

## COMPARATIVE NOTES ON THE CUSHITIC IMPERATIVE

Giorgio Banti (Naples)\*

### Introduction.

All Cushitic languages<sup>1</sup> have a special set of verbal forms that are used when issuing commands to one or more addressees. This set is commonly referred to as Imperative (Impt.). A considerably different set of forms is used for negative commands in several of these languages. As an example, the two sets used in Bilin, Sidamo, and Somali are shown in (1).

- (1) Affirmative (Aff.) and negative (Neg.) Impt. forms in one Agaw and two East Cushitic languages

	Bilin	Sidamo	Somali
	<i>gäb-</i> “refuse”	<i>hun-</i> “destroy”	<i>fur-</i> “open”
Aff. 2s.	<i>gäb-i</i>	<i>hun-i</i>	<i>fúr</i>
Aff. 2p.	<i>gäb-á</i>	<i>hunn-e</i>	<i>fúr-a</i>
Neg. 2s.	<i>gäb-əg</i>	<i>hun-toot-i</i>	<i>ha fúr-in</i>
Neg. 2p.	<i>gäb-g-á</i>	<i>hun-tinoont-e</i>	<i>ha fur-in-a</i>

It is apparent that the Aff. Impt. forms in these three languages display a certain degree of similarity to each other, while their Neg. counterparts are considerably different. Indeed, Bilin has a Neg. suffix *-(ə)g-*, Somali a Neg. prefix *ha* and a Neg. suffix *-in-*, and Sidamo the complex Neg. suffixes 2g. *-toot-* vs. 2p. *-tinoont-*. Nevertheless, disregarding the Neg. suffixes and the Somali Neg. prefix *ha*, the Neg.

\* A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the X Italian meeting of Hamito-Semitic (Afroasiatic) linguistics in April 2001 in Florence. The author is grateful to those who commented upon it, and to the friends and colleagues who answered with patience to his questions on several occasions, in particular Joachim Crass, Gideon Goldenberg, and Moreno Vergari. It must be stressed that they don't necessarily share some of the views that are expressed here. Research for preparing this paper was funded by the Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente and the Università di Napoli “L'Orientale” within the framework of the joint research project “Cushitic etymological data-base”.

The usual conventions have been followed for transcribing the different languages; only Somali, Oromo, and Saho forms have been transcribed with their national orthographies. Tones have been indicated only when the published sources did so reliably.

<sup>1</sup> This term is used here in its more common value, i.e., as “narrow” Cushitic without Omotic. The author is fully aware, however, of the ongoing discussion about the complex historical relationships between these two language families (cf. Zaborski, in print).

Impt. subject concord is mostly marked in the three languages in parallel ways, i.e., with the same endings as the Aff. Impt. forms: Somali 2s. Ø vs. 2p. *-a*, Sidamo 2s. *-i* vs. 2p. *-e*, Bilin 2p. *-á*. Notice that even Bilin 2g. *gäb-əg* “don’t refuse” with Ø rather than *-í* like 2s. *gäb-í* “refuse” is not a real exception, because Ø also occurs in a few Bilin Aff. Impt. 2g. forms like *lay<sup>w</sup>* “come!” and *ehín* “take!” (Reinisch 1882, 45; but *ʔaháni* in Palmer 1967, 209).

Only the Aff. Impt. forms shall be targeted for a comparative analysis in the following few pages, because their Neg. counterparts have to be accounted for in the wider perspective of the development of Neg. paradigms in Cushitic.<sup>2</sup>

Zaborski (1975, 164) mentioned the Impt. among the “inherited categories” of the Cushitic verb inflection in his final summary, but didn’t analyze systematically the different forms he quoted in this book. Palmer (1977, 201a) didn’t fail to point out this in his review of Zaborski’s book, and added that “the endings are remarkably consistent – zero or *i / ii* for the singular and *a / aʔ / aa* for the plural in all languages except Beja and the Iraq<sup>w</sup> group”. Hetzron (1980, 53 and note 55, 111) took up again the question of the Impt. in a historical and comparative perspective, attaching considerable importance to the Awngi 2p. forms with *-án* like *des-án* “study! (pl.)” from suffix-conjugated (SC) *des-* “study” and *aq-án* from prefix-conjugated (PC) *-ay-* “know”, that he took to be “the most archaic” forms.<sup>3</sup> He thus reconstructed 2s. *\*-i* but 2p. *\*-an*, that he regarded as “a remnant of a periphrastic imperative where the suffixes are old imperatives ... of an auxiliary, without the *t-* prefix (as in Semitic)”.

Hetzron’s extension of the Colizza-Reinisch hypothesis<sup>4</sup> from the Aff. imperfect and perfect to the Aff. Impt. was fully accepted a few years later by Voigt (1984, 238 f.). Yet it didn’t persuade Zaborski, even though this scholar has frequently made use of the above hypothesis to explain the origin of other features of the Cushitic verbal morphology as resulting from the grammaticalization of an old PC

<sup>2</sup> A good example of this is Appleyard (1984a) where the Bilin Neg. imperatives are discussed together with all the other Neg. verbal forms of Agaw, and their possible cognates in other groups of Cushitic languages.

<sup>3</sup> Several Cushitic languages distinguish, on the one hand, a major class of verbs inflected by means of suffixes only and, on the other hand, a smaller class with both prefixes and suffixes and in most cases a considerably different system for marking tense. These two classes are traditionally known as SC verbs and, respectively, PC verbs. For a recent discussion about this issue see, e.g., Voigt (1996; 1998), and Banti (in print) where the relevant literature is also extensively quoted.

<sup>4</sup> The Colizza-Reinisch hypothesis is a better name for what has been frequently referred to as the Praetorius hypothesis, because Giovanni Colizza and Leo Reinisch published its main outlines in 1889 and 1890, while Franz Praetorius did so only in 1893 and 1894 as pointed out, e.g., by Zaborski (1991, 78) and myself (Banti, in print).

## The Cushitic Imperative

auxiliary. In fact, in his above quoted description of what can be reconstructed for Proto-Cushitic morphology, he just lists the “Imperative endings *-a* (masc.), *-i* (fem.), *-a-na* (pl.)” (Zaborski 1991, 78). In doing this, he strongly relies upon the Beja data, consistently with his view that this language is the most conservative language of the Cushitic family.

In the following sections the overall structure of the Aff. Impt. paradigms, the forms of the Impt. 2s., and the Impt. 2p. will be examined in the light of our presently improved knowledge of several individual Cushitic languages, in order to compare them both within Cushitic and in the wider context of Afroasiatic.

The structure of the Aff. Impt. paradigms in Cushitic.

All the Agaw and nearly all the East Cushitic languages have two-place paradigms for their Aff. Impt. like those of Bilin, Sidamo, and Somali in example (1). That is, they all have one form for the 2s., and one for the 2p. It shall be seen below, however, that in some languages different conjugational classes may have different endings.

More complex paradigms with forms also for the 1st and 3rd persons have been described for some languages. For instance, Moreno (1940, 46) reported together with the Sidamo 2s. and 2p. forms that were seen in (1) above also 1s. *huno* “let me destroy! should I destroy?”, 3sm. *huno* “let him destroy!”, 3sf. *hunto* “let her destroy!”, 1p. *hunno* “let us destroy! should we destroy?”, and 3p. *hunno* “let them destroy!”. G. Hudson (1976, 268) correctly separated these forms with final *-o* as Jussive (Juss.) forms that match similar forms with *o* and *u* in the Juss. paradigms of the other Highland East Cushitic (HEC) languages, as well as in Oromo, Saho, Somali, etc. Similarly, Gasparini (1979, 22) lumped the Gujjii Oromo Aff. Impt. forms *cinini* [č’inini] “bite! (s.)” and *cinina’* [č’inina?] “bite! (p.)” together with Juss. forms like *cininu* [č’ininu] “let him bite!”, *cininanu* [č’ininanu] “let them bite!”, etc. It shall be seen below, however, that there is a close connection between the Impt. and the Juss. forms in several Cushitic languages, because both sets are used for commands and wishes. This has caused endings from the one set of forms to spread by analogy to the other set.

A truly different paradigm structure occurs in Beja, that distinguishes m. from f. forms in the singular, as shown in (2). Comparing Beja 2sf. *-ii* ~ *-i* and Semitic 2sf. *-ii*, e.g., in Akkadian and Hebrew *qirb-ī* “approach! (2sf.)” is quite tempting, but the lack of parallels to the Beja distinction between 2sm. *dif-a* and 2sf. *dif-i* in the rest of Cushitic makes it possible to regard it as a language-specific innovation rather than a retention. Indeed one may argue that Beja distinguishes 2sm. from

2sf. forms by means of *-a* and, respectively, *-i* in all its finite verb forms, and even makes use of these two suffixes in order to distinguish a male from a female addressee in sentences like, e.g., *?uu-yaas tamya-heeb-a* “the dog bit (*tamya-*) me (*-heeb-*)” (said to a man) from *?uu-yaas tamya-heeb-i* “the dog bit me ” (said to a woman; from R.A. Hudson 1976, 125), or *?i-gaw-uuk keey-a* “where is your house (*?i-gaw-uuk*)” (said to a man; from R.A. Hudson 1976, 141). It would have been quite easy for these two suffixes to spread by analogy to the Impt. singular. On the other hand, it shall be seen below that evidence for an opposition between 2sm. *\*-ā* and 2sf. *\*-ī* can be found in the Coptic irregular Impt. of “come”, even though seeing it as a residue of an older distinction between m. and f. sg. forms in the Impt. of all the Egyptian verbs is quite speculative.

(2) Beja three-place Aff. Impt. paradigm

	SC verbs ( <i>tam-</i> “eat”)	PC verbs ( <i>-dif-</i> “go”)
2sm.	<i>tam-aa</i>	<i>dif-a</i>
2sf.	<i>tam-ii</i>	<i>dif-i</i>
2p.	<i>tam-aana</i> ~ <i>tam-aan</i> ~ <i>tam-na</i> <sup>5</sup>	<i>dif-na</i>

The ventive imperatives of West Rift and Jiiddu.

In addition to the number of the addressees (singular vs. plural), other grammatical categories are also distinguished in the Aff. Impt. of the West Rift languages: the direction of the action (unmarked vs. ventive when the action is towards the speaker or what is regarded as the center of attention), the presence of a 3.rd person direct object (unmarked intransitive vs. marked transitive).

For instance, Iraqw has eight different forms in the Aff. Impt. of a transitive verb, as shown in (3). Burunge has an even more complex paradigm that distinguishes whether the 3.rd person direct object is masculine, feminine, or plural. For instance, Kießling (1994, 178 f.) showed how for the single Iraqw form *dootek* “dig it/them!” Burunge has the three forms *dootek<sup>u</sup>* “dig it (m.)!”, *dootek<sup>a</sup>* “dig it (f.)!”, and *dootek<sup>i</sup>* “dig them!”, where *-k<sup>u</sup>*, *-k<sup>a</sup>* and *-k<sup>i</sup>* are devoiced counterparts of the object clitics 3m. *gu*, 3f. *ga*, and 3p. *gi* that precede the verbal forms in other tenses and moods both in Burunge and in the other West Rift languages.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> For SC verbs, Almkvist (1881, 126) reports both *-aana* and *-aan*, Reinisch (1894, 186) *-aana* and *-na*, Roper (1928, 40) and R.A. Hudson (1976, 121) only *-aana*.

<sup>6</sup> In Iraqw these three clitics frequently occur as *u*, *a* and *i* respectively.

## The Cushitic Imperative

(3) Iraqw Aff. Impt. of <i>doot-</i> “dig, cultivate” (from Mous 1993, 164)		
	Unmarked	Ventive
2s. (without 3.rd pers. obj.)	<i>dóot</i>	<i>dootán</i>
2p. (without 3.rd pers. obj.)	<i>dooté?</i>	<i>dootaré?</i>
2s. (with 3.rd pers. obj.)	<i>dootéek</i>	<i>dootán</i>
2p. (with 3.rd pers. obj.)	<i>dootaak</i>	<i>dootaré?</i>

It thus appears that the presently somewhat obscure Iraqw forms 2s. *dootéek* and 2p. *dootaak* originate through final vowel loss – “terminal erosion” in Kießling’s (2002, 401) terminology – from non ventive Aff. Impt forms with suffixed object clitics. The Burunge counterparts of the Iraqw ventive *dootán* “dig it/them in my direction!” are *dootánk<sup>m</sup>* “dig it (m.) in my direction!”, *dootánk<sup>f</sup>* “dig it (f.) in my direction!”, and *dootánk<sup>i</sup>* “dig them in my direction!”. Also here the Iraqw form arose through phonological change – final vowel loss and the simplification of *nk* to *ŋ* – while the Iraqw plural ventive form with 3.rd person object has to be explained through a more complex process with different stages of analogical levelling, as shown convincingly by Kießling (2002, 400).

What remains is the opposition between ventive and unmarked Aff. Impt. forms, that would look like a West Rift oddity if a rather divergent dialect spoken in the interriverine area of Somalia, i.e., Jiiddu did not display a similar opposition in its Aff. Impt.:

(4) Jiiddu Aff. Impt. of <i>for-</i> “open”:		
	Unmarked	Ventive
2s.	<i>forí?</i>	<i>fórâan</i>
2p.	<i>foriŋ</i>	<i>fóraabiŋ</i>

Ventive is a grammatical category that has been described so far just for a handful of East and Southern Cushitic languages. In most cases it is in opposition with an unmarked form and is expressed by means of a preverbal particle, as in the southern Somali dialects May (von Tiling 1922, 154 f.: Ø vs. prefixal *sa* or *ha*), and Tunni (Tosco 1997, 99: Ø vs. prefixal *soo*), as well as in Boni (Sasse 1979b, 106; Heine 1982, 43 and 67: Ø vs. prefixal *háa* or, in the north-eastermost dialect, *hóo*), and Rendille (Pillinger and Galboran 1999, 29a: Ø vs. prefixal *sóo*). Also in Iraqw and Burunge the ventive is expressed in non Impt. sentences by means of

the preverbal particle *ni*, rather than by means of inflected forms as in the Impt. forms seen in (3) above.

In Somali and western Omo-Tana the ventive is part of a three-way opposition between unmarked, ventive, and andative – for actions oriented away from what is regarded as the center of attention. Also in these languages such directional categories are marked by particles that occur immediately before the verb, as shown in example (5) below for Somali. For Arbore see Hayward (1984, 310 f.: Ø vs. ventive with prefixal *ʔár* vs. andative with prefixal *ʔúg*), and for Dhaasanac the description by Tosco (2001, 234 ff.: Ø vs. ventive with prefixal *ká* vs. andative with prefixal *gaa*).

(5) Somali examples of unmarked, ventive and andative forms (middle *soc-od-* [so<sup>c</sup>-od-] “walk, go”):

Unmarked	<i>socó</i> “walk!, go on!”
Ventive	<i>sóo socó</i> “come this way! approach!”
Andative	<i>síi socó</i> “go on over there!”

Dahalo is the only known Cushitic language whose ventive and andative particles – *-ʔá* and *-jí* respectively – may occur at the end of the verbal complex both in Impt. and non Impt. sentences. Their position is within a string of clitics that is either suffixed to a verb or to a preceding noun phrase, or split up in two chunks that precede and follow the verb, as shown by Tosco (1991, 69).

(6) Dahalo ventive Impt. of *heeʔ-* “give” (from Tosco 1991, 74)

<i>maʔa</i>	<i>heeʔó-ʔi-ʔa</i>
water	give-me-VENTIVE
“Give (pl.) me water!”	

On the other hand, Jiiddu systematically makes use of an auxiliary verb, *-eb-*, for expressing the ventive. Lamberti (1981, 64 f.) saw it as an old PC verb, that has shifted to the SC pattern in a number of forms, even though he failed to recognize the ventive value of the forms it occurs in. When the Jiiddu 2p. ventive Aff. Impt. *fóraabín* “open (pl.) in this direction!” that was seen in (4) above is compared to Jiiddu *foráa-bidís* “she should open it in his direction!” in (7), it appears that it should be analyzed as *fóraa-bín*, i.e., as having the residue of the auxiliary *-eb-* with the 2p. Impt. ending *-ín* of the unmarked Impt., and a high tone on the first

## The Cushitic Imperative

syllable like the 2s. ventive Impt. *fórâan*. It is thus reasonable to regard it as a properly Jiiddu innovation.

- (7) Examples of unmarked vs. ventive forms of Jiiddu *for-* “open” (from Banti unpublished MS)

	Unmarked	Ventive
Juss. 1s.	<i>forís</i>	<i>foráa-ebís</i> (PC)
Juss. 3sm.	<i>forís</i>	<i>foráa-yebís</i> (PC)
Juss. 3sf.	<i>fortís</i>	<i>foráa-tebís</i> (PC) or <i>foráa-bidís</i> (SC)
Juss. 3p.	<i>fornís</i>	<i>foráa-nebís</i> (PC) or <i>foráa-binís</i> (SC)
Juss. 3p.	<i>forâas</i>	<i>foráa-yebâas</i> (PC)

Yet no obvious trace of the stem of the ventive auxiliary *-eb-* appears to be present in the Jiiddu ventive 2s. *fórâan* whose similarity with its Iraqw counterpart *dootán* makes it unlikely to be a Jiiddu innovation like the 2p. ventive Impt. *fóraabín* and requires an explanation. The relevant forms are repeated in (8) below with the addition of their Burunge counterparts.

- (8) The ventive Aff. Impt. in Jiiddu (*for-* “open”), Iraqw and Burunge (*doot-* “dig, cultivate”)

	2s.	2p.
Jiiddu	<i>fórâan</i>	<i>fóraabín</i>
Iraqw (without 3.rd pers. obj.)	<i>dootán</i>	<i>dootaré?</i>
Burunge (without 3.rd pers. obj.)	<i>doota</i>	<i>dootaar<sup>i</sup></i>

Kießling (2002, 398 ff.) reconstructs 2s. *\*-aŋ* and 2p. *\*-aŋ-ri* > *\*-aari* for his Proto-West-Rift (PWR), i.e., for the common ancestor of both Iraqw and Burunge. Analogy can explain the replacement of *\*-i* with *\*-e?* in the Iraqw 2p., and of *\*dootán* with *\*dootaa* > *doota* in the Burunge 2s. (In the former case the ending came from the non ventive Impt. 2p. *dooté?*; in the second case the new 2s. *\*dootaa* > *doota* may have been created from the 2p. *dootaar<sup>i</sup>* on the model of the Perfect where *doot<sup>i</sup>* is the 1s. and 3sm. counterpart of the 3p. *dootir<sup>i</sup>*.) Since the ventive preverbal particle is *ni* in non-Impt. tenses and moods in both Iraqw and Burunge, one may suggest that it could be appended at the end of Impt. verbal forms just like the 3.rd person object clitics, as in Dahalo. Yet the history of Jiiddu and the correspondences between West Rift and East Cushitic are still rather obscure, and it is difficult to say whether the nasal of the ventive particle was *\*n*,

\**ɣ*, or something else. But the implication is that if the Jiiddu ventive 2s. *-āan* is not a loan from a West Rift language with which Jiiddu has been in contact in the past, it is the only survival in this language of a ventive particle with a nasal that could be appended at the end of, at least, the 2s. Impt forms. When it was lost elsewhere, Jiiddu generalized its new periphrastic ventive forms with the *-eb-* auxiliary. This ventive particle is an isogloss that links the West Rift languages and Jiiddu. A further trace of it may be the final *-n* in the 2s. Aff. Impt. of Bayso non-middle verbs like *dubín* from *dub-* “bake”, *déen* from *dee-* ~ *dii-* “see, look”, or *kíin* from *kee-* “get up” (cf. Hayward 1978, 563), where it lost its ventive value and replaced the older forms.

#### The 2s. Imperative

Most Agaw, East Cushitic and Southern Cushitic languages have Imperative 2s. forms that look very much like those seen in (1) above. That is, they have just one form for the 2s., without distinguishing the gender of the addressee, and either have no ending or end in *-i*.

#### (9.a) Some languages with Ø in the 2s. Impt.

Khamtanga	<i>k'áb</i> from <i>k'äb-</i> “cut”
Saho	<i>fák</i> from SC <i>faak-</i> “open” <i>ucúb</i> [u <sup>˘</sup> úb] from PC <i>-oocob-</i> “drink”
Dhaasanac	<i>fúr</i> from SC <i>fur-</i> “open, untie” <i>kársiš</i> from SC causative <i>kar-siš-</i> “cause to boil” <i>?áagas</i> from PC reduplicated <i>-eges-</i> “kill”
S'aamakko	<i>q'áq'</i> from <i>q'aq'-</i> “cut”
Iraqw	<i>dóoʔ</i> from <i>dooʔ-</i> “dig, cultivate”, cf. ex. (3)

#### (9.b) Some languages with *-i* in the 2s. Impt.

Sidamo	<i>huni</i> from <i>hun-</i> “destroy”, cf. ex. (1)
Oromo	<i>dhúgi</i> [d'úgi] from <i>dhug-</i> “drink”
Dahalo	<i>lúbi</i> “imperfective” Impt. from <i>lub-</i> “hit”
Burunge	<i>dooʔi</i> from <i>dooʔ-</i> “dig, cultivate”

#### (9.c) Some languages with both Ø and *-i* in the 2s. Impt.

Awngi	<i>dés</i> from SC <i>des-</i> “study” <i>lám</i> ~ <i>lámí</i> from SC <i>lám-</i> “shut, cover” <i>aqí</i> from PC <i>-ay-</i> “know”, cf. also ex. (16)
-------	--



## The Cushitic Imperative

Rendille	<i>fúr</i> from SC <i>fur-</i> “open, untie” <i>kári</i> from SC causative <i>kar-ič-</i> “cook” <i>?agîis</i> from PC <i>-igis-</i> “kill”
Harso	<i>téeḥ</i> from <i>teeḥ</i> “give” <i>ékkí</i> from <i>ekk-</i> “take”
Yaaku	<i>deet</i> from <i>deet-</i> “eat” <i>xáni</i> from <i>xan-</i> “go”

Agaw has both  $\emptyset$  and *-i*, sometimes even in the same verb like Awngi *lám-* “shut, cover”; however Bilin has *-i* in most verbs (cf. ex. 1 above and the subsequent discussion), and Khamtanga and Kemant  $\emptyset$ . A residue of older *\*-i* in Khamtanga is probably to be found in the occasional palatalization of the stem final stop in the Impt. sg., cf. example (16). Appleyard (1991, 22) showed that Agaw *i* is generally from long *\*ii*, and an explanation of the alternation between final  $\emptyset$  and *i* < *\*ii* in this language group is attempted in the final section of this paper.

HEC and Oromo have consistently *-i* in the 2s. Imperative. Oromo and, within HEC, Burji usually seem to distinguish several final long and short vowels, and thus suggest short *\*-i* for this ending. Saho-Afar consistently has  $\emptyset$  with verb stems that don't end in double consonants, and Black suggested that this may be due to the loss of final short *\*-i* when it was preceded by an accented vowel (Black 1974, 130), if it is not from  $\emptyset$ . Also Dhaasanac appears to have  $\emptyset$  in most non-middle verbs, but Somali, Rendille and Boni have  $\emptyset$  in primary verbs and *-i* in causative verbs, and Arbore has residues of this distribution in causative verbs such as *kar-is-* “bake” that may have both *kári* with *-i* like Rendille and Somali *kári*, and *karís* with  $\emptyset$  like Dhaasanac *kársiš*. Since final short vowels are generally lost in Omo-Tana its 2s. Imperative forms can be from both old *\*-i* and  $\emptyset$  like the Saho-Afar ones.

The occurrence of *-i* in the causative forms, where it replaces the stem extension, seems to be a specifically Omo-Tana innovation. For Somali and Boni it may be explained within the framework of the allophonic alternations of the causative stem extension discussed by Sasse (1979a, 32) and Voigt (1985, 169 f.): Somali and Boni *-iy-* and Dhaasanac *-i-* before vocalic endings, but Somali and Boni *-is-* and Dhaasanac *-ič-* when it incorporates the initial *\*t* of the non-Impt. 2s., 3sf., and 2p. endings, e.g., Somali *má kar-iy-ó* “he doesn't cook it” vs. *má kar-is-ó* < *\*kar-is-to* “she doesn't cook it”. In Somali and Boni, final *-i* in *kári* “cook!” and similar forms could thus be from *\*-iy-i* > *\*-ii* with the regular shortening of final long vowels. But Rendille and Arbore have different allomorphs here, i.e.,

Rendille *-č-* and Arbore *-s-* before vocalic endings, and *-is-* like Somali and Boni in the non-Impt. 2s., 3sf., and 2p. This is why Voigt (1985, 173) suggested that the final *-i* of Rendille *kári* and Arbore *kari* is due to the loss of the final obstruent of the causative stem-extension, that he reconstructs as *\*-is-*.

In Harso the distribution of  $\emptyset$  vs. *-i* is phonologically conditioned: *-i* after stems that end in two consonants,  $\emptyset$  elsewhere. Yaaku is, unfortunately, not known enough to understand what governs the distribution of  $\emptyset$  vs. *-i* in the 2s. Impt. On the other hand, Kießling (2002, 398) confidently reconstructs for the West Rift languages a final short *-i*, that is preserved as a “Flüstervokal” *-i* in Burunge and is regularly deleted in Iraqw.

A different vocalic ending can be observed in the Saho PC verbs that have stems with final geminate consonants like *-oobb-* “hear” or *-eskett-* “gather, collect”. The few dialects that allow long final vowels have *-aa* here, that is shortened to *-a* in most other dialects: *oobbá(a)* “listen!”, *eskettá(a)* “gather them!”. Interestingly, the closely related Afar dialects either have simply *óob* and *eskét* with  $\emptyset$  and simplification of the final geminate consonants, or add *-Vy*, i.e., *oobbíy* ~ *oobbúy* and *eskettíy* like verbs with a final weak radical (ultima infirmae, ult. inf.) such as *-ođe(y)-* ‘tie’ or *-ettehe(y)-* “give for one’s self” that have, respectively, *uđúy* and *uttuhúy*. Saho ult. inf. verbs have *urhúw* [urúw] ~ *urhúu* and *uttuxúw* [uttuhúw] ~ *uttuxúu* with a different glide that is probably due to the stem vowels, but not *-á(a)* like the verbs with stems in geminate consonants. The three Saho types, i.e., *ucúb* [u<sup>c</sup>úb] “drink!” for verbs with a single non-weak final consonant, *urhúw* ~ *urhúu* “tie up!” for ult. inf. verbs, and *oobbá(a)* “drink!” for verbs with final geminate consonants are thus matched by just two types in Afar, i.e., *u<sup>c</sup>úb* “drink!” and *uđúy* “tie up!”, because the verbs like *-oobb-* are assimilated to one or the other of these according to the dialect. The likeliest conclusion is that the Saho type *oobbá(a)* “drink!” is conservative, and has been lost in Afar.

The West Rift languages seem to have *\*-e* in some 2s. Impt. forms, as argued by Kießling (2002, 398f.). Burunge retains it in its monosyllabic verbs with short stem vowels, like *dife* from *dif-* “hit, beat”, or *gu<sup>?</sup>e* from *gu<sup>?</sup>-* “sleep”, but all the West Rift languages retain it also in the other verbs before 3.rd person object suffixes, like Burunge *doote-k<sup>u</sup>* “dig it (m.)!”, or Iraqw *dootee-k* “dig it/them!” – cf. example (3) above and the subsequent discussion.

The Omo-Tana and Oromoid languages have special endings in the 2s. of middle verbs. It appears from (10) that the Omo-Tana languages have *-o* – Dhaasanac *-u* – or *-a* that replaces the middle verb extension, while the Oromoid languages have *-u* or *-o* added to the stem extension. In Konso this is always *-ad’-* before vowel-

## The Cushitic Imperative

initial suffixes through analogical levelling, while in Oromo it is *-at-* in 3ms. and 3p. forms, but *-addh-* in the 1s. and before the vocalic suffixes of the 2s. and 2p. Impt., see also the discussion about ex. (17). Black (1974, 129) reconstructed *\*-o* for his Proto-Southern-Lowland, i.e., for Omo-Tana and Oromoid, but Hayward (1979, 252) extended this ending to the whole of East Cushitic because of its occurrence in the irregular 2s. Impt. “come!” in Saho *amó*, Gedeo *amo* and some of their HEC cognates. It shall be argued below, however, that these irregular forms have to be explained differently.

(10) The 2s. Impt. of the middle verbs *\*k'ab-at-* and *\*mur-at-* in the main Omo-Tana and Oromoid languages

Somali	<i>qabó</i> from <i>qab-t-</i> “hold for one’s self; do”
Boni	<i>ʔóbo</i> from <i>ʔow-d-</i> “seize”
Rendille	<i>hábó</i> from <i>hab-t-</i> “get hold of”
Bayso	<i>ába</i> from <i>ab-at-</i> “seize personally”
Arbore	<i>k'ába</i> from <i>k'ab-t-</i> “seize, receive”
Dhaasanac	<i>múru</i> from <i>mur-ǝ-</i> “cut for one’s self, harvest”
Oromo	<i>qabáddhu</i> [k'abád'd'u] from <i>qab-at-</i> “catch for one’s self; own”
Konso	<i>k'apad'o</i> from <i>k'ap-ad'-</i> “catch”

Voigt (1985, 173; 1989, 484) more plausibly called attention to Reinisch’s idea (1903, 26 and 95) that Somali *qabó* should be seen as a direct development of an old *\*k'ab-at-*, i.e., as due to the phonological change of the middle stem extension in word-final position,<sup>7</sup> and found independent evidence for the loss of the final *\*t* in nominal endings such as the pl. suffix *-ó* < *\*-ót*. This explains neatly the *a* vowel of the Bayso and Arbore forms, that simply preserves the *a* vowel the middle stem extension usually has in Oromoid and Omo-Tana.

Yet this does not explain the final *-u* of Oromo *qabaddhu* and its Konso counterpart. A possible explanation here is that this vocalic ending spread from the Juss., that has *-u*, *-tu* etc. in Oromo and *-o*, *-to* etc. in Konso. Analogical pressure from the Juss. may have conspired with phonological change also in the

<sup>7</sup> Actually Voigt interpreted these Impt. endings in the perspective of Hetzron’s above mentioned extension of the Colizza-Reinisch hypothesis to the Impt., and reconstructed forms like *\*qab-at-ʔV* where *\*ʔV* is allegedly what remains of the old inflected auxiliary. The present author, instead, is trying to do without the Colizza-Reinisch hypothesis in explaining these forms as well as some other parts of the Cushitic verbal system, cf. Banti (in print).

spread of *-o* and *-u* in the Omo-Tana middle imperatives. The difference is that the Oromoid languages added the originally Juss. *-u* to the middle stem extension replacing what may have been *\*k'abad'd'i*, while in the Omo-Tana languages the Juss. ending just contributed to fixing the quality of the vowel that resulted from final *\*-at* – if it was not *\*-ad'* as in Oromoid. There are several other instances of originally Juss. endings extended to the Impt. in Cushitic, as shown in (11).

(11) Other instances of originally Juss. endings extended to Impt. forms

Maay (= Jabarti, Central Somali) Introduction of *-óy* in the 2s. Impt. of middle verbs, e.g., *gor-óy* “understand (sg.) it!”, cf. Juss. *gór-od-oy* “may he understand it”

Bayso Replacement of the inherited 2p. Impt. ending with Juss. *-en* in middle verbs, e.g., *aba-en* “seize (pl.) personally!” vs. 3p. Juss. *há ab-at-en* “may they seize personally”.

Arbore Introduction of *-é* as a variant of the inherited 2p. Impt. ending *-á* in middle and causative verbs, e.g., middle *k'aʔd'é* beside *k'aʔd'á* from *k'ab-t-* “seize, receive”, causative *karsé* beside *karsá* from *kar-is-* “bake” vs. 3p. Juss. *ʔald'ú-so k'atté* “may they seize”, and *ʔald'ú-so karsé* “may they bake”.

West Rift Kießling (2002, 400) suggests that the inherited 2p. Impt. *\*-a*, preserved in Burunge *doot<sup>a</sup>* “dig (pl.)!”, has been replaced with *\*-eeʔi* from the Juss. in Iraqw *doot-éʔ* “dig (pl.)!” and Alagwa.

It remains to be explained why these analogical processes took place in Omo-Tana and Oromoid only in one or two classes of derived verbs and not also elsewhere, as in Iraqw and Alagwa.

In addition to this, it should be remembered that Dahalo has *-u* in the 2s. Impt. of perfective verbs, like *púh-u* from *puh-* “stab, sting”.

Beside the 2s. Impt. forms in  $\emptyset$  and *-i* that were seen above in (9.c), like Harso *téeh* from *teeh* “give” or *ékkí* from *ekk-* “take”, the Dullay languages have a

## The Cushitic Imperative

different type with *-a*, matched by 2p. *-id'á* in Harso and Dobase, but by 2p. *-iná* in S'aamakko (cf. Amborn, Minker and Sasse 1980, 115; Hayward 1989, 41 ff.). It looks very much like the Arbore Impt. of middle verbs that was discussed above, but has a wholly different distribution, because it characterises what Hayward called Type II verbs, i.e., the verbs of the second tonal class that include both primary and middle verbs, while middle verbs of Type I form their imperatives like the primary verbs of their tonal class, as shown in (12).

(12) Harso singular and plural Impt. forms of Type I and Type II verbs

	Type I verbs		Type II verbs	
	Non-middle	Middle	Non-middle	Middle
	<i>teeḥ-</i> “give”	<i>kod'-ad'-</i> “work”	<i>č'oh-</i> “milk”	<i>fill-ad'-</i> “comb”
2s.	<i>téeḥ</i>	<i>kód'-ad'</i>	<i>č'óḥ-a</i>	<i>fill-ad'-a</i>
2p.	<i>teeḥ-á</i>	<i>kod'-ad'-á</i>	<i>č'oh-id'á</i>	<i>fill-ad'-id'á</i>

Pending a more thorough study of the Dullay languages, one can only suggest that the type 2s. *-a* 2p. *-id'á* may have arisen in middle verbs as in Omo-Tana, but was lost in those middle verbs that were assigned to Type I. In verbs of the second tonal class it spread also to non-middle verbs, while the truly middle verbs underwent reinflection.

The 2s. Impt. of “come” in Saho-Afar, HEC etc.

It is well known, at least since Ferguson’s paper on the Ethiopian language area, that most languages in the Horn of Africa have irregular imperatives for their verb “come”, cf. Ferguson (1976, 74), and recently Tosco (2000, 349 f.). The Cushitic languages are no exception to this, and the particular form of the Saho 2s. imperative of this verb has been mentioned above together with one of its HEC cognates. They are repeated here in (13) together with other Impt. forms that are related to them.

It is possible to reduce these imperatives to two groups of forms, that underwent analogical change in some languages. The first one is *\*amo* preserved as such in Sidamo, Gedeo and Saho, and with some phonetic change in Burji *aamu*. Its final *\*-o* was definitely short because it is short also in the northern Saho dialects that keep the final long vowels distinct from the final short ones. It was normalized in Afar *am* and Kambaata *ami*, where the usual Impt. 2s. endings are Ø and, respectively, *-i*. Kambaata *ameet-i* is the regular Impt. of the stem *ameet-* that is used for the other tenses of “come”, while Somali *imów* is the regular Impt. of the

SC middle stem *imaad-* with long *aa* that is used for some forms of this verb alongside its PC stems *-imi* ~ *-imid* and *-imaadd-*. Somali *imów* – in use beside the more common suppletive Impt. *káalay* “come!” that has good cognates in Dhaasanac, Rendille and Boni – may be regarded as another instance of normalization of the old Impt. sg. *\*amo*.<sup>8</sup> The other group includes Beja *m?*- ~ *m?ee-* – if the variant of the 2sf. is to be analyzed as *m?ee-y* – and Arbore *may*: these forms have no initial *a-*, and their ending looks different.

(13) Cushitic 2s. Impt. of “come” containing *\*m*

Beja	<i>m?aa</i> m. <i>m?ii</i> ~ <i>m?eey</i> f.	vs. SC <i>ee-</i> “come” in Perf. 3sm. <i>eeya</i> , 3sf. <i>eeta</i>
Kambaata	<i>ami</i> ~ <i>ameeti</i>	vs. <i>ameet-</i> “come”
Sidamo	<i>amo</i>	vs. <i>dag-</i> “come”
Gedeo	<i>amo</i>	vs. <i>dag-</i> “come”
Burji	<i>aamu</i>	vs. <i>int-</i> (but Impf. stem <i>intay-</i> ) “come”
Saho	<i>amó</i>	vs. PC <i>-emeet-</i> “come”
Afar	<i>am</i>	vs. PC <i>-emeet-</i> “come”
Arbore	<i>may</i>	vs. PC <i>-eečč-</i> “come”
Somali	<i>imów</i> beside <i>káalay</i>	vs. PC <i>-imi</i> ~ <i>-imid</i> (but Impf. and Juss. stem <i>-imaadd-</i> ) “come”

Newman (1980, 21 f.) already noticed the similarity between the Saho and Beja forms and Old Egyptian *mi*, the irregular Impt. of *iyi* ~ *iwi* “come”, suggesting that they are “inherited features of real classificatory significance”. Also Vycichl (1983, 59b f.) pointed out that the stems used by Beja (*m?*- ~ *m?ee-* Impt. of *ee-* “come”) are an exact parallel of the Old Egyptian ones (*mi* Impt. of *iyi* ~ *iwi* “come”). There are even deeper similarities, although they are somewhat obscured by the nature of the writing systems used for Egyptian, that started to indicate vowels systematically only in the Coptic stage at the beginning of the Current Era. Indeed, in the older texts this Impt. seems always to be *mi*, where the final *i* could indicate the presence of a vowel, a glottal stop or a glide. The variant *im* with a

<sup>8</sup> The presence of *\*amo* > *\*amu* in an earlier stage of Oromo may also be the reason why many of its northern and eastern dialects have *-u* in the non-middle suppletive 2s. Impt. *kóttu* “come!” (vs. *dhuf-* [d’uf-] “come”), from where it spread also to *béenu* “go!” (vs. *deem-* ~ *adeem-* “go”).

## The Cushitic Imperative

prefixed *i* like the Old Egyptian imperatives from biradical and ult. inf. verbs became increasingly frequent during the late II millennium BCE, and was the only one that survived into Coptic. In this final stage of Egyptian, the common invariable stem, the so-called infinitive, of this verb had become  $\epsilon\text{I} \sim \text{I} [\text{i}] < i\text{w}\bar{i} \sim i\text{y}\bar{i}$ , while its sg. Impt. was m.  $\lambda\text{MOY}$  [amú], f.  $\lambda\text{MH}$  [amé], that preserved in their  $\lambda$ - the initial *i*- of the late Egyptian form *im*. The different stressed vowels can be explained as regular developments of different vocalic endings, i.e.,  $*-\bar{a}$  in the m., and  $*-\bar{i}$  in the f., cf. Loprieno (1995, 81). In fact, it is well-known that Pre-Coptic stressed  $*\bar{a}$  was raised to  $\bar{o}$  and, after *m* and *n*, to  $\bar{u}$ , while Pre-Coptic stressed  $*\bar{i}$  yielded both  $\bar{i}$  and  $\bar{e}$ , cf. Schenkel (1990, 88 f.). This opposition between m.  $*-\bar{a}$  and f.  $*-\bar{i}$  reconstructed from the Coptic Impt. of “come” is strikingly similar to the Beja endings in  $m^?aa$  “come (2sm.)!” and  $m^?ii \sim m^?eey$  “come (2sf.)!”.

The origin of the prefix *i*- >  $\lambda$ - is still unexplained. It appears to be a fossil from an earlier stage of the language already in the oldest corpus, and it spread to the Impt. of “come” through analogy. What is particularly interesting is that Cushitic seems to preserve today both the Egyptian forms, i.e., Egyptian *mi* in Beja  $m^? \sim m^?ee$ - and Arbore *may*, and Egyptian *im* > Coptic m.  $\lambda\text{MOY}$  [amú], f.  $\lambda\text{MH}$  [amé] in Saho, Sidamo and Gedeo *amo* and their cognates. There is no evidence for explaining the final *-o* of this Cushitic form as deriving from earlier  $*-\bar{a}$  like Coptic  $-\text{OY}$  [-ú]; it is more likely for this vowel to be the East Cushitic development of the inherited final sound(s) of this form, whose Old Egyptian counterpart is the *-i* of *mi*, rather than a residual Impt. middle ending preserved in Saho-Afar and HEC, as argued by Hayward (1979, 252 ff.) who treated it as a cognate of the Omo-Tana and Oromoid 2s. Impt. endings of middle verbs discussed above in connection with ex. (10). Indeed, Sasse (1980, 158 ff.) has shown convincingly that the *t* in the East Cushitic PC verb  $*-mVVt- \sim *-VVt-$  “come” is a root consonant rather than a stem extension, and the above-mentioned high back endings in the 2s. Impt. of middle verbs are best seen as one of several innovations shared by the Omo-Tana and Oromoid verbal systems.<sup>9</sup>

### The 2p. Imperative

Several languages in three of the four main groups of Cushitic have a final short or long *a* in the 2p. Impt., as shown in (14).

<sup>9</sup> Other shared innovations are the use of the old Subjunctive in  $-o > -u$  as the negative Impf. of main clauses, the use of an invariable, i.e., concord-less tense with a nasal suffix as negative Impf. in relative clauses and other subordinate settings, etc.

(14) Some Cushitic languages with *-a* and *-aa* in the 2p. Impt.

Bilin	<i>gábá</i> from <i>gäb-</i> “refuse”
Kemant	<i>wasá</i> from <i>was-</i> “hear”
Saho	<i>fáka(a)</i> from SC <i>faak-</i> “open” <i>ucúba(a)</i> [u <sup>c</sup> úba(a)] from PC <i>-oocob-</i> “drink”
Oromo	<i>fúrása</i> from <i>fur-</i> “loosen, release”
Konso	<i>furá</i> from <i>fur-</i> “release, free”
Dhaasanac	<i>furá</i> from SC <i>fur-</i> “open, untie”
Rendille	<i>fúra</i> from SC <i>fur-</i> “open, untie” <i>kárča</i> from SC causative <i>kar-ič-</i> “cook” <i>ʔagiisa</i> from PC <i>-igis-</i> “kill”
Harso	<i>teehá</i> from <i>teeḥ-</i> “give” <i>ekká</i> from <i>ekk-</i> “take”
Burunge	<i>dooḥ</i> from <i>dooḥ-</i> “dig, cultivate”

There are some reasons for regarding the longer ending, i.e., *-aa* as the original form, because (i.) Agaw *a* is generally from long *\*aa* while short *\*a* is continued by *ä* (cf. Appleyard 1991, 22), (ii.) the Saho dialects that preserve long final vowels have *fákáa* and *ucúbaa* rather than the forms shown in (14), and (iii.) Black (1974, 133 ff.) has shown that final short vowels in Saho-Afar and Omo-Tana are frequently developments of older long vowels. Indeed, he reconstructed “accented”, i.e., high-toned *\*-áa* for the 2p. Impt. of his Lowland East Cushitic on the basis of the tone patterns of Oromoid, Dhaasanac, Arbore and, one can add here, Dullay. Yet the tonal histories of the East Cushitic languages are still too poorly known for one to regard his reconstructed final high tone as conclusive.

The final breathy vowel of Burunge *dooḥ* is phonologically from short *-a*, and it is a short *\*-a* that Kießling reconstructs for the 2p. of his Proto-West-Rift (Kießling 2002, 398 ff.). According to him, it is preserved only in Burunge but has been replaced with an originally Juss. ending in the other West Rift languages, as already shown in (11). This creates a problem, because West Rift usually keeps short and long vowels apart, as shown by Kießling (2002, 40 ff.). For instance, the nominal suffix *\*-aa* is well preserved in all the reflexes of *\*ilibaa* “milk”: Burunge and Alagwa *ilibaa*, Iraqw *ilwaa* and Gorwaa *ulwaa*. Yet reconstructing short *\*-a* for this Cushitic ending contrasts with the Agaw, Saho, and Oromo data. Kießling’s (2002, 398 ff.) suggestion that forms like Iraqw *dooḥ-é?* “dig (pl.)!” are due to the analogical spreading of an originally Juss. ending is justified by the fact that the West Rift languages have Juss. forms with *\*-ee* and *\*-eeʔi* in the sg. and



## The Cushitic Imperative

1p. and, respectively, in the 2p. and 3p.; for instance, Burunge *ʔinay dootiyeəʔ* “they should dig”, or Iraqw *hooʔ ngi konéʔ* “let them have (*konéʔ* 3p. Jussive) peace (*hooʔ*)”, cf. Mous (1993, 162).

Also Dahalo has *-e* in the 2p. Impt. of its imperfective verbs, e.g., *lube* “hit (pl.)!”, matched by *-e* in the endings of its Juss. forms like *lube* “may I hit (imperfective)”, *lubúteene* “may you hit (imperfective)”, and *lúbe* “may I hit (perfective)”, *lubútime* “may you hit (perfective)”, cf. Tosco (1991, 57 ff.).

It has been suggested above under (11) that even the Arbore middle and causative 2p. Impt. forms like *karsé* from *kar-is-* “bake” may be explained along these lines, because this language has *-é* in the 3p. Juss., e.g., *ʔald’ú-so karsé* “may they bake”. Indeed, like most other Omo-Tana languages – but differently from West Rift – Arbore has *e* in its Jussive 3p., but *o* like the Subjunctive in its Juss. sg. and 1p., e.g., 3ms. *ʔald’u-y karsó* “may he bake” vs. 3p. *ʔald’ú-so karsé* “may they bake”, like Rendille *á karčo* “may he cook it” vs. *á karčeen* “may they cook it”, etc.<sup>10</sup> This may explain also the vowel quality of the Dhaasanac ending *-ii* of the 2p. Impt. in middle verbs and in a few other classes like the PC verbs, e.g., *mud’d’ii* “cut for yourselves!, harvest (pl.)!” from the SC middle verb *mur-ǝ-*, and *yegesii* “kill (pl.)!” from the PC reduplicated verb *-eges-*. This requires one to assume (i.) that the Dhaasanac 2p. *-ii* is from *\*-ée* like its Perf. ending *-i* from *\*-e*, e.g., Perf. 3m. *mud’d’i* < *\*mur-t-e* and 3f. *murati* < *\*mur-at-te* from the above verb *mur-ǝ-* “cut for one’s self, harvest” (cf. Black 1974, 128), and (ii.) that this language had 3p. Jussive forms with *\*-ée* like Arbore before replacing them with the originally 3sm. form as it did in its other tenses.

All the HEC languages have 2p. Impt. forms with final *-e*, lengthened to *-ehe* in Kambaata. Burji instead has long *-ee*, as shown in (15).<sup>11</sup> Qabeena has *-iyyé* in most cases, that is found also in Kambaata with verbs that have final geminate

<sup>10</sup> Yet Arbore has not *-ó* but *-a* in the 1s. Juss. like the Aff. Impf. This happens also in Dhaasanac, but has not been explained yet. For instance, Arbore *ʔald’u-n karsa* “may I bake” ≠ *ʔald’u-y karsó* “may he bake”, Dhaasanac *yú karsia* “may I cook” ≠ *mí <sup>h</sup>i karsiu* “may he cook”, but Rendille *á karčo* “may I cook it” = *á karčo* “may he cook it”, Somali *aan kariyo* “may I cook it” and *há kariyo* “may he cook it” with different tone patterns but with *-o* in both forms like Rendille. The Dullay languages have *-a* in the whole Juss. sg., but *-e* in the Juss. 3p., e.g., D’opaasunte Juss. 1s. *ʔan húr-aʔ*, 3sf. *ʔi húr-taʔ* but 3p. *ʔi húr-éʔ* from *hur-* “leave”, a verb of the first tonal class (cf. Hayward 1989, 42).

<sup>11</sup> A lengthened Impt. 2p. ending is described also by Tosco (1989, 94) for the middle verbs of Qoryooley Karre, e.g., *qab-aq-aaha* “take (pl.) it for yourselves”, and by Gasparini (1979, 22) for Gujjii Oromo, e.g., *cininaʔa* “bite (pl.) it!” from *cinin-* [č’inin-]. These forms are taken here, together with Kambaata *-ehe*, as parallel innovations that are not relevant for reconstruction. A possible explanation is that they arose as doubly inflected forms in order to preserve their endings from phonetic erosion, e.g., Qoryooley Karre *\*qabaḏaa* > *\*qabaḏah* > *\*qabaḏaa* + *-aa* > *\*qabaḏaahaa* > *qabaḏaaha*.

consonants like *mass-* ‘carry, take’, whose Impt. is 2s. *massi*, 2p. *massiyye*. Qabeena appears to have generalized this ending also to most verbs like *agar-* ‘wait’ and *it-* whose final geminate occurs only in the 2p. Impt., and not also in the 2s. Impt.

Before discussing the question of these final geminates in the 2p. Impt. stem in Qabeena, Kambaata, Hadiyya, Sidamo and Gedeo, some words have to be spent on the nature of the vowel in the ending of this Impt. form, that is shared by all the HEC languages.

(15) Aff. Impt. forms in HEC languages

		<i>mar-</i> “go”, Qab. <i>agar-</i> “wait”	<i>it-</i> “eat”	<i>he?</i> - “live”, <i>ba?</i> - “be lost, go out”, Qab. <i>oro?</i> - “go”
Qabeena	2s.	<i>agari</i>	<i>iti</i>	<i>oro?i</i> , <i>he?i</i>
	2p.	<i>agariyyé</i>	<i>iččiyyé</i>	<i>oro?yé</i> , <i>he?iyyé</i>
Kambaata	2s.	<i>mari</i>	<i>iti</i>	<i>he?i</i>
	2p.	<i>marre</i>	<i>ičče</i>	<i>he?e</i>
Hadiyya	2s.	<i>mare</i>	<i>ite</i>	<i>he?i</i>
	2p.	<i>malléhe</i>	<i>ittéhe</i>	<i>he?léhe</i>
Sidamo	2s.	<i>mari</i>	<i>iti</i>	<i>ba?i</i>
	2p.	<i>marre</i>	<i>itte</i>	<i>ba??i</i>
Gedeo	2s.	<i>mari</i>	<i>iti</i>	<i>ba?i</i>
	2p.	<i>marre</i>	<i>itte</i>	<i>ba?we</i>
Burji	2s.	<i>mari</i>	<i>iti</i>	<i>ba?i</i>
	2p.	<i>maree</i>	<i>itee</i>	<i>ba?ee</i>

It has been mentioned above that Burji appears to distinguish short from long vowels at the end of words, and Sasse (1982, 17) points out that “as a rule, final long vowels are shortened and/or slightly glottalized, whereas final short vowels are voiceless”. In the other languages transcriptions of word final vowels are not consistent, but the general impression is that long vowels are quite rare in this position. For instance, R.J. Sim (1989, 12) clearly states that in Hadiyya the length of several final long vowels “is a phonetic matter only”, and that true final long vowels occur only in “canonical coordination” and in some forms of the converbs. Pending a systematic analysis of HEC vocalism, it is anyhow possible to assume that final long vowels were generally shortened in HEC with the exception of Burji, and that the original length in the ending *-ee* of this language.

## The Cushitic Imperative

The quality of this vowel poses a historical problem because, on the one hand, there is no other known instance of a HEC final *-e* that can be reasonably derived from an older *\*-a* or *\*-aa*. On the other hand, differently from West Rift, Dahalo, Arbore, and Dhaasanech, no HEC language now has Juss. forms in *\*e(e)* as a source of analogical spread from the Juss. to the Impt. Indeed, all the HEC languages have high or mid back vowels in this mood, like Oromoid, Saho (and probably also Afar),<sup>12</sup> and the Omo-Tana sg. and 1p. The relationship between these two types of Juss. is unclear. On the one hand, the Southern Cushitic forms with final *\*-e(e)* and the Afar and Beja ones with *-ay* – in the Beja negative tense of SC verbs that is called Optative Negative by Roper (1928, 51ff.) but Bound Negative by R.A. Hudson (1976, 116 ff.) – may be related to each other. Indeed Kießling (2002, 41) seems to suggest in this regard that West Rift *\*ee* is actually from older *\*ay*. On the other hand, it has been already said that Jussives with high and mid back vowels are well attested in HEC, Saho-Afar, Oromoid and Omo-Tana – though apparently not in Dullay – and may have a parallel in the Kemant Juss., e.g., 1p. *was-n-u* from *was-* “hear”.<sup>13</sup>

Reconstructing the Cushitic Juss. is an intricate question, because in several languages its forms blended with the dependent Subjunctive and other tenses. For instance, the Omo-Tana type with *-o* or *-u* in the sg. and the 1p. but *-een* and *-é(e)* in the 2p. and 3p. may be seen as the result of the fusion of the two sets of forms, the one with high or mid back vowels that prevailed in the sg. and 1p., the other one with *\*-ay* > *\*-e(e)* that assimilated the long vowel that preceded the *-n-* in the 2p. and 3p. forms before being deleted, i.e., 2p. *\*-tVVn-e(e)* > *\*-teen-e(e)* > *-teen*,

<sup>12</sup> Saho has a Juss. with final falling-toned *-ô* in the sg. and 1p., and *-oonâ* in the 2p. and 3p. (In the northern dialects that preserve final long vowels these endings are *-ôo* and *-oonâa*, respectively.) Afar preserves the 1s. and 1p. of these forms in its Requestive or Consultative mood, but has a different Juss. paradigm with final *-ay*, 2p./3p. *-ôonay*, and antepenultimate high tone like its Subjunctive (cf. Bliese 1981, 141 ff.; Parker and Hayward 1985, 254 ff.). The example below shows some of the relevant forms of Saho and Afar *sool-* “get up”:

		Jussive		Requestive
Saho	1s.		<i>soolô</i>	
	1p.		<i>solnô</i>	
	3p.		<i>sooloonâ</i>	
Afar	1s.	<i>sóolay</i>		<i>soolô</i>
	1p.	<i>sóllay</i>		<i>sollô</i>
	3p.	<i>soolóonay</i>		

<sup>13</sup> Yet the other Agaw languages have different forms, and even Kemant has an alveolar infix in other persons that is at variance with the East Cushitic forms, e.g., 3sm. *was-d-u*, 3p. *was-d-ən-u* vs. Gujjii Oromo Juss. 3sm. *qab-u*, 1p. *qan-n-u*, 3p. *qab-an-u* from *qab-* “have”, cf. Gasparini (1979, 22, 24.).

paralleled by 3p.  $*-VVn-e(e) > *-een-e(e) > *-een$ .<sup>14</sup> It is thus possible to suggest that the HEC languages had a Juss. in  $*-ay > *-ee$  that spread its suffix to the Impt. 2p. before being lost, along the same lines as Kießling's suggestion for Iraqw and some other West Rift languages, that was extended in the above pages also to Dahalo, Arbore, Dhaasanac and the Bayso middle verbs. It is however remarkable that the same kind of analogical spread should have taken place in so many different languages, and it cannot be excluded that an Impt. 2p. ending with  $*-ee$  should be posited beside  $*-aa$  for the common ancestor of East and South Cushitic for some verbs or contexts.

A look at the HEC Impt. paradigms in (15) shows how the 2p. Impt. forms of Qabeena, Kambaata, Hadiyya, Sidamo and Gedeo can be characterized for most verbs as having a geminated final stem consonant. In Kambaata and Qabeena this consonant is also palatalised if it is an alveolar with a palatal phonemic counterpart like  $t \sim \check{c}$  in *it-* "eat", cf. M.G. Sim (1988, 59) and Crass (2001). Verbs with a final glottal stop don't geminate it in Kambaata, because in this language the opposition between simple and geminate consonants is neutralised for this sound. In Qabeena they either have *-iyyé* as if the glottal stop was a geminate, e.g., *he<sup>?</sup>iyyé* "live (pl.)!", or they have just *-yé* like *oro<sup>?</sup>yé* "go (pl.)!".

The Kambaata and Qabeena forms have been explained by M.G. Sim (1988, 63 ff.) and Crass (personal communication) as containing *y*, that causes palatalization and surfaces after stems with final geminate consonants and, in Qabeena, also after a glottal stop. Indeed, the default epenthetic vowel is *i* in Qabeena and Kambaata, and a form like *massiyye* "carry (pl.)!, take (pl.)!" is cleanly explained as *mass-* followed by *-(y)ye* with epenthetic *i* in order to avoid the cluster *ss-(y)y*.

Yet Gedeo verbs with a final glottal stop have a labiovelar glide, i.e., *ba<sup>?</sup>we* from *ba<sup>?</sup>-* "go out" according to G. Hudson (1976, 267), whereas Hadiyya has *l* here, i.e., *he<sup>?</sup>léhe* according to R.J. Sim (1985, 31; 1988, 84).<sup>15</sup> This raises a problem, because positing  $*y$  also as an historical explanation does not account cleanly for the clusters  $?l$  in Hadiyya and  $?w$  in Gedeo, and requires positing  $*Cy > CC$  in all

<sup>14</sup> It should be noticed that the Arbore 3p. with *-é*, as well as the reconstructed Dhaasanac ending  $*-ée > -ii$ , may be due to analogy rather than to phonological loss of final  $*n$ . Several East Cushitic languages that preserve final *n* have 2p. and 3p. endings both with *n* and without it: e.g., Somali Past 3p. *wây kariyeen* "they cooked it" but Short Past 3p. *kariyé* "they cooked it", Western Oromo Past 3p. *dhufan* [d'ufan] "they came" but Present 3p. *hín-dhufu* "they are coming", etc. And Dhaasanac preserves final  $*n$  in its negative tenses, e.g., Dhaasanac <sup>h</sup>*i ma fúriñ* "he didn't open it" from *fur-* vs. Somali *má furín* "id.", Dhaasanac <sup>h</sup>*i ma fúran* "he didn't open it for himself" from SC middle *fur-ð-* vs. Somali *má furán* "id."

<sup>15</sup> Notice that Hadiyya *malléhe* from *mar-* is not relevant here: geminate *r* is always realised as *ll* in this language.

## The Cushitic Imperative

the other cases, that is not motivated independently. A comparison with other Cushitic groups shows interesting parallels.

In Afar a SC verb like *sool-* “stand up” has Impt. 2s. *sol* but 2p. *sóola* because of a pervasive phonological rule that shortens long vowels when they end up in closed syllables as a consequence of morphological processes. Accordingly the *oo* of /*sool*/ is shortened to *sol* in the 2s., but remains long in the 2p. /*soola*/, that is syllabified as *soo.la*. This rule of vowel shortening in closed syllables has been shown by Hayward (Hayward 1983, 224 ff.; Parker and Hayward 1985, 216 f.) to occur both in Afar and in Saho. For instance, it causes the Saho Imperfect 1s. and 2s. of the above verb to be *soola* and *solta*, respectively. Its Impt. 2s. is *sol* like Afar, but its 2p. is *sóla* as if *sol-* were a closed syllable here. Since it is not so, a reasonable assumption is that Afar regularized the pattern in compliance with the above rule of vowel shortening, while Saho preserves an older type that had some consonantal sound between the final stem consonant and the *-a* of the 2p. ending. Saho 2p. *sóla* may thus be from *\*solCa* with a closed syllable, where the stem vowel was regularly shortened before the initial *C* of the ending was lost. Alternatively, Saho *sóla* may be seen as an innovation, due to an analogical extension of the Impt. 2s. stem *sol* to the 2p.

Two Agaw languages, Khamtanga and Awngi, have Imperatives with consonantal ablaut in the last stem consonant of some of their verbs. In Khamtanga these are a few verbs in *y* that have *q* in their Impt. stems, like *zəy-* “drink” with Impt. *zəq-*, *näy-* “give here” with *näk’*, and *wäš-* “hear” with *wäč-*, cf. Appleyard (1987, 478 ff.). As shown by *zəč’* “drink (sg.)!” in (16) below, the Impt. 2s. may additionally be palatalized in Khamtanga, though not predictably so according to Appleyard (1987, 482). Consonantal ablaut occurs in Awngi in several more verbs. The alternations it consists of involve glides vs. voiceless stops, voiced vs. voiceless stops, voiced fricatives and affricates vs. voiceless affricates or stops, as shown in (16).

Hetzron (1976, 13) suggested that, since the Awngi consonantal ablaut always involves devoicing, Impt. forms like *sép* “fight (sg.)!” may be from *\*séb#*, with the stem-final consonant becoming devoiced in pre-pausal position. This entails that this devoiced form was reinterpreted as a special Impt. stem and spread analogically to the other Impt. forms, i.e., both the 2p. *sepán*, and the 2s. forms with *-i* like *tsipí* “do!” and *kunki* “jump!”. The same explanation can be invoked for the Khamtanga ablauted imperatives. It has been seen above that a parallel line of reasoning may explain the Saho Impt. 2p. forms like *sóla* from *sool-* “stand

up”, as analogical extensions of the Impt. 2s. stem where the short vowel is phonologically motivated by a rule of vowel shortening in closed syllables.

(16) Some examples of Khamtanga (Kh.) and Awngi (Aw.) SC and PC verbs with consonantal ablaut in their Imperatives

	Stem	Impt. 2s.	Impt. 2p.
Kh.	SC <i>zəy-</i> “drink”	<i>zəč’</i>	<i>zəq-tən</i>
Kh.	SC <i>näy-</i> “give here”	<i>näk’</i>	<i>näk’-t’ən</i>
Aw.	SC <i>woy-</i> “sell”	<i>wók</i>	<i>wok-án</i>
Aw.	SC <i>tsew-</i> “do”	<i>tsíp ~ tsip-i</i>	<i>tsep-án</i>
Aw.	SC <i>seb-</i> “fight, prick”	<i>sép</i>	<i>sep-án</i>
Aw.	SC <i>kung-</i> “jump”	<i>kunk-i</i>	<i>kunk-an</i>
Aw.	SC <i>azez-</i> “order”	<i>azets</i>	<i>azets-án</i>
Aw.	PC <i>-áy-</i> “be”	<i>aq-i</i>	<i>aq-án</i>

In his work on the reconstruction of Agaw consonants, Appleyard (1984b, 35) appears to accept the above explanation advanced by Hetzron, but Voigt suggested in the same year (1984, 238 f.) that the devoiced consonants of the Awngi and Khamtanga Impt. stems may be due to the presence of an old glottal stop, e.g., 2s. *\*tsew-ʔi > tsípí* and 2p. *\*tsew-ʔan > tsepán* from *tsew-* “do”. This glottal stop is, in his opinion, a residue of the initial glottal stop of the old auxiliary that formed a periphrastic imperative according to the already mentioned suggestion by Hetzron (1980, 53). Further evidence for this was found by Voigt (1984, 238) in the Oromo imperatives of middle verbs, where the middle stem extension *-at-* has the allomorph *-addh-* [-ad’d’-] both in the 2s. and the 2p., as shown in (17). This was explained by him as a development of a cluster with a glottal stop, i.e., *\*qabat-ʔu > [k’abád’d’u]*, *\*qabat-ʔaa > [k’abád’d’aa]*.

(17) Oromo and Omo-Tana imperatives of middle verbs

	Stem	Impt. 2s.	Impt. 2p.
Oromo	<i>qab-at-</i> “catch for one’s self, own”	<i>qabáddhu</i>	<i>qabáddhaa</i>
Banaadir Som.	<i>qab-t-</i> “hold for one’s self”	<i>qabó</i>	<i>qábdha</i> [qábɖa]
Boni	<i>ʔow-d-</i> “seize”	<i>ʔóbo</i>	<i>ʔówd’a</i>
Rendille	<i>hab-t-</i> “get hold of”	<i>hábo</i>	<i>hábɖa</i>
Bayso	<i>ab-at-</i> “seize personally”	<i>ába</i>	<i>abáen</i>
Arbore	<i>k’ab-t-</i> “seize, receive”	<i>k’ába</i>	<i>k’aʔd’á ~ k’aʔd’é</i>

## The Cushitic Imperative

An allomorph of the middle stem with implosive *d'* or retroflex *ɖ* is well attested also in Omo-Tana, yet only in the Impt. 2p. With verbs that end in a single consonant this allomorph retains the vowel *a* only in Bayso *abáen* < \**ab-áɖ-*, but loses it in the other languages. Northern Somali and some dialects from central Somalia like Maay and Tunni replaced *ɖ* with the allomorph this stem extension has before other vocalic endings, e.g., Northern Somali *qábita* “hold (pl.) it for yourselves! do it!” like *wáy qab-t-eeen* “they held it for themselves”, Maay *gadadá* “buy (pl.) it!” like *gád-ad-eeη* “they bought it”, Tunni *qobáda* “get (pl.) it!” like *qob-áɖ-êen* “they got it”.

To sum up, on the one hand Oromo and Agaw have a special stem in the Impt 2s. and 2p. that has been seen as a residue of a cluster \**Cʔ* or – only for Agaw – an analogical extension of the pre-pausal form of the 2s. stem, on the other hand all the HEC languages with the only exception of Burji oppose an Impt. 2s. stem to an Impt. 2p. stem with gemination, palatalization or other evidence of an older cluster \**CX*, where \**X* stands for a palatal glide, or a still unspecified consonant. Saho and the Omo-Tana middle verbs show evidence of a special stem for the Impt. 2p. but have no relevant forms for reconstructing the 2s. All other languages have no special stems in their Impt. forms. If one assumes the Agaw and Oromo pattern to be the oldest one, the HEC languages would have lost it in their Impt. 2s. but retained it in their 2p. It is difficult to justify such a development. The more likely assumption is exactly the opposite: the HEC languages retain the oldest pattern, with a final cluster in the Impt. 2p. stem. This imbalanced paradigm gave rise to different kinds of analogical levelling: in Burji and most other Cushitic languages the Impt. 2s. stem was extended also to the Impt. 2p., since it was the stem that also occurred elsewhere before vocalic endings. In Agaw and the Oromo middle verbs the special Impt. 2p. stem was instead extended analogically to the Impt. 2s.<sup>16</sup>

If this cluster included a glottal stop, this could not be the initial sound of an auxiliary, because in Voigt’s suggestion this auxiliary should have been present also in the Impt. 2s. It appears more reasonable to assume that the second

<sup>16</sup> A special stem like that of the Impt. 2p. also occurs in the 1s. of all tenses in Khamtanga and Awngi, and of the middle verbs of Oromo and several Omo-Tana languages like Karre, Boni, Rendille, Bayso and Arbore. In Kambaata and Qabeena it occurs in the 1s. and 3sm. of perfective tenses, but not in their old 3p. that is now used as polite 2s., nor in any form of the Imperfective tenses. The distribution in the two HEC languages has to be taken as crucial again, because it cannot be accounted for through analogy. Banti (in print) argues that it has a different origin from the Impt. 2p., and that it is good evidence against the Colizza-Reinisch hypothesis.

consonant in the cluster was the initial sound of the ending, or even a stem extension. Accordingly, the Impt. paradigm was something like (18):

(18) Reconstructed Impt. forms of a biconsonantal *CVC* verb

Impt. 2s.	<i>*CVCi</i> or <i>*CVC</i>
Impt. 2p.	<i>*CVCXaa</i>

The study of the historical phonology of Cushitic is still in its infancy, and at the present state of our knowledge there is not enough evidence for reconstructing the nature of this Cushitic sound *\*X* that yielded Oromoid and Omo-Tana *\*tX > ḏ* (i.e., *ḏ* or *d'*), Saho *\*CX > C*, the complex kinds of devoicing and fortition involved in the Khamtanga and Awngi consonantal ablaut, and the different reflexes that have been seen above for HEC. It seems reasonable to posit its existence, however.

The Impt. plural endings with *n*

A small number of languages has different Impt. 2p. endings, all characterized by the presence of *n*. For one of these, that occurs in the Bayso middle verbs, it has already been suggested in (11) that it is due to an analogical extension of the Juss. pl. ending. Bayso *abaen* “seize (pl.) it personally” is thus likely to be from an earlier *\*qabaḏaa* with *-en* from Juss. forms like Bayso *há abaten* “they should seize it personally”.

The Beja and Awngi forms have been seen above in (2) and (16). As already mentioned in the introductory section of this paper, some scholars have attached considerable importance to them; for instance, Hetzron (1980, 53) reconstructed *\*-an* for the Impt. 2p., and Zaborski (1991, 32) *\*-a-na*. It should be pointed out, however, that the Beja Impt 2p. endings have clear parallels in other Beja main clause tenses like the Negative Present and the Preterite, as shown in (19). They may thus be due to analogical levelling like the Impt. pl. forms with *-n* in some Late Aramaic and Neo-Aramaic dialects (cf. Lipiński 1997, 367).

(19) Beja Impt. 2p. and its parallels in Beja non-Impt. tenses

	Impt. 2p.	Preterite 2p., Negative Present 2p.
Beja PC <i>-dif-</i> “go”	<i>difna</i>	<i>tidifna, ki-ddifna</i>
Beja SC <i>tam-</i> “eat”	<i>tamna ~</i> <i>tamaana ~ tamaan</i>	<i>tamtaana ~ tamtaan,</i> <i>ka-tamtaana ~ ka-tamtaan</i>



## The Cushitic Imperative

However, Beja also has a variant *tam-na* in its SC verbs. It is identical to *dif-na* in the PC verbs, that has *-na* like the 2p. forms of the Preterite and Negative Present. It is thus possible to take Impt. 2p. *-na* as an old ending in the Beja Impt. both for the PC and the SC verbs, that caused *-aana* and *-aan* to be introduced in the Impt. of the SC verbs analogically because of its similarity to the *-na* in *tidifna* and *kiddifna* in PC verbs. Awngi *-an* in, e.g., *wokán* “sell (pl.)!” from *woy-* has to be explained through a more complex process of analogy, because of the thorough restructuring of its verbal system. Alternatively it can be seen as the result of blending the old Impt. 2p. ending with *\*-aa* – that has survived in other Agaw languages like Bilin and Kemant, cf. ex. (14) – and other pl. endings with *n*.

The Khamtanga pl. imperatives with *-tən* that have been seen above in (16) are difficult to explain, as far as their *-t-* is concerned, unless one regards them as somehow related to the Kemant Juss. forms with a dental infix that have been mentioned in note 13.

Also Jiiddu has plural imperatives with *n*, as seen in (4). The ending *-in* < *\*-in* of *forin* “open (pl.)!” also occurs in the Perfect 2p. *fortin* and 3p. *forin* but not in the Juss., that has *-âa-s* in this language: 2p. *fortâas* and 3p. *forâas*, as already shown in ex. (7).

Another isolated instance of *n* in the Impt. 2p. is found in the S’aamakko verbs of the second tonal class, corresponding to *-id’á* in the other Dullay languages as mentioned above while discussing the Impt. 2s. For instance, Hayward (1989, 43) reports S’aamakko *ji’iná* “eat (pl.)!”. Also here, the Juss. is different, because it has 3p. *ji’e*, with *e* like Arbore and, possibly Dhaasanac (see the discussion after ex. 14).

No explanation is attempted here for the Impt. 2p. ending *-ánta(a)* that occurs in Saho, but not in Afar, with *amó* “come!” and verbs that have *-a(a)* in their Impt 2s., e.g., *amánta(a)* “come (pl.)!”, *oobbánta(a)* “hear (pl.)!”, etc.

Finally, Yaaku has *-in* in the Impt. 2p. of the verbs that have *-i* in the corresponding 2s., e.g., 2p. *hánin*, *éčin* vs. 2s. *hání*, *éči* from *han-* “go” and *éč-* “eat” respectively. The other verbs have *-o*, e.g., 2p. *égo* vs. 2s. *éq* from *eq-* “drink” (Heine 1974, 50). Unfortunately no data are available on the Juss. of Yaaku.

Looking beyond Cushitic, Semitic has purely vocalic endings in the Impt. 2p. Akkadian may preserve the oldest pattern here with gender-indifferent *-ā*, e.g.,

*limd-ā* “learn (pl.)!”, while all the other Semitic languages introduced *-ū* in the Impt. 2pm., e.g., Hebrew *limd-ū*, Geez 2pm. *lāməd-u* “learn (pl.)!”, etc.<sup>17</sup>

Several Berber languages have *-t* or developments of it in the 2pm., but *-mt* or developments of it in the 2pf. The latter ending also occurs in other tenses, while some varieties have only a gender-indifferent 2p. in *-t* in their Impt., e.g., *-at* in Zemmur according to Durand (1998, 117), that does not occur in other tenses. This *-t* seems thus to be the oldest ending, while *-mt* was introduced by analogical pressure for the new Impt. 2pf. Interestingly, several Omotic languages have a gender-indifferent Impt. 2p. with *\*t*; for instance, Kullo, a variety of central Omoto, has 2s. *ma* vs. 2p. *miite* “eat!”, 2s. *gisa* vs. 2p. *gisiite* “sleep!” (Allan 1976, 337), and Bender (2000, 215 ff.) indeed reconstructs Impt. pl. *\*te* or, better, *\*-Vte* for the whole of Northern Omotic, i.e., Macro-Ometo plus Yem, Kefoid, etc. Suffixal *\*t* in the Impt. 2p. is thus an important isogloss that links Berber and Omotic.

The Chadic Impt. pl. forms have been discussed in detail by Newman (1990, 121 ff.), who reconstructed *\*-a* as the true Impt. 2p. form, that is still preserved in forms such as Bole *sòor-âa* “follow (pl.)!” or *d’òpp-aa kòm* “follow (pl.) the cow!”, or Ngizim *a táf-a* “enter (pl.)!” (vs. 2s. *a táfì*). A number of languages have Impt. pl. endings with *n*, like Saya *mur-ən* “cut (pl.)!” or *ban-ən* “open (pl.)!” (vs. 2s. *muri* and *bani*), Mubi *nger-unu* “run (pl.)!”, or Dangaleat *às-oŋ* “come (pl.)!”. The endings are judged by him (1990, 131) as instances of an originally “more general marker of plural agreement on verbs, which ... has been extended to imperatives and in some cases has been preserved only there”. In addition to this, the Biu-Mandara languages have *\*-am(ə)* in the Impt. 2p., an innovation that is one of the characteristic features of this group within Chadic, e.g., Tera *masa-ma* “buy (pl.)!”, Ga’anda *ràk-àmà* “run (pl.)!”, Mandara *fəl-am(ə)* “dance (pl.)!”, etc.

Old Egyptian is somewhat obscure. In several cases there is no formal distinction between the Impt. 2s. and 2p., while in other cases the pl. forms are marked by the plural strokes of the hieroglyphic writing. Sometimes, yet not predictably so, Impt. 2p. forms are marked by *-w* like nominal plurals, as noted by Edel (1955,

<sup>17</sup> Stempel (1999, 106) notes that it is difficult to justify through analogy an extension of the 2pf. suffix to the 2pm. in Akkadian, as required by the traditional reconstruction of Proto-Semitic 2pm. Preterite *\*tVlimd-ū*, Impt. *\*limd-ū*, and 2pf. Preterite *\*tVlimd-ā*, Impt. *limd-ā*, but Akkadian 2pmf. Preterite *talimd-ā*, Impt. *limd-ā*. Indeed, analogy generally requires a given pattern or form to be interpreted as more general or unmarked, in order to be extended to less general and more marked contexts. But the personal pronouns and the Akkadian Stative always distinguish 2pm. from 2pf., and the 3pm. is kept apart from the 3pf. in all verbal forms by having *-ū* instead of *-ā*. This makes it more likely that the Akkadian 2p. pattern is the oldest one, that was regularised in Hebrew, Aramaic, etc. by introducing the suffix *-ū* in the 2pm.

## The Cushitic Imperative

290), while verbs with a final weak radical frequently have *y*, i.e., *ii*, whatever its true phonetic value. In Coptic the Impt. of most verbs is invariable and identical to the so-called Infinitive. In Demotic one verb has an Impt. 2p. form with *-n*, that does not seem to be attested in the older language: the older forms *miw* ~ *my* “come (pl.)!” are replaced by *im.n* – vs. *im* “come (sg.)!” that has been already discussed above. This form survives into Bohairic and Fayyumic Coptic **ⲁⲙⲟⲓⲛⲓ** [amóini] “come (pl.)!”. Bohairic has also **ⲙⲟⲓⲛⲓ** [móini] “take (pl.)!”. Its origin is unclear, while the Impt. 2p. ending **-ⲧ̅ⲛ** [-tən] that occurs in Sahidic Coptic in these verbs – Sahidic **ⲁⲙⲬⲈⲓⲧ̅ⲛ** [améitən] “come (pl.)!” and **ⲙⲙⲬⲈⲓⲧ̅ⲛ** [əmméitən] “take (pl.)!” – is the usual form of the 2p. suffix in auxiliaries and the other few residues of old Egyptian suffix-conjugated forms, and is due to analogy. Another Coptic 2p. form **ⲁⲗⲟⲧ̅ⲛ** [alótən] “stop (pl.)!, put an end to!” is used as an Impt., but its 2sm. **ⲁⲗⲟⲕ** [alók] and 2sf. **ⲁⲗⲟ** [aló], with the typical endings of the old Egyptian suffix conjugation, show that it is not etymologically a real Impt. Such endings were also used, e.g., in earlier prospective forms like 2sm. *m.k*, 2sf. *m.t* > *m.t*, 2p. *m.tn* > *m.tn* “may you see” > “look!”, that were grammaticalized already in the early II millennium BCE as presentative forms.

### Conclusions

It has been seen above that Agaw, East Cushitic and Southern Cushitic have Impt. 2s. forms with  $\emptyset$  or short *-i*, sometimes occurring side by side in the same language as in Harso, and Yaaku. The West Rift languages have also some instances of *\*-e*, that is not a regular development of *\*-i*. In addition to this Agaw has *-i* in Bilin, Kemant, and Awngi, that is the regular reflex of long *\*ii*. Yet it has been seen in (2) that Beja has *-ii* in the 2sf. of its SC verbs, but short *-i* in its PC verbs. This looks as the regularization of an alternation that may have had a phonological motivation in an earlier stage, and one may suggest that Agaw generalized the long alternant, while the short one developed regularly to *-ə* and was subsequently dropped.

Beja is the only Cushitic language with a distinction between 2sm. and 2sf. Impt. forms. It is marked by *-a(a)* and *-i(i)* respectively, as shown in (2). This has a unique parallel in the Egyptian forms 2sm. *\*amā* and 2sf. *\*amī* that have to be reconstructed on the basis of Coptic **ⲁⲙⲟⲩ** [amú] “come (sg.m.)!” and **ⲁⲙⲬ** [amé] “come (sg.f.)!” as argued above. It has to be stressed that this is the only evidence for these endings in Coptic, where the only other Impt. with a 2sm. vs. 2sf. distinction is **ⲁⲗⲟⲕ** [alók] “stop (sg.m.)!”, **ⲁⲗⲟ** “stop (sg.f.)!”, that has been argued above not to be etymologically an Impt., because of its endings 2sm. *-k*

and 2sf.  $\emptyset < -t < -t̄$  that are those of the old Egyptian suffix conjugation. Because of the character of the old Egyptian writing systems, it is not clear whether an opposition between 2sm.  $*-ā$  and 2sf.  $*-ī$  has to be reconstructed only for the Impt. of “come” or also for other verbs. Were the answer yes, it would provide a strong parallel to the Beja pattern, and one may argue that it existed also in the rest of Cushitic but has been lost, as argued by Zaborski (1991, 78). The only other trace of the old Impt 2sm. ending may be the Saho imperatives like *oobbáa* “hear (sg.) it!” from verbs with final geminate consonants. Since such an ending has no parallels in other Afroasiatic groups, it has to be seen as an isogloss that links Egyptian to Cushitic. The few other Impt. 2s. endings have been argued to be due either to sound shifts or to analogical extension.

For the plural Impt. there is, as shown above, evidence for reconstructing  $*-Xaa$ , where  $*X$  is a consonantal sound that geminated and, in some cases, palatalized the final stem consonants in HEC, devoiced and strengthened them in Khamtanga and Awngi, etc. Parallels for the vocalic element  $*aa$ , but not for  $*X$ , have been found in Chadic and in Semitic. In Aramaic and Ge’ez and, probably, in Ugaritic  $*-ā$  was used only for the Impt. 2pf., while the 2pm. had  $*-ū$ . Akkadian instead had  $-ā$  both in the 2pm. and the 2pf. of its Impt. Also the ending  $*-i$  of the Impt. sg. in several Agaw, East Cushitic and Southern Cushitic languages – and in Chadic as well according to Newman (1990, 130) – corresponds to a sg. feminine ending in Beja, the reconstructed pre-Coptic Egyptian and Semitic. Voigt (1984, 239) already pointed out this fact. It has been argued above especially in note 17 that  $*-ū$  in the 2pm. of the Impt. may be due to analogy, and that Akkadian may preserve the oldest pattern, that survives till now also in Cushitic and Chadic. In this manner it is only the occurrence of  $*-i$  for orders to male addressees in Cushitic and Chadic that has to be explained. A possible scenario is that  $*-i$  or  $*-ii$  was originally confined to the 2sf. as in Semitic and Pre-Coptic  $*amī$  “come (sg. f.)!”, and that confusion arose in some classes of verbs with final weak radicals; for instance, Akkadian *bny* “build” had Impt. 2sm. *bini* vs. 2sf. *binī*, and *bānī* was also the 2sm. Impt. of this verb in Aramaic.

The Impt. 2p. forms with *n* of Beja, Khamtanga, Jiiddu, Yaaku, and the S’aamakko verbs of the second tonal class may preserve an ending that occurred only in some contexts, but there is not enough evidence for regarding it as a secondary innovation as in Chadic. Egyptian provides a puzzling parallel, with  $-n > -INI$  [-ini] popping out of nowhere in Demotic seemingly only in one verb, from where it spread also to the irregular Impt. of “take” in Bohairic Coptic.

## The Cushitic Imperative

### References

- Allan, E.J., "Kullo". In M. L. Bender, ed., *The Non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*, 324-350, East Lansing (Mich.) and Carbondale (Ill.) 1976.
- Almkvist, H., *Die Bischari-Sprache*, Vol. I, Uppsala 1881.
- Amborn, H., Minker, G., and H.-J. Sasse, *Das Dullay*, Berlin 1980.
- Appleyard, D.L., "The morphology of the negative verb in Agaw", *TPhS* 1984a, 202-219.
- Appleyard, D.L., "The internal classification of the Agaw languages: a comparative and historical phonology". In J. Bynon, ed., *Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics*, 33-67, Amsterdam and Philadelphia 1984b.
- Appleyard, D.L., "A grammatical sketch of Khamtanga – II", *BSOAS* 50 (1987), 470-507.
- Appleyard, D.L., "The vowel system of Agaw: reconstruction and historical inferences". In H.G. Mukarovsky, ed., *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress (Beiträge zur Afrikanistik 41)*, 13-28, Vienna 1991.
- Banti, G., "New perspectives on the Cushitic verbal system". In *BLS-27S Volume on Afroasiatic Linguistics*, Berkeley in print.
- Banti, G., "Field notes on Jiiddu", unpublished MS.
- Bender, M.L., *Comparative morphology of the Omotic languages*, Munich 2000.
- Black, P.D., *Lowland East Cushitic: subgrouping and reconstruction*, PhD dissertation at the Yale University 1974.
- Bliese, L.F., *A Generative Grammar of Afar*, Dallas and Arlington 1981.
- Colizza, G., "Le lingue kuscitiche", *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 3 (1889), 128-139.
- Crass, J., "The position of K'abeena within Highland East Cushitic", *AAP* 67 (2001), 5-60.
- Durand, O., *Lineamenti di lingua berbera – Varietà tamazight del Marocco centrale*, Rome 1998.
- Edel, E., *Altägyptische Grammatik*, vol. I, Rome 1955.
- Ferguson, C.A., "The Ethiopian language area". In Bender, M.L., Bowen, J.D., Cooper, R.L., and C.A. Ferguson, eds., *Language in Ethiopia*, 63-76, London 1976.
- Gasparini, A., *A practical outline of Gujji Grammar*, Awasa 1979.

- Hayward, R.J., "Bayso revisited: some preliminary linguistic observations – I", BSOAS 41 (1978), 539-570.
- Hayward, R.J., "Some inferences from an irregular imperative form in Saho", IOS 9 (1979), 245-257.
- Hayward, R.J., "Some aspects of the phonology of ultimate vowels in Saho-<sup>o</sup>Afar". In Segert, S., and A.J.E. Badrogligeti, eds., *Ethiopian studies dedicatd to Wolf Leslau*, 221-231, Wiesbaden 1983.
- Hayward, R.J., *The Arbore language: a first investigation*, Hamburg 1984.
- Hayward, R.J., "Comparative notes on the language of the S'aamakko", JAAL 1 (1989), 1-53.
- Heine, B., "Notes on the Yaaku language (Kenya)", Parts 1 and 2, *Afrika und Übersee* 58 (1974), 27-61.
- Heine, B., *Boni dialects (Language and dialect atlas of Kenya 10)*, Berlin 1982.
- Hetzron, R., *The Verbal System of Southern Agaw*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969.
- Hetzron, R., "The Agaw languages", *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 3 (1976), 31-75.
- Hetzron, R., "The limits of Cushitic", *SUGIA* 2 (1980), 7-126.
- Hudson, G., "Highland East Cushitic". In M. L. Bender, ed., *The Non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*, 232-277, East Lansing (Mich.) and Carbondale (Ill.) 1976.
- Hudson, R.A., "Beja". In M. L. Bender, ed., *The Non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia*, 97-132, East Lansing (Mich.) and Carbondale (Ill.) 1976.
- Kießling, R., *Eine Grammatik des Burunge*, Hamburg 1994.
- Kießling, R., *Die Rekonstruktion der südkuschitischen Sprachen (West-Rift)*, Cologne 2002.
- Lamberti, M., *Der Dialekt der Jiddu - Af-Jiddu*, Cologne 1981.
- Lipiński, E., *Semitic Languages: outline of a comparative grammar*, Louvain 1997.
- Loprieno, A., *Ancient Egyptian: a linguistic introduction*, Cambridge 1995.
- Moreno, M.M., *Manuale di sidamo*, Milan 1940.
- Mous, M., *A grammar of Iraqw*, Hamburg 1993.
- Newman, P., *The classification of Chadic within Afroasiatic*, Leiden 1980.
- Newman, P., *Nominal and verbal plurality in Chadic*, Dordrecht 1990.
- Palmer, F.R., "Bilin", *Lingua* 17 (1967), 200-209.
- Palmer, F.R., Review article of Andrzej Zaborski's *The verb in Cushitic*, BSOAS 40 (1977), 198-202.

## The Cushitic Imperative

- Parker, E.M., and R.J. Hayward, *An Afar-English-French Dictionary (with Grammatical Notes in English.)*, London 1985.
- Pillinger, S., and L.Galboran, *A Rendille dictionary*, Cologne 1999.
- Praetorius, F., *Zur Grammatik der Gallasprache*, Berlin 1893.
- Praetorius, F., “Über die hamitischen Sprachen Ostafrika’s”, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und Vergleichenden Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* 2 (1894), 312-341.
- Reinisch, L., *Die Bilin-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika*, Vienna 1882.
- Reinisch, L., *Wörterbuch der Saho-Sprache*, Wien 1890.
- Reinisch, L., *Die Beɗauye-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika*, Vol. III, Vienna 1894.
- Reinisch, L., *Die Somali-Sprache*, Vol. III – Grammatik, Vienna 1903.
- Roper, E.M., *Tu Beɗawie*, Hertford 1928.
- Sasse, H.J., “The consonant phonemes of Proto-East-Cushitic (PEC): a first approximation”, *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7 (1979a), 1-67.
- Sasse, H.-J., *Boni grammar - First draft*, MS 1979b.
- Sasse, H.-J., “Ostkuschitische und semitische Verbalklassen”. In Diem, W., and S. Wild, eds., *Studien aus Arabistik und Semitistik Anton Spitaler zum siebzigsten Geburtstag von seinen Schülern gewidmet*, 153-174, Wiesbaden 1980.
- Sasse, H.-J., *An etymological dictionary of Burji*, Hamburg 1982.
- Schenkel, W., *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft*, Darmstadt 1990.
- Sim, M.G., “Palatalization and gemination in the Kambaata verb”, *Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 1 (1988), 58-65.
- Sim, R.J., “The morphological structure of some main verb forms in Hadiyya”. In Abebe Gebre-Tsadik, Sim M.G., Sim, R.J., Wedekind, C., and K. Wedekind, eds., *The verb morphophonemics of five Highland East Cushitic languages including Burji*, AAP 2 (1985), 10-43.
- Sim, R.J., “Violations of the two-consonant constraint in Hadiyya”, *African Languages and Cultures* 1 (1988), 77-90.
- Sim, R.J., *Predicate Conjoining in Hadiyya: A Head-Driven PS Grammar*, PhD Dissertation at the University of Edinburgh 1989.
- Stempel, R., *Abriß einer historischen Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, Frankfurt am Main 1999.
- von Tiling, M., “Die Sprache der Jabarti”, *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenensprachen* 12 (1922), 97-162.
- Tosco, M., *Schizzo grammaticale del dialetto Karre di Qoryooley*, Rome 1989.

- Tosco, M., *A grammatical sketch of Dahalo*, Hamburg 1991.
- Tosco, M., *Af Tunni; grammar, texts, and glossary of a southern Somali dialect*, Cologne 1997.
- Tosco, M., "Is there an 'Ethiopian language area'?", *Anthropological Linguistics* 42 (2000), 329-365.
- Tosco, M., *The Dhaasanac language*, Cologne 2001.
- Voigt, R.M., "Die Form des Reflexivstammes und der ersten Person Singular im Kuschitischen", *AuÜ* 67 (1984), 233-247.
- Voigt, R.M., Review article of R.J. Sim's "Morphophonemics of the verb in Rendille" and A. Oomen's "Gender and plurality in Rendille", *ZDMG* 135 (1985), 163-178.
- Voigt, R.M., Review article of R.J. Hayward's *The Arbore language*, *ZDMG* 139 (1989), 481-487.
- Voigt, R.M., "Zur Gliederung des Kuschitischen: die Präfixkonjugationen". In C. Griefenow-Mewis, and R.M. Voigt, eds., *Cushitic and Omotic languages – Proceedings of the 3.rd International Symposium*, 101-131, Cologne 1996.
- Voigt, R.M., "Zur Gliederung des Kuschitischen: das Beḍauye und das Restkuschitische". In I. Fiedler, C. Griefenow-Mewis, and B. Reineke, eds., *Afrikanische Sprachen im Brennpunkt der Forschung – Linguistische Beiträge zum 12. Afrikanistentag*, 309-324, Cologne 1998.
- Vycichl, W., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*, Louvain 1983.
- Zaborski, A., *The Verb in Cushitic*, Krakow 1975.
- Zaborski, A., "Insights in Proto-Cushitic morphology". In H.G. Mukarowsky, ed., *Proceedings of the 5.th International Hamito-Semitic Congress*, Vol. 2, 75-82, Vienna 1991.
- Zaborski, A., "Typological development from Archaic to Neocushitic". In S. Uhlig, ed., *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, Hamburg, in print.