = mk(k) "to sink" [KB WUS #1561], Hbr. mkk qal "zusammensinken, niedergedrückt", nifal "sich senken" [GB 421] = qal "to lower, sink", nifal "to come low (timberwork)", hofal "to be(come) immersed" [KB 580], Samar. Aram. mkk qal "to be low, descend", (?) p^{c} l "to lower, let down, bring down", mkk "lowliness, humbleness" [Tal 2000, 456], Syr. mkk "niedrig werden" [WUS], Mnd. mkk "to lie down, go/make flat or level, spread out, become lowly, humble" [DM 1963, 271]. There is a *Nebenform* to Can. * mkk in Hbr. mwk qal "herunterkommen, verarmen" [GB 404] = "to become impoverished" [KB 555], PBHbr. & JAram. mwk "sinken, niedrig sein" [GB; Levy 1924 III 45] = mwk "sinken, niederlegen", nāmōk "niedrig" [Dalman 1922, 227, 235] = mwk "to be down, be depressed, grow poor" [Zbr.] = nifal "to be low", hifil "to cause to sink, reduce" [KB 555] vs. JAram. by-form m^{r} k peal "sinken, niedrig werden" [Dalman 1922, 221] (Sem.: WUS #1561; Zbr. 1971, 75, #140; Frj. 1979, 2)
- **3.** GT: or perhaps Eg. md < AA * m-ĉ "to penetrate, sink in (?)" [GT], cp. OSA: Sab. mḏy-t-m "deep, penetrating wound" [SD 84] = mḏy "to penetrate" [Biella 1984, 282], Ar. mḏy : maḏā I "3. passer ou pénétrer plus loin, 4. pénétrer dans le corps (se dit de toute arme ou instrument piquant ou tranchant)" [BK II 1120] = "to penetrate, go deeper" [Biella] ||| WCh.: Hausa móóḏè "to sink in (cheeks)" [Abr. 1962, 677]?
NB: Alternatively, cf. perhaps PCu. * maĉ - "empty" [GT] > LECu.: Som. maḏ "Leere, Leerheit" [Rn. 1902, 287] = maḏan "empty", maḏi "to be empty" [Ehret] || SCu.: WRift * maĉ - "to be empty" [Ehret] = * maĉ - [GT] > Irq. maĉaṇ "room, space", Alg. maĉ-it- "to leave alone" (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 323, #32)? Semantically less probable.

- **4.** GT: on the analogy of Hbr. ʿāmoq “deep” ~ Geez ʿamāqā or ʿamaqa “1. to be deep, 2. excavate”, ʿammaqa “to deepen, dig deeply, dig out”, Amh. ammāqā “to press down with the hand” (Lsl.: perhaps orig. “to deepen”) (Sem.: Lsl. 1969, 25; 1987, 63) or ES: Harari $\text{bu}^{\text{ʿ}}\text{ur}$ > būr “deep”, $\text{bō}^{\text{ʿ}}\text{ara}$ “to become deep” explained by W. Leslau (1963, 39) from Ar. $\text{bu}^{\text{ʿ}}\text{r-at-}$ “hollow, dug in the ground, in which to cook”, an ultimate connection with AA (ECu.-NOM.-ECh.) *m-g “to dig, bury” [GT] cannot be ruled out.

NB: Attested in LECu. *mōg- [GT]: Konso mōk- [-k- reg. < *g-] “to bury”, mōk-a “grave” [Lmb.], Dirayta-Mossiwa mōk- “to bury” [Lmb.] | HECu. *mōg- “to bury”, *mōg-o ~ *mōgg-a “grave” [Hds. 1989, 418]: Darasa (Gedeo) mog- “seppellire” [Mrn.] = mōg- “to bury”, mōgg-o “grave” [Hds.], Kambatta mōg- “to bury”, mōg-u “grave” [Hds.], Alaba mōg- “to bury”, mōg-i “grave” [Hds.], Sidamo mōg- “seppellire” [Mrn.] = mōga “to bury by piling up stones on the tomb”, mōgo (m) “grave not dug in the ground, the mound out of the ground” [Gsp. 1983, 236] = mōg- “to bury”, mōg-o “grave” [Hds.] (HECu.: Mrn. 1937, 238; Hds. 1989, 34, 73) ||| NOM.: Omt. (sic) mog- “seppellire” [Mrn. 1938, 152], Wolamo mog ~ muog “seppellire”, muogā “tomba” [Crl.] = mōg- “to bury” [Lmb.], Zala mōg “seppellire, tomba” [Crl.] = mōg- “to bury” [Lmb.], Gamu mōg- “to bury” [Lmb.], Dache mōg- “to bury”, mōg-e “grave” [Lmb.], Gofa muog (pass. muog-it) “seppellire”, muog “tomba” [Crl.] = mog- “to bury” [Lmb.], Dawro mog-et- “to be buried” [Lmb.] | Koyra mōg- “to bury” [Hyw. 1982, 238], Zayse mōg-utt- “to bury”, mōg-e “cloth to dress the corpse” [Lmb.], Kcm. mog-ānā , mog-āys “seppellire”, mog-ā ~ -u “tomba, sepulcro” [CR 1937, 653] = mog- “to bury” [Lmb.] | Chara mog “seppellire (to bury)” [Crl., Lmb.] | Janjero (Yemsa) muogā “tomba” [Crl.] = mōg-a “grave” [Wdk. 1990, 131] = mō:gā “grave” [Akl.-Sbr. 1993, 38] = mōg-ā “grave” [Lmb.] = mōōgā “grave” [Akl. MS n.d., #94] (ECu.-NOM.: Crl. 1929, 32, 44; 1938 III, 80, 171; Lmb. 1993, 364; LS 1997, 457) ||| CCh.: (?) Nzangi ngt-ḍadi [ng- < *mg-?] “enterrer” [Brit.-Jng. 1990, 91] || ECh. *√m-g “to bury” [GT]: Tumak mòg “1. enterrer un mort, 2. planter (noyaux, tubercules)”, mūgān (m) “tombe” [Cpr. 1975, 83–84] | EDng. māginē , pl. māggān “le tombeau, la tombe” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 192]. The Cu. root was borrowed into Eth.-Sem.: Gurage dialects. $\text{m}^{\text{w}}\text{āggā}$ ~ $\text{m}^{\text{w}}\text{ākā}$ ~ mekkā “to bury” [Lsl. 1979 III, 395].

- **5.** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 178) equated it with ECu. *mig- / *mug- “full” (for details cf. Eg. md “10” above). Semantically questionable, but not impossible.

NB: In principle, we might eventually figure a relationship with AA *m-g “big, long, high” [GT] (supposed ultimate ancestor root of Eg. md , above). For the semantic dispersion, cf., e.g., CCh.: Tera kōri “deep, long” [Nwm. 1964, 45]. Any connection to Ar. maḡḡa IV “2. s’engager dans l’intérieur des terres et s’écloigner (fi des pays)” [BK II 1062]?

- Other suggestions are out of question:

- **6.** L. Homburger (1930, 285): ~ Ful luggere (!) “profondeur”.
- **7.** A. Loprieno (1986, 1309, 1316, n. 33) suspected the ultimate common origin of both Eg. md “10” vs. md “deep” (possible) and (!) Sem. *mṣṣ “aufsaugen” (!), *mdd (!) “lang ziehen, ausdehnen”, *mṭṭ (!) “lang ziehen, ausdehnen”.
- **8.** A.M. Lam (1993, 395): ~ Ful mūṣ “plonger qqch. dans l’eau”.
- **9.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 195, #1769), in turn, affiliated it with LECu.:

Afar muḏḏ-ita “to abound, be too much”, muḏḏi “greater, more” [PH 1985, 171] and even NOm.: Zayse muḏḏ- “fat (adj.)” [Ehret]. NB: For the Afar form cf. Eg. *mt.t/*md.t (supra) and for Zayse m-ḏ see Eg. mḏ.t “oil” (supra).

md3 “Land bei Nubien, auch als Herkunftsort der Wohlgerüche” (OK, Wb II 186, 1) = “(im M.R.) die nubische Wüste zwischen Nil und Rotem Meer, möglicherweise bis in die Gegend von Koptos hinab (cf. Urk. IV 931)” (Sethe 1926, 36–37) = “(OK) a small district, possibly just north of the 2nd cataract, inhabited by Nḥsjw, a general term for men of Nubian, but not of negro race” (AEO I 73–74, 88 pace Junker, JEA 7, 1921, 121f.) = “area inhabited by a nomad tribe, probably in the desert east of the Nile, no farther south than the second cataract” (Dixon 1958, 48–49) = “Land in der Wüste östlich des Niltals, auch das große Gebiet des Wadi Allaqi und des Wadi Cabgaba mit seinen Goldminen” (Edel 1962, 101 & fn. 7 pace Daressy, ASAE 20, 1920, 137) = “Länder zwischen Nil und Rotem Meer (ihre Produkte sind Gold und ḥs3j.t-Balsam)” (Hofmann 1969, 1119) = “zweifelloos das östliche Wüstengebiet von Nubien” (Wenig, LÄ IV 527) = “(A.R. bis M.R.) südlich Ägyptens lokalisierte geographische Größe (eine genauere Eingrenzung ist problematisch, und möglicherweise ist... mit diachronen Veränderungen zu rechnen)” (Peust 1999, 213) = “Medja (nubisches Land)” (ÄWb I 579; II 1170).

NB1: For the localization of the land md3 see Sethe 1926, 36–37; AEO I 73*–80* & 88*–89* §188, II 269*–271*; Volten 1955, 59, 69–70, §8; Dixon 1958, 48–49; Posener 1958, 38–43; Edel 1962, 101; Bietak 1966, 77f.; Hofmann 1969, 1119–20; Zibelius 1972, 134–7. As formulated by I. Hofmann (1969, 1119), it was “*kein kleiner Gebietskomplex, sondern größere Regionen mit mehreren Hauptlingstümem*”. In the MK (probably by the time of the Ächtungstexte), the land name md3 disappeared as a historic reality and “*ceased to be an exactly defined geographic entity*” (Grd.), as the old md3j population was ousted by a new race, though the md3j still existed as a separate clan/tribe (AEO I 78*–79*; Zibelius 1972, 136).

NB2: In C. Peust’s view (1999 Nap., 213 & fn. 88), the “*Landesname md3 ist schlecht bezeugt*”, since “*die meisten, vielleicht alle in den Belegstellen angegebenen Beispiele könnte man auch als pluralische Volksbezeichnung Md3.w lesen*”, which has not been maintained by other authors.

NB3: This toponym may have survived in the “LEth.” (à la Wb) inscriptions of the Napatan and Meroitic kings as mdd(t) ~ mdj(t) (as suggested in Schäfer 1901, 41f.; AEO I 81*; Hofmann 1969, 1121–2; Zibelius 1971, 133–7), although even the identity of mdj (Nastasen) with mdd (Harsiotef) has been debated by K. Sethe (1916, 129: “*hat... nicht damit... zu tun*”). A. H. Gardiner (AEO I 81*) regarded both mdj and mdd as “*doubtless identical*”, although he maintained that these have “*hardly anything to do with the Medjay*”. Paradoxically, he, nevertheless, admitted that Schäfer’s hypothesis on the relationship of the md3j and the Beja “*is advanced by the mention of Md3j (sic)*” in the inscriptions of the “Ethiopian” kings, i.e., the attestation of Napatan mdj ~ mdd. Although C. Peust (1999 Nap., 213–4) was disposed to equate Napatan mdd vs. mdj and disconnect both from GR mtj ~ mdj “Mede” (as “*historisch kaum plausibel*” contra AEO I 81*), he doubted their etymological connection

with old Eg. $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}3$ as “aus lautlichen Gründen zweifelhaft”. LEg. $\text{*m}\bar{\text{d}}3 >$ Napatan $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{d}}$ is perhaps reflected apud Plinius VI 35:11 vs. VI 190 by the name of the “*Stamm der Mattien (südlich von Meroe, in jener Gegend liegt die Insel Medoe)*” (Hofmann 1969, 1121–2 & fn. 76), but G. Farina (1925, 53) is probably mistaken in reconstructing Eg. $\text{*mi}\bar{\text{s}}\bar{\text{o}}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{e}}$ (sic) on the basis of the Plinius form.

- Hence: (1st IMP) $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}3 \sim$ (MK-NK) $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}3\bar{\text{j}}$ (mostly attested in pl.) “1. Bewohner des Landes $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}3$, auch in Ägypten als Hilfstruppen, auch von Göttern und vom König, 2. (first XIII.) als Berufsbezeichnung: Jäger, Polizisten (bes. von der Polizei in der theban. Nekropole)” (Wb II 186, 4–11) = “(NK) hunter” (Grd. 1911, 39*, fn. 4: cf. Pap. Anastasi IV 10:5, Urk. IV 994) = “1. (OK-MK) Nomadenvölker, 2. (später) als Polizisten und Jäger tätig” (Sethe 1926, 36–37) = “1. (OK) Nubians (southerners rather than nomads of the Eastern Desert), 2. (in the MK and a little later it had come to mean) ‘Nubian’ in a broad and general sense (to embrace people living probably far beyond the Second Cataract), 3. (NK) auxiliaries in the Eg. army, policeman, troops serving mainly in the desert, desert-ranger specially dealing with desert-life, pursuit of wild game (having lost all actual connection with Nubians)” (AEO I 73*, 78*, 82*, 86*, 88*) = “semi-military desert police” (FD 123) = “(NK) mercenaries and soldiers of police” (Smith 1978, 360–1) = “(NK) police” (DLE I 259; cf. ASAE 22, 76) = “1. Bewohner des Landes Medja und Nubiens (in Ägypten auch als Hilfstruppen eingesetzt), 2. Wüstenpolizei” (GHWb 380; ÄWb I 579–580; II 1170) = “Benennung der bergnubischen Nomaden, dann der aus diesen rekrutierten Söldnern, spezifisch: Polizist (der thebanischen Nekropole)” (Junge 1999, 353) = “ein ursprünglich in der Ostwüste beheimatetes Volk, das sich mit dem Ende des M.R. im Niltal Unternubiens und Oberägyptens anzusiedeln begann, wobei die Einwanderer in Ägypten... häufig als Soldaten verdingt und sich bis zum Beginn des N.R. gänzlich akkulturiert hätten (wobei der ursprüngliche Volksname zu einer Berufsbezeichnung gewandelt hat)” (Peust 1999 Nap., 213) = “(OK) ägyptische Bez. der Pangrave-Leute aus der Ostwüste” (WD III 58 after SAK 1, 1974, 175 & fn. 104). Wüstenbewohner.

nB1: It was traditionally (pace Brugsch, so recently, e.g., Altenmüller in LÄ III 219) regarded as the etymon Cpt. (SB) $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{o}}\bar{\text{i}}$, (SL) $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{o}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{i}}$, (F) $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{a}}$ (m) “soldier” (CD 190b), which was declined already in Wb II 186, 3. A.H. Gardiner (AEO I 82*, 88*) too, found it “*doubtful if there is any instance of $\text{M}\bar{\text{d}}3\bar{\text{j}}$ in the true meaning ‘Nubians’ after Dyn. XVIII*”. K. Zibelius (1972, 136–7) also denied the survival of $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}3\bar{\text{j}}$ after Dyn. XX claiming that this term “*im Koptischen ist überhaupt nicht belegt*”. So also Peust (1999 Nap., 214): “*das neuägyptische $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}3$ ‘Polizist’ im späteren Ägyptischen nicht fortlebt*”. One may indeed agree with C. Peust (1999 Nap., 213) in that depalatalization $-\bar{\text{d}}- > -\text{d}-$ presumably did not occur in $\text{m}\bar{\text{d}}3\bar{\text{j}}$, since its C_2 was constantly written as $-\bar{\text{d}}-$ until the late NK and also in the Ptol. texts. Most of the authors (e.g., Griffith 1909 III,

319; Sethe 1916, 124–131; 1923, 169; Spg. KHW 66; Kees 1930, 346–7; AEO I 81*; Hofmann 1969, 1121, fn. 65; Zibelius 1972, 137, fn. 122; CED 93; KHW 105; Smith 1978, 360–1; DELC 125; Peust 1999 Nap., 213–4; Quack 2005, 314) have derived the Cpt. term from Dem. mtj “Medien, auch: Meder” (DG 185:2) = “1. Meder, genauer: Perser, 2. (!) Soldat” (Peust). Although W. Vycichl (DELC 125) also accepted the derivation from GR mdj “Mede”, he has still assumed (SB) $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ < *matáj, pl. *mató3j (sic, *-3j, pace Lacau). As a compromise, some authors surmised that Cpt. (SB) $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ etc. “*ist aus den lautlich zusammengefallenen Begriffen mdj ‘Meder’ und md3j ‘md3j-Nubier’ entstanden*” (Kaplony, LÄ V 271, n. 15 pace DG 195; Hodge 1969, 11–12; KHW 105; DELC 125), i.e., via contamination of both lexemes, cf. Dem. mdw ~ mdj ~ mtj “Soldat, auch: Polizist (später mit mtj ‘Meder’ zusammengefallen)” (DG 195:1). J. Černý’s (CED 93) allegation that Wb II 86, 4 “*confuses mdy with the African people md3y!*” is somewhat misleading, since the relevant Belegstellen have evidently md3j. Moreover, the authors of Wb (l.c.) have clearly denied the connection of the Cpt. word with Eg. md3j: “*vermutlich nicht das Kopt. $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$* ” (Vrg. 1950, 294: “*sans doute à bon droit*”). H. Satzinger (kind p.c., 14 April 2007), however, still holds the opposite view: “*It is clear to me that Coptic $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ goes back to this [i.e., LEg. md3j], notwithstanding any late allusions to, or pun with, the Medes*”.

NB2: T. Säve-Söderbergh (1941, 138f.) and M. Bietak (1966, 61–78; LÄ IV 999, 1003), followed by I. Hofmann (1969, 1127), J. Vercoutter (1970, 164), K. Zibelius (1972, 135–6), and A. Eggebrecht (1974, 175, fn. 104) identified the md3j with the population of the pangrave-culture (Pfannengräberkultur, spread between Middle Egypt and the 2nd cataract, late MK and 2nd IMP) as well as the beginning of the tradition of the md3j serving in Egypt (end of Dyn. XIII) with the expansion of the pangrave-culture. In the NK, there is hardly any proof for that the md3j “*police troops comprised men of Nubian stock*”, while their officers were presumably Egyptians (AEO I 83*-84*; Zibelius 1972, 136 & fn. 120 with lit.).

- Although the Eg. term has an abundant literature, its ultimate origin is still little known. This debate cannot be discussed here in full details. This entry has predominantly to be restricted to presenting the etymological aspect of the question. So far, no satisfactory etymology has been proposed.
- **1.** Following H. Schäfer, several egyptologists have identified Eg. md3 with the name of the Beja tribes attested as Bed. beḏaûye ~ beḏaûye “1. (m) Bedschavolk, 2. (f) die Bedauesprache” [Rn. 1895, 44] = beḏawi ~ biḏawi “low-born”, hence beḏáwīe ~ biḏáwīe “the language of the Hadendiwa and kindred tribes” [Rpr. 1928, 160] = tū-beḏawīyē (with fem. art.) “Bedauesprache” [Zhl.] = beḏáwīe ~ beḏáwīe “Bedja” (m) vs. tū-beḏawīye (f) “Sprache der Bedja” [Behrens after Almkvist] = ū-beḏáuye “the Beja”, ā-beḏáuye “the Bejas” [Zbr.]. E. Zyhlarz (1932–33, 168) analyzed the name as *biḏa (Hadendowa) “Nomaden” + an ancient *Formativelement* *-āwi. P. Behrens (1981, 31) also isolated the element *beḏa that “*als chemeliges Ethnonym der Bedja-Stämme anzusehen (ist)*”. A. Zaborski (1989, 176, n. 5) found the pure stem *biḏa in biḏa-y gau “nomad’s hut” (gau “hut”, -y gen. ending). A.H. Gardiner (AEO I 81*) was disposed to accept Schäfer’s etymology assuming that it “*might still be true if we suppose the*

descendants of the Medjay were gradually pushed back from the Baṭn el-Hagar southwards and eastwards towards the Red Sea, but it is not provable". This etymology, which has a number of difficulties, has been rejected by W. M. Müller (quoted in AEO I 80*), von Bissing (RT 34, 127), and L. P. Kirwan (1937, 75). C. Peust (1999, 214) has remained neutral: "*ob diese Beja... mit den ägyptischen Md3.w und/oder den napatanischen Mdy gleichzusetzen sind, lässt sich kaum sicher entscheiden*". But neither of the authors managed either to convincingly demonstrate the identity of OK md3 and the etymon of Bed. *biḏa or even to realize and address the most fundamental and most disturbing phonological hindrance, whereby we may probably definitely rightly discard this Eg.-Bed. comparison, namely that why b- shifted to m- in OEg, and how OK -3 could reflect Bed. -Ø. Secondly, several authors assumed for Bed. *biḏa an old etymon with *-g- (below) but failed to explain how *biga (or sim.) became md3 in OEg, i.e., how *-g- was palatalized during the borrowing (as noted already by A. H. Gardiner, AEO I 81*: the -g- "*makes a connection with Eg. md3 very difficult*").

LIT.: e.g. Schäfer 1901, 38, 41–42, 136 (accepted also by E. Meyer and H. Kees, cf. AEO I 80*); Zhl. 1932–33, 168; Sethe 1926, 36–37; Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 18; AEO I 81*; Rsl. 1950, 491, #6; Arkell 1961, 42; KHW 105; Adams 1978, 22; Smith 1978, 360–1; Herzog, LÄ I 676 (Bedja); Wenig in LÄ II 1021 (Harsiotef); Altenmüller, LÄ III 219 (Jäger) vs. 235 (Jagdtracht); Zbr. 1989, 169–170, 174–5. For further discussion (and lit.) on Eg. md3 vs. Beja (from a more or less neutral position): AEO I 73*–89*, esp. 80*; Vcl. 1958, 183; Zaborski, FO 7 (1965), 298f.; Zibelius 1972, 108, 133, 137; Herzog in LÄ I 676–7 & n. 2 (Bedja/Bega, sic!); Grzymski 1982, 27–29. Besides, the rather poor lexicon entry by R. Herzog (l.c.) is to be treated with caution, where, a.o., Beja is treated as "*Sammelbezeichnung für... Stämme..., deren Sprache zum Ostkuschitischen (sic!)... gehört*".

NB1: I. Hofmann (1969, 1127) maintained that "*das Gebiet vom Ostufer des Nil bis zum Roten Meer war von altersher von einer nomadischen Bevölkerung besiedelt, der die Pfannengräber-Kultur zugeordnet werden muß... Die Md3j... sind wahrscheinlich mit diesen Pfannengräber-Leuten identisch. Die heutigen Beja-Völker gehören dem gleichen Kulturbereich an.*" But eventually, Hofmann hesitated to derive the name Beja from Eg. md3 (instead, she saw its ancestor rather in bwgm occurring in the late Eg. sources, below). P. Behrens (1981, esp. 24, 27, 33), in turn, tried to establish the relative chronology of the supposed subsequent settlement of the Nubian and the Beja (identified with the Blemmyes, the brhm of the late Eg. sources in the second half of the 1st mill. BC) tribes merely on the basis of a couple of lexical isoglosses, whereby he "takes for granted" (Zbr.) "*daß das Niltal nicht Urheimat der Bedja sein kann*" and "*daß die Bedja erst nach den Nubiern das Niltal erreichten*", i.e., that the "*Belhe... seine Bewohner – wohl ein Unterstamm der Bedja – im Zuge schwindender pharaonischer Macht kurz vor Ende des Neuen Reichesschubweise ins obere Niltal verstoßen*", whence he concluded to that "*man geht wohl nicht fehl, als Zeitpunkt des **spätestmöglichen** Erscheinens der Bedja im Niltal die Zeitwende anzusehen*". This hypothesis has been fully rejected by A. Zaborski (1989, 169–170, 174–5), who doubts "*whether Md3w are to be identified simply with Beja. In my opinion – so Zaborski – such a possibility to identify them exists indeed though it is quite possible that the name Md3w was used not only for the Beja, i.e. not only for one and the same people. It could have a broader and a not very precise meaning like 'Ethiopians', 'Nubians' and even 'Beja'*"

in the Middle Ages". In the light of the "quite attractive" hypothesis about the location of the AA *Urheimat* in the Sudanese aj-Djazira or in Ethiopia, Zaborcki holds the view that "there should be no need to consider the Beja as relatively late newcomers but as true natives of the Red Sea Hinterlandsince very prehistoric times". He tentatively accepted the identity of Beja vs. Md3 assuming "that political factors were crucial also in the process of the introduction of the... name Blemmyes... when Egypt became gradually weak... and the Blemmyan chieftains became strong... so that the old name Md3w/Md3yw especially with its secondary meanings 'hunters', 'policemen'... was no more adequate...".

NB2: The etymology of the name Beja (Beḏawye) is very much disputed. No convincing suggestion has been put forward. Some of the various reflexes of this ethnonym in ancient sources are also uncertain.

(1) Its traditional derivation from Ar. badwiyy- ~ badāwiyy- "nomade, bédouin, habitant du désert" < badw- "désert où vivent des peuples nomades" [BK I 99–100] (mentioned, e.g., in AEO I 81*; Vcl. 1958, 183) should be excluded (as there is no correspondence between Ar. -d- and Bed. -ḏ-). Note that I. Wajnberg (1935, 63) erroneously explained Geez bādā "desertum" [Dillmann] and Tna. bādō "deserto" [Bassano] from the contraction of a hypothetical *bā^ʿedō or *ba + *ʔaḥādū.

Recently, it has been a common view that the name of the Beja originally contained *-g- (and not *-ḏ-) reflected by a number of Nubian ethno-/toponyms of the type *Bega/*Buga explained by A. Zaborski (1989, 173) as a reflex "actually going back to Beja which, in its turn, has the stem Beḏa with a retroflex /ḏ/ as its source", although there is no evidence in each case for the common origin of all these names:

(2) E. Zyhlarz (1958, 14 & n. 18) tried to prove its presence as the 1st component of the Eg. TN bgšg (around the 4th and 5th cataract) occurring in a list of countries in Kush (Thotmes III), which he interpreted as *bg "Beja" + Mer. śayī (sic) "small", lit. "small Bega (?)", (located in the Bayuda steppe). Rather dubious. K. Zibelius (1972, 113) received Zyhlarz's suggestion with right reservation and she was rather inclined to emend the rdg. of the TN as gbšg.

(3) I. Hofmann (1969, 1124–7) maintained that the Beja were identical with the enigmatic people bwgm ~ bwkm (in the Eastern Desert) of the Eg. religious sources from the LP (she combined its suffix -m with Bed. -b "dir. Objektssuffix").

(4) A number of authors, a.o., A. H. Gardiner (AEO I 81*), W. Vycichl (l.c.), F. Hintze (1967, 79), P. Behrens (1981, 30–31, §4.1.2–3), C. Peust (1999, 214) traced the name Beja in the inscriptions of king Ezana, ruler of the Axum Empire (around 350 AD), where he is named a.o. as king of the Bega or Buga (Geez var.) vs. βουγαεῖτων (Gk. var. in gen.pl.), in which "möchte man die Vorfahren der Beja sehen" (Behrens). Gardiner (AEO l.c.) referred also to an inscription from Adulis (south of Massawa), where Beγά is attested, rightly noting that "the -γ- makes a connection with Eg. md3 very difficult".

(5) L. P. Kirwan (1937, 70) found the ethnonym Bega (Beγά) in the work on Christian topography by Kosmas Indikopleustes mentioning this as the name given by the Ethiopians for the Blemmyes (a people settled between Egypt and Ethiopia), whence P. Behrens (1981, 31) has quite convincingly stated that "somit dürfte an der Identität Bega = Blemyer kaum noch ein Zweifel bestehen". The relation of the two names is obscure. A. Zaborski (1989, 173): "Whether there is any etymological connection between Blhmöwe and Beja/Bega is quite improbable. That this different usage could reflect dialect differences is possible".

(6) W. Vycichl (1958, 183) correctly stated the identity of Beja with Ar. buḡā (Al-Wāqḏī, 790 AD) ~ beḡā (Ibn Hawqal, 988 and Maqrīzī, ca. 1400), whose -ḡ- H. Almkvist (1885, 10) regarded as "fehlenhafte Aussprache" of the retroflex Bed. -ḏ- "seitens der Araber". Following him, P. Behrens (1981, 31) saw "eine gewisse Wahrscheinlichkeit, daß Beja (Buḡā) und Bega (Buga) Aussprachevarianten des Stammesbezeichnung Beḏa (Buda?) darstellen". He also assumed that the Bed. retroflex -ḏ- was "von Sprechern des Arabischen entweder als j... artikuliert... oder als g in Bega – so der Name eines Dorfes, das von Beja bewohnt

wird, und gleichzeitig eine Bezeichnung für die Bedja selbst". I. Hofmann (1969, 1125, fn. 103), in turn, postulated a reverse way of derivation, i.e., that in this case Bed. -d-, which she defined as postvelar or supra-dental (Almkvist: *präkakuminal*), represents in fact a borrowed Ar. -ğ-, cf. Ar. ʿağm- "1 pétri (farine, pâte, etc.), 2. pâte" [BK II 185] borrowed into Bed. ʔađm "Teig" [Rn. 1895, 8]. In Hofmann's view, the old name *bega became in Ar. *beğa-wiya, which, in turn, was re-borrowed into Bed. as beđawiye. Zaborski (1989, 175) "it is possible that... the traditional names of the Beja people are genuine and not of foreign origin".

(7) In addition, Hofmann (l.c.) surmised that "möglichlicherweise hängt auch der Name der Nilinsel Bigge (die im Nubischen Bijje ausgesprochen wird) mit dem Volk Bigga (sic, -gg-) zusammen".

(8) K. Grzymiski (1982, 27–29) assumed an etymological connection with Meroitic medewi ~ bedewi "Meroe (Μερόη)" [Peust] = bedewe ~ mdewe, act. /*berdowi ~ *mberdowi/ [Zibelius] (the name was identified so by F. L. Griffith 1917, 169–171; 1929, 70–71 after A. H. Sayce). Grzymiski supposed the var. with m- (attested older) to reflect a southern dialect, while the var. with b- a northern Mer. dial. He compared this variation to that of Eg. brw.t (XXV. and later) ~ mrw.t (Ptol., Zibelius 1972, 106–7) > Dem. mrw "das Land Meroe" (DG 169:7) > (?) OCpt. περωε (attested in an obscure context, cf. Koenig 1987, 109). Ultimately, however, Grzymiski hesitated to maintain the continuity of OK md3 → LEg. md(3) → Mer. medewi ~ bedewi → Bed. *biđa, which "seems rather unsubstantiated in the light of" the different wtg. of Eg. brw.t (LP-GR) vs. md3 (NK). Since "das meroitische <d> wird traditionell als retroflexes [d] interpretiert", C. Peust (1999 Nap., 209) supposed quite suggestively that "man kann... als angenäherte Aussprache des Toponyms etwa *[berwe] oder *[beđwe] rekonstruieren", but he refrained from drawing any further conclusions. Besides, M. F. L. Macadam (Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin 22, 1966, 52) suggested that Begarawiya [Macadam] = Bag(a)rāwīya [Peust pace Engelbach], the modern name of the site of Meroe preserves the ancient name (Mer. -d- being "close" to -r- "or more like" -ǰ-). He presumed it to have sounded rather *beǰrawīya (coming from Mer. bedewi), which Grzymiski (1982, 30, n. 16) was inclined to accept with regard to the shift of m- > b- conceived as a "chronological factor", but Peust (1999 Nap., 208) correctly voiced the reservation that the inlaut -g- (written with Class. Ar. -q-) "macht es eher wenig wahrscheinlich, dass dieser auf das alte Meroe zurückgeht".

(9) GT: on the other hand, any connection to Gumuz (in Ethiopia): Sai bəga, Sese bəga, Gojjam bag(ā), Kokit ba:ha, pl. bəgá "person" (Gumuz: Bnd. 1979, 63)?

- **2.** A. Ember (1911, 93, fn. 4), surprisingly enough, was deceived by the misleading coincidence of NK md3j "policeman" with Akk. maššartu [< *ma-šar-t-] "Bewachung, Wache" [AHW 620], which have naturally nothing in common with one another. Absurd. This hasty etymology was soon rejected by F. Behnk (1927, 80).

NB: The Akk. word derives from Akk. nšr "bewachen, schützen, bewahren" [AHW 755] which is, of course, unrelated to Eg. md3. Note that the underlying Sem. *nšr stem from a bicons. AA *č-r "to watch" [GT], cp. WCh. Hausa mácàráá (ts-) "place occupied by those on guard", mácàríí "watchman, watcher, lookout, picquet, outpost" < càrì ~ cáróó (m) "guarding" [Abr. 1962, 667, 879].

- **3.** O. Bates (1914, 42, fn. 15) suggested in a rather unprecise and obscure form, albeit "with great reserve" (no surprise), that "the name of the 'Mazoi' Ethiopians" (sic) might be akin to the Hamitic (i.e., in this case, Berber) names (i.e., ethnonyms) stemming from the root *√m-z-γ, assuming that "also the Hamitic-Negro (sic) Masai (sic) may be a survival of it". Absurd.

- **4.** E. Zyhlarz (1934–1935, 172, 245) connected Eg. md3 with Nub.: Kunuzi, Dongola boǵi “Freiland, Steppe”. Unconvincing (for the phonological problems cf. above).
- **5.** C. T. Hodge (1969, 11–12) eventually suggested a native Eg. origin of the name, which he erroneously based on the mistaken assumption that primarily md3 was “*actually the name of these mercenaries sent by Egypt to guard her frontiers*”. This made him explain Akk. mi/ušru “Egypt (also: ‘boundary’)” and Hbr. mišrayim “Egypt” < Sem. *mišr- regarded by him as a back-formation deriving from *mišray borrowed (!) from Eg. md3.j, the nisbe of Eg. md3 (which, in his view, merged with the genuine Sem. word for “boundary”!). In addition, Hodge ultimately affiliated Eg. md3.j with Eg. dr.w “boundary”. Absurd.
NB: Alternatively, he proposed for Eg. md3.j a different (but equally far-fetched) etymology: prefix m- + d3j “to cross over” resulting in *m-d3j lit. *’traverser” (Hodge: “*not far from ‘hunter’*”!) or *’the one who moves about” (Hodge: “*specialized to a group of nomads many of whom took service in Egypt and became a foreign name for Egypt, at least to the northeast as these soldiers represented their adopted country on that frontier*”) on the analogy of ḥabiru “an unsettled people” (< *ḥbr, Hodge: lit. *’one who crosses from place to place, transient”). He derived also Eg. d3j “boat” and d3j.w “opponent” ~ Akk. šerru and Hbr. šar “enemy”. Equally false. Hodge confused diverse roots that are etymologically unrelated.
- **6.** GT: provided **(1)** some of the Cushitic tribes (including ECu., and the Beja) had inhabited the area primarily signified by Eg. md3 by the time when the palatalization of AA *g > pre-OK d took place, and if **(2)** this was a very old (pre-OK) Eg. toponym borrowed before the palatalization as *mg3 and later treated as a native word (hence subject to the shift of PEg. *-g- > OK -d-), then one might eventually compare LECu.: Somali magāl-o “Stadt, Landschaft, Stadt mit dem umgebenden Gebiet” [Rn. 1902, 288] = “town” [Abr. 1964, 170], hence Somali-Jabarti mágal (coll.) “Männer, Volk” [Rn. 1904, 77] (with a shift of the basic mng.). This daring theory naturally has to be further investigated so it may be either rejected or verified.
NB1: The representation of borrowed *-l in OEg. as -3 seems possible (cf. Vcl. 1972, 220; Hodge 1979, 933; 1990, 649–650).
NB2: The etymology of the Somali term is not entirely evident. The possibility, that it represents the *nomen loci* of ECu. *gal- “to enter, go home” [Sasse 1979, 17; 1982, 76; Black 1974, 182], seems attractive, which H.-J. Sasse (p.c., 23 April 2007) does not exclude (“*It is very well possible that magālo is a ‘nomen loci’ derived from *gal-*”), although the anomaly of long -ā- of Som. magālo vs. short *-ā- of ECu. *gal- (attested with short -a- also in Som.) would have to be explained. D. Appleyard (p.c., 24 April 2007) voices his reservations: “*unfortunately, the root meaning ‘enter, go home’ has a short vowel, including in its Somali reflex, gal, whereas ‘town’ has a long ā. . . . Besides, ma- is not a productive formative in Somali*”. M. Tosco (p.c., 24 April 2007), in turn, surmises that it might be a loan from Ethiopian Semitic. On the other hand, Ch. Ehret (p.c., 24 April 2007) thinks that “*the long-vowel structure of -āl would normally indicate that we are dealing with a stem *mag- and a noun suffix element *-āl*”.

md₃.t “1. Buchrolle, Buch, 2. Schriftstück, Brief, Erlaß, Aktenstück, Schuldschein, 3. religiöses Buch, Zauberbuch” (PT, Wb II 187–188) = “le rouleau de papyrus ou de cuir” (Lacau 1954, 72, U28; 1972, 37, fn. 3) = “papyrus-roll, letter, despatch” (FD 123) = “papyrus-roll, book, writings” (DCT 193) = “1. Buch, Buchrolle, Schriftrolle, 2. Brief, Erlass, Aktenstück” (ÄWb I 580; II 1171).

NB1: Its correct rdg. as md₃.t has been established a.o. by F. L. Griffith (1899, 269–270, §2) with respect to the full wtg. attested in the PT.

NB2: R.O. Faulkner (AECT II 108, 110, spell 473, n. 20; II 115, spell 474, n. 9; II 113, spell 474, n. 24; II 116, spell 474, n. 34; II 117–8, spell 476, n. 8) suggestively interpreted md₃.t (CT VI 6h, 7a, 18c, 22i-o, 31d, 38j, 42r-s, 45k) as “roller (?)” (clearly assuming an etymological connection to md₃.t “papyrus-roll”). But others see in it a distinct lexeme (and root): “pole, stick” (DCT 194) = “Gestänge (des Netzes)” (ÄWb II 1171).

NB3: In the view of D. Meeks (AL 78.1942), hence may presumably derive LEg. md₃.t (GW) “nom d’une étoffe” (AC 1978, 14) rendered by him as “rouleau d’étoffe iscrit (donc d’un livre)”.

- Derives certainly from *mgl-t, being a perfect match of Can. *magi/all-at- “scroll” [GT], cf. Hbr. mägillā “Buchrolle, Volumen” [GB 397] = “livre (act. un rouleau de cuir)” [Lacau 1954, 72, U28] = “Schriftrolle” [Vrg.] = “scroll (on which to write)” [KB 545], Phn. mgllh & Off.Aram. mgl̄t “scroll, book” [DNWSI 593], PB/NHbr. mägillā “1. Buchrolle, 2. Schrift” [Dalman 1922, 223] = mägillā ~ mägillā “(Buch)Rolle” [Levy 1924 III 16] = mägillā ~ mägillā “(sc)roll, volume, part of a sēper” [Jastrow 1950, 729], BAram. mägillā “Buchrolle” [GB 913], JAram. mägillōtā “Buchrolle” [GB, Dalman] = mägillōtā “Buchrolle” [Levy 1924 III 16] = mägiltā [KB], JNAram. maḡilla “the scroll of the Book of Esther” [Sabar 2002, 211], Syr. mgalltā (mägallōtā), pl. m(ə)gallē “1. volumen, 2. (pl.) syngraphae”, m(ə)gallonā “volumen parvum” [Brk. 1928, 115b] = magallōtā [KB], Mand. magalta “parchment, scroll, skin” [DM 1963, 238b] = magaltā [KB]. The Can. term, which is a deverbal noun deriving from Sem. *gll “to roll” [Hnrg.], was borrowed into Akk. (LBab.) magallatu “Pergamentrolle” [AHW 574] = “scroll” [CAD m1, 31] and also Ar. maḡall-at- “1. rouleau sur lequel on écrit, 2. livre, code” [BK I 309] = “1. a book, volume, writing, or written paper or the like, in which is science, any book or writing, 2. hence: science and the doctrine, or science, of practical law” [Lane 438c] (not derivable from any of the mngs. of Ar. √gll).

LIT. for Eg.-Hbr.: Ember 1913, 112, #20; 1917, 84, #108, 88, fn. 2; 1919, 32; 1930, #3.c.13, #24.a.1; Sethe 1927, 131; ÜKAPT II 238; Alb. 1927, #98; Vcl. 1934, 63; Clc. 1936, #419; Vrg. 1945, 130, #1.d.14, 146, #24.a.8; Lacau 1954, 72, U28; 1972, 37, fn. 3; Wessetzky 1958, 13–14; 1959, 90.

NB1: P. Lacau (1954, 72, U28 & fn. 3; 1972, 37, fn. 3) correctly reconstructed the

underlying Eg. biconsonantal root as *d3 “rouler, turner”, whence he derived also Eg. d3 [< *gl] “der Feuerbohrer” (Lit. MK, Wb V 511, 10) = “le drill à faire le feu (un instrument agissant par la rotation)” (Lacau) = “fire-drill” (FD 318) and md3.t “Meißel” (Wb, below) = “le perçoir (?), act. an instr. “que l’on manœuvrait avec l’archet de menuisier” (Lacau). He equally correctly identified Eg. *d3 with Sem. *gll, although he still regarded it as “impossible de dire si nous avons à faire à un mot appartenant au présémitique, ou si les deux groupes de langues ont créé séparément ces deux mots par une même dérivation en m sur un même radical”. Similarly, W. Wessetzky (1958, 14; 1959, 90) conceived the lit. mng. of Eg. md3.t as “Rolle als etwas Abgeschlossenes, das innerlich und äußerlich eine Einheit darstellt”, which he etymologically combined with d3d3.t “Kollegium” (OK, Wb, below), d3 “der runde Feuerbohrer” (Lit. MK, Wb, above), and even md3.t “Saugrohr” (Med., Wb, q.v.). Doing so, he assumed “eine charakteristische Ausdrucksweise, die den Gegenständen, die einander in der äußeren Form gleichen, die gleiche Benennung gibt”. Wessetzky explained these forms from an Eg. *d3j (sic, -j) that he apparently equated with d3j “eig. kreuzen, bes.: den Fluß beim Überfahren” (OK Wb V 511), which seems plausible, albeit not fully certain.

NB2: The Eg.-Can. isogloss and Sem. *gll belong to a widespread AA root family ultimately originating from biconsonantal AA *g-l with the basic sense “round” [GT] whose reflexes may be grouped as follows:

(1) Sem. *gll “rund (sein)” [Rsl.] = “катиться” [Djk. 1965, 48] = “to roll” [Hnrg. 2000, 2063; SED I 71, §75] > Akk. galālu “1. pebble, 2. a stone treated in a specific way” [CAD g 11] = “roll” [Lsl.] = “caillou, pierre polie (?)” [DRS] || Can. *gll “(bes. große Steine) wälzen” [GB 141] > Hbr. qal gll “rollen, wälzen”, nifal “zusammengerollt werden, sich fortwälzen (von einem Fluße)”, hence: gal “Steinhaufe” ~ gālāl “Stein” [GB 139, 141–2] = gll qal 1. to roll (stone), 2. (metaph.) roll away (to God)”, nifal “to be rolled together”, 2. roll out, flow forth (stream)”, gālīlā “district” (Hnrg.: lit. “circuit”) [KB 193–4] = gal “monceau de pierres” [DRS], PBHbr. gll “1. wälzen, rollen, 2. von sich abwälzen”, nifal “zusammengerollt, angeheftet werden”, gālāl “Kügelchen”, PBHbr. gōlēl & JAram. gōlōlā “Rollstein (von jedem Verschluß des Felsengrabes)” vs. JAram. gll pael “rollen, wälzen”, gōlālā “1. Stein, 2. Körnchen, 3. Exkrement”, gōlālā “1. Stein, 2. Körnchen, 3. Exkrement”, gōlālānītā “1. klumpig, 2. grob” [Dalman 1922, 73, 80] = PBHbr.-JAram. gll “to roll, unfold”, PBHbr. gālāl “1. rolling along with, appendage, 2. something rolled, rounded, ball, ordure, excrement, dung, 3. a material used for vessels (supposed to be baked ordure)” & JAram. gōlāl “1. id., 2. untrimmed stone, cobble, 3. lump, 4. ordure, 5. wave”, PBHbr. gōlēl & JAram. gōlōlā “the stone placed on top of a burial cave, top-stone” [Jastrow 1950, 222, 249–250], Syr. gll pael “fluctuavit, volvit, rotundum fecit”, etpael “aestuavit, agitatus/volutatus est, in semet convolutus est”, afel “volvere fecit”, g(ə)loltā, pl. g(ə)lolē “circinus, globus, pila”, g(ə)lilā “rotundus, regio, gyrus lapidum”, g(ə)liltā “integumentum”, g(ə)lilitū “forma rutunda”, g(ə)lilonā “globulus”, g(ə)lālā “rotunditas, rotundus, vallis”, maglonā “globulus luteus”, gullinā “roti figuli et tornatoris” [Brk. 1928, 114–5] = gallel “rouler, faire tourner”, *etgallel “s’agiter, être en effervescence”, gōlālā “rondeur, rond (subst.)”, gōlīlā “rond (adj.)”, gōloltā “globe, balle” [DRS] vs. galalō “etwas rundes, Kugel” [IS] | Dat. ḡulla “boule”, ḡalīlā “balle de fusil”, ḡalūlā “boulet de canon”, ḡalīlā (pron. ḡalēl) “balle de fusil” [GD 291–2; DRS] || MSA: Jbl. ḡilōlt “1. bullet, 2. bullet-wound” [Jns. 1981, 74] = “balle, blessure causée par une balle” [DRS] || ES: Tigre ḡālālā & Amh. ḡ’āllālā “tournoyer, tourbillonner (fumée)” [DRS] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 108–9; DRS 125–6) || Eg. g33 if < *gll] “kentern” (PT 662b, Wb V 149, 12) = g3j (emphatic form g33) “kentern” (ÄWb I 1363) || SBrb.: Hgr. ḡ’eell-et (ḡ-) “être rond (être de forme circulaire), former un rond (être en cercle, se mettre en cercle)”, ḡ’eellw-et “arrondir (rendre de forme circulaire), faire un rond circulaire), faire un rond (ou des ronds) à faire un cercl (ou des cercles) sur une surface” [Fcd. 1951–2, 433–4], EWLm. & Ayr ḡālāl-ət “être rond, circulaire (e plat), former un rond (p.ex. corde enroulée)”, EWLm.

ta-gələll-et vs. Ayr. tə-gləll-et “cercle, rond”, EWM. & Ayr. a-gələlla, pl. i-gələlla-t-an “objekt rond, circulaire et plat”, Ayr i-gələlla-t-än “région (lit. les cercles)” [PAM 2003, 215] || WCh.: Hausa gùlùùlù “1. ball of earth at top of spinning-spindle, 2. cotton-boll, 3. lump (of food), 4. gùlùùlái: type of ornamentation of saddle-cover” [Brg. 1934, 406; Abr. 1962, 340] etc. In Sem. lexicography (GB, KB etc.), some further isoglosses have been mentioned among the reflexes of Sem. *gll, e.g. Akk. gullatu “Wulst, Kugel an einem Säulenkapitäl” [Zimmern 1917, 31 quoted also in CAD & GB] = “Säulenwulst” [Jensen, ZA 9, 133] = “Volute” [Weidhaas, ZA 45, 117f.] = “bowl-shaped capital” [May, BASOR 88, 24f.] = “Säulenbasis” [Meissner, Or. NS 11, 253, n. 2] = “column base [CAD g 128] = “ornement d’or (en demi-sphère?)” [DRS], Hbr. (prob. from Akk.) gullā “ein Teil des Säulenkapitäl” [GB 140] = “Kugel, Wulst” [Rsl. 1952, 132] = “nom d’une partie de colonne ou de chapiteau” [DRS]. From Sem. *gll have been eventually derived also Akk. (j/spB) gillu “Welle” [GB] = “vague, flot (?), marée (?)” [DRS] vs. *gallu (fem. gallatu) “(etwa) wogend (?)” [AHW 275a] = “(mng. unknown, literary epithet of the sea)” [CAD g 18] = “waving (?)” [KB] || Hbr. gal “Quelle”, gullot-mayim TN “Wasserquellen” [GB 139, 143] = *gal “wave” [KB 190], cf. esp. Hbr. gl “rollen, sich wälzen (Wasser)” [GB 141], Syr. gallā “unda”, gallānāyā “undosus” [Brk. 1928, 114] = gallā “vague” [DRS] etc. Cf. perhaps also Hbr. gal “Steinhaufe” [GB 139] = “heap (of stones)” [KB 190], Off.Aram. gl “1. stone (object), 2. stone (material)” [DNWSI 224] || (???) Geez gl “sich häufen” (sic) [GB] = “to lay on the back” [Lsl. 1987, 191]. But Ar. ġalal- “Kleinigkeit” [GB] = ġalal- “something small, slight” [KB] have hardly anything to do with Sem. *gll “to roll” (contra GB, KB). Following the tradition of Sem. lexicography (GB, KB, Lsl. l.c. etc.), L. Kogan (SED l.c.) treated Sem. *gall- “dung” [Kogan] too as “possibly related to, or contaminated with, Sem. *gll ‘to roll’...”, cf. Hbr. ġēl ~ ġālāl “Kot, Menschenkot (als Brennmaterial), Mistfladen” [GB 139, 141] = ġēl “human dung”, ġālāl “dung” [KB 190, 194], J.Aram. ġālāl “ordure, excrement” [Jastrow 1950, 250], Mnd. gal ~ gala “rubbish-heap, ordure, dung”, glalāia “faeces”, glala “dung” [DM 1963, 76, 93] | Ar. ġall-at- ~ ġill-at- ~ ġull-at- “boule de fiente, fiente des bestiaux, bouse de vache employée pour le chauffage” [BK I 308] = ġill-at- “dried dung of animals as fuel” [KB], cf. also Ar. ġalġal- “balayures, crotte, boue” [Dozy I 205] || ES: Tigre (Lsl. 1982, 167: borrowed from Ar.?) ġällo “dung” [LH 560] (Sem.: DRS 126; SED I 70–71, §75).

(2) AA *g-l “pot” (lit. “sg. round?”) [GT] > Sem. *gull-(at-) “bowl or sim.” [GT]: Akk. (OBab.) gullum “Schale, Becken” [AHW 297] = gullum “a container” [CAD] = “bowl” [KB], cf. Akk. (NBab.) gullatu “ewer” [CAD g 129] = bassin, aiguière” [DRS 125] = “ein Gefäßname” [GB] || Ug. gl “cup” [Gordon 1955, 251, #403; DUL 297] = “(etwa) Kanne” [WUS #645] = “coupe, cuvette” [DRS] = “bowl” [KB], Hbr. gullā “Ölgefäß” [GB 140], Syr. ġüllinā “tour de potier” [DRS] | Ar. ġull-at- “panier fait de feuilles de palmier” [BK I 308] || cp. perhaps Eg. g3j [< *gly?] “Napf, Schale (aus Ton, Bronze)” (late NK, Wb V 150; GHwB 893) = “(wide) cup” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 194f.) = “jar, bowl, flask” (DLE IV 50) vs. d3j (contraction of d3d3) “pot” (late NK: Ostr. Berlin 12635, CED 311) = “ein Topf” (GHwB 993) || CCh. *g-l “pot” [GT]: Bana ġälā “pot” [Stl.] | Musgu gullāi “Strohflasche” [Rohlf’s apud Lks. 1941, 57] = “straw bottle” [Stl.] | ECh.: Lele ġölū “pot” [Stl.] (Ch.: OS 1989, 134; HSED #979). Cf. also Ch. *g-l “calabash” [JS 1981, 58C; 1994 I, 25C]. For Sem.-Ch. etc. see Hodge 1990, 647, §24.

(3) Sem. *gwl “to move in circular form” [GT]: Ug. ṽgwl: syll. gu-PI-[li] /guw(w)āli/ “circuit” [Hmg. 1999, 136], PBHbr.-J.Aram. gwl “rollen” vs. gyl “einen Kreis bilden, rollen (?)”, PBHbr. ġowīl “1. unbehauener Stein, Bruchstein, 2. starkes Pergament (von ungespaltenem Leder)”, J.Aram. ġilā “etwas Rundes” [Dalman 1922, 73, 77] = PBHbr.-J.Aram. gwl ~ gyl “(zusammen)rollen”, cf. PBHbr. ġowīl vs. J.Aram. ġowīlā “1. unbehauener Stein (eig. von der Kruste Umgebenes), 2. Pergament (und zw. eine noch nicht völlig zubereitete Tierhaut)” [Levy 1924 III 310–1] = PBHbr.-J.Aram.

gyl ~ gwl “to form a ball, circle, roll up (a scroll)”, PBHbr. *gawlā (st.cstr. gəwal-) “ball, roll (like the weaver’s roll)” [Jastrow 1950, 221] = gwl “faire le cercle, rouler” [DRS], NHbr. gōlā “Rollstein” [GB], NSyr. ḡāil “faire un tour, une promenade, chercher” [DRS] | Ar. ḡwl, impf. ya-ḡūl-u “sich kreisförmig bewegen” [GB] = ḡwl “1. aller, courir, tourner, voltiger en cercle, faire le tour de..., tourner autour de..., 2. tourner, voltiger tout autour (se dit des cavaliers arabes qui préludent par des courses et une fuite simulée, à l’attaque), 3. conduire qqn. tout autour, tourner avec lui, lui faire faire le tour, 4. tourbillonner, tourner dans l’air (poussière soulevée par le vent)”, ḡūl- “parois intérieures d’une fosse, d’un puits, de la mer” [BK I 358] || Jbl. gwl: egtél “(us. animals) to gather, wander, tour around” [Jns. 1981, 80] || ES: a.o. Amh. gāwāl alā “tourner, se mouvoir lourdement” [DRS], cf. also Amh. gul “zolla” [Guidi] = g^wāl [Baeteman] (ES: Wajnborg 1935, 59 with further ES cognates). Cf. also Sem. *ḡil- “generation” [GT]: Hbr. ṡgyl > i.a. ḡil “Generation, Alter, eig. Kreis” [GB 138] = “circle, âge, période” [Gray, Chn.], PBHbr. ḡil “Kreis, Genossenschaft”, ḡilā “Versammlung, Kreis” [Dalman 1922, 77] = “Zeitalter, Zeitpunkt (Grundbedeutung: ‘Kreis, in der Bezeichnung der Zeit’), gleichzeitig, Gleichzeitigkeit” [Levy 1924 I 324] = “circle, association of coevals” [Jastrow 1950, 238] etc. | Ar. ṡgyl > ḡil- “1. troupe d’hommes, 2. tribu, nation, 3. âge d’homme, génération” [BK I 362]. The Sem. lexicographers (GB, KB etc.) used to explain also Hbr. gyl ~ gwl qal “frohlocken, jauchzen” [GB 138] = (lit.) “sich im Kreise drehen, rollen, wälzen” (sic) [Brunner] (Sem.: DRS 108) from the same root.

(4) AA *g-l (or rather *g-l-y ~ *g-y-l?) “head” [GT] = *g[ay]l-/gul- “head” [Blz.] || EBrb.: Audjila t-ḡīli ~ t-ḡīli, pl. t-ḡīli-wīn “testa” [Prd. 1960, 175] || NOM.: Dizoid *gayl- “head” [Blz.] > Dizi gaylli [Blz.], Dizi-Maji geli [Bnd.], Dizi-Jeba ḡāli “head” [Flm. 1990, 28], cf. Sheko geri “head” [Bnd.] = gari “head” [Blz.] (Dizoid: Bnd. 1971, 261–2) || CCh.: perhaps Muktele ḡāl [unless < *gar] “head” [Rsg. 1978, 268, #355 quoted also in JI] || ECh.: Kwang ḡóló “head” [Jng./JI], Kwang-Modgel gol-um “mein Kopf” [Lks. 1937, 97] = *gol- “head” [Grb.], Kwang-Mobu ḡóló “head” [Jng. in JI] | Sokoro geltim [< *gel-t-um] “dein Gehirn” [Lks. 1937, 33] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 183). For the AA etymology see esp. Blz. 1989 MS Om., 18, #58.

(5) Sem. *galgal- “Rad” [Eilers 1978, 126] = *galgal- “sg. round” vs. *glgl “to be round, roll, move circularly” [GT]: Akk. gaggultu [-gg- < *lg-] “Augapfel” [Holma 1911, xvii; GB] || (?) Ug. glgl “(possibly) to roll” [de Moor 1980, 310] = “?” [Watson, AuOr 13, 1995, 221] = glgl “cup” [DUL 298] (for an alternative rendering cf. below), Phn. glgl “le tourneur/porteur de statue (?)” [Xella 1992, 89–90], Hbr. galgal & *gilgāl (st.cstr. gilgal) “Rad”, cf. gilgāl TN (Guthe, ZDPV 13, 129: lit. “Steinkreis”, Baudissin, ZDMG 58, 40: “zusammengerollte Steine”) [GB 141] = galgal “1. wheel, 2. paddle-wheel”, *gilgāl (st. cstr.) gilgal “wheel”, ha-gilgāl TN “stone-circle, Gilgal” [KB 190–1], PBHbr. gilgēl vs. JĀram. galgēl “rollen, wälzen, drehen”, PBHbr. galgal “(eig. was sich dreht, etwas Rundes) 1. Rad, 2. (übertr.) *rota fortunae* oder die kreisende Himmelssphäre, der Tierkreis, Galgal”, galgal “1. Rad, Kugel, Räderwerk, 2. Schöpfwerk, 3. Winde, 4. Himmelssphäre, Tierkreis, 5. Augapfel, 6. (pl.) Wechsel (des Glücks), 7. Körnchen”, JĀram. galgālā “1. Rad, Kugel, etwas Rundes, 2. Tierkreis, der Galgal des Himmels, 3. der Augapfel, 4. runder Gegenstand wie Stein”, gilgūl “1. das Rollen, Wälzen, 2. das Sichrollen, der Körper derjenigen, die außerhalb Palästinas starben, das Sichwälzen des Toten nach dem Ort der Auferstehung” [Dalman 1922, 78–79; Levy 1924 I 329], JPĀram. glgl “wheel”, glgl “to roll, impose” [Sokoloff 1990, 129] vs. gilgālē “prunelles de l’oeil” [DRS], OĀram. & Punic & Samar. Aram. glgl “wheel” [DNWSI 222], Mnd. galgla “globe, sphère” [DM 1963, 76], Syr. galgal & ḡalag peal “(weg)wälzen” [Eilers 1987, 513], NSyr. galgōlā “balle” [DRS] || Soqotri gilégel “petites boules” [Lsl. 1938, 108–9] (Sem.: DRS 118) || LECu.: Somali ḡalgal “rollen, drehen, wälzen” vs. “rollende Bewegung, von einem Rad oder überhaupt einem runden Gegenstand” [Rn. 1902, 169–170]. W. Wessetzky (1958, 13–14; 1959, 90) combined the Eg.-Hbr. isogloss

(*ma-gVll-at- “scroll”) with a certain LECu.: Somali galgal “Schriftrolle” (sic) that he erroneously rendered as redupl. of Som. √gal (lit. “die in sich Eintretende, im Kreis sich schließende”).

(6) Eventually here might belong AA (ES-Eg.) *g-l-g-l (“to gather (intr.)” (orig. “to form a circle”?) [GT] attested in Geez glg: ʔangallaga “to assemble (intr.), come together, keep company, band together, gather in crowds, be in an uproar, rage”, angalgā “congregation, assembly, council, concourse, meeting, gathering, multitude, throng” & Tigre gālgāla “to gather” [Lsl. 1987, 190] (derived by W. Leslau l.c. from Sem. *gll ~ *glgl “to roll together” > “to come together, be assembled”) || Eg. d3d.t ~ d3d3.t [*<* *glg-t] “Behörde, Kollegium” (OK, Wb V 528–529) = “magisters, collegium” (FD 319), cf. the circle det. associated with the root *d3d(3). For alternative etymologies of Eg. d3d(3).t Kollegium” see Takács 1998, 155, #1.4.

(7) Can.-Eg. (?) *g-l-g-l “pot” [GT] > Ug. glgl “copa (?)” [DLU I 146] = “cup” [DUL 298] (rendering dubious, for a different rendering cf. alternatively above) || Eg. d3d3.w [provided *<* *glgl-w] “1. (Med.) Topf, 2. Behälter (für Honig wie eine Maßbezeichnung), 3. (late NK) Trinkgefäß, Krug” (MK, Wb V 532) = “1. Kopftopf (für Medikamente), Räuherkopf, 2. Becher” (MK, ÄWb II 2824). Redupl. of AA *g-l “vessel” [GT]? The validity of this isogloss is highly dubious as the origins of both comparanda are debated. W.G.E. Watson (1995, 221 & fn. 62) explained Ug. glgl alternatively a foreign word as a borrowed either from Hurr. kelkelli or kulgullu [GLH 142, 152]. On the other hand, a different Sem. etymology (*√šršr) has been proposed for Eg. d3d3.w too (independently) both by C.T. Hodge (1969, 107, §6) and A.Ju. Militarev (1986, 68, fn. 11; MM 1983, 209), cf. esp. Akk. šaršāru “ein Weihwasserkrug” [AHW 1086].

(8) AA (Sem.-Eg.) *g-l-g-l (redupl.) “head, skull” [GT] > Sem. *gulgul-(at-) “skull, cranium” [Frz. 1964, 268, #2.43; cf.] = *gulgul-at-/*galgal-at- “skull” [Kogan] > Akk. gulgullu ~ gulgullatu “Schädel” [AHW 297] = “1. skull, 2. container shaped like a human skull” [CAD g 127–8] || Hbr. gulgolet “Schädel, Kopf” [GB 139] = “skull” [KB 191] = gulgōlet “Schädelstätte” [Eilers 1987, 513], PBHbr. gulgo/ōlet “1. Kopf, Schädel (eig. etwas Rundes), 2. (übertr.) Kopfgeld (eine kgl. Steuer)”, galgīlōn ~ galgālōn “Turban, der um den Kopf gebunden wird” [Levy 1924 I 330], JAram. gulgultā ~ gulgālā “1. Schädel, 2. Kuge, runder Stein, 3. Kopfsteuer/geld”, [Dalman 1922, 79; Levy 1924 I 330] = gulgultā ~ gulgaltā “skull, head” [Jastrow 1950, 221], JPArAm. gōgaltā ~ gülgültā [DRS], CPArAm. gwlgwltʔ “skull” [KB], Samar. Aram. glgh [DRS], Syr. gāgoltā “cranium” [Brk. 1928, 103b] | Ar. gālağ-at- [Kogan: *<* *galğal-at-?] “1. crâne, 2. tête” [BK I 311] (Sem.: Holma 1911, 11; DRS 118; SED I 74–75, §79) || Eg. d3d3 [*dā3dā3 from *galgal-] “Kopf” (OK, Wb V 530–531). Following the old view expressed frequently in both Sem. and Eg. linguistics (lit. infra), L. Kogan (SED l.c.) too has recently admitted the etymological connection with the reflexes of AA *g-l “round” [GT]: “Sem. *gll/*glgl ‘to be round’... may eventually be the source of Sem. ‘skull’”. Note that Ar. gulğul-at- [Holma] and galğal-at- [KB] - as Kogan rightly remarked - “are not found in the available dictionaries”. For disproving the Rösslerian etymology of Eg. d3d3 cf. Takács 2006, 102–3.

(9) AA (Sem.-Ch.) *n-g-l ~ *g-l-n (?) “round” [GT] > ES: Geez nagala “to roll (up), make into a ball” [Lsl. 1987, 392] || WCh.: Boghom gūlōñḥ, Zaar gilaawo, Zaar of Gambar Leere giḥḥ, Zaar of Kal ningerungēḥ, Zakshi ngyarlḥ, Boghom gūlōñḥ, Barang gāngālayē, Langas gāngāli “round” (Sbauchi: Smz. 1978, 45, #100; Mkr. 1987, 302) || CCh.: Logone ḥgolóo “round” [Lks. 1936, 114]. Cf. perhaps also ECh.: Tumak māğāl “anneau de pied” [Cpr. 1975, 81]?

LIT. for the Sem. bicons. comparison: Alb. 1927, #98; Gray 1933, 126; 1934, 35; WUS #645; Frz. 1964, 268, #2.43; Hrbek 1968, 97–99; Brunner 1969, 150, #849; Zbr. 1971, #55; IS 1971, #94; Rabin 1975, 88, #70; Eilers 1978, 130; 1987, 512, §2, 513, §3, 514; Zbr. 1991, 1680, §5; Blv. 1993, 34, #24; Hnrg. 2000, 2063.

LIT. for the comparison of the diverse reflexes of AA *g-l : Ember 1911, 88, 91; 1913, 112, #20; 1919, 32; 1930, #24.a.2; Farina 1924, 324; Sethe 1927, 131; Alb. 1918, 90; 1927, #98; Vcl. 1934, 63; 1972, 174; Clc. 1936, #419; Lexa 1938, 226; Loret 1945, 240; Vrg. 1945, 130, #1.d.14, #1.d.29; 1965, 86; Chn. 1947, #212, #218 (reviewed in Brk. 1950, 60); Rsl. 1952, 132; Wessetzky 1958, 13–14; 1959, 90; Grb. 1963, 58; Djk. 1965, 48; IS 1966, 333, #6.18; 1971, #94; Janssens 1967, 87; Lacau 1970, 32; Ward 1972, 19; Hodge 1981, 372, #19; 1981, 406; 1990, 647, #24; Blz. 1989 MS Om., 18, #58; Mlt. 1991, 257, #24.2; Schenkel 1993, 142; HSED #948 & #980; Takács 1994, 43–54; 1994, 172–4; 1998, 153f.

- Alternative etymologies for Eg. md3.t can be safely excluded.

NB: (1) C.T. Hodge (1966, 45, #32) suggested a comparison of Eg. *d3 > md3.t with WCh.: Hausa *cáarà* (ts-) “to arrange (hair, of woman), align, compose, edit (newspaper)” [Abr. 1962, 878]. (2) A.M. Lam (1993, 385): ~ Ful *maṣṣatā* “qui ne se perd pas, document écrit”. (3) Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 193, #1764) combined Eg. md3.t with Ar. *māḍ* “to wrap up the head”, Eg. *md.wt* “bonds”, *mdh* “belt, girdle”, and Cu. **maž-* (**madl-*) “to roll, twist”.

md3.w “Widersacher” (PT 1237b, Wb II 187, 2; ÄWb I 580) = “adversary” (Faulkner).

NB: R. O. Faulkner (AEPT 293–4, utt. 683, n. 3) abstained from rendering md3 in PT 2048 (“?”) maintaining that md3.w of PT 1237 “*can hardly be intended here*” (contra ÄWb l.c.).

- Derives (via m- prefix of participles), as correctly suggested by E. Edel (AÄG 110, §256), from Eg. *d3j* “sich widersetzen” (PT, Edel) = “to act hostile, oppose, oppose o’self to (m)” (FD 318; DCT 812–3), cf. hence also *d3j.tj* “Widersacher” (PT, Wb V 519, 1) vs. *d3j.w* “Widersacher” (PT, ÄWb I 1491), *d3j.t* “1. Widersetzlichkeit, Übertretung, 2. Unheil, Böses” (MK, Wb V 518, 3) = “1. Unheil, Übel, Schaden, 2. Mißwuchs” (PT 1582a, ÄWb I 1491). Cp. still *d3d3* “to be hostile” (CT II 382e, DCT 818) = “feindlich sein” (ÄWb II 2824–5) > *d3d3* “1. feindlich (sein gegen jem.?), 2. Feind, Widersacher” (GR, Wb V 532–3). NB1: H. Grapow (1914, 33) eventually explained PT md3.w from *d3j* “entgegenstrecken” following the fairly common view expressed also in other works (Wb V 514; FD 318; Hodge 1976, 17, n. 13; DCT 812–3) that the primray sense of *d3j* was “den Arm feindlich ausstrecken nach jemandem, feindlich jemandem entgegenstrecken, sich feindlich in den Weg stellen” (Wb) ultimately originating “*in übertragener Bedeutung als feindliche Handlung*” (Wb) from *d3j* “den Arm ausstrecken” (Wb) = “to extend arm, stretch forth arms” (DCT), which, however, can hardly be related with the motion verb *d3j* of various significations (“1. eig. kreuzen, 2. bes.: den Fluß zu Schiff überfahren, tr., 3. übersetzen, durchziehen, nicht im Schiff”, hence “4. etwas fortbringen, 5. an den Mund führen, 5. eine Speise verzehren”) as suggested in Wb V 511–4. We are dealing here with the confusion of diverse roots which cannot be discussed (cf. *d3j*).

NB2: Due to the diverse values of Eg. *d* (from PAA **g* or **ç*/**ç*/**ç̣*) and 3 (**r* or **l*), the proper etymology of the underlying Eg. root (*d3j* sich widersetzen”, above) is not unambiguous:

(1) Sem. **gry* “to be hostile” [Testen]: Akk. *garû* “bekämpfen”, *garû* “Feind” [GB] = *gerû* “befehlen, prozessieren”, *gērû* “Feind, Gegner” [AHW 286] = *gerû* ~ *garû*

G “to be hostile, start a lawsuit”, D gurrû “to open up hostilities, make war, start a lawsuit”, N itegrû “to quarrel”, gērû ~ gārû “foe, adversary” [CAD g 61–62] || Hbr. gry piel “Streit erregen”, hitpael “Krieg anfangen, leidenschaftlich erregt werden” [GB 147] = gry piel “to stir up a strife, go to court”, hitp. “1. to get excited, strive, 2. get involved in strife, battle” [KB 202] = “to start a quarrel, fighting, prepare for war” [Zbr.], Imp./Off.Aram. gry qal “to sue, institute suit against” [DNWSI 234] = “to plead, prosecute at law” [Zbr.], JAram. grʔ pael “reizen, erregen” (Personen, Feuer) [GB], Eg.Aram. gry “gerechtlich angreifen” [GB] = “to go to court” [KB], Syr. gry pael (garrî) “instigavit, irritavit” [Brk.] = pael “to be persecuted”, etpael “to be attacked” [Zbr.] = pael “to stimulate”, etpael “to get involved in a strife” [KB] (Sem.: Dj. 1967, 196, fn. 55; Zbr. 1971, #61; Testen 1992, 75–76). D. Testen (l.c.) suggested a possible Ar. cognate, namely gāriy-at- “girl, slave woman” (orig. perhaps *woman associated with the enemy” arguing that “raids in military campaigns were presumably an important source of slaves for the early Arabs”). Both I. M. D’jakonov (l.c.) and A. Żaborski (l.c.) assumed a Sem. bicons. *gr “to attack, begin a quarrel” [Zbr.] based on the comparison of Sem. *gry with Sem. *gwr > Hbr. gwr qal “angreifen” [GB 135] = “to treat with hostility, attack” [KB 185] = “to persecute, assault” [Zbr.] | Ar. ġwr: ġāra I “2. être injuste, commettre une injustice à l’égard de qqn. (comme juge), 3. opprimer qqn., agir en tyran, en oppresseur à son égard” [BK I 352] = I “to act unjustly” [Zbr.] = I “to do wrong to (ʿalā) a person” [KB]. Cf. perhaps also ES: Haruro māgāra “adversary, opponent” [Lsl. 1963, 104; no Sem. etymology] || NOm.: Omt. magara “nemico, avversario” [Mrn. 1938, 151]? M. L. Bender (kind p.c., 29 April 2007) would not exclude a connection to NOm.: Kefoid: Anfillo kaar- “to fight” [Moges and Teshome 1995 quoted by Bnd.] and Bworo (Shinasha) kara “to fight” [Rottland quoted by Bnd.]: “these could perhaps be nominalized to mVkar- > mVgar-, but this is pure speculation and the semantics is not exact”.

(2) Sem. šʔl [Kraus] = *šʔlʔ [Lsl.] = *šʔl ~ *šʔlʔ “to be hostile” [GT]: Akk. šālu ~ šēlu “to fight, object, quarrel”, hence muššālu ~ muššallu ~ muššēlu “quarrelsome, hostile, choleric” [CAD § 89 & m2, 245] = šēlu “to oppose, be at enmity, hostile to” [Alb., Lsl.] = šēlu “streiten” vs. mušallū “Feind”, muššālu ~ mušallu “streitsüchtig” [AHW 678–9, 1079] | Ar. šaʔula “être farouche, furieux (se dit d’un chameau)”, šaʔu/il- “farouche, qui se jette sur les hommes (chameau)” [BK I 1301] vs. Ar. šwl I: šāla “1. se jeter avec fureur contre qqn. (un homme en colère, un animal en fureur)”, šawila “être en fureur, et attaquer avec fureur” [BK I 1386] || Geez šālʔa “to hate” [Lsl. 1944] = šālʔa “to hate, be hostile to” [Alb.] = šalʔa “to hate, abhor, be hostile toward, not want” [Lsl. 1987], Tigre šālʔa & Tna. šālʔe “to hate” [Lsl.], Gafat (tä)šālʔä “to quarrel” [Lsl.] etc. (Sem.: Alb. 1927, §97 with false inner Sem. etymology; Kraus, AfO 11, 1936–37, 228; Lsl. 1944, 57; 1987, 554). For Eg.-Sem. see Alb. 1927, §97; Ember 1930, §3.c.24. Following W. von Soden (AHW l.c.), W. Leslau (1987 l.c.) compared ES *šʔlʔ/*šʔlʕ (sic) “to hate” [AHW] with Akk. šelû “to cheat” [CAD § 24] = “beschimpfen” [AHW 1090] = “to insult, abuse” (sic) [Lsl. 1987], which is semantically dubious.

(3) Sem. *qarr- “enemy” [Gray] vs. *qrr “1. to oppose, 2. attack, 3. harm” [GT]: Akk. šerru “Feind(schaft)” [AHW 1093] = “1. enemy, 2. (f) second wife, rival, 3. adversary” [CAD § 137–8] = “hostility, enemy” [Lsl.] || Ug. šr (*šrr) “befeinden”, šr-t “Feindschaft, Feind” [WUS #2353] = *šrr “to hurt, afflict”, šr-t “enemy” [Lsl. pace Gordon 1955, 318, #1655] = šr-t “enmity” > “enemy, adversary” [DUL 792], Hbr. šrr qal “anfeinden, befehlen”, šar “Feind” [GB 694, 697] = šrr “vouloir du mal à qqn.” [Lsl.] = šrr qal “to treat with hostility, attack”, šar “enemy” [KB 1052, 1058–9], JAram. ʿrr [ʕ < *q] pael “widersprechen”, ʿār “Feind” [GB] = ʿrr “Einwand erheben” [Levy 1924 III 706], CPAr. *ʿr “to be indignant, oppose” [KB] | OSA: Sab. qrrw “to wage war”, qr “war, enemy”, ʔqr “damage, harm (?)” [SD 42] = qr “Krieg, Feind” [GB] = qr “war, enemy” [Zbr.], Mdb. qr “guerre” [Arbach 1993, 35], Ar. qrr I “nuire (à qqn.), être nuisible”, III “1. nuire (à qqn.),

s'opposer à qqn., le combattre, être l'adversaire de qqn., 3. être jaloux de qqn.", *ḡurr*- "1. malheur, 2. mal, dommage, 3. mauvais état d'une chose" [BK II 14] = *ḡrr* I "to hurt, injure, be harmful" [Zbr., Lsl.], *Dofar ḡarra* "traiter en ennemi" [Lsl.] || MSA: *Sqt. ḡér(r)* "battre" [Lsl. 1938] = "to strike" [Lsl. 1987] || Geez *ḡarara* "to become an enemy, become a foe, be hostile, be an adversary, rebel, revolt, stir up trouble, start a fight, a war", *ḡarāri & ḡar* "enemy, hostile" [Lsl.], Tna. (ṭ)ḡarārā "to be hostile", ṣār "enemy" [Lsl.], Tigre (ṭ)ḡarāra "to be hostile" [Lsl.], Amh. (ṭ)ṭarrārā "to quarrel, be enemies", ṭāro "enemy" [Lsl.] vs. Sem. *ḡwr (var. *ḡyr?) > Hbr. ṣwr qal "verfolgen, anfeinden" [GB 679] = "to bring into straits, be hostile" [Zbr.] = "to attack, fight" [KB 1015], Syr. ʿ(ə)yārā "rival" [Payne Smith apud KB] | Ar. ḡwr (n.d'act. ḡawr-) I "nuire, faire du mal à qqn." [BK II 45] = ḡyr "anfeinden" [GB] = ḡw/yr "to harm, injure, damage, mischief" [Zbr., KB pace Wehr & Cowan] (Sem.: GB 697; Gray 1934, 16; Lsl. 1938, 364–5; 1987, 152; WUS #2353; Zbr. 1971, #46; Blv. 1993, 34, #9; KB 1058–9) < Sem. bicons. *ḡr "to harm, injure" [Zbr.]. Lit. for Eg.-Sem.: Hodge 1969, 109, #18; HSED #583; Takács 2006, 102. V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1990, 84; HSED #587) combined Sem. *ḡrr with WCh.: Hausa *cīri* (-ī-) "1. doing things contrary to usual custom or practice, 2. ostracizing a person" [Brg. 1934, 1040, cf. Abr. 1962, 887] | Angas *siir* "one who refuses to do what he is told, lazy (but especially the former meaning)" [Flk. 1915, 282], which is phonologically uncertain.

NB3: W. A. Ward (1962, 404–405) and C. T. Hodge (1976, 11, 17, n. 13; 1981, 407) equated Sem. *ḡrr with Eg. *ḡrḡr* "fremd (sein) (jemdm. anderen gehören)" (MK, Wb V 604; ÄWb I 1509: 1st IMP; II 2852: MK) = "strange, stranger" (FD 324), although its meaning "fremd, feindselig handeln gegen (r) den Bruder" (Wb V 604, 12) represents a late and secondary use. As correctly pointed out by E.S. Meltzer (1991), Eg. *ḡrḡr* is to be connected rather with Sem. *ḡwr > Ug. gr "foreign resident" [Meltzer] = "protected, guest, foreigner" [DUL 306], Hbr. ḡēr [*ḡayir < *ḡawir] "stranger, protected citizen" < gwr I qal "to dwell as alien and dependant" [KB 184, 201] = "foreigner, newcomer" [Meltzer], JAram. *ḡiyūrā* "proselyte" [KB], Syr. *ḡiyūrā* "alien" [Meltzer]. V. Blažek (1994, 433) has erroneously extended the Eg.-Sem. etymology to WCh. *ḡ^wirVm "slave" [Stl. 1987, 219], although this term (with *m as part of the original root, lit. "garçon") is probably cognate rather to Eg. *d3m* [from *ḡrm] "Jugend" (MK, Wb V 523–524) || LECu.: Somali *goromsā* "young man" [OS] || SCU.: Iraqw *ḡārma* "boy" [Wtl. 1953]. For WCh.-Eg.-Cu. see OS 1992, 169; HSED #961. For disproving the Rösslerian etymology of Eg. *d3j* see Takács 2006, 102.

md3.t "bâton, crochet" vs. "(pl.) les bois autour desquels on arrimait les cordages, crochets, bittes ou taquets" (MK, Jéquier 1911, 61, §18) = "cheville de bois (employée dans la construction des bateaux)" (Montet 1925, 339; 1928, 9) = "1. (CT VI 6h, 18c, 22i-o, 31d, 38j, 42r-s, 45k) roller (?), 2. (CT V 133b & 134a) a wooden tube (compared to the teeth of Osiris)" (AECT II 108, 112–4, 116–7, 119, 121, 123, 125–6 vs. AECT II 34 & 38, spell 398, n. 29, resp., but AECT III 203 index: mng. unknown!) = (pl.) "Holzpflocke, Holzstäbe, Holzrollen, im Schiffbau gebraucht als Verbindungsstücke, die aus dem Holz emporragen, die Stäbe oder Streben des Gestänges (an denen die Netze befestigt sind) und die Pflöckchen, die man in den Boden einschlug (aus der Liste von Schiffsteilen eines Fährmannspruches)"

vs. (as coll.sg.) “Gestänge, das Gerüst, das die Netzstücke trägt, alle Holzteile des Schlagnetzes (bis auf den Spannpflock ausgedehnt)” (CT V 133b & 134a etc., Bidoli 1976, 72–73) = “cheville de bois” (AL 77.1959; 78.1941) = “wooden peg or pin with three usages: 1. in shipbuilding designating a wooden dowel or peg used in mortise and tenon fashion, to attach the horizontal joins of the planks of the hull, 2. in medicine (see below), 3. in fowling probably as a gripping dowel (i.e. a stake) used to keep the net securely fastened to the ground” (Piccione 1981–2, cf. AEB 84.321) = “Holzzapfen” (KHW 522 pace Montet, Kêmi 1, 1928, 9) = “Rundholz, Dübel, Pfosten (mit dem Rücken des Beils oder des Dechsels eingeschlagen, verbindet Holzteile oder dient als Pfosten zum Anlegen einer Seilbindung dem Belegen mit einem Tau oder also Stütze)” (Düring 1995, 85–86: CT 133b) = “1. (CT VI 6h, 18c, 22i–o, 25f, 25n, 27i, 31d, 35l, 38j, 42r–s, 44e, 45k) Gestänge (des Netzes), 2. (CT V 134a) Holzdübel, Holzzapfen” (GHWb 381, so also ÄWb II 1171) = “pole, stick” (DCT 194 referring to CT exx. also listed in AECT l.c.).

NB1: Occurs in the CT lists of ship parts following immediately cords. Both R. O. Faulkner (AECT l.c.) and R. Hannig (ÄWb l.c.) separate the md3.t of CT V 134a as a distinct gloss (AECT: “wooden tube”, ÄWb: “Holzdübel”) from the rest of the CT occurrences (AECT “roller?”, ÄWb: “Gestänge”), while other authors (Bidoli, Piccione, Düring) treat these as one and the same lexeme.

NB2: The attestation in CT V 133b is highly disputed. G. Jéquier (l.c.) regarded the -b- of md3b.t attested on the coffin from Assuan (Cairo 28127) as an error for -3-, which he disconnected from md3b.t “écope” (q.v.). Jéquier equated the md3b.t in question (of the Assuan coffin) with CT V 134a md3.t of Cairo 42826 (coffin from Meir) that he considered as the correct form. The same view has been maintained also in Wb II 189, 1 where md3b.t “als ein Teil des Schiffes” (CT, Cairo 28127) is treated as “*anscheinend verschieden vom vorstehenden Wort*”, i.e., from md3b.t “Schöpfkelle” (CT, Wb, below). So also FD 123: “drainer for bilge (?)” (distinguished from md3b.t “bailer of boat”). Later, R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 34 & 38, spell 398, n. 29) and D. Bidoli (1976, 73) also assumed in CT V 133b md3b.t of both G1T (coffin of jqr, from Gebelein, in Turin) and A1C (MK coffin, from Assuan, Cairo 28127) an error for md3.t, although in the M13C var. (coffin of nḥt, from Meir, Cairo 28055), only md3- is legible and the end of the word is damaged. Most recently, in addition, both R. van der Molen (DCT 194) and R. Hannig (ÄWb II 1172a) conceive CT V 133b as an instance of md3b.t “bailer of boat” (FD 123; DCT) = “*Abfluß (für Leckwasser)” (GHWb 381, ÄWb).

NB3: As pointed out by P. Montet (1925, 339), the same lexeme may have an attestation already in the OK (mastaba of Ti, Dyn. V) that has been, however, rendered equivocally: “die Holzrollen, welche ein Schiffsbauer zimmert (mḏr)” (Bidoli 1976, 72) = Grabstichel (für Bearbeitung von Stein und Holz, auch bei der Mundöffnung)” (ÄWb I 580).

- The same word may be preserved in md3.t (Wb: with masc. var.?) “ein Zubehör des Netzes” (BD, Wb II 188, 11–12) = “quatre objets pointus: les bois autour desquels on les arrimait, crochets, bittes ou taquets” (Jéquier 1911, 61, §18 rejecting “chaîne” by P. Renouf)

= “part of fowling net, doubtless one of the posts or braces which support the net” (Breasted 1930, 184) = “a net appurtenance” (Caminos 1956, 36) = “valve” (Faulkner apud Piccione 1981–2, 82) = “1. (CT VI 6h, 18c, 22i–o, 31d, 38j, 42r–s, 45k) roller (?), 2. (CT V 133b & 134a) a wooden tube (compared to the teeth of Osiris)” (AECT II 108, 112–4, 116–7, 119, 121, 123, 125–6 vs. AECT II 34 & 38, spell 398, n. 29, resp., but AECT III 203 index: mng. unknown!) = “das Gestänge, das Gerüst, das die Netzstücke trägt, alle Holzteile des Schlagnetzes (bis auf den Spannpflock ausgedehnt)” (Bidoli 1976, 35, 72–73) = “un accessoire du filet” (AL 78.1944) = “probably a gripping dowel (i.e. a medium size stake), used to keep the net securely fastened to the ground” (Piccione 1981–2, 81–86) = “Gestänge des Vogelnetzes” (Guglielmi, LÄ IV 465, n. 12 & VII 468 index) = “Gestänge des Netzes” (GHWb 381) as rightly suggested by D. Bidoli (l.c.) and D. Meeks (AL l.c.).

NB1: G. Jéquier (l.c.) erroneously affiliated it with BD mt3 “bâton, crochet” (q.v.).

NB2: D. Bidoli (1976, 72, fn. 5) supposed md3 “eingesperrt sein” (late NK, Wb, below) to be “sicher aus md3.t ‘Gestänge’ abgeleitet”, which is, however, disputable (v. infra).

- The suggestive rendering as “Holzrolle”/“roller” by R. O. Faulkner (AECT II 110, spell 473, n. 20) and by D. Bidoli (1976, 72) implies a supposed etymological connection with (derivation from) Eg. md3.t “scroll” (supra), which has been reaffirmed also by N. Düring (1995, 85 & 86, fn. 208): “*der äußeren Form nach von der Buchrolle abgeleitet*”. He extended this comparison also to Med. md3.t “Saugrohr” (infra) that “*im nautischen Kontext, als Schiffsteil ‘eine Holzröhre als Seilführung oder Auflage für das Spanntau’ ist denkbar*”. In P. A. Piccione’s (1981–2, 75–76, 86) view, md3.t basically signified “a cylindrically shaped object”, which was the source of diverse specific senses of md3.t, namely “peg”, “book-roll”, “oral brace”, and “chisel” (q.v.).

md3.t “Meißel, Grabstichel (für Arbeit in Stein und in Holz), auch als Instrument bei der Mundöffnung” (NK, Wb II 188, 5–10) = “name of the chisel used in the ‘opening the mouth’ of the deceased” (Griffith, PSBA 21, 1899, 270, §2 with exx.) = “ciseau” (Jéquier 1921, 278 & fn. 5–6: MK & NK exx., resp.) = “some kind of chisel or graver” (Breasted 1930, 184) = “chisel” (AEO I 72*, §181; FD 123; DCT 194: CT III 299d, VII 137e) = “Meißel (als Mundöffnungsgerät schon CT III 299, nach einer Darstellung ist dessen Griff kürzer als der des mddf.t-Gerätes und die Klinge ist leicht konkav gebogen, bei jenem gerade, md3.t scheint nicht aus dem alten Bestand des Mundöffnungsritual zu stammen, eine Geräteliste von Leiden führt

führt es unter den ‘modernen’ Geräten auf, md̄df.t unter den Kultgeräten) (Otto, *ÄMÖR* II 20 & fn. 3 with lit.) = “le perçoir (?)” (Lacau 1954, 72, U28) = “Graviereisen” (Helck, *MWNR* 985) = “foret (que l’on fait tourner avec l’archet de menuisier)” (Lacau 1972, 37, fn. 2) = “chisel, esp. mortising chisel, used by carpenters, sculptors with a wooden handle” (Janssen 1975, 317–8, §89) = “graver and borer” (Śliwa 1975, 30–31, §5 with lit.) = “Bez. für Meißel” (Drenkhahn 1976, 120) = “Meißel aus gehärtetem Kupfer, meist das Arbeitsgerät der Reliefbildhauer (als ‘großer Meißel’ auch ein wertvolles und von Staats wegen ausgegebenes Arbeitsgerät der Grabbaumanschaft)” (Junge 1999, 353) = “1. Stechbeitel (besonders aus Metall, mit Holzgriff), 2. Grabstichel (für Bearbeitung von Stein und Holz, auch bei der Mundöffnung)” (*ÄWb* I 580: VI. vs. V., resp.; *ÄWb* II 1171: CT exx.) > Dem. md̄j (DG contra Spg. followed by Grd.: md̄3j, Vos: md̄j.t) “Meißel” (Spg., *ZÄS* 56, 1921, 26; Grd., *AEO* I 72*, §181; Osing 1998, 118, fn. 533) = “Art Instrument (bei der Balsamierung der Apisstiere gebraucht)” (DG 194:4) = “chisel” (CED 100; Tait 1982, 221, l. 13; cf. also *WD* I 100) = “(md̄j t̄b) instrument utilisé lors de l’embaumement de l’Apis, prob. herminette” (DELC 132) = “brace” vs. md̄j.t t̄3bj (sic) “brace (used in the Apis ritual to operate on the mouth of the Apis)” (Vos 1993, 190, 355, §279; Dem. Pap. Wien 3873) > (S) $\mu\alpha\chi\epsilon$, (B) $\mu\alpha\chi\iota$, (F) $\mu\alpha\chi\iota$, $\mu\alpha\omega\iota$ (m) (\approx Gk. $\lambda\alpha\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$) “a mason’s or wood-cutter’s tool” (Griffith, *PSBA* 21, 1899, 270, §2) = “Meißel, Axt, Beil” (Spg. *KHW* 71; *Wst. KHW* 113, 522) = “chisel, axe, pick” (CD 213a; CED 100) = “ciseau” \approx Ar. qaddūm- “herminette” (DELC 132) = “Hacke, Beil” (Osing 1998, 118).

NB1: As pointed out by A.H. Gardiner (*AEO* I 72*, §181), the *Wb* II 188, 6–10 “*wrongly queries*” the rdg. of its logographic wtg. as md̄3.t.

NB2: Vocalized as *mēd̄3j (Osing 1998, 97, n. i).

NB3: Cf. also md̄3.t in *Mag. Pap. Torino CG 54003 (MK)* rendered as “tooth (part of a snake)” lit. “chisel (?)” (Borghouts 1999, 171). Especially noteworthy is CT V 133b where md̄3b.t (treated by R.O. Faulkner, *AECT* II 34, 38, spell 398, n. 29 and D. Bidoli 1976, 73 as an error for md̄3.t, see above) is compared to the teeth of Osiris. But this coincidence may well be accidental and md̄3.t “chisel” vs. md̄3.t “a wooden tube (?)” (Faulkner) may represent two distinct lexemes.

NB4: J. Osing (1998, 117–8, n. d) assumed the masc. counterpart of our word to be attested in md̄3j (wood det.) “(in einer Aufzählung von Geräten)” (late NK, *Wb* II 187, 4) occurring with the same wtg. also in *Ostr. DeM 239* rt. 2:5 and *Ostr. CG 25670* rt. 2:7 as well as in the Tebtunis onomasticon (2nd cent. AD) as md̄3 “Art Hacke (?)” (Dem. gloss md̄j). Henceforth, Osing (1998, 118, fn. 534) supposes to have resolved the anomalous *Genuswandel* of Eg. md̄3.t vs. the Dem.-Cpt. reflex (m) by deriving the Dem.-Cpt. form directly from Eg. md̄3 of Tebtunis “*ohne Genuswechsel*”.

NB5: W. Westendorf (*KHW* 522) and D. Meeks (*AL* 77.1959) combined the Cpt. reflex with Eg. md̄3.t “Holzzapfen” (*KHW*) = “cheville de bois” (*AL*), which is erroneous, the latter being a distinct lexeme (cf. above).

- Etymology disputed.
- **1.** J. H. Breasted (1930, 184): “possibly identical with” Eg. Med. md3.t “a wooden brace” (Breasted) = “Saugrohr” (Wb, infra). KHW 522: ~ Eg. md3.t “Holzzapfen” (supra). In P.A. Piccione’s (1981–2, 75–76, 86) view, md3.t basically signified “a cylindrically shaped object”, which was the source of diverse specific senses of md3.t, namely “peg”, “book-roll”, “oral brace”, and “chisel” (q.v.). Semantically doubtful.
- **2.** P. Lacau (1954, 72, U28; 1972, 37, fn. 2) saw in it an instrument “que l’on manoeuvrait aussi avec l’archet de menuisier”, which made him explain it (as an m- prefix *nomen instr.*) from Eg. *d3 “rouler, tourner” and affiliate it with d3 “le drill à faire le feu (un instrument agissant par rotation)”, d3d3.w “pot (fait au tour)”, d3d3 “tête (comparée à un pot)” (cf. Lat. testa), md3.t “le rouleau de papyrus” ~ Sem. *gll > Hbr. gll “tourner” (for details cf. Eg. md3.t “scroll”). Plausible.
- **3.** G. Fecht (quoted in KHW 522) traced it back to a hypothetical Eg. etymon *m-wd3.t > md3.t “das Eindringende” (sic, not in Fecht 1960). Baseless.
- **4.** W. Westendorf (KHW 113, fn. 2) saw in it an “m-Bildung von” Eg. wd3 “wohlbehalten sein” arguing that Egyptians regarded “Meißel als Lebenserhalter”, cf. sʿnh “als Titel des Bildhauers: der am Leben erhält (durch sein Kunstwerk)” (NK, Wb IV 47, 14) ~ sʿnh “als Bildhauer bilden” (XX., Wb IV 47, 17). Far-fetched, especially because Westendorf failed in demonstrating the derivation of the *nomen instr.* from Eg. √wd3 (whose primary sense is not identical with that of √ʿnh).
- **5.** C.T. Hodge (1966, 45, #33; 1969, 109, #16) treated it as *nomen instr.* (deriving via m- prefix from an Eg. root *d3) compared by him with some of the reflexes of AA *t-r “1. резать, расщеплять, 2. острый камень” [IS] = *čVrr- “flint, obsidian” [Djk. 1981] = *čər “flint, hard stone, rock” [Djk. 1986] = *čVr “id.” [Mlt.-Stl.] = *č-r “(to cut with a) fint” [GT]. Probably false.
NB1: Cf. Sem. *zurr- “selce” vs. *zūr- “rocca” [Frz. 1968, 287, #5.07] = *turr- “flint(stone)” [Hodge]: Akk. šurru “Obsidian, Feuerstein”, šurtu “Flintmesser” [AHW 1114–5] = šurru ~ šurtu “1. obsidian, flint, 2. flint blade” [CAD s 257, 261], Hbr. šor (probably a primary noun) “flint (of the sword), i.e., sharpness (of the sword)”, šūr ~ šur “1. rock, rocky ground, rock face, 2. boulder, free standing rock, 3. rocky hill, mountain”, šar “silex” [KB 1016, 1052–3] | OSA zr “gravestone”, zrn “rock” [Rössler, ZA 54, 1961, 166], Ar. zirr- ~ zurar- “sharp-edged hard stone, a stone having an edge like that of the knife, a kind of smooth and broad stone which a man breaks and with which he slaughters a camel”, denom. zarra “to cut or split off, slaughter (an animal) with a stone called zurar-”, mi-zarr- “a stone with which one strikes fire, fragments of sharp-edged stone, a stone with which one cuts” [Lane 1909] = zurr- “pierre tranchante propre à couper comme un couteau” [Lsl.] = zirr- “scharfkantiger Stein, Feuerstein” [Wehr 1952, 524] = zirr- “sharp-edged

stone, flint" [KB] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 351; Bmh. 1984, 219–220) || NBrb.: Mzg. a- i-zru "rocher, grosse pierre" [Tf. 1991, 826] | Qabyale a-zru, pl. i-zra "rocher, pierre, caillou", cf. i-zra bb'ayzen "rochers près de Ouaghzen" [Dlt. 1982, 955] || SBrb.: Ahaggar a-zeru "muraille rocheuse" [Fcd. 1951–2, 1988]. The Sem.-Brb. isogloss has been usually equated with the following AA cognates: LECu.: Oromo čiru (c-) "1. tagliare, abbattere alberi, disboscare, 2. sbranare, fare a pezzi, lacerare" [da Thiene 1939, 70] = čira "to pick up, clear, cut" [Gragg 1982, 84] = čir- "to cut (off), cut through, incise" [Djk., Mlt.], Borana čiri "резать" [IS after Andrzejewski, BSOAS 19/2, 358] || HECu.: Burji (from Orm.?) čir- "to chop, gnaw" [Sasse 1982, 49], Sidamo čira "to shave" [Lsl.] (HECu.: Lsl. 1988, 185) || WCh.: Hausa cùré (ts-) "to pierce and remain in, execute by impaling on a stake", cùréé "1. bits of meat spitted on stick and toasted", ciryáá "long iron tool for hollowing-out a mortar", cúúrà "to pierce", cúúráá "handleless knife or sword" [Abr. 1962, 868, 892], cf. still Hausa cáràà "to lance, cut" [Brg. 1934, 1029]. Lit. for this AA root: Hodge 1966, 45, #33 (Eg.-Hausa); 1969, 109, #16 (Sem.-Eg.-Hausa); IS 1971, #53 (Sem.-Oromo); Djk. 1981, 51 (Sem.-Orm.); MM 1983, 199 (Sem.-Orm.); Djk. etc. 1986, 38 (Sem.-Brb.-Orm.-Hs.); OS 1988, 80 (Sem.-Hs.); Blz. 1989, 203 (Eg.-Brb.-Hs.); Blv. 1989, 18 (Sem.-Orm.); Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 57 (Sem.-?Orm.-Brb.-Hs.-Eg.); HSED #514 (Sem.-Brb.-Hs.). For the regular correspondence of Hausa c- (ts-) vs. Sem. *t- (note that Hausa c- ~ Sem. *s- is equally attested and plausible), cf. Hausa cáráá "the middle of the back from the neck to the coccyx" [Brg. 1934, 1029; Abr. 1962, 878] ~ Sem. *zahr- "dorso" [Frz. 1964, 271, #2.65] = *tVhr- "back" [SED I 253–4, #284]. The underlying AA root has been equated by the adherents of the Nst. theory with Krt. *čr- "резать, рубить" [Klimov 1964, 255] = *ča/er- [IS] < Nst. *čVrV "осгрие" [IS 1965, 353] = *čArA "to cut" [Blz. 1989, 203] = *čarV "to cut" [Dlg. 1991 MS, #287].

nb2: E. Dévaud (CD 781a), followed by W.A. Ward (1962, 404–406), C.T. Hodge (1969, 109, #16), V.M. Illič-Svityč (1971, #53), and W. Westendorf (KHW 432), identified Sem. *trr with Cpt. (S) xwp "to sharpen, whet" (CD) = "schärfen, wetzen" (KHW). Nevertheless, the absence of earlier an Eg. evidence as well as the preservation of Cpt. -p seem to suggest a late loan from Sem. rather than a cognate (CED 318). Besides, Ward erroneously quoted the Sem. proto-root as *šr (sic, *š-!) "to sharpen" (sic).

nb3: C.T. Hodge (1969, 109, #16; 1979, 497, #1.5; 1981, 374, #46) and (independently) A.Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 199; Sts. et al. 1995 MS, 26), followed by V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED #514), combined the Sem.-Hausa (etc.) parallel (above) also with Eg. d3 "Feuerbohrer" (MK, Wb V 511, 10) and/or wd3.t "Art Messer oder Schwert" (GR, Wb I 402, 7) = "knife or sword" (PL), but the perspective of their derivation from a common biconsonantal Eg. *d3 is baseless. Eg. wd3.t is a very rare and late word and its meaning "knife" may be secondary (originating from the destructive force of the wd3.t-eye, cf. PL 288). On the other hand, for other alternative etymologies of Eg. d3 cf. Alb. 1927, #96; Clc. 1936, #934; Chn. 1947, #312; Djk. etc. 1986, 48.

nb4: The Russian authors (MM 1983, 199; Djk. et al. 1986 MS, 38; Mlt.-Stl. 1990, 57) and V. Blažek (1989, 203) preferred to affiliate the reflexes of AA *č-r (mostly instead of Eg. d3) with Eg. nd3.w "Splitter o.ä. (von Holz und Stein)" (MK, Wb II 377, 7–8) = "(a general word for) chip, splinter" (Harris) = "chips of stone" (FD 144) = "twig, splinter of wood (e.g., Pap. d'Orbiney 18:4)" (Ember) = "éclat de bois" (Vrg.) = "éclat de pierre, ostracon, grain de poussière" (Aufrière 1990, 101, 684). Independently from this false AA etymology, E. Edel (AĀG lxiv, §256.A) also regarded the initial n- as a prefix in the light of the comparison (followed by J. Vergote 1973 Ib, 156 and J. Černý in CED 308) with Cpt. (S) xh, (B) xh "chip, mote (of straw, dust)" (CD 747b) = "éclat" (Vrg.) = "Spreu, Schnitzel, Span, Splitter, Staubkorn" (KHW 410). But the function of n- would require an explanation. J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 156) assumed an original prefix *m- > n-, but he failed to prove the reason of such a shift. In addition, the Cpt. term has been alternatively derived

(in KHW l.c.) from Dem. d^c “Spreu, Häcksel” (Thompson) < Eg. d^c “Zweig” (Wb V 535, 8–10). Similarly unconvincing is the comparison of Eg. nd_3 with Hbr. $n\dot{s}er$ “Schoß, Schößling” [GB 519] = “twig, rod” [Ember] = “sprout, offshoot” [KB 718] suggested by A. Ember (1912, 87; 1930, #11.a.39; GÄSW 102, #428) and also its equation with Eg. nh_3 “Art Messer (aus Feuerstein)” (BD, GR, Wb II 306) with the interchange of Eg. $h \sim d$ supposed by E. E. Knudsen (1962, 35, §8). More reasonable is the theory put forward by J. R. Harris (1961, 27, cf. also ZÄS 110, 1983, 169, fn. 208) on Eg. nd_3 < ndr “zimmern” (OK, Wb II 382, 11–16), which also Eg. ndr (GW) “éclat de pierre” (NK, AL 79.1695) = “ostracon” (DLE II 44; Helck, LÄ IV 636; GHwB 450; Junge 1999, 354) = “break-down (WD III 68) stems from. L. Gestermann (LÄ V 702) was probably correct in taking both words from a common source. But it can hardly have been Eg. $ndrj$ “fassen” (as mentioned in SAK 19, 1992, 141, fn. 32). GT: the eventual derivation from Eg. ndr is corroborated by Ar. $nağara$ “raboter le bois avec un rabot” > $nuğar-at$ “coupaeu ou éclat de bois qui tombe du bois travaillé par le charpentier” [BK II 1202–3], cf. also Jbl. $nugr$ “Stein” [Bittner 1917, 54] = $nugur$ “cliff of sand and stone” [Jns. 1981, 184].

nb5: A. G. Belova (1989, 18) tried to identify Sem. $*\dot{t}urr-$ with Eg. $\dot{s}sr$ “Pfeil” (PT, Wb IV 546), although Sem. $*\dot{t}$ can only correspond to Eg. \dot{d} (for the correct etymology of Eg. $\dot{s}sr$ cf. Alb. 1918, 248, #101; Ember 1926, 8; 1930, §12.b.14, §18.a.29, #19. c.5; MM 1983, 229; HSED #475).

nb6: WCh.: Hausa $c\acute{y}r\acute{a}\acute{a}$ (f) “long tool for hollowing out a mortar” [Abr. 1962, 888] has been alternatively equated by L. Kogan and O. Stolbova (1994 MS, 1, #5) with Hbr. $s\dot{i}r$ “thorn, hook” [Kogan] = $*s\dot{i}r\acute{a}$ “1. the thorny, bushy plant, *Poterium spinosum*, 2. thorn, fishing-rod (hardly a fish-hook, rather a sort of harpoon)” [KB 752] || Eg. srt “Dorn, Stachel” (BD, Wb IV 190–1).

- **6.** GT: the unattested verbal root of Eg. $md_3.t$ ($*d_3$ or sim.) could also be cognate with Sem. $*\dot{s}wr \sim *\dot{s}yr$ (?) “to split open” [GT].

nb1: Cf. (?) Akk. $\dot{s}iru \sim \dot{s}irru$ “ein ölverbrauchendes Schleifwerkzeug” [AHW 1105] = “a copper tool with a wooden handle (its characterization ‘oil-eater’ could refer to a whetting tool of some type)” [CAD § 214] | Ar. $\dot{s}wr$ I “4. rompre, fendre, 5. couper, trancher, 6. décider”, $\dot{s}yr$ I “5. couper, pourfendre” [BK I 1383, 1390] = “fendre” [Lsl.] || Sqt. $\dot{s}er$ “séparer, renvoyer, retenir, refuser”, $\dot{i}m\dot{s}eyroh$ “séparation au milieu de la tête”, $\dot{s}ayre \sim \dot{s}eyreh \sim zaireh$ “couteau” [Lsl.]. Cf. perhaps also Hbr. $*\dot{s}ir$ “Türzapfenloch (wohl nicht Türangel) oder Pflanze (urspr. aber: Loch, Höhlung, Spalt)” [GB after Haupt]? The same biconsonantal root may have been preserved by Can. $*\dot{s}ry$: Akk. (LBab. < Aram.) $\dot{s}urr\acute{u}$ “gespalten (Palmbblatt)” [AHW 1114] || JAram. $\dot{s}iry\acute{a} \sim \dot{s}iry\acute{a}$ “Spalt, Höhlung”, JAram. $\dot{s}er\acute{a}$ “1. zerreißen, 2. spalten” (also in pael), itpeal “zerreißen werden, sein” [Dalman 1922, 367; Levy 1924 IV 188, 216] = $\dot{s}iry\acute{a} \sim \dot{s}iry\acute{a}$ “slit, incision”, $\dot{s}er\acute{e}/\acute{a}$ “to split, tear”, pael “to burst”, itpeal “to be split, burst” [Jastrow 1950, 1281, 1301], (?) OAram. $\dot{s}rr$ (sic) “расщеплять” [IS < ?], Deir $\acute{c}Alla \dot{s}rh$ (2) “to rip up or lacerate” [DNWSI 975], Syr. $\dot{s}ry$ “раскалывать (zerspalten)” [Mlt.] = $\dot{s}r$? [IS] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 351; IS 1971, #53; MM 1983, 199; HSED #444). Derived by V.M. Illič-Svityč and A. B. Dolgopolsky from Nst. $*\dot{c}arV$ “резать” [IS 1965, 360] = $*\dot{c}iry\acute{x}$ “to chisel, give a form toy (an object)” [Dlğ. 1991 MS, #227].

nb2: Phonologically, this Sem. root has nothing to do with Sem. $*\dot{t}rr$ (above) (contra IS 1971, #53; MM 1983, 199). Note that Orm. $\dot{c}ir-$ (usually combined with Sem. $*\dot{t}rr$; above) has been affiliated in HSED #444 with Sem. bicons. $*\dot{v}sr$.

- **7.** GT: since the AA origin of the Eg. simplex $*d_3$ is disputable (either from AA $*\dot{c}r$, $*\dot{c}r$, $*gr$ or $*gl$ etc.), it is not to be excluded that Eg. $md_3.t$ reflects an earlier $*mgl-t$, i.e., a *nomen instr.* of AA $*g-l$ “to cut” [GT]. If so, Eg. $md_3.t$ might be compared with Eth.-Sem.:

Gurage: Selti & Wolane mägläl “kind of knife used as a razor or for circumcision, razor made locally” [Lsl. 1979 III, 394], which was borrowed into HECu.: Kambatta magläli-ta, Tembaro magalalli [Lsl.]. NB: For the underlying root (ES *gll) cf. Grg.: Goggot gällälä “to separate (the milk from the whey)” [Lsl.], Amh. gällälä “to cut, mow, uproot”, gälälä alä “to separate, cut” [Lsl.], Harari gälälä bäya “to separate, cut”, gälälä “to remove the impurities from the surface” [Lsl.]. The ES root gll is eventually akin to Sem. *gly: i.a., Geez galaya “to cut off, away, pluck off, break off, separate, divide etc.” vs. gayala “to cut, separate” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1979 III, 273; 1987, 192–3, 208) ||| NAgaw: Qemant gualay “séparer, diviser” [CR 1912, 197] = g^wäläy “to separate” [Lsl.], Qwara & Dembea goleau “to separate”, golegna “separation” [Flad apud Rn.] = gälē “trennen, beiseite-, wegnehmen” [Rn. 1885, 63] = galē [CR] = gälē [Lsl.] ||| LECu.: Afar gilē “langes Dolchmesser, Säbel” [Rn. 1886, 849–850; 1887, 147] = gile “knife, dagger” [PH 1985, 113] ||| NOm.: Kaffä gallō “sorta di scure (per tagliare la bosaglia)” [Crl. 1951, 443], cf. perhaps also Mocha gälli(yé) “to judge” (orig. * “to separate”?) [Lsl. 1959, 31] ||| WCh.: cf. Nbauchi *(ŋ)golatō “sickle, adze” [Skn. 1977, 39] = *n-galatA “cepn” [Stl. 1987, 258] ||| CCh.: PBata *gil- “knife, dagger” [GT] > Nzangi gilá “Messer, Dolch” [Str.] = ngila “knife”, ngila “sword” [Krf.], Holma giilá “Messer, Dolch” [Str.], Gude ŋgila “knife” [Krf.], Kobochi geeláá “Messer, Dolch” [Str.], Wadi giiláá “Messer, Dolch” [Str.] | Gawar gēldē “Messer, Dolch” [Str.] ||| ECh.: (?) Mubi kééli [k- < *g-?] “Messer” [Lks. 1937, 183] (Ch.: Str. 1922–23, 131; Krf. 1981, #237; Mlt. 1985 MS, 1, #3; 1989, 129; Kvl.-Mlt. 1993, 28, #3; 1994 MS, 2, #2.3). For Ch.-Afar-Kafa see Blz. & Boisson 1992, 17, 19, fn. 16.

- **8.** GT: a comparison with ES *mšr > Geez mäšärä “to chew” [Lsl.], Tigre mäçra “to chew, crunch” [LH 144], cf. prob. also Amh. moččärä “to scratch” [Lsl.] (ES: Lsl. 1982, 50) seems unlikely.
- **9.** A. M. Lam (1993, 385): Eg. md3.t “ciseau” ~ Ful meččata ‘qui cisèle’ > “ciseaux”. Baseless.

md3.t “ein (hölzernes) Saugrohr (um einem Patienten flüßige Nahrung einzuführen)” (Med., Wb II 187, 3) = “a tube for the introduction of food by suction (of food) on the patient’s part” (Grapow quoted by Breasted) = “a wooden brace: 1. (in Pap. E.Smith) padded or wrapped in linen for some purpose, to make it less hard before inserting into the mouth): perhaps a wedge (cf. md3.t ‘chisel’) or means of holding the mouth open, while the liquid was being administered (?), 2. (in Pap. Ebers) a hollow reed, a tube used for inhalation (which would much more suit for use in Pap. E.Smith too)” (Breasted 1930, 184) = “a medical implement, perhaps a wooden dowel which was worked into the mouth (presumably by force), a means of prying the mouth open and keep it open to facilitate the feeding (with liquid) of one suffering from lockjaw” (Piccione 1981–2, cf. 77–78, 81, cf. AEB 84.321).

NB: The assumption of A. Erman and H. Grapow (Wb l.c.), that it may have been miswritten for md3b.t (below), has not been accepted in other standard works.

- Etymology debated. Most probable is #2.

- **1.** J. Breasted (1930, 184) regarded it as “possibly identical with” Eg. md₃.t “some kind of chisel or graver” (q.v.) and also md₃.t “part of fowling net” (q.v.). Similarly, in their lexicon of medical texts, H. von Deines and W. Westendorf (WMT I 415) have treated md₃.t of Pap. Smith 3:14 (rendered lit. as “Meißel aus Holz, bei einer Kieferngelenksperre”) as identical with Eg. md₃.t “Meißel”. Similarly, P. A. Piccione (1981–2, 75–76, 86) maintains md₃.t to have basically signified “a cylindrically shaped object”, which was the source of diverse specific senses of md₃.t, namely “peg”, “book-roll”, “oral brace”, and “chisel” (q.v.).
- **2.** W.(V.) Wessetzky (1966, 145), followed by G. Takács (1994, 172), in turn, supposed an etymological connection with Eg. md₃.t “Buchrolle” (above) because of the similarity of the two objects. So also N. Düring (1995, 86, fn. 208): md₃.t lit. “Rundholz”.
NB: Takács (l.c.) pointed out the similar derivation of Akk. gillu “ein Stück Rohr” [AHW 288] = “cut reed” [CAD g 73] < Sem. *gll “to roll” [GT] (discussed s.v. Eg. md₃.t “scroll” supra). In this case, Eg. md₃.t [< *mgl.t?] was an m- prefix form.
- **3.** GT: a derivation from AA *m-ç-r “to suck” (or sim.) [GT] seems very unlikely.
NB: Cf. Ar. mašara I “1. traire une femelle avec le bout des doigts, 2. tirer tout ce qu’il y avait de lait dans les pis” [BK II 1115] ||| ECh.: Bdy. miḏyār “sucrer”, miḏyārō (f) “le fait de sucer” [AJ 1989, 99], Mgm. miḏyirō “aspirer” [JA 1992, 106].

md₃ (phallus det.) “begatten” (NK hapax, Brunner 1964, 16) = “féconder” (AC 1978, 14) = “féconder, engendrer” (AL 78.1939, 78.1941) = “to be fertile” (DLE I 258) = “befruchten, begatten” (GHWb 380; WD II 70).

NB: H. Brunner (1964, 17, n. d ad text ILa) and D. Meeks (AL 78.1939) maintain that it was merely a var. wtg. of mt₃ “das männliche Glied” (NK-GR, Wb II 175, 5, cf. supra): “la véritable lecture de ce mot est sans doute *mt₃...” (Meeks), “dessen allgemeiner Sinn sich... aus Zusammenhang und Determinativ mit Sicherheit ergibt, wenn auch die Nuance offenbleibt”. (Brunner). Nevertheless, no verbal mng. of mt₃ has been attested. In addition, the Belegstellen ad Wb II 175, 5 list no single ex. of mt₃ written with -d-. Therefore, if the rendering of md₃ is correct, it is difficult to accept the identity of both words.

- If distinct from Eg. mt₃, the following possibilities are to be accounted for for further research:
- **1.** R. Hannig (GHWb 382) surmised that it might be perhaps akin to Eg. mḏr (phallus det.) “?” (PT 233b hapax, Wb, v. infra). Uncertain, since its mng. is unknown.
- **2.** GT: the suggested meaning of Eg. md₃ “to beget” could be euphemism < Eg. mḏr “*pressen, drücken” (PT 1022d, ÄWb, below) ~ CCh.: Mbara mūgūl “presser, appuyer sur” [TSL 1986, 296].
NB: Semantically plausible, cf. e.g. Hung. basz- “to copulate” borrowed from OTurkish bas- “to press” [MNYTESz I 256].

- **3.** GT: its connection with Ar. maṣāla IV “3. mettre bas un foetus qui ne présente encore qu’une masse informe de chair” [BK II 1117] ||| ECh.: Birgit mūrđi (met.?) “engendrer” [Jng. 1973 MS] has also to be accounted for, although it seems rather uncertain.
NB: Cf. also NBrb.: Mzab ta-mḍār-t, pl. ti-mḍār-in “oeuf (mot rare)” [Dlh. 1984, 116] ||| LECu.: Orm. mičirē [-č- < *-d-?] “testicle” [Gragg 1982, 285]?
- **4.** GT: a relationship to Ar. mağara “avoir dans le ventre un foetus très-grand (se dit d’une femelle)”, mağr- “1. ventre ou achat d’un foetus à naître, 4. foetus à naître” [BK II 1064] = mağr- “what is in the belly of a pregnant animal (a she-camel or of ewe or a she-goat), when her pregnancy has become manifest” [Lane 2690] seems equally unlikely. Cf. perhaps also LECu.: Orm. magre “croître, pousser, bourgeonner” [Guiraudon 1896, 181] (hardly borrowed from Ar.).
NB: Its Sem./AA etymology is obscure. W. Leslau (1945, 243) has combined it (reluctantly though) with MSA: Mehri mūṣīr “rectum”. GT: Ar. mağr- might be perhaps compared rather to MSA: Jbl. migér “skin (container) for milk” [Jns. 1981, 169] ||| CCh.: Buduma (Yedina) mōgōrej “testicles” [Lks. 1939, 119; Mkr. 1987, 322–3].

md3 (or GW for **md**?) “Haube: der Hauptbestandteil der Doppelfederkronen” (NK hapax, GHWb 381: on a statue, Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico, inv.no. K.S. 1813, kind p.c. by I. Hafemann on 19 May 2000).

- No certain etymology. Purely hypothetically, two tentative alternatives may be put forward:
- **1.** GT: if merely **md** is to be read (GW), cp. i.e. the correct reading is AA *m-g-(^o) “head” [GT]
NB: Cf. HEcu.: Burji mug-ā “testa” [CR 1913, 423] = mūg-a “head, top” [Ss. 1982, 148] = mug-a “to, hair, head” [Hds. 1989, 156, 214] | Dullay: Tsamay muga^o-te [ECu. affix -^o of anatomic terms?] “head” [Hyw. 1989, 46] ||| CCh.: Musgu mok [Overweg] = mag (mage) [Rohlf’s] “Kopf” [Lks. 1941, 68], Pus mok “tête” [Trn. 1991, 106], Muskum māk “tête” [Trn. 1977, 29]. For ECu.-Musgu see HSED #1780; Blz. 2000, 182, #4. Because of the length of the middle consonant, R. Hayward (l.c., fn. 3) excluded a relationship of Tsamay with Dullay forms like paḥ- and pukka^o- te even assuming an alternation *m- ~ *b-.
- **2.** GT: if, in turn, Eg. **md3** < *d3m (via met.) < *grm, cp. Bed. gírma ~ gúrma “Kopf, Haupt” [Rn. 1895, 102] = girma ~ gilma “head, corner” [Rpr. 1928, 187] ||| WCh.: perhaps Hausa kúnǵúǵmíi “1. the crown of the head, 2. cranium” [Brg. 1934, 643] = “headpad” [Abr. 1962, 555] (Skn.: compound of *kún + *ǵm-?).
LIT.: for Bed.-Hausa see Skn. 1992, 348; Blz. 1994 MS Bed., 17.

md3 “(wie ein Vogel) eingesperrt sein” (LEg. 2x: Pap. Pushkin 127, 2:8 & Pap. BM 10474, 15:2, Wb II 187, 1; Bidoli 1976, 72, fn. 5) = “einsperren (parallel mit ḥ3q ‘gefangen nehmen’)” (Lange 1925,

75) = “to tie up, fetter” (Caminos 1977, 28, fn. 11) = “entraver, enchaîner” (AL 77.1958) = “to fetter (?)” (DLE I 258) = “Fessel anlegen, fesseln” (GHWb 380).

- Etymology highly debated and debatable. Most likely seems #2.
- **1.** D. Bidoli (l.c.): “*sicher aus md3.t ‘Gestänge’ abgeleitet*”, since this CT term signifies in fact “Verbindungsstücke des Netzes, die aus dem Holz emporragen”. A denom. derivation seems doubtful, albeit an ultimate cognacy – in the light of AA *m-g-r (discussed in #5) – is not be excluded.
- **2.** R. Caminos (l.c.): “*doubtless a var. of mh3 ‘to fetter’*” on the basis of the supposed interchange of Eg. ḥ ~ ḏ (cf. Goedicke 1955; Vycichl 1957, 71–73; Knudsen 1962, 33–36). Seems convincing.
NB: Caminos’ (1977, 28, fn. 12) reference to Goedicke (1955, 33) and Knudsen (1962, 35, §7) is, however, rather misleading, since in fact both of the quoted authors have combined Eg. mh3 with md.t “Art Klammer oder Fessel” (PT, Wb, supra), which can be certainly excluded.
- **3.** L. H. Lesko (DLE I 258), admitting that md3 might be a var. to Eg. mh3, alternatively assumed a connection with Eg. mdd “to press hard, crush” (OK, below), which was primarily motivated by the similarity of the dets. Evidently false for semantical considerations.
- **4.** R. Hannig (GHWb l.c.), in turn, surmised a link to both Eg. mh3 (above) and md.t “bonds” (PT, FD, supra). But the latter word certainly represents a separate root.
- **5.** GT: the (probably correct) comparison with Eg. mh3 does not eventually rule out a relationship to AA *m-[g/g]-r “to tie (or sim.)” [GT] which may be a var. root to AA *m-ḳ-r “1. to bind, 2. twist” [GT] that Eg. mh3 (above) may eventually derive from.
NB1: Cf. Ar. miḡār- “corde avec laquelle on attache la dernière articulation du pied du chameau pliée au haut de la jambe, en sorte que l’animal ne s’appuie plus que sur trois pieds et reste à sa place” [BK II 1064] || ES: Amh. maggārā “to make a trellis, entangle”, Harari miḡār “the tying of pieces of wood against a strong wooden frame in the structure of a house” (ES: Lsl. 1963, 104) || LECu.: Orm. miggara (≈/< Harari miḡār) “cerchio, cerchiamento (di botti, ecc.)”, miggaru “cerchiare i legni di una casa, circondare, investire, allacciare, stringere con cinghie, legare strettamente” [da Thiene 1939, 244, not in Gragg 1982], Orm.-Borana māgara “1. to interweave sticks (constructing a house or a door), 2. bind poles and sticks together in the construction of a house” [Strm. 1995, 205] || ECh.: EDng. mágirā (f) “filet tressé aux mailles espacées pour ranger une gourde ou une calebasse” [Fédry 1971, 115]. Cf. also CT md3.t “Gestänge” (Bidoli et al., supra)
NB2: Is Eg. mdr “umwallen, umschließen” (MK, Wb, below) also related to AA *m-g-r?
- **6.** GT: alternatively, provided Eg. md3 < AA *√m-ḳ/ḳ/ḱ-r, cf. perhaps LECu.: Orm. miḳirā “copper bracelet worn by men” [Sasse] | HECu.: Burji miḳirā “copper bracelet worn by men” [Sasse 1982, 144] = “bracelet, armband (of copper)” [Hds. 1989, 30: isolated in HECu.].

- **7.** GT: or does it represent a late var. of Eg. mḏr “to shut out (storms), wall in (treasure)” (MK, FD 123, discussed below) with -r > -3?
- **8.** GT: or (if Eg. mḏ3 < *mgl), cp. perhaps ECh.: Tumak mǎḡəl “anneau de pied” [Cpr. 1975, 81].
NB: The etymology of WCh.: DB maḡil “Schnur, Strick” [Jng. 1970, 218] is obscure.

mḏ3j “Art Gefäß oder Maß für Bier” (late NK, Wb II 186, 18) = “jug, jar” (DLE I 258) = “ein Gefäß (für Bier)” (GHWb 380).

● Origin uncertain.

- **1.** Treated in DLE (l.c.) and GHWb (l.c.) as a var. or miswritten form of Eg. mḏqtj “ein Gefäß (für Bier, Öl, Honig)” (late NK, Wb, below), although this has not been thoroughly demonstrated. Note that the two words differ also in their orthographies (mḏ3j was written with ḏ3 [U28] and “double” -j, while mḏqtj with -ḏ- [I10] and usually with final -tj, i.e., “single” -j). Moreover, this idea has no recognition in Hoch 1994, 180, §243 either.

- **2.** GT: if we assume its independent status, LEg. mḏ3j (or GW for *mḏj²) seems well explainable on AA grounds, although no definite etymology can be offered as yet.

NB: Cp. the following alternatives: **(1)** Ar. māḡūr-, pl. mawāḡīr- “terrine, vase (pot) à fleurs” [Dozy II 569; BK II 1064] ||| ECh.: Birgit mǎḡáráy (f), pl. mǎḡáráy (≈ Ar. dowanī) “marmite à bierre” [Jng. 1973 MS], Toram mǎḡàr “pot (gen.)” [AJ 1988 MS, 13; Alio 2004, 259, #294]. **(2)** If Eg. mḏ3j reflects *mgl, cf. ECh.: Jegu mǎḡāl, pl. mǎḡālē ~ mǎḡīl “großer Wassertopf” [Jng. 1961, 114]. **(3)** If mḏ3j < *mḏr (or sim.), cp. perhaps EBrb.: Gdm. √m-ṣ-r: ta-maṣura, pl. t-maṣur-aw-īn “vase de terre cuite à col très évasé, sans pied ni anses, pour provisions sèches” [Lanfry 1973, 219, #1042]. **(4)** Less probably, if it is act. a GW for *mḏj, cf. perhaps CCh.: Muturwa māḡaía “Topf” [Str. 1910, 464]. The etymology of SCu.: Asa mget “gourd or calabash, for drinking water or mead” [Flm. 1969, 14, #24] is obscure for me. **(5)** Eg. mḏ3j has probably nothing to do with Akk. muṣarriru “ein Tropfgefäß” [AHW 678] = “a flat dish” [CAD m2, 241] either, which derives (with prefix m- of *nomina instr.*) from Akk. ṣarāru “tröpfeln” [AHW 1084].

- **3.** GT: on the other hand, one may not exclude that it was extended (via m- prefix) from LEg. ḏ3j “pot” (Ostr. Berlin 12635, CED 311) = “ein Topf” (GHWb 993).

NB: The simplex may be the reduced form of Eg. ḏ3ḏ3.w [< *ggl?] “Topf” (MK, Wb V 532) = “jar, pot, drinking mug” (DLE IV 151) attested also in Cpt. (SL) xw, (LA) xoy (m) “cup” (CD 759b) = “Becher” (KHW 413). The external parallels of this word have been discussed s.v. Eg. mḏ3.t “scroll” (supra), cf. esp. Sem.: Akk. (OBab.) gullum “Schale, Becken” [AHW 297] || Ug. gl “cup” [Gordon 1955, 251, #403] = “etwa Kanne” [WUS #645], Hbr. gullā “Ölgefäß” [GB 140] ||| WCh.: perhaps Nbauchi *gal(iy)- “calabash” [data: Skn. 1977, 14] || CCh.: Bana ḡālā “pot” [Stl.] || ECh.: Lele ḡōlū “pot” [Stl.] (Ch.: OS 1989, 134; HSED #979). Some authors have proposed alternative cognates for Eg. ḏ3ḏ3.w [if < *ḡḡr], cp. Sem.: Akk. ṣarṣāru

“ein Weihwasserkrug (?)” [AHW 1086] || PBHbr. *ṣarṣūr* “Flasche, Krug” [Dalman 1922, 328; Levy 1924 IV 223] = *ṣi/irṣūr* “a stone vessel containing a strainer and having an indented (comb-like) rim; a sort of cooler” [Jastrow 1950, 1305]. This Eg.-Sem. isogloss is supposed (lit. *infra*) to be eventually related to Can. **yṣr* “to make, create” > Pun. *yṣr* “potter” [Harris 1936, 107; DNWSI 466], Hbr. *yōṣēr* “1. potter, 2. thrower, caster” [KB 403] || LECu.: Somali *ḍéri* “irdener Kochtopf” [Rn. 1902, 141] = “cooking pot of clay” [Abr. 1964, 57] || HECu.: Kambatta *ḥora* “clay” [Mlt. *contra* Hds. 1989] || WCh.: Hausa *ḍòḍréré* “building with clay but not bricks” [Abr. 1962, 224]. See Hodge 1969, 107, #6 (Sem.-Eg.-Som.-Hs.); MM 1983, 209 (Sem.-Eg.); Mlt. 1986, 68, fn. 11 (Sem.-Eg.-Kmb.). For fully different, but phonologically equally possible Eg. etymologies of these Sem.-Ch. data cf. Ward 1961, 40, #31; OS 1989, 134; HSED #878.

- 4. V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED 381, #1754) erroneously derived it from their entirely baseless AA **maṣi*?- (sic) “vessel” solely based on its phonologically untenable comparison with Akk. *maziû* (sic, -û) “bronze vessel”. Absurd.

NB: Alternatively, Orel & Stolbova suggested that NAss. (!) *maziu* “ein Bronzgefäß” [AHW 637] = “a metal pot for liquids” [CAD m1, 438] (explained from a nowhere attested PSem. **maḍi*?-) was borrowed into Eg. (late NK!).

md3j.t “bande d’étoffe” (Ceugney 1880, 9) = “(fabric)” (DLE I 259) = “ein Stoff” (WD).

- Derived by C. Ceugney (l.c.) from Eg. *d3.wt* (PT) > *d3j.t* (MK) “Zeugstoff, Kleid, Binde” (Wb V 519) = “cilice, étoffe du crin” (Ceugney).

md3b.t (also masc. **md3b** in the 1st IMP and CT V 139a) “Schöpfkelle, mit der das Wasser aus dem Schiff geschöpft wird (auch bildlich gebraucht)” (CT, Wb II 188, 13) = “pompe de navire” (Ceugney 1880, 9 after Maspero: *md3b.w*) = “l’écoppe (l’acte d’épuiser de l’eau au fond d’un bateau étant considéré, dans certaines cérémonies, comme un acte rituel; l’écoppe était une sorte d’écuelle de bois il y en avait plusieurs à bord de chaque bateau)” (Jéquier 1911, 68, §28) = “écuelle (à écoper)” (Drioton 1956, 38) = “bailer of boat” (FD 123; AECT II 34, 38, spell 398, n. 29 & II 52, spell 404, n. 41 & III 203 index; DCT 194) = “die Bezeichnung der Schöpfkelle, die zum Schöpfen von Trinkwasser aus Krügen und und zum Befeuchten der Seilbindungen des Schiffs, bzw. zum Abschöpfen des zu hoch stehenden Wassers aus der ‘Bilge’, der vom Schiffsboden gebildeten Wanne” (Düring 1995, 86) = “1. bailing scoop, an important piece of boat equipment (well attested from the funerary lit.), used in the boat of Horus (it empties out water like the very best myrrh), 2. also an implement for removing dangers or undesirable elements” (PL 483) = “1. (fem., VI. 1x, CT etc.) Schöpfkelle (zum Ausschöpfen des

Bootes), 2–3. (masc.: CT V 138b-139a vs. fem.: CT V 204m, 138b–139a, 133b!) *Abfluß (für Leckwasser)” (ÄWb I 580; II 1171–2).

NB1: Its attestation in CT V 133b (Faulkner: “her teeth are the md3.t of Osiris”, said of the barge) is ambiguous (for detailed discussion cf. Eg. md3.t “Gestänge” supra). In any case, R.O. Faulkner (AECT II 34, 38, spell 398, n. 29) maintains that md3b.t in the versions of G1T (MK coffin from Gebelein, in Turin) and A1C (MK coffin from Assuan, Cairo CG 28127) is an error and the true reading is md3.t “a wooden tube”, which pertains to Piccione’s (Serapis 7, 1981–2, 77–78) rendering of md3b.t as “carpenter’s wooden peg, dowel used to fasten together planks of hull”. On the other hand, others have kept the rdg. md3b.t and rendered it as “part of ship” (Jéquier 1911, 61, §18) = “drainer for bilge (?)” (FD 123) = “drainer for bilge (?) (distinct from md3b.t ‘bailer for boat’)” (Jones 1988, 199) = “ein Schiffsteil” (Düring 1995, 86) = “Abfluß (für Leckwasser)” (GHWb 381, ÄWb II 1172). R. Hannig (ÄWb II 1172a) extended the rendering “*Abfluß (für Leckwasser)” also to CT V 138b-139a and 204m. Ignoring this mng., R. van der Molen (DCT 194) conceived all CT instances of md3b.t (even CT V 133b) as “bailer of boat”. But as R. O. Faulkner (FD 123) and N. Düring (1995, 86) have stressed, in the case of CT V 133b, “eine Identifikation mit” md3b.t “Schöpfkelle” (above) “ist nicht möglich”.

NB2: For the cryptographic phon. value m of the hrgl. V30 (det. of md3b.t) via acrophony cf. Drioton 1956, 38.

- Hence (denom.): md3b “schöpfen (mit der Schöpfkelle)” (BD, Wb II 189, 2) = “to bale out water from boat” (Jones 1988, 215, §38) > fig. md3b “vertreiben (eig. ‘ausgießen’) der Feinde” (1st IMP: 1x, ÄWb I 580) = “to expel foes” (BD, FD 123).
- Evidently an m- prefix *nomen instr.* as rightly surmised already by H. Grapow (1914, 33), although the origin of the apparently unattested Eg. simplex *d3b (either < *grb, *glb or *c**r**b) is disputable. GT: semantically, its closest parallel is doubtlessly represented by Sem. *γrp “to scoop” [GT] and the m- prefix *nomina instr.* thereof, but phonologically this equation is doubly irregular (Eg. d- ≠ Sem. *γ- vs. Eg. -b ≠ Sem. *-p). In principle, one might expect Eg. *^ʕ3p/*^ʕrp according to the “old school”. But the Rösslerian system would allow assuming an Eg. *h3p (cf. EDE I 371–5) of which the underlying *d3b might be conceived to be a root var. (with the interchange of h ~ d).

NB1: Attested in Ar. miḡraf-at- “1. tout ustensile creux avec lequel on puise de l’eau, 2. cuiller, surtout à écumer” vs. ḡuruf- “petit gobelet à boire” < ḡarafa “1. puiser (de l’eau, etc.) avec la main ou avec qq. autre ustensile creux (comme godet, cuiller, etc.)” [BK II 458] = miḡraf-at- “Schöpfgefäß, Trinkschale” vs. ḡuruf- “poculum parvum” [Rn.] = ḡarafa “to take, lade out the water with one’s hand (as with a ladle)”, miḡraf-at- “a ladle, a thing with which is performed the act of lading out (water or food)” [Lane 2249–50], Hd̄rm. muḡraf “gobelet” [Lsl.], Dathina ḡrf “schöpfen, in ein anderes Gefäß Wasser umgießen, (das Nachtmahl) auftragen (tirer ou prendre du pot pour servir)”, muḡruf- “gobelet, pot (Becher, Topf, Gefäß)”, miḡraf-at- “ustensil à puiser (de l’eau), grande cuiller, bol, écuelle pour puiser de l’eau, vase à anse” [GD 2365], cf. OSA ^ʕrf “well from which one draws water” [Avanzini 1978, 64–66 as quoted by Lsl.] || MSA *ḡrp: Sq̄t. má^ʕrif “verre” [Lsl.] = má^ʕr̄af “cup” [Jns.]

Jbl. *yārōf* “to scoop up (us. water) into a receptacle”, *mayrēf* “half-coconut used as a dish or spoon” [Jns. 1981, 88], Mhr. *yarōf* “schöpfen”, hence: *mágraf* (sic, -g-) “Trinkglass” [Jahn] = *γərōf* “to fetch (water), scoop up (water), take the cream off milk”, *məyrēf* “half-coconut used as a dish or spoon” [Jns. 1987, 141] || ES: Geez *ʿərḥ* “1. spoon, 2. handle of a plough, plough (here? cf. Brk. 1950, 17 separating the two mngs.)” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 328; 1987, 70). The Ar. terms were compared by L. Reinisch (l.c.) with LECu.: Som. *moqórof* ~ -ǧ- (m) “Schöpfgefäß, Trinkschale” < *górof* “ein aus dem Bast des Móroh-Baumes oder Palmbllättern wasserdicht geflochtenes Gefäß zum Wasserschöpfen oder als Melksechter verwendet” [Rn. 1902, 178, 293], which can only be borrowing from Ar.

NB2: Among the phonologically acceptable Sem. roots that might be alternatively cognate to Eg. **d3b*, we find **glb*, **grb*, **šrb*, although neither of these fit semantically as perfectly as Sem. **yrp*. Which alternative is correct can hardly be decided with absolute certainty.

(1) If Eg. **d3b* primarily denoted “to take out, away” (or sim.), cf. Ar. *ǧalaba* “1. (at)tirer, traîner, 2. (a)mener quelque objet, ou des esclaves, pour vendre, 3. ammener qqn., apporter chez..., à..., 4. réunir, rassembler, attirer un grand nombre, une foule (d’hommes)”, *ǧaliba* “se réunir, se rassembler, affluer de tous côtés chez qqn.”, II “3. réunir, rassembler, ramasser de toutes parts”, VIII “1. réunir et transporter, conduire d’un endroit à un autre (des bestiaux, des esclaves), pour vendre”, X “2. tirer qq. objet de qq. part” *maǧlab-at-* “ce qui tire, ce qui arrache (surtout des armes)” *yaǧalibu* (formé de la 3^e pers. sing. du fut. de la VII^e) “certain coquillage auquel on attribue les vertus fascinatoires” [BK I 309–311], Dathina *ǧalab* “to catch fish in a net” [Lsl.] || MSA: Jbl. *gólób* “to buy livestock in the market” [Jns. 1981, 75], Mhr. *agōlōb* “id”. [Jns. 1987, 119] || ES: Geez *galaba* “to catch fish, capture” [Lsl.] etc. (Sem.: DRS 116–7; Lsl. 1987, 189).

(2) Assuming a similar basic sense (“to take away from sg.?”) for Eg. **d3b*, one might compare alternatively Sem. **grb* > JAram. *gərab* “fortnehmen, entreißen” [Levy 1924 I 354] = “to rob, seize, levy” [Jastrow 1950, 263], JPAram. *gərab* “enlever” [DRS] = “(mng. unclear)” [Sokoloff 1990, 135] || ES: Tigre *gārābā* “couper; arracher”, *gərbāt* “fin”, *gərbān* “nain”, *gərbīt* “courte lance” [DRS] (Sem.: DRS 178). The Tigre reflexes suggest a secondary shift of mng. “to deprive” → “to shorten”, which may be perhaps the case also with Eg. *d3b* “Mangel” (LP, Wb V 522, 5).

(3) Or cp. Sem. **grp* (with irreg. Eg. -b ~ Sem. *p) > Hbr. *grp qal* “mit sich fortreißen (v. einem Strome)” > **megrāpā* “(unsicheres Wort) Gerät zum Zusammenscharren” [GB 149, 398] = *grp qal* “empporter (course d’eau)” [DRS] = *grp qal* “to wash away (river)” > **migrāp* “shovel, spade or hoe” [KB], MHbr. & JAram. *grp* “aus-/wegraffen, wegscharren, wegspülen”, MHbr. *magrēp* & *magrēpā* vs. JAram. *magrōpītā* “Schaufel” [Levy I 364, III 21–22] = MHbr. & JAram. *grp* “to shovel away, clear (of ashes), remove (ashes and coal from the stove), remove (leavened things)”, MHbr. *magrēpā* “1. spoon, ladle, trowel, 2. spade (used for digging and shovelling), shovel” vs. *magrēp* “1. trowel, 2. shovel” vs. JAram. *magrōpītā* “1. shovel, spade, 2. trowel” [Jastrow 1950, 272, 730; KB], Syr. *grp* “inonder, arracher”, *magrapītā* “Löffel”, *magrūpītā* “Schaufel” [GB, DRS], Mnd. *grap* “racler, emporter” [DRS] | Ar. *ǧarafa I* “enlever, emporter tout (en balayant, d’un coup de balai ou de pelle), ravager, emporter (torrent), balayer”, II “enlever, emporter avec un balai, une pelle (se dit aussi du courant d’eau qui enlève la terre et détruit le rivage)” [BK I 280], Palest. Ar. *miǧrafa(t)* “a hoe, or mattock, for opening and closing the water channels in the fields” [KB], Post-Class. Yemeni Ar. *maǧraf* “kind of pulling shovel used for levelling the ground”, *maǧrafa(h)* “ladle-shape iron coffee-roaster” [Piamenta 1990–1, 65] || Hrs. *gerōf* “to brush out, brush away” [Jns. 1977, 41], Jbl. *gérōf* vs. Mhr. *gərōf* “to sweep, muck out” [Jns. 1981, 78; 1987, 124] || ES:

Geez garafa “tendre des lacs pour prendre des animaux” [DRS], Grg. (Soddo) gor-rāfā “to stream, flow” [Lsl.] (Sem.: DRS 190–1; Lsl. 1979 III, 292; KB 204, 546). Is this Sem. root remotely related to Sem. *γrp?

(4) Alternatively, provided we are dealing in Eg. with a denom. derivation (and not a *nomen instr.*) with m-, cp. perhaps Eg. d3b (vessel det.) “(noun)” (NK, GHWb 994) || Sem.: Akk. gurābu “Sack, Umhüllung” [AHW 299] || PBHbr. gārāb & JAram. gārābā “irdenes Faß” [Levy 1924 I 354] vs. PBHbr. gārāb vs. JAram. garab “the quantity collected on emptying the wine or oil press, (in gen.) bottle, keg as a measure” [Jastrow 1950, 263], JPAram. grb “a type of vessel or jar used mainly for storing liquids” [Sokoloff 1990, 135] | Ar. ġirāb- “sac en cuir, de berger, de voyage”, cf. ġurāb- “navire (surtout large et plat)” [BK I 273] = “bag” [Lsl.] || Jbl. ġerōb “long (date-)basket containing a specific amount” [Jns. 1981, 78], Mhr. ġirōb “long basket (measure) of dates” [Jns. 1987, 123] = ġerōb [DRS] = ġirib “panier à dattes” [Lsl.], Sq̄t. ġirib “panier” [Lsl. 1938] = ġarib “basket” [DRS & Jns.] = ġirib “receptacle, vessel” [Lsl. 1964] = ġirib “basket” [Lsl. 1987] || Geez gārāb “leather bag, leather bottle, vessel of skin” [Lsl.], Tigre gārāb “receptacle, vessel” [Lsl.] = “récipient, outil, choses” [DRS], Amh. ġirba “outre de peau” [DRS] = “container for water and honey made of calf skin” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 114; 1964, 116; DRS 178; Lsl. 1987, 201).

(5) Or cp. perhaps Ar. šaraba I “1. couper ou arracher et enlever une chose de son tout, 3. gagner, réaliser un profit”, šariba I “se ramasser petit à petit”, II “1. boire du lait aigre” [BK I 1327]? A remotely related var. root may be Ar. šalaba “4. tirer, extraire la moelle des os”, VIII “tirer la moelle des os ou la graisse broyée” [BK I 1356–7]?

- Other etymologies for Eg. d3b are evidently out of question.
- 1. C. Ceugney (1880, 9) explained it from a certain Eg. tbw (sic) “puiser”.
- 2. C. T. Hodge (1969, 110, #32) equated Eg. *-d3b with Ar. ḍaraba “1. frapper, battre, 2. remuer etc.” [BK II 16–17] = “to beat, throw overboard” [Hodge] || LECu.: Somali ḍur “Suppe aus dem Topf, Wasser aus dem Eimer schöpfen” [Rn. 1902, 141] = ḍūr-ayya “to scoop up”, ḍarūr-ayya “to take the clean part of the water” [Abr. 1964, 51, 70] || WCh.: Hausa ḍúúràà “to pour liquid through narrow orifice, into bottle”, ḍúrààréé “to trickle out”, ḍàwrayàà “to plate, rinse” [Abr. 1962, 236], but neither of these *comparanda* can be accepted.
NB: Ar. ṣḍrb (basic meaning “frapper”) is clearly unrelated with Eg. md3b.t and the Somali and Hausa isogloss, which, in turn lack the trace of AA *-b > Eg. -b.
- 3. Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 194, #1765) combined it with Psem. *mq̄- “to make go away”, Eg. mḍr “to shout out, wall in”, mḍ.t “byre”, Afar mēḍ- “to choose, select, set apart”, ignoring that m- in Eg. md3b.t is clearly a prefix.

md31 (Dem., superscribed gloss: μετηλ) “soot” (CED 101 after Spg.) = “suie” (DELIC) > Cpt. (OS) μεχηλ, (S) μιχα (pl.) “soot” (CD 213b) = “Asche, Ruß” (NBÄ 828, n. 1110; KHW 113, 523) = “prob. braises” (DELIC 132).

NB1: Vocalized as *m̃d̃é/ú3̃r “Asche” (NBÄ 256, 791).

NB2: May be preserved also by the toponym (SB) ΗΕΧΗΛ > Ar. maṣīl (in Delta) ~ Gk. Μετηλις, cf. DNG II 109; Daressy 1926, 250 (the year was misquoted by Vycichl as 1916).

- J. Osing (NBÄ 256, 829, n. 1110) derived it from Eg. d̃3r “1. (tr.) etwas kochen, 2. (intr.) kochen” (GR, Wb V 526, 1–2) = “to boil, cook with water” (Edfu, PL 1220) assuming for the latter an unattested *Grundbedeutung* *(ver)brennen”, whence he explained also Eg. dr (Osing: act. *d̃3r!) “Feuer” (GR, Wb V 595, 14) as well as Cpt. (Sf) χωρ “(mit Ruß) schwärzen, dunkel färben”, (S) χοορ(ε)+ “verfinstert, verborgen sein” (KHW 432 & fn. 6) and Cpt. caus. (SAL) χερω, (S) χερω, (Sf) χελα, (B) σερω (CD 781b) = “brennen, anzünden, lodern”, + ερωλ “anbrennen, schwärzen, verkohlen” (KHW 431). Although Osing has convincingly demonstrated Eg. -3r > (S) -λ as a regular shift (NBÄ 676–8, n. 755), he failed to find the reason for the lack of this change in (S) χωρ and χερω etc. < Eg. d̃3r, which “läßt sich noch nicht bestimmen”. This theory, which was uncritically adopted in KHW 523, has been rightly rejected (as “difficile à admettre”) by W. Vycichl (DELC 132) in the light of the (1) different structures, (2) the anomaly of -r vs. -l, and (3) the distinct basic senses (“soot” vs. “to cook”).

NB: J. Černý (1971, 46) derived (SAL) χερω etc. from *dj-ḥ.t-r “Feuer legen an” (Wb III 217, 12), while W. Westendorf (KHW 431) took it from GR d̃3r and dr. This was accepted by J. Osing (NBÄ 829, n. 1110), who found the Dem. wtg. t̃3j-r (for *dj-d̃3r) “anzünden” (DG 669) to be “pseudoetymological” reflecting in fact *d(jt)-d̃(3)r̃ä.

md^c (GW) “vom Ackerbau als Dienstpflicht” (XXII. 2x, Wb II 189, 3) = “to grow, cultivate” (Hoch 1994, 178, §239: to be dated XIX., not in DLE).

NB: Syllabic spelling: ma-ḏa-ḏa^ca (Hoch).

- The same root (or lexeme?) is presumably present also in md^c (GW) “crops” (XX. hapax: Pap. BM 10052, 10:15, DLE I 259 after Peet 1930, pl. 31) = “produce (noun), crops (in the context of a commodity transaction)” (Hoch 1994, 178, §240) = “Art Feldfrüchte” (GHWB 381).

NB1: Syllabic spelling: ma-ḏa-ḏa^ca (Hoch). But it has been read by D. Meeks (1997, 43–44, §239) as m^cd̃3 (so, with -ḏ-).

NB2: The connection of the two occurrences from Dyn. XX with that attested in Pap. BM 10052, 10:15 has been accepted by J. Hoch (l.c.).

- Etymology disputed. No convincing suggestion has been made.
- 1. A. H. Gardiner (1940, 157, fn. 15) maintains that md^c “vom Ackerbau als Dienstpflicht” (Wb) is “obviously related” with Eg.

m^od₃ “gain, profit” (Adoption Pap., rt. 5–6, Ramses XI, Grd. 1940, 158) = “Profit, Nutzen, Gewinn” (Lüddeckens 1960, 187, n. 39) = “Zugewinn in Ehe” (GHWb 329) = “produit, profit” (Meeks), which Gardiner (l.c.) and E. Lüddeckens (1960, 187, n. 39) assumed to be a figurative sense (“fruit, dates” → “fruit of work”) of NK m^od₃ (or GW for m^od/md₃?) “Art Maß für Datteln” (Wb II 186, 15; Lange 1925, 78) < CT V 185a-d m^od.t “corn-measure” (AECT, cf. above). This assumption is dubious, since the three instances of md^o (GW) hardly be regarded as erroneous wtg. or occasional met. of *m^od.
 NB: Gardiner argued that the metaphor of “basket for dates” > “profit” via “fruit of labour” (cf. Gk. καρπός, Lat. fructus) resulted from the fact that “dates were valuable annual produce of Eg. agriculture”. D. Meeks (1997, 44) “*L’apparement des deux mots peu ne pas paraître évident, même si Gardiner propose un rapprochement sémantique entre ‘fruit’ (dattes) et ‘fruit’ (du travail)*”.

- 2. J. Hoch (1994, 177–8, §239) was inclined to treat it separately from Eg. m^od₃ (or GW for m^od or md₃?) “gain, profit” (above) and “a basket measure for dates” (Pap. Harris I 37a:5), which, in his view, “are almost certainly distinct”. He vocalized md^o (GW) “produce, crops” as *šamḥa/*šamaḥa (sic!), which he explained as a borrowing from NWSem. *šmḥ (or *šmḥ) “to grow” [Hoch]. Phonologically unacceptable. Rightly denying this suggestion, D. Meeks (1997, 43–44, §239) firmly sided with Gardiner’s position, arguing that Hoch’s idea would require assuming a met. and a shift Sem. *ḥ > Eg. ṣ “*qui est des plus improbables et semble une création purement ad hoc*”. In addition, Meeks pointed out an ex. of m^od₃ “mesure de dattes” written with initial j- (Urk. IV 1992:3), “*qui ne cadre pas avec l’idée qu’il puisse s’agir d’un emprunt*”.

mdf.t ~ df.t ~ mddf.t “ein Gerät aus Erz bei der Mundöffnung” (NK, Wb II 189, 4) = “the chisel for opening the mouth” (Wainwright 1932, 15) = “ein magischer Gegenstand, aber auch ein wirkliches Instrument aus Metall: wohl eine Art Meißel(artiges Gerät) oder Grabstichel aus Erz in einem langen schweren Holzgriff (sein Griff wohl aus Ebenholz)” (Otto 1954 ÄMÖR II 20) = “chisel used in Opening the Mouth” (FD 124) = “Meißel” contra msḥtjw “Dechsel” (Helck 1967, 33) = “ein Stichel (als Gerät bei der Mundöffnung)” (GHWb 382).

NB1: The original spelling of this term has been reconstructed diversely: mdf.t (FD 124 pace Wainwright, JEA 18, 1932, 7, fn. 1) = mddf.t (e.g., Otto l.c. & fn. 2 and Roth 1993, 65, fn. 31) = mdf.t vs. mdf.t < *mddf.t (GHWb 382). The Wb (l.c.) gives merely mdf.t.

NB2: The var. df.t (Wb V 569) may be conceived as either a simplex (with m- “mobile”?) or a defective writing.

- The proper consonantal structure of the word is debated (above). In any case, there can be little doubt that this is an m- prefix *nomen instr.* But the root it was derived from remains obscure.
- **1.** E. Otto (ÄMÖR II 20): “*wohl nomen instr. von einem dreiradikaligen Verb ddf (sic)*”, but no such root seems to be attested that would fit semantically. GT: nevertheless, perhaps we might regard the hypothetical **ddf* (from **gdf*?) as a var. root to Eg. *ddb* (from **gdb*?) “stechen (Skorpion mit Schwanz)” (NK Mag., Wb V 632, 7–10; GHWb 1019) = “to sting, incite” (FD 326; DLE IV 169) ~ *ddm* (from **gdm*?) “stechen (vom Skorpion, von etwas Spitzem)” (NK Mag., Wb V 634, 19–20) = “1. stechen (Skorpion, Spitzes), 2. brennen (Gift im Körper)” (GHWb 1019) this variation is to be observed also in the case of the respective Sem. equivalents (**gdp* ~ **gdb* ~ **gdm*).
 NB1: Cf. **(1)** Sem. **gdp* (var. **gdp*) > PBHbr. *gdp qal* “1. einschneiden, ritzen, verletzen, 2. auskratzen, wegscharren” [Levy 1924 I 303] = *qal* “to cut, scrape”, *piel* “1. to hollow out, scrape or chisel so as to form an enclosure or rim, 2. scrape, empty to the drags” [Jastrow 1950, 214], Mnd. *gdp* “to cut away, scrape” [DM 1963, 81] | Ar. *ğadafa* vs. *ğadafa* “couper, rogner, raccourcir (to cut, clip, shorten sg.)” [Blachère I 1366; DRS] = *ğadafa* “couper un membre du corps” vs. *ğadafa* “couper, retrancher” [BK I 265, 269] = *ğadafa* vs. *ğadafa* “to cut (off)” [Lane 391, 396] ~ **(2)** Sem. **gdb* (var. **gdb*) > Ar. *ğadaba* “to tear out by pulling” [Lsl.], Post-Class. Yemeni Ar. *ğadab* “to hit s’one with a sword on his thigh, pierce s’one’s eye with a spear” [Piamenta 1990–1, 62] || Geez *gʷadaba* “to cut with an axe, dig a ditch, excavate”, *gʷadb* ~ *gudb* “axe” [Lsl.] = /*gʷadb*/ “ronop” [Dlg.], Tigre (tə)*gadāba* “to split into”, *gadəb* “axe” [Lsl.] = *gədb* “hache” [DRS] = /*gadəb*, *gʷadb*/ “ronop” [Dlg.], Tna. *gādābā* “to cut” [Lsl.], Amh. *gʷāddābā* “to cut, dig”, *gʷānāddābā* (augmented -n-) “to cut, carve”, *māgʷdābiye* vs. *gidāba* ~ *gidoba* “axe” [Lsl.] = *gudba* “coupé, tranchée de défense” [DRS] (Sem.: Lsl. 1988, 95; DRS 99) || NAgaw: *Bilin gʷdúb* “Axt, Beil, Hacke” [Rn. 1887, 140] = *gʷədub* [Dlg.] = *gudub* “axe” [Lsl.] || LECu.: Som. *ǰidib*, pl. *ǰidbo* “Axt, Beil, Hacke” [Rn. 1902, 185] (ES-Cu.: Lsl. 1987, 181; Dlg. 1973, 74) ~ **(3)** Sem. **gdm* (var. **gdm*) > Akk. (MAss.) *gadāmu* “abschneiden” [AHW 273] = “to cut off (hair)” [Lsl.] || PBHbr. *gdm* “abstumpfen, eig. abschneiden, abhacken” [Levy 1924 I 303] = “to lop off, stump, cut off” [Jastrow 1950, 218], NHbr. *gdm* “élaguer” [DRS], Syr. *gədam* “to cut down” [Lsl.] | OSA *gdm* “couper, mutiler” [DRS], Ar. *ğadama* I “couper, retrancher en coupant” vs. *ğadama* I “mutiler en coupant les extrémités d’un membre”, II “couper, mutiler horriblement” [BK I 266, 270], Post-Class. Yemeni Ar. *ğadam* “to bite (dog)”, *ğidim* “to bite, hit, strik” [Piamenta 1990–1, 62] || Sqt. *gidem* “être coupé” [Lsl. 1938, 102] = *gidem* “to be cut” [Lsl.] || ES: Geez *gadāmit* “that which cuts, scissors” [Lsl.], Tigre *gəddom* “pickaxe” (prob. not borrowed from Ar. *qaddūm*- as in LH 599) [Lsl.], Amh. *gāǰāmo* “axe” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 103; Lsl. 1964, 116; 1987, 182; DRS 101). From bicons. **√gd*-? Cf. Sem. **gdd* “to cut” [GT, cf. Lsl. 1964, 116].
 NB2: The only trace (beside Eg. *mddf.t*) the otherwise unattested Eg. **ddf* (from **gdf*) may have eventually left is perhaps Eg. *ddf.t* “1. Wurm, Gewürme, 2. auch Schlange” (BD, Wb V 633) = “1. snake, 2. internal bodily worm” (FD 326) = “1. Schlange, 2. Gewürm (auch als Sammelbegriff für Eingeweidewürmer)” (GHWb 1019) on the analogy of Post-Class. Yemeni Ar. *ğidam* “worms”, *ğudamī* “black worm, grain parasite” < *ğadam* “to bite” (above) [Piamenta l.c.].

- **2.** C. T. Hodge (1966, 45) compared Eg. *mdf.t* “chisel” with WCh.: Hausa *màcécéfàtá* “tweezers” [Brg. 1934, 784] = “1. pair of tweezers, 2. an instrument made of sheath of corn-stalk for extracting splinters” [Abr. 1962, 668] = “implement for removing thorns etc.” [Hodge], although he failed to identify the underlying verbal root ($\sqrt{c-f-t} < AA *ç/*ç/*c-f-t?$). Semantically weak.

NB: The Hausa word would seem *prima vista* to be a ma- prefix *nomen instr.* P. Newman (p.c., 5 May 2007), although he does not know its etymology, has confirmed that it doesn't have the form of an instrumental noun. Instrumental nouns with the ma- prefix all have all high tone, whereas the tone of this word is low-high-high-low.

- **3.** GT: on the other hand, if the correct (primary) spelling was *mdf.t* (as in Wb), one might seek the original verb of this m- prefix form Eg. *dfj* “ein-, versinken (auch: in die Erde, auch vom Fuß im weichen Boden)” (Wb V 569, 4; WMT 1003; GHwB 1006) = *dfj* “to penetrate”, cf. *dfj.t* “penetration” (Med., FD 322).

NB1: For its supposed (albeit unlikely) connection with GR *df* “verfallen (von Gebäuden)” (Wb V 569, 7) = “to deteriorate (of a building)” (Gdk.) > Cpt. (S) $\chi\omega\varphi\epsilon$ “verwüsten” (KHW 439) cf. Goedicke 1956, 51.

NB2: Although the AA origin of Eg. *dfj* is somewhat uncertain, neither of the alternative etymologies would be without implications for reconstructing the primary sense of Eg. *mdf.t*.

(1) Most probably, Eg. *dfj* is of common origin with LECu.: Orm. *çūpa* “to dip, baptize” [Gragg 1982, 89] = “to immerse” [Hds.] | HECu. **çēp-* “to immerse (tr.)” [Hds. 1989, 407] > Burji *çūb-*, Gedeo (Drs.) *çūp-*, Hdy. *çēf-*, Kmb. *çef-*, Sdm. *çū?* (HECu.: Hds. 1989, 82) with a shift of **ç-p* (via glottal assimilation) < AA **[ç]-p* “to penetrate, immerse” [GT] > PEg. **dpj* (apparently incompatible, cf. Peust 1999, 299) > Eg. *dfj*.

(2) On the other hand, if the primary meaning of Eg. *dfj* was **“(be) press(ed) in”, cp. Sem. *dpp/*špp “to press (?)” [Dlg.]: PBHbr. šāpūp “bedrängt, beengt” vs. JAram. šipšēp (š- Hebraism) pilpel “(sich) drängen” [Levy 1924 IV 212] | Ar. dff I & VI “se presser en foule (I: et se ruer tous ensemble sur qqch. vs. VI: tous à la fois)” [BK II 30] = dff VI: *taḏāffa* “to throng in a point (crowd)”, *ḏaff-at-* “crowd of people” [Dlg.] ||| (?) ECU. **dīb-* [irreg. **-b-*] “to squeeze, press” [Dlg.]: Somali *dīb-dīb-* (intens.) “to bring things together to close clutch” [Ss.] | Dullay **ūp-* “to press” [Ss.] (ECU.: Sasse 1979, 29–30) ||| WCh.: Hausa *cááfa* (ts-) [c- < AA **ç-* reg.] “to squeeze o’self into a small space, e.g., between two or more persons” [Brg. 1934, 1022] = “to squeeze through (one’s way between so.)” [Abr. 1962, 872] | (?) Ngz. *čāapú ~ čāapáú* [č- < **ç-?*] “2. to squeeze out, press down to reduce bulk” [Schuh 1981, 31]. See Hodge 1969, 110, #26 (Eg.-Hausa); Dlg. 1983, 141 (Sem.-ECU.).*

(3) Thirdly, in the 32th scene of the Eg. *Mundöffnungsritual*, *md(d)ft* is “*zusammen mit den ‘Finger aus Gold’ vom ‘Sohn’ gebraucht*” (Otto), i.e., “*ausdrücklich neben Finger aus Gold erwähnt*”, where “*Öffnen von Mund und Augen, zuerst mit dem mddf.t, dann mit dem Finger von Elektron*” is being performed (Helck l.c.). In this context, it is highly noteworthy that Eg. *dfj* might be theoretically explained also from an older **dfr* < AA **ç-f-r* as a cognate of Ar. *zafara* II “2. tremper les ongles dans qqch., 3. imprégner”, VIII “1. enfoncer les ongles dans qqch.” (denom. verb of *zu/ifr- ~ zufur-* “ongle”) [BK II 134–5]. Already C.T. Hodge (1976, 12; 1984, 417) and A. G. Belova (1989, 19, fn. 9) have suggested an equation of Eg. *dfj* with Sem. **tupr-* “unghia, artiglio” [Frz. 1964, 274] = **ūp(V)r-* “nail” [SED] = **tuf-r ~ *tūf-r* “fingernail, claw” [GT] (Sem.: GB 687; Lsl. 1945, 237; Rabin 1975, 87, #13; Dlg. 1994, 11, #11; SED I

255–6, #285), which represents a common AA heritage, cf. SCu.: Brg. čarafu “claw” [Flm. 1969, 24, #12] = Brg. & Alg. čarafu “nail, claw” [Ehr. 1980, 329] ||| WCh.: NBch. *čarf- [GT] = *k-r-b (!) [Skn.]: Pa’a kərfaṇ [velarization of *č-] “fingernail” [Skn. 1977, 21] < AA *čVrVf- ~ *čVfVr- “fingernail” [GT]. Lit. for Sem.-Cu.: Dlg. 1966, 60, #2.10; Flm. 1969, 24, #12; Blz. 1989 MS Om., 12, #34; HSED #513.

***mdnj.t (?) > (MK-NK) mdnj.t > (LP) mdn.w ~ (Piankhi) mtm.w**

“Stadtname (!): eine größere Stadt zwischen dem Wādi Natrūn und Ehnas (was zu Aphroditopolis-Atfih stimmen würde)” (Spg. 1920, 259, fn. 1) = “name of the 22nd (and last) Upper Egyptian nome, the northern limit of Upper Egypt” (OK, AEO II 120*, §393; Nims 1952, 343–5 with detailed disc.) = “22. oäg. Gau” (Helck 1974, 128 with exx.) = “auch ein Ort zwischen Pr-[j]ffj und Herakleopolis Magna” (!) (Kuhlmann 1992, 205) = “Medenit (Name des 22. oberägyptischen Gaus)” (FÄW 204: first III.; ÄWb I 1558; II 2953).

NB1: The original spelling of the name has been reconstructed diversely. No agreement as to whether its C₂ was *-d- or *-d-: *mdnj.t (Nims l.c.; Fecht 1960, 226–7, *Nachtrag zu* §315; Helck, LÄ IV 112; Kuhlmann l.c.) = *mdnj.t (Helck 1974, 128; ÄWb l.c.) = *mtnj.t, i.e. *mdnj.t (FÄW l.c.; Kahl 1994, 552, 922). The linguistic evidence analyzed below speaks for *-d-.

NB2: Written logographically until the MK (therefore the OK spelling cannot be deduced from the contemporary wtg.), but the original mng. of the underlying ideogram is debated (Fecht 1960, 227: “das Gauzeichen ohne Standarte dargestellt” was “jünger als die meisten Anderen”). Its (probably) earliest instance from Dyn. III (Kahl 1994, 552) contains the hrgl. K6 depicting a “fish-scale” (Grd. 1927, 467) horizontally. In the late OK, in turn, e.g., in the biography of Uni (Urk. I 101, 105) and the *Weltkammer* (Helck 1974, 128), “die Hrgl. zeigt vielleicht ein ‘gestopfes Loch’ und setzt sich wohl aus der horizontal gelegten Loch-Hieroglyphe... sowie einem das Loch begrenzenden ‘Damm’-Strich zusammen” (Kuhlmann 1992, 206, fn. 50–51, for the hrgl. “Darstellung eines stehender Schutzgrabens” cf. also Grd., JEA 6, 1920, 104 & t. 11). But as rightly noted by Ch.F. Nims (1952, 346), the form of this late OK logogram of mdnj.t (Uni, *Weltkammer*) somewhat resembles the hrgl. U8 depicting a “hoe, without the rope connecting the two pieces” (Grd. 1927, 502) = “a cutting tool” (Nims 1952, 346 & fn. 29) = “Schneidewerkzeug, eine Art Messer oder Muschelschale (?)” (Helck, LÄ IV 112 referring another hrgl.: L6 “bivalve shell”), which is associated in PT 278 with dnj “to dike” (Nims) = “abdämmen” (ÄWb I 503) and in PT 716b^t with dnj.t “quarter moon day, part day” (Nims) = “Monatsviertel (7. Montagstag als erstes Viertel der Mondphase, Monatsfest)” (ÄWb I 1478), which was objected by A. H. Gardiner (1927, 507, V11, n. 1): “the det. of dni in Pyr. 278, 716, namely a kind of hoe, cannot well be the prototype of our sign” (V11: “cartouche cut in half”).

NB3: Identified as by W. Spiegelberg (OLZ 23, 1920, 259, fn. 1) with Atfih, which was correctly rejected by A. H. Gardiner (JEA 9, 1923, 7, n. 8) as a proposal made “on rather slender grounds” since “it is on the wrong side of the Nile for a traveller coming from the Wādy Natrūn” (cf. Peasant R 38), although later Gardiner (AEO II 120*) also admitted that “occasionally the Fayyūm was reckoned as part of the XXIInd nome”. In addition, Ch.F. Nims (1952, 344–5 & fn. 23) firmly maintained that it was the name of the nome. For the problem of m(-)dnj.t in Merikare (P) 98–99 cf. Burkard 1977, 261.

NB4: Vocalized as *mādnay/t (Vrg.) = *mađānj.ṯ (Kuhlmann). Its earliest full wtg. (with phonograms) in Peasant R38 reads mdnj.t (with -d-), which may be due to the shift of old d > d (late OK by MK). The LP var. mdn.w (m) is reflected also

by Gk. Ἀρμωτής ~ -μωτής < hr-mdn.w “Horus vom 22. oäg. Gau” (Fecht 1960, 229, *Nachtrag zu* §373) = “Horus de Medenit” (Vrg.). G. Fecht (l.c.): “*der ursprüngliche Konsonantenbestand war sicherlich *mdnj (*mādn̄j < *mād̄n̄j), während *mdnj.t (wenn so in der älteren Zeit zu lesen ist) eine weibliche Parallelbildung zu mdnj sein mußte, nicht dessen ältere Form*”.

NB5: K. P. Kuhlmann (1992, 207) assumed a process of *mađānj.ṭ > *madā"- > *madō"- > *mato(e/i) evidenced, i.a., by the var. mdj.t (Peasant A5) displaying the positional erosion of -n- before -j- (cf. Peust 1999, 157, §3.14.5) seen also in dnj.t “Teil, Anteil” (Wb V 465), i.e., *dānj.ṭ > *dō- > Cpt. (S) ΤΟΕ, ΤΟ, ΤΑ, ΤΟΕΙ, (B) ΤΟΙ, (P) ΤΟΟΕ, (S^{AL}) ΤΑΕ, (AL) ΤΑΕΙΕ “Teil, Anteil” (KHW 219). Moreover, Kuhlmann projects an odd association in the story of the Eloquent Peasant between MK mdnj.t (Kuhlmann: *Mato) vs. mrj-jtm (Maydum) and a hypothetical *mrj-dnj.t (lit. “who desired share”) → Cpt. (S) ΜΑΙ-ΤΟ referring to dḥwtj-nḥt.w, “*der nur auf seinen Gewinn bedachte Gutsverwalter aus dem Landkreis von Mdnj.t:Mato*”, whose figure in the story “*war für den Ägypter ein lebendes Beispiel des ‘Habgierigen’, auf Ägyptisch auch mrj-dnj.t (n-ḥ3w) ‘einer, der (viele) Anteile liebt*”, cf. Cpt. (S) ΗΠΤΗΛΙΓΟΠΡΟΓΟ “Habsucht” (KHW 219) misquoted by Kuhlmann with -ἦροογ (sic, -ροογ) “Habgier”. A similar change is to be observed with Eg. dnj.wt (usually written with the hrgl. V11) “bellow, cry” (DCT 780) = “Geschrei (Mensch)” (ÄWb II 2791) = “shriek” (Grd.) that occurs in the MK (Sinuhe, Peasant, and once CT) “*infolge Wegfall des n*” (Wb V 466, 10) also as dj.wt (written, a.o., with the ideogram of dj “5”). Although A. H. Gardiner (1927, 507, V11, n. 5) has warned that “*it seems doubtful whether the hieratic word... was originally written with this sign*” (i.e., V11), the var. lacking -n- is attested also in CT V 221a (vars. B1C, B2L): (nb-k3.w) kh3 dj.wt=f “lord of the bulls who bellow his cry” replaced in other versions by (nb-mt.wt) k3 djw “lord of the seed of the five bulls” (AECT II 58 & 59, spell 407, n. 15).

- Whether mtn.w and mdn.w (written for mtn.w?) “Messer” (GR, Wb II 182, 10; Jéquier 1921, 210, fn. 2 pace Brugsch) = mdn.w “couteau” (Vrg.) = “knife, axe” (GR Edfu, PL 476) stems from the same root (as suggested e.g. by J. Vergote 1973 Ib, 155) appears to be highly doubtful.

NB: Queried also by Ch.F. Nims (1952, 346 & fn. 31): “*as to whether mdn(w), ‘knife’, of the Greek period comes from the name of the (22nd UEg) nome or from the old word *mdnit, there is no evidence...*”. Cf. rather Eg. (CT) mṯn.wt “Art Beil” > (LP-GR) mṯnj.t “Messer” (Wb, v. supra). The misleadingly similar late wtg. of the old name *mdnj.(t) of the 22nd UEg. nome as mdn.w (with knife det., AEO II 120*) may be due to a contamination of two separate lexemes.

- As suggested by Ch.F. Nims (1952, 343–6), G. Fecht (1960, 226–7, *Nachtrag zu* §315), J. Vergote (l.c.), and K. P. Kuhlmann (1992, 206), it may be explained as an “*Instrumental- bzw. Lokativbildung zu*” (Kuhlmann) Eg. dnj “1. (PT) abdämmen (auch: gegen das Wasser), (die Ufer) befestigen (mit Stein), stopfen (Topf), 2. (BD) jemanden zurückhalten, von etwas fernhalten, (an einem Tun) hindern” (Wb V 464, 10–17 & 575, 9; ÄWb I 1503; II 2790 vs. 2842) = “to sunder, divide, distribute, dam off” (Grd. 1920, 104, fn. 5) = “to dam off, restrain” (Grd. 1927, 507) = “1. to dam (water), construct dam, 2. hold back, restrain s’one, 3. revet earthen banks with stone” (FD 314) = “1. couper (!), 2. barrer” (Vrg.) = “1. abdämmen, befestigen,

2. zurückhalten” (Kuhlmann). There is no agreement as to whether it is a *nomen loci* or *instr.* In the view of Nims (1952, 346 & fn. 29), “it seems probable that the origin of the nome sign was a cutting tool named *mdnīt, a feminine nomen instr. formed by m prefixed to the root”. Similarly, W. Helck (1974, 128; LÄ IV 112) saw in it a *nomen instr.* signifying a “Schneidewerkzeug, eine Art Messer oder Muschelschale (?)”. But Fecht (1960 l.c.) hold it equally possible that we are dealing either with “eine m-Bildung mit der Bedeutung des Part. Passiv: ‘der (das) Abgeteilte, Abgeschnittene’ oder Part. Aktiv: ‘der (das) Abgeteilende, Abgescheidende’” (cf. Grapow 1914, 14; AÄG §253–6) or perhaps an abstract noun “Abtrennung, Abdämmung” (arguing that “diese Bezeichnung würde recht gut zu dem Grenzgau passen, dessen Nordgrenze ja tatsächlich Ober- und Unterägypten ‘abtrennt’”). Fecht regarded it also possible that it alternatively “das Grenzgebiet als das ‘(von Unterägypten) Abgetrennte, Abgeschnittene’ bezeichnet”. Kuhlmann (l.c.), in turn, reconstructed the literary sense of *mdnj.t (*nomen loci*) as “ein Ort, wo ein Damm, Wassergraben existiert” → “ein Schutzdamm gegen die Nilflut”.

NB1: The etymology of Eg. dnj has been debated. The primary form of this very root had d- (PT 278c, ÄWb I 1503). But the assumption that “die... mit dem Zeichen [V11] geschriebenen Wörter haben ursprünglich den Stamm dnj gehabt” (Wb V 464, 7 & 575, 8) can hardly be extended to all the (eventually unrelated) words written so. R. Hannig listed an alleged OK (Dyn. V) ex. of dnj “abdämmen” written as dnj (ÄWb I 1478), which was not commented on by D. Meeks (2005, 259). Gardiner (1927, 507, V11), followed by Nims (1952, 346) and Fecht (1960, 227, *Nachtrag zu* §315), has suggested that Eg. dnj “to dam” in fact “may originally have meant ‘cut off’; cf. the later word dnit ‘portion’, ‘fraction’...” (Sethe 1916, 89), which would imply an ultimate etymological connection with MK dn “1. abschneiden (Köpfe), töten (Feind, Seele)” (CT, ÄWb II 2790) = “to cut off (heads), kill s’one” (DCT 797–8) as well as MK dnj “aus-, zuteilen” > dnj.w “Anteil (was zusteht)” (ÄWb II 2791) = dnj “to share out” > dnj.w “share, portion” (FD 314). The earliest certain instances of both roots are, however, attested with d-. Note that both obscure PT exx. for dnj (with d-) “aus-, zuteilen” (listed in ÄWb I 1478) were rendered differently by R. O. Faulkner. PT 1284b: ndnj “to be cut up (?)” (AEPT 203) vs. PT 1965a: dnj “to shape” as a metaphorical use of OK dn “to knead” (AEPT 284–5, utt. 669, n. 9). CT V 381b dnj (with d-) “has been tentatively identified with” MK dnj “to share out (?)” (AECT II 98–99, spell 468, n. 2; DCT 799). Nevertheless, all these factors make the supposed relationship of Eg. dnj “to dam” vs. dn “to cut off” vs. dnj “to share” rather unlikely.

NB2: If Eg. dnj (from *gny or *čny) represents distinct root, it might be akin either to (1) Sem. bicons. *gn “to enclose, fence” [Zbr. 1971, #59] = *gn “скрывать, запирать, заточать” [Blv. 1993, 37, #64] > i.a. Akk. ganānu “(etwa) einsperren” [AHW 280] || Can. *gnn “bedecken, schützen” [AHW] || CCh.: Bdm. gen “verweigern, zurückhalten” [Lks. 1939, 100] (as suggested by G. Takács 2005, 410, #140) or (2) Sem.: Hbr. šinnā “der große, den ganzen Körper desckende Schild” [GB] | Ar. šwn “to preserve, protect” [Lsl.] || Geez šawwana ~ dawwana “to protect, defend, preserve, shelter” [Lsl.] = “umhegen, behüten” [GB] (Sem.: GB 687; Lsl. 1987, 566–7) || WCh.: AS *ḍen (var. *ḍen?) “to prevent, keep back” [GT]: presumably Gerka dun-dang (so, -u-) “to prevent” (dang obscure) [Ftp. 1911, 219],

Angas den (so, d-) “to hinder” [Ormsby 1914, 209] = den (so, d-) “to prevent, stop (someone)” [Flk. 1915, 166] = dén “ablehnen, zurückweisen” [Jng. 1962 MS] = den (so d-) “to deny (someone, something)” [ALC 1978, 11] = den “to keep” [Gcl. 1994, 72], Mpn. dén “to refuse, prevent, deny” [Frj. 1991, 15], Msr. den “to keep” [Dkl. 1997 MS] = den “to keep” [Jng. 1999 MS, 3–4], Gmy. den (so, plain d-) “to refuse, hinder, forbid” [Srl. 1937, 32] = den [den] (so, d-) “to prevent, forbid” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 5] (AS: GT 2004, 89). The latter Eg.-Sem. etymology was mentioned already by Th. Schneider (1997, 207 #107), but he erroneously quoted Eg. tnj (i.e., dnj). (3) The comparison with Sem. *dlw “to draw water” proposed by C. T. Hodge (1976, 13, #79) cannot be accepted either semantically or phonologically (Eg. d- ≠ Sem. *d-).

*mdnb.w (older form unattested) > (MK) mdnb.w (pl.) “part of the heaven: boundary (of the sky), limit (lit. ‘point of turning back’)” (MK hapax: coffin of Seni, B.M. 30842, Spencer 1978, 54) = “borne, limite” (AL 78.1932) = “limits” (Kemp 1989, 60) = “die himmlischen Wendemarken (des Sonnenumlaufes im Ost- und Westhorizont)” (Wst. 1992, 350) = “Grenze” (WD I 99).

NB: Disputed whether the same word occurs perhaps also in CT VII 200k (Pap. Grd. II), where only mdb is visible and, henceforth, mdb has been read in AECT III 99, spell 990, n. 8 and DCT 192. The rendering “shore (?)” suggested by R. O. Faulkner (AECT l.c.) is apparently motivated by a supposed derivation from jdb “Ufer(land)” (Wb I 153).

- Derived by A. J. Spencer (1978, 54, fn. 18 pace W. V. Davies) and W. Westendorf (1992, 350) from Eg. dnb “krumm sein, vom Wege abbiegen” (MK, Med., Wb V 576, 2, 5) = “to turn away, round” (Spencer) > dnb.w “als südliche und nördliche ‘irdische’ Wendemarken beim Kultlauf des Königs dienten” (NK, Wst. after Wb V 576, 7) = “boundary-markers, boundaries, limits” (Spencer) = “Wendemarke, Laufstation, Grenzmarkierung (als Wendepunkt, Wendemarke beim Sedfest)” (GHWb 1007).

mdr “sich wenden zu” (PT 484b, 498b, Wb II 189, 8; GHWb 382; ÄWb I 580: also PT 1109c, 1954a, 1955c, 2248c; ÄWb II 1172: CT I 183c, 191a) = “sich jemandem zuwenden” (PT 484b, ÜKAPT VI 136) = “1. (PT) jemandem begegnen, zu jemandem kommen, 2. (PT 498b) treffen” (Vcl. 1933, 179) = “to turn to, turn about, show movement (to demonstrate that one is still alive)” (PT 484b, 498b, 1109c, 1953c–1954a, AEPT 95, 97, 283, 329, and esp. 184, utt. 508, n. 4 contra Sethe) = “to turn to (so.)” (AECT I 37, spell 44, n. 13; DCT 195; Allen 1984, 582) = “(se) tourner” (PT & CT, AL 78.1947; Jacq 1986, 31).

NB: Th.G. Allen (l.c.) assumed a IVae root (mdrj). Others have accepted only a trirad. mdr.

- Origin not clear with full certainty. Most likely seems #5.
- **1.** W. M. Müller (1909, 190, fn. 1), W. F. Albright (1918, 225), and G. R. Castellino (1984, 12) think Eg. *mdr* to be somehow related to *mdd* “treffen” (PT, Wb, below) = “to press” (Alb.). W. Vycichl (1933, 179) was even disposed to see in PT 498c *mdr* a *hapax* meaning “treffen”. But an interchange of Eg. *r* ~ *d* has not been justified by convincing examples.
- **2.** W. F. Albright (1918, 225, #29), in addition, equated both Eg. *mdr* and *mdd* with Ar. *mašara* I “1. traire une femelle avec le bout des doigts, 2. tirer tout ce qu’il y avait de lait dans les pis” [BK II 1115] = “to milk by squeezing the teats between the fingers” [Alb.], which is semantically doubtful.
NB: For the Ar. root cp. rather ECh.: WDng *miḏyirè* “sucer” [Fédry 1971, 131], EDng *miḏyirè* “sucer” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1975, 203]. It is not excluded, although it would have to be demonstrated that the Ar.-Dangla isogloss comes from the primary sense “to wring out (milk)” (cf. AA *m-[ç]-r “to turn, twist” [GT] discussed below). Less probably, cf. CCh.: Gude *murəḏə* “to pinch between thumb and knuckle of index fingers” [Hsk. 1983, 245].
- **3.** W. Vycichl (1933, 179) rendered Eg. *mdr* as an *m-* prefix form of a hypothetical Eg. **dr* “packen, greifen” (postulated also in KBIÄF 160), on the analogy of NBrb.: Shilh: Tazerwalt *gër* “anfassen” > *méggër* (*m-* “*der Sozietät und Reziprozität*”) “zusammentreffen” [Feichtner 1932, 218], with which he directly compared the Eg. root deduced from Eg. *ndrj* “fassen, packen” (OK, Wb II 382–3) = “to take hold of” (Allen 1984, 582) and *dr.t* “Hand” (Vcl.: lit. **“Greifer”*). This derivation of Eg. *mdr* is *ab ovo* dubious (“to turn” ≠ “to seize”). The etymological connection of Eg. *ndrj* vs. *dr.t* and *rdj* “to give” (via met. < **drj*), which appears to be equally unconvincing, has been suggested and maintained also by a number of authors, e.g., K. Piehl (1893, 253), K. Sethe (1912, 96), K.M. Feichtner (1932, 224), F. von Calice (GÄSW 168–9, #684), P. Lacau (1972, 35, §40), and P. Kaplony (KBIÄF 160, n. 208). Neither of these Eg. *comparanda* has been etymologically clarified. This is why Vycichl’s proposal concerning Eg. *mdr* and *dr.t* is highly problematic.
NB1: The common Brb. prefix *m-* “*der Sozietät, Reziprozität*” [Feichtner] can hardly be projected to Eg. *m-*. In any case, it has so far not been demonstrated on the basis of a convincing etymological evidence.
NB2: Eg. *dr.t* (< **gr-t*) “Hand” (PT, Wb V 580–589), var. *ḏ3.t* “Hand” (PT, Wb V 516, 5–8) are presumably related to CCh.: (?) Ngweshe *hàrà* “hand” [IL] | Mofu *hár* “hand” [Brt.] | Daba gr. **ḡra* “hand” [GT]: Daba *nḡər* ~ *ngra* “bras, main, doigt” [Mch. 1966, 143], Musgoy *ngra* “Arm” [Str. 1910, 453] = *wúri ngra* (pl.) [Mch./JI], Kola *ngrá* “hand” [Schubert/JI] | Musgu *ngrange* “arm” [Roeder/JI] (CCh.: JI 1994 II, 179) || (?) ECh. **g-r-N* “hand, wing, shoulder” [Skn. 1992, 346]:

Dangla (Karbo) goreny “shoulder” [Grb. 1963, 59]. All other etymologies for Eg. *ḏr.t* are out of question: **(1)** A. Erman (1892, 112): ~ Sem. **yad-* “hand”. **(2)** NWSem.: OHbr. *zeret*, Syr. *zartā* “span (as measure)” represent probably an early (MK or even before?) borrowing from Eg. **ḏār*: *Ṿt*, st.pron. **ḏārt-* (Vcl. 1983, 220) into NWSem. **zart-* (as pointed out by Lambdin 1953, 149–150; Conti 1976, 267, fn. 18) and by no means cognate to it (as maintained by numerous authors: Bondi 1894, 132; Sethe 1912, 94; Alb. 1918, 90; Farina 1924, 324; Ember 1930, #24.c.1; Yeivin 1932, 73, fn. 6; Brunner 1969, 88, #483; Ward 1972, 22, #293). Besides, Müller (1909, 191) declined any connection between the Eg. and Hbr. forms. **(3)** The comparison of Eg. *ḏr.t* with Sem. **dirāc-* “shoulder, arm” (suggested by Yeivin 1932, 73, fn. 6; Bomhard 1984, 218; Blažek 1989 MS Om., 16, #52) is to be rejected, since Eg. *ḏ* ≠ Sem. **d*, and there is no match for Sem. **c* in Eg. **(4)** E.A. Knauf (1982, 37, fn. 19) combined Eg. *ḏr/3.t* with Akk. *qātu* “hand”, but these have nothing in common either (Eg. *ḏ* ≠ Akk. *q*, while Eg. *-r-* ≠ Akk. *-Ø-*). **(5)** The same is valid about C. T. Hodge’s (1979, 497) comparison of Eg. *ḏr.t* with Ar. *ṯarr-at-* “flank” and Brb. **a-ḏer* “leg” (Eg. *ḏ* ≠ Sem. **t*, while Eg. *ḏ* vs. Brb. **d* is in principle possible). **(6)** Th. Schneider (1997, 208, #116): ~ Qbl. *i-ḡil* “Arme, Elle” | Mzg. *i-ḡil* “Arm, Vorderarm, Elle” || Trg. **a-ḡil* “(ganzer) Arm”, but Eg. *ḏ* ≠ Brb. **ḡ* < AA **k-/ḡ-*, while the Cpt. evidence suggests an old Eg. */-r-/* (not */*-l-/*).

nš3: The origin of Eg. *ndrj* is still just as uncertain as whether its initial *n-* was a prefix as Vycichl, Feichtner, and others (l.c. supra) presumed. **(1)** GT: most probable seems its connection with Sem. **nšl* “herausziehen, herausfallen” [Soden] = “herausreißen” [AHW] > Akk. (OBab.) *našālu* “hinausbringen (?)” [AHW 755] || Hbr. *nšl qal* “herausziehen, -reißen” [GB 517–8] = “to split, plunder, deliver, drop off” [Guillaume], Off.Aram. *nšl* “1. to (re)take, remove, 2. save, preserve” [DNWSI 753] | Ar. *našala* II “5. délivrer qqn. de qqch., acquitter (un coupable)” [BK II 1274–5], Yemeni Ar. *našal* “wegnehmen, -werfen” [Deboo 1989, 197] || Geez *našala* “to detach, separate” [Lsl. 1987, 404–5] (Sem.: Lsl. 1958, 34–35; Guillaume 1965 II, 25). W. von Soden (1968, 177) supposed a prefix *n-* in this Sem. root. **(2)** GT: or cp. perhaps Sem.: JNAram. *nḡl* “to tidy, put things away” [Sabar 2002, 229] | Yemeni Ar. *naḡal* I “to transport, unload”, II “to strip off, take off etc.” [Piamenta 1990–1, 479], Dathina *nḡl* “transporter, décharger” [GD 2748]? **(3)** A. Ember (1913, 120, #96, 121; 1930, §12.a.18, §24.b.5), W. F. Albright (1927, 223), and C. T. Hodge (1984, 416) combined Eg. *ndrj* with Sem. **nṯr* “to watch observe” [Ember] || WCh.: Hausa *cārè* (ts-) “to guard, keep the eyes open” [Brg. 1934, 1030], which is rather unconvincing semantically. **(4)** V. Orel & O. Stolbova (1992, 198; HSED #957) equated it with ECh. **√g-w-r* “to catch” [GT]: Ndam goore “to catch” [Stl. < ?] | Sokoro *góuree* “angreifen” [Lks. 1937, 33]. GT: cp. still SCu. **ger-* “to take” [GT] > Irq. *gagar-* & Alg. *geger-* “to carry” | Qwd. *gel-* [-l- < *r-] “to choose” | Ma’a *-géra* “to bring” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 237). **(5)** GT: similarly unconvincing is the equation with Sem.: Akk. *galû* “in die Verbannung gehen” [AHW] || Tigre *gāla* “to take away, carry off” [Lsl.] (Sem.: Lsl. 1964, 116) || WCh.: Klr. *gul* “nehmen” [Jng. 1970, 352]. **(6)** E. E. Knudsen (1962, 36, §27) saw in it a var. to Eg. *ḡnr* “ein-sperren” (MK, Wb III 295) via met. and on the basis of the supposed interchange of Eg. *ḡ* ~ *ḏ*, which appears even less likely. **(7)** Ch. Cannuyer (1983, 27), in turn, analyzed it as prefix *n-* + Eg. *ḏr* “fernhalten von, einen Zustand beseitigen, Fuß aufhalten” (PT, Wb V 595, 5–9) = “retenir, faire obstacle, empêcher” (Cannuyer). Semantically weak. **(8)** Naturally, Eg. *ndrj* can have nothing in common with CCh. **nadir-* “to hunt” as suggested by Orel & Stolbova (1992, 196).

- **4.** GT: if we hypothetically accept a fossilized (non-productive) reflexive (?) verbal prefix *m-* in Eg. *mḏr* (pace Feichtner and Vycichl, for the problem cf. also Eg. *msḏj* “to hate” above), its cognate might be found either in WBrb.: Zng. *e-mmuger* “s’en retourner, devenir”,

caus. š-muger “faire retourner, renvoyer, rendre” [Bst. 1890, 316–7; 1909, 244: falsely listed under $\sqrt{m-g-r}$] < Zng. $\sqrt{g-r-h}$ “revenir” [TC 2006, 199] or NBrb.: Mzg. $\sqrt{m-g-l-y}$: mgulley (Tf.: *dériv. en m-?*) “se retourner, tourner (intr.), se tourner, se retourner pour se mettre en face de” [Tf. 1991, 406].

- **5.** GT: at the moment, both phonologically and semantically, most attractive seems its derivation from AA *m-[ç]-r “1. to turn, 2. twist” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Sem. *mšr “1. to turn around, 2. twist” [GT] > Akk. (OB) mašāru G & D “to move in a circle, proceed in a circle (?), make a detour through, linger”, N “form a circle” [CAD m1, 329–330] = G “(etwa) umschreiten (?)” [AHW 619] || PBHbr. & JArām. mšr (qal/peal) “to twist, make a rope” [Jastrow 1950, 827], JPAram. mšr “to twist, spin” [Sokoloff 1990, 326], Mnd. mšr “to stretch, twist rope” [DM 1963, 277] || LECu.: Oromo mičiru “1. (ri)torcere, attorcigliare, avvitare, incurvare, far girare su di un perno, 2. premere, pressare” [da Thiene 1939, 243] = mičira “to twist” [Gragg 1982, 285], Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata) mičira “to wring (cloths), twist” [Strm. 1987, 366; 2001, 55], (Borana of Isiolo) mačarsa “to squeeze out (fruit)” [Strm. 1987, 362], Arb. miččir- “to wring, twist (tr.)” [Hyw. 1984, 385] | HECu.: Burji (Lsl.: < Orm.) miččir- “to wring out, squeeze” [Ss., Hds.], Sidamo miččira “to twist, wring (wet clothes)”, muččūra “to wring, squeeze, crush” [Gsp. 1983, 230] = miččir-a “to twist, wring (wet clothes)” [Lsl.] = muččūr- “to wring, squeeze” [Hds.], Darasa (Gedeo) miččir- “to twist” [Hds.] (HECu.: Ss. 1982, 144; Hds. 1989, 142, 159; Lsl. 1988, 195). Cf. also Orm. (Orma, Borana) miččira “bracelets for men (made of intertwined strips of copper and brass)” [Strm. 1987, 366; 2001, 55]. M. Lamberti (1992, 75) erroneously derived Orm. miččir- from a biconsonantal Cu.-Om. *biḏy- “to squeeze”.

NB2: This Sem.-Eg(?)-LECu. root has a promising match (via met.) in WCh.: Hausa mūrḏa “1. to twist, 2. wring out, 3. twist out of shape, 4. sprain a limb” [Abr. 1962, 685] || CCh.: Mafa mōrd- “1. tordre le cou, 2. tendre les cordes d’une harpe” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 230] – provided these stem from AA *m-r-[ç].

- **6.** GT: finally, noteworthy is Akk. maḥāru “gegenübertreten, angehen, empfangen”, cf. G “(i.a.) 1. entgegentreten, 2. sich wenden an (acc.), jmd. angehen” [AHW 577–8]. Interchange of Eg. -ḥ- ~ -ḏ-?

mdr “pressen, drücken” (PT 1022d hapax, Erman 1892, 112; Sethe 1892, 54) = “to press” (Müller 1909, 190, fn. 1, cf. also Alb. 1918, 225, #29) = “niederdrücken, tief machen” (ÜKAPT VI 136) = “to press down (the earth under feet)” (AEPT 171) = “*pressen, drücken” (ÄWb I 580).

- Etymology disputable.

- **1.** GT: whether it is akin to Eg. mdr (PT 484b, 498b, 1109c, 1954a, CT I 183c, 191a) rendered as “sich wenden zu” (Wb II 189, 8) = “to turn to” (AEPT 95, 97, 183, 283, 329) is semantically doubtful.

NB: Nevertheless, this comparison may not be *a priori* excluded. In principle, the semantic connection “to press” vs. “to turn” is possible, cf., e.g., PIE *seu- > Hitt. šuwāi- “stoßen, drängen, schieben” vs. OIrish sóid “wendet, kehrt, dreht” (Friedrich 1952, 200; IEW 914).

- **2.** GT: in theory, Eg. *mḍr* may be derived from **mgl* perhaps reflected also by CCh.: Mbara *mùgúl* “presser, appuyer sur” [TSL 1986, 273, 296].
- **3.** GT: or, if it stems from an earlier **mgr*, cp. Can. **mgr* “to overthrow” [GT]: Hbr. *mgr piel* “stürzen, hinwerfen” [GB 397], BAram. *mgr pael* “stürzen” [GB 913], OfAram. *mgr pael* “to overthrow” [DNWSI 594], JAram. *mgr pael* “1. niederwerfen, stürzen, 2. vernichten” [GB; Dalman 1922, 224] = “1. hinstürzen, zum Fall bringen, 2. wegraffen, vernichten” [Levy 1924 III 20] = “1. to drag down, throw over, 2. scrape off, diminish, destroy” [Jastrow 1950, 730], Syr. *mgr* “fallen” [GB].
NB: P. Haupt (AJSL 24, 106) has equated the Can. root with Akk. *magāru* “will-fahren, gehorchen” [GB] = “einwilligen, zustimmen” [AHW 575], for which cf. rather Eg. *mḥ3* (above).
- **4.** GT: a kinship with Ar. *maṣara* “auspressen” [Nöldeke, ZA 21, 381] = *maṣara* “traire une femelle avec le bout des doigts, 2. tirer tout ce qu’il avait de lait dans les pis”, pass. *maṣira* “être lancé pour courir de toutes ses forces (se dit du cheval dont on veut tirer tous les efforts)” [BK II 1115] and (?) ECh.: WDng. *mòḍirè* “constiper (ventre)” [Fédry 1971, 136] seems also plausible.
NB: Cf. also Ar. *marāṣa* “serrer, presser avec les doigts (le sein, la mamelle)” [BK II 1091] (with met.)?
- **5.** K. Sethe (1892, 54), followed by G. R. Castellino (1984, 12), treated MK *mḍd* “drücken usw.” (infra) as a late var. (!) of old Eg. *mḍr*, but both he and Castellino failed to etymologically demonstrate the alleged shift of old Eg. *-r* > MK *-d*. Alternatively, Sethe assumed an erosion of old *mḍr* > **mḍj* > **mḍ*, which was extended by an affix *-d* in the MK. False. Rejected already by W. M. Müller (1909, 190 and fn. 1) as a “*desperate explanation*” (instead, he assumed an original **mḍr*, whereby *-d* appeared from the dissimilation of *-ḍ-*, i.e., **mḍ[r]ḍ[r]* > **mḍ[r]d[r]*, which is equally unconvincing). There was no *Systemzwang* of obligatory triconsonantization at all in Eg. Moreover, Eg. *mḍd* is attested already in the OK. Later, Sethe (1899, §361) gave a third etymological solution: prefix *m-* + **ḍr* → *mḍr* “(zusammen)pressen” → **mḍj* + affix *-d* → *mḍd* (rejected by E. Otto *ÄMÖR* II 61).
NB: Nevertheless, Sethe’s mistaken hypothesis may contain perhaps at least one element of scientific truth, namely that we may not rule out the possibility that Eg. *mḍr* (provided < **mḍr*) and *mḍd* (provided < **mḍd*) eventually stemmed from the same PAA biconsonantal root, i.e., **m-ḍ* “to press” (or sim.) [GT] (for details cf. Eg. *mḍd* infra). How the occasional MK var. *mḍr* (XII., Wb II 89, 9) of old *mḍd* (whose basic mng. has been reconstructed by K. Sethe 1892, 55 equally as “pressen, drücken”) to all this would be premature to decide.

- **6.** A. Erman (1892, 112) compared Eg. *mdr* with Hbr. *mšw* “auspressen”, which was rightly rejected soon by W. M. Müller (1909, 190, fn. 1), since in Hbr. there is no match for the third -r of Eg.

mdr (phallus det.) “(Substantiv?)” (PT 233b, Wb II 189, 5) = “Personenbezeichnung, vielleicht Hirte” (ÜKAPT VI 136) = “the Male” (AEPT 55) = “(?)” (ÄWb I 580).

- Mng. and origin obscure.
- **1.** R. Hannig (GHWb 382) surmised an etymological connection to Eg. *md3* “befruchten, begatten” (NK, GHWb, above).
- **2.** GT: if the rendering offered by R.O. Faulkner (AEPT) is valid, it might be in principle akin to LECu.: PSam *mVgVl- “male person” [GT].

NB1: Attested in Som.-Afgoy megal “man” [Ehret & Nuuh Ali 1984, 238], Som.-Benadir magal “man, vir” [Flm.], Rnd. *məʒel* [-ʒ- < *-g-] “man, vir” [Flm. 1964, 68] = *məʒel* (pl. only) “male persons” [Heine 1976, 218] = *máʒel* “Mann, männlich, Ehrenmann, großzügig, Mann” [Schlee 1978, 139, #729] = *məʒel* “male(s), men (referring to human beings only)” [PG 1999, 223].

NB2: This etymology does not necessarily exclude the supposed relationship to Eg. *md3* [from *mgr?] “befruchten, begatten” (NK, GHWb), cf., e.g., Eg. *wtt* [< *wtk] “erzeugen” (OK, Wb I 381–2) ||| Bed. *tak*, pl. *tika* “Mann, Gatte” [Rn. 1895, 224; Dlg. 1973, 53] = *tak* “male, husband” [Rpr. 1928, 242] ||| SOM.: Galila *tik-* “coire” [Flm.]. Lit. for Eg.-Cu.: Zhl. 1932–33, 166; Blz. 1990 MS, 6, #10.

mdr “1. umwallen, umschließen (Schätze), 2. auch: abhalten (vom Berg, der den ‘Wind’ abhält)” (MK, XVIII., Wb II 189, 6; GHWb 382; ÄWb II 1172b) = “fortifier, encercler” (Badawy 1952–4, 141) = “to shut out (storms), wall in (treasure)” (FD 123) = “to enclose (?) (CT I 280g: clause incomprehensible), enclose, wall in (Urk. IV 1087:10)” (AECT I 61, spell 66, n. 4).

NB: Cf. also *md3* “eingesperrt sein” (late NK, above)?

- From the same root: *j.mdr* (Griffith: var. *mdr*) “Schutzwall”, pl. “Grenze(n)” (MK, Wb I 188, 19; GHWb 73) = “defence, wall” (Griffith 1898, 110; Müller 1909, 195) = “Befestigung oder Mauer” (Spg. 1899, 39, §xxxiii) = “enceinte, muraille” (Badawy 1952–4, 141) = “rampart” (FD 22).

NB1: Vocalized as *emḍr (Spg. l.c.).

NB2: Questionable whether it was a deverbal noun or *vice versa*, *mdr* “to wall in” was a denom. verb of *j.mdr* (as suggested e.g. in Spg. 1899, 39–41) just as it is the case with the respective Sem. correspondences, namely common (*sine* MSA and ES) Sem. *mišr- “Grenze” (primary noun) > denom. Akk. and Mnd. *ṽmšr* “Grenze setzen” [Dietrich 1967, 299] (cf. below).

- Eg. *mdr* derives from an earlier (AA) *m-ç-r [GT] being identical with Sem. *mišr- “border” [GT]: Akk. (Bab., Amarna, M-NAss.) *mišru*

(rarely also *miširru* ~ *mišaru*) “Grenze, Gebiet”, *mašāru* G (here?) “(etwa) umschreiten (??)”, D (denom. of *mišru*?) “Grenze setzen, abgrenzen” [AHW 619–620, 659] = *mašāru* “limitare” [Mrs.] = *mišru* “Landesgrenze, Mark” [WUS] = “1. border (line), 2. territory, region, land (as a political term), march” [CAD m2, 113f.] || PBHbr. *mšr* “eig.: einengen, einschließen, davon: begrenzen (Levy), als Grenze angeben (Dalman)”, JAram. *peal mšr* “1. begrenzen, durch Grenzenangabe”, *me/išrā* “Grenze” [Levy 1924 III 213–5; cf. Dalman 1922, 249] = PBHbr. & JAram. *mšr* “to define the boundaries, bound” [Jastrow 1950, 827] = JAram. *mšr* “definire i confini” [Mrs.], OAram. (epigr.) *mšr* “*осада*” [SAN IV 201] = *mšr* “1. limite, confine, 2. assedio” [Mrs.], Off.Aram. *mšr* “border, limit” [DNWSI 677–8], Mnd. *mšr* II “to mark a boundary, make a line of demarcation”, *mišra* “limit, boundary or separating line, demarcation” [DM 1963, 269, 277] | Ar. *mišr-* “limites, confins qui séparent deux choses ou deux territoires” [BK II 1116] = *mišr-* “1. a partition, a barrier, or thing (interwining between two things), a limit, boundary (between two lands), 2. (hence) a great town”, *mašara* II “to make it (a town) a limit or boundary, between two things, make or appoint the place to be a *mišr-*” [Lane 2719] = *mišr-* “partizione, barriera, confine (prestito?), grande città” [Mrs.] (Sem.: Mrs. 1971, 103–104).

This Eg.-Sem. isogloss has been usually combined also with the Sem. word for “Egypt” (contra AHW 659: “*nicht dazu?*”): Akk. (LL) *mišrû* (adj.) “Egyptian” [CAD m2, 116] || Ug. *mšry-m* “gentilic: Egyptian(s)” vs. *mšr-m* “Egypt” [Gordon 1955, 290–1, #1151; DUL 588–9] = *mšr-m* “Ägypten” [WUS #1645], Phn. *mšrm* “Egypt”, *mšry* “Egyptian” [Harris 1936, 121], Hbr. *mišrayim* “Ägypten” [GB 454], OAram. *mšryn* “Egypt” [Lidzbarski apud GB; SAN IV 201] | Ar. *mišru* “Égypte” [BK II 1116]. The ultimate verbal root of all these forms and the nature of their relationship have been rather diversely disputed in the lit. (discussed *infra*).

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Spg. 1899, 39, §xxxiii (quoted also by Naville 1917, 230–1); Haupt 1910, 710, fn. 2; Ember 1911, 94; 1930, §12.a.50; Clc. 1936, §373; Vrg. 1945, 147, #24.c.10; Ward 1962, 403–404, §5.

NB1: M. Dietrich (1967, 299) considered the Akk. and Mnd. verbal root *mšr* “Grenze setzen” as denominative of the primary noun **mišr-* “Grenze”.

NB2: *Prima vista*, Eg. *mđr*, esp. in its sense “(den Wind) abhalten (vom Berg)” (Wb, GHWb supra), seems to be comparable also with Akk. (OAss.) *mašārum* (or -s/z-) “(etwa) behindern” [AHW 618] = “to withhold (?)” [CAD m1, 322], but the connection (if any) of this root to Sem. **mišr-* has not been clarified in the lit.

NB3: Similarly, Akk. (OB) *mašāru* G & D “to move in a circle, proceed in a circle (?), make a detour through, linger”, N “form a circle” [CAD m1, 329–330] = G “(etwa) umschreiten (?)” [AHW 619] seems to represent a distinct root, cf. also Eg. *mđr* “to turn to” (AECT) above.

nb4: The rendering and etymology of Ug. mšr “Gebiet (?)” [WUS #1644] = “territoire (?)” [Caquot & Sznycer apud DUL] = “campo” [Mrs.] = “stronghold” [de Moor apud DUL] = “sob” [DUL 587–8] has been strongly debated. G. del Olmo Lete & J. Sanmartín (DUL l.c.) suggest a derivation from Ug. nšr “to sob” [DUL 647].

nb5: The etymology of the Sem. name of Egypt has been also equivocal in the lit. Thus, e.g., Halévy (JÉS 13, 12 quoted in GB 454) derived it from the primary sense “border”. P. Haupt (ZDMG 64, 710; AJSL 26, 216f., cf. GB 454) explained this from the primary sense “Festung” assuming the underlying verbal root to have been preserved by Hbr. šrr “zusammenbinden” [GB] (discussed below). O. Bates (1914, 258, fn. 8), in turn, proposed the absurd idea (albeit “with great reserve”) that Hbr. mišrayim is related to Brb. *ʕm-z-γ with the “permutation” of *γ > -r. Alternatively, he took it from Akk. mušri (sic) “1. part of Cappadocia, 2. place in the Anti-Taurus” assuming that the special toponym perhaps yielded a general term. False. É. Naville (1917, 230–1) treated Hbr. mišrayim as a secondary form of Hbr. māšōr (quoted as māšōr) rendered literally as the “enclosed land connected with the walls (built on the eastern frontiers to prevent invasion from the Sinaitic peninsula)” and rejected Spiegelberg’s (l.c. infra) assumption that the Sem. term was merely a “transcription” of Eg. mdr “wall” (since “it would be rather extraordinary to find a regular Sem. dual to an Eg. word”, he suggested that Hbr. mišrayim was probably a “translation” of Eg. mdr). W. von Soden (AHW), however, explained the Can. and Ar. name of Egypt as a loan borrowed ultimately from Akk. mišru, in which, in turn, he saw a deverbal noun of Akk. mašāru (above). E. Lipiński (1992, 139, §1.2), on the other hand, maintains that the name has come originally from Can. *mišru (sic) akin to Akk. mišru signifying in fact “territoire, c’est-à-dire une étendue délimitée de terre dépendant ouvertes aux nomades”.

nb6: For the Hbr. dual ending too, diverse theories have been proposed. W. Spiegelberg (1899, 40–41) took the Hbr. term from an etymon *mešer (sic) “Mauerland” akin to Eg. j.mdr. He argued that, since the alleged Eg.-Sem. unity (!) must have preceded the conception of Egypt as “Two Lands” (Eg. t3.wj), the Hbr. dual in fact reflects a borrowing from Eg. in a later period after the unification of Egypt. Alternatively, Spiegelberg supposed that Hbr. mišrayim comes from Eg. *mdr with the primary sense “Doppelmauer”, since “an einer Reihe von noch erhaltenen ägyptischen Festungen läßt sich eine doppelte Mauer oder Umwallung nachweisen”. On the other hand, F. Buhl (GB 454) assumed that “die Endung ist wahrscheinlich keine Dual-, sondern eine Lokalendung..., falls nicht (wie Jensen ZDMG 48, 439) urspr. *mišrīm gemeint ist”. É. Naville (1917, 230–1) derived Hbr. mišrayim from its Hbr. var. māšōr (misquoted as mašōr) “Egypt” [KB 623; GB 453], whose literary mng. he rendered as “enclosed land” (!) arguing that Egypt was referred to herewith as “the two enclosures”. E. Lipiński (1992, 139, §1.2), following Buhl (quoted above), thinks that the Hbr. dual ending has nothing to do with the duality of LEg. vs. UEg. (just as Hbr. nahārayim does not denote the “Land of Two Rivers”). Instead, Hbr. -ayim ~ -ayin was rather an ending of place names (as in Hbr. ʔeprayim, dotayin, ḥorōnayim, sēparwayim, yirūšalayim).

nb7: The isogloss of Sem. *mišr- and Eg. mdr is supposed in the lit. to have originated from the very same biconsonantal root (attested in both AA branches), cf. Sem. *šrr vs. *šwr “racchiudere, circondare, ligare, avvolgere, etc.” [Marrassini 1971, 103–4] = bicons. *šr “to enclose, be in a distress” [Ward 1962, 402–3] > Hbr. šrr “(tr.) 1. zusammenbinden, einbinden, in ein Tuch, Bündel, 2. (intr.) zusammengedrängt, enge sein” > šōrōr “Bündel”, mēšar “enger Ort, Bedrängnis” [GB 454f., 696] = šrr qal (tr.) “1. to wrap up, envelop, 2. tie up, 3. lock up (of woman denied marital intercourse)” vs. (intr.) “4. to be cramped for space, be short, narrow, 5. restricted, hampered (footsteps, strides), 6. be cramped, constricted, fearful, anxious, be in trouble, pressed, have problems, be hard pressed, be in distress, in trouble, 7. be depressed, worried, afraid” > mēšar “distress” [KB 1014, 1058] = mēšar “strettoia,

confine, fune” [Mrs.], PBHbr. *šrr* “eig. einengen, drängen, daher auch: einwickeln, zusammenbinden” & JAram. *šrr* “zusammenbinden, zusammenpressen” > PBHbr. *šərōr* “1. das Zuknüpfende, 2. Bündel, Päckchen, Beutel”, JAram. *šərārā* “Bündel, Päckchen, Geldbeutel” [Levy 1924 IV 223–4] | Ar. *šrr* I “1. serrer et nouer une bourse, 2. serrer le pis d’une chamelle avec une ficelle”, *šrr-at-* “bourse”, *šarr-* “serré, noué (outré, etc.)” [BK I 1325–6]. The same bicons. root is present also in Hbr. *šwr qal* “1. (Geld) zusammenschnüren, (in einen Pack), 2. aufzwängen, auf etwas befestigen, 3. einschließen, 4. (daher) belehern (eine Stadt)” > *māšōr* “1. Bedrängnis, 2. Einschließung, 3. Befestigung, Festungswall”, *māšūrā* “1. Wall der Belagerer, 2. Feste, Festung” [GB 453, 679] = *šwr qal* “1. to tie up, bind, 2. encircle, lay siege to (a city, a person shut up in the city), etc.” > *māšōr* I “distress, siege” vs. II “fortified city, stronghold, watchtower”, *māšūrā* “1. distress, 2. fortified cities, siege-wall” [KB 623–4] = *šwr* “to confine, besiege” [Ward] = *māšōr* “an enclosure, a wall of fortification” [Koenig/Naville] = *māšōr* “Belagerung, Wall” [Clc.] | (?) Ar. *šwr* I “8. réunir, rassembler” [BK I 1383]. One is disposed to agree with P. Marrassini (1971, 103–4) who found it difficult to judge the relationship of Sem. **mišr-* (perhaps prefix **ma-* ?) to Sem. **šrr* vs. **šwr*. The same is valid of Eg. *mḍr* that has been usually treated as the *m-* prefix form of *ṽḍr* (below), although the way of derivation has not been perfectly clarified. The problem of Eg. *mḍr* vs. Sem. **mišr-* ~ Sem. **šrr* vs. **šwr* requires, however, further investigation.

NB8: The origin(s) of Hbr. *māšōr* is (are) uncertain. Th. Nöldeke (ZA 21, 381) equated it with Ar. *mšr* “auspressen” (!), while F. Buhl (GB 453) explained its 3rd mng. via borrowing from Akk. *maššartu* ~ *maṣartu* “Bewachung, Wache” [AHW 620b]. Similarly, KB 623 suggested the following alternative etymologies for Hbr. *māšōr* II: (1) from *ṽšwr* or (2) nomen loci of *ṽnšr* or (3) borrowed from Akk. *maššartu* (above) ~ Ar. *manzar-at-* “place with a wide view, watchtower” [KB]. Note that these forms are distinguished from Hbr. *māšōr* (“*le nom poétique*” for Egypt), which E. Lipiński (1992, 139, §1.2) explained as a loan borrowed “probably” from an Akk. var. form *mušur* (sic, not confirmed in the lit.).

NB9: In the works of the “old school”, Sem. **šrr* vs. **šwr* > Sem. **mišr-* vs. Eg. *mḍr* have been usually equated with Eg. **ḍr* reconstructed on the basis of the phon. value of the hrgl. depicting in the OK a “bundle of green stems, of flax”, later a “basket of fruit” (Grd. 1927, 473: M36–38) = “(signe figurant) un lien, un paquet” (Cohen) = “rather a sheaf” (Ward) > (?) *ḍr* “basket used as a trap (?)” (DCT 846) as well as a number of the most diverse Eg. parallels the relationship of which is, however, problematic: *ḍr* “fernhalten von jem. (r), einen Zustand beseitigen, Fuß (Schreiten) aufhalten” (PT, Wb I 595, 5–9) = “to hinder, obstruct” (FD 323) = “aufhalten (Fuß, Schritt), beseitigen (Zustand, Hunger)” (ÄWb I 1507–8: PT; ÄWb II 2851: CT, MK Lit.), *ḍr* (wall det.) “als Bez. für ein primitives Grab in der Fremde” (Lit. MK 1x, Wb V 598, 12) = “primitives Grab (im Ausland)” (ÄWb II 2852), cf. also *ḍr* (wall det.) “als Ortsname: Djer (ein Weinort)” (Urk. I 64:2, ÄWb I 1579; Wb V 598, 11), *ḍrj* (wall det.) “Umfassungsmauer, Einfassung” (OK, ÄWb I 1509 pace Gdk. 1967 KDAR 228–230, fig. 31), *ḍrj.t* “wall (?)” (FD 323) = “*Mauer, Palissade” (MK, ÄWb II 2852), *ḍr.w* “walls” (MK, FD 324) = “*Mauern (des Hauses)” (CT, ÄWb II 2852), *ḍr.w* “Ende, Grenze” (PT, Wb V 585–9), *ḍrj* “ein-, umschließen” (CT I 386a, ÄWb II 2852), *ḍ3r* “Bedürfnis” (MK, Wb V 524–5) = “distress, need” (Ward pace FD 319). Lit. for this bicons. Eg.-Sem. etymology: Spg. 1899, 39–41; Ember 1911, 94; 1930, §12.a.50; Clc. 1935, #375; Vrg. 1945, 147, §24.c.10; Cohen 1947, #311; Ward 1962, 402–3 (with a few erroneous Sem. *comparanda* like Akk. *usurtu*, Hbr. *yšr*). W. Spiegelberg (l.c.) derived Eg. *ḍr(j)* “einwickeln”, *ḍr.w* “Grenze”, *ḍr(j)* “Mauer, Wall”, and *mḍr* (m- prefix, lit. “was Umschließf” → “Wall”) > denom. verb *mḍr* “umschließen”, from Eg. **ḍr* ultimately related to Sem. **šr* > Hbr. *šwr* vs. *šrr*. He identified Eg. *mḍr* directly with Hbr. *māšōr* “wall (Mauer)”, which he “*möchte... in der gemeinemitischen Bez. für Ägypten sehen*” (cf. also Spg. 1899, 40, fn. 4 “über

die bisherigen Versuche, von welchen keine annehmbar ist"). In the light of the PT evidence, Spiegelberg maintained that the "Grenzmauern bei den Bitterseen schon für die älteste Zeit anzunehmen haben" and supposed that "daß dieses Bollwerk, welches den semitischen Nomaden den Eingang in das fruchtbare Niltal wehrte, für die Semiten den Namen für das gesamte Land ergeben konnte, ist mir durchaus nicht unwahrscheinlich. Ursprünglich bezeichnete der Name gewiß nur das Delta... später aber... ganz Ägypten". Even further went A. Badawy (1952-4, 140-1), who derived Eg. mdr from an Eg. *dr "écarter" based on the (often dubious) comparison of sdr "forteresse", drj.t "salle, chambre", dr.wt "sarcophage", dr.w "famille, parent", dr "fin, limite", dr "obstacle, obstruction", dr.w "mur", drj "être éloigné, écarter", dr.t "main", dr.w "crâne", whose problems cannot be analyzed here in detail. C. T. Hodge (1969, 11-12), in addition, considered the ultimate connection of the Sem. name of Egypt with Eg. md3j, Akk. miṣru "boundary", and Eg. dr.w "boundary" (supra) to be "likely".

NB10: Note that for Eg. dr.w "border" (frequently connected with these Eg. mdr ~ Sem. *miṣr-, cf. above), a few alternative etymologies should also be considered: (1) E. Zyhlarz (1932-33, 173) and J. Vergote (1971, 44) combined it with Bed. gil "Grenze, Ziel" [Rn. 1895, 95]. Rejected by Vcl. 1960, 262; 1978, 75. The Bed. word may be connected rather with Nub. kel "Grenze" [Rn.]. In addition, the Cpt. reflexes, e.g., (OSALMBF) THTP= vs. (SB) TAP (KHW 241-2) with -p- instead of *-λ-, also speak against the Eg.-Bed. equation. (2) C. T. Hodge (1966, 47, #99; 1969, 108, #13) proposed a connection with WCh.: Hausa cārnuú (ts-) "slender post for fencing" and even cārāá (ts-) "middle of back from neck to coccyx" [Abr. 1962, 878-9], which is semantically very weak (for Hs. cārāá cp. rather Sem. *ṭahr- "back"). (3) GT: ~ Brb. *-grur "enclosure, fence, wall" [Mlt. 1991, 152, fn. 4; 1991, 169] ||| WCh.: Angas gir "1. to close up, 2. jam together, so as to leave no aperture" [Flk. 1915, 188]?

● Other etymologies for Eg. mdr are evidently out of question.

NB: (1) F. L. Griffith (quoted by Spg. 1899, 39, §xxxiii) derived it from Eg. mdr "drücken, pressen" (above), which was tentatively accepted by W. Spiegelberg ("das ist gewiß möglich!"), although he hold a connection with Eg. dr(j) "einwickeln" (above) more probable. (2) W. M. Müller (1909, 195): < drj ~ dr "to ward off, exclude" (cf. also Spg., RT 21, 39 with exx.). (3) P. Langlois (1919 passim, esp. 155) combined Eg.-Sem. *miṣru (sic) with Eg. t3-mrj and many other impossible *comparanda* derived ultimately from Eg. mr "to bind" (supra). Absurd. (4) L. Homburger (1930, 283): ~ Ful meddy-ude "enfermer". (5) Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 194, #1765): ~ P.Sem. *mḏ- "to make go away", Eg. mḏ.t "stalled cattle" (!), mḏ3b "to expel" (!), LECu.: Afar mḏ- "to choose, select, set apart". (6) GT: a connection with LECu.: Saho makare "to surround" [Vergari 2003, 130] (ECu. *-k- ≠ Eg. -ḏ-) seems also to be excluded.

mdrj (GW) "enclosure" (LEg. hapax, Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 82) = "Umwallung, Umschließung" (GHWb 382).

NB1: Occurs in the toponym pn-mdrj (Pap. Wilbour B3:22, perhaps also B7:20 corrupted into n3-ḥndr).

NB2: Syllabic spelling: ma-sá-ra-ja (Helck) = ma-šá-ra-ya (Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey).

NB3: Cf. also mdrj (GW) "(in dem Ausdruck: jr mdrj als ein Beruf neben Konditor)" (LEg., Wb II 189, 10) = *Umhüllung (des Gebäcks)" (GHWb 382)?

● Etymology debated.

- 1. R. O. Faulkner (1952 IV, 82) surmised that it might be "perhaps identical with" the LEg. toponym pn-mḏ3, which A. H. Gardiner (1948

II, 42) supposed to represent the late form of old pr-mdd (AEO II 111*, cf. Wb II 191) and the direct LEg. etymon of Dem. pr-md “Oxyrhynchos (el-Behna/esa/e)” (DG 134:2) > Cpt. (SB) πμχη, πμχε “id.” (KHW 478).

- **2.** Other supposed it to have been borrowed from Can., but the source is uncertain. W. Helck (1971, 515, #134) identified it with Hbr. məšūrā “Einschließung” < √šwr (for which cf. above s.v. Eg. mdr “umwallen”). D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992, 16, §1.2.2.1; 36, §2.1.3.2.4, and 37, §2.1.4.1), in turn, vacillated between explaining it from Sem. *šwr > Hbr. māšōr or məšūrā (so also Quack 1996, 175) or alternatively from a *ma- prefix *nomen loci* of Sem. *nṭr “to watch, guard”. Accordingly, they have reconstructed the LEg. form either as *mašārā/aya or *mašaraya > *maššaraya, resp.

mdrn (GW, metal det.) “(?)” (XIX. 2x: Libyan war inscr. of Merenptah, line 61, KRI IV 9:9, also KRI IV 22:15, AC 1978, 14) = “(subst. inconnu)” (AL 78.1948) = “a weapon (?)” (Hoch).

NB: Syllabic spelling: (KRI IV 9) m-da-ra-na₂ vs. (KRI IV 22) ma₄-da-r-[...], vocalized as *maḏarāna (?) (Hoch).

- Origin debated. In any case, it looks like a Sem. loan-word borrowed from a Can. (?) *nomen instr.* (but even this is dubious) signifying some sort of metal tool.
- **1.** J.-J. Janssen (1975, 325, fn. 72) saw in it a defective wtg. (or var. form?) of Eg. mrqdn (GW, metal det.) “metal object the nature of which is unknown, but which may be tool” (middle of XX., Ostr. DeM 434, II, 7) = “un outil” (AC 1978, 14; AL 78.1799, 79.1283) = “a metal tool” (DLE I 229).
- **2.** J. Hoch (1994, 178, §241), however, assumed it to be a distinct lexeme which is perhaps related to Ug. mdrn (sg.) “the weapon used by soldiers who are called mdrǵlm” [Gordon 1955, 286–7, #1071a: cf. Nougayrol, Syria 25, 1953, 193, n. 1] = “a kind of weapon (for chariots): broadsword (?)” [DUL 530] the ultimate origin of which is uncertain. This term is present also in Akk. (CAD: WSem. word, i.e., < Ug.?) mazarunu “an implement” [CAD m1, 437–8]. Hoch’s *a priori* assumption that this “*may not be Semitic*” is perhaps premature.
NB1: Cf. also Ug. mdrǵl “term for a military class, probably watchman, guard” [DUL 529], which, however, is explained by others from a Hurro-Akk. /maššār=ūḫl-/ with the Hurr. *nomen agentis* (cf. also Goetze, JCS 1, 1947, 72; DL, WO 3, 1966, 198f.; Djk. 1971, 78; Thiel, UF 12, 1980, 354, fn. 38). The authors of DUL (l.c.) regard it recently “less likely” that the Ug. title denoted “soldiers who bear the mdrn” [Gordon 1955, 287, #1071b; 1965, #1435] = “porte-mdr” [Nougayrol, Iraq 25,

1963, 118, fn. 48] = “a mḏr-bearer (soldier)” [Hoch] = “users of the mḏrn weapon” [Railey quoted in DUL].

NB2: The equation of Ug. mḏrn with Akk. namṣāru “(großes) Schwert” [AHW 729] = namṣaru “1. sword, 2. (awooden stick or mace with stones affixed to it)” [CAD n1, 246] (Sanmartín, UF 21, 1989, 342; DUL 530) seems phonologically equivocal. Alternatively, J. Aistleitner (quoted by Hoch l.c. who gave no reference) associated it with Ar. ḏarra “to scatter”, which for Hoch rightly “*this seems unlikely on semantic grounds*”.

mdl ~ **mdwl** “Zwiebel” (Dem., DG 195:4; Vittmann 1996, 440) > Cpt. (SB) (ϵ)MΧΩΛ “onion” (CD 213b; CED; DELC).

NB: To be vocalized as *mˁdāl (GT).

- Borrowed from Sem., cf. Hbr. *bāšāl, pl. bəšālīm “Zwiebel” [GB 109], PBHbr. bāšēl or bešel vs. J.Aram. bāšlā ~ bušlā “Zwiebel” [Levy 1924 I 251], Syr. bešlā [DRS] | Ar. bašal- “oignon” [BK I 132] || Sqt. bišle “oignon” [Lsl.] || Geez bašal ~ bošal “onion, garlic” [Lsl.: < Ar.] etc. (Sem.: DRS 77; Lsl. 1938, 93; 1987, 111). W. Vycichl (1990, 83) explained the Eg. term from a Can. gen. *bašāl-i (sic). As correctly stated by J. F. Quack (2005, 314), “*die Reduktion des Vortonvokales*” and the completion of the regular shift of old *ā > Cpt. -ō- point to “*eine ältere Entlehnung*”, which is corroborated also by the inner-Eg. change of m- < *b-.

LIT. for Dem./Cpt. < Sem.: GB 109; Behnk 1927, 82, #15; Stricker 1937, 19; CED 101; KHW 113; Smith 1978, 361; DELC 132; Vcl. 1990, 83; KB 147; Vittmann 1996, 440. NB1: For exx. of the shift m > b, late /β/ vs. b > m in the proximity of r/l see Peust 1999, 167.

NB2: For the survival of the Sem. word in Brb. (borrowed from Punic), e.g., NBrb.: Shilh azalim | Qbl. izlem cf. Stumme in ZA 27, 125; Vcl. 1952, 199; 2005, 3.

mdḥ “1. Holz behauen; 2. Schiffe usw. zimmern” (MK, Wb II 190, 6–7) = “to carpent (of making door in Ostr. Berlin 10663, rt. 5, also of the tomb of Ramses V)” (Černý 1973, 34, fn. 2) = “mit der Axt bearbeiten” (OK, Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza I 149) = “to build boat, hew” (Jones 1988, 215–6, §39 with lit.) > Dem. mth “zimmern, konstruieren” (Dem. Pap. Wien 3877, 1:2, Thissen 1992, 19: hardly < mdḥ “gürten” or mdḥ “salben”).

NB: For establishing the correct rdg. of the underlying logogram as mdḥ cf. Sethe 1905, 142.

- Hence: mdḥ.(w) “1. Zimmermann, Tischler, Steinmetz, 2. (in den Titeln, bei denen die Beziehung zum Zimmern großenteils nicht erkennbar ist)” (OK, Wb II 190, 8) = “1. Zimmermann, Schreiner, Steinhauer, 2. Vorsteher (in Titeln)” (OK, Pusch 1974, 21 after Junker: Giza I 149–150, VII 27, cf. also IÄF 19f. for Dyn. I–III and Otto 1954 ÄMÖR II 14 for NK) = “Schreiner, Stühleschreiner, Säger,

Tischler, Schiffszimmerhandwerker, Zimmermann, Holzarbeiter, -handwerker allgemein” (Drenkhahn 1976, 122–3) = “Zimmermann, mit Axt und Dechsel arbeitend beim Zimmern von Schiffen” (KBIÄF 127–8) = “2. Leiter, Direktor, Koordinator” (Düring 1995, 208) = “1. (Zimmermann)Meister, einige zusätzlich auf die Ölverarbeitung spezialisiert (die Produktion der Öle ist bei der Holzverarbeitung seit dem prädyn. Zeit belegt)” (Koura 1999, 273–5) = “1. carpenter, shipwright, 2. (the same title is also used to describe the office of) overseer, director” (Jones 2000, 455–6, §1702 with extensive lit.) = “Zimmermann, Meister” (FÄW 206: already I–III).

NB1: For the semantic shift of mdh “Zimmermann” > “Vorsteher”, which is attested already at the beginning of Dyn. III and is supposed to have undergone during Dyn. I, cf. IÄF 521. Trying to explain this change, D. Bidoli (1976, 31, fn. 4) surmised that “*das in frühe Zeiten zurückreichende Ansehen der Zimmerer mdh.w, deren wichtigste Gruppe die Schiffbauer bildeten, äußert sich in der Übernahme des Berufszeichens mdh als Titelbez. für ‘Meister, Vorsteher’ auch in anderen Künsten*”. For the interpretation of the title mdh-nḥn cf. Pirsich 1997, 351f.

NB2: Hence derives (via borrowing) Hbr. mēzah “wharf, shipyard (?)” [KB 565]. Cf. also Hbr. mēzah “waistband” [KB] < Eg. mdh (above).

- Most probably, Eg. mdh < AA *m-ḥ-ḥ ~ *m-ḥ-ḥ (met.) “to hit” [GT], being related with Sem. *mḥṣ “to hit” [GT] > Ar. maḥaṣa “frapper le sol du pied” [BK II 1067] = “to stamp, trample” [Lsl.] || ES: Geez maḥaṣa “ferire, percutere” [Möller 1911, 156] = māḥaṣä “to break, cut” [Lsl. 1945] = māḥaṣä “to pierce” [Lsl. 1969] = māḥaṣä “to hit” [Lsl. 1982] = maḥaṣa ~ məḥṣa ~ maḥaḍa ~ məḥḍa [variation of -ṣ- ~ -ḍ-] “to smite, cut, pierce through, split, chisel, destroy, injure, insult, blame, criticize” [Lsl. 1987], Tna. māḥaṣä “couper, casser” [Lsl. 1956] = māḥaṣä “to hit, break” [Lsl. 1982] = māḥaṣa “to hit, cut, break” [Lsl. 1987], Tigre (influenced by Ar. mḥḍ, below?) māḥaṣa “agiter le lait pour en faire du beurre” [Lsl. 1956] = māḥaṣa “to to churn, shake milk” [Lsl. 1987 pace LH 111b] = maḥaṣa “to strike” [KB], Arg. māḥaṣa “to hit” [Lsl.], Gafat maṣä “to hit” [Lsl. 1945] = “frapper” [Lsl. 1956] (Sem.: GB 415; Lsl. 1945, 164; 1956, 218; 1969, 58; 1982, 51; 1987, 337; Held 1959, 169–176; Müller 1963, 311; KB 571) ||| NAgaw (from ES?) *maḥaḥ “бить” [Djk. 1965, 49] > Bilin maḥaḥ “schlagen, bedrängen, drangsaliieren” vs. maḥaḥ “schlagen” [Rn. 1887, 266]. Cf. also Djk. 1965, 49 (Sem.-NAgaw). An AA var. root *m-ḥ-ḥ/ḥ [GT] has been preserved by Sem. *mḥḍ/ṣ “бить” [Djk. 1965, 49] ~ PCan. var. *mḥṣ [GT] > Oakk. maḥāṣum “to beat, strike, beat in, drive” [Gelb 1973, 174] > Akk. maḥāṣu “zerschlagen, verwunden” [GB] = maḥāṣu “schlagen” > miḥiṣtu ~ miḥiṣ/ltu “1. Schlag, Wunde, 2. Schramme auf Galle,

3. (in Stein eingemeißeltes?) Schriftzeichen” [AHW 580, 651] = maḥāṣu “to strike, beat (but the terminative or perfective connotation ‘to smash to pieces’ or ‘to slay’ was alien to this root)”, miḥiṣtu “beating, scar” [Held], Ebl. /maḥāḍi/ “(Zusammen)Schlagen der Hände” [Krebernik 1983, 20, #531a] = /maḥāṣu(m)/ “to strike (of the hands)” [Frz. 1984, 128, 145] || OCan. *mḥṣ qal “to strike, kill” > Amarna (EA 245:14) ma-aḥ-ṣú-ú “they killed him”, (EA 335:8) mi-ḥi-ša “they have been killed” [DNWSI 614; Izre’el 1998, 425 with lit.] = √mḥṣ G “(er)schlagen, verwunden” [Knudtzon 1915, 1459], Ug. mḥṣ (Nebenform mḥš) G “zerschmettern, erschlagen”, Qt “metzeln, kämpfen”, mḥṣ “Metzger (?) oder (nach Held) Weber (?)” [Ast. 1948, 212; WUS #1547 & #1550] = mḥṣ “to smite, slay” > mḥṣ-m “members of a certain guild, perhaps butchers” vs. mḥš “to destroy, kill” [Gordon 1955, 287–8, #1087 vs. #1089] = mḥṣ “to strike, slay (by striking down)” [Ginsberg quoted by Held, so also Segert 1984, 192] = mḥṣ “to smite” [Dahood 1965, 64, #1460] = mḥṣ “to immerse violently, plunge into” [Moor 1973, 89, n. 1] = mḥṣ “to crush” [Dahood 1976, 350–1 rejecting Moor, cf. also Biblica 56, 1975, 97] = mḥṣ “battre, frapper” [Xella 1990, 471] = mḥṣ G “to wound, beat, crush, kill” [DUL 540–1], cf. also Ug. mṣḥ (met.?) “abattre” [Caquot & Szyner apud DUL] = “to stamp” [Margalit] = “schlagen (gegen die Stirn)” [Delekat, UF 4, 1972, 12] = “to throw, strike or beat down” [Renfro], Hbr. mḥṣ qal “zerschlagen, zerschmettern (den Kopf, die Feinde, die Hüften)” [GB] = “to strike, slay (by striking down)” [Held] = “to strike, smite, break to pieces” [Lsl.] = qal “to smash” [KB] | OSA mḥṣ (sic, -ṣ) “(er)schlagen” [WUS] = mḥḍ/ṣ (Qtb.) “to dig” vs. (Sab.) “to strike, break up stone, quarry” [Ricks 1982, 140] = (Sab.) mḥḍ “to smite, defeat (frapper, battre un ennemi)” [SD 84] = (Sab.) mḥḍ “1. to break up (stone), quarry, 2. strike, overthrow (enemy)” [Biella 1982, 271] = mḥḍ “to smite, hew out, defeat” [Lsl.], (?) Ar. maḥaḍa I “1. écrêmer le lait, 2. baratter le lait, l’agiter dans une outre, pour en faire du beurre, 3. agiter, secouer violemment une chose” [BK II 1073] = “stoßen, schütteln” [GB], but cf. Post.-Class. Yemeni Ar. maḥaḍ “1. to beat (eggs), crush (one’s bowels, of a camel as it goes along), 2. disquiet, vex, 3. throw off”, II “to confuse”, VIII “to be alarmed” [Piamenta 1990–1, 461] || (?) Geez maḥaḍa ~ mähḍa (var. to maḥaṣa ~ mähṣa) [irreg. -ḥ-] “to smite, cut, pierce through, split, chisel, destroy, injure, insult, blame, criticize” [Lsl. 1987].

The same AA bicons. root, namely *m-ḥ “to hit” (or sim.) [GT]

has been preserved in SBrb.: EWlm. & Ayr məmməz-ət “écraiser” [PAM 1998, 218] (for Brb. *z < AA *ç cf. Takács 2006, 61–62) ||| NAgaw: Bilin maç y “1. (zer)hauen, schlagen, 2. antreiben das Vieh” [Rn.] || HECu.: (?) Sdm. maṭ- [unless < *maṭar-] “to cut branches, prune” [Gsp. apud Hds. 1989, 46] ||| NOm.: Kaffa māç- [-ç- < *-ç-?] “hauen, schlagen mit laufem Geklatsch, zerhauen Stein, Holz, auch das Vieh treiben oder schlagen” [Rn. 1888, 315] = maçç- “tagliare, incidere” [Crl. 1951, 468], Mocha maççī(yé) “to cut, reap” [Lsl. 1959, 39] ||| WCh.: AS *m^wat > *ma₃t (?) [*-t < AA *-ç seems reg.] “to beat” [GT]: Angas muat “to beat, strike” [Ormsby 1914, 208, 315] = mwat ~ mwot ~ mat “to beat, strike” [Flk. 1915, 250–251] = mwàt ~ mwòt (K) “schlagen, hauen, to beat” [Jng. 1962 MS, 27] = mot (sg.) “to hit” [ALC 1978, 39] = mwàt “to hit” [Krf.] = mwàt “to hit”, cf. nyin-tom mwat mwa “they panic” (lit. “panic hit them”) [Gcl. 1994, 69, 120] (AS: GT 2004, 259) || CCh.: Gude m^wacə (-ts-) [-c- seems reg. < *-ç-] “to trim, cut off, slice off (hair, grass, strands of fiber)” [Hsk. 1983, 246].

nb1: Both Akk. and Ug. have a var. with -š (exactly with the same mng.), which were earlier combined with Akk. ḥamāšu and Ar. ḥamāšu (cf. Held, Leshonenu 18, 1953, 151, n. 35). But as pointed out by M. Held (1959; WUS #1550), these are more probably due to a “secondary phonetic modification” (Held) of ṽmḥš, i.e., an assimilation of *-št > -št. Nevertheless, M. Dahood (1965, 64, #1460) postulated a separate root (ṽmḥš) in the light of EA 252:19 (yimāḥašši).

nb2: The rendering of Ug. mḥš-m (pl.) has been equivocal: “Metzger (?) oder (nach Held) Weber (?)” [Ast., WUS l.c. supra] = “members of a certain guild, perhaps butchers” [Gordon l.c. supra] = “un corps de soldats ou de gardes” [Heltzer, UF 19, 1987, 449] = “tisseurs” [Xella 1990, 471].

nb3: For the problem of the Aram. reflexes cf. Held 1959, 171, fn. 38 (with lit.) and the entry for Eg. mḥj “durchstoßen” (GR, Wb, above with further disc. and lit.).

nb4: Ar. mḥḍ is problematic semantically, but acceptable phonologically as rightly stated by M. Held (1959, 171 & fn. 43–44), who argued against a direct association of the mng. “to churn (milk)” with Sem. *mḥḍ “to strike”. He maintains that its other mngs. (“to be taken with the pains of parturition” and “to shake” in general) indicate no semantic relation either with Sem. *mḥḍ “to strike”, since “the process of churning milk does not involve beating but rather shaking”. This latter use of the Ar. root he combined with Akk. māšu (*mws?) “buttern” [AHW 621] = “to churn” [CAD m1, 350], which is certainly false, cf. rather Ug. mys “Melker (?)” [AHW | Yemeni Ar. mwḍ: I māḍ “to milk, make thick milk, churn butter” [Piamenta 1990, 474].

nb5: J. Aistleitner (1948, 212, §6; WUS #1639) and F. Renfroe (1992, 130–2) affiliated the Sem. root with the basic sense “to hit etc.” (above) also with Ug. mḥḥ “austoßen” [Ast.] = “(aneinander) stoßen” [WUS] = “to pull” [DUL 586] and Ar. mḥḥ “wegstoßen” [WUS]. As pointed out by Renfroe, the Ug. root was used to describe a struggle like like lsmm (obscure), while the Ar. one principally signifies “the characteristic configuration of concentric sheaths or layers possessed by certain plants”, cf. Ar. muṣṣāḥ- “a plant which has layers like onion”, ʔumṣūḥ-at- “such a layer or sheath”, whence the verbal significations, e.g., Ar. mḥḥ I “to pull away, remove (a sheath, coat, layer)”, I, V, VIII “to peel, snatch off a thing from another

thing, remove sg. from around sg. else” [Lane 2718] are, in Renfroe’s view, of denominative origin, while the same does not fit Ug. mšh which Renfroe regarded as cognate rather to Ug. mḥš (above).

NB6: Whether Sem. *mḥd “to weave” is ultimately related (as suggested e.g. in Held 1959, 175–6) is highly dubious. In any case, noteworthy is its parallelism with Eg. mdh “Kopfbinde” (OK, Wb, above). D. Bidoli (1976, 32–33, fn. 10) tried to explain the etymological connection of both Eg. roots in another way. He tentatively rendered the Eg. title mdh “der würendenverleihende Meister” arguing that “eine Weihe oder Würdenverleihung bestand in einer zweifachen Umbindung” (cf. CT V 158a-d: “Seht mich an, wie ich gegürtet bin [mdh-kwj] mit dem mdh-Gürtel, wie ich gebunden bin mit der ḥfn-Binde...”), which led him to assuming that “möglicherweise bedeutet mdh wörtlich ‘der Umwundene’ (Zimmerer)”. This assumption and the double det. (Binde + Beil) of mdh in Urk. I 253:18, however, can hardly be regarded as convincing etymological evidence.

NB7: H. Möller (1911, 156) derived Aram. mḥc > mḥ? “schlagen” and Geez maḥaša from a biconsonantal Sem. *mḥ- based on their comparison with Hbr. mḥq “zer-schlagen”, Ar. maḥik- “rixator” and maḥaza “pugno percussit”.

NB8: A. B. Dolgopolskij (1973) erroneously derived Kafa mač- (above) from PCu. *maĀA[h]- “рвать, резать” [Dlg] which he reconstructed on the basis of ES (explained by him as borrowed from Cu.): Tigre /maĉiḥa/ “вырывать” [Dlg. page LH], hence re-borrowed into NAḡaw: Bilin mačeh- “aus-, wegreißen, -putzen” [Rn. 1887, 265] = “abhäuten” [Rn. 1902, 287] = “вырывать, сорвать, вычистить, снять кожу очистить плоды от кожуры” [Dlg.] || LECu.: Somali muḍaḥ- “ablegen, abhäuten” [Rn. 1902, 287], Somali-Isaq muḍh- “to tear off etc.” [Abr. quoted by Dlg.] (Cu.-Om.: Rn. 1887, 265; Dlg. 1973, 307–308). All these comparanda seem, however, to have stem from Sem., cf. also Ar. maṣaḥa I “1. tirer, extraire une chose” vs. maḥaša II “enlever, ôter qqch. de dessus, de manière à purifier” [BK II 1067, 1115]. In addition, Dolgopolskij compared the Cu.-Om. root also Sem. *bdḥ “to tear or break apart”, which has been rejected by G. Takács (1999, 53).

NB9: Probably no connection to WBrb.: Zng. √m-d ~ √n-d “1. plier, 2. mettre en oeuvre, traïter, 3. forger” > a-nə-muḍ “artisan, forgeron” [Ncl. 1953, 206].

NB10: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED 385, #1779) compared Som. muḍaḥ- with CCh.: Gsg. moḍ “to tear” which they erroneously explained from an alleged AA *modaḥ- (sic) “to tear”. But he failed to demonstrate the case of Hausa -r- < *-ḍ- on the basis of an extensive etymological evidence.

NB11: P. Newman (1970, 42) assumed Angas √m*-t (above) to be etymologically related to WCh.: Hausa määraá “to slap” [Abr. 1962, 655] and derived the C₂ in both cases from PWCh. *-ḍ-.

NB12: A. Drexel (1925, 7) supposed a prefix m- in Akk. mḥš “schlagen” (baseless) which he affiliated with WCh.: Hausa kàcà (-ts-) “zerreißen, sprengen, brechen” [Drexel] = “1. to scrape off, 2. plane wood, 3. snap (thread, rope), 4. pluck (fruit), 5. tog up etc.” [Abr. 1962, 504] (semantically unconvincing).

- Other etymologies are out of question.

NB: (1) W. F. Albright (1918, 233, #52), followed by F. von Calice (1936, #644) equated it with Hbr. ḥšb “to hew (wood, stone)”, Ar. ḥšm “to break wind”. cf. also Akk. ḥšb “to cut” [Alb.] = “abbrechen” [AHW 331]. (2) E. Zyhlarz (1934, 111) compared Eg. mdh with SBrb.: Ahaggar a-mrəḥ “Handsäge, Sichel”. The two words have nothing to do with one other: Eg. -ḍ- ≠ Brb. *-r-, while Ahaggar -h reflects PSBrb. *-z in this case (cf. Eg. m3z, above). (3) L. Homburger (1930, 285): ~ Ful lahal, laʔal “écuelle en bois”, law-de “travailler de bois”. Absurd just like (4) A. M. Lam’s (1993, 385) etymology: Ful mačča “grande hache à large tranchant pour le gros bois”.

mdh “Gürtel” (OK, Wb II 189, 11) = “Schurz” (Edel quoted by Gdk. l.c. infra) = “fillet (not girdle)” (EG 1927, 492: S10, fn. 2; so also Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 68) = “bandeau” (Grdseloff, ASAE 42, 1943, 118) = “a special type of fillet of a soft material and has streamers” (Kern 1961, 93–95) = “ein Gürtel, der mit dem Galaschurz (ein sehr feierliches Kleidungsstück) zusammen getragen wird (weil die anderen Schürze gürtellos sind)” (Staehelin 1966, 28) = “Stirnbinde (Attribut der Geschlechtsreife)” (Wst. 1967, 143) = “Binde” (ÄWb I 580) = “Kopfbinde (nicht Gürtel)” (Quack 2005, 314, fn. 12) > mdh “eine Kopfbinde” (MK, Wb II 190, 1; GHWb 382; ÄWb II 1172) = “fillet” (FD 123 after EG l.c.; DCT 195) = “Kranz” (CT VII 118i, Altenmüller 1975, 349) = “der aus Blumen gewundene Kranz” (Feucht 1995, 242 pace Kern).

NB1: The OK term only occurs in the expression tz mdh “den Gürtel umbinden” ≈ “mannbar werden” (Wb, so also Staehelin) = “nouer le bandeau” ≈ “devenir élève” (Grdseloff, ASAE 42, 1943, 118f.) = “to bind on the girdle” ≈ “to attain puberty” (Lambdin) = “an expression for reaching manhood” (Kern 1961, 93–95) = “eine Art Reifezeremonie: das Knoten und Umlegen einer Kopfbinde zum Zeitpunkt der Reife und der Verantwortungsfähigkeit (nicht das Anlegen des Galaschurzes)” (Feucht 1995, 238–245), which was – according to Kaplony (KBIÄF 134–5, n. 111) – in fact “eine schon im A.R. nicht mehr geübte Sitte”. The OK and MK terms derive from the same root and both are supposed to represent even the same word (cf. Gunn, JEA 25, 1939, 218; Kern 1961, 93–95), which may have had – in the view of Staehelin (1966, 29) – the primary sense “eines einfachen Zugstreifen, d.h. im M.R. um die Taille, im A.R. um den Kopf gelegt”. Goedicke (1967 KDAR, 69) rendered its occurrence in PT 1214b^{PM} as “Stirnband”. Although Staehelin (l.c.) firmly disproved the rendering of OK tz mdh as “eine Kopfbinde knüpfen”, and Feucht (1995, 242) also found the argument *prima vista* attractive that “mit der Reife setzt das Schamgefühl ein, so daß sich das Kind... beginnt zu verhüllen”, the latter author has nevertheless excluded “daß ein so wichtiges... Handlungselement... sich von einem Schurz zu einer Kopfbinde verändert hat”. The MK mng. “Kopfbinde” is reaffirmed also in the Sign Pap. of Tanis (cf. Griffith & Petrie 1889, pl. 6, 26; Staehelin 1966, 26).

NB2: Kaplony (IÄF 327, 475f.) suggested an archaic var. bdh (as PN) “Kopfbinde”, which seems rather uncertain and has been rightly declined by Staehelin (1966, 25, fn. 5). For the problem of reading mdh in Pap. Westcar 7:4–5 and 8:25–9:1 cf. Eyre 1992, 281, fn. 14.

NB3: The assumption that old mdh is reflected by Dem. mdh “Gürtel” (DG 195) > Cpt. (S) μαχ2, ποτχ2, μοχ2, μογχ2, (A) μαχ2, (B) μοχ3, μογχ3, μο3χ “girdle of soldier or monk” (CD 213b) = “Gürtel” (KHW 114) has been abandoned already in the Wb II 189. Still, Staehelin (1966, 29) speaks of a late word “bewahrt in der volkssprachlichen Tradition”. The Dem.-Cpt. form point to an etymon *mdh, while Erman (1892, 112) preferred to side with reconstructing *mdh. The fact, that the derivation of Dem.-Cpt. mdh from old mdh is not accepted in the Wb II 189, did not hinder Vergote (1950, 292) in thinking that the reasons thereof “ne sont peut-être pas un argument décisif”. Moreover, W. Westendorf (KHW 114 & fn. 4) erroneously assumed that the connection to old mdh “setzt einen Übergang h > h voraus”, which he – rather illogically – compared to “den Wechsel von h zu h in der Umgebung von m” (mentioned by Fecht, ZÄS 92, 1967, 26, fn. 2). W. Vycichl (DELG 132–3) misquoted the Dem. word as mdh (sic). Lambdin (1953, 152) and Quack (2005, 314 and fn. 12) set up an old *mādh on the basis of the Cpt. (!) evidence (with the Lautverschiebung of old *ā

> o), albeit Quack too rejected the derivation from old mdh (contra DELC 132–3). More realistic is – provided we keep maintaining that Dem. mdh has nothing to do with OK mdh – to suggest that the Cpt. forms are due to a change of old *māḏḥ ~ *māḏḥ.

- Hence (denom.): mdh “den Kopf umwinden mit einer Binde, mit einem Diadem, mit einem Kranz” (XVIII., Wb II 190, 2–4; GHWb 382; ÄWb II 1172: already CT V 158a) = “to invest with insignia” (FD 124) = “(urspr.) umgürten, (speziell) umbinden mit der Kopfbinde” (Bidoli 1976, 33, fn. 10) = “to be invested (with insignia)” (DCT 195).
- AA origin uncertain. Most promising seems #3.

- 1. Usually identified with Hbr. mēzah “1. Gürtel, 2. Damm, Deich” (cf. also *māzīḥ “Gürtel oder Damm”) [GB 411] = “waistband (always worn directly next to the skin)” (cf. also *māziḥ “belt, waistband”) [KB 565] = “girdle” [Ember] = “ceinture” [Lexa]. Later, Hbr. mēzah and Eg. mdh were also equated with Akk. (LBab.) mēze/aḥu ~ māzaḥu “Schärpe (von Gottesbildern)” [AHW 650] = (NBab.) mēze/aḥu ~ māzaḥu “a scarf or belt” [CAD m2, 46] = mēzah (sic) “belt, waist-band” [KB 565]. The suggested etymological connection of the Eg.-Hbr.-Akk. parallel full of controversies. At any rate, the cognacy of Eg. mdh with Akk. mēzah- or Hbr. mēzah is excluded (Eg. -ḏ- ≠ Sem. *-z- or *-ḏ-). At the present moment, it is difficult to form a definite judgement on this matter. One may only underline some circumstances for orientation (discussed below), which suggest that probably there was no relationship at all.

LIT. for Eg.-Sem.: Erman 1892, 112; Ember 1911, 90, 92; 1930, #10.a.22, #14.a.7; Stricker 1937, 18; Lexa 1938, 222; Lambdin 1953, 152; Staehelin 1966, 26 & fn. 3; Conti 1976, 267, fn. 18; KHW 114; MM 1983, 177, fn. 4.

NB1: The Hbr. word is attested three times in the OT, but in the view of Lambdin (1953, 152), only one of these occurrences can be certainly rendered as “girdle”. Staehelin (l.c.) mentions even a Hbr. var. māḏḥ (sic, with -d-) “Gürtel”, which is in fact a false transcription of the unattested *māzīḥ.

NB2: It is clear that – for phonological reasons – Hbr. mēzah cannot be a genetically inherited cognate of Eg. mdh as rightly stated already by Vycichl (DELC 133): “*le correspondance [Hbr.] z : [Eg.] ḏ ne vaut que pour les mots d'emprunt*”, while “ḥ : ḥ n'est pas une correspondance régulière”.

NB3: In theory, the Hbr. word might be late a borrowing from OEg. mdh (provided we discard deriving Dem. mdh and the Cpt. reflexes from it) as it has been suggested by a number of authors (Bondi 1894, 132; Erman 1892, 112; Clc. 1936, #643; Lambdin 1953, 152; Staehelin 1966, 26 & fn. 3; Castellino 1984, 15). Indeed, Eg. ḏ > Can./Hbr. z is possible, cf., e.g., Eg. ḏr.t “hand” (OK) > (?) Ug. ḏr-t [Dahood 1965, 7f. contra DUL 289], OHbr. zeret “Spanne” [GB] = “span of the hand (as a measure)” [KB], Syr. zartā ~ zirtā [KB] etc. (Can.-Eg.: GB 208; KB 283). W. M. Müller (1905, 362, fn. 1) too supposed a Hbr. < Eg. borrowing trying to explain the sound changes another way: “*nicht klar ist msh (sic, probably for msh) ‘Gürtel’ = h. mzḥ, bei denen ägyptischer Ursprung nahe liegt*” arguing that “*in mzḥ könnte man das m auf ṣ einwirkend denken*”. B. Gunn (JEA 25, 1939, 218f.), in turn, correctly opposed the

identification of the Hbr. term as an Eg. loan, since (1) Eg. *mdh* is wrongly translated “girdle” (instead of “fillet”), while (2) Eg. *-d-* > late *-d-* ≠ Hbr. *-z-*, and also because (3) the Hbr. form has Sem. background (below). The latter argument has been reaffirmed by Vergote (1950, 292): “*le mot mēzah cité par Spiegelberg pourrait aussi figurer parmi les mots hébreux*”. Muchiki (1999, 248–9) also maintained that Hbr. term could not be a loan from Eg. *mdh*.

nb4: The fact, that the Hbr. form has alleged Sem. cognates (below), led Černý (CED 101) and Muchiki (1999, 248–9) to treat Dem. *mdh* and Cpt. (B) *מוחז* etc. (separately from OEg. *mdh*, cf. above) as late loan from Sem. But this LEg. < Sem. borrowing suggested in CED 101 is impossible for the significant anomalies of vocalization (LEg. **módh* ≠ Akk. *mēzah-* or Hbr. *mēzah*).

nb5: Searching for the further inner Sem. connections for Hbr. *mēzah*, most authors in the lit. (GB 411; Ember 1911, 92; 1930, #14.a.7; Gunn, JEA 25, 1939, 218f.; KB 565) have suggested or preferred a derivation from Sem. **√hzm* “girdle” [Gunn pace Driver] (the most widespread etymology), cf. OSA (Minaean) *hzm* “Gürtel” [GB] = “strapped” [Driver quoted by Gunn], Ar. *ḥazama* I “entourer et serrer avec des cordes, faire des ballots, emballer”, *ḥizām-* “1. sangle (d’une bête de somme, d’une monture), 2. langes (d’enfant), 3. (Eg. dial.) ceinture en soie rayée en trois lés, avec franges” [BK I 420–1] = *ḥazama* “festbinden, die Gurten anziehen” [Clc.]. At any rate, G. R. Driver’s (apud Gunn) PSem. **mzḥ* is baseless, while his Ar. *ḥazama* (sic, with *ḥ-*) is simply erroneous. Though a metathesis in Hbr. *mēzah* is not impossible, Calice (1936, #643) called this Hbr.-Ar. comparison as problematic (a comparison of Sem. **hzm* ~ Eg. *mdh* seems even less convincing). At the same time, Vycichl (1934, 43; 1936, 109; 1939, 141), followed by Zaborski (1971, #227) and Belova (1993, 43, #216, 45, #267), considered the initial *h-* to be a root complement, deriving Ar. *ḥazama* from a biconsonantal **√zm* > Ar. *zamma* I “1. lier, serrer etc.” [BK I 1008] = “binden, schnüren” [Vcl.] and *ʔazama* I “1. s’attacher à qqn. et en être inséparable” [BK I 30] = “привязываться” [Blv.] etc. For further etymologies of Hbr. *mēzah* cf. GB 411. Recently, D. Testen (kind p.c., 28 February 1998) postulates that Hbr. *mēzah* goes back to **mizḥ-* or **mizḥ-*, i.e., that the **m* was an original radical of the triconsonantal root rather than an affix in it. This makes it hard to relate it to Akk. *mēzah* (the instrumental noun to the verb *ezēḥu*, cf. below). In addition, Testen found it difficult to separate the Hbr. word from Ar. *miḥ-* (pl. *ʔamsāḥ-*, *musūḥ-*) “2. feutre épais que l’on met sous la selle et immédiatement sur le dos d’une bête de somme” [BK II 1103] = “a garment of thick, or coarse, hair-cloth, a piece of such stuff as is spread in a house or tent, an old and worn-out garment” [Lane 2714] = “hair shirt” [Testen], which he suspects to result from devoicing of **-z-* by a following *-ḥ*. If this is correct, so ponders Testen, either the Akk. form (with *-ḥ-*) or the Ar. form (with *-ḥ-*) is a loanword from NWSem. If not, then both. It seemed best for Testen to reconstruct an early NWSem. **mizḥ-*, which might well be a loan, possibly from Eg. *mdh*. This might well be in principle true if the OK-MK term is unrelated to Dem. *mdh* and its Cpt. counterpart (reflecting a different vocalism). R. M. Voigt (p.c., 22 July 2007) still maintains that “*die Verknüpfung von hebräisch mēzah mit dem akkadischen Wort der Wurzel ezēḥu ist evident*”. Militarev (MM 1983, 177, fn. 4) erroneously combined the Akk.-Hbr. parallel also with Akk. (NAss.) *mazāʔu* (*mezāʔu*) “ein Ledergegenstand” [AHW 637] = “a leather object” [CAD m2, 438], which seems rather unconvincing both phonologically and semantically. Besides, the Hbr. term (in its 2nd mng.) has been combined by Landberg (quoted in GB) with Dathina *māsiḥ* “palissade de branche” [GD 2694] = “Damm” [GB 411].

nb6: As noted in AHW 269 & 650 and CAD l.c., Akk. *mēzah-* (treated in GB 411 mistakenly as a “*Fremdwort*”) derives (via prefix **ma-*) from O/LBab. *√jzḥ*: *ezēḥu* “gürten” [AHW 269] = “to gird” [CAD e 426]. Thus, the LBab. noun goes back to **ma-jzāḥ-*, i.e., a *nomen instr.* of the *ma-pras-* pattern. As rightly suggested already by Lambdin (1953, 152), one has to point to the substantially different vocalization

of Hbr. *mēzah* < **mizh-* (?) vs. Akk. *mēzahū* < **ma-jzah-* vs. Eg. **mādh* < **magh-*/**maḥ-* (or sim.?) [GT]. Similarly, J. F. Quack (2005, 314): “*im Vergleich mit akk. mēzeḥu*”, in Hbr. “**mēziḥ ist die Vokalstruktur verändert*”, which also speaks against an Eg. > Hbr. borrowing. Naturally, all these facts certainly exclude that (1) the source of the Akk. term was the poorly documented OT Hbr. *mēzah* (if there was any connection at all, it may have only been not *vice versa*, i.e., an Akk. > Hbr. borrowing), and (2) that – as Vycichl (1983, 133) rightly emphasized – the false Akk.-Hbr. parallel cannot be cognate to Eg. *mdh* as the only regular correspondence is the initial *m* (Eg. *ḥ* ≠ Sem./Akk. **ḥ*). Note that Staehelin (1966, 26 & fn. 3) mistakenly surmised in the Akk. term a borrowing from Eg.

NB7: If there was any connection, the only question can be: who borrowed from whom? LEg. **mdh* or **mdh* could indeed have been borrowed from L Bab. *mēzahū*. But OEg. *mdh* cannot have come either from a L Bab. or Can./OT source. L Bab. *mēzahū* cannot be a Can. or Eg. loan either as it originates from the Akk. root *ṣzh*. In theory, Hbr. *mēzah* could have been borrowed from Akk. *mēzahū*, but not from Eg. **mādh*. A cognacy between Akk. *mēzahū* vs. Eg. *mdh* is excluded. Besides, P Sem. **-ḥ* ~ OEg. *-ḥ* is impossible (though, in principle, a change **-dh* > *-ḥ* under the influence of *-d-* should not be ruled out). It would be just as well baseless to suppose in OEg. *mdh* a very early loan-word from a Sem. word akin to Hbr. *mēzah*, since the data at hand are insufficient to set up a P Sem. reconstruction. All in all, the coincidence of the Eg., Akk., Hbr. forms is probably misleading that no safe comparison can be based on.

- 2. H. Abel (1933–34, 304) and E. Zyhlarz (1934–35, 175) found an areal parallel of Eg. *mdh* in Nub.: Kunuzi *amāḏi* “Gürtel”, *amaḏē* “sich gürten”.
- 3. C. T. Hodge (1966, 45, #34) identified Eg. *mdh* with WCh.: Hausa *máacè* “to firmly wind on (turban)” [Abr. 1962, 668]. Semantically good, phonologically problematic (PAA **-ḥ-* vs. Hausa zero is problematic). According to Stolbova (1987, 89, t. 2.7), WCh. **-ḥ-* yielded Hausa *-g-*. For the Hausa root cf. rather Eg. *md.t* “hobble for cattle” (Grd. 1927, 508–9, discussed above).
- 4. H. Goedicke (1967 KDAR, 69), in turn, supposed in Eg. *mdh* an *m-* prefix derivative of Eg. *dh(3)* signifying “eine spezielle Art von Personen” and also “Männer, die eng mit dem Königshof verbunden sind”, whereby Goedicke deduced that “*diese Männer sind jung*” and that the underlying basic sense was perhaps “Jungmann”. Even less convincing is his idea that Eg. *wdh* “ein Kind entwöhnen” (Wb I 409, 14) is “*vermutlich*” also related. Naturally, as Goedicke rightly noted, “*ein Zusammenhang mit dem Ortsnamen z3-dhw (Junker: Giza III 181) ist unsicher*”. Neither of Goedicke’s etymologies can be accepted, since even if we *a priori* assume Eg. *mdh* to be a *nomen instr.*, one might expect a quite different primary sense of its verbal root.
- 5. W. Vycichl (1983 DELC, 133) suggests that Eg. *mdh* is eventually equivalent with Hbr. *mēšah* “Stirn” (cf. **mišhā*, st.cstr. *mišhat-* “Beinschiene, gleichs. die Stirn des Beines”) [GB 453] = “brow” [KB

623]. Attractive, but uncertain, as the etymology of the Hbr. term is highly disputed.

NB: The lexicographers surveyed in GB 453 left it without comment. W. Leslau (1945, 242) combined the Hbr. word for “forehead” with MSA: Jbl. (Shahri) *fizḥait* “forehead” [Lsl.] (which has been, surprisingly, ignored in KB), while Guillaume (quoted in KB 623) explained it from Ar. *wḏḥ* “to be bright”.

- **6.** A. Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 177, fn. 4) extended the comparison of Eg. *mḏḥ* vs. Akk. *mēzaḥu* to LECu.: Somali *máyḏáḥ* “inner bark of trees used for rope-making” < *mḏḥ*-in-ayya “1. to strip off (the leaves), 2. undress, 3. (thief) despoil s’one” [Abr. 1964, 177, 182] = *múḏaḥ*- “abhäuten, abbalgen” [Rn. 1902, 287]. The Eg.-Somali equation could be phonologically correct, but semantically it is clearly untenable. The suggested Akk.-Somali etymology evidently is out of question.

NB: A. B. Dolgopol’skij (1973, 307) derived the Som. root from his PCu.-Om. **mAcA[h]*- “рвать, резать” (based in fact on a Som.-Kaffa comparison), for which cf. rather Eg. *mḏḥ* “(Holz) behauen, (Schiffe) zimmern” (Lit. MK, Wb, above).

- **7.** Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 193, #1764) regarded its -ḥ as a root extension and combined it with Ar. *mḏḏ* “to wrap up the head”, Eg. *mḏ.wt* “bonds”, *mḏ3.t* “papyrus roll” (!), and Cu. **maḏ-* (**-dl-*) “to roll, twist?”. Incorrect.

NB: Naturally, Eg. *mḏ3.t* (from **m-gl.t* ~ Sem. **gll* > Hbr. *məgillā* < AA **g-l*, above) is unrelated.

- **8.** GT: noteworthy is the striking parallelism between Eg. *mḏḥ* “to hew” ~ Sem. **mḥ/ḥṣ* “to hit” (cf. above) and Eg. *mḏḥ* “(orig.) to bind, tie around (?)” ~ Sem. **mḥ/ḥṣ* “to weave”, the ultimate origin of both Sem. roots being supposed to be the same.

NB1: The latter Sem. root is attested in Akk. *maḥāṣu* [irreg. -ḥ- < **-ḥ-?*] “2. weben” [AHW 580] = “to weave” [CAD m1, 78] > *māḥiṣu* “(taking part in the weaving process together with *kāmidu*)” [Held 1959, 175–6] || Ug. *mḥṣ* “weaver (lit. one who beats)” [Held l.c.; DUL 541], PBHbr. (< Aram.) *mḥ?* “to interlace, weave”, *itpeal* “to be interwoven, fastened” [Jastrow 1950, 760], Aram. **mḥ?* “to weave” (via **mḥ^ᶜ*) [GT] > Jaram. *məḥā?* “weben” [Dalman 1922, 230] = *məḥā?* “3. spinnen, weben”, hence *məḥītā* “Gewebe” [Levy 1924 III, 68, 74], Samar. Aram. *mḥy* “weaving”, *qal* “to weave” [Tal 2000, 461], JPAr. *mḥy* “to weave” [Sokoloff 1990, 300], Syr. *məḥā* “to weave” [Lsl.] || Sqt. *məḥād* [-ḥ- poss. < both **-ḥ-/*-ḥ-*] “tisser” [Lsl. 1938, 240] = *məḥād* “to weave” [Lsl. 1944, 56] || ES: Harari *māḥatā* “to weave” [Lsl.], Tigre *māmḥəṣ* “loom” [LH 1963, 106] (Sem.: Landsberger 1912, 130, §2; Zimmern 1917, 27; Lsl. 1938, 240; 1944, 56; 1982, 52; Held 1959, 175–6).

NB2: That the root is attested also in Akk. *maḥāṣu* “weben” [AHW 580] || MSA: Sqt. *məḥād* “tisser” [Lsl. 1938, 240] proves that Common Aram. *mḥ?* “to weave” is due to a dissimilation of an earlier **mḥ^ᶜ* and can only derive from Sem. **mḥḏ/ṣ* (Aram. ^ᶜ < old **q* being a regular reflex of Sem. **ḏ/ṣ*).

NB3: Traditionally (Landsberger 1912, 130, §2; Lsl. 1944, 56; Held 1959, 175–6; AHW 580), the basic sense of this Sem. root has been explained from that of the homophonous root meaning “to hit” (e.g., J. Levy l.c.: “*eig. wohl: die Fäden übereinander schlagen oder mit dem Webeschiffchen anschlagen*”, L. Kogan, p.c. on 26 Dec. 2006: it “*must be somehow connected with the basic meaning ‘to strike’ even if the semantic shifts implied are not yet*

properly understood). Although Sqt. -h- does not decide the question of the PSem. C₂ (as Sqt. -h- < *-h- is also possible, cf. SED I lxix), the supposed semantic history (“to weave” < “to hit”) suggests that all reflexes are ultimately to be derived from Sem. *mḥd/š “to hit, shoot” [Lsl.].

- **9.** GT: alternatively, we might derive it from an AA *m-ç/ĉ/ĉ-h reflected by (possibly without trace of the C₃) HECu.: Sid. miṭ-e (f) “belt, girdle, especially used by children” [Gsp. 1983, 235].
NB: The etymology of CCh.: Mafa mózok^w “ceinture de fibre rouge à laquelle sont suspendus d’autres fibres, cache-sexe en fibre rouge” [Brt.-Bléis 1990, 236] is fully obscure. At any rate, there seems to be no correspondence between Mafa -z- and Sid. -ṭ-, let alone the anomaly of Mafa -k^w vs. Eg. -h.
- **10.** GT: if, in turn, we assume an AA etymon *m-g-ḥ, cp. WCh.: PAngas *muk ~/> *m^wak [AS *-k# < AA *-g reg.] “to gird up loin-cloth” [GT 2004, 254]: Angas yem mwak “a grass used as dress by women instead of leaves” (cf. AS *yim “leaf, grass”) [Flk. 1915, 249] = muk ḥwin “to gird up loins” (ḥwin “loins, waist”) [ALC 1978, 40].
- Other suggestions are evidently out of question:
- **11.** L. Homburger’s (1930, 303) comparison to Ful lasal, pl. lase (sic) is absurd.
- **12.** A. M. Lam’s (1993, 403): ~ Ful moṣ- “couvrir”.

mdh.t (GW, written also **mddh.t**) “(in einer Liste von Geräten)” (late NK, Wb): cf. **mdh.t** (infra).

mdh.tj “Salböl” (LP, Wb II 191, 8) = “une sorte d’onguent (analogue au md.t)” (GR, Chassinat 1930, 141) > Dem. mth “Salböl” (DG 193) = mthj “juniper oil” (in Dem. Pap. Ashmolean D.4 [1968.4], l. 16, Reymond 1973, 73) = mth ~ mdh ~ mdḥe ~ mdḥ3.t “(nicht als Ölbezeichnung belegt)” (Koura 1999, 189).

NB1: F. R. Herbin (1994, 117, 423) assumes **mdh.tj**, **mnnn**, and **mrḥ.t** to denote the same material.

NB2: Cf. also **mḥd.t** “huile” (AL 77.1836). Met. < ***mdh.t**?

NB3: For the rendering of Dem. mth in Pap. Wien (KHM) 3877, 1:2 see Thissen 1992, 19.

- Mng. and etymology obscure.
- **1.** D. Meeks (AL 77.1836) explained it from an OK name of oil read as **mḥd.t** (early Dyn. III & Dyn. V, cf. Altenmüller & Moussa 1977, 107, no. 21), which “*pourrait être la forme ancienne de mdḥtj*”. B. Koura (1999, 189), however, thinks that there is “*kein Beweis für die Behauptung Meeks*”. Elsewhere, in the same work, Koura (1999, 125) labelled Meeks’ idea only as “*nicht zweifelsfrei*”.
NB: The rendering of the OK term for oil is debated. H. Balcz (1934, 77) assumed it to be “*vielleicht... mit dem späteren md.t identisch*” (approved also by H. Altenmüller, quoted by Koura 1999, 124–5), which is certainly out of question (due to -h-).

P. Kaplony (IÄF I 308), in turn, read it *mḥ-jb-d.t* “Öl, welches das Herz der Götter (?) füllt”, which is hardly more than pure speculation. B. Koura (1998, 71) assumed in *mḥ.d.t* a compound of *mḥ* “füllen” + *d.t* “Leib” < (sic!) *md.t* (q.v.): “zusammen mit dem Wort *mḥ* für “füllen” ergibt sich ein sinnvoller Kontext, so daß *md.t* zu (*mḥ*)-*m-dt* ergänzt werden kann in der Bedeutung ‘das Füllen mit dem, was sich in dem Körper befand’”. Difficult to follow.

- 2. On the other hand, in the light of Eg. *mdḥ-mrw* “Gefäßaufschrift: aus dem Behauen des *mrw*-Holzes gewonnene Öl” (Dyn. 0–III) and *mdḥ* “die Ölverarbeitung (im Goldhaus)” (early Dynastic), B. Koura (1999, 255) wondered – with right hesitation (“*kann nicht festgestellt werden*”) – whether LP *mdḥ.tj* derived directly from Eg. *mdḥ* “Holz behauen” or from a *nisba* (!) of the *Berufsbezeichnung* *mdḥ.w* “Zimmermann, Meister”, which would, however, require a more profound demonstration.

mdq (GW) “ein Gefäß für Bier und Honig” (late NK: 4x, Wb II 191, 9–10, exx. apud Hoch) ~ **mdq.t** (GW) “ein Gefäß für Bier und Öl” (late NK: 7x, Wb II 191, 11–12, exx. apud Hoch) ~ **mndq.t** (GW) “Nebenform zu dem (auch daneben vorkommenden) häufigeren *mdk.t*” (late NK: RAD 34:13, Pap. Anastasi IV 12:11 & V 4:1, Wb II 94, 3) = “Flasche (besonders für Bier)” (Müller 1899, 106) = “Ölkrug” (Lange 1925, 130) = “flask” (Caminos 1954 LEM, 194; DLE I 224) = “(seems to have been) a large and quite common container of roughly 50 *hin*, usually for beer (the same as the *mḥ-jar*, probably there was a difference only in shape)” (Janssen 1975, 347–8; 1961, 88 pace Černý 1954, 908, fn. 20) = “large stone jar” (Ward 1985, 333, §7 quoted also in WD III 58) = “flask, pouring vessel” (SCR 1992, 17, 18, 41, 80 index, 82) = “large vessel (often contained beer, but also honey and cream or curds)” (Hoch 1994, 131–2, 180) = “a common LEg. term for a pottery vessel” (Ward 1996, 28).

nb1: Syllabic spelling: *ma-(n)-ṣ-(e)-q-ti* (Müller 1899, 106 after Bondi) = *ma-an-d-q-ta* (Alb.) = *ma-š-q-tá* (Helck 1971, 515, #135) = *ma-dq-tá* ~ *ma-n-dq-tá* (Ward 1985, 333, §7) = *ma-ša-q-tá* ~ *ma-ša-qa-tá* (“or just a partly syllabic spelling”: *ma-ṣ-q-tá?*) ~ *ma-n-ša-q-tá* (SCR 1992, 17, §1.2.2.1 & 18, §1.2.3 & 41, §2.2.1 & 80 & 82) = *ma-d-q-ta* ~ *ma-d-q* ~ *ma-n-d-q-ta* (Hoch 1994, 131, 180). Vocalized as **mašiqta*, i.e., **maddiqta* (Alb.) = **maysiqta* > **maššiqta* > **mašsaqta* (SCR 1992, 17, §1.2.2.1) = **mansiqta* ~ **māšiqta* (Hoch 1994, 131, #171 & 180, #243). Read by S. Birch (1868, 9) falsely as *mḥqt* (syll. *mḥqata*) due to a confusion of hieratic *d* vs. *f*.

nb2: Reflected also by Amarna Akk. (hapax) *maziqda* (or better *ma-ši-iq-tá*, i.e., *mašiqta*) “steinernes Gefäß, mit Öl gefüllt” [KMAV] = “(an alabastron, foreign word)” [CAD m1, 438] = “(Eg. name for) kukkubu-container filled with perfumed oil” [Ward] (only in EA 14, 3:40 in the list of gifts from Ekhnaton to Burnaburiash of Babylon). For Eg.-Akk. cf. Müller 1899, 106; KMAV 12; Burchardt 1910 II, no. 522; Lange 1925, 130; Caminos 1954 LEM, 194; Helck 1971, 515, #135; Ward 1996, 28.

NB3: Following W. Erichsen, G. Vittmann (1996, 440) treats Dem. *mdg* “ein Gefäß (in der Liste der Mitgift)” (DG 195:7) = “a vessel (which regularly appears in lists of bridal possessions)” (Smith) as a reflex of NK *mdq*, although Smith (1978, 362) was disposed to combine this rather with Cpt. (S) *μακκε, μιχεκε, μιχδε* “a woman’s garment” (CD 213a) = “ein Kleidungsstück (für Frauen)” (KHW 113) = “(in a list of women’s garments and possessions)” (Smith) that J. Osing (NBÄ 633, n. 655) and W. Westendorf (KHW 523) derived from (S) *χω(ω)δε* “färben”.

- Etymology uncertain. Usually regarded to be borrowing from a Can. word ultimately stemming from Can. **yšk* “to pour out” [Ward] < Sem. **wšk* (?) [Lambdin] (**w-* seems here ill-founded), cf. Hbr. **mūšāqā* “1. Guß, 2. Gießgefäß” & *mūšāq* “Metallguß, als Bezeichnung der Auflösung und des Schmelzens” [GB 407] = **mūšāqā* & *mūšāq* “1. cast metal” [KB 559]. W. F. Albright (VESO l.c. infra), in turn, saw in the rare Eg. var. *mnḏq.t* a Can. **maqtilatu* form of a disused Sem. **nšk* eventually related to Ug. *yšq* G “1. to pour (out), serve, 2. smelt, cast” [DUL 987], Hbr. *yšq qal* “1. ausgießen (Wasser), 2. (intr.) sich ergießen, 3. Metallarbeiten gießen” [GB 312] and *šwq qal* “gießen” [GB 678]. Albright’s theory has been approved by J. Hoch (1994, 132) but objected by D. Sivan & Z. Cochavi-Rainey (1992 l.c. infra). In addition, as rightly pointed out by W. A. Ward (1996, 28, #171), the “*Sem. cognates have to do with casting metal*”. This made Ward regard the usual derivation of our word from Sem. as improbable and assume that “*this is rather a native Eg. term appearing in a list*” that “*has many similar statements where the Eg. term is given*”. GT: although a connection to Hbr. *yšq* indeed poses semantical problems, a native Eg. origin is, however, more than unlikely, the sequence **ḏq* being incompatible in Eg. roots (for the true Eg. reflex of Sem. **šk* < AA **c-k* cf. EDE I 327).

Lrr. for Eg.-Sem.: Müller 1899, 107; Alb. 1934 VESO 44–45, §viii.9; Lambdin 1953, 367, §20; Janssen 1961, 88; Helck 1971, 515, #135; Sivan & Cochavi-Rainey 1992, 17, §1.2.2.1 & 18, §1.2.3; Hoch 1994, 131–2, #171 & 180, #243; Vittmann 1996, 440.

NB: Mesnil (quoted by Janssen l.c.) erroneously supposed a compound of Eg. *mn* “vase” + **ḏq* ~ Hbr. *yšq* “to pour”.

- (*) **mdd** phon. value of the hrgl. depicting an object whose rendering is “(doubtful)” (Grd. ED 1927, 527, Aa23) = “*Presse*” (Sethe 1892, 54) = “un pressoir (représente deux mâts et un ligne tordu, maintenu entre eux, et représenté schématiquement par les lignes horizontales)” (Moret 1907, 78–79) = “tronçon de barricade formé de deux éléments verticaux réunis par une traverse” (Montet 1946, 180) = “two forking posts about which a cord is stretched” (Badawy 1956–57, 55) = “a warp stretched between two uprights (a weaving term, implies sg.

held tight and straight with a measure of force)” (Grd. 1957, 520, Aa23 quoted in PL 485) = “(sa forme plus classique:) corde tendue entre deux piquets” (Grd. 1957 as quoted by Baud l.c. infra) = “(was es darstellt, ist unklar) vielleicht eine Kelter oder ein Teil von ihr (was hinsichtlich der Grundbedeutung des Wortes – ‘pressen’ – wohl nicht unglaublich ist)” (Peterson 1963, 84–86) = “presse (dont la forme particulière est expliqué par son ancienneté)” (Baud 1998, 19) = “zwei durch eine Schnur verbundene Stützen (Weinpresse?)” (GHWb MbEd 1383). Attested also as an artificial word in the Sign Pap. of Tanis (26): mdd (wood det.) “als Name des Schriftzeichens” (LP, Wb II 191, 13, cf. Peterson 1963, 85, fn. 3).

NB1: The sign was read by P. Lacau (1954, 79) as mdr, which was first suggested by K. Sethe (1892, 55–56) for the verbal root mdd (below) assuming an erosion of original mdr into md, which would have been extended by an additional third root consonant -d in the MK (on the analogy of the alleged derivation of Eg. šʿj > šʿd “to cut”). For the problem cf. the following lexicon entry.

NB2: A. Badawy (l.c.) explained the hrgl. from the verbal root mdd (below), cf. mdd nb3.t rendered by him as “an action of setting the posts in a line, using the stretched cord”.

NB3: Although the hrgl. mdd “dem šzm-Zeichen sehr ähnlich ist (vgl. Šzm.w, der Gott der Wein- und Ölpressen, dessen Wortzeichen zeigt eine Kelter)” (Peterson 1963, 85) that depicts “la presse à sac (un ligne tendu entre deux piquets que l’on tord pour presser le raisin)” and thus šzm was often confused with mdd from the 1st IMP (Baud 1998, 24). However, M. Baud (1998, 19, fn. 22) warns that “... il n’y a pas lieu de confondre avec le signe mdd, du moins avant le Moyen Empire” (cf. also Moret 1907, 78) with respect to “l’emploi de mdd pour le rassemblement des os du roi au Pyr. 530a, alors que c’est jʿb qui est généralement employé”.

- P. Wilson (PL 485–6) explained it from the primary signification of the Eg. verbal root mdd that she conceived as “to be (held) straight, strong”. In her view, the hrgl. Aa23 used for writing this root was “referring to the fact that in the determinative the warp-(thread) is held tightly and stright”. GT: since Eg. mdd can originate (i.a.) in an earlier *mgd, the coincidence with Sem.: PBHbr. māgōd “Ausbreiter (Holzstange?)” [Dalman 1922, 223] = “ein Gegenstand, worüber etwas gezogen, ausgedehnt wird, wie z.B. ein Pfahl, auf welchem die Wäsche behufs Trocknens ausgebreitet wird” [Levy 1924 III, 12] = “a frame to spread clothes on” [Jastrow 1950, 726] seems noteworthy, although its verbal root (√ngd) is apparently incompatible with the initial m- of Eg. mdd. NB: Cf. JAram. nōgad “1. to stretch, draw, pull, spread, 2. lash, 3. guide, rule, 4. grow long, be drawn, follow after” [Jastrow 1950, 871] (which has a different signification in PBHbr.). Nevertheless, an ultimate connection of Can. *ngd and the Eg. verbal root mdd cannot be ruled out (discussed below) and thus all these forms might be eventually related.

mdd “Verbum unklarer Grundbedeutung: 1. treffen, treffsicher zielen (mit einer Waffe, Pfeil, Speer tödlich ‘treffen’, Flamme das Böse), 2. pressen, drücken (hart auf)” (OK, Wb II 191–2; AWb I 582–3;

II 1173) = “(zusammen)pressen” (Sethe 1899 I, §361) = “(sense primitif:) press(ur)er” (Moret, JA 1912, 103; RT 29, 1907, 78–79 & n. 88) = “to press (here possibly of crushing the horse against the side of a mountain; a less probable rendering would be: to press forward, urge on)” (Pap. Anastasi I 24:4, Grd. 1911, 26*, fn. 12) = “to press (denoting the intrusive pressure on the brain from an injury)” (Med.: Pap. E. Smith 4:16, Breasted 1930, 212) = “to hit (a mark)” (Grd. 1927, 527: Aa23) = “(fundamental mng.): to press hard, violently (can be used with or without object)”, hence GR Edfu uses: “1. to press hard on, i.e., thrust violently (with harpoon at), 2. (cast one’s harpoon at foes amain in order to) press (one’s enemies) hard, 3. cast amain, 4. batter (one’s head), 5. (of cubits) attain (lit. be pressed to) perfection, 6. amount to (lit. be pressed towards), 7. resemble (amount) s’one” (Blackman & Fairman 1943, 19–20, #3) = “(Grundbedeutung in einem handwerklichen Terminus) verzahnen, ein Ding in ein anderes einpassen, einfügen” > “1. pressen, 2. treffen (d.h. eindringen eines Geschoßes), 4. einklingen (mit einem Wunsch)” (Otto 1954 ÄMÖR II 61, 66) = “(sens primitif) adhérer” (Žaba 1956, 165) = “1. to meet an aim (arrow, spear)” (Badawy 1956–57, 55) = “to press (hard) on, strike” (FD 124) = “(Grundbedeutung) pressen (hart), schlagen” (Peterson 1963, 84) = “verzahnen (von Aktion und Reaktion)” (Kaplony, LÄ I 1059, n. 17) = “zusammenstoßen, treffen” (Wst. 1973, 139) = “ankleben (?)” (CT II 30c, Zandee 1974, 67) = “presser, adhérer, coïncider” (AL 77.1967, 78.1952) = “to puncture, penetrate” (PT, Allen 1984, 557) = “adhérer, attachment, atteinte” (Posener 1987, 30, n. 4 quoted by Fischer-Elfert 1999, 143) = “betreten” (Moftah 1987, 130) = “einpassen, verfugen (Terminus der Tischlerei)” (Assmann 1990, 61 & n. 9) = “1. pressen, drücken (hart auf), 2. treffen (mit einer Waffe, Flamme das Böse), treffsicher zielen” (GHWb 383) = “(originally) a weaving term implying sg. held tight and straight with a measure of force” > “1. to press hard, violently, 2. also: thrust violently (with harpoon), 4. be like, resemble, follow an example” (PL 485–6 pace Faulkner 1937, 169; Fairman & Blackman 1943, 19–20, n. 3) = “(sens premier:) toucher (à un endroit clé), atteindre (précisément), ficher (au bon endroit), imprimer, adhérer” > “1. frapper, toucher, presser, écraser, broyer, 2. toucher au but, atteindre le point névralgique, pénétrer (cf. PT spell 260, CT VI 188d–189a)” (Baud 1998, 19–20, 22) = “einfügen, gefügig machen” (Fischer-Elfert 1999, 465 index & p. 143 with lit. of the mng. of \sqrt{mdd}) = “1. to press, persist, hit with (m), strike, be pressed, 2. be pressed” (DCT 195) = “richtig

sein, genau sein (oder ähnliche Bedeutung)” (FÄW 207 pace Baud 1998, 23: mçt, sic with -t!).

- The verbal root *mdd* occurs also in the following expressions:

(1) *mdd* nb3.t: “3. vom Einschlagen des Pfahles bei der Tempelgründung” (Wb) = “3. action of setting the posts in a line, using the stretched cord” (Badawy) = “3. einschlagen (des Pfahles)” (GHWb).

(2) *mdd*-r: “den Mund... (als Teil der Mundöffnungszeremonie)” (Wb) = “5. Einfügen, Einschneiden der Öffnung zwischen den Lippen als symbolische Nachahmung einer solchen handwerklichen Verrichtung (viel sinnvoller als ein ‘Pressen’)” (Otto: ÄMÖR) = “(the exact sense as applied to the mouth is uncertain, but perhaps refers to the articulation of the jawbones, a common place of Opening of the Mouth)” (Grd. 1957, 49, fn. 9) = “presser, appuyer fortement, insérer, placer une chose dans la bouche (initialement accompli avec la main, et consistait à introduire le petit doigt dans la bouche du défunt)” (Baud 1998, 19, 22) = “4. Berühren des Mundes (im Mundöffnungsritual)” (GHWb) = “to adjust (!) the mouth” (WD II 70 pace Grd.) = “berühren des Mundes (im Mundöffnungsritual)” (ÄWb I).

(3) *stj* (or *wdj*) *r mdd* (NK sporting texts): “der treffsicher schießt (eigtl. der schießt um zu treffen, als Beiwort des Königs)” (Wb II 191, 17; Edel SAK 7, 1979, 23–28) = “to shoot at the target” (Helck quoted and rejected in PL) = “3. to throw (harpoon) or shoot (arrow) straight or strong” (PL) = “tirer pour frapper (la cible), plus exactement: tirer pour faire mouche (sur)” (Baud 1998, 19 pace AL 78.1952, 79.1443).

NB: E. Edel (1979, 23) firmly denied the rendering of *mdd* as a noun “Zielscheibe”.

(4) *mdd* w3.t or *mdd* mṯn: “4. Befehl, Weg jemds. befolgen, gehorchen” (Wb, ÄWb) = “den Weg jemandes drücken (d.h. folgen, vgl. *vestigia alicuius premere*)” (Sethe 1892, 54) = “2. adhere to a path” (Grd.) = “3. einen Weg folgen, befolgen eines Weges” (Otto: ÄMÖR) = “2. (abstract) follow, obey order, way” (Badawy) = “to obey the will of s’one, follow the way of someone” (PT 2048 & Urk. IV 484:5, Faulkner 1969 AEPT, 293–4, utterance 683, n. 2; FD 124) = “6. gehorchen, befolgen Befehl, 7. loyal, ergeben sein” (GHWb) = “3. suivre, adhérer à, s’ajuster à, se conformer à, se contenir dans (à partir de la XI^e dyn., particulièrement dans les expressions du répertoire autobiographiques qualifiant la fidélité au roi)” (Baud 1998, 20). Cf. also *mdd* ṯb.w “die Fußsohle folgen” (ZÄS 111, 1984, 136; WD I 100).

NB1: From the instances written as *mdd*, *m^cd*, *md*, H. Brugsch (1868, 23) erroneously set up an *Unwurzel* **md* (rendered as “offnen, aufmachen”). Whether the original root is to be read in feat as **mḍr* had been long debated. K. Sethe (1892, 55–56)

listed two alleged exx. of MK *mdd* w3.t n.t (or *mṯn*) written with final -r, whereby he reconstructed the primary verbal root as *mṯr* (!) assuming that the final consonant of the original *mṯr* was lost and the biconsonantal **mṯ* was then enlarged by an additional third root consonant -d in the MK (false, since -d is already attested in the OK) on the analogy of the alleged derivation of Eg. š^cj > š^cd “to cut” (cf. also Sethe 1899 I, §361). W. M. Müller (1909, 190) too surmised (falsely) an original (**)mṯr* (*mṯr*) “to press” and a secondary derivative *mṯd* (*mṯd*), but he declined Sethe’s “*desperate explanation*” outlined above. Instead, Müller found it easier to assume an original (**)mṯr* and -d as a result of dissimilation of -ḏ- (for which he erroneously cited Eg. pšš ~ pšš, which are in fact two distinct roots), i.e., that the primary root was actually reduplicated into **mṯ[r]d[r]* < **mṯ[r]ḏ[r]*, which is baseless. Even recently, G. R. Castellino (1984, 12) maintains the change -r > -d in Eg. *mṯr* > later *mṯd*, which is a mistake since the consonants of the root have long been safely identified. The right doubt as to the rdg. **mṯr* has already been expressed by Moret 1907, 78, fn. 1 (“*la lecture māzer [sic] ... ne me semble pas solidement établie*”). Note that OK *mṯr* (written without the logogram Aa23) “(den Weg) jemandes drücken” (PT 1022d, ÜKAPT VI 136) = “pressen, drücken” (PT 1022d, AWb I 580) is to be treated as an etymologically distinct root (above).

NB2: A. Badawy (1956–57, 55) explained basic sense of the verbal root in accordance with the “word-sign” of Eg. *mdd* (Aa23) showing “two forking posts about which a cord is stretched”. P. Wilson (PL 486) too tried to understand the original sense of the verbal root (given by her as “to be (held) straight, strong”) in the light of the hrgl. Aa23 used for writing this root conceived by her as “a warp stretched between two uprights (a weaving term, implies sg. held tight and straight with a measure of force)”, which, in her view, was “*referring to the fact that in the determinative the warp-(thread) is held tightly and stright*”. Naturally, the object depicted by the hrgl. Aa23 may be presumably somehow connected with the basic notion carried by Eg. *ṽmdd*. Since, however, a common agreement has not yet been achieved as for the “decipherment” of the sign, it would be risky to build far-reaching theories on this.

NB3: The same (?) verbal root may occur also in the Eg. TN *pr-mdd* > Cpt. (SB) *ṽmṯn*, *ṽmṯḫ* “Oxyrhynchos”, whose lit. signification is uncertain. Perhaps “Haus des Bedrückers (?)” (KHW 478 page Helck)?

● Hence, i.a.:

(1) *r mdd.w n jḅ n* “gemäß dem Wunsche des...” (MK, Wb II 192, 12; GHWb 383).

(2) *mdd* (in: *mdd pw jr.t nb.t*) “Verzahnung (in: ‘das ist die Verzahnung alles Tuns’)” (Merikare 123, Otto, LÄ II 37) = “Ineinandergreifen (in: ‘das ist das Ineinandergreifen allen Tuns’)” (Otto 1954 AMÖR II 66).

(3) *mdd.t* “compress” (Med. hapax: Pap. E.Smith 5:4, Breasted 1930, 223; Wreszinski’s 1909, 179 rdg. is dubious).

(4) *mdd* (divine name, BD 17) “He who hits a mark” (Piankoff 1955, 58) = “oppressore” (Rachewiltz 1958, 29) = “smiter” (Allen 1960, 90, 95 contra Peterson 1963, 87, fn. 1: “*nicht so gut geeignet*”) = “(allem Anschein nach) ein Beiwort, Baineame des Šzm.w (der Gott der Wein- und Ölprese, ein Keltergott, dessen Wortzeichen zeigt eine Kelter), der auf seine Strafausübung in Eigenschaft als Auspresser anspielt (wenn die in Strafe Verfallenen zum zusammenpressen verwendet

wird): der Erpresser, Folterer, oder besser Auspresser” (Peterson 1963, 84 & fn. 5, also p. 85 & 87) = “(époque tardive) une épithète de Šzm.w, ‘le frappeur, écraseur, oppresseur’” (Baud 1998, 24).

NB: E. Amélineau’s (1910, 37) rendering of BD 17 mdd as “Mélangeur” (in comparison with Cpt. $\text{m}\ddot{\text{o}}\text{x}\tau$ “to mix”, for which cf. $\text{m}\ddot{\text{t}}\text{k}$ above) has been rightly rejected by K. Sethe (1892, 55f.).

- Basic sense disputed. One of the most difficult Eg. roots from the viewpoint of etymology.
- **1.** GT: in principle, Eg. mdd might stem from AA *m-ç-d that might be reconstructed as an ancient triconsonantal var. (extended with *-d) to AA *m-ç “1. to press out, 2. suck” [GT]. Probably F. Hommel (1883, 440, fn. 30) was the first to observe the connection between Eg. mdd (cited by him as “meṭ ‘pressen’”, sic) and Sem. *mšš (quoted as “maš”, sic). A remotely related triconsonantal match (with the same AA complement *-d) of Eg. mdd (with a more developed semantics) might be Ar. mašada “1. téter, sucer (p.ex. le sein de sa mère, se de l’enfant), 3. cohabiter avec une femme” [BK II 1115] = “to kiss and suck (her) breast in a certain manner, suck saliva from (her) mouth” [Lane 2718] = “to press, be oppressive” [Müller] = mašada “to suck the breast” [KB], which can only be explained from a basic sense “to press” (cf. also below). This Eg.-Ar. match has been observed already by W. M. Müller (1909, 190, fn. 1), although he viewed that the Ar. root “*coincides only accidentally*” with Eg. mdd (he did not disclose whether his reservation was of semantical nature). Cf. also Ar. mašata “1. presser la plaie pour en faire sortir le pus, 2. cohabiter avec une femme” [BK II 1114].

NB1: The authors of KB combined the Ar. verbal root $\sqrt{\text{m}\ddot{\text{s}}\text{d}}$ with Ar. mašd-/mašād- “mountain peak, place of refuge” [KB], but failed to semantically justify this connection.

NB2: AA *m-ç is attested by the diverse tricons. derivatives (extensions) of Sem. bicons. *mš “to suck, press out” [Zbr.] (for Sem. bicons. comparison: DM 1962, 277; Zbr. 1971, #148; Lsl. 1987, 370–1) as well as a number of further AA cognates that may be grouped as follows:

(1) Sem. *mšš- “succhiare” [Frz.] = *mšš “to suck” [GT]: Ug. mšš “saugen” [WUS] = mšš G part. “one who sucks, is suckled” [DUL 589], Hbr. mšš qal “saugen, schlürfen” [GB 454] = “to lap” [Zbr.], PBHbr. mšš “1. aus-, 2. einsaugen” & JAram. mašas “1. saugen, 2. ausdrücken” [Dalman 1922, 249] = “1. (aus)saugen, 2. (von leblosen Wesen) einziehen” [Levy 1924 III, 213] = “1. to press, suck, 2. drain” [Jastrow 1950, 827], Samar. Aram. mšš “sucking” [Tal 2000, 483] | Ar. mšš “1. humer, boire petit à petit en humant, 2. sucer” [BK II 1114] = “saugen, schlürfen” [WUS] = “to suck” [Zbr.], cf. also PBHbr. mišmēš “aussaugen” [Levy 1924 III, 211], JAram. mčmč “to suck (a breast), eat tiny pieces of meat off the bone, lick” [Sabar 2002, 211] || MSA *mšš “to suck” [GT after Lsl.] || Geez mašša “to suck(le)” [Lsl.] (Sem.: WUS #1643; Frz. 1971, 630, #7.14.b; Lsl. 1987, 370–1). It is to be remarked here that ES: Tigre a-mätäta “to squeeze a milk or honey skin” [LH 144 apud Lsl.], Amh. mäṭṭätä “succhiare” [Frz.] (in spite of Frz. 1971, 630, #7.14

and Lsl. 1982, 54 deriving these ES forms from Sem. *mšš ||| HECu.: Hdy. muṭ- “to suck” [Hds. 1989, 146: isolated in HECu.] ||| ECh.: Sarwa moḏā “sucer” [JI 1990 MS, 13, #248] (has the Hdy.-Sarwa isogloss preserved the original bicons. AA root?) may represent rather a distinct AA (var.?) root, namely *m-t “to suck” [GT] (variation of AA *-c ~ *-t?). Note that Sem. *š yields Tigre š ~ č (while Tigre ṭ < Sem. *ṭ), cf. SED I lxix. Of course, the isogloss (AA *m-t?) represented by Ar. matakā V “humer” [BK II 1058] (root ext. -k?) ||| ECh.: Kwang (Gaya) imte, (Alowa) yimte, (Mindera) ʔimte “sucer” (Kwang: Coates 1991 MS, 3) does not belong here. The same applies to Akk. ṽmzʔ and Ar. ṽmzz (contra Frz. l.c.).

(2) Sem. *-mšiy- “succhiare” [Frz.] = *mšw/y “to press out” [GT]: Akk. mašū “to suck, press out” [Zbr.] || Hbr. mšw qal “1. aussaugen, ausleeren, 2. die Nässe ausdrücken”, nifal “1. ausgeleert, 2. ausgepreßt werden” [GB 452] = “to press out” [Zbr.] = “to drain out” [Lsl.] = qal “1. to wring out (wet fleece), 2. slurp (from a cup)”, nifal “to be press out” [KB 621], PBHbr. mšw “auspressen” [Dalman 1922, 248], JAram. mašāʔ “1. auspressen, 2. saugen” [Dalman 1922, 248] = “Flüßigkeit ausdrücken, auspressen” [Dalman 1922, 209], JPArām. mšy “to wring out” [Sokoloff 1990, 325], Syr. mašā “to press out, suck out” [Zbr.] = “to suck, draw out” [Lsl.], Mnd. mša II “to press, suck out, suckle” [DM] | Ar. mšw II “bis auf den letzten Tropfen leeren” [GB] = “to press out” [Zbr.] = “to empty to the last drop” [Lsl. after Dozy] || Tigre mašäyā “succhiare” [Frz.] = mašaya “to suck, nurse” [Lsl. apud KB] (Sem.: Frz. 1971, 630, #7.14.a) ||| WCh.: Kir masiye “to squeeze” [Csp. 1994, 67] || ECh.: PDangla-Migama *miḏyV “1. to squeeze out, 2. to milk” [GT] > Bidiya miḏy “essorer, presser” [AJ 1989, 99], WDangla miḏyé “presser pour faire sortir liquide d’un filtre, d’une époude humide, traire” [Fédry 1971, 131], EDangla miḏyé “extraire (en pressant), presser, traire” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 203] = “melken” [Ebs. 1979, 128; 1987, 88], Migama miḏyó “presser, essorer (par ex. linge, sésames pour en faire sortir l’huile)” [JA 1992, 106], Birgit mēḏʔži [GT: -ʔž- reg. < *-d-] “essorer” [Jng. 1973 MS], (?) Mkl. ʔòndá [JI: < *mòḏá?] “sucer, lécher” [Jng. 1990, 154] (for this Mkl. root pattern cf. Takács 2002, 145f.) | Toram meḏye (f) “filter (for beer)” [AJ 1988, 25]. The Mokilko form has been identified with Hausa macàà (-ts-) “to squeeze” by H. Jungraithmayr & D. Ibrizimow (1994 I, 160).

(3) Sem./Can. *mw/yš “to press out” [GT]: Hbr. *mšy > *miš, st.cstr. miš “das Drücken, Pressen” [GB 420] = “the pressing out (of milk)” [Lsl.], PBHbr. miš “das Ausgedrückte, Ausgepreßte” [Levy 1924 III, 107], JAram. mwš “saugen” [GB] etc. ||| ECU. *mayḏ- “pressen” [Sasse 1981, 155] > LECu.: Orm. miḏḏa “oppression, repression”, miḏā “1. harsh, harmful, 2. oppressor”, miḏū “1. to injure, harm, hurt, 2. oppress, repress” [Bitima 2000, 196], Orm. (Borana, Orma, Waata) mič-a, mič-it-a “to squeeze, wash, press out” [Strm. 1987, 367; 1995, 209; 2001, 56], PBoni *mič- “to press, squeeze” [Heine 1982, 122, 147] = mič “auspressen” vs. mič “drücken” [Heine 1977, 285–6: borrowed “*vermutlich*” from Orma Orm.], Arb. mič- “to squeeze” [Hyw. 1984, 385] = “zerschmettern” [Lmb.] | HECu.: Darasa (Gedeo) mič- “to squeeze” [Hds.] = “zerquetschen, auspressen” [Lmb.] (ECu.: Hds. 1989, 142, 159) ||| NOM.: Haruro māz-āys- [GT: -ā- < *-aw/y(a)-?] “mungere”, māz-ā “latte di burro” [CR 1937, 655] ||| WCh.: Hausa máácà (-c- is usually transcribed as -ts-, but conceived as a reflex of AA *-c-) “1. to squeeze out (juice from the lime-fruit), extract (oil from the ground-nuts), 2. press together, 3. massage, eke out (food)”, macà “1. to pinch together, squeeze together, 2. hem in, pester worry, 3. pull tight (rope when binding the sheaf)” [Abr. 1962, 666, 668] = maša (sic, -š-) “ausdrücken, zerquetschen, auspressen” [Drexel 1925, 14] = macàà (-ts-) “to squeeze” [JI], Gwnd. máca ~ máca (-ts-) “to squeeze”, macà (-ts-) “to be tight”, macé- (followed by an obj. suffix) “to be tight” [Mts. 1972, 77] | PAngas-Sura *mʷoyos ~ *mʷeyes [Dlg. 1982: *-γ- reg. < AA *-w- too, GT pace Stl. 1996, 112, t. 22: AS *-s reg. < AA/Ch. *-c] “to press together (?)” [GT 2004, 259]: Angas mwes “to squeeze” [ALC 1978, 40] = mwes “to squeeze” [Krf.], Sura mōyōs “zwei Dinge, Gegenstände

zusammenbringen” [Jng. 1963, 75] | Bade-Ngizim *màḍú [GT: *-ā- < *-aw(a)-?] “to squeeze” [Schuh] > Bade màḍuwú “to squeeze” [Schuh], Ngizim màaḍú “to squeeze (out)”, màḍtú “to compress”, màḿḍú “to be crowded, hemmed in” [Schuh 1981, 108, 110] = maḍ- “to compress” [Skn.], Duwai màaḍó “to squeeze” [Schuh] (BN: Schuh 1977, 165). For the AA etymology see also Drexel 1925, 14 (who was the first to compare Hbr. mṣṣ and mṣṣ with the Hausa root).

NB3: F. Hommel (1883, 440, fn. 30) has already referred to the Eg.-Sem. parallel in a rather obscure form: Eg. meṭ “pressen” (sic) ~ Sem. maṣ (sic). This etymology was quoted also by L. Reinisch (1887, 263) who combined Eg. mḍd with Hbr. mṣw. W. M. Müller (1909, 190, fn. 1) too accepted the equation of Eg. mḍd and Hbr. mṣṣ but declined that of Eg. mḍd and Hbr. mṣw, Ar. mṣw, and Sem. *mṣṣ “to suck” (that – to quote him – “do not belong, although usually compared”). In addition, he regarded the coincidence of Eg. mḍd with Ar. mṣd “to press, be oppressive” (sic) as being due to pure chance, although it is by far the best match offered as yet for Eg. mḍd (perhaps beside Can. *ngd and WCh.: Ngizim màḍú below). Approaching the etymology of our Eg. root from a Chadic perspective, C. T. Hodge (1966, 45, #34) identified Eg. mḍd with WCh.: Hausa macii “being crowded”. Hodge treated Eg. -d as a root extension added to Eg. *mḍ-. Note that at the same time, Hodge (1966, 45) equated Hausa màáà “1. to squeeze out, 2. massage” with Eg. mḍ.t “Salbe” (above). N. Skinner (1996, 198–9) accepted Hodge’s comparison of Eg. mḍd with Hausa (and some further AA cognates).

NB4: C. Gouffé (1974, 368) combined the Hausa root with SBrb.: Hgr. ə-zmu “presser, compriemer pour exprimer un liquide” [Fcd.] (with met.), which was adopted by N. Skinner (1996, 198–9) adding further WCh., ECh., and ECu. parallels.

NB5: M. Lamberti (1993, 367) erroneously explained the Cu. reflexes (listed above) from a hypothetical OCu. *baḍ-/ *bīḍy-.

NB6: The etymology of ECh.: Lele mèṣṣigè “appuyer”, mèṣṣigè “pression” [WP 1982, 62] is not clear.

NB7: V. Orel & O. Stolbova (HSED 370, #1703) erroneously compared Hs. maaca (above) with NOm.: Kaffa mačč- “to cut” (derived from a baseless AA *maç- “to press, cut”).

NB8: AA *m-ç [GT] has been extended via root complement *-r in at least three branches of AA, cf. AA *m-ç-r “to press out, wring” [GT] > Sem. *mṣr: (?) Hbr. māšōr “Bedrängnis” [GB] = “distress, siege” [KB 623 with a different and more logical derivation from ṽšwr] | Ar. mašara I “1. traire une femelle avec le bout des doigts, 2. tirer tout ce qu’il y avait de lait dans les pis” [BK II 1115] = “auspressen” [GB] (Sem.: GB 453 pace Nöldeke, ZA 21, 381) ||| LECu.: Oromo mičira “to twist (tr.)” [Gragg 1982, 285] = miččir- “zerquetschen, auspressen” [Lmb.], Arb. miččir- “to wring, twist (tr.)” [Hyw. 1984, 385] | HECu.: Burji mičir- “to wring out” [Hds.], Sidamo muččūr- “to wring” [Hds.] (ECu.: Hds. 1989, 142, 159) ||| ECh.: EDng. mīḍyírè “saugen” [Ebs. 1987, 91]. M. Lamberti (1993, 367) mistakenly derived the Cu. forms from OCu. *baḍ-/ *bīḍy-.

- 2. GT: on the other hand, for semantic considerations, its derivation from AA *m-ç (assuming here too a root extension -d) and a connection to Sem. *mṭ? “to reach” [Dlg. 1992 MS, 38, #47] = *mṭ? (var. *mṭy?) “treffen” [GT] cannot be ruled out either.

NB1: Cf. esp. (i.a.) Oakk. mṣ? (?) “to reach, arrive” [Gelb 1973, 183] > Akk. mašū “genug sein, finden, erreichen” [Ebeling 1915, 1465] = “hingelangen, finden” [Ast. 1948, WUS] = mašū (Ass. mašā?u) “entsprechen, genügen, ausreichen”, G “1. (mala, nA ammar ~ mar) z.B. jmdm. an Wert entsprechen, (mala/ammār libbi- + suffix) Wünsche erreichen, 2. (ana) genügen, (eine Zahl oder Zeit) erreichen, 5. gleichwertig werden, 6. ki maši: wie entspricht es? wie viel?”, (OBab.) mišūm “Entsprechung” [AHW 621–2, 659] || Ug. mṣā “treffen” [WUS #1649] = “jemand. treffen” [Diet-

rich] = G “to meet, run into” [DUL], Phn. mšʔ “to find” [DNWSI 675], Hbr. māšāʔ qal “(eigtl.) hingelangen: 1. gelangen zu etwas, 2. (acc.) treffen (v. einer Axt, v. Wandernden, die einen Ort treffen)”, nifal “1. gefunden werden, 2. vorgefunden werden, vorhanden sein, 3. sich finden lassen, 4. ausreichen” [GB 450–1] = māšāʔ qal “1. to reach, 2. meet accidentally, 3. find what was sought, 4. obtain” [KB 619–620] = “gelangen zu, treffen, finden” [WUS, DL], PBHbr. māšāʔ “eig.: auf etwas stoßen, zu etwas gelangen > antreffen, finden” [Levy 1924 III 205], PBHbr. māšāʔ “eig.: auf etwas stoßen, zu etwas gelangen > antreffen, finden” [Levy 1924 III 205], BAram. mʔʔ peal “1. wohin reichen, sich erstrecken, 2. wohin gelangen, 3. (an)kommen” [GB 913] || MSA: Jbl. mdy: miḏi “to reach” [Jns. 1981, 169] || Geez mašʔa “to come, happen to, occur to, come upon, arise, (with acc.) overtake” [Lsl. 1987, 369–370] (ES: Lsl. 1956–57, 271; 1959, 266; 1982, 54; Sem.: Lsl. 1938, 241; 1969, 57; 1987, 374; Cohen 1961, 69, #79; Brk. quoted in WUS #1627; DL 1967, 306; Dietrich 1967, 299; Ricks 1982 MS, 140–1; Voigt 1994, 108; Tropper 1994, 24; 2000, 95; Dlg. 1999, 25–26, §47; Kogan 2000, 718 with corrigenda ad Tropper l.c.; DUL 533) || WCh.: Hausa mácè “1. to approach” [Abr. 1962, 668].

NB2: A Sem. correspondence with *š- (< AA *-ç-) is attested in some Can. languages, cf. Ug. mšā “to reach to (l-)” [Gordon 1955, 290, #1145] = D “gelangen machen” [WUS] = mšʔ/mʔʔ (sic) “kommen” [Voigt], Epigr.Aram. mšʔ, mšy “добывать, доставать, приобретать” [SAN IV 201], Samar. Aram. mšy “finding”, qal “to find” [Tal 2000, 483], JPAram. mšy “to be able” [Sokoloff 1990, 325], JNAram. mšy “to be able” [Sabar 2002, 223], Syr. mēšā “etwas können, finden”, afel “finden lassen” [WUS] = “to find, reach, be in a position to do sg.” [KB], Mnd. mša I “to be a match for, be equal in force, be able, 2. attain to, arrive at, reach, achieve” [DM 1963, 276b] (Sem.: Ast. 1948, 216; WUS #1634). Y. Sabar (2002, 223) explained all Aram. forms with -š- as Akkadisms.

NB3: Is NBrb.: Wargla ə-ndəḏ “adhérer, coller à, se cramponner à” [Dlh. 1987, 212] related (nd- assim. < *mḏ-ʔ)?

- **3.** GT: it has to be further investigated whether the fairly significant overlapping of the rather wide semantical spectrum of Sem.: Can. *ngd with that of Eg. mḏd (in theory, derivable from an earlier *mgd) is due to mere chance or perhaps a common feature inherited from PAA. The semantic history and the basic sense of the ultimate (PSem.) root of Can. *ngd is not fully evident. Whether this high semantical diversity covers one common root or we are dealing with more than one roots (despite the rather “suggestive” hypothetic primary senses listed in the standard lexicons), has still to be cleared.

NB1: Cf. esp. (1) PBHbr. ngd “geißeln” [Dalman 1922, 261] vs. nəḡīd (m), nəḡīdā (f) “1. Drechslerarbeit (eig. part. pass.: gedrechselt, geschlagen), 2. Führung, Leitung” [Levy 1924 III, 333], JAram. nəḡad “(eig. *lang sein, sich hinziehen, sich in die Länge ziehen, davon) 1. (fort)ziehen, leiten, ausdehnen, 2. (eig. mit dem Riemen streichen, Streiche geben) schlagen, geißeln, 3. fließen (eig. sich hinziehen, gehen)” [Levy 1924 III, 333] = nəḡad “1. to stretch, draw, pull, spread, 2. lash, 3. guide, rule, 4. grow long, follow after, flow” [Jastrow 1950, 871] vs. (2) Hbr. néged (prep.) “1. vor, 2. im Beisein v. jem., 3. (in Gedanken) gegenwärtig, 4. nach jem. Auffassung, seiner Schätzung, 5. entsprechend” [GB 482–3] = neged “(originally a substantive) *‘that which is opposite, that which corresponds’, hence “1. in front of, before, 2. opposite to, 3. immediately in front of, 4. corresponding, 5. contrary, against” [KB 666], PBHbr. bə-neged “1. gegenüber, an, 2. entsprechend” [Dalman 1922, 261] = neged “line, direction”, prep. bə-neged “towards, opposite, corresponding to” [Jastrow 1950, 872] = neged *“(eig.) das, was einer Person oder einer Sache

gegenüberliegt, dorthin zieht” > “1. vor, gegenüber, 2. entsprechend” [Levy 1924 III, 333]. (3) Whether BHbr. *ngd hifil* “to propose, announce, inform, give evidence, 2. provide an explanation” [KB 666] is related (e.g., via a hypothetical sense “to present sg. prominently or meaningfully before s’one” or “to place sg. in front of s’one, confront s’one with sg.” as in KB?) to all (or some of) these forms is equally dubious. NB2: For the interchange of *m-* ~ *n-* in Eg.-Sem. etymologies cf., e.g., Eg. *nd3* [*< *ngr*] “ersticken, verdursten” (MK, Wb II 377, 5–6) = “to parch with thirst” (FD 144) || Sem.: Ar. *nağara I* “9. être pris d’un violent accès de soif (hommes, animaux)” ~ *mağara* “avoir soif (un homme)” [BK II 1064 & 1202]. Lit. for Eg.-Ar.: Ember 1926, 310, #5, fn. 6; 1930, #3.b.50.

- **4.** GT: in theory, Eg. *mdd* (basic sense “to press”?) can be derived also from a hypothetical AA **m-g-t* > WCh.: Ngizim *màgdú* “to make pelvic thrusts, as in sexual intercourse” [Schuh 1981, 108]. The data are insufficient.

NB: Besides, the *C*₃ of the Ngizim root may be a root extension, cf. Ch. **mug-* “to squeeze” [GT] > WCh.: PAngas **muk* “to squeeze, throttle” [GT 2004, 254]: Angas *muk* “to press, squeeze” [Flk. 1915, 247] = *mùk* “würgen” (≈ Hs. *šáákè* “1. to strangle, 2. fill chock-full, be brimful”, Abr. 1962, 643, 799), *mùk* *ğwàñ-ğwàñ* “to throttle” (*ğwàñ-ğwàñ* “Adam’s apple”) [Jng. 1962 MS, 26] || CCh.: Bdm. *mugu* “comprimer, presser” [Gaudiche 1938, 30].

- Other etymologies are evidently out of question:

- **5.** L. Reinisch (1887, 263) combined it with Ar. *mzḥ* (sic, *mng.* not given, NB: BK II 1099 lists no *mng.* comparable to those of Eg. *mdd*) || NAgaw: Bilin *măd* “auf den Kopf schlagen, den Kopf blutig schlagen jemdm.” [Rn.] || LECu.: Orm. *madā* “wound” [Gragg 1982, 273]. But Eg. *-d-* ≠ AA **-z/ž-*.

- **6.** K. Sethe (1899 I, §361) divided it into prefix *m-* + **√dr* → **m_{dr}* → **mdj* → **md* → *mdd* explaining its *Grundbedeutung* “(zusammen) pressen” ultimately from Eg. **dr* (phon. value of the *hrgl.* depicting) “bundle of green stems or flax” (EG 1927, 473), which already E. Otto (1954 *ÄMÖR* II 66) has rightly rejected: “*paßt nicht zu den recht unterschiedlichen Bedeutungen von mdd*”, let alone the problem of *-r* ≠ *-d*.

- **7.** E. Zyhlarz (1934, 111) suggested a comparison with SBrb.: Hgr. *ēḏēḏ* “beißen, stechen mit Zahn oder Stachel”, hence refl. *m-ēḏēḏ* “sich verbeißen” [Zhl.] = *ēḏēḏ* “1. mordre, 2. piquer (un animal ayant un aiguillon)” [Fcd. 1951–2, 163], cf. also Ayr & EWlm. *ēḏēḏ* “mordre, piquer (scorpion)” [Alj. 1980, 18] = *ēḏēḏ* “1. mordre, piquer (scorpion, serpent)”, *tă-ddōd* “morsure, coup de dent (plaie laissée par une morsure), piqure (faite par un animal ayant un aiguillon)” [PAM 2003, 78]. Approving and exploiting Zyhlarz’s idea, E. Otto (1954 *ÄMÖR* II 66 & fn. 5) saw in the case of Eg. *mdd* the underlying “*Grundbedeutung in einem handwerklichen Terminus*” that he defined as “*verzahnen, ein Ding in ein anderes einpassen, einfügen*”, whereby he deduced that here “*...ebenfalls ein verbales m- Präfix im Sinne der Reziprozität oder*

Sozialität vorliegen könnte". In addition, in Otto's view, "möglich wäre eine Verwandtschaft mit" Eg. *ḏdm* ~ *ḏdb* "stechen", "ferner vielleicht auch" with Eg. *ḏdf.t* "Wurm, Schlange". This is evidently incorrect both semantically (the far-fetched connection to teeth cannot be evidenced on Eg. grounds) and phonologically (Eg. -*ḏ*- ≠ Tuareg -*d*-).

NB1: For the Tuareg root cf. perhaps Sem. **ḥdd* "to be pungent, sharp", **ḥadd*- "pungent, sharp" [GT]: esp. Akk. *eddu* [< **ḥadd*-] "spitzig" [AHW 185] || Hbr. **ḥad*, pl. *ḥaddīm* "sharp (sword)" [KB 291] | Ar. *ḥadda* "to edge, sharpen (a knife, a blade, a sword, or anything blunt), point, make sharp-pointed (an arrow-head or the like, with a stone or file)", *ḥadd*- "(extremity of the) edge, point (of sword, knife, spear-head, arrow)" [Lane 524–5] || Tigre *ḥdd* "to cut up" [KB] etc. || (?) Eg. *ḥdd.t* "Göttin in Gestalt eines Skorpions" (BD, Wb III 206, 6) || presumably LECu. **ḥadd*- [Dlg.: < **ḥadd*- influenced by **ḥ*-] "bitter" [Sasse] > esp. Konso *ḥadd-ā* "snake venom" [Black] (LECu.: Dlg. 1973, 249; Black 1974, 196; Sasse 1979, 54). For Sem.-ECu.: Dlg. 1988, 631, #21; Eg.-AA: Takács 2005, 56–57, #4.31 & fn. 156.

NB2: Otto's observation (borrowed from Kaplony quoted in *ÄMÖR* II 66, fn. 5) on the relatedness of Eg. *ḏdb* ~ *ḏdm* and *ḏdf.t* is, however, indeed correct, but their AA correspondence is fully different from that suggested by Zyhlarz (cf. the entry for *ḡdf.t* above).

NB3: In spite of some far-fetched attempts (like that by Zyhlarz 1934), the use of a prefix *m*- of reciprocity has not yet been satisfactorily demonstrated in Eg. In theory, following Zyhlarz's and Otto's idea, one might ponder a derivation < fossilized prefix **m*- + **gd* "treffen", cf. WCh.: AS **kat* [k-/t reg. < **g*-/d] "1. to find, 2. get" [GT] = **k*,at "to get" [Stl.] (AS: Hfm. 1975, 23, #188, Stl. 1977, 154, #90; 1987, 206, #570; GT 2004, 167–8). But this reasoning would contradict just the tr. root mng. of Eg. *ṡmdd*.

- **8.** C. T. Hodge (1969, 109, #22) too analyzed Eg. *mdd* as a compound of *m*- prefix + **dd* and erroneously equated the latter with Ar. *ṡddd* and Hgr. *ṡz-d* that are semantically more than dubious.

NB: Cf. Ar. *ḡadda* I "1. avoir le dessus sur qqn. dans une querelle, 2. écarter qqn. doucement, sans violence" [BK II 13] = "1. to overcome, 2. avert, turn s'one, send away or back, prevent, hinder from doing sg. by gentle means" [Lane 1775] || SBrb.: Hgr. e-zed "moudre, réduire en poudre, à sec, par frottement entre deux corps durs" [Fcd. 1951–2, 1930].

- **9.** W. Westendorf (1973, 139; KHW 234, fn. 9), in turn, surmised in it a metathesis of Eg. *dmd* "zusammenfügen, vereinigen, vereint sein" (Wb V 457–9), to which he even attributed a baseless *Grundbedeutung* (!) "zusammenstoßen, treffen" (only very late attested).

NB: Cf. GR hrw-*dmd* "Tag des Zusammentreffens (im Kampf)" (Wb V 459, 21–24) and Cpt. (SALB) τωητ etc. "treffen, begegnen, zusammenkommen" (KHW 234), which evidently emanate from the (mostly late) pass. use of the old tr. mng. "vereinigen".

mdd ~ **mdd.w** "Eigenschaftswort in den Namen der Cheops (hr. w-*mdd.w* als Horusname, *mdd* r nb.tj als nb.tj-Name)" (IV., Wb II 192, 10–11; cf. Edwards 1888, 132) = "(émithète associée à une habileté technique, à un savoir-faire, qui peuvent même traduire la notion d'infaillibilité, à la justesse, à la précision et au bien-fondé des

actes du souverain, peut-être ‘celui qui touche au but’, ‘qui atteint ses objectifs’)” (Baud 1998, 23).

NB: M. Baud (1998, 23 & fn. 54) maintains the same *mdd* to occur in some older (Dyn. II) private personal names assuming that “*dans l’onomastique privée, son extinction est encore plus ancienne: attesté dans les noms Mdd-k3.j, Mdd-sn et ʿnh-mdd, il se cantonne à la période thinite*”.

- The proper meaning is still to be defined. This question requires a more thorough analysis. Till then, we only may assume that it may have been an adj./part. signifying with a positive connotation.
- **1.** Whether *mdd* in the name of Cheops (and in others from the Thinite era) really has to do with this or that supposed primary sense of the Eg. verbal root *mdd* (above) or it represents rather a separate lexical root, has not yet been evidently demonstrated.

NB1: K. Sethe (1892, 52–56) and W. M. Müller (1909, 190) viewed that it represents “*apparently a participle*” (Müller) of Eg. *mdd* “to press” (above). But their ideas on the history of this root (Sethe: old *mḏr* > **mḏ* with the loss of *-r > *mdd* with the addition of -d in the MK, while Müller: *mḏr* > *mḏd*, sic!) can hardly be maintained. P. Montet (quoted and refuted by M. Baud 1998, 21) rendered *mḏd.w* as “celui qui impose” (< *mdd* “presser, imposer”). Later, K. Sethe (ZÄS 62, 1926, 1–2) changed his translation of the name *mḏd.w* for “attached” (< *mdd* “to follow, adhere to”) that was rightly declined by Baud (l.c.), since *mdd* in this sense is only attested accompanied by either *w3.t* or *mtn* “way” and only in private context. Its rendering as “der Gelenkte” (Barta, ZÄS 114, 1987, 106) was received by Baud (l.c.) with reservation, since a basic mng. “*celui qui est guidé, dirigé*” would imply that “*elle donne à l’attribution royale un caractère passéiste qui n’est guère admissible, et qui ne s’accorde pas à un contenu divin de principe de gouvernement*”. R. Gundlach (1998, 167–8) translated *mḏd.w* as “(Horus) der Austeilende” (Baud: “celui qui distribue, qui partage”), hence “der Wohltäter” (Baud: “le bienfaiteur”), while *mdd r nb.tj* as “der gemäß den Beiden Herrinnen Austeilende” (Baud: “celui qui partage conformément aux Deux Maîtresses”), which was approved by Baud (1998, 21–22) arguing that “*la répartition des richesses est effectivement une prérogative royale*”, which would allow an etihet “le dispensateur de bienfaits”. Accordingly, Baud interpreted Redjedef’s (Dyn. IV) name *šzp mdd=f* as “celui qui reçoit sa distribution, (le fruit de) ses bienfaits” or “celui qui reçoit sa part, celui qui reçoit sa juste dotation” or “le doté du partage” suggesting that *mḏd.w* signified “le justement doté, le bien placé” and *mdd-r-nb.tj* “celui qui est doté conformément à Nebty” wondering whether “*peut-être s’agit-il de l’héritage royale envisagé comme un dû envers un individu d’exception*”. Alternatively, Baud (1998, 23) assumed in *mḏd.w* an act. part. of *mdd* “*caractérisant l’individu associé à la manipulation de cet instrument*”, thus *šzp mdd=f* would denote “celui qui saisit, l’instrument à/pour *mdd*” or “celui qui reçoit sa qualité de *mdd*” (arguing that “*la nature exacte se rapporte à la justesse, à la précision et au bien-fondé des actes du souverain*”). In addition, Baud also proposed further possibilities based on *mdd* “atteindre”: *mḏd.w* “(peut-être) celui qui touche au bout”, *šzp mdd=f* “(peut-être) celui qui atteint ses objectives”, respectively. At the same time, he (Baud 1998, 26) did not rule out that in these royal names simply the basic sense of *mdd* “to press” underlies: *mḏd.w* “*peut véhiculer des images bien effrayantes de sorte que l’Horus du même nom pouvait devenir sans difficulté... un oppresseur*”. J. Kahl (FÄW 207), in turn, suggested a derivation from the alleged basic sense of Eg. *mdd* “richtig, genau sein” (sic). But all these renderings have to remain equally speculative.

NB2: On the other hand, *mdd* occurs in further names of the archaic period and the OK, whose signification is equally uncertain. Baud (1998, 23 & fn. 56) found that H. Ranke’s (PN II 293:4) rendering of *mḏd-k3=j* (Dyn. II.) as “mein Ka trifft (?)” in

fact “*ne fait évidemment guère de sens*”. He equally doubted R. O. Faulkner’s hypothesis that PT 2048 mdd.(t)-jt “Name einer Göttin” (Wb II 192, 13) denotes in fact “she who does the will of the monarch” (AEPT 293–294, utt. 683, n. 2).

- **2.** P. Langlois (1919, 160) too assumed an erroneous Eg. *mḏr.w* (sic) vocalized by him as **mézru* (sic) and identified with Ar. *miṣr-* in an obscure way. Absurd.
- **3.** GT: if, however, we presume that it was derived from a distinct root that had become out of use (and no longer understood), our presumption seems to be supported by Sem. **mgd* (var. to **ngd*²). Of course, mapping the semantical history of both Sem. roots and their relations to the Eg. *mḏd* lexemes (if any) has to be subject to further research.

NB1: Cp. esp. Ar. *mağada* I “1. surpasser qqn. en illustration, particulièrement tirée de ses ancêtres”, II “glorifier qqn. et le regarder comme illustre”, *mağd-* “gloire, illustration, surtout celle qui vient des ancêtres”, *mağīd-* “noble, illustre, glorieux” [BK II 1063–4] = *mağada* “to be glorious, honoured, dignified, noble”, *mağīd-* “glorious, honoured, dignified, noble, generous and munificent, good in disposition, liberal, bountiful”, *mağd-* “glory, honour, dignity, nobility” [Lane 2689–2690] = *mğd* I “edel, nobel sein” [GB] = *mağuda* “geehrt, edel sein, Alles an Rum übertreffen” [Levy] = *mağd-* “(chez les chrétiens) gloire, la béatitude dont on jouit dans le paradis, 2. puissance, autorité” [Dozy II 569] = *mğd* I “to be noble, famous” [Zbr.], post-class. Yemeni Ar. *mağd* “dignitary” [Piamenta 1990, 459] || MSA (from Ar.?): Jbl. *mged* “loben” [Bittner 1917, 50].

NB2: The ultimate etymology of the Sem. root has been debated. Following S. S. Majzel’, A. Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 214, §13.3) combined Ar. *mağd-* “glory” and its Can. cognates (listed s.v. Eg. *mḏd* “Abgabe”, below) with Ar. *mağd-* ~ *nağd-* “terrain (plus) élevé (que les alentours), endroit le plus élevé, plateau (d’un pays)” [BK II 1064, 1201] = “возвышенность, плато” [Mlt.] as well as Cu. **g^wVd-* “ropa, вершина” [Dlg. 1973, 239]. Cf. also Hbr. **ngd* “sich erheben, hoch sein” (not attested as such) > *nāğīd* “1. Häuptling, 2. Fürst, König” [GB 482–3]. A. R. Bomhard (1984, 270, #271), in turn, regarded the C₃ of P^{Sem}. **mgd* “to be exalted, eminent” as root extension (baseless).

NB3: Note that Sem. **mgd* has nothing to do with NAgaw: Qwara *māğ^wz* “geschmackvoll, zierlich, elegant, vortrefflich sein oder werden” [Rn. 1885, 97], which is a recent ES loan, cf. Geez *mogasa* “to be gracious”, Tigre & Tna. & Amh. *mogās* “benevolence, kindness, favor”.

- mḏd** “5. u.a.: (etwas als Frohnde, als Abgabe) auferlegen” (OK: Urk. I 211:14, 287:10, Wb II 192, 6–7; ÄWb I 583) = “1. peser, imposer, exercer une pesée sur, 2. peser avec une balance, mesurer” (Moret 1907, 78–79) = “steuerpflichtig sein” (Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 69) = “5. auferlegen (als Abgabe)” (GHWb 383) = “contribuer (financière-ment)” (Baud 1998, 20).
- Hence: **(1)** *mḏd* “Frohnde” (OK, Wb II 192, 14) = “Lasten” (Sethe quoted in KDAR 125, n. 23) = “Fronden, Lasten” (Borchardt, ZÄS 42, 1905, 6) = “impositions, mesures (applicables)” (Moret, JA 1912, 103; RT 29, 1907, 78, n. 88) = “(signifie) ce qui est compté, mesuré, les

impôts proprement dits (opposées aux corvées)” (Pirenne 1938, 12–13, fn. 1; WD II 70) = “(special) corvée” (Grd. quoted in KDAR 125, n. 23) = “forced labor, corvée (≈ h3)” (Hayes 1955, 131) = “eine veranschlagte Leistung . . ., die nicht körperlich durchzuführen ist: wahrsch. Steuer, Steuerzahlung (meist in Parallele zur physischen Arbeit, als materielle Auflage zu verstehen, nicht eine physische Arbeit, wie es eine Übersetzung ‘Fronde’ mit sich bringen würde)” (Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 59 & 60, n. 14 & 98 & 125, n. 23) = “steuerähnliche Abgaben (die für Bewässerungskanäle, Teiche, Brunnen, Schadufs und Bäume gezählt werden mußten; sie treten zu den Hauptsteuern für Haustiere und Felder; in einzelnen Büros des Staates abgerechnet)” (Helck, LÄ I 4 adopted in ÄWb I 583) = “service due” (Urk. I 12:7, 210:4, 211:17, AECT II 246–7, spell 681, n. 8) = “eine Auflage” (LÄ VII 468 index) = “Abgabe, Auflage” (GHWb 383) = “obligation, imposition, contribution, une corvée” (Baud 1998, 20), (2) jrj mdd. wt “to perform service due to” (CT VI 308d, AECT II 246–7, spell 681, n. 8; DCT 195).

- If this is a distinct root from Eg. mdd “treffen etc.” (above), Most attractive is naturally solution #1.
- 1. A. Moret (l.c.) derived this kind of use of mdd from the basic mng. of Eg. mdd defined by him as “press(ur)er”, which seems quite logical (at least, for a European mind).
- 2. H. Goedicke (1967 KDAR, 125, n. 23) and M. Baud (1998, 20), in turn, preferred to combine it rather with Eg. mdd.t “Anteil der Totenpriester” (OK, Gdk.) and mdd “Einteilung” (Urk. I 12:7). Baud conceived mdd “corvée” as “part qui pèse” suggesting an ultimate derivation from mdd “p(r)es(s)er”.
- 3. GT: or, purely hypothetically, one might ponder whether we are dealing with a remotely related reflex of Sem. *mgd “to make a generous offering” [GT] displaying a different semantic development, which is all the more noteworthy, since there is a certain semantical overlapping also between some other Eg. mdd words and certain further reflexes of Sem. *mgd (above).

NB1: Cp. esp. Can.: Palm. mgd pael “to make a generous present” [Zbr.] = mgd “liberality, generous gift, offering” [DNWSI 592: from Ar.?] = mgd “to present as a gift” vs. mgd? “precious offering” [KB after Jean], Hbr. *megeḏ, st.cstr.pl. mōgāḏīm “köstliche, edle Gabe (der Natur)” [GB 395–6: “wohl” < Palm.] = “gift, present” [Zbr.] = “fine fruits, delicacies” [KB 543], Hbr. megeḏ “excellence, excellent or choice things” [Bmh.], PBHbr. megeḏ “1. köstliche, edle Gabe (bes. der Natur), 2. köstliche Früchte” [Levy 1924 III 12] = “precious goods, esp. fine fruit (orig.: allotted gift)” [Jastrow 1950, 726], JAram. migdā ~ magdā “Kostbarkeit, köstliche

Frucht" [Levy l.c.] = magdā ~ migdā "precious ware, fine fruit" [Jastrow], Syr. magdā "fruit", magdonē "precious gifts" [KB] || Ar. mǧd II "3. faire un don généreux, considérable" [BK II 1063] = II "reichlich schenken" [GB] = II "to bestow, make a present" [Zbr.] || ECh.: (?) EDng. mǧdyī "riche, fortuné", mǧdyīnāw (f) "richesse, abondance, fortune" [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 191] (GT: borrowed from Ar.?). Note that CCh.: Mada mīygdā "notable, riche" [Brt.-Brunet 2000, 197] is a recent borrowing from Mandara.

NB2: The etymology of Sem. *mgd has long been disputed. M. Jastrow (l.c.) took Hbr. mgd (via prefix m-) from Hbr. gdd > gād "fortune". A. Zaborski (1971, 61, #48) too derived it from Sem. biconsonantal *gd "to make a present, be munificent" assuming an ultimate connection with Ar. ḡwd: ḡāda "to be generous, munificent, offer generously", nǧd "to help", ḡdw: ḡadā "to offer as a gift, make a present" and OSA gdy IV "to make a present, bestow". A. R. Bomhard (1984, 270, #271), in turn, regarded the C₃ of P_{Sem}. *mgd "to be exalted, eminent" as root extension (baseless).

mdd "Einteilen" (OK: Urk. I 12:7, Gdk. 1967 KDAR, 125, n. 23) = "portion (of lands, people and everything)" (Breasted quoted by Moret) = "presser, peser avec une balance, mesurer" > "délimitation, dispositions" (Moret 1907, 78–79) = "partager" (V. lx, PK 1976 I, 227; AL 77.1967) = "8. teilen" (GHWb 383; ÄWb I 583) = "partager; distribution, partage" (Baud 1998, 20).

NB1: The translations vary depending on whether the exx. are taken to be infs./verbal nouns or verbs.

NB2: The rendering of mdd (Baud 1998, 21: mdd.t, false, since it can only be an inf. here) in Merikare 123 (db3.tw zḥ m mjtj=f, mdd pw jr.wt nb.wt, Baud l.c.: "un [mauvais] coup est payé par son semblable, c'est... de tous les actes") has been strongly debated (cf. Baud l.c. fn. 42). E.g., Gardiner (JEA 1, 1914, 33): "consequence", Otto (ÄMÖR II 66): "Konsequenz" < "das Ineinandergreifen (des allen Tuns)"; Lichtheim (AEL I 105): "response"; Helck (1988, 76–77): "Verknüpfung"; PK (1976, 227–8) supported by Baud (l.c.): "la (juste) part".

- Hence: mdd.t "Anteil bei einer Teilung (?)" (OK: Urk. I 13:2, 14:1, 14:11, Wb II 192, 15; GHWb 383) = "Anteil (der Totenpriester)" (Gdk. l.c.) = "part (dans un partage)" (OK: V., PK 1976 I, 228, cf. fn. 1 for Urk. I 12–13 & CT VI 308d, AL 77.1968, 78.1953) = "part (d'un partage)" (Baud 1998, 20).

NB: Faulkner (AECT II 247, spell 681, n. 8) explained mdd.t in CT VI 308d as "service due to".

- Origin uncertain. GT: since no Sem. or other AA parallels with the sense "to divide" (or sim.) have been found, an inner Eg. innovation seems very likely.

NB: Following A. Moret (l.c.), H. Goedicke (l.c.) and Baud (1998, 20) related it to Eg. mdd "Steuer" (above). Baud (1998, 21) explained both mdd "partager" and mdd "contribution, imposition" from the primary sense "presser, peser" via "part qui pèse". R. Hannig (GHWb, ÄWb l.c.) too listed both the verb "teilen" and the noun "Anteil" as derivatives of Eg. mdd "treffen". P. Posener-Krieger (l.c.), in turn, remained more careful stating merely that the primary verbal sense of the underlying root was unknown.

mddh.t (GW, written also **mdh.t** ~ **mdd.t**) “(in einer Liste von Geräten)” (late NK, Wb II 193, 2) = “la pierre à moudre et à piler, mortier” (Dévaud 1921, 171–2) = “mortar” (Černý, JEA 31, 1945, 38; Janssen 1975, 326–7, §97; 1991, 86, n. o; DLE I 260; cf. also JEA 77, 1991, 86) = “Mörser” (KHW 638) = “mortier” (AL 77.1966, 79.1441 pace Frandsen 1979, 289, 295) = “objet en pierre” (DELIC pace Wb) = “mortar, quern” (Hoch 1994, 179 with further lit.) > Cpt. (SB) $\text{M}\chi\alpha\tau\epsilon$, (via met.) $\text{M}\chi\alpha\tau$ (f) “mortier (pour piler)” (Dévaud 1921, 171; DELIC 133) = “mortar” (CD 214a) = “Mörser” (Stricker 1937, 5; Vrg. 1950, 293; KHW 114).

NB1: The Ramesside form occurs in the following vars.: mddh.t (Ostr. Cairo 25670, rt. 2:6, XIX./XX.) ~ mdh.t (Naunakhte passim, XX. & Pap. BM 10401, 1:11, XX.) ~ mdd.t (Ostr. DeM 69, 5). J. J. Janssen (l.c.) adds an odd var. mdh.t (spelled m3dh. wt) in Ostr. Cairo 25678, 25 & 27.

NB2: The proper spelling of the word has been misunderstood as most works quoted above (Černý, CED, KHW, AL, DELIC, Ward, GHWb) suggest to read only mdh.t, while the old rdg. mddh.t (Wb) has apparently long been abandoned. For reading the group -dd- in the late NK as -d- (GW) > -x- cf. Černý, JEA 31, 1945, 38; GMT §23.2; KHW 114, fn. 5; Ward 1985, 333, fn. 20. Nevertheless, the Cpt. evidence clearly testifies to that -d- (whence Cpt. -t-) was indeed pronounced after -d- and thus it cannot be regarded merely as part of a “group” for -d- in this case.

NB3: Syllabic spelling for the diverse vars.: m(̣)-sa-h(̣)-t ~ var. m(̣)-se-h-ta (Helck 1962, 587) = ma-dd-h-tá ~ ma-dd-tá (so, -dd-!) (Ward), which, for the reason discussed in NB2, cannot be accepted.

NB4: W. Westendorf (KHW 114) surmised a connection between Cpt. reflexes and (P) $\text{M}\text{O}\chi\chi\epsilon$ “mischen”, which is certainly erroneous, the underlying root of the latter being entirely different (mṭk).

- Most attractive seems solution #3.
- **1.** É. Dévaud (1921, 171–2) surmised that it was perhaps “*un mot étranger*”. So viewed W. Helck (1962, 587) too classifying our word among the “*asiatische Fremdworte im Ägyptischen*”. However, both of them failed to present the lexical evidence. J. Hoch’s (1994, 179, #242) idea in this respect is hardly tenable: he projected an unattested *maḥhatta (?) reflecting a fem. Can. *nomen instr.* of common Sem. *ṭḥn “to grind” (cf. MHbr. maḥḥēn “grinding mill”, NHbr. maḥḥēnā “grinder”) assuming that the anomalous Eg. d < Sem. *ṭ (“*not expected*” by Hoch either) was “*perhaps*” due to *-h-.
- **2.** W. A. Ward (1985, 333, §6), in turn, maintained that the group -tj was a fem. ending (in GW) also for native words and derived our word from Eg. mdh “to hew wood, cut stone”, which is equally false as (1) the consonantal sequences do not overlap and (2) because, in the case of a quadriconsonantal term denoting an instrument and having an initial m-, one would logically (and *a priori*) expect an original triconsonantal root (ddh) without m-.

- **3.** GT: in principle, *mddh.t* might be an *m-* prefix *nomen instr.* of an unattested Eg. root **ddh* “to pound (or sim.)”, which might derive from an earlier **gdh* (or **gth*). In this context, highly noteworthy is NAgaw: Bilin *məgdəʕ* “Mörser” [Lmb.] = “mortar” [LT 1997, 500, 505], whose origin is equally obscure (apparently from ES because of -ʕ), but it clearly represents an *m-* prefix *nomen instr.* of **√gdʕ*. In theory, we may not rule out a cognacy (inherited from AA) between ES **gʷdʕ* “to crush” (?) [GT] and pre-Eg. **gdh*.

NB1: M. Lamberti and L. Tonelli (l.c.) supposed the (apparently isolated) Bilin form to be “*probably of Semitic origin*”, but they failed to identify the ES root in question, which, in any case (even if it is unattested and thus merely hypothetical), may be akin to Sem. **gdʕ* (or **gʷdʕ*) > Hbr. *gdʕ qal* “1. to cut off (arm, horn, trees), 2. scatter (staff, peoples, army)”, *nifal* “1. to be cut off, 2. be cut down into pieces, 3. cut to pieces” [KB 180], JAram. *gədaʕ* “abstumpfen, abhacken” [Lévy 1924 I 303] | Ar. *ḡadaʕa I* “1. mutiler qqn.” [BK I 264] = “to cut off the nose, mutilate, make injury, diminute, destroy” [Lane 390] = “mutiler qqn., lui trancher le nez, l’essoriller, trancher (la main, le pied)” [Blachère I 1364] || ES **gʷdʕ* “to crush” [GT] > Gees *gʷadʕa* ~ *gʷadʕa* “to strike, smite, thrust, knock, crush, shake, touch, butt, heave with sobbs” > *magdəʕ?*, Tigre *gädʕa* “to push, pound”, Tna. *gʷadʕe* “to crush, damage” etc. (ES: Lsl. 1987, 180).

NB2: A remote AA cognate to ES **gʷdʕ* and Eg. **ddh* “to pound in mortar” may perhaps appear in CCh.: Mnd. *əgdza dzra* “pilon” [Mch.] | Musgu *gəḪa* “stampfen, schlagen” [Lks. 1941, 56] = *gəda* “piler” [Mch.] (CCh.: Mch. 1950, 44) || ECh.: Kwang *kùtē* “to pound (in mortar)” [Jng./JI 1994 II 269] – unless the CCh. forms come from AA **g-š* [GT].

NB3: For the irregular (?) correspondence of Sem. **-dʕ* (a sequence that is incompatible in native Eg. roots) vs. Eg. *-dh* (instead of *-dḥ*, cf. EDE I 326–7), a striking parallel can be quoted, cf. Eg. *ddh* [reg. < **gdh*] “verhaften, einsperren, gefangen setzen, (Feinde) einschließen (in einer Stadt)” (XVIII., Wb V 635) → *ddh.w* “Gefängnis” (LP, Wb V 635, 13) > Dem. *dth* “1. Verhaften, 2. Haft” (DG 688) > (?) Cpt. (O) *ⲭⲧⲁⲓ* “ins Gefängnis kommen, verhaftet werden” (Spg. KHW 280 pace Griffith 1900, 78–79) = “Gefängnis (?)” (Wst. KHW 437) || Ar. *ḡadaʕa I* “2. jeter qqn. dans un cachot, dans les fers” [BK l.c.] = “to confine, restrict, imprison” [Lane l.c.] = “2. séquestrer, incarcérer” [DRS 102].

NB4: Earlier, M. Lamberti (1988, 98, #236; 1993, 111; 1993 Yemsa, 364–5; 1993 Sns., 354) suggested a fully different (Cu.-Om.) etymology for Bilin *məgdəʕ* “Mörser”, which he ultimately derived from his hypothetical and baseless “OCu.” (i.e., PCu.-Om.) **mög*- “Mörser” [Lmb.] and erroneously affiliated it with a number of unrelated synonymous terms that can be grouped as follows: (1) LECu.: Saho *mōgól*, pl. *māwáḡel* (m) [Rn.: **ma-ūḡel* < **ma-ūḡed*] “Mörser” [Rn. 1890, 260] = *mōḡad* “mortier” [CR] = *mōḡod* (-dh) “Mörser” [Lmb.] = *mōḡot* (-rh: voiced retroflex flap) “mortar” [Vergari 2003, 136], whereby Lamberti assumed a deglottalization of the velar C₂ (**-gʷ*) and an additional suffix *-d-* (-dh-). But the Saho term is in fact ultimately related to ES forms like Harari *mōqāč* [Lsl.], Amh. *muqačča* “mortar” [Lsl.] = *mawqača* [Hds.], cf. also Amh. *mawgača* “mortier” [CR] = *māwḡača* [Apl.] = *mawgača* “mortar (of mortar and pestle, for grinding coffee, spices)”, which represent an instrumental noun formation with *mā-* prefix + *-ya* suffix (palatalizing *-t-* as *-č-*) deriving from ES **wqt* “to crush” ~ Amh. var. *wqt* “pound in mortar, crush (testicles)”, signifying thus lit. “an instrument for pounding something” (Lsl. 1963, 109; also p.c. by G. Hudson, L. Bender, and D. Appleyard on 12 July 2007). (2)

LECu.: Afar madagge “Mörser” [Lmb.], cf. also Saho madagdag “little mortar for coffee” [Vergari 2003, 129]. But this term can hardly be related (via metathesis) as even M. Vergari (l.c.) supposed combining it with Saho *mōgoṭ* (-rh) “mortar” (above). Instead, cf. rather NBrb.: Shilh a-madaṭ “meule” [Jst. 1914, 121] < Ar. madaqq- “endroit que l’on bat pour l’aplatir ou l’amollir”, cf. also muduqq- ~ midaqq- ~ madaqq-at- ~ midaqq-at- “1. battoir, 2. maillet en bois, 3. pilon pour broyer ou égruger les aromates, les graines, le blé, 4. instrument pour aplatir le sol” < daqqa “(con)casser” [BK I 715–6]. A connection with ES: Geez madḥe “upper millstone” [Lsl. 1987, 130] (explained by W. Leslau 1988, 72 from Ar. *daḥā* “to push”) seems less probable. (3) ECu. **mōy*- “mortar” [Lmb. < **mōg*“-], which clearly represents a distinct AA root, namely AA **m-y* “to pound” [GT] (cf. Takács: *Lexica Afroasiatica VII*, forthcoming, #628). Besides, L. Reinisch (1884, 391; 1895, 96) and G. Conti Rossini (1912, 234) also combined the LECu.: Saho *mōgól* “Mörser” [Rn.] with NAgaw: Qwara *mô* ~ *maù* “Mörser” [Rn.] = “pilar” [Flad], Qemant *maw* “mortier” [CR] || LECu.: Orm. *moyé* [Rn.] and even LECu.: Hamir *magú* ~ *miḡú* “Mörser” [Rn.]. False. (4) NOm.: Yemsa *moḡoy*- “mahlen (durch Stampfen)”, *moḡoyò* “Mörser” [Lmb.], for which cf. rather AA **m-k* “to pound (in mortar)” [GT] (cf. Takács: *Lexica Afroasiatica VI*, forthcoming, #546). (5) NOm.: Sns.-Bworo *mōngá* “Mörser” [Lmb.], which seems equally unrelated.

QUOTED LITERATURE

Since volume three contains a significant number of new references not quoted in the previous volumes, this list covers all works cited throughout this volume including – for the sake of convenience – also those works that are to be found in the bibliographies of EDE I–II.

- Aartun, K.: Ugaritisch mh.= UF 11 (1979), 1–5.
AAA = Archiv für Ägyptische Archäologie (Wien).
AAG = Edel, E.: Altägyptische Grammatik. Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
Abdel-Massih, E. T.: A Computerized Lexicon of Tamazight. Berber Dialect of Ayt Seghrouchen. Ann Arbor, 1971., Center for Near Eastern and North African Studies, University of Michigan.
Abel, H.: Nubisch-ägyptisches Sprachgut.= Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 24 (1933–34), 303–306.
Abès, M.: Manuel de berbère marocain. (Place not indicated), 1916. (?), (publisher not indicated).
Abraham, R. C.: Dictionary of the Hausa Language.² London, 1962., University of London Press.
—: Somali-English Dictionary.² London, 1964., University of London Press Ltd.
Abubakar, A.: A Further Look at Hausa Plurals.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 320–336.
Acta Or. Hung. = Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae (Budapest).
Adams, W. Y.: Nubia. Corridor to Africa. London, 1977., Penguin.
—: Geography and Population of the Nile Valley.= *Africa in Antiquity*. Vol. 1. New York, 1978.
AEB = Annual Egyptological Bibliography.
AEL = Lichtheim, M.: Ancient Egyptian Literature. Vol. I, II, III. London & Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1975., 1976., 1980., University of California Press.
AECT = Faulkner, R. O.: The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts. Vol. I–III. Warminster, 1973–8., Aris & Phillips Ltd.
AEO = Gardiner, A. H.: Ancient Egyptian Onomastica. I–II. Oxford, 1947., Clarendon Press.
AEPT = Faulkner, R. O.: The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts. I. Oxford, 1969., Clarendon Press.
AFO = Archiv für Orientforschung (Wien).
Aghali-Zakara, M.: Racines homophones en berbères: cas de KL.= Nait-Zerrad, K. (ed.): *Articles de linguistique berbère*. Méorial Werner Vycichl. Paris, 2002., L'Harmattan. Pp. 43–55.
Aituv, S.: The [mnj] Measure.= JEA 58 (1972), 302.
AHW = Soden, W. von: Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. I–III. Wiesbaden, 1965–1981., Otto Harrassowitz.
AIPHO = Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales (Université Libre de Bruxelles).
Aistleitner, J.: Untersuchungen zum Mitlautbestand des Ugaritisch-Semitischen.= Löwinger, S. & Somogyi, J. (eds.): *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume. Part I*. Budapest, 1948., Globus. Pp. 209–225.

- Ajello, R.; Karyo, M.; Melis, A.; Dobio, Ou.: *Lexique comparatif de six langues tchadique central* (Gizey, Ham, Lew, Marba, Masa, Musey). Pisa, 2001., Edizioni Plus, Università di Pisa.
- Ajhenval'd, A. Ju.: *Strukturno-tipologičeskaja klassifikacija berberskih jazykov. Material i metodika issledovanija*. Imja. Mestoimenie. Moskva, 1986., Nauka.
- : *Strukturno-tipologičeskaja klassifikacija berberskih jazykov*. Glagol. Moskva, 1987., Nauka.
- : *Strukturno-tipologičeskaja klassifikacija berberskih jazykov. Sintaksis. Kratkaja istorija klassifikacij berberskih jazykov. Rezul'taty strukturno-tipologičeskoj klassifikacii berberskih jazykov*. Moskva, 1987., Nauka.
- : *On Berber Cases in the Light of Afroasiatic Languages*. = Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*. Vol. 1. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 113–121.
- : *Livijskie jazyki*. = Solncev, V. M. (ed.): *Jazyki Azii i Afriki*. IV. Kniga 2. *Afrazijskie jazyki*. Moskva, 1991., Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 183–237.
- AJSL = *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* (Chicago).
- Aklilu, Y. & Siebert, R. & Siebert, K.: *Survey of the Omotic Languages "Sheko" and "Yem"*. = *Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (S.L.L.E.) Reports* 10 (1993), 1–25.
- Aklilu, Y.: *Yem wordlist*. MS. Not dated.
- AL I–III = Meeks, D.: *Année lexicographique. Égypte ancienne*. Tome 1–3 (1977–1979). 2^{ème} édition. Paris, 1998., Cybele.
- Albright, W. F.: *The Egyptian Names of the Solar Bark of Morning and Evening*. = *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 296 (1917), 34.
- : *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology*. I. = *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 34/2 (1918), 81–98.
- : *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology*. II. = *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 34/4 (1918), 215–255.
- : *A New Synchronism Between Egypt and Mesopotamia 3000 B.C.* = *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 316 (1919), 28.
- : *Notes on Assyrian Lexicography and Etymology*. = *Revue d'Assyriologie* 16/4 (1919), 173–194.
- : *Magan, Meluḡa, and the Synchronism Between Menes and Narâm-Šin*. = *JEA* 7 (1921), 80–86.
- : *The New Cuneiform Vocabulary of Egyptian Words*. = *JEA* 12 (1926), 186–190.
- : *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology*. III. = *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 47 (1927), 198–237.
- : *Mitannian maryannu, "Chariot-Warrior", and the Canaanite and Egyptian Equivalents*. = *Archiv für Orientforschung* 6 (1930), 217–221.
- : *Review of Ember, A.: Egypto-Semitic Studies*. = *Language* 7/2 (1931), 147–150.
- : *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. New Haven, Connecticut, 1934., American Oriental Society.
- : *The Egyptian Correspondence of Abimilki, Prince of Tyre*. = *JEA* 23 (1937), 190–203.
- : *Review of Calice, F.: Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. = *Archiv für Orientforschung* 12 (1937–39), 71–73.
- : *The Furniture of El in Canaanite Mythology*. = *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 91 (1943), 39–44.
- : *In Reply to Dr. Gaster's Observations*. = *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 93 (1944), 23–25.
- : *Cuneiform Material for Egyptian Prosopography 1500–1200 B.C.* = *JNES* 5 (1946), 7–25.
- : *Review of Vergote, J.: Phonétique historique de l'égyptien. Les consonnes*. = *JAOS* 66/4 (1946), 316–320.

- : *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment*. Cambridge, 1966., Harvard University Press.
- ALC 1978 = Angas Language Committee (in Cooperation with Nigeria Bible Translation Trust): *Shək nkarŋ kè shəktok mwa nḍon Ngas. Ngas–Hausa–English Dictionary with Appendix Showing Some Features of Ngas Grammar*. Jos, Nigeria, 1978., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.
- Ali, M. & Zaborski, A.: *Handbook of the Oromo Language*. Wrocław, 1990., Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Alio, Kh.: *Wordlist of Gələmbi*. MS. 1988 (?).
- : *Wordlist of Ngamo*. MS. 1988 (?).
- : *Wordlist of Karekare*. MS. 1988 and 1991 (?).
- : (in collaboration with H. Jungraithmayr): *Tóoròm allgemeine Kulturwortliste*. MS. 28 December 1988. 32 p.
- & Jungraithmayr, H.: *Lexique bidiya*. Frankfurt am Main, 1989., Vittorio Klostermann.
- : *Galambi Basic Vocabulary*. MS. April 1990. 8 p.
- : *Galambi Cultural Vocabulary*. MS. 1990. 16 p.
- : *Karekare Basic Vocabulary*. MS. 1990 (?). 7 p.
- : *Karekare Cultural Vocabulary*. MS. March 1990. 37 p.
- : *Ngamo Basic Vocabulary*. MS. Not dated, probably 1991. 17 p.
- : *Préliminaires à une étude de la langue kajakse d'Am-Dam, de Toram du Salamaat, d'ubi du Guéra et de masmaje du Batha-est.* = Takács, G. (ed.): *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl*. Leiden, 2004., E. J. Brill. Pp. 229–285.
- Allam, M. Z.: *Zur Lesung des Titels mr.* = ASAE 71 (1987), 1–3.
- Allam, Sh.: *Hieratische Ostraka und Papyri*. Tübingen, 1973., im Selbstverlag des Herausgebers.
- Allati, A.: *Phonétique et phonologie d'un parler amazigh du Nord-Est marocain (Le parler des Ait-Said)*. Tome III. Thèse de doctorat de 3^{ème} cycle. Université de Provence, Centre d'Aix-en-Provence, 1986. 4 p.
- Allen, T. G.: *The Egyptian Book of the Dead*. Documents in the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago. Oriental Institute Publications 82. Chicago, 1960., Oriental Institute Press.
- : *The Book of the Dead or Going Forth by Day*. Chicago, 1973., Oriental Institute Press.
- : *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*. Bibliotheca Aegyptia, vol. 2, fasc. 1–2. Malibu, 1984., Undena Publications.
- Alliot, M.: *Les rites de la chasse au filet, aux temples de Karnak, d'Edfou et d'Esneh.* = RdE 5 (1946), 57–118.
- : *Le culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées*. Vol. I–II. Le Caire, 1949., 1954., IFAO.
- Almkvist, H.: *Die Bischari-Sprache Tū-Beḍāwie in Nordost-Afrika*. Zweiter Band: *Bischari-deutsches und deutsch-bischarisches Wörterbuch*. Uppsala, 1885., Akademische Buchdruckerei.
- Alojalj, Gh.: *Lexique touareg-français*. Copenhagen, 1980., Akademisk Forlag.
- Alt, A.: *Eine syrische Bevölkerungsklasse im ramessidischen Ägypten.* = ZÄS 75 (1939), 16–20.
- Altenmüller, H.: *Die Texte zum Begräbnisritual in den Pyramiden des Alten Reiches*. Wiesbaden, 1972., Harrassowitz.
- : *Synkretismus in den Sargtexten*. Wiesbaden, 1975., Otto Harrassowitz.
- & Moussa, A.: *Das Grab des Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep*. Mainz am Rhein, 1977., Philipp von Zabern.
- : *Zur Frage der mww.* = SAK 2 (1975), 1–37.

- : Die Vereinigung des Schu mit dem Urgott Atum. Bemerkungen zu CT I 385d–386b.= SAK 15 (1988), 1–16.
- : Kälbehirte und Schafhirte. Bemerkungen zur Rückkehr des Grabherrn.= SAK 16 (1989), 1–19.
- : Die Wanddarstellungen im Grab des Mehu in Saqqara. Mainz, 1998., Philipp von Zabern.
- ALUOS = Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society.
- Amborn, H. & Minker, G. & Sasse, H.-J.: Das Dullay. Materialien zu einer ostkuschitischen Sprachgruppe. Berlin, 1980., Reimer Verlag.
- Amélineau, É.: Géographie de l'Égypte à l'époque copte. Paris, 1893. Reprinted by Otto Zeller Verlag, 1973., Osnabrück.
- : Étude sur le chapitre XVII du Livre des morts.= Journal Asiatique, 10^e série, tome 15 (1910), 395–463.
- Andreu, G. & Cauville, S.: Vocabulaire absent du Wörterbuch (I).= Revue d'Égyptologie 29 (1977), 5–13.
- : Vocabulaire absent du Wörterbuch (II).= Revue d'Égyptologie 30 (1978), 10–21.
- ANET = Pritchard, J. B.: Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Princeton, 1950., Princeton University Press. 2nd edition: 1955. 3rd (revised and enlarged) edition: 1969.
- Anselin, A.: Boeufs et pasteurs – Soudan, Libye. Égypte antique.= Cahiers Caribéens d'Égyptologie 1 (2000), 71–119.
- Anthes, R.: Die Felseninschriften von Hatnub nach den Aufnahmen Georg Möllers. Leipzig, 1928., J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Applegate, J. R.: An Outline of the Structure of Shillha. New York, 1958., American Council of Learned Societies.
- : The Internal Classification of the Agaw Languages. A Comparative and Historical Phonology.= Bynon, J. (ed.): Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 33–67.
- Appleyard, D.: A Comparative Approach to the Amharic Lexicon.= Afroasiatic Linguistics 5/2 (1977).
- : The Radical Extension System of the Verb in Agaw.= Goldenberg, G. (ed.): Ethiopian Studies. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference, Tel-Aviv, 14–17 April 1980. Rotterdam, Boston, 1986., A. A. Balkema. Pp. 1–23.
- : Agaw, Cushitic, and Afroasiatic: the Personal Pronoun Revisited.= Journal of Semitic Studies 31/2 (1986), 195–236.
- : A Grammatical Sketch of Khamtanga–I.= Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 50 (1987), 241–266.
- : A Grammatical Sketch of Khamtanga–II.= Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 50 (1987), 470–507.
- : Agaw and Omotic Links. The Evidence of the Lexicon. MS. Paper presented at the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Torino, November 1989. Proceedings forthcoming.
- : Agaw Vocabulary Comparative Notes. MS. London, 1989. 24 p.
- : The Vowel Systems of Agaw: Reconstruction and Historical Inferences.= Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band II. Wien, 1991., Afro-Pub. Pp. 13–28.
- : A Comparative Agaw Wordlist. MS. London, 1991. 13 p.
- : A Falasha Prayer Text in Agaw.= Goldenberg, G. & Raz, Sh. (eds.): Semitic and Cushitic Studies. Wiesbaden, 1994., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 206–251.
- : Preparing a Comparative Dictionary of Agaw. MS. Paper presented at the III. Kuschitisten- und Omotistenkongress, Berlin, March 1994. 4 p.
- : The Position of Agaw within Cushitic.= Zemánek, P. (ed.): Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Literatures. Memorial Volume for Karel Petráček. Praha, 1996., Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Oriental Institute. Pp. 1–14.

- : 'Kailiña' – A 'New' Agaw Dialect and Its Implications for Agaw Dialectology.= Hayward, R. J. & Lewis, I. M. (eds.): *Voice and Power. The Culture of Language in North-East Africa*. London, 1996., SOAS. Pp. 1–19.
- : *Preparing a Comparative Agaw Dictionary*.= Griefenow-Mewis, C. & Voigt, R. (eds.): *Cushitic and Omotic Languages. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium*. Berlin, March 1994. Köln, 1996., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 185–200.
- : *Language Death: The Case of Qwarenya (Ethiopia)*.= Brenzinger, M. (ed.): *Endangered Languages in Africa*. Köln, 1998., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 143–161.
- : *Afroasiatic and the Nostratic Hypothesis*.= Renfrew, C. & Nettle, D. (eds.): *Nostratic: Examining a Linguistic Macrofamily*. Cambridge, 1999., The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. Pp. 289–314.
- : *Comparative Agaw Dictionary*. MS. Printout of 3 February 2005. 130 p.
- : *A Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages*. Köln, 2006., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Arbach, M.: *Le maḏābīen: lexique – onomastique et grammaire d'une langue de l'Arabie méridionale préislamique. Tome I. Lexique maḏābīen comparée aux lexiques sabéen, qatabānite et aḏramawtique*. Thèse de doctorat. Université de Provence Aix Marseille I, Centre d'Aix, septembre 1993. 128 p.
- ARE = Breasted, J. H.: *Ancient Records of Egypt. Vol. I–V*. Chicago, 1906., University of Chicago Press.
- Arkell, A. J.: *A History of the Sudan from the Earliest Times to 1821, with a Foreword by Sir Harold MacMichael*. 2nd revised edition. London, 1961., Athlone Press.
- Armbruster, Ch. H.: *Initia Amharica. Part III. Amharic-English Vocabulary with Phrases*. Cambridge, 1920., Cambridge University Press.
- Aro, J.: *Die semitischen Zischlaute (ṭ), ṣ, ś und ihre Vertretung im Akkadischen*.= *Orientalia* 28/4 (1959), 321–335.
- : *Die Vokalisierung des Grundstammes im semitischen Verbum*.= *Studia Orientalia Fennica* 31 (1964).
- : *Gemeinsemitische Ackerbauterminologie*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 113/3 (1964), 471–480.
- ArOr = *Archiv Orientální (Praha)*.
- ASAE = *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte (Qairo)*.
- Assmann, J.: *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete. Die Bibliothek der alten Welt*. Zürich, 1975., Artemis Verlag.
- : *Ma'at, Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im alten Ägypten*. München, 1990., Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Aufrère, S.: *Études de lexicologie et d'histoire naturelle I–III*.= *BIFAO* 83 (1983), 1–31.
- : *Études de lexicologie et d'histoire naturelle IV–VI*.= *BIFAO* 84 (1984), 1–21.
- : *Études de lexicologie et d'histoire naturelle VII*.= *BIFAO* 85 (1985), 23–32.
- : *Études de lexicologie et d'histoire naturelle VIII–XVII*.= *BIFAO* 86 (1986), 1–32.
- : *Études de lexicologie et d'histoire naturelle XVIII–XXVI*.= *BIFAO* 87 (1987), 21–44.
- : *Études de lexicologie et d'histoire naturelle XXVII*.= *BIFAO* 89 (1989), 15–14.
- : *L'univers minéral dans la pensée égyptienne. Vol. I–II. BdÉ 105*. Le Caire, 1990., 1991, IFAO.
- : *Le hiéroglyphe du crible à grain ḥ et la métaphore désignant le nouveau-né dans l'Égypte ancienne*.= Grimal, N. et al. (ed.): *Hommages à Fayza Haikal*. Le Caire, 2003., IFAO.
- AuOr = *Aula Orientalis (Barcelona)*.
- Avanzini, A.: *Studi di lessico sudarabico antico*.= *Atti e Memorie della Accademia Toscana La Colombaria* 43 (1978), 53–76 and 44 (1979), 17–31.

- ÄF = Ägyptologische Forschungen.
- ÄG⁴ = Erman, A.: Ägyptische Grammatik.⁴ Berlin, 1928., Akademie-Verlag.
- ÄMÖR = Otto, E.: Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual. Teil I–II. Wiesbaden, 1954., Otto Harrassowitz.
- ÄWb I = Hannig, R.: Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I. Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit. Hannig-Lexica 4. Mainz am Rhein, 2003., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- ÄWb II = Hannig, R.: Ägyptisches Wörterbuch II. Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit. I–II. Hannig-Lexica 5. Mainz am Rhein, 2006., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Badawi, A. M.: Denkmäler aus Saññarah.= ASAE 40 (1941), 495–501.
- Badawy, A.: À propos du signe [dr].= ASAE 52 (1952–54), 137–144.
- : Maru-Aten: Pleasure Resort or Temple? = JEA 42 (1956), 58–64.
- : Philological Evidence About Methods of Construction in Ancient Egypt.= ASAE 54 (1956–57), 51–74.
- : Dialectes égyptiens. Deux contrats ptolémaïques.= RT 3 (1881–82), 32–42.
- : Les noms de l'esclave en égyptien.= RT 27 (1905), 32–38, 193–217.
- : Les noms de l'esclave en égyptien.= RT 28 (1906), 113–131.
- : Les noms de l'esclave en égyptien.= RT 29 (1907), 6–25.
- Baines, J.: Fecundity Figures – Egyptian Personification and the Iconology of a Genre. Warminster, 1985., Aris & Phillips.
- Balcz, H.: Die Gefäßdarstellungen des Alten Reiches. I.= MDAIK 3 (1932), 50–113.
- : Die Gefäßdarstellungen des Alten Reiches. III. Fortsetzung und Schluß des Aufsatzes in Band IV, Heft 1 und 2.= MDAIK 5 (1934), 45–94.
- Ball, C. J.: The Ideogram [...].= PSBA 15 (1892), 48–50.
- Baranov, H. K.: Arabsko-russkij slovar'.⁷ Moskva, 1976., Russkij Jazyk.
- Bardinet, Th.: Remarques sur les maladies de la peau, la lèpre, et le châtiment divin dans l'Égypte ancienne.= RdE 39 (1988), 3–36.
- : Dents et mâchoires dans les représentations religieuses et la pratique médicale de l'Égypte Ancienne. Roma, 1990., Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Bargery, G. P.: A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary Compiled for the Government of Nigeria. London, 1934., Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.
- Barguet, P.: Le rituel archaïque de fondation des temples de Medinet-Habou et de Louxor.= RdE 9 (1952), 1–22.
- : Les stèles du Nil au Gebel Silsileh.= BIFAO 50 (1952), 49–63.
- : La stèle de la famine à Séhel. Le Caire, 1953., IFAO.
- : Une liste des pehou de l'Égypte sur un sarcophage.= Kemi 16 (1962), 7–20.
- : Le Livre des Morts des anciens égyptiens. Paris, 1967., Éditions du CERF.
- : Les textes des sarcophages égyptiens du Moyen Empire. Paris, 1986., Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Barns, J. W. B.: Five Ramesseum Papyri. Oxford, 1956., University Press at Oxford by Charles Batey.
- : A New Wisdom Text From a Writing-Board in Oxford.= JEA 54 (1968), 71–76.
- Barreteau, D.: Le mofu-gudur, langue tchadique du Nord-Cameroun.= Africana Marburgensia 10/1 (1977), 3–33.
- : Aspects de la morphologie nominale du mofu-gudur.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jung-raithmayr, H. (eds.): Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 95–113.
- : Structure du lexème verbal en mofu-gudur.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jung-raithmayr, H. (eds.): Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 115–142.
- : Un essai de classification lexico-statistique des langues de la famille tchadique parlées au Cameroun.= Barreteau, D. (ed.): Langues et cultures dans le bassin du lac Tchad. Paris, 1987., ORSTOM. Pp. 43–77.

- : Description du mofu-gudur. Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun. Livre II. Lexique. Paris, 1988., Éditions de l'ORSTOM.
- Barreteau, D. & Bléis, Y.: Lexique mafa. Langue de la famille tchadique parlée au Cameroun. Paris, 1990., ORSTOM, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Barreteau, D. & Jungraithmayr, H.: Les verbes monoradicaux dans les langues tchadiques.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.): Études tchadiques. Verbes monoradicaux suivis d'une note sur la négation en haoussa. Actes de la XII^{ème} réunion de Groupe d'Études Tchadiques LACITO-CNRS-PARIS. Paris, 1990., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner. Pp. 37–214.
- Barreteau, D.: Comparaison des systèmes consonantiques dans les langues tchadiques de la branche centrale.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 185–198.
- Barreteau, D. & Jungraithmayr, H.: Calculs lexicostatistiques et glottochronologiques sur les langues tchadiques.= Barreteau, D. & Graffenried, Ch. von (eds.): Datation et chronologie dans le bassin du Lac Tchad (Dating and Chronology in the Lake Chad Basin). Paris, 1993., Éditions de l'ORSTOM. Pp. 103–140.
- Barreteau, D.: Vowel and Tonal Variations within the Consonantal Framework of the Verbal System in Central Chadic Languages.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (eds.): Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 197–228.
- Barreteau, D. & Ibrizimow, D. & Jungraithmayr, H.: The Vocabulary of Death in Chadic and Hamito-Semitic Languages.= Mort et rites funéraires dans le bassin du Lac Tchad (Death and Funeral Rites in the Lake Chad Basin). Paris, 1995., ORSTOM Éditions. Pp. 229–242.
- Barreteau, D. & Brunet, A.: Dictionnaire Mada. Berlin, 2000., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Barreteau, D.: Sakun. MS. Noted dated. 6 p.
- Barta, W.: Das Gespräch eines Mannes mit seinem BA (Papyrus Berlin 3024). Berlin, 1969., Verlag Bruno Hessling.
- : Zur Bedeutung des snwt-Festes.= ZÄS 95 (1969), 73–80.
- : Der Königsring als Symbol zyklischer Wiederkehr.= ZÄS 98 (1970), 5–16.
- : Bemerkungen zur Bedeutung der mr-Hacke.= GM 54 (1982), 11–16.
- : Zur Lokalisierung und Bedeutung der mrt-Bauten.= ZÄS 110 (1983), 98–104.
- Barth, H.: Vocabulary of Budduma, Spoken by the Inhabitants of the Islands in Lake Chad.= Journal of the Royal Geographical Society 21 (1851), 214.
- : Auszug aus einem Briefe des Dr. Barth an Dr. Beke.= ZDMG 6 (1852), 412–413.
- : Collection of Vocabulary of Central-African Languages (Sammlung und Bearbeitung zentralafrikanischer Vokabulieren). Gotha, 1862., Justus Perthes.
- Barth, J.: Etymologische Studien zum semitischen, insbesondere zum hebräischen Lexikon. Leipzig, 1893., J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- : Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebräischen und aramäischen Lexikon. Leipzig, 1902., J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Bartholomae, Ch.: Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Straßburg, 1904., Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Barton, G. A.: Semitic and Hamitic Origins. Social and Religious. Philadelphia, 1934., University of Pennsylvania Press.
- BASOR = Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (New Haven, CT).
- Bassano, F. da: Vocabulario tigray-italiano e repertorio italiano-tigray. Roma, 1918., Casa Editrice Italiana di C. de Luigi.
- Basset, A.: Le nom de la "porte" en berbère.= Mélanges René Basset. Tome II. Paris, 1925., Éditions Ernest Leroux. Pp. 1–16.
- : Études de géographie linguistique en kabyle. (I. Sur quelques termes berbères concernant le corps humain). Paris, 1929., Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- : La langue berbère. Morphologie. La verbe: étude de thèmes. Collection du centenaire de l'Algérie. Paris, 1929., Librairie Ernest Leroux.

- Basset, R.: Notes de lexicographie berbère.= *Journal Asiatique*. Ser. VIII, vol. 1/3 (1883), 281–342.
- : Notes de lexicographie berbère.= *Journal Asiatique*. Ser. VIII, vol. 5 (1885), 148–198.
- : Notes de lexicographie berbère.= *Journal Asiatique*. Ser. VIII, vol. 10 (1887), 365–464.
- : Loqmân berbère avec quatre glossaires et une étude sur la légende de Loqmân. Paris, 1890., Ernest Leroux.
- : Le dialecte de Syouah. Paris, 1890., Ernest Leroux.
- : Notice sur les dialectes berbères des harakta et du djerid Tunisien.= *Publications du Neuvième Congrès International des Orientalistes*, Londres, 1891., Woking, 1892., Oriental University Institute. 18 p.
- : Étude sur la Zenatia de l'Ouarsenis et du Maghreb Central. Paris, 1895., Ernest Leroux.
- : Mission au Sénégal. Tome I. Étude sur le dialecte zenaga. Paris, 1909., Ernest Leroux.
- Bates, O.: *The Eastern Libyans*. London, 1914., Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.
- : The Name of Osiris.= *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 2 (1915), 207–208.
- Baucom, K. L.: Proto-Central-Khoisan.= *Third Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 7–8 April 1972. Bloomington, 1972., Indiana University. Pp. 3–37.
- Baud, M.: Études sur la statuaire de Rêdjedef. II. Une épithète de Rêdjedef et la prétendue tyrannie de Chéops.= *BIFAO* 98 (1998), 15–30.
- : Famille royale et pouvoir sous l'Ancien Empire égyptien. BdE 126/1–2. Le Caire, 1999., IFAO.
- Bauer, H.: Die Etymologie von Adam und Verwandtes.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 28 (1914), 310–311.
- : Babylonische Etymologien.= *ZA* 30 (1915–16), 106–107.
- : Verkappte t-Reflexiva im Semitischen.= *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 10 (1935), 174–176.
- Bauer, H. & Leander, P.: *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Erster Band: Einleitung, Schriftlehre, Laut- und Formenlehre. Hildesheim, 1962., Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Baum, N.: Arbres et arbustes de l'Égypte Ancienne. La liste de la tombe thébaine d'Ineni (n° 81). Leuven, 1988., Département Orientalistik.
- BdE = Bibliothèque d'Études.
- Beauregard, O.: De l'articulation des mots égyptiens, à propos de la question d'un alphabet conventionnel de transcription.= *Actes du Huitième Congrès International des Orientalistes*, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiania. Quatrième partie. Leiden, 1892., E.J. Brill. Pp. 165–189.
- Bechhaus-Gerst, M.: Sprachliche und historische Rekonstruktionen im Bereich des Nubischen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Nilnubischen.= *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 6 (1984–1985), 7–134.
- : "Nile-Nubian" Reconsidered.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): *Topics in Nilo-Saharan Linguistics*. Hamburg, 1989., Buske Verlag. Pp. 85–96.
- : Sprachwandel durch Sprachkontakt am Beispiel des Nubischen im Niltal. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer diachronen Soziolinguistik. Köln, 1996., Köppe.
- : Old Egyptian and Afro-Asiatic. The State of the Art.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 56 (1998), 111–129.
- Beckerath, J. von: Die "Stele der Verbannten" im Museum des Louvre.= *RdE* 20 (1968), 7–36.
- BED = Anonymous: *Bura-English Dictionary*. (Place unknown), 1953., (publisher unnamed). Master copy in the library of the Seminar für Afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen der Universität Hamburg (inv. no.: 15 748 / JT 1526).
- Bedecha, B. S.: The 320 Item SLE Word List on Zway, With Silt'e Entries Privoded by Eeva Gutt and Hussein Mohammed.= *Survey on Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia* 14 (1994), 2–8.
- Beguinit, F.: Sul trattamento delle consonanti b, v, f in berbero.= *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. V, vol. 33 (1924), 186–199.
- : *Il berbero Nefûsi di Fassâto*¹. Roma, 1931., Istituto per l'Oriente.

- : *Il berbero Nefûsi di Fassâto*.² Roma, 1942., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- : Lexikalische Beiträge zur ägyptisch-semitischen Sprachvergleichung = Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 62 (1927), 80–83.
- Behnk, F.: Über die Beziehungen des Ägyptischen zu den hamitischen Sprachen. = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 82 (1928), 136–141.
- Behnstedt, P.: Weitere koptische Lehnwörter im Ägyptisch-Arabischen. = WdO 12 (1981), 81–98.
- Behnstedt, P. & Woidich, M.: Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte. Band 1–2. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Band 50. Wiesbaden, 1985., Harrassowitz.
- Behnstedt, P.: Die Dialekte der Gegend von S'a^cdah (Nord-Jemen). Wiesbaden, 1987., Harrassowitz.
- : Die nordjemenitischen Dialekte. Teil 2: Glossar. Wiesbaden, 1992–, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- : Glossar der jemenitischen Dialektwörter in Eduard Glasers Tagebüchern (II, III, VI, VII, VIII, X). Wien, 1993., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- : Der arabische Dialekt von Soukhne (Syrien). Teil 2: Phonologie, Morphologie, Syntax. Teil 3: Glossar. Wiesbaden, 1994., Harrassowitz.
- Behnstedt, P. & Woidich, M.: Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte. Band 4: Glossar. Arabisch-Deutsch. Wiesbaden, 1994., Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Behrens, P.: C-Group-Sprache – Nubisch – Tu Bedawiye. Ein sprachliches Sequenzmodell und seine geschichtlichen Implikationen. = Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika 3 (1981), 17–49.
- : Das afroasiatische Diminutivmorphem t im Ägyptischen. = Göttinger Miszellen 57 (1982), 17–24.
- : Wanderungsbewegungen und Sprache der frühen saharanischen Viehzüchter. = Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika 6 (1984–85), 135–216.
- : Review of Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte. = Enchoria 15 (1987), 237–245.
- : (Unpublished comparative wordlists from Afro-Asiatic). MS. Compiled in the 1980s (?).
- Bell, C. R. V.: *The Somali Language*.² London, 1969., Longmans, Green and Co.
- Bell, H. I.: Comments on the Foregoing [Gardiner 1943, 37–46]. = JEA 29 (1943), 46–50.
- Belova, A. G.: Struktura kornja v drevneegipetskom i semitskih jazykah. = Piłaszewicz, Stanisław Jerzy (eds.): *Problemy języków Azji i Afryki*. Warszawa, 1987., Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Pp. 275–282.
- : The Position of Himyaritic within the South Semitic Group of Semitic Languages (Yemenite-Ethiopian Isoglosses). = Gromyko, A. A. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies (Moscow, 26–29 August 1986)*. Vol. 5. Moscow, 1988., Nauka. Pp. 28–34.
- : Refleksy semitskih sibiljantov v drevneegipetskom. = Meroé 4 (1989), 9–21.
- : Struktura semitskogo kornja i semitskaja morfologičeskaja sistema. = *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1 (1991), 79–90.
- : 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.: La structure de la racine afroasiatique. Le cas d'extension phonétique. = 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. 15–20.
- : Recenzija na Ehret, Ch.: Origin of the Third Consonants in Semitic Roots: An Internal Reconstruction Applied to Arabic. = *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 3 (1992), 135–139.

- : K voprosu o rekonstrukcii semitskogo kornevogo vokalizma.= Voprosy Jazykoznanija 6 (1993), 28–56.
- : Istoričeskaja morfoložija arabskogo jazyka. Moskva, 1994., Izdatel'skaja Firma "Vostočnaja Literatura" Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk.
- : Jazykovye svjazi meždu Južnoj Araviej i Vostočnoj Afriki.= Vostok 6 (1995), 106–111.
- : Očerki po istorii arabskogo jazyka. MS. Moskva, 1995. Forthcoming. To be published by: Institut Vostokovedenija Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk.
- : Komplementy i struktura kornja v afrazijskom. MS. Moskva, 1995. Still unpublished.
- : Sur la reconstruction du vocalisme radical en arabe et en sémitique.= Zemánek, P. (ed.): Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Literatures. Memorial Volume of Karel Petráček. Praha, 1996., Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Oriental Institute. Pp. 81–88.
- : Pis'mo N. V. Jušmanova I. Ju. Kračkovskomu 27 marta 1925 g.= Vostok 6 (1996), 202–209.
- : Problemy istoričeskoj fonetiki i fonologii arabskogo jazyka.= Gumanitarnye nauki v Rossii: sorosovskie laureaty. Moskva, 1996., RGGU. Pp. 276–283.
- : Préfixe du causatif dans le système chamito-sémitique (afroasiatique). MS. Handout for the 2nd World Congress of African Linguistics, Leipzig, July 1997. 2 p.
- : Omonimija v arabskom korneslove i struktura semitskogo kornja.= Jazyki Azii i Afriki: tradicii, sovremennoe sostojanie i perspektivy issledovanij. Materialy konferencii (5–8 oktjabrja 1998 g.). Moskva, 1998., Rossijskaja Akademiya Nauk, Institut Vostokovedenija. Pp. 11–15.
- : K voprosu o strukture semitskogo kornja (komplementy i fonetičeskie rassiriteli).= Istorija i jazyki Drevnego Vostoka: pamjati I. M. D'jakonova. Sankt-Peterburg, 2002., Institut Vostokovedenija Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk -Sankt-Peterburgskij Filial. Pp. 29–36.
- Bender, M. L.: Xamta 100-Item Basic Word List (Investigator: M. L. Bender). MS. Carbondale, Illinois, 29 January 1970. 6 p.
- : Kunfel 100-Item Basic Word List (Investigator: T. Birru & Z. Adal). MS. Carbondale, Illinois, 1 June 1970. 6 p.
- : The Languages of Ethiopia. A New Lexicostatistic Classification and Some Problems of Diffusion.= Anthropological Linguistics 13/5 (1971), 165–288.
- : Kimant Basic Elicitation Form for Linguistic Fieldwork in Ethiopia (Investigator: H.-J. Sasse). MS. Carbondale, Illinois, 29 August 1973. 12 p.
- : Awiya Basic Elicitation Form for Linguistic Fieldwork in Ethiopia (Investigator: R. Hetzron). MS. Carbondale, Illinois, 29 August 1973. 12 p.
- : Word and Phrase List for Fieldwork in Western Ethiopia (rev. 1974). MS. 1974.
- : Word and Phrase List for Fieldwork in Western Ethiopia (rev. 1974). Chara I. MS. 1974.
- : Omotic: A New Afroasiatic Language Family. Carbondale, Illinois, 1975., Southern Illinois University.
- Bender, M. L. & Fleming, H. C.: Non-Semitic Languages.= Bender, M. L.; Bowen, J. D.; Cooper, R. L.; Ferguson, C. A. (eds.): Language in Ethiopia. London, 1976., Oxford University Press. Pp. 34–58.
- Bender, M. L.: Gumuz: A Sketch of Grammar and Lexicon.= Afrika und Übersee 62 (1979), 38–69.
- : The Meroitic Problem.= Meroitic Newsletter September (1981), 19–24.
- : Some Nilo-Saharan Isoglosses.= Schadeberg, Th. & Bender, M. L. (eds.): Nilo-Saharan. Proceedings of the First Nilo-Saharan Linguistic Colloquium (Leiden, 1980). Dordrecht, 1981., Foris. Pp. 253–267.
- : Introduction.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): Nilo-Saharan Language Studies. East Lansing, Michigan, 1983., Michigan State University. Pp. 1–10.

- : Proto-Koman Phonology and Lexicon.= Afrika und Übersee 66 (1983), 259–297.
- : Remnant Languages of Ethiopia and Sudan.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): Nilo-Saharan Language Studies. East Lansing, Michigan, 1983., Michigan State University. Pp. 336–354.
- : A Possible Cushomotic Isomorph.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 6 (1986), 149–155.
- : Lexical Retention in Ethio-Semitic: Checking up on a Myth.= Fishman, J. A. (ed.): The Fergusonian Impact. Vol. 1: From Phonology to Society. Berlin, New York, 1986., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 291–299.
- : First Steps Toward Proto-Omotoc.= Odden, D. (ed.): Proceedings of the 16th Annual Conference on African Linguistics. Providence, Rhode Island, 1987., Foris. Pp. 21–35.
- : 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.
- : Comparative Aroid (South Omotic) Morphology. MS. Paper prepared for the II International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, 16–18 November 1989, Torino. 27 p.
- : Coming and Going in Afrasian.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 22 (1990), 19–40.
- : The Limits of Omotic.= Hayward, R. J. (ed.): Omotic Language Studies. London, 1990., SOAS. Pp. 584–616.
- : A Survey of Omotic Grammemes.= Baldi, Ph. (ed.): Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology. Berlin, New York, 1990., Walter de Gruyter. Pp. 661–695.
- : Comparative Aroid (South Omotic) Syntax and Morphosyntax.= Afrika und Übersee 74 (1991), 87–110.
- : A Survey of Omotic Grammemes.= Baldi, Ph. (ed.): Patterns of Change. Change of Patterns. Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology. Berlin, New York, 1990., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 263–297.
- : Central Sudanic Segmental and Lexical Reconstructions.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 29 (1992), 5–61.
- : Classification genetique des langues nilo-sahariennes.= Linguistique Africaine 9 (1992), 15–39.
- : Comparative Komuz Grammar.= Afrika und Übersee 77 (1994), 31–54.
- : Aroid (South Omotic) Lexicon.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 38 (1994), 133–162.
- : The Mystery Languages of Ethiopia.= Marcus, H. (ed.): New Trends in Ethiopian Studies. Vol. 1. Lawrenceville, 1994., Red Sea Press. Pp. 1153–1174.
- : Is Omotic a Genetic Family? The “New” Lexicostatistics. MS. Paper prepared for the Third Congress of Cushitic and Omotic Studies, Berlin, 18 March 1994. 20 p.
- : Afrasian. MS. Course materials for students, spring semester 1995, Southern Illinois University of Carbondale. 8 p.
- : Nilo-Saharan '95.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 45 (1996), 1–25.
- : Genetic Grouping of East Sudanic.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 45 (1996), 139–150.
- : Wordlists of Dimé, Dizi, Nayi, Sheko. MS. 5 August 1996.
- : The Nilo-Saharan Languages. A Comparative Essay.² München, Newcastle, 1997., Lincom Europa.
- : Upside-Down Afrasian.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 50 (1997), 19–34.
- : The Eastern Jebel Languages of Sudan I: Phonology.= Afrika und Übersee 80 (1997), 189–215.
- : Nominal Plurality in Omotic. MS. Paper presented at the 25th NACAL, Miami, Florida, 22 March 1997. 18 p.

- : A Third-Millennium Lexical Study of African Languages: A Programmatic Statement with Examples. MS. Handout for the 2nd World Congress of African Linguistics, Leipzig, 29 July 1997.
- : The Eastern Jebel Languages of Sudan II. Comparative Lexicon.= *Afrika und Übersee* 81 (1998), 39–64.
- : The Omotic Languages: Comparative Morphology and Lexicon. München, 1999., Lincom Europa.
- : Synthesis of the Northwest Omoto Dialect Cluster. Chart 1: Selected Lexical Items of the Welaitta Cluster. Preliminary extracts from the author's preparing Omotic Comparative Lexicon. MS. Carbondale, Illinois, 1999. Pp. 8–37.
- : Nilo-Saharan.= Heine, B. & Nurse, D. (eds.): *African Languages. An Introduction*. Cambridge, 2000., Cambridge University Press. Pp. 43–73.
- : Proto-Forms in Omoto: First 150 items. MS. Preliminary extracts from the author's preparing Omotic Comparative Lexicon. MS. Carbondale, Illinois, 14 September 2000. 16 p.
- : Synthesis of the Northwest Omoto Family. Chart 5: Selected Lexical Items of the Noerthwest Omoto Family. Preliminary extracts from the author's preparing Omotic Comparative Lexicon. MS. Carbondale, Illinois, 2000.
- : *Omotic Lexicon and Phonology*. Carbondale, 2003., SIU Printing / Duplicating, Southern Illinois University.
- : *The East Sudanic Languages: Lexicon and Phonology*. Carbondale, 2005., SIU Printing / Duplicating, Southern Illinois University.
- Bengtson, J. D. & Ruhlen, M.: *Global Etymologies*. MS. Paper presented at the Symposium "Language and Prehistory", Ann Arbor, November 1988. 40 p.
- Bentolila, F.: *Grammaire fonctionnelle d'un parler berbère. Aït Seghrouchen d'Oum Jeniba (Maroc)*. Paris, 1981., SELAF.
- Berhanu, H.; Sisay, D.; Wedekind, K.: *Khamir – the People [ximra] and Their Language [xim't'aja-]*.= *Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia* 23 (1995), 1–8.
- Berlev, O. D.: *Obščestvennye otnošenija v Egipte v epohu Srednego Carstva*. Moskva, 1978., Nauka.
- Bergsträsser, G.: *Glossar des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Ma⁹lūla*. Leipzig, 1921., DMG. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 15/4 (1921), 1–123.
- Bevan, E.: *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*. London, 1927., Methuen.
- Biarnay, S.: *Étude sur le dialecte berbère de Ouargla*. Paris, 1908., Ernest Leroux.
- : *Étude sur le dialecte des bet't'ioua du Vieil-Arzen*.= *Revue Africaine* 277 (1911), 1–261. Paris & Alger, Typographie Adolphe Jourdan.
- : *Étude sur les dialectes berbères du Rif*. *Lexique, textes et notes de phonétique*. Paris, 1917., Ernest Leroux.
- Biberstein Kazimirski, A. de: *Dictionnaire arabe-français*. Paris, 1860., Maisonneuve & Co. Editeurs.
- Bickel, S. & Mathieu, B.: *L'écrivain Amennakht et son enseignement*.= *BIFAO* 93 (1993), 31–51.
- Bidoli, D.: *Die Sprüche der Fangnetze in den altägyptischen Sargtexten*. Glückstadt, 1976., J. J. Augustin.
- BIE = *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte (Le Caire)*.
- Bianchi, A.: *Remarks on the Beings Called mrwty or mrwryt in the Coffin Texts*.= *JEA* 73 (1987), 206–7.
- Biella, J. C.: *Dictionary of Old South Arabic*. Chico, 1982., Scholars Press at Harward.
- Bietak, M.: *Ausgrabungen in Sayala-Nubien 1961–1965. Denkmäler der C-Gruppe und der Pan-Gräber-Kultur*.= *Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien)*, phil.-hist. Klasse, Band 92 (1966).
- BIFAO = *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale (Le Caire)*.
- BiOr = *Bibliotheca Orientalis (Leiden)*.

- Birch, S.: *Varia*. = ZÄS 6 (1868), 9–12.
 —: *Varia*. = ZÄS 8 (1870), 130–132.
- Birru, T. & Adal, Z. & Cowley, R. W.: *The Kunfal People and Their Language*. = *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 9/2 (1971), 99–106.
- Bishai, W. B.: *Coptic Lexical Influence on Egyptian Arabic*. = *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 23 (1964), 39–47.
- Bissing, F. W. Freiherr von: *La chambre des trois saisons du sanctuaire solaire du roi Rathourès (V^e dynastie) à Abousir*. = *ASAE* 53 (1955–56), 319–338, pl. I–XXIII.
- Bitūma, T.: *A Dictionary of Oromo Technical Terms. Oromo-English*. Köln, 2000., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Bittner, M.: *Studien zur Šhauri-Sprache in den Bergen von Dófar am Persischen Meerbusen. I. Lautlehre und zum Nomen im engeren Sinne*. Wien, 1915., Alfred Hölder.
- : *Studien zur Šhauri-Sprache in den Bergen von Dófar am Persischen Meerbusen. IV. Index (šhauri-deutsches Glossar) und Nachträge zu den Texten von D. H. von Müller (textkritische Noten nach den ersten Aufnahmen)*. = *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, phil.-hist. Klasse*, 183. Band, 5. Abhandlung (1917), 1–106.
- : *Vorstudien zur Grammatik und zum Wörterbuche der Soqōṭri-Sprache. II.–III*. Wien, 1918., Alfred Hölder.
- Blachère, R. & Chouémi, M. & Denizeau, C. & Pellat, Ch.: *Dictionnaire arabe-français-anglais (Langue classique et moderne)*. Tome I–III. Paris, 1967–1976., Maisonneuve et Larose.
- Black, P. D.: *Lowland East Cushitic: Subgrouping and Reconstruction*. Ph.D. dissertation. 1974., Yale University.
- : *Regular Metathesis in Gidole*. = *Folia Orientalia* 15 (1974), 47–54.
- : *Linguistic Evidence on the Origins of the Kongsoid Peoples*. = Marcus, H. G. & Hinnant, J. (eds.): *Proceedings of the First U.S. Conference on Ethiopian Studies (Michigan State University, 2–5 May 1973)*. East Lansing, 1975., African Studies Center, Michigan State University. Pp. 291–302.
- : *Werizoid*. = Bender, M. L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, Michigan, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 222–231.
- Blackman, A. M.: *Some Middle Kingdom Religious Texts*. = ZÄS 47 (1910), 116–132.
- : *The Rock Tombs of Meir. Vols. I–VI*. London, 1914–53., The Egypt Exploration Society.
- : *On the reading of [“king”] as “ny-šw.t”*. = *RT* 38 (1916), 69.
- : *The Pharaoh’s Placenta and the Moon-God Khons*. = *JEA* 3 (1916), 235–249.
- Blackman, A. M. & Peet, T. E.: *Papyrus Lansing: A Translation with Notes*. = *JEA* 11 (1925), 284–298.
- Blackman, A. M.: *Oracles in Ancient Egypt. II*. = *JEA* 12 (1926), 176–185.
- : *Notes on Certain Passages in Various Middle Egyptian Texts*. = *JEA* 16 (1930), 63–72.
- : *Some Notes on the Story of Sinuhe and Other Egyptian Texts*. = *JEA* 22 (1936), 35–44.
- : *Review of A. H. Gardiner: Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum: Third Series: Chester Beatty Gift*. = *JEA* 22 (1936), 103–106.
- : *The Stela of Shoshenq, Great Chief of the Meshwesh*. = *JEA* 27 (1941), 83–95.
- Blackman, A. M. & Fairman, H. W.: *The Myth of Horus at Edfu. II. C. The Triumph of Horus Over His Enemies. A Sacred Drama*. = *JEA* 29 (1943), 2–36.
- : *The Myth of Horus at Edfu. II*. = *JEA* 30 (1944), 5–22.
- Blažek, V.: *Some Nostratian Etymologies. First Part*. = *Linguistica* 22 (1982), 239–248.
- : *Afrasian Numerals*. MS. Paper prepared for the 5th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Vienna, 1987.

- : Some Notes About New Korean Etymologies of G. J. Ramstedt.= *ArOr* 55 (1987), 156–161.
- : Problémy a perspektivy nostratické hypotézy (fonologie).= *Slovo a Slovesnost* 49/1 (1988), 39–52.
- : *Lexica Nostratica. Addenda et Corrigenda I.*= *Archív Orientální* 57 (1989), 201–210.
- : A New Contribution to Comparative-Historical Afrasian Linguistics.= *Asian and African Studies* 24 (1989), 203–222.
- : Omotic Lexicon in Afroasiatic Perspective: Body Parts Cognates. MS. Paper presented at the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages (Torino, November 1989). 41 p.
- : A Comparative-Etymological Approach to Afrasian Numerals.= *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Vol. I. Vienna, 1990.*, Afro-Pub. Pp. 29–44.
- : 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 ijunja 1990 g. čast' II.* Moskva, 1990., Institut Slavjanovedenija i Balkanistiki Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 40–45.
- : *Lexica Nostratica. Addenda et Corrigenda II.*= *Archív Orientální* 58 (1990), 205–218.
- : K typologii pojmenování “člověka” v indoevropských jazycích (v nostratickém kontextu).= *Slavia* 59/3 (1990), 262–270.
- : *Bedawye Etymologies.* MS. Příbram, around 1990. 10 p.
- : Basque and North Caucasian or Afroasiatic?=*Mother Tongue* 14 (1991), 9–13.
- : Honey in Cushitic and Omotic Languages.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 26 (1991), 37–66.
- : Kartvelian Material in Nostratic Lexicon.= *Archív Orientální* 59 (1991), 360–369.
- & Boisson, C.: The Diffusion of Agricultural Terms from Mesopotamia.= *Archív Orientální* 60 (1992), 16–37.
- : Basque and North Caucasian or Afroasiatic?=*Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E. R. & Thomanek, K. É. (eds.): Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovskij anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags.* Wien, 1992., Afro-Pub. Pp. 21–30.
- : Kartvelian Material in Nostratic Lexicon: New Etymologies II.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind.* Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 129–148.
- : Emotions in Nostratic Lexicon.= *Sborník Prací Filozofické Fakulty Brněnské Univerzity. Řada Jazykovědná* 40 (1992), 135–146.
- : Who Are You, Homo Sapiens Sapiens?=*Human Affairs* 2/2 (1992), 138–149.
- : The New Dravidian-Afroasiatic Parallels. Preliminary Report.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind.* Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 150–165.
- : Some Nostratic Etymologies. A Continuation.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind.* Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 245–265.
- : The Microsystem of Cushitic Numerals. MS. Paper presented at the 23rd CALL, Leiden, September 1993. 11 p.
- : Review of Baldi, Ph. (ed.): *Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology.*= *Archív Orientální* 62/1 (1994), 99–103.
- : Elephant, Hippopotamus and Others: On Some Ecological Aspects of the Afroasiatic Homeland.= *Asian and African Studies* 3/2 (1994), 196–212.
- : Review of Kaye, A. S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honour of Wolf Leslau.*= *Archív Orientální* 62 (1994), 428–435.

- : Toward the Position of Bed'awye within Afroasiatic. An Analysis of the Body Parts Terminology. MS. Printout in Köln, March 1994. 49 p.
- : Elam: A Bridge between Ancient Near East and Dravidian India? MS. Paper presented at the 3rd World Archaeological Congress, New Delhi, December 1994. 26 p.
- : The Semitic Divine Name *^cattar(-at-) and Its Possible Afroasiatic Cognates.= Zemánek, P. (ed.): Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Literatures. Memorial Volume of Karel Petráček. Prague, 1996., Oriental Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences. Pp. 133–141.
- : Indo-European “Seven”.= Hegedús, I.; Michalove, P. A.; Manaster Ramer, A. (eds.): Indo-European, Nostratic, and Beyond: Festschrift for Vitalij V. Shevoroshkin. Washington D.C., 1997., Institute for the Study of Man. Pp. 9–29.
- : Cushitic Lexicostatistics: The Second Attempt.= Bausi, A.; Tosco, M. (eds.): Afroasiatica Neapolitana. Contributi presentati all'8^o Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semítica), Napoli, 25–26 Gennaio 1996. Papers from the 8th Italian Meeting on Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Naples, January 25–26, 1996. Napoli, 1997., Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Pp. 171–188.
- : Kartwelische Numeralia.= Georgica 21 (1998), 95–103.
- : Numerals. Comparative-Etymological Analyses and Their Implications. Brno, 1999., Masarykova Univerzita v Brně.
- : Elam: A Bridge between Ancient Near East and Dravidian India? = Blench, R. M. & Spriggs, M. (eds.): Archaeology and Language IV. Language Change and Cultural Transformation. London & New York, 1999., Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. Pp. 48–78.
- : Review on Lamberti, M. & Sottile, R.: The Wolaytta Language.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 58 (1999), 143–156.
- : Egyptian Numerals.= 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-Semítica), Trieste, 23–24 Aprile 1998. Padova, 1999., Unipress. Pp. 229–264.
- : Toward the Discussion of the Berber-Nubian Lexical Parallels.= Chaker, S. & Zaborski, A. (eds.): Études berbères et chamito-sémitiques. Mélanges offerts à Karl-G. Prasse pour son 70^e anniversaire. Paris, Louvain, 2000., Éditions Peeters. Pp. 31–42.
- : The New Dravidian-Afroasiatic Lexical Parallels.= Starostin, S. A. (ed.): Problemy izučenija dal'nego rodstva jazykov an rubeže tret'ego tysjačeletija. Doklady i tezisj naučnoj konferencii (Moskva, 29 maja – 2 ijunja 2000 g.). Moskva, 2000., Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet. Pp. 180–193.
- : Fragment of a Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of Beja Anatomical Lexicon. MS. 2000. 90 p.
- : The New Dravidian-Afroasiatic Lexical Parallels. Full version. MS. Paper presented at the Conference “Problemy izučenija dal'nego rodstva jazykov an rubeže tret'ego tysjačeletija” (Moscow, 29 May – 2 June 2000). 26 p.
- : Beja Colour Terminology in a Comparative-Etymological View. MS. 2000. 5 p.
- : Beja Kinship and Social Terminology. MS. 2000. 11 p.
- : Flora in Beja Lexicon. MS. 2000. 8 p.
- : Fauna in Beja Lexicon. MS. 2000. 27 p.
- : Toward the Berber Kinship Terminology in the Afroasiatic Perspective.= Nait-Zerrad, K. (ed.): Articles de linguistique berbère. Mémoial Werner Vycichl. Paris, 2002., L'Harmattan. Pp. 103–135.
- : Fauna in Beja Lexicon. A Fragment of a Comparative-Etymological Dictionary of Beja.= Kogan, L. (ed.): Orientalia: Papers of the Oriental Institute. Issue III. Studia Semitica. Moscow, 2003., Russian State University of Humanities. Pp. 230–294.

- : Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic Prepositions and Related Words: Common Heritage or a Result of Convergence? = Hegedűs, I. & Sidwell, P. (eds.): Nostratic Centennial Conference: The Pécs Papers. Pécs, 2004., Lingua Franca Group. Pp. 1–25.
- : Natural Phenomena, Time and Geographical Terminology in Beja Lexicon. Fragment of a Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of Beja: I. = Babel und Bibel 2 (2006), 365–407.
- Bléis, Y. (avec la collaboration de D. Barreteau): Lex extensions verbales en mafa. = Jungraithmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.): Études tchadiques. Classes et extensions verbales. Paris, 1987., Paul Geuthner. Pp. 99–114.
- Blench, R. M.: The Westward Wanderings of Cushitic Pastoralists. = Baroin, C. & Boutrais, J. (eds.): L'homme et l'animal dans le bassin du lac Tchad. Actes du colloque Réseau Méga-Tchad, Orléans, 15–17 octobre 1997. Paris, 1999., Éditions IRD. Pp. 39–80.
- : Can We Combine Linguistics and Archaeology to Reconstruct African Prehistory? MS. Paper presented in Frankfurt a/M on 17 May 2000. 27 p.
- : Fyer Word List. MS. 2000. 8 p.
- : Why Reconstructing Comparative Ron Lexicon is so Problematic. MS. Paper prepared for the Biennial International Colloquium on the Chadic Language Family (July 5–8, 2001, in Leipzig). This printout: London, 11 July 2001. 13 p.
- : The North Bantoid Hypothesis. MS. Draft paper for comment. n.d. 34 p.
- Blok, H. P.: Zu sumer. munu > Aeg. mnjw. = Archiv für Orientforschung 6 (1930), 23–24.
- BN = Biblische Notizen. Beiträge zur exegetischen Diskussion (Bamberg, München).
- Boeser, P. A. A.: The hieroglyph [m3^c]. = Studies presented to F. Ll. Griffith. Oxford, 1932., Egypt Exploration Society, Oxford University Press. P. 45.
- Boisacq, É.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Heidelberg, Paris, 1916., Carl Winter, Klincksieck.
- Boisson, Cl.: Sumerian/Nostratic/Sino-Caucasian Isoglosses. Version 3.16, 5 November 1989. MS. Lyon, 1989. 74 p.
- : Additions to “Sumerian/Nostratic/Sino-Caucasian Isoglosses (Version 3.16)”. Version 0.4. MS. Lyon, 1990. 31 p.
- Bojowald, S.: Noch einmal zur Vogelbezeichnung “w3r” aus oGardiner 25, verso 2–5. = GM 197 (2003), 15–20.
- Bomhard, A. R.: Indo-European and Afroasiatic. New Evidence for the Connection. = Arbeitman, Y. L. & Bomhard, A. R. (eds.): Bono Homini Donum. Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1981., John Benjamins. Pp. 351–474.
- : Toward Proto-Nostratic. Amsterdam, 1984., John Benjamins.
- : Common Indo-European/Afroasiatic Roots. Supplement 1. = General Linguistics 26 (1986), 225–257.
- : Rekonstrukcija prasemitskoj sistemy soglasnyh. = Voprosy Jazykoznanija 5 (1988), 50–65.
- : The Reconstruction of the Proto-Semitic Consonant System. = Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1988., John Benjamins. Pp. 113–140.
- : Peresmotr indoeuropejsko-semitskoj gipotezy. = Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike. Vypusk XXI. Novoe v sovremennoj indoevropistike. Moskva, 1988., Progress. Pp. 433–450.
- : A Sample of the Comparative Vocabulary of the Nostratic Languages. Revised Version. MS. July 1990. 610 p. Published later in Bomhard, A. R.; Kerns, J. C.: The Nostratic Macrofamily. A Study in Distant Linguistic Relationship. Berlin, New York, 1994., Mouton de Gruyter.

- Bondi, J. H.: Die Bezeichnung der ägyptischen Spanne.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 32 (1894), 132–133.
- Bonhême, M.-A.: Les désignations de la titulature royale.= *BIFAO* 78 (1978), 347–387.
- Bonnet, H.: *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin, 1952., de Gruyter.
- Bonvini, E.: A propos et en marge de 'greater Chadic': le cas du voltaïque.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 85–117.
- Borchardt, L.: Beiträge zu Griffith' Benihasan III.= *ZÄS* 35 (1897), 103–7.
- : Ein altägyptisches astronomisches Instrument.= *ZÄS* 37 (1899), 10–17.
- : Zu Sinuhe 25ff.= *ZÄS* 29 (1891), 63.
- : Drei Hieroglyphenzeichen.= *ZÄS* 44 (1907), 75–79.
- : Altägyptische Sonnenuhren.= *ZÄS* 48 (1910), 9–17.
- Boreux, Ch.: Les pseudo-stèles C.16, C.17 et C.18 du Musée du Louvre.= *BIFAO* 30/1 (1931), 45–48.
- Borger, R.: *Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste*. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978., Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer.
- Borghouts, J. F.: *The Magical Texts of the Papyrus Leiden I 348*. Leiden, 1971., E. J. Brill.
- : *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts*. Leiden, 1978., E.J. Brill.
- : The Ram as a Protector and Prophet.= *RdE* 32 (1980), 33–46.
- : Review of Meeks, D.: *Année lexicographique, tome 1 (1977)*.= *CdE* 56 (1981), 268–275.
- : *Lexicographical Aspects of Magical Texts*.= Grunert, S. & Hafemann, I. (eds.): *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch. Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie*. Leiden, 1999., E. J. Brill. Pp. 149–177.
- Bougchiche, L.: *Glossaire kabyle des termes et des énoncés figurant dans les chapitres liminaires et dans l'ensemble mythique du volume I des Volksmärchen der Kabylen* (pp. 3–114).= *Littérature Orale Arabo-Berbère* 26 (1998), 277–338.
- Boulifa, S. A.: *Une première année de langue kabyle (dialecte zouaoua) à l'usage des candidats à la prime et au brevet de kabyle*. Deuxième édition. Alger, 1910., Adolphe Jourdan.
- Bouny, P.: *Wordlist of Kotoko*. MS. N'Djamena, January 1975–June 1976. 42 p.
- : *Wordlist of Kotoko (French-Kotoko)*. MS. 1975–76 (?). 17 p.
- : *Inventaire phonétique d'un parler kotoko: le mandangué de mara*.= Caprile, J.-P. (ed.): *Études phonologiques tchadiennes*. Paris, 1977., SELAF. Pp. 59–78.
- : *La formation du pluriel des nominaux en kotoko*.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 51–65.
- : *Intervention au sein du groupe de travail sur la reconstruction d'un proto-tchadique à partir de la liste de 225 items présentés par l'équipe de Marburg*.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. P. 59–78.
- : *Un conte mandague (parler kotoko)*.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Caprile, J.-P. (eds.): *Cinq textes tchadiques (Cameroun et Tchad)*. Berlin, 1978., Reimer. Pp. 73–119.
- Bouny, P. & Jouannet, F.: *Comparaison lexicale: kanembou-kotoko*.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 177–191.
- : *Bata Phonology: A Reappraisal*. München, 2002., Lincom Europa.
- Böhlig, A.: *Zuñ- im Koptischen*.= *GM* 23 (1977), 11–23.
- Bravmann, M. M.: *Studies in Semitic Philology*. Leiden, 1977., E.J. Brill.
- Breasted, J. H.: *Ancient Records of Egypt*. Vol. I–V. Chicago, 1906/07., University of Chicago Press.

- : The Edwin Smith Surgical Papyrus. Vol. I. Chicago, 1930., The University of Chicago Press.
- Brenzinger, M.: The "Islanders" of Lake Abaya and Lake Ch'amo: Harro, Ganjule, Gats'ame and Bayso.= SLLE Linguistic Reports 26 (1995), 4–27.
- Brinks, J. & Westendorf, W.: gmḥ.wj "doppelter Teil der Tür".= GM 23 (1977), 25–29.
- Brockelmann, C.: Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. I. Band: Laut- und Formenlehre. Berlin, 1907. (1908.), Verlag von Reuther & Reichardt.
- : Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. II. Band: Syntax. Berlin, 1911. (1913.), Verlag von Reuther & Reichardt.
- : Semitische Reimwortbildungen.= Zeitschrift für Semitistik 5 (1927), 6–38.
- : Lexicon syriacum². Halle, 1928., Max Niemeyer.
- : Ägyptisch-semitische Etymologien.= Zeitschrift für Semitistik 8 (1932), 97–117.
- : Gibt es einen hamitischen Sprachstamm? = Anthropos 27 (1932), 797–818.
- : Abessinische Studien.= Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, philologisch-historische Klasse 97/4 (1950), 1–60.
- Bross, M. & Ibrizimow, D. (et al.): Pots, Potters and Their Language Among the Hausa and the Bole. A Contrastive Analysis.= Berichte des Sonderforschungsbereichs 268/2 (1993), 75–93.
- Brovarski, E.: Ahanakht of Bersheh and the Hare Nome in the First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom.= Simpson, W. K. & Davis, Wh. M. (eds.): Studies in Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Sudan. Essays in Honor of Dows Dunham on the Occasion of His 90th Birthday, June 1, 1980. Boston, 1981., Dept. of Egyptian and Ancient Near Eastern Art, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Pp. 14–30.
- : Two Old Kingdom Writing Boards from Giza.= ASAE 71 (1987), 27–52.
- Brown, J. P.: The Mediterranean Vocabulary of the Vine.= Vetus Testamentum 19 (1969), 146–170.
- Brunatelli, V.: Some Remarks on Semitic Numerals and the Ebla Texts.= Fronzaroli, P. (ed.): Studies on the Language of Ebla. Firenze, 1984., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 85–99.
- Brugsch Wb = Brugsch, H.: Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch. Bd. I–VII. Leipzig, 1867–1882., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Brugsch, H.: Lexikalisches.= ZÄS 6 (1868), 72.
- : [mnh] menḥ.= ZÄS 14 (1876), 71–77.
- : Sendschreiben an Professor Ebers.= ZÄS 2 (1882), 55–86.
- : Die biblischen sieben Jahre der Hungersnoth nach dem Wortlaut einer altägyptischen Felsen-Inschrift. Leipzig, 1891., J. C. Hinrichs.
- : Aethiopica.= ZÄS 29 (1891), 25–33.
- : Die Alraune als altägyptische Zauberpflanze.= ZÄS 29 (1891), 31–33.
- Brunner, H.: Die Lehre des Cheti. Glückstadt, 1944., J. J. Augustin.
- : Die Geburt des Gottkönigs. Studien zur Überlieferung eines altägyptischen Mythos. Wiesbaden, 1964., Harrassowitz.
- : Die Hieroglyphen für "räuchern", "bedecken", "Handfläche" und ihnen entsprechenden Wörter.= Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse 3 (1965), 79–96.
- Brunner, L.: Die gemeinsamen Wurzeln des semitischen und indogermanischen Wortschatzen. Versuch einer Etymologie. Bern, 1969., Francke Verlag.
- Brunner-Traut, E. & Brunner, H.: Die ägyptische Sammlung der Universität Tübingen. Mainz, 1981., Zabern.
- Brunner-Traut, E.: Altägyptische Märchen.⁸ Köln, 1989., Diederichs Verlag.

- : Der Tanz im Alten Ägypten. Nach bildlichen und inschriftlichen Zeugnissen. Dritte, erweiterte Auflage. Glückstadt, 1992., J. J. Augustin.
- Bruyère, B.: Rapport sur les fouilles de Dêir el Médineh (1926). Le Caire, 1927., IFAO.
- BSEG = Bulletin de la Société d'Égyptologie de Genève.
- BSFE = Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie (réunion trimestrielles, communications archéologiques, Paris).
- BSOAS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (London).
- Buchberger, H.: Transformation und Transformat. Sargtextstudien I. Wiesbaden, 1993., Harrassowitz.
- Budde, D. & Kurth, D.: Zum Vokabular der Bände Edfou V–VIII.= Kurth, D. (Hrsg.): Edfu: Studien zu Vokabular, Ikonographie und Grammatik. Wiesbaden, 1994., Harrassowitz. Pp. 1–24.
- Bulakh, M.: Etymological Notes on the Akkadian Colour Terms.= Kogan, L. (ed.): *Orientalia: Papers of the Oriental Institute. Issue III. Studia Semitica.* Moscow, 2003., Russian State University of Humanities. Pp. 3–17.
- Burchardt, M.: Die altkanaanäischen Fremdworte und Eigennamen im Aegyptischen. Teil I–II. Leipzig, 1909–10., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Burkard, G.: Textkritische Untersuchungen zu ägyptischen Weisheitslehren des Alten und Mittleren Reiches. Wiesbaden, 1977., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Literarische Tradition und historische Realität.= ZÄS 121 (1994), 93–106.
- Burquest, D. A.: A Preliminary Study of Angas Phonology.= *Studies in Nigerian Languages* 1 (1971).
- Burtea, B. & Tropper, J. & Younansardaroud, H. (ed.): *Studia Semitica et Semitohamitica.* Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004. Münster, 2005., Ugarit-Verlag.
- Büchner, H.: Vokabulare des Sprachen in und um Gava (Nordnigerien).= *Afrika und Übersee* 48 (1964), 36–45.
- 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.
- BZAW = Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Beihefte (Berlin).
- CAD = The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Vol. 1–21. Glückstadt & Chicago, Since 1956, J. J. Augustin, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Cagiola, L.: Alcune note sui cereali dell'Antico Regno.= *Discussions in Egyptology* 9 (1987), 7–17.
- CAH = Cambridge Ancient History.
- Cañtucoli, C.: Schèmes tonals et morphologie du verbe en masa.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique.* Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 67–87.
- : *Lexique masa.* Paris, 1983., Agence de Coopération Culturelle et Technique.
- Calice, F. von: Eine Etymologie.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 35 (1897), 171–172.
- : Zur ägyptisch-semitischen Wurzelverwandtschaft.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 39 (1901), 146–147.
- : Das Gefäß nms.t.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 9/1 (1906), 47–48.
- : Zur Entwicklung der Negationen im Neuägyptischen.= ZÄS 43 (1906), 149–151.
- : Der Name Ramses.= ZÄS 46 (1909), 110–111.
- : Zur Entwicklung des U-Lautes im Ägyptischen und Koptischen.= ZÄS 63 (1928), 141–143.
- : Ägyptisch-semitische Sprachvergleichung.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 84 (1930), 61–62.

- : Über semitisch-ägyptische Sprachvergleichung.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 85 (1931), 25–37.
- : Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung. Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- Callender, J. B.: Plural Formation in Egyptian.= *JNES* 46/1 (1987), 27–37.
- Cantineau, J.: Review of Cohen, M.: *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*.= *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 44/2 (1948), 173–180.
- Caprile, J.-P.: Le mawer: une nouvelle langue du groupe “tchado-hamitique”?= *Africana Marburgensia* 4/2 (1971), 47–61.
- Calverley, A. M. & Broome, M. F.: *The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos*. Vol. 2. London, 1935., The Egypt Exploration Society.
- Caminos, R.: *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*. London, 1954., Oxford University Press.
- : *Literary Fragments in the Hieratic Script*. Oxford, 1956., Oxford University Press.
- : *The Chronicle of Osorkon*. Roma, 1958., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- : Papyrus Berlin 10463.= *JEA* 49 (1963), 29–37, pl. vi.
- : The Nitocris Adoption Stela.= *JEA* 50 (1964), 71–101.
- : Another Hieratic Manuscript From the Library of Pwerem Son of Kiki (Pap. B. M. 10288).= *JEA* 58 (1972), 205–224.
- : *A Tale of Woe: Papyrus Pushkin 127*. Oxford, 1977., Griffith Institute.
- Cannuyer, Ch.: Les formes dérivées du verbe en ancien égyptien. *Essai de systématisation*. = *GM* 63 (1983), 25–33.
- : L'obèse de Ptah et de Samuel.= *ZÄS* 113 (1986), 92–103.
- : Du nom de la giraffe en ancien égyptien et de la valeur phonétique du signe [sr].= *GM* 112 (1989), 7–10.
- Capart, J.: Une liste d'amulettes.= *ZÄS* 45 (1908), 14–21.
- Caprile, J.-P.: Le mawer: une nouvelle langue du groupe “tchado-hamitique”?= *Africana Marburgensia* 4/2 (1971), 47–61.
- : Kebe monde (gabri). MS. Djoun, commune de Lai, février 1972.
- : *Lexique tumak-français (Tchad)*. Berlin, 1975., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- : Notes linguistiques sur le tobanga à partir d'un conte en cette langue.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Caprile, J.-P. (eds.): *Cinq textes tchadiques (Cameroun et Tchad)*. Présentation linguistique. Berlin, 1978., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 121–175.
- : Les mots voyageurs dans l'interfluve Bahr-Erguig/Chari/Logone: comparaison lexicale entre le barma, langue sara de l'ancien royaume baguirmien, et le tumak, langue tchadique.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Groupe travail sur les langues tchadiques (22–24 septembre 1977, Ivry). Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 145–156.
- Caquot, A.: “Hier” et “demain” dans les langues sémitiques.= *GLECS* 7 (1954–57), 97–98.
- Carnochan, J.: *Bachama and Chadic*.= Bynon, J.; Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 459–468.
- Caron, B.: Guus, aka Sigidi (Chadic, West-B, South Bauchi): *Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary*.= *AuÜ* 84 (2001), 1–60.
- : *Dott aka Zoḍi (Chadic, West-B, South-Bauchi)*.= *AuÜ* 85 (2002), 161–248.
- : *Le luri: quelques notes sur une langue tchadique du Nigeria*.= Boyeldieu, P. & Nougayrol, P. (eds.): *Langues et cultures: terrains d'Afrique*. Hommage à France Cloarec-Heiss. Louvain, 2004., Peeters. Pp. 193–201.
- Cassuto, U.: *Biblical and Oriental Studies*. I–II. Jerusalem, 1973–75., The Magnes 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.

- Cauville, S.: Une offrande spécifique d'Osiris: le récipient de dattes (m^cd3-bnr).= RdE 32 (1980), 47–64.
- : irt: un nom de la situle? = RdÉ 34 (1982–83), 137.
- Cauville, S.: Essai sur la théologie du temple d'Horus à Edfou. Le Caire, 1987., IFAO.
- Cauville, S.: Un préfixe p en égyptien? = Revue d'Égyptologie 38 (1987), 183–184.
- CdE = Chronique d'Égypte (Bruxelles).
- CD = Crum, W. E.: A Coptic Dictionary. Oxford, 1939., Oxford, 1939., Oxford University Press.
- CED = Černý, J.: Coptic Etymological Dictionary. London, Cambridge, 1976., Cambridge University Press.
- Cenival, F. de: Notes de grammaire et de lexicologie à propos du mythe de l'oeil du soleil.= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 215–231.
- Cenival, F. de: Remarques sur le vocabulaire du "Mythe de l'oeil du Soleil".= Vleeming, S. P. (ed.): Aspects of Demotic Lexicographie. Leuven, 1987., Peeters. Pp. 3–8.
- Cenival, F. de: Le Mythe de l'oeil du Soleil. Sommerhausen, 1988., Gisela Zauzich Verlag.
- Černý, J.: The Gender of Tens and Hundreds in Late Egyptian.= JEA 23 (1937), 57–59.
- : Two Puzzles of Ramesside Hieratic.= JEA 23 (1937), 60–62.
- : Greek Etymology of the Name of Moses.= ASAE 41 (1941–42), 349–354.
- : Nouvelle série de questions adressées aux oracles.= BIFAO 41 (1942), 14–24.
- : The Origin of the Name of the Month Tybi.= ASAE 43 (1943), 173–181.
- : Philological and Etymological Notes.= ASAE 42 (1943), 341–350.
- : On the Origin of the Egyptian Conjunctive.= Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 35 (1949), 25–30.
- : Notes on Some Coptic Etymologies.= Coptic Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing Crum. Boston, 1950., The Byzantine Institute. Pp. 35–47.
- : Philological and Etymological Notes.= ASAE 51 (1951), 441–446.
- : Prices and Wages in Egypt in the Ramesside Period.= Cahiers d'histoire mondiale 1 (1954), 903–921.
- : The Inscriptions of Sinai from Manuscripts of Alan H. Gardiner and T. Eric Peet edited and completed. Forty-fifth Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Society. Part II. Translations and Commentary. London, 1955., Egypt Exploration Society.
- : Some Coptic Etymologies.= Firchow, O. (Hrsg.): Ägyptologische Studien. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 30–37.
- & Kahle, P. E. & Parker, R. A.: The Old Coptic Horoscope.= JEA 43 (1957), 86–100.
- : Some Coptic Etymologies III.= Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 57 (1958), 203–213.
- : Hieratic inscriptions from the tomb of Tut^cankhamūn. Oxford, 1965., Oxford University Press (for the Griffith Institute).
- : The Valley of the Kings. Fragments d'un manuscrit inachevé. Le Caire, 1973., IFAO.
- : Papyrus hiératiques de Deir el-Médineh. Tome I (nos I–XVII). Le Caire, 1978., IFAO.
- & Groll, S. I.: A Late Egyptian Grammar. Roma, 1978., Biblical Institute Press.
- Cerulli, E.: Note su alcune popolazioni sidāmā dell'Abissinia meridionale II: i Sidama dell'Omo.= Rivista degli Studi Orientali 12 (1929), 1–69.
- : Studi etiopici. I. La lingua e la storia di Harar. Roma, 1936., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- : La racine monosyllabique (consonne + voyelle ou voyelle seule) en couchitique.= GLECS 3 (1937–40), 33–36.

- : Studi etiopici. II. La lingua e la storia dei Sidamo. Roma, 1938., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- : Studi etiopici. III. Il linguaggio dei Giangerò ed alcune lingue Sidama dell'Omo (Basketo, Ciara, Zaissè). Roma, 1938., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- : Studi etiopici. IV. La lingua caffina. Roma, 1951., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Četveruhin, A. S.: Egipetskaja realizacija dvuh afrazijskih dejtiko-reljativnyh morfem.= Voprosy Jazykoznanija 2 (1990), 91–101.
- Ceugney, C.: Du rôle de m préfixe en égyptien.= Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à la Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes 2 (1880), 1–9.
- Chabas, É.: Le voyage d'un Égyptien en Syrie, en Phénicie, en Palestine, etc. au XIV^e siècle avant notre ère. Chalons-sur-Saône, 1866., Maisonneuve.
- Chaker, S.: Les racines berbères trilitères à 3^{ème} radicale alternante.= Comptes Rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques (GLECS) 18–23 (1973–79), 293–303.
- : Tizi-wuccen. Méthode audiovisuelle de langue berbère (kabyle – 1^{er} niveau). Aselmed amezwaru n tmaziyt (taqbaylit). Aix-en-Provence, 1987., Edisud, La Calade.
- : Lexicographie et comparaison. Le “Dictionnaire informatisé de la langue berbère”.= Bentolila, F. & Leguil, A. (eds.): Journée de linguistique berbère (11 mars 1989, Sorbonne) – La comparaison. Paris, 1989., INALCO. Pp. 39–48.
- Charpentier, G.: Recueil de matériaux épigraphiques relatifs à la botanique de l'Égypte antique. Paris, 1981., Trismégiste.
- Chassinat, E.: Un papyrus médical copte. Le Caire, 1921., IFAO.
- : Le mot mrt dans les textes médicaux.= Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiés à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion à l'occasion du centenaire de la lettre à M. Dacier relative à l'alphabet des hiéroglyphes phonétiques lue à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres le 27 septembre 1822. Paris, 1922., Champion. Pp. 447–465.
- : Quelques parfums et onguents en usage dans les temples de l'Égypte ancienne 3 (1930), 117–167.
- : À propos d'un mot incertain.= Volume offert à Jean Capart. Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales, Tome III (1935), 107–112.
- : Le Mammisi d'Edfou. Le Caire, 1939., IFAO.
- Cherkesi, E.: Georgian-English Dictionary. Oxford, 1950., Oxford University Press.
- Chermette, M. & Goyon, J.-C.: Le catalogue raisonné des producteurs de styrax et d'oliban d'Edfou et d'Athribis de Haute Égypte.= SAK 23 (1996), 47–82.
- Cheru, Zewde; Wedekind, K.; Tanaba, Wolde-Gebriel: On the Wordlists of Diraasha (Gidole) and Muusiye (Bussa).= SLLE Linguistic Reports 19 (1994), 3–16.
- Četverukhin, A. S.: Old Egyptian Introductory Particles of the Base m(j) and the Verb “See, Behold, Look”.= Archív Orientální 58 (1990), 135–146.
- : A Morpheme Meaning “As, Like” in Old Egyptian and Akkadian.= Ancient Egypt and Kush. In Memoriam Mikhail A. Korostovtsev. Moscow, 1993., Nauka Oriental Literature Publishers. Pp. 124–140.
- Christophe, L.: À propos de mots désignant des parures.= GM 96 (1987), 23–32.
- Claus, (?): Die Wangómwia.= Zeitschrift für Ethnologie 42 (1910), 489–497.
- Clère, J. J.: Sur un nom du Wâdi Maghâra (Sinâi).= JEA 24 (1938), 125–126.
- : Sur un passage de la stèle Louvre C1.= JEA 24 (1938), 242.
- : Sur un emploi parallèle des prépositions arabe littéral bi- et ancien égyptien m.= GLECS 4 (1945–48), 24–25.
- : L'expression dnš mhwt des autobiographies égyptiennes.= Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 35 (1949), 38–42.
- : Deux nouveaux exemples de l'expression dnš mhwt.= JEA 37 (1951), 112–113.
- : La lecture de la fraction “deux tiers” en égyptien.= ArOr 20 (1952), 629–641.

- : L'ancienneté des négations à b initial du néo-égyptien.= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 14 (1956), 29–33.
- Coates, (?): Kwang Wordlists. MS. 1991. 6 p.
- Cochavi-Rainey, Z.: Egyptian Influence in the Amarna Texts.= *UF* 29 (1997), 95–114.
- Cohen, D.: Le vocabulaire de base sémitique et le classement des dialectes méridionaux. Matériaux pour un premier essai de glottochronologie.= *Semitica* 11 (1961), 55–84.
- & Taine-Cheikh, C.: À propos du zénaga. Vocalisme et morphologie verbale en berbère.= *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 95/1 (2000), 267–320.
- Cohen, M.: Nouvelles études d'éthiopien méridional. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences historiques et philologiques 275. Paris, 1939., Éditions Honoré Champion.
- : Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique. Paris, 1947., Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Colombel, V. de: Esquisse d'une classification de 18 langues tchadiques du Nord-Cameroun.= Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Border Area*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 103–122.
- : Phonologie quantitative et synthématique. Propositions méthodologiques et théoriques avec application à l'ouldémé (langue tchadique du Nord-Cameroun). Paris, 1986., SELAF.
- : Classes verbales en ouldémé? = Jungraithmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.): *Études tchadiques. Classes et extensions verbales*. Paris, 1987., Paul Geuthner. Pp. 25–31.
- : Les extensions verbales productives, mi-figées ou fossilisées en langue ouldémé.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.): *Études tchadiques. Classes et extensions verbales*. Paris, 1987., Paul Geuthner. Pp. 65–91.
- : Evolution du système verbal en linguistique tchadique: synchronie dynamique et diachronie.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 199–212.
- : Noms de plantes. Classification, reconstruction et histoire à partir des noms de six cents plantes en dix langues tchadiques des monts du Mandara.= Ibrizimov, D.; Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 229–251.
- : La labgue ouldémé (Nord-Cameroun). Précis de grammaire, texte, lexique. Paris, 1997., Association de Linguistique Africaine.
- Conti, G.: Egiziano 3šh “tagliare col falcetto”, etiopico ʔəzh “pietra focaia”. = *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 48 (1973–74), 29–35.
- : Il sistema consonantico egiziano.= *Oriens Antiquus* 15/1 (1976), 44–55.
- : Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nelle denominazioni egiziane del tetto.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 50/3–4 (1976), 265–273.
- : Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nel lessico egiziano dell'agricoltura. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- : Studi sul Biliteralismo in Semitico e in Egiziano. 1. Il Tema Verbale N1212. Firenze, 1980., Istituto Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.
- : Arcaismi in eblaita.= Fronzaroli, P. (ed.): *Studies on the Language of Ebla*. Firenze, 1984., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 159–172.
- Conti Rossini, C.: Note sugli agau. 1. Appunti sulla lingua khamta dell'Averghellé.= *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 17/2a (1905), 183–242.
- : Note sugli agau. 2. Appunti sulla lingua Awiyā del Danghelà.= *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 18 (1905), 103–194.
- : La langue des Kemant en Abyssinie. Wien, 1912., Alfred Hölder.
- : Schizzo del dialetto saho dell'alta Assaorta in Eritrea. Roma, 1913., Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei.

- : Studi su popolazioni dell'Etiopia.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 6 (1913), 365–426.
- : Sui linguaggi dei Naa e dei Ghimirra (Sce) nell'Etiopia Meridionale.= *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, ser. VI, vol. I (1925), 512–636.
- : Sui linguaggi parlati a nord dei Laghi Rodolfo e Stefania.= *Festschrift C. Meinhof. Sprachwissenschaftliche und andere Studien*. Hamburg, 1927. Pp. 247–255.
- : Contributi per la conoscenza della lingua Haruro (Isole del Lago Margherita).= *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser. VI, vol. XII, fasc. 7–10 (1937), 621–679.
- Cooper, K. N.: *Lexique zime-français. Vūn tārī. Sarh (Tchad)*, 1984., Centre d'Études Linguistiques.
- Copland, B. D.: *A Note on the Origin of the Mbugu with a Text*.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 24 (1933–34), 241–5.
- Correll, Ch.: *Materialien zur Kenntnis des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Bahġa*. Ph.D. Diss., Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität, München, 1969.
- Cosper, R.: *South Bauchi Lexicon. A Wordlist of Nine South Bauchi (Chadic) Languages and Dialects*. Halifax, 1994., The Author (Saint Mary's University).
- : *Barawa Lexicon. A Word-list of Eight South Bauchi (West Chadic) Languages: Boghom, Buli, Dott, Geji, Jimi, Polci, Sayanci and Zul*. München, 1999., Lincom Europa.
- Couroyer, B.: *brk – mrk*.= *Orientalia NS* 32 (1963), 170–177.
- : *Trois épithètes de Ramses II*.= *Orientalia NS* 33 (1964), 443–453.
- CRAIBL = *Comptes Rendus (des Séances) de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Paris)*.
- Crass, J.: *The Position of K'abeena Within Highland East Cushitic*.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 67 (2001), 5–60.
- Crum, W. E.: *Review of Spiegelberg, W.: Koptisches Handwörterbuch*.= *JEA* 8 (1922), 187–190.
- : *Ein neues Verbalpräfix im Koptischen*.= *ZÄS* 65 (1930), 124–7.
- Cruz-Uribe, E.: *Hibis Temple Project. Volume I. Translations, Commentary, Discussions and Sign List*. San Antonio, Texas, 1988., Van Siclen Books.
- CT = *Buck, A. de: The Egyptian Coffin Texts. Vol. I–VII*. Chicago, 1935–61., The University of Chicago Press.
- Curto, S.: *Ricerche sulla natura e significato dei caratteri geroglifici di forma circolare*.= *Aegyptus* 39 (1959), 226–261.
- : *Annotazioni su geroglifici arcaici*.= *ZÄS* 94 (1967), 15–25.
- CWC = *Jungraithmayr, H.: Chadic Word Catalogue. Database*. Marburg & Frankfurt a/M, since 1970.
- Czapkiewicz, A.: *Ancient Egyptian and Coptic Elements in the Topography of Contemporary Egypt*.= *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, prace językoznawcze, zeszyt 28* (1971).
- Czermak, W.: *Die Laute der ägyptischen Sprache. Eine phonetische Untersuchung. I. Teil: Die Laute des Alt- und Mittelägyptischen*. Wien, 1931., Verlag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Ägyptologen und Afrikanisten in Wien.
- : *Die Laute der ägyptischen Sprache. Eine phonetische Untersuchung. II. Teil*. Wien, 1934., Verlag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Ägyptologen und Afrikanisten in Wien.
- Dahood, M.: *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology. Marginal Notes on Recent Publications*. Rome, 1965., Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- : *Psalms. III*. Garden City, 1970., Doubleday.
- : *Hebrew Lexicography: A Review of W. Baumgartner's Lexikon, Volume II*.= *Orientalia NS* 45 (1976), 327–365.

- Dallet, J.-M.: Dictionnaire qabyle-français. Parler des At Mangellat (Algerie). Paris, 1982., SELAF (Société d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France).
- Dalman, G. H.: Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch. Frankfurt a/M, 1922., J. Kaufmann Verlag.
- Damman, E.: Einige Notizen über die Sprache der Sanye (Kenya).= Zeitschrift der Eingeborenen-Sprachen 35 (1949-50), 227-234.
- Daressy, M. G.: Un modèle du signe [ms].= ASAE 4 (1903), 122-123.
- : Une inscription d'Achmoun et la géographie du nom libyque.= ASAE 16 (1916), 221-246.
- : La statue n° 35562 du Musée du Caire.= ASAE 17 (1917), 81-85.
- : Le signe mes aux trois chacals.= ASAE 19 (1919-20), 176.
- : Recherches géographiques.= ASAE 26 (1926), 246-272.
- Darnell, J. C.: Two Notes on Marginal Inscriptions at Medinet Habu.= Bryan, B. M. & Lorton, D. (eds.): Essays in Egyptology in Honor of Hans Goedicke. San Antonio, 1994., Van Siclen Books. Pp. 35-55.
- : Hathor Returns to Medamûd.= SAK 22 (1995), 47-94.
- Daumas, F.: Note sur la plante matjet.= BIFAO 56/1 (1957), 59-64.
- David, A. R.: Religious Ritual at Abydos (c. 1300 B.C.). Warminster, 1973., Aris and Phillips.
- Davies, N. M.: Birds and Bats at Beni Hasan.= JEA 35 (1949), 13-20.
- Dawson, W. R.: The Plant Called "Hairs of the Earth".= JEA 12 (1926), 240-241.
- : Three Anatomical Terms.= 62 (1927), 20-23.
- : Studies in the Egyptian Medical Texts.= JEA 18 (1932), 150-154.
- : Studies in the Egyptian Medical Texts-II.= JEA 19 (1933), 133-137.
- & Peet, T. E.: The So-Called Poem on the King's Chariot.= JEA 19 (1933), 167-174.
- : Charles Wycliffe Goodwin, 1817-1878: A Pioneer in Egyptology. London, 1934., Oxford Univ. Press.
- : Studies in the Egyptian Medical Texts-IV.= JEA 20 (1934), 185-188.
- : Studies in the Egyptian Medical Texts-V.= JEA 21 (1935), 37-40.
- : Some Interesting Observations on Passages in Ch. Beatty Papyri VII, VIII, and IX.= JEA 22 (1936), 106-108.
- DCT = Molen, R. van der: A Hieroglyphic Dictionary of Egyptian Coffin Texts. Leiden, 2000., E.J. Brill.
- Deboo, J.: Jemenitisches Wörterbuch. Arabisch-Deutsch-Englisch. Wiesbaden, 1989., Harrassowitz.
- DED = Burrow, T.; Emeneau, M. B.: A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary. Oxford, 1961., Clarendon Press.
- Deines, H. von; Grapow, H.: Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Drogennamen. Berlin, 1959., Akademie-Verlag.
- DELIC = Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte. Leuven, 1983., Peeters.
- DELL = Ernout, A. & Meillet, A.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots. Quatrième édition revue, corrigée et augmentée d'un index. Paris, 1959., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Delheure, J.: Dictionnaire mozabite-français. Paris, 1984., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologique de France (SELAF).
- : Dictionnaire ouargli-français. Paris, 1987., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologique de France (SELAF).
- Dempwolff, O.: Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Sprachen in Deutsch-Ostafrika.= Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen 7 (1916-17), 309-325.
- Dendara I = Rochmonteix, Marquis de; Chassinat, E.: Le temple de Dendara. Tome I. Le Caire, 1932., Imprimerie de l'IFAO.

- Dendara II–IV = Chassinat, E.: Le temple de Dendara. Tome II–IV. Le Caire, 1934–35., Imprimerie de l'IFAO.
- Dendara V = Chassinat, E.: Le temple de Dendara. Tome V, fasc. 1–2. Le Caire, 1947–52., Imprimerie de l'IFAO.
- Dendara VI–VIII = Chassinat, E.; Daumas, F.: Le temple de Dendara. Vol. VI, VII, VIII. Le Caire, 1965., 1972., 1978., Publications de l'Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire.
- Dendara IX = Daumas, F. (avec la collaboration de B. Lenthéric): Le temple de Dendara. Tome IX. Le Caire, 1987., Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Deny, J.: Le nom du safran en arabe.= GLECS 5 (1948–51), 11–14.
- Depuydt, L.: On the Grammar of Demotic Sacerdotal Decrees.= CdE 73 (1998), 54–65.
- Derchain, Ph.: Rites égyptiens. I. Le sacrifice de l'oryx. Bruxelles, 1962., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth.
- Derchain, Ph.: Ménès, le roi "quelqu'un".= RdE 18 (1966), 31–36.
- Derchain-Urtel, M. Th.: Das n- Präfix im Ägyptischen.= Göttinger Miscellen 6 (1973), 39–54.
- Derchain-Urtel, M.-Th.: T3–mrj – 'Terre d'héritage'.= Broze, M. & Talon, Ph. (ed.): L'atelier de l'orfèvre. Mélanges offerts à Ph. Derchain. Leuven, 1992., Peeters. Pp. 55–61.
- Destaing, E.: Interdictions de vocabulaire en berbère.= Mélanges René Basset. Tome II. Paris, 1925., Éditions Ernest Leroux. Pp. 177–277.
- : Vocabulaire français-berbère (tachelit du Souûs). Paris, 1938., Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- : Encore un mot sur le nom du Nil, Ḥ^cpi.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 47 (1910), 163–4.
- : Les maximes de Ptahhotep d'après le Papyrus Prisse, les Papyrus 10371 / 10435 et 10509 du British Museum et la Tablette Carnarvon. Texte. Fribourg, 1916., (no publisher indicated).
- : Le conte du naufragé.= RT 38 (1916), 188–210.
- : Étymologies coptes.= RT 39/3–4 (1921), 154–177.
- : Études d'étymologie copte. Fribourg (Suisse), 1923., Ancienne Librairie Ad. Rody.
- Devauchelle, D.: L'arbre rdm.t.= RdE 32 (1932), 65–68.
- DG = Erichsen, W.: Demotisches Glossar. Kopenhagen, 1954., Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Dietrich, M.: Zum mandäischen Wortschatz.= BiOr 24/5–6 (1967), 290–305.
- Dietrich, M. & Loretz, O.: Untersuchungen zur Schrift- und Lautlehre des Ugaritischen (I). Der ugaritische Konsonant ḡ.= WdO 4 (1967), 300–315.
- Dietrich, M. & Loretz, O. & Sanmartín, J.: Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (VIII). Lexikographische Einzelbemerkungen.= UF 5 (1973), 105–117.
- : Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie.= UF 7 (1975), 157–169.
- Dietrich, M. & Loretz, O.: mt "Môt, Tod" und mt "Krieger, Held" im Ugaritischen.= UF 22 (1990), 57–66.
- : Die ugaritischen Wortpaare dm || mm^c und brkm || hlqm im Kontext westsemitischer anatomischer Terminologie.= UF 35 (2003), 141–179.
- Dillmann, C. F. A.: Lexicon linguae aethiopiae. Lipsiae, 1865., T. O. Weigel.
- Dimmendaal, G. J.: The Lexical Reconstruction of Proto-Nilotic: a First Reconnaissance. = Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 16 (1988), 5–67.
- Dixon, D. M.: The Land of Yam.= JEA 44 (1958), 40–55.
- 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.
- D'jakonov, I. M.: Urartskie pis'ma i dokumenty. Moskva, Leningrad, 1963., Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk.

- : Semitohamitskie jazyki. Opyt klassifikacii. Moskva, 1965., Nauka.
- : Jazyki Drevnej Perednej Azii. Moskva, 1967., Nauka.
- : Problems of Root Structure in Proto-Semitic.= *Archív Orientální* 38 (1970), 453–480.
- : Die Arier im vorderen Orient: Ende eines Mythos. Zur Methodik der Erforschung verschollener Sprachen.= *Orientalia* NS 41/1 (1972), 91–120.
- : Hamito-Semitic Languages.= *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.¹⁵ *Macropaedia*. Volume 22. Chicago, 1974., The University of Chicago Press. Pp. 740–748.
- : Lingvističeskie dannye k istorii drevnejših nositelej afrazijskih jazykov.= *Africana. Afrikanskij Étnografičeskij Sbornik* 10 (1975), 117–130.
- : On Root Structure in Proto-Semitic.= Bynon, J. and Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 133–153.
- : Earliest Semites in Asia. Agriculture and Animal Husbandry According to Linguistic Data (VIIIth–IVth Millennia B.C.).= *Altorientalische Forschungen* 8 (1981), 23–74.
- : O prarodine nositelej indoevropskih dialektov.= *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 3 (1982), 3–30.
- : Father Adam.= *Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft* 19 (1982), 16–24.
- : On the Original Homeland of the Speakers of Indo-European.= *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 13/1–2 (1985), 92–174.
- & Starostin, S. A.: *Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language*. München, 1986., Kitzinger.
- with assistance by Militarev, A. Ju. & Stolbova, O. V.: *Proto-Afrasian and Old Akkadian*. MS. Leningrad, around 1986. Published in the *Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 4/1 (1992).
- : Obščefrazijskie imennye kategorii.= *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XIX godičnaja naučnaja sessija LO IV AN SSSR*. Moskva, 1986., Nauka. Pp. 47–62.
- ; Starostin, S. A.: *Hurro-urartskie i vostočnokavkazskie jazyki*.= *Drevnij Vostok. Étnokul'turnye svjazi. LXXX*. Moskva, 1988., Nauka. Pp. 164–207.
- : *Afrasian Languages*. Moscow, 1988., Nauka.
- : Proto-Afrasian and Old Akkadian.= *Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 4/1 (1992), 1–133.
- & Kogan, L. E.: Addenda et Corrigenda to “Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary” by V. Orel and O. Stolbova. A Review Article. MS. St. Petersburg, 1995.
- : Addenda et Corrigenda to *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary* by V. Orel and O. Stolbova.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 146 (1996), 25–38.
- : Some Reflections on the Afrasian Linguistic Macrofamily.= *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 55/4 (1996), 293–294.
- : The Earliest Semitic Society. *Linguistic Data*.= *JSS* 43/2 (1998), 209–219.
- & Kogan, L.: *Semitic Terms of Kinship and Social Sphere*.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. & Seibert, U. (Hrsg.): *Eine Von Ägypten zum Tschadsee. Eine linguistische Reise durch Afrika. Festschrift für Herrmann Jungrathmayr zum 65. Geburtstag*. Würzburg, 2001., Ergon Verlag. Pp. 147–158.
- Djibrine, B. A. Z. & Montgolfier, P. de (etc.): *Vocabulaire dangaléat. Kawo da ṅ la*. Place not indicated, around 1973. (deduced by G. Takács), publisher not indicated.
- DLE = Lesko, L. H.: *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*. Volume I, II, III, IV. Berkeley, 1982., 1984., 1989. B.C. Scribe Publications.
- DLU I = Olmo Lete, G. del & Sanmartín, J.: *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica*. Vol. I. ^{ʾ(a/i/u)-l}. Barcelona, 1996., Editorial AUSA.
- DLU II = Olmo Lete, G. del & Sanmartín, J.: *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica*. Vol. II. m-z. Barcelona, 2000., Editorial AUSA.

- DNG = Gauthier, H.: Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques. Tom I–VII. Le Caire, 1925–1931., IFAO.
- DNWSI = Hofstijzer, J. & Jongeling, K.: Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions. Part 1–2. Leiden, 1995., E. J. Brill.
- Dolgopol'skij, A. B.: Metody rekonstrukcii obščeeindoevropskogo jazyka i vneindoevropskie sopostavlenija.= Problemy sravnitel'noj grammatiki indoevropskih jazykov. Moskva, 1964., Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta. Pp. 27–30.
- : Gipoteza drevnejšego rodstva jazykovyh semej severnoj Evrazii s verojatnosnoj točki zrenija.= Voprosy Jazykoznanija 2 (1964), 53–63.
- : Metody rekonstrukcii obščeeindoevropskogo jazyka i sibiroevropskaja gipoteza.= Étimologija (1964), 259–270.
- : Materialy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike kušitskih jazykov. Gubnye i dental'nye smyčnye v načal'nom položenii.= Uspenskij, B. A. (ed.): Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 35–88.
- : La permutation des *m et *b initiaux dans les racines couchitiques.= Il Congrès International des Africanistes. Communications de la délégation de l'URSS. Moscou, 1967., Nauka. Pp. 3–17.
- : Struktura semitohamitskogo kornja v sravnitel'no-istoričeskom osveščanii.= Problemy jazykoznanija. Moskva, 1967., Nauka. Pp. 278–282.
- : Drevnie korni i drevnie ljudi.= Russkaja Reč' 2 (1968), 96–108.
- : Nostratičeskie osnovy s sočetaniem šumnyh soglasnyh.= Étimologija (1967), 296–313.
- : 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.
- : O nostratičeskoj sisteme affrikat i sibiljantov: korni s fonemoj *ʒ.= Étimologija (1972), 163–175.
- : Materialy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike kušitskih jazykov. Veljarnyj zvonkij v anlaute. = Ohotina, N. V. & Uspenskij, B. A. (eds.): Problemy afrikanškogo jazykoznanija. Tipologija, komparativistika, opisanie jazykov. Moskva, 1972., Nauka. Pp. 197–216.
- : Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika kušitskih jazykov. Moskva, 1973., Nauka.
- : Materialy po leksike jazyka hadija.= Bepis'mennye i mladopis'mennye jazyki Afriki. Moskva, 1973., Nauka. Pp. 67–82.
- : Chadic-Semitic-Cushitic: Epenthetic -y- in Sura in the Light of Hamito-Semitic Comparative Linguistics.= Jungrauthmayr, H. (ed.): The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigrific Border Area. Papers of the Marburg Symposium (1979, Berlin). Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 32–46.
- : Semitic and East Cushitic. Sound Correspondences and Cognate Sets.= Segert, S. & Bodrogligeti, A. J. E. (eds.): Ethiopian Studies Dedicated to Wolf Leslau. Wiesbaden, 1983., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 123–142.
- : On Personal Pronouns in the Nostratic Languages.= Gschwantler, O.; Rédei, K.; Reichert, H. (eds.): Linguistica et Philologica. Gedenkschrift für Björn Collinder (1894–1983). Wien, 1984., Wilhelm Braumüller. Pp. 65–112.
- : Semitic Nomina Segolata in Ethiopic.= Goldenberg, G. (ed.): Ethiopian Studies: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference, Tel Aviv, April 1980. Rotterdam, Boston, 1986., Balkema. Pp. 71–90.
- : South Cushitic Lateral Consonants as Compared to Semitic and East Cushitic.= Jungrauthmayr, H. & Müller, W. W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Amsterdam, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 195–214.
- : On Etymology of Pronouns and Classification of the Chadic Languages.=

- Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): *Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1988., John Benjamins. Pp. 201–220.
- : *Semitic and East Cushitic: Word-Initial Laryngeals*.= Taddese, B. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, University of Addis Ababa, 1984. Volume 1. Addis Ababa, 1988., Institute of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa. Pp. 629–637.
- (ed.): *Cultural Contacts of Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Indo-Iranian with Neighbouring Languages*.= *Folia Linguistica Historica* 8/1–2 (1989), 3–36.
- : *Problems of Nostratic Comparative Phonology (Preliminary Report)*.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*. Bochum, 1989., Brockmeyer. Pp. 90–98.
- : *On Lateral Obstruents in Hamito-Semitic*.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*. Bochum, 1989., Brockmeyer. Pp. 99–103.
- : *On Chadic Correspondences of Semitic *š*.= Mukarovskij, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*. Band 1. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 213–225.
- : *List of Nostratic Roots* (5 December 1991). MS. Haifa, 1991. 36 p.
- : *From Proto-Semitic to Hebrew: Phonology. Etymological Approach in a Hamito-Semitic Perspective*. MS. Haifa, 1992. 298 p.
- : *Some Hamito-Semitic Names of Body Parts in Goldenberg, G. & Raz, Sh. (eds.): Semitic and Cushitic Studies*. Wiesbaden, 1994., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 267–287.
- : *On the Origin of Some Semitic Names of Body Parts*. Preprint. Haifa, 1994.
- : *External Relations of Afroasiatic*. MS. Paper presented at the 3rd World Archaeological Congress, New Delhi, December 1994. 5 p.
- : *Hamito-Semitic Etymologies*. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 1 p.
- : *Origin of Gender in Hamito-Semitic*. MS. Paper presented at the 8° Incontro di Linguistica Afro-Asiatica, Napoli, January 1996. MS. 2 p.
- : *Pertinent Entries from the “Nostratic Dictionary” by A. Dolgopolsky (in Preparation)*. Annex to the paper presented at the 8° Incontro di Linguistica Afro-Asiatica, Napoli, January 1996. MS. 11 p.
- : *The Nostratic Macrofamily and Linguistic Paleontology*. Cambridge, 1998., The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- : *On the Origin of the Hebrew *Nota Accusativi* ’et ~ ’et and the t-Accusative in Akkadian, Agaw and Saho*.= 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° Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semita), Trieste, 23–24 Aprile 1998. Padova, 1999., Unipress. Pp. 43–46.
- : *Emphatic and Plain Voiceless Consonants in Hamito-Semitic in the Light of Internal and External Comparative Evidence*.= Fronzaroli, P. & Marrassini, P. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 10th Meeting of Hamito-Semitic (Afroasiatic) Linguistics (Florence, 18–20 April 2001)*. *Quaderni di Semitistica* 25. Firenze, 2005., Dipartimento di Linguistica, Università di Firenze. Pp. 29–34.
- : *Nostratic Grammar: Synthetic or Analytic?*= *Orientalia et Classica*. Trudy Instituta Vostočnyh kul'tur i antičnosti. Vypusk VI: *Aspekty komparativistiki* 1. Moskva, 2005., Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet. Pp. 13–38.
- Dombrowski, F. A.; Dombrowski, B. W. W.: *Numerals and Numeral Systems in the Hamito-Semitic and Other Language Groups*.= Kaye, A. S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau*. Volume 1. Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 340–381.
- Donner, H.: *Review of Albright, W. F.: The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment*.= *Journal of Semitic Studies* 12 (1967), 273–281.

- Doornbos, P.: Mubi (Minjile) Wordlist. MS. 25 July 1979. 6 p.
 —: Minjile Wordlist. MS. 1979/1980. 11 p.
 —: Kajakse Notes. MS. 3–4 May 1981. 4 p.
 —: Kujarke Notes. MS. 5 May 1981. 4 p.
 —: Kujarke Notes. MS. 1981. 12 p.
 — & Bender, M. L.: Languages of Wadai-Darfur.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): Nilo-Saharan Language Studies. East Lansing, Michigan, 1983., Michigan State University. Pp. 43–79.
- Dozy, R.: Suppléments aux dictionnaires arabes. Tome I–II. Leiden, Paris, 1881., E. J. Brill, Maisonneuve.
- Drenkhahn, R.: Die Handwerker und ihre Tätigkeit im Alten Ägypten. Wiesbaden, 1976., Harrassowitz.
- Drexel, A.: Der semitische Trikonsonantismus und die afrikanische Sprachwissenschaft.= WZKM 32 (1925), 1–29.
- Drioton, E.: Recueil de cryptographie monumentale.= ASAE 40/1 (1940), 305–429.
 —: La cryptographie du papyrus Salt 825.= ASAE 41 (1941–42), 99–134.
 —: À propos du cryptogramme de Montouemhêt.= ASAE 42 (1943), 177–181.
 —: Le texte dramatique d'Edfou. Le Caire, 1948., IFAO.
 —: Un cryptogramme relatif aux souffles de vie.= Firchow, O. (Hrsg.): Ägyptologische Studien. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 44–50.
 —: Voeux inscrits sur des scarabées.= MDAIK 14 (1956), 34–41.
- Driver, G. R.: Canaanite Myths and Legends. Edinburgh, 1956., Clark.
- Drower, E. S. & Macuch, R.: A Mandaic Dictionary. Oxford, 1963., Clarendon Press.
- 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.
- Duisburg, A. von: Überreste der Sso-Sprache.= Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen 17 (1914), 39–54.
- DUL = Olmo Lete, G. & Sanmartín, J.: A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One [ʔ(a/i/u)-k]. Part Two [-z]. Leiden, 2003., E.J. Brill.
- Durand, O.: Problèmes de lexicologie berbère-sémitique: la berbère préislamique.= RSO 67 (1993), 229–244.
 —: Introduzione ai dialetti arabi. Milano, 1995., Centro di Studi Camito-Semitici.
- Düring, N.: Materialien zum Schiffbau im alten Ägypten. Berlin, 1995., Achet Verlag N. Düring.
- Dybo, A. V.: Methods in Systematic Reconstruction of Altaic and Nostratic Lexics.= Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka. Materialy k diskussijam na konferencii (Moskva, 29 maja – 2 ijunja 1989 g.). Čast' 1. Moskva, 1989., Nauka. Pp. 196–209.
 —: Saharskaja sem'ja – šestaja gruppa afrazijskih jazykov? = Starostin, S. A. (ed.): Problemy izučenija dal'nego rodstva jazykov an rubeže tret'ego tysjačeljetija. Doklady i tezis naučnoj konferencii (Moskva, 29 maja – 2 ijunja 2000 g.). Moskva, 2000., Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet. Pp. 49–60.
- Ebbell, B.: The Papyrus Ebers, The Greatest Egyptian Medical Document. Copenhagen, 1937., Levin & Munksgaard.
 —: Ägyptische anatomische Namen.= Acta Orientalia 15 (1937), 293–310.
 —: Alt-ägyptische Bezeichnungen für Krankheiten und Symptome. Oslo, 1938., Dybwad.
 —: Die altägyptischen aromatischen Harze der Tempelinschrift von Edfu.= Acta Orientalia 17/2 (1938), 89–111.
 —: Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte einiger Infektionskrankheiten.= Skrifter Utgitt

- av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi I Oslo, II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, Ny Serie No. 6 (1967), 1–112.
- Ebeling, E.: Glossar.= Knudtzon, J. A.: Die el-Amarna Tafeln². Leipzig, 1915., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Ebers, G.: 1. Mennus – Mallus. 2. Eine Hathor-Astarte-Spur in Assyrien. 3. *παμόλης* – Min. 4. Der Gott [hrt] *χeld*. = ZÄS 6 (1868), 70–72.
- : Wie Altägyptisches in die europäische Volksmedizin gelangte.= ZÄS 33 (1895), 1–18.
- Ebert, K. H.: Felduntersuchungen zur Kera-Sprache.= *Africana Marburgensia* 6/2 (1973), 49–57.
- : “Tuburi” und Kera. Identifikation und Korrektur der Lukas’schen “Tuburi” – Wortlisten.= *Africana Marburgensia* 7/1 (1974), 9–33.
- : Sprache und Tradition der Kera (Tschad). Teil II. Berlin, 1976., Dietrich Reimer.
- : Vergleich Kera-Kwang. MS. Noted dated (1977?). 4 p.
- : Vergleich Kera-Tupuri-Français-Kwang-Mobu. MS. Noted dated (1977?). 10 p.
- : Kera-tupuri-français – “Peve”. MS. Noted dated (1977?). 10 p.
- : Lexical Root and Affixes in Kera.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 41–50.
- : A First Comparison of Kera and Kwang.= *Langues tchadiques et langues non tchadiques en contact en Afrique Centrale*. Paris, 1985., SELAF. Pp. 61–69.
- Ebobisse, C.: Die Morphologie des Verbs im Ost-Dangaleat (Guera, Tschad). Berlin, 1979., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : Les verbaux du dangaléat de l’est (Guera, Tchad). *Lexiques français-dangaléat et allemand-dangaléat*. Berlin, 1987., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- EDE I = Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume One: A Phonological Introduction*. Leiden, 1999., E. J. Brill.
- EDE II = Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume Two: b-, p-, f-*. Leiden, 2001., E. J. Brill.
- Edel, E.: Untersuchungen zur Phraseologie der ägyptischen Inschriften des Alten Reiches.= *MDAIK* 13 (1944), 1–90.
- : Neue keilschriftliche Umschreibungen ägyptischer Namen aus den Boğazköytexten. = *JNES* 7 (1948), 11–17.
- : Inschriften des Alten Reichs. II–V.= *MIO* 1 (1953), 210–226.
- : Zur Vokalisation des Neuägyptischen.= *MIO* 2 (1954), 30–43.
- : Beiträge zum ägyptischen Lexikon I.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 79 (1954), 86–90.
- : *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- : Beiträge zum ägyptischen Lexikon II.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 81 (1956), 6–18.
- : Beiträge zum ägyptischen Lexikon III.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 81 (1956), 68–76.
- : Beiträge zum ägyptischen Lexikon IV.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 85 (1960), 12–18.
- : Zu den Inschriften auf den Jahreszeitreliefs der “Weltkammer” aus dem Sonnenheiligtum des Nuserre. Teil I.= *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 8 (1961), 211–255.
- : Zur Lesung und Bedeutung einiger Stellen in der biographischen Inschrift S3-rnpwt¹ I. (Urk. VII 1, 20; 2, 1; 2, 4). = ZÄS 87 (1962), 98–107.
- : Zu den Inschriften auf den Jahreszeitreliefs der “Weltkammer” aus dem Sonnenheiligtum des Nuserre. Teil II.= *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 4 (1963), 92–142 & 5 (1963), 143–217.
- : Die Felsengräbernekropole der Qubbet el-Hawa bei Assuan. 1. Band: Die

- Topfaußchriften aus den Grabungsjahren 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963 und 1965. 1. Teil. Zeichnungen und hieroglyphische Umschriften. Wiesbaden, 1967., Harrassowitz.
- : Zur Etymologie und hieroglyphischen Schreibung der Präpositionen ꜥꜥ- und ꜥꜥꜥ.-= *Orientalia NS* 36 (1967), 67–75.
- : Beiträge zum ägyptischen Lexikon V.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 96 (1969), 4–14.
- : Die Felsengräbernekropole der Qubbet el-Hawa bei Assuan. 1. Band: Die Topfaußchriften aus den Grabungsjahren 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963 und 1965. 2. Teil. Text (Fortsetzung). Wiesbaden, 1970., Harrassowitz.
- : Das Akazienhaus und seine Rolle in den Begräbnisriten des alten Ägyptens. *Münchener Ägyptologische Studien* 24. Berlin, 1970., Verlag Bruno Hessling.
- : Zwei Originalbriefe der Königsmutter Tūja in Keilschrift.= *SAK* 1 (1974), 105–146.
- : Die Felsengräbernekropole der Qubbet el-Hawa bei Assuan. II. Wiesbaden, 1975., Harrassowitz.
- : Beiträge zum ägyptischen Lexikon VI.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 102 (1975), 13–30.
- : Zur Deutung des Keilschriftvokabulars EA 368 mit ägyptischen Wörtern.= *GM* 15 (1975), 11–16.
- : Neue Deutungen keilschriftlicher Umschreibungen ägyptischer Wörter und Personennamen.= *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse* 375 (1980), 1–48.
- : Hieroglyphische Inschriften des Alten Reiches. Opladen, 1981., Westdeutscher Verlag.
- : mjnbyt, die ausführlichste Schreibung des Wortes für “Beil”.= *SAK* 13 (1986), 29–34.
- : Zur Deutung der Glosse ma-ah-da in dem Amarna-Brief 14. Geschenkliste Amenophis’ IV. für den Babylonierkönig Burraburriaš.= *SAK* 14 (1987), 43–47.
- : Der Name di-q3j-j3-s in der minoisch-mykenischen Liste E_Nli 8 gleich Θηβαίς? = *ZÄS* 115 (1988), 30–35.
- : Weitere Beiträge zum Verständnis der Geschenklisten des Amarna-Briefes Nr. 14.= Neu, E.; Rüster, Ch. (eds.): *Documentum Asiae Minoris antiquae*. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag. Wiesbaden, 1988., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 99–114.
- : Ägyptische Glossen in den Geschenklisten des Amarnabriefes Nr. 14.= *SAK* 16 (1989), 27–33.
- Edfu (Edfou) I = Rochmonteix, Marquis de; Chassinat, E.: *Le temple d’Edfou*. Tome I. Le Caire 1897., Leroux.
- Edfu (Edfou) II–XIV = Chassinat, E.: *Le temple d’Edfou*. Tome II–XIV. Le Caire, 1918., 1928–34., Leroux.
- Edfu (Edfou) XV = Cauville, S.; Devauchelle, D.: *Le temple d’Edfou*. Tome XV. Le Caire, 1985., IFAO.
- Edgerton, W. F.: *The Nauri Decree of Seti IA Translation and Analysis of the Legal Portion*. = *JNES* 6/4 (1947), 219–230.
- Edwards, A. B.: *The Provincial and Private Collections of Egyptian Antiquities in Great Britain*. = *RT* 10 (1888), 121–133.
- EEWC = Takács, G.: *Egyptian Etymological Word Catalogue*. Unpublished data base. Székesfehérvár, since 1994.
- EG 1927 = Gardiner, A. H.: *Egyptian Grammar*.¹ Oxford, 1927., Clarendon Press.
- EG 1957 = Gardiner, A. H.: *Egyptian Grammar*.³ London, 1957., Oxford University Press.
- Egberts, A.: A Note on Pap. Lansing 13b, 4.= *GM* 67 (1983), 29–32.
- Eggebrecht, A.: Überlegungen zur Härtebestimmung. Plädoyer für eine technologische Untersuchung altägyptischer Keramikerzeugnisse.= *SAK* 1 (1974), 147–177.

- Eguchi, P. K.: Notes on the Mandara Language of Mora.= Kyoto University African Studies 3 (1969), 133–141.
- Eguchi, P. K.: Matériaux pour servir à l'étude de la langue hidé. Vocabulaire.= Kyoto University African Studies 6 (1971), 195–283.
- Ehret, Ch.: Ethiopians and East Africans. The Problem of Contacts. Nairobi, 1974., East African Publishing House.
- : Ma'a – English Vocabulary. MS. Los Angeles, California, around 1974 (in Ehret 1980, 390 dated for 1966–74). 82 p.
- : Cushitic Prehistory.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia. East Lansing, Michigan, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 85–96.
- : The Historical Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic Phonology and Vocabulary. Berlin, 1980., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : Kw'adza Vocabulary. MS. Los Angeles, California, 1980. IV + 17 p.
- : Revising Proto-Kuliak.= Afrika und Übersee 64 (1981), 81–100.
- : The Classification of Kuliak.= Schadeberg, Th. & Bender, M. L. (eds.): Nilo-Saharan. Proceedings of the First Nilo-Saharan Linguistic Colloquium (Leiden, 1980). Dordrecht, 1981., Foris. Pp. 269–289.
- : The First Spread of Food Production to Southern Africa.= Ehret, Ch.; Posnansky, M. (eds.): The Archaeological and Linguistic Reconstruction of African History. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1982., University of California. Pp. 158–181.
- & Nuuh Ali, M.: Soomaali Classification.= Labahn, T. (ed.): Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Somali Studies. Vol. 1. Hamburg, 1984., Buske Verlag. Pp. 201–269.
- : Proto-Cushitic Reconstruction.= Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika 8 (1987).
- & Elderkin, E. D. & Nurse, D.: Dahalo Lexis and Its Sources.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 18 (1989), 5–49.
- : The Origin of the Third Consonants in the Semitic Roots. An Internal Reconstruction Applied to Arabic.= Journal of Afroasiatic Languages 2/2 (1989), 107–202.
- : The Consonant Inventory of Proto-Eastern Cushitic.= Studies in African Linguistics 22/3 (1991), 211–275.
- : Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian). Vowels, Tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary. Berkeley, Los Angeles, California, 1995., University of California.
- : (Additions to the Afroasiatic reconstructions.) MS. Los Angeles, California, 1997. 522 p.
- : A Historical-Comparative Reconstruction of Nilo-Saharan. Köln, 2001., Köppe.
- Eichler, E.: Untersuchungen zu den Königsbriefen des Alten Reiches.= SAK 18 (1991), 141–171.
- Eilers, W.: Semitische Wurzeltheorie.= Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semitica, Firenze, 16–19 aprile 1974. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 125–131.
- : Die zweiradikalige Basis der semitischen Wurzel.= Jungraithmayr, H.; Müller, W. W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 509–524.
- : Zu Resch als Wurzel determinativ (r-).= Orientalia Suecana 36–37 (1987–88), 39–45.
- Eissa, A.: Die Benennung "Mastaba" – ist sie Arabisch oder Ägyptisch?=*Lingua Aegyptia* 10 (2002), 123–125.
- Eitan, I.: A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography. New York, 1924., Columbia University.
- : Hebrew and Semitic Particles. Comparative Studies in Semitic Philology.= American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 44 (1928), 177–205; 44

- (1928), 254, 260; 45 (1928), 48–63; 45 (1929), 130–145; 45 (1929), 197–211; 46 (1929), 22–51.
- Elderkin, E. D.: Dahalo Wordlist (Damman's Sanye). MS. Nairobi, April 1973. 9 p.
- : On the Classification of Hadza.= *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 4 (1982), 67–82.
- & Maghway, J. B.: Some West Rift Roots.= *African Languages and Cultures* 5/1 (1992), 43–64.
- Ellenbogen, M.: Foreign Words in the Old Testament. Their Origin and Etymology. London, 1962., Luzac & Co., Ltd.
- El Minai, M.: Karbo Lexicon. MS. Not dated. 34 p.
- El-Sayed, R.: Quelques précisions sur l'histoire de la province d'Edfou à la 2^e période intermédiaire.= *BIFAO* 79 (1979), 167–207.
- El-Sayed, R.: Mots et expressions évoquant l'idée de lumière.= *ASAE* 71 (1987), 61–86.
- Ember, A.: Semito-Egyptian Sound Changes.= *ZÄS* 49 (1911), 87–92.
- : Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words.= *ZÄS* 49 (1911), 93–94.
- : Notes on the Relation of Egyptian and Semitic.= *ZÄS* 50 (1912), 86–90.
- : Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words. New Series.= *ZÄS* 51 (1913), 110–121.
- : Several Semito-Egyptian Particles.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 28/2–4 (1914), 302–306.
- : The Etymological Equivalent in Egyptian of the Common Semitic Word for "Life".= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 19 (1916), 72–74.
- : (a) New Semito-Egyptian Words. (b) Some African Words in Old Egyptian.= *JAOS* 37 (1917), 21.
- : Egyptian ʔwj "be Long, Stretch out" = Hebrew ʔiūua "Desire".= *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 296 (1917), 38–39.
- : Asherah and Osiris.= *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 296 (1917), 48–49.
- : Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words (New Series). Continued from Vol. 51 pp. 110–121.= *ZÄS* 53 (1917), 83–90.
- : Egyptian ʕ3m "Semite" = Semitic 'Arab "Arab, Bedouin".= *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 306 (1918), 5.
- : Egyptian ʔidnw "Subordinate, Substitute".= *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 306 (1918), 29–31.
- : Egyptian BT "Shepherd" = "Bedouin".= *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 316 (1919), 18–19.
- : The Equivalents of Several Egyptian Consonants in the Other Semitic Languages.= *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 316 (1919), 29–32.
- : (a) The Phonetic Value of Several of the Egyptian Alphabetic Signs and Their Correspondence Etymologically in the Other Semitic Languages. (b) Metathesis in Old Egyptian.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 41 (1921), 177.
- : Several Egypto-Semitic Etymologies.= *Oriens. The Oriental Review* 1 (1926), 5–8.
- : 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.*
- : *Egypto-Semitic Studies. Leipzig, 1930., The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.*
- Erichsen, W.: Aus einem demotischen Papyrus über Frauenkrankheiten.= *MIO* 2 (1954), 363–375.
- Erman, A.: Das Verhältnis des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 46 (1892), 93–129.
- : Der Zauberpapyrus des Vatikan.= *ZÄS* 31 (1893), 119–124.
- : Das Gespräch eines Lebensmüden mit seiner Seele aus dem Papyrus 3024

- der Königlichen Museen. Berlin, 1896., Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- : Die Umschreibung des Ägyptischen.= ZÄS 34 (1896), 51–62.
- : Zur ägyptischen Wortforschung.= Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (1907), 1–16.
- : Zum Namen des Osiris.= ZÄS 46 (1909), 92–95.
- : Assimilation des Ayin an andre schwache Konsonanten.= ZÄS 46 (1909), 96–104.
- : Ein altes Verbaladjektiv.= ZÄS 46 (1909), 104–106.
- : Die mit dem Zeichen [zb] geschriebenen Worte.= ZÄS 48 (1910), 31–47.
- : Reden, Rufe und Lieder auf Gräberbildern des Alten Reiches.= Abhandlungen des Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse 15 (1918), 1–62.
- : Die Literatur der Ägypter. Leipzig, 1923., J. C. Hinrichs.
- : Ägyptische Grammatik.⁴ Berlin, 1928., Akademie-Verlag.
- : Neuägyptische Grammatik. Leipzig, 1933., Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann.
- Ernout, A. & Meillet, A.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots. Quatrième édition revue, corrigée et augmentée d'un index. Paris, 1959., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Ernstedt, P. V.: Egipetskie zaimstvovanija v grečeskom jazyke. Moskva, Leningrad, 1953., Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk.
- Esna I = Sauneron, S.: Quatre campagnes à Esna. Le Caire, 1959., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Esna II = Sauneron, S.: Le temple d'Esna. Textes nos. 1–193. Le Caire, 1963., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Esna III = Sauneron, S.: Le temple d'Esna. Textes nos. 194–398. Le Caire, 1968., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Esna IV/1–2 = Sauneron, S.: Le temple d'Esna. Textes nos. 399–472. Le Caire, 1969., 1975., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Esna V = Sauneron, S.: Les fêtes religieuses d'Esna aux derniers siècles du paganisme. Le Caire, 1962., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Esna VI/1–2 = Sauneron, S.: Le temple d'Esna. Textes nos. 473–546. Le Caire, 1975., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Esna VII = Sauneron, S.: Le temple d'Esna. Textes nos. 547–642. Manuscrit.
- Esna VIII = Sauneron, S. (avec une note de J. J. Clère): L'écriture figurative dans les textes d'Esna. Le Caire, 1982., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Eyre, C. J.: Yet Again the Wax Crocodile: PWestcar 3, 12ff.= JEA 78 (1992), 280–281.
- : The Water Regime for Orchards and Plantations in Pharaonic Egypt.= JEA 80 (1994), 57–80.
- Faber, A.: Phonetic Reconstruction.= Glossa 15/1 (1981), 233–260.
- : Semitic Sibilants in an Afro-Asiatic Context.= Journal of Semitic Studies 29/2 (1984), 189–224.
- : On the Actuation of Sound Change. A Semitic Case Study.= Diachronica 3/2 (1986), 163–184.
- : Indefinite Pronouns in Early Semitic.= Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1988., John Benjamins. Pp. 221–238.
- Fagnan, E.: Additions aux dictionnaires arabes. Alger, 1923., Jules Carbonel.
- Fairman, H. W.: The triumph of Horus, London, 1954., Batsford.
- Faltings, D.: Die Keramik der Lebensmittelproduktion im Alten Reich. Ikonographie und Archäologie eines Gebrauchsartikels. Heidelberg, 1998., Heidelberg Orientverlag.
- Farah, M. A. & Heck, D.: Somali Wörterbuch. Hamburg, 1993., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Farina, G.: Review of Sottas, H. & Drioton, E.: Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes.= Rivista degli Studi Orientali 10 (1923–25), 322–327.

- : Le vocali dell'antico egiziano.= *Aegyptus* 5/4 (1924), 313–325.
- : Contributo alla Geografia dei “paesi barbari meridionali” dell'antico Egitto.= *Aegyptus* 6 (1925), 51f.
- : Grammatica della lingua egiziana antica in caratteri geroglifici.² Milano, 1926., U. Hoepli.
- Faulkner, R. O.: The “Cannibal Hymn” from the Pyramid Texts.= *JEA* 10 (1924), 97–103.
- : The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus – I.= *JEA* 22 (1936), 121–140.
- : The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus – II.= *JEA* 23 (1937), 10–16.
- : The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus – III.= *JEA* 23 (1937), 166–185.
- : The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus – IV.= *JEA* 24 (1938), 41–53.
- : The Wilbour Papyrus. Ed. by A.H. Gardiner. Volume IV. Index. Oxford, 1952., Oxford University Press.
- : Ptahhotpe and the Disputants.= Firchow, O. (Hrsg.): *Ägyptologische Studien*. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 81–84.
- : The Man Who Was Tired of Life.= *JEA* 42 (1956), 21–40.
- : Review of E. Edel: *Altägyptische Grammatik*. I.= *OLZ* 53 (1958), 30–34.
- : *An Ancient Egyptian Book of Hours* (Pap. Brit. Mus. 10569). Oxford, 1959., Oxford University Press, Charles Batey.
- : Dw, wdj, rdj.= *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 45 (1959), 102–3.
- : M3st “Knee”.= *JEA* 45 (1959), 104.
- : *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. I. Oxford, 1969., Clarendon Press.
- : *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*. I. Warminster, 1973., Aris and Phillips.
- : *Abnormal or Cryptic Writings in the Coffin Texts*.= *JEA* 67 (1981), 173–174.
- Fähnrich, H. (Penrihi, H.) & Saržvelaže, Z.: *Kartvelur enata eřimologiuri leksiřoni*. Tbilisi, 1990., Tbilisi Universitetis Gamomcemloba.
- FÄW(b) = Kahl, J.: *Frühägyptisches Wörterbuch* (unter Mitarbeit von M. Bretschneider und B. Kneißler). Wiesbaden, Lieferung 1–4. Wiesbaden, 2002–4., Harrassowitz.
- FD = Faulkner, R. O.: *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford, 1962., Clarendon Press.
- Fecht, G.: Die i-Klasse bei den anfangsbetonten koptischen Infinitiven starker dreiradikaliger Verben (Schluss).= *Orientalia NS* 24 (1955), 395–402.
- : *Der Habgierige und die Maat in der Lehre des Ptahhotep* (5. und 19. Maxime). Glückstadt, 1958., J. J. Augustin.
- : *Zu den Namen ägyptischer Fürsten und Städte in den Annalen des Assurbanipal und der Chronik des Asarhaddon*.= *MDAIK* 16 (1958), 112–119.
- : *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache*. Glückstadt, 1960., Verlag J. J. Augustin.
- : *Literarische Zeugnisse zur “persönlichen Frommigkeit” in Ägypten*.= *Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1 (1965).
- : *Die Königs-Insignien mit s-Suffix* (1. Teil).= *SAK* 1 (1974), 179–200.
- : *Schicksalsgöttinnen und König in der “Lehre eines Mannes für seinen Sohn”*.= *ZÄS* 105 (1978), 14–42.
- : *Die Berichte des hrw-hwj.f über seine drei Reisen nach j3m*.= Görg, M. & Pusch, E. (Hrsg. unter Mitwirkung von A. Wuckelt und K.-J. Seyfried): *Festschrift Elmar Edel*. 12. März 1979. Ägypten und Altes Testament. Studien zu Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des Alten Testaments. Bamberg, 1979., Manfred Görg, Bamberg. Als Manuskript gedruckt, in Kommission Verlag Harrassowitz Wiesbaden (publisher not indicated). Pp. 106–134.
- : *Die Lesung von [rnp.t-zp] Regierungsjahr als rnp.t-zp*.= *Ägypten. Dauer und Wandel*. Symposium anlässlich des 75jährigen Bestehens des DAI Kairo am 10. und 11. Oktober 1982. Sonderschrift 18 des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo. Mainz, 1985., Zabern. Pp. 85–96.

- Federn, W.: "As Does a Potter's Wheel".= ZÄS 93 (1966), 55–56.
- Fédry, J. (avec la collaboration de Khamis, J. & o/Nedjei, M.): Dictionnaire dangaleat (Tchad). Thèse de 3^{ème} cycle, Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales. Lyon, 1971., Afrique et Langage.
- : Aperçu sur la phonologie et la tonologie de quatre langues de groupe «mubi-karbo» (Guera) (dangaléat-est, dangaléat-ouest, bidiyo, dyongor).= Caprile, J.-P. (ed.): Études phonologiques tchadiennes. Paris, 1977., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France. Pp. 87–112.
- : Verbes monosyllabiques en dangaleat.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.): Études tchadiques. Verbes monoradicaux suivis d'une note sur la negation en haoussa. Actes de la XIIème réunion de Groupe d'Études Tchadiques LACITO-CNRS-PARIS. Paris, 1990., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner. Pp. 9–13.
- Feichtner, M. K.: Die erweiterten Verbalstämme im Ägyptischen.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 38 (1932), 195–228.
- : Die t-Präfix- und t-Suffixverben im Ägyptischen.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 39 (1932), 295–316.
- Feucht, E.: Das Kind in Alten Ägypten. Die Stellung des Kindes in Familie und Gesellschaft nach ägyptische Texten und Darstellungen. Frankfurt, New York, 1995., Campus Verlag.
- Fischer, H. G.: A Scribe of the Army in a Saqqara Mastaba of the Early Fifth Dynasty.= JNES 18/4 (1959), 233–272.
- : Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C. Down to the Theban Domination of Upper Egypt. New York, 1968., J. J. Augustin Publishers.
- : Egyptian Studies I. Varia. New York, 1976., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- : Egyptian Studies II. New York, 1977., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- : Another Example of the Verb nh "Shelter".= JEA 64 (1978), 131–132.
- : Review of Ali Hassan: Stöcke und Stäbe im pharaonischen Ägypten.= JEA 64 (1978), 158–162.
- : Ancient Egyptian Calligraphy. 2nd edition. Now York, 1983., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- : Egyptian Titles of the Middle Kingdom. A Supplement to Wm. Ward's Index. Parts II–III: Corrections and Comments. Fascicle 1. New York, 1985., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- : The Trumpet in Ancient Egypt.= Baines, J.; James, T. G. H.; Leahy, A.; Shore, A. F. (eds.): Pyramid Studies and Other Essays Presented to I. E. S. Edwards. London, 1988., The Egypt Exploration Society. Pp. 103–109.
- : Varia Nova. Egyptian Studies III. New York, 1996., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- : Titles and Epithets of the Egyptian Old Kingdom (Review of Jones, D.: An Index of Ancient Egyptian Titles, Epithets and Phrases of the Old Kingdom).= BiOr 59/1–2 (2002), 18–36.
- Fischer-Elfert, H.-W.: Literarische Ostraka der Ramessidenzeit in Übersetzung. Wiesbaden, 1986., Harrassowitz.
- : Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Wiesbaden, 1986., Harrassowitz.
- : Die satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I.2., erweiterte Auflage. Wiesbaden, 1992., Harrassowitz.
- : Vermischtes.= GM 127 (1992), 33–47.
- : Die Lehre eines Mannes für seinen Sohn. Eine Etappe auf dem "Gottesweg" des loyalen und solidarischen Beamten des Mittleren Reiches. Textband. Wiesbaden, 1999., Harrassowitz.
- Fitzpatrick, J. F. J.: Some Notes on the Kwolla District and Its Tribes.= Journal of the Royal African Society 10 (1910–11), 16–52, 213–22.

- Fleming, H. C.: Baiso and Rendille: Somali Outliers.= *Rivista degli Studi Etiopici* 20 (1964), 35–96.
- : Ethiopic Language History: Testing Linguistic Hypotheses in an Archaeological and Documentary Context.= *Ethnohistory* 15/4 (1968), 353–388.
- : Asa and Aramanik: Cushitic Hunters in Masai-Land.= *Ethnology* 8/1 (1969), 1–36.
- : The Classification of West Cushitic Within Hamito-Semitic.= McCall, D. F. & Bennett, N. R. & Butler, J. (eds.): *Eastern African History*. New York, 1969., Praeger. Pp. 3–27.
- : Sheko Word List. MS. Ca. 1972. 10 p.
- : Omotic as an Afroasiatic Family.= *Studies in African Linguistics. Supplement* 5 (1974), 81–94.
- : Recent Research in Omotic-Speaking Areas.= Marcus, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the First United States Conference on Ethiopian Studies, 1973*. East Lansing, Michigan, 1975., Michigan State University. Pp. 261–278.
- & Bender, M. L.: *Non-Semitic Languages*.= Bender, M. L.; Bowen, J. D.; Cooper, R.; Ferguson, Ch. (eds.): *Language in Ethiopia*. London, 1976., Oxford University Press. Pp. 34–58.
- : Omotic Overview.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 299–323.
- : Kefa (Gonga) Languages.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 351–376.
- : Chadic External Relations.= Wolff, E. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H. (eds.): *Studies in Chadic and Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Hamburg, 1983., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 17–31.
- : Kuliak External Relations: Step One.= Vossen, R. & Becchaus-Gerst, M. (ed.): *Nilotic Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Languages and History of the Nilotic Peoples, Cologne, January 4–6, 1982*. Berlin, 1983., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 423–478.
- : Surma Etymologies.= Vossen, R. & Becchaus-Gerst, M. (ed.): *Nilotic Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Languages and History of the Nilotic Peoples, Cologne, January 4–6, 1982*. Berlin, 1983., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 523–555.
- : The Importance of Mao in Ethiopian History.= Rubenson, S. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*. Uppsala, 1984., Scandinavian Institute of African Studies. Pp. 31–38.
- : Proto-Gongan Consonant Phonemes: Stage One.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Leo Reinisch. Werk und Erbe*. Wien, 1987., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Pp. 141–159.
- : Mao's Ancestor. Consonant Phonemes of Proto-Mao. Stage One.= Gromyko, A. A. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies (Moscow, 26–29 August 1986)*. Vol. 5. Moscow, 1988., Nauka. Pp. 35–44.
- : Proto-South-Omotic or Proto-Somotic Consonant Phonemes: Stage One.= Bechhaus-Gerst, M. & Serzisko, F. (eds.): *Cushitic-Omotic. Papers from the International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6–9, 1986*. Hamburg, 1988., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 163–175.
- : Omotica, Afrasiana and More: Ethiopia as the Ever-Flowing Vase.= *Mother Tongue* 12 (1990), 22–30.
- : Hamar, Recorded by Harold Fleming in 1990 from Awok'e Akike, Baldambi Son. MS. 1990. 13 p.
- ; Aklilu Yilma; Mitiku, A.; Hayward, R.; Miyawaki, Y.; Mikeshe, P.; Seelig, J. M.: Ongota (Or) Birale. A Moribund Language of Gemu-Gofa (Ethiopia).= *JAAL* 3/3 (1992) or (1992–93), 181–225.
- : A Reply to Lamberti.= *Anthropos* 87 (1992), 520–525.
- : Second Reply to Lamberti.= *Anthropos* 88 (1993), 557–558.

- & McCall, D.: The Preclassical Circum-Mediterranean World: Who Spoke Which Languages? = *Mother Tongue* 21 (1994), 22–29.
- FO = *Folia Orientalia* (Kraków).
- Fodor, A. & Fóti, L.: Haram and Hermes: Origin of the Arabic Word Haram Meaning Pyramid. = *Studia Aegyptiaca* 2 (1976), 157–171.
- Foot, E. C.: *A Galla-English, English-Galla Dictionary*. Cambridge, 1913., University Press.
- Forrer, E.: Stratification des langues et des peuples dans le Proche-Orient préhistorique. = *Journal Asiatique* 217 (1930), 227–252.
- Foucauld, Ch. de: *Dictionnaire touareg-français, dialecte de l'Ahaggar*. Vol. I–IV. Paris, 1951–52., Imprimerie Nationale de France.
- Foulkes, H. D.: *Angass Manual. Grammar, Vocabulary*. London, 1915., Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
- Fournet, J.-L.: Les emprunts du grec à l'égyptien. = *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 84 (1989), 55–80.
- Fox, J.: Isolated Nouns in the Semitic Languages. = *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 11 (1998), 1–31.
- Frajzyngier, Z.: Notes on the R₁R₂R₂ Stems in Semitic. = *Journal of Semitic Studies* 24/1 (1979), 1–12.
- : Another Look at West Chadic Verb Classes. = *Africana Marburgensia* 15/1 (1982), 25–42.
- : *A Pero-English and English-Pero Vocabulary*. Berlin, 1985., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : *A Dictionary of Mupun*. Berlin, 1991., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Franci, M.: *Egypto-Semitic Lexical Comparison: New Correspondences and Phonological Problems in the Lexicon of Anatomy and Physiological Functions*. = Mengozzi, A. (ed.): *Studi afroasiatici. XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemitica. Afro-Asiatic Studies: 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Milano, 2005., Francoangelli. Pp. 57–66.
- Frandsen, P. J.: Review of J. J. Janssen: *Commodity Prices from the Ramesside Period*. = *Acta Orientalia* 40 (1979), 279–302.
- Franke, D.: Probleme der Arbeit mit altägyptischen Titeln des Mittleren Reiches. = *GM* 83 (1984), 103–124.
- Frick, E. J.: Dghwede. = Dakubu, M. E. K. (ed.): *West African Language Data Sheets*. Vol. I. (Place not indicated), 1976., West African Linguistic Society.
- Friedrich, J.: *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1952., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- : *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 1. Ergänzungsheft*. Heidelberg, 1957., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Frolova, T.: The Reconstruction of the Vowel in the Proto-Semitic Verbal Base -C₁C₂VC₃-. The Evidence of Akkadian and Arabic. = Kogan, L. (ed.): *Orientalia: Papers of the Oriental Institute. Issue III. Studia Semitica*. Moscow, 2003., Russian State University of Humanities. Pp. 79–101.
- : Glottalized Sibilant ξ in modern South Arabian Languages and Its Etymological Perspective. = *Babel und Bibel* 2 (2005), 429–455.
- Fronzaroli, P.: Le origini dei semiti come problema storico. = *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XV, fasc. 3–4 (1960), 123–144.
- : Studi sul lessico comune semitico. I. Oggetto e metodo della ricerca. = *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XIX, fasc. 5–6 (1964), 155–171.
- : Studi sul lessico comune semitico. II. Anatomia e fisiologia. = *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XIX, fasc. 7–12 (1964), 243–280.
- : Studi sul lessico comune semitico. III. I fenomeni naturali. = *Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*. Ser. VIII, vol. XX, fasc. 3–4 (1965), 135–150.

- : Studi sul lessico comune semitico. IV. La religione.= Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XX, fasc. 5–6 (1965), 246–269.
- : Studi sul lessico comune semitico. V. La natura selvatica.= Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XXIII, fasc. 7–12 (1968), 267–303.
- : Studi sul lessico comune semitico. VI. La natura domestica.= Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XXIV, fasc. 7–12 (1969), 285–320.
- : Studi sul lessico comune semitico. VII. L'alimentazione.= Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XXVI, fasc. 7–12 (1971), 603–642.
- : On the Common Semitic Lexicon and Its Ecological and Cultural Background.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 43–53.
- : West Semitic Toponymy in Northern Syria in the Third Millennium B.C.= *Journal of Semitic Studies* 22/2 (1977), 145–166.
- & Garbini, G.: *Paleontologia semitica: il patrimonio lessicale semitico comune alla luce dell'affinità linguistica camito-semitica*.= *Paleontologia linguistica*. Atti del VI Convegno Internazionale di Linguisti tenuto a Milano nei giorni 2–6 settembre 1974. Brescia, 1977., Paideia Editrice. Pp. 155–172.
- : *The Eblaic Lexicon. Problems and Appraisal*.= Fronzaroli, P.: *Studies on the Language of Ebla*. Firenze, 1984., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 117–157.
- Fürst, J. & Ryssel, V.: *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Leipzig, 1876., Bernhard Tauchnitz.
- Gabelentz, G. von der: *Die Verwandtschaft des Baskischen mit den Berbersprachen Nord-Africas nachgewiesen von G.v.d. Gabelentz*. Herausgegeben nach dem hinterlassenen Manuscripte durch Dr. A. C. Graf von der Schulenburg. Braunschweig, 1894., Verlag von Richard Sattler.
- Gaboda, P.: A p- Prefix in Egyptian.= *Studia Aegyptiaca* 12 (1989), 93–117.
- : Sünskaraboid kriptografikus felirattal.= *Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts* 73 (1990), 85–92.
- Gabra, G.: *Bemerkungen zu einigen Wörtern des oxyrhynchitischen (mesokemischen) Psalters*.= Giversen, S.; Krause, M.; Nagel, P. (eds.): *Coptology: Past, Present, Future*. Studies in Honor of Rodolphe Kasser. Leuven, 1994., Peeters. Pp. 193–195.
- Gadd, C. J. & Smith, S.: *A Cuneiform Vocabulary of Egyptian Words*.= *JEA* 11 (1925), 230–240.
- GAG = Soden, W. von: *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Roma, 1952., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Galán, J. M.: The Use of *šalāmu* and *barāka* in Ancient Egyptian Text.= *ZÄS* 124 (1997), 37–44.
- Galand, L.: *Notes de vocabulaire touareg*.= *FO* 12 (1970), 69–78.
- : *Latin stāmen, français étaim, berbère idd “fil de chaîne”*.= Cohen, D. (ed.): *Mélanges Marcel Cohen*. Paris, 1970., Mouton. Pp. 245–253.
- Gamer-Wallert, I.: *Fische und Fischkulte im alten Ägypten*. Wiesbaden, 1970., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gamkrelidze, T. V.; Ivanov, V. V.: *Indoeuropejskij jazyk i indoeuropejcy*. Tbilisi, 1984., Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo Universiteta.
- García, J. C. M.: *La population mrt*.= *JEA* 84 (1998), 71–83.
- Gardiner, A. H.: Notes: (1) [jwjt] and [ntj]. (2) The Demonstrative [n] and Its Derivatives.= *PSBA* 22 (1900), 321–325.
- : The Group [mr] “Overseer”.= *ZÄS* 40 (1902–03), 142–144.
- : The Reading of [d^cm].= *ZÄS* 41 (1904), 73–76.

- : The Word [jwn3/jn]. = ZÄS 41 (1904), 130–135.
- : The Egyptian Word for “Herdsmen”, &c. = ZÄS 42 (1905), 116–123.
- : The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage from a Hieratic Papyrus in Leiden (Pap. Leiden 344 Recto). Leipzig, 1909., J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung. 2. Nachdruck: Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, 1990., Georg Olms Verlag.
- : The Tomb of Amenemhet, High-Priest of Amon. = ZÄS 47 (1910), 87–99.
- : Egyptian Hieratic Texts. Series I: Literary Texts of the New Kingdom. Part I: The Pap. Anastasi I and the Pap. Koller Together With the Parallel Texts. Leipzig, 1911., J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung.
- : The Nature and Development of the Egyptian Hieroglyphic Writing. = JEA 2 (1915), 61–75.
- : Some Coptic Etymologies. = PSBA 38 (1916), 181–185.
- : Notes on the Story of Sinuhe. Paris, 1917. (1916.), Librairie Honoré Champion.
- : An Unrecognized Egyptian Adverb. = PSBA 40 (1918), 5–7.
- : The Ancient Military Road Between Egypt and Palestine. = JEA 6 (1920), 99–116.
- : Egyptian Grammar.¹ Oxford, 1927., Clarendon Press.
- : An Egyptian Split Infinitive and the Origin of the Coptic Conjunctive Tense. = Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 14/1–2 (1928), 86–96.
- : Late Egyptian Stories. Bruxelles, 1932., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élysabeth.
- : The Dakhleh Stela. = JEA 19 (1933), 19–30.
- : The Supposed Particle [n]. = ZÄS 69 (1933), 70–71.
- : Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Third Series. Chester Beatty Gift. Vol. I–II. London, 1935., British Museum.
- : The Egyptian Origin of Some English Personal Names. = JAOS 56 (1936), 189–197.
- : The Word m^cd3 and Its Various Uses. = JEA 26 (1940), 157–158.
- : The Name of Lake Moeris. = JEA 29 (1943), 37–46. Commented on by Bell 1943, 46–50.
- : Ancient Egyptian Onomastica. I–II. Oxford, 1947., Clarendon Press.
- : The Wilbour Papyrus. Vol. II: Commentary. Oxford, 1948., Oxford University Press.
- : Ramesside Administrative Documents. London, 1948., Geoffrey Cumberlege London: Oxford University Press.
- : The First Two Pages of the Wörterbuch. = JEA 34 (1948), 12–18.
- : The Ramesseum Papyri. Plates edited by Sir Alan Gardiner. Oxford, 1955., Printed for the Griffith Institute at the University Press by Charles Batey.
- & Peet, T. E. (ed. by J. Černý): The Inscriptions of Sinai. Vol. I–II. London, 1955., Oxford University Press (for The Egypt Exploration Society).
- : Minuscula Lexica. = Firthow, O. (Hrsg.): Ägyptologische Studien. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 1–3.
- : The Proposed New Reading of the Word for “Overseer”. = JEA 41 (1955), 121–122.
- : A Pharaonic Encomium (II). = JEA 42 (1956), 8–20.
- : Egyptian Grammar.³ London, 1957., Oxford University Press.
- : Hymns to Sobk in a Ramesseum Papyrus. = RdE 11 (1957), 43–56.
- Garnot, J. S. F.: Sur le nom de “Horus cobra”. = MDAIK 16 (1958), 138–146.
- Gasparini, A.: Sidamo-English Dictionary. Bologna, 1983., E.M.I.
- Gaster, T. H.: The Furniture of El in Canaanite Mythology. = Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research 93 (1944), 20–23.
- Gaudiche, (?): La langue boudouma. = Journal de la Société des Africanistes 8 (1938), 13–32.

- Gauthier, H.: *A travers la Basse-Égypte*. = ASAE 22 (1922), 81–107.
 —: *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques. Tom I–VII. Le Caire, 1925–1931., IFAO.*
- Gautier, J. E. & Jéquier, G.: *Mémoire sur les Fouilles de Licht. MIFAO 6. Le Caire, 1902., IFAO.*
- Gayet, A.: *Stelen der XII. Dynastie. Paris, 1886., Musées du Louvre.*
- GÄSW = Calice, F. von: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung. Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.*
- GEA = Montet, P.: *Géographie de l'Égypte Ancienne. I–II. Paris, 1957., 1961., Librairie C. Klincksieck.*
- 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.*
- GD = Landberg, Le Comte de: *Glossaire daïnois. Vol. I–III. Leiden, 1920., 1923., 1942., E. J. Brill.*
- Gelb, I.: *Hurrians and Subarians. Chicago, Illinois, 1944., The University of Chicago Press.*
- Gelb, I.: *Glossary of Old Akkadian. Chicago, Illinois, 1973., The University of Chicago Press.*
- Gensler, O.: *Two “Marked” Areal Features in Songhay Syntax: Implications for Prehistory. MS. Presented at the Institut für Afrikanische Sprachwissenschaften, Frankfurt a/M, 1 December 2000. 10 p.*
- Germer, R.: *Untersuchung über Arzneimittelpflanzen im Alten Ägypten. Dissertation. Universität Hamburg, 1979. 400 p.*
 —: *Flora des pharaonischen Ägypten. Mainz, 1985., Philipp von Zabern.*
 —: *Katalog der altägyptischen Pflanzenreste der Berliner Museen. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 47. Wiesbaden, 1988., Otto Harrassowitz.*
 —: *Die Heilpflanzen der Ägypter. Düsseldorf, Zürich, 2002., Artemis & Winkler.*
- Gerstmann, J.: *Giziga Wordlist. MS. Kaélé (Cameroon), 26 May 1979. 43 p.*
- Geßler-Löhr, B.: *Die heiligen Seen ägyptischer Tempel. Hildesheim, 1983., Gerstenberg.*
- Ghalioungui, P.: *The Liver and Bile in Ancient Egyptian Love and Medicine.* = ASAE 64 (1981), 15–24.
- Ghica, V.: *Les désignations de l'aliboufier et du storax en copte.* = BIFAO 106 (2006), 75–87.
- Ghul, M. A.: *New Qatabāni Inscriptions [I].* = BSOAS 22 (1959), 1–22, 419–438.
- GHWb = Hannig, R.: *Grosses Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800–950 v. Chr.). Mainz, 1995., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.*
- GHWb MbEd = Hannig, R.: *Grosses Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800–950 v. Chr.). Marburger Edition. Mainz, 2006., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.*
- Giger, M. & Lienhard, R.: *Daba Wordlist. MS. Yaoundé (Cameroon), August–September 1974. 33 p.*
 —: *Daba (parler de Pologozom). Description phonologique. Yaoundé, 1975., Société Internationale de Linguistique.*
- Gilula, M.: *ʿIdn = “an Ear”.* = *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 61 (1975), 251.
- Giorgieri, M. & Röseler, I.: *Notes on the Mittani Letter. MitN no. 8–1 : Mit.III 57–59.* = *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians* 8 (1996), 281–284.
- Glanville, S. R. K.: *Records of a Royal Dockyard of the Time of Thutmosis III.* = ZÄS 66 (1931), 1–7, 105–121.
 —: *Records of a Royal Dockyard of the Time of Thutmosis III.* = ZÄS 68 (1932), 7–41.
- GLECS = *Comptes-Rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques (Paris).*
- Gluhak, A.: *Etruscan Numerals.* = *Linguistica* 17 (1978), 25–32.

- : Is Sino-Tibetan Related to Nostratian? = *General Linguistics* 18/3 (1978), 123–127.
- : Grč. *Ánthrōpos*. = *Živa Antika* 29/2 (1979), 223–225.
- GM = Göttinger Miszellen (Göttingen).
- GMT = Westendorf, W.: *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*. Berlin, 1962., Akademie-Verlag.
- Gochal, G.: *A Look at Shik Ngas*. Jos, 1994., Jos University Press.
- : *Les oiseaux* ꜥꜥ et mꜥꜥ. = *BIFAO* 56/1 (1957), 19–20.
- Goebis, K.: *Untersuchungen zu Funktion und Symbolgehalt des nms*. = *ZÄS* 122 (1995), 154–181.
- Goedicke, H.: *Alternation of ḥ and ḏ in Egyptian*. = *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 80 (1955), 32–34.
- : *King ḥwḏf3?* = *JEA* 42 (1956), 50–53.
- : *A Provision-Jar of the Time of Asosis*. = *RdE* 11 (1957), 61–71.
- : *A Sportive Writing of the Interrogative in + m*. = *JEA* 47 (1961), 155.
- : *Die Laufbahn des Mṯn*. = *MDAIK* 21 (1966), 1–71.
- : *Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich*. Wiesbaden, 1967., Harrassowitz.
- : *The Report about the Dispute of a Man with his Ba*. Baltimore & London, 1970., The Johns Hopkins Press.
- : *The Report of Wenamun*. Baltimore, 1975., Johns Hopkins University Press.
- : *The Protocol of Neferyt (The Prophecy of Neferti)*. London, 1977., The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- : *Sinuhe's Foreign Wife*. = *BSÉG* 9–10 (1984–85), 103–107.
- : *Menna's Lament*. = *RdE* 38 (1987), 63–80.
- : *“Narmer”*. = *WZKM* 85 (1995), 81–84.
- : *Dienstränge im Alten Reich?* = *SAK* 25 (1998), 101–111.
- : *Comments Concerning the “Story of the Eloquent Peasant”*. = *ZÄS* 125 (1998), 109–125.
- : *Das ägyptische Credo*. = *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 27 (1999), 87–106.
- : *Min*. = *MDAIK* 58 (2002), 247–255.
- Goldwasser, O.: *The Narmer Palette and the “Triumph of Metaphor”*. = *Lingua Aegyptia* 2 (1992), 67–85.
- Good, R. M.: *Some Ugaritic terms relating to draught and riding animals*. = *UF* 16 (1984), 77–81.
- Goodwin, Ch. W.: *Hieratic papyri*. = *Cambridge Essays Contributed by Members of the University*. Nr. 4. London, 1858., Parker. S. 226–282.
- : *On the Interchange of the Letters [n] and [r] in Egyptian*. = *ZÄS* 5 (1867), 85–88.
- : *Notes on Egyptian Numerals*. = *ZÄS* 5 (1867), 94–95, 98–101.
- Gordon, C. H.: *Review of J. Friedrich: Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*. = *Orientalia* 21 (1952), 119–123.
- : *Ugaritic Manual*. Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- : *Egypto-Semítica*. = *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 32 (1957), 269–278.
- : *Ugaritic Textbook*. Roma, 1965., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- : *The Wine-Dark Sea*. = *JNES* 37/1 (1978), 51–52.
- : *West Semitic Factors in Eblaite*. = Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): *Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1988., John Benjamins. Pp. 261–266.
- : *Eblaite*. = Kaye, A. S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-Fifth Birthday November 14th, 1991*. Vol. I. Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 550–557.
- Gouffé, C.: *Compléments et précisions concernant le haoussa dans le cadre de l'Essai comparatif de M. Marcel Cohen*. = *Comptes Rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques* 14 (1969–1970), 27–43.

- : Contacts de vocabulaire entre le haoussa et le touareg.= Cohen, D. (ed.): Actes du Premier Congrès International de Linguistique Sémitique et Chamito-Sémitique, Paris, 16–19 juillet 1969. Paris, 1974., Mouton. Pp. 357–380.
- : La langue haoussa.= Perrot, J. (ed.): Les langues dans le monde ancienne et moderne. Paris, 1981., Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Pp. 415–428.
- Goyon, J.-C.: À propos de Morgan, Kom Ombos II, n° 633.= Mélanges Adolphe Gutbub. Montpellier, 1984., Institut d'Égyptologie, Université Paul Valéry. Pp. 77–86.
- : Une identification possible de la plante hdn des anciens égyptiens.= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 241–250.
- Görg, M.: Untersuchungen zur hieroglyphischen Wiedergabe palästinischer Ortsnamen. Bonn, 1974., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität.
- : mrk (Wb II, 113) = kan. mlg?²= GM 13 (1974), 13–15.
- : Alttestamentliche Kleidernamen ägyptischen Ursprungs.= GM 15 (1975), 17–18.
- : “Maru” und “Millo”.= GM 20 (1976), 29–30.
- : Ein semitisch-ostmediterranes Kulturwort im Alten Testament.= Biblische Notizen 8 (1979), 7–10.
- : Das Ratespiel um Mw-ḳd.= GM 32 (1979), 21–22.
- : Identifikation von Fremdnamen. Das methodische Problem am Beispiel einer Palimpsestschrift aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III.= Görg, M. & Pusch, E. (Hrsg. unter Mitwirkung von A. Wuckelt und K.-J. Seyfried): Festschrift Elmar Edel. 12. März 1979. Ägypten und Altes Testament. Studien zu Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des Alten Testaments. Bamberg, 1979., Manfred Görg, Bamberg. Als Manuskript gedruckt, in Kommission Verlag Harrassowitz Wiesbaden (publisher not indicated). Pp. 152–173.
- : Ein vermeintliches Fremdwort.= ZÄS 106 (1979), 175–176.
- : Lexikalisches zum Papyrus Berlin 10463.= JEA 66 (1980), 160–161.
- : Ägyptologische Marginalien zur Deutung des Vokabulars in Ex. 16,14.= Maiberger, P. (ed.): Das Manna. Eine literarische, etymologische und naturkundliche Untersuchung. Teil I. Wiesbaden, 1983., Harrassowitz. Pp. 320–322.
- : Mm̄ – ein charakteristischer Begriff der Priesterschrift.= Biblische Notizen 24 (1984), 12–15.
- Graefe, E. & Wassef, M.: Eine fromme Stiftung für den Gott Osiris-der-seinen-Anhänger-in-der-Unterwelt-rettet aus dem Jahre 21 des Taharqa (670 v. Chr.).= MDAIK 35 (1979), 103–118.
- Gragg, G.: Oromo Dictionary. East Lansing, Michigan, 1982., Michigan State University.
- Grande, B. M.: Kurs arabskoj grammatiki v sravnitel'no-istoričeskom osveščanii. Moskva, 1963., Nauka.
- Grandet: Le Papyrus Harris I (BM 9999). Volume I. Bibliothèque d'étude 109/1. Le Caire, 1994., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Grapow, H.: Der Name der Göttin Isis und der Lautwert des Zeichens [s.t].= ZÄS 46 (1909), 107–108.
- : Über die Wortbildungen mit einem Präfix m- im Ägyptischen.= Abhandlungen der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1914), 3–33.
- : Die Welt von der Schöpfung. Ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte.= ZÄS 67 (1931), 34–38.
- : Untersuchungen über die altägyptischen medizinischen Papyri. I–II. Teile. Leipzig, 1935–36., J. C. Hinrichs.

- : Ägyptische Jenseitswünsche in Sprüchen ungewöhnlicher Fassung aus dem N.R.= ZÄS 77 (1942), 57–78.
- : Zur Wortbildung des Ägyptischen.= *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia*. Berlin, 1950., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 54–76.
- : *Anatomie und Physiologie (Grundriß der Medizin der Alten Ägypter I)*. Berlin, 1954., Akademi-Verlag.
- Gray, L. H.: *Notes étymologiques sur les "verbes faibles" en hébreu biblique*.= *Archiv Orientalní* 5 (1933), 124–130.
- : *Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics*. New York, 1934., AMS Press.
- Grdseloff, B.: *Notes d'épigraphie archaïque*.= *ASAE* 44 (1944), 279–306, pl. xxv–xxvi.
- : *Deux remarques*.= *ArOr* 20 (1952), 482–486.
- Greenberg, J. H.: *The Patterning of Root Morphemes in Semitic*.= *Word* 6 (1950), 162–181.
- : *Studies in African linguistic Classification*. Branford, Connecticut, 1955., Compass Publishing Company.
- : *The Labial Consonants of Proto-Afro-Asiatic*.= *Word* 14 (1958), 295–302.
- : *On the African Affiliation of Hebrew and the Semitic Languages*.= *Jewish Social Studies* 24 (1962), 79–85.
- : *The Languages of Africa*.= *International Journal of American Linguistics* 29 (1963).
- : *The Evidence for */^mb/ as a Proto-Afroasiatic Phoneme*.= *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgie Kuryłowicz*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, 1965., Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Pp. 88–92.
- Greenfield, J. C.: *Ugaritic mdl and its Cognates*.= *Biblica* 45 (1964), 527–534.
- Gressmann, H. (in Verbindung mit E. Ebeling, H. Ranke, N. Rhodokanakis): *Altorientalische texte zum Alten Testament*. Berlin, 1926–1927., Walter de Gruyter.
- Grieve, J. A.: *Kilba*.= Dakubu, M. E. K. (ed.): *West African Data Sheets*. Vol. I. (Place not indicated), 1976., West African Linguistic Society.
- Griffith, F. L. & Petrie, W. M. E.: *Two Hieratic Papyri from Tanis*. London, 1889., The Egypt Exploration Society.
- Griffith, F. L.: *The Inscriptions of Siût and Dêr Rifeh*. London, 1889., The Egypt Exploration Society.
- : *A Collection of Hieroglyphs*. A Collection of Hieroglyphs. A Contribution to the History of Egyptian Writing. London, 1898., Egypt Exploration Fund, Kegan Paul & Trench & Trübner & Co.
- : *Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob (Principally of the Middle Kingdom)*. Text. London, 1898., Bernard Quaritch.
- : *Notes on Hieroglyphs*. The Head. The Papyrus Roll. The Soldier.= *PSBA* 21 (1899), 269–272.
- : *The Old Coptic Horoscope of the Stobart Collection*.= *ZÄS* 38 (1900), 71–85.
- : *Chronological Value of Egyptian Words Found in the Bible*.= *PSBA* 23 (1901), 72–77.
- Griffith, F. L. & Thompson, H.: *The Demotic Magical Papyrus of London & Leiden*. I–III. London & Leiden, 1904., 1908., 1909., H. Grevel.
- Griffith, F. L.: *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. I–III., Manchester & London, 1909., University Press & Bernard Quaritch, and Sherrat and Hughes.
- : *Papyrus Dodgson*.= *PSBA* 31 (1909), 100–109.
- : *The Glosses in the Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden*.= *ZÄS* 46 (1909), 117–131.

- : Additional Notes on the Papyrus Dodgson.= PSBA 31 (1909), 289–291.
- : Meroitic Studies.= JEA 3 (1916), 22–30, 111–124.
- : Meroitic Studies III.= JEA 4 (1917), 21–27.
- : Meroitic Studies IV.= JEA 4 (1917), 159–173.
- : Meroitic Studies VI.= JEA 15 (1929), 69–74.
- Griffiths, J. G.: The Inverted Use of ‘Imy.= JEA 28 (1942), 66–67.
- : The Egyptian Derivation of the Name of Moses.= JNES 12 (1953), 225–231.
- : Egyptian Nationalism in the Edfu Temple Texts.= Ruffle, J. & Gaballa, G. A. & Kitchen, K. A. (eds.): Glimpses of Ancient Egypt. Studies in Honour of H. W. Fairman. Warminster, 1979., Aris & Phillips. Pp. 100–106.
- : Review of P. Springborg: Royal Persons: Patriarchal Monarchy and the Feminine Principle.= JEA 80 (1994), 237–239.
- Grimm, A.: Das Fragment einer Liste fremdländischer Tiere, Pflanzen und Städte aus dem Totentempel des Königs Djedkare-Asosi. Zu drei bisher unbekanntem afrikanischen Toponymen.= SAK 12 (1985), 29–41.
- Grottanelli, V. L.: Missione etnografica nel Uollega occidentale. Volume primo. Roma, 1940., Reale Accademia d’Italia.
- Grzymiski, K.: Medewi/Bedewi and Md3/Bedja.= GM 58 (1982), 27–30.
- Guglielmi, W.: Reden, Rufe und Lieder auf altägyptischen Darstellungen der Landwirtschaft, Viehzucht, des Fisch- und Vogelfangs vom Mittleren Reich bis zur Spätzeit. Bonn, 1973., Rudolf Habelt Verlag.
- : Zu einigen literarischen Funktionen des Wortspiels.= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 491–506.
- : Das Ostrakon Gardiner 25 Verso und seine hyperbolische Vergleiche.= ZÄS 112 (1985), 139–143.
- : Die Göttin Mrt.: Entstehung und Verehrung einer Personifikation. Leiden, 1991., E. J. Brill.
- : Die Biergöttin Menket.= Minas, M. & Zeidler, J. (Hrsg.): Aspekte spätägyptischer Kultur. Festschrift für Erich Winter zum 65. Geburtstag. Aegyptiaca Treverensia, Band 7. Mainz, 1995., Verlag Philipp von Zabern. Pp. 113–132.
- Guillaume, A.: Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography. A Comparative Study. Reprinted from: Abd-Nahraim. Vol. I–IV (1959–65). Leiden, 1965., Brill.
- Guiraudon, Th.G. de Dictionnaire galla-français. Première édition. MS (ouvrage écrit à la main). Commencé Nov. 1894. Terminé Mai 1895. Révision comm. Mai 1895. Continué 1896. 194 p.
- Gundlach, R.: Der Pharao und sein Staat. Darmstadt, 1998., Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Gunn, B.: The Eg. (sic) for “Short”.= RT 39 (1921), 101–104.
- : Syntax in Egyptian Syntax. Paris, 1924., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Gusmani, R.: Lydisches Wörterbuch. Mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung. Heidelberg, 1964., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Gustavs, A.: Subaräische Namen in einer ägyptischen Liste syrischer Sklaven und ein subaräischer (?) Hyksos-Name.= ZÄS 64 (1929), 54–58.
- Guthrie, M.: Comparative Bantu. An Introduction to the Comparative Linguistics and Prehistory of the Bantu Languages. Part I. Vol. 2. Bantu Prehistory, Inventory and Indexes. Westmead, Farnborough, Hants, 1971., Gregg International Publishers.
- GVGSS I = Brockelmann, C.: Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. I. Band: Laut- und Formenlehre. Berlin, 1907. (1908.), Verlag von Reuther & Reichardt.
- Györy, H.: Egy múmiakoporsó Gamhudból. Budapest, 1990., Szépművészeti Múzeum.
- Habachi, L.: The Second Stela of Kamose and His Struggle Against the Hyksos Ruler and His Capital. Glückstadt, 1972., J. J. Augustin.

- Haberland, E. & Lamberti, M.: Ibaaddo ka-Ba'iso. Culture and Language of the Ba'iso. Heidelberg, 1988., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Hačikjan, M. L.: Hurritskij i urartskie jazyki. Erevan, 1985., Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Armjanskoj SSR.
- Hailu Berhanu; Sisay Derese; Wedekind, K.: Khamir – the People [ˈximra] and Their Language [xim't'ana]. = Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia 23 (1995), 1–8.
- Hall, R. M.: The Pharaonic mss Tunic as a Smock? = GM 43 (1981), 29–38.
- HAM = Westendorf, W.: Handbuch der altägyptischen Medizin. Leiden, 1999., Brill.
- Handoussa, T.: The Goddess Mikt. = ASAE 71 (1987), 101–105.
- Hanke, R.: Lusthaus. = LÄ III 1102–3.
- Hannig, R.: Beiträge zur Lexikographie 1: Mögliche Phantomwörter im HL1. = Takács, G. (ed.): Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycich. Leiden, 2004., E. J. Brill. Pp. 69–97.
- Hannig, R.: Aus der Versenkung geholt. = Marburger UniJournal, 25. April 2006, pp. 15–18.
- Harries, J.: Tamazight Basic Course. Ait Mgild Dialect. Final Report. Madison, Wisconsin, 1974., University of Wisconsin.
- Harris, J. R.: Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals. Berlin, 1961., Akademie-Verlag.
- : A Hitherto Unrecognized Substantive. = Orientalia NS 30 (1961), 366–370.
- Harris, Z. S.: A Grammar of the Phoenician Language. New Haven, Connecticut, 1936., American Oriental Society.
- Haruna, A.: Cultural Vocabulary of Guruntum. MS. 27–30 December 1991 and 7–9 February 1992. 17 + 37 p.
- : Guruntum-English. MS. 1992 (?). 43 p.
- : English-Guruntum. MS. 1992 (?). 32 p.
- : Cultural Vocabulary of Bubure. MS. 3–6 January 1992. 37 p.
- : Bubure (unsortiert). MS. 1992 (?). 31 p.
- : Englisch-Bubure. MS. 1992 (?). 36 p.
- : Hausa and Other Chadic Languages. A Lexical Comparison Between Hausa, Guruntun (Gurnuŋ), Zaar and Bubbure. = Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter 5 (1993), 75–81.
- : On the Glottalic Consonants in Chadic. = Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (eds.): Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 138–162.
- : Die Wörter šbd und m3wḏ. = MDAIK 35 (1979), 119–124.
- Hassan, S.: Excavations at Giza. Vols. I–X. Cairo, 1932–60., Government Press.
- Haupt, P.: Elul und Adar. = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 64 (1910), 703–714.
- Haussig, H. W. (ed.): Götter und Mythen im Vorderen Orient. Stuttgart, 1965., Klett.
- Hayes, W. C.: A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum (Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446). New York, 1955., The Brooklyn Museum.
- : A Selection of Thutmoside Ostraca from Der el-Bahri. = JEA 46 (1960), 29–52.
- Hayward, R. J.: The Segmental Phonemes of ʿAfar. = BSOAS 37 (1974), 385–406.
- : The Qawko Dialects and Yaaku. = Abbay 9 (1978), 59–70.
- : The Place of Bayso Within Eastern Cushitic. = Hess, R. L. (ed.): Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Ethiopian Studies. Session B. April 13–16, 1978, Chicago, USA. Chicago, 1979., University of Chicago Press. Pp. 73–90.
- : Bayso Revisited: Some Preliminary Linguistic Observations. II. = Bulletin of the School of African and Oriental Research 62 (1979), 101–132.
- : Nominal Suffixes in Dirayta (Gidole). = BSOAS 44 (1981), 126–144.

- : Notes on the Koyra Language.= *Afrika und Übersee* 65 (1982), 211–268.
- : The Arbore Language: A First Investigation Including a Vocabulary. Hamburg, 1984., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- : Remarks on Omotic Sibilants.= Becchaus-Gerst, M. & Serzisko, F. (eds.): *Cushitic-Omotic. Papers from the International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6–9, 1986.* Hamburg, 1988., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 263–299.
- : Comparative Notes on the Language of the S'amakko.= *JAAL* 1 (1989), 1–53.
- : The Notion of "Default Gender": A Key to Interpreting the Evolution of Certain Verb Paradigms in East Omoto, and Its Implications for Omotic.= *AuÜ* 72 (1989), 17–33.
- : Introduction.= Hayward, R. (ed.): *Omotic Language Studies.* London, 1990., School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. Pp. VII–XIX.
- : The Velar Stem Alternation in Omotic. MS. Paper for the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress (Moscow, April 1994). 5 p.
- : The Velar Stem Alternation in Omotic.= Griefenow-Mewis, C. & Voigt, R. M. (eds.): *Cushitic and Omotic Languages. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium (Berlin, March 17–19, 1994).* Köln, 1996., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 167–181.
- : Review of Hudson, G.: *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary.*= *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 18/1 (1997), 106–120.
- : The Velar Stem Alternation in Omotic. MS. Not dated. 5 p.
- HCVA 1 = Diakonoff, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.; Stolbova, O. V.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian. Part 1.*= *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 2 (1993), 5–28.
- HCVA 2 = Diakonoff, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.; Stolbova, O. V.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian. Part 2.*= *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 3 (1994), 5–26.
- HCVA 3 = Diakonoff, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.; Stolbova, O. V.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian. Part 3.*= *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 4 (1994), 7–38.
- HCVA 4 = Diakonoff, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian. Part 4.*= *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 5 (1995), 4–32.
- HCVA 5 = Diakonoff, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian. Part 5.*= *St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 6 (1997), 12–35.
- HED = Puhvel, J.: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary.* Berlin, New York, Amsterdam, since 1984, Mouton Publishers.
- HEG = Tischler, J.: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar.* Innsbruck, since 1977, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Heine, B.: *Vokabulare ostafrikanischer Restsprachen. Teil I.*= *Afrika und Übersee* 56 (1973), 276–283.
- : *Vokabulare ostafrikanischer Restsprachen. Teil II.*= *Afrika und Übersee* 57 (1974), 38–49.
- : Notes on the Yaaku Language (Kenya).= *Afrika und Übersee* 58/2 (1975), 119–138.
- : *Tepes und Nyang'i – zwei ostafrikanische Restsprachen.*= *Afrika und Übersee* 58 (1975), 290–300.
- : *Ik – eine ostafrikanische Restsprache. Historische Entwicklung und Vokabular.*= *Afrika und Übersee* 59 (1975–76), 31–56.
- & Voßen, R.: *Zur Stellung der Ongamo-Sprache (Kilimandscharo).*= *AuÜ* 59 (1976), 81–105.

- : Notes on the Rendille Language.= Afrika und Übersee 59 (1976), 176–223.
- & Voßen, R.: Zur Stellung der Ongamo-Sprache (Kilimandscharo).= Afrika und Übersee 59 (1976), 81–105.
- : Bemerkungen zur Boni-Sprache (Kenia).= Afrika und Übersee 60 (1977), 242–295.
- : The Sam Languages. A History of Rendille, Boni and Somali.= Afroasiatic Linguistics 6/2 (1978), 23–115.
- ; Rottland, F.; Voßen, R.: Proto-Baz: Some Aspects of Early Nilotic-Cushitic Contacts.= Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika 1 (1979), 75–91.
- : The Non-Bantu Languages of Kenya. Berlin, 1980., Reimer.
- : Boni Dialects. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Helck, W.: Untersuchungen zu den Beamtentiteln des ägyptischen Alten Reiches. Glückstadt, 1954., J. J. Augustin.
- : mr = jmj-r3? = Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 79 (1954), 76–77.
- : Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches. Leiden, 1958., Brill.
- : Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reiches. Teil II.= Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 11 (1960). Teil III: 2 (1963). Teil IV: 3 (1963). Teil V: 4 (1964). Teil VI: 4 (1969). With continuous pagination.
- : Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Wiesbaden, 1962., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Einige Bemerkungen zum Mundöffnungsritual.= MDAIK 22 (1967), 27–41.
- : Die Lehre des Dw3-Ḥtj. Teil I: Textzusammenstellung. Wiesbaden, 1970., Harrassowitz.
- : Das Bier bei den alten Ägyptern. Berlin, 1971., Gesellschaft für die Geschichte und Bibliographie des Brauwesens & E.V., Institut für Gärungsgewerbe und Biotechnologie.
- : Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. 2., verbesserte Auflage. Wiesbaden, 1971., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Gartenanlage, -bau.= LÄ II (1977), 378–380.
- : Die altägyptischen Gaue. Wiesbaden, 1974., Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- : Einige Bemerkungen zu Artikeln in SAK 2.= SAK (1976), 115–124.
- : Der Name des Thot.= SAK 4 (1976), 131–134.
- : Die Lehre für König Merikare. Wiesbaden, 1977., Harrassowitz.
- : Der “König von Ober- und Unterägypten”.= Junge, F. (ed.): Studien zur Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Band 1: Sprache. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen, 1984., Hubert & Co. Pp. 251–256.
- : Grundsätzliches zur sogenannten “syllabischen Schreibung”.= SAK 16 (1989), 121–143.
- : Zum Statuensockel des Djoser.= Gamer-Wallert, I. & Helck, W. (Hrsg.): Gegengabe. Festschrift für Emma Brunner-Traut. Tübingen, 1992., Attempto Verlag. Pp. 143–150.
- Held, M.: Mḥs/*mḥš in Ugaritic and Other Languages.= JAOS 79 (1959), 169–176.
- Hellwig, B.: Goemai – English – Hausa Dictionary. MS. Draft. Printed out on 20 August 2000. 42 p.
- Heltzer, M.: Goods, Prices and the Organization of Trade in Ugarit. Marketing and Transportation in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Half of the II Millennium (sic!) B.C.E. Wiesbaden, 1978., Harrassowitz.
- Herbin, F. R.: Le livre de parcourir l'éternité. OLA 58. Leuven, 1994., Peeters.
- Hess, J.-J.: Geographische Benennungen u. Pflanzennamen in der nördlichen Bischârî-Sprache.= Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen 9 (1918–1919), 209–225.
- : Über das präfigierte und infigierte ʿ im Arabischen.= Zeitschrift für Semitistik 2/1 (1923), 219–223.

- Hetzron, R.: Agaw Numerals and Incongruence in Semitic.= JSS 12 (1967), 169–197.
- : The Verbal System of Souther Agaw. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1969., University of California Press.
- : Third Person Singular Pronoun Suffixes in Proto-Semitic.= *Orientalia Suecana* 18 (1969), 101–127.
- : The Nominal System of Awngi (Southern Agaw).= BSOAS 41 (1978), 121–141.
- Hickmann, H.: La scène musicale d'une tombe de la VI^e dynastie à Guîzah (Idou).= ASAE 54 (1956–57), 213–237.
- : La chironomie dans l'Égypte pharaonique.= ZÄS 83 (1958), 96–127.
- Hintze, F.: Konsonantische Übergangslaute im Koptischen.= *Zeitschrift für Phonetik* 3/1–2 (1949), 46–53.
- : Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache neuägyptischer Erzählungen.= *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung Nr. 2 & 6*. Berlin, 1950., 1952., Akademie-Verlag.
- : Zur hamitosemitischen Wortvergleihung.= *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5 (1951), 65–87.
- : Ist koptisch sow'n "wissen" eine Pielbildung?=*MIO* 1 (1953), 27–37.
- : Die sprachliche Stellung des Meroitischen.= Lukas, J. (ed.): *Afrikanistische Studien*. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 355–372.
- : Meroe und die Noba.= ZÄS 94 (1967), 79–86.
- Hinz, W. & Koch, H.: *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin, 1987., Dietrich Reimer.
- HO = Černý, J. & Gardiner, A. H.: *Hieratic Ostraca. Vol. I*. Oxford, 1957., Oxford University Press.
- Hoch, J. E.: *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton, 1994., Princeton University Press.
- Hodge, C. T.: Review of Leslau, W.: *A Dictionary of Mocha (Southwestern Ethiopia)*.=*African Studies* 20 (1961), 113.
- : Hausa-Egyptian Establishment.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 8/1 (1966), 40–57.
- : Some Afroasiatic Etymologies.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 10/3 (1968), 19–29.
- : The Medjay/mišri.= *Language Sciences* 8 (1969), 11–12.
- : Egyptian ḡ Amid Afroasiatic Languages.= Sinor, D. (ed.): *American Oriental Society, Middle West Branch, Semi-Centennial Volume. Asian Studies Research Institute, Oriental Series #3*. Bloomington, 1969., Indiana University Press. Pp. 104–110.
- : Hausa nàà: "To Be" or Not "To Be"?=*African Language Review* 8 (1969), 156–162.
- : Afroasiatic Pronoun Problems.= *International Journal of American Linguistics* 35/4 (1969), 366–376.
- : Afroasiatic. An Overview.= *Current Trends in Linguistics* 6 (1970), 237–254.
- : Afroasiatic: An Overview.= Hodge, C. T. (ed.): *Afroasiatic. A Survey*. The Hague, 1971., Mouton. Pp. 9–26.
- : Afroasiatic s- Causative.= *Language Sciences* 15 (1971), 41–43.
- : Lisramic.= *Language Sciences* 20 (1972), 13–16.
- : Egyptian and Survival.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, 1975., Mouton*. Pp. 171–191.
- : Lisramic II.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 17/5 (1975), 237–272.
- : An Egypto-Semitic Comparison.= *Folia Orientalia* 17 (1976), 5–28.
- : Lisramic (Afroasiatic). An Overview.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, Michigan, 1976., African Studies Center of Michigan State University. Pp. 43–65.

- : Review of Callender, J. B.: Middle Egyptian.= *Language* 53/4 (1977), 930–940.
- : Lislakh.= *The Fourth LACUS Forum* 1977. Columbia, 1978., Hornbeam Press. Pp. 414–422.
- : 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.
- : Lislakh IV: Hindo-Hittite Haitch.= *The Fifth LACUS Forum* 1978. Columbia, 1979., Hornbeam Press. Pp. 497–502.
- : Indo-Europeans in the Near East.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 23/6 (1981), 227–244.
- : Lislakh Labials.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 23/8 (1981), 368–382.
- : Comparative Evidence for Egyptian Historical Phonology.= Young, D. W. (ed.): *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*. East Gloucester, 1981., Pirtle and Polson. Pp. 401–413.
- : The Hausa Relative.= Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Border Area*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 254–260.
- : Some Implications of Lislakh.= Gutwinski, W. & Jolly, G. (eds.): *The Eighth LACUS Forum* 1981. Columbia, 1982., Hornbeam Press. Pp. 308–315.
- : 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.
- : Afroasiatic: The Horizon and Beyond.= *Jewish Quarterly Review* 74/2 (1983), 137–158.
- : Elilim.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 25/2 (1983), 178–188.
- : Lislakh: Progress and Prospects.= Bynon, J. (ed.): *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 413–421.
- : Were the Rekhyt Indo-Europeans?=*Discussions in Egyptology* 2 (1985), 13–23.
- : Indo-European Consonant Ablaut.= *Diachronica* 3/2 (1986), 143–162.
- : A Relative Matter.= Marino, M. & Pérez, L. A. (eds.): *The Twelfth LACUS Forum* 1985. Lake Bluff, 1986., LACUS. Pp. 148–157.
- : Hausa and English: Related Languages.= Yaro Yahaya, I. & Rufa'i, A. (eds.): *Studies in Language, Literature and Culture. The First Hausa International Conference*. Kano, 1986., Bayero University. Pp. 335–341.
- : The Status of Lisramic (Hamito-Semitic) Sound Correspondences.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Müller, W. W. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, Marburg, 20–22 September, 1983. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 11–24.
- : Review of Bomhard, A. R.: *Toward Proto-Nostratic*.=*Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 9 (1987), 63–65.
- : Lislakh Cluster Resolution.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 29/1 (1987), 91–104.
- : Consonant Ablaut in Indo-European.= Fleming, I.: *The Thirteenth LACUS Forum* 1986. Lake Bluff, 1987., LACUS. Pp. 591–599.
- : Prothetic Alif and Canonical Form in Egyptian.= Duncan-Rose, C. & Vennemann, T. (eds.): *On Language: Rhetorica, Phonologica, Syntactica. A Festschrift for Robert P. Stockwell*. London, 1988., Routledge. Pp. 195–202.
- : Consonant Ablaut in Lislakh.= Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): *Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1988., John Benjamins. Pp. 267–276.
- : Lateral Drift.= Embleton, Sh. (ed.): *The Fourteenth LACUS Forum* 1987. Lake Bluff, 1988., LACUS. Pp. 373–377.
- : Touching the Bases (Presidential Address).= Brend, R. M. & Lockwood, D. G. (eds.): *The Fifteenth LACUS Forum* 1988. Lake Bluff, 1989., LACUS. Pp. 5–21.

- : Hausa and Prothetic Alif.= Frajzyngier, Z. (ed.): *Current Progress in Chadic Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1989., John Benjamins. Pp. 219–232.
- : Thoth and Oral Tradition.= Key, M. R. & Hoenigswald, H. M. (eds.): *General and Amerindian Ethnolinguistics*. In *Remembrance of Stanley Newman*. Berlin, New York, 1989., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 407–416.
- : Splitting Homonyms.= Jordan, M. P. (ed.): *The Sixteenth LACUS Forum 1989*. Lake Bluff, 1990., LACUS. Pp. 168–176.
- : The Multivalence of Hittite *h*.= *The Seventeenth LACUS Forum 1990*. Lake Bluff, 1990., LACUS. Pp. 368–374.
- : The Role of Egyptian within Afroasiatic.= Baldi, Ph. (ed.): *Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology*. Berlin, New York, 1990., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 639–659.
- : Etymological Reassessment.= Mukarovskiy, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band II*. Wien, 1991., Afro-Pub. Pp. 95–105.
- : Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic.= Lamb, S. M. & Mitchell, D. (eds.): *Sprung from Some Common Source*. Stanford, 1991., Stanford University Press. Pp. 141–165.
- : Prothetic Alif in Egypto-Coptic.= Mendel, D. & Claudi, U. (eds.): *Ägypten im afro-orientalischen Kontext. Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens*. Köln, 1991., Universität zu Köln. Pp. 171–176.
- : Review of Petráček, K.: *Altägyptisch, Hamitosemitisch und ihre Beziehungen zu einigen Sprachfamilien in Afrika und Asien: vergleichende Studien*.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111/2 (1991), 382–384.
- : Miktam.= Kaye, A. S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-Fifth Birthday November 14th, 1991*. Vol. 1. Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 634–644.
- : Consonant Ablaut in Egyptian.= *Discussions in Egyptology* 23 (1992), 15–22.
- : Tooth and Claw.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 34 (1992), 202–232.
- : Semitic b and w.= Brend, R. M. (ed.): *The Eighteenth LACUS Forum 1991*. Lake Bluff, 1992., LACUS. Pp. 291–297.
- : Some Proto Affixes.= Becker-Makkai, V. (ed.): *The Twentieth LACUS Forum 1993*. Chapel Hill, 1994., (publisher not indicated). Pp. 526–536.
- : *Lectio Difficilior*.= Powel, M. J. (ed.): *The Twentieth LACUS Forum*. Chapel Hill, 1995., LACUS. Pp. 635–643.
- : An Egyptian Etymology: Egypto-Coptic *m3č*.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 39/2 (1997), 196–219.
- : The Trickle Down Approach.= Afsaruddin, A. & Zahniser, A. H. M. (eds.): *Humanism, Culture, and Language in the Near East. Studies in Honor of Georg Krotkoff*. Winona Lake, 1997., Eisenbrauns. Pp. 337–343.
- Hodge, C. T. & Schwabe, C. W. & Adams, J.: *Egyptian Beliefs about the Bull's Spine. An Anatomical Origin for Ankh*.= *Anthropological Linguistics* 24/4 (1982), 445–479.
- Hoffmann, C.: *Zur Sprache der Cibak*.= Lukas, J. (ed.): *Afrikanistische Studien*. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 118–143.
- : Ancient Benue-Congo Loans in Chadic?= *Africana Marburgensia* 3/2 (1970), 3–23.
- : On the Classification of Nancere.= *Journal of West African Languages* 8/1 (1971), 5–12.
- : On the Position of Paduko.= *Actes du huitième congrès international de linguistique africaine*. Abidjan, 24–28 Mars 1969. Vol. 1. Abidjan, 1971., Université d'Abidjan. Pp. 221–233.
- : Masa and Kim.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 122 (1972), 180–219.
- : *Towards a Comparative Phonology of the Languages of the Angas-Goemai Group*. MS. University of Ibadan, faculty seminar on 19 March 1975. 32 p.

- : Were There Labial Alveolars and Labial Palatals in Proto-Bura-Margi? = Jungraithmayr, H.; Müller, W. W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Amsterdam, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 451–474.
- Hoffmann, F.: Der literarische demotische Papyrus Wien D6920–22. = SAK 22 (1996), 167–200.
- : Ägypten. Kultur und Lebenswelt in griechisch-römischer Zeit. Berlin, 2000., Akademie Verlag.
- : Beitrag zur Herkunft der Pfannengräber-Leute. = ZDMG Supplementa I (XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag. Vorträge. Teil 3) (1969), 1113–1135.
- : Zur Bedeutung des Titels pelmos atolis. = MNL 17 (1976), 34–40.
- : C-Gruppen-Sprache und Nobiin. = GM 65 (1983), 39–43.
- ; Tomandl, H.; Zach, M.: k3rm.t – Armband aus Elefantenhaar? = GM 74 (1984), 7–9.
- : Bewohner Kordofans auf ägyptischen Darstellungen? = GM 75 (1984), 15–18.
- : nab-un = *sab-in “denn es ist eine Giraffe“? = GM 77 (1984), 19–23.
- : Ein weiteres altägyptisches Lehnwort im Meroitischen. = GM 115 (1990) 57–61.
- Hohenberger, J.: Semitisches und hamitisches Sprachgut im Masai. Mit vergleichendem Wörterbuch. Eine sprachvergleichende Untersuchung unter Berücksichtigung von rund 50 semitische, hamitischen, nilo-hamitischen und anderen afrikanischen Sprachen. Sachsenmühle (Fränkische Schweiz), 1958., Selbstverlag des Verfassers.
- : The Nominal and Verbal Afformatives of Nilo-Hamitic and Hamito-Semitic. = Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 42/2 (1975).
- : Lexikalische Gleichungen: Nilo-Hamitisch – Kuschitisch – Semitisch. = *Africana Marburgensia* 11/1 (1978), 43–54.
- : Hamito-semitische Wortstämme im Bari und Lotuho sowie in verwandten Sprachen. = *Africana Marburgensia Sonderheft* 3 (1979), 1–62.
- Hohenwart-Gerlachstein, A.: Nubienforschungen. Dorf- und Sprachstudien in der Fadidja-Zone. Wien, 1979., Engelbert Stiglmayr.
- Holladay, W. L. (ed.): A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1971., William B. Eerdmans.
- 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.
- : Kleine Beiträge zum assyrischen Lexikon. = *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia*. Sarja B, nid. 7, no. 2 (1913), 1–103.
- : Lexikalische Miscellen. = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 28 (1914), 147–162.
- : Zur semitisch-hamitischen Sprachwissenschaft. = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 32 (1919), 34–47.
- : Weitere Beiträge zum assyrischen Lexikon. = *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia*. Sarja B, nid. 15, no. 1 (1921), 1–22.
- Homburger, L.: Notes sur quelques morphèmes communs à l'égyptien et aux langues négro-africaines. = *Journal Asiatique* 212 (1928), 323–345.
- : Les langues africaines modernes et l'égyptien ancien. = *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 23/3 (1929), 149–174.
- : Les représentants de quelques hiéroglyphes égyptiens en peul. = *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 23/5 (1930), 277–312.
- : La morphologie nubienne et l'égyptien. = *Journal Asiatique* 218 (1931), 249–279.
- : Les langues négro-africaines. Paris, 1957., Payot.
- : De quelques éléments communs à l'égyptien et aux langues dravidiennes. = *Kémi* 14 (1957), 26–33.
- : Sur l'origine de quelques langues couchitiques. = *GLECS* 9 (1960–63), 54–57.
- Hommel, F.: Die Namen der Säugethiere bei den südsemitischen Völkern. Leipzig, 1879., J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

- : Die semitischen Völkern und Sprachen. Leipzig, 1883., Otto Schulze.
- : s und z als verschiedene Laute im Altägyptischen.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 30 (1892), 9–11.
- : Über den Grad der Verwandtschaft des Altägyptischen mit dem Semitischen.= *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 2 (1894), 342–358.
- : Die ältesten Lautwerte einiger ägyptischen Buchstabenzeichen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 53 (1899), 347–349.
- : *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des Alten Orients*. München, 1904., C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- : *Miscellanea*.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 10/7 (1907), 380–385.
- : *Miszellen*.= Weil, G. (ed.): *Festschrift Eduard Sachau zum siebzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*. Berlin, 1915., Verlag von Georg Reimer. Pp. 15–21.
- Hornung, E.: *Lexikalische Studien I*.= *ZÄS* 86 (1961), 106–114.
- : *Das Amduat. Die Schrift des verborgenen Raumes nach Texten aus den Gräbern des Neuen Reiches*. Teil I: Text. Teil II: Übersetzung und Kommentar. Teil III: Die Kurzfassung. Wiesbaden, 1963., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : *Das Buch von der Anbetung des Re im Westen (Sonnenlitanei)*. Nach den Versionen des Neuen Reiches. Teil II: Übersetzung und Kommentar. *AEgyptiaca Helvetica (Ägyptologisches Seminar der Universität Basel et Centre d'Etudes Orientales de l'Université de Genève)* 3. Genève, 1976., Éditions de Belles-Lettres.
- : (unter Mitarbeit von A. Brodbeck und E. Staehelin): *Das Buch von den Pforten des Jenseits*. Nach den Versionen des Neuen Reiches. Teil I: Text. Teil II: Übersetzung und Kommentar. Basel, Genève, 1979., 1980., Ägyptologisches Seminar der Universität Basel, Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Genève.
- Horrack, P. J. de: *On the Phonetic Value of the Sign [mr]*.= *PSBA* 16 (1894), 142–144.
- Hoskison, J. T.: *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Gude Language (Chadic)*. Ph.D. dissertation. 1983., The Ohio State University.
- Houghton, W.: *Was the Camel Known to the Early Egyptians?*= *PSBA* 12 (1889), 81–88.
- Houlihan, P. F.: *The Birds of Ancient Egypt. With the Collaboration and a Preliminary Checklist to the Birds of Egypt by Steven M. Goodman*. Warminster, 1986., Aris & Phillips.
- Hovestreydt, W.: *A Letter to the King Relating to the Foundation of a Statue (P. Turin 1879 Vso.)*.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 5 (1997), 107–121.
- Hölscher, W.: *Libyer und Ägypter. Beiträge zur Ethnologie und Geschichte libyscher Völkerschaften nach den altägyptischen Quellen*. Glückstadt, 1955., Verlag J. J. Augustin.
- HPBM III = Gardiner, A. H.: *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Third Series*. Chester Beatty Gift. London, 1935., British Museum.
- HPBM IV = Edwards, I. E. S.: *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. 4th Series: Oracular Amuletic Decrees of the Late New Kingdom. Vols. I–II*. London, 1960., The British Museum.
- HPBM VII = Leitz, Ch.: *Magical and Medical Papyri of the New Kingdom. Hieratic Papyri of the British Museum VII*. London, 1999., British Museum Press.
- Hrbek, I.: *hg und verwandte Wurzeln in den semitischen Sprachen*.= *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 17/2–3 (1968), 95–104.
- Hrozný, B./F.: *Über das Bier im alten Babylonien und Ägypten*.= *Anzeiger der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* 26 (1910).
- : *Sur quelques rapports entre Sumer-Akkad et l'Égypte au IV^e millénaire avant J.-C.*= *Archiv Orientalní* 10 (1938), 369–374.
- : *La charrue en Sumer-Akkad, en Égypte et en Chine*.= *Archiv Orientalní* 10 (1938), 437–440, pls. XXVI–XXVIII.

- HSED = Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, 1995., E. J. Brill.
- Hudson, G.: *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary*. Hamburg, 1989., Buske.
- : *Enset Vocabulary in Eight Ethiopian Cushitic and Semitic Languages*. Presented at the 4th International Conference of Cushitic-Omotc Languages, Leiden, 10–12 April 2003. 4 p.
- Hudson, R. A.: *A Dictionary of Beja*. Draft Printout. February 29, 1996. Version prepared by R. M. Blench.
- Huehnergard, J.: RS 15.86 (PRU 3, 51f.)= UF 18 (1986), 169–171.
- : RS 19.55 (PRU 4, 293b.)= UF 18 (1986), 453.
- : *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. Harvard Semitic Studies 32. Atlanta, 1987., Scholars Press.
- : *Semitic Languages*.= Sasson, J. M. (ed.): *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. Volume IV. New York, 1995., Simon & Schuster MacMillan. Pp. 2117–2134.
- : *A Grammar of Amarna Canaanite*.= BASOR 310 (1998), 59–77.
- : *Ugaritic Words in Syllabic Texts*.= Watson, W. G. E. & Wyatt, N. (eds.): *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Leiden, 1999., Brill. Pp. 134–139.
- : *Proto-Semitic Language and Culture*.= *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Fourth Edition. Boston, New York, 2000., Houghton Mifflin Company. Pp. 2056–2068.
- : *Akkadian ḥ and West Semitic *ḥ*.= Kogan, L. (ed.): *Orientalia: Papers of the Oriental Institute*. Issue III. *Studia Semitica*. Moscow, 2003., Russian State University of Humanities. Pp. 102–119.
- Hvidberg, F. F.: *Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament. A Study of Canaanite-Israelite Religion*. Leiden, 1962., Brill.
- HW(b) = Friedrich, J.: *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1952., Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- Ibrizimow, D.: *Towards a Common Chadic Lexicon*.= *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace językoznawcze* 102 (1990), 1–122.
- : *Notes on Chadic Lexical Comparisons – Selected Issues*.= *Folia Orientalia* 27 (1990), 199–216.
- : “Femme” et “homme” en comparaison avec les autres langues chamito-sémitiques.= Echard, N. (ed.): *Actes du IV^e colloque Méga-Tchad, CNRS/ORSTOM, Paris, du 14 au 16 septembre 1988*. Volume II. *Les relations hommes-femmes dans le bassin du Lac Tchad*. Paris, 1991., Éditions de l’OSTROM. Pp. 47–58.
- & Gimba, A.M. (eds.): *Bole Language and Documentation Unit. BOLDU Report I*. Köln, 1994., Köppe.
- : *The Verb in Ngamo*. MS. Presented at the 2nd Biennial International Colloquium on the Chadic Languages, Prague, 11–12 October 2003. 8 p.
- IÄF = Kaplony, P.: *Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit. I–III*. Wiesbaden, 1963., Harrassowitz.
- IEW = Pokorny, J.: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band I. Bern-München, 1959., Francke Verlag.
- IF = *Indogermanische Forschungen*.
- IL = *Institute of Linguistics. Bauch Area Survey Report* presented by N. Campbell and J. Hoskison. MS. Zaria, 1972.
- Illič-Svityč, V. M.: *Drevnejšie indoevropsko-semitskie jazykovye kontakty*.= Toporov, V. N. (ed.): *Problemy indoevropskogo jazykoznanija*. Moskva, 1964., Nauka. Pp. 3–12.
- : *Materialy k sravnitel’nomu slovarju nostratičeskich jazykov*.= *Étimologija* (1965), 321–373.
- : *Iz istorii čadskogo konsonantizma. Labial’nye smyčnye*.= Uspenskij, B. A. (ed.): *Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii*. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 9–34.

- : Sootvetstvija smyčnyh v nostratičeskikh jazykah.= *Étimologija* (1966), 304–355.
- : Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskikh jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-Ķ). Moskva, 1971., Nauka.
- : Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskikh jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (l-ž). Ukazateli. Moskva, 1976., Nauka.
- : Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskikh jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (p-q). Po kartotekam avtora. Moskva, 1984., Nauka.
- IOS = Israel Oriental Studies (Jerusalem).
- Ishaq, E. M.: Egyptian Arabic Vocabulary, Coptic Influence On.= Atiya, A. S. (ed.): *The Coptic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 8. New York, 1991., MacMillan. Pp. 112–118.
- Ivanov, V. V.: Obščeeindoevropskaja, praslavjanskaja i anatolijskaja jazykovye sistemy. Sravnitel'no-tipologičeskie očerki. Moskva, 1965., Nauka.
- : O vozmožnom otrazhenii odnogo migracionnogo termina v hausa (hausa birnī “gorod”).= Uspenskij, B. A. (ed.): *Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii*. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 105–110.
- Iversen, E.: Some Ancient Egyptian Paints and Pigments. A Lexicographical Study.= *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-Filologiske Meddelelser*, Bind 34, nr. 4 (1955), 1–42.
- Ivanov, V. V.: Drevnie kul'turnye i jazykovye svjazi južnobalkanskogo, égejskogo i maloazijskogo (anatolijskogo) arealov.= *Balkanskij lingvističeskij sbornik*. Moskva, 1977., Nauka. Pp. 3–39.
- : Urartsk. mari, hurritsk. marianne, hajassk. marija.-= *Peredneaziatskij sbornik*. III. Moskva, 1979., Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 101–112.
- Iversen, E.: Fragments of a Hieroglyphic Dictionary. Pap. Carlsberg Nr. VII. Copenhagen, 1958., Ejnar Munksgaard.
- : The Inscription of Herwerre' at Serâbit-el-Kâdem.= Junge, F. (hrsg.): *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 507–519.
- Izre'el, Sh.: A New Dictionary of Northwest Semitic and the Amarna Glosses.= *Israel Oriental Studies* 18 (1998), 421–429.
- Jaggat, Ph. J.: Guruntum (gürdù ṅ) (West Chadic-B): Linguistic Notes and Wordlist.= *African Languages and Cultures* 2/2 (1989), 175–202.
- Jahn, A.: Mehri-Sprache in Südarabien: Texte und Wörterbuch. Wien, 1902., Alfred Hölder.
- James, Th. G. H.: The Ḥeḡanakhte Papers and Other Early Middle Kingdom Documents. New York, 1962., Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- James, W.: Ganza Word List. MS. 1965. 1 p. (Kindly offered by M. L. Bender.)
- Jansen-Winkel, K.: Ägyptische Biographien der 22. und 23. Dynastie. Teil 1: Übersetzung und Kommentar. Teil 2: Phraseologie. Teil 3: Texte. Wiesbaden, 1985., Harrassowitz.
- : Zu einigen “Trinksprüchen” auf ägyptischen Gefäße.= *ZÄS* 116 (1989), 143–153.
- : Zwei Bemerkungen zu Gebel es-Silsila Nr. 100.= *JEA* 75 (1989), 237–239.
- : Nisbeadjektiv und Partizip.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 3 (1993), 7–16.
- : Spätmittelägyptische Grammatik der Texte der 3. Zwischenzeit. Wiesbaden, 1996., Harrassowitz Verlag.
- : Zur Bedeutung von jm3ḥ.= *BSÉG* 20 (1996), 29–36.
- : “Horizont” und “Verklärtheit”: Zur Bedeutung der Wurzel 3ḥ.= *SAK* 23 (1996), 201–215.
- : Eine Stele mit “kryptographischem” Bildfeld.= *BSÉG* 21 (1997), 13–20.
- : Ein Kaufmann aus Naukratis.= *ZÄS* 124 (1997), 108–115.

- Janssen, J. J.: Two Ancient Egyptian Ship's Logs. Papyrus Leiden I 350 Verso and Papyrus Turin 2008 + 2016. Leiden, 1961., E. J. Brill.
- : A Twentieth-Dynasty Account Papyrus (Pap. Turin no. Cat. 1907/8).= JEA 52 (1966), 81–94.
- : Requisitions from Upper Egyptian Temples (PBM 10401).= JEA 77 (1991), 79–94.
- : & Janssen, R. M.: mk. An Obscure Designation of Cloth.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 7 (2000), 177–182.
- Janssens, G.: Contribution to the Hamito-Semitic and the Egyptian Phonetic Laws.= CdE 42 (1967), 86–122.
- JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society (Ann Arbor, Michigan).
- Jaouen, R.: Wordlist of Muturwa and Midjivin. MS. Midjivin, 26 April 1973.
- Jacq, Ch.: Lexique des verbes de mouvement dans les textes des pyramides et les textes des sarcophages. Paris, 1986., I.M.O., Recherches Égyptologiques.
- Jasnow, R.: A Late Period Hieratic Wisdom Text (P. Brooklyn 47.218.135). Chicago, 1992., The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- : The Hieratic Wooden Tablet Varille.= Silverman, D. P. (ed.): For His Ka. Essays Offered in Memory of Klaus Baer. Chicago, 1994., The Oriental Institute of Chicago. Pp. 99–112.
- : A Lexicographical Note on the Medinet Habu Inscription of Year 11.= JEA 80 (1994), 201–202.
- Jastrow, M.: A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. Volume I: ʔ-k, Volume II: l-t. New York, 1950., Pardes Publishing House Inc.
- JCS = Journal of Cuneiform Studies (New Haven, Connecticut).
- JEA = Journal of Egyptian Archaeology (London).
- Jean, Ch. T.: Cenni intorno a recenti studi sulle affinità camito-semiteche.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 6/1 (1913), 69–87.
- JEOL = Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux (Leiden).
- Jéquier, G.: Essai sur la nomenclature des parties de bateaux.= BIFAO 9 (1911), 37–82.
- : Notes et remarques.= RT 39 (1920), 11–19.
- : Les frises d'objets des sarcophages du Moyen Empire. Le Caire, 1921., IFAO.
- : Le préfixe [m] dans les noms d'objets du Moyen Empire.= RT 39 (1921), 145–154.
- : À propos de la danse des mouaou.= *Revue de l'Égypte Ancienne* 1 (1925–27), 144–151.
- JES = Journal of Ethiopian Studies.
- JESHO = Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (Leiden).
- JNES = Journal of Near Eastern Studies (Chicago).
- JNWSL = Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages (Stellenbosch).
- Jobling, W. J.: Nabataean-Aramaic: A Provisional Lexicon (Nablex). Kensington, Maryland, 1995., DP Dunwoody Press.
- Johnson, S.: A New View on Some Old Vegetables: A Study of the Generic Words w3d and smw.= GM 150 (1996), 75–81.
- Johnstone, J. M.: Clothes for the Living – Linen for the Dead. A MSS Garment from the Egyptian Museum, Cairo.= Eldamaty, M. & Trad, M. (eds.): Egyptian Museum Collections Around the World. Volume One. Cairo, 2002., American University in Cairo Press. Pp. 595–605.
- : Harsūsi Lexicon. London, 1977., Oxford University Press.
- : Jibbāli Lexicon. London, 1981., Oxford University Press.
- : Mehri Lexicon. London, 1987., University of London.
- Joly, A.: Les chaouiya des Ouled-Sellem. Suivi d'un vocabulaire. Alger, 1912., Typographie Adolphe Jourdan.

- Jonckheere, F.: Une maladie égyptienne [°3°]. L'hématurie parasitaire. Bruxelles, 1944., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.
- : Le papyrus médical Chester Beatty. Bruxelles, 1947., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.
- : La mesdemet.= *Histoire de la Médecine* 7 (1952), 2f. Quoted after Harris 1961.
- Jones, D.: A Glossary of Ancient Egyptian Nautical Titles and Terms. London, New York, 1988., Kegan Paul.
- : An Index of Ancient Egyptian Titles, Epithets and Phrases of the Old Kingdom. Vol. I. Oxford, 2000., Archaeopress, Publishers of the British Archaeological Reports.
- Jordan, A.: Dictionnaire berbère-français (dialectes tašelhait) contenant 6.025 formes. Rabat, 1934., Éditions Omnia.
- JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review (Philadelphia).
- JSS = Journal of Semitic Studies (Manchester).
- JSSEA = Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities (Toronto).
- Junge, F.: Zur "Sprachwissenschaft" der Ägypter.= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 257–272.
- : Einführung in die Grammatik des Neuägyptischen. 2., verbesserte Auflage. Wiesbaden, 1999., Harrassowitz.
- : Die Lehre Ptahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt. Freiburg, 2003., Universitätsverlag & Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Vokalharmonie im Tangale.= *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 10 (1957), 144–152.
- : Beobachtungen zur tschadhamitischen Sprache der Jegu (und Jonkor) von Abu Telfan (Republique du Tchad).= *Afrika und Übersee* 45 (1961), 95–123.
- : Wörterbuch der Angas-Sprache. MS. 1962.
- : Wörterbuch der Goemay-Sprache. MS. 1962.
- : Die Sprache des Sura (Maghavul) in Nordnigerien.= *Afrika und Übersee* 47 (1963), 8–89, 204–220.
- : Sätze im Ngamo (übersetzt aus dem Hausa). Wörterverzeichnis Ngamo-Deutsch. Wörterverzeichnis Deutsch-Ngamo. MS. 1963. 1 + 4 + 3 p.
- : Materialien zur Kenntnis des Chip, Montol, Gerka und Burrum (Südplateau, Nordnigerien).= *Afrika und Übersee* 48 (1965), 161–183.
- : Die Laryngale ɸ und ʕ im Scha (Süd-Plateau, Nordnigerien).= *Afrika und Übersee* 49 (1966), 169–173.
- : Kanakuru-Deutsch. MS. 1966. 19 p.
- : Specimens of the Pa'a ("Afa") and Warja Languages with Notes on the Tribes of Ningi Chiefdom (Bauchi Province, Northern Nigeria).= *Afrika und Übersee* 50/3 (1967), 194–205.
- : A Comparative Word List of the Ron Languages (Southern Plateau, N. Nigeria).= *Africana Marburgensia* 1/2 (1968), 3–12.
- : Ancient Hamito-Semitic Remnants in the Central Sudan.= *African Language Review* 7 (1968), 16–22.
- : Class Languages of Tangale-Waja District (Bauchi Province, Northern Nigeria).= *AuÜ* 52/3–4 (1968–69), 161–206.
- : Die Ron-Sprachen. Tschadhamitische Studien in Nordnigerien. Glückstadt, 1970., Verlag J. J. Augustin.
- : Reflections on the Root Structure in Chadhamitic (Chadic).= *Actes du Huitième Congrès International de Linguistique Africaine, Abidjan, 24–28 mars 1969. Vol. 1. Abidjan, 1971., Université d'Abidjan. Pp. 285–292.*
- : Wordlist of Mulwi. MS. Collected on 11 December 1971. 30 p.
- : Miltu (pp. 1–29). Gadang (pp. 51–59). Begonnen am 20.3.1972. MS. 97 p.

- : Dictionnaire birgit-français. MS. 1973.
- : Gadang. MS. Bouso, 1973. Consists of the following parts: Gadang / Noms. March 1973. Pp. 1–31. Gadang / Verbes I. March 1973. Pp. 32–63. Gadang / Verbes II. 21 March 1973. Pp. 65–83. Gadang-Sätze, Nomina. 1973. Pp. 85–99.
- : Masa (Bongor) Lexicon. MS. Marburg (now in Frankfurt), 1973.
- : Kwang-Wörterbuch (bis mwónà). MS. 1973. 52 p.
- : Mesme. MS. Not dated (perhaps 1973). 13 p.
- : Grundzüge des Verbalsystems des Mokilko der Sprache von Mokoulou (Guéra, Tschad). Fortsetzung = AM 10/2 (1977), 3–12.
- : “Essen” und “Trinken” in Sprachen des Tschadsee-Gebietes. = Benzing, B. & Böcher, O. & Mayer, G. (eds.): Wort und Wirklichkeit. Studien zur Afrikanistik und Orientalistik. Teil II. Linguistik und Kulturwissenschaft. Meisenheim am Glan, 1977., Verlag Anton Hain. Pp. 45–55.
- : Apophony and Grammatical Tone in the Tense System of Chadic Languages. = Afrika und Übersee 60 (1977), 79–82.
- : Das Verb im Moku und das alttschadhamitische Aspektsystem. = Möhling, W. J. G.; Rottland, F.; Heine, B. (eds.): Zur Sprachgeschichte und Ethnohistorie in Afrika. Neue Beiträge afrikanistischer Forschungen. Berlin, 1977., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 81–90.
- : Sprachhistorische Schichtstufen im Tschadraum. = Paideuma 23 (1977), 95–100.
- : Wordlist of Sarwa (collected on 16 March 1973). MS. 1977. 30 p.
- : Kofa Wordlist. MS. 1977. 18 p.
- : The Zime Dialect Cluster (“Kado”, “Dari”) in Southern Chad: Its Verbal Aspect System. = Afrika und Übersee 61/1 (1978), 1–27.
- : Les langues tchadiques et le proto-tchadique: documentation, analyse et problèmes. = Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 17–30.
- : Présentation d’un conte en sibine (sumray) – texte, notes et vocabulaire. = Jungraithmayr, H. & Caprile, J.-P. (eds.): Cinq textes tchadiques (Cameroun et Tchad). Présentation linguistique. Berlin, 1978., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 177–211.
- : Ablaut und Ton im Verbalsystem des Mubi. = Afrika und Übersee 61 (1978), 312–320.
- : Mawa. MS. 21 February 1978. 65 p.
- : Über die Mawa (Guera, Tschad) – Ethnographische und linguistische Notizen. MS. 1978. 75 p.
- : Wörterverzeichnis Französisch. Index Deutsch-Mawa. Index Französisch-Mawa. MS. 1978. 49 p.
- : Les degrés principiaux de développement du thème verbal dans les langues tchadiques. = Bouquiaux, L. (éd.): Multilinguisme dans les domaines bantou du nord-ouest et tchadique. Le point de la question en 1977. Paris, 1979., SELAF. Pp. 142–148.
- & Kaplony-Heckel, U. & Müller, W. W., & Rössler, O. & Shimizu, O.: Common Chadic-Hamitosemitic Roots. Handout C for the Tschadsprachen-Symposion (Marburg, Oktober 1979). 1 p.
- : Kontakte zwischen Adamawa-Ubangi- und Tschad-Sprachen: zur Übertragung grammatischer Systeme. = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 130/1 (1980), 70–85.
- & Shimizu, K.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Vol. II. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading and Distribution. Berlin, 1981., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- : Inventaire des langues tchadiques. = Perrot, J. (ed.): Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne. Paris, 1981., Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Pp. 407–413.
- : Le daffo (ron). = Perrot, J. (ed.): Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne. Paris, 1981., Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Pp. 429–433.

- (ed.): *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Border Area*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : *Chadic within Hamitosemitic or between Hamitosemitic and Nigritic?*= Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Border Area*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 3–8.
- : *On Mono- and Triradicality in Early and Present-Day Chadic. How Reliable are Reconstructions?*= Wolff, E. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H. (eds.): *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*. Hamburg, 1983., Buske Verlag. Pp. 139–156.
- : *Hausa and Chadic: A Reappraisal*= Furniss, G. & Jaggar, Ph. (eds.): *Studies in Hausa Language and Linguistics in Honour of F. W. Parsons*. London, New York, 1988., Kegan Paul International & International African Institute. Pp. 62–77.
- : *Zur Negation in afrikanischen Sprachen*.= Kosta, P. (ed.): *Studia Indogermanica et slavica. Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag*. München, 1988., Verlag Otto Sagner. Pp. 485–496.
- & Alio, Kh.: *Lexique bidiya*. Frankfurt am Main, 1989., Vittorio Klostermann.
- : *Zur frühen Geschichte des Zentralsudan im Lichte neuerer Sprachforschung*= *Paideuma* 35 (1989), 155–167.
- : *Is Hausa an Early or Late Stage Chadic Language?*= Frajzyngier, Z. (ed.): *Current Progress in Chadic Linguistics* Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1989., John Benjamins. Pp. 251–266.
- : *Lexique mokilko*. Berlin, 1990., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : *Différents héritages culturels et non culturels à l’ouest et à l’est du bassin du Tchad selon les données linguistiques*.= Barreteau, D. & Tourneux, H. (éds.): *Relations interethniques dans le bassin du Lac Tchad. Actes du III^{ème} Colloque MEGA-TCHAD*, Paris, ORSTOM, 11–12 septembre 1986. Paris, 1990., ORSTOM. Pp. 43–52.
- : “Tod” und “Sterben” im Tschadischen.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 235–247.
- : *Lexique mubi-français (Tchad oriental)*. MS. Frankfurt a/M, 1990. 50 p.
- & Ibrizimow, D.: *Wordlist of Sarwa, Gadang, Miltu (Gali)*. MS. Groupe d’Études Tchadiques. 1990. 15 p.
- & Ibrizimow, D.: *Sur les langues sarwa, gadang et miltu (groupe sibine/somray)*. MS. Groupe d’Études Tchadiques. 1990. 20 p.
- (in collaboration with N. A. Galadima and U. Kleinewillinghöfer): *A Dictionary of the Tangale Language (Kaltungo, Northern Nigeria) with a Grammatical Introduction*. Berlin, 1991., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : *Final Consonants in Old Hausa*.= *Harsunan Nijeriya* 16 (1991–92), 18–28.
- & Adams, A.: *Lexique migama*. Berlin, 1992., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : *Complexité et diversité du vocabulaire tchadique*.= *Linguistique Africaine* 9 (1992), 53–65.
- : *Méthodes de reconstruction et classification des langues tchadiques*.= *Annali Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 52/4 (1992), 375–389.
- : *On Vowel Systems in Chadic. A Typological Overview*.= *Folia Orientalia* 29 (1992–93), 119–129.
- & Ibrizimow, D.: “Chadic Lexical Roots” – Wege zum Urtschadischen.= IX. *Afrikanistentag – Beiträge zur afrikanischen Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft*. Köln, 1993., publisher not indicated. Pp. 129–148.
- & Leger, R.: *The Benue-Gongola-Chad Basin – Zone of Ethnic and Linguistic Compression*.= *Berichte des Sonderforschungsbereichs 268/2* (1993), 161–172.
- : *Lexique sibine (sumray)-français*. MS. Frankfurt a/M, versions of 20 April 1993 (ʔa-bákùgómā), 7 June 1993 (bālāwra ñ -gəndārā), 17 June 1993 (gəñiny-sərà), 7 June 1993 (sár-ʔywalr). 67 p.

- & Ibrizimow, D.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume I. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading, Distribution and Comments. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- & Ibrizimow, D.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume II. Documentation. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : "Zweite Tempora" in afrikanischen Sprachen – ägyptisch-tschadische Gemeinsamkeiten? = Zwischen den beiden Ewigkeiten. Festschrift Gertrud Thausing. Wien, 1994., Eigenverlag des Institutes für Ägyptologie der Universität Wien. Pp. 102–122.
- : Was ist am Tschadischen hamitosemitisch? = Zeitschrift für Althebraistik 7/2 (1994), 225–233.
- : Zum Stand der Erforschung alttschadischen Wortgutes. = Wunsch, C. (ed.): XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Vorträge, München, 8.-13.4.1991. Stuttgart, 1994., Franz Steiner Verlag. Pp. 443–452.
- : Erosive Prozesse in der Tangale-Sprache. = Berichte des Sonderforschungsbereichs 268, Band 5 (1995), 215–222.
- : Mushere Vocabulary. Preliminary version composed on the basis of one part (the first 70 pages) of the material "Mushere Sprichwörter". MS. Frankfurt a/M, 1999. 20 p.
- & Takács, G.: Altägyptisch zwr (swr) gleich berbero-tschadischem *sw-? = Meißner, A. & Storch, A. (eds.): Nominal Classification in African Languages, Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter 12 (2000), 113–125.
- : Das Birgit, eine osttschadische Sprache – Vokabular und grammatische Notizen. = Takács, G. (ed.): Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl. Leiden, 2004., E. J. Brill. Pp. 342–371.
- Junker, H.: Die Onurislegende. = Denkschriften der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien 59, Abh. 1–2 (1917).
- : Giza. I–XII. = Denkschriften der (Kaiserlichen/Österreichischen) Akademie der Wissenschaften (1929–1955). Band I: Wien, 1929. Band II: Wien, 1934. Band III: Wien, Leipzig, 1938. Band IV: Wien, Leipzig, 1940. Band V: Wien, Leipzig, 1941. Band VI: Wien, Leipzig, 1943. Band VII: Wien, Leipzig, 1944. Band VIII: Wien, 1947. Band IX: Wien, 1950. Band X: Wien, 1951. Band XI: Wien, 1953. Band XII: Wien, 1955.
- : Das Brandopfer im Totenkult. = Miscellanea Gregoriana. Vatikan, 1941., Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana.
- : Der sehende und blinde Gott. = Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (München), phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 7 (1942).
- : Vorschriften für den Tempelkult in Philä. = Studia Biblica et Orientalia 3, Analecta Biblica 12 (1959).
- Jušmanov, N. V. (edited by Belova, A. G.): Izbrannye trudy. Raboty po obščej fonetike, semitologii i arabskoj klassičeskoj morfologii. Moskva, 1998., Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
- Justinard, (?): Manuel de berbère marocain (dialecte chleuh). Paris, 1914., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- : Manuel de berbère marocain (dialecte rifain). Paris, 1926., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Kahl, J.: Die Defektivschreibungen in den Pyramidentexten. = Lingua Aegyptia 2 (1992), 99–116.
- : Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift in der 0.-3. Dynastie. Wiesbaden, 1994., Harrassowitz Verlag.
- ; Kloth, N.; Zimmermann, U.: Die Inschriften der 3. Dynastie. Eine Bestandsaufnahme. Wiesbaden, 1995., Harrassowitz.
- : Die Farbgebung in der frühen Hieroglyphenschrift. = ZÄS 124 (1997), 44–56.
- Kákósy, L.: Ein magischer Papyrus des Kunsthistorischen Museums in Budapest. = Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 19/3–4 (1971), 159–177.

- Kákósy, L. & Moussa, A. M.: A Horus Stela With Meret Goddesses.= SAK 25 (1998), 143–159.
- Kamal, A. bey: Rapport sur les fouilles exécutés dans la zone comprise entre Dêirout, au nord, et Dêir-el-Ganadlah, au sud.= ASAE 12 (1912), 97–127.
- : Le pain de nebaq des anciens Égyptiens.= ASAE 12 (1912–13), 240–244.
- : Rapport sur les fouilles exécutés dans la zone comprise entre Dêirout, au nord, et Dêir-el-Ganadlah, au sud.= ASAE 14 (1914), 45–87.
- Kammenhuber, A.: Die Arier im Vorderen Orient. Heidelberg, 1968., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kammerzell, F.: Panther, Löwe und Sprachentwicklung im Neolithikum. Bemerkungen zur Etymologie des ägyptischen Theonyms M3fd.t, zur Bildung einiger Raubtiernamen im Ägyptischen und zu einzelnen Grosskatzenzeichnungen indoeuropäischer Sprachen. Göttingen, 1994., Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, Göttingen.
- : Zur Etymologie des ägyptischen Zahlworts “4”.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 4 (1994), 165–189.
- : The Sounds of a Dead Language. Reconstructing Egyptian Phonology.= *Göttinger Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 1 (1998), 21–41.
- : Glottaltheorie, Typologie, Sprachkontakte und Verwandtschaftsmodelle. Besprechung von Gamkrelidze, Th. & Ivanov, V. V.: *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture.*= *Indogermanische Forschungen* 104 (1999), 234–271.
- Kane, Th. L.: *Amharic-English Dictionary.* Wiesbaden, 1990., Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Kaplony, P.: *Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit. I–III.* Wiesbaden, 1963., Harrassowitz.
- Kaplony, P.: *Strukturprobleme der Hieroglyphenschrift.*= *CdE* 41 (1966), 60–99.
- : Bemerkungen zu fünf Texten der Ersten Zwischenzeit und der späteren 11. Dynastie.= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 25 (1969), 22–32.
- : Das Hirtenlied und seine fünfte Variante.= *CdE* 44 (1969), 27–59.
- : Das Papyrusarchiv von Abusir.= *Or. NS* 41 (1972), 11–79, 180–244.
- : *Die Rollsiegel des Alten Reichs. Band I.* Bruxelles, 1977., *Foundation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth.*
- Karlberg, G.: *Über die ägyptischen Wörter im Alten Testamente.* Uppsala & Stockholm, 1912., *Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri.*
- Kasser, R.: *Compléments au Dictionnaire Copte de Crum.* Le Caire, 1964., IFAO.
- Kaye, A. S.: Review of Bomhard, A. R.: *Toward Proto-Nostratic.*= *Language* 61/4 (1985), 887–891.
- : *Etymology, Etymological Method, Phonological Evaluation, and Comparative Semitics: Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic) ʔagr and Colloquial Syro-Palestinian Arabic ʔəʔr “Foot” One Last Time.*= Kaye, A. S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-Fifth Birthday, November 14th, 1991. Volume I.* Wiesbaden, 1991., *Otto Harrassowitz.* Pp. 826–849.
- & Daniels, P. T.: *Comparative Afroasiatic and General Genetic Linguistics.*= *Word* 43/3 (1992), 429–458.
- : *Review of Ehret, Ch.: Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian). Vowels, Tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary.* MS. Fullerton, California, 1997.
- KB = Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W.: *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. I–V.* Leiden, 1994., E. J. Brill.
- KBIÄF = Kaplony, P.: *Kleine Beiträge zu den Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit.* Wiesbaden, 1966., Harrassowitz.
- KDAR = Goedicke, H.: *Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich.* Wiesbaden, 1967., Harrassowitz.

- KEEL = Penriḫi, H. (Fähnrich, H.) & Saržvelaṣe, Z.: Kartvelur enata eṭimologiuri leksikoni. Tbilisi, 1990., Tbilisis Universiṭetiṣ Gamomcemloba.
- Kees, H.: Ein alter Götterhymnus als Begleittext zur Opfertafel.= ZÄS 57 (1922), 92–120.
- : Kultlegende und Urgeschichte. Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zum Horusmythus von Edfu.= Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse (1930), 345–362.
- : Der Götterglaube im alten Ägypten¹. Berlin, 1941., Akademie-Verlag.
- : Kulttopographische und mythologische Beiträge.= ZÄS 77 (1941), 24–27.
- : Der Götterglaube im alten Ägypten². Berlin, 1956., Akademie-Verlag.
- : Der angebliche Gauname “Schlangenberg”.= MDAIK 20 (1965), 102–109.
- Keimer, L.: Die Gartenpflanzen im alten Ägypten: ägyptologische Studien von Ludwig Keimer. Mit einem Geleitwort von Georg Schweinfurth. Hamburg, Berlin, 1924., Hoffmann und Campe.
- : Die Pflanze des Gottes Min.= ZÄS 59 (1924), 140–143.
- : Flechtwerk aus Halfagras im alten und neuen Ägypten.= OLZ 30/2 (1927), 76–85.
- : Sur un fragment de statuette en calcaire ayant la forme d'un oiseau (vautour?) à tête de reine.= ASAE 35 (1935), 182–192.
- : Remarques au sujet de l'oiseau ΔAKNIΣ (Hésychius) ou ΔAKNAΣ (Festus).= ASAE 41 (1942), 315–322.
- : L'hiéroglyphe... = ASAE 43 (1943), 183–189.
- : Notes prises chez les Biṣārīn et les nubiens d'Assouan.= Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte 32 (1949–50), 49–101.
- : Les hiboux constituant les prototypes de la lettre M de l'alphabet égyptien.= Annals of the Faculty of Arts, Ibrahim Pasha University (Cairo) 1 (1951), 73–83.
- : Notes de lecture (suite).= BIFAO 56/1 (1957), 97–102.
- : Die Gartenpflanzen im Alten Ägypten. Ägyptologische Studien. Mit einem Geleitwort von Georg Schweinfurth. Hildesheim, 1967., Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- : Die Gartenpflanzen im Alten Ägypten. Band II. Hrsg. von Renate Germer. Mainz, 1984., Philipp von Zabern.
- Kemp, B. J.: Ancient Egypt. London & New York, 1989., Routledge.
- Kent, R. G.: Old Persian.² New Haven, Connecticut, 1953., American Oriental Society.
- Kern, E. E.: Addendum to “Boatman's Fillet”.= Acta Orientalia 26 (1961), 93–95.
- KEWA = Mayrhofer, M.: Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Band I–III. Heidelberg, 1956–1976., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kidda, M. E.: Tangale Phonology: a Descriptive Analysis. Ph.D. thesis. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana, Illinois, 1985.
- : Dera Basic Vocabulary. MS. October 1991. 17 p.
- : Dera Cultural Vocabulary. MS. October 1991. 37 p.
- KHW = Westendorf, W.: Koptisches Handwörterbuch. Heidelberg, 1977., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kieschke, R.: Esquisse phonologique du mesme. Langue tchadique du groupe masa (Sud du Tchad). M.A. thesis. Paris, 1990., Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris III, Institut de Linguistique et Phonologie Générale et Appliquée, Centre de Linguistique Africaine.
- Kießling, R.: The Integration of Bantu Loans Into Burunge (Southern Cushitic).= SUGIA 16–17 (2001), 213–238.
- & Mous, M.: The Lexical Reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic. Kuschitische Sprachstudien, Band 21. Köln, 2004., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Kirwan, L. P.: Studies in the Later History of Nubia.= Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology (University of Liverpool) 24 (1937).

- Klein, E.: *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English*. New York, 1987., Macmillan.
- Kleinewillinghöfer, U.: *Aspects of Vowel Harmony in Waja and Tangale-Waja Common Vocabulary*. = *Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter* 2 (1990), 93–106.
- Klimov, G. A.: *Étimologičeskij slovar' kartvel'skih jazykov*. Moskva, 1964., Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Kluge, F.: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 23., erweiterte Auflage (Jubilaums-Sonderausg.). Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin & New York, 1999., Walter de Gruyter.
- KMAV = Ranke, H.: *Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation*. Berlin, 1910., Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Knaufl, E. A.: *Zur Etymologie der Handhieroglyphe*. = *Göttinger Miszellen* 59 (1982), 29–39.
- Knudsen, E. E.: *Der Wechsel ḥ:d im Ägyptischen*. = *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 88 (1962), 33–36.
- Knudtzon, J.: *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. I–II. Leipzig, 1915., J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Koch, H. & Hinz, W.: *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin, 1987., Dietrich Reimer.
- Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W.: *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. I–V. Leiden, 1994., E. J. Brill.
- Koemoeth, P. P.: *La "racine" w3b: du mythe à la métaphore*. = *SAK* 20 (1993), 109–123.
- : *La plante s(3)r(t) et la crue du Nil*. = *SAK* 24 (1997), 147–159.
- Koenig, Y.: *Le papyrus Boulaq 6*. Transcription, traduction et commentaire. Le Caire, 1981., IFAO.
- : *La Nubie dans les textes magiques*. = *RdE* 38 (1987), 105–110.
- Kogan, L.; Stolbova, O. V.: *Semitic (Canaanite) – Chadic Lexical Parallels*. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 2 p.
- : *Remarks on J. Tropper's Ugaritische Grammatik. A Review Article*. = *UF* 32 (2000), 717–732.
- : *Novye i utočnennye etimologii k semitskim nazvanijam životnyh*. MS. Handout of the paper presented at the Conference "Problemy izučenija dal'nego rodstva jazykov an rubeže tret'ego tysjačeljetija" (Moscow, 29 May – 2 June 2000). 5 p.
- & Diakonoff, I. M.: *Semitic Terms of Kinship and Social Sphere*. = *Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. & Seibert, U. (Hrsg.): Eine Von Ägypten zum Tschadsee. Eine linguistische Reise durch Afrika. Festschrift für Herrmann Jungraithmayr zum 65. Geburtstag*. Würzburg, 2001., Ergon Verlag. Pp. 147–158.
- : *Addenda et Corrigenda to the Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary (HSED) by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (II)*. = *JSS* 47/1 (2002), 183–202.
- : *Popular Etymology in the Semitic Languages*. = *Kogan, L. (ed.): Orientalia: Papers of the Oriental Institute. Issue III. Studia Semitica*. Moscow, 2003., Russian State University for the Humanities. Pp. 120–140.
- : **y in Ethiopian*. = *Burtea, B.; Tropper, J.; Younansardaroud, H. (Hrsg.): Studia Semitica et Hamitosemitica. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004*. Münster, 2005., Ugarit-Verlag. Pp. 183–216.
- : *Lexicon of the Old Aramaic Inscriptions and the Historical Unity of Aramaic*. = *Babel und Bibel* 2 (2005), 513–566.
- Kopf, L.: *Studies in Arabic and Hebrew Lexicography*. Jerusalem, 1976., The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University.
- Korostovcev, M. A.: *Vvedenie v egipetskuju filologiju*. Moskva, 1963., Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury.

- Kossmann, M.: *Essai sur la phonologie du proto-berbère*. Köln, 1999., Köppe.
- : *L'origine du vocalisme en zénaga de Mauritanie*.= *Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter* 13 (2001), 83–95.
- Kottsieper, I.: *mgg – “Krieg führen, kämpfen”*. Eine bisher übersehene nordwestsemitische Wurzel.= *UF* 20 (1988), 125–133.
- Koura, B.: *Die “7-Heilige Öle” und andere Öl- und Fettnamen*. Eine lexikographische Untersuchung zu den Bezeichnungen von Ölen, Fetten und Salben bei den alten Ägyptern von der Frühzeit bis zum Anfang der Ptolemäerzeit (von 3000 v. Chr. – ca. 305 v. Chr.). Aachen, 1999., Shaker Verlag.
- Kovalev, A. A. & Militarev, A. Ju.: *Šumery i semity: vstreča ravnovelikih kul'tur*.= *Oriens. Vostok* 5 (1993), 22–33.
- : *Sumerians and Semites. An Encounter of the Equipotential Cultures*. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 4 p.
- König, E.: *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. 7th ed. Leipzig, 1936., Dietrich.
- Köpfstein, S.: *Altägyptische Bezeichnungen für Tische, Sitz- und Liegemöbel vom Alten bis zum Neuen Reich*.= *Altorientalische Forschungen* 16/1 (1989), 3–35.
- Kraft, Ch. H.: *Gude-Dialekte*. MS. 1972.
- : *Chadic Wordlists. I–III*. Berlin, 1981., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Krebernik, M.: *Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexikalischen Texte aus Ebla*. Teil 2 (Glossar).= *ZA* 73 (1983), 1–47.
- KRI = Kitchen, K.A.: *Ramesside Inscriptions – Historical and Biographical*. Vol. I–VII. Oxford, 1968/1975–83/89., Oxford University Press.
- Kristensen, W. B.: *Het leven uit den dood. Studien over Egyptischen en Oudgriekchen godsdienst*. Haarlem, 1926. (quoted after Boeser 1932).
- Kronasser, H.: *Hurrisch makanni- “Geschenk”*.= *Die Sprache* 4 (1958), 127.
- Kruchten, J.-M.: *Le terme topographique “Meshrou”*.= *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres* 22 (1978), 24–28.
- Kuhlmann, K. P.: *Die Stadt ([n]wt)* als Sinnbild der Nachbarschaft.= *MDAIK* 47 (1991), 217–226.
- : *“Bauernweisheiten”*.= *Gamer-Wallert, I. & Helck, W. (Hrsg.): Gegengabe. Festschrift Emma Brunner-Traut*. Tübingen, 1992., Attempto Verlag. Pp. 191–209.
- Kurth, D. & Thissen, H.-J. & Weber, M.: *Kölner Ägyptische Papyri (P. Köln ägypt.)*. Band 1. *Papyrologica Coloniaensia*, Vol. IX. *Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Köln, 1980., Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Kurth, D.: *“Same des Stieres” und “Same”*. Zwei Bezeichnungen der Maat.= *Junge, F. (Hrsg.): Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 273–281.
- : *Über Horus, Isis und Osiris*.= *Studia Aegyptiaca* 14 (1992), 373–383.
- (ed.): *Studien zu Vokabular, Ikonographie und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden, 1994., Harrassowitz.
- : *Ein semitisches Lehnwort im Demotischen*.= *Kloth, N. & Martin, K. & Pardey, E. (Hrsg.): Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück. Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag*. Hamburg, 2003., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 247–254.
- Kusia, D. & Siebert, R.: *Second Survey of Languages of the Gawwada, Tsamay, and Diraasha Areas With Excursion to Birayle (Ongota) and Arbore (Irbore)*.= *SLLE Linguistic Reports* 20 (1994), 2–12.
- Kutler, L.: *A “Strong” Case for Hebrew mar*.= *UF* 16 (1984), 110–118.
- Kühnert-Eggebrecht, E.: *Die Axt als Waffe und Werkzeug im alten Ägypten*. Berlin, 1969., Verlag Bruno Hessling.
- KZ = Historische Sprachforschung.

- Labat, R.: Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne.⁵ Paris, 1976., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Lacau, P.: Métathèses apparentes en égyptien.= RT 25 (1903), 139–161.
- : Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Nos. 28087–28126. Sarcophages antérieurs au Nouvel Empire. Vol. I–II. Le Caire, 1904–06., IFAO.
- : À propos des voyelles redoublées en copte.= ZÄS 48 (1910), 77–81.
- : Suppressions et modifications de signes dans les textes funéraires.= ZÄS 51 (1913), 1–64.
- : Notes de grammaire: à propos de la grammaire égyptienne de M. Erman.= RT 35 (1913), 59–82, 217–231.
- : Sur le [n] (n) égyptien devenant p (r) en copte.= Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion. Paris, 1922., Champion. Pp. 721–731.
- : Sur la chute de [t] final, marque du féminin.= Revue d'Égyptologie 9 (1952), 81–90.
- : Deux magasins à encens du temple de Karnak.= ASAE 52 (1952), 185–198.
- : Sur le système hiéroglyphique. Le Caire, 1954., IFAO.
- : Égyptien et sémitique.= Syria 31 (1954), 286–306.
- : Le signe [wh/ħm] whm.= BIFAO 63 (1965), 1–18.
- : Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique. Paris, 1970., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- : Études d'Égyptologie. I. Phonétique égyptienne ancienne. Le Caire, 1970., IFAO.
- : Études d'Égyptologie. II. Morphologie. Le Caire, 1972., IFAO.
- Lallemand, H.: Les assemblages dans la technique égyptienne et le sens originel du mot menkh.= BIFAO 22 (1923), 77–98.
- Lam, A. M.: De l'origine égyptienne des Peuls. Paris & Gif-sur-Yvette, 1993., Présence Africaine & Khepera.
- Lambdin, Th. O.: Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament.= Journal of the American Oriental Society 73 (1953), 145–155.
- : Another Cuneiform Transcription of Egyptian msh "Crocodile".= Journal of Near Eastern Studies 12 (1953), 284–285.
- : Egyptian Words in Tell El Amarna Letter No. 14.= Orientalia NS 22 (1953), 362–369.
- : The Bivalence of Coptic eta and Related Problems in the Vocalization of Egyptian.= JNES 17 (1958), 177–193.
- Lamberti, M.: Gamu Wordlist. MS. 1985. 27 p.
- : Die Somali-Dialekte. Eine Vergleichende Untersuchung. Hamburg, 1986., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- : The Arbore Language.= Anthropos 81 (1986), 681–685.
- : Some Konsoid Etymologies.= Anthropos 82/4–6 (1987), 529–541.
- : Kuliak and Cushitic. A Comparative Study. Heidelberg, 1988., Universitätsverlag Carl Winter.
- : The Correspondence "Labial-Velar-Glottal" in Cushitic.= Bechhaus-Gerst, M.; Serzisko, F. (eds.): Cushitic-Omotc. Papers from the International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6–9, 1986. Hamburg, 1988., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 303–308.
- : 1989 11
- : Cushitic and Its Classifications.= Anthropos 86 (1991), 552–561.
- : Some Phonetic Laws of the Gonga Languages. First Part.= Rassegna di Studi Etiopici 36 (1992), 57–76.
- : Die Shinassa-Sprache. Materialien zum Boro. Heidelberg, 1993., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

- : Materialien zum Yemsa. Heidelberg, 1993., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- : The Ari-Banna Group and Its Classification.= *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 22/1 (1993), 39–87.
- : Some Phonetic Laws of the Gonga Languages. Second Part.= *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici* 37 (1993), 89–114.
- : Omotic and Cushitic. A Reply to Fleming.= *Anthropos* 88 (1993), 555–558.
- : Sulla classificazione dell’ “Omotico”.= Brugnatelli, V. (ed.): *Sem, Cam, Iafet. Atti della 7^a Giornata di Studi Camito-Semitici e Indoeuropei* (Milano, 1^a giugno 1993). Milano, 1994., Centro Studi Camito-Semitici. Pp. 99–126.
- : A Few Remarks on Verb Derivation in Yemsa.= Griefenow-Mewis, C. & Voigt, R. M. (eds.): *Cushitic and Omotic Languages. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium* (Berlin, March 17–19, 1994). Köln, 1996., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 333–347.
- & Sottile, R.: *The Wolaytta Language*. Köln, 1997., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- & Tonelli, L.: *The Noun System of Bilin*.= Fukui, K. & Kurimoto, E. & Shigeta, M. (eds.): *Ethiopia in Broader Perspective. Vol. I. Papers of the XIIIth International Conference on Ethiopian Studies* (Kyoto, 12–17 December 1997). Kyoto, 1997., Shokado. Pp. 499–524.
- : Some Notes on the Gawwada Language.= Burtea, B.; Tropper, J.; Younansardaroud, H. (Hrsg.): *Studia Semitica et Hamitosemitica. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004*. Münster, 2005., Ugarit-Verlag. Pp. 217–241.
- Landberg, Le Comte de: *Études sur les dialectes de l’Arabie Méridionale. Premier volume: Ḥaḍramoût*. Leiden, 1901., Brill.
- : *Glossaire daḡinois. Troisième volume (z-y)*. Publié par K. V. Zetterstéen. Leiden, 1942., E. J. Brill. Pp. 1815–2976.
- Landsberger, B.: *Babylonisches*.= *ZDMG* 26 (1912), 127–131.
- : Die Fauna des alten Mesopotamien nach der 14. Tafel der Serie HAR-RA = ḥubullu.= *Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 42/6 (1934).
- 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.
- Lang, K.: Die Etymologie des Wortes “Pyramide”.= *Anthropos* 18–19 (1923–24), 551–553.
- Lange, H. O.: Der Titel *jmj-r*.= *ZÄS* 42 (1905), 142.
- : Das Weisheitsbuch des Amenemope aus dem Papyrus 10,474 des British Museum.= *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* 11/2 (1925), 1–141.
- Langlois, P.: *Essai pour remonter à l’original égyptien du terme sémitique désignant l’Égypte*.= *Revue Égyptologique, nouvel série* 1 (1919), 148–162.
- Laoust, É.: *Étude sur le dialecte berbère du chenoua comparé avec ceux des Beni-Menacer et des Beni-Salah*. Paris, 1912., Ernest Leroux.
- : *Étude sur le dialecte berbère des Nūfa. Grammaire. Textes*. Paris, 1918., Ernest Leroux.
- : *Mots et choses berbères*. Paris, 1920., Challamel.
- : *Cours de berbère marocain. Grammaire – vocabulaire – textes. Dialectes du sous du Haut et de l’AntiAtlas*. Paris, 1921., Augustin Challamel.
- : *Siwa. I. Son parler*. Paris, 1931., Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- : *Contribution à une étude de la toponymie du Haut Atlas*. Paris, 1942., Paul Geuthner.
- Lapp, G.: *m3ḥ(r)tt “die Reibschale”*.= *GM* 94 (1986), 49–51.
- Laroche, E.: *Études hourrites*.= *RA* 54 (1960), 187–201.

- : Glossaire de la langue hourrite. Paris, 1980., Éditions Klincksieck.
- Lauth, J.: Semitische Lehnwörter im Aegyptischen.= ZDMG 25 (1871), 618–644.
- LÄ = Helck, W. & Westendorf, W. (Hrsg., begründet von W. Helck und E. Otto): Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Band I–VII. Wiesbaden, 1975–92., Harrassowitz.
- LD = Lepsius, R.: Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien nach den Zeichnungen der von Seiner Majestät dem Könige von Preussen Friedrich Wilhelm IV. nach diesen Ländern gesendeten und in den Jahren 1842–1845 ausgeführten wissenschaftlichen Expedition. Berlin, 1849–1858., Nicolaische Buchhandlung.
- Lebeuf, J.-P.: Vocabulaires kotoko: Makari, Goulfeil, Kousseri, Afadé.= Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Afrique Noire 4 (1942), 160–174.
- : Études kotoko. Paris, La Haye, 1976., Mouton.
- Lefébure, E.: Rites égyptiens. Construction et protection. Paris, 1890., Leroux.
- Lefébvre, G.: Un des noms de la royauté septentrionale.= ZÄS 31 (1893), 114–117.
- : Le tombeau de Petosiris. Tomes I–III. Le Caire, 1923–24., IFAO.
- : Sur l'origine de la langue égyptienne.= Chronique d'Égypte 22 (1936), 266–292.
- : Grammaire de l'égyptien classique.¹ Le Caire, 1940., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Le Caire.
- : Tableau des parties du corps humain mentionnées par les égyptiens. Le Caire, 1952., Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- : Grammaire de l'égyptien classique.² Le Caire, 1955., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Le Caire.
- : Essai sur la médecine égyptienne de l'époque pharaonique. Paris, 1956., Presses Universitaires de la France.
- Leger, R.: Sprachproblem aus dem Westschadischen. Kupto- und Kwamitexte.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 28 (1992), 5–32.
- : Die Geschichte der Kwami nach einer Erzählung von Yerma Buba mit grammatischen Erläuterungen.= Mitteilungen des Sonderforschungsbereichs 268 (1993), 143–177.
- Legrain, G.: Statues et statuettes de rois et de particulières. Vol. I–III. Le Caire, 1906., 1909., 1914., IFAO.
- Leitz, Ch.: Tagewählerei. Das Buch ḥ3t nḥḥwj ḏt und verwandte Texte. Textband. Wiesbaden, 1994., Harrassowitz.
- : Die Schlangensprüche in den Pyramidentexten.= Orientalia NS 65/4 (1996), 381–427.
- : Magical and Medical Papyri of the New Kingdom. Hieratic Papyri of the British Museum VII. London, 1999., British Museum Press.
- : Besprechung von Osing, J.: The Carlsberg Papyri, 2. Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis.= Bibliotheca Orientalis 57/3–4 (2000), 270–278.
- Lenssen, T.: Das Verb im Kwang (Tschad) – eine phonologische Studie. M.A. thesis, Marburg, 1982., Philipps-Universität Marburg.
- : Studien zum Verb im Kwang (Tschad).= Africana Marburgensia Sonderheft 8 (1984).
- LES = Gardiner, A. H.: Late Egyptian Stories. Bruxelles, 1932., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élysabeth.
- Les(estücke).= Sethe, K.: Ägyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch im akademischen Unterricht. Texte des Mittleren Reiches. Dritte unveränderte Auflage. Hildesheim, 1959., Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Lesko, L. H.: The Ancient Egyptian Book of Two Ways. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1972., University of California Press.
- Leslau, W.: Explications et rapprochements à propos de quelques éléments du vocabulaire mehri.= GLECS 1 (1931–34), 35–38.
- : Lexique soqotri (sudarabique moderne), avec comparaisons et explications étymologiques. Paris, 1938., Librairie C. Klincksieck.

- : Vocabulary Common to Akkadian and South-East Semitic (Ethiopic and South-Arabic).= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 64 (1944), 53–58.
- : *Gafat Documents. Records of a South-Ethiopic Language. Grammar, Text and Comparative Vocabulary.* New Haven, Connecticut, 1945., American Oriental Society.
- : The Parts of the Body in Modern South Arabic Languages.= *Language* 21 (1945), 230–249.
- : Four Modern South Arabic Languages.= *Word* 3 (1947), 180–203.
- : Examen du supposé argobba de Seetzen et de Lefebvre.= *Word* 5 (1949), 46–54.
- : Review of Cohen, M.: *Essai comparatif etc.*= *Language* 25 (1949), 312–316.
- : *Étude descriptive et comparative du gafat (éthiopien méridional).* Paris, 1956., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- : Some Mutilated Roots in Ethiopic.= *Lingua* 6 (1956–57), 268–286.
- : Additional Notes on Kambatta of Southern Ethiopia.= *Anthropos* 51 (1956), 985–993.
- : *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1958., University of California.
- : *A Dictionary of Moča (Southwestern Ethiopia).* Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1959., University of California Press.
- : Traces of the Laryngeals in the Ethiopic Dialect of Ennemor. A Contribution to the Semitic Laryngeals.= *Orientalia* 28 (1959), 257–270.
- : Homonyms in Gurage.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 80/3 (1960), 200–217.
- : Southwest Semitic Cognates to the Akkadian Vocabulary. I.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 82 (1962), 1–4.
- : Semitic and Egyptian Comparisons.= *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21 (1962), 44–49.
- : A Prefix ḥ in Egyptian, Modern South Arabian, and Hausa.= *Africa* 32 (1962), 65–68.
- : *Etymological Dictionary of Harari.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1963., University of California.
- : Southeast Semitic Cognates to the Akkadian Vocabulary. II.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84 (1964), 115–118.
- : Observations on Semitic Cognates in Ugaritic.= *Orientalia NS* 37 (1968), 347–366.
- : *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic.* Wiesbaden, 1969., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Southeast Semitic Cognates to the Akkadian Vocabulary. III.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89 (1969), 18–22.
- : The Negative Particle ʾin in Arabic and ʾən in Ethiopic.= *Annali. Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 29/2 (1969), 137–145.
- : *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic). Vol. III. Etymological Section.* Wiesbaden, 1979., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Proto-Sidamo *z.= *Afrika und Übersee* 53 (1980), 119–129.
- : North Ethiopic and Amharic Cognates in Tigre.= *AION (Supplemento)* 31, vol. 42, fasc. 2 (1982), 1–86.
- : *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic).* Wiesbaden, 1987., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Analysis of the Geʿez Vocabulary: Geʿez and Cushitic.= *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici* 32 (1988), 59–109.
- : Observations on Sasse's Vocabulary of Burji.= *Afrika und Übersee* 71 (1988), 177–203.
- 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.

- LEW = Walde, A.: Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 3., neubearbeitete Auflage von Hofmann, J. B. Band I–III. Heidelberg, 1938–1956., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lewy, H.: Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen. Berlin, 1895., R. Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung Hermann Heyfelder. Nachdruck Hildesheim: Olms 1970.
- : Étymologies.= *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 58 (1931), 16–35.
- Lexa, F.: Développement de la langue ancienne égyptienne.= *Archív Orientální* 10 (1938), 215–272.
- : Le développement de la langue égyptienne aux temps préhistoriques.= *Archív Orientální* 10 (1938), 390–426.
- Leyew: cf. Zelealem.
- Lichtheim, M.: Situla no. 11395 and Some Remarks on Egyptian Situlae.= *JNES* 6 (1947), 169–179.
- Lidzbarski, M.: Mtkte.= *ZÄS* 55 (1919), 93.
- Lienhard, R. & Giger, M.: Daba Wordlist. MS. Yaoundé (Cameroon), August-September 1974. 33 p.
- : Daba (parler de Pologozom). Description phonologique. Yaoundé, 1975., Société Internationale de Linguistique.
- Lipiński, E.: Les Chamites selon Gen 10,6–20 et 1Chr 1,8–16.= *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 5 (1992), 135–162.
- : Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar. Leuven, 1997., Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies.
- : Review of Brown, J.P.: Israel and Hellas, Volume II.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 54/2 (2001), 207–209.
- Lippert, J.: Über die Stellung der Haussasprache unter den afrikanischen Sprachgruppen.= *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen der Königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 9/3 (1906), 334–344.
- Littmann, E. & Höfner, M.: Wörterbuch der Tigre-Sprache. Tigre-Deutsch-Englisch. Wiesbaden, 1956., Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Loprieno, A.: A proposito delle consonanti dentali e velari in egiziano ed in semitico.= *Annali. Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 37/2 (1977), 125–142.
- : Methodologische Anmerkungen zur Rolle der Dialekte in der ägyptischen Sprachentwicklung.= *GM* 53 (1982), 75–95.
- : Afroasiatische Sprachwissenschaft in Bewegung.= *GM* 54 (1982), 85–94.
- : Zahlwort.= *LÄ* VI (1986), 1306–1319.
- : Zu einigen Phänomenen ägyptischer Phonologie.= Behlmer, H. (ed.): *Quaerentes Scientiam. Festgabe für Wolfhart Westendorf zu seinem 70. Geburtstag überreicht von seinen Schülern*. Göttingen, 1994., Hubert & Co. Pp. 119–131.
- : New Tendencies in Egyptological Linguistics.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 4 (1994), 369–382.
- : Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction. Cambridge, 1995., Cambridge University Press.
- Loret, V.: Étude sur quelques arbres égyptiens.= *RT* 2/1 (1880), 21–26.
- : Le verbe [šd] et ses dérivés.= *RT* 11/3–4 (1889), 117–131.
- : La flore pharaonique. Paris, 1892., Ernest Leroux. Reprint: 1975.
- : Notes sur la faune pharaonique.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 30 (1892), 24–30.
- : Sur l'arbre narou.= *RT* 15 (1893), 102.
- : Recherches sur plusieurs plantes connues des anciens égyptiens. Suite. Parts VI–IX.= *RT* 15 (1893), 105–130.
- : La racine [hm].= *RT* 14 (1893), 106–120.
- : Recherches sur plusieurs plantes connues des anciens égyptiens. Suite. Parts X–XII.= *RT* 16 (1894), 1–14.

- : Recherches sur plusieurs plantes connues des anciens égyptiens. Suite. Parts XIII–XIV.= RT 16 (1894), 92–102.
- : Études de droguerie égyptienne. Parts I–II.= RT 16 (1894), 134–162.
- : Sur deux termes anatomiques du papyrus Ebers.= RT 18 (1896), 176–181.
- : Les animaux reproducteurs dans l'Égypte ancienne.= RT 18 (1896), 196–209.
- : Une hypothèse au sujet de la vocalisation égyptienne.= PSBA 26 (1904), 227–234, 269–275.
- : Quelques notes sur l'arbre âch.= ASAE 16 (1916–17), 33–51.
- : La turquoise chez les anciens égyptiens.= Kêmi 1 (1928), 99–114.
- : Pour transformer un vieillard en jeune homme (Pap. Smith, XXI,9 – XXII,10).= Mélanges Maspero. Tome 1, fasc. 2. Le Caire, 1938., Imprimerie de l'IFAO. Pp. 853–877.
- : La lettre l dans l'alphabet hiéroglyphique.= Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres, comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1945, avril–juin, pp. 236–244.
- Loretz, O.: Hebräisch tjrwš und jrš in MI 6,15 und HI 20,15.= UF 9 (1977), 353–354.
- : Ugaritisch-hebräisch hm̄r/hmr und msk/(mzg). Neu- und Mischwein in der Ägäis und in Syrien-Palestina.= UF 25 (1993), 247–258.
- Louali-Raynal, N.: La spirantisation en berbère.= 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-Semita), Trieste, 23–24 Aprile 1998. Padova, 1999., Unipress. Pp. 271–298.
- Loubignac, V.: Étude sur le dialecte berbère des Zaïan et Aït Sgougou. Textes (deuxième section).= Paris, 1924., Ernest Leroux.
- Loundine, A. G.: L'inscription proto-sinaïtique N° 357.= Études sud-arabes. Recueil offert à Jacques Ryckmans. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1991., Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste. Pp. 101–115.
- Löhr, D.: Die Sprache der Malgwa (Nárá Málgwa). Grammatische Erstbeschreibung einer zentralschadischen Sprache Nordost-Nigerias. Frankfurt a/M, 2002., Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Löw, I.: Die Flora der Juden. Band I–III. Hildesheim, 1967., Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- LRL = Wente, E. F.: Late Ramesside Letters. Chicago, 1967., The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Lubetsky, M.: The Early Bronze Age Origin of Greek and Hebrew limen 'Harbour'.= Jewish Quarterly Review 69 (1978–79), 158–180.
- Lucas, A. & Rowe, A.: The Ancient Egyptian Bekhen-Stone.= ASAE 38 (1938), 127–156.
- : Additional References to the Article "The Ancient Egyptian Bekhen-Stone".= ASAE 38 (1938), 677.
- Lucas, A.: Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries.³ London, 1948., Edward Arnold & Co.
- : Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries.⁴ London, 1962., Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.
- Luft, U.: Indizes aus dem Buch über neuere Illahun-Papyri. MS. 2004. Pp. 15–28.
- Lukas, J.: Die Logone-Sprache im Zentralen Sudan.= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 21/6 (1936).
- : Zentralsudanische Studien.= Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde. Hansische Universität, Reihe B, Band 45/24 (1937).
- : Der hamitische Gehalt der tschadohamitischen Sprachen.= Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 28 (1937–1938), 286–299.
- : Die Sprache des Buduma in Zentralen Sudan.= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 24/2 (1939).

- : Deutsche Quellen zur Sprache der Musgu in Kamerun. Berlin, 1941., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : Die Sprache der Tubu in der Zentralen Sahara. Berlin, 1941., Akademie-Verlag.
- : Das Hitkalanci, eine Sprache um Gwoza (Nordostnigeria).= *Afrika und Übersee* 48 (1964), 81–114.
- : Tschadohamitische Sprachproben aus Nordnigeria (Karekare- und Bolanci-Texte).= Lukas, J. (ed.): *Neue afrikanistische Studien*. Hamburg, 1966., Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung. Pp. 173–207.
- : *Studien zur Sprache der Gisiga (Nordkamerun)*. Hamburg, 1970., Verlag J. J. Augustin.
- : Über das erweiterte Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigeria).= *Journal of African Languages* 10/1 (1971), 1–14.
- : Die Personalia und das primäre Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigeria). Mit Beiträge über das Karekare.= *Afrika und Übersee* 55 (1971), 114–139.
- : Studien zur Bade-Sprache (Nigeria).= *Afrika und Übersee* 58 /2 (1974–75), 82–105.
- : Ein Text in der Sprache der Djonkor des Gera-Massivs.= *Afrika und Übersee* 58/3–4 (1975), 212–226.
- : Tschadische Studien I. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Mokulu.= *Afrika und Übersee* 60 (1977), 1–58, 182–229.
- Lukas, J. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H.: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zum Kotoko.= *Afrika und Übersee* 53 (1980), 177–187.
- Lukas, R.: Das Nomen im Bade (Nordnigeria).= *Afrika und Übersee* 51 (1968), 91–116, 198–224.
- : *Nicht-islamische Ethnien im südlichen Tschadraum*. Wiesbaden, 1973., Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Luling, V.: *Somali-English Dictionary*. Wheaton, 1987., Dunwoody.
- Lutz, H. F.: A Sumerian Loanword in Egyptian.= *Archiv für Orientforschung* 5 (1928–29), 185–186.
- Lüddeckens, E.: *Ägyptische Eheverträge*. Wiesbaden, 1960., Harrassowitz.
- Lüring, H. L. E.: Die über die medicinischen Kenntnisse der alten Ägypter berichtenden Papyri verglichen mit den medicinischen Schriften griechischer und römischer Autoren. Leipzig, 1888., Breitkopf & Härtel.
- MacAdam, M. F. L.: *The Temples of Kawa. I. The Inscriptions*. London, 1949., The Griffith Institute.
- MacDonald, J.: New Thoughts on the Bilateral Origin for the Semitic Verb.= *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 5 (1963–65), 63–85.
- Mace, A. C. & Winlock, H. E.: *The Tomb of Senebtisi at Lisht*. New York, 1916., The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- MacMichael, H. A.: Notes on the Zaghawa and the People of the Jebel Midob.= *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 42 (1912), 283–344.
- Maddieson, I.; Spajić, S.; Sands, B.; Ladefoged, P.: Phonetic Structures of Dahalo.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 36 (1993), 5–53.
- Maghway, J. B.: *Iraqw Vocabulary*.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 18 (1989), 91–118.
- Magnanini, P.: Sulla corrispondenza consonantica arabo /š/ – ebraico /š/. = *Annali, Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 34, NS 24 (1974), 401–408.
- Magwa, J. G. et al. (20 members of the “Ron Language Committee”): *A Ron Alphabet*. Jos, Nigeria, 1985., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.
- Majzel', S. S. (additions by and edited by Militarev, A. Ju.): *Puti razvitija kornevogo fonda semitskih jazykov*. Moskva, 1983., Nauka.
- Malaise, M.: *l'étymologie égyptienne du toponyme “Canope”*.= *CdE* 74 (1999), 224–230.

- Manniche, L.: *Ancient Egyptian Musical Instruments*. München, Berlin, 1975., Deutscher Kunstverlag.
- : *An Ancient Egyptian Herbal*. London, 1993., British Museum Press.
- : *Sacred Luxuries. Fragrance, Aromatherapy and Cosmetics in Ancient Egypt*. London, 1999., Art Books International Ltd., Opus Publishing Limited, London.
- Manning, J. G.: Review of S.P. Vleeming (ed.): *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography*.= *JNES* 50/2 (1991), 157–159.
- Margalit, B.: *Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic (Part I: KTU 1.17–18)*.= *UF* 15 (1983), 65–103.
- : *Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic (Part II: KTU 1.19)*.= *UF* 16 (1984), 119–179.
- Marrassini, P.: *Formazione del lessico dell'edilizia militare nel semitico di Siria*. Firenze, 1971., Università di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali.
- Masqueray, E.: *Comparaison d'un vocabulaire du dialecte des Zenaga avec les vocabulaires correspondants des dialectes des Chawiya et des Beni Mzab*.= *Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Littéraires*, 3^{ème} série, tome 5^{ème} (1879), 483–533.
- Maspero, G.: *À travers la vocalisation égyptienne*.= *RT* 25 (1903), 15–29, 161–177.
- : *Sur les signe [ms]*.= *RT* 30 (1908), 175–177.
- Massart, A.: *The Leiden Magical Papyrus I 343 + I 345*. Leiden, 1954., E. J. Brill.
- : *À propos des "listes" dans les textes égyptiens funéraires et magiques*.= *Studia Biblica et Orientalia*. Vol. III. Roma, 1959., Pontificio Istituto Biblico. Pp. 227–246.
- Masson, M.: *Étude d'un parallélisme sémantique: "tresser"/"être fort"*.= *Semitica* 40 (1991), 89–105.
- Mathieu, B.: *Sur quelques ostraca hiératiques littéraires récemment publiés*.= *BIFAO* 93 (1993), 335–347.
- : *La poésie amoureuse de l'Égypte ancienne. Recherches sur un genre littéraire au Nouvel Empire*. Le Caire, 1996., IFAO.
- Matsushita, Sh.: *An Outline of Gwandara Phonemics and Gwandara-English Vocabulary*. Tokyo, 1972., Tokyo Press.
- Mattha, G.: *The Demotic Legal Code of Hermopolis West. Preface, Additional Notes and Glossary*. Le Caire, 1975., IFAO.
- Mayer, M. L.: *Ricerche sul problema dei rapporti fra lingue indoeuropee e lingue semitiche*.= *Acme* 13 (1960), 77–100.
- Mayrhofer, M.: *Indoiranisches Sprachgut aus Alalah*.= *Indo-Iranian Journal* 4 (1960), 136–149.
- : *Der heutige Stand zu den indoiranischen Sprachen in Vorderasien*.= *ZDMG* 111 (1961), 451–8.
- MÄS = *Münchener Ägyptologische Studien*.
- MDAIK = *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* (Wiesbaden).
- Meek, C. K.: *Tribal Studies in Northern Nigeria. Volume I–II*. London, 1931., Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co., Ltd.
- Meeks, D.: *ἰwn-n-pt = ^s ἀγχιπτε = le lin*.= *Revue d'Égyptologie* 24 (1972), 116–9.
- : *Liste de mots méroïtiques ayant une signification connue ou supposée*.= *Meroitic Newsletter* 13 (1973), 3–20.
- : *Notes de lexicographie (§1)*.= *Revue d'Égyptologie* 26 (1974), 52–65.
- : *Les fêtes Amesysia: essai d'étymologie*.= *CdE* 49 (1974), 380–383.
- : *Notes de lexicographie (§2–4)*.= *Revue d'Égyptologie* 28 (1976), 87–96.
- : *Notes de lexicographie (§5–8)*.= *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 77 (1977), 79–88.
- : *Une fondation memphite de Taharqa (Stèle du Caire JE 36861)*.= *Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Sauneron. I*. Le Caire, 1979., Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale. Pp. 221–259.

- : Les oiseaux marqueurs du temps.= Cercle Lyonnais d'Égyptologie Victor Loret, Bulletin no. 4 (1990), 37–52.
- : Review of Hoffmeier, J. K.: Sacred in the Vocabulary of Ancient Egypt. The Term *Dsr*, With Special Reference to Dynasty I–XX.= Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 77 (1991), 199–202.
- : Le nom du dieu Bès et ses implications mythologiques.= Studia Aegyptiaca 14 (1992), 423–436.
- : Migration des plantes, migration des mots dans l'Égypte ancienne.= Amouretti, M.-C. & Comet, G. (eds.): Des hommes et des plantes. Plantes méditerranéennes, vocabulaire et usages anciens. Table rond Aix-en-Provence, Mai 1992. Aix-en-Provence, 1993., Université de Provence, Service des Publications. Pp. 71–92.
- : Étymologies coptes. Notes et remarques.= Giversen, S. & Krause, M. & Nagel, P. (eds.): Coptology: Past, Present, and Future. Studies in Honour of Rodolphe Kasser. Leuven, 1994., Uitgeverij Peeters. Pp. 197–212.
- : Review of Jones, D.: A Glossary of Ancient Egyptian Nautical Titles and Terms.= CdE 69 (1994), 254–260.
- : Les emprunts Égyptiens aux langues sémitiques durant le Nouvel Empire et la Troisième Période Intermédiaire. Les aléas du comparatisme. Recension de Hoch, J. E.: Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period.= Bibliotheca Orientalis 54/1–2 (1997), 32–61.
- : Année lexicographique. Égypte ancienne. Tome 1 (1977). 2^{ème} édition. Paris, 1998., Cybele.
- : Année lexicographique. Égypte ancienne. Tome 2 (1978). 2^{ème} édition. Paris, 1998., Cybele.
- : Année lexicographique. Égypte ancienne. Tome 3 (1979). 2^{ème} édition. Paris, 1998., Cybele.
- : Dictionnaires et lexicographie de l'égyptien ancien. Méthodes et résultats. Recension de l'ouvrage de Wilson, P.: A Ptolemaic Lexicon.= Bibliotheca Orientalis 56/5–6 (1999), 569–594.
- : Mots sans suite ou notations rituelles? (O.DeM 1696 et O. Petrie 36).= Demarée, R. J. & Egberts, A. (eds.): Deir el-Medina in the Third Millennium AD. A Tribute to Jac J. Janssen. Leiden, 2000., Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten (NINO). Pp. 235–249.
- : Dance.= Redford, D. B. (ed.): The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt. Volume 1. Oxford, 2001., Oxford University Press. Pp. 356–360.
- : Review of Hannig, R.: Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I. Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit.= Lingua Aegyptia 13 (2005), 231–263.
- Meinhof, C.: Linguistische Studien in Ostafrika.= Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen 8 (1905), 177–222.
- : Linguistische Studien in Ostafrika. Fortsetzung.= Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen 9 (1906), 278–333.
- : Linguistische Studien in Ostafrika. Fortsetzung.= Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen 10 (1907), 90–123.
- : Die Sprachen den Hamiten. Hamburg, 1912., Friedrichsen & Co.
- Melikišvili, G. A.: Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi. II. (Otkrytija i publikacii v 1954–1970 gg.).= Vestnik Drevnej Istorii 4 (1971), 267–294.
- Meltzer, E. S.: An Observation on the Hieroglyph *mr*.= Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 56 (1970), 193–194.
- : *Dr*, q3, gr. The Intervining of Some Roots in Egyptian and Semitic.= Kaye, A. S. (ed.): Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-Fifth Birthday November 14th, 1991. Vol. II. Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 1042–1048.

- Meparišvili, M. N.: Sibiljanty v južnosemitskih jazykah. MS. Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoj stepeni kandidata filologičeskikh nauk. Tbilisi, 1987., Institut Vostokovedenija AN Gruzinskoj SSR.
- Mercer, S. A.: *The Pyramid Texts in Translation and Commentary*. Vol. I–IV. New, York, London, Toronto, 1952., Longmans & Green.
- Mercier, H.: *Vocabulaires et textes berbères dans le dialecte des Ait Izdeg*. Rabat, 1937., René Céré.
- Mercier, G.: *La numération libyenne*. = *Journal Asiatique* 222 (1933), 303–322.
- Meyer-Bahlburg, H.: *Studien zur Morphologie und Syntax des Musgu*. Hamburg, 1972., Buske.
- : *Deutsch-Musgu: Nomina (Girvidig aufgenommen von J. Lukas in 1957–58, Pus aus dem Neuen Testament)*. MS. 1972 (?). 11 p.
- : *Texte im Musgu von Girvidik (Nordkamerun)*. = *Afrika und Übersee* 56 (1972–1973), 61–71.
- MGT = Prasse, K.-G.: *Manuel de grammaire touaregue*. I–III. Phonétique – écriture – pronom. Copenhague, 1972., Université de Copenhague. Vol. IV–V. Nom. Copenhague, 1974., Akademisk Forlag.
- MHT = Schenkel, W.: *Memphis – Herakleopolis – Theben. Die epigraphische Zeugnisse der 7.–11. Dynastie Ägyptens*. Wiesbaden, 1965., Harrassowitz.
- MIFAO = *Mémoires Publiées par les Membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire (Qairo)*.
- Migeod, F. W. H.: *The Languages of West Africa*. Vol. I. London, 1911., Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- : *Ngala, and Its Dead Language*. = *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 52 (1922), 230–241.
- Militarev, A. Ju.: *O predpolagaemom prasemitskom *p̄*. = *Istorija i filologija Drevnego Vostoka. Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka*. XI godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR. Moskva, 1976., Nauka. Pp. 21–27.
- : *Ob odnom obščefrazijskom zemledel'českom termine*. *Novye lingvističeskie dannye o proishozhdenii zemledelija*. = *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 4 (1983), 97–106.
- : *Sovremennoe sravnitel'no-istoričeskoe afrazijskoe jazykoznanie: čto ono možet dat' istoričeskoj nauke?* = *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka*. Čast' 3. Moskva, 1984., Nauka. Pp. 3–26.
- & Starostin, S. A.: *Obščaja afrazijsko-severnokavkazskaja kul'turnaja leksika*. = *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka*. Tezisy i doklady konferencii. Čast' 3. Jazykovaja situacija v Perednej Azii v X–IV tysjačeljetjah do n.é. Moskva, 1984., Nauka. Pp. 34–43.
- : *Shemy razdelenija afrazijskoj sem'i jazykov (po glottohronologii), karty rasprostranjenija drevnepis'mennyh i sovremennyh afrazijskih jazykov*. = *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka*. Čast' 3. Moskva, 1984., Nauka. Pp. 44–50, and shema 2–3.
- : *Afrazijsko-šumerskie leksičeskie svjazi*. = *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka*. Tezisy i doklady konferencii. Čast' 1. Moskva, 1984., Nauka. Pp. 58–61.
- : *Tuaregi na kanarah*. = *IV vsesojuznaja konferencija afrikanistov "Afrika v 80–e gody: itogi i perspektivy razvitija"* (Moskva, 3–5 oktjabrja 1984 g.). Tezisy dokladov i naučnyh soobščenij. Vypusk IV, čast' II. Literaturovedenie, jazykoznanie. Moskva, 1984., Institut Afriki Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 85–87.
- : *Jazyk meroitskoj epigrafiki kak istoričeskij istočnik v svete ego genezisa*. = *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 2 (1984), 153–170.
- : *Sumerian-Afrasian Parallels*. MS. Paper presented at the occasion of the 70th birthday of I. M. Diakonoff, Leningrad, 12 January 1985.

- : Proišoždenie kornej so značením “tvorit’, sozdavat’” v afrazijskikh 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.
- : Afrazijsko-indoevropskie leksičeskie svjazi.= Irano-afrazijskie jazykovye kontakty. Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 98–108.
- : (Afrasian etymologies). MS. Moscow, around 1987. Material for the paper presented at the 5th International Hamito-Semitic Congress (Wien, 1987). 31 p.
- : Tamahaq-Speaking Tuaregs in the Canary Islands (Linguistic Evidence).= Brauner, S. & Wolff, E. (eds.): *Progressive Traditions in African and Oriental Studies*. Berlin, 1988., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 101–107.
- : Tamahaq Tuaregs in the Canary Islands (Linguistic Evidence).= *Aula Orientalis* 6 (1988), 195–209.
- : Ešče raz o proišoždenii zemledelija po dannym praafrazijskoj (prasemitohamskoj) lingvističeskoj rekonstrukcii.= *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1 (1989), 128–131.
- & Orel, V. É. & Stolbova, O. V.: *Hamito-Semitic Word-Stock: 1. Dwelling*.= *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka. Materialy k diskusijam na konferencii* (Moskva, 29 maja – 2 ijunja 1989 g.). Čast’ 1. Moskva, 1989., Nauka. Pp. 137–158.
- : Anri Lot o jazyke i pis’mennosti tuaregov.= Lot, A. (Lhote, H.): *Tuaregi Ahagara*. Moskva, 1989., Nauka. Pp. 246–262.
- : *Afrasian Cultural Terms* (Preliminary Report).= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Proto-Languages and Proto-Cultures*. Bochum, 1990., Brockmeyer. Pp. 33–54.
- & Stolbova, O. V.: *First Approach to Comparative-Historical Phonology of Afrasian* (Consonantism).= Mukarovskij, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 45–72.
- : *Evidence of Proto-Afrasian Cultural Lexicon* (I. Cultivation of Land. II. Crops. III. Dwelling and Settlement).= Mukarovskij, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band 1*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 73–85.
- : *Neskol’ko peredneazijskikh étimologij*.= Irano-afrazijskie jazykovye kontakty. Vypusk 2. Moskva, 1991., Nauka. Pp. 72–77.
- : *Garamantida v kontekste severoafrikanskoj istorii. Sud’ba odnogo naroda glazami lingvista*.= *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 3 (1991), 130–158.
- : *Livijsko-guančskie jazyki. I. Obščie svedenija*.= Solncev, V. M. (ed.): *Jazyki Azii i Afriki. IV, kniga 2*. Moskva, 1991., Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 148–162.
- : *Guančskie jazyki. Fonetika*.= Solncev, V. M. (ed.): *Jazyki Azii i Afriki. IV, kniga 2*. Moskva, 1991., Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 163–173.
- : *Istoričeskaja fonetika i leksika livijsko-guančskih jazykov*.= Solncev, V. M. (ed.): *Jazyki Azii i Afriki. IV, kniga 2*. Moskva, 1991., Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 238–267.
- & Kovalev, A. A.: *Šumery i semity: vstreča ravnovelikih kul’tur*.= *Oriens. Vostok* 5 (1993), 22–33.
- : *Glazami lingvista: Garamantida v kontekste severoafrikanskoj istorii* (vmesto posleslovija).= Kobiščanov, Ju. M. & Militarev, A. Ju. (eds.): *Garamantida* (afrikanskaja Atlantida). Moskva, 1994., Izdatel’skaja Firma “Vostočnaja Literatura” RAN. Pp. 230–282.
- & Starostin, S. A.: *Names of Body Parts in Afro-Asiatic and Sino-Caucasian*. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 2 p.
- : *Šumery i afrazijscy*.= *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 2 (1995), 113–127.
- : *Home for Afrasian: African or Asian? Areal Linguistic Arguments*.= Griefenow-Mewis, C. & Voigt, R. M. (eds.): *Cushitic and Omotic Languages. Proceedings of the*

- Third International Symposium (Berlin, March 17–19, 1994). Köln, 1996., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 13–32.
- : Semitic Etymological Dictionary, Volume 1: Anatomy of Man and Animals. Handout for the paper presented at the 27th North American Conference on Afro-Asiatic Linguistics (NACAL 27, Baltimore, 20 March 1999). The handout contains pages from the 1st volume of the “Semitic Etymological Dictionary” published by Militarev, A. Ju. & Kogan, L. E. on the internet (website address: <http://starling.rinet.ru>) in January 1999.
- (head of team) & Kogan, L. (with contributions by A. Belova, A. Kovalev, D. Nosnitsyn): Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Volume One. Anatomy of Man and Animals. Preprint. MS. Moscow, 2000. 476 p.
- & Kogan, L. (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.
- : Towards the Chronology of Afrasian (Afroasiatic) and Its Daughter Families.= Starostin, S. A. (ed.): Problemy izučeniya dal'nego rodstva jazykov an rubeže tret'ego tysjačeljetija. Doklady i teziy naučnoj konferencii (Moskva, 29 maja – 2 ijunja 2000 g.). Moskva, 2000., Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet. Pp. 215–217.
- & Kogan, L.: Ob agrobiologičeskikh predstavlenijah v Drevnej Perednej Azii. Terminy “opyl'jat” i “privivat” (rastenija) v jazyke drevnih semitov IV – načala III tys.= Vestnik Drevnej Istorii (2000), 229–236.
- : Root Extension and Root Formation in Semitic and Afrasian.= *Aula Orientalis* 23 (2005), 83–129.
- : Once More About Glottochronology and the Comparative Method: the Omotic-Afrasian Case.= *Orientalia et Classica*. Trudy Instituta vostočnyh kul'tur i antičnosti. Vypusk VI. Moskva, 2005., Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet. Pp. 339–408.
- : Towards the Genetic Affiliation of Ongota, a Nearly-Extinct Language of Ethiopia. I.= *Babel und Bibel* 2 (2005), 567–607.
- : Toward a Complete Etymology-Based Hundred Wordlist of Semitic: Items 1–57. MS. Presented at the 2nd Workshop for Comparative Semitics, Sitges, 31st May 2006. 40 p.
- MIO = Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung (Berlin).
- Mirt, H.: Zur Morphologie des Verbalkomplexes im Mandara.= *Afrika und Übersee* 54/1–2 (1970–71), 1–76.
- MMA = Metropolitan Museum of Arts (New York).
- MMIFAO = Mémoires Publiées par les Membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire (Qairo).
- MNL = Meroitic Newsletter (Milano, Paris, Valbonne, Montreal).
- MNyTESz = Benkő, L. (ed.): A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára. I–III. Budapest, 1967–76., Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Moftah, R.: Frühgeschichtliche Anschaulichkeit und Onomasticon (sic).= *ASAE* 66 (1987), 125–143.
- Mogensen, M.: La Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg. La collection égyptienne. I–II. Copenhagen, 1930., Levin & Munksgaard.
- Mohrlang, R.: Higi Phonology.= *Studies in Nigerian Languages* 2 (1972), 1–106.
- Molčanov, A. A. & Neroznak, V. P. & Šarypkin, V. P.: Pamjatniki drevnejšej grečeskoj piš'mennosti. Vvedenie v mikenologiju. Moskva, 1988., Nauka.
- Monier-Williams, M.: A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages. Delhi, 1899., Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Montet, P.: Notes sur les tombeaux de Béni-Hassan.= *BIFAO* 9 (1911), 1–36.
- : Le préfixe n en égyptien.= *Sphinx* (revue critique embrassant le domaine entier de l'égyptologie) 14 (1911), 201–244.

- : La fabrication du vin dans les tombeaux antérieures au Nouvel Empire.= RT 35/3-4 (1913), 117-124.
- : Scènes de la vie privée dans les tombeaux égyptiens de l'ancien empire. Strasbourg, 1925., Istra.
- : Notes de lexicographie égyptienne à propos du Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache publié par MM. Ermann (sic) et Grapow.= Kêmi 1 (1928), 3-18.
- : Tombeaux de la I^e et de la IV^e dynasties à Abou-Roach.= Kêmi 8 (1946), 156-227, pl. I-XIV.
- : Géographie de l'Égypte Ancienne. I-II. Paris, 1957., 1961., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Moor, J. C. de: Studies on Ugaritic Lexicography.= Quaderni di semitistica 2. Firenze, 1973., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali. Pp. 61-102.
- : An Incantation Against Infertility (KTU 1.13).= UF 12 (1980), 305-310.
- : An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Leiden, 1987., Brill.
- & Spronk, K.: A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Leiden, 1987., Brill.
- Moreno, M. M.: Appunti sulla lingua darasa.= Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VI, vol. XIII (1937), 211-240.
- : Introduzione alla lingua omoto. Milano, 1938., Mondadori.
- : Manuale di sidamo. Grammatica, esercizi, testi, glossario. Roma, 1940., Casa Editrice A. Mondadori.
- Moret, A.: Une classification des sens du mot "hosou" [hs].= RT 17 (1895), 84-93.
- (avec la collaboration de L. Boulard): Donations et fondations.= RT 29, NS 13 (1907), 57-95.
- : Mystères égyptiennes.= Annales du Musée Guimet 37 (1912), 1-105.
- : Mystères égyptiens.³ Paris, 1927., Colin, Librairie Armand C.
- Moscatti, S.: Il biconsonantismo nelle lingue semitiche.= Biblica 28 (1947), 113-135.
- : Sulla ricostruzione del protosemítico.= Rivista degli Studi Orientali 35/1-2 (1960), 1-10.
- & 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.
- Motylnski, A. de C.: Le dialecte berbère de R'edamès. Paris, 1904., Ernest Leroux.
- Mouchet, J.: Vocabulaires comparatifs de 15 parlers du Nord-Cameroun.= Journal de la Société des Africanistes 8/2 (1938), 123-143.
- : Vocabulaires comparatifs de quinze parlers du Nord-Cameroun.= Bulletin de la Société d'Études Camerounaises 29-30 (1950), 5-74.
- : Vocabulaires comparatifs de sept parlers du Nord-Cameroun.= Bulletin de la Société d'Études Camerounaises 41-42 (1953), 136-206.
- : Le parler daba: esquisse grammaticale précédée d'une note sur l'ethnie daba, suivie de lexiques daba-français et français-daba. Yaoundé, 1966., R.E.C.
- El-Mountassir, A.: Initiation au tachelhit, langue berbère du sud du Maroc. Ra nsawal tachelhit. Paris, 1999., Langues & Mondes, L'Asiathèque.
- Mourski, M.: Corpus der Mnevis-Stelen und Untersuchungen zum Kult der Mnevis-Stiere in Heliopolis.= SAK 10 (1983), 247-267.
- Mous, M.: Was There Ever a Southern Cushitic Language (Pre-)Ma'a'=? Griefenow-Mewis, C. & Voigt, R. M. (eds.): Cushitic and Omotic Languages. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium (Berlin, March 17-19, 1994). Köln, 1996., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 201-211.
- : Broken Plurals and Syllable Sequence Restrictions in Iraqw.= Lecarme, J. & Lowenstamm, J. & Schlonsky, U. (eds.): Studies in Afroasiatic Grammar. Papers from the Second Conference on Afro-Asiatic Languages, Sophia Antipolis, 1994. The Hague, 1996., Holland Academic Graphics. Pp. 268-277.

- & Qorro, M. & Kiefling, R.: *Iraqw-English Dictionary with an English and a Thesaurus Index*. Köln, 2002., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Möller, G.: *Die beiden Totepapyrus Rhind. des Museums zu Edinburgh*. Leipzig, 1913., J. C. Hinrichs.
- : *Aegyptisch-libysches.*= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 24/9–10 (1921), 193–197.
- : *Die Ägypter und ihre libyschen Nachbarn.*= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 78 (1924), 36–60.
- Möller, H.: *Vergleichendes indogermanisch-semitisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen, 1911., Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Muchiki, Y.: *Spirantization in Fifth-Century B.C. North-West Semitic.*= *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 53/2 (1994), 125–130.
- : *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic.* *Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series* 173. Atlanta, Georgia, 1999., *Society of Biblical Literature*.
- Mueller, D.: *A Middle Egyptian Word For "Measure".*= *JEA* 58 (1972), 301–302.
- Mukarovsky, H. G.: *Das "Sonnenrind" der Ful'be.*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 54 (1957), 130–140.
- : *Altmediterranes Wortgut in Westafrika.*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 55 (1959), 1–48.
- : *Baskisch und Berberisch.*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 59–60 (1963–64), 52–92.
- : *Les rapports du basque et du berbère.*= *GLECS* 10 (1963–66), 177–184.
- : *Euro-Saharanisch, eine alte Spracheinheit Europas und Afrikas.*= *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 95 (1965), 66–76.
- : *West African and Hamito-Semitic Languages.*= *Wiener Völkerkundliche Mitteilungen* 13 (1966), 9–36.
- : *Besprechung von Wölfel, D. J.: Monumenta Linguae Canariae.*= *Wiener Völkerkundliche Mitteilungen* 13 (1966), 101–107.
- : *Langues apparentées au chamito-sémitique.*= *GLECS* 11 (1966–67), 83–91.
- : *Zur Stellung der Mandesprachen.*= *Anthropos* 61 (1966), 679–688.
- : *Baskisch-berberische Entsprechungen.*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (1969), 32–51.
- : *Besprechung von Leslau W.: A Dictionary of Moča; Etymological Dictionary of Harari.*= *WZKM* 62 (1969), 342–345.
- : *A Study of Western Nigritic.* Vol. II. Wien, 1976., Afro-Pub.
- : *Einige hamitosemitische und baskische Wortstämme.*= *Jungrauthmayr, H. & Mieke, G. (eds.): Berliner Afrikanistische Vorträge XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Berlin 24.–29. März 1980.* Berlin, 1981., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer. Pp. 105–118.
- : *Wo steht das Saharische? = Afrika und Übersee* 64 (1981), 187–226.
- : *Hamito-Semitisch, Afro-Asiatisch, Erythräisch: Zum Wandel von Begriffen und Verständnis.*= *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 34 (1981), 511–526.
- : *Lateinische Lehnwörter im Hausa.*= *Jungrauthmayr, H. (ed.): The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Border Area.* Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer. Pp. 261–268.
- : *Mande-Chadic Common Stock. A Study of Phonological and Lexical Evidence.* Wien, 1987., Afro-Pub.
- : *Grundzahlwörter im Tschadischen, Kuschitischen und Omotischen.*= *Jungrauthmayr, H.; Müller, W. W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20–22 September, 1983.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins Publishing Company. Pp. 25–46.
- : *Review of Kraft, Ch. H.: Chadic Wordlists.*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 77 (1987), 114–116.

- (ed.): Zu Reinischs Werk über das Kunama.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): Leo Reinisch. Werk und Erbe. Wien, 1987., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Pp. 177–203.
- : Diskussionsbeitrag zu Reinischs Werk über das Barea.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): Leo Reinisch. Werk und Erbe. Wien, 1987., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Pp. 231–238.
- : Songhai – eine tschadische Sprache?= Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter 1 (1989), 15–29.
- : On the Relations of Cushitic, Omotic and Chadic Languages. MS. Handout for the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Torino, 1989. 6 p. Proceedings not published.
- : 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.
- : Chadic, Mande and Nigritic.= Ibrizimow, D.; Leger, R. (eds.): Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 65–75.
- Munro, P.: Der Unas-Friedhof Nord-West I: topographisch-historische Einleitung; das Doppelgrab der Königinnen Nebet und Khenut. Mainz, 1993., Zabern.
- Murtonen, A.: The Semitic Sibilants.= Journal of Semitic Studies 11/2 (1966), 135–150.
- : Hebrew in Its West Semitic Setting. Part One: A Comparative Lexicon. Leiden, New York, København, 1989., E. J. Brill.
- Müller, D. H.: Mehri- und Soqotri-Glossen.= ZDMG 58 (1904), 780–786.
- 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.
- Müller, W. M.: Eine Hieroglyphe.= RT 15 (1893), 32–36.
- : Das Silbenzeichen md.= ZÄS 31 (1893), 126–127.
- : Aus der Pithomstele.= Zeitschrift für Ethnologie 25 (1893), 316–317.
- : Die Umstellungen in der altägyptischen Orthographie.= ZÄS 32 (1894), 27–35.
- : On a Hieroglyphic Sign.= PSBA 18 (1896), 187–191.
- : Altafrikanische Glossen.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 10 (1896), 203–211.
- : Zu zwei asiatischen Völkernamen.= OLZ 2/2 (1899), 38–39.
- : Der lupakku-nophek-Stein.= OLZ 2/2 (1899), 39–41.
- : Zu den ägyptischen Wörtern von Amarna 294.= OLZ 2/4 (1899), 104–107.
- : Das Prinzip der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift.= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 2/8 (1899), 259–263.
- : Review of Reinisch, L.: Die Somali-Sprache. Band II.= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 6/2 (1903), 75–79.
- : Zum ägyptischen und semitischen Namen der Akazie.= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 6/11 (1903), 446–448.
- : Lautsystem und Umschriften des Altägyptischen.= OLZ 8/8 (1905), 313–323; 8/9 (1905), 361–371; 8/10 (1905), 413–423.
- : Ägyptische und semitische Umschreibungsfragen.= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 10 (1907), 299–305, 358–360.
- : Zum ägyptischen Wörterbuch.= OLZ 10/10 (1907), 513–517.
- : Die ältesten Zeugnisse für den Hackbau in Asien und Ägypten.= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 12/3 (1909), 107.
- : 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.
- : Egyptological Researches. Vol. II. Washington, 1910.

- : Zur Aussprache des Buchstaben Ain.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 17/6 (1914), 247–248.
- Müller, W. W.: Äthiopisches zur semitisch-ägyptischen Wortvergleichung.= *Muséon* 74 (1961), 199–205.
- : Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon.= *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75/3 (1963), 304–316.
- : Review of Diakonoff, I. M.: *Semito-Hamitic Languages*.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 7–8 (1968), 363–366.
- : Beiträge zur hamito-semitischen Wortvergleichung.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semita. The Hague, 1975.*, Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 63–74.
- : Review of Leslau, W.: *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopia)*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländische Gesellschaft* 131/2 (1981), 396–404.
- : Äthiopische Marginalglossen zum sabäischen Wörterbuch.= Segert, S. & Bodrogligeti, A. (eds.): *Ethiopic Studies Dedicated to Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, November 14, 1981*. Wiesbaden, 1983., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 275–285.
- : Beiträge aus dem Mehri zum etymologischen Teil des hebräischen Lexikons.= *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Maxime Rodinson*. Paris, 1985., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner. Pp. 267–278.
- Müller-Wollermann, R.: Die sogenannte ober- und unterägyptische Gerste.= *VA* 3 (1987), 39–42.
- : “Ich bin ein Besitzer von Booten”.= *SAK* 26 (1998), 229–237.
- MVÄG = Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft (Fortsetzung von MVAG mit fortlaufender Bandzählung, Leipzig).
- MVG or MVAG = Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft (Fortsetzung durch MVÄG mit fortlaufender Bandzählung, Berlin).
- MWNR = Helck, W.: *Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reiches*. Teil II.= Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, *Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 11 (1960). Teil III: 2 (1963). Teil IV: 3 (1963). Teil V: 4 (1964). Teil VI: 4 (1969). With continuous pagination.
- NÄG = Erman, A.: *Neuägyptische Grammatik*. Leipzig, 1933., Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann.
- Nagy, I.: Szisztrum-töredék a Szépművészeti Múzeumban.= *Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts* 48–49 (1977), 201–208.
- Nait-Zerrad, K.: *Dictionnaire des racines berbères (formes attestées)*. I: a-b^oz. Paris, Louvain, 1998., Peeters.
- Nakano, A.: *Comparative Vocabulary of Southern Arabic – Mahri, Gibbali and Soqotri*. Tokyo, 1986., Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Naville, É.: *Études grammaticales*.= *RT* 27 (1905), 156–161.
- : *La plante de Horbéit*.= *ASAE* 16 (1916–17), 187–190.
- : *Some Geographical Names*.= *JEA* 4 (1917), 228–233.
- NAWG = *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*.
- NBÄ = Osing, J.: *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. I–II. Maiz/Rhein, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- NCED = Nikolaev, S. L. & Starostin, S. A.: *A North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary*. Moscow, 1994., Asterisk Publishers.
- Needler, W.: *A Thirty-Square Draught-Board in The Royal Ontario Museum*.= *JEA* 39 (1953), 60–75.
- Nehllil: *Étude sur le dialecte de Ghat*. Paris, 1909., Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- Netting, R. M.: *Kofyar Vocabulary*. MS. 1967.
- Newberry, P. E.: *Beni Hasan. Part 1. Archaeological Survey of Egypt, no. 1*. London, 1893., Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

- : Šsm.t.= Studies presented to F.L. Griffith. Oxford, 1932., Egypt Exploration Society, Oxford University Press. Pp. 316–323.
- : The Owl in Ancient Egypt.= JEA 37 (1951), 72–74.
- Newman, F. W.: Kabail Vocabulary Supplemented by the Aid of a New Source. London, 1887., Trübner.
- Newman, P.: A Word List of Tera.= Journal of West African Languages 1/2 (1964), 33–50.
- : A Brief Note on the Maha Language.= Journal of West African Languages 2/1 (1965), 57–58.
- & Ma, R.: Comparative Chadic: Phonology and Lexicon.= Journal of African Languages 5/3 (1966), 218–251.
- : Historical Sound Laws in Hausa and Dera (Kanakuru).= Journal of West African Languages 7/1 (1970), 39–51.
- : A Grammar of Tera. University of California Publications, Linguistics 57. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1970., University of California Press.
- : The Kanakuru Language. Leeds, 1974., The Institute of Modern English Language Studies, University of Leeds in association with The West African Linguistic Society.
- : Chadic Classification and Reconstructions.= Afroasiatic Linguistics 5/1 (1977), 1–42.
- : Lateral Fricatives (“Hlaterals”) in Chadic.= Newman, P. & Newman, R. M. (eds.): Papers in Chadic Linguistics. Leiden, 1977., Afrika-Studiecentrum. Pp. 107–119.
- : The Classification of Chadic within Afroasiatic. Leiden, 1980., Universitaire Pers Leiden.
- Newman, R. M.: Y-Prosody as a Morphological Process in Ga’anda.= Newman, P. & Newman, R. M. (eds.) Papers in Chadic Linguistics. Leiden, 1977., Afrika-Studiecentrum. Pp. 121–130.
- Nicolai, R.: Songhay septentrional et touareg: contacts de langues et contacts de populations.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 147–162.
- Nicolas, F.: Tamesna. Les Ioullemmeden de l’Est ou Touareg “Kel Dinnik”. Cercle de T’awa – Colonie du Niger. Notes de linguistique et d’ethnographie berbères. Dialectes de la Tamàzəq-Taulləmét. Paris, 1950., Imprimerie Nationale.
- : La langue berbère de Mauritanie. Dakar, 1953., Institut Français d’Afrique Noire.
- : Vocabulaires ethnographiques de la Tamàjeq des Iullemmeden de l’est (Touareg de la Colonie du Niger, Afrique Occidentale Française).= Anthropos 52 (1957), 49–63, 564–580.
- Nims, Ch.F.: The Name of the XXIInd Nome of Upper Egypt.= ArOr 20 (1952), 343–346.
- Niwiński, A.: Ritual Protection of the Dead or Symbolic Reflection of his Special Status in Society? The Problem of the Black-Coated Cartonnages and Coffins of the Third Intermediate Period.= Studia Aegyptiaca 14 (1992), 457–471.
- Nöldeke, Th.: Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. Strassburg, 1910., Karl J. Trübner.
- Nurse, D.: Reconstruction of Dahalo History through Evidence from Loanwords.= Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika 7/2 (1986), 267–305.
- Nunn, J.: Review of Walker, J. H.: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Anatomical Terminology.= JEA 85 (1999), 257–259.
- Obenga, Th.: Origine commune de l’égyptien ancien, du copte et des langues négro-africaines modernes. Introduction à la linguistique historique africaine. Paris, 1993., Éditions L’Harmattan.
- O’Connor, M.: Semitic *mgn and Its Supposed Sanskrit Origin.= Journal of the American Oriental Society 109/1 (1989), 25–32.
- Ogdon, J. R.: A Note on the Meaning of [mr] in Archaic Texts.= GM 49 (1981), 61–64.

- Ol'derogge, D. A.: Hamitskaja problema v afrikanistike.= Sovetskaja Étnografija 3 (1949), 156–170.
- : Proishoždenie narodov Central'nogo Sudana (iz drevnejšej istorii jazykov gruppy hausa-kotoko).= Sovetskaja Étnografija 2 (1952), 23–38.
- : Jazyk hausa. Kratkij očerk grammatiki, hrestomatija i slovar'. Leningrad, 1954., Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta.
- : Proishoždenie jazyka hausa. The Origin of the Hausa Language.= Doklady sovetskoj delegacii na V Meždunarodnom Kongresse Antropologov i Étnografov. Papers Presented by the Soviet Delegation at the V International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Moskva, 1956., Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 3–28.
- : The Origin of the Hausa language.= Wallace, A. F. C. (ed.): Men and Cultures. Philadelphia, 1960., University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. 795–802.
- Olmo Lete, G.: The Monoconsonantal Series in Semitic.= *Aula Orientalis* 16 (1998), 37–75.
- : Notes on Semitic Lexicography (III). The Proto-Semitic Base (/dal-/) and Its Expansions.= *Aula Orientalis* 21 (2003), 205–211.
- OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung (Berlin).
- O'Mara, P. F.: Once Again: Who Was Menes? An Orthographical Approach.= *GM* 182 (2001), 97–105.
- OMRO = Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden (Leiden).
- Oomen, A.: Gender and Plurality in Rendille.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 8/1 (1981), 35–75.
- Or. = *Orientalia* (Roma).
- Or. Ant. = *Oriens Antiquus* (Roma).
- Orel, V. É.: Južnoslavjanskij obrjad zaščity ot tuiči ego balkanskije istoki.= *Zbornik za Filologiju i Lingvistiku* 29/1 (1986), 55–62.
- & Stolbova, O. V.: K rekonstrukcii praafrazijskogo vokalizma. 1–2.= *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 5 (1988), 66–83.
- : Iz kušitskoj leksiki material'noj kul'tury.= *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka. Čast' 3.* Moskva, 1989., Nauka. Pp. 88–89.
- : Čadsko-egipetskie izoglossy v oblasti kul'turnoj leksiki.= *Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka. Čast' 1.* Moskva, 1989., Nauka. Pp. 131–136.
- : Iz semitohamitskih dopolnenij k nostratičeskomu slovarju.= *Konferencija "Srvnitel'no-istoričeskoe jazykoznanie na sovremennom étape"* pamjati V. M. Illič-Svityča. 6–9 fevralja 1990 g. Moskva, 1990., Institut Slavjanovedenija i Balkanistiki Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 15–16.
- : K rekonstrukcii praafrazijskogo vokalizma. 3–4.= *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2 (1990), 75–90.
- : Cushitic, Chadic, and Egyptian: Lexical Relations.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind.* Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 167–180.
- : On Chadic-Egyptian Lexical Relations.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind.* Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 181–203.
- : Position of Cushitic (Preliminary Report).= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind.* Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 204–224.
- : *Mir semito-hamitov.*= *Principy sostavlenija étimologičeskijh i istoričeskijh slovarėj raznyh semej. Tezisy dokladov konferencii 8–9 nojabrja 1993 g.* Moskva, 1993., Institut Jazykoznanija Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk. Pp. 37–44.
- : On the Ancient Contacts between Hamito-Semitic and North Caucasian.= *Folia Linguistica Historica* 15/1–2 (1994), 37–46.
- : From Hamito-Semitic to Egyptian: Historical Phonology. MS. Tel-Aviv, 1994. 11 p.
- : Semitohamitskij, sinokavkazskij, nostratičeskij.= *Moskovskij Lingvističeskij Žurnal* 1 (1995), 99–116.

- : Semitohamitskij i nostratičeskij: dopolnenija k nostratičeskim étimologijam i novye sopostavlenija.= Moskovskij Lingvističeskij Žurnal 1 (1995), 117–128.
- : 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.
- Or. Succ. = *Orientalia Suecana* (An international journal of Indological, Iranian, Semitic, Turkic studies, Uppsala).
- Osing, J.: Isis und Osiris.= *MDAIK* 30/1 (1974), 91–113.
- : *Der spätägyptische Papyrus BM 10808*. Wiesbaden, 1976., Harrassowitz.
- : *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen. I–II*. Mainz/Rhein, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- : *Ächtungstexte aus dem Alten Reich (II)*.= *MDAIK* 32 (1976), 133–185, Taf. 40–51.
- : Zur Wortbildung von Δ , MHIT Δ KBA “Gegenwart”.= *GM* 27 (1978), 43–44.
- : Nochmals zur ägyptischen Nominalbildung.= *GM* 27 (1978), 59–74.
- : Review of CED.= *JEA* 64 (1978), 186–189.
- : Review of James, T. G. H.: *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions in the Brooklyn Museum. Vol. I*.= *OLZ* 74/1 (1979), 12–13.
- : Zur Entstehung der mittelägyptischen Negation [nn].= Görg, M. & Pusch, E. (Hrsg. unter Mitwirkung von A. Wuckelt und K.-J. Seyfried): *Festschrift Elmar Edel. 12. März 1979. Ägypten und Altes Testament. Studien zu Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des Alten Testaments*. Bamberg, 1979., Manfred Görg, Bamberg. Als Manuskript gedruckt, in Kommission Verlag Harrassowitz Wiesbaden. Pp. 302–313.
- : Zum Lautwechsel j ↔ ʕ unter Einfluss von ḥ.= *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 8 (1980), 217–225.
- : Ägyptische Namen der Oase Charga in arabischer Überlieferung.= *GM* 87 (1985), 55–62.
- : Sprüche gegen die jbh3tj-Schlange.= *MDAIK* 43 (1987), 205–210.
- : *Das Grab des Nefersecheru in Zawyet Sulṭan*. Mainz am Rhein, 1992., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- : *Zu einigen magischen Texten*.= *Studia Aegyptiaca* 14 (1992), 473–480.
- : Zum Lautwert von 3 und ʕ.= *Studien zum Altägyptischen Kultur* 24 (1997), 223–229.
- : *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis I. Text*. Copenhagen, 1998., Museum Tusulanum Press.
- : Zum Lautwert von [d] und [d].= *Lingua Aegyptia* 9 (2000), 165–178.
- : Review of Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian, Vol. I*.= *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 58/5–6 (2001), 565–581.
- Otto, E.: *Über die Demonstrativa und Nominalbildung im Altägyptischen*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 101 (1951), 52–66.
- : *Das ägyptische Mundöffnungsritual. Teil I–II*. Wiesbaden, 1954., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Bedeutungsnuancen der Verben mrj “lieben” und mšdj “hassen”.= *MDAIK* 25 (1969), 98–100.
- Panova, N. S.; Dolgopopol’skij, A. B.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.: *Central’nočadskie fonemy i étimologija central’nočadskih kornej v svete dannyh vnešnego sravnenija*.= *Konferencija po sravnitel’no-istoričeskoj grammatike indoevropejskih jazykov (12–14 dekabnja 1972 g.)*. Predvaritel’nye materialy. Moskva, 1972., Nauka. Pp. 64–65.
- : *Dopolnenija k nostratičeskim étimologijam po gruppe margi central’nočadskih jazykov (kil’ba, margi, bura, čibak)*.= *Konferencija “Nostratičeskije jazyki i nostratičeskoe jazykoznanie”*. Tezisy dokladov. Moskva, 1977., Institut Slavjanovedenija i Balkanistiki. Pp. 56–60.
- Pantalacci, L.: *Un été à Serabit el-Khadim (encore sur l’inscription de Hourou, Sinai n° 90)*.= *GM* 150 (1996), 87–91.

- Paradisi, U.: Il berbero di Augila. Materiale lessicale.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 35/3–4 (1960), 157–177.
- : El-Fôgâha, oasis berberofona del Fezzân.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 36/3–4 (1961), 293–302.
- : Il linguaggio berbero di El-Fogaha (Fezzân). Testi e materiale lessicale.= *Annali del Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 13 (1963), 93–126.
- Pardee, D.: The Semitic Root mrr and the Etymology of Ugaritic mr(r) || brk.= *UF* 10 (1978), 249–288.
- Parker, E. M. & Hayward, R. J.: *An Afar-English-French Dictionary (with Grammatical Notes in English)*. London, 1985., School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Pearce, M.: Consonant and Tone in Kera (Chadic).= *Journal of West African Languages* 27/1 (1998–99), 33–70.
- Peet, T. E.: *Great Tomb Robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty. Vol. I*. Oxford., 1930., Clarendon Press.
- Pellat, Ch.: *Textes berbères dans le parler des Aït Seghrouchen de la Moulouya*. Paris, 1955., Éditions Larose.
- Penchoen, Th. G.: *Tamazight of the Azt Ndir (Afroasiatic Dialects, Volume 1)*. Los Angeles, 1973., Undena Publications.
- Pennacchietti, F.: Sull'etimologia di arabo mūsā "rasoio".= Mengozzi, A. (ed.): *Studi Afroasiatici: XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemitica. Afro-Asiatic Studies: 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Milano, 2005., Francoangeli. Pp. 231–237.
- : Sull'etimologia e sul significato della preposizione araba ʿan.= Burtea, B.; Tropper, J.; Younansardaroud, H. (Hrsg.): *Studia Semitica et Hamitosemitica. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004*. Münster, 2005., Ugarit-Verlag. Pp. 283–306.
- Penrihi, H. (Fähnrich, H.) & Saržvelaže, Z.: *Kartvelur enata etimologiuri leksikoni*. Tbilisi, 1990., Tbilisis Universitetis Gamomcemloba.
- Perles, F.: *Babylonisch-biblische Glossen*.= *OLZ* 8/4 (1905), 125–129 & 8/5 (1905), 179–183.
- : *Babylonisch-talmudische Glossen*.= *OLZ* 8/8 (1905), 335–339; 8/9 (1905), 381–385.
- Peterson, B. J.: *Der Gott Schesemu und das Wort mdd*.= *Acta Orientalia Suecana* 12 (1963), 83–88.
- : A New Fragment of the Wisdom of Amenemope.= *JEA* 52 (1966), 120–128.
- Petráček, K.: *Leo Reinisch: der einheitliche Ursprung der Sprachen der Alten Welt und die afrikanische Urheimat der semitohamitischen und der semitischen Sprachen*.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Leo Reinisch. Werk und Erbe*. Wien, 1987., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Pp. 309–331.
- Petrie, W. M. F.: *Denderah 1898*. London, 1900., The Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Peust, C.: *Zur Herkunft des koptischen n*.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 2 (1992), 117–125.
- : *Möglichkeiten einer Rekonstruktion ägyptischer Vortonvokale aus dem Befund der koptischen Dialekte*.= *GM* 149 (1995), 67–82.
- : *Neue Impulse in der afroasiatischen Sprachwissenschaft. Zum Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary von Vladimir Emmanuilovič Orël und Ol'ga Valer'evna Stolbova*.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 5 (1997), 251–276.
- : *Egyptian Phonology. An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*. Göttingen, 1999., Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag GbR.
- : *Das Napatanische. Ein ägyptischer Dialekt aus dem Nubien des späten ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausends. Texte, Glossar, Grammatik*. Göttingen, 1999., Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag GbR.
- : *Über ägyptische Lexikographie. 1. Zum Ptolamaic Lexikon von Penelope Wilson; 2. Versuch eines quantitativen Vergleichs der Textkorpora antiker Sprachen*.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 7 (2000), 245–260.

- : Besprechung von Takács, G. (ed.): *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl.* = *Lingua Aegyptia* 13 (2005), 265–271.
- : Nochmals zur Lesung der Kopf-Hieroglyphe. = *GM* 208 (2006), 7–8.
- Peyron, M.: “Isaffen gghanin” (Rivières profondes). *Poésies du Moyen-Atlas Marocain* traduites et annotées. Casablanca (Maroc), 1991. (?), Wallada.
- Pfirsch, L.: À propos du titre... attribué à Imhotep. = Berger, C. & Mathieu, B. (éds.): *Études sur l’Ancien Empire et la nécropole de Saqqâra*. Montpellier, 1997., Université Paul Valéry. Pp. 351–354.
- Philippi, F. W. M.: *Grundstamm des starken Verbums im Semitischen. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen.* = *Morgenländische Forschungen. Festschrift Herrn Professor Dr. H. L. Fleischer zu seinem fünfzigjährigen Doctorjubiläum am 4. März 1874*. Leipzig, 1875., F. A. Brockhaus. Pp. 69–106.
- Piamenta, M.: *Dictionary of Post-Classical Yemeni Arabic. I–II*. Leiden, 1990–91., Brill.
- Piankoff, A.: *The Shrines of Tut-ankh-amon*. New York, 1955., Pantheon Books.
- Piccione, P. A.: The md3.t, ‘Peg’, in Ancient Egyptian. = *Serapis* 7 (1981–82), 75–86.
- Piehl, K.: Notes de philologie égyptienne. = *PSBA* 13 (1890), 40–53, 106–118.
- : Notes de philologie égyptienne. = *PSBA* 14 (1891), 45–59.
- : Notes de philologie égyptienne. = *PSBA* 13 (1891), 235–245, 350–367, 562–575.
- : Remarques générales sur le dictionnaire hiéroglyphique ainsi que sur la manière dont à l’état actuel de la science il faut le dresser. = *Actes du huitième congrès international des orientalistes, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiana. Quatrième partie*. Leiden, 1892., E. J. Brill. Pp. 1–23.
- : Observations sur les quelques signes et groupes hiéroglyphiques. = *Actes du huitième congrès international des orientalistes, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiana. Quatrième partie*. Leiden, 1892., E. J. Brill. Pp. 27–42.
- : Notes de philologie égyptienne. = *PSBA* 15 (1892), 31–47.
- : Notes de philologie égyptienne. = *PSBA* 15 (1892), 133–142.
- : Notes de philologie égyptienne. = *PSBA* 15 (1893), 247–268, 471–493.
- : Notes de lexicographie égyptienne. = *Actes du dixième congrès international des orientalistes, session de Genève, 1894. Quatrième partie*. Leiden, 1897., E. J. Brill. Pp. 126–138.
- : Contributions au dictionnaire hiéroglyphique. = *PSBA* 20 (1898), 190–201, 306–327.
- : Notes de lexicographie égyptienne. Troisième article. Un siège et son nom. = *Actes du douzième congrès international des orientalistes, Rome 1899. Tome troisième, deuxième partie*. Florence, 1902., Société Typographique Florentine. Pp. 33–36.
- Pierret, R.: *Étude sur le dialecte maure. Étude du dialecte maure des régions sahéliennes de l’Afrique occidentale française*. Paris, 1948., Imprimerie nationale.
- Pillet, M.: De l’objet représenté par le signe [mn] mn. = *Revue de l’Égypte Ancienne* 1 (1925–27), 157–175.
- Philippson, G.: A Prefix “m-” in Omotic? MS. Presented at the 4th International Conference of Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Leiden, 10–12 April 2003.
- Pillinger, S. & Galboran, L.: *A Rendille Dictionary*. Köln, 1999., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Pilszczikowa, N.: Contribution à l’étude des rapports entre le haoussa et les autres langues du groupe nigéro-tchadien. = *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 22/2 (1958), 75–99.
- : Le haoussa et le chamito-sémitique à la lumière de l’Essai comparatif de Marcel Cohen. = *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 24/1 (1960), 97–130.
- Pilter, W. T.: The Manna of the Israelites. = *PSBA* 39 (1917), 155–157, 187–206.
- Pirrenne, J.: Une nouvelle interprétation des “Instruction du roi Kheti à son fils Merikara” (IX^e dynastie). = *RdE* 3 (1938), 1–25.
- PL = Wilson, P.: *A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu*. Leuven, 1997., Peeters.

- Planert, W.: Über die Sprachen der Hottentotten und Buschmänner.= *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen* 8 (1905), 104–176.
- Plassmann, Th. B.: Notes on the Stem D-B-R.= *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 4/2 (1942), 119–132.
- Plazikowsky, H. & Wagner, E.: Studien zur Sprache der Irob.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 53 (1953), 378–393.
- Plazikowsky-Brauner, H.: Zahlen und Zahlensysteme in den sogenannten kuschitischen Sprachen.= *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 8/3 (1963), 466–483.
- Platt, A. F. R.: The Ancient Egyptian Methods of Working Hard Stones.= *PSBA* 31 (1909), 172–184.
- Pleyte, W. & Rossi, E.: Papyrus de Turin. Wiesbaden, 1869–75., LTR-Verlag.
- PM = Porter, B. & Moss, R. L.: *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*. Vol. I–VII. Oxford, 1927–55., Clarendon Press. 2nd edition since 1960.
- PN = Ranke, H.: *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*. Band I: Verzeichnis der Namen. Band II: Einleitung. Form und Inhalt der Namen. Geschichte der Namen. Vergleiche mit anderen Namen. Nachträge und Zusätze zu Band I. Umschreibungslisten. Hamburg, 1935., 1952., Verlag von J. J. Augustin.
- Polotsky, H. J.: Zur koptischen Lautlehre I.= *ZÄS* 67 (1931), 74–77.
- Poplinskij, Ju. K.: *Iz istorii étnokul'turnyh kontaktov Afriki i égejskogo mira*. Moskva, 1978., Nauka.
- Porhomovskij, V. Ja.: *Istoričeskij konsonantizm jazykov kotoko*. Moskva, 1972., Institut Jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- : *Dental'nye smyčnye jazykah kotoko (opyt rekonstrukcii)*.= *Jazyki zarubežnogo Vostoka. Sbornik statej*. Moskva, 1977., Nauka. Pp. 105–110.
- Posener, G.: Les signes noirs dans les rubriques.= *JEA* 36 (1950), 77–81.
- : Le conte de Néferkaré et du général Siséné (recherches littéraires, VI).= *RdE* 11 (1957), 119–139.
- : [nhšjw] et [md3jw].= *ZÄS* 83 (1958), 38–43.
- : *Cinq figurines d'envoûtement*. Le Caire, 1987., IFAO.
- Posener-Kriéger, P.: *Les archives du temple funéraire de Néferirkarê-Kakaï (Les papyrus d'Abousir)*. I–II: Traductions et commentaire. Le Caire, 1976., IFAO.
- : *Quelques pièces du matériel culturel du temple funéraire de Rénéferéf*.= *MDAIK* 47 (1991), 293–304.
- : *I papiri di Gebelein*. Scavi G. Farina 1935. Edizione a cura di Sara Demichelis. Torino, 2004., Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali, Soprintendenza al Museo delle Antichità Egizie.
- Powels, S.: Indische Lehnwörter in der Bibel.= *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 5 (1992), 186–200.
- Praetorius, F.: *Die amharische Sprache*. Halle, 1879., Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- : *Beiträge zur äthiopischen Grammatik und Etymologie*.= *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 1 (1890), 21–47, 369–378.
- Prasse, K.-G.: L'origine du mot amāziy.= *Acta Orientalia* 23/3–4 (1959), 197–200.
- : A propos de l'origine de h touareg (tahaggart).= *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 43/3 (1969).
- : *Manuel de grammaire touaregue*. I–III. Phonétique – écriture – pronom. Copenhague, 1972., Université de Copenhague.
- : *Manuel de grammaire touaregue*. IV–V. Nom. Copenhague, 1974., Akademisk Forlag.
- : *The Reconstruction of Proto-Berber Short Vowels*.= *Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th.* (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 215–231.
- : *New Light on the Origin of the Tuareg Vowels e and o*.= *Mukarovsky, H. G.* (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*. Band I. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 163–170.
- Prasse, K.-G. & Alojaly, Gh. & Mohamed, Gh.: *Lexique touareg-français*. Copenhague, 1998., Museum Tusculanum Press, Université de Copenhague.

- Prasse, K.-G. & Dicko, A.D.: Renseignements sur le touareg des Udalān (Burkina Faso).= *Acta Orientalia* 63 (2002), 7–30.
- Prasse, K.-G. & Alojaly, Gh. & Mohamed, Gh.: Dictionnaire touareg-français (Niger). Copenhagen, 2003., Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen.
- Pritchard, J. B.: *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, 1950., Princeton University Press. 2nd ed. (revised and enlarged): 1955. 3rd ed.: 1969.
- Prost, A.: Les langues mandé-sud du groupe mana-bousa. Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Afrique Noire, n° 26. Dakar, 1953., IFAN.
- Provotelle, (?): Étude sur la tamazir't ou zénatia de Qalaāt es-Sened (Tunisie). Paris, 1911., Ernest Leroux.
- PSBA = Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (London).
- PT = Sethe, K.: Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte. I–II. Leipzig, 1980., 1910., J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Puhvel, J.: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam, since 1984, Mouton Publishers.
- Pusch, E.: Register der ägyptischen Wörter zu Junker Giza I–XII.= *ZÄS* 101 (1974), 13–35.
- Pweddton, N. N. (ed. by N. Skinner): *Bwatiye-English Dictionary with English-Bwatiye Index*. Madison, Wisconsin, 2000., Dr. Nicholas Pweddton.
- PWR = Wissowa, G. (hrsg.): *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Bd. 1–85. Stuttgart, 1894–1980., J. B. Metzler (from 1972 on, published in München by Alfred Druckenmüller).
- Quack, J. F.: *Studien zur Lehre für Merikare*. Wiesbaden, 1992., Harrassowitz.
- : Ein altägyptisches Sprachtabu.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 3 (1993), 59–79.
- : Die Lehren des Ani. Ein neuägyptischer Weisheitstext in seinem kulturellen Umfeld. Freiburg, Göttingen, 1994., Universitätsverlag Freiburg, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- : Das Pavienshaar und die Taten des Thot (pBrooklyn 47.218.48+85 3,1–6).= *SAK* 23 (1996), 305–333.
- : Review of Hoch, J. E.: *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 146/2 (1996), 507–514.
- : Bespr. von Hamig, R.: *Grosses Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch*.= *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54/3–4 (1997), 328–334.
- : Zur Lesung von Gardiner Sign-List Aa8.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 7 (2000), 219–224.
- : Zur Stellung des Ägyptischen innerhalb der afroasiatischen Sprachen.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 97/2 (2002), 161–185.
- : Zum Lautwert von Gardiner Sign-List U23.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 11 (2003), 113–116.
- : Zu den vorarabischen Lehnwörtern im Koptischen.= Burtea, B.; Tropper, J.; Younansardaroud, H. (Hrsg.): *Studia Semitica et Hamitosemitica*. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004. Münster, 2005., Ugarit-Verlag. Pp. 307–338.
- : A Visit to Siwa.= *ASAE* 18 (1918), 78–112.
- Quirke, S.: *Translating Ma'at. A Review Discussion of Ma'at, Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im alten Ägypten* by Jan Assmann, Munich, 1990, Verlag C. H. Beck.= *JEA* 80 (1994), 219–231.
- Rabin, Ch.: *Hittite Words in Hebrew*.= *Orientalia NS* 32 (1963), 113–139.
- : La correspondance d hébreu – d arabe.= Cohen, D. (ed.): *Mélanges Marcel Cohen*. Paris, 1970., Mouton. Pp. 290–297.
- : *Lexicostatistics and the Internal Divisions of Semitic*.= Bynon, J.; Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, 1975., Mouton*. Pp. 85–102.
- : *Hebrew Etymologies Based Upon the Cushitic Languages*.= Heqer Veiyun. *Studies in Judaism*. Haifa, 1976., The University of Haifa. Pp. XXI–XXII, 233–258.

- : Hamitic Languages as a Source of Semitic Languages.= Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies (held at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 13–19 August 1973 under the auspices of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities). Volume I. Jerusalem, 1977., World Union of Jewish Studies. Pp. 329–340.
- : Ron-Semitic Etymologies.= Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigrific Border Area. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 24–31.
- : Problems of Inter-Branch Comparison.= Wolff, E. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H. (eds.): Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics. Hamburg, 1983., H. Buske Verlag. Pp. 65–77.
- Rachewiltz, B.: Il libro dei morti degli antichi egiziani. Milano, 1958., All'Insegna del Pesce d'Oro (Vanni Scheiwiller).
- RAD = Gardiner, A. H.: Ramesside Administrative Documents. London, 1948., Geoffrey Cumberlege London, Oxford University Press.
- Rainey, D.: The Soldier-Scribe in Papyrus Anastasi I.= JNES 26 (1967), 58–60.
- : Egyptian Evidence for Semitic Linguistics. Review of Hoch, J. E.: Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period.= IOS 18 (1998), 431–453.
- Ranke, H.: Zum Lautwerte der Hieroglyphe [hm].= ZÄS 46 (1909), 109–110.
- : Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation. Berlin, 1910., Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- : Das altägyptische Schlangenspiel.= Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 4. Abh. (1920), 1–30.
- : Tiernamen als Personennamen bei den Ägyptern.= ZÄS 60 (1925), 76–83.
- : Eine alte Anspielung auf den Mythos von Horus und Seth.= ZÄS 69 (1933), 104–106.
- : Die ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I: Verzeichnis der Namen. Band II: Einleitung. Form und Inhalt der Namen. Geschichte der Namen. Vergleiche mit andren Namen. Nachträge und Zusätze zu Band I. Umschreibungslisten. Hamburg, 1935., 1952., Verlag von J. J. Augustin.
- : Keilschriftliches X–XII.= ZÄS 73 (1937), 90–93.
- Rapp, E. L. & Benzing, B.: Dictionary of the Glavdá Language. Frankfurt am Main, 1968., Bible Society Frankfurt am Main.
- Raulwing, P. & Schmitt, R.: Zur etymologischen Beurteilung der Berufsbezeichnung aššuššanni des Pferdetrainers Kikkuli von Mittani.= Anreiter, P. & Bartosiewicz, L. & Jerem, E. & Meid, W. (eds.): Man and the Animal World. Studies in Archaeozoology, Archaeology, Anthropology and Palaeolinguistics in Memoriam Sándor Bökönyi. (Place not indicated on the copy), 1998., Archaeolingua. Pp. 675–706.
- Ray, J. D.: The Archive of Hor. London, 1976., Egypt Exploration Society.
- : Are Egyptian and Hittite Related? = Lloyd, A. B. (ed.): Studies in Pharaonic Religion and Society in Honour of J. Gwyn Griffiths. London, 1992., The Egypt Exploration Society. Pp. 124–136.
- : The Voice of Authority: Papyrus Leiden I 382.= JEA 85 (1999), 189–195.
- : The Name of King Narmer.= Lingua Aegyptia 10 (2003), 131–138.
- RB = Revue Biblique (Paris).
- RdE = Revue d'Égyptologie (Paris).
- Reder, D. G.: Pojavlenie motygi i pluga v drevnem Egipte i Šumere.= Drevnij mir. Sbornik statej Akademiku Vasiliju Vasil'jeviču Struve. Moskva, 1962., Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 165–170.
- Redford, D.B.: The Meaning and Use of the Term gnwt “Annals”.= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 327–341.
- : The Name of Manetho.= Lesko, L. H. (ed.): Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker. Presented on the Occasion of his 78th Birthday December

- 10, 1983. Hanover and London, 1986., Published for Brown University Press by University Press of New England. Pp. 118–121.
- : East Karnak and the Sed-Festival of Akhenaten.= Berger, C.; Clerc, G.; Grimal, N. (éds.): *Hommages à Jean Leclant*. Vol. 1. Le Caire, 1994., IFAO. Pp. 485–492.
- Reichelt, H.: *Avesta Reader*. Texts, Notes, Glossary and Index. Strassburg, 1911., Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- 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.
- : *Die Barea-Sprache*. Wien, 1874., Wilhelm Braumüller.
- : *Die Sprache Saho-Irob in Abessinien*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Classe 90/9 (1878), 89–142.
- : *Die Nuba-Sprache*. II. Wien, 1879., Wilhelm Braumüller.
- : *Die Chamirsprache in Abessinien*. II. *Chamir-deutsches Wörterbuch*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Classe 106 (1884), 330–450.
- : *Die Quarasprache in Abessinien*. II. *Quarisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Classe 109/1 (1885), 3–152.
- : *Die ʿAfar-Sprache*. II.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Classe 113/2 (1886), 795–916.
- : *Wörterbuch der Bilin-Sprache*. Wien, 1887., Alfred Hoelder.
- : *Die ʿAfar-Sprache*. III. *Deutsch-ʿAfarisches Wörterverzeichnis*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Classe 114/1 (1887), 89–168.
- : *Die Kafa-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika*. II. *Kafa-Deutsches Wörterbuch*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Classe 116 (1888), 251–386.
- : *Wörterbuch der Saho-Sprache*. Wien, 1890., Alfred Hölder.
- : *Das Zalwort vier und neun in den chamitisch-semitischen Sprachen*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Classe 121/12 (1890).
- : *Die Kunama-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika*. III.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 122/5 (1890), 1–112.
- : *Die Bedawye-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika*. III.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Classe 130/7 (1894), 1–80.
- : *Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache*. Wien, 1895., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- : *Die Somali-Sprache*. II. *Wörterbuch*. Wien, 1902., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- : *Der Dschäbärtidialekt der Somalisprache*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 148/5 (1904), 1–88.
- Reintges, Ch.: *Egyptian Root-and-Pattern Morphology*.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 4 (1994), 213–244.
- Reisner, G. A.: *The Hearst Medical Papyrus*. Hieratic Text in 17 Facsimile Plates in Collotype with Introduction and Vocabulary. Leipzig, 1905., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Reniso, A.: *Étude sur les dialectes berbères des Beni Iznassen, du Rif et des Senhaja de Srair*. Grammaire, textes et lexique. Paris, 1932., Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- RES = *Revue des Études Sémitiques* (Paris) and *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Sémitique* (publié par la Commission du Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, Paris).
- Reutt, T. E. & Kogan, E. Z.: *Materialy po leksike jazykov margi i bura*.= *Bespis'mennye i mladopis'mennye jazyki Afriki*. Moskva, 1973., Nauka. Pp. 83–147.
- Renfroe, F.: *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies*. Münster, 1992., Ugarit-Verlag.
- Renouf, P.: *Miscellanea IV*.= *ZÄS* 6 (1868), 45–48.
- RES = *Répertoire de l'Épigraphie Sémitique*.

- Reymond, E. A. E.: *Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the Ashmolean Museum. Volume I: Embalmers' Archives from Hawara*. Oxford, 1973., Oxford University Press by Vivian Ridler.
- Rhodokanakis, N.: *Der vulgärarabische Dialekt im D'ofâr (Z'fâr). II. Einleitung, Glossar und Grammatik*. Wien, 1911., Alfred Hölder.
- : *Die Inschriften an der Mauervon Kohlân-Timna^c. = Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 200/2 (1924)*.
- Richter, T. S.: *Leib oder Leber? Zum Wort *ḥocε* im demotischen P.Magical XIII,12. = ZÄS 125 (1998), 137–139*.
- Ricke, H.: *Der Geflügelhof des Amon in Karnak. = ZÄS 73 (1937), 124–131*.
- Ricks, S. D.: *A Lexicon of Epigraphic Qatabanian*. Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley, California, 1982., Graduate Theological University, Berkeley, California.
- : *Lexicon of Inscriptional Qatabanian*. Roma, 1989., Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- RITA = Kitchen, K. A.: *Ramesside Inscriptions Translated and Annotated*. Oxford, 1993–2003., Blackwell.
- Ritner, R. K.: *Review of M. Heerma van Voss et al. (eds.): Studies in Egyptian Religion Dedicated to Professor Jan Zandee. = JNES 50/3 (1991), 209–213*.
- RO = *Rocznik Orientalistyczny (Warszawa)*.
- Roberts, J.: *Lexique Mawa*. MS. October 1994. 11 p.
- Roccati, A.: *Papiro ieratico N.54003. Estratti magici e rituali del Primo Medio Regno*. Torino, 1970., Edizioni d'Arte Fratelli Pozzo.
- : *Recherche sulla scrittura egizia – III. La notazione vocalica nella scrittura geroglifica. = Oriens Antiquus 27 (1988), 115–126*.
- : *Per l'origine di egiziano "altro". = Brugnatelli, V. (ed.): Sem, Cam, Iafet. Atti della 7^a Giornata di Studi Camito-Semitici e Indoeuropei (Milano, 1^a giugno 1993)*. Milano, 1994., Centro Studi Camito-Semitici. Pp. 183–185.
- : *Lessico dinamico nell'egiziano antico. = Verhoogt, A. M. F. W. & Vleeming, S. P. (eds.): The Two Faces of Graeco-Roman Egypt. Greek and Demotic and Greek-Demotic Texts and Studies Presented to P. W. Pestman (P.L. Bat. 30)*. Leiden, 1998., Brill. Pp. 87–91.
- Roeder, G.: *Kulte, Orakel und Naturverehrung im alten Ägypten. Die ägyptische Religion in Texten und Bildern. Bd. 3*. Zürich, 1960., Artemis Verlag.
- Roper, E.-M.: *Tu Bedawie. An Elementary Handbook for the Use of Sudan Government Officials*. Hertford, 1928., Stephen Austin & Sons.
- Roquet, G.: *Sur l'origine d'un hapax en vieux-nubien: τΟΖΟΗΛΕ < copte: (τ+)Ḡεηετε < égyptien: ḥwt-nṯr...? = BIFAO 71 (1972), 97–118*.
- : *Incompabilités dans la racine en ancien égyptien I. = Göttinger Miscellen 6 (1973), 108–117*.
- : *Espace et lexique du sacré: autour du nom du "ciel" en vieux-nubien. = BIFAO 73 (1973), 155–176*.
- : *šmt(=j) "ma belle-mère" (6^e Dynastie). = BIFAO 77 (1977), 119–127*.
- : *Wḥm, verbe plein et semi-auxiliaire. À propos d'une inscription d'Ancien Empire. = BIFAO 78 (1978), 487–495*.
- : *Chronologie relative des changements phonétiques affectant [z] et [r] et dialectalismes provinciaux à l'Ancien Empire. T'zrf et mrzt à Ḥawârta/Tahna. = Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Sauneron 1927–1976. I. Égypte pharaonique*. Le Caire, 1979., IFAO. Pp. 437–462.
- : *Notes de lexique égyptien et copte. = Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 69 (1983), 321–356*.
- : *La réécriture: facteur critique de l'étymologie. = Junge, F. (Hrsg.): Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 355–382.

- : "ΘΑΣΙΣ – ὈΜΝΑΣΙ. De textes des pyramides à Théophraste. Datation relative de processus morphophonologiques par l'emprunt.= Berger, C.; Clerc, G.; Grimal, N. (éds.): *Hommages à Jean Leclant*. Vol. 4. Le Caire, 1994., IFAO. Pp. 303–316.
- : Une constante de phonographématique générale: la notation de nasale dévoisée. De l'égyptien *ṯw zp* au copte *ⲧⲏⲡⲥⲟⲩ* "chaque fois".= *BIFAO* 95 (1995), 367–381.
- Rossing, M. O.: *Mafa-Mada: A Comparative Study of Chadic Languages in North Cameroun*. Ph.D. dissertation. Wisconsin, 1978., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Roth, A. M.: Fingers, Stars, and the "Opening of the Mouth": The Nature and Function of the *nṯrwj*-Blades.= *JEA* 79 (1993), 57–79.
- Rowe, A.: Provisional Notes on the Old Kingdom Inscriptions from the Diorite Quarries".= *ASAE* 38 (1938), 391–396.
- : Additional References to the Article "Provisional Notes on the Old Kingdom Inscriptions from the Diorite Quarries", in *ASAE* 38.= *ASAE* 38 (1938), 678–688.
- : The "[w3s]-Sceptre" Sub-Gang of Workmen at Meydûm.= *ASAE* 41 (1942), 339–341.
- Rowińska, E.: The Akkadian Origin of the Word *mḥr* "Basket".= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 48/1 (1992), 43–44.
- Rössler, O.: Verbalbau und Verbalflexion in den semitohamitischen Sprachen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 100 (1950), 461–514.
- : Akkadisches und libysches Verbum I–II.= *Orientalia* 20 (1951), 101–107, 366–373.
- : Der semitische Charakter der libyschen Sprache.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50 (1952), 121–150.
- : Ghain im Ugaritischen.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 54, NF 20 (1961), 158–172.
- : Libysch-Hamitisch-Semitisch.= *Oriens* 17 (1964), 199–216.
- : Das ältere ägyptische Umschreibungssystem für Fremdnamen und seine sprachwissenschaftliche Lernen.= Lukas, J. (ed.): *Neue afrikanistische Studien*. Hamburg, 1966., Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung. Pp. 218–229.
- : Die lexikalischen Beziehungen des Hausa und die afrikanische Lautverschiebung.= *Africana Marburgensia* 2/2 (1969), 17–21.
- : 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.
- : Berberisch-tschadisches Kernvokabular.= *Africana Marburgensia* 12/1–2 (1979), 20–31.
- : Review of Vycichl, W.: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 137/2 (1987), 383–385.
- RS(t)O = *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* (Roma).
- RT = *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* (Paris).
- Ruelland, S.: Le tupuri (langue adamawa) et les langues tchadiques voisines: comparaison lexicale.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 157–175.
- Rundgren, F.: Besprechung von Leslau, W.: *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon*.= *Oriens* 14 (1961), 365–370.
- : Hebräisch *bäšär* "Goldertz" und *ʔamar* "sagen". *Zwei Etymologien*.= *Orientalia NS* 32 (1963), 178–183.
- Růžička, R.: Die Wurzel *rʕ* in den semitischen Sprachen.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 25 (1911), 114–138.

- Ryhiner, M.-L.: L'offrande du lotus dans les temples égyptiens de l'époque tardive. Bruxelles, 1986., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.
- : La procession des étoffes et l'union avec Hathor. Bruxelles, 1995., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.
- Sabar, Y.: A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dictionary. Dialects from Amidya, Dihok, Nerwa and Zakho, Northwestern Iraq. Wiesbaden, 2002., Harrassowitz.
- Sachnne, M.: Notes sur le zime (lame) parlé au Cameroun.= *Africana Marburgensia* 9/1 (1976), 71–86.
- : 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.
- : Dictionnaire lamé-français. *Lexique français-lamé*. Paris, 1982., SELAF.
- SAK = Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur (Hamburg).
- Saleh, A.-A.: Some Problems Relating to the Pwenet Reliefs at Deir el-Baari.= *JEA* 58 (1972), 140–158.
- Salonen, A.: Die Hausgeräte der alten Mesopotamier. Wiesbaden, 1965–66., Harrassowitz.
- SAN = Vinnikov, I. N.: Slovar' aramejskih nadpisej. Part I: ?-d.= *Palestinskij Sbornik* 66 (1958), 171–216. Part II: h-y.= *Palestinskij Sbornik* 70 (1962), 196–237. Part III: k-l.= *Palestinskij Sbornik* 72 (1962), 141–160. Part IV: m-^c.= *Palestinskij Sbornik* 74 (1964), 189–234. Part V: p-t.= *Palestinskij Sbornik* 76 (1965), 217–262.
- Sander-Hansen, C. E.: Die phonetischen Wortspiele des ältesten Ägyptischen.= *Acta Orientalia* 20 (1948), 1–21.
- Sanmartín, A. J.: Semantisches über ?mr / "sehen" und ?mr / "sagen" im Ugaritischen.= *UF* 5 (1973), 263–270.
- : Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (VI).= *UF* 21 (1989), 335–348.
- Šapiro, F. L.: Ivrít-russkij slovar' s prilozheniem kratkogo grammatičeskogo očerka jazyka ivrit, sostavlennoho prof. B. M. Grande. Moskva, 1963., Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Inostrannyh i Nacional'nyh Slovaroj.
- Sarnelli, T.: Il dialetto berbero di Sokna.= *L'Africa Italiana* (Napoli), supplement (1924–25).
- : Sull'origine del nome imāzigen.= *Mémorial André Basset* (1895–1956). Paris, 1957., Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve. Pp. 131–138.
- Sasse, H.-J.: Kimant Wordlist. MS. Approx. 1972. 12 p.
- : Bemerkungen zum "Language Survey of Ethiopia".= *ZDMG* 123 (1973), 117–128.
- : Spuren von Pharyngalen im Galab.= *Afrika und Übersee* 56 (1973), 266–275.
- : Notes on the Structure of Galab.= *BSOAS* 37 (1974), 407–438.
- : Galla /š/, /s/ und /f/.= *Afrika und Übersee* 58 (1975), 244–263.
- : Weiteres zu den ostkuschitischen Sibilanten.= *Afrika und Übersee* 59 (1976), 125–142.
- : The Consonant Phonemes of Proto-East-Cushitic (PEC).= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7/1 (1979), 1–67.
- : Textproben der Boni-Sprache.= *Afrika und Übersee* 63 (1980), 79–101.
- : Ostkuschitische und semitische Verbalklassen.= Diem, W.; Wild, S. (eds.): *Studien aus Arabistik und Semitistik Anton Spitaler überreicht*. Wiesbaden, 1980., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 153–174.
- : Afroasiatisch.= Schadeberg, Th. (ed.): *Die Sprachen Afrikas*. Band 2. Afroasiatisch. Hamburg, 1981., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 129–148.
- : Neue Perspektiven im Afroasiatischen?= Jungraithmayr, H. & Mieke, G. (eds.): *Berliner Afrikanistische Vorträge XXI*. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Berlin 24.–29. März 1980. Berlin, 1981., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer. Pp. 145–165.
- : Kuschitisch.= Schadeberg, Th. (ed.): *Die Sprachen Afrikas*. Band 2. Afroasiatisch. Hamburg, 1981., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 187–215.

- : An Etymological Dictionary of Burji. Hamburg, 1982., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- : Notes on the Prefixation of *ʔa- in Afroasiatic.= Mendel, D.; Claudi, U. (eds.): *Ägypten im afro-orientalischen Kontext: Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes. Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens (Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere, Sondernummer 1991)*. Köln, 1991., Universität zu Köln. Pp. 271–277.
- Satzinger, H.: (Rezension von) Wölfhart Westendorf: *Koptisches Handwörterbuch. 2. Lieferung*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 63–64 (1972), 252–255.
- : (Rezension von) Wölfhart Westendorf: *Koptisches Handwörterbuch. Lieferung 5*= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 68 (1976), 186–187.
- : *Sudan-Ägyptisch und Elephantine-Koptisch*= *Bulletin. Société d'Égyptologie Genève* 4 (1980), 83–87.
- : *Attribut und Relativsatz im älteren Ägyptisch*= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wölfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Band I*. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 125–156.
- : *Das ägyptische «Aleph»-Phonem*= *Zwischen den beiden Ewigkeiten. Festschrift Gertrud Thausing*. Wien, 1994., Eigenverlag des Institutes für Ägyptologie der Universität Wien. Pp. 191–205.
- : *An Old Coptic Text Reconsidered: PGM 94 Ff*= Giversen, S. & Krause, M. & Nagel, P. (eds.): *Coptology: Past, Present, and Future. Studies in Honour of Rodolphe Kasser. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 61*. Leuven, 1994., Peeters. Pp. 213–224.
- : *Egyptian in the Afroasiatic Frame: Recent Egyptological Issues with an Impact on Comparative Studies*= Bausi, A.; Tosco, M. (eds.): *Afroasiatica Neapolitana. Contributi presentati all'8° Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semítica)*, Napoli, 25–26 Gennaio 1996. *Papers from the 8th Italian Meeting on Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics*, Naples, January 25–26, 1996. Napoli, 1997., Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Pp. 27–48.
- : *Reading Late Egyptian*= *Revue Roumaine d'Égyptologie* 2–3 (1998–99), 77–83.
- : *Egyptian ʕayin in Variation with d*= *Lingua Aegyptia* 6 (1999), 141–151.
- : *Afroasiatischer Sprachvergleich*= Grunert, S. & Hafemann, I. (Hrsg.): *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch. Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie*. Leiden, 1999., Brill. Pp. 367–386.
- : *Zur Kontraktion der Lautfolge VjV im Vor-Urkoptischen*= Györy, H. (éd.): *Mélanges offerts à Edith Varga. [zšš wbn m t3] “le lotus qui sort de terre”*. *Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beau-Arts. Supplément*. Budapest, 2001., Szépművészeti Múzeum. Pp. 423–430.
- : *The Egyptian Connection: Egyptian and the Semitic Languages*= *IOS* 20 (2002), 227–264.
- Sauneron, S. & Yoyotte, J.: *Le cynocéphale...comme graphie du nom de Thot*= *RdE* 7 (1950), 9–13.
- Sauneron, S.: *Rituel de l'embaumement, Pap. Boulaq III, Pap. Louvre 5.158*. Le Caire, 1952., Imprimerie Nationale.
- : *Copte (S) ΚΑΛΛΩΣΗ*= *Mélanges Maspero. I*. Caire, 1961., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale. Pp. 113–120.
- : *Remarques de philologie et d'étymologie (en marge des textes d'Esna)*= *Mélanges Mariette*. Le Caire, 1961., IFAO. Pp. 229–249.
- : *Remarques de philologie et d'étymologie (§§19–25)*= *RdE* 15 (1963), 49–62.
- : *Remarques de philologie et d'étymologie (§§26–35)*= *BIFAO* 62 (1964), 15–31.
- : *Remarques de philologie et d'étymologie: A propos du toponyme Achérou*= *BIFAO* 62 (1964), 50–57.
- : *Un traité égyptien d'ophiologie. Papyrus du Brooklyn Museum N° 47.218.48 et .85*. Le Caire, 1989., Publications de l'IFAO.

- Savà, G.: English-Ts'amakko Wordlist. MS. 2005.
- Saxon, D. E.: Sokoro Wordlist. MS. Los Angeles, May–June 1977. 40 p.
- : Linguistic Evidence for the Eastward Spread of Ubangian Peoples.= Ehret, Ch. & Posnansky, M. (eds.): *The Archaeological and Linguistic Reconstruction of African History*. Berkeley, 1982., University of California Press. Pp. 66–77.
- Saydon, P. P.: Maltese Etymological Notes.= JSS 10 (1965), 67–82.
- : Hebraico-Maltese Notes.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 41/2 (1966), 115–154.
- Säve-Söderbergh, T.: Ägypten und Nubien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte altägyptischer Außenpolitik. Lund, 1941., Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri.
- SBAW = Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (München).
- Scharff, A.: Briefe aus Illahun.= ZÄS 59 (1924), 20–51.
- Schäfer, H.: Der Name Jhw-n-Jtn.= ZÄS 34 (1896), 166–167.
- : Der ägyptische Name des “Königsringes”.= ZÄS 34 (1896), 167.
- : Die aethiopische Königsinschrift des Berliner Museums. Leipzig, 1901., J. C. Heinrichs.
- : Das Zeichen für ꜥwn.= ZÄS 43 (1906), 74–76.
- Scheel, B.: Studien zum Metallhandwerk im alten Ägypten I. Handlungen und Beischriften in den Bildprogrammen der Gräber des Alten Reiches.= SAK 12 (1985), 117–177.
- Schenkel, W.: Die Farben in ägyptischer Kunst und Sprache.= ZÄS 88 (1963), 131–147.
- : Memphis – Herakleopolis – Theben. Die epigraphische Zeugnisse der 7–11. Dynastie Ägyptens. Wiesbaden, 1965., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : Die Wurzel bnj “süss”.= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 20 (1965), 115.
- : Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur im Ägyptischen.= OLZ 63/11–12 (1968), 533–541.
- : Die Bewässerungsrevolution im Alten Ägypten. Mainz/Rhein, 1978., Philipp von Zabern.
- : Kritische Anmerkungen zur Methode der Bestimmung von Lautgesetzen für die Rekonstruktion ägyptischer Nachtonvokale.= Görg, M. & Pusch, E. (Hrsg. unter Mitwirkung von A. Wuckelt und K.-J. Seyfried): *Festschrift Elmar Edel*. 12. März 1979. Ägypten und Altes Testament. Studien zu Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des Alten Testaments. Bamberg, 1979., Manfred Görg, Bamberg. Als Manuskript gedruckt, in Kommission Verlag Harrassowitz Wiesbaden (publisher not indicated). Pp. 369–389.
- : Aus der Arbeit an einer Konkordanz zu den altägyptischen Sargtexten. Teil I: Zur Transkription des Hieroglyphisch-Ägyptischen (unter Mitarbeit von Rainer Hannig). Teil II: Zur Pluralbildung des Ägyptischen. Wiesbaden, 1983., Harrassowitz.
- : Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen. Wiesbaden, 1983., Harrassowitz.
- : Weiteres zur Transkription des Hieroglyphisch-Ägyptischen. IV.= GM 86 (1985), 33–36.
- : z3.t “Kindchen”, t3.t “Jüngchen”.= *Göttinger Miscellen* 84 (1985), 65–70.
- : Das Wort für “König (von Oberägypten)”.= GM 94 (1986), 57–73.
- : Zu den Verschluss- und Reibelauten im Ägyptischen und (Hamito)Semitischen. Ein Versuch zur Synthese der Lehrmeinungen.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 3 (1993), 137–149.
- : Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift. Tübingen, 1997., Universität Tübingen.
- : *múh̄n̄t “Fähre”. Die Graphie mw̄ des Nominalbildungspräfixes m: in den Sargtexten, Schreiberlaune und Indiz für die Vokalisation.= GM 168 (1999), 87–100.
- : 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.

- : Ägyptisch wnm “essen”. Zur Interpretation der Graphien.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 10 (2002), 59–77.
- Schlee, G.: *Sprachliche Studien zum Rendille: Grammatik, Texte, Glossar*. Hamburg, 1978., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Schneider, Th.: Sur l'étymologie de ncr “dieu”. A propos d'une interprétation récente.= *Studi di Egittologia e di Antichità Puniche* 12 (1993), 77–86.
- : Zur Etymologie der Bezeichnung “König von Ober- und Unterägypten”.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 120/2 (1993), 166–181.
- : Review of Hoch, J. E.: *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*.= *Orientalia* NS 65 (1996), 174–177.
- : Beiträge zur sogenannten “neueren Komparatistik”. Zum Gedenken an Otto Rössler (1907–1991).= *Lingua Aegyptia* 5 (1997), 189–209.
- : *Ausländer in Ägypten während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit. Teil 1. Die ausländischen Könige*. Wiesbaden, 1998., Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Schott, S.: *Schreiber und Schreibgerät im Jenseits*.= *JEA* 54 (1968), 45–49.
- Schröder, P.: *Die phönizische Sprache. Entwurf einer grammatik, nebst Sprach- und Schriftproben. Mit einem Anhang, enthaltend eine Erklärung der punischen Stellen im Ponulus des Plautus*. Halle, 1869., Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Schubert, K.: *Kola Wordlist. MS. Moloko*, 1971. 18 p.
- : *Matakam Word List. MS. Mokolo (Noth Cameroon)*, 1971–72. 11 p.
- : (Manuscript from 1978).
- Schuh, R. G.: *Notes to Bade Dialect Map*.= *Africana Marburgensia* 5/2 (1972), 50–56.
- : *Nunation and Gender in Bade*.= *Afrika und Übersee* 58/2 (1975), 106–119.
- : *Bade/Ngizim Verbal System and Its Afroasiatic Nature*.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 3/1 (1976), 1–14.
- : *West Chadic Verb Classes*.= Newman, P. & Ma Newman, R. (eds.): *Papers in Chadic Linguistics*. Leiden, 1977., Afrika-Studiecentrum. Pp. 143–166.
- : *Bole-Tangale Languages of the Bauchi Area (Northern Nigeria)*. Berlin, 1978., Dietrich Reimer.
- : *Bade/Ngizim Vowels and Syllable Structure*.= *Studies in African Linguistics* 9/3 (1978), 247–283.
- : *A Dictionary of Ngizim*. Berkeley, California, 1981., University of California.
- : *An Early Nineteenth Century Chadic Wordlist: Kallaghee*.= *Africana Marburgensia* 14/2 (1981), 43–54.
- : *The Hausa Language and Its Nearest Relatives*.= *Harsunan Nijeriya* 12 (1982), 1–24.
- : *West Chadic Vowel Correspondences*.= Bynon, J. (ed.): *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 167–223.
- : *Shira, Teshena, Auyo: Hausa's (Former) Eastern Neighbors*.= *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 16–17 (2001), 387–435.
- Schulman, A. R.: *Mhr and Mškb, Two Egyptian Military Titles of Semitic Origin*.= *ZÄS* 93 (1966), 123–132.
- Schweitzer, S. D.: *Verbalklassen und Verbalklassenwechsel am Beispiel des koptischen Stativs KHK⁺*.= Blöbaum, A. I. & Kahl, J. & Schweitzer, S. D. (Hrsg.): *Ägypten-Münster. Kulturwissenschaftliche Studien zu Ägypten, dem Vorderen Orient und verwandten Gebieten, donum natalicium viro doctissimo Erharto Graefe sexagenario ab amicis collegis discipulis ex aedibus Schlaunstraße 2 / Rosenstraße 9 oblatum*. Wiesbaden, 2003., Harrassowitz. Pp. 233–248.
- 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.
- SDAIK = *Sonderschrift des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo*.
- SED I = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A. (with assistance of A. Belova, A. Kovalev, A. Nemirovskaja, D. Nonsitsyn): *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.
- Segert, S.: *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language with Selected Texts and Glossary.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1984., University of California Press.
- Seibert, P.: *Die Charakteristik. Untersuchungen zu einer altägyptischen Sprechsitte und ihren Ausprägungen in Folklore und Literatur. Teil I. Philologische Bearbeitung der Bezeugungen.* Wiesbaden, 1967., Harrassowitz.
- Seibert, U.: *Comparative Ron Wordlist.* MS. Frankfurt, 2000. 45 & 17 p.
- : *Studien zum Vokabular der Landwirtschaft im Syrischen I.= Altorientalische Forschungen 15/1 (1988), 133–173.*
- : *Studien zum Vokabular der Landwirtschaft im Syrischen II.= Altorientalische Forschungen 16/1 (1989), 89–139.*
- Seignobos, Ch. & Tourneux, H.: *Note sur les baldamu et leur langue (Nord-Cameroun).*= *Africana Marburgensia 17/1 (1984), 13–30.*
- SEL = *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico (Verona).*
- Sethe, K.: *Der Lauthwert des Horusnamens der Königs Cheops.*= *ZÄS 30 (1892), 52–56.*
- : *Das Zahlwort 10.*= *ZÄS 34 (1896), 90.*
- : *Das ägyptische Verbum im Altaegyptischen, Neuägyptischen und Koptischen. Bd. I–III.* Leipzig, 1899–1902., J. C. Hinrichs.
- : *Koptische Etymologien.*= *ZÄS 38 (1900), 145–148.*
- : *Das Wort für “zimmern”.*= *ZÄS 42 (1905), 142.*
- : *Der Name der Göttin Neith.*= *ZÄS 43 (1906), 144–147.*
- : *Bemerkungen zur “Geschichte des Schiffbrüchigen” (Im Anschluß an Ermans Bearbeitung dieses Textes in ÄZ.43).*= *ZÄS 44 (1907), 80–87.*
- : *Zur Reform der ägyptischen Schriftlehre.*= *ZÄS 45 (1908), 36–43.*
- : *Neue Spuren der Hyksos in Inschriften der 18. Dynastie.*= *ZÄS 47 (1910), 73–86.*
- Sethe, K. & Gardiner, A. H.: *Zur Vokalisation des Dualis im Ägyptischen. Der Name von Gebelén und der Name des Gottes Antaios.*= *ZÄS 47 (1910), 42–59.*
- Sethe, K.: *Das Wort für König von Oberägypten.*= *ZÄS 49 (1911), 15–34.*
- : *Zur altägyptischen Sage vom Sonnenauge, das in der Fremde war.* Leipzig, 1912., J. C. Hinrichs.
- : *Der Name des Gottes Sukhos.*= *ZÄS 50 (1912), 80–83.*
- : *Das Wort für “Hand” im Ägyptischen und der Laut d.*= *ZÄS 50 (1912), 91–99.*
- : *Die ägyptischen Worte für “hier” und “dort”.*= *ZÄS 50 (1912), 99–103.*
- : *Das perfektische Hilfsverbum w3ḥ im Demotischen und Koptischen.*= *ZÄS 52 (1914), 112–116.*
- : *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern und was für andere Völker und Sprachen daraus zu lernen ist.* Strassburg, 1916., Karl J. Trübner.
- : *Der Ursprung des Alphabets.*= *Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Geschäftliche Mitteilungen, Heft 2 (1916).*
- : *Spuren der Perserherrschaft in der späteren ägyptischen Sprache.*= *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse (1916), 112–133.*
- : *Der Lauthwert von...* = *ZÄS 57 (1922), 137.*
- : *mśn.w “Harpunierer” (Ä.Z. 54, 50).*= *ZÄS 57 (1922), 137–138.*
- : *Die Vokalisation des Ägyptischen.*= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 77 (1923), 145–207.*
- : *Die Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefäßscherben des Mittleren Reiches.* Berlin, 1926., Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- : *Die ägyptischen Ausdrücke für “jeder” und ihre semitischen Entsprechungen, ein neues Zeugnis für die Verwandtschaft des Ägyptischen mit den semitischen Sprachen.*= *Zeitschrift für Semitistik 5 (1927), 1–5.*

- : Neuägyptisches m-dr für m-dj. Mit Beiträgen zur Erklärung des Amenemope-Buches. Die angebliche Bezeichnung des Vokals ě im Demotischen.= ZÄS 62 (1927), 5–13.
- : Aaron Ember.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 62 (1927), 130–131.
- : Dramatische Texte zu altägyptischen Mysterienspielen. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 10. Hildesheim, 1928., Georg Olms Verlag.
- : Atum als Ichneumon.= ZÄS 63 (1928), 50–53.
- : Zum Namen Pharbaithos.= ZÄS 63 (1928), 99.
- : Zu ÄZ 62, 83ff.= ZÄS 63 (1928), 99–101.
- : Die beiden alten Lieder von der Trinkstätte in den Darstellungen des Luxorfestzuges.= ZÄS 64 (1929), 1–5.
- : Das Wort im “Seite” und der Ursprung der neuägyptischen Präposition irm(w) “mit”.= ZÄS 64 (1929), 9–12.
- : Urgeschichte und älteste Religion der Ägypter. Leipzig, 1930., Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in Kommission bei F. A. Brockhaus.
- : Die Bau- und Denkmalsteine der alten Ägypter und ihre Namen.= Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 22 (1933), 1–65.
- : Zur Geschichte der Einbalsamierung bei den Ägyptern und einiger damit verbundener Bräuche.= Sonderausgabe aus den Sitzungsberichten der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 13 (1934).
- Settgast, J.: Untersuchungen zu altägyptischen Bestattungsdarstellungen. Hamburg, 1963., J. J. Augustin.
- Seyfried, K.-J.: Zur Deutung der Bezeichnung [jmj.t-r] u.ä.= GM 23 (1977), 65–70.
- Shaheen, A.el-D. M.: Horned m ([m]) in the Egyptian Texts.= GM 152 (1996), 71–80.
- Shalunov, S.: The Prefix *ʔV- in Semitic. MS. Handout for the paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress (Moscow, April 1999). 2 p.
- Shatnawi, M. A.: Die Personennamen in den tamudischen Inschriften. Eine lexikalisch-grammatische Analyse im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung.= UF 34 (2002), 619–784.
- Shevoroshkin, V. V.: On Laryngeals.= Bammesberger, A. (ed.): Die Laryngalthorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems. Heidelberg, 1988., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. Pp. 527–546.
- Shimizu, K.: Boghom and Zaar: Vocabulary and Notes. MS. Kano, 1975. 40 p.
- : The Southern Bauchi Group of Chadic Languages. A Survey Report.= Africana Marburgensia. Special Issue 2 (1978), 1–50.
- : Mumuye-protowestnigritische Lautensprechungen und ihre Bedeutung für die Rekonstruktion des protonigritischen Ur-Lautsystems.= Afrika und Übersee 64 (1981), 3–23.
- Shore, A. F.: Smash Not Sieve: Heqanakhte II, Rt. 30.= JEA 76 (1990), 164–166.
- Sibomana, L.: Tarok-Erzählungen.= Afrika und Übersee 64 (1981), 249–279.
- Siebert, R. & Siebert, K. & Wedekind, K.: Survey on Languages of the Asosa – Begi – Komosha Area.= Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (S.L.L.E.) Reports 11 (1993), 1–22.
- Siebert, R.: Languages of the Abbaya/Chamo Area – Report Part I (with Notes on Koorete by L. Hoefl).= Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (S.L.L.E.) Reports 21 (1994), 1–24.
- Siebert, R. & Wedekind, Ch.: Third S.L.L.E. Survey on Languages of the Begi/Asosa Area.= Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (S.L.L.E.) Reports 15 (1994), 1–19.
- Siebert, R.: A Survey of the Male Language.= Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (S.L.L.E.) Reports 24 (1994–95), 1–12.
- : Dime Lexicon. MS. 1996.

- Sima, A.: *Tiere, Pflanzen, Steine und Metalle in den altsüdarabischen Inschriften. Eine lexikalische und realienkundliche Untersuchung.* Wiesbaden, 2000., Harrassowitz.
- : *Der Lautwandel $s^3 > s^1$ und $s^1 > s^3$ im Sabäischen.* = ZDMG 151 (2001), 251–262.
- Simeone-Senelle, M. C. & Lonnet, A.: *Lexique soqotri: les noms des parties du corps.* = Kaye, A. S. (ed.): *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau. Volume II.* Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 1443–1487.
- : *Compléments à “Lexique soqotri: les noms des parties du corps”.* = *Matériaux Arabes et Sudarabiques* NS 4 (1992), 85–108.
- Simeone-Senelle, M.-C.: *The Modern South Arabian Languages.* = Hetzron, R. (ed.): *The Semitic Languages.* London, New York, 1997., Routledge. Pp. 378–423.
- Simons, P.: *Lele Wordlist.* MS. Marwa, July-August 1981. 42 p.
- Sirlinger, E.: *Dictionary of the Goemay Language.* Jos, Nigeria, 1937., Prefecture Apostolic of Jos.
- 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-p-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.
- SISAJa II = D'jakonov, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.; Stolbova, O. V.: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskih jazykov.* Vypusk 2. t-t-d. = *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka.* XVI godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR. Moskva, 1982., Nauka. Pp. 3–93.
- SISAJa III = D'jakonov, I. M.; Belova, A. G.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Porhomovskij, V. Ja.; Stolbova, O. V.: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskih jazykov.* Vypusk 3. s-c-č-ž, č-č-ž, š-č-č s labialami. = *Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka.* XVI godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR. Moskva, 1986., Nauka. Pp. 3–46.
- Sivan, D. & Cochavi-Rainey, Z.: *West-Semitic Vocabulary in Egyptian Script of the 14th to the 10th Century BCE.* Negev, 1992., Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.
- Sjöberg, Å. W.: *Studies in the Emar S^a Vocabulary.* = ZA 88 (1998), 240–283.
- Skinner, M. G.: *Aspects of Pa'anci Grammar.* Ph.D. thesis. Madison, 1979., University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Skinner, N.: */ts/ and /k/ in Hausa.* = *Anthropological Linguistics* 13/6 (1971), 301–310.
- : *A Note on the North Bauchi Language Group (with Map).* = *Africana Marburgensia* 7/1 (1974), 47–50.
- : *North Bauchi Chadic Languages: Common Roots.* = *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 4/1 (1977), 1–49.
- : *“Fly” (Noun) and “Mouth” in Afroasiatic.* = *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 4/1 (1977), 51–62.
- : *Domestic Animals in Chadic.* = Newman, P.; Newman, R. M. (eds.): *Papers in Chadic Linguistics.* Leiden, 1977., Afrika-Studiecentrum. Pp. 175–198.
- : *Loans in Hausa and Pre-Hausa: Some Etymologies.* = Jungraihtmayr, H. (ed.): *Berliner afrikanistische Vorträge.* XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Berlin, 1980. Berlin, 1981., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 169–202.
- : *Afroasiatic Vocabulary. Evidence for Some Culturally Important Items.* = *Africana Marburgensia. Sonderheft* 7 (1984), 1–64.
- : *“Eye” and “Tongue” in Afroasiatic.* = Jungraihtmayr, H.; Müller, W. W. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20–22 September, 1983.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 73–83.
- : *Body Parts in Hausa – Comparative Data.* = Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E. R. & Thomanek, K. Ě. (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.
- : Evidence for Earlier Nominal Affixation in Afroasian.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (Hrsg.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 25–35.
- : *Hausa Comparative Dictionary*. Köln, 1996., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- : *dyi/*gyi, *maʔ- and *am in Non-Khoisan African Languages.= Jungraithmayr, H.; Barreteau, D.; Seibert, U. (éds.): *L'homme et l'eau dans le bassin du Lac Tchad*. Paris, 1997., ORSTOM. Pp. 73–80.
- Śliwa, J.: *Studies in Ancient Egyptian Handcraft. Woodworking*= *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, prace archeologiczne* 21 (1975), 1–82.
- SLLE = Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (Addis Abeba).
- Smith, H. S.: Three Coptic Etymologies.= *JEA* 44 (1958), 122.
- : Some Coptic Etymologies.= *JEA* 61 (1978), 197–200.
- : Review of CED.= *BSOAS* 41 (1978), 358–362.
- : *Varia Ptolemaica*.= Ruffle, J.; Gaballa, G. A.; Kitchen, K. A. (eds.): *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt. Studies in Honour of H.W. Fairman*. Warminster, 1979., Aris & Phillips. Pp. 161–166.
- Smith, M.: On Some Orthographies of the Verbs m3 'See', mn 'Endure' in Demotic and Other Egyptian Texts.= Thissen, H.-J. & Zauzich, K.-Th. (eds.): *Grammata Demotika. Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983*. Würzburg, 1984., Gisela Zauzich. Pp. 193–210.
- : *Lexicographical Notes on Demotic Texts*.= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 387–391.
- : *Mortuary Texts of Papyrus BM 10507*. London, 1987., British Museum Publications Ltd.
- : *Egyptian Invective. A Review Discussion of Der verkommene Harfenspieler: eine altägyptische Invektive (PWien KM 3877), by H. J. Thissen*.= *JEA* 86 (2000), 173–187.
- Smith, S. & Gadd, C. J.: *A Cuneiform Vocabulary of Egyptian Words*.= *JEA* 11 (1925), 230–240.
- Smith, W. S.: *The Coffin of Prince Min-Khaf*.= *JEA* 19 (1933), 150–159.
- : *The Old Kingdom Linen List*.= *ZÄS* 71 (1935), 134–149.
- Smither, P. C.: *A Coptic Love-Charms*.= *JEA* 25 (1939), 173–174.
- : *A New Use of the Preposition m*.= *JEA* 25 (1939), 166–169.
- Soden, W. von: *Zum akkadischen Wörterbuch*. 61–66.= *Orientalia NS* 24 (1955), 136–145.
- : *Zum akkadischen Wörterbuch*. 67–80.= *Orientalia NS* 24 (1955), 377–394.
- : *Vedisch magham 'Geschenk' – neuarabisch mağğaniyā 'Gebührenfreiheit': Der Weg einer Wortsippe*.= *JEOL* 18 (1965), 339–344.
- : *N als Wurzelaugment im Semitischen*.= *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 17/2–3 (1968), 175–184.
- Sokoloff, M.: *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Bizantine Period*. Ramat-Gan, 1990., Bar Ilan University Press.
- Sottas, H.: "Mnw" = Socle.= *Revue Égyptologique, nouvel série* 1 (1919), 28–29.
- : *Remarques sur le "poème satirique"*.= *Revue Égyptologique, nouvel série* 1/3–4 (1919), 129–147.
- Sottile, R.: *The Consonant System of Gamu*.= 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. 427–446.

- Souley, S.: *Le nom buduma, ses determinants et ses substitués*. M.A. thesis, Université Abdou Moumouni Dioffo (Republique du Niger), Niamey, 1993. 104 p.
- Sölken, H.: *Seetzens Áffádéh. Ein Beitrag zur Kotoko-Sprachdokumentation*. Berlin, 1967., Akademie-Verlag.
- Spalinger, A.: Notes on the Day Summary Accounts of P. Boulaq 18 and the Intradepartmental Transfers.= *SAK* 12 (1985), 179–241.
- Spaull, C. H. S.: Review of Edel, E.: *Die Felsengräber der Qubbet el-Hawa bei Assuan*. II. Abt. Bd. I.= *JEA* 55 (1969), 221–222.
- SPAW = Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin).
- Spencer, A. J.: Two Enigmatic Hieroglyphs and Their Relation to the Sed-Festival.= *JEA* 64 (1978), 52–55.
- Speidel, M. A.: *Die Friseure des ägyptischen Alten Reiches. Ein historisch-prosopographische Untersuchung zum Amt und Titel [jr-šn] (jr-šn)*. Konstanz, 1990., Hartung-Gorre Verlag.
- Spiegel, J.: *Das Auferstehungsritual der Unas-Pyramide*. Wiesbaden, 1971., Harrassowitz.
- Spiegelberg, W.: *Varia*.= *RT* 17 (1895), 93–99.
- : *Varia*.= *RT* 21 (1899), 39–55.
- : *Varia*.= *RT* 24 (1902), 30–36
- : *Varia*.= *RT* 24 (1902), 175–185.
- : *Koptische Miscellen*.= *RT* 26 (1904), 34–40.
- : *Varia*.= *RT* 26 (1904), 41–52.
- : mnš “Königsring” (Kartusche).= *ZÄS* 43 (1906), 158.
- : *Koptische Miscellen*.= *RT* 28 (1906), 204–214.
- : Eine ägyptische Darstellung des Peripteros-Tempels.= *ZÄS* 45 (1908), 86–87.
- : mrt “Weber” und die Hieroglyphe [mr].= *ZÄS* 45 (1908), 88–89.
- : Ägyptisches w3r = hebr. yeter (watar-) “Strick”.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 17/10 (1914), 424.
- : *Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenaug nach dem Leidener demotischen Papyrus I 384*. Strassburg, 1917., Schultz.
- : *Varia*.= *ZÄS* 53 (1917), 91–115.
- : *Demotische Miscellen*.= *ZÄS* 53 (1917), 116–129.
- : *Koptische Miscellen*.= *ZÄS* 53 (1917), 130–139.
- : *Koptische Etymologien. Beiträge zu einem koptischen Wörterbuch*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse*, 27. Abh. (1919–20), 1–63.
- : Ein Bruchstück des Bestattungsrituals der Apistiere (Demot. Pap. Wien Nr. 27).= *ZÄS* 56 (1920), 1–33.
- : *Die Begräbnisstätte der heiligen Kühe von Aphroditopolis (Atfih)*.= *OLZ* 11/12 (1920), 258–260.
- : *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1921., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- : *Zu dem Feuerbohrer*.= *ZÄS* 58 (1923), 150–151.
- : *Dd-mdw im Koptischen*.= *ZÄS* 59 (1924), 160.
- : *ⲁⲓⲈ (S) : ⲁⲓⲈ (B) “spinnen”*.= *OLZ* 27/10 (1924), 568–570.
- : *Demotische Grammatik*. Heidelberg, 1925., Carl Winter.
- : *Demotica I–II*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse* 6 (1925) & 2 (1928).
- : *Zu der Pluralbildung auf ê im Koptischen*.= *OLZ* 30/8 (1927), 655–657.
- : *Die Lesung von mw.t ‘Mutter’ und nw.t ‘Stadt’*.= *ZÄS* 63 (1928), 104–5.
- : *Die Vokalisation von mh.j.t “Nordwind”*.= *ZÄS* 65 (1930), 131.
- : *Aus der Geschichte von Zauberer Ne-nefer-ke-Sokar*.= *Studies presented to F.L. Griffith*. Oxford, 1932., Oxford University Press. Pp. 171–180.
- Springborg, P.: *Royal Persons: Patriarchal Monarchy and the Feminine Principle*. London, 1990., Unwin Hyman. Reviewed by J. G. Griffiths in *JEA* 80 (1994), 237–9.

- Stachelin, E.: Untersuchungen zur ägyptischen Tracht im Alten Reich. Dissertation, Universität Basel. Berlin, 1966., Verlag Bruno Hessling.
- Stadelmann, R.: Tempel und Tempelnamen in Theben-Ost und -West.= MDAIK 34 (1978), 171–180.
- Starostin, S. A.; Dybo, V. A.; Dybo, A. V.; Helimsky, E. A.; Militarev, A. Ju.; Mudrak, O. A.; Starostin, G. S.: Basic Nostratic-Afrasian-Sino-Caucasian Lexical Correspondences. Preliminary working version. MS. Moscow, 1995.
- : Statistical Evaluation of the Lexical Proximity Between the Main Linguistic Families of the Old World.= Kogan, L. (ed.): *Orientalia: Papers of the Oriental Institute. Issue III. Studia Semitica*. Moscow, 2003., Russian State University of Humanities. Pp. 464–484.
- Steindorff, G.: Mouillierung der Liquida [r] im Ägyptisch-Koptischen.= ZÄS 27/2 (1889), 106–110.
- : Zwei altkoptische Mumienetiketten.= ZÄS 28 (1890), 49–53.
- : Die keilschriftliche Wiedergabe ägyptischer Eigennamen.= *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 1 (1890), 330–361, 593–612.
- : Koptische Grammatik mit Chrestomathie, Wörterverzeichnis und Litteratur.¹ Berlin, 1894., Reuther und Reichard.
- : Koptische Grammatik mit Chrestomathie, Wörterverzeichnis und Litteratur.² Leipzig, 1904., J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- : Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik. Chicago, 1951., University of Chicago Press.
- Steiner, R. C.: Review of Johnstone, T. M.: *Ḥarsūsi Lexicon*.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 8/4 (1982), 189–200 (9–20).
- Steinthal, (?): Zur Sprachwissenschaft. I. Über die Verwandtschaft des semitischen und indoeuropäischen Sprachstammes mit einander.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 11 (1857), 396–426.
- Stern, L.: Die XXII. manethonische Dynastie.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 21 (1883), 15–26.
- Stolbova, O. V.: Soglasnye verhnezapadnočadskih jazykov. Genetičeskie sootvetstvija.= Makaev, Ė. A. (ed.): *Istoriko-tipologičeskie i sinhronno-tipologičeskie issledovanija (na materiale jazykov raznyh sistem)*. Moskva, 1972., Institut Jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- : Materialy k sravnitel'noj fonetike afrazijskih jazykov (zapadnočadskie rekonstrukcii).= Ivanov, V. V. & Bulatova, R. V. & Dybo, V. A. & Helimskij, E. A. (eds.): *Konferencija "Nostratičeskie jazyki i nostratičeskoe jazykoznanie"*. Tezisy dokladov. Moskva, 1977., Institut Slavjanovedenija i Balkanistiki Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 64–65.
- : Opyt rekonstrukcii verhnezapadnočadskih kornej.= *Jazyki zarubežnogo Vostoka. Sbornik statej*. Moskva, 1977., Nauka. Pp. 152–160.
- : Rekonstrukcija konsonantnoj sistemy zapadnočadskih jazykov.= *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. 80–115.
- : Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika i slovar' zapadnočadskih jazykov.= Porhomovskij, V. Ja. (ed.): *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie. Problemy rekonstrukcii*. Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 30–268.
- : Cushitic and West Chadic: Isoglosses and Cognate Sets.= Gromyko, A. A. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies (Moscow, 26–29 August 1988)*. Vol. 5. Moscow, 1988., Nauka. Pp. 114–119.
- : Lateral Sibilants in Chadic (Reconstruction) and Their Correspondences in Semitic and Egyptian. MS. Paper presented at the Symposium on Chadic and Hamito-Semitic, Frankfurt am Main, 6–8 May 1991. 9 p. Its shortened version was published in 1995 (see below).

- : Akkadian-Chadic Cognates. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 1 p.
- : Chadic Reflexes of Egyptian žš, šš, šz. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 2 p.
- : Lateral Sibilants in Chadic (Reconstruction) and Their Correspondences in Semitic and Egyptian.= Ibrizimow, D.; Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 58–64.
- : Kornevyje varianty v čadskih jazykah.= Koval', A. I. & Vinogradov, V. A. (eds.): *Problemy izučeniya jazykov Afriki. Materialy konferencii, posvjaščennoj 30-letiju otdela afrikanskih jazykov*. Moskva, 1995., Institut Jazykoznanija Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk. Pp. 148–155.
- : *Studies in Chadic Comparative Phonology*. Moscow, 1996., "Diaphragma" Publishers.
- : *Vocabulary of Water in Chadic*.= Jungraithmayr, H.; Barreteau, D.; Seibert, U. (éds.): *L'homme et l'eau dans le bassin du Lac Tchad*. Paris, 1997., ORSTOM. Pp. 81–87.
- : Akkadsko-čadskie leksičeskie paraleli.= *Istorija i jazyki Drevnego Vostoka: Pamjati I. M. D'jakonova*. Sankt-Peterburg, 2002., Institut Vostokovedeniya RAN – Sankt-Peterburgskij Filial. Pp. 268–279.
- : Sibilant Affricates in Chadic.= Bender, M. L. (chief ed.); Appleyard, D. & Takács, G. (eds.): *Selected Comparative-Historical Afroasiatic Linguistic Studies in Memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*. *Lincom Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics* 14. München & Newcastle, 2003., Lincom Europa. Pp. 291–306.
- : Chadic Lexical Database. Issue I. L, N, NY, R. Kaluga, 2005., Poligrafiya.
- : *Vocabulary of "Fishing" and "Hunting" in Chadic and Hamito-Semitic*.= Mengozzi, A. (ed.): *Studi Afroasiatici: XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemitica. Afro-Asiatic Studies: 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Milano, 2005., Francoangelli. Pp. 29–41.
- Strelcyn, S.: *Quelques éléments du vocabulaire magique éthiopien (séries verbales)*.= *GLECS* 5 (1948–51), 41–45.
- Stricker, B. H.: *Trois études de phonétique et de morphologie coptes*.= *Acta Orientalia* 15 (1937), 1–20.
- Strobel, A.: *Der spätbronzezeitliche Seevölkersturm. Ein Forschungsüberblick mit Folgerungen zur biblischen Exodusthematik*. Berlin, New York, 1976., Walter de Gruyter.
- Stroomer, H.: *A Comparative Study of Three Southern Oromo Dialects in Kenya*. Hamburg, 1987., Buske.
- : *A Grammar of Boraana Oromo (Kenya). Phonology, Morphology, Vocabularies*. Köln, 1995., Buske.
- : *A Concise Vocabulary of Orma Oromo (Kenya)*. Köln, 2001., Köppe.
- Strümpell, E.: *Vergleichendes Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen Adamauas*.= *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 42 (1910), 444–488.
- : *Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen des Mandara-Gebirges (Adamaua)*.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 13 (1922–23), 109–149.
- Stumme, H.: *Handbuch des Schilchischen von Tazerwalt*. Leipzig, 1899., J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- : *Gedanken über libysch-phönizische Anklänge*.= *ZÄS* 27 (1912), 121–128.
- : *Eine Sammlung über den berberischen Dialekt der Oase Siwe*.= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse* 66/2 (1914), 91–109.
- Sturtevant, E. H.: *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. New Haven, 1951., Yale University.
- Sudlow, D.: *The Tamasheq of North-East Burkina Faso. Notes on Grammar and Syntax Including a Key Vocabulary*. Köln, 2001., Köppe.
- Swynerton, G. H.: *Vernacular Names for Some of the Better-Known Mammals in the Central Province, Tanganyika*.= *Tanganyika Notes and Records* 21 (1946), 21–38.

- Taifi, M.: Dictionnaire tamazight-français (parlers du Maroc central). Paris, 1991., L'Harmattan-Awal.
- Taine-Cheikh, C.: Morphologie et morphogenèse des diminutifs en zénaga (berbère de Mauritanie).= Nait-Zerrad, K. (ed.): Articles de linguistique berbère. Mémorial Werner Vycichl. Paris, 2002., L'Harmattan. Pp. 427–454.
- : Dictionnaire zénaga-français. Berbère de Mauritanie. MS. Paris, 2006. 568 p.
- Tait, W. J.: Papyrus from Tebtunis in Egyptian and in Greek (P.Tebt.Tait). London, 1977., The Egypt Exploration Society.
- : P. Carlsberg 230: Eleven Fragments from a Demotic Herbal.= Frandsen, P. J. (ed.): Demotic Texts from the Collection. The Carlsberg Papyri 1. Copenhagen, 1991., The Carsten Niebuhr Institute of Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Museum Tusulanum Press. Pp. 47–92.
- Takács, G.: Egyptian *d3, *dn, *g3, *gn, and *qd “to be Round”.= General Linguistics 34 (1994), 44–54.
- : Egyiptomi *g3, *gn, *g3, *gn.= Antik Tanulmányok (1994), 172–175.
- : Some Notes on the History of Egyptian m3t “Ten”.= Folia Orientalia 30 (1994), 217–218.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica I.= Discussions in Egyptology 32 (1995), 93–99.
- : Some Egyptian Etymologies I.= Lingua Posnaniensis 37 (1995), 105–108.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica II.= Discussions in Egyptology 33 (1995), 123–131.
- : Egyptian m3t “to Think out”.= Archiv Orientální 63/2 (1995), 159–161.
- : The Afrasian Origin of Egyptian rm “Fish” (shortened version).= Koval', A. I. & Vinogradov, V. A. (eds.): Problemy izučeniya jazykov Afriki. Materialy konferencii posvjaščennoj 30-letiju Otdela Afrikanskih Jazykov Instituta Jazykoznanija Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk (Moskva, 4–6 dekabnja 1995 g.). Moskva, 1995., Institut Jazykoznanija RAN. Pp. 159–164.
- : Egyptian sb3 “Star”, sb3 “to Teach”, Their Origin and Related Questions.= Folia Orientalia 31 (1995), 177–188.
- : Towards the Etymology of Egyptian m3t “to Think out”.= Živa Antika 46/1–2 (1996), 13–21.
- : Some Berber Etymologies I.= Lingua Posnaniensis 38 (1996), 43–59.
- : The Afrasian Origin of Egyptian rm “Fish”.= Folia Orientalia 32 (1996), 89–93.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica III.= Discussions in Egyptology 34 (1996), 117–122.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica IV.= Discussions in Egyptology 35 (1996), 123–128.
- : Egyptian Lexics in an Afrasian Perspective: New Etymologies.= Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia 1 (1996), 125–171.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica VIII.= Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 28 (1996), 125–129.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica X.= Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia 1 (1996), 173–180.
- : Towards the Etymology of Egyptian md “Ten”.= Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae 49/3 (1996), 441–448.
- : Note on the Name of King Narmer.= Linguistica 37 (1997), 53–58.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica VII.= Discussions in Egyptology 39 (1997), 89–94.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XII.= Lingua Posnaniensis 39 (1997), 93–98.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica VI.= Discussions in Egyptology 38 (1997), 97–102.
- : Note on the Origin of Phonetic Value of Egyptian Hieroglyphs.= Lingua Posnaniensis 39 (1997), 99–103.
- : “Tired” and “Weak” in Egyptian and Afrasian.= Lingua Posnaniensis 39 (1997), 105–111.
- : Review of V. É. Orel and O. V. Stolbova: Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary.= Journal of Cuneiform Studies 49 (1997), 108–117.
- : Afrasian Numerals in Egyptian and Egyptian Numerals in Afrasian.= Lingua Aegyptia 5 (1997), 211–222.
- : Selected New Egypto-Afrasian Correspondences from the Field of Anatomical Terminology.= Bausi, A. & Tosco, M. (eds.): Afroasiatica Neapolitana. Papers from

- the 8th Italian Meeting of Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Naples, January 25–26, 1996. Napoli, 1997., Istituto Universitario Orientale. Pp. 225–250.
- : The Common Afrasian Nominal Class Marker *ḥ.= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 2 (1997), 241–273.
- : Two Observations on the Name of Osiris. II. On the Possible Afrasian Etymology of Osiris.= *Archív Orientální* 65/3–4 (1997), 249–254.
- : Note on the Origin of Indo-European *pes- “Penis”.= *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 25/3–4 (1997), 371–382.
- : The Etymology of Old Egyptian m3jn.w.= *Revue Roumaine d’Égyptologie* 2–3 (1998–99), 105–112. Published in 2001.
- : The Law of Belova in Work.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 51/2 (1998), 115–128.
- : Some Egyptian Etymologies. II.= *Živa Antika* 48/1–2 (1998), 125–132.
- : More on Egyptian rm “Fish”.= *Živa Antika* 48/1–2 (1998), 133–148.
- : Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) Substratum in the Proto-Indo-European Cultural Lexicon?=*Lingua Posnaniensis* 40 (1998), 141–172.
- : Refining Some Etymologies around the Root “Round” in Afrasian and Egyptian.= *General Linguistics* 36/3 (1998), 153–166.
- : Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) Comparative-Historical Linguistics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union. München, Newcastle, 1999., Lincom Europa.
- : The “Aleph Problem” in Ancient Egyptian.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 52/1 (1999), 101–122.
- : “Ear” and “Hear” in Egyptian and Afrasian.= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 4 (1999), 157–172.
- : History of Pero k in an Afro-Asiatic Perspective.= *Folia Orientalia* 35 (1999), 157–174.
- : History of Angas-Sura *č in an Afro-Asiatic Perspective.= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 41 (1999), 167–175.
- : Review of Solncev, V. M. (ed.): *Jazyki Azii i Afriki IV/2 – A New Contribution to Berber Comparative-Historical Linguistics* by A. Ju. Militarev: Some Etymological Notes.= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 41 (1999), 198–209.
- : Contribution of V. M. Illič-Svityč to Chadic Comparative-Historical Linguistics.= *Archív Orientální* 67 (1999), 361–378.
- : Sibilant and Velar Consonants of South Cushitic and Their Regular Correspondences in Egyptian and Other Afro-Asiatic Branches.= Lambert, 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.
- : South Cushitic Consonant System in Afro-Asiatic Context.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61 (2000), 69–117.
- : Proto-Afro-Asiatic Origin of “Gum”?= *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 63/1 (2000), 96–99.
- (jointly with Prof. H. Jungraithmayr): Altägyptisch zwr (swr) gleich berberotschadischem *sw-?=*Meißner, A. & Storch, A. (eds.): Nominal Classification in African Languages, Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter (Frankfurt)* 12 (2000), 113–125.
- : Tangale-Etymologien I.= *Meißner, A. & Storch, A. (eds.): Nominal Classification in African Languages, Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter* 12 (2000), 127–143.
- : Compensatoric Lengthening of *ā in East Cushitic: Some Marginal Etymological Notes.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61 (2000), 197–204.
- : Note on the Hapax bn.w in the Pyramid Texts.= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 42 (2000), 198–199.
- : Towards the Afro-Asiatic Etymology of Egyptian zš ‘To Write’.= *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 63/2 (2000), 261–273.

- : The Origin of Ahaggar h in an Afro-Asiatic Perspective.= Chaker, S. & Zaborski, A. (eds.): *Études berbères et chamito-sémitiques. Mélanges offerts à Karl-G. Prasse pour son 70^e anniversaire.* Paris & Louvain, 2000., Éditions Peeters. Pp. 333–356.
- : Recent Problems of Egyptian Historical Phonology at the Present Stage of Comparative-Historical Afroasiatic Linguistics.= Lecarme, J. & Lowenstamm, J. & Shlonsky, U. (eds.): *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar. Papers from the Third Conference on Afroasiatic Languages, Sophia Antipolis, France, 1996.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 2000., John Benjamins. Pp. 345–378.
- : Towards Proto-Afro-Asiatic Phonology: Ancient Remnants in South Cushitic, Angas-Sura, and North Bauchi = *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 54/2 (2001), 55–125.
- : Mokilko and Afro-Asiatic Comparative Linguistics.= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 44 (2002), 145–161.
- : Outline of a North Bauchi Historical Phonology.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 70 (2002), 167–190.
- : *Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XVI.*= Bács, T. (ed.): *Studia Aegyptiaca XVII. A Tribute to Excellence. Studies Offered in Honor of Ernő Gaál, Ulrich Luft, László Török.* Budapest, 2002., La Chaire d'Égyptologie. Pp. 455–471.
- : Questions of Egyptian and Afro-Asiatic Comparison.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 56/1 (2003), 59–132.
- : Some Berber Etymologies II: Berber Lexical Roots with *b-. = *Lingua Posnaniensis* 45 (2003), 93–119.
- : The Nature and Background of Angas-Sura *gʷ-: The Lexical Evidence.= *Folia Orientalia* 39 (2003), 105–122.
- (ed.): *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl.* Leiden, 2004., E. J. Brill.
- : *Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages.* Berlin, 2004., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : *Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XIX.*= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 57/2 (2004), 47–89.
- : *Angas-Sura Etymologies II.*= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 57/1 (2004), 55–68.
- : *Lexica Afroasiatica V.*= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 9 (2004), 159–178.
- : Some Berber Etymologies III: Berber Lexical Roots with *b-. = Naït-Zerrad, K. & Ibrizimow, D. & Voßen, R. (eds.): *Nouvelles études berbères Le verbe et autres articles. Actes du “2. Bayreuth-Frankfurter Kolloquium zur Berberologie”.* Berber Studies vol. 8. Köln, 2004., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. pp. 191–204.
- : *Afrasian and Nostratic: Addenda to the Nostratic Root List of A. B. Dolgopolsky.*= Hegedűs, I. & Sidwell, P. (eds.): *Nostratic Centennial Conference: The Pécs Papers.* Pécs, 2004., *Lingua Franca Group.* Pp. 193–227.
- : *Egyptian Lexicography and Etymology: Against or With Afro-Asiatic Comparison?*= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 58/2 (2005), 14–113.
- : *A Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages.*= Mengozzi, A. (ed.): *Studi Afroasiatici: XI Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camitosemitica. Afro-Asiatic Studies: 11th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics.* Milano, 2005., Francoangelli. Pp. 43–55.
- : *Problems of Afro-Asiatic Historical Phonology: Ancient Remnants of Sibilant Affricates in South Cushitic and Chadic.*= Fronzaroli, P. & Marrassini, P. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 10th Meeting of Hamito-Semitic (Afroasiatic) Linguistics (Florence, 18–20 April 2001).* *Quaderni di Semitistica* 25. Firenze, 2005., Dipartimento di Linguistica, Università di Firenze. Pp. 65–83.
- : *Aaron Ember and the Establishment of Egypto-Semitic Phonological and Lexical Comparison. Part I.*= *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 6/2 (2005), 78–101.
- : *Aegyptio-Afroasiatica IX (new version).*= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 47 (2005), 163–187.
- : *Some Berber Etymologies IV: Berber Lexical Roots with *f.*= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 10 (2005), 173–201.

- : Recent Problems of Semitic-Egyptian and Semito-Cushitic and -Chadic Consonant Correspondences.= Olmo Lete, G. del (ed.): Proceedings of the Barcelona Symposium on Comparative Semitic (19–20 November 2004), *Aula Orientalis* 23/1–2 (2005), 207–231.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XVII.= *Cahiers Caribéens d'Égyptologie* 7–8 (2005), 207–235.
- : New Progress in the Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic: Review of Kießling, Roland: Die Rekonstruktion der südkuschitischen Sprachen (West-Rift), Von den systemlinguistischen Manifestationen zum gesellschaftlichen Rahmen des Sprachwandels (Kuschitische Sprachstudien Band 19, Köln, 2002., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag) and Kießling, Roland & Mous, Maarten: The Lexical Reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic (Kuschitische Sprachstudien Band 21, Köln, 2004., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag).= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 47 (2005), 213–225.
- : “Sun” and “Moon” in Semitic and Egyptian in an Afro-Asiatic Context.= Apor, É. & Ormos, I. (eds.): *Goldziher Memorial Conference. Oriental Studies* 12. Budapest, 2005., Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Pp. 271–284.
- : Marginal Notes on “Working” in Egyptian.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 95 (2005), 325–345.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XI.= *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hung.* 58/4 (2005), 409–420.
- : 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.
- : Tamazight Lexicon and Its Afro-Asiatic Background: The Evidence of Root-Initial *q*- and *z*-.= Allati, A. et al. (eds.): *Linguistique amazighe: les nouveaux horizons. Actes du Colloque international: 17, 18, 19 février 2005. Tétouan, 2006, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Tétouan, Université Abdelmalek Essaâdi.* Pp. 48–63.
- : Otto Rössler's New System of Egypto-Semitic Consonant Correspondences. Part One.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 59/2 (2006), 90–127.
- : Comparative Angas-Sura Phonology in the Light of the Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages.= Ibrizimow, D. (ed.): *Papers from the 2nd Biennial International Colloquium on the Chadic Languages, Prague, October 11–12, 2003. Topics in Chadic Linguistics II.* Köln, 2006., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 105–132.
- : Angas-Sura Etymologies III.= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 48 (2006), 121–138.
- : Seventy Years after the First Attempt at Egyptian Etymological Dictionary: Evaluation of F. von Calice's “Grundlagen der ägypto-semitischen Wortvergleichung”.= *Lingua Posnaniensis* 48 (2006), 139–163.
- : Werner Vycichl and His Contribution to Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) Comparative Phonology and Lexicon.= Morel, Mary-Annick & Danon-Boileau, Laurent & Mettouchi, Amina & Lonnet, Antoine (eds.): *Faits de Langues sur les langues Chamito-Sémitiques (Afro-Asiatiques).* Paris, 2006. Pp. 154–171.
- : Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XXI.= Borbone, P. G. & Tosco, M. & Mengozzi, A. (eds.): *Loquentes linguis. Studi linguistici e orientali in onore di Fabrizio A. Pennacchiotti.* Wiesbaden, 2006., Harrassowitz Verlag. Pp. 675–683.
- Tal, A.: *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic. Vol. I–II.* Leiden, 2000., E. J. Brill.
- Talbot, P. A.: The Buduma of Lake Chad.= *Journal of the Royal Archaeological Institute* 41 (1911), 245–259.
- Tawfiq, S.: Der Palermostein als frühester Beleg für die Weihformel.= *Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar. Vol. II.* Le Caire, 1985., IFAO. Pp. 309–313.
- Tawil, H.: Hebrew škl – skl, Akkadian saklu: A Lexicographical Note III.= *Beit Mikra* 153 (1998), 216–203.

- : Late Hebrew-Aramaic spr, Neo-Babylonian sirpu/sirapu: A Lexicographical Note IV.= *Beit Mikra* 154–155 (1998), 339–344.
- Testen, D.: Arabic jāriyat-un “Girl, Slave Woman”.= *Die Welt des Orients* 23 (1992), 75–76.
- : On the Development of the Energetic Suffixes.= *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics V*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1993., John Benjamins. Pp. 293–311.
- Te Velde, H.: *Seth, God of Confusion*. Leiden, 1967., Brill.
- Thacker, Th. W.: *The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems*. Oxford, 1954, Clarendon Press.
- Thausing, G.: Über einh- Präfix im Ägyptischen.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 39 (1932), 287–294.
- : Ägyptische Confixe und die ägyptische Verbalkonstruktion.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 68 (1941), 5–34.
- Thelwall, R.: *Wordlists of Bedawye (Tibḏaawyi)*. MS. 7 February 1970. 9 p.
- Théodoridès, A.: La notion égyptienne de possession exprimée par la locution prépositive m-dī.= *RdE* 22 (1970), 139–154.
- Thiene, G. da: *Dizionario della lingua Galla con brevi nozioni grammaticali*. Harar, 1939., Vicariato Apostolico.
- Thissen, H.-J. & Kurth, D. & Weber, M.: *Kölner Ägyptische Papyri (P. Köln ägypt.)*. Band 1. *Papyrologica Coloniaensia*, Vol. IX. *Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Köln, 1980., Westdeutscher Verlag.
- : *Die Lehre des Ancheschoni* (PBM 10508). Bonn, 1984., Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH.
- : *Der Name Manetho*.= *Enchoria* 15 (1987), 93–96.
- : *Das verkommene Harfenspieler. Eine altägyptische Invektive (PWien KM 3877)*. Sommerhausen, 1992., Gisela Zauzich Verlag.
- Thomson, J. K.: *A Shield Bearer and Warrior of Ramesside Times*.= *JEA* 83 (1997), 218–222.
- Till, W. C.: *Achmîmisch-Koptische Grammatik mit Chrestomathie und Wörterbuch*. Leipzig, 1928., J. C. Hinrichs.
- : *Koptische Dialektgrammatik mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch*. München, 1931., C. H. Beck. 2nd ed. published in 1961.
- : *Das Pi^oel im Ägyptischen*.= *ZÄS* 73 (1937), 131–138.
- : *Die Arzneikunde der Kopten*. Berlin, 1951., Akademie-Verlag.
- : *Koptische Grammatik. Saïdischer Dialekt*. Leipzig, 1955., Otto Harrassowitz.
- : *Zum Sprachtabu im Ägyptischen*.= Firchow, O. (Hrsg.): *Ägyptologische Studien*. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 322–337.
- Tilmatine, M. (avec la collaboration de El Molghy, A.; Castellanos, C.; Banhakeia, H.): *La llengua rifenya Tutlayt tarifit*. 1. *Gramàtica Rifenya*. 2. *Lèxic bàsic Amazigh-Català-Francès*. 2a edició revisada, corregida i ampliada. Barcelona, 1998., Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Departament de Traducció i d'Interpretació.
- Tischler, J.: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck, since 1977, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- TLA = *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (Berlin) available at <http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/index.html>.
- Torczyner, H.: *Besprechung von Holma, H.: Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 66 (1912), 767–771.
- Tosco, M.: *A Grammatical Sketch of Dahalo*. Hamburg, 1991., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- : *The Dhaasanach Language. Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary of a Cushitic Language of Ethiopia*. Köln, 2001., Köppe.
- Toselli, P. G.: *Elementi di lingua magi. Grammatica e dizionario con alcuni cenni sulla popolazione magi*, a cura del P.G. Chiomio. Torino, 1939., Istituto Missioni Consolata.

- Tourneux, H.: Une langue tchadique disparue: le muskum.= *Africana Marburgensia* 10/2 (1977), 13–34.
- : Le mulwi ou vulum de Mogroum (Tchad). Langue du groupe musgu – famille tchadique. Paris, 1978., Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- : Première note sur le mbara.= *Africana Marburgensia* 11/2 (1978), 27–61.
- : Racine verbale en mulwi.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 89–93.
- : Le préfixe nominal a- en mulwi.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 203–208.
- & Seignobos, Ch. & Lafarge, F.: *Les Mbara et leur langue (Tchad)*. Paris, 1986., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.
- : Note complémentaire sur les baldamu et leur langue.= *Africana Marburgensia* 20/1 (1987), 52–58.
- : Place du masa dans la famille tchadique.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 249–260.
- : *Lexique pratique du munjuk des rizières. Dialecte de Pouss*. Paris, 1991., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- : L'argument linguistique chez Cheikh Anta Diop et ses disciples.= Fauvelle-Aymar, F.-X. & Chrétien, J.-P. & Perrot, C.-H. (eds.): *Afrocentrismes. L'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique*. Paris, 2000., Éditions Karthala. Pp. 79–102.
- Tritton, A. S.: The Place of n in Forming Semitic Roots.= *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7 (1933–35), 595–597.
- Trombetti, A.: Delle relazioni delle lingue caucasiche con le lingue camitosemitiche e con altri gruppi linguistici.= *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 15 (1902), 177–201.
- : *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).
- Tropper, J.: Das ugaritische Konsonanteninventar.= *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 20/2 (1994), 17–59.
- : Akkadisch nuḫḫutu und die Repräsentation des Phonems /h/ im Akkadischen.= *ZA* 85 (1995), 58–66.
- : *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Münster, 2000., Ugarit-Verlag.
- Troy, L.: *Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myth and History*. BOREAS. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations, 14. Uppsala, 1986., Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis.
- Tucker, A. N. & Bryan, M. A.: *Linguistic Survey of the Northern Bantu Borderland. Vol. Four: Languages of the Eastern Section, Great Lakes to Indian Ocean*. London, New York, 1957., Oxford University Press.
- : The “Mbugu” Anomaly.= *BSOAS* 37/1 (1974), 188–207.
- Tyloch, W.: The Evidence of Proto-Lexicon for the Cultural Background of the Semitic Peoples.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic. The Hague*, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 55–61.
- UEW = Rédei, K.: *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Budapest, 1986–1989., Akadémiai Kiadó.
- UF = Ugarit-Forschungen (Münster).
- Uljas, S.: The “Intrusive” [m] of Late Egyptian Independent Pronouns.= *GM* 206 (2005), 87–90.
- Ullendorf, E.: The Contribution of South Semitic to Hebrew Lexicography.= *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956), 190–198.
- Unseth, P.: *Linguistic Bibliography of the Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, Michigan, 1990., African Studies Center, Michigan State University.
- Urk. I = Sethe, K.: *Urkunden des Alten Reiches. Band I. 2. Auflage*. Leipzig, 1932–33., J. C. Hinrichs.

- Urk. II = Sethe, K.: Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit, Leipzig, 1904., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Urk. III = Schäfer, H.: Urkunden der älterer Äthiopienkönige. Heft 1–2. Leipzig, 1905., 1908., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Urk. IV = Sethe, K. & Helck, W.: Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Heft 1–16 & 17–22. Berlin, 1927–30., 1955–58., Akademie-Verlag.
- Urk. V = Grapow, H.: Religiöse Urkunden. Ausgewählte Texte des Totenbuches. Heft 1–3. Leipzig, 1915–16., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Urk. VI = Schott, S.: Urkunden mythologischen Inhalts. Heft 1–2. Leipzig, 1929., 1939., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Urk. VII = Sethe, K. & Erichsen, W.: Historisch-biographische Urkunden des Mittleren Reiches. I. Leipzig, 1935., J. C. Hinrichs.
- Urk. VIII = Firchow, O.: Thebanische Tempelinschriften aus griechisch-römischer Zeit. Berlin, 1957., Akademie-Verlag.
- ÜKAPT I–VI = Sethe, K.: Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten. I–VI. Glückstadt, Hamburg, 1935–62., J. J. Augustin.
- Vandersleyen, C.: Les guerres d'Amosis. Bruxelles, 1971., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth.
- Vandier, J.: Jousâas et (Hathor) Nebet-Hetepet.= RdE 17 (1965), 89–176.
—: Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne. Tome VI. Paris, 1978., Éditions A. et J. Picard.
- Velde, H. Te: Seth, God of Confusion. Leiden, 1967., Brill.
- Venberg, R.: Phonemic Statement of the Peve Language.= Africana Marburgensia 8/1 (1975), 26–43.
- Ventris, M. & Chadwick, J.: Documents in Mycenaean Greek. Three Hundred Selected Tablets from Knossos, Pylos and Mycenae with Commentary and Vocabulary. Cambridge, 1956., Cambridge University Press.
- Venturino, B.: Dizionario borana-italiano. Bologna, 1973., Editrice Missionaria Italiana.
- Vercoutter, J.: Mirgissa I. Paris, 1970., CNRS.
- Vergari, M. & Vergari, R.: A Basic Saho-English-Italian Dictionary. Asmara, Eritrea, 2003., (publisher not indicated).
- Vergote, J.: Phonétique historique de l'égyptien. Paris, 1945., Le Muséon.
—: Review of Erman, A. & Grapow, H.: Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache, Band VI.= Muséon 63 (1950), 289–294.
—: Où en est la vocalisation de l'égyptien? = BIFAO 58 (1959), 1–19.
—: Sur les mots composé en égyptien et en copte.= BiOr 18 (1961), 208–214.
—: Les dialectes dans le domaine égyptien.= CdÉ 36 (1961), 237–251.
—: Le Roi Moiris – Marès.= ZÄS 87 (1962), 66–76.
—: Le rapport de l'égyptien avec les langues sémitiques.= Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, klasse der letteren 27/4 (1965), 71–107.
—: Egyptian.= Hodge, C. T. (ed.): Afroasiatic. A Survey. The Hague, 1971., Mouton. Pp. 40–66.
—: Grammaire copte: introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie systématique (structure des sémantèmes). Tome Ia: partie synchronique. Ib: partie diachronique. Louvain, 1973., Peeters.
—: À propos du nom de Moïse.= BSEG 4 (1980), 89–95.
—: Pitaš ni mu?tu = 'coffre à brancard'.= Israelit-Groll, S. (ed.): Egyptological Studies, Scripta Hierosolymitana 28 (1982).
—: Grammaire copte. Morphologie syntagmatique. Tome IIb: partie diachronique. Louvain, 1983., Peeters.
—: La structure du nom Hatshepsout – *Aspesis.= Hommages à François Daumas. Montpellier, 1986., Université de Montpellier. Pp. 579–585.

- Verhouvern, U.: Grillen, Kochen, Backen im Alltag und im Ritual Altägyptens. Ein lexikographischer Beitrag. Bruxelles, 1984., Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth.
- Vernus, P.: Athribis. Textes et documents relatifs à la géographie, aux cultes et à l'histoire d'une ville du Delta égyptien à l'époque pharaonique. Le Caire, 1978., IFAO.
- : Études de philologie et linguistique (V).= RdE 37 (1986), 139–147.
- : Le vizir et le balancier.= Berger, C. & Mathieu, B. (éds.): Études sur l'Ancien Empire et la Nécropole de Saqqâra dédiées à Jean-Philippe Lauer. Montpellier, 1997., Université Paul Valéry. Pp. 437–443.
- : Situation de l'égyptien dans les langues du monde.= Fauvelle-Aymar, F.-X.; Chrétien, J.-P.; Perrot, C.-H. (éds.): Afrocentrismes. L'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique. Paris, 2000., Éditions Karthala.
- : Situation de l'égyptien dans les langues du monde.= Fauvelle-Aymar, F.-X. & Chrétien, J.-P. & Perrot, C.-H. (eds.): Afrocentrismes. L'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique. Paris, 2000., Éditions Karthala. Pp. 169–208.
- : Sagesses de l'Égypte pharaonique. Paris, 2001.
- VESO = Albright, W. F.: The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography. New Haven, Connecticut, 1934., American Oriental Society.
- Virolleaud, Ch.: Sur la transcription babylonienne du prénom Nb-m⁹t-r⁶ d'Aménophis III.= GLECS 4 (1945–48), 18.
- : Nouvelles questions de vocabulaire ougaritique.= GLECS 7 (1954–57), 21–23, 32–33, 45–46.
- Vittmann, G.: Nochmals zur Etymologie von mrk (WB II, 113).= Göttinger Miscellen 15 (1975), 45–46.
- : Zum koptischen Sprachgut im Ägyptisch-Arabischen.= WZKM 81 (1991), 196–227.
- : Ägyptisch-aramäische Kleinigkeiten.= WZKM 83 (1993), 233–246.
- : Die Autobiographie der Tathotis (Stele Wien 5857).= SAK 22 (1995), 283–323.
- : Semitisches Sprachgut im Demotischen.= WZKM 86 (1996), 435–447.
- : Besprechung von Hoch, J. E.: Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period.= WZKM 87 (1997), 277–288.
- Voigt, R. M.: Zur semitohamitischen Wortvergleihung.= Göttinger Miscellen 107 (1989), 87–95.
- : Die Lateralreihe /š, ś, z/ im Semitischen.= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 142 (1992), 37–52.
- : Die Entsprechung der ursematischen Interdentale im Altäthiopischen.= Heinrichs, W. & Schoeler, G. (eds.): Festschrift Ewald Wagner zum 65. Geburtstag. Band 1. Semitische Studien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Südsemitistik. Beirut, 1994., im Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart. Pp. 102–117.
- : Der Lautwandel s³ > s¹ und s¹ > s³ im Altsüdarabischen.= Le Muséon 111 (1998), 173–186.
- : Vergleichende Tschadistik heute – Fortschritte in der tschadischen und semitohamitischen Komparatistik. Besprechung von Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibrizimow, D.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Vol. I–II.= Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 93/6 (1998), 607–619.
- : Die Präpositionen im Semitischen: Über Morphologisierungprozesse im Semitischen.= Edzard, L. & Nekroumi, M. (eds.): Tradition and innovation: Norm and deviation in Arabic and Semitic linguistics. Wiesbaden, 1999., Harrassowitz. Pp. 22–43.
- : The Hamitic Connection: Semitic and Semitohamitic.= IOS 20 (2002), 265–290.
- Vollers, K.: Beiträge zur Kenntniss der lebenden arabischen Sprache in Aegypten.= ZDMG 50 (1896), 607–657.

- Volten, A.: Demotische Traumdeutung (Pap. Carlsberg XIII und XIV Verso). Kopenhagen, 1942., Ejnar Munksgaard.
- : Zwei ägyptische Wörter, die im Wörterbuch nicht stehen.= Firchow, O. (Hrsg.): Ägyptologische Studien. Berlin, 1955., Akademie-Verlag. Pp. 362–365.
- : L'étymologie de deux mots coptes.= Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 58 (1959), 21–28.
- : Ägypter und Amazonen.= Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek NS 6 (1962).
- Vos, R. L.: The Apis Embalming Ritual. P.Vindob. 3873. Leuven, 1993., Peeters.
- Voßen, R.: The Eastern Nilotes. Linguistic and Historical Reconstructions. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- : Comparative Eastern Nilotic.= Bender, M. L. (ed.): Nilo-Saharan Language Studies. East Lansing, Michigan, 1983., Michigan State University. Pp. 177–207.
- VT = Vetus Testamentum (Leiden).
- Vycichl, W.: Aigyptiaka. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Hamitosemitistik.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 40 (1933), 171–180.
- : 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.
- : Über ein ḥ- Präfix im Arabischen.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 43 (1936), 109–110.
- : Pi-Solsel, ein Dorf mit koptischer Überlieferung.= MDAIK 6 (1936), 169–175.
- : Festgabe für Hermann Junker zu seinem 60. Geburtstag.= Archiv für Ägyptische Archaeologie 1/6 (1938), 131–140.
- : Der Pi'el im Koptischen.= ZÄS 74 (1938), 148.
- : Ein medizinischer Ausdruck im Papyrus Ebers.= Archiv für Ägyptische Archaeologie 1/7 (1938), 157.
- : Nochmals das arabische ḥa- Präfix.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 46 (1939), 141–142.
- : Eine vorhamitische Sprachschicht im Altägyptischen.= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 101 (1951), 67–77.
- : Punischer Spracheinfluss im Berberischen.= Journal of Near Eastern Studies 11 (1952), 198–204.
- : Die ägyptischen Ausdrücke für "Selbst".= Muséon 66 (1953), 41–44.
- : Das persönliche Fürwort im Bedja und im Tigré. Eine Studie zur Grammatik und Religionsgeschichte der Bedja Stämme.= Muséon 66 (1953), 157–161.
- : Über eine Klasse ägyptischer Verbum ult. j.= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 53 (1953), 373–377.
- : Der bestimmte Artikel in der Bedja-Sprache. Seine Beziehungen zum Ägyptischen und Berberischen.= Muséon 66 (1953), 373–379.
- : Die ägyptischen Pronominalendungen. Ihre vokalische Aussprache und ihre Funktion untersucht im Zusammenhang mit ihren Entsprechungen im hamitischen und semitischen Sprachen.= Muséon 66 (1953), 381–389.
- : Gab es eine Pluralendung -w im Ägyptischen? = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 105 (1955), 261–270.
- : Der Umlaut in den Berbersprachen Nordafrikas. Eine Einführung in die berberische Sprachgeschichte.= Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 52 (1955), 304–325.
- : Varia Grammatica.= Kush 4 (1956), 39–47.
- : Pi'elformen im Ägyptischen und im Koptischen. Die Etymologie von koptisch ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲏ "wissen".= Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 5 (1957), 10–25.
- : Über den Wechsel der Laute ḥ und ġ im Ägyptischen.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 82 (1957), 71–73.

- : L'article défini du berbère.= *Mémorial André Basset*. Paris, 1957., Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve. Pp. 139–146.
- : Die Selbstlaute. Zur Lautlehre der ägyptischen Sprache.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 54 (1957), 214–221.
- : Ein passives Partizip im Ägyptischen und im Hausa (British Nigeria). Die passive Konjugation sgmm-f.= *Muséon* 70/3–4 (1957), 353–356.
- : Die Bildung des Duals im Ägyptischen. Die Vokalisation des Zahlwortes snau "Zwei".= *Muséon* 70/3–4 (1957), 357–365.
- : Über eine ägyptische und arabische Bezeichnung des Kalksteins.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 52/9–10 (1957), 393–395.
- : The Present State of Meroitic Studies.= *Kush* 6 (1958), 74–81.
- : Ägyptisch mr "Pyramide" und seine arabische Etymologie.= *Muséon* 71 (1958), 149–152.
- : A Late Egyptian Dialect of Elephantine.= *Kush* 6 (1958), 176–178.
- : Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung.= *MDAIK* 16 (1958), 367–405.
- : Is Egyptian a Semitic Language?=*Kush* 7 (1959), 27–44.
- : Nouveaux aspects de la langue égyptienne.= *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 58 (1959), 49–72.
- : Studien der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung. Die Klassifikation der Etymologien. Zwölf neue Etymologien.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 84 (1959), 70–74.
- : Ägyptisch-semitische Anklänge.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 84 (1959), 145–147.
- : Gedenken zur ägyptisch-semitischen Sprachverwandtschaft.= *Muséon* 73 (1960), 173–176.
- : The Beja Language Tū Beḏawīye. Its Relationship with Old Egyptian.= *Kush* 8 (1960), 252–264.
- : Berber Words in Nubian.= *Kush* 9 (1961), 289–290.
- : Die durative Form zweiradikaliger Verben im Ägyptischen und in den Berbersprachen.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 88 (1963), 148–150.
- : Die Verben der Klasse UBAK, UFAD, UHAL im Tuareg.= *Muséon* 77 (1964), 225–230.
- : Tuareg "takuba", hausa "takobi" "Schwert, spada".= *Annali, Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* NS 15 (1965), 279–283.
- : Die 2-radikaligen Verben des Ägyptischen und Berbersprachen.= *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 23 (1966), 247–248.
- : Sprachliche Beziehungen zwischen Ägypten und Afrika.= *Lukas, J. (ed.): Neue afrikanistische Studien*. Hamburg, 1966., Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung. Pp. 265–272.
- : Sumerisch AN.BAR, armenisch erkath "Eisen".= *Handes Amsorya* 81 (1967), 67.
- : Linguistique et comparatisme.= *Textes et langages de l'Égypte pharaonique. Cent cinquante années de recherches 1822–1972. Hommage à Jean-François Champollion*. Le Caire, 1972., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire. Pp. 81–89.
- : Sur les noms des parties du corps en égyptien.= *Chronique d'Égypte* 47 (1972), 173–182.
- : Les emprunts aux langues sémitiques.= *Textes et langages de l'Égypte pharaonique. Cent cinquante années de recherches 1822–1972. Hommage à Jean-François Champollion*. Le Caire, 1972., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire. Pp. 219–230.
- : Berberisch tinelli "Faden, Schnur" und seine semitische Etymologie.= *Muséon* 85/1–2 (1972), 275–279.
- : Ushebti. Die Vokalisation des ägyptischen Verbaladjektivs.= *Muséon* 85/3–4 (1972), 533–534.

- : Les études chamito-sémitiques à l'Université de Fribourg et le "Lamekhitique".= Caquot, A. & Cohen, D. (eds.): Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique, Paris 16–19 juillet 1969. Paris, 1974., Mouton. Pp. 60–67.
- : Nafāfir und nafāfāraw. Punktuelle und durative Partizipien des frequentativen Verbums in der ägyptischen Sprache.= Drevnij Vostok. Sbornik 1. Moskva, 1975., Nauka. Pp. 39–41.
- : Egyptian and Other Hamito-Semitic Languages.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 201–212.
- : Begadkefat im Berberischen.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 315–317.
- : L'état actuel des études chamito-sémitiques.= Fronzaroli, P. (ed.): Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semítica, Firenze, 16–19 aprile 1974. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 63–76.
- : Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte. Leuven, 1983., Peeters.
- : Linguistica comparativa camito-semitica.= Pennacchietti, F. & Roccati, A. (eds.): Atti della Terza Giornata di Studi Camito-Semítici e Indoeuropei. Roma, 1984., Università degli Studi "La Sapienza". Pp. 19–27.
- : Das Verbalnomen zweiradikaliger Verben im Ägyptischen.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 111 (1984), 78–82.
- : Hamitic and Semitic Languages.= Bynon, J. (ed.): Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 483–488.
- : Eine altägyptische Bezeichnung für "Milch".= Discussions in Egyptology 1 (1985), 67–71.
- : Das Zeichen für d "Hand" in der Hieroglyphenschrift und die semitischen Entsprechungen des zugrunde liegende Etymons.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 112 (1985), 169–179.
- : The Origin of the Hamito-Semitic Languages.= Jungrauthmayr, H. & Müller, W. W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20–22 September 1983. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 109–121.
- : Beja – A Language with Seven Seals.= Becchaus-Gerst, M. & Serzisko, F. (eds.): Cushitic-Omotc. Papers from the International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6–9, 1986. Hamburg, 1988., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 411–430.
- : Arabisch nāq-a.t "Kamelstute": ein altes passives Partizip (ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Hamitosemitistik).= Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1988., John Benjamins. Pp. 483–489.
- : Études de phonétique et d'étymologie berbères.= Journée d'Études de Linguistique Berbère Samedi 11 mars (1989), 1–18.
- : Die hamitosemitische Bezeichnung der "Zunge".= Mediterranean Language Review 4–5 (1989), 23–41.
- : La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne. Tome I^{er}. La phonétique. Le Caire, 1990., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- : 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.
- : L'étymologie sémitique de berbère tameṭṭut "femme". Le ḥ emphatique en touareg et en arabe dialectal d'Égypte.= Annali, Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli 50/1 (1990), 79–82.

- : Hundert Jahre hamito-semitische Forschung.= Mukarovskij, H. G. (ed.): Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 103–109.
- : L'origine des verbes monoradicaux en haoussa.= Jungräthmayr, H. (éd.): Verbes monoradicaux. Paris, 1990., Paul Geuthner. Pp. 221–227.
- : Etymology.= Atiya, A. S. (ed.): The Coptic Encyclopaedia. Vol. 8. New York, 1991., MacMillan. Pp. 118–124.
- : L'Égyptien et les langues négro-africaines.= RSO 66 (1992), 193–196.
- : Die pharyngalen Laute ʿayin und hā im Berberischen.= Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E. R. & Thomaneck, K. É. (eds.): Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovskij. Wien, 1992., Afro-Pub. Pp. 383–386.
- : Considérations sur les vieux nubien.= Chronique d'Égypte 68 (1993), 329–340.
- : Participi camito-semitici.= Brugnatelli, V. (ed.): Sem, Cam, Iafet. Atti della 7ª Giornata di Studi Camito-Semitici e Indoeuropei. Milano, 1994., Centro Studi Camito-Semitici. Pp. 245–250.
- : Zur vergleichenden Morphologie hamitosemitischer Sprachen.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (eds.): Studia Chadica et hamitosemitica. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 17–24.
- (ed. by D. Ibrizimow and M. Kossmann): Berberstudien & A Sketch of Siwi Berber (Egypt). Köln, 2005., Köppe Verlag.
- Vydrin, V. F. & Pozdnjakov, K. I.: Rekonstrukcija fonetičeskoj sistemy pramanden.= Porhomovskij, V. Ja. (ed.): Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie. Problemy rekonstrukcii. Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 294–356.
- Wagner, H.: Indogermanisch-Vorderasiatisch-Mediterranes.= Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung 75 (1958), 58–75.
- Wainwright, G. A.: Iron in Egypt.= JEA 18 (1932), 3–15.
- : Letopolis.= JEA 18 (1932), 159–172.
- : Some Sea-Peoples.= JEA 47 (1961), 71–90.
- : The Meshwesh.= JEA 48 (1962), 89–99.
- Wajnberg, I.: Étude sur les quadrilittères tigrīna.= RO 11 (1935), 52–78.
- : Abessinische Etymologien.= RO 13 (1937), 24–41.
- Walker, J. H.: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Anatomical Terminology. Warminster, 1996., Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Walle, B. van de: La tortue dans la religion et la magie égyptiennes.= La Nouvelle Clio 5 (1953), 173–189.
- Wallert, I.: Die Palmen im Alten Ägypten. Eine Untersuchung ihrer praktischen, symbolischen und religiösen Bedeutung. Berlin, 1962., Verlag Bruno Hessling.
- Wandres, C.: Alte Wortlisten der Hottentottensprache.= Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen 9 (1918–19), 26–42.
- Ward, W. A.: Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic.= Journal of Near Eastern Studies 20 (1961), 31–40.
- : Some Egypto-Semitic Etymologies.= Orientalia NS 31 (1962), 397–412.
- : Notes on Some Semitic Loanwords and Personal Names in Late-Egyptian.= Orientalia NS 32 (1963), 413–436.
- : Notes on Some Egypto-Semitic Roots.= Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 95 (1968), 65–72.
- : The Semitic Root hwy in Ugaritic and Derived Stems in Egyptian.= Journal of Near Eastern Studies 28/4 (1969), 265–267.
- : Review of Lacau, P.: Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique.= Bibliotheca Orientalis 29/1–2 (1972), 18–23.

- : Middle Egyptian nhrhr “Self-Satisfaction”.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 98 (1972), 155–156.
- : The Semitic Biconsonantal Root sp and the Common Origin of Egyptian čwf and Hebrew súp: “Marsh(-Plant)”.= *Vetus Testamentum* 24 (1974), 339–349.
- : The Biconsonantal Root *b3 and Remarks on Bilabial Interchange in Egyptian.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 102 (1975), 60–67.
- : Lexicographical Miscellanies.= *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 6 (1977), 265–292.
- : The Four Egyptian Homographic Roots b3. Rome, 1978., Biblical Institute Press.
- : Egypto-Semitic mr, “Be Bitter, Strong”.= *UF* 12 (1980), 357–360.
- : Lexicographical Miscellanies II.= *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 9 (1981), 359–373.
- : Index of Egyptian Administrative and Religious Titles of the Middle Kingdom. With Glossary of the Words and Phrases Used. Beirut, 1982., American University of Beirut.
- : 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.
- : Late Egyptian ʿrt: The So-Called Upper Room.= *JNES* 44/4 (1985), 329–335.
- : Essai on Feminine Titles of the Middle Kingdom and Related Subjects. Beirut, 1986., American University of Beirut.
- : Some Remarks on the Root gbi/gbgb, “To Be Weak, Lame, Deprived”.= *ZÄS* 11 (1986), 79–81.
- : Egyptian thbs: a Hurrian Loan-Word in the Vernacular of Deir el-Medineh.= *Göttinger Miszellen* 109 (1989), 73–82.
- : Some Foreign Names and Loan-Words from Deir El-Medineh Ostraca.= H. J. Kantor *Festschrift*. Chicago, 1989., The Oriental Institute. Pp. 289–303.
- : A New Look at Semitic Personal Names and Loanwords in Egyptian.= *Chronique d'Égypte* 71 (1996), 17–47.
- Watson, P. J.: Consonantal Patterning in Egyptian Triliteral Verbal Roots.= Ruffle, J.; Gaballa, G. A.; Kitchen, K. A. (eds.): *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt. Studies in Honour of H.W. Fairman*. Warminster, 1979., Aris & Phillips. Pp. 100–106.
- : The Interchange of 3 with n in Ancient Egyptian.= *Göttinger Miszellen* 37 (1980), 41–57.
- Watson, P. L.: *Mot, the God of Death, at Ugarit and in the Old Testament*. Ph.D. diss., 1970., Yale University.
- Watson, W. G. E.: *Puzzling Passages in the Tale of Aqhat*.= *Ugarit-Forschungen* 8 (1976), 371–378.
- : Lexical Notes.= *Newsletter for Ugaritic Studies* 28 (1982), 94.
- : Lexical Notes.= *Newsletter for Ugaritic Studies* 36 (1986), 17–18.
- : Unravelling Ugaritic mdl.= *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico* 3 (1986), 73–78.
- : An Egyptian Split Infinitive and the Origin of the Coptic Conjunctive Tense.= *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14/1-2 (1928), 86–96.
- : Notes on Some Ugaritic Words.= *SEL* 6 (1989), 47–52.
- : Ugaritic Onomastics (3).= *Aula Orientalis* 11 (1993), 213–222.
- : Ugaritic Onomastics (4).= *Aula Orientalis* 13 (1995), 217–229.
- : Ugaritic Lexical Studies in Perspective.= *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico* 12 (1995), 217–228.
- : Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon.= *UF* 27 (1995), 533–558.
- : Comments on Some Ugaritic Lexical Items.= *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 22/1 (1996), 73–84.

- : Ugaritic Onomastics (5).= *Aula Orientalis* 14 (1996), 93–106.
- : Final -m in Ugaritic Yet Again.= *Aula Orientalis* 14 (1996), 259–268.
- : Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon.= *UF* 28 (1996), 701–719.
- : Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon.= *UF* 30 (1998), 751–760.
- : Ugaritic Lexicography.= Watson, W. G. E. & Wyatt, N. (eds.): *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Leiden, 1999., E. J. Brill. Pp. 122–133.
- : Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon (4).= *UF* 31 (1999), 785–799.
- : Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon (5).= *UF* 32 (2000), 567–575.
- : El's Erudition (KTU 1.4 v 3–5).= *Aula Orientalis*. Forthcoming in 2000.
- : Personal Communication on 25 April 2000.
- : The Lexical Aspect of Ugaritic Toponyms.= *Aula Orientalis* 19 (2001), 109–123.
- : The Wood of Aqhat's Composite Bow. MS. 2001. Preliminary Version. 5 p.
- : Terms for "Rain" in Ugaritic.= Loretz, O.; Metzler, K.A.; Schaudig, H. (Hrsg.): *Ex Mesopotamia et Syria Lux*. Festschrift für Manfred Dietrich zu seinem 65. Geburtstag. Münster, 2002., Ugarit-Verlag. Pp. 795–801.
- : Tools of the Trade (KTU 4.127 and 4.385).= *UF* 34 (2002), 921–930.
- : A Ugaritic Reference Grammar for the 21st Century.= *Aula Orientalis* 21 (2003), 87–95.
- : El entierro de Aqhat KTU 1.19:III:41.= Gonzáles Blanco, A.; Vita, J. P.; Zamora, J. Á. (eds.): *De la tablilla a la inteligencia artificial*. Zaragoza, 2003., Instituto de Estudios Islámicos y del Oriente Próximo. Pp. 81–91.
- : Ugaritic Onomastics (7).= *Aula Orientalis* 21 (2003), 243–248.
- : Ugaritic Fragments: KTU 1.1 IV 11 and 1.16 IV 5.= *SEL* 21 (2004), 71–73.
- WÄDN = Deines, H. von & Grapow, H.: *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Drogennamen*. Berlin, 1959., Akademie-Verlag.
- Wb = Erman, A. & Grapow, H.: *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*. I–V.² Berlin, 1957–1971., Akademie-Verlag.
- WD = Lapp, G. & Lüscher, B.: *Worddiskussionen*. Provisorische Ausgabe. Band I–III. (Place not indicated), 2002–03., (no publisher).
- W(d)O = *Die Welt des Orients* (Göttingen).
- Wedekind, K.: Kolá, tpalá, ou ?kpalá? Notes sur les occlusives doubles dans la langue daba-musgoy (kola) du Nord-Cameroun.= *African Languages* 2 (1976), 121–136.
- : Sidamo, Gedeo (Derasa), Burji: Phonological Differences and Likenesses.= *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 14 (1976–79), 131–176.
- : Generating Narratives. Interrelations of Knowledge, Text, Variants, and Cushitic Focus Strategies. Berlin, 1990., Mouton de Gruyter.
- : Gimo-Jan or Ben-Yem-Om: Benč-Yemsa Phonemes, Tones, and Words.= Hayward, R. (ed.): *Omoti Language Studies*. London, 1990., SOAS. Pp. 68–141.
- Wedekind, K.; Tanaba, Wolde-Gebriel; Cheru, Zewde: On the Wordlists of Diraasha (Gidole) and Muusiye (Bussa).= *SLLE Linguistic Reports* 19 (1994), 3–16.
- : A Survey of Awngi.= *SLLE Linguistic Reports* 28 (1995), 2–22.
- : Conclusion of the SLLE Survey.= *SLLE Linguistic Reports* 33 (1995), 5–10.
- Wehr, H.: *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Leipzig, 1952., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Weibegué, Ch. & Palayer, P.: *Lexique lele-français*. Sarh, Tchad, 1982., Centre d'Études Linguistiques.
- Weigall, A. E. P.: *Miscellaneous Notes*.= *ASAE* 11 (1911–12), 170–176.
- Weill, R.: *Notes sur les monuments de la période thinite*.= *RT* 29 (1907), 26–53.
- Wenig, S.: *Zur Inschrift auf der Statue des Berliner Ägyptischen Museums Nr. 22463*.= *ZAS* 96 (1970), 139–142.

- : Was wurde aus *ḡ im Altäthiopischen? = Nebes, Norbert (hrsg.): Neue Beiträge zur Semitistik. Erstes Arbeitstreffen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft Semitistik in der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft vom 11. bis 13. September 2000 an der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena. Jenaer Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 5. Wiesbaden, 2002., Harrassowitz. Pp. 289–298.
- Wente, E. F.: Late Ramesside Letters. Chicago, 1967., Oriental Institute.
- Wente-Lukas, R.: Zur sprachlichen Stellung des Bana (Mándara-Gebirge, Nordwestkamerun). = Afrika und Übersee 57 (1973), 1–15.
- Wenzel, A.: Die Formen der altägyptischen Liege- und Sitzmöbel. Diss. Heidelberg, 1939.
- Wessetzky, V.: Az óegyiptomi könyv. = Antik Tanulmányok 5/1–2 (1958), 1–24.
- : Zur Problematik des altägyptischen Buch- und Bibliothekswesens. = Akten des vierundzwanzigsten internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, München, 28. August bis 4. September 1957. Wiesbaden, 1959., Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. Pp. 89–91.
- : Bildhafte Ausdruckweise und Wortbildung im Ägyptischen. = ZÄS 93 (1966), 144–146. Reprinted in *Studia Aegyptiaca* 6 (1981).
- : A Szépművészeti Múzeum démotikus fölíratú egyiptomi áldozati köve. = Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts 65 (1985), 77–80.
- : Bemerkungen über das “Flagellum” den Fliegenwedel und das Zeichen ms. = *Studia Aegyptiaca* 12 (1989), 425–429.
- Westendorf, W.: Grammatik der medizinischen Texte. Berlin, 1962., Akademie-Verlag.
- : n^{cc} ḫb “mit ausgeglichem Herzen”. = MDAIK 15 (1957), 297–298.
- : Altägyptische Darstellungen des Sonnenlaufes auf der abschüssigen Himmelsbahn. Berlin, 1966., Verlag Bruno Hessling.
- : κλομαει und κογλωλ. = ZÄS 92 (1966), 78.
- : Beiträge aus und zu den medizinischen Texten. = ZÄS 92 (1966), 128–154.
- : Bemerkungen zur “Kammer der Wiedergeburt” im Tutanchamungrab. = ZÄS 94 (1967), 139–150.
- : Beiträge aus und zu den medizinischen Texten. III. Incubus-Vorstellungen. = ZÄS 96 (1970), 145–151.
- : Zur Entstehung übertragener und abstrakter Begriffe. = GM 6 (1973), 135–144.
- & Brinks, J.: gmḫ.wj “doppelter Teil der Tür”. = GM 23 (1977), 25–29.
- : Zu Frühformen von Osiris und Isis. = GM 25 (1977), 95–113.
- : Noch einmal: Die “Wiedergeburt” des heimgekehrten Sinuhe. = SAK 5 (1977), 293–304.
- : Das strandende Schiff. Zur Lesung und Übersetzung von Bauer B 1,58 = R 101. = Assmann, J. & Feucht, E. & Grieshammer, R. (Hrsg.): Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur. Studien zum Gedenken an Eberhard Otto. Wiesbaden, 1977., Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. Pp. 503–509.
- : Beiträge zum Wörterbuch. = GM 29 (1978), 153–156.
- : Der Wortstamm k3(j) “heben, tragen” > “hervorbringen, erzeugen”. = Bulletin de la Société d’Égyptologie de Genève 4 (1980), 99–102.
- : Eilen und Warten. = GM 46 (1981), 27–31.
- : Der Körper, das Herz und die Gefäße. = GM 82 (1984), 73–75.
- : Das Aufkommen der Gottesvorstellung im Alten Ägypten. = Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 2 (1985), 99–119.
- : Zur Etymologie des Namens Osiris: *w3s.t-jrt “die das Auge trägt”. = Osing, J. & Dreyer, G. (Hrsg.): Form und Mass. Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst der alten Ägyptern. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 65. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987. Wiesbaden, 1987., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 456–461.

- : Bemerkungen und Korrekturen zum Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Göttingen, 1989., Universität Göttingen.
- : Die geteilte Himmelsgöttin.= Gamer-Wallert, I. & Helck, W. (Hrsg.): Gegengabe. Festschrift Emma Brunner-Traut. Tübingen, 1992., Attempto Verlag. Pp. 341–357.
- Whiteley, W. H.: Studies in Iraqw. Kampala, 1953., East African Institute of Social Research.
- : A Short Description of Item Categories in Iraqw (with Material on Gorowa, Alagwa and Burunge). Kampala, 1958., East African Institute of Social Research.
- : The Verbal Radical in Iraqw.= African Language Studies 1 (1960), 79–95.
- Wiedemann, A.: Aegyptologische Studien. Part 8. Die Praeposition xeft. Die Augenschminke mestem. Bonn, 1889., Henry.
- : Das alte Ägypten. Heidelberg, 1920., Carl Winter.
- Wildung, D.: Zur Deutung der Pyramide von Medum.= RdE 21 (1969), 135–145.
- : Ägypten vor den Pyramiden. Mainz, 1981., Zabern.
- Wilke, C.: Ein Regenzauber in den Pyramidentexten? = ZÄS 67 (1931), 127–128.
- Willems, H.: Crime, Cult and Capital Punishment (Mo^oalla Inscription 8). = JEA 76 (1990), 27–53.
- Wit, C. de: Some Values of Ptolemaic Signs.= BIFAO 55 (1955/6), 111–121.
- : Les valeurs du signe de l'oeil dans le système hiéroglyphique.= Görg, M. & Pusck, E. (Hrsg. unter Mitwirkung von A. Wuckelt und K.-J. Seyfried): Festschrift Elmar Edel. 12. März 1979. Ägypten und Altes Testament. Studien zur Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des Alten Testaments. Bamberg, 1979., Manfred Görg, Bamberg. Als Manuskript gedruckt, in Kommission Verlag Harrassowitz Wiesbaden (publisher not indicated). Pp. 446–455.
- Witzak, K. T.: Indo-European Word for “Leech” and Its Nostratic Equivalents.= Archiv Orientální 60 (1992), 38–42.
- WKAS I = Kraemer, J. & Gätje, H. & Spitaler, A. & Ullmann, M.: Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache. Band I: k. Wiesbaden, 1970., Otto Harrassowitz.
- WMT = Deines, H. von & Westendorf, W.: Wörterbuch der medizinischen Texte. I–II. Berlin, 1961–2., Akademie-Verlag.
- W(d)O = Die Welt des Orients (Göttingen).
- Wolff, E.: Die sprachliche Situation im Gwoza-Distrikt (Nordostnigeria). = Journal of African Languages 10/1 (1971), 61–74.
- : Die lokativen Erweiterungsaffixe der Verben der Bewegung im Laamang (Hidkala-Dialekt). = Six, V. et al. (Hrsg.): Afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen – Ein Querschnitt. Festschrift J. Lukas. Hamburg, 1971., Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung. Pp. 209–216.
- : Die Verbalphrase des Laamang (Nordostnigeria). Eine Studie zur Morphologie tschadischer Sprachen. Ph.D. dissertation. Hamburg, 1972., Universität Hamburg, 213 p.
- : Neue linguistische Forschungen in Nordostnigeria.= Afrika und Übersee 58/1 (1974), 7–27.
- : Sprachwandel und Sprachwechsel in Nordostnigeria.= Afrika und Übersee 58/3–4 (1974–75), 187–212.
- : Verb Bases and Stems in Migama.= Afrika und Übersee 60 (1977), 163–177.
- & Gerhardt, L.: Interferenzen zwischen Benue-Kongo- und Tschad-Sprachen.= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Supplement III/2 (1977), 1518–1543.
- : Le laamang = Perrot, J. (ed.): Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne. Paris, 1981., Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Pp. 435–441.
- : Reconstructing Vowels in Central Chadic.= Wolff, E. & Meyer-Bahlburg, H. (eds.): Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics. Hamburg, 1983., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 211–232.

- : Consonant-Tone Interference and Current Theories on Verbal Aspect Systems in Chadic Languages.= Jungraithmayr, H.; Müller, W. W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 475–496.
- : 150 Jahre Hausaforschung.= *Anthropos* 85 (1990), 523–529.
- : Hausa-Plurale in diachronischer Perspektive. Hinweise auf frühen Sprachkontakt? = 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. 405–421.
- & Gerhardt, L.: Interferenzen zwischen Benue-Kongo- und Tschad-Sprachen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Supplement III/2* (1977), 1518–1543.
- Woodhouse, R.: The Biblical Shabboleth Story in the Light of Late Egyptian Perceptions of Semitic Sibilants: Reconciling Divergent Views.= *JAOS* 123/2 (2003), 271–289.
- Worrell, W. H.: The Hamitic Background of Semitism.= *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science. Arts and Letters* 7 (1926), 269–272.
- : *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection*. Ann Arbor, London, 1942., University of Michigan Press, Oxford University Press, resp.
- Wölfel, J. D.: Les noms de nombre dans le parler guanche des Iles Canaries.= *Hespéris* 41 (1954), 47–79.
- : Eurafrikanische Wortschichten als Kulturschichten.= *Acta Salamanticensia. Filosofia y letras* 9/1 (1955).
- : *Monumenta linguae Canariae. Die kanarischen Sprachdenkmäler. Eine Studie zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte Weißafrikas*. Graz, 1965., Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Wreszinski, W.: *Der große medizinische Papyrus des Britischen Museums* (Pap. Berl. 3038). Leipzig, 1909. J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- : *Bäckerei*. = *ZÄS* 61 (1926), 1–15.
- : [mr] und [3b]. = *Studies presented to F.L. Griffith*. Oxford, 1932., Egypt Exploration Society, Oxford University Press. Pp. 133–134.
- WUS = Aistleitner, J.: *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*. = *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 106/3 (1963).
- WZKM = *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* (Wien).
- Xella, P.: *Arsenie et vieilles dentelles ;encore sur la terminologie des textiles à Ugarit*. = *UF* 22 (1990), 467–474.
- : *Matériaux pour le lexique phénicien – I*. = *SEL* 9 (1992), 81–93.
- Yeivin, Sh.: The Sign 3 and the True Nature of the Early Alphabets.= *Archiv Orientalní* 4 (1932), 71–78.
- : *Haqīrōt hašwaʿa bəbalšanūt šemīt-mišrīt*. 1.= *Ləšōnenū* 2 (1932), 136–153.
- : *Haqīrōt hašwaʿa bəbalšanūt šemīt-mišrīt*. 2.= *Ləšōnenū* 3 (1933), 105–111.
- : *Studies in Comparative Egypto-Semitic IV*. = *Kēmi* 6 (1936), 63–80.
- : *Who Were the Mntyw?* = *JEA* 51 (1965), 204–205.
- Youssef, A. A. H.: A Nineteenth Dynasty New Word for Blade and the Semitic Origin of Some Egyptian Weapon-Names and Other Related Words.= *MDAIK* 39 (1983), 255–260.
- : *Etymological and Philological Studies*. = *ASAE* 74 (1999), 83–90.
- Yoyotte, J.: *Études géographiques, l'isherou de Bouto et le problème des isherou*. = *RdE* 14 (1962), 101–110.
- : *Des lions et des chats. Contribution à la prosopographie de l'époque libyenne*. = *RdE* 39 (1988), 155–178.

- ZA = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Verwandte Gebiete (Berlin, New York).
- Žaba, Z.: Les maximes de Ptaḥhotep. Prague, 1956., Académie Tchécoslovaque des Sciences.
- Zaborski, A.: Notes on the Mediaeval History of the Beja Tribes.= *Folia Orientalia* 7 (1966), 289–307.
- : Prefixes, Root-Determinatives and the Problem of Biconsonantal Roots in Semitic.= *Folia Orientalia* 11 (1969), 307–313.
- : Biconsonantal Verbal Roots in Semitic.= *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, prace językoznawcze 5 (1971), 51–98.
- : On the Hamito-Semitic Suffix -ay in Cushitic.= *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 48 (1973–74), 23–32.
- : Afroasiatic Formative ?a-.= *Africana Marburgensia* 7/2 (1974), 81–87.
- : The Verb in Cushitic.= *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, prace językoznawcze, zeszyt 48 (1975), 1–184.
- : Material for a Comparative Dictionary of Cushitic Languages: Somali-Galla Comparisons.= Bynon, J.; Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, 1975.*, Mouton. Pp. 321–331.
- : Consonant Apophony and Consonant Alternation in Bilin Plurals.= *Afroasiatic linguistics* 3/6 (1976), 11–22 (121–132).
- : Some Internal Plurals in Cushitic.= Fronzaroli, P. (ed.): *Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica Camito-Semitica*, Firenze, 16–19 aprile 1974. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze. Pp. 369–378.
- : Basic Numerals in the Omotic Languages.= Segert, S.; Bodrogligeti, A. J. E. (eds.): *Ethiopian Studies dedicated to Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday November 14th, 1981 by His Friends and Colleagues*. Wiesbaden, 1983., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 375–392.
- : Review of Schuh, R. G.: *Bole-Tangale Languages of the Bauchi Area (Northern Nigeria)*.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 79/2 (1984), 210–212.
- : Review of Sasse, H.-J.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*.= *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 7 (1985), 84–92.
- : 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.
- : Can Omotic Be Reclassified as West Cushitic?=*Goldenberg, G. (ed.): Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, Tel Aviv, 14–17 April 1980. Rotterdam, Boston, 1986., A. A. Balkema. Pp. 525–530.
- : Reinisch and Some Problems of the Study of Beja Today.= *Reinisch and Some Problems of the Study of Beja Today*.= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Leo Reinisch. Werk und Erbe*. Wien, 1987., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Pp. 125–139.
- : Basic Numerals in Cushitic.= Jungraithmayr, H.; Müller, W. W. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20–22 September, 1983*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 317–347.
- : Zur genetischen Klassifikation der kuschitischen Sprachen.= *Problemy języków Azji i Afryki*. Warszawa, 1987., Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Pp. 361–370.
- : Remarks on the Verb in Beja.= Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.): *Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1988., John Benjamins. Pp. 491–498.
- : The Problem of Blemmyes-Beja: An Etymology.= *Beiträge zur Sudanforschung* 4 (1989), 169–177.

- : 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.
- : Insights into Proto-Cushitic Morphology.= Mukarovskij, H. G. (ed.): Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band 2. Wien, 1991., Afro-Pub. Pp. 75–81.
- : Biconsonantal Roots and Triconsonantal Root Variation in Semitic: Solutions and Prospects.= Kaye, A. S. (ed.): Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau. Volume II. Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 1675–1703.
- : The Position of Cushitic and Berber Within Hamitosemitic Dialects.= Bausi, A.; Tosco, M. (eds.): Afroasiatica Neapolitana. Contributi presentati all'8° Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semita), Napoli, 25–26 Gennaio 1996. Papers from the 8th Italian Meeting on Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Naples, January 25–26, 1996. Napoli, 1997., Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Pp. 49–59.
- : On Hamitosemitic Participles.= 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° Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semita), Trieste, 23–24 Aprile 1998. Padova, 1999., Unipress. Pp. 35–39.
- : Remarks on Derived Verbs in Hamitosemitic.= Edzard, L. & Nekroumi, M. (eds.): Tradition and Innovation. Norm and Derivation in Arabic and Semitic Linguistics. Wiesbaden, 1999., Harrassowitz. Pp. 44–51.
- : Review of EDE vol. I.= Rocznik Orientalistyczny 53/1 (2000), 151–153.
- : Verbale Flexion und Derivation mit T und M/N – ein etymologischer Versuch.= Wild, S. & Schild, H. (Hrsg.): Akten des 27. Deutschen Orientalistentages (Bonn, 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1998). Norm und Abweichung. Würzburg, 2001., Ergon Verlag. Pp. 593–599.
- : Tense, Aspect and Mood Categories in Proto-Semitic.= Edzard, L. & Retsö, J. (eds.): Current Issues in the Analysis of Semitic Grammar and Lexicon I. Oslo-Göteborg Cooperation, 3rd–5th June 2004. Wiesbaden, 2005., Harrassowitz. Pp. 11–30.
- Zadok, R.: Notes on the West Semitic Material from Emar.= *Annali, Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 51/2 (1991), 113–137.
- Zandee, J.: *Death as Enemy According to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions*. Leiden, 1960., Brill.
- : Sargtexte, Spruch 80.= *ZÄS* 101 (1974), 62–80.
- Zavadovskij, Ju. N.: *Berberskij jazyk*. Moskva, 1967., Nauka.
- : Les noms de nombre berbères a la lumiere des études comparées chamito-semitiques.= Caquot, A.; Cohen, D. (eds.): *Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique*. Paris, 1974., Mouton. Pp. 102–112.
- : Problema berberskikh čislitel'nyh v svete sravnitel'nogo semito-hamitskogo jazykoznanija.= *Drevnij Vostok. Sbornik 1. K semidesjatiletiju akademika M. A. Korostovceva*. Moskva, 1975., Nauka. Pp. 42–51.
- : Filologičeskie zametki.= *Drevnij Vostok. Sbornik 2. Pamjati akademika Borisa Aleksandroviča Turaeva*. Moskva, 1980., Nauka. Pp. 136–143.
- & Kacnel'son, I. S.: *Meroitskij jazyk*. Moskva, 1980., Nauka.
- ZAW = *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Berlin).
- ZÄS = *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* (Leipzig).
- ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden).
- ZDPV = *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* (Leipzig).
- Zeidler, J.: Zum Ansatz eines Lautwertes jn der Hieroglyphe [jn/nw].= *GM* 49 (1981), 85–89.

- : Nochmals zur Etymologie der Handhieroglyphe.= Göttinger Miscellen 72 (1984), 39–47.
- : Altägyptisch und Hamitosemitisch. Bemerkungen zu den Vergleichenden Studien von Karel Petráček.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 2 (1992), 189–222.
- : A New Approach to the Late Egyptian “Syllabic Orthography”.= Sesto congresso internazionale di egittologia. Atti. Volume II. Torino, 1993., Società Italiana per il Gas p.A. di Torino. Pp. 579–590.
- : Einige neue keilschriftliche Entsprechungen ägyptischer Personennamen. Zu weiteren Namen in Jacobsen, CT NMC Nr. 68.= *WdO* 25 (1994), 36–65.
- : Beiträge zur Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen.= *WdO* 29 (1998), 21–32.
- : Pfortenbuchstudien. Teil I: Textkritik und Textgeschichte des Pfortenbuches nach den Versionen des Neuen Reiches. Wiesbaden, 1999., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Zealelem Leyew: First Report on a Survey of the Shinasha and Agew Dialects and Languages.= *Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (SLLE) Linguistic Reports* 18 (1994), 1–8.
- Zibelius, K.: Afrikanische Orts- und Völkernamen in hieroglyphischen und hieratischen Texten. Wiesbaden, 1972., Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- : Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches. Wiesbaden, 1978., Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Ziegler, Ch.: Catalogue des stèles, peintures et reliefs égyptiens de l’Ancien Empire et à la Première Période Intermédiaire vers 2686–2040 avant J. C. Paris, 1990., Editions de la Réunion des Musées Nationaux.
- Zima, P.: Common Chadic Lexemes and Songhay.= *Archív Orientální* 58 (1990), 50–59.
- Zimmern, H.: Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluß. Leipzig, 1917., J. C. Heinrichs.
- Zivie, C. M.: Giza au deuxième millénaire. Cairo, 1976., IFAO.
- Zonhoven, L.: Studies on the sdm.t=f Verb Form in Classical Egyptian. IV: The Passive sdm.t=f / ms.(y)t=f.= *ZAS* 125 (1998), 78–92.
- Zorn, J.: LÚ.PA-MA-ĤA-A in EA 162:74 and the Role of the MHR in Egypt and Ugarit.= *JNES* 50/2 (1991), 129–138.
- ZS = Zeitschrift für Semitistik.
- Zunke, P.-H.: Über die Vokalisation des Ägyptischen (nach dem hinterlassenen Manuskript aus 1923 herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Holger Gutschmidt & Carsten Peust). Göttingen, 1997., Peust & Gutschmidt.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Koptische Etymologien.= *WZKM* 32 (1925), 169–178.
- : Die ägyptisch-hamitische Dekade.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 67 (1931), 133–139.
- : Ältere und jüngere Pluralbildung im Berberischen.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 22 (1931–32), 1–15.
- : Ursprung und Sprachcharakter des Altägyptischen.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 23 (1932–33), 25–45, 81–110, 161–194, 241–254.
- : Das Wort für “Jahr” im Altlibyschen.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 23 (1932–33), 75–77.
- : Meroitisches Sprachgut im heutigen Abessinien.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 24 (1933–1934), 230–232.
- : Konkordanz ägyptischer und libyscher Verbalstammtypen.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 70 (1934), 107–122.
- : Die Sprachreste der unteräthiopischen Nachbarn Altägyptens.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 25 (1934–35), 161–188, 241–261.
- : Das geschichtliche Fundament der hamitischen Sprachen.= *Africa* 9 (1936), 433–451.

- : Die Sprache der Blemmyer (ein Beitrag zur Alt-Afrikanistik).= Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 31 (1940–41), 1–21.
- : Der Zenāga-Dialekt des Berberischen.= Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 33 (1942–43), 81–111.
- : Das kanarische Berberisch in seinem sprachgeschichtlichen Milieu.= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 100 (1950), 403–460.
- : Die Fiktion der "kuschitischen" Völker.= Kush 4 (1956), 19–33.
- : The Countries of the Ethiopian Empire of Kash (Kush) and Egyptian Old Ethiopia in the New Kingdom.= Kush 6 (1958), 7–38.

