1500 n.Chr. zu gewinnen. Nur allzu lange wurde dieser Zeitabschnitt wie ein wichtiges Vorspiel zu späteren Epochen der Staatenbildung behandelt.

RESUME

Sur la base de données d'une part recueillies sur le terrain et d'autre part collectées dans des archives sur 44 langues du Bantou du Grand Lac et 10 langues bantoues voisines, le présent article établit, en s'appuyant sur la lexicostatistique et les innovations lexicales, la classification génétique des langues bantoues du Grand Lac. Cette classification donne un aperçu sur l'expansion de la "langue bantoue" dans une aire connue pour ses diverses racines culturelles et où sont domiciliées des branches de trois des quatre grandes familles des langues africaines, à savoir le Niger-Congo, l'Afro-Asiatique et le Nilo-Saharan. L'analyse des langues bantoues du Grand Lac montre clairement les différentes étapes de leur expansion; elle dévoile en outre les aspects des interactions culturelles entre les locuteurs des langues bantoues du Grand Lac et ceux ayant parlé des langues non-bantoues. A l'aide de la glottochronologie, l'évolution historique du territoire occupé par les locuteurs du Bantou du Grand Lac et par leurs descendants a été calculée. Nous sommes ainsi en mesure d'avoir des lumières sur les conditions de vie et les habitudes de ceux-ci pour la période allant de 500 avant J.-C. à 1500 après J.-C. Cet intervalle de temps a été considéré trop longtemps comme un prélude peu important des périodes ultérieures ayant mené à la formation des nations.
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have, broadly speaking, two opposite views, summarised as follows by Heine (1982: 141):

"(1) The forest was inhabited by non-Sam-speaking people who, as a result of contacts with Sam pastoralists along the forest fringes, adopted a Sam language. This would imply that the Boni relationship with the Sam people is merely a linguistic one; their cultural origin would have to be sought with those hunter-gatherers who lived in the forest prior to the arrival of the Eastern Sam ...

(2) Part of the Eastern Sam, i.e. the immediate ancestors of the Boni, entered the coastal forest and adopted a hunter-gatherer existence. Such a development is likely to have been caused by war, stock raiding or ecological stress, forcing the Sam people to give up their livestock economy."

Broadly speaking, the choice is between an ethnic and economic preservation accompanied by a linguistic shift (hypothesis 1), and a linguistic preservation accompanied by a socio-economic shift (hypothesis 2).

Heine himself supports the second hypothesis, arguing that "there are a number of examples of forest hunters giving up their language in favour of that of their pastoralist neighbours. But in all cases known from East Africa, language replacement was preceded by major economic transformations, the forest dwellers adapting their economy to that of their neighbours" (Heine 1982:141). In doing so, Heine is coherent with his reconstruction of the history of the Sam peoples (Heine 1978:47f): the "Proto-Sam"-speaking populations, after having lost the ancestors of present-day Rendille, spread "in a south-eastern direction ... past the Lorian Swamps to the Tana River and along its eastern banks to the Indian Ocean", there, part of the population settled, while the majority turned northwards and became the Somali. Part of the "Sam" that stayed behind "due to unknown circumstances, were forced to give up animal husbandry and decided on a hunter-gatherer existence in the forest belt", becoming the present-day Boni.

I suppose that the "backwardness" of the cultural and economic way of life of the hunter-gatherers is probably at the very core of these theories: notwithstanding the dangers implicit in any strong association between culture and language, these peoples are assumed to be "linguistic survivors", because they are - presumably - "cultural survivors". These theories do not take into account that

1 The origins of the Boni language and people

The question of the linguistic status of Boni goes hand in hand with the problem of the very origins of the Boni as a people. We
language shift is probably a much more recurrent phenomenon than any romantic association between people and culture leads us to assume.

Linguistically, Heine’s hypothesis of subsequent binary splits has been criticised by Schlee (1987:297ff) for what concerns the Rendille-Somali relations. But Heine’s model is contradicted also by Ehret & Ali’s (1984) hypothesis of a Rendille-Somali split on a higher level than the Boni-Karre split from *Soomaali III (cf. below).

From a purely ethnological point of view, new insights into the problem of the origins of the Boni have been offered by Stiles (1988), who has stressed the importance of “the mechanism of casting out when an individual seriously contravenes a social norm. Female outcasts are created when a girl becomes pregnant prior to marriage or a married woman exceeds the fairly tolerant standards of fidelity in marriage by blatant promiscuity. Males might be cast out of society by not fulfilling proper obligations with kin, not settling disputes in the way agreed upon by the elders, etc. Children born out of wedlock become outcasts and often are said by informants to be left out in the bush to their fate” (Stiles 1988: 39). Many years before, Cerulli had already expressed himself against the hypothesis of a common origin of all the low-cast groups of East Africa, speaking instead of an “analogo processo storico ... l’incrocio cioè di più elementi etnici nelle basse caste” (1957:52).

The out- (or low-) caste role of the Boni and other peoples of the area, such as the Oromo-speaking Waata, the Bantu-speaking Ilwana, and, in my opinion, the Dahalo, too (cf. Tosco, forth.c.) - as is found today or was found until the very recent past - would have been, in other words, one of the causes of their very existence.

Stiles accepts Heine’s hypothesis of the Boni as “Sam who stayed behind” and turned to hunting. His reasoning is not that the pastoralists lost their cattle after having entered the forest (“I find it extremely unlikely that camel pastoralists went through the humid coastal belt. The type of vegetation and the presence of tsetse flies are both inimical to penetration by camels. ... It is much more likely that the pastoralists remained outside the forest belt” [Stiles 1988:41]); rather, Stiles argues that

“... One cannot view subsistence economies characterized by the terms hunter-gatherer, pastoral, agricultural, of fishing as being mutually exclusive. ... Early pastoralists no doubt engaged in hunting ...
Bajuni traditions. As for the Bajuni, Grottanelli (1955:202ff) has collected the names of at least three sections of the Bajuni who claim Garre descent: the "Kisimayu" (from the name of the island opposite the modern town of Kismayu), the "Va-Kachwa" (who inhabit the village of Gedeni, on the island of Koyama), and the "Tawayu" who are dispersed all along the coast. The people of Gedeni claim that they originated in Afmadow; they also claim that their ancestors, arriving in Koyama, met the Portuguese: as these lost their last stronghold, Mombasa, in 1698, Grottanelli dates the arrival of the Garre to the islands a little before 1700. In other words, the Wakatwa are not former Boni, as per Stiles, but former Garre who became Bajuni.

Coming back to the Boni, it is possible to consider the Boni language (not the Boni people!) as the result of the Somalisation (in fact, "Garre-isation") of an earlier population.3

The Garre clan is the most important member of the "pre-Hawiya" tribal family, made up of clans who claim Northern Somali origin and would have preceded the nowadays numerically preponderant Hawiya in their north-to-south expansion (Colucci 1924, followed by Lewis 1955). They are presently split in four geographically separated groups: "on the lower reaches of the Shebelle in Audegley district, around Dolo on the upper Juba, between the Webi Gestro and the Webi Mana in contact and to some extent intermixed with the Arussi Gassa, and to the south-west between the Ajuran and Digodia Somali and the Boran Galla of the Northern Frontier Province of Kenya" (Lewis 1955:27). As pointed out by Ali (1985:165), this very division and the geographical extension of the area in which they found today are hints to a previous larger occupation:

"There is a distance of 1,000 kilometers between the various present-day Garre settlements: Aweer populations span a distance of 500 kilometers. The existence of far-flung pockets of Garre-Aweer settlements [??] in southern Somalia and the Kenya Tana region, leads us to surmise that in previous times the proto-Garre as a group occupied a large and at least partially continuous territory: a territory encompassing the most remote sections of both groups."

Cerulli proposed that the Garre and the Tunni, coming from the northeast, crossed first the Webi Shabeelle and then the Juba: the Tunni settled between the lower Shabeelle and the Juba, immediately west of the Jiiddu - where they are still found today - while the Garre divided themselves into three groups: the first settled in the Dolo area, another between the Shabeelle and the Buur Haqaba area (the present-day Karre), while still another "si spinese alla foce del Giuba ed è ora del tutto disperso" (Cerulli 1957:66); Turton (1975:530) reports that "there are Somali traditions that the Garre founded the small town of Giumbo at the mouth of the river." Cerulli's hypothesis has been by and large followed by Turton (1975) and Ali (1985). While the former dates the Garre expansion to the period between 1400 and 1700, Ali, mainly on the basis of various Garre, Waata and Bajuni oral traditions, argues that "very late in the first millennium A.D." the Garre clan began a southward expansion ("very possibly in part owing to its adoption of the camel"), starting from somewhere "very possibly near the upper Jubby". According to Garre traditions, the movement began "from an area located at or near the present-day settlement of Luuq, down the right side of the River Juba. The expansion took the form of sections of Garre communities spreading from Afmadow southwards, until they reached the Juba-Tana region, where they "co-existed with Dahaloon hunter-gatherers"; their "impact led the Dahaloon food collectors to give up their Dahaloon tongue for Garre. To this day, the Aweer [i.e.Boni] ... speak dialects of Garre. All that remains of previous Dahaloon speech is a single community near the coast ..., and even its lexic has been influenced by Garre" (Ali 1985:161ff). Thus, for Ali the Boni are Dahalo who have been Somalised, just as many centuries before these hunter-gatherers had given up their original (?) Khoisan language and adopted a Cushitic language, i.e. Dahalo. In Tosco (forth.) I traced back to Karre some "Somali" loans into Dahalo, such as the verbs zir- 'to be there, to exist' (only Karre and Boni have Somali k > s [-i]) and munne- 'to swallow' (in Karre and Boni: Somali *s > 7/ for 'to swallow' for this root is found in Boni).

Naturally, central to this hypothesis is the assumption that the southward expansion of the Garre took place well before the 16th century, allowing a large enough time span for the language shift of the Boni to occur. While on the one hand Ali's dating ("very late in the first millennium A.D.") is exaggerated, Turton's time span (between 1400 and 1700), on the other hand, is probably too late as an absolute dating, if not too short for a language shift, especially
when one takes into consideration the autonomous radical development of Boni.

Sociologically, between the Boni and the dominant Garre there probably existed just that cultural and economic symbiosis to which Galaty (1986, with data on the Torrobo-Maasai relationship) has drawn attention as a crucial phenomenon in the comprehension of hunter-gatherer peoples. What is certain is that the Garre have been successively defeated and driven back by the Orma (Turton 1975) and by Northern Somali clans moving southwards. The record of their defeat is still found in the oral traditions of the area, e.g., in Dhinsoor among the Dabarre, who proverbially speak of “being defeated as the Garre” (C.C. Mansuur, pers. comm.). Today, whole reer of the Rahanwin and of the Tunni as well claim to be of Garre origin (Colucci 1924: 114, for whom also the Bajuni are “di origine Ghera”). One can safely assume that with the Oromo invasions the Garre influence on the Boni came to an end, and that the Boni entered into association with the Orma (which resulted in the strong Oromisation of Boni [cf. Sasse 1979], and possibly, according to Stiles, in the partial adoption of the Orma language). As anticipated, this Boni-Orma association was in its turn broken by 19th century Northern Somali penetration (and a new wave of Somali linguistic pressure on Boni).

2 Boni, Karre, and "Digil" within the Somali dialects

Linguistically, the classification of Boni bears naturally on that of Somali dialects, for which two proposals have been put forward in recent years: the first one by Lamberti (1983, 1984 and 1986), the second by Ehret & Ali (1984). As explicitly stated by the author himself (Lamberti 1983: 38), Lamberti’s classification is essentially descriptive and typological, and it is not meant as reflecting the genealogical interrelations of the dialects. Phonological, morphological and syntactic isoglosses are taken into account; lexicon is dealt with only insofar as four geographical areas are established: Karre and Boni, alongside with Maay and all "Digil" (except Jiiddu) which build up the third, or "Oberjuba", type - Jiiddu alone forming the fourth type.

While one could theoretically avoid the dangers implicit in the exclusive use of lexicostatistical data, when considering phonological, morphological and syntactic isoglosses, Lamberti in practice tends to give the same weight to phenomena of very different value: true phonological changes and shared morphological elements are put side by side with syntactic tracts and lexical data which are most likely the result of reciprocal influence or parallel historical development. Moreover, phonological laws without exception and mere tendencies which find application in just a few dubious cases; highly specific, relatively context-free and regular processes; and context-dependent, very natural processes are given the same weight. Thus, the desonorisation of initial /d, g/ in Karre and Boni (the most conspicuous isogloss linking the two) is valued in as much the same way as the spirantisation of intervocalic /b/ to /β~w/, a very common phenomenon, more or less widespread all over the Somali domain, and especially in the south (Maay, Dabarre, Tunni). The same tendency is found in Boni and a part of Karre (the speech of the Quranyow), but it is obviously unnecessary to ascribe it to Proto-Karre-Boni. It is rather an areal feature, particularly common along the left bank of the Lower Shabeelle, where it is found in dialects of different origin: Af-Bimaal, the local Ashraaf dialect, Jiiddu, Karre-Quranyow, and many others.

Moreover, the set of phonological rules which bridge the gap between Proto-Somal and the modern dialects are likewise deprived of intermediate stages, and therefore lack historical depth: they are rather to be taken as a set of "laws" of dialectal correspondences.

According to Lamberti, Karre, Tunni, Dabarre and Jiiddu make up for the southernmost group of Somali dialects, or "Digil". Lamberti points out that this is "the most heterogeneous dialectal group of the Somali Democratic Republic, and it is indeed questionable, whether the Digil dialects form a single group, or whether each single Digil dialect constitutes its separate group. This does not apply so much to Tu[nil] and Dab[arre], but it does to Gr [=Karre] and especially so to Ji[diddu]" (Lamberti 1984: 180). The very existence of the Digil group is justified by a few morphological and morphological isoglosses, and by the fact that the dialects were spoken by Digil clans (Lamberti 1983: 61f). For the Garre, we have seen that this is definitely untrue. As for Boni (which, being spoken mainly in Kenya, has no direct bearing in Lamberti 1983), it is affirmed that

"Also the Boni language of Kenya ... is very closely related to Gr. [=Karre], indeed one could say that Gr. is the Boni of Somalia or, if
you want, Boni is the Gr. of Kenya" (Lamberti 1984:182).

Apart from the obvious exaggeration - Boni and Karre are not alike - and the fact that there are Boni speakers in Somalia, namely the Wayoore clan (Heine 1982:12), Lamberti oversimplifies the difference between Karre and Boni when he states that

"The most salient difference between Boni and Gr. consists in the fact that Boni was more influenced by Oromo, while Gr. was more influenced by the other Somali dialects" (Lamberti 1984:197, fn. 13).

In sharp contrast to Lamberti, Ehret & Ali's (1984) classification does have historical implications, and aims at a reconstruction of the genealogical relations not only between the Somali dialects but to Rendille, Boni (i.e., the whole "Sam" subgroup of Omo-Tana), and Bayso, too. According to this proposal, Karre and Boni (called "Garree" and "Aweer", respectively) split directly from *Soomaali III, a proto-language lying at the base of all the proper Somali dialects except Jiiddu. Tuni and "Bardheere" (see below) split likewise from *Soomaali III; all the rest of Somali is derived from *Soomaali IV:

SOOMAALI
I. Bayso-Jiiddu
   A. Bayso
   B. Jiiddu
II. *Soomaali II
   A. Rendille
   B. *Soomaali III
      1. Garree-Aweer
         a. Garree
         b. Aweer dialects
      2. Juba
         a. Tuni
         b. Bardheere 4
      3. *Soomaali IV
         a. Maay
         b. Banaadir-Northern

(from Banaadir-Northern, all the Benaadir, Ashrauf and Northern Somali dialects are derived [Ehret & Ali 1984:209f]).

The consequences of Ehret & Ali's classification are:
a. Karre and Boni on one side, and Tunni and Dabarre on the other, have more historical proximity to each other than to the rest of Somali;
b. Jiiddu's position within the tree is even higher, on the same level as Bayso and even less close to Somali than to Rendille.

Concerning the internal relationships in the Karre-Boni subgroup, it is stated that

"It is also not clear that Garree-Aweer should be bifurcated into Garree and Aweer divisions. Dialect differences of some note are known to exist among Aweer speakers, and it is quite possible, for instance, that some of the northern Aweer dialects might be closer to Garree or that the group has a three- or four-way split" (Ehret & Ali 1984:211).

Confirming this supposition, the Killi dialect of Boni (the northernmost), being the most archaic, is the closest to Karre, and is therefore of special importance for reconstruction.

What is striking in both Lamberti's and Ehret & Ali's classifications is that one would have a Somali dialect closely related to a separate language. The problem has been raised by Sommer (1988:86):

"Hierbei handelt es sich erneut um eine Gliederung, die (aufgrund lexicostatistischer Evidenzen) einen Somali-Dialekt - das Garree - auf eine gemeinsame Gliederungsebene mit einer Sam-Sprache - dem Boni - stellt, die normalerweise dem Somali nicht in dieser Weise zugeordnet wird."

Having ruled out the possibility that "dialect" and "language" are to be taken as mere sociolinguistic labels (both Karre and Boni are, sociolinguistically, dialects), it is probable that behind these terms we are facing here a mixture of both sociological and historical reasons: Karre is naturally assumed to be a Somali dialect because it is spoken in Somalia by people of Somali culture who claim to be Somali; Boni is likewise assumed to be a language, as it is spoken by people who are economically, culturally and ethnically differentiated sharply by the Somali. The danger of this confusion between different levels of analysis appears to be obvious, and is well-known from other, better studied areas (the Italian linguistic situation be-
ing an example).

3 Reconstructing Proto-Karre-Boni

3.1 Phonology

3.1.1 Devoicing in initial position

The best known development which has occurred in K and B is the devoicing of /d/ and /g/ in initial position; /j/ (= [dз]) is devoiced and fricativised, yielding /s/ (= [ʃ]). While this last process is found sporadically in other dialects, too (as in Abgaal ṣomd ‘when?’, cf. NS īrma), the first two are indeed the most evident proof of a genetic relationship between K and B. Word-internal devoicing is very rare; apart from cases of /u/ < /d/ across morpheme boundaries (as in the verbal paradigms), we have no cases of devoicing of /g/ (Lamberti [1983:328] reports K kуkа? ‘thunder’, actually kуба), and only a pair of examples of /s/ < /j/: K bəsr ‘house’ and (according to Lamberti) таңшərin ‘guinea-fowl’ (cf. B daŋшər).

3.1.2 The treatment of */q/

In K, as in the neighbouring "Digil" and Maay dialects, the opposition between /q/, */q/ and */h/ is neutralised in final position, where */q/ only is found. In the other positions */q/ is realised as voiced ([ɡ], or, intervocally, [e]). While the neutralisation of */h/ and */q/ into */q/ is found in B, too, the treatment of */q/ is more complex.

From the comparison with the status of */q/ in B, one may conclude that neither the voiced realisation nor the neutralisation in final position were found in PK-B; they should rather have entered K from its present-day neighbouring dialects.

The present-day realisation of historical */q/ in B varies according to the dialect as well as the position; three dialectal areas can be detected:

(i) the northernmost Kilii dialect,
(ii) the immediately adjacent Baddey dialect,
(iii) all the rest of B (with partially autonomous developments in Bireeri).

Three positions within the word must be considered: word-initial, intervocalic, and word-final position.

Notwithstanding numerous exceptions, the situation can be generalised as follows:

Table 1. Realisations of */q/ in Boni.

| position | K | V | Hunter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>word-initially:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilii ḱаa, Baddey g'īdə, Bireeri/Jara ḏаa, Safaree ḏаa ‘bow’(K, NS qaano);</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K’-g’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilii ḱаbа, Baddey g’čid, Bireeri/Safaree/Kiijee ۆfəd, Jara ۆfəd ‘to catch’; Kilii k’or, Baddey g’or, Bireeri/Safaree/Jara or ‘to carve’ (NS qor ‘to carve, write’);</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervocally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilii ḱuk’a, Baddey dag’id, Bireeri dä(’)edə, Jara da’ad ‘to wash’ (NS dhaq); Kilii ḱ, Baddey dug’qoba, Jara dą’qoba ‘elders’;</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word-finally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilii yàk’, Baddey yag’, Bireeri yà, Jara jaa ‘baobab’ (cf. NS yaaq).</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduction of /g/ to //?/ and φ no longer operated when Southern Oromo influence affected the B dialects (cf. section 1), but voicing of ejectives in intervocalic position did and was generalised in many dialects to other phonemes. On the contrary, in Birreeri the universally marked character of the implosives /g/ and //?/ (cf. Maddieson 1984:111ff) prevented this voicing process:

Oromo k'oc'a > Kilii g'?a vs. Birreeri k'oc'a 'tortoise';

Oromo danak'a > Jara/Kijje damag' vs. Birreeri/Kilii damak' 'to be frightened';

Oromo waac'uu > Jar/Baddey waaj'ú, Kilii waaj'ú vs. Birreeri waac'o 'acacia';

and in some cases also caused a fortitive process of devoicing in intervocalic position:

Swahili tojiri > Kilii tøjýr, Kijje/Jara tsajýr vs. Birreeri tsac'ýr 'rich person'.

An exception to the preceding generalisations is Jara, Kijje and Kilii bág'ol '100' (Birreeri has reintroduced /k': bok'ol/; /g/ may here be due to the back context, or to the influence of neighbouring Somali dialects with voiced realisations.

Many other words defy any explanation so far, and their uniformity in every dialect is perhaps due to interdialectal borrowing, e.g., the word for 'bow string' has everywhere /?/ for Proto-Somali *//g//: Birreeri bù?u(n), Jara and Baddey bù?un, Safaree and Kilii bù?un (cf. NS and K boqon).

3.1.3 Common phonological processes

K and B share a certain number of historical processes, partially dealt with by Lamberti (1983:349ff); they can be subsumed under two general headings: (1) in a nasal + stop cluster, assimilation operates progressively for what concerns manner of articulation (i.e., the stop turns to nasal) and regressively for place of articulation (i.e., the nasal takes on the articulatory point of the following stop); (2) in a cluster of two dentals, total regressive assimilation occurs.

3.1.3.1 Reduction of nasal+stop clusters

a. m + b > nm ~ m. Example:

Kömür, B-Baddey sömür, B-Birreeri šomir 'bird'.

b. n + g k > n. Examples:

K hanûur, B hanyûro 'throat'; k lana 'the man'.

This process has little historical bearing, being highly natural and common. It has given rise to many occurrences of /g/ in both K and B which cannot be accounted for synchronically. In Tosco (1989:17) I discussed the status of /g/ in K, allowing it phonemic value on the basis of its unpredictability in medial position. The same probably is true of B; cf. the following pair:

B-Jara/-Baddey hanyûro and K-Tuuf haqoor 'throat' vs.
B-Jara/-Kijje/-Kilii hanûûr and K-Tuuf hanûur 'navel'.

c. n + q > nn n. Example:

K-Tuuf inno, B inno 'eyes'.

d. n, m + t > nn

This process occurs in the affixation of 2sg and pl and 3f subject affixes of verbal paradigms as in:

K-Tuuf unnoy (< *un-toy) 'you eat/she eats'.

For B, the process is dealt with by Heine (1982) under his "Conjugation IV" which groups nasal-final verbal stems:

B-Kilii unna 'you/she/we (will) swallow'.

3.1.3.2 Assimilation in dental clusters

a. d + t > tt ~ t

This process is found in verbal paradigms with d-final stems. Word-internally, it is found in B-Kilii itti 'fingernail', while K and the rest of B have iddi.

b. g + n, t > (h)n, (h)t

This process is found in the conjugation of the verb 'to see' (see below).
3.1.3.3 Diverging phonological processes in Karre and Boni

It is important to note that none of the preceding processes is found in the "Digil" dialects, which in this regard generally follow either Maay or NS. Other developments group K or B with various "Digil" dialects and against each other. Thus, /m, n + n/ result in /nn/ in K and in /nn/ in B:

K wa-s wany 'we eat', B-Kili 'we-?unna 'we swallow'.

Here it is probably K which has assumed an areal feature: /nn/ is found in Darabar, Tunni and Maay (Lamberti 1983: 362).

*/hn/ has been retained in K and in B-Kili, while other B dialects have */hn/ > /nn/. The same has happened in Maay and Tunni (Darabar has */hn/), but, again, we are probably facing autonomous developments.

If we accept the hypothesis that B derived from the linguistic shift of an earlier non-Somali population, we can well expect to find many autonomous developments in B, especially of a simplificatory kind, devoid of historical value in comparison. This simple fact seems to have been generally overlooked. Thus, we find in B a general tendency to shift any oral+nasal consonant cluster to either glide+nasal or nasal+nasal; e.g. */kn/ > /nn/ (B-Jara), /nn/ (B-Kili):

B-Jara má-a jiyne 'invariable negative of 'to drink''
B-Kili wá-ajinn 'we drink'.

*/sn/ > /nn/ (B-Jara), lyn (B-Kili):

B-Jara ha-?ofinné 'don't kill''
B-Kili ha-?igáyne 'don't kill''

The treatment of */dn/ is a good example of both the general conservatism of B and K vis-à-vis "Digil" and Maay, and the possibility of autonomous developments in B. */dn/ is generally retained as such in K and B. The only case of assimilation is found in K win(n)++, B wénn 'heart' (cf. NS wadne). From a Proto-Omo-Tana form with */zn/ this would be simply a case of desonorisation of /z/, with following */sn/ > /nn/. /dn/ is also retained across morpheme boundary in conjugation. The process */dn/ > /nn - n/ claimed by Lamberti (1983:361) for B possibly exists (the only example is á-boonnr 'we ran', B-Jara form; the root means 'to jump' in Somali), but, again, is an autonomous development within B.

While there are no historical phonological processes common to all but the "Digil" dialects, K, and B, a certain number of developments are found to occur in K, B, "Digil", a nd Maay. For example, in K and B as in Southern Somali in general, pharyngeals have become glottals: */h/ > /ʔh/ (the latter sharing the fate of original */ʔ/ and /h/; see above for the neutralisation of glottals in final position). But in general, the occurrence of these processes in K and B is often severely restricted. For instance, while palatalisation of */k/ (*/k/ > /ʔk/ /e,i [Lamberti 1983:273]) finds regular application in K and B as well as in Maay and "Digil", palatalisation of */k/ (*/k/ > /ʔk/ /e,i [Lamberti 1983:288]) seems to be found in K and B only in the word form 'armpit': K šišii, B-Birreeri šišil, B-Kili šiši šiši (cf. NS slikalo; this is the only example reported by Lamberti, and I could find no others). Thus, we have Maay and "Digil" 'seen 'to take' vs. K, B (and NS) keen; Maay šedid and Tunni šedid 'versus. K keledye, B-Kili kaledde (cf. NS keligay) 'me alone'.

Lamberti notes that 'Die Tatsache, daß diese Palatalisierung in den einzelnen, betroffenen Dialekten oft nicht bei denselben Lektionen durchgeführt worden ist, beweist eindeutig, daß sie einzeldialektal gewesen ist' (Lamberti 1983:288), but he nevertheless counts "Digil". It seems safer to conclude that palatalised words were accepted in the various dialects of the interriverine region, also touching K (and consequently B).

In conclusion we may state that, while K and B are linked by few but highly specific isoglosses, nothing associates them with "Digil"; rather, we find very general tendencies shared by K, B, "Digil", Maay, and possibly other Southern Somali dialects. This can also be seen in the quantitative analysis of Lamberti's isoglosses (1983:446 ff) between the dialects of the area; the percentage of shared innovations between K and Maay is higher than between K and "Digil":

K-Maay: 62.440 %
K-Dabarre: 58.293 %
K-Jiiddu: 53.957 %
K-Tunni: 63.636 %
B-Maay: 50.921 %
B-Dabarre: 52.611 %
B-Jiiddu: 68.125 %
B-Tunni: 53.149 %

The slightly higher percentage of K-Tunni is explained by the common process */-ay/ > /a/, but I have no explanation for the high value (68.125 %) of the B-Jiiddu pair.
3.2 Morphology

3.2.1 Verbal classes

Apart from a few prefix verbs (which will be treated below, 3.2.3) both K and B have preserved separate classes of suffix verbs for "causative" (here labelled C2) and "autobenefactive" (C3). C2 verbs are characterised by -s in 2sg, 3f and 2pl person markers; this feature groups K and B with NS against "Digil" and Maay, in which causatives are morphologically treated as C1 verbs - from which they eventually differ in the stem form. For example, in Maay the stem is extended by -y throughout the paradigm, and -s changes to -d; in Tunni final -y is added only before vocalic affixes which are the same as with C1 verbs; in Dabarre -s- has been re-analysed as part of the stem, to which C1 person markers are affixed.

Table 2. Past affirmative of causative verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>B-Kili</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>Dabarre</th>
<th>Maay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to give'</td>
<td>'to give'</td>
<td>'to give'</td>
<td>'to give'</td>
<td>'to cook'</td>
<td>'to count'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>siiya</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>siiyay</td>
<td>suiya</td>
<td>karasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>sise</td>
<td>sis</td>
<td>sissey</td>
<td>siita</td>
<td>karati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>siya</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>siiyay</td>
<td>suiya</td>
<td>karasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>sise</td>
<td>sis</td>
<td>sissey</td>
<td>siita</td>
<td>karati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>siiinna</td>
<td>siiyn</td>
<td>sinnay</td>
<td>sinnna</td>
<td>karasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>siiseen</td>
<td>siisee</td>
<td>siiseen</td>
<td>siiseen</td>
<td>karasen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>siiyee</td>
<td>siiye</td>
<td>siiyen</td>
<td>siiyen</td>
<td>karasen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K and B share an important isogloss in C3 verbs: they both preserve "-d" (realised /d/ in K and /d/ in B) in 1sg of present and past, and in 2pl of the imperative. While this is attested in certain Central Somali dialects (Banti 1983: 70), it is totally unknown in the interriverine region (see the Tunni paradigm below).

HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF PROTO-KARRE-BONI

Table 3. Past affirmative of autobenefactive verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-Tuuf</th>
<th>B-Kili</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s gabad</td>
<td>kabaa</td>
<td>'obaa</td>
<td>gabad - goba</td>
<td>qablay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s gabad</td>
<td>kabaa</td>
<td>'obaa</td>
<td>goba</td>
<td>qabatay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m gabad</td>
<td>kabaa</td>
<td>'obaa</td>
<td>goba</td>
<td>qabatay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f gabad</td>
<td>kabaa</td>
<td>'obaa</td>
<td>goba</td>
<td>qabatay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p gabaana</td>
<td>kabaana</td>
<td>'obana</td>
<td>gobaana</td>
<td>qabannay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p gabad</td>
<td>kobaa</td>
<td>'obaa</td>
<td>gobaan</td>
<td>qabateen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p gabad</td>
<td>kobaa</td>
<td>'obaa</td>
<td>gobaan</td>
<td>qabateen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Imperative affirmative of autobenefactive verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-Tuuf</th>
<th>B-Kili</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s gaba</td>
<td>k'baa</td>
<td>oba</td>
<td>goba</td>
<td>qaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p gabaasaa</td>
<td>k'baa</td>
<td>'oba</td>
<td>gobaas</td>
<td>qabaas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Quranyow dialect of K, which does not have /d/ in 1sg, has it in the verbal noun of C3 verbs (as gabaqaaal). This isogloss is shared by some B dialects, too:

Table 5. Verbal noun of autobenefactive verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-Quranyow</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>B-Bala, Kijee</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>K-Tuuf</th>
<th>B-Kili</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gabaqaaal</td>
<td>qbad'w</td>
<td>qwd'w</td>
<td>wa</td>
<td>gabaas</td>
<td>k'abann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Suffix verbs

The analysis of the personal affixes showing subject agreement is hampered by their reduced phonetic substance. While the past tense causes no problem - but is of little significance anyhow as the same endings are found in "Digil" and Maay - the present tense shows interesting differences even between K and B.
3.2.2.1 Past affirmative

In both K and B past tense is characterised by final -a. Lamberti (1983: 249) considers the -a endings of K, B and Tunni as reflexes of a law reducing *-ay to -a in polysyllabic words. This "law" seems to have touched the past endings of the verbs only, and a similar reduction is found in Dabarre and Maay, too. I am inclined to agree with Giorgio Banti (pers. comm.) on the fact that both -i of Dabarre and Maay and -o of K, B, and Tunni are not the reflex of *-ay but of a paradigm corresponding to the NS "short past". Moreover, NS 3m is marked by -ay instead of -a in certain varieties (Banti 1985:49), which could explain the difference between 3m in -i and 1sg in -o in Tunni - a feature found also in Ashraaf which was lost in the other dialects.

If the hypothesis of the derivation of K, B and "Digil" past tense from a "short past" is acceptable, the presence of final -a in 2 and 3pl in all dialects except B is a striking case of a B archaism: it is not B which lost a final /-a/, rather the other dialects (including K) adapted it in analogy to the other paradigms when they lost the difference between "short" and neutral past tense.

Table 6. Suffix verbs, past affirmative endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni-Kili</th>
<th>Boni-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>Dabarre/ Maay</th>
<th>Jiddu</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2.2 Present affirmative

The Karre Tuuf of the Qoryool area (whose speech is described in Tosco 1989) use a set of desinences in -ay for both dependent and main clauses (distinguished through the use in main clauses of the preverb so); other Karre - mainly Quranyow, seem to reserve the -ay set to the dependent present, while in main clauses the -aa set is used. A comparison with the Boni forms bearing no trace of /-i/, suggests that K-Quranyow has preserved the original form, whereas K-Tuuf has extended the dependent paradigm to main clauses. A dependent present with endings in -ey is reported for the Mogadishu Ashraaf dialect by Moreno (1953/54:119ff).

On the one hand, a PK-B paradigm in -aa can therefore be assumed, with shortening to -a in B. On the other hand, this leaves open the problem of the present dependent in -a of K and B-Kili, and in -o of B-Jara (see below).

Table 7. Suffix verbs, present affirmative endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni-Kili</th>
<th>Boni-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>Dabarre/ Maay</th>
<th>Jiddu</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>-ay ~ -aa</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>-ay ~ -aa</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>-ay ~ -aa</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>-ay ~ -aa</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>-ay ~ -aa</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>-ay ~ -aa</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>-ay ~ -aa</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a. 2pl and 3pl Dabarre forms are given with short /i/ and /a/ by Lamberti (1980); the forms with long vowels are reported by Lamberti (1983) and, for Maay, by Saeed (1982);

b. In Tunni, past and present are mainly distinguished through the use of the preverb so for the present/future;

c. For Jiddo present, the "altere Paradigma" (Lamberti 1981: 67) is used.

The 2pl form with -ii links K and B with the Benadir and Ashraaf dialects and has entered the Ogaadeen and other NS dialects spoken today across the Juba. I agree with Lamberti (1983:70), who considers -ii more archaic than -taan on the basis of its less paradigmatic coherence. -ii in 3pl is restricted to K and B; PK-B analogically reformed 3pl according to 2pl. A similar phenomenon was noted by Moreno (1955: 65) who wrote that "in alcune parlante del Benadir alla terza persona plurale si ode, analogamente, -ii in luogo di -an". In any case B and K have kept a
very archaic tract, while the extension of /i:/ to some NS dialects
can be a clue to the past influence of the Karre in the whole area.
(Lamberti [1983] instead thinks of an influence of the coastal, or
"Benaadir", dialects.) Another unsolved problem is the anomalous
B-Kiliil 2pl and 3pl present endings in -ùù.

3.2.2.3 Negative paradigms

Some B dialects (Bireeri, Jara) have a negative present para-
digm similar to the NS one, characterised by a set of desinences in
-o. B-Kiliil and K have instead a -a-set, i.e., the vocalic part of all the
endings is replaced by /a/ (as in the past), except for 2pl and 3pl
which are identical with their affirmative counterparts. I think that
for PK-B one can safely assume a set of desinences in -e- as in NS
-with the exception of 2pl and 3pl. In B-Jara final -c- of PK-B has
been retained (probably due to its high tone), while its reduction to
-a in K and B-Kiliil was part of the general process which reduced
final short vowels.

An -a-paradigm is found also in Tuni, Dabarre and Maay, yet in
these dialects there is no difference to the paradigm of the inde-
pendent present (except for possible tonal oppositions; cf. Saeed

In K the -a-set is used only in negative clauses, while in de-
pendent ones the ay-set is used.

Table 8. Suffix verbs, present negative endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Bireeri-Kiliil</th>
<th>Boni-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>-le</td>
<td>-le</td>
<td>-to</td>
<td>-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-c</td>
<td>-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-to</td>
<td>-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>-naa</td>
<td>-no</td>
<td>-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>-tun</td>
<td>-tun</td>
<td>-tuu</td>
<td>-tuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>-inl</td>
<td>-uu</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The negative past (or invariable negative) is characterised in K
and B, as well as in "Digil" and Maay dialects, by a -nV ending (NS
has -in). B has retained final -e which K, following Southern Somali
dialects, has reduced it to -a.

B: NEG + stem + -né
K: NEG + stem + -n

Banti (1991/92) argues for an Oromo influence on the Southern
Somali negative past -n- and points to another agreement between
Oromo on the one hand, and "Digil", Maay, K and B on the other;
i.e., the vocalisation of the middle root-extension (where Southern
Somali goes with Oromo in having -Cad/Iv against Somali -Cd/Iv
in 1sg, 3m and 3pl).

A striking isogloss linking K with B and excluding all the rest of
Somali is the presence of a long ending of 2pl imperative negative.
Just as the Tuuf dialect of K and the Kiliil dialect of B go together,
so do Quranyow and Southern B (partly Jara, Bireeri):

K-Tuuf  -naaka  B-Kiliil-Jara  -naha
K-Quranyow  -niin-o  B-Jara  -niya, B-Bireeri  -nîa'

(the B-Bireeri form is taken from Heine 1977:277).

Both endings can be traced back to PK-B, the present-day
dialects using one or the other. The K-Quranyow form is derived from
*nîya + -na (invariable past).

The very existence of an imperative negative paradigm is an
archaic isogloss linking K and B to NS, while "Digil" and Maay
dialects make use of the jussive endings -bs (sg) and -been (pl; Jiiddu
-ta; Lamberti 1983:104). As in the present negative, these dialects
express negation through the use of a negative particle alone, while
the more conservative K and B, just like NS, use the invariable
negative form (with tonal differences in NS) for the imperative
negative. The long affixes of 2pl imperative negative in K and B are
probably derived from the invariable negative and a plural marker
(?) *-a (cf. NS -ina < -in + a), i.e. -n + *a > *naha, -niya.

In K-Tuuf, moreover, -naaka can optionally mark the 2pl with
the invariable negative: the usage seems to be subject to stylistical
and lexical limitations, and it is said by the informants to be obso-
lete.
3.2.2.4 Verbal noun

To build the verbal noun, K uses -aal (Tuuf C3 verbs -aad⁄) while the B dialects use -ow. Both endings are found in "Digil" and Maay dialects. The verbal noun is a nominal form, only loosely linked to the verbal paradigms, and its desinence is apt to be borrowed, but, on the whole, borrowing of -aal in K (e.g., from Tuni) seems more likely than borrowing of -ow in B.

Table 9. Suffix verbs, verbal noun endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni</th>
<th>Tuni</th>
<th>Jiddu</th>
<th>Dabarr</th>
<th>Maay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-aal</td>
<td>-č (Kili), čč ~ čč (jara)</td>
<td>-aal</td>
<td>-aa</td>
<td>-ow</td>
<td>-č</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 Prefix verbs

The very existence of prefix-conjugated verbs opposes K and B to all the interriverine dialects, with the exception of Jiddu. While especially B - and to a lesser extent K - have retained a good number of prefix-conjugated roots, the paradigms have undergone deep restructuring.

The following prefix verbs are found in B and K. (Verbs which are not prefix-conjugated in one dialect, or are suffixal in part of their paradigm, generally the past tense, are represented by "/").

Table 10. Prefix verbs of Karre and Boni.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>B-Kili</th>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-aham-/-uhum-</td>
<td>-aham-/-uhum-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>&quot;to eat&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-isgaas/-isg</td>
<td>-isgaas/-isg</td>
<td>-isgaas/-isg</td>
<td>&quot;to kill&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-iyaad/-ibid</td>
<td>-iyaad/-ibid</td>
<td>-ibaad/-ibid</td>
<td>&quot;to come&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uwaad/-uwud</td>
<td>-uwaad/-uwud</td>
<td>-umaad/-umud</td>
<td>&quot;to die&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-erah/-erh</td>
<td>-erah/-erh</td>
<td>-erah/-erh</td>
<td>&quot;to say&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-raad/-raar/-raar</td>
<td>-jaar/-jaar</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>&quot;to run (slowly)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ak/-ak</td>
<td>-ak/-ak</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>&quot;to drink&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aab/-aal</td>
<td>-aab/-aal</td>
<td>-aab? (-) / -</td>
<td>&quot;to stay&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ehe/-ehe</td>
<td>(-) / -</td>
<td>-eh/ -</td>
<td>&quot;to be&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
peared, so that 1 pl forms are now exclusively suffixal.

In a synchronic analysis of K, therefore, there are no past and present stems but, rather, prefix and suffix stems.

While B appears to be more conservative as to the number of preserved prefix verbs and the general make-up of the paradigm, the actual forms were more affected by phonological developments in B than in K. Therefore, though the overall system of prefix verbs of PK-B is mainly based upon the B forms, the reconstructed paradigms below more closely resemble K.

3.2.3.1 'to come'

Table 11. 'to come', past affirmative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni-Kili</th>
<th>Boni-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>tibda</td>
<td>*irada ~ tibda</td>
<td>tada</td>
<td>tibda</td>
<td>imid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>tibda</td>
<td>tibda</td>
<td>tada</td>
<td>*tibda</td>
<td>tima(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>yibda</td>
<td>yibda</td>
<td>*yibda</td>
<td>yibda</td>
<td>yima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1FS</td>
<td>tibda</td>
<td>tibda</td>
<td>tida</td>
<td>tibda</td>
<td>tima(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PS</td>
<td>yibdeen</td>
<td>tibdeen</td>
<td>tida</td>
<td>*tibdeen</td>
<td>timaadeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PS</td>
<td>yibdeen</td>
<td>tibdeen</td>
<td>yida</td>
<td>*yibdeen</td>
<td>yimaadeen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. 'to come', present affirmative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni-Kili</th>
<th>Boni-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>tibday</td>
<td>*imaada</td>
<td>tyaada</td>
<td>*tibada</td>
<td>imaadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>tibday</td>
<td>tibaada</td>
<td>tyaada</td>
<td>tibaada</td>
<td>timaadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>yibday</td>
<td>yibaada</td>
<td>*yibada</td>
<td>yibaada</td>
<td>yimaadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1FS</td>
<td>tibday</td>
<td>tibaada</td>
<td>tyaada</td>
<td>*tibaada</td>
<td>timaadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PS</td>
<td>yibdun</td>
<td>tibaadu</td>
<td>tyaadi</td>
<td>*tibadun</td>
<td>timaaddaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PS</td>
<td>yibdun</td>
<td>tibaadu</td>
<td>yada</td>
<td>*yibadun</td>
<td>yimaaddaan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for final /u/ in 2pl and 3pl of Kili, see 3.2.2.2 above)

This verb has /b/ in K; in B both /b/ and /m/ are found in different positions. Moreover, the change to a glide has affected the labial in all B dialects except Kili.

Lamberti (1983: 294ff) has noted that an earlier *w > *b > m process as well as a more recent *m > b shift are attested in Somali. The latter, found particularly in NS and K/B, would in its turn have preceded the shift *b > w found in the Low Shabeelle region; it would be responsible for the B developments. While the shift *imaad- > *ibaad- can be posited in PK-B, it is noteworthy that K has not been affected by the successive *b > w development which, according to our informants, is found only among the Karre most influenced by Maay speech. (Spirantisation of /b/ to /β/ or /w/ is common in Maay, Tunni, Dabarre and Jiddu; cf. Lamberti 1983: 300.)

The situation in B is far more complex. Both /b/ and /m/ within the same paradigm are found in Kili, with /m/ restricted to 1sg forms. B-Jara has present forms with /β/, for which Heine (1982:79) suggests an improbable direct shift *m > y. A better explanation can be provided if the present stem -*yaad- is considered to have been built on the basis of the past stem -*id-, in which a labial between two palatal vowels had been dropped and was later reinterpreted as -*id-*, with the usual present stem marker /a/. Now, the labial most apt to drop between vowels surely is /β/. The complete history of the labial element in this root was therefore:

*ma (Proto-Somali -*imid-*imaad-)
*y (PK-B: still attested in Karre and B-Kili: -*ibid-*ibaad-)
*w (not found with this root in B)
*θ (past stem in B-Jara: -*id-, from which the present stem -*yaad- is derived)
*y (present stem in B-Jara: -*yaad-)

A different problem is the presence of /m/ in B-Kili, not only in the 1sg past and present but also in the verbal noun imaa dë, in the invariable (past) negative mi-imaanne, in the negative imperative sg ha-imaañne, pl. ha-imaañnahaa, and in the negative present 1sg haab'ena (~ haab'tba) and 3m haab'ena (~ haabjiba). Note that in all these forms there is no subject marker, which is likewise excluded in the 3m of negative present with /m/: the presence of /m/ seems synchronically to be triggered by the absence of person markers. We may hypothesise that PK-B was characterised by variation between /b/ and /m/; while Karre later adopted /b/ through-
out, the variation was preserved in Kilii under the form of a morphophonological alternation between a stem used with variable verbal forms, and another one used with invariable verbal forms. In the same way, the vowel alternation in Karre was reanalysed along the opposition within the paradigm between forms conjugated through suffixes only, and those which mark gender/person with prefixes. The former past stem -ibid- was used with prefixes, whereas the former present stem -ibaad- came to be used with invariably suffixal verbal forms (such as the 1pl past ibaanay and present ibaanay ~ ibaanay).

3.2.3.2 'to die'

The /w/-stage of the developments of the labial is attested in this root, which has /m/ in K but /w/ in B; here again, /w/ is preserved in every context in B-Kilii, while it is dropped between two labial vowels in B-Jara:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni-Kilii</th>
<th>Boni-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S ummu'da</td>
<td>'uwu'uda</td>
<td>'uda</td>
<td>*ummu'da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S tummu'da</td>
<td>tuwu'uda</td>
<td>tuuda</td>
<td>*tummu'da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M yummu'da</td>
<td>ywu'uda</td>
<td>yuuda</td>
<td>*yummu'da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P tummu'da</td>
<td>tuwu'uda</td>
<td>tuuda</td>
<td>*tummu'da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P muumama</td>
<td>nuwuda</td>
<td>nuuda</td>
<td>*numama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P tummudeen</td>
<td>tuwu'udee</td>
<td>tuuda</td>
<td>*numu'deen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P yummudeen</td>
<td>ywu'udee</td>
<td>yuuda</td>
<td>*numu'deen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3.3 'to kill'

In this root we find in both K and B dialectal variation in the stem vowel of the present:

K-Tuuf -igis-/igees- vs. T-Quranyow -igis-/igees-
B-Kilii -igis-/igees-
B-Jara -is-/iyees-

The /a:/ ~ /e:/ variation probably goes back to PK-B but is more widespread: one may think of such alternating forms as gaal – geel 'camel', and gaas – gee 'horn', which cut across dialectal groupings and are probably of areal character (G. Banti, pers. comm.). The evidence for an */a:/ > /e:/ shift (as per Lambert 1983:221) is scant.

Again, the present stem has been built upon the past; cf. the shift */g/ > /y/ in B-Jara and B-Kijee: *-igis- > -is- > present stem -iyaas-.

3.2.3.4 'to say'

As Banti (1988) has demonstrated, all the Somali forms go back to a *d-h root (found also in Saho-Qafar as dh: present ad he, past ed he); postvocalic /d/ has passed to /r/ in many Somali varieties, while /h/ disappeared everywhere when preceded directly by /d/. The NS stems irah(d)- (present stem), iri- (past stem), and oran- (for suffix-conjugated forms in north-central Somalia) therefore are derived from *irhaha-, *irhi-, and *orhan-, respectively.

The NS present and past stems are represented in K by irah- and ir-, respectively. The former finds a neat correspondence in B -erah-, while the K past stem seems to be a borrowing from neighbouring dialects (cf. Darbar ir- and Maay er-, both suffix-conjugated). In fact, the B past stems are -erah- in Kilii (in which /h/ has been preserved), and -(e)er- in Jara (forms with /e/ are reported for the past only). Note that 2pl and 3pl of the Jara present are built upon the past stem er-, which is just the opposite of the situation found in NS, with 2pl and 3pl of the past built with the present stem (see above). I have no explanation for this anomaly.

I propose to reconstruct for PK-B a present stem *irah- and a past stem *irih-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>B-Kilii</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>irray</td>
<td>*eraha</td>
<td>*eraha</td>
<td>*iraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>tiiray</td>
<td>teraha</td>
<td>teraha</td>
<td>*tiraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>yray</td>
<td>*yeraha</td>
<td>*yeraha</td>
<td>*yiraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>*irahay</td>
<td>teraha</td>
<td>teraha</td>
<td>*teraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>*irahay</td>
<td>*neraha</td>
<td>*neraha</td>
<td>*niraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>turrun</td>
<td>terahu</td>
<td>teru</td>
<td>*turhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>yirrun</td>
<td>yeruu</td>
<td>yeru</td>
<td>*yirhun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. 'to say'; past affirmative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K</th>
<th>B-Kilii</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like other Somali dialects of the central, southern, and coastal regions, K makes use of the stem deh- for the imperative affirmative and the verbal noun. In B, however, *deh- is unknown, and also the imperative (both affirmative and negative) and the verbal noun are built upon the present stem - often in alternation with different verbs altogether:

Table 16. 'to say'; imperative (affirmative and negative) and verbal noun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K</th>
<th>B-Kilii</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impv. Aff. S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impv. Aff. P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impv. Neg. S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impv. Neg. P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Noun</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kilii joom- is a borrowing - or a substrate form?; cf. Dahalo joom-)

The most interesting forms here are the Jara imperative affirmative and the Jara and Kilii verbal noun. As K deh- may well be a borrowing (among the "Digii" dialects, Tunni has suffix-conjugated de/ah- 'to say'), while an influence of Somali dialects using *ir- upon B is unlikely, one may assume that B has preserved an ancient state of things, with the present stem used also in the imperative and all the suffix-conjugated paradigms.

3.2.3.5 'to be'

The prefix conjugation has been preserved in the present.

Table 17. 'to be'; present affirmative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>B-Kilii</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>Maay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(An independent paradigm for B-Kilii is not reported)

As for suffix verbs, K forms show the alternation -ay ~ -aa (see above, 3.2.2.2), but seem on the whole more conservative than the corresponding B paradigms. A PK-B set with final *-ay (as has been proposed for the present of suffix verbs) can be postulated, with raising *-ay > *-ee > -e in Jara.

Table 18. 'to be', past affirmative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>B-Kilii</th>
<th>B-Jara</th>
<th>B (Sasse)</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>Maay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>ḥaṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
<td>ṣeṣa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The past is suffix-conjugated, as elsewhere, and has the "typical" Southern Somali -ay ending in 1sg and 3m (vs. NS -aa). Banti (1987:145) has proposed that both the Southern and NS systems derive through "opposite processes of analogical levelling" from an older paradigm with 1sg *ahay and 3m *ahaa. This process, as well as the final vowel found in his B paradigm (provided by H.-J. Sasse,
and reported above) - which I think represents the B-Bireeri forms - are for Banti "expressions of a tendency to align an older paradigm with the perfect of the 'Prætorius'-conjugation". It should be noted that Sasse's B paradigm is very similar to the K one, from which it is different in three minor points:

a. it has preserved in all its forms an original final vowel which K and other B dialects have reduced to /ə/ or to ə;

b. as in Jara, intervocalic */d/ in 2sg and 3f has become /d/; this is probably no more than a reflex of an areal tendency to make implosives the voiced plosives in intervocalic position;

c. 2pl and 3pl have lost, as usual in B, final */n/.

The past of other B dialects has undergone much more radical changes: Jara has lost the initial vowel; the Kilii paradigm is more puzzling: both /ay/ and /ee/ are found. The first occurs in both final position (1sg, 3m), and when followed by a non-consonantal ending (3pl), /ee/ occurs in front of the consonantal suffixes (2sg, 3f, 1 and 2pl). It is possible (from the evidence of Sasse's paradigm) that 1sg and 3m too, were originally marked by -i (as proposed by Banti 1987). In this case the preservation of -ay in Kilii would find a neat explanation on the basis of the sequence *-ay-i, in which final /i/ would have blocked the raising of the diphthong before falling out; on the contrary, -ay-C was raised to -ee-C, and would have caused the raising of the initial /a/ to /e/, too. Thus, this Kilii alternation can be original, while K and the rest of B would have independently levelled the first onto the second ending.

I likewise accept Banti's hypothesis of considering the final vowel of this paradigm as an analogical leveling onto the past of suffix verbs. On the whole, I propose the following PK-B past paradigm of 'to be':

### 3.2.4 Pronouns

#### 3.2.4.1 Independent personal pronouns

The following table shows the K and B independent personal pronouns in comparison with those of other Somali dialects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>*ana</td>
<td>ani-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>idi</td>
<td>ad(a)</td>
<td>*adi</td>
<td>adi-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>usu</td>
<td>us(a)</td>
<td>*usa</td>
<td>isa-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>iy(ι)</td>
<td>(ja)</td>
<td>*iy(ι)</td>
<td>iya-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(y(ι))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>unnu</td>
<td>un(ο)(ja), un(ο)(Ki)</td>
<td>*unu</td>
<td>anna-ga (excl.), inna-ga (incl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ado</td>
<td>*ada</td>
<td>idın-xa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>iy(ι)</td>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>*iy(ι)</td>
<td>iya-ga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dab (1)</th>
<th>Dab (2)</th>
<th>Tunny</th>
<th>Jiddu</th>
<th>Maay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>inne</td>
<td>inne</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>ide</td>
<td>ide</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ab-ə ~ u ~ i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>usu</td>
<td>usu</td>
<td>usu</td>
<td>usu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>iusšu</td>
<td>išu</td>
<td>iyi</td>
<td>išuššu ~ aži</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>unnu</td>
<td>unnu</td>
<td>unnu</td>
<td>unne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>iššuŋ</td>
<td>išuŋ</td>
<td>išuŋ</td>
<td>essen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>iššuow</td>
<td>išow</td>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>ussen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

a. The first series of Dabarre forms is quoted from Lamberti (1980: 49); the second one from Gebert & Mansuur (1984:175).

b. For Northern-Central Somali the forms of the standard language are reported, but with the core pronouns and the determinative separated.

The conservative character of K and B emerges clearly: K and B have not extended the element -s- to 3f and 3pl, as the "Digil" dialects have done. In this respect K and B go with Maay, but they are set apart from it by the 2pl form. While all the Somali dialects spoken in the area ("Digil", Maay, and "Ashrafil") have a 2pl based on *isin, K and B go with NS but lack the suffixed article which is found in the latter.

The divergent developments in K and B may be ascribed to regularisation of the paradigm in opposite directions: in B-Kili the final vowel of 2pl became /a/ in analogy with the 3pl /yo/; along the model of 2pl and 3pl (as suggested by Heine 1982:79), the 1pl *um was then changed to ano.

In K, instead, analogical levelling has affected the singular forms: note that they are built on a VC, CV₂ model, with V₁ = V₂, and each person is given a different vowel: /a/ for 1, /i/ for 2, /u/ for 3. 1pl *um is probably taken over from neighbouring dialects, which all have geminate /n/; final /u/ harmonises, as in the singular, with the first vowel (and the same form is found in Tuni).

The PK-B paradigm proposed is derived from the assumption that the reduced final vowel of B forms has been a successive development from */a/; forms deprived of final vowel are found, peripherally, in Karre (an, id, us, etc.; cf. Tosco 1989: 42) and in B (an, ad, us, etc. are the forms reported by Heine 1977:263).

### 3.2.4.2 Bound personal pronouns

Little can be said about bound pronominal forms. Here, K and B have /d/ in 2pl, as NS and against "Digil" and Maay. PK-B forms should have been identical with present-day K, while the B 2pl with final /d/ (short according to Heine 1977:264) and high tone may be interpreted as the result of analogical levelling, which changed VC to CV.

### Table 21. Bound personal pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni</th>
<th>PK-B</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Tunni</th>
<th>Dab.</th>
<th>Jideku</th>
<th>Maay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>*i/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ak/i/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>/ku/</td>
<td>/ku/</td>
<td>*ku</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>/ku/</td>
<td>/ku/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>*nu</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>nooku</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>/ad/</td>
<td>/día (1a)</td>
<td>*ad</td>
<td>xdin</td>
<td>xski</td>
<td>1sniṣ</td>
<td>assim</td>
<td>saq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a. The first Dabarre form is quoted from Lamberti (1980), the second one from Gebert & Mansuur (1984).

b. In Ji’di there are optional forms for 3 persons too.

### 3.2.5 Determiners

There are five types of determiners: article, anaphoric, indefinite, demonstratives, and possessives. Their shape is common Somali; where K and B present striking divergences from the rest of Somali and close resemblance to each other, is in the affixation of the determiners to masculine nouns. As usual in Somali, determiners are preceded by a gender marker. Of the common Somali gender markers, -k for the masculine and -t for the feminine, the latter is found in both K and B (though subject to morphological rules), while -k is present in K and B only with a subset of the determiners. With the widely used article and the possessives, the determiner is simply added to a masculine noun without an intervening gender marker.

The article is -s in B, phonemically -a in K (subject to reduction to /s/). With feminine nouns we have:

- **indefinite**
  - Kšimnirt
  - B-Jara šim(m)jīrt

- **definite**
  - Kšimni-rt
  - B-Jara šim(m)jīrt-rt

- **gloss**
  - "bird"
  - "id."

With masculine nouns:

- **indefinite**
  - K, B ḍīf
  - K, B ḍīf-ū

- **definite**
  - K ḍīf-ū

- **gloss**
  - "mouth"
  - "liver"
With vowel-final masculine nouns, K and B show divergent exits: K as -g, just as NS does (from which I think it has been borrowed), such as in webi, definite webi-ga 'river'; with vowel-final (/a/ in native vocabulary; also other vowels in loans) masculine nouns, B marks the definite with -atu, like in cal-à, definite cal-àù 'bag'.

In Tosco (1989) I proposed to consider -ka the underlying form of the article in K, on the basis of the behaviour of nasal-ending nouns:

K lan
laga (< lan-ka) 'person'

but in fact -k never "surfaces" in the article and the possessives in K (except sometimes with nasal-ending nouns, such as lan-ka, which is said to be less "pure" K). The evidence of B suggests, on the contrary, that in both K and B (and presumably in PK-B, too) the masculine gender marker is indeed ø with the article and the possessives, and -k with the other determiners (see Heine [1982:50] for B-Killii).

The following table shows the K and B possessive pronouns in comparison with those of other Somali dialects, and the proposed reconstructed PK-B paradigm.

**Table 22. Possessive determiners.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K</th>
<th>B-Kilii</th>
<th>B-Jarri</th>
<th>B-Bireeri</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>-ëy</td>
<td>-ëe</td>
<td>-ëe</td>
<td>-ë?</td>
<td>-k/t-ëy (-g/d-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-āh</td>
<td>-āa -- -aaha</td>
<td>-āa</td>
<td>-a7 -- -aha</td>
<td>-k/t-āa (-g/d-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>-jīs</td>
<td>-jīsa -- jīsaa</td>
<td>-ūi</td>
<td>-tjīsaa</td>
<td>-k/t-jīsaa (-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>-ēed</td>
<td>-ēeta</td>
<td>-ēē</td>
<td>-ēē(d'aa)</td>
<td>-k/t-ēed (-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>-āan</td>
<td>-ēene</td>
<td>-āni</td>
<td>-āan?</td>
<td>-k/t-āay (-g/d-a) (exc.1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-k/t-ēen (-na) (exc.1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>-ēn</td>
<td>-ōoza</td>
<td>-ūnl</td>
<td>-ūnl?</td>
<td>-k/t-ēn (-n-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>-ōod</td>
<td>-ōota</td>
<td>-ōo(d'aa)</td>
<td>-ōooda</td>
<td>-k/t-ōod (-a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a. The B-Bireeri forms are from Heine (1977:259, 1982:82), who also provides the three forms for Safaree (3m -ĩ(x), 3f -ēēd, 3p -ooda), and of Kije -identical to the Jara forms, except that 3p has only the short -oo form.

b. The Darbarre, Jiddu and Maay paradigms are quoted from Banti (1984:138f).

c. The gender marker is omitted, except in the third persons of Maay forms, in which it is merged with the possessive.

d. The last column reports the Maay feminine forms where they differ from the corresponding masculine ones.

K and B forms have a marked "northernlike" character; e.g., while the "Digii" dialects rebuilt their 2pl and 3pl possessive affixes on the basis of the independent pronouns, K and B have preserved forms similar to the NS ones.

B-Kilii shows again its conservatism, having retained a final vocalic element which was lost in both K and Southern B dialects. About this final vowel, which I propose to reconstruct as *-a except for 1pl and 2pl which had *-i (see below), the situation in B seems to confirm Appleyard's hypothesis that the final vowel found in (most) Somali possessives is original, and later underwent reinterpretation as an article:

"The final vowel of all but the sg.1, sg.2, and pl.1 exclusive of the Somali long forms [i.e. those with the added "article"], where the final element is indisputably the article, may be seen as original and only secondarily to have been reinterpreted as an allomorph of the article with the vocalisations -u, -u, and -u alongside the original -a" (Appleyard 1984:117).

The B-Kilii forms still have final /a/ on all forms except 1sg and 2sg. In the 1sg, after the regular reduction of *-a to *-u, *-/y/ assimila-
lated to the preceding vowel, causing its raising and tenseness: *-ey-a > *-ey-o > -ee. Note that tenseness of the vowel alone synchronically distinguishes in Jara 1sg from 3f.

In the 2sg, /h/ blocked the regular process of reduction to /e/. When the final vowel was lost, /h/ changed to /?/ (as normal in final position; cf. 3.1.2) - a stage still found in Bireeri. The drop of final /?/ in Kilili and Jara caused lengthening of /a/. The proposed development went like this:

*-aha
*-ah
*-ä
*-äa

1pl and 2pl of PK-B had final *-i, preserved in Jara. In the 1pl of Kilili final *-i/ shifted to */a/ but caused the raising of preceding */aa/ to /ee/. Therefore: *-aan-i > *-een-a > -een-o. I think that an alternative explanation, namely that -een-o was simply borrowed in recent times from a neighbouring NS dialect, is unlikely (such a borrowing would be isolated within the paradigm). The 2pl was instead analogically rebuilt upon the model of 3pl (as in the personal pronouns); final *-i/ was then reduced to /e/, inducing tenseness of the preceding vowel: *-iin-i > *-oon-i > -oon-o.

The proposed reconstruction of 3f and 3pl with /d/ (retroflex) follows Heine (1978) and Appleyard (1984), and it is supported by the Bireeri forms and by the long form of Jara 3pl -ooda. In B, retroflex /d/ changed to implosive /d/ (Heine 1977:249). The 3f B-Jara form -ëdë would have been derived from *-eda, in which /d/ would have first been shifted to /t/ or /r/, and then lost altogether. The B-Kilili forms with /t/ go back to a suffixed feminine gender marker -t - alternatively, one may think that the 3f and 3pl were reinterpreted as containing an affixed gender marker (as proposed by Appleyard 1984 for NS). Now, it is a general process that in a /dt/ cluster the implosive assimilates to the plain stop (cf. Tosco 1988:324). Therefore, the affixation of /t/ took place after PK-B */d/ shifted to B /d/ (and was most probably a particular development of Kilili), and the historical development was:

*\(d\) (PK-B)
*\(d\) (Proto-Boni)
*\(\dot{t}\) (suffixation of a feminine gender marker or reinterpretation of the form; Proto-Kili)
*\(\ddot{t}\) (assimilation of the implosive)
*\(\dddot{t}\) (modern B-Kilili form, in which the geminated consonant has been simplified, and the form is no more bi-morphemic; the gender marker has been completely "absorbed")

The 3pl short form -oo of Jara is probably built on the model of the other three forms (3m - ß, 3f -ëë). In K the final vowel was lost altogether under pressure from the neighbouring dialects and the paradigm assumed, in this respect, its current "Southern Somali" aspect.

The following determiners are always preceded, in K and B (as in the other Somali dialects), by the gender marker of the noun they are affixed to.

The anaphoric is -ii in K, it is not mentioned as such by Heine (1982), but an -i affix is found on the head of relative clauses (as the anaphoric in Somali) in B-Bireeri (Heine 1982: 31).

The indefinite (used in K even in interrogatives) is -oo in K, corresponding to the B "particular" -oo. This is an isogloss with Maay and Benaadir dialects, and traces of it are found in NS, too.8

The state of PK-B demonstratives is more difficult to ascertain: K has both the common Somali -an 'this' and -aas 'that', and I think that *-an and *-aas can be posited for PK-B, too. The first is represented in B by a -a (→-a in B-Kilili, thus homophonous with the article) - final *-n/ has dropped in B as usual. *-aas has disappeared without trace. This, and the (near-)homophony of the article and the near demonstrative, have led the B dialects to develop new demonstratives through the affixation of deictic elements to other determinants; thus, -h (Jara) and -h (Kilili) are added to the indefinite/particular -oo in order to convey the meaning of 'that': B-Jara -k/-t-he, B-Kilili -k/-t-ëhe. In Kilili this has shifted to the role of unmarked deixis (*NEAR, -FAR'; Heine 1982: 52), and far deixis is expressed by the autonomous form fida 'that finger'. In Jara, a new anaphoric ("PAST, NEAR HEARER"; Heine 1982: 31) has been formed with the affixation of -au to the definite form of the noun; this element seems to be the Waata Oromo deictic suu 'that, those'.9

An isogloss shared by K and B alone is the element kun- which
marks plurality on demonstratives: K kukkan, -kunu ‘these’, kunas ‘those’, corresponding, respectively, to B-Jara -ku(ro) and kunxogh, and to the B-Kili predicate demonstratives waa-kiniu and waa-kuniu.

### 3.2.6 Particles

K and B share with some Southern Somali dialects the merging of NS ka (‘from’, ABLATIVE) and ku (‘in; with’ INSTRUMENTAL) into ka. But they have u for ‘to’ (GOAL), while Maay and "Digil" have in or the like (also Tunni i belongs here).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>Dab</th>
<th>Maay</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>u ‘to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kə</td>
<td>kə</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>‘too; wish’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>kə</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>‘from’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronominal particles of K and B show no peculiarities; they are given here for reference:

### Table 24. Pronominal particles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>Dab</th>
<th>Maay</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>‘wish’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronoun in K is 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>Dab</th>
<th>Maay</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>s(a)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>a6</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>reflexive/reciprocal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lə</td>
<td>l(t)</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>lə</td>
<td>impersonal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

For Dabarre, lə is reported by Gebert & Mansuur (1984). I found no instances of a reflexive/reciprocal pronoun.

Somali dialects either obligatorily mark with a focus marker any declarative sentence (NS and Benaadir), or lack a verbal focus marker altogether ("Digil" and Maay).

Karre and Boni share with NS and Banaadir dialects the characteristic of possessing both a verbal and a nominal focus particle, but, unlike them, a pragmatically neutral sentence can be left syntactically unmarked as far as focus is concerned, just as in "Digil" and Maay, where a verbal form can by itself be a grammatical sentence.

The existence of a verbal focus marker is surely to ascribe to PKB, as it is found not only in K (which could have borrowed it from Standard Somali), but also in B.

In K a sentence pragmatically neutral in focus can be found without a focus marker, but normally, as in NS, the verbal focus marker is present. Speakers seem to diverge in their acceptance of focus unmarked sentences; some speakers accept unmarked sentences as answers in a dialogue (Tosco 1989: 70), whereas NS would use the short or independent past (cf. Banti 1985: 49). As in the other dialects, WH-questions lack a focus marking - as focus is inherent in the WH-word.

A syntactically similar system is found in B: Sasse (1981) found focusless sentences in his texts, but the norm seems to be the presence of a focus marker in B too, obligatory according to Heine (1977 and 1982); "neutral" focus being expressed through the use of the verbal focus marker.

Also the actual expression of focus in K looks very much "NS-like": nominal focus is marked by yaa (or suffixed -aa), or by iyaa (which is never suffixed and said to be a typical K-Tuuf form). Verbal (and neutral) focus is expressed by preverbal wa. K iyaa is probably a recent loan from NS.

B focus markers are ō for nominal focus and d (wa in Kili) for verbal focus. They look more conservative than the K forms, and very similar to the Rendille focus markers -é (nominal focus) and -d- (verbal focus; cf. Oomen 1978). I propose a very similar system for PK-B, with nominal focus expressed by a front vowel (*é ?*), and a verbal focus marker *wa. The reconstruction of PK-B focus markers finds thus external support, and it is a clear instance of conservatism in peripheral dialects.

Traces of the original nominal focaliser are also found in the focalised personal pronouns. As in NS, they are characterised by final high, but differently from what is the case in NS (cf. anáa, addá from ani/-adi- + (b)aa), the final vowel is high in both K and B on
the one hand, and Rendille on the other (except, in B and Rendille, when the final vowel of the pronoun is back); the origin of these forms from the affixation of the nominal focus marker is more evident in B-Jara (especially 3m and 3f).

Table 26. Focalised personal pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Karre</th>
<th>Boni</th>
<th>Rendille</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>*inj</td>
<td>*nëë</td>
<td>*nëë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>*inj</td>
<td>ade</td>
<td>atë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>ujin</td>
<td>*usëë (Jara), *usë (Kili)</td>
<td>usëë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>jynj</td>
<td>*inë (Jara), jynë (Kili)</td>
<td>icëë (excl), intë (incl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>untni</td>
<td>unëë (Jara), anë (Kili)</td>
<td>nëëë (excl), intëë (incl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>atni</td>
<td>adëë</td>
<td>atëë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>jynj</td>
<td>jynëë</td>
<td>icëë</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rendille forms from Oomen (1978: 61).

According to Heine & Reh (1983), the obligatory and all-encompassing focus marking is the final stage of development of focus marking systems. Our knowledge of Southern Somali dialects is still lacking, but it is interesting to note that the otherwise very innovative "Digil" and Maay lack the obligatory marking of focus and the verbal focus marker, found instead in Rendille and NS (and, by and large, in K and B, too).

3.2.7 Nominal plurals

The K and B major characteristic in nominal number marking is the use of the following pair of affixes:

a. a dental affix with masculine nouns,
b. a vocalic affix with feminine nouns.

The only dialect which closely resembles K and B is Tunni. In other Southern Somali dialects, in particular Dabarre, the use of a dental affix for masculine nouns is widely known, but the vocalic affix is lacking.

It is also important to note that this clear-cut picture has been partly obscured, in K due to the loaning of NS and Southern Somali plural markers, in B for the phonological processes which some of the plural affixes have undergone, and also for the use of other markers of unclear origin.

The dental affix for masculine singulars is -ë, while the marker for the feminine is -ë. They are by far the most frequent plural markers in both K and B, and can be posited for PK-B, too.

It is probable that these affixes in origin were gender markers: masculine names were pluralised with the feminine gender affix -ë plus the determiner -ë; feminine names, conversely, with the determiner -ë, preceded by $\emptyset$ (masculine nouns).

Alongside -ë and -ë both K and B bear traces of a third plural marker, which I reconstruct as *-ców. Evidence for this marker comes partly from the existence in both K and B of one and the same morphophonemic process.

In K and B, as in many other Somali dialects, a general phonological rule prescribes /l/ $\rightarrow$ /s/; but this rule is blocked in K and B when /l/ is part of the plural marker of masculine names -ë. E.g., the feminine article -ë fuses with the final /l/ of a feminine noun, yielding /s/ (/ss/ in B-Kili):

K  meël + -ë (ART) $\rightarrow$ meësëë 'the place'
B-Jara meël + -ë (ART) $\rightarrow$ meësësëë 'id.'
B-Kili meël + -ë (ART) $\rightarrow$ meësësëë 'id.'

/l/ $\rightarrow$ /s/ applies also between a /l/-ending verbal root and a 2sg, 3f and 2pl desinencc:

K  je?'nëë + tahëë $\rightarrow$ je?'ëëhëëë 'you love/she loves'
B-Jara ma?'ëël + ta $\rightarrow$ ma?'ëësëëë 'you will hear'

Instead, when the pluraliser -të is added to a masculine name ending in /l/, two possibilities occur: either no process intervenes and the sequence /l/ is preserved:

K  bëal + -ë (PL) $\rightarrow$ bëalëëë 'feather(s)'
B-Jara, Kili bëal + -ë (PL) $\rightarrow$ sëalëëë 'thumb(s)'
or, in a part of K and B /l/ shifts to /s/ but /l/ is preserved:

K  bëal + -ë (PL) $\rightarrow$ bëalëëë 'feather(s)'
B-Jara, Kili bëal + -ë (PL) $\rightarrow$ bëalëëë 'id.'

The blocking of the rule /l/ $\rightarrow$ /s/ (where /l/ is part of a plu-
rall morpheme) is found in Tunni (baaltó ‘feathers’); in Jiiddu and the so-called Ashraf dialects, instead, the rule does not exist and /lit/ is retained everywhere. The second solution (/lit/ → /lit/ where 
/l/ is part of a plural morpheme) is not attested, as far as I know, elsewhere. For what concerns the other neighboring dialects of K, in Maay /l/ assimilates to the preceding /l/, yielding /ll/ - the most important isogloss of Maay according to Lamberti (1983:52); in Dabarre, /lit/ → /lit/ is generalised (as in NS and other dialects). Borrowing of /lit/ into K and B is therefore excluded. The following section deals with the origin of the morphophonemic rule /lit/ → /lit/ (where /lit/ is part of a plural morpheme).

There is evidence that -šó (which can presently be regarded as an allomorph of -š) was originally a different suffix altogether; the first proof comes from the fact that in B-Kili -šó is used also with a number of other nouns, mainly /-f/- and /-n/-final, but also vowel-final:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bal</td>
<td>buašó</td>
<td>‘nest(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo'ór</td>
<td>bçáferó</td>
<td>‘calabash(es)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dibín</td>
<td>dibísó</td>
<td>‘jaw(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngeró</td>
<td>ngařóó</td>
<td>‘eyebrow(s)’ (also in B-Jara; a Swahili loan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second and more important fact pointing to a separate suffix comes from the Bireeri dialect, where -čó regularly corresponds to -šó of other dialects:

B-Bireeri     suul-čó vs. suul-šó ‘feathers’
hamad-čó vs. hamat-šó ‘chests’
hamín-čó vs. hamín-šó ‘cooking-pots’

The phoneme /č/ - though present without comments in Heine's (1982) dialectal descriptions, is of rare occurrence, being mainly restricted to loans (as the Orma singulative -čág in Jara) and a few words such as cáló ‘bag’), and, in Bireeri, to the plural affix -čó; but its presence in PK-B can be assumed on the basis of the “jüngerer Palatalisierungsgezette” (Lamberti 1983: 287) which derive /š/ from */k/ in Maay, “Digiti” and K-B. The first of these laws, in Lamberti’s reconstruction, went like this: *k → s’, i.e.

Contrary to Lamberti, I think that an intermediate stage with */č/ has to be posited (as already proposed by AIl), not only on the basis of the B evidence, but also on general phonetic grounds: velar /k/ must shift forward its articulation point to palatal /č/ before turning to palatal fricative /š/. The phonological context of the rule has to be modified, too, as the presence of a following /l/ or /e/ is doubtful, both in the case of the plural affix and in some cases discussed by Lamberti (as Dabarre šó ‘aufstehen’; cf. NS kac). On the whole, one has to speak more of a tendency to palatalisation than of a proper rule (cf. also 3.1.3.3).

Following Heine’s reconstruction of Proto-Boni (1982:73), I assume therefore the phoneme */č/ and a plural marker *čó (going back to *ča) for PK-B. This affix has been maintained in Bireeri as -čó, and turned into -šó in K and the other B dialects.

We can now see the origin of the plural markers of B and K -tó, -ö and -čó as going back to the gender markers. The gender markers acted as plural markers (with possibly a different final vowel: -a vs. -o) when used with nouns of the opposite gender. PK-B, in this view, resorted for expressing the nominal plural to a radical version of the concept of "polarity", whereby feminine nouns become masculine in the plural, and conversely, masculine nouns make feminine plurals. My idea can also be seen as a revision and an extension of Oomen (1981), who proposed the feminine marker *ór as the source of Rendille plurals. Moreover, plural morphemes in -k, though rare, are not totally unknown in Cushitic, being found in Yaaku, Dahalo, and the Agaw languages (cf. Zaborski 1986); shift to -šó is likewise common. The use of the masculine gender marker as a pluraliser can therefore be seen as a tendency surfacing from time to time in Cushitic.

Two plural markers of feminine nouns were used in PK-B (*a and *ča) because two were the morphemes which expressed the masculine gender marker: a with the article and the possessives, and -k with the other determinants.

In the subsequent history of PK-B, *ča was largely reduced in scope because, as it turned to -šó, it lost its association with the masculine gender marker - a link retained instead by -a, which extended therefore its use as the "normal" marking of plural feminine nouns.

The main problem with this proposal is that while the gender association of -šó and -a is quite strict (*a being used with masculines, -čó with feminines), -čó and -šó are found with nouns of both genders. In K and B-Jara, actually, the only (few) examples are for masculine nouns (and at least in K šó can be treated as an allomorph of -čó). Especially B-Kili seems to have enlarged the number of šó plurals, also to feminine nouns:
3.3 Lexicon

Chapter 3 of Heine (1982) is devoted to the reconstruction of dialect development within B. Heine points out the main dialect areas and suggests a series of splits from Proto-Boni. The principal flaw in his work is that it does not take into account Somali at all, deriving Boni directly from Proto-Sam, and thus arriving at reconstructions which are utterly at odds with the Somali picture. For example, Heine posits a P-B form *tāur ‘forest’, on the basis of B-Ki tāur. All the other B dialects, and K alike, have duur, and this is the common Somali form, too. The problem is therefore to decide that tāur was the Proto-Karre (and consequently Proto-Boni) form, and present-day K and B other than Kilii have lost the initial devoicing in this word in a process of Somalisation, or that Ki has just extended the devoicing to this and other words in which it was never present in K.

This is not the only instance in which the Kilii dialect of B looks "more Karre" than Karre itself: devoicing of initial /d/ and /g/ is found in Kilii only, while the common Somali form is found elsewhere. Another case is B-Ki kqas vs. K gees ‘horn’.

The following list of partial or absolute K/B lexical isoglosses is not meant as exhaustive:

1. *suur ‘good, beautiful’: K suurle, B-Bireeri suur-ida, B-Jara and Kijee suur-iya, B-Kilii suur-īwa (Heine 1982:110). This isogloss has been cited by Ali (1985:164). NS has suur ‘beauty; good shape’ (from Arabic suura ‘form, shape; manner’). The K form thus means ‘having goodness, beauty’, while the B forms mean ‘being good’. The use of this lexeme as the normal way to express of ‘good, beautiful’ is limited to K and B.

2. K oy, B oy ‘dog’; all the rest of Somali has e(e)yi.

3. K sakuu ‘semi-fluid butter’, B-Kilii sakūūr, B-Jara, -Kijee sakūūr ‘fat, oil’ (Heine 1982:105). This word is found also in Tunni suqur (Ali 1985:234, n.29), and could be of areal diffusion.

4. K kuba?, B kiwq ‘thunder’ (Heine 1982:133); Ali (1985:311, n.198) has a K form with intervocalic /w/; kiwq?; other Southern Somali dialects have either intervocalic /g/, as Ji giga?, Maay giga? (Lamberti 1983: 328, who gives also K kuka ?, cf. also Kendille gugah [Ali 1985:311, n.198], NS gac) or other roots are found: Tu hur (Ali 1985:312, n.198).

5. K ma’dan, B-Kijee, -Baddey, -Jara ma’dā ‘sweet’ (Heine 1982:131); “Digil” and Maay have shifted intervocalic /?/ (= */?/)
(6) Another case of intervocalic //*/ (< */*/ in K is kaʔan 'arm' (root not reported for B) vs. Tu ganq?, Ji jinis, and "Dhinsoor", "Afgooye", etc. gallan (Ali 1985:233 ff, n.45).
(7) K maduul, B-Jara, -Baddey mutuul 'charcoal' (Heine 1982: 98); cf. NS mad(di)uul 'soot'; Maay and "Digil" alike have other words: Ji jirim, Maay dihuul, madid (Ali 1985:345f, n.65).
(8) K maʔaq, B-Safaree, -Jara, -Kijee, -Killi maʔan, but B-Bireeri madag (Heine 1982: 118) 'name' vs. common Somali *magaj: NS magac, Rendille magak, Maay, Tu maga? (Lamberti [1983: 359] gives erroneously this form as K, too); K and B are derived from a PK-B form with metathesis /g/-/*/. *(9) K iddoood, B-Bireeri, -Jara iddoohood (Heine 1982: 137) 'women'; Lamberti (1983: 460) relates this form to Tu dhaggow, Rendille deiyo as "ein typisches Lexem des Niederschelbe-Raums" - but the phonological evidence is scanty. The Tu and Rendille forms can rather be linked with NS dhaddig 'woman'. The K and B forms can instead be seen as instances of morphological collectives of the type of NS bidood 'slaves', dheddigood 'women' (Giorgio Banti, p.c.).
(10) A K/B-Kili isogloss is manah 'to vomit'; the rest of B has maah (Heine 1982:135). I think that the K/B-Ki form goes back to PK-B, while the rest of B has accepted a more recent NS loan (cf. NS man(n)tag).
(11) Another word which links K with B-Kili is K kirkirir, B-Ki kikirr 'wart-hog' (Heine 1982:121; the rest of B has an Oromo loan). But this word is known in other interriverine dialects as kirkirir, and can be considered another case of lexical areal diffusion (G. Banti, p.c.).
It is fair to assume that the K lexicon has been "re-Somaliised" in recent times, acquiring many areal interriverine and common Somali words, while the Boni have better preserved the original K forms. For example, K has ṣid 'stone', which is an areal word of the interriverine zone (found at least in Maay, Tunni, and Dabarre), while B has various correspondences of Northern Somali dhagax. We may therefore assume that the reflex of Proto-Somali *dagah was found in Proto-Karre-Boni, too.
The process is naturally culture-bound: the Karre have preserved the original K word for 'camel', keel, while the Boni, who are not pastoralists, use the common Somali gēel, or gāal (from Oromo gaala. Heine [1977: 250, fn. 8] proposes Proto-Boni *kaal; cf. also

Heine [1982:141f] for examples of semantic shifts in B). On the contrary, the K ( Quranyow dialect) has preserved to the word oor (cf. NS aaw) the meaning 'male camel', while B ḍir has shifted to 'male elephant'.
This means that, in order to recognise the PK-B lexicon, one should be able to distinguish different layers of Somalisation, and strip them off present-day Boni: the first layer, in fact, Karreisation, gave rise to the "historical" Boni, whatever language this population may have spoken before (probably some form of Dahaal; Dahalo relics are still found in Boni, as B-Ki jādm word, cf. Dahalo doom 'to speak'). As we saw above, when the Karre influence in the area vanished, the Boni were culturally colonised first by the Oromo, and then by various Northern Somali clans in their southward move. This leaves open the question of why just the Kili dialect of B (spoken in the northernmost corner of Boni area, within present-day Somalia) should have preserved the "purest" Karre. Maybe the Kili were more profoundly affected by Karre influence (or maybe they are just Karre who "stayed behind"), and we know that the Oromo impact was deeper on southern Boni groups, such as the Bireeri. If this hypothesis is accepted, the importance of the dialect of the little and scarcely investigated Kili section of Boni in shedding light to an earlier phase of the language will become obvious.

4 Conclusions

As to the classification of the Somali dialects the following conclusions can be drawn:

a. the Karre-Boni relationship cannot be accounted for by mere contact, but requires the hypothesis of a common genetic origin, which I propose to call Proto-Karre-Boni;

b. in the light of the dialectal situation of southern Somalia, where the proto-dialect was spoken and where up to this Karre is found, Karre and Boni are distinguished by a series of conservative (and often "northern-like") features, which are lacking in the "Digil" dialects and in Maay;

c. Karre and Boni are best seen, therefore, as the last representatives of a linguistic layer of the Somalisation of the interriverine region, a layer which has been successively dispersed and absorbed by the following incoming "Digil" and Maay speakers;

d. the interriverine dialects show traces of a non-Somali sub-
stratum, or of the intrusion of non-Somali ethnic elements - e.g., in the personal pronouns, the demonstratives and the paradigm of 'to be' (Giorgio Banti, p.c.) - which left Karre relatively untouched (but see below for Boni):

e. a new picture of the Southern Somali dialects seems to emerge, in which Lamberti's theory of a "Digil" group is discarded, while Ehret & Ali's proposal fares better: the separation of Karre and Boni from Common Somali and the close link between Dabarre and Tunni are confirmed; the position of Jiiddu and Maay remains a problem.

With regard to the internal differentiation and successive evolution of Boni, the dialects can be arranged on a scale of linguistic development paralleling their geographical position: Kilili, the northernmost dialect, is also the most conservative dialect; immediately to the south, Baddey is in an intermediate stage, while the other dialects are the richest in autonomous developments; Bireeri, spoken to the extreme south and west of the Boni territory, is a little apart. Thus, the Karre influence was most intense in the north, and gradually fading in the south. Conversely, the younger Orma influence on Boni mostly touched the peripheral areas of Boni, Kilili and Bireeri being the most affected dialects (cf. Heine 1982: 78ff).

Kilili shared with Karre some innovations from PK-B, eventually brought about by the contact with the Somali dialects of the interriversine region; more to the south, after the first moment of Karre domination which was so strong as to prompt them to give up their former ("Dahaloan") language in favour of PK-B, the Boni communities evolved autonomously. Alternatively, one may suggest that the Karre dialects were differentiated from the very beginning: the linguistic shift to Karre was probably accomplished over a long period and under different conditions, and communities who had less contacts with the Karre cattle breeders had less opportunities to learn the language of their masters, and when they eventually adopted it, their speech was more substratum-influenced. Here again, a deeper investigation of Boni dialects is needed.

Nowadays Boni and Karre are geographically and linguistically separated: Maay, "Digil" and NS dialects across the Juba intervene to separate them. But, interestingly enough, the dialects which ideally occupy a central position within the Karre-Boni Sprachraum - i.e., the Kilili dialect of Boni and the Tuuf dialect of Karre - are the closest and most conservative.

**NOTES**

* The original Italian version of this paper dates back to 1987, and was due to appear in a collection of Italian writings in Africanistics; but the project was abandoned, and the paper has not been published since then. In the meantime, more fieldwork in Somalia (in 1987, 1989 and 1990) enriched my data on Karre (published in Tosco 1989) and "Digil" (still unpublished material on Tunni). Research in Somali dialectology has not progressed much since then, but Sommer (1988) has provided a detailed state of the art. The situation was ripe for a new, totally revised version of my original paper.

I thank my friend Giorgio Banti for his precious comments and criticisms on a preliminary draft of this work. Naturally, all faults and omissions are entirely mine.

For dialects the following abbreviations are used:

- K: Karre
- B: Boni
- NS: Northern Somali
- PK-B: Proto-Karre-Boni

1 I agree with Schlee's (1987: 297) criticisms on this term. To use "Somali", "Macro-Somali", "Somaloid" or the like would not necessarily diminish the role of Rendille and possibly other languages (after all, we still use "Germanic" for a whole array of languages, not only German), and would be clearer.

2 "Garre" will be used for naming the clan in general; instead I call the section of the Garre settled in the Lower Shabeelle basin and their dialect "Karre", with devoicing of initial /g/, not only in hommage to the principle of autoglossonomy (naming any language by the name used by its speakers), but also in order to distinguish them from other sections of the same clan which do not speak "Karre" but various Somali or Oromo dialects.

3 Naturally, it is out of question that the Garre are aware of, or admit, their relationship with Boni: the last being an out-caste people, no Somali would ever admit historical (i.e. blood) links with them.

4 Regarding the enigmatic "Bardeere" (actually a town on the Juba river), Lamberti (1984: 194) has suggested that it is perhaps the language of nomadic Dabarre who were accidentally in town during Ehret's fieldwork. While this is reasonable (for Dabarre is totally lacking in Ehret & Ali's classification), Lamberti's conviction seems less reasonable: i.e., that Ehret & Ali's proposal of a subgroup consisting of Tunni and "Bardeere" (Dabarre?) is arbitrary, and that "one has to set up either a separate group for every Digil dialect (so that for all Digil dialects four different groups would be set up) or a common group consisting at least of Tu, Dab. and Gr./Boni" (Lamberti 1984:194; interestingly,
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ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Im vorliegenden Artikel wird versucht, die enge sprachliche Beziehung zwischen Karre · einem Somali-Dialekt (besser bekannt als "Garre") · und Boni zu verifizieren. Nach historischen und linguislichen Geschichtspunkten möchte man behaupten, daß das Boni · von sprachlicher Eigenständigkeit weit entfernt und doch mit dem Somali verwandt · historisch nichts anderes als ein Karre-Dialekt ist. Somit wird es von den sog. "Digil"-Dialekten des Somali · und selbst...
die Existenz dieser Gruppe erscheint zweifelhaft - unterschieden.


An einen Abriss der Ethnologie der Boni und die Darstellung gängiger Klassifikationen der südlichen Somali-Dialekte schließt sich die dialektal-vergleichende Analyse an, wobei zunächst die phonologische und sodann, im Mittelpunkt der Arbeit, die morphologischen Probleme im Kontext der lexikalischen Vergleichung behandelt werden.

**RESUME**

L'article essaie de vérifier l'étroit lien linguistique entre le karre (un dialecte somalien mieux connu comme "garre") et le boni. Sur la base de considérations historiques et linguistiques, on soutient que le boni, loin d'être une langue autonome (bien qu'apparente au somali), n'est historiquement qu'un dialecte karre. Quant à ce dernier, on le sépare des dialectes somaliens "digil" (et l'existence même de cette groupe dialectal est mise en doute).

Les particularités qui séparent aujourd'hui le boni de tous les dialectes somaliens sont donc le résultat du différent habitat et de la très différente structure socio-économique des communautés Boni vis-à-vis des Somalis. Ces différences, ainsi que l'influence exercée pendant plusieurs siècles par différents dialectes somaliens (et, pour ce qui concerne le boni, par des langues étrangères aussi, comme l'oromo), rendent la comparaison lexicale entre boni et karre fort difficile, même impossible. Le présent article fonde donc la démonstration de la parenté génétique karre-boni et la reconstruction d'une proto-langs commune (le proto-karre-boni) surtout sur l'analyse des structures grammaticales des dialectes actuels, alors que le lexique et la comparaison syntaxique ne jouent qu'un rôle secondaire.

Après un aperçu ethno-historique sur les Bonis et sur les classifications courantes des dialectes somaliens, surtout méridionaux, on aboutit à l'analyse dialectale comparée, en abordant les problèmes phonologiques et ensuite, dans la partie centrale du travail, morphologiques, avec un appendice sur la comparaison lexicale.