SOME WORD ORDER PRINCIPLES OF SAHO-AFAR

MARCELLO LAMBERTI

1. SAHO–AFAR AND ITS CLASSIFICATION

Saho and Afar constitute a dialect cluster reflecting a continuum that stretches from the Eritrea and Tigray Provinces in the north across to Jibouti and the Hararge Province in the south, where the Somali speaking area begins. Saho is mainly spoken in the Ethiopian Provinces of Eritrea and Tigray, while Afar (Danakil) also represents the mother tongue of the majority of the citizens of the Republic of Jibouti besides being spoken in the Ethiopian Provinces of Eritrea, Tigray and Welo. Saho and Afar genetically belong to the Lowland Branch of the Cushitic language family, and as such they share a lot of common features with Oromo, the Konsoid languages, the Dullay dialects, and so on. Nevertheless they differ from the other languages of their group in some important respects. In fact Lowland Cushitic is to be sub–divided in two main groups the first one just consists of Saho and Afar and could be called "Northern Lowland Cushitic", while the other one ("Southern Lowland Cushitic") encompasses all the remaining languages of the group. The most evident isoglosses that justify such a sub–division, are:

A) *in phonological respect*:

1) the preservation of the pharyngeals and
2) the development of the glottalized sounds in words of Cushitic origin;

B) *in morphological respect*:

3) the nearly total absence of the gender markers *k–* (for masculines) and *t–* (for feminines), which constitute one of the

most showy features of the rest of Lowland Cushitic, and consequently

4) the forms of the demonstratives and possessives that clearly diverge from those of the rest of Lowland Cushitic, and finally

5) the extension of the conjugation by prefixes and the consequent consolidation of the ablaut system connected with it, while the rest of Lowland Cushitic is just marked in its further development by a clear and consistent decomposition of the prefix conjugation;

C) *in syntactic respect*:

6) the absence of a focus system, as it exists in the other Lowland Cushitic languages such Somali, Konsoid, Dullay and so on (i.e. with a morpheme that either follows the noun phrase under focus or precedes the focussed verb complex respectively) and

7) the sequence of the elements within the noun phrase; in nearly all other Lowland Cushitic languages the governing noun takes the first place within the noun phrase, while its complements usually follow it. In Saho and Afar instead the governing noun as a rule follows its complements concluding in that way the noun phrase (for the structure of noun phrases in Saho and Afar see below).

Lexically Saho and Afar diverge from the rest of Lowland Cushitic more than those languages do from each other. The rest of Lowland Cushitic seems in fact to show a noteworthy lexical influence from Oromo which is, on the other hand, missing in Saho and Afar.

Of course the common (Lowland) Cushitic elements dominate to a great extent so that in spite of this relatively isolated position within the group, the affiliation of Saho–Afar to Lowland Cushitic cannot seriously be questioned. Saho–Afar is in fact steadily tied with it through Northern Somali with which it shares very numerous linguistic and cultural common features. The Northern Somali dialects act indeed as an intermedial link supplying Saho–Afar with a special state within this Cushitic sub–branch, but also rendering it in the same time a full member of it. The internal difference between Saho and Afar could be explained in a very over–simplified way by the observation that, while 'Afar was characterized in the course of its development by a strong influence

of Arabic, Saho instead rather underwent the influence of the Ethiosemitic languages of Northern Ethiopia and in a special way that of Tigrinnya. In agreement with this Afar seems to be linguistically closer to Somali than Saho is, always maintaining of course that Saho and Afar constitute a dialectal unity (Northern Lowland Cushitic).

2. THE MATERIAL

The material on which this paper is based was collected during a period of six months' field work in Ethiopia that I had the chance to do in 1984/85 within a project financed by the Stiftung Volkswagenwerk. In that occasion I had the chance to work on the Afar dialect of the Assab region and on the Saho Irob dialect. Yuusuf Yaasin acted as my main informant for Afar. He was a 24 year old student of international relations at the Addis Abeba University, born in Tio (District of Assab) and grown up in Assab. My main informant for Saho was Gaym Wolde–Giorgis, likewise a 26 year old student at the Addis Abeba University, who was born in ʻAlittenā (in the ʻAgāma District of the Ethiopian Province of Tigray). Since the age of eleven he had been living in Asmara (Eritrea). Both these informants quickly understood the questions I put them and turned out to be very cooperative. As both could speak fluently English, the material collection took place in English (with verification in Amharic) without any problems or difficulties. The cooperation and communication were excellent and they could not have been better.

3. PHONOLOGICAL NOTES AND TRANSCRIPTION SYSTEM

Before entering the real theme of this paper, it is, I think, in order to avoid misunderstandings, necessary to illustrate very briefly the phonological system of Saho and Afar and to spend a few words on the orthography adopted here.

The consonant inventory of Afar is quite poor in phonemes, indeed it consists only of 17 phonemes, cf.

	lab.	dent.	alv.	retroflex	pal.	vel.	glot.	phar.
stops	b	d		x		g		
		t				k		
fricatives								q
	f		s				h	c
nasals	m	n						
lateral		l						
rolled			r					
glides	w				y			

Apart from the dental retroflex *x* [*ɖ*] and the pharyngeals *q* [ʕ] and *c* [ħ], all the other sounds are familiar to the great part of European languages and thus have their own symbol in the Latin script. Problematic are instead the phonemes reported here as *x, q* and *c* that do not have any phonetic correspondence in the European languages, and for which there is consequently no symbol in the Latin orthography to write them. Afar writers nowadays tend more and more to transcribe these sounds, if they use the Latin script, by adopting the symbols that are applied here. This can be explained by the need to maintain a certain linguistic identity and to avoid a potential confusion with Somali which also possesses these phonemes and with which Afar shares a good part of its lexicon. According to the official Somali orthography the dental retroflex and the pharyngeals are transcribed by the symbols *dh* [*ɖ*], *c* [ʕ] and *x* [ħ] respectively. In order to preserve their linguistic identity the Afar people ought thus to choose other symbols. As a token of my respect for the people, whose language I am going to try to describe in this paper, I adopt here the orthography that the Afar people usually apply to their own language, although I personally find (perhaps because of a certain lack of imagination) that it is by far less favourable than the Somali one; especially the symbol *x* (other than *dh*) does not cause any association of a dental at all in my mind.

In order to avoid confusion and not to cause artificial differences that actually rely on a different spelling, between Saho and Afar, I also apply the orthography adopted here for Afar to the Saho sentences, thus also the Saho phonemes /*ɖ*/, /ʕ/ and /ħ/ are transcribed here for the sake of uniformity by the symbols *x, q* and *c* respectively. Saho, for its part, also shows, besides the 17

phonemes already reported above for Afar, a glottal stop (that could be, however, a phonetic variant of the pharyngeal *q*) and the three ejectives *t'* (voiceless dental ejective), *s'* (voiceless alveolar ejective) and *k'* (voiceless velar ejective) that entered into the phoneme inventory of the language by borrowing from Tigrinnya. The lateral /*l*/ is pronounced very darkly in the Saho dialect I studied and its realization corresponds to the Russian *l* in the syntagma ona čitala (she read). Nevertheless it phonologically corresponds to the respective Afar phoneme /*l*/.

The sound [*z*] (voiced alveolar fricative) only rarely occurs in the material I collected and this evidently in loans mainly from Arabic (in 'Afar) or from Tigrinnya (in Saho). [*ʃ*] (voiceless palato–alveolar fricative) instead does not occur at all in the Afar and Saho dialects, which this paper is based on. Consonant gemination is phonologically relevant both in Afar and in Saho and is graphically represented here by double writing of the symbol of the geminated consonant. Among the phonological rules I adduce here only the following ones because of their importance and their frequency in this paper:

1. intervocalic, not–geminated /*x*/ is realized as [*ɾ*] in Afar and Saho as well, cf.
   Saho/Afar   /*axaxe*/ [*'aɾaɾe*] "he shivered".
   In Saho the realization of /*x*/ as [*ɾ*] also takes place in word–initial position, cf.
   Saho   /*xiine*/ [*ɾi:ne*] "he slept";

2. x + t → *xx* (in both Saho and Afar), cf.
   Saho/Afar   *cax-* + *-te* → /*caxxe*/ [*ħadde*] "she spilled";

3. x + n → *nn* (in Saho), cf.
   Saho   *xaax-* + *-ne* → /*xaanne*/ "we intended";

4. x + n → *nx* (in Afar), cf.
   Afar   *gex-* + *-ne* → /*genxe*/ "we went",
                fax- + *-na* → /*fanxa*/ "we want";

5. d + t → *dd* (in both Saho and Afar), cf.
   Saho/Afar   *kud-* + *-te* → /*kudde*/ "she ran (away)"[1];

---

[1] In Afar this rule is not always effective, in fact it is some times replaced there by regressive consonant assimilation, cf.
   Afar   *rad–* + *–te* → *ratte*   (she fell) vs.
   Saho   *radde*   (id.).

6. s + t → *ss* (in both Saho and Afar), cf.
   Saho/Afar   *waris– + –te* → /*warisse*/ "she informed";

7. t + n → *nn* (in Saho), cf.
   Saho   *ugut– + –ne* → /*ugunne*/ "we stood up".

For further phonological and morphophonemic rules I refer here to Parker & Hayward (1985:215–218) for Afar and to Welmers (1952:152–154) for Saho.

Concerning the v o c a l i s m both Saho and Afar have the following vowels:

$$i \qquad\qquad u$$
$$e \qquad\quad o$$
$$a$$

Vowel quantity is phonologically relevant, thus the vowel system of both languages consists altogether of ten vocalic phonemes; long vowels are reported here by the repetition of their symbol, while the short ones are written singly. Centralized vowels (also including ə) have evidently no phonemic state and therefore they are not marked here. Vowel centralization mainly occurs in environment of pharyngeals (especially in Saho). Long vowels occurring in a closed syllable are often shortened in both Saho and Afar, e.g.

Saho/Afar   *oob–* (descend) →   *oobe* (he descended) vs.
                                    ob [*op*] (descend!);

Afar   *guur–* (move from a place to another) →
             guure (he moved from a place to another) vs.
             gur (move from a place to another!);

Saho   *ilaal–* (wait) →   *ilaale* (he waited) vs.
             ilal (wait!).

Tone marking is left out of consideration in this short paper, since in Saho and Afar, as also in Somali, the tone represents an important component, but mainly a phonetic one and its neglect by no way either prejudices the intelligibility of the single words or causes any misunderstandings. For the treatment of the tonal system and its behaviour in Afar I refer here to Parker & Hayward (1985:218–224).

4. CLAUSE STRUCTURE

As in the other Cushitic languages the most evident feature of the Saho and Afar syntax consists of the fact that the verb complex as a rule concludes the clause, while the noun phrase of the subject usually opens it, cf.

Saho/Afar *awki yemmeete*
the–boy came,

Saho *amay irri beeten*   Afar   *ta urri yokmen*
the children ate,   these children ate.

Equally, if the noun phrase of the subject consists of a pronoun:

Saho/Afar *anu xiine* (I slept).

This rule (concerning the position of the noun phrase of the subject), however, does not seem to be very rigidly applied in Saho. See below for examples, where the subject does not occupy the first place within the sentence. Finally the single complements are as a rule inserted between the noun phrase of the subject and the verb complex, cf.

Saho *amay awki mes'caf yiqiddige*
the boy a–book bought
(the boy bought a book),

Afar *awki kitab xaame*
the–boy a–book bought,
(id.)

Saho *(atu) qaxameqe awka tuble*
(you) nice girl saw
(you saw a nice girl),

Afar *(atu) meqe awka tuble*
(you) nice girl saw,
(id.)

Saho *toy numa amay awka xag tedeye*
that woman the girl to went
(that woman went to the girl),

Afar   *woo barra awka lekke gexxe*
              that woman girl to went,
              (id.)

Saho   *anu qaree–d ane*   Afar   *anu qari addal an*
              I house–in am   I house inside am
                            I am in the house.

If the sentence contains several complements, the sequence of these is from a syntactic point of view completely free in Saho, so that it is the speaker who in the last analysis determines the sequence of the noun phrases which are inserted between the subject and the verb complex, cf.

Saho   *usuk mas'caf toy numa–h yocoye*
              he book that woman–dat. gave
              (he gave a book to that woman)
  also   *usuk toy numa–h mas'caf yocoye* (id.),

              amay heyaw cado karra–h kitifan
              the people meat knife–instr. cut
              (the people cut the meat with a knife)
  also   *amay heyaw karra–h cado kitifan* (id.),

              amay irri Addis Abeba mankina–h yedeyin
              the children Addis Abeba car–instr. went
              (the children went to Addis Abeba by car)
  also   *amay irri mankina–h Addis Abeba yedeyin* (id.)
  also   *mankina–h Addis Abeba amay irri yedeyin* (id.),

              atu dagu maal harestaa–h sas'un–ud difeesse
              you some money peasant–dat. box–loc. put
              (you put some money for the peasant into the box)
  also   *atu harestaa–h sas'un–ud dagu maal difeesse* (id.).

In any case the sequence of the noun phrases following that of the subject seems to be influenced by pragmatic points of view according to the criterium which noun phrase is to be more stressed.

In Afar on the other hand, the sequence of the single complements seems rather to depend on more severe restrictions. As a rule the indirect object usually precedes the direct one, cf.

Afar
usuk woo barra–h kitab yece(–h)
he that woman–dat. book gave(–foc.)
(he gave a book to that woman),

is woo urru–h missila warisse(–h)
she those children–dat. tale told(–foc.)
(she told a tale to those boys),

although my material also contains a few sentences where it follows the noun phrase in object case, cf.

Afar
awka can wali–num– uh bacte
girl milk some–one–dat. brought
(the girl brought the milk to someone).

Otherwise the direct object usually precedes the other complements, that are not in the dative, cf.

direct object + ablative:
Afar
makaabanti kitab num– uk ma geenna
judge book man–abl. did–not–get
(the judge did not get the book from anybody),

oson dago lakoqo yo– k been
they some money me–abl. took
(they took some money from me),

but also ablative + direct object:
Afar
idalti weli–num– uk dago lakoqo bee(–h)
old–man some–one–from some money took(–foc.)
(the old man took some money from someone);

direct object + instrumental:
Afar
kay barra baab maftac– at fakte(–h)
his wife door key –instr. opened(–foc.)
(his wife opened the door with the key),

anu sara saabun–ut kaqalise
I cloth soap –instr. washed
(I washed the clothes with the soap),

but also instrumental + direct object:
Afar
is gira–t tet cararisse
she fire–instr. her burnt
(she burnt it with the fire);

direct object + locative:

Afar　　　　*atu dago lakoqo buqure–abeena–h sandug– ut hayte*
　　　　　　　you some money peasant–dat. box –loc. put
　　　　　　　(you put some money for the peasant into the box).

But also in Afar the sequence of the single complements does not seem to be very rigid, as the examples reported above show; here too, as in Saho, there is evidently a certain freedom in the ordering of the noun phrases of the single complements. In any case the basic rule of the Saho–Afar clause structure remains the principle that the noun phrase of the subject takes the first place within the sentence, while the verb complex concludes it.

Adverbs of manner preferably immediately precede the complex, although they can, of course, also be separated from this by other complements. Temporal adverbs usually immediately follow the noun phrase of the subject thus preceding the other complements, but this rule too is by no way very rigidly applied, so that one can say that also the adverbs are usually inserted between the noun phrase of the subject and the verb complex, but between these two poles thair position is quite free, cf.

Saho　　　　*amay heyaw xayih Addis Abeba makina–h yedeyin*
　　　　　　　the people recently Addis Abeba car–instr. went
　　　　　　　(the people recently went to Addis Abeba by car),

Afar　　　　*sinam xayih Qaddis Abeba makkina–t gexen*
　　　　　　　people recently Addis Abeba car–instr. went (id.),

Saho　　　　*amay heyaw kaado Addis Abeba makina–h addik–yanin*
　　　　　　　the people now Addis Abeba car–instr. going–are
　　　　　　　(the people are now going to Addis Abeba by car),

Afar　　　　*sinam away Qaddis Abeba makkina–t gexxah–yanin*
　　　　　　　people now Addis Abeba car–instr. going–are (id.),

Saho　　　　*labacayti amay cado karra–h qayniseh kitife*
　　　　　　　man the meat knife–instr. badly cut
　　　　　　　(the man cut badly the meat with a knife [preferred
　　　　　　　　　construction]),

　　　some other possible sequences are:
　　　　　　　labacayti amay cado qayniseh karra–h kitife (id.),
　　　　　　　labacayti qayniseh amay cado karra–h kitife (id.);

similarly in Afar:

preferred construction:

Afar   *num cado gile–t umamah yirgeqe* (id.)
            man meat knife–instr. badly cut,

other possible constructions:
            num cado umamah gile–t yirgeqe (id.),
            num umamah cado gile–t yirgeqe (id.).

Thus also concerning the position of the adverbs pragmatic points of view seem to play an important role.

Summing up: from what has been said above results that the Saho and Afar sentence presents a quite rigid SOV construction, where S stays for the noun phrase of the subject, V for the verb complex and O for the single complements, the sequence of which is syntactically free between the two poles S and V.

5. STRUCTURE OF THE NOUN PHRASE

As was said at the beginning of this paper, the structure of the noun phrase of Saho and Afar essentially differs from that of the other Lowland Cushitic languages and it rather bears resemblance to that of Burji–Sidamo and West Cushitic.

As usual the noun phrase can only consist of the governing noun, in that case case markers are suffixed to it, cf.

Saho/Afar   *awka*   (a boy, absolute case),
             awki   (a boy, subject case),
             awka–h   (to a boy, dative),
             agaboyta   (a woman, absolute case),
             agaboyta–h   (to a woman, dative),
                             and so on.

If the governing noun is qualified within the noun phrase by a complement (see below), this has on principle to precede it, while the governing noun assumes the necessary case marking. From that the following combinations result:

a) article [2] + governing noun:

Saho	*amay heyawto*	(the man, absolute case),
	amay heyawtu–h	(to the man, dative case),
Afar	*ama num*	(the man, absolute case),
	ama num–uh	(to the man, dative);

b) demonstrative + governing noun:

Saho	*o awka*	(that boy, absolute case),
	o awka xag	(to that boy, directive),
	tay qare	(this house, absolute case),
	tay qaree–ko	(from this house, ablative),
Afar	*woo num–uh*	(to that man, dative),
	a qari	(this house, absolute case),
	a qari–k	(from this house, ablative);

c) possessive + governing noun:

| Saho/Afar | *ku saga* | (your cow, absolute case), |
| | *ninni saga–h* | (to our cow, dative); |

d) adjective + governing noun:

Saho	*xex heyawto*	(a tall man, absolute case),
	xex heyawto xag	(to a tall man, directive),
	qaxameqe awka	(a nice girl, absolute case),
	qaxameqe awka xag	(to a nice girl, directive),
Afar	*xer num*	(a tall man, absolute case),
	xer num lekke	(to a tall man, directive),
	meqe awka	(a nice girl, absolute case),
	qusba qaruwa addal	(in the new houses, locative);

---

[2] Saho and Afar do not actually possess any morpheme that corresponds exactly to the article of the European languages. Thus what is called here "article" is rather a particle consisting either of a demonstrative (definite article) or of the numeral *inik* "one" (indefinite article) used in a similar way as the article is in the European languages. Though, especially in Afar, the definite and the indefinite article as well often remain without any correspondence in translations from an European language.

e) numeral + governing noun:

Saho	*lamma awka*	(two boys, absolute case)
Afar	*namma awka*	(id.),
Saho	*affara numa*	(four women, absolute case),
Afar	*affara barra*	(id.);

f) relative clause + governing noun:

Afar	*yemmeete num*	(the man who came, object case),
Saho	*yemmeete heyawto*	(id.),
	tohol tane awka xag there is girl to	(to the girl who is there, directive case),
Afar	*wookkel tan awka lekke* there is girl to;	(id.)

g) genitive + governing noun:

Saho	*awki gaala*	(the boy's camel),
	agaabi sara	(the clothes of the women),
	gaali can	(camel milk),
	awkah cangal	(the head of the girl),
Afar	*awki rakuubu*	(the boy's camel),
	agaabah sara	(the clothes of the women),
	alah cana	(camel milk),
	awkah amo	(the head of the girl).

The only part of speech that follows its governing noun are the prepositions. The former, however, formally consists of a genitive or an ablative governed by the preposition itself, cf.

Afar   *caxa–k amo–l*
tree–abl. head–loc.
(on the tree, lit. " on the head from the tree "),

caxa–k guba–l
tree–abl. bottom–loc.
(under the tree, lit. " on the bottom from the tree "),

qari–k darre–t
house–abl. back–loc.
(behind the house, lit. " on the back from the house "),

Saho	*caxa–t amu–k* tre–gen. head–abl. (on the tree, lit. "from the head of the tree"),
	caxa(–t) dab–al tree(–gen.) bottom–loc. (under the tree, lit. "on the bottom of the tree"),
	qar–i qaada house–gen. back (behind the house, lit. "the back of the house").

If the article or another demonstrative is used in a noun phrase, it usually precedes the adjective, cf.

Saho	*amay xex heyawto* the tall man (absolute case),	*amay qinxa awki* the little boy (subject case),
	toy qinxa awka that little girl (object case),	*tay qusub qaree–ko* this new house–abl. from this new house (abl.),
Afar	*ama xer num* the tall man (absolute case),	*ama qunxa awki* the little boy (subject case),
	woo qenxa awka–h that little girl–dat. (to that little girl, dative),	
	a qusba qari–k this new house–abl. (from this new house, ablative).	

Possessives also precede the adjective, if they are used in the same noun phrase. Thus the adjective is inserted between the possessive and the governing noun, which takes the case marking for the whole noun phrase, cf.

Saho	*kaa qaxameqe awka* his nice girl,	*ten xex qaxxeeta* their tall friends,
	sinni qusub qaruwa–d their new houses–loc. (in their new houses)	

Afar   *kay meqe awka*   *ken xer kataysis*
          his nice girl,   their tall friends,

          sinni qusba qaruwa addal
          their new houses inside
          (in their own new houses).

If the adjective is qualified by an Adverb, then it follows it, cf.

Saho   *gadah xex heyawto*   *gadah qenxa t'awla*
          (a) very tall man,   (a) very small table,

          gadah qaxameqe awka
          (a) very nice girl,

Afar   *kaxxam xer num*   *kaxxam qunxa tarbeeda*
          (a) very tall man,   (a) very small table,

          kaxxam meqe awka
          (a) very nice girl.

If the article (or another demonstrative) is added to that combination, then it takes the first place within the noun phrase, cf.

Saho   *amay gadah qenxa*   *amay gadah qaxameqe awka*
             t'awla
          the very small table,   the very nice girl,

Afar   *inki kaxxam qunxa*   *ama kaxxam qunxa tarbeeda*
             tarbeeda
          a very small table,   the very small table.

Though its application is quite rare in such cases, especially in Afar where it is, in any case, understood. If instead of the article or a demonstrative the noun phrase contains a possessive, it is this that occupies the first place within it, cf.

Saho   *kaa gadah xex qaxxi*   *ten gadah qaxameqe qaxxeeta*
          his very tall friend,   their very nice friends,

Afar   *kay kaxxam xer kataysa* *ken kaxxam meqe kataysis*
          his very tall friend,   their very nice friends.

If the noun phrase contains both a demonstrative (or the article) and a possessive as well, then the former precedes the latter, cf.

Saho   *tay kaa xex qaxxi*
                this his tall friend
                (this tall friend of him),

                toy ten xex qaxameqe qaxxeeta
                those their tall nice friends
                (those tall and nice friends of them),

Afar   *a kay xer kataysa*
                this his tall friend
                (this tall friend of him),

                woo ken xeer–ih meqe kataysis
                those their tall–and nice friends
                (those tall and nice friends of them),

but also *woo xeer–ih meqe ken kataysis* (id.).

Within a noun phrase numerals take the same position as adjectives do, cf.

Saho   *amay lamma awki*   *toy koona awka*
                the two boys   those five girls
                (subject case),   (object case),

                inni adooca qaxxi xag
                my three friend dir.
                (to my three friends, directive),

Afar   *woo koona baxuwa*   *a tabna mara*
                those five girls   these ten persons
                (object case),   (absolute case),

                yi sidiica kataysis lekke
                my three friends dir.
                (to my three friends, directive)

but also *sidiica yi kataysis lekke* (id.).

As usual in Ethiopian languages, relative clauses are free so far their position within the noun phrase is concerned. Nevertheless, if they act as the sole complement of the governing noun, then they usually precede it, see above for examples. This sequence does not change, even if an article or another demonstrative is added to it, in fact this latter precedes both the relative clause and the governing noun, cf.

Saho   *toy yemmeete heyawto*
the came man
(the man who came, object),

amay tuble awka–h
the you–saw boy–benef.
(for the boy you saw, benefactive case),

tay yemmeetiinih–yanin irro–k
these having–come–are boys–dat.
(to these boys who had come, dative),

Afar   *woo yemmeete num–uh*
that came man–dat.
(to that man who came, dative),

a temmeete awka
this came girl
(this girl who came, subject).

But such combinations (with demonstratives) are quite rare in Afar, since the demonstrative (or the article) is mostly omitted there, cf.

Afar   *yemmeete num* (the man who came, object),
tuble awka–h (for the boy you saw, benefactive case)

cf. above the corresponding version of these syntagmas in Saho.

If the governing noun is qualified by other elements besides the relative clause, then this is as a rule either placed first, cf.

Saho   *awka sabaqe kaa xex qaxxi*
child beat his tall friend
(his tall friend who beat the child),

toy masmur abte tay kaa awka
that song made this his girl
(this girl of him who sang the song),

felo yo–h bacte ten xex qaxxeeta
food me–to brought their tall friends
(their tall friends who brought me some food).

Afar   *awka yogore kay xer kataysa*
child beat his tall friend
(his tall friend who beat the child),

gad abte a kay awka
song made this his girl
(this girl of him who sang the song),

maaqo yo–h bace ku qunxa meqe baxu
food me–to brought your little nice daughters
(your nice little daughters who brought me some
food),

or more often countersigned by a "relative marker" (reported here
in the interlinear translation as "rel.") and postponed to the
governing noun, cf.

Saho   *kaa xex qaxxi awka sabaqe–ya*
                his tall friend child beat–rel.
                (his tall friend who beat the child),

                tay... kaa awka toy masmur abte–ye
                this... his girl the song made–rel.
                (this... girl of him who sang the song),

                ten xex qaxxeeta felo yo–h bacte–ya
                their tall friends food me–to brought–rel.
                (their tall friends who brought me food),

Afar   *kay xer kataysa–y awka yogore*
                his tall friend–rel. child beat
                (his tall friend who beat the child),

                a... kay awka–yi gad abte
                this... his girl–rel. song made
                (this... girl of him who sang the song),

                a qunxa meqe ku baxuwu–y maaqo yo–h bace
                this little nice your daughters–rel. food me–to
                   brought
                (your nice little daughters who brought me some
                food).

Although the noun phrase ends with an inflected verb form
(and thus looks like a sentence), the morphemes *–ya/–ye* (in Saho)
and *–y(i)* (in Afar) signaled to the hearer that he is faced with a
relative clause, so that misunderstandings are easily avoided.

For Saho also relative clauses inserted between further
elements of the noun phrase and its governing noun have been

quite seldom recorded. In this last case they are not countersigned by any relative marker, cf.

Saho   *kaa xex awka sabaqe qaxxi*
            his tall child beat friend
            (his tall friend who beat the child).

6. STRUCTURE OF THE VERB COMPLEX

As we have already seen above, the verb complex usually concludes the clause in Saho–Afar. As a rule it consists at least of an inflected form that has to agree with the subject of the clause in person, number and gender (only by the 3rd person singular). In the inflected form mood, tense, aspect and the kind of action (progressive, ingressive, etc.) are to be coded. As in other Cushitic languages, also in Saho and Afar the inflected form usually represents the last element of the verb complex and thus that of the whole clause, cf.

Saho   *awka dagu baani beetak tane*
            girl some bread eating is
            (the girl is eating some bread),

Afar   *awka dago baani takmeh tan*
            girl some bread eating is.
            (id.)

In this example the verb complex consists of the sequence "*beetak tane*" (Saho) and "*takmeh tan*" (Afar) respectively. The inflected form concluding the verb complex, i.e. tane/tan, agrees with the subject of the sentence (*awka* "girl") in number (singular), person (3rd) and gender (feminine). The ending –e (in Saho) points out that we are dealing with an indicative form (subjunctive and jussive have other endings in these languages) and the ablaut in –a– reveals that *tane/tan* is a present form. If the verb complex contains an auxiliary, then this usually makes up the inflected form, while the main verb appears either in the subjunctive, cf.

Saho   *atu dagu cado beetto gurta*
            (you want to eat some meat)
    cf.   *beetto* (subjunctive form of *beet*– "eat"),

usuk dagu baani beeyo xiqa
(he can take some bread)

cf.   *beeyo* (subjunctive form of *bey*– "take"),

Afar   *oson xiinoonu faxan*
(they want to sleep)

cf.   *xiinoonu* (subjunctive form of *xiin*– "sleep"),

isin xiintoonu duudden
(you, pl., could sleep)

cf.   *xiintoonu* (subjunctive form of *xiin*– "sleep"),

or in the gerund, cf.

Saho   *anu cado beytak ine*
I meat eating was
(I used to eat meat),

atu yi mas'caf beyteh tine
you my book having–taken were
(you had taken my book),

Afar   *anu xiinak ene*
I sleping was
(I used to sleep),

atu gexxeh tan
you having–gone are
(you have gone),

or embedded in a subordinate clause (see below), cf.

Saho   *atu yi mas'caf beytam gurta*
(you want to take my book, lit. "you want that you
    take...""),

isin xiinaanam guran
(they want to sleep, lit. "they want that they sleep"),

Afar   *oson xiinaanam duudan*   (they can sleep),
atu gexxam faxxa   (you want to go).

or in the infinitive, cf.

Saho   *atu dagu cado bee–lito*
(you'll take some meat),

	isi yi mas'caf beeye waytoy
	(she shall/may not take my book!)
cf.	*bee(ye)* (infinitive form of *bey–* "take"),

Afar *is xiine waytay*
(she shall/may not sleep)

cf. *xiine* (infinitive form of *xiin–* "sleep"),

atu yoo cate waytaa–mal...
if you had not helped me...

cf. *cate* (infinitive form of *cat–* "help").

If the verb is negated, the negation (ma "not") immediately precedes the inflected form, cf.

Saho *isi mas'caf yo–h ma beenna*
she book me–for not did–take
(she did not take the book for me),

anu laye aqubik maane
I water drinking not–am
(I am not drinking the water),

atu dagu baani beete ma–lito
you any bread to–eat not–have
(you will not eat any bread),

Afar *is kitab yo–h ma bacinna*
she book me–for not did–bring
(she did not bring the book for me),

anu lee aqubih maan
I water drinking not–am
(I am not drinking the water),

nanu xiinnu ma wayna
(we are not going to sleep).

7. EXPRESSION OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

Subordinate clauses function in Saho-Afar as a kind of "verb complement", as such they therefore are usually embedded within the principal clause that governs them, cf.

Saho   *nanu usuk worak'at as'cefik–yine–m noobbe*
            we he letter writing–was–obj. we–heard
            (we heard that he was writing a letter),

Afar   *nanu usuk guwab aktabuk–yene–m noobbe*
            we he letter writing–was–obj. we–heard
            (id.)

The subordinate clauses "*usuk worak'at as'cefik–yine*" (Saho) and "*usuk guwab aktabuk–yene*" (Afar) form the direct object of the verb (of the principal clause) *noobbe* (we heard) and therefore their place in the sentence is between the noun phrase of the subject (*nanu*) and the verb complex (*noobbe*). Only rarely in Saho and Afar do subordinate clauses also precede the subject of the principal clause, cf.

Saho   *...oobnee–nko lakal, amay heyawti toy cakk'e yo–k*
            iyye
            ...we–descended–after, the man the truth me–to said
            (after we had descended..., the man told me the truth),

Afar   *a baaxo–l an–uk tet meqe maaqo yo–l temqe*
            this country–loc. liv–ing her good food me–loc.
            was–good
            (living in this country I enjoyed its good food)
            (lit. "her good food was good to me").

According to the kind of subordinate clauses and according to the morphemes that introduce (or better conclude) them, the subordinate clauses of Northern Lowland Cushitic can be classified as follows:

a) objective clauses,   *b*) relative clauses,
c) temporal clauses,   *d*) causal clauses,
e) conditional clauses,   *f*) final clauses,
g) indirect interrogative clauses.

The internal structure of subordinate clauses does not essentially differ from that of the principal clauses. The noun phrase of the subject occupies the first place, while the verb complex concludes the subordinate clause and finally all the other complements are inserted between the subject and the verb complex. The sequence of the complements is, as we have already

seen for the principal clauses, syntactically free and varies according to pragmatic principles (see above the structure of the main clauses). The agreement of the first two persons that often characterizes the verb forms of the subordinate clauses in the languages belonging to the Western Cushitic branch, does not however seem to occur in Saho–Afar.

7.1. *Objective Clauses*

Objective clauses correspond in Saho–Afar to a (long) object complement and as such they are embedded between the subject and the verb complex of the principal clause governing them. In these languages they are marked by means of the morpheme –(V)m (cf. the ending *–am that served to mark the object case in the noun inflection of Old Cushitic and that still exists in Ari–Banna as –am and in West Cushitic as –n). This is suffixed to the inflected verb form of the subordinate clause marking so its end, cf.

Saho   *anu atu Addis Abeba iba–h tedeye–m oobbe*
I you Addis Abeba foot–on you–went–obj. I–heard
(I heard that you went on foot to Addis Abeba),

              isi dagu baani amay heyawto–ko xaamte–m maskot–ko ubleh ane
she some bread the man –abl. bought–obj. window–abl. having–seen I–am
(I have seen through the window that she bought some bread from the man),

              beera dagu felo timherti–beet–il beete–lito–m akkale
tomorrow some food learning–house–loc. you'll–eat–obj. I–thought
(I think that you'll eat some food tomorrow in the school),

Afar   *anu atu Qaddis Abeba iba–h gexxe–m oobbe(–h)*
I you Addis Abeba foot–on you–went–obj. I–heard(–foc.)
(I heard that you went on foot to Addis Abeba),

              anu is dago baani num–uk xaamte–m taagat–ak uble
I she some bread man–abl. bought–obj. window–abl. I–saw
(I saw through the window that she bought some bread from the man),

> *anu atu beera iskoolla–l dago maaqo akmeetto–m
> akkale*
> I you tomorrow school–loc. some food you'll–eat–obj.
> I–thought
> (I think that you'll eat some food tomorrow in the
> school).

7.2. *Relative Clauses*

Saho and Afar do not seem to have any relative pronouns, but only a relative marker that countersings the relative clause, if its governing noun precedes it. The syntactic function that the noun governing the relative clause assumes in the main clause does not seem to have any influence on the form or on the position taken by the single elements within the relative clause. If the governing noun is not the subject of the relative clause, this can easily be detected, because the latter is either explicitly expressed in the clause itself, where it takes the first place, or it is in any case coded in the inflected verb form, cf.

Saho	*amay usuk deeqe heyawto* the he called man (the man he called),
Afar	*usuk yuble num* he saw man (the man he saw).
Saho	*toy tuble awka–h* (for the boy you saw),
Afar	*tuble awka–h* (id.).

In the first two examples the presence of the pronoun *usuk* (he) clarifies that the governing noun cannot be the subject of the relative clause, because otherwise *usuk* would be replaced by the (object) form *kaa* (him), cf.

Saho/Afar   *kaa yuble awka*   (the boy who saw him).

In the last two examples it is the verb form (i.e. *tuble*) that clarifies that the governing noun cannot be the subject of the relative clause, since there is no agreement between the two elements (tuble refers to the 2nd person singular, while *awka*

requests the agreement with the 3rd person masculine singular).
Indeed if *awka* (the boy) were the subject of the relative clause it
governs, then its verb form would be *yuble* (instead of *tuble*, as it
is), cf.

Saho	*amay yuble awka*	(the boy who saw it),
Afar	*yuble awka*	(id.).

Relative clauses that follow their governing noun are always
marked in my material by a relative marker *–ya/–ye* (in Saho) and
–y(i) (in Afar) respectively. In Saho *–ya/–ye* concludes the relative
clause, while in Afar *–y(i)* is directly suffixed to the noun
governing the relative clause that it precedes.

Numerous examples illustrating the structure of relative clauses
and the position that they take within the noun phrase in Saho
and Afar can be easily found above in the paragraph on the
"Structure of the noun phrase", here only one further example is
reported on this theme, cf.

Saho   *toy dagu baani isi numa–h xaame heyawto tuble-ho?*
            the   some   bread   his   wife–benef,   bought   man
              you–saw–quest.
            (did you see the man who bought some bread for his
             wife?)

Afar   *dago baani isi barra–h xaame num may tublee?*
             some   bread   his   wife–benef.   bought   man   quest.
              you–saw?
            (id.)

7.3. *Temporal Clauses*

Temporal clauses sharing the same subject with the principal
clause that governs them, are usually expressed in Saho–Afar, as in
other Ethiopian languages, by means of a gerundial construction.
There are two different kinds of gerundial constructions according
to whether the temporal clause chronologically precedes its
principal clause (perfect gerund) or simultaneously happens with it
(imperfect gerund). In both cases condition for the application of
gerundial constructions in Saho–Afar, as usual in languages of the
Ethiopian cultural area, seems to be that the subject of both
actions (that expressed by the gerundial form and that of the
principal clause) must be the same.

Gerundial constructions are used in Ethiopian languages to express two or more actions in succession and thus to string several verb forms one after another. If the actions happen at the same time, then the verb of the first ones is inflected in the imperfect gerund and that of the last one in the indicative, cf.

Saho   *beytak difeye*
            eating I–sat
            (I sat down and ate),

Afar   *xiinak kaarisa*
            sleeping he–snores
            (he sleeps and snores),

Saho   *agabi sirray axcenik carid kaa–ko aban*
            women wheat grinding flour it–abl. make
            (the women grind the wheat and make flour of it, i.e.
            while the women grind the wheat, they make flour of
                it).

Afar   *agaaba sirnay riyak bulul aka–k abaan–ah*
            women wheat grinding flour it–abl. make–foc.
            (id.)

If instead the actions take place at a different time, then the verb of that one which happens first is coded in the perfect gerund, while the verb of the more recent one is inflected in the indicative, cf.

Saho   *yedeyeh essere*
            having–gone he–asked
            (he went and asked),

            ugunneh nedeye
            having–stood–up we–went
            (we stood up and went),

            isi koo–ya dagu baani beettisseh dagu laye–le ku tefeqe
            she you–obj. some bread having–fed some water–
                comit. you let–drink
            (she let you first eat some bread and then drink some
                water),

Afar   *gexeh essere*
            having–gone he–asked
            (he went and asked),

soolleh genxe
having–stood–up we–went
(we stood up and went),

is dago baani koo toskomeeh dago lee koo tefqe
she some bread you having–fed some water you
    let–drink
(she let you first eat some bread and then drink some
    water).

In spite of the interdependence between the verb in the gerund
and that of the principal clause (they must have the same subject),
the former does not belong to the verb complex of the latter. The
gerundial construction has, in any case, to precede the verb
complex of the principal clause. Indeed as some of the examples
reported above illustrate, it is certainly possible that between the
gerundial form and the verb complex complements (i.e. noun
phrases) are inserted, if these are governed by the verb of the
principal clause. Complements governed by the gerundial form
instead must always precede it, so that constructions such

Saho *agabi axcenik sirray carid kaa–ko aban*
    the women grind the wheat and make flour of it,

    *isi beettisseh koo–ya dagu baani dagu laye–le ku
     tefeqe*
    she let you eat some bread and drink some water,

Afar *agaaba riyak sirnay bulul akak abaanah*
    the women grind the wheat and make flour of it,

    is toskomeeh dago baani koo dago lee koo tefqe
    she let you eat some bread and drink some water;

are not possible according to the syntactic rules of Saho and Afar.
For the correct word order of these sentences see above.

If the sentence contains more than one gerundial phrase, these
are tied to each other either by a conjunction or by ordering them
one after another, cf.

Saho *maysitak–kee axaxak geqa–t daqabah datteye*
    fearing–and quivering quarrel–loc. about he–discussed
    while he was quivering with fear, he discussed the
     quarrel,

maqado yigdileenih yi qaree–d sayeenih baxeexa geen–im inkoh been

door having–broken my house–loc. having–entered thieves they–found–what all they–took

(after the thieves had broken the door and entered my house, they took all what they found),

Afar   *usuk meesitak–kay axaxak qeebi–t walale*

he fearing–and quivering quarrel–loc. discussed

(while he was quivering with fear, he discussed the quarrel),

garaqaleela baab yiggileenih yi qari culeenih geen–im been

thieves door having–broken my house having–entered they–found–what took

(after the thieves had broken the door and entered my house, they took what they found).

If the subject of the temporal clause is not the same as that of the principal one, then the temporal clause is expressed by means of a conjunction that concludes it. Thereby for the internal construction of the temporal clause the general syntactic rules that we have already seen above (i.e. subject at the beginning of the clause, verb complex at its end and the other complements between both elements) fully preserve their validity. As in English, the choice of the conjunction that concludes the temporal clause depends on its sense and function. The conjunction "after" corresponds in Saho to the expressions *lak–al* (on foot, in the retinue) or *sarra–h* (at the back) that govern the ablative. Thus the whole temporal clause is firstly turned into a single complement by the nominalizing morpheme $-Vm$ (see here above the objective clauses) and then is marked by the ablative ending *–ko* followed by the posposition lakal or sarrah, cf.

Saho   *isi dooba–lih dagu felo usuk beetee–n–ko lakal, anu inni numa xag qare–h edeye*

his–friends–comit. some food he ate–compl.–abl. after, I my wife direct. house–benef. went

(after he had eaten some food with his friends, I went home to my wife),

> *gadde nedeyee–n–ko sarrah, amay heyawti toy cakk'e*
>   *yo–k iyye*
> river we–went–compl.–abl. after, the man the truth
>   me–dat. said
> (after we had gone to the river, the man told me the
>   truth).

In Afar the nominalizer *–Vm–* is usually omitted, the temporal clause appears therefore only marked by the ablative ending *–k*. In Afar too the "postposition" governing the temporal clause is *lakal*, cf.

Afar *aabba–lluk a cagidi–t yabnee–k lakal, andabbeenno*
      boss–comit. this matter–loc. we–spoke–abl. after,
        we'll–come–back,
      (after we have spoken to the boss about this matter,
        we'll come back)

      weqaytu fan genxee–k lakal, num numma yo–h warse
      river dir. we–went–abl. after, man truth me–dat.
        referred
      (after we had gone to the river, the man told me the
        truth).

The conjunction "when" is rendered in Saho either by the noun gul (time), that formally governs a relative clause (and that can thus be translated into English by "the time at which…") or by the "postposition" *daqab–al* (in the position of) governing the genitive case [3]. Examples illustrating the application of gul (time) in its function of temporal conjunction are:

Saho *anu inni numa–lih engeqe gul, tee–ko enfetece*
      I my wife–comit. quarreled time, her–abl. divorced
      (when I quarreled with my wife, I divorced her),

      dike gace gul, isi cuggayti–h baxa s'irga–l gee
      home he–came–back time, his neighbour's daughter
        road–loc. met
      (when he came back home, he met on the way the
        daughter of his neighbour).

By using the locative form *daqab–al* (in the position of) the whole temporal clause must be as usual turned into a complement by the nominalizing morpheme *–(V)m–* that immediately precedes the genitive ending, cf.

Saho   *anu inni numa–lih engeqe–m–ih daqabal, tee–ko enfetece*

I   my   wife–comit.   quarreled–compl.–gen.   when, her–abl. divorced

(when I quarreled with my wife, I divorced her),

ku daqab–ah tay ware oobbe–m–ih daqabal, ingerrime
your position–gen. this news I–heard–compl.–gen. when, I–wondered

(when I heard this news about you, I was astonished).

In Afar "when" is rendered by the locative morpheme *–kkel* (in the place in which) suffixed to the inflected verb form of the temporal clause and completed by the particle elle that is instead inserted in it immediately preceding its verb complex, cf.

Afar   *anu inni barra–llih elle oome–kkel, woo–waqdi–k tet cabe*

I my wife–comit. quarreled–when, that–time–at her left

(when I quarreled with my wife, I suddenly left her)

vs.   *anu inni barra–llih oomeh woo–waqdik tet cabe*
after I had quarreled with my wife, I suddenly left her (gerundial construction),

ku gidinnak a xaagu elle oobbe–kkel, itqijjibeh
you about this news I–heard–when, I–wondered

(when I heard this news about you, I was astonished).

The conjunction "while" is likewise rendered in Saho by the noun gul (time). Nevertheless this last kind of clause differs from those governed by "when" in the verb form of the subordinate clause; indeed this is usually progressive or anyway aspectually imperfective in clauses governed by "while", cf.

Saho   *tay baaxo–l marak–ine gul, tee meqe felo ikceyne*
this country–loc. living–I–was time, her good food I–loved

(while I was living in this country, I enjoyed its good food),

vs.   *tay baaxol mare gul*
       (when I lived in this country, punctual action)...,

       usuk amah ayih–yine gul, saga amahaaneyka timibice
       he so saying–he–was time, cow soon was–sold
       (while he was saying so, the cow was soon sold),

       dike gacak–yine gul, isi cuggayti–h baxa s'irga–l gee
       home coming–back–he–was time, his neighbour's
          daughter road–loc. met
       (while he was coming back home, he met on the way
          the daughter of his neighbour).

My material unfortunately contains only one record concerning the use of the conjunction "while" in Afar (i.e. *–ih*), namely

Afar   *usuk toh axc–ih, saga xayih limmoote*
        he so say–while, cow soon was–sold
        (while he was saying so, the cow was soon sold).

Thus I refer here to Bliese (1981:74) for further examples. All the other sentences constructed with the conjunction "while" that I submitted to my informant, were translated to me either by means of the imperfect gerund, since they had the agreement of the subject with that of the principal clause, or by using the suffix *–kkel* (see above for the introduction of this morpheme), cf.

Afar   *a baaxo–l an–uk tet meqe maaqo yo–l temqe*
        this country–loc. liv–ing her good food me–loc.
           was–good
        (while I was living in this country, I enjoyed its good
           food, lit. "..., its good food was good for me"),

        usuk buxa–h andabbuk sugak gita–l cuggaane–h baxa gee
        he home–dat. coming–back keeping way–loc.
           neighbour–gen. daughter met
        (while he was coming back home, he met the
           daughter of his neighbour on the way)

or

> *usuk   buxa–h   andabbuk   elle   sugee–kkel,   gita–l*
> *cuggaane–h baxa gee*
> he home–dat. coming–back he–kept–when, way–loc.
>   neighbour's daughter met.
> (id.)

Also for the only while–sentence reported here I noted an alternative version containing a gerundial construction, cf.

Afar   *usuk toh axc–uk saga xayih limmoote*
        he so say–ing cow soon was–sold
        (while he was saying so, the cow was soon sold).

This version is quite amazing, as the primary condition for the use of gerundial constructions, i.e. the agreement of the subject of the gerundial form with that of the principal clause (cf. also Parker/Hayward 1985:256: "the subject of a non–final clause containing a K–participle must be the same as that of the final clause"), is not fulfilled here. In any case the sentence reported above seems also to be the only record occurring in my Afar material that contradicts this rule, but also see Bliese (1981:73).

7.4. *Causal clauses*

Causal clauses are formed, like other subordinate clauses, by means of a morpheme that concludes them. In Saho this morpheme consists of the noun *hixxa* (cause/reason) inflected in the benefactive case (thus *hixxa–h* "for the reason of"). For its part *hixxa* request that the causal clause is marked at its end by the nominalizer *–(V)m*, cf.

Saho   *tee maal dangaheytak yine–m hixxa–h kurrayte*
        her money becoming–little was–compl. cause–benef.
          worried
        (as her money was getting less and less, she worried).

In Afar the way of expressing causal clauses corresponds to that of Saho, however two differences are to be taken into consideration, namely: instead of *hixxa* Afar people use the lexeme *sabbata* (cause/reason) which is equally inflected in the benefactive case (thus *sabbata–h*) and secondly the causal conjunction (i.e. *sabbatah* "because") requests the genitive marker *–ih* after the nominalizer *–Vm*, cf.

Afar   *anu inni barra–llih oomee–m–ih sabbatah woo–waqdi–k*
               tet cabe
               I   my   wife–comit. quarreled–compl.–gen. because
               that–time–at her I–left·
               (as I quarreled with my wife, I suddenly divorced
               her)

        vs.   *anu inni barra–llih oomeh woo–waqdi–k tet cabe*
               after I had quarreled with my wife, I suddenly left
               her (gerundial construction)

        vs.   *anu inni barra–llih elle oome–kkel, woo–waqdi–k tet*
               cabe
               when I quarreled with my wife, I suddenly left her
               (temporal clause);

               is lakoqo teet–ik daggootee–m–ih sabbatah tucsube
               her money her–abl. diminished–compl.–gen. because
               worried
               (as her money was getting less and less, she worried)

        vs.   *is lakoqo teet–ik elle daggoote–kkel, tucsube*
               when her money got less, she worried (temporal
               clause).

7.5. *Conditional clauses*

Hypothetic clauses are formed in Saho and Afar by placing
the protasis before the apodosis. Thereby the protasis usually ends
with something acting as a conditional conjunction. As in other
Ethiopian languages there are also three different kinds of
hypothetic clauses in Saho–Afar according to the criterium whether
the set condition can be fulfilled or not, and in positive cases how
probable its fulfilment is. From what has been said above the
following classification results:

a) hypothetic clauses containing a condition that is likely to be
   fulfilled;

b) hypothetic clauses containing a condition that can be fulfilled,
   but is unlikely to be and

c) hypothetic clauses (unreal conditionals) containing a condition
   that cannot be fulfilled.

The clauses under *a*), which are also the simplest and most common conditionals of all, are expressed in Saho and Afar by marking the whole protasis with an ablative ending that thus acts as a conditional conjunction. In Saho the ablative marking requests, however, that the protasis is turned into a "noun complement" and this is done by means of the nominalizing marker *–(V)m–* that immediately precedes the ablative ending. The inflected verb form of the protasis appears in the perfect, even if it concerns the future, while that of the apodosis is as a rule aspectually imperfective and mostly in future, cf.

Saho   *atu yi cattimte–m–ko, mas'caf ko–caye–liyo* [4]
              you me helped–compl.–abl., book you–give–I–shall
              (if you help me, I'll give you a book),

              anu ku cattime–m–ko, mas'caf yo–caye–lito [5]
              I you helped–compl.–abl., book me–give–you–will
              (if I help you, you'll give me a book),

              atu yi cattime wayte–n–ko, mas'caf ko–caye ma liyo
              you me to–help failed–compl.–abl., book you–give
                 not I–shall
              (if you don't help me, I'll not give you a book).

In Afar the nominalizer *–(V)m–* is omitted, thus only the ablative ending *–k* acts as a conditional conjunction in that language. The verb of the protasis appears, like in Saho, in the perfect, while that of the apodosis is usually inflected in the imperfect, cf.

Afar   *atu yoo catte–k, kitab ko–h ace*
              you me helped–abl., book you–dat. I–give
              (if you help me, I'll give you a book),

              oson sin cateeni–k, kitab keen–ih tacen
              they you helped–abl., book them–dat. you–give
              (if they help you (pl.), you'll give them a book),

[4] Contracted form from *ko–h acaye–liyo*
                        you–dat. give–I–have (I'll give you).
[5] Contracted form from *yo–h acaye–lito*
                        me–dat. give–you–have (you'll give me).

isin yoo cate wayteeni–k, kitab siin–ih maaca[6]
you me to–help failed–abl., book you–dat. not–I–give
(if you (pl.) don't help me, I'll not give you a book).

The conditionals under *b*) are constructed in Saho by means
of the conjunction *–ado* (if) that, as expected, concludes the
protasis. The verb complex of the apodosis consists of the main
verb in its infinitive form, to which the auxiliary *xaax–* (almost
do/intend) is added. *Xaax–* is inflected in the perfect. The verb of
the protasis instead appears in the imperfect and, as already
mentioned above, is completed by the conditional conjunction
–ado, cf.

Saho *usuk tee cattimaa–do, mas'caf aka–caye*[7] *xaaxxe*
he her he–helps–if, book him–to–give she–intended
(if he helped her, she would give him a book),

nanu sin cattimnaa–do, mas'caf no–h baace xaaxxen
we   you   we–help–if,   book   we–dat.   to–bring
    you–intended
(if we helped you (pl.), you would bring us a book),

*atu yi cattime waytaa–do, mas'caf ko–caye ma
    xaaxinna*
you me to–help fail–if, book you–to–give not
    intended
(if you did not help me, I would not give you a
    book).

In Afar the conditionals under *b*) are constructed by means of
the auxiliary *way–* (be in need) which is inflected in the perfect.
Way– immediately precedes the ablative marker of the protasis.
The main verb of the protasis appears instead in subjunctive and
for its part precedes *way–*, while the verb of the apodosis is
conjugated in simple future, cf.

Afar *atu yoo cattu wayte–k, anu kitab ko–h aceeyyo*
you me help would–abl., I book you–dat. I'll–give
(if you helped me, I would give you a book),

---

[6] Contracted form from *ma aca*
            not I–give (I don't give).
[7] Contracted form from *aka–h acaye*
            him–dat. to–give (to give him).

nanu sin catnu wayne–k, isin kitab ne–h aceetton
we you help would–abl., you book we–dat. will–give
(if we helped you (pl.), you would give us a book),

*isin nee cate waytoonu wayteen–ek, nanu kitab siin–ih
   ma naca*
you us to–help fail would–abl., we book you–dat. not
   we–give
(if you, pl., did not help us, we would not give you a
   book).

Conditionals built with the verb form *tekke–k* (if it becomes
that...), as illustrated by Bliese (1981:77–78), do not occur in my
Afar material (but see below the expression of unreal hypothetic
clauses in Saho), although such constructions are not unusual in
Ethiopian languages.

The unreal conditionals are characterized in Saho by the
presence of the perfect gerund. The protasis ends with the
conjunction *–ado* (if) immediately preceded by the imperfect of the
verb *–ekk–* (become). The main verb appears, as already mentioned
above, in the perfect gerund which is, as usual, inflected according
to the person acting as subject. The verb of the apodosis insetad,
besides of the perfect gerund of the main verb, also consists of the
infinitive of the the verb *–in–* (be), i.e. *anye* (to be), and of the
auxiliary *xaax–* (almost do, intend) that is regularly inflected in the
perfect, cf.

Saho   *anu ku cattimeh akkee–do, mas'caf yo–h tocoyeh anye
                 xaaxxe*
              I you having–helped I–become–if, book me–dat.
                 having–given to–be you–intended
              (if I had helped you, you would have given me a
                 book)

vs.   *anu ku cattimeh akkee–do, mas'caf yo–h acaye xaaxxe*
              I you having–helped I–become–if, book me–dat.
                 to–give you–intended,
              (if I had helped you, you would give me a book)
              *isi ni cattimteh takkee–do, mas'caf aka–h nocoyeh anye
                 xaanne*
              she us having–helped she–becomes–if, book her–dat.
                 having–given to–be we–intended,
              (if she had helped us, we would have given her a
                 book)

> *atu yi cattimteh akke waytaa–do, mas'caf ko–h ocoyeh
> anye ma xaaxinniyo*
> you me having–helped to–become fail–if, book
>   you–dat. having–given to–be not I–intended.
> (if you had not helped me, I would not have given
>   you a book).

In Afar it is the locative marker *–Vl* that acts as the conditional conjunction and thus functionally corresponds to Saho *–ado*. The morpheme *–Vl* as a rule concludes the protasis. By its suffixation the protasis is nominalized by the morpheme *–Vm–*. From the combination of *–Vm–* and *–Vl* the ending *–Vmal* (sometimes also *–Vmil*) results. This is added to the verb of the protasis which is inflected in the imperfect indicative. The apodosis, on the other hand, uses the verb *–en–* (be) as auxiliary and requests that the main verb is conjugated in the imperfect gerund, while *–en–* iteself appears in the perfect, cf.

Afar

> *anu koo cataa–m–al, atu kitab yo–h acay–uk ten*
> I you help–compl.–loc., you book me–dat. giv–ing
>   you–were
> (if I had helped you, you would have given me a
>   book),
>
> *is nee cattaa–m–al, nanu kitab teet–ih acay–uk nen*
> she us helps–compl.–loc., we book she–dat. giv–ing
>   we–were
> (if she had helped us, we would have given her a
>   book),
>
> *atu yoo cate waytaa–m–al, anu ko–h kitab acay–uk
> ma–nanniyo*
> you me to–help fail–compl.–loc., I you–dat. book
>   giv–ing not–I–was
> (if you had not helped me, I would not have given
>   you a book).

7.6. *Final Clauses*

My data on the expression of final clauses is unfortunately very poor, and for this reason the rules concerning their formation are set here with a certain reservation. In Saho final clauses are constructed by means of the noun *qeylo* (cause?, cf. also Reinisch

1890:62) which is usually inflected in the dative, thus *qeylo–h* ("for
the sake of"?). *Qeyloh* concludes the final clause that, formally,
seems to me to make up a relative clause, noteworthy is in any
case the fact that its verb is inflected in the subjunctive. As usual
in relative clauses the use of the nominalizing marker *–(V)m–* is
superfluous, cf.

Saho   *saga daagge–d yabloona qeylo–h yaadeyin*
            cow enclosure–loc. they–see cause–dat. they–go
            (they go in order to see the cow in the enclosure),
            cf. yabloona ("that they see", subjunctive).

In Afar final clauses are marked by the dative ending *–h*, but,
as in Saho, here, too, the nominalizer *–Vm–* is not applied and the
verb of the final clause is inflected in the subjunctive, cf.

Afar   *oson dagiire–t tan saga yabloonu–h gexan*
            they enclosure–loc. is cow they–see–dat. they–go
            (they go in order to see the cow which is in the
                enclosure),
            cf. yabloonu ("that they see", subjunctive),

            cado yakamu–h wadar usgud!
            meat he–eat–dat. goat slaughter!
            (slaughter a goat in order that he eat meat!),

            anu daffeyu–h usuk soola
            I sit–dat. he stands
            (he stands in order that I sit)

from Bliese 1981:69.

7.7. *Indirect interrogative clauses*

Indirect interrogative clauses mostly formally correspond to
objective clauses, indeed they are formed, like those, by means of
the simple suffixation of the morpheme *–(V)m* to the verb form of
the clause. The interrogative pronoun opens the clause, if it acts as
subject; otherwise it is inserted between the noun phrase of the
subject and the verb complex, cf.

Saho   *iyyi yemmeete–m yo–kk ey!*
            who came–obj. me–dat. say!
            (tell me who came!),

iyyi adiyeele–m a–kk ey!
who will–go–obj. he–dat. say!
(tell him who is going!),

isin (aym) yubliini–m yo–kk ey!
they (what) they–saw–obj. me–dat. say!
(tell me what they saw!),

aym–ih [8] *tee fakeeni–m m–aaxige*
what–instr./dat. her they–opened–obj. not–I–know
(I don't know with/for what they opened it),

atu anda weqak tine–m yo–kk ey!
you when crying were–obj. me–dat. say!
(tell me, when you were crying!).

If the interrogative pronoun acts as subject, the whole indirect interrogative clause can, of course, also be pronominalized and thus expressed by a "pronoun", cf.

Saho   *yemmeete–tiya yo–kk ey!*
          came–who–one me–dat. say!
          (tell me who came!)
cf.   *yemmeete–tiya* (the one who came),

          adiyeele–tiya a–kk ey!
          will–go–who–one he–dat. say!
          (tell him who will go!)
cf.   *adiyeele–tiya* (the one who will go).

In Afar indirect interrogative clauses can be on principle expressed in a similar way as in Saho, i.e. by the suffixation of *–(V)m–* at their end, cf.

Afar   *atu aka–h yabta–m usuk ma yaaxiga*
          you which–dat. you–speak–obj he not knows
          (he does not know why you are talking),

          atu aka–h weqta–m yo–h waris!
          you which–dat. you–cry–obj. me–dat. refer!
          (tell me why you are crying!),

[8] The interrogative *aym–ih* is actually ambiguous here; it can be interpreted in fact either as a dative with the meaning "for what?/why?" or as an instrumental and thus mean "with/by what?".

edde fakeeni–m m–aaxiga
instr. they–opened–obj. not–I–know
(I don't know what they opened it with).

Nevertheless they are usually completed by a copulative clause (mostly constructed with *kinni* "he/she is") that seems to me to have the task of stressing somehow the interrogative pronoun, although it is built–in in a subordinate clause, cf.

Afar   *temmeete–m kinni wakti kaa–h waris!*
              you–came–obj. is time him–dat. refer!
              tell him when you came!,
              (lit. "tell him the time that is that you came, i.e. tell
                 him what time you came!").

              usuk lee–k faxa–m kinnih gide ma naaxiga
              he water–abl. wants–obj. is amount not we–know
              we don't know how much water he wants,
              (lit. "we don't know what the amount of water is
                 that he wants"),

              elle tokme–m kinni–kke yo–h waris!
              loc. you–ate–obj. is–place me–dat. refer!
              tell me where you ate!,
              (lit. "tell me what the place is where you ate!").

The copulative form that shall emphasize the interrogative must not necessarily be *kinni* and in this latter case it can also stay at the beginning or at the end of the sentence, cf.

Afar   *yubleeni–m mac–ay yo–h waris!*
              they–saw–obj. what–is me–dat. refer!
              tell me what they saw!,
              (lit. "tell me what is that what they saw!")

besides   *mac–ay yubleeni–m yo–h waris!*
              what–is they–saw–obj. me–dat. refer!
              (id.),

              iyy–ay gexxa–m kaa–h waris!
              who–is she–goes–obj him–dat. refer!
              tell him who is going!,
              (lit. "tell him who is that who is going!"),

> *yo–h waris temmeete–m iyy–ay!*
> me–dat. refer she–came–obj. who–is!
> tell me who came!,
> (lit. "tell me who is that who came!").

Though at the same time my data on Afar also contains some indirect interrogative clauses which are expressed neither by means of a copula nor by the suffixation of *–(V)m*, cf.

Afar
> *iyyi yemmeete yo–h waris!*
> who came me–dat. refer!
> (tell me who came!),
>
> *iyyi gexa–h kaa–h waris!*
> who (is) go–ing him–dat. refer!
> (tell him who is going!)

or
> *kaa–h waris iyyi gexa–h!* (id.),
>
> *maakkina baani faxxah yo–h waris!*
> how–much bread you–want me–dat. refer!
> tell me how much bread you want!,
>
> *atu aka–h abte–nna yo–h baxxays!*
> you which–instr. you–did–way me–dat. explain!
> explain to me how you did!,
> (lit. "explain to me the way in which you did!").

7.8. *Other Kinds of Subordinate Clauses*

Subordinate clauses governed by verbs such as *kalit–* (prevent/hinder/refuse) and *soolis–* (stop) in Saho and *caat–* (prevent/stop) and *kal–* (prevent/hinder) in Afar are constructed in both languages by means of the ablative marker *–k(o)*, which is immediately preceded by the nominalizer *–(V)m–*. In Saho, however, the morpheme *–(V)m–* mostly changes to *–n–* before the ablative marker. Thereby the verb of the subordinate clause is usually inflected in the imperfect indicative, cf.

Saho
> *isi tee caba–n–ko yi kalitte*
> she her I–leave–compl.–abl. me prevented
> she prevented me from leaving her,
> (cf. *caba–n–ko ← caba–m–ko*),

> *muluq bar weqak sugta–n–ko ku soolise*
> whole   night   crying   you–keep–compl.–abl.   you
>   I–stopped
> I stopped you from crying the whole night
> (cf. *sugta–n–ko* ← *sugta–m–ko*),
>
> *kudna–n–ko ni soolisse*
> we–run–compl.–abl. us she–stopped
> she stopped us from running away.

Similary it is in Afar, where the shift from *–m–* to *–n–*, however, does not seem to take place, cf.

Afar
> *tet caba–m–ak yoo caatte*
> her I–leave–compl.–abl. me prevented
> (she prevented me from leaving her),
>
> *anu atu inki–h yan bar weqak tene–m–ik koo caateh*
> I   you   one   is   night   crying   were–compl.–abl.   you
>   I–stopped
> (I stopped you from crying the whole night),
>
> *is nanu kudna–m–ak nee caatteh*
> she we we–run–compl.–abl. us she–stopped
> (she stopped us from running away).

For the same examples in English illustrating another construction in Afar see Bliese (1981:14).

REFERENCES

Bliese, Loren F. 1981: *A Generative Grammar of Afar*, Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington, Dallas (Texas).
Parker, E.M., and R.J. Hayward, 1985: *An Afar–English–French Dictionary*, School of Oriental and African Studies, London.
Reinisch, Leo 1890: *Wörterbuch der Saho–Sprache*, 2nd volume of "Die Saho–Sprache", Alfred Hölder, Vienna.
Welmers, William 1952: *Notes on the Structure of Saho*, "Word" 8, pp. 145–162 and 236–251.