

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK

## TWO GREEK WORDS OF A FOREIGN ORIGIN:

### I. ἑλέφας, II. φοῖνιξ

#### I.

Greek ἑλέφας, -αντος means both “ivory” (*Il.* 5.583 etc.) and later also “elephant” (*Hdt.* 3.114, 4.191; cf. also ἑλέφαντος ὀδόντες in 3.97). The former meaning is evidently older, judging by the witness of Mycenaean texts where only “ivory” is attested: nom. sg. *e-re-pa* (KN Sd 4412a, Va 482), acc. sg. *e-re-pa-ta* (Kn Og 7504), gen. sg. *e-re-pa-to* (KN V 684.1, Ce 144.1; PY Sa 793), instr. sg. *e-re-pa-te* (KN Ra 1028.A, Sd 4401.b, 4403.b, 4408.b, 4450.c; PY Ta 642.2, 708.1), adj. *e-re-pa-te-jo* instr. pl. ntr. (KN Sd 4403.a), instr. pl. m. or ntr. (PY Ta 642.3, 707.1, 708.1, 710.1, 715.1, 721.1-5, 722.1), *e-re-pa-te-jo-pi* instr. pl. m. (KN Se 891.A,B), *e-re-pa-te-ja* nom. sg.f. (PY Ta 713.2, 715.2.2), *e-re-pa-te-ja-pi* instr. pl. f. (Py Ta 707.2, 708.2, 722.3.3) etc. — see Aura Jorro 1985: 240-241.

During the last almost 4 centuries there were presented numerous, sometimes rather bizarre etymologies. The origin has been sought in both Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages.

#### A. Indo-European origin:

a) Saussure, *MSLP* 3 [1878]: 208 and Lewy 1895: 5 derive “ivory” from the meaning “white” attested in Greek ἀλφός “lepra” (Hesiod and others), ἀλφούς · λευκούς & ἀλωφούς · λευκούς, ἀλφινία · ἡ λεύκη (Hesych.). Lewy l.c. mentions the use of the ivory as a synonym of “whiteness”, cf. λευκοτέρην δ' ἄρα μιν θῆκε πριστοῦ ἑλέφαντος (*Od.* 18.196).

b) Osthoff 1901: 281 speculates about the root \*el- “horn”, seeking it also in ἔλαφος “deer”.

c) Kretschmer (1951 & 1952) connects Greek “elephant” with Gothic *ulbandus* “camel” and reconstructs the heteroclitic paradigm \*léb<sup>h</sup><sub>r</sub> / \*l<sup>h</sup>b<sup>h</sup>ánt-, finding a support for the *r*-form (\*ἔλεφαρ) in the verb ἐλεφαίρομαι “destroy” (about the Nemean lion — see Hesiod, *Th.* 330) and “cheat with empty hopes”, used anagrammatically together with ἑλέφας (*Il.* 562-565).

d) Laroche 1965: 56f proposes a connection of Greek ἐλέφας and Hittite or Luwian *lahpa-* “ivory”. Following Güterbock & Hoffner (see CHD 12), Ivanov 1984: 68–69 adds Hittite *lahma-* & *lahmant-* known e.g. from the following context: *periš uizzi* [...] *peran SİR*(coll.)-*RU la-aḫ-ma-aš paizzi* (KBo 17.43 iv 5–6). Ivanov interprets it as “elephant goes [...] before [him] they sing, *lahma-* goes”, where *lahma-* should represent a native synonym to *peri-*, probably a borrowing from Akkadian *pēru*, *pīru*, *pīlu* “elephant”, perhaps via Hurrian (cf. Hurrian *šinnipera/uḫḫu* < Akkadian *šinni pi(-i)-ri* “ivory”, lit. “tooth of elephant” — see AHw 867).

B. Non-Indo-European origin:

e) A borrowing from Semitic *\*ʔalp-* “ox” (already M. Martinius 1623, G.J. Vossius 1662, S. Bochart 1663 and still B. Hemmerdinger, *Glotta* 48 [1970]: 52 — see in details West 1993: 126). Pott, *ZDMG* 4 [1842]: 15 has modified this etymology starting from *\*aleph Hindi* “tauris Indicus”, assuming a Phoenician transmission (this solution is discussed by Müller 1861).

f) Schrader & Nehring 1917–23: 242 separate ἐλ- (‘Arabic-like article’!) from the root -εφ- which they compare with Latin *ebur* “ivory”, Old Indic *ibha-* “elephant” and Hebrew (1 Kings 10.22 = 2 Chron. 9.21) *šenhabbîm* “ὀδόντων ἐλεφαντίνων”, seeking an origin in Egyptian *3bw* “elephant”, beginning from the Middle Kingdom also “ivory”.

g) Lokotsch 1927: 48 assumes for ἐλέφας the same origin as for Arabic *fil* “elephant”, Persian *pīl* id., deriving them from ‘Hamitic’, concretely Tuareg *elu*, plus prefixed Egyptian article *p-*!

h) Rössler 1942: 296 has mentioned a similarity of the Greek ἐλέφας and Berber “elephant”, concretely Tuareg (of Taitoq) *ēlū*, pl. *ēlwan*, deriving the Greek word from an early Berber source of the type *\*eleḫ*.

i) Analyzing (almost) all existing etymologies till 1977, Vallini 1979: 182, fn. 137 adds her own solution, namely Egyptian (Old Kingdom) zoonym *irb3*, interpreted “rhinoceros” after its determinative (Wb. I: 115).

j) Blažek 1992: 144 proposes an origin of Greek ἐλέφας and Hittite/Luwian *lahpa-* “ivory” in Egyptian *ibḫ* “tooth, elephant tusk”, Demotic *3bḫ* (Vycichl 1983: 154), if it is derived from *\*l-b-ḫ*). This idea was independently supported by Hodge (1992: 215).

2. Let us judge the presented etymological attempts.

Ad a) The white color of ivory is undoubtedly its characteristic feature, cf. Greek ἐλεφάντινα · λευκά (Hesych.), Sumerian logographic expression **KA** x **UD** [**AM** · **SI**] “ivory”, i.e. “mouth + white [elephant]” (Tischler 1990: 14–15) etc. But from the point of view of laws of Indo-European apophony the initial vowels *ē-* and *ā-* are incompatible. The only solution would be an assumption of assimilation from *\*ἀλεφαντ<sup>ο</sup>* (cf. ἄτερος vs. ἔτερος).

Ad b) The semantic motivation based on “horn” is also quite legitimate, cf. e.g. Sumerian **AM** · **SI** “elephant”, lit. “bull” + “horn”, Geez (Old Ethiopic) *garna nage* “elephant tusk”, lit. “horn of elephant”, Hebrew *qarnōt šēn* id., lit. “horns of tooth”, i.e. “ivory” (Ez 27<sub>15</sub>). But Osthoff’s separation of the root *\*el-* “horn” is not generally accepted. The explanation of the rest of the word lacks.

Ad c) The reconstruction of the form \*ἐλεφάρ is implied by existence e.g. of τέκμαρ derived from τεκμαίρομαι (Schwyzer 1939: 724). The root ἐλέφ<sup>ο</sup> has been compared with ὀλοφώϊος “deceptive, tricky; destructive, deadly” (cf. ἐρέφω “cover” vs. ὄροφος “roof”) and further with Lithuanian *vilbinti* “to make a fool of”, although not without uncertainty (Beekes 1969: 41).

On the other hand, any connection (cognate or borrowing) of Gothic *ulbandus*, Old Icelandic *ulfalde*, Old English *olfend* “camel” with Greek ἐλέφαντ<sup>ο</sup> is improbable in the light of Hittite *ḫuwalpant-* “humpback, hunchback”, Luwian *ḫu-wa-al-pa-na-ti-ar*, how Puhvel (1991: 424–426 and 1993: 187–189) has recognized. Already Schrader & Nehring 1917–23: 553 speculated about an influence of languages of Asia Minor on Gothic spoken in the North Pontic area. Puhvel l.c. admits a common heritage of the Germanic and Anatolian words, but regarding the *-nt*-suffixation typical for Anatolian (‘animates’ or participles of denominative verbal derivatives) he prefers a cultural influence of the late Anatolian civilization. But Pijnenburg (1996: 479–480) has demonstrated that just the *-nt*-suffix forms some animal names in Germanic, cf. Old High German *wisunt*, *wisant* “aurochs”, Old English *browend* “scorpion”, *slincend* “reptile”, Middle Low German *ellent*, Middle Dutch *elent*, *ellant* “elk”, *arent* “eagle” etc.

Ad d) The Anatolian words evidently cannot be a source of Greek ἐλέφαντ<sup>ο</sup> (and vice versa). Probably, both Anatolian and Greek “ivory” / “elephant” were borrowed independently from a common source.

Ad e) Semitic \**ʔalp-* continuing in Akkadian *alpu* “ox, cattle”, Phoenician *ʔlp*, Ugaritic *ʔlp* “ox”, Hebrew *ʔélep*, used in pl. tantum *ʔālāpīm* “oxen, bullocks, cows, cattle”, Empire Aramaic *ʔlpʔ* “ox”, Soqotri *ʔalf* “heifer” (Leslau 1938: 62; Cohen 1970: 21) designated “tamed animal”, cf. Arabic *ʔalifa* “grow tame”, Aramaic *ʔallep* “get used”, Hebrew *ʔallūp* “domestic” (Fronzaroli 1969: 28, # 6.41). Masson 1967: 82 mentions that none of the quoted words was used for “elephant” or even “ivory” (similarly already Th. Hyde in 1694!). Recently West (1993: 127–128) tries to rehabilitate this etymology assuming a starting point of the type \**alap* *Ḫanê* “ox of Ḫanû”, as Akkadian speakers from North Syria about 1800–1500 BC **could** designate the elephant living on the upper and middle Euphrates in the second mill. BC (the Egyptian pharaoh Tutmosé III hunted elephants in the land of Niy, probably east of Aleppo) and even still in the first millennium BC (the Assyrian king Tiglat-Pilešar I killed ten elephants in the land Harran). This region was inhabited in the first half of the second millennium BC by a semi-nomadic people of West Semitic origin called *Ḫanû*, in Hurrianized texts *Ḫaniaḫḫe*. This undoubtedly tempting solution does not overcome two problems: (i) in semantics — the primary meaning of the Greek and Anatolian words was apparently “ivory”; (ii) in vocalism — Hebrew *ʔélep* resembling most Greek ἐλέφ<sup>ο</sup> reflects the Masoretic vocalization developed in the second half of the first mill. AD; the situation of the second mill. BC is reflected besides Akkadian by Ugaritic *ʔlp*. Even the borrowing of the beginning of the first mill. BC, namely the name of the letter ἄλφα borrowed from Phoenician (cf. ἄλφα · βοὸς κεφαλή · Φοίνικες, Hesych.), preserves the vowel *a-* in the first syllable.

Ad f) The Old Indic, at least Vedic, *ibha-* means “Gesinde, Tross, Hauswesen, Hofstaat” (EWAI I: 194). Mayrhofer, KEWA III: 644 confirms that the meaning “elephant” appears only in the later language (Mānava-Dharmaśāstra) probably thanks to misinterpretation of an original Vedic text (cf. further Pali *ibha-*, Prakrit *i(b)ha-*; Sinhalese *iba* looks like a direct borrowing from Pali — see Turner 1966: 71, # 1587).

The Hebrew *šēnhabbīm* is more probably corrupt for \**šēn* (*wə*)*hābnīm* “ivory and ebony” (West 1993: 128; the source of “ebony” was Egyptian *hbnj* “ebony(-tree)” (from the 5<sup>th</sup> dynasty) — see Spiegelberg 1907: 131 (Bancel 1990 tries to find a source of *hbnj* in the Niger-Congo languages, cf. Soninke *binne* “black”, proto-Bantu \*-*pīnd-* “be black” > Ibalí *-peen-* id., *i-vindu* ebony, i.e. black wood); the other conjecture \**šēnhalbīm* is discussed by Pictet 1855: 129). Latin *ebur* “ivory” reflects a late Egyptian pronunciation of Egyptian *šbw* “elephant” preserved in the name of the island Elephantine known in both Greek transcription Χνομός [N]εβιήβ, Χνουβώ Νεβιήβ (the epochs of Ptolemaios VI and X) corresponding to Egyptian *Hnmw š3 nb šbw* “Hnum the great, lord of **Elephantine**”, and Coptic Sahidic (ϸ)IHB “Elephantine” (Vycichl 1983: 61–62). The Egyptian *šbw* meant “elephant” beginning from the Old Kingdom, from the Middle Kingdom it was also used in the meaning “ivory”. The consonant *š* represents not only “aleph”, but it frequently serves as a substituent of \**l* or \**r*. There are remarkable examples demonstrating that the colloquial speech continuing in Coptic sometimes preserves these liquids even in the positions where the Egyptian language written in hieroglyphs used *š* (see also Satzinger 1994: 199):

(1) *šbh* “burn, be hot” (Coffin Texts) vs. Coptic Sahidic ΛΩΒΩ “be hot, glow” (Vycichl 1983: 95);

(2) *hšb* “a catch (of fish or fowl)” (Pyramid Texts; later *hb*) vs. Coptic Sahidic ϨΑΛΙΒ „casting-net” (Vycichl 1983: 297; Hodge 1992: 209);

(3) *hšb* (Middle Kingdom) “sickle” vs. Coptic Bohairic ΧΡΟΒΙ id. (Vycichl 1983: 246);

(4) *hpš.t* “navel” (Pyramid Texts) vs. Demotic *hlpy*, Coptic Sahidic ϨΑΠϸ, Bohairic ϥΕΛΠΙ id.; cf. also Argobba *hulufo* “navel” (Vycichl 1958: 389 and 1983: 298);

In other cases only external comparisons allow to determine an original character of *š* (for simplicity the examples are limited to Egypto-Semitic parallels):

(5) *šh.t* (Old Kingdom) > Demotic *šh* & *iḥ.t* (Middle Kingdom) “field” > Coptic Sahidic ΕΙΩϨϸ, Bohairic ΙΟϨΙ id. vs. Arabic *lawḥ* “flower-bed”, Hebrew *lūāḥ* (Vycichl 1983: 69);

(6) *dšb* “fig” (Pyramid Texts), in Papyrus Ebers “a cake made out of figs”, vs. Hebrew *debēlā* “cake of pressed figs”, Ugaritic *dbl* “fig cakes” etc. (Ember 1930: 17–18);

(7) *hšf* “leave, forsake, pull, let” (Pyramid Texts), Coptic Bohairic ΧΩ, Sahidic ΚΩ id. vs. Arabic *ḥalaḥa* “remove, pull off, depose, dismiss, divorce (wife)”, *ḥaluḥa* “cast off” (Ember 1930: 20);

(8) *šis* “brain” (Med.) vs. Arabic *raʿs*, Hebrew *rōš*, Akkadian *rēšū* “head” (Rössler 1966: 227);

(9) *k3p* “cover, hide” (19th Dyn.), Coptic ΚΩΠΤ “hide, be hidden” vs. Arabic *kafara* “cover”; Hebrew *kapar* “atone for, make atonement” meant orig. “cover” (Ember 1930: 16);

(10) *q3b* “entrails, midst” (Med.) vs. Hebrew *qereb* “midst, interior”, Ugaritic *qrb* id., Akkadian *qirbu* “inward part, interior” etc. (Ember 1930: 9).

The following step should decide between *\*l* and *\*r*. Without safe Coptic data only the external parallels can answer this question. There are several elephant names in various Afroasiatic branches compatible with *3bw*, but they are mutually incompatible (cf. Blažek 1994: 197–198):

(11) East Cushitic *\*ʔarb-* “elephant”: Somali *arba*, Rendille *arab*, Arbore *arab*, Dasenech *'arab*, Elmolo *árap*, Oromo *arba*, Konso *arpa*, D'irayta *arp*, Burji *árba*, Dullay *arap-ka* id., Yaaku *arape* “large feline” or “carnivorous animal” and South Cushitic: Maa *áro* “large herbivore elephant”;

(12) Common Berber *\*Hiliw*, pl. *\*Hiliwan* “elephant” (Prasse 1974: 124–125): South = Tuareg: Ahaggar *êlw*, pl. *êlwân* (Foucauld), Ayr *iləw*, pl. *ilwan*, Iullemmiden *eləw*, pl. *elwan* (Alojaly), Taitoq *elw*, pl. *elwan* (Masqueray), Ghat *alu* (R. Basset); West = Zenaga *idjit*, pl. *adjadan* (R. Basset), *əjĭh*, *ijĭh* (Nicolas), *iyi*<sup>h</sup> (Taine-Cheikh);

(13) West Chadic: Tangale *labata*; East Chadic: Mokilko *ʔêlbi* “elephant” (Jungraithmayr & Ibriszimow 1994: 124–125). The Central Chadic elephant names sometimes connected with the preceding ones (Jungraithmayr & Ibriszimow l.c.) are probably of a different origin. Sukur *rvveri* resembles suggestively names of “lion” in other Central Chadic languages: Hwona *lifari*, Kilba *levári*, Higi Dakwa *liveri*, Hildi *luvari*, Higi Futu *lùvâri*, Dghwede *rvirè*, Laamang *ərvárè* etc. In respect to the regular change *\*-n- > -r-* characteristic for most of Central Chadic this zoonym is compatible with West Chadic “leopard”: Kulere *rúwân*, Daffo *řáfân*, Hausa *râbíi*, all from *\*lub-an-* (cf. Jungraithmayr & Ibriszimow 1994: 222, 226–227; otherwise Stolbova 1996: 89 who reconstructs Proto-Chadic *\*ʔa-luba-ri*). The Kotoko forms as Logone (Bouny) *ʔarĕĕ*, Makeri *árfu*, Gulfei *árfu(r)*, Shoe *arfu*, Kuseri *árwi* “elephant” seem to be similar too. More probably they are related to Ngala *ánwe*, Yedina *ambu*, Logone (Lukas) *neví* id. The development in Kotoko could look as follows: *\*nəwi* (cf. Logone after Lukas) > *\*ʔənwə* (cf. Yedina, Ngala) > *\*ʔərwə* (cf. Kuseri, Logone by Bouny, Shoe etc.). There are also important parallels outside Kotoko supporting our reconstruction: Nzangi (Mouchet) *ñíwə* and Sura *níi*, Ankwe *niye* etc. (Jungraithmayr & Ibriszimow 1994: 124–125).

The external parallels within Afroasiatic do not solve our question: the Cushitic and Berber data imply *\*r* and *\*l* respectively; our knowledge of Chadic historical phonology allow to confirm the originality of *\*l* only in Mokilko and perhaps in Tangale too:

(14) Mokilko *ʔilzé* “tongue”, Mubi *lísí*; Bole *lisim* (the same group as Tangale, where it was replaced by another word *dagə*) etc. (Jungraithmayr & Ibriszimow 1994: 328–329) vs. Semitic *\*lišān* // Egyptian *ns*, Coptic ΛΔC // Berber *\*Hilis*, pl. *\*-āwan* (Prasse 1974: 111, 125) > Siwa *ilēs*, Tuareg Ahaggar *iləs* etc. (Vycichl 1983: 99);

(15) Mokilko (East Chadic) *ʔulbó* “heart”, Chip (West Chadic) *ləp* “lungs”, Daba (Central Chadic) *liḃi* “belly” (Kraft) vs. Semitic *\*libb-* / *\*lubb-* “heart” // Berber *\*wiliH* or *\*HuluH* ? “heart” (Prasse 1974: 72) > Taneslemt *ulh*, pl. *ulhawən*, Zenaga *udj*, pl. *allun* // Cushitic: Beja *ləw* “pylorus” (Roper); Agaw *\*ləbb-ak-* “heart, soul”; East Cushitic *\*lubb-* “heart, soul” > Afar *lubb-i*, Konso *lupp-oota* (Sasse 1982: 136); South Cushitic: Asa *liba* “chest” // Egyptian *\*iub* > *ib*, Coptic ΥΒ- “heart” (Vycichl 1983: 243). Hodge 1976: 20 and 1992: 211–212 offers another reading. He mentions the word “ax”, in the traditional transcription *mibt* & *mīnb* (Wb. II: 42, 44), which is based on the Middle Egyptian reading *mī* of the signs MILK-JUG IN NET [W19] and CHANNEL [N36] respectively (the references to signs follow Gardiner 1988). Using the older reading *mr* instead *mī*, both the forms become easy compatible: *mrbt* & *mrnb* unambiguously indicate *\*m-l-b(-t)*. The alternative spellings (using *r* instead *ī*) *mr-HEART-t* AX (coffin of Min-khaf, 4th Dyn.), *mn-n-HEART-t* AX BLADE (3rd-4th Dyn.), *mr-n-HEART-b* INGOT [N34] (Sarc.) imply the primary transcription of the HEART-sign *\*nb* ~ *\*rb* besides later *\*i3b* > *ib*, i.e. *\*[u]b* ~ *\*ʔulb* > *\*i3lb* with the prothetic alif (it was already Edel 1964: LVII offering the reading *jnb* for the HEART-sign).

(16) G. Takács drew my attention to the following possibility to determine the liquid substituted by *ʃ* in Egyptian *ʃbw* “elephant”. The words ‘elephant’, ‘elephant tusk’ and ‘ivory’ were usually spelled *ʃb-(b)-w* ELEPHANT, *ʃb-b-(w)* TUSK and *ʃb-b-(w)* HARPOON POINT (Wb. I: 7; Faulkner 1981: 2). In most cases the sign *ʃb* depicting “chisel” was used (Gardiner 1988: 518, U 23; Faulkner l.c. also mentions the spelling with the sign SPEAR DECKED OUT AS STANDARD [R 15] read as *ʃb* from Dyn. XVIII, but with original value *i3b* — see Gardiner 1988: 502). The ‘chisel’ was the main instrument for writing in stone and hence it could serve as a symbol of writing for neighbors of Egyptians. There is at least an undirect support of this idea in the the word *ʃb.t* “brand” (Pyramid Texts) spelled *ʃb*(=‘CHISEL’)-*b-w* with ideograms SCRIBE’S OUTFIT (determining the words as *zš* “write”, *zšw* “writings”, *tms* “red” etc.) and ‘GLEAM’ (Faulkner 1981: 2; Gardiner 1988: 534, Y 3 & 505, S 15 respectively). Accepting this identification, there are suggestive parallels in Berber beginning from the oldest sources. So in the Numidian inscription from Thugga we read *t.t.rb t-rb.t-n*, lit. “sie (*t-*) wurde (*-t-*) geschrieben (*√rb*), die Schrift (*t-rb.t*) diese (*-n*)” (Rössler 1942: 290–92; Woelfel 1955: 117; cf. Augila *teturef* “it is written” f. after Beguinot — see Wölfel 1965: 462). The root *√(ʔ)rb* continues in the living Berber languages too: Ghadames *uṛəḃ* “write”, verbal noun *atiirəḃ* (Lanfry) = *aref* “write” vs. *tiraf* “script” (C. Motylinski), Augila *arév* & *úrev* “write”, nom. act. *arrâv* (Paradisi); Zenaga *arha* “write”, *tirekt* “script” (R. Basset); Shilha *ara* “write”, *arra* & *tirra* “script” (Wölfel), Nefusi *ári* “write” (Beguinot), Zayan *ali* “write”, nom. act. *tirra* (Loubignac), Senhaja *ari* “write”, *tira* “script” (Renisio), Snus *âriy* “write”, *tira* “script” (Destaing), Kabyle *aru* “write”, *tira* “script, inscriptions” (Boulifa); Taitoq *tīrawt*, pl. *tīra* “écrit, amulette” (Masqueray), Ayr *tīrāwt*, pl. *tīra* “lettre (missive), amulette écrite” (Alojaly), Ahaggar *têrāwt*, pl. *têra* (Prasse 1974: 184

reconstructs \**t-Hirāw-t*, pl. \**t-Hirāw*, nom. act. of the verb  $\sqrt{HrH}$  “write”; cf. also Prasse 1969: 19, 28 postulating roots  $\sqrt{H_1rH_2}$ ,  $\sqrt{H_1rw}$ ,  $\sqrt{H_1ry}$ . Guanche (Gran Canaria) *tarha* “marque pour les souvenirs” = *tar(j)a* “señal para recuerdos” (Wölfel 1965: 461) belongs here too. The old *-b-* is also preserved in Hausa *rubu-tu* “write” borrowed (via Kanuri: *-tu* is the infinitive ending in Kanuri) from some Berber-Libyan source (Vycichl 1934: 40).

The hypothetical connection of the Egyptian sign 3*b* ‘CHISEL’ and the common Berber-Libyan root  $\sqrt{(?)}rb$  “write” implies these probable conclusions: (i) The Berber-Libyan “write” is borrowed from an Egyptian source for its more primitive meaning. (ii) The Egyptian 3 substitutes \**r* here. Hence, the original reading of the Egyptian word “elephant” should be \**r[a]baw* or \**?[a]rbaw* (regarding the spelling *ḥ3b-b-w* — see above). (iii) The proposed reading is fully compatible with East Cushitic \**?arb-* (see # 11). On the other hand, any connection with Greek ἐλέφ is imaginable only via mediation of some substratal language of the Eastern Mediterranean. Let us mention that judging by the Linear B script, the language of the linear A script did not differentiate *r* and *l*.

Accepting this tempting idea of Takács, we must conclude: the Egyptian 3*bw* probably is not a direct source of Greek ἐλέφας.

Ad g) The idea of the prefixed (late) Egyptian article *p-* was first formulated by Hommel (1879: 381) who derived Geez (= Old Ethiopic) *bəḥə*, *bəḥə*, *biḥ/h* “hippo” from Coptic ⲬⲚⲈ “cattle; cow” (< Egyptian *ḥ*) with the definite article Π-. But the Geez “hippo” is apparently of a substratal, namely Cushitic, origin, cf. (Central) Khamir *biwā*; (East) Rendille *ibeh*, Arbore *yibéh* etc. id. (see Blažek 1994: 202). Arabic *fīl* “elephant” is related to its counterparts in other Semitic languages: Syrian *pīlā*, Postbiblical Hebrew *pīl*, Akkadian (Old Babylonian, Middle Assyrian) *pīru(m)*, *pīlu* id. The vacillation *r ~ l* in Akkadian is perhaps explainable from the protoform \**pir-l-* with following assimilation \**pill-* & \**pirr-* and further \**pīl-* & \**pīr-*. There is a hopeful etymology based on the primary meaning “horn” in other Afroasiatic branches: West Chadic: Kofyar *feer*; Miya *əpər*, Kariya *pār*, Pa’a *pur-kiti* // North Omotic: Shakko *fāra* id. // ? East Cushitic: Yaaku *puria*, pl. *purian* “rhinoceros” (in details — see Blažek 1994: 196). The Akkadian *pīru* was borrowed in Old Persian *pīruš* “ivory” (and New Elamite *pi-ri-um-na* “from ivory” — see Hinz & Koch 1987: 210) while Middle & Modern Persian *pīl* “elephant” probably represent an Aramaic borrowing. The late Old Indic *pīlu-* “elephant” is borrowed from some Iranian source. Any connection to Greek ἐλέφας is improbable.

Ad h) Prasse’s reconstruction \**Hiliw*, pl. \**Hiliwan* “elephant” is based only on Tuareg data (see # 12). In Ghadames, Augila or in Old Libyan, i.e. languages preserving the ‘weak’ \**b* (Rössler and Militarev use the symbols \**ḅ* and \**ḇ* respectively), this word is not known. But the vacillation *w ~ h* of the final radical in Tuareg vs. Zenaga respectively represents the same correspondence as continuants of Berber-Libyan  $\sqrt{(?)}rb$  studied in # 16. This conclusion allows to expect a Berber-Libyan starting-point \*\**?ilib*, pl. \*\**?iliban*. Just this reconstruction is in a good agreement with external cognates, especially Mokilko (East Chadic) *?ēlbi* “elephant” (see # 13) and probably also Semitic \**?ibil-*

“camel” > Akkadian *ibilu* “camel”, Syrian *hebaltā* “herd of camels”, Arabic *ʔib(i)l*, Thamudic, Safaitic, Sabaic *ʔbl*, Šheri *iyél* “camel” (Cohen 1970: 3; the sequence of radicals fully corresponding to the skeleton *ʔ-l-b* attested in the Berber & Mokilko “elephant” could be still preserved in Arabic *ʔalaba* “rassembler les chameaux”).

A hypothetical source of the Greek ἐλέφαντ<sup>ο</sup> should be sought either in the plural *\*ʔiliban* or in the determined form *\*ʔilib-Vn*, where *\*-Vn* represents a post-positive demonstrative, cf. Numidian *trbt-n* “this inscription”.

In respect to other Greek words which can be of a Berber-Libyan origin, e.g. *πίθηκος* (from Archil.), Doric *-ᾱκος* (Ar. *Ach.*), perhaps also the Mycenaean man’s name *Pi-ta-ke-u* (PY Jn 389) = *\*Pithākeus* (Ventris & Chadwic 1973: 572), besides the dim. *πίθων* (Pi.), vs. Tuareg of Ahaggar *ābiddaw*, pl. *ibiddawän*, Ghadames *biddu* “monkey” (cf. Blažek 1984: 443–447; let us mention that ‘monkey’ was known already for the Minoan civilization, judging by the fresco with two grey macacs depicted on the wall of the room 6 of Complex B found on Thera), the Berber-Libyan origin of the Greek ἐλέφαντ<sup>ο</sup> is quite possible.

Ad i) The spelling *irb3* can perhaps reflect the skeleton *\*ʔ-l-b* or *\*ʔ-b-l* (cf. *\*p-l-g* > *png3*, Coptic ΠΩΛΒ “separate” vs. Arabic *falaḡa* “separate in two”, Hebrew *pālag* “divide” or *\*z-b-l* > *znb3* “fall”, Coptic CΒΛ-ΤΕ — see Vyčichl 1958: 374 and 1983: 159, 184). In spite of the semantic difference it is tempting to compare it with the isogloss *\*ʔilib-* ~ *\*ʔibil-* attested in Berber and Chadic in the meaning “elephant” and in Semitic as “camel” (see above ad h). The variant *\*ʔ-l-b* in Egyptian looks formally compatible with Greek ἐλέφας, but the semantic difference needs to explain.

Ad j) Besides ‘standard’ spellings *i-b-ḥ* with various ideograms (TUSK[F18].STROKE[Z2], TUSKS), *i-b-ḥ-w* TUSK. PELLETS[N33] and *i-b-ḥ-t* TUSK.FLESH[F51] Hodge 1992: 203 quotes e.g. HEART[F34]-*ḥ* TUSK and *i-b-KID[E8]-ḥ-w*. Just the last two spellings open new readings. Hodge has demonstrated (see # 15) that the HEART-sign [F34] traditionally read *ib* is to be read *\*nb* ~ *\*rb* ~ *\*i3b*. Also for the KID-sign, traditionally read *ib* [E8] as well, there are alternative variants *3b* and *ibī* (Hodge 1992: 204 after Edel 1955: 59) indicating the ‘maximum’ reading *\*i3bi* “kid”. The presence of 3 in the word “tooth, tusk” is supported by Demotic *3b* & *3bh*. Finally, the Coptic continuants agree too (after Hodge 1992: 203–204 with Satzinger’s corrections):

Sahidic **OBZE**, **ABZE**, **OΦZE**, Ahminic **ABZE**, Bohairic **OBI** < *\*CVCC-Vt* = *\*3ābḥat* (after Satzinger this feminine looks as a participle of the type “die Beissende”);

Sahidic **OBZ**, Fayumic **ABZ** < *\*CVCC-Vw* = *\*3ābḥVw* (originally perhaps plural);

Fayumic **ABAZ**, **ABEZ** < *\*ʔV-CCVC* = *\*ʔə3bāḥ* (Hodge). Satzinger admits only the accented *á* in the first syllable, while the vowel of the second syllable should be a ‘Sprossvokal’. The creation of the prothetic syllable *ʔə-* is natural when the vowel between *C<sub>1</sub>* and *C<sub>2</sub>* was lost.

The use of the HEART-sign allows to identify 3 = *\*l* (see # 15). Besides this argument of Hodge, there is still an undirect witness: Semitic *\*l* & *\*r* were



regularly substituted by ʒ in so called ‘Proscription Texts’ from the Middle Kingdom, cf. the borrowed proper names *ʒk3m* = *ʒagirum*, attested in Mari *Ḫagi-rum*, related to Arabic *ʒagir* “be thick”, *ʾIw3t* = *Ullaza*, *Ṭb3nw* = *Zabulon*, *Ḫ3wb3ḫ* = *Ḫālu-barīḫ*, *M3k3m* = *Malkī-ilum* etc. (Rössler 1966: 223; Vycichl 1990: 209). There are particular cases of the same way of transcription which are older: *3pīm* = *Rapiʔum* (Mari *Ra-pi-ū-um*, Ugarit *Rpʔu*; the place name *Ndi3* attested in the tomb of Inti (6th Dyn.) would correspond to Hebrew *\*nəṯūʔēl*, parallel to the really attested place name *Pənūʔēl* (the verbs *naṯū* and *panū* are synonymous — they mean “sich zuwenden” — see Rössler 1966: 225). Another support could be found in Arabic *labāḥa* “senescere” compared with *ibḥ* by Ember 1930: 30–31. In spite of Calice’s scepticism (1936: 116) the meanings “tooth, tusk” and “grow old” are compatible, starting from the primary semantics “white” — cf. Ugaritic *lbn*, Hebrew *lābān* “white” with other third radical. This idea implies the etymology “tusk” = “white”. Starting from the biradical root *\*l-b*, it is possible to imagine its extension by the suffix *\*-ḥ*, serving as a body part marker (cf. Takács 1997: 241–273). The alternative possibility consists in the sign TUSK OF ELEPHANT [F18] appearing as a phonetic determinative *ḫw* (Gardiner 1988: 463; Ember 1930: 17 derives *ḫw* from *\*ḫwr* and compares it with Semitic *\*ḥ-w-r* “be white” > Arabic *ḥawir*, Hebrew, Aramaic *ḥawar*; cf. also East Cushitic *\*ḥir-* “tusk of elephant” > Rendille *ḥiir*, Harso *ḥir-ce* — see Sasse 1982: 98). On the other hand, Hodge 1992: 203–206 derives *\*i3bh* from the homonymous biradical base *\*l-b* with a hypothetical meaning “pierce”, including here also *3bw* “elephant” and *3b*, older *i3b* (written with the sign R15 — see above # 16) “fingernail, claw”, Demotic *yb*, Coptic Ahminic **IEEBE**, Sahidic **EIEB**.

Accepting the presented arguments and regardless on the concrete etymology, Egyptian *ibḥt* (attested only in the late language, but certainly older) can reflect *\*ʔə3bḥat* = *\*ʔəlbḥat*. This form, borrowed in the East Mediterranean substratal language knowing only open syllables (judging by the Linear B script), should be remodelled in *\*ʔəlabʰat* vel sim. And just this hypothetical reconstruction is well compatible with Greek ἐλέφας < \*ἐλέφασ(ς). Hittite/Luwian *lahpa-* could be borrowed from a source of the type *\*labḥaw* or *\*labḥat*.

## Conclusion

Among the analyzed etymologies just the last solution, i.e. the Egyptian origin of both Greek and Anatolian denotations of “ivory” looks as the most hopeful.

Appendix: An overview of the most important mistakes accompanying the etymologies of the zoonym “elephant” in Indo-European languages.

— ‘Coptic **EBOY** “elephant”’ does not exist. This ghost-form has an origin in the ‘training’ transcription of J.-F. Champolion of Egyptian *3bw* which continues only in the Coptic name of the island Elephantine (see above ad f; already

in 1834 I. Rosselini speculated about the correspondence of the Coptic and Greek names of this island — see Vallini 1979: 158–165). This error is copied from dictionary to dictionary (e.g. Boisacq, Ernout & Meillet, Walde & Hofmann, Chantraine, Mayrhofer in KEWA I, etc.) and even it continues in the recent publications, e.g. Ivanov 1984: 71, Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 524.

— Arabic *fīl* “elephant” is not borrowed from Modern Persian *pīl* id. which cannot be analyzed in the Egyptian article *p-* plus Tuareg (or even “Hamitic” ! — so Walde & Hofmann 1938: 389) *elu* “elephant” (see above ad g).

— Colloquial Arabic *bil* “camel” cannot be compared with Arabic *fīl* “elephant”, as Puhvel does (1993: 187). The form *bil* is simply shortened from *ʔibil* (see above ad h).

— Ivanov 1977: 161 and Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 525 have created another ghost-word in ‘Tocharian *\*alpi* “camel”’, a presumable cognate of Greek ἐλέφαντ<sup>ο</sup>, referring to Clauson 1973: 40. But Clauson says exactly: “For example, applying the normal rules of Tokharian phonetics to the Indo-European words for “barley”, the Tokharian word should have been something like *alpi* which is very like Turkish *arpa*. Again the Chinese word for ‘camel’, which is disyllabic and so a loan-word, might well be Tokharian”. The unattested Tokharian *\*alpi* is postulated on the basis of Greek ἄλφι and Albanian *elp*, *elbi* “barley” (Pokorny 1959: 29). Common Turkic *arpa* represents more probably an Iranian borrowing (the change *l > r* is regular in Iranian languages, but not in Tocharian or Turkic), cf. Pashto *orbašē* (pl.), Ishkashim *urwus*, Sanglichi *vərvəs*, Yidgha *yaršīō* “barley” < Iranian *\*arbasyā*; with other extension Yazgulami *xarban* “millet” (Stebelin-Kamenskij 1982: 23; otherwise Morgenstierne 1927: 11). Today we know the Tocharian word for camel too, cf. B *partāктаññe pitkesa* “Kamelspeichel”. L. Isebaert assumes a Middle Iranian source of the type *\*partaxt* < *\*pari-taxta-* “faisant le tour de, circulant, se promenant”. A.J. Van Windekens reconstructs *\*par(t)-* + *\*āk(to)-* < *\*b<sup>h</sup>er-* + *\*aḡ-to-* “load” + “carried” (*IF* 93[1988]: 99–100). Regardless of the decision which of these etymologies is correct, there is no connection between the Tocharian “camel” and the Greek “elephant”.

— Gothic *ulbandus* “camel” with its counterparts in other Germanic languages is not borrowed from Greek ἐλέφαντ<sup>ο</sup>, but it is connected with Hittite *ḫuwalpant-* “hunchback, humpback” (Puhvel 1991: 424–426 and 1993: 187–189; see above ad c). The regular Germanic continuants of the Greek “elephant” are e.g. Old English *elpend*, *ylpend*, Old High German *elfant*, *elafant* “elephant”, borrowed via Latin.

## REFERENCES:

- AHw von Soden, Wolfram 1972: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Aura Jorro, Francisco 1985: *Diccionario micénico*, I. Madrid: Instituto de Filología.
- Bancel, Pierre 1990: EBENE: un emprunt de l'égyptien ancien à une langue négro-africaine au 3<sup>e</sup> millénaire av. J.-C. Ms.
- Beekes, Robert S.P. 1969: *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague — Paris: Mouton.
- Blažek, Václav 1984: Gr. πίθηκος. *Linguistica* 24, pp. 443–447.
- Blažek, Václav 1992: *Historická analýza indoevropské zoologické terminologie (savci)*. Brno: Unpublished dissertation.
- Blažek, Václav 1994: Elephant, hippopotamus and others: some ecological aspects of the Afroasiatic homeland. *Asian and African Studies* 3/2, pp. 196–212.
- CHD *The Hittite Dictionary of The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, eds. H.G. Güterbock & H.A. Hoffner. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard 1973: Philology and archaeology. *Antiquity* 47, pp. 37–42.
- Cohen, David 1970: *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques*. Paris — Lattaye: Mouton.
- Edel, Elmar 1955–64: *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Ember, Aaron 1930: *Egypto-Semitic-Studies*, ed. by F. Behnk. Leipzig: Verlag Asia Major.
- EWAI Mayrhofer, Manfred 1986: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarisch* I. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Faulkner, Raymond O. 1981: *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Fronzaroli, Pelio 1969: Studi sul lessico comune semitico VI. La natura domestica. *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Rendiconti della Classe Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser. VIII, vol. XXIV, fasc. 7–12, pp. 1–36.
- Gamkrelidze, Tamas V. & Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1984: *Indoevropskij jazyk i indoevropejcy*. Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo univerziteta.
- Gardiner, Sir Alan 1988: *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Hinz, Walther & Koch, Heidemarie 1987: *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Hodge, Carleton T. 1976: An Egypto-Semitic Comparison. *Folia Orientalia* 17, pp. 5–28.
- Hodge, Carleton T. 1992: Tooth and Claw. *Anthropological Linguistics* 34, pp. 202–232.
- Hommel, Fritz 1879: *Die Namen der Säugethiere bei den südsemitischen Völkern*. Leipzig: Hinrichs Buchhandlung.
- Hughes-Brook, Helen 1992: Ivory and related material. *Discussions in Egyptology* 23, pp. 23–37.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1977: Nazvanija slona v jazykax Evrazii. 1–3 (3. Xet. lahpa- 'slonovaja kost' i greč. ἐλέφανς). *Étimologija* 1975, pp. 66–75.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1984: O proisxoždenii dr.-greč. ἐλέφανς 'slonovaja kost', slon'. In: *Étymogenez narodov Balkan i severnogo Pričernomorja. Lingvistika, istorija, arxeologija*. Moskva: Nauka, pp. 66–76.
- Jungrauthmayr, Herrmann & Ibrizimow, Dymitr 1994: *Chadic Lexical Roots*, II. Berlin: Reimer.
- KEWA Mayrhofer, Manfred 1956–76: *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, I–III. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Kretschmer, Paul 1951: Der Name des Elefanten. *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 88, pp. 307–325.
- Kretschmer, Paul 1952: Nachträge zum Name des Elefanten. *Ibid.* 89, pp. 191–193.
- Laroche, Emanuel 1965: Sur le nom grec de l'ivoire. *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 39, pp. 56–59.
- Leslau, Wolf 1938: *Lexique soqotri (sudarabique moderne)*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Lewy, Heinrich 1895: *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*. Berlin: Gaertner.
- Lokotsch, Karl 1927: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Masson, Emilia 1967: *Recherches sur les plus emprunts sémitiques en Grec*. Paris: Klincksieck.

- Morgenstierne, Georg 1927: *An Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto*. Oslo: Dybwad.
- Müller, Friedrich 1861: Ist ἐλέφας = elef hindí? *KZ* 10, pp. 267–269.
- Osthoff, H. 1901: *Etymologische Parerga*, I. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Pijnenburg, W.J.J. 1996: The etymology of Dutch *windhond*, Frisian *wynhûn*, German *windhund* 'greyhound'. *NOWELE* 28–29, pp. 479–483.
- Pictet, Adolphe 1855: Encore une conjecture sur l'origine d'ἐλέφας. *KZ* 4, pp. 128–131.
- Pokorny, Julius 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern-München: Francke.
- Prasse, Karl — G. 1969: A propos de l'origine de *h* touareg (tāhāggart). København: *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 43.3
- Prasse, Karl — G. 1974: *Manuel de grammaire touaregue* (tāhāggart), IV-V (Nom). Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Puhvel, Jaan 1991: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. 3: *Words beginning with H*. Berlin — New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Puhvel, Jaan 1993: On the origin of Gothic *ulbandus* 'camel'. *Linguistica* 33, pp. 187–189.
- Rössler, Otto 1942: Libyca. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 49, pp. 282–311.
- Rössler, Otto 1966: Das ältere ägyptische Umschreibungssystem für Fremdnamen und seine sprachwissenschaftlichen Lehren. In: *Neue Afrikanistische Studien*, hrsg. J. Lukas. Hamburg: Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung, pp. 218–229.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen 1982: *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Satzinger, Helmut 1994: Das ägyptische "Aleph" — Problem. In: *Zwischen den beiden Ewigkeiten. Fs. Gertrud Thausing*, eds. M. Bietak, J. Holaubek, H. Mukarovsky, H. Satzinger. Wien: Institut für Ägyptologie der Universität Wien, pp. 191–205.
- Schrader, Otto & Nehring, Alfons 1917–23: *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, I. Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schwyzler, Eduard 1939: *Griechische Grammatik* I. München: Beck.
- Spiegelberg, Wilhelm 1907: Ägyptische Lehnwörter in der älteren griechischen Sprache. *KZ* 41, pp. 127–132.
- Steblin-Kamenskij, Ivan M. 1982: *Očerki po istorii leksiki pamirskix jazykov. Nazvanija kul'turnyx rastenij*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Stolbova, Olga V. 1996: *Studies in Chadic Comparative Phonology*. Moscow: Diaphragma.
- Takács, Gábor 1997: The common Afrasian nominal class marker \*h. *Studia Etymologica Cra-coviensia* 2, pp. 241–273.
- Tischler, Johann 1990: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Lief. 5 und 6 (L-M). Innsbruck: IBS 20.
- Turner, R.L. 1966: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Iranian Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Vallini, Cristina 1979: Gr. ΕΛΕΦΑΣ: storia di un'etimologia. *Annali del Seminario di Studi del Mondo Classico*, sezione linguistica, I, pp. 123–186.
- Ventris, Michael & Chadwick, John 1973: *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Völfel, Dominik J. 1955: *Eurafrikanische Wortschichten als Kulturschichten*. Salamanca: Acta Salmanticensia, *Filosofia y Letras*, IX.1
- Völfel, Dominik J. 1965: *Monumenta Linguae Canariae*. Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt.
- Vycichl, Werner 1934: Hausa und Ägyptisch. *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, 37.3.
- Vycichl, Werner 1958: Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleiche. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo*, Bd. 16 (Fs. H. Junker, II). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 367–405.
- Vycichl, Werner 1983: *Dictionnaire étymologie de la langue copte*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Vycichl, Werner 1990: La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne, I. La phonétique. *Institut Français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*, Bibliothèque d'étude, XVI.

- Walde, Alois & Hofmann, J.B. 1938: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I (A-L). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Wb. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, I-VI, hrsg. A. Erman & H. Grapow. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- West, M.L. 1993: Elephant. *Glotta* 70, pp. 125–128.

## II.

§1. Greek φοῖνιξ “palm”, esp. “date palm-tree” (*Od.* ζ 163), also “date”, has been connected with the ethnonym Φοῖνιξ “Phoenician” (cf. Frisk 1032; Chantraine 1218–19). But in the Greek lexicon there are more homonyms which mean “string instrument, lyre”; “mythical bird, phoenix”; “purple”. Although Mycenaean offers more words which can be connected with φοῖνιξ in any meaning, their semantic determination is not definitive (Aura Jorro 1993: 138–41 with literature):

*po-ni-ke-ja* f., dat., ‘women’s name’ [KN Ln 1568] = \*Φοινίκεια, perhaps “woman working with purple”;

*po-ni-ke- + -qe* m., instr. sg. [PY Ta 722.1] = \*φοίνικει and *po-ni-ki-pi* instr. pl. [PY Ta 714.2] = \*φοίνιχ-φι “(with) date palm-tree(s)” or “(with) phoenix”;

*po-ni-ki-ja* f., nom. sg. [KN Sd 4402.b; 4404; 4405.5; 4408.b; 4409.b; 4413.b; Se 882; 965.B; Sf 4428.b, etc.] & *po-ni-ke-a* f., nom. sg. [KN Se 880.2] = φοινίκιος & φοινίκεος, f. -ία, -έηα and *po-ni-ki-jo* f., nom. du., probably “purple, carmine”;

*po-ni-ki-jo* n., nom. sg. [KN Bg 834; 992; 1020; 1021; 1040.b; 5584; 8438; 9297.b; 9298; KN Ga 417.a; 423.A; 420.A; 423.A; 424.a; 425.A; 426.A; 427.1; 1335.b; 7425.1; 7429.1; X 9735.b] = \*φοινίκιον “nomen herbae”, lit. “[herba] Phoenicea”?

§2. For the Greek ethnonym Φοῖνιξ there is not known any source in Semitic onomastics. Sometimes it has been derived from the homonym φοῖνιξ “purple” which is derivable from φοινός “red”, with explanation that the Phoenicians were known as producers and exporters of purple (cf. Chantraine 1219). But it cannot represent an exhaustive etymology for the homonym meaning “date palm-tree” etc. The most natural approach etymologizing such the dendronym is to seek an origin in the languages spoken in the area where the date palm-trees were familiar, i.e. in the North Africa or the Near East. In Aegean region the date-palm was also known but probably imported (Schrader & Nehring 1917–23: 184). It is almost generally accepted that Greek δάκτυλος “date” is of Semitic origin, cf. Mishna Hebrew *déqel* “date palm-tree”, in Biblical Hebrew attested only in the place name *Diqlā* (*Gen.* x, 27; *1Chron.* i, 22), Aramaic *dql*, Syrian *deqlā*, Mandaic *diqlā* (with a doublet in *z-*) id., Arabic *daqal* “dates of low quality” (Lewy 1895: 20; Cohen 1970f: 303; contra: Muss-Arnolt 1892: 107–08). The first attestation by Aristotle (*Meteor.* I, 4, 9; II, 9, 4) would indicate a relatively late borrowing. But on the basis of evidence of the syllabic scripts of the Aegean region there is a tempting possibility to shift the knowledge of this term to the 2nd mill. BC. In the Linear script B the sign #01 |- “*da*” corresponds to Cypriote -| or |- “*ta*” and further to the Linear A sign |- or |’ (see Godart 1979: 39). Unfortunately the signs are too stylized to recognize their primary model. Recently Best & Woudhuizen (1989: 105–06) have identified this sign with a more realistic sign from the inscribed altar-stone from Mallia, depicting probably a **palm branch**. Accepting this identification, the sign “*da*” was formed via acrophonic principle on the basis of Semitic \**daqal*-“palm-tree”.

In the Semitic languages there is no convenient source for Greek φοῖνιξ “date-palm”. But there are suggestive ‘candidates’ in both the Egyptian (cf. Fournet 1989: 74, fn. 67) and Berber languages:

§3. Egyptian (Old Kingdom) *bny* “date”, (Pyramid Texts) *bny.t* “date palm-tree” (cf. Vycichl 1990: 217, referring to Schenkel), with archaizing but not archaic spelling (Middle Kingdom; beginning of the 12th dyn.) *bnry* “date”, Demotic *bn* & *bn.t* “date” & “date palm-tree” respectively, Coptic Sahidic **BNNE**, Bohairic **BEINI** m. “date”, f. “date palm-tree” (for the feminine form Vycichl 1983: 29 proposes the vocalisation *\*binya.t*; the corresponding masculine, although without direct reflexes in Coptic, is reconstructible as *\*binyu* or *\*binyaw*).

The Egyptian origin can be supported by other cases of cultural borrowings from Egyptian into Greek. It is interesting that other two homonyms also represent the Egyptian loans:

§3.1. φοῖνιξ “phoenix” (Hesiod, *Fr.* 171,4; *Hdt.* 2,73) < Egyptian (Middle Kingdom: Book of Dead) *bynw*, also *bnw* “phoenix” (*Wb.* I: 458), cf. Sethe 1908: 84–85; Fournet 1989: 74.

§3.2 φοῖνιξ “a kind of a lyre” (*Hdt.* 4,192) < Egyptian (Old Kingdom) *byn.t* & *bn.t* “harp” (*Wb.* I: 457; cf. Fournet 1989: 74), Coptic Sahidic **BOINE** “harp” (Vycichl 1983: 26 proposes a vocalization *\*bayna.t*).

These apparent borrowings confirm a regular character of the substitutions (i) *b* > *φ* and (ii) *\*-ay-* (> Coptic **-OI-**) > *-oi-*. In the case of φοῖνιξ “date-palm” the change (i) has operated too but there are no traces of the diphthong in Egyptian. Its creation is probably a result of an inner Greek development, approximately *\*binyV°* > *\*bʰən̄iV°* > *\*bʰə̄jnV°* > *\*φοινV°*.

§4. Berber *\*(w)a-bayn-aw* m. / *\*ta-bayn-ay* f. (with prefixed articles) > Ghadames *ab̄ina*, pl. *b̄ināwen* “date”, *tab̄inawt*, pl. *t̄binaw̄in* “(date) palm-tree” (Lanfry 1973: 14, 17), Siwa *tiyni* “date” (Laoust 1931: 222); Proto-Tuareg *\*t-Haynay*, pl. *\*t-Haynīwīn* > Taneslemt *teh̄ayne*, Ahaggar *téine*, pl. *teiniwīn* “date” (Prasse 1974: 338), Ayr *tāyne*, Awlemidden *tine*, pl. *tinawen* id. (Alojaly 1980: 137); Shilha of Sus *wainiw* / *tainiwt* m./f. “palm-tree” (Beguinet 1924: 197), Shilha of Ashtuken *wainiw* “pollen ou fleur du dattier-mâle” (Laoust 1920: 476, 512), Shilha of Tazerwalt *tiini* “dates”, singulative *tiinit*, vs. *tēniwt*, pl. *tēniwīn* “palm-tree” (Stumme 1899: 233–34), Tamazight *teyini* “date” (Cid Kaoui 1907: 68); Zenaga *teini* “date” (Basset 1909: 100).

§4.1. A borrowing of the Berber(-Libyan) protoform *\*bayn-* into Greek φοῖνιξ can also be supported by other Greek words of Berber(-Libyan) origin, e.g. Greek πίθηκος, Doric *-ᾱκος* “monkey”, maybe the Mycenaean man’s name *Pi-ta-ke-u* [PY Jn 389.5] if reflects *\*Πιθᾶκευς* (Ventris & Chadwick 1973: 572; Aura Jorro 1993: 129); with other suffixal extension πίθων · πίθηκος (Hesych.), vs. Proto-Berber *\*(w)a-bidd-aw* “monkey” > Ghadames *biddu* (Lanfry 1973: 4); Kabyle *iddew*, pl. *iddawen* (Dallet 1982: 161), Zuawa *iddu*, pl. *-en* (Basset, *Journal Asiatique* ser. VIII, T. I [1883]: 341); Tuareg of Kel Wi *biddu* (Basset l.c.), Taitoq *abiddō*, pl. *ibiddwen* (Masqueray 1893: 315), Awlemidden pl.

*ibiddauen* (Barth 1858: 686), Ahaggar *ābiddaw*, pl. *ibiddawān* (Prasse 1974: 326 reconstructs Proto-Tuareg *\*ā-biddāw*, pl. *\*ī-biddāwān*). The substitution of Proto-Berber(-Libyan) *\*bidd-* by Greek  $\pi\theta$  ° implies intermediates *\*b<sup>h</sup>id<sup>h</sup>-* > *\*φiθ-*, in agreement with Grassmann's law. If this etymology is correct, it can serve for determination of chronology of this law. Let us mention the depiction of grey monkeys (*Cercopithecus*) on a fresco from the Room 6 of Complex B discovered on Thera. Together with depictions of papyrus-like plants and antelopes, rhytons from ostrich-egg shells, it represents a witness of early contacts between Minoan civilization and Northern Africa (Doumas 1994: 43, 48, 49, 56).

§5. Recently Danka & Witczak (1998: 139–144) have proposed a tempting etymology deriving both Greek  $\phi\omicron\iota\nu\lambda\zeta$  “date palm-tree” and Hittite *paini-* “tamarisk” (plus Old Icelandic *beinn* “Baumart”) from the same Indo-European stem *\*b<sup>h</sup>oini-*. But Hittite <sup>GIS</sup>*pain(n)i-*, <sup>GIS</sup>*paeni-* “tamarisk” has been interpreted as a Hurrian borrowing, ultimately of Akkadian origin (Laroche 1976–77: 193). Danka & Witczak (1998: 142) express doubts about Akkadian *bīnu(m)* “tamarisk” (AHw 127) as a primary source of Hurrian *paini* “tamarisk” (Laroche, l.c.) > Hittite <sup>GIS</sup>*pain(n)i-*, <sup>GIS</sup>*paeni-*, alternatively written <sup>GIS</sup>ŠINIG, i.e. “(tree) tamarisk” (CHD 55–56). Their objection is undoubtedly rightful. In Akkadian the monophthongization attested in *\*baynu(m)* > *bīnu(m)* is older than the first written records, hence also older than the first historical contacts between Akkadians and Hurrians. But Danka & Witczak are mistaken assuming an isolated position of the Akkadian word within Semitic and consequently a Hittite origin of both the Hurrian and Akkadian dendronyms. Cohen (1970f: 62) found cognates in Aramaic (Yudeo-Palestinian & Syrian) *bīnā* id. (although probably borrowed from Akkadian, cf. Zimmern 1915: 53) and Arabic *bān* “arbre qui donne la noix muscade; saule d’Egypte” (*\*bayan-*). But the most probable source of the Hurrian and consequently Hittite denotations of tamarisk was discovered only in seventies, namely in Eblaic *\*baynu(m)* “tamarisk”, attested as *i-zu ba-ne(-um) / ba-nu = |šīḏu baynim / baynu(m)|* glossed GIŠ.ŠINIG, i.e. “the tree tamarisk” (Krebernik 1983: 15; Fronzaroli 1984: 131, 138). The spelling *a = |ay|* is regular, cf. *ba-du-um = |baytum|* “house” (Fronzaroli 1984: 137). Let us add that the Eblaic language was spoken (and written) at the city of Ebla in Syria in the second half of the 3rd mill. BC, i.e. in the same area where Hurrians are attested in the 2nd mill. BC.

#### §6. Conclusion

The analyzed lexical material allows to reconstruct the following scenario:

(1) Proto-Berber *\*bayan-* “date (palm-tree)”, Proto-Egyptian *\*biny-* “date (palm-tree)” and Proto-Semitic *\*bay[a]n-* “tamarisk” probably represent a common Afroasiatic heritage.

(2) One of continuants of the Semitic dendronym, Eblaic *\*baynu(m)* “tamarisk”, was borrowed into Hurrian *paini* id. (probably in the end of the 3rd mill. BC) which itself became a source of Old Hittite *painni-*, *paeni-* id. (in the first half of the 2nd mill. BC).

(3) The Egyptian or Berber(-Libyan) denotations of the date palm-tree repre-



sent the most promising source of Greek φοῖνιξ “date (palm-tree)”. Accepting the Mycenaean evidence, the borrowing can be dated before the 13th cent. BC.

(4) There are more words, frequently cultural or zoological terms, for which a North African (i.e. Egyptian or Berber-Libyan) origin can be proposed. Besides “lyre”, “phoenix”, “monkey” analyzed above (§§ 3.1., 3.2., 4.1.), e.g. ἐλέφαντ “elephant” studied above.

(5) Another term for the date palm-tree penetrated into Greek and maybe also into pre-Greek language(s) of the eastern Mediterranean from the Semitic languages of the Syro-Palestinian region. One of the apophonic variant, viz. \**daqal*-, could become the model for the sign “*da*” in all linear syllabic scripts of the 2nd mill. BC continuing in “*ta*” of the Cypriote script of the 1st mill. BC.

(6) The new term for the date-palm (φοῖνιξ) of the North African origin could be used to name the country characterized by cultivation of the date palm-tree and by export of its products, viz. Phoenicia.

## REFERENCES

- AHw *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Band I (A-L), bearbeitet von Wolfram von Soden. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Alojalj, Ghoubeid, 1980: *Lexique Touareg-Français*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Aura Jorro, Francisco, 1993: *Diccionario micénico II*. Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas.
- Barth, Heinrich, 1858: *Reisen und Entdeckungen im Nord- und Central-Afrika*, Bd. 5. Gotha: Justus Perthes.
- Basset, René, 1909: *Mission au Sénégal I: Étude sur le dialecte zénaga*. Paris: Leroux.
- Beguino, Francesco, 1924: Sul trattamento delle consonanti *b, v, f* in Berbero. *Rendiconti di Accademia nazionale dei Lincei (Roma), Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, vol. 33, ser. 5, pp. 186–99.
- Best, Jan, & Woudhuizen, Fred, 1989: *Lost Languages from the Mediterranean*. Leiden: Brill.
- Chantraine, Pierre, 1968–80: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- CHD *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (P), eds. Hans G. Güterbock & Harry A. Hoffner. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago 1994f.
- Cid Kaoui, S., 1907: *Dictionnaire Français-Tachelh'it et Tamazir'it*. Paris: Leroux.
- Cohen, David, 1970f: *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques*. Paris - La Haye: Mouton.
- Dallet, J.-M., 1982: *Dictionnaire kabyle-français*. Paris: SELAF.
- Danka, Ignacy R. & Witezak, Krzysztof T., 1998: Grecka nazwa palmy daktylowej (φοῖνιξ f./m.) i jej indoeuropejskie odpowiedniki (ie. \**bhoinis* f.). In: *Studia Indogermanica Lodziensia I*, ed. Ignacy R. Danka. Łódź: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, pp. 139–144.
- Doumas, Christos, 1994: *Santorini. A Guide to the Island and its Archaeological Treasures*. Athens: Ekdotike Athenon.
- Foumet, Jean-Luc, 1989: Les emprunts du grec à l'égyptien. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 84, pp. 55–80.
- Frisk, Hjalmar, 1991: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fronzaroli, Pelio, 1984: Eblaic Lexicon. In: *Studies on the Language of Ebla*, ed. Pelio Fronzaroli. Firenze: Istituto di linguistica e di lingue orientali (*Quaderni di semitistica* 13), pp. 117–157.

