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1. Introduction

DISTRIBUTION, CLASSIFICATION, EARLIER WORKS, FOCUS OF THE STUDY...
1.1. Contact zone

- Earlier works on language contact in this area by Crass & Meyer, e.g. (2007) on deictics, copulas and focus
1.2. Language classification

Ethiosemitic

North (Tigre, Tigrinya, †Geez)  South

Transversal

Central (Amharic, Argobba)

Eastern  Central (Amharic, Argobba)  Outer

Harari  East Gurage (Zay vs. Silt’e, Wolane)

†Gafat vs. Kistane, Dobbi

Muher  Mesqan  Chaha Group (Chaha, Ezha, Gumer, Gura)
Inor Group (Inor, Gyeta, Endegagn, Enar, †Mesmes)

Gunnän-Gurage

based on Hetzron (1972; 1977)
1.2. Language classification

Based on Tosco (2000)

Cushitic

North (Beja)
Central (e.g. Awngi)
East

Highland
Kambaata
Sidaama
Hadiyya
Libido
Alaaba
K’abeena

Gedeo
Burji

Yaaku-Dullay

Lowland
Omo-Tana e.g.
Dhaasanac, Somali
Oromoid (Oromo, Konso)
Saho-Afar

South (e.g. Iraqw)
1.3. Sources and Focus

• Chapters on demonstratives in grammatical descriptions of Gurage and HEC (and related) languages


• Own research: Meyer (2010) on Muher demonstratives in space and discourse, Treis (forthc. a) on presentatives in HEC, Treis (forthc. b) on manner and related demonstratives in Kambaata

• Focus of this study: Exophoric and (to a lesser extent) endophoric use of demonstratives
2. Demonstrative systems compared

2.1. DEICTIC DEGREES, 2.2. MORPHOSYNTACTIC TYPES, 2.3. ONTOLOGICAL CATEGORIES (ESP. MANNER)
2.1. Deictic degrees
Deictics degrees: Gurage I

- **2-term system** (PROX – DIST) most common:
  Zay, Wolane (East Gurage – EG)
  Kistane, Mesqan, Endegegn (Gunnän Gurage – GG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wolane</th>
<th>?innä</th>
<th>?annä</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kistane</td>
<td>zi</td>
<td>za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endegegn</td>
<td>wadä</td>
<td>hadä</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **3-term system** (PROX – MED – DIST): Muher (GG)

  zi / hi / zah / bəda!
  PRX.SPK  MED  DST  take-away.IMP[s2sm]

  ‘Take this (proximal) / that (medial) / that (distal).’
Deictics degrees: Gurage II

- **4-term system**: Gumer (GG) (Völlmin 2017: 206, 213)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>$zi(x)$</th>
<th>Near to interlocutors</th>
<th>Nearer to speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>$xi(x)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearer to addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal 1</td>
<td>$za(x)$</td>
<td>Far from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal 2</td>
<td>$xa$</td>
<td>interlocutors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distinction not entirely clear: $xa$ further away than $za(x)$ and expressing ‘the other in the same surrounding’

**xa-ta**  jä-mägära dannära banä
DST2-POSS.3SM ATTR-calves tanned_hide AUX.PST.3SM

‘The other ones were calf leather.’
Deictics degrees: Gurage III

• So far: speaker-centered systems

• Reference to entities far from speaker and near to addressee is expressed by 3rd person independent personal pronoun (cf. also Amharic)

  • lit. “Take him!” = ‘Take the one far from me (speaker) and close to you (addressee)!”
  • Reported for East Gurage (Zay, Wolane), Mesqan, Muher

Most Ethio-Semitic languages outside the zone: 2-term system; see Geez, Tigre, Tigrinya (North ES), Amharic, Harari (Transversal ES)
Deictics degrees: HEC I

• 2-term system (PROX – DIST): Gedeo, Burji
• 3-term system: (PROX – DIST – CNTR): Oromo (LEC)*, K’abeena
• 3-term system (PROX – MED – DIST/CNTR): Libido
• 3-term system (PROX – MED – DIST): Hadiyya
• 4-term system (PROX – MED – CNTR – DIST): Kambaata, Alaaba
• 4-term system (PROX1 – PROX2 – MED– DIST): Sidaama

*NB: Oromo variety in contact with Gurage not described!
Deictics degrees: HEC II

• ‘this/that other one’ (CNTR): Reported for/observed in Kambaata, Alaaba, K’abeena, Libido (HEC), Oromo (LEC), Gumer (Gunnän Gurage), Gamo* (Omotic)

KAMBAATA

Ánn-unku-s ciil-á-s áff
father-mNOM<N>-DEF child-mACC-3mPOSS take.3mPCO

káaph ciil-i ann-i min-i márr-o.
A_DEM3.mACC child-mGEN father-mGEN house-mACC go-3mPFV

(Context: One day two children quarreled. One of them went home, crying, and told his father what had happened.) ‘The father took his child and went to that (i.e. the other) child’s father.’

* Hayward & Eshetu (2014: 115) speak of “allogenous” demonstratives in Gamo (Omotic), define them as “direct[ing] attention away from the expected object of discussion” and translate them as ‘the other’.
2.2. Morphosyntactic types
Morphosyntactic types: Gurage I

- **Adnominal vs. pronominal** demonstratives: not clearly distinguished, but pronouns can have additional nominal morphology

- Gunnän Gurage (except Kistane and Endegegn): adnominal = pronominal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributive</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. zi(-we) bərtukʷan j-alf-u</td>
<td>b. zi(-we) bida!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRX(-DEF) orange 3SM-be.better\IPFV-MVM</td>
<td>PRX(-DEF) take\IMP(.2SM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘This orange is better.’</td>
<td>‘Take this one!’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- East Gurage (Zay, Wolane): 
adnominal + gender/number + definiteness > pronominal
Morphosyntactic types: HEC I

- **Adnominal vs. pronominal** demonstratives are usually formally distinguished in HEC, pronouns are either nominalized adnominal forms or distinct paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M.PL</th>
<th>F.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td><strong>káan</strong></td>
<td>táan</td>
<td>kará</td>
<td>tará</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>kíum</td>
<td>tíin</td>
<td>kurú</td>
<td>tirú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>káníi</td>
<td>tanné</td>
<td>karri</td>
<td>tarri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>káníi(ha)</td>
<td>tannée(ha)</td>
<td>karri(ha)</td>
<td>tarrii(ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>káníichch</td>
<td>tannéechch</td>
<td>karriichch</td>
<td>tarriichch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP</td>
<td>káníin</td>
<td>tannéen</td>
<td>karriin</td>
<td>tarrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>káníén</td>
<td>tannéen</td>
<td>karráan</td>
<td>tarráan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>kánne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>kabá</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED-COP3</td>
<td>kánínee-t</td>
<td>tannée-t</td>
<td>kárraa-t</td>
<td>tárraa-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Proximal (‘this’) adnominal demonstrative

Kambaata

Table 3. Proximal (‘this one’) pronominal demonstrative (‘that one’)

---
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Morphosyntactic types: Gurage II

• No dedicated **place demonstratives** in Gunnän Gurage: Regular demonstratives are combined with affixes encoding location, i.e. *bä-* (LOC) and/or -*e(t)/-ät* ‘place, vicinity’

  ![Muher](bä-
  -m  tona!  zi-jät  am-bäsa-ho!)
  LOC-MED-FOC  be_seated\IMP(.2SM)  PRX-ADE  PROH-come\NEG.PFV-2SM.MVM
  ‘Stay (lit. be seated) just there! Don’t come here!’

• Dedicated or not straightforwardly composite place demonstratives in East Gurage
  • Zay: *jihiij/jahaaj* ‘this/that’ but: *yux/yax* ‘here/there’
  • Wolane: *ʔinnä/ʔannä* ‘this/that’ but *bibbi/babbi* ‘here/there’

• Other ES languages: dedicated forms in North ES (Geez, Tigre, Tigrinya)
Morphosyntactic types: HEC II

- Languages with only composite **place demonstratives**, use of case-marked “regular” (object, person etc.) demonstratives, Kambaata, Alaaba, K’abeena (cf. Gurage language Muher)

  K’ABEENA (Crass 2005: 131, translation ours)
  
  **kanneen**¹  **safarro**
  DMP1:M:LOC  settle:PRV:3P
  ‘They settled here (lit. at/on this).’

  **hikkanneen**¹  **rošsat**¹  **rosisu**  **jammarroomni**¹
  DMP2:M:LOC  class:ACC  teach:VN:ACC  start:PRV:1s
  ‘I began to teach there (lit. at/on that).’
Morphosyntactic types: HEC III

- Languages with one/some dedicated **place demonstrative(s)** that is/are not generated on the basis of “regular” demonstratives and sometimes not even similar to them:

  - Languages with one or more place demonstrative(s) (restricted case marking potential), e.g. Libido *ke* ‘here’ (cf. *ku, ka* ‘this (NOM, ACC)’)
    
    (Crass n.d.; see also Hadiyya, Gedeo, Burji; Oromo)

    See also in Oromo (LEC): *acci* ‘there’ (cf. *suni, sana* ‘that (NOM, ACC)’, *asi* ‘here’ (cf. *xuni, xana* ‘this (NOM, ACC)’)

    (Owens 1985: 87; Gragg 1982: 6)

  - Separate paradigms of fully-inflecting place demonstratives in Sidaama: *kawa* ‘here’ (PROX1), *hakka* ‘here’ (PROX2), *kaa’a* ‘there’ (MED), *ka’’a* ‘there far’ (DIST)

    (Dukamo 2014: 30f, Kawachi 2007: 190)
Morphosyntactic types: Gurage III

**Presentative** demonstratives not much discussed in the literature

- Muher: presentative construction consists of DEM-FOC-COP(-DEM)
  
  \[ zi \sim zi\text{-}mni\text{-}n(-zi)/hi\text{-}mni\text{-}n(-hi)/za\text{-}mni\text{-}n\text{-}zah \ ‘voilà, here/there/yonder it is’ \]

Other presentatives

- Wolane: invariable presentative
  
  \[ ji\text{-}hole! \ ‘Here it is!’ \]

- Zay: deictic base \textit{jaa-} combines with **verbal** suffixes agreeing in gender and number with the addressee (cf. HEC Hadiyya: number of the addressee)
  
  \[ ja\text{-}x, ja\text{-}ʃ, jo\text{-}hum \ ‘Here it is (SM/ʃF/PL)’ \]
Morphosyntactic types: HEC IV

- **Presentative** demonstratives all over HEC (Treis forthc. b), in predicative function (but rarely with copula), take nominative subjects, not always a presentative morpheme segmentable, based/formally similar to nominative demonstratives

- Hadiyya: 4 presentative forms, PROX.M, PROX.F, MED.M, MED.F

- Libido: 6 presentative forms, composite (Crass n.d.)

- Kambaata: 12 (+12) presentative forms (marked for gender, number, deictic degree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>kun-ko’o</td>
<td>ku-to’o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>haa-ko’o</td>
<td>haa-to’o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>ha’i-ko’o</td>
<td>ha’i-to’o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sidaama: 1 invariant presentative, Gedeo, Oromo (LEC): 2 gender-neutral presentatives (PROX VS. DIST)

(Context: Waitress serves coffee to the addressee. She points out the coffee herb, because the client asks for it.) ‘Here is the coffee herb!’
2.3. Ontological categories
Manner demonstratives: Gurage

• Ontological categories: persons, objects, events, places, times, **manner**, quality, degree etc.

• Composite manner demonstratives: demonstrative base plus similative, lit. ‘like this’ in Wolane (EG), Kistane, Mesqan, Endegegn (GG) – see also other ES languages (except Tigre, Tigrinya ?)

• Non-composite, dedicated manner demonstratives: Muher (GG): 1 dedicated manner DEM, Zay (EG) and Gumer (GG): proximal vs. distal manner DEM

ZAY (Diriba 2013: 51)

a. \textit{wut giñi-j jukku saan-ā-m maat'-ā-j-n-u}  
   \text{3SM \ dog-DEF like_this make\textbackslash PFV-3SM-CN\ make:pfv-SBJ.3SM-OBJ.3SM-FOC-MVM}  
   ‘He hit the dog like this.’ (+ showing the manner of hitting)

b. \textit{jaakku maat'-ā-ji-m k'ātf'-ā-j} …  
   \text{like_that hit\textbackslash PFV-SBJ.3SM-OBJ.3SM-CN\ kill\textbackslash PFV-SBJ.3SM-OBJ.3SM}  
   ‘Having hit it [the dog] like that, he killed it.’

\text{PROX = exophoric}
\text{DIST = endophoric}
Manner demonstratives: HEC

- Non-composite manner DEMs in all HEC languages, reduction/neutralisation of deictic distinctions; if 2 manner DEMs, then semantic component of distance lost; no, vague, or fair resemblance to other demonstratives

  - Hadiyya: *kide* (~ PROX), less common: *'eéde* (~ MED)
  - Libido: *kid* (~ PROX), less common: *hid* (~ MED/DIST) (Crass n.d.: 465)

    ```
    (...)
    gudda haa billi kid
    connection ACC DMD2 day.NOM like.this
    tiramuko untie.PASS.3S.M.PRV
    ```

    ‘On that day the bond (...) was thus untied (i.e. in the way it was reported before).’

  - Sidaama: *togo* (~ PROX1), *hatto* (~ PROX2)
  - Kambaata *hitt-ita*, K’abeena *hitti*, non-composite but similar to medial DEM
  - Gedeo: *iitta*, non-composite but similar to distal DEM (in 2-term system)
  - Burji: *ungu*, no formal resemblance to other DEM

  - Composite: Oromo *akkana*, *akkasi* ‘like this’, contains *akka*- ‘like’ (similative)
3. Summary and outlook
Summary and outlook

- Areally relevant feature: 2-term (speaker-centered) deictic systems common in ES outside of the HEC/Gurage zone; ES inside the zone: **larger systems**, i.e. + medial or + contrastive

- Areally relevant feature: **non-composite manner** demonstratives

- **Presentatives** of various types (demonstrative and/or verbal) detected in the HEC/Gurage zone, but no contact-induced distribution > presentatives are generally under-researched in Ethiopian languages

- Dedicated/non-composite **place** demonstratives attested in the HEC/Gurage zone, but no contact-induced distribution can be detected

- We lack: (i) studies of demonstrative other than adnominal and pronominal, and, even more important, (ii) corpus studies on the use of demonstratives
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