



Questioning the Origin of Indo-European: A Comparative Evolutionary Analysis of Hittite and Cushitic (Oromo)

Dereje Tadesse Birbirso^a, Tesfaye Gudeta Gerba^{b*}

^{a,b} College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Haramaya University, P.O.Box 251 138, Dire Dawa, Ethiopia

^aEmail: dtadesse@yahoo.com

^bEmail: gudetatesfaye36@gmail.com

Abstract

Hittite, in particular, and Anatolian, in general, encompasses both new insights and obscurantism. Some point to African ('Egyptian') origin, others to Balkan and still some point, putatively and specifically, to Oromo-Cush origin. The general aim of this paper is to comparatively analyze Hittite and Oromo phonological, lexical and grammatical items. Hittite and Oromo, as well as, for historical and a real reasons, some Egyptian and (Proto) Indo-European ((P-) IE), corpora are collected and comparatively analyzed. The results show significant level of phonological, lexical and grammatical resemblances. A large number of these are shared not only between and among the latter two but also Egyptian lexemes and (P-) IE roots and aspirates and pharyngeal reconstructions. The paper presents, in Section 1, the debates about the Ancient African and Anatolian relations will be briefly highlighted, justifying the causes of this study. In Section 2, comparative analysis and discussion of the data will be presented. In the final section, Section 3, conclusion and implications are drawn.

Keywords: Oromo; Cushitic; Hittite; Anatolia; Indo-European; Proto-Indo-European; Classical Greek, Latin, Black Africa

* Corresponding authors.

E-mail address: gudetatesfaye36@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

1.1. The Conflicting report on Proto-Indo-European (PIE)

The origin and relationship between Anatolian and PIE roots/language are abounding of conflicting reports. Three dominant models about the origin of (Proto) Indo-European language are available.

One is the Ancient Model, which argues that Black Africans, or Nilo-Cush people, originated civilization, ruled over Europe pre-Classical Greek times, and left their civilization, culture and language, all of which evolved to present condition [35]. Bernal [15] does not describe them as *Africans* but as “Levantine, on the periphery of the Egyptian and Semitic cultural area” or, sometimes, “Egyptians and Phoenicians”.

The second is what Bernal calls the “anti-Semitic” Aryan Model, according to which “unreported”, “mysterious” people invaded the “local “Aegean” or Pre-Hellenistic” people “from the north”, from which Greek civilization arose as “mixture of the Indo-European speaking Hellens and their indigenous subjects” [35]. Later on Bernal [12, 7, 13] rejected the Ancient Model because it is advocated by Afrocenterists, “who maintained that the Ancient Egyptians were black or nearly so, and that hence Europeans had derived their civilizations from Africans” [13,5]. He, thus, suggested the third model, namely the Revised Ancient Model, which “offers direct and indirect (through Crete) influences on Greek from the Afroasiatic in the Third and early Second Millennium”, whereby the “Egyptian and Semitic spoken by the settlers of the early Mycenaean period...substantially modified the local Indo-European dialect” [12, 37,38].

Merritt Ruhlen, one of the leading evolutionary linguists of our time, states Anatolia is “the first to separate from Proto-Indo-European” [50]. Among Anatolian languages, Hittite is one of the best-attested and most important representatives of the extinct Anatolian family [65] believed to be spoken from seventeenth to thirteenth-century BCE [48,61,43,49]. Hittite is preserved in clay tablets written in “cuneiform script”, also “labeled “hieroglyphic” because of the pictorial nature of its symbols”, but “acquired from Akkadian-speaking peoples of Mesopotamia perhaps by way of Syria” [65]. Other Anatolian-family languages include Lycian (seventh–fifth century BCE), Lydian (ninth to fourth century BCE) and Luvian (second–early first millennium BCE) and others which are believed to be used by “speakers of pre-Greek Crete”. On his part, Woodard points to the Balkan origin of Anatolians.

On the other hand, we know that the Anatolian branch was only discovered in the early 20th century [51]. According to Ruhlen, the leading evolutionary linguist, the so-called Indo-European family is a relatively recent (4000 BCE) daughter of a super-family called Indo-Hittite (6500 BCE). In his critical and empirical lecture, Ruhlen [51] <http://hstalks.com/bio> speculates that even Indo-Hittite itself might still be a branch of a larger and more ancient family. Nevertheless, Ruhlen explains, the “20th century Indo-Europeanists, even today”, offer a baseless “verdict” that “there is no evidence that Indo-Hittite is related to any other family because “languages change so rapidly that, after 6000 years, all traces of genetic relationship will have totally been erased by simple linguistic evolution” and, hence, they argue, “even if Indo-Hittite were related to any other families, evidence for this relationship would no longer exist”. Ruhlen explains that the 6000-years ceiling “has been known to be

incorrect over a century” and is “nothing more than a myth invented by 29th century Indo-Europeanists to protect the splendid isolation of their family.”

1.2. Ancient East-North Africa and Near East.

Scholars like Woodard [65,47] discuss that it is from Herodotus’ report which was written in the reign of the Egyptian Pharaoh, called Psammetichus, that “demonstrated the Egyptians satisfaction that the Phrygians, and their language, enjoy existential primacy”. Woodard, however, doubts asking: Exactly where the speakers of that language were prior to their appearance in central Anatolia in the eighth century BCE? Where is the language of the king who lay buried in that tear washed tomb—the first of all languages for Psammetichus? Contemporary “phylogenetic, craniometric, textual, historical and linguistic evidence” continue to support Cushite colonization of Eurasia as was also “maintained by the Classical writers” [64].

Many scholars also associate Oromo to ancient Anatolian and the Biblical peoples such as Hittite and Israelites. Bartels [6], the great Catholic priest and anthropologist, also associates Oromo to ancient Biblical peoples, cultures and languages such as “Levites” and “Israelites”. De Salviac [22], another greatest priest and scholar, expounded that Oromo [“Galla”], “constitute ... one language made supremely remarkably in Africa and above all in the Nile basin” and, whose grammatical, lexical, semantic cognates he found as far, in time space, as in Gauls, Irish, Sanskrit and others. De Salviac [22,16,17,45] stresses: “Just as in the Sanskrit, the Hindu...the Slav, the Oromo verbs roll on the series of simple articulations, on the mechanism of simple correlation of causative, intensive, emphatic forms, etc. This language, therefore, maintains a cache of great antiquity”.

1.3 Objectives.

This paper contends that Oromo and Hittite might be historically, typologically and genetically related. Crabtree and other scholars have already suggested what Ruhlen [52] says “putative evidence”. What remains to be proven is “the recognition of grammatical and lexical resemblances *in both form and meaning* that leads to the supposition that certain languages (or language families) are genetically related” [52]. Therefore, the specific questions to be explored are:

- 1) Can phonological, lexical and grammatical cognates between Oromo and Hittite be recognized?
- 2) What about the Indo-Hittite family itself? Does it share similarities with other language families, indicating that ‘Ḫatti’/‘Ad’ē’ is simply a branch of even larger and more ancient family?
- 3) Can Oromo play a role in bridging ‘the existing’ gap between the African Cushites (or the shaky taxonomization ‘Afroasiatic’) and Indo-Hittites or PIE?

1.4. Methods and Procedure.

Anatolian data are mainly collected from Watkins [61, 42] who treated Hittite and other Anatolian languages quite comprehensively. Watkins’ analysis is based on data obtained from cuneiform documents and scriptures of Old Hittite (seventeenth or early sixteenth century BCE), Middle Hittite (1500 BCE to 1375 BCE), and Neo-

Hittite (1375 BCE to 1200 BCE). Oromo corpus is obtained mainly from Tutschek's *Oromo ['Galla'] Dictionary* [59] and *Oromo ['Galla'] Grammar* [60, 63]. Owens [44] and [31, 40] are also significant resources. Besides, native-speaker (including the authors) data are added.

2. Analysis and Discussion

2.1 Phonology and transcription

The International Phonetic Association (IPA) conventions, signs, symbols and abbreviations as in Crystal [21] are followed. Most notably, the IPA symbols for the palatoalveolar fricative voiceless \int and $t\int$ have been replaced by the more familiar \check{s} and \check{c} , respectively. Similarly, y is used for the palatal glide rather than j .

Primarily, it is good to note that the Hittite phonemes are only non-categorical transliterations. Moreover, ancient writing systems, including Hittite, do not record vowel sounds. Vowel harmonization, opposition of long and short vowels, lengthening of accented short vowels, and correlation of stress and vowel length are as much Hittite feature [61] as are Oromo [44, 28]. Current Oromo writing system shows elongation of vowel sounds, both of which marks grammatical and semantic difference, by doubling the letter in focus [28].

The Hittite consonantal phoneme inventory (Table 1) is adopted from Watkins [61], while that of Oromo is adapted from Tutschek [59, 60], Cerulli [17], [2] and Owens [44]. The latter two focus on Boran (southern) and Hararggee (eastern) dialects, respectively, while the former two describe the unique and isolated (before 'Semitic' finally infiltrated into the remaining Cushitic Land) dialects of Wallo (northern), Mačč'a (central and western) dialects. All the authors discuss that the Oromo language is far more unified entity, by contrast to their initial expectations of high dialectological difference.

Table 1: Hittite and Oromo consonantal phoneme inventory

Class	Hittite	Oromo
Bilabials	b, f.	b, p', f
Nasals	m, n	m, n, ɲ, ŋ, ñ
Liquids	r, l	r, l
Fricatives	S	s, ʃ, z, š, ç
Alveolar, Retroflex	t; d	t', t, t; d, d, d', d'
Affricates	<z> ^a ; *'	č', č, dʒ; dʒ, ğ, dʒ
Palatal, Vela, Uvular	k, k ^w ; g, g ^w , *, **	c, c', k', k, g, ğ, q', q
Glottalic	h<-ḥ->H <-ḥḥ->	χ, h, ḥ, ḥ, ʔ, ʕ, ʔ
Approximants	w, y	w, y

2.2 Word Structure. According Watkins, Hittite words can be either inflected or uninflected. The basic inflected word structure is: ROOT + SUFFIX(ES) + ENDING [61]. For instance (1), the noun *kartimmiyatt-* 'anger' is

built by the nominalizing action noun suffix -att- on the verb-stem kartimmiya-, with denominative verbal suffix -iya-, itself formed from a *probable* nominal stem *kartim(m)a-with suffix -(i)ma-.

(1) kart-(i)mma-iy-att- (Hittite)
 'heart-NOM-DEN-NOM
 'anger'

Watkins discusses that root gives the basic semantic content. *Suffixes* give derivational or grammatical meaning as well as specify part of speech. In Hittite, the *stem* comprises ROOT + SUFFIX(ES) together. The stem “constitutes a lexical or dictionary entry, an inflected word in the language”.

The Oromo root indexes any grammatical category, though verb is, usually, the first to come to mind (e.g., ba can be categorized as verb ‘to go out, emerge’ or noun ‘origin, genesis’ or adjective or adverb ‘east, eastward, easterly’, or others). It is only by context/co-text or prosodic feature of *stemization* that the functional class appear clear. Likewise, in Hittite the “a thematic stems are consonant stems” [61]. Furthermore, Hittite “shows the familiar Indo-European pattern of morphological type known as *fusional*...for example, -s marks nominative case, singular number, animate gender...rich inflexion of nominal, pronominal, and verbal categories” [61].

Table 2: Vowel-stems

Hittite Particles	Oromo Particles
Verbal	Verbal
-i /-e, 3.PRES.SG	-e, AOR/PRET.SG.IND except for 3PL
-i, 3.IND	-i, SG.IMP or SG.IPFV.ACTIVE
-u, 3IMPER	-u, SG.IMP.NOM or INF.PRS.PTCP or FUT
	-a, 1.IPFV. IND. ACTIVE
Nominal (Old Hittite)	Nominal
-i, VOCANIM.SG	-i, VOCINAN.SG
-a, INAN.PL	-a, ANIM.PL (PL in the sense of mass or
-a, DIRECTIVE. SG	universal)

In the following illustrations (3), no farther break down into the primordial root, for instance q’a ‘to have an opening or hole’ is considered.

(2) d’eer-ef-aate (Oromo)
 long-MID.REFL-2PRET
 ‘you lengthened something’ [44]

(3) qar-omma-ya-ad’-ā (Oromo)

sharp-MID-NOM-COP.REL-RES

to have become a civilization

‘civilization’

The Oromo concepts of being ‘lovable, good, charitable; being educated, civilized’ (qārī) or ‘agent man’ (q’er-o, ‘lit., VOC, unmarried man or woman of age 13/15-25’) and of ‘heart’ (qarā, in the sense of ‘mind, persona’) are inseparable. Literally, people ‘enter into one others’ hearts’ (wal qara) when they ‘be or become good, fair, reconciling, charitable, friends to one another’ or, in contrast, they, literally, ‘face away from each other’ (wal’ra qara), i.e., they be enemies, foes to one another. Hence is the proverb, in translation, ‘it is heart (qara) and road/way (kara) that conjoins/befriends as well as isolates. Therefore, the above Hittite-PIE root *er ‘heart’ (1) and Oromo qara ‘heart’ are plausibly cognates.

(4) ḥed’-oma-ya-ta-a

(Oromo)

add-MID-NOM-AUX-RES ‘abundance’

According to Watkins, the Hittite noun kartimmiyatt- (1), meaning ‘anger’ is built by the nominalizing action noun suffix -att- appended to the verb-stem kartimmiya-, and the latter is made of -iya- ‘denominative verbal suffix’ appended to “a probable nominal stem *kartim(m)” [61]. Accordingly the nominalizer suffix -(i)ma-, the double m being “probably just due to the usual spelling with the sign tim”, is appended to “the noun stem kart- = kard- of the body part ‘heart’, PIE *ord-”[61].

The Oromo –ma or -oma is appended to an intransitive singular verbal roots (e.g. qári ‘to be fair, good’) to form a denominatives used as reflexive middle voice verbs (e.g. qároma ‘to become, get good; goodness, civilization’). Appended to transitive (plural) verbs, it forms passive verbs. Since these Oromo primary suffixes are similar to the PIE athematic active singular ending *-mi, and the Ancient Greek –μα- (or –ομαι) ‘direct-reflexive MID’ (e.g., λούομαι ‘MID, bathe, wash oneself’, as compared to λούω-ACC ‘wash someone, something’). It is likely that the Hittite -(i)ma- cannot be different [4, 11].

Similarly, the Hittite nominalizing action noun suffix -att- (1, 7) and Oromo copula -d’a, the resultative auxiliary -ṭa or -t’a (geminated, -ṭṭa) are likely the same (8 below). This is possible, for the “common Anatolian *-ti of unknown origin, commonly termed ‘reflexive’, though it has other functions as well...[and] with some transitive active verbs -za can express benefit of the subject” [61] are cognates to the Lycian -ti “enclitic reflexive particle or -ad- ‘do, make’” [42]. These and the Attic Greek aorist marker -θη-, as in (4) from PIE and Proto-Anatolian –ti [62] all show no difference.

(5)τά-θη

(Attic Greek)

stretch-AOR.

‘stretched’

[59,60]

(6)ʃa-adʹ-e (Oromo)

sit-COP.REFL-AOR

‘I became to be/sat for/by myself’

The verb ʃa in (6) also means ‘to be, become’, and serves as auxiliary verb and a probability modal verb (Tutschek [59, 60]. It compares to (7):

(7) itʹa-adʹ-e (Oromo)

swell/bind-COP.REFL-PRF/AOR

‘I stretched it myself’ [$\text{> hid}^{\circ}\text{a-d}^{\circ}\text{a}$]

The Oromo (auto-)benefactive suffixes are derived from the juxtaposition of the main copulatives or reduplication of either: -fādʹa (from (u)f ‘self’ and -dʹa), -mādʹa (from -ma ‘MID.’ and -dʹa), -adʹādʹa (redup., -adʹ) and -ʃādʹa (-ʃa ‘AUX’ and -dʹa). These are found in Mycenaean, Doric and Archaic Greek as: -φής, -μες, vti, -ασι from PIE *-ti, itself from earlier *-di < -dh [6].

2.3 Periphrastic Verbs.

The word structure of Oromo (8) and Hittite (7) appear more correspondents with the periphrastic verbs.

(8) kúrur-ia-ḫ-ta (Hittite)

hostilities-PRES 3SG-PRES- PRET

‘had begun hostilities’

(9)qoror-ī-ʔa-at-e (Oromo)

gnarl-SG.IPFV-DUR.IPFV-AUX- PRET 3 SG

‘had begun to be growling’

The Hittite suffix -ta (1) and Oromo -at- (8) must be a grammatical cognates because the Lycian *ad-* serves as lexical/auxiliary verb for ‘do, make’ (9), which cuts parallel as well with Oromo dʹâ ‘to make, do’ (dʹâ-e ‘make/do-PRET.’ as in 10 & 11).

(10)ad-e/ad-K

(Lycian)

do-PRET

‘he/she did/made’

(Merchert: 53)

(11) ḡaabé dʿa-e

(Oromo)

hairstyle make-PRET

‘he made the ḡaabé hairstyle’

(12) ḡaabé dʿá-adʿ-*e*

(Oromo)

‘a hairstyle make-BEN COP/AUX-PRET

‘he made/did for himself his hairstyle ḡaabé’

2.4. Old Hittite ḡ-conjugation and Oromo ʔ-conjugation.

The Hittite particle -ḡ- (7) and Oromo -ʔa- (8) are grammatical most probably cognates because the Hittite -ḡ(ḡi) (Old Hittite -ḡḡe), known as ḡ-conjugation, stands always in present tense form [61] and so does Oromo ʔ-conjugation mark progressive or imperfect participial or preadverbials [60,31]. Especially, Oromo -ʔ (> -ʕ) is commonly annexed to the singular verbs ending in the trills followed by close vocalization (-ri, -li, -ni) to make deverbials. Examples are the substantives of ba ‘to go out, emerge, appear’: baḡi ‘to be, break, go apart’ v baḡa ‘(is) wide’; boḡi ‘to lit, to be dawned; to be or become gray’ v baḡiḡ ‘has dawned; is beautiful’.

Similar pattern of conjugation is tʿóḡi ‘to be brown’ v. tʿólʔa (> tʿolaḡa) ‘is, has become brown’ and maḡi ‘to break through; to ooze’ v. malaḡ ‘pus’. Erman [26] treated similar Egyptian phonology under “special points” calling them “certain sounds for which the sign is wailing”. Erman adds they occur “as the final letter of many words, which interchanges with *ī*”. These directly point to the Egyptian rhotics: *r* (represented by lips-pictogram), *í* (represented by reed leaf like pictogram or two-arm pictogram) and *ʕ* (represented by hawk). These sounds and their respective pictograms might still resonate with pertinent Oromo lexemes: qʿoḡo ‘hawk, crow’, araḡeḡa (> araḡeḡa) ‘raven’ (lit. araḡ-éza ‘cry-CAUS.ACC’, i.e., ‘taler, messenger, prophesier’ because it is belied in Oromo religion that this bird carries out this role, see Aguilar [1]; ḡuḡu ‘larynx; snout’ (accurately snout plus nose plus the hustling breath), ʔḡaba ‘tongue, larynx’ or iḡe ‘arm, limbs’. This inference is possible because the Erman speculative word, “wailing”, is signified in Oromo by ʔiḡoi designates ‘wailing’ (lit., áḡi-o-i ‘wail-ART-SBJV). These are conceivably similar to what Watkins [61] calls Hittite ḡ-conjugation built on ‘final consonants’, ‘vowels’, ‘long vowels’, ‘diphthongs.’

All the above parallelism between the two languages compels us to infer two big points. One is that the stems, Oromo singular qororī (>k'ororie) 'growl, gnarl' and Hittite kúrur- 'hostilities', are possibly lexical cognates because of their phono-semantic likeness.

Given the so far observations, we are compelled to infer that the so-called Hittite -ḫ(ḫi) or Old Hittite ḫ-conjugation and Oromo ḡ-conjugation (with variants ḡ, ḡ, d') are cognates. The foregone hypothesis is further supported by the fact that the Oromo -(a)ḡa (>-ka) 'and (serial, sequential), duality' and -ḡa (> -aa) 'progressiveness, continuumness' (12) are perhaps correspondent to, respectively, the Hittite "geminated -a" meaning 'and' [61] and the stative -ē- (*-eh₁-), which turns inchoative -ēš- (*-eh₁-s-) [61]. In serial actions the Oromo particle -ḡ^a turns perfective -ḡe (> -ye) as in:

(13) ka-ḡ-é ḡoḡ-e (Oromo)

arise-inch-PRET stir-PRET.

'he arose and went, surreptitiously'

(14) bā-ḡa adé-m(a)-na (Oromo)

appear-ASSERT go-MID-PL

'come and let us go, thence'

The above (14) Oromo particle, -ḡa, is a prototypical of what linguists say 'secondary articulations', segments lacking precise meaning in themselves. Here, the form -ḡa (>-qa, -ka) realizes the *assertoric* mode (in the sense of Habermasian communicative pragmatics), that is 'validity claim to reason' that it is 'true' that 'you come out' and 'we have to go out'. Similarly, the form with similar semantics, namely <-ḡ> (allophones: -qa, -que, or -ka) is common in Anatolia and early Ancient Greek. For instance, "Lycian in most cases corresponds to a cuneiform ḫ...reflecting the Proto-Indo-European second laryngeal (preterite frist singular ending -ḡa < *-h₂e)" [42].

In addition to the ḫ-conjugation discussed above, Hittite also shows what is called *mi-conjugation*. According to [61] the root (1) athematic presents with ablaut é : Ø (kuen- : kun-, remade in ē š- : aš-, ēp- : app-); derives (2) the acrostatic presents with ablaut é : é (ēdmi : edwani, remade in adweni); and (3) the nasal-infix presents as in ḫarni(n)k- 'destroy' (also ḫark- 'perish') with probably innovated transitivity value. Additional Hittite examples are: ēdmi 'I eat', ḫariemi 'I bury', tepnumi 'I belittle' (see 25 & 26 below). The key form is the Hittite thematic first singular active marker -škimī, -ie/-iyami [61]. Similarly, the Oromo suffix -ma (> -ba, -fa, -wa, -na) designate middle voice and impersonal or reflexive copula. Compare Hittite ēdmi 'I eat' with Oromo:

(15) ñā-d'a (Oromo)

eat-COP.BEN

‘I eat for my sake’

(16) ñã-d’ a-mé (Oromo)

‘eat-AUX-PASS.PRET.

‘I was eaten’ (i.e., I was robbed, cheated)

(17) ñã-dā-wa (Oromo)

eat-AUX-RES

‘food, dish’

Many Oromo verbs and deverbials are of *ma*-conjugation type see Tutschek [60].

Hittite ḫ-conjugation išḫa- ‘blood’ (see 29 & 30) and Oromo d’ík’a ‘blood’ are conceivably cognates. This is possible because in ancient Egyptian and other texts, the sounds ḏ, š, z, d are transliterated in confused manner [12]. The Egyptian ḏ, determinative of the pictogram of a serpent, is signified in Oromo by dýáwe (>ǵ’awé) ‘anaconda snake’, named after the onomatopoeic-image of ‘lightening flash’. This morpheme is reconstructed as *d^h in PIE, as confirmed by Paul Hopper and Thomas Gamkrelidze [55]; or, as Semitic k^w [12]. Hopper and Thomas, also point out that the right approach to the so-called Proto-Indo-European aspirated stops (e.g., p^h, t^h, d^h, k^h) is re-casting the reconstructed voiced stops as ejectives sounds (more in Section 2.13).

2.5 Conjugation and Aspect.

The Oromo –e, preterite or aorist singular neuter marker, is like the Hittite –a, marking preterite tense and surely is cognate with the Lycean preterite marker –e. Note that the Hittite hieroglyphics does not record, like Egyptian or Meroitic, vowels. Also, Watkins states that the Hittite “endings of the present may show...particle -ri; those of the preterite may end in -ti rather than the usual (apocopated) –t” [61]. Additionally, [61] states some Hittite “verbs show scriptio plena (repeating the vowel of a CV or VC sign with the matching V sign) in the third singular ending –āri, and here the particle -ri is obligatory” (ibid). All these conform with the Oromo present/non-past singular inanimate deverbal ending –rí or -lí (above Section 2.4.), the present perfective –ra [60], the (subjunctive) modal –aṭa >- ḏ a (det..., -aṭi >-ḏ i) and the preterite (except 1 person) singular -aṭe (>-ḏ e):

(18) adem-te-rt-a (Oromo)

walk-PRET-PRES.PRF- 2 SG

‘you have gone’

Similarly, the Hittite non-*h*-conjugation middle verbs show endings such as *-ta(ri)* ‘a present third singular’ and secondary thematic middles show *-ietta(ri)*, *-iyatta(ri)* [61], which appears similar to the Oromo *-rta* (15) and *-dʒirta* (19), *-tirta* (20), *-adʒuʒirta* or *-adʒuʒirtare*.

(19) *adem-uf-dʒirt-a* (Oromo)

walk-FUT- PRES. PRF-2 SG

‘you are to leave’

[60: 40].

(20) *adem-uʒi-rta* (Oromo)

‘walk-present cont-PRES.PRF-2 SG

‘you are going’.

(21) *adem-adʒ-uʒi-rta* (Oromo)

walk-BEN-PRES. PRF-2 SG

‘you are going for yourself’.

(22) *adem-adʒ-uʒi-rta-re* (Oromo)

walk-auto BEN-PRES. PRF-2 SG-EMPH

‘pray, you are going for yourself, then!’

The Hittite durative form (23) is marked by the form *-anna-i* as in *iyanna-i* ‘starts walking’ from *ie-/iya-* ‘walk’, which is like the Oromo *-naan-yi/-ii* [31] describes *-mnaan/-nnaan* as gerundive).

(23) *iya-(a)nna-i* (Hittite)

walk-DUR

‘starts walking’

based on Watkins [61].

(24) *yā-naan-ii* (Oromo)

flow-DUR-ing

‘starts flowing’.

The Hittite *tepnu-meni* and Oromo *tap’a-uma-ni* are at least similar by their roots:

(25) *tepnu-meni* (Hittite)

‘we belittle’

(26) *tap’a-uma-ni* (Oromo)

play-FOC-PL-INS

‘play, just humorously, to harm none.’

The Oromo multiplex postpositive particle *-ni* marks plural instrumental case, and state of ‘being of, over, about’ (essive and/or adessive case as in Crystal [21]).

(27) *tap’a-naan-yi* (Oromo)

play-DUR-ing

‘starts playing; playing starts’

For more comparative conjugation-aspect forms and semantic see 28 and 29:

(28) a. *karap-e/a-* (Hittite)

‘lift- DEV.CAUS’

b. *karp-ya-*

‘lift-DEV/DEN’

(29) a. *kip’-é/-í* (Oromo)

hop-DEV.CAUS.SG.PRES.

‘springbok’ (lit., that which hops)

b. *ki(r)ip’-aa/-ya*

hop-DEV-PROG

‘jumping (a game)’

2.6. Sentence Connectives

Sentence connectives are essential element for historical/evolutionary comparative analysis. Table 3 illustrates some sentence connectives collected from Watkins (for Hittite) and Griefenow-Mewis (for Oromo). The sign ‘=’ is original as in Watkins (standard function is to show *deletion*). If the common alternating sounds, d^ʔ/š/z, l/r, ʔ/y are considered there are high level of resemblances.

Table 3: Hittite-Oromo sentence connective particles

Hittite	Oromo
wa(r)- ‘quotative’	mali- , wan- ‘quotative’
=ma ‘correlative focus, weakly adversative adding new information’	-moo ‘disjunctive conjunction used in questions demanding decision only’, -uma ‘adversative; in vain’
= za (=z) ‘reflexive’	-(a)d ^ʔ a ‘reflexive’
=kan, =šan, =ašta ‘local/aspectual?’	-kan/akan, san/suni, adó, adzi ‘therefore, then, even if’
=a (geminating), = ya ‘and’	-aa, -ʔa,- ʒa ‘for, and, because’ (AOR and INTROG: -ʒo, -ôo -woo, -hoo)
=a (non-geminating) ‘but, however’	-yo/-ʔyu ‘even if, although’

Interesting resemblance in clausal connection is observed in 24 and 25:

(30) kururiahta kuti... (Hittite)

‘had begun hostilities because...’

[61]

(31) ġorori-ʔa-at-e, gatí... (Oromo)

anger/hum-PRES -AUX-PRET, because...

‘he had begun to be grumbling (grumble towards me), because...’

From this, we can only infer that Oromo ġororia ‘to hum, to be angry’ and ória (>ʔoria) ‘to attack, assail; to trouble’ see Tutschek [59] and the above Hittite roots *kur-*(28), *kar-* ‘anger’ (1) are most probably cognates.

2.7. Ergativity.

Garrett [29] uses Anatolian (Hittite, Luvian and Lycian) morphologization properties to advance what he calls NP-split ergativity. Garrett [29] stated: an “ergative” system is characterized by the existence of one case, the absolutive, marking both “S function”, that is the subjects of intransitive verb, and “O functions”, the objects of transitive verbs, and a second case, the ergative, marking just the subjects of the transitive verbs. The key

Hence, in Oromo “the second form, or the first verb derived from the root is, in general, the middle voice [II conjugation] of the first form” [60]. Hence, the root is, generally, intransitive (need no object) and ends with the athematic vowel –a (or lifted ^a), ‘marking’ multitudinal-abstractness or with –i (or liftedⁱ) ‘marking’ singulative-concreteness, as was discussed above under Section 2.2. The II level conjugation denotes reflexivity and/or benefecativity marked by copulative –d’a (with variants such as -ʔ^a, –[a, -dʒa). It is, generally, at III level conjugation that transitiveness is marked in –za > –ʒa (with affricate variants -za, -dʒa). At depth, there is no syntactic as well as signification difference between transitiveness, accusativeness (marked, in general in –ča, see Table 4) and causativity or animatization, to which we turn.

Thus, the Oromo suffix –za (and its variants) gives, technically speaking, ‘spirit to the spiritless’. That is, it attributes transitivity, transformativity or causativity to the intransitive. To illustrate qera ‘to strike, stab’, qeraa ‘the act of striking back with claws, finger, sharp object’; qerama, Middle Voice and with m changing to n:

(36) qera-ŋ-za (Oromo)

strike-NOM-ACC.CAUS.ERG

‘leopard’ (lit., that which slays)

(37) loe-ŋ-č’a (Oromo)

thrust-NOM-ACC.CAUS.ERG

‘lion’ (lit., that which crawl and simultaneously move fast)

Note that in Oromo, the notions *accusative* and *nominative* are not equal to the concepts *objective* and *subjective*. For instance, the accusative case form of the base-form nama ‘man’, namča, can also take *subjective* position by only changing the final vowel: namči. Griefano-Mewis [31] accurately describes the Oromo suffix –inza as a derivational affix forming nouns from causatives. It is formed from the latter (34, 35) two particles, namely –ŋ and –z, and conjoined as –ŋz. Therefore, the secret of ergativity, in general, and Hittite ‘ergativity’ (in Garrett’s words) and Oromo ‘causativity’ markers, in particular, lie in what Garret describes as ‘animatization’ or, alternatively, transitivization. Both the Hittite and Oromo particles are cognates in that they animatize, confound the transitive power to the inanimate objects, or non-cased, non-declined forms, forms which basically are verbs.

Before ending this section, let us note that the Hittite non-finite particle –ant is appended to ‘a single adjective or particle’ to formulate non-finite verb [61]. Its function is to mark the accomplishment of the semantic notion of the verb; with transitive verbs, the value is past passive (ēp-zi ‘takes’, app-ant- ‘taken, captive’) and with intransitive verbs it denotes an attained state (ak-i ‘dies’, akk-ant- ‘dead’). Quite related to this is the Oromo form –nt- (> –ŋt-, –ŋt-) realizing non-finite deverbials [60]. One good example is gudaŋta ‘(to be or have become) grown, developed’ from the adjectival-nominal guḏā ‘great, big’, from the impersonal verb guḏa, which, without annexing the predicative copulative –(a)d’a cannot be complete.

2. 8. Cases.

There are ‘primary’ Oromo words ending in vowels –ú/-ū, -ō/-ó, -í/-ī, -ē, -é, yet all these are already accusative forms. Hence to mark their nominative forms, the suffix –n is appended [60]. Again, what is worth noting is through similar evolutionary process the suffix -n has appeared/changed to ‘thematic’ role i.e., appeared part and parcel of the root. For instance, in the words kana ‘this’, san ‘that’, šan ‘five’, ilkan ‘teeth’, afan ‘mouth’, fuñan ‘nose’, keñan ‘ceiling’, kurna(n) ‘a number of ten’, all obfuscate the fact that the final -n (>-an, -na, -ni) is a marker of nominative-(accusative) case. For this reason, Tutschek [59] calls such lexemes invariable, ‘substantives whose form of nominative is equal to that of the accusative’ [60].

Table 4: Hittite-Oromo nominative and accusative cognates

Hittite		Oromo	
Nominative	Accusative	Nominative	Accusative
ANIM. SG: -aš, -š, -∅	ANIM. SG: –an	ANIM.SG: -dʒi, -(i)dí,	ANIM.SG: -ča, -dʒa, -ğa
INAN. SG: -an, -∅	ANIM. PL: -uš	-∅	ANIM.PL: -ódʒa, -ūdʒa
ANIM. PL: –eš		INAN.SG: -n(i), -∅, -i	Invariable: -(a)n, -dʒa
INAN. PL: -a		ANIM.PL: -otea, -eeṭi(n)	
		INAN. PL: -a	
Genitive		Genitive	
-aš ‘GEN SG’; -aš-an ‘GEN SG?’		-za, -za ‘GEN.SG.M’;	
-an ‘GEN PL’		-çí, -ší ‘GEN.SG.F’	
		-zān, -zāni ‘GEN.PL’	
		ça- ‘GEN.SG.INAN.’	

Watkins shows us that the Old Hittite accusative singular animate and inanimate markers are, respectively, -an and –an, -∅ and, those of the plural are, respectively, -uš and -a. We have seen that –n (or -ni) is accusative as well as nominative marker (invariable) in Oromo; and, -an is both nominative singular inanimate and accusative singular (both animate and inanimate) marker in Hittite. Likewise, the Oromo particle –ča (-oča ‘plural’, -iči ‘singular’) with all its variants is as much nominative as it is accusative; and, the Hittite accusative plural animate marker becomes -uš (in contrast to –eš of the nominative).

Similar to ergativity pattern discussed above, the Oromo animate accusative marker -za (allophones, -ğa, -dʒa, -č’a) formulates adjectives used as noun and the newly formed answers the English ‘the...-er’. Examples are:

adamdiča ‘the hunter’ (from adamó<adamú ‘hunting’, adamşu, causative-infinitive), ayandıča ‘the guardian angel’, ñãđža ‘the crocodile; teeth’ (from ñã ‘to eat, munch’) and so forth.

2.9. Possessive and Relative Constructions.

Some genitive constructions in both Oromo and Hittites have been touched above (Table 4). The general Oromo genitive construction structure is summarized by Griefenow-Mewis [31]: POSSESSED + (KAN/TAN) + POSSESSOR (+ ELONGATION OF SHORT VOWEL OF THE LAST WORD), or POSSESSED + (KAN/TAN) + POSSESSOR + -II (FOR NOUNS TERMINATING IN -N).

Both Hittite [61] and Oromo show *Possessed-Possessor* syntax and pleonastic feature (35, 36). The general genitive construction of the Oromo base-form, for instance, is: mana nama-a ‘house man-VOWEL ELONGATION,’ i.e. somebody’s house. The two parts of a genitive construction can be connected by non-compulsory relative-genitive particle kan (M) or tan (F).

(38) Possessed (N/PRN) + possessor (N) (Hittite)

N/ PROGEN N + POSS.SUFF

‘of X its Y’ = ‘the Y of X.’

(39) Possessed (N/PRN) + Possessor (N/PRN) (Oromo)

N/PRO GEN (kañ /tan) N/PRO + POSS.SUFF vowel elongation)’

i.e. ‘of X its Y’ = ‘the Y of X.’

(40) za-ñi (ka) aba-za (Oromo)

seed-NOM (GEN) father-POSS.SUFF

‘the son of father his father’ (i.e., germane son)

The Oromo possessive pronouns are derived from (or derive) the weak form of personal pronouns z^a (>ç^a) ‘2, 3 SG’ (zã >zã ‘his’, çĩ > şĩ ‘her’, zãni ‘their’) or from the deictic ka: ka-n ‘this at hand-NOM’, ça-ča ‘this at hand-ACC.’. Hence the possessive pronouns are ko ‘mine’, keña > keņa ‘our’, kezani ‘your, PL’, ke ‘your, SG’. Due to this possessive-personal pronouns overlap, the normal co-construction of ka (or the nominative kan) and personal pronoun (except 1SG) translates the redundant English forms: theirs, hers, ours ([60]).

Very interesting correspondence engendered by these common features is the Oromo za-ñi ‘3 SG-NOM’ ‘the son of; the one of’ (32) and, on the one hand, the Hittite Ša ‘the one of?’ [61]. Yet, the Hittite [61] ‘only two’ demonstrative pronouns stems: kãš ‘this’ (INAN, kī, ACC., kūn) and apãš ‘that’ (inan, apāt). These might still, respectively, correspond to the Oromo interrogative-demonstrative-relative pronoun root k^a- (> q^a-) or the

deictic *ka* (*ka-ča*, ACC.) and the deictic-indefinite-specific pronoun *wa* (*wača*, ACC), which is difficult to translate but roughly ‘thing, one, some, something’; the above mentioned absolutive, obviative pronoun *aba* (namely, *ab-iči*, ACC-subjective) must be duplex of the latter. As in the interchanging Oromo labials, “Luvian *pa* = Hittite *-ma*” [42, 2, 3, 9] and “prehistoric **w* appears as *b* before a consonant” [42, 8]. Thus, the latter conclusion seems plausible because, according to Garret [29], the Hittite *apāš* ‘that’ and *kāš* ‘this’ are ‘the ordinary common-gender nominative demonstrative pronouns.’

In above discussion, we saw that Oromo *aba* ‘lit., father, the generator’ and *ad’a* ‘lit., mother, the causal, begetor’ are used as masculine and feminine obviative or 4th person pronouns as well as genitives. Hence, the Lycian *ebeiija* ‘these’ (N.NOM-ACC. PL) [42] cannot be different from:

(41) *aba-za* (Oromo)

4 M.GEN SG-it/he

‘that/this who/which is owner of this/that ‘

(42) *ab-ōtei qabeña* (Oromo)

4M.GEN.SG-PL SUBJ wealth

those who are owners of wealth (i.e., the rich, investors)

As genitive marker, *aba* signifies the agentive-genitive semantic: ‘a father of, an owner of, a man to who X is accorded, -er’. Thus, in Gada System political structure: *Aba Dula* or *Aba Qara* ‘lit., a man of war, weapon’ (allegory for, a defense minister), *Aba Fuño* ‘lit., a man of cord’ (allegory for ‘a judge, magistrate). No surprise, in ancient Greek, the pre-positive loanword from Egyptian, namely *ὕπό*, is used with “the notion of occupation” [58,54]. So, it is likely that in the Hittite *dān pedaš* ‘GEN.SG, of second place, rank’, the element *pe* is similar to the Greek *ὕπό* and Oromo (-Egyptian) *Aba* (*Obo* or *Abo*, VOC) and the final element *-aš* is possibly similar to the Oromo accusative marker *-ča* (Table 4).

It is worth noting that, in Oromo culture the agentive-genitive *Aba* used allegorically for male lion, bulls, horses, serpents, and birds of prey, respecting their appearance and what they can do, while *Ad’a* is, similarly, used mainly for ordinary birds, for instance, *teuteu* (>*ḏḏēḡú*) ‘owl’, *ad’a k’é* ‘ibis, phoenix’ and female lion, horse and cow and so forth. It is so surprising to find the same and other lexemes and sememes in spatiotemporally far languages as Hurrian (HUR) versus Oromo (OR). According to Wilhelm [63] Hurrian, believed to be one of the ancestors to Indo-European, is an ancient Near Eastern language widely spoken in the northern parts of the “Fertile Crescent” present-day northern Iraq, northern Syria, southeast Turkey, from at least the last quarter of the third millennium BCE on until the end of the second millennium BCE.

HUR *šarri* ‘king’; *šarri* ‘(divine) king’; OR *ḡalla*, *č’alla* ‘priest, godfather’, *aṯṯ-êza* ‘raven’, *č’irri* ‘vulture’, *q’oṭo* ‘hawk’, *č’orriza* ‘parrot’

HUR ašt=ašhe ‘female attributes’, ašti ‘woman; wife’, ašt ašše ‘womanliness’; OR ad’a ‘mother’; ad’ē-d’í > Aṭeṭṭee ‘mother-F.ACC., ancient queen mother; consecration to Her as the goddess of fertility’; aššeed’í ‘to fruit, vegetate; vegetation’

2.10. Degree of Adjectives.

According to Watkins, Hittite “adjectives show agreement in gender and number with nouns” [61]. The same is true in Oromo, for instance, barie-tu ‘beautiful F’ and barie-ḍa ‘beautiful M’, from the base bori-e ‘for the sun, to be dawn-PRF.; to be gray-PRF; East, Boran-Oromo’ [17]. If I understood Watkins well, by ‘with nouns’, he might be suggesting a similar feature as in Oromo, namely it is almost impossible to distinguish the adjective form from noun, for instance d’ugá ‘true’, ‘truth’.

Therefore, to mark plural number, there are (only) two options. One is to append the particle –o (sometimes a para-fix). However, as usual the final -o does not inflect for gender [60]. Similarly, Hittite adjectives are “not inflected for degrees of comparison” [61], It is quite the same with pre-Homeric Greek neuter and plural ending –o /ω/ [4, 57] and ancient Egyptian plural particle –o /-w/ [12]. For instance, it is good to consider the Greek (text) plural adjectives with case ending –v, χείρων ‘inferior in rank, strength or skill’, versus Oromo č’ora ‘meek, weak in mind’ (antonym q’oro ‘aristocrat’).

In Hittite “comparative and superlative are expressed by syntactic means alone positive plus dative-locative or ablative, and positive plus genitive plural (dative-locative plural?) respectively” [60]. Almost the same is true to Oromo; the only singular verb that marks comparative degree is č’ála ‘to be greater’, sometimes alternating with ḡiṭa ‘exist (considerably)’, and collecting with iṭa/-ṭṭa ‘above, over’ [59, 44]. This verb relies on collocation with case systems: dative-locative (expressed in relative/deictic pronouns kana/sana ‘this/that’) or ablative (expressed in propositional irra/iṭa ‘on, upon’) and genitive (expressed in *kan*). For instance (41, 42):

(43) a. ini na-ṭṭa ḡiṭa (Oromo)

he I-above exist

he exist above me

‘he is older than me [60]

b. kana na-ti č’ála

this.deictic I-towards great

‘this is greater in my view’ [59]

(44) a. áli-n na-ṭṭa č’ála d’ēra (Oromo)

Ali-NOM I-over great tall

‘Ali is taller than me’ [44]

b. áli-n iza-ɽɽa na-fu qári-dʼa (Oromo)

Ali-NOM he-above me-ADVRS good-COP

‘Ali is far good to me (contrastive to...)

As is observed in the above the abstract concepts of ‘to exist and work’ (ǵira>dyiru), ‘to be great, priestly, friendly’ (čʼała > dʒaǵâ) and ‘to be good, fair, civilized, top’ (qára>garoma) are interchangeably used in some dialects, a reflex of common past root and rhotism (Plato discusses, in *Republic*, the indivisibility of these concepts).

In addition, in some dialects there is expression with the verb ɽara ((>ɽʼara) ‘to pass, surpass’ to designate superlative degree (43):

(45) iši-n obola-šē-ɽa (čʼal-tee) ɽar-ti (Oromo)

she-NOM brethrens-her-above (great-ADVRS.F)surpass-AUX.F.ACC

‘she is (greater) even surpasses her brethrens’

‘she is the handsomest’ (or contextually filled super quality)

It is so thought provoking that in Hittite, too, comparative and superlative are marked with the form ‘šalli’ or šalli- ‘great’ [61, 24]. Watkins provides the following illustrations: “*iškiši šalli* ‘big to the (other’s) back’ = ‘bigger than the (other’s) back’ and *šallayaš* = *kan DINGIR MEš- aš kuiš šallis* ‘who of the great gods (is the great(est))’” [61, 24]. According to Watkins this syntactic pattern is found marginally in other ancient IE languages as well, like Vedic *yé devānām yajñīyā yajñīyānam* ‘who of the worshipworthy gods is (the most) worshipworthy’, or Homeric Greek *δῖα γυναικῶν* ‘(the most) divine of women.’ Similar ways of expressing superlative degree involve:

(46) waakʼa kan waakʼ-oti hunda čʼal-u (Oromo)

god REL god-PL.DET all great-INF

‘that God, who is the greatest of all Gods’

(47) adʼa adʼa-ra na-f čʼaal-tu (Oromo)

mother mother-ABL me-REL great-F.DET.

‘the greatest, most beloved mothers of all’ (or mother above all mothers).

Note that the Oromo word for ‘queen mother’ is qeña, the same with the above genitive marker kan (or keña ‘GEN1PL’).

Finally, it is good to mention here that the Oromo č’āla (>ğaała) ‘godfather’, džiṛra (>ğarṛa) ‘circumcision’ comes from the same above degree-verb č’āla ‘to be great(er)’. It is not by chance that the ancient Egyptian š3 means ‘to ordain predestine’ and š3w means ‘weight, worth, value’.

2.11. Lexemes.

Lexeme analysis is one of the key Comparative Method techniques. Below are Hittite (HT) lexicons obtained from Watkins [61]. The corresponding Oromo (OR) are obtained from Tutschek [59]. Sometimes, Classical Greek (GK) equivalents are given.

HT *densu-, daššu- ‘massive’; OR danu ‘multitude’; daḏza ‘massive’; d’ansa ‘massive, huge’

HT ištalk- ‘make smooth, flatten’; GK σκληγγίς ‘scraper’; OR č’alalaqa ‘to precipitate, clear off, settle (for fluid)’; č’alal(q)tu ‘scraper’

HT tukkāri ‘is prescribed, important’; OR (ta) gari ‘(that which is)

important, good, fair’

HT šarr- ‘break’; OR č’irr- ‘root out, tear; pluck out’

HT ḥar- ‘eagle’; OR q’oro, k’uro ‘hawk’

HT šiluḥa ‘kind of cake’; OR č’ariḡi ‘immature, gravy cake’; č’urk’a

‘unripe, green’; č’ora ‘meek’

The correspondence between the Hittite ḥuwai/iya- ‘run’ and the Oromo kaa (>kawa, kaya) ‘to rise, get up; to begin X-ing’ [31,60], is not only semantic but also lexico-grammatical. The Hittite *densu-, daššu- ‘massive’ and Oromo danu ‘multitude’, d’ansa ‘massive, huge’, daḏza ‘massive’, from d’a- ‘to be two, double; to beget, branch’, are possibly cognates, because the “original inherited sequence VnsV [V=vowel] became in Hittite VššV, as in *densu- > daššu-” [61]. Watkins adds that this “treatment was generalized across morpheme boundary in accusative singular + enclitic possessive” [61].

The Hittite akkiš ‘died’ seems an nominative/accusative form of the root ak(k)-, for the suffix –(i)š is the recurrent suffix. In Oromo, like many other onomatopoeical verbs, the verb k’ā ‘to be dead’ cannot stand without the postpositive (serial) verb dḗā (REFL, ḡad’a) ‘say; perform’. So, k’ā ḡad’e, literally, ‘he said/performed k’ā’ means ‘he died suddenly’. The middle voice k’a(o)me >k’omame means ‘he was assassinated.’ The decorative terms of Hittite laḥa- ‘ivory’ [33]; hedging is original), Mycenaean Greek ἐλέφα- / e-re-pa/ ‘ivory’ [57] and Oromo ilḫa ‘ivory’ (or ilḫa-arbaa, lit., ‘tooth of elephant’), aṛṛabé ‘turtle’ (lit., tongued)

are also eye-catching correspondence for evolutionary and historical linguists. The Oromo *arfii*, *ħarfii* ‘apex, tip’ and *arba* > *abra* ‘elephant’, *arabé* ‘turtle’ are quite related; they are descriptive of protruding appendage. In a document named *Periplus of Erythraen Sea* [56] translated by Wilfred Schoff, claimed to have been written in the 1st century AD by an unknown author, ‘elephant’ is said to have been written as *ibha*, and according to the translator, from this came the Biblical Hebrew *shen habbhin* ‘elephant teeth’, while Ancient Egyptian *ibha* became *abu*, and Etruscan *ebur* [56]. Note that in Oromo, *ħumbi* (or *ħumbi arbaa*) means ‘trunk of an elephant’.

Above (Section 2.1), we discussed that Oromo trills *r*, *l*, and *n* alternate among themselves and with *d*^ʳ. This, so-called rhotacism, is also common in Anatolian, as confirmed especially in Luvian [42]. Therefore, with these alternation and the normal interchange among the labials *f*, *b*, we find little or no difference among the Hittite *nepi-š* ‘heaven’, Luvian **rēb^(h)es* ‘heaven’, Oromo *rufo*, *d^ʳābá-ča* or *ħabé-ča*. For the same reason, no doubt, the Oromo *ħoka* ‘rain, rainwater, heavenly water’, *Waak’a* (> *Wooq’a*) ‘sky, heaven, God’, *wák’eza* ‘to worship God’ cognate with Hittite *wek-zi* “request or same meaning” [42]. Still primordial words in Oromo are: *ba* ‘to be, or possess, life; mouth, language’; *aba*, ‘human subject’; *abalu* ‘someone’; *bia* ‘people’; *naṣsé*, *ħufu* ‘life, soul-alive’. Crabtree [20] agrees that the Oromo *ba* ‘life, man’ is a primordial human ‘language’. So is *obā* (also *obora*) ‘orb; the primordial water’, whose feminine-accusative form *obāṭi* means ‘afterbirth; amniotic fluid’.

Since the Hittite form *dagān* ‘earth’ is nominative-accusative form [61], the terminal *-n* at work is precisely the same to the Oromo *-n* ‘invariable, nominative case marker’ as in *d^ʳāka-n* (also *d^ʳāga-n*) ‘stone’. Also, *d^ʳoq^ʳe* means ‘mud.’ For an outline and discussion of contemporary Oromo nominative (subjective) and accusative (objective) patterns see Gamtaa [27]. The Oromo *k* interchanges with *ħ*, as in Eastern Dialect [44]. Therefore, *akaka* (*axaxa*) ‘grandfather’ and *ako* (>*axo*) ‘grandmother’ (*akaka-yo*, *aki-yo* are accusative-hypocoristic-vocative) completely cognate with Hittite *ħuḫḫaš* ‘grandfather.’ For the reason discussed above under ergativity, the final *-yo* (*axaxa-yo*, *axi-yo*), whose accusative masculine form is *-dzo* (< *-yo* + *-ča*), is possibly similar to the Hittite final *-š* (in *ħuḫḫaš*). As was discussed above, the root **ka* (> *axa*) is a multiplex whose meaning/function involve ‘to be consanguineous, to imitate; pronoun (relative, interrogative); genitive; duality (plural, etc)’.

2.12. PIE Laryngeal Theory in the Eyes of Hittite and Oromo.

Above under Section 2.4, we observed parallels among the latter, on the one hand, and the PIE aspirate stops (**d^h*, **p^h*, **t^h*, **k^h*) and Semitic “labio-velars” such as **k^w*, on the other. According to PIE scholars, the PIE laryngeals, whose precise phonetic value is unclear, but represented as **ħ₁*, **ħ₂* and **ħ₃* (or alternatively *ə₁*, *ə₂*, and *ə₃*) are said to have disappeared except in Anatolian that includes Hittite [48]. According to Raul, it is likely that *ħ₁* = [h] or [ʔ], *ħ₂* = [ħ] and *ħ₃* = [ʕ]. To Bernal [12], they are divided into velar fricatives /ħ/ and /ǵ/, pharyngeals /ħ/ and /ʕ/ and “laryngeal /h/. Bernal argues “all of these existed in Ancient Semitic and except for /ǵ/ in Egyptian” [12]. On his part, Raul [48] argues, the loss of these consonants in IE are mostly recognized by the “coloration” effects they had on neighboring vowels and consonants, or the loss of **ħ₂* and **ħ₃* has changed a neighbouring **e* to **A* or **o* [18]. This effect is also known as “backing and lowering or rounding”. Thus, in order to make additional comparative analysis of the so-called PIE laryngeal/aspirated sounds against Oromo ejectives/glottalics (velaro-palatal, epiglottal, uvular, guttural), the following Hittite (HT), *PIE, Greek (GK)

and Latin (LAT) lexemes are collected from Watkins [61] and other contributors to the same book edited by Bakker [11]. The corresponding Oromo (OR) are obtained from the same key resource, namely Tutschek [59].

HT *daluki*- 'neck'; PIE **dolh₁iǵo-* 'neck'; Gk *δειρή*; OR *delqi* 'musculus

sternocleidomastoideus'; *dalʔú* 'the hump upon the neck of the

buffalo'

PIE **sed-* 'have to do with 'sitting'; GK *ἔδος* 'seat' < **sed-os*; GK *ἴζω*

'I seat' < PIE **si-sd-o***h₂**; OR *ṭâ>ṭaya* 'to be, become; AUX to

be'> *táf* 'to seat'> *ṭadʔa* 'I sit REF'

HT *palḥi-* 'broad', PIE **p^hh₂-i-*; OR *baḥa* 'to be broad, extended';

baḥā 'broad, large, extended'

HT *šalli-* 'great'; PIE **solh₂-i-*; OR *čʔālá* 'to be great'; *ǵállʔee*

'hypocoristic, great man'

HT *ḥāran-* 'eagle'; PIE **h₃or-n-* < **h₃er-n-*; GK *ὄρνις*; OR *qʔoro*

'hawks, raven'; learned-man, aristocrat'; *čʔulo* 'eagle, horsekite';

čʔirri (*arba/roppʔi*) 'vulture, hippopotamus bird'; *čʔoriza* 'parrot'

In the above lexemes we find considerable syntactic, semantic as well as phonological parallelism. Firstly, in the last but one row, we find the PIE “ **-h₂eh₂e* (> **-ā*) a reduplicated form of the ending **-h₂e* which also is found in Hittite” [62]. Compare the reduplication, to show intensity and frequentativeness *dʔidʔidʔadʔa* 'to be assiduous, busy' or the causative *dʔidʔidʔadʔiz₁* 'to cause somebody to be assiduous, busy' and the Archaic Greek “form *τιθέασι, διδóασι, ιστᾶσι, ἰᾶσι*” [62]. Watkins also shows the Hittite “iterative-imperfectives” in *-šš(a)-* as in *ḥalzi-šš(a)-i* 'calls' from *ḥalzi/a-* [62]. Given the consistent correspondence between Hittite *š* and Oromo *dʔ* phonemes, the both Hittite *-šš-* and PIE **-h₂eh₂e* are most probably the same reduplication to mark intensity and/or iterativity as in Oromo *-dʔadʔa*.

On his part, Wilhelm [63] finds in the Ancient Asia Minor text/language known as Hurrian the 'the several suffix complexes *-ḥḥe* and *-ašḥ*' forming such forms such as *ašti* 'woman'; wife', *ašti=o=ḥḥe* 'female attributes' or *ašt ašše* 'womanliness'. Compare this with Oromo *adʔa* 'mother', *adʔé* 'hypocoristic honorific feminine title', *adda* 'aesthetic providence' (believed to be inherited from descents, parents)', *ādā* 'custom' and *Adʔēdʔi* (>*Aṭeṭeṭe*) 'consecration to or festival in the name of the goddess of fertility, an ancient Queen Mother'

symbol of $\chi\upsilon\eta\delta\upsilon\delta'$ 'virginity' (lit., $\chi\alpha\eta\text{-d}'\upsilon\delta'$ 'DEM-ediface/non-pierced'). Aṭeete also translates the concept 'philosophical aesthetics' [22, 17, 30].

So far, PIE laryngeal or pharyngeal versus Oromo ejective \check{c} , d' , k' , q' and, glottal/pharyngeal stops $ʔ$, ξ , ζ , ς and glottalic fricatives χ , $ħ$, ξ , $ħ$, $ħ$ clearly show correspondence. Let us see that the Hittite ḫappar 'transaction' (PIE $*\text{h}_3\text{op-}$, $*\text{h}_3\text{ep-}$) and Oromo ḫafura 'news, intelligence' (lit. 'breath, sigh') are interesting. In Oromo $\text{ḫafura kee na ergi}$ 'lit., send me thy breath' is an idiomatic expression for 'send me news about your condition.' Moreover, the Hittite ḫāran- 'eagle', PIE $*\text{h}_3\text{or-n-}$ $< * \text{h}_3\text{er-n-}$, GK ὄρνις and Oromo q'oro 'hawk, eagle'; $\check{c}'\text{ulo}$ 'kite', $\check{c}'\text{orofé}$ 'falcon', $\check{c}'\text{iṛi}$ 'vulture', $\check{c}'\text{oṛiṣa}$ 'parrot' are again interesting, for hawks and vulture are among the key Egyptian-Meroitic hieroglyphic pictograms, representing aristocrats and misters. We have discussed above that in Oromo q'oro or with full title, aba q'oro , means 'wise, aristocrat, minister, learned-man', hence, is the idiomatic expression idṣa aba q'oro 'eyes of the Father Wiseman', meaning the insightful, intellectual. It is commonly calqued 'hawk-eyed' or 'eye-of-ḫorus', 'the Wiseman'.

The Oromo waak'e-za 'to worship', a causative form of Waak'a 'God, sky, heaven', is conceivably a cognate with the Hittite wek-zi "request or same meaning" [61]. In the language known only in document, namely, Vedic, vís- means 'worship'. This is said to have come from a hypothetical Proto-Aryan $*\text{wíc-}$ 'house, royal house' [53]. The latter is, rather, an erroneous interpretation that reminds us another monk-error, namely pharaoh, defined by many as 'great house'. The Oromo bera (Bero, VOC; Boran, multitudinal) means 'the great man, the judge; the old, the retired president', and bero 'palace, hedge' are precisely the Egyptian pr with same meaning. Socio-structurally, barabara designates "the oldest age group in Gada class who are empowered to mobilize all the members of their age set" [38]. It is vital here to remind that the original, meaning of *barbaroi* does not mean "barbarians" in the sense that word would later acquired. Rather, it originally meant "foreigner" in Athena-Greek [43]. Who are those foreigners? [24, 36, 35] are a few who have adequately explained.

Finally, the form and meaning correspondence among the Hittite hant- , IE $*\text{h}_2\text{ent-}$ 'front' $>$ Latin ante , GK antí , on the one hand and the Oromo d'a-e 'head, start', ad'a 'front'; ad'a $>$ ḫad'a 'mother' on the other, should confirm Crabtree's putative evidence that Oromo is "possibly the language of the Anti or Hill-folk [60,24,35, 43] which is one of the putative evidence that triggered this study. Furthermore, the phono-semantic commonalities among the PIE $*\text{st}_2\text{tó-}$ 'standing, stood' $>$ Latin status , Gk statós and Oromo d'ap'a , d'abad'a 'stand, establishment'; d'id'a 'tread'; ēḏa $<$ ēd'a 'step' should explain that the PIE $/\text{st}/$ is a reflex of the Oromo-Cush phoneme $/d'/$.

2.13. Hittite: Indo-European or Cushitic?

In the final section of his discussion, Watkins [61] committed himself to explaining away what he calls "the false impression" held "early in this century [20th century] that the Hittite lexicon was largely of "foreign" non-Indo-European" [61]. In particular, he explains that the verb-conjugations of the Hittite language are "now seen to be archaisms" pre-dating rather the separation of it from the IE. Watkins adds that about "half of the 230-odd Indo-European roots" cited in his earlier works are represented in Hittite and this only adds to the now available

information on the IE origin of Hittite lexicon and this “firmly confirmed Indo-Europeanness of Hittite and the rest of Anatolian family” [61]. Let us analyze next some of the IE roots represented in Hittite.

One of the key Hittite roots that Watkins thinks it agrees with his argument is the Hittite word *pad-*, which cognates with English and Greek ‘foot’. In Oromo the infinitival *bād’u* means ‘prop, support, basis, what is put under a thing for supporting it’, from *bad’a* ‘to carry, bear’. Besides, related phono-semantic network involves: *fona* ‘lit., thick flesh, calf (leg); fold’; *benu* which Tutschek [59] accurately described ‘verb, defected (probably the corrupt 1st person plural present of *bâ* ‘let us go’) used as interj., well, come on’, *-ana* ‘sole; footstep’ (from *bâ* ‘to go out’), *fúd’a* ‘to set on foot, march; to lift, take’, *imāla* ‘travel’, from *mila* ‘foot’ and *bala* > *wala* ‘to swarm (branching off)’. All these should remind us that the pictorial symbol of foot, which was used by ancient Egyptian as well as Hittite in their hieroglyphic system; it is, usually, transliterated as representative of the sound /b/, which normally alternates with /p/ /f/, /m/).

Another of Watkins’ Hittite lexicon which agrees with Greek, hence IE, is *keššar-* ‘hand’. The Oromo word for ‘hand’, *ḥarka* (>ḥα), agrees with Russian, Polish and Serbo-Croatian *ruka*, *réka* and *ruka*, respectively, and possibly also with English, Swedish and German *hænd*, *hand* and *hant*, respectively. The possible Oromo word related to the Hittite *keššar-*, if at all it is accurately deciphered, is either the legal term *k’ačč’ara* ‘to handle, to decide, arbitrate, fix’ or *q’ičč’ilee* (> č’iq’ilee) ‘elbow’.

Watkins adds that, if the Hittite *kaga-* ‘tooth’ is ‘cognates with English ‘hook’, we need to recall that the Slavic and Tocharian word for tooth’ are cognate with English ‘comb’ [61]. The Oromo words for ‘tooth’ is *ilka* (*ilka-ni* ‘NOM-ACC’; *ašo* > *?ašo* ‘grinder teeth’), for ‘hook’ is *hooḳo* (no doubt, is related to *hok’a* ‘scratch’), and for ‘comb’ is *fāq’ē* (also, *fila*). The English ‘hook’ perfectly matches with these Oromo lexicons. The IE base **ġembh-* ‘to bite’, Greek *γαιομφία* ‘grinder tooth, tooth of a key’, *γαμοφαί* or *γαμοφλαί* ‘jaws of animals, beak or bill of birds’ [37] can be compared to the following Oromo lexemes: *čómḥola* ‘to gnaw off’, *č’afaḡo* ‘dumpling’; *č’afak’a* ‘to conglob’, *č’aba* ‘to crash, break in pieces’, *č’ifa-d’a* ‘to bite off’, *džimfu* ‘shaft, stock of a spear’, and *ḡifara* ‘a speckled shawl’, *k’ariffa* ‘canine’. The IE base **ġembh-* might relate to Oromo *k’uba* (also *k’up’a*) ‘finger, toe, hoof’ or *qimid’u* ‘pinchers’.

Furthermore, Watkins [61] warns that ‘sometimes the Hittite facts require revision of accepted semantic view’. He substantiates his position with examples: the ‘usual’ IE verb ‘drink’ (**pō*, **poh₃-*) means, rather, ‘take a swallow’ in Hittite *pāš-* and the usual Hittite verb *eg^w-*, *eku-* ‘drink’ residually survives in the Greek verb for ‘go without drink’ and the Latin for ‘drunk’ (*eb-rius*). Here, it is essential for comparative semantics to draw attention to the (Proto-)IE **pō*, **poh₃-* and Hittite *pāš-*, on the one hand, and on the other, the following Oromo words: *obā* (CAUS *obaza*) ‘to water’, *ḥabuq’a* (REFL, *ḥabuq’ad’a*) ‘to take a mouthful (when drinking)’, *ḥabuq’i* ‘so much as a man can take in his mouth (to drink)’, *foroč’a* ‘to wolf’ (only for dogs, etc), *borč’a* ‘to wade in the water and trouble it’ and *maččā* (>*maččawa*) ‘drunkard’. Note that in Oromo /r/ and /l/ are the commonest semi-consonantal epenthetic sounds.

Finally perfect cognates are the Hittite *eg^w-*, *eku-* ‘drink’ and Oromo *una* (> ህጎሳ) ‘to sip, sup’, *d’uq^a* ‘drink’ (*d’uḫu* ‘INF, drinking’) and *d’ud^a* ‘to devour’. The so-called Latin *eb-* is in fact from Oromo *d’ebu* (> ጎጭ) ‘to thirst; to water, soak’ (*ጎጭ* ‘thirst’, *d’ebod^a* ‘to be thirsty’).

3. Summary and Conclusion

The main aim of this paper was to explore comparative analysis of grammatical particles, lexical items and syntactic structures of Oromo (as a family of Ancient and contemporary Cushite) and Hittite would yield any clue as whether they are genetically related. It was firstly instigated by ‘putative cognates’ identified by some scholars like De Salviac [22], Crabtree [20] and Bartels [6], who, thus, suggested they might. However, “putative cognate set *are* diagnostic evidence for any family” [52] that emphasis original. Therefore, the anticipation was identifying, or not, grammatical and lexical cognates, in both form and meaning, which could confirm or refute the supposition that Oromo and Hittite were (un)related. With this intention, Hittite phonological, grammatical and lexical items were collected to comparatively analyze with corresponding Oromo in the wider historical context.

Let us iterate Watkins’ [61] conclusion. Firstly, Watkins concluded that there is widespread “existence” of Hittite lexicon in IE family even before the “second millennium BCE”. Secondly, there is adequate evidence of the passing of Hittite “clitic chain” into other IE languages. Thirdly, Watkins confirms the preservation as “*h, ḫ* of two of the three Proto-Indo-European laryngeals”. Similarly, in this paper we have seen that the comparison of Oromo, Hittite and PIE lexico-semantic features confirm that the Oromo vocabulary, by and large, cognates with both Hittite and PIE languages. In addition, not only have we observed corresponding “clitic chains” between Hittite and Oromo, but also we have observed that Hittite-Oromo languages resemblance, in both form and meaning, along the grammatical properties of nominative and accusative cases, ergativity, sentence connectives, possessive construction, lexical-semantics and degree of adjectives.

Only one of the following interpretations can explain these correspondences. One is “chance”. This needs no attempt of falsification or refutation for it speaks in and for itself. Second is borrowing. This is less unlikely, for the simple reason that the spatiotemporal distance rules it out. The third explanation is genetic i.e. common proto-language from which both descended. This is the only plausible explanation. The so-called PIE laryngeals/laryngeals and labiovelars/aspirates must be reflexes of Oromo backed-ejectives (*k’, q’, x’*) or front-ejectives (*p’, t’, d’, č’, c’*) and of the epiglottal-pharyngeal stops/voiced-affricates (*ʔ, ʕ, ḫ, h, χ*). Or, as its very nature, the so-called (P) IE laryngeal theory is just hypothetical i.e. simply non-existent.

From the finding, it is possible to believe that, as a pattern in dispersion in a certain era, ‘Hittite’ came to a state of, after being powerful, unified pattern-in-dispersion for a longer and wider timespace, it became into a state of being fallen-pieces. It corresponds with what great scholars since Classical time insist. For instance, Houston [35], the wonderful scholar on ancient history, writes “according to Stephanus of Byzantium, [Ancient Cushite] were the first established country on earth and were the first to set up the worship of the gods and to establish laws.” The wonderful words of Houston are always insatiable: “The gods and goddesses of the Greeks and Romans were but the borrowed kings and queens Cushites”. We have seen some theological, ritual, cultural,

socio-structural cognates to Oromo, not only in Anatolian but also across Asia Minorite, all of which establish further the validity of Houstonian ancient history.

Because of the consistent correspondence of Oromo ejective/glottalized phonemes and the Hittite ḫ as well as the so-called PIE laryngeal theory, we can speculate upon the very people so-called “Hittite”. It is said that the word “Hittite” comes from differently signified hypothesis: “Katta”, “Ḫatti”, or “Ḫattili”. These might be bilingual rendering or mis-transliteration of q’āḍ’a ‘(to make) concordance, alliance, correlation’ whose substantive is ḡadā-meza ‘the amniotic sac-AGT’. This is also the etymon of ‘Gada’, the socio-philosophical system [39, 6, 30]. Horapollo [34] documented that by depicting “Two Men Joining their Right Hands”, Egyptian denoted “concordance”. In Oromo ‘to join or seize one another’s hands’ directly translates ‘to cooperate’ while qoñña means, literally, ‘to make a hook, to knuckle one another with the small finger’, but its socio-semantics is ‘to concord, to ally, to automatically, *intersubjectively* read one another’s minds’.

Additional enlightening evidence is the word išḫiul, recurrent in Old Hittite documents, meaning “contract” [61: 6], which, with consistent phonological correspondence between Hittite š, ḫ and, respectively, Oromo d’, q’ (k’), and possible deformation, might relate to the Oromo plural form q’āḍ’a-lé ‘pact-s’. Bernal [12] reconstructs the hypothetical Afroasiatic root “*koz “knot, unite” from the “extremely ramified” Egyptian ḫts “cord, kot”. Still, these correspond to the accusative form of the latter Oromo, namely q’āḍ’a-tēa.

Finally, Diop appears right when he states: “Wherever we find ancient civilization, whether in Hittite or in Egypt, Babylon” or in “Indus and Ganges”, or in Athens or Rome, what is sure is “Aryans and Semites” are “totally alien” to it [23]. In Lenormant’s categorical words it was “borrowed from the people of the Cush who preceded them” [23]. It is either yet to be disproved or simply admitted that the Anatolians are Cushites who are the pioneer ‘learned-men’ (k’ara-úmato), the ‘great men’ (béroo or *pharaoh*) of the Nile.

References

- [1] Aguilar, Mario. The Eagle as Messenger, Pilgrim and Voice: Divinatory Processes among the Waso Boorana of Kenya. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 1996, 26:56-72.
- [2] Andrzejewski, Vitalis. Some Preliminary Observations on the Borana, Aubin, Penelope. Evidence for an Early Nubian Dialect in Meroitic Inscriptions. *Meroitic Newsletter*, 2003, 30: 15-39.
- [3] George, Coulter. Jewish and Christian Greek, in *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker. Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing, 2010, 267-280.
- [4] Balme, Maurice and Gilbert Lawall. *An Introduction to Ancient Greek*, Book I, II. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [5] Bard, Kathryn. (ed). *Encyclopaedia of the archaeology of Ancient Egypt*. London: Routledge, 1999

- [6] Bartels, Lambert. *Oromo religion myths and rites of the Western Oromo of Ethiopia*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1983.
- [7] Baxter, Paul and Aneesa Kassam. Performing the Soodduu Ritual. *Journal of Oromo Studies*, 2005, 12: 1-20.
- [8] Paul Baxter, et al. (ed). *Being and becoming Oromo: Historical and anthropological enquiries*, eds. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, 1996.
- [9] Baxter, Paul. Innocently Dateless: Lambert Bartels and the Making of Oromo Religion. *Journal of Oromo Studies*, 2005, 12: 21-34.
- [10] Bekerie, Ayele. *Ethiopic: An African writing system*. Asmara: Red Sea Press.
- [11] Bakker, Egbert (ed) 2010. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing, 1997.
- [12] Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization: Vol. III: The Linguistic Evidence*. London: Free Association Books, 2006 .
- [13] Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena writes back*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2001 .
- [14] Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization. Vol.II. The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence*. London: Free Association Books, 1991.
- [15] Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization: Vol.I*. London: Free Association Books, 1986.
- [16] Bunson, Margaret. (comp & ed). *Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*. Facts on File, Inc Copyright © Margaret R. Bunson, 2002.
- [17] Cerulli, Enrico 1922. *Folk-literature of the Galla of southern Abyssinia*. Harvard, Mass: Harvard African Studies, 3.
- [18] Clackson, James. *Indo-European Linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [19] Clackson, James and Geoffrey Horrocks (ed). *The Blackwell history of the Latin language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007 .
- [20] Crabtree, W. A. Letter from W. A. Crabtree. *Journal of the Royal African Society* , 1924, 23/91: 253-256.

- [21] Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*, 6th ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008.
- [22] De Salviac, Martial. . *The Oromo: An ancient people of great African Nation*, trans. Ayalew Kanno. Paris: H. Oudin © 2005 by Ayalew Kanno, 1901 .
- [23] Diop, Anta Cheikh . *Pre-colonial Africa*, trans. Harold Salemon. Westport, Connecticut: Lawrence Hill & Company, 1987 .
- [24] Diop, Anta Cheikh. *The African origin of civilization: Myth or reality*, trans. Mercer Cook. New York: Lawrence Hill & Company, 1975.
- [25] Du Bois, Burghardt. *The Negro*. New York: Holt, 1915.
- [26] Erman, Adolf. *Egyptian grammar*, trans. Henry Breasted. London: Williams and Norgate, 1894. .
- [27] Gamta, Xilahun.. Forms of Subject and Object in Afaan Oromo. *Journal of Oromo Studies*, 2001, 8: 73-98.
- [28] Gamta, Xilahun. *Oromo-English dictionary*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Printing Press, 1989.
- [29] Garrett, Andrew. The Origin of NP Split Ergativity. *Language*, 1990, 66/2: 261-296.
- [30] Gidada, Nagaso. *History of the Sayyoo Oromoo of Southwestern Wallaga, Ethiopia from 1730 to 1886*. Frankfurt am Main, 1984.
- [31] Griefenow-Mewis, Catherine. *A Grammatical sketch of written Oromo*. Köln: Köppe, 2001
- [32] Habermas, Jurgen. *The theory of communicative action: Reason and rationalization*, Volume I, trans Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984 .
- [33] Hawkins, Shane. Greek and the Languages of Asia Minor to the Classical Period in, *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker. Malden, Ma: Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing, 2010, 213-227.
- [34] Horapollo Nilous. 1840. *The hieroglyphics of the Horapollo Nilous*, trans Alexander Turner Cory. Available at [http www.forgottenbooks.com](http://www.forgottenbooks.com).
- [35] Houston, D. Dudjee. *Wonderful Ethiopians of the ancient Cushite empire. Book I*. Oklahoma City, Okla: The Universal Publishing Company, 1926.
- [36] James, George. *Stolen Legacy: The Greeks were not the authors of Greek philosophy, but the people of North Africa, commonly called the Egyptians*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954 .

- [37] Klein, Ernest. *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English Language*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1996 .
- [38] Legesse, Asmerom. *Oromo democracy: An indigenous African political system*, Lawrenceville, N J and Asmara: The Red Sea Press, 2000.
- [39] Legesse, Asmerom. *Gada: Three approaches to the study of African society*. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- [40] Loprieno, Antonio. *Ancient Egyptian: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [41] Massey, Gerald. *Ancient Egypt: The light of the world*. London, 1907.
- [42] Melchert, Craig. Luvian, Palaic, Lycian, Lydian, Carian, in *The ancient languages of Asia Minor*, ed. by. Roger Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008: 31-64.
- [43] Miller, Platter. *History in dispute: Classical antiquity and classical studies*, ed. Volmeger. 20. Detroit: St. James Press, 2005.
- [44] Owens, Jonathan. *A grammar of Harar Oromo*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1985. .
- [45] Phillipson, David. The antiquity of cultivation and herding in Ethiopia, in *The archaeology of Africa: Foods, metals and towns*, ed. by T. Shaw et al. London: Routledge, 1993: 344-357.
- [46] Phillipson, David. *African archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [47] Peust, Carsten. *Egyptian phonology: An introduction to the phonology of a dead language*. Göttingen: Peust & Gutschmidt, 1999.
- [48] Rau, Jeremy. Greek and Proto-Indo-European, in *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker. Malden, Ma: Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing, 2010 : 171-188.
- [49] Rilly, Claude. 2004. The Linguistic Position of Meroitic Arkamani. *Sudan Journal of Archaeology and Anthropology*. http://www.arkamani.org/meroitic_studies/rilly.htm
- [50] Rowan, Kirsty. Meroitic – an Afroasiatic language? *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, , 2006,14: 169-206.
- [51] Ruhlen, Merritt. 2007. Linguistic Evolution, in L.L. Cavalli-Sforza, M. Feldman (eds), *Human population genetics: Evolution and variation* , The Biomedical & Life Sciences Collection London: Henry Stewart Talks Ltd. <http://hstalks.com/bio>.

- [52] Ruhlen, Merritt. 2005. Taxonomy, Typology and Historical Linguistics, in *Language Acquisition, Change and emergence: Essays in evolutionary linguistics*, ed. by James W. Minett and William Wang. City University of Hong Kong Press: 41-368. Available at <http://www.merrittruhlen.com/files/2005.pdf>.
- [53] Schmitt, Rudiger. Old Persian, in *The ancient languages of Asia and the Americas*, in Roger Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. : 76-100.
- [54] Strong, James. *Greek dictionary of the New Testament*. Albany, Or: Books for the Ages /Ages Software, 1997.
- [55] Szemerényi, Oswald. *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996..
- [56] *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*. Translated from the Greek and annotated by Wilfred Schoff. New York: Longmans, 1912
- [57] Thompson, Rupert. Mycenaean Greek, in *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker. Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing:189-199, 2010.
- [58] Tovar, Torallas. Greek in Egypt, in *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker. Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing, 2010: 253-266.
- [59] Tutschek, Charles. *Dictionary of the Galla [Oromo] language*. Munich: Lawrence Tutschek, 1844.
- [60] Tutschek, Charles. *A grammar of the Galla [Oromo] language*. Munich: Lawrence Tutschek, 1845.
- [61] Watkins, Calvert. Hittite, in *The ancient languages of Asia Minor*, ed. by Roger Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008: 6-29.
- [62] Weiss, Michael. Morphology and Word Formation, in *A companion to the ancient Greek Language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker. Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing, 2010: 104-119.
- [63] Wilhelm, Gernot. Hurrian, Urartian, in *The ancient languages of Asia Minor*, ed. by Roger Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.: 81-104.
- [64] Winters, Clyde. The Kushite Spread of Haplogroup R1*-M173 from Africa to Eurasia. *Current Research Journal of Biological Sciences* 2/5, 2010. 294-299,
- [65] Woodard, Roger. Phoinikēia Grammata: An Alphabet for the Greek Language, in *A companion to the ancient Greek language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing, 2010: 25-46.