



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Directives to humans and to domestic animals: the imperative and some interjections in Zargulla

Amha, A.; Simeone-Senelle M.C., Vanhove M.

Citation

Amha, A. (2013). Directives to humans and to domestic animals: the imperative and some interjections in Zargulla. In V. M. Simeone-Senelle M.C. (Ed.), *Cushitic and Omotic Studies* (pp. 211-229). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/49785>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/49785>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Directives to Humans and to Domestic Animals: The Imperative and some Interjections in Zargulla

AZEB AMHA – Leiden University

Abstract

The paper presents analysis of the imperative clause in Zargulla. The imperative is used to express directives both to humans and domestic animals, representing an overlapping area between inter-human and human-to-animal communication. In directives to humans, the imperative in Zargulla makes distinction between singular and plural addressee. Moreover, emphatic and negative imperatives as well as reported directives are morphologically distinguished. Directives to domestic animals include interjectional summonses and dispersal terms as well as a restricted set of verbal commands to take or not to take specific positions or directions of movement. In the verbal commands to domestic animals only the second person singular imperative form is used. As such, the forms used are not simple mimicry of the calls the animals make. Rather, they reflect a level of arbitrariness that is characteristic of human language. Although some mechanisms such as repetitions, shortening, nasalization of vowels, and/or alternating tone and intonation characterize directives to animals, Zargulla utterances used for addressing different domestic animal types are discrete units. They constitute a sub-system of the lexicon and grammar of the language which speakers must learn for communication.

1. Introduction

The Zargulla language is spoken in southwest Ethiopia, about 550 km from the capital city, Addis Ababa. With the officially stated figure of 7,000 speakers, it is one of the minority languages in the area (cf. 1994 national census). Administratively the Zargulla people are part of the Bonke district of the Gamo Gofa zone, the capital of which is Arba Minch.

The Zargulla are mixed farmers, their products include honey, *t'eff*, sorghum and maize. Ensete, beans and various root crops are also widely grown. Farming is done with ox-plough; on the slopes the hoe is used. Side by side farming, some families keep cows, sheep and goats for sell or for domestic consumption. Donkeys and mules are means of transportation of people and goods in some areas.¹ Other domestic animals in the area are chicken. Dogs

¹ Several villages are accessible by car during the dry season but there are no line-busses and trucks and other private cars also do not go to the villages regularly because of bad roads.

are kept by some as guards for the home and the farm and cats are used to guard off mice.

In the present contribution we discuss the structure of imperative verbs. This construction is used to command or direct humans and to some extent, to command domestic animals. Part of the forms used in the latter case also involves interjections. We will briefly examine the interjectional forms as well as imperative verbs that are used to summon or disperse domestic animals or to restrict their (direction of) movement.

We use the term “directive” to refer to commands both to humans and animals. Searle (1983: 166) states that through directives “we try to get our hearers to do things”. In this sense, the term “directive” covers the functions of some interjections and imperatives. Palmer (1998: 166) notes that an imperative can be a proposition in which “the hearer is left to judge the force of his obligation to act from the circumstances”. In communication to animals, however, no such subjectivity is expected on the part of the addressee. Unheeded imperative expressions to animals may be repeated as curt commands (often accompanied by physical punishment) or comforting (pleading) utterances, depending on the control of the human agent on the animal. We thus find the term “directive” more appropriate than “command” or “animal call” when referring to the function or use of the imperative verb form.

Information on Zargulla directives to animals were first acquired during informal conversation with friends. Afterwards the data are checked with several speakers during four fieldwork periods starting from 2003.² Subsequently data on Wolaitta directives to animals are collected, which we present in Section 3 together with data on Maale (Azeb Amha 2001). For the practical reason of showing morphological contrasts clearly, most of the illustrative material presented in the present work are extracts from longer utterances or are elicited data. The latter were substantiated and, in some cases, were motivated by their attestation in spontaneous utterances, recorded dialogues or narratives. The paper does not provide exhaustive information on directives to animals in the three languages, it is mainly intended to bring into attention the overlapping areas of inter-human and human-to-animal communication and to emphasize that directives to animals are often not “paralinguistic” as generally considered. In fact, other than the excellent study by Bynon (1976) on the Tamazight dialect of Berber and references therein of studies on other Berber varieties, little information is available on this aspect of African languages. However, as Bynon (1976: 63) rightly points out, studies on the register used for communication with domestic animals might be relevant for identifying information on names, origins and paths of diffusion of the species themselves as well as on contact phenomenon among speech communities.

² I would like to thank Ato Tariku Chifaw, Ato Ayyele Bola, Ato Arche Apa, Ato Atnafu Yimer, Mulu Tsegaye, Temesgen Tariku and Mulatu Aberra, all native speakers of Zargulla, for their unreserved help during fieldwork and for their friendship. The study on Zargulla was made possible through the support of the Dutch National Science Foundation through its Endangered Languages Programme, which I acknowledge with much gratitude.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we describe the morpho-phonemics and morpho-syntax of the imperative and related verbal forms in Zargulla. Then directives to domestic animals are discussed in Section 3, by comparing these to the imperative clause used in inter-human communication. Parallel examples from Maale and Wolaitta and some background information on localities and ways of cattle keeping among the three speech communities are also briefly discussed in this section. Summary and concluding remarks are made in Section 4.

2. Directives to humans

2.1. The morpho-phonemics of the imperative verb in Zargulla

The imperative is morphologically distinguished from the declarative / indicative, interrogative, and to some extent from the optative. It is marked by the morpheme *-a* for both singular and plural addressee. However, in the plural, the imperative takes an additional morpheme *-ite* (see below for further discussion on *-ite*).

The sentences in (1) were addressed to a single addressee.

- (1) a. *yéla* *?uúnnó* *kiníne* *lulumm-á*
 2SG.M.VOC malaria.ABS tablet.ABS swallow-IMP
 ‘(Boy!) take malaria medicine!’
- b. *hí* *?ogg-ó* *?áikk-í* *hamm-á*
 that road-ACC hold-CNV go-IMP
 ‘Follow that road!’

Gender distinction is not morphologically marked on the imperative verb. The morpheme *-a* may be realized with a high or low tone,³ as illustrated in (2):

- (2) a. 2SG Imperative, A b. 2SG Imperative, B
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <i>doór-a</i> ‘pile up (wood/grain)!’ | <i>door-á</i> ‘sit and chat!’ |
| <i>dápp-a</i> ‘release! / divorce!’ | <i>dap-á</i> ‘pull!’ |
| <i>k’ápp-a</i> ‘scatter!’ | <i>s’eell-á</i> ‘look!’ |
| <i>?áss-a</i> ‘add!’ | <i>bonk’-á</i> ‘snatch!’ |
| <i>šoóbb-a</i> ‘plead!’ | <i>geešš-á</i> ‘clean!’ |
| <i>máss-a</i> ‘shape wood!’ | <i>moot-á</i> ‘accuse!’ |

Comparison with other (derived and inflected) verb forms shows that such variation is determined both by the lexical tone of the verb root (always a bound morpheme) and by the nature of the verbal suffix(es) that are attached to the verb root. Such a difference is noted, for example, in the imperative and infinitive verb forms. If the verb root has a lexical high tone-accent, both the imperative and infinitive suffixes are realized with low tone. Compare

³ In Zargulla two tones are clearly distinguished: low tone and high tone. The former is characterized by higher pitch and intensity. In morphologically complex words, surface tone is generated by the interplay of the inherent tone of the lexeme, grammatical morphemes and/or the default tone added at a word-level, similar to the related tone-accent or pitch-accent languages such as Wolaitta and Zayse.

tone realization in the disyllabic imperative verbs in (3a-b) and the trisyllabic ones in (4a-b):

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| (3) a. Imperative | | b. Infinitive | |
| <i>k'ápp-a</i> | 'scatter!' | <i>k'áp-e</i> | 'to scatter' |
| <i>pínn-a</i> | 'cross (river, valley)!' | <i>pín-e</i> | 'to cross (river, valley)' |
| <i>páatt-a</i> | 'seed cotton harvest!' | <i>páat-e</i> | 'to seed cotton harvest' |
| <i>póok'k'-a</i> | 'peel off maize cob!' | <i>póok'-e</i> | 'to peel off maize cob' |
| <i>pótt-a</i> | 'pierce!' | <i>pót-e</i> | 'to pierce' |
| <i>šódd-a</i> | 'up-root!' | <i>šód-e</i> | 'to up-root' |
| <i>c'óomm-a</i> | 'chew!' | <i>c'óom-e</i> | 'to chew' |
| <i>c'óodǎ-a</i> | 'chop (vegetable)!' | <i>c'óod-e</i> | 'to chop (vegetables)' |
| <i>yédǎ-a</i> | 'step on!' | <i>yéd-o</i> | 'to step on' |
-
- | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| (4) a. Imperative | | b. Infinitive | |
| <i>k'ílím?-a</i> | 'close eyes!' | <i>k'ílím?-e</i> | 'to close eyes' |
| <i>k'úrútt-a</i> | 'break off friendship!' | <i>k'úrútt-e</i> | 'to break off friendship' |
| <i>bíggútt-a</i> | 'work fast!' | <i>bíggútt-e</i> | 'to do work fast' |
| <i>sárús-a</i> | 'greet!' | <i>sárús-e</i> | 'to greet' |
| <i>k'íhús-a</i> | 'knock!' | <i>k'íhús-e</i> | 'to knock' |
| <i>s'úggún-a</i> | 'bend down!' | <i>s'úggún-e</i> | 'to bend down oneself' |

The examples in (3) show that the length of the final consonant of the imperative is different from that of the infinitive verb. Thus while most imperative verbs have a geminated final consonant the corresponding infinitive verb may have a non-geminated consonant, even though both have a single vocalic suffix. However, the contrast in gemination does not apply to all verbs as can be seen from some of the verbs in (2b) and the last three verbs in (4) which have a non-geminated consonant both in the imperative and infinitive. It is interesting that the distinction in gemination turns out to be helpful for distinguishing a reported directive from a reported speech (cf. Section 1.6).

In contrast to the examples in (3-4), if the verb root is not lexically accented, a default high tone-accent is added either to the vowel of the suffix or to the final vowel of the verb root, depending on the construction: in the imperative the morpheme *-a* takes the default high tone-accent whereas in the infinitive, with the exception of the two verbs in (6c-d), the default high tone is realized on the final vowel of the verb root, not on the infinitive markers *-o* or *-e*. This is illustrated in (5a-b) for disyllabic imperative verbs and in (6a-b) for trisyllabic ones.

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| (5) a. Imperative | | b. Infinitive | |
| <i>punn-á</i> | 'blow fire!' | <i>pún-o</i> | 'to blow fire' |
| <i>šupp-á</i> | 'slaughter!' | <i>šúp-o</i> | 'to slaughter' |
| <i>žadǎ-á</i> | 'drink!' | <i>žád-o</i> | 'to drink much' |
| <i>c'add-á</i> | 'pound!' | <i>c'ád-o</i> | 'to stab, to pound' |
| <i>miic'c'-á</i> | 'laugh!' | <i>míic-o</i> | 'to laugh' |
| <i>pižž-á</i> | 'tear!' | <i>pižž-o</i> | 'to stripe, tear vertically' |
-
- | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| (6) a. Imperative | | b. Infinitive | |
| <i>zabadǎ-á</i> | 'lie down for a while!' | <i>zabád-o</i> | 'to lie down for a while' |
| <i>piradǎ-á</i> | 'fly!' | <i>pirád-o</i> | 'to fly' |

<i>gender-á</i>	‘roll over (intr)!’	<i>gendér-o</i>	‘to roll over’
<i>gufánts-á</i>	‘spill!’	<i>gufánts-o</i>	‘to spill sth.’
<i>hordof-á</i>	‘walk fast!’	<i>hordóf-o</i>	‘to walk fast’
<i>wolakk-á</i>	‘mix!’	<i>wolák-o</i>	‘to mix’
<i>dikkants-á</i>	‘fold!’	<i>dikkánts-o</i>	‘to fold’

The following words are the two exceptions in our data in which low tone in the vowel of the verb root and high tone on the infinitive affix occurs.

(6) c. Imperative	d. Infinitive		
<i>bookk-á</i>	‘dig!’	<i>book-ó</i>	‘to dig a hole’
<i>bukk-á</i>	‘hit with stick!’	<i>buk-ó</i>	‘to hit with a stick’

2.2. Plural addressee

When the addressees are plural, an additional morpheme *-ite* is added to the second person singular imperative form, as in (7).

(7) Plural addressee imperative	Plural addressee imperative, B		
<i>door-á-ite</i>	‘sit and chat!’	<i>doór-a-ite</i>	‘pile up (wood/grain)!’
<i>dap-á-ite</i>	‘pull!’	<i>dápp-a-ite</i>	‘release!/divorce!’
<i>s’ell-á-ite</i>	‘look!’	<i>k’ápp-a-ite</i>	‘scatter!’
<i>bonk’-á-ite</i>	‘snatch!’	<i>?áss-a-ite</i>	‘add!’
<i>geešš-á-ite</i>	‘clean!’	<i>šoóbb-a-ite</i>	‘plead!’
<i>moot-á-ite</i>	‘accuse!’	<i>máss-a-ite</i>	‘shape wood!’

Other than the imperative/optative negative verb *dokk-/dikk-*, the morpheme *-ite* is not directly affixed to verb roots (cf. Section 1.5). Rather, it is preceded by the singular imperative marker *-a*. In contrast, in many Ometo languages including Haro, Maale and Wolaitta, the exact cognate of the Zargulla plural/polite addressee marker *-ite* is directly affixed to the verb root to mark second person plural imperative. Compare: Wolaitta *wot’t’-á* ‘run (2SG)!’ vs. *wot’t’-ité* ‘run (2PL)!’ However, we do not analyze the morpheme *-ite* in Zargulla as an imperative marker because it is not restricted to directives as can be seen from the examples in (8). It may seem appropriate to analyze it as a plural number marker since it occurs following the imperative morpheme *-a/-á* (which is unmarked for number) and since it is consistently used when the addressee are plural. Moreover, the second person plural verbal agreement marker in affirmative indicative clauses, *-it-*, is formally similar to the morpheme *-ite* in the examples in (7). However, *-ite* is not only used in imperative constructions as in (7), but also in other expressions which exclusively involve interactive contexts. These include calls as in (8) and response to calls (9) as well as conative interjections as in (10) which are directed at an auditor (cf. Ameka 1992, 1994 for classification of interjections). We thus gloss the morpheme as PL.ADR (plural addressee) in the present contribution.

(8)	<i>yéša-ite</i>	(to call several people or a respected person, feminine or masculine)
	<i>yébi</i>	(to call a single, fem. person, younger or of the same age or status as speaker)
	<i>yéla</i>	(to call a single, masc. person, younger or of the same age or status as speaker)

- (9) *yé-ite*
 (response to a call made by several people, or by a respected single person)
yéé
 (response to a call made by a person younger or of the same age or status)
- (10) *hó-ite*
 (a positive response to a polar question posed by a respected person, same as “yes” in English)
hóó
 (a positive response to a polar question posed by a younger person)
- (11a) *haʔáite*
 (uttered when giving something to several people or to a respected person. This can also be pronounced as: *haʔúite*)
haʔá
 (when giving something to a single individual, younger or of the same age as speaker. It can also be pronounced as: *haʔú*)
- (11b) *lóʔoite*
 (greeting form for a respected/elderly person. cf. *lóʔo* ‘be good, be well’)

The examples in (8-11) illustrate that *-ite* is used to express politeness or respect to a single individual for example, in greetings (11a) or when offering something to someone (11b). It is customary to address elderly people and relatives with a polite form; thus vocative forms of certain nouns also take *-ite*, e.g. *ʔíndó* ‘mother’ vs *ʔíndóite* (when calling one’s mother or any elderly woman). Age and/or social status also determine whether or not one is addressed with the plural/polite form, using *-ite*. Second person plural pronouns and verbs inflected for second person plural are similarly used as polite/honorific forms in Zargulla and related languages.

2.3. *Emphatic command*

For emphatic command, for example in case of urgency, or to repeat an earlier made but not headed command, the morpheme *-wa* is added to the imperative form as illustrated in (12).

- (12) *mílle-ts-a-wa*
 side-CAUS-IMP-EMPH
 ‘Move it sideways!’

The sentence in (12) was uttered in a fast speech repeating a command to a boy who was keeping watch of a cow at the side of a road. The boy did not take action when the speaker first gave the directive to lead the cow sideways using the regular imperative. In the many instances this morpheme is recorded, its underlying meaning seems to be that of “urgency” (12) or “importance” (13) of action to be taken as a result of the directive.

- (13) *s’eell-á-wa*
 see-IMP-EMPH
 ‘look (quickly)!’

[Context: a warning to the addressee if the driver of the track passing by was the one he was expecting]

Similarly the utterance in (14), in contrast to the formally simpler command *míya* ‘eat!’, gives more weight to the directive or invitation.

- (14) *míy-a-wa*
 eat-IMP-EMPH
 ‘You should eat! Do eat!’

There is an affirmative interrogative copula morpheme *-wa* which is formally identical to the emphatic imperative discussed above. This morpheme is freely interchangeable with another copula marker *-na*, with no apparent semantic difference, as in the following two examples.

- (15a) *ha ?esi ?oóde-wa*
 this 3MSG.SBJ who-Q:COP₁
 ‘Who is this man?’

- (15b) *ha ?esi ?oóde-na*
 this 3 MSG.SBJ who-Q:COP₂
 ‘Who is this man?’

It was not possible to verify whether the interrogative copula morpheme *-wa* and the emphatic imperative *-wa* represent one and the same morpheme. In another Ometo language Maale, it was observed that there is formal similarity between a morpheme that is used to express curt command (*-bey*) and that which marks past negative interrogative (*bay*). Moreover, some of the verbal directives to domestic animals in Wolaitta (see Table 1 in Section 3) are based on negative interrogative forms. This interrogative-imperative link merits further comparative research.

2.4. Directives based on nominal forms

A few cases are recorded where an imperative form is based on a lexeme that basically is a nominal. For example, the imperative verb in (16) involves *nac'é* ‘a single individual sprout offshoot among a bunch of offshoots of a nucleus *ensete* plant’. With the imperative morpheme *-a*, the utterance in (16) expresses a highly specific directive about replanting the offshoot in a specific location, as the near-translation in brackets indicate.

- (16) *nac'-á*
 (Directive to separate each of the individual offshots of *ensete* from the bunch and plant them under the eave of houses to be replanted elsewhere some two months later)

In contrast, the directive in (17) is generic since it may refer to various activities depending on the context it is used, as the list of English verbs in the free-translation line indicates. It is derived from the numeral *támm* ‘ten’ by suffixing the causative marker and the imperative morpheme, without an additional verbalizing morpheme. This form of the numeral ‘ten’ is not attested in other moods such as the declarative in our data and speakers were not asked if it is possible to generate such forms.

- | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|
| (17) | Singular imperative | Plural/polite imperative |
| | <i>tan-ts-á</i> | <i>tan-ts-á-ite</i> |
| | ten-CAUS-IMP | ten-CAUS-IMP-2PL.ADR |
| | ‘Make/do/give/count (something) ten (times)!’ | |

It is not possible to derive comparable forms as that shown for ‘ten’ in (17) using other numerals. Rather, with other numerals the causative form of the predicative verb *hi(yy)-* ‘say’ is obligatory, as illustrated in (18) with the numeral *?izípp* ‘six’.

- | | | |
|------|--|----------------|
| (18) | <i>?izípp</i> | <i>h-íss-a</i> |
| | six | say-CAUS-IMP |
| | ‘Make/do/give/count (something) six (times)!’ [lit. ‘make say six!’] | |

In some Omotic languages the so-called cognate object constructions are reported to have the function of denoting a generic or a highly specific activity as those nominal-based imperatives we illustrated in (16-17) above (cf. Mulugeta Seyoum [2008] on Dime, Azeb Amha [2009a] on Wolaitta). The following two examples from Zargulla also illustrate cognate object constructions.

- | | | |
|-------|--|----------------|
| (19a) | <i>k’éca</i> | <i>k’ec-á</i> |
| | fence | make.fence-IMP |
| | ‘Make fence!’ | |
| (19b) | <i>yeepó</i> | <i>yeep-á</i> |
| | tears | cry-IMP |
| | ‘Visit a mourning family / attend a funeral ceremony!’ | |

The ‘object’ which is identical in form to the verb does not refer to a patient, affected entity or experiencer as in the case of objects of other transitive verbs but rather refers to the result or outcome of the activity denoted by the verb (19a), or the verb and its object express some idiomatic meaning as in (19b). Unlike the numeral-based verb *tants-* ‘make/do/give ten!’, the cognate object constructions such as those in (19) are freely used in all moods.

2.5. *Negation and the link between the imperative and optative/hortative moods*

The negative imperative is formed by a complex predicate consisting of the converb of the negated verb and a negative imperative verb *dókk-* or *díkk-*. The following examples illustrate the negative imperative, also referred to as the preventive.

- | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| (20a) | <i>(neí)</i> | <i>?ep-í</i> | <i>dókk-o</i> |
| | 2SG.NOM | take-CNV | NEG.VP-2SG.OPT |
| | ‘Don’t take (2SG M/F)!’ | | |
| (20b) | <i>(wútúní)</i> | <i>?ep-í</i> | <i>díkk-íte</i> |
| | (2PL.NOM) | take-CNV | NEG.VB -2PL.ADR. |
| | ‘Don’t take (2SG M/F)!’ | | |

A formally related negative verb is used to express negative wishes (negative optative) for first and third person, as illustrated in (21).

- (21a) *(tá) ham-í díkk-ánna*
 1SG go-CNV NEG.VB-1SG
 ‘Let me not go!’
- (21b) *(núní / níní) ham-í díkk-iínno*
 (1PL.INC / 1PL.EXC.NOM) go-CNV NEG.VB-1PL
 ‘Let’s not go!’
- (21c) *(?ésí) ham-í díkk-áye*
 3MSG.NOM go-CNV NEG.VB-3MSG
 ‘Let him not go!’
- (21d) *(?ísí) ham-í díkk-íya / díkk-áya*
 3 MSG.NOM go-CNV NEG.VB-3FSG
 ‘Let her not go!’
- (21e) *(?úsúní) ham-í díkk-awo / díkk-uússo*
 3PL.NOM go-CNV NEG.VB-3PL
 ‘Let them not go!’

The subject-agreement markers on the verb in (21) are not restricted to the optative/imperative verb. Rather, the same forms are used in polar negative interrogative forms, as in (22).

- (22) Negative Interrogative, Past tense:
hang-í-b-ánna ‘Didn’t I go?’
hang-í-b-ay ‘Didn’t you go?’
hang-í-b-íya ‘Didn’t he go?’
hang-í-b-áye ‘Didn’t she go?’
hang-í-b-úнно ‘Didn’t we go?’
hang-í-b-íнно ‘Didn’t we go?’
hang-í-b-íte ‘Didn’t you (pl.) go?’
hang-í-b-áwo ‘Didn’t they go?’

The affirmative optative also uses the same set of subject-agreement markers, as the sentential examples in (23) illustrate. Subject-agreement markers in other moods, e.g. the declarative affirmative, are different from these (cf. Azeb Amha 2009b).

- (23a) *(támí) ?epp-aná*
 1SG.NOM take-1SG.OPT
 ‘Let me take!’
- (23b) *(núní) ?epp-uúnno*
 1PL.INC.NOM take-1PL.INC.OPT
 ‘Let’s take!’
- (23c) *(níní) ?epp-iínno*
 1PL.NOM take-1PL.EXC.OPT
 ‘Let’s take!’
- (23d) *(?ésí) ?epp-ó* [Also: *?epp-eésse / ?epp-áye* ‘Let him take!’]
 (3MSG.NOM) take-3.OPT
 ‘Let him take!’

(23e) (*ʔísí*) *ʔepp-ó* [Also: *ʔepp-išša* / *ʔepp-áya* ‘Let her take!’]
 (3FSG-NOM) take-3.OPT
 ‘Let her take!’

(23f) (*ʔúsúní*) *ʔepp-ó* [Also: *ʔepp-uússó* / *ʔeppá-wo* ‘Let them take!’]
 3 PL.NOM take-3.OPT
 ‘Let them take!’

The difference among the three paradigms is that, in the affirmative optative, the person, number and gender markers are directly affixed to the main verb (see examples in [23]), whereas in the negative imperative and the negative interrogative, the subject-agreement markers are attached to the respective negative verbs of the paradigms: *dVkk* (representing *dókk-* and *díkk-* in the above examples) in the negative imperative and *b-* (negative existential verb) in the negative interrogative (cf. Azeb Amha 2009b).

The first person optative agreement markers (*-aná*, *-uúnno* and *-ínno*) in (21) resemble the subject pronouns given in bracket (the same is true with the first and third person negative optative forms). The semantics of the alternative third person optative agreement markers in examples (23d-f) is not fully understood. However, there seems to be a slight meaning difference between the invariable third person optative marker *-ó* and the optative forms within brackets that are distinct for gender and number. That is, the form with the *-ó* suffix is mainly used when the speaker is obliged to make a choice or give permission (without good will). For example if some one says *ʔeppó* ‘let him/her/them take (some thing)!', it is likely that the addressee has been repeatedly asking the consent or permission of the speaker that someone else gets something. Another example, when something falls and the speaker cannot save it, he might say: *ʔúmbó* ‘let it fall then’ rather than the alternative forms *ʔúmbeésse* or *ʔúmbáye*.

The imperative and optative in Zargulla can be regarded as subtypes of the same mood. This is evident from the patterning of the negative imperative with the negative optative by taking the verb *dVkk-*. Moreover, similar person, number and gender marking affixes are used in the paradigms of the imperative and optative (see examples [21-23]), whereas subject-agreement markers in other moods such as the affirmative declarative or interrogative are formally distinct.

2.6. *Reported directives*

Reported speech in Zargulla involves “direct speech” plus inflectional affixes that indicate tense, polarity as well as the person, gender and number of the reported speaker. The inflectional affixes must have originally been part of the quotative verb *hi(yy)-* ‘say’ but the latter verb is not more pronounced in quotative clauses.⁴ Examples:

(24a) *hamm-á-tt-iš-ínne*
 go-IMP-FOC-3FSG-PAST
 ‘She said “go!”’

⁴ When asked, speakers recognize the complete construction, i.e. the reported utterance plus the appropriate form of the verb *hi(yy)-* ‘say’, as a quotative clause but they do not use this ‘long form’.

- (24b) *hamm-á-tte-s-íne*
 go-IMP-FOC-3MSG-PRES
 ‘He says “go!”’

It is noteworthy that the utterances in (24) are similar to verb forms that are labelled as “extended declarative-indicative paradigms”, first used in Hayward (1991) for Zayse, which are also derived from a complex construction comprising an intensive (INT) verb stem (verb root and *-á* or *-ó*) plus “say”-verb (cf. Azeb Amha 2007). Compare the imperative forms in (24a-b) above with the corresponding extended declarative forms in (25): feminine subject past tense (25a) and masculine subject present tense (25b):⁵

- (25a) *hám-á-tt-iš-ínne*
 go-INT-FOC-3FSG-PAST
 ‘She went’
- (25b) *hám-á-tte-s-íne*
 go-INT-FOC-3MSG-PRES
 ‘He goes’

Comparison of the verbs in (24) and (25) shows that the two differ in that the imperative verb in (24) has a geminate verb-root final consonant whereas the final consonant of the verb-root of the declarative in (25) is not geminated. Moreover, the tone-accent of the verb roots in (24) and (25) is different: past, present and future tenses of all verbs are marked with a high tone-accent on the first vowel of the verb root, whereas in the imperative the tone of the verb root is lexically determined, as discussed in Section 2.1. Another example of similarity and contrast between the reported imperative and the extended declarative is shown in example (26):

- (26a) *dents-á-tt-iš-ínne*
 lift-IMP-FOC-3FSG-PAST
 ‘She said “lift/pick (it) up!”’
- (26b) *dénts-á-tt-iš-ínne*
 lift-INT-FOC-3FSG-PAST
 ‘She lifted/picked (it) up’

Some verbs take the intensive marker *-ó* instead of *-á* which is homophonous with the imperative morpheme *-a* (compare examples in 24 with those in 25).⁶ In the case of verbs that take the intensive marker *-ó* in the declarative, the morphological contrast between the reported directive and the extended declarative is directly apparent. Compare the highlighted morphemes in the (a) and (b) examples in (27) and (28).

⁵ This is a special innovation of the East Omoto languages including Zayse (cf. Hayward 1990), Zargulla (Azeb Amha 2007). A parallel construction but using different sets of morphemes to mark focus and subject-agreement are reported for Haro (Hirut Woldemariam 2003) and Koorete (Biniam Sisay Mendisu 2008).

⁶ The distribution of the intensive markers *-á* and *-ó* is partly determined by valence (cf. Azeb Amha 2007).

- (27a) *ʔútt-á-tt-iš-ínne*
sit-IMP-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She said “sit!”’
- (27b) *ʔútt-ó-tt-iš-ínne*
sit-INT-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She sat’
- (28a) *kól-á-tte-s-ínne*
demolish-IMP-FOC-MSG-PAST
‘He said “demolish (it)!”’
- (28b) *kól-ó-tte-s-ínne*
demolish-INT-FOC-3-MSG-PAST
‘He demolished (it)’

Some verbs have variants that are used in different tenses and moods. For example, for ‘eat’ we have the forms *muús* (infinitive), *m(íy)*- (progressive, imperative, optative), *muútt*- (past, present, future), *muúd*- (perfective, negative optative). In such cases the reported command and the declarative construction are even more readily distinguished:

- (29a) *míy-á-tt-iš-ínne*
eat-IMP-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She said “eat!”’
- (29b) *muútt-á-tt-iš-ínne*
eat-INT-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She ate’

The following is an example of a reported directive involving plural addressee:

- (30) *míy-á-ite-tt-iš-ínne*
eat-IMP-2PL.ADR-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She said ‘(2PL) “eat!”’

A reported optative form (reported indirect command) is formed using the same structure as the reported directive, as illustrated in (31):

- (31a) *míy-ó-tt-iš-ínne*
eat-3.OPT-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She said “let him/her/them eat!”’
- (31b) *m-ííšša-tt-iš-ínne*
eat-3FSG.OPT-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She said “let her eat!”’
- (31c) *míy-úusso-tt-iš-ínne*
eat-3PL.OPT-FOC-3FSG-PAST
‘She said “let them eat!”’

3. Directives to domestic animals

In this section we present imperative and interjectional expressions used in directives to domestic animals in Zargulla. In Table 1, we list these expres-

sions including some data from two other Ometo languages, Maale and Wolaitta, for comparative purposes. Some of the expressions are direct cognates in the three languages whereas others are different. Wolaitta has more verbal directives to animals than the other two languages and in this language many of the summons expressions are vocative forms of the “name” of the animal. The “naming” of animals is based on age or sex, e.g., a male goat has a distinct term of address than the female one and the term used to summon (goat) kids is different from these two. Some of the names referring to cows are derived from colour terminology specific to animals e.g., *dulkó* ‘black (of cow)’, while others seem to be borrowed expressions e.g., *tiito* ‘name to refer to dogs’. The difference among the three languages in whether or not they use “proper names” when referring to domestic animals could perhaps be a result of the different population density and settlement patterns and subsequent adaptation in farming-herding activities. It is the impression of the present author that domestic animals are fewer in number, more closely guarded and kept closer to the farms and homes of their owners in the Wolaitta area (especially so in its northern and eastern territory) than in Zargulla or Maale. Most Zargulla for example, keep cattle in what they refer to as *?aimmá*, a place some two to six hours’ distance from the villages, where cattle can be raised in relatively large numbers, with just a few members of the family attending to them. The father and/or one or two older children stay in the *?aimmá* in turns for several weeks. They return home occasionally to deliver dairy products and return with grain, flour and other food items needed at the *?aimmá*. The Maale have a similar custom of keeping cattle at distance. In Wolaitta, it seems that cattle are more individualized and personified as they are mainly kept in homesteads, explaining why in this language more verbal expressions are used in directives to domestic animals.

3.1. *Summonses and dispersal expressions in Zargulla*

Summonses are utterances made to have the animal move close to the speaker. Dispersals are directives for an animal to move away from a certain location (not necessarily from where the speaker is found). Most of the forms used to summon and disperse animals are interjectional. However, some verbal utterances are also used. Acoustically, summons are characterized by several repetitions, lengthening of vowels and by what appears to be a more friendly or normal intonation. Dispersals on the other hand are uttered with exaggeratedly-raised voice, they may or may not be repeated several times (depending on how fast the directive is heeded) and there seems to be a significant speed in the transition of articulating the consonant(s) and vowel(s) in the utterance: it seems that a monosyllabic dispersal expression appears to take ‘shorter time’ than a monosyllabic summon expression. Nasalization of vowels is observed as a phonetic modification in summon and dispersal forms in directives to animals whereas only oral vowels are used in inter-human communication in the language. With the exception of vowel length and tone-accent, not all suprasegmental features are consistently indicated in the data presented in the present section.

(32)	Summonses		Dispersals
	cows	<i>ʔaa</i> (also to stop/calm down when agitated)	<i>káís</i>
	oxen	<i>ʔãã</i> (to lead to mating location)	<i>wãã</i>
	goat	<i>miíʔo</i>	<i>ʔiśśá</i>
	sheep	<i>baáʔ</i>	<i>ʔúss</i>
	chicken	<i>lúk / ʔíkʔ</i>	<i>čúk</i>
	cats	<i>wurruu</i>	<i>kíp</i>
	dogs	<i>háč(i)</i>	<i>káč</i> or <i>kéči</i>

(There are comparable interjections that are addressed to humans such as *héč* ‘go away! get lost!’ but these are not discussed in the present contribution.) Some of the forms listed in (32), for example the summonses to goats and sheep and the dispersal form for cats, seem to be imitations of the natural cry the animals make. In the other cases, summons and dispersal forms are not similar to calls the animals make. Neither are they related to the names of the domestic animals themselves, which are given in the left hand-side of the examples in (33-35) below. They are also different from the verbal forms humans use to express the act of making the sounds, which are represented in the verbal forms in examples (33-35):

- (33) *maído-y sʔaágg-í*
 ox-NOM make_noise-PF
 ‘The oxen made noise’

Similarly:

- (34) *haré-y haáʔ-í* ‘The donkey made noise / did hiha’
kaná-y bóčʔ-í ‘The dog barked’
kúttó-y ʔuuʔ-í ‘The rooster cockadoolleedooed’

There is a general verb, *ʔuukk-*, which is used to express the act of making noise by various animals other than those listed in (33-34) above. Examples:

- (35) *kúttó-y ʔuukkí* ‘The hen cackled’
miíss-í ʔuukk-í ‘The cow mooed’
sʔégá-y ʔuukk-í ‘The goat made noise’
doró-y ʔuukk-í ‘The sheep made noise’
šuuró-y/garawá-y ʔuukk-í ‘The cat meowed’
kapó-y ʔuukk-í ‘The bird sang’

For some (non-domesticated) animals there is either a dispersal or summons form only. This seems to correspond to the use of the respective animals or trouble caused by them. Thus for birds there is only a dispersal form whereas for bees there is only a summons form:

- (36a) *caáy*
 (utterance to disperse birds)
- (36b) *búl búl táná bir-á, kawó ʔamaat*
 (utterance to summon queen bee and colony)

While uttering the expression in (36b), speakers throw a hand-full of soil upwards so that when the soil falls back on the ground, each member of the colony would ‘think’ that the other bees have descended and it too would

descend. In the same example, *birá* in *táná birá* is a transitive verb meaning ‘lead, go ahead (of speaker)’ and it implies that the speaker and addressee arrive at the same destination. *?amaat* in (36b) is generally used for pleading. For example, when trying to stop parents from punishing their children by whipping, neighbours or relatives present would say the following utterances to the parent:⁷

- (37) *né ?índo ?amaat*
 2SG.GEN mother ?amaat
 ‘On the name of or for the sake of your mother do what I beg you to do (i.e. stop the whipping).’

Or:

- (38) *né ?ádo ?amaat*
 2 SG.GEN father ?amaat
 ‘On the name of or for the sake of your father do what I beg you to do (i.e. stop the whipping).’

The summons expression for bees therefore, can be analysed as a sentential utterance, ‘requesting’ or ‘pleading to’ the bee to go ahead and settle in the hive the speaker had prepared for it.

3.2. Directives related to movement and direction of domestic animals

For some animals there are more interjectional and non-interjectional directives. Perhaps the most elaborate is that used for oxen in the farms as illustrated in (39) and (40).

- (39) *waáhh*
 Directive to ploughing oxen to move quicker
waah-á
 Directive to have oxen stop movement
horó
 Directive to oxen to resume movement after stopping for a while
čér-a
 Directive to oxen (and cows) to enter into the barn and take their place

The base form of some of the directives to oxen in example (39), e.g. *waah-á* and *čér-a* are interjectional but the final vowel seems to be the singular imperative morpheme *-a*, irrespective of the fact that the speaker addresses at least two oxen (a pair of oxen is used to ‘pull/carry’ the yoke). The distribution of high tone accent on the vowel strengthens this analysis

⁷ In the same context, Wolaitta speakers use the expression *niayyiyo ?ic’c’á* or *niawá ?ic’c’á*, the first of these is a fused form of the words glossed in (1) below. Concerning the use of the verb *?ic’c’-* ‘hit chest’ in this context we note that sympathy/empathy is often expressed by the simultaneous gesture of hitting the chest, e.g., during accident or as a reaction to a sad story. In Amharic the expression in (2) can be used for pleading:

- (1) *ne ?aayy-íyo ?ic’c’-á*
 2SG.POS mother-F.ACC hit.chest-2SG.IMP
- (2) *bä-(i)nnat /abbat-ih (yīžž-e-h-all-ähu)*
 INST-mother/father-2 SG.POS hold-1SG.CNV-2SG.OBJ-AUX-1SG.SBJ

(compare *waah-á* and *cér-a* in (39); see also Section 1.1 on discussion on the imperative markers). The other directives addressed to oxen are verbal utterances, and they may be used as directives to humans too. For example, from the verb roots *wots-* ‘descend, climb down’, *kés-* ‘go out’, *?aats-* ‘let pass, put something in a container’ the following directives to oxen are formed:

- (40) *wots-á* ‘move down!’
kéz-a ‘move up!’
 (To correct an out of line movement of ploughing oxen)
?aats-á
 (Directive to oxen that reached the end of the length of the farm to make a U return)

Similar directives used to influence movement of other domestic animals are given in (41). Most of the directives to stop movement involve long vowels and repetitions (41a) and thus look like summons forms discussed in the previous section. This may be not to scare the animals or that they do not make a jerk movement. Directives to start or continue movement on the other hand are curt commands with short syllables and raised voice (41b).

- (41a) *?aa?aa* (Directive to cows to stop movement)
tooššé (Directive to donkeys to stop movement)
noóč (Directive to horse or mule to stop movement)
- (41b) *há’k* (Directive to donkeys to start or continue movement)
má’č (Directive to horse or mule to continue fast movement)

In the present section, we described Zargulla utterances used for commanding animals. Similar forms are attested in related Omotic languages such as Maale and Wolaitta; in some cases they are identical. In fact, parallel systems and even cognate forms are found in a number of Ethiopian Semitic and Cushitic languages as well.⁸ Limited data available on Maale summons and dispersal forms are included in Table 1. In Wolaitta too, both interjectional and verbal directives are used for commanding animals, as the forms listed in column 4 of Table 1 show. Interestingly, in Wolaitta, there are different sets of ‘names’ used for summoning domestic animals. Names typically given to oxen include: *duúla*, *málka* and *gérša*. Names appropriate for a particular domestic animal are selected on the basis of its physical statue, colour and/or temperament. For example the name *kuuló* designates a cow that is easy to handle; *dulkó* and *wosóllo* respectively imply black and red-coloured cows. As attributes to other entities, the corresponding colour terms used are respectively, *karétta* ‘black’ and *zo?ó* ‘red’. Names for horses include: *giraáč’*, *dibilá*. Whether a similar naming system is used in Zargulla and Maale is not investigated. In Table 1, the sign + is added in the last column to indicate whether the forms used in human-to-animal communication have a corresponding verbal form (in this column Z stands for Zargulla, M for Maale and W for Wolaitta).

⁸ I thank Zelealem Leyew and Graziano Savà for examples and discussion on this.

Table 1: Summary of directives to (domestic) animals in Zargulla, Maale and Wolaitta

Animal	Zargulla	Maale	Wolaitta	Parallel verbs?		
	To summon	To summon	To summon	Z.	M.	W.
		<i>ḃóó</i>				
cows	<i>?aa?aa</i>	—	(call by name)	N	N	N
oxen	<i>?āā</i>	<i>wúruú</i>	(call by name)	N	N	N
goats	<i>mí?o</i>		<i>?obbole</i> (male)	N	N	N
			<i>?oččé</i> (female)	N	N	N
			<i>mí?iw</i> (kid)	N	N	N
sheep	<i>baá?</i>	<i>báá marayi</i>	<i>damasá</i> (male)	N	N	N
			<i>badǵé</i> (female)	N	N	N
chicken	<i>lúk/bík'</i>	<i>lúkku</i>	<i>bík' bík'</i>	N	N	N
cats	<i>wurruu</i>	<i>wurréé</i>	<i>šur(i) šur(i)</i>	N	N	N
dogs	<i>háč(i)</i>	—	<i>tiito / bučči</i>	N	N	N
donkeys	—	—	(by name)	N	N	N
bees	<i>búl búl táná</i> <i>birá...kawó</i> <i>?amaat</i>		<i>koómott</i> ⁹			
	To disperse	To disperse	To disperse			
oxen	<i>wāā</i>	<i>?áy</i>	<i>tíyk</i>	N	N	Y
cows	<i>káis</i>	<i>?áy</i>	<i>?arkiyay</i>	N	N	Y?
goat	<i>?iššá</i>	<i>káči / kíči</i>	<i>?áskiyáy</i>	N	N	Y?
sheep	<i>?úss</i>		<i>?adík / ?adíya</i>	N	N	Y?
chicken	<i>čúk</i>	<i>čúkkku</i>	<i>šúh / šúk</i>	N	N	Y
cats	<i>kíp</i>	<i>šikk-íbey</i>	<i>baík(i)</i>	N	Y	Y
dogs	<i>káč / kéči</i>		<i>baík(i)</i>	N		Y
donkeys			<i>?išík</i>	N		Y
horse			<i>?išík</i>	N		Y
group of cows/oxen			<i>horró</i> (‘do orderly!’ directive during drinking)	N		N
birds	<i>caáy</i>		<i>hírr</i>	N		N
	Start/cont. mvt		Start/cont. mvt			
oxen	<i>waáhh</i>		<i>?aattá</i>	N		Y
donkeys	<i>hák'</i>		<i>párt'</i>	N		Y
horse	<i>máč'</i>		<i>máč'č'</i>	N		Y
mule	<i>máč'</i>		—	N		Y
	Stop mvt.		Stop mvt.			
oxen	<i>waah-á</i>	—	<i>waah-á</i>	N		N
cows	<i>?aa?aa</i>		<i>?aán</i>	N		N
donkeys	<i>tooššé</i>		<i>?iššá</i>	N		N
horse/mule	<i>noóč</i>		<i>?iššá</i>	N		N
goats/sheep	—		<i>?ižžoo</i>			N
	Resume mvt.		Resume mvt.			
oxen	<i>horó</i>		—	N		

⁹ This seems to be a contracted form of a (possessive) noun phrase: *kawó matta* ‘king’s bee’, involving the nouns *kawó* ‘king’ and *mátta* ‘bee’.

	Enter (barn)	Enter (barn)		
oxen/cows	<i>čér-a</i>	<i>hirká or:</i> <i>yuuššá</i>	N	N
			N	Y
	Move down			
oxen	<i>wots-á</i>	—	+	
	Move up	Move up		
oxen	<i>kéz-a</i>	<i>t'ók' tok'</i>	Y	Y
	Return			
oxen	<i>?aats-á</i>	—	Y	

4. Summary and conclusion

In the previous sections, we presented analysis of imperative verbs and interjections used in addressing humans and (domestic) animals in Zargulla. The two have a common function of manipulating hearers to do what the speaker wants them to do. Using “directive” as a cover term for both, analysis of their morphology and, to some extent, the semantics is made. It is shown that directives to humans are mainly made by imperative verbs while directives to animals are mostly interjectional. However, as shown in Section 3, the imperative may also be used in directives to animals. The morpheme *-á* marks the imperative and it is used in directives to humans as well as in directives to animals. The plural addressee marker *-ite* is added to the imperative verb only in directives to humans. It is not used in directives to animals. This morpheme is not a mood marker; it is attested in other interactive contexts as we showed in Section 2. The negative imperative in Zargulla is expressed by a complex predicate involving an invariable converb and an inflecting negative verb. The same negative verb root is used in the paradigm of the negative optative, suggesting that the imperative and optative are sub-systems of a single modal category.

Interjectional directives to animals may or may not take the imperative marker. Both interjectional and verbal directives to animals may be modified phonetically by extra lengthening and/or nasalization of vowels and by altering intonation patterns. Other mechanisms such as repetitions and temporal reduction in articulation of the utterances are also common features in directives to animals. There seems to be some kind of phono-semantics involved with these modifications. That is, most of the directives to summon animals and to ‘halt movement’ have longer vowels, they are uttered with (gentle) regular intonation and are generally repeated two or more times. “Start movement” commands in contrast have short vowels and are not always repeated several times. As can be seen from the list of comparable forms (with some gaps), from Wolaitta and Maale, a similar system is attested in related languages. A more exhaustive and rigorous documentation of these forms in Omotic as well as in other Ethiopian languages may facilitate comparison within the family and help identify contact phenomenon among the major language families. It may also shed light on general questions and hypothesis on this mono-directional communication system. For example, the communication behaviour of the speakers towards domestic animals such as the use of verbal or non-verbal form in directives may be explained in the domestic animal’s role or value in the socio-economics of the society. Indications for this include the use of more verbal imperatives in directives to oxen than that used in communication to other

household animals. Similarly, appeasing sentential expressions in summonses of bees may be related to their relative independence from humans.

5. References

- Azeb Amha. 2001. *The Maale Language*. Leiden: CNWS.
- . 2007. Are *-a-* and *-o-* in the indicative verb paradigms of Zargulla nominalizers? In: Azeb Amha, G. Savà and M. Mous (eds.). *Omotic and Cushitic Languages Studies: Papers from the Fourth Cushitic Omotic Conference, Leiden, 10-12 April 2003*, pp. 1-22. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- . 2009a. Participant marking and valence in Wolaitta. In: Dimmendaal, G. (ed.), *Participant Marking: Case Studies from Twelve African Languages*, pp. 355-384. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . 2009b. The morpho-syntax of negation in Zargulla. In: Leo Wetzels (ed.), *The Linguistics of Endangered Languages: Contributions to Morphology and Morpho-Syntax*, pp. 199-220. Utrecht: LOT.
- Ameka, Felix. 1992. Interjections: the universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 101-118.
- . 1994. Interjections. In: Asher, R.E. and J.M.Y. Simpson (eds.). *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, pp. 1712-1715. Oxford, New York, Seoul, Tokyo: Pergamon Press.
- Binyam Sisay Mendisu. 2008. *Aspects of Koorete Verb Morphology*. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Bynon, James. 1976. Domestic Animal Calling in a Berber Tribe. *Language and Man: Anthropological Issues*. In: McCormack, W.C. and S.A. Wurm (eds.). pp. 39-66. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Fleming, Harold. 1976. Cushitic and Omotic. In: Bender, L.M. (ed.). *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, pp. 299-323. East Lansing: African Studies Centre, Michigan State University.
- Hirut Woldemariam. 2003. The grammar of Haro with comparative notes on the Omoto linguistic group. Unpublished PhD thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Mulugeta Seyoum. 2008. *A Grammar of Dime*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- Palmer, Frank R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John. 1983. *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.