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**Résumé français.** Il y a un détail morphologique signifiant qui sépare le statif Akkadien du parfait des autres langues sémitiques. Ici, une explication hypothétique est offerte qui est basée sur une analyse de l’afro-asiatique comme étant d’un alignement syntaxique du type nominatif-absolutif.

**English Abstract.** There is a significant morphological detail that distinguishes the Akkadian stative from the perfect of the other Semitic languages. A hypothetic explanation for this is offered, which is based on an analysis of Proto-Asiatic being of nominative-absolutive syntactic alignment.

In his competent and well-organised overview of the “situation of Egyptian in the languages of the world”, P. Vernus enumerates the essential correspondences between Egyptian and the Semitic family 1, among them, of course, the verb paradigm under consideration:

Un paradigme verbal entier, celui du pseudoparticipe, a des homologues manifestes en sémitique, sans compter les vestiges du berbère:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Désinences du singulier</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1re pers. commune</td>
<td>Kw [...] (graphie « syllabique » pour ku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e pers. du masculin</td>
<td>tf (graphie « syllabique » pour t (+V))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e pers. du féminin</td>
<td>tf (graphie « syllabique » pour t (+V))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e pers. masculin</td>
<td>w (graphie « syllabique » pour u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e pers. féminin</td>
<td>tf (graphie « syllabique » pour t (+V))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Désinences du pluriel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1re pers. commune</td>
<td>wyn (graphie « syllabique » pour w’n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e pers. commune</td>
<td>twny (graphie « syllabique » pour ṭu’n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e pers. commune</td>
<td>w (graphie « syllabique » pour u)...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 P. VERNUS, « Situation de l’égyptien dans les langues du monde », dans Fr.-X.
Ce paradigme est caractérisé par des désinences clairement apparentées à celles de l’accompli sémitique tel qu’il apparaît par exemple en akkadien…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Désinences du singulier</th>
<th>Désinences du pluriel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1re pers. commune</td>
<td>nū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e pers. du masculin</td>
<td>.ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e pers. du féminin</td>
<td>.ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e pers. masculin</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e pers. féminin</td>
<td>.at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all Semitic languages, the Egyptian stative (Polotsky), or old perfective (Gardiner), or pseudo-participle (Erman, who had discovered this paradigm) has more features in common with the Akkadian stative than with the corresponding suffix-conjugated paradigms of the other Semitic languages, called the perfect. There is a particular gap between Akkadian (East Semitic) and all the rest.

Features that Akkadian does not share with the other Semitic languages, include:

1. The absolute state of the noun.¹
2. The stative, in respect to its semantic features which differ from those of the perfect of the other Semitic languages (both stative and perfect represent the Semitic suffix conjugation²);
3. The conjugation of the stative, which differs both from that of the South Semitic perfect, and that of the other Semitic languages.
4. The prefix-conjugated perfect irpis (though there are remnants of comparable forms, viz. the Arabic negative perfect lam yaf’al, and the Hebrew waw perfect, wayyiqtol³);
5. The prefix-conjugated, r-inserting perfect iptaras (though Zaborski⁴ suggests to see remnants of it in several VIII⁶ stem verbs (iffa’ala) of Arabic).

¹ The absolute state of the Syriac noun is of similar functions, but it is the result of later development, in particular, of the morpheme -a losing its determinating function; cf. H. Satzinger, “Absolute state and absolutive case in Afro-Asiatic,” in M. Moriggi (ed.), XII Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camito-semitica (Afroasiatica). Atti (Medioev. Romanzo e Orientale. Colloqui 9.), 63–69, in particular, 64–65.
² Note that the Egyptological use of “suffix conjugation” is a misnomer: it has neither suffixes nor is it a conjugation, in the strict morphological sense. The only true Egyptian “suffix conjugation” is the stative.
6. The dichotomy of disyllabic perfect *iprus and trisyllabic
"imperfect" *iparras; South Semitic has at least the second of these
forms, like Ge’ez yesabber “he breaks, is breaking” (cf. the jussive
yesber “may he break”).

For most of these features, which are alien to North-West, Central, and
South Semitic, parallels from other Afro-Asiatic languages can be
adduced. On account of this, it may be assumed that they go back to a
common ancestor language; the divergent features of the other Semitic
languages would then have to be seen as innovations.

Ad 1: The absolute state of Akkadian is an absolute state and not a
case: it stands in paradigmatic relation not to the individual cases, but
rather to the whole block of cases.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute state</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ṣarr “king”</td>
<td>šarrum</td>
<td>šarram</td>
<td>šarrim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless it may be compared with the absolutive case of both
Berber and Cushitic. However, this absolutive case covers also the
function of an accusative case.

Ad 2: The semantic features of the Akkadian stative may be
compared with those of the Egyptian stative (in particular, its true stative
variant, *satpāku, ”he has been chosen”, cf. below), and the Kabyle

---

5 A. Zaborski, “Traces of iptaras in Arabic,” in G. Takács (ed.), *Egyptian and
Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam W. Vycichl* (Studies in Semitic
Languages and Linguistics, 39), 160–174; A. Zaborski, “Main and secondary functions

6 O. Rössler, „Verbalbau und Verballflexion in den semito-hamitischen Sprachen."
Vorstudien zu einer vergleichenden semito-hamitischen Grammatik, *ZDMG* 100 [25]
(1950), 461–514; O. Rössler, “The structure and inflection of the verb in the Semito-
Hamitic languages.” Preliminary studies for a Comparative Semito-Hamitic grammar.
Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns* (Amsterdam Studies in
the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series IV – Current Issues in Linguistic
Theory 16.), Amsterdam 1981, 679–748.

177–183, in particular p. 179.

8 H.-J. Sasse, “Case in Cushitic, Semitic and Berber,” in: J. Bynon (ed.), *Current
Progress in Afro-asian Linguistics*. Papers of the Third International Hamito-Semitic
Congress, 111–126; H. Satzinger, “Zero article, bare noun, absolutive case,“ in a
Festschrift, printing; H. Satzinger, “Absolute state and absolutive case in Afro-Asiatic,”
in: M. Moriggi (ed.), *XII Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camito-semitica (Afroasiatica).
Atti. (Medioevo Romano e Orientale. Colloqui 9., 63–69; H. Satzinger, “Observations in
the Field of the Afroasiatic Suffix Conjugation,” in M. Lamberti & L. Tonelli (eds.),
*Afroasiatica Tergestina. Papers of the 9th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-
Semitic) Linguistics. Trieste, April 23–24, 1998 / Contributi presentati al 9° Incontro di
suffix conjugation of the verbs of quality (\textit{hnin-\textit{e}G} “I’m compassionate”, \textit{hnin-\textit{e}D} “you are…”, etc.; cf. below). Elsa Oreal has plausibly argued that the two stative forms, of Egyptian and Akkadian, are anything but congruent in respect to semantic and syntactic characteristics: one being adverbial, the other nominal, etc. Nevertheless, they are of similar morphological appearance, of similar build, and they have many semantic features in common. For a structuralistic description of the Egyptian stative see my account at the Cambridge Conference\footnote{H. Satzinger, “Varieties of the Old Perfective in Old Egyptian,” in C. J. Eyre (ed.), \textit{Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists}, Cambridge, 3–9 September 1995 (OLA 82), 1021-1028.}.

Ad 3: The Akkadian stative conjugation differs from that of the Semitic perfect mainly in two respects: a) the endings of the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} persons; b) the (kind of) thematic vowel -\textit{ā} of these same forms\footnote{E. Lipiński, \textit{Semitic Languages}, 368 (§ 40.3).}, singular and plural, which is lacking elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Ge’ez</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pars-\textit{ā}-\textit{ku}</td>
<td>qatal-\textit{ku}</td>
<td>\textit{fa’al}-\textit{tu}</td>
<td>qātal-\textit{ā}</td>
<td>\textit{kītob-\textit{ēt}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pars-\textit{ā}-\textit{ta}</td>
<td>qatal-\textit{ka}</td>
<td>\textit{fa’al}-\textit{ta}</td>
<td>qātal-tā</td>
<td>katab-\textit{tā}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pars-\textit{ā}-\textit{ti}</td>
<td>qatal-\textit{ki}</td>
<td>\textit{fa’al}-\textit{tī}</td>
<td>qātal-t</td>
<td>katab-\textit{ā}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pars-\textit{at}</td>
<td>qatal-\textit{a}</td>
<td>\textit{fa’al}-\textit{a}</td>
<td>qāal</td>
<td>katab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Semitic suffix conjugation, 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} persons singular, has endings that display certain alternations in the individual languages and language groups, with the initial consonants -\textit{k}- and -\textit{t}- changing places. Traditional opinion has it that Akkadian, with -\textit{ku} and -\textit{t}-, possesses the original sounds; that South Semitic has generalised the consonant \textit{k}, by making also the forms of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person commence with it (which hereby coincide with the respective suffix pronouns); that the others (Canaanite, Aramaic, Arabic, …) on their part replace the -\textit{ku} of the 1\textsuperscript{st} person by -\textit{tu},
letting thus all these endings begin with the same letter -t-. In recent times, however, this scenario was questioned. Thus, Lipiński inserts for the 2nd person both forms in his table of endings of the suffix conjugation: 2sm *-ka / *-ta, and so on for both genders and the three numbers. The initial -t- is said to be, not an innovation of West Semitic (here including Arabic), but rather already existent as a variant in the proto-language. On the other hand, Voigt suggests an „alternativer, ergativistisches Modell” which makes a distinction between transitive verbs and verbs of state; the first-mentioned, having the inflection *-tū, *-tā, *-tī etc., are thought to be continued in the West Semitic perfect, whereas the others, having *-akū, *-akā, *-akī etc., would be continued, in respect to the consonants, in South Semitic. In East Semitic [i.e., Akkadian], however, both conjugations would intermingle, hereby generalising the infix -ak- of the verbs of state: *-āku, *-ātā, *-ātī etc. This would imply the existence of a proto-Semitic case paradigm of absolutive case (?) *-ku, *-ka, *-ki, and ergative case *-tu, *-ta, *-tī.

However, the Akkadian and South Semitic ending *-ku of the 1st person, as against *-tu, is proven to be the original Semitic feature by the correspondences in Egyptian and Berber.

Ad 3b: Results of recent research show that there are two paradigms of the Egyptian stative, of which one has obviously a vowel between the stem and the ending, like the Akkadian stative, 1st and 2nd persons, whereas the other has not, like the Semitic perfect. The first is seemingly a true stative, with most transitive verbs having passive present perfect character, while the second is active with transitive verbs.

*saṭāp’ku* “I chose, have chosen” ~ Arabic aḥaḍtu “I took”
*saṭāpu’ku* “I have / having been chosen” ~ Akkadian alḥāḍku “I have been seized”

Ad 4/5: For the sake of completeness it should be added that there are not only remnants of perfective / preterite prefix conjugation paradigms in other Semitic languages (as mentioned above), but also that perfective

---

15 E. Lipiński, Semitic Languages, 368–369.
17 There is, however, also an “object pronoun” *-nī, *-kā, *-kī (R. Voigt, Zeitschrift für Althebraistik 15/16 (2002/2003), 158).
18 Translated from the German of H. Satzinger, „Anmerkungen zur semitischen Suffixkonjugation“, 493.
19 Aside from Akkadian and South Semitic, the -k- forms exist also in Arabic dialects of Yemen (E. Lipiński, Semitic Languages, 370 (§ 40.5), which is quite probably the result of areal effects of South Arabian idioms.
/ preterite prefix conjugations are normal in Cushitic; the Berber paradigms display in both aspects a mixed prefix / suffix conjugation (see below). The *iprus : iparras* dichotomy is reflected in the Berber and Cushitic tense systems, if not in Egyptian and Chadic reduplicated intensive / pluralic stem variants (called “imperfective” in traditional Egyptological terminology).

Here we will, in the main, be concerned with the stative and with the absolute state of Akkadian. The Berber and the East Cushitic languages teach us an important lesson on the Afro-Asiatic case system, namely that there is not only a nominative-accusative alignment (as in Semitic), as against an ergative-absolutive alignment (in proper ergative languages, such as Basque, and as is assumed by some for Proto Afro-Asiatic21), but also an intermediary structure: the nominative-accusative alignment.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ergative-Absolutive:</th>
<th>Nominative-Absolutive:</th>
<th>Nominative-Accusative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive case (-a)</td>
<td>Absolutive case (-a)</td>
<td>Accusative case (-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotation, address,</td>
<td>quotation, address,</td>
<td>object,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicate, focus,</td>
<td>predicate, focus,</td>
<td>adverbial form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic, pre-genitive</td>
<td>object,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form, subject of</td>
<td>adverbial form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intransitive verbs,</td>
<td>Nominative case (-u)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object, adverbial</td>
<td>subject of intransive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form Ergative case</td>
<td>agent (subject) of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-u) agent (subject)</td>
<td>transitive verbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of transitive verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g., Basque Berber, Cushitic23

In fact, Akkadian stands somewhere between the Berber / Cushitic and the general Semitic type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative-Absolutive:</th>
<th>Transitory:</th>
<th>Nominative-Accusative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive case (-a)</td>
<td>Accusative case (-a)</td>
<td>object, adverbial form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotation, address,</td>
<td>object, adverbial form</td>
<td>object, adverbial form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


22 H. Satzinger, printing.

The origin of the Semitic variants of the suffix conjugation can be assumed to be dating back to an early stage. The emergence and grammaticalisation of the suffix conjugation can be seen as the result of the transition from the nominative-absolutive to the nominative accusative alignment, partially performed by Akkadian, and (almost\textsuperscript{24}) completely by the other Semitic languages.

The proto-language had nominative-absolutive alignment, disposing of a nominative case (probably in $u$), and an absolutive case, presumably in a (as in Cushitic). The prototype of the stative is composed of an infinite verb form that is neutral to diathesis, and to which the subject is added (except pronominal subjects of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person). The verb, being the nucleus of the predicative phrase, bears the mark of the absolutive case ($a$):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{1.1} *\textit{aḫiḏ+a tupp-$u$} “the tablet has been seized”.
\end{itemize}

NB. Here, a VSO word order is assumed, as corresponds to Arabic, Hebrew, Egyptian, Berber\textsuperscript{25}, rather than to Akkadian. It is generally thought that the latter’s SOV order is due to Sumerian influence\textsuperscript{26}.

If the subject is a personal pronoun of the 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} person, it is of a paradigm that does not exist anymore in historical times, but that has left traces also in the absolute personal pronoun; singular forms, namely *\textit{ku}, *\textit{ta}, *\textit{ti} (cf. the pronouns ‘\textit{anā-ku}, *\textit{an-\textit{ta}}, *\textit{an-ti}).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{1.2} *\textit{aḫiḏ+a ku} “I have been seized”, *\textit{aḫiḏ+a ta} “you (m.)…”,
  \item *\textit{aḫiḏ+a ti} “you (f.)…”.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{24} Why ”almost completely”? The Arabic and the Ethiopian accusatives have still a few functions that are domains of an absolutive, like the predicative noun of verbs of being ("daughters of \textit{kāna}"), and adverbial uses. Cf. H.-J. Sasse in J. Bynon (ed.), \textit{Current Progress in Afro-asiatic Linguistics}, 119–120.

\textsuperscript{25} E. Lipiński, \textit{Semitic Languages}, 498 (§ 50.13).

\textsuperscript{26} E. Lipiński, \textit{Semitic Languages}, 499 (§ 50.14).
If it is a pronoun of the 3rd person it need not be expressed; the pronominal notion is implied in the gender / number morpheme of the verb.

1.3  *aḥid+a “he has been seized”, *aḥidat+a “she has been seized”, *aḥidī+a “they (m.) have been seized”, etc.

These forms would yield in Akkadian:

1.1  tupp aḥi “the tablet has been seized”.
1.2  aḥzāku “I have been seized”, aḥzātī “you (f.)…”,
1.3  aḥi “he has been seized”, aḥzi “she has been seized”, aḥzū “they (m.) have been seized”, etc. (for the loss of final -a see below).

If the verb has two actants, the diathesis is active. In this case the predicative phrase comprises both a verb and a noun. The scenario presented here only works on the assumption that the absolutive case morpheme is a free one, that is, not a morphological ending of the verb, but is freely added to the phrase in question. In our case it is joined to the complement noun, the apical element of the predicative phrase, rather than to the verb.27

2.1  *aḥi zi kāt u tupp+a “the man has seized the tablet”

With pronominal subject:

2.2  *aḥi ku tupp+a “I have seized the tablet”, etc.

3rd person pronominal subject:

2.3  *aḥi tupp+a “he has seized the tablet”, etc.

What happened next is that an accusative case emerged from the absolutive case, or rather, that the absolutive case (in *-a) split into an accusative case (in -a) for the direct object, etc., and — at least in Proto-Akkadian — an absolute state (in zero) for quotation, address, predicate, focus, topic, etc.: kind of a bare noun.28

• In Proto-Akkadian, this also affected the stative forms, insofar as they ended in -a: *parisə became paris, *parisata became par(is)at, etc.

• It did not affect the forms where the -a ending had come to be between the stem and the personal morph and was thus not anymore felt to be the absolutive ending, like *paris-a-ku becoming par(is)āku, etc.

• Generally speaking, Proto-Akkadian generalized the passive / intransitive-stative paradigm, extending its forms also to active use (aḥi “he has seized”).

---

28 H. Satzinger, printing.
The other Semitic languages, on the other hand,

- grammaticalised the active forms, hereby giving up the forms with inserted -a-. (This -a now marked the direct complement, as accusative.)

In abandoning the absolutive case in the course of transforming it into the new accusative case, they went farther than Akkadian.

- For some reason or other, the 3sm forms in -a were selected or retained in South Semitic and Arabic: qatala.²⁹

- The consonant of endings 1sc, 2sm ad 2sf was generalized in -k- in South Semitic, in -t- elsewhere.

- Stem vocalization was completely reorganized; cf. Arabic with CaCaC-, CaCiC- and CaCuC-: ‘aḥaṭtu, -ta, -ti, ‘aḥaḍa, ‘aḥaḍat etc., “I / you / he / she took”; ‘alimtu “I learned” etc.; hasuna “he has become good” etc. The internal passive is probably another innovation: ‘aṭliha “he has been taken”.

None of the other Afro-Asiatic sub-families has internal passives.³⁰

Chadic does not seem to have unequivocal remnants of the suffix conjugation at all. The normal Berber conjugation has for both aspects a mixed paradigm, partly prefixes, partly suffixes, partly both:

Kabyle (Taqbaylit):³¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1sc</th>
<th>2sc</th>
<th>3sm</th>
<th>3sf</th>
<th></th>
<th>1pc</th>
<th>2pc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sc</td>
<td>keččem -eğ</td>
<td>te- keččem -ed</td>
<td>i- keččem</td>
<td>te- keččem</td>
<td>“I enter, am entering”</td>
<td>hnin-eğ “I am pitiful”</td>
<td>hnin-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sc</td>
<td>Ø kešm -eğ</td>
<td>te- kešm -ed</td>
<td>i- kešm</td>
<td>te kešm</td>
<td>“I entered”</td>
<td>hnin-it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i- kešm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>te kešm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Etc.

In several idioms there exists, however, a stative paradigm which is a pure suffix conjugation:³² les adjectifs conjugués (Taine-Cheikh).³³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1sc</th>
<th>2sc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sc</td>
<td>hnin-eğ “I am pitiful”</td>
<td>hnin-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sc</td>
<td>hnin-edl</td>
<td>hnin-it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁹ According to E. Lipiński, Semitic Languages, 369 (§ 40.3), this is not an original feature of Arabic, but rather due to South Arabian influence.

³⁰ Cf. E. Lipiński, Semitic Languages, 416 (§ 41.43): “… they are probably to be regarded as a secondary development of West Semitic, that spread to South Arabia”.


³² O. Rössler, ZDMG 100 [25] (1950), 481.

Other idioms with relevant features are East Cushitic and Egyptian. For long time it was thought that Cushitic has not any traces of the ancient Afro-Asiatic suffix conjugation. Where its verb forms were conjugated by endings, these were obviously the relics of an ancient prefix-conjugated auxiliary verb (comparable to Reinisch’ *verbum substantivum*).

### Suffix Conjugation in Ts’amakko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
<th>3rd person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* ‘úg-í*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-dí*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-í*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* ‘úg-dí*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-í*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-dí*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* ‘úg-í*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-dí*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-í*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* ‘úg-ní*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-dí*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-í*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* ‘úg-dí*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-í*</td>
<td>* ‘úg-dí*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Giorgio Banti has made plausible that there is in East Cushitic languages another paradigm of suffix conjugation that goes back to the common origin of the Afro-Asiatic suffix conjugation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
<th>3rd person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* ‘usubiy-ó*</td>
<td>* ‘usubit-ó*</td>
<td>* ‘usub-á*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

34 Other idioms, like e.g. Zenaga, differentiate between the persons; cf. C. Taine-Cheikh, in A. Mengozzi (ed.), *Studi Afroasiatici*, 98-100.


36 L. Reinisch, *Das persönliche fürwort und die verbaflexion in den chamito-semitischen sprachen*, Wien 1909, in particular, e.g., 308.


39 The ending of the 1st person is *-í*, like the suffix pronoun. Note that no Cushitic language has an absolute pronoun in *-k*, like Egyptian *ink*, Akkadian *anāku*, Biblical Hebrew *'anōkî*, Berber *nēk*.
Banti reconstructs the personal morphs of this paradigm in this way:

\[
\begin{align*}
2sf & \quad \text{‘usub-á} \quad \text{cusíb} \quad \text{Etc.} \\
1sc & \quad {^*}i-\text{yi} \ (\sim \ '-'i-\text{yu}) \\
2sc & \quad {^*}i-\text{tu} \\
1pc & \quad {^*}i-\text{nu} \\
2pc & \quad {^*}i-\text{tin}
\end{align*}
\]

As for the use of this conjugation, he says,

In Saho-Afar and in Somali the reduced paradigm is characteristic of a lexically defined group of verb roots including ‘to be’ or copula, ‘to have’ and ‘to lack’, emotion-cognitive verbs such as ‘hate’, ‘love’, ‘know’, and adjectival concepts such as ‘white’, ‘red’, ‘new’, ‘long’, ‘bad’.

All these Afro-Asiatic suffix conjugations have in common that they are stative, and are mostly used of verbs of quality. This is in agreement with typical employment of the Akkadian stative. However, we do not find in the Cushitic and Berber forms an insertion of ‘-a-’ before the personal endings of the 1st and 2nd persons, as in the Akkadian stative, and seemingly also in that variant of the Egyptian stative that is used for a similar type of verbs. But then — the ending ‘-a’ of the absolutive case is never found with verb forms in Cushitic (as also not in Berber).

---

40 M. Mous, “Cushitic,” 45.