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

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

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

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

2.1. Introduction

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

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

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

---

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

\(^3\) Kambaata has 21 nominal declensions, of which 9 are feminine and 12 masculine (Treis 2008: 103).
Table 1. Case paradigm of a masculine and a feminine Kambaata noun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Dat</th>
<th>Abl</th>
<th>ICP</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>Pred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>dum-á</td>
<td>dum-i</td>
<td>dum-ii(-ha)</td>
<td>dum-iichch</td>
<td>dum-in</td>
<td>dum-áan</td>
<td>dum-a</td>
<td>dum-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>gat-i-ta</td>
<td>gat-é</td>
<td>gat-ée(-ha)</td>
<td>gat-éechch</td>
<td>gat-éen</td>
<td>gat-i</td>
<td>gat-e</td>
<td>gat-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental/Comitative/Perlative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique/Vocative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative (with COP2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Morphology and morphosyntax of =g ‘manner’

For the expression of comparison of similarity, Kambaata makes use of constructions in which the standard of comparison is marked by an enclitic morpheme =g, which is consistently glossed G throughout this chapter due to its wide array of different functions. The comparee can be marked for different cases, depending on its syntactic function in the clause. In (1), the comparee ‘I’, which is only marked by a 1s agreement morpheme on the verb, is the subject of the clause; in (2), the comparee ha’mmichchús ‘the enset corm’ is the direct object of ‘boil’ and thus marked by the accusative case; see Treis (forthcoming b) for details on the possible syntactic functions that a comparee can adopt in simulative constructions.
The standard of comparison is always an adverbial modifier to the predicate. As seen in (1)-(2), the standard phrase (in curly brackets) consists minimally of a genitive noun followed by an enclitic morpheme =g, which is itself case-marked. The double case-marking in the standard phrase – once on the semantic head, once on the standard marker =g – clearly points to a nominal origin of the enclitic (see the discussion below). Furthermore, the literal translations of (1)-(2) show that the standard marker =g is in fact a manner nominaliser in Kambaata. An adequate description of the functions of =g can thus not simply begin with its standard-marking function in similitative constructions but needs to start with a more comprehensive analysis of its manner-nominalising function.

The morpheme =g belongs to a group of enclitic nominalisers including =b ‘place’, =bii(-ta) NMZ1 ‘one (m/f)’, =hann NMZ2 ‘one (m)’, =tann NMZ2 ‘one (f)’, =r NMZp ‘thing(s), ones’, all of which are of (pro)nominal origin and take modifier phrases, e.g. genitive nouns, rather than stems as their input (3)-(4).

---

4 In the examples, curly brackets are meant to help match certain Kambaata constituents with their English translations.
(3) lal-i=b-a ‘(the) place of (the) cattle, (the) cattle-place’
   cattle-mGEN=PLACE-mACC

(4) lal-i=g-a ‘(the) manner of (the) cattle, the cattle’s way of doing things’
   cattle-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL

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

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

\(^6\) In contrast, the syncretism between the oblique and the predicative case (Table 2) is also characteristic of the
decension of masculine nouns ending in -á in the citation form – but not, for instance, of the declension of masculine
nouns ending in -í.
Table 2. Case paradigm of =g compared to that of masculine full nouns

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

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

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

---

7 This chapter is only concerned with the enclitic =g. Note, however, that Kambaata also has a derivational suffix -g in two de-demonstrative manner pronouns (Treis 2008: 279f, 338f) and four de-demonstrative manner adjectives (Treis 2008: 285ff). The unproductive suffix -g is surely historically related to the enclitic =g.
Apart from danáamog(g)a ‘in a good way, well’, fárrag(g)a ‘in a bad way, badly’ and hiilag(g)a ‘in a bad way, badly’, at least 14 other =g-marked adjectives are attested – as in (5) – in adverbial function in my corpus. In contrast, in other HEC languages manner or simulative morphemes are only used either with ‘good’ and ‘bad’, as in Alaaba (Schneider-Blum 2007: 103), K’abeena (Crass 2005: 239), Libido (Crass this volume) or with a very limited number of adjectives (including ‘good’ and ‘bad’) in Hadiyya (as seen in the examples in Tadesse 2015) and Sidaama (Kawachi 2007: 173).

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

---

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

9 As seen in (5)-(6), the manner nominaliser is sometimes realised with a geminate gg. A geminate gg often occurs when the stress falls on the penultimate syllable of its host.
Ank’r-úta Aashaam-é min-uhú-u bub-áno íkke
(last_night-fACC A.-fGEN house-mNOM-ADD burn-3mIPV INACT)

\{am-a-së=g-ii=tann-ée\} fâ’-o

mother-fGEN-3fPOSS=G-mGEN=NMZ2-fDAT save-3mPVO

‘Last night Aashaame’s house would have burnt down, too, (but) it was spared {thanks to her mother’s way (of doing things)} (i.e. the way her mother reacted).’

The manner-nominalised entities used in subject function in (8)\textsuperscript{10} and in oblique (locative) object function in (9) are relative clauses.

(8) (…) \{ka moos-ú ka’mmam-ií\}

DDEM1.mACC disease-mACC prevent-mDAT
dandees-anó=g-u\}
yóo’u

be_able.CAUS1-3mIPV.REL=G-mNOM COP1.3

‘(…) there is {a way in which one can prevent this disease}.’ (K89: 3.1)

(9) \{Ass-anó=g-áan\}

do-3mPV.REL=G-mLOC tell-3honIPV-3mO.REL=NMZp-mNOM

yóo-ba’i-a; abbishsh muccúr-u-a

COP1-NEG.REL-mCOP2 exceed.CAUS1.3mPCO clean-mPRED-mCOP2

‘There is nothing to complain (lit. tell) {about the way he does (things)}; it is perfect (lit. very clean).’

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

(10) Aass-eenno-si=g-unku

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

\[
\{awwánn kul-am-áno-a=gg-a\}
\]

\[
{\text{follow.3mPCO tell-PASS-3mIPV.REL-mCOP2=G-mPRED}}
\]

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

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

---

\(^{11}\) Kazuhiro Kawachi (p.c. 2011) confirmed this entry.

\(^{12}\) The discourse function of -n in Kambaata is still to be determined. Schneider-Blum (2007) calls the Alaaba -n-morpheme an “emphasis marker”. Crass (this volume), too, calls the functionally equivalent -m morpheme in Libido an “emphasis marker”, whereas Sim (1989) glosses the -m morpheme with “&” (for coordination).
independently in an earlier stage of the language but no longer synchronically. The manner-nominalising function of \(=g\) paved the way for the extended functions of the morpheme, which are discussed in sections (2.3 - 2.15).

2.3. Similarity

By definition, simulative constructions express sameness of manner (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998: 278), whereby manner needs to be understood in a broader (vaguer) sense, namely not only as the techniques, the instruments and the means that are applied and the type of movements (motor patterns) that are carried out. For example, in (1), the compared entities share the same instrument (a shard), and probably also the same technique (licking) and body posture for drinking. In (2), the compared entities share the same means of preparation, namely boiling water. Sameness of manner could also mean that the actions are carried out at the same rate or that the disposition, the attitude or other psychological, social and physical conditions are shared by the compared entities. One could, therefore, argue that the morpheme \(=g\) in its function as standard marker in constructions expressing comparison of similarity, as illustrated in (1)-(2), has already started to undergo semantic extension. While \(=g\) is a nominaliser of manner in the narrow sense of the word (techniques, instruments, means, types of movement) in the non-comparison examples in (6)-(10), the manner encoded by \(=g\) in simulative constructions is manner in the broader sense of the word. This is illustrated by example (11), in which the literal translation ‘Mountain goats eat grass and leaves in the manner of (domestic) goats’ no longer expresses the same meaning as the simulative construction, which is a comparison of the eating habits and not the eating techniques, instruments or movements.
(11) Waaliy-u  {fellee’-i=g-a}  hix-itá-a
walia_ibex-mNOM  goats-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL  grass-fACC-ADD
bonx-ahá-a  it-áno
leaf-mACC-ADD  eat-3mIPV

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

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

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

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

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

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

All elements of a similative construction may be found in one noun phrase. In these attributive constructions, ‘an X which V-s like a Y’, the comparee serves as the head of the noun phrase, see
‘water’ in (14), and the standard of comparison, marked by \( =g \), is expressed in a relative clause modifying the head noun.

\[
\{\text{Barad-}i=\text{g-}a \quad \text{gê'} \quad \text{afuu'Il-} \text{é} \}\text{REL} \quad \text{wô'-u}_{\text{COMPAREE}} (\ldots)
\]

hail-f\(\text{GEN}=\text{G-}\text{ACC/OBL} \quad \text{coagulate.3mPCO} \quad \text{sit-3mPVE.REL} \quad \text{water-mNOM}
\]

‘Water \{that has frozen (lit. coagulated) like hail and set\} (i.e. ice) (\ldots).’ (K89: 7.122)

If a ‘be’ verb is required in the relative clause, ‘an X which is like a Y’, the locative copula COP1 is used (15)-(16).\(^{13}\)

\[
\{\text{finniiz-}i=\text{g-}a \quad \text{yôo}\}\text{REL} \quad \text{darshan-} \text{átacomparee} \quad \text{malah-} \text{áno}
\]

pustule-m\(\text{GEN}=\text{G-}\text{ACC/OBL} \quad \text{COP1.3.REL} \quad \text{swelling-} \text{fACC} \quad \text{show-3mIPV}
\]

‘(\ldots) (the patient) has (lit. shows) fat swellings \{like pustules/that are like pustules\} on his face and on his ears.’ (K89: 8.48)

\[
\{\text{Kíi=hann-}i=\text{g-}\text{anka} \quad \text{yôo}\}\text{REL} \quad \text{billaww-} \text{á comparee} \quad \text{hi’rr-} \text{áamm}
\]

\(2\text{sGEN=}\text{NMZ2-} \text{mGEN=}\text{G-}\text{mACC<N>} \quad \text{COP1.REL} \quad \text{knife-mACC} \quad \text{buy.MID-1sIPV}
\]

‘I will buy a knife \{like yours/which is like yours\}.’

If an attributive similative construction is headless, it is nominalised with a dummy head, e.g. \( =r \)

‘thing(s), ones’, and thus serves to express ‘N-like thing(s), N-like one(s)’ (17).

\(^{13}\) It would be ungrammatical to drop the relative verb \( yôo \) in the attributive similative construction in (15). In contrast, in Sidaama, the standard phrase can directly modify the comparee, e.g. \( âté-gede mancó \) 2sGEN-like person.f\NOM ‘a person like you’ (Kawachi 2007: 446).
The use of COP1 in attributive simulative constructions is especially noteworthy because this copula is otherwise found only in constructions expressing location, existence and possession (Treis 2008: 398-407). Instead of COP1, one would have expected the use of the verb *ih*– ‘be(come)’, which is the fully inflectable verbal substitute of the ascriptive and identificational copulas COP2 and COP3 in subordinate clauses (Treis 2008: 427ff). Note, however, that *ih*– ‘be(come)’ is used in simulation constructions (Section 2.4). The use of the locative copula in subordinate simulative constructions is not only a peculiarity of Kambaata but also observed in the Omotic language Yemsa (Zaugg-Coretti this volume).14 In Amharic subordinate simulative constructions, either the locative copula *allä* or the ascriptive/identificational copula *honä* can be used (Leslau 1995: 277).

More information on attributive constructions with *yoo*- COP1 is found in Section 2.8 on the exemplification function of =g.

### 2.4. Simulation

Constructions expressing simulation (‘as if’), i.e. hypothetical similarity, are either formally indistinguishable from or based on simulative constructions. In (18), it is only the broader context – the sentence is taken from a text about an impostor – that helps the listener to understand that the =g-marked phrase (‘like his own ones’) expresses hypothetical rather than real similarity; there is no overt marking of simulation.

---

14 Yemsa is not a direct neighbour of Kambaata but the western neighbour of Hadiyya.
(18) (…) danaam-īta oddiishsh-āta argicc-ān

beautiful-fACC clothes-fACC borrow.MID-3mICO

{gag-i-sī=tann-ē=g-a} odaqq-āno

self-mGEN-3mPOSS=NMZ2-fGEN=G-mACC/OBL wear.MID-3mIPV

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

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

(19) (…) {duuball-i=g-a ĕkk} hinc y-ēe-se

rich-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL become.3mPCO approach say-3mPVE-3fO

‘(When he wanted to court a girl,) he approached her, {pretending to be/as if he were rich (lit. having become like a rich one)}.’
‘He asked me suddenly, as if seized by agony (lit. having become like people who have entered great agony).’ (Deginet in preparation)

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

\begin{align*}
\text{Similarity:} & \quad \{\text{Relative clause} = \text{g-}a\} \text{SIMIL } \{\text{superordinate clause}\} \\
& \text{cf. (12)-(13)}
\end{align*}
Simulation: \{Relative clause=NMZ=g-a ih-/ass-PCO\}_{SIMUL} \{superordinate clause\}

cf. (20) and (21)

The simulative construction in (21) encodes the notion that the subject talks as if he was someone who paid back money that he borrowed – but that he is in fact someone who cannot be trusted. If assi ‘(he) doing’ was left out, the subject would rather talk like someone who pays back borrowed money, with no judgement about whether =g marks real or hypothetical similarity.

(21) (…) \{ga’-áanta fanqashsh-i

\quad next_day-fACC<N> return.CAUS1-3mPCO

\quad baat-anó=hann-i=g-a ass-i\} xawaaqq-i (…)

\quad pay-3mIPV.REL=NMZ2-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL do-3mPCO talk-3mPCO

‘(When he needed money to invite the girl, he went to other people to borrow money,) talked (to them) {as if he would pay it back (lit. doing like one who pays it back) on the next day} (…).’

2.5. Equality

The =g-morpheme does not only mark the standard of comparison in simulative and simulative constructions but also in equative constructions, i.e. constructions expressing that a parameter is attributed to two (or more) compared entities to an equal extent or equal degree. In (22), the standard of comparison is a simple noun, whereas in (23) it is a noun modified by a preceding genitive noun.
‘Unless you are strong {like a lion} (i.e. as strong as a lion), don’t dare to step (into) my front yard!’ (K89: 6.124 [corr])

(From a prayer:) ‘Make our country’s government {strong like an iron centre-pole} (i.e. as strong as an iron centre-pole) and (…).’

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

‘The meat of mountain goats (\textit{walia ibex}) is tasty {like that of (domestic) goats} (i.e. as tasty as that of (domestic) goats).’ (K89: 5.41)
Example (25) exemplifies an attributive equative construction. The comparee (‘knife’) is the head of the NP; it is modified by the adjectival parameter (‘sharp’), which itself takes the standard phrase (‘like yours’) as an adverbial modifier.

(25) \{kii=hann-i-g-anka\} iiphph-á billaww-á

2sGEN=NMZ2-mGEN=G-mACC<N> sharp-mACC knife-mACC

‘a knife sharp {like yours} (i.e. as sharp as yours)’

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

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

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

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

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

(26) {Baad-i-sí wog-i=g-a} (…) koh-éenno-ssa
    country-mGEN-DEF custom-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL offer_food-3honIPV-3pO
    ‘{According to the traditions of the country,} (…) one offers food to them.’

(27) {Kull-oon-ké=g-anka} ros-eemmá xáw-u
    tell-1sPVO-2sO.REL=G-mACC<N> adopt-3honPVE.REL thing-mNOM
    hambó y-eemmá=dá-a da’ll-i hab-am-áno-ba’a
    forget.1pJUS say-3honPVE.REL=COND-ADD do_fast-3mPCO forget-PASS-3mIPV-NEG
    ‘{As I have told you,} a habit that one has adopted cannot be forgotten easily even if one decides to forget it (lit. even if one says “let’s forget”).’ (K89: 4.19)

However, ICP-marking is more common than ACC/OBL-marking; see the accord phrase in (28) and the accord clause in (29). No functional difference can so far be attributed to the use of the ACC/OBL versus the ICP case form on accord phrases and clauses: wogi=ga ACC/OBL in (26) could be replaced by wogi=giin ICP, as a native speaker confirmed.
(28) Isso’óot lám-unku Yesuus-i resh-á oróos-s {Ayihud-i} 3pNOM two-mNOM<N> Jesus-mGEN corpse-mACC take_out-3fPCO Jews-mGEN roshsh-á=g-íin} anjan-áan barg-it fuutt-i oddishsh-áan kafan-too’u habit-fGEN=G-mICP spices-fICP add-3fPCO cotton-mGEN clothes-fICP wrap[?]-3fPVO (Literal translation:) ‘The two of them took out the body of Jesus, wrapped him, {according to the traditions of the Jews,} in cotton clothes with spices.’ (John 19, 40)

(29) {Malées-u Latám-i-n oot-áan beekk-é y-í \begin{itemize}
    \item wise-mNOM L-mNOM-N enclosure-fLOC divide-2pIMP say-3mPCO
    \item sajj-ó=g-íin} beeh-éemma advise-3mPVO.REL=G-mICP divide-3honPVE
\end{itemize}

‘{As the wise Latamo had advised (him), saying “Divide (the herd) into (two) enclosures!”}, he (honorific) divided (them).’ (K89: 2.43)

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

2.7. Correlation

Another function associated with =g is the expression of correlation and dependency. Here, as in Section 2.6, =g is often most appropriately translated as ‘according to’. In the accord phrases of the previous section, for example in (26), the translation ‘according to’ can be paraphrased as ‘as stated by, as stated in, as laid down in, conforming to’, i.e. =g expresses accordance with information presented earlier or agreement with rules, traditions etc. In the examples in this section, however, =g expresses a correlation or dependency, so the translation ‘according to’ can be paraphrased as
‘depending on, in proportion to, in relation to’. In (30), the choice of cattle breeding techniques is said to be dependent on climatic and economic conditions, both of which are marked by a coordinate ACC/OBL form of =g. In (31), the meaning of words is said to be dependent on the context in which they occur; here a relativised clause expressing the factor on which the meaning depends is marked by the ICP form of =g.

(30) Lal-ú xaqq-eennó=g-u
    cattle-mACC breed-3honIPV.REL=G-mNOM
    {hegeeg-i-sí ayyar-i duuh-á=g-á-a
     area-mGEN-DEF weather-mGEN condition-fGEN=G-mACC/OBL-ADD
     dikk-o-sí=g-á-a} annann-á ih-áno
     market-fGEN-DEF=G-mACC/OBL-ADD different-mACC be-3mIPV

‘The way in which cattle are bred is different {according to/depending on the climatic conditions of an area and the market (i.e. economic conditions)}.’ (K89: 8.109)

(31) (...) {wiim-aa sawwitt-i aaz-éen aag-gáa=g-iiin}
    full-mOBL thought-mGEN inside-mLOC enter-3fIPV.REL=G-mICP
    hiirat-ó annannoom-áta eeb-báa kambaatiss-á
    meaning-fGEN difference-fACC bring-3fIPV.REL Kambaata_language-fGEN
    laag-aakk-áta qú’mm át-t (...) word-PL2-fACC collect do-2sPcO

‘(…) collect Kambaata words that vary in meaning {according to/depending on the context in which they occur} (lit. collect Kambaata words that bring a meaning difference depending on their entering into full thoughts) (…)’ (K89: 7.68)
2.8. Exemplification

The =g-morpheme is added to noun phrases to mark them as examples, i.e. as something or someone characteristic of its kind or illustrating a general rule. In this function, =g is translated as ‘such as, for instance, for example’.\footnote{16} The similative morpheme has also developed an exemplification function in the Central Sudanic language Yulu (Boyeldieu this volume).

\begin{equation}
\{tuhaann-i=g-a \quad yóó \quad alit-t-áta\}
\end{equation}

\hspace{1cm}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
bedbug-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL & COP1.3.REL & parasite-PL1-fACC \\
ba’-is-anó & zabb-ú \\
get\_lost-CAUS1-3mIPV.REL & medicine-mACC \\
\end{tabular}

‘medicine which eradicates \{parasites \textbf{such as}/for example bedbugs\} (ruled out in the context: *\textit{parasites which are like bedbugs})’ (K89: 3.60)

Numerous examples of the exemplification function of =g occur especially in the written corpus (e.g. schoolbooks). The exemplification construction consists of a head noun (phrase) representing what is to be exemplified (e.g. ‘parasites’ in (32)). This noun (phrase) is modified by a preceding relative clause which consists of a relative verb form of yoo- COP1 and a =g-marked adverbial phrase expressing the example (e.g. ‘bedbugs’ in (32)). The exemplification construction is thus identical to the attributive similative construction discussed in Section 2.3 above; cf. examples (15)-(16). The complex noun phrase \{NP\_2=g\ COP1.REL NP\_1\} in (32) expresses that bedbugs are one example or an exemplary member of a group of different parasites that are targeted by the insecticide. Semantically, the example (NP\_2) and the group (NP\_1) are in a hyponym-hyperonym relationship. Given a different context, the very same complex phrase could be interpreted as expressing comparison of similarity. If the speaker talked about undetermined species of parasites,
s/he could, for instance, say that these species are parasites like (meaning ‘similar to’) bedbugs and use exactly the same phrase as is found in curly brackets in (32).

As in attributive similative constructions such as (17), the nominal head of the exemplification construction may not be simply dropped. If it is absent, the whole construction needs to be nominalised; see (33), where the nominaliser =r NMZp ‘one(s)’ is attached to the relative clause containing yóo and the =g-marked example (‘a nail or a thorn’).

(33) (...) lokk-á-nne {musmaar-i-na ut-i=g-a
foot-fACC-1pPOSS nail-mGEN-CRD thorn-mGEN=G-mACC/OBL
yóo=r-u} qashsh-ó=da (...) titaanoos-á
COP1.3.REL=NMZp-mNOM pierce-3mPVO.REL=COND tetanus-mACC
y-eennó móos-u af-íi dand-anó=tannée (...)
say-3honIPV.REL disease-mNOM catch-mDAT be_able-3mIPV.REL=REAS

‘(…) because one can contract a disease called tetanus if {for instance a nail or a thorn} (ruled out in this context: *ones that are like a nail and a thorn) pierce our feet’ (K89: 4.119)

2.9. Role phrases (“Functive”)

As in many European languages (see e.g. Creissels 2014, Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998, Ylikoski this volume), the =g-morpheme can also mark role phrases or, in Creissels’ (2014) terminology, functives in Kambaata. Role phrases are understood as phrases that “express the role or function in which a participant appears” (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998: 321); see (34), in which the =g-marked phrase expresses that salt had the role of a salary.
‘It was salt that the Roman soldiers of old days received {as a salary} (lit. work price).’ (K89: 7.72)

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

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

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

The =g-morpheme is also used to mark temporal clauses expressing immediate anteriority ‘as soon as’,\(^{17}\) which are here referred to as IM.ANTE-clauses following Kortmann (1997). These are relativised perfect or perfective (PVO/PVE) clauses\(^{18}\) to which =g encliticises in its oblique (36) or accusative forms (37). In the vast majority of examples expressing immediate anteriority, the case marker is followed by the pragmatically determined -n-morpheme (whose discourse function is still to be determined)\(^{19}\). Note, however, that the presence of -n on =g is no sufficient criterion for determining its function as an IM.ANTE-marker. The -n-morpheme can also be present on =g-marked phrases and clauses with all other functions described in this chapter. If -n is present, it is possible to distinguish the oblique from the accusative form of =g.

---

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

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

\(^{19}\) In the closely related language Hadiyya, the functionally equivalent -m morpheme is also commonly found on verbs in IM.ANTE-clauses. “Heightened immediacy” is expressed by the suffixation of the singulative to the simulative morpheme (Sim 1989: 318).
An assessment of the context and the most natural semantic relations between the sub- and superordinate clauses helps to determine whether a =g-marked clause is a similitative, simulative, accord, correlation or IM.ANTE-clause. As clauses expressing immediate anteriority cannot be based on imperfective verbs, ambiguities between an IM.ANTE and another interpretation may –
but in reality seldom do – arise when the clause-final verb is marked for the perfect(ive) aspect. Example (38) is taken from a recorded story. A native speaker favoured the interpretation of the =g-marked clause as an accord clause (i). However, he considered an interpretation of the same example as an IM.ANTE-clause (ii) possible in a different context.

(38) \{Mix-\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{xóo}}}}}=g-\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{anka}}}}}\} \quad \text{híkka} \quad \text{tibbekk-ichch-ú}

\text{wish-3fPVO.REL=G-mACC<N>} \quad \text{DEm2.mACC bear-SG-mACC}

\text{ík-k} \quad \text{agur-tóo’}

\text{become-2fPCO leave-3fPVO}

(i) (Favoured interpretation in context:) ‘As she had wished (i.e. in accordance with her wish),} she turned into that bear.’

(ii) (Alternative interpretation out of context:) ‘As soon as she had expressed her wish,} she turned into that bear.’

The use of ‘like’ as subordinators of temporal clauses of simultaneity (‘when’) or immediate anteriority (‘as soon as’) is well attested in European languages and beyond; see e.g. Eggs (2006: 428-473) on temporal \text{wie} and \text{sowie} in German, Moline (2006) on temporal (and causal) \text{comme} in French, and Taine-Cheikh (2004) on the use of ‘like’ equivalents as temporal clause markers in Arabic dialects. The chapters by Crass, Darmon and Zaugg-Coretti in this volume and Section 3 below show that ‘as soon as’ is also a common grammaticalisation target of ‘like’ in other Ethiopian languages.

2.11. Contrast

The =g-morpheme is attested as a marker of a contrastive relation between clauses. Example (39) is one of four proverbs from the written corpus on the basis of which other examples could be elicited.
(39) \{Godab-á-se zar-eemmáa-t he’-óo=g-a\}  

\begin{align*}
\text{belly-mACC-3fPOSS} & \quad \text{tear-3honPVE.NMZ.VV-fNOM} \quad \text{exist-3fPVO.REL=} \text{g-mACC/OBL} \\
\text{qexx-á-se zar-eemmáat} & \quad \text{yaar-tóo’u} \\
\text{leather_skirt-fACC-3fPOSS} & \quad \text{tear-3honPVE.NMZ.VV-fNOM} \quad \text{be_worse-3mPVO-3fO}
\end{align*}

‘{There was one (f) who had her belly torn but} the one who had her leather skirt torn cried.’

(Free translation: One would have expected the one whose belly was torn open to cry, but surprisingly, it was the one who just had her skirt torn who cried.) (K89: 8.44)

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

2.12. Purpose

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

\(^{20}\) So far, \(=g\) is only attested in contrastive clauses ending in the verb \(he’\) ‘exist’.

\(^{21}\) In the Alaaba examples, contrastive \(=g\) is mostly found on clauses ending with the verb \(yoo\) ‘be (located), exist’.
‘And on their hips they wear an unfrayed enset leaf on top (lit. in front) of their clothes {so that the enset juice does not touch (lit. reach) and spoil them}.’

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

(Literal translation:) ‘He has blinded their eyes (…) {so that they don’t see with their eyes, so that they don’t understand in their heart, and so that they don’t turn to me and I heal them}.’ (John 12, 40)
Affirmative purpose clauses are usually marked by dative verbal nouns (43) or by purposive converb clauses (Treis 2010). Purposive converb clauses are marked for switch-reference, see, for instance, the different subject (DS) form in (42)-A. However, neither verbal nouns nor purposive converbs can be negated morphologically. Thus purpose clauses with =g are used in corresponding negative contexts. Example (42) quotes two possible answers to a multiple choice exercise enquiring about the purpose of an action. Answer A contains a focussed affirmative clause ending in a purposive converb while answer B contains a focussed negative clause based on a negative relative verb (NREL) plus a dative-marked =g-morpheme.

(42) A. Hujantoommi=r-a xabbéeen-aa=gg-íin xûunduntaa-t
work.1pPVO.REL=NMZp-mACC proper-mOBL=G-mICP see.1pPURP.DS.VV-COP3
B. Íll-i-nne hoog-gúmb-o=gg-iihaa-t
eye-fNOM-1sPOSS become_tired-3fNREL-mOBL=G-mDAT.VV-COP3

(From a multiple choice exercise: Why should we keep the documents about one span away from our eyes when we read or write?) A. So that we see properly what we are working on. B. So that our eyes don’t become tired. (…)’ (K89: 6: 134)

Affirmative purpose clauses with =g are difficult to find in my corpus. An alleged affirmative purpose example (Treis 2010: 20 [ex. 36]) that I checked again during my last field trip has turned out to be better analysed as a manner clause (cf. Section 2.2). So no unequivocal affirmative purpose clauses with an ACC/OBL-marked =g can be provided here. However, some affirmative clauses marked by a dative =g do occur in the database (43)-(44). The =g-marked clause in (43) is considered equivalent to a purpose clause based on a dative verbal noun.
‘He called the children of the neighbourhood {in order to play}.’

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

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

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

Weak obligation (recommendation) can be expressed by a construction consisting of an imperfective relative clause marked by \(=g\) plus the locative/existential copula (45). Syntactically, the \(=g\)-marked clause is an adverbial to the copula. COP1 is used invariantly in the third person form \(yóó’u\) and does not share the subject of the \(=g\)-marked clause, which is 3hon in (45) and 2s in (46); the 3hon and 2s forms of COP1 would be \(yóomma\) and \(yóont\), respectively. In the obligation construction, the subject slot is empty, i.e. COP1 has no overt (pro)nominal subject argument.

(45) Lankée dikk-úta mar-eenán abbis-éen  
second.DAT market-fACC go-3honICO exceed.CAUS1-3honPCO  
qoraphph-eennó\(-g\)\(-a\) yóó’u  
take_care.MID-3honIPV.REL=G-mACC/OBL COP1.3  

‘One had better/one should take care (not to be cheated gain) when one goes to the market next time.’

(46) Kánn woqq-áan ka’lliixx-u bata’-anó=tannée  
DDEM1.mOBL road-mLOC accident-mNOM be_many-3mIPV.REL=REAS  
{lácc y-it maran-taanti\(-g\)\(-a\) yóó’u}  
slow say-2sPCO walk.PASS-2sIPV.REL=G-mACC/OBL COP1.3  

‘Because accidents are frequent on this road, {you’d better/ you should walk slowly}.’

The construction exemplified in (45)-(46) is considered less strong than an obligation expressed by \(has\-is\)- ‘need (lit. make want)’ (47).\(^{22}\) Instead, (48) is considered an adequate periphrasis of (46).

\(^{22}\) See also the obligation expressed in (13).
Schmidtke-Bode has observed that purpose clauses can show structural overlaps with constructions expressing deontic necessity and proposes the following functional explanation for this overlap (or functional extension): “[T]he realm of purpose and deontic modality share the property of a hypothetical result state and someone’s will or desire for it to be obtained” (2009: 163).

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

2.14. Complementation

In the preceding sections the =g-morpheme has been shown to be attached to different types of adverbial clauses. Apart from being an adverbial clause marker, =g is used to mark complement clauses that serve as arguments of a verb. Object complement clauses are marked by a =g-morpheme in the accusative case (or rather accusative/oblique, see Table 2). The =g-marked complement clause fills the direct object slot of the verb. Thus the superordinate verb which governs the complement
clause, e.g. *dag*- ‘know’ in (49), can not have another direct (accusative) object. In contrast, adverbial clauses, which can be accusative/oblique-marked just as complement clauses, do not prevent the superordinate verb from having a (pro)nominal direct object; see for example the verb *qo’rr*- ‘wear’ in (40) which is superordinate to the purpose clause and which also governs a direct accusative object *aabichchú* ‘unfrayed leaf’.

(49) {Bajig-u-s áyee-ti-la y-itaante-’é=g-a} dag-áamm

B.-mNOM-DEF who.VV-COP3-MIT say-2sIPV-1sO.REL=G-mACC know-1sIPV

‘I know {that you will say to me “Who is this Bajigo?”}.’ (K89: 8.21)

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

(50) {Mannoom-a-nné aaz-éen maxín-it yóo=g-u}

body-fGEN-1pPOSS inside-mLOC salt-fNOM COP1.3.REL=G-mNOM
dag-ámm-ee-haa

know-PASS-3mPVE.REL-mCOP2

‘It is known {that there is salt in our bodies}.’ (K89: 7.73)

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

---

23 As =g-marked complement clauses block other accusative objects, it can be assumed that the case form =g-a represents the accusative (and not the oblique) case; thus =g-a is glossed only ACC in complementation examples.
Apart from relative-based, =g-marked complement clauses (49)-(50), Kambaata also has other types of complement clauses, namely those with headless relative verbs, verbal nouns, purposive converbs and conditional verbs (see Treis 2010, 2012b). The choice of a particular complementation strategy is partly dependent on (morpho-)syntactic parameters and the semantic class of the complement-taking verb. Complement clauses marked by =g are typically dependent on utterance verbs (e.g. xa’mm- ‘ask’, kul- ‘tell’), propositional attitude verbs (e.g. amma’n- ‘believe’), knowledge verbs (e.g. dag- ‘know’), perception verbs (e.g. maccoocc- ‘hear’) and manipulative verbs (e.g. ass- ‘do, make, cause’).

The complementation function of =g is likely to be an extension of the manner-nominalising function. Utterances about someone knowing, seeing, telling the way in which something is done have come to be re-interpreted as expressing the fact that something is done. Nominative =g-marked clauses, for instance, are still open to two interpretations, either as manner-nominalised clauses in subject function (8), or as subject complement clauses (50). However, context usually helps the hearer determine the function of =g in a particular example. In (50), for instance, it makes little sense to translate the bracketed constituent as ‘the way that there is salt in our bodies’. In order to avoid possible ambiguities the question pronoun hattita ‘how’ can be inserted into =g-marked clauses in order to signal, for example in (51), that the way – and not the fact – that we need to eat is explained.
(51) \{\text{Hatt-ita it-u has-is-ano-nnê=}_g\text{-ú-u}\}
how-fACC eat-mNOM want-CAUS1-3mIPV-1pO.REL=G-mNOM-ADD
kul-ámm-ee’u
say-PASS-3mPVE

‘It is also explained in which way we need to eat (them) (lit. \{The way in which eating (them) is how required for us\} is said).’ (K89: 7.73)

2.15. Exclamation

Isolated nominative-marked =g-clauses without a superordinate clause can be used as exclamations of surprise, appreciation and disapproval. Example (52) is taken from a chapter on irony in a schoolbook.

(52) \text{Maandar-aan-ch-ichch-o} \text{ qixxo}
quality_of_housewife-AAM-SG-SG-mOBL INTJ.SURPRISE
sho’il-itóo=r-u xe’-áyyoo=\text{g-u!}
cook.MID-3fPVO.REL=NMZp-mNOM taste_good-3fPROG.REL=G-mNOM

(Ironic:) ‘You wonderful housewife, how good what you cooked tastes!’ ‘You wonderful housewife, the (extraordinary) degree to which what you cooked tastes good.’ (K89: 6.13)

The ironic overtone of (52) is not evoked by the construction itself but by the double singulative marking (SG) on the address form ‘housewife’, and possibly also by a particular intonation pattern. The same formal type of exclamation can be used to express appreciation (53) and critique (54). Exclamations with =g do not underlie any aspectual restrictions; see the progressive (PROG) in (52), the perfect (PVE) in (53) and perfective (PVO) in (54).
At first sight the exclamations seem to be insubordinate subject complement clauses being used without a superordinate main clause (for a cross-linguistic treatment of insubordination see Evans 2007). A closer look reveals, however, that =g is not as desemanticised as in the complementation examples of Section 2.14. In exclamatives, =g still conveys the meaning of manner/way or extent/degree, or rather – in this exclamative context – extraordinarily good or bad manner/way (53) or extraordinary degree/extent (52), (54). I have attempted to represent this semantic aspect in the alternative translations. So the =g-morpheme has a function that is still fairly close to the manner-nominalising function, which is described in Section 2.2 and illustrated in (8) and (10).

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

---

24 Six examples are attested in my corpus.
25 On these aspects see Moliné (2008) for a detailed analysis of the French exclamative comme.
nominative-marked in its exclamative function. Usually isolated nominal constituents occur in the accusative case, which is the citation form; only clausal subjects are nominative-marked in Kambaata. Therefore, it seems plausible that exclamatives are elliptic constructions in which the predicate, possibly ‘{Subject} is great, is extraordinary, is unbelievable’ etc., is left unexpressed.

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

2.16. Summary

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

In some functions aspectual restrictions are imposed on the verbal host; for example, =g-marked purpose clauses always end in an imperfective or aspectless verb. Sometimes, it makes more
sense to attribute a function to a construction of which $=g$ is a part rather than to $=g$ alone; for example, $=g$ necessarily co-occurs with the locative copula $yoo$- in the exemplification and the weak obligation construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Function abbreviated</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Case on (=g)</th>
<th>Syntactic function of (=g)-constituent</th>
<th>Aspect restrictions</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>‘Manner’ (N)</td>
<td>Manner nominaliser</td>
<td>Any case</td>
<td>Any function</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>Standard marker in simulative constructions</td>
<td>ACC/OBL</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>SIMU</td>
<td>Standard marker in simulative constructions</td>
<td>ACC/OBL</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Double nominalisation; (=g)-marked constituent usually adverbial to converb form of (ih)- ‘be(come)’ or (ass)- ‘do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>EQU</td>
<td>Standard marker in equative construction</td>
<td>ACC/OBL</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>(–)(^{26})</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>ACD</td>
<td>Marker of accord phrases and clauses</td>
<td>ACC/OBL, ICP</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>CORR</td>
<td>Marker of correlation phrases and clauses</td>
<td>ACC/OBL, ICP</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>ACC/OBL</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>(n.r.)</td>
<td>Always in combination with locative COP1 (yoo)-, attributive to the exemplified N(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>Marker of role phrases</td>
<td>ACC/OBL</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>(n.r.)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{26}\) Recall from Section 2.5 that no equative examples with a \(=g\)-marked clausal standard are attested in my database.
| 2.10 | IM.ANTE | Marker of temporal clauses (immediate anteriority) | ACC/OBL | Adverbial | PVO | – |
| 2.11 | CNTR | Marker of contrastive clauses | ACC/OBL | Adverbial | (–) | – |
| 2.12 | PURP | Marker of (negative) purpose clauses | ACC/OBL, DAT | Adverbial | IPV | – |
| 2.13 | OBLG | Marker of a weak obligation | ACC/OBL | Adverbial | IPV | Always in combination with locative COP1 yoo- |
| 2.14 | COMP | Marker of complement clauses | ACC/OBL if object, NOM if subject | Subject or Object | – | – |
| 2.15 | EXCL | Marker of exclamations (extraordinary manner or extent) | NOM | (in isolation) | – | – |

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

Abbreviations: n.r. = not relevant since =g not attached to verbs; – none; (–) probably none but only little or no data.
While it seems plausible that the full noun ‘manner’ first grammaticalised into a manner-nominaliser, it is not clear in which order the other functions developed. Many functions could be subsumed under a kind of macro-function “similar manner or extent”, including similarity, simulation, accord, correlation, exemplification, role, equality and exclamation (extraordinary manner or extent). IM.ANTE-clauses may have developed out of the similative clauses: Doing two events in the same way came to be interpreted as doing one event at the same time as another. The grammaticalisation of morphemes expressing (similar) manner into complementisers is widely discussed in the literature on grammaticalisation (e.g. Saxena 1995; Heine & Kuteva 2002: 273f.; see also Güldemann 2008 for a review of the relevant literature). Furthermore, purpose clauses and complement clauses often show formal overlaps in the languages of the world (see Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 157-65). However, in the Kambaata case, it is unclear whether the purpose developed out of the complementation function or whether both are functional extension of the (similar) manner marking function. Finally, purpose clauses and weak obligation constructions are semantically related and formally similar in Kambaata (see the aspectual restrictions), and the latter is likely to be an extension of the former function.

Asking which functions developed earlier or later, across which intermediate functions, and in which bridging contexts is, of course, interesting for grammaticalisation theory. However, these questions may not be that relevant for the analysis of (the history of) Kambaata. The next section demonstrates that the multi-functionality associated with Kambaata =g, which is used among others as standard marker in similative constructions, can also be observed for similative morphemes in a great number of other Ethiopian languages. It makes little sense to assume that each of these languages developed the typological fairly untypical bundle of extended functions on its own. I propose instead that the multifunctionality of the similative morpheme was replicated across languages through contact. In other words, the multifunctionality of the similative morpheme in one language was mapped onto its translational equivalent in another language.
Before turning to this Ethiopian overview in Section 3, it is important to mention in which functions the =g-enclitic is not used. Most notably, it is not used in quotative function, which is often shown to be the bridge between the simulative and the complementising function in other languages. Instead, direct speech is followed (or sometimes, introduced) by a converb form of y-‘say’ (29) in Kambaata. Formal overlaps between purpose and reason clauses are frequent cross-linguistically too (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 151-54). Therefore, it needs to be stated that =g is never used with reason clauses.

3. Similative-purpose multifunctionality in Ethiopia

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

This article is not the first to be concerned with the grammaticalisation of ‘like’ in Ethiopia. Based on data from six languages of the Ethio-Semitic/HEC micro-contact zone as well as the two lingua francas Amharic (Semitic) and Oromo (Lowland East Cushitic), Crass & Meyer (2008) have come up with simulative-complementation-purpose multifunctionality as one out of several newly proposed features of the Ethiopian Linguistic Area (ELA). In response, Rapold & Zaugg-Coretti (2009) have checked the newly proposed ELA features on data from two Omotic languages, Bench and Yemsa. They demonstrate, among other things, that Yemsa, too, uses a simulative morpheme as a marker of complement clauses governed by verbs of saying, hearing and cognition and as a marker of negative purpose clauses (see also Zaugg-Coretti this volume). In contrast, the simulative morpheme of Bench has neither a complementising function nor is it used in purpose clauses.
Rapold & Zaugg-Coretti 2009: 66ff). So the findings in Bench already show that only a subgroup of Ethiopian languages displays the kind of multifunctionality proposed by Crass & Meyer (2008) to be diagnostic of the ELA.

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

3.1. Cushitic

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>SIM ‘like’ (‘manner’)</th>
<th>PURP</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>Other functions and meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Xamtanga -ŋä</td>
<td>yes NEG</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ACD, EQU, GLOTT, IM.ANTE, SIMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Morpheme</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemant</td>
<td>-ŋä²⁷</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>IM.ANTE, SIMU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awngi</td>
<td>-ta ~ -sta</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambaata</td>
<td>=g ~ =gg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ACD, CNTR, CORR, EQU, EX, EXCL, IM.ANTE, OBLG, ROLE, SIMU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaaba</td>
<td>-ga</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ACD, ADJ, CNTR, HOW, TEMP (incl. IM.ANTE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K’abeena</td>
<td>-gga</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ADJ, EQU, IM.ANTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidaama</td>
<td>=gede</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>EQU, ADJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadiyya</td>
<td>-is-a</td>
<td>yes²⁸</td>
<td>ADJ, CORR, EQU, HOW, IM.ANTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libido</td>
<td>+ k’aaʔla</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>‘manner’ (N), ACD, ADJ, EQU, ROLE, SIMU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ?is-o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ADJ, EQU, CMD, FUNC, GLOTT, IM.ANTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedeo</td>
<td>-ssha</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ADJ, CMD, GLOTT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-k’ic’o</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ADJ, UP.TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burji*</td>
<td>+ yekk’ee</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-nna</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromo*</td>
<td>akka +</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>‘manner’ (N), ACD, ADJ, CMD, EQU, EX, EXCL, HOW, ROLE, TEMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

²⁸ Examples from Sim (1989) show that almost all purpose clauses contain a simulative morpheme in the dative case, -is-ina SIM-DAT.
Table 4. Similative-purpose multifunctionality in Cushitic

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

---


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

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

31 Two examples of purpose clauses marked by kah … –nnah, with the latter morpheme being a form of inna ‘manner’, are given in Simeone-Senelle & Hassan Kamil (2014), while Bliese (1981), Morin (1995) and Hassan Kamil (2015) do not mention the use of this morpheme in their respective chapters on purpose clauses. Morin’s dictionary contains two other potential purpose examples with kah ... –nnah (2012: 568). If similative-purpose multifunctionality is confirmed in Afar, it is at most marginal.
that was multifunctional but not (yet) attested in simulative constructions, this ‘manner’-noun is included in the SIM column between round brackets.

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

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

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

---

32 The transcription of the morphemes has been retained as given in the consulted sources. If the sources contain different transcriptions, I have chosen the one of the latest publication. Note, furthermore, that some authors provide only the stem of the simulative morpheme (or ‘manner’ noun) while others give the form with a case suffix.
Cushitic languages are possibly cognate too, e.g. Afar *inna*, Tunni *in* and Rendille *i’d*. Furthermore, the grammatical status of the standard marker varies. While it is analysed as a (semi-)dependent morpheme in most languages, there are some languages, e.g. Oromo *akka*, Somali *si*, Afar *inna* and Libido *k’aαʔla*, where the standard marker has a primary use as a free noun meaning ‘manner’. And even if a language cannot (or can no longer) use its similitative morpheme as a full noun, its presumed nominal origin may still be reflected in its case-marking potential (e.g. in Hadiyya where the similitative morpheme is used, depending on its functions, either in its accusative or dative case) or the formal marking of standard that it governs (which is often marked for the genitive case).

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

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

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

The situation in Bayso is unclear. Hayward (1978-79: 567) states that “[t]he range of *gógo* appears very like that of Amharic *əndă* or Oromo *akka*”. However, no examples of *gógo* as a similitative
morpheme or as a purpose clause marker are found in his grammatical sketch. Konso, an Oromoid language, represents an interesting case and shows how even closely related languages differ in details. Whereas Oromo uses the morpheme *akka*, among other things, as a simulative morpheme, purpose clause and complement clause marker, Konso uses the cognate *akkaá* only in purpose and complement clauses but not in simulative constructions. Instead, *mina?* marks the standard of comparison in simulative and equative constructions and it also marks a locative relation (‘towards, facing’).

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

Even though there are exceptions – most notably (Northern) Somali and Tunni, a Southern Somali dialect – the following general distribution of simulative-purpose multifunctionality can be observed: The further one moves away from the highlands of Ethiopia to the East and South, the less ‘like’ or ‘manner’ is likely to be used as a purpose clause marker. This impression is reinforced if we take into account data from the South Cushitic branch, of which no language is spoken in Ethiopia. To the best of my knowledge, South Cushitic languages do not use simulative morphemes or ‘manner’-nouns as a marker of purpose clauses. In Iraqw, the multifunctional ‘manner’ noun *adoo* (f) is used, among other things, to introduce the standard of comparison in simulative constructions and as a complementiser with verbs of speaking and knowing (Mous 1993: 260, 296). However, it is not used as a purpose clause marker. The Burunge simulative circumfix *da-...-’ay* (Kießling 1994: 86) is not reported to have any extended functions. As Vanhove (this volume) discusses in detail, the simulative morpheme =*(iː)t* (singular) / =eːt (plural) in the Sudanese language Beja, which is the
only Northern Cushitic language, has acquired some extended functions (e.g. marker of role phrases, hypothetical similarity clauses, accord clauses) but it is used neither as a complementiser nor as a purpose clause marker.

### 3.2. Ethio-Semitic

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>SIM ‘like’</th>
<th>PURP</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>Other functions and meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigre§</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ACD, EX, IM.ANTE, TEMP, REAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mensa dialect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigre§</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>‘how many’, TEMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rigbat dialect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigrinya*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ACD, COND, EQU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gə’əz†</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>IM.ANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transversal</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ACD, CMD, CORR, EQU, EX, EXCL, HOW, IM.ANTE, INSTEAD, ROLE, SIMU, TEMP; in complex verb forms: COND, DUR, RESU, TEND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

34 According to Elias (2005: 193), kam (‘how many’) and kom (similative marker) that occur in other Tigre dialects have merged into kam in the Rigbat dialect.
Table 5. Similative-purpose multifunctionality in Ethio-Semitic

The similative morphemes of North ES and Outer South ES are obviously cognate. They all contain a sequence of an initial voiceless velar or glottal obstruent \((k, x, h)\), a central vowel \((a, ä, ə)\) and a bilabial nasal \(m\). The nasal is only missing in Inor. Gumer, Muher and Ga‘az have an additional final vowel \(a\). The similative morphemes of Transversal South ES are possibly related to that of the other languages; see the velar or glottal consonants as \(C_1\) and/or \(m\) as \(C_2\). Only the Amharic morpheme \(ənd(ā)\)- lacks any phonological similarity with the morphemes elsewhere in ES. With regard to morphological status and position, we find free-standing, preposed morphemes in the northern branch. In the southern branch, all similative morphemes are bound and mostly suffixed; only Amharic and Argobba have similative prefixes. Unlike the descriptions of Cushitic languages, the grammars of ES languages mention hardly any nominal features of the similative morphemes.35

Only the description of Harari by Beniam (2013: 276) mentions and exemplifies the use of \(-kut\) as a

\[\text{Languages outside of Ethiopia: Tigre – Eritrea, Sudan; *Cross-border language: Tigrinya – Ethiopia, Eritrea; †Extinct: Ga‘az (Old Ethiopic).}\]

35 It is only sometimes mentioned that certain clauses marked by the similative morphemes require a relative verb form (see e.g. Tesfay 2006: 878 on Tigrinya).
manner nominal (or nominaliser), which can be case-marked and used in different syntactic functions in the clause.

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

**Gumer (South ES)**

(55) t’ay-xʷat {e-k’e-xāma} agād-xʷ-ən-əm.

sheep-DEF NEG.3smS-disappear-IPV-like tie-PV-1sS-3smO-M

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

**Ga’az (North ES)**

(56) wa-fannaw=ḵwo fətun=a {kama tar’ayəwo}

and-send.PRF=1s+him quick=ACC like see.SBJV.2mp+him

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

When considering the other extended functions of the similative morpheme, it might come as a surprise that Amharic has so many of them (see last column of Table 5). To a certain extent, this elaborate multifunctionality can be attributed to the healthy documentary status of the language – it may be that we merely have insufficient knowledge about the less common additional functions of the similative morpheme in other languages. Two sections of Leslau’s reference grammar of
Amharic are dedicated to the functions of ənd(ä)- as a preposition (1995: 611-614) and as a conjunction, i.e. in combination with verbs and nouns (1995: 690-704). The author gives numerous examples, distinguishing nine functions of prepositional ənd(ä)- and no less than 27 functions of the conjunction ənd(ä)-. He also discusses the use of ənd(ä)- in multi-word verb complexes, which are generally not taken into account (or which do not exist) in other languages.36

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

36 Leslau (1995) provides no information on the frequency of these functions in Amharic texts. Note, however, that Hartmann (1980) mentions mostly the same functions.
37 A thorough study of the descriptions of individual language by a Semitist would, however, be necessary to corroborate this point.
multifunctionality replication. No original Ga’az manuscripts that were actually written at the time when the language was still spoken have survived (Weninger: 1999: 4).

3.3. Omotic

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>SIM ‘like’</th>
<th>PURP</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>Other functions and meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mao</td>
<td>+ bane</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>EQU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sezo (Mao)</td>
<td>(+ hînk’)39</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exophoric manner deictic, QUOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ hánk’</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>endophoric manner deictic, EQU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizi</td>
<td>+ gant</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheko</td>
<td>+ gôntifi</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ gomâ (Tepi variety)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>-oâ ‘ũ’-ośn̄</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemsa</td>
<td>-nẽ/-(y)sẽ</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>IM.ANTE, COND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 Ganza is the only Omotic cross-border language; it also spoken in Sudan.
39 Sezo hînk’ is not used in similitative constructions of the type ‘N runs like X’ in the examples in Girma (2014); it is only used as a similitative deictic ‘like this’. In contrast, hánk’ is also used as a non-deictic ‘like’.
The similative morphemes are very different across Omotic. Only in the Ometo languages Gamo and Wolaitta (Central Ometo) and Zayse and Zargulla (East Ometo) is a cognate morpheme *mala* found.\textsuperscript{44} Several grammatical descriptions mention nominal features or a possible nominal origin of

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

\textsuperscript{41} The transcription of this morpheme differs in the sources: -\textsuperscript{41}daani\textsuperscript{41} in Wakasa (2008), -\textsuperscript{41}dan\textsuperscript{42} in Azeb (2009) and -\textsuperscript{41}dani\textsuperscript{42}, shortened to -\textsuperscript{41}da, in Lamberti & Sottile (2007).

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

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

\textsuperscript{44} In the Western Ometo language Baskeet, there is a polysemous noun *malá* ‘circumstance, condition, way, manner, method; solution’ (own data), which has, however, not been grammaticalised into a similative morpheme.
the similative morpheme without mentioning a specific source noun; see, for instance, Zaugg-Coretti (this volume) on Yemsa màtó, Hellenthal (2010: 276) on Sheko gôntfì and Wakasa (2008: 650) on Wolaitta -daani. Hayward & Eshetu (2014) show that Gamo málá is still used as a full noun ‘likes, kind’ in the synchronic state of the language. It assumes various syntactic positions in the clause and is marked for different cases, e.g. the ablative case in (57). The same is also true of Wolaitta malá, as the examples in Wakasa (2008) illustrate.

Gamo (Hayward & Eshetu 2014: 231)

(57) Ne malappe tana Ts’oossi aššo

[2sPOSS kind.OBL+ABL 1sABS God.NOM save.3mJUSS]

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

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

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

\(^45\) In other languages, the similative morphemes are not inherently deictic. Manner deictics are usually formed through the combination of a demonstrative element plus the similative morpheme, e.g. hagàa-daani /this.ms.OBL-SIM/ ‘like this’ in Wolaitta (Wakasa 2008: 513). Such manner deictics can then be used as quotatives.
functions as a complementiser (Girma 2014: 143, 252ff, 276, 293f). However, Sezo does not use the similative morphemes in purpose clauses.

3.4. Ethiopian Nilo-Saharan

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>SIM ‘like’ (‘like this’)</th>
<th>PURP</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>Other functions and meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Sudanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywa*</td>
<td>kàa + clause</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>‘place, kind’ (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majang</td>
<td>òkó</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gumuz*</td>
<td>ŋéa</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gumuz*</td>
<td>ŋéla</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uduk*</td>
<td>mê’d</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>‘hand’ (N), EQU, ROLE, TEMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berta*</td>
<td>mithil (&lt; Arabic)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sha- ~ tha, shámá)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>TEMP, REAS, QUOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cross-border languages: Ethiopia-Sudan

Table 7. Similative-purpose multifunctionality in Nilo-Saharan
According to Andersen (forthcoming), Berta, a language that constitutes a Nilo-Saharan subgroup of its own, has a morpheme *sha* in the following functions: as part of a temporal conjunction *shambá* (< *sha* plus pronoun *mbá*) ‘when’, as a causal conjunction *sha* ‘because’, as part of a purposive conjunction *sháa* (< *sha* plus sequential particle *ā(a)*) ‘in order to’ and as a quotative morpheme *sha*. An element *sha* is also found in the interrogative pronoun *shainée* ‘how’. In the Berta dictionary by the Benishangul-Gumuz Language Development Project, the same morpheme *sha* (pronunciation variant: *tha*) is used as a complement clause marker governed by perception, cognition and utterance verbs (2014: 22, 108, 126, respectively). The composite morpheme *shambá* (= Andersen’s *shambá*) also serves as a complement clause marker and as a manner deictic ‘like’ (2014: 46, 112). However, the dictionary contains no examples in which *sha* or *shambá* is used as a non-deictic (‘like’) standard marker in similitative constructions – which explains the brackets in the Berta line in Table 7.46 Instead, the dictionary provides an Arabic loan *mithil* (2014: 90).

---

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

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

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

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

One is tempted to ask in which language (group) similative-purpose multifunctionality could have originated in Ethiopia and spread to neighbouring languages. However, the answer can only be speculative. In each of the three Afroasiatic branches, Semitic, Cushitic and Omotic, we find languages where this feature is present and where it is absent. As similative-purpose multifunctionality is not very widespread in Omotic and restricted to the contact zone with Highland East Cushitic, one can probably exclude Omotic languages as the source. However, whether it developed first in Ethio-Semitic and was then transferred to Cushitic, or whether it spread form
certain Cushitic languages to Ethio-Semitic (and possibly back again via the lingua franca Amharic) is impossible to say at the present stage of knowledge. It is, however, safe to assume that not each individual language has grammaticalised a simulative morpheme into a purpose clause marker on its own and without external influence.

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

47 Note that the Omotic language Maale and the Cushitic language Konso are included in her sample.
that in Tabasaran, another Lezgic language, the simulative morpheme -si is also sometimes used on converbs in purpose clauses. The use of a manner and degree deictic (‘so’) as part of multi-morphemic purpose clauses markers, as observed in European languages (see König this volume on English), is a case of multifunctionality that is not readily comparable to the Ethiopian case where purpose clause marker are non-deictic.

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

Appendix 1: Abbreviations of Glosses

AAM    proprietive
ABL    ablative
ADD    additive
CAUS1  simple causative
CAUS2  double causative
COP1   yoo-copula
COP2   ha/-ta-copula
COP3   VV-t-copula
CRD    coordinative
DAT    dative
DDEM   demonstrative adjective
DEF    definite
DS     different subject
f      feminine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>multifunctional =g-morpheme (source meaning: ‘manner’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hon</td>
<td>honorific, impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICO</td>
<td>imperfective converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP</td>
<td>instrumental-perlative-comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEM</td>
<td>demonstrative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INACT</td>
<td>inactual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUS</td>
<td>jussive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>mitigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULT</td>
<td>multiplicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>pragmatically determined morpheme (function as yet unclear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPV</td>
<td>non-imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMZ.VV</td>
<td>nominalisation marked by a long vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMZ1</td>
<td>nominalisation with =bi\textit{i}(-ta/-ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMZ2</td>
<td>nominalisation with =hann/=tann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMZp</td>
<td>nominalisation with =r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>negative relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCO</td>
<td>perfective converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>plurative with –C-áta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>plurative with –aakk-áta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL3</td>
<td>plurative with –n-ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>predicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVE</td>
<td>e-perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVO</td>
<td>o-perfective (perfect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY</td>
<td>marker of tens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VV vowel lengthening

Appendix 2: Abbreviations of Functions

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

48 See Zaugg-Coretti this volume.
50 See Leslau (1995: 299f) for Amharic.
INSTEAD marker of ‘instead of’-phrases and clauses

OBLG marker in complex verb forms expressing obligation (Section 2.13)

PURP marker of purpose clauses

REAS marker of reason clauses

RESU marker of result clauses

ROLE marker of role phrases (functives) (§2.9)

SIMU marker of simulative (hypothetical similarity) clauses (§2.4)

TEMP marker of temporal (simultaneity and/or anteriority, but not necessarily IM.ANTE)

TEND marker in complex verb forms expressing a tendency (‘have the tendency to V’)

UP.TO marker of a locative relation (‘up to, until, towards, facing’)

Appendix 3: Sources

Cushitic


Alaaba Schneider-Blum 2007, 2009

Awngi Hetzron 1969

Bayso Hayward 1978-79


Dhaasanac Tosco 2001, Mauro Tosco p.c.

Gedeo Hudson 1989, Wedekind 1990

Hadiyya Perrett 2000, Sim 1989, Tadesse 2015

K’abeena  Crass 2005

Kambaata  own data

Kemant  Appleyard 1975, Zelealem 2003


Libido  Crass (this volume)


Rendille  Pillinger & Galboran 1999, Schlee 1978


Sidaama  Anbessa 2000, Kawachi 2007, forthcoming

Somali  Saeed 1999

Tunni  Tosco 1997

Xamtanga  Darmon (this volume)

**Ethio-Semitic**

Argobba  Wetter 2010

Amharic  Hartmann 1980, Kane 1990, Leslau 1995

Ga’az  Weninger 1999, 2011

Gumer  Sascha Völlmin p.c.

Harari  Abdurahman & Wagner 1998, Beniam 2013

Inor  Berhanu & Hetzron 2000

Muher  Crass & Meyer 2008

Tigre (Mensa dialect)  Leslau 1945, Raz 1983

Tigre (Rigbat dialect)  Elias 2005

Tigrinya  Leslau 1941, Mason 1996, Tesfay 2006, Dirk Kievit p.c., Rainer Voigt
p.c.
Wolane Meyer 2006
Zay Meyer 2005

**Omotic**
Baskeet own data, Inui 2012
Bench Rapold 2006, Rapold & Zaugg-Coretti 2009
Dizi Beachy 2005
Koorete Lydia Höft p.c.
Maale Azeb 2001a
Northern Mao M. Ahland 2012
Oyda Bernhard Köhler p.c.
Sezo Girma 2014
Sheko Hellenthal 2010
Yemsa Zaugg-Coretti this volume
Zargulla Azeb 2007, 2009a
Zayse Hayward 1990

**Nilo-Saharan**
Anywa Reh 1996
Berta Benishangul-Gumuz Language Development Project 2014, Triulzi 1976,
Andersen forthcoming
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