

item no. 37 head, all those Semitic languages having a word of type ras will be assigned form no. 1, all those having a word of type dumi will be assigned form no. 2, all those having a word of type gunar will be assigned form no. 3, etc. All those pairs of languages having form no. k for item m will be given a score of 1 in the cognate count; all those pairs having different form numbers will score 0. In the case of a pair for which the item is missing in one or both languages, the item will be omitted and the cognate percentage will be based on less than the maximally possible 98 items.

Table 2
THE ETHIOPIAN SURVEY 98-ITEM LIST

1 all	26 father	51 meat	76 snake
2 ashes	27 fire	52 moon	77 stand
3 bark (tree)	28 fish (n.)	53 mountain	78 star
4 belly	29 fly (insect)	54 mouth	79 stone
5 big	30 foot	55 name	80 sun
6 bird	31 give	56 neck	81 swim
7 bite (v.)	32 go	57 new	82 tail
8 black	33 good	58 night	83 thin
9 blood	34 grass	59 —	84 this
10 bone	35 hair (of head)	60 nose	85 three
11 breast	36 hand	61 one	86 thou
12 burn (tr. v.)	37 head	62 other	87 tongue
13 claw (animal)	38 hear	63 rain (n.)	88 tooth
14 cloud	39 heart	64 red	89 tree
15 cold (of air)	40 horn	65 road	90 two
16 come	41 I	66 root	91 warm
17 die	42 kill	67 sand	92 water
18 dog	43 know	68 say	93 we
19 drink (v.)	44 knee	69 see	94 wet
20 dry (adj.)	45 leaf	70 seed	95 what?
21 ear	46 liver	71 sit	96 white
22 eat	47 long	72 skin (human)	97 who?
23 egg	48 louse	73 sleep (v.)	98 woman
24 eye	49 man	74 small	99 ye
25 fat (n.)	50 many	75 smoke (n.)	

The word list used by the Language Survey of Ethiopia is given in Table 2. It is the result of several modifications of the Swadesh-Rea 100-item list (see Hymes 1960) dictated by experience in the Ethiopian field. Some choices were not happy ones, as it turned out; keeping no. 26 father, was a particularly bad decision.

Problems of deciding which items are to be assigned the same form numbers (i. e. which items are probable cognates) could be but are not solved in an algorithmic way.⁵ This is partly because the status of our knowledge is better for some languages and groupings than others. For example, we can make firmer decisions in the case of the Semitic languages