## Notes bibliographiques



*FOLIA ORIENTALIA*
*TOME XVII* 1976

## ARTICLES

CARLETON T. HODGE

# AN EGYPTO-SEMITIC COMPARISON

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The following is an effort to define more closely the relationship of Egyptian to Semitic. Bergsträsser's list (1928: 181—92) is taken as a representative Semitic corpus and probable Egyptian cognates given wherever possible. The proportion of Egyptian words found to be cognate should give us a good estimate of how closely Egyptian approximates Semitic (but not vice versa, which would entail taking an Egyptian list and searching for general Semitic cognates).

1.2 Assumptions. A number of assumptions are made, the following being the primary ones:

1.2.1 The language groups known as Semitic (Sem.), Egyptian (Eg.) — including Coptic (C.), Omotic (cf. Fleming 1969, Black 1972, Bender [1975]), Chadic and Berber are genetically related, deriving from a common proto-language. The group as a whole the present writer prefers to call Lisramic (L), though it is more commonly known as Afroasiatic, Hamito-Semitic or Semito-Hamitic (see Hodge 1972). The hypothetical parent language will accordingly be referred to as proto-Lisramic (pL = pAAs = pHS = pSH).

1.2.2 These six groups of languages are not coordinate in the sense that they all diverged from the proto-language at about the same time. While the latter is a possibility, it is not a probability. It is more likely that there was a series of splits from the parent language, similar to the situation found in Indo-Hittite.

While contacts between groups subsequent to earlier splits must also be assumed, the general character of the individual groups appears to be the result of the original divisions. The investigation of the character of each individual branch and its relationship to the others will eventually enable us to set up a reasonable sequencing of the original divisions.

1.2.2 While the end result is at least six definitely distinct branches, the precise nature of the splits is not known. Any number of situations may have existed: sharp splits with little subsequent contact, gradual splits with long periods of mutual influence before final separation (cf. Rabin 1963 on Semitic), etc.

1.2.4 Assumption 1.2.2 implies that the study of L should properly proceed by reconstructing each branch and then comparing the resulting proto-languages with each other. This is correct; this must be done, but it does not — and should not — preclude the comparison of fewer than six branches for special purposes. It is here assumed that it is not only a legitimate procedure but a necessary one to compare Egyptian and Semitic without substantial reference to other branches. It has often been pointed out that the comparison of languages so disparately attested in time raises very great difficulties (e.g., Leslau 1962: 44). We should rather view the existence of such data, as distantly dispersed in time and space as they are, as an opportunity to test our theories of language history and relationship. We have on the one hand historical data (Semitic, Egyptian) which in all likelihood far antedate such prehistory as we can reconstruct (proto-Cushitic, proto-Omotic, etc.). It would appear reasonable to assume that those languages which are attested earliest best preserve the phonology of the proto-language (pL). This is not necessarily so, but it is probable. If we can reconstruct a pre-Egypto-Semitic phonology, this will provide a firmer base for considering the development of the other branches between pL times (approximated by the Egypto-Semitic) and the times represented by proto-Cushitic, etc. While the primary purpose of the present paper is not such a reconstruction, it is hoped that it will contribute to it.

1.2.5 It is assumed that while Egyptian and Semitic are different branches of L, they have a great deal in common. This similarity



struck early workers in the field as being very great. Brugsch, for exemple, wrote: 'Im voraus kann ich es weissagen, dass die Sprachforschung eines Tages erstaunt sein wird über das enge Band der Verwandschaft, welches die ägyptische Sprache mit ihren semitischen Schwestern zusammenknüpft, und über die mir jetzt schon feststehende Thatsache, dass alle eine gemeinsame Mutter haben' (1867, quoted from Brugsch 1891: 91). On occasion scholars have even been led to say that Egyptian is a Semitic language (Ember 1912: 86, Albright 1923: 70). This view is often later abandonned by its proponents (such as Albright), but the fact that it could be seriously entertained is significant. It is therefore a fair assumption that there is a great deal of phonetic similarity between Egyptian and Semitic and that we should look for cognates with very similar phonetic shapes. (Phonetic identity of consonants transcribed by the same symbol is, of course, not assumed).

1.2.6 In the investigation of genetic relationships primary attention must be paid to formal correspondences. In accordance with assumption 1.2.5 a strong effort has been made to search out Egyptian words which can easily be made to correspond on clear phonologic grounds. Elaborate rationalizations of differences (as, e.g., in Albright 1927) are to be avoided. This is not to say that etymologies supported by theories of sound change of various sorts and degrees are necessarily wrong. They are only held to be wrong when clearly better etymologies replace them or where they are seen to be based on erroneous views of the phonologies involved. On the whole they are merely stored until such time as further knowledge will enable us to evaluate them properly.

This stress on close formal correspondence is not meant to imply that it is irrelevant or unimportant to study what meanings are held in common and how these meanings are distributed vis-à-vis form. Such a study would be very valuable. It is simply not the aim of the present treatment, which has as its interest the common retention of forms which can reasonably be identified as the same in both groups.

1.2.7 It is assumed that a set of forms (chronomorphs; see Hodge 1975) common to a group of languages represents such a set in the proto-language. Where the meanings can reasonably

be reconstructed for the proto-language, these forms and meanings give us a segment of the proto-culture involved. Bergsträsser's list is therefore taken as representative of proto-Semitic culture.

It would be possible to improve and expand the list, given present knowledge. It would also be possible to make sub-lists for the various branches of Semitic (cf. D. Cohen 1970: 16—20). Much more of proto-Semitic culture would be reflected if one did not insist on a form occuring in four or five branches (cf. Barr 1968: 156—66). It is, however, felt that the list is useful as it stands and will serve our present purpose.

1.2.8 A set of assumptions is made here concerning Egypto-Semitic phonologic correspondences. These are:

| Egyptian | Semitic | Egyptian | Semitic |
|---|---|---|---|
| ꜣ | r l n | χ | χ |
| ʔ | ʔ | χ̂ | (ʔ) |
| ꜥ | ʿγ | z | z ð |
| w | w | s | š θ |
| b | b m | š | s |
| p | p | q | q |
| f | p | k | k |
| m | m b | g | g |
| n | n l | t | t |
| r | r l | č | k |
| h | h | d | d ð |
| ḥ | ḥ | ǧ | ṣ ḍ ṭ θ̣ ð̣ |

As this list follows the order of the Egyptian alphabet, differences from other transcription systems are readily apparent. Note especially the consistent use of ʔ for reed-leaf (Gardiner Sign List, M17). In general only cognates fitting these correspondences are considered as probable in the list below.

This list reduces multiple correspondences to a minimum. It is hoped that they may be further reduced or more closely defined in the not too distant future. For example, the relationship of *m* and *b* will be more accurately stated when we know which pL roots had *b*, which *m* and which *mb*. One might hazard the guess that the similar problem of *z*/*z*, ð/*z* and ð/*d* may eventually be



resolved by the positing of an additional proto-phoneme, such as **dh*. At present, dialect mixture is assumed to account for the poorly defined correlations.

The above list is not exhaustive; it is rather what is considered fairly certain. Any other correspondences need detailed justification. A good many previously held ones are demonstrably invalid (e.g., Sem. *l*, Eg. ʔ [i]). For some earlier reevaluations of Egypto-Semitic phonetic correspondences see Vycichl 1958, Müller 1961, Leslau 1962, Diakonoff 1965.

1.2.9 It is assumed that the pL root usually consisted of two consonants plus a sonant (Diakonoff 1965: 29—38). The precise nature of the root must be determined by reconstruction, but there is increasing evidence that only two of three strong consonants in Semitic or Egyptian reflect the pL root (cf. Zaborski 1971). In the following list many roots turn out to have only two consonants in common. At this stage of our knowledge it is not always possible to explain the origin of the third consonant, but cognates are not rejected for lack of such explanation.

## 2. THE LIST

2.1 Organization of the list.

2.1.1 Order. The order of items in the list is as follows:

1. Number
2. English gloss
3. Semitic root consonants
4. Common Egyptian equivalents
5. Egyptian cognates

5.1 Clear Egyptian cognate
5.2 Cognate with semantic shift
5.3 Cognate reflected graphically but not lexically
5.4 Cognate with significant formal difference
5.5 Conjectured cognate

6. Possibly relevant Egyptian lexemes

2.1.2 Notes on entries by order.

2.1.2.1 Number. Bergsträsser's list contains 172 entries (unnumbered). In two instances two entries have been counted as

one number, being the same root: 'son', 'daughter' and 'to go up', 'upon'. Bergsträsser's order is kept, but these are numbered 7a 7b and 105a 105b respectively.

2.1.2.2 English glosses of the Semitic root. The glosses are meant to represent the general meaning of the Semitic root. It is not always possible to do this, due to the diversity in the meanings of some roots. Every root was reexamined and checked with lexicons of the languages involved. This resulted in some revisions of the glosses.

2.1.2.3 Semitic roots. For most roots only the consonants may at present be considered as definitely relevant. Even where the vowels appear to be reconstructable (e.g., *ʔab-*), they are omitted for the sake of consistency and because the Egyptian (aside from Coptic) has no written vowels.

2.1.2.4 Common Egyptian semantic equivalent(s). Obviously the most striking correspondences are those in which the usual Egyptian word is also the most likely cognate (numbered 4—5.1).

2.1.2.5 This category includes all Egyptian words here presented as cognate with the Semitic root in 3. Various scholars have proposed schemes for grading presumed cognates on the basis of their apparent probability (e.g., Vycichl 1958). It seemed advisable to treat the materials here in some such fashion. The resultant categories are 5.1—5.5. 5.1 gives those Egyptian words which are clearly cognate with the Semitic of 3 on the basis of both the meaning and the sounds (using the list of correspondences in 1.2.8 above). If there is a significant semantic shift, though the formal correspondence is still very good, the cognate is rated 5.2. 5.3 is for a small number of roots which survived in Egyptian until after the writing system was established but are not attested as Egyptian lexemes. They are reflected by the writing system, being the (or, a) consonantal value of a hieroglyph (e.g., *d*, written with a hand [D46], No. 47 below). 5.4 gives those cognates which have a significant formal difference. There is, however, such formal and semantic similarity that the relationship seems certain (see notes on examples below). Egyptian words which appear highly likely as cognates but which require considerable justification before being accepted as certain are given as 5.5 (conjectured or probable cognates).



To category 6 belong not only the items listed below but a great many cognates proposed elsewhere. The formal/semantic problems of correspondence are too great to label these as more than 'items of interest, to be kept in mind'. They may turn out to be cognate, or the resemblances, such as they are, may be accidental.

2.2 The List

1. man(kind) 3. *nš 4. rmč 6. wꜣšt 'people (?)'
2. male 3. *zkr 4—5.4 čꜣʔ
3. woman 3. *ʔnθ 4. ḥmt, zt
4. father 3. *ʔb 4. ʔt
5. mother 3. *ʔmm 4.—5.4. mwt
6. stepfather 3. *ḥm 4. šꜣm (?), C. šōm
7a. son 3. *bn 4. zꜣ 5.2. bnn 'beget'
7b. daughter 3. *bnt 4. zꜣt 5.2 bnn 'beget'
8. child 3. *bkr 4. ʔꜣd 5.2 bkꜣ 'be pregnant'
9. to bear (child) 3. *wld 4. msʔ 5.2 ʔꜣd 'child'
10. brother 3. *ʔχ 4. sn 5.5 χ 'placenta'
11. lord (possessor) 3. *bʿl 4. nb
12. slave 3. *ʔmt 4. ḥm 5.5 ʔmt(y) '(royal) foster-child'
13. concubine 3. *ḫrr 4. ḥmt 'wife' 5.5 ǧrǧrʔ 'stranger'
14. to love 3. *wdd 4. mrʔ
15. king 3. *mlk 4. nsw 5.5 bꜣk 'work; servant'
16. strange 3. *nkr 4. ǧrǧr 5.5. nčr 'god'
17. lion 3. *ʔrw 4—5.1 rw
18. panther 3. *nmr 4—5.4 bꜣ
19. wolf 3. *ðʔb 4. wnš
20. dog 3. *klb 4. čzm 6. knmt (an animal)
21. to bark 3. *nbḥ 4—5.4 bḥn
22. (wild) pig 3. *χnzr 4. šʔꜣ
23. deer 3. *ʔyl 4. ʔyr
24. bull 3. *θwr 4. kꜣ
25. donkey 3. *ḥmr 4. ʿꜣ 6. mr 'bind', ʔbꜣw 'Barbary sheep'
26. vulture 3. *nsr 4. nrt
27. scorpion 3. *ʿqrb 4. srqt
28. fly 3. *ðbb 4. ʿff 6. dm 'to be sharp'
29. grape 3. *ʿnb 4. ʔꜣrrt 6. 'nb 'reed-stalk'
30. onion, garlic 3. *θwm 4. ḫǧw 5.2 smw 'plants'
31. cucumber 3. *qθθʔ 4. sšpt

32. cummin 3. *kmn 4. tpnn 5.5 km 'black'
33. seed 3. *zrʿ 4. prt 6. sr 'spread, scatter', zr? (part of tree)
34. ear (of grain) 3. *θbl 4. χms 5.2 smꜝ 'scalp'
35. head 3. *r?š 4. ǧꜝǧꜝ, tp 5.2 ꜝ?s 'viscera'
36. eye 3. *ʿyn 4. ?rt 5.3 'nw (place)
37. ear 3. *?ðn 4. msǧr 5.3 ?dn
38. to hear 3. *šmʿ 4. sǧm 6. šmʿ 'make music, sound'
39. nose 3. *?np 4. fnǧ 5.1 nf 'breathe, breath'
40. mouth 3. *p 4. r? 6. ?wf/?f 'flesh, meat'
41. tongue 3. *lšn 4—5.1 ns
42. taste 3. *ṭʿm 4. dpt 5.4 ʿm 'swallow'
43. bitter 3. *mrr 4. dḥr 6. bnf 'gall'
44. tooth 3. *šnn 4. ?bḥ 5.3 sn (arrow-head)
45. hair 3. *śʿr 4. šn? 6. sr 'tress'
46. gray hair 3. *śyb 4. skm 6. sm? 'whip'
47. hand 3. *yd 4. ǧrt 5.3 d 5.4 wd? 'to place'
48. right (side) 3. *ymn 4—5.1 ?mnt
49. handful 3. *ḥpn 4. ǧrt 5.2 ḥfn 'great quantity'
50. fingernail, claw 3. *θ̣pr 4. ʿnt 5.5 ǧf? 'penetrate'
51. knee 3. *brk 4. mꜝst
52. wing 3. *knp 4. ǧnḥ 5.5 npꜝpꜝ 'flutter'
53. tail 3. *ðnb 4. sd 6. dm? 'touch, stick to'
54. horn 3. *qrn 4. ʿb 6. krt? 'horns'
55. bone 3. *ʿθ̣m 4. qs
56. heart 3. *lbb 4—5.1 ?nb
57. belly 3. *krš 4. χt 5.5 kns 'genitals'
58. liver 3. *kbd 4. m?st
59. kidney 3. *kly 4. dpt 6. kns 'genitals', kꜝt 'vagina'
60. breath 3. *npš 4—5.4 nft
61. death 3. *mwt 4—5.1 mt
62. to strangle 3. *χnq 4. C. ōgᵛt
63. to bury 3. *qbr 4. qrs 5.5 qmꜝ 'mourn'
64. blood 3. *dm 4. znfw 5.5 dbdb 'thump (of heart)
65. urine 3. *θyn 4. wzšt
66. heaven 3. *šm 4. pt
67. star 3. *kb 4. sbꜝ 6. km (hieroglyph)
68. sun 3. *šmš 4. rʿ, šw



69. to set 3. *ɣrb 4. sk?, ḥtp
70. shade 3. *θ̣ll 4. šwt 5.1 ǧꜝw 'night' C. ǧōr 'be black'
71. day 3. *ywm 4. hrw 6. wbn 'rise, shine'
72. night 3. *lyly 4. grḥ 6. n?wt, nnt 'lower heaven'
73. land 3. *?rḍ 4. tʾ 5.5 ?ꜝdt 'tract (of land)'
74. field 3. *ḥql 4. sχt 5.5 ḥqꜝt (a grain measure)
75. water 3. *m? 4—5.1 mw
76. lightning 3. *brq 4.—5.1 bꜝq 'bright'
77. spring, source 3. *nbʿ 4. wbn 5.4 bʿbʿt 'stream'
78. well 3. *b?r 4. xnmt 5.2 b?ꜝw 'mine, quarry'
79. to draw (water) 3. *dlw 4. pnq 5.5 dn? 'to dam'
80. flame 3. *lhb 4—5.4 nb?
81. smoke 3. *qtr 4. ḥt?
82. trace 3. *?θr 4.— 6. sr 'make known'
83. wood 3. *ʿð̣ 4. χt 6. 'ǧ 'spool'
84. house 3. *byt 4. pr
85. post 3. *ʿmd 4. zχnt
86. bed 3. *ʿrs- 4. ꜝčt
87. bow 3. *qš(t) 4. pǧt 6. qs 'bone'
88. arrow 3. *ḥθ̣θ̣ 4. šsr 6. ḥǧ 'mace'
89. shoot, throw 3. *rmy 4. st? 6. ꜝms 'club'
90. rope 3. *ḥbl 4. nwḥ 6. mn? 'moor (ship)', mn?t 'necklace'
91. vessel 3. *nw? 4—5.4 ḥnw 5.5 ?n? 'bring'
92. (ground) meal 3. *qmḥ 4. nǧ
93. to grind 3. *ṭḥn 4. nǧ
94. honey 3. *dbš 4. b?t
95. poison 3. *ḥm(t) 4. mtwt
96. slaughter 3. *ṭbχ 4. smꜝ 6. xdb 'kill'
97. to cook 3. *bšl 4. ps? 6. b̂šꜝ 'malted barley (?)'
98. to roast, burn 3. *qlw 4. ꜝšr 6. qn 'make ready, finish'
99. intoxicating beverage, beer 3. *škr 4. ḥnqt
100. to be (firm) 3. *kwn 4—6 wn 'to be'
101. to establish 3. *śym 4. smn
102. to carry, raise 3. *nś? 4. fꜝ? 5.2 nst 'seat'
103. to rest 3. *nwχ 4. ḥtp 5.5 χn? 'to make a halt'
104. to go out 3. *wð̣? 4—5.1 wǧ?
105a. to go up 3. *ʿly 4—5.1 ʿr

106. to go forward/in front 3. *qdm 4. pr? 5.5 qdm (a place)
107. to draw near 3. *qrb 4. tkn 5.2 qːb 'interior', qːbt 'breast'
108. to weep 3. *bky 4. rm?
109. to shriek 3. *ṣrχ 4. sbḥ
110. to blow 3. *npχ 4—5.4 nf 'breathe'
111. to size 3. *?χð 4. ːmm
112. to remember 3. *ðkr 4. sχː
113. name 3. *šm 4. rn 5.5 sm? 'to report'
114. to ask 3. *š?l 4—6 šn? 'inquire into; curse'
115. to bring good news 3. *bśr 4. sm?
116. to have mercy on 3. *rḥm 4. nʿ
117. to count 3. *mny 4. ḥsb
118. to put on clothes 3. *lbš 4—5.4 ḥbs
119. to wash 3. *rḥð 4. rχt, ?ʿ?
120. to mix, soak 3. *bll 4—5.4 šbn
121. to hem in 3. *ḥgr 4—5.4 grg 'to snare'
122. to twist, braid 4. *ptl 4. čz 6. nbd 'plait'
123. to dig 3. *ḥpr 4. šːd 5.5 ḥfːʔ 'to twist'
124. to pierce 3. *nqb 4. whb
125. to winnow 3. *ðry 4. χːχː
126. to pasture 3. *rʿy 4. nw? 5.5 ?ːʿ (verb used concerning handling of cattle)
127. to water 3. *šqy 4. szwr
128. to tie together 3. *ḏmd 4. dmː
129. to travel, ride 3. *rkb 4. nm? 6. ːčp 'to load'
130. to watch over, protect 3. *nθr 4. zːw 5.4 nğ 'to protect'
131. to look after 3. *pqd 4. χrp
132. to hold back 3. *klʔ 4. ḥnḥn
133. to loosen 3. *ptr 4. sfχ 6. pğ 'stretch, extend'
134. well-being 3. *šlm 4. wğːw 5.1 snb 'be healthy'
135. sweet, pleasing, good 3. *tyb 4. nğm
136. bad 3. *bʔš 4—5.4 bʔn
137. to harm 3. *χbl 4. thʔ 5.2 χbn 'distort', χbnt 'crime'
138. to be lost 3. *ʔbd 4. χtχt
139. to break in pieces 3. *θbr 4. ḥsb
140. powder(ed) 3. *dqq 4—5.1 dq
141. to bite (off) 3. *krṣ 4. pzḥ



142. to cleanse (ritually) 3. *qdš 4. wʿb 6. qd 'form, nature character'
143. to err 3. *χtʔ 4. thʔ 6. ḥğʔ 'to injure'
144. sacrifice, offering 3. *ðbḥ 4. zfč 'to sacrifice', zb (n sğt) '(burnt) offering' 5.5 zbʔ 'to perish'
145. to bless 3. *brk/krb 4.— 6. mːč 'to acclaim'
146. all 3. *kll 4. nb 5.2 čnw 'number; each, every'
147. full 3. *mlʔ 4. mḥ
148. to be like 3. *mθl 4. nḥr
149. small, insignificant 3. *qll 4. nğs 6. qːː 'grains (?)'
150. a. costly b. heavy 3. *wqr 4. a. šps b. dns 5.4 ?qr 'excellent
151. strong 3. *ʿz 4. wsr
152. new 3. *ḥdθ 4. mː
153. low(ly) 3. *špl 4. dhʔ 5.5 spːt 'district'
154. to open 3. *ptḥ 4. wpʔ 6. ptḥ 'create'
155. a. yellow green b. vegetables 3. *wrq 4. a. wːğ 'green' b. rnpwt 5.1 ?ːqt 'leeks, vegetables'
156. one 3. *whd 4. wʿ?w 6. ?ḫw (a measure of metal)
157. two 3. *θn 4—5.1 snw
158. three 3. *θlθ 4. χmtw 6. sːwʔ 'two thirds fine (of gold)'
159. four 3. *rbʿ 4. fdw 6. ːmʿ 'ramus (of jaw); fork (of bone)'
160. five 3. *χmš 4. dʔw 6. χmʿ 'sieze'
161. six 3. *šdθ 4—6 srsw
162. seven 3. *šbʿ 4—6 sfχw
163. eight 3. *θmn 4—6 χmnw
164. nine 3. *tšʿ 4. psğw
165. ten 3. *ʿśr 4. mğw 6. 'šː 'many'
166. hundred 3. *mʔt 4. št
167. when 3. *mt 4—5.1 m (preposition)
168. in, by 3. *b 4—5.1 m
169, as, like 3. *k 4. mʔ 5.5 ky 'other, another'
105b. upon 3. *ʿly 4. ḥr 5.1 ʿr 'to go up'
170. and 3. *w/ʔu 4. ḥnʿ 5.2 ʔw (clause introducer)

2.3 Notes on the list.

1. The meaning of *wːšt* is unknown (Wb 1: 262 'Bez. für Men-

schen?'; Faulkner 1969: 205 'honored ones [?]'), and *š/š* is not a good correspondence. It is a good example of category 6.

2. Eg. *č;?* matches the *-kr* of *zkr*, but the *z-* remains unexplained. Were it not for the distribution of *zkr* in Semitic, one could conjecture that the *z-* is related to demonstrative ð- (and so to Eg. *z* 'man', Cohen 1947: 158). (Compare the Chadic forms for 'cock' given by Newman-Ma 1966: 235).

4. Eg. *;bt* 'family' cannot be related to Sem. *?b* as ; does not correspond to ? (Cohen 1947: 77). It is to be connected with Sem. *rbb* 'be numerous'.

6. Eg. *š;m* is not a feasible cognate, as the form is too diverse (*contra* Cohen 1947: 103).

7. One may suggest the possibility that Eg. *wbn* 'rise (of sun)' belongs here. If so, *wbn* originally reflected the Egyptian concept that the sun is born anew every morning. There is no certain reflex of this meaning in dynastic times. (See also 71 below). Eg. *z;* is probably to be connected with Sem. **ðr*, as in Ar. *ðuriyya* 'offspring'.

8. Cf. Albright 1927: 205.

9. The Egyptian word for 'boy' has a variant writing *?;d*, along with a more usual *?d*. As the writing with ; is New Kingdom (Book of the Dead), it has not been given the weight which it deserves. The correspondence *wld/?;d* is excellent, as shown by a number of similar pairs (e.g., No. 155). Gardiner has a very relevant discussion of the words for 'cow' and 'womb, uterus' (1948: 258*—262*). He argues that these words are to be read *?dt*. The writings involve the uterus hieroglyph (F45) and one representing a well (N41). The uterus is the ideogram (or core writing); the well is part of the phonetic value (or margin). The word for 'boy' is usually read *?d* and 'girl' as *?dyt*. It immediately appears likely that all these words are related to each other. It is here proposed to read *?;d* 'boy' (attested), *?;dyt* 'girl', *?;dt* 'cow' and 'uterus'. The evidence is as follows: 1) 'boy' has a variant *?;d* (Budge 1898: 185, 10). 2) The hierohlyph well (N41) is used in the writing of *b?;* 'copper' (Gardiner 1957: 492). Gardiner has no explanation of this ('for obscure reasons'), but a reasonable explanation is that it had the value *?;* (see the examples in Gardiner). 3) The word 'womb' is written *oote* in Sahidic Coptic. This implies



three consonants in the older language, the second being a liquid such as *r* or ;, which became [?] by Coptic times, /o?te/. 4) Demotic *'lw* 'child', Coptic *alou* 'youth, maiden' has *l*. The use of ' in Demotic is not a serious objection (cf. Spiegelberg 1925: 4—5). 5) There are unrelated words associating the hieroglyphs N41 and the burial mound read *?;t* (Gardiner 1948.2: 261*). This supports the reading *?;* for N41. Compare also the writings of *?dr* 'herd' and *?dr* 'bandage' discussed by Gardiner (260*).

One might also ask whether the reading *ḥmt* for 'woman' (written with N41), attested by Coptic *hime*, is not a secondary one and that 'woman' was originally also *?;dt*.

Returning to the problem of the initial consonants in the comparison, one notes that *wld* is only one of several possible proto-Semitic forms. Arabic and older Akkadian have *wld*, Hebrew and Ugaritic have *yld*, while later Akkadian has *?ld*. Two factors are at work here. One is an alternation between formatives *w-*, *y-*, and *?-*. The other is the alternation between consonantal value for *w* and vocalic value: *w(a)* but *(?)u* (cf. No. 170). The latter type of alternation is also to be assumed for Eg. *?t* 'father', probably **?yt* in root form. Old Egyptian *?t* reflects **?it*; Coptic *yōt* reflects a vocalization such as **?iyātu* (a plural formation with *-ā-*; cf. Greenberg 1955). This avoids any interpretation of reedleaf (M17) as *y-*, for which we have no evidence from early transcriptions; all such evidence indicates M17 is [?].

10. Eg. *sn* 'brother' is likely cognate with Sem. **θn* 'two' (No. 158).

12. The root here is probably that reflected in Eg. *m* 'in'. *?mt* is then 'that which is inside (the household)'. See also No. 167.

13. No word for 'concubine' is listed in either Erman-Grapow or Crum. There are several possible Egyptian cognates, complicated by the question of the relationship of 'concubine' and 'enemy' in Semitic. Here *ǧrǧr?* is considered a more likely cognate to **ðrr* than *mǧ;w* 'opponent' (Hodge 1969: 109), the latter more probably connected with *ǧ;?* 'cross over'.

15. So Albright 1927: 214. I would offer an alternative solution to the problem of the semantic relationship. It may be understood as originator (the assigner of work) and result (the worker). Faulkner gives as meanings of the verb *b;k*: 'work, work (horses

fields), carry out (task), enslave'. One may also ask if a similar semantic relationship exists between Eg. *ḥm* 'majesty' and *ḥm* 'servant'.

16. Cohen 1947: 186; supported by Vycichl 1958: 394—95. Perhaps to be rated 5.2.

17. Cohen 1947: 83.

18. Egyptian has *bꜣ* 'leopard skin' (attested as early as the Pyramid Texts), *bꜣ* 'panther' (Middle Kingdom; Wb 1.415) and *ꜣby* 'panther' (New Kingdom, Wb 1.7). These are probably two roots, not metathesis. The earlier attested correlates with Sem. *nmr*, the later with Hausa *râbbii* (Hodge 1966: 44). Both *bꜣ šmʿ* and *ꜣby šmʿ* are taken to mean 'leopard' and also represent someone who is very fierce. They are written as if they are *bꜣ* or *ꜣby* 'of the south'. Beston points out (1973) that in pre-Islamic Arabic *simʿ* means 'sand-cat', a very fierce animal. It appears highly likely that these words (*smʿ*/*šmʿ*) are cognate and that the Egyptian is better translated 'sand-cat'.

19. The old correspondence ð?*b*/*zꜣb* is ruled out, as ? does not correspond to *ꜣ*. Cf. Cohen 1947: 158; for the *-b* see Diakonoff 1965: 55 n3.

20. The suggestion *knmt* (Cohen 1947: 115) fits well formally, but little is known of its meaning. It occurs in Pyr. 1462 and is translated 'leopard (?)' by Faulkner (1969: 225).

21. Noted by Calice 1901: 146. There is an afformative *n-* in Egyptian, as there is in Semitic. One need only assume that *n* could be prefixed or suffixed (as with 'causative' *s*). Semitic used *n-*, Egyptian used *-n*.

23. Late Egyptian *?yr* is taken to be a loan.

25. One can only make suggestions as to possible cognates to *ḥmr*. As *ḥ-* is a known preformative, one is justified in considering such words are *mr* 'bind' ('one bound [with a load]'?) and *?bꜣw* 'Barbary sheep' (for semantics cf. Gordon 1965: 455 No. 1848). Cf. also Diakonoff's view that *-r* is a suffix here (1ð65: 55 n3).

26. No connection is here postulated between *nsr* and *nrt*. The chance of a defective spelling in Egyptian (for **nsrt*) is dispelled by C. *noure*.

28. The suggestion that ðbb may be connected with *dm* rests on the following semantic connections: The Semitic word may refer to a biting insect (**ðubāb-* '(stinging) fly' Diakonoff 1965: 55). The Egyptian word refer to sticking someone with a pointed object (including the action of a snake bite). Possible cognates elsewhere include Hausa *zumàà* 'honey, bee' and Somali *dabayya* 'to haft'. These presume a proto-root 'stick, pierce'.



29. Eg. *ʿnb* 'reed-stalk' is perfect formally, but we lack justification for the semantic shift.

30. 'Plants' is so vague that closer definition to close the semantic gap would be very welcome.

32. Cf. C. *stikeme* 'black cummin' (lit. 'smell of black').

33. The word *zr?*(*w*) occurs in medical texts as part of the *ksbt* tree (Westendorf 1962: 38). *Zr* 'scatter' C. *sōr*, occurs only late, after *s* and *z* had merged. It is written *zr* but given as *śr* by the Wb (4.191). It should be connected with Sem. **ðr* 'scatter' (Zaborski 1971: 60).

34. In addition to *smꜣ* 'scalp, hair of the head' there is also *smꜣw* 'branches (of tree)', which may well be related. The latter is written *zmꜣw*, but as this is late (New Kingdom), the use of *z* rather than *s* is not significant.

35. Eg. *ꜣ?s n ǧnnt* '*ꜣ?s* of the skull' means 'brain'.

36. The value *ʿn* for a hieroglyph including an eye shows that Egyptian earlier had *ʿn* (or *ʿyn*) for 'eye' (Ember 1913: 115, Gardiner 1957: 451, D8).

37. The hieroglyph ear (F21) has the value *?dn* but not the meaning 'ear' (connection with Semitic attributed to Brugsch). There is also Eg. *?d?* 'to be deaf'.

38. Egyptian *s* should correspond to Semitic *š*, so *šm* is not a good match, though it merits notice. Eg. *sǧm* 'to hear' cannot reasonably be connected at this time (cf. Erman 1892: 118, with query).

39. There is a strong temptation to connect Nos. 39, 60 and 110, with a common root **np*. Compare, however, the analysis of *npḥ* as *n-* plus *pḥ* (Zaborski 1971: 79). Cohen (1947: 83) presumes a root **fn* and connects Eg. *fnǧ*.

40. The semantics makes *?*(*w*)*f* a weak candidate, as are others, such as *fnǧ* 'nose' (Diakonoff 1965: 42).

42. The connection with *ʿm* seems too good semantically not to be related, though *ṯ-* remains unexpained. An old etymology (Calice 1936: 34).

43. I see no necessary connection between 'bitter' and 'illness', so have not adopted Eg. *mr* 'sick' (Calice 1936: 32, where Sem. *mrṣ* is also given). See also Cohen 1947: 191 and Leslau 1949: 315.

44. The etymology is taken from Diakonoff (1965: 43), changing his 'harpoon' to Gardiner's 'arrow-head' (T22).

45. The formal correspondence of Eg. *šn?* to the Semitic is not good enough for me to recommend it, though it has been adopted by others (Albright 1927: 230, Cohen 1947: 138, with reservations).

46. Eg. *sm?* at least formally possible.

47. Erman 1892: 122, Calice 1936: 25, 28.

48. Erman 1892: 107. The Coptic variants *eimnt*, *eimnte* (Crum 1939: 56a) show that the *y-* of Semitic survived in Egyptian as *-i-* after *?-* in some vocalizations of the word (cf. the discussion under No 9 above).

49. Cohen 1947: 101. (includes Sem. **ḫfl*), Wb 3. 74 only *ḫfl*.

50. Diakonoff 1965: 43 and Cohen 1947: 160 give no Egyptian equivalences.

51. Cf. Albright 1927: 205. Could the *mꜣ* of *mꜣst* be the *br* of *brk?*

52. Eg. *npꜣpꜣ* is semantically good, but one must assume a *k-* prefix in Semitic and a *-ꜣ* suffix (and reduplication) for Egyptian.

53. Eg. *dm?*, meaning 'to touch, be attached to, be stuck to', is possible semantically, but the absence of *-n-* puts it into category 6.

54. Leslau 1962: 47 'perhaps' *krt?*.

56. The Egyptian word for 'heart' is usually transcribed *?b* (i.e., reedleaf, *b*). It was early equated with *libbu*, e.g. Erman 1892: 107. The clue that *?b* is not the full complement of consonants for the word comes from variant spellings of the word for 'ax'. The latter is transcribed *m?nb*. Some spellings have the heart hieroglyph as part of the consonant spelling: *m?* — *n* heart — *b*, *m?* — *n* — heart. Gardiner interpreted the use of the heart here as a spelling of the *-?-b* of *m?nb*, omitting the *n* (1916: 52). The more plausible explanation is that the heart (F34) is to be read *?nb* (with a probable dialect variant *?ꜣb*). This gives



an excellent correspondence with Semitic. It also eliminates a most unfortunate correspondence of reedleaf with Semitic *l*.

57. This equation is queried by Cohen. The *r/n* correspondence is not given as one of the 'certain' ones in the table above (1.2.8). It still seems very likely.

59. Cohen gives C. *glote* 'kidney' (1947: 116). Note also *kns*, *kꜣt* given as 6. Either fits well formally.

60. Calice 1936: 33, after Ember. Cf. Nos. 39, 110.

61. Erman 1892: 111, after Brugsch.

63. A new suggestion, I believe. Cohen gives no Egyptian (1947: 125).

67. Wb: *km* 'Haufen brennender Holzkohlen. Nur im Schriftzeichen belegt' (5: 122). The sign I6 is considered by Wb as a later interpretation. See also de Buck 1967: 202. Cf. also Eg. *kk* 'to be dark' (Wb 5: 144), and note variant Semitic reduplications: Heb. *kwkb*, Ug. *kbkb*.

68. Cf. Cohen 1947: 134.

70. Cf. Hodge 1969: 108 (No. 14).

71. *Bn/wbn* (No. 7) and *ywm/wbn* are, of course, mutually exclusive.

72. 6. is here a strong possibility. Cf. Cohen 1947: 183.

73. The semantic correspondence with *?ꜣdt* is good enough to make one wonder whether the Egyptian word was originally **?ꜣǧt*, which would give the proper *ḏ/ǧ* correspondence.

74. The suggested cognate *ḥqꜣt* is supported by the Semitic use of 'ass' for measures of land and grain.

75. Erman 1892: 111, attributed to Brugsch.

76. Ember 1914: 114; cf. Calice 1936: 29.

78. Ember 1914: 112.

79. While there is some problem with the semantics, the balance is in favor of the correspondence. Cf. *dn?* 'to dam (water)', *dn?t* 'ditch, canal', *dn?t* 'bowl', *dn?* 'to share out'.

80. Cohen (1947: 183) gives Eg. *rhb* 'heat of a fire' (Wb 2: 440). This, however, appears to be a loan.

82. As *?θr* is something left by someone which is indicative of that person's passage, it seems plausible to relate it to a verb 'to make known'. There is also *sr* 'to show (?) (something to someone)'.

155. Ember 1911: 88. Note the 'semantic bundling' here. Such a connection as 'green; vegetables' seems very natural. It is paralleled by Eg. *wꜣḏ* 'green', *wꜣḏḏt* 'vegetation'. The regular Egyptian word for 'vegetables' is, however, *rnpwt*, connected with *rnpy* 'young; fresh'.

157. Eg. *sn* 'brother', *snt* 'sister' are probably the same root.

158. Eg. *sꜣw?* is taken to be 'the two sides (lit., backs)', specialized in this meaning (Sethe 1916: 95; Edel 1955: 179). The curious formal and semantic connection deserves note.

159. Could 'four' be possibly associated with these body parts?

160. It would appear at least possible that the *χm* — of Eg. *χmʿ* 'sieze, grasp' (determinative sometimes fist D49) is connected with the *χm-* of Sem. **χmš*. There is also Eg. *χfʿ* 'fist, grasp', though no *m/f* alternation is yet established.

161. On the Semitic root see Brockelmann 1908: 170—71, Moscati et al. 1964: 119, Grande 1972: 107. On the reading of the Egyptian see Edel 1955: 169. The Ugaritic (*θdθ*) and Egyptian (*srsw*) forms suggest that the roots were respectively **θd* and **sr*, with reduplication (cf. **θlθ*). The other Semitic forms would then be seen as dissimilations; cf. Grande on Arabic *sds* (1972: 307).

165. Ember connects Eg. *ʿšꜣ* with Sem. **ʿθr* (1911: 88), Cohen with **ʿśr* (1947: 86).

167. Sem. **mt* is here taken to be a noun with affix *-t* from the root *m*. For its nominal use cf. Akk. *ad mati*, *ina mati* (Soden 1952: 165, 163). The *-y/-ay* is an ending (Soden 1952: 163). Eg. *m* is a preposition often having the meaning 'when' (see Edel 1955, Gardiner 1957 sub voce).

168. There is, of course, a difficulty in connecting both **mt* and **b* with Eg. *m*. It assumes a proto **mb*, which is sporadically *m* and *b*. I suspect there were at least two different proto-forms (**m* and **mb?*) which merged semantically and resulted in the extant confusion. For Sem. *b*, Eg. *m* see Hommel 1894: 353.

169. The *-m-* occurs elsewhere, e.g. Hausa *kàman* 'like'. Cf. Eg. *km* 'to total up to'.

170. Gordon 1957: 275.



## 3. CONCLUSIONS

The results may be tabulated as follows. Each item is counted only once. (7a, 7b as one; 105a, 105b as one; 47 as 5.3 only).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.1 | 17 (4—5.1: 12) | | |
| 5.2 | 13 (4—5.2: 1) | | |
| 5.3 | 4 | | |
| 5.4 | 15 (4—5.4: 4) | | |
| 5.5 | 23 (4—5.5: 2) | Total cognates | 72 |
| 6 | 43 (4—6: 5) | | |
| — | 55 | Total non-cognates | 98 |

These figures indicate that of a vocabulary representative of general Semitic 72 or 42.35 per cent have what appear to be genuine Egyptian cognates. Of these the closest relationship is shown when the usual Egyptian word is that which is cognate. Such combinations (4—5.1—5) amount to 27 or nearly 16 per cent. One may also consider only 5.1—4, omitting any which may be considered marginal (5.5). The result is 49 or nearly 20 per cent, still a very respectable number.

While one may argue that some given as cognates under 5.5 should be eliminated, another may also argue that some classified 6 should be rated 5.5 or better. On balance our figure of 42 per cent seems reliable for our present state of knowledge. The probability is that future research will increase rather than decrease assured cognates, so that one would expect the figure to rise closer to 50 per cent in the next few years.

This high figure supports the view that Egyptian, while not a Semitic language, is closely related to Semitic. Such a large percentage of cognates in a limited corpus also raises one's hopes of establishing a reasonable proto-phonology for these two branches. The above treatment of the list would indicate that it is more rewarding to work with firmer cognates, at least for the time being, leaving those which require considerable explanation to the period of inquiry following the reconstruction of the other branches of L.

This comparison has been able to eliminate such a late loan as *ʔyr* (No. 23), but the question of Semitic influence in late predy-

nastic or early dynastic times has not been raised. Some of the near-correspondences of 6 may be the results of such loans, with the result that their phonetic shape is close but does not follow regular correspondence patterns (cf., e.g., No. 114). On the other hand such divergences may represent non-standard Egyptian dialects with differing phonologies.

The present paper has had a modest goal — to assess the relative closeness of Egyptian to Semitic as reflected lexically. This should be followed by similar comparisons of the other branches with Egyptian, with Semitic, and with each other. The time element will affect the results — as would have a comparison of Semitic with Coptic rather than older Egyptian. We therefore cannot take the results of these comparisons as directly comparable to that of Egyptian and Semitic. More accurate assessments of the various relationships will involve other than purely lexical grounds.

## REFERENCES


Albright, William F. 1923. *The principles of Egyptian phonological development.* RT 40: 64—70.

Id. 1927. *Notes on Egypto-Semitic etymology. III.* JAOS 47: 198—237.

Barr, James. 1968. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Beeston, A. F. L. 1973. *The heart of Shanfara.* JSS 18: 257—58.

Bender, M. Lionel. 1975. *Omotic: a New Afroasiatic Language Family.* Carbondale: University Nuseum.

Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. 1928. *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen.* Münich: Max Hueber.

Black, Paul. 1972. *Cushitic and Omotic classification.* Language Sciences 23: 27—28.

Brockelmann, Carl. 1908 [1961]. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen.* Vol. 1. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Brugsch, Heinrich. 1891. *Die Aegyptologie.* Leipzig: W. Friedrich.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. 1898. *The Book of the Dead. Text.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

Calice, Franz. 1901. *Zur ägyptisch-semitischen Wurzelverwandtschaft.* ZÄS 39: 146—47.

Id. 1936. *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung.* Ed. by Heinrich Balcs. Vienna: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität. (WZKM Beiheft 1).





Cohen, David. 1970. *Études de linguistique sémitique et arabe.* (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, 81). The Hague: Mouton.

Cohen, Marcel. 1947. *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique.* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, 291) Paris: Honoré Champion.

Crum, W. E. 1939. *Coptic Dictionary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

de Buck, Adrian. 1967. *Grammaire élémentaire du moyen égyptien.* Tr. by B. van de Walle and J. Vergote. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Diakonoff, I. M. 1965. *Semito-Hamitic Languages.* Moscow: Nauka.

Edel, Elmar. 1955. *Altägyptische Grammatik* .Vol. 1. (Analecta Orientalia 34) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Ember, Aaron. 1911. *Semito-Egyptian sound-changes.* ZÄS 49: 87—92.

Id. 1911. *Kindred Semito-Egyptian words.* ZÄS 49: 93—94.

Id. 1912. *Notes on the relation of Egyptian and Semitic.* ZÄS 50: 86—90.

Id. 1914. *Kindred Semito-Egyptian words.* ZÄS 51: 110—21.

Erman, Adolf. 1892. *Das Verhältniss des Aegyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen.* ZDMG 46: 93—129.

Erman, Adolf and Hermann Grapow. 1957. *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache.* 6 vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. (Abbreviated: Wb).

Faulkner, Raymond O. 1962. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Oxford: At the University Press.

Id. 1969. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gardiner, Alan H. 1916. *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe.* Paris: H. Champion.

Id. 1948. *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica.* 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Id. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar.* 3rd ed. London: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, Cyrus H. 1957. *Egypto-Semitica.* RdSO 32: 269—77.

Id. 1965. *Ugaritic Textbook.* Glossary, Indices. (Analecta Orientalia, 38) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Grande, B. M. 1972. *Vvedenie v Sravniteljnoe Izučenie Semitskix Jazykov.* Moscow: Nauka.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1955. *Internal a-plurals in Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic).* Afrikanistische Studien Diedrich Westermann zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, 26) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Hodge, Carleton T. 1966. *Hausa-Egyptian establishment.* Anthropological Linguistics 8.1: 40—57.

Id. 1969. *Egyptian ǧ amid Afroasiatic.* American Oriental Society Middle West Branch, Semi-centennial Volume, ed. by Denis Sinor, pp. 104—110. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Id. 1975. *Egyptian and survival.* (Hamito-Semitica, ed. James and Theodora Bynon, pp. 171—191. The Hague: Mouton).

Id. 1972. *Lisramic.* Language Sciences 20: 13—16.

Hommel, Fritz. 1894. *Über den Grad der Verwandtschaft des Altägyptischen mit dem Semitischen.* Beiträge zur Assyriologie 2: 342—58.
Leslau, Wolf. 1949. Review of *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique,* by Marcel Cohen. Language 25: 312—16.
Id. 1962. *Semitic and Egyptian comparisons.* JNES 21: 44—9.
Moscati, Sabatino; Spitaler, Anton; Ullendorff, Edward, and Wolfram von Soden. 1964. *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages: Phonology and Morphology,* ed. by Sabatino Moscati. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, N. S., 6) Leiden: Otto Harrassowitz.
Müller, W. W. 1961. *Äthiopisches zur semitisch-ägyptischen Wortvergleichung.* Muséon 74: 199—205.
Newman, Paul and Roxana Ma. 1966. *Comparative Chadic: phonology and lexicon.* Journal of African Languages 5: 218—51.
Rabin, Chaim. 1963. *The origin of the subdivisions of Semitic* [in:] Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver, ed. by D. W. Thomas and W. D. McHardy, pp. 105—15. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Sethe, Kurt. 1916. *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern.* Strassburg: K. J. Trübner.
Soden, Wolfram von. 1952. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik.* (Analecta Orientalia, 33) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
Spiegelberg, Wilhelm. 1925. *Demotische Grammatik.* Heidelberg: C. Winter.
Vergote, J. 1945. *Phonétique historique de l'égyptien. Les consonnes.* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 19) Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon.
Vycichl, Werner. 1958. *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung.* MDAIK 16: 367—405.
Westendorf, Wolfhart. 1962. *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte.* (Grundriss der medizin der alten Agypter, 8) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
Zaborski, Andrzej. 1971. *Biconsonantal verbal roots in Semitic.* Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 269: 51—98.

FOLIA ORIENTALIA
TOME XVII 1976

R. J. HAYWARD

# A QUESTION IN OROMO MORPHOPHONOLOGY

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to consider a set of morphophonemic phenomena which occur regularly in Oromo verb stems of certain definable types. The phenomena have been noted by most previous writers and have been given an interpretation which, one presumes, has been generally accepted insofar as no alternative has, to the writer's knowledge, been proposed. Here, however, an alternative and, it is believed, more plausible interpretation of the facts is advanced.

## I

In at least two grammars of Oromo [1] the shapes of the so-called causative and double causative stem extension suffixes [2] are given as *-s* and *-s -is* respectively. Eg. M. *čab-s-* 'break', H. & W. *bō-s-īs-* 'cause to mourn'. Moreover, both grammars refer to 'triple' or

[1] Moreno (1939), p. 91; Hodson and Walker, p. 64. Moreno's grammar is based on the Tulámā (Showa) dialect. In many respects the language described by Hodson and Walker seems to be not too dissimilar, although the authors nowhere state their commitment to any one particular dialect, which may mean that the treatment attempts to be multidialectal. In this paper any forms cited from these grammars will be preceded by the initial letters of the author's name. Forms not so marked were collected during my own field research near Batie (Wollo Province). The transcription used here corresponds with that employed by Moreno in his grammar, with the exception that the voiced palato-alveolar affricate [*dž*] is represented by *j* rather than *ǧ*. Accent marks are omitted except in cited forms.

[2] Ie. derivational suffix or stirpes.