

Addis Ababa University
College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication
Department of Linguistics and Philology

Information Structure in Oromo

By: Aynalem Girma

A Dissertation submitted to the Department of Linguistics and Philology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

June, 2020

Addis Ababa University
College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication
Department of Linguistics and Philology

Information Structure in Oromo

By: Aynalem Girma

A Dissertation submitted to the Department of Linguistics and Philology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

June, 2020

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by **Aynalem Girma** entitled: **Information Structure in Oromo** and submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics complies with the regulations of the university and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Shimelis Mazengia

Advisor

Signature

Date

Maarten Mous (Prof.)

External Examiner

Signature

Date

Baye Yimam (Prof.)

Internal Examiner

Signature

Date

Declaration

I hereby declare that the research and writing of this PhD dissertation entitled “Information Structure in Oromo” was carried out by me, Aynalem Girma, under the supervision of my advisor Doctor Shimelis Mazengia for the fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics. It is my own original work and has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification before. All the sources used in the study were also duly acknowledged.

Candidate's Name

Signature

Date

Aynalem Girma

Contents	page
Declaration.....	iii
List of Abbreviations and Symbols.....	ix
Abstract.....	x
Acknowledgments.....	xi
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.0 Prelude.....	1
1.1 The Language and the People	1
1.2. Review of Related Literature	3
1.3 Statement of the Problem	8
1.4 Objective	9
1.5 Significance.....	9
1.6 Delimitation.....	10
1.7 Research Methodology and Procedures.....	10
Chapter Two:Conceptual Framework	12
2.2 Information Units	14
2.2.1 Topic/Comment	15
2.2.2 Given/New	16
2.2.3 Focus/Background	18
2.3. Means of Information structuring	23
2.3.1 Phonological	23
2.3.2 Morphological.....	25
2.3.3 Lexical.....	25
2.3.4 Syntactic.....	25
Chapter Three:Utterance Structure	30
3.1 Utterance Structure and Syntactic Structures.....	30
3.2 Roles of Sentence Constituents.....	31
3.3 Allosentences and Information Structure.....	35
3.4 Binomial and Trinomial Divisions of Information Structure.....	38
Chapter Four:Topic-Comment Structure	41
4.1 Distinguishing Topic-Comment Structure	41

4.2 Topic Articulation	46
4.3 Sentence Topic	47
4.4 Frame Setting	52
4.5 Topic Marking.....	54
4.6 Means of Topic Marking.....	55
4.6.1 Marking Topic Lexically	55
4.6.1.1 Aboutness test	56
4.6.1.2 Marking Topic via Converse Terms	56
4.6.1.2.1 Topic Marking via Converse Verbs.....	57
4.6.1.2.2 Topic Marking via Converse Nouns.....	58
4.6.1.2.3 Topic Marking via Converse Postpositions	59
4.6.2 Marking Topic Syntactically.....	60
4.6.2.1 Basic Word Order Change.....	60
4.6.2.2 Passivization	65
4.6.2.3 Cleft Constructions	66
4.6.2.4 Topicalization	67
4.6.2.5 Dislocation	70
4.6.2.5.1 Left Dislocation	72
4.6.2.5.2 Right Dislocation	74
4.7 Topic Integration Levels	75
4.8 Topic and Given Information.....	77
Chapter Five: Given-New Information.....	81
5.1 Given Information.....	81
5.2 Encoding Given Information.....	83
5.2.1 Given Information and Definite Reference.....	83
5.2.2 Given Information and Context	86
5.2.2.1 Physical Context	87
5.2.2.2 Discourse Context.....	88
5.2.2.3 Experiential Context	90
5.2.2.4 Human Context.....	90
5.3 Given Information and Uniqueness	91

5.4 Given Information and Pronouns	92
5.5 Given Information and Proper nouns	98
5.6 Given Information and Singulative Marker	99
5.7 Given Information and Substitution	100
5.8 Given Information and Deixis	102
5.8.1 Endophoric and Exophoric Deixis	103
5.8.2 Symbolic and Gestural Deictic Use	107
5.8.3 Given Information and Deixis Types	108
5.8.3.1 Given Information and Person Deixis	109
5.8.3.2 Given Information and Social Deixis	112
5.8.3.3 Given Information and Spatial Deixis	115
5.8.3.4 Given Information and Time Deixis	121
5.9 New Information and Indefiniteness	124
5.10 Information Flow Principle	127
5.11 Marked and Unmarked Focus Position	129
5.11.1 Unmarked Focus Position	129
5.11.2 Marked Focus Position	131
Chapter Six: Focus-Background Information	136
6.1 Focus-Background Information Identification	136
6.2 Focus Marking Strategies	138
6.2.1 Syntactic Focusing	138
6.2.1.1 Marking Focus via Scrambling	138
6.2.1.2 Focus Marking via Cleft Constructions	139
6.2.1.2.1 Cleft Constructions	139
6.2.1.2.1.1 Cleft Construction Types	140
6.2.1.2.1.1.1 Simple Cleft Constructions	140
6.2.1.2.1.1.2 Pseudo Cleft Constructions	142
6.2.2 Morphological Focusing	148
6.2.3 Focus Marking Particles	164
6.2.3.1 Noun Focus Particles	165
6.2.3.2 Verb Focus Particles	178

6.2.4 Lexical Focusing.....	186
6.2.5 Prosodic Focusing.....	187
6.2.5.1 Focus Marking via High Pitch.....	188
6.2.5.1.1 Focus Marking via Contrastive High Pitch.....	190
6.2.5.3 Focus Marking via Emphatic High Pitch.....	193
6.2.5.4 High Pitch and Word Final Vowel Length.....	194
Chapter Seven: Copula Clause Information Structure.....	198
7.1 Copular Elements.....	198
7.2 Copula Clauses.....	202
7.3 Copula Clause Types and Information Structure.....	203
7.3.1 Predicational Copula Clause Information Structure.....	203
7.3.2 Specificational Copula Clause Information Structure.....	206
7.3.3 Identificational Copula Clause Information Structure.....	207
7.3.4 Equational Copula Clause Information Structure.....	209
7.3.5 Possessive Copula Clause Information Structure.....	212
Chapter Eight: Negative and Passive Clause Information Structure.....	215
8.1 Negation.....	215
8.2 Negation Strategies.....	216
8.2.1 Single Negation Strategy.....	216
8.2.2 Multiple Negation Strategy.....	219
8.3 Scope of Negation.....	222
8.4 Negation Focus Interaction.....	223
8.5 Passive Clause Information Structure.....	225
8.5.1. Types of Passive Constructions.....	228
8.5.1.1 Agentive Passive Constructions in Oromo.....	228
8.5.1.2 Agentless Passives in Oromo.....	229
8.5.2 Passive Function in Marking Information Structure.....	233
Chapter Nine: Interrogative Clause Information Structure.....	236
9.1 Interrogative Clauses Types.....	236
9.1.1 Information Question Information Structure.....	236
9.1.1.1 Information Question and Ellipsis.....	244

9.1.1.1.1 Ellipsis Types.....	247
9.1.1.1.2 Ellipsis Distribution	250
9.1.1.1.3 Information Questions and Unexpected Responses.....	252
9.1.2 Polar Question Information Structure.....	255
9.1.3 Alternative Question Information Structure	261
Chapter Ten:Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation.....	266
References.....	271

List of Abbreviations and Symbols

ABS	Absolutive	PP	Prepositional phrase
ADP	Adposition	PS	Passive
AP	Adjective phrase	PV	Perfective
CD	Communication Dynamism	Q-A	Question-answer
CM	Clause Marker	QM	Question-Marker
CNV	Converb	REL	Relative
COP	Copula	S	Subject
CAUS	Causative	TM	Topic Marker
CC	Copula complement	1S	First Singular
CS	Copula subject	1PL	First plural
DAT	Dative	2S	Second singular
F	Feminine	2PL	Second plural
FOC	Focus	3MS	Third masculine Singular
FSP	Functional Sentence Perspective	3FS	Third feminine Singular
HON	Honorific	3PL	Third Plural
IMPV	Imperative	∅	Zero morpheme
INST	Instrument	*	Ungrammatical
IPV	Imperfective	-	Affix boundary
IS	Information Structure	?	Questionable/marginal
LOC	Locative		
M	Masculine		
M	Masculine		
MD	Middle Voice		
NEG	Negative		
NOM	Nominative		
NMZR	Nominalizer		
NP	Noun phrase		

Abstract

This dissertation aims at describing and analyzing the information structure of Oromo. It focuses on how information is structured in sentential structures. The descriptive approach has been used to attain the objective of the study. The study is framed based on the theory of FSP. The data were collected from the native speakers via recording. The reliability of the data has been verified introspectively, since the researcher is a native speaker of the dialect. The data were organized, transcribed, glossed and translated. Among information structural divisions, the study was mainly limited to the description of topic-comment, given-new, background–focus information. Oromo has information status markers that show sentence topic. It marks sentence topic via converse terms and non-canonical syntax. Because the effects of IS can extend to non-canonical syntax to describe a single event in various ways. Previously known information is also encoded linguistically by definite referring expressions. Thus, IS helps the addressor to choose nouns, pronouns and other referring expressions based on the context. Besides definite expressions, linguistic and situational contexts help to encode given information. Focused information is marked by phonological, morphological, lexical or syntactic means. Focus is evident in the prosody of speech via high pitch and the effects of focus are also visible in the use of focus particles. Oromo alters its form via word order, referential form, morphological marking and prosody based on the information to be conveyed. The IS of copula, negative, passive and interrogative clauses is also described. Especially, pragmatically marked copula clauses convey various focus types based on the communicative function of focus because word order change reflects information packaging. Passivization is another pragmatically marked structure that encodes IS by demoting and promoting verb arguments. Interrogative clauses are used to bring missing information into the discourse. However, negative clauses do not bring new information into the discourse; rather they deny what has been previously stated.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. Shimelis Mazengia for his critical and insightful comments, suggestions and guidance from the inception to the completion of this dissertation. I am also indebted to him for his strong moral support and for providing me with various books, while I was working on the project.

Besides my advisor, I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to my informants: Asrat Gebeyehu, Gemechu Gebeyehu, Dereje Daba, Dereje Dagima, Tola Hunde, Takele Girma, Sintayehu Birhanu, Mengistu Gadisa and Dinaol Gadisa for their great patience and cooperation in supplying me with all the necessary data. Particularly, I would like to thank Takele and Sintayehu again for their cooperation in introducing me with different individuals, while I was looking for informants.

I also gratefully acknowledge Bahir Dar University for granting me permission and financial support to do my PhD research. I would also like to acknowledge Addis Ababa University for funding my research. My sincere thank also goes to BDU staff members: particularly, Dr. Marew Alemu, Dr. Mellese Gelane, Dr. Mesfin Wedajo, Ato Teshome Yimer, Ato Leul Tesfasilassie and Ato Abinet Solomon for providing me with books. I also wish to thank my friends Dr. Aster Mulu and w/ro Hirut Admasu for their strong moral support and sharing with me their office.

Last but not least, I am indebted to my family members for their unreserved support in different ways. The contribution of my spouse Dr. Eshetu Moges was immense in providing me with different materials and taking the lion's share concerning the family responsibilities. I am grateful to my kids, Yordanos and Amen, for their love and affection. My special thank also extends to my father, Ato Girma Beyene, as well as my sisters, brothers and relatives. Especially, I would like to thank Belaynesh Girma, Roman Hailu, Elfinesh Hailu, Wossen Hailu, Tadesse Berecha, Genet Bekele and Emebet Asnake for their strong moral support and for being by my side through thick and thin. Without their precious support, it would have been impossible for me to complete my studies.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Prelude

The central role of language is serving as a means of information exchange based on its systematic nature. Every language has utterances and sentences with diverse syntactic and information structures. Information structure can be linguistically encoded using prosody, morphology, syntax (i.e., non-canonical) or by one or more of these means based on the nature of the language. Utterances convey information accurately when they are structurally and contextually acceptable. If their structuring does not match with the information packaging required by the context, they become inappropriate in that particular context, though they are grammatically wellformed. Utterances have to be acceptable from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspectives because they can be grammatically and semantically well formed but sense problems in a particular speech context.

Utterances have both syntactic structure and information structure. However, their syntactic structure is not the concern of this work. The study focuses on their information structure based on the theory of functional sentence perspective, since this theory helps to describe the information structure of utterances. Information structure mainly deals with how a certain message can be conveyed not what to be communicated. Thus, the main focus of this study is investigating how information is structured in Oromo not on the content of utterances. It deals with how information is linguistically structured via prosody, morphology/lexical units and syntax in Oromo. Among the various pairs of information units, this work only describes how topic-comment, given-new information, and background-focus are linguistically encoded in the Oromo declarative and interrogative clauses as well as passive, negative and copula clauses are examined.

1.1 The Language and the People

Ethiopia is a heterogeneous country consisting of many languages. Ethiopian languages belong to the Semitic, Cushitic and Omotic families of the Afro-asiatic phylum and to the Nilo-Saharan phylum.

Cushitic is a diverse language family consisting of languages that are divided into four subgroups: Northern, Southern, Eastern and Central (Kawachi 2007:6). The East Cushitic subgroup is further subdivided into Highland and Lowland. Compared with the Highland East Cushitic the Lowland East Cushitic comprises more languages. Oromo, which is the focus of this study, is subsumed under the Lowland East Cushitic group. The term Oromo refers to both the language and the people in the literature. However, the speakers call their language "*Afaan Oromoo*", (literally 'mouth of Oromo'; otherwise 'the Oromo language'). Sometimes it is called '*Oromiffa*' to mean the latter. The name Oromo will be employed to refer to both the people and the language in the present study, as is commonly used in the literature.

Oromo is one of the major languages of Ethiopia and is also spoken in Kenya. It has been a vernacular language for a long time. But it has been written, since the Bible translation of the 19th century using the Ethiopic script. It has been in use for radio broadcasting, since the time of Emperor Haile Sellasie; plus, since the time of the Derg, it has been a literacy language and the news paper *Bariisaa* has been coming out in Oromo. Currently, Oromo is on TV, additionally, it is a medium of instruction at the elementary level, a subject at high school level and an area of specialization at the university level. Earlier in Ethiopic script, currently, it is a written language. It is an official language in the Oromia regional state. It serves as a language of the court, media, education and religion. It is spoken as a native tongue by a large population. According to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Population Census Commission (2008) report it is spoken by 27,158,471 Ethiopians (i.e.13, 676,159 males and 13,482,312 females). Oromo is spoken as a second language by many Ethiopians and 36.7% of the Ethiopian population is Oromo.

The language has different dialects. Fedaa (2015:3) states that dialect variation is a linguistic feature which is observed in languages and Oromo is no exception. Bender and Mulugeta (1976:130) divide Oromo dialects into Western, Central, Northern, Eastern and Southern on the basis of geographical boundary. On the other hand, Kebede (2009:1) divides Oromo dialects spoken in Ethiopia and Kenya into ten varieties: Wello, Raya, Tulama, Mecha, Arsi, Barentu, Guji, Borena, Orma and Waata. The Tulama dialect is spoken in the former Shewa province, in the vicinity of Addis Ababa and in Salale extending to Abbay River bordering Gojjam (Kebede 2009:3). However, the present study focuses on the Tulama variety spoken in North Shewa

around Derba, Gorfo and Duber areas. North Shewa is one of the zones in the Oromia regional state. It is bordered by Addis Ababa and Gojjam in the south and north, respectively. The selected study sites are located in Sululta Wereda North Shewa Zone.

Ethiopia is a multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural country. Oromo is one of these ethnic groups. It is the largest ethnic group that dwells in the Oromia regional state, other regions of Ethiopia and outside Ethiopia (e.g., Kenya). Bender and Mulugeta (1976:130) state that Oromo probably comprises the largest single tribal group in Africa. Like any other ethnic groups of Ethiopia, they are proud people bound with their language, history and traditions. They are people that have their own linguistic and cultural identity. They have oral literatures, various types of cultural foods, marriage and wearing styles through which they reflect their identity.

The Oromo people are Muslim, Orthodox, Protestant and followers of traditional beliefs. Their livelihood and economy is based on agriculture and animal husbandry. Some are also engaged in trade and government jobs.

1.2. Review of Related Literature

As the survey of the previous related studies reveals, Oromo is a fairly well-studied and documented language. Both local and foreign linguists have conducted many studies on various aspects of Oromo. There are many studies (i.e., BA senior essay, MA theses, PhD dissertations and articles) that deal with the phonological, morphological and syntactic and semantic aspects of Oromo. However, due attention has not been given to the pragmatics of the language. There are some studies that deal with some facets of focus (i.e., one of the information structure categories) and these are briefly reviewed as follows.

Gragg (1976), in his sketch grammar of Wellega Oromo, described focus briefly and identified the formatives /-uu/, /-ǽlee/, /-uma/, and /-oo/ as focus markers after nouns and pronouns. The morpheme /-ka/ and /-m/ are suffixed to predicates to mark focus. The focus marker /ka/ should be /kaa/ since the vowel should long. The focus particle is not confined only to predicate since it can be adjoined to various elements of a clause. I would also rather treat /-oo/ as the variant of the sentence topic marker /ho/ not as a focus marker. I did not come across /-m/ as a focus morpheme in my target dialect. Gragg stated that the focus morpheme /-tu/ is commonly used to

highlight any constituents of a sentence. However, the morpheme is not suffixed to any element of a sentence freely. In noun phrase with a modifier, it is suffixed to the modifying adjective or quantifier not to the head noun as illustrated below.

1. (a) *C'aalaa-tu raf- ϕ -e*
 Chala-FOC sleep-3MS-PV
 'It was Chala who slept'.

- (b) *barat-oota lamaa-tu duf- ϕ -e*
 student-PL two FOC come-3MS-PV
 'It was two students who came.'

The focus morpheme */-tu/* highlights the subject noun phrase 'Chala' in example (1a) and the noun phrase 'two students' in clause (1b). It is suffixed to the quantifier 'two' though its scope is over the whole NP. Baye identified */-tu/* as a noun focus marker. on the other hand, Gragg (1976) stated that morpheme */-tu/* can be usually used to focus on any constituent of a sentence. I partly disagree with Gragg because though the focus morpheme */-tu/* is not confined only to the subject argument it can't be suffixed to adverbs, verbs (except converbs) and elements with non subject functions at least in the Tulama dialect of Oromo. It can be suffixed to a subject constituent and converbs as illustrated below.

2. (a) *mana keessa-tu gaarii-da*
 house inside-FOC good COP
 'It is inside a house that is good.'

- (b) *ñnni mana barumsa-a deem-ee-tu hin beek- ϕ -u*
 he house education-GEN go-CNV-FOC NEG know-3MS-IPV
 'He never ever goes to school'

The focus morpheme /-tu/ is suffixed to the phrase /mana keessa/ ‘inside (a) house’ and the converb /deem-/ ‘go’ in examples (2a) and (2b). The phrase takes the focus morpheme/-tu/, since it is used as the subject of the sentence. The morpheme can not be suffixed to adverbs and postpositional phrases with adverbial functions (dealt with in chapter six of the present study). Gragg (1976) contributed to the description of Oromo focus system only by briefly describing the distribution of the aforementioned focus markers. He did not identify many focus markers especially focus particles. He also did not deal with focus types and other information units.

Owens (1985), in his grammar of Harar Oromo, only distinguished /-llee/, /-tu(u)/, /ni-/ , /-uma/, /-n/ and /-nis/ as focus markers. Possibly, the author identified /-nis/ as a focus marker wrongly. The focus marker is only /-is/. The /-n/ in /-nis/ is a nominative case marker not part of the focus morpheme, since the focus morpheme /-(i)s/ does not disallow nominative case marking at least in the dialect under investigation. However, as to his view, in order to encode focus these morphemes have to be accompanied with tone, because he believes that all affixes have a basic tone. Besides, he believes that there is a link between high tone and information prominence. The role of tone in marking focus is also highly emphasized in his work. He indicated that constituents (e.g., subject and verb) can be focused. Like Gragg (1976), Owens (1985) contributed to the study of focus marking in Oromo through distinguishing focus markers and presenting their distribution briefly.

Baye (1988) also provided a formal account of focused structures in Oromo in light of the generative framework and distinguished focus markers in relation to four word categories (i.e., noun, verb, adjective and preposition). He identified /-tu/, /hin/ and /-da/ as the focus markers of nouns, verbs and prepositional phrases, respectively. He states that adjectives are highlighted using prosodic or structural devices. However, the focus particle /-da/ cannot be used to highlight on postpositional phrases at least in the dialect under investigation. Example:

3. *C'aalaa-n ስቲክ-ገላ-ገላ-n nam-icca rukut-ፀ-e*
 Chala-NOM stick-COP-with man-SGV.ABS hit-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala hit the man with a stick.’

The particle */-da/* is used as a copular element not as a focus marker in the above example. Thus, the postpositional phrase ‘with a stick’ is unfocused or focus neutral, since the formative cannot be used to highlight a postpositional phrase. Baye (1988:365) further explained that adjectives are focused, using prosodic or syntactic devices i.e., cleft constructions. He states that clefting highlights adjectives and other word classes. He showed that in Oromo, focus can be marked using focus particles, special word ordering and prosodic features. He also briefly dealt with presentational, informative and contrastive focus. However, his study is limited only to the analysis some focus markers and the aforementioned three pragmatic functions of focus. The study does not deal with various focus particles except */hin/*. Except focus, other information units were not deal with in the study. The current study is different from baye’s study in providing a detail description of focus and other information units or IS in general in light of the theory of function sentence perspective. Baye’s article is distinct from Gragg (1976), Taha (1999) and Owen (1985) work in approaching focus markers in relation to word classes and in light of the generative framework.

Another related work is Taha (1999) BA senior essay. He is fully devoted to the analysis of focus marking and the pragmatic functions of focus in the *mec’c’a* dialect of Oromo. He states that in Oromo, focus can be marked prosodically, morphologically and syntactically. He identified */-tu/*, */-bar/*, */ hin/*, */-ra/*, */-ho/*, and */-uma/* as focus morphemes and described their distribution. However, I disagree with Taha regarding */-ra/* and */ho/* since they are not focus markers. I would rather consider the form */ho/* as a sentence topic marker not a focus marker (dealt with in chapter four of the present study). I also considered the form */-ra/* as the cliticized form of the verb */jir-/* ‘exist’ not a focus marker as illustrated below. The clitic form of the auxiliary verb is given in brackets in the next example.

4. *ānni mana barumsa-a deem-ee jir-ø-a [-ra]*
 he house education-GEN go-CNV exist-3MS-PV
 ‘He has gone to school.’

Taha (1999) also attempts to describe how focus is marked phonologically via stress and pause and syntactically via word order change. However, the current study shows that Oromo, at least

the dialect under investigation does not employ stress to encode focus instead it uses high pitch, since it is a pitch-accent language. Besides, he presents various types of focus functions such as: completive, replacing, expanding, restricting, selecting and parallel. Besides focus, Taha did not deal with other informational units at all.

Griefenow-Mewis (2001) also identified /-tu/, /-uma/ and /-ni/ as focus markers and briefly presents their distribution. The author also distinguished -llee/ǎllee, -mmoo/ǎmmo, /-oo/-woo/-hoo/ and /jjuu/ǎjjuu) as emphatic particles. As already stated, I would rather consider the alternative particles -oo/-woo/-hoo as sentence topic markers not as focus markers. Griefenow-Mewis (2001) is limited to identifying and exemplifying the distribution of focus markers like Gragg (1976) and Owens (1985) since they are general works.

Dabala and Meyer (2003) investigated focus on the Mec'c'a dialect of wellaga Oromo and identified /-tu/, /-n/, /hin/, /-ti/ and /-da/ as focus markers. They considered /-tu/ and /-da/ as contrastive focus markers and /-n/ as a contrastive or assertive focus marker based on the context. They state that focus can be encoded by syntactic structures like cleft construction. They briefly described focus marking in declarative and interrogative sentences.

Another general work that deals with focus to some degree is Crass *et al.* (2004) study. Crass *et al.* (2004) studied the general overview of the types of copula and focus constructions of six selected Ethiopian languages: Ge'ez, Tigrigna, Wellega Oromo, K'beena, Zay and Silt'e. They dealt with copula and focus in Oromo briefly and identified /-da/ and /-i/ as positive copulas and /miti/ as a negative copula without giving a detailed description of focus marking and focus types. The aforementioned work is a typological study involving a number of languages in its data unlike the present one. The copular element /-da/ is identified in Debela and Meyer (2003) as focus marker. Thus, Oromo copula is suppletive, since the positive and negative copulas are totally different in relation to their phonetic shape. They identified morpheme /-tu/, /-da/, /-i/ and /miti/ as copula elements and exemplified their distribution shortly.

In general, Baye (1988), Taha (1999) and Dabala and Meyer (2003) are quite similar in dealing with focus markers and various pragmatic functions of focus in the mec'c'a dialect of Oromo.

However, Taha (1999) gave a detailed analysis of focus types based on its pragmatic functions than others. On the other hand, Gragg (1976), Owens (1985), Griefenow-Mewis (2001) and Crass et al. (2004) mainly focused on distinguishing focus markers and briefly describing their distribution. The pragmatic functions of focus have not been treated in their studies. Almost all of the above works are based on the Mec'c'a variety of Oromo unlike the current one. None of them focus on the Tulama variety of Oromo. The earlier studies and the present one are similar in dealing with focus encoding. However, unlike the previous studies, the present one is not limited to the description of focus alone. Of course, particularly, except, Taha (1999), Baye (1988), Dabala and Meyer (2003) the rest of the previous authors deal with various issues which are not related to the present study, besides focus. Hence, they are not fully devoted to focus. The earlier studies and the present one are distinct in their scope; because a number of issues related to focus in particular and IS in general were not treated in the previous studies. None of them gave a detailed description of some focus markers at length especially focus particles. They did not deal with complex focusing, iterative use of focus markers, highlighting more than one elements per clause and focusing on a single element of a clause using more than one focus markers. In a nutshell, none of the earlier studies addressed the issue of information structure in light of the theory of functional sentence perspective. Thus, the previous studies and the present one are distinct in their scope and objectives. Most of the previous studies aim only at identifying some focus markers and describing their distributions while the present study goes beyond distinguishing focus markers since it aims at analyzing the IS of Oromo sentential structures.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

As indicated above, the phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects of Oromo have received considerable attention from various linguists. There are also some works on some aspects of focus. However, the semantics and pragmatics of the language are under-researched except for Debela (2011) as well as Alemu (2013), Teshome (2013) and Zeleke (2013) studies. Debela studied the semantic aspect of Oromo frontal adpositions, while the rest aforementioned three scholars focused on discourse analysis.

To my knowledge, the information structure of Oromo, within the domain of pragmatics is almost an untouched. Thus, the present study investigates the information structure of Oromo sentences based on the Tulama variety, the dialect which has not been given due attention by

researchers, unlike the Western and Eastern varieties of Oromo. The study attempts to answer the following key research questions.

1. How topic-comment, given-new and background-focus are linked with syntax-proposition?
2. What are the occurrences and functions of the focus markers?
3. What characteristic features of information structure are observed vis-à-vis modalities?
4. What systems are observed in the information packaging?

Based on these basic research questions the following objectives are designed.

1.4 Objective

The main objective of this study is to provide a detailed description of how Oromo packages information in sentential structures. To realize the general objective, the study has the following specific objectives:

1. To investigate how information categories are encoded and structured in a sentence.
2. To identify types of topic, given, focus or new information realized in sentences.
3. To analyze the characteristic features and functions of modality in information packaging.
4. To determine the systems employed in information structuring.

1.5 Significance

This study is assumed to have the following significance.

1. It contributes to our knowledge of the pragmatic aspect of Oromo, particularly, with respect to information structure.
2. It contributes to the documentation of Oromo.
3. It serves as an input for the production of Oromo teaching materials.
4. It could motivate researchers to take up the topic of information structure in relation to the other Cushitic and also the rest of Ethiopian languages.

1.6 Delimitation

This study is concerned with the description of ways of information structuring in Oromo. The analysis was mainly devoted to the information structure of simple declarative and interrogative sentences. However, the structures used as data are drawn from recorded oral text. The study depends on speech language or utterance. Furthermore, discourse (i.e., text dialogue) level phenomenon was taken into account when required for the description of sentences. However, discourse level phenomenon such as discourse topic and thematic progression and so forth. are not described, since they are part of discourse structure not IS. Because IS is dealt with the organization of a sentence within the discourse, not with the organization of the discourse itself. The term discourse is used in this work as language beyond the sentence (Yule, 2010:142).

The work was mainly confined to the description of topic-comment, given-new and focus-background expression of information structure in Oromo due to, the overlapping realized among information units and, since they are considered as “common pairs of dimensions of information structure.” The terminologies used to describe IS are also varied and under-formalized. Saeed (1982:19) states that standard set of descriptive terms are lacking. Among the aforementioned information units the study mainly focuses on those which are linguistically marked in some way.

The study was limited to the Tulama variety of Oromo spoken in North Shewa, particularly around Duber. The variety spoken in this area was selected, since it is considered relatively less influenced by the Mec’c’a variety of Oromo and Amharic, compared with the Tulama variety spoken in the nearby areas of Addis Ababa. Besides, the variety is chosen, since the researcher herself is the speaker of the dialect and this helps her to collect data with ease.

1.7 Research Methodology and Procedures

Qualitative description was used based on lexical, phrasal, sentential and textual data. The work relies on fieldwork to obtain authentic primary data. The first fieldwork was carried out from December 2016 to February 2017 and the second one is in May 2017-June 2017. Adult Oromo speakers were selected as informants from both genders. All the informants were residents of the study area and were selected using purposive sampling method based on their communicative competence. Both literate and illiterate adult Oromo speakers 25 to 80 years of age participated as informants in the study. Mainly youngsters participated, since the speech of elders is highly

influenced by Amharic. However, the Tulama dialect of Oromo is changing rapidly due to the influence of the Mac'c'a variety in various ways.

The collected primary data were preferred, since they show the true features of the dialect and written data could, in some cases, hide the characteristics of the dialect. In fact, the available written materials in Oromo are in the orthography that is considered to be in the process of standardization in the attempt to represent all the dialects of the language. In general, written Oromo texts were not used. Data were collected through recording. The data were mainly obtained from the discussion extensively held with the speakers of the dialect.

For data collection, a Digital Audiotape was used. To record the text, small group discussion was mainly used as a primary tool to collect the data. The recorded texts include sentences, mini dialogues or conversations and question-answer congruence. The accuracy of the collected data was repeatedly checked with the informants and via introspective method.

The data extracted from the oral texts based on the objectives of the study were systematically organized and presented using nearly phonemic transcription by using IPA symbols (consonant gemination and vowel length are indicated via doubling the respective letter symbol), glossed, translated and analyzed. High pitch is however not marked in the transcription. Words focused with high pitch are written in bold in order to distinguish them from unfocused words.

Chapter Two

Conceptual Framework

The theory of functional sentence perspective is followed in this study. A descriptive approach is chiefly used to analyze how utterances are structured to communicate information in Oromo. In this subsection, some basic concepts that have relevance for framing the descriptive approach of the dissertation are briefly surveyed.

2.1 Information Structure

Lambrecht (1994:2) states that information packaging (Chafe 1976), information structure or theme (Halliday 1967) functional sentence perspective (Prague School of Linguistics) and discourse pragmatics or most recently Informatics (Vallduví 1990) are among the labels used to denote the same concept by various scholars. Trask (2007:102) says that examining sentences and utterances in terms of their information structure was instituted by the Prague school linguists, particularly by the Czech Vilém Mathesius, under the label “Functional Sentence Perspective” at the very beginning of the 20th century. Functional sentence perspectivists divide utterances into two portions (i.e., theme-rheme) having a function in the communication process. Halliday (1967, 1968) disseminated the Praguean ideas of IS in the wider linguistic community. He devised the term IS, modified and refined the notion of theme and rheme. According to him, IS is a component of grammar different from syntax and semantics, but interacts with them in various ways (Matić, 2015:97). NewMark (1988:61) states that FSP treats the arrangement of the constituents of an utterance in relation to its linguistic, situational and cultural context. Matić (2015:95) defines IS as “a subfield of linguistic research dealing with the ways speakers encode instructions to the hearer on how to process the message relative to their temporary mental states.” It is linked with utterance structures. Because it is primarily dealt with how the speaker organizes an utterance in a certain communicative context in order to enhance communication. In short, IS is concerned with how a message is sent, rather than what the message is about. The question of how information is structured in a sentence is a crucial issue for communication. Lambrecht (1994:7) also denotes that information structure does not deal with the structure of discourse, but with the systematic arrangement of the clause within a discourse. It is usually concerned with the question of how and specifically in what order the addressor prefers to

present the information of a clause. It belongs to sentence grammar (i.e., part of linguistic structure). IS mainly focuses on sentence structure than discourse structure though it may go beyond sentence structure. That means that the logical arrangement of paragraphs in a text, or of turn-taking in a conversation are irrelevant to the study of IS, except in cases where the context affects the structure of the sentence. Lambrecht (1994:3) also states that IS is a component of grammar particularly sentence grammar. IS has structural and functional or semantic aspects. As Cruse (2011:389) describes IS does not deal with the content of utterances as such instead it deals with how a certain piece of information can be packaged linguistically and how certain ways of information structuring are suitable in various discourse contexts. Krifka and Musan (2012:30) also state that the languages of the world vary concerning the linguistic ways they use to encode particular information units or structural categories. They say that the inventory of linguistic devices used to encode IS are numerous; languages apply various morphological, lexical, syntactic as well as prosodic devices though they are often optional.

A sentence is a string of words with linear and interpretive arrangements. Linear and interpretive arrangements refer to grammatical (syntactic structure) and information structure, respectively. The two types of arrangements of sentence may, but need not, coincide. Distinct syntactic structures can be used to convey the same information from various perspectives. This reveals that IS and syntactic structure can operate under different circumstances (Fribas, 1992:12-16).

Based on syntactic structure, sentences are categorized into subject and predicate, whereas based on information structure they are usually divided into information units such as: given/new, topic/comment, or focus/background. Theories of IS proposed a myriad of terminological pairs to designate information units and each of them is defined variously. Finegan (2008) also states that the literature on information structure encompasses a plethora of words that overlap but are applied in various and conflicting ways. Because the terms used for naming the information units are not as such universal or standardized. The definitions given for various information units are chiefly incompatible in various works (i.e., accepted definitions are lacking).

Halliday and Hasan (1976:27) state that IS involves organizing texts independently of their syntactic structures into units of information based on given/new distinctions. Trask (2007:102)

states that instead of given/new, Mathesius used the terms theme/rheme, and these terms are also currently used particularly by the advocates of Systemic Linguistics. Still other linguists favor to use the terms topic/comment in the same sense. The literature shows that various linguists use different pair of terms such as: old/new, given/new, topic/comment, theme/rheme, presupposition/assertion, psychological subject/psychological predicate, background/foreground or focus, to refer to information units. The definitions of these information units are highly inconsistent in the literature. Payne (1997:267) points out that various terms are commonly applied to refer to a single pragmatic status. For example, early Prague school linguists used the terms rheme, assertion and new information in place of focus.

Language has many functions because people communicate for various reasons. It is used for conveying message, requesting information, requesting and ordering actions, maintaining social relationships and many other functions. Human languages are also structured in a way that shows the content and purpose of utterances that is, the information which is conveyed via words and structures that make up the utterances (Foley and Van Valin, 1985: 282, and Kim *et al.* 2013:403).

Hadian *et al.* (2013:24) define IS as the organization and arrangement of sentences in which the addressor states his/her message in a sequence of information units. This facilitates the understanding of speech easier and shows which segment of the message is the most useful. As Halliday (1967:200) explains the addressor is forced to chunk his speech into information units and to present his message in a series of packages. However, he is free to determine the beginning and end of each information unit.

2.2 Information Units

Utterances are analyzed based on information units. Information structure contains various sub-domains or information units. Information unit is what the speaker selects to encode as a unit of discourse (Halliday, 1967:202). Based on their function, information structure is divided into information units: given/new, topic/comment, etc. These terms are called pragmatic statuses (Payne, 1997:261) and also pragmatic or discourse roles (Burling, 1992:246). Thus, pragmatic statuses, information units, pragmatic roles and discourse roles are terms used to refer to the same notions by different scholars.

The information structure of utterances can be divided into information units using bipartite or tripartite division. The bipartite and tripartite divisions of IS into information units was introduced by Prague school linguists particularly by Czech Vilem Mathesius and Vallduví (1993), respectively. Halliday (1967, 1985), Tomioka (2007) and several scholars employ bipartite division (e.g., theme/rheme, topic/comment or given/new) of IS, whereas the tripartite division of information units is also used by Vallduví and others. The trinomial division of IS comprises focus/new, link and tail. Vallduví states that background information subsumes link and tail. Link is a topic like constituent, which appears in clause initial position. The theorists do not agree on the number of parts a clause should be segmented into, what the units should be called, and regarding the purposes of the parts. This study adopts the twin dichotomy, since it is widely used and embodies the tripartite division. Tomioka (2007:99) says that the basic concepts usually mentioned in relation to IS are essentially bipartite.

2.2.1 Topic/Comment

Topic-comment structure is a universal and unique feature of human language, not realized in animal communication (Krifka, 2006:1). Comment is the complementary notion of topic. Usually, the speaker introduces a topic and then states something about it in a topic-comment structure. Comment is what is predicated about the topic. As to Kim (2008:10) and Burling (1992:246), from a discourse-pragmatic perspective, topic and comment convey old and new information, respectively. Burling (1992:246) states that topic is what the addressor presents a comment about. Radford *et al.* (2007:39) denote that the notion of old information is closely related to the notion of topic and topic can be implicitly or explicitly encoded. Topic can be a sentence- or discourse-level category. Discourse topic expresses what a discourse is about. Reinhart (1981:54) indicates that discourse topic is realized in larger units (i.e., text) and can be more abstract but not inevitably. Discourse topics deal with what the whole discourse is about. They may not be equated with the subject of the sentence or given information, since they are usually different from subject.

Sentence topic can be called linguistic or local topic. Crystal (2008:488) defines sentence topic as what is predicated about a person or thing mentioned in the sentence. Nikolaeva and Dalrymple (2011:48) also state that topic usually refers to an element of sentence grammar, rather than a discourse level notion. Thus, sentence topics have a direct grammatical manifestation and

interrelated with the main reference entities referred to in the sentences or utterances of the addressor which has to be coherent and will have to be associated in a certain means to higher levels of topicality of discourse as a whole. They are very relevant to the study of grammar, because they are areas in which discourse interfaces with pragmatic grammar. In this study, only sentence topic is dealt with because discourse topic is beyond the scope of the study.

2.2.2 Given/New

The Theory of FSP is dependent upon the idea that separate elements of an utterance do not equally contribute to the development of communicative process. This shows that, all pragmatic roles do not equally contribute for the advancement of communication dynamism (Firbas, 1992:8). Within a sentence, elements differ from each other in their degree of CD. For example, new information contributes more than old information for the advancement of communication dynamism (CD) and their role is also different. Even interlocutors do not pay equal attention for all pragmatic roles.

According to linguists of Prague School (e.g., Mathesisus), all sentences comprise two segments: the part that refers to what the hearer/reader is assumed to already know and the part that conveys novel information. However, some sentences may contain totally new ideas (Payne, 1997:267). The given-new division serves on the premise that every clause consists of some material that is familiar to the addressee that is, 'given' and some material that is unfamiliar, 'new.' The given and new portions of the clause are labeled as speaker oriented and hearer oriented, respectively. Given refers to the part of an utterance which is already in the forefront of the listener's mind, while new represents the main contribution of the utterance (Donnelly, 1994:77-78). The way in which languages allow their speakers to identify 'old' and 'new' information is an aspect of pragmatics that has received a special attention (Burling, 1992:246). Given information is treated by an addressor as recoverable either endophorically or exophorically. Burling (1992:246) states that old or given information is put into the background and the new one is focused. Given information is always required to create context for the novel one and is usually put into the background so that the new information will be clearly presented. It is necessary to identify retrievable and irretrievable information in a sentence. As already stated, irretrievable information contributes more to the development of communication (Firbas, 1992:6). It contributes more to the development of communication dynamism (i.e., for the

discourse or hearers), since it is an informative part of a clause. Thus, given and new refer to the less informative and the more informative part of a clause, respectively.

Given and new information can be identified in various ways. Halliday (1985:277) indicates that what is treated as old may be so because it has been mentioned previously; but this is not the only means. It may be something that is in the situation like I and you; or in the air, so to speak; or something that is not around at all but that the speaker wants to present as given for rhetorical purposes. Likewise, what is considered as irretrievable may be something that has not been mentioned; but it may be something unexpected, whether it is previously mentioned or not. Donnelly (1994:77-78) explains that if an addressor intends to notice the given/new contrast to maintain coherence, topic can be encoded by repeating words, employing pronouns and words related in meaning (i.e., synonyms). According to Cruttenden (1986:89), old information can be shown via linguistic elements and physical or situational context and is usually encoded via verbatim repetition. Payne (1997:263) indicates that some noun phrases stand for things that the sender supposes has to be distinguished by the receiver of the message. Payne states that nouns can be specified in various ways: via using proper nouns and definite articles. Usually, a noun can be identified by its correlation with some previously identified noun phrases (e.g., Mary's husband). The referent of the noun 'husband' is specified by the inherently definite noun 'Mary' in this noun phrase, since NPs that are owned by differentiable NPs are definite.

A noun is encoded as definite when the speaker presupposes the addressee can uniquely identify its referent; otherwise it is identified as indefinite (Cheng, 2012:496). Pronouns and proper nouns are good examples of definite NPs. The referents of indefinite NPs are usually generic or new. Definite NPs are usually used to mark new while indefinite NPs encode given information. Firbas (1992:21) shows that information encoded by a definite article cannot be always regarded as given from the FSP viewpoint. Burling (1992:247) says that a definite article does not always indicate that something has already been explicitly mentioned but it does suggest that it can be readily identified (e.g., look at the cow grazing over there.). Burling states that previously mentioned, visible or audible and unique (i.e., the only one of its kind) entities (e.g., earth, sun, etc.) are definite. Payne (1987:791) says unique things are specific (definite), since their uniqueness permits immediate identification, though they have not been previously mentioned or implied.

Halliday (1985:277) also says that there are many elements in languages that are inherently 'given'. These elements are not interpretable without referring to some previously mentioned entities or some features of the situation: anaphoric expressions and deictic forms convey given information. Anaphoric expressions stand for entities mentioned previously, while deictic forms are terms which are interpreted by referring to the 'here and now' of the discourse. Example:

5. (a) She was born here.
- (b) I lived here, in Addis Ababa.

The word 'here' is used as deictic expression in this example. Deictic expressions like personal pronouns (usually first and second persons) and demonstrative pronouns can be used to mark given information. Radford *et al.* (2007:389) consider tense as deictic form, since its interpretation is sensitive to the context of utterance. For instance, the sentence 'kasa is reading a book.' can be interpreted only based on the deictic center of time or utterance time. In other words, kasa has to read the book at the time of utterance for the clause to be true. Yule (1996a:129) shows that deictic expressions cannot be interpreted unless the physical context of the speaker (i.e., the deictic center of person, time, and place) is specified and they do not carry new information except contrastive focus. Nouns specified by deictic words and proper nouns are definite and hence convey contextually recoverable information. Context is very vital for effective oral communication. The context can be linguistic, situational, experiential or epistemic context. Andrews (2007:132) also says language is used not only to depict the world, but also to communicate in it. Speakers are also the part of the world they talk about. Thus, there is an additional aspect of meaning, concerning more than just what a sentence is about (i.e., semantic meaning), which contributes to determining when it may be used. This aspect of meaning, is called pragmatics, involves such things as the hearer's presumed ignorance or knowledge of various features of the situation being talked about, the presumed spatial and social relationships between the speaker and the hearer, what the speaker thinks the hearer might be attending to, what the speaker wants the hearer to take special notice of and so forth.

2.2.3 Focus/Background

The IS of a sentence commonly comprises of two parts: one less informative part that relates the sentence to the preceding discourse (i.e., given, old, presupposed information). In fact focus-

background and given-newness cannot be reduced just to one opposition as these pairs of notions are only partially overlapping. For example, given expressions, like pronouns, can be focused usually to denote contrastive focus. New information is said to be focal not in the sense that it cannot have been previously mentioned, although it is often the case that it has not been, but in the sense that the speaker/addressor presents it as non recoverable from the preceding discourse. Mutually known information can encompass a social or cultural background, a linguistic or environmental domain, and expectations about the course of the conversation.

Focus is unshared knowledge, while background refers to the shared knowledge/belief of the interlocutors. Cheng (2012:495) says given information more or less correlates with presupposition, while focus correlates with assertion, but new information does not always correlate only with the focused element. Background/presupposition is the out of focus part, while foreground/focus refers to the in-focus part. Krifka (2006:1) states that focus/background structure is a universal and unique feature of human language. Lambrecht (1994:390-391) states focus is the part of the clause which is essential to the ability of the clause to convey a piece of novel information to the addressee, which the addressor assumes the addressee is unfamiliar with. Focus stands for singling out a particular element of a structure as conveying the most significant novel information.

Information structure can be studied by focusing on question-answer pairs under the assumption that questions direct the conversation and give context for the answers. Bender and Song (2012:332) state that content questions are used as a means to probe focus interpretation and marking. The element analogous to the question word in the answer bears focus. Some syntactic forms are overt markers of focus: for example, content questions normally target the so called narrow focus. Payne (1997:267) says that one means for identifying the focus of a sentence is to assume the sentence as a response for a content question. The focus is the part of the answer that fills in the information requested by the information question. According to Radford *et al.* (2007:389-390), given and new information can be contrasted by using the traditional device of question-answer dialogue, sometimes called the "commutation test". Q-A pair test is particularly helpful for illustrating focus distinctions (i.e. as a diagnostic for focus), since the nature of question forces the addressor (assuming he/she is being cooperative) to identify a certain part of

his response as focus (Comrie, 1989:63). In the next example, the focus conflates with the question word 'who'.

6. (a) Who killed the lion?
- (b) Kasa killed it.

In this example, the questioned word corresponds to the focused element. Except the question word 'who' the entire VP presents background information, while the noun 'kasa' carries the focus to complete the information gap realized in the interrogative clause. Thus, the focus coincides with a single element. However, it can also conflate with a configuration of elements. Hence, pragmatic roles, like focus can be a noun phrase, verb phrase or the entire clause. Thus, the above question-answer congruence helps to identify given and new information. The response clause shows how the focused element correlates with the question word-phrase in the interrogative clause. The Q-A sequence shows how the focus of a clause determines its felicity conditions, or indicates which question it replies.

Focus can be categorized into various types based on its domain and pragmatic/communicative functions. Payne (1997:268) describes that focus domain refers to the scope of focus and the chief difference in the typology of marked focus falls under the heading of 'scope of focus.' Payne states that the scope of focus of a clause is either the truth value (i.e., the status of a sentence as true or false) of the entire clause or a constituent of the clause. Either the entire clause (i.e., whole clause focus) or a particular phrasal constituent predicate or argument (e.g., subject, object, or predicate) of a clause can be in the scope of focus. Thus, based on scope, focus can be divided into polar focus or truth value focus and constituent focus. Based on the same parameter, Lambrecht (2000:611) divides focus structure into argument focus, predicate focus and sentence focus. It can also be categorized into narrow and broad/wide focus based on the same parameter (Rooth, 2007:59). Focus may range from having narrow scope over a single constituent or having broad scope over the entire sentence. Narrow or constituent focus includes verb focus and argument focus. Narrow focus extends only over a single element such as NP or PP in focus. Both core and non core arguments can be subject to narrow focus. On the other hand, broad or wide focus comprises predicate focus and sentence focus. Rooth (2007:59)

defines broad focus as a focus on a relatively large phrase (e.g., verb phrase) comprising more than one or several elements. Hence, broad focus differs from a constituent focus. Predicate focus extends over more than an element, since it belongs to broad focus. Lambrecht (2000:615) defines predicate focus as a structure encoding a pragmatically constructed proposition in which the subject is a topic and the VP presents non-given information concerning the sentence topic. Sentence focus is a subtype of broad focus. It can be termed presentational, all-new, all-focus orthetic. Lambrecht (2000:617) says in sentence focus the whole clause is highlighted (i.e., the focus center extends over the whole clause and as a result a presupposition is lacking). Thus, the scope of focus is not solely limited to noun phrases, prepositional phrases or verbs because it can extend to predicates or the whole clauses. In short, the scope of focus shows either the focus is assigned to the entire clause or only to a particular element or part of a clause. This shows that the size of material to be focused has an upper limit. According to Andrews (2007:150),thetic articulation lacks topic expression (i.e., visible element or a word or phrase) not a topic entity (i.e., the referent). In some languages, it is usual for clauses with a topic entity to possess no topic expression, since topic entity and topic expression are distinct. Lambrecht (1994:14) explains that ‘the communicative function of sentence-focus structure is either to introduce a new discourse referent or to announce an event involving a new discourse referent.’ Sentence foci chiefly come at the beginning of narratives. It can be identified as a target of content questions like predicate focus and narrow focus.

The scope of focus is also related to focus domain. Lambrecht (1994) divides focus domain into potential and actual. In some works, potential and actual focus are called focus domain and focus center, respectively. The actual focus domain is the part of the clause which is actually in focus in a given context. Lambrecht (1994) refers to it simply as the ‘focus center’. The potential focus domain is the syntactic constituent (i.e., the part of the clause or the entire syntactic domain) in which focused element may appear in, while the actual focus domain is the part of the clause that is actually in focus in a given clause (Hooshmand and Rezai, 2012:131). Focus domains are necessarily phrasal not lexical categories, since entities and state of affairs are syntactically expressed in phrasal categories (Lambrecht, 1994:215).

Focus can be typologized into various types based on its semantic-pragmatic/communicative functions or the purposes of the highlighted element in the discourse. For example Vermeulen *et al.* (2009:1) divide it into information focus and contrastive focus. The aim of the focused constituent may thus be presentational; informative or completeive; or contrastive (Culicover and Rochemont, 1983; Dik *et al.* 1981 as cited in Ansha, 2014:162). Focus has the pragmatic functions of filling an information gap (completeive/assertive focus), rejecting, replacing, expanding, restricting and selecting information. Contrastive focus is sometimes called selective or identificational focus as to (Valle, 2014:56 and Kiss, 1998:245), respectively. In short, focus has various purposes. Thus, addressors usually use it to highlight information, to introduce novel information, to reintroduce the information that has already been mentioned but dropped, and to shift the listener's attention to another topic of conversation or to highlight a piece of information.

Payne (1997:269) explains that if the scope of focus of a certain sentence is an element, then the type of focus can be assertive, counter-presuppositional, exclusive (contrastive) or exhaustive listing. von Heusinger (1999:96) also says that on the basis of the embedding context, Culicover and Rochemont (1983:152) divide focus at least into contrastive, informational and presentational in natural language, while Vermeulen *et al.* (2009:1) divide it into informative and contrastive focus. According to Dabala and Meyer (2003:164), the distinction between informative and contrastive focus in terms of the background knowledge presupposed between the addressor and the addressee. Contrastive focus is involved when the addressor wants to correct the presupposed background knowledge of the addressee. In contrast, informative focus asserts part of an utterance without presupposing any background knowledge. In information focus, entities are introduced for the first time and they are entirely new, whereas in contrastive focus, they are already introduced overtly or covertly in the discourse context.

All languages have negation, since it is widely used in everyday language or communication to deny what has been formerly conveyed. It is always the case that statements are affirmative by default. Locke and Angela (2006:44) denote that 'negating and questioning are basic human needs, which are encoded grammatically by negation and by interrogative, respectively'. Negation reverses the truth value of an utterance or changes the polarity of the utterance. Payne

(1997:282) points out that negative sentences are used to assert that some event, situation, or state of affairs does not hold or occur. Negative sentences are virtually used in the context of some presupposition, serving to negate or counter-assert that presupposition.

In Oromo, negation interacts with focus. As cited in Miestamo (2007:566), Dahl (1979) identifies two means in which languages may associate focus and negation. These are focus-dependent and verb dependent negative placement. In the first means, the negator is situated in front of the focused element; whereas in the later, the negator is always placed in relation to the verb and focus needs to be marked in other ways. Payne (1985:232-3) notes that in some languages the association of negation and focus is made by regular syntactic means of focusing (clefting as realized in English, but some languages show special devices for linking negation and focus). Payne mentions two means in which languages may link negation and focus. These are focus-dependent or related to negative placement and verb dependent or related to negative placement as in German and special negative forms linked with elements focused by fronting for example as the case in Welsh and Yoruba.

2.3. Means of Information structuring

Clauses are usually divided into information units and the contrast between the information units can be encoded linguistically in various ways. The need to signal information structuring is a universal feature of human language, but the linguistic means to do so vary widely across the languages of the world (Cheng, 2012:492). IS can be encoded lexically, morphologically and syntactically. Payne (1997:271) states that pragmatic statuses can be marked by intonation, word order, morphosyntactic operators (affixes or particles) and various cleft constructions. IS intervenes with all meaning-bearing levels of the grammatical system (Lambrecht, 1994:6).

2.3.1 Phonological

IS can be encoded phonologically through prosodic features. Prosodic features include suprasegmental features such as tone, pitch, intonation and so forth. Hadian *et al.* (2013:24) shows that phonetic parameters like: pitch-accent, deaccentuation and short pause are commonly used for packaging information in sentences. Payne (1997:271) says that possibly the most regular means of adjusting the pragmatic status of a certain piece of information is intonation.

For instance, a speaker draws special attention to parts of utterances by pronouncing those elements more loudly and/or at a higher pitch.

Thus, beyond segmental features, utterance can contain suprasegmental features. Utterance conveys much more than just the information that is lexically encoded in the words. Prosodic features may add other purposes to the basic meaning of the utterance. For instance, intonational patterns may affect the interpretation of the utterance. von Heusinger (1999:3) says that intonation and information structure are mainly interrelated in one way or the other. The way a particular intonation contour is used with reference to the purpose or the meaning of a clause or more precisely to its informational organization, which is also known under the term information packaging. Information can be structured phonologically in distinct ways. Prosodic features such as: intonation, pause, high pitch, and tone usually play a major role in focus marking. Intonation has also structural function and this function signals the grammatical or structural role of an utterance, deciding, for instance, whether the utterance is a declarative, a question, a request or an instruction. Vocalizations (i.e., loudness, whisper, scream and slow or fast speeches) are used to convey different information in various contexts in the language. As cited in Taha (1999:36), Dik (1981:42) states that prosodic features (e.g., intonation prominence, stress, high tone, and emphatic accent) are used as the focalizing devices of linguistic expressions.

Morphological or particle focusing can be syntax or pragmatic controlled. Meyer and Dabala (2003:164-165) suggest that focus marking is sometimes described as a process operating only on the pragmatic level of grammar, though it may possess morpho-syntactic properties. In pragmatically controlled focus system, the addressor is free to select among various highlighted and non-highlighted elements or no focus phrase altogether, based upon the discourse situation. In a syntax-controlled focus system, the addressor must focus on one of the phrasal elements to construct a finite clause. The addressor is merely free to determine which specific element of a clause is to be focused. Meyer and Dabala (2003, 164-165) subsume the wellega dialect of Oromo under the group of dialects or languages where focus marking and morphosyntax correlate. Hence, two types of focus markers must be identified in the dialect: primarily syntax-controlled focus markers and focus markers which function only on the pragmatic level.

As cited in Meyer and Dabala (2003:170), Sasse (1981:209) states that one typical feature of the Cushitic languages is mandatory syntax-controlled focus system. However, they argue that on a synchronic level, this does not seem to be fully applicable to the Wellega variety of Oromo. This also holds for the Tulama dialect of Oromo, since the distribution of all focus markers is not controlled by syntax and in fact, this argument is entirely based on synchronic data.

2.3.2 Morphological

Information can be packaged morphologically via affixes, particles, and various deictic terms. Besides prosodic features, Oromo chiefly employs various special affixes and particles to mark focus. Definite referring expressions such as: deictic expressions and proper nouns are employed for encoding given information in Oromo. Akmajian *et al.* (2010:250) express that the term deictic originates from the Greek word for indicating, and the idea is that deictic forms get their referents like pointers, that is, in virtue of some relation to the context of utterance. In this, they are unlike names which are given to persons, places, and things and unlike definite description (definite article plus noun) which refer by describing their referents. Cruse (2011) shows that definite expressions include: NP with definite determiners (e.g., the boy, this girl, my father so forth.), personal pronouns, proper nouns, certain locative adverbs (e.g., yonder, here, etc.), temporal adverbs (e.g., now, then, next Easter and so forth.) and certain verb tenses (e.g., go and come, etc).

2.3.3 Lexical

The term lexical refers to the words or vocabulary of a language that can be subsumed under various word classes. Information structure can be packaged lexically. Topic can be marked lexically using converse nouns and verbs. For instance, many languages have more than one predicate to describe a given state, event or action (e.g., (a) Kasa bought a goat from Aster and (b) Aster sold a goat to Kasa. These sentences are structured distinctly around the converse verbs “bought” and “sold”. The information packaging differences rely on the lexical selection of the predicate (Foley and Van Valin, 1985:294). This means of information packaging is widely used in Oromo.

2.3.4 Syntactic

Syntax plays a great role in structuring information. Finegan (2008:270) states that syntax has to encode information structure. It can be used to encode semantic information (the semantic role of

a noun phrase) and pragmatic information (the relative importance of noun phrases in a discourse). Thus, it should help to distinguish various semantic roles and information units. Lambrecht (1994:16) says that sentences without morphosyntactic and phological structure are missing. In the same way, there are no sentences without information structures. Information structure can be encoded syntactically (Foley and Van Valin, 1985:284). Thus, basic word order change, cleft constructions (i.e. it cleft and wh-cleft) and other types of special constructions can encode information structure syntactically. Locke and Angela (2006:250) explain that the main discourse function of simple cleft (it-cleft) is marking contrastive focus covertly. The term simple cleft is used in place of it cleft in this study, since Oromo lacks the impersonal pronoun ‘it’. The term pseudo-cleft or wh-cleft stands for a clause which is similar with it-cleft in that a single clause is split into two parts, each having its own verb, but with the basic variation that the subject is a free-standing wh-clause (for English) (Crystal, 2008:395). Clefts are sentences with specialized syntactic structures (or marked word order patterns). Dĕkány (2010:40-41) states that the commonest categorization, and the one which is widely accepted by all researchers, is that between it-clefts (also called simple clefts) and wh-clefts (or pseudo-clefts). Cleft clauses do not contain a single clause type: they are divided into subgroups based on their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties (Locke and Angela, 2006:24).

Focus can be marked syntactically via cleft constructions in Oromo. Cleft constructions set off a discourse prominent element structurally from the remaining part of the clause. Payne (1997:268) shows that clauses can be “focused” or “focus neutral”. Clauses having “focused” or have a “focused constituent” are pragmatically marked. Payne (1997:262) denotes that languages usually mark diverse pragmatic roles via special morpho-syntactic operators. Some of such elements are often called ‘focus or emphatic device’.

Besides cleft constructions, sentence topic can be commonly marked syntactically by word order change, topicalization and dislocations (e.g., Oromo). Reinhart (1981:53) explains that the topic of a certain sentence is identified by the context of utterance and linguistic structure. Foley and Van Valin (1985:340) say that sentence topic usually overlaps with the subject of the sentence. Topic can be marked syntactically via special constituent orders. The word order pattern of a sentence is described by referring to syntactic categories like subject, object and verb and this

word order is not arranged as a simple list. Rather, words cluster together to form groups of various sizes called constituents. The word order patterns of languages cannot be described adequately without referring to constituents (Kroeger, 2005:26). What decides deviations from a normal word order in many languages is typically the need to highlight an element often with further implications of meaning (Verschueren, 2003:126). Hence, IS affects word order.

Word order relies upon the communicative function of a sentence or an utterance and any alternation in the communicative purpose causes in a change of word order. Dryer (2007:76) considers pragmatics as one of the criterion applied to identify the basic word order of a language. It can mainly be argued that one word order in a language is pragmatically unmarked, while others are pragmatically marked and show some added pragmatic effects. The same information or proposition can be expressed with different sentences packaged in various ways from distinct perspectives (e.g., active and passive sentence counterparts). Foley and Van Valin (1985:284) show that two distinct clauses which are packaging variants of the same information usually indicate different syntactic behavior for NPs.

Topic can be marked via basic word order change (i.e., scrambling). Besides basic word order change, it can be marked syntactically through special constructions such as topicalization, left and right dislocations (Foley and Van Valin, 1985:299-358). In this study, the terms left and right dislocations refer to any transposition of a sentence constituent to sentence initial and final positions, respectively when accompanied by pronominal reference. According to Trask (2007:179), movement is a process that includes a range of structures such as raising, fronting, extraction or *wh*-movement and extraposition in which an element of a sentence shifts from its normal position to its non-canonical position. Trask (2007:179) defines fronting as a process of transposing an element from non-initial position to the initial position of a sentence. Raising refers to any rule that shifts a constituent to a higher syntactic position (Crystal, 2008:401)

Crystal (2008:182) states that extraposition stands for moving a constituent from its canonical position to a position at or near the end of the clause. As to Crystal (2008:181), extraction is a syntactic process which shifts an element from within a unit to a position outside that unit (e.g., John killed the lion. In this example, "John" is extracted from its unit and the sentence becomes,

it was John who killed the lion). Wh-movement is also a type of movement that involves transposing a wh-phrase to the beginning of the sentence (Crystal, 2008:520).

Topicalization and dislocations (left and right) help to mark topic/comment structure. As to Payne (1997:271), left and right dislocations are rarely referred to as preposing and postposing, respectively. Trask (2007:179) shows that topicalization is a process that changes a non-subject element into an explicit topic via preposing. Topicalization and left dislocation are alike, in moving a topic element to an initial position outside the syntactic boundary of the sentence. Unlike topicalization, left dislocation fills the canonical position from which the topicalized element is moved by a pronoun or a full lexical noun phrase (e.g., John, I like him/the young boy) (Foley, 2007:443). Right dislocation also relegates a topic element to the end outside the syntactic boundary of the sentence and fills the normal position of the topicalized constituent by a pronoun or full lexical noun phrase (Crystal, 2008: 418).

According to Foley (2007:418), topicalization, left and right dislocations are a clause external information packaging devices. Unlike passivization, topicalization and dislocation are not normally marked in the predicate. The VPs in the topicalized and dislocated sentences are the same as the VPs in their untropicalized and undislocated versions (Keneen (1985:246).

Burling (1992:246) notes that in passive clause old information is put into backgrounded, whereas the new one is highlighted. One important discourse function of passive is accommodating IS. Hadian *et al.* (2013:24) show that passivization alters the unmarked IS of a sentence to mark IS by passivization, the speaker can focus on a part of a message, which seems more vital and introduce the other part as the background of the discourse.

In general, According to Lambrecht (1994:6), IS is formally realized in aspects of prosody, in special grammatical markers, in the form of syntactic (in particular nominal) elements, in the form of complex grammatical constructions, and in certain choices between related lexical items. Lambrecht (1994:6) says that information analysis relies upon the comparison of semantically analogous but formally and pragmatically distinct pairs, such as active and passive, canonical vs topicalized, canonical vs clefted or dislocated, subject-accented vs predicate accented sentences, etc. using a term introduced by Danes (1966), Lambrecht (1994) labels such pairs as pairs of allosentences. Variations in the information structure of clauses are always apprehended in terms

of contrast between allosentences, i.e., against the background of available but unused grammatical options for expressing a certain proposition (Mukherjee, 2001:89).

The suitability of alternative structures or allosentences can be tested by supplying questions. The factors which determine the choice of one option over the others are pragmatic and comprise the next five basic questions or points (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004:221).

- (a) Which element of the proposition represents the main topic, what the clause is about?
- (b) Which part of the message does the speaker consider most important?
- (c) Which part of the message does the speaker treat as known to the hearer, and which is presented as new?
- (d) What information, if any, is presupposed at any given point in the discourse?
- (e) Which element does the speaker choose as the point of departure of the message?

Chapter Three

Utterance Structure

This chapter briefly deals with utterance constituents in relation to information structure using various allosentences. It also deals with the division of IS into information units.

3.1 Utterance Structure and Syntactic Structures

Unlike sentences, utterances are context bound. Payne (1997:261) says that utterances are concrete examples of language use in context, thus they always appear in a context and their interpretations always affect and are affected by the context. Utterances have information structure and syntactic structure. Thus, they can be described using various information units and syntactic units. Syntactically and semantically acceptable structures may not be suitable for certain communicative contexts, since syntax and semantics are not the only regulators of clause structure (Finegan, 2008:249). Information structure denotes the structure of utterance, which is independent and sometimes even orthogonal to syntactic constituency (von Stechow, 1999:101). The information structure of a clause also reflects its context in the discourse. The examples below show how allosentences are used to present the IS of utterances.

7. (a) *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem-φ-e*
Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
'Chala went to school.'
- (b) *mana barumsa-a C'aalaa -n deem-φ-e*
house education-GEN Chala-NOM go-3MS-PV
'Chala went to school.'
- (c) *C'aalaa-tu mana barumsa-a deem-φ-e*
Chala-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
'It was Chala who went to school.'

Oromo often uses a variety of allosentences or alternative structures to convey the same basic semantic meaning. The above clauses essentially have similar content, though their information

structures are distinct. This denotes the presence of morphological and syntactic means to convey very similar senses. The focus morpheme */-tu/* and topicalization are employed as linguistic mechanisms to construct the clauses in (7b) and (7c), respectively. As example (7a) and (7b) show, clauses with different word orders can be used to impart the same basic meaning. Thus, the clauses denote the difference between the types of syntactic constructions found in particular languages and the categories of information structure.

3.2 Roles of Sentence Constituents

Sentences and utterances are constructed from constituents with different roles. The roles of the constituents can be syntactic, semantic and pragmatic based on syntactic, semantic and pragmatic point of view, respectively. For instance, subject and predicate are syntactic roles used to construct syntactic structure. Agent and patient, etc. are subsumed under semantic roles, while topic, comment, focus and so forth. belong to pragmatic roles. Distinctions can be drawn between the grammatical subject and predicate of a sentence as well as its logical and psychological subject and predicate. However, the study is mainly devoted to various pragmatic roles than syntactic and semantic roles, since it focuses on the IS of utterances. Syntactic, semantic and pragmatic roles can conflate. Example:

8. *Magarsaa-n foon jaat- ϕ -e*
 Megersa-NOM meat eat-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa ate meat.’

This structure can be divided into subject and predicate in relation to its syntactic structure. The noun ‘Megersa’ is a grammatical subject, while the rest of the clause is a grammatical predicate. The noun ‘Megersa’ is a subject, since it stands for what is being dealt with, whereas the verb phrase */foon jaate/* ‘ate meat’ is a predicate, since it is the element which states something about the referent of the noun ‘Megersa’. On the other hand, based on semantics and information structure, the noun ‘Megersa’ is the agent and topic of the clause, respectively. While the verb phrase */foon jaate/* ‘ate meat’ is the comment of the clause. The noun ‘Megersa’ is used as psychological, grammatical and logical subjects from syntactic, pragmatic and semantic point of view. In short, psychological, grammatical and logical subject refer to topic, subject and agent, respectively. The term subject comprises psychological, grammatical and logical subjects. The

first type of subject refers to what the addressor had in his/her mind to embark upon the articulation of the clause or in other words, it is the concern of the message. The second kind of subject refers to an entity about which something is stated and the third type of subject stands for the doer of the action (Halliday, 1985:33-34). The syntactic, semantic and pragmatic roles of a sentence constituent can conflate. However, information units do not inevitably correspond to any units in the clause grammar, since syntactic structure can be denoted differently from information representations or structures as in example (9).

9. (a) *C'aalaa-n ስህሎ c'ab-s-φ-e*

Chala-NOM stick break-CS-3MS-PV

'Chala broke a stick.'

(b) *ስህሎ-n c'ab-s-am-φ-e*

stick-NOM break-CS-PS-3MS-PV

'A stick broke.'

(c) *ስህሎ -n C'aalaa-daa-n c'ab-s-am-φ-e*

stick-NOM Chala-COP-INST break-CS-PS-3MS-PV

'A stick was broken by Chala.'

(d) *kalee ስህሎ-n C'aalaa-daa-n c'ab-s-am-e*

yesterday stick-NOM Chala-COP-INST break-CS-PS-3MS-PV

'Yesterday, a stick was broken by Chala.'

In clause (9a), the noun 'Chala' which is the subject of the sentence conflates with the agent and topic of the clause. Hence, the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic roles of the clause coincide in one wording. In this example, the topic-comment diachotomy is analogous to the subject-predicate syntactic dichotomy, where the subject is the topic and the predicate is the comment. Subject is usually used as unmarked linguistic topic in canonical or basic declarative clauses of Oromo, since it is an SOV language. However, in example (9b) only the subject and topic of the clause are conflated into a single element. The agent is left unstated, since the clause is an

agentless passive. In clause (9c), the NP /*ɳulee*/ ‘stick’ plays the role of subject and topic, while the phrase /*C’aalaadaan*/ ‘by Chala’ is used as the agent. All the three types of roles can be combined into one unit as in example (9a). It is also possible to conflate only the two roles as in clause (9b) and (9c). The three roles can also be expressed with different elements as in clause (9d), since they do not inevitably overlap with one another. The subject, agent and topic roles are expressed using different elements. In the clause, the noun /*kalee*/ ‘yesterday’, /*ɳulee*/ ‘stick’ and the PP /*C’aalaadaan*/ ‘by Chala’ are used as the topic, subject and agent, respectively. The topic and subject of clause (9d) do not coincide, since it is a topicalized structure. Sentence topics are not necessarily grammatical subjects and grammatical subjects are not inevitably sentence topics (Lambrecht 1994, 118). Hence, the sequence of words and thought may not overlap in topicalized structures. von Heusinger (1999:101) says that information units are independent and sometimes even orthogonal to syntactic units.

As already stated, the term subject stands for psychological, grammatical or logical subjects. In example (10a) and (10b) the noun ‘Megersa’ is the psychological, grammatical and logical subject of the clause from pragmatic, syntactic and semantic point of view, respectively. Psychological, grammatical and logical subjects stand for the topic, subject and agent of the clause, respectively. A topic is called a psychological subject, since it comprises what the addressor had in his/her mind to embark upon the articulation of the utterance. Hence, topic is the concern of the message. Grammatical subject stands for an entity, thing or person about which something is stated, while logical subject is the doer of the action stated by the transitive or intransitive verb as the next examples demonstrate.

10. (a) *Magarsaa-n* *korp’eessa* *naa-f* *bit- ϕ -e*
 Megersa-NOM ram me-DAT buy-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa bought me a ram.’

(b) *Tolaa-n* *kolf- ϕ -e*
 Tola-NOM laugh-3MS-PV
 ‘Tola laughed.’

In sentence (10a) and (10b) the nouns ‘Megersa’ and ‘Tola’ are the psychological, grammatical and logical subject of the structures and hence the three types of subject overlap. Topic, subject and agent roles are usually conflated into a single element in topic-comment sentences. The above clauses are topic-comment sentences. Thus, the more informative part of the clauses follows the less informative part of the clause. The syntactic and information structural units of these clauses coincide with one other. However, information structural categories do not inevitably coincide with syntactic units as the next question-answer pair shows.

11. (a) *hoolaa-ni koo ʒeessa-a*
 sheep-NOM my where-QM
 ‘Where is my sheep?’

(b) *Magarsaa-n fud-at-ø-e ʔisa*
 Megersa-NOM take-MD-3MS-PV him
 ‘Megersa took it.’

It is obvious from the response clause in (11b) that the constituent */Magarsaan_{NP} fudate_V/* ‘Megersa took’ forms a single information unit called focus in the discourse in relation to information structure. However, based on syntactic structure, the constituent cannot be a single syntactic unit. Thus, the VP ‘Megersa took’ is the focus, while the pronoun */ʔisa/* ‘him’ is the old or background information of the clause. From syntactic point of view ‘Megersa’ is the subject, while the remaining is the predicate of the clause. The interrogative clause in (11a) creates a context for uttering the response clause in (11b). The response clause shows that the syntactic structure and information structure of a clause do not always coincide. Information units may not overlap with syntactic units and that is why, the information structure of clauses does not always rely on their syntactic structure. Thus, a major difference is manifested between the kinds of syntactic structures realized and the categories of IS in Oromo. The constituent that presents new information may not put in the basic slot occupied by the analogous question word of the interrogative clause in Oromo. Hence, example (11b) does not follow the principle of end-focus due to the basic word order change. Hence, one major purpose of Oromo syntax is marking

pragmatic function or IS. Syntactic structures such as passivization and topicalization play a vital role in marking information structure.

3.3 Allosentences and Information Structure

The same information can be manifested using different allosentences having a link with a particular function in discourse. They are pragmatically divergent in prosodic, lexical or syntactic strategy to encode information structure. The disparity of the information structure of clauses is perceived in terms of the contrast between allosentences (Lambrecht, 1994:6). The following are instances of allosentences having various discourse functions.

12. (a) *C'aalaa-n mana Magarsaa-ñtti gurgur-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM house Megersa-LOC sell-3MS-PV
 'Chala sold (the) house to Megersa.'
- (b) *man-ni C'aalaa-daa-n Magarsaa-ñtti gurgur-am-ø-e*
 house-NOM Chala-COP-INST Megersa-LOC sell-PS-3MS-PV
 '(The) house was sold to Megersa by Chala.'
- (c) *C'aalaa-da kan mana Magarsaa-ñtti gurgur-ø-e*
 Chala-COP REL house Megersa-LOC sell-3MS-PV
 'It was Chala who sold (the) house to Megersa.'
- (d) *mana kan C'aalaa-n Magarsaa-ñtti gurgur-ø-e*
 house REL Chala-NOM Megersa-LOC sell-3MS-PV
 'It was (the) house that Chala sold to Megersa.'
- (e) *C'aalaa-tu mana magarsaa-ñtti gurgur-ø-e*
 Chala-FOC house Megersa-LOC sell-3MS-PV
 'It was Chala who sold (the) house to Megersa.'

- (f) *mana C'aalaa-n Magarsaa-ñtti gurgur-ø-e*
 house Chala-NOM Megersa-LOC sell-3MS-PV
 'A house, Chala sold to Megersa.'

Clause (12a) is pragmatically unmarked or neutral, while the remaining ones are pragmatically marked. The subject noun 'Chala' is the topic while the remaining is the predicate of the clause. The predicate conflates with the comment of the clause. In other words, the subject-predicate division of the sentence coincides with the topic-comment structure of the clause. The informational flow of the clause follows the principle of end-focus, because it presents the comment or what is predicated about the topic comes later. All the pragmatically marked clauses given in (12b) to (12f) can be paired with the basic clause in (12a) and become allosentences. The clauses in (12b), (12c), (12d) and (12f) are pragmatically marked passive, simple cleft, pseudo cleft and topicalized constructions, respectively. Only the pragmatically marked clause in (12e) is focused by the focus morpheme */-tu/*. For instance, in (12b), (12c) and (12f) the topic is the noun */mana/* 'house' not 'Chala' the remainder is the comment. Information structure is encoded in various ways in the above pragmatically marked sentences. Passivization, clefting, morphological marking and fronting are used for encoding the IS of the clauses (12b), (12c), and (12d), (12e) and (12f), respectively. In order to encode IS in a clause, addressors depend on the fact that syntactic operations permit alternative means of shaping clauses (Finegan, 2008:250). Although, the structures share the same basic meaning, they are used in different communicative contexts, since each of them answers or presupposes various questions. For example, clause (12a) may answer the question 'what did Chala do?' In contrast, clause (12b), (12c) and (12e) presuppose the content question 'who sold the house?' The clause (12d) also presuppose the questions 'what did Chala sell to Megersa?' These examples denote that the same information can be communicated in differently. The structures are almost semantically equivalent, though they are divergent both formally and pragmatically. Information structuring, then, is not dealt with the semantic content of utterances (i.e., that is the concern of semantics not pragmatics) as such, but with how a certain piece of information can be structured formally and linguistically using various means and how a particular ways of information packaging suits various communicative contexts. Kim *et al.* (2013:403) say that information structure helps to state why

speakers express things in diverse ways. People normally make choices about how to express their utterances.

Various portions of the sentences are distinguished as given-new information in the above clauses. For instance, in example (12a) it is the predicate that is the most important part of the discourse, while, in (12b), (12c) and (12e) the parts that talk about 'Chala' is the most basic. In clauses (12d), the portions that deal with the house is the most essential. Clause (12c) and (12e) convey entirely the same message, but they are structured distinctly. In the expressions, the addressor is not merely talking only 'Chala's selling Megersa's house'. But the addressor is denoting that, it was Chala not 'someone else' who sold Megersa's house'. The same semantic effect is achieved using the focus formative */-tu/* and the cleft construction. The structures of the clauses differ based on the information being imparted. Some of the means in which the above structures vary encompass morphological marking and word order change.

The above clauses are alternative structures basically conveying the same information though they vary in their communicative significance. These possibilities are not equally suitable at any given point in the discourse. But, the information imparted is normally identical, the message is structured differently, and the various forms highlight distinct aspects of the message. Sentence structure varies as a result of the information being communicated. The formal structure of clauses is related to the communicative context in which sentences are used. In all cases, there is a transfer of the house from the seller to the purchaser. Though, the expressions are structured in distinct ways, they share the same truth conditions. The clauses are applied in various communicative contexts, since they are distinct in relation to their information structure. They are pragmatically divergent; due to their syntactic or prosodic structure variation and do not share the same pragmatic roles (e.g., topic, focus). Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:221) also state that the factors which determine the choice of one option over the others are pragmatic. The above examples denote that clauses can be pragmatically marked or unmarked. Pragmatically neutral structures have higher distribution than the analogous unmarked ones. Pragmatically, unmarked structures can also be easily interpreted than the marked ones. The above examples have no equal distribution in the discourse. Pragmatically unmarked structure has higher distribution than the marked one. The neutral term is the one which appears in the widest variety

of contexts (Cruse, 2011:162). Pragmatically marked allosentences are related with the application of various means of information structuring. Example:

13. (a) *C'aalaa-n foon nyaat-ø-e*
Chala-NOM meat eat-3MS-PV
'Chala ate meat.'

(b) *foon C'aalaa-n nyaat-ø-e*
meat Chala-NOM eat-3MS-PV
'Meat, Chala ate.'

(c) *C'aalaa-tu foon nyaat-ø-e*
Chala-FOC meat eat-3MS-PV
'It was Chala who ate meat.'

Among the above allosentences, clause (13a) is pragmatically unmarked, since it follows the basic word order of the language. The remaining two are the allosentences of the basic clause in (13a) constructed using syntactic and morphological means of information structuring. The above pragmatically marked and unmarked clauses are used in diverse contexts. They are semantically equivalent but differ in relation to information structure. Information structure is a dichotomy of a clause and the contrast between the two complimentary parts or the information structure of utterances is marked linguistically in various ways. In general, in Oromo, phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic devices play a great role in encoding IS. Various information units are encoded differently. A detail analysis of how the information units are marked is presented in the next chapters.

3.4 Binomial and Trinomial Divisions of Information Structure

Utterances and sentences are usually divided into two or three information units based on their information structures. The information structures of utterances can be divided into different information units based on various criteria. The twin dichotomy of IS is used to describe the IS of utterances in this work. Example:

14. (a) *C'aalaa-n maal dug-φ-a*
 Chala-NOM what drink-3MS-IPV
 'What does Chala drink?'

(b) *C'aalaa-n buna dug-φ-a*
 Chala-NOM coffee drink-3MS-IPV
 'It is coffee tha Chala drinks.'

15. (a) *C'aalaa-n maal taʔ-φ-e*
 Chala-NOM what become-3MS-IPV
 'What happened to Chala?'

(b) *C'aalaa-n hin duʔ-φ-e*
 Chala-NOM FOC die-3MS-PV
 'Chala died surely.'

In sentence (14b), except the focus noun */buna/* 'coffee' the remaining words present background information. The subject of this clause overlaps with the topic, while the verb phrase corresponds with the comment and the focus or new information is the part of the comment. Thus, focus can overlap with comment, but the whole comment may not be focus. Comment and focus are usually placed near/at sentence final position in unmarked structures. The focus of the clause can be a part of the comment as in the example [Chala_(topic) drinks coffee_(focus)] or can be equated with the entire comment as in the clause [Chala_{topic} died_{comment}]. It is not possible to segment clause (15b) into three information units following the trinomial division. However, clause (14b) can be divided into link, tail and focus as [Chala_{link} drinks_{tail} coffee_{focus}] based on the trinomial classification of information structure.

The main points dealt with in this chapter are the following. Utterances have linear and interpretive arrangements linked with syntactic structure and information structure, respectively. Syntactic structure is realized using syntactic units, while IS is expressed using information units such as topic-comment, given-new information, etc. Information structuring follows bipartite or

tripartite divisions of utterances. In Oromo the syntactic and information structures of an utterance can coincide in one wording or become orthogonal. They become orthogonal since a single utterance/sentence can have more than one information structures. Allo-sentences are very helpful for analyzing the IS different structures. Active vs. passive, canonical vs. scrambled, canonical vs. topicalized, canonical vs. dislocated constructions are pairs of allosentences highly used to describe the information structures of utterances and sentences in Oromo. Allosentences are usually used in different contexts though they convey the same meaning since their information is structured differently.

Chapter Four

Topic-Comment Structure

Topic-comment structure, topic types, frame setting, levels of topic integration and sentence topic encoding means are discussed in this chapter.

4.1 Distinguishing Topic-Comment Structure

Topic and comment are usually complementary notions. The easiest way to identify topic and comment is looking at mini-dialogue or question answer congruent where the choice of topic is forced. Foley (2007:403) suggests that the operation of IS is well illustrated using mini-dialogues. The NP containing the response to the question word is the focus of the clause, carrying the comment or new information the sentence is expected to supply.

As aforesaid question-answer pairing strategy plays a vital role in distinguishing topic-comment expression. The topical constituent is linked with an overt or covert question of the type ‘what about x?’ The word /*hoo*/ ‘what about’ is commonly used. Example:

16. (a) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa ḥsaa gurgur-ḥ-e*
Megersa-NOM sheep his sell-3MS-PV
‘Megersa sold his sheep.’

(b) *C’aalaa-n hoo*
Chala-NOM TM
‘What about Chala?’

(c) *C’aalaa-n hoolaa ḥsaa hin gurgur-ḥ-e raḥee gurgur-ḥ-e*
Chala-NOM sheep his NEG sell-3MS-PV goat sell-3MS-PV
‘Chala didn’t sell his sheep, but he sold a goat.’

The topic of sentence (16a) is the noun ‘Megersa’. The noun ‘Chala’ is also used as a topic in sentence (16c) as established by question (16b). The subject and topic roles conflate with each other in both clauses. In many languages, the subject grammatical relation is conflated with the

expected or switch topics function (Andrews, 2007:149). The interrogative clause in (16b) forces the noun ‘Chala’ to be the topic of the response clause in (16c). Topic usually conflates with the grammatical subject of basic declarative clauses in Oromo. In example (16b) the word /*hoo*/ ‘what about’ is adjoined to the topic ‘Chala’ thus, it forces this noun to be the topic of the response clause (16c). The topic marker /*hoo*/ usually introduces a sentence topic in follow up questions and commonly in elliptical constructions. Example (16a) plays a vital role in distinguishing the topic of clause (16c). Because it creates a linguistic context for the question in (16b). Discourse context access is required to distinguish topic (Lambrecht, 1994).

A clause usually has a topic and new information (i.e., comment) about the topic. The new information can be the comment as a whole or partly and usually comes at or towards the end of the sentence. Foley (2007:403) denotes that highlighted information usually occurs at the end of a clause. Example:

17. (a) *C’aalaa-n* *k’arfii* *fud-at-φ-e*
 Chala-NOM money take-MD-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala took (the) money.’

(b) *k’arfii-n* *C’aalaa-daa-n* *fud-at-am-φ-e*
 money-NOM Chala-COP-INST take-MD-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘(The) money was taken by Chala.’

In these clauses, it is possible to identify what is talked about (i.e., topic) and what is said about it (i.e., comment).. Example (17a) is a topic-comment sentence and the topic of this active sentence is the noun ‘Chala’, since it is the person about which something is said. The rest of the clause is the comment stating something about this topic entity. The new information is the verb phrase /*k’arfii fudate*/ ‘took money’ and the noun ‘money’ is the important piece of new information. The entire verb phrase can be focused in the structures with predicate focus structure. In clause (17b), the new information is the agent postpositional phrase /*C’aalaadaan*/ ‘by Chala’, while the patient subject ‘money’ is the topic. Because ‘money’ is the entity about which something is predicated. In other words, it is the entity the utterance is dealing with. In

Oromo, passivization usually promotes direct object to topic position. Comment and new information are closely interrelated though they are mutually inclusive. Because comment cannot be equated with the whole clause in sentences with argument focus. Example:

18. (a) *ʒeɽnuu-tu duʔ-φ-e*
who-FOC die-3MS-PV
'Who died?'

(b) *Magartuu-tu duʔ-φ-e*
Megertu-FOC die-3MS-PV
'It is Megertu who died.'

The subject-predicate of clause (18b) is analogous with the focus-background information of the clause. Clause (19b) and (18b) are identical in relation to their syntactic structures, but they are completely distinct in relation to their information structure. Because the two clauses do not presuppose the same question in the given context. Number and gender distinction is neutralized in (18b), since the focus morpheme */-tu/* is suffixed to the subject to mark argument focus.

In sentence focus, new information is equated with comment due to the absence of any elements having a specific function as topic and any subject is not held to express topicality. The whole thing is subsumed under focus/new information in clause (19b), since the IS of the clause cannot be divided into topic-comment. Normally, there are some utterances without the topic element totally. A topic is not a compulsory portion of every utterance, though the most common types of utterance do contain a topic (Van Valin and Lapolla, 1997:203). Example:

19. (a) *maal-tu dal-at-φ-e*
what-FOC born-MD-3MS-PV
'What happened?'

- (b) *C'aalaa-tu duʔ-φ-e*
Chala-FOC die-3MS-PV
'It was Chala who died.'

Clause (19b) has topic entity but it lacks any topic expression, since the whole structure presents new information. The focus of this clause extends over the subject and predicate. Example (19b) can be divided into subject and predicate based on its syntactic structure, though it has only comment and lacks topic-comment categorization in relation to IS. The example shows that in Oromo sentence focus structures where the subject and the predicate elements are highlighted detopicalization of the subject is accompanied by suspended subject-verb agreement and the verb takes third person masculine singular form for all persons.

Clause (17b) (18b) and (19b) show that syntactic and information units may or may not coincide with each other. Sentences comprising distinct grammatical structures but conveying the same basic meaning can have different topic in various contexts (Cruse, 2011:389). In example (17a) the referent of the NP 'Chala' is what the sentence is about. The VP presents new information about him which the addressor assumes will add to the addressee's knowledge. Lambrecht (1994) calls clauses, in which the grammatical subject overlaps with the topic, topic-comment sentences. Conversely, example (18b) does not have the function of giving information about the topic entity 'Megertu'. In clause (18a) the speaker presupposes that 'someone died' and the speaker identifies the individual for the addressee as 'Megertu'. This type of sentences are called an identificational sentence (Lambrecht, 1994). On the other hand, in clause (19b) the whole information is new. This type of clause is called sentence focus sentence (Lambrecht, 1994). The above examples imply that topic cannot be determined without considering the speech context.

All sentences are not divided into topic-comment as well as subject-predicate. Usually, most emotive, imperative and ellipitcal sentences cannot be divided into information units. The following pro-sentence responses illustrate this.

20. (a) *Magarsaa beek-t-a-a*

Megersa know-2S-IPV-QM

‘Do you know Megersa?’

(b) *ʔeejjeen*

‘Yes!’

21. (a) *ʔeeju-tu konkolaataa fud-at-φ-e*

who-FOC car take-MD-3MS-PV

‘Who was the one that took the car?’

(b) *Magarsaa-da*

Megersa-COP

‘It is Megersa’

In relation to their syntactic structures, Oromo sentences are usually divided into subject and predicate. Conversely, there are also clauses that do not overtly show subject-predicate or topic-comment distinction. For instance, it is difficult to segment the response pro-sentences in clause (20b) and (21b) into subject-predicate or topic-comment expression. The pro-sentence in (20b) clearly states only new information. The term pro-sentence stands for function words or expressions (e.g., yes, no, okay) that replace for the entire clause whose content is recoverable from the context. The elliptical clause in (21b) may not be divided into information units, since it contains only the the noun ‘Megersa’ and this noun presents only new information. In the response clauses, the background information is deleted but it can be recovered from the linguistic context given by the interrogative clauses.

Besides elliptical and pro-sentences, Oromo has numerous eventive clauses lacking topic. The following weather sentences (i.e., clauses with weather verbs) have no topic, since they are all new sentences. They are subsumed under the category of event reporting sentence based on the sentences classification Lambrecht (1994). Eventive clauses introduce a whole event and they

contrasted in this way with topic-comment sentences (Féry, 2007:164). The following clauses are instances of eventive clauses.

22. (a) *roob-aa-ti* *jir- ϕ -a*
rain-IPV-COP exist-3MS-IPV
'It is raining.'

(b) *bubbis-aa-ti* *jir- ϕ -a*
blow-IPV-COP exist-3MS-IPV
'It is blowing.'

These are nonreferential sentences having no clear topic-comment structure. The subjects or agents of the actions stated in clause (22a) and (22b) are not obviously stated. Thus, it is difficult to identify the topic of the clauses. These clauses describe about weather condition but lack subject, since Oromo has no impersonal pronouns or expletive subjects (i.e, it is a language with null expletive). The noun /*rooba*/ 'rain' and /*bubbe*/ 'wind' may be rarely used as clear substitute for the zero subject in the clauses. Situational and linguistic contexts play a vital role in identifying the given information. Thus, it might be possible to distinguish the topic entity (but not the topic expression) of clause (22a) as 'rain' and that of (22b) as 'wind' based on general knowledge or epistemic context and situational context. In Oromo, topic does not always overtly appear in running text or speech, due to topic dropping. In other words, topic is not necessarily explicitly encoded as a topic expression. When old topic is deleted, the clause remains grammatically wellformed and contextually acceptable. Andrews (2007:149) calls this kind of topic an expected topic and it can be encoded by zero anaphora.

4.2 Topic Articulation

Krika (2006:1) states that topic-comment structure is language universal. However, it is lacking in topicless sentences-focus structures. It is one of the basic pragmatic articulations of sentence-structure (Andrews, 2007:148). Topic-comment structure deals with the internal organization of information. It refers to the distinction between 'what the utterance is about' and 'what the speaker says about it'. The former unit is often termed topic (or theme) and the latter is comment (or rheme) (von Heusinger, 1999:30). Topics can be entities familiar or unfamiliar to the

addressor or they can carry new or old information (Andrews, 2007:149). Unfamiliar entities can enter into the discourse and serve as topics: this is the purpose of thetic articulation, particularly its presentational sub type. Andrews (1985:78) denotes that two major types of topics exist: those whose topicality is predictable from the preceding linguistic context and those which are not predictable.

4.3 Sentence Topic

Sentence topic refers to the entity, person or thing the information conveyed by the clause is about. von Heusinger (1999:31) says that the topical element is connected with the covert or overt constituent question type of ‘what about x’. In Oromo, the form */x-hoo/*, which is equivalent to ‘and what about x?’ where ‘x’ refers to the topic of the clause, usually used to distinguish the topic (i.e., aboutness topic) from the comment expression. Because sentence topics can be distinguished in responses to request for information about someone/something. Question-answer context is usually used to evoke sentence topic and focus. For instance, the word */hoo/* obviously forces the element that preceding it to be the topic of the response clause. It is impossible to consider topic-comment articulation as purely grammatical or syntactic notional categories, since they are primarily more connected with the aboutness aspect of a sentence than its syntactic structure (Von Heusinger, 1999:104).

Sentence topic and subject can conflate. In Oromo declarative sentences with basic word order, sentence topic (not discourse topic) normally overlaps with subject, while the comment conflates with predicate. Andrews (2007:149) presents that in many languages the subject grammatical relation is correlated with the topic (expected or switch/shifted/new topic) function. Sentence topics can be simple or conjoined topics. Example:

23. (a) *C’aalaa-n Magarsaa wajjii-n lamma deem-φ-a*
 Chala-NOM Megersa with-INST now go-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala goes with Megersa now.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n C'aalaa wajjii-n λamma deem-φ-a*
 Megersa-NOM Chala with-INST now go-3MS-IPV
 'Megersa goes with Chala now.'

(c) *Magarsaa fi C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem-an*
 Megersa and Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3PL-IPV
 'Megersa and Chala went to school.'

Example (23a) and (23b) convey the same basic information and are logically equivalent though the information is structured differently. Although these clauses are logically equivalent clause (23a) is more appropriate to talk about 'Chala' than (23b), while (23b) is more suitable to talk about 'Megersa' than clause (23a). The above basic declarative clauses are topic-comment sentences with distinct topic. In basic declarative sentence, topic and comment usually conflate with the grammatical subject and predicate. The topics of clause (23a) and (23b) are 'Chala' and 'Megersa', respectively. The examples show that equivalent clauses even mentioning the same referents can have distinct topic and comment. Topic-comment expression is linked with given-new information in pragmatically unmarked structures. 'Topic is discourse established, while the comment gives new information with respect to the topic' (von Heusinger, 1999:31).

Clause (23c) shows that a sentence can have a conjoined topic. The conjoined nouns 'Megersa and Chala' are used as a linguistic topic. In principle, there is no upper limit on the number of topics admitted, though in practice sentential meaning and other factors interfere to limit the number (Miyagawa, 2017:2). In some cases, it is even very difficult to identify the topic of a sentence when it shows a scope of ambiguity due to the presence of some universal quantifiers like */hunduu/* 'all' as in the example below.

24. *nam-ni hunduu hattuu miti*
 person-NOM all thief not-be
 'Everybody is not a thief.'

This clause appears to be ambiguous and hence interpreted in two different ways due to the universal quantifier /*hunduu*/ ‘all’. It can be interpreted as ‘everybody fails to have the property of theft.’ In other context, it can also mean ‘there are some individuals who have the property of theft.’ Thus, it is not easy to determine the referent of the indefinite expression /*namni hunduu*/ ‘all individuals’, since the universal quantifier /*hunduu*/ ‘all’ is indefinite and has no definite referent. Thus, the sentence lacks topic. Unlike a topic, a sentence does not lack focus or new information that pushes the discourse forward. von Heusinger (1999:32) says that from a purely informational point of view utterance that lacks focus or comment does not make sense, since it does not give information. What is more interesting is the contrast between topic-comment and topic-less sentences (or in another terminology: focus-background and all-focus sentence). This implies that every utterance has to have either marked or unmarked focus, because addressor(s) presumably speak for the sake of imparting a certain piece of information. A topic-less sentence is realized in all-focus sentences.

Sentence topic can be either aboutness or contrastive topic. Clauses usually contain a single topic but those with contrastive topics have multiple topics or are about more than one referent. Sentence (25b) and (25c) have contrastive and aboutness topic, respectively. Contrastive topic is marked by fronting and deaccenting phonologically as illustrated below. In clause (25a), the addressor asks about the whole topic referent set ‘children’. But the set can be divided into three partitions in example (25b) as ‘Megersa’, ‘Megertu’ and ‘Balcha’ and ‘Toltu’. These nouns are used as contrastive subjects/topics for the clause.

25. (a) *ʃjoollee-n tee ʒeessa jir-aat-an*
 children-NOM your where exist-MD-3PL.IPV
 ‘Where do your children live?’

(b) *Magarsaa-n Dubar jir-aat-φ-a Magartuu-n Ficee Bac'aa-n*
 Megersa-NOM Dubar exist-MD-3MS-IPV Megertu-NOM Fiche Bacha-NOM

fi Toltuu-n ʃmmoo Bok'uu jir-aat-an
 and Toltu-NOM however Boku exist-MD-3PL.IPV

‘Megersa lives in Dubar and Megertu lives in Fiche, but Bacha and Toltu live in Boku.’

- (c) *ñjoollee -n too Ficee jir-aat-an*
 Children-NOM my Fiche exist-MD-3PL.IPV
 ‘My children live in Fiche.’

Topic and focus can have contrastive interpretation. Vermeulen *et al.* (2009:18) state that both topics and foci can be interpreted contrastively. However, as clause (25b) denotes contrast in topic is not a correction like contrast in focus. Contrastive topic and contrastive focus are non aboutness topic and new information focus interpreted contrastively in that order. Non contrastive topics are aboutness topic. Oromo admits putting some elements of a clause before the subject for the sake of emphasising or contrasting them with another phrase. The language marks contrastive topic using topicalization. It can be assumed that contrastive topics can only appear in combination with focus. Krifka (2006:33) states that contrastive topics do not comprise information-packaging category in their own right, but correspond to a combination of topic and focus. Question (25a) may involve various subquestions (i.e., where do your sons or daughters live?) or where do your sons and daughters live? The topic of the response clause is ‘my children’ and the subjects of each clause coincide with the contrastive topics (also partial topics), because the speaker is expected to give various answers regarding the place where each child lives. But, if all of them reside in ‘Fiche’ as in (25c) the response of the addressor can begin with the subject or simple topic noun phrase ‘my children’ or with the pronoun ‘they’ .

Sentence (25b) has three foci (i.e., multiple foci) and three contrastive topics/multiple topics. The contrastive topics are ‘Megersa’, ‘Megertu and ‘Bacha and Toltu’. while the nouns ‘Duber’, ‘Boku’ and ‘Fiche’ are the foci of the clause and are marked by high pitch. In contrast, clause (25c) has only a single non contrastive topic and focus. Thus, the clause has an aboutness topic and new information focus. The topic and focus of clause (25c) are ‘children’ and ‘Fiche’. Example (25c) shows that all children of the questioner reside in the same place, whereas as example (25b) shows the children live in different places. It is the variation of the place where the children reside that brings contrastive sense in clause (25b). Example (25b) denotes that in clauses with contrastive topics a single clause does not give all the necessary information that is expected or required. Hence, contrastive topics are commonly used as a strategy of increasing

information. Each successive clause has its own topic and focus in example (25b). However, clear demarcation is lacking between focus and topic elements, since the foci are partly interwoven with the topic expression of the complex clause. The contrastive topics of sentence (25b) are unmarked since contrastive topics are unmarked when they overlap with subject.

The topic of sentence (26b) is marked, since it does not overlap with the subject. The direct object of clause (26b) becomes marked topic due to topicalization, since the subject and topic of the clause are distinct. The example shows that Oromo has unusual word orders for specialized functions like topicalization. Chiefly, when a non-subject element of a sentence is topicalized it is preposed, leading to a variation in the default word order. Oromo puts the object or other arguments in front position before the subject of the clause, especially when it makes a link or contrast with what has gone before. The contrastive topics are marked by fronting of the direct objects in clause (26). Thus, topicalization is a vital process that alters the linear arrangement of a basic declarative clause to mark information structure specifically sentence topic. The fronted topic communicates given information. For instance:

26. *buna* *ʎani* *hin* *dug-φ-u* *faajii* *ni-ʎan* *dug-φ-a*
 coffee I NEG drink-1S-IPV tea FOC-I drink-1S-IPV
 ‘Coffee, I don’t drink; tea, I do.’

This clause has two contrastive topics, */buna/* ‘coffee’ and */faajii/* ‘tea’. The nouns move to clause initial position and become contrastive topics due to topicalization. The clause places special contrast on these contrastive topics or object arguments using fronting. The contrast is presented in a single structure appropriate in a context where a category of drinks has been evoked. The syntactic typology of Oromo cannot be described based on structures like (26), since it is pragmatically marked due to object fronting (i.e., deviates from the basic word order). If it is so, it comes up with a wrong conclusion. The subject of the second part of the contrastive clauses is dropped, since the language is a subject prodrop language. Both core and non-core arguments of a verb can be chiefly preposed to show contrastive topics and foci. In example (26), the subject of the second part of the contrastive clause is elided, since it can be shown via agreement marking. Oromo verbs incorporate only subject pronoun. They do not incorporate

direct object pronouns into their inflection (i.e., There is no agreement between verb and direct object marked on the verb.), independent personal pronouns are not necessarily required to identify the subject of a verb phrase especially for first person singular and third person masculine singular and second person singular and third person feminine singular. For these persons, the subject pronouns can be overtly stated to avoid ambiguity or for the correct interpretation of information in discourse. For instance:

27. (a) *ʔani/ʔnni deem-ø-e*
I/ he go-1S/3MS-PV
'I/he went.'

(b) *ʔati/ʔʃin deem-t-e*
you/she go-2S/3FS-PV
'You/she went.'

Example (27a) denotes that the form of the verb is the same for first person singular and third person masculine singular. The same holds for second person singular and third person feminine singular as in (27b). To resolve such vagueness, mentioning the subject pronoun is helpful.

4.4 Frame Setting

Aboutness, frame setting and familiarity are the three basic portions of sentence topics. A frame-setting topic determines a frame in which the remainder of the clause is interpreted. It is very common in so-called 'topic languages' (Féry, 2007:164-168). Frame setting is related with topichood and helps to describe the topic person, entity or thing from a specific dimension. Krifka (2007:46) says that frame setters denote the general information that can be stated about a person. Overt frame setters invariably show options, they specifically belong to IS. Krifka and Musan (2012:31, 34) define frame setter as the information actually given is limited to the specific aspect identified. Frame setters are not used in the absence of alternate view. The words that appear at the beginning of the following clauses are frame setters not topics. They determine or set the frame or scene in which the clauses should be interpreted.

28. (a) *beekumsaa-n C'aalaa-ṛrra Magarsaa wajj-φ-a*
 knowledge-INST Chala on Megersa better-3MS-IPV
 'In terms of knowledge, Megersa is better than Chala.'

(b) *guddinaa-n C'aalaa-n Magarsaa hin c'aal-φ-u*
 growth-INST Chala-NOM Megersa NEG better-3MS-IPV
 'Regarding growth, Chala is not better than Megersa.'

The topic of example (28a) is the noun 'Megersa' while that of (28b) is the proper noun 'Chala'. The forms 'in terms of knowledge' and 'regarding growth' are used as frame setters. The frame setters appear at sentence initial position to describe 'Megersa' by contrasting him with 'Chala' and by contrasting 'Chala' with 'Megersa' in clause (28a) and (28b), respectively only based on the mentioned qualities. Because 'Megersa' is described contrastively only in relation to 'his knowledge'. In the same way, 'Chala' is also described contrastively in relation to his 'growth'. The rest aspects of their disparity have not been touched upon. Thus, the frame setters narrow down the scope of the sentence topic.

Besides the aforementioned frame setters, terms like /*ṛakka*/ 'as/like' and /*gara*/ 'towards' plus postpositions or nouns are used as frame setters as shown below.

29. (a) *gara kitaaba-tii-n ṛani hundaa sii-f-ṛan kenn-φ-a*
 towards book-COP-INST I all you-DAT-1S give-1S-PV
 'Concerning books, I will give you all.'

(b) *ṛakka koo-tiit hat-ni gaarii miti*
 as my-COP theft-NOM good not-be
 'As to me, theft is not a good.'

Clause (29a) states that the addressor is interested to give books to someone. The addressor is interested to condemn the badness of theft from his point of view in clause (29b). The pronoun

/ʔani/ ‘I’ and the noun */hanna/* ‘theft’ are used as sentence topics. The examples show how various frame setting devices are used in interrogative clauses. Example:

30. (a) *C’aalaa-n ʔakkam-i*
 Chala-NOM how-COP
 ‘How is Chala?’

(b) *gara fajjaa saa-tii-n naguma*
 towards health his-COP-INST fine
 ‘Healthwise/as for his health/ he is fine.’

31. (a) *C’aalaa jir-uu-n ʔsaa ʔakkam-i*
 Chala exist-NMZR-NOM his how-COP
 ‘How is Chala’s life?’

(b) *jir-eeɲ-ni ʔsaa baajʔee gaarii-da*
 exist-NMZR-NOM his a few good-COP
 ‘His life is very good.’

In response clause (30b), the term */gara/* ‘towards’ can be used as a frame setter to restrict the aspect from which the topic entity, person, or thing is viewed. In other words, it restricts context-sensitive expressions. For example, clause (30b) states only about ‘Chala’s health condition.’ The speaker is interested only in the life condition of the person in the interrogative clause in (31a). The answerer responds only in relation to the life condition of the person.

4.5 Topic Marking

Sentence topic can be marked or unmarked. The clauses below show the distinction between marked and unmarked sentence topic.

32. (a) *ñsaan kaleessa sangaa bit-an*
 they yesterday ox buy-3PL.PV
 ‘They bought an ox yesterday.’

(b) *foon ñani ni-ñan naadd-φ-a daabboo hin naadd-φ-u*
 meat I FOC-I eat-1S-IPV bread NEG eat-1S-IPV
 ‘Meat, I do eat bread, I don’t.’

Clause (32a) has unmarked aboutness topic /*ñsaan*/ ‘they’, while the one in (32b) has a marked contrastive topics. Clause (32b) presents /*foon*/ ‘meat’ and /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ as contrastive or double topics, since it has two clauses. The contrastive topics are marked using topicalization. As example (32a) shows the unmarked aboutness topic and the subject conflate, while subject and contrastive topic do not coincide as clause (32b) denotes. The subject of the sentence is the initial element in a pragmatically unmarked clause like (32a) and interpreted as a sentence topic. When another element appears at sentence initial position before the subject of the sentence, this non subject element is considered as a sentence topic as in (32b).

4.6 Means of Topic Marking

Sentence topic can be marked or unmarked. Radford *et al.* (2007:391) say in some languages, indicating topic is an inevitable part of the grammar and there are a variety of markers for achieving this. Japanese is mentioned as a well known example of topic marking or topic-centered languages. Jacobs (2001:641) states that topic is marked phonologically, lexically, morphologically or syntactically. Sentence topics can be encoded linguistically by lexical and syntactic means in Oromo. For instance, sentence topics are encoded lexically using various independent converse terms. Topicalization, passivization, dislocation and cleft constructions also encode sentence topic syntactically.

4.6.1 Marking Topic Lexically

Topic can be encoded lexically via aboutness test and converse terms. These means of topic marking are presented at length in the next sections.

4.6.1.1 Aboutness test

Marked topic can be encoded lexically by ‘as for test’ and ‘aboutness test’. Levinson (1983:390) presents these tests as the two means of evaluating the topic status of an element. The tests are commonly mentioned as topicalizing phrases. Sentence topics can be encoded lexically by independent topicalizing words like /*waaʔee*/ ‘about’ in Oromo. Hence the ‘tell me about test’ is mainly used in Oromo for identifying topic. Elements singled out by the term /*waaʔee*/ are topics. This term marks aboutness or non contrastive topic. Example:

33. (a) *ʔani waaʔee diina koo-ti-i haasawf-uu hin barbaad-ø-u*
I about enemy my-COP-GEN talk-NMZR NEG want-1S-IPV
‘I do not want to talk about my enemy.’

(b) *hijjummaa ʔlaal-sis-n-e-ti haasawf-n-a*
poorness look-CS-1PL-PV-COP talk-1PL-IPV
‘We will talk about poverty.’

These examples show that Oromo can employ free words to mark topic. The topic of declarative sentence (33a) is encoded overtly by the word /*waaʔee*/ ‘about’. The addressor is clearly informing his/her addressee(s) what he/she is going to talk about. In the same way, in example (33b) the term /*ʔlaalsis-*/ ‘concern’ overtly marks the sentence topic ‘poverty.’ The phrase /*diina koo*/ ‘my enemy’ and the noun /*hijjumma*/ ‘poverty’ are sentence topics, as overtly encoded by the topic marking lexical devices.

4.6.1.2 Marking Topic via Converse Terms

Addressors use various information packaging strategies in clauses to ensure discourse coherence. A single event can be stated in various ways across languages (Foley, 2007:364-365). Converse terms reveal a kind of oppositeness or contradiction in relation to their meaning. A pair of terms such as parent/child, employer/employee and above/below are converses of one another. Meaning interdependence is realized between these pairs of converse terms such that one member of the pair presupposes the other member (Crystal, 2008:114). Oromo has many

alternative pairs of lexical items which are interrelated with syntactic structures which reveal variations of point of view. Converse relations is manifested in various verbs, nouns and postpositions. The converse terms help to construct structures that basically convey the same meaning from various perspectives as described in the next part.

4.6.1.2.1 Topic Marking via Converse Verbs

Converse predicate is one of the strategies used in Oromo to encode the same message from different perspectives by using diverse topic entities following the alternation of converse verbs. It constitutes a lexical means of presenting one situation from two different perspectives using different information structures. Preferring one converse term over the other has direct repercussions in the participant framework. For example, the converse verbs such as /*gurgur-*/ ‘sell’ and /*bit-*/ ‘buy’, /*kenn-*/ ‘give’ and /*fud-*/ ‘take’ help to mark IS lexically via conversion. Foley and Van valin (1985:294) state that in the majority of languages, more than one verb is used to describe a certain state, event, or action. For instance, a commercial transaction involving two participants and an object can be described either as shown in example (34a) or (34b).

34. (a) *C'aalaa-n hoolaa Balcaa -ñtti gurgur-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM sheep Balcha-LOC sell-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala sold a sheep to Balcha.’

(b) *Balcaa-n hoolaa C'aalaa-ñrraa bit-ø-e*
 Balcha-NOM sheep Chala-ABL buy-3MS-PV
 ‘Balcha bought a sheep from Chala.’

35. (a) *Magarsaa-n C'aaltuu-daa-f k'arfii kenn-ø-e*
 Megersa-NOM Chaltu-COP-DAT money give-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa gave money for Chaltu.’

(b) *C'aaltuu-n Magarsaa ñrraa k'arfii fud-at-t-e*
 Chaltu-NOM Megersa ABL money take-MD-3FS-PV
 ‘Chaltu took money from Megersa.’

In clause (34a), the verb /*gurgur-*/ ‘sell’ stands for the commercial event from the point of view of the seller, while /*bit-*/ ‘buy’ oppositely presents the event from the buyer point of view in clause (34b). Example (34a) should be stored as information about ‘Chala’ while the one in (34b) must be stored as information about ‘Balcha’. The nouns ‘Megersa’ and ‘Chaltu’ are subject arguments used as the topics of clause (35a) and (35b) in that order. The lexical options in these clauses describe choices of various view points. Thus, the above paired clauses are topic-comment sentences having different topics. They express the same basic event or have the same central meaning. Though, they are structured differently in relation to their syntactic and information structures due to the structural variation realized based on the alternation of the converse verbs. The message conveyed by the paired clauses is the same. For instance, the IS of the clauses in (34a) and (34b) is packaged distinctly around the verbs ‘buy’ and ‘sell’. With the verb ‘buy’ the recipient of the sheep is the sentence topic and subject while with ‘sell’ the vendor of the sheep is the sentence topic and subject. The information units are also structured in distinct ways in the two structures. The subject a sentence is the most topical element in Oromo. In the above examples, the verb ‘buy’ makes the recipient the topic, while ‘sell’ indicates that the vendor is more topical. The information packaging variations are based on lexical choice of the predicate and it is called lexical packaging devices as (Foley and Van valin, 1985:294). Converse verbs change the information structure of clauses by changing the order of NPs but they have no effect on the basic meaning of clauses. In the above sentences, the same conceptual events are described or packaged formally in variable ways from different perspective using converse verbs. Languages have variable means of structuring the same event (Foley, 2007:363).

4.6.1.2.2 Topic Marking via Converse Nouns

Besides converse verbs, Oromo employs converse nouns to mark information structure. Crystal (2008:114) mentions pairs of terms like parent/child, employer/employee as converse nouns. The examples below show how noun conversion operates in Oromo.

36. (a) *Magarsaa-n ʔabbaa C'aalaa-ti*
 Megersa-NOM father Chala-COP
 ‘Megersa is Chala’s father.’

- (b) *C'aalaa-n ሻlma Magarsaa-ti*
 Chala-NOM son Megersa-COP
 'Chala is Megersa's son.'

Clause (36a) and (36b) convey the same central meaning, since they are paraphrase of each other. The variation in syntactic structure apparently has no influence on the basic meaning of the structures. The converse terms /*ḥabbaa*/ 'father' and /*ḥilma*/ 'son' help to describe the relation between the 'father' and 'son' from alternate view points. The message is communicated from different perspectives because the two structures are variable in relation to their syntactic and information structures. Foley (2007:366) shows that point of view is a principal and pervasive fact across all human languages. The above sentences are subsumed under the category of topic-comment sentence type. Because the subject-predicate of the clauses coincide with the topic-comment structure. Clause (36a) and (36b) state about 'Chala' and 'Megersa', respectively. The clauses have different topic.

4.6.1.2.3 Topic Marking via Converse Postpositions

Besides converse verbs and nouns, Oromo converse postpositions encode IS from various perspectives by changing the order of the information units. Foley (2007:367) says that the change in preposition is merely enough to show the variation in view point. Example:

37. (a) *Toltuu-n C'aaltuu fuula dura tees-t-e*
 Toltu-NOM Chaltu in front of sit-3FS-PV
 'Toltu sat in front of Chaltu.'

- (b) *C'aaltuu-n Toltuu dubba tees-t-e*
 Chaltu-NOM Toltu back sit-3FS-PV
 'Chaltu sat behind Toltu.'

The postposition /*dubba*/ 'back' and /*fuula dura*/ 'in front of' encode the converse relation of the clause (37a) and clause (37b). In these clauses, the place where 'Toltu' sat is described in relation to the place where 'Chala' sat and vice versa. Thus, the application of different

postpositions results in the variation of the organization of information units in these clauses. and they vary in relation to their topic-comment articulation. The topic of sentence (37a) is ‘*Toltu*’, while that of (37b) is ‘*Chaltu*’. No basic meaning variation is observed though the message is conveyed from different perspectives in the clauses. However, they cannot be used in the same context.

As presented above, conversion brings topic-comment change by altering the order of the information units of a clause. In other words, using converse nouns, verbs and adpositions brings the change of the arrangement of information units. Declarative clauses constructed around converse terms are topic-comment sentences with unmarked focus.

4.6.2 Marking Topic Syntactically

One of the prime means in which languages unlike from one another is in the sequence of elements, or, as it is usually called, their word order. When people refer to the word order of a language, they are frequently referring specifically to the order of subject, object and verb of the clause in relation to each other, but word order can stand more generally to the order of any set of constituents, either to the arrangement of any set of elements, either at the clause level or within phrases, such as the arrangement of elements within a noun phrase (Dryer, 2007:61). Languages may have fairly fixed or fairly free or flexible word order. In other words, they are called configurational languages and non-configurational languages, respectively.

Oromo has a basic word order which is basic to its clause structure. It is basically an SOV language. Apparently, it is subsumed nearly under the category of free word order language. It usually admits scrambling, since its word order does not have grammatical function due to case marking. presumably, it is a non-confugurational language, where the syntactic functions of subject and object cannot be deduced from their positions in the clause.

4.6.2.1 Basic Word Order Change

Word order can be basic or non basic. Hatim (1997:115) denotes that word order includes various operatives applied in manipulating texture and in the process underlying topic salience within the sentence. For instance, a noun phrase may be removed from its canonical slot and put

in an unusual or in a marked slot. Adverbials can appear at clause initial, middle or final position. Kroeger (2005:197) says that word order variation frequently helps to make one part of the clause more prominent than the another. Numerous languages employ the sequential order of noun phrases or sentence elements to encode variations in IS (Finegan, 2008:266). Oromo uses considerable clause word order variation almost fully for this purpose, since it does not associate basic word order change with case marking. Thus, in Oromo, scrambling does not bring basic meaning change though it plays a crucial role in relation to the IS of sentences. Because, syntax plays a vital role in the realization of information structure in the language.

Dryer (2007:73-74) says that it can normally be argued that one word order in a language is pragmatically unmarked or neutral, while the other has some added pragmatic effect. Pragmatically neutral structures are unmarked. When languages admit optional word orders; one order is virtually overwhelmingly used. But in the other examples, the variation in frequency may be much less extreme and this variation is a clear operation test. Trask (2007:30) says that “a convenient and widely used means of characterizing canonical word order is in terms of just three major constituents: subject, object and verb, or S, O and V.” The default word order of Oromo declarative clauses with transitive verbs is SOV. Trask (2007:30) states that “SOV” order is the most frequent on the planet, followed closely by SVO and more distantly by VSO.” However, these order may vary to OSV, SVO or even other type of basic word orders under some circumstances for the purpose of information structuring. A range of possible orders exist for the major clausal arguments in Oromo. Payne (1997:271) points out that the first step in determining what element orders are used to encode pragmatic statuses is to decide whether the language has a canonical word order based on grammatical relations. It is impossible to identify the marked word order of a language unless its default word order is known. special or marked word order is normally used to denote special pragmatic functions such as topic and focus (Kroeger, 2005:198, 199). For example, Oromo uses non-canonical word order to show special pragmatic roles such as topic and focus.

Information can be presented to an addressee variously and this is called sequence (Hatim, 1997). Word order change plays a great role in Oromo and the change is encoded by dislocation, passivization and scrambling. Crystal (2008:425) defines scrambling as “...an optional rule

proposed to handle the way constituents permute in free word-order languages.” It is a common term for pragmatic word order. In Oromo, it is possible to scramble noun phrases without causing meaning change. The sentences below differ in their word order, but convey the same basic meaning. Their meaning is all about ‘Tola insulted Megersa’ though they are not used in the same communicative context. As indicated below, different elements can appear at the beginning of a non basic declarative sentence and become sentence topics. The topic of clause (38a) and clause (38c) conflate with the subject. In clause (38b) and (38f) the sentence topic conflates with the direct object of the clause. In example (38d) and (38e) the topic of the clause coincides with the verb not with its arguments.

38. (a) *Tolaa-n Magarsaa ጎarrabs-ፀ-e*
 Tola-NOM Megersa insult-3MS-PV
 ‘Tola insulted Megersa.’
- (b) *Magarsaa Tolaa-n ጎarrabs-ፀ-e*
 Megersa Tola-NOM insult-3MS-PV
 ‘Tola insulted Megersa.’
- (c) *Tolaa-n ጎarrabs-ፀ-e Magarsaa*
 Tola-NOM insult-3MS-PV Megersa
 ‘Tola insulted Megersa.’
- (d) *ጎarrabs-ፀ-e Tolaa-n Magarsaa*
 insult-3MS-PV Tola-NOM Megersa
 ‘Tola insulted Megersa.’
- (e) *ጎarrabs-ፀ-e Magarsaa Tolaa-n*
 insult-3MS-PV Megersa Tola-NOM
 ‘Tola insulted Megersa.’

- (f) *Magarsaa ʎarrabs-φ-e Tolaa-n*
 Megersa insult-3MS-PV Tola-NOM
 ‘Tola insulted Megersa.’

All six word orders are possible in Oromo. Thus, sentence (38a) to (38f) are all acceptable; although they are not equally recurrent. Moreover, they would not basically be spoken in the same context for the same communicative purposes. Except clause (38a), the rest are non basic clauses, since they deviate from the basic word order of Oromo. They are obtained by scrambling the canonical word of the basic clause in (38a) in various ways. The above clauses have SOV, OSV, SVO, VSO, VOS and OVS orders in their respective order. They are not equally permissible due to their word order variation. The presence of these alternative word orders denotes that Oromo word order is not strict. In other words, the basic word order is not mandatorily used in the language. However, the changes from the basic word order are not random but rather occur for various reasons. The above clauses are used in various contexts due to their word order disparity but they are similar in relation to their basic meaning. The Prague School Linguists call the principle underlying the flexibility in word order as “Functional Sentence Perspective or FSP.”

The above examples denote that the same basic content can be encoded with various syntactic constructions. The word order variations of these clauses are associated with the information structure. In general, basic word order change can be used to impart pragmatic information, since it does not encode the grammatical function of sentence constituents . Payne (1997:132) claims that word order varies for pragmatic purpose and plays a central role in information packaging. Though, the basic word order change (i.e., scrambling) does not mark basic syntactic or grammatical roles in Oromo, it is not worthless. Because, it has an impact on the information structure of sentences. For instance, topicalization or scrambling moves the direct object of a clause from its canonical comment position and marks it as the topic of as in clause (38b). The direct object is topicalized or scrambled without any change of its grammatical relation. The noun ‘Megersa’ appears outside the SOV pattern and used as the topic in (38b). Because it is not part of the predication and viewed as an entity about which information is given in the discourse as a topic. The only pragmatic function that can be assigned to ‘Megersa’ is topic in this clause.

The above clauses denote that the effects of IS extend to variation in constituent order. The clauses show that a single event can be expressed in numerous ways. Languages vary in the extent to which the order of elements is grammatically significant, and in the sort of semantic effect changes in the order of elements produced. In languages like English, word order change is linked with case marking, while in languages like Oromo variations of word order have no impact on the grammatical roles (e.g., subject, object) of nouns, since it does not affect their grammatical relations and their semantic roles. Besides scrambling, dislocation alters the default word order of sentences though it employs a resumptive pronoun. Example:

39. (a) *marga raʎee-n ʃsa jaat-t-e*
 grass goat-NOM him eat-3FS-PV
 ‘Grass, (the) goat ate it.’

(b) *raʎee-n ʃsa jaat-t-e marga*
 goat-NOM him eat-3FS-PV grass
 ‘(The) goat ate it, grass.’

These non basic clauses reveal that Oromo displays flexibility in the ordering of the constituents clause. The clauses deviate from the basic word order of the language. The direct object is shifted to the beginning in example (39a) and to the end in clause (39b). The dislocated direct objects are replaced by the resumptive pronoun /ʃsa/ ‘him’ in both clauses. There is co-indexing relationship between the direct object /*marga*/ ‘grass’ and the pronoun /ʃsa/ ‘him’ in the clauses. The resumptive pronoun is used anaphorically in clause (39a) and cataphorically in clause (39b). The examples denote that dislocation results in sentences having different IS. Dislocation makes one element of a clause more prominent than the others. Word order changes are frequently used to make one portion of the clause more prominent than another (Kroeger, 2005:197). Thus, besides basic word order change or scrambling, topicalized constructions and various pragmatically marked clauses with non-canonical syntax like passive clauses, etc. are realized in Oromo as presented in the following sections.

4.6.2.2 Passivization

Passivization is a means of reordering the constituents of a sentence. One of the functions of passive is redistributing noun phrases in a way that makes them conform more closely to the expectation that topic/old information will come early in the sentence. Payne (1997:204) states that a prototypical passive clause is characterized both morpho-syntactically and in terms of its discourse function. In relation to discourse function, a prototypical passive is used in context S where the A is relatively low in topicality with respect to the P. The choice between active and passive equivalent is used in Oromo to mark IS since it employs passivization to convey pragmatic information. Example:

40. (a) *C'aalaa-n hoolaa gurgur- ϕ -e*
Chala-NOM sheep sell-3MS-PV
'Chala sold (the) sheep.'

(b) *hoolaa-n C'aalaa-daan gurgur-am- ϕ -e*
sheep-NOM Chala-COP-INST sell-PS-3MS-PV
'(The) sheep was sold by Chala.'

Clause (40a) is active, while clause (40b) is passive. Both clauses are topic-comment sentences. A distinction can be drawn between them. Clause(40b) varies from clause (40a) morphosyntactically due to the word order change and suffixation of the passive marking morpheme /-am/. The clauses convey the same basic meaning but vary in their syntactic and information structures. The noun 'Chala' is the topic of the active clause in (40a), while the noun 'sheep' is used as the topic of the passive clause (40b). As in sentence (40b) passivization encodes information structure or topic-comment articulation by affecting topic selection. It usually topicalizes the direct object of the active clause in Oromo. The syntactic structure and information structure of clause (40a) and (40b) conflate. But, two semantically equivalent but structurally distinct structures vary in their communicative context since one form cannot be used freely at the expense of another. Cheng (2012:495) suggests that "the immediate discourse context determines the proper choice between active and passive, as with all information-structure alternatives."

4.6.2.3 Cleft Constructions

In sentences with marked topic, topic is formally distinguished from comment. For instance, word order change and cleft constructions play an immense role in marking topic in Oromo. Clefting is a means of constituent rearrangement. Like passivization, it alters the structure of information and it is one means of syntactic topic and focus marking strategies. It splits a single clause into two parts, each with a separate verb. Oromo brings either new or old information to the front of the sentence via clefting. Simple cleft or it-cleft or sentence initial cleft puts new information at the beginning whereas pseudo or wh-cleft or sentence medial cleft puts old information at the end. Clefts have split between the topic and the rest of the sentence. Besides scrambling and passivization, basic sentence constituents: subject, object and verb can be restructured using cleft constructions to produce various pragmatically marked structures. Example:

41. (a) *C'aalaa-n daabboo jaat- ϕ -e*
Chala-NOM bread eat-3MS-PV
'Chala ate bread.'
- (b) *C'aalaa-da kan daabboo jaat- ϕ -e*
Chala-COP REL bread eat-3MS-PV
'It was Chala who ate bread.'
- (c) *daabboo-da kan C'aalaa-n jaat- ϕ -e*
bread-COP REL Chala-NOM eat-3MS-PV
'It was bread that Chala ate.'

The independent clause of a cleft construction presents focus while the dependent clause conveys the topic. In Oromo cleft constructions, the given topic element contains a dependent clause. The topic of clause (41a) and (41c) is "Chala" while the topic clause (41b) is *daabboo* "bread". The three clauses are arranged in differently ways. Clause (41a) and (41b) are the cleft forms of the basic clause in (41a). The term */kan/* can occur before or after the name 'Chala' to introduce the

dependent clause of the cleft constructions. The above clauses convey the same basic meaning although; they are used in various situational contexts, since their information is structured variously. In relation to focus-background, the element 'Chala' and 'bread' convey new information, while the rest of the clauses presents topic/old information in the pragmatically marked clauses in (41b) and (41c). In Oromo cleft sentences almost any underlying component may appear directly in front of the copula as its predicative complement and serves as the focus of the comment. In clause (41b) the new information precedes the old one, while the reverse is realized in clause (41c). The above cleft clauses have pragmatically marked word order, since they deviate from the basic word order of the language. The pragmatically unmarked clause in (41a) does not present any part of the clause as being unusually emphasized or contrasted. Though, the word order of examples (41a) to (41c) is distinct, they describe the same basic event or have the same basic meaning: however, they cannot be normally used for the same purpose in the same communicative, due to the focused constituent variation.

4.6.2.4 Topicalization

Fronting and thematization are used as alternative designations for the term topicalization. In Oromo, certain pragmatic factors (e.g., fronting and dislocation) influence word order and thus one can come across sentences with other elements than the subject in initial position via the process of topicalization. Topic can also optionally remain in-situ. Taylor (1995:163) defines topicalization as the selection and placement of non-subject element in sentence initial position. In Oromo, any core or non-subject non-core argument can become a topic of a sentence and situated in a sentence initial position. Thus, sentence topic can be marked without using any morphological element only by putting the topic element at the beginning of the clause. Meyer and Demeke (2007:25) state that every clause initial element can be used as sentence topic, particularly when it conveys background information. Topicalization structures are often (but not always) correlated with switch-topic functions (Andrews, 1985:78). It is one of the syntactic means that is used to mark IS particularly, topic. In Oromo, topicalization helps to signal a sentence topic or givenness, and a fronted element usually represents given information. Oromo allows word order alternation for pragmatic purpose. The subject of a clause often appears at the very beginning of a clause, but not always. Another phrase can also be placed at a sentence initial position before the subject. Putting a phrase before a subject helps to highlight a phrase or

to contrast it with phrases in other sentences. The phrase in front position is more prominent than the one in its normal position. Example:

42. (a) *ǎnni nam-icca san hin jaal-at-φ-u*
 he person-SGV.ABS that NEG like-MD-3MS-IPV
 ‘He does not like that man.’

(b) *nam-icca san ǎnni hin jaal-at-φ-u*
 person-SGV.ABS that he NEG like-MD-3MS-IPV
 ‘That man, he does not like.’

These basic and non basic clauses deal with various things although they convey the same message. Example (42a) is a basic canonical structure, while example (42b) is a topicalized non basic clause. Clause (42b) is a structure with marked topic without a resumptive pronoun. The pronoun /*ǎnni*/ ‘he’ is the topic element in clause (42a). The noun phrase /*namicca san*/ ‘that man’ is the topic of clause (42b). Example (42b) denotes that there are topics occurring sentence initially before subject and structurally outside a sentence. This is a clear case of non subject topic in the target language. Clause (42b) is an object fronting construction and the topic of the clause is marked by word order alternation. The object noun phrase/ *nam-icca san*/ ‘that man’ appears before the subject and causes the clause to deviate from the unmarked SOV order. In clause (42a) the pronoun ‘he’ is both the subject and topic, since subject position is typically topic when topic coincides with subject. The topicalized phrase /*namicca san*/ ‘that man’ in clause (42b) normally stands for someone that is already in awareness based on the linguistic or situational context. The phrase moves from its canonical position to occupy a syntactically more prominent position. The pronoun /*ǎnni*/ ‘he’ can be elided in (42b), since Oromo is a null-subject or subject prodrop language and admits subject omission under some information-structural conditions (e.g., null subject cannot function as a focus). Clause (42a) and (42b) are similar in what they say about the world, i.e., but vary in the way their information is packaged. The clauses have no truth-value unless they are contextualized or uttered but if they are spoken they will be truth conditionally equivalent. Because sentences lack truth-value unless they are spoken and the definite referring expressions realized in them are assigned referents otherwise they do

not express a specific proposition. Utterances are located in space and time and have agents or speakers. Both sentences and propositions are not located in space and time and they do not possess agents, since they are abstract objects (Cruse, 2011:8).

Object topicalization is common in Oromo. Besides core arguments like object, non core arguments of a verb can also be topicalized. Example:

43. (a) *gatii-n ሻaannan-ii Salaale-፳tti rakasa*
 price-NOM milk-GEN Selale-LOC cheap
 ‘The price of milk is cheap in Selale/Milk is cheap in Salale.’

(b) *Salaale-፳tti gatii-n ሻaannan-ii rakasa*
 Selale-LOC price-NOM milk-GEN cheap
 ‘In Selale, the price of milk is cheap.’

(c) *፳saan mana Tola sa፳aatii lama tur-an*
 they house Tola hour two stay-3PL.IPV
 ‘They stayed at Tola’s house for two hours.’

(d) *sa፳aatii lama ፳saan mana Tola tur-an*
 hour two They house Tola stay-PL.IPV
 ‘For two hours, they stayed at Tola’s house.’

The complement phrase */Salaale-፳tti/* ‘in Selale’ and ‘for two hours’ are topicalized in clause (43b) and (43d), respectively. Clause (43a) and (43b) as well as (43c) and (43d) convey the same message regardless of their word order variation. Clause (43b) and (43d) are examples of constructions with non core argument or adjunct topicalization. The topics are marked through basic word order change. The phrase ‘in Selale’ and ‘for two hours’ have to be separated from the main clause by short pause in the topicalized structures in speech. The complement of the clauses appears before the subject and thus the clause deviates from the unmarked SOV order.

Lambrecht (1994) states that clauses equivalent in terms of their truth-condition can be encoded in various syntactic structures. For instance, clause (43a) and (43b) communicate the same message. The sentences do vary not in what they state about the world but they differ in their information structure. Example (43a) and (43c) follow the basic word order (i.e., pragmatically neutral), while clause (43b) and clause (43d) are pragmatically marked by topicalization. Thus, the information is packaged differently in the paired allo-sentences. Compare (43a) and (43b), although they differ in their truth conditions, they show a certain interpretive equivalence. The paired allo-sentences in (43a) and (43b) and (43c) and (43d) vary in how they say about the world, but not in what they say about the world. They cannot be used alternatively in the same context. Using a certain alternative is determined by the communicative context or is empirically confirmed in terms of discourse suitability. Thus, linguistic and extralinguistic contexts have an impact on information structuring.

4.6.2.5 Dislocation

Dislocation is a formal device standing for putting a constituent outside the syntactic boundary of a sentence (Payne, 1997: 273). In Oromo, the information structure of sentences can be encoded syntactically using left and right dislocation of constituents. Dislocation is common in speech than in writing Oromo. It is occasionally called detachment (Locke and Angela, 2006:233). It is divided into right and left dislocation constructions. Dislocated topic is taken up by a resumptive pronoun and the dislocated topic is connected to the main clause by a resumptive pronoun. Crystal (2008:415) says that resumptive is a form used in grammatical analysis to stand for a constituent or construction which repeats or in some means restate the meaning of a prior constituent. The syntactic change observed due to dislocation is encoded by resumptive pronoun in dislocation constructions. An extra NP is put at the left or right end of the clause due to dislocation. Displaced noun phrases are set off from the clauses prosodically by short pause in speech and by punctuation in writing. The dislocated nouns are not parts of the clauses proper. Because the function of the external NPs is to present information about the identity of the pronouns which are inserted into the clauses in the slots of the full noun phrases. It is possible to use various grammatical structures under different communicative contexts to convey the same message. Example:

44. (a) *daabboo Magarsaa-n āsa jaat-φ-e*
 bread Megersa-NOM him eat-3MS-PV
 ‘Bread, Megersa ate it.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n āsa jaat-φ-e daabboo*
 Megersa-NOM him eat-3MS-PV bread
 ‘Megersa ate it, bread.’

The topic of an utterance is separated from the maximal clause by short pause in dislocation constructions. The dislocated topic is put at the left or right periphery of a clause without altering its case, its syntactic and semantic functions. Example (44a) denotes the left dislocated element maintains its absolutive case. Clause (44a) is a left dislocation construction, where a noun phrase from the clause is placed at the beginning of the sentence and established the sentence topic. It is a clause with a marked topic and a resumptive pronoun.

Clauses (44a) might be considered as topicalization with resumptive pronoun, since the direct object of the clause is replaced by a resumptive pronoun and appears at sentence initial position and becomes a dislocated topic. The resumptive pronoun /*āsa*/ ‘him’ is used as a place-holder for the dislocated noun and that this has effect on the degree of topicality. On the other hand, in (44b) the core argument noun phrase ‘bread’ appears at the end of the sentence and its referent is used as a topic entity.

In the above examples, the direct object of both clauses is base-generated and its normal position is occupied by a resumptive pronoun. The Left and right dislocated elements are identified from the main clauses but become the antecedents of the resumptive pronouns and used as sentence topics. Left and right dislocations are encoded using a preposed and postposed argument coindexed with a resumptive pronoun in the maximal or main clause, respectively. In left and right dislocations, the resumptive pronoun must agree with its antecedent in number, gender and case. Thus, sentence topic vary from the syntactic subject in clauses with non canonical syntax.

4.6.2.5.1 Left Dislocation

Left dislocation construction follows non basic word order. Crystal (2008:273) states that it is a kind of sentence in which one of the elements appears in sentence initial position and its prototypical position is occupied by a pronoun or a full lexical noun phrase with identical reference. It is a syntactic means of topic marking which is formally handled by co-indexing the fronted constituent with a resumptive pronoun inside the core clause. Example:

45. *Magarsaa ʔani ʔsa jibb-φ-e*
Megersa-NOM I him hate-3MS-PV
'Megersa, I hated him.'

The direct object argument 'Megersa' is base-generated and put at sentence initial position and the syntactic slot of the direct object is occupied by the resumptive pronoun /ʔsa/ 'him'. The antecedent and the anaphoric resumptive pronoun are overtly stated in the left dislocated clause. In Oromo, left dislocation is naturally used in unplanned or informal speech and writing. Left dislocation is a structure that introduces a new topic into the discourse. Because a person usually begins a sentence with what he/she has in his/her mind, which is the topic. Like topicalization, left dislocation puts an argument in non-canonical position, left peripheral position. As to Foley (2007:443) topicalization and left-dislocation clauses are superficially alike. They shift a topic NP immediately to the left of the clause. The two are identified formally by a pronominal constituent in left dislocation constructions that stands for the topic which is absent in topicalization constructions. Example:

46. (a) *ʔani biddenna hin jaad-φ-u*
I injera NEG eat-1S-IPV
'I do not eat even injera.'
- (b) *biddenna ʔani ʔsa hin jaad-φ-u*
injera I him NEG eat-1S-IPV
'Injera, I don't eat it.'

47. (a) *C'aaltuu-n na hin jaal-at-t-u*
 Chaltu-NOM me NEG like-MD-3FS-IPV
 'Chaltu doesn't like me.'

(b) *C'aaltuu-n ʔiin na hin jaal-at-t-u*
 Chaltu-NOM she me NEG like-MD-3FS-IPV
 'Chaltu, she doesn't like me.'

The direct object argument is left dislocated in example (46b), while in clause (47b), the subject argument 'Chaltu' becomes the topic of the clause without leaving its canonical position. The noun 'Chaltu' is a base-generated topic since there is no movement and the direct object argument is followed by the resumptive pronoun /ʔiin/. Thus, this clause shows that the presence of a resumptive/shadow pronoun does not correlated with an argument movement. There is a co-indexed resumptive pronoun which must be present in the main clause of dislocated constructions. Thus, in dislocated constructions, the left or right dislocated arguments can be base-generated but not moved. Crystal (2008:273) also says that left dislocation constructions and topicalization sentences are contrasted in transformational grammar. The formers are analyzed as base-generated and the latter as involving movement. Apparently, the proper name 'Chaltu' is a base-generated topical element. This clause external left dislocated topic element has to be identified from the full clause /ʔiin na hin jaal-at-t-u/ by short pause.

Subject and direct object left dislocation constructions are common in the language. The topic noun /biddenna/ 'injera' is distinguished from the subject pronoun /ʔani/ 'I' by short pause in speech in example (46b) and this clause has external left dislocated topic. However, in clause (47b) there is a resumptive pronoun, the topical elements is an external topics since they are outside the syntactic boundary of the clause. However, the proper noun 'Chaltu' has to be distinguished from the following clause via short pause in speech though the clause has double topics referring to the same entity with various levels of topicality. Foley and Van valin (1985:300) shows that subjects and external topics are constituents which exist as topical

elements, NPs which are important because of their information status. However, the status of the two NP elements is basically distinct in relation to syntactic structure.

The left dislocated clause in (46b) is divided into two parts: the left dislocated referent, which is a marked topic and the full sentence. The full sentence has a resumptive pronoun that refers back to the left dislocated element. In this structure, the left detached phrase is set off from the following clause by short pause. If the element in the phrase serves as an argument in the following clause, a resumptive pronoun referring back to the dislocated NP exists. In Oromo, left dislocation is more common than right dislocation. It seems, all languages use left dislocation as grammaticalized structure, some also use right dislocation (Payne, 1997:274). Topicalization and left dislocation constructions involve the appearance of an external topic NP followed by a clause which connects it in some means. Usually, the external topic conflates with some NP element in the sentence in which the external topic has some purpose (Foley and Van Valin, 2007:355).

4.6.2.5.2 Right Dislocation

Like left dislocation, right dislocation is also a non-canonical construction. Crystal (2008:418) defines right dislocation as a kind of sentence in which one of the elements of a sentence is located in final position and its basic slot is occupied by a pronoun with identical reference. Besides left dislocations, right dislocation marks sentence topic by placing the topic at clause final position. Sentence topic is not inevitably located at sentence initial position since it can be put at final position. Besides topic marking, Oromo usually uses right dislocation for correcting speech errors and giving clarification for ambiguous reference. Subject and direct arguments are usually right dislocated. Example:

48. (a) *ʎani Magarsaa hin jaal-add-φ-u*
I Megersa NEG like-MD-1S-IPV
'I do not like Megersa.'

- (b) *ʔani ʔsa hin jaal-add-φ-u Magarsaa*
 I him NEG like-MD-1S-IPV Megersa
 ‘I do not like him, Megersa.’

Clause (48a) is a pragmatically unmarked structure, while clause (48b) is pragmatically marked via right dislocation. The topic of clause (48a) is the pronoun /*ʔani*/ ‘I’. In (48b) the right dislocated topic noun ‘Megersa’ appears at the end outside the clause boundary. The resumptive pronoun /*ʔsa*/ ‘him’ and the antecedent topic noun ‘Megersa’ are in cataphoric relation in this clause. The right detached noun ‘Megersa’ must be set off from the preceding clause by short pause when the structure is uttered. This doubling allows addressors to process the information as they proceed; it is for this reason that it is called a feature of unplanned speech.

Presumably, any nominal sentence elements used as a sentence topic may be relegated to the left when it is marked anaphorically and to the right when it is marked cataphorically, by a pronoun only if it is definite. In other words, a resumptive pronoun is applied in dislocated constructions only if the dislocated topical element refers to a definite entity. The topics of the above sentences are core and non core arguments. Sentence elements other than nouns can be topical. In short, not only nouns serve as topics.

4.7 Topic Integration Levels

Sentence topic can integrate with the rest of the clause. Jacobs (2001:641) shows that the syntactic encoding of topic–comment structure in natural languages are distinct in numerous ways. Because sentence topic can depict various degree of syntactic integration into the rest of the clause, from full integration (the topic possesses a grammatical function in the main clause of the sentence) by loose integration (the topic is manifested outside the clause, but is co-indexed with a constituent inside the clause) to total lack of integration (the topic is neither within the clause nor co-indexed with a constituent in the sentence). Sentence topics are loosely integrated when they form a chain with the constituents of the clause and different degrees of connectivity (e.g., with respect to case agreement) can be realized. These levels of topic integration are observed in Oromo. Topic shows full integration in topic-comment sentences, since it is an internal topic and the subject and the topic of the clause conflate. Sentence topic forms loose

integration via co-indexing in dislocated constructions. Sentence topic totally lacks integration when it is marked by topicalization. There is a strong preference in discourse to interpret the grammatical subject of a clause as an unmarked topic or to put the topic in the subject position. Subject and sentence topic can coincide in one wording. Example:

49. (a) *C'aalaa-n* *Magarsaa wajjii-n* *jaat- ϕ -e*
 Chala-NOM Megersa with-INST eat-3MS-PV
 'Chala ate with Megersa.'

(b) *Magarsaa-n* *C'aalaa wajjii-n* *jaat- ϕ -e*
 Megersa-NOM Chala with-INST eat-3MS-PV
 'Megersa ate with Chala.'

These topic-comment sentences have unmarked topic. The topic and subject of the sentence coincide with each other in each clause. The unmarked pattern of topic-comment is altered using various linguistic means. Clause (49a) and (49b) are semantically equivalent, since they impart the same message. However, the interest of the utterer varies in both clauses. The addressor is mainly talking about 'Chala' in clause (49a) and about 'Megersa' in sentence (49b). Full syntactic integration of topic is observed in the clauses. The topic is fully integrated with the subject in both sentences. In other words, the subject and topic elements are the same in both examples. In Oromo, the grammatical subjects of topic-comment sentences generally conflate with unmarked topics. However, topic and subject do not always obligatorily coincide with each other. Left and right dislocated constructions and topicalized structures have fixed or structurally marked topic position, which means that arguments in these positions are obligatory. Example:

50. (a) *daabboo* *Magarsaa-n* *ñsa* *jaat- ϕ -e*
 bread Megersa-NOM him eat-3MS-PV
 'Bread, Megersa ate it.'

(b) *Magarsaa-n āsa jaat-φ-e daabboo*
 Megersa -NOM him eat-3MS-PV bread
 ‘Megersa ate it, the bread.’

(c) *daabboo Magarsaa-n jaat-φ-e*
 bread Megersa-NOM eat-3MS-PV
 ‘Bread, Megersa ate.’

Full integration of topic is lacking in the left and right dislocated and topicalized structures in (50a), (50b) and (50c), respectively. The external topics are base-generated and adjoined to the maximal clauses in the constructions with dislocated elements. The subject and topic elements are distinct in each clause. The noun /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ is used as a topic in all clauses. The topic noun ‘bread’ does not conflate with the subject noun ‘Megersa’. In the dislocation constructions loose topic integration is manifested using resumptive pronoun /*āsa*/ ‘him’, while in the topicalized structure in (50c) topic integration is lacking. The topic of the clause is marked by left dislocation, right dislocation and topicalization in the clauses in (50a), (50b) and (50c), respectively. The topic noun ‘bread’ is set off from the rest part of a clause by short pause in the topicalized construction in example (50c). This depicts the pragmatic function of pause.

4.8 Topic and Given Information

Sentence topic usually conveys old information but it rarely communicates new information. Trask (2007:229) says that the segmentation of a clause from the perspective of information content into topic-comment is basically identical to the given-new distinction, but the term topic has some additional linguistic functions. Sentence topics usually convey old information that the left part comments on. However, they can also communicate new information and cannot be always equated with given information. Sentence topics can be introduced into the discourse as new topics for the first time. But, when they are mentioned repeatedly, they become old or known topics as in the short text below.

51. *ābbaa-n hoolaa bit-φ-e waan biraa garuu hin k’ab-φ-u*
 father-NOM sheep buy-3MS-PV thing other however NEG has-3MS-IPV

ʔlm-i ʔsaa ʔmmoo reʔee bit-ø-e
son-NOM his but goat buy-3MS-PV

‘(The) father bought a sheep but he doesn’t have anything else, while his son bought a goat.’

In this text, the noun /ʔabbaa/ ‘father’, ‘zero anaphora’ and /ʔlma ʔsaa/ ‘his son’ are used as topics in that order. The position of the zero anaphora is before the word /waan/ ‘thing’. The anaphora is an expected topic coreferring back with the topic noun ‘father’ and its referent is the same with the referent of the topic noun /ʔabbaa/ ‘father’. The noun /ʔlma ʔsaa/ is a switched topic that enters into the discourse as a new topic but it does not convey new information since it is specified by the possessive pronoun /ʔsaa/ ‘his’. The topic of each clause coincides with the subject. The topic noun /ʔabbaa/ ‘father’ is newly introduced into the discourse, but it is replaced by a zero anaphora standing for familiar topic in the next part of the sentence. The topic of the next sentence switched to ‘his son’. The topic noun ‘father’ and the ‘zero anaphora’ refer to the same entity. The topic continuity is interrupted in the last sentence due to the topic shifting. Only the topic of the first sentence of the text conveys new information. Because sentence topic can deliver old or new information. The text shows that sentence topic can be given based on contextually, situationally or generally given information.

As hinted above, sentence topic usually sustains in a discourse and becomes constant topic. New topics refer to sentence topics entering into the discourse at some point for the first time, while sustained topics are topics occurring in a given text consecutively. Sentence topics convey given information via appearing in various ways. Levinson (1983:192) mentions pronouns or pronominal forms, total or partial direct repetition, substituted form/synonym or lexical replacement, specification and phrasal counterpart as means of topic repetition. These expressions are as means of sustaining sentence topics in a discourse. These topic sustaining strategies are used to present given information. Example:

52. (a) *Magarsaa-n ṛlma ṛsaa baajʔee jaal-at-ø-a muc'aa-n*
 Megersa-NOM son his a few like-MD-3MS-PV boy-NOM

garuu baajʔee ṛsa hin jaal-at-ø-u
 however a few him NEG like-MD-3MS-IPV

‘Megersa likes his son very much, but his son does not like him that much.’

(b) *barsiisaa Balcaa-n nama gaarii-da garuu Balcaa-n*
 teacher Balcha-NOM person good-COP however Balcha-NOM

barsiis-uu hin jaal-at-ø-u
 teach-NMZR NEG like-MD-3MS-IPV

‘Teacher Balcha is a good person; however, Balcha/he does not like teaching.’

(c) *Balcaa-n nama gaarii-da garuu Balcaa-n*
 Balcha-NOM person good-COP however Balcha-NOM

barsiis-uu hin jaal-at-ø-u
 teach-NMZR NEG like-MD-3MS-IPV

‘Balcha is a good person however, Balcha does not like teaching.’

(d) *Magarsaa fi Bik'iltuu-n baratt-oota garuu barumsa hin*
 Megersa and Bikiltu-NOM student-PL but education NEG

jaal-at-an
 like-MD-3PL-IPV

‘Megersa and Bikiltu are students; however, they do not like education.’

Lexical replacement (using related lexeme), partially repeated form, total repetition and elided form or zero anaphora are used as means of topic sustaining strategies in example (52a) to (52d) in their respective order. In example (52a) the noun /*muc'aa*/ ‘boy’ replaces the noun /*ṛlma*/

‘son’ and in (52b) the phrase */barsiisaa Balcaa/* ‘teacher Balcha’ is reduced to the topic head noun */Balcaa/* ‘Balcha’, while in clause (52c) the topic noun ‘Balcha’ repeats itself. In example (52d) the pronoun */ãsaan/* ‘they’ is elided from the second part of the sentence. Thus, as the discourse persists, sentence topics can be either sustained as old or continuing topics, occasionally for a considerable stretch or dropped out causing topic shifting.

As already stated topic and comment are among the complimentary notions of IS. Mini-dialogue or question-answer congruent plays a vital role in distinguishing topic-comment expressions. Topic and comment usually coincide with given and new information, respectively. The contrast between topic and comment is usually encoded via topic markers in structures with marked topics. Sentence topics can be expressed implicitly or explicitly and can be marked or unmarked. They can be marked lexically or syntactically. In Oromo, sentence topics can be marked lexically using the word */waaʔee/* and */hoo/* ‘what about x’. Besides the aforementioned topic markers, sentence topics can be marked lexically using converse nouns, verbs and postpositions through altering point of view. Converse terms show a kind of oppositeness or contradiction in relation to meaning though they express the same notion or proposition from two different perspectives. Oromo marks sentence topics syntactically using scrambling, topicalization, dislocation, passivization and cleft constructions. Sentence topics can be aboutness or contrastive. The first type of sentence topic is usually marked lexically by the forms */waaʔee/* and */hoo/* ‘what about x’ and converse terms. It can also be encoded syntactically via cleft, dislocation construction, while the second type of sentence topic is normally marked via topicalization.

Chapter Five

Given-New Information

The main objective of this chapter is describing how given-new information is structured in Oromo. It also provides a detail analysis of various means of encoding given information.

5.1 Given Information

The distinction between given and new information may play a vital role in deciding the organization of a clause. In languages with relatively free word order, given information can precede the new one and even in languages with more fixed word order like English. The variation between given and new information will play a role in deciding word order (Foley and Van Valin, 1985:286-287). As already stated, IS is divided into distinct categories or information units based on various criteria. For example, the division of IS into given-new status depends on the assumption that the addressee is aware of some part of the information that is conveyed by the addressor. Locke and Angela (2006:240) also state that given information refers to the information which is supplied by the addressor as retrievable to the addressee(s). Cheng (2012:492) says that given information functions as a link or mark of relevance to new information. von Stechow (1999:5) explains that a clause imparts its content by conveying something new against something old (i.e., the background or common ground). Given information serves as background information for the new one. Given-new expression follows the pragmatically unmarked arrangement of information units, while new-given denotes a pragmatically marked patterning of IS. New-given expression corresponds with focus-background information, while the first one conflates with background vs. focus. Thus, the second pattern is the opposite of the first one. Reich (2012) says that information structural notions such as focus are heavily depend on their context of use. Example:

53. (a) *ājoollee-n mana barumsa-a deem-t-e*
 children-NOM house education-GEN go-3FS-PV
 ‘The children went to school.’

(b) *ʔeeɲuu-tu mana barumsa-a deem-ɸ-e*
who-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
‘Who was the one that went to school?’

(c) *ʔjoollee mana barumsa-a deem-ɸ-e*
children house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
‘It was the children who went to school.’

(d) *maal-tu dal-at-ɸ-e*
what-FOC born-MD-3MS-PV
‘What happened?’

(e) *ʔjoollee-tu mana barumsa-a deem-ɸ-e*
children-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
‘It was the children who went to school.’

The declarative clauses in (53a), (53c) and (53e) convey the same meaning but structured differently in relation to their information structure. Example (53a) is a pragmatically unmarked clause with unmarked focus and topic, while the ones in (53c) and (53e) have pragmatically marked focus. Unlike the expressions in (53a) and (53c) example (53e) is an event-reporting structure withthetic sentence focus. The structure in (53c) and (53e) presuppose the questions given in (53b) and (53d), respectively. Clause (53a) is a given-new or topic-comment structure and can be divided into topic-comment and the topic corresponds with old information, while the comment partly corresponds with the new information, since this structure answers, the content question ‘where does the student go?’ the phrase ‘to the school’ is the focus center, while example (53c) can be divided into focus-background distinction based on its informativeness. The NP /*ʔjoollee*/ ‘children’ is the informative, whereas the VP /*mana barumsaa deeme*/ ‘go to school’ is the uninformative part of the clause. Example (53a) shows that the noun /*ʔjoollee*/ ‘children’ is feminine in gender though it is plural in its form. The typical test for the focus unit of a sentence is using information question, while the clause in (53e) lacks presupposition and contains only focus/new information. It is challenging to segment example (53c) into focus-

background, unless it is contextualized in the way it is presented. In clause (53e), the whole thing is new or the structure encompasses only focus since binary division is lacking. Thus, some sentences may not be divided into two parts, one conflating to topic and the other to comment. Clause (53a) and (53c) or (53e) denote that the absence of one to one correspondence between syntactic structure and information structure. A single structure may have more than one information structures. The clauses have the same syntactic structure but they vary in relation to their information structure.

5.2 Encoding Given Information

The term given and old information are normally used synonymously. Halliday and Mathiessen (2004:91) state that there exist various elements (e.g. anaphoric and deictic) in language that are inherently given. Oromo applies various linguistic devices for encoding the information that is already known in the discourse (i.e., given) and the information that is being freshly expressed definitely (i.e., new information). Old information can be marked via substitution and definite expressions in Oromo. Cruse (2000:313) lists NP with definite determiners, personal pronouns, proper names, and certain place and time adverbs as definite referring expressions. Unique entities are also subsumed under novel definite referring expressions. In general, the retrievability of old information is marked by co-reference, (total or partial repetition), pronouns, synonymous words, and specification and phrasal counterpart. These means serves to signal given information.

5.2.1 Given Information and Definite Reference

Nouns can be definite, indefinite or generic. There are three types and modes of reference: definite, indefinite and generic. Definite reference is very essential for the functioning of language (Cruse, 2000:382). The notion of definiteness and indefiniteness is related with information structure. Identifiability and referentiality are pragmatic statuses having vital role in the grammars of most languages. Certain noun phrases stand for entities that the addressor judges should be distinguishable by the addressee. For example, the article ‘the’ is one way of showing identifiability in English (Payne, 1997:263). Definiteness and indefiniteness are commonly correlated with noun phrases. Oromo marks both definiteness and indefiniteness but lacks definite and indefinite articles. It marks definiteness morphologically using the singulative marker and lexically using various determiners. Indefiniteness is encoded lexically by the

independent word /*tokko*/ for masculine and /*takka*/ ‘one’ for feminine. However, singulative markers do not always particularize nouns. Example:

54. (a) *nam-icci* *biiraa* *dug-uu* *sun* *Balcaa -da*
 man-SGV-NOM beer drink-IPV that Balcha-COP
 ‘The man drinking beer is Balcha.’

(b) *nam-icci* *dakaa* *kana* *baat- ϕ -e* *k’otijjoo* *ĩrra* *jaba-at- ϕ -a*
 man-SGV.NOM stone this carry-3MS-PV ox on strong-MD-3MS-IPV
 ‘The man who can carry this stone is stronger than an ox.’

When structure (54a) is uttered the speaker has a specific individual in mind because the man is certainly identifiable. The clause would be suitable in a situation where there is only one man drinking beer and the addressee is aware of that. In contrast, while clause (54b) is uttered there is no any specific individual in the mind of the speaker since the man is certainly not yet identifiable. This shows that the singulative marker /-*icci*/ does not always encode definiteness. In example (54a), the noun /*namicca*/ ‘the man’ has a referential use since it refers to a definite entity, while in example (54b) the noun has semantic reference and plays an attributive role. This clause can be paraphrased as “whoever, can carry this stone is stronger than an ox.” The noun has the same phonetic form or shape though it has definite referent in clause (54a) and indefinite referent in clause (54b). Clause (54b) implies that there are cases where definite expressions are non specific since definiteness is not necessarily linked with givenness. Thus, the definite noun has speaker reference and semantic/attribution reference in clause (54a) and (54b), respectively. Context determines the type of reference in which the definite expression is used.

Referring expression depends upon the assumed information status of the referent. Languages offer their speakers with various means of referring to discourse entities. Givón (1993:174) shows that one aspect of information predictability is identifiability. Some information units are taken by the addressor as predictable to the addressee, i.e., (approximately) definite. Other chunks of information are not identifiable, i.e., (roughly) indefinite. Such kind of information is obviously less predictable. Levinson (1983:70) points that when something is entered into a

discourse for the first time, using indefinite expression is suitable. However, once the entity has been introduced into the discourse, definite expressions can be used or it can be taken as definite. Nouns can be particularized by using various types of determiners. For example, anaphoric expressions specify nouns to signal given information. In Oromo, old and new information is usually typically introduced by definite and indefinite expressions, respectively. Languages use various means to signal both old and new information. Different languages encode definiteness typologically in various ways. Cruse (2000:313) mentions five types of definite referring expressions. These are: NPs with definite determiners (e.g., the book, this book), personal pronouns, and proper nouns, certain locative and temporal adverbs. Hence, nouns can be made definite using these alternatives.

Besides singulative marker, Oromo encodes definiteness by using demonstrative and possessive pronouns as determiners and so forth. Thus, it has various types of definite referring expressions. Definite expressions serve as a formal marking of NPs and information status. Definiteness is linked with both familiarity (with the discourse) and uniqueness (to the hearer). Hence, it is one means of marking given information. The choice of articles is based on the knowledge of the addressor of his/her own knowledge and of the addressee's knowledge. Definite expressions are used when the referent is known to both addressor and addressee. Levinson (1983:71) denotes that definiteness is a characteristic of a noun phrase chosen by an addressor to communicate his or her assumption that the addressee will be able to identify the referent of the noun phrase, usually because, it is the only thing of its type in the context of the utterance, or because it is unique in the universe of discourse. For instance, the object in the world that (e.g., /*muc'aa-n kuni*/ 'this boy') refers to a known individual by both interlocutors based on situational context in clause (55b).

55. (a) *muc'aa-n* *duf- \emptyset -e*
 boy-NOM come-3MS-PV
 'A boy came.'

(b) *muc'aa-n* *kuni* *duf- \emptyset -e*
 boy-NOM this come-3MS-PV
 'This boy came.'

The clauses in (55a) and (55b) basically convey the same message. However, they are used in different situational contexts. Clause (55b) can only be suitable when the speaker assumes the addressee can identify which boy is being referred to usually based on the situational context. The indefinite noun /*muc'aa*/ 'boy' in clause (55a) does have a referent, but only the addressor knows the entity that it refers to since indefinite nouns are used when their referents are known only by the speaker. The above expressions do not vary with regarding to their truth value, though they vary in relation to the definite and indefinite nouns. The definiteness of a referring expression tells us nothing about the referent itself, but rather relates to the question of whether the referent has been mentioned (or taken for granted) in the preceding discourse. Example:

56. *ānni foon hin jaal-at-φ-u*
 he meat NEG like-MD-3MS-IPV
 'He does not like meat.'

In this example, the referent of the noun /*foon*/ 'meat' is unknown to both the addressor and the addressee. There might be no any entity that could be the referent for the word 'meat' in the situational context and it has no definite referent. Non referential indefinite nouns are used when their referents are not specific or unknown to both the addressor and addressee. Saeed (2003:196) says that one basic means for an addressor to communicate her/his assumption that something is known or given is to apply a definite nominal.

5.2.2 Given Information and Context

Context specifies the referent of nouns. Givón (1993:174) claims that the predictability of information does not rely on identifiability or definiteness alone; because it is also based on the communicative or situational context within which the information is communicated. Situational context covers the identities of participants the temporal and spatial parameters of the speech events. Fromkin *et al.* (2011:207) define situational context as the non-linguistic environment in which a clause or discourse is realized. It involves the addressor, the addressee, and any third parties available, along with their beliefs and their beliefs about what the others believe.

The production and interpretation of any discourse does not reside only on the lexical and syntactic structures of a discourse, but also upon its place within its temporal and spatial setting; its relationship to the discourse producer, or addressor, and its recipient(s) or addressee(s); and other factors (Vallduví, 1993:19). Various ways of context classifications exist in pragmatics. Fromkin *et al.* (2011:217) divide context into discourse or linguistic context and situational or extra-linguistic context. They define linguistic context as what was previously spoken or written, whereas situational context as the knowledge of the world and also subsuming the speech situation. On the other hand, Cruse (2011:8) subsumes contexts at least under three headings: physical context, human context and discourse context. Thus, cruse adds human context to the category.

5.2.2.1 Physical Context

Physical or situational context plays a vital role in the process of communication. Cruse (2011:8) shows that physical context stands for things that the interlocutors can perceive with their eyes, ears, and so forth, and each participant can suppose that is accessible to the other(s). In the next examples, the interlocutors perceive the ‘bird’ and the ‘cat’ on the basis of physical context via their eyes and ears, respectively. Foley and Van Valin (1985:386) depict those elements carrying new information may be taken as definite if they are part of the immediate physical situation of the interaction. Example:

57. (a) *sinbir-ni sun raammo jaac-aa jir-t-i*
 bird-NOM that worm eat-IPV exist-3FS-IPV
 ‘That bird is eating a worm.’

(b) *ʔadurr-icca laal-i*
 Cat-SGV.ABS look-IMPV
 ‘Look at that cat.’

(c) *sirb-icca dageef-add-u*
 song-SGV.ABS listen-MD-IMPV
 ‘Listen to the music.’

Clause (57a) and (57b) intend to inform the addressor that there are a bird and a cat in the vicinity. The referents of the NPs mentioned in example (57a) and (57b) must be physically involved in the speech situation or physical context, since they are expected to be visible and perceived by the sense of sight (i.e., they are identifiable via the immediate situation of utterance). The addressor may denote the referent in the situational context by accompanying with gesture, whereas the referent of the noun /ʔadurre/ ‘cat’ in clause (57b) is involved in the speech situation and can be perceived via the sense of hearing because the entity is audible though it is invisible. The clauses show the role of situational context in marking given information. Examples (57a) to (57c) are interpreted based on situational or physical context. The examples show the situational uses of the demonstrative determiner and the singulative marker, in that the physical situation in which the addressor and addressee are located contributes to the familiarity of the referents of the definite nouns. Payne (1997:261) denotes that utterances are concrete examples of language use in context, thus they habitually appear in a context and their interpretations always influence and are influenced by the context. The above structures are used in face to face conversation, the referents of the nouns mentioned in these clauses can be distinguished by the listener as definite based on the situational context in which the structures are used. Halliday (1985:277-278) denotes that what is viewed as old information may be so because it has been aforementioned, but that is not the only possibility. It may be something that is in the environment like the referents of the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘you’ or in air, so to speak; or something that is not around at all but that the addressor wishes to provide as known for rhetorical purposes.

5.2.2.2 Discourse Context

Discourse context is also called co-text or linguistic context. Fromkin *et al.* (2011:207) refer to it as verbal or linguistic context. Cruse (2011:8) denotes that “the discourse context of an utterance consists of the utterance(s) which preceded it in the same discourse, in a conversation or a text.”

In short, it stands for what is previously spoken or written. For instance:

58. *muc’aa-n barat-aa-dā barana dargaggoo woggaa kuda torbaa-ti*
 boy-NOM student-M-COP this year youngster year ten seven-COP
 ‘(The) boy is a student. He is a seventeen years old youngster this year.’

Definiteness is inferred if there is enough information to distinguish it, either in the text or outside the text. In this short text, the noun /*muc'aa*/ 'boy' is indefinite, since it is cited for the first time. The zero anaphora in the second sentence is interpreted based on the referent of the previously mentioned indefinite noun 'boy' hence, it conveys discourse-familiar as well as hearer-familiar information. The definite NP implied via zero anaphora refers back to the indefinite noun 'boy' since they have the same referent.

Situational and linguistic contexts play a crucial role in signaling given information. IS also determines the addressor's choice of nouns, pronouns and other referring expressions, because as the above example denotes the indefinite noun 'boy' cannot be used in place of the definite noun phrase implied by zero anaphora, since the referent of the pronoun is once introduced into the discourse previously and it is definite. A referent can enter into a discourse or conversation using full expressions (e.g., a boy), possibly modification or qualification (e.g., the tall boy) or name (e.g., proper nouns like Chala).

Information structure highly influences how interlocutors refer to various entities or referents, including both introducing novel entities into a discourse and referring back to the already aforementioned ones. This can influence definiteness, pronoun use, and modification. The impacts of IS on reference are modulated by general knowledge or experience and inferences (Kim *et al*, 2013:404). Various forms serve to express old/definite and new/indefinite information. For example, once a noun enters into the discourse using indefinite expression for the first time then, it is identified in the immediate subsequent utterances. The zero anaphora in the second clause of the text can be replaced by the pronoun /*ānni*/ 'he' in the second clause of the text in (58) because the application of pronouns (i.e., third person pronouns) supplies an efficient shorthand way of standing for already-mentioned, prominent referents and helps addressors to refrain from excessive reiteration. But, first and second person pronouns do not replace nouns, since their referents have to be physically present in the speech situation.

5.2.2.3 Experiential Context

Experiential or epistemic context refers to the general or background knowledge shared by interlocutors. In other words, it stands for what they know about the world. Thus, general knowledge is very valuable for utterance interpretation. Example:

59. *C'aalaa-n ãlma hin k'ab-ø-u*
Chala-NOM son NEG has-3MS-IPV
'Chala has no son.'

Example (59) clearly states that Chala has no son (or he may have immoral son) or has only one or more daughters. For instance, based on his/her experiential context the addressee may conclude that Chala has only daughter(s). Thus, the example indicates that given information can be implicitly or explicitly stated. Thus, utterance or text interpretation depends not only on what has been introduced linguistically, but also on what can be inferred from the text or mentioned entities or from the situational context. This shows that definites are not restricted to cases where the referent is overtly given.

5.2.2.4 Human Context

In addition to physical context, discourse and experiential, human context contributes for effective communication. Human context is linked with the background information the addressor has about the addressee(s). Thus, it simplifies the process of communication. Cruse (2011:8) states that human context basically stands for addressor's evaluation of features of the addressees which are liable to influence their ability to comprehend a message. An addressor communicates message in various ways depending on the age, ability and relevant knowledge of addressee(s). The same message can be conveyed in diverse ways to people with various age group, educational background or command of language. Cognitive features such as the participants' knowledge, beliefs and assumptions are very essential. Cruse (2011:8) mentions parameters like age, background knowledge, command of language etc., as obviously relevant to addressor's decision concerning the balance between overt and covert information-how much (and what) to encode in the utterance and how much to leave to the addressee to figure out. If the

addressor depends too heavily on the addressee's powers of inference, the message may be communicated wrongly.

5.3 Given Information and Uniqueness

Unique entities are definite and are the only one of their kind. Burling (1992:247) denotes that a word may stand for unique entities. The sun, last letter of the alphabet, sky, earth, rain, moon, and so forth are unique, and provide permanently available information, since they are entirely unlike anything else or invariably definite. The referents of the words presented as the subject of clause (60a) and (60b) are part of the world knowledge shared by interlocutors. Entities can be hearer-old or hearer-new based on whether they are assumed to exist within the addressee's knowledge store. They can be grouped as discourse-old and discourse new based on whether or not they have been evoked in the prior discourse. The unique entities mentioned in the examples denote information that is discourse-new but representing entities that have not been evoked in the prior discourse but which can be judged to be familiar to the addressee. Example:

60. (a) *ʔaddee-ttii-n* *baah-t-e*
 moon-SGV.F-NOM got out-3FS-PV
 ‘The moon rose.’

(b) *ʔaduu-n* *lit'-t-e*
 sun-NOM sink-3FS-PV
 ‘The sun set.’

The noun /*ʔaduu*/ ‘sun’ does not normally take the feminine singulative marker. The topic or subject of clause (60a) and (60b) are the inherently definite nouns ‘moon’ and ‘sun’, respectively. There is only a single entity in the world or in a normal universe of discourse that is known as the moon or sun. Hence, these nouns are invariably definite and carry given information. Novel definites refer to entities that are well known to all and known to be unique (e.g. the moon, the sky). Unique entities like sun and moon are identifiable, since their uniqueness allows immediate identification though they have not been mentioned or implied before.

5.4 Given Information and Pronouns

Except indefinite and interrogative pronouns, personal pronouns are definite descriptions usually conveying given information. Finegan (2008:255) states that like proper nouns, pronouns are generally definite. They are grouped into personal, demonstrative, interrogative, indefinite, reflexive and reciprocal pronouns. Personal, reciprocal, reflexive and demonstrative pronouns signal given information, since they refer to definite entities. Schachter (1985:25) states that pronoun is the most widely known type of pro-form. Pro-form (e.g., here, he and so forth.) is an element that replaces another word(s) and whose meaning is recovered from the linguistic or extralinguistic context. In the next sections, the function of various types of pronouns in relation to given information is briefly touched upon.

Personal pronouns refer to definite entities. Lyons (1977:638) states that “the grammatical category of person relies on the notion of participant roles and upon their grammaticalization in particular languages.” The main function of personal pronouns is establishing major referents in the discourse by setting up referential (or identity) chains by means of anaphora. Personal pronouns appear in two forms: neutral or citation (e.g., focus neutral) and focused forms. Example:

61. (a) *ʃiin barat-tuu-da*
she student-F-COP
‘She is a student.’

(b) *ʃsaa-tu barat-aa-da*
him-FOC student-M-COP
‘It is him who is a student.’

The subject of clause (61a) and (61b) is the personal pronoun /*ʃiin*/ and /*ʃsaa*/, respectively. The pronoun /*ʃiin*/ refers to a definite entity hence it carries given information, while the pronoun /*ʃsaa*/ receives the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ since it carries focus. This shows that personal pronouns do not always encode given information though they are inherently definite since they can also carry focus. For instance, the absolutive case of Oromo personal pronouns have focused

and unfocused forms. However, their nominative case forms do not take the morpheme */-tu/*. They are usually altered into their absolutive case forms to receive some focalizing devices like the focus marker */-tu/* and */k'ofa/*. Thus, Oromo has two forms of subject: nominative case and absolutive case. Crucially, nominative case marker is realized only on topical subjects, while non-topical or focused subjects must appear in absolutive form. Absolutive subject normally appears with a subject focus marker. Thus, the IS role of subject determines its case marking and agreement paradigm. A non-topical or focused argument can be used as a subject in Oromo.

Reciprocal pronouns usually convey given information. Payne (1997:200-201) explains that a canonical reciprocal structure is one in which two participants equally act upon each other, i.e., both equally plays the roles of agent and patient. Example (62a) and (62b) show that the same information can be structured in distinct ways by reciprocal constructions. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:39) identifies */wal/* as the only reciprocal pronoun in Oromo. This pronoun has different case forms but it does not inflect for person, gender and number. Example:

62. (a) *C'aalaa-n Magartuu fuud-φ-e*
 Chala-NOM Megertu marry-3MS-PV
 'Chala married Megertu.'
- (b) *Magartuu-n C'aalaa heerum-t-e*
 Megertu-NOM Chala.ABS marry-3FS-PV
 'Megertu married Chala.'
- (c) *C'aalaa fii Magartuu-n wal- jibb-an*
 Chala and Megertu-NOM each other hate-3PL.IPV
 'Chala and Megertu hated each other.'
- (d) *wal- jibb-an C'aalaa fii Magartuu-n*
 each other hate-3PL.IPV Chala and Megertu-NOM
 'Chala and Megertu hated each other.'

In example (62a) and (62b) convey the same basic meaning though they are organized differently, since they contain various information units due to the inherently reciprocal verb /*fuud-*/ and /*heerum-*/. Oromo uses the reciprocal verb /*fuud-*/ for masculine and /*heerum-*/ feminine to convey the notion of marrying. The noun ‘Chala’ and ‘Megertu’ are the topical subjects of the reciprocal clauses in (62a) and (62b) in their respective order. The clauses encode the same relation by using the inherently reciprocal verb /*fuud-*/ and /*heerum-*/ ‘marry’. But the clauses have different information structure due to the reciprocal verbs. The reciprocal pronoun /*wal*/ ‘each other’ serves as an anaphoric and cataphoric pronoun in examples (62c) and (62d), respectively. It refers to the same person as its conjoined antecedents in both structures. It conveys given information by referring backward and forward to the already mentioned information only and its antecedent conveys known information.

Like reciprocal pronouns, reflexive pronouns are usually used to convey given information. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:38) states that Oromo reflexive pronouns have three variants /*ɔf*/, /*ɔf*/ and /*ɔf*/. The variant /*ɔf*/ is applied for all persons without any number and gender distinction to construct reflexive structures in the Tulama dialect. Besides /*ɔf*/, in the Tulama dialect, reflexive pronoun can be formed by using the word /*mataa*/ literally ‘head’ plus the possessive pronouns. Example:

63. (a) *Magarsaa-n* *ɔf* *ɔɣɣees-ɸ-e*
 Megersa-NOM self kill-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa killed/hurt himself.’

(b) *ɔf* *ɔɣɣees-ɸ-e* *Magarsaa-n*
 self kill-3MS-PV Megersa-NOM
 ‘Megersa killed/hurt himself.’

(c) *laal-i* *ɔkkat* *ɔf* *ɔɣɣees-ɸ-e*
 look-IMPV how self kill-3MS-PV
 ‘Look how he killed himself.’

- (d) **ʔof** ʔajjees-*φ*-e
 self kill-3MS-PV
 ‘It was himself that he killed.’

The pronoun /ʔof/ ‘self’ is used as anaphoric pronoun in clause (63a) and as cataphoric pronoun in clause (63b). The reflexive pronoun /ʔof/ can mark focus when it receives high pitch in the example. The antecedent of this pronoun can be expressed overtly or covertly. In clause (63c) and (63d) the antecedent is deleted and implied morphologically via agreement morpheme on the verb. The pronoun /ʔof/ ‘self’ is coreferential with the noun ‘Megersa’ in (63a) and (63b), but in (63c) it is used as an exophoric form, while in clause (63d) it is coreferential with the covertly implied antecedent by the verb. The antecedent of the pronoun can be recovered either from the linguistic or situational context.

The reflexive pronoun /ʔof/ can be replaced by the alternative reflexive pronoun /mataa ʔsaa/ ‘himself’ in the above examples, since reflexivization can be encoded by the word /mataa/ ‘head’ plus a possessive pronoun based on person because different possessive pronouns are used for all persons. For all persons, the pronoun /ʔof/ ‘self’ and /mataa/ ‘head’ plus a suitable possessive pronoun can be employed alternatively. The examples denote that reflexive pronouns usually mark given information. However, they can be used to carry focus based on the context in which they are used as in example (64b) when it receives high pitch. The referent of the focused element ‘himself’ is salient in the discourse and it is taken as new information not given information since it substitutes the question word /ʔeeju/ ‘who’. However, to encode new information, the reflexive pronoun /ʔof/ ‘self’ has to receive high pitch as in clause (64b). Hence the pronoun /ʔof/ is written in bold to indicate the high pitch to encode focus. For instance:

64. (a) *Magarsaa-n* **ʔeeju** *miid-φ-e*
 Megersa-NOM who hurt-3MS-PV
 ‘Who did Megersa hurt?’

- (b) *Magarsaa-n /ɔf miid-φ-e*
 Megersa-NOM self hurt-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa hurt himself.’

The noun ‘Megersa’ is used as a sentence topic in these examples. This noun is specified in question (64a) as the topic or part of the background information in clause (64b), while the pronoun /*ɔf*/ ‘self’ is specified as a contrastive focus expression. This implies that given or definite expressions like pronouns can be focused in some context. The noun ‘Megersa’, which is the topic of the clause and the pronoun /*ɔf*/ ‘self’ which is focused using high pitch refer to the same individual and have the same referent. NPs with the same referent carry distinct pragmatic roles or information units in the same clause. In this case, identifying which NP plays which role cannot be determined based on what is known about their referents.

Like personal, reciprocal and reflexive pronouns, possessive pronouns encode given information. Oromo has possessive pronouns and possessive determiners having the same form except for third person singular and third person plural. As shown below, for third person, the determiners are formed by adding the genitive marker /*kan*/ which can be translated into ‘of’.

Person	Possessive determiners/pronouns	Gloss	Person	Possessive determiners/pronouns	Gloss
1S	<i>koo</i> or <i>kijja</i>	my/mine	2PL	<i>keessan</i> or <i>teessan</i>	your/yours
	<i>too</i> or <i>tijja</i>		3MS	<i>(kan/tan) ṽsaa</i>	his
1PL	<i>teeṇa</i> or <i>keeṇa</i>	our/ours	3FS	<i>(kan/tan) ṽṽii</i>	her /hers
2S	<i>tee</i> or <i>kee</i>	your/yours	3PL	<i>(kan/tan) ṽsaan(ii)</i>	their/ theirs

Possessives indicate a relationship between two entities. Hatim (1997:204) says that possessive expressions commonly invoke kinship and other interpersonal relationships. Example:

65. (a) *ñlkaan ñsaa*

teeth his

‘his teeth’

(b) *mana saree*

house dog.GEN

‘Dog’s house’

In example (65a) the concept of possession is lexically marked by the possessive pronoun. The noun /*ñlkaan*/ ‘teeth’ is followed by the third person possessive pronoun /*ñsaa*/ ‘his’. The notion of possession is marked only by juxtaposition in clause (65b). The noun /*mana*/ ‘house’ precedes the ownership /*saree*/ ‘dog’. The noun ‘house’ is specified or becomes definite by the noun ‘dog’. Example (65a) shows that nouns modified by possessive pronouns convey given information since they become definite referring expressions. Thus, the concept of possession is lexically encoded by possessive pronouns and juxtaposition at phrasal level and the phrases encode given information. Possession can be marked by a possessive pronoun at clausal level as in example (66b). The noun /*mana*/ ‘house’ is specified by the possessive pronoun /*koo*/ ‘my’ and becomes definite.

66. (a) *man-ni bit-am-ø-e*

house-NOM buy-PS-3MS-PV

‘A house was bought.’

(b) *man-ni koo bit-am-ø-e*

house-NOM my buy-PS-3MS-PV

‘My house was bought.’

These clauses convey the same basic information. The topic is the indefinite noun ‘house’ in example (66a) and the definite noun ‘my house’ in clause (66b). The topic noun of sentence (66b) becomes definite or given, since it is modified by the possessive pronoun /*koo*/ ‘my’ because possessive determiners normally specify nouns.

5.5 Given Information and Proper nouns

Proper nouns are a subcategory of nouns subsumed under definite expressions, since they refer to specific individuals. There are three grammatically distinct types of singular definite expressions: proper nouns, definite noun phrases and pronouns. Proper nouns are inherently definite and cannot logically be conceived of as indefinite. They stand for an individual person, place and entity, etc. and express given information, since they are inherently definite and stand for a single entity. Payne (1997:263) states that noun phrases can be particularized in numerous means. Using a proper noun usually shows that the addressor assumes the addressee can distinguish the referent. Example:

67. (a) *Tulluu-n hoolaa bit- ϕ -e*
Tullu-NOM sheep buy-3MS-PV
'Tullu bought a sheep.'

(b) *Tulluu-n ʔobboleess-i koo hoolaa bit- ϕ -e*
Tullu-NOM brother-NOM my sheep buy-3MS-PV
'Tullu, my brother, bought a sheep.'

The addressor usually assumes that the addressee can effortlessly identify the person about whom he is talking or the identity of the participant referred to as 'Tullu' in example (67a). Because proper names are inherently definite in that they communicate addressor's assumption that the addressee can identify the referent. The addressee is expected to attach quickly the name 'Tullu' to its referent. But if he fails to identify the person, he may ask the question 'who is Tullu?' and the ambiguity can be resolved by associating the person 'Tullu' with some other already known individual. Frequently a noun phrase is specified by its association with some other already specified noun phrase. A noun is considered as specific if its referent is overt enough for the addressor current purposes (Payne, 1997: 263). In clause (67b), the referent of the noun 'Tullu' is established through associating it with the phrase 'my brother', since the referent of the pronoun 'my' can be inferred from the situational context. The addressor can have only one brother who is known by the name 'Tullu'. The proper name 'Tullu' is inherently definite since it refers only to a single individual.

Unlike proper nouns, common nouns do not normally refer to a single entity. They stand for a set of persons, objects or things. They have generic reference and do not name anything specific in a dictionary. However, when they are used in discourse they need to be specified by a determiner. The nouns /*hoolaa*/ ‘sheep’ and /*mana*/ ‘house’, etc. are examples of common nouns. Example:

68. (a) *man-ni* *gurgur-am-φ-e*
house-NOM sell-PS-3MS-PV
‘A house was sold.’

(b) *man-ni* *kuni* *gurgur-am-φ-e*
house-NOM this sell-PS-3MS-PV
‘This house was sold.’

In example (68a) the common noun ‘house’ stands for indefinite entity since it is an indefinite noun. On the other hand, in example (68b), the common noun ‘house’ becomes definite since it is specified by the demonstrative determiner /*kuni*/ ‘this’ and hence refers to a definite entity. In Oromo, unique, previously mentioned, physically present referents or referents assumed as common knowledge are classified as referential definites and encode given information.

5.6 Given Information and Singulative Marker

Singulativity is linked with singular nouns having indefinite referents to specify them. The singulative marker /-*ħcca*/ serves for specifying entities with masculine gender, while /-*ħttii*/ is used for feminine gender as exemplified below.

69. (a) *niita-ttii* *beek-t-a-a*
woman-SGV.F know-2S-IPV-QM
‘Do you know the woman?’

(b) *nama-ttii* *beek-t-a-a*
person-SGV.F know-2S-IPV-QM
‘Do you know the little man?’

The referent of the topic noun /*niitii*/ is specified in clause (69b) by the suffixation of the singulative marker /-*āttii*/. The feminine singulative marker is suffixed to nouns referring to masculine entity to specify and show contempt in clause (69b). In this clause, the singulative marker does not encode gender. It particularizes the entity that the addressor refers to to denote smallness or endearment based on context. The singulative marker encodes old information by specifying the noun in the example. Shimelis (2014:10) also states that the singulative marker is used to single out or particularize one entity.

5.7 Given Information and Substitution

Substitution encodes given information by replacing a sentence constituent with various linguistic units or proforms. Halliday and Hasan (1976:99) define it as “a grammatical relation, a relation in the wording, rather than in the meaning, the various types of substitution are defined grammatically rather than semantically.” There are various types of substitutes (i.e., nominal, verbal and clausal). Donnelly (1994:102) states that substitution is very much interrelated to reference in that pro-forms (substitute nouns, verbs and clauses) are also used as substitute. Halliday and Hasan (1976:89) explain that “the distinction between substitution and reference is that substitution is a relation in the wording rather than in the meaning.” Levinson (1983) claims that substitutions help as deictic markers to indicate nominals, verb groups and clauses. Unlike ellipsis, substitution does not omit old information to signal only the new information. Because it is used for wording the same thing or idea repeatedly in various ways by creating cohesive ties. Example:

70. (a) *C'aalaa-n nama hamaa-dā*
 Chala-NOM person cruel-COP
 ‘Chala is a cruel/bad person.’

(b) *Magarsaa-ni-s san-uma*
 Megersa-NOM-FOC that-FOC
 ‘Megersa is also the same.’

(c). *Magarsaa-uma-ti-llee*

Megersa-FOC-COP-FOC

‘Megersa is also the same.’

The expression */nama hamaada/* ‘is a cruel person’ is substituted by a filler term in the examples in (70b) and (70c). The substitution avoids the repetition of the redundant information (i.e., the verb phrase) that is known to the addressee from the linguistic context. The syntactic slot from which the given information is omitted is not left null rather it is occupied by filler. The filler forms */sanuma/* and */-λumtillee/* are used as verb phrase substitutes in example (70b) and (70c), respectively. The examples denote that substitution helps to avoid repetition of given information by filling the structural slot by filler, while ellipsis leaves a structural slot null. Fromkin *et al.* (2011:212) state that inessential words and phrases are commonly omitted to make a discourse more concise and economical. Verb phrases are not overtly stated, the whole clauses are elided; direct objects disappear and pronouns roam freely. Yet interlocutors still understood each other and it is partly because grammatical and discourse rules combine with contextual knowledge to fill in what is unknown and make the discourse coherent. Various terms are used as fillers since substitution does not left the syntactic slot empty unlike ellipsis. Example:

71. (a) *ʔnni horii ʔabbaa hat-ee gurgur-at-uu barbaad-φ-a*
he animal father steal-CNV sell-MD-NMZR want-3MS-PV
‘He wants to steal and sell his father’s cattle.’

- (b) *ʔani garuu kana/ʔakka-s hin barbaad-φ-u*
I however this/as-FOC NEG want-1S-IPV
‘However, I do not like this or I do not that.’

72. (a) *ʔnni k’arfii barbaad-φ-a*
I money want-3MS-IPV
‘He needs money.’

- (b) *ʔanii-s ʔis-uma-n barbaad-ø-a*
 I-FOC he-FOC-1S want-1S-PV
 ‘I also need that one.’

The word */kana/* ‘this’ and */ʔakkas/* ‘like that’ and */ʔsuman/* ‘that one’ are used as fillers in example (71b) and (72b), respectively. These fillers replace the phrase */horii ʔabbaa kooti hatee gurguruu/* ‘stealing and selling my father’s cattle’ in clause (71b) and the noun */k’arfii/* ‘money’ in clause (72b). The examples show that substitution can be realized at phrasal or clausal level. In short, a phrase and clause can be replaced by a filler element.

5.8 Given Information and Deixis

Deictic expressions are language universal words or phrases that require contextual information to be interpreted and convey message. Kroeger (2005:136) says that deictic forms typically stand for things that the addressor could actually point to, while he/she is speaking. Lyons (1977:637) denotes that deictic terms are linguistic units convey the location and identification of individuals, entities, events, processes and activities being discussed or referred to, in relation to the spatio-temporal context created and continued by the act of utterance and the involvement in it, normally, of one addressor and at least one addressee. For example, the word */ʔani/* ‘I’, */ʔamma/* ‘now’ and */ʔas/* ‘here’ are deictic forms. The speaker being the deictic center, the referents are obviously identifiable. The above deictic terms refer to the speaker, the time of utterance and the location of the speaker in that order. Sentences involving such deictic terms are inevitably context-dependent. The referent of the deictic forms is context dependent. These deictic forms or deictic forms in general have fixed semantic but variable pragmatic meaning (i.e, non basic meaning), since they are context dependent terms and cannot be understood without additional contextual information. They always change their referent based on context keeping their semantic meaning constant. For example, the personal pronoun */ʔani/* ‘I’ could refer to various persons based on speech situation keeping its semantic meaning (i.e., first person singular) fixed. Akmajian *et al.* (2010:251) put that deictic expression has an indexical use. Example:

73. *ʔani ʔamma ʔsa ʔas-ʔtti jaam-ø-e*
 I now him here-LOC call-1S-PV
 ‘I called him to here now.’

Out of context, it is impossible to understand this clause. Because it comprises deictic forms that depend upon the immediate physical context for their interpretation. To determine whether the above clause is true or false, we need to know who uttered it, at what time and where. In other words, the deictic centers of person, time and place are required. The deictic terms /ʔamma/, ‘now’, /ʔas/ ‘here’, /ʔani/ ‘I’ and /ʔsa/ ‘him’ should be associated with specific referents. The pronoun /ʔsa/ ‘him’ can only be used as a deictic expression when its referent is physically involved in the speech context. If he is not in the seen, the pronoun cannot be considered deictic. If, however, it refers to an antecedent in a discourse which was, in turn, used in reference to exophoric entity, it is an anaphora. The reference of these deictic terms totally relies on the situational context of the utterance. Deictic words depend on the addressor and addressee sharing the same immediate physical context. It is virtually very difficult for someone to understand the above clause if he/she does not know who is speaking about whom, where and when. Out of context, the clause becomes extremely vague; due to the aforementioned deictic terms. For instance, Unlike proper nouns, the pronoun /ʔani/ ‘I’ does not refer to real world entity, rather it is linked with discourse referent that can be identified from situational context only when the referent is physical involved in the speech context. Halliday and Ruqaiya (1976:31) consider deictic terms as language universal units that cannot be interpreted semantically in their own right, rather refer to something else for their interpretation (i.e., have the property of reference). When an addressor uses deictic terms he/she is working with an assumption that the addressee identifies the intended individual, time and location. In a more general way, addressor continually designs linguistic messages on the basis of assumptions about what the addressors already know.

5.8.1 Endophoric and Exophoric Deixis

Deictic expressions can be grouped into endophoric (e.g., discourse deixis) and exophoric deictic terms. Endophoric forms guide the addressee to look back or forward for their interpretation. When they are used endophorically and exophorically their interpretation lies within the text and

outside the text, respectively. Thus, deictic terms have deictic and non-deictic usage. Non-deictic usage subsumes anaphoric and non-anaphoric references. Deictic expressions encode given information, since their interpretation and meaning are recovered from linguistic and situational context. They do not usually carry information focus; if they do, they present contrastive focus. Akmajian *et al.*(2010:252) say that deictic words can have other functions and are not always inevitably used as deictic terms.

Anaphora or cataphora is a pronoun or nominal demonstrative used as substitute for NP. Pronouns have endophoric and exophoric relations. Endophoric relation includes anaphoric and cataphoric relations. Halliday and Hasan (1976:33) refer to endophoric reference as textual and exophoric reference as situational reference. They state that what is primary to both kind of references is that there is a presupposition that must be fulfilled; the thing referred to has to be recognizable somewhat. Example:

74. (a) *ʔani san-ijjuu hin beek-ϕ-u*
 I that-FOC NEG know-1S-IPV
 ‘I do not know even that one.’

(b) *ʔani kana-jjuu hin beek-ϕ-u*
 I this-FOC NEG know-1S-IPV
 ‘I do not know even this one.’

In example (74a) and (74b) the demonstrative pronoun /*san*/ ‘that’ and /*kana*/ ‘this’ may show distance in relation to place. The focus particle /-*ʔijjuu*/ which is adjoined to the demonstrative pronouns can be roughly translated into the English scalar focus marker ‘even’. The focused pronoun /*san-ʔijjuu*/ ‘even that one’ and /*kana-ʔijjuu*/ ‘even this one’ are understood in relation to situational context, since they are exophoric or deictic forms.

75. (a) *san naa-f fid-t-e-e*
 that me-DAT bring-2S-IPV-QM
 ‘Did you bring me that?’

(b) *ʔani waan san bit-ɸ-e*

I thing that buy-1S-PV

‘I bought that (thing).’

In example (75a) and (75b), the pronominal /*san*/ ‘that’ and the addnominal /*waan san*/ ‘that thing’ represent something which is already familiar to the addressor and addressee but unfamiliar to a third party (e.g., bystander). The thing that the interlocutors are referring to may not be physically present in the situational context. The examples show that exophoric and endophoric use of pronouns (i.e., exophoric and endophoric deixis in that order) is determined on the basis of situational and textual or linguistic context, respectively.

Deictic forms with exophoric references can be used with body gestures because gestures and facial expressions convey meaning in support of oral communication. Danesi (2004:30) says that the most common realization of indexicality can be observed in the pointing index finger which, human being all over the world uses instinctively to point out and locate entities, people, and events in the world. Akmajian *et al.* (2010:251) says that “demonstratives involve a supplementary gesture (demonstration) or special setting in order to determine reference.” Using demonstratives successfully to refer involves more than just the aspects of the context of utterance required by indexical (speaker, time, place, etc.)’. Demonstrative pronouns are often accompanied by facial expressions, lip protruding/pointing and hand or body system because gesture helps to resolve ambiguity. Example:

76. (a) *muc’aa-n kuni Magarsaa-da*

boy-NOM this.NOM Megersa-COP

‘This boy is Megersa.’

(b) *mic’ajjoo san laal-i*

girl that look-IMPV

‘Look at that girl’.

(c) *C'aalaa muc'aa san ḷagar-t-e-e haada ḷsaa ḷeeg-uu-f*
 Chala boy that see-2S-PV-QM mother his wait-NMZR-DAT

gamas ḷyy-at-ḷ-e-e
 yonder stand-MD-3MS-PV-QM

‘Chala, have you seen that boy? He is standing over there waiting for his mother?’

The deictic forms used in these examples can usually be used with paralinguistic feature (e.g., eye gaze, a nod of head, lip protruding, a gesture with hand, etc.) which draws the attention of the addressee to the referent in the situation context. The clauses can be accompanied with body gesture like lip protruding or index finger pointing in speech and the vital role of gesture is disambiguating and focusing the information conveyed orally. The demonstrative determiner /*san*/ ‘that’ helps to identify the referent of the noun /*mic'ajjoo*/ ‘girl’ and /*muc'aa*/ ‘boy’ in the above examples. The referents of the modified nouns can be retrieved from the situational context. The addressor can show the referents of the noun ‘girl’ and ‘boy’, since they are physically present in the situational context. Exophoric deictic forms can be accompanied by gestures like lip protruding and index finger pointing. Thus, gesture and utterance context help the addressee to identify the entity intended by the speaker.

Nouns modified by demonstrative determiners have also a purely deictic function when their referents are physically involved in the speech context as in the examples. However, exophoric deictic and endophoric deictic usages are not mutually exclusive and the same phonetic form is used as endophoric deictic and exophoric expressions. Example:

77. *C'aaltuu-n Magarsaa-n ḷakka ḷjii jaal-at-ḷ-u beek-t-i*
 Chaltu-NOM Megersa-NOM as her like-MD-3FS-IPV know-3FS-IPV
 ‘Chaltu knows that Megersa likes/loves her.’

The referent of the pronoun /*ḷjii*/ ‘her’ in example (77) depends on the linguistic or situational context in which it is used. The pronoun /*ḷjii*/ corefers with the antecedent noun ‘Chaltu’ when it is used as an anaphoric pronoun. On the one hand, when it is used as an exophoric deictic expression, it refers to some other individual outside the text not to ‘Chaltu’. Thus, it is possible

to interpret the pronoun as exophoric and endophoric deictic expressions based upon linguistic context and situational context, respectively. When it is interpreted based on linguistic context as endophoric deixis, it corefers with ‘Chaltu’, whereas when it is used as exophoric deixis, it refers to someone who is present in the physical context based on situational context. In short, a pronoun stands for an entity in the situational context that fulfills its descriptive content when it is used as an exophoric deictic expression.

5.8.2 Symbolic and Gestural Deictic Use

Deictic terms have symbolic and gestural usages. Some functions of deictic forms need continuous monitoring of significant aspects of the speech situation for their interpretation: in the clearest cases, the addressee has to be able to notice the addressor and their body gestures (Cruse, 2000:324). Gestural deictic usage signifies the combination of indexicals with gestures which point to the referent, while symbolic usage (i.e., deictic use minus gesture) expects the addressee simply to know the basic spatio-temporal parameters of the speech event (Levinson, 1983:65). Pointing at things via non linguistic means using body language such as eye-gaze, lip protruding and head, hand or other body parts movement and demonstrative pronouns is used to disambiguate the referent. Usually, index finger pointing is used even for things located at distance. Demonstrative pronouns normally involve selective gesture. Thus, the gestural use of deictic terms can be realized in various ways. The clauses below show gestural and symbolic uses of deictic terms.

78. (a) *kitaaba kana bit-i kunoo*
 book this buy-IMPV here it is
 ‘Here it is, buy this book.’

(b) *kitaaba kana fudá-u kunoo*
 book this take-IMPV here it is
 ‘Here it is, take this book.’

- (c) *ʎani k'uba of mur-ɸ-e kunoo kana*
 I finger self cut-1S-PV here this
 'Here, I cut this finger.'

Clause (78a) and (78b) can be concomitant by gestural deictic forms when uttered. These clauses can be accompanied by gestural deictic via pointing with index finger or lip protruding at the book. They can also be uttered through handing or giving the book itself to the addressee (i.e. presentation of an object). In example (78a) the addressor may be ordering or recommending the addressee to buy the book on his/her hand itself or another copy of it, while in clause (78b), the addressor is showing the addressee to take the book. In symbolic deictic, body gesture is not involved, while in gestural deictic the involvement of body part movement is mandatory. Levinson (1983:65) says that deictic expressions applied in a gestural deictic way can merely be understood based on an audio-visual tactile, and in general a physical, monitoring of the speech event. Only gestural deictic is required via presenting the injured finger in example (78c). In this clause, the term /*kana*/ 'this' refers to whatever a finger refers to, however, the deictic term must be concomitant concurrently by the presentation of the relevant finger. Thus, the example shows that it is not allowable for the gestural deictic to apply with the non-deictic anaphoric usage. Levinson (1983:65) denotes that commonly a few terms exist in a language that can solely be applied gesturally: for example, there are presentatives like the French "voioil", and English "cheers" and so forth.

5.8.3 Given Information and Deixis Types

There is no uniformity regarding deixis classification. Levinson (1983:62) categorizes it into three major groups as: person, place and time deixis. Following other scholars' categorization this author adds discourse/text and social deixis. Danesi (2004:30) mentions person, place and time deixis as the three basic kinds of deictic expressions. In contrast, Cruse (2000:402) divides deixis into five subgroups as personal, social, spatial, temporal and discourse deixis. Discourse deixis is not described in this study, since it relies on linguistic than situational context since it has endophoric reference. The aforementioned deictic types are realized in Oromo, since it has a complex and elaborated deictic system.

5.8.3.1 Given Information and Person Deixis

Person deixis operates based on tripartite system or triadic behaviour (i.e., addressor, addressee and the entity talked about) to point to people. Besides person deictic expressions, speech participants can be expressed by agreement markers on verbs. Cruse (2000:319) says that the term person concerns the individual(s) who is/are involved in the utterance: with the discourse role of addressor(s), addressee(s) or participant(s). Person deixis is linked with most personal pronouns. Personal pronouns are forms used in place of a noun to denote someone or something already mentioned (e.g., she, he). There are pronouns that do not have substitutional function, because first and second person pronouns do not substitute nouns, since their referents are expected to be physically involved in the immediate speech situation not in the text. Addressor and addressee are discourse-old referents, since the discourse implies their presence. First and second person pronouns cannot be interpreted without referring to the actual speech context. Fromkin *et al.* (2011:209) say that pronouns are perhaps used to stand for entities previously mentioned in discourse or for entities that are presumably familiar with the interlocutors of a discourse or conversation.

Cruse (2000:319) states that person deixis basically refers to the addressor (first person), the addressee (second person) and other significant participant(s) in the speech situation, neither a speaker nor a hearer, is known as third person. However, third person pronouns are used as deictic expressions only when their referents are physically involved in the speech context. The participants in the speech event fall under the rubric of person deixis, and the person deictic terms themselves are defined in terms of the discourse roles such as addressor, addressee, or non-participant. Thus, in the same manner, person deictic terms are classified based on their discourse roles. The roles subsume addressor, addressee, participant, bystander/hearer. First, second and third person pronouns refer to addressor, addressee and participants, respectively. First, second and third person plural pronouns have representative and actual use. Cruse (2000:320) says that plural pronouns have either representative or true use. This table provides the person deictic forms of Oromo.

Person Deixis					
Person	Nominative	Gloss	Absolutive	Gloss	Discourse Role
1S	<i>ʎani</i>	I	<i>ʎana</i> or <i>na</i>	me	addressor
1PL	<i>nu</i> or <i>nuji</i>	we	<i>nu</i> or <i>nuji</i>	us	addressor(s)
2S	<i>ʎati</i>	you	<i>si</i>	you	addressee
2PL	<i>ʎsin</i>	you	<i>ʎsin</i>	you	addressee(s)
3MS	<i>ʎnni</i>	he	<i>ʎsa</i>	him	participant
3FS	<i>ʎfi</i>	she	<i>ʎfiin</i>	her	participant
3PL	<i>ʎsaan</i>	they	<i>ʎsaani</i>	them	participant

First and second person pronouns have deictic functions. However, third person pronouns have either deictic or non deictic usages based on the situational and linguistic contexts, respectively. Person deictic expressions refer to singular or plural entities. First and second person non-reflexive personal pronouns rely upon situational context, namely, who is talking and who is listening. Their referents are recovered from the situational context, since they are physically present in the speech situation. Person deictics can be indicated morphologically by verb agreement. First and second person pronouns have always deictic functions, while the deictic role of third person pronouns is conditional. Because they are used as person deictic expressions only when their referents are physically present in the speech context. First and second pronouns are more context-dependent than third person pronouns. Thus, first and second person pronouns do not substitute nouns. Kroeger (2005:136) states that the referent of the deictic terms is altered based on speech situation. In Oromo, only third person singular pronouns make gender distinction. Gender and number distinctions are not deictic forms, since they are part of the semantics of the pronouns and cannot be interpreted based on the situational context. Cruse (2000:319) claims that every meaning of deictic terms is not basically deictic in nature.

Personal pronouns signal given information when they are applied endophorically or exophorically. They are used as person deictic forms only when their referents are involved in the speech context. The endophoric functions of the pronouns are exemplified below.

79. (a) *C'aalaa-n kaleessa foon ʎaat-φ-e harʎa garuu ʎnni*
 Chala-NOM yesterday meat eat-3MS-PV today however he

daabboo *naat- ϕ -a*

bread eat-3MS-IPV

‘Chala ate meat yesterday; however, he is going to/will eat bread today.’

(b) *ñnni* *harʔa-immoo* *daabboo* *naat- ϕ -e* *C’aalaa-n*

he today-but bread eat-3MS-PV Chala-NOM

kaleessa *garuu* *buddeena* *naat- ϕ -e*

yesterday however injera eat-3MS-PV

‘But today he ate bread, Chala ate injera yesterday.’

The personal pronoun /*ñnni*/ ‘he’ has anaphoric and cataphoric or anticipatory reference not exophoric reference (i.e., visibly referred), since it refers to something earlier in (79a) and something later in (79b). Endophoric reference subsumes anaphoric and cataphoric references. anaphoric reference is common than cataphoric reference in Oromo. The pronoun /*ñnni*/ ‘he’ is used endophorically and cannot be semantically interpreted without making reference to something else based upon linguistic context. Both ‘he’ and its antecedent refer to the same entity. Cataphora helps to show dramatic effect. It creates suspense and keeps the reader waiting, thus slowing comprehension (Donnelly, 1994:100). Situational context has to be inevitably taken into account to interpret exophoric pronouns. Endophoric and exophoric pronouns signal given information, since they omit unnecessary repetition of linguistic elements conveying given information. Third person pronouns are used either endophorically or exophorically but, they are mainly applied endophorically. Only third person pronouns are employed either anaphorically or cataphorically to omit too frequent repetition of nouns or other elements. First and second person pronouns are not used endophorically to avoid repetition. Foley and Van Valin (1985:287) say that third person pronouns do not refer to participants in a speech act. They are normally used to substitute a full NP to avoid unnecessary repetition of noun. Third person pronouns are semantically and syntactically quite distinct from first and second persons. First and second person non reflexive pronouns are bound to the addressor and addressee, respectively. They rely on situational context for their interpretation. However, semantic rules admit third person

pronouns to be bound or free. In example (80) the pronoun /*ǎnni*/ ‘he’ does not have deictic usage, since it is not bound to its referent.

80. *C’aalaa-n ǎnni nama gaarii miti*
Chala-NOM he person good not-be
‘Chala, he is not a good person.’

Example (80) shows the anaphoric use of the pronoun /*ǎnni*/ ‘he’ and its antecedent is the noun ‘Chala’. The interpretation of this pronoun depends on linguistic context not on situational context, due to its endophoric reference or non deictic function. Fromkin *et al.* (2011:209-210) show that the interpretation of pronouns is highly correlated with linguistic or situational contexts, because their antecedent must come from context. A pronoun can be free or bound. When a pronoun gets its reference from an NP antecedent in the same clause, it is bound to that noun phrase antecedent, whereas when it denotes some entity outside the clause or not overtly mentioned in the discourse or situational context, it is called free or unbound. The reference of a free pronoun must ultimately be determined by the situational context. Free and bound pronouns have deictic and non deictic functions or exophoric and endophoric references, respectively.

5.8.3.2 Given Information and Social Deixis

It can also be subsumed under person deixis. Diessel (2012:1-2) calls both person and social deictic terms participant deixis, while place, time and discourse deixis are called object deixis. The first type of deixis deals with the role of speech participants and their social relationship to each other, while the second type of deixis deals with linguistic forms standing for aspects of the situational or discourse context. Unlike non honorific pronouns, the honorific ones do not only point to an individual but also to his/her social status (i.e., the social identities or relationships of the participants) and such forms are used as social deictic expressions showing higher status. Levinson (1983:89) says that social deixis can be manifested via polite pronouns (i.e., reflected in the pronominal system) and titles of address and so forth. Social deixis is applied to different social status or the role and the relationship of the interlocutors. In Oromo, various kinship terms, polite pronouns and words or expressions such as professional titles express politeness. Lyons (1977:641) expounds that participant roles are grammaticalized/lexicalized in many languages, at

least partly, in terms of social status or social roles. Social superiority may rely on social role, sex, age and various other factors.

Utterances have style. Cruse (2000:74) defines the term style as the formality or informality of an utterance or speech. Utterance style can be formal or informal based on context. In other words, the style of speech can be graded as very polite and impolite. Polite forms are usually used in formal speech contexts. The basic concept of honorifics is realized differently in many languages. Yule (1996b:10) says that expressions which encode higher status are called honorifics. Based on the amount of respect or difference the interlocutors wish to exhibit. This respect or politeness is usually indicated using honorific or polite pronouns in Oromo. The language lacks two different second person singular forms, one formal and the other informal or familiar. Oromo draws the polite pronoun /*ʃsin*/ ‘you’ and /*ʃsaan*/ ‘they’ from their second and third person plural non polite/familiar counterparts. The polite forms are only based on plural forms. The polite and plural forms are the same in relation to their phonetic forms. Thus, Oromo honorific pronouns indicate that the addressee is either unfamiliar or superior to the addressor in relation to social status, age and so forth. As one of my oldest informants told me, in Oromo culture, priests and lawyers, etc. are respected regardless of their age. Addressing father-in-law and mother-in-law by their their names is not allowed.

Personal pronouns can show number, gender, person and social status. Saeed (1997:178) shows that languages vary in the amount of contextual information that is incorporated in pronouns. Here, finite verbs agree in number in both cases, with the superficial plural pronouns. Pronouns are used to encode social deixis; however, all personal pronouns are not included under honorific pronouns. Because only second and third person plural pronouns serve as social deixis forms. In contrast, languages like Amharic use distinct forms for honorific and plural forms. This implies that social deixis is realized differently from language to language. In Oromo, social relationships can be marked in honorific pronouns. Cruse (2000:319) denotes that in many languages, pronoun usage encodes social deixis. Second and third person plural pronouns plus verb agreement are used as social deixis in the next examples. The pronouns are in the plural form and the verbs also take plural marker.

81. (a) *ʔsin biddeena ɲaadda-a*
you injera eat-IMPV
'You (PL/HON) eat injera!'

(b) *ʔsaan foon ɲaat-an-i*
they meat eat-3PL.PV-QM
'Did they eat injera?/Did he/she (polite) eat injera?'

These examples show that based on the relative social status and social familiarity between the participants, Oromo uses second and third person plural pronouns as honorific pronouns or social deixis forms though they are usually omitted since it is a subject prodrop language and the referent of these pronouns are also physically involved in the situational context. The pronoun */ʔsin/* 'you' in clause (81a) and */ʔsaan/* 'they' in clause (81b) may show either intimacy or distance based on the situational context. These pronouns usually do not show intimacy when their referents are singular. However, the verb takes plural agreement marker in both cases. The pronouns */ʔisin/* and */ʔsaan/* are used in a more formal or polite context as honorific pronouns. The speech context basically determines either the pronouns are used as honorific forms or not. The above clauses become vague as to whether they are polite or not when they are out of context since the number of the addressee(s) involved is unclear. They have only a single referent in their honorific use. However, situational context resolves the ambiguity. An utterance conveys a clear message when it is suitable to the speech context. The level of formality and informality of the speech context determines the type of pronouns (i.e., honorific or non honorific) to be used. When interlocutors have equal social status or are closely intimate, honorific pronouns are not used. Like that of honorific pronouns, the interpretation of Oromo kinship terms (e.g, sister, aunt, uncle, grand mother and so forth.) is also context dependent. They have deictic usage, since their referent is extracted from the situational context. For example, if a person has two or more uncles, the referent of the kinship term */ʔessuma/* is determined by the situational context. Thus, such kinship terms are used as lexical deictic terms marking given information.

Social deixis can be divided into relational and absolute (Levinson, 1983:90 and Hatch, 1992:221). Kinship terms, honorific pronouns, terms showing marriage, age, etc. are subsumed under relational social deixis, while professional title (i.e., common nouns such as professor, doctor, teacher, etc.) and titles of address like Mr. President, your majesty/honour, etc. are included under absolute social deixis. Levinson (1983:90) further expounds that “relational social deixis is a deictic reference to some social characteristic of referent apart from any relative ranking of referents or deictic reference to a social relationship between the speaker and addressee. On the other hand, absolute social deixis is a deictic reference usually expressed in certain forms of address, which will include no comparison of the ranking of the speaker and addressee.” Absolute social deictic expressions are used only for authorized recipients. Hatch (1992:221) states that relational social deictic expressions vary from absolute terms in that they locate persons in relation to the addressor rather than by their roles in the society as a whole.

5.8.3.3 Given Information and Spatial Deixis

Spatial deictic forms are called place deictic terms and usually refer to the place of utterance. Danesi (2004:30) states that spatial deictic forms stand for the spatial locations of objects, people, and events in relation to the user. Levinson (1983:62) explains that “spatial deixis deals with the encoding of spatial locations relative to the location of the participants in the speech event.” Oromo uses locative adverbial deictic terms /*ʔas*/ ‘here’ and /*ʔac*/ ‘there’ as spatial deictic terms. Such terms require situational information about the place of utterance. Cruse (2000:320) says, spatial deixis is realized chiefly in the form of locative adverbs such as ‘here’ and ‘there’ and demonstrative pronouns/determiners such as ‘this’ and ‘that’. Oromo spatial deictic forms can be used with endophoric and exophoric references (or with non deictic and deictic uses) to signal given information. The aforesaid locative adverbs serve as spatial deictic forms. Example:

82. (a) *ʔani ʔas-ʔitti-ʔan dal-add-ee gudd-add-ø-e*
 I here-LOC-1S born-MD-CNV grow up-MD-3MS-PV

magaalaa Dubar kana-itti garuu ʔas jir-aat-uu hin barbaad-ø-u
 town Duber this-LOC however here exist-MD-NMZR NEG want-1S-PV
 ‘I was born and grew up here in Duber town but I do not want to reside here.’

The deictic terms /*garana*/ ‘towards here’ and /*garas*/ ‘towards there’ are used to show location. The addressee must be closer to the addressor or deictic center of place in clause (83a) but further away in clause (83b). The directional deictic expressions show the direction and place where the addressee is. These deictic expressions can be supported by body gesture.

Demonstratives are subsumed under the class of deictic expressions. As stated above, spatial deictic terms involve demonstratives. Oromo has a two way demonstrative distinction: proximal and distal as in the table below.

Demonstratives				
Case	Proximal	Gloss	Distal	Gloss
Absolutive	<i>kana</i> (M) <i>tana</i> (F)	this/these	<i>san</i> (M/F)	that/those
Nominative	<i>kuni</i> (M) <i>tuni</i> (F)	this/these	<i>sun</i> (M/F)	that/those

Besides the above demonstratives, usually the literate speakers of the dialect use the newly evolving plural demonstratives /*kunniin*/ and /*kanneen*/ ‘these’ and /*sunniin*/ and /*sanneen*/ ‘those’. The table presents demonstrative pronouns and determiners with pronominal and adnominal functions, respectively. They show where something is situated in relation to the addressor(s) or the deictic center. Both the proximal and distal forms do not make number distinction in the Tulama dialect. Only the proximal demonstratives show gender distinction. The proximal and distal determiners must agree with the noun they modify in case marking. The dialect has only two proximal demonstrative pronouns (i.e., does not have a variety of demonstratives) having diverse forms for nominative and absolutive cases. The demonstrative pronouns can occupy the syntactic slot of both core and noncore arguments. The determiners also appear before or next to the arguments that they modify. For instance:

84. (a) *san* *ʎana-a* *fid-i*
 that me-DAT bring-IMPV
 ‘Bring me that/those.’

(b) *waan san ʔana-a fid-i*
 thing that me-DAT bring-IMPV
 ‘Bring me that thing/those things.’

(c) *muc’aa -n kuni maalii-f hin duf-n-ø-e*
 boy-NOM this why-DAT NEG come-NEG-3MS-PV
 ‘Why doesn’t this boy come?’

The distal demonstrative pronoun /*san*/ ‘that’ has a recognitional role in clause (84a) and (84b). It refers to something that the addressor and addressee know in common. It is used as nominal and determiner in example (84a) and (84b), respectively. In the examples, the referent of the pronoun /*san*/ ‘that’ is not vague for the addressee though a person that lacks the common knowledge will be unable to find its referent. The interlocutors can be in the same or different place when the addressor utters the clauses. The demonstrative pronoun /*san*/ in its secondary or recognitional function can stand for something which is unfamiliar to a third party. Thus, it can be used when what the interlocutors are talking about is not situated in the place where the conversation is taking place. The referent(s) of /*san*/ ‘that’ may or may not be physically involved in the speech situation. Thus, its referent(s) might be visible or invisible (i.e., no concrete object may exist in the speech situation). The demonstrative pronouns have deictic functions when their referents are physically involved in the speech situation. The pronouns usually encode given information. They have endophoric references in their non deictic usages and exophoric references in their deictic functions. Lyons (1977:661) states that “whether the pronoun is interpreted as having non deictic (i.e., anaphoric) or deictic reference (or both) would seem to depend on primarily the context-of-utterance and cannot be determined within a microlinguistic analysis of the structure and meaning of the sentence.” The adnominal form /*waan san*/ ‘that thing’ can be used in place of the demonstrative pronoun /*san*/ ‘that’ as in example (84b) to address something secretly. The pronoun /*san*/ ‘that’ is used as a demonstrative pronoun and determiner in (84a) and (84b) respectively. The disparity between the two examples is that, in clause (84a) only the deictic word is used as a pronominal, while in example (84b) the deictic term is used as a determiner. The referents of the pronoun /*san*/ ‘that’ may not be physically present in both clauses. However, the referents are new only for the third party.

Example (84c) shows that nouns like /*muc'aa*/ 'boy' can stand for a concrete entity in the situational context when it is accompanied by demonstrative determiner. The pronoun /*kuni*/ 'this' is used as a determiner in (84c). It is not always used only as proximal demonstrative pronoun. In example (84c) the referent of the noun 'boy' is situated at distance from the addressor. Oromo proximal demonstrative pronouns usually refer to entities near to the deictic center and express visible referents near enough to be reached by the addressor, while the distal forms describe visible referents near enough to be reached by the addressee than by the addressor. As showed above demonstrative pronouns refer to something in the situation or something situated near or away from the the speaker. In the example /*kuni*/ 'this' stands for something situated closer to the addressor, while /*suni*/ 'that' refer to something which might be located far away from the addressor and closer to the addressee or far away from both. The distinction between proximal and distal demonstrative pronouns depends upon proximity to the zero-point of the deictic context.

Besides showing things nearer or further away in space, demonstrative determiners show things nearer or further away in time from the utterance time as an extension of their primary use. Saeed (1997:177) denotes that in numerous languages place deictic expressions, like demonstratives are extended to refer to time. Example:

85. (a) *bar-i kuni gaarii-da*
 year-NOM this good-COP
 'This year is good.'

(b) *ñnni bara sani Salaale deem-ø-e*
 he year that Selale go-3MS-PV
 'He went to Selale that year.'

The proximal demonstrative determiner /*kuni*/ 'this' and the distal demonstrative determiner /*sani*/ show things closer and far away in time as shown above. The proximal and distal demonstrative determiners express time related to the present and past, respectively. In general, Oromo demonstrative determiners specify a noun by denoting whether it is closer or far away

from the speaker in space or time. Thus, the major function of the demonstrative pronouns and determiners is deictic and used to signal given information based on linguistic or situational context since they are definite referring expressions. Cruse (2000:313) includes demonstrative pronouns under the category of definite determiners. Oromo pronouns and determiners usually mark focus particularly contrastive focus based on context and can be concomitant by an optional pointing gesture. They are used in their basic function primarily to focus the addressee's attention on elements in the surrounding situations but may refer to elements of the ongoing discourse or elements that are already in the addressee's knowledge store. Demonstrative determiners are used to introduce a novel topic entity into the discourse. For instance:

86. (a) *kuni* *Magarsaa-dā*
this Megersa-COP
'This is Megersa.'

(b) *tuni* *k'amadii-dā*
This wheat-COP
'This is wheat.'

In the identificational copula clauses in (86a) and (86b) the subject demonstrative pronoun /*kuni*/ and /*tuni*/ are used as nominals because the addressor wants to identify someone or something or introduce the noun 'Megersa' and 'wheat' to his addressee.

Oromo has also presentive demonstrative pronoun. The addressor usually uses presentive demonstrative to present or hand over something to the addressee. The presentive demonstrative /*kunoo*/ 'here he/she/they is/are' is interrelated with spatial deictic expressions. It can be used only once or reduplicatively. Example:

87. *kunoo* 'Here he/she/it/they is/are'

The presentive demonstrative /*kunoo*/ 'here he/she/it/they is/are' can be used to introduce or hand over something. It denotes the distance at which something is put from the deictic center and used whether the entity is physically present or not in the situational context (i.e., for visible or

invisible entities). It can be supported by body gesture when the speaker is referring to something which is physically present in the speech context. It is possible to show where something is situated using the presentive demonstrative /*kunoo*/. The presentive demonstrative /*kunoo*/ is used as a determiner in the next clause.

88. *kunoo ʔnni duf-φ-e*

here he come-3MS-PV

‘Here he is, he has come.’

The addressor can indicate to the person who is coming or arriving using index finger while the presentive demonstrative is uttered. Cruse (2011:392) points out that the kind of help that addressors give to addressees can roughly be describing, pointing and naming. These helps are not, mutually exclusive; a given expression may involve more than one of them. The pronoun /*kunoo*/ ‘here’ can be put in the preceding example in clause initial, medial or final position without any meaning distinction.

5.8.3.4 Given Information and Time Deixis

Time or temporal deixis refers to the utterance time and normally associated with deictic adverbs of time and tense markers. Danesi (2004:30) says that time deictic expressions connect entities to each other in terms of time. Time adverbs or forms with time adverbial functions are used as time deictic expressions. Thus, Oromo has various words and phrases obviously marked for time deixis. The word /*ʔamma*/ ‘now’ /*jeroo kana*/ ‘currently’, /*torban lamaan harʔaa*/ ‘two weeks from today’, /*harʔa*/ ‘today’, /*jeroo san*/ ‘at that time’, /*torban darbe*/ ‘last week’, and /*boru*/ ‘tomorrow’ and so forth are examples of time deictic expressions. Some of these terms are simple lexical deictic terms, while others are composite deictic expressions/phrases. Example:

89. (a) *harka fi fuula ʔamma dik'-add-u*

hand and face now wash-MD-IMPV

‘Wash your hands and face now.’

- (b). *PhD koo hojj-acc-aa-ti-ʔan jir-φ-a*
 PhD my work-MD-IPV-COP-I exist-1S-IPV
 ‘I am working on my PhD.’

Clause (89a) and (89b) have time deixis. The time adverb /*ʔamma*/ ‘now’ is used as a lexical expression to encode time deixis in (89a). The time deixis is realized by grammatical expression (i.e., tense/aspect morpheme) in example (89b). In the example, the time deixis is lacking but the tense marker plays the role of the deictic expression. Oromo has four deictic names of days: two named days back from today and two ahead used as a time deixis. These are /*dēengada*/ ‘the day before yesterday’, /*kaleessa*/ ‘yesterday’, /*harʔa*/ ‘today’, /*boru*/ ‘tomorrow’ and /*ʔftaan*/ ‘the day after tomorrow’.

Time adverbs are usually used as time deictic expressions. Besides time deictic adverbs, Oromo uses tense markers as time deictic expressions. It has grammatical devices used for indicating past and non past time (i.e., present and future tense), which must also be regarded as deictics, because past, present and future tenses are defined by referring to the time of utterance. Radford *et al.* (2007:389) consider inflectional categories as deictic terms. For instance, the tense category is sensitive to the context of utterance. Tense is a deictic category, since it identifies the phase relative to the ‘now’ of the utterance (Saeed, 1997:172). Time deictic terms play a vital role in identifying present and future tense, since the language has no distinct verb forms for present and future tenses. For instance:

90. (a) *ʔani mana C’aalaa ni-ʔan deem-φ-a*
 I house Chala FOC-I go-1S-IPV
 ‘I go/will go to Chala’s house.’

- (b) *ʔani mana C’aalaa ʔammaa-n deem-φ-a*
 I house Chala now-1S go-1S-IPV
 ‘I go to Chala’s house now (not some other time).’

(c) *ʎani mana barumsa-a hegeree-n deem-φ-a*
 I house education-GEN next year-1S go-1S-IPV
 ‘I will go to school next year (not some other year).’

(d) *ʎani mana barumsa-a deem-φ-e*
 I house education-GEN go-1S-IPV
 ‘I went to school.’

Example (90a) shows that Oromo does not make present and future tense distinction by its inflectional morpheme because the tense of this clause can be present or future tense. However, the ambiguity can be resolved by situational context or time deictic expressions. Example (90b) and (90c) are marked for present and future tenses, respectively. The tense difference is clearly shown by the time deictic words */ʎamma/* ‘now’ and */hegere/* ‘next year’. Oromo marks past tense morphologically by morpheme */-e/* as in example (90d) without any time deictic adverb. Cruse (2000:321) says that time deictic expressions help to locate points or intervals on the time axis, using (ultimately) the moment of utterance as a reference point. The three major divisions of time axis/reference are before, at and after the time of utterance (i.e., past, present and future). Deictic forms are interpreted based on the deictic centers, since deictic centers serve as the point of reference for definiteness and proximity. Tense has deictic function. For instance, it identifies a ‘proximal’ event expressed by the present tense. Oromo uses pairs of deictic verbs like */kott-/* ‘come’ and */deem-/* ‘go’ and */fid-/* ‘bring’ and */fud-/* ‘take’. These motion verbs make distinction between the direction of motion, towards or away from the addressor and retain deictic sense when they mark movement toward or away from the addressor. The verbs are linked to the vantage-point of the addressor who utters them and the addressee who interprets them.

Temporal deictic terms are interpreted based on the context of utterance or the deictic center of time, which is the time of utterance. This time must be known to understand what specific time such expressions refer to, clearly for example, the deictic expression ‘next month’ has various references when uttered today than a month from today. Cruse (2000:313) lists time adverbs such as ‘now’, ‘then’, ‘yesterday’, next x-mas and certain verb tenses as a type of definite referring expressions. The clause below shows the function of time deixis */ʎamma/* ‘now’.

91. *ɫamma ɫas roob-aa-ti jir-ø-a*
 now here rain-IPV-COP exist-3MS-IPV
 ‘It is raining here now.’

The deictic term /*ɫamma*/ ‘now’ and /*ɫas*/ ‘here’ are used in (96) and interpreted as referring to the time and place of the utterance. When these deictic forms are uttered by two individuals who resides or situated in different places at the same time the time deixis /*ɫamma*/ ‘now’ refers to the same point of time, while the place deixis /*ɫas*/ ‘here’ stands for two various places. The adverb ‘here’ picks out place based on its proximity to the location of the addressor. The time deixis /*ɫamma*/ ‘now’ signals given information in relation to the time of utterance. Temporal deictic terms signal given information, since they are definite referring expressions. Given information marking means are described in detail. The next section is devoted to new information.

5.9 New Information and Indefiniteness

The term indefinite refers to an entity which is incapable of specific identification. Indefinite reference is the opposite of definite reference. Oromo lacks an indefinite article system. Cruse (2000:384) notes that “the essence of indefinite reference is that the identity of the referent is not germane to the message: that is, nothing hinges on the individual features of the referent, only the class features are presented as relevant.” Indefiniteness is marked lexically by the word /*tokko*/ ‘one’ for masculine and /*takka*/ ‘one’ for feminine in the sense that do not show number. Indefinite pronouns are also used to show indefiniteness. The word /*tokko*/ or /*takka*/ is a translation equivalent of the indefinite article ‘a/an’. Unlike the word /*tokko*/, the word /*takka*/ can also be used with plural nouns in the Tulama dialect. Indefinite markers do not determine the identity of the person, thing or event they refer to. Thus, they impart new information. An entity is considered as indefinite when there is nothing in the discourse context, situational context or our general knowledge of the world that identifies or specifies it. Cruse (2011:386) shows that indefinite reference can be specific or non-specific and the term specific can be definite or indefinite. But, the term specific and non-specific are usually synonymous with definite and indefinite, respectively.

92. *k'otijjoo-n tokko muc'aa tokko rajees-ø-e*
 ox-NOM one boy one kill-3MS-PV
 'An ox killed a boy.'

The notion of indefiniteness is expressed by the word */tokko/* 'one' in this clause. presumably, the subject entity */k'otijjoo/* 'ox' and the direct object entity */muc'aa/* 'boy' denote a particular or specific entity as far as the addressor is concerned under the right circumstance but it definitely seems indefinite for the addressee. The use of the indefinite term */tokko/* 'one' in the example basically informs the addressee that a certain unknown 'ox' and 'boy' exist that the addressor is referring. That is, the addressor considers the participants under discussion (i.e.,ox and boy) as unidentifiable entities for the addressee. The language encodes indefiniteness lexically by the word */tokko/* 'one' due to the lack of indefinite article.

As already stated the notion of indefiniteness is conveyed by indefinite expressions and indefinite pronouns in Oromo. The indefinite pronouns fill slots in a clause by referring to unspecified persons or things without giving much specific meaning. Oromo indefinite expressions or pronouns usually convey new information by directly referring to an indefinite person or thing, or a broad class of persons or things, not to a referent already present in the discourse. In this respect, they behave more like nouns with indefinite referent than pronouns. The table below presents expressions used as indefinite pronouns in Oromo.

<i>/tokko/</i> -based indefinite expressions	Gloss	<i>/taʔe/</i> -based indefinite expressions	Gloss
<i>nama tokko/takka</i>	'someone/body'	<i>nama taʔe</i>	'someone/body'
<i>waan tokko/takka</i>	'something'	<i>waan taʔe</i>	'something'
<i>bakka tokko/takka</i>	'somewhere'	<i>bakka taʔe</i>	'somewhere'
<i>jeroo tokko/takka</i>	'sometime'	<i>jeroo taʔe</i>	'sometime'

In Oromo, forms with indefinite pronouns usage are formed either by using the word */tokko/* or */takka/* 'one' or the verb */taʔe/* 'become' plus the word */nama/*, 'person' */bakka/* 'place' and */waan/* 'thing' as the table shows. It seems that */tokko/* or */takka/* 'one' and */taʔe/* 'become' is the source of indefinite meaning in the above expressions with indefinite pronouns function. The

expressions are used when the speaker does not suppose that the addressee can identify the referent of the NPs and these expressions do not convey given information. Example:

93 (a) *waan taʔ-φ-e na-a kenn-i*
 thing become-3MS-PV me-DAT give-IMPV
 ‘Give me something.’

(b) *bakka taʔ-φ-ee deem-φ-a*
 place become-3MS-PV go-3MS-PV
 ‘He will go somewhere.’

(c) *ʔnni waan tokko si-i hin bin-t-φ-e*
 he thing one you-DAT NEG buy-NEG-1S-PV
 ‘He did not buy you anything.’

(d) *ʔnni nama tokkoo lal-aa jir-φ-a*
 he person even one look-IPV exist-1S-IPV
 ‘He is looking at someone.’

The indefinite expressions */waan taʔe/* ‘something’, */bakka taʔe/* ‘somewhere’ and */waan tokko/* ‘something’ refer to unknown individual or entity. Forms like */waan tokko/* are one-based indefinite expressions. The indefinite expressions do not stand for any specific person or place that the addressee is aware of in particular. The addressee(s) does not exactly know to whom or what the expressions normally refer to. The indefinite terms in the above examples mark new information. In example (93d) the speaker can use the indefinite form to keep the name of the person that is being watched secret or indefinite for the addressee(s). However, the expression */nama tokko/* roughly equated with ‘someone’ or ‘somebody’ refers to someone who is specific for the speaker.

Like definiteness, indefiniteness is interrelated with discourse functions associated with the information structuring of the content of a sentence or extended discourse into given and new

information that is, what is viewed by the addressor as old to the addressee, and what is taken as new, respectively (Locke and Angela, 2006:420). Definite article marks old, while and indefinite article encoded new discourse participants. For example, the word /*tokko*/ marks masculine new discourse participant while /*takka*/ marks feminine new discourse participant. Oromo deictic expressions typically mark the status of discourse participants. Indefinite referring expressions are used when something is mentioned for the first time. Clauses with indefinite subjects usually introduce new referent into the discourse. In a series of connected sentences, new items are commonly introduced with indefinite expressions, but when the same entity is referred to repeatedly definite expressions are used.

5.10 Information Flow Principle

Information flow principle is related to the normal ordering of information (following unmarked pattern or moving from given to new information). This is the default flow of information for languages. It is usual to process information in a message so as to achieve a linear presentation from low to high information value what is known as ‘the principle of end-focus’. Putting old information before the new one has its own advantage. Because when a clause starts with something known, it is usually useful for grasping the message easily. Xiao (2007:12) states that presenting given information before the new one contributes to the cohesion of the text. Because presenting old information at the beginning connects the clause to the preceding discourse while the new information is usually taken up in the continuing discourse. But if the link is not clear at first, the addressee has to work harder to clearly understand the message. The example below shows the information flow principle of Oromo. Question (94a) is given two different possible replies and the responses show the alternatives of information flow.

94. (a) *ñsaan mana barumsa-a joom deem-an*
 they house education-GEN when go-3PL.IPV
 ‘When do they go to school?’

(b) *ñsaan mana barumsaa torban duuf-u deem-an*
 they house education-GEN week come-IPV go-3PL.IPV
 ‘They will go to school next week.’

- (c) *torban duf-u mana barumsa-a deem-an āsaan*
 week come-IPV house education-GEN go-3PL.IPV they
 ‘Next week, they will go to school.’

The phrase */torban dufu/* ‘next week’ conveys new information in the above clauses though it appears in different positions in the two examples. The clauses fill the incomplete argument. Though two different replies, the responses have different word order. However, except for the position of old and new information, these clauses are either identical or very similar. Response clause (94b) is more normal, since it follows the principle of end-focus. In clause (94c) the focused element appears at clause-initial position, while the background information is put towards clause final since old information is not necessarily put before the new. In Oromo, new information usually follows the old one. The new material which is the noun phrase ‘next week’ is focused, while the rest part of the clause carries given information. Besides clause final position, clause initial position is another optional slot for focus expression. However, it is easier to process the information that follows the principle of end focus than the one which violates it. Oromo sentences with predicate focus structures usually follow the principle of end-focus, since new information comes towards the end as in clause (94b). New information also can occur at the end of the clause as in example (95b).

95. (a) *Tolaa-n Magarsaa maal good-φ-e*
 Tola-NOM Megersa what do-3MS-PV
 ‘What did Tola do to Megersa?’

- (b) *Tolaa-n Magarsaa hin rukut-φ-e*
 Tola-NOM Megersa FOC beat-3MS-PV
 ‘Tola beat Megersa surely.’

In the response clause, only the verb */rukut-/* ‘beat’ is focused by the preverbal focus marker */hin/* and subsumed under focus/new information. Because the element which is analogous to a question word is a focus while the rest of the clause serves as background information to this focus; that is, the focus is highlighted with respect to this material. The clause has topic-

comment expression following the principle of end focus. Since Oromo is a verb final language; the information flow principle is usually adherent to the principle of end-focus in sentences with predicate focus.

5.11 Marked and Unmarked Focus Position

Focus occupies a particular structural position in the clause. Thus, focus structure stands for the grammatical arrangement of information structure. Elena (2000) defines focus structure as the link realized between the pragmatic and syntactic domains in focus constructions. As already stated, focus is the missing information, which the addressor presumes that the addressee wishes to know and can appear in marked or unmarked focus position. Based on information flow principle and the principle of end-focus, unmarked focus usually occurs towards clause final, while marked focus occurs in other positions except towards clause final position.

5.11.1 Unmarked Focus Position

Unmarked focus position is usually at or towards the end of a clause. Locke and Angela (2006:241) describe that in focus neutral structures, it is common to begin conveying message from what the addressor supposes the addressees know and progress to what they are unfamiliar with. In clauses with unmarked focus, given/background information appears before focus/new information. This is often referred to as the principle of end-focus. The unmarked placement of focused material is towards clause final position. Example:

96. *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem- ϕ -e*
Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
'Chala went to school.'

From IS view point, example (96) can be segmented into two parts: focus-background or given-new information. The ordering of the information units of the clause follows given-new order, which is unmarked order. The noun 'Chala' cannot be taken as the part of the comment, since it is the topical subject due to the nominative case marker. As to Lambrecht (1994) classification of sentence based on focus structure this example is subsumed under topic-comment sentence. The predicate of the clause may entirely coincide with the focus domain, while its complement

correlates with the focus center. Only the focus center can be new information, since it is possible to give a short answer by eliding contextually recoverable information. In general, unmarked or end focus position is towards the end in topic-comment sentences. Hooshmand and Rezai (2012:131) state that predicate focus is a universally unmarked focus structure. It is a topic-comment structure where the comment or predicate presents the focus. Crosslinguistically, it is unmarked because new information appears towards the end. The pragmatic presupposition of the predicate focus includes knowledge of a certain topic and the assertion that states a comment about the topic. It is a subtype of broad focus that increases information about the topic referent. The focus domain of predicate focus can be the entire VP or some part of it. Clauses with verb focus and predicate-focus differ in their information structural values and their realization. In clauses with predicate focus, the VP is the focused element. In other words, the VP is what remains after reducing the old information from the new one. In the declarative clause below the entire verb phrase is focused and the predicate comments upon the topic. The material inside the focus domain is not focus, rather it is part of the background information. Particularly, the verb is focused by high pitch as a central element of the focus. The next Q-A pair shows predicate focus.

97. (a) *Tolcaa-n maal-uma god-aa jir- ϕ -a*
 Tolcha-NOM what-FOC do-IPV exist-3MS-PV
 ‘What is Tolcha really doing?’

(b) *ānni buna-uma **dūg-aa** jir- ϕ -a*
 he coffee-FOC drink-IPV exist-3MS-PV
 ‘He is really drinking coffee.’

In the topic-comment sentence in (97b), the focal element is the part of the answer that correlates with the question word. The VP is analogous to the part of the clause within the actual focus domain. The marked focal element is */bunuma dūgaa/* ‘drinking coffee’. The element of the focus domain or the focus center */buna/* is focused by the focus marker */-uma/* and the verb */dūgaa/* has to be marked by high pitch. In this clause, only the predicate is the informative and non-omissible part of the clause. The predicate corresponds to the question word and the focus

structure is evoked linguistically when a question asks for predicate information about an individual. The remaining words can be elided if the addressee is not interested in providing a long response. The subject of the predicate-focus sentences bears the pragmatic functions of aboutness topic. Predicate focus adds predicate to a certain given argument. In clause (97b), focus does not extend over a single element; rather it stretches over the whole non subject part of the clause. In a nutshell, the non subject arguments of the verb and the verb (i.e., action) are given as new information in clauses with predicate focus.

Predicate focus can also encompass multiple foci because highlighting multiple arguments is felicitous in Oromo. Thus, the interaction of multiple focusing constructions within a single clause is realized. Clauses with multiple foci have two or more question words. Hence, two or more elements receive focus in multiple foci clauses. They are clauses based on multiple content questions because Q-A pair is usually used as a tool in diagnosing the size of the focused element. In multiple foci clauses, the addressor is looking for different information using a single question with various question words at a time and the clause forces the addressor to elicit new information if he/she is willing or cooperative.

5.11.2 Marked Focus Position

The distinction between marked and unmarked focus position is where the focus falls. Based on the principle of end focus, sentence final focus is unmarked focus position. However, focus is not always the final element in the clause because it can appear anywhere within the clause and such type of focus is referred to as marked focus position. Example (98b) can be taken as marked narrow focus based on the position where the focus NP 'Tola and Chala' falls. Subject is he most marked focus in Oromo. Unlike topic-comment sentences, identificational sentences with focused subject normally contain marked focus position. In identificational sentences focus position coincides with the position of the question word in the interrogative clause. Example:

98. (a) *ʒeeɲuu-tu mana barumsa-a deem-ø-e*
 who-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 'Who was the one that went to school?'

- (b) *Tolaa fi C'aalaa-tu mana barumsa-a deem-ø-e*
 Tola and Chala-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 'It was Tola and Chala who went to school.'

Focus is usually equated with comment or part of it. But, in clause (98b) it does not coincide with the comment. In clause (98b) the focused element that carries the most salient and unpredictable information in the discourse is the subject "Tola and Chala" and it is focused by the focus morpheme */-tu/*. There is no subject topic in the response clause. Thus, this shows that Oromo allows non-topical or focused subject. The question word */ʒeɲuu/* 'who' in (98a) and the noun phrase 'Chala and Megersa' in clause (98b) can be focused by high pitch instead of the focus morpheme */-tu/*. In the identificational sentence (98b), the subject cannot be marked by a nominative case marker due to the focus morpheme */-tu/*. Because when a subject argument is focused by the focus morpheme */-tu/* it disallows inflections for grammatical features such as case, person, gender and number. Hence, verbs do not show number and gender distinctively for all persons, since the subject focus morpheme neutralizes the person, gender and number agreement of a verb and the verb remains in the 3rd person singular masculine.

As the example shows, argument focus structure can be observed in identificational sentences. The argument-focus structure is evoked merely when a single argument in the structure corresponds to the question word. Because question words and their responses mainly result in argument focus constructions. The informative and non-elidable part of a clause is either a core or non-core argument in this focus type. The suitability of the focus structure of a clause is determined by correctness of the question-answer congruent. As illustrated above, the main function of argument focus is providing missing or unknown information.

Besides in identificational sentences, focus can be realized in event reporting sentences. Sentence focus is usually elicited or linked with the content question */maaltu gale/* or */maaltu dalate/* 'what happened?' von Heusinger (1999:31) states that broad focus is linked with a general question like 'what happened?' An event reporting sentence is a subtype of clause in relation to information structure (Lambrecht, 1994). Example (99b) shows that in event reporting clauses subject is usually marked. It might be difficult to determine focus position in (99b), since the entire clause is under the scope of focus though the focus marker is only associated with subject.

99. (a) *maal-tu* *dal-at-φ-e*
 what-FOC born-MD-3MS-PV
 ‘What happened?’
- (b) *Magarsaa-tu* *duʔ-φ-e*
 Megersa-FOC die-3MS-PV
 ‘It was Megersa who died.’

In this Q-A congruence, the focused question word /*maaltu*/ ‘what’ is inevitably replaced by the focused noun /*Magarsaatu*/ ‘Megersa’ otherwise the interrogative clause would be unacceptable. Because the focal word must be focused morphologically or prosodically in order to be a suitable response. Thus, the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ is indispensably suffixed to the question word /*maal*/ ‘what’ in example (99a). In the interrogative clause, the question word /*maal*/ ‘what’ cannot be focused by high pitch instead of the focus morpheme /-*tu*/. The focus noun /*Magarsaa*/ is necessarily focused by the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ or high pitch in order to be a suitable response. As stated above, marked focus position is realized in identificational sentences with focused argument. Though the subject takes a focus marker, it seems difficult to talk about focus position in relation to clauses with sentence focus since the whole clause carries focus or new information. Clause (99a) is an instance of whole-event information question, since the entire clause in the response clause in (99b) lacks a presupposed sentence topic. Thus, the subject and predicate of the clause are asserted or informationally unpredictable (i.e., newsy). The clause has unpredictable information and the speaker presupposes nothing in the discourse, implying that every element in the utterance is brand new (i.e., totally new). Sentence focus structures strikingly contrast with predicate focus structures, due to lack of topical subject, since the entire clause is under the scope of focus. The whole structure equals the focus-sentence and as a result the bipartite/tripartite division of information structure is possibly lacking.

In Oromo sentence focus, except subject every word of the clause is not accented (i.e., receives high pitch) or requires focus morpheme or focus particle. The focus is marked on the subject, though the focus domain is the entire clause. In sentence (99b), no special emphasis is given to any particular element. Thus, it satisfies the conditions of sentence focus, where no elements are presupposed. Thus, the focus is the whole clause including all elements of the clause. It is not a

statement about an entity, rather it characterizes a situation as a whole and the focus domain and topic expression are non-existent. Topic expressions refer to linguistic expressions denoting the topic entities while topic referents are topic entities. Bender and Song (2012:332) denote that all sentences presumably involve at least one focus, though they do not always have a topic.

Various elements of a clause can be questioned and highlighted at the same time using focused question words. The language permits the questioning of a whole clause, phrase or an individual lexical item within a given clause. In other words, it admits questioning and focusing on an entire sentence, a clause, a phrase or an individual lexical item within a clause. Hence, focus is not limited to NPs because the focused element can be a VP, or even the whole clause. In short, the focal unit can be a word, phrase or an entire sentence. Narrow and predicate focus are used to identify a referent entity and comment on the topic, respectively, while sentence focus is used for reporting an event or presenting a new discourse referent (Van Valin and Lapolla, 1997:206).

In general, chapter five focuses on given-new expressions. Given information is usually old information conflating with background information, while new information is the most important information that conflates with focus. Given information is shared, predictable or context-construable information. Discourse, situational and experiential contexts play a vital role in distinguishing old information. Context specifies the referents of definite referring expressions since definite referring expressions usually convey given information or given information is realized via definite referring expressions. It can be encoded using the singulative markers */-icca/* and */-itti/* for specifying nouns referring to masculine and feminine entities, respectively. Like singulative markers, demonstrative and possessive determiners particularize the referents of nouns. Besides personal pronouns, proper nouns normally communicate given information since they are inherently definite terms with specific referents. Besides, the aforementioned expressions, given information can be encoded using person, social, time and place deictic expressions. Deictic terms are used endophorically as well as exophorically to encode given information. The gestural and symbolic functions of deictic expressions carry given information, since they are context-bound.

Unlike given information, new information is unshared and unpredictable and it is not context construable information. New information is linked with indefinite expressions. New information is not necessarily equated with focus since it is not inevitably focused. It usually appears towards or at the end of a clause but not always. Hence, it can appear in marked and unmarked positions. Marked focus can occur at sentence initial position since it is not confined to unmarked topic.

Chapter Six

Focus-Background Information

The chapter aims at analyzing focus-background information. It provides a detail analysis of syntactic, morphological, lexical and phonological means of focus marking in Oromo.

6.1 Focus-Background Information Identification

Focus and background are among the basic complementary notions of IS. Gussenhoven (1983: 389) considers them as universal notions. What is obviously not universal are the means in which languages encodes focus. Focusing divides utterances into focus and background information. Bender and Song (2012:332) state that a backgrounded constituent is an element which is neither the topic nor the focus of the sentence. Topic-comment expression sometimes coincides with background-focus. Focus can be part of the comment. however, comment is not necessarily the same to focus. Example:

100. (a) *ʒabbaa-n koo kitaaba na-a bit-ee jir- ϕ -a*
father-NOM my book me-DAT buy-CNV exist-3MS-PV
'My father has bought me a book.'

(b) *kitaaba na-a bit-ee jir- ϕ -a ʒabbaa-n koo*
book me-DAT buy-CNV exist-3MS-PV father-NOM my
'My father has bought me a book.'

These clauses have different information structures. They differ in relation to their information structure, since clause (100a) is pragmatically unmarked, while clause (100b) is pragmatically marked. Both clauses convey the same basic meaning though they vary in terms of their arrangement of information units. The background information precedes the new information in the basic clause in (100a), while this pattern is reversed in the pragmatically marked clause in (100b). Because the new information or the unmarked focus in this case precedes the background information. In example (100a) the information flows from old to new, while the flow of the information is reversed in (100b). Word order change plays a vital role in placing new information before the old one. Clause (100a) follows the basic word order of Oromo but (100b)

deviates from the canonical word order of the language. Hence these clauses differ in their information structure. The example shows that the arrangement of information units is not fixed. Besides statements, constituent questions are usually used in Oromo to show focus-background information distinction. The part of the response clause analogous to the question word carries focus while the rest is background information. Example:

101. (a) *mana barumsa-a ʒeɽnu-tu deem-ø-e*
house education-GEN who-FOC go-3MS-PV
‘Who is the one that went to school?’

(b) *C’aalaa-tu mana barumsa-a deem-ø-e*
Chala-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
‘It is Chala who went to school.’

The response clause in (101b) replies or presupposes the interrogative clause in (101a). The subject of clause (101b) is the focal noun ‘Chala’. Except this focal subject the rest of the clause conveys background information. The response clause denotes that subject position is not exclusively topical though unmarked topic is often linked with the grammatical subject. The focal noun is put at subject position in clause (101b). Thus, the subject overlaps with the focus of the clause since subject position is not confined only to topic. Given constituent may be highlighted and a new element can occur as sentence topic.

Focus-background structure correlates with subject-predicate in clause (101b). The noun ‘Chala’ is marked for contrastive focus by the focus morpheme */-tu/*. This clause is organized into focus and background based on the level of informativeness of the information units. The focused part of the clause is interrelated with the most informative part, while the remaining part of it embraces background. The background information is already available in the discourse or in the information question in (101a) and the interlocutors share it. The focused element marked for argument focus is brand-new and is not context-given or discourse-given. Clause (101b) is pragmatically marked and subsumed under identificational sentence, on the basis of Lambrecht (1994) categorization of sentences in relation to IS. Question (101a) is used for focus test. von

Heusinger (1999:30) says that the usual test for the focus of a clause is the constituent question. It is needless to give a detailed analysis about background information since it is linguistically unmarked in some way.

6.2 Focus Marking Strategies

Focus can be marked in various ways in Oromo. Ansha (2014:167) says languages vary in the strategies they apply to show which part of the information in an utterance is most relevant or salient. Phonological, morphological and syntactic means of focus marking are attested in the language as presented in the next sections.

6.2.1 Syntactic Focusing

Oromo chiefly uses alternative means to mark focus. High pitch, focus marking particles, focus morphemes, constructions with special syntax and basic word order change are major means of focus marking in the language. Syntactically, focus can be marked via basic word order change and cleft construction as described below.

6.2.1.1 Marking Focus via Scrambling

Oromo admits syntactic focusing using scrambling. An element of a clause can be highlighted morphologically and prosodically without leaving its basic position in Oromo. However, the reverse is realized when it is focalized by scrambling. A focused element can be put in its canonical slot (i.e., in-situ focus) or removed from its usual position and placed somewhere else (ex-situ). Example (102b) shows how ex-situ focus is encoded syntactically by scrambling.

102. (a) *C'aalaa-n daabboo jaat- ϕ -e*
Chala-NOM bread eat-3MS-PV
'Chala ate bread.'

(b) *C'aalaa-n jaat- ϕ -e daabboo*
Chala-NOM eat-3MS-PV bread
'Chala ate, bread.'

Clause (102a) follows the basic word order, while the one in (102b) deviates from the basic word order of Oromo and rather follows a pragmatically marked order. The noun /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ is removed from its normal syntactic position and put at the end of the clause. In example (102b) short pause is used to set off the boundary of new information or focus from the old one. The noun ‘bread’ is viewed as new information, since (102a) may answer the information question ‘what did Chala eat?’ in a given context. Thus, the focus is syntactically marked via scrambling in the response clause. Moving new information or focal elements to clause final creates a sort of suspense on the part of an addressee. The information situated at the end facilitates the addressee’s role in focusing upon what is viewed interesting or newsworthy.

6.2.1.2 Focus Marking via Cleft Constructions

In this sub topic, the function of simple and pseudo cleft constructions in relation to information structure particularly focus is dealt with. The main distinction observed between the two types of cleft constructions is described in relation to IS mainly focus.

6.2.1.2.1 Cleft Constructions

Cleft constructions re-organize the content of a single clause into two interrelated parts: independent and dependent clauses. The effect of the cleft structure is to focus on one element, the new, which always precedes the copular element if there is any copular element and this shows the flexibility of focus position in Oromo. The basic sentence in (103a) is divided into two parts in the cleft clauses in (103b) and (103c). Normally, cleft constructions contain independent and dependent clauses. The independent clause is foregrounded, while the dependent clause is backgrounded in cleft constructions. Example:

103. (a) *Magarsaa-n kutaa keessa jir- ϕ -a*
 Megersa-NOM classroom inside exist-3MS-IPV
 ‘Megersa is in the classroom.’

(b) *kutaa keessa kan Magarsaa-n jir- ϕ -u*
 Classroom inside REL Megersa-NOM exist-3MS-IPV
 ‘It is in the classroom that Megersa is found.’

- (c) *Magarsaa-da kan kutaa keessa jir-φ-u*
 Megersa-COP REL classroom inside exist-3MS-IPV
 ‘It is Megersa who is found in the classroom.’

The cleft sentences convey the same or equivalent central message with the pragmatically neutral original simple clause. The basic clause in (103a) conveys an event in a fairly balanced way (i.e., without focusing on any element), while clause (103b) and (103c) are non basic or cleft structures with a focused element. The cleft clauses are associated with focus and usually encode argument focus. The postpositional phrase */kuta a keessa/* ‘in a classroom’ and the noun ‘Megersa’ are in strong focus in the cleft clauses in (103b) and (103c), respectively. The examples show that Oromo nouns take absolutive case form when they are focused by cleft constructions and the focal elements occur in the object position. In cleft structures, the focused elements shifted from their normal syntactic and put in an independent clause. In clause (103c) the focused element */kuta a keessa/* is not followed the copula verb */-da/* since the head word */keessa/* ends with a short vowel.

6.2.1.2.1.1 Cleft Construction Types

Oromo has both simple and pseudo cleft constructions. Though the notion of both cleft types exists, it seems illogical to use the term *it-cleft* and *wh-cleft* constructions for two basic reasons. The first rationale is that, the language does not use any equivalent pronoun of the English impersonal pronoun ‘it’ in simple cleft constructions, due to the lack of the expletive pronoun. The second rationale is that, Oromo question words do not begin with ‘*wh-*’. Thereby, in this work the term ‘simple cleft’ and ‘pseudo cleft’ constructions are adopted instead of *it-cleft* and *wh-cleft* constructions, respectively.

6.2.1.2.1.1.1 Simple Cleft Constructions

The main discourse function of simple or *it cleft* is to signal contrastive focus covertly (Locke and Angela, 2006:250). The information structural divisions of sentences can be realized in cleft constructions. The part of the clause following */kan/* presents background information because simple cleft constructions belong to focus-background in relation to their information structure. In short, simple clefts cleave information into focus and presupposition, which is based on the

assumption that new information is focused and the old one or shared knowledge is backgrounded. Any constituent can be focused using cleft constructions. Example:

104. (a) *ñnni k'arfii barbaad-φ-a*
 he money want-3MS-IPV
 'He needs money.'

(b) *k'arfii-dā kan ñnni barbaad-φ-u*
 money-COP REL he want-3MS-IPV
 'It is money that he needs.'

105. (a) *Magarsaa-n Tolaa-dāa-f foon kenn-φ-e*
 Megersa-NOM Tola-COP-DAT meat give-3MS-PV
 'Megersa gave meat to Tola.'

(b) *Magarsaa-dā kan Tolaa-dāa-f foon kenn-φ-e*
 Megersa-COP REL Tola-COP-DAT meat give-3MS-PV
 'It was Megersa who gave meat to Tola.'

Example (104a) and (105a) are basic clauses, while those in (104b) and (105b) are pragmatically marked simple clefts presenting focused elements. The noun /*k'arfii*/ 'money' in (104b) and /*Magarsaa*/ 'Megersa' in (105b) are identified as focus words. They appear before the copular element /-*dā*/ to present contrastive focus. The term /*kan*/ can be placed before or after the subject of the dependent clause without any meaning change. The main clause of the simple cleft normally lacks subject, since expletive pronoun is missing and the subject slot is left empty as in clause (104b) and (105b). In Oromo relative clauses, verb agreement markers can be used or the verb takes the form of third person masculine singular for all persons. In the simple cleft, the subject slots is syntactically and semantically left empty, since its syntax does not require an expletive subject or a cleft pronoun unlike other languages (e.g., English). In short, clefts use a zero subject, due to the lack of the neuter pronoun 'it'. The main clause of the cleft structures can be constructed without expletive subject (i.e., with zero subject) and copula element. The

independent clause is reduced only to the focused element when the subject and copular element are missing. Example:

106. (a) *ʃnni baratt-oota jaam-φ-e*
he student-PL call-3MS-PV
'He called students.'

(b) *baratt-oota kan ʃnni jaam-φ-e*
student-PL REL he call-3MS-PV
'It was students that he called.'

Clause (106a) is called non cleft but clause (106b) is a simple cleft construction. The information communicated by this cleft clause is identical to the information presented by the canonical structure with no difference in the truth condition or value. In the cleft structure, the main clause contains only the focused constituent, because it is verbless and the subject slot is also left empty. In Oromo cleft sentence, an independent clause usually precedes the dependent or the embedded clause. As shown above, the language does not use any expletive or impersonal pronoun as an introductory word or pronoun to introduce the main clause. However, it usually introduces the relative or dependent clause by the word /*kan*/.

6.2.1.2.1.1.2 Pseudo Cleft Constructions

Like simple clefts, pseudo clefts can be identified as information packaging devices containing two parts: the independent clause conveys focus and the dependent clause presents background information. These cleft constructions have a syntactically marked information structure contrasted with their prototypical counterparts. In pseudo cleft constructions, the information is structured as background-focus or it is adherent to the information flow principle. Example:

107. (a) *warabess-i bosona keessa jir-aat-φ-a*
hyena-NOM forest inside exist-MD-3MS-IPV
'Hyena lives in a forest.'

- (b) *kan bosona keessa jir-aat- ϕ -u warabessa*
 REL forest inside exist-MD-3MS-IPV hyena
 ‘What lives in a forest is hyena/the one that lives in a forest is hyena.’

108. (a) *ʔnni kop'ee ʔadii hin jaal-at- ϕ -u*
 he shoe white NEG like-MD-3MS-IPV
 ‘He does not like white shoe.’

- (b) *kan ʔnni jibb- ϕ -u kop'ee ʔadii-da*
 REL he dislike-3MS-IPV shoes white-COP
 ‘What he dislikes is white shoes.’

Example (107a) and (108a) are basic clauses, while the clauses in (107b) and (108b) are non basic pseudo cleft constructions. These basic and non basic clauses are interrelated and basically convey the same message though they cannot be used in the same communicative context. They differ in relation to their syntactic structure and focus marking. The basic clauses are pragmatically unmarked, since they follow the default word order, but the cleft clauses are pragmatically marked due to the deviation from the canonical word order. The non basic clauses are marked for contrastive focus. The phrase */warabessa/* ‘hyena’ in clause (107b) and */kop'ee ʔadii/* ‘white shoes’ in (108a) are highlighted by pseudo cleft as new information. The pseudo clefts put old information before the new one. In other words, the pseudo cleft constructions put new information at the end of a clause. The main discourse function of pseudo cleft is introducing a new topic into the discourse.

Oromo pseudo cleft constructions are introduced by the word */kan/* or */waan/*. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:63) identifies */kan/* and */waan/* as relative particles standing for various things. The word */kan/* refers to persons, animals and things, while */waan/* stands only for unanimated things. The word */kan/* and */waan/* ‘thing’ are used to introduce the pseudo clefts. Unlike English, Oromo does not use the question word ‘that’ or ‘what’ to form cleft constructions. Example:

109. (a) *kan* *ñsaan* *barbaad-an* *daabboo-dā*
 REL they want-3PL.IPV bread-COP
 ‘What they need is bread.’

(b) [?]*waan-i* *ñsaan* *barbaad-an* *Magarsaa-dā*
 thing-NOM they want-3PL.IPV Megersa-COP
 ‘What they need is Megersa.’

(c) *kan* *mana-ñtti* *hojjat-am-ø-e* *kana*
 REL house-LOC work-PS-3MS-PV this
 ‘The one which was made at home was this one.’

The introductory term /*kan*/ and /*waan*/ cannot be used alternatively to construct cleft constructions, since they refer to different things. For instance, clause (109b) seems odd, due to the word /*waan*/ because /*kan*/ is more appropriate than /*waan*/. These terms can appear before or after the subject of the dependent clause. In the pseudo cleft, the word /*kan*/ or /*waan*/ is used in place of the question word. The pseudo cleft presents the focus at the end of the second unit, but in simple cleft the focused element appears at the beginning of the independent clause. The examples denote that cleft construction is a means of information structuring, particularly focus marking. The above cleft structures can be divided into dependent and independent clauses. The focused element is separately put in the independent clause. Clefting changes the prototypical word order of the basic clauses to non basic or pragmatically marked structures.

The independent clause of Oromo cleft constructions carries new information, while the dependent clause presents given information. Both types of cleft constructions distinguish the element that carries new and given information. Oromo cleft construction puts a focused element near the front or end of clause, in the corresponding structure of English it-cleft (i.e., simple cleft) focus occupies the first slot in the clause, since there is no dummy subject pronoun. In contrast, in the clause corresponding to wh-cleft (i.e., pseudo cleft) the focused element appears at the end of the clause by immediately preceding the copula element. In short, in Oromo simple cleft constructions, new information precedes the old one and it is a typical example of focus-

background expression, while the reverse holds for pseudo cleft constructions. Thus, information is structured differently in the two types of cleft constructions. The examples show that cleft constructions have alternative word orders, since the language allows altering the order of dependent and independent clauses (i.e., Changing the word order of simple cleft clauses bears pseudo cleft constructions). Thus, it is possible to convert one type of cleft to another. Both simple and pseudo clefts mark contrastive focus. Payne (1997:270) shows that languages usually apply exaggerated stress and cleft clauses to signal contrastive focus. The cleft constructions show that focus does not merely occur in response to the interrogative clauses but also in contrasting statements. As denoted above, the element directly preceding the copula element presents contrastive focus in the cleft constructions.

Both positive and negative Oromo copular elements including a zero copula play a great role in constructing cleft sentences. They appear immediately next to the focus word in the independent clause. Focused elements cannot be put in the postverbal position (and accordingly must be preverbal) in Oromo. Simple-cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions basically convey the same meaning and mark contrastive focus but, they vary in their information structure. Oromo declarative cleft constructions serve to mark contrastive focus. No cleft can carry all new information or sentence focus in Oromo. As the above simple and pseudo clefts show, Oromo constructs various cleft sentences from a basic clause by focusing on various elements of a clause. Thus, a single clause can be altered into cleft sentences in different ways.

Oromo cleft constructions assign prominence to various arguments of a clause. In cleft clauses, focused constituent appears before the copular element, if there is any copula. In the cleft sentences, the element following /*kan*/ presents background as shown by the fact that it can refer to something just mentioned in the previous clause. Both core and non core arguments of a verb can be clefted constituents (i.e., expresses a certain type of focus). Example:

110. (a) *Magarsaa-n kalee āsa-a wajjaa bit-φ-e*
 Megersa-NOM yesterday him-DAT clothes buy-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa bought him clothes yesterday.’

(b) *Magarsaa-dā kalee kan āsa-a wajjaa bit-φ-e*
 Megersa-COP yesterday REL him-DAT clothes buy-3MS-PV
 ‘It was Megersa that bought clothes for him yesterday.’

(c) *kalee-dā Magarsaa-n kan āsa-a wajjaa bit-φ-e*
 yesterday-COP Megersa-NOM REL him-DAT clothes buy-3MS-PV
 ‘It was yesterday that Megersa bought him clothes.’

Clause cleft (110b) and (110c) are obtained from the basic cleft in (110a). The core argument of a verb ‘Megersa’ in example (110b) and the non core one with adverbial function */kalee/* ‘yesterday’ in (110c) are focused via clefting. Cleft constructions help the addressor to shift his/her emphasis from one element to another and determine the foregrounded and backgrounded information. Various focus-background divisions give rise to various cleft constructions. In the above clauses, both core and non core arguments of a verb are focused using cleft constructions. Unlike the copular elements, Oromo converbs are focused using cleft constructions. Example:

111. (a) *ānni k’arfii hat-ee-dā kan λati beek-t-u*
 he money steal-CNV-COP REL you know-2S-IPV
 ‘What you know is that he stole money.’

(b) *kan λati beek-t-u ānni k’arfii hat-ee-dā*
 REL you know-2S-IPV he money steal-CNV-COP
 ‘What you know is that he stole money.’

The simple and pseudo clefts in (111a) and (111b) convey the same meaning and share the same presuppositions and focus but the information is structured differently. More than one argument of a clause cannot be focused at a time in simple and pseudo cleft constructions. The phrase ‘has stolen money’ is focused in both clefts and the focus center is the converb verb */hatee/* ‘stolen’ in the clauses. Hence, Oromo admits emphasizing main verbs using cleft constructions. Basic declarative clauses are altered into cleft constructions in the above examples. Besides

declaratives, it is possible to construct polar question cleft clauses. In such clauses, the copular elements function to form polar interrogative cleft constructions. For instance:

112. (a) *Tolcaa-n k'arfii koo hat-φ-e-e*
 Tolcha-NOM money my steal-3MS-PV-QM
 'Did Tolcha steal my money?'

(b) *Tolcaa-dā-a kan k'arfii koo hat-φ-e*
 Tolcha-COP-QM REL money my steal-3MS-PV
 Is that Tolcha, the one who stole my money?

(c) *kan k'arfii koo hat-φ-e Tolcaa-dā-a miti-i*
 REL money my steal-3MS-PV Tolcha-COP-QM not-be-QM
 'Is that not Tolcha, who stole my money?'

Example (112a) is a basic polar question, but the clauses (112b) and (112c) are its simple and pseudo cleft versions, respectively. In sentence (112b), only the affirmative copula element /-dā/ is used, but in (112c) both the affirmative copula /-dā/ and the negative copula particle /miti/ 'not be' are employed. The noun 'Tolcha' is focused in the polar cleft constructions. Apart from polar questions cleft, the language admits content questions cleft constructions to mark an argument focus. Example:

113. (a) *ʔeɲuu-tu ʔisa rukut-φ-e*
 who-FOC him beat-3MS-PV
 'Who is it that beat him?'

(b) *kan ʔisa rukut-φ-e ʔeɲuu-dā-a*
 REL him beat-3MS-PV who-COP-QM
 'Who is the one that beat him?'

- (c) *ʔeeɲuu-dā-a kan ʔisa rukut-φ-e*
 who-COP-QM REL him beat-3MS-PV
 ‘Who is the one that beat him?’

Example (113a) is a plain or basic content question, while the clauses in (113b) and (113c) are the simple and pseudo cleft construction counterparts of the basic content question. The question word */ʔeeɲu/* ‘who’ is a clefted element in the cleft constructions. In the plain version, the question word is spoken with high pitch when the focus marker */-tu/* is omitted. The copula verb */-dā/* is optional in the above clauses. The examples show that content question clefts do not mark contrastive focus like declarative clause clefts; rather they signal new information focus (i.e., completive focus). Because the question words imply the missed information. Thus, Oromo marks both information and contrastive focus via cleft constructions.

6.2.2 Morphological Focusing

Morphological focusing refers to the assignment of a focus morpheme to the element to be focused. Finegan (2008:259) states that “some languages have grammatical morphemes whose sole function is to mark categories of information structure.” Oromo has a range of focus morphemes and words belong to various word classes focused morphologically. Some focus morphemes are linked with a particular word class, while others have wider distribution and interrelated with various word classes. Some focus morphemes are not strictly confined to a single word class. The focus marking morphemes are described in the next sections.

(a) Focus Morpheme */-tu/*

It is one of the focus morphemes. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:53) indicates that Oromo has two types of focus operators in addition to several focus particles: one for the predicate and the other for the subject. It seems that Oromo focus markers can be roughly divided based on the grammatical roles with which they go along with. For instance, there are some focus markers that are usually used to highlight subject or object argument. However, most focus markers are not confined only to a single grammatical role or word class. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:53) identifies */-tu(u)/* as a subject focus marker for the northern variety in writing. (Baye, 1988:365) treats */-tu/*, */hin/*, */-dā/*, prosodic features and cleft constructions as noun phrase, verb phrase,

prepositional phrase and determiner phrase focus markers, respectively. However, the identified focus markers are not restricted only to the mentioned elements at least in the target dialect.

The focus morpheme */-tu/* is usually affixed to a subject NP to mark either new or contrastive focus based on communicative context. It always occurs at the end of the phrase that it highlights. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:53) denotes that predicate focus operator is a pre-verbal particle, while subject focus marker is attached to the last element of the noun phrase. Baye (1988:365) distinguishes */-tu/* as a NP focus marker. Meyer and Debala (2003:165) say that “the focus morpheme */-tu/* occurs as a contrastive focus marker for subject in almost all Oromo varieties.” The focus morpheme */-tu/* normally highlights noun phrases in the Tulama dialect but it is not confined only to noun phrases. On the other hand, Eshetu (1981) identifies */-tu/* as a copula verb. Meyer and Dabela (2003) identify */-tu/* as a focus marker not as a copula verb due to its co-existence with a copular element in the same clause as exemplified below. They state that clauses with a focused subject cannot be considered as cleft constructions. They assume that the focus morpheme */-tu/* assigns contrastive focus to the subject and impedes spreading of agreement features to the verb. This function of the morpheme is clearly pragmatic, though it has a major impacts on the syntax. In the next example, the focused element is the noun ‘Megersa’. The noun occupies sentence initial position followed by the focus morpheme */-tu/*. Example:

114. (a) *Magarsaa-n gudd-aa-da*
 Megersa-NOM big-M-COP
 ‘Megersa is big.’

(b) *Magarsaa-tu gudd-aa-da*
 Megersa-FOC big-M-COP
 ‘It is Megersa who is big.’

Example (114a) is the most widely used pragmatically unmarked structure, while clause (114b) is pragmatically marked structure having an overt formal focus morpheme */-tu/*. The pragmatically unmarked structure in (114a) is the more recurrent option and the one that has the most neutral meaning than the pragmatically marked clause in (114b). Meyer and Debela

(2003:166) denote that the coexistence of the copular element /-*dá*/ and the morpheme /-*tu*/ clearly shows that /-*tu*/ is a focus marker not a copular element. I also share this idea because the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ is not a copula verb, since it cannot construct copula clauses and cleft constructions.

115. (a) *C'aalaa-n hoolaa bit- ϕ -e*
 Chala-NOM sheep buy-3MS-PV
 'Chala bought a sheep.'

(b) *Magartuu-tu hoolaa bit- ϕ -e*
 Megertu-FOC sheep buy-3MS-PV
 'It was Megertu who bought a sheep.'

The nominative marker /-*n*/ and the focus marker /-*tu*/ appear after the subject in (115a) and (115b), respectively. Clause (115a) is pragmatically unmarked, but it has unmarked predicate focus, while the one in (115b) is pragmatically marked, due to the presence of the focused noun 'Megertu'. In example (115b) the subject noun 'Megertu' is marked by the subject focus marker /-*tu*/. This noun conveys focus, while the rest of the clause carries background information. The example shows that the subject focus marker /-*tu*/ is basically added to a noun with absolutive case. Because in (115a) when it is suffixed to the nominative case marked noun 'Chala' the clause becomes illformed. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:53) states that the focus marker /-*tu(u)*/ is suffixed to the absolutive case form of nouns. The predicate can merely have the form of a third person masculine singular. In clause (115b) the subject argument is focused hence the subject position is not limited only to topic. Focal subjects lack some of the morphological properties of canonical topical subjects. For instance, the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ neutralizes gender distinction as in example (115b). It also neutralizes person and number distinctions as shown in clause (116b) since the distribution of the focus marker is pragmatics controlled not syntax controlled.

116. (a) *ñsaan-tu mana barumsa-a deem- ϕ -e*
 them-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 'It was them who went to school.'

- (b) *sii-tu mana barumsa-a deem-φ-e*
 you-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 ‘It was you who went to school.’

The subject pronouns are altered into their absolutive case form /*ʔsaan*/ ‘them’ and /*sii*/ ‘you’ due to the suffixation the focus marker /-*tu*/ and the person and number distinctions are also neutralized in example (116a) and (116b), respectively. The verb takes the same form in both clauses. Because the subject of both clauses is focused by the focus formative /-*tu*/. The examples show that the subject focus morpheme /-*tu*/ neutralizes person, gender and number distinctions and as a result the verb becomes invariant for all persons.

In addition to proper nouns and pronouns, the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ is suffixed to the question words /*ʔeɲu*/ ‘who’, /*maall*/ ‘what’ and /*kam*/ ‘which’ when they are used as subject. Example:

117. *ʔeɲu-tu si ʔarrabs-φ-e*
 who-FOC you insult-3MS-PV
 ‘Who was it that insulted you?’

The focused words /*maaltu*/ ‘what’ and /*kamtu*/ ‘which’ can replace the question word /*ʔeɲutu*/ ‘who’ in this clause. However, except these ones, other question words do not occupy the subject slot. Except the question word /*ʔeɲu*/ ‘who’ other question words cannot be focused by the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ in their canonical position, since they are not used as a subject. For instance, the focused question words /*maaltu*/ ‘what’, /*kamtu*/ ‘which’ and /*ʔeessatu*/ ‘where’ cannot be used in their in-situ position since /-*tu*/ is a subject focus marker. Instead of /-*tu*/ high pitch can be used to highlight question words in their normal syntactic slot. This shows that focus can be in situ or ex situ in Oromo.

Other than a single word or noun as exemplified above, the focus marker /-*tu(u)*/ can be suffixed to nouns connected by coordinating conjunction. Example:

118. (a) *C'aalaa fi Magarsaa-tu k'arfii koo hat-φ-e*
 Chala and Megersa-FOC money my steal-3MS-IPV
 'It was Chala and Megersa who stole my money.'

(b) *C'aalaa fi Magarsaa k'arfii koo hat-φ-e*
 Chala and Megersa money my steal-3MS-IPV
 'It was Chala and Megersa who stole my money.'

The focus morpheme /-tu/ can be replaced by high pitch without any variation in clause (118b). The pitch has to put at the final syllable of the noun 'Megersa' in (118b). Both clauses are pragmatically marked. Clause (118a) uses the focus marker /-tu/, while clause (118b) is supposed to apply high pitch. The clauses convey the same meaning in relation to their communicative function hence can be interchangeable in the same communicative context. The focus morpheme /-tu/ and the high pitch have the same functional meaning in the above clauses. The focus morpheme is suffixed to bare nouns (i.e., nouns without modifier) with the grammatical role of subject. It can also be suffixed to nouns modified by adjectives, determiners, etc. The element which the addressor considers as the most prominent information in the next clause is marked for contrastive focus by the focus morpheme /-tu/.

119. (a) **wajjaa-tu diimaa bit-am-φ-e*
 clothes-FOC red buy-PS-3MS-PV
 'It was red clothes that was bought.'

(b) *wajjaa diimaa-tu c'aal-φ-a*
 clothes red-FOC better-3MS-IPV
 'It was red clothes which is better.'

(c) **ānni wajjaa diimaa-tu bit-φ-e*
 he clothes red-FOC buy-3MS-PV
 'It was red clothes that he bought.'

When a noun is modified by an adjective/determiner the focus morpheme */-tu/* has to be suffixed to the modifier not to the head noun. Because in non bare noun phrases, suffixing the morpheme to the head noun makes the clause illformed as in clause (119a). The focus morpheme */-tu/* shifts from the subject noun */wajjaa/* ‘clothes’ to the adjective */diimaa/* ‘red’ in clause (119b). However, the scope of focus extends over the whole NP. Otherwise the clause would be illformed. The morpheme cannot be suffixed to bare and modified nouns with object function because it is not an object focus marker as in clause (119c). Like nouns having an adjective in the phrase */muka jalaa-tu(u)/* ‘under a tree’ the focus morpheme */-tu/* is suffixed to the head word not the modifier. Example:

120. *muka jalaa-tu(u) gaarii-da*
 tree under-FOC good-COP
 ‘It is under a tree which is good.’

The focus morpheme */-tu/* highlights a postpositional phrase in example (120) and suffixed to the head word */jala/* ‘under’ not to the modifier word */muka/* ‘tree’ though the scope of focus extends over the whole phrase. The morpheme encodes contrastive focus and the sense of contrastiveness is expressed implicitly. However, the contrast can be implicit or explicit. The contrast is explicit when two or more contrastive things are overtly stated. Besides nouns or noun phrases, the focus morpheme */-tu/* can be suffixed to converbs. Example:

121. (a) *ʔnni mana barumsa-a deem-ee-tuu hin beek-φ-u*
 he house education-GEN go-CNV-FOC NEG know-3MS-IPV
 ‘He never ever went to school.’
- (b) *ʔnni hoolaa sirii gurgur-ee-tuu hin beek-φ-u*
 he sheep never sell-CNV-FOC NEG know-3MS-IPV
 ‘He never ever sold a sheep.’

The focus marker */-tu/* is suffixed to the intransitive verb */deem-/* ‘go’ and transitive verb */gurgur-/* ‘sell’ in these examples since it is not confined only to focusing subject.

Focus Morpheme */-uma(a)/*

It is a non subject focus morpheme which is roughly equivalent in meaning with the English focus particle ‘only’ or ‘even’ based on context. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:55) shows that it is commonly used to highlight NPs with an object or adverbial function. Thus, it is not confined only to a direct object. It can highlight core and non core arguments of a verb, excluding subject. Oromo object or non-subject argument focus markers do not neutralize the person, gender and number of the object argument, since Oromo verbs do not agree with object or non-subject arguments. Example:

122. (a) *ñjiin C'aal-uma beek-t-i*
 she Chala-FOC know-3FS-IPV
 ‘She knows only Chala.’

(b) *ñnni jabii-umaa/-daa k'ab-ø-a*
 he calf-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘He has even a calf.’

The direct object noun ‘Chala’ is focused by the focus morpheme */-uma/* in clause (122a) because morphological focus marking is not restricted only to subject. In example (122b) the copular focus marker */-daa/* can be used in place of */-umaa/* without meaning difference due to their functional similarity. von Heusinger (1999:40) shows that ‘it is also possible that two focus particles linked with the same focus, so to speak, they share the same focus.’ Two focus markers can encode the same type of focus in Oromo. The focus marker */-daa/* and */-umaa/* are equivalent in relation to focus marking with the English focus particle ‘even’ in the above context. They highlight the noun with direct object function which is ‘calf’ without any meaning variation. They convey the same sense or are roughly equivalent in relation to their functional meaning with the scalar focus marking adverb ‘even’ in the above context. The animal (i.e., calf) is labeled as ‘high’ or given ‘high rank’ on the scale of expectedness. Besides the direct objects like ‘Chala’

and ‘calf’ as shown above, the object focus marker */-uma/* can be suffixed to question words used in non subject position. It is usually applied as non subject argument focus marker. Example:

123. (a) *ʔnni ʔeyn-uma ʔarrabs-ø-a*
 he who-FOC insult-3MS-IPV
 ‘Whom does he really insult?’

(b) *ʔnni maal-uma ʔaat-ø-e*
 he what-FOC eat-3MS-PV
 ‘What did he really eat?’

(c) *ʔnni ʔeess-uma deem-ø-e*
 he where-FOC go-3MS-PV
 ‘Where did he really go?’

The focus morpheme */-uma/* is suffixed to question words with distinct grammatical functions in the above clauses. It is suffixed to the question words that occupy direct object positions in the examples in (123a) and (123b). While in example (123c), it is suffixed to the complement of the verb. Hence, the morpheme is not confined only to direct object and it can highlight both direct object and non direct object arguments except subject. In the Tulama dialect, all non-subject question words can be focused by the morpheme */-uma/* when they are situated in their basic syntactic position (i.e., in-situ focus). Question words focused by the focus morpheme */-uma/* can only be put in their usually position by replacing nouns or PPs that can be supplied as answers. Thus, the focus morpheme has extremely wide distribution. Taha (1999) identifies */-uma/* as a direct object focus marker. However, it is not confined only to direct object focusing. Because it can be suffixed to non direct object argument as in (123c).

Besides bare direct object nouns, the focus marker */-uma/* cannot be directly suffixed to direct object arguments with a modifier(s). It is suffixed to the direct object modifier not to the direct object though the scope of focus extends over the whole NP. Example:

124. (a) *ānni kitaaba tokk-uma k'ab-φ-a*
 he book one-FOC has-3MS-PV
 'He has only one book.'

(b) *ānni kitaaba t'inn-uma k'ab-φ-a*
 he book little-FOC has-3MS-PV
 'He has only few books.'

(c) *kitaaba kan-uma k'ab-φ-a*
 book this-FOC has-3MS-PV
 'He has only this book.'

In the above examples, the object focus morpheme */-uma/* is not directly suffixed to the direct object rather, it is suffixed to the quantifier */tokko/* 'one' and the adjective */t'innool/* 'small' and the determiner */kana/* 'this'. Thus, the clauses denote that the focus morpheme */-uma/* is suffixed to the direct object modifier when the direct object is not a bare noun though the scope of focus extends over the entire NP. The morpheme marks restrictive/exhaustive listing focus in the examples but in the next examples, it encodes expanding focus (i.e., additive meaning). In this case, the focus morpheme is roughly equivalent in meaning with the focus particle 'even' and suffixed to non subject arguments. It is normally used in both statement and interrogative clauses to highlight non subject arguments. Example:

125. (a) *ānni C'aal-umaa beek-φ-a*
 he Chala-FOC know-3MS-IPV
 'He knows even Chala.'

(b) *ānni C'aal-umaa beek-φ-a-a*
 he Chala-FOC know-3MS-IPV-QM
 'Does he know even Chala?'

The focus morpheme /-umaa/ highlights the object argument ‘Chala’ in these clauses. When the following clauses are spoken with rising intonation they become rhetorical questions not true content questions. On the other hand, when they are spoken with falling intonation they become declarative clauses. Rhetorical questions are clauses having the morpho-syntactic structure of interrogatives but which do not require a literal answer rather, they help to focus or intensify an assertion (Payne, 1997:354). The next rhetorical questions are not true interrogative clauses.

126. (a) *ānni kam-umaa k’ab-ø-a*
 he which-FOC has-3MS-PV
 ‘Does he have anything?’

(b) *ānni ʔeess-umaa deem-ø-e*
 he where-FOC go-3MS-PV
 Did he go anywhere?

(c) *ānni maal-umaa beek-ø-a*
 he what-FOC know-3MS-PV
 ‘What does he really know?’

In the above clauses, the focused question words are /kamumaa/, /ʔeessumaa/ and /maalumaa/. The clauses become rhetorical questions only when they are spoken with rising intonation. The indirect speech acts involve question words for some other purpose other than asking questions. These clauses are used to show strong denial and the question words serve as expressions of emphatic negative polarity about the stated situation. The rhetorical questions are used to emphasize a point or present a challenge. When falling intonation is used the above clauses are changed into true declarative sentences stating strong or emphatic assertion. The meanings of the focused question words would be changed. Example:

127. (a) *ānni kam-umaa k’ab-ø-a*
 he which-FOC has-3MS-PV
 ‘He has everything.’

(b) *ʔnni ʔeess-umaa deem-ø-e*
 he where-FOC go-3MS-PV
 ‘He went to everywhere.’

(c) *ʔnni maal-umaa beek-ø-a*
 he who-FOC know-3MS-PV
 ‘He knows everything.’

These are examples of statements not true interrogative clauses though they contain question words. Thus, the focus morpheme */-umaa/* encodes strong assertion or emphatic focus in all case. In general, high pitch or intonation must play a role in marking the difference between example (126) and (127). The clauses in (126) and (127) are spoken with rising and falling pitch because they are rhetorical questions and statements in that order.

(c) Focus Morpheme */-(i)s/*

The focus marker */-(i)s/* is roughly translated into the English focus markers ‘also’, ‘too’ and sometimes it can also be translated into ‘as well as’. It is normally used to convey additive meaning. Hence it marks an expanding or additive focus. It can also encode contrastive focus based on the context it is used. It can be suffixed to a verb, noun and pronoun to encode expanding or contrastive focus based on the situational context in which it is applied. Example:

128. (a) *ʔnni daabboo jaat-ø-e ʔani-s*
 he bread eat-3MS-PV I-FOC
 ‘He ate bread, me too.’

(b) *ʔani-s ʔisa beek-ø-a*
 I-FOC him know-1S-IPV
 ‘I also know him.’

- (c) *ʔsa-s/ ʔsa-tu si beek - ϕ -a*
 him-FOC you know-3MS-PV

‘It is him that knows you’ (i.e., you do not know him or I do not know you.)

The focus words are highlighted by the focus formative */(i)s/* in the above clauses. The focus morpheme encodes expanding focus in clause (128a) and (128b), while in (128c) it marks contrastive focus. Clause (128a) and (128c) show the repetition of the same action. The focus morpheme is used as a pro-form for the deleted but contextually recoverable information */daabboo jaade/* ‘ate bread’ in clause (128a) and implies the implicit contrastive information in clause. The focus morpheme is suffixed to the pronoun */ʔsa/* ‘him’ to encode contrastive focus in example (128c). It can be used instead of the focus morpheme */-tu/* to mark contrastive focus with no difference in this case. The focus morpheme is suffixed to the absolutive case marked pronoun like */-tu/* in example (128c). It neutralizes the gender, person and number distinctions.

The focus morpheme */(i)s/* is suffixed to a single word in the above examples. But, it can be suffixed to a series of words or only to a single word in the series. Example:

129. (a) *ʔnni fira manaa fii k’arfii-s k’ab- ϕ -a*
 he relative house and money-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘He has a relative, house and also money.’

- (b) *ʔnni fira-s mana-s k’arfii -s k’ab- ϕ -a*
 he relative-FOC house-FOC money-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘He has also a relative, house and also money.’

These examples contain highlighted nouns. The focus marker */-is/* is suffixed to the last name of the series in (129a), but in (129b) it is suffixed to each noun in the series. It seems, clause (129b) is more emphatic than clause (129a). As example (129b) shows when it is suffixed to each word in a series, a conjunction is not required. In the examples, the focus morpheme encodes either expanding or contrastive focus based on the communicative context in which it is employed.

Besides a series of nouns, the focus morpheme */-is/* can be suffixed to a series of adjectives, verbs and postpositions. Oromo usually, highlights subject, direct object, oblique object and adjunct. In clause (130a), (130b) and (130c) */-is/* is suffixed to the adjectives, postpositions and verbs, respectively. Example:

130. (a) *ǃnni hoolaa gurraaca -s ǃadii-s k'ab-ϕ-a*
 he sheep black-FOC white-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘He has a black and white sheep too/He has both black and white sheep.’

(b) *ǃadurree-n siree jala-s ǃirra-s c'iis-t-e*
 cat-NOM bed under-FOC on-FOC sleep-3FS-PV
 ‘A cat lays under and on the bed.’

(c) *c'irree ǃaat-ϕ-ee-ti-s diis-ϕ-ee-ti-s beek-ϕ-a*
 breakfast eat-3MS-PV-COP-FOC leave-3MS-PV-COP-FOC know-3MS-PV
 ‘He sometimes ate his breakfast but sometimes not.’

(d) *ǃnni gabaa deem-ee-s hin beek-ϕ-u*
 he market go-CNV-FOC NEG know-3MS-PV
 ‘He never ever goes to a market.’

The focus morpheme */-is/* focalizes a single or series of words that belong to the class of noun, adjective, verb, and postposition as given above. When it is suffixed to a series of adjectives or postpositions the scope of the focus extends over the whole phrases as in clause (130a) and (130b). Example (130c) denotes that in a series of dependent clauses the polarity of the verbs focused by */-is/* must be identical to the previous one, since the morpheme encodes additive focus. Apparently, this condition is linked with expanding focus. A single converb */deemeel/* ‘gone’ is focused in clause (130d).

(b) Focus Morpheme /-uu/

It is roughly equated with the English focus marker ‘even’. Functionally, it is also equivalent with the focus marking particle /-*ɹijjuu*/. The focus particle /*ɹijjuu*/ appears alone without being hosted by any word when it is adjoined to words ending in consonant. The focus morpheme /-*uu*/ may be changed into /-*ɹijjuu*/ by consonant gliding to highlight words that belong to various word classes. They can be used alternatively without meaning difference. Example:

131. (a) *ɹani san-uu beek-ϕ-a*
I that-FOC know-1S-IPV
‘I know even that (one).’

(b) *ɹsaan wal-uu beek-u*
They each other-FOC know-3P-IPV
‘They know even each other or one another.’

(c) *ɹnni foon-uu hin jaat-ϕ-u*
he meat-FOC NEG eat-3MS-IPV
‘He does not eat even meat.’

(d) *ɹnni foon diimaa-dá-ɹuu/ijjuu hin jaat-ϕ-u*
he meat red-COP-FOC NEG eat-3MS-PV
‘He does not eat even red meat.’

The focus morpheme /-*uu*/ is used for implying reinforcement by being suffixed to various word classes with subject, direct object functions and so forth. It is suffixed to the pronoun /*san*/ ‘this’, the direct object reciprocal pronoun /*wal*/ ‘each other/one another’, the direct object noun /*foon*/ ‘meat’ and the modifying adjective /*diimaa*/ ‘red’ in the examples. Clause (131d) shows that the focus morpheme /-*uu*/ or /*ɹijjuu*/ is switched to an adjective or a modifier in noun phrases having modifiers though the scope of extends over the whole NP. Besides nouns, the two focus markers

can be suffixed to main verbs and copular elements. When it is suffixed to a copular element, it highlights the copula complement not the copular element. Example:

132. (a) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa bit- ϕ -ee- λ jjuu*
Megersa-NOM sheep buy-3MS-PV-FOC
'Megersa even bought a sheep.'

(b) *λ nni barat-aa-daa- λ jjuu*
he student-M-COP-FOC
'He is even a student.'

The focus particle /- λ jjuu/ is adjoined to the verb /bit-/ 'buy' and copular element /-daa/ in these examples. A verb and copula complement are focused in (132a) and (132b), respectively. The focus particle can be replaced by the focus morpheme /-uu/ without any meaning change.

In the preceding sections, the focus morphemes are used separately though they can be used separately or jointly. In contrast, the next subsection deals with complex morphological focusing. In this work, the term Complex focusing (i.e., complex morphological or particles focusing) refers to suffixing or adjoining more than one focus morphemes or particles. Complex focusing normally increases the level of emphasis. More than one focus morphemes or focus morphemes plus focus particles are used to show complex focusing. Complex morphological focusing is briefly presented as follows.

(a) Complex Morphological Focusing

The complex focus morpheme /-umatu(u)/ is constructed by merging the focus morpheme /-uma/ and /-tuu/. Unlike /-uma(a), it highlights a subject not an object and is roughly equivalent in function with the English focus marker 'really' or 'even'. It encodes contrastive as well as additive focus based on context. It can be used in both statement and interrogative clauses to focus on the subject of the clause due to the subject focus morpheme /-tu(u)/. Example:

133. (a) *ʒeɛŋ-umaa-tu mana barumsa-a deem-ɸ-e*
 who-FOC-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 ‘Who was the one that really went to school?’

(b) *Magarsaa-umaa-tu mana barumsa-a deem-ɸ-e*
 Megersa-FOC-FOC house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 ‘It was Megersa who really went to school.’

The focus marker */-umatu(u)/* may show strong focus than the simple focus morphemes */-uma/* and */-tu(u)/*. It is suffixed to a bare noun with the grammatical role of subject. But, when the subject argument has a modifying adjective, it shifts from the noun to the adjective though the scope of focus is over the whole NP. Example:

134. *wajjaa diim-umaa-tu gaarii-dā*
 clothes red-FOC-FOC good-COP
 ‘It is red clothes which is good.’

This example shows that when the subject of a clause has a modifier or an adjective, the focus morpheme must shift from the subject or the head noun to the adjective. Because when this focus morpheme is directly suffixed to the head noun the clause becomes ungrammatical. The focus morpheme */-tu/* encodes exhaustive listing focus in example (134). It can also mark additive focus. Example:

135. (a) *Magars-uma-tuu midagaa-dā*
 Megersa-FOC-FOC handsome-COP
 ‘Even Megersa is handsome.’

(b) *Magars-uma-tuu midagaa miti*
 Megersa-FOC handsome not-be
 ‘Even Megersa is not handsome.’

Clause (135a) asserts that though Megersa is handsome, there is someone else who is more handsome than him. Example (135b) is presented by opposing someone who believes that Megersa is handsome and shows that he is not as such ugly as others. The focus morpheme marks expanding focus in clause (135a).

Another complex focus marking morpheme is */-tuma/*. It is formed by merging the focus morpheme */-tu /* and */-umaa/*. It can be suffixed to verbs as in the examples below.

136. (a) *ʔani foon bit-ee-tu-umaa hin gal-n-ϕ-e*
 I meat buy-CNV-FOC-FOC NEG enter-NEG-3MS-PV
 ‘I never ever bought meat and came home.’

(b) *ʔnni mana barumsa-a deem-ee-tu-umaa hin beek-ϕ-u*
 I house education-GEN go-CNV-FOC-FOC NEG know-3MS-PV
 ‘I never ever go to school altogether.’

The focus morpheme */-tuma/* highlights the converb */bitee/* ‘bought’ in clause (136a) and */deemeel/* ‘gone’ in example (136b). It encodes emphatic focus in these clauses.

6.2.3 Focus Marking Particles

Oromo focus sensitive particles convey various focus meanings. A focus particle occurs with the highlighted element in a certain position focusing on an certain element of a clause. Thus, the effects of IS are evident using various focus particles. Focus sensitive particles are used as a syntactic cue to determine the focus of a clause. Because they have discourse/pragmatic functions and help for the interpretation of clause. Usually, the interpretation of clauses varies as the position of the focus particle is changed. Focus particles like */k’ofa/* ‘only’ alter the meaning of the clause, due to their semantic effect.

Oromo has a rich system of focus sensitive particles and among these some of them are words, while others are clitics or affixes. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:61) denotes that Oromo applies many particles, that help to highlight a part of a clause or a word or to emphasize the feature or type of

an utterance, e.g., as a question or an emphatic demand. The focus particles do not only have distinct contrastive strength, but they also vary in form, meaning and function from one dialect to the other. She identifies /*llee*/ or /*ɿllee*/ ‘even, exactly’, /*(i)mmoo*/ ‘and even’, /*-oo/-woo/-hoo*/ ‘and what about x’, /*-uma*/ and /*ɿ(i)jjuu*/ ‘even’. However, the form /*-oo/-woo/-hoo*/ is a sentence topic marker not as a focus marker (dealt with in chapter four of the present study) because it brings a certain element of the clause to topic position in the dialect under investigation. Besides the aforesaid focus particles, additional particles such as /*bicaa*/ or /*k’ofa*/ ‘only’ /*-ɿttuu*/ or /*keessattuu*/ ‘especially’, etc. are observed in the language. The pragmatic functions or properties of the particles are dealt with in the next sections.

6.2.3.1 Noun Focus Particles

Focus particles can be nominal or verbal focus markers. However, the nominal focus particles are not strictly confined only to highlighting nouns as presented below.

(a) Focus Particle /*-ɿllee*/

This particle is closely equivalent with the English focus particle ‘even or at least’ based on context. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:62) says that /*ɿllee*/, /*ɿmmoo*/, and /*moo*/ are spelled as free words in modern Oromo spelling. They are virtually suffixed to the preceding word in speech. In these cases /*ɿmmoo*/ and /*illee*/ are used without the prothetic /*i-*/. It seems that /*-illee*/ is used with the affirmative and negative utterances. Example:

137. (a) *Magarsaa -n hoolaa kana-llee k’ab-φ-a*
 Megersa -NOM sheep this-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘Megersa has even this sheep.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa tokko-llee k’ab-φ-a*
 Megersa-NOM sheep one-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘Megersa has at least one sheep.’

- (c) *Tulluu-n daabboo-llee hin k'ab-φ-u*
 Tullu-NOM bread-FOC NEG has-3MS-IPV
 ‘Tullu does not have even bread.’

The examples denote that the particle */-ǎllee/* can highlight words belong to various word classes. It is suffixed to the demonstrative pronoun */kana/* ‘this’, the quantifier */tokko/* ‘one’ and the common noun */daabboo/* ‘bread’ in clause (137a), (137b) and (137c), respectively. The scope of focus extends over the whole NP though it is adjoined to the modifiers in examples (137a) and (137c). Sentences with a focused element with */-ǎllee/* can be interpreted differently based on the situational context. For instance, clause (137b) can be interpreted as “Megersa has at least this sheep (i.e., he has no some other properties).” The focus marker */-ǎllee/* interacts with the negation marker */hin-/* to strengthen the degree of focus more as in clause (137c). It can be suffixed to the last word of the list of nouns or to each noun as in the clauses and interpreted in diverse ways based on context. Example:

138. (a) *ǎfjin manaa fi k'arfii-illee k'ab-t-i*
 she house and money-FOC has -3FS-IPV
 ‘She has even a house and money.’

- (b) *ǎfjin mana-illee k'arfii-illee k'ab-t-i*
 she house-FOC money-FOC has-3FS-IPV
 ‘She has even a house and money.’

The focus particle */ǎllee/* is linked up with one or more element(s) of a series of words in the above examples. There is no basic meaning variation between the two clauses. It seems, the second one is more emphatic than the first one. The phrase ‘house and money’ are focused in both structures. As the position of the focus marker is changed, the element that receives focus is altered and as a result some kind of meaning modification is observed based on the context.

Unlike the focus morpheme /-tu/, the focus particle /*ɿllee*/ does not neutralize number, person and gender distinctions when it highlights the subject of a sentence. For instance:

139. (a) *Magarsaa-n-illee hoolaa hin k'ab-φ-u*
 Megersa-NOM-FOC sheep NEG has-3MS-IPV
 ‘Even Megersa doesn’t have a sheep.’

(b) *ɿfiin-illee mana hin jir-t-u*
 she-FOC house NEG exist-3FS-IPV
 ‘Even she is not (available) at home.’

(c) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa bit-φ-e-illee-da*
 Megersa-NOM sheep buy -3MS-PV-FOC-COP
 ‘Megersa even bought a sheep.’

The focus particle /*ɿllee*/ does not neutralize the verb agreement morpheme in clause (139a) and (139b) though it is linked up with subject. However, it is adjoined to the verb /*bit-*/ ‘buy’ in (139c). When it is adjoined to words ending in consonant, it appears alone without being hosted by any word.

(b) Focus Particle /-*ɿttuu*/

This focus particle is an intensifier and used to highlight words or phrases in a sentence. Crystal (2008:248) defines intensifier as a term used in some grammatical categorization of words to refer to a group of adverbs which possess a highlighting or lowering impact on the semantics of another constituent in the clause. Intensifying adverbs comprise very, terribly, definitely, hardly and kind of and so forth. Emphatic expressions can involve adding an (adverb) intensifier to an existing structure to express feelings emphatically. The focus particles /-*ɿttuu*/ and /*kessattuu*/ are intensifiers. The focus particle /*keessattuu*/ is composed of the word /*keessa*/ ‘inside’ and the particle /-*ɿttuu*/. Both particles are roughly equivalent with the English intensifier ‘particularly’ and emphasize elements of a clause by specifying them. They can be used alternatively or concurrently by accompanied with short pause, to particularize and emphasize various sentence

elements. But, the short pause is not required when the focalizers appear at the end of a clause.
 Example:

140. (a) *ǻttuu ʎani foon diimaa hin jaal-add-φ-u*
 FOC I meat red NEG like-MD-1S-IPV
 ‘Especially I, do not like red meat.’

(b) *ʎani ǻttuu foon diimaa hin jaal-add-φ-u*
 I FOC meat red NEG like-MD-1S-IPV
 ‘I do not like especially red meat.’

(c) *ʎani foon ǻttuu diimaa hin jaal-add-φ-u*
 I meat FOC red NEG like-MD-1S-IPV
 ‘I do not like meat, especially red.’

These examples depict that focus can be switched to various elements of a clause based on the placement of the focus marker. In the above clauses, the focus marker /-ǻttuu/ highlights various elements of the pragmatically unmarked clause. The clauses with a focused constituent vary in terms of what is new and old information. The pronoun /ʎani/ ‘I’, the noun /foon/ ‘meat’ and the noun phrase /foon diimaa/ ‘red’ are focused in clause (140a), (140b) and (140c) respectively. In example (140b) the focus particle can alternatively be put after the noun phrase ‘red meat.’ A short pause must be used after the focal element is spoken to separate the focused element from the unfocused one. The focus particles can precede or follow the element to be focused without any meaning variation. Besides nouns and pronouns, the focus particles can be adjoined to an adverb. Example:

141. (a) *ǻsaan ǻttuu/keessattuu ʎamma barumsa jibb-an*
 they particularly now education hate-3PL.IPV
 ‘They hate education especially now.’

- (b) *ʃsaan ʒamma ʃttuu/keessattuu barumsa jibb-an*
 they now particularly education hate-3PL.IPV
 ‘They hate education especially now.’

The focus particles emphasize the time adverb /*ʒamma*/ ‘now’. They can appear before or after the adverb or the word with adverbial function without any meaning change as shown in the examples. But, they usually appear after an adverb. These focus particles can be used iteratively or concurrently in a single clause to escalate the degree of focus. They are usually repeated twice but sometimes more than that. For instance:

142. (a) *ʃttuu keessattuu ʒani foon deedi hin jaal-add-ø-u*
 particularly particularly I meat raw NEG like-MD-1S-IPV
 ‘Especially I do not like raw meat.’

- (b) *ʃttuu ʃttuu ʒani foon deedi hin jaal-add-ø-u*
 particularly particularly I meat raw NEG like-MD-1S-IPV
 ‘Especially I, do not like raw meat.’

- (c) *Magarsaa-n keessattuu keessattuu foon deedi hin jaat-ø-u*
 Megersa-NOM particularly particularly meat raw NEG eat-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa does not eat especially raw meat.’

Example (142a) shows that /*ʃttuu*/ and /*keessattuu*/ are used concurrently to particularize various elements of a clause. One of the two appears first when they are used concurrently. The focus particle /*ʃttuu*/ and /*keessattuu*/ are used iteratively in clause (142b) and (142c), respectively. The phrase iterative use refers to using one focus marker repeatedly to emphasize on a single constituent to strengthen the degree of emphasis. It is also possible to use the two iteratively even more than twice to strengthen the level of emphasize. Frequentative use of focus particles is common in Oromo. In the above examples, the pronoun /*ʒani*/ ‘I’ and the noun phrase /*foon*

deedii ‘raw meat’ are focused by the iterative use of the focus particles. The particles are used iteratively to encode nominal, verbal, postpositional and adverbial focus.

(c) Focus Particle /*k’ofa*/

It is a lexical focus marker or focus sensitive particle which is roughly equivalent in meaning with the English focus marker ‘only’. This particle induces an exclusive reading. It highlights various elements of a clause except verb. Usually, it is followed by the focus morpheme /-*tu*/ to highlight the subject of the clause. The focus marker /*k’ofa(tu)*/ marks exhaustive listing focus interchangeably with its equivalent Amharic word /*bicaa(tu)*/. The particle /*bicaa*/ is usually used by illiterates. When the subject of a clause is focused by /*k’ofa (tu)*/ it must be in its absolutive case. The focus particle neutralizes gender, person and number distinctions when it highlights the subject argument. Example:

143. (a) *Bik’iltuu k’ofa-tu damma Balcaa-daa-f bit-ø-e*
 Bikiltu only-FOC honey Balcha-COP-DAT buy-3MS-PV
 ‘It was only Bikiltu who bought honey for Balcha.’

(b) *Bik’iltuu-n damma Balcaa-daa-f k’ofa bit-ø-e*
 Bik’iltu-NOM honey Balcha-COP-DAT only buy-3MS-PV
 ‘Bikiltu bought honey only for Balcha.’

(c) *Balcaa-n damma k’ofa Bik’iltuu-daa-f bit-ø-e*
 Balcha-NOM honey only Bikiltu-COP-DAT buy-3MS-PV
 ‘Balcha bought only honey for Bikiltu.’

In these examples, different elements of the clauses are highlighted on by the focus particle /*k’ofa*/ for exhaustive listing. The effect of the particle on the meaning of the clauses crucially depends on their information structural properties. The phrases ‘Bikiltu’, ‘for Balcha’ and ‘honey’ are focal elements in (143a), (143b) and (143c), respectively. The meaning of the clauses changes as the focus particle is adjoined to different elements. Positional variability is one of the most noticeable features of focus particles. The focus particle /*k’ofa*/ appears in different

positions to highlight various elements of a clause. It directly follows the focused element. The meaning of the clauses in (143b) and (143c) is very vague because /*k'ofa*/ can be used as the time adverb 'before'. However, this ambiguity can be resolved by using the situational context and its alternative focus marker /*bicaa*/. Using short pause after the focus marker or the focused term also helps to resolve the ambiguity. When the focus particle /*k'ofa*/ is used as an adverb, the meaning of clause (143c) becomes 'Biklitu bought honey for Balcha earlier'. The focus particle usually directly follows the focal element. The positional variability of the focus /*k'ofa*/ alters the truth condition or value of the above clauses and it requires a focal element in its scope for interpretation.

In the above clauses, the focus particle /*k'ofa*/ is linked up with bare nouns. Besides bare nouns, it can highlight modified noun phrases and postpositional phrases. Example:

144. (a) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa lama k'ofa k'ab-ø-a*
 Megersa-NOM sheep two only has-3MS-IPV
 'Megersa has only two sheep.'

(b) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa ʔadii k'ofa k'ab-ø-a*
 Megersa-NOM sheep white only has-3MS-IPV
 'Megersa has only a white sheep.'

(c) *Magarsaa-n muka jala k'ofa raf-ø-e*
 Megersa-NOM tree under only sleep-3MS-PV
 'Megersa slept only under a tree.'

The focus particle /*k'ofa*/ is used for emphasizing and restricting the number of the sheep in example (144a) and the color of the sheep in clause (144b). It focuses on the postposition phrase /*muka jala*/ 'under a tree' in clause (144c). In general, as already said, the particle can be used to highlight different word classes except verb.

(d) Focus Particle /*bee*/ or /*bar*/

These focus particles are used alternatively to focus on various constituents of a clause. Taha (1999) treats /*bar*/ as a sentence focalizing device. However, it is not confined only to a sentence at least in the Tulama dialect and hence, it can be adjoined to various elements of a clause. These focus particles can be used interchangeable to encode contrastive focus only in declarative sentences (i.e., not in interrogative and imperative clauses) without meaning change. They usually appear following the focal element or their host with no phonological integration into their host. They can be linked up with words belong to any part of speech to mark both narrow and broad focus. They are followed by short pause when they occur at the middle of the clause to distinguish the focus element from the unfocused one. For instance:

145. (a) *C'aalaa-n buna dug- ϕ -ee bee*
Chala-NOM coffee drink-3MS-PV FOC
'But Chala has really drunk coffee.'

(b) *C'aalaa-n bunaa bar dug- ϕ -ee*
Chala-NOM coffee FOC drink-3MS-PV
'But Chala has drunk even coffee.'

(c) *C'aalaa-n bar buna dug- ϕ -ee*
Chala-NOM FOC coffee drink-3MS-PV
'But Chala has drunk coffee.'

The focus particles /*bar*/ and /*bee*/ can be freely used alternatively without any meaning difference in the clauses. The focus particle /*bar*/ highlights the verb / *dug-*/ 'drink', the noun /*buna*/ 'coffee' and 'Chala' in (145a), (145b) and (145c), respectively. Hence it can be adjoined to words that belong to various word classes. The focus particle /*bar*/ appear with bare nouns and verb phrase in the above clauses. Besides bare nouns, they can occur with nouns with modifier and postpositional phrase. Example:

146. (a) *ʔnni mana gudd-aa bar hin k'ab-φ-u*
 he house big-M FOC NEG has-3MS-IPV
 'But he does not have a big house.'

(b) *hoolaa-n muka jala bar/bee jir-φ-a*
 sheep-NOM wood under FOC exist-3MS-IPV
 'But the sheep is found under a tree.'

The focus particle /*bar/* or /*bee/* highlights the noun phrase /*mana guddaa/* 'a big house' and the postpositional phrase /*muka jala/* 'under a tree' in these examples. Short pause is required to distinguish the focused elements from the unfocused element of the clauses. The focus markers /*bar/* and /*bee/* can be used to highlight various elements of a clause as in the above examples. When their distribution is linked with the whole clause they appear at the end of the clause. The distribution of these focus particles is pragmatics controlled not syntax controlled.

(e) Focus Particle /*kaa/*

The focus particle /*kaa/* 'then' is used in imperative clauses or in dialogues to emphasize fact. It conveys various kinds of attitude emphatically based on clause type. It shows suggestion, argument or dissent in declarative clause emphatically, whereas in interrogative clauses it conveys confirmation, surprise, anger, etc. It is applied in command for strongly motivating or reinforcing the addressee(s). Example:

147. (a) *Tulluu-n foon deedi hin jaat-φ-a-a kaa*
 Tullu-NOM meat raw FOC eat-3MS-IPV-QM then
 'Does Tullu eat raw meat then?'

(b). *ʔnni foon deedi hin jaat-φ-a kaa*
 he meat raw FOC eat-3MS-PV then
 'He eats raw meat then.'

(c) *mana barumsa-a deem-i kaa*
 house education-GEN go-IMPV then
 ‘Go to school then.’

(d) *nam-icci kuni maali-f hin duf-n- ϕ -e kaa*
 person.SGV this why-DAT NEG come-NEG-3MS-PV then
 ‘Why did this man not come then?’

The focus particle /*kaa*/ ‘then’ is used in polar questions, declarative, imperative sentences and information questions in example (147a) to (147d), in that order. In clause (147a) to (147c) the verb receives focus. The focus word is the question word /*maali-f*/ ‘why for’ in clause (147d). Clause (147a) can show confirmation, surprise or anger, etc. based on situational context. If clause (147a) is used for confirmation, the speaker presupposes that ‘Tullu eats raw meat’. Hence, it is used to confirm whether ‘Tullu eats raw meat or not.’ The examples show that the focus particle /*kaa*/ can be adjoined to different elements of the clause. The focus particle can occupy various positions based on the number of constituents of a sentence. Example:

148. (a) *C’aalaa-n Magarsaa-daa-f k’arfii kenn- ϕ -e kaa*
 Chala-NOM Megersa-COP-DAT money give-3MS-PV then
 ‘Chala gave money for Megersa then.’

(b) *C’aalaa-n kaa Magarsaa-daa-f k’arfii kenn- ϕ -e*
 Chala-NOM then Megersa-COP-DAT money give-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala gave money for Megersa then.’

(c) *C’aalaa-n Magarsaa-daa-f kaa k’arfii kenn- ϕ -e*
 Chala-NOM Megersa-COP-DAT then money give-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala gave money for Megersa then.’

These examples denote that focus particle /*kaa*/ is placed in different positions to highlight various elements of the clause. It appears with a verb, subject and indirect object of the sentence.

The verb ‘give’ the phrase ‘Chala’ and ‘for Megersa’ are focused in the above clauses in their respective order. The focused elements are altered as the position of the focus marker is changed as in the above clauses.

(f) Focus Particle /*ǎmmaa*/

This focus particle can be roughly translated into the English focus marker ‘of course’. It marks different word classes for contrastive focus. Example:

149. (a) *ǎnni wajjaa gurraaca ǎmmaa hin jaalat-φ-u*
 he clothes black of course NEG like-3MS-IPV
 ‘Of course, he does not like black clothes.’

(b) *ǎnni wajjaa ǎmmaa gurraaca hin jaalat-φ-u*
 he clothes of course black NEG like-3MS-IPV
 ‘He does not like black clothes.’

(c) *ǎnni ǎmmaa wajjaa gurraaca hin jaalat-φ-u*
 he of course clothes black NEG like-3MS-IPV
 ‘He does not like black clothes.’

(d) *ǎnni mana fuuldura ǎmmaa taaʔ-φ-e*
 he house in front of of course sit-3MS-PV
 ‘He sat in front of the house.’

The focus particle /*ǎmmaa*/ is linked up with various word classes in the above clauses. It is adjoined to the adjective /*gurraaca*/ ‘black’, the noun /*wajjaa*/ ‘clothes’ the pronoun /*ǎnni*/ ‘he’ and the postpositional phrase /*mana fuul dura*/ ‘in front of the house’ in (149a) and (149b), (149c) and (149d), respectively. It appears following the focus word to signal contrastive focus by contrasting the focused things with the overtly unstated ones. The particle stands alone when the word that immediately preceding it ends with a consonant. It appears after the head noun

/wajjaa/ ‘clothes’ in clause (149b) while in example (149a) it occurs after the adjective */gurraaca/* ‘black’. Though, it directly appears after the adjective, the scope of focus extends over the whole NP. A meaning difference is realized between clause (149a) and (149b) because the particle is adjoined to different words. Clause (149a) implies that “he dislikes black clothes”, whereas clause (149b) denotes that ‘he dislikes black clothes but he likes other black things.’

Apart from nouns and postpositional phrases, the focus particle */ammaa/* can appear after main verbs and copular elements. When it is adjoined to copular elements the scope of focus extends over the copula complement. It can also be linked up with serial verbs in order to highlight them. The predicates are focused though the particle is hosted by the main verb or copular elements as exemplified below.

150. (a) *ānni barat-aa-dā ammaa*
 he student-M-COP of course
 ‘He is a student, of course.’

(b) *ānni hirijaa koo-ti miti ammaa*
 he peer group my-COP not-be of course
 ‘He is not my peer group, of course.’

(c) *ānni mana barumsa-a deem-ee ammaa hin beek-ø-u*
 he house education-GEN go-CNV of course NEG know-3MS-IPV
 ‘He never went to school, of course.’

The focus particle shows predicate focus because it is adjoined to the copular elements and content verbs in the examples. It is adjoined to */-dā/*, */miti/* and the content verb */deem-/ /-dā/*, in the clauses in (150a), /150b/ and /150c/, respectively. The examples show that the particle can be adjoined to any element of a clause.

(g) Focus Particle /-*dā(a)*/

It is identical in its phonetic shape with the present tense affirmative copular element /-*dā*/ and equivalent in function with the English focus marker ‘even’. Example:

151. *Tulluu-dā dūf-φ-e*
Tullu-COP come-3MS-PV
‘It was Tullu that came.’

Example (151) is unacceptable, since particle /-*dā*/ cannot highlight a subject. The particle is usually directly suffixed to a direct object argument ending with long vowel. Example:

152. (a) *Tolcaa-n farsoo dūg-φ-e*
Tolcha-NOM local beer drink-3MS-PV
‘Tolcha drank local beer.’

(b) *Tolcaa-n farsoo-dā dūg-φ-e*
Tolcha-NOM local beer-FOC drink-3MS-PV
‘It was local beer that Tolcha drank.’

Clause (152a) is a focus neutral clause. While in example (152b) the direct object argument /*farsoo*/ ‘local beer’ is highlighted by the focus marker /-*dā*/. It is only suffixed to words (i.e., head nouns or modifier) ending in long vowel. It highlights question words ending in long vowels as in clause (153). Meyer and Dabala (2003:182) say question words can be highlighted via the focus marker /-*dā(a)*/. Example:

153. *ʔeɛnuu-dā beek-φ-a*
who-COP know-3MS-PV
‘Whom does he know?’

The question word /*ʔeɛnuu*/ ‘who’ is focused by the particle /-*dā*/ because it occupies the direct object position. According to Baye (1988:376) the focus particle /-*dā(a)*/ marks postpositional

phrases for contrastive focus. However, possibly, this particle is used as a copular element not as a focus particle with postpositional phrase at least in the Tulama dialect. Example:

154. (a). *Tulluu-n Magarsaa ḷulee-dāa-n rukut-φ-e*
 Tullu-NOM Megersa stick-COP-INST beat-3MS-PV
 ‘Tullu hit Megersa with a stick.’

(b). *Tulluu-n Magarsaa ḷulee-n rukut-φ-e*
 Tullu-NOM Megersa stick-INST beat-3MS-PV
 ‘Tullu hit Megersa with a stick.’

This clause has no focus reading, due to the absence of a focused constituent. The particle serves as a copular element not as a focus marker. To focus on the postpositional phrase */ḷuleedaan/* ‘with a stick’ high pitch is required. Meyer and Dabala (2003:171-172) state that the form */-da/* can appear as part of postpositional phrases with nouns ending in a long vowel, where it does not have a focus reading. Thus, it is not employed as a focus marker with adjuncts in Wellega Oromo. As shown in clause (154a) and clause (154b), no variation is observed between the phrase */ḷuleedaan/* ‘with a stick’ and */ḷuleen/* ‘with a stick’, since both of them are focus-neutral. High pitch is required to focus on the PP phrase ‘with stick’ in both examples.

6.2.3.2 Verb Focus Particles

So far the nominal focus markers are dealt with. This section aims at describing the focus particle of verbs. The focus particle */sirii/*, */ni/* and */hin/* are confined only to verbs particularly, main verbs. Copular elements do not receive a focus marker, due to lack of semantic meaning. When the focus markers are adjoined to copular elements it is the CCs that are focused. Categories that do not have semantic meaning such as expletives and semantically empty auxiliaries cannot encode any information structural meanings, since they are informatively empty (Bender and Song, 2012:332). The next sections deal with verb focus markers.

(a). Verb Focus Particle /*sirii*/

The focus particle /*sirii*/ “never or totally” is one of the free standing focus particles of verbs or intensifiers helps to give force or emphasize for the action stated by the verbs. Example:

155. (a) *ʔani ʔsaan sirii ʔarg-ee hin beek-φ-u*
I they never see-CNV NEG know-3MS-IPV
‘I have never seen them totally.’

(b) *ʔnni sirii maraat-φ-e*
he totally become mad-3MS-PV
‘He became totally mad.’

(c) *ʔnni sirii sirii maraat-φ-e*
he totally totally become mad-3MS-PV
‘He became totally mad.’

The focus particle /*sirii*/ is a predicational focus marker that highlights an action. It occurs before the focused verb /*ʔarg-/* ‘see’ and /*maraat-/* ‘become mad’ in the examples. It can be used iteratively in affirmative and negative clauses to strengthen the level of emphasize as in (155c).

(b). Verb Focus Particle /*hin*/

It is a free standing preverbal element used only in affirmative clauses to mark an assertive focus. It highlights transitive and intransitive verbs with perfective and imperfective aspects. The focus particle /*hin*/ can be used interchangeably with the focus particle /*ni*/ without any variation in the Tulama dialect of Oromo. The focus particle /*ni*/ is usually used by literates than illiterates. As the next examples show these particles can be employed alternatively.

156. (a) *ʔnni hoolaa hin/ni gurgur-φ-e*
he sheep FOC sell-3MS-PV
‘He sold a sheep surely.’

(b) *ʔnni ʔsaan hin/ni beek-ø-a*
 I they FOC know-1S-IPV
 ‘He knows them surely.’

(c) *ʔnni ni kuf-ø-a*
 he FOC fell down-3MS-IPV
 ‘He fells/will fell down surely.’

The transitive verb /gurgur-/ ‘sell’ and /beek-/ ‘know’ and the intransitive verb /kuf-/ are highlighted by the preverbal focus particle /hin/ or /ni/ in these examples. The focus particles are not inevitably required with perfective aspect verbs, since their distribution is pragmatics-controlled in this case. However, they are necessarily required in clauses with intransitive imperfective aspect verb to construct syntactically and pragmatically acceptable clauses. The particles are adjoined to intransitive or transitive verbs with perfective and imperfective aspects and encode assertive focus in the absence of another focused element. Focus encoding is rarely considered as a process working merely on the pragmatic level of grammar, even if it may have morphosyntactic features (Meyer and Dabala, 2003:164).

When the subject of the sentence is first person singular, the preverbal focus marker /ni/ is used not /hin/ to emphasize on the action stated by the verb. Example:

157. (a) *ʔani foon ni-ʔan ʔaad-ø-a*
 I meat FOC-I eat-1S-IPV
 ‘I (will) eat meat surely.’

(b) *ʔani hoolaa ni-ʔan gurgur-ø-e*
 I sheep FOC-I sell-1S-PV
 ‘I sold a sheep surely.’

When the focus particle /ni/ highlights a verb in sentences with first person singular subject, it is followed by the first person singular pronoun /-ʔan/ and forms the free standing form /nan/ as

indicated above. When a verb is focused, the pronoun */-ʔan/* always follows the verb focus marker */ni/*. Otherwise, it is suffixed to other elements of as in clause (158).

158. *ʔani foon-ʔan ʔaal-aɗɗ-ɸ-a*
 I meat-I like-MD-1S-IPV
 ‘I like meat.’

As shown above, unlike the noun focus markers, the verbal focus markers usually directly appear before the verb. Thus, the focus particles */hin/*, */ni/* and */sirii/* always appear before a verb. So far, it was dealt with how each focus particles are used separately. The next section deals with how various focus particles plus morpheme are used jointly.

(a) Complex Focus marker */ʔttuumaal/*

It is the combination the focus particle */ʔttuu/* ‘especially’ and the focus morpheme */-uma(a)/*. It is more emphatic than both */-ʔttuu/* and */-umaal/*. This complex focus marker can be adjoined to various elements of a clause. Example:

159. (a) *ʔani ʔttu-umaa Tola ʔibb-ɸ-e*
 I especially-FOC Tola hate-1S-PV
 ‘I hated especially Tola.’

- (b) *ʔani Tolaa ʔttu-umaa ʔibb-ɸ-e*
 I Tola especially-FOC hate-3MS-PV
 ‘I hated especially Tola.’

The focus marker */ʔttuumaal/* emphasizes the direct object argument ‘Tola’ in the examples. It can be put before or after the noun it modifies. It is not suffixed to the direct object argument, since it is a free standing form.

(b) Complex Focus Marker /ʃttumatuu/

The focus marker is obtained from the focus particle /-ʃttuu/ and the focus morphemes /-uma(a)/ and /-tuu/. It can be used alternatively with /keessumatuu/ to highlight various elements of a clause. It is adjoined to the noun ‘Tola’ and /ʃannani/ ‘milk’ in the clauses below.

160. (a) *ʃani ʃttu-uma-tuu Tolaa jibb-φ-e*
I especially-FOC-FOC Tola hate-3MS-PV
‘I hated especially Tola.’

(b) *ʃani keess-uma-tuu ʃannani hin jaal-add-φ-u*
I inside-FOC-FOC milk NEG like-MD-3MS-PV
‘I do not like especially milk.’

The focus markers /ʃttumatuu/ and /keessumatuu/ ‘especially’ highlight the nouns ‘Tola’ and ‘milk’. These focus markers are composed of different simple focus markers though the meaning or function of /-ʃttuu/ and /keessattuu/ outshines. They appear with subject without neutralizing gender, person and number agreements.

(c) Complex Focus Marker /-umallee/

It is formed from the focus morpheme /-uma/ and the focus particle /ʃillee/ ‘even. It does not highlight a subject arguments since it contains the object focus morpheme /-uma/.

161. (a) *Tulluu-n daabb-uma-ʃillee hin k'ab-φ-u*
Tullu-NOM bread-FOC-FOC NEG has-3MS-IPV
‘Tullu does not have even bread.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n fard-uma-ʃillee gurgur-φ-e*
Megersa-NOM horse-FOC-FOC sell-3MS-PV
‘Megersa sold even a horse.’

The noun /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ and /*farda*/ ‘horse’ are focused by the focus marker /-*umallee*/. The clauses show the increment of the degree of focus when complex focus markers are used.

(d) Complex Focus Marker /*siruma*/

It is a verb focus marker containing the focus particle /*sirii*/ and the focus morpheme /-*uma(a)*/. When the focus particle /*sirii*/ is followed by other focus markers the degree of focus increases than when it is used alone. It can occur with other focalizing devices like /-*ǎjjuu*/ or /-*uu*/, /*ǎmmaa*/ and so forth. Example:

162. (a) *ʔani sirii-umaa Tolaa ʔarg-ø-e hin beek-ø-u*
 I never-FOC Tola see-1S-PV NEG know-1S-IPV
 ‘I never ever saw Tola.’

(b) *ʔani sirii-uma-ǎjjuu Tola ʔarg-ø-e hin beek-ø-u*
 I never-FOC-FOC Tola see-1S-PV NEG know-1S-IPV
 ‘I never ever saw Tola.’

The verb /*ʔarg-*/ ‘see’ is highlighted by the focus marker /*sirumaa*/ and /*sirii-uma-ǎjjuu*/. The above clauses vary in their level of focus. It seems example (162a) is less emphatic than example (162b) due to the variation of the number of the focus markers merged. The complex focus markers used in these examples are used only to highlight a verb due to the verbal focus particle /*sirii*/. The examples show that the focus markers can be used together to express strong focus.

As presented above, the focus morpheme /-*tu(u)*/ and /-*uma(a)*/ are especially combined with several focus particles. The first one usually appears following other particles, while the second one occurs either before or after other focus morphemes or particles. Thus, when two or more focus markers are used concurrently, they follow a fixed systematic arrangement. For example, when /-*uma(a)*/ and /-*tu*/ are merged /-*uma(a)*/ always appears before /-*tu*/. So far, it is dealt with how focus morphemes or particles are used concurrently to focus on various elements per clause. Besides complex focusing (i.e. focus morphemes or particles), when more than one simple or complex focus markers are used consequently per clause, different elements of a clause are focused at a time. Example:

163. (a) *ʃsaa-uma-tu mana barumsa-a-tu deem-ø-e*
 him-FOC-FOC house education-GEN-FOC go-3MS-PV
 ‘It was only him who went even to school.’

(b) *ʃsaa-uma-tu mana-uma barumsa-a-tu deem-ø-e*
 him-FOC-FOC house-FOC education-GEN-FOC go-3MS-PV
 ‘It was only him that went even to school.’

A clause normally contains at least a single focus marker. However, the examples show that a single sentence can have two or more focused elements. These clauses convey the same meaning when both simple and complex focus markers are employed. The subject and complement arguments are focused in both clauses. Thus, Oromo focus structure allows multiple focusing per clause. Besides multiple focusing, marking a single element by adjoining the focus markers to various words at once is allowable. Both simple and complex focusing can be used for this purpose. Example:

164. (a) *foon-uma-tuu [umtuu] diim-uma-tuu gaarii-ða*
 meat-FOC-FOC red-FOC good-COP
 ‘Even meat, it is red which is good’.

(b) *muk-uma jala-tu gaarii-ða*
 wood-FOC under-FOC good-COP
 ‘It is under a tree which is good.’

(c) *kitaab-uma kan-uma k’ab-ø-a*
 book-FOC this-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘He has only this one even a book.’

(d) *ʃnni mana barumsa-a sirii-umaa deem-ee-tuu hin beek-ø-u*
 he house education-GEN never-FOC go-CNV-FOC NEG know-3MS-IPV
 ‘He never ever went to school at all.’

A single element is focused by placing the focus markers in various positions in each clause. In example (164a) the NP /*foon diimaa*/ ‘red meat’ is focused the focus marker /-umatuu/. The phrase /*muka jala*/ ‘under tree’ is focused by the focus morphemes /-tu(u)/ and /-uma/ in example (164b). The NP /*kitaaba kana*/ ‘this book’ is focused by the focus morpheme /-uma/ in (164c). The converb /*deemee*/ ‘gone’ is focused by the focus marker /*sirumaa*/ and /-tuu/ in clause (164d). These examples show that more than one focus markers can be used to focus on a single element. Oromo also admits drawing attention to various elements per clause. Thus, the speaker is free to focus on any elements of an utterance based on the meaning he/she intends to convey.

The focus morphemes or particles described so far are syntax controlled or pragmatic controlled. However, most of them are pragmatics controlled. The syntax controlled ones are essential for the grammaticality of clauses. In pragmatics controlled focus system, the addressor is free to single out between focused and unfocused phrases, or no highlighted phrase altogether, as to the discourse situation. Thus, the addressor is free to choose the element of the clause to be focused. In syntax controlled focus system, the addressor obligatorily focuses on one of the phrasal elements to construct a finite clause. The next examples show this.

165. (a) *maal-tu danf- ϕ -e*
 what-FOC boil-3MS-PV
 ‘What was boiling?’
- (b) *bifaan-tu danf- ϕ -e*
 water-FOC boil-3MS-PV
 ‘It was water which was boiled.’
- (c) *ʔani loon ni-ʔan bit- ϕ -a*
 I cattle-I FOC-I buy-1S-IPV
 ‘I will buy cattle surely.’

The focus morpheme /-tu/ must be suffixed to the interrogative pronoun /*maal*/ and the noun /*bifaan*/. The morpheme is necessary for pragmatic reason to construct pragmatically acceptable

clauses. The focus particle /-ni/ is indispensable, since it is both syntax and pragmatics controlled focus marker in (165c). The distribution of the focus morpheme /-tu/ is controlled by pragmatics and in fact, this argument is entirely based on synchronic data.

Thus, the dialect has syntax and pragmatic-controlled focus markers. Among the various focus markers dealt with some of them are required either for syntactic purpose, pragmatic purpose or for both. Focus morphemes with both syntactic and pragmatic functions are obligatorily required for the grammaticality of clauses, while those connected only with pragmatic functions are optionally used to signal focus. The focus markers /hin/ and /ni/ are usually obligatorily required in sentences having only subject and imperfective intransitive verb, while focus morphemes like /-tu/ and /-is/ are optional when the speaker is not interested to show emphasis.

6.2.4 Lexical Focusing

Oromo marks focus lexically by emphatic or intensive pronouns. The emphatic pronouns are not included under morphological focusing since they are not morphemes. Kroeger (2005:137) describes emphatic pronouns as forms having no independent status within the clause since they stand in apposition to their antecedents and have the same function to their antecedents. Apposition refers to a relationship between two or more words or phrases in which the two elements are grammatically parallel and have the same referent. They simply highlight the identity of the phrases which functions as their antecedents and do not bear their own semantic roles and grammatical relations. Oromo emphatic pronouns do not encode new information but mark emphasis. They are only used to highlight the information previously stated. They mark emphatic focus in their endophoric or exophoric functions. Example:

166. (a) *C'aaltuu-n mataa ʃjii-tii-n ʒas hin jir-t-u*
 Chaltu-NOM head her-COP-NOM here NEG exist-3FS-IPV
 'Chaltu herself is not available here.'

(b) *ʒani mataa koo-tii-n gaaffii san beek-ø-a*
 I head my-COP-NOM question that know-1S-IPV
 'I myself know that question'

The emphatic pronoun */mataa ʃiitiin/* ‘herself’ in example (166a) and */mataa kootiin/* ‘myself’ in clause (166b) mark emphatic focus not new information focus. The noun */C’aaltuu/* and the pronoun */ʒani/* are focused by their analogous emphatic pronouns. The pronouns are put immediately after the antecedent noun or pronoun to be focused and share the same grammatical and semantic functions. The emphatic pronoun */mataa ʃiitiin/* is used endophorically, while */mataa kootiin/* is used only exophorically. In other words, the pronoun */ʒani/* and its analogous emphatic pronoun have referent outside the text while the noun ‘Chaltu’ and its emphatic pronoun refer to the antecedent in the text. Like their antecedents, Oromo first and second person emphatic pronouns have exophoric referent. On the other hand, third person emphatic pronouns are usually used exophorically only when their referents are physically present in the communicative context.

Emphatic pronouns can be used to highlight both subject and object pronominals but, they are not essential for the understanding of clauses. They can be deleted without affecting the core meaning of the clause. The reflexive pronouns formed by the word for head */mataa/* plus possessive and emphatic pronouns are closely similar in form. Kroeger (2005:137) points out that emphatic and reflexive pronouns have the same form in array of languages but their function and distribution are absolutely distinct.

6.2.5 Prosodic Focusing

The preceding sections deal with morphological and particles focusing; while this one deals with focus marking using prosodic features in Oromo. Apart from segmental features, prosodic features (e.g., pitch and lengthening of sounds) are involved in speech. Prosodic features are very vital in speech to determine the information structure of sentences or utterances. The way an utterance is spoken conveys much more than just the information that is lexically encoded in the words (von Heusinger, 1999:13). Speech comprise some of these prosodic features: intonation, stress, pitch, tone and vowel length, etc. which are superimposed over a syllable, word or the entire sentence. It is organized in segmental phonemes which combine to formulate syllables, words and clauses. Speakers pronounce these linguistic units based on their segmental features; concurrently, their pronunciation varies in other respects as well. They modify their voice by a variety of tones and other auditory means, which are called suprasegmental features.

Gussenhoven (2015:714,720) divides prosodic features into word and sentence prosody. Word prosody distinctions signal lexical and grammatical morphemes, prosodic phrasing imperfectly reflects syntactic structure, and melodic contrasts signal discourse and focus meanings. Languages often apply prosodic features for signaling focus and information status in sentences.

6.2.5.1 Focus Marking via High Pitch

Apart from syntactic and morphological focus marking, Oromo relies on prosodic feature specifically, high pitch to signal information structure particularly focus. Perhaps, At least the Tulama dialect belongs to the category of pitch-accent languages because pitch has limited distribution and function in the dialect. The pitch variation (e.g., high and low pitch) does not dynamically alternate as in the tonal languages in Oromo. Shimelis (2014) subsumes Oromo under pitch-accent languages.

The linguistic function of high pitch is to highlight new information and signal contrastive focus by shifting the pitch from one word to another in an utterance. Hence, the same prosodic feature conveys diverse meanings based on its positions of occurrence. von Heusinger (1999:95) states that “the stress pattern of utterance was defined in terms of relative prominence.” High pitch highlights information bearing words to mark new information, emphasis or contrast. Hence, both contrastive and information focus can be marked using prominent pitch accent. Phonetically, the high pitch that encodes new information and contrastive focus is the similar except its function, since focus can be either new information focus or contrastive focus. The type of focus marked by high pitch must be distinguished, because the pitch may merely give emphasis to the importance of a given element or contrasts the information of that constituent. The word with emphatic high pitch is spoken with extra forces. Unlike contrastive pitch, emphatic pitch does not contrast one entity with another. It simply gives prominence to the focused constituent. A clause is focused through emphasizing a word or phrase. Thus, in Oromo, a word or a phrase can be focused using contrastive or emphatic high pitch. Because focus structure can give prominence to a constituent of a sentence with contrastive or emphatic focus though it is not new information focus. In (167b) and (167c) the noun phrase /*foon kana*/ ‘this meat’ is focused by high pitch. The pitch helps the speaker to categorize the clauses into two elements: a prominent part (i.e., focus) and the non prominent part. The choice to highlight some

words rather than others depends on the speech context and the particular meaning the addressor wishes to impart. The focused elements of the clause are spoken with high pitch. To mark the high pitch the focused constituents are written in bold in the next examples.

167. (a) *ǎnni foon kana jaat- ϕ -e*
 he meat this eat-3MS-PV
 ‘He ate this meat.’

(b) *ǎnni **foon** kana jaat- ϕ -e*
 he meat this eat-3MS-PV
 ‘It was this meat that he ate.’

(c) *ǎnni foon **kanaa** jaat- ϕ -e*
 he meat this eat-3MS-PV
 ‘He ate even this meat.’

The clauses basically convey similar message. All the words in (167a) are focus-neutral. Hence this clause is a focus neutral statement giving a neutral description of the situation, with no specific meaning effects related to focus, but in (167b) the phrase */foon kana/* ‘this meat’ is focused by high pitch, while in clause (167c) the NP */foon kanaa/* is focused using the terminal vowel length plus high pitch because focus is intonationally prominent whilst background is not. In clause (167b) the phrase is marked by high pitch to show contrastive focus. It is uncommon to hear clause (167b) any other way than denoting contrast due to the high pitch. Example (167a) and (167b) are identical clauses having different pitch word. The word */foon kanaa/* is focused by emphatic high pitch plus word final vowel length to denote non contrastive focus in (167c). Thus, Oromo marks various types of focus using high pitch, though it does not only rely on prosody for marking focus structure, since it has a rich system of focus morphemes and particles.

Besides some subject focus markers (e.g., */-tu/*, */k’ofa/*), high pitch cannot be superimposed on nouns with the nominative case marker. In example (168a) the nominative case marker */-n/* is omitted due to the contrastive high pitch on the noun ‘Tullu’. Number, person and gender

distinctions are neutralized when the subject of a clause is focused prosodically by high pitch.
Example:

168. (a) **Tulluu** *leenc'a* *ʒajjeess-φ-e*
Tullu lion kill-3MS-PV
'It was Tullu who killed a lion.'

(b) *Tulluu-n* **leenc'a** *ʒajjeess-φ-e*
Tullu-NOM lion kill-3MS-PV
'It was a lion that Tullu killed.'

The focused words are in bold in these examples. Focus is usually encoded prosodically by superimposing high pitch on the focal element of the clause. For example, the subject noun /*Tulluu*/ in clause (168a) and the direct object noun /*leenc'a*/ in clause (168b) are obviously focused by high pitch. The noun /*Tulluu*/ receives high pitch at the expense of the omission of nominative case marker /-n/. The position of the high pitch plays a vital role in producing various readings of the same clause. The clauses are pragmatically marked due to the presence of the focused elements. The high pitch bears meaning variation due to its contrastive or emphatic functions. Communicative context determines which element of an utterance has to be focused. This implies that the elements of an utterance are not focused arbitrarily.

6.2.5.1.1 Focus Marking via Contrastive High Pitch

Oromo marks focus using contrastive high pitch. Clause (169a) can have array of levels of meaning when uttered relying on the pitch word according to the contrastive choices. Examples (169b) to (169e) indicate that contrastive pitch shows the relative prominence of one word within each utterance. These clauses differ in meaning based on the word that receives the high pitch. In all cases, the high pitch has to superimpose on the final syllable of the word. The pitch splits the clauses into focus and background in various ways. Example:

169. (a) *C'aalaa-n kaleessa foon deedii naat- ϕ -e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday meat raw eat-3MS-PV
 'Chala ate raw meat yesterday.'
- (b) *C'aalaa kaleessa foon deedii naat- ϕ -e*
 Chala yesterday meat raw eat-3MS-PV
 'It was Chala that ate raw meat yesterday.'
- (c) *C'aalaa-n **kaleessa** foon deedii naat- ϕ -e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday meat raw eat-3MS-PV
 'It was yesterday that Chala ate raw meat.'
- (d) *C'aalaa-n kaleessa **foon deedii** naat- ϕ -e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday meat raw eat-3MS-PV
 'It was raw meat that Chala ate yesterday.'
- (e) *C'aalaa-n kaleessa foon deedii **naat- ϕ -e***
 Chala-NOM yesterday meat raw eat-3MS-PV
 'Chala surely ate raw meat yesterday.' (i.e., he did not refuse to eat it.)

Clause (169a) is focus neutral or plain due to lack of marked focus. The focused clauses have different focal elements and presuppose various content questions based on context. In example (169b) to (169e) the elements in bold present focused words. Though, these clauses have the same strings of words, the word that receives contrastive high pitch is distinct in each case because of the shifting of the high pitch from one element of the clause to another. Oromo admits high pitch shifting from one element of a clause to another when something is more important. The pitch highlights the part of the utterance which is more vital for the addressor or the part that the addressor wishes the addressee to focus on. The pitch superimposed on various words (has no fixed distribution) based on what is intended to be said. Thus, different elements of a clause are focused using high pitch. Ansha (2014:162) denotes that elements that are highlighted carry the most prominent information in the utterance. The clauses in (169a) to (169e) basically convey

the same semantic meaning. There is a person called ‘Chala’ and he ate raw meat yesterday’. The information structure of the above structures is different. Except (169a), the remaining clauses have a focused element. The focused clauses use high pitch to mark contrastive focus (i.e., narrow focus). In clauses (169b) to (169e), ‘Chala’, ‘yesterday’, ‘raw meat’ and the verb ‘ate’ are focused by contrastive high pitch in their respective orders. The pitch shift always marks the clause to fit into some special context. Payne (1997:270) states that usually, languages will use extra pitch and some kind of cleft structure to mark contrastive focus.

The subject, complement, direct object and the verb are focused via contrastive high pitch in the above examples. Besides these elements, a postpositional phrase, an adverb and adjective can be focused by contrastive high pitch. Example:

170. (a) *muc’aa-n muka jala jir-φ-a*
 boy-NOM wood under exist-3MS-IPV
 ‘The boy is found under the tree.’

(b) *ānni āamma mana barumsa-a deem-φ-e*
 boy now house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 ‘He goes to school now.’

(c) *ānni hoolaa gudd-aa bit-φ-e*
 boy sheep big-M buy-3MS-PV
 ‘He bought a big sheep.’

The contrastive high pitch is superimposed on the postposition /*jala*/ ‘under’, the adverb /*āamma*/ ‘now’ and the adjective /*guddaa*/ ‘big’ in clause (170a), (170b) and (170c), respectively. The focused words are implicitly contrasted with their opposites. The contrasted elements would make sense in the situational context of the discourse. The focus extends over the entire phrase in (170a) and (170c).

6.2.5.3 Focus Marking via Emphatic High Pitch

In addition to contrastive focus, high pitch marks emphatic focus in Oromo. Krifka (2006:23) refers to emphatic focus as a scalar focus. Unlike contrastive high pitch, emphatic high pitch does not contrast one entity with another rather, it marks emphasis. Perhaps, the commonest way of adjusting the pragmatic status of a certain piece of information is intonation. For example, we draw special attention to parts of the utterances by pronouncing those parts more loudly and/or at a higher pitch (Payne, 1997:271). Emphatic high pitch can be used with long vowel or alone to highlight an element of an utterance as shown below. Word classes with various grammatical relations can be focused using emphatic high pitch. The high pitch gives extra force to a word expressing an extreme quality or feeling but not to express new information. Example:

171. (a) *ʔnni mana gudd-aa k'ab-ø-a*
he house big-M has-3MS-IPV
'He has a big house.'

(b) *C'aalaa-n hamaa-dā*
Chala-NOM cruel-COP
'Chala is very cruel/bad.'

The adjective /*guddaa*/ 'big' and /*hamaa*/ 'cruel' are focused using emphatic high pitch to impart the information with special emphasize. The size of the 'house' and the cruelty of 'Chala' is exaggerated. Besides emphasis, high pitch encodes new information as in clause (172b).

172. (a) *ʔnni maal naat-ø-e*
he what eat-3MS-PV
'What did he eat?'

(b) *ʔnni daabboo naat-ø-e*
he bread eat-3M-PV
'It was bread that he ate bread.'

The question word /*maal*/ ‘what’ is spoken with high pitch. Similarly, the noun /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ is focused with extra high pitch in the response clause. This noun present focus while the rest of the clause conveys background information. Thus, Oromo employs high pitch as one means of focusing on important words in a sentence. The word that receives high pitch is determined based on the meaning of the sentence and the communication context. It marks words with a higher pitch to contrast/clarify information, to give/highlight new information, to show emphasize and so forth. Focus can be marked by doubling word final vowel plus using emphatic high pitch as presented in the next section.

6.2.5.4 High Pitch and Word Final Vowel Length

Vowel length is contrastive or brings meaning change. A word final short vowel is usually doubled and accompanied by emphatic high pitch to mark focus. Apparently, word final /a/ is usually elongated and requires pitch to encode focus. However, sometimes word final short vowel /u/ and /o/ are also lengthened to mark focus. Contrastive focus can be marked phonologically only using high pitch, but emphatic focus is usually encoded using emphatic high pitch plus vowel length. When a word final vowel becomes long due to morphologically lengthening and accompanied with high pitch, it usually highlights the element of a clause and roughly translated into the focus marker ‘even’. Example:

173. (a) *ñnni damma jaat- ϕ -e*
 he honey eat-3MS-PV
 ‘He ate honey.’

(b) *ñnni **dammaa** jaat- ϕ -e*
 he honey eat-3MS-PV
 ‘He ate even honey.’

174. (a) *Tolaa-n boru deem- ϕ -a*
 Tola-NOM tomorrow go-3MS-IPV
 ‘Tola will go tomorrow.’

- (b) *Tolaa-n boruu deem-φ-a*
 Tola-NOM tomorrow go-3MS-IPV
 ‘Tola will go just tomorrow.’ (i.e., He stays no more).

175. (a) *ānni hoolaa tokko k’ab-φ-a*
 he sheep one has-3MS-PV
 ‘He has one sheep.’

- (b) *ānni hoolaa tokkoo k’ab-φ-a*
 he sheep one has-3MS-PV
 ‘He has even a sheep.’

176. (a) *Tolaa-n daabboo jaat-φ-e*
 Tola-NOM bread eat-3MS-PV
 ‘Tola ate bread.’

- (b) *Tolaa-n daabboo-dāa jaat-φ-e*
 Tola-NOM bread-FOC eat-3MS-PV
 ‘It was bread that Tola ate.’

Clause (173a), (174a) and (175a) are focus neutral while those in (173b), (174b) and (175b) are focus marked. In these clauses, the nouns ‘honey’, ‘tomorrow’ and ‘sheep’ are focused using vowel length plus emphatic high pitch in their respective order. The word final vowels /a/, /u/ and /o/ are doubled due to morphological lengthening in (173b), (174b) and (175b), respectively. The emphatic high pitch and word final vowel length express emphatic focus in the examples. Emphatic high pitch plus word final long vowel /aa/ and /uu/ are used in (173b) and (174b) to highlight the nouns /*damma*/ ‘honey’ and /*boru*/ ‘tomorrow’. Clause (173b) is interpreted at least in two ways based on the situational context in which it is used. It could mean that ‘he ate even honey’. This may show that the person ate ‘honey’ besides other types of food or he did not want to eat another food, since he ate honey before’. In example (176b), the focus is encoded by the focus marker /-*dā(a)*/ not by high pitch, since the focal element /*daabboo*/ normally ends

with long vowel). This example can be interpreted in two ways as clause (173b) because it could mean “Tola ate bread not some other sort of food (e.g., not meat)” or “he ate the food with high value honey not the food with low value.” In example (173b) and (176b) the noun ‘honey’ and ‘bread’ could be taken as foods with ‘high’ or ‘low’ value based on the situational context. These clauses show that Oromo can use high pitch to highlight new information or emphatic focus. Thus, information structure is reflected in the prosody of speech in Oromo. Clause (173b), (174b), (175b) and (176b) are pragmatically marked because they contain prosodically highlighted elements. As the examples illustrate words ending in short vowel /a/, /u/ and /o/ usually do not take the focus copular element /-da(a)/ and instead they double their terminal vowel and spoken with high pitch to convey the functional meaning that presented by the copula focus marker /-da(a)/. Meyer and Dabala (2003:171) state that nouns terminating in short /a/ normally do not take the focus marker /-da/. Unlike words ending in short vowel /a/, /u/ and /o/ words ending in short vowel /i/ are usually highlighted by the focus marker /-ɿjjuu/ or /-uu/ in place of doubling the vowel. For instance, the word /sadi/ ‘three’ is focused by the focus particle /-ɿjjuu/ or /-uu/ due to the terminal vowel /i/ in clause (177b).

177. (a) *ɿnni hoolaa sad-ɿjjuu k’ab-ø-a*
 he sheep three-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘He has even three sheep.’

(b) *ɿnni hoolaa sad-uu k’ab-ø-a*
 he sheep three-FOC has-3MS-IPV
 ‘He has even three sheep.’

These clauses show that Oromo allows adjusting the pragmatic status of parts of a clause by using different degrees of loudness and levels of pitch.

The core points of this chapter are briefly presented as follows. Focus marking divides an utterance at least into two parts: focus and background. Oromo marks focus linguistically using syntax, morphology and prosody. It marks focus syntactically using scrambled and cleft constructions. Cleft constructions alter mono-clausal structures into bi-clausal (i.e., independent

and dependent clauses) structure to encode IS. In cleft constructions, new information appears before a copular element if there is a copular element. They highlight various constituents of a clause. In simple cleft constructions, new information or focus appears before the background information while the reversed is realized in pseudo cleft constructions. Thus, simple cleft structures do not follow the principle of end focus while pseudo cleft structures are adherent to the principle of end focus. Various arguments of a verb and the verb itself can be focused using cleft constructions.

Besides syntax, Oromo marks focus morphologically using focus morphemes. Morphological focusing refers to affixing a focus morpheme(s) to the element to be focused. Focus morphemes such as */-tu/*, */-uma/* and */-uu/* highlight nouns and converbs. They mark focus by appearing before the noun and after the converb that they highlight. Noun focus morphemes shift from the head nouns to the modifiers.

Focus marking particles are also used in Oromo. The position of the particle determines which element of a clause is in the scope of focus. The particles highlight nouns and verbs to convey various focus meaning. Nominal focus particles include */k'ofa/*, */ʔillee/*, *bee/bar*, */kaa/*, */ʔittuu/* and */-da/*. Verbal focus particles subsume */hin/*, */ni/* and */sirii/*. Noun focus particles appear after the constituent that they highlight and are not confined only to nouns. Unlike noun focus particles, verb focus particles are limited only to verbs and they usually occur only before a verb. Like focus morphemes, focus particles appear after a modifier or quantifier in non bare NPs.

Besides the abovementioned linguistic means, Oromo marks focus prosodically by high pitch and the pitch divides the clause into focus and background to mark contrastive, emphatic or new information focus. Various elements of a clause are focused prosodically without leaving their canonical slot based on the communicative context. The constituents that receive the pitch are determined based on the meaning of the sentence and the communicative context.

Chapter Seven

Copula Clause Information Structure

Chapter seven dwells on the information structure of Oromo copula clauses. It describes the pragmatic functions of basic and non basic copula clauses in relation to information structure.

7.1 Copular Elements

Copular elements or verbs are functional forms. Bussmann (1996:257) denotes that copulas are a subset of verbs that possess grammatical function (i.e., lack semantic meaning) and help to connect copula subject and the copula complement/predicate. Dixon (2002:1) states that both transitive and intransitive verbs possess referential meaning, while copula verbs have relational meaning. Kroeger (2005:173) applies the terms copula and linking verbs alternatively. The term copula is used only for the verb *be*, while ‘copula verb’ also consists verbs (e.g., *be*, *become*, *seem*, *get*) that are similar in function with *be*. Oromo copulas lack semantic meaning and are always appear at the end of a canonical copula clause. Sasse (2007:28) says that copulas are not inevitably verbal in many languages. They can be particles or clitics. Curnow (1999:3-4) identifies using verbal copula, particle copula, inflectional copula and zero/null copula as means of copula clause construction. A zero copula refers to the absence of an explicit copular element. Oromo has positive and negative copular elements.

Copulas can be verbal or non verbal. Non verbal copulas include particles, pronouns and zero copula. Tahir (2009:2) refers to a zero copula as “the linguistic phenomenon in which the presence of the copula is implied rather than expressed explicitly.” Oromo has non-verbal particle copulas. Zero copula and particle copulas are realized in the language. The language can form copula clauses via juxtapositioning of the subject and predicate with no any copular element. Dryer (2007:225) says that copula elements are totally lacking in some languages and the languages express nonverbal predicates directly.

Oromo copular forms do not connect the subject and complement of the basic copula clause since they flank between the two constituents or come at the end of the clauses. Most Oromo copular elements are subsumed under non verbal copula in relation to their parts of speech. Oromo copulars are morphemes or particles not verbals. Both positive and negative copular

elements are used to construct focus marked copula clauses with pragmatically marked word order. In contrast, copula clauses with pragmatically neutral word order usually show unmarked focus (presentational focus). Oromo positive copulars are /-*dā*/, /-*i*/, /-*ti*/ and zero copula. Pragmatically marked copula clauses mark contrastive focus. Example:

178. (a) *ñjiin barat-tuu-dā*
 she student-F-COP
 ‘She is a student.’

(b) *ñji-dā barat-tuu-n*
 her-COP student-F-NOM
 ‘The one who is a student is her/ It is her who is a student.’

Clause (178a) contains unmarked focus, since it is a topic-comment sentence that follows the basic word order of Oromo, while the one in (178b) has marked focus and the focus is marked by changing the basic word order of the copula clause. The unmarked order of Oromo copula clause is subject plus predicate with or without copular. The copula element /-*dā*/ is suffixed to the object pronoun /*ñji*/ ‘her’. In order to encode focus by copula clauses with pragmatically marked word order pronoun takes its absolutive case form. Example (178a) is a pragmatically unmarked canonical copula clause since it is adherent basic word, but clause (178b) is a pragmatically marked non-canonical copula clause since it deviates from the basic word order the language. The unmarked order of Oromo copula clause is subject plus predicate with or without copula. This can be justified by the fact that the pronoun to which a copula element is added is in its absolutive case in focus marked clauses.

Apart from copula /-*dā*/, the affirmative copula particle /-*i*/ is used to construct copula clauses. It is suffixed to nouns or pronouns ending in consonant (e.g., /*bifaan*/ ‘water’). Example:

179. (a) *kuni foon-i*
 this.NOM meat-COP
 ‘This (one) is meat.’

- (b) *foon kana*
 meat this.ABS
 ‘Meat is this one.’

The copular element /-i/ is used to form basic copula clauses as in example (179a), while a zero copula is used in the non basic copula clause in (179b). This clause signals contrastive focus. Dryer (2007:225) shows that “some languages lack copulas entirely, expressing nonverbal predicates directly.” Clause (179a) is usually uttered to identify /*foon*/ ‘meat’ from other variety of food. In other context, this clause can also be used to help someone to distinguish meat from other food(s) if two or more sealed food(s) varieties are found around. In general, clauses using demonstrative pronoun as a subject commonly introduce unfamiliar entities to the addressee or discourse. The pronouns are used to draw addressee’s attention by picking out an object or entity from the real world and identifying it by referencing or pointing.

Besides the aforesaid copular elements, the copula particle /-ti/ helps to construct possessive copula clauses. Example:

180. (a) *kuni mana saree-ti*
 this.NOM house dog-COP
 ‘This one is a dog’s house.’

- (b) *kuni ũlkaan farda-a-ti*
 this.NOM tooth horse-GEN-COP
 ‘This is a horse tooth.’

The copula clause in (180a) denotes alienable while the copula in(180b) shows non-alienable possession. The copular particle is not confined only to clauses showing possessor-possession relationship and helps to construct clauses indicating a thing’s source and function. Example:

181. (a) *kuni bifaan laga-a-ti*
this.NOM water river-GEN-COP
'This is river water.'

(b) *ǎnni hubboo bifaan-ii-ti*
he jar water-GEN-COP
'This is a jar of water.'

These clauses do not show possessor-possession relationship though they are constructed using the copula particle */-ti/*. Clause (181a) denotes the source of the 'water' while clause (181b) shows the function of the 'jar' rather than showing possessor-possession relationship.

Apart from the affirmative copula elements used in the above examples, Oromo has a negative copula particle */miti/* and its variants */moti/* and */mii/*. The copular particle */mii/* is used only to construct interrogative clauses. The copular particle */miti/* and its variants are the only independent copular elements. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:91) shows that the negative copula is merely */miti/*. Except */miti/* and its variants, all Oromo copular elements are not free standing forms and do not belong to the word class of verb. There is no negative copula clause with a zero morpheme in Oromo. Like the positive copular elements, the negative copular element */miti/* are used in negative copula clauses without any number, person and gender distinctions (i.e., invariant for all genders, persons and numbers). Example:

182. (a) *ǎjiin barat-tuu miti*
she student-F not-be
She is not a student.

(b) *ǎjii-daa miti barat-tuu-n*
her-COP not-be student-F-NOM
'The one who is a student is not a her.'

Clause (182a) follows basic word order and has no focused element and the new information is put at the end of the clause while clause (182b) is marked for contrastive focus due to the word order change. The object pronoun /ʔjii/ ‘her’ conveys new information in this clause. Besides the positive copular element /-dāa/, the negative copular particle /miti/ ‘not be’ is used in clause (182b) because Oromo allows clauses with double copulas (i.e., positive and negative copula). Negative copular particle can be used alone to construct negative copula clauses. The negative counterpart of all the affirmative copular elements including zero copula is /miti/.

As shown above, the distribution of the copular elements is phonologically conditioned. The copular element /-dāa/ is suffixed to a word or predicate ending with long vowel and a word having long vowel in the penultimate syllable, while the copular particle /-i/ is used after a word ending in consonant. Copula /-ti/ is used after possessive pronouns or possessor nouns ending with long vowel.

Oromo affirmative and negative copula elements do not show number and gender distinctions. The monosyllabic copular element /-i/, /-dāa/, /-ti/ and zero copula construct present tense affirmative copula clauses. It has verbless affirmative copula clauses with present tense but lacks verbless negative copula clauses with present tense, since the presence of the negative copula /miti/ is compulsory. Thus, it does not construct negative copula clauses by juxtaposition. The copula particle /miti/ takes the position of all affirmative copular elements. The positive and negative copular elements help to construct pragmatically marked and unmarked copula clauses.

7.2 Copula Clauses

Clauses can be grouped into declarative, interrogative, command and exclamatory based on their discourse functions. Dixon (2002:1) shows that transitive and intransitive are basic clause types realized in human languages. Numerous languages have also copula clauses. Portner *et al.* (2011:1805) state that copula clauses are a non major clause in which the contentful or lexical predicate is not a verb, but some other categories like noun phrase (NP), adjective phrase (AP) or prepositional phrase (PP). There are various types of copula clauses conveying intuitively distinct types of information. Oromo has copula clauses exhibiting interesting features that are

constructed with or without any copular element (i.e., a zero copula). The next section deals with the information structure of Oromo copula clauses.

7.3 Copula Clause Types and Information Structure

There are various types of copula clauses. Higgins (1979:204-293) introduces predicational, specificational, identificational and equative copula clauses based on their meaning and properties. Scholars like (e.g., Hatim, 1997:204) also add possessive and locative copula clauses to the group.

7.3.1 Predicational Copula Clause Information Structure

Predicational copula clause shows the property of the subject referent or the topic entity. Portner *et al.* (2011:1806-1809) say that the clause states the attribute of the copula subject (or subject referent). They also show that the subject of a predicational copula clause is typically a referential NP though quantificational expressions are also permissible. The copula complement can be an AP, PP, DP or NP. Oromo predicational copula clauses can be constructed with or without any copular element. The language has affirmative predicational copula clauses but lacks negative predicational copula clauses with a zero copula.

Example (183a) is a basic predicational copula clause, while the one in (183b) is a non basic predicational copula clause. In example (183b) the object pronoun /ʔani/ ‘me’ is focused. Oromo first person singular object pronoun has emphatic and non emphatic variants (i.e., double object pronoun /na/ and /ʔana/ ‘me’). The particle /na/ is a plain form, while /ʔana/ is an inherently emphatic pronoun and the two forms cannot be used alternatively without meaning change. The following are examples of predicational copula clauses.

183. (a) ʔani hamaa miti
I cruel.M not-be
‘I am not cruel.’

- (b) *ʔana miti hamaa-n*
 me not-be Cruel.M-NOM
 ‘The one who is cruel is not me.’

The basic word order of pragmatically unmarked Oromo predicational copula clause is (NP₁+AP/NP) plus with or without copular element, where NP₁ is the subject nominal and the remaining part of the clause is a predicate. In general, the basic word order of all types of Oromo copula clauses is copula subject plus copula complement (or predicative expression) plus with or without any copular element. The language also admits inverse or non basic copula clauses. In inverse clause, an absolutive case marked copula complement is followed by a copular element or a zero copula. In copula clauses with a zero copula, a copula complement comes at the beginning of the clause and then followed by copula subject. Thus, Oromo has both pragmatically marked and unmarked predicational copula clauses. Example:

184. (a) *diig-ni diimaa-da*
 blood-NOM red-COP
 ‘Blood is red.’

- (b) *diimaa-da diig-ni*
 red-COP blood-NOM
 ‘Blood is red.’

The predicational copula clauses in (184a) and (184b) attribute the property of redness to the referent of the subject NP */diiga/* ‘blood’. In these examples, the noun */diiga/* ‘blood’ is introduced into the discourse or conversation as a new material and a predication is made of its attribute and supplied by the adjective */diimaa/* ‘red’ and the copular element */da/* ‘be’. The clauses in (184a) and (184b) are typically a pragmatically unmarked and marked predicational copula clauses. The predicational copula clauses encode non contrastive focus, due to the absence of explicit or implicit alternatives in the common ground. von Heusinger (1999:96) shows that presentational focus introduces a new participant or referent that cannot be recovered from the context (i.e., that is the case of out of the blue assertions) into the the communicative

context. It is linked with individuals who are introduced into discourse and of which are made predications of their attributes or properties. This is illustrated by clauses like milk is white (Baye,1988:367). Presentational articulation is a more widely described subtype of thetic articulation denoting the existence or appearance on the scene of a hitherto unfamiliar entity (Andrews, 2007:151).

Clause (184b) is a pragmatically marked predicational copula clause with marked presentational focus. The adjective /*diima*/ ‘red’ is focused via basic word order change in example (184b) since focus can be encoded via changing the normal word order of predicational copula clauses. In short, both pragmatically marked and unmarked copula clauses are allowable in the language. The predicational copula clause in (184a) is a topic-comment sentence that does not confer to marked focus, since it has unmarked focus while clause (184b) has marked focus. The information structure of clause (184b) follows focus-background pattern and this clause does not follow the principle of end focus. Unless the copula clause is verbless (i.e., lacks copular element) the copular element immediately follows the focused or the focus word. Presumably, it is possible to conclude that pragmatically unmarked predicational copula clauses are topic-comment sentences and are linked with unmarked presentational focus in Oromo while the pragmatically marked ones are interrelated with marked presentational focus.

In the above example, the predicate of the predicational copula clause is the adjective /*diimaa*/ ‘red’. Besides adjectives, Oromo predicational copula clause can take a noun as a predicate as in clause (185a).

185. (a) *Tolaa-n hattuu-da*
Tola-NOM thief-COP
‘Tola is a thief.’

(b) *Tolaa-da hattuu-n*
Tola-COP thief-NOM
‘It is Tola who is a thief.’

The predicates of the copula clauses in (185a) and (185b) are the nouns /*hattuu*/ ‘thief’ and ‘Tola’, respectively. Clause (185a) is a topic-comment sentence that does not confer to marked focus, since it follows basic word order and contains unmarked focus. The information structure of clause (185a) follows old-new information pattern. However, the IS of clause (185b) follows focus-background information pattern and this clause is not adherent to the principle of end focus. In this clause, the noun ‘Tola’ is marked for completive or contrastive focus based on the communicative context. The focus is encoded syntactically via basic word order change. Clause (185b) is formed by deviating from the basic word order. Clause (185a) is a predicational copula clause while clause (185b) is a specificational copula clause.

7.3.2 Specificational Copula Clause Information Structure

The second type of copula clauses is specificational. Portner *et al.* (2011:1810) notes that these clauses are applied to specify who (or what) someone (or something) is, rather than describing something about that person or entity. The clauses may express a subset relationship or class membership. The predicate of this clause type can be a noun. Oromo specificational copula clauses ascribe property to the subject entity. For example, the communicative function of the predicational copula clause in (186a) is ascribing the property of being a studentship to “Tola”. The clause gives information about Tola (i.e., ascribes a feature to Tola). But, the specificational copula clause in (186b) is used to specify the person involved in the action of thiefting.

186. (a) *Tolaa-n hattuu-da*
 Tola-NOM thief-COP
 ‘Tola is a thief.’

(b) *hattuu-n Tolaa-da*
 thief-NOM Tola-COP
 ‘The one who is a thief is Tola.’

The specificational copula clause in (186b) is obtained from the predicational copula clause in (186a) by changing the basic word order. The example denotes that it is possible to speculate that reversing the basic word order of predicational copula clauses results in specificational copula

clauses since Oromo specificational and predicational copula clauses can be the order variants of each other. The IS of clause (186a) follows background-focus articulation, while the reverse is realized in clause (186b). The word /*hattuu*/ ‘thief’ and ‘Tola’ present new information in example (186a) and (186b), respectively. The clauses contain unmarked completive focus. Oromo has specificational copulas with basic and non basic word order. For instance:

187. (a) *barat-aa-n* *Magarsaa-dā*
 student-M-NOM Megersa-COP
 ‘The one who is a student is Megersa.’

(b) *Magarsaa-dā* *barat-aa-n*
 Megersa-COP student-M-NOM
 ‘It is Megersa who is a student.’

The basic specificational copula clause in (187b) is changed into the non canonical copula clause in (187a) via basic word order change. In example (187a) old information precedes the new one, whereas in clause (187b) the reverse is the case. These clauses basically impart the same basic meaning and their vocabulary also remains the same though their information is structured differently. The purpose of the clauses is specifying the student as ‘Megersa’. When two equivalent structures vary only in their ordering of information units, as in examples (187a) and (187b), the vocabulary and basic meaning of the clause remain the same. However, the sentential topic or old information comes at the beginning in clause (187a) and (187b), respectively. The clauses in (187a) and (187b) have the same topic, which is the noun ‘student’. The examples show that clauses with different word orders can have the same topic. Sentence topic is not necessarily put at sentence initial position in Oromo. Apparently, basic predicational copula clauses are linked with presentational focus, while specificational copula clauses are linked with informative/contrastive focus based on the communicative context.

7.3.3 Identificational Copula Clause Information Structure

It is characterized by using a demonstrative pronoun or phrase as a subject (Portner *et al.*, 2011:1812). Nominative case marked demonstrative pronouns are usually used as the subjects of

the copula clauses in Oromo. The pronoun introduce the copula predicate into the discourse for the first time by contrasting it with someone or something covertly or overtly mentioned. The clauses usually encode contrastive. They also help to present completive focus based on the communicative context in which they are employed. The predicate of identificational copula clause is a noun phrase. Example:

188. (a) *kuni* *k'amadii-dā*
 this.NOM wheat-COP
 ‘This one is wheat.’

(b) *k'amadii-dā* *kuni*
 wheat-COP this
 ‘This one is wheat.’

The speaker is showing ‘wheat’ by identifying it from other type of crops in the clauses in (188a) and (188b) because it is entered into the discourse for the first time. The subjects of the identificational copula clauses is the demonstrative pronoun /*kuni*/ ‘this’. The pronoun is the topic in both clauses and its referent entity is extracted from the communicative context. In the clause in (188a) the predicate coincides with the comment. Identificational copula clauses with basic and non basic word order convey the same information but they differ in relation to their IS. In the above basic copula clause, background information precedes focus, while the reverse is true for the non basic clause in (188b). The noun ‘wheat’ carries focus in both clauses.

The above examples denote that word order disparity does not bring any meaning variation in identificational copula clause, but it results in IS disparity, because in the canonical identificational copula clauses, the old information precedes the new information, while the reverse is realized in the identificational copula clauses with non basic word order. Identificational copula clauses normally help to introduce the name of things or people. Higgins (1979:237) also says that identificational copula clauses are usually used for teaching the names of people or things. The above identificational copula clauses have copular element. However, there are also identificational copula clauses with no copular element; Example:

189. (a) *kuni damma*
this.NOM honey
'This is honey.'

(b) *damma kuni*
honey this
'This is honey.'

The clauses in (189a) and (189b) are basic and non basic identificational copula clauses. They have only copula subject and copula predicate. The nominative case marked demonstrative pronoun /*kuni*/ 'this' is a copula subject while the noun /*damma*/ 'honey' is a copula complement in both clauses. The identificational copula clause in (189a) contains presentational focus and the information is structured in background-focus pattern, since it is a topic-comment sentence. However, the non basic identificational copula clause in (189b) is marked for identificational or contrastive focus.

In the copula clause with presentational focus in (189a) the addressor is introducing 'honey' into the discourse, while in the copula clause with identificational focus in (189b) the addressor is trying to identify 'honey' from other substances. The demonstrative pronoun is marked for identificational focus in clause (189a) and (189b) using word order change and high pitch, respectively. The demonstrative pronoun encodes identificational focus in the copula clause with pragmatically marked word order. The examples denote that the referent of the demonstrative pronoun is recovered from the situational context, since the referent entity or person must be physically involved in the communicative context. The pronoun can be concomitant with index finger pointing to encode focus emphatically.

7.3.4 Equational Copula Clause Information Structure

Equational/equative copula equates the referent of the two constituents or the copula subject and the copula complement (Portner *et al.* 2011:1807). The referent of the copula subject and copula complement is identical thus the clause asserts that two referring expressions have the same

referent in equational copula clauses. The nouns ‘Megersa’ and ‘Bulcha’ have the same referent in the examples below.

190. (a) *Magarsaa-n Bulcaa-dā*
Megersa-NOM Bulcha-COP
‘Megersa is Bulcha.’

(b) *Bulcaa-dā Magarsaa-n*
Bulcha-COP Megersa-NOM
‘The one who is Megersa is Bulcha.’

Clause (190a) follows the basic word order of equative copula clause, while the one in (190b) deviates from the basic word order. In clause (190a) background information precedes the focus, but the reverse holds for clause (190b), since it is a non basic copula clause. Thus, equative copula clauses with canonical and non-canonical word order vary in their information structures. The two clauses principally impart the same information but it is packaged differently. The examples show that equative copula clauses have elements marked for assertive or contrastive focus based on the situational context in which they are used. In both clauses, the name ‘Bulcha’ is focused and it is new information for the addressee. The two NPs are equated and have the same referent. The clauses involve two names with the same referent because the CS and CC or the two NPs are equated and have the same person as a referent. Only the addressor knows the referent individual under the name ‘Bulcha’ but for the addressee ‘Bulcha’ is focus/new information. The examples can be perceived as the person that the addressee calls ‘Megersa’ has also the name called ‘Bulcha’ as an alternative name.

The equative copula clauses provided below are very similar with identification copula clauses, since the copula subjects and the copula compliments stand for the same entity. Equative copula clauses are also used to introduce or teach the name of an individual. Example:

191. (a) *ñjiin Magartuu-dā*
she Megertu-COP
‘She is Megertu.’

- (b) *Magartuu-dā ājiin*
 Megertu-COP she
 ‘The one who is Megertu is her.’

These clauses are informative and natural in a context where the addressee does not know ‘Megertu’ or is unable to recognize her. Clause (191a) is used when the addressor wishes to introduce ‘Megertu’ to the addressee(s) or discourse. In contrast, clause (191b) may help to teach the name of the person when the addressee is unable to identify ‘Megertu’ from other individuals. The addressor can emphatically show ‘Megertu’ to an addressee(s) by pointing at her using index finger when she is physically present in the situational context. The two clauses are used in different communicative contexts. A feature of array of equative copula clauses is that the order of the two referring expressions can be usually reversed without basic meaning change. The topic-comment copula clause in (191a) conveys unmarked focus while the non basic copula clause in (191b) conveys marked focus and the focus is marked via word order change. Basic clause (191a) follows the principle of end focus while the reverse is realized in (191b).

In the clauses below, the copula subjects and complements are similar in their phonetic forms. They also refer to the same thing. Example:

192. (a) *dugaa-n dugaa-dā*
 truth-NOM truth-COP
 ‘Truth is truth.’

- (b) *dugaa-dā dugaa-n*
 truth-COP truth-NOM
 ‘Truth is truth.’

In the equative copula clauses in (192a) and (192b) the CS and the CC have the same referent and the two nouns are equated and phonologically very alike, except the disparity realized due to the nominative case marker /-n/ and the copular element /-dā/. The clauses have two referring

NPs because in equative copula clauses the predicate is a noun phrase. The basic word order of Oromo equative copula clause is CS plus CC (perhaps mainly NP₁ plus NP₂) with or with no copula. The above equative copula clauses encode assertive focus. Clause (192a) is a basic copula clause while the copula clause in (192b) is a non basic copula clause with marked focus. The focus is marked via word order change in clause (192b). Only affirmative equational copula clauses are given in the above example because the CS and CC do not normally have the same referent in equational copula clauses:

193. *Magarsaa-n Bulcaa miti*
 Megersa-NOM Bulcha not-be
 ‘Megersa is not Bulcha.’

The noun ‘Megersa’ and ‘Bulcha’ have different referents in this clause. It is impossible to consider example (193) as equative copula clause since the CS and CC vary in relation to their referents. The two nouns can not be equated due to the presence of the negative copula */miti/*. Thereby, Oromo positive equative copula clauses lack negative counterparts. The example shows that when an equational copula clause is negated the CS and CC refer to two distinct entities and the clause is no more equative copula clause. The information structure of clause (193) follows background-focus pattern, since it is a topic-comment type sentence.

7.3.5 Possessive Copula Clause Information Structure

Possessive copula clauses often invoke kinship and other interpersonal relationships (Hatim 1997:204). They are normally constructed with or without the copula element */-ti/*. When a possessor noun ends with a long vowel, the copular particle */-ti/* is inevitably required. In possessive copula clauses with zero copula, the verb slot is left vacant in Oromo.

194. (a) *Magarsaa-n micuu koo-ti*
 Megersa-NOM friend my-COP
 ‘Megersa is my friend.’

(b) *micuu koo-ti Magarsaa-n*
friend my-COP Megersa-NOM
'Megersa is my friend.'

(c) *ʾnni mana saree-ti*
he house dog-COP
'That one is the house of dog or that one is dog's house.'

(d) *mana saree-tii ʾnni*
house dog-COP he
'That one is the house of dog or that one is dog's house.'

Oromo can show possessor-possession relationship simply via juxtaposing the CS and CC. But, the copula element */-ti/* is always required when the possessor noun ends with long vowel. The pronoun */koo/* and the noun */saree/* 'dog' end in long vowel. Clause (194a) asserts that the nouns 'Megersa' and 'my friend' have the same referent and it is very closely similar to equational copula clause, since the CS and CC refer to the same individual. The example shows the interface between the two clause types. Clause (194a) and (194c) are basic possessive copula clauses, while copula (194b) and (194d) are non basic possessive copula clauses. In the basic copula clauses, information structure follows old vs. new information and the reverse hold for the non basic ones. Like all other affirmative copula clauses, possessive copula clauses are negated using the copular particle */miti/* 'not be'. Example:

195. (a) *mana koo-ti*
house my-COP
'It is my house.'

(b) *mana koo-tii miti*
house my-COP not-be
'It is not my house.'

The copular element */-ti/* is used in the above examples. But for 1st person a zero copula is used in possessive constructions when the possessive pronoun ends in short vowel. All copula clauses constructed using affirmative copular elements and zero copular are negated only using the negative copula particle */miti/* ‘not be’ and its variants. All types of negative copula clauses always require the negative copular element */miti/* ‘not be’. Therefore, the copula particle */miti/* does not carry any verb morphology or agreement since it appears in all environments. The form */-i/*, */-ti/* and */-da/* become */-ii/*, */-tii/* and */-daa/* when used in negative copula clauses and only the copular element */-daa/* is optional.

As the above detailed description shows, the chapter focuses on the IS of copula clauses. Oromo affirmative copula clauses are constructed with or without any copular element. However, negative copula clauses always require the invariable negative copula particle */miti/* ‘not be’. The copular elements are non verbal/particle copulas. The affirmative copular elements are */-da/*, */-i/*, */-ti/* and zero copula. The negative counterpart of the affirmative copular elements is the copula particle */miti/* ‘not be’. Oromo has no negative copula clauses with zero copula because negative copula clauses can not be constructed via juxtaposition. It has canonical as well as non canonical predicational, specificational, equative and possessive copula clauses. In canonical copula clauses, the background information comes before the new information, while the reverse is the realized in non canonical copula clauses. Oromo canonical copula clauses have copula subject followed by copula complement with or without any copular element. The copula clauses serve to encode different types of focus.

Chapter Eight

Negative and Passive Clause Information Structure

In this chapter, a comprehensive description of Oromo negative and passive clauses is given in relation to their information structure. The chapter describes how information is structured by passivization and how negation interacts with information structure particularly focus.

8.1 Negation

Negation is language universal. It is always the case that, statements are affirmative by default. Locke and Angela (2006:44) denote that negating is a basic human need, which is marked grammatically by negation. Negation reverses the truth value or polarity of a sentence/an utterance. A negative clause is used to affirm that some event, situation, or state of affairs does not hold or happen. Negative constructions are virtually employed in the context of some presupposition to negate or counter-assert that presupposition (Payne,1997:282). Example:

196. (a) *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a-ti jir-φ-a*
Chala-NOM house education-GEN-COP exist-3MS-PV
'Chala is at a school/Chala is found at a school.'

(b) *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a hin jir-φ-u*
Chala-NOM house education-GEN NEG exist-3MS-PV
'Chala is not (available) at a school.'

These clauses are interconnected, since one is the negative or affirmative form of the other. Clause (196a) is unmarked while the one in (196b) is pragmatically marked by the negative particle /*hin*/. Clause (196b) aims at contradicting clause (196a) due to the presence of the negative marker /*hin*/. In sentence (196a) the addressee assumes that 'Chala is at school.' However, in clause (196b) the fact stated in clause (196a) is counter-asserted. This negative clause does not present any new information, since the major purpose of negation is not bringing new information into the discourse, but denying the information that the addressor assumes the addressee previously knows. Negative clauses are often used to contradict propositions which are contextually recoverable than introducing novel propositions (Payne, 1985:199).

8.2 Negation Strategies

Oromo negates a sentence, or part of it (i.e., constituents) differently. Payne (1985:195) states that languages signal negation in various ways. He identifies four types of negation encoding strategies in the world languages: morphological (affixal) negatives, negative particles, negative verbs (negative auxiliaries and higher negative verbs) and negative nouns. In Oromo, negation is marked morphologically, lexically (e.g., using negative verbs) and by negative particles as presented below. The negation marking means are related to simple and multiple negation strategies.

8.2.1 Single Negation Strategy

It refers to the presence of only one negative marker per clause. Lexical negation is one of the means used to signal single negation. Payne (1997:282) explains that “lexical negation describes a situation in which the concept of negation is part and parcel of the lexical semantics of a particular verb.” There are two varieties of analytic/lexical negations, negative particles and finite verbs. Payne (1997:282, 283) shows that negative particles are typically linked with the main or content verb of the clause. However, they may also be related to clause. Morphemes that state clausal negation are usually, if not always, linked with the verb. Oromo has two verbal sentence negative particles related with main verbs and the distribution of these negative markers is determined by tense/aspect difference. The discontinuous negative marker /hin/ and /-n-/ and morpheme /hin/ are limited only to main verbs and used in clauses with past and non past in that order. The first part of the negative marker /hin/ and /-n-/ which is /hin/ appears at the beginning as an independent item, while /-n-/ is suffixed to a main verb. Miestamo (2007:555) states that De Cuypere (2007) identifies discontinuous negative strategies as negative clauses where negation is stated (at least) by two negative markers located on the opposite sides of the verb.

The negative markers /hin/ and /-n-/ and /hin/ counter-assert the proposition of the affirmative clauses. Clauses negated by /hin/ and /-n-/ and /hin/ are marked for focus via high pitch. In contrast, Baye (1988:369) makes a distinction between /hin/ and /hin/ and /-n-/ based on phonological, morphological and syntactic features and treats /hin-/ as a focus marker and /hin/ and /-n-/ as a negation focus marker. But, in the dialect under study /hin/ and /hin/ and /-n-/ are used to encode negation in negative clauses not focus. The form /hin/ is used as a focus marker

only in affirmative clauses. For instance, the negative clause in (197b) is marked for focus only when high pitch is used.

197. (a) *Tolaa-n hoolaa k'al-φ-e*
 Tola-NOM sheep slaughter-3MS-PV
 'Tola slaughtered a sheep.'

(b) *Tolaa-n hoolaa hin k'al-n-φ-e*
 Tola-NOM sheep NEG slaughter-NEG-3MS-PV
 'Tola didn't slaughter a sheep.'

The affirmative clause (197a) is changed into the negative clause in (197b) by the negation marker */hin/* and */-n/*. The proposition asserted in the affirmative clause is counter-asserted or denied in the negative clause. As previously stated, negative clauses do not supply new information, rather they reveal counter-assertion. The negation marker */hin/* and */-n/* encodes single negation not focus. Oromo perfective and imperfective aspect verbs are negated by different negation devices. Clauses with perfective aspect verb are negated by */hin/* and */-n/* as shown above while verbs with imperfective aspect are negated by */hin/*. Example:

198. (a) *ñnni mana barumsa-a hin deem-φ-a*
 he house education-GEN FOC go-3MS-IPV
 'He will go/goes to school surely.'

(b) *ñnni mana barumsa-a hin deem-φ-u*
 he house education-GEN NEG go-3MS-IPV
 'He will/does not go to school.'

The action stated by the imperfective aspect verb in (198a) is negated in example (198b) by the negation marker */hin/*. The simple negative clause in (198b) can encode focus only when the free preverbal particle */hin/* receives high pitch. As already stated, Oromo marks simple negation morphologically using */hin/* and */-n/* in verbs with perfective aspect and with */hin/* in

imperfective aspect. The use of these negators is constrained by the tense-aspect of main verbs. Thus, this implies the interaction realized between the negation markers and the tense/aspect markers. Except copular elements, all positive main verbs with imperfective and perfective aspects are negated by the particles */hin/* and */hin/* and */-n-/*, respectively. Thus, Oromo uses two ways to negate finite clauses. When the negative marker */hin/* is adjoined to inherently negative main verbs the polarity of the verbs is reversed into positive. Griefenow-Mewis(2001:75) explains that present tense main clause actions are negated by means of the negative particle */hin/* and the verb in subordinate conjunction. In addition to the negative markers */hin/* and */hin/* and */-n-/*, Oromo marks simple negation intrinsically by negative verbs lexically using various finite negative main verbs and the negative copular element */miti/* ‘not be’.

199. (a) *ʔani mana barumsa-a deem-ϕ-e*
 I house education-GEN go-1S-PV
 ‘I went to school.’

(b) *ʔani mana barumsa-a haf-ϕ-e*
 I house education-GEN absent-1S-PV
 ‘I was absent from school.’

The affirmative clause (199a) is negated in (199b) lexically by the inherently negative finite verb */haf-/* ‘absent’. Besides main verbs, the negative copula particle */miti/* ‘not be’ encodes simple negation as example (199b) shows.

200. (a) *Balcaa-n barat-aa-dā*
 Balcha-NOM student-M-COP
 ‘Balcha is a student.’

(b) *Balcaa-n barat-aa-dāa miti*
 Balcha-NOM student-M-COP not-be
 ‘Balcha is not a student.’

The copula Clause in (200b) is the negative counterpart of the copula clause in (200a). Example (200b) is a double copula clause. It comprises the optional affirmative copular element */-daa/* and the negative copula particle */miti/* ‘not be’. The negative copula clause counter-asserts the proposition asserted by the affirmative copula clause. The copular element */miti/* cannot be used with the negative particles */hin/* and */-n-/* like higher verbs except in tag questions. It can be used in negation fragment, since it is not confined only to copula clauses. Example:

201. *Magarsaa-n daabboo jaat-ø-e foon-ii miti*
 Megersa-NOM bread eat-3MS-PV meat-COP not-be
 ‘Megersa ate bread not meat.’

The negative copula particle */miti/* helps to construct the above fragmented negation. */foonii miti/* ‘not meat’. The noun */foon/* ‘meat’ is contrasted with the direct object noun */daabboo/* ‘bread’. The part of the clause that contains fragmented negation is an elliptical sentence showing a sort of contrastive focus. The example denotes that beyond, the inherently negative verbs like */haf-/* ‘absent’ Oromo uses the copular element */miti/* ‘not be’ to encode the notion of negation lexically. Thus, in copula clauses, single negation is encoded by the negative copula */miti/*.

8.2.2 Multiple Negation Strategy

Besides single negation, negative clauses with multiple negative markers are realized. Multiple negations refer to clauses having two or more negative markers or negative elements. The phrase multiple negative is used in this study due to its inclusiveness than double negation. As the name implies, double negative clauses involve only two negative markers. Negative sentences usually contain multiple operators such as an affix and a particle, two particles, or a particle or affix plus a word order change (Payne, 1997:284). Oromo permits using a negative main verb plus a negative particle or indefinite pronouns to construct clauses involving multiple negations to encode strong negation.

The negative particle */lakkii/* ‘no’ is used to encode multiple negation lexically in negative clauses and to give negative responses. The particle is usually used to reply to polar questions negatively as well as to contradict what has been previously said and followed by a lexically or

morphologically marked negative clause. It is normally used in clauses with corrective focus for the sake of counter-assertion like any other lexical negation markers. Example:

202. (a) *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem-φ-e*
 Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 'Chala went to school.'

(b) *lakkii ṅnni mana barumsa-a hin deem-n-φ-e*
 no he house education-GEN NEG go-NEG-3MS-PV
 'No, he did not go school.'

203. (a) *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem-φ-e-e*
 Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3MS-PV-QM
 'Did Chala go to school?'

(b) *lakkii ṅnni mana barumsa-a hin deem-n-φ-e*
 no he house education-GEN NEG go-NEG-3MS-PV
 No, he did not go to school.

Clause (202a) is an affirmative statement, while clause (203a) is an affirmative polar question. Example (202b) and (203b) are the negative counterparts of clauses (202a) and (203a), respectively. The negative particle */lakkii/* 'no' appears with the discontinuous negative morpheme */hin/* and */-n-/* in the response clauses. The negative clauses counter-assert the propositions of their affirmative counterparts. The polar question in example (203a) is negatively replied by the negative particle */lakkii/* 'no' and the negative morpheme */hin/* and */-n-/* in example (203b). This negative particle can be used alone as a short/fragment response for polar question (203a). The negative particle */lakkii/* 'no' and the negation marker */hin/* and */-n-/* simultaneously encode negation emphatically in the above examples. Applying more than one negator reinforce the intensity of negation. The negative morpheme */hin/* and */-n-/* and inherently negative main verbs also encode multiple negative. Example:

204. (a) *ʔinni mana barumsa-a haf- ϕ -e hin deem-n- ϕ -e*
 he house education-GEN absent-3MS-PV NEG go-NEG-3MS-PV
 ‘He was absent from a school, he did not go.’

(b) *kaleessa homtuu homaa hin jaan-n- ϕ -e*
 yesterday no one none NEG eat-NEG-3MS-PV
 ‘No one ate anything yesterday.’

(c). *ʔinni ʔeessa-jjuu hin deem-n- ϕ -e*
 he where.FOC NEG go-NEG-3MS-IPV
 ‘He went to nowhere.’

(d). *ʔinni ʔeeɲujjuu hin jaam-n- ϕ -e*
 he who.FOC NEG call-NEG-3MS-IPV
 ‘He called nobody.’

It is allowable to construct multiple negative clauses (i.e., double and triple negative clauses) by using three negative markers. Example (204a) is a double negative clause marked by the inherently negative verb */haf-/* ‘absent’ and the negative formative */hin/* and */-n-/*. In this clause, the degree of negation is intensified due to the double negation markers. In example (204b) the triple negative markers intensify the level of negation. Words carrying negative meaning are used to encode negation. For example in clause (204b) the negative pronouns */homtuu/* ‘nothing’ and */hoomaa/* ‘none’ and the negative formative */hin/* and */-n-/* are used to strengthen the level of negation. The negative clauses in (204c) and (204d) show that in Oromo a question word plus the focus marker */ʔijjuu/* express emphatic negation since their combination are used as indefinite pronouns not as question words. Thus, forms such as */ʔeeɲujjuu/* ‘nobody’ */joomijjuu/* ‘no time’ and */ʔeessajjuu/* ‘nowhere’ encode emphatic negation at discourse level in negative clauses. Increasing the number of the negation markers augment the degree of counter-assertion. Besides emphasizing negation, double negatives can produce affirmative clause by cancelling each other. Thus, double negation markers do not always mark emphatic negation. Oromo admits

double and triple negative markers to show emphatic negation where only one negative marker is requisite. In example (204b), the negative words /*homa*/ and /*homtuu*/ are used to augment the level of negation. These terms are almost semantically similar except their functional disparity in relation to their distribution.

8.3 Scope of Negation

Scope of negation stands for the part of a clause that is negated. Locke and Angela (2006:25) describe that scope of negation refers to the semantic effect that a negative term has on the rest of the clause that follows it. Payne (1997:282) divides negation into clausal and constituent negation based on its scope. It is possible to negate a particular element of a clause or the entire clause. The most common means of negation marking in any language are those used to negate an entire clause. In constituent negation, a negator is linked only to part of the clause/predicate. Vallduví (1990:325) says that the scope of negation should exclude affirmative elements. Sometimes constituent and clausal negations interact to cause variations on scope of negation. Oromo negates an entire clause or various parts the clause. Example:

205. (a) *horii-n ãsaa hedduu miti*
 animal-NOM his many not-be
 ‘His cattle are not many.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n mana barumsa-a-ti miti kan deem-ø-e*
 Megersa-NOM house education-GEN not-be REL go-3MS-PV
 ‘It was not to school that Megersa went.’

(c) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa koo hin hat-n-ø-e*
 Megersa-NOM sheep my NEG steal-NEG-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa didn’t steal my sheep.’

Only a single element is negated in clause (205a) and (205b). In other words, the clauses are partly negated. The word /*hedduu*/ ‘several’ and /*mana barumsaa-ti*/ ‘it is a school’ are negated in (205a) and (205c), respectively. However, in clause (205c) the scope of negation extends over

the entire clause. The examples show that an entire clause or only the part of the clauses that falls under the scope of negation can be contradicted.

8.4 Negation Focus Interaction

It is impossible to identify a focal element without using high pitch or other focus marking strategies in Oromo negative clauses. Because negation and focus are marked by different devices. Scope of negation usually correlates with focus domain. In Oromo, interaction is observed between negation and focus. The negation marker (i.e., /hin/ or /hin/ and /-n-/) is always put in relation to the verb and the focus is encoded by high pitch, focus morphemes, focus particles or cleft constructions in negative clauses. However, the negation marker morpheme /hin/ does not appear with focus markers like /-tu/ in affirmative clauses. This shows that the morpheme /hin/ does not encode focus in negative clauses. Thus, Oromo belongs to languages with special devices for linking negation with focused element. Hence, negative morphemes and negative particles do not mark focus in the language. Payne (1985:232) states that there are languages that use special devices for linking negation with focus element.

In the negative clauses below, except in (206a) a certain element of the clauses is focused by high pitch. In clause (206a), there is no any focused constituent at all, since there is no any focus marker. The interaction between negation and focus is realized via prosodic feature in Oromo as in the examples (206b) to (206f). These clauses indicate different focal element options delivering different new information as the position of the high pitch changes from one element of the clause to another. Oromo uses high pitch to identify focal element and enjoys relative freedom in its placement; since high pitch can be used to highlight any key words in a clause based on communicative context. As the next examples reveal, Oromo readily admits focus to fall on any clause-internal element from the special clause-initial position to clause-final position, since the focused element is not confined to its normal syntactic position, or has flexible focus structure. In other words, changing the word order of the basic clause in (206a) is not required because the focus can be encoded prosodically to accommodate the various focus possibilities of the clauses. Examples:

206. (a) *C'aalaa-n kalee k'awwee-daa-n leenc'a hin ʔayees-n-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday gun-COP-INST lion NEG kill-NEG-3MS-PV
 'Chala did not kill a lion with a gun yesterday.'
- (b) *C'aalaa-n kalee k'awwee -daa-n leenc'a hin ʔayees-n-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday gun-COP-INST lion NEG kill-NEG-3MS-PV
 'The one who killed a lion with a gun yesterday was not Chala.'
- (c) *C'aalaa-n **kalee** k'awwee-daa-n leenc'a hin ʔayees-n-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday gun-COP-INST lion NEG kill-NEG-3MS-PV
 'It was not yesterday that Chala killed a lion with a gun.'
- (d) *C'aalaa-n kalee **k'awwee -daa-n** leenc'a hin ʔayees-n-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday gun-COP-INST lion NEG Kill-NEG-3MS-PV
 'It was not with a gun that Chala killed a lion yesterday.'
- (e) *C'aalaa-n kalee k'awwee-daa-n **leenc'a** hin ʔayees-n-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM yesterday gun-COP-INST lion NEG kill-NEG-3MS-PV
 'It was not a lion that Chala killed with a gun yesterday.'
- (f) *C'aalaa-n kalee k'awwee-daa-n leenc'a hin **ʔayees-n-ø-e***
 Chala-NOM yesterday gun-COP-INST lion NEG kill-NEG-3MS-PV
 'Yesterday, Chala did not kill a lion with a gun. (i.e., but he might hit it with a gun)

Except clause (206a), examples (206b) to (206f) are partly negated clauses with the same word order placing narrow focus by high pitch on various components. When different elements of a negative clause receives high pitch either core or non core arguments of the verb are focused, since negation can be applied only to the part of the clause. In example (206b) to (206e), /*C'aalaa*/ 'Chala', /*kalee*/ 'yesterday', /*k'awweedaan*/ 'with a gun' /*leenc'a*/ 'a lion' and the negated verb /*ʔayeesne*/ are focused by high pitch. The focused elements are written in bold.

They are written in bold to identify them from the unfocused part of the clauses. When any elements of the negative clauses do not receive focus marker the entire clauses are negated. Because the scope of negation extends over the entire predications/clauses. The above negative clauses contain the same words but the variation of the place of the high pitch brings change of information structure or focal element in each case. Besides high pitch, Oromo can use focus marking morphemes, particles and cleft construction to show the interaction between negation and focus. Example:

207. (a) *Magarsaa-n foon-uma hin bit-n-e*

Megersa-NOM meat-FOC NEG buy-NEG-PV

‘Megersa did not buy even meat.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n foon k’ofa hin bit-n-e*

Megersa-NOM meat only NEG buy-NEG-PV

‘Megersa did not buy only meat.’

(c) *foon miti kan Magarsaa-n hin bit-n-e*

meat not-be REL Megersa-NOM NEG buy-NEG-PV

‘It was not meat that Megersa did not buy.’

Negation-focus interaction is marked in various ways in these examples. In clause (207a), (207b) and (207c) negation is associated with focus by the focus marking morpheme */-uma/*, focus particle */k’ofa/* and by simple cleft construction, respectively. The scope of negation interacts only over the focused elements.

8.5 Passive Clause Information Structure

The active-passive alternative is known as voice. That is, a verb is either in the active or passive voice form. In active voice, the doer of the action is the subject of the verb; but in passive usually the patient or the direct object of the verb becomes the subject. The voice of a verb imparts information on the topical focus of a clause. The doer of the action is normally not stated in Oromo passive clause. Passive voices are usually used in Oromo if the agent is non-designated, unknown, or not to be mentioned for some reason. A basic requirement for a verb to be in

passive form is that it must be a transitive verb. When a passive voice is used, the object of the active verb becomes the subject of the passive verb and this grammatical subject is marked for nominative case in Oromo. Grammatical subject refers to a subject of a sentence, but not to the doer of the action stated by the verb. If an active-verb clause is rephrased as a passive clause, the object of the verb becomes the subject/topic of the sentence, and a verb is marked for passive by the derivational morpheme */-am/*. Word order varies for the sake of information structuring in active-passive contrast since information is structured differently in active and passive clauses. Active–passive alternative denotes that clauses that are truth-conditionally equivalent can be encoded syntactically in various ways. Payne (1997:204) also describes that “a prototypical passive clause is characterized both morpho-syntactically and in terms of its discourse function. In terms of discourse function, a prototypical passive is used in context S where the A is relatively low in topicality with respect to the P.” Locke and Angela (2006:252) say that active-passive alternative is normally used to describe situations which involve two participants and it is commonly possible to treat one or the other participant as a theme/subject/topic. This is chiefly expressed by active-passive contrast in Oromo. Active-passive voice alternative is used in Oromo to mark information structure, because Oromo employs passivization like other syntactic structures such as, clefting and dislocation to convey pragmatic information. The clause below shows active-passive alternative use. Example:

208. (a) *C'aalaa-n harʔa hoolaa gurgur-φ-e*
 Chala-NOM today sheep sell-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala sold a sheep today.’

(b) *hoolaa-n C'aalaa-daa-n harʔa gurgur-am-φ-e*
 sheep-NOM Chala-COP-INST today sell-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘A sheep was sold by Chala today.’

(c) *hoolaa-n harʔa gurgur-am-φ-e*
 sheep-NOM today sell-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘A sheep was sold today.’

Clause(208a) and (208b) are active-passive alternative that basically impart the same information having diverse subject and topic, since they vary in their syntactic and information structures. In the examples, the same basic conceptual event is structured in distinct ways by word order variation, case marking, grammatical function assignment and the passive marking morpheme */-am/* or in short using passivization. Unlike topicalization and dislocations, passivization is marked in the predicate; the VP in the topicalized and left dislocated constructions remains the same in Oromo. Keenan (1985: 246) also says that “the formation of passives in a language takes place at the level of verb-phrase syntax; whereas topicalization and left dislocation (as well as right dislocation) take place at the level of syntax.”

As shown above,when the agent argument is non-topical, passivization is usually required to promote the patient to direct object position. The noun ‘Chala’ and */hoolaa/* ‘sheep’ are both topic and subject, since the syntactic structure coincides with IS in the active clause in (208a) and as well as in the passive clauses in (208b) and (208c), respectively. In Oromo basic active declarative clause, a single element plays the role of agent, subject and topic thus these roles conflate and manifested in one wording. In the active clause (208a), the agent is mapped on to subject and topic, while in the passive clause in (208b) the patient */hoolaa/* ‘sheep’ also becomes the subject and the topic of the clause, while the postpositional phrase */C’aaladaan/* ‘by Chala’ plays the role of agent. In clause (208b) the agent is described and it is termed agentive-passive, while clause (208c) is agentless passive, since it lacks an agent participant. In passive, the agent of the action can be unknown or deliberately left unstated.

A single element plays the role of agent, subject and topic in Oromo basic active declarative clause because these roles can conflate and manifested in one wording. In a typical active declarative clause the agent, subject and topic of a clause coincide. In contrast, in a passive declarative clause these three structural elements (i.e., agent, subject and topic) do not conflate. In natural context of language use, a given message can be conveyed in diverse ways, in which the arrangement of the clause elements can vary because various elements of a clause can be shifted from one slot to another (e.g., from a clause final to initial position). The content of a clause can be linked to the rest of the discourse and the communicative context by restructuring the message of the clause. Thus, active-passive alternative determines the constituent of the

clause that becomes the subject of the sentence and related to choice of topic and the “packaging” or distribution of information. Thus, passivization commonly plays a vital role as a way of information structuring. However, restriction is highly realized regarding the rearrangement of a clause message in passive voice because usually it is the direct object that becomes subject or topic in Oromo passive clause. For instance, an argument with a recipient role cannot be of a sentence topic in passive construction. Active and passive clauses are used in various communicative contexts. Locke and Angela (2006:253) also point out that from the perspective of textual organization of what the addressor wishes to state, it follows that any of the next three possibilities may determine the choice between active and passive. The agent is new information, so will be placed last; the agent is not new and is silenced. Some other element is new and is placed last and an element which is not agent is desired as subject/topic.

8.5.1. Types of Passive Constructions

Oromo applies agentive and agentless passives for various purposes as described below.

8.5.1.1 Agentive Passive Constructions in Oromo

In Oromo, an agent can be demoted from its privileged status and optionally stated as a postpositional phrase in a passive clause. If it is expressed, it occupies clause medial position and receives normal end-focus. But, agentive passive is not usually used; example:

209. (a) *nam-icci poolisii-daa-n k'ab-am-ø-e*
 person-SGV.NOM police-Ccop-INST catch-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘The man was arrested by a police.’

(b) *hoolaa-n koo hattuu-daa-n k'al-am-ø-e*
 sheep-NOM my thief-COP-INST slaughter-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘My sheep was slaughtered by a thief.’

In these agentive passive clauses, the doers of the deeds are overtly stated and highlighted, since they present new information. Such agentive passive constructions are used when it is necessary to mention the performer of the action. Thus, passivization rhematize the agent. The nouns

/nama/ ‘person’ and */hoolaa/* ‘sheep’ are the grammatical subjects or topic of the clause, while the phrases */poolisiidaan/* ‘by police’ and */hattuudaan/* ‘by thief’ are logical subjects and are the part of the clauses conveying new information.

8.5.1.2 Agentless Passives in Oromo

It is a common type of passive clause in Oromo, in which the role of the agent is not represented. It is more applicable than an agentive passive. Agentless passive is used when the agent is either unknown or unimportant. Agentless passive is used when a noun phrase other than the agent of the clause is more prominent as new information than the agent itself. Passivization is usually employed when the subject is indefinite, nonspecific, or not important in the discourse in Oromo. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:254) also describe that in passive voice the agent of an action can be silenced for several reasons. It can be silenced under the following conditions: if it is implied even though it is unknown, can be mentioned directly or indirectly, possible to retrieve based on the context though it is not relevant, if the implied agent can be anyone and the structure describes a general statement and the addressor wishes to focus on the predicator. The speaker can omit an agent of the action to refrain from blaming someone else or to avoid taking the blame oneself. The next examples illustrate these points.

210. (a) *gujjaa tokkoo-atti sijaara baajʔee-tu t'uut'-am-ø-a*
 day one-ADP cigarette a few-FOC absorb-PS-3MS-IPV
 ‘Per day, many cigarettes are smoked.’

(b) *ʔabbaa-n ʔsaa waraana-atti ʔayyeef-am-ø-e*
 father-NOM his war-LOC kill-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘His father was killed in a war.’

(c) *mootummaa-n filat-am-ø-e*
 government-NOM elect-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘The government was elected.’

These are agentless passives. The agents are unknown although implied because in each passive clause the silenced agent can be referred to directly or indirectly. The agentless passives admit the interlocutors to omit the doer of the actions; this distinguishes the passive clauses from their active counterparts where there is no agent.

In the next examples, the omission of the agent role creates a chance for ‘people’ or ‘someone’ to be denoted as an agent without definitely distinguishing him or her. By deleting the agent of the action the situation or action is focused in the clauses. Example:

211. (a) *man-ni seera-n k’ulk’ul-ee-s-am-uu k’ab-ø-a*
 house-NOM properly-INST clean-become-CAUS-PS-NMZR has-3MS-PV
 ‘(The) house has to be cleaned properly.’

(b) *daaʔm-ni seera-n kunuu-s-am-uu k’ab-an*
 children-NOM properly-INST rear-CAUS-PS-NMZR has-3PL-IPV
 ‘Children have to be reared properly.’

In these clauses, though no one is specifically mentioned as the doer of the action, the implied agent is ‘people’ or ‘one’ and the passive clauses express a general statement/proposition. Especially the agentless passive in (212a) can be used, when the agent is a generic entity and its identity is irrelevant to the message of the clause. Example:

212. (a) *dogongor-ni λuum-am-ø-ee jir-ø-a*
 mistake-NOM create-PS-3MS-CNV exist-3MS-PV
 ‘A mistake has been made.’

(b) *deen-ni jeroo-daa-n hin dijees-s-am-n-ø-e*
 lunch-NOM time-COP-INST NEG serve-CAUS-PS-NEG-3MS-PV
 ‘Lunch was not served on time.’

The agent of a passive clause can be deliberately left unstated. Agentless passives do not mention the agents. The agents of the action are not clearly stated in the above examples. Thus, it is difficult to blame someone for the mistake committed. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:254) also express that “either out of politeness, to avoid blaming someone else, or conversely, to avoid taking the blame oneself, the speaker wishes to mask the origin of the action.” Unlike agentive passive, agentless passive presents non agent participants as new information. Participants with non agent roles: instrument, time, manner, force roles, etc. can be focused through passivization in Oromo agentless passives. When the agent participant (i.e., an agentive postpositional phrase) of a passive clause is elided or not overtly stated, some other element inevitably receives end-focus. This element can be a verb, an adjunct or a complement. In the next agentless passives non agent participants receive focus and become new information.

213. (a) *raʔee-n kee ʔalbee kanaa-n k'al-am-ø-e*
 goat-NOM your knife this-INST slaughter-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘Your goat was slaughtered with this knife.’

(b) *wajjaa-n koo bubbee-daa-n fud-at-am-ø-e*
 clothes-NOM my wind-COP-INST take-MD-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘My clothes were taken away by the wind.’

These passive clauses non agent participants becomes the point of interest. The agents of the action are not totally mentioned and elements with instrumental role /*ʔalbee kanaan*/ ‘knife’ and /*bubbee*/ ‘wind’ with force role become new information. Thus, in the examples, the instrumental and force roles are focused using passivization. Besides constituents with instrumental and force roles, elements with other semantic roles can receive focus and presented as new information by passivization. For instance:

214. (a) *ʔanni ʔamma-tti jam-am-ø-e*
 he now-ADP call-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘He was called for now.’

(b) *wajjaa-n koo dök'k'ee-daa-n mark'-am-ø-e*
 clothes-NOM my mud-COP-INST knead-PS-3MS-PV
 'My clothes were kneaded with mud.'

(c) *hoolaa-n tas-uma hat-am-ø-e*
 sheep-NOM suddenly-FOC steal-PS-3MS-PV
 'The sheep was stolen suddenly.'

The examples illustrate that the point of interest of the passive clauses may be non-agent participants. In place of the agent, the time adverb /ʔamma/ 'now' and 'tasuma/ 'suddenly' and the noun /dök'k'ee/ 'mud' become focus in the examples. The agents are not totally mentioned and elements with temporal and manner roles become new information in example (214a) and (214c). In Oromo passive, an agent is cited only if it is important new information and the identity of the doer of the action is required. Hatim (1997:114) suggests that passivization evaluates by suppressing or deemphasizing particular elements of the clause for some purpose. The evaluativeness of the passive clause emanates from, among other things, the marked status of the clause structure and the deliberate fronting of particular elements and not others.

Besides core and non core arguments of a verb, passivization can be used to focus on verbs. In order to highlight a verb, the verb has to carry focus and the agent must be dispensable. The examples below are topic-comment sentences with focused verbs.

215. (a) *man-ni kuni k'ulk'ullees-am-uu k'ab-ø-a*
 house-NOM this.NOM clean-PS-NMZR has-3MS-IPV
 'This house must be cleaned.'

(b) *man-ni barumsa-a ũjaar-am-aa jir-ø-a*
 house-NOM education-GEN build-PS-IPV exist-3MS-PV
 'A school is being built.'

These are agentless passive clauses. The agents are not stated and highlighted, since the addressor wants to focus on the predicators. In the examples, the main verbs are focused. In Oromo except copular elements, main or principal verbs can be focused by passivization. In the examples the main verbs convey new information. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) describe that ‘passive is a helpful tool to focus on a verb, since in cleft clauses the verb cannot be clefted.’ However, in Oromo, besides passivization verbs can be focused using cleft constructions as dealt with in the chapter dealing with cleft construction.

8.5.2 Passive Function in Marking Information Structure

Oromo marks information structure lexically, morphologically or syntactically. It uses various syntactic means to signal variations in the structuring of information. Cleft, dislocation (i.e., left and right) constructions and topicalization are associated with information structural properties. Passivization is also one of the most widely used means of information structuring. Active and passive are alternative structures whose chief variation lies in what the subject and topic are. Thus, the choice of passive over active voice is regulated by IS. Example:

216. (a) *Magarsaa-n maal bit-ø-e*
 Megersa-NOM what buy-3MS-PV
 ‘What did Megersa buy?’

(b) *hoolaa-n Magarsaa-daa-n bit-am-ø-e*
 sheep-NOM Megersa-COP-INST buy-PS-3MS-PV
 ‘(The) sheep was bought by Megersa.’

(c) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa bit-ø-e*
 Megersa-NOM sheep buy-3MS-PV
 ‘Megersa bought a sheep.’

The response clause in (216b) is bizarre because the noun ‘sheep’ becomes topic without considering the context of communication. It is ‘Megersa’ that must be the natural topic in this clause as in question (216a). Thus, the response clause in (216c) is much more appropriate than

the passive clause in (216b). Because the topic of the response clause has to be the noun ‘Megersa’ and the answer or the information question is appropriate in the active voice than passive voice. In the interrogative clause new information is requested by the question word */maal/* ‘what’ and in the response clauses the noun */hoolaa/* ‘sheep’ is presented as new/focus information. Though, the noun */hoolaa/* is presented new information, the second clause is more suitable than the first one in the given communicative context. Therefore, the examples reveal that context determines when to use active or passive voice. The ‘voice’ of a verb conveys information on the topical focus of a clause. Active voice is used when the agent is the subject or topic, while passive voice is used when the object of the verbal action becomes the subject or topic of a clause. Passive voice helps for foregrounding of the patient and de-topicalizing of the agent of the clause by altering it into postpositional phrase or not expressing it.

Passive voice is virtually used in Oromo when the agent participant is unknown or not to be mentioned for some reasons. In a passive voice sentence, mentioning the identity of the agent is usually not common because, it might be unknown or simply unnecessary. The agent of the action is manifested using postpositional phrase in the passive clause. In Oromo, only change of position of arguments is not realized in the reorganization of passive clause because topic or argument promotion and demotion is also manifested. Oromo prototypical passive clause usually promotes the direct object of the active sentence into subject position as a sentence topic. Active–passive counterparts have distinct subject and topic elements. Promotion and demotion of constituents are hand and glove in Oromo passive clause. Xiao (2007:18) also explains that passive clauses are used to accommodate IS via stating information from old to new, keeping the principle of end-focus and end-weight and maintaining the continuity of the topic in discourse. Usually, the subject provides given information, while the agent supplies new information, which means that in most passive constructions the subject has a higher level of givenness than the agent phrase.

Chapter eight dealt with the IS of negative and passive clauses in Oromo. Negation is observed crosslinguistically but it is marked differently. Negative clauses do not bring new information into the discourse rather than denying the previously stated proposition. Oromo encodes negation morphologically and lexically. It applies a single or multiple negation markers. The entire

negative clause or the part of the clause can be negated or counterasserted. Interaction is realized between focus and negation in Oromo. In negative clauses, it is impossible to identify the denied focal element without using high pitch or other focus marking strategies. Thus, Oromo belongs to languages with special devices for linking negation with focus.

The IS of passive clauses is also analyzed in the present chapter since passivization plays a vital role in information structuring. Active and passive constructions are alternative structures whose chief variation lies in what the subjects and topics are. They normally convey closely similar message though their IS varies. The choice of passive over active voice is regulated by IS. Passivization alters the word order of the active clause to encode information structuring. Both agentive and agentless passives are used though agentless passives are widely used in Oromo. Passive clauses promote only the direct object of the active clause into topic position in the language. In agentive passives, the agent is changed into postpositional phrase and encodes new information. Agentless passive is used when an NP other than the agent is more prominent as new information. In agentless passives various elements of the clause including the verb itself become new information at the expense of the agent deletion. In agentless passive constructions, arguments with instrumental, temporal roles or the verb itself becomes the focus words at the expense of the agent deletion. Thus, non agent elements receive end focus since passivization is adherent to the principle of end focus.

Chapter Nine

Interrogative Clause Information Structure

The information structure of Oromo interrogative clauses is addressed in this chapter. Thus, it concentrates on the information structure of Oromo content, polar and alternative questions.

9.1 Interrogative Clauses Types

Interrogative clauses are used for requesting information. Payne (1997:295) shows that languages always use some means for identifying a particular speech to be understood as a request for information, rather than an assertion. Such grammatical constructions are called interrogative clauses. Questions force the addressee to search for a specific piece of information in his or her knowledge store. Locke and Angela (2006:201) describe that interrogative clauses are commonly used to elicit the information that the addressor does not know from the addressee. Information questions usually serve to elicit information that does not exist in the question forms unlike polar and alternative questions.

Köning and Siemund (2007:291) state that interrogative clauses are conventionally interrelated with the speech act of requesting information. They fall into two major broad groups as polar and information questions based on their syntactic and semantic features. Payne (1997:295) identifies content and polar questions as common subtypes of interrogative clauses and subsumes tag question under polar question. Interrogative clause can also be classified into three major types as content questions, yes/no and alternative questions. There are also minor classes of the rhetorical and echo questions. These question types are not the focus of this study.

9.1.1 Information Question Information Structure

Questions typically do not add factual information to the common ground or background information, but show informational gaps on the side of one participant that should be satisfied by a conversational move of the other. Content questions evoke an element or event which will induce focused response by question words and such words are known as wh-words in English. Since Oromo question words do not begin with 'wh' the phrase question words is preferably used in place of 'wh-words' in this study. The language has the following question words that are common and typically focused to elicit new information.

Question word	Gloss	Question word	Gloss
<i>ʒeenu</i>	‘who’	<i>joom</i>	‘when’
<i>maal</i>	‘what’	<i>ʒakkam</i>	‘how’
<i>kam</i>	‘which’	<i>meeek’a</i>	‘how many’
<i>ʒeessa</i>	‘where’	<i>hamam</i>	‘how much’

These question words help to supply new information by signaling the missed information. The word /*ʒeenu*/ ‘who’ and /*maal*/ ‘what’ are invariant for both nominative and absolutive cases. The word /*maal*/ ‘which’ is used for both human and non-human referents but it is usually used for non human entities. The question word /*kam*/ ‘which’ is used to specify one or more people or things from a definite set and hence it has definite referent. The question words are spoken with high pitch to construct questions when focus morphemes or particles are not used.

The term information question and content question refer to the same thing in the literature. Oromo content questions are constructed by using the question words listed above and the information to be requested by the questions can be about people, place, reason, time, etc. They require a more detailed response instead of a simple affirmation or disaffirmation like polar questions. They are used to request some kind of information and presuppose a reply from an open range of replies. Köning and Siemund (2007:291) denote that this type of questions receive responses that give the kind of information represented by the question words. Example:

217. (a) *gabaa-n harʒa ʒeessaa*
market-NOM today where
‘Where is the market today?’

(b) *gabaa-n harʒa-a Dubari*
market-NOM today-GEN Duber
‘Today’s market is (in) Duber.’

In clause (217a), the speaker is requesting for the specification of a market place and the addressee has given an answer regarding the place. Because the most basic objective of asking questions is to get new information that the questioner believes the addressee knows. Thus, the

question word /ʔeessa/ ‘where’ is replaced by the place noun ‘Dubar’. The purpose of the question word is indicating the type of missed information which is subsumed under interrogative focus. The missed information is given by the noun ‘Dubar’ and is spoken with high pitch. Because the right constituent that encodes focus must be focused. The above example shows that only the element that carries new information has to be focused. In relation to IS, only the focus is subsumed under the interrogative scope, while the remaining of the response clause represents background information as in (217b). Meyer and Dabala (2003:182) emphasize that content questions with question words reveal peculiarities and restrictions in relation to focus marking. Interrogative words play the syntactic role of subject, direct object and object of postposition in content questions. Thus, they can be put in various syntactic positions. Based on the position of occurrence of the question words, interrogative clauses can be divided into in-situ and ex-situ. Oromo is normally a question word in-situ (i.e., wh-in-situ) language though it has ex-situ content questions sometimes. Thus, Oromo question words either follow or deviate from the basic word order. When they deviate from the basic word order of the language the question words used as subject, direct/indirect object, or object of postposition can appear clause initially. Payne (1997:302) asserts that in most OV languages a question word can either remain in situ or can move to the sentence initial position.

Oromo content questions are usually constructed following canonical word order. The question words typically appear immediately before the verb in the canonical clause. They are placed in the same spot with the corresponding noun phrases as exemplified below.

218. (a) ʔinni **maal** ɲaat- ϕ -e
 he what eat-3MS-PV
 ‘What did he eat?’

(b) ʔinni **foon** ɲaat- ϕ -e
 he meat eat-3MS-PV
 ‘He ate meat.’

Different constituents can be focused in content questions using various focus markers. The addressor asks for the identity of the element that gives unknown information in question (218a). The word /*maal*/ ‘what’ occurs in clause medial position in the basic position of the object argument. Example (218a) is an in-situ interrogative clause, since it is adherent to the basic word order or to the question word substitution rules. The in-situ interrogative clause has the same word order pattern with its analogous basic declarative clause. The question word /*maal*/ ‘what’ and the object noun /*foon*/ ‘meat’ occur in the same position preverbally in their insitu position. The focal noun /*foon*/ ‘meat’ that replaces the word /*maal*/ ‘what’ is placed in its normal syntactic position and highlighted by high pitch. The question word /*maal*/ shows the presence of incomplete or missed information in the object position, since the rest of the clause presents background information the questioner introduces the missed information which is /*foon*/ ‘meat’ to the response clause.

Oromo also allows shifting question words to clause initial position. Thus, question word substitution rules vary from question word preposing rules. In other words, question words are used to form in-situ and ex-situ interrogative questions by using question word substitution and preposing rules, respectively. The following are ex-situ interrogative clauses.

219. (a) *maal* *naat-ø-e* *ñnni*
 what eat-3MS-PV he
 ‘What did he eat?’

(b) *joom* *deem-ø-e* *ñnni*
 when go-3MS-PV he
 ‘When did he go?’

In these clauses, the question word /*maal*/ ‘what’ and /*joom*/ ‘when’ are used to construct ex-situ interrogative clauses. The question words are focused by high pitch. The question words are shifted from their default positions to clause initial positions by deviating from the canonical word order rule. Oromo question words can be put at the beginning or middle of a clause. These clauses are not impossible, though they are not the most natural ones. The examples show that

inherently non subject question words can appear at clause initial position in questions with non-canonical word order. Though, Oromo uses ex-situ interrogative clauses, the question words do not appear totally after a verb. Example:

220 **ʔnni deem-ø-e ʔessa*
he go-3MS-PV where
'Where did he go?'

This example is unacceptable or ungrammatical, since the question word /*ʔessa*/ 'where' cannot be totally put after a verb or at the end of a clause. The question word has to receive high pitch. All Oromo question words do not appear everywhere in a sentence. Verb initial content questions are totally non existent in Oromo while verb medial word order is sometimes attested. Example:

221. (a) **deem-t-e ʔfiin ʔessa*
go-3FS-PV she where
'Where did she go?'

(b) **ʔaat-ø-e ʔnni maal*
eat-3MS-PV he what
'What did he eat?'

These clauses are ungrammatical because verbs do not occur at the beginning of information questions. Some restrictions are realized regarding the ordering of constituents around the verb. Question words do not appear immediately before subject in the dialect. Questions that place question words sentence initial before subject are ungrammatical. Example:

222. (a) **ʔessa ʔnni raf-ø-e*
where he sleep-3MS-PV
'Where did he sleep?'

- (b) **maal* *ʔnni beek-ø-a*
 what he know-3MS-PV
 ‘What does he know?’

These examples show that Oromo question words reveal word order restriction. It lacks ex-situ interrogative clauses with question words at the beginning of the clause immediately followed by a subject. The language commonly have content questions with verb final order. Owens (1985:207) shows that question word tends to appear near to the content verb though like other noun phrases at the sentence level, its syntactic place is not firmly limited to a single place. This affinity shows that the unmarked place for introducing novel information is preverbal.

The above examples have only a single question word, Oromo also admits multiple content questions with two or more question words and the addressor expects the addressee to elicit various information at a time. For instance:

223. (a) *ʔeeju-tu* *ʔessa deem-ø-e*
 who-FOC where go-3MS-PV
 ‘Who went to where?’

- (b) *Magarsaa-tu* *Salaale deem-ø-e*
 Megersa-FOC Selale go-3MS-PV
 ‘It was Megersa who went to Selale.’

The above example involves two question words because two elements of the clause are asked as well as focused using multiple content questions. Oromo allows the questioning of a whole clause, phrase or an individual lexical item within a given sentence based on focus structure. This implies that a clause can have more than one focal elements. In the above example, the question words are replaced by core and non core arguments in the response clause. The first question word is obligatorily focused by the focus morpheme */-tu/*, since high pitch is not used in this case. while the second one does not appear with focus morpheme instead it employs high

pitch. It is interesting to note the place where a question word occurs in a sentence. In the above clauses, the position where the question words appear is the same as the place that is occupied by the subject NP and the complement NP. In content questions, a question word substitutes one of the elements of the analogous declarative clause. The question word is always the element of the question that representing the important piece of new information that is being required. The new information that replaces the question word is always focused by the focus morpheme or high pitch in information questions. Questions like (223a) can also be considered as negative clauses at some context since question words can encode emphatic negative polarity at the level of discourse based on the context in which it is used. In this case, question words are used as expression of emphatic negative polarity. However, this is not the focus of this chapter.

Oromo focused question words preferably require focused answers. The referents coindexed with the focal words in the questions are usually foci in the response clauses. Example:

224. (a) *C'aalaa-n maal-uma dug-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM what-FOC drink-3MS-PV
 'What did Chala really drink?'

(b) *ǎnni ʎaanan-uma dug-ø-e*
 he milk-FOC drink-3MS-PV
 'He drank just milk.'

Discourse context or situational context determines the element that must be focused. In the interrogative clause in (224a) the question word */maal/* 'what' is focused for narrow focus by the focus morpheme */-uma/*. The presupposition on which question (224a) relies on is that "Chala drank something." In response clause (224b) the element that corresponds to */maal/* 'which' is */ʎaanan/* 'milk' takes the focus morpheme */-uma/*. Thus, the focused element correlates with the focused question word. Thus, speakers usually focus on items that they want their addressees give attention to, and which they thought the addressees are not already giving attention to. Content questions usually encode completive or informative focus as in example (224). Thus, noun */ʎaanan/* 'milk' is the focus or new information. Clause (224a) and (224b) are Q-A

congruent. The question word /*maal*/ can be focused by /-*uma*/ or high pitch. In clause (224b) the noun ‘milk’ conveys completive focus because the incomplete material in (224a) is filled by supplying the noun ‘milk.’ The example denotes that completive focus is discourse-new and context-new informational focus and it is the non-presupposed or unknown information. New information becomes much clearer in the response of information questions than in statements. According to von Heusinger (1999:96) informational focus is the response to an information question. Thus, it is connected with Q-A pairs (i.e., wh-NPs and their replies). In content question, the constituent analogous to the question word phrase is a focus, while the rest of the clause is the background information. Information questions are usually linked with completive focus, since they serve to seek and fill missed information. Valle (2014:56) points out that when options are lacking in the background information, the focus has information function.

As stated above, completive focus is realized in content questions since they help to elicit missed information using question-answer context. Usually, the whole information cannot be new for the addressee in clauses with completive focus, since the clause contain an argument, a verb or predicate focus. For instance, in verbal focus, only a verb is focused where the subject, object(s) and adjunct(s) are presupposed as in the example below.

225. (a) *ñsaan ñsa maal-uma god-an*
 they him what-FOC do-3PL.PV
 ‘What did they do to him?’

(b) *ñsaan ñsa hin ðarrabs-an*
 they him FOC insult-3PL.PV
 ‘They insulted him.’

The focused question in (225a) requires focused answer. Only the verb is focused in the response clause (225b). Thus, it is permissible to overtly present only the verb as new information. In verbal focus, the verb tends to occur alone when other elements are omitted (i.e., old information can be elided altogether). The arguments of the verb are not part of the new information or they are outside the scope of focus. In Oromo, except content verbs, copulas cannot be assigned for

focus since they do not have lexical meaning. Thus, verbal focus is non-existent in both verbal and verbless copula clauses.

9.1.1.1 Information Question and Ellipsis

Sometimes given information is simply left out of a sentence altogether. Hence, the term ellipsis refers to leaving out recoverable linguistic elements of a sentence that the addressee can insert on his/her own. Trask (2007:83) defines ellipsis as the deletion from a clause or an utterance of material which is logically inevitable but which is retrievable from the context. Ellipsing is a total phonetic reduction. Via ellipsing only the focused part of a sentence becomes prominent, since the old information is just elided (Krifka and Musan, 2012:34). “Any information unit, that is, non-initial in a discourse, with recoverable information tends to be represented anaphorically via reference, substitution or ellipsis” (Halliday, 1967:206).

An elliptical sentence is a shorthand representation of clauses with some words being elided without missing the original meaning to avoid unnecessarily repeated words. The content of the ellipsis site has to be recoverable from the discourse. There is a trend to convey old information by shorter forms (notably proforms, ellipsis) since elliptical sentences are quite commonly used as illustrated below.

226 (a) *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem- ϕ -e*
Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
'Chala went to school.'

(b) *Magarsaa-ni-s deem- ϕ -e*
Megersa-NOM-FOC go-3MS-PV
'Megersa also went.'

A response clause may contain recoverable information but the crux of the reply that makes it a relevant answer is the focus. The complement of the verb /*deem-*/ 'go' which is the phrase /*mana barumsaa*/ 'to school' is given in (226a) but omitted in (226b). The deleted information can be retrieved from the linguistic or discourse context. Omission is used only when the elided information can be retrieved either from the linguistic or situational context. The recoverable

constituent is omitted to focus on the new information using ellipsis in clause (226b). Ellipsis creates cohesive ties to nominals, verbals and clauses. According to Hatch (1992:225) “ellipsis can be thought as a “zero” tie since the tie is not actually said.” Elliptical sentences avoid unnecessary repetition of given information in normal conversation, reduced clauses, and in clauses joined by coordinating conjunctions and etc. These sentence fragments are also usually used in question-answer contexts to omit contextually recoverable information. Example:

227. (a) *ʔati ʔeessa deem-aa jir-t-a*
 you where go-IPV exist-2S-IPV
 ‘Where are you going?’

(b) *ʔani mana barumsa-a-t-ʔan deem-aa jir-ø-a*
 I house education-GEN-COP-I go-IPV exist-1S-IPV
 ‘I am going to school.’

(c) *mana barumsa-a-ti*
 house education-GEN-COP
 ‘It is a school.’

Question (227a) is given long response in clause (227b) and short answer in (227c). Short and long answers are called fragmented and full-fledged answers, in that order. It is also possible to provide long and short responses for polar and alternative questions. Addressor(s) omits an element of a clause only when it is already accessible from the prior discourse. Usually in conversation, incomplete clauses are used by dropping given information. Because the subject and the verb are already familiar to the addressee, the answerer did not overtly state them in the response clause in (227c). Thus, it is allowable to omit contextually recoverable information and leave only the new one. In (227c), the addressee responds to the addressor’s question only by supplying the new information and eliding the contextually recoverable information. Since it is possible to give short response by eliding the accessible information. A short answer presents only the focus or new information. Repeating the old information yields a full answer. However, clause (227c) cannot be interpreted by itself. It becomes meaningful only based on the right

discourse context. Short and long answers are given based on the interest of the addressor. Long answer provides both the focus domain and focus center (i.e., the old and new information). In short response, only the focus center (i.e., new information) is overtly stated. Both type of answers convey the same required new information. Focus center is usually part of the focus domain if there is any focus domain. In other words, focus center is extracted from the focus domain. The focus center can be a fraction of the focus domain and in some cases the focus domain can be absent. Thus, short answer is the subset of the long one solely in terms of the number of words that it has not in terms of the new information that it conveys. Short answers are usually copula clauses as in (227c). When the addressor is not interested to state the background information, only the new one can be overtly stated.

In general, if the speaker prefers to provide short answer, an argument, a verb and VP are given as responses in sentences with argument, verb focus and predicate focus, respectively. If an addressee states only the focus center as a reply for a given question, it is a short answer; or else it is long. In sentence focus, only a full fullaged statement is supplied as an answer without any option, since the entire clause contains new information.

Besides in information questions, elliptical sentences can be used in reduced clauses. Reduced clause refers to a structure which does not have one or more of the element required to enable it to be used as a full independent structure (Crystal, 2008:406). Thus, ellipses reduce complex clauses into simple clauses. Example:

228. (a) *kan hoolaa gurgur-uu sun nam-icci micuu kijja*
 REL sheep sell-NMZR that person-SGV.NOM friend mine
 ‘The man who is selling a sheep is my friend.’

(b) *nam-icci hoolaa gurgur-uu micuu kijja*
 man-SGV.NOM sheep sell-NMZR friend mine
 ‘The man selling a sheep is my friend.’

Example (228a) contains dependent and independent clauses. These clauses are reduced into a single clause in example (228b). The element */hoolaa gurguruu/* ‘selling a sheep’ is used as a subject modifier in clause (228b) to reduce the complex sentence into simple clause. Besides in reduced clauses, ellipsis can be used in sentences joined by coordinating conjunctions. Usually, contextually recoverable information is elided in clauses joined by coordinating conjunctions. Identical materials need not be repeated for the sake of economy. Example:

229. (a) *C'aalaa-n wajjaa λsaa miic'c'-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM clothes his wash-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala washed his clothes.’

(b) *C'aalaa-n wajjaa λsaa haf-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM clothes his spread-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala spread his clothes.’

(c) *C'aalaa-n wajjaa λsaa miic'c'-ø-e-tii haf-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM clothes his wash-3MS-PV spread-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala washed and spread his clothes.’

The independent clauses in (229a) and (229b) are connected by the optional coordinating conjunction */-tii/* to construct the complex sentence in (229c). Only the verb */haf-/* is taken from clause (229b) by omitting the subject and object arguments to construct the complex sentence in (229c). The given information */C'aalaa-n wajjaa λsaa/* appears only once in clause (229c) to make the clause more economical by avoiding redundant information.

9.1.1.1.1 Ellipsis Types

Locke and Angela (2006:238) state that ellipsis and substitution are means of avoiding the repetition of old information. Ellipsising omits the recoverable elements of a clause to highlight the new information. The elided information can be recovered either from a linguistic or social context (i.e., is related to the social relationship of the interlocutors). Locke and Angela (2006:243) classify ellipsis into textual and situation. In situational ellipsis, various items are

frequently omitted, as they are recoverable from the situational context. Locke and Angela (2006:243) notice that situational and textual ellipsis is retrieved from the social and linguistic co-text, respectively. Example:

230. (a) *sagalee saree hin dagec-u-u*
 sound dog NEG hear-IMPV-QM
 ‘Do not you hear the voice of (the) dog?’

(b) *ʔannan-i hin ʔala-aɗɗ-ø-u*
 milk-NOM NEG like-MD-1S-PV
 ‘I do not like milk.’

The personal pronoun /ʔati/ ‘you’ and /ʔani/ ‘I’ referring to the addressee and the addressor are elided in clause (230a) and (230b), respectively. Consequently, an anaphora or a pronoun ellipsis is realized in these clauses. The pronouns are omitted, since their referents are recoverable from the situational context. Situational ellipsis is allowed when the referents of the pronouns are physically involved in the speech situation.

Anaphora can be overt or covert (i.e, zero anaphora or pronoun ellipsis). For example, zero anaphora is the omission of a pronoun that its antecedent can be preserved by verb agreement marking morpheme. It is widely used to avoid repetition of old information by overtly stating only the new information. Example:

231. (a) *daabboo ʔaadaʔ-ee mana barumsa-a deem-ø-e*
 bread eat-CNV house education-GEN go-1S-PV
 ‘I ate bread and went to school.’

(b) *lafa ɗaʔ-ee hark-i c’ab-ø-e*
 ground hit-CNV hand-NOM break-3MS-PV
 ‘He fell down and his hands were broken.’

The subjects of the above clauses are covertly given via zero anaphora, since Oromo is a subject pro-drop language and can imply the subject of a clause using verb agreement morpheme. These complex sentences are constructed via merging two independent clauses by making one of the two clauses dependent. The subject of the independent clauses are also elided and covert anaphoras are used in both cases, because they convey contextually retrievable information and Oromo admits subject pronoun dropping in neutral clauses in which the subject is unfocused. However, focused subjects can not be omitted.

Another type of ellipsis is textual and is related with linguistic context, since it covers the previously spoken or written discourse. Locke and Angela (2006:243) state that in textual ellipsis, the omitted element is recovered from the linguistic context. It appears when two sequential sentences have elements in common. The linguistic or textual co-text occurs in variable classes of unit, mainly at nominal groups and clausal level. Example:

232. (a) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa baajʔee k'ab-ø-a garuu C'aalaa-n*
 Megersa-NOM sheep a few has-3MS-IPV however Chala-NOM

hoolaa baajʔee hin k'ab-ø-u
 sheep a few NEG has-3MS-IPV

‘Megersa has many sheep, but Chala has not many sheep.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa baajʔee k'ab-ø-a garuu*
 Megersa-NOM sheep a few has-3MS-IPV however

C'aalaa-n hin k'ab-ø-u
 Chala-NOM NEG has-3MS-IPV

‘Megersa has many sheep, but Chala has none.’

(c) *Magarsaa-n hoolaa baajʔee k'ab-ø-a C'aalaa-n-is*
 Megersa-NOM sheep a few has-3MS-IPV Chala-NOM-FOC

‘Megersa has many sheep and Chala too.’

From the compound structure in (232a) no element is dropped. But, the phrase /*hoolaa baajʔee*/ ‘many sheep’ and /*hoolaa baajʔee hin k’abu*/ ‘has no many sheep’ are elided from the second part of the compound sentence in (232b) and (232c), respectively. The omitted elements can be recovered from the linguistic or textual context. Clause (232c) shows that Oromo express old information using shorter forms (notably proforms and ellipsis). The omitted information is encoded by the proform /-(i)s/ in clause (232c). Thus, only the new information is clearly stated in the second part of the clauses in (232b) and (232c).

9.1.1.1.2 Ellipsis Distribution

Ellipsis can appear in different parts of a clause. Based on its distribution, it can be initial, medial or final ellipses (Locke and Angela, 2006:243). Subject omission is subsumed under initial ellipsis, while object deletion is included under medial ellipsis in Oromo. Example:

233. (a) *C’aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem-ϕ-e*
 Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 ‘Chala went to school.’

(b) *Magarsaa-n hoo mana barumsa-a hin deem-n-ϕ-e-e*
 Megersa-NOM TM house education-GEN NEG go-NEG-3MS-PV-QM
 ‘What about Megersa? Didn’t he go to school?’

(c) *Magarsaa-n hoo*
 Megersa-NOM TM
 ‘What about Megersa?’

Question (233b) and (233c) help to confirm whether Megersa went to school or not based on the context in which clause (233a) is spoken. Unlike clause (233c), example (233b) may not be used when the questioner has no any information about Megersa. The response of question (233c) can vary based on situational context. Question (233b) is changed into (233c) by omitting old information. Oromo shows a tendency to delete old information or to reduce it to pronominal status. Thus, ellipsis is observed in this clause due to the omission of the verb phrase. The

questioner is seeking for the unknown information with great curiosity by omitting the old one in example (233c). In general, the response of both questions is determined by the speech contexts. Question (233b) and (233c) denote that the element that precedes particle /*hoo*/ is forced to become a topic in the response declarative sentence.

Ellipsis distribution can be observed using deletion of various elements of a clause. The subject, object, or the complement of a sentence can be elided. Example:

234. (a) *C'aalaa-n mana barumsa-a deem-ø-e*
 Chala-NOM house education-GEN go-3MS-PV
 'Chala went to school.'

(b) *Magarsaa-ni-s deem-ø-e*
 Megersa-NOM-FOC go-3MS-PV
 'Megersa went too.'

The complement phrase /*mana barumsaa*/ 'school' is omitted from clause (234b), since it can be recovered from the verbal context given in (234a). The proform /-s/ refers back to something already stated, which is not, thus, to be stated in full again in clause (234b). In example (234b) only the focus is overtly stated by deleting old information.

Besides core and non core arguments of a verb, the verb itself can be omitted from a clause. Verb omission is highly used to state only the new information by deleting the old one. The focus marker /-s/ is used as a pro-form in the next example. It substitutes the elided given information, by referring back to what has been already stated. For instance:

235. (a) *Saalale roob-ee jir-ø-a*
 Selale rain-CNV exist-3MS-PV
 'It has rained in Selale.'

- (b) *finfinnee-s*
 Finfinne-FOC
 ‘In Finfinne too’

The above example is a mini dialogue or conversation with question and response clause carried out between two individuals. The predicate */roobee jira/* ‘has rained’ is deleted, since it can be preserved from the linguistic context in (235a). The proform */(i)s/* implies the information conveyed by the entire verb phrase. The interpretation of (235b) relies upon clause (235a) due to, the presence of a deleted element. Thus, questions can be given long or short answers. The response of information questions can be either short or full-fledged responses and the element analogous to the question word in the response clause contains focus. In a short response, only new information or focus center is expressed. Thus, long response is linked with focus domain, while short response is linked with focus center. The responses of information questions are declarative clauses with clearly identified focalizing device and the focused element is marked phonologically or morphologically or via ellipsis. When ellipsis is used, the response clauses are usually relatively short, since they are reduced to focus and usually do not give extra information than what is required, i.e., a truth value.

9.1.1.1.3 Information Questions and Unexpected Responses

Besides giving long or short answer, questions do not always reply in the way the speaker expects, because sometimes it is unlikely to get the required information. In real world conversations, the questioner may be unable or unwilling to reply to a question and may keep silent or say ‘why’ as shown below.

236. (a) *ɫati ɳlma Magarsaa-ti-i*
 you son Megersa-COP-QM
 ‘Are you Megersa’s son?’

- (b) *maalii-f na gaaf-at-ø-e*
 why-DAT me ask-MD-2S-IPV
 ‘Why did you ask me?’

Clause (236b) can be a response for clause (236a) but not an answer since the required information is not obtained. Dik (1997:258) states that “an answer to a question is a linguistic expression which provides the information which was requested in the question.” There is some kind of mismatch between the informational need of the questioner and the response given by the speaker in this question-answer pair. The new information that the questioner is looking for does not match with the information included in the response clause. This kind of reply is usually given due to unwillingness in real conversations. Example:

237. (a) *ʔjoollee meek’a k’ab-t-a-a*
 children how many has-2S-IPV-QM
 ‘How many children do you have?’

(b) *ʔjoollee baajʔee-n k’ab-ø-a*
 children a few-1S has-1S-PV
 ‘I have many children.’

(c) *ʔjoollee maali-t-ʔan k’ab-ø-a-a*
 Children what-COP-I has-1S-IPV-QM
 ‘What children do I have?’

The questioner asks the addressee for the exact number of his/her children in clause (237a). The number of the answerer’s children remain a mystery though the quantifier */baajʔee/* ‘several’ can possibly be a focused element. However the given information does not match with the required information. The response clause in (237b) may show the unwilling of the speaker to tell the exact number of his/her children. At least two different answers could be given for clause (237a) based on the situational context. Response clause (237b) and (237c) may also be used when the answerer does not have any children. These are non-answer response clauses that do not give the information which the speaker’s question shows he wishes to get. The questioner may ask such kind of question due to lack of background information in connection with whether the individual has at least one child or not. These responses may commonly be given when the answerer is not willing or becomes nervous to give the relevant information for various reasons.

Besides being unwilling, a direct grammatical link can be non-existent between a question and answer in some cases. For instance, there is no direct relationship between question (238a) and response clause (238b) though an indirect response is given. Example:

238. (a) *Salaale joom deem-t-a*
Selale when go-2S-IPV
'When do you go to Selale?'

(b) *bara kana hojii baajʒee-n k'ab-ø-a*
year this work a few-1S has-1S-IPV
'This year, I have a lot of work.'

A direct link is lacking between the question and the response clause above. Because sometimes a direct grammatical correlation may be lacking between the question and the response clause. The example shows that IS does not obey syntactic constituency in Oromo. What is required is the relevancy of the information given in the response clause. The questioner may realize that the individual may not go to 'Selale' this year but he will go some other year in the future, may be next year. This implied proposition is likely to be inferred by the addressee depending upon contextual information, but he/she goes well beyond the mere filling out of the missing bits in what is actually stated. Example (238a) denotes that the questioner assumes that the answerer may go to 'Selale' this year but, his presupposition is disproved in response clause (238b). Clause (238b) can be a response but not an answer for the question (238a).

In general, information questions present focus-background information. Foley (2007:403) states that it is the NP that gives the response to the question word that carries the focus/new information, while the rest of the clause is background information. In terms of IS, the bulk of the question is not subsumed under the interrogative focus but under the background information. Content questions cannot be constructed without a question word in the dialect since only question words formulate such clauses. Unlike polar questions, the ending vowel of the last word of the content question cannot be lengthened. Rising intonation is indispensably

required in Oromo content questions to imply surprise or that the addressee didn't hear the response the first time and are requesting to have it repeated. Example:

239. *ānni kam beek-φ-a*

he which know-3MS-PV

'Which one does he know?'

Example (239) has to be spoken with falling intonation, since it is an information question and the question word /*kam*/ is used to indicate the missing information. Information questions can be spoken with rising intonation when the speaker is surprised or asking for the repetition of what has been said. Information questions with rising intonation can be either a content or rhetorical question and interpreted as a direct or indirect speech act based on its purpose and situational context.

9.1.2 Polar Question Information Structure

Polar questions are called yes/no questions. Cruse (2011:162) states that the term polarity is usually denotes opposition. Polarity terms are designated as positive or negative. Payne (1997:295) says that the term yes/no question stands for interrogative clauses for which the expected response is either affirmation or disaffirmation. Unlike information questions that require a focused response, they can be simply replied by using /*ʔejjeen*/ 'yes' or /*lakkii*/ 'no'. They are termed as polar questions, since they presuppose affirmation or disaffirmation or permit 'yes' or 'no' as responses. It is solely the polarity that is in question in polar questions. The addressor seeks for confirmation or denial of the clause content, to be supplied by the pro-form 'yes' or 'no'. Such minimal responses might be offensive when the speaker is interested in elaborated response. Short responses frequently sound rather very impolitely brief (Locke and Angela, 2006:183).

Polar questions are distinct from information questions in relation to their function, because they are simply used for affirmation or disaffirmation than eliciting new information as information question. These are questions with non specified alternatives. In polar questions, the positive

particle /ʔeejjeen/ ‘yes’ confirms a positive or negative question (i.e., makes the answer to a negative question negative). The negative particle /lakkii/ ‘no’ also either positively negates or answers a negative question. The options of polar questions are the proposition and its negation, whereas in content questions, the alternatives are all the various propositions one can find with different individuals in place of the question word.

Oromo does not use basic word order change (i.e, inversion) to construct basic polar questions. They are structurally almost identical to declarative clauses. It uses rising intonation plus lengthening the ending vowel of the last word of the question or rising intonation plus question particles to identify polar questions from declarative clauses. Intonation features are marked by punctuation marks in written communication, but in speech they are marked using rising and falling intonation. Intonation is a basic feature of utterance not that of written language.

Pitch variation can be linked with intonation in Oromo. Intonation patterns integrate clauses and help to clarify their functions or interpretations. Intonation can be used to signal the grammatical structure of clauses. For instance, clause (240a) is a declarative sentence, while clause (240b) is a polar question based on pitch variation when spoken. Oromo declarative clauses are normally uttered with falling intonation, while polar questions are spoken with rising intonation. Falling intonation on yes/no question can be interpreted as abruptness. Example:

240. (a) *ʔnni foon ɲaat-ø-e*

he meat eat-3MS-PV

‘He ate meat.’

(b) *ʔnni foon ɲaat-ø-e-e*

he meat eat-3MS-PV-QM

‘Did he eat meat?’

It is normally unthinkable to utter anything without intoning it. It is possible to alter the intonation of utterances for changing some aspects of its meaning or to modify its function. Rising pitch alone is not used to signal the grammatical structure of polar question. Because

besides high pitch, lengthening the ending vowel of the last word of the question is necessarily required. Intonation is used to denote the contrast between grammatical structures (i.e., questions, and statements). It also helps to show surprise, disbelief, sarcasm, teasing, etc. beyond denoting the contrast between grammatical structures.

Polar questions are different from content questions in relation to their information structure particularly focus marking. Unlike content questions, they are not used to provide missed information rather they confirm or disconfirm the entire clause or some part. Example:

241. (a) *ʔnni foon ɲaat-ø-e-e*
 he meat eat-3MS-PV-QM
 ‘Did he eat meat?’

(b) *ʔeejeen ʔnni foon ɲaat-ø-e*
 yes he meat eat-3MS-PV
 Yes, he has eaten meat.

(c) *lakkii ʔnni daabboo ɲaat-ø-e*
 no he bread eat-3MS-PV
 ‘No, he ate bread.’

There is no explicit option and sense of contrast in polar question (241a), since its purpose is confirming or disconfirming. The addressor simply asks whether ‘he ate meat or not’. The basic polar question in (241a) is replied positively and negatively by the response clauses in (241b) and (241c), respectively. The addressee corrected the information of the polar question by supplying new information in response clause (241c). The response clauses denote that polar questions evoke corrective and assertive focus when they are replied negatively and positively. The negative particle */lakkii/* ‘no’ denotes the rejection of the alternative */foon/* ‘meat’ and its replacement by the noun */daabboo/* ‘bread’ in response clause (241c). Both the rejected and replaced elements have to receive high pitch to be focused. The positive particle */ʔeejeen/* ‘yes’

and the negative particle /*lakkii*/ ‘no’ are used in replying polar questions. The particles are taken as the equivalent of the long affirmative and negative response clause.

Besides corrective and assertive focus, polar questions evoke expanding or additive focus. They add up to the alternative already given in the previous discourse and provide extra information to enrich the discourse. Example:

242. (a) *c’iree daabboo jaat-ø-e-e*
 breakfast bread eat-2S-PV-QM
 ‘Did you eat bread for breakfast?’

(b) *ʔeejjeen foon-is jaad-ø-e*
 yes meat-FOC eat-1S-PV
 Yes, and I had [meat] too.

In this clause, the addressor asks whether the addressee had /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ for his/her breakfast or not. The response clause shows that besides ‘bread’, the addressor ate ‘meat’ for his breakfast. Thus, ‘meat’ is added as additional new information. The particle /*ʔeejjeen*/ is optionally used in the response. Polar questions can also encode exhaustive listing. Example:

243. (a) *Tulluu-n fooni-s daabboo-s jaat-ø-e-e*
 Tullu-NOM meat-FOC bread-FOC eat-3MS-PS-QM
 ‘Did Tullu eat both meat and bread?’

(b) *lakkii ʔnni foon-uma jaat-ø-e*
 no he meat-FOC eat-3MS-PV
 No, he ate only meat.

(c) *lakkii foon k’ofa jaat-ø-e*
 no meat FOC eat-3MS-PV
 ‘No, he only had [meat].’

These clauses have a focused element. The response clauses in (243b) and (243c) encode exhaustive listing focus. The noun /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ is excluded from the alternative, since exhaustive focus excludes all options other than one for identificational purpose. Payne (1997:269) states that “exhaustive listing focus, that information which S asserts is unique in that the rest of the clause is true only with respect to it and false with respect to all other possible information.” The noun /*foon*/ ‘meat’ is marked for exhaustive listing by the focus morpheme /-*uma*/ and the focus particle /*k’ofa*/. Thus, the focus markers are used alternatively without meaning change in this context. The focus markers can also be used concomitantly. The inherently negative particle /*lakkii*/ ‘no’ encodes disagreement or disconfirmation in polar questions.

Oromo polar questions usually retain subject initial word order. They follow the basic word order (i.e., SOV) but they can deviate from the basic word order. Example (243a) is a basic polar question with the normal word order. Oromo has also non-canonically ordered (i.e., OVS) polar questions. example:

244. (a) *daabboo jaat-ø-e -e ãnni*
 bread eat-3MS-PV-QM he
 ‘Did he eat bread?’

(b) *lakkii ãnni daabboo hin jaan-n-ø-e*
 no he bread NEG eat-NEG-3MS-PV
 ‘No, he did not eat bread.’

245. (a) *ãsaa daabboo jaat-ø-e-e*
 him bread eat-3MS-PV-QM
 Is that him who ate bread?

- (b) *ʔeejjeen ʔsaa ɲaat-ø-e*
 yes him eat-3MS-PV
 ‘Yes, it was him who ate.’

Polar questions are frequently used to express assertive focus. In polar question (244a), the focused element is the verb whereas in example (245a) the subject of the sentence is focused. The focus domain does not comprise entire clauses in both examples. Both the core and non core arguments of a verb and even the verb itself can be focused in polar questions. Verb is an element usually focused by high pitch as in (244a). The verb and subject elements in bold are focused upon by high pitch in (244a, b) and (245a, b) in that order. In Oromo, voice rises on the focus or new information, while it falls on the old information, since accentation is linked with new and deaccentation is related to old information. Clause (245a) shows that when the subject of polar question is focused the pronouns take their absolutive form. As a result, gender, person and number distinctions are neutralized.

Like content questions, Oromo polar questions can be given either short or full-fledged answers. Short response is a fragment response and usually involves ellipsis of the given information hence, only the focal element is overtly stated. Indeed, the response of some questions can be a word/phrase, but others need to be replied in one or more complete sentences. Example:

246. (a) *daabboo hin ɲaat-t-a-a*
 bread FOC eat-2S-IPV-QM
 ‘Do you eat bread?’

- (b) *ʔeejjeen*
 ‘Yes’

- (c) *ʔeejjeen ʔani daabboo ni-ʔan ɲaadɗ-ø-a*
 yes I bread FOC-I eat-1S-IPV
 ‘Yes, I eat bread.’

The response clause in (246b) contains only the polarity term or pro-sentence. Because only the positive particle /ʔeejjeen/ ‘yes’ or the negative particle /lakkii/ ‘no’ can answer the questions. Usually, it is enough to supply only the relevant piece of information (i.e., incomplete proposition) without repeating all the words of the question or the given information. Since the addressee can reconstruct the full form of the proposition based on contextual clues. However, it is the full form of the proposition that the addressor intends to communicate. If the arguments of the verb are already familiar to the speaker, it is needless to states them. The presupposed constituent can be dropped and the response can encompasses only the non presupposed part of the clause. A full-fledged answer is also given for the above polar question. In the long response, the words of the question can be repeated to give emphasis, for instance, when we want to deny something. The focus of the addressor is on the polarity term ‘yes’ or ‘no’ and the extension of this term is simply supplied as an elaboration of the ‘yes/no’ response. Oromo polar questions can provide new idea which is nonexistent in the old information as a reason.

9.1.3 Alternative Question Information Structure

Another category of questions is alternative question or choice. Alternative questions offer at least two alternatives and one possibility is expected to be singled out, but again, other variants are possible. They are questions with specified alternatives and typically uttered with falling intonation. The answers of these questions would qualify as having selective or contrastive focus. The questions are formulated by putting the disjunction term /moo/ ‘or’ at least between two alternatives or before the last option in the presence or more than two options. Griefenow-Mewis (2001:63) says that /moo/ ‘or’ is a disjunctive conjunction that usually used in interrogative clauses requiring only decision. Besides the word /moo/, the questions can be formed by lengthening the final vowel of the last word of the question plus rising intonation. However, the intonation is not required when the ending vowel of the last word of the question is short.

The disjunctive conjunction or particle /moo/ is always indispensably required in alternative questions however, lengthening the terminal vowel of the last word and applying rising intonation seems optional. Question particles such as /laata/, /ree/ and so forth. can be used to form the questions. Two or more alternative answers can be given for alternative questions as

denoted below. Clause (247a) is marked by the alternative question marker /*moo*/ ‘or’ plus lengthening the terminal vowel of the last word of the question plus falling intonation.

247. (a) *ɔati buna moo ʃaajii barbaad-t-a*
 you coffee or tea want-2S-IPV
 ‘Do you need tea or coffee?’

(b) *ɔani bunaa-n barbaad-ø-a*
 I coffee-1S want-1S-PV
 ‘I need coffee.’

This alternative question encodes contrastive focus. The highlighted element is put side by side with another option and the clause denotes that focus does not inevitably have to be new information. The addressee is required to choose one of the two disjuncts in clause (247a). He/she is requested simply to respond by choosing one of the two disjuncts (i.e., tea or coffee) and the addressee preferred ‘coffee’ to ‘tea’. The question is linked with in-situ contrastive narrow focus. The contrast is stated overtly, since it involves explicit contrast between /*buna*/ ‘coffee’ and /*ʃaajii*/ ‘tea’. Thus in (247b), the addressee singles out only /*buna*/ ‘coffee’, since only one of the contrasted options is requested to be picked out. In the contrastive focus, the element that refers to something previously mentioned is in focus. In response clause (247b), the noun /*buna*/ ‘coffee’ is taken as new information, since it is marked for contrastive focus though it is mentioned. This noun receives high pitch to mark contrastive focus. However, in the alternative question both options require the high pitch. Implicitly or explicitly stated options are necessary for contrastive focus.

In some cases, the alternatives set might be unrestricted. The options given in the questions can be rejected and replaced by another new entity. Example:

248. (a) *Tolaa-n foonii moo daabboo jaat-ø-e*
 Tola-NOM meat or bread eat-3MS-PV
 ‘Did Tola eat meat or bread?’

- (b) *lakkii* *ʔnni* ***biddeena*** *ɲaat-ø-e*
 no he injera eat-3MS-PV
 ‘No, he ate injera.’

The addressor overtly states /*foon*/ ‘meat’ and /*daabboo*/ ‘bread’ as the only options in the question. However, the options are totally rejected and replaced by another novel entity which is ‘injera’ in the response clause. In the response clause, there is rejection (i.e., negation) and replacement of the speaker’s choice by an entirely novel element. When the response is picked out from the alternatives, the role of the addressee is simply confirming the addressor’s idea to identify the focus word. When the clause is answered by bringing new option into the discourse by rejecting the already given ones, it is marked for corrective focus. Thus, corrective focus rejects an element and brings substitute. Thereby, in (248b) the options introduced in the previous discourse are rejected and replaced by the noun /*biddeena*/ ‘injera’ to correct an erroneous argument and the noun ‘injera’ has to receive high pitch to encode corrective focus. The response clause implicitly denotes that the question was wrongly put.

In corrective focus, the word /*lakkii*/ ‘no’ is usually used as a corrective focus particle to signal the rejection of an option(s) and also helps to distinguish presentational focus from corrective focus. According to Krifka (2006:22) the typical use of contrastive focus is corrective, but it can also have additive function. Corrective or replacive focus replaces an option already introduced in previous discourse or in the common ground (Valle, 2014:56).

Alternative question offers the addressee a choice of two or more elements with various syntactic functions (i.e., subject, object, adjectives, etc.) and presupposes that only one disjunct is to be selected. Owens (1985:208) mentions a couple of points to note about the questions. The first one is that, the responses have exactly identical segmental form as the questions (except in the case of subjects). The second point is that the questions are given in the tone of an equative predicate, which is generally different from the tone/intonation of the word in the question.

Question (249a) has /*ʔana*/ ‘me’ and /*ʔsaa*/ ‘him’ as alternative elements and the addressee is expected to choice one of them. The conjoined pronouns appear in their absolute case, since a

focused subject or a subject falls under the scope of focus appears in absolutive case. Thus, the clause would be illformed, when the conjoined pronouns appear in their nominative case:

249. *ʎana moo ʎisaa (-tu) deem-ø-a*
 me or him FOC go-3MS-IPV
 ‘Is that me or him that will go?’

Besides alternative questions with alternative subject, there are also alternative questions with alternative direct object and complement constituent as in example (249). The alternative questions in (250a) has alternative direct object, while clause (250b) has alternative complement. One of the options is expected to be marked for contrastive focus in the response clause in each clause, since the question usually presupposes only one option.

250. (a) *C’aalaa-n daabboo-da moo biddeena ʎaat-ø-a*
 Chala-NOM bread -COP or injera eat-3MS-IPV
 ‘Does Chala eat bread or injera?’
- (b) *muc’aa-n barc’uʎuma ʎirra moo siree ʎirra taaʔ-ø-e*
 boy-NOM chair on or bed on sit-3MS-PV
 ‘Did a boy sit on a chair or bed?’

In alternative questions with non subject argument options under the scope of focus, the subject is inevitably marked for nominative case. The direct object */daabboo/* ‘bread’ and */biddeena/* ‘injera’ are in the focus domain in clause (250a). The alternative complements */barc’uʎumarra/* ‘on a chair’ and */sireerra/* ‘on a bed’ appear in the focus domain in clause (250b). In all cases, the addressee/answerer has to single out one of the two options as a response. The questions are linked with in-situ contrastive narrow focus and the contrast is stated overtly. The examples show that contrastive focus is not brand new, rather it is a discourse-given or context-given focus. Because the options are context construable. Contrastive focus represents a subset of the set of contextually or situationally recoverable elements for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold (Kiss, 1998:248-249). Indeed, information can be unpredictable without being

new. In alternative questions, the focused elements are put side by side with other options. The above examples denote that focus does not inevitably have to be new information. Valle (2014:56) also shows that contrastive or selective focus puts the focused element side by side with another alternative. The questions denote that the highlighted arguments need not be novel information as often supposed, but only need to be unpredictable in the discourse context, allowing for discourse-given or context-given elements in contrastive focus.

This chapter is concerned with the IS of interrogative clauses. They are used for requesting information. Content, polar and alternative questions vary in relation to their discourse functions. Content questions are basically employed to elicit unknown information by using one or more question words, while polar questions serve for affirmation and disaffirmation of the requested information at least by using pro-sentences or polarity terms. Alternative questions also single out the right possibility from the given options. Various elements are given as focus or new information using content questions since different constituents of a clause can fall under the scope of focus. In these questions, old information is stated and then the questions form a request for new information to supplement the recoverable information. The new information supplied as the response of the content question is focused by high pitch or focus morphemes. Content questions are replied using long or short responses. Long responses are full-fledged responses comprising both focus domain and focus center, while the short ones present only the focus center by omitting the focus domain since focus domain carries contextually recoverable information. Thus, the response of interrogative clauses can usually be only the focus center since focus domain conveys shared and contextually recoverable information. Content questions usually encode completive focus, while polar questions encode corrective or selective focus. Alternative questions also encode contrastive or selective focus by singling out one of possibility from the the given alternatives.

Chapter Ten

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

The topic of this study is IS in Oromo. The study focuses on how information is linguistically structured and distributed in the Tulama dialect of Oromo sentence structures. Descriptive approach was used to attain the objective of the study. The descriptive study is framed based on the theory of FSP. The required data were collected from the native speakers of the language using text recording. Introspective method was used to verify the reliability of the data, since the researcher herself is a native speaker of the language. The collected data were transcribed, glossed, translated and analyzed. From the data analysis, the findings below were yielded.

Oromo uses various linguistic means to encode the contrast between pairs of information units and marks how information is distributed in sentences. It uses prosodical, morphological/lexical and syntactic means to mark information structure or information units.

Among the pairs of IS terminologies, the study dealt with topic-comment expression. Aboutness and contrastive sentence topics were described. Oromo marks sentence topic lexically using converse nouns, verbs, and postpositions via altering point of view. Aboutness topic can be marked lexically by the word /*hoo*/ ‘what about x’ and the term /*waaʔee*/ ‘about’. Sentential topic is mainly linked with given information via definite referring expressions. Thus, proper names, pronouns and NPs having determiner usually become sentence topics, since they convey given information. Sentence topics rarely present new information when a certain entity is introduced into the discourse for the first time. Indefinite expressions are not used as sentence topics, since their referents are not specific.

Non-canonical syntax also encodes marked sentence topics, since non basic clauses are pragmatically marked. Oromo uses various means to rearrange the constituents of clauses to improve its fit with pragmatic requirements. Word order variation correlates with information status. Thus, structures with non-canonical syntax or non basic word orders such as: passivization, topicalization, and dislocation mark sentence topic. These constructions are obtained from the basic clause (SOV) by changing the canonical syntax to encode sentence topic.

In addition to topic-comment structure, the information structure of Oromo sentences can be segmented into given-new information based on the understanding of the addressee. The language uses lexical and morphological means to mark given information. Given information is morphologically marked by the */-ācca/* or */ātti/*. It is also encoded lexically by definite referring expressions such as person, place and time deictic expressions, since these forms usually convey contextually recoverable information. Therefore, linguistic and situational contexts play a vital role in encoding given information. Deictic expressions also can encode focus. However, contextually non recoverable or new information is usually linked with indefinite referring expressions.

Another complimentary notions dealt with in this study are focus-background information. Short response clauses present only focus, since background information is omitted. Focus presents new, emphatic or contrastive information. Unlike deletion of topic or given information, focus deletion is not allowed, since it results in meaningless and ungrammatical sentences. All sentences may have something to inform (may have focus but not topic). Focus deletion hinders the communication dynamism not to move forward.

Oromo uses syntactical (e.g., cleft constructions mark contrastive narrow focus), prosodical and morphological focus marking means. Focus can be marked syntactically by scrambling and cleft constructions. The later type of constructions encode focus by splitting the basic clause into independent and dependent clauses and rearranging the words of the basic clause. Since Oromo has structures similar to simple and pseudo cleft constructions. Simple cleft puts focus before the background, while the reverse is the case in pseudo cleft constructions. Focus is always presented in the independent clause of the cleft constructions. Oromo copula clause may present only the new information or focus, since the language has no expletive pronoun and the copular element is also sometime absent.

Prosody is also another means of focus marking in Oromo. New information, contrastive and emphatic focus are encoded prosodically using high pitch. The high pitch highlights various elements of a clause. When focus is prosodically marked using high pitch, sentences with the

same syntactic structure can have more than one information structures based on the position of the high pitch. The focus is called in-situ focus, since the constituents of the clause are not displaced from their canonical syntactic position. Thus, Oromo uses prosody to encode discourse level information. Various ways of pronouncing the same sentence using high pitch directly affects its semantic or pragmatic meaning (i.e., what the speaker intends to convey based on context) due to the change of the focal element. Prosodic focusing distinguishes one interpretation of a sentence from its other interpretations without word order change, even if they may differ in the way in which the words are taken to relate to each other.

Beyond prosodic and syntactic focusing, morphological focus marking is used. Focus morphemes such as */-uma/*, */-tu/*, and */-uu/* are applied. Words that belong to different word classes can be focused morphologically in the language. Some focus markers select word class and grammatical function, while others do not select both word class and grammatical function. For instance, the morphemes */-tu/* and */-uma/* usually highlight nouns with the grammatical functions of subject and direct object, respectively. While the focus particles */ni/* and */hin/* only highlight verbs. Besides a single focus morphemes like */-tu/*, */-uma/* and */-uu/* and complex morphological focusing is allowable.

Focus is also marked using focus sensitive particles. The subject of a sentence is primarily focused using the focus particles */-ǽllee/*, */k'ofa/*, */ǽmmaa/*, */ǽjjuu/* and so forth. In Oromo, verbs are focused by the focus particle */hin/*, */ni/* and */sirii/*. Thus, the language is very rich in focus marking morphemes and particles and hence does not rely only on prosody to encode focus.

Usually most noun focus morphemes and particles follow the noun, while verbal focus markers precede the verb. More than a single element of a clause can be focused at a time per clause. Noun focus morphemes and particles can appear with verbs, while the focus particles of verbs do not appear with nouns. Noun focus marking morphemes and particles are linked up with a modifier in non bare noun phrases though the scope of focus extends over the whole phrase.

NPs focused by the focus markers */-tu/*, */-umatu/*, */k'ofa/*, */kofa(tu)/* */bicaa(tu)/* and high pitch are not subject marked when apparently subject and the subject is always in its absolutive case or not

marked for nominative case. The fact that nominative case marking is not permitted in a focused subject NP suggests that this feature is postsyntactic, that is, it operates at the level of utterance. But this does not hold for verbal focus marking, which is mandatory in all declarative sentences. This implies that focus is syntactic, meaning that it operates at the syntactic VP where it appears in complementary relation with the negative marker, which also has the same complementary relation with agreement (number or gender) and negation. Such interactions among focus, negation, and agreement suggest that the categories may be syntactic in VPs and post-syntactic in NPs. The reason why nominative case marking is missing from a focused subject NP is that case marking is syntactic and focus marking is post-syntactic, holding at the level of utterance. The aforesaid focus markers neutralize subject-verb agreement. When they highlight subject NPs, the verb shows the concord pattern of the third person masculine singular regardless of the person of the focused subject argument. Apparently, this may show that the focus markers are pragmatics controlled not syntax controlled since they are beyond the syntactic rules of the language. Pragmatics controlled focus markers can move from one element of the clause to another and the speaker is free to focus on various elements of a clause based on the context and the information intended to be communicated, thus, Oromo has flexible focus structure. Most information packaging means are often optional while, some are indubitably required. NP focus markers are usually pragmatics controlled while those of verbs are syntax controlled.

The information structure of copula, passive and negative clauses is also analyzed in this study. Oromo copula clauses encode various focus types by changing their basic word order since the pragmatic functions of focus varies across the types of copula clauses. Passivization encodes information structure. Oromo passive constructions usually promote the direct object/patient of the active clause into unmarked topic position. When the patient argument becomes the topic of an agentive passive, the demoted subject of the active clause becomes focus/new information. Agentless passive clause arguments with different semantic roles can convey new information. Oromo commonly uses an agentless passive than agentive passive. The agent is usually omitted when it is unknown, unimportant, general and so forth. At the expense of the agent deletion, arguments with the semantic roles of instrument, temporal, manner, force or the verb becomes focus or new information.

Negative clauses deny only what has been previously spoken. Unlike passives, they do not bring new information into the discourse via rearranging the IS of clauses. An interaction is realized between focus and negation via marking both negation and focus differently. In Oromo, high pitch, focus morphemes and focus particles encode focus-negation interaction. Thus, it belongs to the group of languages interconnecting focus with negation using special devices not the negation markers. Focus-negation interaction affects the reading of negative clauses by focusing the entire clauses or part of them.

This study also analyzes the IS of various declarative and interrogative clauses. These clauses types vary in their function in relation to IS, due to their discourse functions variation. Interrogative clauses encode different types of focus and are usually used for seeking new information. Content question is used for searching the new information requested by the question word. In content question, given information is stated and the clause forms a request for the new information to supplement what is known. Question words are usually focal and focused by focus morphemes, focus particles and high pitch are usually in complimentary distribution with the focal elements of the response clause. Content questions frequently encode completive or informative focus. On the other hand, yes/no questions confirm or disconfirm the entire clause or part of it. Different elements of a clause including a verb can be focused. Like declaratives, they normally encode assertive focus, while alternative questions encode contrastive focus not new focus, since they present alternatives side by side. Among the various pragmatic aspects of Oromo, this study mainly focuses on the IS of simple sentences. Hence, investigating the IS of compound and complex sentences as well as other pragmatic aspects contribute to the pragmatic study of the language.

References

- Akmajian Adrian, Demers Richard A., Farmer Ann K. and Harish Robert M. 2010. *An Introduction to Language and Communication* (6th edn.) Cambridge: the MIT Press.
- Alemu Dissasa. 2013. A Discourse Analysis of Jaarsumma, a Traditional Method of Dispute Resolution by Community Elders: Arsi Oromo in Focus. Unpublished PhD Dissertation: AAU.
- Andrews, Avery D. 1985. The Major Functions of the Noun phrase. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. I, 243-281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrews, Avery D. 2007. The Major Functions of the Noun Phrase. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. I, 132-223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ansha, Mercy, Akrofi .2014. Information Packaging Focus Marking and Focus Construction in Leteh (Larteh). *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 23(3). 162-179
- Baye Yimam. 1988. Focus in Oromo. *Studies in African Linguistics*. 19 (3), 365-384.
- Bender, M.L and Mulugeta Eteffa. 1976. The Galla. In M. Lionel Bender, J.D. Bowen, R.L. Cooper and C.A. Ferguson (eds.), *The Languages of Ethiopia*, pp.130-148. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bender, Emily, M and Song, Sanghoun. 2012. Individual Constraints for Information Structure. *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*.
- Burling, Robbins. 1992. *Patterns of Language Structure, Variation and Change*. London: Academic Pressing INC.
- Bussmann, Hadumod. 1996. *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Cheng, Shufang. 2012. A Short Analysis of Information Structures of English Sentences. *Academy Publisher*. 2(3), 492-497. www.academypublication.com.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. (2nd ed.) Chicago: The university of Chicago press.
- Crass Joachim, Demeke, Girma A, Meyer Ronny and Wetter Andreas. 2004. *Copula and Focus Constructions in Selected Ethiopian Languages*. Papers on Africa, Languages and Literatures: University of Leipzig.
- Cruse, Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: University Press.
- Cruse, Alan. 2011. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* (3rd edn.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruttenden, Alan. 1986. *Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.) Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Curnow Timothy Jowan .1999. Towards a Cross-linguistic Typology of Copula Constructions. *Proceedings of 1999 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*.
- Dabala Goshu and Meyer, Ronney. 2003. *Focus Phenomena in Wellega Oromo*. Africa and Übersee, Band. 86:161-197.
- Danesi, Marcel. 2004. *Messages, Signs and Meanings: A Basic Textbook in Semiotics and Communication Theory* (3rd ed.). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Debela Goshu. 2011. The Semantics of Oromo Frontal Adpositions. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Oslo.
- Dékány, Éva. 2010. The English Cleft-construction It-clefts. *The Odd Yearbook* 8, 39-78. <http://seas3.elte.hu/odd/odd8/OYB8-2-Dekany.pdf>
- Diessel, Holger. 2012. Deixis and Demonstrative in Maienborn, Claudia, von Heusinger, Klaus and Portner, Paul(eds.) *Semantics* (HSK 33.3), de Gruyter, 1–25.

- Dik, Simon, C. 1997. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause* (2nd ed.) Berlin:Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2002. Copula Clauses in Australian Languages: A Typological Perspective. *Anthropological Studies*. Vol. 44 (1), 1-36.
- Donnelly, Colleen. 1994. *Linguistics for Writers*. New York: State University Press.
- Dryer, Matthew, S. 2007. Word Order. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol.I, 61-132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elena, Herburger. 2000. *What Counts: Focus and Quantification*. Cambridge: the MIT Press.
- Eshetu Kebede. 1981.The Verb to be in Oromo. Unpublished M.A Paper AAU.
- Feda Negesse. 2015. Classification of Oromo Dialects: A Computational Approach. *International Journal of Computational Linguistics (IJCL)*. 6:1-10.
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Population Census Commission .2008. Summary and Statistical Report of the 2007 Population and Housing Census; Population Size by Age and Sex. Addis Ababa.
- Féry, Caroline. 2007. Information Structural Notions and the Fallacy of Invariant Correlates. In Féry Caroline, Gisbert Fanselow, Manfred, Krifka (eds). *The Notions of Information Structure. Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure. Working Papers of the SFB 632*, Vol.6, 13-55.
- Finegan, Edward. 2008. *Language and its Structure and Use* (5th ed). Thomson Learning Inc. Wadsworth. www.academia.edu/.../
- Foley, Willam A. 2007. A typology of Information Packaging in the Clause. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol.I, 362-446. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Foley, William A. and Van Valin, JR. 1985. A typology of Information Packaging in the Clause. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol.I, 282-363. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fribas, Jan.1992. *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fromkin, Victoria, Rodman, Robert and Hyams, Nina. 2011. *An Introduction to Language*. Boston: Wodsworth Cengage Learning.
- Gragg, Gene. 1976. *Oromo of Wellega*. In Marvin.L Bender (ed.), *The Non-Semitic Language of Ethiopia*, London: Oxford University Press, 166-195.
- Givón,Talmy. 1993. *English Grammar: A Function Based Introduction Vol.II*. Amsterdam/Philadelphi: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Griefenow-Mewis, Catherine. 2001. *A Grammatical Sketch of Written Oromo*. Köln: Köppe.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 1983. Focus, Mode and the Nucleus. *Journal of Linguistics* 19(2). 377-417.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 2007. Notions and Subnotions in Information Structure. In Féry Caroline, Gisbert Fanselow, Manfred, Krifka (eds). *The Notions of Information Structure. In Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure, Working Papers of the SFB 632*, Vol.6, 185-203. Am Neuen Palais:Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 2015. Suprasegmentals. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Science* (2nd edn). (23) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.52024-8>
- Hadian Bahram, Manoochehr, Tavangar-Rizi and Amouzade Mohammed. 2013. A Functional Analysis of the Passive Structure in Persian. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 5 (4). 22-37.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics*. 3:199-244.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, Ruquiya. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Matthiessen Christian M.I.M. 2004. *Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd edn.). London: Edward Arnold.

- Hatch, Evelyn . 1992. *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatim, Basim .1997. *Communication Across Cultures Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*: University of Exeter Press.
- Higgins, Roger Francis. 1979. *The Pseudo Cleft Constructions in English*. New York: Garland.
- Hooshmand, Mozghan and Rezai, Vali. 2012. Focus Structure in Persian Interrogative Sentences: An RRG Analysis. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 5(8).
- Jacobs, Joachim. 2001. The Dimensions of Topic-comment. *Linguistics*: 39(4). 641-681.
- Kawachi, Kazuhiro. 2007. A Grammar of Sidaama (Sidamo), a Cushitic Language of Ethiopia. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University at Buffalo.
- Kebede Hordofa. 2009. Towards the Genetic Classification of the Afaan Oromo Dialects. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Oslo.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Passive in the World's Languages. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Vol. I, 243-281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Lucy K, Kahn, Jason M, Kaiser, Elsi and Arnold, Jennifer E. 2013. Information Structure: Linguistic, Cognitive, and Processing Approaches. *WIREs Cogn Sci* Vol.4. 403-413
- Kim, Taeho. 2008. Subject and Object Marking in Conversational Korea. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. The State University of New York. [Gradworks.umi.com/33/20/3320486.htm](http://gradworks.umi.com/33/20/3320486.htm)
- Kiss, Katalin É.1998. Identificational Focus Versus Information Focus. *Language*: 74(2). 245-273.
- Köning, Ekkehard and Siemund, Peter. 2007. Speech Act Distinctions in Grammar. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. I., 276-325.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2006. The Origin of Topic/Comment Structure, of Predication, and Foculation: In Asymmetric Bimanual Coordination. Nascent Language Conference. Rockefeller Bellagio, Italy. [Amor.cms.hu.berlin.de/.../Bimanual Coordi...](http://amor.cms.hu.berlin.de/.../Bimanual_Coordi...)

- Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic Notions of Information Structure. In Féry Caroline, Gisbert Fanselow, Manfred, Krifka (eds). *The Notions of Information Structure. Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure, Working Papers of the SFB 632*, Vol. 6, 13-55.
- Krifka, Manfred and Musan Renate. 2012. Information Structure Overview and Linguistics Issues in Krifka Manfred and Musan Renate (eds.). *The Expression of Information Structure*.(1-44).
- Kroeger, Paul, R. 2005. *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud.1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. [www.Cambridge.org/.../information structure](http://www.Cambridge.org/.../information%20structure).
- Lambrecht, Knud .2000. When Subjects Behave Like Objects: An Analysis of the Merging of S and O in Sentence-Focus Constructions Across Languages. *Studies in Language*. 24(3), 611-682.
- Levinson, Stephen, C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Locke, Philip and Angela, Downing. 2006. *English Grammar: A University Course* (2ed.). NewYork: Routledge.
- Lyons, John.1977. *Semantics* Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matić, Dejan. 2015. *Information Structure in Linguistics*. Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands 2015 Elsevier Ltd.
- Meyer, Ronny and Demeke Girma A. 2007. Topic and Topicalization in Amharic. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*. Vol.28.
- Miestamo Matti. 2007. Negation: An Overview of Typological Negation Research. *Language and Linguistics Compass*.1/5, 552-570. [https://www.researchgate.net/...](https://www.researchgate.net/)
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2017. Topicalization. 言語研究 (Gengo Kenkyu) 152,1-29. <http://www.shigerumiyaagawa.com/s/topicalization> 2017 miyagawa.pdf
- Mukherjee, Joybrato. 2001. *Form and Function of Parasyntactic Presentation Structure*. Brill Rodopi.
- Newmark, Peter.1988. *A Text Book of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Nikolaeva, Irina and Dalrymple, Mary.2011. *Objects and Information Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://books.google.com.et>.
- Owens, Jonathan.1985. *A Grammar of Harar Oromo (North Eastern Ethiopia)*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Payne, Doris L.1987. Information Structure in Papago Narrative Discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Society of America*. 63(4), 783-804.
- Payne , John R.1985. Negation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) , *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. I, 197–242. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Payne, Thomas E.1997. *Describing Morpho-syntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Portner, Paul, Maienborn, Claudia and von Heusinger, Klaus. 2011. Copula Clauses. *In semantics: (HSK 33.2)*, 1805-1829.
- Radford Andrew, Atkinson Martin, Britain David, Clohse Harald and Spencer Andrew. 2007. *Linguistics: An Introduction (2nd edn.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reich, Ingo. 2012. Information Structure and Theoretical Models of Grammar. In Manfred Krifka and Renate Musan (eds.) *The Expression of Information Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica* 27, 53-94.
- Rooth, Mats Edward. 1985. Association with Focus. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts: Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats.2007. Notions of Focus Anaphoricity. In Féry Caroline, Gisbert Fanselow, Manfred, Krifka (eds). The Notions of Information Structure in *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure, Working Papers of the SFB 632*, Vol.6, 57-67.
- Saeed John I. 1982. Focus and Topic in Somali. PhD. Dissertation. University of London.
- Saeed, John I. 1997. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Saeed, John I. 2003. *Semantics (2nd)*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

- Sasse, Hans Jürgen. 2007. Nominal and Actival Predication in Lowland Eastern Cushitic. In Meyer Ronny and Crass Joachim (eds.). *Deictics, Copula and Focus in the Ethiopian Convergence Area*. Afrikanistische Forschungen: Vol. xv.
- Schachter, Paul. 1985. Parts of Speech Systems. In Timothy Shopen (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol.I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shimelis Mazengia .2014. Nominalization via verbal Derivation Amharic, Tigrinya and Oromo (A contrastive study): Unpublished PhD Dissertation: AAU.
- Shopen, Timothy and Paul, Schachter .2007. *Parts of Speech Systems*. In Shopen Timothy (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol.I,1-6. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Taha Yasin.1999. Focus Marking in Oromo: A Functional Grammar Approach. Unpublished M.A Thesis. AAU.
- Tahir In'aaam Ismail.2009.Copula in Standard English and its Counterparts in Standard Arabic. *AL-fatih Journal*. No.39.
- Taylor, John H. 1995. *Linguistic Categorization Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Teshome Tafesse. 2013. Environmental Discourse in Borana Oromo: A Focus on Narratives. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. AAU.
- Tomioka, Satoshi. 2007. Information Structure as Information-Based Partition. In Féry Caroline, Gisbert Fanselow, Manfred, Krifka (eds.) *The Notions of Information Structure in Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure, Working Papers of the SFB 632*, Vol. (6), 97-107.
- Trask, R, L. 2007. *Language and Linguistics:The Key Concepts* (2nd edn.).New York: Routledge.
- Vallduví, Enric. 1990. Information Structure and Scope of Sentential Negation. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. 325-337.
- Vallduví, Enric.1993. The Informational Component. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

- Valle, Daniel. 2014. Focus Marking in Kakataibo (Panoan). *Oklahoma Working Papers in Indigenous Languages* (1): 55-78.
- Van Valin, JR and Lapolla Randy, J. 1997. *Syntax, Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vermeulen, Reiko, koot de Van Hans, Titov, Eleva and Neeleman, Ad. 2009. A Syntactic Typology of Topic, Focus and Contrast. <https://www.researchgate.net/.../253975822>
- Verschueren, Jef .2003. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- von Heusinger, Klaus.1999. Intonation and Information structure. Habilitationsschrift. University of Konstanz.
- Xiao, Richard. 2007. *Information Structure and Sentence Structure*. Lancaster: University Press.
- Yule, George .1996a. *The Study of Language* (2nd edn.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, George.1996b. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, George. 2010. *The Study of Language* (4th edn.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zelege Teshome. 2013. A Discourse of Gender Representation in Oromo Cultural Marriage (Wedding) Practices: The Case of Sakala District, Horo Guduru Wellega Zone. Unpublished PhD Dissertation: AAU.