

Typological Studies in Language (TSL)

A companion series to the journal *Studies in Language*. Volumes in this series are functionally and typologically oriented, covering specific topics in language by collecting together data from a wide variety of languages and language typologies.

General Editor

Michael Noonan
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Assistant Editors

Spike Gildea
University of Oregon

Suzanne Kemmer
Rice University

Editorial Board

Wallace Chafe Santa Barbara	Matthew S. Dryer Buffalo	Paul J. Hopper Pittsburgh
Ronald W. Langacker San Diego	Doris L. Payne Oregon	Sandra A. Thompson Santa Barbara
Bernard Comrie Leipzig / Santa Barbara	John Haiman St Paul	Andrej A. Kibrik Moscow
Charles N. Li Santa Barbara	Frans Plank Konstanz	Dan I. Slobin Berkeley
R.M.W. Dixon Melbourne	Jerrold M. Sadock Chicago	Edith Moravcsik Milwaukee
Andrew Pawley Canberra	Bernd Heine Köln	

Volume 75

Interaction of Morphology and Syntax, Case studies in Afroasiatic

Edited by Zygmunt Frajzyngier and Erin Shay

Interaction of Morphology and Syntax

Case studies in Afroasiatic

Edited by

Zygmunt Frajzyngier

Erin Shay

University of Colorado

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia

Between coordination and subordination in Gawwada

Mauro Tosco

University of Naples "L'Orientale"

Gawwada, an East Cushitic language of the Dullay group spoken in Southwest Ethiopia, is a rather typical Cushitic language as far as the sentence and phrasal word order are concerned: SOV and Head-Modifier orders are followed. It is however radically different from the neighboring languages in its clause-linking strategies: for one thing, relative clauses are rather sparingly used; moreover, clefting is unknown, and there are no specific subordinate verbal paradigms. Gawwada makes extensive use of a general coordinator =*pa* in order to link nominals, phrases and clauses, as well as a subset of the adpositions which are used in nominal phrases. Moreover, a specific inflectional form of the verb, the Consecutive, is used in certain circumstances in the non-initial clauses. It turns out to be quite difficult to decide whether the clause-linking mechanisms of Gawwada are instances of coordination, subordination, or yet something else.

1. The language and its speakers¹

Gawwada (/kawwada/, [gaw:áda])² is a dialect of the Dullay cluster (East Cushitic) and is spoken in Southwest Ethiopia. According to current classification, Dullay is

1. The Gawwada data were collected in Arba Minch and in Gawwada town in various periods of fieldwork starting in 2000. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Università di Napoli "L'Orientale" for funding my research, and the assistance of the Institute of Ethiopian Studies at Addis Ababa University for permission to carry on fieldwork in Ethiopia. A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 2nd Conference on the Syntax of the World's Languages (SWL 2), Lancaster University, Lancaster (United Kingdom), 14–17 September 2006.

2. Voice opposition is not phonological for plain stops, and voiceless /p, t, k/ are used throughout in the transcription. This is an areal feature encompassing Dullay, Bensoid, and possibly other varieties, as shown by Sasse (1986). The transcription is phonological and follows the IPA conventions, except for /h/ = IPA /h/ and /y/ = IPA /j/.

a direct offspring of East Cushitic, although Hayward (1978) has substantiated a proposal originally made by Ehret (1974, 1976), according to which, within East Cushitic, Dullay forms a genetic subgrouping with the isolated (and nowadays extinct or nearly so) Yaaku language of the Mount Kenya area. In Tosco (2000) I generally accepted Hayward's arguments and proposed to call the group made up by Dullay and Yaaku "Transversal Southern Lowland East Cushitic".

The Dullay-speaking peoples have no common ethnonym or a common name for their language. The denomination "Dullay" (introduced by Amborn, Minker and Sasse 1980) – actually the local name of the river known in Amharic as Weytò – has replaced other terms, such as "Werizoid" (Bender 1971; Black 1976) and "Qawko" (Hayward 1978) in scientific literature. None of these denominations bears any meaning as an ethnonym to the speakers themselves.

"Gawwada" has recently been introduced in Ethiopia as a cover term for all the Dullay-speaking groups except the Ts'amakko (who live on the western bank of the Weytò river); in this article "Gawwada" will be used instead for the dialect spoken in and around the village of Gawwada, approximately 40 km (one hour's drive) westwards of Konso and to the North of the road leading to Jinka and the Omo valley.

Within Dullay one may easily distinguish a Western and an Eastern group of dialects; the former is basically made up of Ts'amakko and Gawwada and, geographically, spans the two banks of the Weytò river; the Eastern dialects occupy the highlands to the East and North of Gawwada; Harso, Dobaze, and the other dialects studied in Amborn, Minker, and Sasse (1980) are representative of the Eastern group. Mutual intelligibility between the Eastern and Western group is high, and Dullay may probably be regarded as a dialect chain; Gawwada speakers have no trouble speaking with Ts'amakko speakers, while they claim to have some problems understanding the Eastern varieties.

According to the 1994 Ethiopian Census there were approximately 42,000 speakers of Dullay varieties.

The Dullay varieties are not endangered. Bilingualism and multilingualism involve Konso and other Konsoid varieties, Amharic, and possibly Oromo. The Dullay dialects are not written.

2. Basics on word order and adpositions in Gawwada

As elsewhere in East Cushitic, the sentential word order of Gawwada is SOV; in contrast to other languages, where nominals can sometimes be found in postverbal position and cleft structures are common, in Gawwada the ultimate position

of the verb is strictly adhered to. In the basic syntactic configuration the subject is represented before the verbal form by a subject clitic:

- (1) [puda]_{subject} |uruure|_{Object} [i=erak-i]_{Verb}³
 hyena.man wind 3.SUBJ=send-PF.3M⁴
 'the hyena man sent onwards the wind' (from the folktale "The Hyena Man")

As typical in many East Cushitic languages, the phrasal word order is basically Head-Modifier: a nominal head may be followed by an "adjective"⁵ (2); a numeral (3); a possessive (4); another noun in a genitival construction (5); an apposition (6); or a relative clause (7):

- (2) *aa*ke *hii*b-a
 animals other-M
 'the other animals'
- (3) *talte* *to*'otte
 goat one.F
 'one goat'
- (4) *talte* *t*-ayyu
 goat F-my
 'my goat'

3. Gawwada is a pitch-accent language. The position of the accent is often phonological on the verbal forms and on the adjectives (probably a subclass of the former; cf. Note 5), where it will be marked by an acute accent, but not on nominals, where it will be left unmarked.

4. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses:

CAUS	Causative	IMPV	Imperative	PF	Perfective
CONN	Connector	JUSS	Jussive	REC	Reciprocal
CONS	Consecutive	LINK	Linker	S	Singular
CONTR	Contrastive	LOC	Locative	SEM	Semelfactive
DEF	Definite	M	Masculine	SING	Singulative
DIR	Directive	MID	Middle	SIT	Situative
EMPH	Emphatic	NEG	Negative	SPEC	Specific
F	Feminine	OBJ	Object	SUBJ	Subject
FUT	Future	P	Plural	1	First person
IMP	Impersonal Subject	PART	Partitive	2	Second person
IMPF	Impertative	PASS	Passive	3	Third person

5. Very possibly a subgroup of verbs, although displaying a partially different morphology and syntax.

- (5) *karo minn-ete*
direction house-LOC.P
'the direction of home'
- (6) *kawe kilaaša*
gun AK-47
'a Kalashnikov AK-47 gun'
- (7) *kere appa=pa yaayo ye=teeh-eni*
headrest father=LINK mother me=give-PF.3P
'the headrest father and mother gave me' (from a riddle)

Adpositions may follow an NP as postpositions:

- (8) *piye=ma i=pu^s-i*
ground=SIT 3.SUBJ=fall-PF.3M
'he fell to the ground' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")

More commonly, adpositions are separated from the noun phrase and inserted immediately before the verbal form. If subject and/or object clitics are present, the adposition(s) are located between the pronominal clitics and the verbal form, forming what we shall call the "verbal group". There is no object clitic of the third person; adpositional phrases with a third-person pronominal object are represented before the verbal form by a bare adposition:

- (9) *'alawho i=nu=mal-i=pa*
elder.brother 3.SUBJ=DIR=trick-PF.3M=LINK
'the elder brother played a trick on him and...' (from the folktale "The Hyena Man")

Sequences of two adpositions are not uncommon within the verbal group:

- (10) *karatt-akko kawwatto i=na=ma=do^s-os-i*
squirrel-SING.M stone wall 3.SUBJ=PART=SIT=fall-CAUS-PF.3M
'the Squirrel made a stone wall fall upon him (: the Dove)' (from the folktale "The Francolin and the Squirrel")

3. The adpositions in their phrasal context

3.1 The Locative case

Gawwada has one affixal Locative case (LOC), expressing both state and movement, also having genitive value (in Tosco 2006 and 2007 I have assumed that the genitive value is a derived one, following a well known grammaticalization

path; cf. Heine 1997). As with other affixes, nouns lose their final vowel in the affixation of the case, which has the following gender-sensitive case forms:

- ito with Masculine nouns; e.g.: *karmo* 'lion', *karm-ito* 'lion-LOC.M'
- atte with Feminine nouns; e.g.: *kolle* 'river', *koll-atte* 'river-LOC.F'
- ete with Plural Nouns; e.g.: *aake* 'animals', *aak-ete* 'animals-LOC.P'
- y with a subset of proper names and the numerals; e.g.: *na^o* (a male name), *na^o-y* 'N.-LOC'

The locational and genitive value respectively (the latter already seen in (5) above) of LOC may be seen in (11) and (12):

- (11) *minn-ete i=sor-ti*
house-LOC.P 3.SUBJ=run-PF.3F
'she ran to the house' (*minne* 'house' is morphologically plural)
- (12) *pako karm-ito*
mouth lion-LOC.M
'the lion's mouth'

3.2 The Situative adposition =ma

Apart from the Locative case, other adpositional relations are expressed through clitic adpositions or "relational nouns". The latter are nouns expressing such meanings as, e.g., "side", "top", "external location", and the like, which act as heads of genitival constructions with nouns in the locative case.⁶ In what follows two adpositions only will be detailed.

The adposition =ma (glossed SIT for "Situative") is used in expressions of movement (13) as well as for states (14):

- (13) *ano moore=ma an=ašš-i*
I market=SIT 1.SUBJ=go-PF.1S
'I went to the market'
- (14) *šette t-ayyu piye=ma šakkat-ti-ti*
girl F-my ground=SIT sit-MID-PF.3F
'my girl sits on the ground' (from a riddle)

6. On the complex problem of distinguishing cases and prepositions in Cushitic, cf. Hayward (2002). For an overview of Cushitic prepositions, cf. Sasse (2003), as well as, from a comparative and synchronic point of view, Blahk (2005).

As shown in Tosco (2007), the difference between LOC and SIT can be analyzed in terms of "closed" vs. "open" location, or of "point" vs. "area". With an open space (like the ground in (8) and (14) or the market in (13) as state or direction, the adposition =ma is the only possibility. The same holds true with an ethnic group:

- (15) *ano ts'amakko=ma an=áà-i*
 I Ts.=SIT I.SUBJ=go-PF.1s
 'I went to the Ts'amakko country/to the Ts'amakkos'

In contrast, where contact with a point is implied, the LOC case will be found, e.g.:

- (16) *koll-atte sande an=meeç-i*
 river-LOC.P water I.SUBJ=fetch-PF.1s
 'I fetched water at the river'

vs. the ungrammatical:

- (16') **kolle=ma sande an=meeç-i*
 river=SIT water I.SUBJ=fetch-PF.1s

(16') is impossible because one must be at the river (not in the general direction or in the area of the river) in order to fetch water.

In still other cases both LOC and SIT are possible, with slightly different meanings; let us consider (11), repeated here below, and (17):

- (11) *mim-ete i=sor-ti*
 house-LOC.P 3.SUBJ=run-PF.3f
 'she ran to the house'
- (17) *minne=ma i=sor-ti*
 house=SIT 3.SUBJ=run-PF.3f
 'she ran to the house'

Again, in (11) the house is a point, a specific destination towards which one runs; in (17) it is an area, and the sentence is probably better translated as 'she ran home'.

3.3 The Partitive adposition =ma

The adposition =ma (PART) is basically partitive:

- (18) *k'e xuyyu=ma to'okko i=jor-i*
 cows 3my=PART ONE.M 3.SUBJ=die-PF.3M
 'one of my cows died'

- (19) *lokko an=na=lik-u-i*
 slowly I.SUBJ=PART=COME.OUT-FUT-PF.1s=LINK
 'I'll slowly come out (of it)' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")
- (20) *na=suk*
 PART=drink-IMPV.S
 'drink (a part, some) of it!'

4. From the phrase to the clause

As previously stated, the clause is verb-final in Gawwada, and this order is quite strictly adhered to. Gawwada does not use clefts (Tosco forthcoming), in contrast to languages of the area (cf. Appleyard 1989 for clefts as an Ethiopian areal feature); nor does Gawwada have converbs, which are again quite common in Ethiopia.

Moreover, and different from most Cushitic languages, Gawwada does not have any Dependent or Relative paradigm: the "Subordinativ" described by Am-born, Minker and Sasse (1980) for the Eastern varieties of Dullay is unknown in Gawwada (as well as in Ts'amakko; Savà 2005). In Gawwada relative clauses make use of the same paradigms found in main clauses; if the head of the relative clause is the same as that of the main clause, no subject clitic is found on the verb of the relative (21). An object relative clause may be marked as such by a clitic determinative (22):

- (21) *kere appa=pa yaaye ye=teeh-eni i=pu^s-e*
 headrest father=LINK mother me=give-PF.3F 3.SUBJ=fall-PF.3F
 'the headrest father and mother gave me fell ...' (from a riddle, *kere* 'headrest' is morphologically plural; cf. (7) above)
- (22) *haydo ato ar-ti=sa ap=pu^s-ti*
 place you.S know-IMP.NEG.2s=DEF 2.SUBJ=fall-PF.2s
 'The place you do not know you are bound to fall into' (a proverb)

In order to link clauses together, Gawwada makes extensive use of phrasal elements, such as a coordinator and various adpositions. Moreover, a specific paradigm, the Consecutive, is found, although this is very different in nature from a typical "dependent". The following sections will explore these various clause-linking mechanisms.

4.1 Juxtaposition

The simplest clause-linking mechanism is asyndesis, i.e., juxtaposition. With "a" and "b" standing for the first and second clause respectively, this strategy may be represented as

$$a_{\emptyset} b_{\emptyset}$$

This strategy has a low frequency textually, and it is generally restricted to short clauses (minimally, bare verbal forms), in which juxtaposition iconically represents the temporal sequence of actions which follow each other:

- (23) *dap-i / piye sakkad-i / dap-i /*
 fall.down-PE.3M ground sit-PE.3M fall.down-PE.3M
i=qšad-a / i=koror-a
 3.SUBJ=sneeze-IMPE.3M 3.SUBJ=bellow-IMPE.3M
 '(the Elephant) falls down, lies on the ground, falls down; he sneezes, he bellows' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")

4.2 Bare coordination: $a_{pa} b_{\emptyset}$

Apart from juxtaposition, all the other linking strategies involve some kind of marking, which is always realized clause finally, i.e., on the verbal form.

Next to juxtaposition, the simplest marking is represented by the use of the coordinating element =*pa* (LINK) on the first clause and no marking on the second one:

- (24) *āšša-pa hól*
 go.IMPV.S=LINK return.IMPV.S
 'go and come back!' (i.e., 'go, reach your goal, come back')
- (25) *šand-ete kitta-tte an=šak-i=pa lokko*
 water-LOC.P within-LOC.P L.SUBJ=be.there-PP.IS=LINK slowly
an=na=lik-n-i
 I.SUBJ=PART=come.out-FUT-PE.IS=LINK
 'I stay in the water and I'll slowly come out (of it)' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")

With this strategy the clauses are not logically related: they follow each other temporally, but remain otherwise disjointed. The strategy may be represented as

$$a_{pa} b_{\emptyset}$$

and is a simple extension to clauses of the use of =*pa* as a phrase-linking element, as seen in (7) above and in (26) below:

- (26) *pako toʔokko=pa qaame lakki=kka an=šEEK-i*
 mouth one.M=LINK ears two=EMPH I.SUBJ=get-PE.IS
 'I got a mouth and two ears' (from a riddle)

In other words, using Haspelmath's (2004) terminology, =*pa* is a monosyndetic coordinator – i.e., it is affixed to only one of the two coordinated phrases (or coordinands). It is also a postpositive coordinator, i.e., it follows the coordinand. Moreover, and contrary to a widespread tendency in Africa to use different elements in nominal and verbal coordination (Haspelmath 2004: 10), the same element is used in Gawwada for both.

4.3 Introducing the Consecutive paradigm

In Gawwada, there is only one inflectional form of the verb which is limited to non-main clauses. For reasons which will become evident below, I call it Consecutive (CONS). Table 1 shows two typical Consecutive paradigms alongside a Perfective paradigm.

Not only is the Consecutive inflected for the person of the subject, but also in one of the two verbal classes of Gawwada the paradigm of the Consecutive is maximally different, i.e., each of the seven possible forms is represented by a different affix. The Perfective and most other paradigms (the Consecutive of the verbs of Class 2 included) follow the typical Cushitic "interlocking pattern", whereby the persons of the Singular are paired two by two, the first Singular and the third Singular Masculine being expressed by one and the same affix, and the second Singular and the third Singular Feminine by another.

Table 1.

	Perfective, Class 1	Consecutive, Class 1	Consecutive, Class 2
	'to drink'	'to run'	'to go'
1S	<i>šuk-i</i>	<i>sor-á</i>	<i>ašš-ó</i>
2S	<i>šuk-ti</i>	<i>sor-áy</i>	<i>ašš-óy</i>
3M	<i>šuk-i</i>	<i>sor-ú</i>	<i>ašš-ó</i>
3F	<i>šuk-ti</i>	<i>sor-í</i>	<i>ašš-óy</i>
1P	<i>šuk-me</i>	<i>sor-áni</i>	<i>ašš-inóni</i>
2P	<i>šuk-te</i>	<i>sor-ánku</i>	<i>ašš-itónku</i>
3P	<i>šuk-e</i>	<i>sor-ánki</i>	<i>ašš-ónki</i>

The Consecutive never appears in a sentence consisting of a single clause:

* a_{CONS}

Moreover, the Consecutive is restricted to non-initial clauses: in a sequence of clauses it may only be found in the second and in any following clause; as to the verbal form of the first clause, it can be unmarked (a_{O}) or marked (a_x):

$a_{\text{[O, x]}}$, b_{CONS} (, ... n_{CONS})

Marking on the "a" clause is obtained either with the coordinator =*pa* or one of the nominal adpositions discussed in Section 3 above, and which are cliticized to the last element of the "a" clause, i.e., the verbal form. Although the analysis will be restricted to the Partitive =*na* and the Situative =*ma*, the clausal use of the postposition is possible with other adpositions too, such as the Directive =*nu* (cf. (9), (19), (29)) and the Instrumental =*tta*.

We arrive here at an apparent paradox: which, if any, is the main and which is the dependent clause? The presence of an adposition in "a" seems to exclude its status as the main clause and to require an analysis in terms of being dependent upon another, following, clause; but if the verb of "b" is in the Consecutive, then "b" is a dependent clause, because the Consecutive is excluded from main, independent, clauses. Moreover, the use of an adposition after "a" follows syntactically (and even morphophonologically; cf. Note 7) the same pattern of the coordinator =*pa*. But again, if =*pa* is a coordinator, how could the following clause be marked by a special paradigm, the Consecutive?

However, it will soon become apparent that the Consecutive is **not** a dependent paradigm, and that it adds specific semantic values to the whole sentence. To discover the semantics of the Consecutive and of the adpositions in their clausal use (with the accompanying, at times unexpected, semantic shifts) will be the task of the following sections.

4.4 Almost a juxtaposition: a_{O} , b_{CONS}

The use of the Consecutive after an unmarked clause is, as was the case for the bare juxtaposition (a_{pa} , b_{O}), textually rare:

- (27) *ássa sooh-óy*
go.IMPV.S piss-CONS.2S
'go (S) to piss!'

- (28) *qayna-kka an-álli-n-a sande suk-á*
tomorrow=EMPH 1.SUBJ-go-PUT-IMPR.1S water drink-CONS.1S
'tomorrow I'll go and drink water' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")
- (29) *aaake i=ašše araapko=nu šall-ónki*
animals 3.SUBJ-go-PF.3P elephant=DIR speak-CONS.3P
'the animals went and told the Elephant ...' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")

It is evident that the Consecutive paradigm takes on the illocutionary value of the verb of the preceding clause: in (27) the Consecutive-marked clause is imperative, in (28) it is declarative and future, and in (29) declarative and perfective. We can also discern here the semantic value imparted by the Consecutive: the completion of "a", the first clause, is necessary in order for "b", the Consecutive-marked clause, to be true: (27) means 'go **to** piss!', not 'go **and** piss!'; (28) and (29) are better translated 'I'll go **to** drink water', and 'they went **to** tell the Elephant', respectively, and so on.

4.5 Coordination with a twist: a_{pa} , b_{CONS}

As anticipated, the main problem upon deciding whether we are dealing in Gawwada with a coordinating or a subordinating strategy comes from the use of the Consecutive paradigm after the coordinating element =*pa* or an adposition. The use of the Consecutive after a =*pa*-marked clause, i.e.

$a_{\text{=pa}}$, b_{CONS} (, ... n_{CONS})

is the most common structure textually. A few examples are seen in:

- (30) *wáddi=pa yela isqaye pok-k-áç-óy*
come.OVER.IMPV.S=LINK me.LOC lice kill-SEM-MID-CONS.2S
'come here (S) and kill my lice!' (from the folktale "The Donkey and the Oxpecker")
- (31) *okaaya=ppa haayu=sa bad-d-am-ánku*
come.IMPV.P=LINK M.MY-DEF hide-SEM-PASS-CONS.2P
'come (P) and hide by me!' (from the folktale "The Francolin and the Squirrel")
- (32) *kaarko saappe=ma i-hadd-i=pa yela ixše=ma*
tree above=SIT 3.SUBJ-climb-PF.3M=LINK me.LOC eyes=BIT

yoqom-ú=*ppa*⁷ ye sor-as-ú
 shit-CONS.3M=LINK me run-CAUS-CONS.3M
 '(the Monkey) climbed upon a tree, shat me in the eyes and made me run
 away' (from the folktale "The Lion and the Monkey")

Confirming again that the Consecutive-marked clause has the same illocutionary value as the preceding clause, we find in (30) and (31) that the second clause is semantically imperative, while in (32) it is declarative and perfective. Likewise, the second clause in (33) is semantically negative:

(33) ato ha^s-ú=*ppa* ašš-óy
 you.S get.up-PF.NEG.S=LINK go-CONS.2S
 'you did not get up and (you did not) go' (elicited sentence)

It is apparent again that the semantic contribution of the Consecutive to the whole sentence is the framing of the clause as the logical consequence, or the goal, of the preceding one. In (34) the Frog swims close to the Elephant in order to enter and kill him "from within":

(34) muku^s-itte lokko ^sande it'ah i=*na*=taah-ti=*pa* sindé
 frog-SING.F slowly water near 3.SUBJ=PART=swim-PF.3F=LINK nose
 'ila=*na* hul-í=*ppa* ašš-ú kutah n oon-ito
 high=PART enter-CONS.3F=LINK go-CONS.3 up brain-LOC.M
 'the Frog slowly swam close to him (: the Elephant), went up into him, and made it deep up into his brain' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")

The opposition between two logically independent clauses, both marked by main verbal forms (cf. 4.2), and a clause which is dependent for its actualization upon a former clause is apparent in (24) above, repeated here below, vs. (35):

(24) ášša=*pa* hól
 go.IMPV.S=LINK return.IMPV.S
 'go (S) and come back!' (i.e., 'go, reach your goal, make a U-turn')

7. The alternation =*pa*/*ppa* is paralleled by =*na*/*nna*, =*ma*/*mna*, etc. The geminated form is found in the following contexts:

- a. after a final accented vowel: cf. (32) yoqom-ú + =*pa* > yoqom-ú=*ppa*, (33) hul-í + =*pa* > hul-í=*ppa*,
- b. as the result of the assimilation of a final glide: cf. (37) paay ay + =*na* > paay a=*nna*

Finally, neither condition "a" nor "b" can apparently account for the presence of gemination after a plural verbal form: e.g. (38) an=*na* > an=*nna*, ay=yíine + =*pa* > ay=yíine=*ppa*.

(35) ášša=*pa* hól-áy
 go.IMPV.S=LINK return-CONS.2S
 'go (S) and come back!' (i.e., 'come back after you have been where you have to go and done what you have to do')

5. The postclausal use of the adpositions

5.1 =*na*: from Partitive to concomitant/immediate action

When used clause finally =*na* often takes on a clear concomitant value: the clause to which =*na* is affixed takes place within the time frame of the following clause:

(36) keeray konso=*sa* an=*ašš-a*=*na* karmo an=*hi*?-*i*
 yesterday K.=DEF 1.SUBJ=go-IMPV.1S=PART lion 1.SUBJ=see-PF.1S
 'yesterday, while going to Konso, I saw a lion' (elicited sentence)

Such a concomitant value of =*na* does not conflict with its phrasal partitive meaning: in (36) a part of the time frame during which the action of going to Konso takes place is "sliced out" and selected. Example (36) can be contrasted in form and meaning with (37), in which the coordinator =*pa* is used:

(37) keeray konso=*sa* an=*ašš-i*=*pa* karmo an=*hi*?-*á*
 yesterday K.=DEF 1.SUBJ=go-PF.1S=LINK lion 1.SUBJ=see-CONS.1S
 'yesterday I went to Konso and saw a lion' (elicited sentence)

But apart from the clitic attached to the "a" clause (=na vs. =pa), there are other differences between (36) and (37): the verbal form of the "a" clause (Imperfective an=*ašša* in (36) vs. Perfective an=*ašši* in (37)), as well as the verbal form of the "b" clause (Perfective an=*hi*? in (36) vs. Consecutive an=*hi*?*á* in (37)). The pattern

a_{Impf}-*na* b_{Pf}

i.e., the use of the Imperfective in a =*na*-marked "a" clause followed in its turn by a Perfective in the "b" clause is a rather common structure:

(38) xašaar-*itte*=*kka* i=*xapap* paay a=*nna* kar^sitto
 francolin-SING.F=EMPH 3.SUBJ=IDEOPH say-IMPV.3F=PART stomach
 na=*booy*-*i*
 PART=explode PF.3M
 'as the Francolin flapped her wings her stomach exploded' (the stomach exploded to her' from the folktale "The Squirrel and the Francolin")

In other cases the "a" clause appears in the Perfective, followed in the "b" clause by another Perfective:

- (39) *an=saq-ne=ma sakaanko=s-i hattay*
 1.SUBJ=slaughter-**PF**.IP=PART meat=DEF-SPEC quickly
an=yii-ne=ppa
 1.SUBJ=eat-**PF**.IP=LINK
 'we slaughtered it, quickly ate the meat, and ...' (from the text "A Hunting Party")

It will be noted that if the verb of the "a" clause is Perfective (as in (39)), the use of =na does **not** signal concomitant action: the action of "a" ('to slaughter an animal') precedes, both logically and temporally, the action in "b" ('to eat its meat'). It seems that the concomitant value of =na is rather a consequence of the use of the Imperfective in the "a" clause: the Imperfective itself is rather sparingly used in the language, and it generally signals an action in progress (and therefore unfinished). No such notion is by necessity found with a Perfective, as in (39), where the use of =pa is possible:

- (39') *an=saq-ne=ppa sakaanko=s-i hattay*
 1.SUBJ=slaughter-**PF**.IP=LINK meat=DEF-SPEC quickly
an=yii-ne=ppa
 1.SUBJ=eat-**PF**.IP=LINK
 'we slaughtered it, quickly ate the meat, and ...' (from the text "A Hunting Party")

It seems that the use of =na in (39) imparts a value of immediacy to the whole sentence: 'we went from (=na) slaughtering to eat the meat, or 'as soon as we had slaughtered the animal we ate it' (against a plain sequence of events in (39'): 'we slaughtered and ate the meat').

As was the case after =pa in the first clause, either a main or a Consecutive verbal form may appear in the "b" clause after a =na-marked "a" clause:

$a_{=na} b_{[O, CONS]}$

The use of the Consecutive in "b", actually a rarer choice, is shown in (40), in which the verbal form of the "a" clause is again Perfective:

- (40) *šette=s-i far-ti=s-i i-šš-i-na*
 girl-DEF-SPEC die-**PF**.3F=DEF-SPEC 3.SUBJ=go-**PF**.3M=PART
maay-ū=na puča=s-i punkuse i-na
 bury-**CONS**.3M=PAR hyena.man=DEF-SPEC P 3.SUBJ=PART

kalah dšš-i=pa^B
 behind go-**PF**.3M=LINK
 'he went to the girl who had died, buried her, and further went after Punguse, the hyena man ...' (from the folktale "The Hyena Man")

Again, it is difficult to determine what exactly makes the first part of (40) different in meaning from a possible variant with =pa: it will be noted that not only the verb in "a", but also the one in "b" is followed by =na. Again, a sense of immediacy of the actions seems to be implied. As to the use of the Consecutive, going to the dead girl is a logical prerequisite to bury her (whence the Consecutive in "b"; *maayū* 'he buried'), while the latter is **not** a logical necessity in order to trace down the hyena man: consequently, the verb of the "c" clause is in the Perfective (*dšš-i* 'he went').

5.2 =ma: from Situative to adversative

When used clausally after a verbal form, the adposition =ma shows a rather remarkable semantic shift. The use of the Consecutive paradigm is excluded, and the "a" and "b" clauses have different illocutionary values:

$a_{=ma} b_{[O]}$
 $*a_{=ma} b_{CONS}$

In the following sentences the clause ended by =ma is the condition whereby the following clause does **not** become true ("do "a", otherwise "b"):

- (41) *innu dšš-u šande šuk-a=mma / mikuš-itte*
 JUSS go-JUSS.NEG.2s water drink-**IMPF**.2s=SIT frog-SING.F
i=ho-pok-n-ay
 3.SUBJ=2.OBJ.S.M=kill-FUT-**IMPF**.3F
 'do not not go and drink water, lest the Frog kill you!' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")
- (42) *aš=ille-tišan-n-a=mma*
 2.SUBJ=REC=look.around-FUT-**IMPF**.2s=SIT
a=ho-pok-n-a=ye
IMP=2.OBJ.S.M=kill-FUT-**IMPF**.3M=CONTR
 'you'll look around [; take care], lest you not be killed!' (from the folktale "The Two Mice")

B. The verb of the last clause in (40) contains the incorporated adverb *kalah* 'behind'; the subject clitic *i=* precedes it, followed in its turn by the adposition =na.

On the other hand, such a negative implication is not found in the following:

- (43) *ye=téel-ad=ma nahaye t-aahu*
 me=sew-MID.IMPV.2S=SIT wife F-your.S.M
an=ho-kóč-d-in-a=ye
 I.SUBJ=2.OBJ.S.M=do-SEM-FUT-IMPE.IS=CONTR
 'sew me, and I'll be your wife!' (from the folktale "The Francolin and the Squirrel!")
- (44) *ye kal'e kóč=ma an=ašš-in-a pašo*
 me provisions make.IMPV.S=SIT I.SUBJ=go-FUT-IMPE.IS field
poh-à-ye
 harvest-CONS.IS=CONTR
 'prepare me some provisions, and I'll go and harvest the field!' (from the folktale "The Francolin and the Squirrel!")

In (42), (43), and (44) a special Contrastive clitic =*ye* is found: =*ye* is used when two or more clauses differ in illocutionary value (as in (43) and (44)), or semantically contrast with each other, as in (42). Its closest parallel is the Somali coordinator *e(e)*, which takes the form *ye* when affixed to a vowel-ending verbal form, and which is likewise used with different sentence types 'when there is an element of contrast between the clauses' and '[W]hen the clauses differ in polarity or in sentence type' (Saeed 1999: 121).

Semantically, in (43) and (44) the =*ma*-ended clause is the condition whereby the following clause **may** become true: 'if you sew me, I'll become your wife', or 'prepare me some provisions, so that I can go...'

Finally, in still other cases there is an evident **counterexpectational** value to =*ma* ("although "a", "b" is true"):

- (45) *mimmadd-ete olho ho a=yii-n-i hoqqaše=ma/*
 houses-LOC.P thing M.CONN IMP=eat-FUT-PE.3M plenty=SIT
olokko ho koro pok-k-a-kk-i
 something M.CONN people kill-SEM-IMPE.3M=CONTR-3.SUBJ
šak-a
 be.there-IMPE.3M
 'in the houses there is plenty of things people can eat, but there is also something which kills the people' (from the folktale "The Two Mice")
- (46) *šeeṁte t-aayu an=deeeš-i=ma i=dap-at-ti*
 sheep P-my I.SUBJ=look.for-PE.IS=SIT 3.SUBJ=lose-MID-PE.3F
 'I looked for my sheep but it went lost' ('although I looked...') elicited sentence)

- (47) *konso=sa an=mooruy-i=ma ano alo*
 K.=DEF I.SUBJ=go.to.market-PE.IS=SIT I thing
an=pitam-u
 I.SUBJ=buy-PE.NEG.S
 'I went to the market in Konso but did not buy anything' (elicited sentence)

What links together these apparently divergent values of postclausal =*ma*? In 3.2, =*ma* was defined as an adposition of state and movement implying an open, unbounded, non-punctual space as its target. When used post-clausally, =*ma* may be understood as setting the general frame of reference in respect to which the "b" clause holds true: in (43) and (44) the "b" clauses are subject to the conditions set up by the =*ma*-ending "a" clauses (they happen if the sewing and the preparing of the provisions, respectively, are done); in (45) something killing the people is found within the context of houses otherwise full of good things to eat; in (46) the sheep got lost with me looking for it, and in (47) I did not bring back anything from my visit to the market. But how to account for the **negative** implication in (41) and (42), whereby the "b" clauses become true if what is predicated in the "a" clauses is **not** fulfilled? In (41) tragedy strikes if the elephant does go and drink water at the river (i.e., if it does not do the action of not going), and in (42) if the addressee of the warning does not take enough care.

First, it must be noted that the "otherwise" condition is implicit, and (41) and (42) could equally well be rendered: 'do not go and drink water, as the frog will kill you', and 'take care, as something is going to kill you'. What binds (41) and (42) to the other sentences is the logical contrast between "a" and "b": in (45) the use of =*ma* underlines the logical opposition between the good things that can be found in the houses and the dangers lurking there. In the absence of such an opposition, =*pa* would be used in the "a" clause: the implication is that a danger should not be found amidst plenty of good things. Likewise, in (46) the logical expectation of looking for something is to find it, and in (47) going to the market "presupposes" coming back home having bought something. Were these logical expectations realized, =*pa* would again be used in the "a" clause. In (43) and (44), "b" is true if just the condition set up in "a" is realized: (43) is equivalent to: 'if you just sew me I'll be your wife' (the francolin, whose stomach has been cut open, is asking the squirrel for help). And in (44) the francolin again tells the squirrel: 'just get me some provisions, and I'll go ...'. Again, there is a contrast, a logical structure, between "a" and "b". The same contrast appears in (41) and (42), except that in (45)–(47) both "a" and "b" are true states of affairs (because they happened), whereas in (41)–(42) – as well as in (43)–(44) – they are **possible**.

6: Summary and conclusions

Different (and not all of them mutually exclusive) strategies are used in clause linking in Gawwada:

- a. juxtaposition;
- b. the use of the coordinator =*pa*;
- c. the use of a (nominal, phrasal) adposition;
- d. on the non-initial clause, the use of a special paradigm: the Consecutive. The Consecutive is not a nonfinite form: it shows full subject-verb agreement, although it does not show tense/aspect/mood/diathesis variation and takes on the illocutionary value of the preceding clause.

When linking clauses, human languages may choose between two basic strategies: one is **balancing**, defined as a "strategy whereby two (or more) SoAs [; States of Affairs; Mauro Tosco] are coded by means of structurally equivalent verb forms, such that each could occur in an independent clause" (Cristofaro 2003: 54); in **de-ranking**, on the contrary, one of the linked SoAs is "expressed by means of a verb form that cannot be used in independent clauses" (Cristofaro 2003: 55).

Among the strategies defined in a–d above, two are quite straightforward from a syntactic point of view: in juxtaposition as well as in the use of the coordinator =*pa*, provided that the verb of the following clause is **not** in the Consecutive paradigm, one may easily speak of a balancing strategy and of coordination; both clauses are coded by structurally equivalent verbal forms, and (except of course for the use of =*pa* on the first clause) each of them may in principle occur in isolation.

The real troubles come from the presence of an adposition in the first (rather: any non-final) clause, and of the Consecutive paradigm in the second (rather: any non-initial) clause. The main problem lies in identifying the main clause: were the Consecutive considered a dependent paradigm (on the basis of the fact that it cannot occur in an isolated clause), then by necessity the preceding clause would become the main one. But a clause which comes to be followed by an adposition cannot be given the coveted status of main clause. In this case, neither the initial clause nor the Consecutive-marked clause may occur in isolation.

Gawwada can be characterized as a verb-final clause-chaining language. In a way, the Consecutive of Gawwada is similar to the Medial verbs of Papuan languages and, in a certain sense, to many converbial constructions across the world. All these have one thing in common: they do not fulfill the usual criteria for subordination; e.g., they cannot be used in independent sentences; they tend to depend on another verb for the expression of modality, tense, aspect; and they often depend on another verb also for the reference of their subject. For the Papuan

Medial verbs, one may speak of cosubordination (Haspelmath 1995: 23); however, cosubordination implies the presence of an independent, main clause and of a controlling verb. In Papuan languages, as in other canonical verb-final languages, the main clause and the controlling verb are found in final position. In Gawwada, however, the problem lies exactly in the status of the final verb.

At this point, the semantics of the Consecutive may come to our rescue. We have seen that the Consecutive is far from being semantically neutral: it expresses the goal of, or the logical dependency from, the action expressed in the preceding clause(s). We can now understand why, although the Consecutive implies logical dependency on the preceding clause, its presence is definitely **not** a function of the presence of either a coordinator (= *pa*) or an adposition (= *na*): first, a "main" paradigm may well occur in its place; second, the Consecutive itself may be found after an "unmarked" verbal form in the structure $a_{\text{or } b_{\text{CONS}}}$ (cf. Section 4.4). One can therefore take the label Consecutive quite literally as implying **not** only a paradigm restricted in its occurrence to a non-initial clause, but also a paradigm depending, but at the semantic level only, on a preceding clause.

All things considered, a conservative solution (one which does not require the establishment of separate, language- or family-specific categories) may still lie in recognizing for Gawwada the usual categories of coordination and subordination, albeit with a twist: the Consecutive of Gawwada is an inflectional form of the verb restricted to non-initial clauses; it may appear either in coordination or in subordination, and its presence is *not per se* diagnostic of any of the two.

The advantages of such a solution are obvious: it allows a unified analysis of the various clause-linking structures of the language. Juxtaposition and the presence of the coordinator = *pa* may be taken to instantiate balancing, coordinated strategies, while the use of an adposition will signal a deranked, dependent clause, with the following clause as the main one and its verb as the controller.

References

- Amborn, Hermann, Minker, Gunter & Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1980. *Das Dullay. Materialien zu einer ostkuschitischen Sprachgruppe*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Appleyard, David L. 1989. The relative verb in focus constructions: An Ethiopian areal feature. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34(2): 291–305.
- Bender, M. Lionel. 1971. The Languages of Ethiopia: A new lexicostatistic classification and some problems of diffusion. *Anthropological Linguistics* 13: 165–288.
- Black, Paul. 1976. *Werizoid*. In *The Non-Cushitic languages of Ethiopia*, M. Lionel Bender (ed.), 222–231. East Lansing MI: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.

Blažek, Václav. 2006. Traces of a common case system in Afroasiatic. In *Loquentes Linguis. Oriental and linguistic studies in honour of Fabrizio A. Pennacchiotti*, Pier Giorgio Borbone, Alessandro Mengozzi & Mauro Tosco (eds), 91–101. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: OUP.

Ehret, Christopher. 1974. *Ethiopians and East Africans: The Problem of Contacts*. Nairobi: East Africa Publishing House.

Ehret, Christopher. 1976. Cushitic Prehistory. *The Non-Cushitic languages of Ethiopia*, M. Lionel Bender (ed.), 85–96. East Lansing MI: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds), 1–55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Coordinating constructions: An overview. In *Coordinating Constructions* [Typological Studies in Language 58], Martin Haspelmath (ed.), 3–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hayward, Richard J. 1978. The Qawko Dialects and Yaaku. *Abbay* 9: 59–70.

Hayward, Richard J. 2002. Case or postposition? *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 71: 55–73 (*Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Ethiopian Morphosyntax in an Areal Perspective*, Christian Rapold (ed.)).

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession*. Cambridge: CUP.

Saeed, John. 1999. *Somali*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1986. A Southwest Ethiopian language area and its cultural background. In *The Fergsonian Impact*, Vol.1, Joshua A. Fishman, Andrée Tabouret-Keller, Michael Clyne, Bh. Krishnamurti & Mohamed Abdulaziz (eds), 327–342. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 2003. Cushitic adpositions and their possible relatives in Semitic. In *Selected Comparative-Historical Afroasiatic Linguistic Studies in Memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*, M. Lionel Bender, David Appleyard & Gábor Takács (eds), 123–142. München: Lincom.

Savà, Graziano. 2005. *A Grammar of Tsamakko*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Tosco, Mauro. 2000. Cushitic Overview. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 33(2): 87–121.

Tosco, Mauro. 2006. Towards a geometry of adpositional systems: A preliminary investigation of Gawwada. In *Loquentes Linguis. Oriental and linguistic studies in honour of Fabrizio A. Pennacchiotti*, Pier Giorgio Borbone, Alessandro Mengozzi & Mauro Tosco (eds), 695–702. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Tosco, Mauro. 2007. State and Movement in Gawwada. In *Atti del XII Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camito-Semita (Afroasiatica)*, Ragusa, 6–9.6.2005, Mirella Cassarino & Marco Moriggi (eds), 197–204. Soveria Mannelli (Cosenza): Rubbettino.

Tosco, Mauro. Forthcoming. Information structure in Gawwada (East Cushitic). In *Information Structure in African Languages*, Anne Schwarz & Ines Fiedler (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Author index

Note: Self-citations are not included in the index.

A

Ahland, Michael 108, 135
 Aikhenvald, Aleksandra 11, 88,
 29, 39, 40, 63, 64, 83
 Amberber, Mengistu 227
 Mengistu Amberber
 Amborn, H. 208, 213, 225
 Ambros, Arne A. 109, 133
 Appleyard, David 58, 59, 108,
 120, 124, 133, 189, 205, 213,
 225, 226

B

Barðdal, Jóhanna 61, 64, 80, 83
 Beekes, Robert S. P. 130, 132
 Bender, M. Lionel 58, 59, 109,
 111, 132, 133, 205, 208, 225, 226
 Bhaskararao, Peri 29, 39, 64, 83
 Bichakjian, Bernard H. 129,
 132, 134
 Black, P. 208, 225
 Blažek, Václav 114, 132, 211, 226
 Brugnatelli, Vermondo 28,
 39, 135
 Brunk, Karsten 105
 Bybee, Joan 132

C

Chafe, Wallace 9, 39
 Chaker, Saleh 38, 31, 39
 Comrie, Bernard 129, 130, 131,
 132, 159, 176, 177, 183, 203,
 205, 206
 Cross, Joachim 139, 140, 146,
 153, 159, 163, 167, 173, 181, 193,
 195, 197, 205, 206
 Creissels, Denis 38, 39
 Cristofaro, S. 224, 226

D

Dawkins, C. H. 113, 118, 119, 133
 Deutscher, Guy 139
 Diakonoff, Igor M. 3, 4, 43, 59,
 109, 110, 115, 116, 121, 125, 126,
 127, 128, 133, 133, 226
 Dittmer, Clarissa 87, 105
 Dixon, R. M. W. 29, 39, 40, 83,
 130, 133
 DuBois, John 22, 39

E

Ebobissé, Carl 90, 105
 Ehret, Christopher 2, 4, 49, 59,
 54, 55, 58, 59, 208, 226
 Eythóresson, Thorhallur 64, 83

F

Faber, Alice 158, 133
 Frajzyngier, Zygmunt 42, 54,
 58, 59, 83, 85, 86, 94, 95, 102,
 103, 104, 105, 133, 133
 Fulass, Hailu 227 Hailu Fulass

G

Galand, Lionel 9, 30, 39, 39
 Gamkrelidze, Thomas V. 130,
 133
 Getachew, Haile 124, 125, 133
 Givón, Talmy 130, 133, 133
 Goldin-Meadow, Susan 131, 133
 Cragg, Gene 113, 121, 133
 Greenberg, Joseph 110, 111, 133

H

Hailu Fulass 109, 111, 132
 Haspelmath, M. 159, 215, 225,
 226

Hayward, Richard J. 114, 133,
 138, 142, 144, 151, 152, 154, 155,
 156, 159, 208, 211, 226
 Heine, B. 133, 146, 159, 211, 226
 Hetzron, Robert 107, 108, 133,
 114, 122, 123, 124, 133, 146,
 151, 159
 Hodges, Carleton 114, 133
 Hudson, Grover 3, 111, 133,
 151, 205
 Huehnergard, John 110, 134
 Humboldt, Willem von 61

I

Ibrizimov, Dymitr 105
 Ivanov, Vjacheslav V. 130, 133

J

Junggrathmayr, Hermann 39,
 90, 105

K

Kane, Thomas L. 118, 134
 Kaye, Alan 2, 4, 5, 59, 133, 133
 Keenan, Edward L. 130, 134,
 176, 177, 189, 203, 206
 Kiss, Katalin E. 131, 134, 135
 Klimov, Georgij A. 3, 4, 107,
 110, 118, 121, 122, 124, 125, 127,
 159, 134
 König, Christa 35, 39, 103,
 206, 226
 Korhonen, Eisa 105, 107, 197,
 202

Korrmann, Bernd 160, 193,
 194, 206

Krauwentberg, N. J. C. 110, 134