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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 speakers

Gawwada (/kawwâdâ/, [gawwâdâ]) 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 area feature encompassing Dullay, Konso, and possibly other varieties, as shown by Sasse (1998). The transcription is phonological and follows the IPA conventions, except for /l/ = IPA /l/, 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a direct offspring of East Cushitic, although Hayward (1978) has substantiated a proposal originally made by Ehret (1974, 1976), according to which, within East Cushitic, Dullay forms a genetic subgrouping with the isolated (and nowadays extinct or nearly so) Yaaku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 Weyto – 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 Tśamakko (who live on the western bank of the Weyto river); in this article “Gawwada” will be used instead for the dialect spoken in and around the villages 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 Tśamakko and Gawwada and, geographically, spans the two banks of the Weyto 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 Tśamakko 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 Konsooid 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. .*purda*$_{\text{subject}}$ *turure*$_{\text{object}}$ *it$a_{\text{verb}}$ ³
   hyena.man wind 3.SUB=send-PF.3M
   ‘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”* (2); a numeral (3); a possessive (4); another noun in a genitival construction (5); an apposition (6); or a relative clause (7):

2. $\text{akte } hiih-a$
   animals other-M
   ‘the other animals’

3. $\text{akte } to\dot{\text{otte}}$
   goat one-F
   ‘one goat’

4. $\text{akte } t\text{-ayyu}$
   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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUS</th>
<th>Causative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Consecutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTR</td>
<td>Contrastive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPM</td>
<td>Emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Impersonal Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPV</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPF</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Jussive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>Linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>Partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Semiaffactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SING</td>
<td>Singulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUT</td>
<td>Situative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURI</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Very possibly a subgroup of verbs, although displaying a partially different morphology and syntax.
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.: karno 'lion', karn-ito 'lion-LOC.M'
- **-atte** with Feminine nouns; e.g.: kollr '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.: naʔo (a male name), naʔo-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
ground=LOC.P 3.SUBJ=tun-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 genitive constructions with nouns in the locative case. 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=diš-i
squirrel-sing.M stone wall 3.SUBJ=PART=SIT=fall-CAUS-PF.3M
'I went to the market'

(14) seette t-aṣyu piye=ma "akkat-ti-ti
girl F-my ground=SIT sit-MID-PF.3F
' my girl sits on the ground' (from a riddle)

3. Adpositions in their phrasal context

3.1 The Locative case

Gawwada has one affixal Locative case (L OC), expressing both state and movement, also having genitive value (Tosco 2006 and 2007 a). I have assumed that the genitive value is a derived one, following a well known grammaticalization
As shown in Tosco (2007), the difference between *loc* and *set* 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 tiamakko=ma an-sili *i
   1.SUBJ-go-PRS.1s
   'I went to the Tiamakko country/to the Tiamakkos'

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

(16) *koll-a*te *sandu an-meece-fi
   river-LOC.F water 1.SUBJ-fetch-PRS.1s
   'I fetched water at the river'

vs. the ungrammatical:

(16') *koll=ma* sandu an-meece-fi
   river-set water 1.SUBJ-fetch-PRS.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 *set* are possible, with slightly different meanings; let us consider (11), repeated here below, and (17):

(11) *minn-ne te i=sor-ti
   house-LOC.S 3.SBJ-run-PRF.3m
   'she ran to the house'

(17) *minn=ma i=sor-ti
   house-set 3.SBJ-run-PRF.3m
   '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:

(18a) *leke sanyu=ma te okko i-fer-ti
   cows PRT-part one.M 3.SUBJ-die-PRF.3m
   'one of my cows died'

(19) *bokko an-na lik-ni
   slowly 1.SBJ-PART-come out=PRS.1s
   'I'll slowly come out (of it)' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")

(20) *ma=nik*
   PART-drink.IMPVS
   '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 clitics (Tosco forthcoming), in contrast to languages of the area (cf. Appleyard 1989 for clitics 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 Amborn, Minker and Sasse (1980) for the Eastern varieties of Dullay is unknown in Gawwada (as well as in Tiamakko; Sàvà 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 yauye ye=tech-eni i-pu*-
   headrest father=LOC mother give-PRF.3p 3.SBJ=fall-PRF.3p
   'the headrest father and mother gave me fell...' (from a riddle; kere 'headrest' is morphologically plural; cf. (7) above)

(22) *hoyda ato ar-ti=sa ap=pu*-
   place YOURS know-IMPRF.2S=DEF 2.SBJ=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

\[ a \rightarrow b \]

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) \( \text{gap} \rightarrow \text{piye} \) \( \text{nikkə} \rightarrow \text{gap} \)

fall.down-PF.3M ground sit-PF.3M fall.down-PF.3M

'\( \text{the Elephant} \) falls down, lies on the ground, falls down; he sneezes, he bel-

lows' (from the folk tale "The Elephant and the Frog")

4.2 Bare coordination: \( a_{p0} \rightarrow b_{p0} \)

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

Next to juxtaposition, the simplest marking is represented by the use of the coordinating element =\( \text{pa} \) (\text{link}) on the first clause and no marking on the second one:

(24) \( dıs\rightarrow \text{pa} \) \( \text{hal} \)

go.out-PF.5S \text{none} return.IMPS

'go and come back!' (i.e., go, reach your goal, come back)

(25) \( \text{ba} \rightarrow \text{te} \) \( \text{kitt} \rightarrow \text{te} \)

water.LOC-PD within.LOC \text{there} \text{be} water.PF.1S \text{link}

\( \text{ma} \rightarrow \text{lik} \rightarrow \text{a} \)

\text{be} \text{in} \text{there} \text{be} \text{water} \text{come.out} \text{put} \text{PF.5S} \text{link}

'I stay in the water and I'll slowly come out (of it)' (from the folk tale "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

\[ a_{p0} \rightarrow b_{p0} \]

and is a simple extension to classes of the use of =\( \text{pa} \) as a phrase-linking element, as seen in (27) above and in (26) below:

(26) \( \text{pako} \) \( \text{ba} \rightarrow \text{ok} \rightarrow \text{pa} \) \( \text{gaame} \rightarrow \text{lakki} \rightarrow \text{kkwa} \)

\( \text{an} \rightarrow \text{seek} \rightarrow \text{i} \)

mouth one.M \text{link} \text{ears} two.EMPH \text{one.M} \text{get.PF.1S}

'I got a mouth and two ears' (from a riddle)

In other words, using Haspelmath's (2004) terminology, =\( \text{pa} \) 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 (\text{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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perfective, Class 1</th>
<th>Consecutive, Class 1</th>
<th>Consecutive, Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to drink'</td>
<td>'to run'</td>
<td>'to go'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s ( \text{suk-i} )</td>
<td>( \text{so} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td>( \text{a} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s ( \text{suk-di} )</td>
<td>( \text{so} \rightarrow \text{d} )</td>
<td>( \text{a} \rightarrow \text{d} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m ( \text{suk-i} )</td>
<td>( \text{so} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td>( \text{a} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f ( \text{suk-ì} )</td>
<td>( \text{so} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td>( \text{a} \rightarrow \text{d} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p ( \text{sa} )</td>
<td>( \text{sark} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td>( \text{a} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p ( \text{sa} \rightarrow \text{ku} )</td>
<td>( \text{sark} \rightarrow \text{ku} )</td>
<td>( \text{a} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p ( \text{sa} \rightarrow \text{ki} )</td>
<td>( \text{sark} \rightarrow \text{ki} )</td>
<td>( \text{a} \rightarrow \text{a} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Consecutive never appears in a sentence consisting of a single clause:

\[
a_{cons}^{(a)}
\]

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 \((a_u)\) or marked \((a_d)\):

\[
a_{[0,1]} b_{cons}, \ldots n_{cons}
\]

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 criticized 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 \(=na\), the clausal use of the postposition is possible with other adpositions too, such as the Directive \(=nu\) (cf. (9), (19), (29)) and the Instrumental \(=ita\).

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 an "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: \(a_{[0]} b_{cons}\)

The use of the Consecutive after an unmarked clause is, as was the case for the bare juxtaposition \((a_{[0]} b_{[0]})\), textually rare:

(27) \(dššt \quad sōb \.cat\)
\(\text{go.imv}s \quad \text{piss-cons.2s}
\)
'go (S) to piss!'
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) aho ha=ppa ašš-áy
yons get.up-PE 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) mukak-itte lokko sünde itíah i=na=taah-ti=pa
toap.SING.F slowly water near 3.SUBJ=PART=swim-PE.3F=LINK nose
i=ašš-áu hul=ppa ašš-áu kutah n oon-ito
high=PART enter-CONS.3S=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 folk tale “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) ašš=pa húl
go-IMPVS=LINK rehit-IMPVS
'go (S) and come back!' (i.e., 'go, reach your goal, make a U-turn')

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?á
karmo an=hi?á
yesterday K.=DEF 1.SUBJ=go-IMP.F.1S=PART lion 1.SUBJ=see-PE.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
karmo an=hi?á
yesterday K.=DEF 1.SUBJ=go-PE.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=ašša in (37)), as well as the verbal form of the "b" clause (Perfective an=hi?i in (36) vs. Consecutive an=hi?i in (37)). The pattern

ašš= =na b=pa

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) xašuarr-itte=kka i=xu α=pa poyay a=na kuršiš
francolin.SING.=EMPH 3.SUBJ=IMP.SAY IMP.F=PART stomach
na=buuy=ti
PART=explode-PE.3M
as the Francolin flapped her wings her stomach exploded (the stomach exploded to her); from the folk tale "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=nna sakanoa=s:i hattay
1.subj.slaughter pl.1p=part meat=def-spec quickly
an=vi ne=ppa
1.subj.eat pl.1p=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 sakanoa=s:i hattay
1.subj.slaughter pl.1p=link meat=def-spec quickly
an=vi ne=ppa
1.subj.eat pl.1p=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:

\[ a_{=na} b_{\text{main or consecutive}} \]

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) sete=iess-i far=iess-i =dili=na
girl=def-spec die=pl.3m=def-spec 3.subj=go pl.3m=part
many in=na puku=s:i puku=nna =na
party=gen pl.3m=part hyena=gen=def-spec p. 3.subj=part

Kalik =dili=na
behind go=pl.3m=part
he went to the girl who had died, buried her, and further went after Punyose, 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 =spa: 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": maela =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 (dassi '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:

\[ a_{=ma} b_{\text{sit}} \]

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) inu dasti a Sande suk a-umna / muku=ite
juss go-juss.neg.2s water-drink.imp.2s=stf frog-sing.F
i=for=pok-na-ay
3.SUBJ=2.OBJ.pl.3M-kill:put-impl.3F
'do not go and drink water, lest the Frog kill you!' (from the folktale "The Elephant and the Frog")

(42) a=bi=ile=u=an u a=umna
3.SUBJ=look.around encount-impl.2s=stf
a=hes=pok-na-ay
imp.2.OBJ-pl.3M-kill:put-impl.3M=contr
'you'll look around | take care', lest you not be killed!' (from the folktale "The Two Mice")

8. The verb of the last clause in (40) contains the incorporated adverb kalik 'behind', the subject clitic preceding it, followed in its turn by the adposition =ma.
On the other hand, such a negative implication is not found in the following:

(43) ye kalbe kord-ma an-asin-a patio
  me provisions make.imps SIT 1.subj go-FUT-impe.1s=constr
  'prepare me some provisions, and I'll go and harvest the field!' (from the folk tale "The Francolin and the Squirrel")

(44) ye kalbe kord-ma an-asin-a patio
  me provisions make.imps SIT 1.subj go-FUT-impe.1s=constr
  'prepare me some provisions, and I'll go and harvest the field!' (from the folk tale "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 1999:21).

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) minaadalka oo ho a=yi’in-i horqooyey=ma
  house loc p thing M.conn imp=cat-fut-pf.3m plenty=SIT
  ololka ho koro pok k-a=kki
  something M.conn people kill-sem-impe.3m=constr 3.subj
  ban=ka
  be there-impe.3m
  'in the houses there is plenty of things people can eat, but there is something which kills the people' (from the folk tale "The Two Mice")

(46) samooy oo am-suurj=ma 1-al=t-oo
  sheep 3.m.pl look-for-pf.3m=SIT 3.subj lose-mo-pf.3m
  'I looked for my sheep but it went lost' (although I looked..., elicited sentence)

What links together these apparently divergent values of post-clausal =ma? In 3.2, =ma was defined as an adposition of state and movement implying an open, non-punctual, 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 (47) 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.
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. the use of a 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) S0As (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 a second, the Consecutive paradigm may well occur in its place; second, the Consecutive itself may be found after an "unmarked" verbal form in the structure a_{y} b_{om} (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 for 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 dependant, dependent clause, with the following clause as the main one and its verb as the controller.
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