Purpose-encoding strategies in Kambaata

Yvonne Treis

Purpose-encoding strategies in Kambaata

by Y v o n n e T r e i s

ABSTRACT: The Highland East Cushitic language Kambaata employs five different purpose-encoding strategies. Purpose clauses can be headed by switch reference-sensitive purposive verb forms or by dative-marked verbal nouns. A third type of purpose clause is modelled on a similative clause and contains a relative verb to which an enclitic 'like' is added. Two less common strategies are the converb and the quotative strategy. The present article gives a detailed account of the syntax of purpose clauses (and complex sentences) as well as the morphology of the verb forms used in purpose clauses. It also discusses which formal devices are shared between purpose and complement clauses and between purpose clauses and indirect commands (jussive clauses). Finally, the purpose-encoding strategies applied in Kambaata are compared to those in closely related Highland East Cushitic languages.

1 Introduction

A purpose clause is a type of adverbial clause that expresses with which intention the event expressed in the matrix clause is carried out. Kambaata[1] has three common purpose clause types: purpose clauses based on purposive verb forms (1), dative-marked verbal nouns (2), and relative verbs to which a similative ('like') morpheme is attached (3).[2]

(1) {*wo'-á   inkiil-óta*}   *mar-áamm*
     water-mACC   fetch-1s/3mPURP_SS   go-1sIPV

     'I go out to fetch water.'

(2) {*lal-ú   kal-óon   duuss-íi*}   *fúshsh-eemm*
     cattle-mACC   pasture-mLOC   make_full-mDAT   take_out-1sIPV

     'I took the cattle out to let them eat their fill on the pasture.'

(3) {*xuud-dumb-o-'é=g-a*}   *orooqq-éemm*
     see-2s/3fNREL-mOBL-1sO=SIM-mOBL   go_out-1sPVE

     'I went out so that (lit. 'like') she wouldn't see me.'

In general, purpose clauses express a motivating event that is
u n r e a l i s e d at the time of the event expressed in the matrix clause; in
(4) the distribution is not yet determined when the subject ('I') searches
the corpus.

(4)   *I did a search of the corpus {to determine the distribution of the
        purposive morpheme}.*

Purpose clauses are inherently future-oriented. The motivating event
is regarded as possible but its successful realisation is not logically
entailed, i.e. the intended result is hypothetical from the perspective of
the matrix clause. Purpose clauses are semantically related to result
clauses. Result clauses express, however, that the (intended or non-in-
tended) result has been achieved; i.e. the successful realisation is
logically entailed (5) (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 18f; Cristofaro 2003: 157f).

(5)   *I searched the corpus {so that I wasn't relying on elicited examples}.*

Purpose clauses are also semantically related to reason clauses (6)
because purpose can be conceived of as a "reason formulated in terms of
an intended result" (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 18, 152; Jackson 1995: 57) or
because both types of clauses "can be seen as providing *explanations*, or
accounts, for the occurrence of a given state or action" (Thompson & al.
2007: 250).

(6)   *He searched the text corpus {because he could not find examples in
        the grammar}.*

While it is cross-linguistically common that languages use similar or
the same morphosyntactic means to mark purpose, result and reason
clauses (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 151-157), there is little indication that
achieved result and intended result (purpose) are marked similarly in
Kambaata. Purpose clauses also often share marking devices with
complement clauses and expressions of deontic modality (Schmidtke-
Bode 2009: 157-165) and it will be shown in this article that this formal
overlap is prominent in Kambaata as well. Encoding strategies used for
purpose clauses are also employed for clausal complements of e.g.
desiderative and manipulative verbs (3.1.4, 3.2.2, 3.3.3). We will see
furthermore that purposive verb forms – i.e. two paradigms of

subordinate verbs which are primarily used in purpose clauses (1) – are historically related to the jussive verb forms (3.1.3).[3]

Apart from these cross-linguistically well-known formal overlaps, another interesting type of multifunctionality can be observed in Kambaata: the use of the similative morpheme 'like' as marker of purpose clauses (3). This type of multifunctionality has so far attracted only little attention in the literature and it is notably absent from Schmidtke-Bode's (2009) otherwise comprehensive treatment of purpose clause-marking strategies.[4]

Purpose clauses often form an easily identifiable clause type in the languages of the world, even though they may share properties with other clauses, e.g. result, reason and complement clauses. Most grammar writers consider purpose clauses important enough to dedicate a subsection in their description of individual languages to this clause type; see, for instance, the small chapters on purpose clauses in the Dhaasanac grammar by Tosco (2001: 285), the Somali grammar by Saeed (1999: 221) and the K'abeena grammar by Crass (2005: 311f), to name but three randomly selected examples from the Cushitic domain. Given that grammars have to cover all important constructions of a language, the section on purpose clause formation is usually brief. To the best of my knowledge, the only more elaborate description of purpose clauses in a Cushitic language is Vanhove's (2004) study of purpose expressions in Beja. Beyond this, purpose clauses have not been treated in any detail in Cushitic and this has motivated me to take a closer look at the grammar of this clause type in Kambaata, a Highland East Cushitic language spoken by several hundred thousand speakers in South Ethiopia.

In this article, I attempt to give a detailed account of the different strategies that are applied to encode purpose clauses in Kambaata. The syntactic properties of purpose clauses and the morphology of verbs used in these clauses will be discussed. I will examine the relations between purpose clauses and other subordinate clause types (complement clauses, in particular) and take a closer look at the multifunctionality of the morphemes marking purpose clauses.

The structure of this article is as follows: After an overview of Kambaata verbal morphology has been given (section 2), I will treat, turn by turn, the five different purpose-encoding strategies that have been identified in Kambaata: these are the purposive strategy (3.1), the verbal noun strategy (3.2), the similative strategy (3.3), and two marginally attested strategies, i.e. the quotative strategy (3.4.1) and the converb strategy (3.4.2). Section 4 compares the purpose clauses of Kambaata

with those of the closely related Highland East Cushitic languages, while section 5 summarises the findings and suggests areas of future research.

2 Overview of Kambaata verbal morphology

Kambaata is an exclusively suffixing language; it is both head- and dependent-marking with an elaborate case system and subject agreement on verbs. Arguments of verbs can freely be omitted if they are retrievable from the context. Kambaata is consistently head-final, hence all dependent clause types, including purpose clauses, precede the main clauses. The main verb (or copula) is the last constituent in a sentence.

Kambaata distinguishes between fully finite main clause verbs and various types of dependent clause verbs: relative verbs, converbs, purposive verb forms and verbal nouns. In Table 1, the verbs are arranged from left to right on a scale of decreasing finiteness.

	MAIN VERBS		RELATIVE VERBS		CONVERBS		PURPOSIVES		VNS
SUBJ AGR	1s 2s 3m 3f/p 3hon	1p 2p/hon	1s 2s 3m 3f/p 3hon	1p 2p/hon	1s/3m 2s/3f/p 3hon	1p 2p/hon	1s/3m 2s/3f/p 3hon	1p 2p/hon	–
ASP	Imperfective Progressive e-Perfective o-Perfective		Imperfective Progressive e-Perfective o-Perfective		Imperfective Perfective		–		–
MOOD	Indicative Imperative/Jussive Preventive		–		–		–		–
SWI REF	–		–		+		+		–

Table 1. Inflectional categories on main verbs and dependent verbs in Kambaata

Table 1 shows that main verbs have the most elaborate inflectional potential. Seven subject agreement morphemes, depending on person, number, gender and honorificity, are distinguished.

– Main verbs are further marked for four aspectual categories and three modal categories. Relative verbs have a slightly reduced inflectional potential, because they cannot be marked independently for mood.

– Relative verbs are used in relative clauses, complement clauses and various types of adverbial clauses, e.g. temporal, reason, conditional, and purpose clauses (3.3).

– Converbs are further reduced in finiteness, though they are not entirely non-finite. Their morphological make-up is less complex: regarding subject agreement, certain distinctions are neutralised (1s = 3m, 2s = 3f/p), aspectual distinctions are reduced to two (perfective vs. imperfective) and mood is not marked. Converbs are used sentence-medially and are dependent on a main verb or a copula. They are used in adverbial function, in clause chains or in verbal compounds. Converbs are marked for switch reference: if the subject is shared with the next following clause, the converb is unmarked; if the subject changes in the next following clause, the converb receives the morpheme *-yan*.

– Purposive verb forms are primarily used in purpose clauses and thus form one focus of this paper (3.1). They are marked for subject agreement and switch reference: there are two formally distinct paradigms of purposives, which are used in same subject and different subject contexts, respectively.

– Infinite verbal nouns are at the end of the finiteness scale in Kambaata; they are bare of any inflectional verbal morphology being instead inflected like nouns, retaining, however, most of their verbal argument structure.

3 Purpose-encoding strategies

This background knowledge should suffice to proceed with a discussion of the different purpose-encoding strategies that Kambaata makes use of. The strategies are categorised and labelled according to the verb forms or most prominent formal devices used in them. In the first three subsections (3.1-3.3) frequent strategies – the purposive, the verbal

noun and the similative strategy – are dealt with. In the last two subsections (3.4.1-2) two only marginally attested strategies – the quotative and the converb strategy – are considered.

3.1 The purposive strategy

Kambaata has two paradigms of subordinate verb forms that are primarily used to encode purpose meaning and thus are labelled "purposive". Verb forms of the purposive paradigm ending in *-ó-ta* are used in same subject contexts, verb forms of the paradigm ending in *-un-ta* are used in different subject contexts. This section discusses the syntax of purpose clauses based on purposive verb forms, the morphological make-up and the diachronic origin of the purposive verb forms, and the use of purposive verb forms outside purpose clauses.

3.1.1 Same subject versus different subject purposive

Purposive verb forms are sensitive to subject (dis-)continuity. Purposive verb forms ending in *-ó-ta* encode that the purpose and the matrix clause share one subject (SS: same subject). In (7) the subject of 'sing' and of 'open' is identical, i.e. a bird mentioned in a previous sentence.[5]

(7)   {*zammar-tóta*}   *af-óo-se*   *fan-tóo=da*
       sing-2s/3fPURP_{SS}   mouth-mACC-3fPOSS   open-3fPVO.REL=COND

       af-óon   *af-fóo*   *máal-ch-u*   *úull-a*   *úbb-o*
       mouth-mLOC   hold-3fPVO.REL   meat-SG-mNOM   ground-fOBL   fall-3mPVO

       'When it opened its beak to sing, the piece of meat that it held in its beak fell on the ground.'

In contrast, the purposive verb forms ending in *-un-ta* indicate that the subjects of the purpose clause and the matrix clause are different. In (8) the impersonal/honorific subject of the main clause verb 'make eat' is different from the subject of the purposive clause verb 'drop', which is 'cows' (DS: different subject).

(8) {*lál-u   meqqeerr-áta   da'll-í   úujj-unta*}
    cows-mNOM   afterbirth-fACC   do_fast-3mPCO   drop-1s/3mPURP$_{DS}$

    qeegill-éeta   it-is-éenno
    enset_type-fACC   eat-CS1-3honIPV

    'One feeds *qeegillee*-enset to cows so that they drop the[ir] afterbirth
    quickly.'

In most DS purposive clauses, the subject is coreferential with the direct or indirect object of the matrix clause; in (8), for instance, 'cows' would be encoded as the direct object of *it-is* 'feed' in the matrix clause if expressed overtly. Subject-object coreferentiality does, however, not seem to be a requirement.

In (9) two purposive verb forms are used in subsequent clauses. The DS purposive clause is dependent on the SS purposive clause, which is itself dependent on the main clause. The DS purposive indicates, in anticipation, a subject switch from 'brother' to 'I' in the next clause; the SS purposive indicates that its subject ('I') is the same as that of the following main verb.

(9) {{*hiz-óo-'   wáall   xúud-unta-'e*}
    sibling-mNOM-1sPOSS   come.1s/3mPCO   see-1s/3mPURP$_{DS}$-1sO

    kul-óta}   *dabdaab-éeta   xaaf-áyyoomm*
    tell-1s/3mPURP$_{SS}$ letter-fACC   write-1sPROG

    'I am writing a letter to tell my brother to come to visit (lit. 'see') me.'

I am not aware of any exceptions to the rule that subject (dis-)continuity determines the choice of the purposive morphemes.[6] My corpus does, however, not contain any examples in which the subjects of the purposive and the matrix clause are in an inclusion or part-whole relationship in order to test which purposive form would be used in such a case of overlapping subject coreference.[7] My attempts to elicit a sentence of the type 'My father called me so that we go to the market', in which the subject of the matrix clause 'my father' is included in the subject 'we' of the purposive clause, were not successful. Instead, overlapping coreference was avoided and the sentence was restructured in the Kambaata translation as seen in (10): 'my father' is the subject of the matrix clause; 'I' is the subject of the purposive clause and 'father' is expressed in a comitative adjunct *isííni-n* 'with him'.

7

(10) {*ánn-u-'*   *isíini-n dikk-úta*   <u>*már-unta*</u>} *ga''-ée-'e*
       father-mNOM-1sPOSS 3mICP-n market-fACC   go-1sPURP_{DS} call-3mPVE-1sO

      'My father called me so that I would go to the market with him.'
      [Given as translation for: 'My father called me so that we would go
      to the market.']

As arguments of verbs can be freely omitted in Kambaata, the switch reference-sensitive endings on purposives can be an important device to track subject referents across clauses.[8] The reference-tracking potential of purposive verb forms is demonstrated in (10). (10) is a cleft sentence: the first bracketed constituent functions as the subject of the sentence, the remainder of the sentence constitutes the predicate. The predicate contains, among others, a DS perfective converb (PCO) clause; the DS morpheme *-yan* indicates that the subject of the converb clause is different from that of the matrix clause, which is here a relative clause ('work'). The converb governs itself a DS purposive marked by *-un-ta*. The *-un-ta*-morpheme indicates that the subject of the purposive clause is different from that of its matrix clause, i.e. the DS converb clause. Only when the switch reference morphology is taken into account, can the referent of the subject of the purposive clause (which is 'I', not 'house owner') be retrieved.

(11) {*da'll-í*   *hujat-aammíi-hu*}_{SUBJECT OF CLEFT S.} {*min-í*   *ánn-u*
       do_fast-1sPCO work-1sIPV.REL.NMZ1-mNOM   house-mGEN   owner-mNOM

      {<u>*xóof-unta*</u>}   *hássh-i-<u>yan</u>ee-t*}_{PREDICATE OF CLEFT SENTENCE}
      finish-1s/3mPURP_{DS}   want-1s/3mPCO-DS.VV-COP3

      'I work quickly [because] THE HOUSE OWNER WANTS ME TO FINISH (IT).'[9]
      (lit. 'It is [because] the house owner wants me to finish that I work quickly.')

3.1.2 Morphological structure of purposives

The full paradigms of the SS and DS purposive verb forms are given in Table 2. The endings of the purposive forms consist of three separable morphemes, none of which is an aspect morpheme.[10] The first morphemes mark subject agreement and they are not only part of the purposive forms but they are also found in almost all other Kambaata verb forms;[11] the consonant-initial agreement morphemes are subject to various morphophonological processes (Treis 2008a: 59-68). While indicative affirmative main verbs distinguish seven persons (Table 1), the

agreement potential of purposives is reduced and only five distinctions are made.

		SS Purposive	DS Purposive
1s	3m	-∅-ó-ta	´-∅-un-ta
2s	3f/p	-t-ó-ta	´-t-un-ta
3hon		-een-ó-ta	-éen-un-ta
1p		-n-ó-ta	´-n-un-ta
2p/hon		-teen-ó-ta	-téen-un-ta

Table 2. Kambaata purposive paradigms

The SS forms are stressed on the vowel following the subject agreement morpheme, while the DS forms are stressed on the last syllable of the verb stem or on the subject agreement morpheme if the latter contains a vowel. After the subject agreement morphemes, the SS purposive endings can still be segmented into two morphemes, *-ó-ta*, because object pronouns intrude between these two parts if marked on the verb. In (12), the 1s object pronoun *-'e* is inserted between the last two morphemes of the SS purposive.[12]

(12) […] *dagújj*   {*xummis-o-'é-ta*}   *wáall-o*
             run.3mPCO   greet-1sPURP_SS-1sO-PURP_SS   come-3mPVO

     '[…] he ran towards me to greet me.'

Against all expectation, the object morphemes are not inserted before the *-ta* segment of the DS purposive ending *-un-ta* but added to the end of the verb form; cf. the DS purposive in (9). There is thus, at first, no reason to segment the DS purposive ending *-un(-)ta* any further. Variant purposive forms, however, provide evidence for this segmentation. For both the SS and the DS purposive there exist alternative longer forms, which end in *-ó=tannée(ha)* (SS) and *-un=tannée(ha)* (DS), respectively (13)-(14).[13] The parallel formation of the longer forms for SS and DS verbs supports the segmentation of the shorter DS form into the subparts *-un* and *-ta*.

9

(13) [...] {*ichch-áta*   *hacc-itó=tannée*}
      food-fACC   search.MID-2s/3fPURP_{SS}=NMZ2fDAT

    fúl-tee'u   *íkke*
    go_out-3fPVE   INACT

    '[…] [they] went out to look for food.'

(14) *hi'rr-itoo-'é=r-unku*
    buy.MID-3fPVO-1sO.REL=NMZp-mNOM<n>

    {*móol-un=tannée*}   *arriichch-óon* *toll-itóo-'e*
    dry-1s/3mPURP_{DS}=NMZ2fDAT sun-fLOC   spread_out-3fPVO-1sO

    'My buyers spread me out in the sun so that I would dry.'

Short and longer purposive forms can mostly be used interchangeably; one context, however, blocks the use of the longer forms. For unknown reasons, pronominal objects, as in (9) and (12), can only be suffixed to the short forms.

A look at the longer purposive forms is not only helpful to solve the segmentation problem of the shorter purposive forms but it also reveals a partial overlap between the formal devices used for the marking of purpose and reason clauses in Kambaata. The dative-marked nominalizing morpheme =*tannée(ha)*, which we have seen in (13)-(14), is also a marker of reason clauses.[14] In the latter type of clause, it is, however, attached to a relative (not a purposive) form of the verb; see the perfective relative verb in (15) and the imperfective relative verb in (16).

(15) {*Bajíg-u* *wiitim-í* *min-éen*   *hóshsh*
    B.-mNOM   mill-mGEN house-mLOC   spent_the_day.3mPCO

    waall-ó=tannée}   *hoog-íshsh-ee-s*   *íkke*
    come-3mPVO.REL=NMZ2fDAT become_tired-CS1-3mPVE-3mO INACT

    'Because Bajigo came (home) after having spent the whole day
    in the mill, he was tired (lit. '[it] had made him tired').'
    (Kambaatissata 1989: 3.100)

(16) {*ís*   *gizz-á*   *ba'-is-anó=tann-ée*}   *aass-iteenókkoonta-s*
    3mNOM money-mACC spoil-CS1-3mIPV.REL=NMZ2fDAT give-2pPREV-3mO

    'Don't (2p) give him [anything] because he wastes [his] money!'

As a final note on the morphology of purposives, it should be mentioned that purposive forms cannot be negated directly, the similative

(3.3) or quotative constructions (3.4.1) are instead used in negative contexts.

3.1.3 Diachronic origin of the DS purposive

In this section, the formal and functional similarities between purposive verb forms and jussive main verb forms are discussed. The jussive express indirect commands, wishes and suggestions directed to a third person via the addressee (17).

(17) *íse   qans-itán   le'-ís-sun   dul-am-ún-ka!*
    3fNOM   breastfeed-3fICO grow-CS1-3fJUS butcher-PS-3mJUS-NEG
    'Let her breastfeed and raise him. Don't let him be butchered!'

The 1s form is only used in questions by which the speaker asks for permission or asks for a directive; see *bárg-u?* (1s) 'Should I add / can I add (something for you)?'. The 1p form is used for exhortations to the group to which the speaker belongs; see *kaa'll-ínun* (1p) 'Let us help!'. The complete jussive paradigm is given in Table 3.

	JUSSIVE	DS PURPOSIVE	SS PURPOSIVE
1s	*´-∅-u*	*´-∅-un-ta*	*-∅-ó-ta*
2s		*´-t-un-ta*	*-t-ó-ta*
3m	*´-∅-un*	*´-∅-un-ta*	*-∅-ó-ta*
3f/p	*´-t-un*	*´-t-un-ta*	*-t-ó-ta*
3hon	*-éen-un*	*-éen-un-ta*	*-éen-ó-ta*
1p	*-n-ó ~ ´-n-un*	*´-n-un-ta*	*-n-ó-ta*
2p		*-téen-un-ta*	*-teen-ó-ta*

Table 3. Comparison of jussive and DS purposive paradigms

In addition to the subject agreement morphology[15], the jussive and the DS purposive share the morpheme *-un*.[16] As indicated by the accents, the stress pattern of the jussive and the DS purposive is identical, too. However, the DS purposive differs from the jussive in three respects: The DS purposive has an additional final *-ta* morpheme, which might ultimately go back to the feminine accusative proximal demonstrative *ta*.[17] Secondly, the jussive cannot be inflected for the second person; instead, commands to the addressee are encoded by the imperative verb forms which are formally distinct from the jussive forms.[18] The DS

purposive has no such restrictions and it is very well compatible with a second person subject. The third formal difference between the jussive and the DS purposive concerns the negation strategy. While DS purposives cannot be negated directly (the similative strategy discussed in 3.3 is used for negative purpose clauses), the jussive verb is negated by *-(n)ka* (17).

The similarities between purposive and DS jussive verb forms in Kambaata cannot be accidental, given, firstly, that there are also other Cushitic languages in which the two verb forms are formally similar or identical; see e.g. the Highland East Cushitic language Hadiyya (Sim 1989: 145, 151)[19]. Secondly, languages that employ identical or similar formal devices for purpose clauses and deontic expressions (such as those encoded by the Kambaata jussive) are also known in other areas in the world (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 162f). The semantic similarities between the domain of purpose and deontic modality are characterised by Schmidtke-Bode as follows: "[They] share the property of a hypothetical result state and someone's will or desire for it to be obtained" (2009: 163). An important semantic difference is, however, that jussive clauses in Kambaata express the will of the speaker (a speech-act participant) whereas purpose clauses verbalise the will of the subject of the matrix clause.

Since jussive paradigms cognate to those in Kambaata are found in related languages, e.g. Sidaama (Kawachi 2007: 427) and K'abeena (Crass 2005: 171-175), but cognate DS purposive paradigms are missing, it has to be assumed that Kambaata developed the purposive paradigm recently out of the jussive paradigm and not vice versa.

It is not clear whether the SS purposive in *-ó-ta* could also be related to the jussive. The vowels *o* and *u* are the characteristic vowels of the jussive forms in Cushitic (and beyond)[20] and thus the *-ó*-component of the SS purposive could also go back to an older jussive morpheme. Note that one jussive verb form in Kambaata, the alternative 1p form (Table 3), is identical to the SS purposive form (if we ignore the final *-ta* on the purposive).

3.1.4 Purposive verb forms in complement clauses

Purposive verb forms are not only used in purpose clauses but also in clauses dependent on complement-taking verbs. A perusal of Kambaata texts shows that the purposive is used in complement clauses governed by desiderative, manipulative, modal and commentative verbs.[21]

Desiderative verbs such as *has-* 'want' and *qulx-* 'desire' often function as matrix verbs of complement clauses with a purposive verb form. Depending on whether the desired event is carried out by the subject of the matrix clause or by a different participant, the SS or DS purposive is used; for the latter case see (18).

(18) {*mát-u*   *cíil-u*   *am-a-sí*   *unuun-á*
      one-mNOM   infant-mNOM   mother-fGEN-3mPOSS   breast-mACC

      <u>*xá'-unta*</u>}   <u>*has*</u>-*eemmá=da*   *unuun-í*   *lud-áan*
      wean-1s/3mPURP$_{DS}$ want-3honPVO.REL=COND breast-mACC   tip-mLOC

      argees-á   *buur-éenno*
      type_of_plant-mACC   smear-3honIPV

      'If one wants that a small child is weaned from his mother's breast, one smears [the milk of] the *argeesá*-plant on the nipples.'

Complement clauses with purposive forms are also very commonly dependent on manipulative verbs; these encompass verbs of causation, permission and assistance as well as utterance verbs that are used in a directive function. Examples of manipulative verbs are *xa'mm-* 'ask (to)', *kul-* 'tell (to)', *saz-* 'advise (to)', *laagáta aag-* 'promise (to)', *qaag-is-* 'remind', *ass-* 'do, make, cause' and *kaa'll-/tam-* 'help, serve, be useful/used for'. The causing (or manipulating or assisting) agent is the subject of the matrix clause and the affectee is the subject of the complement clause (19).

(19) {*lal-ú*   <u>*usúr-unta*</u>}   <u>*kul*</u>-*éemma-'e*
      cattle-mACC   tie-1s/3mPURP$_{DS}$ tell-3honIPV-1sO

      'S/he (honorific) told me to tie the cattle.'

Combination of a DS purposive verb form ((20): *sagáb-unta*) with a matrix verb *ass-* 'do, make, cause' are particularly frequent in the corpus and used as a periphrastic causative constructions.

(20) *qeráa'rr-ut* *maránch-at* {*ées*   <u>*sagáb-unta*</u>}   <u>*ass*</u>-*itée'u.*
      long-fNOM   walk-fNOM   1sACC become_thirsty-1sPURP$_{DS}$ do-3fPVE

      'The long walk made me thirsty.'

Complements of desiderative and manipulative verbs are semantically similar to purpose clauses, as they also express the intention of the subject of the matrix clause.

SS purposive verb forms are often combined with the modal verb *dand-* 'can, be able; may' in constructions of deontic and epistemic modality; for an epistemic reading of *dand-* see (21).

(21) {*kabar-é   lám-o   sann-íichch   zakk-íin*
      today-mGEN   two-mOBL   Monday-mABL   after-mICP

   áy   dag-áno   Adisaab-á   mar-óta}   *dand-áamm.*
   who.mNOM   know-3mIPV   A.-mACC   go-1sPURP_{SS}   can-1sIPV

   'In two weeks (lit. 'Mondays') from today I may perhaps (lit. 'who knows') go to Addis Ababa.'

Finally, purposive forms are used in complement of verbs like *iittam-/makk-* 'be suitable', which could be called "commentative verbs" (cf. Noonan 2007: 127), as they provide a judgement about the event expressed in the complement clause.

Purposive forms are notably absent from complement clauses dependent on perception (e.g. 'see', 'hear') and knowledge verbs (e.g. 'know'). Purposives are neither used in complements of utterance verbs that are used in a reportative sense (e.g. 'tell that X happened'). In contrast, purposive forms are found in complements of utterance verbs with a manipulative intention (e.g. 'tell so. to do sth.') (cf. Noonan 2007: 121, fn. 29 on the distinction between these two uses of utterances verbs).

3.2 Verbal noun strategy

Kambaata is a case-marking language which distinguishes between nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, instrumental-comitative-perlative, ablative, locative and oblique case (Treis 2008a: 102-126). Every noun in a sentence has to be marked by case suffixes; the nominal stem is never used in isolation and thus only a concept of the linguistic analysis. Nouns are categorised into various declensions according to their accusative form.

Kambaata verbal nouns (VN) are verbal stems that receive the case suffixes of the masculine *-ú*-declension (Treis 2008a: 103); see the case forms of *ag-* 'drink': *ag-ú* 'drinking' (mACC), *ág-u* 'drinking' (mNOM), *ag-í* 'of drinking' (mGEN), *ag-ii(ha)* 'for drinking' (mDAT), *ag-íin* 'by drinking' (mICP), *ag-íichch* 'from drinking' (mABL), *ag-óon* 'on drinking', *ág-o* 'by drinking' (mOBL). VNs distinguish as many case forms as other nouns.

The dative case encodes NPs with the semantic roles of recipient, beneficiary, time, and (predicative) possessor. As shown in (22), the dative case also marks purpose NPs. The first purpose-encoding NP in (22), 'for good (purposes) only', consists of a nominalised adjective followed by an appositive *xallíi* 'only (mDAT)'; the second purpose-encoding NP, 'also for bad (purposes)', is a nominalised adjective with a conjunctive morpheme ('also').

(22)   *mám-mát-u*   *mánn-u*   *xúm-aa=rr-íi*   *xall-íi*
    RED-one-mNOM   people-mNOM   good-mOBL=NMZp-mDAT   only-mDAT

    ih-ú'nna   *híil-aa=rr-iiháa*   *yaa'-íi*
    become-1s/3mNCO   bad-mOBL=NLZp-mDAT.CRD   hold_a_meeting-mDAT

    dand-anó=g-a   *hannó*   *eramm-é*
    can-3mIPV.REL=SIM-mOBL   please   discuss-2pIMP

    'Please discuss that some people may not meet for good [purposes] only but also for bad [purposes].' (Kambaatissata 1989: 3.41)

Dative-marked VNs are used in purpose clauses (3.2.1) and complement clauses (3.2.2).

3.2.1   Dative verbal nouns in purpose clauses

Dative-marked VNs are employed in purpose clauses that share the subject with the matrix clause (23). In DS contexts, purpose clauses with a dative-marked VN are ungrammatical.

(23)   *áachch*   {*wix-áta*   *wiit-isiis-íiha*}
    mum.fNOM   grain-fACC   grind-CS2-mDAT

    wiitim-í   *min-í*   *mar-éemmaa'u*
    mill-mGEN   house-mACC   go-3honPVE

    'Mum went to the mill to have the grain ground.'
    (Kambaatissata 1989: 3.96)

It happens frequently that consultants rephrase sentences with a SS purposive verb form by using a dative VN and vice versa; this shows that they are functionally equivalent in most contexts.

(24) {*gamaam-á*   *waas-áan*   <u>*ereer-an-s-itóta*</u>
     fermented_corm-mACC fermented_leaf_sheath-mLOC mix-PS-CS1-3fPURP$_{SS}$

      ~   <u>*ereer-an-s-íiha*</u>}   *el-óo*   *fan-tóo'u*
      ~   mix-PS-CS1-mDAT   pit-mACC   open-3fPVO

      'She has opened the pit to mix the [product from the] fermented [enset] corm into the [product from the] fermented [enset] leaf sheaths.'

VNs are non-finite and not marked for subject agreement. Object pronouns cannot be attached to VNs unlike to purposives, cf. (12); pronominal objects are instead expressed by independent personal pronouns (25).

(25) {<u>*kesáan*</u>   *daqq-am-iiháa*   *xuud-iiháa*}   […]
      2sICP   find.MID-PS-mDAT.CRD1   see-mDAT.CRD1

      '[…] in order to meet and see you.'

Like purposive verb forms (3.1), VNs cannot receive negative morphology; instead the similative strategy (3.3) has to be applied in negative contexts.[22]

3.2.2 Dative verbal nouns in complement clauses

Much in the same way as purposive verb forms (3.1.4), dative VNs are used in complement clauses. The verb classes taking purposive complements and the verb classes governing dative VN complements overlap to a certain extent.

Desiderative verbs – e.g. *has-* 'want', *tassaa ass-* 'hope', *iittam-/mur-* 'decide' – can be superordinate to complement clauses with purposive verb forms (3.1.4) and dative VNs (26).

(26) *wotár-ch-u-s*   {*iséta*   <u>*aass-íiha*</u>}   *iittam-eemmá=g-a*
      foal-SG-fNOM-DEF   3fACC   give-mDAT   decide-3honPVO=SIM-mOBL

      hattig-óon   {<u>*kaar-ii*</u>}   <u>*dand*</u>-*itoo'íi*   *agud-áno-he*
      how-fICP   suspect-mDAT   can-3fPVO.REL.NMZ1   seem-3mIPV-2sO

      'According to you (lit. '[it] seems to you'), how could the tiny foal suspect that one had decided to sacrifice (lit. 'give') her?'
      (Kambaatissata 1989: 4.35)

The above example also shows that the modal verb *dand-* 'can, be able; may' can govern a dative VN; recall (21) from 3.1.4 where *dand-* governs a purposive clause.[23]

Dative VNs are rare with manipulative verbs because the VN requires a SS context whereas manipulative situations are mostly DS contexts. There are, however, two verbs of assistance (included in manipulative verbs in 3.1.4) which are common with dative VN complements, too; these are the synonymous verbs *kaa'll-* and *tam-* 'help, serve, be useful for, be used for' (27).

(27) {*antabee'-í   wox-íta shol-íi*}   *tan-táa=bíihaa-t*
  chicken-mGEN   sauce-fACC   cook-mDAT   help-3fIPV.REL=REAS.VV-COP3

  '[It] is BECAUSE [THIS POT TYPE] IS NOT USEFUL TO PREPARE
  CHICKEN SAUCE.' (Kambaatissata 1989: 4.62)

Dative VN complements can be dependent on phasal (aspectual) verbs, e.g. *hobbaashsh-* / *xeephph y-* 'be about to VERB, have almost VERB-ed', *birs-* 'VERB first', *ke'-* 'start' (28).[24]

(28) *hárr-it   ga''-aqq-án-t   ta   oonn-áta*
  donkeys-fNOM   call-MID-PS-3fPCO   DDEM1fACC   funeral-fACC

  {*mexxoomáan   mar-íi*}   *ke'-óo'u*
  together   go-mDAT   start-3fPVO

  'The donkeys called each other and they started to go to the funeral
  together.'

Dative VNs are furthermore attested with achievement verbs, e.g. *akeek-* 'try' and *igg-* 'dare', and commentative verbs, e.g. *makk-* 'be suitable', *bajig-is-* / *cúlu ass-* 'be pleasant, appealing' (both terms are used in the sense of Noonan 2007) (29).

(29) {*íll-e   xuud-íi*}   *cúlu   ass-itáa=r-a*
  eye-fOBL   see-mDAT   pleasant   do-3fIPV.REL=NMZp-mACC

  'the ones who are pleasant to look at (lit. 'to see with [one's] eye(s)')'

With respect to token frequency, dative-marked VNs are most common in collocation with *dand-* 'can, be able; may', *has-* 'want', *kaa'll-* / *tam-* 'help, serve, be used for, be useful for' and *akeek-* 'try' as matrix verbs. As observed with purposive complements (3.1.4), certain complement-taking verbs are notably not attested as governing dative-

marked VNs: knowledge verbs ('know'), perception verbs ('hear, see'), utterance verbs ('say') and propositional attitude verbs ('believe').

3.3 Similative strategy

A third very common purpose-encoding strategy is the similative strategy. Here the purpose clause is based on a relative verb to which the enclitic =*g* SIM 'like' is attached.

The similative morpheme is a multifunctional, multiply grammaticalised morpheme, and purpose clause marking is just one of its many functions. In its primary function, the similative morpheme is enclitised to (pro)nouns to mark them as standards of comparison in constructions expressing similarity in manner (30).

(30) <u>*adan-ch-ó=g-a*</u>   *gá'l-*   *agg-óomm*
    cats-SG-fGEN=SIM-mOBL   shard-mOBL   drink-1sPVO

    y-ée'u   *jíi'r-u*
    say-3mPVE   dwarf-mNOM

    '"I drink from a shard like a cat", said the dwarf.'

Likewise, the =*g*-morpheme can attach to clausal standards of comparison for the formation of manner clauses (similative clauses) (31). Similative clauses, like many other adverbial clauses in Kambaata, are based on relative verbs.

(31) {*xon-íta*   *nesáa* *kán-t*
    just_now-fACC   1pDAT   refuse_to_give-2s/3fPCO

    <u>*it-toontí=g-ánka*</u>}   *dánd-i-be*
    eat-2sPVO.REL=SIM-mACC<n>   manage-2sIMP-INDIG

    'Manage it like [= in the same way as] you refused to give [anything] to us and [like / in the same way as] you ate.' [i.e. Manage this situation alone like you have selfishly eaten alone.]

Historically, the similative morpheme probably goes back to a noun meaning 'manner', which is no longer attested in the modern language.[25] The nominal origin explains the case-marking potential of the similative morpheme (cf. the case morphemes with which it combines, e.g. in (30) and (31)).

The next section (3.3.1) will provide information on relativisation and the morphology of relative verbs and thus set the ground for the analysis of purpose clauses modelled after similative clauses (3.3.2). Section 3.3.3 will address the use of the similative morpheme outside purpose clauses.

3.3.1 Relativisation

Relative clauses precede the nouns they modify; see (32), in which the relative clause occurs in curly brackets. The relative verb is the last constituent of the relative clause and thus immediately precedes the modified noun. There are no relative pronouns, enclitics or affixes in Kambaata; relative clauses are simply juxtaposed.

(32) {*im-éeni-na*   *we'ees-éen*   *qixxans-eennó*}   *el-óo*
       dig-3honPCO-CRD   line-3honPCO   prepare-3honIPV.REL   pit-mACC

       'a pit which was dug and lined [with enset leaves] and [thus] prepared'

Affirmative relative verbs are primarily marked suprasegmentally, i.e. by word-final stress. In the affirmative, roughly speaking, non-relativised main verbs are stressed on a non-final syllable while relative verbs are stressed on the final syllable[26]; compare the stress patterns of the relative verb in (32) and the main verb in (33).

(33) *ha'mmichch-ú-s*   *min-í*   *aag-is-éen*
       enset_corm.SG-mACC-DEF   house-mACC   enter-CS1-3honPCO

       gaf-éen   *qixxans-éenno*
       boil-3honPCO   prepare-3honIPV

       'The enset corm is taken to the house, boiled and prepared.'

There are only subtle formal differences between relative and main verbs in the affirmative. In the negative, however, these verbs can be distinguished easily because different negation strategies are applied (Treis forthc. a). The morpheme *-ba'a* marks negative main verbs (34), whereas relative verbs are negated with the morpheme *-umb* (35).

(34) *cíil-at*   *ichch-áta*   *it-táa-ba'a*   / *it-tim-bá'a*
       baby_girl-fNOM   food-fACC   eat-3fIPV-NEG / eat-2s/3fNIPV-NEG

       'The baby girl does / did not eat the food.'

(35) {cíil-at   it-tumb-úta}   ichch-áta
     baby_girl-fNOM   eat-2s/3fNREL-fACC   food-fACC

    (i) 'the food that the baby girl does not eat'
    (ii) 'the food that the baby girl did not eat'

Other important features of negative relative verbs concern aspect marking and agreement: The aspectual distinctions made in negative main verbs (34) are neutralised in negative relative verbs; see the two possible interpretations in (35). Furthermore, negative relative forms are verb-adjective hybrids that agree with the subject of the relative verb – (35): *cíilat* 'baby girl' – in person/gender as well as with the head noun – (35): *ichcháta* 'food' – in gender/case.

3.3.2 Similative morpheme as purpose clause marker

Many adverbial clauses (e.g. temporal, conditional, concessive and reason clauses), including the purpose clause type discussed in this section, are based on relative clauses (Treis 2008b: 189-202). (36) illustrates that the last verb of the purpose clause is a relative verb to which the similative morpheme =g- 'like' is added. Given that the realisation of the intended event expressed in the purpose clause is always posterior to the event expressed in the main clause, the last verb of the purpose clause can only be marked for the imperfective aspect.[27]

(36) {mám-mát-e ma'nn-é   máal-ch-u   hor-íinka
     one-one-fOBL place-fGEN   meat-SG-mNOM   all-mDAT<n>

    iill-anó=g-a}   múrr   mann-íi   beeh-áno
    reach-3mIPV.REL=SIM-mOBL   cut.3mPCO   people-mDAT   divide-3mIPV

    'He cuts and divides [the meat] for the people so that a [small] piece of meat of different parts [i.e. from the tongue, neck, etc.] is provided for (lit. 'reaches') everybody.'

The enclitic similative morpheme found at the end of the purpose clause consists of two morphemes, the stem =g- and a case morpheme (in masculine gender). Purpose clauses can either end in an oblique-marked similative morpheme, =g-a (36)[28] or in a dative-marked similative morpheme, =g-íi(ha). No meaning difference could so far be attributed to these two case-marking options. Note, however, that dative marking of the similative morpheme on purpose clauses is much less common than oblique marking.

When similarive-marked purpose clauses are negated, the relative negator *-umb* occurs (37). The negative morpheme is followed by a case/gender morpheme *-o* (or *-ua*) that agrees with the similative morpheme.[29] For reasons unknown, the similative morpheme *=g-* is often realised with a geminate consonant (*=gg-*) in negative examples if it follows the case/gender morpheme of the negative relative form directly.

(37) {*gooc-á   aag-<u>úmb</u>-o=gg-a*}   *xúff-eemm*
     door-mACC   enter-1s/3mNREL-mOBL=SIM-mOBL   close-1sPVE

    'I closed the door so that he would not enter.'

Object pronouns, here: 3pO, precede the similative morpheme (38).

(38) *yamaz-oon-ta-ssáa   oddishsh-a-ssá   bir-é   wud-íin*
    hip-mLOC-J-3pPOSS.CRD   clothes-fGEN-3pPOSS   front-fGEN   side-mICP

    {*hóog-ut   iill-ít   ba'-is-súmb-o-<u>ssa</u>=g-a*}
    enset_juice-fNOM   reach-3fPCO   spoil-CS1-2s/3fNREL-mOBL-3pO=SIM-mOBL

    aab-ichch-ú   qo'rr-itée'u
    unfrayed_leaf-SG-mACC   wear-3fPVE

    'And on their hips they wear an unfrayed enset leaf on top (lit. 'in front') of their clothes so that the enset juice does not touch (lit. 'reach') and spoil them.'

As in affirmative contexts, the similative morpheme can be marked for dative case, *=g-íi(ha)* (39), or oblique case, *=g-a* (39).

(39) [...] {*farr-áta   roshsh-áta   áf-f*
         bad-fACC   habit-fACC   seize-2s/3fPCO

    le'-úmb-ua=<u>gg-íi</u>}   *kabar-éechchi-n*
    grow-2s/3fNREL-mOBL=SIM-mDAT   today-mABL-n

    ke'-ís-s   qoráphph-u   hasis-áno-kke.
    get_up-CS1-2s/3fPCO   take_care-mNOM   be_necessary-3mIPV-2sO

    'You have to take care from today on so that you do not grow up with a bad habit.' (Kambaatissata 1989: 4.19)

The similative strategy is the most natural choice in negative purpose clauses, because purposive forms (3.1.2) have no negative paradigms and dative-marked VNs (3.2.1) cannot be negated non-periphrastically either.

21

It seems that the use of the similative strategy in negative contexts is much preferred over the use in affirmative contexts.[30]

In affirmative contexts, the purposive and the similative strategy are interchangeable, as (40) is meant to illustrate. The example contains a sequence of two sentences that were given in reply to a question about the purpose of a certain step in the enset food production. Since the purpose was questioned, the purpose clauses are in focus and clefted in the answer. The speaker mentions two purposes: a negative ('so that its colour does not become grey') and a positive purpose ('so that it becomes nice'). In (40a) a negative similative clause is used; in (40b) an affirmative DS purposive clause is used. The juxtaposition of the similative and the purposive strategy in the same context indicates that these strategies are functionally equivalent.

(40) a. *káan*   *ass-eenno-síi-hu*   […]
     IDEM1mACC do-3honIPV-3mO.REL.VV-mNOM

     íll-i-s   *kur-túmb-oa=gg-íihaa-t*
     colour-fNOM-3mPOSS become_grey-2s/3fNREL-mOBL=SIM-mDAT.VV-COP3

     'One does this […] SO THAT ITS COLOUR DOES NOT BECOME GREY.'

    b. *atakáan-u-s*   [...]   *baréed-untaa-t*
     type_of_dish-mNOM-DEF   become_nice-1s/3mPURP~DS~.VV-COP3

     '[…] SO THAT THE *ATAKAANO*-DISH BECOMES NICE.'

Data from elicitation shows furthermore that the similative strategy can be equivalent to the dative VN construction in SS contexts (41).

(41)   *alaphph-anó=g-íi*   ~   *alaphph-íi* *oos-úta*
     play-3mIPV.REL=SIM-mDAT   play-mDAT children-fACC

     hegeeg-íichch ga''-ée'u
     area-mABL   call-3mPVE

     'He called the children of the neighbourhood to play.'

The similative strategy is not sensitive to subject (dis-)continuity but it can be used in either context; see, for instance, the SS context in (39) (the addressee is the subject of 'take care' and 'not to grow') and the DS context in (40) (the impersonal subject of 'do' is different from the subject of 'become grey' and 'become nice').

3.3.3 Similitive morpheme as complement clause marker

The similitive morpheme =g- is a multifunctional grammatical element whose function as a standard marker in similitive constructions (30)-(31) and as a marker of purpose clauses (36)-(41) has already been exemplified. In this section, one of its further functions is discussed.

The =g-morpheme is encliticised to clauses that are dependent on the following types of complement-taking verbs: utterance verbs, propositional attitude verbs, knowledge and perception verbs as well as manipulative verbs. Utterance verbs – e.g. *xa'mm-* 'ask (whether, how, who etc.)', *kul-* 'tell (that)', *er-am-* 'discuss (that)' – govern complement clauses that contain indirect speech (42).

(42) {*antabee'-í   min-í   hatt-íta   <u>min-táa=g-a</u>*}
      chicken-mGEN   house-mACC   how-fACC   build-3fIPV.REL=SIM-mOBL

      rosisaanch-ú-ssa   <u>xa'mm-itóo'u</u>
      teacher-mACC   ask-3fPVO

      'They asked their teacher how to build a chicken house.'
      (Kambaatissata 1989: 1.119)

The verb *amma'nn-* 'believe' is a common propositional attitude verb that can govern a similitive-marked complement clause. Knowledge and perception verbs that combine with similitive-marked complement clauses are, among others: *dag-* 'know', *hab-* 'forget', *qaagg-* 'remember', *zahicc-* 'notice', *xuud-* 'see', *maccoocc-* 'hear'. (43)-(44) contain =g-marked clauses dependent on 'know' and 'notice'.

(43) {*daddaabb-ée al-éen   su'mm-á-'   xúud-d   Bajíg-u-s*
      letter-fGEN   top-mLOC   name-mACC-1sPOSS see-2s/3fPCO B.-mNOM-DEF

      áy-ee-ti-la   <u>y-itaante-'é=g-a</u>}   <u>*dag-áamm*</u>
      who-mNOM.VV-COP3-SURP   say-2sIPV-1sO.REL=SIM-mOBL know-1sIPV

      'I know that you will see my name on the letter and say to me
      "Who on earth is this Bajigo?"' (Kambaatissata 1989: 8.21)

(44) {*kiif-áyyoo   xéen-u   al-í-s*
      drizzle-3mPROG.REL   rain-mNOM   body-mACC-3mPOSS

      <u>*shansh-ée=g-áa*</u>}   <u>*zahicc-im-bá'a*</u>
      drench-3mPVE.REL=SIM-m.OBL.CRD1   notice-1s/3mNIPV-NEG

      'He did not even notice that the drizzling rain drenched him.'
      (Kambaatissata 1989: 8.22)

Examples for manipulative verbs are: *kul-* 'tell (to)', *qaagg-is-* 'remind', *ros-is-* 'teach', *xuud-is-* 'show', *qorab-* 'take care', *ass-* 'do, make, cause'. In combination with a *=g*-marked clause, the latter verb is used for periphrastic causative constructions (45) (cf. (20) in 3.1.4).

(45) {*canc-inu'nnáachch   sereegg-inaammí=g-a*}   *ass-áam*
     chat-1pNCO   study-1pIPV.REL=SIM-mOBL do-1sIPV

     'I will make us study without chatting.' (Kambaatissata 1989: 1.101)

Similative-marked complement clauses cannot only be used in object but also in subject function. As such, they are marked for the nominative case. Intransitive or passive-marked complement-taking verbs, e.g. *maccoocc-am-* 'feel' (lit. 'be heard') (46), take a similative-marked clause as the subject.

(46) {*wó'-u-s   caal-á   ikk-ó=g-u*}
     water-mNOM-3mPOSS cold-mACC become-3fPVO.REL=SIM-mNOM

     maccoocc-ámm-o-s
     hear-PS-3mPVO-3mO

     'He felt that the water was cold.' (lit. 'That the water was cold was heard for/to him.')

RÉSUMÉ:

We have seen in this and earlier sections that all clause types used to encode purpose can also be used as complement clauses. The findings are summarised below:

PURPOSIVE CLAUSE (3.1.4) used as
    1. purpose clause
    2. complement clause of
       • desiderative verbs (e.g. *has-* 'want')
       • manipulative verbs (e.g. *ass-* 'do')
       • modal verbs (e.g. *dand-* 'can, be able, may')
       • commentative verbs (e.g. *iittam-* 'be suitable')

DATIVE VERBAL NOUN CLAUSE (3.2.2) used as
1. purpose clause
2. complement clause of
- desiderative verbs (e.g. *has-* 'want')
- manipulative verbs (V of assistance only; e.g. *kaa'll-* 'help')
- modal verbs (e.g. *dand-* 'can, be able, may')
- phasal verbs (e.g. *ke'-* 'start')
- achievement verbs (e.g. *akeek-* 'try')
- commentative verbs (e.g. *makk-* 'be suitable')

SIMILATIVE CLAUSE (3.3.3) used as
1. purpose clause
2. complement clause of
- utterance verbs (*xa'mm-* 'ask')
- propositional attitude verbs (e.g. *amma'nn-* 'believe')
- knowledge and perception verbs (*dag-* 'know', *xuud-* 'see')
- manipulative verbs (e.g. *ass-* 'do')

Only manipulative verbs can govern purposive clauses, dative VN clauses and similative clauses as complements. All other complement-taking verbs show a preference for a certain clause type or they are incompatible with a certain clause type. Desiderative and modal verbs, for instance, can govern complement clauses with dative VNs and purposive verb forms but they do not seem to permit similative-marked complements. On the other hand, utterance, propositional attitude, knowledge and perception verbs govern similative complements but no purposive or dative VN complements.

TWO CAVEATS are necessary at the end of this section: Firstly, there are also other complementation strategies (e.g. accusative VNs, nominalised headless relative clauses) for some of the complement-taking verbs mentioned above. In this article, however, I have not attempted to describe complementation in general but only to follow up on the formal overlap between purpose clauses and complement clauses. Therefore, only those strategies that are used in both domains have been analysed (accusative VNs, for instance, are never used in purpose clauses and thus not discussed here).

The second caveat concerns the multifunctionality of the similative morpheme. In addition to the functions mentioned above, the =*g-*

morpheme is also used in various other grammatical contexts: as a marker of temporal clauses of immediate anteriority, as a marker of illocutionary clauses, as a marker of pretence clauses, as an adverbialiser of adjectives and as the standard marker in equative constructions. The entirety of its functions and the full grammaticalisation scenario departing from the noun 'manner' will have to be elaborated upon in a separate publication (Treis 2011).

3.4 Minor purpose-encoding strategies

3.4.1 Quotative strategy

Apart from the three common purpose-encoding strategies discussed in the preceding sections, Kambaata speakers also have the option to employ a quotative construction for the expression of purpose. The intention with which the action in the matrix clause is carried out is expressed as an actual or imagined direct quote of the agent (47).

(47) {*oddiishsh-á-s*   *lág-u*   *oroos-ún-ka*}   *y-ín*
      clothes-fACC-DEF   river-mNOM   carry_away-3mJUS-NEG   say-1pPCO

      abbíns   *daguxx-ámm-eemm*   *íkke*
      exceed.1pPCO   run.MID-PS-1sPVE   INACT

      'We ran very quickly so that the river wouldn't carry away the clothes.' (lit. 'Saying "May the river not carry away the clothes", we ran very quickly.')

The direct speech complement – a jussive clause – is followed by a converb form of the verb *y-* 'say', which is dependent on the verb expressing the action that is carried out with the aforementioned intention in mind. (47) is a negative purpose construction; in contrast, (48) contains an affirmative speech complement.

(48) {*ciil-i-sé*[31]   *san-óon*   *fóoshsh-u*   *áag-un*}   *y-ít*
      infant-mGEN-3fPOSS   nose-fICP   breath-mNOM   enter-3mJUS   say-3fPCO

      gunguushsh-itu'nnáachch   *ossíis-see'u*
      cover_s.o.'s_head-2/3fNCO   lay_down_to_sleep-3fPVE

      'She laid the child down to sleep without covering his head so that the breath would enter through his nose.' (lit. 'Saying "May the breath enter through the nose of her [my?] child" she laid (him) down to sleep without covering (his) head.')

While quotative constructions are a common source for purpose clauses in the languages of the world – cf. Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 192ff) and Vanhove (2004) – the quotative purpose construction is only marginally attested in the Kambaata corpus and no generalisations about its use can be made at the present moment.

3.4.2 Converb strategy

In Kambaata, converbs are dependent, sentence-medial verb forms that are morphologically distinct from main, purposive and relative verb forms (Table 1). Kambaata distinguishes perfective, imperfective and negative converbs: imperfective converbs express events that are simultaneous to the event expressed by the next following verb; negative converbs express that the event in the main clause is done 'without VERB-ing' or 'before VERB-ing'; the semantic relation between the perfective converb clause and the subsequent clause is vague, though often interpreted as expressing anteriority or manner. Given an appropriate context, converb–main verb sequences may invite a concessive, result, reason, or purpose interpretation of the semantic relation between the clauses.

(49) *án   y-eemmíi-hu   ann-am-áakk-a-nne*
     1sNOM   say-1sPVE.REL.NMZ1-mNOM   father-mother-PL-fNOM-1pPOSS

   xáll-u   haww-itáa=hanníichch
   only-mNOM   be_troubled-3fIPV.REL=NMZ2.mABL

   na'ootíi   hujánt   íntunee-t
   1pNOM.CRD   work.1pPCO   eat.1pJUS.VV-COP3

   'I said THAT NOT ONLY OUR PARENTS SHOULD BE TROUBLED
   [TO MAKE A LIVING] [BUT] WE SHOULD WORK TO EAT, TOO.'
   (lit. 'What I said is that [apart] from our parents only being troubled,
   also we should work [and] eat.') (Kambaatissata 1989: 3.99)

The semantic relation between the converb and the main verb is unmarked in (49); the context of this utterance, however, facilitates the interpretation of the main verb as expressing the purpose ('eat') of the event encoded by the converb ('work'). (See Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 103-109 for a discussion on purpose inferences.)

4 Purpose-encoding strategies in other Highland East Cushitic languages

The purpose-encoding strategies employed in Kambaata are also found in related Highland East Cushitic (HEC) languages. In this section some commonalities and differences between purpose clause marking in Kambaata and Alaaba, K'abeena, Hadiyya and Sidaama will be pointed out. So far no information is available on the encoding of purpose in the remaining HEC languages Libido, Gedeo and Burji.

In A̲L̲A̲A̲B̲A̲ and K̲'̲A̲B̲E̲E̲N̲A̲, the closest relatives of Kambaata, a dative verbal noun, a purposive and a similative strategy can be identified (Schneider-Blum 2007: 382ff; Crass 2005: 311f). For all purpose clause types, morphemes are employed that are cognate to those morphemes used in the same function in Kambaata. Interestingly, however, Alaaba and K'abeena only have o n e purposive paradigm (labelled "intentional" and "final clause converb" in the descriptions) corresponding formally to the SS paradigm in Kambaata (Table 2) though being used both in SS and in DS context, as the examples in the grammars document. A further difference concerns negation: the purposive forms in K'abeena can be negated directly, while this is impossible in Kambaata. (50) illustrates the use of a negative purposive verb form in a DS context in K'abeena.

(50) {*'at^i*   *k'ama'-o-ba'i-t^a*}   *k'aaww-a-s^i*
        2sNOM   drink-2s/3fPURP-NEG-PURP   coffee-mACC-DEF

        keess^i   *maat'-t'o.*
        pick_up.1s/3mPCO   hide-3mPV

        'She has hidden the coffee so that you wouldn't drink it.'
        (K̲'̲A̲B̲E̲E̲N̲A̲; Crass 2005: 311) [Glosses adapted; English translation by YT]

H̲A̲D̲I̲Y̲Y̲A̲ distinguishes between a SS and a DS purposive ("subjunctive") much in the same way as Kambaata does. The SS purposive paradigm ends in *-eena*, the DS paradigm in *-ona* (Sim 1989: 337); the morphemes are possibly not cognate to the purposive endings *-ó-ta* (SS) and *-un-ta* of Kambaata. The DS purposive (51) and the jussive main verb forms (52) are formally identical (recall the formal similarities between these verb forms in Kambaata, 3.1.4), apart from the fact that the jussive verb does not inflect for 2s and 2p (in which case the imperative forms are used).

(51) […] *mat k'at'a* {*buuzal-ona*} *k'ure'* *suume ifiis-akkamo*
    one amount cook-1s/3mPURP_{DS} pot.GEN mouth cover-3honIPV

'[…] one covers the mouth of the pot a while that it might cook.'
(HADIYYA; Sim 1989: 340) [glosses adapted]

(52) *masseebee'e* *keyye* *diss-ona*
    until_he_takes_away here put-3mJUS

'Until he takes it away, let him put it here.'
(HADIYYA; Sim 1989:172) [glosses adapted]

Hadiyya also uses dative VNs ("infinitives"; Sim 1989: 353f) and similative-marked relative verbs in purpose clauses (Sim 1989: 316). The similative morpheme is *-s-a* (or dative *-s-ina*).

The inspection of Kawachi's (2007) and Anbessa's (2000) grammars shows that SIDAAMA also applies three different purpose-encoding strategies. Analyses and examples of the purposive and the similative strategy are found in Kawachi (2007: 419f, 424, 442). Note that Kawachi himself does not use the label "purposive" but treats the verb form in the section on "infinitives". The morphological structure of the Sidaama purposive is slightly different from that of the languages mentioned above. The complex verbal endings are multi-morphemic and contain, among others, subject agreement morphemes and a dative case marker *-ra* (for details see Kawachi 2007: 420). The purposive paradigm shows no similarities with the jussive ("optative") paradigm but it overlaps partly with the imperfective main verb. The purposive verb forms are used in SS and DS contexts alike. The Sidaama morpheme *-gede* 'like' is as multifunctional as the similative morpheme of Kambaata, Alaaba, K'abeena and Hadiyya. The use of dative VNs, seemingly much less frequent in Sidaama than in other HEC languages, is attested by only three examples in Anbessa (2000: 162, 207f).

To conclude, all HEC languages for which we have reliable data at the present use three very similar purpose-encoding strategies, namely those discussed for Kambaata in more detail in 3.1-3.3. Kambaata and Hadiyya are the only HEC languages where the purposive verb forms are marked for switch reference and where the DS purposive paradigm is related to the jussive paradigm. In all HEC languages, dative VN clauses, purposive clauses and similative clauses are not only used to express purpose but are also used as complements of desiderative, modal, manipulative, utterance and other complement-taking verbs.[32]

5 Summary and outlook

This article has aimed at describing the purpose-encoding strategies of Kambaata, the (morpho-)syntactic features of different purpose clause types and the morphology of the verb forms used in purpose clauses. The main focus has been on the purposive, the dative VN and the similative strategy; the quotative and the converb strategies of encoding purpose have only been briefly addressed. The following noteworthy features have been identified in the course of the analysis: Kambaata has two paradigms of subordinate verb forms, the same subject (SS) purposive and the different subject (DS) purposive, which are primarily used in purpose clauses, sensitive to subject (non-)coreference between purpose clause and matrix clause, and historically related to the jussive main verb forms. Dative-marked verbal nouns have been shown to be restricted to purpose clauses that share the subject with the matrix clause. The most intriguing feature of the third purpose clause type – the similative-marked, relative-based purpose clause – is the multifunctionality of the clause-final morpheme =*g*- 'like'.

The three common purpose clause types can be arranged on a scale of decreasing integration (cf. Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 35):

> ➢ Dative VN clauses are most deranked (see the absence of TAM, subject agreement and object marking on the VN);

> ➢ Purposive clauses occupy an intermediate position (cf. the absence of TAM marking but the presence of a reduced system of subject agreement marking and the possibility to encode objects on the purposive verb form);

> ➢ Similative clauses are most balanced (see the presence of (default) TAM marking, subject agreement and object marking on the verb).[33]

This ranking is further supported by the fact that only similative clauses (and the marginal quotative construction) can be morphologically negated.

This article has also illustrated the substantial similarities in the morphosyntactic devices used to encode purpose and complement clauses. While it has been difficult to grasp the f u n c t i o n a l differences between the three common purpose clause types – essentially only f o r m a l differences in switch reference, negation, subject agreement and object marking could be identified – the choice of one or

the other complement clause type is shown to be determined, to a large extent, by the semantics of the complement-taking verbs (3.3.3). Desiderative verbs, modal verbs and phasal verbs, for instance, are largely incompatible with similative clauses, whereas dative VNs and the purposive cannot mark complements of utterance, knowledge and perception verbs.

While it is cross-linguistically very common that purpose clauses share marking devices with reason clauses, only very few formal similarities between these clauses could be identified in Kambaata (3.1.2.)

Apart from providing a description of purpose-encoding strategies in Kambaata, the purpose-encoding strategies attested in other HEC languages have been summarised.

This article raises questions that go beyond the HEC language group and require further investigation in the future. Firstly, the following ones have to be explored: how common it is for languages of the Cushitic language family and other languages spoken at the Horn of Africa to have multiple purpose-encoding strategies, to have (a) separate purposive paradigm(s), to make a distinction between SS and DS purposives, and to have purposives that are historically derived from jussive verb forms.

Secondly, it is still to be examined how common it is for languages of the area to have a multifunctional similative morpheme that can be used to mark purpose clauses and how this functional extension can be explained.[34] It is well attested that similative morphemes ('like') develop into quotatives or manner deictics ('so/like this') and from there into complementisers and other related clause linkage markers (including purpose clause markers) (see e.g. Güldemann 2002, Meyerhoff 2002, Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 163f). However, in Kambaata and other Ethiopian languages there is no evidence that similative morphemes are or have been used as quotatives, i.e. as markers of direct speech reports, instead the verb 'say' is used. Nor is there evidence that the similative morpheme is used as a manner deictic 'so/like [this]' in Ethiopian languages. Since the quotative and the manner deictic function have so far been assumed to be bridges in the development of similative morphemes into complementisers (and other clause linkage marker), a detailed investigation of the Ethiopian similative multifunctionality may well turn out to challenge the grammaticalisation paths proposed in the literature.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	NIPV	non-imperfective
ACC	accusative	NMZ1	nominalisation (by vowel lengthening)
COND	conditional		
COP3	*-t*-copula	NMZ2	nominalisation (by enclitic demonstrative pronoun)
CRD	coordination		
CS1	simple causative	NMZp	plural nominalisation (by enclitic =*r*-)
CS2	double causative		
DAT	dative	NOM	nominative
DDEM	determining demonstrative	NREL	negative relative
DEF	definite	O	object
DS	different subject	p	plural
f	feminine	OBL	oblique
GEN	genitive	PCO	perfective converb
hon	honorific, impersonal	PL	plurative
ICO	imperfective converb	POSS	possessive
ICP	instrumental-comitative-perlative	PREV	preventive
		PROG	progressive
IDEM	independent demonstrative pronoun	PS	passive
		PURP	purposive verb form
IMP	imperative	PV	perfective
INACT	inactual (past, irrealis)	PVE	*e*-perfective
INDIG	indignation	PVO	*o*-perfective
IPV	imperfective	REAS	reason
J	juncture	RED	reduplication
JUS	jussive	REL	relative
LOC	locative	s	singular
m	masculine	SG	singulative
MID	middle	SS	same subject
n	unanalysed pragmatically determined morpheme	SURP	surprise
		VN	verbal noun
NCO	negative converb	VV	long vowel
NEG	negation		

References

Anbessa Teferra, 2000: A grammar of Sidaama. PhD thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Carlson, Robert, 1994: A grammar of Supyire. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Crass, Joachim, 2005: Das K'abeena. Deskriptive Grammatik einer hochlandostkuschitischen Sprache. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Crass, Joachim & Ronny Meyer, 2008: Ethiopia. In: Bernd Heine & Derek Nurse (eds.), A linguistic geography of Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 228-249.

Cristofaro, Sonia, 2003: Subordination. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Güldemann, Tom, 2002: When 'say' is not say. The functional versatility of the Bantu quotative marker *ti* with special reference to Shona. In Tom Güldemann & Manfred von Roncador (eds.), Reported discourse. A meeting ground for different linguistic domains. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 253-287.

Jackson, Howard, 1995: Grammar and meaning: A semantic approach to English grammar. London: Longman.

Kambaatissata. *Rosaanchi maxaafa*, [Kambaata language. School book.] 1989 E.C.: Grade 1-8. Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples Regional State: Education Bureau.

Kawachi, Kazuhiro, 2007: A grammar of Sidaama (Sidamo), a Cushitic language of Ethiopia. PhD thesis, University at Buffalo, State University of New York.

Maatewoos Shagana, 1992 E.C.: *Kambaatissa xifati seerrata* [Rules of writing the Kambaata language]. Ed. by Liiranso Wotango & Tiitoos Heegana, Duuraame: Educational Department of the Kambaata-Alaaba-Xambaaro Zone.

Meyerhoff, Miriam, 2002: All the same? The emergence of complementizers in Bislama. In: Tom Güldemann & Manfred von Roncador (eds.), Reported discourse. A meeting ground for different linguistic domains. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 341-359.

Noonan, Michael, 2007: Complementation. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.), Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. 2: Complex constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52-150.

Rapold, Christian & Silvia Zaugg-Coretti, 2009: Exploring the periphery of the Central Ethiopian Linguistic Area: Data from Yemsa and Benchnon. In: Joachim Crass & Ronny Meyer (eds.), Language contact and language change in Ethiopia. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe, 59-81.

Saeed, John, 1999: Somali. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten, 2009: A typology of purpose clauses. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schneider-Blum, Gertrud, 2007: A grammar of Alaaba, a Highland East Cushitic language of Ethiopia. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Sim, Roland J., 1989: Predicate conjoining in Hadiyya. A Head-Driven PS grammar. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Thompson, Sandra A., Robert E. Longacre & Shin Ja J. Hwang, 2007: Adverbial clauses. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.), Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. 2: Complex constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 237-300.

Tosco, Mauro, 2001: The Dhaasanac language. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Treis, Yvonne, 2008a: A grammar of Kambaata. Part 1: Phonology, morphology, and non-verbal predication. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

–,   2008b: Relativization in Kambaata from a typological point of view. In: Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Erin Shay (eds.), Interaction of morphology and

syntax: Case studies in Afroasiatic. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John
Benjamins, 161-206.

–, 2011. Shared multifunctionality in Ethiopian languages: A case study of
'like'. Paper presented at the Journée scientifique, 18th November 2011,
CNRS-LLACAN, Villejuif.

–, forthcoming a. Negation in Highland East Cushitic. In: Ghil'ad
Zuckermann (ed.), Afro-Asiatic languages and cultures. Cambridge:
Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

–, forthcoming b. Switch-reference in Ethiopian languages. In: Journal of
Language Contact.

Vanhove, Martine, 2004: 'Dire' et finalité en bedja: Un cas de
grammaticalisation. In: Journal of African Languages and Linguistics 25,
2: 133-53.

Zaborski, Andrzej, 1975: The verb in Cushitic. Warsaw: Nakładem
Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

---

[2] Purpose clauses are marked by curly brackets throughout this article.

[3] An important note on the terminology used throughout this article: The
terms "purpose clause" and "purposive clause" are n o t used interchangeably.
A "purposive clause" is but one type of purpose clause in Kambaata, namely a
purpose clause whose final verb is from a purposive paradigm (cf. Table 1).
Purpose clauses cannot only contain purposive verb forms but e.g. also verbal
nouns (3.2) and relative verbs (3.3).

[4] Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 76) quotes one example from the Gur language
Supyire (Carlson 1994) in which a similative morpheme is used to mark a
purpose clause.

[5] The Kambaata data is written in the official orthography (to which I added
accents to indicate the position of phonemic stress; furthermore I marked all
word-medial and word-final glottal stops overtly) (Maatewoos 1992 E.C.). The
following graphemes are not in accordance with the IPA conventions: *<ph>* =
/p'/, *<x>* = */t'/*, *<q>* = */k'/*, *<j>* = */dʒ/*, *<c>* = */ʧ'/*, *<ch>* = */ʧ/*, *<sh>* = */ʃ/*, *<y>* = */j/*
and *<'>* = */ʔ/*. Length is indicated by double letters, e.g. *<aa>* = */a:/*, *<bb>* =
/b:/, and *<shsh>* = */ʃ:/*. The second consonant of a glottal stop-sonorant cluster is
generally written as double, although the cluster only consists of two phonemes,
e.g. *<'mm>* = */ʔm/*; this convention helps to distinguish these clusters from

glottalised sonorants, which are written <*'r*> and <*'l*>. Word-final unstressed /i/ does not occur orthographically, irrespective of its phonological status.

[6] The only counterexample is in fact an erroneous example published in Treis (2008a: 189, ex. 567). Instead of the SS purposive *fanqalóta* 'so that I return' (SS), the example should have included the DS purposive *fanqálunta* 'so that I return' (DS) (information by Deginet Wotango, 15/04/2011).

[7] If the subject of a converb clause and an adjacent clause are not entirely coreferent (part-whole or inclusion relationship), the DS converb form is used (Treis forthc. b).

[8] Switch reference-sensitive converbs (see Table 1) are even more important referent-tracking devices in Kambaata because they have a higher frequency than purposives.

[9] In the translations, focussed constituents are printed in small caps.

[10] The morphemes are usually not broken up in the glosses of the examples.

[11] With the exception of affirmative imperatives and verbal nouns.

[12] For details on object marking on verbs see Treis (2008a: 338-348).

[13] The morpheme =*tannée(ha)* originates from the feminine dative demonstrative pronoun *tannée(ha)* 'for this one (f)' (Treis 2008a: ch. 9.3).

[14] For other reason clause constructions see Treis (2008b: 195ff).

[15] The subject agreement morphemes are closest to the verbal stem: 1s/3m -∅, 2s/3f -*t*, 3hon -*een*, 1p -*n*, and 2p -*teen* (see the initial morphemes in all columns of Table 3). They are often subject to morphophonological processes (assimilation, metathesis and epenthesis); see e.g. (17) where -*t-un* 3fJUS is realised as -*s-un* after the verb stem *le'-is-* 'make grow'.

[16] The morpheme is reduced to -*u* in the 1s jussive.

[17] The demonstrative *ta* underwent multiple grammaticalisations in Kambaata (Treis 2008a: 128ff, 410).

[18] The affirmative imperatives have no person morphemes and their endings are not related to those of the jussive. The singular form ends in an unaccented, devoiced *i*; see *ít*[*i*] 'Eat!' The 2pIMP ends in -*é* (triggering palatalisation and/or gemination on single stem-final vowels) or in -*yyé* (if the stem ends in a geminate consonant or a cluster); see e.g. *ichch-é* 'Eat (p)!'

[19] Sim (1989) treats jussive and purposive verb forms under the label "subjunctive". The DS purposive ("subjunctive 2") is identical to the jussive.

[20] Cf. Sim (1989: 153) referring to comparative work on the Cushitic verb by Andrzej Zaborski (1975).

[21] The list of verb classes taking purposive complements may not be exhaustive. The labels for the different types of complement-taking verbs (or predicates) are taken from Noonan (2007).

[22] I cannot exclude that dative-marked VNs may be negated periphrastically with *hoog-* 'not do'. However, no periphrastically negated VNs in purpose clauses could so far be found in the corpus.

[23] Irrespective of whether it is used in deontic or epistemic function, the verb *dand-* 'can, be able; may' permits dative-marked VN and purposive complement clauses.

[24] Note that phasal verbs like *ins-* 'start' and *jammar-* 'start' (< Amharic) usually govern accusative-marked VNs; see e.g. *áayyee yú* (mACC) *insitóo'u* 'they started to mourn' (lit. 'they start to say *aayyee*').

[25] According to Kazuhiro Kawachi (19/04/2011, p.c.), there is a noun *gara* 'way, manner' in Sidaama, a HEC language closely related to Kambaata.

[26] This simplifies the matter because there are exceptions to this rule: some verb forms (progressive verbs and some forms of the *e*-perfective paradigm) do not undergo stress shift; in these cases, the relative forms are indistinguishable from the main verb forms.

[27] In Treis (2008b: 200) I had written that relative-based purpose clauses can be marked for different verbal aspects. This was clearly an error on my part and has to be corrected.

[28] There is in fact no difference between the OBL and ACC case forms of the similative; both are *=g-a*.

[29] Recall (35): negative relative verbs agree with their heads in case and gender. The similative morpheme is of nominal origin. It is of masculine gender and if it inflects for a non-accusative/non-nominative case form (e.g. as a marker of purpose clauses) its modifiers (incl. negative relative verbs) end in -*o/-ua* (masculine oblique).

[30] This tendency still requires exact quantification.

[31] The use of the 3fPOSS 'her' rather than the 1sPOSS 'my' in this direct speech complement is probably an error (in other quotative constructions of the corpus the pronouns are not adapted to the viewpoint of the speaker of the entire sentence but the viewpoint of the quoted speaker is retained).

[32] The interested reader is referred to the chapters on complementation in the grammars mentioned in this section.

[33] "Balanced" and "deranked" are used in the sense of Cristofaro (2003).

[34] Meyer & Crass (2008) as well as Rapold & Zaugg-Coretti (2009) have already followed up on the multi-functionality of the similative in selected languages but a systematic account of its distribution in the languages of the Horn of Africa is still pending.