



Type: Book Chapter

Appendix A: Sound Correspondences of the Semitic and Egyptian Infusions in Uto-Aztecan from Semitic-Kw, Semitic-p, and Egyptian

Author(s): Brian D. Stubbs

Source: *Exploring the Explanatory Power of Semitic and Egyptian in Uto-Aztecan*

Published: Provo, UT; Grover Publications, 2015

Pages: 362

interpreted as a difference in time depth—that Sem-p separated earlier from the Near-East and Sem-kw later. However, that would not need to be the case. The fact that the Phoenician alphabet has two letters for the four sounds suggests that the merger had already taken place in Phoenician by the development of the Phoenician alphabet (1500-1200 BC), whereas Israelite Hebrew bore with using some symbols to represent two sounds each (ʕayn for ʕ and ġ, ḥeyṭ for ḥ and x, šin for š and ś) for a millennium or so, like English uses *th* for both *ð* (*this*, *Heather*) and *θ* (*think*, *Timothy*). Thus, the Phoenician merger of the four Proto-Semitic consonants to two happened a millennium before the Israelite merger of the four to two. If the Semitic-kw speakers came on a Phoenician vessel, that would explain their merger and much else.

Much remains to be worked out, but less than remained to be figured out in UA previously, as these data explain much that was not explainable before (6.1-6.7). As well, the specific Egyptian and Semitic data may eventually help identify the Old World times and places from whence the dialects came.

This corpus may provide enough promising data for varieties of other analytical studies. For example, the Semitic-p *ti'na 'mouth' (< Aramaic diqn-aa, 617) vs. Semitic-kw ca'lo 'chin' (< Hebrew zaaqn-o 'chin-his', 628), from the same Semitic cognate pair, offer a potential to illuminate much. Several other pairs of the same word, one from each, provide examples of the potential.

If these proposed ties are as viable as the statistical probabilities suggest, they provide a leap forward in explaining scores of previous unknowns, only some of which might have been attainable after many more decades of comparative UA work. Keep in mind, as if 1500 matches were not enough, that there is another way to know whether this is a valid case or not: if it be truth, then this is only the beginning of findings.

APPENDIX A: Sound Correspondences of the Semitic and Egyptian Infusions in Uto-Aztecan from Semitic-K^w, Semitic-p, and Egyptian: C- (initial), -C- (medial), C (all environments)

<u>Semitic, Egyptian</u>	<u>UA terms from Semitic-kw in UA</u>	<u>UA terms from Semitic-p in UA</u>	<u>UA terms from Egyptian</u>
b	kw	b/p	b/p
p	p	p	p
'	ø/'	w/'	w/'
ḥ	hu/w	hu	hu
x (> ḥ Phn)	hu/w	k/h	k
ʕ	w/o/'	w/o/u	w/o/u
ġ (> ʕ Phn)	w/o/'	k	-- (not in Egyptian)
ṣ/d	c	s	s
ṭ	c/s	t/c	-- (not in Egyptian)
t	t-, medially -r-/-l-	t-, -r-/-l-	t-, -r-/-l-
d	t-, medially -r-/-l-	t-, -r-/-c-	t-, -r-/-l-
k	ø-, -k-	k	k
g	ø-, -k-, but Tak ŋ	k	k
q	ø-, -k-, but Tak ŋ	k, but Tak q	k, but Tak q
h	h/ø	'/ø	'/ø
m	m	m	m
n	n	n	n
l	l	l	-- (not in Middle Egyptian)
r	t-, medially -y-	t-, -r-	t-, -r-/-y-
ḏ (> z Phn)	s/c	t	-- (not in Egyptian)
z	s/c	c	-- (not in Egyptian)
θ (> š Phn)	s	s	s
s ₁ (> š)	s	s	s
s ₂ (> ś)	s	s	s
s ₃ (> s)	s/c	s	s
y/i	y/i	y/i	y/i
w	w	w	w