



HAL
open science

Simulative morphemes as purpose clause markers in Ethiopia and beyond

Yvonne Treis

► **To cite this version:**

Yvonne Treis. Simulative morphemes as purpose clause markers in Ethiopia and beyond. Yvonne Treis; Martine Vanhove. Simulative and Equative Constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective, 117, John Benjamins, pp.91-142, 2017, Typological Studies in Language, ISBN 9789027206985. hal-01351924

HAL Id: hal-01351924

<https://hal.science/hal-01351924>

Submitted on 4 Aug 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Similative morphemes as purpose clause markers in Ethiopia and beyond

Yvonne Treis

LLACAN (CNRS, INALCO, Université Sorbonne Paris-Cité)

Abstract

In more than 30 languages spoken at the Horn of Africa, a similative morpheme ‘like’ or a noun ‘manner’ or ‘type’ is used as a marker of purpose clauses. The paper first elaborates on the many functions of the enclitic morpheme =g ‘manner’ in Kambaata (Highland East Cushitic), which is used, among others, as a marker of the standard in similative and equative comparison (‘like’, ‘as’), of temporal clauses of immediate anteriority (‘as soon as’), of complement clauses (‘that’) and, most notably, of purpose clauses (‘in order to’). The second part of the paper gives a detailed account of the distribution of the use of ‘like’, ‘manner’ or ‘type’ as a purpose clause marker in Afroasiatic and Nilo-Saharan languages of the Horn of Africa. Similative-purpose multifunctionality, which is cross-linguistically rare, concentrates especially in central areas of Ethiopia and can be assumed to be the result of language contact between certain Cushitic, Ethio-Semitic and Omotic languages.

Keywords

Similarity; purpose clauses; language contact; Ethiopian Linguistic Area; multifunctionality replication.

1. Introduction

In many Ethiopian languages, non-deictic similative morphemes (‘like’) or nouns meaning ‘manner’ or ‘kind’ not only mark the standard of comparison in similative constructions, but have also extended their functions widely and are used as markers of certain temporal clauses, complement clauses and, most strikingly, purpose clauses. Largely absent is the use of similative morphemes as quotatives, i.e. as morphemes introducing direct speech. This chapter first gives a detailed overview of the wide array of functions covered by the enclitic morpheme =g ‘manner’ in Kambaata, a Highland East Cushitic language of Ethiopia (Section 2), where it is used, among other things, as a similative morpheme and as a purpose clause marker. Then I elaborate on the distribution of the bundle of functions, as observed with =g in Kambaata, across other Ethiopian and cross-border languages (Section 3) and try to determine the limits of similative-purpose multifunctionality in the Horn of Africa. I argue that the characteristic function bundle widely associated with non-deictic similative morphemes in Ethiopian Cushitic, Omotic and Ethio-Semitic languages is an areal phenomenon and the result of multifunctionality replication in the Ethiopian Linguistic Area. Section 4 summarises the results of my survey and views them in a typological perspective.

My analysis of the Kambaata morpheme =g is based on a variety of data: (i) recorded natural speech events (narratives, conversations), (ii) imagined near-natural dialogues that native speakers dictated to me, (iii) elicitation made in the field and by email, and (iv) different written documents, among others, Kambaata schoolbooks (labeled K89), a translation of the Gospel of John, a draft translation of the Little Prince (Deginet in preparation) as well as other educational and religious materials.¹

¹ I am indebted to my long-term language assistant Deginet Wotango, and also to Martine Vanhove, with whom I had many fruitful discussions on the topic of this paper. I would like to thank Teshome Danye, Tessema Handiso and all the other Kambaata language consultants I have been working with since 2002. I am grateful to the Culture Department of the Kambaata-Xambaaro Zone for their support during my fieldtrips. Meaza Kerlos collected most written Kambaata sources. Mirja Saksa obtained the Gospel of John for me. Research for this paper was sponsored by the federation *Typologie et universaux linguistiques : données et modèles* (CNRS, FR 2559) via the project *Expression des comparaisons d'égalité et de similitude* (2014-2018).

2. The multifunctionality of =g ‘manner’ in Kambaata

2.1. Introduction

Kambaata is a Highland East Cushitic (HEC) language spoken by more than 600,000 speakers in the South of Ethiopia in an area approximately 300 km south-west of the capital Addis Ababa. The immediate neighbours are speakers of other HEC languages (Hadiyya and Alaaba) and Omotic languages of the Omotic family (Wolaitta and Dawro). The most widespread second language of Kambaata speakers is the Ethiopian lingua franca Amharic.

The Kambaata language is exclusively suffixing and, regarding its morphological type, agglutinating-inflectional with many portmanteau morphemes. It is both head- and dependent-marking with a fairly elaborate case system and subject agreement on verbs. The language is consistently head-final; hence all modifiers, including relative clauses, precede the noun in the noun phrase, and all dependent clauses precede independent main clauses. The main verb or a copula is usually the last constituent in the sentence.² Clefting is a very common focussing device.

Kambaata has four major open word classes: nouns, adjectives, verbs and ideophones, all of which can be defined on the basis of morphological and morphosyntactic criteria (Treis 2008: 81-97). Nouns are obligatorily specified for one of nine case forms, and for either masculine or feminine gender. Table 1 exemplifies the case paradigms of the masculine noun *dum-á* ‘back room (in a house)’ and the feminine noun *gat-í-ta* ‘backyard’.³ The accusative is the functionally unmarked case form. It does not only mark direct objects but also certain temporal and manner adverbial phrases, and it serves as the citation form of nouns.

² However, in cleft sentences, it is not uncommon to find the predicate with the copula in a non-final position.

³ Kambaata has 21 nominal declensions, of which 9 are feminine and 12 masculine (Treis 2008: 103).

		<i>dum-á</i> (m.) 'back room'	<i>gat-í-ta</i> (f.) 'backyard'
Accusative	ACC	<i>dum-á</i>	<i>gat-í-ta</i>
Nominative	NOM	<i>dúm-u</i>	<i>gát-i-t</i>
Genitive	GEN	<i>dum-í</i>	<i>gat-é</i>
Dative	DAT	<i>dum-íi(-ha)</i>	<i>gat-ée(-ha)</i>
Ablative	ABL	<i>dum-íichch</i>	<i>gat-éechch</i>
Instrumental/Comitative/Perlative	ICP	<i>dum-íin</i>	<i>gat-éen</i>
Locative	LOC	<i>dum-áan</i>	<i>gat-éen</i>
Oblique/Vocative	OBL	<i>dúm-a</i>	<i>gát-e</i>
Predicative (with COP2)	PRED	<i>dúm-a</i>	<i>gát-i</i>

Table 1. Case paradigm of a masculine and a feminine Kambaata noun

2.2. Morphology and morphosyntax of =g 'manner'

For the expression of comparison of similarity, Kambaata makes use of constructions in which the standard of comparison is marked by an enclitic morpheme =g, which is consistently glossed G throughout this chapter due to its wide array of different functions. The comparee can be marked for different cases, depending on its syntactic function in the clause. In (1), the comparee 'I', which is only marked by a 1s agreement morpheme on the verb, is the subject of the clause; in (2), the comparee *ha'mmichchús* 'the enset corm' is the direct object of 'boil' and thus marked by the accusative case; see Treis (forthcoming b) for details on the possible syntactic functions that a comparee can adopt in similative constructions.

- (3) *lal-í=b-a* ‘(the) place of (the) cattle, (the) cattle-place’
 cattle-mGEN=PLACE-mACC
- (4) *lal-í=g-a* ‘(the) manner of (the) cattle,
 cattle-mGEN=**G**-mACC/OBL the cattle’s way of doing things’

The case marker following the nominalisers is not fixed but dependent on the syntactic function and the semantic role of the phrase in the clause, i.e. the ACC/OBL-marking *-a* on the standard phrase in the similative constructions in (1)-(2) is due to its adverbial function. The morpheme *=g* is inherently masculine (see the gloss of the case/gender portmanteau suffix with which it combines) and inflects almost like any other full noun. Its case paradigm in Table 2 shows that no distinction is made between the accusative and the oblique case,⁵ which is a type of syncretism not attested for any other nominal declension.⁶

⁵ As seen in Table 2, the ACC and the OBL forms cannot be differentiated if the case marker is the last morpheme of the word. However, the presence of additional suffixes, e.g. the pragmatically determined morpheme *-n*, causes a distinction to surface again between the ACC and OBL forms, which was presumably made in an earlier stage of the language. The combination of *=g-a* OBL and *-n* results in *=g-a-n* (36). In contrast, in the ACC case, the *-n* is infixed into the older, uneroded ACC case marker *-aha*, which results in *-anka* (12).

⁶ In contrast, the syncretism between the oblique and the predicative case (Table 2) is also characteristic of the declension of masculine nouns ending in *-á* in the citation form – but not, for instance, of the declension of masculine nouns ending in *-í*.

	=g (m.) 'manner'		<i>dum-á</i> (m.) 'back room'	<i>min-í</i> (m.) 'house'
ACC	=g- <i>a</i>	← syncretism ←	<i>dum-á</i>	<i>min-í</i>
NOM	=g- <i>u</i>		<i>dúm-u</i>	<i>mín-u</i>
GEN	=g- <i>íi</i>		<i>dum-í</i>	<i>min-í</i>
DAT	=g- <i>íi(-ha)</i>		<i>dum-íi(-ha)</i>	<i>min-íi(-ha)</i>
ABL	=g- <i>íichch</i>		<i>dum-íichch</i>	<i>min-íichch</i>
ICP	=g- <i>íin</i>		<i>dum-íin</i>	<i>min-íin</i>
LOC	=g- <i>áan</i>		<i>dum-áan</i>	<i>min-éen</i>
OBL	=g- <i>a</i>		<i>dúm-a</i>	<i>mín-e</i>
PRED	=g- <i>a</i>		<i>dúm-a</i>	<i>mín-i</i>

Table 2. Case paradigm of =g compared to that of masculine full nouns

The equal sign in Table 2 indicates that the enclitic =g is phonologically and syntactically dependent on a host.⁷ It is stressless in certain case forms and can never be used in isolation.

The morpheme =g is attached to any type of modifier phrase for the purpose of nominalisation and generate phrases that are translatable as '[adjective] manner/way' (5)-(6), 'manner/way of [(pro)noun]' (7) or 'manner/way that [relative clause]' (8)-(9). The resulting manner phrases can assume any syntactic function and any semantic role in a clause.

In (5), the manner-nominalised adjective is an adverbial constituent, while it serves as the subject of the clause in (6).

⁷ This chapter is only concerned with the enclitic =g. Note, however, that Kambaata also has a derivational suffix -g in two de-demonstrative manner pronouns (Treis 2008: 279f, 338f) and four de-demonstrative manner adjectives (Treis 2008: 285ff). The unproductive suffix -g is surely historically related to the enclitic =g.

- (5) (...) *biir-o* *danáam-o=gg-a* *aaqq-í* *ké'* (...)

office-fOBL good-mOBL=**G**-mACC/OBL receive-3mPCO get_up.3mPCO

‘(...) he received me well (lit. in a good way) in (his) office (...).’

- (6) *Ta* *huj-íta* *hujat-ii* *kann-íichch*

DDEM1.fACC work-fACC work-mDAT IDEM1m-mABL

{*danáam-u=gg-u*} *yóo-ba'a*⁸

good-mNOM=**G**-mNOM COP1.3-NEG

‘There is no better way than this (one) to do the work (lit. There is no {good way} from this (one) to do the work).’

Apart from *danáamog(g)a* ‘in a good way, well’, *fárrag(g)a* ‘in a bad way, badly’ and *hiilag(g)a* ‘in a bad way, badly’, at least 14 other =g-marked adjectives are attested – as in (5) – in adverbial function in my corpus.⁹ In contrast, in other HEC languages manner or similitive morphemes are only used either with ‘good’ and ‘bad’, as in Alaaba (Schneider-Blum 2007: 103), K’abeena (Crass 2005: 239), Libido (Crass this volume) or with a very limited number of adjectives (including ‘good’ and ‘bad’) in Hadiyya (as seen in the examples in Tadesse 2015) and Sidaama (Kawachi 2007: 173).

The manner-nominalised genitive noun *amasé=gi* ‘of her mother’s way’ in (7) is combined with the morpheme =*tannée*, which marks phrases expressing a beneficiary (‘for the benefit of X’), a purpose (‘for the purpose of X’) or a reason (‘because of X, due to X, thanks to X’). As =*tannée* is itself a nominaliser of pronominal origin (see above), the unit to which it attaches needs to be marked for the genitive case – which explains the genitive marking on =g in (7).

⁸ Example (6) also illustrates how comparison of superiority is expressed in Kambaata. The standard of comparison is marked by the ablative case (‘better than X’ = lit. ‘good from X’).

⁹ As seen in (5)-(6), the manner nominaliser is sometimes realised with a geminate gg. A geminate gg often occurs when the stress falls on the penultimate syllable of its host.

It is very likely that =g goes back to a full-fledged noun ‘manner, way of doing something’, which is no longer in use today and whose original form is not clear. In Sidaama, a closely related HEC language, there is a noun *gara* (m.) ‘manner, way of doing something’ (Gasparini 1983: 114),¹¹ whose Kambaata cognate may have served as the nominal source for =g. The nominal origin of =g is not only reflected in its case-marking potential (Table 2) but also in the way it is marked when used as a predicate. Example (10) illustrates that the copula COP2 (in bold) is not attached to the right edge of the sentence-final predicate but inserted after the host of =g. This predicate-medial position of the copula is typical of complex predicate phrases that consist of a modifier and a head noun (see Treis 2008: 414-8 for more details on the position of the copula), which is more evidence that =g is of nominal origin. Furthermore, =g is able to host morphemes that are also found on other full nouns, e.g. the additive morpheme (glossed ADD) (30), the -’*nnu*-morpheme ‘and what about?’ and the pragmatically determined -*n*-morpheme (glossed N) (10).¹²

(10) Aass-eeño-sí=g-unku

give-3honIPV-3mO.REL=G-mNOM<N>

{awwánn kul-am-áño-**a**=gg-a}

follow.3mPCO tell-PASS-3mIPV.REL-**mCOP2**=G-mPRED

‘And the way one renders (lit. gives) him (first aid) {is (in) the way it is explained (lit. told) in the following}.’ (K89: 64)

Thus it is safe to assume that the manner-nominalising function of =g is the first step in the grammaticalisation process of a full noun ‘manner, way of doing something’, which was used

¹¹ Kazuhiro Kawachi (p.c. 2011) confirmed this entry.

¹² The discourse function of -*n* in Kambaata is still to be determined. Schneider-Blum (2007) calls the Alaaba -*n*-morpheme an “emphasis marker”. Crass (this volume), too, calls the functionally equivalent -*m* morpheme in Libido an “emphasis marker”, whereas Sim (1989) glosses the -*m* morpheme with “&” (for coordination).

independently in an earlier stage of the language but no longer synchronically. The manner-nominalising function of =g paved the way for the extended functions of the morpheme, which are discussed in sections (2.3 - 2.15).

2.3. Similarity

By definition, similitive constructions express sameness of manner (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998: 278), whereby manner needs to be understood in a broader (vaguer) sense, namely not only as the techniques, the instruments and the means that are applied and the type of movements (motor patterns) that are carried out. For example, in (1), the compared entities share the same instrument (a shard), and probably also the same technique (licking) and body posture for drinking. In (2), the compared entities share the same means of preparation, namely boiling water. Sameness of manner could also mean that the actions are carried out at the same rate or that the disposition, the attitude or other psychological, social and physical conditions are shared by the compared entities. One could, therefore, argue that the morpheme =g in its function as standard marker in constructions expressing comparison of similarity, as illustrated in (1)-(2), has already started to undergo semantic extension. While =g is a nominaliser of manner in the narrow sense of the word (techniques, instruments, means, types of movement) in the non-comparison examples in (6)-(10), the manner encoded by =g in similitive constructions is manner in the broader sense of the word. This is illustrated by example (11), in which the literal translation ‘Mountain goats eat grass and leaves in the *manner* of (domestic) goats’ no longer expresses the same meaning as the similitive construction, which is a comparison of the eating *habits* and not the eating techniques, instruments or movements.

- (11) Waalíy-u {fellee' -í=g-a} hix-itá-a
 walia_ibex-mNOM goats-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL grass-fACC-ADD
 bonx-ahá-a it-áno
 leaf-mACC-ADD eat-3mIPV

‘Mountain goats (*walia ibex*) eat grass and leaves {**like** (domestic) goats}.’ (K89: 5.40)

The standard of comparison is not necessarily an NP (11), but can also be an entire clause (12). Simulative clauses (and all other adverbial and complement clauses discussed in this chapter) are relativised clauses plus the standard marker =g.

- (12) {Mánn-u min-i-sí am-áta
 men-mNOM house-mGEN-3mPOSS mother-fACC
 sharr-anó=g-anka} handar-ití-i sharr-itáa' -indo?
 chase_away-3mIPV.REL=G-mACC<N> dove-fNOM-ADD chase_away-3fIPV-Q

‘Do doves chase away (their children) {**like** men chase away their wives (lit. their mother of the house)}?’ (K89: 8.20)

- (13) {Ánn-u-kk kées kaa'll-ee-hé=g-anka} atí-i
 father-mNOM-2sgPOSS 2sACC help-3mPVE-2sO.REL=G-mACC<N> 2sNOM-ADD
 hitt-ínta beet-ú-kk kaa'll-u has-is-áno-he
 like_this-fACC<N> son-mACC-2sPOSS help-mNOM want-CAUS1-3mIPV-2sO

‘{**Like** your father has supported you,} so you also should support your son.’

All elements of a simulative construction may be found in one noun phrase. In these attributive constructions, ‘an X which V-s like a Y’, the comparee serves as the head of the noun phrase, see

- (18) (...) danaam-íta oddiishsh-áta argicc-án
 beautiful-fACC clothes-fACC borrow.MID-3mICO
 {gag-i-sí=tann-é=g-a} odaqq-áno
 self-mGEN-3mPOSS=NMZ2-fGEN=G-mACC/OBL wear.MID-3mIPV

‘(When he went to the girl) he borrowed fine clothes (from his friends) and wore them {**as if** (they were) his own (lit. **like** his own ones)}.’

In many cases, however, the converb forms of ‘become’ and ‘do’ are used in combination with a =g-marked noun phrase (19) or a =g-marked nominalised clause (20)-(21), in order to mark hypothetical similarity explicitly. If the converb *ikk* ‘(he) becoming’ in (19) was left out, the most natural interpretation of the sentence would be that the subject approaches the girl *like* a rich person would approach her. The presence of *ikk* suggests that the subject behaves *as if* he were rich, i.e. pretending to be rich.

- (19) (...) {duuball-í=g-a íkk} hínc y-ée-se
 rich-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL become.3mPCO approach say-3mPVE-3fO

‘(When he wanted to court a girl,) he approached her, {pretending to be/as if he were rich (lit. having become **like** a rich one)}.’

(20) Ís méxxenin {ább-ata mudd-á aaz-éen
 3mNOM suddenly great-fOBL agony-fGEN inside-mLOC
 aagg-ó mann-í-g=a íkk} hitt-íta
 enter-3mPVO.REL people-mGEN=**G**-mACC/OBL become.3mPCO like_this-fACC
 y-í xa'mm-ée-'e
 say-3mPCO ask-3mPVE-1sO

‘He asked me suddenly, as if seized by agony (lit. having become **like** people who have entered great agony).’ (Deginet in preparation)

The examples from my corpus – irrespective of whether they come from oral texts, elicitation or translation – show that simulative (‘as if’) constructions have a fairly complex structure. Simulative clauses mostly end in a converb form of *ih-* ‘become’ (20) or *ass-* ‘do’ (21), which governs a preceding adverbial constituent marked by =g. The unit that =g takes as its host is not a simple relative clause (as in the case of simulative clauses in (12)-(13)) but a nominalised relative clause. In (20) the semantically fairly empty noun ‘people, someone’ is the nominal head of the relative clause, whereas in (21) it is the nominaliser =*hann* NMZ2. As formalised below, the =g-marked simulative (‘like’) clauses modify the next highest verb directly. The expression of simulation (‘as if’) requires an additional nominalisation operation before the attachment of =g and the presence of a PCO converb which governs the =g-marked nominalised clause and which itself modifies the next highest clause.

Similarity: {Relative clause=*g-a*}_{SIMIL} {superordinate clause}
 cf. (12)-(13)

(22) {Zoobb-ée=**g**-a} xalig-á ik-kumb-óochch
 lions-mGEN=**G**-mACC/OBL strong-mACC become-2fNREL-ABL
 urr-ú-’ kad-dókkooont
 front_yard-mACC-1sPOSS step-2fPREV
 ‘Unless you are strong {**like** a lion} (i.e. as strong **as** a lion}, don’t dare to step (into) my
 front yard!’ (K89: 6.124 [corr])

(23) Baad-i-nné mangist-á {birat-í
 country-mGEN-1sPOSS government-mACC iron-mGEN
 utub-í=**g**-a} qáar-s-i-i (...)
 centre_pole-mGEN=**G**-mACC/OBL become_strong-CAUS1-2sIMP-ADD
 (From a prayer:) ‘Make our country’s government {strong like an iron centre-pole} (i.e. as
 strong as an iron centre-pole) and (...).’

In (24), the standard phrase is more complex: the standard marker =g is added to a nominalised
 standard of comparison ‘that of goats’, resulting in *fellee’í=hanni=ganka* ‘like/as that of goats’.

(24) Waaliy-í máal-u {fellee’-í=hann-í=**g**-anka}
 walia-mGEN meat-mNOM goat-mGEN=NMZ2-mGEN=**G**-ACC<N>
 xee’nnáashsh-a-a
 tasty-mPRED-mCOP2
 ‘The meat of mountain goats (*walia ibex*) is tasty {**like** that of (domestic) goats} (i.e. as tasty
as that of (domestic) goats).’ (K89: 5.41)

Example (25) exemplifies an attributive equative construction. The comparee ('knife') is the head of the NP; it is modified by the adjectival parameter ('sharp'), which itself takes the standard phrase ('like yours') as an adverbial modifier.

- (25) {kii=hann-í=g-anka} iiphph-á billaww-á
 2sGEN=NMZ2-mGEN=G-mACC<N> sharp-mACC knife-mACC
 'a knife sharp {like yours} (i.e. as sharp as yours)'

While similitive constructions express equal manner (in a broad sense), equative constructions express equal extent or degree with respect to a parameter that is made explicit. In Kambaata, the parameter is either expressed by a simple or derived adjective, e.g. *xalig-á(-ta)* 'strong' (22), an inchoative-stative property verb, e.g. *qaar-* 'be(come) strong' (23), or a quantifier or a numeral, e.g. *hoolam-á/-íta* 'many', *lam-ú/-íta* 'two' (Treis forthcoming a). As shown in Section 2.3, the =g-marked standard phrases in similitive constructions can often still be translated literally and felicitously as 'in the manner of [X]'. However, a literal translation of =g in equative constructions (*'strong in the manner of lion') no longer makes sense, as comparison of equality is a type of quantitative comparison (Fuchs 2014). Clearly, we are dealing here with an extended function of the manner nominaliser =g.

No examples of =g-marked equative clauses have been attested so far.¹⁵ Treis (forthcoming b) provides information on an alternative equative construction with the standard marker *qax-á* 'quantity, extent', which can also mark equative clauses.

¹⁵ In the Highland East Cushitic language Libido (Crass this volume), similitive morphemes mark the standard of equative comparison only if it is a noun phrase but not if it is a clause.

2.6. Accord

Accord phrases and clauses are illocutionary adverbials (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998: 320). They do not modify the main clause but the utterance, and they can thus be considered metalinguistic comments on the content of the main clause. Accord clauses typically aim to affirm the truth and thus the reliability of the content of the clause they modify. They may, for instance, “identify the source of the speaker’s information, or express agreement with somebody else’s opinion” (Kortmann 1997: 88). So in accord clauses one finds verbs of speaking and perception or cognition.

In Kambaata, accord phrases and clauses can take an ACC/OBL-marked =g-morpheme, as in simulative phrases and clauses (Section 2.3), see (26)-(27).

- (26) {Baad-i-sí wog-í=**g**-a} (...) koh-éenno-ssa
 country-mGEN-DEF custom-mGEN=**G**-mACC/OBL offer_food-3honIPV-3pO

‘{**According to** the traditions of the country,} (...) one offers food to them.’

- (27) {Kull-oon-ké=**g**-anka} ros-eemá xáw-u
 tell-1sPVO-2sO.REL=**G**-mACC<N> adopt-3honPVE.REL thing-mNOM
 hambó y-eemá=dá-a da'll-í hab-am-áno-ba'a
 forget.1pJUS say-3honPVE.REL=COND-ADD do_fast-3mPCO forget-PASS-3mIPV-NEG

‘{**As** I have told you,} a habit that one has adopted cannot be forgotten easily even if one decides to forget it (lit. even if one says “let’s forget”).’ (K89: 4.19)

However, ICP-marking is more common than ACC/OBL-marking; see the accord phrase in (28) and the accord clause in (29). No functional difference can so far be attributed to the use of the ACC/OBL versus the ICP case form on accord phrases and clauses: *wogí=ga* ACC/OBL in (26) could be replaced by *wogí=gín* ICP, as a native speaker confirmed.

(28) Isso'oot lám-unku Yesuus-í resh-á oróos-s {Ayihud-í
 3pNOM two-mNOM<N>Jesus-mGEN corpse-mACC take_out-3fPCO Jews-mGEN
 roshsh-á=**g**-iin} anjan-áan barg-ít fuutt-í oddishsh-áan kafan-too'u
 habit-fGEN=**G**-mICP spices-fICP add-3fPCO cotton-mGEN clothes-fICP wrap[?]-3fPVO
 (Literal translation:) 'The two of them took out the body of Jesus, wrapped him, {**according**
to the traditions of the Jews,} in cotton clothes with spices.' (John 19, 40)

(29) {Malées-u Latám-i-n oot-áan beekk-é y-í
 wise-mNOM L-mNOM-N enclosure-fLOC divide-2pIMP say-3mPCO
 sajj-ó=**g**-iin} beeh-éemma
 advise-3mPVO.REL=**G**-mICP divide-3honPVE
 ' {**As** the wise Latamo had advised (him), saying "Divide (the herd) into (two) enclosures!"},
 he (honorific) divided (them).' (K89: 2.43)

While accord phrases and clauses can be marked for two different cases (ACC/OBL, ICP) without any apparent difference in meaning, the standard of comparison in similitive, simulative and equative constructions (Sections 2.3 - 2.5) is never marked for the ICP case – in these constructions only the ACC/OBL form is permitted.

2.7. Correlation

Another function associated with =g is the expression of correlation and dependency. Here, as in Section 2.6, =g is often most appropriately translated as 'according to'. In the accord phrases of the previous section, for example in (26), the translation 'according to' can be paraphrased as 'as stated by, as stated in, as laid down in, conforming to', i.e. =g expresses accordance with information presented earlier or agreement with rules, traditions etc. In the examples in this section, however, =g expresses a correlation or dependency, so the translation 'according to' can be paraphrased as

(34) Wod-ó Room-í gaaz-áan-n-u {huj-e-ssá
 old_days-mGEN Rome-mGEN wage_war-AAN-PL3-mNOM work-fGEN-3PL
 waag-í=**g**-a} daqq-ittaa'íi
 price-mGEN=**G**-mACC/OBL find.MID-3fIPV.REL.NMZ.VV.mNOM
 maxin-ítaa-t ikke
 salt-fACC.VV-COP3 INACT

'It was salt that the Roman soldiers of old days received {as a salary} (lit. work price).' (K89: 7.72)

Note, however, that only a handful of functive examples occur in my corpus and they are all found in texts that are likely to be translations from Amharic or English. Furthermore, apart from the example given above, all role phrases are found in clauses headed by the verb *kaa'll-* 'help, serve as' or *ta'mm-* 'help, serve as' (35).

(35) (...) kaashsh-aakk-á tumús-u {habaras-í=**g**-a}
 plant-PL2-fGEN rotten_thing-mNOM fertiliser-mGEN=**G**-mACC/OBL
 kaa'll-íi dand-áno
 help-mDAT be_able-3mIPV

'(If no cow dung is available,) rotten plants can serve {as fertiliser}.' (K89: 8.7)

It remains to be investigated whether data from oral texts confirms the functive function of =*g*.

2.10. Immediate anteriority

The =*g*-morpheme is also used to mark temporal clauses expressing immediate anteriority ‘as soon as’,¹⁷ which are here referred to as IM.ANTE-clauses following Kortmann (1997). These are relativised perfect or perfective (PVO/PVE) clauses¹⁸ to which =*g* encliticises in its oblique (36) or accusative forms (37). In the vast majority of examples expressing immediate anteriority, the case marker is followed by the pragmatically determined -*n*-morpheme (whose discourse function is still to be determined).¹⁹ Note, however, that the presence of -*n* on =*g* is no sufficient criterion for determining its function as an IM.ANTE-marker. The -*n*-morpheme can also be present on =*g*-marked phrases and clauses with all other functions described in this chapter. If -*n* is present, it is possible to distinguish the oblique from the accusative form of =*g*.

¹⁷ In a few examples from the written corpus the =*g*-marked adverbial clause and the superordinate clause seem not to be in semantic relation of immediate anteriority but of simultaneity; thus ‘when’ seems a more appropriate translation of =*g* in these examples.

¹⁸ The perfect paradigm (PVO) is defective (Treis 2015) and its gaps are filled by perfective (PVE) forms. Furthermore, the perfect and perfective paradigms always overlap (i.e. display syncretism) in the 2p and 3hon forms. Whenever a PVO form is available, it is used in the temporal clauses described in this section. If a PVO is not available, the corresponding PVE form is used.

¹⁹ In the closely related language Hadiyya, the functionally equivalent -*m* morpheme is also commonly found on verbs in IM.ANTE-clauses. “Heightened immediacy” is expressed by the suffixation of the singulative to the simulative morpheme (Sim 1989: 318).

- (36) Qomaax-í móos-u yoo-ssá ann-iichchí-i
 leprosy-mGEN disease-mNOM COP1.3-3pO.REL father-mABL-ADD
 am-aachchí-i qal-an-táa ciil-l-áta
 mother-fABL-ADD bear-PASS-3fIPV.REL infant-PL1-fACC
 {qal-an-tóo=g-a-n} annann-á ass-éen (...)
 bear-PASS-3fPVO.REL=G-mOBL-N separate-mACC do-3honPCO
 ‘Infants are separated from their leprous father and mother {as soon as they are born} (...).’
 (K89: 8.54)

- (37) Taabba’ii le’-o-sí=r-u farr-á haqq-á
 if_not grow-3mPVO-DEF.REL=NMZp-mNOM bad-mACC tree-mACC
 ikk-ée=da {ay-í-i won-á kod-ánta
 be-3mPVE.REL=COND who-mNOM-ADD first time-fACC<N>
 xuujj-ó=g-anka} uull-á al-íichch ba’-ís-u
 see-3mPVO.REL=G-mACC<N> earth-fGEN top-mABL disappear-CAUS1-mNOM
 has-is-áno-s
 want-CAUS1-3mIPV-3mO
 ‘But when it is a bad plant, one must destroy it (lit. make it disappear from earth) {as soon as one sees it for the very first time}.’ (Deginet in preparation)

An assessment of the context and the most natural semantic relations between the sub- and superordinate clauses helps to determine whether a =g-marked clause is a similative, simulative, accord, correlation or IM.ANTE-clause. As clauses expressing immediate anteriority cannot be based on imperfective verbs, ambiguities between an IM.ANTE and another interpretation may –

- (39) {Godab-á-se zar-eemmáa-t he'-óo=g-a}
 belly-mACC-3fPOSS tear-3honPVE.NMZ.VV-fNOM exist-3fPVO.REL=G-mACC/OBL
 qexx-á-se zar-eemmáat yaar-tóo'u
 leather_skirt-fACC-3fPOSS tear-3honPVE.NMZ.VV-fNOM be_worse-3mPVO-3fO
 ‘{There was one (f) who had her belly torn but} the one who had her leather skirt torn cried.’
 (Free translation: One would have expected the one whose belly was torn open to cry, but
 surprisingly, it was the one who just had her skirt torn who cried.) (K89: 8.44)

A native speaker confirmed these contrastive examples as perfectly natural and rejected interpreting the =g-marked clauses as expressing any other semantic relation (e.g. similarity, immediate anteriority or purpose). However, it remains to be investigated which type of contrast is expressed by =g and how the construction in (39) relates to other formal means expressing contrastive relations in Kambaata, e.g. the conjunction *bagáan* ‘but’, the concessive conditional morpheme =*dáa* ‘although’. It would also be interesting to explore whether there are any formal constraints with =g-marked contrastive clauses.²⁰ The contrastive use of the =g-morpheme is widely attested in the closely related language Alaaba; see proverbs 36, 134, 149, 162, 205 and 398 in Schneider-Blum (2009: 9, 33, 37, 41, 51, 97).²¹

2.12. Purpose

Another important function of the morpheme =g is its use as a purpose clause marker. More precisely, =g is the default marker in negative purpose clauses and as such frequently attested in all types of sources in the database, for example a recorded text (40), the Bible (41) and a schoolbook (42). In its function as purpose clause marker =g occurs either in the accusative/oblique case (40) or the dative case (42).

²⁰ So far, =g is only attested in contrastive clauses ending in the verb *he'*- ‘exist’.

²¹ In the Alaaba examples, contrastive =g is mostly found on clauses ending with the verb *yoo-* ‘be (located), exist’.

- (40) Yamaz-oon-ta-ssá-a oddishsh-a-ssá bir-é wud-iin
 hip-mLOC-J-3pPOSS-ADD clothes-fGEN-3pPOSS front-fGEN side-mICP
 {hóog-ut iill-ít ba'-is-súmb-o-ssa=**g**-a}
 enset_juice-fNOM reach-3fPCO spoil-CAUS1-3fNREL-mOBL-3pO=**G**-mACC/OBL
 aab-ichch-ú qo'rr-itée'u
 unfrayed_leaf-SG-mACC wear.MID-3fPVE

‘And on their hips they wear an unfrayed enset leaf on top (lit. in front) of their clothes {so that the enset juice does not touch (lit. reach) and spoil them}.’

In (41) three negative purpose clauses are coordinated with the additive morpheme (ADD).

- (41) {Ill-éen-ta-ssa xuud-dúmb-o=**gg**-a-a wozan-áan-ta-ssa-n
 eye-fICP-L-3pPOSS see-3fNREL-mOBL=**G**-mACC/OBL-ADD heart-mLOC-J-3pPOSS-N
 qoors-itúmb-o=**gg**-a-a íi=b-a
 understand-3fNREL-mOBL=**G**-mACC/OBL-ADD 1sGEN=PLACE-mACC
 fanqál-ti-yan án fayyis-úmb-o=**gg**-a-a}
 turn-3fPCO-DS 1sNOM heal.CAUS1-1sNREL-mOBL=**G**-mACC/OBL-ADD
 ill-í-ssa qooq-íshsh-ee' (...)
 eye-fACC-3pPOSS become_blind-CAUS1-3mPVE

(Literal translation:) ‘He has blinded their eyes (...) {so that they don’t see with their eyes, so that they don’t understand in their heart, and so that they don’t turn to me and I heal them}.’ (John 12, 40)

- (43) {Alaphph-anó=**g**-íi (~ alaphph-íi)} oos-úta
 play-3mIPV.REL=**G**-mDAT play-mDAT children-fACC
 hegeeg-íichch ga''-ée'u
 area-mABL call-3mPVE

'He called the children of the neighbourhood {in order to play}.'

- (44) (...) {kolóo'll-u-s foroffiit-táa=**g**-íi} kooloo'll-o-sí
 pot_sp-fNOM-DEF let_out_steam-3fIPV.REL=**G**-mDAT pot_sp-fGEN-DEF
 af-óo sás-e ma'nn-éen haqq-iin qas-éen (...)
 mouth-mACC three-fOBL place-fLOC stick-mICP pierce-3honPCO

(From a recipe:) '(...) three holes are pierced into the (leaf covering the) opening of the (cooking) pot {so that the pot lets the steam escape} (...).'

As with all other =g-marked clauses discussed in this chapter, purpose clauses, too, are based on relative clauses. Kambaata affirmative relative verbs distinguish four aspect forms (imperfective, progressive, perfective and perfect), whereas these distinctions are neutralised in the negation. There is only one negative relative paradigm characterised by a morpheme *-umb* (NREL) (see Treis 2012a: 222-38 for details). Purpose clauses marked by =g are always marked for imperfective aspect if affirmative (43)-(44), or not marked for aspect if negative (40)-(42).

For information on other languages that use a similative marker as a purpose clause marker, see the contributions by Crass (Libido), Darmon (Xamtanga), Jenny (Mon), Ylikoski (North Saami) and Zaugg-Coretti (Yemsa) in this volume.

(47) ... {lácc y-ít marám-u has-is-áno-kk}
 slow say-2sPCO walk.PASS-mNOM want-CAUS1-3mIPV-2sO

‘... {you need to walk slowly}.’

(48) ... {lácc y-ít maran-toontí=da wóyy-a-a}
 slow say-2sPCO walk.PASS-2sPVO.REL=COND better-mPRED-mCOP2

‘... {it is better if you walk slowly}.’

Schmidtke-Bode has observed that purpose clauses can show structural overlaps with constructions expressing deontic necessity and proposes the following functional explanation for this overlap (or functional extension): “[T]he realm of purpose and deontic modality share the property of a hypothetical result state and someone’s will or desire for it to be obtained” (2009: 163).

A construction expressing obligation, which is almost parallel to that of Kambaata, is found in Tunni, a Cushitic language of Somalia, where “[A] relative clause introduced by *ina* [‘way, manner’] and with the copula as the main clause conveys the meaning of ‘must’ [...]” (Tosco 1997: 136). Crass (this volume) shows that in subordinate clauses with *ʔiso* (similative) are used in Libido to expressing wishes and commands. See also Sim (1989: 318) on Hadiyya and Leslau (1995: 339, 354, 368) on Amharic.

2.14. Complementation

In the preceding sections the =g-morpheme has been shown to be attached to different types of adverbial clauses. Apart from being an adverbial clause marker, =g is used to mark complement clauses that serve as arguments of a verb. Object complement clauses are marked by a =g-morpheme in the accusative case (or rather accusative/oblique, see Table 2). The =g-marked complement clause fills the direct object slot of the verb. Thus the superordinate verb which governs the complement

clause, e.g. *dag-* ‘know’ in (49), can not have another direct (accusative) object.²³ In contrast, adverbial clauses, which can be accusative/oblique-marked just as complement clauses, do not prevent the superordinate verb from having a (pro)nominal direct object; see for example the verb main verb *qo’rr-* ‘wear’ in (40) which is superordinate to the purpose clause and which also governs a direct accusative object *aabichchú* ‘unfrayed leaf’.

- (49) {Bajíg-u-s áyee-ti-la y-itaante-’é=g-a} dag-áamm
 B.-mNOM-DEF who.VV-COP3-MIT say-2sIPV-1sO.REL=G-mACC know-1sIPV
 ‘I know {that you will say to me “Who is this Bajigo?”}.’ (K89: 8.21)

The =g-morpheme marks subject complement clauses as well. In this function, it is marked for nominative case (50). As the enclitic is of masculine gender it triggers 3m agreement on the verb of which it is the subject, e.g. on *dag-am-* ‘be known’ in (50).

- (50) {Mannoom-a-nné aaz-éen maxín-it yóo=g-u}
 body-fGEN-1pPOSS inside-mLOC salt-fNOM COP1.3.REL=G-mNOM
 dag-áamm-ee-haa
 know-PASS-3mPVE.REL-mCOP2
 ‘It is known {that there is salt in our bodies}.’ (K89: 7.73)

While we have seen that some adverbial clause types are only compatible with either imperfective (see purpose clauses, Section 2.12) or perfect aspect (see IM.ANTE clauses, Section 2.10), there are no aspectual restrictions in complement clauses. The final verb in complement clauses can either be marked for imperfective (IPV), perfective (PVE), perfect (PVO) or progressive (PROG) aspect.

²³ As =g-marked complement clauses block other accusative objects, it can be assumed that the case form =g-a represents the accusative (and not the oblique) case; thus =g-a is glossed only ACC in complementation examples.

Apart from relative-based, =g-marked complement clauses (49)-(50), Kambaata also has other types of complement clauses, namely those with headless relative verbs, verbal nouns, purposive converbs and conditional verbs (see Treis 2010, 2012b). The choice of a particular complementation strategy is partly dependent on (morpho-)syntactic parameters and the semantic class of the complement-taking verb. Complement clauses marked by =g are typically dependent on utterance verbs (e.g. *xa'mm-* 'ask', *kul-* 'tell'), propositional attitude verbs (e.g. *amma'nn-* 'believe'), knowledge verbs (e.g. *dag-* 'know'), perception verbs (e.g. *maccooc-* 'hear') and manipulative verbs (e.g. *ass-* 'do, make, cause').

The complementation function of =g is likely to be an extension of the manner-nominalising function. Utterances about someone knowing, seeing, telling the *way* in which something is done have come to be re-interpreted as expressing the *fact* that something is done. Nominative =g-marked clauses, for instance, are still open to two interpretations, either as manner-nominalised clauses in subject function (8), or as subject complement clauses (50). However, context usually helps the hearer determine the function of =g in a particular example. In (50), for instance, it makes little sense to translate the bracketed constituent as 'the way that there is salt in our bodies'. In order to avoid possible ambiguities the question pronoun *hattita* 'how' can be inserted into =g-marked clauses in order to signal, for example in (51), that the way – and not the fact – that we need to eat is explained.

(53) Shaameeb-í oonn-áan diráamm-ee=**g**-u!
 Sh.-mGEN mourning_ceremony-fLOC sing-3mPVE=**G**-mNOM

(Appreciative:) ‘How (well) he sang at Shaameebo’s funeral!’/‘The (great) way in which he sang at Shaameebo’s funeral!’

(54) Ammóo ber-é dikk-úta soh-éeni-yan
 and yesterday-fACC market-fACC send-3honPCO-DS
 már-t das-soo-sí=**g**-u-’nnu!
 go-3fPCO be_late-3fPVO-DEF(?).REL=**G**-mNOM-what_about

(Disapproving:) ‘And how much time she took to go (shopping) when she was sent to the market yesterday.’/‘The (extraordinary) extent to which she was late to go (shopping) when she was sent to the market yesterday!’

At first sight the exclamations seem to be in subordinate subject complement clauses being used without a superordinate main clause (for a cross-linguistic treatment of insubordination see Evans 2007). A closer look reveals, however, that =g is not as desemanticised as in the complementation examples of Section 2.14. In exclamatives, =g still conveys the meaning of manner/way or extent/degree, or rather – in this exclamative context – extraordinarily good or bad manner/way (53) or extraordinary degree/extent (52), (54). I have attempted to represent this semantic aspect in the alternative translations. So the =g-morpheme has a function that is still fairly close to the manner-nominalising function, which is described in Section 2.2 and illustrated in (8) and (10).

Until more data is available,²⁴ the analysis of exclamations with =g remains tentative. I still need to explore in which contexts exclamative =g gets a qualitative (unusual manner) or quantitative (unusual extent) interpretation.²⁵ Furthermore, I can only speculate on why the morpheme is

²⁴ Six examples are attested in my corpus.

²⁵ On these aspects see Moline (2008) for a detailed analysis of the French exclamative *comme*.

nominative-marked in its exclamative function. Usually isolated nominal constituents occur in the accusative case, which is the citation form; only clausal subjects are nominative-marked in Kambaata. Therefore, it seems plausible that exclamatives are elliptic constructions in which the predicate, possibly ‘{Subject} is great, is extraordinary, is unbelievable’ etc., is left unexpressed.

Some other Ethiopian languages that have similar exclamatives are mentioned in Tables 4 and 5. Anbessa (2000: 191) reports about the use of the similative morpheme *gede* in the exclamation *hiitto gede* (lit. how like) to express an emphatic ‘yes’ in Sidaama. Crass (this volume) describes the use of in subordinate clauses with *ʔiso* (similative) in Libido not for exclamations but for wishes and commands. In my Kambaata data, this desiderative or directive function of isolated =g-marked clauses is not attested (see, however, Section 2.13).

2.16. Summary

Table 3 summarises the information on the wide range of functions associated with the enclitic morpheme =g, which has been shown to go back to a full noun ‘manner’. When used in its first extended function as a manner nominaliser (e.g. *ii=gu* 1sGEN=G-mNOM ‘my way of doing things’), the =g-morpheme can combine with any case form, dependent on its syntactic function in the clause and its semantic role. In its other extended functions (Sections 2.3 - 2.15), the case form with which =g combines is either fixed, or two variant, semantically equivalent forms are possible. Most constituents marked by =g are adverbial and as such are marked by adverbial cases (ACC/OBL, ICP, DAT). Complement clauses, however, are arguments of the superordinate verb and are therefore marked by either one of the two core cases, NOM or ACC. Exclamations are not syntactically integrated into the clause.

In some functions aspectual restrictions are imposed on the verbal host; for example, =g-marked purpose clauses always end in an imperfective or aspectless verb. Sometimes, it makes more

sense to attribute a function to a construction of which =g is a part rather than to =g alone; for example, =g necessarily co-occurs with the locative copula *yoo-* in the exemplification and the weak obligation construction.

Section	Function abbreviated	Function	Case on =g	Syntactic function of =g-constituent	Aspect restrictions	Additional information
2.2	'Manner' (N)	Manner nominaliser	Any case	Any function	–	–
2.3	SIM	Standard marker in simulative constructions	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	–	–
2.4	SIMU	Standard marker in simulative constructions	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	–	Double nominalisation; =g-marked constituent usually adverbial to converb form of <i>ih-</i> 'be(come)' or <i>ass-</i> 'do'
2.5	EQU	Standard marker in equative construction	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	(–) ²⁶	–
2.6	ACD	Marker of accord phrases and clauses	ACC/OBL, ICP	Adverbial	–	–
2.7	CORR	Marker of correlation phrases and clauses	ACC/OBL, ICP	Adverbial	(–)	–
2.8	EX	Exemplification	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	(n.r.)	Always in combination with locative COP1 <i>yoo-</i> , attributive to the exemplified N(P)
2.9	ROLE	Marker of role phrases	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	(n.r.)	–

²⁶ Recall from Section 2.5 that no equative examples with a =g-marked clausal standard are attested in my database.

2.10	IM.ANTE	Marker of temporal clauses (immediate anteriority)	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	PVO	–
2.11	CNTR	Marker of contrastive clauses	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	(–)	–
2.12	PURP	Marker of (negative) purpose clauses	ACC/OBL, DAT	Adverbial	IPV	–
2.13	OBLG	Marker of a weak obligation	ACC/OBL	Adverbial	IPV	Always in combination with locative COP1 <i>yoo-</i>
2.14	COMP	Marker of complement clauses	ACC/OBL if object, NOM if subject	Subject or Object	–	–
2.15	EXCL	Marker of exclamations (extraordinary manner or extent)	NOM	(in isolation)	–	–

Table 3. Overview of the extended functions of the manner nominaliser =g

Abbreviations: n.r. = not relevant since =g not attached to verbs; – none; (–) probably none but only little or no data.

While it seems plausible that the full noun ‘manner’ first grammaticalised into a manner-nominaliser, it is not clear in which order the other functions developed. Many functions could be subsumed under a kind of macro-function “similar manner or extent”, including similarity, simulation, accord, correlation, exemplification, role, equality and exclamation (extraordinary manner or extent). IM.ANTE-clauses may have developed out of the similative clauses: Doing two events in the same way came to be interpreted as doing one event at the same time as another. The grammaticalisation of morphemes expressing (similar) manner into complementisers is widely discussed in the literature on grammaticalisation (e.g. Saxena 1995; Heine & Kuteva 2002: 273f.; see also Güldemann 2008 for a review of the relevant literature). Furthermore, purpose clauses and complement clauses often show formal overlaps in the languages of the world (see Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 157-65). However, in the Kambaata case, it is unclear whether the purpose developed out of the complementation function or whether both are functional extension of the (similar) manner marking function. Finally, purpose clauses and weak obligation constructions are semantically related and formally similar in Kambaata (see the aspectual restrictions), and the latter is likely to be an extension of the former function.

Asking which functions developed earlier or later, across which intermediate functions, and in which bridging contexts is, of course, interesting for grammaticalisation theory. However, these questions may not be that relevant for the analysis of (the history of) Kambaata. The next section demonstrates that the multi-functionality associated with Kambaata =g, which is used among others as standard marker in similative constructions, can also be observed for similative morphemes in a great number of other Ethiopian languages. It makes little sense to assume that each of these languages developed the typological fairly untypical bundle of extended functions on its own. I propose instead that the multifunctionality of the similative morpheme was replicated across languages through contact. In other words, the multifunctionality of the similative morpheme in one language was mapped onto its translational equivalent in another language.

Before turning to this Ethiopian overview in Section 3, it is important to mention in which functions the =*g*-enclitic is *not* used. Most notably, it is not used in quotative function, which is often shown to be the bridge between the similitive and the complementising function in other languages. Instead, direct speech is followed (or sometimes, introduced) by a converb form of *y-* ‘say’ (29) in Kambaata. Formal overlaps between purpose and reason clauses are frequent cross-linguistically too (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 151-54). Therefore, it needs to be stated that =*g* is never used with reason clauses.

3. Similitive-purpose multifunctionality in Ethiopia

Having surveyed the functions covered by the Kambaata morpheme =*g* in the preceding section, I now take an Ethiopian-wide perspective on the multifunctionality of morphemes expressing ‘like’ (and/or ‘manner’, ‘type’). Since the use of ‘like’ or ‘manner’ as a purpose clause marker has not yet been treated in much detail in the typological literature, I especially concentrate on this extended function and treat other functional extensions in less detail.

This article is not the first to be concerned with the grammaticalisation of ‘like’ in Ethiopia. Based on data from six languages of the Ethio-Semitic/HEC micro-contact zone as well as the two lingua francas Amharic (Semitic) and Oromo (Lowland East Cushitic), Crass & Meyer (2008) have come up with similitive-complementation-purpose multifunctionality as one out of several newly proposed features of the Ethiopian Linguistic Area (ELA). In response, Rapold & Zaugg-Coretti (2009) have checked the newly proposed ELA features on data from two Omotic languages, Bench and Yemsa. They demonstrate, among other things, that Yemsa, too, uses a similitive morpheme as a marker of complement clauses governed by verbs of saying, hearing and cognition and as a marker of negative purpose clauses (see also Zaugg-Coretti this volume). In contrast, the similitive morpheme of Bench has neither a complementising function nor is it used in purpose clauses

(Rapold & Zaugg-Coretti 2009: 66ff). So the findings in Bench already show that only a subgroup of Ethiopian languages displays the kind of multifunctionality proposed by Crass & Meyer (2008) to be diagnostic of the ELA.

This section follows up on Crass & Meyer’s proposal and aims to determine the limits of the similative-purpose multifunctionality. To this end, I have consulted all available published and unpublished sources on 51 Ethiopian and cross-border languages from three branches of Afroasiatic (Semitic, Cushitic and Omotic) and from four branches of Nilo-Saharan (Berta, Gumuz, Koman, East Sudanic). If no information on any extended functions of the similative morpheme could be found in the grammatical descriptions, I have consulted glossed examples and/or text data on the respective language. Appendix 3 lists the sources which contained information or data on similative morphemes and its extended functions.

3.1. Cushitic

In Ethiopia, languages from two of the four sub-branches of Cushitic are spoken. Central Cushitic (Agaw) languages are spoken in northern Ethiopia; East Cushitic languages, which split into Highland and Lowland East Cushitic, are found in regions all over Ethiopia as well as in the neighbouring countries of Eritrea, Djibouti, Somali and Kenya.

	Language	SIM ‘like’ (‘manner’)	PURP	COMP	Other functions and meanings
Central	Xamtanga	- <i>ŋä</i>	yes ^{NEG}	yes	ACD, EQU, GLOTT, IM.ANTE, SIMU

	Kemant	<i>-ŋä</i> ²⁷	yes	yes	
	Awngi	<i>-ta ~ -sta</i>	yes	?	IM.ANTE, SIMU
Highland East	Kambaata	<i>=g ~ =gg</i>	yes	yes	ACD, CNTR, CORR, EQU, EX, EXCL, IM.ANTE, OBLG, ROLE, SIMU
	Alaaba	<i>-ga</i>	yes	yes	ACD, ADJ, CNTR, HOW, TEMP (incl. IM.ANTE),
	K'abeena	<i>-gga</i>	yes	yes	ADJ, EQU, IM.ANTE
	Sidaama	<i>=gede</i>	yes	yes	EQU, ADJ
	Hadiyya	<i>-is-a</i>	yes ²⁸	yes	ADJ, CORR, EQU, HOW, IM.ANTE
	Libido	<i>+ k'aa?la</i>	yes	yes	'manner' (N), ACD, ADJ, EQU, ROLE, SIMU
		<i>+ ?is-o</i>	yes	yes	ADJ, EQU, CMD, FUNC, GLOTT, IM.ANTE
	Gedeo	<i>-ssha</i>	yes	?	ADJ, CMD, GLOTT
		<i>-k'ic'o</i>	?	yes	ADJ, UP.TO
	Burji*	<i>+ yekk'ee</i>	yes	yes	
<i>-nna</i>		?	?		
Lowland East	Oromo*	<i>akka +</i>	yes	yes	'manner' (N), ADJ, ACD, CMD, EQU, EX, EXCL, HOW, ROLE, TEMP

²⁷ Zelealem (2003: 257) describes the Kemantney morpheme *-ŋä* as equivalent to Amharic *ənd(ä)*- but no similative examples are given in his grammar. It thus remains unclear whether the morpheme really does have a similative function. Appleyard (1975: 343) mentions a "particle" *känä* 'like', which is not discussed in Zelealem (2003).

²⁸ Examples from Sim (1989) show that almost all purpose clauses contain a similative morpheme in the dative case, *-is-ina* SIM-DAT.

Konso	<i>mina?</i> +	no	no	EQU, UP.TO
Bayso	+ <i>aani</i>	no	no	
	<i>gógo</i> +	?	yes	ACD
Somali*	<i>sí</i> +	yes	no	‘manner’ (N), EQU
Rendille [§]	(<i>sággí</i> + ²⁹)	no	yes	‘direction’ (N), ‘manner’ (N), HOW
	<i>í’d</i> +	no	no	‘manner’ (N)
Tunni [§]	(<i>ín</i> + ³⁰)	yes	yes	ADJ, ‘manner’ (N), OBLG, TEMP
Saho*	+ <i>bali-</i>	no	no	ACD, EQU, SIMU
Afar*	+ <i>inna</i>	(yes) ³¹	no	‘manner’ (N), ACD, ADJ, CORR, EXCL, EQU, IM.ANTE
Dhaasanac*	<i>hát-a</i> +	no	no	‘manner’ (N)

[§]Languages outside of Ethiopia: Rendille – Kenya; Tunni – dialect of Somali in Somalia; *Cross-border languages:

Afar – Ethiopia, Djibouti, Eritrea; Burji – Ethiopia, Kenya; Dhaasanac – Ethiopia, Kenya, Oromo – Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia; Saho – Eritrea, Ethiopia; Somali – Somalia, Kenya, Ethiopia, Djibouti.

Table 4. Similitive-purpose multifunctionality in Cushitic

Table 4 brings together information on the form of the similitive morphemes in individual Cushitic languages. Due to data limitations, I was sometimes unable to determine how the standard of comparison is marked – which explains the absence of some Cushitic languages from the list (e.g. Dahalo, languages of the Dullay group). However, if I found that a language had a noun ‘manner’

²⁹ No unequivocal similitive example could be found in Pillinger & Galboran (1999) or in Schlee (1978).

³⁰ As Tosco (1997) contains no similitive example, it is unknown whether the noun *ín* ‘way, manner; quantity’ is actually used as a standard marker in expressions of similarity.

³¹ Two examples of purpose clauses marked by *kah ... -nnah*, with the latter morpheme being a form of *inna* ‘manner’, are given in Simeone-Senelle & Hassan Kamil (2014), while Bliese (1981), Morin (1995) and Hassan Kamil (2015) do not mention the use of this morpheme in their respective chapters on purpose clauses. Morin’s dictionary contains two other potential purpose examples with *kah ... -nnah* (2012: 568). If similitive-purpose multifunctionality is confirmed in Afar, it is at most marginal.

that was multifunctional but not (yet) attested in similitive constructions, this ‘manner’-noun is included in the SIM column between round brackets.

Furthermore, Table 4 shows whether ‘like’ (or ‘manner’) is used as a marker of purpose clauses and/or complement clauses. The last column assembles details on other functions or meanings associated with ‘like’ (or ‘manner’) as they are described in the literature or attested in the examples. The information is inevitably incomplete and, of course, highly dependent on the documentary status of the individual languages. Many of the functions described for Kambaata =*g* in Section 2 are attested in other languages too. In addition, there are functions that are absent in Kambaata. Libido, Gedeo and Xamtanga, for instance, use the similitive morpheme to derive language names (GLOTT); see also Wolaitta in Table 7, Section 3.3. Appendix 2 lists the abbreviations in the last column.

In Central and Highland East Cushitic, the standard of comparison in similitive constructions is marked by postposed morphemes, either suffixes (“mark: -), enclitics (mark: =) or postpositions (mark: +). Lowland East Cushitic languages (with the exception of Afar and Saho) have similitive morphemes that precede the standard of comparison; see, for instance, Oromo *akka*. Some languages have two different similitive morphemes the functional differences of which are as yet unknown; see, however, Crass (this volume) on the functional range of the two similitive morphemes in Libido.

Even if we ignore differences in the transcription and segmentation conventions between the authors, it is apparent that the ‘like’ or ‘manner’ morphemes are not cognate across Cushitic.³² Related morphemes can be identified in closely related sub-branches; see the cognate morphemes of the Kambaata branch (Kambaata, Alaaba, K’abeena) and Sidaama, of the Hadiyya branch (Hadiyya, Libido), and of Xamtanga and Kemant. Some of the morphemes in the Lowland East

³² The transcription of the morphemes has been retained as given in the consulted sources. If the sources contain different transcriptions, I have chosen the one of the latest publication. Note, furthermore, that some authors provide only the stem of the similitive morpheme (or ‘manner’ noun) while others give the form with a case suffix.

Cushitic languages are possibly cognate too, e.g. Afar *inna*, Tunni *in* and Rendille *i'd*. Furthermore, the grammatical status of the standard marker varies. While it is analysed as a (semi-)dependent morpheme in most languages, there are some languages, e.g. Oromo *akka*, Somali *sí*, Afar *inna* and Libido *k'aaɖla*, where the standard marker has a primary use as a free noun meaning 'manner'. And even if a language cannot (or can no longer) use its similative morpheme as a full noun, its presumed nominal origin may still be reflected in its case-marking potential (e.g. in Hadiyya where the similative morpheme is used, depending on its functions, either in its accusative or dative case) or the formal marking of standard that it governs (which is often marked for the genitive case).

In 15 (or possibly 16) of the 20 Cushitic languages investigated, the similative morphemes or 'manner'-nouns are used as purpose clause marker. As in the case of Kambaata, the similative is usually one of several options for marking purpose clauses besides, for instance, the use of dative-marked verbal nouns, purposive converbs etc. All Central and Highland East Cushitic languages (seem to) use 'like' or 'manner' as purpose clause markers and as complementisers. Note, however, that information on Gedeo, Burji and Awngi is fragmentary and incomplete so needs to be handled with due care.

The picture is rather different and more heterogeneous in the Lowland East Cushitic languages. Here we find languages which use 'like' or 'manner':

- (i) for COMP and PURP: Oromo and Tunni
- (ii) for COMP only: Rendille (one of two morphemes)
- (iii) for PURP only: Somali (and Afar?)
- (iv) for neither COMP nor PURP: Konso, Saho and Dhaasanac

The situation in Bayso is unclear. Hayward (1978-79: 567) states that "[t]he range of *gógo* appears very like that of Amharic *ändä* or Oromo *akka*". However, no examples of *gógo* as a similative

morpheme or as a purpose clause marker are found in his grammatical sketch. Konso, an Oromoid language, represents an interesting case and shows how even closely related languages differ in details. Whereas Oromo uses the morpheme *akka*, among other things, as a similitive morpheme, purpose clause and complement clause marker, Konso uses the cognate *akkaá* only in purpose and complement clauses but not in similitive constructions. Instead, *mina?* marks the standard of comparison in similitive and equative constructions and it also marks a locative relation ('towards, facing').

Darmon (this volume) reports that Xamtanga uses the similitive morpheme only in negative purpose clauses. Section 2.12 of the present chapter has shown that =*g*-marked affirmative purpose clauses are fairly rare in Kambaata. However, my Cushitic survey does not confirm that there is a general tendency to restrict similitive morphemes to negative purpose clauses. If grammars included sufficient purpose examples, negative as well as affirmative purpose clauses with 'like' could probably be found.

Even though there are exceptions – most notably (Northern) Somali and Tunni, a Southern Somali dialect – the following general distribution of similitive-purpose multifunctionality can be observed: The further one moves away from the highlands of Ethiopia to the East and South, the less 'like' or 'manner' is likely to be used as a purpose clause marker. This impression is reinforced if we take into account data from the South Cushitic branch, of which no language is spoken in Ethiopia. To the best of my knowledge, South Cushitic languages do not use similitive morphemes or 'manner'-nouns as a marker of purpose clauses. In Iraqw, the multifunctional 'manner' noun *adoo* (f) is used, among other things, to introduce the standard of comparison in similitive constructions and as a complementiser with verbs of speaking and knowing (Mous 1993: 260, 296). However, it is not used as a purpose clause marker. The Burunge similitive circumfix *da-...- 'ay* (Kießling 1994: 86) is not reported to have any extended functions. As Vanhove (this volume) discusses in detail, the similitive morpheme =*(i:)t* (singular) / =*e:t* (plural) in the Sudanese language Beja, which is the

only Northern Cushitic language, has acquired some extended functions (e.g. marker of role phrases, hypothetical similarity clauses, accord clauses) but it is used neither as a complementiser nor as a purpose clause marker.

3.2. Ethio-Semitic

All Semitic languages spoken in Ethiopia belong to the Ethio-Semitic (ES) branch. It is divided into a northern group, consisting of Tigre, Tigrinya and the classical language Gə'əz (Old Ethiopic), and a southern group, which splits up into Transversal and Outer South ES. For this survey on the limits of similative-purpose multifunctionality, I have consulted grammars and text collections of 12 ES language spoken in Ethiopia, Eritrea and Sudan (Table 5).

		Language	SIM 'like' ³³	PURP	COMP	Other functions and meanings
North		Tigre [§] (Mensa dialect)	<i>kəm</i> +	no	yes	ACD, EX, IM.ANTE, TEMP, REAS
		Tigre [§] (Rigbat dialect)	<i>kam</i> +	no	yes	'how many', ³⁴ TEMP
		Tigrinya*	<i>käm</i> +	no	yes	ACD, COND, EQU
		Gə'əz†	<i>kama</i> +	yes	yes	IM.ANTE
South	Transversal	Amharic	<i>ənd(ä)-</i>	yes	yes	ACD, CMD, CORR, EQU, EX, EXCL, HOW, IM.ANTE, INSTEAD, ROLE, SIMU, TEMP; in complex verb forms: COND, DUR, RESU, TEND

³³ The transcription of vowels has been unified across the sources: ə = high central vowel, ä = low central vowel.

³⁴ According to Elias (2005: 193), *kam* ('how many') and *kəm* (similative marker) that occur in other Tigre dialects have merged into *kam* in the Rigbat dialect.

		Argobba	<i>ama-</i>	yes	yes	CMD, CORR, IM.ANTE
		Harari	<i>-kut</i>	yes	yes	‘manner’ (N), ACD, ADJ, APPROX, CORR, EQU, HOW, IM.ANTE, (N), ROLE, SIMU
		Wolane	<i>-kō</i>	yes	yes	ACD, ADJ, HOW, IM.ANTE
		Zay	<i>-hum</i>	yes	yes	CMD, IM.ANTE
	Outer	Gumer	<i>-xäma</i>	yes	yes	IM.ANTE
		Muher	<i>-häma</i>	yes	yes	
		Inor	<i>-xä</i>	yes	yes	HOW

§Languages outside of Ethiopia: Tigre – Eritrea, Sudan; *Cross-border language: Tigrinya – Ethiopia, Eritrea; †Extinct: Gə’əz (Old Ethiopic).

Table 5. Similative-purpose multifunctionality in Ethio-Semitic

The similative morphemes of North ES and Outer South ES are obviously cognate. They all contain a sequence of an initial voiceless velar or glottal obstruent (*k, x, h*), a central vowel (*a, ä, ə*) and a bilabial nasal *m*. The nasal is only missing in Inor. Gumer, Muher and Gə’əz have an additional final vowel *a*. The similative morphemes of Transversal South ES are possibly related to that of the other languages; see the velar or glottal consonants as *C*₁ and/or *m* as *C*₂. Only the Amharic morpheme *ənd(ä)-* lacks any phonological similarity with the morphemes elsewhere in ES. With regard to morphological status and position, we find free-standing, preposed morphemes in the northern branch. In the southern branch, all similative morphemes are bound and mostly suffixed; only Amharic and Argobba have similative prefixes. Unlike the descriptions of Cushitic languages, the grammars of ES languages mention hardly any nominal features of the similative morphemes.³⁵ Only the description of Harari by Beniam (2013: 276) mentions and exemplifies the use of *-kut* as a

³⁵ It is only sometimes mentioned that certain clauses marked by the similative morphemes require a relative verb form (see e.g. Tesfay 2006: 878 on Tigrinya).

manner nominal (or nominaliser), which can be case-marked and used in different syntactic functions in the clause.

The analysis of the extended functions of the similative morphemes in ES reveals two language types. On the one hand, Tigrinya, an Ethiopian-Eritrean cross-border language, and Tigre, a language spoken in Eritrea and Sudan, use the similative morpheme as a marker of complement clauses but *not* of purpose clauses. On the other hand, all South ES language use the similative morpheme also in purpose clauses (55). Interestingly, the ancient language Gə'əz, which is the closest relative of Tigrinya and Tigre and which was historically spoken in Northern Ethiopia, also displays similative-purpose multifunctionality (56).

Gumer (South ES)

(55) t'ay-x^wət {e-k'e-xäma} agäd-x^w-ən-əm.
 sheep-DEF NEG.3smS-disappear-IPV-like tie-PV-1sS-3smO-M

'I tied the sheep {so that it does not disappear}.' (Sascha Völlmin, p.c.; glosses and transcription of central vowels adapted)

Gə'əz (North ES)

(56) wa-fannaw=kəwo fəṭun=a {kama tər'ayəwo}
 and-send.PRF=1s+him quick=ACC like see.SBJV.2mp+him

'I sent him quickly, {that you may see him}.' (Weninger 1999: 29; glosses adapted)

When considering the other extended functions of the similative morpheme, it might come as a surprise that Amharic has so many of them (see last column of Table 5). To a certain extent, this elaborate multifunctionality can be attributed to the healthy documentary status of the language – it may be that we merely have insufficient knowledge about the less common additional functions of the similative morpheme in other languages. Two sections of Leslau's reference grammar of

Amharic are dedicated to the functions of *ənd(ä)*- as a preposition (1995: 611-614) and as a conjunction, i.e. in combination with verbs and nouns (1995: 690-704). The author gives numerous examples, distinguishing nine functions of prepositional *ənd(ä)*- and no less than 27 functions of the conjunction *ənd(ä)*-. He also discusses the use of *ənd(ä)*- in multi-word verb complexes, which are generally not taken into account (or which do not exist) in other languages.³⁶

The missing purposive function of ‘like’ in the northernmost ES languages Tigre and Tigrinya raises the question how widespread the purposive use of ‘like’ is elsewhere in Semitic. A brief look into the comparative literature has shown that this extended function does not seem to be very common.³⁷ In Akkadian, a multifunctional preposition/conjunction *kīma* is attested. According to Deutscher (2000: 38), the functional range of *kīma* was already very wide in the earliest attested period of Old Akkadian. It was used as a simulative morpheme (‘like’, ‘as’, ‘according to’, ‘instead of’, ‘in the manner of’), as a temporal clause marker (‘when’, ‘as soon as’) and as a causal and purpose clause marker (‘because’, ‘on account of’, ‘so that’). In the subsequent Old Babylonian period, *kīma* also acquired a complementising function. Even though this functional range is reminiscent of ES languages, it is not clear whether the Akkadian case can help us decide on whether simulative-purpose multifunctionality was inherited by ES from an earlier Semitic stage or whether it is a later development in ES – after all Akkadian is a Semitic language that was spoken much earlier than the languages analysed here and is only distantly related to them. To complicate matters, the existence of simulative-purpose multifunctionality in the classical language Gə’əz is not necessarily a proof that this type of multifunctionality was attested at an earlier stage of ES and subsequently lost in Tigre and Tigrinya. It cannot be excluded that the use of ‘like’ as a purpose clause marker in Gə’əz texts reflects the influence of non-native copyists and thus be a case of

³⁶ Leslau (1995) provides no information on the frequency of these functions in Amharic texts. Note, however, that Hartmann (1980) mentions mostly the same functions.

³⁷ A thorough study of the descriptions of individual language by a Semitist would, however, be necessary to corroborate this point.

multifunctionality replication. No original Gə'əz manuscripts that were actually written at the time when the language was still spoken have survived (Weninger: 1999: 4).

3.3. Omotic

All Omotic languages are spoken in Ethiopia.³⁸ The integrity and the sub-classification of the group are still an ongoing debate but usually Omotic is divided into a northern and a southern branch. The Omoto group of languages is a well-established genetic unit within North Omotic even though it is not clear on which level. I found information on the expression of similarity for 14 languages in grammatical descriptions, text collections and via personal communication, but the Omotic overview remains incomplete. Most notably, I have been unable to obtain information on similative constructions in publications on South Omotic (Aari, Dime, Hamar, Karo) and the Gonga languages (Kafa, Shekkacho, Shinasha, Anfillo).

	Language	SIM 'like'	PURP	COMP	Other functions and meanings
North	Northern Mao	+ <i>bane</i>	no	no	EQU
	Sezo (Mao)	(+ <i>hìnk</i> ´) ³⁹	no	yes	exophoric manner deictic, QUOT
		+ <i>há nk</i> ´	no	yes	endophoric manner deictic, EQU
	Dizi	+ <i>gant</i>	no	no	
	Sheko	+ <i>gōntfi</i>	no	no	
		+ <i>gomà</i> (Tepi variety)			
	Bench	- <i>oī</i> ´ <i>nī</i> ´- <i>ośn</i> ´	no	no	
Yemsa	- <i>nē</i> ´/-(<i>y</i>) <i>sē</i>	no	no	IM.ANTE, COND	

³⁸ Ganza is the only Omotic cross-border language; it also spoken in Sudan.

³⁹ Sezo *hìnk*´ is not used in similative constructions of the type 'N runs like X' in the examples in Girma (2014); it is only used as a similative deictic 'like this'. In contrast, *há nk*´ is also used as a non-deictic 'like'.

		+ <i>màtó</i>	yes ^{NEG}	yes	ACMP, CORR, ⁴⁰ EQU
	Baskeet	- <i>peen</i>	yes	yes	ACD, APPROX, EQU, EX, CMD, ROLE
	Maale	+ <i>gudi</i>	yes	yes	EQU
	Oyda	+ <i>gaar(a)</i>	yes	yes	EQU
	Wolaitta	- <i>daani</i> ⁴¹	yes	yes	ACD, ADJ, EQU, RESU, SIMU
		- <i>ttuwa</i> ⁴²	yes	yes	GLOTT
		+ <i>malá</i> ⁴³	yes	yes	‘appearance’, ‘kind’ (N)
	Gamo	+ <i>mála</i>	yes	yes	‘likeness’, ‘likes’, ‘similarity’, ‘kind’, ‘type’, ‘sake’, ‘reason’, purpose’ (N), ACD, EQU, RESU, SIMU
	Zayse	+ <i>malaa</i>	?	yes	
	Zargulla	+ <i>malá</i>	yes	?	‘type, kind’ (N), EQU
	Koorete	- <i>(ni-)ke</i>	yes	yes	ACD, EQU, IM.ANTE
No relevant data available on South Omotic languages					

Table 6. Similitive-purpose multifunctionality in Omotic

The similitive morphemes are very different across Omotic. Only in the Omoto languages Gamo and Wolaitta (Central Omoto) and Zayse and Zargulla (East Omoto) is a cognate morpheme *mala* found.⁴⁴ Several grammatical descriptions mention nominal features or a possible nominal origin of

⁴⁰ Zaugg-Coretti (this volume) labels one of the extended functions “accord” but in my opinion the similitive morpheme marks a semantic relation that I have labeled “correlation” in Section 2.7.

⁴¹ The transcription of this morpheme differs in the sources: *-daani* in Wakasa (2008), *-dan* in Azeb (2009) and *-dani*, shortened to *-da*, in Lamberti & Sottile (2007).

⁴² According to Wakasa (2008: 1082f), the use of the morpheme *-ttuwa* as a similitive morpheme may be geographically restricted; it was only used by an informant born near Areka.

⁴³ Lamberti & Sottile (1997) consider the same morpheme to be a suffix and transcribe it *-maala*.

⁴⁴ In the Western Omoto language Baskeet, there is a polysemous noun *malá* ‘circumstance, condition, way, manner, method; solution’ (own data), which has, however, not been grammaticalised into a similitive morpheme.

the similative morpheme without mentioning a specific source noun; see, for instance, Zaugg-Coretti (this volume) on Yemsa *mátó*, Hellenthal (2010: 276) on Sheko *gōntfi* and Wakasa (2008: 650) on Wolaitta *-daani*. Hayward & Eshetu (2014) show that Gamo *mála* is still used as a full noun ‘likes, kind’ in the synchronic state of the language. It assumes various syntactic positions in the clause and is marked for different cases, e.g. the ablative case in (57). The same is also true of Wolaitta *malá*, as the examples in Wakasa (2008) illustrate.

Gamo (Hayward & Eshetu 2014: 231)

(57) Ne malappe tana Ts’oossi aššo
 [2sPOSS kind.OBL+ABL 1sABS God.NOM save.3mJUSS]

‘May God save me from the likes of you!’ (Glosses adapted)

Similative-purpose multifunctionality is almost restricted to the closely related group of Omoto languages. The only other language that uses a similative morpheme as a purpose clause marker is Yemsa, which is believed, in most classifications of North Omotic, to be a close relative of Omoto. Moreover, Omoto languages and Yemsa are those languages of the Omotic family that are spoken in proximity to the Highland Cushitic languages, all members of which have similative-purpose multifunctionality (Section 3.1). All languages that use ‘like’ as a purpose clause marker also use it for (certain types of) complement clause.

Sezo represents an interesting case in my sample. It is the only language in which the similative morphemes alone *hìnk’* ‘like this’ and *hánk’* ‘like (that)’ are used as manner deictics.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the proximal deictic *hìnk’* is used as a quotative and as a complementiser; the distal deictic *hánk’* marks the standard of comparison in similative and equative constructions and

⁴⁵ In other languages, the similative morphemes are not inherently deictic. Manner deictics are usually formed through the combination of a demonstrative element plus the similative morpheme, e.g. *hagáa-daani* /this.ms.OBL-SIM/ ‘like this’ in Wolaitta (Wakasa 2008: 513). Such manner deictics can then be used as quotatives.

functions as a complementiser (Girma 2014: 143, 252ff, 276, 293f). However, Sezo does not use the similative morphemes in purpose clauses.

3.4. Ethiopian Nilo-Saharan

The non-Afroasiatic languages spoken in Ethiopia belong to the Berta, East Sudanic, Gumuz and Koman branches of the Nilo-Saharan phylum. From the limited data available, no formal overlaps can be observed between the standard marker in similative constructions and purposive markers in any of these languages except Berta.

		Language	SIM ‘like’ (‘like this’)	PURP	COMP	Other functions and meanings
Nilo-Saharan	East Sudanic	Anywa*	<i>kàa + clause</i>	no	no	‘place, kind’ (N)
			<i>téey + clause</i>	no	no	‘kind, type’ (N)
			<i>káma + NP</i>	no	no	
		Majang	<i>òkó</i>	no	no	
	Gumuz	North Gumuz*	<i>ʔéa</i>	no	no	
		South Gumuz*	<i>éla</i>	no	no	
	Koman	Uduk*	<i>mè’d</i>	no	no	‘hand’ (N), EQU, ROLE, TEMP
	Berta	Berta*	<i>míthil</i> (< Arabic)	no	no	ROLE
			<i>(sha- ~ tha, shámbá)</i>	yes	yes	TEMP, REAS, QUOT

*Cross-border languages: Ethiopia-Sudan

Table 7. Similative-purpose multifunctionality in Nilo-Saharan

According to Andersen (forthcoming), Berta, a language that constitutes a Nilo-Saharan subgroup of its own, has a morpheme *sha* in the following functions: as part of a temporal conjunction *shambá* (< *sha* plus pronoun *mbá*) ‘when’, as a causal conjunction *sha* ‘because’, as part of a purposive conjunction *sháa* (< *sha* plus sequential particle *á(a)*) ‘in order to’ and as a quotative morpheme *sha*. An element *sha* is also found in the interrogative pronoun *sháinee* ‘how’. In the Berta dictionary by the Benishangul-Gumuz Language Development Project, the same morpheme *sha* (pronunciation variant: *tha*) is used as a complement clause marker governed by perception, cognition and utterance verbs (2014: 22, 108, 126, respectively). The composite morpheme *shámbá* (= Andersen’s *shambá*) also serves as a complement clause marker and as a manner deictic ‘like’ (2014: 46, 112). However, the dictionary contains no examples in which *sha* or *shámbá* is used as a non-deictic (‘like’) standard marker in simulative constructions – which explains the brackets in the Berta line in Table 7.⁴⁶ Instead, the dictionary provides an Arabic loan *míthil* (2014: 90).

⁴⁶ Triulzi et al. (1976: 523) also mention a preposition *sha- ~ she* ‘because of, like’, but without providing an example.

4. Summary

The survey in Section 3 has shown that simulative-purpose multifunctionality is restricted to central areas of Ethiopia. The core of the area is made up of South Ethio-Semitic, Highland East Cushitic, Central Cushitic, Oromo (Lowland East Cushitic) as well as Yemsa and the Omoto branch of Omotic. In addition to this core Ethiopian area, we find simulative-purpose multifunctionality in the ancient Ethio-Semitic language Gə'əz, in Somali, possibly (and if confirmed, marginally) in Afar (which are both Lowland East Cushitic) and maybe also in Berta (Nilo-Saharan). Simulative-purpose multifunctionality does not seem to be inherited from earlier stages of the Semitic, Cushitic or Omotic language families (and thus from the Afroasiatic stage), because related languages outside of Ethiopia or at the fringes of the country do not share this feature. So there is good reason to assume that simulative-purpose multifunctionality is a contact-induced phenomenon in the Ethiopian Language Area. Since the simulative morphemes are often phonologically very different from language to language and since only closely related languages have similar or identical morphemes, there is no evidence that simulative morphemes have been borrowed between the languages. The widespread simulative-purpose multifunctionality must therefore be the result of multifunctionality replication where languages in close contact mapped the bundle of grammatical functions associated with a language X onto a morpheme of language Y that shared the same primary function.

The most grammaticalised morphemes are found in South Ethio-Semitic and, if one can claim this on the basis of such restricted data, in Central Cushitic. In Highland East Cushitic and Omotic, some languages still use the standard marker in simulative constructions as a full noun meaning 'manner' or 'kind', or their morphemes have retained important nominal features.

When speaking of the multifunctionality of the simulative morpheme in the languages of this survey, it needs to be kept in mind that simulative morphemes are often not *the* purpose clause marker, *the* complementiser or *the* temporal clause marker in a language. Simulative morphemes are, more often than not, only one of the formal means used to mark these clause types. Across the

languages, similative morphemes are especially common in (but not restricted to) purpose clauses in different subject and negative contexts, because affirmative purpose clauses are often based on infinite verb forms (e.g. verbal nouns), which cannot be negated or marked for person. Furthermore, similative morphemes are attached to different aspectual or modal forms so that similative, temporal, purpose and complement clauses often have a different morphological makeup although they share one important marker. Apart from Sezo (Omotic, Section 3.3) and Berta (Nilo-Saharan, Section 3.4), the similative morphemes in my survey are non-deictic in their base form. Therefore, similative morphemes have not been grammaticalised into quotatives, and the quotative stage cannot be assumed to be the bridging context in the development from similative to complementiser in the Ethiopian Language Area. While formal overlaps between purpose and complement clauses are very common in Ethiopia and beyond, little overlap is observed between purpose and reason clauses in my survey. Note that Tigre (North Ethio-Semitic) uses ‘like’ for ‘because’ but not for ‘in order to, so that’; here the use of ‘like’ as a reason clause marker might have proceeded via its function as temporal clause marker. Some languages (Gamo, Wolaitta, Amharic) use ‘like’ in result clauses. Another common functional extension of ‘like’ is its use as a marker of temporal clauses expressing immediate anteriority (‘as soon as’, ‘just as’). At least 18 Ethiopian languages use ‘like’ for ‘as soon as’, and some use it as well as or instead of other temporal relations, most commonly temporal overlap (‘when’).

One is tempted to ask in which language (group) similative-purpose multifunctionality could have originated in Ethiopia and spread to neighbouring languages. However, the answer can only be speculative. In each of the three Afroasiatic branches, Semitic, Cushitic and Omotic, we find languages where this feature is present and where it is absent. As similative-purpose multifunctionality is not very widespread in Omotic and restricted to the contact zone with Highland East Cushitic, one can probably exclude Omotic languages as the source. However, whether it developed first in Ethio-Semitic and was then transferred to Cushitic, or whether it spread from

certain Cushitic languages to Ethio-Semitic (and possibly back again via the lingua franca Amharic) is impossible to say at the present stage of knowledge. It is, however, safe to assume that not each individual language has grammaticalised a similative morpheme into a purpose clause marker on its own and without external influence.

Similative-purpose multifunctionality does not seem to be very widespread elsewhere in the world. In Heine & Kuteva's (2002) grammaticalisation lexicon, 'like' is not given as a source of purpose clause markers. In Schmidtke-Bode's (2009) comprehensive typology of purpose clauses, which also discusses possible diachronic pathways of purpose morphology, similative-purpose multifunctionality is not discussed. However, he does cite one example from Carlson's (1994) grammar of Supyire (Gur, Mali), in which 'in order to get' is literally expressed as 'as if they were to get' (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 76), as well as a Somali example (Lowland East Cushitic) quoted from Saeed (1999: 221) in which a purpose clause is headed by a noun 'way, manner' (see Section 3.1). In her work on the origin of circumstantial clause linkers, Martowicz (2011) mentions that some of her 84 sample languages have purpose clause markers which followed a grammaticalisation path that may be comparable to that of many Ethiopian languages.⁴⁷ In Japanese, a purpose clause marker is said to go back to a noun meaning 'manner, likeness, resemblance', in Cubeo (Tucanon) to a noun meaning 'similarity' and in Akan (Kwa, Niger-Congo) to a verb meaning 'be equal to, resemble, benefit, deserve'. Other languages that are known to use a similative morpheme as a purpose clause marker are the Austroasiatic language Mon (Jenny this volume), the Uralic language North Saami (Ylikoski this volume). Schulze (this volume) also mentions a certain formal overlap between similative and purpose morphemes in Caucasian Albanian. In the Lezgian languages (North East Caucasian) Lezgian and Agul, formal overlaps between accord clauses and purpose clause can be observed (Haspelmath 1993: 392-93, 400; Timur Maisak p.c.). Babaliyeva (2013: 293f) shows

⁴⁷ Note that the Omotic language Maale and the Cushitic language Konso are included in her sample.

that in Tabasaran, another Lezgian language, the similative morpheme *-si* is also sometimes used on converbs in purpose clauses. The use of a manner and degree deictic ('so') as part of multi-morphemic purpose clauses markers, as observed in European languages (see König this volume on English), is a case of multifunctionality that is not readily comparable to the Ethiopian case where purpose clause marker are non-deictic.

Although one cannot consider the affinities between similarity and purpose to be very rare in the languages of the world, the high concentration of languages using 'like' (or 'manner' or 'type') for 'in order to' in Ethiopia is certainly cross-linguistically unusual and can only be interpreted as a contact-induced phenomenon.

Appendix 1: Abbreviations of Glosses

AAM	propriative
ABL	ablative
ADD	additive
CAUS1	simple causative
CAUS2	double causative
COP1	<i>yoo</i> -copula
COP2	<i>ha-/ta</i> -copula
COP3	VV- <i>t</i> -copula
CRD	coordinative
DAT	dative
DDEM	demonstrative adjective
DEF	definite
DS	different subject
f	feminine

G	multifunctional =g-morpheme (source meaning: ‘manner’)
GEN	genitive
hon	honorific, impersonal
ICO	imperfective converb
ICP	instrumental-perlative-comitative
IDEM	demonstrative pronoun
IMP	imperative
INACT	inactual
IPV	imperfective
INTJ	interjection
JUS	jussive
L	linker
LOC	locative
m	masculine
MID	middle
MIT	mitigative
MULT	multiplicative
n	noun
N	pragmatically determined morpheme (function as yet unclear)
NEG	negation
NIPV	non-imperfective
NMZ.VV	nominalisation marked by a long vowel
NMZ1	nominalisation with = <i>bii(-ta/-ha)</i>
NMZ2	nominalisation with = <i>hann/=tann</i>

NMZp	nominalisation with = <i>r</i>
NOM	nominative
NREL	negative relative
O	object
OBL	oblique
ORD	ordinal
p	plural
PASS	passive
PCO	perfective converb
PL1	plurative with <i>-C-áta</i>
PL2	plurative with <i>-aakk-áta</i>
PL3	plurative with <i>-n-ú</i>
POSS	possessive
PRED	predicative
PROG	progressive
PV	perfective
PVE	<i>e</i> -perfective
PVO	<i>o</i> -perfective (perfect)
Q	question
RED	reduplication
REL	relative
s	singular
SG	singulative
TY	marker of tens

VV vowel lengthening

Appendix 2: Abbreviations of Functions

ADJ	adverbialiser on adjectives ('in an ADJ way', 'ADJ-ly')
ACD	marker of accord phrases and clauses (Section 2.6)
ACMP	marker of clauses expressing accompanying circumstances ⁴⁸
APRX	approximate number or location ('about')
COND	marker of (real/unreal) conditional clauses ⁴⁹
DUR	marker in complex verb form expressing duration ('keep on V-ing, always V, still V') ⁵⁰
EQU	standard marker in equative constructions (Section 2.5)
EX	marker of examples/for exemplification (Section 2.8)
EXCL	marker of exclamatives of extraordinary manner or extent (Section 2.15)
CMD	marker of commands (in subordinate purpose clauses)
COMP	marker of (usually finite) complement clauses
CORR	marker of correlation (Section 2.7)
CNTR	marker of contrastive ('but') or concessive conditional clauses ('although') (Section 2.11)
GLOTT	language name derivation
HOW	marker of manner complement clauses (e.g. 'see how/in which way', 'know how/in which way') (Section 2.14)
IM.ANTE	marker of temporal clauses of immediate anteriority (Section 2.10)

⁴⁸ See Zaugg-Coretti this volume.

⁴⁹ See Leslau (1995: 380) for Amharic (real conditional) and Tesfay (2006: 881) for Tigrinya (unreal conditional).

⁵⁰ See Leslau (1995: 299f) for Amharic.

INSTEAD	marker of ‘instead of’-phrases and clauses ⁵¹
OBLG	marker in complex verb forms expressing obligation (Section 2.13)
PURP	marker of purpose clauses
REAS	marker of reason clauses
RESU	marker of result clauses ⁵²
ROLE	marker of role phrases (functives) (§2.9)
SIMU	marker of simulative (hypothetical similarity) clauses (§2.4)
TEMP	marker of temporal (simultaneity and/or anteriority, but not necessarily IM.ANTE)
TEND	marker in complex verb forms expressing a tendency (‘have the tendency to V’) ⁵³
UP.TO	marker of a locative relation (‘up to, until, towards, facing’)

Appendix 3: Sources

Cushitic

Afar	Bliese 1981, Hassan Kamil 2015, Morin 1995, 1996, 2012, Simeone-Senelle & Hassan Kamil 2014
Alaaba	Schneider-Blum 2007, 2009
Awngi	Hetzron 1969
Bayso	Hayward 1978-79
Burji	Hudson 1989, Roba & Wedekind 2008, Wedekind 1990
Dhaasanac	Tosco 2001, Mauro Tosco p.c.
Gedeo	Hudson 1989, Wedekind 1990
Hadiyya	Perrett 2000, Sim 1989, Tadesse 2015

⁵¹ See Leslau (1995: 402, 612) for Amharic.

⁵² See Leslau (1995: 694) for Amharic.

⁵³ See Leslau (1995: 698) for Amharic.

K'abeena	Crass 2005
Kambaata	own data
Kemant	Appleyard 1975, Zelealem 2003
Konso	Mous & Ongaye 2009, Ongaye 2013, Ongaye Oda p.c.
Libido	Crass (this volume)
Oromo	Crass & Meyer 2008, Gragg 1982, Owens 1985, Stroomer 1995
Rendille	Pillinger & Galboran 1999, Schlee 1978
Saho	Banti & Vergari 2005, Morin 1995, Moreno Vergari p.c.
Sidaama	Anbessa 2000, Kawachi 2007, forthcoming
Somali	Saeed 1999
Tunni	Tosco 1997
Xamtanga	Darmon (this volume)
Ethio-Semitic	
Argobba	Wetter 2010
Amharic	Hartmann 1980, Kane 1990, Leslau 1995
Gə'əz	Weninger 1999, 2011
Gumer	Sascha Völlmin p.c.
Harari	Abdurahman & Wagner 1998, Beniam 2013
Inor	Berhanu & Hetzron 2000
Muher	Crass & Meyer 2008
Tigre (Mensa dialect)	Leslau 1945, Raz 1983
Tigre (Rigbat dialect)	Elias 2005
Tigrinya	Leslau 1941, Mason 1996, Tesfay 2006, Dirk Kievit p.c., Rainer Voigt

p.c.

Wolane Meyer 2006

Zay Meyer 2005

Omotic

Baskeet own data, Inui 2012

Bench Rapold 2006, Rapold & Zaugg-Coretti 2009

Dizi Beachy 2005

Gamo Hayward & Eshetu 2014, Hompó 1990, Taylor 1994

Koorete Lydia Höft p.c.

Maale Azeb 2001a

Northern Mao M. Ahland 2012

Oyda Bernhard Köhler p.c.

Sezo Girma 2014

Sheko Hellenthal 2010

Wolaitta Azeb 2001b, 2009b, Lamberti & Sottile 1997, Wakasa 2008

Yemsa Zaugg-Coretti this volume

Zargulla Azeb 2007, 2009a

Zayse Hayward 1990

Nilo-Saharan

Anywa Reh 1996

Berta Benishangul-Gumuz Language Development Project 2014, Triulzi 1976,
Andersen forthcoming

Gumuz	C. Ahland 2012
Majang	Joswig forthcoming
Uduk	Killian 2015

References

- Abdurahman Garad & Ewald Wagner 1998. *Harari-Studien. Texte mit Übersetzung, grammatische Skizzen und Glossar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ahland, Colleen 2012. *A Grammar of Northern and Southern Gumuz*. PhD thesis. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.
- Ahland, Michael 2012. *A Grammar of Northern Mao (Mawes Aas'e)*. PhD thesis. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.
- Anbessa Teferra 2000. *A Grammar of Sidaama*. PhD thesis. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Andersen, Torben forthcoming. Berta. In: Bedilu Waqjira, Ronny Meyer & Zelealem Leyew (eds.). *Handbook of Ethiopian Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Appleyard, David L. 1975. A descriptive outline of Kemant. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 3, 2: 316-350.
- Azeb Amha 2001a. *The Maale Language*. Leiden: CNWS Publications.
- Azeb Amha 2001b. Ideophones and compound verbs in Wolaitta. In: Voeltz, F.K. Erhard & Christa Kilian-Hatz (eds.). *Ideophones*, p. 49-62. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Azeb Amha 2007. Verbal subject-agreement and modality distinction in Zargulla. Paper presented at the Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, Melbourne, La Trobe University, 10 October 2007.

- Azeb Amha 2009a. The morphosyntax of negation in Zargulla. In: Wetzels, Leo (ed.). *The Linguistics of Endangered Languages. Contributions to Morphology and Morphosyntax*, pp. 199-220. Utrecht: LOT.
- Azeb Amha 2009b. Discourse particles and attitudinal markers in Wolaitta. Paper presented at the *Discourse Markers in African Languages Workshop*, CNRS-LLACAN, Villejuif, 20 November 2009.
- Babaliyeva, Ayten 2013. *Études sur la morphosyntaxe du tabasaran littéraire*. PhD thesis. Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études.
- Banti, Giorgio & Moreno Vergari 2005. A sketch of Saho grammar. *Journal of Eritrean Studies* 4, 1-2: 101-131.
- Beachy, Marvin Dean 2005. *An Overview of Central Dizin Phonology and Morphology*. MA thesis. Arlington, TX: The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Beniam Mitiku Cherinet 2013. *Harari. A Descriptive Grammar*. PhD thesis. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Benishangul-Gumuz Language Development Project 2014. *Bertha – English – Amharic – Arabic Dictionary*. 2nd edition, Assosa, Addis Ababa: Education Bureau, Bureau of Culture & Tourism; SIL Ethiopia.
- Berhanu Chamora & Robert Hetzron 2000. *Inor*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Bliese, Loren F. 1981. *A Generative Grammar of Afar*. Dallas: SIL.
- Boyeldieu, Pascal (this volume). Expressing similarity in Yulu and some other SBB languages (Central Africa).
- Carlson, Robert 1994. *A Grammar of Supyire*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Crass, Joachim 2005. *Das K'abeena. Deskriptive Grammatik einer hochlandostkuschitischen Sprache*. (Kuschitische Sprachstudien, 23.) Cologne: Köppe.
- Crass, Joachim (this volume). Similarity and related functions in Libido.

- Crass, Joachim & Ronny Meyer 2008. Ethiopia. In: Heine, Bernd & Derek Nurse (eds.). *A Linguistic Geography of Africa*, pp. 228-249. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creissels, Denis 2014. Functive phrases in typological and diachronic perspective. *Studies in Language* 38, 3: 605-647.
- Darmon, Chloé (this volume). The morpheme *-(ä)ñä* in Xamtanga: Functions and grammaticalisation targets.
- Deginet Wotango (transl.) in preparation. *Qakkichchu Laaha* [The Little Prince by Antoine de Saint Exupéry]. Durame. Ms.
- Deutscher, Guy 2000. *Syntactic Change in Akkadian. The Evolution of Sentential Complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eggs, Frederike 2006. *Die Grammatik von als und wie*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Elias, David Lyndon 2005. *Tigre of Habab. Short Grammar and Texts from the Rigbat People*. PhD thesis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Evans, Nicholas 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In: Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.). *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, pp. 366-431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fuchs, Catherine 2014. *La comparaison et son expression en français*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Gasparini, Armido 1983. *Sidamo-English Dictionary*. Bologna: Editrice Missionaria Italiana.
- Girma Mengistu 2014. *A Grammar of Sezo*. PhD thesis. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Gragg, Gene B. ed. 1982. *Oromo Dictionary*. East Lansing, MI: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.
- Güldemann, Tom 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 34.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hartmann, Josef 1980. *Amharische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1993. *A Grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Haspelmath, Martin & Oda Buchholz 1998. Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe. In: Auwera, J. van der (ed.). *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, pp. 277-334. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hassan Kamil, Mohamed 2015. *L'afar: Description grammaticale d'une langue couchitique (Djibouti, Erythrée et Éthiopie)*. PhD thesis. Paris: INALCO.
- Hayward, Richard J. 1978-79. Bayso revisited: Some preliminary linguistic observations I, II. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 41, 3: 539-570; 42, 1: 101-132.
- Hayward, Richard J. 1990. Notes on the Zayse language. In: Hayward, Richard J. (eds.). *Omoti Language Studies*, pp. 210-335. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Hompó, Éva 1990. Grammatical relations in Gamo: A pilot sketch. In: Hayward, Richard J. (ed.). *Omoti Language Studies*, pp. 356-405. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Hayward, Richard J. & Eshetu Chabo 2014. *Gamo-English-Amharic Dictionary. With an Introductory Grammar of Gamo*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hellenthal, Anne-Christie 2010. *A Grammar of Sheko*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Hetzron, Robert 1969. The verbal system of Southern Agaw. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hudson, Grover 1989. *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Inui, Hideyuki 2012. エチオピア言語調査用基本動詞例文集 [Basic verb sentences for Ethiopian language research]. *Studies in Ethiopian Languages* 2012: 48-211.
- Joswig, Andreas forthcoming. Majang. In: Bedilu Waqjira, Ronny Meyer & Zelealem Leyew (eds.). *Handbook of Ethiopian Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kambaattissata. Rosaanchi Maxaafa*. [Kambaata Language. School Book.] 1989 E.C. Grade 1-8. Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples Regional State: Education Bureau.

- Kane, Thomas Leiper 1990. *Amharic-English Dictionary*. 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kawachi, Kazuhiro 2007. *A Grammar of Sidaama (Sidamo), a Cushitic Languages of Ethiopia*. PhD thesis, University at Buffalo, State University of New York.
- Kawachi, Kazuhiro forthcoming. Mermaid constructions for evidentiality in Sidaama. In: Tsunoda, Tasaku (ed.). *Mermaid Constructions*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kießling, Roland 1994. *Eine Grammatik des Burunge*. (Afrikanistische Forschungen, 13.). Cologne: Köppe.
- Killian, Don 2015. *Topics in Uduk Phonology and Morphosyntax*. PhD thesis. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Kortmann, Bernd 1997. *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lamberti, Marcello & Roberto Sottile 1997. *The Wolaytta Language*. (Studia Linguarum Africae Orientalis, 6.) Cologne: Köppe.
- Leslau, Wolf 1941. *Documents tigrigna (éthiopien septentrional). Grammaire et textes*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Leslau, Wolf 1945. Short grammar of Tigré: [1.] The verb in Tigré (North-Ethiopic), dialect of Mensa, [2.] Grammatical sketches in Tigré (North-Ethiopic), dialect of Mensa. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 65, 1: 1-26, 3: 164-203.
- Leslau, Wolf 1995. *A Reference Grammar of Amharic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Martowicz, Anna 2011. *The Origin and Functioning of Circumstantial Clause Linkers: A Cross-linguistic Study*. PhD thesis. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Mason, John 1996. *Säwasəw Təgrəñña, Tigrinya Grammar*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Red Sea Press.
- Meyer, Ronny 2005. *Das Zay. Deskriptive Grammatik einer Ostguragesprache (Äthiosemitisch)*. Cologne: Köppe.

- Meyer, Ronny 2006. *Wolane. A Descriptive Grammar of a Gurage Language (Ethiosemitic)*. Cologne: Köppe.
- Moline, Estelle 2006. Et comme minuit allait sonner, ... Pour en finir avec la partition temporelles vs. causales. *Cahiers Chronos* 15: 63-90.
- Moline, Estelle 2008. L'emploi exclamatif de comme, proforme *qu-* de manière. *LINX* 58: 25-45.
- Morin, Didier 1995. "Des paroles douces comme la soie": Introduction aux contes dans l'aire couchitique (*bedja, afar, saho, somali*). Paris: Peeters.
- Morin, Didier 1996. Afar praise poetry: Orowwah. In: Hayward, Richard J. & I.M. Lewis (eds.). *Voice and Power: The Culture of Language in North-East Africa. Essays in Honour of B.W. Andrzejewski*, pp. 269-274. (ALC Supplement, 3.) Taylor & Francis
- Morin, Didier 2012. *Dictionnaire afar-français (Djibouti, Erythrée, Ethiopie)*. Paris: Karthala.
- Mous, Maarten 1993. *A Grammar of Iraqw*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Mous, Maarten & Ongaye Oda 2009. The semantics of clause linking in Konso. In: Dixon, R.M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *The Semantics of Clause Linking*, pp. 336-355. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ongaye Oda Orkaydo 2013. *A Grammar of Konso*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Owens, Jonathan 1985. *A Grammar of Harar Oromo (Northeastern Ethiopia)*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Perrett, Denise Lesley 2000. *The Dynamics of Tense Construal in Hadiyya*. PhD thesis. London: University of London.
- Pillinger, Steve & Letiwa Galboran 1999. *A Rendille Dictionary (Including a Grammatical Outline and an English-Rendille-English Index)*. (Kuschitische Sprachstudien, 14.) Cologne: Köppe.
- Rapold, Christian 2006. *Towards a Grammar of Benchnon*. PhD thesis. Leiden: Leiden University.
- Rapold, Christian & Silvia Zaugg-Coretti 2009. Exploring the periphery of the Central Ethiopian Linguistic Area: Data from Yemsa and Benchnon. In: Crass, Joachim & Ronny Meyer (eds.). *Language Contact and Language Change in Ethiopia*, pp. 59-81. Cologne: Köppe.

- Raz, Shlomo 1983. *Tigre Grammar and Texts*. Malibu: Undena.
- Reh, Mechthild 1996. *Anywa Language. Description and Internal Reconstructions*. Cologne: Köppe.
- Roba Dame & Charlotte Wedekind 2008. *Burji Dictionary*. 86p. Ms.
- Saeed, John 1999. *Somali*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Saxena, Anju 1995. Unidirectional grammaticalization: Diachronic and cross-linguistic evidence. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48, 4: 350-72.
- Schlee, Günther 1978. *Sprachliche Studien zum Rendille. Grammatik, Texte, Glossar. With English Summary of Rendille Grammar*. (Hamburger Philologische Studien, 46.) Hamburg: Buske.
- Schneider-Blum, Gertrud 2007. *A Grammar of Alaaba, a Highland East Cushitic Language of Ethiopia*. (Kuschitische Sprachstudien, 25.). Cologne: Köppe.
- Schneider-Blum, Gertrud 2009. *Máakut(i) t'awá shuultáa ,Proverbs finish the problems': Sayings of the Alaaba (Ethiopia)*. (Verbal Art and Documentary Literature in African Languages, 28.) Cologne: Köppe.
- Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten 2009. *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Sim, Ronald J. 1989. *Predicate Conjoining in Hadiyya: A Head-Driven PS Grammar*. PhD thesis. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Simeone-Senelle, Marie-Claude & Mohamed Hassan Kamil 2014. Expression de la comparaison d'égalité, de la similitude et polyfonctionnalité du lexème *inna* 'manière' en afar. Villejuif. Ms.
- Stroemer, Harry 1995. *A Grammar of Boraana Oromo (Kenya). Phonology, Morphology, Vocabularies*. Cologne: Köppe.
- Tadesse Sibamo Garkebo 2015. *Documentation and Description of Hadiyya*. PhD thesis. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

- Taine-Cheikh, Catherine 2004. De la grammaticalisation de “comme” (comparative) en arabe. In: Haak, Martine, Rudolf de Jong & Kees Versteegh (eds.). *Approaches to Arabic Dialects. A Collection of Articles Presented to Manfred Woidich on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, pp. 309-328. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Taylor, Nicholas 1994. *Gamo Syntax*. PhD thesis. London: University of London.
- Tesfay Tewolde 2006. Some points of comparison between Akkadian *kīma* and Tigrinya *kām*. In: Uhlig, Siegbert (ed.). *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Hamburg, July 20-25, 2003*, pp. 876-884. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Tosco, Mauro 1997. *Af Tunni. Grammar, Texts, and Vocabulary of a Southern Somali Dialect*. (Cushitic Language Studies, 13.) Cologne: Köppe.
- Tosco, Mauro 2001. *The Dhaasanac Language*. (Cushitic Language Studies, 17.) Cologne: Köppe.
- Treis, Yvonne 2008. *A Grammar of Kambaata. Part 1: Phonology, Morphology, and Non-verbal Predication*. (Kuschitische Sprachstudien, 26.) Cologne: Köppe.
- Treis, Yvonne 2010. Purpose-encoding strategies in Kambaata. *Afrika und Übersee* 91: 1-38.
- Treis, Yvonne 2012a. Categorical hybrids in Kambaata. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 33, 2: 215-254.
- Treis, Yvonne 2012b. Complementation strategies in Kambaata (Cushitic). Paper presented at the *Journée d'étude: La complementation*, LACITO-CNRS/INALCO, Paris, 14th May 2012.
- Treis, Yvonne 2015. The perfective paradigms of Kambaata: Double agreement, defectiveness and overlaps. Paper presented at the 19th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Warsaw, 24-28 August 2015.
- Treis, Yvonne forthcoming a. “They are only two, like the teats of a donkey”: Kambaata denumerals revisited. In: Kießling, Roland & Raija Kramer (eds.). *Festschrift Mechthild Reh*.
- Treis, Yvonne forthcoming b. Comparison in Kambaata: Superiority, Equality and Similarity. *Linguistic Discovery*.

- Triulzi, A., A. A. Dafallah & M.L. Bender 1976. Berta. In: Bender, M.L. (ed.). *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, pp. 512-532. East Lansing, Michigan: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.
- Vanhove, Martine (this volume). Similitive, equative, and comparative constructions in Beja (North-Cushitic).
- Wakasa, Motomichi 2008. *A Descriptive Study of the Modern Wolaytta Language*. PhD thesis. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo.
- Wedekind, Klaus 1990. *Generating Narratives: Interrelations of Knowledge, Text Variants and Cushitic Focus Strategies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Weninger, Stefan 1999. *Gə'əz (Classical Ethiopic)*. 2nd revised edition. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Weninger, Stefan 2001. *Das Verbalsystem des Altäthiopischen. Eine Untersuchung seiner Verwendung und Funktion unter Berücksichtigung des Interferenzproblems*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wetter, Andreas 2010. *Das Argobba. Eine deskriptive Grammatik der Varietät von Shonke und T'ollaha (Zentraläthiopien)*. Cologne: Köppe.
- Ylikoski, Jussi (this volume). Similarity, equality and the like in North Saami.
- Zaugg-Coretti (this volume). Similitive morphemes and their grammaticalisations in Yemsa.
- Zealelem Leyew 2003. *The Kemantney Language: A Sociolinguistic and Grammatical Study of Language Replacement*. Cologne: Köppe.