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It is well known that intense contacts between Egypt and its north-west-Semitic speaking neighbours have left many traces in the respective languages. The Semitic loan-words in Egyptian were recently collected by J. Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period* (Princeton 1994) and G. Vittmann, Semitisches Sprachgut im Demotischen, *WZKM* 86 (1996), pp. 435-447. For Hoch's book, there are important reviews by D. Meeks, *BiOr* 54 (1997), 32-61; J.F. Quack, *ZDMG* 146 (1996), 507-515; A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 116 (1996), 431-453; G. Rendsburg, *JAOS* 116 (1996), 508-517; Th. Schneider, *Or* 65 (1996), 174-177; G. Vittmann, *WZKM* 87 (1997), 277-288; W. Ward, *CdE* 71 (1996), 17-47. The present publication gives the counterpart to these studies by presenting to us a collection of Egyptian names and words attested in north-west Semitic languages. Among the languages, Aramaic gets the lion's share of the treatment. That is obviously due to the many Aramaic papyri from Egypt. Though there are some true loan-words taken over by the Semitic languages, the bulk of the attestations consists of personal names. Of course, they create special problems. Shorter and less distinct name-types are often difficult to attribute to either Egyptian or a Semitic language. As a result, the number of doubtful cases is rather high. Given the fact that so much of the material studied here is late, sometimes it would have been advisable to make use principally of the *Demotisches Namenbuch*, not of Ranke, *Personennamen*.

In general, the author is up to date in sources and discussions. Nevertheless, sometimes lacunae in the bibliography are to be noted, especially for works published after the original submission of the dissertation in 1990. For Aramaic, the reviewer has pointed out in *WdO* 23 (1992), p. 15-20 that šnby nhwt in the Bauer-Meißner Papyrus is a
loan from Egyptian Demotic. For biblical Hebrew, many proposals by M. Görg (most of them collected in M. Görg, Aegyptiaca - Biblica, ÄAT 11 (Wiesbaden 1991) have not been mentioned. Even if one disagrees with them, a discussion would have been useful, especially since the author mentions many other proposals without firm adherence. Additionally, the reviewer would have liked to see a discussion about whether Hebrew thwt (Ps. 51, 8; Job 38, 36) is a loan-word and designates the Egyptian god Thot; see e.g. the discussion by A.I. Baumgarten, The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos, EPRO 89 (Leiden 1981), p. 70-72.

Most of the tricky problems of historical phonetics are adequately tackled, though sometimes a more stringent line of reasoning would have been possible. Besides, the author would have profited from taking into account the results of the "new comparatistic" in the wake of Otto Rößler. Unfortunately, the number of annoying spelling errors in this book is quite high, sometimes creating real problems. This does not seem to be the right place to discuss all minor points. Nevertheless, some detailed remarks might be of further interest:

- P. 43f.: The commentary on the Egyptian form of the god Osiris is misguided. Actually, there are unambiguous spellings with alphabetical w as first consonant already at the beginning of the first millennium BC, e.g. in papyrus Greenfield. The Semitic forms with initial ʔ are due to different syllabic structures in the different languages: In Egyptian, the w is a syllabic consonant forming a syllable of its own. In Semitic where such a syllabic structure is not possible, this sound was adapted as the vowel u which, as no word in Semitic phonetics could begin with a vowel, needed to be introduced by an ʔ.
- P. 69: The correspondence of „spmt âm to ns-mt-şpsi can be further confirmed by pointing out that late Egyptian writings attest the sound-change şpsi > ūbs, see J.F. Quack, in: Per aspera ad astra. Wolfgang Schenkel zum neunundfünfzigsten Geburtstag (Kassel 1995) p. 114f.
- P. 75: The author's remarks on the supposed loss of b in hr-ib are besides the point, because his reading of the Egyptian name is wrong. The heart-sign is a determinative, so the name is simply to be read as hri(=w), see DemNB, p. 746-748.
- P. 78: The form hhr, mistakenly identified by the author with h(t)-hr(w) "Temple of Horus" (which is never attested as a personal name), is in reality the Aramaic rendering of anh-hr.w "as true as Horus lives," a very common Egyptian name. The Aramaic form is very important for showing that the phonetic shortening of anh to h in this type of names (see J.F. Quack, Göttinger Miszellen 123 [1991], 91-100) had already taken place quite early.
- P. 133: The name pštwt could be more convincingly explained as pA-šri-(n)-twtw "the son of the god Tutu,"DemNB, p. 274. It seems that in names of the type
PA-sři-(n)-DN, the n is often not marked in Aramaic renderings, so also pswbsty
and [p]š’mn (p. 132) should be explained according to that type.

- P. 144: The proposal sr(i.t) (n) nA hb.w for Aramaic šr nhyb is impossible for the
  simple fact that the person in Saqq. 6,4 is clearly male. Perhaps it is possible to
  read šnnhyb and understand čA-n-n(A)-hb.w "child of the ibises" (Ranke, PN I,
  386, 30).

- P. 157: Perhaps it is better to read *ptm and see that as a rendering of nfr-tm
  which often looses the n in the beginning, see G. Fecht, MDAIK 16 (1958), p.
  113f. where just the cuneiform writing cited by Muchiki was recognised to be
  read correctly as ip-ti-mur-ti-šu.

- P. 208f.: Muchiki accepts Kitchen's proposal to analyse Joseph's wife Ase(n)net
  as iw=s-n=č "she belongs to you." However, this is hardly possible. The suffix č
  is not preserved as a consonant in later Egyptian, and n=č becomes nou or ne in
  Coptic (depending on the dialect).

- P. 216f.: After a rather detailed discussion, the author proposes that the name
  of Moses is, contrary to common assumption, not a loan from Egyptian, but
  probably Semitic (though he does not produce an actual derivation). His
  arguments are based on the fact that Egyptian s involved in the root msy "bear"
  could not correspond to Semitic š. Actually, things are more complicated. The
  correspondence of Egyptian s to Hebrew s is typical for the first millennium. In
  older times, it was Egyptian č(mostly, but rather unfortunately transcribed as t -
  this sort of transliteration leads to the error that the author commits on p. 192)
  which corresponds to Semitic s (at that time still realised as an affricate). Egyptian
  s in the second millennium, corresponds mostly to Semitic t (which was the
  nearest equivalence for a language not having an unaffricated voiceless sibilant).
  Now Semitic t was changed to š in Hebrew. It is quite obvious that the name of
  Moses underwent that process, becoming thus what it is now. This has some clear
  implications: The name Moses, and the remembrance of the man, must go back to
  the second millennium, more or less to a time when the exodus (if it ever
  happened as such) actually took place, whereas the naming of the town "Ramses"
  belongs to a later historical phase. For a further discussion of these problems, see
  especially the pertinent remarks by E.A. Knauf, Midian (Wiesbaden 1988), p. 105
  note 478.

- P. 224-226: Muchiki adds one new proposal to the already numerous ideas on the
  Egyptian name of Joseph, namely čfA (=i)-ncr-pA-ahh. To the reviewer, this
  seems impossible, because Egyptian čfA was phonetically changed to t fA since
  the Middle Kingdom, and e.g. the name čfA-hapi cited by Muchiki as a parallel is
  written twf-hapi in Demotic. The reviewer sees no serious reason not to adopt
  Steindorf's proposal (of the alternatives, only that proposed by Krall seems
  worthy of consideration, because also thpnys can be best explained as tA-hm.t-
  nsw "the kings wife" with the same change or writing error of p for m), because
  (a) names beginning with čt + DN are quite frequent in late period Egyptian, and
  (b) if the iw=f is not word-initial, there is no need for an aleph. Besides this, in
Demotic, iw=f is a graphic device for a prefix actually pronounced as simple f (as in Coptic).

- P. 229f.: For thpnys as a designation of the Egyptian king's wife, the obvious solution should be tA-ḥm.t-nsw "the kings wife." It should be pointed out that the Egyptian vernacular texts (even in Demotic) always write nsw without the definite article pA in this construction, thus making all proposals operating with pA-nsw unlikely. The Hebrew p remains to be explained if it is not a mistake of textual transmission (see above) but the interpretation can hardly be in doubt.

- P. 236: Concerning with thpnhs, the Demotic forms written as with nAy=w/tAy=w-aAm-pA-nhs should be considered, see K-Th. Zauzich, Ägyptologische Bemerkungen zu den neuen aramäischen Papyri aus Saqqara, Enchoria 13 (1985), p. 115f. Perhaps the original Egyptian word is tA-why.t-pA-nhs, why.t written with the throwing-stick that was then interpreted in Demotic writing as aAm.

- P. 242: Hebrew dyw "ink" is a very early loan from Egyptian ry.t, probably going back to the Middle Kingdom when Egyptian r regularly corresponded to Semitic d, see J.F. Quack, Göttinger Miszellen 130 (1992), p. 76f.