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SUMMARY
Black Athena, vol. III The Linguistic Evidence came out in 2006 to very little fanfare. Unsurprisingly so; the book which professes to give readers the demonstration of the contentious Afrocentric etymologies with which Bernal had scandalized most Classicists and Indo-Europeanists, among countless other derivations, intermingles Chinese comparanda with the marshaling of Egyptian and West Semitic data in such a tightly opaque manner that the wood cannot easily be seen for the trees. The present piece aims to disentangle the various strata of Bernal’s argumentation, analysing individual etymologies and the macrolinguistic speculations seeking to diminish the autonomy of Proto-Indo-European.
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RESUMEN
Black Athena, vol. III The Linguistic Evidence fue publicado en 2006 con muy poco ruido. Lo cual no es sorprendente: el libro que pretende ofrecer a los lectores pruebas que sustenten las polémicas etimologías afrocéntricas con las cuales Bernal había escandalizado a la mayor parte de filólogos clásicos y especialistas en indoeuropeo, entre otras innumerables derivaciones, mezcla comparaciones a partir del chino con datos procedentes del egipcio y del semitico occidental de una forma tan irrespirablemente opaca que los árboles no permiten ver el bosque. El presente artículo se propone desenredar la maraña que forman los varios estratos en la argumentación de Bernal, analizando etimologías individuales y aquellas especulaciones a nivel macrolingüístico cuyo propósito es disminuir la autonomía del proto-indoeuropeo.
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1 Since the present disquisition bridges three disciplines, namely Classics, Indo-European linguistics, and Near Eastern and Oriental studies (Egyptology, Assyriology, Semitics), none of the practitioners of which can be expected to be familiar with the standard abbreviations used outside of their own field, the author has asked, and was courteously given, permission to depart from the bibliographical norms of this journal. With a view to the immediate identification
The writing and assessment of comparative works of scholarship is a complex task that requires many skills. Key among them is the aptitude to see the data for what they are; for if you cannot tell a howler from a secure fact at the brick and mortar level, or discriminate between discredited fancies and ideas that have withstood the tests of time and new information, then you have no business to make pronouncements on the relationship between two civilizations. It is all too easy to make snap judgements about factual errors in books concerned with cross-cultural comparisons. But to criticize their worth it is desirable to have an extensive knowledge of ratio et res ipsa plus the state of opinion before the author came on the scene. This is a very tall order with Martin Bernal’s *Black Athena*, for it claims to combine linguistic and philological erudition in Greek, the Semitic and African languages, and Indo-European, with a broad marshalling of cultural change, archaeology, mythography, and chronography. Of necessity, I will focus on the former aspects, for the work stands and falls on its capacity to provide evidence for the alleged Afroasiatic impact on the Greek language.

It behooves every writer who trangresses a consensus omnium to provide the relevant apparatus of proof and meet conceivable strictures with erudition and logic. It is not enough for the author of a non-fiction book that ‘works’ (p. 6) to apply to it a veneer of scholarship by compiling a Harvard-type bibliography that supplements one or two hundred pages of primary and secondary references. His discussion must reflect the scholarly era in which we live, since nothing ages more quickly than linguistic knowledge, notably in the case of Egyptian and the Semitic languages. The arguments deployed by a radical revisionist must exhibit rational restraint too: a writer who allows himself a highly permissive set of rules yet juggles termini technici or broad concepts borrowed from social sciences is in no position automatically to claim the higher ground. Finally, anyone who seeks to rewrite history should not need to destroy a whole discipline in order to feel vindicated; all of the secondary literature cited, acronyms for the title of periodicals have been banned; every book comes equipped with its place(s) and publisher(s), abbreviated if cumbersome; the full particulars of every article, including the pagination, are furnished (except for reviews); and as few shorthands of any kind as possible have been used.

the more so when he blunders far oftener than his peers. If *Black Athena* is ever to leave a mark outside of Afrocentric circles in the twenty-first century, it has thus to demonstrate scholarly capacity on all three levels: control of the evidence, theoretical soundness, accuracy. Otherwise, the series will be compelled to join in the grave with J. M. Allegro’s *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross* and G. Semerano’s *Le origini della cultura europea*. The debate stirred by Bernal is in any case moribund; it was not revived by W. van Binsbergen’s reprint of the ill-fated *Black Athena: Ten Years Later* (1996) with fresh matter by himself and Bernal.

Beyond the languages he deals with, the comparative scholar must be equipped with tireless industry and nearly boundless curiosity, as he will inevitably be called upon to qualify his conclusions and weigh their worth. He also needs a sure instinct to know when it is best to hammer away a point and when to tread lightly. Bernal begs to differ. To present the reader with ‘competitive plausibilities’, he relies on lexical verisimilitude, viz. on consonantal resemblances reinforced by semantic matches between a Greek word and its putative source(s) in Egyptian or West Semitic. The considerable ingenuity these comparisons exhibit is not matched by their theoretical foundations in macrolinguistics. First of all, these foundations

3 T. Jacobsen, “Mr. Allegro Among the Mushrooms”, *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 26, 1971, 235–46 at 237 sqq., showed how much nonsense informs his Sumerian doctrine (or lack thereof); as regards Semerano, his huge volumes, seemingly reviewed only in Italian journals and by non-linguists, were left virtually untouched by classicists, Indo-Europeanists, and Semitic scholars abroad (*Aristarchus antibarbarus*, 203–4 note 17). Bernal remained unaware of both writers, cf. also *infra* note 181. The one he most resembles, however, is Simon Davis (see H. A. Hoffner, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 31, 1972, 35–7, especially 36–7).

4 *BA III* provoked no scholarly ripple at all: very few classicists mention it and nobody wrote a review — a fact Bernal’s supporters are loath to admit in print. Apart from Bernal, the only exception known to me is the Latinist turned paragon of Africana studies P. D. Rankine in his “Black Apollo? Martin Bernal’s *Black Athena* (…), volume iii, and Why Race Still Matters”; D. Orrells, G. K. Bhambra, and T. Roynon (edd.), *African Athena. New Agendas* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011), 40-54 at 42 note 8.

5 *Black Athena Comes of Age. Towards a Constructive Re-assessment* (Berlin, Lit, 2011). No similar generosity was extended to those participants in the original volume who were critical of Bernal (J. Blok, A. Egberts), which is revelatory of conspicuous bias.


7 The net gains of which are poor, as he readily admits: «I have looked for possible Afroasiatic influences on Greek at four levels: phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon. The first two attempts were largely unsuccessful» (p. 584). His ignorance of comparative grammar includes Schwyzer; H. Rix, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen* (1976); M. Mayrhofer’s *Lautelehre (Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen)*, in *Indogermanische Grammatik* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1986), I, 75-216. He is also unaware that, *contra* his view of the Egyptian impact on Indo-European and Greek, there is evidence in the
appear subsidiary to the core of the series. From the start, *Black Athena* was meant to address the cultural relationships of Greece and Egypt in the third and (mostly) second millenium B.C. *BA I-II* have accordingly subsumed under Afroasiatic that part of the Greek lexicon which cannot be explained by standard Indo-European or Proto-Indo-European processes. The series is not directly concerned with the influences of the Afroasiatic phylum on Proto-Indo-European phonology and morphosyntax which Bernal now prides himself on having discovered, since these chronologically predate both his chosen period and the emergence of Greece as a regional power by several thousand years. Such influences are therefore useless to demonstrate that Greece or the Greek language was indebted to Africa. The appeal to Nostratic, which launches Bernal’s construct (chapter 2, pp. 39-58), entails too much ad hoc pleading to be convincing. Endorsing the methods of J. Greenberg, viz. mass or multilateral comparison\(^8\), Bernal proceeds from the most remote, then swiftly moves downward until PIE, and Greek, are lumped together under a merely hypothetical line of descent. There are good reasons mainstream linguists avoid going back so far in time (Pre-Proto-Indo-European is a ‘pre-morphosyntactic era’ with ‘half-cognitive, half-grammatical’ categories: N. E. Collinge, “Before PIE: Motives for Thematism”, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 16, 1995, 3-27 at 3-4), and «the Nostratic hypothesis is highly controversial and has very few supporters among specialists in Afroasiatic languages» (Z. Frajzyngier and E. Shay, in their edited volume *The Afroasiatic Languages* [Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012], 4). Another major issue is Bernal’s lack of linguistic control over the evidence, for *BA III*, pp. 24-164, rests on a trinity of handbooks, two of which belong to the Russian school of linguistics, with a little Diakonoff and early Dolgopolsky on the side\(^9\). As a consequence, he

---

\(^8\) It remains premature to tell whether or not, and in what measure, he was right (A. M. Ramer, “Tonkawa and Zuni: Two Test Cases for the Greenberg Classification”, *International Journal of American Linguistics* 62, 1996, 264-88 at 285-6; etc), but notice the skepticism of the best scholar of writing as to his methods and achievement (P. T. Daniels, *Language* 80, 2004, 889-90).

gulped down the last dregs of imaginative linguists, misprints included. Thus the statement on p. 92 «likely the Kartvelian (Georgian) family, a “sister” of Euroasiatic and Hurrian as well as the apparent isolate Hattic, greatly influenced Hittite and even provides it with its name. (The Hittites called themselves Nes and their language Nesili)» will not delude anyone with a modicum of Caucasian linguistics. The core of the matter is the (Proto-) Anatolian connections of the Indo-European loans in Kartvelian; if they are minimal (as seems to be the case), then Kartvelian cannot belong to Proto-Indo-Hittite. On the Afroasiatic level, we lack reconstructions of the various subfamilies; so what **BA III** does is merely pick out convenient pieces and equate them to similar Greek or (P)IE data with no understanding of the system. Bernal’s wish to marginalize the Indo-European family of languages...
is conspicuous throughout; it is rooted in the disregard for American, English, French, and German-speaking scholarship posterior to Porkorny’s dictionary to which we owe the suppression in BA III of masterpieces of such enduring relevance as R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (1967), and C. Watkins, *How To Kill A Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (1995), or its shabby treatment of Benveniste’s synthesis of IE institutions (infra, note 64). Another proof that Bernal does not have a great understanding of the discipline comes from his subtraction of (Proto-)Anatolian from Proto-Indo-European, an old, respectable view, albeit a minority one; however, the latest research on the innovations shared by the Indo-European languages versus Anatolian tends to suggest that Hittite belongs to Proto-Indo-European. Too bad Bernal makes a parody of a debate in which material culture and linguistic paleontology must go hand in hand (T. P. J. van den Hout, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 63, 2004, 229). Defences of PIH, particularly the wide-ranging P. W. Brosman, “Evidence in Support of Proto-Indo-Hittite”, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 23, 2002, 1-21, cf. his “The nt-Participles and the Verbal Adjectives in *-to*”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115, 2010, 22-34 at 23, did not make it onto his radar screen, and I fail to grasp how

12 A. Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2008), 7-11, cf. 237-9 (s.v. *ekku-*), 300-1 (s.v. *harra-*), 578, 581-2 (s.v. *mimma-*), 691, and 903-4. «Each and every example (...) shows that the non-Anatolian IE languages have commonly undergone an innovation where Anatolian has preserved the original situation. This can only lead to one conclusion, namely that the non-Anatolian IE languages still formed one language community (at least close enough for innovations to reach all speakers) at the moment that the Anatolian branch split off. In other words, each of these examples is conclusive evidence that the Anatolian branch was the first one to split off from the mother language. (...) I think that the term Proto-Indo-European is still adequate as long as we keep in mind that the Anatolian branch may have preserved an original situation that has undergone innovations or losses in the other IE languages (but likewise the Anatolian branch may have innovated or lost an original situation that is still present in the other IE languages, of course). So, the times of a solely Graeco-Indic reconstruction of PIE are definitely over: we should always take the Anatolian material into account and keep in mind the possibility that the non-Anatolian IE languages have commonly undergone an innovation where Anatolian preserves the original, PIE situation» (pp. 10-1). Some Tocharian evidence points to the same conclusion, cf. R. Kim, “‘To Drink’ in Anatolian, Tocharian, and Proto-Indo-European”, *Historische Sprachforschungen* 113, 2000, 151-70 at 164-5, and A. Nikolaev, “Indo-European *dem(h)* ‘to build’ and its derivatives”, *ibid.* 123, 2010, 57-96 at 58-9; this confirmation from another language that diverged early from PIE is crucial.

13 Alone in the IE languages, Hittite has an indifference to voice, the nt-participle being either passive (with transitive verbs) or active (with intransitive ones). This is attested also in Luwian (...) and in Hieroglyphic Luwian. Since in each case it possessed a passive meaning when belonging to transitive verbs (...), it seems clear that the Hittite usage was inherited from Proto-Anatolian. That the contrasting Indo-European usage was also a common inheritance seems equally safe to say, for it or vestiges of it occurred in every traditional Indo-European dialect (...). Presumably one should conclude that one usage or the other prevailed in Proto-Indo-Hittite and was inherited by both Indo-European and Anatolian, where it was retained
the partisan stamp of his scholarship could be missed here. The temptation to castigate all of this loosely-woven patchwork as a dilettante concoction is high but shall be resisted.

The second half of *BA III* surveys in a series of thematic chapters (pp. 165-582) the Egyptian or West Semitic etymologies of Greek lexemes either void of obvious (Proto-)Indo-European origins or whose (P)IE pedigree found no favor in the eyes of Bernal. In gathering his information, he seems to have had no recourse to a large variety of sources; method as well as convenience separate him from lexicographers of Greek and of any of the Near Eastern languages. Though he can cite the whole output of a few linguists, Ehret, Hodge, Szemerényi, he displays no familiarity with PIE studies, Assyriology, Greek and Semitic scholarship, whether monographs to or papers, apart from run-of-the-mill lexica for the two classical languages (the semantism and attestations of Greek words derive from LSJ, without its (Revised) Supplement, their IE roots, from Pokorny as updated by Frisk and Chantraine; Latin words and etymologies come from Ernout-Meillet and spotty mentions of antiquated or inadequate Semitic dictionaries (Erman-Grapow for Egyptian; Klein, Gesenius as revised by Brown-Driver-
Briggs, for Hebrew; Muss-Arnolt for Akkadian; Lewy for Canaanite) and grammars (Harris [1939] for Phoenician, Gardiner [1957] for Egyptian). The only standard tools used in BA III are, in increasing order of frequency: Černý’s Coptic dictionary (sure etymologies only); the Leskos’ lexicon, whose shortened version (A Dictionary of Late Egyptian, Fall River, MA, s. ed., 2002-2004, 2 vol.) appears only once, p. 652 note 54; Hoch’s Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period (rich and up-to-date, but often perverse; yet Bernal relies on it blindly); Vycichl’s Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte, which he loves to chide; and the first two volumes of Takács’ very tentative Étymological Dictionary of Egyptian, his favorite. So BA III leaves unchecked all of its quotations from Akkadian, Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew, Canaanite, 16, Arabic, 17, Aramaic and Hebrew, 18, Canaanite, 19,


17 A useful tool is M. R. Zammit, A Comparative Lexical Study of Qur’ānic Arabic (Leiden-Boston-KölN, Brill, 2002), 67-446 (it lists in abbreviated form all Semitic cognates). For vernacular, the ambitious P. Corriente, A Dictionary of Andalusi Arabic (Leiden-New York-KölN, Brill, 1997), proves to be a helpful supplement to the far larger Wehr, which I shall mention in due time.


19 Viz. Old Canaanite (glosses in the Amarna letters and documents); Phoenician/Punic; Ammonite, Moabite, Edomite; and epigraphic Hebrew: basic is now I. K. H. Halayqa, A Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite (Münster, Ugarit, 2008). The vintage classic H. Lewy, Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen (Berlin, Gärtner, 1895), should no longer serve as the source of such words.
Kartvelian\textsuperscript{20}, Phoenician\textsuperscript{21}, Sumerian\textsuperscript{22}, Syriac\textsuperscript{23}, Ugaritic\textsuperscript{24}, plus the lone African, Caucasian, or Slavic vocable which pops up sporadically third-hand and is never sourced — a fruitful occasion for howlers of all sizes (\textit{infra}, note 33). Thus it turns out that \textit{tolī} is not so much Baltic (p. 269) as Lithuanian (E. Fraenkel, \textit{Litauisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch} [Heidelberg / Göttingen, Winter / Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 1965]. II, 1105), and that the Albanian for ‘dream’ (also: ‘sleep’) is \textit{ëndërr}, and\textit{ërr} (Orel, \textit{Albanian Etymological Dictionary} [Leiden-Boston-Köln, Brill, 1998], 92), not ‘ädërë and \textit{ëndërrë}’ (BA III, p. 273). Even Bernal’s pet languages, Chinese and Egyptian, hardly fare better. The relevance of the former to the \textit{Black Athena} project is controversial\textsuperscript{25}, so the Chinese of \textit{BA III} should have been

\textsuperscript{20} Klimov (rich but ill-edited, posthumous publication entailing many absurd or erroneous glosses; looks backwards to Gamkrelidze-Ivanov for the historical divergence and spread of Kartvelian, pp. IX-XII); Fähnrich and S. Sardshweladze, \textit{Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Kartwel-Sprache}, Leiden, Brill, 1995\textsuperscript{5} (the rival reconstruction, far less indo-europeanist), reworked as Fähnrich-Sarjveladze, \textit{Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages} (‘Second Revised and Supplemented Edition’), (Tbilisi, Tbilisi Sulkhan-Saba & Orbeliani State University Press, 2000) (in Georgian), then as Fähnrich, \textit{Kartwelisches etymologisches Wörterbuch}. — \textit{Pace} Bernal, p. 603 note 48, these tools muster hardly any Akkadian loan (none for Fähnrich; 3 for Klimov: pp. 3 [\textit{arwa}-], 4 [\textit{as} \textit{ir}-], 251 [\textit{\textasciitilde{swid}}]-).


\textsuperscript{22} The only complete tool, A. Deimel, \textit{Šumerisches Lexikon}, II. Teil \textit{Vollständige Iedogram-Sammlung} (Rome, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1928-1933), 4 vol., has been out of date since the fifties; its competitor, the online \textit{Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary} (\textit{olim} Philadelphia, 1984-1998, 4 parts), progresses at a snail’s pace and still covers too few letters. The standard lists of values are R. Burger, \textit{Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste} (Kevelaer etc, Butzon & Bercker etc, 1988\textsuperscript{4} [1978]), 225-300, and C. Mittermayer, \textit{Altbabylonische Zeichenliste der sumerisch-literarischen Texte} (Fribourg / Göttingen, Academic Press / Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 2006), 249-78, yet we miss a comprehensive work like C. Rüster and E. Neu, \textit{Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon}, (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1989).


\textsuperscript{25} Here is his justification : ‘the parallel between China, Korea, and Japan on the one hand, and Egypt, the Levant, and Greece on the other seems a useful one, but in a different way from that suggested by Jasanoff and Nussbaum. As I see it, in both cases, the ultimate recipient culture initially used a language that was unrelated or, at most, only distantly related to those of the outside sources. In both cases, we have substantial archaeological, iconographic,
impeccable. Yet his mistakes range from careless mention of the original in a translation (on p. 8, Bernal equates ‘western practices or techniques’ to yong, instead of wei yong, in the late Quing formula ‘Chinese learning for essence / substance, Western learning for function / utility / practical application’ to blunders in pinyin that create a superficial layer of rubbish uncreditable to any Sinologist. Pace p. 101, the word for ‘(mountain) goat’, the beast whose arrival after winter heralds the beginning of spring (Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 53, 1995-1996, 74-5), is yang, not jie: Chinese Characters Dictionary with English Examples (Shanghai, Shanghai Jiaotong Daxue Chubanshe, 2002), 1249; A. Schuessler, ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese (Honolulu, University of Hawai’i Press, 2007), 557, s.v. yáng. Despite pp. 103-4, ‘(honey) bee’ is mì (CCDEE, p. 722; Schuessler, 383 s.v. m̀i). Against p. 502, ‘intestine, bowel’ = chāng (CCDEE, p. 110; Schuessler, 202, s.v. n°6), not gāng, perhaps a slip due to the following gāng, ‘harbor, creek’.

Now for Bernal’s Semitic. He patronized skeptics for their inability to assess his Egyptian etymologies, yet his lexicography is mostly one of decoys (CR 63, 143-4), alongside poor morphology and syntax. For the latter, consider on p. 414 «irr ‘evildoer’, irrt ‘work’ provide a reasonable etymology for the Homeric hapax εἰρε̂ρον ‘slavery’. Chantraine denies any link with the Latin servus and is skeptical of all other proposals». Appearances are deceiving, for it has been concealed to the reader that he is not dealing with nouns. These comparanda are forms of the verb ȋr, ‘to make, do/act’ (J. Winand, Temps et aspect en égyptien. Une approche sémantique [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2006], 128-9): irr means ‘he who does’, viz. evil or good according to the context despite Faulkner, p. 27 bottom, cf. the Tale of the eloquent peasant, B 1.224, on the negative side, Sinuhe, B 263 irr hm=k mri.t=f, ‘may your Majesty do/act as he wishes’, on the positive one; as for irrt, it is passive participle of ȋr and signifies ‘that which is done’, ‘what is done’, compare ȋr̂y.t, ‘that which was done’, ‘what has been done’. It is hard to see how the substantive εἰρέ̂ρος (for Odyssey 8.529 — in an interpolated simile: H.
van Thiel, *Odysseen* [Basel, Schwabe, 1988], 117? — has the accusative) may have evolved out of an intrinsically neutral Egyptian verb, *nomen actionis*, or participle: εἰρερος is clearly understood, within a context of war loss, after εὑρεν, ‘to arrange in a row, bind, fasten together’ (cf. φθινύθουσι 530). The sketchiness of Bernal’s lexicography strikes the eye on every page; for example, on 185, the Latin *penates* may come from *p3 nṯr*, “the god”: better here, ‘the divine figure / statue’ (N. Grimal, *Les termes de la propagande royale égyptienne de la XIXe Dynastie à la conquète d’Alexandre* [Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1986], 287-8), as in Wenamun, 1.39 (H. Goedicke, *The Report of Wenamun* [Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975], 54; B. U. Schipper, *Die Erzählung des Wenamun* [Fribourg / Göttingen, Academic Press / Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 2005], 57, 263-4). Bernal refers twenty or so times (out of thousands words) to the semantically solid yet antiquated Erman-Grapow. Coupled with his disregard for its separate series (*Bellegstellen*), this means that Egyptian roots and lexemes are cut off from their attestations, a wholly anomalous procedure in Egyptology. We need an explanation. From the odd reference to Gardiner’s listings in his *Egyptian Grammar*, I surmise that Bernal must have worked in desultory fashion with those resources available to him according to opportunity and familiarity, instead of starting from scratch by digging his way through the indexes to Erman-Grapow before consulting more recent literature (like J. P. Allen’s glossary and list of grammatical forms in *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts* [Malibu, Undena, 1984], II, 541-601, 602-58, or P. Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu* [Leuven, Peeters, 1997]; cf. D. Meeks, “Dictionnaires

---

28 The Berlin *Wörterbuch* (1925-1931, 5 + 2 vol., reimpr. 1971; *Bellegstellen*, 1935-1953, 5 vol.) includes nothing later than the early 1900s, thus misses all of the Coffin and Pyramid Texts (a corpus in constant expansion: C. Berger-el Naggar - J. Leclant - B. Mathieu - I. Pierre-Croisiou, *Les textes de la pyramide de Pépy I* [Cairo, IFAO, 2001], I, 9-11); one will find them in R. Hannig’s vast thesaurus: *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch*, Mainz, Zabern, I (Old Kingdom), 2003, II (Middle Egyptian), 2006, 2 vol. The reliable *Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* by Gardiner’s longtime assistant, R. O. Faulkner (Oxford, Griffith Institute, 1962), features very lightly in *BA III* yet silently informs many of its glosses (e.g. p. 439: “ṣḥḥ itself is ‘to glorify [a god], beautify [a tomb]’ ~ Faulkner, 210 ‘spiritualize dec’d’, ‘glorify god’, ‘beautify tomb’, etc). It was never meant to be used as an all-sufficient tool, à la Bernal.

29 This is confirmed by Bernal’s memoir, *Geography of a Life* (sine loco, XLibris, 2012), 412-3. After a chance encounter in a bookshop, he bought copies of Černý and Faulkner in which he ‘began to look for and find plausible Egyptian etymologies of Greek words’; this initial phase of his research he describes as follows: «when Leslie and Patrick [his newborn son] returned from hospital, I spent many nights half asleep, waiting for the next cry. This state, which [sic] resembles the ‘incubation’ practised in Egyptian and Greek medicine, the ‘half sleep’ when dreams or ideas come to you. In my case, these often took the form of etymologies. Many of these disappeared as I woke up. Most of those I could remember seemed absurd in the light of day. Some, however, remained plausible, increasing my confidence that I was on the right track». The doubts of Slack as to his linguistic expertise, pp. 2-3, are thus vindicated.
Jean-Fabrice Nardelli
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Once he had enough appealing words in his files, Bernal never backtracked to check them out or look at them in actual texts, otherwise one would not face an average of two or three howlers a page. This explodes his oft-repeated claims to profound Auseinandersetzung with the sources\(^{30}\); it also comes a long way towards explaining the abnormally numerous voces nihili that mar his Near Eastern isoglosses. To my samples in CR 63, 142-3, Aristarchus antibarbarus, 13-6, 19-20, 200-1, add pp. 68-9 «qrsln “small bones” occurs in Akkadian and Canaanite» (Akk. qarnu, Ugaritic and Phoenician qrn, Hebrew qeren mean ‘horn’. S. Levin, Semitic and Indo-European. The Principal Etymologies [Amsterdam, Benjamins, 1995], 29-35); p. 158, where καὶ is taken out of λοῦ, ‘other’, a blatant misreading of Gardiner, p. 78 § 98 (λοῦ, pl. λοῦ/λυ/); and p. 321, in which a lim qua ‘many’ is bestowed on Akkadian (vere LIM, limu, ‘thousand’) whereas the Ugaritic for ‘people’ appears as l’m instead of lim as in limu, Neo-Akkadian l’imu, Hebrew lø’om, Eblaite li-im (Del Olmo Lete-Sanmartin, I, 487-8; A. F. Rainey, Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets... [Leiden, Brill, 1996], I, 190). Awkward thumbing explains the unreliability of his glosses of comparanda\(^{31}\); and even if Bernal has them right, he all too soon muddles them\(^{32}\). Let four instances suffice.

First, Akkadian pilaqqu (sic p. 104; actually pilakku) is ‘spindle’, not ‘ax’ (Francis, “Impact...”, 487; M. M. Fritz, “...und weinten um Tammuz”. Die Götter Dumuzi-Ama’ušumgal’anna und Damu [Münster, Ugarit, 2003], 319 note 1315; CAD P [2005], 371-3). Second, pace p. 314, where it sources σκυλάειν, σκυλεύειν, σκύλλειν, συλάειν, plus the noun σκύλα, the Semitic √SLH does not convey the notion of ‘cast out, send away’, with sole respect to the Arabic verb salaḥa which Bernal wrongly defines as ‘flay an animal,

\(^{30}\) «It should be clear to any reader that my books are based on modern scholarship. The ideas and information I use do not always come from the champions of conventional wisdom, but very few of the historical hypotheses put forward in BA are original. The series’ originality comes from bringing together and making central information that has previously been scattered and peripheral» (Black Athena Writes Back, 109; that is to say, he freely retains whatever suits best his purposes); language, or the relationships between Greek on the one hand and Egyptian and West Semitic on the other, is my strongest suit » (Geography of a Life, 438).

\(^{31}\) Unlike mainline linguists, who try hard to ascertain the quality of their data, using the best lexica (e.g. F. Bader, “Liage, peausserie et poètes-chanteurs”, in F. Létoublon (ed.), La langue et les textes en grec ancien [Amsterdam, Gieben, 1992], 105-19 at 116 sqq.).

\(^{32}\) Akkadian marru, ‘hoe’ with an ‘extended meaning “channel, canal”’ in Hittite (p. 343), is false: it means ‘shovel, spade’ and \(^{\text{CAD M Part1}}\) is the emblem of 4_AMAR.UTU (CAD M Part1 [1977], 289c; W. Sommerfeld, Der Aufstieg Marduks. Die Stellung Marduks in der babylonischen Religion des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr. [Kevelaer etc, Butzon & Bercker etc, 1982], 55; J. Peterson, Godlists from Old Babylonian Nippur in the University Museum, Philadelphia [Münster, Ugarit, 2009], 3297, 9915), see further Rüster-Neu, Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon, n°191 p. 183, W. Schramm, Akkadische Logogramme (Göttingen, Universitätsverlag, 2010), 17, 99.

33 So W. Leslau, *English-Amharic Context Dictionary* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1973), 703, 704; T. L. Kane, *Amharic-English Dictionary* (ibid., 1990), I, 168-170. ‘Allocated land’ corresponds to ṭër, mārrit (Kane, 170) as distinct from ṭēr, mārra, cf. ṭēr, māret, ‘earth, ground, soil, terrain, land; lot or plot (of ground), tract (of land), territory; floor, bottom (of a body of water)’ (Kane, 184), and ṭēr, yāmāret, ‘terrestrial’, as acknowledged by Bernal (‘the Amharic mārra and mārrit “distribution of land by the government”’). ‘Allocated land’ for mārra is only referenced in G. T. Getahun, *Advanced Amharic Lexicon. A Supplement to Concise Amharic-English Dictionaries* (Münster, Lit, 2003), 25, yet after ‘led, gave guidance’ and ‘being quartered or billeted’.
T. VI 55. Finally, Bernal prints way too much gibberish. He forgets that assyriologists mark vocalic contraction in Akkadian by a circumflex (e.g. bīrtu ‘fortress’, not birtu p. 391, from Muss-Arnolt’s bīrtu [1, 196]; līliātu / lilātu, ‘evening’, becomes lilatu p. 46 and is mistranslated ‘night’ next to two such cognates; the garment used as bed covering is lītu, lētu, liitu, not ‘lītu or letu’ [p. 332]; lāqah is not Akkadian pace p. 333, cf. leqû, laqû, laqā’u, ‘to take over / away / off’), and s, š or š sound the same for him. So on p. 183 «a Latin loan from Semitic is summa. (...) It would seem much more plausible to derive it from the Afroasiatic and Semitic root *sam “high” attested in Semitic the Ugaritic smm, the Phoenician smm and the Hebrew šāmāyim “heavens”»34; yet, all three words have an initial š, as at BA III, 492 (cf. my note 168), whereas smm is ‘perfume’ in Ugaritic (Del Olmo Lete-Sanmartín, II, 763; Halayqa, 298).

Combination of these defects proves lethal, witness on p. 403 «the root sbl appears in the Akkadian sūbultu “to cause to hang down,” the Arabic sabala with the same meaning plus “to let fall”, the Ugaritic sblt and the Hebrew šibōlet “flowing stream, ear of grain”35. Saying shiboleth / siboleth was, of course, the test of dialect. The sense of hanging down would fit the meaning of ἀσπαλιεύς (3) “fisherman using line”. The prothetic vowel would shield the double consonant». The tendency of wild etymologists to juggle substantives (or quasi-substantives such as infinitives) and ignore, or misinterpret as such, all verbal forms, is on display here. Bernal has been misled by F. Brown - S. R. Driver - C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1907), 987, s.v. šēḇēš «v of foll.; cf. Ar. יְבֵד IV. cause to hang down, יַּבְדֵה flowing dress; As(syrian) šābultu, šunbultu (Meissner), Ar. יֶבְדֵה, יְבֶּדֵה (BaRB207), Eth. Šāḇāl, Aram. šūḇāš, <Syriac> ḫāḏḥā, all ear of grain». The Semitic √SBL / ŠBL, ‘to carry a load, be laden’36, actually produced in Akkadian the


substantives šūb/pultu ~ šūb/piltu, ‘consignment, shipment, gift’ (CAD S part 3 [1992], 188-90; AHw., III, 1258-9), and šub/pultu ~ šub/piltu, ‘ear, spike of corn / barley’ (CAD Š.3, 187-8; AHw., III, 1258) with no trace whatsoever of a verb, let alone a causative one37; in Ugaritic, the noun šblt, ‘ear, spike of corn’ (C. Cohen and H. R. Cohen, Biblical Hapax Legomena in the Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic [Missoula, Scholars Press, 1978], 112-3; Del Olmo Lete-Sanmartín, II, 805); and in Arabic, the noun sabal, collective for ‘ears of corn’, and the verb sabala, ‘to drag’ (verbatim: ‘to let hang down, let fall, drop’), after Wehr, 550 = Wehr-Colwan, 396. For the sake of precision, I shall mention the Canaanite and Akkadian words meaning ‘ill / sick, illness’, ‘burden, burdened’ (Halayqa, 294-5), and the Jewish Aramaic šəbaltā/šubaltā, Syriac šebbālā, šebbaltā, all of which signify ‘ear of corn’ (see Sokoloff, 538; Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, II, coll. 4033-4, 4232-3; and Sokoloff, Syriac Lexicon, 1504, 1580 — Hebrew / Aramaic has its own term for ‘barley’: Sokoloff, 572). √ SBL / ŠBL is thus very far from cohering with the notion of (a fisherman’s!) hanging line. Furthermore, that spelling ִשֹׁכֶּּלת, šibbōlet (18x), or ִסֹכֶּּלת, sibbōlet (once: Judges 12:6), was ‘a test of dialect’ (viz. another furtum from Brown-Driver-Briggs: p. 987 s.v. ִשֹׁכֶּּלת) according to the communis opinio exemplified in, say, Lipiński, Studies II, 107-9, remains unsettled; those who find here a matter of literacy or cultural level may very well be right (e.g., R. S. Kawashima, Biblical Narrative and the Death of the Rhapsode [Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2004], 36). Worse, this issue has nothing to do with Bernal’s proposed etymon; it merely evidences his fondness for obscurantistic comments. Last but not least, Chantraine dismissed too eagerly ἀσπαλιεύς as a derivative of ἄσπαλος influenced by ἁλιεύς (so J.-L. Perpillou, Les substantifs grecs en -εύς [Paris, Klincksieck, 1973], §§ 337-8, pp. 305-7), yet Bernal did not demur: ‘DELG strangely doubts the connection of ἀσπαλιεύς and ἄσπαλος’ Beekes (note 43), I, 153. Cf. DELG, 1377 (Supplément).

Bernal combines this abysmal grasp of Egyptian and Semitic with other blinkers. Just as he remained unaware of all post-Chantraine studies in Greek etymology, he paid little or no attention to Anatolian38, Indo-
Iranian and Tocharian, unless they were quoted in Pokorny, Frisk, or Chantraine, to the extent that he chides them for mentioning these terms (so p. 24: «Pokorny derives this root from (...) such far-fetched forms as the Tocharian ånt “plain”», cf. 339 «Chantraine then turns to even less-likely Indo-European etymologies» or 387 «all they can find is the Old Persian rūda, Ossetic rūd “intestines!”»). It is no more invalid to deploy such forms in defence of a (P)IE etymon than to marshal the Icelandic lǣ, the German Leid, and the French laid to secure the IE leig-/leik- ‘dürftig, elend; Krankheit, schlechtes Ergehen’ (Pokorny, I, 667). Too bad for Bernal the Anatolian languages, though often tantalizing, seem to hold the key to many etymological enigmas in the Greek lexicon! Bettering Pokorny is


40 A. J. van Windekens, Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes (Leuven, s. ed., 1976-1982), 3 vol., ought not to be used (so, e.g., Winter, Language 57, 1981, 935-41); standard are now Adams, A Dictionary of Tocharian B (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1999, reissued 2007), despite its numerous flaws (see Winter and X. Tremblay in Aristarchus antibarbarus, LXXIX), and the up-to-date lexicon of the verbs offered by M. Malzahn, The Tocharian Verbal System (Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2010), 517-1000.


42 Cf. the rare nakkuš, ‘damage’, ‘loss’, ‘fault’ (Tischler, II, 262-3; ‘Schaden’ idem, Hethitisches Handwörterbuch, 110). E. Laroce, “Hittite nakkuš — nakkušiš”, in Hoffner - G. M. Beckman (edd.), Kanisüwar. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday (Chicago, Oriental Institute, 1986), 137-40 at 139-40, speculates that «en restituant à l’anatolien le groupe de nakkuš et ses dérivés, on récupère le représentant de la racine indo-européenne *nek- ‘périr, faire périr.’ A cette racine appartient le vieux terme juridique latin noxa, pratiquement synonyme du hittite nakkuš: en grec, le dérivé nekus ‘cadavre’ et en latin nocuus ‘nuisible’ ont le même thème d’adjectif en -u- que le hitt. nakkuš(i) < *nok-u-s-(i) », which is less strained (for the objections of HED, VII, 56, may be overcome: Rix (dir.), Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen [Wiesbaden, Reichert, 2001; LIV³], 451-2) than it is incapable of being proved or disproved (Kloekhorst, 595).

43 Aristarchus antibarbarus, XI bottom, 182 note 1, 183 ibid.; all the cases in van Windekens, “Graeco-Hittitica”, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 100, 1987,

It follows that virtually no argument detailed in the second part of BA III ever carries any conviction, whether Vycichl gets flogged for being too cautious in his search for Afroasiatic materials behind Coptic (list at Aristarchus antibarbarus, 10; commentary on select examples, 27-9) or the specific objections of Bernal’s bêtes noires Jasanoff and Nussbaum to his etymological grid are dismissed. As expected, positive evidence against
their (P)IE defence of Greek words he deems Semitic is extremely limited in quantity; as his parallels are seldom of such a nature to command assent, all he does is dodge and muddle the issues at stake. Accordingly, Bernal never meets their challenge to him to watch beyond the surface of things\textsuperscript{45}. That decent (PIE) etyma are shunned in favor of extravagant or merely specious speculations comes as no surprise\textsuperscript{46}. The sheer naivety of his derivations is more interesting to pursue. Ὀβελός ~ Dorian and Arcadian ὀδελός descend

\textsuperscript{45} ‘Word Games’, 200: ‘there is a certain sameness to all of Bernal’s etymologies. In each case, a Greek word is said to “come from” an Egyptian or Semitic expression to which it bears some real or fancied similarity of meaning and a vague, often extremely tenuous, phonetic resemblance. No effort is made to go beyond the realm of appearances; known and inferable facts about the history of individual forms are systematically ignored, misrepresented, or suppressed. Above all, there is a thoroughgoing contempt for phonetic consistency (...). To be sure, an excuse is offered for the confusion; the inconsistencies that we observe in the treatment of foreign sounds, Bernal tells us, are due to differences in the date at which individual words were borrowed. But he made no effort to substantiate this claim by arguing, for example, that Greek words which exhibit the “early” treatment of Eg. ð also consistently show the “early”, and never the “late” or “middle” treatment of the similarly variable sounds b, t and f. In fact, it is quite clear that no such regularities exist; the hypothesis of relatively early versus relatively late borrowing is simply another wild card (…)’. Rendsburg’s “An Etymological Response”, Arethusa Special Issue. The Challenge of Black Athena, 1989, 67-82, was obviously too sympathetic.

\textsuperscript{46} He thus explains θάλασσα from ṭjš, ‘boundary, limit’ (p. 197; rather *τᾱ ἄλ-ασσα < *sal-ə, ‘salt water’, after van Windekens’ Dictionnaire étymologique complémentaire [Leuven, Peeters, 1986], 98-9? ‘typically Pre-Greek’ Beekes, I, 530); (ϝ)ἄναξ, from ‘nh ḡt, ‘may he live forever’ (259-60: on ‘nh J. Kahl, Frühägyptisches Wörterbuch, I [Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2002], 82-5; Hannig, I. 272-7; II. I. 508-34), though the Greek word clearly points to Anatolia (Aristarchus antibarbarus, XII; T. G. Palaima, “Wanaks and Related Power Terms in Mycenaean and Later Greek”, in S. Deger-Jalkotzy – I. S. Lemos (edd.), Ancient Greece. From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer [Edinburgh, University Press, 2006], 53-71 at 53-8), which puts to rest both its stamp as a substrate (Beekes, I, 98-9) and any linkage with the Hebrew ‘anāqîm (S. B. Noegel, “The Aegean Ogygos of Boeotia and the Biblical Ὑγ of Bashan: Reflections of the Same Myth”, Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 110, 1998, 411-26 at 420); δοῦλος, from the Afroasiatic *√dal-, ‘to be weak, tired’, and a Semitic (?) *√DL(L), ‘dependent’ (pp. 326-8; better PIE *√des-, ‘enemy’, with Mallory-Adams, Encyclopedia, 169, Introduction, 269? the semantic shift may have been exaggerated by Chantraine after Benveniste [infra, note 64]; Beekes, I, 350, is grossly ignorant); κόδος, κόδρος, etc, from the Semitic √QDS, ‘holy, sacred, cultic’ (W. Kornfeld, in id. and Ringgren, ‘ψτθ qds, TDOT, XII [Grand Rapids-Cambridge, Eerdmans, 2003], 521-45 at 521-6; Hoftijzer-Jongeling, II, 993-7), despite the IE connection stabilized by M. Meier-Brügger, “A propos de la partie étymologique du Dictionnaire de Chantraine”, in Létoublon, La langue et les textes en grec ancien, 267-72 at 269, read further Beekes, I, 796-7 (BA III, 336-7); and finally the doublet Ζεύς ~ Δίος, from nsu, a title of the Egyptian god Amun to whom Zeus was identified by some fifth-century Greeks (pp. 478-9; contra, Δ(ϝ)κόνη and the IE cognates of Διός Bernal so crassly misconstrued that it borders on the grotesque: Aristarchus antibarbarus, XIII-XIV; Beekes, I, 388, 498-9).
from /wβ3 / wdf (pp. 373-4), sparing us the labiovelar, but where does the /l/ hail from? Better PIE *√h₂egw̚-, ‘to fry’ (R. Plath, “Zur Etymologie von homerisch δθελός”, Historische Sprachforschungen 105, 1992, 243-59 at 251 sqq.), than Pre-Greek (Beekes, II, 1043); on *oge̮lós cf. Plath, 256 «denn das Griechische hat in anderen Fällen öfters in den anderen indogermanischen Einzelsprachen nur schlecht oder gar nicht bezeugte Lexeme weitergeführt und gelegentlich sogar durch Derivation auf dem nominalen wie auf dem verbalen Sektor zu einem umfangreichen System ausgebaut». Θάνατος και θνήσκειν perpetuate the Egyptian tni < ḫni, ‘to be weak of old age’, ‘(mark) of old age’, by an euphemism of the same kind as the one assumed by Chantaine to drag in the IE (p. 409); that the verb tni is euphemistic for death is a guess47, unlike the PIE *√d₂eh₂- (LIV ², 144-5; contra, Beekes, II, 533-4). Bernal tars us with the same brush p. 302: ûḇręz adapts wr-ib, ‘of great / wide heart’, either in good part (‘brave, magnanimous’) or negatively (‘insolent’ Ptahhotep, 8.10), never mind that the expected idea of power is recovered through PIE *√h₂ek-’, ‘to be(come) sharp, pointed’ (D. S. Wodtko, B. Irslinger, and C. Schneider, Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon [Heidelberg, Winter, 2008], 287-300), cf. Nikolaev, “Die Etymologie von altgriechischem ûḇręz”, Glotta 80, 2004, 211-30 at 211-21, criticized by Beekes, II, 1525. How may wr-ib persuade, though, when the state of the Egyptian morphology and phonology at each historical stage when borrowing is supposed by Bernal to have taken place, never receives any attention in BA III (S. Patri, ‘La perception des consonnes hittites dans les langues étrangères au XIIIe siècle’, Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie 99, 2009, 87-126 at 93-6, 99-113)? Nonetheless Bernal asserts bluntly that the New Kingdom was crucial, with the Peripheral Akkadian of the royal letters acting as a buffer. He even equates a Greek word to an Akkadian one he suspects of being a loanword from Egyptian so that he can reconstruct this ‘etymon’. On 219-223, he hypothesizes the serial borrowing p3 sr > Boğazköy Akkadian pa-ši-ia-ra > Linear B qa/pa₂-si-re-u, Cypriot pa-si-le-wa(-se) (~ pa-si-le-ō-se): attestations in M. Egetmeyer, Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre [Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2010], I, § 527, pp. 417-8)

47 Did it replace mwt, ‘to die’, as did ṣm, ‘to go’ (J. Zandee, Death as an Enemy According to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions [Leiden, Brill, 1960], 54-5)? There is a use of ḫnì for ‘to be miserable’: Goedicke, “The Letter to the Dead, Nag Ed-Deir N 3500”, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 58, 1972, 95-8 at 96. Compare G. Lambin, La chanson grecque dans l’Antiquité (Paris, CNRS, 1992), 106-25 with the endnotes at 411-8, for death qua object of songs and the various euphemisms used to broach it.

48 Bernal is far from suspecting that ib qua ‘(physical) heart’, in competition with ḫnty, has been doubted by J. H. Walker, Studies in Ancient Egyptian Anatomical Terminology (Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1996), 169-71; on ib qua ‘self, psyche’, idem, 172-5. It might turn out that he was right: the P. Zagreb 601, c. 27.13, says īw ìb n nk ḫtw, ‘oh, you who take the jb-heart and tear out the ḫtyj-hearts’ (I. Uranić, “Book of the Dead Papyrus Zagreb 601”, Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur 33, 2005, 357-71 at 365).
> βασιλεύς (not a title: Perpillou, § 452, pp. 392-3), a monstrosity (CR 63, 143; Aristarchus antibarbarus, 31-2). He could have made the Akkadian pa-ši-ia-ra the name of one of the Egyptian senders of this Boğazköy letter, on the strength of the equivalence *P3-sirw: ἘΤΙΟΥΡΡ, ‘the (ΠΕ) eunuch (ΕΤΙΟΥΡΡ: M. Fieger - S. Hodel-Hoenes, Der Einzug in Ägypten. Ein Beitrag zur Alttestamentlichen Josefsgeschichte [Bern-Oxford, Lang, 2007], 86-7): Ψιοῦρις (F. Preisigke, Namenbuch enthaltend alle... Menschennamen, soweit sie in die griechischen Urkunden Ägyptens sich vorfinden [Heidelberg, s.ed., 1922], col. 493), probably ‘LePrince’ since Pharaonic Egypt never had eunuchs, but no! Bernal links ἘΤΙΟΥΡΡ... to ψιλός (pp. 223-4). Never did he ask himself whether it was standard practice, for a diplomatic letter in Akkadian, to be addressed by nameless ‘Grandees’ (LUMIS.GALMIS) and P3 sr, ‘the official’ (!). This highly codified genre always names or identifies the correspondents49, so Bernal cannot be right. He must not have read E. Edel at all (references to his works at CR 63, adding “Zwei Originalbriefe der Königsmutter Tūja in Keilschrift”, Studien zur Alttägyptischen Kultur 1, 1974, 105-46 at 131-2; also Vycichl, 185-6 s.v. ἘΤΙΟΥΡΡ). The mutual influences of Egyptian and Akkadian require care, and not haste, if they are to be broached in a study of the Levantine impact on the Greek language50.

A further defect in BA III is its indigent acquaintance with facts of civilization. Egyptian titulature suffers, either because Bernal misrepresents data at the brick-and-mortar level, e.g. nsw(t), ‘king’, and kn(ī) (his qnī), ‘effective, brave, valiant’ (p. 386)51, or because he roots vastly inflated...

49 W. L. Moran, The Amarna Letters (Baltimore-London, Johns Hopkins, 1992), XXII-XXIII; J. Mynarova, Language of Amarna - Language of Diplomacy. Perspectives on the Amarna Letters (Prague, Czech Institute of Egyptology, 2007), 126-30. «The primary identification of both correspondents must be purely functional, providing the respective names and the functions of the two persons. Only when it is assured that the message will be delivered to the right person and the addressee will certainly identify the identity of the sender, the second level of identification containing the social status of both correspondents (...) can follow» (p. 126). For Peripheral Akkadian titles, cf. W. Heimpel, Letters to the King of Mari (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2003), 571-604 passim.


claims in unstable grounds. The title *idnw*, when used separatim, means the ‘deputy’ of a higher up (then the nature of the function is normally clear in the mind of the writer as determined by the context), whereas it specifies, in compounds, the holder of the inferior, or medium-level, charge that immediately follows52. *BA III*, p. 88, states that *idnw* inspired the West Semitic ‘lord’53, Ugaritic ‘*adn*’, Phoenician ‘*dn*’ (Krahmalkov, A Phoenician-Punic Grammar [Leiden-Boston-Köln, Brill, 2001], 135, 136; idem, Phoenician-Punic Dictionary, 34-8), Punic *dn* (Krahmalkov, A Phoenician-Punic Grammar, § 4d, 36-7; Hoftijzer-Jongeling, I, 15-7), and Hebrew ‘*ādôn*’ / ‘*ādôn*’, with the terse comment that ‘this terminology reflects the difference of power between the two regions’. The idea belongs to S. Yelvin and W. F. Albright and, while interesting, lacks conclusive evidence (O. Eissfeldt, תינק אדון ‘*ādhôn*; פֶּאָדָני ‘*adhōnāi*, Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, I ['Revised edition', Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1974], 59-73 at 59-60). The material civilization of Egypt is not handled better. The standard measure of grain *ḫȝr* becomes a nonsensical *ḥ*ar p. 218; p. 227, *ṣ*ḫp translated ‘the beer jug’ is equated to the sign W22 (Beth), for which such a gloss obtains (Gardiner, p. 530), yet a vessel for drinking *ḥ* does not seem to exist; p. 368, a verb *mgȝr* declared to mean ‘broil or grill’ and etymologize μαγειρεύειν, μάγειρος has been misread from Hoch, 170-1 n°227 — it is actually mgr, a late hapax whose value remains elusive (Lesko-Switalski Lesko², I, 212, endorses Hoch, but cf. Takács, III, 679-80.2-3); worse, the derivation of the Greek words cannot be accepted (Takács, 678-9 N.B 3)54.

57 note 39 (κνί).


53 The Ugaritic ‘*adn*’ signifies ‘father’ too; this dual meaning (Del Olmo Lete-Sammartin, I, 18-9; J. Huehnergard, *The Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription* [Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1987], 48, 104, who posits */n*adānul, ‘lord; father, head of the family’; A. Rahmouni, Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetical Texts [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2008], 26 note 4; M. S. Smith - W. T. Pitard, The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume II. Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3-1.4 [Leiden, Brill, 2009], 291) remains vexing even when one considers that social structures can be shaped (or mirrored) in familial ones, cf. H. J. Marsman, Women in Ugarit and Israel. Their Social and Religious Position in the Context of the Ancient Near East (Leiden, Brill, 2003), 133. Tropper’s Ugaritische Grammatik (Münster, Ugarit, 2000), eschews this duality of values in its 1056 pages: the word, which he never discusses, is rendered everywhere ‘Herr’ (viz. its sole meaning in prose); contrast D. Sivan, A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language (‘Second Impression with Corrections’, Leiden–Boston–Köln, Brill, 2001), 68, 73, P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, A Manual of Ugaritic (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2009), I, 295 (glossary), and read further Halayqa, 36.

54 Far more natural verbs for ‘to b(r)oil, cook’ are *p/fsi*, cf. the substantive *p/fsw* (Hannig, I, 489; Takács, II, 114-5), and *wdd* (Takács, II, 101; Hannig, II.1, 757), cf. *wdp.w*, ‘cook’ but much oftener ‘butler, attendant, steward’ (Jones, 406-7 n°1494-7; Kahl, Frühägyptisches Wörterbuch, I, 127; Hannig, I, 391-2, II.1, 750-4; L. D. Morenz, “Zu einem scheinbar enigma-
The history of ideas fares badly too, not so much because a correspondence more striking than most of its kind has been missed than because *BA III* conflates the Greek gods with their Egyptian or West Semitic counterpart with little regard for phonetics (and, *pace* p. 254, B/βάκχος cannot stem from νῆκας: Steiner, “On the Rise and Fall of Canaanite Religion at Baalbek: A Tale of Five Toponyms”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128, 2009, 507-25 at 520 note 72). The history of techniques gets equally short shrift. P. 100, Bernal borrows from Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (I, 616-7) a PIE root *r(e)udḥ-*, ‘red, red metal, copper’, and contends that, if the Hebrew <<kōp(p)er “red” also meant “copper,” Kypros / Cyprus seems to be a West Semitic name for the island famous for its copper, rather than the toponym originating the metal name found in the Latin *cuprum* etc. Now this is a laryngealist root, *ḥ/Hreudḥ* (Mallory-Adams, *Encyclopaedia*, 379; D. Stifter, “Study in Red”, *Die Sprache* 40, 1998, 202-23 at 206-7; B. A. Olsen, “Another Account of the Latin Adjectives in –idus”, *Historische Sprachforschung* 116, 2003, 234-75 at 258-9; *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European* and the *Proto-Indo-European World* [Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press, 2006], 332; Wodtko-Irslinger-Schneider, 580-5); *pace* Gamkrelidze-Ivanov, ‘copper’ seems a mere semantic extension thus should not be assigned to the PIE (*Encyclopaedia*, 379-80); and Bernal ignores that the best work on the ancient names of Cyprus rules out a Semitic connection with this metal (Palaima, *The Triple Invention of Writing in Cyprus and Written Sources for Cypriote History* [Nicosia, A. G. Leventis Foundation, 2005], 21 with 47 note 36; Egetmeyer, I, 24, 243). Finer points have this lover of generalities who cannot tell when they are warranted (compare pp. 263-4, on φιλοσοφία versus Egyptian teachings, with B. Alster, *Wisdom of Ancient Sumer* [Bethesda, CDL, 2005], 18-24; he shuns the Greek Romance, despite G. A. A. Kortekaas, *Commentary on the Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* [Leiden-
Boston, Brill, 2007], 428, or S. Panayotakis, *The Story of Apollonius, King of Tyre. A Commentary* [Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2012], 365-6; and so on) rather at sea. He uses Karum Kanesh as a blanket toponym (pp. 91, 114): at Kaneš, the lower city was a commercial hub, whence the shorthand *kārum* Kaneš to distinguish it from the city mound (C. Michel, *La correspondance des marchands de Kanish* [Paris, Cerf, 2001], 25-30; K. R. Veenhof, in idem and J. Eidem, *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period* [Fribourg / Göttingen, Academic Press / Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 2008], 41-6). Bernal’s dating of *kārum* Kaneš II is misguided (p. 601 note 3, with a shadowy reference to ‘Manning *et al.* (2001)’) and he makes a travesty of the linguistic situation by speaking of the ‘early Hittite names’ attested there (p. 91: these Anatolian names are not only Hittite, viz. Indo-European, but Hattic, Luwian, and Hurrian).

Finally, Bernal’s shaky acquaintance with the Greek literature pervades almost every page. Perhaps the most glaring instance appears on p. 474: broaching the topic of the birth of Apollo, he discusses what should have been introduced as the Pindaric hymn *Θήβαις εἰς Δία* (frr. 29-35 Snell-Maehler) and states that «Pindar enlarged the story» (told in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo) «with the claim that Delos was only the “mortal” name of the island, the immortal one was *Αστερία* “star”». However *Αστερία* does not appear in this composition; all fr. 33c says, in an elaborate set of appositions (P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare* [Paris, Peeters, 1993], 364), is that mortals call the island Delos disparently from ‘blessed Olympians’:

\[\text{ἄν τε βροτοῖ | Δάλον κικλήμασιν, μάκαρε δ’ ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ (33c, 4-5).}\]

Pindar merely has Asteria once as the «sister of Leto, daughter of Koios and Phoebe; a Titan pursued by Zeus and turned into the island of Delos» (W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* [Berlin, De Gruyter, 1967], 76). Bernal must not like the Theban poet, for on another occasion he neglects to source his *Ἄμμων Ὀλύμπου δέσποτα* (fr. 36), from which an identification of Zeus with the Egyptian Am(m)on would stem, instead of the cultic name it can only be. Discarding all such quirks, we must now pause to consider the ways the all-important early Greek poetry features in *BA III*. For it is no mean achievement of Bernal to etymologize numerous Greek words, toponyms, and gods first to be found in the Homeric epics without ever paying heed to formularity, oral composition, and other concepts and bibliographical resources familiar to Homerists, nor taking into account the characteristics of epic style. In the case of the Homeric glossa, this comes tantamount to renouncing verisimilitude. Bernal does not disappoint when he is faced with *γλαυκῶπις*, pp. 578-9. He paraphrases it without further ado ‘pale and brilliant eyes’, transferring the rival interpretation, from *γλαῦξ* (which he does not mention as the equally possible alternative it is), to the goddess Neith from which name Athena in his view ultimately derives. However (*Aristarchus antibarbarus*, p. XII), *γλαυκόπις* < *γλαυκός* is at least as
likely to be an early re-interpretation of this archaic lexeme ossified in the formula and no longer clear to the poet, than its original shade of meaning. For γλαυκός cf. of late C. L. Wilkinson, *The Lyric of Ibycus* (Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2013), 247-8. Apart from twelve (!) lines on the Greek article in Homeric and early Greek (pp. 162-3, drawing on Meillet’s *Apercu* instead of Chantraine’s *Grammaire homérique*), everywhere in *BA III* the reader remains in the dark as to the uniqueness of the Homeric diction. Not only is it an artistic medium (*Kunstsprache*), quite unlike everything else in the Greek literature; it shows to a high degree the influence of Mesopotamian and Levantine narrative traditions. When at last this became inescapable, in the sixties, so great was the zest for this dependence of Homer or his tradition on the Near East that Ugaritic poetry was identified as the model for a majority of the stylistic devices the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* rely on.

That there exists an intricate intertwining of Hellenic, if not Indo-European, motifs and Near Eastern themes in the monumental epics, was eventually recognized, and the so-called Levantine roots of the Homeric technique fell

---

57 This undermines S. Deacy - A. Villing, “What Was the Colour of Athena’s Aegis?”, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 129, 2009, III-29 at 121-4 (‘it was coloured in ways that denoted Athena’s protective and inherently ambivalent, and potentially destructive, power’, p. 125). Nor is γλαυκῶπις hers exclusively, for it applies to Hera in the anonymous *Palatine Anthology* 9.189.1 ἐλθέτε πρὸς τέμενος γλαυκώπιδος ἀγλαὸν Ἥρης, naturally enough (D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* [Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981], 338: ‘the transference of γλαυκῶπις from Athena to Hera is not more remarkable than the transference of βοῶπις from Hera to Artemis in Bacchylides 11.99, or to Amphitrite in 17.110, or to Harmonia in Pind. Pyth. 3.91; it is less surprising than the transference of Ἀργειφόντης from Hermes to Apollo in Sophocles fr. 1024’). In any case, K. Tümpel, “Lesbiaka”, *Philologus* 50, 1891, 566-8 at 567 note II, has a pointed explanation. So beware, like Bernal, of taking too rigid a new of the ritual epithets in early poetry and religion: S. P. Morris, *Daidalos and the Origin of Greek Art* (Princeton, University Press, 1995), 52-3, 56-7.

58 C. H. Gordon, *Before the Bible. The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations* (New York, Harper & Row, 1962), 128-205; A. F. Campbell, “Homeric and Ugaritic Literature”, *Abr-Nahrain: An Annual* 5, 1965, 29-56; P. Walcot, “The Comparative Study of Ugaritic and Greek Literatures I-III”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 1, 1969, 111-8, 2, 1970, 273-5, and 4, 1972, 129-32; M. Maróth, “Epischer Stil im Ugaritischen und im Griechischen”, *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 23, 1975, 65-76. They were arguing against the influential contentions of T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London, Methuen, 1958), 64-90, for whom ‘the manner of Eastern poetry has many parallels in Homer, and this comparison may lead to useful inferences about the manner and performance of Mycenaean poetry and about its preservation in Homer. By itself however this would show that Mycenaean poetry was a local variant of Eastern Mediterranean poetry (just as we have seen that Mycenaean civilization and Mycenaean art is a local variant of Eastern Mediterranean civilization and art), but not that Mycenaean poets borrowed Eastern themes’ (67). We are now in a far better position to assess the situation; the contacts between the Greeks and people from the Levant in the Proto-Geometric period had the former rediscover the cultural climate of exchange of the Mycenaean age that they remembered from their oral poetry (S.-T. Teodorsson, “Eastern Literacy, Greek Alphabet, and Homer”, *Mnemosyne* 59, 2006, 161-87 at 166-9; this might well have led to the creation and writing down of the Homeric epics: idem, 172-5).
into disregard. No matter the stance of Bernal with respect to the Graeco-Egyptian acculturation, it is cheap of him to confine to oblivion the strong Mesopotamian flavor of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* whenever he deals with epic myths; heroic personal names, such as Ἀχιλλεύς (Perpillou, 241 note 8; H. von Kampztz, *Homerische Personennamen* [Göttingen, Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 1982], 348), Μελάμπους, Πηλεύς (Perpillou, § 204, pp. 183-4; Von Kamptz, 300-1); the origins of Zeus, Apollo, Athena, Demeter, etc; and ethnics, toponyms, or astynyms for which Homer is our oldest testimony. Intertextuality along well-trodden paths is not indifferent to the core of these instances; yet *BA III* tramples the principles of sound interpretation of the epics in order to treat snippets from them as open to whatever fancy floats Bernal’s boat. \textit{Nihil vitiosus.}

Lefkowitz quipped that «Bernal is concerned with making particular arguments, not with constructing a coherent hypothesis» (“Black Athena: The Sequel”, 602). My reader has now reason to suspect that she was just being kind. As the book operates in the realm of possibilities and chance, it hardly bothers to build a case for its Afroasiatic derivations whenever the evidence is in short supply. Time and again the reader faces propositions asserted \textit{ex cathedra} of the form ‘X admits of no IE etymology, yet Semitic preserves Y or Z’, viz. absurdities qualified by philological leaps of faith. Thus «\textit{båyay}, \textit{bi} are particles of entreaty in Arabic and Hebrew, used in formulae of address to superiors. \textit{Bαίος [sic]} (5) is ‘small, without importance, mean and humble’. It has no Indo-European etymology» (p. 409) with ‘\textit{baios}, an obscure form of humble address’ on 413. Only through ignorance of sociologuistics can someone see an address in this adjective used in the neuter singular with an adverbial value, \textit{paulisper}, from Hesiod on (\textit{Works and Days}, 418), or in the nominal group χρόνον βαιόν (see E. Dickey,


\textit{60} This recipe for disaster originates in a vastly skewed notion of the achievements of Greek scholars with respect to \textit{Hellenorientalia} and their impact on Homer. In its narrative of the post-1945 situation, \textit{BA I}, 400-38, remains mum on the progressive discovery of the links between the *Iliad* and the epic of Gilgameš by Homerists, as if the contemporary scholarly blackout on the part played by the Phoenicians during the Greek protohistory was not justified, after the fifties and the sixties, by the evidence for such links with the Mesopotamian corpus (\textit{Aristarchus antibarbarus}, 185 note 3, has more details). Bernal's mishap handling of Homer in \textit{BA III} was consequently to be expected; it could only have been avoided had his Greek scholarship ripened between 1987 and 2006.
Greek Forms of Address. From Herodotus to Lucian [Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996], 4–19, cf. 247–8). What is more, βαιός, though deprived of IE connections (Prellwitz, Boisacq are antiquated), does not miss cognates, per F. A. Wood, “Etymologische Miszellen”, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen 45, 1912, 61-71 at 64. Quacks of the ilk of I. Van Sertima claimed that ‘Black’ Africans discovered America before Colombus, only to be met with scorn once it was demonstrated that these Afrocentrists falsified the record to extinguish the achievements of Native Americans⁶¹; Bernal blunts the edge of the linguistic data, yet protests that his appeals to a paradigmatic shift within the research on Graeco-Semitic relationships fell on deaf ears. Who of the two is more guilty here, pray tell?

The will to operate within a framework far broader than the ones experts of Greek or Indo-European normally use⁶² counts for little without preparation (the patient collation of data), flexibility (their painstaking elaboration), and sound common sense (the final decision, with an eye on the most recent scholarship available⁶³, between what looks almost certain, what


⁶² It is easy to abuse the comparative method to try and reconstruct a common IE inheritance from previously unexplained puzzles of a mythographic or philosophical character in two cognate languages. Let mentions of B. Sergent, Athéna et la grande déesse indienne (Paris, Belles Lettres, 2008) «ce que je reproche à Bernard Sergent, c’est d’avoir ratissé large sans se préoccuper de l’histoire des traditions si disparates qu’il sollicite. La comparaison doit avant tout rapprocher des traditions homogènes» E. Pirart, La naissance d’Indra. Approche comparative des mythes de l’Inde ancienne [Paris, L’Harmattan, 2010], 63; cf. note 153), and of the needlessly long-winded A. Pinchard, Les langues de sagesse dans la Grèce et l’Inde anciennes (Geneva, Droz, 2009) (647 p!), and D. Frame, Hippota Nestor (Washington-Cambridge, Mass, Center for Hellenic Studies, 2009) (922 p!!), both of which violate Wortphilologie while going overboard in their analogical comparative dealings, suffice as evidence that this pitfall of the game is gaining popularity. While they do not invalidate the investigation of IE poetics as a whole, such attempts put it beyond any doubt that the range of PIE is so massive as to prove hard to control at the brick-and-mortal level. A far larger range yet, more Bernalian, is clearly unmanageable.

⁶³ I cannot postpone any longer the exposition of one of the most irritating features of BA III: Bernal has linked together the three tomes of the series in an undesirable way by
seems likely, what is merely possible, and what one would like to squeeze out of the evidence). Otherwise results, meager as they are, are achieved at the expense of historical probability and comparative linguistics. Instead of leading the reader by the hand along those very guidelines towards what he feels is the truth, Bernal prefers to give him an impatient shove. The obvious poverty of the Indo-European pedigree of the Greek words he preyed upon, being copied (not altogether correctly) from the outdated Pokorny, Frisk, or Chantraine, leaves the unwary user in no doubt that the best course of action is the Semitic connection put forward so confidently. This shifts the onus of the proof from the author to the critic in a move which subverts scholarly standards of decency, while the brisk pace of the book makes it sure that Semiticless readers will not pause and peak too closely at the credentials of its Egyptian or Levantine etyma. The monograph which Bernal advertizes as a linguistic revolution thus sinks each time one of the three things that follow happens: either it is discovered that the author's Near Eastern materials are ghost words (forged by him, miscopied from a source, misprinted in the typescript, etc) or inspection demonstrates that he has abused them (by editing their translation, by pressing them too far, by fabricating unwarranted or conjectural semantic links, and so forth) or a technically defendable PIE etymon exists that Bernal took no notice of owing to his strained lexicographical basis. The conspicuous marks of too-lengthy pregnancy in BA III confirm this bleak view: the bibliography, referring us back to BA I or BA II as if science had not moved on in the two decades that elapsed since these books appeared. Thus all BA III has to say on the Ionians, viz. ‘the form iwntyw provides a plausible origin for ‘Ἰωνες’ (p. 211), comes with note 6 on p. 628 (see Vol. I, 83, and Vol. 2, 129); his only discussion is in BA I, and it magisterially disregarded modern scholarship, not citing one study. Ἰων.ἰω, plural Ἰων.ὑἱο (the scriptural context in J. Vercoutter, L’Égypte et le monde égéen préhellénique. Étude critique des sources égyptiennes (du début de la XVIIe à la fin de la XIXe dynastie) [Cairo, IFAO, 1956], 79-81), literally ‘bowman’ because it was felt to be an Asiatic emblem (T. Säve-Söderbergh, in Lexikon der Ägyptologie, I [Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1975], coll. 845-6), means ‘tribesman’ (Faulkner), ‘nomad’, ‘beduin’, ‘Asiatic foreigner’, ‘troglydyte’, cf. C. Leitz (ed.), Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen, I (Leuven, Peeters, 2002), 193, or Hannig, I, 60, II.1, 145. The true equation behind ‘Ἰωνες, Ἰωνες is with the Assyro-Babylonian and Aramaic Yâw(a)naya / Yâm(a)naya, cf. Demotic wînn (R. Rollinger, “Zur Bezechnung von ‘Griechen’ in Keilschrifttexten”, Revue d’Assyriologie 91, 1997, 167-72, building on J. A. Brinkman, “The Akkadain Words for ‘Ionia’ and ‘Ionians”, in R. F. Sutton (ed.), Daidalikon. Studies in Memory of R. F. Schoedel [Wauconda, Bolchazy-Carducci, 1989], 53-71), ‘Ionians’, viz. ‘Greeks, Greek speakers’: Brinkman, 54-6; Rollinger, “The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East. Textual Evidence and Historical Perspectives (ca. 750-650 BC)”, in R. M. Whiting (ed.), Mythology and Mythologies. Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences (Helsinki, Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001), 233-64 at 237-9; O. Casabonne - J. De Vos, “Chypre, Rhodes et l’Anatolie méridionale: la question ionienne”, Res Antiquae 2, 2005, 83-102 at 84-7 (probably the best brief summary); and N. Luraghi, “Traders, Pirates, Warriors: The Proto-History of Greek Mercenary Soldiers in the Eastern Mediterranean”, Phoenix 60, 2006, 21-47 at 30-3.
pp. 741-95, contains titles up to 2003, in tiny numbers, but scholarship and textual findings from the nineties are called ‘recent’ in the notes or the text; the book includes whole chunks of Black Athena Writes Back lifted verbatim, a fact that invites caution, if not dismay; the sequel of at least one major study to which Bernal pays lip-service, went unnoticed although it came out early enough (Levin, Semitic and Indo-European. Volume II Comparative Morphology, Syntax and Phonetic [2002]; note 180); lexica, handbooks, and monographs crop up in a thoroughly erratic way, with no rationale behind their appearance at some point and their absence everywhere else; and the fanciful, disappointingly thin indices surpass the endnotes (pp. 587-694) in inadequacy. Needless to say, the amount of rubbish in these sections is staggering; Bernal could not even be bothered to transcribe titles accurately (p. 753: ‘Elementis Alexandrini Opera’, instead of Clementis Alexandrini Opera; p. 787, within the same entry: ‘annotationibus’, ‘Leipsig’; etc). As the method behind the work is sheer madness; as the learning of the author falls short of the lowest conceivable standards; and as his critical

---

64 Note 171. E. Benveniste, Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes (Paris, Minuit, 1969, 2 vol. = Indo-European Language and Society, London, Faber & Faber, 1973), is referred to in connection with the IE divide δᾶμος versus domus (309, with 645 note 37); about the IE roots *kʷei- or *kʷei (actually, *kʷei-; *kʷei-: 242 with 634 note 187); and for the IE king (619 note 13) — not a large harvest for such a foundational work. To take one case-in-point, BA III, 326-7, would have been less bad, apropos of δῆμος and its putative origins in Asia Minor, for exploiting Benveniste (1969, I, 387-9 = 1973, 291-2; R. Rosól, Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen [Frankfurt am Main, Lang, 2013], p. 169). Similarly, why was R. Edwards’ epoch-making Kadmos the Phoenician. A Study in Greek Legends and the Mycenaean Age (Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1979), never used in BA III once its delayed publication is mentioned (p. 4, with a misspelling)? The answer is: Bernal builds on Astour’s demonstration that the contents of the myths of Kadmos are thoroughly West Semitic, yet it has been exploded in Kadmos, 139-61; thus the assertions of BA III, 466-7, on Kadmos and Europa qua the morning and evening stars, had to suppress Edwards, 142-6, or be ruled out. Finally, it is infuriating that Van Windakens’ Dictionnaire was only used four times (with respect to αὐτός [p. 159, cf. note 18], ἄξονα [637 note 99], ναός [649 note 39], πέπλος [686 note 60]), and not systematically when Bernal tackles one of his words, like αἷμα (p. 5 ~ BA III, 329); Ἀφροδίτη (p. 29 ~ BA III, 234-7; far less foolishly than Bernal’s pr wḥḏy.t, ‘temple-city’ of Wadjayat, בוגר / בוגו, Boutó, M. L. West, “The Name of Aphrodite”, Glotta 76, 2000, 134-8, reconstructs *Aprodīt, from the Semitic √PRD / PRD, and seeks a likely Canaanite value of this root, which he finds in the Hebrew prāzît, female dweller of a hamlet; so Ἀφροδίτη = ‘She of the Villages’, cf. Beekes, I, 179); or γυμνός (W., 59-60 ~ BA III, 387).

65 Scattered between 712-40 and 797-807, owing to the intrusion of the bibliography in between, are a copious index of Greek words (713 sqq.), then what Bernal terms one of ‘letter correspondences’ (731 sqq.), and a listing of modern names and themes; the former does not replace the exhaustive Semitic index without which this maze of a book can hardly be used by students of the Near East, while the general index should have been far more comprehensive. Lacking too is an index locorum. The endnotes are many yet meager and seldom extend beyond the immediate needs of the main text, whose source(s) they barely manage to spell out, plus the odd qualification or ancillary matter; the reader with no other resource will starve on them. Finally, to make the work less forbidding, a glossary (pp. 695-711) explains, with Bernal’s usual standards of inaccuracy, most technicalities and linguistic vocables.
faculty comes close to zero, the conclusion arrived at in *Black Athena Revisited* must be rehearsed: the ill-prepared Bernal overtaxed himself.\(^\text{66}\) The staunchest proof of this verdict lies in his assimilation of the situation of Greek vis-a-vis Egyptian / Semitic, with that of Japanese vis-a-vis Chinese.

Both the Greeks and the Japanese borrowed their scriptural vehicle from an older, more advanced and culturally sophisticated language to which their own was totally unrelated; the analogy breaks down there, for differences nigh impossible to bridge appear so soon as one considers the particulars. «Historically, the Japanese were initiated into the art of writing by the Chinese and through the Chinese language. First using the Chinese language for purposes of written communication, they gradually developed ways of writing Japanese with Chinese characters. Thus, since the introduction of writing into Japan in the third or fourth century of our era, Chinese has played a vital role in the linguistic economy of Japan. Together with the script many Chinese words were borrowed into Japanese, the net result being that almost half of the morpheme inventory of modern Japanese is of Chinese origin. This Sino-Japanese stratum of the Japanese language serves a function similar to that of the stratum of Greek and Latin based words in European languages (...)»\(^\text{67}\). A complication unmentioned by Bernal intervenes here,

\(^\text{66}\) So, e.g., J. E. Coleman, on p. 294 «there is a positive side to Bernal’s work, despite his many errors, the flaws in his methods, and the failure of his arguments to convince», and M. Liverani, on 421 «I take it as given that it is filled with too many logical and methodological inconsistencies, historical and philological mistakes, and documentary and bibliographical omissions to discuss here in detail». It should not be countered that «scholars belong to guilds held together by common opinions, attitudes, and methods. As a rule, innovation is welcome only when it is confined to surface details and does not modify the structure as a whole. For this reason, new interpretations of a problematic word or verse may be applauded by the very academicians who will stop at nothing to discredit a breakthrough destined to touch off a major reappraisal of the entire field», since such sociology of knowledge is typically brandished by interlopers (Gordon, *Forgotten Scripts. Their Ongoing Discovery and Decipherment* [‘Revised and Enlarged Edition’, New York, Basic Books, 1982], 35–6). I can almost predict Bernal’s apology: «there are always those who believe exactly what they want to believe, facts notwithstanding. It is a mistake to take obscurantists too seriously, no matter how learned they happen to be» (Gordon, 130, predicated of the refusal of Egyptologists to accept Champollion’s decipherment in the first decades after his death).


\(^\text{68}\) Historically-minded narrative in K. Heffernan, “The Gradual Rise of Bilingualism and the Use of Chinese as a Diglossic Language”, *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 16, 2007, 61–86 at 64: «the gradual rise of bilingualism and the use of Chinese as a diglossic language during the Nara and early Heian periods (ca. 700–1000) was a result of the massive borrowing of cultural, religious, and political knowledge from China. At the time, the Japanese did not
namely that «the actual relation between E(arly) M(iddle) C(hinese) and O(ld) J(apanese) is anything but direct, as Chinese came to Japan by way of the Korean peninsula» and was very likely based on a different stage, if not variety, of Chinese; and finally, EMC is itself a reconstruct, i.e. hypothetical (Frellesvig, 30-1). The production of dictionaries and lexicographical works have their own writing system and therefore used Chinese as the medium for the exchange of knowledge. The reduction in bilingualism during the Heian period was a consequence of the Japanese gradually adapting Chinese writing to their own language, leading to a variety of native writing styles. Furthermore, civil war in China and court struggles in Japan greatly impeded cultural exchange. The result was a long period in which the Japanese did not travel to China, with a few exceptional cases of Buddhist monks. The consequence of this was the gradual decline in the level of oral fluency of Chinese at the Japanese court although Chinese remained the prestige language. On the other hand, the use of Chinese to recite the Buddhist scriptures helped spread a ritualistic version of the Chinese language from the nobility to the general populace.


we are dependent upon for the oldest strata of Chinese began as early as the Han Dynasty and its achievement of unprecedented prosperity and stability without which neither education nor scriptural studies could really be expected to bloom. On the other hand, Early Middle Chinese rests on an unique source from the Sui Dynasty, Lu Fayan’s dictionary of Cut Rhymes (Qieyun: 切韵, 切韻), completed in 601 AD; the testimonial significance of this composition raises thorny problems even without broaching any of the comparative issues which bear on Old Japanese. Not only is EMC thus distant; a vital point to digest is that, during the centuries following the adoption of Chinese writing, the Japanese could choose one of three media for composing any text: Chinese proper (kanbun, jun kanbun: official pieces, religious and cultic texts, academic works); the Chinese syllabic transcription of Japanese (mostly poetry); and the Chinese encoding of Japanese. By ca. 900 AD, jun kanbun steadily declined; the trend was for people to use that third medium and write Chinese with more and more infiltrators from their indigenous grammar and vocabulary. This uncouth hentai kanbun, verbatim ‘variant Chinese-writing’ (kanbun covers all compositions couched [=bun] in characters with a surface appearance of Chinese [=kan, the Han Dynasty]), eventually yielded to wakan konkōtai, the Sino-Japanese mixed prose style. Hentai kanbun is best epitomized in the 940 AD gunki, or war narrative, Shōmonki (Chronicle of Masakado, per the Japanese title); read G. Stramigioli, “Preliminary Notes on Masakadoki and the Tairo no Masakado Story”, Monumenta Nipponica 28, 1973, 261-93 (264-6 on the style), and T. B. Hare, “Reading Kano no Chōmei”, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 49, 1989, 173-228 at 173-4 (Chōmei wrote in 1212 AD Hōjōki, a literary testament under the guise of a religious confession that is widely recognized as the first masterpiece of wakan konkōtai). So I invite the reader to decide whether the Japanese side of Bernal’s analogy qua a «saturat[ion]

72 Miyake, Old Japanese, 93-5, repackages older views and shows that the Middle Chinese of Qieyun is only an approximation of the language then in use. On the scriptural and linguistic culture as reflected in the progress of lexicography, a most convenient reference (it eschews all kinds of annotation) is H. Yong – J. Peng, Chinese Lexicography. A History from 1046 BC to AD 1911 (Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press, 2008); read, e.g., 15-43, for the origins, and 134-52, for some theoretical issues.

73 For practical illustrations of this state of affairs and the ways early Japanese writers modified Chinese — the best I can do here due to my plain man’s approach —, recourse will be had to J. R. Bentley, A Descriptive Grammar of Early Old Japanese (Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2001), 8-10; survey of various styles of hentai kanbun at 11-8. Cf. A. E. Gnanadesikan, The Writting Revolution. Cuneiform to the Internet (Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 113-115.

74 I confine to a note another issue which contributes to rob the Sino-Japanese analogy of its value: whereas Chinese can be encoded with relatively straightforward ease thanks to the Mandarin romanization, the transliteration of Japanese, particularly nouns common and proper, is so historically conditioned, riddled with patterns of multiple renderings for many signs, and partial to idiosyncrasies of pronunciation, as to discourage one of looking for ‘correct’ scriptural representations in the Latin script. See L. Butler, “Language Change and...
with elements from the older, more elaborate, continental civilization» at the
levels of writing and vocabulary encapsulates the core of the facts correctly,
if obviously far too briefly, or was meant from the start to deceive.

Let us now look at the, more familiar, adoption of the West Semitic
alphabet by the Greeks and their earliest use of the writing technology. The
first scriptors, in the early eighth or very late ninth century, never took over
the Phoenician language nor used it ‘for purposes of written communication’,
to borrow Coulmas’ expression; they created an alphabet out of the Phoenician
syllabary under conditions that still remain somewhat opaque, then put the
newly minted graphemes to use by writing down their own language⁷⁵,
possibly to preserve the Homeric poems owing to their monumentality (so
H. T. Wade-Gery, A. Snodgrass, Powell), or, and rather more probably, to
assist their memory in their day-to-day dealings (both Ruijgh⁷⁶ and Johnston
toyed with a purely commercial goal, either accountancy or ownership
marking, which draws help from the one-word, incomplete as to its case-

‘Proper’ Transliterations in Premodern Japanese”, *Japanese Language and Literature* 36, 2002, 27-44, who quips at 36 that ‘for those working in premodern Japanese languages, the challenges never seem to end’. To analogize the putative dynamic of Egyptian and West Semitic borrowings in Greek with the inflation of Chinese in Japanese is thus to explain *obscurum per obscurius*.


⁷⁶ “Sur la date de la création de l’alphabet grec”, *Mnemosyne* 51, 659-61. Il faut conclure que l’emploi de l’alphabet pour graver des inscriptions sur pierre et sur métal est secondaire: il appartient à une phase ultérieure de l’écriture alphabétique, où la connaissance de l’écriture se répandait de plus en plus et parvenait à d’autres groupes sociaux que ceux de la noblesse commercante» (p. 661; he supposes the Greek alphabet to have appeared very early, around 1000 B.C. in round numbers, cf. “D’Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique. Analyse dialecctologique du langage homérique, avec un excursus sur la création de l’alphabet grec”, in J. P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homerica Questions...* [Amsterdam, Gieben, 1995], 1-96 at 26-46). On the contrary, one of the key aspects of the problem is the nearly instantaneous spread of literary once the Phoenician alphabet was adapted.
ending, graffito at Osteria dell’Osa, a personal name dated to ca. 775, but otherwise is hard to reconcile with the fact that early inscriptions are all versified save this one, see S. Sherratt, “Visible Writing: Questions of Script and Identity in Early Iron Age Greece and Cyprus”, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 22, 2003, 225-42 at 230-4). Therefore the major difference boils down to the joint issues of typology and diglossia: whereas the Greeks needed not learn West Semitic to use its alphabet, since only the sounds matter in a syllabic (i.e. phonetic) writing system, so they never developed any bilingualism beyond a smattering of loanwords, the Japanese who faced the Chinese logographic system in which the language mostly comes from the writing needed to become bilingual, as we have just seen. If an analogy was to be sought for the linguistic economy of Old Japanese, Akkadian vis à vis Sumerian provides it. From the twenty-sixth century B.C. onwards, the Semitic speakers of Old Akkadian had lived alongside the Sumerians in Southern Babylonia; the former took up the cuneiform script devised for the language of the latter even though their own was enormously different\(^77\) and ended up with marked Sumerian influences on their phonology, syntax, and lexicon (but adjectives and verbs remained immune\(^78\)). What is more, speakers of Akkadian never stopped practicizing Sumerian, which stayed artificially alive as the vehicle of the higher culture\(^79\). Thus the semasiographic status of Old Japanese was, to all extent and purposes, that of Early to Late Middle Chinese as mediated through Korea, whereas the Greek vocal alphabet remained from the start radically discrepant from its West Semitic model —

\(^77\) Very little bibliographical guidance is necessary here, unless one wishes to reinvent the wheel; cf. R. Labat, Manuel d’épigraphie akkadienne (‘Revu et augmenté par F. Malbran-Labat’, Paris, Geuthner, 1988\(^6\) [1948]), 1-4, 6-15, and von Soden, Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik (‘3., ergänzte Auflage unter Mitarbeit von W. R. Mayer’, Rome, Pontifical Institute, 1995 [1952]), 7-11. In some cases, e.g. the seal inscriptions of the Old Akkadian kings, which are short and formulaic and make heavy use of logograms, it even proves difficult to determine whether the language of a particular piece is Sumerian or Akkadian (Kienast and Gelb, Die altakkadischen Königinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr. [Stuttgart, Steiner, 1990], 39-48). «Archaic cuneiform was not a tool for writing poetry or narrative. It was an administrative tool with extraordinary flexibility» (N. Veldhuis, in P. Michaelowski and idem (edd.), Approaches to Sumerian Literature. Studies in Honor of Stip (H. L. J. Vanstiphout) [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2006], 197).

\(^78\) Loanwords excepted, of course. So it cannot be assumed a priori that whatever is not markedly Semitic in Akkadian must be borrowed or derived from Sumerian: Kienast, Historische semitische Sprachwissenschaft (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2001), § 398, pp. 435-6; N. J. C. Kouwenberg, The Akkadian Verb and its Semitic Background (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2010), 159-60, 244.

as different indeed from Phoenician as this West Semitic syllabary was with respect to Middle Egyptian and its twenty-four unilaterals, or alphabetic signs\textsuperscript{80}. For Ugaritic and Phoenician-Punic have consonant phonemes, whereas Egyptian does not — actually it cannot have them due to the utter indifferentiation between the unilaterals and the bi- or trilaterals which they often reinforce\textsuperscript{81}, notwithstanding the claims of some (about the unilaterals, C. T. Hodge, “The Role of Egyptian Within Afroasiatic (/Liskah”), in Baldi (ed.), \textit{Linguistic Changes and Reconstruction Methodology} [Berlin-New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1990], 639-59 at 644-7, contends that «from the manner in which they are used, we may assume that each represents a different consonant phoneme. As they are presumed to come from words beginning with these consonants, they represent only those phonemes which occur initially», 644). Last but not least, whereas the West Semitic influences to which the Greeks owed their alphabet were, if not a one-time occurrence, at least a stream which soon dried up never to regain full momentum, there were no less than three successive waves of Sino-Japanese: \textit{go-on}, based on Early Middle Chinese, in the sixth century; \textit{kan-on}, modelled after Late Middle Chinese and adopted by the imperial court of Japan in the eighth century; finally \textit{tō-in}, \textit{tō-on}, or \textit{tō-sō-on}, the product of the spelling of words brought from China’s Wu region by Japanese Zen monks in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries\textsuperscript{82}. For the Chinese acculturation in Japan to operate as a valid analogy for the conjectural Egypto-Canaanite penetration in Greece, you thus need to demonstrate that the latter occurred on the \textit{longue durée}, otherwise both phenomena are far too dissimilar to be compared. Mere


possibilities do not suffice to make such a claim palatable; unfortunately, there is no evidence whatsoever to bear it out. The conclusion is inescapable: you must be either linguistically ignorant or unscrupulous to assert that the influence of Chinese on Japanese mirrors the impact of Egyptian and West Semitic on Greek. In my mind, Bernal is both.

Yet, far from withdrawing this analogy, *BA III* force-feeds it from the start to the unsuspecting reader: «over the last twenty years, the study of language contacts and mixture has become more fashionable. Approaches have varied but share various features. The most important commonality is the conviction that languages are not autonomous entities but social creations spoken by living populations. Therefore, linguistic contact is a reflection of social contact. A corollary is that, while similarity of language, such as that between English and German, may ease borrowings from one language to another, the social and cultural relations between the two groups of speakers form the determining factor. Thus, for instance, substantial cultural contact over many centuries has led to massive Chinese influence on the Japanese lexicon, even though the two languages are completely unrelated» (p. 14). The reason I see behind this grandstanding of Bernal's lies in the absence of refutation of the Sino-Japanese analogy in *Black Athena Revisited*, but for an incidental remark by Jasanoff-Nussbaum (p. 188). Now that it has been exposed for the fabrication it is, I hope that no one will blindly swallow such nonsense in the foreseeable future, nor deem Bernal vindicated when

---


84 Of the acknowledged Semitic and Egyptian borrowings in Greek (viz. those in E. Masson’s book now largely superseded by Rosól’s), they remark that «such words, several of which are already found in Mycenaean, suggest lively Greek-Phoenician commercial relations going back to the second millennium B.C.E. But unlike the Norman French loan words in English or the Chinese loan words in Japanese, these do not suggest the kind of prolonged, transformative cultural contacts that the Revised Ancient Model presupposes» (emphasis mine).

85 I shall stand my ground here. Legitimate irritation rises when one reads such declarations as «in their semantic range, the non-Indo-European elements in Greek resemble the French and Latin words in English, the Arabic in Swahili and the Chinese in Korean, Japanese and Vietnamese. These parallels would tend to go against the explanatory principle of a conquest of non-Indo-European speakers by Proto-Greeks» (p. 167), or «if, on the other hand, the Revised Ancient Model is applied, Greek fits neatly into the larger group including English, Swahili,
he rehearses it to maintain his aberrant phonetics. This happens in *BA III*, 246-7 (= *Black Athena Writes Back*, p. 115): «in their critique of my work, Jasanoff and Nussbaum found my proposal that *ntr* was “given five different phonetic treatments in Greek” to be absurd and outrageous. Parallels from varying manifestations of Chinese loans into Japanese or Romance loans into English, however, make the number in itself unexceptionable. (...) See the character for ‘lark’ or ‘pipit’ pronounced *liu* in modern Chinese. It has eight different *on* (Chinese) readings in Japanese; *ryū<, ru, bō, hyū, mu, kyu, gu*, and *ryō*. Thus, unlike Jasanoff and Nussbaum, I have no difficulty in believing that the Egyptian *nṯr*, which is more complicated phonetically than the prototype of *liu*, could have had “five distinct phonetic treatments”86. The moral is obvious. As an academic outsider, you must take steps to keep in check the intellectual habits of your former speciality lest they mislead you into familiar yet not necessarily warranted territory. The Sinologist Bernal was unconcerned about having a one-track mind even in the midst of his Panafarian inquiries, or, rather, he did not suspect that he had one; as a consequence, *Black Athena* wrings subtleties out of the languages and civilizations it is supposed to compare only by gross insensitivity to their characteristics, treating them as it would the East Asian ones87.

In his memoir, Bernal states: «I continue to put my faith in schizophrenia — that younger scholars in these disciplines will simultaneously hold the two models, Aryan and Revised Ancient, and that sooner or later the better one will emerge» (*Geography of a Life*, 447). This implies that both paradigms

---

86 A Japanese character is susceptible of having several, in some cases: multitudinous, Sino-Japanese readings (they are authoritative compiled in the Morohashi dictionary), but this does not vindicate Bernal in the least. Such a phenomenon is normal in the case of a *logographic* writing system, and a complex one at that (compare the polysemy of Sumerian words used as logograms in Akkadian); it does not apply to Egyptian, which, though not (really) logosyllabic, is *logophonetic*, and makes no sense whatsoever for the firmly *syllabic* Greek. Egyptian loanwords in Greek are thus perfectly incapable of the diversity of phonetic treatment seen in Sino-Japanese.

87 To this insensitivity he adds a tactical sense of the battles he can wage and those he had best avoid — a sure proof of his cynical approach to the evidence. As he prefers to focus on divine names, toponyms, or flashy words, Bernal eschews the true enigmas of the Greek lexicon (*ἀγαθός, ἄλσος, ἀλω(ι)ή, ἀμνίον, ζωρός, λάας, λαῖτμα, πέτρα, ταναός, ὑάκινθος...); nor does he etymologize the highly emblematic *Νεῖλος*, though the Egyptian *nṯw-hsw(t)*, ‘the river mouth(s)’ (Goedicke, “*Νεῖλος*: An Etymology”, *American Journal of Philology* 100, 1979, 69-72 at 71-2), and an intriguing Berber etymon (*Aristarchus antibarbarus*, 35 note 80), were at hand (a further problem being the alternate name for the Nile, *Tríōn*, which Hermippos of Smyrna, fr. 90 Bollansée, tells us is the original one: commentary in *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker Continued*, IV A.3 [Leiden-Boston-Köln, Brill, 1999], 589-90).
stand on equally strong foundations. Yet, far from proving that the gist of the preceding tomes was correct, pending the day when some of Bernal's main conclusions would enter the mainstream, his linguistic case, completed at last, demonstrates that the whole series comes from an amateur scholar of the ancient worlds who was not well-placed to lecture Indo-Europeans, Hellenists, and historians about their supposed contempt for Africa. (If contempt there is, it must be put at Bernal's door, for always discarding the well-known partiality of the Greek language to loanwords and semantic calques from Mesopotamia or Anatolia). Contacts between Egypt and parts of the Hellenic mainland — Crete was rather more advanced in the Late Bronze Age due to its exposition to Syro-Phoenicia, Cyprus too because of its copper — indeed happened as early as Mycenaean times, but they seldom, if ever, were so intensive as to provoke the kind of cultural transfers Bernal needs for his model to work. The ceramologist Van Wijngaarden even cautions that, since, «at most sites, the Mycenaean pottery appears to derive from multiple sources in the Aegean (...), it therefore remains questionable


89 Suffice it to mention N. C. Stampolidis - A. Kotsenas, “Phoenicians in Crete”, apud Deger-Jalkotzy and Lemos, Ancient Greece, 337-60 at 340-9, who put flesh on J. Whitley, The Archaeology of Ancient Greece (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001), 102-24, notably 120-1, and A. B. Knapp, Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus. Identity, Insularity, and Connectivity (Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press, 2008), 307-41, mostly 311-3, 317-8, 325-7; on the types and distribution of artefacts in the Mediterranean, G. J. van Wijngaarden, Use and Appreciation of Mycenaean Pottery in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy (ca. 1600-1200 BC) (Amsterdam, University Press, 2002), 13-22, is foundational. Bernal sometimes pays heed to such geography of the archaic trade, but only to misconstrue it as a map of linguistic penetration, a step which ought not to be taken lightly and is certainly supported by nothing cited in BA III (pp. 122, 236, 283 sqq. [Crete], 526-7 [Cyprus]).
whether exclusive connections between overseas places and particular regions in Mycenaean Greece were common practice» (p. 13). These contacts\textsuperscript{90} never left the lexicographical traces in the Greek language that Bernal has obsessed about for decades. As there are more cogent ways than his of dealing with the proportion of words destitute of a reasonably sound Indo-European descent, his experiment is moot. The amount of such unexplained lexemes complicates the task of present-day etymologists of Greek despite their cutting-edge models of Proto-Indo-European which leave Pokorny far behind. Some of the most senior among those experts accordingly theorize a Pre-Greek stratum of non-PIE stamp. This attempt to refine on the ‘Asianic’ or ‘Mediterranean’ substrates (e.g., Baldi, \textit{The Foundations of Latin} [Berlin-New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1999, 2002\textsuperscript{2}], 100, 100-1 note 2) one may reasonably be leery of, as this theory does not appear to have progressed that much since E. J. Furnée adumbrated it after an hecatomb of the extant views up to the middle of the sixties (\textit{Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen. Mit einem Appendix über den Vokalismus} [The Hague, Mouton, 1972], 29-98)\textsuperscript{91}. Even today, considerable sweeps of the phonetic system of this Aegean Pre-Greek keep eluding us, including the number of vowels (were they three or five?), so probably the least adventurous conclusion would be that it should serve mainly as a starting point in piecemeal reconstructions, leaving aside, for the time being, the broader aspects (this minimalism informs D. Testen, “Iranian and Anatolian Cognates to Greek \((k)súν\)”, \textit{Journal of the American Oriental Society} 131, 2011, 287-93 at 288 top). Anyway, no matter the stand one takes with respect to Pre-Greek, the proportion of the Greek lexicon we cannot elucidate through Proto-Indo-European and borrowings, \textit{Wanderwörte}, or \textit{Lehnwörte}, is not quite troublesome enough to convince classicists to push the clock back to preparadigmatic times and behave à la Bochart under the pretence of catering to the new, global agenda. Though it found no acceptance


\textsuperscript{91} Its heart (pp. 101-331, plus the three appendices) functions as a dictionary, with data so raw and detached from their context (temporal and geographical distribution is disregarded) as to be open to any manipulation; it hardly throws light on what it purports to map out, viz. the consonantal alternations. «Wir wollen das nicht fortsetzen; zweifellos wird mit ähnlichen Einwänden ein Teil von F.'s Material eliminiert oder bestritten werden» (G. Neumann, \textit{Gnomon} 46, 1974, 433-7 at 437; so too Beekes, I, XIV-XV).
and slipped out of memory so completely that, for once, Bernal incurs no blame for ignoring it, the attempt by W. Merlingen to explain much of the unetymologized lexicon of Greek by borrowings from a new Indo-European language, which he termed Psigriechisch\(^2\), would suffice, anyway, to show that counsels of despair are uncalled for.

Bernal’s demonstration can in no way soar higher in persuasiveness than these foundations. Unable of rising up to the standards he was dared by his critics to observe, he identifies them with scholarly blinkers, so we have to put up with a shameless double standard: since the tree model is dead — long live the nongenetic contacts and areal shifts! —, mainstream linguists are ordered to prove everything they claim that concerns Indo-European and are vilified whenever they do not, whereas Bernal merely points the way to the possibility that any given snippet of Egyptian entered Greek. For the cross-linguistic elucidation of lexicographical cruces an alert and nimble mind is necessary, but so too is sobriety of reasoning. Bernal dresses up his fancy\(^3\) as the cutting edge of sociolinguistics, counting for proof on the sheer mass of his etymologies.

Most of them are merely ludicrous; they appear to be marginal jottings in Faulkner clumsily amplified regardless of all standards of logic and common sense. Ἀπόλλων < ḫprr comes at the end of an amazing chain of fake deductions: «Apollo as the youthful divinity of the sun» resembles Horus\(^4\);
the Egyptians linked him with the sun; there are titles ‘Horus of the sun / horizon’ that equate to ḫprr; as Απόλλων and ḫprr have both «a double liquid», they balance one another, but for the troublesome change /h/ > /a/; just suppose, then, a Ptolemaic intermediate for this borrowing, which must have been late enough for the merging of the glottal and pharyngeal fricatives to be in full swing (BA III, 462). Who was this providential Canaanite deity that equates to the Egyptian Kheper (for we possess fairly precise notions of how ḫprr must have sounded)? Of the same ilk is ἄτομος < ītm, Atum. It compels one to postulate that those Presocratics who use

very well-known name for Seth. (...) Even the word itself is borrowed from a foreign language, so accentuating the foreign nature of its bearer» H. te Velde, Seth, God of Confusion. A Study of his Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion [‘Reprint with some corrections’, Leiden, Brill, 1977 (1967)], 149).

95 As witnessed by the transcriptions of Hebraic names in the Septuagint and of Demotic names in Greek, the Semitic /ḥ/ became χ, while /h/ was turned into a vowel (Steiner, ‘Dating...’, 233-4): e.g. ītˤmr > Χαρράν vs. ʾĕśāk. So the Semitic distinction between the two fricatives was felt by some speakers of Greek until at least the second or the first century B.C. Bernal’s «the problem is that /h/ was very seldom transcribed into Greek as /ø/» makes the whole point opaque (even if one flips back to p. 738 bottom).


97 From the verb ḫprr and comparing, e.g., ḫyːr, Khor / Khar (Syria). From ‘scarab, beetle’, ḫprr (Hannig, I, 940, II.2, 1870-1) came to mean Kheper / -pri, ‘Scarab god (qua symbol of the sun’), rejuvenated form of the sun-god at dawn: J. Assmann, in Lexikon der Ägyptologie, I, coll. 934-940; Allen, Genesis in Egypt. The Philosophy of Ancient Egyptian Creation Accounts (New Haven, Yale Egyptological Seminar, 1988), 10-1; O. Keel, Corpus der Stempel-siegel-ammulette aus Palästina / Israel. Katalog (Freiburg / Göttingen, Universitätsverlag / Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 1997), I, 779-81; M. Minas-Nerpel, Der Gott Chepri. Untersuchungen zu Schriftzeuggnissen und ikonographischen Quellen vom Alten Reich bis in griechisch-romische Zeit (Leuven, Peeters, 2006), 463-77, cf. 148-9, 366, 376, 382, for his title ‘Lord of the sky’. Bernal should have told us how Kheper / -pri could sound like Απόλλων... ἄτομος is lost sight of in BA III. The mere suggestion that ἄτομος should be set aside from τάμνων (Attic τέμνειν; τάμνων < *tāmnēn, Ruijgh, “Dama / duma δάμαρ / δύμαρ et l’abréviation DA, notamment en PY En 609,1”, in P. H. Ilievski – L. Crepajac (edd.),
ἄτομος (cf. W. Kranz, *Wortindex*, in Diels and Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, III [‘12., unveränderte Auflage’, Dublin-Zürich, Weidmann, 1967], 82) knew about the theology of Atum in a more or less pure form or else would have been unable to take his Hellenized name as a byword for what is materially primary. A gratuitous theory, this ignores the fact that Middle and New Kingdom sources are uncomfortable with what represents Atum’s main claim to the quality of a cosmogonic god, viz. the creation of the primary divine couple Shu and Tefnut through his self-pleasuring, to such an extent that they have them born instead from the mouth or the heart of Ptah; which puts the final touch to the effacement of Atum that began as early as the jibes of Coffin Texts, I 75 §§ 354c-356 (contra, e.g., II 77 § 18, II 80 § 31; at an earlier stage preference was given to a creation by the heart and spoken word of the god: H. Willems, *The Coffin of Hegata* [Leuven, Peeters, 1996], 304–8, after L. Kákosy, “A Memphite Triad”, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 66, 1980, 48–53 at 52–3). Neither Democritus’ Egyptian trip nor the claim that «the cult of Atum, though often fused with that of Re, retained its independence in the Late and Ptolemaic periods» (Black Athena Writes Back, 391) suffice to overcome those strictures.99 Other Graeco-Egyptian propositions of Bernal’s exhibit a less gratuitous semantic match, yet remain very much on the wild side, such as σοφία, σοφός < sb3100, ‘to teach, educate, make wiser’, as a substantive ‘pupil’ (pp. 262–3), or φιλία, φίλος101 < mri,


101 In typical fashion, he cannot explain the verb φιλέιν and suppresses the width of meaning of φιλός in early and classical poetry. Progress since H. Fränkel (*Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentum* [München, Beck, 1962], 92 = Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy [Oxford, Blackwell, 1975], 83) has been immaterial: the standard studies take the attributive value as primary (M. Landfester, *Das griechische Nomen ‘Philos’ und seine Ableitungen* [Hildesheim, Olms, 1966], 5–92, e.g. 72 «φιλός, Freund’ ist ein emphatisch gebrauchtes substantiviertes Possessivpronomen»; Beekes, II, 1574) before guest-friendship pushed the word towards the affective side of the scale, or have (ritualized) friendship for the earliest sense (H. T. Kakridis, *La notion de l’amitié et de l’hospitalité chez Homère* [Thessaloniki, s.ed., 1963], 5–10, 86–108; Benveniste, *Vocabulaire*, I, 335–53; D. B. Robinson, “Homeric φιλός: Love of Life and Limbs, Friendship with One’s θημός”, in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens. Essays*...
'to love, like, appreciate’, ‘to want, wish, desire'\textsuperscript{102} (p. 206), cf. Lefkowitz, \textit{History Lesson. A Race Odyssey} (New Haven–London, Yale University Press, 2008), 182-3, on the necessity of rejecting these interferences — not least because of the unlikelihood of an absence of native Greek bywords for such fundamental notions.

Finally, several etymologies showcase Bernal’s manipulations at their worst. He has not retracted his impossible Θῆβαι < ḏbt < ḏbt despite the easily increased strictures of Jasanoff-Nussbaum (see Aristarchus antibarbarus, 196-7) and keeps the pot boiling by putting forward a fresh suggestion in which extravagance coupled with ignorance reaches new heights, namely σῖτος < swt (ibid., pp. 200-5). Nonetheless, the fittest sample remains his emblematic treatment of Athena, for nowhere else in his four tomes are the defects of his methods; the limits of his learning; his lack of phonetic and philological rigor; and his absence of scruple more on display. He has successively derived Ἀθηνᾶ from Ἡ[w]t nt (BA I, 51-2) and Ἡ-t-nt[r] {nt} Nt (BA III, 581), ‘temple of Neith’, the religious name of the city of Sais. Apart from the subtle differences between ḥwt and pr which were kept out of the debate; the fact that ḥwt-nt[r] designates «the cult-centre (ḥwt) of a god as opposed to the cult-centre of a deified king» (P. Spencer, \textit{The Egyptian Temple. A Lexicographical Study} [London, Kegan, 1984], 42-55 at 55, cf. Hannig, I, 784-5, II.2, 1632-5 — 1634 sqq. for the diverse gods involved); and a fundamental mistake in the revamped etymon which I cannot allow to remain unexposed\textsuperscript{103}, nobody could ever swallow this etymology but

\textsuperscript{102} Cf. Jones, \textit{Index}, 436-46 n°1607 to 1670. Its range increased with time: Lesko-Switalski Lesko\textsuperscript{\textdegree}, I, 192 (‘to love, to desire, to want, to cherish, to prefer, to covet’); F. Junge, \textit{Late Egyptian Grammar. An Introduction} (Oxford, Griffith Institute, 2005), 335 (‘to love, cherish, adore, covet, demand someone or something; to wish or want something; to wish, want, desire something for one’s self (with preposition n and reflexive pronouns); desire, choose’). Now compare mrw.t in the Old and Middle Kingdoms (Mathieu, \textit{La poésie amoureuse de l’Égypte ancienne. Recherches sur un genre littéraire au Nouvel Empire} [Cairo, IFAO, 1996], §§ 54-5, pp. 170-1): «(...) la mrw.t, à l’Ancien et au Moyen Empire, obéissait à des règles de circulation très précises: c’est invariablement le supérieur qui ‘aime’ l’inférieur, c’est à dire qui provoque un sentiment d’amour, la relation réciproque s’exprimant par le verbe ḏw3, adorer. Il faut attendre le Nouvel Empire pour rencontrer des exemples d’inversion du processus. (...) Le verbe mrj se rapproche dès lors de notre verbe aimer» (§ 55). Bernal should have drawn a semantic line between the New Kingdom and the earlier periods.

\textsuperscript{103} Despite BA III, 581 top, ḫ(w)nt[nr] nt/Nt does not mean ‘house/temple of Neith’, but merely
Rendsburg ("An Etymological Response", 72-3). «If $hwt$ $nt$ is the source of $\text{Athênai}$, one final -$t$ remained while the other was lost. I would explain this case by postulating the borrowing during a period in the history of the Egyptian language when final -$t$ was lost in absolute forms ($nt$) but was still retained in construct forms ($hwt$) (Gardiner 1957.34 n.1a)» (p. 73), that is, any time after 2000 B.C. Not only is the chronological range thus produced very broad; this idea of Rendsburg’s has been exploded\(^\text{104}\) and he uses swagger rather than caution\(^\text{105}\). His semantic support is no firmer\(^\text{106}\): the

\(^\text{104}\) Egberts, “Consonants in Collision: Neith and Athena Reconsidered”, reprinted in Black Athena Comes of Age, 149-63 at 155-9. Working on a statistical basis, he collected all known cases of the Coptic and Greek transcriptions of feminine composites in $ht$; in 11 cases, \(t\) left no trace in the adapted forms, so must have been elided in the Egyptian pronunciation before it came to be adapted; in the three remaining ones, Greek and Coptic retained it ($Ht$-$hry$-$ib$ > $\text{στρέφω}$, $\text{σωφρός}$ / $\text{σωφρού}$ > $\text{Ἀθηνᾶς}$; $Ht$-$hr$ > $\text{κλωσσίς}$, $\text{κλωσσός}$ > $\text{ἈΘῆρ}; Nbt$-$ht$ > $\text{νεβόος}$ > $\text{Νέφθυς}$). Egberts thus asserted that the dental in such composite words was dropped unless it came to be adapted; in the three remaining ones, Greek and Coptic retained it ($w$t-$n$-$r$-$nt$ $Nt$ > $\text{ⲁⲧⲣⲏⲡⲉ}$). Rendsburg thus asserted that the dental in such composite words was dropped unless a laryngeal spirant follows, which forbids the $Ht$ in $Ht$-$nt$ from sounding /at/ after 2000 B.C.: since the $n$ in $nt$ is a nasal dental, $Ht$ in $Ht$-$nt$ was merely /$a$/ to the ears of the Greeks, and they had no reason whatever to turn it into the $\ddth$- of $\text{Athēnā}$. Bernal negates this carefully-crafted scheme; after an amount of special pleading, he has the gall to reduce $Ht$-$hry$-$ib$, $Ht$-$hr$, and $Nbt$-$ht$ to the first-cited item, then to call this case-in-point merely a ‘complication’ (BA III, 580), instead of the lethal objection it embodies. For a breezy rejoinder, cf. Black Athena Comes of Age, 165-71 at 169 sqq.: instead of meeting this careful phonology, Bernal accuses Egberts of being an old-style Neo-Grammarians (168, 170: a familiar tune!). As we call it in French, c’est noyer le poisson.

\(^\text{105}\) The quality of this article perpetuates his master Gordon’s standards (note 121), which can be lax (notes 144, 149-50, 184, 185). How will he explain the Masoretic text $\text{סנֶֽהְו}$ at Genesis 41:45 in the vicinity of $\text{סנֶֽהְו}$ (< $\text{sn}$-$n$-$t$., ‘she belongs to Neith’; $\text{אֶשֶנַּו}$$\text{יְthose}$) and $\text{סנֶֽהְו}$ ($\text{p3$-$d$-$p3$}$-$r$., ‘he who was given by $\text{Ra}$: $\text{Πεπαφρά}$, Potipher)? The sense is likely to be ‘the god has decreed: he will live’, but whether it should be attained by *$gd$-$p3$-$n$-$r$-$iw$-$f$-$w$-$nh$ (lastly Loprieno in J. Tait (ed.), ‘Never Had the Like Occurred’, Egypt’s View of its Past [London, UCL, 2003], 154) or by *$gd$-$iw$-$f$-$w$-$nh$ (J. Lanckau, Der Herr der Träume. Eine Studie zur Funktion des Traumes in der Josefsgeschichte der Hebräischen Bibel [Zürich, Kösel, 2006], 272) is unsettled. Unfortunately, the pattern of this name might be doubted (Schulman, “On the Egyptian Name of Joseph: A New Approach”, Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur 2, 1975, 235-43 at 239-41) and $\text{Φοινικώμας}$ of the LXX points to *$p3$-$sn$-$d$-$m$-$ib$-$w$-$n$-$3$, ‘der das Herz mit Leben angenehm macht’.

\(^\text{106}\) Egberts, 154 «since there is at least one example in Greek mythology of a personage who owes his name to a town in the Nile delta, viz. king Busiris of Egypt, Bernal’s explanation (…need not be impeded by semantic considerations) vs. Jasonoff-Nussbaum, 194 ‘temple of Neïth’ is no more likely, a priori, than ‘olive grove’, ‘rocky crag’, or countless other possible
putative ḥ{w}t nt > Αθηναίη would mirror the deities Hathor (Ḥ{w}t-ḥr) = hwt hr, ‘house (temple) of Horus’ (e.g. Hannig, I, 1600, II.2, 3106-10), and Bethel = bêt ‘el, לֵכּית, ‘house of god / of El’, parallels to which it will be objected that they are merely unilingual. Furthermore, what of the epigraphic hesitation Bethel (בֵית) versus Baytel (בֵיתא) and of the underlying theology? Even Van Binsbergen was sharply critical (“Dans le troisième millénaire avec Black Athena”, in Fauvelle-Aymar, 127-50 at 144; Black Athena Comes of Age, 53-5). Rightly so: it must be said that ḥ{w}t nt is phonetically possible but breaks down on its lack of explanation for Athena’s middle η/ᾱ (Jasanoff-Nussbaum, 194 top, 204 note 16; despite BA III, 694 note 273, Egberts missed this point), whilst the evolution Ḥt-nr nt Nt > *Αθανατία > Αθηναίη Bernal fashioned to evade this stricture collapses under its own weight. The ‘earliest form’ (BA III, 582) Αθανατία actually appears in dialects which contributed nothing to the Homeric language (Aristarchus antibarbarus, 8, adding W. Blümel, Die aiolischen Dialekte [Göttingen, Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 1982], § 27, p. 35, and L. Dubois, Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile [Rome, École Française, 1989], n°=51.2, 78.4-5, 141, pp. 60, 75, 162); as such, the epichoric Αθηνατία is well nigh unlikely to have produced Αθηναίη (which Bernal seizes since the epicizing Herodotus uses it when he speaks of Sais and Neith: II 28, cf. the commentary of Lloyd [Leiden-New York–Köln, Brill, 1994²], 111) in the Iliad and the Odyssey. Ḥt-nr nt Nt equally and foremost depends on Αθηνατία being an archaism preserved in the Kunstsprache: this, although possible, is far from obvious (Aristarchus antibarbarus, 8-9), therefore cries for demonstration instead of assertion («Homer, whose language was sometimes more archaic than that written in Linear B, uses Αθηνατίη», but it rather appears to be a secondary glosses». Egberts jumps to conclusions; Busiris is comparatively recent, unlike Atana, and I deem it unsound to adduce such a peripheral, unimportant figure to support the notion that the name of a panhellenic goddess of Athena’s importance could have come from an Egyptian city.


108 Bethel / Baytel is an evolution of the more archaic El (G. Athas, The Tel Dan Inscription. A Reappraisal and a New Interpretation [Sheffield, Academic Press, 2003], 210-1, 309-10) with an intermediate hypostasis El-Baytel, אל־בּיתא, ‘the Bethel-stone’, EF (314-5, with Beekes, 1, 193, for the obviously borrowed בַּאֲתֶלוֹס); such betyls, maṣṣēbôt (cf. E. C. LaRocco-Pitts, Of Wood and Stone. The Significance of Israelite Cultic Items in the Bible and its Early Interpreters [Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2001], 205-28; etc), would seem to have stood at city gates to witness legal proceedings qua symbols of El (Athas, 310 sqq.).
derivative of Ἀθήνη, as suggested by its absence in Mycenaean: F. Graf, in J. Latacz (ed.), Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar, Prolegomena ['3., durchgesehenen Auflage', Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2009], 119). A third hindrance weakens Bernal’s case: he behaves as if the long form Ἀθηναίη were a variant of the short one, but neither this nor an adjectival ‘of Athena, Athenaic’ makes much sense, even in the sporadic tag Παλλᾶς Ἀθηναίη (unless rendered ‘Athenian maid’, which is not warranted by the Greek). So N. Wachter reminds us of the old notion that it must be the name of the city\(^{109}\) (Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions [Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press, 2001], 263 § 247) — a difficult solution in several respects\(^{110}\), it explains in a pellucid way lines like Iliad 6.300, τὴν γὰρ Τρῶες ἐθηκαν Ἀθηναίης ἱέρειαν, «she whom the Trojans had established to be priestess of the Athenian (goddess)»\(^{111}\).

All that remains of the several Egyptian etymologies of Ἀθηνᾶ ~ Ἀθηναίη which epitomize Black Athena are the similarities between Athena and Neith, adding J. Quaegebeur, W. Clarysse, and B. Van Maele, “Athêna, Nêith and Thoêris in Greek Documents”, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 60, 1985, 217-32 at 218-22, plus M. Malaise, Pour une terminologie et une analyse des cultes isiaques (Brussels, Académie Royale de Belgique, 2005),


\(^{110}\) So soon as the seventh century, Ἀθαναία was already felt to be the name of Athena in an inscription on the Judgement of Paris (= Wachter, 31, PCO 2; between 670 and 630), cf., a century later, Ἀθηναίη on a scene illustrating the myth of Geryon (M. Robertson, "Geryoneis: Stesichorus and the Vase-Painters", Classical Quarterly 19, 1969, 207-21 at 208-9). If only we could tell which, of the goddess or the city, came first... For Wachter’s arguments are quite weak: «it seems natural that the Athenians should claim the goddess as theirs. And it is most interesting that other Ionians, including those who must have emigrated to the East around 1000 BC, behaved as if they were Athenians in this respect. As for the Dorian (and Rhodian?) Ἀθαναία, we should perhaps consider it a Pre-Doric form (like Πολυόδωνι (…))» (this looks as arbitrary as Pre-Greek: Beekes, I, 29). Finally, there is the spurious yet intriguing divide Ἀθηναίαι versus ἀσταί, ἀττικαί (Slater, Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta [Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1986], fr. 3, pp. 6-8).

\(^{111}\) This verse so much escaped, or bored, exegesis that not one commentary, whether for schoolboys or seasoned scholars, in the past two centuries, included a note on it (I checked Bothe, Dugas-Montbel, Dübner, Faesi, Doederlein, Ameis-Hentze(-Cauer), La Roche, Pierron, Leaf, Monro, Van Leeuwen, and Kirk; Heyne maior has an irrelevant one in his fourth volume). So only Stoevesandt, Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar, VI.2 (Berlin–New York, De Gruyter, 2008), 104, explains Ἀθηναίης ἱέρειαν, but far too briefly and in keeping with the translation in the fascicle of text: ‘als Priesterin Athenes: zum Athene-Kult in Troia s. 86-101n.’, viz. p. 38. I cite the version by G. Nagy, Homer the Preclassic (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, University of California Press, 2010), 269, in the wake of his discovery of a ‘split reference’ here: the poet has in his mind Troy and the historical Athens at the same time (p. 270).
121-2. One cardinal parallel, the symmetry between Athena’s owl and Neith’s vulture, has been overplayed by Bernal (on 214, 554, 564, 578), judging from the respective importance of her beasts in El-Sayed, *La déesse Neith de Saïs* (Cairo, IFAO, 1982), II *Documentation*. The chapter devoted to her theriomorphic depictions in the first tome *Importance et rayonnement de son culte* tells the same tale: Neith appears mainly as a cow, qua one of the personifications of the celestial mother; then as the crocodile of Sobek, her son (on this filiation, read El-Sayed, I, 101-6); thirdly as the *lates niloticus*, the Nile perch (see of late R.-A. Jean - A.-M. Loyrette, *La mère, l’enfant et le lait en Égypte ancienne* [Paris, L’Harmattan, 2010], 117-9); her vulture persona is at best scarce. A better scholar would have cited the posthumous suggestion of P. E. Newberry that there was a Owl-City in Pre-Dynastic times to be identified with Sais (“The Owls in Ancient Egypt”, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 37, 1951, 72-4 at 73-4; those insights were never bourne out). On the whole, the connection of Athena with Neith remains what it is for Egyptologists and most scholars of Greek religion: a popularizing equation meant to smooth out the dealings of Egyptian natives and Greek traders or tourists in the seventh and sixth centuries. This view is not shaken by Solon’s Egyptian trip according to both Plato (an indirect, unreliable witness: G. Griffiths, “Atlantis and Egypt”, *Historia* 34, 1985, 3-28; *infra*, note 158) and Herodotus (whose testimony looks rather shaky: M. Noussia-Fantuzzi, *Solon the Athenian, the Poetic Fragments* [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2010], 297-300); it receives some measure of confirmation from the Hellenistic astrological evidence related to the traditional Egyptian group of the decans (J. F. Quack, “Les Mages Égyptianisés? Remarks on Some Surprising Points in Supposedly Magusan Texts”, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 65, 2006, 267-82 at 277). The connection of Neith with Athena is accordingly best left unmentioned (as in the standard compendia of Greek religion — by Wilamowitz, Nilsson, Burkert — and in the Neith entries in both H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte* ['3., unveränderte Auflage', Berlin, de Gruyter, 1999 (1952)], 512-7, and D. B. Redford (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt* [Oxford, 1998], 119-20).


113 P. W. Haider, “Der Neith-Mythos und seine Historisierung bei Herodot”, in C. Ulf and Rollinger (edd.), *Geschlechter - Frauen - Fremde Ethnien. In antiker Ethnographie, Theorie und Realität* (Innsbruck-Vienna-München-Bozen, Studien, 2002), 58-78, draws a vivid picture of the goddess in Late Egypt as Herodotus must have come to know about her; it ill-accords with Bernal.
2001], II, 516) or explained differently («Ähnlichkeiten der Wesensmerkmale und der Funktionen führen in der Spätzeit zu einer Verschmelzung mit der griech. Göttin Athene» contends R. Schlichting in the Lexikon der Ägyptologie, IV [Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1982], coll. 392-4 at 392). As regards a borrowing of Ḥt-nṯr nt Nṯ into Ἀθηναίη, the obvious conclusion is that it can safely be ruled out as fundamentally misguided from an historical point of view; for someone has to pay the price of working out a purely formal design, compare J. P. Fokkelman, Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel, I King David (II Sam 9-20 & I Kings 1-2)(Assen, Van Gorcum, 1981), 422-7. — To etymologize the name of a god is a risky venture even when enough evidence survives to sketch his profile (L. Feliu, The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2003], 278-9); Bernal’s analyses of Athena are so unaware of the pitfalls and exacting standards of the game that they dub as a worthy symbol of the arbitrariness of the method behind his series. By reckoning on his principles, howbeit with a display of confidence and skin-deep scholarship well calculated to bluff the unwary, viz. the ‘lay jury’ to which he has chosen to defer (Slack, 6-8), anything could indeed be derived from anything else.


115 Formula: take an unexplained puzzle in the Greek lexicon, preferably an early, absolute hapax on which not much scholarly literature exists — Hipponax, fr. 148 Degani ἀδόνης-μάστιξ παρ’ Ἰππώνακτι = Hesychius α 97, fits the bill, being either borrowed or Pre-Greek (Beekes, I, 4) — and try looking for a Semitic word, or, better, a bunch of words, showcasing a comparable / similar pattern of consonants; their semantism must somehow be made to tally with (one of) the meaning(s) of your unicum. Ἄβδης, ‘scourge’ (‘nom du fouet’ Chantraine, rather than merely ‘whip’ Bernal, 419, under λάμβδα), might be predicated of pests, which were a scourge in classical Athens (M. Davies - J. Kathirithamby, Greek Insects [London, Duckworth, 1986], 13); now Akkadian has a lone hapax dabdabum qua the gloss of Sumerian ur-me to denote a crawling insect. So Å. W. Sjöberg, “UET 7 n° 93. A Lexical Text or a Commentary?”, Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 86, 1996, 220-37 at 228 obverse 39, citing an impressive array of Arabic comparanda: dabba, ‘to walk slowly’, ‘to creep’ (of insects, ants, scorpions, or beasts); dabdab, ‘the walk of a long-legged ant’; dabbbab, ‘crawling, quadruped’; dabib, ‘creeping, reptile’, and dabbät, ‘reptile’, plus an Amorite proper name de-eb-de-bu-um. The meaning of the Semitic √DBB, ‘to walk slowly’, is beyond doubt (Smith-Pitard, 422), and Arabic lexicography corroborates this evidence (Wehr, 375 = Wehr-Colwan, 269-70; S. Tlili, “The Meaning of the Qur’anic Word ‘dābbā’: ‘Animals’ or ‘Nonhuman Animals’?”, Journal of Qur’anic Studies 12, 2010, 167-87 at 167-73, with the caveat that this participle is all-encompassing, from animals, its most usual gloss, to human beings and even angels [Tlili,
It will not be denied now that the work was worth doing and has been done badly.\(^{116}\) Why could the project only be expected to go badly astray? Partly because the Chinese scholar Bernal was in no way the right man for a task that would have required, to be competently and impartially discharged, a team of specialists in the various Near Eastern languages concerned working under the supervision of a senior linguist at home in the entire civilization and history of Greece (someone like F. R. Adrados), partly due to the very danger of misusing bits and pieces of all those languages in an uncritical attitude towards the rules of evidence, to which such an imaginative inquest as the exploration of the West Semitic influences over Greece was inevitably exposed every step of the way. In a nutshell, goals too lofty were aimed at, in conformity with the highly inflated opinion Bernal has of his own capacities; the result is that a modest but serviceable achievement has been

\(^{116}\) One needs not be microscopically minded to acknowledge that, as research consists of the setting up of hypotheses to which evidential rigor was applied, any book whose main theses strain credibility and which is demonstrated to twist the data systematically through ignorance or prejudice (or both), can only be condemned, and its author held accountable for bad method and inadequate scholarship. «Base your assertions on evidence, not on bias or wishful thinking», wrote R. L. Pounder apropos of \textit{BA II}; «in reexamining the past, we must not cast aside the real for the likely, the known for the hoped-for» (\textit{American Historical Review} 97, 1992, 464). In the case of \textit{BA III}, so little remains once all that is erroneous, arbitrary, and simply irrelevant has been discarded that one suspects this bulk to rank among the \textit{raisons d'être} of the book: Bernal wanted to establish his credentials by appearing enormously learned; he needed to canvass massive amounts of detail if his hope to rally Afrocentric readers and cow students into acquiescence was to pass muster. Neither here nor \textit{infra} (note 142) am I preaching a counsel of perfection unattainable for one mere mortal; I am merely advocating modesty and accuracy in the pursuing of inquiries which exact much more from the researcher than the average work of scholarship.
shunned in favor of an absurd cesspool. Instead of dubbing as an accurate appendix to our obsolete etymological lexica, as Van Windekens did, *BA III* carts back the so-called garbage of contemporary scholarship, staking out huge claims for a grid that takes over literally the results of the *interpretatio Graeca* of Hecataeus, Herodotus, and Plato\(^\text{117}\) (not Plutarch; he went his own way\(^\text{118}\)). This anxious adherence to the ethnography and pseudo-linguistics of antiquity where better historians are forced to discard them (Slack, 116–25), stems from a lack of familiarity with the period — this might not be very conspicuous at first glance, between the seemingly professional writing, the austere typography replete with linguistic shorthands or IPA symbols, and

\(^\text{117}\) Which Bernal persists in not acknowledging as such, viz. the fashioning, most usually entailing deformation through explanation, of a ‘foreign’ fact or structure in order for it to make sense for fellow Greeks (Lloyd, “Egypt”, in E. J. Bakker – I. J. F. de Jong – H. van Wees (edd.), *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus* [Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2002], 415–30 at 430–2; J. D. Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars* [Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2003], 155–65; E. S. Gruen, *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* [Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2011], 82–3; etc), no more than Bernal is aware that the fondness for Egypt of the early classical Greeks only makes sense within the Hellenic-Barbarian divide (*Herodotus* 2.158.5–159.1 βαρβάροις δὲ πάντοις οἱ Ἀιγύπτιοι καλέουσι τοὺς μὴ σφίσι ὁμογλώσσους) as analysed by A. A. Lund, “Hellenentum und Hellenizität: Zur Ethnogenese und zur Ethnizität der antiken Hellenen”, *Historia* 54, 2005, 1–17 at 15–6; «die zivilisierten Ägypter bilden mit anderen Worten insofern eine Analogie zu den zivilisierten Hellenen, als sie wie diese auch alle Fremden per definitionem für Barbaren hielten» [p. 16]). One feels accordingly much distress at finding that Bernal neglects to cite the passages of Herodotus where Egyptian kings honor Athena in their own country (e.g. 2.175.1 καὶ τοῦτο [sc. Ἀμασίς] μὲν ἐν Σάι τῆι Ἀθηναίηι προπύλαια θωυμάσια οἷ’ ἐξεποίησε), all of which prove beyond any doubt that the historian is transferring into Greek terms the particulars of the Egyptian cult (in fact Bernal fails to quote Herodotus anywhere in his section about Athena, but for a snippet from Frazer [p. 575], whose ancient authorities he endorses without having checked them; the reader is thus directed towards *Enquiry*, II 59 where Athena does not appear — a blemish repeated by Van Binsbergen, ὁ ἀνήρ κομποφακελορρήμων, in his opening chapter of *Black Athena Comes of Age*, 20 note 24).

\(^\text{118}\) The writer best acquainted with Egyptian of this lot (as evidenced by G. Griffiths, *Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride*, 101-10; read also H.-J. Thissen, “Plutarch und die ägyptische Sprache”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 168, 2009, 97–106 at 106: «es dürfte aber aus den vorangehenden Erläuterungen klar geworden sein, daß Plutarch entweder direkt durch Quellenstudium oder indirekt durch Gewährsmänner sehr gute Kenntnisse (vom Wesen) der ägyptischen Sprache gehabt hat»), he writes, at *De Iside et Osiride*, 2, 351 F, Ἐλληνικόν γὰρ η Ἰσίς ἐστι. This snippet is best taken as the vindication of the Greekness of the name of Isis (cf. Griffiths, 258: «since Isis is here praised for her wisdom, the Greek explanation of her name probably is to derive it from such forms as ἴσιν or ἓσομαι, from οἶδα, ‘I know’) for reasons detailed by D. S. Richter, “Plutarch on Isis and Osiris: Text, Cult, and Cultural Appropriation”, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131, 2001, 191–216 at 195–9. In a nutshell, «the cultic activities of the Egyptians lack meaning in the absence of a Greek interpretive frame» (p. 200); Plutarch is hellenizing the Egyptian myth in a conscious effort to make it true and submit it to Greek philosophy. Confirmation of the rightness of this view in E. Finkelpearl, “Egyptian Religion in *Met.* II and Plutarch’s *Dio: Culture, Philosophy, and the Ineffable*, apud W. Keulen - U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser (edd.), *Aspects of Apuleius’s Golden Ass. Volume III The Isis Book* (Leiden, Brill, 2012), 183-201 at 185-6.
the discouraging perspective of flipping back and forth hundreds of pages to consult the endnotes, but there is far less to the learning of *BA III* than what strikes the eye. One must pin on Bernal an ignorance of the *status quaestionis* that makes one dubious of the relevance of his book; a low proportion of primary texts actually read as opposed to consulted third-hand or seen in some old translation; and the skimpiness on display everywhere. Worse, the work rings painfully hollow in its tone and restless polemics against mainstream lexicography. Bernal is not merely guilty of considerable sloth: he does not behave as the gadfly that stings the sacred cows of stolid conformity and lazy acquiescence. Such a diligent insect goes straight to the most sensitive fleshy parts, whereas *BA III* attempts, none too hard, to make mileage out of feints and flanking movements. He seldom works critically at the brick-and-mortar level; since he rejects so-called rigidities (whether phonetic or graphemic) in his attempts to have Greek and Afroasiatic lexemes cohere, he is thus free to cut the Gordian knot by which his betters were embarrassed. As this amounts to a rhetorical rather than a linguistic treatment, his book is imbued with a false sense of discovery that contrasts with its achievement. So much for the flanking movements. The feints are glaring too. We are asked to believe that not everything goes and that ‘limits’ have been imposed on what he terms his flexibility (p. 584), namely his incapacity to ‘find an Afroasiatic origin’ for ἄνθρωπος and Διόνυσος. The intractable substantive needs not be a loan or a substrate (so Beekes, I, 106) though, since a PIE analysis exists (*h₂nd̪(e)ro-h₂k’-o* from *h₂k’-o*- : Wodtko-Irslinger-Schneider, 372, 381 note 72); the theonym remains utterly baffling, but Semitic perspectives may not be wholly bleak given the Canaanite *B’LBK = BA’LABAKKU = Bάαλ Bάκχος* (Steiner, “Rise...”, 516-8). Bernal’s inability to explain ἄνθρωπος and Διόνυσος through Afroasiatic registers as a stinging defeat, not as limits, let alone self-imposed ones.

Nor does he play quite fair when he argues against works he mistakes for cutting-edge scholarship that they are guilty of perpetuating the ‘Aryan model’ (smear tactics: Slack, 8-9) or of being too conservative in their assessment of the genetic links between Proto-Indo-European and Afroasiatic. Straw men are Bernal’s favorite device: Pokorny is reviled as forever trying to expand the range of common Indo-European; Frisk, Chantraine, for their readiness either to seize on Indo-European cognates or to admit defeat; Vycichl, for his misplaced striving after precision in the elucidation of Coptic or Egyptian lexemes; the few lexicographers of Greek posterior to Chantraine Bernal

---

119 Word-formation, phonetic structures, and Wortphilologie concern Takács less. The entries of his lexicon too often do not progress beyond tedious lists of etymologies he deems absurd; what is more, numerous finer points of his phonological doctrine have met with resistance (J. Osing, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 58, 2001, 565-81; Quack, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 97, 2000, 161-85). For countless important words, theonyms included, it simply appears futile to look for an etymology either Egyptian or Afroasiatic, unless one passes off
mentions, for being ‘Aryanists’. It follows that, after the *Dictionnaire étymologique complémentaire* and the *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, for all their unorthodox dodges, have discharged the duty of stirring up the etymological consensus — the former by integrating both dialects of Tocharian in the reconstruction of the PIE lexicon while infusing new life in many conventional glosses, the latter out of its decisions to favor a Pre-Greek approach and cut down to the barest minimal bibliography, philology, and updating —, the holy cows of Indo-European can rest peacefully with the Bernal-shaped bug nearby. He is guaranteed not to trouble much their slumber, for he clearly attempted a task far beyond his powers. Whether


121 A reviewer of Astour (see following note) pictures the ideal interpreter: «in language and onomastics as in art it is too easy to pull a parallel of some sort out of the Near Eastern hat and our tests must be rigorous. (...) We require a Semitist with a sense of history, a deep understanding of the Greek evidence, and no axe to grind» (J. Boardman, *Classical Review* 16, 1966, 86-8 at 87, 88). Here I shall paint with the same brush Bernal and Rendsburg, who has written haughtily about the refusal of Hellenists to adopt his master Gordon’s ‘decipherment’ of Linear A (“Someone Will Succeed in Deciphering Minoan’: Cyrus H. Gordon and Minoan Linear A”, *Biblical Archaeologist* 59, 1996, 36-43 at 40-2); neither of them comes close to Boardman’s
he second-guessed his claims of improving on Pokorny, Frisk, Chantraine, whom he takes to task for behaving like hapless bunglers whose achievements were limited by the constraints of method and intuition, one cannot tell. Yet his usual reluctance to do more than mention a Semitic or Egyptian word, or cluster of words, in front of a putative Greek isogloss, and leave the reader to pass judgment on the semantic and consonantal matches thus adumbrated, amounts to a step away from Bernal's own daring which I take to underscore a serious lack of confidence in his scholarship. In fact, whenever he contrives to explain himself, we usually see him sending smoke screens to the reader; more accurately, it would appear that Bernal indulges in the sport of slaying the bugbears of his own imaginings in manners strikingly reminiscent of Astour's. His predecessor\textsuperscript{122} «makes no allowance for coincidence» (T. T. Duke, \textit{Classical Journal} 61, 1965, 135) and «take[s] the work of men like Beloch and Ed. Meyer as representing the current consensus of classical scholarship. (...) Mr Astour has deliberately set up a straw man in order to be able to knock it down with ease» (J. D. Muhly, \textit{Journal of the American Oriental Society} 85, 1965, 586). Today as in the sixties, it remains true that «until some rigid ground-rules can be worked out for playing the game, all efforts by the mythographical-etymological school will remain what they have always been: personal creations which reveal nothing so much as the author's own predilections and idiosyncrasies», to quote from Muhly once more. His view is scarcely upset by the passing of time; as we know far about more cuneiform, Egyptian, and Semitic than our forefathers did, so have raised our expectations, and one of the main reasons why the Near Eastern games of \textit{BA III} fail to make strides proportional to our information is precisely that Bernal underestimated the growing sophistication of the field. This skewed notion of progress culminates in his confusing the least plausible kind of cross-cultural discourse with a quantum leap in the salvaging of the ‘Ancient model’\textsuperscript{123} he


bestows upon Herodotus — notwithstanding the enduring debate about the modalities of the anthropological grid used by that historian\textsuperscript{124}. By digging up Egyptian antecedents for countless Greek words, intellectual structures, and institutions, \textit{Black Athena} harks back to the least believable parts of the works of Foucart and Bérard\textsuperscript{125} in defiance of the achievements of Gordon or Hoch in West Semitic; for to tell how much you admire a scholar is not tantamount to emulating him. As K. A. Kitchen once wrote, «no useful purpose is served by refuting old works long made obsolete by more recent discoveries, or by merely setting one opinion against another without reference to the underlying facts»\textsuperscript{126}. Comparative scholarship has little business resembling a

\textsuperscript{124} Moyer, \textit{Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism}, 42-83 at 43-51, marshalls the essentials. For his aptitudes as an historian, L. Scott, \textit{Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6} (Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2005), 1-37, is fine; on his non-Greek sources and the way he envisioned himself as wiser than them, see Luraghi, “The Importance of Being λόγιος”, \textit{Classical World} 102, 2009, 439-56.


\textsuperscript{126} The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.) (Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1973), XI. For the sake of antithesis, let me adduce “Self-Reflection, Egyptian Beliefs, Scythians and ‘Greek Ideas’: Reconsidering Greeks and Barbarians in Herodotus”, \textit{The European Legacy} 11, 2006, 1-19, by the, presumably Greekless, scholar of philosophy and political science A. Ward. Her «argument (...) seeks to mediate between the claims of Bernal and the claims of scholars such as Lefkowitz and Palter. Like Bernal, I argue that for Herodotus significant elements of Greek culture, specifically Greek religious thought and practice, have their source in Egypt to the south. Yet, like Lefkowitz and Palter, I also conclude that the development of phi-
flea market in which the older the stuff the more valuable it turns out to be. So far as the *Hellenorientalia* extend, we needed a well-ordered store with the latest novelties on display and a wise selection of vintage lore looming in the background for the sake of evaluation or illustration. Astour attempted, within his chosen parameters, to furnish us with this tool; the dilettante Bernal, who could not aim at such a goal, did not care one bit about what was doable and needed. This is where I draw the line between them.

Not only will Indo-Europeanists conceive renewed contempt for the Semitic comparanda owing to his transgressions; the danger is considerable of them growing ever more sectarian and distrustful of all outsiders. Their lack of sympathy for intruders from neighboring fields appears to be rivalled only by their, more or less benign, acceptance of the trifunctional lore of the French. (Even such a linguistic powerhouse as West\textsuperscript{127} is as good as wasted on them, whether *The East Face of Helicon* or *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*\textsuperscript{128} — perhaps the much more focussed *Old Avestan Syntax and Stylistics. With an Edition of the Texts* [2011] will put down the walls of their isolationism.) Thanks a lot, *Black Athena*: far from promoting a spirit of friendly emulation between philologists from the non-Indo-European Levant, especially Egyptologists (whose specific blinkers so far as theoretical linguistics extend are already spectacular, see Winand, *Temps et aspect en égyptien*, 6-9), and classical linguists, this series has put in

\textsuperscript{127} The victim of Bernal’s jealous scrimping and scraping at *Black Athena Writes Back*, 319-44, his lifelong engagement with the Near East (minus Egypt) is well assessed in a review article by K. Dowden: “West on the East: Martin West’s *East Face of Helicon* and its Fore-runners”, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 121, 2001, 167-75. On his way, Dowden presents the least biassed survey to date of the past two centuries of research on the Oriental influences on Greece (168-71). A fair-minded researcher, he even tries to rehabilitate the rather unlikable Astour (within reasonable limits, that is: in a most tentative and modest manner): pp. 170, 175.

\textsuperscript{128} They must have heard about his quirks. His prehomeric dating of Hesiod, which he has maintained since the late sixties in the face of very well articulated opposition (overwhelmingly on linguistic grounds: G. P. Edwards, R. Janko, Ruijgh), casts a shadow on his, otherwise splendid, verbal scholarship, while it leaves him vulnerable to biased endorsement by Bernal (G. Nisbet, “Hesiod, Works and Days”: A Didaxis of Deconstruction”, *Greece & Rome* 51, 2004, 147-63 at 150, 150-1 note 14). His Iliadic scenario is fated not to gain West many followers and might even cut down the number of his admirers, in that it caters neither to the prevailing Oral Poetics nor to the Neo-Analytic current still entrenched in Germany while displaying what can be construed as high-handedness (*The Making of the Iliad. Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* [Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011], 1-68, 431; his tone is flippant, his arguments extremely uneven, and what is gained by calling ‘P’ the poet who revised and amplified his own creation?).
the head of the epigons of Brugmann and Meillet a renewed emphasis on the need to ignore the folly of Indo-European bashers! One shudders at the thought of the consequences for higher education, research, or the interethnic relations, of Bernal’s teachings ever becoming mainstream. «Subjects like history and philosophy will be replaced by indoctrination, and each of us will believe the brand of “truth” that best serves his or her own selfish purposes» (Lefkowitz, History Lesson, 76-7); the cause of African-Americans, or Europeans of black descent, will trump the pursuit of truth; dedication to this cause will replace academic training, visceral engagement (through racial inheritance) with the ‘spirit’ of those times will cancel the patient weighing of the evidence; the need for any updating of our handbooks and dictionaries of Egyptian, Hebrew, Phoenician, or Akkadian will no longer be felt, as the century-old ones are enough to bury the would-be lexicographer of Greek under a morass of Semitic etymologies, whose superficial neatness guarantees their rightness to un instructed eyes; and fact-based research being thus disheartened, eventually there may come to be «no progress, no revolution of ages, in the history of knowledge, but at most a continuous and sublime recapitulation»129. One needs not wonder why initially sympathetic scholars like Berlinerblau, Bomhard, Jasanoff, Levin, Moore, grew distant130. If these experts thought they could not

129 U. Eco, The Name of the Rose (San Diego, Harcourt, 1983), 399, as the ultimate wish of Jorge. This bleak view contrasts with the picture drawn by Van Binsbergen when he insists on the liberating potential of Bernal’s intellectual undertaking in the context of our era’s global politics of knowledge (Fauvelle-Aymar et al., 130, 132, 145-6, 147, assumed in Black Athena Comes of Age, 62). No matter the strength, or lack thereof, one concedes to his arguments, the suspicion can hardly be quelled that they are but an instance of politically correct rubbish designed to save face and salvage the main thrust of Black Athena. All the more so in the light of Van Binsbergen’s lack of qualification as a classicist (whoever remains skeptical is advised to read his “Before the Presocratics. Cyclicity, Transformation, and Element Cosmology: The Case of Transcontinental Pre- or Protohistoric Cosmological Substrates Linking Africa, Eurasia and North America”, Quest. An African Journal of Philosophy 23-24, 2009-2010, 394 pp.; they will face a recrudescence of hollow rambling about systems or thought processes citing decontextualized evidence, Greek words, and secondary literature, with a view to collapse the standards of philosophical history in favor of a wide interchange of ideas actually so vague as to be unremarkable). No Semitist, classicist, or Indo-European scholar worth their reputation would get it into their mind to decide what is valuable in African studies, Van Binsbergen’s province, from the viewpoint of their speciality, and where the succulent pastures lay; yet he does the reverse as an anthropologist, and presumes to teach us where we stand with respect to progress. This I call impudence.

130 According to Bernal’s own testimony, and generous allowance being made for mnemonic lapses and interpretationes a posteriori. See Geography of a Life, 247, 398-9 (Jasanoff); 399 (Gordon); 403 (Levin); 404-405 (Bomhard); 441, cf. 446 (Moore); 445-6 (Berlinerblau). Although not paranoid, this retelling of past relationships eschews candor inasmuch as Bernal always questions the reasons of these friends for becoming estranged or shunning him, but never asks himself whether or not his ideas, his manners, and his public behavior were congenial to them qua experts (only Moore was not a Semitic scholar or a linguist; of his reluctance to edit more manuscripts of Bernal’s after his work on Black Athena Writes Back, I am tempted to declare: ‘once burned, twice shy’).
go on with being his friends; if pioneers in the comparative assessment of the Greek and Semitic languages and cultures of the quality of Levin and Brown declined to enter the fray yet never ever declared themselves in favor of anything akin to cultural transfers from the Levant to Greece more Bernalio; and if even Gordon, the great paragon of Pan-Semitism, did not see fit to support Bernal after his review of BA I — why on earth should Classicists, when presented with a massive amount of evidence as to his inanity, shy away from calling Black Athena intellectually brain-dead?


132 By which I mean both Black Athena Revisited and Not Out of Africa². It is nothing short of extraordinary, in my eyes, that Bernal’s sour disposition towards these two books, along with his blackening of their authors in an ad hominem manner, could be misconstrued by some classicists as a case of ebullient yet basically right droit de réponse. He fabricated a narrative identifying Black Athena with a progressive stance versus the old-fashioned conservativeness of Lefkowitz (whom he also charges with incompetence for her ‘so many mistakes’: Black Athena Writes Back, 377) and experts shaken in their certainties — a cunning obfuscation propagated by the sociologist of religions J. Berlinerblau, *Heresy in the University. The Black Athena Controversy and the Responsibilities of American Intellectuals* (New Brunswick-London, Rutgers University Press, 1999), 5-6, 36-8; the historian of classical scholarship C. Stray, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117, 1997, 229-31 at 230-1, who caters to Afrocentrists by writing such sentences as this one: “Black Athena Revisited, to some the publication (sic) of scholarly assessment by a group of serious academics, is dismissed in other quarters as a concerted attack by reactionary intellectuals, backed by right-wing foundations, on radical views which offer hope to oppressed minorities” (p. 230); and, at its most trenchant, by the Latin and gender scholar M. M. Levine, “The Marginalization of Martin Bernal”, *Classical Philology* 93, 1998, 345-63, notably 354-61. I will go farther than the understated ‘failed effort at evenhanded criticism’ Lloyd-Jones directed at this piece (“Interesting Times”, 596 note 56); her fondness for snappy commonplaces (p. 348 «it is always easier to “deconstruct” than to “construct”». If nothing more, Black Athena 2 compels us to confront this truism once again etc) and apodeictic utterances (p. 349 «as a group, the essays most useful to classicists are those that treat the substance of Bernal’s evidence for an Egyptian presence in late Bronze Age Greece» etc) cloaks an ignorance of language and philology (she can only pit Rendsburg’s ‘Etymological Response’ against Jasanoff-Nussbaum [p. 358 notes 9-10], before impugning what she calls the ‘absolutism’ [p. 359-60] of the latter scholars), and of the Near East in general, which should have dissuaded her from acting all high and mighty with masters in those disciplines. The narrative of a progressive Bernal vying with hard-nosed pundits stuck in their rigidities from eras past was exploded by T. A. Schmitz in an e-pamphlet that does not seem to have made many ripples (“Ex Africa Lux. Black Athena and the Debate about Afrocentrism in the US”, *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 2, 1999, 17-76 at 47-50; neither Slack nor the contributors to Fauvelle et al., *Afrocentrismes*, noticed it, whereas Black Athena Writes Back barely pays lip-service to its riches). It was only natural that this fallacy should
Whether or not he made the profession more self-conscious in race-related issues is irrelevant, since he never put such a claim at the core of his ambitious revisionism. Let those who stick to this *fable convenue* — from Rankine, *Ulysses in Black. Ralph Ellison, Classicism, and African American Literature* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 71-7, 204-6, to D. E. McCoskey, *Race. Antiquity and its Legacy* (London-New York, Tauris, 2012), 172-81 — digest the review of *BA II* by L. Lesko in the *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 24, 1994, 518-21, then come back to my piece and watch by themselves how Bernal’s Near Eastern scholarship, methods, and technical standards have improved between 1991 and 2006. Has he even deferred to the rule evoked by Marchand-Grafton, that intellectual historians should read the sources on which they profess to pass judgment, not merely quotations from them or derivative works about them (“Martin Bernal and His Critics”, p. 4)? I will take a leap of faith and predict the answer of our yes-sayers: not much. «It is Bernal’s own intolerance that I find most revolting», writes Lesko (p. 519); «among the most painfully obvious flaws in volume II are the countless repetitions of phrases, sentences, paragraphs, quotations, even erroneous calculations (...). Inconsistent transliterations, missing diacritics, meanings far removed from the root meanings of words could be excused, but for someone attempting to convince scholars rather than merely impress the masses, his use of consonantal and vocalic shifts, metathesis, and analogy to produce whatever equation he desires is far too loose. I expect more careful work at all levels» (p. 520); and finally, «“misplaced precision” is his critique of careful scholarship that resulted in conclusions different from

leave traces in subsequent scholarship, whether in monographs of the highest order (Moyer, *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*, 29 and note 105, 50 note 28, who seems to put Bernal and Lefkowitz on a par, takes for granted the calumnies of the former scholar on the latter) or in works of a more lightweight quality (P. Vasunia, *The Gift of the Nile. Hellenizing Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexander* [Berkeley, University of California Press, 2001], 16-7 and elsewhere, displays an enthusiasm about *BA I-II* which borders on hysteria and contrasts with his own control of the evidence). Let the present pages set the record right: despite Levine’s vocal assertions of the contrary (356, 360), waiting for Bernal’s ‘answers’ proved vain; as in the case of *Black Athena Writes Back* (rightly shot down by P. Cartledge, *Classical Review* 53, 2003, 238-9, as a chutzpah and a self-indulgence), these answers merely contribute more confusion to an already muddled field of inquiry.

133 The degree of bias, ignorance, and levity in the Rankine contribution which purports to assess Bernal’s qualitative impact (“Does Black Athena Make a Critical Contribution to our Understanding of the Ancient World?”, in P. A. Miller (ed.), *History in Dispute. Classical Antiquity and Classical Studies* [Farmington Hills, Mich., St. James Press, 2005], 1-10) is little short of astonishing. One may cite, among its numerous *reductiones ad absurdum*, «it is perhaps important to note, as Lefkowitz does, that Bernal had no formal training in classical philology or Egyptian» (p. 4) and «certainly Bernal’s Models are crude, but even his opponents concede several crucial arguments, including the notion that classical scholars of the nineteenth century were essentially Eurocentric» (p. 5); he even fails to disclaim that *BA I-II* are error-ridden. I entertain little hope, by way of consequence, of teaching Rankine something.
his. (...) Bernal tries to accumulate enough possibilities to demonstrate his preconceived ideas. It is the worst possible example of “scholarly” writing that could be recommended to students» (ibid.)\textsuperscript{134}. He cannot by any means be turned into a pioneer whose power of asking the right questions, albeit embarrassing ones, redeems the technical mediocrity. Who but a dimwit would take unexplained Latin words from Egypt without any intermediate after having declared that «no evidence exists of an Egyptian presence in Italy in the first half of the first millenium BCE. Thus, any Egyptian influence on early Rome would be indirect, through Etruscan, Punic or Greek\textsuperscript{135}» (p. 184)? Who but a dilettante would explain the verb ἐλεγαίνειν from the substantive ἱжить, ‘mourning, bereavement’, mistranslated ‘tearing the hair’ because it is spelt with the sign for the lock of hair (D3), then dream up that ἔλεγος was a ‘song of mourning’. The diminution of women’s rights brought an attempt to tame mourning and to have it controlled by men in

\textsuperscript{134} «One hesitates to review a book so incompetent as this one. It is a thankless task. Readers who know any of the (...) languages will see in a moment that it proposes nonsense. But Classicists (...) should be warned not to take this latest attempt seriously» (Hoffner [note 3], 37, on Davis’ last book). So I did not follow L. P. Williams, “Why I Stopped Reading Black Athena”, Academic Questions 7, 1994, 37-9, even if every aspect of BA III is abysmal and throws away the few points Bernal might have scored. Unhappily, ill-informed classicists (Rankine; F. M. Ahl, Two Faces of Oedipus. Sophocles’s Oedipus Tyrannus and Seneca’s Oedipus Translated and with an Introduction [Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2007], 76, who also cites Budge [1]; etc) and philosophers (T. Curnow, Wisdom in the Ancient World [London, Duckworth, 2010], 81, 149, 170), as well as seasoned philologists who should know better (I. Rutherford: Aristarchus antibarbarus, IX-X), draw on BA III as if it were a mainstream or trustworthy authority. So the colossal pretence behind Bernal’s work could not be left undressed, lest sheer quantity be allowed to impose upon the tired or the gullible.

\textsuperscript{135} Egyptian influences on Italy are attested between the eighth and the fifth centuries B.C., see P. Kingsley, “From Pythagoras to the Turba philosophorum: Egypt and Pythagorean Tradition”, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 57, 1994, 1-13 at 3-4; they include items traded by the Phoenicians which were recovered in Italian tombs (by no means recent news, cf. T. J. Dunbabin, The Western Greeks [Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1948], 233-5, 461-5), and religious or ‘wisdom’ traditions (as反射 in some of the Orphic gold plates, though this is not quite certain, pace Kingsley, and rival Mesopotamian influences on these texts, or some strikingly similar documents, do exist: A. Lebedev, “Pharnabazos, the Diviner of Hermes: Two Ostraka with Curse Letters from Olbia”, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 112, 1996, 268-78 at 276-8). On the other hand, Pythagoras’ ideological debt to Egypt, a predominantly Middle- and Neo-Platonician view (D. J. O’Meara, Pythagoras Revived. Mathematics and Philosophy in Late Antiquity [Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989], 13 — but Numenius, fr. 1, makes for extremely poor evidence: E. des Places, Numenius. Fragments [C.U.F., Paris, Belles Lettres, 1973], 103 note 3, 26-7, 93-5), we have very little reason not to deem a fiction after Burkert (Washeit und Wissenschaft. Studien zu Pythagoras, Philolaos und Platon [Nürnberg, Carl, 1962], 103-5 = Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism [Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1972], 126-8). Bernal’s suppression of all Egyptian links to Italy, the country of election for Orphic-Dionysiac rites in the fourth century and later (e.g. West, The Orphic Poems [Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1983], 24-6) is as bad as his awareness of Egyptian motives in the Orphica (BA III, pp. 260, 374, 467).
the ἐλεγεῖον ‘elegy’, spoken in a male voice» (p. 436)? Even if Bernal had been a pioneer who did good things in the long run so can be forgiven for his sins, the likes of McCoskey could hardly tell. Indeed, it is not incumbent upon literary scholars of Greek to spearhead the final assessment of Black Athena, no matter their sympathy (or lack thereof) for the ideas of Levine. Whether or not they are experts on the reception and historiography of the classics, or on race, or on cultural contacts in general, has little bearing on the issue, particularly when they can only contribute theory. And having no inkling of textual criticism even in their home turf, they can only turn a blind eye to the crudely mechanical handling of Near Eastern compositions by wild diffusionists. To put things in a blunt manner: as they lack tools and credentials for this endeavor, if McCoskey and co. nail their colors to the

136 A piece of demented balbutience, it ignores, among other considerations, that the early Greek elegy was emphatically not a mere song of mourning; for a discussion of this literary genre, encompassing a rich analysis of ἐλεγος, ἐλεγεῖον, and ἐλεγεία, go to West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1974), 2-21, particularly 3-9. Significant material has accrued since then, which sheds light especially on the historical elegy favored by Simonides of Ceos (see L. M. Kowerski, Simonides on the Persian Wars. A Study of the Elegiac Verses of the 'New Simonides' [New York-London, Routledge, 2006], 63-146, not without the reminder by D. Sider, “The New Simonides and the Question of Historical Elegy”, American Journal of Philology 127, 2006, 327-46, that ‘historical’ is quite the misnomer, particularly when brought to bear on generic discussions [331-7]).

137 Even though they (should) have enough technical equipment in classics to know when Bernal is acting like a schoolboy (witness his unenlightened use of Loeb editions; at p. 213, cf. 628 note 22, he goes to the length of quoting an Hesiodic fragment from Evelyn-White instead of Rzach, or Merkelbach-West!) and when he has left unopened the most basic bibliography (Hesiod is subpoenaed before his court with no regard whatsoever for West’s commentaries, let alone all later scholarship, like L. Koenen, “Greece, the Near East, and Egypt: Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the Catalogue of Women”, Transactions of the American Philological Association 124, 1994, 1-34; Bernal would have learned from it about «the cultural layers out of which both Hesiod and the author of the Catalogue formulated their own concepts» (p. 34), yet he only cites Koenen as a foil, 4-6). For a classicist, to remain blind to such proofs of Bernal’s inadequacy as an Hellenist comes tantamount to admitting one’s own incapacity / unwillingness to assess his work. See Rosół, Frühe Semitische Lehnwörter..., where Bernal is castigated, 300 words previously deemed Semitic are disproved (155-216), and 65 validated as such (21-112).

138 Whose degree of textuality inamusch as it bears on editorial technique has always been a sore spot for assyriologists, particularly in matters sumerological (the standard position, per se and for the building of a ‘composite’ text versus a ‘score’, is articulated best in Michalowski, The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur [Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1989], 21-5). A quantum leap can be expected from M. Worthington, Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism (Boston-Berlin, De Gruyter, 2012), here at 41-4; P. Delnero, The Textual Criticism of Sumerian Literature (Boston, American School of Oriental Research, 2012), concerns itself with the issues of orthographic and finer semantic variations in Old Babylonian texts (cf. his 2525-page Variation in Sumerian Literary Compositions. A Case Study Based on the Decad, diss. Pennsylvania, 2006, at 1844-56). Michalowski, The Correspondence of the Kings of Ur (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2011), 211-24, tangles with the overwhelming difficulty of matters of authenticity.
mast with the view that Black Athena has somehow been epoch-making or foundational, their making a fool of themselves will be far less momentous than the stigma affixed on our discipline. For classics get debased in the eyes of specialists of the areas and disciplines infringed upon by Bernal each time one of us asseverates that the core of Black Athena is the triad race - Rezeptionsgeschichte - Geistesgeschichte139, viz. an a priori construct which stands by itself and may impress the unwary practitioners of these three crafts, rather than the languages and civilizations of Greece, Africa, and the Near East. The implication is of course that neither a minute knowledge of the particulars of the Egypto-Levantine gamut of disciplines supposed to root Black Athena nor the control of comparative ingenuity by a sure and steady judgement are what it takes to treat Bernal fairly. The amount of detail the present discussion canvasses aims at eliminating for good this kind of apology, all too attractive in an age where doctrinaire models are allowed to run afool of the limits of philology (what passes for theory in our post-postmodern era ought not to be allowed to strong-arm the reader).

With respect to pre-Hellenistic Greece, such truth as there is to the proverb ex Africa semper aliquid novi has come undone before our eyes as regards BA III: the serious reader with access to a fully staffed Near Eastern and Egyptological library might be able to glean useful information on a range of particulars140, yet the construction includes so much that is of doubtful

139 His all-pervasive notion of a white racist conspiracy engaged in the downplaying of Egyptian achievements whatever their date is lost on these yes-sayers and even some reviewers (A. H. Joffe, Journal of Near Eastern Studies 64, 2005, 146-50, whose parting shot on Black Athena Writes Back is «in the end was Greece a European or Levantine creation? It was neither; it was a Greek creation. If nothing else, Martin Bernal and the Black Athena project remind us of this fact»). Not only should they read the demolition of some of the broader swipes of Bernal’s portrayal of Mohammed Ali by Slack, 554-6, plus Blok, ‘Proof and Persuasion in ‘Black Athena’: The Case of K. O. Müller’, Journal of the History of Ideas 57, 1996, 705-24 (barely damaged by the rebuttal in BAWB, 190-6); they ought to keep in mind the extent to which the historiographical truth is the reverse of what Bernal holds. Levine, “The Use and Abuse of Black Athena”, American Historical Review 97, 1992, 440-60, deemed BA I on the right tracks; she was too ready to believe (e.g. «armed with a formidable aegis of scholarly apparatus (...) marshals considerable epigraphic, linguistic, and archaeological evidence», p. 442) and ignorant. For D. Gange, “Religion and Science in Late Nineteenth-Century British Egyptology”, The Historical Journal 49, 2006, 1083-103, has demonstrated that «the imperial agendas that would have encouraged a negative image of ancient Egypt were in fact pushed deep beneath the surface of Egyptology, being submerged under agendas relating to the Bible which inspired a remarkably positive image of Egyptian civilization» (p. 1085). Cf. also p. 1103: «far from denigrating ancient Egypt as Bernal suggests, most Egyptologists reacted to it with awe instead, considering it to be the civilization in which Moses — according to St Paul — had learnt his wisdom, providing evidence that Christian ethics were God-given; as old as civilization itself. Egyptian archaeology, rather than being ‘the handmaiden of history’, remained the handmaiden of theology for several decades past the point at which religious belief has been considered to have ceased to be definitive of archaeological practice (...»).

140 On the express condition that he begins by discarding Bernal’s bibliographical indica-
truth and relevance that it belongs in the clouds. Other than a fascination with Egypt envisioned as the cradle of civilization and mother of wisdom, the Egyptian impact on the religion, literature, language, and way of life of the late Archaic and Classical Greeks is virtually non-existent. Bernal eschewed this very barrenness of evidence by using an approach that harks back to times when there was no method other than the compilation of whatever primary data could be dug up regardless of age and pedigree. So when BA III prides itself on having embroidered a large-scale continuum around the testimonies of Herodotus and Plato interpreted at face value, it passes off for compelling demonstrations a proliferation of detail, some of it indeed neglected this century, but the huge majority of it perfectly incapable of supporting the weight of Bernal’s deductions, so great is his


\[\text{(footnote 142): You must go patiently and circumspectly to work, approaching your topic from several sides and sparing no pains to ascertain both that your primary evidence excludes nothing vital and that your selection from secondary sources is representative yet not tautological; weighing, or trying to weigh, the probability of all alternative solutions to the one you prefer, comes once you are done checking out the textual data your argument will embed. This examination of the linguistic evidence you ought to perform not the way your sources handpicked it, particularly if these are old or not mainline, but as the contemporary, acknowledged experts of these languages use it, viz. critically. In our technological era there are solutions to overcome a lack of linguistic expertise in the Near East (attractive advice in P. Briant, Histoire de l’empire perse. De Cyrus à Alexandre [Paris, Fayard, 1996], 13 = From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire [Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2002], 4-5); so Bernal’s blindness and lack of sifting cannot be forgiven.}
lack of philological control and awareness of what was really at stake in each case. It takes a classical scholar of some calibre to pick out the wheat from the chaff in matters of lexicography and historiography without falling prey to the animus of the Greek writers fascinated by Egypt\textsuperscript{143}; one needs have too an extensive acquaintance with Egypt and Mesopotamia to be able to handle these civilizations without living from hand to mouth in the trail of the pundits. Yet like the average Afrocentric writer, Bernal merely possesses an indirect grasp of Egyptian and Semitic, if not Greek. A state of affairs that did not improve from \textit{BA I} to \textit{BA III}, it makes one doubtful of the depth of his dedication during the last quarter century. As he combines these paltry standards with Afrocentrists’ usual distrust of mainstream authorities and his personal love of obscure scholarly resources, no matter how obsolete they can be, it is no cause for wonder that he was blinded to the inevitable: the probability of a boastful layman succeeding where Gordon and his first-hand familiarity with all the Levantine scripts, languages, and bibliography, had

\textsuperscript{143} Thus Hecataeus of Miletus (S. R. West, “Herodotus’ Portrait of Hecataeus”, \textit{Journal of Hellenic Studies} III, 1991, 144–60 at 151–9), Herodotus, and Plato were much more eager to credit the impressive, long-memory Egyptians than to bet on the Hellenic ingenuity or on Near Eastern influences. Other than broad surveys like C. Froidefond, \textit{Le mirage égyptien dans la littérature grecque d’Homère à Aristote} (Aix, Ophrys, 1971), 115–207 (130–5 for Herodotus 2.35 sqq.); S. M. Burststein, \textit{Graeco-Africana. Studies in the History of Greek Relations with Egypt and Nubia} (New Rochelle, Caratzas, 1995), 7–8, 9–12; or Vasunia, \textit{Gift of the Nile}, 75–116, 216–47, read L. V. Zakbar, “Herodotus and the Egyptian Idea of Immortality”, \textit{Journal of Near Eastern Studies} 22, 1963, 57–63 (‘all we can say is, that the information of the Egyptian priests, or rather insufficiently instructed interpreters, about the various forms which the dead could assume in his happy after-life was associated by Herodotus with the Orphic-Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration known to him from the Greek sources and the origin of this doctrine was attributed by him to the Egyptians’ [p. 63]). I deem it striking that the amount of crypto-Egyptian lore embedded in the works of the classical authors who spear-headed this Hellenic fascination for Egypt does not cut a figure that much higher than the total of similar nuggets lurking in Imperial writers, mainly Plutarch and the romancers (J. J. Winkler, \textit{Auctor & Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius’s Golden Ass} [Berkeley–Los Angeles-Oxford, University of California Press, 1985], 306–19; Rutherford, “Kalasiris and Setne Khamwas: A Greek Novel and Some Egyptian Models”, \textit{Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik} 117, 1997, 203–9, for Heliodorus; etc). Even the belated Nonnus preserves mythographical data from Middle Kingdom Egypt (P. Chuvin, \textit{Mythologie et géographie dionysiaques. Recherches sur l’oeuvre de Nonnos de Panopolis} [Clermont-Ferrand, Adosa, 1991], 236–9). Is not Herodotus’ own brand of Egyptomania supposed to have been vital or groundbreaking (the latter view being Moyer’s: \textit{Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism}, 277–8)? Centuries of Graeco–Roman rule over Egypt played a role in the diffusion of the \textit{Ae–}

\textit{gyptiaca}; of course, things were slowly changing there and an inevitable amount of obsolescence, discounting the philosophical interferences of Greek pedigree like Middle Platonism, ensues in later accounts (G. Griffiths, \textit{Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride}, 18–52 passim; J. Hani, \textit{La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque} [Paris, Belles Lettres, 1976], 26–117; etc), yet I wonder whether or not the Imperial writers were better acquainted with aspects of Egypt than Herodotus or Plato could (hope to) be. In other words, there were perks to being a \textit{πεπαιδευμένος} in the first centuries AD.
failed\textsuperscript{144} was nil right from the start. Healthy levels of modesty on Bernal’s part were warranted: did not Astour, a yet more encyclopaedic mind than Gordon, only manage to burn himself out?

Now, unless they desire to be crowned kings of shreds and patches by readers more savvy than they in Near Eastern minutiae, there is no rosy future for those who thirst after Egyptian influences on, let alone roots in, the Greek language. They will not be wasting their time in sterile pursuits provided they cast their net far narrower than Bernal and allies; for the main progress one can (tentatively) identify in this field\textsuperscript{145} rests with the identification of loanwords from the Nile valley among those terms which lack clear-cut Indo-European or Mesopotamian cognates and apply to goods, items, and things that seem to have been unknown, or exotic-sounding, to the Greeks\textsuperscript{146}. Trouble is, most of these loanwords lead nowhere. Suffice

\textsuperscript{144} Not because all classicists remained skeptical out of sheer ignorance and incapacity, as Rendsburg malignantly claims (‘Someone Will Succeed...’, 40), but because Gordon’s Semitic decipherments of Linear A, Eteochypriot, and Eteocretan collapsed under the scrutiny of ideology-free specialists. Let it be enough to defer to the Mycenologist Y. Duhoux, in \textit{L’étéérotois. Les textes, la langue} (Amsterdam, Gieben, 1982), 222-33, with a nod to the superb connoisseur of Anatolia A. Heubeck (review of Gordon, \textit{Evidence for the Minoan Language}, in \textit{Gnomon} 39, 1967, 705-9; Heubeck was unafraid to speak of ‘dilettantischen Versuchen’ [p. 709]). As for Gordon’s knowledge of Greek, good according to Rendsburg, it was demonstrated by no less a scholar than E. L. Bennett to be poor, at least for philological purposes (review of \textit{Evidence...} in \textit{Language} 44, 1968, 110-8; read also \textit{infra}, note 185). On the other hand, Semitists unaffiliated to Gordon have complained about his handling of the Levantine evidence: J. C. Greenfield, \textit{Journal of Biblical Literature} 86, 1967, 241-4 at 242 sqq. — This bleak picture admits of one explanation only: so little did Gordon’s models function, that he had to tailor his materials to them. The misrepresentation Rendsburg perpetuates has been allowed to fester for too long, feeding off the resentment of Afrocentrists towards classicists; it is timely to expose the weak sides of those Bernal regards as his model (Gordon) and his ‘dear friend’ (Jasanoff-Nussbaum, 203 note 1), if only to push back against that misconception.

\textsuperscript{145} Leaving aside the \textit{cultural image} carried by the Greeks among Levantines, a cardinal blind spot of such studies. As J. C. Waldbaum asks, «more important (…) is the interaction between these transplanted Greeks and their eastern hosts. Did Greeks in the East make their presence felt in any significant way, other than as purveyors of attractive tableware and other commodities? Or did the sophisticated easterners simply ignore them as western barbarians?» (“Greeks in the East or Greeks and the East? Problems in the Definition and Recognition of Presence”, \textit{Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research} 305, 1997, 1-17 at 12). The earliest Greeks may have received recognition due to their and their forefathers’ partaking of shared traditions (B. Wells – F. R. Magdalene (edd.), \textit{Law from the Tigris to the Tiber. The Writings of Raymond Westbrook} [Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2009], I, 303-53).

\textsuperscript{146} An example of what it is possible to do is Rosöl, “Griechisch κάλαθος - ein ägyptisches Lehnwort?”, \textit{Historische Sprachforschung} 123, 2010, 176-80. His rebuttal of Bernal’s etymon \textit{q}/\textit{krh.t} deserves to be better known: «gegen diese Etymologie spricht jedoch ein ernstaftes Problem im Bereich der Phonetik. Es geht hier um das auslautende \textit{-t}, das ein Femininumsuffix ist. Dieses Suffix wird zwar regelmäßig geschrieben, wurde aber schon seit der Zeit des Alten Reiches nicht mehr ausgesprochen. Bernal ist sich dieses Problems bewusst und gibt die folgende Erklarung: “The borrowing could have taken place before final \textit{-t} were dropped or later re-inserted as an archaism, very common in religious contexts” (S. 447). Ohne Zweifel
it presently to mention στίμ(μ)ι, στίμμις, Koine στίβι, ‘stibium, kohl’, which Eustathius, in a little-known piece of information, calls ‘Egyptian’ (Commentaries on the Iliad, II, p. 635, 5–7 Van der Valk ωi συμμητέων καί οτι το εἰρημένον ουδέτερον όνομα το στίμμι και στίμμις εὑρήται λεγόμενον θηλυκός. γράφει γοῦν τις οὕτω στίμμες ἣ εἰς τὰ ὀμάτα χρήσιμος, Αἰγυπτίων φωνῆι) and indeed originates in the Demotic stm, ‘eyeshadow’, Coptic CTHM — so Lewy, Fremdwörter, 247, Vycichl, 199, Takács, III, 602-3; absent in both editions of Prellwitz, accepted by Boisacq, Frisk, Chantraine. A descent from the Egyptian sdm, ‘to make up’ (Hannig, I, 1271, II.2, 2395; sdm Erman-Grapow, Faulkner), is remoter and should be divorced from msdm.t, as shown by Takács, 602 N.B. 1; both Brown, Israel and Hellas, 241 note 57, endorsing Fournet as his sole authority, and B. Hemmerdinger, “Noms communs grecs d’origine égyptienne”, Glotta 46, 1968, 238-47 at 243, are thus put out of court (the French scholar, whose sources are Crum’s Coptic dictionary and Erman-Grapow, viz. an insufficient basis, if not an inadequate one, prints (m)sdm.t as if it were a matter of triangulation from Egyptian and Coptic...). Now the derivation stm > στίμμι tells us nothing except that the cosmetic blackening of eyes must have arrived in Greece from the Semitic Levant. It might turn out, too, that Homeric hapaxes or formulae preserve a Levantine residue, though one will have to look hard and elaborate cogent evidence going beyond mere echoes thematic and grammatical. Thanks to Burkert and West studies of the Near Eastern

ist jedoch eine Entlehnung schon im 3. Jahrtausend historisch nicht nachvollziehbar. Wenig plausibel scheint auch die Annahme einer archaisierenden Aussprache zu sein. Der Weiteren ist diese Etymologie aus semantischen Gründen fragwürdig, denn Αγυπτ. qrh.t bedeutet „Topf“ und nicht „Korb“ (pp. 177-8). Rosól then advocates the New Egyptian khr.t, a container mainly used for flowers, as the source of the syllabically spelled κάλαθος (178-89); the phonetic changes are attractive and I simply miss references (in his note 16) to Y. Muchiki, “Spirantization in Fifth-Century B.C. North-West Semitic”, Journal of Near Eastern Studies 53, 1994, 125-130 at 129 note 141, or Lipinski, “The Inscribed Marble Vessels from Kition”, in Z. Zevit – S. Gitin - Sokoloff (edd.), Solving Riddles and Untying Knots. ... Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield (Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1995), 433-42 at 435, who reminds us of the Egyptian variant spelling q/khr.t matching the Phoenician q’ht (134-5). I shall also mention T. Pommerening’s demonstration that the component mixed with human milk in a Greek remedy against female infertility is not the ‘butter’ of Latinists and Hellenists alike (βούτυρον, butyrum; lastly, F. J. Barnett, “The Second Appendix to Probus”, Classical Quarterly 56, 2006, 257-78 at 271) but, as had been seen for a century by Egyptologists, the fruit or sweet vegetable βάτοα (w-k3) (Hannig, II.1, 830), identified as the water melon by L. Manniche, An Ancient Egyptian Herbal (Austin, University of Texas Press, 1989), 92-3 — “Βούτυρος, ‘Flaschenkürbis’ und κουροτόκος im Corpus Hippocraticum, De sterilibus 214: Entlehnung und Lehnübersetzung aus dem Αἰγυπτικαν”. Glotta 86, 2010, 40-54.

147 I have one to put forward here. The Epic ὄρχαμος, which, ossified in the epithets ὄρχαμος (-με, -μον) ἀνδρῶν or λαῶν, applies to warriors or heroic figures in the Iliad before being extended to low life in the Odyssey (Eumaios, Philoitos), is usually interpreted with reference to Linear B o-ka > ὄρχα, ‘command’, cf. ὄρχη (DMic., II, 19-21), thus ‘leader of men / people’: an awkward phrasing for servants even if one qualifies the offence as a mechanistic
impact on Greece have moved far beyond mere assertion and generalization backed by a handful of case-specific samples. Therefore whoever attempts to recover the conjectural Egyptian prototype of an epic tidbit must emulate the standard set by these masters or lack credibility. No one ought to rebuke the existing models for lacking credibility on philological or logical grounds only to end up with a proposal which is actually far wilder. So Griffith, “Elysium Revisited”, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 27, 1999, 79-85: he chides Burkert, Puhvel, Alford yet adduces the West Semitic taršštś touts by Gordon as a *Wanderwort*; «once the weaknesses of Burkert’s

---

use of the technique of oral formulaic composition (M. Ndoye, *Groupes sociaux et idéologie du travail dans les mondes mondiaux de l’âge de fer et hésiodique* [Besançon, Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2010], 218-20; differently, and better, M. Skempis, *‘Kleine Leute’ und grosse Helden in Homers Odyssee und Kallimachos’ Hekale* [Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2010], 110-4 *passim*). Thus I would rather explain ὄρχαμος as imbued with the strength of a superlative, comparing the Ugaritic epithet of Baal ‘al’iy qrdm, ‘mightiest of warriors’ (Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Volume 1* [Leiden, Brill, 1994], 153; Del Olmo Lete-Sanmartin, I, 53; Rahmoni, *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetical Texts*, 49-52), and the Middle and New Egyptian ‘ḥyw.ti nfr, ‘perfect fighter’, applied to the hero of the Tale of the Two Brothers, Bata (apud W. Wettengel, *Die Erzählung von den beiden Brüdern. Der Papyrus d’Orbiney und die Königsideologie der Ramessiden* [Freiburg / Göttingen, Universitätsverlag / Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 2003], 29 and note 105; on ‘ḥyw.ti cf. Erman-Grapow, I, 217-8, Belegstellen, I, 38; Vycichl, 319 s.v. ʒoqyt, “mâle”, aussi “impétueux” et “sauvage” (dit de plantes); Hannig, II.1, 553; Schulman, *Military Rank, Title, and Organization in the Egyptian New Kingdom* [Berlin, Hessling, 1964], 49). So Homer, far from paying an extravagant and most artificial compliment to some of his humblest heroes, even under the compulsion of orality, could in fact call Achilles (3x), Agamemnon, Asios (2x), Menelas (7x), Peisistratus (3x), Polites, or Ulysses the ‘mightiest of their peers’, viz. the best at their craft, no less well than the swineherd Eumaios (6x) and the goatherd Philoithios (3x): a pointed alliance of decorum and relevance. Difficulties remain though, not least the secondary stamp of the use of ὄρχαμος for servants: indeed, both Hesiod and Aeschylus conform to the *Iliad* in predicating ὄρχαμος ἄνδρῶν / λαῶν of heroic figures exclusively (A. Sideras, *Aeschylus Homericus. Untersuchungen zu den Homerismen der aeschyleischen Sprache* [Göttingen, Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 1971], 36, 192), thereby making it likely that such was the epithet’s original range of meaning. 

148 The point of departure should be a widely recognized perplexity rooted in philological fact, such as the puzzling characterization of Atlas close to the start of the *Odyssey*. F. Mewes, “Atlas und Schu. Zur Deutung von Od. 1.52-4”, *Hermes* 133, 2005, 131-8, solves it by adducing the primeval Shu and *Theogony*, 517-9, 746-8: «die Atlas gewidmeten Verse der etwa zeitgleich mit der ,,Odyssee’’ entstandenen „Theogonie” Hesiods enthalten einige Hinweise auf eine Verbindung mit dem ägyptischen Schöpfungs-mythos. Atlas wird als stehend und die Breite des Himmels mit seinem Kopf und den Händen stützend beschrieben. Halten wir uns die Darstellung des den Leib der Himmelsgöttin stützenden Schu vor Augen, so ist der Kopf samt Schmuck auf nahezu einer Linie mit den Händen, womit man ihn, da der Leib Nuts in seiner Spannung der Linie linke Hand - Kopf - rechte Hand folgt, als neben den Händen stützend betrachten kann» (p. 137). This might very well be right; but all the Near Eastern parallels to the deed of Atlas put together leave one crucial issue unaddressed, namely the problematic, if not pointless, epithet ὀλοόφρων affixed to the Titan.

149 Not *trāšš* (Griffith) — from ‘wine-red, wine-dark’ (not ‘vinous, of wine’, G.), it would have come to apply to the Mediterranean (as against the Red Sea and the Black Sea); whence...
and Puhvel’s theses have been clearly exposed and the objection to the bastard quality of the phrase on Alford’s theory has been met, the probability that Egyptian sḥt ikrwy in fact inspired Homer’s Ἡλύσιον πεδίον is revealed to be very high indeed» (p. 84). The traditions compared need preferably be homogenous enough for a straightforward line of transmission to appear;
in attempts at theological or cultic comparatism\textsuperscript{152}, the literary core of the deities between whom a parallel is drawn should never be lost sight of, lest the cross-cultural process degenerates into infecund bowdlerization\textsuperscript{153}. The sun god of the Greeks, whether Helios or (post-)classical Apollo, ill-resembles the one of the Egyptians, who is born of the sky goddess Nut every morning (the earliest iconographical attestations of this motif do not antedate the Nineteenth Dynasty, but we know it to be much older: Assmann, \textit{Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott. Untersuchungen zur altägyptischen Hymnik} [Berlin, Hessling, 1969], 120-2). Now many gods, including Horus, underwent a solarization process: G. Griffiths, \textit{Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride}, 497-8, for Osiris and the sun, with J. C. Darnell, \textit{The Enigmatic Netherworld Books of the Solar-Osirian Unity. Cryptographic Compositions in the Tombs of Tutankhamun, Ramesses VI and Ramesses IX} (Fribourg-Göttingen, Academic Press / Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 2003), 452-3, for the preference given to the solarized Osiris over the mummified one by certain deceased; C. Graindorge-Hérel, \textit{Le dieu Sokar à Thèbes au Nouvel Empire} (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1994), 344-82; Darnell, 305-8, particularly 307 sqq., for the solar eye / eye of Horus, alongside Lesko, “The Field of Ḥetep in Egyptian Coffin Texts”, \textit{Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt} 9, 1971-1972, 89-101 at 93-4, for Coffin Text, V 465 §§348b-352e, and Minas-Nerpel, \textit{Der Gott Chepri}, 446-8, for Horus as against Khepri. This whole current is totally alien to the Greek and Roman religious mindset: only Apollo might be argued to have passed through a magnification of his solar aspects, whether or not this continues a putative, original trait of his (e.g. H. S. Versnel, \textit{Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion, Vol. II Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual} [Leiden-New York-Köln, 1993], 290-292, especially 292 note


\textsuperscript{153} Il est nécessaire de tabler sur des matériaux formant système et d'éviter de se livrer à des collages hasardeux de traditions. (...) En outre, nous devons, me semble-t-il, nous interdire d'aligner des ressemblances approximatives, anisomorphiques, ou trop vagues de séquences qu'un récit indien pourrait présenter avec un mythe grec (...) La comparaison ne peut aboutir à diluer la singularité (...) ou à l'affadir (...)” (Pirart, \textit{La naissance d’Indra}, 64). G.-R. Vincent, “La poursuite de Jayadratha par Arjuna (Mahâbhârata, VII, 32-121) vaut-elle pour celle d’Hector par Achille (\textit{Iliade}, XX à XXII)?”, \textit{Gaia} 11, 2007, 131-73 at 158-72, accedes to this creed; the numerous parallels drawn by M. Mazoyer between the myths of Apollo and Telepinu do not (\textit{Télépinu, le dieu au marécage. Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du royaume hittite} [Paris, L’Harmattan, 2003], 116-7, 119-20, 131, 156-8, 200-1, 214).
9); from the Archaic period onward, the sun is merely the highest point of comparison for human achievements, as evinced by the choral lyrical and melic poetry (M. Puelma, “Die Selbstbeschreibung des Chores im Alkmans grossem Parthenien-Fragment”, Museum Helvetica 34, 1977, 1-55 at 7-19); a new, enduring twist on this solar symbolism appears in the Hellenistic era, when it fusions with the symbolism of the stars to become a crucial part of ruler ideology (S. Weinstock, Divus Julius [Oxford, Clarendon, 1971], 375-384; etc). Thus solarization widens to the dimensions of an unbridgeable chasm the divide we have seen between the Greek and Egyptian notions about the deified sun; this dissuades one of putting any credence in cross-cultural interminglings of myths or cultic devices no matter how good they might seem. Unless, of course, one is prepared to discard the irredeemably discrepant mindsets of the Greek and Levantine religions; come what may, I cannot imagine anyone taking that quantum leap.

All considered, though, the avenue of research most likely to raise to a higher plane the debate on the recognition of Egyptian patterns in the Greek literature would be the investigation of narrowly defined topics encompassing a restricted chronological range. This trend has already produced two monuments: one quite successful, Lazaridis’ Wisdom in Loose Form. The Language of Egyptian and Greek Proverbs in Collections of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods (Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2007), the other inadequate, A.-A. Maravelia’s Les astres dans les textes religieux en Égypte antique et dans les Hymnes orphiques (Oxford, Archeopress, 2006)\textsuperscript{154}. The latter work rightly did not deem it superfluous to lay bare 154 For a most impressive compendium of philology and ‘hard’ science, it is unfortunate that the details have been left to the reader to ponder and that the book merely achieves a compilation of all primary data intermingled with sparse interpretive comments. Far too much Egyptian lexicography is assumed, as in tables III.1 (92-121) and III.3 (139-209), which reproduce in the author’s own meticulous transliteration the utterances of the Pyramid and Coffin Texts relating to astronomy / cosmology: an exhausting tool for sure, it cannot be used directly since no translation has been provided (Greek and Egyptian are very seldom translated in the whole opus, with bizarre exceptions on 327-8 [Pyramid Texts of Wenis] and 365 [the Cosmic Egg]). Not only is the Egyptian section (89-304) thus made less reader-friendly than it should have been; Maravelia constantly misinterprets these tables, and the frequency lists she constructs from them, for an analysis of the scientific impact on literary texts (e.g., 274: «à partir de notre étude (voir Tables III.9 & III.10), il est évident que les éléments astronomiques de la première catégorie (jour et lumière, nuit et obscurité, &c.) sont assez nombreux», cf. 265, 266, 277, 278). The Orphic chapter looks like a hurried addition, being three times shorter and almost desultory in character. Under astronomical headings (the sun, the moon, the planets, etc), some Hymns are printed in Greek with illustrative footnotes before general conclusions are drawn (305-50). Obviously, these texts were far less important in themselves than as fodder for the, equally brief, comparison with Egyptian texts which follows (350-76). There Maravelia reproduces, in hieroglyphs and annotated transliteration, a solar hymn from Any’s Book of the Dead, 358-62, before one page of global commentary whose few references to the Greek thought are outdated (for the theology of Greek philosophers all she cites is Jaeger’s 1947 classic: p. 363 note 234), then a table canvassing the technical vocabulary of the hymn is adduced (362-4).
the idiocy of the Afrocentric valorisations of Egyptian astronomy (§ 1.6 ‘La “Science” Égyptienne: Une Croyance Arbitraire (voire “Désir Pieux”) de l’Afrocentrisme”, 409-10\textsuperscript{155}). Yet I am not sure researches of this kind should become a fad, even if they lead straight to promoting junior scholars equally fluent in both languages. First, there is a dearth of ancient testimonies pointing out to an interplay between Greece and Egypt on those topics. When such evidence exists, it merely pertains to the background. So the tendency of the biographical materials to have classical and early Hellenistic artists or thinkers stay for a while in Egypt; actually, far from standing up to informed scrutiny, it amounts to nothing deeper than a formulaic theme (tabulated in M. Kivilo, *Early Greek Poets’ Lives. The Shaping of the Tradition* [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2010], 227-31) informed by the desire of the Hellenistic Greeks of Alexandria to root facets of the culture they were heirs to in the prestigious mainstream of Egyptian learning (Lefkowitz, ‘Visits to Egypt in the Biographical Tradition’, in M. Erler and S. Schorn (edd.), *Die Griechische Biographie in Hellenistischer Zeit* [Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2007], 101-113). Additionnally, trying too hard to push uncertain or convoluted arguments on the basis of surface resemblance is what bedeviled comparative studies for the whole century, getting us in hot water with Astour, Gordon, and Bernal; we hardly need more research where apparent commonalities are never actually demonstrated not to be bogus or random since the contentions these shared traits serve to evidence hardly admit of proof. Further work along those lines can only serve to divert our attention from more pressing needs\textsuperscript{156}. Moreover, apart from exceptionally

Basing herself on this thin dossier, she declares that «on a essayé d’analyser comparativement deux hymnes anciens adressés au dieu solaire Hēlios / Rē. Tous les deux montrent l’existence d’une pensée astronomique latente qui était plus développée dans l’hymne orphique au soleil (…)» (363). As her claim, pp. 375-6, that the Orphic texts reflect astronomical conceptions from the second millennium rests on a paper-thin basis and, for the time being, must be pronounced a figment of her imagination, I cannot grant her that she gave the evidence the ‘regard frais et interdisciplinaire’, let alone the ‘comparaisons de deux distinctes voies de pensée anciennes’, touted in the introduction (p. 12).


\textsuperscript{156} What we need most are Hellenists with a grasp of cuneiform. As a sample of the work
favorable cases-in-point (Herodotus’ Egyptian logos, Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride; contrast, say, Aeschylus’ Supplices or the Egyptian allusions in Plato, the former virtually void of ‘couleur locale’

left to do, cf. the semantic family of μισεῖν: a non-PIE enigma, it is explained by Bernal (303) from the Egyptian msḏ ḫ, ‘to dislike, hate, detest’, which he supposes to «provide a perfect semantic correspondence and a reasonable phonetic one». Less arbitrarily, Akkadian preserves the dental-free muḫ ḫuṣu. D form of the verb muḫ ḫuṣu (logographic ṣg ḫ [PA], RA: Borger, Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon [Münster, Ugarit, 2003], n°464, 511, pp. 333, 356, adding S. M. Maul, ‘Herzberuhigungsklagen’. Die sumerisch-akkadischen Eršaḫunga-Gebete [Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1988], 259 at 4’1, for RA = maḫ ḫuṣu): muḫ ḫuṣu conveys the meanings ‘to hurt, hit with a vengeance, smash, destroy, kill’ (CAD M Part 1 [1977], 82-83 n°7; AHw., II, 581), so coheres well with the rejection of someone or something as yesterday’s garbage that constitutes the root value of μισεῖν. More phonetically distant, yet worth mentioning, is the Gt form of maḫ ḫuṣu (more occurrences of this verb in volumes I, III, and IV of the States Archives of Assyria series, respectively pp. 219, 139, and 339), mith ḫuṣu, literally ‘to fight with each other’, viz. ‘to do battle, go to war, engage in combat’ (CAD, 81-2 n°5; AHw., II, 580; S. Lackenbacher, Textes akkadiens d’Ugarit. Textes provenant des vingt-cinq premières campagnes [Paris, Cerf, 2002], 80 note 218). What is more, μισής and μίσημα can be compared to the substantives mith ḫuṣu, ‘fight, combat, attack, assault, onslaught’ (CAD M Part 2 [1977], 138-9; AHw., II, 662-3), and mittu ṭurṭu. From its original adversative value ‘conflict, contrast, clash, opposition’, the latter came to signify ‘balance, correspondence, harmony’ (CAD M Part 2, 137-8; AHw., II, 662), per se but particularly within the formulas sanuq mithu ṭurṭu, ‘what brings opposite things together’, ‘matching one another’ (M.-J. Seux, Hymnes et prières aux dieux de Babylone et d’Assyrie [Paris, Cerf, 1976], 529-30 note 14), and l낸 ṭu ṭurṭu (translating e-me-ḫa-mu-n), whose meaning is a crux (from T. Jacobsen, Towards the Image of Tammuz and Other Essays on Mesopotamian History and Culture [Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1970], 365 note 32 ad finem, to Hallo, Origins, 154-5; etc). Direct knowledge of Akkadian would be helpful to Egyptologists, too; in his analysis of the late mṣḏi.w (Սmadi.uw) attested only in the plural (‘bearers of offerings [?]’), Takács, III, 129-30, utterly fails to adduce the Ugaritic maḏ (an Akkadian loanword for a class of skilled workers: Del Olmo Lete-Sanmartín, II, 524) and its original, māḏu. For a discussion of the latter, Lackenbacher, 239 note 815: there were those who stuck to ‘courtier’ (e.g. J. J. Finkelstein, “On Some Recent Studies in Cuneiform Law”, Journal of the American Oriental Society 90, 1970, 243-56 at 253-4), adducing the frequent māḏu ᵑarrā ᵑarrātī, ‘m. of the king / queen’ (J. D. Schloen, The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol. Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East [Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2001], 243, for figures), but most recent authorities maintain that ‘knowing, expert, competent, well-tested, experienced, wise (in a craft)’, thus ‘acquaintance’ (of the royals), is preferable (Seux, Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes [Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1967], 168-70; CAD M Part 2, 163-7; CDA², 214; Durand, Les documents épistolaires du palais de Mari, I, 285, III, 193-4; ‘au courant’).

As opposed to the ideological construction of Egyptian characters and mores in this tragedy (Vasunia, Gift of the Nile, 40-58), I have in mind the general ambiance and the rarity of Egyptianizing details: let me mention Apis and the plain named after him (vv. 260-70; cf. G. Griffiths, “Lycophron on Io and Isis”, Classical Quarterly 36, 1986, 472-7 at 475); the possible identification of Epaphos with Apis in the corrupt v. 41 (E. W. Whittle, “Two Notes on Aeschylus, Supplices”, ibid. 14, 1964, 24-31 at 26; H. Friis-Johansen – E. W. Whittle, Aeschylus. The Suppliants [Copenhagen, Nordisk Forlag, 1980], II, 39-40; C. W. Willink, “The Invocations of Epaphus in Aeschylus, Supplices 40-57 and Euripides, Phoenissae 676-89”, Mnemosyne 55, 2002, 711-9 at 713, cf. 715-6); or the ornithological detail of v. 212 καὶ Ζηνὸς ὀρνὶ τόνδε νῦν κιλὴσκετε (Friis-Johansen and Whittle, II, 170-2, take this to be an allusion to the solar hawk of Amun-Re mistaken by the poet for the eagle of Zeus and reject
independent awareness of what makes factual comparability between Greece and Egypt⁵⁸), the law of diminishing returns applies implacably to Graeco-

⁵⁸ The extent of Plato’s direct awareness of Egypt is hard to assess; Mathieu, “Le voyage de Platon en Égypte”, Annales du Service des Antiquités d’Égypte 71, 1987, 153-67, merely builds a house of cards which is not strengthened by speculations on the late sage Petese (so, rightly, K. Ryholt, The Petese Stories II (P. Petese II) [Copenhagen, Museum Tusculanum, 2005], 13-6), thus caveat lector. In at least one instance — Solon’s Egyptian sojourn —, Plato’s knowledge would appear to derive from Greek sources, namely Herodotus (G. Griffiths, ‘Atlantis and Egypt’, 4), not from Solon himself or through autopsy as is acknowledged even by H. Görgemanns, “Wahrheit und Fiktion in Platons Atlantis-Erzählung”, Hermes 128, 2000, 405-19 at 417 (a scholar for whom «die interpretierenden Überlegungen haben uns zu einer allgemeinen Annahme über den Realitätsbezug der Atlantis-Erzählung geführt: Platon hat eine Überlieferung über historische Fakten benutzt, diese allerdings erzäherisch ausgestaltet» [p. 412]; for G. Griffiths, on the contrary, «the story certainly does not derive from Egypt in toto. Diverse sources and materials have been used, and the process is patently the construction of a pastiche» [p. 27]). Plato depends on Herodotus too for the story of the ring of Gyges (Republic, II, 359 c 7-360 b 3), a narrative he might very well have invented for the sake of the ethical points he was concerned with making; A. Laird, “Ringing the Changes on Gyges: Philosophy and the Formation of Fiction in Plato’s Republic”, Journal of Hellenic Studies 121, 2001, 12-29 at 13-23. Keeping in mind Plato’s use of sources and his love of fictional narratives, all we can say with confidence on the topic of his allusions to Egypt is that the philosopher approved on very personal grounds of such-and-such a trait of (Late) Egyptian society or culture (W. M. Davies, “Plato on Egyptian Art”, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 65, 1979, 121-7, who begins in a suitably skeptical fashion [121-2] before piling hypothesis on hypothesis [123 §2] in support of the relevance to Plato of the view that [123 §1] «even if Greek experience in the sculptural ‘factories’ of Egypt is denied, of course, the Greeks could have procured considerable experience of Egyptian art by indirect means», helps little; rather Froidefond, Mirage..., 326-337, and N. Demand, “Plato and the Painters”, Phoenix 29, 1975, 1-20 at 2, 19) whereas Plato no less individually frowned upon other Egyptian customs (mostly the use of writing: Baines, Visual and Written Culture in Ancient Egypt [Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press, 2009], 43-4, 108; Baumgarten, Heiliges Wort..., 171-81). The heart of the matter is thus a question of sources and authorial intent (cf. H. Joly, “Platon égyptologue”, Revue philosophique de la France et de l’Étranger 172, 1962, 255-66 — «Teuth, Saïs, Isis opèrent bien, par le langage et les images, comme des miroirs égyptiens, mais ce sont surtout les réalités grecques et la philosophie platonicienne qu’ils refletent» [p. 65] —, and L. Brisson, “L’Égypte de Platon”, Études philosophiques 2/3, 1989, 153-68 — speaking of his ‘attitude (...) particulièrement ambiguë’, he states that «l’Égypte lui permet avant tout de définir, en un double mouvement d’admiration et de répulsion, ce que devrait être l’Athènes de son temps» [p. 167]). We must leave aside all postmodern readings of historiography and their suppression of the criteria of truth in favor of supposedly more sophisticated models; so, e.g., D. Lenfant, Citésias de Cnide (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2004), p. CLXXI: «au fil des siècles, la grande question est restée celle de la fidè de Citésias et de la dichotomie mensonge-vérité dans laquelle on s’est enfermé depuis Aristote» (emphasis mine). A creative mind not particularly concerned with ascertaining bare facts as he strives to reach higher levels of truth, Plato passes down mediated views of Egypt which he transforms with embarrassing freedom. (Aristotle and his school certainly went further, if A. I. Ivantchik was right to postulate that their use of Sesostris pertook of attempts at a blending of Egyptian and Zoroastrian ideas: “Eine griechische Pseudo-Historie. Der Pharao Sesostris und der skytho-ägyptische Krieg”, Historia 48, 1999, 395-411 at 409-11; he asks himself whether this was already a conception of Plato’s). I regret having to rehearse at such length things so
Egyptian inquiries. They must demonstrate that they have a point instead of proceeding as if they stood on stable ground and going their merry way. For no amount of minute achievement balances a skewed larger picture. The tendency towards accumulation of fact, let alone the outright exhaustivity of citation or reference in handling the ancient evidence, conspicuous in *Les astres dans les textes religieux...* and in Griffith’s *Mummy Wheat*, tends to prevent any vigorous consideration of the value of the sources marshaled (I mean their pedigree, animus, scholarly exploitation, which are normally assessed before a fair-minded scholar uses these). Such a proliferation of the primary evidence kept more or less isolated from its scholarly interpretations circumvents *de facto* any criticism of the methodology to be adopted in working out a great variety of ancient texts — a neat trick in monographs whose guiding star is a wholly hypothetic view of the Graeco-Egyptian interplay. Unfortunately, it does violence to sound method; it shall not be encouraged by any means. Considering all of this, I find it impossible to tell what there is to gain if one works à la Lazaridis in a specific segment of the Greek and Egyptian literatures, virgin soil or not; adding a few grains of learning to our stores would in no manner be a contemptible achievement, even if this outcome of book-length inquiries looks anticlimactic. It is far less tolerable, for the potential writers of such works, to misconstrue the so-called results they claim to have reached as so many proofs of a cultural impact of the older civilization on the younger one; for who will be able to tell whether

---

159 Partial allowance might be made for the concepts of allegory, on which fresh scrutiny of the Egyptian materials according to the sharpest reading grids (e.g., R. B. Parkinson’s: *Poetry and Culture in Middle Egyptian Kingdom. A Dark Side to Perfection* [London - New York, Continuum, 2002], 290; *Reading Ancient Egyptian Poetry. Among Other Histories* [Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009], XI-XIV) could hope to reap some benefits. Yet, so far as I am aware, little in the abundant secondary literature on the allegorical interpretations of Homer (from Buffière to D. Dawson through J. Pépin, to mention only a few landmarks) suggests any proximity to the Egyptian lore; and, other than Plutarch’s symbolism in the *De Iside et Osiride*, the Greek evidence hardly looks ample enough to warrant a book-length inquiry. It was marshaled by G. Griffiths, “Allegory in Greece and Egypt”, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 53, 1967, 79-102 at 83-99; his survey of possible cross-cultural affiliations concludes that “although Egyptian religion supplied the fundamental data by which Plutarch allegorized the Osiris-myth, the ultimate process is here a Greek achievement. Yet the fact remains that the use of allegory in both its forms originated in Egypt” (p. 102; cf. Plutarch’s *De Iside et Osiride*, 100-5 passim, with D. Babut, *Plutarque et le stoïcisme* [Paris, P.U.F., 1969], 868-88, and Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* [Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford, University of California Press, 1992], 58-66, for Plutarch’s allegorism).

or not a fascination for Egypt mired in nothing sounder than the myth of the ‘stolen legacy’ was the unspoken assertion behind their work? Such is the nature of Afrocentric concerns world-wide that even tame statements are incapable of not being twisted into the confirmation that Africa was ransacked by the Greeks, and through them the Western civilization. So I take issue at Maravelia’s «nous constatons qu’à la fois Égyptiens et Hellènes dotèrent le monde de l’esprit, la mythologie archétypique et la science avec des dons uniques et valables» (p. 442).

Despite Bernal, his adepts, and their fanbase, the whole of the Ægypto-Graeca is a continuous stream from Solon down to Heliodorus; it has its highlights which repeatedly attracted scholarly attention, but does not lend itself to clear-cut divisions and broad generalizations, nor can it be mistaken to include the Homeric epics or any early poetry. The Black Athena posse has also been prevailed upon to follow the easy course of ignoring the unassailable, if scant and generally arcane, remains of the feelings of awe the Greeks entertained for Mesopotamia: in their eyes, the ‘Assyrians’ and

here seem to have chosen to use a form of expression common to their cultures, following its rules and challenges, but also making use of the space and liberties it offered for adding pieces of their own cultural experience. In general, I do not believe that the structural similarities identified could have been products of direct inter-cultural communication for the following reasons: firstly, the fact that most of the forms of proverbial expression employed at this stage also existed in the Egyptian and Greek literatures produced in the era before the Hellenistic and Roman period; secondly, the absence of any interest in the other’s grammar and syntax (since, even in the case of translations (...), no demotic grammatical constructions found their way into Greek writing and vice versa), and, thirdly, the absence of any major direct translations from each other’s body of proverbs. (...) In conclusion, comments such as “the Egyptian material was influenced by the Greek proverbs” or “the Greek writers copied their Egyptian colleagues” cannot reflect the actual complexity of the problem (241-2). We have known for decades how little Demotic was influenced by Greek, apart from proper names (see J. D. Ray, “How Demotic Is Demotic?” , Egitto e Vicino Oriente 17, 1994, 251-64 in general, and the onomastic indices and discussion of Clarysse – G. van der Veken – S. P. Vleeming, The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt. Chronological Lists of the Priests of Alexandria and Ptolemais with a Study of the Demotic Transcriptions of their Names [Leiden, Brill, 1983], 72-117, 133-65); so Lazaridis’ conclusion is hardly of such a nature as to cause uneasiness. Contrast now Griffith’s certainties (‘Sailing to Elysium...’, 234): «to conclude, we have seen that the river, ship, and ferry-man whom dead Egyptians met on their way to the Reed-Field left their mark on the Odyssey and that Menelaus comes thither thanks to Zeus’ anxiety over a specifically matrilineal succession better attested in Tuthmosid Egypt than in Greece itself. We have also seen that there is a reason, quite unlike those that let bards adopt these ideas, that kept them alive into the seventh century. These facts make it yet more likely that the nub of Egyptian funerary myth, the Field of Reeds, appears therein as Elysium». The contrast between the conclusions of Lazaridis and Griffith is not merely painful; it makes it clear how anxieties of influence discriminate the ideologues (those who channel most crudely their Egyptomania through such anxieties: Griffith, Maravelia) from mainstream researchers, who are apt to tell these bouts apart, control them, and attempt probative syntheses (G. Griffiths, Lloyd, Lazaridis). I would take a leap a faith here; all scholars should question their procedures who tout sensational findings of their own in a field which is both barren and hugely difficult to plow comprehensively in an ideology-free fashion — unless I am gravely deluded.
'Chaldaeans' were enviably great too, like the Egyptians. It will not do to explain out this duality of sentiments through competitive plausibility, that is, through an instance of 'either...or' reasoning. It is not even a matter of On this prestige of the Assyrians, J. M. Dillon, *Iamblichus Chalcidensis in Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta* (Leiden, Brill, 1973), 274-5, quotes and discusses a few striking texts with early classical roots in his treatment of Iamblichus' *On the Timaeus*, I, fr. 11 (itself well worth of mention: Ἀσσύριοι δὲ, φησίν Ἰάμβλιχος, οὐχ ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι μυριάδας ἐτῶν μόνας ἐτήρησαν, ὥς φησιν Ἰππαρχος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλας ἀποκαταστάσεις καὶ περιόδους τῶν ἐπτά κοσμοκρατόρων μνήμη παρέδοσαν· πολλοῦ ἄρα δεῖ πρὸς ταῦτα παραβάλλεσθαι ἡ παρ’ Ἕλλην πολυθρύλητος ἀρχαιολογία). For the Greeks and the Χαλδαῖοι (proprio sensu 'Iranians', but rather 'mages' or 'astronomers'), beyond, say, A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1971), 123-49, particularly 141-8, and the speculative work of Kingsley in the 1990s, e.g., "The Greek Origin of the Sixth-Century Dating of Zoroaster", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London 53, 1990, 245-65 at 252-4, the main evidence ranges from Herodotus down to Agathias (A. de Jong, *Traditions of the Magi. Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature* [Leiden-New York-Köln, Brill, 1997], 76-250), which qualifies the hostility of the Greeks towards Persia. Read further Cook, "Near Eastern Sources for the Palace of Alkinos", *American Journal of Archaeology* 108, 2004, 43-77, for the conviction that the Neo-Assyrian culture impacted the *Odyssey* (44 note 5, on the relationships between Assyrians and Early Greeks), and Rollinger's proof that the adoption of the vocables Συρία and Ἀσσύρια ought to be dated to the eighth century B.C. and placed into the multicultural, Assyrian-fearing milieus of southern Anatolia or northern Syria wherein Greeks interacted with Luwians, Phoenicians, and Aramaeans ("The Terms 'Assyria' and 'Syria' Again", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 65, 2006, 283-7). A vital issue for the quite high regard in which some Greeks held Ασσύρια also escaped Bernal's notice: «universal historians of Greece and Rome made some effort to assign the Assyrians their proper place in world history. No similar effort was made on behalf of the Egyptians. Ephorus, Trogus, Nicolaus and Cephalion seem to have done nothing with Egyptian history. Diodorus had much to say on Egyptian geography, fauna, and customs, but precious little on its history. Yet Egypt was a fabled country, with its own unbroken tradition of the past, and was visited by countless Greeks and Romans. Assyria was more remote in time and space. The inclusion of Assyria in the universal histories can only be explained by the influence of Assyrian history upon the evolution of Greek views about pre-Trojan times, and upon the evolution and consolidation of a chronology for that period» (R. Drews, "Assyria in Classical Universal Histories", *Historia* 14, 1965, 129-42 at 137-8). Interest in what had happened in the western regions of Mesopotamia during the earliest ages of Greece was part of the trade of the global historian from the Hellenistic period on, whereas Egypt could safely be relegated to the margins, as a endless source of mirabilia — so much for an 'Ancient Model'... Bernal, *Black Athena Writes Back*, 295: «relating all cultural influences to ceramic design and restricting such influence to the seventh century has also had a number of ideological advantages. First, it enabled the establishment of the Olympic Games and the formation of the polis in the early eighth century to be seen as purely Hellenic developments. Second, it located in Assyria the first "Orient" encountered by Greeks. The Assyrian Empire fits remarkably well with the stereotype of Oriental despotism and, thus, diverts attention from the Phoenicians, the foreigners with whom Greece had had most contact in the tenth, ninth, and eighth centuries, and whose city states looked disconcertingly similar to those developing in Greece toward the end of that period» (emphasis mine). On the fallacy of equating without further ado foreign city-states with πόλεις, which betrays once more an ignorance of the extent to which the Greeks were fond of reading their own structures into other cultures, cf. M. H. Hansen - T. H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford-New York, 2001), 251."
weighing the authority and bias of the various sources for these two mindsets. For they thrived side by side\textsuperscript{163} in defiance of an all-prevailing, Egyptocentric, ‘Ancient Model’ whose existence outside of Bernal’s mind is actually little short of bogus. Berlinerblau and Levine and Rankine and McCoskey erred so spectacularly in their assessment of it — one thus feels bound to speculate that none but the hard-nosed pundit is equipped to unravel any segment of the \textit{Aegypto-Graeca} free from the Afrocentric spell. This continuum ought to be explored by philologically robust historians endowed with strong cultural flair, whether Herodotean scholars, Lagid experts, or students of the (more or less heavily Egyptianized) magical and Hermetic corpora\textsuperscript{164}. I also count among them those who, having made themselves at home in the ‘Oriental’ cults of the Roman empire, corroborate G. Griffiths’s conclusion that Plutarch and Apuleius are tolerably exact storehouses of Egyptian religious data\textsuperscript{165}. The construction and

\textit{In light of the above, let me restate my main tenets. Egypt never was the prime linguistic, scriptural, technical, or religious influence over Greece during the (Late) Bronze Age and Early Classical period; that role belongs to Mesopotamia — with Anatolia a distant second}\textsuperscript{166}. The construction and

\textsuperscript{163} After he has discussed the programmatic passage Herodotus 1.1-5, Luraghi states that «the contrast between Persians, Egyptians, and Scythians, in terms of being λόγιοι, appears to reflect a more general contrast between the level of competence and quality of information characteristic of these three peoples, and also, more broadly, their level of civilization. If we compare Egypt and the Black Sea, the contrast is particularly obvious in the enormous depth of the Egyptian past as opposed to the nonexistence of an ancient history of the Scythians. As for the Persians, they turn out to be more loquacious than reliable, as shown by Herodotus’ repeated references to multiple Persian versions of key episodes of Achaemenid history» (‘Being λόγιος’, 445). The cultural superiority given to Egypt by the historian (itself a problematic view, but let us discard this point in the present context) is therefore relative and mired in a comparative, a priori superstructure, marked by inclusivity rather than exclusion; Bernal’s crude notion of the indebtedness felt by Herodotus, Plato, and so on may makes but a travesty of the relatively sophisticated ethnography of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

\textsuperscript{164} A sample of such ventures is B. Legras’ prosopographical “Les experts égyptiens à la cour des Ptolémées”, \textit{Revue Historique} 304, 2002, 963-91 (Egyptian evidence at 979-87). I spelled out the Egyptianization of magic since the classical uses of μάγος point to Iran (doxography by Bernabe at the Derveni Papyrus, vi 2: \textit{Poetae Epici Graeci}, II.3 [Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2007], 196), despite T. Kouromenos - G. M. Parassoglou - Tsantsanoglou, \textit{The Derveni Papyrus} (Florence, Olschki, 2006), 166-8.

\textsuperscript{165} Lastly, V. Gasparini, “Isis and Osiris: Demonology vs. Henotheism?”, \textit{Numen} 58, 2011, 697-728 at 698-702; compare, e.g., J. Aliquot, “\textit{Aegyptiaca et Isiaca} de la Phénicie et du Liban aux époques hellénistique et romaine”, \textit{Syria} 81, 2004, 201-28, notably 216-7 for a nuanced discussion of Plutarch (and notice the caveats expressed in the note 76 on 217).

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{Pace}, for instance, \textit{Black Athena Writes Back}, 204: «(...) my concern is not with a
negotiation of the ethnic identity of the main Greek powers pay little heed to the feelings of indebtedness towards Egypt which Bernal reconstructs. The same conclusion obtains for the Greeks’ creative engagement with their past called by most scholars the ‘invention of tradition’. Hellenes merely labored under the impression that there was a particular kindredship between their culture and that of Late Egypt once they entered the country as mercenaries, then merchants and settlers. Travellers like Herodotus were soon moved to question the historical reliability of the Homeric epics when these ran contrary to Egyptian narratives of ‘the truth of what happened’, τὴν ἀληθείην τῶν πρηγμάτων. The Greeks made heavy weather of their interpretationes Graecae so far as religion and political structures were concerned while borrowing a smattering of their words in the domain of material civilization, but hardly anything from the realm of higher culture. All efforts to enlarge the number of loanwords from the Nile valley to lexemes ill-explained by the common Indo-European stock break down on Bernal’s abysmal grasp of the bare bones of linguistics and on his extraordinarily outdated and paltry knowledge of the languages he uses.

competition between Egypt and Mesopotamia over which was the greater or more creative civilization. I am interested merely in which had the greater impact on the formation of Ancient Greece. Here, archaeological evidence and Greek tradition overwhelmingly prefer Egypt, and this would seem obvious from a geographical point of view». The recoverable Egyptian impact on early Greek poets is neither extensive nor widespread (Koenen, ‘Greece...’, 14-8) and attempts to find more of it stand and fall on their wild conjectures (as in Rutherford, ‘Kala-siris...’, 206).

167 *Enquiry*, II 116-20, best read with L. Kim, *Homer Between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010), 30-7. Herodotus goes to the length of claiming that Homer δηλώσας ὡς καὶ τοῦτον ἐπίσταιτο τὸν λόγον (116.1), as he was aware of Alexander’s journey to Egypt (δηλοῖ ὅτι ἠπίστατο 116.6). ‘What Herodotus is looking for is (...) certain elements in the text that are slightly out of place, that do not quite fit, but suggest a correspondence, however tenuous, to the Egyptian version. (...) These may be strained connections, but that is precisely the point; they are not meant to stand independently as convincing proof, only to raise suspicions that there is more going on than meets the eye. (...) Homer has placed them in the text in order that skilled readers like Herodotus, so accustomed to scanning visible objects and logoi for traces of the distant past, would notice them and realize that the poet did in fact know the truth about Helen, Egypt, and the Trojan War’ (Kim, 37-8). Herodotus was merely spinning a tale on a then-popular theme in Athens. For the tradition of Helen’s Egyptian sojourn is firmly posthomeristic (not earlier than the Hesiodic fr. 358 Merkelbach-West, itself of dubious authenticity); her presence there for the duration of the Trojan war might possibly be an ‘old legend’ known to Homer (so F. J. Groten, “Herodotus’ Use of Variant Versions”, *Phoenix* 17, 1963, 79-87 at 83-7; a ‘syncrétisme gréco-égypto-phénicien’ for Froidefond, *Mirage...*, 67), but both it and the tale of the Helen-shaped εἴδωλον taken to Troy by Paris seem intrinsically unlikely to predate the sixth century, see J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodoeia. Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d’oeuvres attribuées à Hésiode* (Leiden, Brill, 1960), 552-5.

168 He is only ‘apparently proficient in a variety of difficult languages’ (Jasanoff-Nussbaum, *Black Athena Revisited*, 201), thus error-laden and prone to philological frauds. Consider «a more general sense of ‘high’ is found in the Aramaic and Syriac šomayi and the Arabic
This conjunction of a silly writer and a queer topic is not enough to condemn the latter as barren; it needs the protracted failure of scholars for this verdict to be iron-clad. Since Gordon, Astour, Bernal, Griffith, busily ransacked the whole Semitic lexicon with no success whatsoever in any of the areas they attempted to cast light upon, Egypt and the alphabetic Levant have no business being a part of the agenda of philologists or Greek lexicographers in the times to come. They will do only if those experts seek to emulate the excellence of Lloyd on Herodotus’ second book or Griffiths, on the De Iside et Osiride and write equally large commentaries on those compositions. To repack the Egyptomania of the fifth century B.C. à la Haziza and Moyer demands no exceptional aptitude for seeing the wood for the trees; now such a high capacity is indispensable for whoever attempts to examine afresh the writings of Herodotus and Plutarch on Egypt, if he wishes to avoid

\[\text{samā́} \text{was high, lofty} \] (183). This pellucid-looking sentence will mislead a Semitic-free reader into believing that these two Semitic cognates mean one and the same thing; actually Aramaic-Syriac \( \text{šamä́} \) is a substantive, ‘sky, heaven(s),’ like Ge’ez \( \text{samā́} \) (Sokoloff, Dictionary of Jewish-Palestinian Aramaic, 557; idem, Syriac Lexicon, 1572-3; Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, II, coll. 4208-9; Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez (Classical Ethiopic) [Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1991], 504), while the Arabic verb \( \text{samā́} \) means ‘hoch, erhoben sein, hoch emporragen, aufragen; erhoben sein, sich erheben (über); zu stolz sein (für); zu hoch od<er> schwierig sein (für); übersteigen (das Verständnis); aufsteigen (zu, über); höher sein (als); streben, trachten (nach); emporheben, hinaufführen (zu), j-m, e-r S. Aufschwung verleihen’ (Wehr, 600-1= Wehr-Colwan, 432, with Corriente, Dictionary of Andalusi Arabic, 263, under *\( \sqrt[2]{SMW} \); Bernal’s preference for the past infinitive in his glosses is arbitrary).

Needless to say, \( \text{šamä́} \) embodies no ‘more general sense of “high”’ than its homonymous cognates: Akkadian \( \text{šamû/samû, šamā́, šamā́mû} \) (CAD S.1, 340-6; AHw., III, 1160; W. Horowitz, Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography [Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 1998], 223-4, 228-33), Ugaritic \( \text{šmm} \) (Del Olmo Lete-Samartin, II, 826-7; Rahmouni, Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts, 245; Smith-Pitard, The Ugaritic Baal Cycle II, 109), Canaanite \( \text{šym} \) (Hoftijzer-Jongeling, II, 1160-2; Halayqa, 328), Hebrew \( \text{šemā́} \) (Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, XV, 204-36; etc). An intelligent undergraduate equipped with the right dictionaries would do better than Bernal.

Certainly the most difficult task: «les matériaux soigneusement vérifiés s’accumulent à pied d’œuvre, tandis que l’édifice paraît à peine progresser. C’est sans doute que la tâche des architectes est la plus difficile, et leurs constructions souvent hâtives et provisoires. Mais c’est surtout qu’à force de porter son attention sur le choix des pierres, on n’a plus le temps de les assembler en assises», states G. Rodier at the close of his doxography of Greek philosophy (Revue de synthèse historique XIII, 1906, 191-362 at 361). Yet the great linguist V. Henry went so far as to speak of «cette minute suprême de synthèse qui est la récompense et le couronnement d’une vie entière d’analyse» (Antinomies linguistiques [Paris, Alcan, 1896], 44): there is no magnificent tree without sturdy roots.

As for Herodotus’ Egyptian book all the update we got to Lloyd — both his large commentary and his contribution to the edition of the Lorenzo Valla foundation — has been the fuzzy, theory-obsessed T. Haziza, Le kaléidoscope herodotéen. Images, imaginaire et représentations de l’Égypte à travers le livre II d’Hérodote (Paris, Belles Lettres, 2009), cf. Aristarchus antibarbarus, 162 note II, 165-6 (in profound disagreement with Burstein, Classical Review 61, 2011, 41-2, over the quality of this attempt to assess the judgementality of fifth-century Greeks and Late Egyptians). No large-scale treatment of the De Iside et Osiride
came out since G. Griffiths and Hani (on the relationship of La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque with Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride, cf. the former, p. 23); Froidefond’s Budé édition appeared in 1988 but was already outdated by at least a decade (the author tells us thrice that he could not use Griffiths’ The Origins of Osiris and his Cult [1980]: pp. 132 note 2, 141 note 2, 176 note 1) and contains too much falsehood to be trusted — S. Schröder in Gnomon 62, 1990, 485-98. Not only is the editing erratic and the apparatus misleading; constant inaccuracy of reference mars the lengthy ‘Notice’ and the derivative ‘Notes complémentaires’. For example, on p. 308 note 1, where τὰ μέν semble reprendre τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ (cf. J. Festugière, Deux notes sur le De Iside de Plutarque, C.R.A. I.B.L., 1959, p. 312-316), read ‘A. J. Festugière’ and ‘p. 312’ (these generic references are a scholarly bane whenever they recur too often, as here, pp. 33 note 1, 52 note 2, 70 note 6, 75 note 1, 79 note 1, 83 note 3, 84 notes 2-3, 91 note 3, 113 note 1, 118 note 2, 129 note 3, etc., cf. E. Laughton, Classical Review 6, 1956, 38); on p. 261 note 2, Froidefond cites an article “Platon in Ägypten” by K. Nawratil in the Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung 28, 1978, but he has the pagination so wrong (‘p. 421-439’; vere 598-603) that one suspects a second-hand reference — indeed, his reason to quote this study is too remote from its contents to evidence a direct knowledge of it (‘il est probable que Platon visita en effet la vallée du Nil’, whereas Nawratil marshals eidetic resemblances of a vague stamp between some Platonian doctrines and a few Egyptian texts). On the Egyptological side, which the Plutarch scholar Schröder could not assess, the Budé is far outshined by G. Griffiths; though he utilized Hani, Froidefond embodies very little progress on his predecessor, and his individual contribution lacks solidity. He relies on dated scholarship (Erman’s old religious handbook, p. 75 note 1; Lefebvre on the Egyptian ‘novels’, p. 92 note 1; Maspero, ibid, note 2; etc), whereas, of the work posterior to 1970, he mainly plundered F. Dunand’s theses; small wonder his bibliographies, when he bothers to give them, provide weak guidance (an excellent instance on 133 note 3)... Finally, beware of his contradictions; in the section of the ‘Notice’ on the Osiridian myth (132-40), we are successively told that the origins of Osiris, Isis, Horus, and Seth «se prêtent bien aux exégèses “évhéméristes” qui, comme celles de K. Sethe, par exemple, prétendent en déduire les événements principaux de la protohistoire égyptienne. Ce sont là de pures spéculations, et on ne peut en vouloir à Plutarque de les avoir écartées» (132), then that «on admet à présent qu’Osiris fut à l’origine un roi mort par noyade et c’est sans doute le séjour du cadavre dans le Nil, mis en rapport avec la crue fertilisante, qui avait fait d’Osiris, dès l’Ancien Empire, le dieu de la fertilité agraire et, en particulier, du blé» (135; by ‘à présent’ Froidefond means two studies from 1909-1915, cf. his note 2 — on the drowning of Osiris, read rather Te Velde, Seth, God of Confusion, 84-6; Hani, 48-51; and Griffiths, Origins, 9-10, all of whom envision it as his assassination by Seth rather than the natural, or fitting, death of a Nilotic figure; Froidefond’s view is tacitly discarded by D. Delia, “The Refreshing Waters of Osiris”, Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt 29, 1992, 181-90, cf. 182-8 for a survey, down to the Imperial era, of the Osiridian funerary beliefs associated with the liquid element). Froidefond was at least cognizant with Egypt; whether this applies to M. García Valdés, Plutarco, De Iside et Osiride. Introducción, texto crítico, traducción y comentario (Pisa-Rome, Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1995), is far from certain, owing to her preference for Wortphilologie and textual criticism over Egyptological, philosophical or religious analysis in the (thin) commentary and the notes to the translation. In fact, these interests were determined by her editorial policy: a very conservative editor who seems to relish in casting off long-accepted emendations, her text is often so strained as to demand exegesis going beyond the help of a crib. At 359 B grammar has been elicited out of the gibberish of the copyists by the clumsy arrangement πρὸς Πύλαι (πύλαις, πύλας mss.) νιστιτα (νιστιτάνην, νιστιτά μην mss.) ἄλλως, despite an unattested spelling and the weird geography entailed by this mention of the gates (of Memphis); parallels in Strabo and Diodorus strongly support πρὸς Φλωίς (Squire) νησίδα (the Adina; or νησίτιδα) ἄλλως, as advocated by Griffiths (365-7; the slight awkwarness of the unanswered μέν which immediately follows he justifies on
lapsing into the recrudescence of trendy verbiage which diminishes in my eyes the value of the Kaléidoscope and compromises the dialogical impact of the priestly knowledge on Greece Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism aims to uncover. Provided the details are never allowed to obscure the cardinal points raised by the Greek of Herodotus or Plutarch, and that the latest news from Egyptology are reviewed with proper independence of mind by the would-be interpreter, replacements of G. Griffiths or Lloyd are sure to prove a boon to knowledge while driving the last nail in Bernal’s coffin. A vast, new treatment of Diodorus’ first book is another great desideratum, albeit one diminished by this compiler’s clumsiness (T. W. Africa, “Herodotus and Diodorus on Égypt”, Journal of Near Eastern Studies 22, 1963, 254–8 at 254–5) and his astonishing gaps (O. Murray, Journal of Hellenic Studies 95, 1975, 215). The non-Egyptological A. Burton, Diodorus Siculus Book One. A Commentary, Leiden, Brill, 1972, generally turned a blind eye to these defects; «it provides a thoroughly useful primer to the many problems raised while rarely making more than the most tentative effort to solve them» (Lloyd, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 60, 1974, 289), and has cast long shadows on the issue of the sources and the detail of the text. Forty years

171 This is perhaps the best place to spell out a troublesome concern. Reference treatises whose narrative would have shed light on Bernal’s big picture and which double as treasure-troves of data, like Le mirage égyptien..., La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque, or The Gift of the Nile, only appear in BA III for details, nearly always of secondary importance, and in very low numbers (Froidefond elicited three mentions, Hani four, Vasunia one); Lloyd’s major commentary was somewhat more useful to Bernal due to the exalted position Herodotus occupies within his Ancient Model, yet its presence in the linguistic demonstration barely reaches the double figures (thirteen mentions by my reckoning). On the other hand, G. Griffiths on Plutarch is cited thrice, whereas none of the commentaries on Plato’s Timaeus (or on any other classical text) attracts a mention in the half-dozen places where this work features.

172 Burton tends to eschew the traces of Diodorus’ sloppiness except when they are huge, like the chronological discrepancy at 1.4.6-5.1 (39–42; either emend or plead guilty, pace P. Green, Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1 [Austin, University of Texas Press, 2006], 237–9, whose own scenario is baseless: «the historian (...) changed his mind at the last moment, subsequently forgetting — or not living long enough — to rework his chronological figures (...)» [p. 239]). Her Quellenbeitrag, pp. 1-34, extends to the entire book the conclusions reached by W. Spörri for chapters 7-8, 10-13 (Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter, Basel, Reinhardt, 1959, savaged by O. Gigon, Gnomon 33, 1961, 771–6, as an effort to dissolve into bland generalities the personality of the authors who peer through Diodorus’ rewriting;
after, considering its errors, many of them wide-ranging (e.g. Henrichs, “The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: Prodicus as the Spiritual Father of the Isis Aretalogies”, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 88, 1984, 139-58 at 147 note 32); its inclination to naivety (e.g. Burstein, *Graeco-Africana*, 27 note 30); and its low level of bibliographical engagement, this synthesis is toothless — no more «l’analyse approfondie d’un commentateur qualifié (qui) décelle un effort de synthèse par confrontation des sources» (Chamoux, p. XXIX) than the Egyptian chapters of Diodorus I have any right to be called «une monographie très complète, la plus complète et la plus intéressante qui soit intégralement parvenue jusqu’à nous depuis le livre II d’Hérodote» (*ibid.*, 8, ‘Notice’ by Vernière). No other project ought to command the same level of obsession with Egypt as the one seen in *Black Athena* than the writing of fresh commentaries on Herodotus II, Diodorus I, and the *De Iside and Osiride* especially now that we have Rosól’s book.

Of course there will be scholars who will raise their hands in horror at such a minimalist piece of advice, as the outcome of a massive disquisition no less. Did I only slay beasts to come up with the obvious? Yet I believe this appeal to be the child of necessity. In an already darkened and erratic world, no great flood of light is likely to be forthcoming unless it springs from the re-examination of our most extensive literary witnesses conducted in accordance with strict philological guidelines. When the task has been done, we shall use these new tools to reap knowledge in quarters which, for the

---

that 9 sqq. can still originate in Hecataeus of Abdera was shown by A. D. Nock, *Classical Review* 12, 1962, 50-1): for Burton, 37-41 and perhaps parts of 30-36 draw upon Agatharchides or Artemidorus; 7-13 reflect Spoerri’s philosophical *koine* of the first century B.C.; and the remainder of the book rests on a mosaic of informants, among which Hecataeus is by no means prominent, the personality of Diodorus showing through the repetitions and contradictions. Cf. rather Murray, “Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship”, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56, 1970, 141-71 at 169-70, Burstein, *Graeco-Africana*, 3-18, and compare the debate over Zosimus’ use of his sources in books II-V 25 of the *‘Istoria νέα.*

P. 118 «but whereas it was natural for a Greek colony in a foreign land to attempt to establish a firm connection with the strangers by claiming that the colony had been founded by some indigenous hero, the Greeks would be unlikely to invent at a later date a barbarian founder for their own famous cities in Greece unless tradition actually suggested that such was the case»; p. 127 note 1 «(...) the name Αἴγυπτος is conjectured to have come from *hwt k3 Pth* (...)». Montet, *Géographie*, 1, 32 disagrees on the grounds that *hwt* becomes in Greek ά or ἁ (e.g. *Hwt-Hr* becomes *Ἤθυρ* [sic]), but clearly the borrowings belong to completely different periods. Αἴγυπτος being borrowed much earlier than the rest, and therefore quite possibly following a different phonetic progression»; etc.

The apologetic tendency of the *Introduction générale* by F. Chamoux (in idem - P. Bertrac - Y. Vernière, *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque historique*, I, ’C.U.F.’, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1993) has justly been castigated as the result of faulty judgement informed by prejudice: J. Moles, *Classical Review* 44, 1994, 272-4 at 273, states that «failure (...) adequately to contextualise D. within ancient historiography exaggerates his distinctiveness (...)». Many of C.’s judgements seem too favourable». There is another cause to this leniency: Chamoux was entirely under the spell of his adviser (p. VII note *) Spoerri, cf. XI-XII, XXXVII note 95, etc.
moment, remain uncharted or inadequately mapped out. Perhaps the most burning topic is the Egyptian opus of Hecataeus of Abdera (FGrHist 264 F 1-6 plus the monstrous F 25 = Diodorus 1.10-98; not even its title has been preserved: Ἀἰγυπτιακά? or Περὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων?). This work buttressed the dependence on Egypt not only of Greece but, in a move not normally given its fair share of attention by Hellenists despite a concordance with the mindset of the Third Intermediate Period, of the entire world (per Diodorus 1.28, 1-29, 6). The Egyptian treatise of Hecataeus also appears to have been an influential source of Diodorus’ first book, in which the Hecataean ‘fragments’ loom large, and of Euhemerus, who followed his predecessor in

175 Especially 28.1 οἱ δ’ οὖν Αἰγύπτιοι φασι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα άποικίας πλείστας εξ Αἰγύπτου κατά πάσαν διασπαρῆναι τὴν οἰκουμένην, the source of which appears to Burton ‘unlikely to be Hecataeus. The problem is a vexed one’ (p. 18), despite Murray, ‘Hecataeus...’, 145 (for whom it would have given this ethnographer «an effective claim for the attention of the civilized world on behalf of the nascent Ptolemaic state, and one which provoked answers from other Hellenistic historians under different patronage»), and G. E. Sterling, Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography (Leiden, Brill, 1992), 71-2. An Egyptian source states that Amun has founded all the lands of the world plus Egypt, from which the manual crafts (mnḫ.t) came forth: Wenamun, 2. 19-21, in Schipper, Die Erzählung des Wenamun, 72-3 (bilingual text with notes), cf. 195-6 (commentary); both translation and interpretation are wide off the mark in Goedicke, The Report of Wenamun, 84-153, 85. If Schipper is right to emphasize a relatively late date for the composition of this work, under Shosheng l (viz. 943-923 B.C.; Hornung - R. Krauss - D. A. Warburton (edd.), Ancient Egyptian Chronology [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2006], 493; ca. 945-924 for Kitchen, Third Intermediate Period..., §§ 58-60, pp. 72-6 at 76), the importance given Amun by the redactor mirrors both this god’s theocratic status in the 21-22th Dynasties and his presence on seal-amulets of the post-Ramesside period discovered in Palestine and Egypt (Schipper, 299-324). In any case, Wenamun 2. 19-21 provides more than a passable fit with both Diodorus, 1.28.1 and 69.5 λέγουσι τοῖνυν Αἰγύπτιοι παρ’ αὑτοῖς τὴν τε τῶν γραμμάτων εὕρεσιν γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀστρόν παρατήρησιν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τὰ κατὰ τὴν γεωμετρίαν θεωρήματα καὶ τῶν τεκνῶν τὰς πλείστας εὑρεθῆναι (the latter passage already noted by Sterling, 71 and note 68). Hecataeus is the most likely intermediate, if not the only conceivable one so far as we can know, who appears to have consulted Egyptian materials (priestly lists — e.g. Murray, ‘Hecataeus...’, 151 and note 3; Moyer, Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism, 104 — and perhaps more, despite his ignorance of the language: Burstein, “Hecataeus of Abdera”, in J. H. Johnson (ed.), Life in a Multicultural Society. Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond [Chicago, Oriental Institute, 1992], 45-9 at 49 = Graeco-Africana, 19-27 at 24). 176 Pace Burton, 15-6, reflected by Chamoux (pp. XXVIII-XXIX), and with all due awareness of C. E. Muntz, Diodorus Siculus, Egypt, and Rome (diss. Duke, 2008), 9-27; cf. rather J. Campos d’Arca – P. P. Fuentes Gonzales, ‘Hécatée d’Abdère’, in R. Goulet (dir.), Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques (Paris, CNRS, 2000), II, 505-25 at 509-13, and Sterling, 61-75. The most conspicuous test for the dependence of large chunks of Diodorus I on a source well-informed of things Egyptian — the issue was not put in those terms by Spoerri — can be sought in the separation of Heaven and Earth, after which the air plays a large role, at 7.1. This chapter and most of the following one (Spoerri, 1-131, particularly 114 sqq.) have been variously given to Democritus, Hecataeus, Epicurus, Posidonius (doxography in Chamoux et al., 185 note 3; 1 7, 1-3 + 1 10, 2 + 1 10, 6-7 = Posidonius, fr. 306 W. Theiler, defended at Poseidonios. Die Fragmente [Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1982], 183-5); we need not seek any unity of source here (Burton, 44, 46) and the agreement of 7, 1 κατά γὰρ τὴν εξ ἀρχῆς
building a Greek utopia, or rather a fantasy, out of Egyptian elements\textsuperscript{177}. On the whole, Hecataeus cuts a more dignified figure than is currently supposed, cf. Burstein, p. 49 «his revised kinglist was a considerable achievement, an achievement which suggests that a similar analysis of the fragments of those portions of Hecataeus’ work that deal with Egypt in his own time would also be worthwhile». The Αἰγυπτιακά / Περί τῶν Αἰγυπτίων thus demands the kind of assessment which only a meticulous commentary of Diodorus I may put on a sound basis if it has a firm grasp of both Egypt and the historian’s compilatory method\textsuperscript{178}. «Having chosen to use a certain author


\textsuperscript{178} That the major strands of his surviving books, if not his entire books, stem from one source at a time — P. Goukowsky, Diodore de Sicile Livre XVII (C.U.F., Paris, Belles Lettres, 1976), IX-XXVI at XV-XIX (‘il reste vrai que le travail de Diodore a surtout consisté à résumer un historien hellénistique’ p. XVI, namely Clitarchus); idem, Livre XVIII (ibid., 1978), IX-XXIV at XII-XVII (Hieronymus of Rhodes); B. Bommelaer, Livre III (ibid., 1989), IX-XXXI at X-XIV (Agatharchides) — is now doubted by the most recent editors in the ‘C.U.F.’ (for Ephorus, J. Haillet, Livre XI [2001], X-XX at XV; B. Eck, Livre XII [2003], X-XXXVII at XIV-XV). It must be declared that what they replace it by is both complicated and fragile: for instance, Haillet, X-XI, tells us that Herodotus was a / the key source for the Thermopylae episode, which surprises one given the massive discrepancies between the later narrative and the earlier one. More damagingly, P. J. Stylianou, A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998), 49-84, showed with strong arguments how Ephorus lurks behind most of book 15, which confirms the old notion that Diodorus actually epitomized him for the Greek and Persian narratives of books 11-5; differently, G. Parmeggiani, Εφορος τῆς Κοινῆς Στοιχείωσης τοῦ Σμύρνης (Bologna, Patrón, 2011), 349-94, who does not dispose of all of Stylianou’s evidence. As I hope to have suggested by (seemingly forgotten) Egyptian parallels to Diodorus 1.7.1 and 1.28.1 - 69.1, in specific instances the positivist stance retains some merit. Generally speaking, the trendy methods of present-day historians look to me more assertory than probative, in that they demand cogency in the harebrained operations of a compiler (Muntz, Diodorus Siculus, Egypt, and Rome, 19-21); turn into a positive virtue Diodorus’ efficiency in erasing the stylistic particulars of the one historian he draws upon (e.g. Green, Diodorus Siculus, 26–9) while mistaking the position of the Quellenforscher (of course, per Parmeggiani, 392, Diodorus does not transcribe the contents of his source; compare F. W. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, II [Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967].
because that author’s particular interests coincide with his own, [Diodorus] has a tendency to interpolate variant accounts of those aspects which again particularly interest him. Thus the original author is expanded precisely at those points on which he gave most information, and correspondingly perhaps abbreviated most heavily where he was originally weakest; the faults and virtues of the original are intensified» (Murray, ‘Hecataeus…’, 148).

«A mixture of incompetence, lack of care, and ignorance is responsible for the vagaries which abound. (...) A complete list of Diodorus’ blunders would be of very respectable length» (Stylianou, 137-8). Unfortunately, once the best of replacements for Lloyd and Griffiths and Burton are available, there is a real chance that even small-scale advances might never occur, so murky is the ancient evidence.

Needless to say, such commentaries would only ever play in the hands of scholars reminiscent of Van Sertima. Afrocentrists are, with the rarest exceptions, plunderers who forever give a twist to what they have read and only dip into the learned literature insofar as it supports their views; the finest commentaries will be lost on them. Those classicists who endorse(d) Bernal look scarcely, if at all, more likely to put to good use a fresh Diodorus I, Herodotus II, or De Iside et Osiride: Levine, McCoskey, Rankine possess neither inclination nor technical equipment to dirty their hands with philological subtleties; and the output of Griffith, who has both, exhibits an extravagance which at times reaches romance. Indeed the least that must be written about him is that he throws caution to the wind in order to score a point whether he deals with a problem of classical philology or

246-7 at 10.36.5); and pillory source criticism as assumption-ridden and hyperspeculative, as if their own ventures were not (e.g. C. A. Baron, Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography [Cambridge-New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013], 12-4). The whole matter of the sources remains, for Diodorus, an affair of individual, scholarly conviction; I am glad to find myself in agreement with Moyer, Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism, 104 and note 68.

179 Griffith, “Putting Your Mouth Where Your Money Is: Eumolpus’ Will, Pasta e Fagioli, and the Fate of the Soul in South Italian Thought from Pythagoras to Ennius”, in G. Casadio - P. A. Johnston (edd.), Mystic Cults in Magna Graecia (Austin, University of Texas Press, 2009), 131-6. The wish of this Petronian character to be eaten after his death so that he should acquire a ‘living tomb’ serves as the pretext for a Gorgias-centered attempt to trace all Graeco-Roman beliefs in rebirth back to Italy; it compensates its dearth of compelling arguments with a pompous title and displays of largely irrelevant learning. «The point of intersection is the one heir not repelled by Eumolpus’ stipulation (...). This man (...) is named Gorgias. This cannot fail to recall the “indefatigable stylist” (...) from Leontini, Sicily, who enthralled Athenians at the turn of the fourth century with his verbal pyrotechnics developed as “an analog of the culinary art” (...) — remember that the connection between rhetoric and cuisine is drawn in the very first chapter of the Satyricon (1.3, 2.1, 2.8-9 (...))», Griffith contends on 132, yet nothing specifically points to the Sophist there (cf. S. Breitenstein, Petronius, Satyrica 1-15. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar [Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2009], 22-7). What is more, he cannot even be trusted upon to mention his predecessors (the suggestion that the Petronian Gorgias was meant to recall Gorgias of Leontini should have been credited to E. Courtney,
attacks an Egyptocentric issue. All the more reason, after BA III, to call for a moratorium on the spread of the literary scholarship devoted to the Egyptian influence on Greece and have the Afroasiatic zest bite the dust for good: mihi persuasissimum est Bernalem recte facturum numquam. I am not naive; the postmodernism of the eighties and nineties may have elapsed, its extreme disavowal of the clear-cut answers of traditional scholarship is no longer popular, yet the air has not been completely cleared of the spirit of irrationality that allowed Bernal to pass off his counternarrative for legitimate research. The lack of nose for shoddy scholarship out of which Levine and others waxed poetic about Black Athena still persists, that no ostracism of their ringleader and containment of Egyptocentrism will remedy. Before a neurotic analogy with Darwin, On the Origin of Species, Bernal closed BA III by asserting «I am convinced that between cultures known on other grounds to have been in contact, while quality of etymologies is desirable, quantity is also important. I believe that the more plausible etymologies of the kind proposed here one finds, the more additional ones should be accepted» (p. 585). As if the multiplication of possibilities, however protracted, of itself increased probability! The best we should achieve is ensure that such idle talk does not reach posterity; I suggest extinguishing its eventual by-products as soon as they come out and building a shield wall around those tenets of BA III and its attending literature that look deceitful enough to grow roots. (Time shall decide whether the present disquisition will nip in the bud attempts at canonization of the series; I merely trust I have made more complicated the task of whoever decides that the world will be the better for a fresh apology of Bernal or another exposition of the need for extreme cultural diffusionism applied to Greece).

The Egyptian impact on the Greek language barely exists (if anything, Greek was more influential on Egyptian through Coptic). Researching that so-called impact is a dead end and a waste of time. West Semitic influences on Greek at the lexical level there were, yet what remains to be brought to light in this field does not allow one to jump the wagon and juggle claims of wholesale Afroasiatic penetration on Greece. On the other hand and in deference to the truth, the reverse stance must be declared equally uncalled for. A Hellenist’s obsession with those parts of the Near East which are now demonstrated to have been most influential on the budding Greek civilization too easily degenerates into displays of foolhardiness and insobriety. The will

“Two Notes on Petronius”, Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici 40, 1998, 205-7 at 207, who sees an echo in 116.9), let alone use them to their fullest extent (so H. D. Rankin, “‘Eating People Is Right’: Petronius 141 and a ΤΟΠΟΣ”, Hermes 97, 1969, 381-4; Griffith pays lip-service to it yet remains mum on its reconstruction of a genealogy of the topic of cannibalism from the fifth century B.C. Sophists down to the school θέσει of the first century AD, clearly so that it should not spoil his own, different and much more speculative, descent — this I call scholarly dereliction of duty).
to march with the times determined some classicists to wildly attack with Levantine comparanda what they might without rashness have interpreted along purely Greek lines\textsuperscript{180}. They were not entirely misguided, for looks-alike at the lexical level\textsuperscript{181} from Mesopotamia or the Levant embody a

\textsuperscript{180} Even though he wrote prior to \textit{The East Face of Helicon}, which proved to be both a landmark and a game-changer, and looked backwards to the antiquated Frisk and Chantraine or the fragmented articles by Szemerényi, Hemmerdinger, and Fournet, which were still fresh but rest on data that cannot any longer be deemed adequate, Francis was basically right to caution against overconfidence in assigning the origins of Greek lexemes and cultural artifacts to Anatolia, or the Levant, or Mesopotamia: «(...) we must beware of supposing that, even with the great advances in Near Eastern lexicology over the past thirty years, our present impression of the relationship between Greece and the Near East in matters of lexicon will undergo radical change. There are many reasons for such restraint. Even though we are increasingly well-informed about contacts between Greeks and their trading partners in the ancient world, it is often difficult to find the kind of cultural evidence which might render an apparent connection between a Greek and non-Greek word more than merely adventitious» (‘Impact…’, 486). Suffice it to constrast the stance of the enthusiastic yet ill-informed Louden: «the likeliest scenario for cultural diffusion is Greek contact with Phoenician culture, whether in ancient Syria, on Cyprus, or in the Greek world. Ongoing archeological research affirms how close ties were at times between Greeks and various Near Eastern peoples, the Phoenicians in particular. Since the Greeks obtained their alphabet from the Phoenicians (...), and Greek myth assigns key roles to Phoenicians (Cadmus, most importantly), it is likely that the two cultures also engaged in \textit{exchanges of narratives}, or specific genres of myth, as well» (\textit{Homer’s Odyssey and the Near East}, 10, original emphasis). The proof of the pudding being in the eating, when all that Louden can muster amounts to pleading, in note 10, that «the \textit{Odyssey} makes many references to Phoenicians or Phoenician culture: 4.83–4, 618; 13.272, 285; 14.291; 15.118, 415, 419, 425, 473; cf. \textit{Iliad} 6.290–1; 23.743–4», one feels cheated. Another textbook case of insobriety lies in Kingsley’s treatment of Egypt and Mesopotamia in his \textit{Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic. Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition} (New York, Clarendon Press, 1995): learning means little, and there is an enormous amount of it in this book, when assertion displaces demonstration in the case of the nature and geographical spread of what Kingsley defines as the Orientalized wisdom Empedocles and the Pythagoreans upheld; too much should not be read for these philosophers into the fact that their homeland, Sicily, was a cultural and trading \textit{plaque tournante} in the Archaic period (242–4, 331–2) unless there exists material evidence apt to be detailed in a less exalted and cursory fashion than Kingsley’s.

\textsuperscript{181} G. Rubio, \textit{Language} 74, 1998, 686–7 (review of Levin, \textit{Semitic and Indo-European}): «ultimately this book does not deal with etymologies at all but with look-alikes. From the very beginning the author himself declares the kinship between his approach and Alfredo Trombetti’s (viii). This book is, thus, a continuation of such a prescientific and merely intuitive way of searching for etymologies. With the same lack of methodological awareness, the author could have broadened his scope by comparing also Greek \textit{potamós} with Potomac, Latin \textit{deus} and Nahuatl \textit{teotl}, etc.» To set the record right, one ought to specify that, if Levin’s appreciation for the oeuvre of Trombetti, primarily the \textit{Saggi di glottologia generale comparata} (which he was only able to consult at the eleventh hour, pp. VIII–IX), rather seems to belong to the personal level, it will not be denied that \textit{Semitic and Indo-European} seems extremely fond of referencing the wild Italian (as per the index, p. 462). With respect to methodology, both writers can be lumped together as irrationalists, since Levin damages his stance by harking back to the naivety of Trombetti. Does he not posit that «the language of the received texts in those manuscripts» (of Homer, the R̥g-Veda, and the Hebrew Bible) «must be taken to go indefinitely far back for we have no data about the language as it was earlier»: \textit{The Indo-Eu-
temptation that should be resisted whenever the conditions are not favorable — when staunch linguistic considerations can hardly be adduced on their behalf and too little emphasis lays on the cumulation of evidence and the reciprocal support between aspects of the hypothesis. Yet whoever does a crude postmortem on the Homeric epics, brands them a concatenation of several genres of myths richly present in the Bible or the Ugaritic epics, then recovers a dialogical relationship between the Greek poems and these Levantine forerunners, can be a fine scholar like Louden, nonetheless he hardly improves on Bernal’s magpie-like picking out of diamonds and shards of glass in the primary sources. This cross-cultural researcher is very unlikely to be willing to glance beyond the surface of things when lexical looks-alike in Greek and a Near Eastern language cross his path. (One must be a properly informed and properly attentive interpreter to feel the type of Anstoss which prevents one from embracing causes a West or a Burkert would never throw the weight of their authority behind). The same temptation to forgo method has to be resisted in the case of the common etymological meaning of lexemes which we know to have been current in a roughly similar field or capacity at the same time, in possibly related parts of Greece and the Near East. Both types of commonalities usually turn out to be mere

ropean and Semitic Languages (Albany, SUNY Press, 1971), 11? On the contrary, thanks to Linear B (which Levin strangely discards in his first tome; Semitic and Indo-European II makes but restricted use of this evidence, on 128, 242, 257, 375) and the Bronze Age formulaic elements embedded in the Homeric dialect, like ἀσπίδος ἀμφῖβρότης, Διὶ μῆτὶν ὀτῶλαντος, Ἑνῡαλίωι ἀνδρειφόντηι, we are able to make more than educated guesses at ‘the language as it was earlier’. Unsurprisingly, the sheer mass of data made available in both volumes of Levin is the only good thing about them.

182 So the overseer called ἐπίσκοπος in institutional, fifth-century B.C. Attic parlance and רכבר in the Hebrew of Qumran, backed up by the equivalence (?) between the contemporary verbs ἐπισκοπεῖν and רכבר (Ezra 7: 14). Steiner thus speculated that «the רכבר in the Persian empire was the model for the ἐπίσκοπος in the Athenian empire. After all, the Athenian empire grew out of an alliance of Greek states against Persia. And it is certainly suggestive that the earliest attestations of the ἐπίσκοπος in the technical sense is in a decree from Erythrae in Ionia. The Greek cities of Ionia were part of the Persian empire before being incorporated into the Athenian empire, and Erythrae in particular was a hotbed of Medizers before they were driven out. It seems likely that ἐπίσκοπος was their term for the occasional רכבר sent by the Persian government. One might even theorize that the Athenians learned both the institution and the technical use of the term (and perhaps even a Persian-style uniform) from the Ionians, but this is not essential to my argument» “The mbqr at Qumran, the episkopos in the Hebrew Empire, and the Meaning of ἐβαρ in Ezra 7: 14: On the Relation of Ezra’s Mission to the Persian Legal Project”, Journal of Biblical Literature 120, 2001, 623-46 at 628-9). Steiner’s discussion, 626-9, has been debunked by D. Janzen, The Social Meanings of Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible. A Study of Four Writings (Berlin, De Gruyter, 2004), 197-8: you cannot reduce the ἐπίσκοπος to its Attic use, and the philology fails to cohere. The Septuagint, which employs ἐπίσκοπος but twice to equate to ν PQD (so Janzen, 198 note 42, adding H. S. Gehman, “Ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἐπισκέφθης, ἐπίσκοπος, and ἐπισκοπή in the Septuagint in Relation to פֵּקַד and Other Hebrew Roots: A Case of Semantic Development Similar to That of Hebrew”, Vetus Testamentum 22, 1972, 197-207, e.g. at 199-204 for ἐπισκέπτομαι), never has
scholarly illusions which it would be unreasonable to maintain, let alone multiplicate. Otherwise, true Levantine borrowings in Greek are likely to pass unnoticed\textsuperscript{183}, and all Classical interlopers on the cuneiform or alphabetic

\begin{quote}
\textit{ἐπίσκοπος} apropos of $\sqrt{BQR}$ (ץעב; cf., e.g., Hoftijzer-Jongeling, I, 187, bqr 1), « which would be odd if \textit{episkopos} is the Greek translation of a Northwest Semitic $mbqr$ » (Janzen, 198). More damaging yet, Steiner speculates that « $ארָכֶה$ has the meaning "to exercise the office of רָכֶה" (just as $ἐπίσκοπος$ has the meaning "to exercise the office of $ἐπίσκοπος$" and just as B(iblical) $H(ebrew)$ $נַחַל$ has the meaning "to exercise the office of $נַחַל$" and that the $דַּרְכֶּה$ was a “temporary overseer” or “visiting commissioner” sent by the Persian government to subject states to oversee major projects, like the setting up of a judicial system» (628); yet the claim hardly goes beyond a chain of analogies void of Persian evidence. Steiner only documents the Athenian side whereas the plausible Persian loanword in the Aramaic of the \textit{Mishnah Tamid}, 5:3, תפ, ‘overseer’, was at hand, like the further cases marshaled by C. E. Carter, \textit{The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period. A Social and Demographic Study} (Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999), 80. Finally, despite Steiner’s silence, the Attic $ἐπίσκοπος$ is hardly capable of not being proved to be the eminent Persian official which the Greeks translated as $ὄφθαλμος$ τοῦ $βασιλέως$ or $βασιλείας$ $ὄφθαλμος$, the overseer / observer / spy not yet attested directly outside of the Indo-Iranian mythology. Old Iranian *spašaka-, Old Persian *spaštaka-, cf. Proto-Iranian *spas-, ‘to attend to, serve’ (Cheung, \textit{Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb}, 533-4; also, Bailey, \textit{Dictionary of Khotan Saka}, 436-7, s.v. spāss-, ‘to look’, Mayrhofer, \textit{Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen}, II, 107-8, s.v. \textit{PAS}) and PIE *$v$spek’, ‘to look around, take notice’. Read further H. Lommel, “Die Späher des V aruna und Mitra und das Auge des Königs”, \textit{Oriens} 6, 1953, 323-33, whose philological part, 324-31, remains unsurpassed; A. L. Oppenheim, “The Eyes of the Lord”, \textit{Journal of the American Oriental Society} 88, 1968, 173-80; J. M. Balcer, “The Athenian Episkopoi and the Achaemenid ‘King’s Eye’ ”, \textit{American Journal of Philology} 98, 1977, 252-63 at 255-62 (the basic study; « the major difference between the two offices is obviously not in their function but rather in their method of selection », p. 262); and Briant, \textit{Histoire de l’Empire perse}, 355-6 = \textit{From Cyrus to Alexander}, 343-4. The *spašaka- is a great deal more thorny and elusive than J. Wiesehöfer, \textit{Ancient Persia. From 550 BC to 650 AD} (London, Tauris, 2001), 266, cf. 62, makes it look; cf. A. F. Garvie, \textit{Aeschylus Persae. With Introduction and Commentary} (Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press, 2009), at v. 980, p. 354 (alas with inadequate bibliography and limited understanding, as happens too often in his handling of Achaemenid matters); we cannot even ascertain whether our Greek sources are to be trusted whenever they suppose the uniqueness of the Eye, in which case he must have been of far more exalted rank than an underling like a spy (so Wiesehöfer; Garvie; or M. Brosius, “New Out of Old ? Court and Court Ceremonies in Achaemenid Persia”, in A. J. S. Spawforth (ed.), \textit{The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies} [Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007], 17-57 at 30-1). As a matter of fact, whoever considers that the Eye influenced the Attic $ἐπίσκοπος$ in any capacity will naturally tend to diminish the status of this Persian official, as per the comparative evidence, see Oppenheim, 180 « the documentary sources at our disposal hardly mention the day-to-day doings of that host of ever present and interfering “eyes” and “ears.” We learn more about them when their activities are transferred to a supernatural level and they appear either as evil demons, as the swift messengers and servants of the “Eyes of the Lord” ». To conclude, whatever the usual qualities of Steiner’s scholarship, not only is his argumentation lightweight and lacking in profundity on both Greek and Semitic sides; there is not much to say for the derivation רָכֶה > $ἐπίσκοπος$ and decisive objections against it. His failure stands as a warning against reading too much into cross-cultural similarities: the boundary between (more or less striking) coincidences and conceivable instances of derivation or borrowing must not be blurred further.

\textsuperscript{183} That is, whenever they are not as clear as $אֱּצֶרוֹס$ (Slater, \textit{Lexicon to Pindar}, 58) < Iranian *$a$xšaina-, ‘dark-colored’ (Old Persian $a$xšaina-, Young Avestan $a$xšaēna-, Ossetic $a$xśin
traditions of the Near East will eventually end up mimicking the paragons of intuitive scholarship who inspired Bernal\footnote{One has to do them justice: the differences between Levin, Astour, or Gordon and Bernal all boil down to the dichotomy between polymath linguists and an uncontrolled amateur. While the former scholars are basically competent in all of the scripts and languages they compare (Levin being far more philologically aware in Greek than either Gordon or Astour, who in turn dwarf him in matters assyriological), Bernal is not in possession of a working knowledge of the main Classical, Near Eastern, and Afroasiatic tongues. Yet, are not the differences between a professional linguist and a crank abolished when one watches Gordon decide that the Linear A sign L57 (whose phonetic value was very uncertain back in 1966, when Evidence for the Minoan Language was released) must be \textit{ja-ne} = Hebrew יין, \textit{yayin}, ‘wine’, for no more compelling reason that the group of signs L32-L57 were found on a pithos fragment and that other pithoi carry the wine ideogram? The frequency of similar leaps of faith in the works of Astour, Gordon, Bernal makes an ugly smear across the scholarship of the past half century.}

I see no point in mincing words here: Greek philology and linguistics are rather more difficult to master at an advanced level than Semitists think, lulled as they are into a fake feeling of safety by the ease of the script and the existence of a plethora of sophisticated grammatical and lexicographical repertories the likes of which hardly exist in their home turf. It follows that experts in the Levantine languages usually tackle comparative matters with methods and an erudition no classicist worth his reputation would deem businesslike\footnote{Gordon does not know the Doric plural genitive of the \textit{-ά} themes (θυρῶν, not θυρανός); the Doric spelling of μονή (μόνα, not μόνα); or the grammatical expression of reciprocity (the Greek epigraphic sequences Μ\textit{[YN]}ΑΤΟΔΙΟΙ and ΜΥΝΑΤΟ\textit{[OI} both get analyzed as \textit{μονή τω μονή}, viz. μονή τω \textit{ολλάς}, ‘one [f.] to another [m.]’; not only is this mere gibberish for \textit{ολλάς τω ἀλλῷ}, the only correct form to which other archaic Cretan and Dorian inscriptions conform, the true readings are ΜΗΑΤΟΔΙΟΙ and ΜΥΝΑΟΔΙΟΙ — all three examples borrowed from Duhoux, \textit{L’étocrétois...}, 226 (cf. Heubeck, \textit{Gnomon} 39, 708, for the last two). Red herrings crop up in large numbers in Astour, \textit{Hellenosemitica}, 145-7; I shall address only two: \textit{the adjective “Phoenician” was already used by the Mycenaean Greeks as \textit{ponike} (= \textit{phoinika}) (145) misreads PY Ta 722.1 out of blind reliance on Ventris-Chadwick, \textit{Documents of Mycenaean Greek} (the singular \textit{po-ni-ke} followed by \textit{qe} is an instrumental listed after a horse, a man, and an octopus — \textit{a-to-ro-qo i-qo-qe po-ru-po-de-qe po-ni-ke-qe} — so can only be a material object, ‘palm-tree’ rather than ‘palmette’); this error is repeated and grows to massive proportions on 146-7, where Astour preys on \textit{po-ni-ke}, \textit{po-ni-ki-ja} > \textit{φοίνικιος} (\textit{DMic.}, II, 138-140) to posit a West Semitic loanword for the Greek names of the purple and the Phoenicians — unfortunately, the semantic-etymological relationship between the toponym and the color is outright muddled, something an Hellenist or a linguist would hardly have ignored (cf., e.g., Beekes, s.v. φοίνικς; II, 1584-5). Astour further asseverates, p. 169 note 4, that an \textit{inscription} of the Phrygian king Midas (...) contains the peculiar Mycenaean}. Small wonder one hundred
years and some of ‘scientific’ Semitic etymologizing of the Greek enigmas, from Lewy to Bernal, reaped but little firm result. To add insult to injury, these dealings were seldom met head on by those most qualified to assess the situation from the Levantine side. So we classicists really ought to stop imitating wild Semitists by dragging in the Levant or Mesopotamia on texts where traits from these cultures are not obviously bubbling below the surface. For we should know better than to perpetuate the circles which end up foisting upon the reader a mass of speculations best forgotten. If it means that some of us need to move on to greener pastures, well, this will be a small price to pay.

titles lawag(e)ta (or lawalta, Phrygian variant) and wanakta, “duke” and “king”, as if Linear B wa-na-ka did not mean ‘lord’ applied to king or god (P. Carlier, La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre [Strasbourg, AECR, 1984], 76-91, DMic., II, 400-1, D. Nakassis. Individuals and Society in Mycenaean Pylos [Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2013], 6-7 for the king, 13-14 for the chief producer; Linear B preserves ra-wa-qa-ta and ra-wa-qa-ja for a kind of leader second only to the wa-na-ka: DMic., II, 229-231); Astour also equates ki-e-u to ‘Ugaritic Ky, Kyn and Nuzu Ki-ia’, 342, in defiance of the crystal-clear *Xihuêγς (DMic., II, 388) and though the Ugaritic comparanda are mere personal names, not ethnics (Del Olmo Lete-Sanmartín, I, 474); etc.

With the one exception of M. H. Pope (who mauled Gordon’s Before the Bible in the Journal of Biblical Literature 83, 1964, 72-6, underscoring ‘an excess of zeal and defect of caution in the search for parallels’ [76]), the greatest Semitic scholars, Albright, Driver, M. Cohen, Moscati, or Lipiński, did not distance themselves from their colleagues eager to teach Hellenists how unexplained Greek lexemes, customs, institutions can be traced back to the Levant. These masters must have been keenly aware of the similarity of method between Gordon or Astour and the prescientific Bochart and Bogan, yet they remained mum. Had Bernal’s models been assailed by the best of their peers, he would perhaps have thought twice before entering the fray the way he did. The historiographical myth of the distrust of all Classicists and Indo-Europeans vis-à-vis the Semitic languages, which resulted from the demolition of Gordon and Astour by the only competent readers of their books who decided to assess their case, viz. specialists of linguistics and Greek, has its roots in this abstention of Albright et al. (this further Weakens the stance of Rendsburg, ‘Someone Will Succeed...’).

Martin Bernal died of illness on June 9, 2013 while the present pages were in their ultimate stage of revision. It has been judged timely not to delay their publication and indispensable to preserve their outspokenness, as if the old fighter were still among us and would swiftly respond. Truth seemed more important than the courtesy due the dead, the future of classical studies (which have not been unaffected by the cultural war waged around Black Athena) takes precedence over a politically correct sense of scholarly loss. — This article is dedicated to Mary Lefkowitz, for her indefatigable commitment to the best historiographical and philological tradition despite the ingratitude of big chunks of the academe (sunt enim quibus nihil omnino satisfaciat). Her scrutiny of the many successive drafts of these pages, along numerous comments or suggestions, has been instrumental too; her assistance is acknowledged here with the deepest gratitude. Stephanie Budin, Thomas Römer, and Oliver Simkin have put me in their debt by answering queries over points of detail, by no means always bearing directly on Black Athena, and by providing welcome stylistic input. Needless to say these four scholars share no responsibility in my vitriol (and at least two of them strongly dissent from my, politically incorrect, name-calling). It was necessary, though, to confront sloppiness and unmask the instances in which friendship or partisanship had been allowed to override the facts; I might well have been crueler and drawn a list of well-regarded classicists thanked by Bernal in his prefaces — the same ones who happen to rely on insights from Black Athena III,
ADDENDA

- Note 40:
Adams has now revamped his lexicon: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged* (Amsterdam, Rodopi, 2013), 2 vol. The complementary project edited by G. Carling in collaboration with G. Pinault and Winter, *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A, I A-J* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2009), would have warranted a mention had its etymological sections not eschewed, as a rule, all speculations on the Proto-Indo-European affiliations to limit the reconstruction at the Common Tocharian stage (p. XIII). The appendices in M. Peyrot, *The Tocharian Subjunctive. A Study in Syntax and Verbal Stem Formation* (Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2013), provide a parsing of the relevant passages from both dialects, pp. 621-717, and a richly annotated ‘Overview of stem patterns’, pp. 719-847. It may be worth pointing out that *BA III* is oftener wrong than right as regards this evidence, by dint of dependence on sources both antiquated and second-hand; thus, on p. 371, ‘the Tocharian B aĭ’ — without the hyphen! — should be āy- or -e A (Carling et al., I, 41-2) and ay- B, aĭ- actually being the root (Malzahn, 542-3, 546) though it is usually considered the spelling of the B dialect (Adams¹, 100-1; Adams², I, 106-107; it entails the meaning ‘to give’ only in the active); on p. 391, ‘to fall’ should be klāw- A, klāy- B rather than merely klā- as reported in Chantraine (Adams¹, 220-1; Malzahn, 619-20; Peyrot, 743; Adams², I, 238-239); on p. 637 note 99, no less than three unsourced howlers have crept in, put right in *Aristarchus antibarbarus*, XII.

- P. 301:
An infamous instance of cultural contact through a Greek colony in Egypt, the identification of Zeus with Ammon can hardly be ‘far older’ than Pindar, whatever the «close links between the ancient oracle of Zeus at Dodona and

whether or not they endorse the book (for instance, Ahl: see *BA I*, XVI; *BA II*, XXII; *Black Athena Writes Back*, XI; and *BA III*, XVI). Finally, I must thank Miryam Librán Moreno for her kind offices, and the staff of *Exemplaria Classica* who dealt efficiently with the demanding manuscript of an opinionated author; without them, it would have proved impossible to treat *Black Athena III* with the necessary παρρησία and ἀγχίνοια. I must apologize to the reader before taking my leave: I intended to debunk Bernal with the amount of technicalities in the absence of which such a sore loser is sure to claim to have been malignantly misunderstood, yet his attempt to blur the lines between legitimate, cross-cultural ingenuity and multilingual quackery was so intricate, with layer upon layer of error-ridden special pleading, that the outcome has been a recrudescence of brick-and-mortar detail. I am loath to plead guilty for this state of affairs whilst admitting that a more laconic style and a sterner refusal to digress might have been preferable. What I ask forgiveness for is the inevitable degree of rigidity my piece exhibits in matters ethnographical and historiographical; I confess to being a pragmatist, old school if you prefer, insofar as influences and sources are concerned, so I favored scraps of evidence, however arcane or minute, over theory-ridden superstructures.
those of Am(m)on at Siwa and Thebes» (BA III, 478), cf. C. J. Classen, “The Libyan God Ammon in Greece before 331 B.C.”, Historia 8, 1959, 349-55, as summarized on 355: «in the third quarter of the fourth century B.C. the Libyan god Ammon, who had originally come from Thebes in Egypt, and his oracle in the oasis of Siwah were well known in many parts of Greece, the mainland as well as the islands and Asia Minor. It was obviously through the (mainly Dorian) colonists in Cyrene that the Greeks became acquainted with the god, first on the Peloponnesos, then elsewhere, especially in ports which had close commercial contacts with Cyrene. And as Ammon came to Greece through the mediation of Greeks he was not, though a Libyan god, regarded as foreign and his oracle took its place beside Delphi and Dodona. The history of its increasing fame in Greece is an interesting chapter of colonial history as it reveals the rôle which the colony Cyrene played as mediator between two civilisations». Consult further A. M. Woodward, “Athens and the Oracle of Ammon”, Annals of the British School at Athens 57, 1962, 5-13, for some fourth-century B.C. dedications to Zeus Ammon, along, e.g., I. Malkin, “Lysander and Libys”, Classical Quarterly 40, 1990, 541-5, for the marked, politically-coloured favor shown Siwa by Spartans during the fifth century; H. W. Parke, The Oracles of Zeus. Dodona, Olympia, Ammon (Oxford, Blackwell, 1967), 194-241, for the sanctuary itself; I. Rutherford, Pindar’s Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre (Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press, 2001), 352-5, for our earliest literary evidence; Lloyd, Herodotus Book II. A Commentary, I, 195-8, for the Libyan roots of the cult of Ammon in Siwa; V. Brouquier-Reddé, Temples et cultes de Tripolitaine (Paris, CNRS, 1992), 255-66, particularly 257-60, with A. Cadotte, La romanisation des dieux. L’interpretatio romana en Afrique du Nord sous le Haut-Empire (Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2007), 158-63, for Jupiter Hammon and its interferences with Baal Hammon (the Roman Saturn); and S. Georgoudi, “Des sons, des signes et des paroles: la divination à l’œuvre dans l’oracle de Dodone”, in S. Georgoudi - R. Koch Piettre - F. Schmidt (dir.), La raison des signes. Présages, rites, destin dans les sociétés de la Méditerranée ancienne (Leiden, Brill, 2012), 55-90 at 59-61, for judicious remarks on Zeus Ammon. It should be borne in mind that writing ‘Am(m)on’, as Bernal does apropos of Pindar, allows the purely Egyptian Amun to loom in the background of Zeus; most of the documentary case of Black Athena rests on this, deliberate and more or less artfully contrived, kind of ambiguity.

- Note 114:

Bernal’s old etymology of the name of Athena is confusingly endorsed by V. Blažek, “Hēphaistos versus Ptah”, in Van Binsbergen - E. Venbrux (edd.), New Perspectives on Myth. Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of the International Association for Comparative Mythology, Ravenstein...
(the Netherlands), 19-21 August, 2008 (Haarlem, Shikanda, 2010), 243-22 at 249-51. This so-called ‘Post-scriptum in the light of the Black Athena debate’ disappoints, in that too much weight is still given to the functional equivalence between Athena and Neith, despite an obvious interpretatio Graeca; BA III’s ‘etymons’, the impossible \( h(w)t-n\r nNt \) and the possible but shadowy \( h(w)t-n\r nt \) \( Nt \), are tacitly discarded; and the point of Egberts’ strictures with respect to the dentals in \( ht-nt \) is made moot through an orogenesis of verbiage and graphemic manipulations allowed by the absence of Coptic and Greek equivalences of this formula. «One of Bernal’s weakest arguments is his explanation of origin of the second vowel in the theonym *At\( ^h \)\( ^\dot{\eta} \)\( ^\alpha \)\( ^\nu \)(i). In the compound \( H.t \) \( N(y) \)\( .t \) there is no space for any middle vowel. (...) Bernal solves this puzzle by the genitive particle \( n \), correctly \( ny \) in m. and \( n.t \) in f., vocalized as *\( niy-u \) and *\( ni.t-u \) respectively (...). But there are no traces of the prothetic vowel, neither in the genitive particle nor in the divine-name, as Egberts mentions (1996-97, 159). The genitive particle connecting two feminines should also be in agreement with the same gender. So the whole formation could be reconstructed as *\( Ha(y)i)t-ni\( t\)-N\( z\)\( i\)t around 2000 B.C., in the 1st millennium B.C. probably *\( Ha(t)ni(t)\)N\( \dot{\eta}y\)it» (p. 250 § 3). This chain of arguments does not merely come tantamount to a series of non sequitur s; their linguistic doctrine jettisons the evidence. First of all, the detail of the proposed Middle and New Egyptian vocalizations is anything but firm. Blažek initially hesitates between *\( N\)\( \dot{\eta}y\)it and *\( N\)\( \dot{\eta}i\)yt (p. 250 § 2); marshaling the Greek anthroponyms composed with N\( \eta\)\( ι\)θ, he should also have specified that Na-, though bolstered by Πε\( \tau\)\( ε\)\( ν\)\( σ\)\( α\)\( ι\)\( θ\)\( ι\)ς (-\( \eta\)\( θ\)ς), or Πε\( σ\)\( β\)\( ο\)\( ν\)\( ο\)\( ι\)\( θ\)\( ι\)ς (-\( \eta\)\( θ\)ς), may be doubted in the light of Πε\( τ\)\( ε\)\( ν\)\( ν\)\( ι\)\( θ\)\( ι\)ς (-\( \eta\)\( θ\)ς), and Πε\( ν\)\( ι\)\( ν\)\( υ\)\( τ\)\( ι\)ς (the references, with short discussion, in Quaegebeur - Clarysse - Van Maele, ‘Athêna...’, 223-4). The vocalic color of N\( .t \) similarly varies in the Akkadian transcriptions of Egyptian anthroponyms entailing her, so provides no safer footing: one finds both -\( Na\)- and -\( Ni\)- (A. C. V. M. Bongenaar - B. J. J. Haring, “Egyptians in Neo-Babylonian Sippar”, Journal of Cuneiform Studies 49, 1994, 59-72 at 71). Furthermore, the goddess is indifferently written N\( .t \) (with or without the water determinative), N\( i.t \), N\( t.y \), and even N\( r.t \), in New and Late Egyptian, pace Blažek who merely operates with N\( .t \) and the marginal, archaizing spelling N\( r.t \), altogether concealing to his reader that the latter came out of a confusion with the vulture and is a talking name (‘terrible (one)’). Last but not least, the phonetic realization of N\( .t \), etc, in these terminal stages of the Egyptian language, cannot be predicted insofar as the vulture sign conjectured by Blažek is concerned: was \( ȝ \) dropped? did it weaken into \( y \) or a secondary glottal stop? It is not difficult to fashion an etymological process when someone takes so skewed and superficial a view of the Egyptian phonology. The Czech linguist tried hard to make a name for himself as the one who clarified the origins of Athena (“At\( ^\mu\)\( ^\dot{\alpha} \)\( ^\nu \)\( ^\alpha \)\( ^\nu \)\( i\)). What Was the First: The Name of Goddess or of City?”, Aspects of Comparative
Linguistics 4, 2009 [proceedings of a March 2008 conference dedicated to the memory of Starostin], 125-43; there he validates the Hurrian and Semitic attempts at etymologization, but not Bernal’s old ḫ(w)t-nt, cf. 135-6); it is strange that Blažek should forget the solid doctrine of this article so soon after its completion and, succumbing to the πειθανάγκη of Van Binsbergen (“Hēphaistos versus Ptah”, 249 note 21), fall back on an etymon that the vagaries of the New Egyptian vocalization prevent from being demonstrated as more than a distant look-alike to Ἀθηνᾶ, Ἀθηναίη.

- Note 154:
  Maravelia’s massive volume reads like a study in credulity insofar as the semantic fields of cosmology and astronomy in Egyptian are concerned. Indeed, she uncritically endorses whatever results her great predecessor, the concise yet truly pioneering R. Krauss, Astronomische Konzepte und Jenseitsvorstellungen in den Pyramidentexten, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1997, arrived at, even when this by no means blemish-free work (J. P. Allen, Journal of Near Eastern Studies 61, 2002, 62-8 at 63 sqq.) discovers a previously ignored level of astronomical sophistication — read her summary, pp. 21-2. It is thus incumbent on the reader to remain uncertain at several identifications assumed as so many facts in Les astres dans les textes égyptiens..., even when the case looks strong, like the assimilation of the Pyramid Texts’ mr-nḥ3i, ‘shifting / winding waterway’, with the ecliptic detailed by Krauss, 14-66, and agreed upon by Allen. «Le Canal sinuex (...), s’inonde des eaux célestes et sur lequel le Soleil et la Lune se meuvent dans leurs barques sacrées» (Maravelia, 135), cf., e.g. Pyramid Texts, 359 § 599b ‘that he might bring Neferkare the ferryboat of the shifting waterway’, or 697 § 2172c ‘let Neferkare board the bark like Re, upon the banks of the shifting waterway’. Despite Krauss’ learning, all that Maravelia musters in favor of this identification is PT, 334 § 543a sqq. (p. 132 note 30, cf. Krauss, 18): this snippet only has Re traverse, nmi, the sky and cross, ḏ3i, both Nut and the mr-nḥ3i, quite a common motif in the PT (263 § 337a; 265 § 351a; 266 § 358b; 334 § 543a; 473 § 926b; 481 § 999c; 507 § 1103b; etc) and the Coffin Texts (I 18 §§ 53d-54b; I 62 §§270g-271c; II 163 § 405c-l; etc) and no instance of what was described by Allen, 63, as «one of the recurrent goals of the deceased in the Pyramid Texts is to cross the Shifting Waterway from south to north in order to reach the Imperishable Stars in the Field of Offerings». Since Maravelia has little philological independence — e.g. she persistently miscopies the reading of Krauss’ proved inadequate by Allen (63 note 2) mr-ṇi-h3 as mr-n-h3 —, her book cannot be used to control the Astronomische Konzepte... on either astronomical or lexicographical grounds. To top it off, Maravelia has little scruple about combining notions deemed separate by mainstream Egyptologists. Her discussion of Nu.t, 382-92, ends on the following piece of rhetoric: «nous signalons, enfin, que
plusieurs fois, dans la religion et la mythologie égyptienne, l’on rencontre des aspects et des variantes différents d’un même mythe, or le fait que Nūt personnifiait à la fois le ciel et la Voie Lactée n’est pas du tout contradictoire, mais au contraire il est absolument compréhensible et raisonnable. Il montre en plus l’ingéniosité des Égyptiens, qui pouvaient combiner des notions archétypiques d’une manière assez ouverte, féconde, et solide» (391-2; this presupposes of course that mr-nḫjỉ is not the Milky Way, as was widely believed before Krauss). I find this difficult to reconcile with PT 511 § 1149a, cited at Maravelia, 108, but not otherwise discussed: ‘Geb laughs and Nut utters aloud her joy before he (= Pepi I) as he takes to the sky (p.t). The sky (p.t) roars for him, the earth shakes for him, the storm is broken for him, and he roars as Seth’. (Had a translation been provided for all the Egyptian in the book, this difficulty would probably not have been ignored). An identification of Nut with the Milky Way might seem simpler, per, say, R. A. Wells, “The Mythology of Nūt and the Birth of Ra”, Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur 19, 1992, 305-21 at 308-9 (Maravelia pays lip-service to that article, pp. 386 note 50 and 451 note 8, but, as is her manner, does not engage its contents); yet it is vital not to juxtapose such distinctive notions as the sky and the visible galaxy under the byword Nw.t without a scrap of justification, for this sidesteps the problem in the most unscholarly manner conceivable. A reader-unfriendly work, Les astres dans les textes égyptiens... accordingly demands much more than the usual prophylactic caution; the ingenuity of the author runs ahead of her judgement\textsuperscript{188}. 

\textsuperscript{188} I avail myself of this opportunity to explain out the system I followed when quoting from the Coffin Texts (after Maravelia, 31): I furnish first the reference to the relevant volume of A. de Buck, The Egyptian Coffin Texts, I-VII (Chicago, University Press, 1935-61), then the number of the Spell he carved out, from 1 to 1185, and as the paragraph(s), the relevant page(s) and column(s) each text occupies in De Buck’s copies. These indications, which do not respect the editor’s preferences (for he wanted the texts to be cited by volume, page, and letter, which leaves out the unity of each spell), allow one to quickly consult the admirable translation of Faulkner (The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts, I-III, Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1973-78), who prints the volume and page / column numbers of each spell in the margin. The usual references found in Egyptology for the CT lack precision (number of spell, with occasionally an indication of page and column). My references to the Pyramid Texts are orthodox: first the number of the Spruch / Utterance, from 1 to 759, in the Sethe copies and commentary (Die Altägyptischen Pyramidentexte, I-II, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1908-10; Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den Pyramidentexten, I-VI, Glückstadt-Hambourg, Augustin, 1935-62) completed by Faulkner’s Supplement of Hieroglyphic Texts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969, then the paragraphs Sethe divided the texts into, from 1 to 2291, finally the line(s) or column(s). The standard renderings are Faulkner, The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts, translated into English, ibid., 1969, and P. Barguet, Les Textes des sarcophages égyptiens du Moyen Empire, Paris, Cerf, 1986. To end on an unfortunately sour note: the bilingual versions of C. Carrier should be avoided, since they were done at enormous speed and are not very critical (Textes des sarcophages du Moyen Empire égyptien, I-III, s.l. (Monaco), Ed. du Rocher, 2004; Textes des pyramides de l’Egypte ancienne, I-VI, Paris, Cybèle, 2009-10; the latter has a half-decent introduction).