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An introductory example

The apprehensive forms in Kambaata:
Warnings of dangers, threats and prohibitions

(1) (…) án waal-tókkoon y-áayoommi
1sNOM come-2sAPP say-1sPROG.REL-NMZ1a.mNOM

worr-iichch-u kar-ókkoo-he y-i-nee-b-be
snakes-SG-mNOM sting-3mAPP-2sO say-1sPCO-N.VV-COP3-PRAG3

(Little Prince speaking to the pilot:) ‘(…) I said “Don’t come!” (because) I thought (lit. said) “The snake might bite you”.’ (Saint Exupéry 2018: 87)
1. Some background on Kambaata

CLASSIFICATION, SPEAKER AREA, TYPOLOGICAL PROFILE ...
1.1. Classification and Sociolinguistics

- Afro-Asiatic > Cushitic > … > Highland East Cushitic
- Speaker Area: Southwest Ethiopia
- Number of speakers: > 600,000 (acc. to 2007 census)
- Medium of instruction in primary schools
- Official orthography (used here with minimal modifications)
- Amharic (Semitic): most important 2nd language
- Works on related languages contain, to the best of my knowledge, no information on apprehensive
1.2. Typological profile I

• **Suffixing**, agglutinating-fusional with many portmanteau morphemes

• Head- and dependent-marking
  • 9 nominal cases
  • subject indexing on verbs

• **Strict head-finality**
  • dependent clauses before main clauses
  • main verb or copula = last constituent in a sentence
  • all modifiers (incl. relative clauses) before head noun

• **Phonemic stress**, but no lexical, only grammatical minimal pairs, e.g. ánganne (NOM) - angánne (ACC) - anganné (GEN) ‘(of) our hands’
1.3. Typological profile II

Parts of speech

- 4 large sets with open membership: nouns, adjectives, verbs, ideophones
- Several small (closed) sets: various sets of pronouns, numerals and quantifiers, demonstratives, …
1.4. Terminological caveat

For a long time I have not been sure how to name the -ókkoo-paradigm. Thus the verb form has been glossed in, let’s say, sometimes adventurous ways in my earlier papers on Kambaata, e.g. “intimidative”, “admonitive”, “preventive”, “adverteive”…
1.5. Origin of the data

- Field recordings
- Local written publications
- Elicited data prompted by text examples
1.6. Structure of this talk

2. Morphology
   • Where do the apprehensive forms fit into the verbal system?
   • What is the morphological make-up of the apprehensive forms?

3. Meaning
   • Which meaning does the apprehensive express (dependent on the person of the subject)?

4. (Possible) Diachrony
2. Morphology

MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF APPREHENSIVE VS. OTHER MAIN VERB PARADIGMS
2.1. Categorization of verb forms

Main verbs

- Indicative
  - Imperfective
  - Perfective
  - Perfect
  - Progressive

- Directive
  - Imperative
  - Jussive
  - Apprehensive

Subordinate verbs

- Relative verbs
  - Imperfective
  - Perfective
  - Perfect
  - Progressive

- Converbs
  - Perfective converb
  - Imperfective converb
  - Purposive converb

?? (see directive meaning, but morphological structure of indicative verb)
Figure 1. Categorization of Kambaata verb forms

Main verbs

- Indicative
  - Imperfective
  - Perfective
  - Perfect
  - Progressive

- Directive
  - Imperative
  - Jussive
  - Apprehensive
    (Periphrasis: Verbal noun + hoog- ‘to not do’)

Negation

- Imperfective Negative
- Non-imperfective Negative

Subordinate verbs

- Relative verbs
  - Imperfective
  - Perfective
  - Perfect
  - Progressive

- Converbs
  - Perfective converb
  - Imperfective converb
  - Purposive converb
    (Periphrasis: Negative Relative + =g- ‘like’)

- Negative Relative

- Negative Converb
2.2. Categorization of verb forms

Figure 2. Structure of inflected verbs with one subject index slot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Subject Index</th>
<th>Inflection</th>
<th>TAM</th>
<th>(Object Suffix)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 subject different indexes

Figure 3. Structure of inflected verbs with discontinuous subject index slot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Subject Index</th>
<th>Inflection</th>
<th>Subject Index</th>
<th>(Object Suffix)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 subject different indexes
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- All affirmative indicative main verbs
- Imperfective Negative
- Affirmative and Negative Imperative
- Affirmative and Negative Jussive
- Negative Relative
- All affirmative and negative converbs
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- All affirmative indicative main verbs
- Imperfective Negative
- All affirmative relative verbs
- **Apprehensive**
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Inherited from Proto-Afroasiatic
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- All affirmative indicative main verbs
- Imperfective Negative
- All affirmative relative verbs
- Apprehensive

Double subject verbs assumed to be more recently grammaticalized, especially from the fusion of periphrastic verb forms (e.g. Tosco 1996)
2.3. Apprehensive paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-SBJ</th>
<th>-ókkoo</th>
<th>-SBJ</th>
<th>ub- ‘fall’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
<td>ub-ókkoomm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>ub-bókkeont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
<td>ub-ókkoo ’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3hon</td>
<td>-een</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mma</td>
<td>ub-eenókkoomma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
<td>u&lt;mm&gt;b-ókkoomm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p 2hon</td>
<td>-teen</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-nta</td>
<td>ub-beenókkonta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Apprehensive paradigm

Table 1. The Apprehensive Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-SBJ</th>
<th>-ókkoo</th>
<th>-SBJ</th>
<th>ub- ‘fall’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
<td>ub-ókkoommm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>ub-bókkoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
<td>ub-ókkoo ’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3hon</td>
<td>-een</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mma</td>
<td>ub-eenókkoomma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
<td>u&lt;m&gt;b-ókkoomm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>2hon</td>
<td>-t-een</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-nta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Found on all inflected verbs
- Found on perfective, imperfective and progressive main verbs
### 2.3. Apprehensive paradigm

**Table 1. The Apprehensive Paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-SBJ</th>
<th>-ókkoo</th>
<th>-SBJ</th>
<th>ub- ‘fall’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
<td>ub-ókkoomm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-nt</td>
<td>ub-ókkoott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
<td>ub-ókkoo’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3hon</td>
<td>-een</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mma</td>
<td>ub-eenókkoomma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-ókkoo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
<td>u&lt;mm&gt;b-ókkoomm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>2hon</td>
<td>-t-een-ókkoo</td>
<td>-nta</td>
<td>ub-beenókkoonat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphophonological processes of apprehensives identical to processes of other verb forms.
3. Meaning

DANGER WARNINGS, THREATS, NEGATIVE COMMANDS/PROHIBITIVES
3.1. 1\textsuperscript{st} Person Apprehensive
3.1. 1st person: Danger warning

- Apprehensive of 1st person, function 1: Warning
  - There is a possible/looming danger / undesirable event ahead.
  - Message: Addressee, do something about it!
  - Here in (2): The event is dangerous / undesirable for the speaker.

(2) \textit{Ub-ðkkoomm}
fall-1s\textit{APP}

(Context: Speaker is standing on a ladder that is held by the addressee. Speaker warns of a danger) ‘(Take care,) I might fall!’ – Message: ‘Hold the ladder properly.’ (fieldnotes 2003)
3.1. 1st person: Threat

- Apprehensive of 1st person, function 2: Threat
  - There is a possible/looming undesirable and/or painful action of the speaker ahead.
  - Message: Addressee, do something about it! Stop it!
  - Here in (3): The possible event is undesirable for the addressee.

(3)  *Woggar-ókkoon-ke*
hit-1s APP-2sO

(Context: Addressee has been teasing the speaker for a while. Speaker threatens addressee:) ‘I might hit you!’ (fieldnotes 2003)

- This data from elicitation is confirmed by examples from texts.
3.1. 1st person: Danger warning

- Apprehensive of 1st person, function 1: Warning
  - There is a possible / looming danger / undesirable event ahead.
  - Message: Addressee, do something about it!
  - Here in (4): The event is dangerous / undesirable for the speaker and addressee (or speaker and their group).

(4)  Gĩr-àta  ānàam-o=gga  tì ’nnm=a’-ì  hóog-gi-yan
  fire-fACC  good-mOBL=G-mOBL  narrow_down.IDEO=do-mACC  not_do-2sPCO-DS

  mát-oa=rr-áan  aphph-iti-yan  bu<m>bókkoomm!
  one-mOBL=NMZp-mLOC  seize.MID-3fPCO-DS  burn<1p>APP

‘If you don’t narrow down the fire properly [to the small spot in the center of the fireplace], (the fire) might light something and we might burn/there is a danger that we are going to burn.’
3.1. 1st person: Threat

- Apprehensive of 1st person, function 2: Threat

(5) Ĭi béet-o, lankii kān̄n  haqq-i  al-i
    1sPOSS son-mOBL again  A_DEM1.mOBL tree-mGEN top-mACC

ful-táni-yen  xuud-ókkoon-ke
climb-2sICO-DS  see-1sAPP-2sO

(Although the mother has strictly forbidden it, a boy (= the addressee) continues to climb onto the fruit tree in the front yard. The mother gets angry and threatens him:) ‘My son, don’t let me see again (lit. I might see again) that you climb up this tree!’ (Message: Stop or you’ll be punished!) (Kambaatissata 1989: 4.45)
3.2. 2\textsuperscript{nd} Person Apprehensive
3.2. 2\textsuperscript{nd} person (I): Danger warning

- Apprehensive of 2\textsuperscript{nd} person, \textbf{function 1}: Warning of a possible/looming danger or undesirable event, message: addressee, do something about it!, here: event undesirable for addressee (NB: contrast this with negative imperative in (6b))

(6)  
(a) \textit{Orc-\textipa{\d{a}g-g\d{a}kk\d{o}ont}}
    \textit{mud-mLOC enter-2sAPP-2sO}

(Context: Addressee approaching a muddy spot unintentionally. Speaker warns them of a danger:) ‘Take care, you might step into the mud / Take care not to step into the mud! / Don’t step (accidentally) into the mud!’ (fieldnotes 2005)

(b) \textit{Orc-\textipa{\d{a}g-g\textipa{\d{o}ot-i}}}
    \textit{mud-mLOC enter-2sNEG-2sIMP}

(Context: Addressee, e.g. a child, is happily jumping into every mud pit on the way.) ‘Don’t step into the mud!’ (fieldnotes 2005)

The same apprehensive-negative imperative “minimal pair” with \textit{ub}- ‘fall’: APP: ‘Take care not to fall (unintentionally)!’ vs. IMP ‘Don’t let yourself fall (intentionally)!’
3.2. 2nd person (II): Negative command

- More common: Apprehensive of 2nd person with function 2: Negative command

(7) \( Ta \ ma’n-n-ichch-	extit{ Uinta-ma} \ iill-\textit{ teentachch} \)
\[ \text{A DEM1fACC place-SG-fACC\textless N\textgreater -PRAG4 reach-2pPFV.REL.ABL} \]
\( \\textsl{håy \ sarb-an-teenókkoonta} \)
please hurry-PASS-2pAPP

(Pilot to the readers of the Little Prince:) ‘If you should come upon this spot, please do not hurry on.’ (Saint-Exupéry 2018: 95)

- The apprehensive 2nd person has been considered by some speakers to be a reinforced negative command (if compared to the negative imperative).
3.3. 3rd Person Apprehensive
3.3. 3rd person (I): Danger warning

- Apprehensive of 3rd person: **Warning**, of a possible/looming danger or undesirable event, message: addressee, do something about it!, here in (8): event undesirable for addressee (or the speaker who needs to wash the clothes?)

(8)   Agúr-i     Hádd-e   hittíg-oo-b-ba'a!
stop-2sIMP   PN-mOBL   P_SIM2-fOBL.VV-COP3-NEG

Hitt=at-támi-yan   oddîshsh-a-kk   ba’-’ókkoo‘u!
SIM1_P DEM=do-2sICO-DS   clothes-fNOM-2sPOSS   spoil-3fAPP

(Context: Speaker sees Hadde wiping his nose on his sleeve.) ‘Stop, Hadde, it’s not like this (/one doesn’t do like this), if you do it like this, your clothes run the risk of becoming dirty.’ (Kambaatissata 1989: 4.17)
3.3. 3rd person (I): Danger warning

- Apprehensive of 3rd person: **Warning** of a possible/looming danger or undesirable event, message: addressee, do something about it!, here in (9): event undesirable for speaker

(9)  (...)  *shum-áa*  *ful-tani-i* (...)  
  urine-3fDAT  go_out-3fICO-ADD  
  *billaww-ahá-a*  *ka*  *xit-ahá-a*  áf-f  
  knife-mACC-ADD  A_DEM1.mACC soot-mACC-ADD  seize-3fPCO  
  *ful-táa’u*  *michch-ókkoo-se*  *y’éeni-van*  
  go_out-3fIPV  get_disease_sp-3mAPP-3fO  say-3honICO-DS  

‘(Speaking about a woman who has recently given birth:) ‘(...) (according to the Kambaata tradition,) she grabs a knife and this (bunch of straw smeared with) soot when she goes out to pee, (people) saying “She might get attacked by the *michcha*-disease (lit. it might *michcha* her)”.’  
(EK2016-02-23_002.doc)
3.4. Summary

- Apprehensive = Verb form of interactional contexts
- Warnings of (strongly) possible dangers, undesirable events
  - Natural catastrophes and accidents as well as undesirable actions of 3rd persons
  - Undesirable speaker’s reaction towards addressee (= Threat)
- Response of the addressee is requested (in order to counter/avoid the undesirable event) → directive verb form
- Undesirability for the speaker (or quoted speaker) or the addressee (or the quoted addressee)
- The undesirable event is possible in the future (unclear if always assumed to be imminent?)
- Precautionary situation is not syntactically linked to the apprehensive
- No corresponding opposite polarity form (if forced: speakers resort to periphrasis)
3. (Possible) Diachrony

PURPOSIVE + EXISTENTIAL > APPREHENSIVE
3.1. Diachrony: Introduction

- Historical sources → not existing
- Comparison with related and geographically adjacent languages → but no apprehensive verbs reported about
- I am left with: internal comparison
### 3.2. Source: periphrastic verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>-SBJ1</th>
<th>-SBJ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>[Stem]</td>
<td>-∅</td>
<td>-ôkkoo- mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>[Stem]</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ôkkoo- ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>[Stem]</td>
<td>-∅</td>
<td>-ôkkoo- ’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f 3pl</td>
<td>[Stem]</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-ôkkoo- ’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3hon</td>
<td>[Stem]</td>
<td>-een</td>
<td>-ôkkoo- mna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>[Stem]</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-ôkkoo- mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p 2hon</td>
<td>[Stem]</td>
<td>-teen</td>
<td>-ôkkoo- nta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘exist’</th>
<th>-SBJ2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yóo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yóo</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yóo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yóo</td>
<td>-’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yóo</td>
<td>-mna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yóo</td>
<td>-mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yóo</td>
<td>-nta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Identical subject markers in the 2nd slot
- ôo of existential verb is found in the apprehensive suffix
3.2. (Formal) diachronic scenario

< Purposive converb + existential copula ‘[Subject] is about to V’ *
< [Verbal stem]-SBJ1-ó-(k/h)a + yóo-SBJ2
< [Verbal stem]-SBJ1-ó-(k/h) + yóo-SBJ2
< [Verbal stem]-SBJ1-ók(-)koo-SBJ2
 [Verbal stem]-SBJ1-ókkoo-SBJ2 ‘[Subject] might V (= undesirable)
 [Addressee, do something about it]’

NB:
Today’s purposive converb:
[Verbal stem]-SBJ1-ó-ta
But note: -ta = fACC, while ka ~ -ha = mACC

* cf. Treis (2011) on proximatives ‘be about to’
< purposive + COP3
3.3. Parallel scenario: Development of the Progressive

- Parallel historical scenario in the development of the progressive (which Kambaata does not share with the most closely related languages): fusion of converb and existential verb

  Imperfective converb + existential copula  "[Subject] exists while V-ing"
  <  [Verbal stem]-SBJ1-án  +  yöo-SBJ2
  <  [Verbal stem]-SBJ1-áy(-)yoo-SBJ2
  [Verbal stem]-SBJ1-áyyoo-SBJ2  "[Subject] is V-ing"
3.4. (Semantic) diachronic scenario

Still unclear, but possibly:
‘[1/2/3 Subject] is about to V’
> ‘[1/2/3 Subject] might V’
> ‘[1/2/3 Subject] might V, and this is undesirable’
> ‘It is undesirable that [1/2/3 Subject] V-s, addressee act’
> (further development in the 2nd person) ‘Addressee act!’
To be continued...

• Perhaps a more meticulous search through examples in grammars of Ethiopian languages might unearth functionally similar verb forms.

• Collection of fieldwork on closely related HEC languages and dialects, especially Alaaba, Xambaaro, Hadiyya.

• Comparison with insubordinated negative purposive verb in Amharic (‘So that you do not V!) necessary (but note the formal difference with Kambaata).
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Abbreviations

A_ adjectival; ABL ablative; ACC accusative; ADD additive; APP apprehensive; COP3 copula with -VV-t; DAT dative; DEM1 proximal demonstrative; DS different subject; f feminine; G manner nominalizer =g; GEN genitive; ICO imperfective converb; IDEO ideophone; IMP imperative; IPV imperfective; LOC locative; m masculine; MID middle; N pragmatically determined morpheme; (function yet to be determined); NEG negative; NMZ1a nominalization with -VV; NMZp nominalization with =r(r); NOM nominative; O object; OBL oblique; p plural; P_ pronoun; PASS passive; PCO perfective converb; PFV perfective; PN proper noun; POSS possessive; PRAG3 pragmatically determined morpheme; (function yet to be determined); PRAG4 pragmatically determined morpheme; (function yet to be determined); PROG progressive; REL relative; s singular; SG singulative; SIM similitave
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