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Review articles


The six papers collected in this volume developed out of a workshop organized by the two editors at the University of Mainz on December 13–14, 2007, with the aim of discussing “linguistic contact and contact-induced language change in Ethiopia from a broader perspective” (p. 2). It followed a first workshop held in 2004 at the same institution, which especially targeted deictics, copulas and focality in Cushitic, Omotic, and Semitic languages of the Horn of Africa.1

The authors of the papers in the 2009 volume are two young Ethiopian (Binyam Sisay and Ongaye Oda), and four German and Swiss Ethiopian scholars (Ronny Meyer, Christian J. Rapold, Sascha Völlmin, and Silvia Zaug-Coretti). For a member of the older generation like the present reviewer, it is refreshing to see so many young people engaged in new and well-documented research of Ethiopian languages, their structure and their historical contacts.

Binyam Sisay addresses the function and origin of the morpheme -(k)ko in two East Ometo languages, Koreete2 and Haro. He does not deny the received view that this morpheme derives from an old masculine ‘copula’, whose feminine counterpart is -tte, as shown by other East Ometo languages, such as Zayse and Zargulla.3 The two copular markers ultimately derive from an old deictic, with a grammaticalization process that occurred several times across several Afroasiatic language groups.4 Yet Binyam does not pursue this

---

1 Some of the papers of this first workshop were published in J. CRASS – R. MEYER (eds.), Deictics, Copula and Focus in the Ethiopian Convergence Area = Afrikanistische Forschungen 15, Köln: Köppe, 2007.
2 Also known as Koyra in the previous literature. It is the language whose verb morphology Binyam Sisay discussed in his Ph.D. thesis at the University of Oslo in 2008.
3 This view has been suggested, e.g., by Hayward in a paper on the notion of “default gender”, cp. R.J. HAYWARD, “The Notion of Default Gender: A Key to Interpreting the Evolution of Certain Verb Paradigms in East Ometo, and its Implications for Omotic”, Afrika und Übersee 72, 1989, pp. 17–32.
distant origin further; rather, he discusses the distribution and function of this morpheme in the two above languages, clearly arguing that it is only a marker of focus, that can be attached to the right of different clause constituents, such as the subject, the object, the verb, etc. He argues that this is an instance of a grammaticalized focus system “which originated from copula constructions”, i.e., -\((k)ko\) in Koorete and Haro previously had a copular function, but lost it and became a marker of focus. Implicitly, this means that such focus constructions derive from older cleft sentences, and one wonders whether traces of their old biclausal structure, with the presupposed part embedded as a subordinate clause, are still visible in the Koorete and Haro focus constructions.

The short paper is well argued, even though there are some terminological problems. For instance, on p. 8 the author writes that “the assertive focus marker in interrogative sentences is -\(a\) which occurs instead of -\(ko\)". Since the standard dictionary definition of an assertion is "a definite statement or claim that something is true", one wonders what an interrogative assertion might be. The simpler phrase “the focus marker in interrogative sentences” would have avoided this oxymoron. Another point regards example (3.b) on p. 9, i.e., \(kana-ko\) keema-i 'THE DOG is an animal'. Binyam explicitly states that the focus marker is here suffixed to the subject, and his translation appears to reflect this analysis, whereby ‘an animal’, i.e. keema-i is the predicate. But he glosses -i as a nominative marker, even though he concedes in note (3) that "the issue needs further investigation". The problem is that in other known instances, both Omotic and East-Cushitic languages with case systems appear to have so-called marked nominative systems, whereby the subject and the nominal predicate of a verbless sentence are marked differently: only the subject is in the nominative or subject case. It is in some Semitic languages such as Classical Arabic and in several Indo-European languages that both of them are in the nominative case. As a consequence, the present reviewer suggests that there may have been some misunderstandings with the informants in eliciting example (3.b).

In the second contribution, Ronny Meyer discusses the quotative verb in the Ethio-Semitic languages and in Oromo. By quotative verb he refers to verbs that mean ‘to say’, etymologically derived from *BHL both in North and in South Ethio-Semitic, as different from verbs meaning ‘to tell’ (e.g., Tərgənə nəgərə, Amharic nəggərə, Harari ēda, etc.) or ‘to speak’, like Tərgənə səwəyə, Amharic tənaggərə, Harari asənəna (a denominative from sinən ‘language, speech’), etc. The Oromo counterpart of these Ethio-Semitic quotative verbs from *BHL is jedhe [jedhe] ‘he said’ (southern

Oromo yedhe), that this reviewer has shown to derive etymologically from 
EDH an old prefix-conjugated verb that still survives, e.g., in Saho-‘Afar- 
edb- (e.g., Saho yerbxe ‘he said’), Northern Somali yidbi ‘he said’, etc.5 The 
main foci of his paper are, on the one hand, the different valency frames or 
argument structures of these verbs and, on the other hand, a careful character-
ization of several other syntactic features (e.g., the affectedness of the 
subject) of the major constructions the quotative verbs are used in, especial-
ly in South Ethio-Semitic and, particularly, in Muḫar, one of the Gurage 
languages. Such constructions range from functioning as supporting verbs 
with ideophones, to the well-known idiomatic pseudo-quotations that one 
frequently finds in these languages, e.g., ‘the house door said to me “I won’t 
be open”’ = ‘I didn’t manage to open the house door’ (example 19). Meyer 
adds a number of other uses to these constructions, such as the frequent 
ocurrence of convers or other subordinate forms of quotative verbs for 
expressing purpose, as in his example (27) ‘It was while saying “for you!” 
that I came’ = ‘I came for the sake of you’.

The paper is well argued, and discusses a significant part of the previous 
literature. Some claims should have been explained in more detail, however; for 
instance, Meyer writes that in Oromo the addressee of the quotative verb “is 
treated as the emphatic direct object marked by the instrumental -dha)an” 
(p. 26). It is true that in, e.g., naan jedhe ‘he told me’, naan is the INS case 
form of na ‘me’, but it is wholly unclear to the present reviewer why this 
should be an “emphatic direct object”. Owens just remarks that this is an 
instrumental complement in his example dubbii naan je’e ‘he said a word to 
me’. Interestingly, this verb also requires an instrumental marker for the ad-
dressee in Northern Somali, i.e. the etymologically different preverbal particle 
ku, as in dhurwaagii baa dabadeed ku yidhi “...” ‘and later the hyena told 
him “...”’.6 In addition to this, it would have been interesting to look not only 
into what happens in Oromo, but also in other Cushitic languages as the pic-
ture is partially different in, e.g., Northern Somali and Saho-‘Afar. To men-
tion just one example, it is true that “deriving ideophones from existing verb 
roots to express an augmented or weakened result of an action” does not ap-
pear to be attested in Oromo, whereas it is well described for Amharic, as in

5 Cf. G. BANTI, “New Perspectives on the Cushitic Verbal System”, in: A. SIMPSON 
ed., Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics 
Society, March 22–23, 2001 – Special Session on Afroasiatic Languages, Berkeley, CA: 
6 J. OWENS, A Grammar of Harar Oromo (Northeastern Ethiopia): Including a Text 
and a Glossary = Kuschitische Sprachstudien 4/Cushitic Language Studies 4, Ham-
sābār [sic!] alā ‘it broke a little bit’ and sobār alā ‘it broke completely’ from SBR ‘break’ (p. 33). But similar phenomena are also well known in Afar, e.g., fākkā iyē ‘it opened’ from fake ‘open’, nabā faddīmma iyē ‘food is really wanted’ from faddīme ‘to be wanted’. As in Amharic, the final consonant of the stem or of the stem extension is geminated. Parker and Hayward treat such derived verb forms as a ‘diminished action stem’, whereas Bliese states that they offer “a stylistic method of emphasizing the verb”. In his review of Parker and Hayward’s above-mentioned dictionary, Bliese insists that describing these ‘Afar forms “as ‘diminished action’ is questionable. It seems rather that they show intensified action. Recently, Yvonne Genat in discourse analysis studies of ‘Afar narrative has found that these compound verbs mark pivotal events, which are normally high points in the action’. It would thus have been quite interesting to further investigate this area, where an Ethio-Semitic and an East Cushitic language clearly display similar constructions. In addition to this, it would have been useful at least to mention the fact that verbs meaning ‘to say’ are also used as supporting verbs with ideophones in several Omotic and even Nilo-Saharan languages of the Horn, not only in Ethio-Semitic and in Cushitic.

Ongaye Oda discusses ‘The spread of punctual derivation in Dullay and Oromoid languages’ in the third contribution. He thus focuses on a peculiar area of intensive language contact in south-western Ethiopia that Sasse suggested to name the “Sagan language area” in 1986. It includes the entire Dullay group, the Konso group of Oromoid, Burji of Highland East Cushitic (HEC), and ‘Ongota (also known as Birale or Birelle in the literature), and Ongaye describes in some detail the current social developments in this area, with a particular focus on the Konso. Punctual derivation “expresses doing something only once” (p. 46), and may additionally “convey the meaning of...

---

intensity” (pp. 46, 54); it has been called “singulative” derivation in a part of the previous literature on these languages, but Ongaye explains why he prefers the term “punctual” derivation, that was introduced by Savà in 2005.12 Both in Dullay and in Konso it involves geminating the second stem consonant, as in Konso ikk- ‘take a drink’ from ik- ‘drink’, Šamoakko ‘ugg- ‘sip’ from ‘ug-‘drink’, Šamoakko baq’al- ‘sprout at once’ from baq’al- ‘sprout’, etc. It doesn’t seem to occur neither in Oromo nor in Burji, and is thus an isogloss that links just Dullay and Konsoi. The author reports several details about how verbs displaying this kind of derivation are used, particularly in Konso and in Šamoakko, the best described Dullay language. For instance, in both languages punctual derivation in imperatives “also indicates an immediate fulfilment of an order” (p. 53); in addition to this, “the objects of transitive punctual verbs are understood as a single item” (p. 54), because the action is performed only once. With plural objects, punctuality requires not only punctual derivation, but also the reduplication of the first syllable of the verb, that by itself marks frequentative or distributive derivation, as in mantasi bellaasine lelebbiti ‘the girl kicked each of the children once’ (example 21, with lelebbiti from leb-).

In the fourth paper of the volume, Christian Rapold and Silvia Zaug-Coretti discuss data from the two Omotic languages they have been doing extensive fieldwork on, respectively Benchnon (Benč) and Yámsa (Yám). Both languages have been referred to in the older literature with different names: Gimira for Benchnon, and Gangáro for Yámsa. The former is in contact with other Omotic languages to the north and west, and with Nilo-Saharan Surmic languages to the south and east; instead, Yámsa is spoken to the west of the Gurage cluster, and is surrounded by several HEC languages and by Oromo. After describing in some detail the sociolinguistic situation of the two languages, Rapold and Zaug-Coretti investigate and try to evaluate “the presence or absence in Benchnon and Yámsa of the features identified for the ‘Ethiopian Linguistic Area’ by Crass and Meyer”.13 These features are the following:

(i.) ablative > comparative,
(ii.) ablative > ‘since‘-temporal > real conditional,
(iii.) similative > complementizer > purposive,
(iv.) prospective aspect and intentional as separate categories,
(v.) experiential perfect with the verb ‘know’,
(vi.) benefactive focused by the verb ‘say’,

(vii.) different copulas in main and subordinate clauses, (viii.) existential > 'have' possessive, (ix.) 'have' possessive > obligation and, finally, (x.) past > apodosis of irrealis condition.

On p. 77 these ten features are displayed in a table, together with their occurrence in five southern Ethio-Semitic languages (Amharic and four Gurage languages, i.e., Zay, Wâlâne, Gumâr, and Muhydration), in Oromo, and in two northern HEC languages (Qabeena and Libido). It appears that the two HEC languages, the four Gurage ones and Amharic share most of them, with minimal deviations for one or two features in a few of them, whereas Oromo and the two Omotic languages display a quite different picture:

Oromo lacks features (ii.), (iv.), (viii.) and (ix.);
Yâmsa lacks features (ii.), partially (iii.), (iv.), (ix.) and (x.),
Benchnon lacks features (i.), (ii.), (iii.), partially (iv.), (ix.) and (x.).

Rapold and Zaug-Coretti insist that this is just a first probe into the actual significance of Crass and Meyer’s ten features that were initially developed for languages of the Central Highlands. Indeed, as the two authors of this contribution write, it would be necessary to have, on the one hand, (a.) a wider palette of Omotic languages, chosen both among those that are geographically closer to HEC and Gurage, and among those that are spoken farther away; (b.) “to see whether Yâmsa, Benchnon and Oromo also have positive features in common, to the exclusion of the Semitic and Highland East Cushitic languages” (p. 78). The present reviewer would also add (c.) some other East Cushitic languages, since at least Saho and ‘Afar behave differently from Oromo in some of them; for instance, both Saho and ‘Afar are positive for features (ii.) and (ix.). And (d.) also the areas further north should be taken into account, i.e. Agâw and northern Ethio-Semitic. Anyhow, it is clear that there is still much to investigate in the languages spoken in the central areas of the Horn, in order to shed more light upon the complex contact phenomena that have been taking place between them.

Sascha Völlmin’s paper assesses a number of similarities and differences between Chaha and Gumâr, the language he focused his own 2006–08 fieldwork upon. It is a Gurage variety that had not received much attention before Völlmin’s new extensive data. On the one hand, the Gumâr regard themselves as being very closely related to the Čaha: *câxâ tâ-gwâmar immat-u* ‘Chaha and Gumâr are the same’ (example 1) and, for their language, Leslau claimed that “there is no difference between Gumâr and Čaha”. On the other hand,

---

almost 20 years before Leslau, Hetzron had written that “Chaha and Gumer ... should be considered two dialects of the same language”.\(^\text{15}\) Völlmin’s data show that Leslau’s claim was too extreme, and that there are indeed a few dialectal differences between these two Gurage varieties. Most of the differential features he lists are phonological ones, such as (i.) the preservation of \textit{ai} and \textit{ay}, and of \textit{au} and \textit{aw} in Gumâr vs. their reduction to \textit{e} and, respectively, \textit{o} in Čaha, (ii.) the partial preservation of historical geminates in some verbs as well as in nominals, whereas Čaha generally replaced the old geminates with devoiced or strengthened consonants, or (iii.) the preservation of \textit{-l} in the Gumâr benefactive object suffixes such as \textit{3SM -la}, \textit{3SF -la}, \textit{3PM -lo} and \textit{3PF -loma}, while Čaha has rhotacized forms, i.e., \textit{3SM -ra}, \textit{3SF -ra} etc. A historically somewhat puzzling difference is the variation between \textit{-p}, and \textit{-k}, in several Čaha ‘heavy’ malefactive object suffixes, such as \textit{1S -pi} \~ \textit{-ki}, \textit{3SM -pa} \~ \textit{-ka}, etc., while Gumâr has only the variants with \textit{-p} that preserve their etymological place of articulation, since they originated from forms with the old preposition \textit{*b-}. Völlmin adds that “there might also be differences in vocabulary” (p. 93), but does not pursue this any further in his paper. It is interesting to note that most of the differential features discussed by Völlmin show Gumâr to be more conservative than Čaha; can this be due to the fact that the Gumâr are settled at a higher and, thus, relatively less accessible area than the Čaha? The author adds however that “in villages close to the Chaha area one can also hear Chaha-like pronunciations ... The two variants are hardly separated by a sharp borderline but seem to form a continuum” (p. 94).

The final contribution in this volume is by Silvia Zaug-Coretti, who discusses the Yâmsa focus marker \textit{-tu} as a possible instance of morphological borrowing from Cushitic Oromo. She carefully discusses how \textit{-tu} marks focussed subjects, direct objects, instrument and locational phrases, adverbs and converbs, but not main clause verbs in Yâmsa, and that it “occurs only on one constituent in a sentence”. In order to focus main verbs, a verbal noun derived from the main verb has to precede it and to be focussed by means of \textit{-tu}, as in example (23): \textit{Kûrbû ìbê Yêmni kêja-tû kêfê} ‘the Gurage formerly used to \textit{fight} the Yem’, with \textit{kêja-tû kêfê} being lit. ‘fighting=FOC use-to-fight’. A more complex function of \textit{-tu} can be observed when it is attached to converbs in narrative texts, as in examples (24)–(26). In such cases, Zaug-Coretti points out that “equal weight is granted to both actions” (p. 105), i.e. what is expressed by a focussed converb and what by the main verb; “none of them is presupposed” (\textit{ibid.}), but “there is a conceptual shift after the converb marked

\(^{15}\) R. HETZRON, \textit{The Gunnân-Gurage Languages} = Ricerche 12, Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1977, pp. 4f.
by \textit{=tu}. The first action, represented by the converb, is completed before the next action starts” (ibid.). After a detailed discussion, the author concludes that the focus marker \textit{-tu} on such converbs “does not seem to indicate focus per se, but simply shows that the marked clause with its possible preceding clauses is not presupposed but asserted” (p. 106). Subsequently, the author discusses how \textit{-tu} is used in Oromo. After correctly pointing out that “the use of \textit{-tu} differs among the varieties of Oromo” (p. 106), she describes its behaviour in Wälläga Oromo because (a.) “this has been the variety that is in contact with Yemsä” (p. 107), and (b.) there is a detailed article by Dabala Goshu and Ronny Meyer on the grammar of focalization in this very variety of Oromo.\(^{16}\) As in Yamsa, \textit{-tu} marks subject focus in Wälläga Oromo, as well as in the other known varieties of this language, with the exception of the southernmost dialects where it is marked by \textit{-ti} \textendash{} \textit{-tti}. Direct objects are not focalized by means of \textit{-tu} in Wälläga Oromo, but adjuncts and “medial verbs in adverbial function” (p. 108) are. The present reviewer has shown that such verbal forms are “functional equivalents of converbs” to all effects\(^{17}\) and the similarity with the Yamsa converbs with \textit{-tu} is thus more apparent. Dabala Goshu and Meyer claim that \textit{-tu} functions in questions as an “assertive focus” marker in Wälläga Oromo (p. 185), and Zaug-Coretti repeats their claim: “\textit{-tu} is used to mark ... assertive focus in interrogative sentences” (p. 109) without realizing that, as already pointed out above, this is an oxymoron, because an interrogative assertion makes no sense. Finally, the author discusses with great care (i.) whether the Yemsa focus marker \textit{-tu} can be a development of an old feminine copular marker related to Zayse and Zargulla \textit{-tte}, that was briefly mentioned above while discussing Binyam Sisay’s paper; or whether it should be regarded as the result of borrowing from (ii.) a southern Ethio-Semitic copula in \textit{-t} (e.g., in some Gurage languages such as Zay and Kastane), (iii.) a HEC feminine copula such as Hadiyya/Libido \textit{-tte} or Qabeena \textit{-ta}, or (iv.) the Western Oromo focus marker \textit{-tu}. In the present reviewer’s opinion, she argues quite convincingly that the latter is the “most plausible of all options” (p. 116), because:

a) “the functions are very similar, more so that [sic!] compared to other candidates” such as the Eastern Ometo, Gurage or HEC copulas;
b) “the forms are identical, not only similar”;
c) “contact between Yemsä and Oromo must have been quite intense” as shown by the high number of Oromo lexical loanwords in Yamsa (p. 116).


She attaches however too much importance to the fact that she analyzes Yâmsa -tu as a clitic, and accordingly usually spells it as =tu, whereas in descriptions of Oromo it has been treated as “a suffix”. She wonders how it is possible that a suffix of the donor languages is borrowed as a clitic in the receiver language. The issue is theoretically interesting, but becomes practically meaningless if one considers that the terms “clitic” and “suffix” are used in quite dishomogeneous ways by the different authors that described Oromo, and that Zaug-Coretti and her data relies on this East Cushitic language and its dialects on other people’s analyses, not on her own one. In addition to this, she does not discuss one further fact that strengthens the case of Yâmsa -tu being borrowed from Wälläga Oromo, namely that when it is used for focusing the subject, “the verb always occurs in the 3rd person”. This has an obvious parallel to Oromo where the verb in a clause with a focussed subject marked by -tu must occur in a special form that is segmentally similar to the 3rd masculine singular, even if it is 3rd plural, 1st or 2nd person. Differently from Oromo, the Yâmsa verb whose subject is marked by -tu has to agree with it in gender, but this can easily be explained as an innovation that took place when -tu was adapted to Yâmsa. Zaug-Coretti also remarks that when the subject is focussed by -tu “the verb is obligatorily nominalized by the suffix -r”, and adds: “This is a cleft sentence” (p. 98). Yet she does not explain why this should be a cleft, nor further elaborates upon the suffix -r. Does she mean that verbs with the suffix -r are relative verb forms? A few more details to justify her claim would have been useful, just as a few more words on what she means by “completive and contrastive focus” (p. 102). Indeed, the conceptual frameworks used for describing information structure (IS) phenomena such as focus are extremely varied and it is useful to clearly define one’s use of such terms. Finally, a remark about relying too much upon other people’s analyses of a language one only knows partially. Zaug-Coretti reports a Wälläga Oromo subject-focussed sentence in her example (27): isheetu dhufa ‘SHE comes’, and remarks that “this construction is not to be considered a cleft-sentence synchronically, because there is no copula” (p. 107). It is true that this is not a cleft, but not for the reason she mentions. Indeed, dhufa is not a relative or dependent verbal form, and thus it does not justify a biclausal analysis, and clefts are always at least biclausal constructions. Secondly, had she read Owens,18 or Banti,19 she would have realized that whenever one analyzes Oromo

18 Owens, A Grammar of Harar Oromo (Northeastern Ethiopia), Hamburg, 1985, pp. 79f. [s. fn. 6 above].
grammar and takes into consideration also tone and not only segmental phenomena, one sees that Oromo “has no proper affirmative imperfect copula. Adjectives and nouns used as predicates are marked phrase-finally by a special tone pattern”. The elements -ti and -dba, that have sometimes been regarded as copulas, are actually suffixes that are also added to non predicates in different contexts, for supporting word final inflectional suffixes or tonal melodies.

In conclusion, the volume is a collection of quite interesting contributions on a wide palette of languages spoken in the Horn of Africa. It is an important reading for scholars interested in Cushitic, Ethio-Semitic, and Omotic, as well as in contact phenomena and areal linguistics.

Giorgio Banti, Università degli studi di Napoli L’Orientale


Antonella Brita nous livre, dans ce beau volume, une version révisée de la première partie de sa dissertation doctorale – I racconti tradizionali sulla cristianizzazione dell’Etiopia: il “Gadla Liqanos” e il “Gadla Pantaléwon”, réalisée sous la direction d’Alessandro Bausi et soutenue à “l’Orientale” de Naples, au mois de juin 2008 – consacrée à une étude d’ensemble des textes hagiographiques mettant en scène les Ts’atu Qaddusan, les célèbres “Neuf Saints”, les moines “missionnaires” originaires de “Rom” (l’Empire byzantin) qui seraient arrivés à Aksoum à l’époque du roi Ḫllā Ḫmida et qui auraient été les héros, sous ses successeurs Ṭāţenza, Kaleb et Gābrā Māṣqāl, au cours du dernier quart du Ve et des premières décennies du VIe siècle, de celle que l’on a l’habitude d’appeler la “seconde christianisation” (l’utilisation des guillemets est, dans ce cas, de rigueur) de l’Éthiopie.

L’introduction (pp. VII–X), dans laquelle sont brièvement présentés le contenu et les perspectives de l’ouvrage, est suivie d’une bibliographie exhaustive (pp. XI–XXX) et d’une liste des abréviations utilisées (pp. XXXI–XXXIII). Le premier chapitre (pp. 1–17) s’ouvre sur un recensement des textes examinés et de leurs témoins manuscrits, souvent inédits, que l’auteure a eu le mérite de découvrir et de photographier, principalement au