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This paper presents a descriptive overview of the phonology and morphology of the Lower Jubba dialect of Maay, a language of southern Somalia. The paper highlights several points of typological, dialectological, and theoretical interest in this language. For example, the nominal morphology exhibits a somewhat unusual pattern of plural marking that interacts in a complex way with the gender marking system. Where relevant, comparisons are made between this dialect and other dialects of Maay and Somali, and speculation is made as to the historical origin of some of the unusual phonological and morphological phenomena observed in this dialect.

1. Introduction.

This paper presents aspects of the phonology and morphology of a dialect of Maay, a Cushitic language of southern Somalia. The dialect to be discussed here, which I will refer to as Lower Jubba Maay (LJM), appears to be undescribed in the literature. The data in this paper are the result of four months of research with a native speaker of LJM in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in winter and spring of 2006.

1.1 Somali Dialects. There exists no comprehensive study of Somali and Maay dialects, and in fact the question of whether Somali and Maay represent dialects of the same language or different languages entirely has not been resolved, since
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what are sometimes described as Somali dialects (including Maay dialects) are in some cases mutually unintelligible (Saeed 1987: 2). Anecdotal impressions from Maay speakers suggest that the language situation in Somalia is a "dialect continuum" in that neighboring dialects are all mutually intelligible, but the dialects at opposite ends of the continuum are not mutually intelligible. For example, the Maay consultant for the present study is from the far south of Somalia and reports that he is able to understand the Central Somali dialect described by Saeed (1982) but not the Somali spoken in the far north. As will be discussed, in several ways LJM appears to be an innovative dialect with respect to other dialects of Maay and Somali, such as Central Somali (Saeed 1982) and Standard Somali (Saeed 1987).

Map 1: Map of Somalia showing Lower Jubba state and city of Kowan
1.2 Lower Jubba Maay. The dialect to be described here (Lower Jubba Maay, or LJM) is spoken in the state of Lower Jubba, which is the southernmost state in Somalia. The consultant is a 27 year-old man from Kowan, which is just across the Jubba River from the city of Jamaame (see Map 1).

LJM shares many features with Central Somali (Saced 1982) and the Standard Somali spoken in the north, but there are significant differences, including differences in the consonant and vowel inventories, morphology, and lexical items. These will be pointed out throughout the paper as they become relevant.

2. Phonology.

2.1 Segmental Inventory. The segmental inventory of LJM differs not only from the inventory of Standard Somali, but also from that of the more closely related Central Somali. The consonantal inventory of LJM is presented below. Sounds in parentheses are very rarely attested, while sounds in brackets occur in surface forms but are not posited as phonemes of the language.

(i) Consonants of Lower Jubba Maay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Alveo-</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palatal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) b</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>ŋ j</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f [β]</td>
<td>[β]</td>
<td>s s</td>
<td>[y] h</td>
<td>[ɣ]</td>
<td>[ɣ]</td>
<td>[ɣ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>ŋ n</td>
<td>[r] n</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[y]</td>
<td>[y]</td>
<td>[y]</td>
<td>[y]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The alveolar and velar implosives [ŋ] and [ŋ] correspond to a voiced retroflex plosive [d] and voiceless uvular plosive [q], respectively, in both Standard and Central Somali. The palatal implosive [ŋ] may correspond to the voiced palatal stop [ŋ] in Somali, though no cognates have been established to verify this. Though long consonants are documented in Standard and Central Somali, they are not found in LJM. In all cases where affixation would yield sequences of identical consonants, some process prevents these from surfacing. In the case of heteromorphic sequences of any nasal + n, the first nasal always surfaces as [ŋ], as in forms such as aŋ-ŋi ‘we ate’ (from underlying /aam-ŋi/). This could be
analyzed as a dissimilatory process if we assume that the first nasal in such sequences first assimilates to the following \( n \) via the regular assimilation process to be described in section 2.4., though such an analysis is admittedly somewhat abstract. Sequences of identical consonants other than \( n \) are reduced to a single consonant. As in Central Somali (as discussed by Saeed 1982: 4), the phonological difference between underlying \( C_1C_2 \) vs. \( C \) is maintained among stops in intervocalic position since underlying singleton stops undergo weakening to fricatives whereas sequences of identical stops resist weakening. For example, input /k+k/ surfaces as [k] ~ [g] intervocically, while input /k/ and /g/ surface as [γ] in the same environment. This accounts for the difference between the intervocalic velar obstruents in [diiki] ~ [diigi] ‘the rooster’ (from underlying /diik + ki/) and [diβiγi] ‘bull’ (from underlying /diβigi/).

Though its consonants differ significantly from other dialects of Maay and Somali, the vowel inventory in LJM is identical to those of both Central and Standard Somali except that Saeed describes a sixth vowel in the short vowel inventory of Central Somali, a high central vowel, that does not seem to exist in LJM. The vowel inventory of LJM is presented below.

(2) Vowels of Lower Jubba Maay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five vowels have both long and short forms. As described by Saeed (1982, 1987) for Central and Standard Somali, corresponding long and short vowels in LJM have somewhat different qualities. In LJM, the short vowels in general are less widely dispersed in the vowel space than their long counterparts. This phonetic difference is not phonologically contrastive. Throughout this paper, I will use the five standard vowels to indicate both long and short vowels, but the phonetic difference in quality between long and short vowels should be kept in mind. On a related note, there is no evidence for a vowel harmony process in LJM like the one found in Standard Somali (Saeed 1987: 19, Armstrong 1934).

2.2 Tone or Accent. Hyman (1981), Saeed (1982, 1987), and Armstrong (1934) document contrastive tone and/or accent in some dialects of Somali. In Standard Somali, tone distinguishes not only lexical items, but also some grammatical
categories such as case (Saeed 1987). However, no such effects of tone or accent are found in LJM. Stress is root-final, but it is not very prominent and is often not distinguishable at all, and the pitch profile of words is predictable based on the number and shape of syllables in the word and the position of the word in the sentence. Saeed (1982: 9) shows that in Central Somali (CS), tone is contrastive on noun roots. According to Saeed, most nouns have final high tone, while some disyllabic roots have initial high tone. As seen in the examples below, both patterns correspond to final stress in LJM. (3a) shows nouns with final high tone in CS and the corresponding final-stressed nouns in LJM (high tone is marked with an acute accent for the CS examples; stressed syllables in LJM are indicated by underlining the vowel). (3b) shows high-initial nouns in CS for which LJM cognates were found, and as can be seen here, the LJM cognates have final stress, not initial stress.¹

(3) CS LJM

a. osbó usbo ‘salt’
boodó boodo ‘thigh’ (CS) / ‘heel’ (LJM)
djimaaño djimaaño ‘mosquito’
b. tārow faro ‘zebra’
ökun okun ‘egg’
eyduur eey duuret ‘wild dog’

In monosyllables, CS contrasts high vs. low tone. There is no such contrast in LJM; all monosyllables are produced with the same kind of word stress. Some examples are shown below (words with no acute accent in CS have low tone). Note that in some cases, tone distinguishes masculine nouns (4a) from feminine nouns (4b) in CS; this distinction is neutralized in the LJM cognates.

¹ While eeyduur ‘wild dog’ is transcribed by Saeed (1982: 85) as a single word, the LJM cognate appears to be a noun phrase, eey duuret. In LJM, duuret is an adjective meaning ‘wild’, and is used in the names of other animals such as mukulal duuret ‘wild cat’ and lōt duuret ‘wild cow’. Because eey duuret has two roots, its stress pattern does conform to the root-final stress generalization. It should also be pointed out that the LJM nouns cited here are monomorphemic, despite the high frequency in this data set of final o that might suggest that these words are morphologically complex. I believe the high frequency of o here to be an accident resulting from the particular CS cognates cited by Saeed, since o is not necessarily the most common final vowel in LJM.
In addition to the lack of lexically contrastive stress, the case-marking function of tone in some Somali dialects is also absent in LJM. Saeed (1982) gives an example of two sentences distinguished by tone: *usā dili* ‘he killed it’ vs. *usō dili* ‘it killed him’. The two sentences are homophonous in LJM (*usú dili*), since in LJM nouns are pronounced with the same pitch pattern regardless of their function in the sentence. Thus, the lack of case marking (whether by tones or segments) results in ambiguity in sentences where the subject and object would trigger the same verb agreement marking. To give another example, the sentences *ii yahas aanti* and *yahas ii aanti* can both mean either ‘she ate a crocodile’ or ‘a crocodile ate her’. This is because the pronoun *ii* ‘she’ and the noun *yahas* ‘crocodile’ are both feminine singular forms and therefore can both be the subject of the verb *aan-i* ‘eat-Fem-Past’. The word order in LJM is relatively free with a preference for the verb to occur last, but in the sentences cited above, word order may be used to disambiguate the meaning, since the consultant first volunteers forms in which the subject occurs before the object (e.g., the consultant volunteers *ii yahas aanti* for ‘she ate a crocodile’ and *yahas ii aanti* for ‘a crocodile ate her’). However, it is also possible that this is merely an effect of the word order in the English stimulus.

Saeed also reports that verbs exhibit characteristic tonal patterns in different morphological contexts in Central Somali (1982: 10). These are absent in LJM. Below are the forms of the Central Somali verb *šeey* ‘bring’ (Saeed 1982: 24-26) that have clear correspondents in LJM. Note that regardless of the location of the high tone in each Central Somali form, the root bears stress in the corresponding LJM form.
Aspects of Maay Phonology and Morphology

(5)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS</th>
<th>LJM</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šeen-i</td>
<td>šeen-i</td>
<td>‘I brought’ (simple past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeen-ą ʃé-ri</td>
<td>šeen ʃi-ri</td>
<td>‘I used to bring’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeen-öoy-ą</td>
<td>šeen oy-e</td>
<td>‘I am bringing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeen-é</td>
<td>šeen-e</td>
<td>‘I am about to bring’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeen-ą doon-ą</td>
<td>šeen doon-ya</td>
<td>‘I will bring’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeen</td>
<td>šeen</td>
<td>‘bring!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeen-ą</td>
<td>šeen-ą</td>
<td>‘bring! pl.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I conclude that LJM is not a tonal language. It is unclear whether LJM has lost its tone or whether tonal contrasts were innovated in dialects spoken further to the north, but the former seems more likely since root-final stress is uniform in LJM and there is no obvious environment that would have conditioned a split into high vs. low tone in the northern and central dialects.

2.3 Root Shape and Loanword Adaptation. The largest native roots in LJM are three syllables; longer words appear to be affixed forms, compounds, or borrowings. Roots may begin with a consonant or a vowel (in the latter case, initial glottal stops are inserted to provide an onset when the preceding word does not end in a consonant). Roots may end with a consonant or vowel, though some segments are much more common than others in root-final position. For example, while many roots end in /m/, very few end in /n/, and it seems that no root ends in /n/ or /ŋ/ (though almost all nasal-final words have final [ŋ] on the surface due to a process to be described in section 2.4). Glottal stop is also very rare as a root-final segment. Impressionistically, among stem-final vowels, /e/, /o/, and /a/ are common while /i/ is somewhat less common and /u/ is rare.

The maximal syllable in LJM is CVVC. Consonant clusters are not permitted in onset or coda position. The longest sequences of consonants consist of two consonants, and these occur only intervocally. The minimal syllable consists of a single short vowel, but no words of this shape are recorded; the smallest words have the shape VV (e.g., ii ‘she’).

Loanwords have been identified as being borrowed from at least four different languages: English, Italian, Swahili (or other Bantu), and Arabic. The patterns of loanword adaptation provide evidence for the root and syllable structure generalizations mentioned above as being part of the grammar of the language rather than mere statistical generalizations. For instance, as seen in the examples below, consonant clusters in the source language are eliminated via vowel inser-
tion or consonant deletion (inserted vowels are in bold type; sites of consonant deletion are underlined).

(6)  basipor_      ‘passport’
     tareŋ        ‘train’
     kombuyuter  ‘computer’
     isbuña      ‘sponge’ (< It. spugna)
     fiyus       ‘fuse’
     bol_        ‘bolt’
     kareem      ‘shaving cream’

Borrowings from Arabic include tilbab ‘door’ (cf. St. Ar. el baab ‘the door’) and sa?at ‘watch/clock’ (cf. St. Ar. sa?a, pl. sa?at); borrowings with a Bantu source include ṓaama ‘meat’ (cf. Proto-Bantu *nyama) and mateesa ‘peanut’. Words borrowed from these languages undergo minimal changes, probably because the syllable structure restrictions of the source languages are similar to those of LJM.

2.4 Phonological Processes. LJM exhibits four major phonological processes that result in alternations: Nasal Place Assimilation, Final Nasal Velarization, Coronal Fusion, and Intervocalic Lenition. There is no crucial ordering or ranking of these processes, since no combination of them applies to the same type of sound in the same environment. The four processes are described below.

First, a process of Nasal Place Assimilation is observed, in which nasals agree in place of articulation with any immediately following consonant, in some cases resulting in alternations. This applies within words via both affixation (7a) and compounding (7b). The nasal-final roots are shown in both pre-consonantal (assimilating) and pre-vocalic (non-assimilating) contexts to give evidence for the underlying place of articulation of the nasal (in each of these cases, the underlying nasal is /m/; see below for further discussion).

(7)  Pre-consonantal context                Pre-vocalic context

a.  ereñ-yal      ‘goats’                ern-o               ‘goats’
    aan-ti        ‘she ate’                aam-i            ‘he ate’
    ŋaň-ti        ‘she drank’             ani ina-dam-añ     ‘I might drink’
    bilan-tew     ‘which woman’         bilam-o         ‘women’
    saa-ñ-ti      ‘the foot’         saa-ñ-o            ‘feet’
    gaʔan-tey     ‘my hand’            gaʔam-o         ‘hands’
    miniŋ-ki      ‘the house’         minim-o        ‘houses’
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b. okun šalal ‘egg and tomato dish’ okun-o ‘eggs’
inaŋ gewer ‘baby girl’ ijan-o ‘babies’
eren gondolo ‘sheep’ erem-o ‘goats’

The one exception to this generalization is that any nasal before \( n \) surfaces as \( \eta \), as discussed in section 2.1.

A second process in LJM, Final Nasal Velarization, affects the place of articulation of nasals: word-final nasals in LJM, as in Central Somali (Saeed 1982: 5) neutralize to [\( \eta \)]. A small number of exceptions have been found in LJM, but all of the exceptions found in this study were borrowed words, e.g., kareem ‘shaving cream’, dalaʃin ‘television’, and broon ‘brown’. Other nouns (including other borrowed words such as biy ‘pin’ from underlying /bin/ and baloon ‘ball’ from /baloon/) do undergo velarization, and the result of this in combination with the nasal assimilation rule discussed above is that the identity of a stem-final nasal is generally only recoverable in plural forms with the -o suffix. Below are examples of nouns with underlying /m/ (8a) and /n/ (8b).

(8) a. laam-o ‘branches’ laan ‘branch’
suut-o ‘belts’ suun ‘belt’
suom-o ‘poisons’ suun ‘poison’
sim-o ‘hips’ simul ‘hip’
biilam-o ‘women’ bilan ‘woman’
erem-o ‘goats’ eren ‘goat’
minim-o ‘houses’ minem ‘house’
diidiim-o ‘turtles’ diidiin ‘turtle’
ilim-o ‘teardrops’ lii ‘teardrop’
okum-o ‘eggs’ okun ‘egg’
naaʃim-o ‘coconuts’ naaʃin ‘coconut’
naam-o ‘feet’ saan ‘foot’
gaaʔam-o ‘hands’ gaʔan ‘hand’
saham-o ‘food trays’ sahan ‘food tray’

b. buubun-o ‘snails’ buubun ‘snail’
bin-o ‘pins’ bin ‘pin’
baloon-o ‘balls’ baloon ‘ball’

Interestingly, as is represented in the above data set, most nouns exhibit a single pattern: [m] in the plural form corresponds to [\( \eta \)] in the singular form. It is a very
small number of words (e.g., ‘snail’ and ‘pin’) that establish the direction of the process seen here as \( \{m, n\} \rightarrow \eta \) in uninflected forms, rather than \( \eta \rightarrow m \) in the plural. It is possible that an analogical change is underway such that all of the nasal-final stems end in \([m]\) in the plural form. Evidence for the change could include instances of stem-final \([m]\) in LJM plurals corresponding to other, nonlabial nasals in Standard Somali. Unfortunately, several sources such as Luling (1987) list nouns in their singular forms, which may have undergone neutralization in the place of articulation of final nasals, and I have been able to establish only one LJM cognate with forms cited in sources that do indicate the precise identity of stem-final nasals (e.g., Kenstowicz 1994). The one example is LJM \( \text{day} \) ‘affair’ (pl. \( \text{dam-o} \)) corresponding to Somali \( \text{dan/ dan-o} \) (Kenstowicz 1994: 128). This example does support the hypothesis that stem-final nasals are changing to \(/m/ \) in LJM, but more examples are needed.

The domain of application for this rule does appear to be the word-final position, as opposed to, e.g., utterance-final position. As shown below, a word-final nasal surfaces as \(/\eta/ \) even when followed by a vowel in the following word, at least within the syntactic contexts represented in these examples (words exhibiting Final Velar Nasalization are indicated in bold). No examples were found in which a word-final nasal fails to undergo Final Nasal Velarization (except in the case of the specific exceptional words mentioned above).

\[(9) \text{ niñ-ki inañ ili ďeďeel-o -e} \]
\text{ man-det baby with play -pres.prog-3sgm.pres.prog}
\text{ ‘the man is playing with a baby/child’ (cf. inam-o ‘babies’)}

\[\text{ ereq eey-ki dini-’ye roor-o -e} \]
\text{ goat dog-det side -3sg run -pres.prog-3sgm.pres.prog}
\text{ ‘a goat is running beside/behind the dog’ (cf. erem-o ‘goats’)}

\[\text{ baloonq inañ-ki dariša-ďi ka ’yeď-i} \]
\text{ ball baby-det window-det inst. break-3sgm.past}
\text{ ‘the baby/child broke the window with a ball’ (cf. baloon-o ‘balls’)}

\[\text{2 The word order that is volunteered first for this sentence is inañ-ki baloonq dariša-ďi ka ’yeď-i. However, the sentence presented here (selected in order to provide the pre-vocalic context for the final nasal of baloon) is also accepted by the consultant, along with corresponding sentences exhibiting four additional possible orders for a total of six.}\]
A third phonological process of LJM is Coronal Fusion. LJM differs from both Central and Standard Somali in its treatment of /l+t/. In Central Somali, /l+t/ becomes [l] (Saeed 1982: 5). In Standard Somali, these consonants fuse into [s] when the /t/ belongs to an inflectional suffix (Saeed 1987: 24) (this is very often the case, since all of the inflectional suffixes with feminine agreement begin with /t/, as will be discussed below). The result of the Standard Somali fusion process is seen in possessed forms of walaal ‘sister’ in LJM, as seen below (all possessive suffixes have underlying initial /l/ when the possessed noun is feminine).

(10) walaash-ey ‘my sister’ walaash-aynu ‘our sister’
walaash-a ‘your sister’ walaash-in ‘your pl. sister’
walaash-is ‘his sister’ walaash-i ‘their sister’
walaash-ie ‘her sister’ walaash-i ‘the sister’

It appears that walaal is exceptional in undergoing this process, since all other /l+t/ sequences that were elicited in LJM reduce to [l] instead of [s]. Examples are shown below; all nouns in this set are feminine, and therefore, as will be explained in section 3.2, the suffixes have underlying initial /l/.

(11) weel ‘calf’ hambal ‘leaf’
weel-ey ‘my calf’ hambal-ey ‘my leaf’
weel-a ‘your calf’ hambal-a ‘your leaf’
weel-i ‘the calf’ hambal-i ‘the leaf’
’yonfol ‘bark’ mukulal ‘cat’
’yonfol-ey ‘my bark’ mukulal-ey ‘my cat’
’yonfol-a ‘your bark’ mukulal-a ‘your cat’
’yonfol-i ‘the bark’ mukulal-i ‘the cat’
kaal ‘spoon’ il ‘eye’
kaal-ey ‘my spoon’ il-ey ‘my eye’
kaal-a ‘your spoon’ il-a ‘your eye’
kaal-i ‘the spoon’ il-i ‘the eye’

3 The fact that these are feminine nouns is evident when they are contrasted with masculine l-final stems, which take k-initial masculine-agreeing suffixes: aloi-key ‘my tray’, baskil-key ‘my bicycle’, shawel-key ‘my tiger’, kel-key ‘my nut’, jornal-key ‘my newspaper’, and nali-key ‘my light’.
This process can be thought of in two different ways. It could be analyzed as assimilation of /t/ to an immediately preceding /l/ (as in Central Somali) followed by the application of the weakening process (already motivated in LJM) that reduces geminates to singletons. In this view, the reduction of /l+t/ to [l] would take place in two steps: \(lt \rightarrow ll \rightarrow l\). Alternatively, one could analyze this as simply a single process that deletes /t/ after /l/. One advantage of the two-step analysis is that each step is independently motivated (though the first step is motivated in a different dialect); on the other hand, there is no direct evidence for the intermediate stage \(ll\). The alternative one-step proposal does not have this problem, and furthermore, it seems likely to be the analysis posited by the language learner since /l+t/ apparently always surfaces as [l] in regular forms (except in forms of *walaal*). Therefore, I will assume that the reduction of /l+t/ is the result of a single rule deleting /t/ in this environment.

A final phonological process to be discussed here is Intervocalic Lenition. As was mentioned earlier in the discussion of underlying geminates vs. singleton consonants, stops in LJM occur as voiced fricatives at the same place of articulation when they are in intervocalic position. The resulting alternation can be observed in the examples below, where suffixation of the plural marker -o to a stem ending in a stop provides the intervocalic context that triggers lenition.⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>geet</th>
<th>'tree'</th>
<th>geeð-o</th>
<th>'trees'</th>
<th>belet</th>
<th>'city'</th>
<th>beleð-o</th>
<th>'cities'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iribit</td>
<td>'needle'</td>
<td>iribið-o</td>
<td>'needles'</td>
<td>hidik</td>
<td>'star'</td>
<td>hidiy-o</td>
<td>'stars'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diik</td>
<td>'rooster'</td>
<td>diiy-o</td>
<td>'roosters'</td>
<td>buuk</td>
<td>'book'</td>
<td>buuy-o</td>
<td>'books'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>luk</td>
<td>'leg'</td>
<td>luy-o</td>
<td>'legs'</td>
<td>dek</td>
<td>'ear'</td>
<td>dey-o</td>
<td>'ears'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>harak</td>
<td>'rope'</td>
<td>haray-o</td>
<td>'ropes'</td>
<td>kasap</td>
<td>'sugar cane'</td>
<td>kasaβ-o</td>
<td>'sugar canes'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ilbap</td>
<td>'door'</td>
<td>ilbaβ-o</td>
<td>'doors'</td>
<td>kop</td>
<td>'cup'</td>
<td>koβ-o</td>
<td>'cups'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Note that although some roots are transcribed with final voiced obstruents while others have final voiceless obstruents, there is apparently no voicing contrast root-finally. No minimal or near-minimal pairs have been found that would motivate such a contrast. I have therefore reproduced these examples just as I transcribed them. Word-final dental stops tend to sound like [t], and word-final velars sound like [k], while word-final labial stops vary between [b] and [p]. All are unreleased word-finally.
The reason for assuming that these words have underlying final stops that change to fricatives rather than *vice versa* is that voiced fricatives have a more limited distribution than do stops in LJM. Voiced fricatives occur only intervocally, whereas stops occur word-initially, word-finally, and in syllable-final position before another consonant. Stops do also occur intervocally in words such as *diiki* 'rooster', but recall from section 2.1 that the [k] in this form corresponds to underlying /k+/k/, so the presence of surface intervocalic stops results from the fact that geminate reduction applies after intervocalic lenition (reduction counterfeeds lenition).

Intervocalic lenition does not always apply; it is variable, but at least in morphologically derived contexts, application of the rule is always possible. There are some monomorphemic words within which the rule will never apply, even optionally. For example, in the data set above, the word [hidik] always surfaces with medial [d], never [ð]. A possible explanation for this is that the word has an underlying medial geminate, i.e. /hiddik/, and that the /dd/ reduces to [d] on the surface. There is no external evidence for /dd/, but this does solve the problem of non-application in words of this type, and it is consistent with the doubled consonant reduction pattern that we already know to exist in the language.


The noun morphology of LJM exhibits a number of interesting characteristics, such as an unusual pattern of plural marking that includes optional phonologically licensed multiple plural marking, and an interesting interaction between number and gender. Markers modifying singular feminine nouns have initial /t/, while the masculine correspondents generally have initial /k/ with a few principled exceptions. The gender distinction is motivated by the fact that nouns referring to female humans and animals take suffixes beginning with /t/, while nouns referring to male humans and animals take suffixes beginning with /k/, and all other nouns pattern arbitrarily in the suffixes that they take, regardless of their phonological shape, semantics, or any other grammatical factor. Nouns taking *i*-initial suffixes include words corresponding to English *woman*, *mother*, *girl*, *grandmother*, *daughter*, *female cow*, *female dog*, and also *knife*, *crocodile*, *napkin*, *foot*, *finger*, *leg*. Nouns taking *k*-initial suffixes include words corresponding to *man*, *father*, *boy*, *grandfather*, *son*, *brother*, *bull*, *male dog*, and also *bicycle*, *cup*, *rabbit*, *tree*, *head*, *mouth*, and *high*. A
noun can have masculine or feminine gender agreement with a corresponding
meaning change, e.g., *eey-kì* ‘the (male) dog’ vs. *eey-tì* ‘the female dog’.

The *t* vs. *k* distinction is so prevalent that one could call them agreement
markers and factor them out from the grammatical markers that include them
(definite markers, demonstratives, and possessive markers). For example, we
could assume that the definite marker does not have two underlying forms, femi-
nine /-ti/ and masculine /-kì/, but rather that it has a single form /-i/, which can be
preceded by a feminine agreement marker /t/ or a masculine agreement marker
/k/, yielding the surface forms *-ti* and *-kì*. In the examples below, I have not in-
cluded morpheme breaks after these ‘gender agreement’ markers, but one could
assume that these are, in fact, separate morphemes.\(^5\)

3.1 **Number.** LJM exhibits phonologically conditioned suppletive allomorphy
(PCSA) in the plural marking. Plural is marked by two suffixes, *-o* and *-yal*. All
vowel-final stems take the *-yal* suffix; they cannot take the *-o* suffix. Examples
are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>šati</em></td>
<td><em>šati-yal</em></td>
<td><em>buundo</em></td>
<td><em>buundo-yal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mindi</em></td>
<td><em>mindi-yal</em></td>
<td><em>baaka</em></td>
<td><em>baaka-yal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aweesa</em></td>
<td><em>aweesa-yal</em></td>
<td><em>liwa</em></td>
<td><em>liwa-yal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kora</em></td>
<td><em>kora-yal</em></td>
<td><em>déji</em></td>
<td><em>déji-yal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bakaile</em></td>
<td><em>bakaile-yal</em></td>
<td><em>muata</em></td>
<td><em>muata-yal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>raka</em></td>
<td><em>raka-yal</em></td>
<td><em>mateesa</em></td>
<td><em>mateesa-yal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>maða</em></td>
<td><em>maða-yal</em></td>
<td><em>indo</em></td>
<td><em>indo-yal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bakeeri</em></td>
<td><em>bakeeri-yal</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) There are two main reasons why I have not indicated separate gender agreement morphemes.
The first is mere notational convenience. The second is that, as will be seen, there are two
problematic possessive markers that do not exhibit the usual *t* vs. *k* agreement pattern.
Though the small number of exceptional morphemes does not necessarily disprove the gender
agreement marker hypothesis, I have elected not to use a type of notation that would require a
synchronic explanation for these exceptional forms.
At first, the distribution of the two plural suffixes might appear to be a neat complementary one, with vowel-final stems taking -yal and consonant-final stems taking -o. And, in fact, plural forms with -o are usually volunteered first when the consultant is asked to pluralize consonant-final nouns. However, the situation is more complicated, in that there are three ways to form a plural for any consonant-final stem. As seen in (14), consonant-final stems can take not only -o, but also -yal, or the combination of -o followed by -yal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gaʔaŋ</td>
<td>gaʔam-o ~ gaʔaŋ-yal ~ gaʔam-o-yal</td>
<td>'hands'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahanŋ</td>
<td>saham-o ~ sahaŋ-yal ~ saham-o-yal</td>
<td>'food trays'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ereŋ</td>
<td>erem-o ~ ereŋ-yal ~ erem-o-yal</td>
<td>'goats'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buubunŋ</td>
<td>buubun-o ~ buubun-yl ~ buubun-øyal</td>
<td>'snails'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biŋ</td>
<td>bin-o ~ biŋ-øyal ~ bin-øyal</td>
<td>'pins'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mukulal</td>
<td>mukulal-o ~ mukulal-yl ~ mukulal-øyal</td>
<td>'cats'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eey</td>
<td>eey-o ~ eey-yl ~ eey-øyal</td>
<td>'dogs'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geet</td>
<td>geet-o ~ geet-yl ~ geet-øyal</td>
<td>'trees'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yahas</td>
<td>yahas-o ~ yahas-yl ~ yahas-øyal</td>
<td>'crocodiles'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ees</td>
<td>ees-o ~ ees-yl ~ ees-øyal</td>
<td>'grasses'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miis</td>
<td>miis-o ~ miis-yl ~ miis-øyal</td>
<td>'tables'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuras</td>
<td>kuras-o ~ kuras-yl ~ kuras-øyal</td>
<td>'chairs'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hidik</td>
<td>hidik-o ~ hidik-yl ~ hidik-øyal</td>
<td>'stars'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basal</td>
<td>basal-o ~ basal-yl ~ basal-øyal</td>
<td>'onions'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>af</td>
<td>af-o ~ af-yl ~ af-øyal</td>
<td>'mouths'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kawaš</td>
<td>kawaš-o ~ kawaš-yl ~ kawaš-øyal</td>
<td>'cabbages'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultant reports that there is no meaning difference among plurals formed in each of these three different ways. Although the forms with -o tend to be volunteered first (though this is not always the case), all three forms are judged by the consultant to sound equally good. The examples in (15) confirm that there is no difference in the function of the different types of plural nouns, since each can be a subject or object.
| (15) | a. eey-o | usu | dil-eena | yahas -o | usu | aam-eena |
|      | dog-pl  | 3sgm | kill-3pl.past | crocodile-pl | 3sgm | eat -3pl.past |
|      | 'dogs killed him' |          |          | 'crocodiles ate him' |          |          |
|      | eey-yal | usu | dil-eena | yahas -yal | usu | aam-eena |
|      | dog-pl  | 3sgm | kill-3pl.past | crocodile-pl | 3sgm | eat -3pl.past |
|      | 'dogs killed him' |          |          | 'crocodiles ate him' |          |          |
|      | eey-o-yal | usu | dil-eena | yahas -o-yal | usu | aam-eena |
|      | dog-pl-pl | 3sgm | kill-3pl.past | crocodile-pl-pl | 3sgm | eat -3pl.past |
|      | 'dogs killed him' |          |          | 'crocodiles ate him' |          |          |
|      | b. usu | eey-o | dil-i | usu | yahas -o | aam-i |
|      | 3sgm | dog-pl | kill-3sgm.past | 3sgm | crocodile-pl | eat -3sgm.past |
|      | 'he killed dogs' |          |          | 'he ate crocodiles' |          |          |
|      | usu | eey-yal | dil-i | usu | yahas -yal | aam-i |
|      | 3sgm | dog-pl | kill-3sgm.past | 3sgm | crocodile-pl | eat -3sgm.past |
|      | 'he killed dogs' |          |          | 'he ate crocodiles' |          |          |
|      | usu | eey-o-yal | dil-i | usu | yahas -o-yal | aam-i |
|      | 3sgm | dog-pl-pl | kill-3sgm.past | 3sgm | crocodile-pl-pl | eat -3sgm.past |
|      | 'he killed dogs' |          |          | 'he ate crocodiles' |          |          |

The existence of three different plurals for all consonant-final stems is unusual and also problematic for some ideas in morphology, e.g. the treatment of blocking. Any theory of morphology must account for how, e.g., lexicalized forms block the production of regular inflected forms. Often the notion of economy has been invoked, so that the form with the smallest number of morphemes is always selected to convey any given set of meanings. For example, in English, the already plural sheep prevents the morphology from producing *sheeps because sheep already conveys the semantics of the noun plus the plural all in one morpheme, so using two morphemes (sheep + s) would be uneconomical in comparison, and this is therefore ruled out. If this economy principle were a real property of grammars, we would expect it to extend to cases where there is a choice between a form in which a morphological category is marked by a single affix vs. a form where the same category is multiply exponed. Although economy would allow for the optional use of one affix or another to mark a particular cate-
gory plural (e.g., in Maay, -o vs. -yal), it also predicts that that simple affixation should always win out over multiple exponence, so that multiply marked forms such as the Maay plurals in -o-yal should be blocked by the existence of forms in -o and forms in -yal. To allow for -o-yal plurals, one could assume that the economy requirement is not universally obeyed but is rather a violable constraint in the Optimality Theory sense. However, this would significantly weaken the economy concept, which has been invoked as an inviolable filter on surface forms in the analyses of many different languages. The problem of multiple plural marking therefore warrants further study.

It should be noted that there is no evidence in LJM for declension classes, unlike in some dialects of Somali (see e.g. Hyman 1981, Saeed 1987, Lecarme 2002). In LJM, the only division in nouns with respect to plural marking is between consonant- vs. vowel-final stems, and all nouns not following this pattern appear to be irregular rather than forming any additional classes. Nouns that in other dialects have plural forms other than -o or -yal do take these regular suffixes in LJM. For example, in the Somali dialect described by Lecarme, the noun ey ‘dog’ takes a ‘prosodic plural’, meaning that the plural is marked by a tone shift, while the noun af ‘mouth’ takes an ‘internal -a- plural’, which is a suffixed partial reduplicant with a fixed /a/ in place of the stem vowel (2002: 116-117). In LJM, both of these nouns take regular plural marking: eey-o ~ eey-yal ~ eey-o-yal ‘dogs’; af-o ~ af-yal ~ af-o-yal ‘mouths’.

Another interesting fact about plurals in LJM is that adjectives can optionally exhibit plural marking in a complex noun phrase. There are a variety of ways in which this can be manifested, as seen in the examples below.

---

6 As discussed below, there is some evidence that while -o is a suffix, -yal is a clitic. One might therefore argue that the multiple plural marking is not problematic because it involves marking by two different types of morphemes rather than by two suffixes. However, blocking does not seem to differentiate between affixes and clitics. For example, in English, the possessive -'s has been analyzed as a clitic while the plural -s is a suffix. But forms like *my’s are blocked by the existence of lexical (monomorphemic) possessives like mine in just the same way that the plural form *women’s is blocked by women. Therefore, it is not clear that invoking the difference between affixes and clitics will solve the problem of multiple plural marking here.
(16) a. Mass noun/ inherent plural with unmarked adjective
moos  jaale  ‘yellow bananas’
banana(es)  yellow
b. Mass noun/ inherent plural with reduplicated adjective
det  fa-fas  ‘beautiful people’
people  pl-beautiful
c. Mass noun/ inherent plural with adjective ending in -yal
barada  kulel-yal  ‘hot potatoes’
potato(es)  hot-pl
d. Noun ending in -o with unmarked adjective
geē-o  ayar  ‘green trees’
tree-pl  green
e. Noun ending in -o with reduplicated adjective
geē-o  de-deer  ‘tall trees’
tree-pl  pl-tall
f. Noun ending in -o with adjective ending in -yal
geē-o  ayar-yal  ‘green trees’
tree-pl  green-pl
g. Noun ending in -yal with unmarked adjective
megel-yal  deer  ‘tall men’
man-pl  tall
h. Noun ending in -yal with reduplicated adjective
megel-yal  de-deer  ‘tall men’
man-pl  pl-tall
i. Noun ending in -o-yl with unmarked adjective
geē-o-yl  ayar  ‘green trees’
tree-pl-yl  green
j. Noun ending in -o-yl with reduplicated adjective
geē-o-yl  mo-moornj  ‘big trees’
tree-pl-yl  pl-big

We have already seen that (consonant-final) nouns can be pluralized by using either -o or -yal, or a combination of both, and in addition there are some mass nouns and inherent plurals that do not need an affix to convey plural meaning. Adjectives that modify a plural noun do not have to have plural marking, but when they do, they can either undergo prefixing reduplication or they can take -yal (this suggests that -yal may be better analyzed as a clitic rather than a suffix since it does not have to occur immediately next to the noun; -o, on the other
hand, must always occur next to the noun). The combination of four types of plural nouns (mass nouns/ inherent plurals, -o, -yal, and -o-yal) with three types of adjectives that can modify them (no marking, reduplication, and -yal) should yield twelve possibilities for plural noun phrases with a noun + adjective. However, as seen above in examples (16a-j), only ten of these possibilities are attested. The two unattested possibilities are a noun with -yal followed by an adjective with -yal, and a noun with -o-yal followed by an adjective with -yal. Both can be ruled out by a restriction that the same plural marking cannot be used more than once in the same noun phrase.

My analysis of this situation is that the plural marking on adjectives is not agreement per se, but is rather overt plural marking just like plural marking on nouns. There are three ways that the morphology can mark plural in a noun phrase: the suffix -o, the clitic -yal, and reduplication. At least one of these must be used within the noun phrase to make it plural (unless the noun is already inherently plural). All of these can co-occur, but each can only be used once within a single noun phrase. The suffix -o is restricted to occurring with noun roots, and reduplication can apply only to adjectives; -yal, on the other hand, can occur next to either a noun or a noun phrase. The interaction of these requirements yields the observed patterns of plural noun phrases with a noun + adjective.

3.2 Gender. All nouns in LJM have either masculine or feminine gender. In the noun phrase, gender agreement is manifested in the definite marker, demonstratives, and possessive markers. Examples of these will be given in sections 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, respectively. In each case, where the masculine form of the marker has initial /k/, the feminine form of the marker has initial /t/. The pattern is consistent for all of the grammatical markers mentioned above with two exceptions: the 3sg masculine possessor of a masculine noun has the form -'ye rather than the form *-kie which would be expected since its feminine-agreeing counterpart is -tie, and similarly, the 3pl masculine-agreeing possessor has the form -'yo rather than the expected -kio.7

Though there are two genders in singular forms of nouns, all nouns trigger

7 But note that these could derive historically from *-kie and *-kio via a series of sound changes *ki > *j > 'y, where k and i merge into a palatal j which later changes to 'y. The change from j to 'y is plausible since we know that the other two stop sounds of Standard Somali that are absent from the inventory of LJM (namely, d and g) correspond to implosives (d and g, respectively) in LJM. Further evidence in favor of *-kie and *-kio as the respective sources of LJM -'ye and -'yo is that the corresponding Standard Somali forms do begin with [k]: -kiisa and -kooda (Saeed 1999: 115).
masculine gender agreement when they are pluralized. This is true regardless of
the way in which the plural is formed (for consonant-final stems that have three
different plural forms). As seen in the examples below, nouns that take feminine
agreement when in the singular form take masculine agreement in the plural. The
feminine-agreeing suffixes all have allomorphs beginning in [i], [ə], and Ø, dis-
tributed as follows: [ə] occurs when the stem ends in a vowel (or i, though there
is only one example of this, which could possibly be an exception), Ø occurs
when the stem ends in i'd or i, and [t] occurs elsewhere. Similarly, the masculine-
agreeing suffixes begin with [ŋ] when the stem ends in a vowel, Ø when the stem
ends in k/g, and [k] elsewhere.

(17) jeer-ten 'my hippo' jeer-o-ten 'my hippos'8
    walaas-ey 'my sister'9 walaal-o-ten 'my sisters/brothers'
    gewer-ten 'my daughter' gewer-o-ten 'my daughter'
    mindi-øey 'my knife' mindi-yal-key 'my knives'
    ga'an-ten 'my hand' ga'am-o-yal-key 'my hands'
    far-ten 'my finger' far-o-ten 'my fingers'

As seen below, there is no change to masculine nouns in the plural; they
retain masculine agreement.

(18) awo-o-ten 'my grandfather' awo-yal-key 'my grandfathers'
    walaal-key 'my brother' walaal-o-ten 'my sisters/brothers'
    igar-key 'my son' igar-o-ten 'my sons'
    bakeeri-øey 'my cup' bakeeri-yal-key 'my cups'
    bakaile-øey 'my rabbit' bakaile-yal-key 'my rabbits'
    ajir-key 'my thigh' ajir-o-ten 'my thighs'

8 For this and all other forms in my data (with no exceptions), the possessive suffix can be
added to a plural noun made in any of the three ways that are possible for consonant-final
stems. For example, in addition to jeer-o-ten, 'my hippos' can also be jeer-yal-key or jeer-o-
yal-key. Here I will give only the possessed plurals formed with -o for consonant-final stems.

9 The form walaas-ey comes from /walaal-ten/; /i+t/ fuses into [i] here as described above in
section 2.4. We know that this form has feminine agreement in the 1sg possessive suffix (i.e.,
that the suffix is /-tey/ rather than the masculine /-key/) because the initial /k/ of the mascu-
l ine form would not fuse with stem-final /i/. This is apparent in the word 'brother', which dif-
fers from 'sister' only in its gender; the form meaning 'my brother' is walaal-key.
A point of interest here is that in at least one case, the neutralization of the gender distinction in the plural leads to ambiguity. In the singular, the words meaning ‘brother’ and ‘sister’ are homophonous (walaal) and are distinguished only via agreement, as in walaas-ey ‘my sister’ vs. walaal-key ‘my brother’ (see footnote 3). In the plural, since both take masculine agreement, the form walaal-o-vey has two possible interpretations: it can mean ‘my sisters’ or ‘my brothers’.

The relationship between gender and number in LJM is different not only from Standard Somali but also from the more closely related Central Somali. Standard Somali exhibits a phenomenon known as ‘gender polarity’ in which ‘most nouns reverse their gender when they become plural’ (Saeed 1987: 115). This applies to both masculine and feminine nouns and is true of plurals formed with -o or with -yal, so the identity of the plural suffix does not condition polarity. (Unlike in LJM, the choice of plural suffixes in Standard Somali is determined by the noun’s ‘declension class’.) In Central Somali (as in Standard Somali), the choice between -o and -yal is determined by declension class, but in Central Somali, only plurals with -o exhibit true polarity. Plurals with -yal exhibit a different pattern in which all nouns are masculine in the plural. Thus, there is gender reversal when the singular noun is feminine since it becomes masculine in the plural, but there is no change when a singular masculine noun is pluralized. LJM exhibits a third variation on the gender polarity theme: as demonstrated above, all plurals are masculine regardless of whether the plural is formed with -o or -yal. There is no evidence for declension classes in LJM; as has been shown above, all vowel-final stems take -o plural marking regardless of their gender, while all consonant-final stems can take -o, -yal, or -o-yal regardless of their gender. In the unidentified Somali dialect discussed by Lecarme (2002), there is yet a fourth variation: plurals in -yal exhibit true polarity, while plurals in -o are all masculine (Lecarme 2002: 118-119) (i.e., the reverse of the Central Somali pattern). 10 It would seem that LJM is the most innovative of the dialects, since the existence of gender polarity in other Cushitic languages (e.g. Oromo (Andrzejewski 1960) and Rendille (Oomen 1981)) suggests that it is an old feature. If gender polarity was a feature of the common ancestral language of Somali and Maay, then Central Somali has undergone a change in the -yal plurals, while the dialect described by Lecarme

---

10 The situation is more complicated in this dialect than I have represented it, in that there are more than two ways to form plurals. The reader is referred to Lecarme (2002) for more details as well as a theoretical analysis of gender polarity in the Distributed Morphology framework.
has undergone a change in the -o plurals, and LJM exhibits the same change in both types of plurals.

3.3 Definiteness. Whereas Central and Standard Somali have remote (past or physically far away) vs. non-remote (present or future) definite marking on nouns (Saeed 1982, 1987), LJM has only one set of definite markers, -ki/-ti. These are cognates with the Standard Somali and Central Somali remote/past definite markers. They exhibit gender agreement with nouns, as seen below.

(19)  
cuy-ki  ‘the dog (generic)’     eey-ti  ‘the female dog’
di’bi-γi  ‘the bull’     sa’-δi  ‘the cow (female)’
inay-ki  ‘the boy’     gewer-ti  ‘the girl’
niŋ-ki  ‘the man’     aana-δi  ‘the milk’
miis-ki  ‘the table’     istaraša-δ̣i  ‘the napkin’
geet-ki  ‘the tree’     yahas-ti  ‘the crocodile’
de’ji-γi  ‘the snake’     saan-ti  ‘the foot’
moos-ki  ‘the banana’     suuk-ti  ‘the market’
barit-ki  ‘the rice’     baaka-δ̣i  ‘the box’
bruug-i  ‘the book’     tubo-δ̣i  ‘the jar’

As mentioned above, all nouns trigger masculine agreement in the plural. The definite marker obeys this generalization: as demonstrated below, the definite marker -ki/ is used for plural nouns regardless of whether the singular form is masculine (20a) or feminine (20b).

(20)  
a.  moos-ki  ‘the banana’     moos-o-γi  ‘the bananas’
    inaŋ-ki  ‘the boy’     dalo-γi  ‘the boys’

b.  far-ti  ‘the finger’     far-o-γi  ‘the fingers’
    okun-ti  ‘the egg’     okum-o-γi  ‘the eggs’
    galanša-δ̣i  ‘the fem. elephant’     galanša-yal-ki  ‘the fem. elephants’

11 This is the one exception in my data to the generalization that the voiced fricatives occur only intervocally. The noun in isolation does have a final glottal stop ([sa?] ‘cow’), so there is no evidence for an underlying root-final vowel. Perhaps glottal stops are transparent to the intervocalic lenition process described in section 2.4. Word-final glottal stops are very rare, so it has not yet been possible to test the hypothesis that glottal stops are transparent to lenition.
Though the notation in the examples above implies that the definite markers are suffixes, there is evidence to suggest that they are instead clitics. The evidence for this is that in a noun phrase consisting of a noun + adjective, the definite marker occurs after the adjective, as seen in the examples below.

(21) geet deer-ki  
    baaka geūd-i  

    'the tall tree'  
    'the red box'

Note that these are not analyzable as agreement markers, since only one instance of the definite marker is permitted for a given noun phrase (thus, the forms *geet-ki deer-ki and *baaka-ūi geūd-i are ungrammatical).

3.4 Demonstratives. There are three demonstratives in LJM, corresponding to 'this', 'that', and 'which...?'. Each exhibits the same t- vs. k- gender agreement pattern as in the definite markers described above. Examples of masculine-agreeing demonstrative markers are shown below.

(22) eey-kaŋ  
    eey-kas  
    eey-kew  

    'this dog'  
    'that dog'  
    'which dog'

    buug-kaŋ  
    buug-as  
    buug-ew

    'this book'  
    'that book'  
    'which book'

    geet-kaŋ  
    geet-kas  
    geet-kew  

    'this tree'  
    'that tree'  
    'which tree'

    megel-kaŋ  
    megel-kas  
    megel-kew

    'this man'  
    'that man'  
    'which man'

Examples of feminine-agreeing demonstrative markers are shown below with feminine nouns in the singular form.

(23) yahas-tañ  
    yahas-tas  
    yahas-tew

    'this crocodile'  
    'that crocodile'  
    'which crocodile'

    istaraša-ðañ  
    istaraša-ðas

    'this napkin'  
    'that napkin'

    istaraša-ðew

    'which napkin'

    mukulal-añ  
    mukulal-as  
    mukulal-ew

    'this cat'  
    'that cat'  
    'which cat'

    bilaan-ñañ  
    bilaan-ñas  
    bilaan-ñew

    'this woman'  
    'that woman'  
    'which woman'
Like the definite markers, the demonstrative markers always take the masculine form when the noun is plural, even when the singular form of the noun is feminine, as in the examples below.

(24) yahas-o-yaŋ ‘these crocodiles’  istaraša-yal-kaŋ ‘these napkins’
yahas-o-yas  ‘those crocodiles’  istaraša-yal-kas ‘those napkins’
yahas-o-yew  ‘which crocodiles’  istaraša-yal-kew ‘which napkins’
mukulal-o-yaŋ  ‘these cats’  bilaam-o-yaŋ  ‘these women’
mukulal-o-yas  ‘those cats’  bilaam-o-yas ‘those women’
mukulal-o-yew  ‘which cats’  bilaam-o-yew ‘which women’

Also like the definite markers, demonstratives in LJM appear to be clitics since in complex noun phrases they occur at the end of the phrase rather than immediately after the noun, as in the examples below.

(25) geet gab-kaŋ  ‘this short tree’
    geet deer-kaŋ  ‘this tall tree’
    baaka geđud-as ‘that red box’

However, as with the definite markers, there cannot be multiple instances of the demonstrative marker within the same noun phrase. Phrases such as *geet-kaŋ gab-kaŋ are ungrammatical, which shows that demonstrative marking on an adjective is not simply agreement with the noun.

3.5 Possessives. Possessive marking exhibits the same gender agreement pattern as the definite and demonstrative markers, including the pattern of all-masculine agreement in the plural forms discussed in section 3.2. Some examples of masculine possessed nouns are shown below.¹²

¹² Forms given here for ‘her X’ are in the regular masculine agreement form, but there is an interesting effect where (apparently) all masculine nouns can optionally take -tie instead of the expected -ye. That is, when the 3sg possessor is feminine, the feminine-agreeing suffix can optionally be used with a masculine noun. The effect is only found in the 3sg, and it does not apply in the opposite direction (i.e., the masculine-agreeing 3sg masculine suffix -ye cannot be used for ‘his X’ where X is a feminine noun; instead, the feminine-agreeing -tis must be used).
Feminine possessed (singular) nouns are shown below. Note that, unlike masculine nouns, feminine nouns take different forms depending on whether the 3sg possessor is masculine or feminine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(26)</th>
<th>walaal-key</th>
<th>'my brother'</th>
<th>walaal-kaynu</th>
<th>'our brother'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walaal-ka</td>
<td>'your brother'</td>
<td>walaal-kiŋ</td>
<td>'your pl. brother'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walaal-’ye</td>
<td>'his/her brother'</td>
<td>walaal-’yo</td>
<td>'their brother'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>igar-key</td>
<td>'my son'</td>
<td>igar-kaynu</td>
<td>'our son'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>igar-ka</td>
<td>'your son'</td>
<td>igar-kiŋ</td>
<td>'your pl. son'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>igar-’ye</td>
<td>'his/her son'</td>
<td>igar-’yo</td>
<td>'their son'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aw-key</td>
<td>'my father'</td>
<td>aw-kaynu</td>
<td>'our father'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aw-ka</td>
<td>'your father'</td>
<td>aw-kiŋ</td>
<td>'your pl. father'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aw-’ye</td>
<td>'his/her father'</td>
<td>aw-’yo</td>
<td>'their father'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bakeeri-’ye</td>
<td>'my cup'</td>
<td>bakeeri-’aynu</td>
<td>'our cup'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bakeeri-ya</td>
<td>'your cup'</td>
<td>bakeeri-’iŋ</td>
<td>'your pl. cup'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bakeeri-’ye</td>
<td>'his/her cup'</td>
<td>bakeeri-’yo</td>
<td>'their cup'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eey-key</td>
<td>'my dog'</td>
<td>eey-kayno</td>
<td>'our dog'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eey-ka</td>
<td>'your dog'</td>
<td>eey-kiŋ</td>
<td>'your pl. dog'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eey-’ye</td>
<td>'his/her dog'</td>
<td>eey-’yo</td>
<td>'their dog'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buug-ey</td>
<td>'my book'</td>
<td>buug-ayno</td>
<td>'our book'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buug-a</td>
<td>'your book'</td>
<td>buug-’iŋ</td>
<td>'your pl. book'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buuk-’ye</td>
<td>'his/her book'</td>
<td>buuk-’yo</td>
<td>'their book'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(27)</th>
<th>gewer-ney</th>
<th>'my daughter'</th>
<th>gewer-tno</th>
<th>'our daughter'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gewer-tna</td>
<td>'your daughter'</td>
<td>gewer-tn</td>
<td>'your pl. daughter'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gewer-tis</td>
<td>'his daughter'</td>
<td>gewer-tio</td>
<td>'their daughter'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gewer-tie</td>
<td>'her daughter'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mindi-’eya</td>
<td>'my knife'</td>
<td>mindi-’ayno</td>
<td>'our knife'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mindi-’ea</td>
<td>'your knife'</td>
<td>mindi-’iŋ</td>
<td>'your pl. knife'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mindi-’is</td>
<td>'his knife'</td>
<td>mindi-’io</td>
<td>'their knife'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mindi-’ie</td>
<td>'her knife'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saʔ-ðey</td>
<td>‘my cow’</td>
<td>saʔ-ðayno</td>
<td>‘our cow’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saʔ-ða</td>
<td>‘your cow’</td>
<td>saʔ-ðiŋ</td>
<td>‘your pl. cow’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saʔ-ðis</td>
<td>‘his cow’</td>
<td>saʔ-ðio</td>
<td>‘their cow’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saʔ-ðie</td>
<td>‘her cow’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hambal-ey</td>
<td>‘my leaf’</td>
<td>hambal-ayno</td>
<td>‘our leaf’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hambal-a</td>
<td>‘your leaf’</td>
<td>hambal-iŋ</td>
<td>‘your pl. leaf’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hambal-is</td>
<td>‘his leaf’</td>
<td>hambal-io</td>
<td>‘their leaf’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hambal-ie</td>
<td>‘her leaf’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istaraʔa-ðey</td>
<td>‘my napkin’</td>
<td>istaraʔa-ðayno</td>
<td>‘our napkin’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istaraʔa-ða</td>
<td>‘your napkin’</td>
<td>istaraʔa-ðiŋ</td>
<td>‘your pl. napkin’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istaraʔa-ðis</td>
<td>‘his napkin’</td>
<td>istaraʔa-ðio</td>
<td>‘their napkin’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istaraʔa-ðie</td>
<td>‘her napkin’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔjeer-tey</td>
<td>‘my hippo’</td>
<td>ʔjeer-tayno</td>
<td>‘our hippo’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔjeer-ta</td>
<td>‘your hippo’</td>
<td>ʔjeer-tiŋ</td>
<td>‘your pl. hippo’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔjeer-tis</td>
<td>‘his hippo’</td>
<td>ʔjeer-tio</td>
<td>‘their hippo’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔjeer-tie</td>
<td>‘her hippo’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in section 3.2, feminine nouns take masculine agreement when pluralized. The nouns seen above are shown here in their plural possessed forms with masculine agreement.

(28) gewer-o-γey ‘my daughters’ gewer-o-γayno ‘our daughters’
gewer-o-γa  ‘your daughters’ gewer-o-γiŋ ‘your pl. daughters’
gewer-o-γye  ‘his/her daughters’ gewer-o-γyo ‘their daughters’
mindi-yal-key ‘my knives’ mindi-yal-kayno ‘our knives’
mindi-yal-ka  ‘your knives’ mindi-yal-kiŋ ‘your pl. knives’
mindi-yal-kis  ‘his/her knives’ mindi-yal-kiyo ‘their knives’
saʔ-o-γey  ‘my cows’ saʔ-o-γayno ‘our cows’
saʔ-o-γa  ‘your cows’ saʔ-o-γiŋ ‘your pl. cows’
saʔ-o-γye  ‘his/her cows’ saʔ-o-γyo ‘their cows’
hambal-o-γey ‘my leaves’ hambal-o-γayno ‘our leaves’
hambal-o-γa  ‘your leaves’ hambal-o-γiŋ ‘your pl. leaves’
hambal-o-γye  ‘his/her leaves’ hambal-o-γyo ‘their leaves’
Like definite markers and demonstratives, the possessive markers occur at the end of the noun phrase when the noun is followed by an adjective. This is seen in the examples below.

(29) saʔ wiin-tey 'my big cow'
geet deiʔ-key 'my tall tree'
mindi yarisi-tey 'my small knife'
baaka geʔud-eʔy 'my red box'

4. Verb Morphology.

4.1 Derivational Morphology. This study did not reveal a robust system of verbal derivational morphology. The verbal extensions documented by Saced (1982) are difficult to elicit from the LJM consultant and may be lexicalized in the forms that are attested. The two attested extensions, Causative and Reflexive, are discussed below.

A causative suffix -i is exhibited with one verb, warab 'drink'. When the suffix is added, the meaning of the verb is 'water' (i.e., cause to drink). No other instances of this suffix are documented.

(30) ani  bio waraβ>-i
1sg  water  drink -1sg.past

mukulal-i  bio  warap-ti
cat  -def  water  drink  -3sg.fem.past

mukulal-i  bio  waraβ-i  -i
cat  -def  water  drink  -caus-1sg.past

A second verbal extension in LJM is the reflexive. Like the causative, this suffix is apparently not very productive; it was found with only three verbs in this study, and in one case the meaning of the suffix is not transparent, suggesting that the combination of the verb with the reflexive suffix is lexicalized, at least for that particular verb. Examples of the reflexive suffix are shown below.
(31) a. Reflexive forms with transparent semantics

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ani} & \text{bar -oy -e} & \text{‘I am teaching’} \\
1sg & \text{teach-pres-1sg} \\
\text{ani} & \text{bar -iô -oy -e} & \text{‘I am learning’} \\
1sg & \text{teach-refl-pres-1sg} \\
\text{ani} & \text{mini} & \text{dis -oy -e} & \text{‘I am building a house’} \\
1sg & \text{house} & \text{build-pres-1sg} \\
\text{ani} & \text{mini} & \text{dis -iô -oy -e} & \text{‘I am building myself a house’} \\
1sg & \text{house} & \text{build-refl-pres-1sg}
\end{array}
\]

b. Reflexive form with non-transparent semantics

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ani} & \text{gaô-oy -e} & \text{‘I am selling’} \\
1sg & \text{sell-pres-1sg} \\
\text{ani} & \text{gaô-iô -oy -e} & \text{‘I am buying’} \\
1sg & \text{sell-refl-pres-1sg}
\end{array}
\]

4.2 Person marking and agreement. Verbs are marked with suffixes that indicate person and number (and, for 3sg, masculine or feminine gender). These can co-occur with an independent proclitic pronoun, or the independent pronoun can be omitted (this is, in fact, the default case; the independent pronoun is used only to emphasize the subject). For each tense/aspect/mood (to be discussed in the sections to follow), each person/number/gender is marked by a separate suffix, except that the 1sg verb forms are always identical to the 3sg masculine forms, and 2sg forms are always identical to 3sg feminine forms. This is true in other dialects as well; for example, in Central Somali, 1sg and 3sgm are identical, and 2sg and 3sgf are identical, except in a small number of irregular verbs (Saeed 1982: 23-28).

Feminine gender is indicated on the verb only when the subject is 3sg. Tense, aspect, and mood suffixes are t-initial when the subject is feminine. There is likely a connection between this -t and the t that is observed at the beginning of feminine-agreeing noun markers, but this does not necessarily demonstrate the existence of a separate /-t/ feminine suffix since verbs with 3sg feminine subjects lack [t] in some contexts (e.g., the simple future forms to be described in section 4.3). Also, verb forms with 2sg and 2spl subjects also have t-initial verb suffixes.
regardless of the gender of the subject, so if there is a feminine suffix /-v/, there would have to be a homophonous second person suffix /-u/ despite the fact that first person and third person are not marked.

4.3 Tense. Six tenses are distinguished in LJM: past, two present tenses, and three different futures. The past, both present forms, and the simple future consist of individual verb stems inflected with a single tense suffix, while the two other future tenses involve the use of what are analyzed as auxiliary verbs.

The set of subject markers indicating past tense (Simple Past) are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(32)</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>1sg</th>
<th>-ni</th>
<th>1pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>-teen</td>
<td>2pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>3sg masc</td>
<td>-ena</td>
<td>3pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>3sg fem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of the use of these suffixes are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(33)</th>
<th>ani</th>
<th>roor-i</th>
<th>'I ran'</th>
<th>unu</th>
<th>roor-ni</th>
<th>'we ran'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aði</td>
<td>roor-ti</td>
<td>'you ran'</td>
<td>isinl</td>
<td>roor-teena</td>
<td>'you pl. ran'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usu</td>
<td>roor-i</td>
<td>'he ran'</td>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>roor-ena</td>
<td>'they ran'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>roor-i</td>
<td>'she ran'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ani</th>
<th>šagiatan-i</th>
<th>'I worked'</th>
<th>unu</th>
<th>šagiatan-ni</th>
<th>'we worked'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aði</td>
<td>šagiatan-ti</td>
<td>'you worked'</td>
<td>isinl</td>
<td>šagiatan-teena</td>
<td>'you pl. worked'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usu</td>
<td>šagiatan-i</td>
<td>'he worked'</td>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>šagiatan-ena</td>
<td>'they worked'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>šagiatan-ti</td>
<td>'she worked'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ani</th>
<th>dow-i</th>
<th>'I hit'</th>
<th>unu</th>
<th>dow-ni</th>
<th>'we hit'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aði</td>
<td>dow-ti</td>
<td>'you hit'</td>
<td>isinl</td>
<td>dow-teena</td>
<td>'you pl. hit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usu</td>
<td>dow-i</td>
<td>'he hit'</td>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>dow-ena</td>
<td>'they hit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>dow-ti</td>
<td>'she hit'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ani</th>
<th>aan-i</th>
<th>'I ate'</th>
<th>unu</th>
<th>aan-ni</th>
<th>'we ate'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aði</td>
<td>aan-ti</td>
<td>'you ate'</td>
<td>isinl</td>
<td>aan-teena</td>
<td>'you pl. ate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usu</td>
<td>aan-i</td>
<td>'he ate'</td>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>aan-ena</td>
<td>'they ate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>aan-ti</td>
<td>'she ate'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The category that I will refer to as Simple Present A is used to form the present tense of active verbs. It is apparently not very commonly used, since the consultant first volunteers a different form (the Present Progressive) when prompted to give a present form, even when the English prompt is stated in a generic future form rather than progressive (e.g., ‘I eat’ instead of ‘I am eating’). The Simple Present A was first found on auxiliary verbs in constructions such as the Generic Future and Future Potential, and was never elicited with other, lexical verbs. The set of suffixes that mark Simple Present A is given below.

(34)  
- e 1sg - ne 1pl  
- te 2sg - teena 2pl  
- e 3sg masc - eena 3pl  
- te 3sg fem

Some examples of Simple Present A verbs are shown below.

(35)  
an i raβ-e ‘I will’  
 addi rap-te ‘you will’  
 usu raβ-e ‘he will’  
 ii rap-te ‘she will’  

ani muð-e ‘I think’  
usu muð-e ‘he thinks’  

unu raβ-ne ‘we will’  
isiri rap-teena ‘you pl. will’  
iyo raβ-eena ‘they will’  

(no other simple present forms were accepted for this verb)

A different simple present form is used with stative verbs. I refer to this as Simple Present B. The subject agreement suffixes used in Simple Present B are shown below.

(36)  
- ya 1sg - na 1pl  
- ta 2sg - tena 2pl  
- ya 3sg masc - yena 3pl  
- ta 3sg fem

Some examples of stative verbs in Simple Present B are given below.
Another tense, the Generic Future, indicates general future action with no specific timeframe. The Generic Future verb consists of an uninflected form of the main verb followed by a form of the auxiliary verb /don/ with a subject agreement suffix taken from the set below. Note that this set of suffixes is very similar to those used with the Simple Present B (stative) forms discussed above, but the suffixes are not identical.

\[ ^{13} \text{The underlying form of this verb, with respect to the final nasal, is not fully determined by the data since it occurs only in pre-consonantal environments. As was seen above, the most common final nasal in nouns is } /m/, \text{ so this could be extended to argue in favor of } /don/ \text{ rather than } /don/. \text{ However, we have no clear evidence for a similar pattern in verbs (only two nasal-final lexical verbs were observed, and although both happen to end in } /m/, \text{ this sample size seems too small to generalize). Furthermore, the verb never surfaces with the form } [\text{don}], \text{ whereas it does surface as } [\text{don}] \text{ when it occurs with } r\text{-initial suffixes. Although this fact is consistent with both } /\text{don}/ \text{ and } /\text{don}/, \text{ I will assume } /\text{don}/ \text{ for the sake of minimizing abstractness.} \]
(38) -ya 1sg -ne 1pl
-te 2sg -teena 2pl
-yə 3sg masc -yeena 3pl
-te 3sg fem

Examples of Generic Future forms are given below.

(39) ani roor dón-ya ‘I will run’
aði roor dón-te ‘you will run’
usu roor dón-ya ‘he will run’
ii roor dón-te ‘she will run’
unu roor dón-ne ‘we will run’
isiy roor dón-teena ‘you pl. will run’
iyo roor dón-yeena ‘they will run’

ani nook dón-ya ‘I will be tired’
aði nook dón-te ‘you will be tired’
usu nook dón-ya ‘he will be tired’
ii nook dón-te ‘she will be tired’
unu nook dón-ne ‘we will be tired’
isiy nook dón-teena ‘you pl. will be tired’
iyo nook dón-yeena ‘they will be tired’

ani šaŋgeey dón-ya ‘I will work’
aði šaŋgeey dón-te ‘you will work’
usu šaŋgeey dón-ya ‘he will work’
ii šaŋgeey dón-te ‘she will work’
unu šaŋgeey dón-ne ‘we will work’
isiy šaŋgeey dón-teena ‘you pl. will work’
iyo šaŋgeey dón-yeena ‘they will work’

ani hees dón-ya ‘I will sing’
aði hees dón-te ‘you will sing’
usu hees dón-ya ‘he will sing’
ii hees dón-te ‘she will sing’
unu hees dón-ne ‘we will sing’
isiy hees dón-teena ‘you pl. will sing’
iyo hees dón-yeena ‘they will sing’
The Immediate Future is a simple future tense that indicates action that will take place very soon, within even a few seconds. The meaning seems to correspond to that of the English construction "about to X". Immediate Future forms consist of the verb followed by a subject agreement suffix from the set shown below.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
(40) & -e & 1sg & -ane & 1pl \\
     & -ase & 2sg & -aseena & 2pl \\
     & -e & 3sg masc & -ayeena & 3pl \\
     & -ase & 3sg fem & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Some examples of Immediate Future verbs are shown below.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
(41) & ani & roor-e & \text{"I will run"} & unu roor-ane & \text{"we will run"} \\
     & adi & roor-ase & \text{"you will run"} & isin roor-aseena & \text{"you pl. will run"} \\
     & usu & roor-e & \text{"he will run"} & iyo roor-ayeena & \text{"they will run"} \\
     & ii & roor-ase & \text{"she will run"} & & \\
     & ani & kooy-e & \text{"I will come"} & unu kooy-ane & \text{"we will come"} \\
     & adi & kooy-ase & \text{"you will come"} & isin kooy-aseena & \text{"you pl. will come"} \\
     & usu & kooy-e & \text{"he will come"} & iyo kooy-ayeena & \text{"they will come"} \\
     & ii & kooy-ase & \text{"she will come"} & & \\
     & ani & gor-e & \text{"I will write"} & unu gor-ane & \text{"we will write"} \\
     & adi & gor-ase & \text{"you will write"} & isin gor-aseena & \text{"you pl. will write"} \\
     & usu & gor-e & \text{"he will write"} & iyo gor-ayeena & \text{"they will write"} \\
     & ii & gor-ase & \text{"she will write"} & & \\
     & ani & nooy-e & \text{"I will be tired"} & unu nooy-ane & \text{"we will be tired"} \\
     & adi & nooy-ase & \text{"you will be tired"} & isin nooy-aseena & \text{"you pl. will be tired"} \\
     & usu & nooy-e & \text{"he will be tired"} & iyo nooy-ayeena & \text{"they will be tired"} \\
     & ii & nooy-ase & \text{"she will be tired"} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

The Near Future form of a verb indicates action that will happen shortly, perhaps within the next 15 minutes to an hour, according to the consultant. Near Future forms consist of the main verb in its Generic Potential form (the Generic
Potential will be described in section 4.4.2) followed by the Simple Present A form of the auxiliary verb /raβ/. Examples are shown below.

(42) ani roor-o raβ-e ‘I will run’
aði roor-to rap-te ‘you will run’
usu roor-o raβ-e ‘he will run’
ii roor-to rap-te ‘she will run’
unu roor-no rab-ne ‘we will run’
isin roor-tona rap-teena ‘you pl. will run’
iyo roor-ona raβ-eeña ‘they will run’

ani umboh-o raβ-e ‘I will go’
aði umboh-to rap-te ‘you will go’
usu umboh-o raβ-e ‘he will go’
ii umboh-to rap-te ‘she will go’
unu umbah-no rab-ne ‘we will go’
isin umbah-tona rap-teena ‘you pl. will go’
iyo umbah-ona raβ-eeña ‘they will go’

ani šaαey-o raβ-e ‘I will work’
aði šaαey-to rap-te ‘you will work’
usu šaαey-o raβ-e ‘he will work’
ii šaαey-to rap-te ‘she will work’
unu šaαey-no rab-ne ‘we will work’
isin šaαey-tona rap-teena ‘you pl. will work’
iyo šaαey-ona raβ-eeña ‘they will work’

ani gor-o raβ-e ‘I will write’
aði gor-to rap-te ‘you will write’
usu gor-o raβ-e ‘he will write’
ii gor-to rap-te ‘she will write’
unu gor-no rab-ne ‘we will write’
isin gor-tona rap-teena ‘you pl. will write’
iyo gor-ona raβ-eeña ‘they will write’

Two primary moods are distinguished aside from the unmarked, default (indicative) mood: Imperative and Potential. Each of these moods is discussed below.
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Imperative is unmarked when the subject is singular, and is marked by -a when the subject is plural, as seen in the examples below.

(43) aði roor ‘run!’ aam-a ‘eat!’
isiŋ roor-a ‘run! pl.’ aam-ŋ ‘eat! pl.’

bah ‘go!’ gør ‘write!’
bah-a ‘go! pl.’ gør-a ‘write! pl.’

Potential mood is generally used to indicate actions that may be taking place in the present or future: ‘maybe X’ or ‘I think that X’ or actions that did not take place in the past (past conditional forms of the type ‘I would have X, but...’). Potential mood is marked by ina, which occurs before the verb and is indicated as a prefix here but may be a complementizer that introduces clauses containing potential verbs. There are two types of Potential verbs: Future Potential and Generic Potential.

Future Potential verbs consist of a main verb preceded by ina and inflected with a suffix from the set in (44), followed by muθ-e, which is the 1sg Simple Present A form of the verb meaning ‘to think’.

(44) -aw 1sg -aano 1pl
-aso 2sg -aasona 2pl
-aw 3sg masc -aayona 3pl
-aso 3sg fem

Examples of Future Potential verbs are shown here. Note that these forms are not complete utterances: in actual use, each of these forms would be followed by muθ-e.

(45) ani ina-[ʔ]aam-aw ‘I might eat’
aði ina-[ʔ]aam-aso ‘you might eat’
usu ina-[ʔ]aam-aw ‘he might eat’
i ina-[ʔ]aam-oso ‘she might eat’
unu ina-[ʔ]aam-aaŋo ‘we might eat’
isiŋ ina-[ʔ]aam-aasona ‘you pl. might eat’
iyo ina-[ʔ]aam-aayaŋo ‘they might eat’
ani ina-hees-aw  ‘I might sing’
aði ina-hees-aso  ‘you might sing’
usu ina-hees-aw  ‘he might sing’
ii ina-hees-aso  ‘she might sing’
unu ina-hees-aano  ‘we might sing’
isiŋ ina-hees-aasoona  ‘you pl. might sing’
iyo ina-hees-aayoona  ‘they might sing’

ani ina-kooy-aw  ‘I might come’
aði ina-kooy-aso  ‘you might come’
usu ina-kooy-aw  ‘he might come’
ii ina-kooy-aso  ‘she might come’
unu ina-kooy-aano  ‘we might come’
isiŋ ina-kooy-aasoona  ‘you pl. might come’
iyo ina-kooy-aayoona  ‘they might come’

ani ina-dam-aw  ‘I might drink’
aði ina-dam-aso  ‘you might drink’
usu ina-dam-aw  ‘he might drink’
ii ina-dam-aso  ‘she might drink’
unu ina-dam-aano  ‘we might drink’
isiŋ ina-dam-aasoona  ‘you pl. might drink’
iyo ina-dam-aayoona  ‘they might drink’

Generic Potential forms indicate action that may be taking place currently or may have happened in the past. Present forms consist of the main verb preceded by ina, inflected using one of the suffixes in (46), and obligatorily followed by lakayaawe ‘maybe’.

(46)  -o  1sg            -no  1pl
      -to  2sg           -tona  2pl
      -o  3sg masc       -ona  3pl
      -to  3sg fem

Some examples of present tense Generic Potential forms are shown below. Note that in order for these forms to become coherent utterances, they should each be followed by lakayaawe.
Another context for the use of the Generic Potential is in conditional forms, which are apparently only used in the past tense. A past conditional form consists of the Generic Potential form of the main verb (without ina) followed by the Past Progressive form (see section 4.5) of /rap/, which is the same auxiliary verb stem that is used in the Near Future tense described in section 4.3. Examples are shown below.

(48) ami roor-o raβ-ay-i ‘I would have run’
  amī roor-to raβ-ay-ti ‘you would have run’
  usu roor-o raβ-ay-i ‘he would have run’
  ii roor-to raβ-ay-ti ‘she would have run’
  unu roor-no raβ-ay-ni ‘we would have run’
  isiŋ roor-tona raβ-ay-teena ‘you pl. would have run’
  iyo roor-ona raβ-ay-ee na ‘they would have run’

ami umbah-o raβ-ay-i ‘I would have gone’
  amī umbah-to raβ-ay-ii ‘you would have run’
  usu umbah-o raβ-ay-i ‘he would have run’
  ii umbah-to raβ-ay-ti ‘she would have run’
  unu umbah-no raβ-ay-ni ‘we would have run’
  isiŋ umbah-tona raβ-ay-teena ‘you pl. would have run’
  iyo umbah-ona raβ-ay-ee na ‘they would have run’
4.5 Aspect. Two aspectual categories are marked in LJM: Progressive (present and past), and Habitual (past only). These aspects are described below.

The Present Progressive aspect is marked with the suffix -oy. This suffix occurs before the subject agreement suffixes, which are taken from the set of Simple Present A suffixes discussed in section 4.3.

(49) ani roor-oy-e  'I am running'
    aõi roor-oy-te  'you are running'
    usu roor-oy-e  'he is running'
    ii roor-oy-te  'she is running'
    unu roor-oy-ne  'we are running'
    isiõ roor-oy-teena  'you pl. are running'
    iyo roor-oy-ena  'they are running'

ani aam-oy-e  'I am eating'
    aõi aam-oy-te  'you are eating'
    usu aam-oy-e  'he is eating'
    ii aam-oy-te  'she is eating'
    unu aam-oy-ne  'we are eating'
    isiõ aam-oy-teena  'you pl. are eating'
    iyo aam-oy-ena  'they are eating'

ani hundur-oy-e  'I am sleeping'
    aõi hundur-oy-te  'you are sleeping'
    usu hundur-oy-e  'he is sleeping'
    ii hundur-oy-te  'she is sleeping'
    unu hundur-oy-ne  'we are sleeping'
    isiõ hundur-oy-teena  'you pl. are sleeping'
    iyo hundur-oy-ena  'they are sleeping'

ani siy-oy-e  'I am giving'
    aõi siy-oy-te  'you are giving'
    usu siy-oy-e  'he is giving'
    ii siy-oy-te  'she is giving'
    unu siy-oy-ne  'we are giving'
    isiõ siy-oy-teena  'you pl. are giving'
    iyo siy-oy-ena  'they are giving'
The Past Progressive is marked by the suffix -ay, which is followed by a subject marker from the same set as used with the simple Past tense discussed in section 4.3. Thus, the Past Progressive is transparently composed of affixes marking progressive aspect and past tense (in that order).

(50) ani roor-ay-i ‘I was running’
adī roor-ay-ti ‘you were running’
usu roor-ay-i ‘he was running’
iī roor-ay-ti ‘she was running’
unu roor-ay-ni ‘we were running’
isiŋ roor-ay-teena ‘you pl. were running’
iyo roor-ay-eeña ‘they were running’

ani šaŋgeey-ay-i ‘I was working’
adī šaŋgeey-ay-ti ‘you were working’
usu šaŋgeey-ay-i ‘he was working’
iī šaŋgeey-ay-ti ‘she was working’
unu šaŋgeey-ay-ni ‘we were working’
isiŋ šaŋgeey-ay-teena ‘you pl. were working’
iyo šaŋgeey-ay-eeña ‘they were working’

ani luyooy-ay-i ‘I was walking’
adī luyooy-ay-ti ‘you were walking’
usu luyooy-ay-i ‘he was walking’
iī luyooy-ay-ti ‘she was walking’
unu luyooy-ay-ni ‘we were walking’
isiŋ luyooy-ay-teena ‘you pl. were walking’
iyo luyooy-ay-eeña ‘they were walking’

ani .setViewport(230,783,318,806)搅 disrupting-ay-i ‘I was bathing’
adī .setViewport(230,806,318,829)搅 disrupting-ay-ti ‘you were bathing’
usu .setViewport(230,829,318,853)搅 disrupting-ay-i ‘he was bathing’
iī .setViewport(230,853,318,876)搅 disrupting-ay-ti ‘she was bathing’
unu .setViewport(230,876,318,900)搅 disrupting-ay-ni ‘we were bathing’
isiŋ .setViewport(230,900),(335,923)搅 disrupting-ay-teena ‘you pl. were bathing’
iyo  viewport(230,923),(335,946)搅 disrupting-ay-eeña ‘they were bathing’

The habitual aspect is used only in the past tense. Past Habitual verbs are
formed by using the infinitive (unmarked) form of the main verb followed by the Past Progressive form of the auxiliary verb jir. Examples are shown below.

(51) ani roor jir-i ‘I used to run’
añi roor jir-ti ‘you used to run’
usu roor jir-i ‘he used to run’
ii roor jir-ti ‘she used to run’
unu roor jir-ni ‘we used to run’
isiq roor jir-teena ‘you pl. used to run’
iyo roor jir-eena ‘they used to run’

ani šaŋey jir-i ‘I used to work’
añi šaŋey jir-ti ‘you used to work’
usu šaŋey jir-i ‘he used to work’
ii šaŋey jir-ti ‘she used to work’
unu šaŋey jir-ni ‘we used to work’
isiq šaŋey jir-teena ‘you pl. used to work’
iyo šaŋey jir-eena ‘they used to work’

ani lugoy jir-i ‘I used to walk’
añi lugoy jir-ti ‘you used to walk’
usu lugoy jir-i ‘he used to walk’
ii lugoy jir-ti ‘she used to walk’
unu lugoy jir-ni ‘we used to walk’
isiq lugoy jir-teena ‘you pl. used to walk’
iyo lugoy jir-eena ‘they used to walk’

ani aani jir-i ‘I used to eat’
añi aani jir-ti ‘you used to eat’
iyo aani jir-eena ‘they used to eat’
ii aani jir-ti ‘she used to eat’
unu aani jir-ni ‘we used to eat’
isiq aani jir-teena ‘you pl. used to eat’
usu aani jir-i ‘he used to eat’

4.6 Negative. Each of the verb forms discussed above in sections 4.3-4.5 can be negated. In many cases, negation is marked by either or both of the following: a ma- prefix and an -o suffix that takes the place of one of the subject agreement
suffix vowels. This situation may be a bit more complex than in the related Central Somali dialect described by Saeed; only a general preverbal negative particle \( ma \) and a negative imperative particle \( ag \) are mentioned for that dialect (1982: 22) along with some tone changes (1982: 23). There is no mention of a correspondent to LJM -o; this may relate to the general reduction of many vowels (especially final vowels) in Central Somali to [ə].

In this section, I present examples of negative forms corresponding to each of the verb forms from sections 4.3-4.5. The negative verb forms are presented according to the way in which they are formed, with the most basic negative forms given first, followed by more complex forms. Since potential verbs are negated using only a single prefix, these are presented first.

Potential verbs are made negative by prefixing \( ma- \) to the verb and using the same set of person markers as in the affirmative. Examples are shown below.

(52) a. Future Potential Negative

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ani} & \text{ina-ma-hees-aw} & \text{muð-e} \quad \text{‘I might not sing’} \\
\text{aði} & \text{ina-ma-hees-aso} & \text{muð-e} \quad \text{‘you might not sing’} \\
\text{usu} & \text{ina-ma-hees-aw} & \text{muð-e} \quad \text{‘he might not sing’} \\
\text{ii} & \text{ina-ma-hees-aso} & \text{muð-e} \quad \text{‘she might not sing’} \\
\text{unu} & \text{ina-ma-hees-aano} & \text{muð-e} \quad \text{‘we might not sing’} \\
\text{isñ} & \text{ina-ma-hees-aasona} & \text{muð-e} \quad \text{‘you pl. might not sing’} \\
\text{iyo} & \text{ina-ma-hees-aayona} & \text{muð-e} \quad \text{‘they might not sing’}
\end{array}
\]

b. Generic Potential Negative

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ani} & \text{ina-ma-hees-o} & \text{lakayaaøe} \quad \text{‘I might not be singing’} \\
\text{usu} & \text{ina-ma-hees-o} & \text{lakayaaøe} \quad \text{‘he might not be singing’} \\
\text{ii} & \text{ina-ma-hees-to} & \text{lakayaaøe} \quad \text{‘she might not be singing’} \\
\text{unu} & \text{ina-ma-hees-no} & \text{lakayaaøe} \quad \text{‘we might not be singing’} \\
\text{aði} & \text{ina-ma-hees-to} & \text{lakayaaøe} \quad \text{‘you might not be singing’} \\
\text{isñ} & \text{ina-ma-hees-tona} & \text{lakayaaøe} \quad \text{‘you pl. might not be singing’} \\
\text{iyo} & \text{ina-ma-hees-on-a} & \text{lakayaaøe} \quad \text{‘they might not be singing’}
\end{array}
\]

Several other types of verbs form plurals by prefixing \( ma- \) and using the same set of subject agreement suffixes as in the affirmative except that the first vowel of each suffix is changed to [o]. As seen below, this happens in the Simple Present A (and therefore also in the Near Future, whose auxiliary verb is in the
Simple Present A), Simple Present B (stative), Generic Future, and Present Progressive (which uses the same subject agreement suffixes as the Generic Future).

(53) a. Simple Present A Negative
ani ma-raš-o ‘I will not’ unu ma-rab-no ‘we will not’
aḏi ma-rap-to ‘you will not’ isiŋ ma-rap-toona ‘you pl. will not’
usu ma-raš-o ‘he will not’ iyo ma-raš-oona ‘they will not’
iį ma-rap-to ‘she will not’

b. Near Future Negative
ani roor-o ma-raš-o ‘I will not run’
aḏi roor-to ma-rap-to ‘you will not run’
usu roor-o ma-raš-o ‘he will not run’
iį roor-to ma-rap-to ‘she will not run’
unu roor-no ma-rab-no ‘we will not run’
isiŋ roor-toona ma-rap-toona ‘you pl. will not run’
iyo roor-onoa ma-raš-oona ‘they will not run’

c. Simple Present B Negative
ani ma-deer-yo ‘I am not tall’
aḏi ma-deer-to ‘you are not tall’
usu ma-deer-yo ‘he is not tall’
iį ma-deer-to ‘she is not tall’
unu ma-deer-no ‘we are not tall’
isiŋ ma-deer-toona ‘you pl. are not tall’
iyo ma-deer-yona ‘they are not tall’

d. Generic Future Negative
ani ma-roor doň-yo ‘I will not run’
aḏi ma-roor don-to ‘you will not run’
usu ma-roor doň-yo ‘he will not run’
iį ma-roor don-to ‘she will not run’
unu ma-roor doň-no ‘we will not run’
isiŋ ma-roor don-toona ‘you pl. will not run’
iyo ma-roor doň-yona ‘they will not run’
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e. Present Progressive Negative

ani  ma-roor-oy-o    ‘I am not running’
aði  ma-roor-oy-to   ‘you are not running’
usu  ma-roor-oy-o    ‘he is not running’
ii   ma-roor-oy-to   ‘she is not running’
unu  ma-roor-oy-no   ‘we are not running’
isíŋ ma-roor-oy-toona ‘you pl. are not running’
iyo  ma-roor-oy-oona ‘they are not running’

Three verb forms have plurals with a ma- prefix and -ne suffix: Simple Past, Past Progressive, and Past Habitual. There is no person marking on these Negative forms, but the subject pronoun is still able to be omitted. When there is no overt subject marker, the verb form is ambiguous and the intended subject must be recovered from context. In Central Somali as well, Simple Past Negatives have only a single form, which has a -nɔ suffix (Saeed 1982: 23), but unlike in LJM, Past Habitual forms in Central Somali use the same set of person/number/gender suffixes as in the affirmative rather than using -nɔ. Examples of LJM Past Negative forms are shown below.

(54)  a. Past Negative

ani  ma-roor-ne      ‘I didn’t run’
aði  ma-roor-ne      ‘you didn’t run’
usu  ma-roor-ne      ‘he didn’t run’
ii   ma-roor-ne      ‘she didn’t run’
unu  ma-roor-ne      ‘we didn’t run’
isíŋ ma-roor-ne      ‘you pl. didn’t run’
iyo  ma-roor-ne      ‘they didn’t run’

b. Past Progressive Negative

ani  ma-roor-ay-ne   ‘I was not running’
aði  ma-roor-ay-ne   ‘you were not running’
usu  ma-roor-ay-ne   ‘he was not running’
ii   ma-roor-ay-ne   ‘she was not running’
unu  ma-roor-ay-ne   ‘we were not running’
isíŋ ma-roor-ay-ne   ‘you pl. were not running’
iyo  ma-roor-ay-ne   ‘they were not running’
c. *Past Habitual Negative*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Negative Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ani</td>
<td>ma-roor</td>
<td>jir-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aði</td>
<td>ma-roor</td>
<td>jir-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usu</td>
<td>ma-roor</td>
<td>jir-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ií</td>
<td>ma-roor</td>
<td>jir-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unu</td>
<td>ma-roor</td>
<td>jir-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiñ</td>
<td>ma-roor</td>
<td>jir-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>ma-roor</td>
<td>jir-ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Immediate Future Negative is formed by prefixing *ma-* to the verb and by changing the subject agreement suffixes. For the 2sg, 3sg feminine, and all plural subjects, the second vowel of the suffix changes to [o]. For 1sg and 3sg masculine, the negative suffix is *-aw*, which is not directly related to the corresponding affirmative suffix, *-a*, though it is not difficult to imagine that historically the negative suffix had the form *-eo*, which could have undergone some sound changes to surface in the modern language as *aw*. Central Somali has *-aw* for the 1sg and 3sgm here as well (Saced 1982: 24); apart from the Simple Past Negative mentioned above, this is apparently the only segmental person/number/gender suffix change that occurs in the negative form for any tense/aspect in Central Somali. Immediate Future Negative forms in LJM are shown below.

(55) **Immediate Future Negative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Negative Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ani</td>
<td>ma-roor-aw</td>
<td>‘I will not run’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aði</td>
<td>ma-roor-aso</td>
<td>‘you will not run’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usu</td>
<td>ma-roor-aw</td>
<td>‘he will not run’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ií</td>
<td>ma-roor-aso</td>
<td>‘she will not run’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unu</td>
<td>ma-roor-ano</td>
<td>‘we will not run’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiñ</td>
<td>ma-roor-asoono</td>
<td>‘you pl. will not run’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>ma-roor-afoona</td>
<td>‘they will not run’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one verb form whose Negative form does not fit any of the descriptions above is the Imperative. The Imperative Negative is formed by prefixing *an-* to the Imperative verb and adding a suffix *-t* or *-tina* (for singular or plural subjects, respectively). Note that the negative suffixes do not relate transparently to the corresponding affirmative suffixes, *-o* (for a singular subject) and *-a* (for a plural subject). Imperative Negative examples are given below.
(56) Imperative Negative

an-roor-to 'don’t run!'
an-roor-tona 'don’t run! pl.'

An issue that arises in the analysis of Negative verb forms is in identifying what part(s) of a complex verb the negation applies to. In the case of simple verbs with no auxiliary verb, such as the Present Progressive, the negative prefix occurs immediately before the verb stem, and the negative ‘suffix’ is manifested by changing a vowel of the subject agreement suffix. In some verb forms, such as the Near Future, the negative markers apply only to the auxiliary verb, whereas in other complex forms, such as the Generic Future, the negative prefix occurs before the main verb stem while the suffix vowel change applies to suffixes attached to the auxiliary verb. It may be the case that in cases where a negative prefix and suffix ‘surround’ both the main and auxiliary verbs, then perhaps the auxiliary verb is better analyzed as a suffix on the main verb; perhaps the location of the negative markers can serve as a diagnostic for auxiliary verbs vs. suffixes. I leave this issue for future research.

The person/gender/number suffixes for each of the tenses and aspects described above (affirmative and negative) are summarized below in Table 1. It was observed above that the 1sg and 3sgm suffixes are always identical, as are the 2sg and 3sgf suffixes (except in the case of the imperative, since there is no 3sgf imperative form). Some further observations can be made about the form of the suffixes as follows. First, second person and feminine both appear to be marked with /t/. All second person and feminine suffixes begin with /t/ except for the Immediate Future and Future Potential; in those tenses/aspects, the second person and feminine suffixes contain /s/, which could be the reflex of a historical *t (though the Central Somali correspondent to LJM Immediate Future also has /s/ in these suffixes (Saeed 1982: 24)).

A second generalization is that where 2sg/3sgf has /t/ or /s/, the 1pl suffix has /n/. This is the only difference between 2sg/3sgf and 1pl in every tense/aspect except the Future Potential, in which there is also a vowel length difference between the suffixes -aso and -aano. In addition, the 2pl and 3pl suffixes are always identical except that 2pl has /t/ or /s/ where 3pl has /y/; their vowels are always the same, though the vowel portion of these suffixes cannot be analyzed straightforwardly as constituting the plural marking, since as mentioned above, the 1pl suffixes pattern with the singular suffixes in terms of their vowels and overall shape. Interestingly, despite several vowel differences, these generaliza-
tions about suffix consonants and suffix shapes in LJM are true of Central Somali (Saeed 1982) as well.

Table 1: Person/Number/Gender suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense/Aspect</th>
<th>Aff.</th>
<th>1sg/3sgm</th>
<th>2sg/3sgf</th>
<th>1pl</th>
<th>2pl</th>
<th>3pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Past/</td>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>-teena</td>
<td>-eeena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Progressive</td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>No person/number/gender suffix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Present A/</td>
<td>Aff.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-te</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>-teena</td>
<td>-eeena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Progressive</td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-to</td>
<td>-no</td>
<td>-toona</td>
<td>-oono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Present B</td>
<td>Aff.</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-tena</td>
<td>-yena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>-yo</td>
<td>-to</td>
<td>-no</td>
<td>-tona</td>
<td>-yona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Future</td>
<td>Aff.</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>-te</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>-teena</td>
<td>-yeena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>-yo</td>
<td>-to</td>
<td>-no</td>
<td>-toona</td>
<td>-yoona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Future</td>
<td>Aff.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ase</td>
<td>-ane</td>
<td>-aseena</td>
<td>-ayeena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>-aw</td>
<td>-aso</td>
<td>-ano</td>
<td>-asoona</td>
<td>-ayoona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Future/</td>
<td>Aff./</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-to</td>
<td>-no</td>
<td>-tona</td>
<td>-ona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Potential</td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Aff.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-Ø/NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-to/NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-tona</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Potential</td>
<td>Aff./</td>
<td>-aw</td>
<td>-aso</td>
<td>-aano</td>
<td>-aasona</td>
<td>-aayona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Habitual</td>
<td>Aff./</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>No person/number/gender suffix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusion.

This paper has presented an overview of the phonology and morphology of Lower Juba Maay. This is a previously undescribed language that is significantly different from dialects of Somali and Maay that have been described in the literature. It has been demonstrated that there are several areas of theoretical and typological interest in this language, in particular with regard to plural and gender marking in the nominal morphology.
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