

Coptic loanwords of Egyptian Arabic in comparison with the parallel case of Romance loanwords in Andalusí Arabic, with the true Egyptian etymon of Al-Andalus

[Préstamos coptos del árabe egipcio, comparado con el caso paralelo de préstamos romances en árabe andalusí, además del verdadero étimo egipcio de Alandalús]

Federico CORRIENTE
University of Saragossa, Spain
fcorrien@posta.unizar.es

Resumen: El propósito del presente artículo es cotejar los resultados obtenidos por Bishai sobre los préstamos coptos, en 1964, con aquellos casos en los que el Diccionario de árabe egipcio estándar de Hinds y Badawi atribuyen un origen copto a algunos términos. A lo anterior se adjunta una nueva propuesta con el étimo correcto de la voz Alandalús.

Abstract: The aim of this article is to compare the results of Bishai's survey of Coptic loanwords in 1964 with the cases in which the standard Egyptian Arabic dictionary, Hinds and Badawi, attributes some terms to a Coptic origin. A new proposal with the true etymon of Al-Andalus is also provided.

Palabras Clave: Préstamos. Copto. Árabe. Romance. Árabe andalusí. Etimología. Alandalús.

Key Words: Loanwords. Coptic. Arabic. Romance. Andalusí Arabic. Etymology. Al-Andalus



The fact that Coptic (henceforth Cp), as the last scion of Old Egyptian (henceforth OE), is not a Semitic language has had an undesirable consequence, namely, the scarcity of studies on its remote kinship and quite extensive secular borrowing in both directions between it and the Semitic tongues, old and modern. It is true that Egyptologists have often concerned themselves with this issue and pointed to Egyptian loanwords in such Semitic languages as Old Hebrew and Arabic, but more surveys are still needed, both

in the case of old Semitic tongues and of Neo-Arabic dialects, most particularly those of the Nile Valley.

The first comprehensive study of the latter issue, namely, Bishai 1964 (henceforth B), counted 109 such loanwords, considered by that author as valid, and was followed by Behnstedt 1981, who made a considerable number of additions, mostly derived from field work in rural areas, and Vittmann 1991, again followed by a host of important remarks in Behnstedt 1997.¹ The main purpose of this paper is to compare their results, as the latter two authors did with the cases in which the standard Egyptian Arabic (henceforth EA) dictionary, Hinds and Badawī 1986 (henceforth HB), attributes some terms, not necessarily the same as in Bishai 1964, to a Cp. origin, and to offer our own reflections on this issue. The harvest is this:

ʔāba “Father (as a title of priests and monks, cf. Crum 13 *apa, abba*), in B 40 and HB 1 and 34, with the variants *ʔanbā, ʔapb/pa*. This term, however, is clearly borrowed by Cp. from Syriac, in the aftermath of the introduction of Christianity in Egypt by Aramaic speaking preachers from Syria and Palestine. As for *ʔāba* “Daddy”, although declared by HB as “perhaps Cp.”, not being there any native word which could have generated it, it can only be another adaptation of that Aramaic etymon, *abbā* or a baby-talk variant of the vocative forms of OA, *ya ʔabāhu / ʔabati*, etc. Vittmann 217-218 also discards a Cp. origin, and wonders whether there could lie a remnant of the Old Arabic accusative morpheme, as well as in cases like *yāba* “Father!” and *yaba ʕali* “uncle Ali!”, extracted from Mitchell 1962:55 and Bauer 1957:327. Behnstedt & Woidich in their unpub. article support a mere intra-Arabic development; we too, in keeping with our views on the emergence and background of Middle Arabic,² would rather attribute those shapes either to the Old Arabic exclamatory suffix *-āh*,³ or to reflexes of OA dialects with uninflected shapes ending in *-ā* for the “six nouns”⁴ and a few more cases, about which see Corriente 1975:52, 1976:92 and 1992:84.

¹ Our dear friend and most respected colleague has been kind enough to communicate us the unpublished text of a revision of this issue written in collaboration with M. WOIDICH (“Die Rolle des Koptischen bei der Herausbildung der ägyptischen Dialekte: Substrat und koptische Lehnwörter”), counting up to 180 Cp. items in EA, resulting from field work done by both scholars during their survey of these dialects. In the final assessment of this matter they say that, including several plant names possibly of Cp. origin, the total count of these loanwords might reach 250 or 300 items, many more than in BISHAI’s and VITTMANN’s surveys, although including some doubtful etyma.

² Recently resumed in CORRIENTE 2007c.

³ See WRIGHT, I, 294 and II, 94.

⁴ I.e., *ab, ax, ḥam, fū, dū* and *han*, inflected in CA with long vowels in annexation.

ʔabīb “5th month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 5, from Cp. *epē/ip*.

ʔād, y -: “hey, boy!”: HB 1, “possibly related to Cp.”. But it has a close equivalent in the lowest register of EA, *yā wād*, generally supposed to derive from Ar. *yā walad*, through mere successive hypocoristic clipping. This is also Vittmann’s most reasonable view (Vittmann 218), as well as Behnstedt and Woidich’s in their unp. article.

ʔādi: “here it / he is”: HB 1, reported as Cp., and so it is (Mallon 45, *ettē*). Vittmann 218 rejects this etymon and considers that an intra-Arabic explanation (deictic *hā*, plus a demonstrative or personal pronoun) is enough to account for both *ʔādi* and a synonymous *ʔahōh*: “here it / he is”, which is also Behnstedt & Woidich’s opinion in their unp. article. However, the perfect phonetic correspondence with Cp., the abnormal absence of the expected inflexions for fem. and pl., unlike the case of *ʔahōh*, and the lack of matches in other Arabic dialects are all in favour of the Cp. hypothesis, in spite of some Arabic scholars’ reluctance to admit other Cp. loanwords than those related to agriculture and animal names.

ʔāl ”jacks, five-stones”: HB 2 and B 40, who suggests the Cp. etymon *al* “pebble” (Crum 3), accepted by Vittmann 203 and mentioned without comments by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

ʔāh “yes”: HB 2, reported as Cp., as well as in B 39, who suggests the Cp. etymon *aha* (Crum 64: *ehe, ahe/a*). Vittmann 218 is against such a derivation for such a basic interjection, and so are Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

ʔithalīsa “run aground! (in the jargon of Nile boatmen)”: HB 6, reported as Cp. without suggesting any particular etymon, as is systematic in that work. In our view, from Cp. *at+hli+sa* “without any place”, i.e., “going nowhere” (Crum 668 and 313; see below *ʔadwad* for another occurrence of the privative prefix *at-*). Vittmann 204 hesitantly suggests Cp. **thelis* “mud” < Greek *ilýs* but, in addition to leaving the final vowel unexplained, such a borrowing is not documented, not to speak of the unlikelihood of Nile boatmen resorting to a foreign designation for “mud”. As for Behnstedt 1997:32, he reports an interesting *hēliṣa* “up we go!” (upon hoisting a heavy object), from the area near to the Rosetta branch of the Nile, perhaps a distant reflex of the entry, which he would connect with expressive interjections, sea shanties and working songs often containing onomatopoeical sequences.

(ʔu)gāy “help!”: HB 7 and 146, reported as Cp., and B 42 *jay*, who provides its etymon, Cp. *oučai* ”safety, health” (Crum 511). Bishai offers two possible and acceptable explanations for the loss of the first syllable, though apparently unaware that the longer and more conservative variant has also

survived, according to HB. The latter work includes an optional extension of this idiom, — *ya hūh* in HB 146, possibly from Cp. *eia/e* “then” (Crum 74) and *ho* “face” (as in *čī ho* “pay heed”, cf. Crum 647). Vittmann 220, generally bent on rejecting Cp. loanwords, prefers a derivation from the agentive participle *gāy* “coming” in EA, which is rather unconvincing, in our view and considering the extended shape *ʔugāy*, in spite of the support of our most knowledgeable colleague Behnstedt 1997:36.

ʔagbiyya “horologium”: HB 7 and B 40 *ajbiya*, who provides its Cp. etymon (*pi*)+*ačpia*, with or without the definite article (Crum 778). Bishai supposes that the Cp. word has been assimilated through the Arabic broken plural pattern {*ʔa12i3ah*}, but in fact that ending points to a morphologically simpler procedure, namely, mere metanalysis of the fem. attributive (*nisbah*) suffix {-*iyah*}. This is also Vittmann’s view (Vittmann 216-217) and Behnstedt & Woidich’s in their unp. article.

ʔagrann+ “because”, followed by pronominal suffixes: HB 7, as usual, without any etymological suggestion. Possibly, a reflex of Cp. *čī ran* “to take name, to be named” (cf. Crum 298), or of phonetically closer *ače ran* “say (its) name” (Crum 754), in a construction reminiscent of EA *ašl+u/ak/*⁵ etc. “because he / you, etc.”, in which *ašl* “origin” has been functionalized in a similar way. That idiom appears again translated into EA as *ʔism(u)+ inn*, lit., “its name is that”, although semantically evolved into “in view of the fact that” (HB 23).

ʔagana: “cold chisel”: is labelled by HB 8 as “perhaps Cp.”, but we have been unable to find a valid etymon in Crum or even among the names of this tool in OE (e.g., in Ermann & Grapow VI:103, s.v. “Meißel”). This item is not mentioned by anyone of the other scholars having dealt with the issue of Cp. loanwords.

ʔadwad: “catamite”, labelled in HB 12 as “Cp.”, is another instance like the preceding one. Vittmann 216, supported by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, is quite reasonably against a derivation from Cp. *teute*, a doubtful hapax possibly referring to external diseases or physical defects; instead, he resorts to an intra-Arabic derivation from *dūdah* “worm”, metonymically said in Morocco of lewdness; however, it should be remembered that the pattern {*a12a3*} of adjectives denoting colour and physical defects is no longer productive in Neo-Arabic. In our view, we again have a Cp. item, most likely a

⁵ See this idiom in HB 35. OE *>rn<* “name” would also have been functionalized in the etymon of Arabic *fulān* and its Semitic cognates; see CORRIENTE 1997a: 406. Similar instances are common in OE, e.g., the subordinative conjunction *æ*, apparently derived from the imperative *ače* “say” (see *gabanyūt* below).

euphemism, probably a compound of the privative prefix *at-* (cf. *ʔithalīsa* < *at+hli+sa* above) and a word like *ouō(ō)te* “choice; different” (Crum, 495; cf. our “homosexual”), or perhaps reflecting the recorded *at-ouōtb* “immutable” (Crum 497, alluding here to indifference to the opposite sex).

ʔidda: “to give”: HB 12-13, without any attribution, and B 42, who proposes a derivation from Cp. *ti* of the same meaning (Crum 392). However, the first syllable is left phonetically unexplained, and the fact that this item exists in other Arabic dialects, more impervious to (Old) Egyptian influence, such as Syrian Arabic (according to Barthélemy), Yemeni,⁶ as well as in Classical Arabic (henceforth CA, *ʔaddà yuʔaddī* “to deliver; to pay”), would require this borrowing, if it is such, to have taken place in much older times than the Cp. period. This is also Behnstedt’s view in 1981:89 and 1997:37; as for Vittmann 219, while rejecting the Cp. etymon, prefers to suppose an evolution of Arabic *aʕtā* which is, as Behnstedt states and we subscribe, unlikely and unnecessary.

ʔardabb “dry measure of 198 l.”: HB 14, “Cp.”. It is closely matched by Greek *artábe* (supposedly of Persian origin, equal to 56 l.), but CA dictionaries list *ʔrdabb* as used by the people of Egypt, and an etymological community with Cp. *rtob* “measure of grain” (Crum 305) is likeliest. However, there can be no connection with much smaller *rifṭāw* mentioned below.

ʔqarw: “oak”: HB 16 and 697, “Cp.” We have been unable to find a valid etymon for it in Crum; however, for OE Ermann & Grapow I 98 have >*inrn*< “oak”, a remotely possible cognate; the same would apply, although without semantic confirmation, to >*irwt*< “a kind of tree”, *ibidem* I 114 and, phonetically best, >*iqrw*< “a tree, whose *ʕgʕt* has medical applications”, *ibidem* I 138 and, perhaps, to OE *ʕrw* (Ermann & Grapow I 210 “a kind of tree, whose parts have medical applications”). Vittmann 217 and Behnstedt (unp. article) are absolutely right upon rejecting Sobhy’s proposal based on Cp. *aro*, which is not “cypress”, but “cyperus”, and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article pointedly underline that Cl.Ar. *qarw* is only “a vessel obtained from the bottom of palm trunks”.

ʔis: “behold!”: HB 18, “Cp.” Indeed, from Cp. *eis* (Crum 85), also accepted by Vittmann 203 and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

ʔisbādīqūn: “central square of the impression with which a eucharistic loaf is stamped”, HB 18, “from Greek”. It is, of course, a reflex of Gr. *despotikón* “of the Lord”, though borrowed through Cp., with metanalysis and

⁶ See BEHNSTEDT 1992: 15-16 with some peculiar idioms which preclude a recent borrowing from EA, as well as phonetic variants with /d/, suggesting contamination with Old and Eastern Arabian *antā* “to give”, which can only have happened locally and in old times.

deglutination of a feminine definite article *t-*, parallel to the case of Arabic *ʔiblīs*, from Greek *diábolos* “devil”.

ʔšbār ʔala: “expression of disdain”: HB 24, “Cp.”, and B 45, who provides the correct etymon, Cp. *špēre* “wonder” (Crum 581), with a semantic shift. Vittmann 219-220, so often distrustful of Cp. interference, toys with a possible intra-Arabic derivation, based on *ašbār* “spans”, so that *ašbār ʔalēna min kalamhum fīna* “what does it matter to us if they gossip about us!” could be construed as “it is many spans away from us..., i.e., we can hardly be concerned by ...”. This is, in our view, less likely than the Cp. hypothesis.

ʔšlāl: “let us pray!”: HB 24, “Cp.”. Indeed, from Cp. *šlāl* “to pray” (Crum 559), accepted also by Vittmann 204 and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

ʔšš “wow, my!”: HB 24, as usual, without etymological attribution. Apparently from Cp. *aš* “what?, who?, which?” (Mallon 47).

ʔašaf: “caper bush”: HB 25, “Cp.”, indeed recorded by Crum 18 *asaf* “bark, rind of the caper-root”. However, its presence in such purist CA dictionaries like the *Lisānu ʔarab* and the *Tāju ʔarūs* makes unlikely a derivation from Cp., in spite of the not altogether uncommon situation that there is nothing similar in Ermann & Grapow for OE. This is also Vittmann’s view (Vittmann 217), who considers that the Cp. is borrowed from Ar.

ʔamšār “6th month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 36, i.e., *mechir* or *mšir*.

ʔamandi: “hell”: B 40. As that author states, from Cp. *amenti* “Hades; the western place” (Crum 8),⁷ accepted by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, while Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts the Cp. origin for this word without pinpointing it. See below *mirīsi* and the etymon of Al-Andalus.

ʔamnūt: “sexton”: B 40, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *mnout* “porter, doorkeeper” (Crum 176), accepted by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article. This prosthetic /ʔa/, instead of more frequent and in Neo-Arabic almost standard /ʔi/, is reminiscent of similar cases in Andalusī Arabic (henceforth AA), in which we attributed it to South Arabian influence.⁸ Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a Cp. origin for this word without pinpointing it.

ʔumbāh: “drink (in baby-talk)”: HB 35, while B 43 has *mbu*, with its correct Cp. etymon *p+moou* “(the) water”.⁹ However, in their unp. article,

⁷ Already studied by DEVAUD 1923.

⁸ See CORRIENTE 1977: 76, fn. 111.

⁹ It has been assumed for some decades that Arabic *mā* “water” had been preserved until recent times as a baby-talk item in the Catalan dialect of Valencia (“*vols mā?*” = Do you want water?”, see BRAMON 1986: 150), and even in standard Catalan *mam*, as she had the kindness of communicating us in private mails. However, the absence of *imālah* in such a position

Behnstedt & Woidich object to this etymon with Omani¹⁰ and Tunisian baby-talk *mbūa* of the same meaning; about this, we must say that baby-talk is often and partially unpredictable but, at times, it may reflect a substratal language.

ʔamm: “food”: HB 37, 834 and 913, labelled as “Cp.,” with the variants *hamm* and *mam*. Indeed, from Cp. *ouōm* “to eat; food” (Crum 478), whence also perhaps the Cp. personal name Ibn Mammātī, as reported by Muslim historians, in principle, a nickname given to the ancestor of the family, because he had fed many people during a terrible famine.¹¹ The last variant is probably due to a not uncommon shift between labial phonemes, while the first two, *ʔhamm*, might have easily developed through metanalysis and elimination of a copulative *wa-*, e.g., in the frequent phrase “drink and food”. Vittmann 217, apparently endorsed by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, consider this term as merely onomatopoeic and rejects its specific connection with Cp.

ʔantūt “peg on the beam of a plough”: HB 40, 105 and 801, “probably Cp.,” with the variants *b/lantūt*. Possibly a reflex of Cp. *ma+nthōuti* “connecting piece”, from *tooute* “to collect / gather” (Crum 447-8), as this piece holds together the main parts of a plough. The original shape must have been *bantūt*, semantically more logical than the bare infinitive, exhibiting a common labial exchange at its onset, while *ʔantūt* would result from haplological dissimilation of nasals in the first syllable, and */lantūt* would be just another case of agglutination of the Arabic definite article. Another possible explanation would be that *bantūt* had agglutinated the Cp. definite article, starting from *ʔantūt*, i.e., **p+antut*. Behnstedt 1981 and Vittmann 220 prefer a derivation from *p+anthōp* oder *hamntōp* “needle”, which is not semantically more cogent, and phonetically requires a contamination by a second related term in order to explain the alteration of the last consonant; however, in a private mail, Behnstedt points out to us that the synonymous *misalla* in Upper Egypt, in principle “pack needle”, may prove that etymon. See *tūt hāwī*.

would be striking, and chances are that the item is, in fact, Berber *aman*, first borrowed by AA from nurses of that ethnic stock, particularly abundant in eastern Spain under Islamic rule, and then, some centuries later, by Catalan from Eastern AA, under similar socio-linguistic circumstances, after the “Reconquista”. The reason for both semantically matching survivals in Spain and Egypt is the same: the conquerors hired native nannies, who at times could not avoid code-switches to the dominated language, when talking to the children in their custody. The loss of the prefix *a-* in Berber items adopted by Arabic is a hallmark of Arabicization, as reported by CORRIENTE 1998: 275 and FERRANDO 1997: 140.

¹⁰ To correct as *mbūh*, from REINHARDT, 125.

¹¹ However, the etymon of this family name is not altogether clear, and might simply contain the imperative idiom *ma mate* “make (us) reach (food)”.

ʔanhīb “peg connecting the beam of a plough to its extensions”: recorded by Behnstedt 1981:83 and etymologised by him as “perhaps from *eiō* ‘peg’” (Crum 76, but better *naeiō* or *anaiō* in Crum 218), or *hame* of the same meaning (Crum 675) and *hēbe* ‘plough’” (Crum 656), the second proposal requiring loss of /h/ and abridgment of /men/ into /n/. In our view, the first choice is a better and simpler solution, the inserted /n/ being the mark of annexation (Mallon 69), i.e., **anaiō+n+hēbe* > **anyōnhēbe*, later undergoing haplology and adaptation to EA morphophonemics, which yield *anhīb*.

ʔūra, *hōra* or *wīra* “rope connecting the yoke to the beam”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:93 and etymologised as containing Cp. *our* “neck or yoke strap” (Crum 488; see also *gunnāfa*), which we subscribe. As for a connection of *wīra* with *oueire* “irrigation device or part of it”, one must be cautious as both this term and its companion *lehlōhe* (see *lixlāx* above, Crum 149 and 489) are considered as of uncertain meaning. One wonders about a possible connection between the entry and EA *qūra* “forehead; brow-band of bridle” (HB 721, the first meaning very common in Cairene speech); these terms appear to derive from Cl.Ar. *qawwara* “to make a round hollow”, because browbands have that shape in order to stay above the eyes and below the ears. The meaning “forehead” would be metonymically taken from the browband, and this might again be the case of the entry. Cf. also Arabic *qawr* “strong cotton rope”.

ʔawa: “misfortune”, e.g., in the curse *gāk ʔawa yiʔwīk* “may misfortune befall you!”: HB 45, “probably Cp.” But, while Cp. *hba* “misfortune” (Crum 656) might look like a perfect semantic match, the irregular reflex of both consonants and the presence of genuinely Arabic *ʔawwah* “helas” cast serious doubts about the pertinence of this etymological proposal. This is also, by the way, Vittmann’s view (Vittmann 217), as well as Behnstedt & Woidich’s in their unpubl. article.

ʔūnī. “mill sound”: B 46, who establishes its Cp. etymon, *euni* “mill” (Crum 62), accepted by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unpubl. article.

ʔēlā ʔubb(a), *š/hēlā bēlā* or *hubb(a)* “heave ho!”: HB 46, 118 and 920, “probably Cp.” As a matter of fact, Cp. *ale* “to go up” (Crum 4) would provide a possible etymon, but a polygenetic expressive interjection is also likely, cf. English “hoop-la”, Castilian **¡upa!** or **¡áupa!**, etc, which is also Behnstedt & Woidich’s opinion in their unpubl. article. Vittmann 203 reproduces Worrell’s proposal of a blending of Ar. *hayyā +li+* Cp. *hōb* “work”, but in 218 appears more inclined to consider such terms as interjections hardly etymologisable, which becomes his definitive diagnostic for *hubb* in 222.

ʔaywa “yes” (HB 46) and *ʔayyūh*: “Of course!” (HB 47), in both cases labelled as Cp. Indeed, Cp. *ha(e)io*, (*h*)*aio*, etc. (Crum 636) do constitute possible etyma, but there are also some Arabic expressive interjections, like *ʔī(h)*, apt to produce similar results. Vittmann 217 rejects the very notion of anything similar to *ʔayyūh* in Cp., which is supported by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

baʔūna “10th month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 50, from Cp. *paōni*.

bāq, *arḍ* —: “land into which the remains of a clover crop have been ploughed to fertilize it”: HB 49, “perhaps Cp.”, a close match of B 40, *bāg* “portion of the field left for cultivating clover or beans”, which the latter scholar derives from Cp. *pok/ce* or *pake* “fragment” (Crum 286), while Vittmann 207 also quotes Worrell’s suggestion, < *pake* “to become thin”, mentioned by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article with no other comment than an allusion to Bedouin *bāg(i)* “remnant”. However, as neither word is ever said of a patch of land, we would instead suggest Cp. *akō* “carrion, filth, thing destroyed” (Crum 3), preceded by the frequent locative prefix *ma-* “place of”, with the same phonetic shift between bilabials taking place in the case of *ʔantūt*.

bāba “2nd month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 49, from Cp. *paape*.

bāh: “penis”: HB 50, labelled as “Cp.” Crum 47 does reflect this term merely as a doubtful item, but the fact that it exists in OA in the meaning “coition”, as a peculiar variant of *bāʔah*, which is a genuine Semitic word (literally, “entering”), advises caution in several ways, as this probable euphemism, of the kind often substituted for taboo-words, might have been borrowed from Semitic by OE, most likely much before the Cp. period. Vittmann 207 and 220 mentions the Cp. item, but does not express any clear opinion on that etymon.

bāy: “my!”: HB 50, labelled as “probably Cp.” However, *bai* in this language only means the owl and similar, in some cases ominous birds, as pointed out by Vittmann 221, who reasonably rejects a derivation from OE *b’* “ba, immortal soul” and prefers a Turkish etymon, *bay* “lord”. On account of the strong Yemeni presence in Egypt, we might be here in front of an old dialectal *bāy* “my father”,¹² this time coinciding totally with Behnstedt 1997:36.

¹² We are not talking here about modern Yemeni dialects, in which this type of words follow the standard Neo-Arabic rules, but about older dialects in which the “six names” were treated as “defective” (*nāqīṣah*) and left uninflected (i.e., *abā*, *axā*, *ḥamā*, *fā*, etc., given as characteristic of the Balḥārīṭ of Najrān; cf. CORRIENTE 1976: 91, and fn. 1; see *abā*). This is also the source

ba/ittāw: “bread made of Indian millet”: HB 51, “perhaps Cp.” Indeed, from Cp. *bōte*, *bōti*, etc. (Crum 45 “durah”); the cauda has resulted from an extended Neo-Arabic *nisbah*-suffix {-āwī}, clearly reflected in the variants *ba/ittāwi(yya)* which, in turn, has been metanalyzed as a standard *nisbah*-suffix and eliminated, generating the set *nomen unitatis* – collective *ba/ittāw(a)*. Vittmann 221 rejects a derivation from OE *t* “bread” and its Demotic variants quite reasonably, but appears to be unaware of that other possible Cp. etymon. As for Behnstedt 1997:32, he did not consider this possibility either, but expressed his conviction that this item must be of Cp. origin, on account of its cauda, similar to other cases (like *bihnāw*, *rifṭāw* and *šalāw*), and of an eventual agglutinated article, which is not the case, in our view.

bitm/n pl. *butūn*: “ridge between furrows”: HB 52. We have been unable to find a valid etymon in Crum, while Behnstedt 1981:85 and Vittmann 208 accept *p+eitn* (in Crum 87, “ground, earth, dust, rubbish; bottom, lower part”, semantically vague); however, in our view, chances are that this item is a mere reflex of Arabic *matn* pl. *mutūn* “back of an animal”, metaphorically very apt to be said of such ridges. The exchange of bilabial phonemes is frequent, as said above.

bag/jurūm “metal rod by which the depth of a ploughshare may be adjusted”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:83, and etymologised as from Cp. *p+carom* “staff, rod” and vars. (Crum 828), which we subscribe.

baḥḥ “gone!, finished!”: HB 54, in baby-talk, “Cp.” Possibly, from *pōh* “to break” (Crum 280). This connection is outright rejected by Vittmann 220 who considers it as merely onomatopoeic and non-etymologizable, which is mentioned by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article without any comment.

bixx: “boo!”: HB 55, “Cp.”, and B 40, who provides the correct etymon in this language, *p+ix* “the devil” (Crum 89). Vittmann 207 mentions this etymon and announces a further comment which, however, is found nowhere in this paper. As for Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, they are clearly in favour of an onomatopoeic origin.

birba “site of a ruined temple”: HB 60, “Cp.”, and B 40. Indeed, from *p(e)+rpe* “the temple” (Crum 299), with agglutination of the definite article, as has been known long since and mentioned by every scholar.

birbir “chicken”: HB 60, “Cp.” But for this meaning, Cp. only has *papoi* (Crum 266), which does not provide a suitable etymon on phonetic grounds; however, there is a *brre* “young person” (Crum 43), semantically apt to evolve in that manner, and phonetically valid, above all, if the Cp. definite article was

of such modern Moroccan forms like *xāy* “my brother”, Andalusī *fā* “mouth”, etc.; see also CORRIENTE 1977: 86, § 5.5.1.

agglutinated, i.e., *pi-brre*, which could easily have developed into a bi-consonantal redoubled root structure; see note on *wirwir*. Vittmann 208 concedes the possibility of such a borrowing in both cases, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are clearly favourable to an onomatopoeic origin.

burubiyya pl. *barāyib* “kind of soil”: is contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, from Vollers 653, attributed to Cp. *roue* (Crum 306 “stubble; land of inferior quality”), with agglutination of the Cp. definite article.

barsim “lucerne”: HB 65, labelled as Cp., and B 40, including the correct etymon *bersim* (Crum 43).

burš “mat made of palm leaves”: BH 65, “Cp.,” and B 41, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *prēš* “mat”, a cognate of *pōrš* “to spread” (Crum 269), also reflected in EA *baraš* “to squat”, in HB 65, in which its Cp. origin is mentioned. Vittmann 206 and 209 reproduces these derivations and does not dismiss them. Semitic *{frš}* “to spread” appears to have been borrowed from Egyptian, but much before the Cp. period.¹³ These items do not come up in Behnstedt’s materials; however, for the same root he has *barš* with two meanings, namely, “fallow land which is ploughed, watered and ploughed again” and “first ploughing”. He considers them related and mentions the possible Cp. etyma *pōrš* “flat surface” (Crum 271), *pōrs* “to break up with the plough” (Crum 269 only “to slaughter”) and a contamination of *pōrš* “fallow” (quoted with an asterisk, however, and unrecorded in Clum) with the latter.

baramhāt “7th month of the Cp. calendar”: BH 70, from Cp. *parmhat*.

baramūda “8th month of the Cp. calendar”: BH 70, from Cp. *parmoute*.

barnūf “fleawort”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, from Cp. *pernoufe*, already suggested by Crum 269.

bisāra / *bušāra* “cooked beans”: HB 73 “Cp.,” and B 40, who establishes its Cp. etymon **pes+arō* “coction of beans” (Crum 263 and 489), apparently accepted by Vittmann 208, in spite of a question mark at the end of this entry.

bissa “cat”: was attributed by Vollers to OE, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article consider it as onomatopoeic, reflecting *biss* “sound made to a cat, usually in order to shoo it away” (BH 74).

bas/ṣxa “foot of plough”: BH 74 and 79, “Cp.,” and B 41, who gives its Cp. etymon *pi+sxō*, literally, “plough-handle” (Crum 384), accepted by Vittmann 206. The evolution of the first vowel, in agreement with Philippi’s law, is

¹³ As shown by Northwest Semitic reflexes, like Old Hebrew *parāš* and Syriac *prās* “to spread”. Since this item was borrowed from Egyptian, it is only normal that it would not occur in Akkadian, in which there is only a homophonous *parāšu* “to flatter”, semantically unrelated.

characteristic of dialects strongly influenced by Old Yemeni usage.¹⁴ Behnstedt 1981:84 not only mentions this entry with the same etymon, but also attaches a *basx* “little peg on the beam of the plough”, with an etymon *pe+sh* “awl” (Crum 379), which we subscribe.

bašbiš “to sprinkle”: BH 76, “perhaps Cp.”, and B 41, who establishes its Cp. etymon *p+šops* “reception; welcome to a wedding” (Crum 576), with agglutination of the definite article. The semantic juncture would lie in the custom of welcoming guests by sprinkling them with perfume; cf. also Arabic *bašša* “to display a friendly mien”; however, these junctures are only conjectural, and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article propound a blending of *taštaš* “to splash” and *balbil* “to wet”; this is questionable on account of their semantic distance. On the other hand, they both suggest (*ibidem*) that *b+šobeš* reflects Neo-Arabic *šabās* “bravo!”, from Persian *šābāš*, to which we would make the same objection. As for Vittmann 220-221, he merely deals with Sobhy’s proposal **bešboš*, matched with a supposed OE *bšb*; as both of them appear to be non-existent, he rejects any Cp. etymon outright; however, in p. 200, fn. 8, he accepts the Cp. origin of *b+šobeš* without pinpointing it.

bašarūs “flamingo”: BH 78, “Cp.”, and B 40, who follows Worrell’s proposal **pet-threšrōš* “that which is red”; however, a Cp. etymon *p-threšrōš* (Crum 432), with just an agglutinated definite article would be less complicated. Vittmann 206 mentions Worrell’s proposal without any particular comment, and adds that of Černý, **pe-trōš* “the red one” with an admiration mark, suggesting his disapproval, understandable in this case, as it is phonetically even more complex than Worrell’s proposal.

bašnīn “lotus”: HB 78, “perhaps Cp.” While it is true that there is a Cp. *p+čēnē* “green herbs” (Crum 774), the necessary semantic shift would be excessive for a plant so characteristically Egyptian. In fact, an item like Neo-Persian *bošnīn* can only be an Arabic loanword, in turn harking back to OE, for which Ermann & Grapow have no less than three possible etyma: *>sšn<* “lily” (in III 485, semantically unapt, but “lotus” in 486), *>sšn<* “lotus flower” (III 487), and *>sšm<* “little lotus flower” (III 486, phonetically best), it being obvious that the Arabic item reflects one of these words, prefixed with the Egyptian definite article. Vittmann 206 and 221, though declaring his conviction that the true etymon of this word is Cp. and OE, expresses his doubts about Cp. *šōšen* (Crum 608 “lily”) with a question mark, preferring a **pešnīn*, posited by Osing 1976:848, whence that Persian term. Chances are

¹⁴ See CORRIENTE 1977: 75-76.

that we are confronted here with reflexes of the OE term with agglutination of the article, but the double /n/ is strange.

bašans: “9th month of the Cp. calendar”: BH 78, from Cp. *pašons*.

bašrōš “oats”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:84, with an etymological proposal Cp. *pi+čro/ōč* “seed” and vars. (Crum 831), to which he objects the abnormal EA reflex of the Cp. affricates. Considering the whole evidence, we would subscribe this etymon together with the occasional occurrence of that equivalence.

bušbuš “bogey”: BH 95 “perhaps Cp.” As Vittmann 221 states, very correctly this time, such supposition is absolutely unlikely, not only on account of the repeated pharyngeal phoneme, but because of the closeness of this entry to Arabic *bašbašah* = *baqbaqah* “gurgling sound of a mug”, while being filled with water or emptied of it, metaphorically assimilated since old with the threatening sounds uttered by a creature which either blabbers or causes or tries to cause fear.¹⁵ Also Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are against the Cp. hypothesis and propound a development of the Neo-Arabic interjection *bū!*, used for frightening. In fact, a synonymous and closely related *bašaww* in BH 88 is not attributed to Cp. there.

baqrūr “frog”: BH 90, “Cp.”, and B 40, who establishes the Cp. etymon *pe+krouw* (Crum 117), with an agglutinated definite article, accepted also by Vittmann 205 and Behnstedt (1981:83 with vars., and in the unp. article in collaboration with Woidich).

baqf “oaf”: BH 90, “perhaps Cp.”. Probably, indeed, from Cp. *pokf*, a derivate of *pake* (Crum 261).¹⁶ At the end of their unp. article, Behnstedt & Woidich include this item in a list of others “sounding like Cp. but obviously Arabic”.

baqlūla “blister”: BH 91, “perhaps Cp.”, and B 40, who establishes the Cp. etymon *pe+kelōl* “pitcher; jar” (Crum 104), accepted by Vittmann 205, with an agglutinated definite article. However, Cp. *kelkoule*, a variant of *kelka* “lump, pustule” (Crum 102-3), is semantically closer and phonetically a better match, when construed as a case of haplology, starting from **pe+kelkoule* and assuming that this word, usually a plural, had become a collective singular; at any rate, the agency of the Arabic diminutive patterns $\{1a22\bar{u}3\}$, $\{1a23\bar{u}3\}$ and $\{1a23\bar{u}4\}$ cannot be excluded; cf. *šabbūra*, *nannūs* and *hallūs* below. On the other hand, Classical Arabic *qullah* “jar” is deeply rooted in this language and

¹⁵ See CORRIENTE 1982: 108, about the etymon of Catalan **baldraca**, in connection with this semantic juncture.

¹⁶ Who merely lists it as a nominal derivate of the verbal stem, with the suffix *{-f}* (MALLON, 56), in the meaning of “thin sheet, plate”, a conceivable metonymy of frailty or mental weakness.

necessarily borrowed in much older periods of the Egyptian language. But Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are rather in favour of a connection with Cl.Ar. *{bq̄bq}* and cognates in the dialects.

baqūfi “tin dish; small basket”: BH 91, “Cp.”, and B 40, who establishes the Cp. etymon *p(e)+kot* “basket” (Crum 127, also as “wheel” in 122, semantically closer), accepted by Vittmann 205, with an agglutinated definite article. Behnstedt 1981:87-88 reflects this entry and attaches to it a var. without agglutination of the Cp. article, *gūfa* “basket or container of palm branches”, as well as a cognate *buʔf*, pl. *buʔūf* “a basket-like cheese mould”, with backformation of the sg. on the pl., directly a reflex of *p(e)+kot*.

baqūl “sluice for irrigation in palm groves”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:84, and etymologised as from Cp. *pi+xōl* “hole” (Crum 556), which we subscribe.

baqlaʔz “to become plump or chubby”: BH 91, without attribution. Possibly from Cp. *kōlč* “to be bent” (Crum 107-8); cf. *metklče* “crookedness”. However, the irregular match of the last consonant, would require a shift /č/ > /t/ within Cp., opposite to the case of *lajj*, q.v., but assumable, nevertheless, in the terms of the variation signalled in Crum 745.

bukla “(large round) water jug”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:85, and etymologised as from Cp. *pe+kle/ē* “vessel for liquids” and vars. (Crum 102), which we subscribe.

bilbila “rounded hanging object” BH 96, “Cp.”. From Cp. *blbile* “single grain of corn; single fruit” (Crum 37), accepted by Vittmann 207. However, Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are more inclined to propound Arabic etyma from the roots *{blbl}* and *{blbf}* which they ultimately consider of onomatopoeic origin.

>*blwr*< “yoke strap”: is a curious item listed by Blau 2006:49, from the Arabic translation of the Bible by the Egyptian Jew Sa’diya Gaon, and commented in Corriente 2007a:315, obviously transmitted from Latin *lōra*, pl. of *lōrum*, through Aramaic, but having a final Cp. phase, in which it acquired an agglutinated definite article.

balas “to bribe” and *itballas* “to be bribed”: HB 98, without attribution. Probably, from Cp. *pōlc* “to be agreed upon; to reach satisfaction; to decide” (Crum 261).

ballās(ī): “large two-handled earthenware pitcher”: HB 101, without attribution. Immediately, it is a gentilic of the place name *kafr ilballās*, a village near Qina, in Upper Egypt, but necessarily connected with Cp. *blče* “earthenware, pottery” (Crum 38, with the same evolution /č/ > /s/ as in *šr*, q.v.).

balham “to bluff”: B 40, who attributes it to Cp. *balhmou* “Blemmye people” (Crum 38), supposedly notorious for their bluffing. However, the sources of that reputation should be made explicit, as a blending of Arabic {*blh*} “to act stupidly” and *bahmah* “brute” would also be apt to generate semantemes very close to the idea of “bluffing in a silly way”. Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article express similar thoughts and suggest blending of Arabic {*bls/š*}, {*bld*}, and the like in Neo-Arabic.

balšūm “heron”: B 40. As has been long known, from Cp. *p+elcōb* (Crum 55, Vollers 654; see also Dozy 1881:I 111), with an agglutinated definite article. Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a Cp. origin for this word. without pinpointing it.

bim: HB 104, in the idiom *ʔwʕa tqūl bim* “not a peep out of you”, without attribution. Apparently, an instance of simultaneous assimilation of bilabials and dissimilation of nasality in Cp. *nim* “every (thing)” (Mallon 49).

bantūt: see *ʔantūt*.

binni “lepidotus, a Nile fish, *Barbus bynni*”: HB 108, “perhaps Cp.”. Although an etymon in this language is not directly reported, as stated by Behnstedt 1997:32, Ermann & Grapow I 8 have >*ʔbnn*< as a kind of fish in OE, also a kind of bird, which is matched by Cp. *bōne* “swallow” (Crum 40), while the latter language also has *bōne* “an edible” (Crum 40), with a recipe with instructions to extract thorns (or fish bones?) from it. Vittmann 207 reports the possibility of a Cp. origin with a question mark.

bahūda “ploughhandle”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:83, and etymologised as from Cp. *p+hōte* “rod, pole” (Crum 722), which we subscribe. See *hu/ūdyā*.

bāhūq “wooden frame onto which loads are fastened on a camel’s back”: HB 109, without attribution. Apparently related to Cp. *hoklef* “camel-saddle” (Crum 664), said also of other wooden structures and apparently a compound of *hōōk* “to gird or brace; girdle” (Crum 661, adopted by Behnstedt 1981:84),¹⁷ there has been agglutination of the definite article and adoption of the pattern {*lā2ū3*}.

bihnāw “broom made of palm branches”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:85, and etymologised as from Cp. *pi+hnaw* “flowering branch of palm” and vars. (Crum 693), which we subscribe.

būrī “a kind of fish”: BH 111, labelled as “Cp.”, and B 41. It is usually derived from Coptic *bōre* (Crum 42), accepted by Vittmann 209 and Behnstedt

¹⁷ The second constituent is not transparent. However, CRUM, 664 suggests a mistake for *hokmes*, which could easily be explained as “litter for young people”. BEHNSTEDT 1981 directly adopts the etymon *p+hōōk* “girdle”.

6 Woidich's unp. article, but considering its early and widespread presence in Arabic, it must have been borrowed in higher epochs of OE, in which it is witnessed by Ermann & Grapow I 465 as >br< "ein Nilfisch".

bōš "looseness of parts which could be more tightly adjusted; size, industrial starch". This is, in fact, a double entry, thus reported in HB 112, with a derivate *bayyīš* "to apply a treatment of size" in 116, while B 41 only has the second item, rendered as "porridge", and attributed to Cp. *p+ōouš* "gruel", also reflected by Vittmann 208 and Behnstedt & Woidich's unp. article. To tell the whole story, Bishai had considered the possibility of a Cp. etymon *bōš* for the first item too, but rejected it in Bishai 1960:127, fn. 12, in favour of Turkish *boş*, while HB still mentions both hypotheses. In our view, the Turkish origin is evident in an idiom like EA *ḡilīl bōš* "to turn out to be nothing", half-translated of Turkish *boş çıkmak*, but in the case of "looseness", the semantics of Cp. *bōš* "to be loosened or undone" (Crum 46) provide a much likelier etymon of the entry than Turkish *boş* "empty".

bōfa "lungs of slaughtered animals": contributed by Behnstedt and Woidich 41, etymologised as a reflex of Cp. *ouof* or *bof* "lungs" (Crum 505). Indeed, an interesting item, as also AA has *buff* with the same meaning, heretofore attributed to a Romance term of onomatopoeic origin, on account of its Castilian and Portuguese equivalent, **bofe(s)**.¹⁸ Although a sheer coincidence on onomatopoeic items must never be excluded, neither could we discount an Egyptian loanword in AA, which would not be an isolated case, as proven by other entries in this survey.

bōn "devious": HB 113, "perhaps Cp.". Indeed, from *bōōn* "bad" (Crum 39), surprisingly missed by Vittmann 221, who would derive this term from Arabic *bawn* "interval". This is supported by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article with the example: *ir-rāgil da bōn* "this man is a disaster!".

bayš or *bēs* "front and back reinforcements for the cutters of a threshing harrow; pegs supporting the carrying belt of a well": contributed by Behnstedt 1981:85, and etymologised as from Cp. *poēiš* "ladder rung" (Crum 277), which we subscribe.

tabtaba "cleverness" and *mutabtib* "clever; experienced": HB 120, without attribution. Possibly from Cp. *tobtb* "to compound; to invent" (Crum 401).

tābūt "sarcophagus": HB 121-122, also said of some irrigation device, without attribution. This item, deeply rooted in OA and other Semitic languages, is not a true derivate of Cp. *taibe* and variants (Crum 397), as mere phonetics make obvious, but from much older Egyptian >ḏb ḏt<.

¹⁸ See GRIFFIN 1961: 115.

tagza “character”: HB 121, without attribution. Possibly, from Cp. *tōks* “to be settled” (Crum 406), although Greek *táxis* “order” cannot be discarded as an alternative etymon, since it also generated standard Neo-Arabic *taqs* “wheather”,¹⁹ of which the item under consideration looks like a *nomen unitatis*, with voicing of the consonantal cluster as a consequence of the pronunciation of Arabic /q/ as /g/ in every rural dialect of EA.

tagūs “transverse plank bridging centre of a Nile sailing boat”: HB 122, without attribution. From Cp. *taks* “seat” (Crum 407); see *dāqūs* below.

taxx “to become drunk”: B 46, who suggests the Cp. etymon *tahe*, although its variant *tha/ixi* is phonetically preferable (Crum 456). Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a Cp. origin for this word without pinpointing it, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article suggest a connection with Cl.Ar. *taxx* “to ferment”.

tirsa: Vollers 654 mentioned this item as the name of a Nile fish, possibly of Cp. origin, but Behnstedt wonders whether it could instead be the Nile turtle (*testudo triunguis*), listed by Kazimirski in his Arabic dictionary. Not being there anything similar in the Cp. and OE dictionaries, chances are that this be a Neo-Arabic term, coined through a metonymy exactly matching German **Schildkröte**, i.e., “shielded toad”, from Arabic *tirs* “shield”.

tišša “fat”: HB 129, “Cp.” Possibly from Cp. *ta(n)šō* or *taša* “to increase” (Crum 456). Vittmann 215 simply provides this item with a question mark, while Behnstedt 1997:35 is more inclined to an Arabic etymon and mentions *tašš* “to swell” in Aleppo.

taff “to spit”: HB 130, without attribution, and B 46, who suggests the Cp. etymon *taf* (Crum 435), endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 7, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article take into consideration some Syrian Arabic cognates, and connect them all with CA. *tafal*, ultimately of onomatopoeic origin. It appears also in HB 130, with the diminutive *taftif* “to spit or splutter while talking”,²⁰ and a related onomatopoeia of disgust *tiffūh/w*.

tikāt “mounting of a scoop in a water-wheel”: HB 132, without attribution. Probably from Cp. *takto* or *tkato* “circumference” (Crum 407).

tallīs “large sack”: HB 135. Wrongly attributed to an unspecified Cp. origin, as it clearly derives from Latin *trīlix*; see Corriente 1997:80.

mitaltil “dripping (said of the nose affected by a cold)”: contributed by Ishaq and Schenkel (after Behnstedt & Woidich’s unp. article) and

¹⁹ Through a considerable semantic evolution, as given away by Jewish Aramaic *taqs* “to arrange or equip”, a situation which is not properly accounted for in JASTROW 1926: 549.

²⁰ The diminutive value of {1212} structures, verbal or nominal, was mentioned by FLEISCH 1961: 404, fn. 1, and is widely attested both in OA and Neo-Arabic dialects.

etymologised as a reflex of CP. *t(e)lt(e)l* “to drip” (Crum 411) sounds like a reasonable proposal, in spite of Behnstedt’s preference for Neo-Ar. derivatives of Cl.Ar. *tall* “hill”.

timsāḥ “crocodile”: HB 136 and B 46. It does not derive, as said often, from Cp. **ti+msah* (irregular for *pi+msah*, according to Vittmann 215, since Crum 187 lists this item as masc.) but, in fact, from OE *>msḥ<*, preceded by a feminine definite article, possibly having a euphemistic function, as this word was normally masculine.²¹

tann(ī) “a quasi-verb indicating continuousness or immediate succession, with the pronominal suffixes”: HB 139, “perhaps Cp.” We have not found grounds for such an attribution, and would instead suggest a derivation from Arabic *tannā* “to double”.²² Vittmann 226 is also clearly in favour of a derivation from Arabic, although based on *tanna* or *tanaʿa* “to remain”, semantically less apt.

tūt “1st month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 141, from Cp. *thōout*.

tūt ḥāwī “call of an itinerant conjurer”: HB 141 and B 46 “gather for the magic player”, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *tooute* “to gather” (Crum 447). This is understandable only when considering that the conjurer meant thereby appears to be a snake-charmer (*ḥāwī*) of the kind still wandering in the streets and offering his services to remove lurking reptiles from gardens, the well-known Rifāʿīs, in principle members of a Sufi order, who claim being gifted with this skill; see HB 344. Cf. *?antūt*. Vittmann 215 suggests that there might be a connection with the characteristic closing of many tales, *tūta tūta firḡit* (or *xilṣit*) *ilḥadduta*, roughly, “and that’s all, folks”²³, which is unlikely, in view of the preceding more cogent explanation.

tawal “to daze / bewilder”: HB 141, without attribution. Probably, from Cp. *thouelo* or *toulo* “to submerge” (Crum 69).

tāk “to wear out”: HB 143, without attribution. From Cp. *tako* “to perish; to be lost” (Crum 405).

²¹ The same happens probably in the immediate Egyptian etymon of aforementioned Arabic *iblīs* “devil”. Cp. grammars say little about gender change and its motivations (see STEINDORFF 1930: 48, § 99), but the situation might have been similar to that of Arabic, in which euphemistic diminutives are found, e.g., *duwayhiyatun* from *dāhiyah* “misfortune”, in order to ward off the omen of negative concepts. Native grammarians, however, interpret these cases as *taṣḡīru ttaṣḡīm* “diminutive for augmentative” (see FLEISCH 1961: I, 390 and WRIGHT 1967: 166).

²² The connection would be again with Yemeni dialects; cf. BEHNSTEDT 1992: I, 155, *tana yaṭnī* “zum zweiten Mal pflügen; ein zweites Mal tun”.

²³ Cf. Castilian **y colorín, colorado, este cuento se ha acabado**.

tōma "blade of a hoe": contributed by Behnstedt 1981:93, who gives a choice of two Cp. etyma, *t+ame* "hoe" (Crum 55), and *t(h)ōm* "to be sharp" (Crum 413), preferable in his opinion on account of vocalism, which we would subscribe.

gāy: see (*ʕ*)*gay*.

gabba "five-stones, jacks": HB 146 and 730, "prob. Cp." An etymon in this language might be *kōb* "to be doubled" (Crum 98); however, the semantic grounds for this attribution are far from unassailable, and Arabic *kabbah* "throwing down upon his face" has no fewer chances of being the real etymon.

gabanyūt "pater noster" (HB 148, "Cp."). Indeed, from Cp. *pen+(e)iot* "our father" (Mallon 38, Crum 86), though preceded by the conjunction *če*, announcing direct speech (Mallon 169) as in the matching passage of the Mass containing this prayer, which is pointed out by Vittmann 209, fn. 28, in line with Schenkel 29.²⁴

gaxx "to spin a yarn: to tell tall stories; to squirt": BH 149, without attribution. Apparently, from Cp. *čōh* "to smear or anoint" (Crum 797), with a semantic juncture also found in Arabic *talā* "to smear; (colloquially) to dupe".

jaxxim, only documented as a participle, *mjaxxim* "dirtied", contributed by Schenkel 27, from Cp. *čōhem* (Crum 797).

jiffa "frost": contributed by Schenkel 28, from Cp. *ca/ef* (Crum 795).

gallābiyya "traditional robe of Egyptian men and women", HB 164 and B 42, who attributes it to Cp. *colbe*. Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai's Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it; in fact, it is unlikely, considering the morphological disparity and its kinship with Arabic *jilbāb* "gown", and other South Semitic cognates, like Ethiopic *gǝlbāb(e)* "wrapper".²⁵ This is also Behnstedt & Woidich's opinion in their unp. article.

gala gala "cry of conjurers when performing tricks": HB 164, without attribution. Perhaps from Cp. *čōōle* "stop" (Crum 766).

gā/īla, *gīla* and *jīlla* "outer peg of a ploughshare; peg between the beam and its extensions": contributed by Behnstedt 1981:86, and etymologised as

²⁴ See *The Horologium of the Egyptian Church. Coptic and Arabic text from a Mediaeval manuscript*, translated and annotated by O.H.E. KHS-BURMESTER (Cairo 1973), 1; the matching passage was localized with the kind help of Prof. Monferrer. That mark, usually listed as a conjunction, etymologically is an abbreviation of the imperative of the verb "to say".

²⁵ See LESLAU 1987: 189 about its genuineness in Ethiopic. DOZY 1881: I, 204 explains *jallābiyyah* as an attributive derivation from *jallāb* "slave trader", assuming that this garment was characteristic of these merchants, or of the slaves in their possession. The latter is likelier, considering the injunction in legal treatises not to display naked female slaves for sale, but dressed conveniently (*kiswatu miṭliḥā*, cf. FERRERAS 1998: 191, being an edition of Al-Jazīrī's formulary of legal deeds). In such case, there would be no etymological relation with *jilbāb*.

from Cp. *kele* (Crum 103-104 *kllē* “bolt; limp; trunk”) or *clle* (not in Crum). Also *kila*, according to Behnstedt, with a meaning very similar to that of aforementioned *bayš*, would share that etymon.

galam/nf “oaf”: HB 167, without attribution. Possibly from Cp. *čē+lem+f* “emptiness of his person” (Crum 747 and 294), if we accept Fayyumic *lem* for more standard *rōme* “man, person” and vars. in other dialects, as one more frequent case of lambdacisms, to remember in connection with the etymon of Al-Andalus (see below).

janba “basket”: contributed by Schenkel (after Behnstedt & Woidich’s unp. article) and connected with Cp. *čnof* (see *šinf* below), (see *šinf* below), is reasonably rejected by Behnstedt in favour of Arabic *janb* “side”, occasionally said of the twin sacks loaded on a beast.

gu/innāfa and *ʕunnāfa* “peg on the yoke of the plough”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:87, and best etymologised as from Cp. *tour+nahbe* (Crum 488 “neck or yoke strap”) or **kour+(n+)nahbe* (Crum 115 “peg, hinge”, and *nahbe*, q.v. under *nāf*) “peg of the yoke”, which we subscribe. Behnstedt suggests a possible relation with Mishnaic Hebrew *kənāfayim* “hooks of the yoke”, mentioned by Dalman; however, the phonetic likeness is not complete, and it might also happen that the Egyptian term has been borrowed through a folk etymology.

janafōr “roof”: contributed by Schenkel 30, from Cp. *čnep(hō)r* (Crum 775).

gahgahūn “haphazardly; in any old way”: HB 177, without attribution. Probably, from Cp. *kahkh* “to smooth” (Crum 133), possibly compounded with *hōn* “to comply with (Crum 687)”.

jōd “intermediate section of an irrigation ditch”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:87, and etymologised as from Cp. *čōte* (Crum 792 “penetration at creation of waters”, also “ditch; well”, according to other sources), which we subscribe.²⁶

gīs “fart”: HB 185 and B 43, who provides the Upper Egyptian var. *juks*, not endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 8, and suggests the true Cp. etymon *čoksi*, it being remarkable that the first form suggests a shift /ʕs/ > /s/, which would be parallel to the glottalized emphasis of /t/ in Upper Egypt.²⁷

²⁶ However, there is no relation with Andalusī Arabic *ijād* “underground stream of water”, quoted by BEHNSTEDT 1981: 87, fn. 10, from DOZY I, 231, which does not belong in the root {ʕjd}, but to {wjd}, as a concretization of the *masdar* of *ʕawjād* “to make obtain; to create” (see CORRIENTE 1997: 558).

²⁷ Described by WOIDICH in FISCHER & JASTROW 1980: 209.

hāba hāba “encouragement to a child to crawl or toddle towards one”: HB 187, without attribution. The semantic similarity with the Arabic root {*ḥbw*} “to crawl” is striking; however, the morphological unlikeness of its derivation would make us give some consideration to Cp. *hōb* “to do work” (Crum 654).

hāta bāta “penniless”: HB 187, without attribution. Possibly, a combination of Cp. *hat* “silver” (Crum 713) and *b/fōte* “to be wiped out” (Crum 46 and 624).

hagna “common reed (*Phragmites communis*)”: HB 193, without attribution. Perhaps a cognate of Cp. *hacin* “scented herb, mint” (Crum 744).

halūm “kind of cheese”: BH 222 and B 42, who provides its Cp. etymon *halōm* (Crum 670). Arabic *ḥālūm*, however, already extant in the CA dictionaries, implies higher dates for this borrowing. Vittmann 222 views this item as a probable Arabic loanword in Cp., which is reasonably supported by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

handūs “lizard”: B 42, who provides its Cp. etymon *hantous* or *anthous* (Crum 692 and 11). Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a CP. origin for this word without pinpointing it, which is done by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

hanṭūr “carriage drawn by horses”: B 42 considers it a derivate of Cp. *htōr* “horses”, which would make sense only as the remnant of a longer syntagm, such as “horse carriage”. BH 229, quoted by Vittmann 200, fn. 7 and by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, suggests Turkish **hinto* of Hungarian origin, but that word is not listed in Turkish dictionaries. If we admit that in older epochs this term designated a carriage drawn by a pair of mules, not a single animal, a connection might be established with Cp. *hōt(e)r* “to be joined, doubled; joint yoke” or its derivate *hatre* “double thing, twin” (Crum 726), with adoption of the pattern {*lā2ū3*}, characteristic of the *nomen instrumentis* (cf. *bāhūq* and *tagūs*), and insertion of a relatively frequent dissimilative /n/.

hinn “earthen milk bowl”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:89, with the Cp. etymon *hin* “vessel; cup” (Crum 685), which we subscribe.

hūhū “last remains”: HB 231, without attribution. Possibly, from Cp. *hōh* “to scrape” (Crum 742); cf. also *xaxow* “scratching” (*ibidem*).

xara “children’s ballgame”: HB 243, “perhaps Cp.” Possibly, from *či hra+ho* “to amuse oneself” (Crum 48). Cf. *sennū*, *daqnu*, *šaka* and *kaḥ/šku*. Vittmann 210 mentions the possibility of a Cp. etymon with a question mark, while Behnstedt 1997:32-33 finds Arabic interpretations for the technical terms of this game, *rijla*, *kaḥka* and *šaq(q)a*, even *xara*, deserving much attention.

xirs “weedy ground”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:93, with a choice of three etyma: Cp. *hroš* “to be difficult” (Crum 706, as such places are hard to till, but the last consonant is mismatched), EA *xirs/š* “a weed” (perhaps a mistake for Neo-Arabic *ħirš* “bushy ground”), and Greek *chērsos* “barren land”. In spite of our colleague’s inclination to the latter, we would once again disavow the likelihood of Greek agricultural loanwords in Egyptian. Incidentally, in the course of our research on Arabic loanwords in Ibero-Romance we have found some exceptional cases of Arabic /š/ transcribed by sibilants instead of hussing phonemes (e.g., Portuguese **alvecim** < Arabic *alwašy* “brocade”, Catalan **salefa** < Arabic *šarīḥa* “slice” and Castilian **albricias** < Arabic *albušrā* “reward for good news”, although all of them having also regular reflexes such as **aluexia**, **xarefa** and **albíxeres**). We have suggested as an explanation for this anomaly that the irregular sibilants might reflect the old lateral /š/, better preserved by Arabs of southern stock in the first period of Al-Andalus,²⁸ which could also apply to Egypt in cases of similar confusions.

xulāgi “prayer book usually containing the three Cp. liturgies”: BH 259, without attribution. The likeness with Greek *eulógion* “praise” is remarkable, but the onset consonant is puzzling, unless it reflects a hypercorrect *spiritus asper*.

xilāwa “rope, joined to a tow rope, that the tower of a boat wraps around his torso” is qualified in HB 264 as “perhaps Cp.,” which is unwarranted to the best of our knowledge. Vittmann 210 mentions the possibility of a Cp. etymon with a question mark, while Behnstedt 1997:33 connects the entry with Ḥassāniyya *xalu*, said of some types of saddle trees, and with CA *xaliyyah* “towed ship”.²⁹

xamāsīn “khamsin, hot southerly wind in Egypt”: this term, traditionally connected with Neo-Arabic *xamsīn* “fifty” and given an etymon reflecting the assumption that such is its usual length³⁰, which is not true, is probably just a folk etymology. In fact, it would derive from a compound of Cp. *hmmē* “heat, fever” (with a Bohairic var. *xemi*, Crum 677) and *sine* (“passing through; afternoon; decline”, Crum 343), allusive to the fact that its strength and duration are lesser than in the case of summer heat.³¹

²⁸ See CORRIENTE 1999: 34-35. The same applies to lateral /d/, reflected as /d/ only in the oldest Arabic loanwords of Ibero-Romance languages.

²⁹ So in KAZIMIRSKI; however, Lane prefers “ship that goes of itself, without its being made to do so by the sailor”, a better semantic match for the root {xlw}.

³⁰ See DOZY 1881: 405, who even posited a CA nominative **xamsīn*.

³¹ See CORRIENTE 1999: 272.

xanaḥ “nasality of speech” is qualified in HB 264 as Cp., which is not the case of the immediately following *xanfar* “to speak with a nasal tone; to snort”. In our opinion, chances are that these items be blendings of Arabic *x/ḡunnah* “nasal tone” and *naxara* “to snort”. As for Vittmann 223 he is clearly against a Cp. etymon, and in favour of the Arabic root {*xnḥ*}, quite reasonably this time, apparently supported by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

xunn “chicken coop”: HB 268, “perhaps Cp.,” which is unwarranted to the best of our knowledge, being also rejected by Behnstedt 1997:33-34 who provides witnesses of its occurrence in kindred Neo-Arabic dialects and, in the case of its synonymous *xumm*, also in CA dictionaries. Vittmann 211 mentions the possibility of a Cp. etymon with a question mark.

dabš “rough-cut limestone”: HB 277, “Cp.” Blau 2006:80 has a possible cognate *jabša* “rubble, quarry stone”, and points to their kinship and presence in other Arabic dialects, although his proposal of a connection to CA *saylun dubāš* is less fortunate, because the semantics of this idiom turns around the idea of a stream carrying away whatever it encounters. A derivation from Cp. *t+paše* “division, half” (Crum 278), with the feminine definite article, is not impossible on semantic grounds; however, Vittmann’s qualms about a Cp. etymon may be justified by the presence of this item in other Arabic dialects, as he says, with the support of Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

darafs “awl, spike”: contributed by Schenkel 21, from Cp. *t(h)raps* (Crum 431).

da/išida “peg on the yoke of the plough”: HB 290, without attribution. Perhaps from Cp. *šāte* “belt of palm fibre” (Crum 594), with agglutination of a feminine definite article. Behnstedt 1981:85 contributes the allomorphs *š/udya*, without agglutination of the Cp. article, used in the northwestern areas of the Delta, unlike the central and northeastern regions.

dašš “unripe fruit”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:85, and etymologised as from Cp. *taš*, which is a risky bet since, according to Crum 449, the meaning of this item is unknown and the rendering “grain, herb” is only tentative. A connection with the Arabic root {*jšš*} “to grind coarsely” is possible, since *jašš* (dialectally *dašš*) means coarsely ground grains, comparable in taste to unripe fruits.

dāḡ(u) gāb “to knock the living daylight out of”: HB 313, “possibly Cp.”. A derivation from Cp. *tako* “to destroy” (Crum 405) is unlikely, in view of Neo-Persian *dāḡ* “brand-mark”, mentioned by Vittmann 222 and clearly reflected by Turkish idioms like *daḡr dil* “great sorrow”, a close reproduction of Neo-Persian *dāḡ del* “heart-sorrow”, and *daḡ basmak* “to brand”.

daqnu “style of serving in the game called *xara*”: HB 297, without attribution. This is a very long shot, but perhaps Cp. *ti knaau* “to give a sheaf” (Crum 112) might be the solution, by supposing a certain similarity between motions in both situations, as suggested by Behnstedt 1997:32-33 for other technical terms of this game.

dāqūs “transverse timber supporting the half-deck in a Nile sailing boat”: HB 297, without attribution. Possibly a variant of *tagūs*, q.v.

dakkūj/ša “jar”: recorded by Dozy 1981 I:453 and 454, not mentioned anymore by HB or B. From Cp. *t+kounčou* (Crum 113), about which see Corriente 1997:181.

dukš “huge and strong”: BH 298, without attribution. Perhaps related to Cp. *kōōše* “to split” (Crum 130), with agglutination of a feminine definite article.

dīmār: “Christ’s nature”, in Blau 2006:220, rather than a direct reflex of Ethiopic would be the expectable transcription of Cp. *ti+mēr* “binding, tying”.³²

dīmāra “time of inundation”: HB 304 and B 41, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *t+emēre* (Crum 56), with agglutination of a feminine definite article, accepted by Vittmann 209.

dahabiyya “houseboat”: contributed by Vollers 655, with the etymological proposal OE *atpa* “sacred boat” (*sic*, possibly *ītp* “ship” in Ermann & Grapow I 153 or *dp.t*, *ibidem* V 446), which is hardly acceptable on phonetic grounds.

du(hu)ks, *di(hi)ks*, *dihisk*, *duhusk* “iron handle of a whip used for scraping the ploughshare”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:85, and etymologised as from Cp. *ti+hoks* “scraper” (Crum 663), which we subscribe.

rabrab “to smear with Nile mud”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:90-91, with a possible etymon in Cp. *rofref* “to smear” (unrecorded by Crum in this meaning), although our colleague also considers the possibility of an Arabic origin related to *murabba* “marmelade”. In fact, we would rather favour a diminutive {1212}, derived from Arabic *rabbab* “to remove the bad smell and taste of leather bottles with scent”.

ramrūm “small fish”: in B 41, who proposes a connection with Cp. *rame*. “tilapia” (Crum 294), synonymous with EA *bulṭi* “Nile perch, tilapia”. This would require the not infrequent adoption of the hypocoristic pattern {1a/u23ū4}.³³ Vittmann 200, fn. 8, mentions this item, as attributed by Bishai to a Cp. origin without further comments. In his unp. article, Behnstedt has an

³² According to our proposal in CORRIENTE 2007a: 324.

³³ About which, see CORRIENTE 1969. CRUM, 181 has a case in which this item refers to substances and persons in theological terms.

homophonous *ramrūm* “Nile mud”, which he connects with *rabrab* and *raharūba*, q.v.

rūmis “a kind of rake for rice fields”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich 176, supposedly from Greek *rumós* “beam of a plough; trace of a harness”, through Cp. In fact, the EA item appears twice in Crum 183 and 812, listed among ship’s appurtenances, and tentatively interpreted as “bundle, faggot” or “raft”, the last meaning being also registered by Dozy I 558. Consequently, if this word indeed reflects that Greek one, the semantic evolution has been considerable.

rāy “Nile fish, *Alestes dentex* / batemose”: BH 319 and B 44, who provides the correct Coptic etymon *rēy* (Crum 287), endorsed by Vittmann 212.

rifṭāw “measure of grain equal to one quarter of a ‘keela’”: BH 344 and B 44, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *reftoou* “one fourth” (Crum 289, Mallon 82), endorsed by Vittmann 212; see note to *?ardabb*.

raharūba “thin mud”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, as a possible cognate of *rabrab*, but simultaneously attributed to Arabic **rūb* “mud”. This is a long shot indeed, but the fact that there is a Cp. *a/ome* “mud” (Crum 254-255, see *tamy* below), first constituent of many compound substantives, e.g., *ame+n+raht* “fuller’s earth”, literally, “cleansing mud”, implies the occurrence of **rah+n+ome* “cleansing with fuller’s earth”, whence possibly, through common phonetic evolution, **rahrōb*, etc.

ruhrī “wet mud”: HB 354, attributed to Cp., with a variant *ruṭrāt*, in Vollers 655, reflected as *ruṭrēt*, in HB 341. There are no grounds for such an attribution, while the same root contains a verb *rahraṭ* “to loosen; to make baggy or flabby” with the matching reflexive measure, and a phonetic variant *raṭraṭ* “to soil” in HB 341. In fact, all of them answer to the patterns {1223} and {1212} frequently adopted in Arabic for expressive connotations, while the semantic juncture lies in the looseness of wet mud (cf. Arabic *rahaṭa* “to knead in one’s hand”).

rawaš “to distract”: HB 358, “perhaps Cp.,” provided by Vittmann with a question mark. Such an attribution might have been based on Cp. *raše* “to rejoice” (Crum 308), or on *rōše* (Crum 309) “to content”, which would account better for the insertion of /w/. On his part, Behnstedt 1997:35 connects this item with the series {*dwš*}, {*šwš*}, {*nwš*} and {*hwš*}, a feature found also in other dialects, suggesting an eventual increase of such series. We would subscribe this, adding that such phenomena are made easier by possible blending with other roots of similar meaning, being characteristic of periods of bilingualism and frequent code-mixing. This means that, in fact, Cp. *raše* or

rōšē may easily have been attracted by that series and been semantically adapted to match it totally.

rīā “a plant, *sapindus*”: B 44, who provides the Cp. etymon *rita* “a plant, flower of *laurus nobilis*” (Crum 305), with a semantic shift otherwise frequent in plant names. Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it.

zagzig “to gain weight, to fatten up”: HB 365. Possibly from Cp. *soksek* “to gather” (Crum 330).

zanzin “to buzz, to make a low vibrating sound”: HB 382. Possibly from Cp. *sensen* “to resound” (Crum 345).

zīr “large handleless earthenware jar used for storing and filtering water”: HB 389 and B 47, who provides the Cp. etymon *sir*, although Crum 353 conversely considers that the Cp. item is of Arabic stock. As a matter of fact, it is included in CA dictionaries, while the Cp. term is unsupported by Ermann & Grapow; Behnstedt in his unp. article mentions several Neo-Arabic dialects reflecting this item, which Vollers derived from Persian *āzīr*.

sās “oakum”: B 44, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *saase* (Crum 358). Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s proposal without endorsing it.

sibī or *saffī* “extension of the beam of a plough”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91, who considers the possibility of a reflex of Cp. *sībe* (cf. *sabyūna* below) or *sēfe/i* (Crum 320, “reed; shinbone”, supported by the fact that some pieces of the plough are designated with the names of parts of the human body, Cp. or Arabic. Probably correct.

s/zubāta “cluster of dates, bananas, etc.”: HB 364 and 392, “probably Cp.” It might derive from *sobte* “preparation, disposition” (Crum 324), perhaps contaminated at least by Arabic *subāṭah* “objects washed away by rain”, of the pattern $\{1u2ā3ah\}$ expressive of fragmentation,³⁴ connectable with South Semitic *zabaṭa* “to hit or strike”. See *safīyya*.

sabyūna “beam of the plough”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91 and tentatively connected with Cp. *sēbe/i* “pipe; stalk” (Crum 320), although the coda with *-ūna* is left unexplained.³⁵ Of the same etymon would also be, according to Behnstedt (*ibidem*), *sibya* or *sība* “tripod of a butter churn or for

³⁴ See WRIGHT 1967: 176.

³⁵ Chances are that it be an old diminutive suffix of the kind studied by FLEISCH 1961: 453-454, with examples from Syrian Arabic, traditionally attributed to the Aramaic substratum, but also from OA and the Omani dialect and Modern South Arabian, in both cases unequivocally pointing to that bundle of features which we have often detected in EA and Western Neo-Arabic, connecting them with their partially South Arabian ancestry. SCHENKEL, 11 considers this case as a variant of those in which EA has metanalyzed Cp. words ending in *-e/i* as fem. and attached a *nomen unitatis* mark.

hanging meat”, which in this case is phonetically irreproachable, while the semantics is questionable in both meanings; however, their interchangeability with Arabic *qaṣabah*, in principle “reed”, would suggest that this material was often used to make those implements.

saxx “to strike / hit / beat”: HB 402, “perhaps Cp.”. However, in spite of some hesitation in Vittmann 212 (fn. 33), there can be little doubt that we are here confronted with Cp. *sax/s* “stroke, blow” (Crum 374). However, Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article would connect it with Arabic *saḥḥ* “to hit” and *ṣaxx* “to hit with something hard”.

saftiyya “prepared”: contributed by Schenkel 23, from Cp. *sa/obte* “preparation” (Crum324). See *s/zubāṭa*.

sikka “plough” or “ploughshare”: B 45 attributes it to Cp. *skai* “to plough” (Crum 328), an etymon justly rejected by Vittmann 200, fn. 8, and Behnstedt in his unp. article, it being unconvincing, both on account of phonetic difficulties and of the fact that the entry is a deeply rooted Arabic item. Its cognates in other Northwest Semitic tongues (cf. Aramaic *sikkā*), would make possible a borrowing only from much older Egyptian. However, that Cp. etymon is valid for the synonymous *sikāya*, contributed by Schenkel 33, with adoption of the Arabic pattern *{li2ā3ah}*, rather than any influence of *siqāyah* “watering”, as suggested by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

salla “basket”: HB 426. Indeed a cognate of Cp. *salō* (Crum 330), but its presence in other Northwest Semitic tongues (cf. Aramaic *sallā*), means that it must have been borrowed from much older Egyptian.

simsim: HB 430, given as Cp. However, in spite of its phonetic and semantic identity with *simsim* in this language (Crum 340), and the distinct possibility of a borrowing from Egyptian, the facts are that this plant is missing in Ermann & Grapow, and that only Akkadian provides a transparent etymon, namely, *šam(aš)šammu* < *šaman šammi* “vegetable oil”, which appears to be also Vittmann’s contention (Vittmann 213, fn. 35).

simmāna “quail”: HB 432, “Cp.”. Indeed, Cp. *smoune* is the Nile goose (*Chenalopex aegyptiacus*), supported by OE >*smn*< “kind of goose” in Ermann & Grapow IV 136, in truth quite a different bird, but semantic shifts in animal and plant names are commonplace. At any rate, Arabic *sum(m)ānā*, more likelier of Egyptian than Persian origin, is listed in CA dictionaries with a vague definition as “a bird”; therefore, it must have been borrowed in older phases of the former language. Its identification with *salwā* might have occurred later.

simīṭ “semolina; sticks or rings of bread, often sprinkled with sesame seeds”: BH 433 and B 44, who propounds Cp. *samit* (Crum 340) as immediate

origin of Arabic, though conceding the ultimate Semitic origin of this item. Indeed, Akkadian *samīdu(m)* and Greek *semídalos* do not point to Egypt, in which there are not old witnesses either. Vittmann 213 accepts that Cp. etymon without further comments, while Behnstedt in his unp. article is not convinced by Bishai's argumentation, in favour of an Egyptian origin on account of the reflex of the dental phoneme, as /d/ and /t/ do at times alternate in Arabic.

san̄ta "acacia": HB 435, "Cp." Indeed a cognate of Cp. *sōnte* (Crum 573), endorsed by Vittmann 212, but the Arabic item must have been borrowed in much higher dates, cf. OE >*sn̄d*<, with a regular Arabic reflex /t/ of OE /d/.

sinn ilmuḥrāt "ploughshare": contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91, who considers likely a derivation from Cp. *sine* of the same meaning (Crum 343), in spite of the phonetic likeness to Arabic *sinn* "tooth; point", possibly contributing to maintain the Cp. item in use. In their unp. article, however, Behnstedt & Woidich concede the same likelihood to both possibilities.

sinnu "style of serving in the game called *xara*": HB 436 and B 44, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *snau* "two" (Crum 346), also endorsed by Vittmann 213. See also Behnstedt 1997:32-33 about the technical terms of this game.

šāl "Nile fish (Synadontis schall, with a variant *šilān*)": HB 448, and B 44 & 41, with a variant *gīl*, spelled *qīl*, who provides the correct Cp. etyma *čēl* and *kēl* (Crum 765 and 102), also accepted by Vittmann 214, though not endorsed in 200, fn. 8..

ša ?ša? "to begin / appear (of dawn or blossoms); to rise (moon, etc.)": BH 448 and B 45, who provides the correct Cp. etyma *ša* (Crum 542), with a phenomenon of redoubling which might be simply expressive or reflect the frequent use with that item of the habitual present prefix {*šay/k/f ...*} (Mallon 105 and 111). Vittmann 224, however, is not satisfied with this etymon, considering that the *hamz* in this Egyptian item can only reflect Arabic /q/, i.e., a root {*šqšq*}, semantically unapt to generate that meaning, as it only connotes certain kinds of voices, like chirping, twittering, etc. in CA, not "to break (dawn)", which Vittmann has attached there, on account of its presence in Wehr's dictionaries, often recording modern usage of dialectal stock. In fact Vittmann, whose view is merely mentioned by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article without any comment, appears to have forgotten the frequency presence in Egyptian and other Neo-Arabic dialects of pausal *hamz* (e.g., *la?* "no[pe]!", which is sufficient to explain that phonetic addition to the Cp. item.

šabbūra "fog": HB 449 and B 44, who provides the correct Cp. etymon **šbrē* "the change of the sun", compounded of *šibe* "change" (Crum 551) and *rē* "sun" (Crum 287), with adoption of the Arabic hypocoristic pattern

{1a22ū3ah}. Vittmann 224 is not in favour of that morphological reshaping and, above all, distrusts that semantic evolution, which in our opinion is just one more symptom of his overcritical attitude towards Cp. borrowings in Arabic, as that pattern is quite productive in Neo-Arabic³⁶ and the connection between absence of sunshine and outbreaks of fog is indubitable. In their unp. article, Behnstedt & Woidich simply attach the presence of the item in one source of Damascus Arabic.

šūbya, *šūb/ma* or *šawb/ma* “stick”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich 253, and etymologized as either *šbot* “rod, staff” (Crum 554) or *šmou* “peg, stake” (Crum 565).

šuxlēla pl. *šaxālīl* “small iron bells attached to the whip”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:92-93 who, considering the synonymy of the matching verbs *šaxlal* and *šaxšax*, hesitates between a reflex of Cp. *škelkil* (see >*šqilqil*< below) and Arabic {šxšx}; in our view, there has been a contamination of both etyma.

šadūf “shadoof, counterpoised swing for raising water”: contributed by Shenkel 24, and etymologised as a reflex of OE *šat.w=f* “the one with a bucket or waterskin”, without Cp. attestation.

š/sin/dda “cheese mould of plaited esparto”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91-92 and attributed to Cp. *šnte* (Crum 572 “plaited work”), which we subscribe.

š/udya: see *da/išīda*.

š/iḏāb, *šidād* and *šaddād* “peg connecting the beam with its extensions”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:92, who considers these items as a result of blending of Cp. *šbot* (Crum 554 “rod, staff”), or rather a metathetical **štob*, with Arabic {šdd}, if not a reflex of CP. *šhōt* “rope of palm-fibre (used by date collector to climb)” (Crum 555). The first hypothesis sound likelier on both phonetic and semantic grounds.

šrb “lumps of soil left after ploughing”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:92, with the Cp. etymon *čalp* (Crum 813 “mass, lump”), which we subscribe.

širs(a) “bundle, bunch” (also in BH 459, without etymological attribution): contributed by Behnstedt 1981:92, with the Cp. etymon *šras* (missing in Crum).

šarāqi “unirrigated”: HB 461 “Cp.” Possibly from Cp. *šarke* “draught” (Crum 586), though at least contaminated by the Arabic root {šrq} “to rise (the sun)”. This possibility becomes a certainty in Vittmann 225, who discounts any connection with Cp., although the pattern {1a2ā3ī} would not be

³⁶ See *baqlūla* above, and CORRIENTE 1969.

explainable in terms of Arabic morphology and semantics, except as a broken quadriconsonantal plural of something identical or very similar to **šarqī*, a good candidate to reflect Cp. *šarke* under the effects of interference by the Arabic root {*šrq*}. In their unp. article, Behnstedt & Woidich just mention Vollers' support of the Egyptian etymon and the fact that others have held different views.

šurumb “whip”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:92 and attributed to Cp. *cerōb* “staff, rod, eventually used for hitting” (Crum 828), which we subscribe.

šurya “thurible”: HB 463 and *šūriya* B 45, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *šourē* (Crum 603), also accepted by Vittmann 215 and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article. The adoption of the Arabic fem. marker, parallel to the case of *tōre/i* (see below), is understandable in a fem. word which would be unmarked otherwise, against the rules of EA.

šaṭya “stick for driving holes for sowing”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91 and attributed to Cp. *šat* “to extort or exact” (Crum 594) or *šōte* (Crum 595 “pit”). This requires a considerable semantic shift and, on the other hand, HB 464 have *šaḍṭya* “splinter” < Arabic *šaḍiyyah*, which offers no serious semantic or phonetic difficulties.

>*šqilqil*< “bell” (to be read *išgilgil*) : B 45, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *šilkil* (Crum 603). Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a Cp. origin for this word without mentioning it. See *šuxlēla*.

šaka “style of serving in the game called *xara*”: HB 472, possibly the same as *šakumba* (HB 474) of the same meaning, perhaps a cognate of Cp. *šōk* “to dig” (Crum 555), assuming again that the technical terms of this game would reflect comparable motions in agricultural labours; see *daqnu* and *xara*. It is worth mentioning that Behnstedt 1997:32-33 spells this item as *šaq(q)a* and etymologizes it tentatively as a reflex of *šaqqa* “side”.

šilba “fishing net”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, and etymologised as a variant of *šinf* (q.v. below), through **šilf*.

šilba “Nile fish (*Silurus mixtus*)”: HB 475 and B 45, who provides the Cp. etymon *clboou* (Crum 810), accepted by Vittmann 214; however, as most of these identifications are uncertain, the possibility of at least contamination by Greek *salpē* “salema”³⁷ should be conceded.

³⁷ I.e., Boops salpa, called *šalba* in Tunisia, within a family of reflexes of the Greek item, with members in every Southern Romance language and Turkish, according to DAVIDSON 1972: 104. Fish names of Greek origin are common everywhere in the Mediterranean area, providing the etymon of at least one item mentioned by BEHNSTEDT & WOIDICH in their unp. article as “sounding Cp.”, namely, *balamūda* = *balamūza* = *balamīta* “Atlantic bonito” < Neo-Greek

šilīta “donkey-pannier”: HB 477, without attribution. Possibly, from Cp. *calite* “vessel or measure” (Crum 813).

šalātī in *umm iš* — “omasum, many-plies”: HB 475, without attribution. Possibly from Cp. *clōt* “internal organs” (Crum 813).

šallūt “kick” in the idiom *darabu biš* “he kicked him out”: HB 475 and B 44, who provides the Cp. etymon *caloj* “foot; knee”, endorsed by Vittmann 213. The phonetic difficulties are eased by the fact that, as Crum 801 states, /c/ and /t/ were often interchangeable, while the confluence of /c/ and /č/ is characteristic of Late Cp. (Mallon 11, Crum 745 and 801); this allows to posit *caloj* > **caloč* > **calot* and, already within Arabic, **šalūt* with elimination of the marginal phoneme, and finally, *šallūt*, with adoption of the pattern {1a22ū3}. In their unp. article, Behnstedt & Woidich mention the occasional occurrence of this item and cognates in Palestinian and Syrian Arabic.

šilh “(durra) sheaf”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91, with the Cp. etymon *šelh* and vars. (Crum 561, “twig, shoot”), with a considerable semantic evolution.

šilixta “large ugly woman”: HB 476, with the far-fetched suggestion of a Yiddish etymon, cf. German *Schlechte* “bad (woman)”. But, of course, Cp. *calaht* “pot” (Crum 813) stands a much better chance of being its true etymon, through metonymy.

šalšil “to pull a kerchief to and fro across the front and back of the neck as a gesture of mourning”: HB 476, “prob. Cp.” Possibly from Cp. *šolšl* “to sift” (Crum 561). Vittmann 224-225 is again unconvinced, though acknowledging the semantic overlapping of both languages, mostly because of an alleged kinship between Cp. *šolšl* and Arabic *xalxala* (sic, for *ħalħala* = Hebrew *ħalħēl* “to shake”). That hypothesis is untenable, once /x/ has been duly corrected as /ħ/ but, besides, it would have no bearing on the borrowing of the Cp. item by EA. In their unp. article, Behnstedt & Woidich consider this item as a denominative derivative of *šāl* “shawl”, like Syrian Arabic *balbal* “to piss” from *bāl*; however, this procedure would be uncommon in the case of a relatively recent borrowing from Persian not belonging to the basic lexicon.

šilq “rope”: HB 476, “perhaps Cp.” Possibly, from Cp. *šōlk* “stitch; weave” (Crum 558).³⁸ As for Vittmann 225, the mere presence of this item in Dozy 1881 I: 783 is deemed sufficient proof of the Arabic origin of this term, in spite of its being totally absent from CA dictionaries, as Behnstedt & Woidich

palamida (< Greek *palāmis* “mole”), reflected by other area languages, like Italian, Turkish and even Spanish *palometa* (DAVIDSON, 141-142).

³⁸ Possibly, the true etymon of And. *šallák/q* “to entangle, lasso, tie” and related items in CORRIENTE 1997a: 289, with an etymological proposal now requiring overhauling.

remind in his unp. article, while suggesting an eventual connection with CA. *šanaq* “to hang”. The same root appears in AA with related meanings,³⁹ which is not surprising, considering the tight connection between all Western Arabic dialects and EA.

šalla “scorpion”: contributed by Ishaq (after Schenkel 29), from Cp. *clē* (Crum 810).

šalāw “belt carrying the buckets of a water-wheel”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91 and etymologized as a reflex of Cp. *šalaw* (Crum 561, where the meaning “waterwheel” is followed by a question mark, but appears likely to be correct on account of the contexts). There was either a semantic shift or an abridgement of a compound noun to its second constituent.⁴⁰

šama/ār “fennel”: HB 477 and B 45, who provides a Cp. etymon *samahēr*,⁴¹ although aware of its difficulties, more than sufficient for Vittmann 200, fn. 7, to reject it. The occurrence of this item in other Northwest Semitic tongues, like Aramaic *šummār(ā)*, makes unlikely a borrowing from Cp. while, for older Egyptian, Ermann & Grapow do not carry this item.

šanšin “to produce a sound which reveals a defect in the constituent material; to jingle / rattle”: HB 481, without attribution. Probably, from Cp. *cencen* “to make music” (Crum 824).

šanaṭ “to tie firmly”: HB 481, without attribution. Probably, from Cp. *šōnt* “to plait” (Crum 572).

šanaḥ “sniff”: HB 481, “perhaps Cp.” There are no grounds for such an attribution, especially when also *šanhiḥ* (HB 482) “to sniffle in crying” points in the direction of an old Semitic causative prefix *š-* attached to a forerunner of Arabic *ʔanf* “nose”. This is also Vittmann’s opinion (Vittmann 214 and 225), mentioned by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article with some additional material from Neo-Arabic suggesting his support.

šinḥ “sack for straw”: HB 481 and B 45, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *čna/of* or *enof* “basquet; crate” (Crum 777, apparently a reflex of OE *>mfj.t<* “Beutel”, in Ermann & Grapow V 380), endorsed by Behnstedt 1981 and Vittmann 214. Since the regular reflex of OE */t/* is Cp. */č/*, it is evident that the frequent shift of this phoneme to */š/* had taken place in this item. Of the same etymon would be also *šanḥ* “dragnet used for carrying straw on camels”, a variant contributed by Behnstedt 1981:91.

³⁹ See CORRIENTE 1997: 289, under *{škn}*, which points to a later merely phonetic contamination with the Arabic root *{šq}*.

⁴⁰ We have described several instances of this phenomenon in the Arabic loanwords of Ibero-Romance; see CORRIENTE 1999: 63-64.

⁴¹ Already suggested by VOLLERS, 654, according to BEHNSTEDT & WOIDICH in his unp. article.

šintiyān “large drawers out of mode”: HB 480 and B 45, who propounded a Cp. etymon *šentō* “robe of linen”. HB, quoted by Vittmann 200, fn. 7, and totally supported by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, seems more correct in its attribution to a Turkish etymon *çintiyān*, already recorded by Dozy 1881 I:790, Redhouse 1890:731 and Sami 1890:516, although younger works like the Turkish Academy’s *Türkçe Sözlük* and Hony, Alderson & İz 1984 only record *çintan*; at any rate, the foreign shape of this term and some phonetic oddities raise some doubts.

šinhāb(i) “certain pegs in the plough”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:92, who suggests as Cp. etymon a compound of *šen* “wood” (Crum 568 “tree”) and *hebi* “plough” (Crum 656), which we subscribe.

šinhāb “sowing under certain conditions of soil humidity”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:92, who suggests as Cp. etymon a compound of *šouie* “dryness” (Crum 602 “tree”) and *haab* “bottom, sediment” (Crum 652, “uncertain”), there being also a verb *šanhib* said of the soil when it begins to dry up. Furthermore, Behnstedt 1981:92 adds a second *šinhāb* “boundary (of a field)”, in which the second constituent would be Cp. *šī* “boundary” (Crum 547-548 “measure, limit”; Schenkel 45 analyzes *šī+n+hōb*, including the genitive mark. We would subscribe the last proposal, while in the first case there is, at least, a noticeable semantic shift, causing some misgivings.

šōb “heat of the day”: B 45, who proposes the Cp. etymon *šōpx* or *šōxp*. However, this characteristic term of Syrian Arabic dialects, is known to reflect Syriac *šawbā* “parching or sultry heat”, as Behnstedt & Woidich say in their unp. article.

šawwaḥ “to sear / sauté”: HB 484, “perhaps Cp.”. Indeed, from *šōbh* or *šōouh* “to scorch” (Crum 554), which is accepted by Vittmann 214. However, Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article mention some Tunisian cognates and consider a possible connection with Cl.Ar. *šawwaḥ* or *šayyaḥ* “to cook thoroughly; to burn”: the latter are not only phonemically, but also semantically divergent, since searing is just the opposite of cooking thoroughly, let alone burning the food and, as far as Egyptian borrowings in Western Arabic are concerned, they are not exceptional in our opinion.

šūša “tassel”: B 45, who suggests a Cp. etymon *šīšōi* “single lock or plait of hair” (Crum 800), also accepted by Vittmann 215; however, the phonetic difficulty for matching the vowels is obvious, while the Arabic item appears to be old and has an eventual cognate *šibšāh* “branch” in Talmudic Aramaic. Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are in favour of a derivation from the Arabic root *šwš* “to confuse”, recorded by CA dictionaries, but most likely an old borrowing from Aramaic *šabbeš*.

šūša “small window”: B 45, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *šouš* “window” (Crum 608). Also mentioned by Behstedt & Woidich 249 who, in their unp. article, attach here *šinēša* “window separating the hall from the parlor”; however, the insertion of /n/ calls for an explanation. Granted that this item has adopted the Arabic diminutive pattern, one must posit an original Cp. **švnš(v)*, which would admit of several interpretations, considering the manifold possibilities of **šv* in this language (pp. 541 to 550 of Crum’s dictionary); only as a working hypothesis we dare suggesting a phrase *šan+še* “we use to go (in)” (habitual present), which might have become the name of that area of the house.

šawšaw “to beat with a whip”: B 45, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *ouošoueš* “to strike, to thresh” (Crum 504), with mere metathesis.

šūta “Newcastle disease (affecting fowls)”: HB 486, “probably Cp.” Possibly from Cp. *šōt* “to slay” (Crum 590). Vittmann 225-226 would connect this item to the Arabic root {*šwṭ*}, whence a 1st measure, “he ran a heat, or single run, or a run at once, to a goal ...” and a 2nd measure “to ride hard (a horse); to overcook (meat); to boil; to damage (plants)”, which would require a considerable semantic evolution. However, after considering the symptoms of that disease, this opinion is conceded some likelihood by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

šōna “storehouse for grains”: BH 487 and B 45, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *šeunē* “barn” (Crum 603), also accepted by Vittmann 214. The interpretation of the last vowel as a feminine mark {-a} is not only a solution to an unusual vocalic cauda, but also a witness to the widespread palatalization of final /a/ in the Egyptian dialect, today excluded from the Cairene dialect, but apparently not so some decades ago, as pointed by the European transcriptions of the name of the famous site of the Pyramids, “G(u)ize(h)”, for *gēa*.⁴²

šawšaw “to beat with a whip”: B 45, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *ouošoueš* “to strike; to thresh” (Crum 504).

ša/uxšāxa, *šuxšēxa*, *ḍahḍūḥa* and *ḍuḥḍēḥa* “kind of harrow for smoothing the soil”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:93, and attributed to Cp. *sehsōh* (“to roll, round, rub down, plane”, Crum 386), which we subscribe. There has been contamination by Arabic *šaḥṣa/āḥ* “flat ground”, and {*dhḍh*} “to shake”, possibly on account of the motions involved in that operation.

šīr “heavily salted small fish”: HB 516 and B 45, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *čīr* “brine” (Crum 780), endorsed by Vittmann 213.⁴³

⁴² See WOIDICH’s assessment of this issue in FISCHER & JASTROW 1980: 208.

⁴³ However, a reflex /s/ of either Cp. or OE /c/ is abnormal and can only be explained in a phase in which Arabic /s/ still had a somewhat affricate articulation, according to STEINER 1982: 75-

dabba “wooden door lock” (H 518 and B 41, who provides a Cp. etymon *t+epō* “part of fastening of door” (Crum 57, with agglutination of the fem. definite article),⁴⁴ however, the borrowing must have been much older, considering the presence of that entry in CA dictionaries. Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article review other scholars’ comments on this item and some possibilities of intra-Arabic etyma, like the root {*ḏmm*} “to draw together”, which in Yemen has acquired the meaning “closing, locking”.

tāb “game for two players with stone counters and four strips of palm branches, each strip having one green and one white side; the strips are thrown against a vertical surface and the various combinations of green and white govern the movement of the stones on a grid drawn in the dust”: HB 528, without attribution. Perhaps from Cp. *tōḏbe* “requital” (Crum 399).

tāš “border of a field”: B 46, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *taš* (Crum 451), mentioned but not endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 8, which is done by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

tabḥa “prayer”: B 46, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *tōbh* (Crum 402). Apparently, the pre-junctural *shewa* has been analysed as a mark of *nomen unitatis*. Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a Cp. origin for this word without pinpointing it, which is done by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

tuqqēsi “small window in a mud dwelling”: BH 543, merely labelled as rural, but the item is recorded by both Kazimirski II 91, as *tuqaysah*, and Dozy 1881 II:49, as *tuqaysah or tuqaysā?*, rendered as a small room separated by a grate from a larger hall, mainly for the purpose of keeping female musical performers out of sight. The etymon might be Cp. *tōks* “piercing” (Crum 407), with adoption of the Arabic diminutive pattern {*1u2(2)ay3*}, but the case is not sufficiently clear.

81, and through an exchange of Cp. *čēnča* (/č/) and *cima* (/c/), it being known that the latter was at a given time pronounced /c/.

⁴⁴ This etymon forces us to modify the entry *aldaba* of CORRIENTE 1999: 146, as it appears now that the similarity between the two meanings of Arabic *dabbah* “female lizard” and “lock; knocker” did not result from a mere metonymy, but from the borrowing of a homophonous foreign term. However, this did not prevent native authors from adopting that etymological explanation, e.g., in the *Lisānu lʿArab*: “Abū Maṣṣūr said that it is called so, because it is wide like the shape of a lizard.” At any rate, the reflex /d/ of either Cp. or OE /t/ is absolutely abnormal and can only be construed as the result of a contamination. The fact that /d/ is not a regular reflex of OE /t/ (/t/ would be it) admits of several explanations, such as a contamination by the root {*tbb*}, in which some semantemes are analysable as close to that concept, or due to penetration through dialects, old and modern, particularly Yemeni, in which /t/ was realized as /d/, about which, see CANTINEAU 1960: 32, including no less than Sibawayhi’s witness in favour of this realization as the genuine one of /t/.

ṭamy “silt”: HB 547, “Cp”. Actually, from Cp. *t+ame* “clay, mud” (Crum 254), with agglutination of the fem. article, already propounded by Vollers 655, and accepted by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

ṭanniš “to act with indifference towards”: HB 547, without attribution. Perhaps from Cp. *tonš* “to threaten” (Crum 421), but cf. Ibn Quzmān 8/2/1 *ṭannaš* “sturdy”, apparently from Latin stock.⁴⁵

ṭohma “invitation”: B 46, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *tōhem* “convocation, calling” (Crum 459, Schenkel 15), mentioned by Vittmann 200, fn. 8, but not endorsed.

ṭūba “brick”: BH 549 and B 46. Indeed a cognate of Cp. *tō(ō)be* (Crum 398), accepted by Vittmann 216, but borrowed by Arabic in much older phases of OE, from >*ḍbt*<. But the attribution to Cp. is only totally correct in the meaning of “5th month of the Cp. year”, from Cp. *tōbe*. Behnstedt 1981 adds here *ṭōf* “mixture of straw and mud for making bricks and walls” (= adobe), as a phonetic variant of the entry. In their unp. article Behnstedt & Woidich consider the possibility of an Arabic etymon from the root {*twf*} “to turn around”, because that mixture is prepared by letting the cattle run in circle ramming it down. We would downgrade this circumstance as possibly triggering the irregular change of the last consonant.

ṭūrya “kind of mattock”: HB 539 and B 46, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *tōri* “hand; (handle of) spade” (Crum 425),⁴⁶ accepted by Vittmann 215, and by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article. This is probably also the etymon of HB 549 *ṭōra* “foursome, group of four (used in counting certain items of food); some, a little”, with a curious semantic juncture in which “four” is identified with a hand without reckoning the thumb. Cf. *šurya* above, about the adoption of the Arabic feminine marker.

ṭayāb “(cool) North wind”: HB 553, without attribution, and B 46 “east wind”, with the correct Cp. etymon *tou+eiebt* (< *teu+eiebt* “wind of the East”,

⁴⁵ See CORRIENTE 1997a: 335. As this word appears to have spread to Morocco, it is not unlikely that it had reached Egypt also, carried along with the large numbers of Andalusí immigrants to that country. The opposite journey of a Cp. word to Al-Andalus was less frequent, although not unheard of, as proven by some terms in this very survey (e.g., *šilq* above) and by similar instances in CORRIENTE 1997, like 69 *bahmút* “cellar” < *bahmi botí*, 72 *páysar* “dish of cooked beans” < *pes+aro*, 81 *táwr* “candelabrum” < *tōre*, 181 *daqqušša* “oil cruet” < *t+kounčou*, 293 *šáni* “galley” < *sēne*, and 267 *sáf* “falcon” < *šaf*, and the very Ibn Quzmān 190/0/1 *šagráf* “to reap”, from EA *šugruf* “medium-sized sickle”, not to speak of cases in which an Egyptian item is shared by several Neo-Ar. dialects, among them AA, of which there is a much longer list, *ibidem*, 591-592.

⁴⁶ Curiously enough, we had resorted to the same metonymy in order to explain Castilian **almocafre**, “dibble”, in CORRIENTE 1999: 195, < *abū kaff* “that of the hand”.

see Crum 439 and 76), accepted by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article. There has been semantic assimilation to Arabic *ḥayyāb* “excellent thing”, as such a wind is generally welcome in Egypt, but Vittmann 200 (fn. 7) would not concede any Cp. interference in what he considers just a normal derivation of the Arabic root *{ḥyb}*.

zarṭa “fart”: B 47, who propounds a Cp. etymon *sartatse*, which is unlikely considering the genuineness of that item in OA. This is also Behnstedt’s view (1981:94), although acknowledging that the initial consonant is an irregular match for this dialect in a word of low register, with a parallel, however, in Ḥassāniyya: perhaps an attempt at making it sound less rude, by euphemistically aping the high-class /z/ for /d/ in some terms? As for the phonetic similarity between the Cp. and Arabic items, it could be explained on onomatopoeic grounds.

farfar “to flutter the wings”: HB 651 and B 41, who suggests a Cp. etymon *forfer* “to fall, to rush down” (Crum 624). This is doubtful on semantic grounds, and a metathesis of possibly onomatopoeic Arabic *{rfif}*, sounds likelier. Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article outright reject it in favour of a reduplicated *farfar*, attested in Syrian Arabic, of CA *farr* “to flee”.

fats “iron wedge used by cabinet-makers”: contributed by Ishaq, with the Cp. etymon *patsi* (“plank” in Crum 276, with considerable semantic evolution).

falt “to spring; to bound”: HB 662, without any etymological attribution, and B 41, who suggests a Cp. etymon *pōt* “to flee” (Crum 274). Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it. Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, consider an eventual blending of Arabic *fazz* “to be frightened” and *naft* “to jump” and very pointedly remarks that Cp. /p/ should have been reflected by /b/.

falt “buttocks”: B 41, who propounds a Cp. etymon *bilti* “hip, rump; anus” (Crum 38). That item, however, is absent in both Spiro and HB and must have circulated scarcely. Vittmann 200, fn. 8, considers, most reasonably this time, that the Cp. origin for this word is yet to be proven. This is also Behnstedt & Woidich’s opinion in their unp. article, reminding that Cp. /b/ would have been reflected as such, and suggesting a connection with Arabic biconsonantal *{fl(+3)}*, present in many roots with the basic semanteme of “splitting, dividing”, so that *falt* should be interpreted as “the half of the buttocks”.

falīl “torch”: in Blau 2006: 513. From Cp. *p+eielel* (Crum 77), with agglutination of the definite article.

fū/ōda or *fawwāda* “palm branch used for wiping the oven”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:85, and etymologised as from Cp. *fōte* “to wipe” (Crum 624), which we subscribe.

fūta “towel”: BH 677 and B 41, who suggests a Cp. etymon *fōte* “to wipe” (Crum 624; Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it, and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article mention similar terms in the Neo-Arabic dialects of Syria and Yemen, allegedly from Persian *fute*. Dictionaries of this language attribute it to Arabic; however, see Corriente 1997a:408 about its undoubtedly Indian origin.

garabān(a), *ʔarabān(a)*, *rabān(a)*, and *rabūn*: “large or small sickle”: this item contributed by Behnstedt 1981:86 is, as he states, an etymological riddle. Arabic appears to be out of question; it could reflect Cp. *xrōbi* and vars. (Crum 516, but this leaves the cauda unexplained, as there is no suffix of this meaning in either Cp. or Arabic). Following Behnstedt’s suggestion, it could be at least contaminated by Greek *drepánē* (assuming metanalysis and deglutination of the Cp. fem. article) and, finally, reflect AA *qurbāl* (DS II 332 and Corriente 1997:420 “billhook”) which, however, is considered unlikely by our colleague. We agree with him on this point, and would not give much weight to the possibility of such an agricultural tool being borrowed by Egyptians from Greek; perhaps the Cp. term had a pl. ending in *-nou* (Mallon 64), although this is usually restricted to masculine noun ending in *-e*, which fails on both accounts. Another possibility, within the Cp. realm, would be a compound word, with a second constituent responsible for the final segment *-an(a)*, perhaps the same *naeiō* found as first constituent of *ʔan+hīb*, q.v. A compound **korb(i)+an(a)* is very apt to evolve into **qar(a)bāna*, by the addition of the same anaptyctic vowel developed in *balakūna* “balcony”, from Italian *balcone*. On the other hand, Behnstedt alludes to the adoption by the allomorph *rabūn* of the pattern {1ā2ū3} of *nomen instrumenti*.

qarw: see *ʔarw*.

gašwa “a fish”: B 41, who provides its correct Cp. etymon *kašou* (Crum 130), accepted by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article. Finally, Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it.

gaṭwiyya, pl. *gaṭwi* “large frail”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:88 who propounds a backformation of the EA sg. from its pl., a reflex of the Cp. pl. *katoowe* of *kat* “basket” (see *baqūti*); the sg. would be reflected by *qaṭwa* “water-wheel bucket”. We agree with either hypothesis.

qilqēl pl. *qalaqīl* (= BH 715 *qulqēla* “clod of earth”): contributed by Vollers 655, is connected by Behnstedt in his unp. article with Arabic and Semitic {qlj} “ball; lump; round”. However, the connection with Cp. *kelkōl* “to

be round”, *kalkil* “wheel” (Crum 103) and other Afroasiatic cognates (cf. Hebrew *gilgāl* “wheel”) is more immediate.

gin(u)w pl. *ignāw* “stalk of the panicle in palm trees”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich 397-398, and attributed to Cp. *kna(a)w* “sheaf”. See *daqnu* above and *kinn* below.

gūta: see *baqūti*.

qīl: see *šāl*.

qīl, *qayl* (i.e., *ʔīl*, *ʔayl*) and *gīl*: “piece of iron connecting the ploughshare to its setting”, contributed by Behnstedt 1981:86, would also share the Cp. etymon of *gāʔīla* and *kīla*.

kās in *ya —i* “oh woe is me”: HB 728, and B 43 “misfortune, pain”. According to the latter author, from Cp. *kās* “qualitative of burial or corpse”, to be more exact “to dress for burial” (Crum 120); Vittmann 200, fn. 8, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it. In our view, however, the substantive *kese* and variants “burial; shroud” would more easily lead to the same connotation; however, Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article offer an intra-Arabic interpretation, namely, *kaʔs* “cup”, based upon the Christian concept of life as a cup full of joy and sorrow which everybody has to drink up, whence the women’s mourning cry *ya wayli ya kāsī* “o my pain, o my cup (of sorrow)”.

kāni wmāni “one thing or another”: HB 729, attributed to Cp. Probably, from *cha-nai ma-nai* “concede these, give these” (Crum 94 and 155 and Mallon 44). Vittmann 223 has not considered this possibility and tends to believe that these are just senseless words invented for fun, while Behnstedt 1997:34 attributes this item to rhythmic slang, most particularly of the kind reported by Woidich, including a rhyming element with an initial /m/ substituting for the onset of the first one (e.g., *ma lūš daʔwa wala maʔwa* “it is nothing of his business at all”).⁴⁷

ku/ixxa “dirty; do not touch”: HB 738 as baby-talk, and B 43 *kex* “dirty”, who suggests Cp. *kax* “soil, earth” (Crum 131), although puzzled by the transcription of Cp. /h/ by Arabic /x/ which, however, happens again in *gaxx* (see above). Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are clearly

⁴⁷ We have collected similar occurrences in Old Arabic, Syrian Arabic, Turkish and Spanish; see CORRIENTE 1975: 46-47 and fn. 1. In their unp. article, BEHNSTEDT & WOIDICH are again in favour of an Arabic etymon and dismiss Cp. *knne* “to be fat” and *nēni* “honeycomb” most reasonably, we must say.

in favour of an onomatopoeic interpretation. A synonymous *kāka* appears to be of Latin stock.⁴⁸

karaš “to drive away”: HB 743, without attribution. Possibly from Cp. *kōrš* “to request; to persuade” (Crum 117).

kaška “cake”: HB 737 and 754, and B 43; Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it. It is no doubt a cognate of Cp. *kake* or *caace* (Crum 101 and 843), although Bishai has some misgivings on account of the presence of /ʃ/ in the Arabic term; this would simply confirm that the borrowing is older than Cp. and answers to OE >*qʃh*< (Ermann & Grapow V 21 “kind of bread”),⁴⁹ it being well-known that OE /ʃ/ and /ʒ/ are often reflected by double vowels in Cp.⁵⁰ As for *kaš/hku* “a style of serving in the game of *xara*”, this item is probably Cp. like other technical words of this game, but it is difficult to pinpoint an etymon, perhaps in connection with a circular motion.⁵¹

kākūla “long straight overcoat with buttons down the front and half-collar (usually worn by members of the Muslim religious professions)”: B 43. From Cp. *koykle* “hood, cowl of monks” (Crum 101), borrowed from Greek *koukoullion*, a diminutive of Latin *cuculla*.

kilāla “wooden strut to which a pot in a waterwheel is attached”: HB 757, “probably Cp.”, a remark prompting Vittmann’s reaction in the form of a question mark. Perhaps from Cp. *klal* “chain in the neck” (Crum 103). Behnstedt 1997:34-35 connects this item with *gā/īla*, *gila* and *jilla* (see above) and, consequently propounds Cp. *kele*, in truth a variant of the same root, similar in meaning and sound. At first sight, *klal* seems phonetically closer to *kilāla*; however, the original item might have adopted the pattern {1i2ā3} of *nomen instrumenti* upon entering Arabic. It is also quite possible that different Cp. dialects had diverse shapes, so that EA *gā/īla*, *gila* and *jilla* would conversely reflect those closer to *kele*.

kalaj “to limp”: B 43, who is probably right in his proposal of a Cp. etymon *kōlč* “to be bent” (Crum 107), in spite of not being endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 8. In his unp. article, Behnstedt does not altogether reject the

⁴⁸ See CORRIENTE 1997a: 436 about the striking coincidence between Latin and OA on this item.

⁴⁹ The same is meant by its being listed in CA dictionaries, though mistakenly attributed to Persian stock, e.g., in the *Lisānu lʿarab*, a common misapprehension of their authors upon dealing with items suspected of being foreign. In their unp. article, BEHNSTEDT & WOJDICH report several scholars’ views about this item, not taking any sides in the dispute about its origin, Egyptian, Persian or Talmudic.

⁵⁰ E.g., *ko(o)h* < *qʃh* “corner”, *meei* < *mʿʃt* “truth”, *maab* < *mʃb* “thirty”, *naeiō* < *nʃj.t* “stake”, *aeik* < *ʃqw* “bread”, *oooh* < *iʃh* “moon”, *soohe* < *ʃʃhʃ* “to remove”, etc.

⁵¹ Cf. AA *kaʃʃāk* “to coil or twist” in CORRIENTE 1997a: 463.

Egyptian etymon, although mentioning possible intra-Arabic etyma containing *q/kl*- sequences, which might have been blended with Arabic {*ʕrj*} “to limp”.

kalūḥ “corn cob beaten to gather the kernels”: BH 758 and B 43, who suggests a Cp. etymon *kōlh* “to strike” (Crum 106), not endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 8, nor by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, in which they signal the presence of variants with /*q*/ and suggest a further member of the Arabic series {*qḥr/l/ḥ*}, {*qlʕ*}, etc.

kullās “kind of *zīr*”: HB 761, “Cp.”. It is, in fact, likely to partially reflect Cp. *kelol* “jar”, attached to a second constituent, which is difficult to ascertain; see *baqlūla* and *ballās(ī)*, of which it could be a blending. Vittmann 211 marks this item with a question mark, and Behnstedt 1997:35 hesitantly propounds a contamination of *ballās* with Arabic *qullah* “water jug”, and suggest kinship with Cp. *kle/ē* and *kele* “vessel for liquids” (Crum 102).

kinn “sheaf”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:90, with the Cp. etymon *knaau* (Crum 112) and vars., which we subscribe. See *daqnu* and *ginw* above.

kiyāk and *kiyahk* “4th month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 772, from Cp. *kiahk*.

libān “tow, rope of a Nile sailing boat”: HB 776 and B 43, who propounds the Cp. etymon *leban* (Crum 137). Vittmann 223 emphatically declares that the Cp. word is borrowed from Arabic, but the CA dictionaries (e.g., *Lisānu lʕarab*, *Tāju lʕarūs* and *Alqāmūsū lmuḥīḥ*) do not carry it, while younger works like Kazimirski’s, where it is listed, do not have that kind of authority.

libās “carp-like Nile fish”: HB 778 and B 43 (*labās*), who propounds the Cp. etymon *labēs* (Crum 148) accepted by Vittmann 211 and Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

libs “bundle of plants”: HB 778 and B 43, who propounds the Cp. etymon *lōbs* “crown, coping or battlement of roof” (Crum 138, metaphorically said of the refrain in a hymn, which is retained by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article), accepted by Vittmann 211. Behnstedt 1981 has instead *libša* “bush; potato or tomato plant”, with the CP. item *lebs* “twigs, brushwood” (Crum 137), a much better option on both phonetic and semantic accounts, in our view.

lajj “to be persistent”: HB 781, without attribution, and B 43, who suggests the Cp. etymon *loč* “to be persistent / impudent” (Crum 151); Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it. In truth, this item is deeply rooted in OA, which requires that borrowing to have been much earlier, probably from OE, cf. Ermann & Grapow II 410 >*rwǵ*< “to be steadfast” and 410, in the idiom >*rwǵib*< “persistently”.⁵²

⁵² Matched by Cp. *ourot* or *rouot*, without lambdacism, which is not a serious difficulty, since the exchanges of /*r*/ and // were frequent in Cp., as a consequence of their phonemical

lixlāx “site of a noria; pipe connecting the well with the main irrigation ditch”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:90, with the Cp. etymon *lehlohe* (Crum 149, an unclear technical term in connection with waterwheels), which we subscribe.

laqqān “Christian ceremony of the washing of the feet”: HB 796, merely attributed to Christian usage. From Cp. *lakent* “cauldron” (Crum 139), whence also *laqqāna* “earthenware tub for kneading dough”, a small *mājūr*, q.v.

lukš “small undeveloped melon”: HB 798, labelled as rural. Probably, from Cp. *lōkš* “to be weak”.

lumma “secondary irrigation ditch”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:90, with the Cp. etymon *lihme* (a doubtful item, unrecorded by Crum who, however, has *lahme* “kneading-trough” and *leh mou* “meaning unknown, descriptive of a field”, in 150), which we would subscribe with the necessary caution.

lāla “to ring out” (voice): HB 799, “Cp.” Possibly, from Cp. *loulai* “to shout aloud or in distress”. Vittmann 223 thinks, not without cause, that both languages resort in this case to independent onomatopoeic innovations. This is mentioned by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article without further comments.

māg/jūr “pot for kneading”: HB 812 and B 43, who suggests the Cp. etymon **majōr*, < *ma* “place” + *čōr* “to scatter” (Crum 782), but it must be agreed that his proposal is semantically far-fetched, so that Vittmann 200, fn. 7, is right while not endorsing it, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article follow Vollers in his support of an intra-Arabic etymon represented by Yemeni *mājil* “cistern”. In fact, *mājūr* or *maʾjūr* is quite common in Neo-Arabic, being recorded by Dozy 1881:I 10 as “terrine; gamelle; vase à fleurs; baquet”, and even in Neo-Persian by Steingass as “flower-pot”. Not excluding a successful borrowing from Cp., perhaps an Arabicization of *makro* “trough” (Crum 162), by adoption of the pattern {*ma12ū3*}, would be semantically closer and phonetically none the less suitable.

mbu: see *ʾumbūh*.

maxwal “feeding trough; rabbit hutch; coop; granary”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981:90, with the Cp. etymon *mahoual* “nest; dovecot” (Crum 208), which we subscribe. However, in Behnstedt 2006:504, and in the unp. article authored by him and Woidich, that Cp. etymon is downgraded to mere semantic contamination, in view of Yemeni Arabic *maxwāl* “food storage

indistinction in OE. For Arabic *lajj* to be a reflex of OE >*rwǵ*<, it should have been borrowed from an Egyptian dialectal variant with /ǧ/ instead of the expectable /t/, as reported by CRUM, 745.

room”, derived from Cl.Ar. *xawal* “property, especially livestock and slaves”. This item, taken by Behnstedt from Dostal, might have semantically influenced the first item, while the Cp. item holds well for the meanings “nest; dovecot”.

margūna “kind of basket”: contributed by Vollers 656 as an Egyptian loanword, is considered by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article as a derivate of *laggāna*, of Greek, Aramaic or Persian origin (see *laqqān* above). However, the application of the mimated patterns to nouns of the pattern {1a22ā3} is not possible in Arabic morphology; therefore, and since the term is characteristically Egyptian, with vars. such as *malgōm*, *milqūm*, *malʔūm*, etc., it might be a compound of *ma-* “place” and a second constituent to be determined, e.g., *lokm* “a piece of furniture or utensil” (Crum 139).

mirīsi “South wind (in the jargon of Nile boatmen)”: BH 819 and B 43, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *ma+rēs* “southern country” (Crum 300), accepted by Vittmann 212. See the etymon of Al-Andalus below.

misrā “12th month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 822, from Cp. *mesōrē*.

mišanna “shallow basket”: HB 825, “perhaps Cp.”. But there are no grounds for such an attribution, as Yemeni *mašanneh* “sieve” points to a different direction, in the Arabic root {šnn}. This is also Vittmann’s opinion (Vittmann 224), mentioned by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article without any comment.

makmak “to hesitate”: contributed by Ishaq, after Schenkel and the unp. article by Behnstedt & Woidich, from Cp. *ma/okmek* “to ponder” (Crum 162).

mam: see *ʔamm*.

mangal “large sickle”: HB 835, “perhaps Cp.” The fact that Arabic *minjal* does not appear to derive from a rather uncommon verb **najala*, and the rarity of reflexes of that entry in Neo-Arabic dialects might support a Cp. etymon *mancale*, although the meanings of this item in Crum 177 are “pick, hoe; winnowing fan”, none of them very akin to a sickle in shape or function. Vittmann 223-224, endorsed by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, considers the Cp. item as ultimately derived from Gr. *mákella*, also meaning “hoe; mattock”, for which there are no insurmountable phonetic difficulties. Borrowing by Arabic from Egyptian in earlier phases than Cp., with the necessary semantic shift is not unlikely, nor objectable on phonetic grounds, but on the other hand one wonders why should established farmers like the Egyptians borrow the name of an agricultural tool from abroad. Hebrew *maggāl* and Aramaic *maggālā* and variants meaning “sickle; scythe”, even Ethiopic *nägälä* “to uproot”, speak all in favour of an early borrowing from OE, and so would the Greek item be as well. That semantic shift might be

explained by a borrowing in a time when western Semites still lived mostly as nomads, scarcely interested in agricultural lore, as reflected also by the fact that also Arabic *faʿl* is both “hoe” and “axe”.

mnāw “thither” and *mnāy* “hither”, which must be read as *ʔimnāw* and *ʔimnāy*: B 44, explained by Sobhy, who spells them as *mennaw* and *mennai*, as reflexes of Cp. *mnai* and *mnē* influenced by *emnau*, respectively. Out of these, *(e)mnai* “hither; here; hence” is recorded by Crum 174, but the second etymon should be read as “*mnē* “there, thither”, influenced by *emmau* “there”. Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a Cp. origin for both words without declaring it, unlike Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article, who are in favour of an intra-Arabic solution, namely, the deictic elements *-āw* for the remoter, and *-āy* for the nearer objects.

mihyās “capricious”: HB 83, “fanfaron” in B 43, who suggests a Cp. etymon **meh+n+iōs* “full of hurry” (Crum 208 and 86); Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it. In fact, an adjectival derivate of the pattern *{mi12ā3}*⁵³ from Arabic *hās* “to act violently” appears to be likelier from both the phonetic and the semantic viewpoints. This is also Behnstedt & Woidich’s viewpoint in their unp. article, in which they mention other forms such as the verb *hayyas* “to cause commotion” and the substantive *hēsa* “row”, spread to Lebanese dialects, which would suggest Arabic etyma.

mēša “measuring or weighing device”: contributed by Behnstedt, with the Cp. etymon *ma(a)še* “balance” (Crum 201), which we subscribe.

nabāri “winter crop of maize”: B 44, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *napre* “grain” (Crum 228), with probable adoption of the broken plural pattern *{1a2ā3ī}*. Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it.

nāf “yoke”: B 843 and B 44, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *nahb* (Crum 243), which is endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 7.

nagra “heat of the day”: Upper Egyptian, after B 44, who provides a possible Cp. etymon **nak+rē* “strong sun” (Crum 250, under *noč* and 287); Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it. Indeed, the semantics of the Arabic root *{nqr}* “to strike, to hit,

⁵³ Particularly common in AA; see CORRIENTE 1977: 79, with a hypothesis about its being a derivate of the IX-XI measure participles, i.e., *{mu12ā3(3)}*, in CORRIENTE 1992: 75. This feature is characteristic of other Western Arabic dialects and, as such, might be due to South Arabian interference.

etc.” could by itself have generated this connotation, as suggested also by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.⁵⁴

nannūs “cute”: BH 887, in B 44 “mignonne”, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *nanous* “she is nice; it is good” (Crum 227, Steindorf 129, as a residual case of the old conjugation). Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s proposal without endorsing it, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are clearly in favour of an intra-Arabic derivation, from Neo-Ar. *nūnu* “baby, *nūni* “eyeball”, which is not easy to accept, not to speak of any connection with Greek *nanos*, Latin *nanus* and French *nain* “dwarf”.

nūs “great or big”: contributed by Vollers 654, from Cp. *noc* (Crum 250).

nūša “disturbance of the mind”: BH 891, but “fever” in B 44, who provides a Cp. etymon *nooše* (Crum 236), a doubtful item, which allows to consider the alternate possibility of an adaptation of Syriac *nūšāyā* “oblivion”. Vittmann 200, fn. 8, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it, while Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article are in favour of the Arabic series propounded by him for *rawaš*, q.v.

hubb: see *ʔēlā / hēlā (ubb[a]*.

habya “dragnet”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich, from Cp. *abooue* pl. of *abō* or *abou* (of the same meaning, Crum 2).

ha/ātūr: “3rd month of the Cp. calendar”: HB 900, from Cp. *hatōr*.

haggās “braggart”: HB 900, “garrulous” in B 41, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *ha+čoo+s* (Crum 635 for the prefix of the 1st perfect, 754 for *čoo* “to speak”, and Mallon 32 for the pronominal suffix). This etymon is rejected by Vittmann 222 on shaky grounds, because that prefix is not irregularly attached to a noun, as he thinks, but to a verb, integrating a sentence (“he said it”) which has then used as an adjective, while his own proposal of a derivation from the Arabic root *{hjs}* “to come to one’s mind suddenly” is semantically far-fetched. He is, however, supported by Behnstedt in his unp. article, though aware that *haggās* “braggart” is not a CA word.

hu/ūdya “beam of a noria”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981, with the Cp. etymon *hōte/i* “rod, pole” (Crum 722), which we subscribe. See *bahūda*.

haram “pyramid”: is given by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article as Egyptian, without propounding an etymon.

hallūs/s “pondweed; cobwebs”: HB 910, in B 42 “cobweb”, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *halous* “spider’s web” (Crum 671).

hamm : see *ʔamm*.

⁵⁴ Cf. Egyptian Arabic *darbit šams* “sunstroke”.

hammis “to sit”: B 42, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *hmoos* (Crum 679, with adoption of the pattern of a II measure verb in EA, {1a22i3}.⁵⁵ However, Vittmann 200, fn. 8, mentions Bishai’s Cp. etymon for this word without endorsing it. Behnstedt & Woidich 96 provide an additional *ḥammūs/za* “arse; coccyx”, with adoption of the hypocoristic pattern {1a22ū3}.

hnayye “matter, affair”: B 42. But his proposal of a Cp. etymon *ho(e)ine* “some, certain” (Crum 689) is not credible in face of quite common OA *hunayyah* “little thing”, also phonetically a better match. Both Behnstedt 1981 (and more recently in his unp. article) and Vittmann 200, fn. 8, mentions Bishai’s proposal without endorsing it.

hōb “working song”: contributed by Behnstedt & Woidich 493, a reflex of Cp. *hōb* “work”, known from other Cp. loanwords (e.g., *šnhāb*) by several scholars and surveyed by Schenkel 46.

hōs “hymn”: HB 916, “Cp.” Indeed, from Cp. *hōs* (Crum 709).

hawjal “flail for threshing”: HB 915, given as Cp., while B 42 renders it as “anchor”, on the authority of Sobhy *haučal*, according to Crum 740, “anchor, hook”, both meanings being aptly surveyed by Behnstedt 1981. The borrowing, however, must have preceded the Cp. phase, since the *Lisānu lŠarab* has *hawjal* as “anchor of a ship”.

hawwiš “to put on a show in order to deceive”: HB 916, in B 42 “to bluff”, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *hoouš* “to abuse or insult” (Crum 737, with the same morphological remark as in the case of *hammis* above). However, Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article prefer an intra-Arabic etymon, *hawwaš* “to arouse”, which is perfectly acceptable.

hēba “a bird, perhaps the ibis”: B 42, who propounds the Cp. etymon *hibōi* (Crum 655), not endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 8, for which Schenkel 45 reasonably prefers the variant *hip*.

hayy or *hāya* “heap of corn”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981, with the Cp. etymon *hoi* “heap of grain” (Crum 651), which we subscribe.

haym or *hēm* “extension of the beam of a plough”: contributed by Behnstedt 1981, with no less than three Cp. etymological proposals, namely, *hōimi* and vars. “hook”, *hemi* and vars. “rudder”, and *hiome* and vars. “forearm”, all of them eligible on phonetic and semantic grounds, although perhaps the last one is best.

wāwa “hurt place”: HB 921, “perhaps Cp.”, which might answer to *ouo(e)i* “woe!”, in Crum 472. But, most likely, this is just a polygenetic onomatopoeia

⁵⁵ Perhaps only seemingly, as we have demonstrated that many verbs of this appearance are, in fact, old geminated imperfectives of South Arabian origin; see CORRIENTE 2004.

of pain, as propounded also by Vittmann 226 and endorsed by Behnstedt & Woidich in their unp. article.

wāḥa “oase”: BH 921, and B 46, who attributes it to Cp. *ouahe* (Crum 508), endorsed by Vittmann 200, fn. 7. But, in view of its presence in CA dictionaries, the borrowing must have happened much earlier, from OE >*wḥʔt*< “region of the Oases”.

waḥwaḥ: HB 928 “to whine; to snivel”, and B 46 “to cry with pain, to bark”, who suggests a Cp. etymon *ouaxbef* “to bark; to growl” (Crum 509, mistakenly read by Bishai as **ouaxbex*); Vittmann 200, fn. 7, mentions Bishai’s proposal without endorsing it. In fact, onomatopoeic Arabic *waḥwaḥ* “to speak with a harsh voice” would allow us to do without this alleged borrowing, which is also Behnstedt & Woidich’s viewpoint in their unp. article.

wirwir “fresh”: HB 934 and B 47, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *brre* or *bēre* “new, young”, repeated in some vendors’ cries; see note on *birbir*.

wēba “a grain measure”: HB 958 and B 46, who provides the correct Cp. etymon *o(e)ipe* (Crum 256), accepted by Vittmann 216. Behnstedt 1981 reports the var. *wayba* “hole of a millstone” and explains that it holds that much exactly.

wēka “a dish of okra”: HB 959 “perhaps Cp.” But this is very unlikely, on account of the late introduction of this vegetable from Sudan in Islamic times. Vittmann 216 simply attaches a question mark; Behnstedt 1997:36, after locating the same item in Yemen as name of Jew’s mallow (Egyptian *mulūxiyya*),⁵⁶ proclaims this item Arabic

wāršūr “wood saw”: B 46. No doubt a cognate of Cp. *bašour* (Crum 47),⁵⁷ but the Semitic roots {*wšr*} and {*nšr*} “to saw” point to a much older borrowing from OE. Vittmann 200, fn. 8, accepts a Cp. origin for this word without pinpointing it. This is not Behnstedt & Woidich’s opinion in their unp. article, in which they favour an Arabic etymon based upon a dissimilation of an odd-looking Arabic **waššūr*.

* * *

Loanwords always call for phonemic and morphological comments, only seldom syntactical ones too. On the phonemic side, Bishai made many remarks

⁵⁶ The opposite happens in Morocco, where okra is often called *mulūxiyya*, the reason for such confusions apparently being that both vegetables are of recent African origin, and both provide a characteristically thick soup, when cooked.

⁵⁷ Already propounded by DEVAUD 1921.

about the more or less regular phonetic matches between the original Cp. and resulting Arabic words, and others could be added in order to provide a list which might help future researchers, as follows:⁵⁸

- 1) Vowel matches in the Cp. loanwords of EA are a complex matter on several accounts, as not only Cp. dialects were often at variance with each other on this matter, and most Cp. nouns and verbs had vocalic alternation in their three states, absolute, construct and pronominal (Mallon 23, 87-102), but it also happened that Cp. had a five-vowel system, while Arabic in principle has only three. Consequently, in many instances it is obvious that the Arabic vowels answer only to the templates required by Arabic morphophonemics (e.g., in the verbs, *balas* < *pōlc*, *gaxx* < *čōh*, *rawas* < *rōše*, *karas* < *kōrš*, *hammis* < *hmōs*, *hawwis* < *hoouš*, in which the vocalization of the language source has been totally disregarded in favour of the vowels required by the selected template), while in other cases there is an approximate phonetic match, when not necessarily interfered by morphophonemic structures. Under such circumstances, Cp. /e/ and /o/ tend to become /a/ or /i/ and /u/, respectively, (e.g., *šlāl* < *šlāl*, *amenti* < *amandi*; *pes+arō* > *bisāra*; *t+šēte* > *da/išīda*, *reftou* > *rifṭāw*, *bōre* > *būrī*, *halōm* > *ḥalūm*, *tōri* > *tūrīya*), with two notorious exceptions, namely, some rare cases in which EA /ō/ and /ē/, resulting from OA /aw/ and /ay/ are the perfect matches of Cp. /ō/ and /ē/ (e.g., *bōš*, *bōn*, *hōs*, *wēba*), and a number of instances in which there appears to be a morphophonemically unexplainable preference for /a/ as the match of Cp. /o/, e.g., *ʔardabb* < *rtob*, *baqf* < *pokf*, *tagza* < *tōks*, *adwad* < *at+ouō* (*ōte*) or *ouōb*, *gala* < *čōōle*.⁵⁹
- 2) /p/ > /b/ is regular, since EA does not have a phoneme /p/, except perhaps as a very marginal one, used by highly educated people who master a foreign language. This is most obvious in the case of Cp. loanwords with an agglutinated definite article (e.g., *bixx*, *birba*, *basxa*, *baqrūr*, *balšūm*, etc.). Otherwise, there are other cases of exchange of bilabials, e.g., *bitm/n*

⁵⁸ A much needed detailed survey of this matter by an Egyptologist is found in SCHENKEL.

⁵⁹ One explanation for this abnormal match could be the South Arabian tendency to backing the /a/'s, opposite to the palatalising trend (e.g., in the *imālah*), characteristic of Old Najdi dialects. But the matter may be simply related to Cp. dialectology since, as POLOTSKY 1970: 560 said "Sahidic so strikingly agrees with Bohairic in having the vowels *o* and *a* where all other dialects have *a* and *e* respectively".

< *matn*,⁶⁰ *ma nthōuti* > *bantūt*, *ouōm* > *mam*, *p+elčob* > *balsūm*, triggered by assimilation and followed by nasal dissimilation in one instance, namely, *bim* < *nim*.

- 3) /t/ > /d/ is nearly regular (e.g., *ʔādi*, *ʔadwad*, *ʔamandi*, *ḥandūs* and every case of agglutinated fem. definite article), and could often be considered as a mere spelling change, as /t/ had become so pronounced in Cp. in Upper Egypt (Mallon 11). However, /t/ is some other times preserved (e.g., *ʔithališa*, *ʔamnūt*, *ʔamtūt*, *balittāw*, *baramhāt*, *tabtaba*, *tūt*, *ḥāta bāta*, etc., either because these items were borrowed from a different dialect or because of positional conditioning and other circumstances surveyed in detail by Shenkel 13-26.
- 4) When /t/ does not evolve into /d/, it is often reflected as /t̤/ (e.g., *baq/qūṭi*, *šūṭa*, *tabḥa*, *ṭamy*, *ṭohma*, *tūrya*, *ṭayāb*, etc., above all in onset positions). Bishai 46 says that “Coptic *t* is unaspirated and its representation in Arabic as *t̤* is normal”; however, the many instances in which this equivalence does not obtain obliges to reconsider this explanation, sometimes given for the transcription with Arabic /t̤/ and /q/ of Latin and Greek /t/ and /k/;⁶¹ at least, partially, the use of the emphatic consonants may be aimed at keeping the desired articulation of /a/ and /o/, and preventing /e/ and /u/ realizations, although this issue is far from definitively solved. This would also apply to cases of /s/ > /s̤/, like *ʔithališa*, *bušāra* and *ʔaṣaf*, not necessarily the optional *baṣxa*, in which it might have been caused by contact assimilation to velar /x/.
- 5) Occasional alternance of /s/ and /z/ (e.g., *zagzig*, *s/zubāṭa*), does not call for much comment, as spontaneous voicing and devoicing take place often in many linguistic families, Arabic included.⁶²
- 6) The richer system of hissing sounds in Cp. (/š/, /č/ and /c/) has being shrunk in Upper EA to just a couple by merger of the reflexes of former /š/ and /c/, and to a single /š/ in dialects like that of Cairo, where /j/ has become /g/; however, the exchange of those sounds was frequent already within Cp., as reflected by the entries *balaš*, *balsūm*, *ḥagna*, *dakkūš/ja*, *šāl*, *šilba*, *šallūt*, *šanšin*, *šinḥ*, *šīr* and *lajj*.

⁶⁰ In which the vowel has been modified by a pseudo-correction reacting to the frequent labialisation of any vowel in this position, the /t/ being possibly responsible for the choice of front vowel, instead of the genuine /a/.

⁶¹ See CORRIENTE 1977: 54, fn. 73 and CORRIENTE 1978: 217.

⁶² We listed some similar cases in AA in CORRIENTE 1977: 48 and fn.63, where we considered some possible triggering factors, all of them disputable.

- 7) The same would apply to a few cases of exchange of /k/ and /q/ (e.g., *baqf* < *pokf*, *q/gīl* < *kēl*, *šqilqil* < *škilkil*, *gašwa* for *qašwa* < *kašou*, *nagra* for *naqra* < *nak+re*).⁶³
- 8) The distribution of /g/ and /j/ answers to the isoglosses of EA dialects, which means that Cp. /č/ may appear as /g/ (e.g., *ʔagbiyya*, *ʔagrann*, *gabanyūt*, it being the overwhelming solution, perhaps because of the prestige of the Cairene pronunciation; see Mallon 12), keep its old value (e.g., *dakkūja*, possibly exported out of Egypt at an early date), or appear with both realizations, obviously conditioned by the dialects (e.g., [*ʔu*]g/jāy, mag/jūr).⁶⁴
- 9) The reflexes of Cp. /h/ are not always regular, i.e., Arabic /h/ (e.g., *ʔāh*, *baramhāt*, *bāhūq*, *gahgahūn*, *tohma*, *hallūs*, *hawjal*, *hēba*): occasionally, we find /ħ/ (e.g., *baħħ* *ħagna*, *ħandūs*, *ħāta bāta*, *ħalūm*, *šawwaħ*, *tabħa*), or even /x/ (e.g., *gaxx*, *xamāsīn*, *xara*, *saxx*, *ku/ixxa*, *šilixta*); in the latter case, the abnormal match may be attributed to pseudo-corrections to the dialectal merger of /h/ and /x/ in Cp., but also, and such is the only explanation in the cases with /ħ/, as a hypocorrect reaction of Cp. speakers who were just trying to master the strange phonemes of Arabic.⁶⁵

In the realm of combinatory phonetics, it should be kept in mind that, once Cp. items had entered EA, they were submitted to its phonotactic rules, which led to further distortion of the original pronunciation, for instance, in the following cases:

- 1) Prosthetic vowels, necessary in OA and partly Neo-Arabic in order to avoid initial consonant clusters or, generally speaking, vowels that were felt as such, use to evolve into /i/ in Neo-Arabic, even more strongly so than in OA. This trend is responsible for the ultimate shape of such items as *ʔithališa* < *athli sa*, *išlal* < *šlel*, *išš* < *ašš*, but South Arabian apparently preferred /a/,⁶⁶ and this explains *ʔardabb*, *ʔamšīr* and *ʔamnūt*. In one case, *ʔumbūh*, < *p+moou*, the outcome has been conditioned by the strong

⁶³ See CORRIENTE 1977: 54 about the same situation in AA.

⁶⁴ SCHENKEL, 26-31 surveys the equivalences of these phonemes between OA and EA in detail, attributing an important role to stress.

⁶⁵ Of course, there can be no talk of preservation of OE /h/ in such instances. Cf. the cases of hypercorrect /h/ in AA, according to CORRIENTE 1977: 58, preceded in 57 by a list of instances in which that phoneme was realized as /x/, which is considered as a South Arabian trait in CORRIENTE 1989: 98-99. SCHENKEL, 43-52 deals with the issue of /h/, /ħ/ and /x/ from OE down to EA in a most detailed manner, again attributing a decisive role to stress.

⁶⁶ See CORRIENTE 1989: 95-96 about the consequences of this trend in AA.

labialising effect of /m/.⁶⁷ In other instances, the solution might have been the insertion of a disjunctive vowel (e.g., *da/išīda* < *t+šēte*, *bilbila* < *blbile*, *kākūla* < *koykle*, *kilāla* < *klal*), also in the case of medial and final consonant clusters (e.g., *ʔithalīsa* < *athli sa*), or even metathesis (e.g., *dabš* < *t+pašē*).

- 2) Combinatory phonetic phenomena of assimilation, dissimilation and metathesis are, of course, reflected by the Cp. loanwords in EA, e.g., in cases of assimilation, like those of contact palatalization (e.g., *tišša* < *ta[n]šo*, *gīš* < **jiks* < *juks* < *čoksi*, *šilba* < *clboou*, *šilita* < *calite*, *šilixta* < *calaxt*, *šilq* < *šōlk*), of dissimilation, like the haplological reduction of *bašarūš* < *p+tr(e)šrōš*, and of metathesis in the case of *baramhāt* < *parmhat*.
- 3) Some alterations of the original Cp. shape may be caused by simple imitation of certain features of Arabic morphophonemics; such is probably the case of the gemination in the cauda of *ʔagrann*, hardly explainable but as an echo of the same spontaneous phenomenon in some Arabic functionals, like *min+nī* "of me", *ʔan+nī*, etc. The same would apply to the at least phonemic addition of /h/ after stressed long vowels in cauda position, e.g., *ʔayyūh*, *ʔumbūh*.
- 4) Some phonetic rules of Neo-Arabic, like Philippi's law, characteristic of dialects under South Arabian-influence and causing the shift of /i/ to /a/ in stressed closed syllables, may occasionally have acted in some cases, like *bas/šxa* < *pish/xo*.
- 5) Very often the Cp. loanwords have been forced into one of the templates characteristic of Arabic morphophonemics, e.g., *{1i2ā3}* and *{1a/ā2ū3}* (*nomen instrumenti*, e.g., *tikāt*, *bāhūq*, *rabūn*, *tagūs*),⁶⁸ *{1a2ū3}* (passive adjective, e.g., *kalūh*), *{1a22ū3(a)}* (diminutive, e.g., *nannūs*, *hallūs/š*, *šabbūra*, *dakkūš/ja*, *ramrūm*) and *{1a22ā3}* (intensive adjectives, e.g., *haggāš*). Some other times, an Arabic suffix has been added in order to

⁶⁷ Most conspicuously reflected by the hundreds in EA: *tultumiyya*, *rubsumiyya*, *xumsumiyya*, *suttumiyya*, *subsumiyya*, *tumnumiyya* and *tussumiyya*.

⁶⁸ This function of *{1i2ā3}* is already reported by BROCKELMANN I, 350, who is also aware of its being the forerunner of standard *{mi12ā3}*; as for *{1ā2ū3}*, its Aramaic origin is notorious, but it must have been adopted by Arabic even in pre-Islamic times, to judge from instances like *rāwūq* "filter", *šāqūl* "spiked stick", *ʔa/āmūd* "column, prop", etc. Its vitality is demonstrated even in the adoption by Neo-Arabic of some foreign items, such as *šākūs* "hammer" and *xāzūq* "stake (for impaling)" from Turkish *çekiç* and *kazıq*, and in its modern use in neologisms such as *hāsūb* "computer". In the case of *rabūn*, its derivation from *garabān(a)*, is pointed out to by BEHNSTEDT 1981: 86, it being known that phonotactic rules of EA prevent the realization of length in the first vowel of *{1ā2ū3}*.

make the loanword fit into its morphological structures, e.g., fem. or *nomen unitatis* {-a}, e.g., *ḥagna*, *baʔūna*, *šurya*, *tūrya*, *šilba*, *tabḥa*, *tohma*, *gašwa*,⁶⁹ or even a possessive suffix as in *ya kāsī*, a broken pl. (e.g., *nabāri*), etc. Finally, it happens at times, as Behnstedt 2006 underlines, that the shape of certain Cp. nouns have been interpreted as a broken plural pattern, so that a new Arabic singular has been obtained therefrom through metanalysis, e.g., Cp. *kna(a)u* “yarrow” > *ignāw*, analysed as pl. or collective and generating a sg. *ginw* and a *nomen unitatis* *ignāwa*, or being initially a pl. it has been borrowed as such, but also generating a sg., e.g., **katooue* “baskets” (pl. of *kat*), borrowed by EA as *gaṭāwi* and generating a sg. *gaṭwiyya*.

There is not much to say about morphological features of the Cp. loanwords in EA. Most verbs have been borrowed in their infinitive form, also serving as imperative, but for isolated cases of peculiar imperatives (such as *ma* “give” and *ače* “say”); usually, they have adopted one of the measures of the Arabic verbal system, and only exceptionally continue to reflect traces of the OE conjugation (e.g., *nannūs* < *nanou+s* and *haggās* < *ha+čoo+s*, Mallon 146-157). In the case of substantives, none of them exhibits synchronically effective marks of gender or number, which are inexistent in Cp. in the first case and almost so in the second (Mallon 55 and 63-67), but no less than 19 items have been borrowed with an agglutinated masc. definite article *p+*, while its fem. counterpart *t+* has been agglutinated in 7 instances and deglutinated in one. This provides a heretofore neglected basis of comparison with the case of Arabic loanwords in the Hispanic languages, in which the agglutination of the definite article is a pervasive feature, to which some diverse explanations have been given.⁷⁰

Finally, the syntactic information that can be retrieved from the Cp. loanwords of EA is very scanty, as usual in similar cases, since loanwords very seldom contain even a short phrase. There are a few cases of annexation of two

⁶⁹ This is underlined by SCHENKEL, 9-11.

⁷⁰ See about this topic CORRIENTE 1999: 57-63, containing a survey of previous opinions and arguments in favour of attributing the agglutination to imitation of imperfect bilinguals, either Berbers or native speakers of dialects under strong South Arabian influence who, not having an article in their own languages, used it as a mere marker of the grammatical class of the substantives. By the way, and as far as the kind of Arabic practiced by most of the Muslim conquerors of Egypt, the situation appears to have been similar, and therefore, that explanation would also be valid for the frequent cases of agglutination of the Cp. definite article in the loanwords of this stock in EA.

nouns (*bisāra* < *pes+arō*, *bas/sxa*, < *pi+sxo*, even one in which the second constituent has an attached pronominal suffix, namely, *galam/nf* < *če+lem+f*), a possible case of the habitual present prefix {*šay/k/f ...*} in *ša?ša?*, as well as traces of the wide use of imperatives, single or in couples for narrative purposes (e.g., *baḥḥ*, *gala gala* and *gahgahūn*), a case of rhythmic slang (*kāni w māni*) and little else.

From the lexical viewpoint, these data can be submitted to either a semantic, diachronic, diatopic and diastratic classification or to a comparative panchronic survey. On that first account, most Cp. words which have entered EA clearly belong to certain categories, such as religious terms (*?āba*, *?agbiyya*, *?adwad*, *?isbādīqūn*, *?islāl*, *?amandi*, *?amnūt*, *gabanyūt*, *xulāgi*, *dīmār*, *ṭabḥa*, *laqqān*, *hōš*), craft jargons, such as those of husbandry (*?amtūt*, *bāq*, *bitm/n*, *barsīm*, *bas/sxa*, *bāhūq*, >*blwr*<, *tikāt*, *da/išīda*, *dimīra*, *s/zubāta*, *šarāqi*, *šōna*, *ṭāš*, *ṭamy*, *kalūḥ*, *libš*, *nabāri*, *nāf*, *wāḥa*), animal breeding (*birbir*, *simmāna*, *sūta*), building (cf. *birba*, *dabš*, *šūša*, *ḍabba*, *ṭuqqēsi*, *ṭūba*), river fishing and sailing (*?iṭhalīša*, *tagūs*, *dāqūs*, *liban*), milling (*?ūni*, *ba/ittāw*), mat and basket making (*bursš*, *sās*, *salla*), or are designations of tools and instruments (*šuriya*, *šqilqil*, *šilīta*, *šilq*, *šinf*, *ṭūrya*, *kilāla*, *māg/jūr*, *mangal*, *hawjal*, *wāršūr*), calendar months (*tūt*, *bāba*, *hatur*, *ṭūba*, *kiyah* or *kiyāhk*, *amšīr*, *baramhāt*, *baramūda*, *bašans*, *ba?ūna*, *abīb*, *misrā*), and whether conditions (*xamāsīn*, *šabbūra*, *ṭayāb*, *mirīsi*, *nagra*), measures (e.g., *?ardabb*, *rifṭaw*, *wēba*), plant and animal names (e.g., *?qarw*, *?aṣaf*, *ḥagna*, *rīta*, *sanṭa*, *lukš*; *bašarūš*, *bašnin*, *baqrūr*, *balšūm*, *binni*, *būri*, *timsāḥ*, *ḥandūs*, *ramrūm*, *rāy*, *šāl* or *qāl*, *šilba*, *qašwa*, *libīs*, *hallūs/š*, *hēba*), clothing items (*kākūla*), cookery and household items (*bisāra*, *baqūṭi*, *bilbila*, *ballāši*, *tābūt*, *ḥalūm*, *dakkūj/ša*, *zīr*, *salla*, *šawwaḥ*, *šīr*, *kaška*, *kullāš*), anatomical, pathological and physiological terms (e.g., *bāh*, *baqlūla*, *gīš*, *umm iššalātī*, *falt*, *nūša*), games, folklore and local traditions (e.g., *āl*, *xara*, *daqnu*, *sinnu*, *šaka*, *ṭāb*, *bušbuš*, *gabba*), while other loanwords are semantically diverse verbs ([*ʔu*]gāy, *?iṣbār*, *bašbiš*, *baqla/ʔz*, *balaš*, *balham*, *bayyiš*, *tax*, *taff*, *tann*, *tawal*, *tāk*, *gaxx*, *rawaš*, *zagzig*, *zanzin*, *saxx*, *ša?ša?*, *šalsīl*, *šansīn*, *šanaṭ*, *šawšaw*, *farfar*, *faṭṭ*, *karaš*, *kalaj*, *lāla*, *hammis*, *hawwiš*), or belong to baby-talk (*?umbūh*, *?amm*, *baḥḥ*, *bixx*, *ku/ixxa*, *wāwa*), or to the categories of interjections (e.g., *?ah*, *?is*, *?išš*, *?hēlā*, *?aywa*, *bāy*, *tūt ḥāwī*, *gala gala*, *ya kāsi*, *hubb*), curses (*?awa*) and little else, not excluding some functionalized demonstrative or indefinite pronouns and adverbs (e.g., *?ādi*, *?agrann*, *?iṭhalīša*, *bim*, *kāni w māni*, *?imnāw* and *?imnāy*), as well as some isolated items, not fitting well into any of the listed categories (cf. *baqf*, *bōn*, *tagza*, *tišša*, *galamn/nf*, *gahgahūn*, *ḥāba bāta*, *ḥūḥū*, *xilāwa*, *dukš*, *šbār*, *šilixta*, *šōbaš*, *šallūt*, *ṭibb*, *ṭohma*, *falīl*, *mihyās*,

nannūs, haggās, wirwir), all in all, roughly what can be expected in most instances of countries in which a foreign language has been imported and become dominant until the extinction of the local one.⁷¹ However, the total number of such loanwords is not insignificant, it being obvious that some scholars have underestimated this ingredient of the EA lexicon and gone too far in their attempts at finding intra-Arabic etyma for many of those items. Something similar has happened for AA in the case of its Berber ingredient, an issue which we had to straighten out in Corriente 1998.

As for a diachronic classification, the distinction between true Cp. and other older Egyptian loanwords is relatively easy, as the latter are usually registered in CA dictionaries (e.g., *ʔirdabb, tābūt, timsāḥ, ḥālūm, zīr, salla, šīr, ḍabba, kaṣka, ḥibb, tūba, minjal, hawjal, wāḥa*),⁷² but matters become harder when we deal with post-Islamic, i.e., truly Cp. items, although it stands to reason that earlier borrowings immediately following the Muslims' conquest of Egypt must have differed in some respects from those acquired by the local dialects of Arabic in later times,⁷³ until the extinction of spoken Cp. around the 12th c. The same would apply to diatopic and diastratic classification of this material, although Bishai tries to distinguish between at least the Bohairic, Akhmimic, Fayyumic and Saidic dialects, inasmuch as Crum provides this information.

⁷¹ In their unp. article, BEHNSTEDT & WOIDICH classify the Cp. loanwords of EG into: a) month names, b) Christian technical terms, c) agricultural terms (a large majority), d) animal names, e) plant names, and f) others. There is also a number of items which sound Cp., but cannot be given etyma in the available lexical references of this language, of which BEHNSTEDT 2006 lists, e.g., *bilinf* "vegetable earth, mould", *bisṭif* "a kind of dates", *barif* "small peg on the yoke", *dignās* "little sparrow" or plant names like *amšūt, awāy, balatāy, bašif, buruwaks, daradiks* and *diktāy*" (from BEHNSTEDT & WOIDICH 1994 and TACKHOLM 1974).

⁷² And many other words of at times unsuspected Egyptian stock, such as *marḥ* "to anoint" (cf. Cp. *amrḥe* "bitumen"), *ḥasās* "foundation" (Cp. *esē*), *ḥaḥša* "to sneeze" (Cp. *antaš*), *qumqum* "vessel" (Cp. *koukoumau*), *lajanah* "cauldron" (Cp. *lakent*), *sawq* "to drive (cattle)" (Cp. *sōk*), *sunnah* "custom" (Cp. *sōnt*), *ḥalaṣa* "to go up" (Cp. *talo* "to lift"), *ḥabaṣa* "to print" (Cp. *tōōbe* "to seal", cf. OE *ḥb:f:t*), *laḥlaḥa* "to shine" (Cp. *eieiel*), *mūsā* "razor; Moses" (about which see CORRIENTE 1999: 394-395), *was(a)ḥ* "the middle" (Cp. *ouostn* "to become broad"), *wasiṣa*, "to be large" (Cp. *ouasx*), *warik* "hunch" (Cp. *ōrk* "to swear"), *siṣr* "prize" (Cp. *šār*), *ḥnāḥ* "vessel" (Cp. *hnau*), etc. See other cases in CORRIENTE 1997a: 591-592.

⁷³ Perhaps by such features as the agglutination of the definite article, possibly an earlier phenomenon if, as it can be presumed, it was triggered by at least one of the reasons beyond the matching situation in Al-Andalus, i.e., the fact that many "Yemenite" Arabs, who did not have an article in their South Arabian dialects, tended to use it abusively in their recently learned North Arabian. But, of course, further evidences are needed before anything can be said for sure on such matters.

For any comparative purpose, a necessary basis would be the determination of the total number of Cp. items that can be trustworthy accounted as such. In the resulting combined list of Bishai's materials with later additions, that total would run into about 300 items, of which by our reckoning about 40 some must be stricken off so that, in the final account, it appears reasonable to accept about 250 vouched items of Cp. origin in EA.⁷⁴ These figures, when compared, e.g., with the number of substratal Romance loanwords in AA, an initial 250 after Griffin 1961:29, to which a few dozens more were added by our subsequent surveys (Corriente 1980 and 1981)⁷⁵, call for some comments, which follow:

- a) The number of borrowings from the local language was lower at a statistically significant rate in the case of Egypt, either because of a much larger number of Arabic speaking initial settlers in comparison with the total number of the native population, or of a much more steady and abundant flow of successive waves of Arabic speakers, from Syria, Palestine, Arabia or even Iraq. The low prestige of Cp. vs. Greek, the administrative language of the Byzantine administration and standard international language of the East, until Arabic took its place, might have acted powerfully to speed up the acquisition of this latter language and to abandon a language which, in spite of religious and domestic allegiances, was of no use outside the borders of Egypt, unlike the case of Greek, Arabic, even Aramaic for a while.⁷⁶ The situation was also somewhat

⁷⁴ BEHNSTEDT 2006 literally says: "taking into account that the rural lexicon has not yet been investigated exhaustively all over Egypt, the total rate might be estimated up to between approximately 250 and 300 loans".

⁷⁵ Up to nearly 400 items in the Granadan dialect; however, as many of these appear to be scarcely integrated, a sound operating basis for any comparison may be set at around 330; see CORRIENTE 1981: 5-6, fn. 3 and CORRIENTE 1992: 142, with figures and rates on which we relied mostly for our assessment in CORRIENTE 2007b, our last writing on this topic.

⁷⁶ As in the case of Al-Andalus, made famous by the lamentations of Álvaro de Cordova, the shift of language allegiances even among the Christians was particularly irritating for the clergy. This is illustrated by a very similar text, quotes by MAC COULL, 66, which we take from BEHNSTEDT & WOIDICH's unp. article, as it deserves attention, particularly for the study of the situation among the Mozarabs: "They have abandoned the beautiful Coptic language in which the Holy Spirit spoke through the mouths of our fathers; they teach their children from infancy to speak Arabic, and be proud of it, right inside the sanctuary ... Woe to every Christian who teaches his son from childhood the language of the *hijra*, making him forget the language of his ancestors All at this time are abandoning this (Coptic) language to speak Arabic and glory in it, up to the point where one would not know them for Christians anymore, but would take them for barbarians. And those of al-Şaʿīd who still know and speak Coptic are looked down upon and harmed by their Christian brothers ... When Christians shall dare to speak the

different in the Iberian Peninsula, where Latin, Low Latin and Romance preserved their usefulness for contacts with Christian lands.

- b) The semantic fields in which borrowing took place are similar in both cases, i.e., Christian religious terms (cf., for AA, *fišta* “holyday”, *šánt* “Saint”, *injánya* “consecration of a church”, *paṭriq* “patriarch”, also Jewish *šunúga* “synagogue”), craft jargons (*učúp* “tow”, *duntál* “ploughshare-bed”, *fírka* “pitch-fork”, *fírrát* “dye from rust of iron”, *lašamáš* “mortar”), tools and instruments (*iskirfáč* “rake; scraper”, *buqurnýya* “two-headed anvil”, *barrína* “gimlet”, *mátana* “mallet”, *pála* “shovel”), calendar months (*ibráyr* “February”, *april* “April”, *dujánbir* “December”), wheather conditions (*čírč* “cold northerly wind”, *číqa* “fog”, *labáč* “south-east wind”), measures (*líqwa* “lee”),⁷⁷ animal and plant names (*iǧríl* “cricket”, *ašbúra* “red bream”, *čiqála* “cicada”, *čírba* “hind”, *dilfin* “dolphin”, *murčíqal* “bat”; *búda* “reed-mace”, *čírča* “holly-oak”, *ḥapapáwra* “poppy”), clothing items (*fáyja* “sash”, *pullúta* “petticoat”, *párga* “hempen sandal”, *kanbúš* “veil”, *káppa* “cloak”, *šappát* “shoe”), cookery (*čacčán* “to parboil”, *mirkás* “sausage”, *pulyát* “porridge”, *púyya* “uncooked loaf given as fee for the baking”) and household items (*urún* “basket”, *libríl* “glazed earthenware tub”, *qumšál* “cup”, *rúkka* “distaff”), anatomical, pathological and physiological terms (*imlíq* “navel”, *múčča* “breast”, *pačáyna* “eyelash”, *piš* “penis”; *furfúlla* “dandruff”, *qáll* “corn, callosity”), games, folklore and local customs (*čimícát arramád* “a practical joke”, *dúrqa* “witch”, *ǧáyta* “bagpipe”, *pandáyr* “tambourine”, *pistiqal* “fillip”), a few verbs (*čawčáw* “to chirp”, *laččác* “to shine”, *pákk* “to pick”, *paqqát* “to stick”, *atparrás* “to run aground”, *qarqál* “to guffaw”, *šartál* “to string”), baby-talk items (*bába* “drivel”, *nánna* “nurse”, *pípi* “pap, food”), interjections (*úš/č* “away!”, *šáp* “a word used to frighten cats away”, *áyya* “come on!”), and little else, not excluding again some functionalized demonstrative or indefinite pronouns and adverbs (*yáđđa*, *ađála*, *ađášš* and *ađáqal* “also, even”),⁷⁸ as well as a few isolated items, not fitting well into any of the listed categories (*bássa* “kiss”, *pársana* “slander”, *šintila* “spark”). Some absences are remarkable and no doubt socio-linguistically

language of the *hijra* right at the altar, they are blaspheming against the Holy Spirit and the Trinity: seven times woe to them!”.

⁷⁷ An almost isolated and possibly late case, since the Latin system of weights and measures, except in cases of penetration through the East (cf. *mudī* < “modius”, *qinṭār* “kantar”, *mīl* “mile”), did not stand in face of Greek, and sometimes even Arabic and Persian systems (e.g., *raḥl*, *miṭqāl*, *dirham*, *qirāḥ*, *dānaq*, *ḥabbah*, *xarrūbah*, *mann*, *ūqiyah*, *kaylah*, *mudd*, *qadaḥ*, *qafṣ*, *qisṭ*, *rubṣ*, *ṭumn*; *bāf*, *dirāf*, *farsax*, *qāmah*, etc. (see HINZ 1955).

⁷⁸ See CORRIENTE 1983.

relevant, such as the lack of military borrowings from Cp., vs. its relative abundance in AA from Proto-Romance or Low Latin origin, while curses of this stock are missing in AA, and so on. Any different behaviour on the selection and more or less frequent presence of the various semantic fields is likely to betray dissimilarities in their socio-linguistic context, probably deserving lengthier and deeper studies.

* * *

This survey of Cp. loanwords in EA has finally led us to the solution of a linguistic and historical problem which was not envisaged by our initial project, although having lingered in the back of our mind for decades, namely, the etymon of the geographical name of Al-Andalus. It is well known that the Arabic name of the Iberian Peninsula is not an Arabic word, but neither can it be clearly attributed to Greek, Latin, Berber or Germanic, in spite of many scholars' endeavours to find its etymon in one of those realms.

We had rested this thorny case in *Corriente* 1999:215 for the time being, by accepting a Greek hypothesis, *hē nēsos tēs Atlantidos* "the island of Atlantis", in the lack of anything better although, to tell the truth, neither totally convinced that Plato's poetical myths could have imposed themselves to the crude realities of history and geography or, for that thing, brought about an identification of Atlantis with Hesperia, nor trusting the linguistic capacities of the historians who had generated and advanced that particular hypothesis, not being skilled linguists in any case.

And suddenly the light shone and everything made sense, upon dwelling on Cp. *amenti* "Hades; the West". We had often come across texts dealing with the early history of Al-Andalus and explaining that in the old times nothing good was expected in the East from western lands and people, as only the East and its people played the leading roles in history and culture, and were held in high esteem. This could possibly only stem from an old dislike and even enmity felt by the Egyptians towards a part of the world whence they never expected or received anything good, to the point of placing there the Hades. On this point we remembered something quite trite, but nevertheless remarkable, namely, that the cardinal points are in principle absolutely relative, so that the North is South for the people who dwell beyond a certain parallel, and that West becomes East for whomever crosses a few meridians, and therefore these technical terms have only a relative value. In fact, each important culture has developed its own set of them, and eventually traded it for another, as the Europeans did in the Middle Ages, when the Latin items

(*ōriēns, occīdens, septentriō, mēriđiēs*) were partially forsaken in favour of the now prevailing Germanic terms. As for the Egyptians, they had devised a system from which they would never deviate an inch, as long as their language was spoken, not even as a consequence of Hellenisation, with the following designations: >*iʔbt*< “East”, >*imnt*< “West”, >*mḥtj.t*< “North” and >*rśj*< “South” (Ermann & Grapow I 130, I 68, II 125 and II 453, respectively), which remains basically unaltered in Cp.: *em(e)nt, eiebt, mhit* and *rēs* (Crum 56, 76, 212 and 299, respectively). There were also some peculiar ways to combine them: thus Crum 399 informs us that “Southeast” was said *p+eiebt e-rēs*, literally, “the East by the South”, and this can only mean that “Southwest” was said **p+ement e-rēs* or, without the article, **ement e-rēs*. In late Cp., we have seen that /t/ was often pronounced /d/, and all along the history of the Egyptian language the confusions between /l/ and /r/ have been pervasive, as can still be easily checked in the Cp. dictionary,⁷⁹ consequently, in the epoch of the Islamic conquest of Egypt, the local population must have called the Southwest **emender/lēs*, which the Arabs would hear as **am+andalīs* and, most of them being of Yemenite extraction⁸⁰, they would metanalyze /am+/ as their own dialectal shape of the definite article, instead of /al+/, i.e., thus producing a standard /al+andalīs/.

Of course, the Iberian Peninsula occupies the Southwest of Europe and it stands to reason that, when the Arab conquerors of Egypt learned more geography of the lands farther to the West, before invading them, they heard such names as Latin *Africa*, which through Greek was to become the name of Ifrīqiyah, and some more names like *Numidia, Gaetulia, Mauritania*, etc., which they did not favour, preferring their comprehensive native *mağrib* “West” for the whole stretch of land between Egypt and the Atlantic Ocean. However, they could not ignore that the entity beyond the Strait of Gibraltar was something quite different from North Africa. They must have asked the Egyptians around them, both Christians and Jews, about that country and its name, and probably obtained variegated answers such as Greek *Hesperia* and *Ispania*, perhaps even Hebrew *Šēfārād*,⁸¹ but these terms were not unequivocal,

⁷⁹ With some consequences even in living EA, such as *rāxar* < *alʔāxar* “the other”, and *yā rēt* “would that” < *yā layta*, obvious ultracorrect reactions to the trend to realize /r/ as /l/. As is well-known, there was no /l/ phoneme in OE and their phonemic distinction was still somewhat blurred in Cp.

⁸⁰ About this characteristic shape of the definite article in South Arabia, see the examples given by Wright 1967: I 270 and, for Himyaritic, see BELOVA 1996: 43-44 and its review in CORRIENTE 1997.

⁸¹ Both were ambiguous, as Syriac dictionaries, like PAYNE SMITH 1879-1901:315-6, witness that *espan(i)ya* had become synonymous with Rome, through a phonetic contamination with Greek

so that the local Cp. term, **emender/lēs*, which they heard as **am/l+andalīs* won the day. Incidentally, the fact that Hispania had come to be called **emender/lēs* by the Egyptians may well reflect a half-translation of Greek *esperis* “Western”, easily metanalyzable as **esper+rēs*, as if including the Greek *espéra* “the West”, and Egyptian *rēs* “the South”.

Why, then, they wound up saying Al-Andalus and not **Al-Andalīs*, once the standard form of the article, /al+/, became generalized? Well, in fact, they did use that vocalization, which appears as Al-Andalīš, for instance in Al-Bakrī’s *Al-masālik wal-mamālik*, as the name of the Vandals, who were very notorious to the early historians of the Islamic West, mostly on account of the ravages they caused in North Africa. Quite obviously, on account of the tight phonetic likeness between these two foreign terms, the Al-Andalīs of Cp. origin, brought by the conquerors from Egypt as the name of that Southern region of the West, was mixed up with *ġandaluš*,⁸² a reflex of the Latin or Proto-Romance name of the Vandals. At this point, there are two possible explanations for the change of vocalization in the term Al-Andalus:

a) The Arabic speaking Berbers of the country, who were the majority in the first decades, applied to it the frequent alternancy, characteristic of Berber, between {CvCCiC} and {CvCCuC} (e.g., *amendi/uř* “vagabond”, *ajerji/um* “stalk of a bunch of grapes once they are eaten”, *abəbbi/uš* “breast”, and *adfi/us* “fold”, and, in Moroccan Arabic, *fenni/uš* “mule”, and even in words of Arabic stock, *qərmū/īd* “tile” and *šərmū/īta* “rag”).⁸³ However, this possibility is not too likely, considering the scarce linguistic prestige of Berber at that time in the recently conquered western lands.

b) Learned people became aware of the mix-up and tried to disentangle that mess by separating shapes and meanings, through the recognition of two phonetically distinct and semantically distinguishable terms, on the one hand,

Esperia, i.e., “the West”, which initially and in principle meant only Italy, of course, not Spain. As for the the Hebrew term, in the Bible it meant only a town in Asia Minor (see BROWN, DRIVER & BRIGGS 1907: 709), and would acquire its later meaning only through again the same phonetic and semantic contamination with Greek *Esperia*: consequently, neither term was then and there appropriate to designate the Iberian Peninsula unequivocally.

⁸² See PENELAS 2001: 48 and 355 (Arabic text) with the spellings >ʔfndlš< and >ʔġndlsyyn<. The editor is duly aware of the important fact that this translation was the source of Al-Bakrī in his chapter about the early history of Al-Andalus. But these two spellings reflect the initial consonant of “Vandals”, more or less altered, and cannot be the model on which Al-Andalus was patterned, but simply a word sufficiently close in shape to allow a confusion with the **al/mandi+līs* imported from Egypt.

⁸³ See CORRIENTE 1981: 18 and CORRIENTE 1999: 335, fn. 1. Items excerpted from IBÁÑEZ 1949: 3, 10, 30 and 59-60.

Andalīš (closer to Latin *Vandālus*, but for the loss of the onset consonant and a final vowel contaminated by the Egyptian word), which was licensed as designation of that Germanic nation, or even of a mythical king of Spain, a term bound to disappear with those vague memories, and, on the other hand, Al-Andalus (closer to Egyptian *amandi+r/lēs*, but for the interference of the plural suffix of the Romance reflex of Latin *Vandālus*), which survived as name of the Western country previously known as Hispania. In the meantime, Eastern lexicographers, began to use the harmonized shape Al-Andulus, only one found in dictionaries like *Tāju lʿarūs* and *Lisānu lʿarab*, a word which they justly considered anomalous, but connecting easily with the root {dls} “to be dark”, a traditional attribute of the West and the Atlantic Ocean (“Sea of Darkness”), and not alien to the OE concept of the West as a place very much like hell.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- BARTHÉLEMY, A., *Dictionnaire arabe-français. Dialectes de Syria* (Paris: Geuthner, 1935-69).
- BAUER, L., *Deutsch-arabisches Wörterbuch der Umgangssprache in Palästina und im Libanon* (Wiesbaden, 1957, 2nd ed.).
- BEHNSTEDT, P., “Weitere koptische Lehnwörter im Ägyptisch-Arabischen”, in *Welt des Orients* 12 (1981), pp. 81-98.
- *Die nordjemenitischen Dialekte. Teil 2: Glossar* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1992-2006).
- “Koptisch oder Arabisch?”, in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 87 (1997), pp. 31-39.
- “Coptic loanwords”, in *Encyclopaedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), I, pp. 501-505.
- & WOIDICH, M., *Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte. IV. Glossar Arabisch-Deutsch* (Wiesbaden, 1994).

- BELOVA, Anna G., *Xim'jaritskij jazyk. Areal'nye issledovanija k istorii arabskogo jazyka* (Moscow: Vostočnaja Literatura, 1996).
- BISHAI, G., "Coptic influence on Egyptian Arabic", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 80 (1960), pp. 225-229.
- , "Coptic lexical influence on Egyptian Arabic", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 23 (1964), pp. 39-47.
- BLAU, J., *Millon lēṭeqšim sarbiyyim yēhudim miyyēme habbēnayim. A Dictionary of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic texts* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language – The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2006).
- BOSSONG, G., "Der Name al-Andalus: neue Überlegungen zu einen alten Problem", in David RESTLE & Dietmar ZAEFFERER, *Sounds and Systemns. Studies in Structure and Change. A Festschrift for Theo Vennemann, «Trends in Linguistics» Studies and Monographs 141* (Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002), pp. 149-164.
- BRAMON, Dolors, *Contra moros y judíos* (Barcelona: Península, 1986).
- BROWN, F., DRIVER, S.R. & BRIGGS, C.A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907, several eds.).
- CANTINEAU, J., *Études de linguistique arabe. Mémorial Jean Cantineau* (Paris: Klincksiek, 1960).
- ČERNÝ, J., *Coptic Etymological Dictionary* (Cambridge, 1976).
- CORRIENTE, F., "Qalqūl en semítico. Forma hipocorística y del lenguaje infantil, documentada con ejemplos de interés para la lingüística semítica y general", *Sefarad* 29 (1969), pp. 1-9.
- "Marginalia on Arabic diglossia and evidence thereof in the *Kitāb al-Aḡānī*", in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20.1 (1975), pp. 37-61.
- "From Old Arabic to Classical Arabic through the pre-Islamic koiné: some notes on the native grammarians' sources, attitudes and goals", *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21 (1976), pp. 62-98.
- *A grammatical sketch of the Spanish Arabic dialect bundle* (Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura, 1977).
- "Los fonemas /p/, /č/ y /g/ en el árabe hispánico", *Vox Romanica* 37 (1978), pp. 214-218.
- "Notas de lexicología hispano-árabe. I. Nuevos romancismos en Aban Quzmán y crítica de los propuestos. II. Los romancismos del "Vocabulista in arabico", *Vox Romanica* 39 (1980), pp. 183-210.

- “Notas de lexicología hispano-árabe (II y IV)”, *Awraq* 4 (1981), pp. 5-30.
 - “Precisiones etimológicas a “bassetja” y “baldraca”, *Anuario de Filología* (Barcelona) 8 (1982), pp. 105-109.
 - “La serie mozárabe-hispanoárabe *aḏāla, aḏāqal, aḏāšš* ... y la preposición castellana ‘hasta’”, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 99 (1983), pp. 29-32.
 - “South Arabian features in Andalusī Arabic”, in P. WEXLER, A. BORG & S. SOMEKH (eds.), *Studia linguistica et orientalia memoriae Haim blanc dedicata* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989).
 - *Árabe andalusí y lenguas romances* (Madrid: MAPFRE, 1992).
 - (1997a), *A dictionary of Andalusī Arabic* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
 - (1997b), review of A.G. BELOVA, *Xim’jaritskij jazyk*, in *Estudios de dialectología norteafricana y andalusí* 2 (1997), pp. 244-245.
 - “Le berbère en Al-Andalus”, *Études et Documents Berbères* 15-16 (1998), pp. 269-275.
 - *Diccionario de arabismos y voces afines en iberorromance* (Madrid, Gredos, 1999).
 - “Geminate imperfectives in Arabic masked as intensive stems of the verb”, *Estudios de dialectología norteafricana y andalusí. Homenaje a Peter Behnstedt en su 60 aniversario* 8 (2004), pp. 33-57.
 - (2007a), “Notes on a basic work for the study of Middle Arabic: J. Blau’s *Millon lēteqšim šarbiyyim yēhudim miyyēme habbšnayim* (*A Dictionary of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic texts*), *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 4 (2007), pp. 311-355.
 - (2007b), “Ibero-Romance Loanwords”, in *Encyclopaedia of the Arabic language* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), II, pp. 287-290.
 - (2007c), “The Psalter fragment from the Umayyad Mosque of Damascus. A birth certificate of Nabaī Arabic”, in J.P. MONFERRER-SALA (ed.), *Eastern Crossroads. Essays on Medieval Christian Legacy* (Piscataway, NJ.: Gorgias Press, 2007), pp. 303-320.
- CRUM, W.E., *Coptic dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939).
- DALMAN, G., *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina* (Hildesheim: Gerofg Olms, 1987, reimp.).
- DAVIDSON, A., *Mediterranean seafood* (Bungay: Penguin, 1972).

- DÉVAUD, E., “Étymologies coptes”, *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et l’archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne*, 39 (1921), pp. 155-177 [Paris 1870-1974].
- DOSTAL, W., *Ethnografic Atlas of ‘Aṣṣ. Preliminary Report* (Viena, 1883).
- DOZY, R., *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* (Leiden: Brill, 1881).
- ERMAN, A. & GRAPOW, H., *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie, 1982, 4th ed.).
- FERRANDO, I., “G.S: Colin y los berberismos del árabe andalusí”, *Estudios de dialectología norteafricana y andalusí 2* (1997), pp. 105-145.
- FERRERAS, Asunción (ed.), *Al-maqṣad al-maḥmūd fi talxīṣ al-ṣuqūd* [by Al-Jazīrī], (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas – Agencia Internacional de Cooperación Internacional, 1998).
- FISCHER, W. & JASTROW, O., *Handbuch der arabischen Dialekte* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1980).
- FLEISCH, H., *Traité de philologie arabe* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1961).
- GRIFFIN, D. A., *Los mozarabismos del “Vocabulista” atribuido a Ramón Martí* (Madrid: Maestre, 1961).
- HINDS, M. & BADAWI, E. S., *A dictionary of Egyptian Arabic* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1986).
- HINZ, W., *Islamische Masse und Gewichte* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- HONY, H.C., ALDERSON, A.D. & İZ, F. *The Oxford Turkish-English Dictionary* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1984, 3rd ed.).
- IBÁÑEZ, E., *Diccionario Rifeño – Español* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1949).
- ISAAC, E.M., “VIII, Appendix Linguistics: Coptic Influence on Egyptian Arabic Vocabulary”, in A.S. ATIYA (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia* (New-York – Toronto, 1991).
- JASTROW, M., *A dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature* (New York – Berlin & London: Choreb & Shapiro, Vallentine & Co., 1925).
- KAZIMIRSKI, A. de B., *Dictionnaire arabe-français* (Boulaq: Imprimerie Khédiviale, 1875).
- LESLAU, W., *Comparative dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987).

- MACCOULL, L.S.B., "Three Cultures under Arabic Rule: The Fate of Coptic", in *Bulletin de la Société d' Archéologie Copte* 27 (1985), pp. 61-70.
- MALLON, A., *Grammaire copte* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1956, 4th ed.).
- OSING, J., *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen* (Mainz, 1976).
- PAYNE-SMITH, R., *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1879-1901).
- PENELAS, Mayte, *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš (traducción árabe de las Historiae adversus paganos de Orosio)* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas – Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional, 2001).
- POLOTSKY, H.J., "Coptic", *Current Trends in Linguistics* 6 (The Hague – Paris: Mouton, 1970).
- REDHOUSE, J.W., *A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople: Boyajian, 1890 = rep. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1996).
- REINHARDT C., *Ein arabischer Dialekt gesprochen in Oman und Zanzibar*, Stuttgart (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1972 = 1894).
- SAMI, Š., *Qāmūs turkī* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1989 = 1890).
- SCHENKEL, W., "Glottalisierte Verschlusslaute, glottaler Verschlusslaut und ein pharyngaler Reibelaut im Koptischen. Rückschlüsse aus den ägyptisch-koptischen Lehnwörtern und Ortsnamen im Ägyptisch-Arabischen", *Lingua Aegyptia* 10 (2002), pp. 1-57.
- SOBHY, G., *Common words in the Spoken Arabic of Egypt, of Greek and Coptic Origin* (Cairo, 1950).
- SPIRO, S., *An Arabic-English dictionary of the colloquial Arabic of Egypt* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1973).
- STEINDORF, G., *Koptische Grammatik* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1979, 3rd ed.).
- STEINER, R., *Affricated Šade in the Semitic Languages*, «The American Academy for Jewish Research Monograph Series» 3 (New York: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1982).
- TÄCKHOLM, Vivi, *Student's flora of Egypt* (Beirut, 1974 2nd ed.).
- Türkçe Sözlük*, by the Academy of the Turkish Language [Türk Dil Kurumu], (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1983).
- VITTMANN, G., "Zum koptischen Sprachgut im Ägyptisch-Arabischen", in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 81 (1991), pp. 197-227.
- VOLLERS, K., *The Modern Egyptian Dialect of Arabic* (Cambridge, 1895).

WEHR, H., *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart* (Wiesbaden, 1985, 5th ed.).

WORRELL, W.H., *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection* (Ann Arbor, 1942).

WRIGHT, W., *A grammar of the Arabic language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, 3rd ed.).

Recibido / Received: 05/11/2007

Aceptado / Accepted: 14/03/2008