III.—ON SISTERFAMILIES OF LANGUAGES, ESPECIALLY THOSE CONNECTED WITH THE SEMITIC FAMILY. By Dr. C. Lottner.

As the number of linguistic families is so very great—in Asia and Europe alone there are about thirty—, it is but a natural question, whether some of these families, each of them taken as a whole, may not stand to one another in a more remote yet traceable relationship.

Several attempts in this sense have been made to connect our own family with the Semitic. However, they were attended with so little success, that, besides being failures in themselves, they have thrown this whole branch of linguistic enquiry into discredit. More especially the undeniable points of resemblance between the Semitic and certain African families of speech, though repeatedly brought forward by scholars of no small merit, have not been considered by the general mass of philologists with that degree of attention which they certainly deserve. Thus Bunsen and Schwartze pointed out the salient traces of relationship between Koptic and Semitic, but they maintained at the same time that the Semitic family was also related to our own. This latter being an untenable doctrine, the former theory of theirs also met with only a very indifferent reception on the part of their fellowlabourers in the domain of linguistic science. It is true that Benfey, who first called attention to the numerous coincidences of Egyptian and Semitic, and Newman, who showed that the Berber is allied to the Semitic, did not bring in the Indogerman family. Nevertheless they too have been little regarded, partly no doubt because the truth they teach is not given by them without some alloy of spurious metal. Under these circumstances, and considering moreover that none of these writers has embraced in his comparison at once *all* the sisterfamilies of the Semitic, I deem it not unnecessary to go over this ground again, especially as I have to bring to light some new facts that seem hitherto to have escaped general observation. The end I aim at in this matter is, not to give a great number of

doubtful comparisons, but a few facts that are — in my opinion—decisive. At the end of this enquiry into the sisterfamilies of the Semitic, I shall add the other instances of a similar relationship that I have found, with more or less certainty, in other quarters of the globe. They are however few, and being so, hold out no hope that every family of human speech may one day turn out a relation of some other family, far less do they justify a belief in the possibility of establishing the mutual relationship of all linguistic families. *On the contrary, whatever may be a man's belief concerning the historical unity of all languages, let it be remembered that scientific enquiry is unable to countenance it in any way.* No such attempt at the impossible was contemplated even from afar by the present writer.

The three sisterfamilies of the Semitic are the Saho-Galla, the Berber, and the Egyptian.

I. The Saho and Galla.

It has not been overlooked by Ewald (Journal for the Knowledge of the Orient, V, 410 sq.) that the Saho, a language of upper Abyssinia first made known by the French traveller Abbadie, has a certain similarity with the Semitic, and consequently he calls it at once a Semitic dialect; however with the prudent qualification, that the separation from the Semitic stock must have taken place in an unmeasurably high antiquity ('unermessliche Urzeit', l. c. p. 421). Since then, by Tutschek's labours, we have become acquainted with the Galla; and I can hardly doubt that Ewald, had he known anything of the latter language, would have modified his view of the Saho so as to say, that this language is nearly related to the Galla, and that both — in spite of unmistakeable Semitic features — differ by far too much from it to constitute with it one family, in the same sense as the different Indogerman languages do. The scanty information on the Saho showed indeed the similarity with the Semitic, but the difference was not clearly perceived. It will be therefore my task at present, to put both equally in full relief. This task comprehends three stages. First

it must be shown, that the Saho and Galla are very near re-
lations; secondly, that the Saho-Galla family thus found
offers points of resemblance with the Semitic which could
not be explained by loans; and thirdly, that nevertheless
the differences of both forbid us to call them one family
in the proper sense of the term.

First, the dictionary of the Saho, although at present very
insufficiently known, shows some quite peculiar points of
coincidence with the Galla, compare

SAHO	GALLA
bol, abyss	*bola*, hole, cavity, pit, grave
rob, rain	*roba*, it is raining
af, mouth	*afan*, mouth
kafa, to-day	*gafa*, day.

This indeed taken separately is not very much, but somewhat
more important is the similarity exhibited by the personal
pronouns.

	I	*thou*	*he*	*she*	*we*	*you*	*they*
SAHO	anu	atu	usuk (?)	ishe	nanu	atin	usun
GALLA	ani	ati	iza ('him')	izin	nu	izin	izan

But still far more important is the conjugation.

All the tenses of the Galla originate from the present,
with which must be compared the form of the Saho called
future by Abbadie. It ought to be remarked that in Galla,
as in Saho, the third pers. mscl. sing. and the first pers. sing.
have no termination. Compare

	SAHO	GALLA
sing. 1.	beta 'I shall eat'	adema 'I walk'
2.	bet-ta	adem-ta
3. msc.	beta	adema
3. fem.	bet-ta	adem-ti
pl. 1.	ben-na	adem-na
2.	bet-tan	adem-tu, {-tan-} before the suffixed
3.	bet-an	adem-u, {-an-} *i*, see below.

But the Galla has also an aorist, which is formed by
adding to the presential form *E*, or *I*, before which the con-
cluding vowels are rejected, and in the plural 2. 3. the ap-
parently older forms of the terminations *TAN*, *AN* appear.
The same tense is found in Saho, compare

		SAHO	GALLA
sing.	1.	bet-e 'ἔη αγον'	adem-e 'ἔβην'
	2.	bet-t-e	adem-t-e
	3. m.	bet-e	adem-e
	3. f.	bet-t-e	adem-t-e
plur.	1.	ben-n-e	adem-n-e
	2.	bet-ten	adem-tan-i
	3.	bet-en	adem-an-i.

In Saho the 2. 3. ps. pl. seem to stand for *-tani*, *-ani*, the *i* at the end having caused an infection ('Umlaut') of *a* into *e*, and then having been lost.

While the vowel *a* is the characteristic termination of the present, *i* (*e*) that of the aorist, the third original vowel *u* (*o*) is added to the forms of the Galla present, in order to form a subjunctive mood, which Tutschek however has partly brought under the imperative, and which besides takes for its second and third person plural the corresponding forms of the aorist. Abbadie gives in his Saho-imperative several forms, that are evidently counterparts of this subjunctive, being framed by adding *o* to the forms of the future, compare

		SAHO	GALLA
sing.	1.		adem-u
	2.		adem-t-u
	3. m.	bet-o	adem-u
	3. f.	bet-t-o	adem-t-u
plur.	1.	ben-n-o	adem-n-u
	2.		} (aorist instead)
	3.	bet-ona	

In the third pers. plural of the Saho, *ona* seems to stand for an original *ano*, the *o* having entered the preceding syllable by a sort of 'Umlaut' (see the aorist, above).

The imperative of both these languages has only two forms, but they correspond closely to each other, in as much as they both lack the characteristic *t* of the indicative present; compare

		SAHO	GALLA
sing.	2.	bet	ademi
plur.	2.	beta	adema.

This is at present all that can be said regarding the close

relationship of Saho and Galla, but it is indeed very much, especially if we bear in mind that with what has been said, our knowledge of the Saho is nearly exhausted.

We come now to the second point, the relation of the Galla family to the Semitic.

First,—the present of the Galla or future of the Saho is the same as the so called perfect of the Semits; compare the terminations:

	sing. 1.	2. m.	2. f.	3. m.	3. f.	pl. 1.
GALLA	—	ta		—	ti	na
SAHO	—	ta		—	ta	na
ARABIC	tu	ta	ti	—	at	nâ
HEBREW	tî	tâ	t(i)	—	at [1]	nû

	pl. 2. m.	2. f.		3. m.	3. f.
GALLA	tu (tan-i)			u (an-i)	
SAHO	tan			an	
ARABIC	tum	tunna		û	
HEBREW	tem	ten [2]		û (un [1])	

The coincidence is striking, the only—and indeed a characteristic—difference being the absence of any termination of the 1. sing. in Saho and Galla.

But even a form corresponding to the Semitic imperfect has been preserved, not indeed in Galla, but in Saho. Namely this:—Abbadie gives us of the verb 'to be' (the present of which shows a root *ki* or *kin*) both the future and preterite, which we need only put opposite the Semitic imperfect to see at once the coincidence.

		SAHO		ARABIC	HEBREW
sing.	1.	e-kke 'I was'	a-kke 'I shall be'	a-ktulu	e-kt'ôl
	2. m.	te-kke	ta-kke	ta-ktulu	ti-kt'ôl
	2. f.			ta-ktul-îna	ti-kt'l-i
	3. m.	je-kke	ja-kke	ja-ktulu	ji-kt'ôl
	3. f.	te-kke	ta-kke	ta-ktulu	ti-kt'ôl
plur.	1.	ne-kke	na-kke	na-ktulu	ni-kt'ôl
	2. m.	te-kki-n	ta-kki-n	ta-ktul-ûna	ti-kt'l-û
	2. f.			ta-ktul-na	ti-kt'ôl-nâ
	3. m.	je-kki-n	ja-kki-n	ja-ktul-ûna	ji-kt'l-û
	3. f.			ja-ktul-na	[ji-kt'ôl-nâ [3]]

[1] old.

[2] Before suffixes *tu*, mscl. and fem.

[3] Commonly *ti-k'tôl-nâ*. The other form is **very rare**.

It is quite unnecessary to make a long talk about the analogy with the Semitic, it is clear as the sun.

Another point of resemblance is the gender. Like the Semitic, the Saho-Galla has two genders, which however are only distinguished in the third person sing., but quite after the Semitic fashion. Already in the conjugation we found in the third person a *t* as the characteristic sign of the feminine, both in the suffixed *ti* of the Galla present, and the prefixed *t* of the future and aorist of the verb substantive in Saho. The Galla adjectives frequently add a similar suffix in the feminine, as *hama* 'bad', fem. *ham-tu; hieza* 'poor', fem. *hie-ti*[1]. *T* is also the characteristic of the Semitic feminine.

The comparison of the Semitic languages with one another shows that the original character of the plural is *ÛN*, as well in the verb as in the noun. This *UN* becomes *in* or *án* in Aramean, in the Hebrew verbs and pronouns partly *û*, partly *em, en*. In the Saho and Galla verb we find the plural character *u, an, (i)n* clearly enough; which forms point back to the same original *ÛN*.

Here now would be the place to treat of the pronouns, in as much as they too are very much like the Semitic. But this is on the one hand apparent at once from the verbal personal prefixes and suffixes being identical, and on the other hand the isolated pronouns of the Saho-Galla are somewhat phonetically decayed, so that they *alone* would not be sufficient evidence for the Semitic relationship. I therefore prefer to treat of them afterwards, embracing at once in one comparative view all the sisterfamilies of the Semitic. What has been brought forward, is sufficient to establish the connection between Saho-Galla and Semitic.

The connection. For nevertheless we cannot call them at once Semitic languages, because the points of coincidence are counterbalanced by contrasts equally striking. Thus the curious tripartition of the *present* tense by means of the three original vowels into present, aorist, subjunctive (*adema,*

---

[1] The *z* is lost before *t,* according to an invariable phonetic law.

ademe, ademu, s. above), is unsemitic[1], and so is the dif-
ferentiation of the tense that corresponds to the Semitic
imperfect, into two, by giving the prefixes now the vowel
e, and now *a.* More vital still is the diversity in the for-
mation of the derivative verbs, which are made in Galla by
adding suffixes; as *bá,* to go, *bada,* to go out for one's
self, *ba-za,* to cause to go out, *ba-fada,* to let go out,
drive out for one's self, *baziza,* to cause to let go out,
drive away, *bazizafada,* to cause to let go out for one's
self, &c. &c. Again, the triliteral roots are entirely unknown
to the Galla, in which—apparently at least—most roots
are disyllables, but the vowel is always an integral part of
them, and not liable to the symbolical vowel-changes so
characteristic of Semitic speech. Minor differences are, the
lesser extent of the gender, the want of a termination in
the first person sing. pres., the total absence of the Arabic
caseterminations, which have not only left traces in Hebrew
and even Aramean, but of late have been discovered too
in the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, and must therefore
have belonged to the original Semitic.

As in the grammar, so also in the dictionary, the individuality
of the Galla is very strongly marked. How very great the
difference is in this respect—which is all the more remark-
able because of the close resemblance of the Semitic lan-
guages properly so called in their roots and words—, is
evident from the fact that not one of the Galla numerals
resembles the Semitic.

Thus to the thesis: *"the Saho-Galla is related to the Se-
mitic"* we have the antithesis: *"yet they are not one family"*.

Thereby we are forced, in order to express this particular
relationship, to introduce into linguistic science the new
term of sisterfamilies; or, to apply ourselves more especially
to the case in hand, we must assume, that one aboriginal
nation developed their common speech up to the point of
common verbal inflexion, common signs of plural and femi-

---

[1] Compare however the cohortative *imperfect* in Hebrew, made by
adding *á(h)* to the original forms.

nine, common pronominal forms, that afterwards one branch of this aboriginal nation continued the forming process of speech after their own fashion, by which the original Semitic was evolved, while on the other hand in the same manner an original Saho-Galla was produced, both of the two in their turn — of course long after their first separation — branching off into individual languages.

(To be continued.)

─────────

IV.—ON THE WORD *CULORUM*. By Herbert Coleridge, Esq.

In the Vision of Piers Plouhman (Wright's edition) we find the following passages in which this singular word occurs.

A.   The *culorum* of this cas
       Kepe I noght to telle,
       On aventure it noyed men,
       Noon *ende* wol I make. vv. 1927-31.

B.   Ac I wene it worth of manye,
       As was in Noes tyme,
       Tho he shoop that shipe
       Of shides and of bordes;
       Was nevere wrighte saved that wroghte theron,
       Ne oothir werkman ellis,
       But briddes and beestes,

       . . . .
       Of wightes that it wroghte
       Was noon of hem y-saved.
       God leve it fare noght so bi folk
       That the feith techeth!
       Of holi chirche, that herberwe is
       And Goddes hous to save
       And shilden us from shame therinne,
       As Noes ship did beestes;
       And men that maden it
       A-mydde the flood a-dreynten.
       The *Culorum* of this clause
       Curatours is to mene,