

GRAMMATICALIZATION IN ETHIOSEMITIC WITH
COMPARISONS TO OROMO

BY
ABINET SIME GEBREYES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
LINGUISTICS
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM AND
COMMUNICATION

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN LINGUISTICS

APRIL 2016

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM AND
COMMUNICATION

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

GRAMMATICALIZATION IN ETHIOSEMITIC WITH
COMPARISONS TO OROMO

BY

ABINET SIME GEBREYES

CHAPTER ONE

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aim and Significance of the Study

The main objective of this study is to identify, describe, and explain selected instances of the processes of grammaticalization in the majority of the Ethiosemitic languages with comparisons to Oromo, a Lowland East Cushitic language.

The present study will be a contribution to grammaticalization studies in Ethiopian languages. The study will be of some help to add to our base knowledge of the synchronic and diachronic structure of the the languages considered in the thesis.

1.2 Scope and Limitation of the Study

To carry out grammaticalization studies in all Ethiopian languages would definitely have been an ideal undertaking. With limited time and resources, this approach will not however be an easy task to handle at an individual level. The study is therefore limited to Ethiosemitic languages and to one Cushitic language. With the addition of Oromo, the number of languages considered in the study is eighteen.

Dealing with all the possible instances of the grammaticalization processes in the languages considered would also have been an ideal undertaking. For the same practical reasons, however, the scope of this dissertation is limited to a number of selected instances. Accordingly, grammaticalization of body part terms, similatives, allatives, and demonstratives are the major topics considered in the study.

Many of the Ethiopian languages do not have a long history of writing. Lack of diachronic data was therefore a major limitation to the study. Moreover, except for Harari, Gurage, and Ge'ez (Leslau 1963, 1979b, and 1987 respectively), Highland East Cushitic (Hudson 1989) and Agaw (Appleyard 2006), we do not yet have etymological dictionaries for even the major languages of Ethiopia (such as Amharic, Tigrinya, and Oromo). This was also another limitation.

A number of important grammar books, dictionaries, and journal articles on Ethiopian languages (Ge'ez, Tigrinya, Amharic, etc.) are written either in German, French, or Italian.

Streleyn has, for instance, written four papers on the subject of Old Amharic (1961, 1964, 1968a, 1968b); three of them are in French. Leslau's earliest works are also in French. Praetorius and ContiRossini wrote in German and Italian respectively. As English is the only foreign language I read, this was also another limitation to the present study. Nevertheless, with the help of my thesis supervisor, I have made limited use of these works.

1.3 Methodology

Nearly all the relevant data are collected from published works (grammar books, dictionaries, and texts). I have also taken a good number of examples from the Holy Bible in Ge'ez, Tigrinya, and Oromo. In some cases I have also provided my own data from Amharic (of the standard Addis Ababa dialect) and Oromo (of the Central Shoa dialect). I am a native speaker of Amharic and Oromo.

The following list represents a simplified outline of seventeen Ethiosemitic languages considered in the study (cf. Hetzron 1972; Hetzron 1977; Hudson 2000). Of the languages mentioned under OSES I have referred to Dobbi, Endegeñ, Gafat, and Inor only in few cases.

1. North Ethiosemitic (NES): Ge'ez, Tigre, Tigrinya.
2. South Ethiosemitic (SES):
 - 2.1 Transversal SES: Amharic, Argobba, Harari, Silt'e, Wolane, Zay.
 - 2.2 Outer SES: Chaha, Dobbi, Endegeñ, Gafat, Inor, Kistane, Mäsqañ, Muher.

Based on the available literature, one may distinguish five major dialects of Oromo: Northern (Wollo, Raya), Southern (e.g. Borana), Western (e.g. Wellegga), Eastern (esp. Harar), and Central (Shoa) (cf. Gragg 1976; Bender and Mulugeta 1976; Kebede 2005). For the purpose of the present study, a number of examples are taken from the Wellegga, Harar, Central Shoa, and Borana dialects of Oromo.

1.4 Organization of the Study

The study is organized in the following way. The first (i.e. the present) chapter introduces the aim, significance, and scope of the study. The major topics and the languages considered in the study are also introduced in this chapter. Theory of grammaticalization is briefly reviewed

in the first part of chapter two; in the second part a brief review is made of previous studies on grammaticalization in Ethiopian languages.

The focus of chapter three is on the grammaticalization of body part terms in Ethiosemitic languages. Grammaticalization of body part terms in Oromo is separately dealt with in chapter four. The grammaticalization of the Semitic root *msl* ‘resemble’ is discussed in chapter five. Chapter six is devoted to the discussion of the evolution of similative markers in Ethiosemitic and Oromo.

Grammaticalization of demonstratives in Ethiosemitic and Oromo is discussed in chapter seven. In this chapter the major focus is on the evolution of relative and genitive elements. The origin and evolution of allative markers is discussed in chapter eight. A demonstrative origin is proposed for a number of the allative adpositions considered in this chapter. In the first part of chapter nine major points discussed in the study are recapitulated. Concluding remarks are made in the second part.

1.5 Notes on Transcription

The symbols used in this study are given with their IPA equivalents in the following list. Symbols identical with the IPA are not included in the list. Of the seven vowels in Ge‘ez (**ä, u, i, a, e, ə, o**) Leslau employs the symbol **a** for the first order and the symbol **ā** for the fourth order. When citing from his sources I did not alter these symbols. In line with Leslau’s methods I have also employed **h** for **ሐ**, **ḥ** for **ኸ**, **ś** for **ሠ**, and **ɖ** for **ፀ**.

In transcribing the Oromo data I have used the Latin-based script of the Oromo Qubee writing system. I have also made the transcriptions used in Tilahun (1989) and Owens (1985) consistent with the symbols used in the Qubee script.

When citing data from sources in Ethiosemitic I have kept the original in nearly all cases. The one exception is with the symbol for the palatal ejective affricate (**tʃʼ**) where most Semiticists use the symbol **č̣** with a dot underneath. In place of this, for convenience I have employed the symbol **čʼ**.

Oromo

Symbols used	IPA	Equivaleant
aa	a:	
uu	u:	
ii	i:	
ee	e:	
oo	o:	
j	dʒ	
ph	pʰ	
q	kʰ	
x	tʰ	
ch	tʃ	
c	tʃʰ	
dh	dʰ	
ny	ɲ	
sh	ʃ	
'	ʔ	

Ethiosemitic

Symbols used	IPA	Equivaleant
č	tʃ	
čʰ	tʃʰ	
ğ	dʒ	
ñ	ɲ	
š	ʃ	
s	sʰ	
t	tʰ	
q	kʰ	
h	ħ	
ḥ	ħ	
ū	u:	
ē	e:	
ō	o:	
ā	a:	
ī	i:	
ə	ɨ	
'	ʔ	
‘	ʕ	

CHAPTER TWO

2 THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PREVIOUS STUDIES

2.1 The Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Theory of Grammaticalization

The theory of grammaticalization is the theoretical framework within which this study is carried out. Grammaticalization theory is concerned with the origin and evolution of grammatical categories. Its goal, therefore, is to describe how and to explain why grammatical forms arise and develop (Heine 2004: 7). In other words the theory of grammaticalization is there to describe and explain a specific type of language change called grammaticalization.

Grammaticalization is not about all types of language change. All grammaticalization processes involve language change; but not all language change is grammaticalization (Traugott and Heine 1991: 3-4). The semantic change of the English word *boor* from ‘farmer’ to ‘crude person’ (Traugott and König 1991: 210) is not an instance of grammaticalization.

2.1.2 Definition of Grammaticalization

Grammaticalization is commonly defined as a gradual process of language change in which grammatical morphemes evolve from lexical morphemes. The change also involves the evolution of less grammatical items into more grammatical ones. A widely accepted definition of grammaticalization is the one given by Kuryłowicz:

Grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status, e.g. from a derivative format to an inflectional one (Kuryłowicz 1965: 69, cited in Haspelmath 2004: 38, note 10).

We find two major stages of grammaticalization in the definition given above. The first is the change from lexical to functional categories. This is basically about a shift of category where the shift is from a major word category (nouns, verbs) to a minor word category (adpositions, adverbs, auxiliaries, complementizers, etc.).

In the second stage of grammaticalization we observe a shift of category within the minor category of words. This happens when a less grammaticalized item becomes more grammaticalized. The grammaticalization of the Latin directional preposition *ad* ‘to’ to the Spanish case marker *a* ‘accusative’ (Lehmann 1991: 493) is a good example for the second stage of grammaticalization. Here the shift is from the category of preposition to the category of accusative marker; the latter is more grammatical than the former.

Paradigm size decreases as we move from lexical to grammatical and from less grammatical to more grammatical categories (cf. Lehmann 1995: 133). So, the number of nouns in a language will obviously be greater than the number of adpositions. The number of adpositions in turn will also be greater than, say, the number of direct object markers (cf. Lehmann 1991: 494).

2.1.3 Types of Grammaticalization

If a source item is not confined to a single process of grammaticalization ($A > B$), we may have two types of multiple processes of grammaticalization. The first type is called polygrammaticalization ($A > B$; $A > C$). The second type is known as repeated grammaticalization ($A > B > C$) (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 186).

Polygrammaticalization involves “several independent grammaticalizations of one source item” (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 186). The process proceeds by following multiple distinct pathways. Through such multiple processes of grammaticalization we get polyfunctional items like the English morpheme *to*. Some of the major syntactic functions of *to* are shown in the following sentences (Haspelmath 2003: 212).

- (1) a. Goethe went *to* Leipzig as a student. (Direction)
b. Eve gave an apple *to* Adam. (Recipient)
c. I left the party early *to* get home in time. (Purpose)

- (2) a. ALLATIVE (direction) [A] > DATIVE (Recipient) [B]
b. ALLATIVE (direction) [A] > PURPOSE [C]

The chronological sequencing is schematically shown in (2), where the allative marker is the source item. This item undergoes two independent grammaticalizations along two distinct

pathways (A > B; A > C). The directional preposition *to* grammaticalizes into an indirect object marker as is shown in (2a). In another distinct pathway (2b), this same preposition grammaticalizes into a purpose clause marker.

From the chronological sequencing in (2), we can tell that both the dative (B) and purposive (C) functions are later developments of the allative (A) *to*. We cannot, however, tell which one of the later functions arose first. On the basis of ‘a radial network of senses’ proposed by Lakoff 1987 (see also Taylor 2002: 477), we may also be able to suggest that (B) and (C) are more related to the central sense (A) than to each other.

In repeated grammaticalization “an item that is grammaticalized is itself further grammaticalized” (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 186). The process proceeds from less to more advanced stages of grammaticalization along a single pathway. As in polygrammaticalization, we will also have polyfunctional morphemes through the process of repeated grammaticalization.

This is the case, for example, in the polyfunctional morpheme *sa* of Zande, Ubangian language spoken in Sudan, Central African Republic, and Democratic Republic of Congo. In her study of this morpheme, Pasch (2014: 212-213) has shown that the morpheme *sa* functions as spatial (‘behind’), temporal (‘later’) and logical (‘reason’) marker. The repeated grammaticalization undergone by the morpheme *sa* appears to have proceeded in the following way: *sa* ‘(an animal’s) tail’ > ‘behind’ > ‘later’ > ‘reason’.

According to the “radial network of senses” proposed by Lakoff (1987), the central (source) sense will have various meaning extensions radiating outwards. The difference between the peripheral and the central senses will therefore be more pronounced than the difference between intermediate senses (Taylor 2002: 477). In other words the semantic relation between the intermediate senses is more transparent than is the case between the central and the peripheral senses.

By applying the “radial” approach to grammaticalization of Zande *sa*, we can tell that the sense relation between the central sense ‘tail’ and the peripheral ‘reason’ is more distant than the relation between the intermediate senses, for instance, between ‘tail’ and ‘behind’.

2.1.4 Parameters of Grammaticalization

A number of parameters that serve to identify, describe, and explain grammaticalization instances have been pointed out by Lehmann (1985, 1995), Hopper (1991), Hopper and Traugott (1993), Bybee et al. (1994), Heine (1993), Heine and Kuteva (2002; 2005), Heine (2004), and Heine and Song (2011). For the present study, I have adopted the four parameters suggested by Heine and colleagues. The parameters are the following: Extension, Desemanticization, Decategorialization, and Erosion. These are briefly discussed in the following sub-sections.

2.1.4.1 Extension

Extension is a mechanism of language change where existing forms appear in new contexts by extending their function. The parameter of Extension is taken as a prerequisite for grammaticalization to happen (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 15). Extension (which is pragmatic in nature) comes first and triggers the other semantic, morphosyntactic, and phonological changes that accompany grammaticalization.

Through the mechanism of extension an existing form with concrete lexical meaning assumes an abstract grammatical meaning (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002: 2-4). In other words a form with a literal meaning begins to assume a metaphoric meaning. The key point in this parameter is the shift of category, especially from a major to a minor category.

Consider the sentences in (3) (Heine 1993: 49; Hopper and Traugott 1993: 1-3).

- (3) a. John is going to London.
b. John is going to marry Susan.

In (3a) *go* functions as a main verb; in (3b) it serves as an auxiliary. In the process of change the spatial meaning of *go* in (3a) assumes a temporal meaning in (3b). The extension that we observe here is basically metaphoric; movement in time is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of movement in space. As Givón (1984: 19-20) puts it “going to a place where one will do X” becomes “moving to a time when one will do X”.

In the example given above, John’s intention to marry Susan sometime in the future is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of travelling in space to a certain destination. Thus,

the day John is intending to marry Susan is understood and expressed in terms of a place of destination (e.g., a city like London) that John is travelling to.

The transfer of category that we observe through the mechanism of extension is mainly from lexical (content words) to grammatical (function words). Lateral shifts within major categories, as in *hand* NOUN > *to hand* VERB, are not considered as instances of grammaticalization (cf. Norde 2009).

Directionality is another notable point in the shift of category. In grammaticalization, it is hypothesized that the transfer is unidirectional. The reverse process is considered highly unlikely or, if it does happen, very rare. Thus, the shift from the lexical *go* to the auxiliary *go* is termed grammaticalization. The highly unlikely reverse process, if there is one, from an auxiliary *go* to a lexical *go* is termed not grammaticalization, but degrammaticalization. Counterexamples to unidirectional change in grammaticalization are said to be very few. In recognition of such exceptions, Haspelmath states that “grammaticalization is overwhelmingly irreversible” (Haspelmath 1999: 1043).

The processes of change that accompany the shift of category are also considered to proceed in one direction. These mainly concern the semantic and phonological substance of the form undergoing grammaticalization. It is noted that as the process of grammaticalization advances, the meaning of grammaticalizing items keeps on shifting from concrete (or specific) to more and more abstract (or general).

At an advanced stage of grammaticalization, a morpheme may also lose segments or syllables, becoming shorter than its (intermediate) lexeme source. In the process, free morphemes may also end up as bound ones; polysyllabic morphemes may also be reduced to monosyllabic morphemes.

2.1.4.2 Desemanticization

Desemanticization is concerned with the semantic aspect of language change. In the process of desemanticization a lexical item undergoing grammaticalization is “emptied of its lexical semantics and acquires a grammatical function” (Heine 1993: 54). Such a loss in meaning content is called semantic bleaching. The semantic content of a grammaticalizing item changes from specific to general, from concrete to abstract.

Consider the following examples (Bybee et al. 1994: 5-6).

- (4) a. She is going to London
b. She's gonna have a baby.
c. That tree is gonna lose its leaves.

In (4a) the verb *go* (in the *going to* phrase) has “its full semantic value of movement in space” where the subject “is on a path moving toward a goal” (Bybee et al. 1994: 5). So, in (4a) we have physical movement and a certain direction where the subject is human or animate “capable of willful behavior”.

In (4b) and (4c) we observe loss of the original meaning of the main verb *go*. “In the process of grammaticalization, some of the original relatively concrete meaning of *go* has been lost, specifically motion and directionality” (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 3). In these two sentences the “full semantic value of the movement in space” of the verb *go* is not present. The subjects are “on a course toward a particular end point in the future” (Bybee et al. 1994: 9). So, if there is a “movement”, that movement is not physical or literal. And its “direction” is not through space but through time, towards an end point in the future. Moving through time is metaphorically conceived in terms of moving through space. In (4c) the subject is inanimate and is not “capable of physical movement” (Bybee et al. 1994: 5). Here, a tree is metaphorically conceived in terms of an animate being (cf. Heine 1993: 54).

The loss of meaning in the process of desemanticization is often seen as a generalization in meaning content of lexical items. Seen from this angle, a grammaticalizing item keeps on losing its specific meaning and becomes increasingly more general or schematic.

The degree of generality of meaning appears to start with the source concepts or lexical items that enter into grammaticalization. These have frequently been observed to already have general meanings. The generalized movement verb *go*, for instance, is a better candidate to enter into grammaticalization than more specific movement verbs, such as *stroll*, *swim*, or *roll*. These verbs are less general than the verb *go* and “contain considerable detail about the nature of the movement” (Bybee et al. 1994: 5).

This could be described in three levels. In the first level, the degree of schematicity of meaning of lexemes that are recruited into grammaticalization is higher than for those which are not. In the second level, grammatical items are more schematic than lexical items. Finally, grams (grammatical morphemes) at a later stage of grammaticalization are more schematic than grams at earlier stages of grammaticalization (Bybee et al. 1994: 6).

The type of semantic change involved in grammaticalization is the broadening (or widening) type. Semantic changes that lead to a narrowing of meaning do not, therefore, typically occur in grammaticalization (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 100). In other words, the semantic change that occurs in the process of grammaticalization is unidirectional from a relatively more specific meaning to a relatively more general one.

We observe a similar direction in metaphoric processes by which desemanticization is “frequently triggered” (Heine and Song 2011: 592). We observe that these metaphoric processes follow a similar direction of change where a broadening type of semantic change prevails and that of the narrowing type is missing.

Through the process of metaphoric extension, concrete meanings become less concrete or more abstract; specific meanings become less specific or more general. The relatively more general and abstract concept of spatial ‘behind’, for instance, is frequently understood and expressed in terms of the body part noun ‘back’, which is concrete and visible (Heine and Song 2011: 592).

Another less frequently involved mechanism of semantic change in grammaticalization is metonymy. In the grammaticalization of the body part noun ‘face’ to a spatial adposition ‘front’ the region in front of a person is metonymically understood and expressed in terms of the “face” of a person.

With an increase in semantic generalization, the contexts in which a grammaticalizing item could be used increases dramatically. In this way grammaticalizing items will also exhibit a high degree of text frequency. “The high frequency of grams is in part due to their semantic generality” (Bybee et al. 1994: 8).

Like the degree of generality of meaning, high frequency of occurrence begins with the source lexeme. Lexemes that are eligible for grammaticalization are found to be fairly

frequent already (Heine et al. 1991: 38-39; Bybee 2004: 5). Grammaticalization, therefore, takes a lexeme which is already fairly frequent and makes it even more frequent. And this corresponds to one of the most notable characteristics of grammatical morphemes: compared to lexical morphemes, the text frequency of grammatical morphemes is much higher (Bybee 2004: 1).

The correlation that is observed between the level of frequency and the degree of grammaticality of a morpheme is worth emphasizing: “Frequency information could provide clues regarding the stages of grammaticalization” (Carey 1994: 105). Accordingly, the text frequency of a morpheme at an advanced stage of grammaticalization is higher than the text frequency of a morpheme which is at the beginning stage of grammaticalization. Thus, “the more frequently a form occurs in texts, the more grammatical it is assumed to be” (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 103).

2.1.4.3 Decategorialization

This parameter of grammaticalization is concerned with the morphological and syntactic properties exhibited by an item undergoing grammaticalization. It has been observed that in the process of decategorialization an item undergoing grammaticalization “tends to lose the morphological and syntactic properties that would identify it as a full member of a major grammatical category such as noun or verb” (Hopper and Traugott 1993:103).

A noun undergoing grammaticalization, for instance, would tend to lose its morphological distinctions such as number, gender, and case. Similarly, a verb undergoing grammaticalization would tend to lose its ability to inflect for tense and aspect. In other words, lexical items undergoing grammaticalization tend increasingly to become invariable. Syntactically, they also tend to become fixed and more dependent on other forms.

Heine and Song (2011: 593) identify the following list of changes that decategorialization entails:

- Loss of the ability to be inflected.
- Loss of the ability to take on derivational morphology.
- Loss of the ability to take modifiers.

- Loss of independence as an autonomous form; increasing dependence on some other form.
- Loss of syntactic freedom, e.g. the ability to be moved around in the sentence in ways that are characteristic of the non-grammaticalized source item.
- Loss of the ability to be referred to anaphorically.
- Loss of members belonging to the same grammatical class.

2.1.4.4 Erosion

Grammaticalizing items tend to lose part of their phonological substance. This is what erosion is. Chronologically, the parameter of erosion comes last. An item undergoing grammaticalization need not necessarily undergo erosion. Erosion is not, therefore, “a requirement for grammaticalization to happen” (Heine and Song 2011: 593).

Through the process of erosion, a grammaticalizing morpheme may lose a segment or even a syllable. A polysegmental morpheme, for instance, could be reduced to a monosegmental morpheme. In a similar way, a bisyllabic morpheme may end up being monosyllabic (cf. Heine and Reh 1984: 21).

The reduction of the three morphemes in the English phrase *go-ing to* into one morpheme *gonna* could be taken as an instance of erosion (cf. Hopper and Traugott 1993: 3).

2.1.5 Section Summary

Grammaticalization is a process of language change in which a lexical item evolves into a grammatical item. What is involved in the process is a transfer from major to minor category of words. The major properties of lexemes (major word categories) and grams (minor categories) are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 *Property of Lexemes and Grams*

<i>Property</i>	Lexemes	Grams
Meaning	Specific	Schematic, General
Function	Monofunctional	Polyfunctional
Distribution	Limited	Wider
Freedom	Free	Fixed
Autonomy	Independent	Dependent
Linear-Length	Long	Short

In the gradual shift from a lexical to a grammatical category, an item undergoing grammaticalization will progressively lose the properties inherent to content words and starts acquiring properties inherent to function words or morphemes.

In the process of grammaticalization, the meaning of a morpheme changes from specific to general, or from concrete to abstract. In other words the meaning of a grammaticalizing item will become more schematic. It will also be polysemous and more frequent. Moreover, the syntactic freedom, autonomy, and phonological substance of a grammaticalizing item will be reduced. This is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 *Properties of less grammatical and more grammatical morphemes*

<i>Properties</i>	Less Grammatical	More Grammatical
Schematicity	Low	High
Polyfunctionality	Low	High
Frequency	Low	High
Syntactic Freedom	High	Low
Autonomy	High	Low
Polysegmentality	High	Low

In Table 2 less grammatical and more grammatical morphemes are described as having a High or Low degree of six contrasting properties. Accordingly, less grammatical morphemes are described as having a low level of schematicity, polyfunctionality, and frequency; and the reverse would be true for more grammatical morphemes. The likelihood of having syntactic freedom, of being autonomous and polysegmental is higher for less grammatical morphemes. Such possibilities are low for more grammatical morphemes.

When a content word undergoes grammaticalization, its degree of schematicity, polyfunctionality and frequency of occurrence will increase from Low to High. On the other hand, its degree of syntactic freedom, autonomy and its likelihood of being polysegmental will decrease from High to Low.

In the process of grammaticalization, metaphor is recognized as a near-universal mechanism of semantic change. This has its origin in the metaphoric nature of human conceptualization. In the process of grammaticalization, abstract grammatical meanings are metaphorically conceptualized and expressed in terms of concrete or less abstract lexical meanings: logical meanings (e.g. causal relations, conditional relations, concessive relations) in terms of temporal relations (e.g. since); temporal relations in terms of spatial (e.g. before) relations; spatial relations in terms of physical objects (e.g. back, body part noun) (cf. Heine 1997: 150). This is schematically represented in (5).

(5) PHYSICAL OBJECTS> SPATIAL RELATIONS> TEMPORAL RELATIONS> LOGICAL RELATIONS

The degree of abstractness and grammaticality increases as we move from left to right. Of any two adjacent points, the less abstract source concept precedes the more abstract target concept. As in the unidirectional shift from major to minor categories, metaphoric shifts in grammaticalization are also unidirectional. Thus, as in (5) a metaphoric shift is, therefore, possible only from left to right; the reverse is highly unlikely.

2.2 Previous Studies on Grammaticalization on Ethiopian Languages

The study of grammaticalization in Europe is believed to have begun with the work of Condillac in 1746. Till the beginning of the 20th century the process had no name. Meillet coined the term “grammaticalization” in 1912. For much of the twentieth century there was relatively little interest in grammaticalization studies. A resurgence of interest, however,

began in the 1970s. There has been an explosion of literature on grammaticalization over the last 40 or so years (for a brief history of grammaticalization studies see Lehmann 1995, Heine et al. 1991, Hopper and Traugott 1993, Heine 2004, and Joseph 2004).

The study of grammaticalization is now well underway for languages around the world. This is, however, a new area of research in Ethiopian languages. In general works of grammaticalization studies, one finds very little mention of Ethiopian languages, with only an instance or two (see for example, Heine and Reh (1984: 274 for Amharic), Lehmann (1995: 94 for Amharic), Heine and Kuteva (2005: 36 for Amharic, 290-291 for Oromo), among others). This trend, however, has recently changed.

The last ten years have seen progress in grammaticalization studies on Ethiopian languages. Binyam (2008), in his PhD Dissertation at Oslo University, devotes a section of a chapter to discussing the grammaticalization of focus system in Koorete, an Omotic language. Another contribution to grammaticalization studies in Omotic languages is Henok's MA thesis (2010) at Addis Ababa University. In this thesis, Henok discusses the grammaticalization of copula markers in the languages of the Omoto subgroup. In a similar vein, Debela (2011), in his PhD Dissertation at Oslo University, devotes a chapter to the grammaticalization pathways of some Oromo adpositions. These studies concern Omotic and Cushitic languages.

When we come to the Ethiosemitic languages, we have the following works to pass briefly in review. Wetter (2002) analyzes the verb 'to say' of Amharic within the framework of grammaticalization. In a second paper (2006) he does the same thing for the polyfunctional morpheme *ga* of Argobba. Łykowska wrote three papers (2003, 2006, and 2009) on the subject of grammaticalization in Amharic. Based on text corpora from three periods of the development of Amharic, Łykowska makes a thorough analysis of some instances of grammaticalization in Amharic. Her main focus is on the tense system of the language. Rubin (2005), in his book which evolved out of his PhD dissertation at Harvard University, mentions instances of grammaticalization from Ethiopian Semitic languages. Abinet (2010), in his MA thesis for Addis Ababa University, deals with the grammaticalization of a single morpheme *ge* 'time, place' across Ethiopian Semitic languages. Though grammaticalization is not their main focus, Yoseph (2009) and Solomon (2011), in their MA theses at Addis

Ababa University, mention a few instances of grammaticalization in Amharic and Tigrinya respectively.

Though we have started having a number of contributions especially in the last ten years, grammaticalization study in Ethiopian languages is still in its infancy. The studies made so far are limited in number and coverage. Rubin's coverage of Ethiosemitic languages is limited to a few basic instances. Łykowska's on-going work on Amharic is a meaningful contribution. But her coverage, too, is far from adequate. The other works mention only a few instances. A grammaticalization study of Ethiopian languages with broad coverage and a relatively detailed and exhaustive approach should therefore be a timely undertaking.

In the following sections, I will review the above studies in greater detail. I will not discuss the works on Omotic languages.

2.2.1 Wetter (2002, 2006)

Wetter's paper (2002) on the subject of grammaticalization in Amharic is titled: "A new analysis of the *alä* compound verbs in Amharic based on the grammaticalization theory". In this study, Wetter shows how "the conceptual domain of *alä* is widened through metaphoric expansions" and how "it loses all its semantic content and gains a new function as an auxiliary" (2002: 1838).

Two of the paths of abstraction shown are from SAYING OF HUMAN-BEINGS to the concept of SAYING OF-INANIMATE-OBJECTS: *kasa əmbi alä* 'Kasa said no, refused' > *radiyow əmbi alä* 'the radio stopped functioning' (lit. 'the radio said no'). For ideophones, one of the paths of abstraction proposed is from PRODUCING-A-SOUND to the concept of REPRESENTATION-OF-VISUAL-PHENOMENA: *q^wa alä* 'it made a snapping sound' > *bəlləč'č' alä* 'it shined, twinkled, glittered' (Wetter 2002: 1834-1836).

Wetter's analysis of the Amharic compound verbs with *alä* 'to say' involves the generalization of meaning (desemanticization, bleaching, etc.) seen in grammaticalization. To this end, the mechanism of metaphoric extension is also employed to explain the semantic changes undergone by the verb, both in ordinary expressions and in ideophones.

In his other paper, Wetter (2006) analyzes the polyfunctional morpheme *ga* of the Shonke (or T'ollaha) variety of Argobba. The analysis is done within the framework of

grammaticalization theory. The result of his study shows that the morpheme *ga* grammaticalizes from the NOUN ‘time’ to a TEMPORAL and further to a CONDITIONAL marker. As in his earlier paper, the mechanism of metaphoric extension is invoked to explain the semantic changes undergone by the morpheme.

2.2.2 Łykowska (2003, 2006, 2009)

In her paper “Grammaticalization of the Amharic Tense System” (2003), Łykowska describes grammaticalization patterns leading to the origin of Amharic tense, aspect, and modality (TAM) structures. In the study, the tense (except the past tense), aspect and modality systems of modern Amharic are claimed to have undergone the process of grammaticalization through the development of auxiliary verbs and clausal constructions.

In her second paper on grammaticalization in Amharic (2006), Łykowska discusses six more instances of grammaticalization in Amharic: NEGATION, EXIST (*allä*) > NO (*yallämm*); LOCATION (*allä*) > OBLIGATION (*allä-bb-əññ*); SAY > QUOTATIVE; AND (*-əñña*) > CAUSE; RELATIVE (marker *yä-*) > COMPLEMENTIZER; ALONE (*bəčča*) > ONLY.

In her 2009 paper, Łykowska deals with the “phenomena of suppletion in the context of grammaticalization, as exemplified by historical development of the Amharic verb *all-* BE. LOC. EXIST” (p. 256). In the paper, three paradigmatic tense forms of Amharic *allä* (*allä*, *näbbärä*, and *yəñorall*) are thoroughly analyzed. The possibility of contact transfer from Ge'ez to Amharic and back to Ge'ez is also mentioned. This is raised in relation to the following auxiliaries: *näbbärä*, *näbärä*, and *norä*.

The relation of *näbär-* and *nor* is mentioned as problematic in the paper (p. 205). But *nor* may be derived from *näbärä-*: *näbärä* > **näwra* > *nora*. The type of sound change involved is described by Podolsky as follows: “the non-geminated *b* after a vowel or a sonorant is pronounced as a fricative [β]. This fricative can easily change into a bilabial glide [w] or even disappear while inducing rounding of an adjacent vowel” (Podolsky 1991: 48). The change from *näbärä* > *norä* is parallel with the often-cited *käbd* ‘liver, belly’ > **käwd* > **kod* > *hod* ‘belly’.

Finally, it should be noted that Łykowska, in all three of her papers, bases her research on text corpora from three periods of the development of Amharic. She makes, for example, frequent reference to the Old Amharic Royal Songs (OARS) of the 14th -16th c. This helps her

to trace the development of grammatical morphemes of Amharic, including the auxiliaries *nābārā*, *-all*, and *norā*.

2.2.3 Rubin (2005)

Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization is the title of Rubin's book. Though Rubin's work is a general one dealing with most of the languages in the Semitic family, he has identified a number of grammaticalization instances from twelve of the Ethiosemitic languages. He has, for example, identified several instances from Amharic: the third person pronoun *əssu*, the indefinite article *and*, the auxiliary *all-*, the copula *nā-*, three adpositions *bā...əgər*, *bā...bet*, and *ğārba*, the definite article *-u*, and the direct object marker *-(ə)n*.

For the various grammatical morphemes indicated for Amharic, Rubin cites more than twenty parallels from Ge'ez, seven from Tigre, ten from Tigrinya, and an instance or two from Argobba, Chaha, Gafat, Harari, Inor, Silt'e, Wolane, and Zay.

Rubin deals with an enormous range of data from the Semitic languages. However, much of his work is limited to tracing and discussing a few specific topics: the origin of the third person pronouns, indefinite articles, definite articles, direct object markers, and present tense markers. The last three are each given a chapter.

His treatment of adpositions in Ethiosemitic is scanty. Ge'ez (with two instances) and Amharic (with three instances) are the only Ethiosemitic languages considered to this end. Rubin does not seem to make any mention of conjunctions parallel to adpositions. These are, however, believed to provide a fertile area for grammaticalization studies (cf. Lehmann 1995: 166): we see many adpositions grammaticalizing to function as subordinating conjunctions (or complementizers).

Rubin's focus seems to be entirely on the first phase of grammaticalization, i.e. on the basic change from a lexeme to a gram (cf. Norde 2009). The second phase of grammaticalization, where a less grammatical morpheme becomes a more grammatical one, is not the main focus in Rubin's book. (The grammaticalization of adpositions to conjunctions comes within the domain of this second phase.)

2.2.4 Crass and Meyer (2007)

Crass and Meyer (2007) have identified a number of instances of grammaticalization in eight Ethiopian languages (five Ethiosemitic and three East Cushitic languages). The following are the major instances identified: ablative > comparative; ablative > ‘since’ temporal > real conditional; simile > complementizer > purpose; exist > ‘have’ possessive > obligation.

2.2.5 Yoseph (2009)

Though Yoseph's study is basically on lexical semantic change in Amharic, he treats the topic of grammaticalization briefly (in a page and half). Within a limited space, Yoseph lists some instances of the processes of grammaticalization from Amharic: FACE (*fit*) > SPATIAL > TEMPORAL; BACK (*h^wala*) > TEMPORAL > CONNECTIVE; HEAD (*ras*) > REFLEXIVE PRONOUN; *bä-mäkakkäl* 'at the center' > 'between' (p. 37-38).

2.2.6 Abinet (2010)

Abinet's MA thesis studies the grammaticalization of a single morpheme (*ge*) across the Ethiosemitic languages. The study shows that from a noun meaning 'land' or 'time', the morpheme *ge* grammaticalizes into spatial and temporal markers (adpositions, conjunctions, and subordinators) taking four major pathways: (1) LAND > PLACE > LOCATIVE > TEMPORAL (2) TIME > TEMPORAL > CONDITIONAL and CAUSAL (3) TIME > COMITATIVE (4) TIME > DISJUNCTIVE CONJUNCTION ('or').

2.2.7 Debela (2011)

In his PhD Dissertation, “The Semantics of Oromo Frontal Adpositions”, Debela makes a detailed and lengthy analysis of the semantics of eight “front” and “back” adpositions of Oromo. He does the analysis mainly within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics. The eighth chapter of his work is devoted to the grammaticalization pathways of the eight adpositions: *fuuldura* ‘in front of’, *dura* ‘before’, *fuulee* ‘in front of’, *duuba* ‘behind’, *booda* ‘behind’, *dudduba* ‘in back of’, *faana* ‘move-behind’, *duukkaa* ‘move-behind’.

In the analysis, it is shown how the adpositions grammaticalize from human body part terms and relational nouns. FACE, HEAD, BACK, BUTTOCK, and SOLE (of foot) are the body part terms involved in the process of grammaticalization.

CHAPTER THREE

3 BODY PART TERMS IN ETHIOSEMITIC

Body part nouns rate among the common inputs for grammaticalization worldwide. In their *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* Heine and Kuteva include 16 body part terms as source concepts in their discussion of “over 400 processes relating to the evolution of grammatical categories” (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 1). Body part nouns grammaticalize mainly into adpositions (Heine et al. 1991: 123ff). In some cases, these nouns may also evolve into personal pronouns, and even numerals. In this chapter it will be shown how body part nouns in Ethiosemitic languages grammaticalize into adpositions, adverbs, subordinators, and personal pronouns.

3.1 Body Part Terms > Adpositions

Adpositions are mainly derived from nouns (N-adpositions) and verbs (V-adpositions). Our interest here is on the former type of adpositions. N-adpositions are derived mainly from nouns that denote either body parts or landmarks. Body part terms form the most important source for expression of spatial concepts (cf. Heine et al. 1991: 128). When head nouns in genitive constructions grammaticalize we get grammatical forms known as N-adpositions (Heine 1997a: 59). The development of N-adpositions in Ethiosemitic languages should be seen within this framework.

One of the interesting cases of adpositions in Ethiosemitic is the shift from prepositions to postpositions (through the intermediate stage of circumpositions). This has happened following the change of the basic word order from Semitic VSO to SOV (due to contact with the surrounding SOV languages). Apart from Ge'ez, all Ethiosemitic languages have shifted to a basic SOV word order. All the South Ethiosemitic languages have developed postpositions while preserving some of their former prepositions. Consequently, these languages now have prepositions, postpositions, and even circumpositions at their disposal. Harari, of course, is exceptional by making a nearly complete shift to postpositions. Tigre and Tigrinya have not yet shifted to postpositional language type. This historic shift of typology from prepositional to postpositional language type proceeded in the following way (cf. Greenberg 1980; Croft 1990: 218-230):

- (1) a. SVO > SOV
 b. NAdj > AdjN
 c. NGen > GenN
 d. Prep > Postp

The change from NGen > GenN (the relative order of the possessive attribute (Gen) and its head noun (N)) seems directly responsible for the development of postpositions. In the 14th century (cf. Croft 1990: 223), for example, Amharic had an **N yä Gen** construction alternating with **yä Gen N**. Through time the latter has now replaced the former. In the **N yä Gen** format, we could think of constructions like:

- (2) *h^wala yä-bet-u*
 back of-house-DEF
 'back of the house'

With the shift to yä Gen N, we now have:

- (3) *yä-bet-u h^wala*
 of-house-DEF back
 'back of the house'

When the genitive marker *yä-* is deleted, there appears the postposition *h^wala* alone or as a second postposed element in a circumposition: (Prep-)N Postp as in (4) and Prep-verb (Postp) as in (5).

- (4) *(kä-) bet-u h^wala suq allä*
 (LOC-) house-DEF back shop there-is
 'there is a shop behind the house'

- (5) *kä-hedä (bä-h^wala) mäṭṭaš*
 ABL-he went (after) you came(F)
 'you came after he went'

The cognitive activity involved in the grammaticalization of body part nouns to adpositions is metaphoric in nature (Heine et al. 1991: 131). Body parts are concrete, visible, and tangible. Spatial adpositions refer to locative notions and represent abstract spatial concepts. We thus conceive and express spatial concepts in terms of body part nouns. In a general way, logical relations (like CAUSAL, CONDITIONAL, and ADVERSATIVE) are metaphorically conceptualized in terms of TEMPORAL relations, TEMPORAL relations in turn are conceptualized in terms SPATIAL relations, and SPATIAL relations are conceptualized in terms of physical OBJECTS (cf. Heine 1997a: 150).

The contact-induced structural transfer mentioned above and the cognitive activity of metaphorical transfer of body part nouns into grammatical forms may clearly be illustrated in the following examples (6-10).

(6) Old Amharic: N *yä* Gen

fit *yä* *abännät*
 face of A.
 ‘face of Abinet’

(7) Present-day Amharic

yä *abännät* *fit*
 of A. face
 ‘face of Abinet’

(8) Genitive Marker (*yä*) > \emptyset

abännät *fit*
 A. face
 ‘in front of Abinet’

(9) Preposition + noun + postposition,

kä- *abännät* *fit*
 at-A. face
 ‘in front of Abinet’

(10) Body part noun > Postposition

(Metaphorically conceptualized)

kä- bet- u fit

at- house-DEF face

‘in front of the house’

In the last example (10), the front of a house is metaphorically conceived in parallel with a human face. At this stage the body part region ‘face’ of an animate object is extended to denote the front region of inanimate objects (cf. Heine 1997a: 44).

When the human body in its upright position “serves as a conceptual template for the development of grammatical categories” (Heine 1997: 18), we invoke the anthropomorphic model. In some cases we may also invoke a zoomorphic model, where instead the body of a four-legged animal serves as conceptual template. We may thus find two expressions for the spatial concept ON based either on the body part ‘head’ of a human being or on the body part ‘back’ of a four-legged animal (cf. Heine 1997a: 46). The ‘back’ of a four-legged animal as normally positioned is perceived as UP; its head as FRONT, and its ‘buttocks/anus’ as BACK.

In a cross-linguistic study of 125 African languages conducted by Heine et al. (1991: 123ff.), the spatial reference point ON (above, over, up, on top of) was found to have the body part ‘head’ as its primary source concept. Likewise, UNDER (down, below) derives principally from the body part ‘buttock’ or ‘foot’; BACK (behind, after) from the body part ‘back’; FRONT (before, in front of, ahead) from the body parts ‘face’, ‘eye’ or ‘mouth’; IN (inside, within) from the body part ‘belly/stomach’.

A similar, if not identical, trend is seen in Ethiopia in the grammaticalization of the body part terms chosen for the present study. Thus, ‘back’ is mainly associated with the spatial concept BEHIND; ‘face’ with FRONT; ‘foot’ with ‘UNDER’; ‘head’ with ON; ‘mouth’ with ‘FRONT’; ‘rib’ with ‘SIDE’; ‘sole of foot’ with ‘BEHIND’; and ‘belly’ with IN (for ‘hand’ see below).

In addition to the first phase of grammaticalization (lexical > grammatical), a second phase of grammaticalization (less grammatical > more grammatical) is also considered. The grammaticalization pathways are analyzed within the framework of the following categorial metaphors:

(11) OBJECT (body part) > SPACE (LOCATIVE) > TIME (TEMPORAL) > LOGICAL (CAUSAL, CONDITIONAL, ADVERSATIVE, etc.)

We will now look at the grammaticalization of each of the body part terms, listed alphabetically.

3.1.1 BACK ('back of the body', 'loins')

In nearly all Ethiopian Semitic languages, terms for back of the body grammaticalize mainly into SPATIAL and further into TEMPORAL markers. In Tigre, however, the word for back of the body has further grammaticalized into CAUSAL and CONDITIONAL markers. Some of the developments are shown below.

(12) a. Ge'ez *zabān* 'back, back part, tail' > *ba zabān* 'behind' (Leslau 1987: 631)

b. Amharic *ǧärba* 'back of the body' > 'behind', postposition (Leslau 1995: 682)

c. Argobba *gunž* 'back of the body' > 'behind' (Leslau 1956: 682)

d. Wolane *rer* 'back of the body' > *bä-rer* 'after' (Leslau 1987: 13);

Wolane *rēr* 'after (temporal), behind' (Meyer 2006a: 183)

Leslau (1956: 682) connects Gafat *qäsäla* 'back of the body' with Chaha *qät'əwä* and Amharic *qät't'əlo* 'after' (both spatial and temporal). The last instance may also be related to Amharic *qit* 'buttocks'.

Ge'ez *haqwe*, Tigre *haqwe*, Tigrinya *haqqät* 'loins, hip', Harari *hač'i* 'back of body', develop into 'behind, after' in the "various Gurage dialects as well as in Tigre *haqo* 'after, behind' " (Leslau 1979b: 72). Harari *hač'i*, and Silt'e *anč'e* 'back of the body', do not seem to show any further development or shift of category. In contrast to these two languages, the word clearly grammaticalizes into SPATIAL and TEMPORAL markers in the following languages.

(13) (Leslau 1956: 681-682)

Chaha *tä ...anqyä* ‘behind’ (postposition), spatial;

bä- + PRF + *anqyä* ‘after’ (subordinator), temporal.

This goes similarly for Chaha is similar for Muher, Mäsqaṅ and Dobbi (Leslau 1956: 682; Leslau 1979b: 56, 72). In Zay, *ḥaqwe* develops into adverbs and postpositions (Leslau 1999: 162): *anč'i* ‘backwards’, *lä-anč'i* ‘afterwards, later on’ (adverb); *-anč'i* in *lä...anč'i* ‘behind’ (postposition).

In Tigre, *ḥaqwe* shows a high degree of grammaticalization: It develops from a body part NOUN to a (SPATIAL) > TEMPORAL > CONDITIONAL, and CAUSAL markers. Tigre *ḥaqo* ‘after’ is a temporal preposition as in (14). Consider also the example in (15).

(14) (Raz 1983: 80):

ḥaqo kəl'e sāmən

after two week

‘after two weeks’

(15) (Elias 2005: 193)

ḥaqo gala 'əwān 'əgəl təfgarta

after some time she-will-go-out

‘After a few minutes, she will go out’

Tigre of Habab (unlike Tigre of Mensa) has *ḥaqo* + PRF ‘if’ as in (16).

(16) (Elias 2005: 205, note 137)

māy ḥaqo 'alabka šahi kəfo wadda

water if you-MSG-do-not-have tea how you-MSG-make

‘If you don't have water, how do you make tea?’

Tigre of Mensa (unlike Tigre of Habab) has *ḥaqo* ‘because’ as in (17).

(17) (Leslau 1945a: 199)

haqo halibkum säta
because your milk he drank
'because he drank your milk'

Interestingly, no spatial sense of Tigre *haqo* is recorded by Leslau 1945a, Raz 1983, or Elias 2005.

3.1.2 BELLY ('stomach', 'abdomen')

In many Ethiosemitic languages a development from 'stomach' to IN (spatial) is observed. In Tigre, we have *kärəs* 'inside' (Leslau 1956: 685, note 27) from the body part noun *kars* 'stomach'; 'ət *kabəd* 'in (side)' (Raz 1983: 84) from *kabd* 'stomach' < 'liver'. In Gunnän-Gurage languages (Chaha, Endegeñ, Dobbi, Inor, Mäsqañ, Muher, Kistane) *bä... käs* means 'in, inside, among' (Hetzron 1977: 55). This too is from the body part noun *kars* 'stomach'.

In Silt'e, Wolane, and Zay we have a body part noun *däl* 'belly, stomach'. In Chaha and Dobbi, it appears as *däm*; in Eža, Muher, Mäsqañ, and Dobbi, it appears as *dänn*. In Inor and Endegeñ, we also have *käs* for 'belly, stomach' (Leslau 1979b: 205, 352). In the Gunnän-Gurage languages (Chaha, Dobbi, Eža, Muher, Mäsqañ), *ba- ... dän(n)* means 'in, inside'; in Inor and Endegeñ, *ba- ... käs* means 'in, inside' (Hetzron 1977: 55).

In addition to the spatial IN, *dän* also grammaticalizes into a spatial marker BEHIND (*bä... dän* or *yä ... dän* 'behind') as in the following example from Chaha.

(18) (Leslau 1950: 40)

garad xita tämäsäxta gam^wə bā-mäzānet dän təčona
the-girl with her bridesmaid behind the curtain sits down
'The girl sits down behind the curtain with her bridesmaid'

In Silt'e *dalaa-ba-dal* (lit. belly-to-belly) means 'opposite side' as in the following example.

(19) (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 724)

yadagaageey gaar laññaay gaar la-dalaa-ba-dal-nika yaalay
of Degage house to our house on opposite to opposite there is
'Degage's house is opposite our house'

In Zay “the noun *del* ‘belly’ with demonstrative pronouns occurs in a periphrastic construction referring to a movement or a place towards or away from the speaker: *yindel* ‘towards the speaker’ and *yāndel* ‘away from the speaker’” (Meyer 2006b: 129). The word also appears as in *(y)əndäl (äni)* ‘toward here’ and *yandäl (äni)* ‘toward there’ (Leslau 1999: 26, 162, 188, 297).

In the context *bä* + perfect + *əndäläni* or *bä* + perfect + *yandäläni* the body part noun *däl* ‘belly’ develops further into a marker of temporal relations, ‘since’ as in (20).

(20) (Leslau 1999: 151)

dämam bä-hān-yəndäläni səssətām hān
rich since-he-became avaricious he-become
'Since he became rich, he became avaricious'

The development of the term for the body part ‘belly’ in Gurage (esp. East Gurage) languages into an allative, spatial and temporal markers should be compared with that of Oromo *garaa* ‘belly’ > *gara* ‘towards’ (see next chapter).

3.1.3 FACE

In Ethiosemitic, the body part noun for ‘face’ grammaticalizes into FRONT, FIRST, BEFORE, EARLIER, LATER, SIDE, and DIRECTION. Amharic *fit* ‘face’ develops into a postposition ‘in front’ as in (21). Amharic *fit* could also mean ‘side’ as in (22) and ‘earlier’ as in (23).

(21) *säw fit attəqum*
man face do-not-stand (M)
'Don't stand in front of people'

(22) *č'anät-u wädä and fit agadälä*
 load-DEF towards one side it leaned
 'The load (on a beast of burden) has leaned to one side'

(23) *fit yämättaw man näw*
 early who came who he is
 'Who came earlier?'

(24) *bä-fit yannən səraw*
 in-before that one do it
 'Do that one first'

(25) *əssun wädä-fit ənnayəwallän*
 that one towards-face we will look at it
 'We shall look at that one in the future'

As a second element in a circumposition (*bä...fit*) Amharic *fit* could mean 'in front of, before'. When combined with prepositions, it forms adverbs like *bä-fit* 'before, earlier, formerly, at first' as in (24) and *wädä fit* (toward face) 'in the future, forward, later on, further' as in (25) (cf. Leslau 1995: 855).

In Ge'ez, *gašš* the term for 'face' can also mean 'side' as in (26) and 'direction' as in *artə'a gašš* 'he went toward' (Leslau 1987: 205).

(26) (Ethiopian Languages Research Center 1994: 22)

'argä nəguś dibä məskabu bä-aḥadu gäšš
 went up king on his bed on-one face
 'The king went up on his bed on one side (of the chamber)'

The body part term for 'face' is *yəft* in Chaha. This word extends into an adverb of time 'first' (Leslau 1950: 167). Silt'e has *uft* 'face'; *uft-kollo* 'down, downwards', adverb, cf. *kollo* 'down'; *uft-darra* 'upwards, uphill', adverb, where *darr* means 'upper side, top' (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 583).

3.1.4 FOOT ('foot', 'leg')

The Amharic body part noun for 'foot' is *əgər*. This acquires an additional meaning of DOWN as in (27) and 'ON BEHALF OF' as in (28).

(27) (Leslau 1995: 637)

kä-gäṣṣu ***gər-ge***
at-page-DEF foot-side
'Down the page'

(28) (Leslau 1995: 652)

bä-abbatu ***əgər***
on-father-his foot
'on behalf of his father'

In Silt'e the term for 'foot' is *ingir*. This grammaticalizes into DOWN as in *yiingir-ge* 'lower, lower down, beneath' (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 615). The term for 'foot' in Chaha is *ägər*. Chaha *ägər* extends its meaning to mean 'down' in *ägr-e* (foot-towards) which literally means 'in the direction of the foot'. Chaha *ägər* further extends its meaning to mean BEHIND in *bä... ägər* 'in the back of' (cf. Leslau 1950: 146; Leslau 1956: 683).

3.1.5 HAND

The Amharic body part noun *əğğ* 'hand' acquires an additional meaning and serves as a postposition: *bä...əğğ* 'by, in custody of' (Leslau 1995: 637).

In the Outer Ethiosemitic languages *agat* (in Chaha, Dobbī, Mäsqaṅ, Muher, Kistane, Gafat) or *agad* (in Endegeñ, Inor) means 'arm above the elbow, shoulder'. In the latter two languages *agad* also has an extended meaning of 'direction'. In Endegeñ, for instance, we have *wa'-agad* (this + arm) 'in this direction'; in Inor we have *bäwā agad* (in + this + arm) 'in this direction'. In Chaha *xə agat* (that + arm) means 'yonder, beyond' (see Leslau 1979a: 7, 69, 243, 263; Leslau 1979b: 24, 28).

The body part term for ‘hand’ in Ge‘ez is *'əd*. Ge‘ez *'əd* can also mean ‘place, side’ as in (29). The basic allative prepositions in Ge‘ez are *ḥāba*, *mangala*, and *wa'da* (also *wə'da*) ‘to, towards’. Of these allatives the etymology of *wə'da* is “possibly from the root for ‘hand’ [*'əd*] with a deictic *w*” (Leslau 1987: 602); this word became Amharic *wädä* ‘toward’

In (30) *wa'da* means ‘where, in the place’. In (31) *wə'da* combines with *'əm* ‘from’ to mean ‘from where’. Ge‘ez *wə'da* also combines with the preposition *ba* ‘by’ to mean ‘by the side of’ as in (32). In (33) *wə'da* functions as an allative preposition. In this function, it is interchangeable with *ḥāba* ‘towards’.

(29) (Ezekiel 48: 1)

ḥāba 'əd-a ḥamāt
towards hand-of Hamath

‘On the side of Hamath, next to Hamath, in the direction of Hamath’

(30) (Proverbs 14: 4)

wa'da ālbo ālḥəmət məṣəngā' nəsuḥ
place there is no cattle manger clean

‘Where there are no cattle the manger is clean’

(31) (Kidanewold 1948: 375)

wa-maṣə'a ḥābeha 'ahādu wareza 'əm-wa'da yəṯḥābbā'ə
and-came to-her one young man from-where he will stay hidden

‘A young man came to her from where he was hiding’

(32) (Kidanewold 1948: 375)

ba- wə'da māy-a baḥər
by-side water-of sea

‘By the side of the sea water’

(33) (Kidanewold 1948: 375, citing Deuteronomy 32: 50)

'*atu* *wə'da* *həzbəka*
enter to your people
'Be gathered to your people'

Ge'ez *wa'da* (which may derive from the body part noun for 'hand') is likely the source of Amharic *wädä* 'to, towards' (cf. Leslau 1987: 602; see also Weninger 2011: 169). This assumption would mean that we have the HAND > ALLATIVE path of grammaticalization. The conceptual basis of the meaning transfer that underlies such a possible evolution should be the use of a human hand to show direction. Attested cases of a similar nature include the development of the term for an 'eye' into an allative marker and 'hand' into an ablative marker (cf. Svorou 1994: 78 cited in Heine 1997: 45).

3.1.6 HEAD +-ge 'side of'

Most of the south Ethiosemitic languages add the suffix *-ge* 'side of' to the term for 'head' to refer to 'head of bed' (Leslau 1963: 66; Leslau 1999: 208) as in Amharic *ras-ge*, Kistane *gunnän-ge*, Silt'e *dämi-ge*, Wolane *dämi-ge*, Zay *däm(ə)-gi*. HEAD + *-ge* 'side of head' can also mean ABOVE as in the example in (34) from Amharic.

(34) (Leslau 1995: 652)

kä-betaččən *ras-ge* *gubbəta* *allä*
LOC- house our head-side hill there-is
'There is a hill above our house'

Other than 'head', Amharic has four more terms for body parts which combine with the suffix *-ge*. These are shown in (35).

- (35) a. *angät-ge* 'neck-side, collar'
 b. *əğğə-ge* 'hand-side, sleeve'
 c. *wägäb-ge* 'waist-side, belt'
 d. *əgər-ge* 'leg-side, down, beneath'

Wilkins (1996: 300, note 8) notes that Australian English uses the terms 'neck' or 'arm' to refer to the collar or sleeve of a shirt. According to him, the semantic extension could be accounted for by both metonymic and metaphoric association: on the body, the collar is contiguous to the neck and the sleeve to the arm; off the body, the collar is similar to the shape of the neck and the sleeve to the arm. The same explanation could be applied for the Amharic 'neck-side' > 'collar', 'hand-side' > 'sleeve' semantic extension. (For more on these combinations and on the morpheme *ge*, see Abinet 2010.)

3.1.7 MOUTH

Among Ethiosemitic languages, grammaticalization of the body part 'mouth' seems to be limited to Wolane and Tigre. In Wolane, the body part noun *'af* 'mouth' functions as a relational noun meaning 'just in front of' (Meyer 2006a: 183). In Tigre the body part term *'af* 'mouth' occurs with a temporal meaning in the preposition *'ət 'af* (at mouth) 'before' as in (36); *'ət* by itself means 'to, at'.

(36) (Raz 1983: 83)

<i>'əgəl</i>	<i>sar</i>	<i>'āmat</i>	<i>lagabbə'</i>	<i>'ətta</i>	<i>təmaharko</i>	<i>'ət 'af</i>	<i>'əlla</i>
for	half	year	which is	there	I studied	before	that

'Before that, I studied there for about half a year'

3.1.8 RIB

For the body part 'RIB', Tigrinya has *g^wadni*, Amharic *g^wadən*, Dobbii *g^wädin*, Zay *godən*, Kistane *godin*. With assimilation of *d* to *n*, we further have Amharic *g^wänn* > *gonn*, Kistane *g^wän*, and Silt'e *gon* 'side of body, side, place' (Leslau 1979b: 264, 280).

The body part term for 'rib' shows the following extension of meaning: RIB > FLANK > SIDE > BESIDE. For Amharic this is shown in (37) (cf. Leslau 1995: 654). For the other languages see (38).

(37) a. *godən* 'rib' > *gonn* 'flank' > *gonn* 'side'

b. *kä-* ... *gonn* 'beside, alongside'

c. *gonn lä-gonn* 'side by side'

- (38) a. Harari *mihāt* 'ribs' > *mihi* 'near, beside' (Leslau 1963: 105-6)
- b. Gunnän-Gurage *miya* 'rib' > 'side', 'near'; *bä- ...miyee* 'near' (Hetzron 1977: 55)
- c. Silt'e *meettaq* 'flank' > 'side' (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 93)
- d. Ge'ez *gabo* 'rib, flank, loins' > 'side' (Leslau 1987: 176)
- e. Tigre *samṭ* 'flank' > (*'əb*) *saməṭ* 'near, along, beside' (Leslau 1945a: 197)
- f. Cushitic languages:
- Burgi *dina*, Hadiyya *midaado*, Oromo [*cinaa*] 'ribs' > 'side' (Hudson 1989: 134)

As in Oromo, *č'an* also occurs in Ethiosemitic Silt'e, Wolane, Zay, and Muher *č'anä* 'thigh, hip, back of body'. Amharic, Argobba, and Gafat have *č'an* 'thigh', Harari has *č'an* 'waist'. According to Leslau, the derivation of *č'an* from Ge'ez *ḥəḍən* and Tigre *ḥəṣən* 'hip' is plausible (1979b: 183). The interesting thing about *č'an* is that it apparently grammaticalizes into an ADVERSATIVE 'but' in the three Outer South Ethiosemitic languages: Chaha, Eža, and Gyeto (Leslau 1979b: 182), although Leslau does not assert any connection. The example in (39) is from Chaha.

(39) (Leslau 1950: 40, text line 21)

<i>garad xita</i>	<i>č'an</i>	<i>čama</i>	<i>yäsäč'äče</i>	<i>attəm qar</i>	<i>atbära</i>
the-girl	but	an anthelmintic	because she drank	anything	does not eat
‘But the girl does not eat anything because she drank anthelmintic’					

The semantic extension could have occurred from 'back of body' indicating the concept 'on the opposite side, on the contrary' or from 'hip, thigh' (located on the right and left side of the body) implying 'on the other side, on the other hand'. I speculate that *č'an* with the notion of 'but' could be connected with Amharic, Tigrinya, Gafat, Muher, Silt'e, and Wolane *gən* 'but'; and *gən*, in turn, could also be connected with *g^wädən* 'rib' > *g^wänn* > *gonn* 'flank, side'. But we need more evidence to claim so with more conviction.

3.1.9 SOLE ('sole of foot', 'trace', 'track')

In Tigre and Silt'e the body part term for 'sole' develops into a temporal marker. In Tigre the term for the body part 'sole of foot' is *'asār* (cf. Leslau 1956: 683; Leslau 1987: 45). This noun has grammaticalized into a temporal preposition as in (40).

(40) (Raz 1983: 81)

wahətu kəm mota 'asaru waldu mahammad 'əgəl ləšaymo hazaw
and-he when he-died after-him his son Mohammed to appoint they wanted
'And since he had died, they wanted to appoint his son Mohammed after him'

In Silt'e the body part noun for the 'sole of foot' is *zoof*. This noun grammaticalizes into a temporal postposition. Silt'e *zoof* can appear as a second element in the circumposition *bä-* + [noun] + *zoof* 'after' (cf. Leslau 1956: 683). In (41) Silt'e *zoof* serves as a subordinating conjunction: *ba-* + [PRF] + *zoof* 'after'.

(41) (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 709)

baare ba-balaana zoof arama yeermanaan
lunch LOC-we ate after weed we will weed
'We will weed after we have eaten lunch'

3.2 Body Part Terms > Pronouns

In this section I will look into the grammaticalization of independent personal pronouns (3.2.1) and reflexive pronouns (3.2.2) from body part terms. (There are similar developments for reciprocal pronouns like Amharic *ərs bā-rs* (head by-head) and Gurage languages *gäg bā-gäg* (body by-body) 'each other'. But these are not included in this study.)

3.2.1 HEAD, STOMACH, SOUL > Independent Personal Pronouns

As personal pronouns belong to the most conservative parts of grammar, research works on their grammaticalization so far has been quite sparse (Heine & Song 2011: 587). The recent work of Heine and Song appears to be a major contribution to this area. In their work on the grammaticalization of personal pronouns, the authors made a crosslinguistic analysis of first, second, and third person pronouns. Their overall discussion is based on the five main

conceptual sources of personal pronouns (p. 594): (a) Nominal concepts (b) Spatial deixis (demonstratives), (c) Intensifiers, (d) Plurification, and (e) Shift in deixis. For the discussion of the grammaticalization of independent personal pronouns in Ethiosemitic, the last three sources are found relevant.

Among Ethiosemitic languages Amharic, Argobba, and Tigrinya have made a remarkable shift in replacing their third person pronouns by possessive forms of body part nouns. Tigrinya has gone further by replacing even its second person pronouns by the same mechanism (cf. Hetzron 1972, and Rubin 2005). As the possessive forms of the body part nouns proceed to develop reflexives and pronouns of insistence, the conceptual source of the newly developed personal pronouns could be intensifiers. This is the third source in the list given by Heine and Song. We will now look at each of the three cases in turn.

The third person pronouns of Amharic are *ərsu*, *əssu* (he), *ərs^wa*, *əss^wa* (she), *ənnärsu* [*ənnä-* a plural prefix + *ərsu*] ‘they’, and *ə(r)saččäw* ‘he, she’ (polite). Though optional, in all cases *r* can assimilate resulting in the gemination of *s* (Hetzron 1972: 31). The pronouns are formed by the body part noun **ərs* ‘head’ (cf. Ge‘ez *rə‘əs* ‘head’) plus possessive modifiers. Accordingly, *ərs-u* originally meant ‘his head’, *ərs-wa* ‘her head’, *ərs-aččäw* ‘their head’. These further developed to mean ‘himself’, ‘herself’, and ‘themselves’. These reflexive pronouns and pronouns of insistence went further in their evolution to become the third person independent pronouns of present-day Amharic.

The conceptual sources of present-day Amharic pronouns of polite address (second person singular respect pronoun) would appear to be plurification and shift in deixis. Plurification, according to Heine and Song, denotes the use of plural pronouns to refer to single persons; the shift made is from plural to honorific singular function. A shift in deixis is usually a shift from third to second person. This concerns the grammaticalization of third person plural pronouns to second person pronouns (Heine and Song 2011: 600, 601, and 619).

The second person singular respect pronoun of modern Amharic is *ərs^wo*. Before it came to assume this function, *ərs^wo* served first as a third person plural ‘they’ and then as ‘he/she’ (polite). The processes involved are first plurification and then a shift in deixis. When *ərs^wo* began to function as ‘he/she’ (polite), it was replaced in the meaning ‘they’ by *ərsaččäw* to avoid confusion. But *ərsaččäw* too began to function as ‘he/she’ (polite) and was consequently replaced by *ənnärsu*, *ənnässu* ‘they’. The process of change involved is mainly

plurification. (For a detailed discussion of *ars^wo* and *arsaččäw*, see Kapeliuk 1994; see also Hetzron 1972: 31, 89. On the Amharic *ars^wo*, see also Heine and Song 2011: 604.)

Like Amharic, Argobba too has replaced its original third person independent pronouns by possessive forms of a body part noun **kars* ‘stomach’ (Leslau 1997: 20): *kässu* ‘he’ (originally ‘his stomach’ > ‘himself’ > ‘he’), *kässa* ‘she’ (‘her stomach’ > ‘herself’ > ‘she’), and *kässäm* (‘their stomach’ > ‘themselves’ > ‘they’).

Tigrinya replaced its original second and third person independent pronouns by possessive forms of the noun **nafš* ‘soul’ (cf. Rubin 2005: 19-24, and the references cited there): *nässu* 3MSG (< ‘himself’ < ‘his soul’), *nässä* 3FSG (< ‘herself’ < ‘her soul’), *näss(at)om* 3MPL, *näss(at)än* 3FPL, *nässəxa* 2MSG, *nässəxi* 2FSG, *nässəxatkum* 2MPL, *nässəxtkən* 2FPL.

In addition to second and third persons, Tigrinya also has *nässatna* as a variant of inherited *nəhna* ‘we’. Other than the first person plural pronoun, there is also a variant of the 1SG *ʔanä* in one of the dialects of Tigrinya. The variant is *nässäy*. Both *nässatna* ‘we’ and *nässäy* ‘I’ appear to have developed through the possessive forms of the noun **nafš* as did the second and third persons.

The polite forms of the second and third person pronouns of Tigrinya are the same: *nässom* (2/3M), *nässän* (2/3F). These are originally 3MPL and 3FPL; Unlike Amharic, Tigrinya uses the same form for both the second and third person pronouns of respect (Hetzron 1972: 89). In the process of change, both plurification and a shift of deixis are involved.

To summarize, we have the body part term for 'head' as a source for Amharic personal pronouns, 'stomach' for Argobba, and 'soul' for Tigrinya. As an alternative to these triple sources, Voigt (2009: 179-182) proposes a single common source for the three independent personal pronouns in the three languages. He argues that the “etymological derivation of [the three forms] needs to be considered in the light of Old Amharic” where the 3MSG is *hənsu* (as was observed by Getatchew (1970: 66)). Voigt’s claim is that all three forms of modern Ethiopic might go back to *hənsu* of Old Amharic (Voigt 2009: 179). Voigt further demonstrates how *hənsu* could be derived from Old Ethiopic *karśə*, and this in turn from a Proto-Semitic **kariś* 'stomach, belly' (p.180ff).

Getatchew has observed the occurrence of this word from a manuscript which likely is from the 16th century. The word occurs only once in the manuscript (1970: 65, note 5). But, contrary to this, other forms of the word are given: *bähənsu*, *tähənsu*, *xənsut*, *yalhənsus*, *wäy hənsu*. Getatchew further comments that the present-day Amharic *əssu* and Tigrinya *nəssu* 'he' "may have their origin in this *hənsu* which may have nothing to do with the Ge'ez *rə'əs* 'head' as is now generally accepted" (Getatchew 1970: 66). Voigt comes in here and takes *hənsu* to have still developed from *karsu* > *hənsu* > Argobba *kəssu*, Amharic *əssu*, Tigrinya *nəssu*. Voigt clearly demonstrates the possibility of deriving *əssu*, *kəssu*, and *nəssu* from **kariś*. But he equally argues for the plausibility of the triple-source model (that is if I have understood him properly). Even though Voigt's proposal of a single source appears to be attractive, it is not backed by enough and convincing evidence. It would therefore be better to stick to the widely held view of the triple-source model.

Kistane has *ädi* for its first person singular pronoun. Note also the following: *dähä* 2MSG; *däš* 2FSG; *dähəm* 2MPL; *dähämä* 2FPL. Though with little conviction, Hetzron tentatively connects the component *ä(d)*- with the word for 'hand' **əd* (Hetzron 1972: 31). If Hetzron is correct in this etymology, we will have the grammaticalization of HAND > 1SG. Leslau's reservation on this etymology is that 'hand' in Kistane is expressed by *äg*, not by *əd*. The derivation of Kistane *ädi* from *kabd*, *hod* 'stomach' given by Praetorius (1879: 511) is also doubtful to Leslau (Leslau 1979b: 13).

3.2.2 BODY, HEAD, SOUL > Reflexive Pronouns

In many of the Ethiosemitic languages, reflexive pronouns are formed from body part nouns for 'head', 'soul', and 'body' itself, and in one case 'bone', together with suffixed pronouns. In Chaha, Endegeñ, Muher, Mäsqañ, Dobbi, Silt'e, Wolane, and Zay, *gäg*- 'body' forms the basis of expressions 'I myself', 'he himself' and so on. The word *gäg* itself is borrowed from Cushitic (Kambata, Hadiyya), *gäga* 'body, self' (Leslau 1999: 214). The examples given in (42) and (43) are from Zay and Silt'e respectively.

(42) (Leslau 1999: 25)

äya gäg-ay yəmətāhu
 I body-my I will come
 'I myself will come'

(43) (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 779)

ilihaan saba yak'abaṭa gina gag-ka gabaya heeda
to send person that lacking time self-his market he went
'Lacking somebody to send to the market, he went himself'

The body part term for 'head' is another common source for forming reflexive pronouns. Amharic has *ras-* 'head' as in (44).

(44) (Goldenberg 1991: 535)

ras-wan yämməttəwädd təmäslännälläčč
(head-her-ACC that-she-loves she-seems-to-me)
'She seems to me one who loves herself'

Tigre too has *ra'as* 'head' for reflexive pronouns (Raz 1983: 41). Argobba has *dəmah* 'head' for pronouns of insistence as in (45).

(45) (Leslau 1997: 21)

ay bə-dəmah əməṭälluh
I with-my head I -shall -come
'I shall come myself'

Words for 'soul' are also used in the formation of reflexive pronouns. In Tigre it is *nos*, *nafs* 'soul' (Raz 1983: 41). In Harari (Leslau 1963: 134) we have *ruḥ* 'soul', *ruḥ-* 'oneself', *ruḥ-zō-le* 'by itself, by his own accord'. In Chaha (Leslau 1950: 148) we have *arwa* 'soul', *yarwata* 'for himself'. In addition to *dəmah* 'head', we have *näbs* 'soul' in Argobba as in (46).

(46) (Leslau 1997: 21)

äy näbs-e əməṭälluh
I soul-my I -shall- come
'I shall come myself'

Unlike the other Ethiosemitic languages, Harari uses a body part noun for 'bone' for the expression of 'self' (Leslau 1963: 63): *ät* 'bone' (cf. Amharic *aṭənt*), *ätti* 'self', *aṭti-zo* 'he, himself'.

3.3 Chapter Summary

In this chapter it was shown that a number of body part nouns grammaticalize mainly into adverbs and adpositions. In some cases, the adpositions were also seen developing further into subordinators. The overall transfer of category observed is therefore from body part nouns to adverbial word classes: adverbs and adpositions (in North Ethiosemitic, these are mainly prepositions and in South Ethiosemitic, mainly postpositions). The postpositions usually appear with prepositions as the second post-posed elements in the circumpositions formed. Moreover, it is to be noted that, except in rare cases, in Ethiosemitic, postpositions alone can not serve as subordinators.

To summarize, regarding the development of adpositional concepts, body part terms in Ethiosemitic grammaticalize mainly into prepositions, postpositions, subordinators, contrastive conjunction, and adverbs. This is recaptulated in (47) with the examples repeated here for convenience.

(47a) Preposition (Tigre: *haqo* 'after' from *haq^we* 'loins, hip, back of body')

haqo *gala* 'əwān 'əgəl təfgarta
after some time she-will-go-out
'After a few minutes, she will go out'

(47b) Postposition (Amharic: *fit* 'front' < 'face')

bett-u ***fit*** *suq* *allä*
house-DEF face shop there-is
'There is a shop in front of the house'

(47c) Subordinator (Silt'e: *ba-*+ [PRF] + *zoof* 'after' < 'sole of foot, trace, back of body')

baare *ba-balaana* ***zoof*** *arama* *yeermanaan*
lunch LOC-we ate after weed we-will-weed
'We will weed after we have eaten lunch'

(47d) Contrastive conjunction (Chaha: *č'an* 'but' < 'back of body, thigh, hip')

garad xita ***č'an*** *čama* *yäsäč'äče* *attəm qar* *atbära*
the-girl but an anthelmintic because she drank anything does not eat
'But the girl does not eat anything because she drank anthelmintic'

(47e) Adverbs

Silt'e: *ba-zoof* 'later on'

Zay: *lä-anč'i* 'afterwards, later on' (< *ħaq^we* 'loins, hip, back of body')

At the phrase level the transfer of category could simply be mentioned as Noun Phrase > Adverbial Phrase (cf. Heine et al. 1991: 131). From another perspective, the grammaticalization paths taken could be schematically represented as in (48).

- (48) (body part) OBJECT > SPATIAL > TEMPORAL > (1) CONDITIONAL
(2) CAUSAL
(3) ADVERSATIVE

The CONDITIONAL and CAUSAL are attested only in Tigre. The ADVERSATIVE is attested only in three Gunnän-Gurage languages (*č'an* 'hip, thigh' > 'but') where the intermediate stages (SPATIAL, TEMPORAL) appear to be missing. The path taken by *č'an* could alternatively be put as: (body part) OBJECT > ADVERSATIVE. However, *č'an* with the sense of 'hip' and 'but' may just be a case of homonymy.

Body part terms for soul, body, head, and stomach were mentioned in their role of forming independent personal pronouns and reflexive pronouns. Noteworthy in this case is the development of independent personal pronouns from body part terms. This does not seem to be a very common occurrence in other languages the world over (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002, Heine and Song 2011). What may still need further examination is the possible etymology of Kistane *ädi* 1SG. Voigt's single-source (*kars*) proposal vs. the triple-source (*kars*, *nafs*, and *ras*) model may also need further investigation.

CHAPTER FOUR

4 BODY PART TERMS IN OROMO

In this chapter I will look into the grammaticalization of human and animal body-part nouns in Oromo. Almost all the body part terms identified have evolved into markers of spatial relations. Some of them have also grammaticalized further into markers of temporal relations. In one case, *eegee* ‘tail’ has extended even further into a marker of logical relations. Both the anthropomorphic and zoomorphic models of metaphor are invoked to explain the conceptual transfer from body part nouns to spatial, temporal, and logical relation markers. Illustrative examples are taken from the Western, Eastern, and Southern dialects of Oromo.

4.1 BACK

4.1.1 BACK of Animal

In Oromo the body part noun *dirra* refers to the ‘back of four-legged animals’. Though *dirra* may extend to also refer to the back of humans, its main reference is to the back of animals (cf. Leus 2006: 151; Owens 1985: 258). As is the case in some other languages of the world, Oromo appears to have different nouns for ‘animal back’ (*dirra*) and ‘human back’ (*dugda* > *dudda*) (see Heine 1997: 40 for similar instances).

I assume that the Oromo postposition *irra* (> *rra*) ‘up’ is a reduced form of *dirra* ‘back of animal’. We find a similar loss of the first consonant in Oromo words in the following variants: *dheeraa* > *eeraa* ‘tall’, *dhiiga* > *iiga* ‘blood’ and *dhiis* > *iis* ‘leave it’.

In the zoomorphic model, we find the concept of UP expressed in terms of body part nouns for BACK of four-legged animals (Heine 1997: 40; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 50). When the similarity extends to inanimate objects the top region of an object is conceptualized and expressed in terms of the noun for the BACK of four-legged animals. Accordingly, in Oromo the postposition *irra* (variant *rra*) serves to mark a region of space which is above, over, on, on top, or upon an object as in (1-3).

(1) (Tilahun 1989: 41)

<i>daatu</i>	<i>mataa</i>	<i>rra</i>	<i>qabi</i>
umbrella	head	above	you-hold
‘Hold an umbrella above his head’			

(2) (Griefenow-Mewis 2001: 52)

minjaala irra maaltu jira?
table on what is-there
'What is on the table?'

(3) (Leus 2006: 355)

barchumaa irra taai
chair on you-sit
'Sit on the chair'

From spatial marker UP, Oromo *irra* grammaticalizes to a COMPARATIVE 'than', a marker that introduces the standard of comparison. In the examples given in (4-6), *irra* is a marker of standard. The path of grammaticalization from spatial UP to COMPARATIVE is a common one (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002: 305-307).

(4) (Leus 2006: 355)

anini sirra (si+ irra) jira
I you-above I am
'I am stronger than you'

(5) (Tilahun 1989: 41)

na rra ise jaal'ata
me than her he-loves
'He loves her more than he loves me'

(6) (Owens 1985: 234)

inni heddu na rra guddat-a
he much me than big-IMP
'He is much older than me'

The mechanism of transfer from 'up' to 'more than' appears to have its basis in the orientation metaphor where MORE IS UP and LESS IS DOWN. In this conceptual metaphor QUANTITY ('more') is understood and expressed in terms of VERTICALITY ('up') (Kövecses 2002: 159). The physical basis of the metaphor is explained thus: "If you add more of a substance or a physical object to a container or pile, the level goes up" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 16).

Likewise, in the examples of comparatives given above, ‘more’ QUANTITY (level of strength, amount of love, and number of years or age) is expressed in terms of VERTICALITY, ‘up’; stronger is up; older is up; more love is up.

4.1.2 BACK of Human

The body part noun (*dugda* > *dudda*) in Oromo basically refers to the back of a human being as in (7-8). It can, however, occasionally extend to refer to the ‘back of animal’ (cf. Tilahun 1989: 186; Debela 2011: 165; Leus 2006: 155). The body part noun (*dugda* > *dudda*) grammaticalizes into a spatial marker ‘behind’. In this function it is commonly reinforced by another postposition *duuba* ‘behind’ as in (9).

(7) (Tilahun 1989: 186)

dugda se cabse
back her he broke
‘He broke her back’

(8) (Proverbs 26: 3)

uleen dugda gowwootaaf barbaachisa
stick back stupid people is necessary
‘A stick is necessary for the back of stupid people’

(9) (Debela 2011: 165)

inni ana duduuba jira
he me in back of me exist-3SM: IMPV
‘He is behind me’

4.2 BELLY

In Oromo the preposition *gara* is mainly an allative marker ‘to, towards, in the direction of’ as in the following examples.

(10) (Tilahun 1989: 251)

gara bitaati gori
towards left-to turn
‘Turn to the left’

(11) (Leus 2006: 255)

cheru eesa dhaqe? gara yaaballoo dhaqe
Cheru where went to Yaabelloo he went
'Where did Cheru go? He went to Yaabello'

In Oromo the body part noun *garaa* means 'belly, stomach, abdomen'. This noun is similar to the allative marker *gara* in both meaning and form. This similarity may give us grounds to suspect the derivation of one from the other.

Bender and Mulugeta (1976: 139) proposed that the source of *gara* 'toward' is "probably from a noun basically meaning 'place, part'" This coincides with the other meanings of *gara*: 'share, part, side, at'.

(12) (Tilahun 1989: 251)

gara ko na kenni
share my me give
'Give me my share'

(13) (Tilahun 1989: 251)

ati gara kenya mo gara jaraati
you side our or side people-LOC
'Are you on our side or on theirs?'

(14) (Leus 2006: 255)

isiini eessa jirti? gara mana barnootaa jirti
she-NOM where she is at house education-of she exists
'Where is she? She is at the school'

The allative function of *gara* might then have developed from the noun *garaa* 'belly' through the intermediate meanings of 'share, part, side, at (place)'.

In his *Dictionary of Borana Culture* (2006: 255), Leus derives the noun *garaa* 'belly' from the allative marker *gara*. This should however be the other way round: *gara* < *garaa*, given the unidirectionality hypothesis of grammaticalization. The morpheme *garaa* 'belly' is a lexeme; *gara* 'toward' is a gram. The former is a more concrete concept than the later. As the

near-universal direction of grammaticalization is from a lexical to a functional category or from a less abstract to a more abstract concept, it should be clear that the body part noun *garaa* precedes the allative marker *gara* in time.

The relative position of the human belly, just like the position of the human face, appears to be the conceptual basis for the development of the directional postposition.

The notion of direction in *gara* ‘belly’ is seen in the expression *garaa-f dudda* ‘adversaries, antagonists’ (Tilahun 1989: 247) which literally means ‘belly and back’ or ‘front and back’.

4.3 BUTTOCKS

In Oromo the postposition *booda* functions as a spatial marker as in (15).

(15) (Tilahun 1989: 83)

na booda deemi
me behind you walk
‘Walk behind me’

From its function as a spatial marker *booda* grammaticalizes into a temporal marker. In the examples given in (16) and (17) *booda* serves as a temporal marker.

(16) (Tilahun 1989:83)

booda kottu
later you come
‘Come afterwards’

(17) (Owens 1985: 120)

innii eeríuu qoté sun bóodá qooraan caphse
he field dug that after wood cut
‘He cultivated the field, then after that he split the wood’

The spatial and temporal sense of *booda* appears to be present in the following Oromo proverb:

(18) *gaabbiifi eegeen booda dhufi*
regret-and tail later comes
‘Regret and tail come later’

In the proverb, the abstract concept ‘regret’ is metaphorically compared with the concrete body part ‘tail’. The relative position of the ‘head’ on a four-legged animal is on the front. Its tail is located at the back, behind its head. The feelings of regret, as a feeling of sadness about something that one wish he/she had (not) said or done, does not usually arise on the spot, but in regard to things of the past at the time of speaking.

In the comparison of tail and regret, TIME is conceived as a MOVING OBJECT, just like an animal with a HEAD and TAIL. In this analogy, the regretting person is considered as a fixed observer. EARLIER, which had already moved behind (past) the regretting person is located on the HEAD (or FRONT) of TIME. The right opportunity is located on this spot: a time to say or not to say, to do or not to do something. We observe missed opportunities sitting on the HEAD of TIME.

LATER, the spot (or the time when) where the person regrets, is located on the TAIL or BACK of TIME. This would mean that regrets appear later in time, sitting on the TAIL of TIME. The temporal relation EARLIER is conceived in terms of spatial relations, which is the FRONT of TIME. This in turn is understood and expressed in terms of an object, HEAD.

The temporal relation LATER is conceived in terms of the spatial relation BEHIND. This in turn is understood and expressed in terms of an object, TAIL. The whole process comes under the two conceptual metaphors: TIME IS SPACE; SPACE IS OBJECT.

The postposition *booda* ‘behind, after’ is a commonly used word in the Western and Eastern dialects of Oromo. However, *booda* as a spatial and temporal postposition does not seem to be present in the Southern dialect of Oromo.

We do not find, for instance, *booda* in Stroomer’s (1995) *Grammar of Borana Oromo*. On the other hand, in the *Dictionary of Borana Culture* (2006) by Leus, there is an entry for *booda*. There it is defined only as a body part noun: ‘vagina, for women, girls’.

In Leus (2006: 75) it is also mentioned that the word *booda* is a plain word, not a euphemistic expression. To refer to the external female genitalia, the euphemism used is *qullaa* ‘nakedness’ or *nafa saalaa* ‘the respected (part) of the body’. In fact, neither the more common *muxee* ‘vagina’ nor *booda* is “much used as the Borana do not like to refer to genitals directly” (Leus 2006: 75).

In the Western and Eastern dialects we find *booda* as a postposition, and not as a (body part) noun. In the Southern dialect of Oromo, we have *booda* as a (body part) noun, but not as a postposition.

I suggest that in the Western and Eastern dialects the body part noun *booda* plausibly grammaticalized into a postposition (> BEHIND > AFTER (TEMPORAL)). The erstwhile noun would then have disappeared through time in these dialects. This would mean that we have innovation in these two dialects, but conservatism in the Southern Borana dialect.

As a source concept, vagina is not documented in Heine and Kuteva's *Lexicon*. However, this noun with BEHIND and AFTER as its target concepts behaves somewhat like the body part noun BUTTOCKS.

4.4 CHEEK

In Oromo the body part noun *meddii* refers to the 'cheek(s)' or 'the temples of the head' as in (19) (cf. Tilahun 1989: 437; Leus 2006: 435; and Stroomer 1995: 206).

(19) (Matthew 5: 39)

namni maddii kee isa mirgaa yoo si kabale ...
someone cheek your that right if you slaps
'If someone slaps you on the right cheek ...'

From a noun meaning 'cheek', *maddi* grammaticalizes into a postposition meaning 'near, close, beside' as in the following two examples.

(20) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1996: 391)

na maddii hinteessu?
me beside will you not sit
'Won't you sit beside me?'

(21) (Tilahun 1989: 437)

abidda maddi kaay
fire beside put it
'Put it beside the fire'

The relative location of the cheek (on each side of a person's face) provides the conceptual basis of the transfer of meaning from CHEEK to SIDE. Through metonymy, the region around

the cheek is associated with the term for cheek. The path from the body part noun CHEEK > SIDE is not documented in the *Lexicon*. This path, however, is similar with the path FLANK > SIDE.

4.5 MANE

In Oromo the body-part noun *gamma* (~*gama*) refers to the mane of animals, especially that of horses, “the kind of mane that tends to fall to one side” (Leus 2006: 252). This word has developed a spatial meaning ‘side’. This is illustrated in the examples given in (22-26).

(22) (Leus 2006: 252)

gamma suni mo gamma kana?
side that or side this
‘On this side or that side?’

(23) (Leus 2006: 252)

isiini galaana gamma dufte
she-NOM river side she came
‘She came from the other side of the river’

(24) (Tilahun 1989: 243)

gama mana shantu jira
(on the other) side house five exist
‘There are five houses over yonder’

(25) (Tilahun 1989: 243)

gama taa’i
(on the other) side you sit
‘Sit over there, i.e., opposite to me’

(26) (Owens 1985: 128)

gammá karáa suni jira
side road that he exists
‘He is on that side of the road’

In Heine and Kuteva (2002: 139) the body part noun for FLANK is documented as a source concept for SIDE (SPATIAL). In this regard, MANE (hair on the neck of a horse) behaves just like FLANK.

4.6 RIB

In Oromo the body part noun *cinaa* (also *cina*, *cinaacha*) refers to the ribs of humans and animals. By metonymic extension, *cinaa* refers to the region around the ribs of a body. Through metaphoric extension *cinaa* further refers to the region around the side of other objects and functions as an adposition with the meaning ‘near to, close to, besides, by the side of’. Thus, a body part noun which originally means RIB grammaticalizes into SIDE as in the following examples.

(27) (Tilahun 1989: 117)

cina ko deemi
side my you-walk
‘Walk by my side’

(28) (Tilahun 1989: 117)

cina ko taa'i
side my you-sit
‘Sit by my side’

(29) (Leus 2006: 110)

innii na cina jira
he me side lives
‘He lives close to me’

(30) (Leus 2006: 110)

naafi si cinaacha wali teteenna
me-and you side together we-sit
‘We sit close together’

The path from RIB > SIDE is not documented in the *Lexicon*. This path, however, is similar with the path FLANK > SIDE.

4.7 SOLE ‘sole, sole of foot’

In Oromo the body part noun *faana* basically means ‘sole of foot’ or ‘palm of foot’ as in the following sentence.

(31) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1996: 158)

qoreen faana keessa isa waraane
thorn sole-of-foot inside his pricked
‘A thorn pricked the sole of his foot’

The meaning of *faana* extends to a footprint, a trace or trail left on land by a human or an animal’s foot as in: *faana miilaa* (footprint + leg) ‘footprints’ (Leus 2006: 201); *faana qeransaa* ‘footprint of a leopard’ (Tilahun 1989: 208). Similarly:

(32) (Tilahun 1989: 208)

faana sa dhabeen deebi’e
trace its having failed to find I-returned
‘Having failed to find its trace, I returned’

The shape of a foot print would be similar with the shape of the foot that leaves behind its impression on a surface. The mechanism of transfer from SOLE to FOOT PRINT should obviously be metonymic or metaphoric. Here the IMAGE of an object is conceptualized in terms of the OBJECT itself.

As in the above example, if a certain animal walking along a way, for example, leaves observable footprints behind itself, the footprints could help to trace back where the animal has headed to. This entails the concept of ‘to trace, to track, and to follow’. In such a case, *faana* often appears with verbs like *bu’u* ‘to go down’ and *dha’a* ‘to beat’. Thus *faana bu’u* (lit. ‘to track down’) and *faana dha’a* (lit. ‘beat tracks’) both mean ‘to follow, to go after’ (cf. Tilahun 1989: 208; Stroomer 1995: 256). Consider also the following sentences where *bu’u* and *dha’a* appear with *faana*:

(33) (Tilahun 1989: 209)

hattuu faana buunee qabnee fid-ne
thief track having gone down having caught we brought
‘We pursued [trucked down] the thief, caught him, and brought him back’

(34) (Tilahun 1989: 209)

sangaa faana dha'e argate
ox track having beaten he found it
'He tracked the lost ox and found it'

One of the target concepts of the grammaticalization of the verb FOLLOW is COMITATIVE (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 139). The conceptual basis of the transfer to a comitative marker lies in conceiving the act of accompanying in terms of the act of following someone from behind. Consider the following sentence.

(35) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1996: 158)

isa faana deeme
him with he went
'He went with him'

The sentence in (35) could literally be translated as 'he went behind him, he went after him' or 'he followed him'. However, it mainly means 'he went with him' or 'he accompanied him'.

From the spatial sense of 'being together', *faana* further grammaticalizes into a temporal sense of 'acting together' at close points in a line of time. Here TIME is conceptualized in terms of SPACE. The path from COMITATIVE to TEMPORAL is documented in the *Lexicon* (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 89). In the sentence given in (36) *wal faana* ('together' + 'behind') is an adverb of time meaning 'simultaneously' or 'nearly at the same time'.

(36) (Tilahun 1989: 209)

wal faana manaa bayaan
together behind house-from they went out
'They left simultaneously (one after the other)'

By way of summary, the overall grammaticalization pathways taken by *faana* are shown in (37).

(37) SOLE > FOLLOW > COMITATIVE > TEMPORAL

4.8 TAIL (1)

In Oromo the body part term *eegee* refers to the tail of an animal as in: *eegee loonii* (tail + cow) ‘tail of a cow’; *eegee qeerransaa* ‘tail of a leopard’; *eegee leencaa* ‘tail of a lion’.

For a four-legged animal, its head signifies ‘front, first’ and its tail ‘back, end, last’. As the tail of an animal is located at the end of its body, we find *eegee* ‘tail’ metaphorically extending to refer to the last person in a line, to the last word uttered in a sentence, and to a last-born child as in (38-40).

(38) (Leus 2006: 191)

ka eegee biyya deemu suni
who tail country goes that
‘The one at the end of those walking’

(39) (Leus 2006: 191)

dubbii tami? ta eegee
word which one of tail
‘Which word? The last one’

(40) (Leus 2006: 191)

inni maandha, eegee dhalate
he is the youngest tail he was born
‘He is the youngest; he was born at the end’

Offspring or descendants can also be referred to by *eegee*. Here, it appears that one’s children are seen as tails or the last ones in a line of family descent. Thus, metaphorically parents are seen as heads and children as tails. This is illustrated in the examples given in (41) and (42).

(41) (Stroomer 1995: 172)

eegee inqabu
tail he does not have
‘He has no offspring’

(42) (Leus 2006: 192)

sa'i suni loon keesa eegee hin qabu
cow that herd in tail it does not have
'That cow has no offspring among the herd'

The body part noun *eegee* basically refers to an OBJECT 'tail' and then to an entity that comes at the end. This in turn metaphorically extends to successive events in a line of TIME, where last-borns come at the 'end of a time' in a line of generations or family descendants.

As a tail marks the end part of the body of an animal, *eegee* as a temporal marker is used to mark one of the successive points in time as an end to communicate what had happened 'after' that. Here TIME is conceptualized in terms of an OBJECT (tail) in motion with the following conceptual metaphor (Kövecses 2002: 33): TIME PASSING IS MOTION OF AN OBJECT.

As an adverbial subordinator 'after', *eegee* appears as *eegee*, *eegi*, *egaa*, and *eega*. Consider the following examples.

(43) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1996: 153)

eega inni deemee dhufte
after he went she came
'She came after he went'

(44) (Stroemer 1995: 123)

eegee lola hobbaasanii, ...
then war finish. 3PL PAST
'After they had finished fighting ...'

(45) (Owens 1985: 142)

eegá dhuf-n-e waliin dúbbane
after come-we-pst together spoke
'After we came we spoke to each other'

(46) (Owens 1985: 142)

eegá barcúmaa isá gurguré gale
after stool his sold returned
'After he sold his stool he went home'

(47) (Leus 2006: 192)

eegi roobi dabre, imaltuu dhaqa
after rain passed journey I will go
'After the rain has passed, I will go on a journey'

(48) (Leus 2006: 192)

eegi waraabessi dabre sarreeni faana dutti
after hyena passed dog footprints it barks
'After the hyena has passed the dog barks at his footprints'

In the following two examples, *eega* serves as a temporal marker 'since', almost the same meaning as 'after':

(49) (Tilahun 1989: 196)

eega dhengaddaati na dhukkuba
since the day before yesterday I am sick
'I have been ill since the day before yesterday'

(50) (Tilahun 1989: 205)

eega du'e fagaatera
since he died it has become far
'It has been a long time since he died'

From its function as a temporal marker 'since', *eegaa* further grammaticalizes into a causal marker 'since, so, then, therefore'. In (51-55) *eegaa* is a causal marker.

(51) (Tilahun 1989: 197)

eega barbaade haafudhatuu
since he wants it let him take it
'Since he wants it, let him take it'

(52) (Tilahun 1989: 197)

irsaasi ke sii deebisera ega maal barbaaddaa?
pencil your to you I have returned then what do you want
'I have returned your pencil to you. Then what do you want?'

(53) (Tilahun 1989: 197)

egaa maal sii godhu
then what for you do
'Then what shall I do for you?'

(54) (Matthew 21: 43)

egaa mootummaan Waaqayyoo isini irraa fudhatam[a]
so then kingdom God from you it will be taken
'Therefore the kingdom of God will be taken away from you'

(55) (Luke 11: 9)

egaa isinittan hima
so to you I will speak
'So, I say to you'

Logical relations (such as conditional, causal, purposive, adversative, and concessive) are conceptualized and expressed in terms of temporal relations; temporal relations in terms of spatial relations; spatial relations in terms of physical objects (cf. Heine 1997: 150). We observe a similar pattern of conceptualization in the grammaticalization of *eegee*.

From a noun meaning 'tail of an animal', the Oromo body part term *eegee* grammaticalizes first into a TEMPORAL marker (after, since) and further into a CAUSAL marker (since, so, then, therefore). Here, CAUSE is conceptualized in terms of successively coming events. When these are causally related, cause precedes effect in time; effect comes after the cause. This is represented in (56).

(56) TAIL > TEMPORAL > CAUSAL

The body part noun TAIL is not documented in the *Lexicon* as a source concept. There is, however, a parallel instance in Zande, an Ubangian language spoken in Sudan, Central African Republic, and Democratic Republic of Congo. In Zande the body part noun *sa* '(an animal's) tail' grammaticalizes into a spatial, temporal, and purpose marker (Pasch 2014: 212-213). (Pasch also mentions the instance from Harar Oromo noted above.)

4.9 TAIL (2)

In Oromo the second body part term that refers to ‘tail’ is *duuba*. This term specifically refers to ‘a sheep’s (fat) tail’ (cf. Leus 2006: 154; Stroomer 1995: 303; Tilahun 1989: 182), as in the following example:

(57) (Leus 2006: 154)

duuba hoolaa hinbassani
tail sheep they melt
‘They melt the sheep’s tail’

From a body part noun ‘tail’, *duba* grammaticalizes into a spatial relation marker BEHIND. In the examples given in (58-61) *duuba* is a spatial marker.

(58) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1996: 149)

si duubaan ture ati kanaaf nan agarre
you behind I stayed you for this you did not see me
‘I was behind you; that was why you did not see me’

(59) (Tilahun 1989: 182)

na duuba in ijaajin
me behind do not stand
‘Don’t stand behind me’

(60) (Owens 1985: 120)

namá sun dúubá hin-jíru
man that behind neg-exist
‘He is not behind that man’

(61) (Stroomer 1995: 167)

inni mina duuba eja
he house behind he stands
‘He is standing behind the house’

From a spatial marker BEHIND, *duuba* further grammaticalizes into a temporal marker ‘after’ as in the sentences shown below.

(62) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1996: 149)

gaafni gurra duuba dhalatee gurra caale
horn-NOM ear after born ear surpass

‘The horn which is born [i.e. grows] after the ear surpasses it’

(63) (Leus 2006: 159)

anini dhufee duuba innii na biraa deeme
I came after he me from he went

‘I arrived and then he left me’ [He left after I arrived]

In the grammaticalization of *duuba* (TAIL > BEHIND > AFTER), temporal relations are understood and expressed in terms of spatial relations which in turn are conceptualized in terms of an object, TAIL.

4.10 Chapter Summary

In this chapter the following body part terms were considered: BACK (of animal) *dirra*, BACK (of human) *dugda*; BUTTOCKS *booda*; BELLY *garaa*; CHEEK *maddii*; MANE *gamma*; RIB *cinaa*; SOLE *faana*; TAIL *eegee*, *duuba*. What follows is a summary of the grammaticalization pathways proposed for these body part nouns.

(64) a. BACK (of animal) *dirra* (> *irra*) BACK > UP > COMPARATIVE

b. BACK (of human) *dugda* (> *dudda*) BACK > BEHIND

c. BUTTOCKS (*booda*) BACK > BEHIND > AFTER

d. BELLY *garaa* (> *gara*) BELLY > SIDE > ALLATIVE

e. CHEEK *maddii* CHEEK > SIDE > BESIDE

f. MANE *gamma* MANE > SIDE

g. RIB *cinaa* RIB > SIDE

h. SOLE *faana* SOLE > FOLLOW > COMITATIVE > TEMPORAL

i. TAIL *eegee* TAIL > TEMPORAL > CAUSAL

j. TAIL *duuba* TAIL > SPATIAL > TEMPORAL

CHAPTER FIVE

5 RESEMBLE

This chapter deals with the grammaticalization of the Semitic root *msl* ‘resemble, be like’ in the three North Ethiosemitic languages: Ge‘ez, Tigre, and Tigrinya. Argobba and Amharic adpositions which are possibly related to *msl* will also be discussed briefly. The verb *masala* (~*masla*) ‘seem, look like’ of Ge‘ez, *masla* of Tigre, *mäsälä* of Tigrinya derive from the root *msl*. From the same tri-radical root, we also have the following nouns: *mäsl* (Ge‘ez), *mäsäl* (Tigre), *mäsli* (Tigrinya) ‘likeness, resemblance’ (cf. Leslau 1963: 112; Leslau 1987: 365; Leslau 1997: 213). From their use as head nouns ‘likeness’ in genitive constructions, these nouns grammaticalize into comitative and similitive prepositions. These prepositions in turn further grammaticalize into Noun Conjoining phrase markers (NP-AND) and temporal clause markers.

From its use as a head noun in a genitive construction, *mäsl-a* may have come to function as a preposition through reanalysis. Through reanalysis *mäsl-a maryam* (image-of Mary) ‘the likeness of Mary’, for instance, may have come to mean ‘like Mary’ or ‘with Mary’. The semantic change ‘like’ > ‘with’ will be examined below.

In the *Lexicon*, three target domains are documented for RESEMBLE as a source concept. The last two target concepts can also serve in turn as source domains for further target concepts. This chain of grammaticalization is shown in (1).

The ten target concepts documented for the COMITATIVE are shown in (2). In (3), we find three source concepts documented for the COMITATIVE. Here, RESEMBLE, as a source domain for the COMITATIVE is missing in the *Lexicon*.

Grammaticalization pathways possibly taken by the Semitic root *msl* in Ge‘ez, Tigre, and Tigrinya are discussed in the rest of the chapter.

(1) RESEMBLE > (1) COMPARATIVE

(2) COMPLEMENTIZER > PURPOSE > (1) CAUSE

(2) INFINITIVE

(3) SIMILATIVE > (1) COMPLEMENTIZER

(2) QUOTATIVE

(2) COMITATIVE > (1) AGENT, (2) NP-AND, (3) S-AND, (4) CONTINUOUS, (5) EXIST,

(6) INSTRUMENT, (7) MANNER, (8) PASSIVE, (9) H-POSSESSIVE,

(10) TEMPORAL

(3) COMITATIVE < (1) COMRADE

(2) FOLLOW

(3) TAKE

5.1 *mśl* in Ge‘ez

There are two prepositions in Ge‘ez which appear to be related to the Semitic root *mśl*. These are *məsla* and *'amsāla*. I will look at these in turn.

5.1.1 *məsla*

The preposition *məsla* is the construct state of the noun *mśl* ‘likeness’. The final *a* attached to *mśl* is the ‘binding vowel’ of the construct state (Dillmann 1907: 399, 460). In Ge‘ez *məsla* functions mainly as a comitative preposition.

In sentences (4) and (5) below, *məsla* functions as a comitative preposition, which is its normal use and by far the most common. Here, the path of grammaticalization taken is apparently from the source concept of *mśl* RESEMBLE to COMITATIVE. The concept of COMITATIVE as a target concept of RESEMBLE is not documented in the *Lexicon*. This suggests that such a path of grammaticalization may not be very common. There is, however, a parallel instance worth mentioning.

The grammaticalization of *mśl* to a comitative preposition *məsla* is somewhat similar to the development of the Chinese verb *tong*. This verb once meant ‘to be the same as’ and later

acquired the meaning ‘to share with’ and ‘to accompany’. The verb *tong* then grammaticalized to a comitative preposition (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 140).

(4) (Matthew 26:71)

zəni hallo māsla ’iyasus nāzərawi
this was with Jesus Nazareth
‘This fellow also was **with** Jesus of Nazareth’

(5) (Matthew 22:16).

wa-fannawu ḥabēhu ’ardā’ihomu māsla sab’a hērodəs
and-they sent to him their disciples with men-of Herodes
‘They sent their disciples to him along **with** the Herodians’

In the rest of this sub-section, the other functions of *māsla*, all of which are related to its function as comitative preposition, will be pointed out briefly.

To start with, the ‘companionship’ sense of *māsla* may also include ‘inanimate’ objects to “indicate that which one has upon him, or carries with him” (Dillmann 1907: 400) as in the example in (6) from the Bible in Ge‘ez.

(6) (Matthew 26: 47)

maş’u māsla maṭābəh wa- ’əḏaw
they came with sword and- clubs
‘They came [armed] with swords and clubs’

Moreover, when used with words of separation, *māsla* assumes the meaning ‘from’ (Leslau 1987: 365) as in the examples in (7) and (8).

(7) (Leslau 1987: 365)

talelayu ’aḥadu māsla kālə’u
they separated the one with the other
‘They were separated each from his brother (friend, another)’

(8) (1 Corinthians 7: 10)

itəṭḥādag bə’əsit māsla bə’əsihā
she must not leave wife with her husband
‘A wife must not separate from her husband’

In the last two examples, the conceptual basis of ‘separation from’ lies in the comitative sense of *məsla* ‘to be together’. This was further extended to include the concept ‘to separate from each other’.

For a slightly different meaning of *məsla*, consider the example given in (9).

(9) (Leslau 1987: 365)

'akko kama təkāt gaşşu məslehu
it is not like before his face with him
‘His countenance was not *toward* him as before’

The COMITATIVE sense of *məsla* can still be inferred from (9) as the sentence could be paraphrased as ‘his countenance was not *with* him as before’. And this is similar with the following English sentence: *He is not happy with him.*

The other functions of *məsla* are also extensions from its use as a comitative preposition. In its second stage of grammaticalization, from its function as a comitative marker, *məsla* grammaticalizes into a Noun-Phrase Conjoining (NP-AND) marker as in (10) and a TEMPORAL marker as in (11).

(10) (Kidanewold 1948: 614, citing Jeremiah 20: 4)

... laka məsla 'aḥawika
to you and your friends
‘[I will make you a terror] to yourself and to all your friends’

(11) (Kidanewold 1948: 614)

başəbāh məsla tənsā'e dahāy
in the morning with rising of sun
‘In the morning when the sun rises’

The evolution from comitative marker to marker of noun phrase coordination is attested in many languages of the world. Grammaticalization of comitative prepositions to temporal prepositions and conjunctions is also a common occurrence (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002: 89-90). In the development from COMITATIVE to NP-AND, the concept “to be added to, to be counted as one more” has been conceptualized in terms of the coming together of two or more things. In the development from COMITATIVE to TEMPORAL, TIME will have been

conceptualized in terms of SPACE. In the comitative sense, to be together is basically to be in the same place. In the temporal sense, to be contemporary is to belong to the same time. So, in the development from comitative to temporal, events that occur at the same (or similar) time are evidently conceptualized in terms of objects or people that occupy the same place. Thus, in (11), the rising of the sun is conceived together with the early morning.

From its function as a temporal relation marker, Ge'ez *māsla* grammaticalizes further into an adversative, a marker of logical relations as in (12). This is a common path of grammaticalization (for parallel instances, see Heine and Kuteva 2002: 91).

(12) (Leslau 1987: 365)

māsla zəntu kʷəllu
 with this all
 ‘besides all this, for all this, nonetheless’

In sum, Ge'ez *māsla* functions as a COMITATIVE, CONJUNCTIVE, TEMPORAL, and ADVERSATIVE marker.

5.1.2 'amsāla

The preposition 'amsāla is the construct state of the noun 'amsāl 'likeness', a plural form of *māsl*, but having also the meaning of a singular (cf. Leslau 1987: 365). In (13) 'amsāl functions as a noun.

(13) (Genesis 1:26)

nəgbar sab'a ... ba- 'amsāla -na
 let us make man in-likeness-our
 ‘Let us make man ...according to our likeness’

As a preposition, 'amsāla serves as a similitive marker. In (14) and (15) it functions as a similitive phrase marker and in (16) as a similitive clause marker. In the example given in (17), 'amsāla functions as a purpose clause marker.

(14) (Tinsae 1992: 206)

'amsāla krəstos tasaqla p'etros
 like Christ was crucified Peter
 ‘Peter was crucified like Christ’

(15) (Tinsae 1992: 206)

roša 'asahel 'amsāla hayyal
run A. like ibex
'Asahel runs like a (mountain) goat'

(16) (Zereadawit 1996: 314)

şomu ḥawārəyāt şoma 'amsāla şomu nabəyāt
they fasted apostles fasting like they fasted prophets
'The apostles fasted as the prophets fasted'

(17) (Kidanewold 1948: 131)

'amsāla yəfaqəd nə'īwa
so as he may be willing for hunting
'So that he may be willing to go hunting'

Heine and Kuteva have documented the grammaticalization of a similitive marker into a complementizer (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 273-274), also of a complementizer into a purpose marker (p. 91). Such an instance of grammaticalization is also found to be a common phenomenon among several Ethiosemitic and East Cushitic languages (Crass and Meyer 2007: 238-240).

To summarise, Ge'ez *'amsāla* functions mainly as a SIMILATIVE marker and marginally as a PURPOSE clause marker. The path of grammaticalization taken is therefore from RESEMBLE > SIMILATIVE > PURPOSE. Unlike *məsla*, *'amsāla* does not function as a comitative marker. Regarding their overall distribution, *məsla* is more frequently employed than *'amsāla*.

5.2 *mśl* in Tigre

In Tigre, we find two related prepositions that are derived from the root *mśl* 'be like, resemble'. These are *məsəl* and *kəmsəl*. In the next two sub-sections, I will look into the major functions and possible evolution of the two items.

5.2.1 *məsəl*

In Tigre, as in Ge'ez, *məsəl* functions basically as a comitative preposition as in (18-20). When it is combined with suffixed pronouns we find, for instance, forms such as: *məsəl-ye*

‘with me’; *məsl-u* ‘with him’; *məsəl-ka* ‘with you (MSG)’ (Leslau 1945a: 196; Raz 1983: 38, 80).

(18) (Raz 1983: 115, text line 13)

məsəl woro qəhər mən təqhər
with some (one) anger if [you] become angry
‘If you become angry with someone...’

(19) (Raz 1983: 108, text line 5)

walat far'on məsəl wašāyfa 'ətta mahāz wardat
daughter Pharaoh with her-maid servants to the river she went down
‘The daughter of Pharaoh went down to the river with her maid-servants’

(20) (Elias 2005: 196)

kursi bun məsl-ā lətkarrab
cake with-F it-M-is-served
‘Cake is served with it’

5.2.2 *kəmsal*

Kəmsal, the second Tigre preposition related to the root *msl*, is a blend of the similitive preposition *kəm* and the comitative *məsəl*: *kəm* ‘as, like’ + *məsəl* ‘with’ = *kəmsal*. The first might have come to be reinforced by the latter or the other way round.

Tigre *kəmsal* has two main functions. It basically functions as a similitive marker as in the examples given in (21-23). It could combine with suffixed pronouns as in (22). Otherwise, it stands free as in (21) and (22).

(21) (Elias 2005: 194)

kəmsal 'əlli takka
like this-M it-F-is-boiled
‘It is boiled like this’

(22) (Leslau 1948: 136)

hətu kəmsälyä şəgub tu
he like-my rich he-is
‘He is as rich as I am’

(23) (Raz 1983:110, text line 39)

la-baḥar ... kəl'e tkaffalat ... kəmsal mandaq
the-sea two [it] was divided like wall
'The sea ... was divided into two ... like a wall'

From its function as a similitive marker, *kəmsal* further develops to mark temporal relations. This is illustrated in the examples in (24-26). Simultaneity of time may have come to be conceptualized and expressed in terms of things that resemble each other. The comitative sense of *məsəl* in *kəmsal* may have also contributed in the metaphoric conceptualization of events that occur at nearly the same time in terms of things that occupy nearly the same space. Both as a similitive and temporal marker *kəmsal* appears to have a fairly high text frequency in Tigre.

(24) (Raz 1983: 110, text line 32)

wagabil məsar kullu kəmsal ḡarraba
and people Egypt all of them when [they] were distressed
'When all of the people of Egypt were distressed....'

(25) (Raz 1983: 93)

la-mabrəhat kəmsal 'abreha ... santim ra'a
the-light when he switched on copper coins he saw
'When he switched on the light ... he saw (copper) coins'

(26) (Leslau 1948: 137)

kəmsäl källäsna 'əgəl nigis tu
when we finish then we go it is
'When we finish we shall go'

5.3 *mśl* in Tigrinya

In Tigrinya there is a noun *məsli* 'resemblance, likeness, similarity' which is derived from the Semitic root *mśl* (Leslau 1987: 365). The function of *məsli* as a noun is illustrated in the examples given in (27) and (28).

(27) (Kane 2000: 385)

nayäbbo'u mäsli alläwo
of-his-father looks he-has
'He looks like his father'
[He has his father's looks]

(28) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1985: 73)

mäsli ab 'əddaga yärkäb
resemblance at market it-will-be-found
'One finds his type at a market place'

The comitative preposition *mäs* is understood to have come from the noun *mäsli* (cf. Leslau 1945a: 196, note 154), based on its use as a head noun in genitive construction. It thus would have lost its last radical (or even its last syllable) first in its use as a head noun in a genitive construction and then in its use as a comitative preposition.

In Tigrinya genitive relations are usually expressed by the particle *nay* 'of' as in: *nay gäza wardya* (of house guard) 'house of a guard'. Genitive relations can also be expressed by a simple juxtaposition of nouns. In the latter case, the head noun (the possessed) usually precedes the dependent noun (possessor): *gäza wardya* 'a guard's house'. Unlike the construct state in Ge'ez, the head noun undergoes a phonetic change only when it ends in an *-i*. In a genitive construction, for instance, the noun *həzbi* 'people' appears without the last vowel as in *həzb kätäma* 'inhabitants of a city' (Kogan 1997: 433). In a similar way, the noun *mäsli* may have come to be reanalyzed as a preposition *mäs* in the following way:

(29) a. *mäsli + säb* resemblance + person

b. *məsl säb* 'a portrait of a person'

c. *məsl säb > mäs säb* 'with a person'

The loss of the last radical *l* may have occurred at the stage where *məsl* (> *mäs*) had already started functioning as a preposition with a significant increase in text frequency. It is notable that such a reduction of the last radical has not occurred in either Ge'ez *mäsli* or Tigre *məsəl*.

As a comitative preposition Tigrinya *məs* could appear with suffixed pronouns as in *məs-u* ‘with him’. Otherwise, it usually appears non-affixed as in (30) and (31).

(30) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1985: 70)

məs arägit məxär; məs hayal wərär
with elderly consult; with mighty raid
‘Consult with the elderly; raid with the mighty’

(31) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1985: 71)

məs wäddi ‘addəxa aytəsädäd
with son your country don’t emigrate
‘Do not emigrate with a man from your country’

From its comitative function *məs* further grammaticalizes into a marker of temporal relations. When *məs* marks temporal clauses it precedes the verb in the perfect (Kogan 1997: 443). This is illustrated in the examples given in (32) and (33).

(32) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1985: 69)

məs səhatka məxri yərkäb
when you go wrong advice is available
‘Advice comes after you make a mistake’

(33) (Matthew 21: 34)

nab jalba məs atäwu əti nəfas zəg bala
to boat when they got in the wind slow it-said
‘When they got up into the boat, the wind died down’

Both as a comitative preposition and a temporal marker *məs* appears to have a fairly high text frequency. Though in a rare case, *məs* could also serve as a Noun-phrase conjoining marker (NP-AND) as in (Kane 2000: 381) *läyti məs mä‘alti* ‘night and day’.

To summarize, in Tigrinya, the noun *məsli* RESEMBLANCE (< *msl* RESEMBLE) has grammaticalized into a COMITATIVE. This in turn has further evolved into a TEMPORAL and coordinating CONJUNCTION. In the process of grammaticalization, the bisyllabic noun is reduced into a monosyllabic grammatical marker. Unlike its erstwhile noun *məsli*, *məs* has

become more general in meaning and more frequent in its distribution assuming multiple functions. As a comitative marker, the position of *mäs* is fixed before a noun. As a temporal marker, it is limited to a preceding position before a verb in the perfect. Regarding its autonomy, *mäs* has not yet become a prefix.

5.4 *msl* in Argobba

Unlike in the North Ethiosemitic languages, the Semitic root *msl* barely appears to undergo any processes of grammaticalizations in the South Ethiosemitic languages. One of the exceptional cases is the comitative postposition *mäs* in Argobba, which derives from *msl* ‘be like, resemble’ (Leslau 1997: 213).

Argobba *mäs* appears as a second member in a circumposition with the prefix *tä-*. As the first member of the circumposition is itself a comitative marker, evidently one is being reinforced by the other. The function of Argobba *mäs* is illustrated in the examples given in (34-37). In connection with Argobba *mäs*, Harari *mässä* ‘equal, together’ should also be mentioned. According to Leslau (1963: 112) Harari *mässä* represents a biradical root reflecting the Semitic *msl*. Amharic *mässa* ‘equal’ should also be cognate with Harari *mässä*.

(34) Leslau (1997: 27).

tä-ank mäs yämmimäṭu suččoč ənnäman nem?
 with-you with who-come people who they-are
 ‘Who are the people who come with you?’

(35) (Leslau 1997: 27)

tä-əyyo mäs mäṭṭa
 with-me with he came
 ‘He came with me’

(36) (Leslau 1997: 97)

tä-ma mäs hedk?
 with-who with you went
 ‘With whom did you go?’

(37) (Leslau 1997: 97)

tä-kässu mäs yä-mäṭṭu-čč-u suč äšit nəm
with-him with who-came-pl-the men few they-are
‘The men who came with him are few’

5.5 *mśl* in Amharic

The comitative *mäs* that appears in Argobba is missing in Amharic, nor do we find any other adposition which appears to have been derived from the root *mśl*. The only potential suspect is the preposition *sälä* ‘about, with regard to, because’. In some specific cases, as in the examples given in (38-41), Amharic *sälä* serves as a similitive marker.

(38) *zəqqətännä wəṭtet magñät sälä-mäwdäq yəqqoṭṭärral*
low mark to get like-failing it is considered
‘Getting low marks is considered as failing (in exam)’

(39) (Kane 1990: 442)

sälü-meda näw
like-plain it is
‘[the hill] is like a plain’

(40) (Desta 1962: 1175)

ṭəq^wureta sälü ṭef näw
ṭəq^wureta like *ṭef* it is
‘*ṭəq^wureta* is nearly the same as *ṭef*’
[both *ṭəq^wureta* and *ṭef* are millet-like cereals]

(41) (Ethiopian Languages Research Center 1993: 135)

yəh yämašalla ənğära ... sälü ṭef yəqqoṭṭärral
this of-sorghum ənğära ... like ṭef it is considered
‘This *ənğära* from sorghum is considered like *ənğära* made from *ṭef*’

Ge‘ez *məsla* appears in Amharic in the compound word *məslä-ne* (lit. ‘like-me’) ‘representative, deputy, substitute’. Its near-equivalent is *ändä-rase* (lit. ‘like-myself’). We also find expressions that appear to be similar with *məslä-ne* as in the following sentences.

(42) *sälä-ne hono käbbäda yännagärral*
 like-me having become K. will speak
 ‘Kebede will speak on my behalf’

(43) *sälä-ne hono läge yäfarəmmal*
 like-me having become my son will sign
 ‘My son will sign on my behalf’

Praetorius 1879: 269 and Guidi 1901: 142 (both cited in Leslau 1979b: 542) derive Amharic *säla* ‘because of’ from *s’l* ‘question, ask’. Cohen 1939: 306 and Rundgren 1955: 61 (also cited in Leslau 1979b: 542), on the other hand, analyze *säla* as *sə-lä*. In contrast to these proposals, the function of *sälä* as a similitive marker may tempt one to consider *sälä* as a reduced form of (Ge‘ez) *məslä*. The loss of the first radical *m* is not, however, as easy to explain as was the case with the loss of the last radical in Tigrinya *məs*. We also do not find *säla* functioning as a comitative marker in Amharic as was the case with Ge‘ez *məsla*, Tigre *məsəl*, Tigrinya *məs*, and Argobba *mäs*. The possible development of Amharic *sälä* from (Ge‘ez) *məslä* must therefore remain as pure speculation.

5.6 *Resemble* in Oromo

Bender and Mulugeta (1976: 139) state that the “preposed article” *akka* ‘as, like’ is derived from a noun meaning ‘resemblance, example’. In Oromo the word *akeeka* means ‘resemble’ as a verb and ‘resemblance, example’ as a noun (cf. Leus 2006: 17). Thus the noun *akeeka* may have grammaticalized into the similitive preposition *akka* in Oromo. The word *takka* ‘one, same’ might also be considered as another possible etymology for *akka*. But both possibilities need further investigation.

5.7 Chapter Summary

In what we have considered so far, we have looked into the development of Ge‘ez *məsla* and ‘*amsäla*, Tigre *məsəl* and *kəmsal*, and Tigrinya *məs* from nouns that derive from the Semitic root *mśl*. The main target concepts of *mśl* were found to be the COMITATIVE (Ge‘ez *məsla*, Tigre *məsəl*, Tigrinya *məs*) and the SIMILATIVE (Ge‘ez ‘*amsäla*, Tigre *kəmsal*).

The grammaticalization pathways taken by the root *mśl* in the three Ethiosemitic languages is schematically represented in (44-46). The basic functions of the morphemes considered are also summarised in a table.

(44) Ge'ez

a) *məsla*

RESEMBLE > COMITATIVE > (1) NP-AND

(2) TEMPORAL > ADVERSATIVE

b) 'amsāla

RESEMBLE > SIMILATIVE > PURPOSE

(45) Tigre

a. *məsəl*

RESEMBLE > COMITATIVE

b. *kəmsal*

RESEMBLE > SIMILATIVE > TEMPORAL

(46) Tigrinya *məs*

RESEMBLE > COMITATIVE > (1) TEMPORAL

(2) NP-AND

Table 3 *msl* in Ethiosemitic

Language	Morpheme	COMITATIVE	SIMILATIVE	TEMPORAL	ADVERSATIVE	NP-AND	PURPOSE
Ge'ez	<i>məsla</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓	
	<i>'amsāla</i>		✓				✓
Tigre	<i>məsəl</i>	✓					
	<i>kəmsal</i>		✓	✓			
Tigrinya	<i>məs</i>	✓		✓		✓	
Argobba	<i>tä...mäs</i>	✓					

CHAPTER SIX

6 SIMILATIVES

A similative marker ‘like, as, according to’ is a morpheme which indicates that the marked entity is similar or identical to the standard. In other words, a similative marker expresses similarity in manner, quality, or size (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002: 25; Crass and Meyer 2007: 238; Meyer 2006a: 190).

The source concepts documented in the *Lexicon* for the SIMILATIVE are HOW, MANNER, RESEMBLE, and SAY. The target concepts documented are QUOTATIVE and COMPLEMENTIZER. The complement clause marker in turn serves as a source domain for a PURPOSE clause marker. A TEMPORAL as the target concept of a SIMILATIVE is not documented in the *Lexicon*. However, such a path is observed in nearly all of Ethiosemitic languages and Oromo.

The similative markers considered in this chapter are the following: In Oromo, the basic similative marker is *akka*. In Ethiosemitic languages, the main similative markers appear in two forms. In the Central Transversal South Ethiosemitic languages (Amharic and Argobba) we have *andä* (*andə* with the imperfect). In the rest of Ethiosemitic the similative appears as **kVm*. In the North Ethiosemitic languages the similative appears as Ge‘ez *kämä*, Tigre *kəm*, and Tigrinya *käm*.

In Transversal South Ethiosemitic the basic similative marker appears as *-kut* in Harari, as *-ko* (*yä... ko*) in Silt’e, as *-kō* (*yä...kō*) in Wolane, and as *-hum* (*yä... -hum*) in Zay. In the Outer South Ethiosemitic languages we have *-xama* (*yä... -xäma*) in Chaha, Eža, and Muher; *-hom* (*~ -kom*) (*yä... hom/kom*) in Kistane (cf. Leslau 1979b: 342).

In North Ethiosemitic and Central Transversal South Ethiosemitic the similative markers are preposed and hence are prepositions. In the other South Ethiosemitic languages the similative morphemes are postpositions. In Harari, it is simply postposed “bare”. In the others, the morpheme is postposed as a second member of a circumposition. In Oromo, *akka* is a preposition.

In the rest of this chapter, the grammaticalization paths undergone by the similative markers in Oromo and in most of the Ethiosemitic languages are discussed.

6.1 The Similative *əndä*

6.1.1 *əndä* in Amharic

In Amharic the morpheme *əndä* functions basically as a similative marker ‘as, like, according to’. From its function as a similative marker Amharic *əndä* grammaticalizes into a temporal clause marker. In another independent path, it also grammaticalizes into a marker of complement clauses. The complementizer *əndä* in turn makes a further development into a marker of purpose clauses. As a purpose clause marker *əndä* is attached to imperfect verbs. In this context it appears in a slightly different form, as *əndə-*.

The examples given in (1a-d) illustrate the function of *əndä* as a similative marker. In (1a) Helen’s manner of swimming is compared with that of a fish; it is expressed as similar. In (1b) what is requested of someone is expressed in comparison (of equality) with his ability. What will be given to him is also compared as similar with his needs.

In (1c), too, we observe comparison of equality in size. The height of Helen and the height of her brother are mentioned as similar. In (1d) a comparison of equality is made between the method specified in the verbal instruction and the method employed in the actual performance.

(1a) *helän əndä- asa təwaññalläčč*

Helen like-fish she swims

‘Helen swims like a fish’

(1b) *kä-hullum əndä-čəlotaw; lä-hullum əndä-fəllagotu*

from-all as-his ability; to-all as-his need

‘From each according to his ability; to each according to his need’

(1c) *helän əndä-wändəm^wa räggəm näčč*

Helen like-her brother tall she is

‘Helen is as tall as her brother’

(1d) *helän abbat-wa əndä mäkkärat särraččəw*

Helen father-her as he advised her she did it

‘Helen did (the job) according to her father’s advice’

When *əndä* is employed to mark temporal clauses it must appear attached to verbs in the perfect as in the examples given in (2a-c). In such expressions the time of the action or event mentioned in the main clause is compared with the one in the subordinate clause (where *əndä* is involved). The time of the two events is conceived as nearly identical or similar. In other words, the two events are seen as occurring nearly simultaneously. The time of the action in the main clause comes immediately after the time of the action in the subordinate clause. The time of the two actions may also overlap.

(2a) *helän käbbädä mättamämun əndä-sämmačč ləttäyyəqäw hedäčč*
 Helen Kebede that he was sick as-she heard to visit him she went
 ‘Helen went to visit Kebede as soon as she heard that he was sick’

(2b) *helän məsa əndä-qärräbä mäṭṭačč*
 H. lunch as-was served she came
 ‘Helen came when lunch was served’

(2c) *helän bet-wa əndä-därräsäčč məsa-wan bällačč*
 H. home-her as-she arrived lunch-her she ate
 ‘Helen ate her lunch as soon as she arrived home’

In the examples given in (3a, b) *əndä*, attached to verbs in the perfect, marks complement clauses. The main clause in such cases is commonly a verb of cognition or utterance. The grammaticalization path SIMILE > COMPLEMENTIZER is mentioned in the Lexicon (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 273-274).

(3a) *mäkina əndä-gäzzačč nəgraññalläčč*
 car that-she bought she has told me
 ‘She has told me that she bought a car’

(3b) *mäkina əndä-gäzzačč aqallähu*
 car that-she bought I know
 ‘I know that she bought a car’

In (4a, b) *əndə-* is attached to verbs in the imperfect. It functions as an adverbial purpose clause marker. In (4c), *əndə-* marks a complement-purpose clause.

- (4a) *fätānawən əndə-taləf bārtətāh aṭna*
 the exam so that- you (M) pass intensely study
 ‘You (M) (should) study hard to pass the exam’
- (4b) *bet-u əndihed (for əndə-yəhed) fäqad täyyäqä*
 house-his so that-he may go permission he asked
 ‘He asked for permission to go home’
- (4c) *əndəhed (for əndə-əhed) näggäräññ*
 so that I go he told me
 ‘He told me to go’

To summarize, Amharic *əndä* is a polyfunctional morpheme with a high text frequency. Its meaning has become more general and schematic in its function as temporal, complement, and purpose clause marker. When attached to verbs in the imperfect, its final *ä* is reduced to *ə* or is lost completely.

The schematic representation of the grammaticalization pathways taken by Amharic *əndä* is given in (5).

- (5) SIMILATIVE > (1) TEMPORAL
 (2) COMPLEMENTIZER > PURPOSE

6.1.2 *əndä* in Argobba

The functions of Argobba *əndä* are identical with those of Amharic *əndä*. In the examples given in (6a, b) Argobba *əndä* serves as a similative marker. In (7), it is attached to a verb in the perfect and marks a temporal clause. In (8) and (9) it is attached to verbs in the imperfect and takes the form *əndə-*. In (8) it marks a complement clause and in (9) a purpose clause.

- (6) (Leslau 1997: 94)

- a. *əndü bräd ne*
 like iron it is
 ‘It is like iron’

b. *ay andä kəssu räzzim näññ*
 I like him tall I am
 ‘I am as tall as he is’

(7) (Leslau 1997: 102)

ğəbən andä-hanğa färä
 hyena as-he saw he became afraid
 ‘As soon as he saw a hyena, he became afraid’

(8) (Leslau 1997: 103)

wädä əmm-əyə andä-yəmət öñqälluh
 to mother-my that-he will come I know
 ‘I know that he will come to my mother’

(9) (Leslau 1997: 105)

su simeṭṭät hakim andä-yəhanğe yəzorel
 man when he is sick doctor in order that-he sees him it is necessary for him
 ‘When a man is sick, he should see a doctor’

6.1.3 *kämä* in Amharic and Argobba

In present-day Amharic, we observe the occurrence of *kämä* in the following two expressions: *kämä qəṣbätä-ayən* (like a blink-of an eye) ‘(just) like the blink of an eye’; *kämä-tef* ‘like (the small seed of) tef’. The former is usually shortened to *kämä qəṣbät* and is more commonly employed than the latter. Consider the examples in (10) and (11).

(10) *kämä-qəṣbät täsäwwärä*
 like-a blink he disappeared
 ‘He disappeared in no time’

(11) *kämä-tef alqoträwwəm*
 like-tef I do not regard him
 ‘I do not regard him (even) as (a small seed of) tef’

The morpheme *kämä* in the two expressions is certainly a borrowing from Ge‘ez.

In Argobba, *kämä* appears especially in the formation of adverbs of manner as in (12a, b).

(12) (Leslau 1997: 113)

a. *kämäy nah?*

how you (M) are

‘How are you?’

b. *handhand su kämkäm yäläl*

one-one man such-such he says

‘Some people say thus’

6.1.4 On the Origin of *ändä*

Kapeliuk suggests that Amharic *ändä* may have evolved from Ge‘ez *’anta* (Kapeliuk 2009: 219, 221, note 14). The feminine relative pronoun *’anta*, in some contexts, had already began functioning as a similative preposition ‘as’ in Ge‘ez. The voicing of *t* is explained with such instances as Amharic *gäddälä* ‘to kill’ for Ge‘ez *qatala* and Argobba *bed* ‘house’ for Amharic *bet*.

To Kapeliuk (2009: 221, note 14), however, what “upsets the otherwise almost obvious etymology” is the spelling of modern Amharic *ända* as *händä* ‘as, like’ in Old Amharic. The latter form is recorded by Getatchew (1970: 65) from a manuscript which “does not necessarily belong to a later time than the 16th century” (Getatchew 1970: 62). The morpheme also appears with the following variants: ሕንደ, ሕንደዚህ, ሕንደህ, ኅንድማዕ (p. 65). Getatchew notes further that ሕንድ (*händ*) and እንድ (*änd*) are recorded in Littmann (1944: 11) and the form ሕንደ (*händä*) in Ludolf (1698: 2). In the latter we also find the following: ህንደ, አፍጥኖ ህንደ, ህንደት, and ህንደተኛ (Ludolf 1698: 2). As noted in Podolsky (1991: 29), *händ* and *änd* are recorded in Littmann (1944) in the meaning ‘in order to’.

The appearance of Old Amharic *hand* ‘(numeral) one’ vis-a-vis modern Amharic *and* suggests an alternative possible etymology for Amharic *ändä*. The hypothesis is that *ändä* might have evolved from Amharic *and* ‘one’ which also means ‘the same’. The word for ‘one, same’ appears in Ge‘ez as *’ahadu*, in Tigrinya as *hadä*, in Gurage as *had*. In Amharic and Argobba, it appears as *and* and *hand* respectively; here we observe the insertion of *n* (Leslau 1987: 12). Unlike in Amharic, *h* is retained in Argobba (see also Podolsky 1991: 29). However, we also find the *h* retained in Old Amharic as *hand* ‘one’ (cf. Cowley 1983: 21). The following are also recorded in Ludolf (1698: 4): ሕንድ [*hand* ‘one’], ሕንድ ሴት, ሕንድ ፍሬ

ካው, በሐንድ (ጎቡር), ሐንዳች ነገር, ሐንደኛ, ዐሥራ ሐንደኛ, ሐንድነት, and ሐንደግዜ [*handägəze* (one-time) ‘once’]. In the last instance, *hand* appears as *handä* whose final *ä* is similar to the construct binding vowel *ä* of Ge‘ez. In this connection, it should be noted that nearly all prepositions in Amharic end in the vowel *ä* (Leslau 1995: 597).

The change of the form *hand* to *handä* (> *händä*) and then to *ändä* is not unmotivated. Regarding the semantics, the extended meaning of *and* as ‘the same’ provides plausible grounds for *and* to acquire a similitive meaning as a preposition ‘as, like’.

In conclusion, I suggest that *and* ‘one, same’ as a possible etymology of *ändä* should be considered along with Kapeliuk’s ‘*əntä*’.

6.2 **kVm* in NES

6.2.1 Ge‘ez

Ge‘ez *kama* is considered as a combination of Semitic *k* ‘like’ and the interrogative or indefinite particle *-ma* (Leslau 1987: 285). As a preposition, Ge‘ez *kama* functions as a similitive marker. In its function as a subordinating conjunction, it serves as a marker of complement and purpose clauses.

The examples given in (13) and (14) illustrate the function of *kama* as a similitive preposition (comparison of similarity). In (15) and (16), *kama* serves as a complementizer. In (17) and (18), *kama* serves as a purpose clause marker.

Ge‘ez *kama* alone does not serve as a temporal clause marker, but only when combined with ‘*əm*’ ‘from’ (cf. Leslau 1987: 22; Dillmann 1907: 420). The function of ‘*əm-kama*’ is illustrated in (19).

(13) (Psalms 118: 12)

<i>’agatuni</i>	<i>kama</i>	<i>nəhəb</i>	<i>ma’ara</i>
they surrounded me	like	bee	honey-Acc

‘They surrounded me (just) as bees [surround honey]’

(14) (Matthew 22:39)

<i>’afqər</i>	<i>biṣaka</i>	<i>kama</i>	<i>nafsəka</i>
you (M) love	your neighbour	like	your soul

‘love your neighbour as yourself’

(15) (Matthew 24:33)

'a'əməru kama qarba
you (PL) know that he is near'
'know that He is near'

(16) (Matthew 9:28)

ta'ammənu-hu kama 'əkəl zanta gabira
do you believe that I can this-ACC make-ACC
'Do you believe that I am able to do this?'

(17) (Matthew 2:2)

maša'na kama nəsgəd lottu
we came so that we worship for him
'We have come to worship Him'

(18) (Amsalu 2010: 179)

'arga dabra kama yəşalli
he went up mountain-ACC in order to pray
'He went up a mountain to pray'

(19) (Amsalu 2010: 179)

'əmkama waş'a manfas rəkus 'əm-sab'
when goes out spirit evil from man
'When an evil spirit goes out of a person...'

Ge'ez *kama* is commonly employed in all four functions mentioned and has a high text frequency. Despite its frequent use, however, it has exhibited no reduction of a syllable or even a segment.

6.2.2 Tigre

In Tigre *kəm* functions basically as a similative marker as in the example given in (20). From its function as a similative marker Tigre *kəm* grammaticalizes independently into a complementizer on the one hand and into a temporal clause marker on the other. In the example given in (21) *kəm* marks a complement clause; in (22) it functions as a temporal marker.

It is noteworthy that Tigre *kəm* does not function as a purpose clause marker. This is also the case with Tigrinya *käm* (see below). Purpose clauses in Tigre are mainly marked by *'agəl* with the jussive (cf. Leslau 1945a: 200).

(20) (Raz 1983: 84, 92)

dəgəm gabil kəl dol 'əb nosuma kəm mamhər tətu
 history people all time by himself even like teacher is
 'People's history by itself is always instructive [like a teacher]'

(21) (Leslau 1945a: 200)

män 'assa'alekki lämäsarye nay källat kəm ta
 who told you my axe of clay that it is
 'Who told thee that my axe was of clay?'

(22) (Leslau 1948: 137)

zəlam kem zälma 'ət bet 'ateko
 rain when it rained to house I entered
 'When it rained I entered the hut'

6.2.3 Tigrinya

In Tigrinya, *käm* functions mainly as a similitive marker as in the example given in (23). From a similitive marker it grammaticalizes into a marker of complement clauses as in (24). As a complementizer *käm* is commonly attached to relative verbs either in the perfect or in the imperfect (Kane 2000: 1576). Thus it appears prefixed to the relative particle *zə-*. Kogan (1997: 443) considers *kämzə-* as a marker of complement clauses in Tigrinya.

(23) (Matthew 10:16)

ṭəbiban kām təmən kunu
 wise-PL like serpent become (3PL)
 'Be cautious as serpents'

(24) (Kane 2000: 1576)

lomi nabay kāmzəmäsə'ə 'əfälləṭ
 today to my place that he will come I know
 'I know that he will come to my place today'

As is the case with Tigre *kəm*, Tigrinya *kām* does not function as a purpose clause marker. In Tigrinya, *kə-* prefixed to the simple imperfect can serve as a purpose clause marker as in *nəwäddu kə-ḥarəd* (ACC-son-his to-slaughter) ‘[Abraham] ... in order to slaughter his son’ (Kane 2000: 1553). If the prefix *kə-* is related to Semitic *k* ‘like’ (as is the case with *kām*), there would then be a development of a similative marker into a marker of purpose clauses.

It is also remarkable that Tigrinya *kām* does not function as a marker of temporal clauses. This is not however the case in the other Ethiosemitic languages. One of the main temporal clause markers in Tigrinya is *məs* (see sec. 5.3 above, and cf. Kogan 1997: 443). The original meaning of *məs* (< *mśl* ‘like’) is similar to that of *kām* ‘like’. So, we still have the development of a temporal marker from a similative.

6.3 **kVm* in TSES

6.3.1 Silt’e

In Silt’e the suffix *-ko* functions as a similative marker as in (25). In this function it commonly appears as a second member of a circumposition: *yä- ... -ko*. In its function as a complementizer as in (26) *-ko* occurs suffixed to a relative clause (relative clause + *-ko* ‘that’). As a temporal clause marker *-ko* appears as a second member of a circumposition *ta-...-ko* (*ta-* + [verb] + *-ko* ‘as soon as’) as in (27).

(25) (Gutt 1997: 982)

ya-miiše-ko *tijaajeet*
of-man-like she fought
‘She fought like a man’

(26) (Gutt 1997: 953)

tidaaha-ko *biičil* *iliihaha naarku*
you-go-that if-I-knew I-would-have-sent-you
‘I would have sent it to you, if I had known that you will go’

(27) (Gutt 1997: 983)

baarreka ta-bala-ko timirta gaara heeda
lunch-[acc]-his as-soon-as-he-ate school-[acc] he-went
‘As soon as he had eaten his lunch he went to school’

It appears that in Silt’e *-ko* is not employed to mark purpose clauses. As already noted, this is also the case with Tigre *kəm* and Tigrinya *käm*. Unlike in Silte, however, in Wolane the similative *-kō* (attached to a relative clause) can also serve as a purpose marker (cf. Meyer 2006a: 296; see also note 87, on the same page).

In Silt’e the similative suffix *-ko* has two more functions worth mentioning. The first one is its function as a marker of standard in comparative constructions of inequality as in the example given in (28). In this function too, it appears as second member of a circumposition: *ta...-ko*. The first member *ta-* ‘from’ can indicate a point of comparison (cf. Gutt 1997: 910, 997).

For the COMPARATIVE as a target concept, eight source concepts are documented in the *Lexicon* (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 329). ABLATIVE and RESEMBLE (> SIMILATIVE) are among the eight. In Silt’e, both *ta-* (Ablative) and *-ko* (Similative) may therefore have developed into a comparative marker of inequality.

In the other Ethiosemitic languages, what we observe is the grammaticalization of ABLATIVE into COMPARATIVE. The development of a similative into a comparative of inequality appears to be limited to Silt’e.

(28) (Gutt 1997: 910)

ittate laam ta-attite-ko aybaataamint
this cow from-that-than gives much milk
‘This cow gives more milk than that one’

(29) (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 875)

šiiba sab fayya-ko hidoot ilaaqatill
crippled person properly to walk is not capable
‘A crippled person cannot walk properly’

(30) (Gutt and Hussein 1997: 288)

taačēena bommadina booza-ko anč'ēey naar
yesterday Bommad-ACC badly ill he was
'Bommad was very ill yesterday'

In Silt'e the similative *-ko* can also function in two cases as an adverbializer of adjectives as in (29) and (30). By suffixing *-ko* to the accusative form of the adjective *booz* 'bad', we get *booz-a-ko* 'badly'; *fayya* 'good' + acc. *a* + *-ko* = *fayyako* 'well' (Gutt 1997: 936).

Oromo *akka* 'like' can also serve as an adverbializer of adjectives (for which see below).

6.3.2 Wolane

The similative suffix *-kō* in Wolane is nearly identical with that of Silt'e *-ko*. In its function as a similative marker it appears as a second member of two circumpositions: (a) *yɛ-...-kō* (b) *tɛ- ... -ko* (Meyer 2006a: 190). As a temporal marker it appears as in the second (b) circumposition (cf. Meyer 2006a: 294). In its function as a complementizer, it gets suffixed to a relative clause (cf. Meyer 2006a: 299).

In Wolane, the similative suffix *-kō* sometimes forms manner adverbs as in *fɛyyɛ-kō* 'properly (lit. like good)' (Meyer 2006a: 180, note 74).

6.3.3 Zay

In Zay the suffix *-hum* functions as a similative marker as in (31). It also functions as a marker of complement clauses as in (32) and as a marker of temporal clauses as in (34). In these three functions Zay *-hum* appears postposed as the second member in the *yä- ... -hum* circumposition. In its function as a purpose clause marker as in (33), it appears in the context: simple perfect + *e* + *hum* (cf. Leslau 1999: 151).

(31) (Leslau 1999: 158)

ut yä-əno-ni-hum dāmam-u
he as his-brother rich-he-is
'He is as rich as his brother'

(32) (Leslau 1999: 154)

wērā gār yä-wähäbe-hum sämuh
a-new house that-he-bought-it I heard
‘I heard that he bought a new house’

(33) (Leslau 1999: 152)

läbaša-y tanṭäb-e-hum qorro wәрäd
the clothes in-order-that-you-wash [to]-river go-down!
‘Go down to the river to wash the clothes!’

(34) (Leslau 1999: 150)

uhnäm-gi gār-ä-ni yä-sane^yi-m-hum bәrrәqat wädäqä-bi
as-soon-as his-house that-he-fixed-it lightning fell-upon-it
‘As soon as he fixed his house, lightning fell upon it’

6.3.4 Harari

In Harari the suffix *-kut* basically functions as a similitive marker as in (35). Harari *-kut* can also function as a marker of complement clauses as in (36). In its function as a complementizer the text frequency of *-kut* is very low. As a purpose clause marker, however, *-kut* is frequently used in Harari. In (37) *-kut* functions as a marker of a purpose clause.

In Harari texts of Leslau (1965), I found no instance where *-kut* functions as a temporal clause marker. In this regard, Harari *-kut* is similar to Tigrinya *käm*.

(35) (Leslau 1965: 140)

dūs kut-ma illiyē
honey like-and purified honey oh!
‘You are as sweet as purified honey’

(36) (Leslau 1965: 151)

waldi yibäzḥi-lē-kut tixašat
children so that are numerous to her she wishes
‘She wants to have many children’

(37) (Leslau 1965: 173)

yilihmä-kut *taḥay sūrāč-be yīgli-ma*
that it may be easy for him lower with sūras he begins-and closer
la'ay sūrāč fōñ duq yilal
upper sūras toward he goes closer
'To make it easier for him, he begins with the lower sūras, and proceeds to the upper ones'

Suffixed to the adjective *ōr* 'good', the simulative *-kut* also serves as an adverbializer. Thus, we have a commonly used adverb in Harari: *ōrkut* 'very well, very much, very' (cf. Leslau 1963: 31). The use of *ōrkut* is illustrated in examples (38) and (39).

(38) (Leslau 1965: 57)

ōrkut *yäṭābqōzal* *māḥawaw*
very [that] for which one cares objects-Acc
'Things that are very important to them'

(39) (Leslau 1965: 143)

istā-zōm *dārma* *fäqār-wa māslah* *ōrkut* *yūddal*
even then the young man songs-and dancing very much loves
'Even so, the young very much enjoy singing and dancing'

6.4 **kVm* in OSES

In the Outer South Ethiosemitic languages (probably with the exception of Gafat), the simulative marker **kVm* (*-hom*, *-hām*, *-hāma*, or *ha*) can function as a marker of complement clauses (with a relative verb). Suffixed to verbs in the imperfect, the same suffix can also mark purpose clauses. Though not frequently, the simulative suffix (*bä-/tä-* + perfect + 'like') may also function as a marker of temporal clauses (cf. Hetzron 1977: 99, 103).

In the following three sub-sections, the simulative suffix in Chaha, Mäsqaṅ, and Muher is briefly discussed with illustrative examples.

6.4.1 Chaha

The simulative postposition *hāma* in Chaha is transcribed by Leslau 1950 as *kāma*, by Hetzron (1977) as *hāma*, and by Ford (1986) as *xāma*. Chaha *hāma* functions as a simulative

marker as in example (40). From a similitive marker, it grammaticalizes into a complement clause marker (as in (41-43)) on the one hand and into a temporal clause marker (as in (46)) on the other. From its function as a complementizer, it makes a further development to serve as a purpose clause marker. This is illustrated in the examples given in (44) and (45).

(40) (Ford 1986: 58)

žäp xäma yaxära
 lion like he-shouts
 ‘He roars like a lion’

(41) (Ford 1986: 55)

kʷäčʷim tanä nägä yaʷäri xäma innim saβ yixʷin
 one-gets-tired as tomorrow one-rests that all person he-knows-it
 ‘Everyone knows that by working hard now one rests in the future’

(42) (Hetzron 1977: 99)

yä-säpä-rä-häma ähʷär
 ‘I know that he broke’

(43) (Hetzron 1977: 99)

yäsäβär-häma ähʷär
 ‘I know that he breaks’

(44) (Hetzron 1977: 99)

yäsäβär-häma äšä
 ‘I want that he break’
 [I want him to break]

(45) (Leslau 1950: 49, text line 5)

balabbat y^{wü}räm yakärä kämä “yär atod” yəwün
 the “chief-noble” true to know “witness declare” tells him
 ‘In order to know whether it is true, the ‘chief noble’ tells him: “bring a witness”

(46) (Leslau 1950: 35)

tākā tatčänä k̄āma əšta ənnəm əlall yəbrāma
the child is born as soon as the women all shout for joy
‘As soon as the child is born the women shout for joy’

6.4.2 Mäsqaṅ

In Mäsqaṅ the suffix *-hām* functions as a similitive marker as in (47), as a marker of complement clause as in (48), as a marker of purpose clause as in (49), and as a marker of temporal clause as in (50).

(47) (Hetzron 1977: 184, text line 10)

sostäläjjnä-y qalqälä y-əng^wad-i-hām fätta-m
third-the bag of-other-the-like [he] untied
‘Then he also took the third bag, opened it like the other ones’

(48) (Hetzron 1977: 189, text line 53)

ah^wa-m zəzzəro y-abllätä-hām bā-haro-ham
again Inchling of-outsmarted them-that in-knew-like
‘As they [brothers] realised that Inchling had outsmarted them again...’

(49) (Hetzron 1977: 188, text line 40)

ärbat-əm yəb-hām yä-ros-äh ezzäzä
dinner-his give-in order to-servant-his [he] ordered
‘He ordered the servant to give [Inchling] dinner’

(50) (Hetzron 1977: 184, text line 5)

leba-mm-i- gäbe bā-sälla-häma-t
the thief market in-he arrived-when-t
‘When the thief arrived at the market...’

6.4.3 Muher

The examples given in (51-54) illustrate the multiple functions of the suffix *-xäma* in Muher. In (51) *-xäma* is a similitive marker; in (52) a complementizer; in (53) a purpose clause marker; and in (54) a temporal clause marker.

(51) (Hetzron 1977: 168, text line 17)

yä-č'äññä-nn tāxloxta-xama
of [REL]-begot-him child his-like
'like his own child'

(52) (Hetzron 1977: 177, text line 32)

säb-we yä-fäkkäm^w-xäma bä-xe gi
person-the of-went-[that] in-knew after
'After verifying that the men were gone...'

(53) (Hetzron 1977: 169, text line 34)

yäčot-xäma yä-bet yäğğ-əxäma tə'äta-nn qärräsäčč-əm
works-so that of-house boy-like punishes-him started-M
'[She] started punishing him like a slave-boy so that he would do the work'

(54) (Hetzron 1977: 176, text line 5)

bä-mädär mädär-xənnämu-m yägäbäm-xäma.....
in-place place-their-m enter-[as]
'As they all went to their respective places ...'

6.5 akka in Oromo

In Oromo, *akka* functions basically as a similitive marker as in (55). From its similitive function Oromo *akka* grammaticalizes into a marker of complement clauses as in (56). From a complementizer *akka* makes a further development into a marker of purpose clauses as in (57).

In another line of development, *akka* grammaticalizes into a marker of temporal clauses as in the example (58).

(55) **akka** *abbaa sa dheeraa dha*
like father his tall he is
'He is as tall as his father'

(56) **akka** *deeme nanbeeka*
that he went I know
'I know that he has gone'

(57) *akka deemu itti himeera*
so that he goes I have told him
'I have told him to go'

(58) *akka mana qaqqabeeni dhiyana sa nyaate*
as soon as home he arrived lunch his he ate
'He ate his lunch as soon as he arrived home'

In Oromo, the similative *akka* can also serve as an adverbializer of adjectives. Thus, *akka hamaa* (like bad) means 'badly'; *akka gaari* (like good) means 'well' (cf. Owens 1985: 226). The use of *akka* as an adverbializer of adjectives is illustrated in the following examples.

(59) (Owens 1985: 226)

innii akka gaarii dubach-uu na bar-siis-e
he as good to speak-vn me teach cs pst
'He taught me to speak well'

(60) (Owens 1985: 226)

akka hamaa-tt caha
as bad loc runs
'He runs badly'

(61) (Tilahun 1989: 254)

akka gaaritt jiraata
[like good he lives]
'He lives comfortably'

(62) (Griefenow-Mewis 2001: 98)

manni jaraa akka gaaritti hojjetame
[house people like good was made]
'The house of the people was made in a good manner'

As noted above, among Ethiosemitic languages, the use of a similative marker as an adverbializer appears to be limited to the two East Gurage languages (Silt'e and Wolane) and Harari. It should also be noted that these three languages have been in close contact with Oromo for centuries.

6.6 Chapter Summary

Hetzron (1972: 129, note 11) observes that ‘the same morphemic exponent is used adnominally in the meaning of “like” and adverbially as a purposive “in order that”’ in most Ethiopian languages. Hetzron illustrates this with parallel examples from Ge‘ez, Amharic, Harari, Wolane, Dobbi [Gogot], Gumär, and Ennemor: ‘like a man/in order that he break’.

Crass and Meyer (2007: 238-240, 249) observe that a similitive marker also serves as a complementizer and purpose clause marker in five Ethiosemitic languages (Gumär, Muher, Wolane, Zay, Amharic) and in three East Cushitic languages (K’abeena, Libido, Oromo). Crass and Meyer have also shown that the similitive marker in these languages grammaticalizes first into a complementizer and then further into a purpose marker.

In the present chapter, the grammaticalization of a similitive marker into a complementizer (> a purpose marker) and a temporal clause marker is investigated. It is observed that Tigre *kəm*, Tigrinya *käm*, and Silt’e *-ko* are not employed as purpose markers. It is also noted that Tigrinya *käm* does not mark temporal clauses. In Tigrinya, one of the most frequently used temporal marker is *məs* (< *msl* RESEMBLE > SIMILATIVE > TEMPORAL). The similitive markers in Silt’e, Wolane, Harari, and Oromo were also found serving as adverbializers of adjectives.

There are also cases where some of the similitive markers considered in this chapter could function as conditional, pretensive ‘as if’ and causal clause markers.

In Ge‘ez, *’əm-kama* can be used to mark conditional clauses as in (63). In Amharic, *ändä + honä* (became) may also mark conditional clauses as in (64). In (65), Oromo *akka* is used like Ge‘ez *’əm-kama* and Amharic *ändä + honä*.

(63) (Mark 5:28)

’əm-kama *gasasku* *şənfa* *ləbsu* *’ahāyu*
if I touch edge-of his cloth I will get well
‘If I just touch his clothes, I will get well’

(64) *käbbädä* *yä-mätta* *ändä-honü* *nəggärräññ*

K. that-he came if tell me
‘Tell me if Kebede comes’

(65) (Tilahun 1989: 18)

akka isen achi jirtu ilaali
if she there she is you look
'See if she is there'

In Tigrinya, the pretensive can be expressed by the similitive marker as in (Tesfay 2002: 134): *kām maṣ'a* (like he-came) 'as if he were to come'.

In a number of Gunnän Gurage languages, the pretensive meaning 'as if' can be expressed by a combination of a noun meaning 'thing' with a similitive marker 'like' (cf. Hetzron 1997: 122). The following example (66) is from Gumär.

(66) (Hetzron 1977: 122)

mäsäh^yta yä-härä-häma qär
husband-her of-was-like thing
'As if he were her husband'

In Ennemor, *bä* + perfect + similitive suffix 'like' can express temporal and causal relations (Hetzron 1977: 103, 104). In Silt'e, reason relations can be expressed by the similitive suffix *-ko* as in (67) (cf. Gutt 1997: 951).

(67) (Gutt 1997: 983)

lač'eetku-ko afiuloota ikašaahu
as I am tired rest I want
'I want to rest because I am tired'

The similitive markers are also frequently combined with demonstratives to form manner adverbs as in the following examples from Amharic.

(68) a. *ändä-zzih* (*ändä* 'like' + *zzih* 'here') 'like this'

b. *ändet* (*ändä* 'like' + *yet* 'where') 'how?'

Similarly, in Silt'e we have *aynako* (*ayne* 'where?' + *-ko* 'like') 'how?' (Gutt 1997: 955). In Oromo, we have expressions such as: *akkam* (*akka* 'like' + *kam* 'which') 'how?'; *akkana* (*akka* 'like' + *kana* 'this') 'like this'.

For a brief summary of the three extended functions of the similatives considered in the present chapter, see Table 4.

Table 4 Similatives in Ethiosemitic and Oromo

SIMILATIVE	COMPLEMENTIZER	PURPOSE	TEMPORAL
Ge'ez <i>kämä</i>	✓	✓	✓
Tigre <i>kəm</i>	✓	×	✓
Tigrinya <i>käm</i>	✓	×	×
Amharic <i>ändä</i>	✓	✓	✓
Argobba <i>ändä</i>	✓	✓	✓
Silt'e <i>-ko</i>	✓	×	✓
Wolane <i>-kō</i>	✓	✓	✓
Zay <i>-hum</i>	✓	✓	✓
Harari <i>-kut</i>	✓	✓	×
Chaha <i>-xama</i>	✓	✓	✓
Mäsqañ <i>-häm</i>	✓	✓	✓
Muher <i>-xama</i>	✓	✓	✓
Oromo <i>akka</i>	✓	✓	✓

CHAPTER SEVEN

7 DEMONSTRATIVES

Crosslinguistic evidence (especially as documented in the *Lexicon* of Heine and Kuteva) has shown that demonstratives can develop into the following target concepts: allative marker, complementizer, conjunction, copula, definite article, focus marker, genitive marker, relative marker, subordinator, and third-person pronoun. Eight of the ten target concepts mentioned are documented in the *Lexicon*. Those which are missing in the *Lexicon* are the ALLATIVE and the GENITIVE. These two target concepts of the demonstrative, however, are documented in Diessel (1999: 127, 140-143)

The immediate and further targets of the demonstrative source concept are shown in (1-7). In the rest of the present chapter I will discuss the grammaticalization of demonstratives in Ethiosemitic languages and Oromo.

- (1) DEMONSTRATIVE >
- (1) ALLATIVE →
 - (2) COMPLEMENTIZER
 - (3) CONJUNCTION
 - (4) COPULA →
 - (5) DEFINITE
 - (6) FOCUS
 - (7) GENITIVE
 - (8) RELATIVE →
 - (9) SUBORDINATOR
 - (10) THIRD PERSON PRONOUN

- (2) ALLATIVE >
- (1) ACCUSATIVE
 - (2) COMPLEMENTIZER
 - (3) DATIVE →
 - (4) INFINITIVE
 - (5) PURPOSE →
 - (6) TEMPORAL →
 - (7) UNTIL

(3) DATIVE >	(1) ACCUSATIVE (2) COMPARATIVE (3) GENITIVE
(4) PURPOSE >	CAUSE
(5) TEMPORAL >	(1) ADVERSATIVE (2) CAUSE (3) CONCESSIVE (4) CONDITIONAL
(6) COPULA >	(1) AVERTIVE (2) CONDITIONAL (3) CONSECUTIVE (4) FOCUS (5) FUTURE (6) OBLIGATION
(7) RELATIVE >	COMPLEMENTIZER

7.1 Demonstratives in North Ethiosemitic

7.1. 1 Demonstratives in Ge‘ez

In this section I will look into the grammaticalization of the three demonstratives in Ge‘ez: *zä*, *’əntä*, and *’əllä*.

7.1. 1.1 Ge‘ez *zä*

As a demonstrative element Ge‘ez *zä* appears in two forms: in a nominative form *zə-* and in an accusative form *zä*. In its other functions it regularly takes the latter form. Note that the demonstratives like *za* ‘this (F)’, *’əllu* ‘these (M)’, and *’əlla* ‘these (F)’ do not have distinct accusative forms. But as relative elements *’əllu* and *’əlla* would appear as *’əllä* (cf. Lambdin 1978: 34 and Gragg 1997: 250).

In their function as demonstratives both *zä* and *zə-* are basically employed to refer to masculine singular objects as in the examples given in (8a-d).

(8) (Kidanewold 1948: 409)

(8a) *zə-bə'si*

'this man'

(8b) *zə-həzb*

'this people'

(8c) *təmaləm zä-gize*

yesterday this-time

'yesterday this time'

(8d) *səmə'u zä-nägärä*

you (PL) listen [to] this-speech-ACC

'Listen to this speech'

The demonstrative element *zä* in Ge'ez extends its function into a relative and genitive marker. Its function as a relative clause marker is illustrated in the examples given (9a-i).

(9a) (Amsalu 2010: 147)

iyäsus zä-täbählä krəstos

Jesus who-is said Christ

'Jesus who is called Christ'

(9b) (Amsalu 2010: 147)

bə'əsit zä-mäşə'at 'əm-gondär

a woman who-came from-Gondar

'a woman who came from Gondar'

(9c) (Amsalu 2010: 147)

'abäw zä-tägabə'u bä-niqəya

elders who-were assembled at-Nicea

'the fathers who assembled in Nicea'

(9d) (Amsalu 2010: 147)

'anəst zä-isämə'a məkrä mäşahəft

women who-did not hear advice-of books

'those women who have not heeded the advice of books'

(9e) (Luke 1:19)

'ana wə'ətu gäbrə'el zä-'əqäwwəm qədmä 'əgzi'abəher
I am Gabriel who-stands in front of God
'I am Gabriel, who stands in the presence of God'

(9f) (Tinsae 1992: 210)

zä-šəhafku šəhafku
what-I wrote I wrote
'I wrote what I wrote'

(9g) (Tinsae 1992: 213)

zä-ṭäyāqnahu
what-we have asked
'that which we have asked'

(9h) (John 3: 13)

zä-wärädä 'əm-sämay
who-came down from-heaven
'He who came down from heaven'

(9i) (Matthew 21: 9)

bəruk zä-yəmäsšə' bā-səm-ä 'əgzi'abəher
blessed who-comes in-the name-of God
'Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord!'

In (9a) the antecedent is masculine singular; in (9b) it is feminine singular. In (9c) the antecedent is masculine plural; in (9d) it is feminine plural.

As already noted, in its demonstrative function Ge'ez *zä* makes a distinction in gender and number. This might have also been the case in its early stages as a relative marker. Through time relative *zä* has become more generalized to be employed (optionally) indiscriminately for all numbers and genders. Thus the relative-genitive element *zä* could replace the feminine singular *'əntä* and the common plural *'əllä* in their function as relative and genitive markers. Consequently, *zä* appears much more frequently and is in more general use than the other two elements.

The function of *zä* as a genitive marker is illustrated in the examples given in (10a-d).

(10) (Amsalu 2010: 87-88)

(10a) *wälätt zä-maryam*
daughter of-Mary
'the daughter of Mary'

(10b) *mäṣahəft zä-yohannəs*
books of-Yohannes
'the books of Yohannes'

(10c) *mäṣahəft zä-wəlud*
books of-children
'the books of the children'

(10d) *'amtat zä-'anəst*
husbands of-women
'the husbands of the women'

In its function as a genitive marker, too, *zä*, unlike *'əntä* and *'əllä*, does not reflect gender and number distinctions on the head noun. Thus, in (10a) the head noun is feminine singular; and in (10d) feminine plural. So, *zä* could be used in place of *'əntä* and *'əllä* as a genitive marker. This too makes *zä* to have a fairly more text frequency than the two elements.

We can also compare the frequency of *zä* with the other method of genitive marking in Ge'ez. The examples in (12a-c) correspond to the three methods of genitive marking in Ge'ez shown in (11a-c).

(11a) HeadNoun-*ä* DependentNoun

(11b) HeadNoun-PronominalSuffix *lä*-DependentNoun

(11c) HeadNoun *zä*-DependentNoun

(12) (Amsalu 2010: 87)

(12a) *wäld-ä yoḥannəs*

(12b) *wäld-u lä-yoḥannəs*

(12c) *wäld zä-yoḥannəs*

‘The son of Yohannes’

So far we have noted that the demonstrative element *zä* has evolved into a relative and genitive marker. What remains to be addressed is the possible direction of grammaticalization taken by *zä*. We may have three possible directions as represented in (13a-c).

(13a) DEMONSTRATIVE > RELATIVE > GENITIVE

(13b) DEMONSTRATIVE > GENITIVE > RELATIVE

(13c) DEMONSTRATIVE > (1) RELATIVE

(2) GENITIVE

The possibilities in (13a) and (13b) would imply that there was a repeated grammaticalization with the relative element grammaticalizing further into a genitive or the other way round. The alternative direction represented in (13c) would imply that there was polygrammaticalization where the demonstrative may have grammaticalized independently into a relative marker on the one hand and into a genitive marker on the other.

Dillmann remarks that the function of *zä* as a relative marker must have preceded its function as a genitive marker. One of Dillmann’s justification to this end is the presence of “the original relative meaning” in the genitive construction with *zä* (1907: 127). Dillmann elaborates his point with the following example (Dillmann 1907: 327): *’aklil zä-wärq* ‘crown-which-gold’ > ‘crown-related to-gold’ > ‘crown of gold’.

Rubin’s argument is also similar with that of Dillmann. Rubin assumes that relative *zä* in Ge‘ez must have grammaticalized into a genitive *zä*. He also gives parallel examples from Akkadian, Biblical Aramaic, and Mehri. As a possible conceptual basis of transfer, Rubin suggests the following: ‘the house, the one of the king’ → ‘the house of the king’ (Rubin 2005: 52).

There is also a similar observation made for the Amharic relative-genitive *yä*. Hailu, in his 1972 article on Amharic *yä*, notes that “Amharic genitive phrases originate from relative clauses” (Hailu 1972: 498). According to Hailu the direction of development would be from relative *yä* to genitive *yä*. Some three decades later, Dikken challenged Hailu’s proposal. Though Dikken mentions no clear alternative, he appears to favor the reverse way, of relative clauses as coming from genitive phrases (cf. Dikken 2007: 303, note 2). Hudson’s argument also appears to favor the development of the Amharic relative *yä* from the genitive *yä*- (Hudson 1983: 237).

Dillmann’s, Rubin’s, and Hailu’s proposal correspond to the one represented in (13a): RELATIVE > GENITIVE. Dikken’s and Hudson’s proposal may correspond to the one in (13b): GENITIVE > RELATIVE. I have not yet come across a proposal of direction represented in (13c): a single common source for both the relative and the genitive.

The path from DEMONSTRATIVE to RELATIVE is documented in the *Lexicon*. But the path from DEMONSTRATIVE to GENITIVE is missing. Though missing in the *Lexicon*, the path from DEMONSTRATIVE to GENITIVE is not that uncommon in the languages of the world. According to Diessel’s observation, as “[m]any languages do not have particular possessive markers” they use “personal or demonstrative pronouns (often in genitive case) in order to indicate the possessor” (Diessel 1999: 127). In his further elaboration Diessel cites an example from Supyire where an adnominal demonstrative is also used as a genitive marker.

Moreover, neither the pathway of grammaticalization from RELATIVE to GENITIVE nor from GENITIVE to RELATIVE is documented in the *Lexicon*. This may suggest that such pathways are not very common.

However, we know that there are attested cases where a DEMONSTRATIVE grammaticalizes into a RELATIVE and a GENITIVE marker. It would then be more plausible to assume the direction of development represented in (13c). In this study I will assume a common demonstrative source for the relative-genitive *zä* in Ge‘ez and for the other relative-genitive elements in Ethiosemitic and Oromo. The schematic representation of the assumption is shown in (14).

- (14) DEMONSTRATIVE *zä* > (1) RELATIVE *zä*
 (2) GENITIVE *zä*

Note also that, though marginally, Ge‘ez *zä* could also serve as a directional morpheme as in the examples in (15).

(15a) (Tinsae 1992: 215)

‘argä zä-sämay
he went up toward-heaven
‘He ascended up into heaven’

(15b) (Tinsae 1992: 215)

wärädä zä-mädr
he came down toward-earth
‘He descended down to earth’

7.1. 1.2 Ge‘ez *’əntä*

In its function as a demonstrative element *əntä* appears as in *’ənt-akti* ‘that (F)’ (also as *’əntəkku* ‘that (F)’) (cf. Dillmann 1907: 331, 401, note 2; Leslau 1987: 33). The element *’ənt-akti* always comes before feminine singular nouns as in (16a-c). The nouns could be either animate or inanimate.

(16a) (Amsalu 2010: 39)

’ənt-akti bə’əsit ḥorät ḥabä məsəyət
that woman she went toward market
‘That woman went to the market’

(16b) (Mark 11:21)

’ənt-akti bäläs əntä rägämka
that fig tree which you cursed
‘That fig tree which you cursed’

(16c) (Mark 14:25)

’əskä ’ənt-akti ’əlät
until that day
‘until that day’

Ge‘ez *’əntä* is basically a feminine singular relative marker. Thus, as in (17a-c), relative clauses formed with *’əntä* modify feminine singular head nouns. However, there are also

instances in which the antecedent of a relative clause marker with *'əntä* is a masculine singular noun (cf. Kapeliuk 2009: 225 ff). This is illustrated with the examples given in (18a, b).

(17a) (Amsalu 2010: 148)

bə'əsit 'əntämäs 'at 'əm-gondär
 woman who came from-Gonder
 'A woman who came from Gonder'

(17b) (Amsalu 2010: 148)

wälät 'əntü 'afqärät wäreza ləhuy
 girl who loved young man handsome
 'A girl who loved a handsome young man'

(17c) (Luke 1:27)

dəngəl 'əntä-täfəhərät lä-bə'əsi
 a virgin who-betrothed to-a man
 'A virgin who is betrothed to a man'

(18a) (Tinsae 1992: 213)

giyorgis 'əntü kəhlä šəqayat
 G. who endured tortures
 'Giorgis who endured tortures'

(18b) (Tinsae 1992: 214)

tewodros 'əntü yastäfəsšəḥ gəfu'anä
 T. who will comfort the oppressed
 'Tewodros who will comfort the oppressed'

When marking the genitive, the construction with *'əntä* modifies a feminine singular noun as in (19a-e). The head noun may be either animate or inanimate. But, there are no instances in which a masculine singular head noun appears as in the relative construction.

(19a) (Amsalu 2010: 87)

wälätt 'əntä maryam
daughter of Mary
'The daughter of Mary'

(19b) (Dillmann 1907: 468)

bä- 'älätä 'abbay 'əntä k^wunäne
in-day great of judgement
'In the great day of judgement'

(19c) (Dillmann 1907: 468)

koraye 'əntä bərur
my cup of silver
'my silver cup'

(19d) (Yared 1986: 32)

bə 'əsit 'əntä 'oriyo
wife of Uriah
'the wife of Uriah'

(19e) (Genesis 6:14)

gəbär läkä tabotä 'əntä 'əd
make for-yourself ark-ACC of wood
'Make yourself an ark of wood'

Other than its function as a relative and genitive marker, *'əntä* can also function as a locative preposition. In this function, *'əntä* expresses the concept of 'through, by way of, by, in the direction of' (cf. Leslau 1987: 32-33; Dillmann 1907: 401-402). This is illustrated in the examples given in (20a-e). But, more specifically, as in (21a-c), *'əntä* functions as an allative preposition.

The pathway from DEMONSTRATIVE to ALLATIVE is not documented in the *Lexicon*. However, a number of instances in which adverbial demonstratives (like *here* and *there*) grammaticalize into directional preverbs (allative markers) are mentioned in Diessel (1999: 140-143).

(20a) (Matthew 2:12)

gäbä'u 'əntü kalə' fənot

they entered by another road

'They (the Magi) returned (to their country) by another road'

(20b) (John 10:1)

zä-'i-bo'a 'əntü 'anqäš

who-not-he entered by gate

'He who did not enter by the gate'

(20c) (Kidanewold 1948: 234)

haläfu 'əntü yäbs

they went by land

'They went on land'

(20d) (Kidanewold 1948: 234)

horu 'əntü 'əgər

they travelled by foot

'They went on foot'

(20e) (Kidanewold 1948: 234)

yəbäwwə'u 'əntü maskot

they will enter through widow

'They will enter through a window'

(21a) (Kidanewold 1948: 234)

nəhur 'əntü yäman 'aw 'əntü dägam

let us go to right or to left

'Let us go to the right or to the left'

(21b) (Tinsae 1992: 215)

horä 'əntü gädam

he went to monastery

'He went to a monastery'

(24a) (Amsalu 2010: 147-148)

'abāw 'allä tägabə'u bāniqiya
elders who were assembled in-Nicea
'The fathers who assembled in Nicea'

(24b) (Tinsae 1992: 214)

ḥawarəyat 'allä māharu wāngelä
apostles who they taught gospel-ACC
'Apostles who taught the gospel'

(24c) (Tinsae 1992: 214)

bə'ulan 'allü yətwekkäfu 'anagädä
wealthy who they will entertain strangers-ACC
'The wealthy who entertain guests/strangers'

(24d) (Zenamarkos 1981: 42)

'anəst 'allä yä'amməra šəbəḥa
women who know sauce
'Women who know (how to make) sauce'

(24e) (Zenamarkos 1981: 42)

'antən aḥat 'allü tənəbbəra zəyä
you are (F.SG) sisters who reside here
'You sisters who reside here'

(24f) (Zenamarkos 1981: 42)

bə'si wäbə'sit 'allü 'aḥadu 'akal
man and-woman who one flesh
'Husband and wife who are one flesh'

(24g) (Zenamarkos 1981: 42)

wärazut wä-dänagəl 'allü yətəfaqäru
young men and-girls who love each other
'Young men and girls who love each other'

(24h) (Zenamarkos 1981: 60)

'allu 'amuntu 'allä şähəfu ɬomarä
these (M) they are (M) who wrote letter-ACC
'These are the ones who wrote the letter'

(24i) (Zenamarkos 1981: 60)

'alla 'amantu 'allä yəşəhəfa ɬomarä
these (F) they are (F) who will write letter-ACC
'These (women) are (the ones) who will write the letter'

(24j) (Zenamarkos 1981: 60)

'alla 'amantu 'allä şähəfa ɬomarä
these (F) they are (F) who wrote letter-ACC
'these (women) are (the ones) who wrote the letter'

(24k) (Zenamarkos 1981: 60)

'allu 'amuntu 'allä yəşəhəfu ɬomarä
these (M) they are (M) who will write letter-ACC
'these (men) are (the ones) who will write a/the letter'

When *'allä* functions as a genitive marker, the head (or the modified) nouns will always be in the plural. The dependent noun which comes after *'allä* can be either singular or plural. Examples are given in (25a-e).

(25a) (Amsalu 2010: 88)

mäşahəft 'allä wəlud
books of children
'the books of the children'

(25b) (Amsalu 2010: 88)

'amtat 'allä 'anəst
husands of women
'The husbands of the women'

(25c) (Yared 1986: 32)

'əqubat 'əllä sälomon
concubines of Solomon
'Solomon's concubines'

(25d) (Yared 1986: 32)

mäzäməran 'əllä dawit
singers of David
'David's singers'

(25e) (Tinsae 1992: 214)

ḥawarəyat 'əllä krəstos
apostles of Christ
'Christ's apostles'

The overall grammaticalization pathways taken by the demonstrative *'əllu* (or *'əlla*) are shown in (26).

(26) DEMONSTRATIVE *'əllu/'əlla* > (1) RELATIVE *'əllä*
(2) GENITIVE *'əllä*

Unlike *zä* and *'əntä*, *'əllä* does not function as a locative or an allative preposition.

7.1. 2 The Demonstrative *la* in Tigre

The concern of this section is the element *la* in Tigre. This element has multiple functions. Tigre *la* commonly functions as a marker of relative clauses. It is also commonly employed as a definite article. There are also cases where Tigre *la* is employed in the expression of possession.

Table 5 Tigre Demonstratives, based on Raz (1983: 45)

PERSON	NEAR OBJECTS		DISTANT OR ABSENT OBJECTS	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Masculine	<i>'alli</i>	<i>'allom</i>	<i>lahay/ lohay/ lehay</i>	<i>lahom/ lohom/ leham</i>
Feminine	<i>'alla</i>	<i>'allan</i>	<i>laha/ loha/ leha/</i>	<i>lahan/ lohan/ lehan</i>

It is possible that *la* might have originally been a demonstrative element in Tigre. The first piece of evidence lies in the presence of *la* in the demonstratives for distant objects in Tigre, e.g. in the masculine plural *la-hom*. According to Leslau (1945a: 190), the demonstrative elements for distant objects in Tigre are compounded from the demonstrative *la* and *ha*. The second *ha* too, Leslau notes, is known from Semitic as a demonstrative element.

It should also be mentioned that in all the demonstratives shown in the table, we find *l* as the common element. This element, as Leslau notes, represents the Semitic demonstrative element *l*. Leslau also connects Tigre *'alli* ‘this (M)’ with the plural demonstratives in Ge‘ez: *'allu* and *'alla* (Leslau 1945a: 189).

We also have another piece of evidence for assuming a demonstrative origin of the element *la*. Leslau mentions four instances in which the element *la* has the “value of a demonstrative” (Leslau 1945a: 183). These four examples are given in (27a-d).

(27a) (Leslau 1945a: 183)

lä-səm *'asək* *yom* *hallet*
 this-name until today exists
 ‘This name exists until today’

(27b) (Leslau 1945a: 183)

lä-dol
 that-time
 ‘that time’

(27c) (Leslau 1945a: 183)

lä-’əwan
that-time
‘that time’

(27d) (Leslau 1945a: 183)

əgəl lä-maryam bet nädqäw
for this-Mary house they built
‘They built a house for this Mary’

With the assumption of a demonstrative origin for Tigre *la*, I will now proceed to the other functions of *la*.

Tigre *la* mainly functions as a relative particle and a definite article (Palmer 1961: 23). Its use as a relative particle is illustrated in the examples given in (28a, b).

It is noted that most commonly the relative clause precedes the noun it modifies (Palmer 1961: 25; see also Raz 1983: 43). In (28b), the relative clause follows the qualified (Leslau 1945a: 190). Palmer also notes that the functions of *la* as a relative and a definite article are “not entirely unrelated” (Palmer 1961: 23). This may also be taken as another indication of the common demonstrative origin of the two functions.

(28a) (Leslau 1945a: 190)

wä-lä-wädqä kokäb
and-which-fallen star
‘and the star which has fallen’

(28b) (Leslau 1945a: 190)

lä-’adəg lä-tälä’akä
the-donkey which-was sent
‘the donkey which was sent’

In its second main function, Tigre *la* serves as a definite article as in (29a-c). The definite article *la* is generally prefixed to a noun as in (29c) or to the qualifying element as in (29a, b) (cf. Raz 1983: 35).

(29a) (Palmer 1961: 23)

la *şallim* *bə'ray*
[the black ox]
'the black ox'

(29b) (Raz 1983: 35)

la-gəndäb *'ənäs*
[the-old man]
'the old man'

(29c) (Leslau 1945a: 183)

lä-säb *əgəl həd* *təsalämäw*
[the-men each other they greeted]
'the men greeted each other'

In summary, the plausible assumption would be that Tigre *la* from its demonstrative meaning has independently grammaticalized into a relative article and a definite article. This polygrammaticalization is schematically represented as in (30).

(30) DEMONSTRATIVE *la* > (1) RELATIVE *la*

(2) DEFINITE *la*

Some more points should also be mentioned about the element *la*. It appears that Tigre *la* has reached a high degree of grammaticality. One of the reasons to this end is that *la* is invariable in form; it does not inflect at all (Leslau 1945a: 183; Raz 1983: 34). It also appears to be highly generalized in meaning with a high text frequency. In one of its uses in *la-räbbi* 'God', for instance, *la* seems to have "lost its specific value of a determinative element" (Leslau 1945a: 183). Regarding the high text frequency of *la*, Leslau remarks that "[t]he element *lä* is used in great profusion" (Leslau 1945a: 183).

7.1. 3 Demonstratives in Tigrinya

The basic demonstratives in Tigrinya are shown in Table 6. Note that many variant forms are not included in the table.

Table 6 Tigrinya Demonstratives (based on Kogan 1997: 434 and Voigt 2011: 1159)

PERSON	NEAR OBJECTS		DISTANT OBJECTS	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Masculine	'əzi	'əz-om	'ətu	'ət-om
Feminine	'əz-a	'əz-än	'əta	'ət-än

We have two types of instances of grammaticalization that are notable in Tigrinya demonstratives. We notice the first type of instance in the demonstratives for near objects. In these demonstratives we find *z as a common element. This *z is related to the Ge'ez relative-genitive *zä* and to the Tigrinya relative marker *zə-* (cf. Leslau 1987: 629). Thus, it should be clear that the relative marker *zə-* in Tigrinya has its origin in the demonstrative *z. The use of the relative particle *zə-* is illustrated in the following Tigrinya proverb.

(31) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1985: 368)

zə-ḥaläfä ḥaläfä šähaf zə-täräfä
 which-passed is passed write which-is left
 'What has passed has passed; take note of what is left'

Ge'ez *zä* is both a relative particle and a genitive marker. However, the relative particle *zə-* in Tigrinya does not seem to extend its function to marking genitive relations. As in Tigre, the basic genitive marker in Tigrinya is the particle *nay*. Tigre and Tigrinya are probably the only Ethiosemitic languages where the relative and genitive particles are not identical. As a relative particle, we find the element *z only in Ge'ez, Tigrinya and Harari.

The second type of grammaticalization instance that we observe is in the demonstratives for distant objects. These demonstratives can also function as definite articles (cf. Kogan 1997: 431). Examples for the Tigrinya demonstratives *'ətu* and *'ətom* functioning as definite articles are given in (32) and (33).

(32) (Kogan 1997: 431)

'ətu məšät məs konä ...
 DEF night when happened
 'When the night fell ...'

(33) (Kogan 1997: 431)

'atom kahnat 'atom dāwāl betäkrəstyānat yədəwəlu
the priests the bells of the churches ring
'The priests ring the bells of the churches'

The path of grammaticalization observed in the Tigrinya demonstratives is shown in (34).

(34) DEMONSTRATIVE *z > RELATIVE zə-

*'ət- > DEFINITE *'ət-

7.2 Demonstratives in Transversal South Ethiosemitic

Except in Harari, in both the Transversal and Outer South Ethiosemitic languages, the relative particle is *yä-*. This particle is also identical with the genitive marker.

In the following discussion I will assume a demonstrative origin for the particle *yä-*. There are two major suggestions in the literature for the origin of *yä-*. The first is (Ge'ez) *zä* (> **žä* > *yä*). The second is (Ge'ez) *la* (or *lä*) (for a separate discussion, see below). Both *zä* and *lä* may ultimately be traced back to demonstratives. This should not, therefore, deter us from assuming a demonstrative origin for *yä*.

According to some analyses we find the element *ya* with a demonstrative meaning in *yə'əze* 'now' and in two demonstrative adverbs in Ge'ez: *zəya* 'here' and *həyya* 'there'. There are authorities who see a deictic element *ya* in these three words. As discussed in Leslau (1987: 646), Barth (1913: 90), for instance, considers the *-ya* in *zəya* as a demonstrative element. There are also similar views for *yə'əze* and *həyya* (cf. Leslau 1987: 625, 220).

7.2.1 Amharic *yä*

In Amharic the element *yä-* functions as a relative marker when prefixed to a verb in the perfect as in (35). Prefixed to a Noun possessor, Amharic *yä-* also functions as a genitive marker as in (36). In both cases *yä-* is invariable in form.

(35) *yä- motä säw ayyähu*
 REL-dead person I saw
 ‘I saw a person who is dead’

(36) *yä- käbbädä mäkina*
 GEN-K. car
 ‘Kebede’s car’

In some genitive constructions in Amharic we observe the tendency of making optional or even dropping the genitive marker *yä-*. In the Amharic expressions given in (37a-d), for instance, *yä-* is not compulsory. In fact, in the specific examples given, the expressions without *yä* are more common than with *yä*. These expressions becoming lexicalized compounds. In (37e) the expression with *yä* is more common than without it. In (37f), *yä* is not optional.

(37a) *(yä-) assər aläqa*
 (of-) ten head
 ‘corporal’ (lit. ‘head of ten’)

(37b) *(yä-) šäkla dəst*
 (of-) clay saucepan
 ‘saucepan of (made from) clay’

(37c) *(yä-) təmhərt bet*
 (of-) education house
 ‘school’ (lit. ‘house of study’)

(37d) *(yä-) təmhərt minister*
 (of-) education Ministry
 ‘Ministry of Education’

(37e) *(yä-) wänz wəha*
 (of-) river water
 ‘water of (from) river’

(37f) *yä- käbbädä bet*
 (of-) Kebede house
 ‘Kebede’s house’

(41a) (Leslau 1965: 8)

turumbaw *zi* *sāma'a*
trumpet-ACC who heard
'[He] who heard the trumpet'

(41b) (Leslau 1965: 8)

mārmār-zo-be *kuntā* *ziṭora* *ḥammāl*
back-his-on a quintal who-carried porter
'A porter who was carrying a quintal on his back'

The particle *zi* was also in use as a genitive marker in Ancient Harari as illustrated in (42a) and (42c). In (42c), *zi* is prefixed to an independent personal pronoun to form an independent possessive pronoun. In Ancient Harari the expression of genitive relation by simple juxtaposition of two nouns (possessor-possessed) was also possible as is shown in (42b). This method of expressing genitive relations is what we also observe in Modern Harari (cf. Wagner 1997: 489, 492).

(42a) (Wagner 1997: 492)

zi-dāna *ṭāya* [*č'aya*]
of-cloud shadow
'the shadow of the cloud'

(42b) (Wagner 1997: 492)

zar *mīy*
river water
'the water of the river'

(42c) (Wagner 1997: 489)

zi-iñña *ḥāḡāt*
of-our needs
'our needs'

It appears that the disappearance of *zi* as a genitive marker had already begun in Ancient Harari. In Modern Harari *zi* as a genitive marker has completely disappeared. This contrasts sharply with the status of the genitive *yä-* in present-day Amharic.

We also observe the presence of the element *zi* in some of the demonstratives, independent personal pronouns, and possessive suffixes in Harari (Wagner 1997: 492; Wagner 2011: 1261).

It is in the demonstrative pronouns for distant objects that we observe the presence of *zi* as in *azzo* ‘that (M)’, *azze* ‘that (F)’, and *azziyāč* ‘those’. These three demonstratives are also identical with the third person independent pronouns: *azzo* ‘he’, *azze* ‘she’ and *azziyāč* ‘they’.

In the possessive suffixes, *zi* (or specifically *-z-*) appears throughout the third person and in the plural of the first person. This is illustrated in (43a-d).

(43) (Leslau 1965: 216, 217, 233)

(43a) *af-zo* ‘his mouth’

(43b) *af-ziyu* ‘their mouth’

(43c) *waldāč-zē* ‘her children’

(43d) *dārmāč-ziña* ‘our young men’

One of the four possessive suffixes, *-zo*, also functions as a definite article in Harari. Thus, *gār-zo* could mean either ‘his house’ or ‘the house’ (Wagner 1997: 492; Leslau 1963: 164).

Finally it should be mentioned that Harari *zi* is related to the Ge‘ez demonstrative-relative *zā* and to the Tigrinya *zə-* (Leslau 1963: 164; Hetzron 1972: 31).

The grammaticalization of demonstratives into independent personal pronouns is a common phenomenon, which is exactly what we see with Harari demonstratives for distant objects may have developed into the third person independent pronouns.

As relative, genitive, and definite articles are also known to commonly derive from demonstratives, it would as well be plausible to derive the Harari relative-[genitive] *zi* from a demonstrative **zi*. The possessive suffix and the definite article *-zo* might be derived from the demonstrative *azzo*.

The overall possible pathways of grammaticalization of demonstratives in Harari are schematically represented as in (44a-c).

(44a) DEMONSTRATIVE > INDEPENDENT PERSONAL PRONOUN

azzo ‘that (M)’ > *azzo* ‘he’

azze ‘that (F)’ > *azze* ‘she’

azziyāč ‘those’ > *azziyāč* ‘they’

(44b) DEMONSTRATIVE **zi* > (1) RELATIVE *zi*

(2) GENITIVE *zi* > \emptyset

(44c) DEMONSTRATIVE *azzo* > (1) POSSESSIVE SUFFIX *-zo*

(2) DEFINITE *-zo*

7.2.3 Zay *yä-*

The element *yä-* in Zay functions as a relative marker as in (45), as a genitive marker is as in (46). There are also cases where *yä-* in Zay can function as an allative preposition as in (47a, b). The Amharic equivalent of (47b) would be *wädä-zzih* (towards-here) where *wädä* is the main allative marker.

(45) (Leslau 1999: 138)

yä-mäṭā-i *säb unna-ta*
who-came-the man my brother-is
‘The man who came is my brother’

(46) (Leslau 1999: 144)

yä-šum-i *boqolu*
GEN-chief-DEF mule
‘the mule of the chief’

(47a) (Leslau 1999: 47)

yä-kätäma ayhidu
to-city he-will-not-go
‘He will not go to the city’

(47b) (Leslau 1999: 30)

yä- *iğği* (> *yiğği*)
towards- here
'towards here'

As I did for the Amharic relative-genitive *yä-*, I will also assume a demonstrative source **yä* for the Zay relative-genitive *yä-*. In fact we observe the presence of the element *y-* in the following demonstratives in Zay.

(48) (Leslau 1999: 26)

'this (M)': *yi, yə, yəh*
'this (F)': *yitay, yətay, yəhətay*
'that (M)': *ya, yahay*
'that (F)': *yatay*

The relative, the genitive, and the allative senses are arguably derived from a demonstrative source **yä*. The grammaticalization pathway the particle *yä* in Zay may have taken is schematically represented as in (49).

(49) DEMONSTRATIVE **yä* > (1) RELATIVE *yä-*
(2) GENITIVE *yä-*
(3) ALLATIVE *yä-*

7.2.4 Silt'e *ya-*

In Silt'e the element *ya-* functions as a genitive marker as in (50) and as a relative marker as in (51). In (52), *ya-* is a locative preposition with an allative sense.

(50) (Gutt 1997: 1002)

ya-huseen gar
of-Hussein house
'Hussein's house'

(51) (Gutt 1997: 1003)

ya-maṭa sab alčaalko
who-came man I did not know
'I did not know the man who came'

(52) (Gutt 1997: 1003)

yeewaaṣeeṣ heett
ya-eewaaṣi-ACC heett
to- the witchdoctor she went
'she went to the witchdoctor's'

With an assumption of a demonstrative source **ya*, the overall grammaticalization pathways taken are represented in (53).

(53) [DEMONSTRATIVE] **ya* > (1) RELATIVE *ya*-

(2) GENITIVE *ya*-

(3) ALLATIVE *ya*-

The presence of the element *-y-* in some of the variants of the demonstratives in Silt'e could be taken as a further support for assuming a demonstrative source for the relative-genitive *ya*. The following are the demonstrative pronouns in Silt'e. Note that four of the six variants in (54) have the element *-y-*.

(54) (Gutt 1997: 912; Gutt and Hussein 1997: 519, 618)

'this': *itta, iyii, hiyii*

'that': *atta, ayii, hayii*

7.3 Demonstratives in Outer South Ethiosemitic

The Outer South Ethiosemitic languages comprise the Gunnän-Gurage languages plus the now extinct Gafat (cf. Hetzron 1977). In this section I will focus on the possible grammaticalization of the morpheme *yä-* in three of the Gunnän-Gurage languages: Chaha, Muher, and Kistane.

The accusative, dative, and genitive cases are marked by the prefix *ä-* in Peripheral Western Gurage (PWG) languages (Gyeto, Ennemor, Endegeñ, Inor, Mesmes) and Gura. The prefix *ä-*

is possibly a reduced form of *yä-* (cf. Leslau 1979: 1). In the Central Western Gurage (CWG) languages (e.g. Eža and Chaha) and Northern Gurage (Kistane, Dobbi, Muher) and Mäsqaṅ the prefix *yä-* marks the accusative, dative, and genitive cases. In Kistane *lä-* and *nä-* serve as variants of *yä-* (cf. Hetzron 1977: 54; Meyer 2011: 1243).

In Gafat the accusative case is marked by *-n* and the dative by *lä*. Relative clauses and genitive relations are marked by the particle *mä*. The element *yä-* can also serve as a relative particle and genitive case marker. The particle *yä-*, according to Leslau, may however be an Amharism (cf. Leslau 1945b: 13, 44, 46, 54).

7.3.1 Chaha *yä-*

The main functions of the element *yä-* in Chaha are illustrated in the examples given in (55-59).

(55) (Leslau 1950: 20)

yä-säp^härä säb
 who-broke man
 ‘the man who broke’

(56) (Leslau 1992: 141)

yä- gärad ab
 of- girl father
 ‘the girl’s father’

(57) (Ford 1986: 57)

yaddis aβäβa arte
 [yä-addis]
 to- Addis Ababa I-will-go
 ‘I will go to Addis Ababa’

(58) (Leslau 1992: 141)

yä-reba sädäbäm
 ACC-thief he insulted
 ‘He insulted the thief’

(59) (Leslau 1950: 17)

gʷeta yä-baryata at färüz awänəm
master to-his servant one horse he gave him
‘The master gave a horse to his servant’

In (55), *yä-* marks a relative clause; in (56) it marks the genitive. In Chaha the allative concept ‘towards’ is basically expressed by the suffix *-e* and by the circumposition *yä- ... e* (cf. Leslau 1992: 243; Leslau 1950: 22; Hetzron 1977: 55). However, *yä-* alone can also serve as a directional preposition as in (57). In addition to Chaha, we also find the allative postposition *-e* in the other Central Western Gurage languages (e.g. Eža, Gumär). In Kistane it is *-yy (än)* (cf. Hetzron 1977: 99).

There is a possibility that the directional suffix *-e* in Chaha is a reduced form of *-ya*. The reduction of *-ya* (or *-ay*) into *-e* is a common sound change in most of the Gurage languages. The following are some of the instances recorded in Leslau (1979b: LXIII).

(60) (Leslau 1979b: LXIII)

Eža, Muher *buqe* (which in Chaha and Gyeto is *buqäya* ‘shoot of plant’ (from *bql*))
Muher, Mäsqañ *te* (which in Eža, Inor, Endegeñ is *tay* ‘sheep’ (from *ṭalli*))
Chaha *xade* (which in Eža is *xäday* ‘roof thatcher’ (from *xdr, xdn*))

The sound changes indicated in (60) are recapitulated in (61).

(61) *bql* > *buqäyā* > *buqe*

ṭalli > *tay* > *te*

xdr, xdn > *xäday* > *xāde*

The common sound changes indicated above may support the assumption that the preposition *yä-* in Chaha may have first changed into a postposition *-yā* and then got reduced into the suffix *-e*.

Chaha *yä-* also functions as an accusative and dative marker as illustrated in the examples given in (58) and (59) respectively. As the allative could commonly serve as a source concept

for the accusative and dative concepts, I assume that the allative *yä-* in Chaha should have grammaticalized into an accusative and dative *yä-*.

The relative, genitive, and allative *yä-* in turn may have developed from the demonstrative **yä-*. With these assumptions the overall grammaticalization pathways possibly taken by the element *yä-* in Chaha is schematically represented as in (62).

- (62) DEMONSTRATIVE **yä-* > (1) RELATIVE *yä-*
(2) GENITIVE *yä-*
(3) ALLATIVE *yä-* > (1) ACCUSATIVE *yä-*
(2) DATIVE *yä-*

In his article on the morpheme *yä-* in Chaha, Alemayehu discusses the four functions of the morpheme: direct object marker, possessive marker, preposition [dative and benefactive], and complementizer [relative marker]. In his conclusion, Alemayehu assumes that it is not the same *yä-* that accomplishes these four different functions (Alemayehu 1994: 390). In the present study, Chaha *yä-* is considered instead as polysemous, and its multiple functions the result of grammaticalization processes.

7.3.2 Muher *yä-*

The main functions of the element *yä-* in Muher are illustrated in the examples given in (63-69).

- (63) (Leslau 1992: 188)

yä- bäsä-we mäs
who- came-the man
'The man who came'

- (64) (Leslau 1992: 187)

yä-gännä-we säb
of-village-the people
'The people of the village'

(65) (Hetzron 1977: 167, text line 1)

attə məs yä- gaz t-ifäka ...
one man to-war when-goes
'When a man was going to war'

(66) (Hetzron 1977: 167, text line 5)

yä-bet-ännä fäka-m-ta
to-house-my go! (MSG)-C-[ta]
'go to my house, and ...'

(67) (Leslau 1992: 187)

yä-gäbäz-we yəbu
to-treasurer-DEF he gives
'He gives to the church treasurer'

(68) (Leslau 1992: 186)

yä-däbo-we təcäqq^wəsi
ACC-relative-DEF she begs
'She begs the relative'

(69) (Hetzron 1977: 168, text line 12)

yä- bet- uxta-t fäkka-m...
to-house-his-to went-C
'It [the dove] went to his house, and ...'

Muher *yä-* functions as a relative and genitive marker as in (63) and (64) respectively. In (65) and (66), *yä-* serves as a directional preposition. The allative concept, however, is commonly expressed by the circumposition *yä- ... (ä)t* as in (69). In (67), *yä-* is a dative marker; in (68), it is an accusative marker.

The overall grammaticalization pathways possibly taken by Muher *yä-* are identical with that of Chaha *yä-* (cf. (62) above).

Meyer, in his article on the morpheme *yä-* in Muher, discusses all the major functions of Muher *yä-*: that it marks relative clauses with perfective verbs; that it also marks the accusative, dative, and genitive cases (Meyer 2005: 40, 57).

At the end of his analysis, Meyer remarks that Muher *yä-* “may have its origin either in a case marker indicating directionality ... or in a deictic pronoun” (Meyer 2005: 61). The deictic element proposed by Meyer may support the demonstrative origin of the relative-genitive-allative *yä-* assumed in the present study. The allative source (“a case marker indicating directionality”) proposed by Meyer is assumed here as a source concept for the dative and the accusative and as a target concept of a demonstrative **yä-*.

7.3.3 Kistane *yä-*

The major functions of the element *yä-* in Kistane are illustrated in the examples given in (70-76).

(70) (Leslau 1968: 8)

yä- maṭṭ-i məss
 who- came-DEF man
 ‘the man who came’

(71) (Leslau 1968: 8)

yä- šum-i ge
 of- official-DEF house
 ‘the house of the official’

(72) (Leslau 1968: 10)

yä- zämmih^wan abännət
 to-brother-his he-gave-him (it)
 ‘He gave it to his brother’

(73) (Leslau 1968: 8)

yä- ge^yi ažžo
 ACC-house he saw
 ‘He saw the house’

In (70), *yä-* is a relative clause marker; in (71), it is a genitive case marker. In (72), *yä-* serves as a dative and in (73) as an accusative marker. The dative and the accusative must have developed from an allative **yä-*.

In Kistane the allative is marked by a combination of the ablative preposition *tä-* and a postposition *-əyy* (or *-əyyän* after a consonant), *-yy* (or *-yyän* after a vowel) (Leslau 1968: 34). These are indicated in the examples given in (74-76).

(74) (Leslau 1968: 37, text line 1)

tä-mərab-əyyän
to-west-towards
'towards the west'

(75) (Leslau 1968: 34)

tä- təbtät-əyy
to-morning-towards
'towards morning'

(76) (Leslau 1968: 34)

tä-kätäma-yy alläfo
to-city-towards he went
'He went towards the city'

The allative postposition in Kistane can appear in any of the following forms shown in (77a-d).

- (77) a. *-yy*
b. *-əyy*
c. *-yyän*
d. *-əyyän*

According to Leslau, the postposition represented in (77c, d) is probably composed of *-yy* and an enclitic element *-än* (Leslau 1979b: 690). We observe the element *-yy* in all four forms in (77).

I assume that the preposed demonstrative and allative **yə-* in Kistane may have become postposed as *-yy* with a reduced vowel. This possibility is similar to the preposition *la-* that shifted into a postposition *-le* in Harari.

The overall grammaticalization pathways suggested for Chaha and Muher *yä-* would also apply for Kistane *yä-* (cf. (63) above).

It should also be mentioned that in Kistane the dative can also be marked by either *lä-* or *nä-*. The element *nä-* can also serve as an accusative marker (cf. Leslau 1979b: 445; Leslau 1992: 168; Hetzron 1977: 54). This may have an implication in tracing the origin of *yä-*. I will not, however, go into further detail with this issue.

7.4 Oromo *kana*

In this section I will look briefly into the possible grammaticalization of the demonstrative element *kana* ‘this’ in Oromo. The demonstrative function of *kana* is illustrated in the example given in (78). (On *kan(a)* in Oromo, see also Gragg 1976: 173, 183, 191, 192; Bender and Mulugeta 1976: 135, 146; Owens 1985: 131; Stroomer 1995: 62; Leus 2006: 376; Griefenow-Mewis 2001: 35; Baye 1987).

(78) *nama kana hinjaaladhu*

person this I do not like

‘I do not like this person’

(79) *kalee kan dhufe caalaa dha*

yesterday who came Chala is

‘(the person) who came yesterday is Chala’

(80) *manni kun kan caalaati*

house this of Chala-*ti*

‘This house is Chala’s’

In (79), *kan* serves as a marker of a relative clause; in (80), *kan* marks the possessor in a genitive relation. It is very plausible that the relative-genitive *kan* is a reduced form of the demonstrative *kana*. In the dialect of Borana (cf. Leus 2006: 376), there is a further reduction of the last segment and the relative-genitive element appears as *ka*.

As I did for most of the Ethiosemitic languages, I assume that the demonstrative *kana* has independently grammaticalized into a relative particle and a possessive marker.

The overall grammaticalization pathways possibly taken by Oromo *kana* is schematically shown as in (81).

- (81) DEMONSTRATIVE *kana* > (1) RELATIVE *kan*
(2) GENITIVE *kan*

7.5 Chapter Summary

The main focus of this chapter has been on the derivation of genitive and relative markers from demonstrative elements. In most of the Ethiosemitic languages and in Oromo the same element is observed serving as a genitive and relative marker.

We find exceptions to this rule significantly in Tigrinya and marginally in Harari. The element *zə-* in Tigrinya serves only as a relative marker. In Modern Harari the element *zi* serves as a relative marker. But in Ancient Harari this same element used to function as a genitive marker as well.

The relative element *la* in Tigre appears to be exceptional in that it also functions as a definite article.

In more than half of the languages in Ethiosemitic the relative-genitive elements were also found serving as allative markers. This was the case, for instance, for Ge'ez *'əntä* and (minimally) *zä-*.

Dialectally Amharic *yä-* can serve as an allative marker. Though marginal, the relative-genitive element in Zay and Silt'e can also serve as an allative marker.

In the Outer South Ethiosemitic languages Chaha, Muher, and Kistane the same relative-genitive element is observed functioning as an allative, accusative and dative marker.

In Oromo the genitive-relative element *kan* undergoes no further extension to serve as an allative or a dative marker.

The main functions of the relative-(genitive) elements considered in this chapter are summarized in the following tables.

Table 7 Relative-(Genitive) Elements in NES

		DEM.	GEN.	REL.	ALL.	ACC.	DAT.	DEF
Ge'ez	<i>zä-</i>	✓	✓	✓	(✓)			
	<i>'antä</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			
	<i>'allä</i>	✓	✓	✓				
Tigre	<i>la</i>	✓		✓				✓
Tigrinya	<i>zə-</i>	*z		✓				

Table 8 Relative-(Genitive) Element in TSES

		DEM.	GEN.	REL.	ALL.	ACC.	DAT.	DEF
Amharic	<i>yä-</i>	*y	✓	✓		(✓)	(✓)	
Harari	<i>zi</i>	<i>zə</i>	(✓)	✓				
Zay	<i>yä-</i>	*y	✓	✓	✓			
Silt'e	<i>ya</i>	*y	✓	✓	✓			

Table 9 Relative-Genitive Element in OSES and Oromo

		DEM.	GEN.	REL.	ALL.	ACC.	DAT.	DEF
Chaha	<i>yä-</i>	*y	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Muher	<i>yä-</i>	*y	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Kistane	<i>yä-</i>	*y	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Oromo	<i>kan</i>	✓	✓	✓				

What follows is a schematic representation of the grammaticalization pathways suggested for the demonstrative elements (some reconstructed) in Ethiosemitic and Oromo. The schematic representations are repeated here for the sake of easy reference.

North Ethiosemitic

(82) Ge'ez

DEMONSTRATIVE *zə-, zä* > (1) ALLATIVE *zä*
(2) RELATIVE *zä*
(3) GENITIVE *zä*

DEMONSTRATIVE *'ənt-* > (1) ALLATIVE *'əntä*
(2) GENITIVE *'əntä*
(3) RELATIVE *'əntä*

(83) Tigre

DEMONSTRATIVE *la* > (1) DEFINITE *la*
(2) RELATIVE *la*

(84) Tigrinya

DEMONSTRATIVE **z* > RELATIVE *zə*

Transversal South Ethiosemitic

(85) Amharic

DEMONSTRATIVE **yä-* > (1) RELATIVE
(2) GENITIVE *yä-*
(3) (DATIVE) *yä-* [dialectally]
(4) ACCUSATIVE *yä-* [dialectally]

(86) Harari

DEMONSTRATIVE **z* > (1) RELATIVE *zi*
(2) GENITIVE *zi* [Ancient Harari]

(87) Zay

DEMONSTRATIVE * *yä-* > (1) RELATIVE *yä-*
(2) GENITIVE *yä-*
(3) ALLATIVE *yä-*

(88) Silt'e

DEMONSTRATIVE * *ya-* > (1) RELATIVE *ya-*
(2) GENITIVE *ya-*
(3) ALLATIVE *ya-*

(89) Outer South Ethiosemitic

DEMONSTRATIVE * *yä-* > (1) RELATIVE *yä-*
(2) GENITIVE *yä-*
(3) ALLATIVE *yä-* > (1) ACCUSATIVE *yä-*
(2) DATIVE *yä-*

(100) Oromo

DEMONSTRATIVE *kana* > (1) RELATIVE *kan*
(2) GENITIVE *kan*

CHAPTER EIGHT

8 ALLATIVES

In this chapter I will look into the possible grammaticalization of allative markers in Ethiosemitic languages and in Oromo. Allative markers introduce an allative or directional participant, indicating direction towards (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 17).

In the *Lexicon* three source concepts are documented for the ALLATIVE as a target: ARRIVE, GO TO, and SEE. For the ALLATIVE as a source, the target concepts documented are seven in number: (1) COMPLEMENTIZER, (2) DATIVE, (3) INFINITIVE, (4) PATIENT [ACCUSATIVE], (5) PURPOSE, (6) TEMPORAL, and (7) UNTIL (TEMPORAL). For the DATIVE as a source, the following target concepts are documented: (1) COMPARATIVE, (2) PATIENT [ACCUSATIVE], (3) A-POSSESSIVE, (4) B-POSSESSIVE, and (5) H-POSSESSIVE.

The A-POSSESSIVE ‘of’ concept is described as a marker of attributive (nominal) possession or the genitive case. The B-POSSESSIVE stands for a marker of *belong*-constructions, where ‘X belongs to Y’ would mean ‘X is Y’s. The H-POSSESSIVE (‘have’, ‘own’) stands for a marker of possessive *have*-constructions (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 24).

We have also two more source concepts documented elsewhere for the ALLATIVE. The first is the verb COME (Blake 1994: 165). The second is a DEMONSTRATIVE (Diessel 1999: 127).

8.1 Allatives in North Ethiosemitic

8.1.1 Ge‘ez *la*

In Ge‘ez the main allative prepositions are *la*, *ḥabä*, and *mangala* (cf. Leslau 1987: 750). In this sub-section I will focus on possible grammaticalization of the allative marker *la*.

The basic function of Ge‘ez *la* as an allative preposition is illustrated in the examples given in (1) and (2).

(1) (Tinsae 1992: 252)

tamayta la-bəheru gəbš
returned to-country-his Egypt
‘He returned to (the country of) Egypt’

(2) (Dillmann 1907: 391)

yəgabbə' dahāy la-ṣəbāḥ
returns sun to-east
'The sun returns to the East'

From its function as an allative marker, *la* further grammaticalizes into a dative marker. In the examples given in (3) and (4) *la* serves as a dative marker.

(3) (Lambdin 1978: 84)

wahabo la-'abuhu warqa
he gave to-his father gold
'He gave the money to his father'

(4) (Matthew 22: 21)

habu za-qesar la-qesar
(you M.PL) give of-caesar to-caesar
'Give to Caesar what is Caesar's'

From its function as a dative marker, *la* grammaticalizes further into a genitive marker. In the examples given in (5) and (6) *la* marks genitive relations.

(5) (Dillmann 1907: 391, citing Matthew 12:8)

'əgzi' la-sanbat
lord of-sabbath
'Lord of the Sabbath'

(6) (Leslau 1987: 303)

bet-u la-nəguś
house-his of- the king
'the king's house'

The meaning shift in the development of ALLATIVE > DATIVE > GENITIVE appears to be a metaphorical extension. The allative meaning denotes a spatial concept where motion in space is directed towards a certain destination. The dative denotes the recipient of an act of

transfer, i.e. the destination of the thing transferred. In the development from dative into genitive markers, the recipient of something appears to be taken as the possessor of it. In this evolution “the Genitive may also be conceived of as a Dative” (Dillmann 1907: 471). The sentences in (7) and (8) may illustrate this point.

(7) (Matthew 5: 45)

kama təkunu wəluda la-'abukəmu.
 that you may be sons to-your (M.PL) father
 ‘that you may be sons of your Father’

(8) (Matthew 5: 13)

'antəmu wə'ətu şew la-mədr
 you are salt to-earth
 ‘You are the salt of the earth’

In (7) and (8) *la* marks the genitive participants (father, earth). But the dative sense of *la* could still be conceived of. The translations given in (7) and (8) may alternatively be paraphrased as ‘that you may be sons to your father’, ‘you are the salt to earth’.

The dative is not the only target concept of the allative *la*. Independently the allative *la* makes a further development into an accusative, where *la* marks the direct object, “the undergoer of the action denoted by the verb” (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 23). In the process of semantic extension, motion towards a place is metaphorically extended to action towards an object, where the object is an undergoer of the action denoted by the verb. The function of *la* as an accusative marker is illustrated in the examples given. Consider the sentences in (9) and (10).

(9) (Genesis 1:5)

samayo 'əgzi'abəher la-bərhān 'əlata
 named it God ACC-light day
 ‘God called the light Day’

(10) (Genesis 9:1)

mələ'wa la-mədr
 fill ACC-earth
 ‘fill the earth’

In (9) the “action” of naming is directed towards ‘light’; in (10) the “action” of filling is directed towards ‘earth’.

In addition to the accusative, the allative preposition *la* grammaticalizes into a purpose marker as well. In the examples given in (11) and (12) *la* serves as a purpose marker with a following infinitive.

(11) (Dillmann 1907: 458; Genesis 1: 15)

yəkunu la-’abrəho
let them be to-give light
‘let them serve to give light’

(12) (Leslau 1987: 303; Genesis 2:9)

śannāy la bali’
good for eating
‘good to eat’

The mechanism of transfer from allative to purpose marker is metaphoric. In this process, it appears that ‘action towards a purpose’ is conceptualized in terms of ‘motion towards a place’. Movement towards a goal is common to the two domains.

In addition to the target concepts of the dative, accusative, and the purposive, we also have the temporal as another grammaticalization target of the allative preposition *la*. In (13) *la* serves as a temporal marker denoting the stretch or extent of time. In the process of the transfer from an allative to a temporal marker, “movement towards a location of time” appears to be conceptualized in terms of “movement towards a location of space”.

(13) (Dillmann 1907: 391; Matthew 28:1)

la – śabiḥa ’əḥud
toward-morning Sunday (first day of the week)
‘toward the dawn of the first day (of the week)’

To sum up, Ge'ez *la* functions as a marker of allative, dative, genitive, accusative, purpose, and temporal participants. The schematic representation of the overall grammaticalization pathways taken by Ge'ez *la* is shown in (14).

- (14) ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
 (2) ACCUSATIVE
 (3) PURPOSE
 (4) TEMPORAL

8.1.2 Tigre *'əgəl* and *'əl*

8.1.2.1 Tigre *'əgəl*

The function of Tigre *'əgəl* as a directional preposition is shown in (15). In (16) *'əgəl* serves as a marker of indirect object, in (17) *'əgəl* marks a definite direct object, and in (18) *'əgəl* is a purpose clause marker.

- (15) (Elias 2005: 186)

'əgəl *ǧām* 'at ... *ħalafna*
 to university we-passed
 'We passed ... to university'

- (16) (Leslau 1945a:184)

'əgəl *lāħašil* *bellom*
 to the-elephants he-said-to-them
 'He said to the elephants'

- (17) (Leslau 1945a:184)

'əgəl *lāšakāt* *dāfnāya*
 ACC the-pit he-filled-up
 'He filled up the pit'

- (18) (Elias 2005: 132)

'əgəl *ləstaw* *qərubām hallaw*
 so-that they-might-drink gathering-up they-M-are
 'They are gathering in order to drink'

As allatives are known to be the common sources for datives, accusatives and purpose markers, it could be said that the “allative” marker *'əgəl* has polygramaticalized into three more markers: (1) DATIVE, (2) ACCUSATIVE, and (3) PURPOSE. However, it is only in Elias (2005: 186) that *'əgəl* is documented with a directional sense (which itself may not be a great example of allative). I found no such an instance in Raz (1983), Leslau (1945 and 1948), and Palmer (1961).

The mechanism of semantic change observed could be explained as a metaphoric conceptual transfer. Passing to a university in (15) is more or less a physical movement from a high school to a higher learning institution. In (16), what the subject (he) says to the elephants is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of an animate being that is capable of moving from a source (a point in space) to a destination or goal. The speaker then is the source and the listener the goal.

In (17) the action of the subject (filling up) is directed towards the pit. So, the pit to be filled up is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of a physical destination towards which an animate being moves.

The schematic representation of the overall grammaticalization pathways suggested for Tigre *'əgəl* is shown in (19).

- (19) (*ALLATIVE) > (1) DATIVE
 (2) ACCUSATIVE
 (3) PURPOSE

8.1.2.2 Tigre *'əl*

In Tigre the element *'əl* marks the indirect object as in (20) and the direct object as in (21). The element *'əl* can also serve in the expression of possession. This happens when the perfect forms of the verb *halla* conjugated in the third person are combined with the element *'əl* conjugated in all persons (Raz 1983: 50). This is illustrated in (22). Tigre *'əl* can also serve as a temporal marker as in (23) and as an allative marker as in (24).

(20) (Raz 1983:81)

'azema 'əlla baqalka həwār 'anəs təwalləd 'əlka
 now then this (F) your mule young female she will beget for you
 ‘Now then, this mule of yours will beget a female young one for you’

(21) (Raz 1983: 81)

'abuka 'alka massəl
your father ACC-you resembles
'Your father resembles you'

(22) (Raz 1983: 50)

'ana sannī mas'alit hallet 'əlye
I good camera [there] is to me
'I have a good camera'

(23) (Elias 2005: 188)

'əl 'aza kə'ənnā ləšaḳḳa
up-to now like-this it-is-made
'up to now it is made like this'

(24) (Elias 2005: 189, 314)

'aza ḥaḳo-lā 'əlu baṣḥa məngabbi' ləssabbak
now after up to-it it reached when it-happens it-is-dyed
'Now, after it has reached to this point, it is dyed'

The dative, accusative and, temporal plausibly developed from the allative. In the shift of meaning from the allative ('up to' SPATIAL) into the TEMPORAL 'up to', it appears that a location along an imaginary line of time (goal) is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of a point along a physical space (land).

The genitive sense of 'əl (as in 'əl-ye 'to me'), must have developed from the dative meaning 'to'. Here, the indirect object, the recipient in the dative meaning is taken as a possessor or owner. If there is something (a camera in (22)) to or for someone, then that person owns it.

The overall grammaticalization pathways suggested for Tigre 'əl are shown in (25).

(25) ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
 (2) ACCUSATIVE
 (3) TEMPORAL

8.1.3 Tigrinya *nə-*

The directional morpheme *nə-* ‘to, towards’ in Tigrinya has a variant *nab* which is more frequent and in common use. The directional preposition *nab* itself is a combination of *nə-* ‘to, towards’ and *’ab* ‘in, at’ (Voigt 2011: 1162). It appears that *nə-* is reinforced by *’ab* to form the independent morpheme *nab*. The semantics of *nə-* is preserved in *nab* with the change being only that of form.

Though *nab* is the common allative preposition, *nə-* also appears in a number of instances serving as an allative marker. The function of Tigrinya *nə-* as an allative marker is illustrated in the examples given in (26) and (27).

(26) (Kane 2000: 1300)

nə-ertəra məša’ku
to-Eritrea I came
‘I came to Eritrea’

(27) (Genesis 27:3)

nə-māror wäfirka hadinka ’amşə’aläy
to-field you go and having hunted bring for me
‘Go out to the field and hunt game for me’

Tigrinya *nə-* also functions as a dative marker as in (28) and (29).

(28) (Kane 2000: 1299)

abbo nə-wäddu habo
father to-his son he gave
‘the father gave it to his son’

(29) (Kogan 1997: 432)

’ətu dañña nə- nəgus baqəltuf yəngär
the judge to-king in-hurry let him tell
‘Let the judge tell [it] quickly to the king’

In Tigrinya the common genitive marker in use is *nay*. Though not frequently, the prefix *nə-* can also mark the genitive as in (30) and (31).

(30) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1985: 162)

nə-säb hagäru mägbaru
of-person country-his virtue-his
‘One’s virtue is one’s country (of living)’

(31) (Kane 2000: 1299)

abbo’a nə-wärqaha
father-her of-W.
‘Worqeha’s father’

Tigrinya *nə-* functions as an allative, dative, and genitive marker. The genitive is the extension of the dative and the result of repeated grammaticalization of the allative.

Other than the three functions mentioned, Tigrinya *nə-* also serves as a marker of the direct object as in (32) and (33).

(32) (Palmer 1962b: 42)

bärhedo ’iyyu nə-məsgänna zərə’ayyo?
Berhe-(question) he-is ACC-Məsgänna which-he-saw-him
‘Was it Berhe that saw Mesgenna?’

(33) (Academy of Ethiopian Languages 1985: 162)

nə-säb fätəwo əmbär aytə’əmāno
ACC-person love him but do not trust him
‘Love a person, but trust him not’

When prefixed to the infinitive, *nə-* functions as a marker of purpose clauses as in (34) and (35) (see also Kane 2000: 1299).

(34) (Genesis 1:14)

nəzäbänatən nəmä’altatən ’amätatən kä’a nə-mäfälätata yəkunu
ACC-seasons ACC-days years as to-know let them be
‘Let them serve as signs to mark seasons and days and years’

(35) (Genesis 1:15)

'ab mädri nə-məbrah 'ab ʔäfar sämay bərhanat yəḳunu
on earth to- give light on firmament sky lights let them be
'Let them be lights in the expanse of the sky to give light on the earth'

In addition to marking definite direct objects and purpose clauses, Tigrinya *nə-* can also mark temporal phrases as in (36) and (37).

(36) (Psalms 119: 144)

məsəkkəratəka nə-zälä'aläm šədqi əyyu
your instructions for-ever righteous they are
'Your instructions are always right'

(37) (John 1:43)

nə-šəbbihitu yäsus nab gälila kixäyəd däläyä
in-next morning Jesus to Galilee to go he wanted
'The following day Jesus wanted to go to Galilee'

The functions of *nə-* as an accusative, purpose, and temporal marker plausibly developed independently from its directional meaning. These extended functions are the result of polygrammaticalization. The overall grammaticalization pathways suggested for Tigrinya *nə-* are shown in (38).

(38) ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) ACCUSATIVE
(3) PURPOSE
(4) TEMPORAL

8.2 Transversal South Ethiosemitic

8.2.1 Amharic *lä-* and *-ən*

8.2.1.1 Amharic *lä-*

The main functions of the element *lä-* in Amharic are illustrated in the examples given in (39-44).

(39) *mändär lä-mändär zorä*
village to-village he went around
'He went from place to place'

(40) *lä-käbbädä säṭṭäw*
to-Kebede he gave him
'He gave it to Kebede'

(41) (Afework 1900: 43)
lä-nəgusu ... wändəm alnəbbärəwəm
to-king brother he did not have
'The king did not have a brother'

(42) (Afework 1901: 5)
lä-wättadär yämmifära balagär yälläm
ACC-soldier who is afraid peasant there is no
'There is no peasant who is afraid of a soldier'

(43) *lä-mähed yəfalləgal*
to-go he wants
'He wants to go'

(44) *qədame lä-əhud atbiya*
saturday towards-sunday morning
'Saturday (night) towards the dawn of Sunday'

In (39), the meaning of *lä-* is that of a directional preposition, i.e. an allative preposition. Note that the basic allative marker in the present-day Amharic is *wädä*. In (44) *lä-* is a temporal marker. In this context a destination of location in time is conceptualized in terms of a destination of location in space.

In (40) *lä-* is a dative marker. The element *lä-* in its function as a dative marker is in common use in Amharic. The other common function of *lä-* is marking purpose clauses as in (43) where *lä-* is prefixed to a verbal noun.

The examples in (41) and (42) are taken from two Amharic texts which date back to the beginning of the twentieth century. As the texts are a bit more than one hundred years old, the

function of *lä-* in marking the possessor in (41) may imply a trace of its use in Old Amharic. In present-day Amharic, the sentence in (41) would appear without the prefixed *lä-*. In (42) *lä-* is an accusative marker. In the present-day Amharic the sentence in (42) would appear as *wättadär-ən* with the basic postposed accusative marker *-ən*.

As the writer of the two texts is a learned man from Gojjam, the functions of *lä-* in (41) and (42) may also be termed dialectal, though not necessarily the result of Ge‘ez influence.

The multiple function of *lä-* shown in (39-44) could be sequenced as in the following schematic representation.

- (45) ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
 (2) ACCUSATIVE
 (3) PURPOSE
 (4) TEMPORAL

In Argobba, a closely related language to Amharic, the element *lä-* functions basically as a dative marker (see Leslau 1997: 17). In Gafat, too, *lä-* is a dative marker (Leslau 1945b: 91).

8.2.1.2 Amharic *-ən*

Amharic *-ən* (*-n* after a vowel) in Amharic is commonly employed as a marker of the direct object as in (46), though in rare cases, *-ən* can also mark indirect objects as in (47). An equivalent of the expression in (47) is *lä-ləḡ-u bet-u-n asayyāw* (cf. Leslau 1995: 893).

- (46) *bärr-u-n zägga*
 door-DEF-ACC he closed
 ‘he closed the door’

- (47) (Leslau 1995: 893)

ləḡ-u-n bet-u-n asayyāw
 child-DEF-DAT house-DEF-ACC he showed it to him
 ‘he showed the house to the boy’

- (48) (Baye 2000: 262)

kasa agär-u-n hedä
 Kasa country-his-to he went
 ‘Kasa went to his country’

(49) (Afework 1900; 1901)

- a. *agär-u-n* *gäbba*
country-his-to he entered
'he went to his country'
- b. *agär-əh -ən* *hid*
country-your-to you go (MSG)
'go to your country'
- c. *asmära-w* *-ən* *gäbba*
Asmara -his -to he entered
'he went to Asmara'

There are also instances where *-ən* appears to serve as a directional postposition as in (48). In present-day Amharic, the common allative is *wädä*. The equivalent of the expression in (48) would be: *kasa wädä agär-u- hedä* (cf. Baye 2000: 262).

Afework Gebreyesus, a native of Gojjam, makes frequent use of the element *-ən* as an allative marker in his two books: *ṭobbiya* (1900: 3, 4, 24, 29, 31, 43, 70) and *dagmawi mənīlək* (1901: 5, 49, 63, 84, 101). Some of these are shown in (49a-c).

There is a directional morpheme *-ne* in Ge'ez that serves as an allative marker as in (Leslau 1987:380): *'aḥatta-ne* 'into one place' and *'aska-ne* 'until'. Praetorius (1879: 197, cited in Dillmann 1907: 376, note 3) suggests the derivation of the Amharic direct object marker *-ən* from the suffix *-ne* of Ge'ez.

The grammaticalization of allatives into dative and accusative markers is documented in the *Lexicon* (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 37-38). Attested cases for other languages would allow us to assume the allative *-ən* to be the common source of the accusative and the dative *-ən*. This is schematically represented as in (50).

(50) ALLATIVE *-ən* > (1) ACCUSATIVE *-ən*

(2) DATIVE *-ən*

8.2.2 Harari *-le*

The postposition *-le* in Harari is related to the preposition *lä-* in Ethiosemitic (cf. Leslau 1963: 98; Wagner 1997: 492). The main functions of Harari *-le* are illustrated in the examples given in (51-60).

(51) (Leslau 1965: 7)

ir kittibū' -le

sun sets –to[wards]

‘to the West’ [lit. ‘in the direction of where the sun sets’]

(52) (Leslau 1965: 65)

gār-le gār

house-to house

‘from house to house’

(53) (Leslau 1965: 41)

āhār-le

back-at

‘at the back of, behind’

(54) (Leslau 1965: 47)

ēqād-le

front-in

‘in front of’

(55) (Leslau 1965: 82)

gäläč'ač-le māḥallāq yisṭi

children-to money he gives

‘He gives money to the children’

(56) (Leslau 1965: 33)

gidir mägāla gē-le in inte

main market city-of center [she] is

‘Gidir mägāla is the center of the city’

(57) (Leslau 1965: 169)

yim mōt mäsfa sinät qaḥat waldi-le ḥabi-ze-nta
this-indeed (of) basket weaving the craft a girl-of the work is
‘The craft of basketry is girl’s work’

(58) (Leslau 1965: 29)

sälāt b-ähär-le
midday at-back-at
‘in the afternoon’

(59) (Leslau 1965: 30)

bäğih-zo māḥalläq mō č’a z-ēgäla-le...
many of them money to spend REL-start-since
‘because many of them have begun to spend money’

(60) (Wagner 1997: 505)

yifathō-le waṭtu
unload-to they came out
‘They came out to unload it’

In (51) and (52) *-le* serves as an allative postposition. In (53) and (54) *le* has a locative meaning. Here, the specific directional meaning of *-le* may have developed into a more general locative meaning. It should be noted that *-le* as an allative marker is not in common use. In Harari the morphemes *-de*, *-fōñ*, *kil*, *kim*, *-däle* (< *-de* + *-le*) and *gäräb* (Leslau 1963: 236) appear to be the allative markers in frequent use. One of the common functions of Harari *-le* is to mark indirect objects as in (55). Though marginally, *-le* can also serve as a genitive marker as (56) and (57). This may have developed from the dative meaning of *-le*. In (58) *-le* marks location in time. This may have developed from the spatial locative meaning of *-le* as in (51-54).

Harari *-le* can also serve as a marker of purpose clauses as in (60). This must have developed from the allative meaning of *-le*. In addition to marking purpose clauses, Harari *-le* can also introduce causal clauses as in (59).

Causal *-le* must have developed from purposive *-le* in Harari. Such developments are also attested in a number of languages around the world (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002: 246-247).

Further evidence is also noted from historical documents of Harari. It is noted that purposive *-le* already existed in Ancient Harari and the causal *-le* is a recent development in Modern Harari (Wagner 1997: 505).

The schematic representation of the overall grammaticalization pathways plausibly taken by Harari *-le* is shown in (61).

- (61) ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
 (2) PURPOSE > CAUSE
 (3) TEMPORAL

8.2.3 Zay *lä-*

The main functions of the element *lä-* in Zay are illustrated in the examples given in (62-65). In (68) and (69) it appears as *lə-*.

- (62) (Leslau 1999: 47)

lä-faraz-i gabs wābe
 to-horse-the barley he-gave-him
 ‘He gave barley to the horse’

- (63) (Leslau 1999: 144)

däbər-e lä-yəzoruf ..
 country-ACC to-pillage
 ‘to pillage the country’

- (64) (Leslau 1999: 144)

bəzə gänzäb lä-alä-äñ-e ...
 much money since-there-is-to-me
 ‘Since I have a lot of money...’

- (65) (Leslau 1999: 144)

ənṭet-e lä-yəwədə’ qōč’-e
 tree-ACC until it falls cut-it
 ‘Cut the tree until it falls’

In (62) *lä-* marks an indirect object. In (63) *lə-* marks a purpose clause. The element *lä-* followed by a verbal noun can also express intention (cf. Leslau 1999: 138). The dative and

the purposive *lä-* must have developed from an allative **lä-* in Zay. In (64) *lä-* marks a causal clause. For the grammaticalization path from purpose to cause, see the discussion of Harari *-le* above.

In (65) *lä-* marks a temporal clause. If we assume the allative ‘towards’ proper as a spatial-allative, we can consider the UNTIL concept as a temporal-allative. I assume that the dative, purposive, and temporal *lä-* must have developed from an allative **lä-* in Zay. This assumption will allow us to propose the following pattern of grammaticalization for the element *lä-* in Zay.

- (66) [ALLATIVE] **lä-* > (1) DATIVE
 (2) PURPOSE > CAUSE
 (3) TEMPORAL

8.2.4 Silt’e *la-*

The main functions of the element *la-* in Silt’e are illustrated in the examples given in (67-70).

(67) (Gutt 1997: 943)

la-miiš-ii faranka waabtay
 to-man-DEF money she-gave-him
 ‘She gave money to the man’

(68) (Gutt 1997: 946)

la-saalo feekča aluy
 to-Salo goats there are
 ‘Salo has some goats’

(69) (Gutt 1997: 985)

la-baarre finaacho tigaagraat
 for-lunch bread she is baking
 ‘She is baking bread for lunch’

(70) (Gutt 1997: 985)

saaṭinay la-ṭarabeezzaay awurday!
box to-table put it
'Put the box by the table!'

In (67) *la-* marks an indirect object (dative). In (68) *la-* serves as a genitive marker. In (69) *la-* is a purpose marker. All of these must have developed from the allative **la-*. In (70), the addressee is told to take the box “towards” the table. Here one may sense a trace of a directional meaning of *la-*.

The pattern of grammaticalization proposed for Silt'e *la-* is shown in (71).

(71) [ALLATIVE] * *la-* > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) PURPOSE

In Silt'e it is the postposition *fono* which serves as the basic allative marker (cf. Gutt 1997: 937, 941). In Wolane, a closely related language to Silt'e, the element *le-* serves as a dative and purpose clause marker (cf. Meyer 2006a: 183, 193, 227, 240).

8.3 Outer South Ethiosemitic

The possible grammaticalization of allatives in Outer South Ethiosemitic is discussed in the previous chapter (sec. 7.3.1).

8.4 Allatives in Oromo

In Oromo the main allative marker is *gara* 'to, towards'. As already noted, *gara* may have grammaticalized from the body part noun *garaa* 'belly, heart'. However, it appears that *gara* has not grammaticalized any further.

Unlike *gara*, the element *-ti* (it also appears as *-tti* or *tii*) in Oromo is polyfunctional, serving as an allative, dative, and temporal marker. In (72) *-tti* is a locative suffix with a directional meaning 'to, towards'. In (73) *-tti* marks an indirect object. In (74) *-tti* marks a temporal phrase.

(72) *asgorii-tti kalee dhufe*
Asgori - to yesterday he came
'He came to Asgori yesterday'

(73) *ulee kana tolaa-tti kenni*
stick this Tola-to give
'Give this stick to Tola'

(74) *tolaa-n bara dhufu-tti ebbifama*
Tola-NOM year coming-in he will graduate
'Tola will graduate in the coming year'

The dative and the temporal must have independently developed from the allative. The chain of grammaticalization suggested is shown in (75).

(75) ALLATIVE *-tti* > (1) DATIVE *-ti*
(2) TEMPORAL *-ti*

There is yet another function of *-ti* as in *aduree-n kun kan tolaa-ti* (cat-NOM this of Tola-*ti*) 'This cat is Tola's'. This function of *-ti* has so far been 'controversial'. There are scholars who take the suffix *-ti* as only a genitive marker and others who take it as a copula. Some consider it simply as a "genitive copula" (cf. Bender and Mulugeta 1976: 134 (note 8), 140; Griefenow-Mewis 2001: 44, 90, 106; Crass, Girma, Meyer, and Wetter 2005: 19-22). I have excluded this 'controversial' target concept of *-ti* from the suggested chain of grammaticalization.

8.5 Chapter Summary

The source concepts identified in chapter eight were allative markers. From Oromo the allative marker considered was the element *-ti*. The dative and temporal functions of this element were treated as the target concepts of the allative domain.

The allative markers identified from North and Transversal South Ethiosemitic languages commonly extend into the dative and accusative function. In the Outer South Ethiosemitic languages it is the element *yā* that mainly functions as an allative, dative, and accusative marker. This element was treated in chapter seven and was not raised again in chapter eight.

The allative sources considered from the North and the Transversal South Ethiosemitic languages take the form of either an **l* or an **n* or both. It is possible to trace back these allatives to a demonstrative origin. But in this chapter they are primarily treated as allatives without concern for their earlier etymology.

One of the difference between the elements considered in chapter seven (demonstratives) and in chapter eight (allatives) concerns the evolution of the relative marker. We find this in the former and not in the latter.

A second difference concerns the development of the genitive. In the demonstrative source concepts considered in chapter seven, the genitive derives directly from the demonstrative. In the allative sources considered in chapter eight, the genitives derive from the datives.

The element *la* in Ge‘ez functions as an allative, dative, genitive, accusative, purpose, and temporal marker. The genitive concept must have developed from the dative, which in turn is the target concept of the allative. The accusative, purpose, and temporal functions are taken as independent developments from the allative. Optionally, it is also possible to derive the accusative from the dative.

The element *'al* in Tigre serves as an allative, genitive, dative, accusative, and temporal marker. The last three functions should have independently developed from the first. The genitive must have been a result of repeated grammaticalization through the intermediate stage of the dative.

The element *nə-* in Tigrinya functions as an allative, dative, genitive, accusative, and temporal marker. The chain of grammaticalization for the element *nə-* would be identical with that of *la* in Ge‘ez and *lä* in Amharic.

The element *lä-* in Amharic functions mainly as a dative, purpose, and temporal marker. Though marginally and dialectally, Amharic *lä-* is also observed serving as an allative, accusative, and genitive marker.

The element *-ən* in Amharic functions mainly as an accusative marker. Though marginally and dialectally, Amharic *-ən* is also observed serving as an allative and dative marker.

In Harari the element *-le* functions as an allative, dative, genitive, purpose, causal, and temporal marker. The dative, purpose and temporal are considered as the immediate target

concepts of the allative. The genitive concept must have been an extension of the dative. Similarly, the causal target has the purpose marking as its source concept.

In *Zay* the element *lä* functions mainly as a dative, purpose, causal, and temporal marker. Silt'e *la* functions as a dative, genitive, and purpose marker. An allative **lä* as a source concept can be reconstructed for both languages.

The schematic representation of the grammaticalization pathways proposed for the allative markers is given below. The schematic representations are repeated here for the sake of easy reference.

North Ethiosemitic

(76) Ge'ez *la* ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) ACCUSATIVE
(3) PURPOSE
(4) TEMPORAL

(77) Tigre

'*agal* *ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE
(2) ACCUSATIVE
(3) PURPOSE

'*al* ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) ACCUSATIVE
(3) TEMPORAL

(78) Tigrinya

nə- ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) ACCUSATIVE
(3) PURPOSE
(4) TEMPORAL

Transversal South Ethiosemitic

(79) Amharic

lä- ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) ACCUSATIVE
(3) PURPOSE
(4) TEMPORAL

-ən ALLATIVE > (1) ACCUSATIVE
(2) DATIVE

(80) Harari

-le ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) PURPOSE
(3) TEMPORAL

(81) Zay

lä ALLATIVE * *lä* > (1) DATIVE
(2) PURPOSE > CAUSE
(3) TEMPORAL

(82) Sil'te

la ALLATIVE * *la* > (1) DATIVE > GENITIVE
(2) PURPOSE

(83) Oromo

-ti ALLATIVE > (1) DATIVE
(2) TEMPORAL

CHAPTER NINE

9 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This chapter has two sections. Central points and major findings of the study are recapitulated in the first section (9.1). Concluding remarks are made in the second section (9.2).

9.1 Summary

The major aim of this dissertation has been to identify, describe, and explain selected instances of grammaticalization in most of the Ethiosemitic languages and in Oromo. A number of instances were identified and described from topics that range from body part terms to similatives, demonstratives, and allative markers.

In the first half of chapter two a brief review was made of the definition, types, and parameters of grammaticalization. There grammaticalization is defined as a special type of language change where a lexical morpheme changes into a grammatical morpheme, or where a less grammatical morpheme evolves into a more grammatical morpheme.

Repeated ($A > B, B > C$) and polygrammaticalization ($A > B, A > C$) were noted as the two types of grammaticalization. Extension, Desemanticization, Decategorialization, and Erosion were briefly discussed as the four parameters of grammaticalization.

Degree of grammaticality was described in terms of six properties (schematicity, polyfunctionality, frequency, syntactic freedom, autonomy, and polysegmentality). As the degree of grammaticality of an item increases so does its schematicity of meaning, polyfunctionality, and text frequency. By contrast, the degree of syntactic freedom, autonomy, and polysegmentality of an item will get reduced as the degree of grammaticality increases.

In the second half of chapter two previous studies on grammaticalization in Ethiopian languages were briefly reviewed. There it was pointed out that grammaticalization research in Ethiopian languages is in infancy and there are many gaps yet to be bridged.

In chapter three ten body part terms were identified from Ethiopian Semitic languages. These were found grammaticalizing into spatial, temporal, and in few cases into a logical relation marker. The body part terms for ‘soul’, ‘stomach’ and ‘head’ were also discussed as

grammaticalizing into reflexive and independent personal pronouns in Tigrinya, Argobba, and Amharic.

In chapter four twelve body part terms were identified from Oromo. These were found grammaticalizing mainly into spatial, temporal, and in one case, into a logical relation marker. One peculiar instance was the body part term for ‘tail’. This noun has gone a long way in becoming a marker of causal clauses.

In chapter five the source concept identified was the Semitic root *msl* ‘resemble’. Three nouns from this root were found grammaticalizing into a similitive, comitative, and temporal markers in the three North Ethiosemitic languages.

Similitive markers were the source concepts identified in chapter six. The similitives appeared in three forms: *akka* in Oromo, *əndä* in Amharic and Argobba, and **km* in the rest of Ethiosemitic. In all the languages considered in the chapter, these similitives were observed serving as markers of complement clauses. Except in Tigre, Tigrinya, and Silt’e these allatives have further grammaticalized into markers of purpose clauses. Except in Tigrinya and Harari, the same allatives were also found functioning as temporal markers.

Demonstratives were the source concepts considered in chapter seven. Except in a few cases, these demonstratives were observed serving as relative and genitive markers.

The relative-genitive markers in Ge‘ez (*zä*, *’əntä*, and *’əllä*) and in Tigre (*la*) are also in common use as demonstratives. We do not find the relative elements in Tigrinya (*zə-*) and Harari (*zi*) in common use as demonstratives. However, there are demonstrative traces of these relative elements in Tigrinya and Harari.

In all the South Ethiosemitic languages except Harari, the element *yä-* serves as both a relative and genitive marker. This element is not in common use as a demonstrative. However, we find traces of it in the common demonstratives in these languages.

In the final analysis, the relative-genitive elements considered in Ethiosemitic languages were taken as having a common demonstrative origin.

Moreover, the relative-genitive elements are taken not as a result of repeated grammaticalization (DEMONSTRATIVE > RELATIVE > GENITIVE or DEMONSTRATIVE > GENITIVE > RELATIVE) but as a result of polygrammaticalization (DEMONSTRATIVE > GENITIVE; DEMONSTRATIVE > RELATIVE). In other words, I have assumed that a

demonstrative element (reconstructed or not) has independently grammaticalized into a genitive marker on the one hand and into a relative marker on the other. From this assumption, one may not necessarily be able to tell whether the relative precedes the genitive in time or whether the reverse is the case.

The possible grammaticalization of allative markers into dative, accusative, and genitive markers was dealt with in chapter eight.

9.2 Conclusion

In this study a number of source and target concepts of grammaticalization are identified, described, and explained. Nearly all the major languages from North and Transversal South Ethiosemitic are included. The languages considered from Outer South Ethiosemitic were limited in number. For the sake of comparison, Oromo, a Lowland East Cushitic language, is also included. All in all, the number of languages considered was relatively high. Correspondingly, the topics covered and the source concepts identified became limited in number. Moreover, the overwhelming majority of the source items identified in the study were of nominal origin. The verbal cline of grammaticalization has therefore been largely ignored.

The topics covered and the source concepts identified were applicable in most of the languages considered. I therefore decided to put aside isolated instances of grammaticalization I had spotted here and there in the languages I have investigated.

I should say that there are still hundreds of isolated instances of grammaticalization worth investigating in Ethiopian languages. The element *-mm* in Ethiosemitic, the element *tt* in Old Amharic, and the elements *-n* and *-f* in Oromo are a few among the long list. These and others are potential topics for further research.

In the absence of historical documents, grammaticalization study is probably an essential tool and a good approach to look into the history of languages. Though we have begun to have a number of contributions, grammaticalization studies on Ethiopian languages is still a new area of research. There are lots of outstanding possibilities on the topics of grammaticalization, of which the question of areal and genetic distribution is one. A second major area should be a detailed and comprehensive research on individual languages.

REFERENCES

- Abinet Sime. 2010. Grammaticalization of the Morpheme *ge* in Ethiosemitic. MA thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Abinet Sime. 2014. Grammaticalization of Body-Part Terms in Ethiosemitic. In: Brenzinger and Kraska-Szlenk (eds.), 33-51.
- Academy of Ethiopian Languages. 1985 (EC). *Məslatat təgrəñña* (Tigrinya Proverbs). Addis Ababa: Artistic Printers.
- Academy of Ethiopian Languages. 1994 (E C). *Kəbrä nägäšt*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Academy of Ethiopian Languages. 1996. *Galmee Jechoota Afaan Oromoo*. Addis Ababa: Bole Printing Enterprise.
- Afewerk Gebreyesus. 1900 (EC). *tobbiya*. Rome.
- Afewerk Gebreyesus. 1901 (EC). *Dagmawi aṭe mənīlək*. Rome.
- Alemayehu Abebe. 1994. The Functions of the Morpheme /Yä/ in Chaha. In: Bahru Zewde, R. Pankhurst, and Taddese Beyene (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, vol. I., 383-392.
- Amsalu Aklilu. 2010. *Ge'ez Textbook*. Addis Ababa: Shama Books.
- Appleyard, D. 2004. Some Thoughts on the Origin of the Amharic Object Marker - ? -[ə]n. In: Boll, V. et al. (eds.) *Studia Aethiopica: In Honour of Siegbert Uhlig on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz) 291-301.
- Appleyard, D. L. 2006. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Barth, J. 1913. *Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Baye Yimam. 1987. Relative Clauses in Oromo. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 20: 60-74.
- Baye Yimam. 2000 (EC). *Yä'amarəñña säwasəw*. 2nd edition. Addis Ababa: Elleni PLC.

- Bender, M. L. (ed.). 1976. *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. Michigan: African Studies Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Bender, M. L., J. D. Bowen, R. L. Cooper and C. A. Ferguson (eds.). 1976. *Language in Ethiopia*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bender, M. L. and Mulugeta Eteffa. 1976. Galla. In: Bender, Bowen, Cooper, and Ferguson (eds.), 130-148.
- Berhanu Chamora and R. Hetzron. 2000. *Inor*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Binyam Sisay. 2008. Aspects of Koorete Verb Morphology. PhD Dissertation, University of Oslo.
- Blake, B. J. 1994. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brenzinger, M. and I. Kraska-Szlenk (eds.). 2014. *The Body in Language: Comparative Studies of Linguistic Embodiment*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bybee, J. 2004. Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization: The Role of Frequency. In: Joseph and Janda (eds.), Chapter 19.
- Bybee, J., R. Perkins, and W. Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Carey, K. 1994. The Grammaticalization of the Perfect in Old English: An Account Based on Pragmatics and Metaphor. In: Pagliuca, W. (ed.), *Perspectives on Grammaticalization* (Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins) 103 – 117.
- Cohen, M. 1939. *Nouvelles études d'éthiopien méridional*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Condillac, É. B. de. 1746. *Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines*. Paris.
- Cowley, R. 1983. Ludolf's Fragmentum Piquesii: An Old Amharic Tract about Mary who Anointed Jesus' Feet. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 28 (1): 1-47.

- Crass, J. and R. Meyer. 2007. Ethiopia. In: Heine, B. and D. Nurse (eds.). *A Linguistic Geography of Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 228-249.
- Crass, J., Girma A. Demeke, R. Meyer, and A. Wetter. 2005. *Copula and Focus Constructions in Selected Ethiopian Languages*. Leipzig: ULPA
- Croft, W. 1990. *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Debela Goshu. 2011. Semantics of Oromo Adpositions. PhD Dissertation, University of Oslo.
- Desta Teklewold. 1962 (E. C). *Addis yamarəñña mäzgäbä qalat*. Addis Ababa: Artistic Printers.
- Diessel, H. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dikken, M. den. 2007. Amharic Relatives and Possessives: Definiteness, Agreement, and the Linker. *Linguistics Inquiry* 38 (2): 302-320.
- Dillmann, A. 1907. *Ethiopic Grammar*. London/ Amsterdam: Philo Press.
- Durie, M. and M. Ross (eds.). 1996. *The Comparative Method Reviewed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elias, D. L. 2005. Tigre of Habab: Short Grammar and Texts from the Rigbat People. PhD Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Ethiopian Languages Research Center (ELRC). 1993 (EC). *Amarəñña mäzgäba qalat* (Monolingual Dictionary of Amharic). Addis Ababa: Artistic Printers.
- Ethiopian Languages Research Center (ELRC). 1994 (EC). *Kəbrä nägäšt*. Addis Ababa: Commercial Printers.
- Fisher, O., M. Norde and H. Perridon (eds.). 2004. *Up and Down the Cline: The Nature of Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ford, C. M. 1986. Notes on the phonology and grammar of Chaha-Gurage. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 19: 40-80.

- Getatchew Haile. 1970. Archaic Amharic Forms. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Ethiopian Studies* (Addis Ababa: Institute of Ethiopian Studies) 61-80.
- Getatchew Haile and Seifu Metaferia. 1973. The Dialect of Gojjam. In: Habte-Mariam Marcos (ed.), 115-120.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*. Volume I. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goldenberg, G. 1991. “Oneself”, “one's own” and “one another” in Amharic. In: Kaye, A.S. (ed.), *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz) 531-549.
- Gragg, R. 1976. Oromo of Wellegga. In: Bender, M. (ed.), 166-195.
- Gragg, G. 1997. Ge'ez (Ethiopic). In: Hetzron, R. (ed.), 242-260.
- Greenberg, J. H. 1980. Circumfixes and Typological Change. In: Traugott et al. (eds.), *Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Historical Linguistics* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) 233-241.
- Griefenow-Mewis, C. 2001. *A Grammatical Sketch of Written Oromo*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Guidi, I. 1901. *Vocabolario amarico-italiano*. Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente. [Reprinted in 1935]
- Gutt, Ernst-August. 1997. Concise Grammar of Silt'e. In: Gutt and Hussein, 895-957.
- Gutt, Eva H. M. and Hussein Mohammed. 1997. *Silt'e-Amharic-English Dictionary*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Habte-Mariam Marcos (ed.). 1973. Regional Variation in Amharic. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 11 (2): 113-129.
- Hailu Fulass. 1972. On Amharic Relative Clauses. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35 (3): 497-513.

- Haspelmath, M. 1999. Why Is Grammaticalization Irreversible? *Linguistics* 37 (6): 1043 – 1068.
- Haspelmath, M. 2003. The Geometry of Grammatical Meaning: Semantic Maps and Cross-Linguistic Comparison. In: Tomasello, M. (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language 2*: 211-242. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Haspelmath, M. 2004. On Directionality in Language Change with Particular Reference to Grammaticalization. In: Fisher, Norde and Perridon (eds.), 17-44.
- Heine, B. 1993. *Auxiliaries: Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, B. 1997a. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, B. 1997b. *Possession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, B. 2004. Grammaticalization. In: Joseph and Janda (eds.), Chapter 18.
- Heine, B., U. Claudi and F. Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, B. and M. Reh. 1984. *Grammaticalization and Reanalysis in African Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Heine, B. and K. Song. 2011. On the grammaticalization of personal pronouns. *J. Linguistics* 47: 587-630.
- Henok Wondimu. 2010. Grammaticalization of Copula Markers in the Ometo Subgroup. MA thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Hetzron, R. 1972. *Ethiopian Semitic: Studies in Classification*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Hetzron, R. 1977. *The Gunnän-Gurage Languages*. Naples: Don Bosco.
- Hetzron, R. (ed.). 1997. *The Semitic Languages*. London: Routledge.
- Hopper, P.J. 1991. On Some Principles of Grammaticization. In Traugott and Heine (eds.), I: 17-35.
- Hopper, P. J. and E. C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, G. 1983. Evidence of the Nominal Origin of the Perfect in Amharic. In: Segert, S. and A. J. E. Bodrogligeti (eds.) *Ethiopian Studies Dedicated to Wolf Leslau* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz) 236-242.
- Hudson, G. 1989. *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Hudson, G. 2000. Ethiopian Semitic Overview. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 32 (2): 75-86.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2004. Rescuing Traditional (Historical) Linguistics from Grammaticalization Theory. In: Fisher, Norde and Perridon (eds.), 5-71.
- Joseph, B. D. and R. D. Janda (eds.). 2004. *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing. Blackwell Reference Online. 12 May 2007 <http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/book?id=g9781405127479_9781405127479>
- Kane, T. L. 1990. *Amharic-English Dictionary*. Two vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kane, T. L. 2000. *Tigrinya-English Dictionary*. Springfield, MD: McNeil Technologies/Dunwoody Press.
- Kapeliuk, O. 1994. The Pronouns *ərswo* and *ərsaččäw* as sociolinguistic variants. In: Bahru Zewde, R Pankhurst and Taddese Beyene (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, vol. I., 495-500.
- Kapeliuk, O. 2009. *Selected Papers in Ethiosemitic and Neo-Aramaic Linguistics*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Kebede Hordofa. 2005. The Varieties of Oromo. *ELRC Working Papers*. 1 (1): 134 - 150.

- Kidanewold Kifle. 1948 (EC). *Mäṣḥafä säwasəw wägəss wämäzgäbä qalat ḥaddis*. Addis Ababa: Artistic Printers.
- Kogan, L. E. 1997. Tigrinya. In: Hetzron (ed.), 424-445.
- Kövecses, Z. 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1965. (1975). The Evolution of Grammatical Categories. *Diogenes* 51: 55-71. (Reprint in: *Esquisses linguistiques*, Vol. II, 38 – 54, Munich: Fink, 1975.)
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lambdin, T. O. 1978. *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez)*. Montana: Scholars Press.
- Lehmann, C. 1985. Grammaticalization: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Change. *Lingua e Stile* 20 (3): 303-318.
- Lehmann, C. 1991. Grammaticalization and Related Changes in Contemporary German. In: Traugott and Heine (eds.), Vol. II, 493-535.
- Lehmann, C. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich and Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Leslau, W. 1945a. Grammatical Sketches in Tigré (North Ethiopic), Dialect of Mensa. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 65: 1-26.
- Leslau, W. 1945b. *Gafat Documents: Records of a South-Ethiopic Language*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Leslau, W. 1948. Supplementary Observations on Tigré Grammar. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 69 (3): 127-139.
- Leslau, W. 1950. *Ethiopic Documents: Gurage*. New York: The Viking Fund.
- Leslau, W. 1956. The Expressions 'under, after' in the Ethiopic languages. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 15: 241-245.

- Leslau, W. 1963. *Etymological Dictionary of Harari*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Leslau, W. 1965. *Ethiopians Speak: Studies in Cultural Background, I. Harari*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Leslau, W. 1968. *Ethiopians Speak. Studies in Cultural Background, III. Soddo*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Leslau, W. 1976. *Concise Amharic Dictionary*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W. 1979a. *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*. Individual Dictionaries. (vol. I). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W. 1979b. *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*. Etymological Section (vol. III). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W. 1987. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W. 1992. *Gurage Studies: Collected Articles*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W. 1995. *Reference Grammar of Amharic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W. 1997. *Ethiopic Documents: Argobba*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W. 1999. *Zway-Ethiopic Documents: Grammar and Dictionary*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leus, T. 2006. *Aadaa Boraanaa: A Dictionary of Borana Culture*. Addis Ababa: Shama Books.
- Littmann, E. 1944. *Altamharisches Glossar*. Rome.
- Ludolf, H. 1698. *Lexicon Amharico-Latinum*. Francofurti ad moenum: J. D. Zunnerum.
- Łykowska, L. 2003. Grammaticalization of the Amharic Tense System. In: *Studies of the Department of African Languages and Cultures*, University of Warsaw, 34: 27-41.

- Łykowska, L. 2006. Grammaticalization Patterns in Amharic: Preliminaries. In: Uhlig, S. (ed.) *Proceedings of the XVth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz) 803-812.
- Łykowska, L. 2009. The Paradigm of the Verb “to be (LOC)” in Amharic as an Example of Interaction between Suppletion and Grammaticalization. In: Häberl, G. C. (ed), *Afroasiatic Studies in Memory of Robert Hetzron: Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the North American Conference on Afroasiatic Linguistics* (Cambridge: Scholars Publishing) 256-270.
- Meillet, A. 1912. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia* (Rivista di Scienza) 12. Reprint: Meillet (1921) *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion) 130 – 148.
- Meyer, R. 2005. The Morpheme *yä-* in Muher. *Lissan* 19 (1): 40-63.
- Meyer, R. 2006a. *Wolane: Descriptive Grammar of an East Gurage Language (Ethiosemitic)*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Meyer, R. 2006b. The Zay Language. *ELRC Working Papers* 2(1): 85-165.
- Meyer, R. 2011. Gurage. In: Weninger (ed.), 1220-1257.
- Norde, M. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Owens, J. 1985. *A Grammar of Harar Oromo*. Hamburg: Buske
- Pagliuca, W. (ed.) 1994. *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Palmer, F. R. 1961. Relative Clauses in Tigre. *Word* 17: 24-33.
- Palmer, F. R. 1962a. *The Morphology of the Tigre Noun*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, F.R. 1962b. Relative Clauses in Tigrinya. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 7 (1): 36-43.
- Pasch, H. 2014. Embodiment in Zande. In: Brenzinger and Kraska-Szlenk (eds.), 199-223.
- Podolsky, B. 1991. *Historical Phonetics of Amharic*. Tel-Aviv: NP (Self published).

- Praetorius, F. 1879. *Die Amharische Sprache*. Halle: Waisenhaus.
- Raz, S. 1983. *Tigre Grammar and Texts*. Malibu: Undena Publications.
- Rubin, A. D. 2005. *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Rundgren, F. 1955. *Über Bildungen mit š- und n-t-Demonstrativen im Semitischen*. Uppsala: Almqvist.
- Solomon Niguse. 2011. Language Change in Tigrinya. MA thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Stassen, L. 1997. *Intransitive Predication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strelcyn, S. 1961. Remarques sur la langue des textes médico-magiques éthiopiens. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 25 (1): 107–125.
- Strelcyn, S. 1964. Ethiopian Medical Treatises as a Source for the Study of Early Amharic. In: Bown, L., and Crowder, M. (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Congress of Africanists*, Accra, 11th – 16th December 1962 (London: Longmans) 102 – 112.
- Strelcyn, S. 1968a. *Médecine et plantes d’Ethiopie. Les traités médicaux éthiopiens*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Strelcyn, S. 1968b. Le passage $\text{ṣ} > \text{ṭ}$ en amharique comme objet d’études synchroniques et diachroniques. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 31 (2): 127 – 134.
- Stroemer, H. 1995. *A Grammar of Boraana Oromo (Kenya)*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Svorou, S. 1994. *The Grammar of Space*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Taylor, J. R. 2002. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tesfay Tewolde. 2002. *A Modern Grammar of Tigrinya*. Rome.
- Tilahun Gamta. 1989. *Oromo-English Dictionary*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Tinsae Publishers. 1992 (EC). *Säwasəw Ge’ez (Ge’ez Grammar)*. Addis Ababa: Commercial Printers.
- Traugott, E. C. and B. Heine. 1991. Introduction. In: Traugott and Heine (eds.), I: 1-14.

- Traugott, E. C. and B. Heine (eds.). 1991. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Two vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, E. C. and E. König. 1991. The Semantics of Grammaticalization Revisited. In: Traugott and Heine (eds.) Vol. I., 189 – 218.
- Voigt, R. 2009. Südtigrinische Dialekte. In: Goldenberg, G. and A. Shisha-Halevy (eds.) *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar: Studies in Memory of H. J. Polotsky* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities) 169-183.
- Voigt, R. 2011. Tigrinya. In: Weninger (ed.), 1153 - 1169.
- Wagner, E. 1997. Harari. In: Hetzron (ed.), 486-508.
- Wagner, E. 2011. Harari. In: Weninger (ed.), 1257 – 1265.
- Weninger, S. (ed.). 2011. *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Weninger, S. 2011. Reconstructive Morphology. In: Weninger (ed.), 151-178.
- Wetter, A. 2002. The *alä*-compound Verbs, an Example of Grammaticalization and Sound Symbolism in Amharic. In: *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies 3*: 1829-1839.
- Wetter, A. 2006. The Multifunctional Morpheme *-ga* in Argobba. *Lissan* 20(1/2): 149-162.
- Wilkins, D. P. 1996. Natural Tendencies of Semantic Change and the Search for Cognates. In: Durie and Ross (eds.), 264 –304.
- Yared Fenta. 1986 (EC). *Fənotä Ge'ez*. Asmara: St. Francescho.
- Yoseph Tizazu. 2009. Semantic Change over the History of Amharic. MA thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Zenamarkos Endalew. 1981 (EC). *ṭəntawi gə'əz bāzāmānawi aqqārərāb*. Addis Ababa: Tinsae Publishers.
- Zereadawit Adhana. 1996 (EC). *Märəḥo-sāwasəw zäləssanä gə'əz*. Addis Ababa: Berhanenna Selam Printing Enterprise.

.....

Amharic Bible

United Bible Societies. 1879. *Mäṣhaf qəddus* (The Bible in Amharic).

United Bible Societies. 1954 (EC). *Mäṣhaf qəddus* (The Bible in Amharic).

Bible Society of Ethiopia. 1980. *Mäṣhaf qəddus*.

Bible Society of Ethiopia. 2000. *Mäṣhaf qəddus*.

English Bible

The Bible Societies. 1961. *Good News Bible (Today's English Version)*. New York: Collins/Fontana.

International Bible Society. 1984. *The Holy Bible, New International Version*. London: Clays.

Ge'ez Bible

Tinsae Publishers. 1994 (EC). *Bəluṅ kidan* (The Old Testament in Ge'ez, The first eight books, from Genesis to Ruth). Addis Ababa: Tinsae Publishers.

Tinsae Publishers. 1995 (EC). *Mäṣhafä nägäšt* (Part of the Old Testament in Ge'ez, from First Samuel to Ecclesiastes). Addis Ababa: Tinsae Publishers.

Tinsae Publishers. 1999 (EC). *Mäṣahəftä bəluṅat* (Genesis and Exodus in Ge'ez). Addis Ababa: Tinsae Publishers.

Tinsae Publishers. 2002 (EC). *ḥaddis kidan* (The New Testament in Ge'ez and Amharic). Addis Ababa: Tinsae Publishers.

Tinsae Publishers. 2005 (EC). *Mäzmurä dawit* (Psalms in Ge'ez). Addis Ababa: Commercial Printing Press.

Oromo Bible

The Bible Society of Ethiopia. 1997. *Macaafa Qulqullu Afaan Oromoo – Hiikaa Haraa* (The Holy Bible in Oromo – New Translation in Latin Script). Addis Ababa.

Tigrinya Bible

Bible Society. 1972. *Mäṣhaf qəddus* (The Bible in Tigrinya). Asmara: P'etros sila.

Acknowledgements

I have had the help, encouragement and support of many individuals while working on this doctoral thesis.

I have had unreserved support and guidance from Professor Orin Gensler, my PhD thesis supervisor. He sets high standards and I had to work hard to bring the thesis up to his satisfaction. His personal library has always been open to me. I have now and then checked out a good number of monographs, journal articles and dictionaries on grammaticalization and Ethiopian languages. At my request, Professor Gensler also translated part of Voigt's 2009 paper from German.

A number of linguists from abroad and home were kind enough to provide me with numerous resource materials. Dr. Meyer generously provided me with hundreds of reference materials on Ethiopian languages and on grammaticalization. He has also been generous with his time, advice and encouragement. Professor Baye Yimam, Dr. Zelealem Leyew, Dr. Binyam Sisay, and Dr. Shimelis Mazengia provided me with important reference materials. Their encouragement was also motivational. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to each and every one of them.

Dr Łykowska of the University of Warsaw sent me the offprints of her three papers on grammaticalization in Amharic. She also encouraged me to send an abstract for the International Conference on The Body In Language (BIL) at the University of Warsaw. The BIL Conference was held in Warsaw on the 21-22 October 2011. At the conference I read my paper on the grammaticalization of Body Part Terms in Ethiosemitic. This paper was published as a chapter in a volume along with the other papers presented at the conference in: Brenzinger, M, and I. Kraska-Szlenk (eds.). 2014. *The Body in Language*. Leiden: Brill. The third chapter in the present dissertation is a revised and enlarged version of the second chapter in *The Body in Language*.

I am grateful to Professor Kraska-Szlenk and the University of Warsaw for covering my travel and lodging expenses. I express my heartfelt thanks to Dr Łykowska, Dr. Wolk, and Professor Pawlak for their hospitality during my stay in Warsaw, Poland.

The participants of the conference were very helpful and encouraging. I would especially like to say thank you to Professor Heine, Professor Brenzinger, Professor Pawlak, Professor Mous, Helma Pasch, and Rebecca Voll.

Within a few days of my arrival in Ethiopia, Professor Heine sent me the copies of some of his books and papers which I found very helpful. I was also encouraged to send him the first draft of my rather ambitious paper entitled “Grammaticalizing Words and Dying Stars: a Sketch of Analogy.” He took time to read the paper and to write me comments.

Professor Yri of the University of Oslo sent me the off print of his paper on adpositions in Amharic and Sidamo ?afo. Dr. Yvonne Treis also provided me with a number of resource materials. I would like to express my thanks to Professor Yri and Dr. Treis for their concern and generous help.

Finally I would like to say thank you to my Nunnu (Adeda Haileselassie). Throughout the project, in all the ups and downs, my wife was my strength.

Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents-----	vi
Abbreviations.....	x
Abstract.....	xii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Aim and Significance of the Study.....	1
1.2 Scope and Limitation of the Study.....	1
1.3 Methodology.....	2
1.4 Organization of the Study.....	2
1.5 Notes on Transcription.....	3
2 THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PREVIOUS STUDIES.....	5
2.1 The Theoretical Framework.....	5
2.1.1 Theory of Grammaticalization.....	5
2.1.2 Definition of Grammaticalization.....	5
2.1.3 Types of Grammaticalization.....	6
2.1.4 Parameters of Grammaticalization.....	8
2.1.5 Section Summary.....	13
2.2 Previous Studies on Grammaticalization in Ethiopia.....	15
2.2.1 Wetter (2002, 2006).....	17
2.2.2 Łykowska (2003, 2006, 2009).....	18
2.2.3 Rubin (2005).....	19
2.2.4 Crass and Meyer (2007).....	20
2.2.5 Yoseph (2009).....	20
2.2.6 Abinet (2010).....	20
2.2.7 Debela (2011).....	20
3 BODY PART YERMS IN ETHIOSEMITIC-----	21
3.1 Body Part Terms > Adpositions.....	21
3.1.1 BACK.....	25
3.1.2 BELLY.....	27
3.1.3 FACE.....	28
3.1.4 FOOT.....	30
3.1.5 HAND.....	30
3.1.6 HEAD.....	32

3.1.7 MOUTH.....	33
3.1.8 RIB.....	33
3.1.9 SOLE.....	35
3.2 Body Part Terms > Pronouns.....	35
3.2.1 HEAD, STOMACH, SOUL > Independent Personal Pronouns.....	35
3.2.2 BODY, HEAD, SOUL > Reflexive Pronouns.....	38
3.3 Chapter Summary.....	40
4 BODY PART TERMS IN OROMO.....	42
4.1 BACK.....	42
4.1.1 BACK of Animal.....	42
4.1.2 BACK of Human.....	44
4.2 BELLY.....	44
4.3 BUTTOCKS.....	46
4.4 CHEEK.....	48
4.5 MANE.....	49
4.6 RIB.....	50
4.7 SOLE ‘sole, sole of foot’.....	51
4.8 TAIL (1).....	53
4.9 TAIL (2).....	57
4.10 Chapter Summary.....	58
5 RESEMBLE.....	59
5.1 <i>msl</i> in Ge‘ez.....	60
5.1.1 <i>məsla</i>	60
5.1.2 <i>'amsāla</i>	63
5.2 <i>msl</i> in Tigre.....	64
5.2.1 <i>məsəl</i>	64
5.2.2 <i>kəmsal</i>	65
5.3 <i>msl</i> in Tigrinya.....	66
5.4 <i>msl</i> in Argobba.....	69
5.5 <i>msl</i> in Amharic.....	70
5.6 <i>Resemble</i> in Oromo.....	71
5.7 Chapter Summary.....	71
6 SIMILATIVES.....	74

6.1 The Similative <i>əndä</i>	74
6.1.1 <i>əndä</i> in Amharic	75
6.1.2 <i>əndä</i> in Argobba	77
6.1.3 <i>kämä</i> in Amharic and Argobba	78
6.1.4 On the Origin of <i>əndä</i>	79
6.2 *<i>kVm</i> in NES	80
6.2.1 Ge‘ez	80
6.2.2 Tigre	81
6.2.3 Tigrinya	82
6.3 *<i>kVm</i> in TSES	83
6.3.1 Silt’e	83
6.3.2 Wolane	85
6.3.3 Zay	85
6.3.4 Harari	86
6.4 *<i>kVm</i> in OSES	87
6.4.1 Chaha	87
6.4.2 Mäsqaṅ	89
6.4.3 Muher	89
6.5 akka in Oromo	90
6.6 Chapter Summary	92
7 DEMONSTRATIVES	95
7.1 Demonstratives in North Ethiosemitic	96
7.1. 1 Demonstratives in Ge‘ez	96
7.1. 2 The Demonstrative <i>la</i> in Tigre	109
7.1. 3 Demonstratives in Tigrinya	112
7.2 Demonstratives in Transversal South Ethiosemitic	114
7.2.1 Amharic <i>yä</i>	114
7.2. 2 Harari <i>zi</i>	116
7.2.3 Zay <i>yä-</i>	119
7.2.4 Silt’e <i>ya-</i>	120
7.3 Demonstratives in Outer South Ethiosemitic	121
7.3.1 Chaha <i>yä-</i>	122
7.3.2 Muher <i>yä-</i>	124

7.3.3 Kistane <i>yä-</i>	126
7.4 Oromo <i>kana</i>	128
7.5 Chapter Summary	129
8 ALLATIVES	133
8.1 Allatives in North Ethiosemitic	133
8.1.1 Ge'ez <i>la</i>	133
8.1.2 Tigre <i>'əgəl</i> and <i>'əl</i>	137
8.1.3 Tigrinya <i>nə-</i>	140
8.2 Transversal South Ethiosemitic	142
8.2.1 Amharic <i>lä-</i> and <i>-ən</i>	142
8.2.2 Harari <i>-le</i>	146
8.2.3 Zay <i>lä-</i>	148
8.2.4 Silt'e <i>la-</i>	149
8.3 Outer South Ethiosemitic	150
8.4 Allatives in Oromo	150
8.5 Chapter Summary	151
9 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	155
9.1 Summary	155
9.2 Conclusion	157
REFERENCES	158

Abbreviations

ACC	Accusative
Adj	Adjective
ALL	Allative
AUX	Auxiliary
C	Converb
COM	Comitative
COMP	Complementizer
CONJ	Conjunction
DAT	Dative
DEF	Definite
EC	Ethiopian Calendar
F	Feminine
FOC	Focus
GEN	Genitive
IMFT	Imperfective
INF	Infinitive
LOC	Locative
M	Masculine
NEG	Negative
NOM	Nominative
NP	No Publisher
PAST	Past tense
PL	Plural
PRF	Perfective
REL	Relative
TEMP	Temporal
1 PL	First Person Plural
1 SG	First Person Singular
2 SG	Second Person Singular
2 PL	Second Person Plural
2 MSG	Second Person Masculine Singular
2 FSG	Second Person Feminine Singular

3 MSG Third Person Masculine Singular
3 FSG Third Person Feminine Singular
3PL Third Person Plural

Abstract

The main objective of this study was to identify, describe, and explain selected instances of grammaticalization in Ethiosemitic languages and Oromo. Body part terms, similatives, demonstratives, and allatives are the major topics considered in the study. Body part terms are observed grammaticalizing into markers of spatial, temporal and logical relations. In the North Ethiosemitic languages the Semitic root *msl* is found developing into a comitative and temporal marker. The evolution of similatives into complement, temporal, and purpose clause markers is also observed in the majority of Ethiosemitic languages and in Oromo. The word for ‘one’ (*and*) is proposed as an alternative etymology for the Amharic similative marker *ändä*. Relative and genitive markers are analyzed with a demonstrative origin as a common source. The genitive-relative element *yä-* is treated as a result of polygrammaticalization from a common demonstrative element.